UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 97—PART 11

JANUARY 3, 1951, TO MARCH 15, 1951

(PAGES A1 TO A1448)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1951

2-19-52

Sup. of Doc

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

The Spirit, Soul, and Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of requesting that a very fine work by Mr. Thomas J. Brooks, assistant commissioner of agriculture for the State of Florida, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is entitled "The Spirit, Soul, and Voice of America," and is the type of reading in which every citizen should be interested. It follows:

THE SPIRIT, SOUL, AND VOICE OF AMERICA

(By Thomas J. Brooks)

The author, Thomas J. Brooks, is assistant commissioner of agriculture for the State of Florida, in charge of the bureau of immigration. Mr. Brooks was born in Tennessee and during a colorful career served that State as Senator. He made a speech in the Senate which the United States Senate thought of enough importance to have printed, as a Senate document, and sent it all over the country. When Mississippi State College created the chair of markets and rural economics, Mr. Brooks was chosen to fill that chair. In this capacity, his work was outstanding and he was recognized and appointed by President Woodrow Wilson upon the recommendation of William Jennings Bryan, then serving as Secretary of State, to represent the United States at the International Institute of Agriculture in Rome, Italy. He was also chosen to be a member of the delegation sent from the United States to study rural credits in Europe. Upon that occasion he was honored by having diplomatic courtesies extended to him by every European country visited. He was chosen by the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Banking and Currency of the United States Congress as consultant at the time of the construction of the Federal Reserve Act. He was called again, by the same committee, as consultant at the time of the construction of the rural credit law. Mr. Brooks is the author of numerous works of prose and poetry. His textbook on Markets and Rural Economics was the first college textbook on the subject. Among his other notable works are two philosophical treatises—March of Mind and Victory Over Doubt. Mr. Brooks is also the author of hundreds of bulletins on agriculture and economics.

Individuals, nations, and races have characteristics; crisis brings them out.

1776: The first test of the soul of America: The Boston tea party; Washington's response; the Declaration of Independence.

1812: The pirates.

1812: The second war with England.

1823: The Monroe Doctrine.

1846: Texas and Mexico.

1861: The Civil War.

1898: The war with Spain.

1914: The First World War: What each nation wanted; American flag and uniform at the peace conference.

1918: Alvin York.

1927: Charles Lindbergh.

1941: Second World War: The ideals involved; the disappointed; Russia; punishing war criminals.

1950: The third world war: A new flag? Battles round the world: The sun never sets on the graves of American soldiers; last messages; empty chairs; help for the fallen foe. The forgotten man—feudalism; our civilization—philanthropies; "so long as that flag"; Uncle Sam's legacy to the future.

THE SOUL OF AMERICA

Individuals have distinguishing characteristics. Under ordinary circumstances you will notice nothing particularly unusual about them; but in emergencies inherent traits will flare up, revealing the real soul of the individual.

Nations have their personalities, their outstanding characteristics, their traits, habits of thought, and manner of conduct. While pursuing the even tenor of their way there may not be a marked difference in their general conduct on questions of national policy or of ethical standards; but when a great crisis comes and the hammer of fate strikes the conscience bell in the campanile of the soul, then we get the overtones of the higher life latent in the mind of the Nation. There may not be many instances when a nation reaches the ideal which it cherishes; but sooner or later it will show its real self to the eyes of the world.

The first test of the soul of America was when it made a protest against the governmental policy of "taxation without representation" and raised a flag of its own, dedicated to the fundamental principle that: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." That was the soul of the new Republic.

George Washington, of Virginia, proposed to equip a thousand men at his own expense to defend that principle and exemplified the superiority of that kingliness that rules in human hearts, in contradistinction to that of tinseled royalty, based on fear and braced by bayonets. When he became President of the new Republic he refused to accept his salary—that was the soul of America. When Patrick Henry thundered the challenge to tyranny with his declaration: "Give me liberty or give me death"—that was the voice of America.

When Nathan Hale said: "I only regret that I have but one life to give to my country." That was the spirit of America.

When freezing soldiers at Valley Forge did not desert, when the snows were stained with blood from their frostbitten feet, that was the spirit of America.

The next striking example of the American spirit was when it defied the pirates of the Barbary States of north Africa and refused to purchase immunity from their depredations on the high seas. Other nations, older and more powerful, were paying tribute to be exempt from molestation of the pirates in their ocean commerce—not so the young nation of the west. Stephen Decatur was sent out with a crew of marines to challenge the desperadoes. He cleaned them out and that was the end of their robberies or collecting tributes from any country. That was the soul of America.

Although the United States of America had been recognized by Great Britain, the dogma was still held to that "once an Englishman always an Englishman" and the mother country still claimed the right to enter American ships, in search of Englishmen to impress into English service.

Again the spirit of America glowed and war ensued (1812–14), which ended triumphantly for America. The soul of America rang true to the ideals which have inspired every turn in the progress of liberty, independence, and self-reliance.

When the Nation became firmly established and recognized internationally, the nations of Europe looked with covetous eyes on the Latin-American states and made gestures in that direction. From Washington there emanated the famous Monroe Doctrine, to the effect that no crowned head should set up a kingdom in the Western Hemisphere (attempted in 1865 by Maximillian). As late as the Presidency of Grover Cleveland, England proposed to send battleships to Venezuela to force the payment of debts to England. President Cleveland sounded the warning that such an act would be considered a declaration of war and the United States would take part. Needless to say, nothing was done to forcefully collect the English debt. This doctrine represents the soul of America.

Citizens from the United States went to Mexico, established a colony and applied for a State charter from the Mexican Government. It was refused. This led the Colonists to declare Texas a republic. Of course, war followed. The President of Mexico was captured and made to sign an agreement, acknowledging the independence of the Lone Star Republic of Texas. There ensued a dispute as to just where the line between Texas and Mexico should be. In the meantime, Texas applied for admission to the United States of America as a State, and was admitted. This made the dispute as to boundary a question for the United

States and Mexico to settle and war followed. Old Glory waved over the proud heights of the castles of Montezuma. Mexico ceded a vast territory, mostly deserts, and the United States paid cash for part of it. The use of that has since been made of this country amply justifies the change of ownership.

When the original colonies were being settled slavery was recognized throughout Africa and in many parts of the world. The slave trade became profitable. The colony of South Carolina was the first to attempt to outlaw the trade, but England forbade its being stopped. A verse from Pope's Essay on Man comes to mind:

"Evil is a monster of so frightful a mein
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
But, seen too oft, familiar with its face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

South Carolina was the first State to fire a gun in its defense. For 4 years the Union was baptised in fire and blood. The earth was billowed with the graves of hundreds of thousands and the soil moistened with the tears of sorrowing kindred shed o'er the fallen brave. The true soul of the Nation was not in the tones that rang out from the tower of conscience on either side. There was a jargon of discordant notes. When it was all over the Union was not divided. Slavery was abolished. It was the test of time that brought out the feeling of a common heritage and each respected the other for his valor. This feeling of mutual respect represented the soul of America and since then, the blue and the gray have fought side by side 'round the world:

"Against the wrongs that need resistance
For the cause that needs assistance
For the future in the distance
And the good that they might do."

Spain at one time laid claim to more than half of the Western Hemisphere. It was the custom during the days of exploration to claim all lands discovered for the country represented. (How would those Europeans have viewed the claims, if a ship load of Indians had landed on their shores and claimed the country by right of discovery?) The newly discovered lands were held as conquered, but not annexed boundaries. The remarkable fact is that no country practiced taking in any of its discoveries as a part of its own nation but held them as contributory dependencies. The United States of America is the first to set the example of making no discrimination between new territory and the Original Thirteen States as to rights and privileges under the Constitution. We have always practiced the declaration set forth in the beginning—Government should be by consent. Thirty-five States have been organized since the original 13 and all have the same status and rights.

Holding peoples as conquered vassals in discovered lands is still practiced on far-eastern islands by European nations. England learned a lesson when she threw away a pearl richer than all her tribe, and lost the American colonies. She does not tax her dominions beyond the seas but holds them by trade and national sentiment.

Spain was practicing the feudalistic system as of old and had lost all of her American holdings but Cuba. She was ruling by rank tyranny. A revolt occurred and the United States looked on with increasing disgust, horror, and resentment. Viewing this struggle of the people to free themselves, the United States declared war on Spain in the interest of Cuba. When the war was over, the United States purchased the Philippines from Spain and gave those islands territorial status with the promise of freedom. For these acts this Government did not ask one dollar of indemnity, one bit of land, or promise of any favors. What other nations ever fought a "good samaritan" war? When the Philippines were set free and then invaded by Japan, we drove them out and asked no favors for that. These deeds were exemplification of the principle that patriotism did not stop at boundary lines, but extended in defense of a principle 'round the world.

When World War I broke out there was no intention on the part of this country to take part. The war dragged on. American vessels were sunk by Germany. The purpose of the aggressor was conquest, with no limit as to boundaries. The only interest this country had in the struggle was to oppose aggression, and to join those fighting in self-defense. Monarchies, republics, despotisms, and neutrals were involved.

The immediate cause of the conflict was Austria's strife with one of the Balkans. The outcome of the world-wide antagonisms was of vast concern to the United States in its ultimate results. All contending forces seemed evenly balanced, when suddenly Russia withdrew to fight a civil war. This brought a crisis. Autocracy and conquest were on the aggressive and bid fair to win. At this point the United States entered on the side of the defensive—another instance of helping those who were right and needed support. The hammer of fate struck the conscience bell in the campanile of the soul of America. War on land, on the sea, under the sea, and in the air spread 'round the world.

The only flag that waved along the battle line from the North Sea to the Mediterranean that did not seek a dollar of indemnity nor a foot of land as reward of victory was the Stars and Stripes. The only uniform worn by the 25,000,000 soldiers mustered into service that sought no material gain was the uniform of the soldiers of Uncle Sam. Germany wanted expansion, Austria wanted the Balkans, Bulgaria wanted territory, Turkey wanted anything she could get, Russia was jealous of the Central Powers encroaching on the Asiatic countries which she coveted, Italy wanted territory, France wanted Alsace-Lorraine, England wanted the German colonies, the United States wanted nothing—but peace. That was the soul of America—the success of a righteous cause.

Patriotism has assumed a wider meaning than mere love of country; to America it means love of principle and liberty throughout the world.

At the peace conference every government represented its claims and grievances. The United States was the only nation represented that asked for nothing—refused to accept anything. The President of the United States was there to defend the weaker nations, and incurred the lasting enmity of some of the stronger ones who wanted to treat the smaller ones ruthlessly.

"Other nations fought bravely
For their land and their line
But thou hast fought for a stranger
In hate of a wrong not thine."

That is the soul of America.

Individuals show forth the principle of lofty human character, and interpret for the Nation and the world the ideals of true nobility of soul. To the extent that we have a citizenry led by these spirits the future is safe from the forces of evil, but should we cease to have such leadership an evil retribution will claim its own.

When Lindbergh, the Columbus of the air, made his memorable trip across the Atlantic from the United States to France—alone—he was lionized on two continents; but it did not turn his head. Gentle, unassuming, unspoiled, he took the praise of his heroism with becoming modesty. Large offers to go into the movies did not tempt him—that typified the soul of America. When Alvin York performed the most remarkable feat in the annals of warfare, breaking up two machine-gun nests, capturing and bringing into camp 132 prisoners at one time, he aroused the admiration of all the Allies. He was acclaimed so widely that he was bewildered, but it did not change his attitude or kindle a vain pride. At a banquet at the Waldorf Astoria, listening to the eulogies proclaimed by men of note, he felt no elation but remarked afterward that he would have much rather been at home in the mountains of east Tennessee. When offered fabulous sums to sign advertisements or to go into the movies, he replied "No; this uniform that I wear shall never be commercialized. It cost too much to be measured in gold." That typified the soul of America.

The Second World War came only a quarter of a century later and was instigated by the same nation as that of the first, Germany. Again the war dragged on and finally the United States entered it on the side of the defenders as before. And of all the wars of recorded history this was the most world-wide and devastating in property and loss of life. Unprecedented carnage decimated most of Europe and much of the Far East. No aggressor ever made as much headway before being stopped as did Germany in this war. Again it appeared that Germany would conquer all Europe when the United States joined forces with the Allies against the Germanic powers. This time Germany was crushed.

Strange to relate, one of the more powerful allies then boldly announced that a capitalist and communistic regime could not both survive in the same world. Russia began operations showing that she would undertake the same thing that Germany had tried—world conquest. But the methods followed were different. Russian saboteurs create confusion in other countries. Russia has vetoed peace measures 45 times in the United Nations and keeps an iron curtain around her empire where she practices slavery on millions, to keep production up and military progress in full swing.

Urging satellite countries to start trouble with the United Nations resulted in war in Korea. For the first time in all history there is a flag symbolizing the United Nations now flying in Korea led by the Stars and Stripes.

Old Glory has been carried around the world in defense of the principles on which this Government was founded. It was bowed to at Yorktown by the army of the most powerful nation in the world at that time. It drove piracy from the high seas when older nations were paying tribute for immunity to their commerce. For the second time it humbled British arms for invading American ships in search of seamen. It waved triumphantly above the proud heights of the Montezumas in Mexico. It stood the acid test of 4 years of civil strife. It sent tyranny back across the sea to crouch at the feet of throne-ruled Europe and freed Cuba and the Philippines. It wrote history on the battlefields of the Argonne and the Marne in the First World War. It attested the same zeal for liberty in World War II in Algiers, in Italy, in France, in Belgium, in Holland, in Germany, in the far-off Pacific Islands, in the jungles of the Far East, and in Japan. The sun never sets on the graves of American soldiers who gave the last full measure of devotion to the principles of the Government as established by its founders. A million girls and women took part in the military shops and shared the hardships of army life in these two wars. Many a dying soldier spoke his last message to a faithful nurse, who took down his message and his address as she brushed the death damp from his brow. Many an orphan at home no more hears an answer to the call for daddy. That is the soul of America.

Peacetime vigilance is as necessary as is alertness in war. Depression reached a climax in this country in 1933. The worst period of economic paralysis in our history put millions out of work. The Government turned to the "forgotten man" and extended aid to the millions out of work and willing

to earn an honest living. None was too poor or insignificant to be recognized—that was the soul of America.

Who has been the forgotten man down through the ages? He on whose shoulders rests the burdens of the material world. He is typified by the toilers of all time who have fed, clothed, and sheltered the teeming millions of all lands, but who has been scorned by those who profited by his labor.

This forgotten man built the Pyramids of Egypt, the walls and swinging gardens of Babylon, the palaces of Nineveh, the temples of Palestine, the Parthenon of Athens, the Colosseum of Rome, and the castles of feudalistic Europe.

Once in a great while this forgotten man speaks with the voice of desperation, and governments of class rule quake and tremble. This voice was heard in France and monarchy crumbled in the great "reign of terror" and the Bastile, symbol of feudalism, fell.

It was the voice of the forgotten man that brought forth the Magna Carta in England as organic law, superior to the whims of kings and feudal lords. He tore authority from the castles on the hill and placed it by the fireside of the cabin in the valley.

It was the voice of the forgotten man that inspired the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America.

It was the voice of the forgotten man that wrought havoc with the royal despotism of Russia; but, he only exchanged one despotism for another and which is disturbing the peace of the world and causing preparations for another war. A new dictatorship promised security, only to lead to subjugation. A new coterie is reaching for the conquest of the world. A distracted world looks on in bewilderment and horror. The fate of civilization swings in the balance.

The men who used to be forgotten are not forgotten in this country. The man and woman who are in the humble home, behind the plow, by the forge, in the mine, on the highways, in factories, colleges, and in the Government are not forgotten. He speaks in all lawmaking bodies, in administrative offices, in institutions of learning and guides the destiny of the country. That is the voice of America.

What have we to show the world of those things for which we are proud? What kind of civilization have we built that we can point to as an example of progress and achievement, as compared with those of any and all parts of the globe?

We have reached up and harnessed the lightning from the skies and made a whispering gallery of the world. We build broadcasting stations and talk to every nation and people in the uttermost parts of the earth. We build a civilization with the highest standard of living that has ever existed on this planet. We enjoy more of the equipment of a cultured life than ever before. We dig ores from the mountains and lo, iron monsters roll on tracks of steel across continents, carrying those who rush to and fro, and the burdens of the commercial world. The oceans are flecked with floating palaces carrying people across the seas and the products of every clime from zone to zone. The continents are made to blossom with magnificent cities where the cornucopia of progress pours its bounties into the lap of civilization. Nor does man stop here; the very planet is made to tremble to the vibrant touch of the genius of man. Nor does he stop with the earth; out through space he dares to investigate. From analyzing the atom with hidden powers to exploring the boundless realms of space, with lens, mystic signs and numbers he accurately calculates an eclipse of the sun or moon a thousand years hence. Nor does he pause at solar walk or milky way; on through space he goes balancing galaxies and systems of creation on pivots of thought.

"Let blank defeat, and scorn, and shame
Be his who strives to bind
The onward, leaping waves of thought
The free tide of the mind."

After World War II, for the first time an international civil court tried the instigators of wars of aggression as common criminals. That was a new procedure in jurisprudence. The future of the human race depends on the rational statesmanship exercised by the governments of the world. This Nation set the example of taking a vanquished foe by the hand and helping to restore him to normal life.

We have fought more wars for the liberation of others than all the nations of the past or present. We have given more for philanthropy than all the rest of the world. Are we not jeopardizing our solvency to pour out so many billions of money to resuscitate the bankrupt nations of the eastern continent?

If failure lies in wait, it will be because the Nation and its future citizens have lost the inspiration of the ideals as recited here. The torch of our liberty was lit at the sacred altar of high resolve. The youth of the land should hold to no standard short of the ideal that one is not worthy of the proud title of man, unless he is willing to work for the happiness of unborn generations who may never know that he ever lived. Only by this inspiration can the torch of liberty and justice be passed on to those who follow the vision of unfolding glory. Thus will our country be:

"Like the eagle whose gaze
Feeds on the noontide beams;
Whose golden plume floats aloft
Above the mountains and the crags."

In the language of Gen. Sam Houston in the United States Senate:

"Sirs, so long as that flag bears aloft its glittering stars, bearing them victoriously in the din of battle and waving them triumphantly above the storms of the ocean, so long, I trust, shall the rights and liberties of the American people be preserved and transmitted as a sacred legacy from one generation to another, till discord shall wreck the spheres, the grand march of time shall cease and not one fragment of all creation is left to chafe on the bosom of eternities' waves."

If the legacy we leave to the future rings true to a cultured conscience, then shall the Nation's spiritual glory call for emulation and blend with that which shone from the martyrs of truth in all ages and with the torchbearers of progress who have led the peoples of the earth from savagery to civilization.

Capitalism and the Modern Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward T. McCormick, Commissioner, Securities and Exchange Commission, gave the following talk to the Calvin Bullock Forum in New York City on December 12, 1950. I feel that this is a very timely subject and one that gives some very basic and fundamental facts regarding capitalism and corporations as they exist today. Under leave to extend, I include the above-mentioned:

CAPITALISM AND THE MODERN CORPORATION

(By Edward T. McCormick)

Mr. Chairman, guests of the forum, when the time came for the Temporary National Economic Committee (popularly known as the TNEC) to plan its report on the concentration of economic power it hired a word expert. You would all recognize his name if I were at liberty to reveal it.

For a very fancy price he wrote a confidential memorandum on the wording of the report. His main idea was that certain words were irritation centers and should be avoided. One of his "bad" words, one of the words he cautioned against, was "capitalism." Instead he recommended using sugar-coated variants.

In recent years there seems to have been a considerable reluctance to use the word "capitalism"—as though there was something in its implications of which we might be ashamed. I have never understood that reluctance. To me it is a good word—grand in its history and meaning.

Within the space of a few generations we have, under capitalism, changed our world so thoroughly in its technology, its economic structure, and the amount and forms of its wealth that it is not too much to say that we have been living through a revolution. It has brought about, by peaceful means, a spread of opportunity and of the real goods of life which bloody revolution has never been able to achieve. By natural development it has changed the face of our economy without shock to our social ideals or social values. Nevertheless, like any change, it has brought problems with it, and has created the need for vigilance in preserving those ideals and values.

Essentially, capitalism is a system of private productive enterprise, based on the profit incentive. It includes the local blacksmith who has saved enough to set himself up in business, and the giant corporation that organizes the savings of thousands of investors and the work of thousands of employees into productive, profit-making enterprise.

However, it is the corporation that is the outstanding characteristic of our business life and it is my view that the development of capitalism to the present high level of productive efficiency would have been impossible without the creation of the corporate form of organization. In other words, it is this unique, artificial personality which has made it possible to bring together the enormous pools of funds, labor, and management so necessary to create our modern productive and distributive machinery, and to keep it moving forward.

I may note, at this point, that when we talk today about the small-business man, we can no longer refer only to the blacksmith and small shopkeeper. Millions of American investors, whose savings are pooled to make giant corporate enterprise possible, are the small-business men of our economic generation.

Perhaps the simplest way of understanding the importance and the special nature of the modern corporation is to see it as a government within a government; to recognize that the job of organizing the vast sums of investment, and the huge labor forces under corporate control are problems of government. When we see the corporation as a business government we can see in perspective many of its developments, and understand many aspects of modern corporate regulation.

We think of the concepts of democracy, bureaucracy, oligarchy, etc., as being related exclusively to established civil governments. In fact, all of us know from experience that government is a necessary attribute of any efficient collective action, whether it is civic, social, military, or economic, and in all these

forms of collective endeavor as the venture becomes larger and more complex the premium on centralized and efficient government becomes greater and the difficulty of preserving the direct contact of the individual with the affairs of the venture becomes magnified, and entrenched and irresponsible control, based on apathy, ignorance, and misuse of the franchise machinery is a possibility in any group action—corporate or otherwise.

Furthermore, in each situation, the full participation of the individual, based on information and a fair opportunity to exercise his voting rights is the only democratic answer to entrenched and irresponsible control.

Many of us are strangely double-minded about the problems of government. We accept as basic to our system a set of constitutional guaranties of our civil rights and civil liberties. We are proud of the entire machinery of justice that works to preserve those rights. Yet, when our Congress belatedly recognized in the 1930's that the very same guaranties should apply to the government of our business enterprises in which the public had a financial interest, cries of anger went up. We were, it was confidently observed, departing from the American tradition.

Understandably, one seldom hears that sort of criticism of our Federal securities laws today. Along with our acceptance of the corporation as a system of business government has come an acceptance of the notion that the citizens of that government—that is, the investors—should have access to material information and the right to make an intelligent and informed use of their votes.

We tend today to accept the corporation and rules for corporate conduct as matters of course. It is natural that we should. Practically every type of business endeavor is now carried on through the corporate device and it is well-nigh impossible to state an accurate figure for the number of corporations—industrial, commercial, charitable, etc.—operating in this country. But according to recent figures released by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, about 536,000 corporations filed income-tax returns in a recent tax year. Some idea of their significance can be gained from the fact that their total compiled receipts for that year amounted to the enormous figure of $290,000,000,000.

These statistics are staggering. They tell us how much of a change has taken place in historical methods of business organization when we compare them with the past. The aggregate wealth of publicly subscribed corporations in England in the middle of the sixteenth century was only about £10,000, and at the height of the speculative fever in 1720, in the days when the South Sea bubble grew and burst, their wealth amounted to but £50,000,000—an aggregate for the whole of England that would make one good-sized enterprise today.

Historically in England and many other countries, a businessman had to petition the sovereign or the legislature for a special patent or a special statute in the event he desired to organize a corporation. There were several reasons for that. In early days the corporate form was often associated with monopoly privilege and the crown or the state was likely to grant that privilege only if adequately compensated for it. However, even though the appeal of limited liability drew more and more ventures of a competitive type into the corporate form, special acts of legislature continued until several of our States, in the last century, passed what the lawyers call general incorporation statutes—laws under which any legal venture might be incorporated, with more or less freedom in the promoters to write their own ticket in setting up the venture and dividing powers between the investors and the management.

Unfortunately, the turn of this century brought with it a race among the States to liberalize their corporation laws in order to attract the revenues that come from incorporation fees. Almost as quickly as lawyers' ingenuity could figure out ways of making the sale of securities, the payment of dividends, the manipulation of participations easy and legal, the laws were amended. In analogy to another type of competition among States, the phrase "Corporation Reno" was widely used as a description of places where the law was bent to serve the promoters' aims.

Any survey of the corporate charters and practices which mushroomed on these liberalized laws will convince even the most dubious that while the laws certainly encouraged promotions in corporate form, they were also making possible such overreaching and abuse that if left unattended would soon have seriously threatened the very foundation of our capitalistic system.

An over-all survey of the ills that resulted from these abuses is beyond my scope. But we have had an excellent sample of some of the financial consequences of this liberalization in the history of our public utility holding company empires. Here was an industry which by its nature should have withstood changes in economic cycles better than almost any other. Yet the standardless and unchecked pyramiding of these empires, the creation of overburdening and complex financial structures, the manipulation of accounts and of public investors' rights that characterized some of these enterprises, most of them legal under the enabling corporation laws of the States, made the structures so vulnerable that they levered adverse changes in the underlying companies into tremendous losses for public investors.

The frequency with which the corporation had historically been used to avoid contract obligations, defraud creditors, evade covenants, and perform skulduggery generally, led people like Woodrow Wilson, who was certainly no rabid radical, to condemn the lawyers for letting loose on society this instrument for the subversion of individual obligations.

With the growth of corporations, with the widespread of public ownership in corporations, operating in many States, with the ever-increasing importance of public capital, something had to be done to preserve the integrity of the investment in corporate securities and the proper relation between the management and investors.

Federal regulation in this field was inevitable.

There are two lines of development in corporate standards and methods of financial regulation exemplified in the Federal laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission. One line is purely regulatory. It aims directly at prescribing the types of securities that can be issued, the conditions of issuance, the standards that are to be followed in dividend and other policies. That type of regulation is exemplified in the Public Utility Holding Company Act. However, it is limited in its field of application and has been, so far, incidental to major utility system reorganization programs prescribed by the law.

The other type is exemplified by the Securities Act of 1933 and the reporting requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934—a pattern whose primary emphasis is on disclosure.

That we have, under our Federal legislation, made great strides in improving standards of disclosure is obvious. But the obvious is sometimes worth repeating. Not only the requirements of Federal law under the securities acts, but great strides in the development of accounting technique have ended, we hope for good, the good old days. The good old days were the days when the Banker's magazine took corporations to task for financial statements "notoriously incorrect, and in many cases made so systematically, for the purpose of concealing from the stockholders and the public violations of law and want of fidelity to their trusts," and when Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review complained "Why should these officers be allowed to carry on their trust in secret, to keep from the public all knowledge of the changes in the value of the property? Indeed it is very much owing to the lack of such information that investors shun these securities." They were the days when William Z. Ripley called the disclosure practices of the 1920's "impublicity."

A securities act and an SEC were necessary because it was deemed wiser and more beneficial to buyer and seller alike to prevent loss at the outset through proper advance disclosure than to let mistake or design cause harm which litigation seldom cures. Yet the standards of disclosure under the Securities Acts are basically not new.

Companies which by inadvertence or design skate too closely to the limits of proper disclosure required by Federal law are likely to attribute the SEC's concern with correct disclosure to bureaucratic idiosyncrasies. But the obligation of one who sells securities to tell the whole truth about what he is selling predates the Securities Act. Lord Kilsant can tell you that. He was jailed by a British court because the company of which he was president sold securities under a prospectus which correctly stated average earnings of his company over a period of years but failed to disclose that there were losses in the later years and that profits in the earlier years were war profits. Our Supreme Court awarded heavy damages under common law against an underwriter whose prospectus failed to fix clearly the boundaries of areas in which the issuer had timber rights. That is the kind of disclosure that is sometimes branded as "technical" when required by the SEC. But these cases were decided by courts and not by bureaucrats, and they were not decided under the Securities Act.

As a result of these laws and the increase in public confidence in our system of business enterprise, the corporate security has emerged as one of the most significant forms of modern wealth. Laws which protect the integrity of a security, as one of my colleagues in the SEC once remarked, are as basic as ancient laws against clipping gold coins which were so necessary in maintaining the stability of early gold economies.

But I wish to add that protecting the integrity of the security is not merely a job of policing the relation between the stockholder and his management. One of the prime attributes of the modern security is its liquidity. Liquidity depends on fair and orderly markets. Therefore, protecting the integrity of a security involves also a surveillance of the market in which the security is traded.

To the SEC has been delegated this responsibility.

Markets at their best are indexes of values. The aim of our current system of market regulation is to keep them such. We must achieve this objective, for our securities markets are more than mere barometers of business conditions. They are direct causative factors as well. They not only record the weather, they make it. Businessmen are as sensitive to the behavior of the securities markets as they are to other business factors. Not only are plans of financing likely to be dropped or modified in response to market conditions (thus affecting the expenditure of funds for working capital or plant and equipment) but the general mood of businessmen, their willingness to risk expansion and to maintain full employment may be affected by securities market conditions.

Our activity in regulating the markets places its whole emphasis in keeping the markets from becoming an instrument of any particular person's or group of persons' idea of what price should be. A manipulator and an honest economist may join in believing that the market at any given time is underpricing a security. But neither the economist nor the manipulator is allowed to tamper with the market as a reflection of the collective judgment of buyers and sellers.

I wish to emphasize, however, that our antimanipulative activities, coupled with the information requirements of the Securities Acts and the periodic publication of reliable information by listed companies, are not intended to guarantee that markets will not fluctuate sharply. We have been observing such fluctuations within the past few weeks. But these activities and widespread information are invaluable aids in keeping the long-run markets geared and anchored to reality.

It is hard to measure our success in the policing of our markets and in tempering market behavior with information and disclosure. I believe that we have had a great deal of success, and that the old-fashioned rigs are largely things of the past. One measure of our performance has been the uninterrupted continuity of our markets. During the existence of the SEC they suffered shocks from world events that could, in an era of unregulated high-binding, have driven them into such extreme disorder as to require shutting them down for a period. That has never happened under the SEC and we will have to see events of unprecedented magnitude before it ever becomes a matter of serious consideration.

To keep markets free and open so that this vital barometer and causal factor in our economy shall not be a prey to manipulation, to keep markets orderly within reasonable limits by the best and most reasonable forms of regulation we could provide, are more than technical challenges. I hope that my discussion has shown that they are jobs of top priority in our economic system.

In view of the fundamental role of the corporation in our economy it follows that those who operate our corporations have a high responsibility for the maintenance of our capitalistic system. Unlike the big names of the last generation, the names of bankers whose primary emphasis was on finance and on operating the engines of finance, today's big names are those of the corporate managers who have the job of day-to-day running of these business empires.

How these managers treat with labor, how they react to the public needs, to Government policies affecting the economy, and to the rights of investors will directly affect our strength.

As time goes on and we realize the depth of our commitment to a stable world national morale becomes a top-drawer concern. In measuring the responsibility and performance of the management of American big business, I do not think it too far fetched to suggest that management has as much to do with the national morale as it does with the national economy. The way of life which we defend is in large part defined by our corporate system, and the managements of big business cannot help but bear direct responsibility for the system and the values that Americans are called on to fight for.

I think that the signs are encouraging. More than ever before, management is forward looking, responsive to the needs of those affected by business, and willing to look at its problems in broad perspective.

Great tasks lie ahead of all of us, and without that kind of management we may fail. With it all our united efforts can be pitched toward a better America in a better world.

Change of House Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1949, when the resolution changing the rules of the House was presented, I was a new Member just freshly sworn in. While I had had considerable training in the law prior to that time, I was not too familiar with the rules of the House of Representatives and parliamentary law generally. I had no opportunity then, as a new Member, to draw any conclusions as to how the change of rules would operate on legislation. I was in the same position at that time as many of you Members who are sitting in the House for the first time today.

I voted for the change of rules on January 3, 1949, because at that time I felt with the very meager information I had concerning the effect of the change, that it would actually further true representative government. After sitting in the House for 2 years, and watching the operation of the rules change, I find that I was mistaken in my idea that the change would promote truly representative government. I find, on the other hand, that the rules change actually blocks the legislative processes, and in addition, gives additional dictatorial powers to one Member of the House of Representatives. I therefore shall vote for this amendment today, and urge all my colleagues who may or may not be well informed as to the operation of this rule, to do likewise.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a defense measure.

It has long been recognized by the Defense Establishments of the United States Government, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Resources Board as well as the Army and Navy, that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will be a substantial addition to the industrial mobilization requirements of this country. In this view the Canadian Government authorities as well as the Canadian-American Joint Board of Defense concur.

The recent developments in international conditions emphasize again the fact that the defense of the American way of life and of individual freedom all over the world will fall upon the manpower and resources of the United States and its northern neighbor, Canada. When we contemplate the disparity in the population resources between ourselves and our enemies, it is obvious that the only way we can overcome this handicap is by the utilization of power, improved technology, and natural resources.

One of these basic resources is the steel industry which is at the foundation of our industrial civilization. The continued operation of the steel industry and its expansion requires very large amounts of iron ore. It is now recognized that this country must utilize, in addition to Minnesota and Michigan, new sources of iron ore which must be brought to our middle western steel mills. This is at the very foundation of our strength and we cannot tamper with it without inviting disaster.

It is important that this vital raw material be secured from our own sources in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and from other continental sources such as Ontario and Labrador in order to save our supplies, our ships, and our seamen from the danger of enemy submarines. Viewed in this light the St. Lawrence seaway has become a national necessity.

The present conditions make it obvious that whether we engage in defensive mobilization or we are plunged into war we are in a long period of emergency and of danger. This period must be viewed in a longer span of years than World War II, which lasted from 1939 to 1945. We must in fact think of the development and mobilization of this country in terms of 10 or more years because the struggle for survival will be a long one.

Recent newspaper reports indicate that Soviet Russia, which undertook a gigantic water development program connecting the Volga River with the Don River to create through navigation from the Black Sea to the Caspian Sea and from the Caspian to the White Sea and from the White Sea to the Baltic Sea, which was started in 1946, is nearing completion and it is being given high priority as a part of their war mobilization program. In connection with this development the Russians are diverting water from the Arctic watershed to the Caspian Sea and in the process are generating huge amounts of power.

It is essential, therefore, that we in this country consider the continental developments in Canada as well as in the United States for mutual defense of the

whole Northern Hemisphere. This project, more than any other, will add to the joint capacity of our two countries to wage a successful struggle over the difficulties ahead.

Comparison of 1950 Political Polls With Election Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD relative to a series of predictions made by a number of political prognosticators and poll-takers on the congressional elections of 1950 in comparison with the actual results.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the pollsters and the politicial prophets are to be given publicity and attention prior to an election, they also deserve and should be given an equal amount of attention and publicity after an election. Having the pleasure of knowing personally most of the galaxy of predictors whom I shall quote, I am sure they are all more than willing to have their past predictions and prophecies spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the generations to come after us may have the benefit of their wisdom and their clairvoyant powers, as so well displayed in the weeks and months prior to the congressional elections of November 1950.

So, in the desire to be of service to posterity, I hereby submit the following report of recent political prophecies:

1950 ELECTION PREDICTIONS BY DEMOCRATIC PARTY OFFICIALS AND SOME POLLS AND SURVEYS

1. LESLIE BIFFLE, SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

At Miami, Fla., on October 12, 1950, Leslie Biffle, Secretary of the Senate, predicted that the Democrats would keep control of the House and gain strength in the Senate. Biffle said "without any ifs, ands, or buts" we will beat TAFT in Ohio, CAPEHART in Indiana, and MILLIKIN in Colorado. (UP New York Times, October 12, 1950.)

Result: Senator TAFT defeated Joseph T. Ferguson by 431,184 votes; Senator CAPEHART defeated Alex M. Campbell by more than 103,000 votes; Senator MILLIKIN defeated John A. Carroll by 27,000 votes; the Democrats lost strength in the Senate, their margin whittled to two seats.

On November 2, 1950, Biffle said reports reaching him indicate the Democrats will increase their Senate margin by one or two seats. (Washington Star, November 2, 1950.)

Result: Democrats lost 5 Senate seats (net), decreasing their margin of control to 2 seats—Democrats 49 seats, Republicans 47 seats.

2. WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR., CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Claims of prospective Democratic victories across the Nation's bread basket in November were made today by William M. Boyle, Jr., Democratic National Chairman.

Reporting to party workers in the closed door strategy session held here last month, Mr. Boyle said that State leaders predicted gains in Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, Illinois, and Indiana, including the election of Democratic Senators from Iowa and Indiana.

Mr. Boyle wrote that Jake More, Iowa State chairman, had predicted the defeat of Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, and election of at least four Democratic Congressmen. (New York Times, March 4, 1950.)

Result: Republicans swept Iowa, Kansas, South Dakota, and North Dakota in both the House and Senate; Republicans also gained one House seat in Nebraska to sweep that State; Republicans picked up four House seats in Illinois; Republicans picked up five House seats in Indiana and reelected the Republican Senator.

Boyle contended the outlook for his party had not been better for a long while in an off year. He said he was certain Democrats would control the Eighty-second Congress, registering gains in both Houses. (New York Times, October 26, 1950.)

Result: Democrats retained control of both House and Senate by slim margins losing seats in each:

Republicans:	
House	199
Senate	47
Democrats:	
House	236
Senate	49
Democratic margin:	
House	37
Senate	2

The Democratic Party is assured of continued control of Congress with good prospects of picking 2 to 4 Senate seats and gains in the House. Indications of another smashing Democratic victory. (Baltimore Sun, November 4, 1950.)

Result: Democrats lost 5 Senate seats and 27 House seats.

3. SENATOR CLINTON ANDERSON, OF NEW MEXICO, CHAIRMAN OF SENATE DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Democrats will pick up at least two Senate seats and "no worse than break even in the House. (AP, Washington Star, November 7, 1950.)

Result: Democrats lost 6 Senate seats, picking up one, and lost 29 House seats, picking up two.

4. PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

(Regarding Senator Millard Tydings): His 3-to-1 victory in the Maryland primary was interpreted by the President as a victory for the administration. The President reckoned the outcome a good election omen. (Newsweek, October 2, 1950.)

At a press conference on October 19, 1950, Truman predicted a Democratic landslide on election day that would surprise as many Republicans as his victory of 1948. (New York Times, October 20, 1950.)

In his speech in Kansas City on November 4, 1950, Truman stated, "Tonight the Democratic Party is on its way to victory again." (New York Times, November 5, 1950.)

Result: Senator Tydings was defeated by Republican JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER by 43,000 votes. Elsewhere Democrats lost 29 House seats and 5 Senate seats (in addition to Tydings), picking up only 1 Senate and 2 House seats.

5. VICE PRESIDENT ALBEN BARKLEY

Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY predicted October 19 that the Democrats would keep both Houses and might pick up a few seats. (Congressional Quarterly, October 20, 1950.)

Result: While the Democrats kept control of both Houses, they lost 29 House seats and 6 Senate seats, picking up only one Senate and two House seats.

The Vice President told newsmen that Democratic prospects in Kansas were "very good." (Baltimore Sun, October 8, 1950.)

Result: Republicans swept Kansas in both House and Senate.

6. REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OF OHIO, CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Decisive gains for Democrats. (Washington Daily News, November 4, 1950.)

Result: Democrats picked up only two Republicans' House seats and only one in the Senate.

7. WILLIAM GREEN, PRESIDENT, A. F. OF L.

Green told the crowd at Peoria's armory that he is convinced Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, will be defeated November 7 by Democrat Joseph Ferguson. (Washington Post, October 10, 1950.)

Result: Senator TAFT defeated Ferguson by a margin of 431,184 votes.

8. JACK KROLL, DIRECTOR OF CIO POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Democrats will gain 3 or 4 in Senate and 15 to 30 in House. (AP, Washington Star, November 7, 1950.)

Result: Democrats lost 6 in Senate, picking up only 1, and lost 29 in House, picking up only 2 Republican seats.

9. DREW PEARSON, NOVEMBER 5, 1950, 6 P. M., ABC NETWORK

"I predict that Anna Frohmiller will be elected Governor of Arizona."

Result: J. Howard Pyle, Republican gubernatorial candidate, was elected.

"In Illinois I predict that Senator Lucas, Democrat, will win."

Result: EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican senatorial candidate, defeated Lucas by 275,000 votes.

"In Utah, Senator Elbert Thomas—I also predict he will win."

Result: WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican senatorial candidate, defeated Thomas by 22,000 votes.

"In Iowa I predict that Senator HICKENLOOPER, who has one of the worst absentee records in Congress, will lose."

Result: Senator HICKENLOOPER, Republican, defeated Democratic Candidate Albert J. Loveland by 87,000 votes.

"In Colorado I predict that Senator MILLIKIN, Republican, will be defeated."

Result: Senator MILLIKIN, Republican, defeated Democratic Candidate John A. Carroll by 27,000 votes.

"In the second Idaho race, isolationist HENRY DWORSHAK will also lose."

Result: Senator DWORSHAK defeated Claude J. Burtenshaw, Democratic candidate, by 10,000 votes.

"I predict that Senator TAFT will win by a very slender margin."

Result: Senator TAFT defeated candidate Ferguson by 431,184 votes.

"I predict that Senator Tydings will be elected, also Governor Lane."

Result: Senator Tydings was defeated by candidate BUTLER by 43,000 votes; Governor Lane was defeated by Theodore R. McKeldin by 94,000 votes.

"I predict that Judge Ferdinand Pecora will be elected."

Result: Candidate Impellitteri, acting mayor, was elected.

"Governor Dewey, for the first time in his life, will lose."

Result: Governor Dewey, Republican, defeated gubernatorial candidate Walter Lynch by 572,000.

"In California, I predict Mrs. Douglas will win."

Result: Republican candidate RICHARD NIXON defeated Mrs. Douglas by 680,000 votes.

10. NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE

February 13, 1950: Democratic strategists see a fair chance to pick up the House seats

from Maine held by ROBERT HALE and CHARLES NELSON.

Result: Both HALE and NELSON were reelected.

October 9, 1950: Experienced observers now think Senator ROBERT TAFT is running behind in Ohio. His main troubles are the all-out union activity and a big registration of new young voters who lean Democratic, according to surveys.

Result: Senator TAFT won by 431,184 votes.

October 16, 1950: The Democrats are supremely confident of the outcome. They are, in fact, warning each other against overconfidence. "Things look so good we're worried," said an aide in Lucas' Stevens Hotel headquarters in Chicago. Jake Arvey, the shrewd Cook County Democratic boss, who has been taking polls outside Chicago theaters, estimates on the basis of the results that Lucas will carry Cook County by 400,000 votes and Illinois as a whole by 270,000, even if rural precincts turn in their usual Republican majorities—to Arvey this discontent is a myth. People never vote against the party in power when they're as prosperous as they are now, he contends. And to this he adds a statement which the Republicans of Illinois believe as firmly as he does: "The election will be a referendum on the Truman administration. If Lucas loses here, the Republicans will sweep the country and win the Congress."

Result: Republican Senatorial candidate EVERETT M. DIRKSEN defeated Lucas by 275,000 votes.

November 6, 1950: Correspondents' election preview (50 newspaper reporters and columnists):

Republicans:	
House	198
Senate	45
Democrats:	
House	237
Senate	51
Result:	
Republicans (House)	199
Democrats (House)	236
Republicans (Senate)	47
Democrats (Senate)	49

11. TIME MAGAZINE, OCTOBER 23, 1950

They expected these Democrats to win:

Illinois: Majority Leader Scott Lucas who has forged ahead of ex-Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN since the landing at Inchon.

Maryland: Senator Millard Tydings over JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER.

Result: Senator Lucas was defeated by DIRKSEN by 275,000 votes; Senator Tydings was defeated by BUTLER by 43,000 votes.

12. WASHINGTON POST, NOVEMBER 5, 1950, ROBERT C. ALBRIGHT

Between Senator Lucas and former Representative DIRKSEN appears just as close, with the odds fractionally favoring Lucas.

One Senate seat formerly considered "safe" by Republicans, Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER's Iowa chair, seems in last-minute serious trouble from Democratic nominee Albert J. Loveland.

Result: Senator Lucas was defeated by DIRKSEN by 275,000 votes; Senator HICKENLOOPER defeated Loveland by 87,000 votes.

13. THE GALLUP POLL, NOVEMBER 6, 1950

In a poll dated November 5, 1950, Gallup (American Institute of Public Opinion) predicted a national vote division for the House, excluding 5 percent undecided, of Democratic 51 percent, Republican 49 percent. The release stated that the survey points to continued Democratic control of the House. The survey stated that party percentages cannot be translated into House seats. But the figures show a shift of sentiment toward the GOP which would indicate moderate seat gains for the Republicans. (Washington Post, November 6, 1950.)

Result: An AP story dated December 24, 1950, gives the Republican percentage of national total vote for House as 49.08, Democratic as 48.95, and others as 2.02. (Boston Herald, December 25, 1950.)

14. THE DUNN SURVEY

Headline: "Predicts GOP will fumble and lose again."

The Republican Party this year has the greatest opportunity it has had to beat the New Deal, but, nevertheless, will receive its worst set-back since 1936 in the National, State, and local elections in November. (Chicago Tribune, September 28, 1950.)

Result: Nationally, the Republicans gained 27 House seats (net) and 5 Senate seats (net). In the States, Republicans gained 6 Governor seats (net).

15. LOUIS H. BEAN, LOOK MAGAZINE, AUGUST 29, 1950

Colorado: Democratic Representative John A. Carroll has a better than even chance to replace Republican Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN.

Result: Senator MILLIKIN defeated Carroll by 27,000 votes.

Connecticut: A reasonably certain sweep for the GOP over Democratic Senators McMahon and Benton and Gov. Chester Bowles as well.

Result: Senators MCMAHON and BENTON were reelected, and Governor Bowles was defeated by John Davis Lodge, Republican.

Nevada: Despite a Democratic tradition, there's been a strong swing to the Republicans in this State, Democratic Senator PAT MCCARRAN will probably lose.

Result: Senator MCCARRAN defeated Republican Senatorial Candidate George E. Marshall.

Ohio: In extremely close battle, with indications as of now that Democratic candidate Joseph T. Ferguson will nose out Republican Senator TAFT.

Result: Senator TAFT defeated Ferguson by 431,184 votes.

Here are the safe Senate seats for November:

Democrats: Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina (2), and Utah.

Result: Maryland and Utah elected Republican Senators.

As to the 16 doubtful senatorial seats, according to Bean:

Probable Democrat: Colorado, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Washington.

Result: Colorado and Ohio reelected Republican Senators.

Probable Republican: Connecticut (2), Idaho (2), Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin.

Result: Connecticut and Nevada reelected their Democratic Senators. No prediction California—the outcome is anybody's guess.

Result: The Republican senatorial victory was overwhelming—by 680,000 votes.

Louis H. Bean, the midterm battle

In the gubernatorial races, the Democrats would normally face a midterm loss of two or three of their present governors, but unusually strong candidates may limit Republican net gains to only one.

Result: Republicans made net gains of six.

16. WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR.

Headline: "Boyle asks State Democratic chiefs to explain why their rosy forecasts missed the mark."

William M. Boyle, Jr., Democratic national chairman, as puzzled as anyone, called on party leaders in the States to tell him wherein their forecasts had been in error. State leaders made reports on which he and President Truman based their landslide predictions.

17. NEW YORK TIMES, SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1950

Arizona: Mrs. Frohmiller is expected to become Arizona's first woman Governor.

Result: J. Howard Pyle, Republican gubernatorial candidate, was elected.

California: The Democrats are given a good chance to gain one House seat and thus win a majority in the State's delegation.

Result: The Republicans gained one House seat in California.

Colorado: Mr. Carroll is rated slightly ahead.

Result: Senator MILLIKIN, Republican, defeated Democrat John A. Carroll by 27,000 votes.

Illinois: Since the tide turned in Korea, Mr. Lucas may have pulled ahead slightly.

Result: EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican senatorial candidate, defeated Lucas by 275,000 votes.

Iowa: Mr. Loveland is given a fair chance in the Senate race.

Result: Senator HICKENLOOPER, Republican, defeated Democrat Albert J. Loveland by 87,000 votes.

Maryland: The race for Senator and Governor may be close, with Democrats given the edge.

Result: Senator Tydings was defeated by Republican BUTLER by 43,000 votes. Governor Lane was defeated by Republican McKeldin by 94,000 votes.

New Mexico: The Democrats are expected to win the governorship.

Result: Republican Edwin L. Mechem was victorious.

Oregon: The Democrats have a good chance of unseating two of the Republican Congressmen.

Result: All four Republican incumbents were reelected.

Utah: Senator Thomas is favored to win.

Result: WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, defeated Thomas by 22,000 votes.

West Virginia: Three of the Democratic seats are considered safe, Republicans, including Mr. Holt, are given a good chance in the other three contests.

Result: Republicans did not win any seats in West Virginia.

Wyoming: The Republicans are expected to lose their House seat.

Result: WILLIAM H. HARRISON, Republican candidate, was victorious by 6,563 votes.

Wisconsin: Mr. Thompson is given a good chance to become the first Democrat-elected Governor since 1932. Mr. Fairchild is also considered strong.

Result: Republican Walter J. Kohler, Jr., defeated Mr. Thompson in the gubernatorial race by 62,000 votes. Senator WILEY, Republican, defeated Mr. Fairchild by 80,000 votes.

18. CAPITAL COMMENT: SEPTEMBER 30, 1950

On the basis of these figures, of known trends, and of the quality of our candidates, Democrats in Wisconsin are confident that, with a continued all-out effort, they can elect a Governor and a Senator, and pick up at least two, and maybe four, seats in Congress.

Result: The Republican candidates for Governor and Senator were both successful. The Democrats lost one House seat to the Republicans.

The Democratic trend throughout the Nation is stronger today than it was in 1948, according to reports coming in from all parts of the country.

Result: The division of the total national vote in 1950 as compared with 1948 was: Republicans (1948) 45.1 percent, (1950) 49.03 percent; Democrats (1948) 49.4 percent, (1950) 48.95 percent; others (1948) 5.5 percent, (1950) 2.02 percent.

19. WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR., DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CHAIRMAN

Thus, the Maine election results, which always serve in some degree as a barometer

of political sentiment in the country, this year indicated that we can expect a big total vote and increased Democratic strength in November.

I have analyzed the figures carefully, and they indicate without question that the underlying trend toward the Democratic Party is still running strongly. * * * The Maine voting is the best indication we have had—although there have been others—that the trend is continuing unabated.—(Capital Comment, September 16, 1950.)

Result: Democrats had a net loss of 27 seats in the House and 5 in the Senate. They also lost a net of 6 Governors.

20. WASHINGTON POST, NOVEMBER 5, 1950, ROBERT ALBRIGHT

Officially, Democrats are saying they expect to hold their own and stand a good chance of increasing their House and Senate majorities. Privately, Capt. Victor Hunt Harding, Democratic congressional expert, fixes his range between a net House gain of 10 Democratic seats and a net loss of 20. He thinks the net change in the Senate won't shift more than 2 seats either way.

Because of the widespread attention which Mr. Louis Bean has received as a prognosticator, it is worth noting that his prognostications in 1948 were also worthless. The following is taken from the postelection issue of Newsweek magazine, November 15, 1948, page 29:

THE SEERS—UP THE BEAN POLL

While poll takers Elmo Roper, George Gallup, and Archibald Crossley were holding their heads last week as a result of erroneous election forecasts, a determined advertising and newspaper campaign was launched to prove that one scientific expert—Louis H. Bean, a Government economist—had actually forecast President Truman's amazing victory.

Two days after the election, on Thursday, November 4, Alfred A. Knopf, publisher of Bean's book How To Predict Elections, ran advertisements headed: "Oh, Mr. Gallup! Oh, Mr. Roper! Obviously, you don't know Bean's How To Predict Elections—the book that shows how to accurately predict elections. At all book stores, $2.50."

The following day, the International Latex Corp. of Dover, Del., which has made a practice of running public-service ads on political issues, bought two-column, page-length space to quote from Bean's book under the headline: "Was there an election mystery?"

On Sunday, in its weekly review section, under the headline: "The 'Bean Poll' was right," the New York Herald Tribune carried a Washington story by a staff member, Frederick Gutheim, declaring Bean had predicted as far back as last April that the Democrats not only would retain the Presidency but would recapture control of Congress as well.

Short-sighted hindsight: What everyone had evidently overlooked last week was Bean's own forecast just 3 days before the election. Although Bean in his book had correctly held that the swing from the Democrats had reached bottom after the 1946 GOP landslide, his forecast made to Peter Edson, Scripps-Howard columnist on October 30 (and to Drew Pearson on October 17), was as wrong, if not more wrong, than those of Roper, Gallup, and Crossley:

"President Truman will need an all-out turn-out of nearly 60,000,000 voters to win the election," Bean told Edson. "That is what he is fighting for—to get out the vote and turn the tide which all polls have indicated are against him.

"There are some interesting trends in this election. Many voters who seem to be Democrats when thinking about the congressional election are Republicans when thinking about the Presidential race."

Tracing the total votes in past elections and noting that the polls indicated the vote might go no higher than 51,000,000, Bean forecast to Edson that Mr. Truman would carry only 9 States and that even if it reached 55,000,000 he would carry only 18. Bean, like the other experts, failed to estimate the outcome on the unexpectedly low 47,000,000-vote total. But if his reasoning had been carried out, he would have given Mr. Truman even fewer States than the 9 he accorded him on the basis of a 51,000,000 total vote.

In brief, Bean had never completely dismissed the possibility of Democratic victory, but Bean in October evidently had forgotten Bean in April. (Roper and Gallup also forgot Roper and Gallup of earlier date. Gallup in January and Roper in February had shown Mr. Truman ahead.)

Although Newsweek is silent as to what Drew Pearson actually said on October 17, 1948, inquiry at his office discloses that Mr. Pearson quoted Mr. Louis Bean as predicting that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey would get 27,500,000 votes, Mr. Truman 24,500,000 votes, making Mr. Dewey the winner by a plurality of 3,000,000 votes.

Actual results: Mr. Dewey, 21,969,170; Mr. Truman, 24,105,695.

The Low Ebb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include, at the request of Mr. V. A. Hutton, adjutant of American Legion Post, No. 8, an editorial from the Daily Herald at Fredonia, Kans. In a letter accompanying this editorial, Mr. Hutton states that at a regular Legion meeting a resolution was unanimously passed requesting that this editorial be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

THE LOW EBB

We have not lost confidence in the American people, yet we are forced to admit that, today, we are ashamed of our Nation, rather are we ashamed of our Government.

There have been many times when we, as Americans, have criticized our Government; we pride ourselves in that right, but when we arrive at that point when we are ashamed of our Government, as that feeling is prevalent today in the hearts of nearly all, then we are indeed at low ebb.

We are ashamed of a President, who through his pettiness, has brought us to the brink of a new war, with all nations on earth our critics, in spite of the food and clothing and money we have lavished on them.

We are ashamed of a Secretary of State who apes Chamberlain of Munich and permits our enemies to dictate our policies.

We are ashamed of an Army staff that permits our sons and our brothers to go into battle with a vicious enemy, without previous knowledge of that enemy's disposition, equipment, or strength, and that our troops should meet these fanatics illy equipped and led.

We are ashamed of a commander who sends our troops into certain defeat when by judicious use of accepted military tactics many thousands of lives could have been spared.

We are ashamed of a Nation of businessmen who will sell to our certain enemies needed supplies and equipment definitely planned to be used against our own boys, and a supine Government that is equally guilty in permitting such blood transactions.

And we heartily are ashamed of a Congress that will busy itself with petty problems as the disgusting spectacle continues. Indeed, have we sunk to new depths and there seems no way out.

Import Tax on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on this the first day of the Eighty-second Congress I have reintroduced a bill to suspend the import tax on copper. During both sessions of the Eightieth Congress and in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress legislation of this type was enacted into law. Sectional opposition in the other body prevented its enactment in the session just concluded. It is regrettable, but true, that a group of national legislators were more concerned with regional self-interest than with the national welfare.

Since June 30, 1950, an import tax of 2 cents per pound has been imposed upon copper ore brought to this country from other nations of the world. The natural effect of this tax imposition has been to lessen the supply of copper available to fabricators. This in spite of the protestations of domestic producers that a sufficient supply of copper would be produced without imports from foreign sources.

The reduction of copper for civilian use as ordered by the National Production Authority is evidence of the short supply of this metal. Without assurances of increased amounts of copper ore, cutbacks in production and employment are inevitable in industrial areas of our Nation. This at a time of national emergency, when all our efforts should be directed toward the future security of the United States.

The military stockpile of copper is inadequate to assure even the continuing production of weapons and other war matériel. It is a disgraceful situation in which we find ourselves.

This Congress must face up to the problem of assuring increased imports of copper ore for the national defense. The bill introduced today provides that the import tax shall be suspended from April 1, 1951, until the termination of the national emergency. This tenure is used in preference to a specific cutoff date, as I realize that our need for copper will increase rather than decrease for the duration of the national emergency.

Let us legislate for the best interests of our Nation rather than on a regional basis. The people of America look to this new Congress for faith in our system of government and the preservation of world peace. Let our only consideration in our duties be that what we do is good for America. I trust that this most important legislation will not be the object of partisan wrangling, but rather that public hearings will be scheduled as soon as possible and House approval obtained shortly thereafter.

Physically Handicapped Persons and Disabled Veterans in the Federal Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following statement by Dr. Verne K. Harvey, M. D., Chief of the Medical Division of the Civil Service Commission. Dr. Harvey and the Medical Division of the Civil Service Commission have done outstanding work with respect to the rehabilitation and placement of physically handicapped persons, particularly veterans, in the Federal service. The statement by Dr. Harvey follows:

ROLE OF DISABLED IMPORTANT IN FEDERAL SERVICE, ASSERTS CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION MEDICAL DIRECTOR

To consider ability rather than disability is what the handicapped program of the Civil Service Commission tries to do, Dr. Verne K. Harvey, M. D., Medical Director of the Commission, told the Exchange recently.

The Commission designs its tests with the knowledge that a man can be physically handicapped without being job handicapped.

Dr. Harvey stated the two basic concepts that guide the Commission's program: (1) Is the handicapped person qualified to do the job? (2) Can he efficiently perform the duties of the job without hazard to himself or others?

The Medical Division sets the physical requirements for all jobs. It is responsible for seeing that when an exam is arranged, the physical requirements are those for doing the job efficiently.

"Civil service is on a competitive basis," Dr. Harvey said. "We are out to see that the physical requirements are realistic. It is not realistic to say a job needs a man with two arms when a man with one arm can perform it just as well."

HANDICAPS ARE VALUABLE

The doctor feels that at present hiring officials are much more aware of the value of handicapped employees than they were several years ago.

"There are still some people who are afraid physically handicapped people will be disability retirement risks," Dr. Harvey said. "But this is not the case. The whole basis they are hired on is whether or not they can do the work efficiently and safely."

Explaining the Commission's role, the doctor said, "The Commission does not rehabilitate. Others do that. We are interested in seeing that Uncle Sam gives them equal opportunity after they are rehabilitated."

SECTION HAS AUTHORITY

When agencies are not obeying the Veterans' Preference Act or Public Law 617, the Commission has power to make them do so. Public Law 617 (80th Cong.) reads in part: "No person shall be discriminated against in any case because of physical handicap, with respect to any position the duties of which, in the opinion of the Civil Service Commission, may be efficiently performed by a person with such a physical handicap."

The medical section is also interested in the technique of exams. If a written test is too difficult they will provide help. For example, if a spastic has difficulty writing, it will provide a person to write down the answers he decides.

The medical section also works with appointing officers to help place the handicapped.

PROPERLY PLACED IMPORTANT

"It is important that they are placed properly," Dr. Harvey said. "We emphasize this. We don't believe in taking safety risks."

The handicapped program received its first real impetus under Dr. Harvey. In 1942 the Commission surveyed thousands of jobs from coast to coast to see what jobs existed that could be filled by handicapped. This report was published and made available to departments and agencies. In 1943 a booklet, Untapped Manpower, was issued, telling appointing officers how they could ease their manpower shortage by hiring handicapped.

STUDY BEGUN IN 1943

Then, late in 1943, the Medical Section launched a vast performance study. They took 3,000 handicapped employees and compared their services against 5,000 nonhandicapped. They compared them on production and efficiency, accident experience, sick absenteeism, and turnover. The result showed: (1) Physically handicapped employees compared favorably in the first four items and (2) figures in the study of turnovers showed them to be far superior as stable employees.

This study was first published in the American Medical Journal and later issued as a handbook.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND IN FEDERAL SERVICE

Figures show that from 1942–49 over 100,000 severely handicapped people were placed in the Federal service. Dr. Harvey feels there has been a large increase in handicapped employment since the Korean conflict, though no figures are available.

Asked if he thought the handicapped would play an important role if there is another big increase in hiring due to the present crisis, Dr. Harvey said, "Definitely. An employer who gets a trained handicapped person is fortunate. It's important to know he won't be running around after another job or subject to draft. The tighter the labor market, the better it is to hire handicapped.

"There is another side I'd like to emphasize." I think the handicapped people themselves have a big responsibility to see they maintain their enviable record."

The mild-voiced, 52-year-old doctor has been with the Commission since 1940. A native of Indianapolis, Ind., he took his medical degree at the University of Indiana and did postgraduate work at Johns Hopkins under a Rockefeller Foundation fellowship. He was with the Indiana State Board of Health, and was State health commissioner for 7½ years before coming to the Civil Service Commission.

Statement by Hon. Louis B. Heller, of New York, Against Repeal of 21-Day Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the battle for democracy is never finally won. Either on the field of conflict in foreign lands or in the Halls of Congress itself. A year ago this House defeated a coalition campaign to repeal the 21-day rule by a vote of 236 to 183. That was a great victory for democracy in Congress and for the control of legislative action by the House itself instead of by a small committee clique. Now that victory is threatened with reversal, just as our hard-won gains on the battlefields of far-off Korea have been reversed by the forces of communism.

I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to rise and strike down once again this reactionary resolution. This move to restore autocratic control over legislation to the Committee on Rules is not an isolated phenomenon. It is an episode in a world-wide contest of ideas whose outcome will determine whether government by the few or by the many shall finally prevail—whether democracy or oligarchy shall rule our lives and our legislative processes.

If here in the citadel of democracy, we continue to surrender to the forces of filibuster and pigeonhole in our midst—as we have on civil rights and on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and on home rule for Washington—then the faith of the people in representative government will receive another vital blow and mankind everywhere will know that we do not practice the democracy we preach.

Our enemies abroad have been capitalizing with telling effect upon the failures of American democracy here at home. Our foreign relations have been gravely embarrassed by filibusters against civil rights and statehood in the other body, as well as by the failure of this House to grant elementary rights of local self-government to the people of Washington. The fabric of democracy is weakened by the exclusion of any group from its participation and protection.

If there ever was a time, Mr. Speaker, when we should hold to past gains—and further democratize the internal organization and procedures of Congress—this is that time. For on foreign fields of battle democracy almost everywhere is in bitter retreat and it is much later than we think.

So let us not surrender in this fateful hour to the little men of no vision. Let us not surrender to those who would use the closet of the Rules Committee as a pigeonhole for progressive legislation and a deep freeze for the legitimate aspirations of the American people. Let us not yield our victory of yesteryear to those pusillanimous men who would erect their petty prejudices and sectional selfishness into national policies. Rather, let us seize the democratic torch, men of Congress, and carry it on to new heights of legislative achievement.

The 21-day rule served us well during the Eighty-first Congress. It brought the anti-poll-tax bill and the rivers and harbors bill to the floor of the House in 1949. The threat of its use forced action on the housing and minimum wage bills. During 1950 it was, thanks to the 21-day rule, that we were able to work our will on the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills and the national science foundation

bill. Without this rule, these and other important measures—which had been favorably reported by the legislative committees of the House—would still be buried in the graveyard of the Rules Committee.

Let us not clog the legislative highways of democracy with reactionary road blocks. Let us teach the Rules Committee that it is a traffic director, not a barricade. Let us keep the 21-day rule.

[From the Washington Post of January 3, 1951]

LEGISLATIVE GRAVEYARD

The House of Representatives will be asked today to surrender its power to legislate into the hands of a small group of men who have often demonstrated that they do not know how to use it wisely. Technically stated, the question will be whether the 21-day rule shall be repealed. Everyone familiar with congressional procedure knows, however, that this is the rule which permits the chairmen of legislative committees to lay their bills before the House (after a waiting period of 21 days) if the bill has been pigeonholed by the Rules Committee contrary to the wishes of a majority of House Members. If the repeal resolution is adopted, as Congressman HELLER pointed out when a similar attempt was made a year ago, "the Rules Committee will become a graveyard where the policies of both political parties and the hopes of the American people will be buried."

Sponsors of this reactionary movement seem to be appealing especially to inexperienced new Members and to the partisan interests of the enlarged Republican minority. In our opinion, repeal of the 21-day rule would be unfortunate from the viewpoint of both groups. The one hope that new Members have of getting their proposals accepted lies in working with the legislative committees, in which bills are analyzed on their merits. New Members would gravely handicap their own efforts if they should restore a Rules Committee veto over what the legislative committees do. And how could they face their constituents 2 years hence and admit that their first significant vote in the House was against democratic procedure in lawmaking?

No doubt, many Republicans will be tempted to favor restoration of the Rules Committee graveyard as a means of frustrating the administration. But there are two powerful reasons why they should not yield to this temptation. First, this is a period in which the arbitrary stalling of our legislative machinery might bring disaster. The House cannot resign into the hands of seven men the power to decide whether or not it can act on any given measure without leaving the whole Nation at the mercy of an unrepresentative and often arbitrary faction. In the second place, of course, the Republicans would find the restoration of a Rules Committee dictatorship a critical handicap if they should come to power in 1952. If they should repeal the 21-day rule now, they could not restore it with the advent of a Republican administration without making themselves ridiculous.

The Rules Committee ought to function as a legislative traffic director, working in close cooperation with the House leadership. But experience shows that it will never confine itself to that task unless compelled to do so. It seems to us that every Member of the House, with the possible exception of the 12 Rules Committeemen themselves, has an interest in retaining a check on the autocratic power the committee once wielded. This can be accomplished only by keeping the 21-day rule intact.

How Much Longer Shall American Men Be Compelled by Their Government To Fight and Die Without the Help, Both Direct and Diversionary, of the Strongest Anti-Communist Forces in Asia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the last of three factual articles on the strongest allies America has in Asia, and which, for no discoverable good reason, have been imprisoned on Formosa by our Government, giving the Chinese Reds full opportunity to concentrate their strength against our forces in Korea. It is not only madness; it is murder. How long, Mr. Acheson, how long?

[From the Washington Daily News of January 3, 1951]

CHINESE NATIONALISTS DON'T LACK MEN OR DETERMINATION

(NOTE.—This is the last of three articles by Clyde Farnsworth answering the question raised in some quarters as to whether the Chinese Nationalists can and will fight. Mr. Farnsworth returned to this country recently from an 8-year tour of duty in the Orient.)

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

Of all the things the Chinese Nationalists need to turn Formosa into a counteroffensive base for deliverance to China, the least is manpower and determination to fight their way home again.

These assets they have in impressive quantity, but that is not all.

They have, most importantly, a new know-how for government and national well-being. Formosa has been a refresher course for the Chinese Nationalist movement. Success there may indeed contain the seeds of Nationalist rebirth in China.

The Government, now rid of the economic mess that plagued it on the mainland and insulated against Communist infiltration and sabotage, has wrought virtual miracles of economic stabilization and political reform.

MORE TALENT

It is true that the Nationalists on Formosa have had a greater concentration of administrative talent than ever before. But they have been carrying a proportionally greater weight in the military establishment.

On Formosa the Nationalists have gathered and trained or retrained 500,000 about whom a great deal has already been written—their religious life, their physical condition, their supply problems, their home-made burp guns and reconditioned Japanese rifles.

Less has been heard of Nationalist economic achievements on Formosa.

LONG-TERM PROJECTS

Since the State Department first started publicly doubting that the Nationalists had any morale or self-confidence left the Taipeh Government has invested more than $20,000,000 of its overstrained foreign-exchange balances on a dozen major, long-term economic projects aimed at rice, sugar, and electrical production, transport and industrial growth.

It also invested a considerable talent for engineering and administration. The following, which I have from an American engineer in position to check on Nationalist statistics, are some of the results:

Electrical power production in excess of the peak achieved under Japan's intensive development of Formosa.

JUST SHORT

Railway tonnages just short of the Japanese wartime peak.

Restoration of war-battered railways and rolling stock without the importation of a single piece of equipment.

Threefold increase in the production of chemical fertilizers, with a corresponding reduction of fertilizer imports.

Rice and sugar production approaching the Japanese peak of 1,400,000 and 940,000 tons, respectively, for 1937. This year's crop reports may equal or exceed those figures.

Effective control of prices and currency.

RENTS FORCED DOWN

Meanwhile, the Government also has put through a thoroughgoing reduction of land rents for the predominantly agricultural island, and has expanded democratic processes to municipal election levels.

There is no Communist problem in Formosa and little violence or any movement for Formosan independence.

I witnessed widespread celebrations among both the native and mainland populations when the Government initiated a limited army conscription program on Formosa.

The population of the island exceeds 7,000,000 counting an approximate 1,000,000 Chinese mainlanders. Millions more would have come, if permitted, but Formosa could not have survived.

The 500,000 Nationalist troops on the island by no means represents the maximum manpower at the disposal of Chiang Kai-shek, but with the civilians from the mainland provide the maximum weight of population that Formosa can reasonably support.

Under the direction of talented, American-educated Gen. Sun Li-jen, the half-million soldiers have been molded into a hard core of military strength which could be multiplied by accretion of anti-Communist guerrillas and regulars on the mainland.

The most recent official breakdown of anti-Communist guerrilla strength on the mainland came under a total of 1,614,000 announced in November by the Ministry of National Defense in Taipeh. The bulk of this strength lay in southwest, central, southeast, and south China—more than 1,400,000.

No one can confirm the figure. On the other hand, no one can deny it. Under able leadership and properly supplied it could be a major force in the Asiatic war against communism.

Ambassador Myron M. Cowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Manila Star Reporter of Friday, December 8, 1950:

AMBASSADOR COWEN

The decision of the State Department in Washington to retain Ambassador Myron M. Cowen in Manila, despite an underground move on the part of certain local political elements who wanted another man so they could again do monkey business with the forthcoming United States aids, is dictated by the highest American concern over the welfare of the people of the Philippines in whose interest Mr. Cowen has consistently worked since he became Ambassador here.

The Washington announcement should sober up the elements here who pulled underground wires to have Mr. Cowen replaced, and failed. Mr. Cowen is coming back—to assume responsibility for the supervision of American aid in the Philippines contemplated under the Bell mission recommendations.

This announcement, while disastrous to the back of the cranium designs of many politicians, the manner of whose election is a tragic chapter in our contemporary history, is heartening to the rank and file of the people of the Philippines.

The continuing interest of the American people in the well-being of the people of the Phillippines, no matter who happens to be the temporary trustees of public power here, is best manifested in the decision to keep Cowen in Manila.

It is a wise decision. It is better to have a man here who enjoys the confidence of the Filipino people because he has shown profound concern for their welfare, than a new man who, because of ignorance or lack of prestige, specially if he is a "lame duck," is likely to be hand in glove with the present regime whose fumigation has been repeatedly urged by Mr. Cowen, for the good of the Philippines as a bastion of democracy and free institutions.

And it is an assurance that American aid will go direct to the people, and not into the waiting pockets of known grafters and other undesirable elements who have given the Filipino people a black eye, at home and abroad.

Water Resources Development in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, M. C. Hermann, quartermaster adjutant of the Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is an outstanding veteran leader in California.

"Sam" Hermann has earned a place as a leader in the national veteran movement and is so recognized in veteran circles.

No veteran leader has given closer study to the effect that a national water policy will have upon the lives of veterans than has he. For many years he has been in the forefront of the fight for water policy in the Central Valley that will serve the men who fought for us.

On December 19, 1950, Mr. Hermann made a statement before a subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee meeting in Sacramento, Calif.

Because it is so pertinent to this vital subject I take pleasure in making it available to my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

STATEMENT OF M. C. HERMANN, QUARTERMASTER-ADJUTANT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE AT SACRAMENTO, DECEMBER 19, 1950

Mr. Chairman and members of the congressional committee, my name is M. C. Hermann, and I am quartermaster-adjutant of the department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an organization representing the interests of around 100,000 veterans, all of them with a record of service overseas in the Armed Forces. My business address is 107 Veterans Building, San Francisco, Calif.

In 1944 the Veterans of Foreign Wars made its first public declaration on water resource development in California. At that time special interests were attempting to break down the protections of reclamation law against water monopoly and speculation. We began by saying we do not want the 160-acre water limitation repealed, undermined, or weakened. We want veterans to have the greatest chance possible to make a home for their families on lands supplied with water by the Federal investment. Our position has had fullest support of resolutions by the National Encampments of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. From 1944 to this day, we have made statement after statement before committees of the Congress, asking for the complete, early and unified development of water resources in Central Valley under the Federal reclamation law.

We do not want the water of Central Valley developed as "flood control" projects under "flood control" law, and as separated projects. The Central Valley Basin is a unified watershed, and under a unified reclamation project for irrigation and power generation, we shall not worry about floods, for there will be no damaging floods.

This is a good time to set some of the record straight. This Nation faces an impending crisis, and it is no time to cover up the record when it serves the national interest better to expose it to the light. I have no intention of questioning the motives of any person or organization or official of whom I shall speak. But neither do I shrink from calling a spade a spade when the public record proves that it is a spade.

Certain interests in this State have gone to the greatest lengths to defeat reclamation law, particularly its eminently fair provision that says no one landowner is entitled to water for more than 160 acres of land. The VFW wants that provision enforced, and the American people want it enforced, as the fate of every attempt to repeal it after public hearings has shown.

These interests, carrying a banner inscribed "flood control," have been prepared to risk even damaging floods like the current ones, in order to destroy that protection in the reclamation laws against private water monopoly and speculation. While they complain of floods, they complain of equal treatment under the 160-acre water limitation even more.

On this, the record, as they have made it, is clear. In order to escape the 160-acre water limitation (perhaps for other special purposes as well) certain interests, whom I shall identify from their own public record in a moment, have gone to extraordinary lengths to persuade Congress that reclamation projects are not really reclamation projects but flood-control projects instead. The absurdity of this has been documented recently by a study made for, and published by, the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. That study shows how the Army engineers, during the period while it seemed necessary to persuade Congress that Kings River and Tulare Lake project was not a reclamation project but a flood-control project, estimated the ratio of flood-control benefits to irrigation benefits at 1.19 to 1; but after authorization to the Army engineers was secured and appropriations for construction were made and work was begun, then the estimate fell to a ratio of only 0.63 to 1. In other words, to call the project "flood control" was phony; time brought the truth that the project is really for reclamation, which most people knew from the beginning.

I speak of this particular project on Kings River and in Tulare Lake Basin, because it is a good illustration, and is causing the Veterans of Foreign Wars serious trouble in our effort to obtain farming opportunities for qualified veterans. There are 300 square miles in Tulare Lake Basin with virtually no homes and no towns, more than half of it owned by 25 individuals or corporations, and we are afraid it will stay that way unless reclamation law is enforced and the project is integrated into the great reclamation program for the Central Valley Basin. That is our long run interest in Kings River and the Tulare Lake Basin—and on Kern River as well. At the present time Pine Flat dam on the Kings River is under construction by the Army engineers; that is where the cofferdam recently gave way, and where upper Kings River water users, especially those around Centerville, were flooded. I am not blaming the engineers for the collapse of the cofferdam under unusual stress; simply identifying the project in relation to current flood conditions.

The Tulare Lake Basin water-storage district and the Kings River Water Association, for their purposes, have been willing to impose long delays on construction of the very dams and reservoirs that would prevent the floods that are now occurring. They have been successful in imposing these delays. They have also succeeded so far in breaking the unity of the State water plan for Central Valley and in evading the equitable provisions of the reclamation law, including the provisions for repayment of the public investment. As the study made for the Hoover Commission says: "It may well be that the Federal Government will never turn a thin dime for a large part of the irrigation benefits provided by this project, and the benefits will accrue to the present owners of land rather than to the small independent farmer around whom the whole philosophy of Federal reclamation has been built."

I hope that this committee in its fuller deliberations will examine into this record of the collapse of public policy on the Kings River and Tulare Lake project. It is long, detailed, and documented. I have joined in presenting that record to Congress upon other occasions, notably before the Senate Committee on Army Civil Functions Appropriations for 1951, pages 745–749. Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, of the Fifth San Francisco District, supported my statement, and our position was carried to the Senate floor on August 1 and 4, 1950, by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, himself a distinguished veteran thoroughly aroused to the stake of veterans and of the public in reclamation and the 160-acre water limitation; Senator DOUGLAS' documentation of the record of evasion on Kings River appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 9, pages 11482–11485 and pages 11816–11817. Full discussion of Senator DOUGLAS' contentions at that time was prevented only on the point of order that his proposal involved legislation. In other words, rectification of the Kings River and Tulare Lake situation is possible only through the work of legislative committees. As the appropriate

legislative committee of the House of Representatives, I respectfully request that you examine into this condition and that you take appropriate action. As a first step, I recommend that you integrate Kings River and Tulare Lake project into the basin-wide program of the Bureau of Reclamation for Central Valley.

The record is a long one, and I am refraining from repeating it here in the interest of economy of your time. I trust you will interpret my restraint in that light, and will not underestimate the seriousness of my purpose in calling it, with the places in the public record where it may be found, to your attention.

Today our press carries numerous statements about the necessity for flood control. For example, our new junior Senator was quoted in the San Francisco Chronicle of November 23, 1950, as saying: "If anybody needed to be convinced of the need for flood control, he ought to take a flight over the flood area. Having seen the damage caused by the current flood conditions, it will give me and other California Representatives a very potent argument to get appropriations for flood-control projects." From my preceding remarks to this committee, I am sure that you will understand that it is not flood control that Central Valley needs, but reclamation. Do not be misled by the double meaning of the words "flood control."

Today some men are claiming hindsight, from whom we have had reason to expect more foresight. According to the San Francisco News of November 21, 1950, Mr. Charles L. Kaupke, Kings River watermaster, was quoted as saying: "If dam and reservoir were in operation, Kings River water users wouldn't be flooded." According to the San Francisco Chronicle on December 14, 1950, Mr. Edward Hyatt, formerly State engineer, told the Commonwealth Club that controversies between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have delayed needed work. He said: "Authorized projects which should have been built years ago could have helped to prevent the recent floods which caused $20,000,000 worth of damage in northern California."

If these men, and others similarly responsible for public water policy in the Central Valley over past years could only have foreseen what now we all see—that we need not only controlled floods but also water for irrigation and for all the power we can get to run our defense industries—we should all be much better off. It is even possible that there might be no flood damage at all on the Kings River.

The story of delay and obstruction is simple and it is a matter of public record. As early as 1940 the Bureau of Reclamation held legal authorization to proceed with construction of Pine Flat Dam. True, some delay was caused by World War II, but that was not the only, or perhaps the main, delaying factor in getting a dam at Pine Flat that would control floods and generate power. On March 14, 1940, for example, the Tulare Lake Basin water storage district, instead of getting behind an appropriation to the Bureau to commence construction promptly, passed a resolution requesting Congressman Gearhart to introduce a bill providing an alternative authorization to the Army engineers. With an authorization to the Bureau of Reclamation already in hand, more than 4 years passed by while Kings River and Tulare Lake interests did their work getting an Army engineer authorization, and an additional year before an appropriation could be got to start construction. As a telegram from the Tulare Lake water storage district, placed in the hearings of a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee by Mr. Kaupke on May 27, 1945, said: "Over the several past years we have been required to incur much expense in order to assist in preventing this project from being undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation." The telegram does not give reasons why the district felt required to obstruct the very construction that would control flooding over its lands.

It would be incorrect to saddle the Tulare Lake Basin interests with entire responsibility for the program of delay. The record of a House Appropriations Subcommittee about the same time in 1945, shows southern San Joaquin Valley interests blocking appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation on Kings River on the expressed grounds that the Bureau program would provide for prompt generation of hydroelectric power, and that this would not occur if the Army engineers should be authorized to construct the project. (Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 79th Cong., 1st sess., on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1946, pp. 1373–1386.)

During these years of delay and construction of a dam that would control floods, serve irrigation, and generate power on the Kings River, I have found no public statement by Mr. Hyatt, then State engineer, urging prompt appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation to get the Kings project going. Later on, however, he became very active when there was a chance to get an appropriation for the Army engineers. Following a gesture of impartiality between Reclamation and Army engineers as agencies of construction, his representative in Washington said, "If appropriations are postponed now, the delay in getting flood relief will be a year or a year and a half. The need is urgent." He did not say why the urgency of need for flood relief did not move the State engineer to support earlier appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation that would have afforded the same relief sooner.

The position of the State engineer's office is all the harder to understand because the State water plan, drawn up by the engineer's office, declares Pine Flat Dam to be an integral part of basin development. The State engineer's report of 1931 says "It was concluded that Pine Flat Reservoir should be included as a unit for ultimate development of the State water plan for the San Joaquin River Basin." Unless the State engineer's office has changed its mind from the days when the State water plan was drafted, we should be entitled to expect now, as a minimum, that it will give its full support to the complete integration of Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin project into the Central Valley Basin development. The truth is, the only way to provide stable and adequate water supply conditions and flood control on that 300 square miles of Tulare Lake Basin is to do as the State water plan originally required—make Kings River and Tulare Lake project a unified part of the Central Valley project, and enforce the reclamation law. This will support family farms and thriving towns.

Speaking of the need for unity of development of Central Valley water resources—legal unity, administrative unity, economic unity—California wants full development, and most Californians know that without unified development we will never get full development. We all know that the more profitable has to help pay for the less profitable, in order to make the full development economically sound. The Governor of this State has spoken the wishes of the people when he said "California needs to make the fullest use of its water resources." The State water plan was drawn to accomplish that purpose. Do not be misled, therefore, when the State engineer's office forgets the high purpose of its own great, unified plan, and appears willing to lend a hand in the destruction of unity, as on Kings and Kern Rivers.

Similarly, do not be misled by the declaration of the State director of public works, who told the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in June 1950 that "each unit should be analyzed as to its economic justification at the time of the need for construction." For I am confident that the Governor knows, even if his director does not, that economic unity is the best and probably the only way ever to secure the fullest use of our Central Valley waters.

Do not be misled by the endless repetition of spokesmen on Kings River that the Bureau of Reclamation is going to deprive any water users of their water rights. There is purpose behind the repetition, but the statement, on the face of it is false. Reclamation law specifically requires the Bureau to respect those water rights, and the courts of the United States are open to anybody who thinks his rights are not being protected as required by law. I have not lost faith in the integrity of either the American Congress or the American courts, and I see no reason why that faith should be undermined by any differences of opinion on the Kings River or in Tulare Lake or anywhere else.

Finally, do not be misled by the outcries about socialism and about Federal bureaucrats and Federal domination into thinking that the people of California do not want Federal assistance. The acreage limitation and public power protections against monopoly and speculation are the real target of those who seek to stir a false antagonism between State and Federal Governments.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars knows full well that veterans' opportunities for employment in our factories and on the land depend on full development under the reclamation law. We have not witnessed the benefits of land openings to veterans by reclamation in northern California, the curtailment of employment in the San Francisco Bay area in 1948 because of power shortage, and the decision of industries to locate elsewhere because of unfavorable power quantities and rates here, without a growing conviction in the soundness of the Federal reclamation program for Central Valley, which is just the elaboration of the State's own water plan.

We ask you to consider the reclamation plan for the Central Valley Basin, printed as Senate Document No. 113 of the Eighty-first Congress, and then to take the earliest steps you can to put it into operation. It will serve the needs of the veterans and the people, the West, and the Nation in peace or in war.

The New Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the recent speech of former President Herbert Hoover on foreign policy is being widely discussed throughout America. While I do not agree with all that Mr. Hoover said, I believe his address was timely and that he said some things which very much needed to be said at this time. I feel sure that his address has done much to clear the atmosphere of uncertainty which has prevailed in the field of foreign affairs and that it will do much to bring about the development of a sound American foreign policy.

One reason the Hoover proposal sounds good to so many people is because it seems clear and definite as contrasted with the weakness and vagueness of the policy that has been followed since the end of World War II. Millions of Americans feel that our diplomats have lost everything we gained through World War II. They know that we have neither the military or economic strength to continue the policy of globalism which involves trying to put out the fires of communism wherever they break out.

While I feel that a continuation of our present reckless foreign policy, which is being carried out without any apparent consideration of its costs or its results, would be a fatal mistake, I am just as much opposed to a return to a policy of isolationism which is what a literal acceptance of Mr. Hoover's proposal would mean. Somewhere between globalism and isolationism there is room for a sound, realistic American foreign policy.

In a recent issue of the Hutchinson News Herald, of Hutchinson, Kans., there is contained an excellent editorial which points out in a most effective way the weaknesses of the Hoover proposal. Believing that this editorial will be of interest to every Member of Congress and all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including it herewith under leave to extend my remarks. It follows:

THE NEW ISOLATIONISM

The new isolationism, for which Herbert Hoover is major spokesman, proposes we voluntarily withdraw from Europe and Asia and pin our survival hopes on building a fortress America.

It is a defeatist policy. The loss of ground—of staging areas and allies—spells defeat whether we retreat willingly or are beaten back.

The Hoover policy is based on three assumptions:

1. That we can live, economically, cut off from the rest of the world.

2. That we can keep alive cherished political liberties and social goods, cooped up in a fortress.

3. That eventually we will win because communism is bound to rot from within and be overthrown.

First, in theory, the Western Hemisphere is self-sufficient. World War II proved that for a short period we can get along without world trade. Over the long pull we couldn't do it without a completely changed and controlled economy. Once we reached the plateau of full armament, the economy would have to be locked into place.

Second, living for years behind fortress walls could only mean the security measures the term suggests. No one comes in. No one goes out. Security police become the rulers. Liberty could survive a short period of war emergency. Could it survive decades of being on guard?

Finally, will Communist dictatorship die of its own evil? What dictatorship ever did? The Romans, Napoleon, Hitler, were not overthrown from within; they were defeated or softened up by aggressive forces from without.

The Russian Communists have perfected a control system old dictators never dreamed of. Terror has become a scientifically administered drug, designed to paralyze those who would revolt.

The Roman Empire was weakened by overexpansion. The Russians might suffer the same. If they get too many puppets, sooner or later one will get out of hand. But if the Kremlin needn't worry about us, snug behind our fortress, it can easily put down any dissenters.

If we no longer even offer to help the Titos, Russia will not let the Titos live long.

This is the weakest assumption in Hoover's argument—that Russia will fall soon enough to prevent us falling victim to our isolation.

The whole policy is spoken and acclaimed because we interpret the Korean defeat as a general defeat.

Actually Korea is a result of the success of our foreign policy, not of its failure. We whipped the Communists in France, Italy, Berlin, Greece, and nursed the breath in Yugoslavia. From 1947 on, Russia lost steadily in the west. She had to turn East to find a victory.

We lost in Korea. Should we give up now all we have won elsewhere? We might well take a cue from our enemy who doesn't run howling to the dugout when he has a bad inning.

Gallup Polls

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to two Gallup polls, one dated December 20 and one dated December 22, 1950, which for some reason or other failed to appear in the Washington Post, the local Washington paper that carries the Gallup polls. I feel that the Members of the Congress should avail themselves of these polls.

Mr. Speaker, being a newspaper publisher myself, I am very sure that inasmuch as these polls were issued just prior to the Christmas season or to Christmas itself that probably—in fact I am sure—the only reason why they were not printed was because of the heavy lineage of advertising at that particular season of the year.

These polls follow:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC CRITICAL TOWARD ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY IN ASIA, SURVEY SHOWS—MAJORITY CALL IT POOR JOB; WIDE VARIETY OF MISTAKES CITED BY VOTERS IN OPINION STUDY

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., December 19.—An overwhelming majority of Americans think that the United States Government has done a poor job in handling our foreign policy in Asia.

A wide variety of mistakes are named by voters interviewed on the question in a national opinion survey, with no one item getting more than 20 percent of the vote.

The largest number criticize the military on the grounds of poor preparation and inadequate intelligence in Korea. Others say we were too easygoing in our attitude toward Asiatic Communists.

Still others insist that our main mistake was in abandoning Chiang Kai-shek and ignoring the Chinese Nationalists.

Some also say that our major error was in going into Korea in the first place.

All persons questioned in this survey were asked:

"Do you think our Government in Washington has been doing a good job or a poor job of handling our foreign policy in Asia—that is, in Korea, China, etc.?"

The national vote is:

	Percent
Good job	17
Fair job	21
Poor job	50
No opinion	12
Total	100

Opinion splits along partisan lines, with Republicans more critical of our Asiatic policy than Democrats are. But even among Democrats the weight of opinion is unfavorable, as the following table shows:

	Democrats	Republicans	Independents
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Good	25	14	13
Fair	24	18	21
Poor	39	58	51
No opinion	11	10	15
Total	100	100	100

MAJOR MISTAKES NAMED

All voters in the sample were next asked: "What mistakes, if any, would you say our Government has made in handling the situation in Asia?"

Here is a summary of the results:

	Percent
Military situation criticized, poor preparation	18
Too lenient with Reds, too soft	11
Intervention in Asia a mistake, should have stayed out of Korea	9
Failure to back Chiang	9
Lack of foresight, should have anticipated fighting China	6
Inconsistency in Asia policy	4
Miscellaneous	12
No mistakes made	7
Don't know	25
	101

The table adds to more than 100 percent because some voters named more than one mistake.

Here are some voters' comments typifying the point of view of those who criticize the military aspects of our Asiatic policy:

"Our intelligence was weak in not finding out what the Chinese would do."

"We should have handled Manchuria better. No foresight."

"Our defense was on paper; we weren't prepared."

"Our mistake was not having enough men and equipment now to fight with."

Other comments:

"We ignore Chiang but we don't recognize Red China; we've fallen between two chairs."

"It all goes back to Roosevelt and the deals he made with Russia."

"The mistake was in not giving MacArthur full power."

"Our whole policy was fickle and inconsistent. First we encouraged the Reds in China and now we find they're fighting us."

"The blunder was in thinking the Chinese Reds were only agrarian reformers and wouldn't do what Moscow told them."

"We bungled, gambled—and lost."

WEIGHT OF OPINION FOUND UNFAVORABLE TO ACHESON; VIEWS SPLIT BY PARTY LINES—SURVEY FINDS REPUBLICANS 3 TO 1 FOR HIS RESIGNATION, WHILE DEMOCRATS FAVOR HIM

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., December 21.—Despite continual attacks against Secretary of State Dean Acheson and demands for his resignation, public sentiment is divided on the question of whether he should step down from office.

More voters say they are against him than for him—but opinion divides to a considerable extent along partisan lines.

Republicans want him to go, by a vote of about 3 to 1. But among Democrats the weight of opinion rests in the Secretary's favor by a small margin.

In answer to the question, "Will you tell me who Dean Acheson is?" approximately one-third were not able to identify the name.

These facts are revealed in an opinion survey among a balanced cross section of

the voting population. The study was conducted by the Institute using methods which enabled it to forecast the recent congressional elections with an error of only 1 percentage point.

All persons who could correctly identify Mr. Acheson were asked:

"In general, is your opinion of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State favorable or unfavorable?"

	Percent
Favorable	20
Unfavorable	31
No opinion	15
	66
Could not identify	34
	100

Here is the national vote on the final survey question:

"What do you, yourself, think—should Dean Acheson stay on in his present position, or should he be replaced?"

	Percent
Stay on	21
Replaced	30
No opinion	15
	66
Could not identify	34
	100

PARTY SPLIT

Virtually all the attacks on the Secretary have come from Republicans, both in and out of Congress. Democratic leaders, from the President down, have stanchly defended him.

In fact, when the Secretary flew to Brussels this last weekend to a meeting of the 12 Atlantic Pact nations, the President in a public statement declared:

"Secretary Acheson goes to this meeting with my complete confidence."

The partisan nature of attitudes toward Secretary Acheson can be seen from the following vote in the survey:

	Republicans	Democrats	Independents
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Stay on	13	26	23
Replaced	43	19	31
No opinion	14	14	19
	70	59	73
Could not identify	30	41	27
Total	100	100	100

To a considerable extent Secretary Acheson's own popularity as a Cabinet member is linked with the popularity of President Truman. In recent months this has been at a comparatively low point in surveys by the institute.

Questions Face Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Review, of Hayward, Calif., published a pertinent editorial under date of December 22, 1950.

These are soul searching days in which the American people must choose the right course to follow or jeopardize the future of our democracy that is our cherished way of life.

The Nation needs more editorials like this, not the rantings of the Monday-morning-quarterback-type of armchair strategist or the self-anointed foreign affairs expert.

I am happy to have permission to include this down-to-earth editorial by a typical American newspaper man in the RECORD. It follows:

QUESTIONS FACE US

If former President Herbert Hoover has done nothing else in this time of national emergency, he has placed before the American people the problem of determining our foreign policy.

For some years we have been handed a foreign policy from the national administration without any explanatory notes. Oftentimes we found our policy was not really what we had thought it, or had been changed since previous information.

In short, we were without a policy except, perhaps, in the highest of policy forming groups within the State Department.

We can't agree with the conclusion of our distinguished former President 100 percent. Even before he spoke we imagined there would be difference of opinion on his suggestions. That is natural. This is our democracy; each of us has varying ideas of how it should be run. Now is the time for us to compromise our differences after discussion.

One thing is sure: We must make our Nation the "Gibraltar of western civilization." No other people are in a position to lead the fight against communism.

But should we build up our Navy and Air Force without vastly increasing the size of our Army? Should we make England and Japan our frontier of defense, or should we try to hold Western Europe and free portions of Asia?

Should we try to build up our forces to a set point, then balance the budget and build up our economy? Or should we continue to strengthen our forces until all threat of Communist invasion ends?

Should we cut off dollar and military aid to Europe, leaving that area to its own resources, or should we try to aid in building them while building ourselves?

These are the questions. We, the people, must give the answers in our hearts so representative government in Washington can be truly representative.

Lowell's First Amputee of the Korean Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lowell Sun, telling the story of Lowell's first double amputee of the Korean conflict. It is well worth reading, for it shows clearly the fine attitude of the young veteran, his cheery hopeful outlook for the future, and his bravery in facing that future with his physical handicap of two artificial legs. The article follows:

LOWELL'S FIRST AMPUTEE OF THIS WAR SAYS STOP COMMIES IN KOREA—PFC. ROBERT E. DIXON LOST BOTH LEGS IN TAEGU BATTLE

(By Thomas C. Gallagher)

LOWELL.—A pink-cheeked boy of 18, who lost both legs while fighting with the First Marine Division at Taegu, believes that Communist aggression must be stopped in Korea, if it is to be stopped at all.

Expressing this conviction in an interview at his home today was Pfc. Robert E. Dixon, United States Marine Corps, son of Mr. and Mrs. Bertrand E. Dixon of 24 Barcley Street in the Highlands. Lowell's first amputee of the Korean conflict, he is currently on leave from United States Naval Hospital in Oakland, Calif.

RED TIDE WILL SPREAD

"If we pull out of Korea the Communists will not only take over there, but will quickly move on to Formosa and eventually into Japan" young Dixon pointed out, adding:

"With a Communist fifth column already hard at work in Japan, I don't think the Communists would have too much difficulty enveloping the country."

He freely admitted, however, that some of his fellow marines held divergent views. Although morale was high, the young marine stated, not a few fighting men felt that they were fighting and dying "for nothing" and asked the question:

"What are we out here for, anyway, and what are we fighting for?"

ENLISTED AT 17

The war was a brutally short one for Private First Class Dixon, who, at the age of 17, left Lowell High School to enter the Marine Corps. His parents signed the necessary papers after he "pestered them for weeks." A brother, Bertrand, Jr., only other child of the Dixons, had been a marine in World War II.

Intent on making the Marine Corps his career, young Dixon went through the normal training and, in October of 1949, was shipped to Hawaii.

On September 1, with a contingent of replacements, Private First Class Dixon landed at the port of Pusan, Korea.

Early on the morning of September 4 he was asleep in a fox hole at Taegu. A general advance against the North Koreans was scheduled to begin that day—an advance which was ultimately to push the Korean Reds to the Manchurian border and bring the Chinese Communist hordes pouring into Korea.

EXPLODES MYTH

This is the way he tells it:

"I was awakened by the sound of artillery. It was the Commies. A shell came whining over. There was a blast, and I must have passed out.

"Once I read where you never have to worry when you hear the whine of a shell, because you never hear the one that hits you. Take it from me, it just isn't so."

All the details of what happened thereafter are not clear to Private First Class Dixon. He does remember that three buddies managed to get him into a jeep and move him back to an aid station, where a hospital corpsman administered blood plasma.

GETS PLASMA

He was bleeding badly, and considerable plasma was required to keep him alive. After a period of hospitalization in Japan he was transferred Stateside. Frequent blood transfusions over a 2-month period made his excellent recovery possible.

"I just couldn't keep count of all the blood they gave me, but it was enough so I guess there just isn't very much of my own blood left," he said with a grin.

In connection with his many blood transfusions, he had this to say about the Red Cross:

"The Red Cross undoubtedly saved my life. Blood was made available to me not only in Japan and in the Oakland hospital, but on the battlefield in Korea, when I needed it most. I learned that all of it was blood collected by the Red Cross."

He had an interesting observation to make on the Japanese.

"The great majority of the Japanese look up to General MacArthur, and have an extremely high regard for him," young Dixon said. "They feel this way because they believe he has done a great deal for them."

"DOESN'T MAKE SENSE"

On one of the burning questions of the day, he made the following comment:

"I can't figure out why the Chinese Nationalists, who are able and willing to fight on the side of the United Nations, aren't allowed to do so. It just doesn't make sense."

PET HATE

Like everyone else, fighting men have their pet hates. The major one, says Private First Class Dixon, is "the guy who started the movement to abolish the soldier's beer ration."

Soldiers in the field are rationed canned beer, where possible. It is rationed in such a conservative manner as to be considered humorous under ordinary circumstances. However, to a combat soldier, his can of beer is an almost unbelievable luxury.

Recently, there was a movement afoot to stop such rationing of beer, and it was news of this movement that threw every soldier in the Pacific into a rage, Private First Class Dixon said.

LOOKS TO FUTURE

What are his plans for the future?

Young Dixon points out that the immediate future is pretty well taken care of. His leave expires January 15, and he will return to Oakland by plane, the same way he came home.

He faces 9 months of hospitalization, during which he will be fitted with artificial limbs, and carefully taught how to use them.

After that, he intends to return to Lowell High School, and pick up where he left off.

"I haven't made up my mind what kind of a job I want to learn," he said.

"There are a lot of things I want to do, and eventually I'm going to be able to do them."

Purchasing Power of Dollar Reaches New Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot nowadays about the reduced purchasing power of the inflated American dollar. We are told that taxes of all kinds, and particularly war taxes, from now on will be excessively high, chiefly because of this reduced purchasing power. Because inflation, and the certainty of further inflation, will be an important factor in framing further tax legislation, it is vitally necessary for us to know just where the dollar stands now.

With this in mind, I have prepared some figures, calculated to show truthfully the purchasing power of the dollar today, as compared with its purchasing power in some past years.

The general index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, covering 28 commodities in the spot primary markets of the United States, as of December 22, 1950, stood at 364.1. This means that on that date, it took $3.64 to buy the same amount of goods that $1 would have bought in August 1939, the date on which the comparison is based.

Thus inflation caused the actual purchasing power of the dollar to drop to 27.46 cents in December 1950, as compared with August 1939.

The August 1939 index stood at 75. This means that for 75 cents, the purchaser could have bought commodities which had a value of $1 in 1926.

By means of a simple arithmetical calculation, with which every statistician is familiar, it appears that the 1950 dollar, compared with the 1926 dollar, has dropped to 36.6 cents. And it should be remembered that 1926 was a year of severe inflation.

Since December 1950 a further rise in spot commodity prices has reduced the purchasing power of the dollar to a new low of almost exactly 27 cents flat.

In view of this situation, one is compelled to wonder when the administration intends to stop talking and making political gestures about inflation, and get busy applying the really effective powers it possesses, through the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, to curb the further creation of credit currency, and put an end to this era of easy money.

The Congressional School of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, just across the Potomac River from Washington, D. C., stands a unique and very interesting coeducational institution called the Congressional School.

It is an outstanding example of the great American experiment that private initiative can furnish unequaled service to the public welfare. The metropolitan Washington area is indeed fortunate in having among its educational institutions this famous private school which is providing the very best teaching from kindergarten years up through junior high school.

The growth of Congressional has been truly phenomenal. Ten years ago it was realized that there existed a particular need for a superior school, where the children of many families who are required to reside in the Nation's Capital for a short period of time—not only in the Government services but also in the Congress and diplomatic corps—could receive specialized training. These boys and girls will some day return to the most varied types of school systems in this country and other parts of the world, and it is a vital concern to these families that the years spent in Washington shall not be a period in which their children's education is neglected.

The Congressional School was founded in an attempt to meet that challenge. How well the challenge was met is best measured by the response of the public who have sent their children year after year in increasing numbers. The tremendous response necessitated three changes of location to larger accommodations, the building of additional edifices, and the establishment of a second school at Alexandria, Va. The school is now located on Fort Myer Hill, in Arlington, overlooking the Potomac and the Capital.

Another indication of the school's success is the ease with which the boys and girls of families, who have moved away have fitted into the educational systems available in their new homes. The reputation of Congressional has been spread in this manner over the Nation and it has become a routine matter for parents who have recently moved to Washington from thousands of miles away to call at the school to seek enrollment for their children because friends had recommended the school that their children had attended while they lived in the metropolitan area.

Every economic group is represented and there is absolutely no distinction to be found between the children of families of means and those of modest income. These families have one great ideal in common—they sought and are obtaining the very best in education for their children.

The Congressional School is providing the basic training in education at a vital and important period of a child's life and at a most moderate cost in comparison with other institutions which lack the facilities to provide comparable services.

The school faculty represents an outstanding group of educators, skilled in the profession of teaching and working with children of all age groups. The grounds and buildings are beautiful and equipped with the most modern facilities. Best of all, the boys and girls who make up the student body are as attractive and happy a group as can be found in any school in America. They are receiving an unusual amount of individual study and consideration and are being taught the great joy of becoming useful members of groups of their own age and abilities.

Each child is studied very carefully from every standpoint—not only in the classrooms but on the many playgrounds in an endeavor to correct any existing peculiarities or deficiencies—in the hope of bringing out hidden talents and developing finer and more attractive personalities.

Congressional has a qualified and prominent psychologist on its staff who devotes the entire day in close cooperation with respective teachers.

There is a modern remedial reading department which also guarantees that every child will receive a good educational foundation. This section is made up of specialized teachers that assist a child in overcoming certain reading and speech difficulties.

A unique feature of the school allows every child to be placed in a group which will permit him to advance according to his own ability to acquire higher education.

The institution maintains a qualified and experienced dietitian who plans and

selects proper and healthful menus for a growing child.

It also features an outstanding athletic program. It is one of the few schools in the Nation made up of children below junior high school level that has a tackle football team and teaches major sports both for male and female. The junior high school provides for an unusual amount of sampling in diversified subjects. Students enjoy French, music, art, glee club, shop, home economics, courtesy classes, and a broad athletic program of volley ball, football, fencing, tumbling, badminton, basketball, and swimming.

The Congressional School obviously exists because there is a tremendous need for a superior school and because private initiative has realized that need and is supplying the facilities that are wanted by parents who are determined that their children shall grow and develop in an atmosphere which provides for their happiness, and for directed understanding guidance to assure their maximum potentialities.

Malcolm B. Devers is the founder and president of the school, and his wife, Mrs. Evelyn Devers, is the educational director.

Important Questions of the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wiconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a series of questions that appeared in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel:

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

Question. Is it true that the United States is at war?

Answer. Yes; the United States is at war, fighting for the United Nations in Korea.

Question. What is the United States?

Answer. It is hard to say. The United States used to be an independent Nation, but now it seems to be only a fragment of the United Nations.

Question. What is the United Nations?

Answer. The United Nations is an expensive, socialistic, and impracticable scheme of world government.

Question. Expensive? Who pays for it?

Answer. You do, if you are an American citizen.

Question. Well, if Americans pay for the United Nations, do not Americans run the United Nations?

Answer. No; indeed. The United Nations runs the United States.

Question. Is that not a funny situation—that we let somebody else run our affairs and we pay the bills?

Answer. It is very funny. The Socialists in Europe and the Communists in Russia are laughing their shaggy heads off.

Question. What is it going to cost us?

Answer. Who knows? Except that it will bankrupt us.

Question. Well, do we get anything out of it?

Answer. Sure, we get foreign wars to fight about, as in Korea.

Question. Where is Korea?

Answer. About 7,000 miles away, on the coast of Asia.

Question. Then why are we fighting a foreign war in Korea?

Answer. Because the White House, the State Department, and the United Nations arranged it.

Question. What does Congress think about that?

Answer. Under the New Deal, Congress has no right to think.

Question. What do free American citizens think about it?

Answer. Under the New Deal, there are no free American citizens; this is a Nation of taxpayers, nothing else.

Question. Have these taxpayers anything to say about our foreign policies and our fighting United Nations wars?

Answer. Certainly not. Our State Department takes care of all that; and see what it is doing. It has already put us in the Korean War, and with the help of the United Nations it will never run out of foreign wars for us to fight.

Question. How did the State Department get us into war in Korea?

Answer. Ask Harry Truman and Dean Acheson and Owen Lattimore. Why do you employ experts unless you want them to expert?

Question. Isn't it their business to keep us out of wars?

Answer. Ask them.

Question. What is the war in Korea going to cost us, anyway?

Answer. Ask Truman—or Acheson. Apparently it is going to cost us our Regular Army and Marine Corps. Then in making a new Army we will be in one awful fix. But why bother about that? Haven't you got Truman and Acheson—and Lattimore?

Question. Apparently we are in a mess.

Answer. We are.

Question. Maybe we should do something about the State Department?

Answer. Should we? What do you suggest? And how about the White House, too?

The Omnibus Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely article by the distinguished chairman of the full House Committee on Appropriations, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, published in the Tax Review for December 1950, with an editorial from the Washington Star commenting on the article:

THE ARSENAL AGAINST INFLATION—USE OF CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATION MEASURE, BEST WEAPON, MUST BE CONTINUED

The greatest internal threat to our Government and to the mode of life it represents has been the absence of effective restraints on individual and group pressure for Government expenditures. And the most effective weapon yet devised to combat that threat is the consolidated appropriation procedure followed by the Congress this year for the first time.

Deficit spending is a menace second only to the danger of invasion from abroad, and Congress and the public must marshal forces to assure continued use of this most effective weapon in the arsenal against it and against the accompanying inflation which it fosters.

This menace to American stability and strength has been growing each year, particularly in the last two decades, as the size and scope of Government functions and activities have accelerated. When the Federal Government was small and its activities limited, the facilities of the Congress to review and determine expenditure needs of the Government on a piecemeal basis were considered sufficient. But the continued growth of the Government and the expansion of its services have been accompanied by (and have generated) a tremendous increase in the areas of economic pressure. Government intervention in the economy of individuals and groups has multiplied and mushroomed Federal subsidies and contributions. Government largess affecting one group has inevitably resulted in clamor by other groups, and each class expenditure of Federal funds has generated new pressures.

The only constitutional check on these importunities for spending is the constitutional power of the Congress to appropriate funds, but the piecemeal appropriation process used by the Congress throughout most of its history has too often broken down in the face of pyramiding demands.

The individual appropriation bills were individual sticks, easily broken by the concentrated force of minority pressures. But gathered together in a single bundle, as in the consolidated appropriation measure, they have been able to withstand group raids on the Federal Treasury to a greater degree than ever before. Demands directed to specific chapters can no longer be supported by glib statements that they are too small to materially affect the total, or by nebulous promises that corresponding cuts can be made in a later bill. Each need and demand must be weighed in the light of all needs and demands, and concessions in one area must be matched by simultaneous reductions in another if the over-all objective is to be achieved. The strength thus gained by consolidation has provided the Congress with an opportunity to appropriate adequate funds needed for the legitimate purposes of government, while resisting ever-growing demands for Federal bounty.

TRIAL RUN SUCCESSFUL

An increasing appreciation of the problem by the House Appropriations Committee early this year led to the adoption of the simple but effective expedient of consolidating all appropriations into a single bill. The "trial run" of the omnibus measure during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, admittedly an experiment, can be regarded as highly successful, although there are perhaps defects which continued use of the new procedure may be expected to remedy.

In general, the obvious advantages of the new technique are that the Congress and the taxpaying public were given a more comprehensive view of the entire budget and of its impact on the national economy; that the areas of economic pressure were disclosed and arrayed, one against the other, in a single bill that showed their relation to each other and their effect on the over-all totals; and that the Congress was able to effect not only the specific reductions deemed essential to the public interest but also an over-all reduction in total expenditures.

NINE SPECIFIC ADVANTAGES

The specific advantages of the consolidated appropriation procedure are many and important:

1. Promptness: The new method permits an earlier report of appropriations to the House. All annual appropriations were reported to the House this year on March 21, the earliest date in the history of the Appropriations Committee.

2. Thoroughness: It contributes to a more thorough consideration and processing of estimates and appropriations. Under the old system each member of the committee had to analyze in detail from two to four bills, and the committee staffs were similarly handicapped, with the result that time and attention were divided proportionately. Under the new system each member of the committee and each member of the staff gives undivided attention to one chapter of the bill with the result that the bill is studied in greater detail and more thoroughly processed than ever before.

3. Increases: Consolidation protects the bill against amendments, increasing appropriations or adding new appropriations. For example, this is the first year the committee has been able to fight off amendments increasing appropriations for civil functions, the "pork barrel" section of the bill. This year the bill as messaged to the Senate carried practically no important increases except the committee amendments for national defense.

4. Attendance: The consideration of all appropriations in one bill tends to keep Members on the floor. Under the old system large bills were frequently passed with a scant two dozen Members present, and proponents of increases in appropriations, by timing their attendance, could put through amendments which would not have been agreed to with more Members present. In fact, one of the few objections voiced against the omnibus bill is that it irks Members by keeping them on the floor.

5. Retrenchment: The plan unquestionably retrenches expenditures. The bill as it passed the Congress was far below the budget estimates and was many millions of dollars below what it would have been had the departmental appropriations been reported in a dozen separate bills.

As a matter of fact, the over-all economy amendment intended to decrease total authorizations carried by the bill would not have been possible except for the omnibus plan of consideration. And the vote in favor of the amendment would not have been so overwhelming had not this plan of operation been in use at the time.

6. Logrolling: It prevents logrolling. We had been told this was one of the defects of the new plan: that there would be more logrolling between interests wishing to trade votes in order to add amendments increasing appropriations. But in the practical operation of the plan every attempt of special interests to increase the bill was defeated, and when the last roll call came on reducing the amounts appropriated in the bill, the groups which had been unable to secure increases which they urged for themselves said in effect, "If we cannot get an increase, no one shall have an increase," and instead of logrolling to increase the bill they cooperated to reduce the bill.

7. Responsibility: The one bill visualizes at a glance the outline of national income and expenditures, and centers the attention of the country on the national fiscal program. It was the pitiless limelight of national attention concentrated on these final votes that offset the pleas and importunities of the pressure groups and special interests. The omnibus appropriation bill has made the entire country definitely deficit conscious, has contributed greatly to citizen understanding of the Government's fiscal operations, and has increased citizen capacity and opportunity to influence the course of the national economy. With all appropriations in one bill, accompanied by the figures on Federal income, there is no escape from the responsibility for deficit spending.

One of the great disadvantages of the old system, with a dozen or more separate bills, was that each subcommittee, working in its own segregated corner of the budget, was spending in the dark. Not until the last bill was passed and sent to the President at the end of the session, frequently long after the expiration of the fiscal year, did anyone have any definite idea of how much had been appropriated for the year and what the relation of the various individual bills was to the fiscal program as a whole.

8. Duplications: The handling of all appropriations in the omnibus bill provides for elimination of conflicts, duplications, and overlapping expenditures. The consolidation in one bill supplies opportunity and facilities for identification of all sources of funds allocated to individual agencies, some of them difficult of ready determination. It was sometimes necessary to trace appropriations through a dozen or more items in a number of different bills under the old system. And as a result, inevitably there were from time to time provisions for expenditures which would not have been made had the subcommittee in charge of one bill had jurisdiction of all the items which appropriated money for the activity.

9. Riders: It discourages the practice of attaching irrelevant riders either in committee or by amendment from the floor. Too frequently legislation has been tacked on the several appropriation bills under the guise of limitations or by the admission of germane amendments. In the general attention focused on the bill all such attempts were turned back and the bill was passed singularly free of these impositions on the budget system and covert infringements on the jurisdiction of the Congress' legislative committees.

NO BACKWARD STEP

As against these advantages, no constructive criticism has been lodged against the adoption or continuation of the omnibus appropriation bill procedure. It has vindicated every promise, justified every expectation. And no cogent reason has been advanced for a return to the old system. Indeed, it is inconceivable that the Congress should consider taking a backward step reverting to multiple supply bills. They are the quill pen and the three-legged stool in an adding-machine age. They are the ox-cart and the kyak in a jet-plane era.

Not one of the general objections mentioned in opposition to the omnibus bill presents any substantial reason for returning to the old practice from which the House has been struggling to free itself and the country for the past 30 years. The claim that the Senate must mark time until the bill comes over from the House is unfounded. On the contrary, the Senate under the new system may begin work on any of the annual appropriations within a week or two after the session opens and much sooner than before. During the recently concluded session, the Senate had practically completed hearings on all chapters of the omnibus bill by the time the measure had passed the House. Under the new procedure, the committees of the two Houses are in effect sitting simultaneously, thereby saving time formerly lost in waiting for individual bills.

It has been contended also that it took too long to pass the bill, but the facts do not support the charge. Of course, much of the delay was avoidable. The bill was reported March 21, but could not be called up in the House until April 3. This delayed the measure past the Easter holidays and it was not sent to the Senate until May 10. But even with the delays, the total number of days, in whole or in part, consumed by the House in considering the bill was 21 days, compared with 37 days in 1938, 31 days in 1939, and 20 days in 1948. With ordinary good management in the subcommittees, the committee, and the House, the omnibus bill can be messaged to the Senate each year before Easter, with time to spare, and can be passed in the Senate and sent to the President in ample time to meet the deadline at the end of the fiscal year—greatly facilitating early adjournment.

A further criticism is that there has been lack of interest in the bill and that it has been difficult to keep a quorum on the floor. That is an old complaint. When efforts were being made to secure the consent of Speaker Joe Cannon to the erection of the first House Office Building, he insisted that once offices and committee rooms were provided for Members, it would be impossible to keep a quorum on the floor. His predictions have been frequently vindicated, especially during general debate on the individual appropriation bills when Members burdened with committee hearings and departmental work have waited for the bells to answer roll call. The adoption of the consolidated bill has effected no difference per se in this respect.

However, under the old system, general debate was not confined to the bill before the House and Members usually talked on subjects foreign to the pending measure. And those interested in the appropriations had no reason to neglect other business when the debate was on other and unrelated matters. But under the omnibus bill all debate is confined to the bill before the House and attendance is correspondingly heavier. For every instance cited to indicate a light attendance on the floor during debate on the omnibus bill, more instances can be given showing a still lighter attendance during consideration of the individual bills under the old system.

But the most untenable of all the objections to the omnibus bill is that it is unwieldy. The experience of every major nation in the world and every State in the Union belies such a proposed criticism. England, France, Sweden, and other leading nations have for centuries considered their budgets in one-package bills. Every State in the Union submits its annual budget in an omnibus bill. The United States is the notable exception to the rule. In any nation or any State the suggestion today that it abandon its time-tried method of considering its fiscal program in one bill and resort to the piecemeal expedient of separate bills would be regarded as absurd. None of them find it unwieldy—whatever that means. And the House did not find it unwieldy this time. No one finds it unwieldy except those who oppose sanity and caution in formulating the greatest fiscal program on earth.

SOME IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED

What, specifically, were the results of the use of the omnibus bill procedure in the Eighty-first Congress? There were many, but three appear to be outstanding:

1. Legislators aware of the prospect of a large annual deficit ina period of economic prosperity succeeded in whittling more than $2,000,000,000 from budget requests;

2. The consolidation of all supply bills permitted the over-all cut of $550,000,000 that the Congress felt was required by the fiscal situation; and

3. The fiscal unity achieved by the omnibus bill facilitated the transposition from a peacetime to a defense economy after the start of the Korean incident; instead of having money already appropriated, allocated, and spent under individual supply bills, the Congress found it possible to readjust the entire budget to meet the new emergency.

What improvements can be made in the consolidated appropriation method? Certainly, continued use of the new technique by the Congress will smooth out the growing pains and speed the handling of the omnibus measure. Members of the House and Senate will have every opportunity to propose specific suggestions for improved efficiency and effectiveness contributing to national economy and solvency.

An additional improvement can be anticipated as a result of the enactment of the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1950, which presages greater clarity and uniformity in Government accounting procedures. In the report of the House Appropriations Committee on the 1950 omnibus bill, it was noted that the Congress would be able to appropriate more intelligently and provide funds more nearly in line with actual requirements if it had access to more accurate and understandable accounting data. It is expected

that part of the improvement anticipated under the new statute will relate to accounting entering into the appropriation process.

The consolidated approach has been opposed, not so much because it failed as because it was successful. Its success has been attested by untenable criticisms on the part of the Washington bureaus on which the bill economizes and the lobbying interests which found it harder to slip through appropriations they want and more difficult to defeat appropriations which they are paid to oppose.

The future of the consolidated appropriation method may well lie in the support of an informed public opinion, aware that the new weapon is essential in the fight against inflationary spending. The need is pressing under any circumstance, but with the United States facing years of heavy spending under the stepped-up military preparedness program, the need becomes one of the greatest urgency. The added fiscal control resulting from consolidation of appropriations can play an important part in preserving the strength of the Nation and the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Star is an interesting commentary on the article:

CUBB ON NONESSENTIAL SPENDING

Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, has made a good defense of the single-package appropriation bill in an article for Tax Review, published by the Tax Foundation of New York. No defense of the plan should be necessary, of course, for any appropriating system that lops $2,000,000,000 off the Federal budget without damaging national security and that effects further reductions by nondefense agencies in times like these ought to receive unanimous acclaim. Yet there has been occasional sniping at the omnibus plan, despite its manifest accomplishments.

Mr. CANNON is right in his belief that much of the opposition arises because of the demonstrated success of one-shot appropriations. By lumping 11 major departmental appropriation bills into one measure, the chances for behind-the-scenes logrolling by pressure groups in or outside the Government are reduced. These groups generally met defeat when they tried to prevent certain budget cuts from becoming law. The money was saved and the country is the better off administratively and economically by reason of the savings.

The need for a road block on nonessential spending is more acute today than it was when Congress last year began consideration of the budget requests. No method or device for holding nondefense appropriations to a minimum should be overlooked by the new Congress. Certainly the omnibus appropriation bill is a device that has proved itself under test and that has earned the right to show what it can do in time of national emergency.

General Walker Never Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "General Walker Never Died," written by Mr. Charles W. Loveland, of Shelby, N. C., and which appeared in a recent issue of the Shelby Daily Star. This poem pays high tribute to a great American who died in the heroic discharge of his duty.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL WALKER NEVER DIED

They put him on a transport flying eastward
to the States,
With military honors due the greatest of
the greats;
But strange things sometimes happen shaped
by mystic hands unknown,
So it was in mid-Pacific with the distance
halfway flown.

In his flag-draped, measured coffin General
Walton Walker lay,
Heading for his land of freedom, back to
home in U. S. A.
Like a steady heartbeat pounding was the
motor's constant roar
Bringing back a tested soldier from the battlefields of war.

Then, the engines throbbed more loudly and
the casket seemed to move
As the lid, though fastened tightly, parted
from its molded groove,
All the guard, in solemn silence, sat alert at
death's command
And a figure, stanch and somber, rose in
strong, determined stand.

Now, they say the general's buried in the
land he held so dear,
But the men who flew that run with him
have feelings quaint and queer;
One said he dreamed the general rose to
toss his shroud aside,
And someone else proclaimed he dreamed the
general had not died.

Oh, they didn't bury Walker as was stated
in the press
For in bitter cold Korea still he stands in
battle dress
And wherever men are dying, comrades see
him in the fight—
His spirit couldn't leave his men upon a
one-way flight!

—*Charles W. Loveland.*

Getting Fire Losses Under Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to present for the information of the House an important editorial from the Forest Farmer of October 1950, by Herman Work. It is entitled "Getting Fire Losses Under Control." I recommend it for the valuable information which it contains.

GETTING FIRE LOSSES UNDER CONTROL

(By Herman Work)

The far-sighted editor, in the August issue of the Forest Farmer, called on all his readers to stop and take a look into the future of the woods, further than has been our custom, because we now have to consider the new demands that will come for materials required for war. With foresight sharpened by our experience in War II, owners, operators, and all concerned have the strongest reason to plan now for handling the woods work in ways that will produce the goods with the least possible damage to the great resource on which we all depend for the long future, as well as for today.

It is no news to Americans that war calls for the best we have, and lots of it. It is painfully true also that war is by nature a most wasteful business. Emergency conditions do not encourage careful use of material. Then, too, in war, time is what must be saved. Indeed, when priceless men are being spent in combat, a new scale of values is created for temporary use, a scale in which our people have learned to use material lavishly to save lives, by gaining victory as quickly as possible. The quick victory is the economical one, on every count, including the vital one of saving our selected men.

CUTTING TO SAVE AND SAVING TO CUT

The August editorial stressed the need for planning production in the woods, to assure future supplies. That, of course, is essential. But there is another way we can provide for our future. And it is something to which almost everyone in the country will lend a hand, and gladly, when all understand the problem.

It has been said many times that we have burned up more timber than we have used, in this new land of ours. The era of fires has been destructive over many generations, because it has cut off untold millions of little trees that never had a chance to grow into useful sizes.

Since most of the trees that perished were too small for sawlogs, most people took the loss lightly.

There has been a vast change in attitude, however, as we have approached the end of the virgin stands. This change has come slower in the South than elsewhere, partly because much of the southern lumber has had to seek distant markets and the poorer grades could not stand the shipping charges over long hauls. Now, new industries in the South have created large home markets for trees of small size and ordinary quality.

FIGURES SHOW SOUTH LAGS

A recent American Forest Products Industries compilation of official figures shows that 569,000,000 acres have been covered by some form of organized protection against fire. Of the 82,000,000 acres now lacking protection, 75,000,000 acres are in the Southern States. It also shows that of the total area burned in 1949, 82 percent was on unprotected land, mostly in the South. Could anything be plainer than that?

COMPLETE COVERAGE AND LOW LOSSES GO HAND IN HAND

The last five States, in the table which follows, like most of the others not named, have some degree of protection for all their forest lands. Where the entire area is under guard, the losses on protected land are lower than in the States that have been unable as yet to provide complete coverage. The United States average of 0.46 percent burned on 569,000,000 acres can be reduced to 0.12 percent or 0.14 percent, like Washington and Virginia, respectively.

Newest figures on fire protection in the South

	Unprotected areas (in thousands of acres)	Percentage of protected area burned in average year, last 5 years
Alabama	1,209	2.61
Arkansas	5,943	.56
Florida	12,065	2.71
Georgia	7,622	.91
Kentucky	6,818	.61
Louisiana	5,095	1.47
Mississippi	5,286	2.23
Missouri	8,664	1.47
North Carolina	2,251	1.14
Oklahoma	6,620	1.57
South Carolina	0	1.06
Tennessee	6,750	1.13
Texas	6,418	1.77
Virginia	0	.14
Total above	74,742	

OTHER STATES FOR COMPARISON

West Virginia	0	0.58
Michigan	0	.15
Oregon	0	.20
Washington	0	.12
Maine	0	.32

It should be mentioned here that destructive fires have occurred in States that are now fully protected. An example is the State of Maine, where a dry season brought on some fires a few years ago that got completely out of control. The recent spring season in South Carolina provided another example of extensive losses in a fully organized State. So we cannot afford anywhere to sit back and assume that because all the area is covered there is no need for concern. In fact we should not be satisfied until uncontrolled woods fires are as rare as they are in Europe. Almost all fires spring from human action. They are not normal and natural.

In spite of the examples of fires on protected areas, it is clear from the tabulation that the neglected areas take the big losses, both in the unorganized parts and in those where protection has been arranged. This points to the important fact that the fire problem is worse where the people have not yet accepted the idea that fires are bad and that they can be prevented.

THOSE WHO UNDERSTAND HAVE A CLEAR DUTY

The broadest kind of public education is needed. A great deal of this work is being done in the South today. The unprotected area is being reduced, as for instance in Georgia and Florida. However, there appears to be need for wider participation in the educational effort so that everyone will be reached, not necessarily by the officials charged with the duty, but by anyone who realizes the need for improvement and wants to serve his country in a way that will have far-reaching results.

Many voluntary organizations are working in this field, including Forest Farmers. Does it not appear that the time has arrived for greater efforts by more people and by more organizations, so that the story can be carried by neighbors, to everyone in the country, in the towns, and along the roads? The simple story is that wildfires are depriving the South of income and materials that it should rightfully expect for the future. Now that there are large markets for small trees, it should not be too hard to show owners, operators, business people, and neighbors that tangible benefits can come to them every day from trees that once had values only for the distant future.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN THE SOUTH

The South has had two other problems of its own, in addition to the earlier lack of markets for the lower grades of wood. Perhaps the less important factor has been the belief that fire makes the grazing better and tends to rid the woods of ticks and other pests. Another problem stems from the fact, well known to the people of the southern woods, that fire may be a useful as well as a destructive agent.

When fire is rigidly excluded from pinelands in the South there is likely to be an invasion by brush and by tree species that have generally been less wanted than pine. Again, frequent light fires prevent the accumulation of litter that would provide fuel for fires hot enough to kill many of the larger trees as well as the little ones.

Here a distinction must be made between the wildfires, set by anyone on anyone's land, and the newer idea of controlled or prescribed burning, to give the advantages of fire, without permitting it to burn the whole countryside. People interested in protection have been understandably cautious about accepting the beneficial use of fire, because few people as yet know what is needed to keep a controlled fire in check, and many have not been converted as yet to the need for doing away with wild fire.

The war situation should spur all citizens to a greater effort to convert everyone to the idea that wild fire is really out of place in times like these.

FIRE LAWS O. K.?

After most of the thoughtful and right-thinking people have concluded that fire is bad, there will still be a small number who for one reason or another will not go along with a good cause. Here the law must come in. This might be a good time for members of the Forest Farmers Association to examine the laws in their own States to see if they are as good as they should be to meet present conditions. It is not necessary to try something new, for among the 48 States many kinds of laws have been tested, and this experience should be used to the full.

Owners and operators especially have a chance to point out the needs in their own localities and to advocate reasonable laws to protect the many from the losses that have come from thoughtless actions of a few.

Amendment of Railway Labor Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1950, the House passed S. 3295, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements for union membership and deductions from wages of carriers' employees. This bill is substantially the same as H. R. 7789 in the Eighty-first Congress.

The legislation has the effect of forcing carrier employees to join a union in order to work and hold their jobs. It also forces them to pay dues to the union and directs the carrier employer to deduct the dues from the pay checks of the employees.

I believe in unions for workers and laborers and if I were an employee of a railroad or other carrier I would want to belong to one of the brotherhoods in the craft or the class of the work that I did. However, I believe in the right to belong or not to belong to a union or any other organization. I feel that membership is something that should be left entirely to the choice of the worker. This is in keeping with the general democratic rights of American people and the freedoms which belong to them. Therefore, I did not support S. 3295 which has the effect of forcing workers to join a union and forcing them to pay dues where the shop in which they work is unionized. That choice should be left to each individual worker.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a letter which was received by our State delegation from a man who is a member of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, and whose sentiment is in keeping with that I have expressed above. The letter follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *December 27, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN.
Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON.
Hon. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.
Hon. ARTHUR WINSTEAD.
Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER.
Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

HONORABLE SIRS: As a district chairman of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks representing 257 members transferred here from the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee, and above all a southerner, I am appealing to you gentlemen to vote and exert your influence against H. R. 7789, which would amend the Railway Labor Act to permit negotiations for a union shop on the railroads. While I and my coworkers here on the Louisville & Nashville Railroad believe in the necessity for unions, as our voluntary membership proves, we do not believe in forced membership in either a union, club, lodge, church, or anything else, feeling that such in any form is un-American and should be left to Russia.

This legislation is being sought by the national leaders and the opinion of the people has not been asked for nor considered. They seek such power to further their political ideas which for the greater part are of the FEPC and civil-rights variety, as is evidenced by the propaganda for such in labor papers.

Food for thought is that there are over 300,000 new members of the railway clerks alone and with the passage of this bill would be added some 60,000 forced members. Assess each of these members even the small sum of $5 each, which the law as written provides can be done, and it is easy to see what a power would be unleashed in support of the above political ideas. This alone should warn any southerner against such.

We as railroad employees have made great progress by the expression of the freedom of choice and the Railway Labor Act. Keep this act intact and let us continue to do so, but, either progress or failure, let us be as freemen and not by orders under force from a few. Help us preserve this freedom.

Yours very truly,

W. T. HARRISON.

Impossible for United States To Do Business With Russia on Any Normal Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Eagle of December 26, 1950:

IMPOSSIBLE FOR UNITED STATES TO DO BUSINESS WITH RUSSIA ON ANY NORMAL PLANE

When the holiday season is over we can expect the new defense programs to get rolling in earnest. It has been said that the public generally is more willing to accept the expected restrictions than Washington is to invoke them. That may be true in some instances, but we are a bit inclined to believe that both Congress and the President are much more aware of the situation than they have been given credit for.

Our information is that the long-run and over-all controls are so tough that the man

in Washington feel the people have to be conditioned first for their acceptance.

A confirmation of this attitude rests on the strong speech Governor Dewey made the night before President Truman addressed the Nation on the need of declaring a state of emergency.

The first reactions to the Dewey speech was that the New York Governor was beating Truman to the punch and bolstering Republican political policy. It has come out since from a reliable source that Mr. Dewey cleared his talk with the White House before he delivered it and that the President was pleased to have the Governor break the ice with a plea for the most stringent kind of a program.

While the general feeling among the public seems to be one of willing anticipation of a hard schedule, the fact remains that we have traditionally been slow to resign ourselves to any kind of Government control except in time of actual warfare.

When or if war is to come, no one at the present time can accurately foretell. We have been pushed into such a position, however, that we must be fully and unconditionally prepared to meet any contingency.

We can be sure of some very definite facts. The dangers and threats which are being thrust upon the free nations come not from the local places where hostilities have erupted. The core and center of the evil is in Soviet Russia. Secondly, the Kremlin will not tip its hand to us as to its future moves. It will strike when and where it believes we are least prepared to offset the onslaught.

Finally—and this is a truth that even some seemingly intelligent leaders have not yet learned—there is not the slightest possibility of doing business with the Soviet on any normal plane. The nature of communism gives indisputable proof of that assertion. We might as well make up our minds that dealing with the Reds as we would other normal persons is a delusion.

We must break relations with the Soviet regardless of the consequences. To be a bit more accurate, we should say Russia has long ago broken with the rest of the world and we must acknowledge the facts in the case. It means the Nation must go on a wartime program, not knowing when, where, or if the clash of arms on a global scale will occur. Nor has anyone the least idea how long the crisis will last. It may be a few years, 5, 10, 20. The only thing that can change the picture is a complete and about-face change in communism. We see no hope of that for a long time.

We, as a nation, are to be tested in the years ahead as we have never been tried before. It will take all that we have, every resource we possess—politically, socially, industrially, spiritually—to survive the trial. Individually we can sum up our role in one word—sacrifice. Our heritage of the past and the promises of the future depend on how well we measure up to that word.

Defense Should Begin at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend two letters to the Members of this body for reading. Even in the center of these United States the people are deeply concerned over the present foreign situation. One does not have to read the metropolitan press of our largest cities in order to find constructive thinking.

These two letters emphasize most strongly the feeling among the people—that defense like charity should begin at home:

[From the Concordia (Kans.) Blade-Empire of December 21, 1950]

IN THE MAIL BAG

To the BLADE:

That America stands at the threshold of grave and momentous times every sane man and woman must admit.

Ancient history tells us of Emperor Nero who fiddled while Rome burned. If Nero were alive today his fiddling wouldn't hold a candle to the fiddling that is going on in Washington, D. C. The Pentagon fiddles while the whole world burns.

If America doesn't wake up and change her ways, we are headed for the paths taken by Babylon, Greece, and Rome. The fall of these empires was preceded by an era of wanton luxury and extravagance. These nations fondly imagined their wealth and power would last forever but history has proven their error. They realized this only after it was too late. And history has a habit of repeating itself.

Let's pull our boys out of Korea. Let's bring them home to protect our own shores. We can't play Santa Claus to the whole world. Let's keep our main Pacific bases and build an impregnable defense around America proper. We've spent so many billions on both Western Europe and Eastern Asia it makes us dizzy even to contemplate. And what do we get out of it? A kick in the pants, mostly. We get nations, countries, and peoples who are ready to bite the hand that feeds them. Look what America has done for China the past 100 years. Look what China is now doing for us.

You can imagine what Western Europe would do to us should the hordes of Russia and China, and, yes, India, come sweeping across the eastern plains to invade their countries. In this writer's opinion, they would tamely submit to these invaders rather than have their own countries made a vast battlefield of blood and carnage. In a way you cannot blame them too much, for they went through World War II, and know what it means.

Rather than have their own countries made this vast field of carnage, they would turn on America if we intervened and tried to help them. In spite of all we have done for these countries, no people are hated by them more than Americans.

There is another story of an ancient philosopher who out of the kindness of his heart, picked up a nearly frozen viper and placed it in his bosom. He warmed it back to life and the viper promptly stung him to death.

America has taken many countries of Western Europe and several of Eastern Asia, to its maternal bosom and has warmed them back to life. Will we get the same reward as this ancient philosopher?

Let's spend our billions for home defense.

Let's get out of Asia, for the sleeping giant has wakened and, armed to the teeth with Russian weapons, she can almost whip the world.

Truly we are facing grave and perilous times. Let's recognize this fact before it is everlastingly too late.

C. D. W.

OPPOSES FOOLISH FOREIGN COMMITMENTS

Philip Doyle, World War II veteran and successful farmer, viewing present world conditions, boils over and takes his pencil in hand to express himself in the following screed:

DECEMBER 11, 1950.

DEAR FRIENDS AND READERS: Several years have passed since last I wrote in this manner. At that time I was a GI, a member of that vast military organization recruited to stamp tyranny and oppression from all those parts of the earth, downtrodden by those three monsters, namely, Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini. At that time we were told that if only we could but win the war we would go home and enjoy the fruits of peace and plenty, everyone would love the United States and all she stood for, and admire us for the sacrifices we had made for straightening out the oppressors and binding up the wounds of those who had suffered.

Five years have passed since the cessation of World War II and where do we stand today?

In a few short words I think it can be summed up thus: The diplomatic, political, and military bunglers that represent the head of those departments have lost the peace obtained, at the price of the lives and blood of those youthful Americans who left home and country to wrestle with foreign oppression and hypocrisy. (In passing, lest we forget, let us also remember those maimed and crippled veterans who inhabit the hospitals and sanitariums of our Nation today who are in a state of living death.) I ask you, When we view the state of the Nation and the world as a whole, can there be an alternative except the dismal knowledge that it was only all in vain?

Where can a good American citizen stand and point with pride to any one shining example of success in the foreign policy of our Government agencies. We, the Nation, stand on the brink of inflation and bankruptcy. Our so-called allies, while grasping all the money, supplies, and munitions they can euchre out of our dim-witted diplomatic representatives will not eagerly volunteer their own aid when we ourselves are involved in a national catastrophe, as our ill-advised fiasco in Korea has been. In other words, they insist on dragging their feet on any project that obviously cannot be maneuvered into filling their own pockets with good, hard, United States money.

Where have our statesmen and our old-style, hardheaded diplomats disappeared to?

Now, at the hour when we as a Nation, are at the cross roads where, oh, where, are the men upon whom the people can look for deliverance from the futile and insane policies of those in high places today.

Where is to be found individuals of the caliber similar to those of the Washingtons, the Lincolns, the Ben Franklins, and their like who lived in the days when this wonderful country was launched. Stock from solid, freedom-loving people who came to this wilderness to start a land of their own, where taxation, tyranny, and socialism were not to be the yoke of the coming generations.

I ask you, dear reader, how do you like the outlook for your children? Washington uttered words of prophecy when he said:

"We must, as a Nation, steer clear of foreign entanglements and alliances, or as a free Nation we will cease to exist." We, as a Nation in the past 33 years, have ceased to regard this advice, and I believe most of our present-day troubles can be placed on the doorsteps of these entanglements and alliances. International politics, if continued at the present rate, will cause the downfall of our democratic way of life.

In my opinion, the Government agencies are so infested with the termites of communism that we are being sold down the river to our enemies. Inflation and bankruptcy are two weapons they will use to advantage. The American standard of living will fall, dissatisfaction and disbelief in our leaders will result, and then, brother, life as we have known will be on the toboggan slide to dissolution and despair.

Why do we weaken ourselves by pouring our blood in the form of young men, munitions, food, machinery, and money into the dead corpse of Europe, wherein there is not the will to live in any democratic way of life? The history of Europe has always been one of wars waged by one country or group of countries upon the other. Their jealousies are paramount. In our effort to aid each one of them our efforts have, to a large part, been penalized because all of them were afraid they would not get a lion's share of the feast. They sit like vultures waiting to pounce upon any scrap we might throw them. Our foreign policy, as I see it, since the early forties was but one giant jackpot give-away program. Soon our resources and national wealth will be stripped away from us. Where will we turn and what nation will come to our rescue? I prophesy our plenty-loving friends across the seas will desert us like rats from a sinking ship.

Friendship, among nations as among individuals, cannot be bought by money or gifts of any kind. Friendship is given, not bought. If friendship is not to be given voluntarily, all the financial bribery in the world will not make one iota of difference. When the chips are down the fair-weather friends will fade away.

I fear that in case of a Russian war and things were to start looking bad for us Great Britain, France, Italy, and all those others would desert us like rats from a sinking ship. The Korean deal should be a good example of that. Whose armies have been doing the lion's share of the fighting and dying in that trap? Another of the examples of how much a far cry our diplomats are from the hard-headed horse-trading Yankee statesmen of our past glorious history. When those admirable individuals made a deal they got their money's worth. In spite of our Marshall plan aid on all the other prodigious amounts of philanthrophy bestowed upon our allies it would seem there were no binding clauses which required their unlimited cooperation when we ourselves are in a jam.

Perhaps, we would not be in that jam if the original plans of our fathers still existed. Their idea for government consisted of the Constitution, to be carried out by three branches of government, legislative, executive, and judicial. According to that this war would not be declared or peace made without express act of Congress. I have yet to find anywhere any proof where the present debacle has been the result of being a war declared by Congress. Perhaps that ancient body has been replaced by the President, United Nations, and MacArthur.

It seems strange that our executive branch should be manned by the type of individual who would seem to become much more enraged by a slighting remark made by a critic concerning the quality of his daughter's singing, than he does about the facts of the barbarous butchery and torture of our American troops in a foreign theater, by the Chinese Reds. Am I right?

Perhaps many of the troubles of our times are a direct result of our (the United States public) tending to be lax in supervising the activities of our lawmakers and executives. If we, each and everyone of us, would trouble ourselves to find how our public servants served us in Washington and took them to task by letter or telegram whenever we doubted their decisions they might be slower to be careless with their public trust.

If we as a Nation pass out of existence it will be, in my estimation due largely to three causes: first the involvement by the United States in foreign alliances and the subsequent wasting away of our economy in all the give-away foreign relief it entailed; second, the refusal of the people of the United States to hold their own executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government under constant accountability for their actions plus the fact that we as a Nation fail to concern themselves in the problems confronting their Congressmen; third, the tending of our Government to lean toward and favor socialism or at best a "pink capitalism" if one wishes to be kind. Wake up America. "It's later than you think."

Almost as an afterthought let me say that the two most dangerous aspects in our futile foreign-aid programs are: 1. That perhaps a lot of the aid has gone into the hands and pockets of unscrupulous politicians and organizations in these countries instead of the common people who needed the help and for whom the aid was really intended. 2. The fact that we are building up those areas and that Russia is only waiting for us to fatten up said countries, then come in and take them over to be used in a war against us. With the international situation in those countries as they are, I wonder if that is an impossibility?

I wonder sometimes if it would not have been far better to have cut ourselves off from those decadent countries and made a new world for ourselves here at home. If we had taken a fraction of that money and spent it on our next-door neighbors in Canada and our South American neighbors on the south, they might be forever our friends. At the present rate we will soon be a manufacturing, raw-material-importing Nation. We could manufacture, and they could furnish us raw materials. They would buy our automobiles, refrigerators, tractors, and such like mad. What better set-up could a nation want? It seems odd that we should support those European nations that are in direct competition to us. I maintain that those countries that today depend upon us for charity are for the most part waiting on the day when we can no longer be the No. 1 nation of them all, and they themselves can assume that status. Woe be to us then. We would be shocked at the provisions thrust upon us then.

O. K. United States of America, where do we go from here? Remember, wherever we go from here that the blame or glory, whichever it may be, will rest upon your shoulders. Politicians, diplomats, and agencies of one kind or another are calling the shots and standing in the limelight, but remember you, John Q. Citizen, are the guy who pays and pays and pays.

We have had the New Deal and the Fair Deal—are we ever going to get the Square Deal? Our only chance of survival is for our citizens to plant their feet in United States soil and refuse to budge or be bullied into making any more foolish foreign commitments.

We are being stripped of our wealth and material as the sharper at the fair strips the simple country boy.

Sincerely,

PHILIP J. DOYLE.

Lost Horizons—From Gettysburg to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne of Huntington, W. Va., has for years taken a lively interest in many important public questions. Recently she wrote an article on the subject of Lost Horizons—From Gettysburg to Korea.

I am asking the privilege of having this article printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

LOST HORIZONS FROM GETTYSBURG TO KOREA

Less than one score years ago Franklin Roosevelt brought forth on this continent a false concept of liberty, borrowed from Karl Marx, and dedicated to the proposition that by violating every American principle and tradition—at home and abroad—we could prove that all men are created equal and destined to live in leisure in a welfare world. Those experiments, continued by Mr. Truman, have wrecked our security, economy, and peace at home and our friendships abroad; because of them we engage in many wars proving that this Nation, or any other nation so dedicated, cannot long endure. Because we forgot "The rock from whence we are hewn" we are met on battlefields all over the earth to dedicate them to our sons who fought so valiantly and hopelessly in idealistic wars they could not win; it is not altogether fitting nor proper that they should have done this.

In a realistic sense we cannot condone the maladministration and misguided idealists who allowed these planned attacks on our free institutions to warp, change and undermine the very foundations of this Republic and remake it in their own image. The little men, both living and dead, who through gullibility or design, executed this advance into utopia have wrecked the ship of state far beyond our poor powers to add or detract as long as they are in office.

The world now little notes the miracle of freedom our forefathers wrought here, but it will long remember, because of needless blood, sweat, and tears, what the combined forces of evil under false leadership, did here. The prophets of doom who now predict we must live always in war and confusion belie the premise of repentance for wrong-doing and are only trying desperately to cover up their sins against this Nation.

We can stop the desecration of the faith of our fathers and survive. Therefore, it is for the living, rather to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us to reinstate the fundamental American principles which brought the greatest good to the greatest number, and that from this terrible debacle in Korea we take increased devotion to those Christian precepts and concepts which made and kept us a Nation. Wherever we are involved and whatever the sacrifice, it will be in vain unless we reach these objectives, as we strive once again to rebuild a strong defense for one God, one flag, and one country, lest this Nation, as the symbol and demonstration of liberty for people everywhere, perish from the earth.

Let us resolve now to be practical Christians and make our calling and election sure. Let us resolve to work, pray, and vote for men and women who still believe that the Bible, the Constitution, Ray's arithmetic, and the McGuffey readers made a great and good country, whose people were God-fearing, independent, free-enterprising Americans.

Old fashioned? Yes. So are the Ten Commandments.

Fish Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, members of the Public Lands Committee are interested in the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife and every wise move to bring about that conservation. It has been called to my attention that the National Park Service has recently taken steps to control fishing in the Everglades National Park in the State of Florida. An editorial in the Miami Herald for Thursday, November 16 last, rather fully explains this conservation

effort and why it was necessary. Under leave to print, I extend herewith the editorial as follows:

HEARING CALLED TO CONSERVE FISH VALUES

It is commonly known among sports fishermen, commercial fishermen, and resort operators along the Florida Keys and nearby areas that the use of heavy drag seines has reduced the fish population of fertile Florida Bay in Monroe County.

A loophole in the State law which defines legal nets and seines permits any size to be used in the taking of mullet.

State conservation officers who have apprehended fishermen with huge nets have, time after time, failed to make a case because the fishermen claimed that they were taking mullet. Large, small—mesh nets collect any fish that happens to be in the area—big, little sports fish, commercial fish, and everything else. This has resulted in a waste of fish—a waste that all who know the waters freely admit has been a destroying effect.

Long before Everglades National Park was created, the National Park Service in consultation with commercial and sports fishermen decided that commercial fishing would be allowed to continue in the proposed park on what might be termed a "sustained yield" basis.

Just as in the national forests where timber is cut as a scientifically controlled crop, the fish would be taken from the waters of the park in such a way as to allow seed stock to remain and perpetuate forever this important commercial and recreational resource.

Later, when the Legislature of Florida was holding hearings on the proposed park, the Secretary of the Interior reiterated this proposal in a telegram to Representative Burnie C. Papy at Key West.

Before World War II, commercial fishermen in Florida Bay made their living with gill nets. These nets had a relatively large mesh which permitted small fishes to go through. The nets were "set" by a few men and hauled usually by hand. They did not drag and disrupt the fertile bottom of the bay. The commercial fishermen made a good living and the sports fishermen had plenty of excellent catches.

Then someone decided if they could employ a very large net or seine dragged by a power boat, they could increase the yield of fish. They did, and others followed, taking literally millions of pounds of fish from the waters.

Soon the resident fisherman with his gill nets could not catch enough in the nearly clean-swept waters to make a decent living. It is small wonder that he, too, if he could afford it, turned to the drag seines.

While the majority of commercial fishermen opposed the drag seines and wanted to return to gill nets, they were unwilling to do so as long as others were employing these big nets and reducing the available take for the others.

"We'll quit, if everybody else does," they said. Nobody could give them assurance that the others would quit, too.

When Florida Bay was added to Everglades National Park last February, National Park Service officials went the rounds of the sportsmen clubs, commercial fishing houses, talked with law enforcement and judicial officials and discussed the merits of outlawing the drag seines.

They were met with an eagerness they had not expected to find. The proposed regulations were drawn up and many of the "bugs" were worked out.

Now the Secretary of the Interior has published the proposed special fishing regulations for Everglades National Park and has appointed a special committee to hold a public hearing on them at park headquarters in Homestead beginning at 10 a. m. today.

One of the State's foremost economic resources, commercially and as a sports and recreation attraction, is at stake. The importance of the hearing merits the attendance of all who are interested.

Bitter Results of Recent United States Decisions Must Be Faced Without Fear or Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert M. Grannis in the Brooklyn Eagle of December 3, 1950:

ONE MAN SAYS

(By Robert M. Grannis)

BITTER RESULTS OF RECENT UNITED STATES DECISIONS MUST BE FACED WITHOUT FEAR OR RETREAT

Decent people have a habit of making precipitate decisions based on anger of the moment and then, after thoughtful consideration, they water them down to eliminate any suggestion of ruthlessness—not to mention a will to preserve the status quo in their daily lives. The spirit of decent compromise is deep in our natures.

We are decent people, no matter what the Malliks, the Vishinskys, the General Wus, or the Daily Workers may say about us. We don't like to see people killed needlessly, whether it is a Long Island railroad wreck or a war. We believe that the individual is important and that the state is subject to the will of the people.

We believe that we possess most of the ingredients for an orderly world and acknowledge that there are certain imperfections in the American system that must be worked out through the years by trial and error.

Our job is far from finished

Our spiritual conscience is strong and is a safe barometer to remind us that the job we started more than 170 years ago is far from finished. Our spiritual understanding of other people led us to reject isolationism and accept the fact that we have no monopoly on the right of free choice. To wall ourselves in and hide from the sufferings of others who lack our strength and resources has been recognized as uncharitable and as a device that some day might leave us standing alone against a conquered world.

Now, I believe we have reached a point where the bitter consequences of some of our recent decisions as a nation must be faced without fear, without retreat, and without self-flagellation because our first reaction might be one of horror due to discovery of the strength of our determination.

What we do in the next few months could be the turning point in history and involve the choice between a slave world and a free world. Some of our allies already are wavering. Prime Minister Attlee is expected to ask a settlement with Red China at any cost. Mention of the atom bomb has caused others to raise their hands in horror.

Kremlin sneers at human understanding

We have got to realize we are dealing with people who have no conscience, no respect for the spiritual side of life, and no wish to compromise except on their own terms. The master plan has been written and the people who have been selected to implement it are as small and unimportant in the eyes of the authors as the slaves were when they toiled and died to erect temples to graven images and false gods centuries ago.

Our human understanding is sneered at and rejected by the lords of the Kremlin and their puppets. The truth about Korea, the truth about the world's troubles is not in any Red portfolio carried into the halls of UN. There is one underlying thought and one underlying motive: conquest by infiltration and conquest by force. The simple church, humble people kneeling at prayer, children dropping pennies into boxes to feed the hungry, are factors that stand in the path of the monstrous scheme directed by Moscow.

General MacArthur says that if we lose in Korea we will have to fight it out in Europe and probably lose there. He understands the nature of the Communist threat and the lengths to which its agents will go.

Malik's views are those of a savage

Buried deep in the text of a UN address by Jacob Malik, the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, there is a quote that probably escaped the attention of millions. I repeat it here as the words of a savage to whom all religion is repugnant.

"We all know," said Malik, "that missionaries have always been a weapon of aggression and that they have served to promote the conquests of the ruling circles and to enslave peoples who were a source of income. Missionaries have always been followed by traders and soldiers."

When the word of God is ruled out of our lives it is no time for appeasement. When an altar cannot be raised among men without fear of death or imprisonment the strong must seek the cure or face death slowly with frightened faces.

Beaming our prayers to Moscow is not the answer. We must let them see the strength of our cold steel and understand that decent people are as resolute as the savage fabricators of a gangster plot against all humanity.

Air and Sea Power Our Hope in World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, at various times, since the start of hostilities in Korea, I have presented some of my own ideas, concerning the course this Nation should take, in meeting the world-wide emergency, brought about by Russian imperialistic expansionism.

I have recognized, as surely as you have recognized, in this emergency, the most terrible threat to our national existence ever encountered, since the founding of the Republic.

All of us have come to realize, I think, even as Lenin and Stalin earlier realized, that in no real sense are we living in one world, as the internationalists would have it.

We know that we are living on a globe that is divided into two worlds. One is the free world of democratic republicanism; the other, the slave world of socialistic communism.

We understand now, that they cannot long continue to exist, side by side.

Never did we seek to have it this way. We fought and won the First World War, as we thought, to make the world safe for democracy. But after it was over, we found that the Allied victory meant only a change in the European balance of power.

We fought the Second World War and won it, as we thought, to end all wars. But since that time, we have found that even as World War I gave rise to World War II, the Second World War only spawned a lot of little wars, in a world divided beyond any peaceful adjustment of its conflicting ideologies.

Compromise no longer is possible.

That all of these little wars, and world war III, of which they are merely the opening skirmishes, could have been avoided is undeniable.

The peace after World War I was lost by international politicians, masquerading as statesmen, in a metaphorically smoke-filled room at the Palace of Versailles.

The peace after World War II was lost in the political horse-trading atmosphere of similar rooms at Tehran, Cairo, Yalta, and Potsdam. Lost, it should be noted, even before the war had ended.

Now, through the partisan-political-minded opportunism, the crass blunders and weaknesses of little men in offices of great power both in our own administrations over the past 17 years, and in the chancelries of Europe, the Russian imperialists rule nearly half the land mass of the world and more than a third of the human race.

The Red gangsters of the Kremlin call the tune for a lot of little wars, while the piper is paid in the wealth and blood of America and of the slave satellites of Russia.

With his own forces unimpaired, the bloody handed tyrant of communism sits in the Kremlin planning the Armageddon so soon to come.

The situation now is such that Soviet Russia holds the initiative. Occupying most of Asia and half of Europe, with 12,000,000 men under arms and with tremendous supplies of slave-manufactured weapons and war equipment, the Kremlin still has an effective manpower reserve of nearly 75,000,000 men.

American troops, without the initiative and with the half-hearted support of allies who seem to have lost the will to fight, engage the enemy wherever and whenever the Kremlin wills.

Such well-trained troops as we have are scattered about the world, garrisoning nations which show little desire to defend themselves. At the present moment virtually all of our striking power is tied down in Korea. There the very men who should be training our new armies are fighting and dying in a little war that already is lost.

In 5 years the Congress has appropriated $50,000,000,000 for the armed services, to say nothing of nearly as much for our bread-and-butter allies. Yet we lack the military power, it seems, to win anywhere in the world. Our allies are in worse case.

But in spite of this position, so close to ultimate disaster, the Congress is told—the American people are told—that we must not reexamine the foreign policies which brought it about.

We are urged to rally behind the President and the Secretary of State. We are told to forget the weaknesses and blunders of the past, if they were nothing worse, so that we may blind ourselves to those the future may bring—all in the name of unity.

And what, may I ask, would that kind of unity be? Unity without leadership; a nation united in futility and defeat.

The voices calling for this kind of unity are the voices of a folly so vast as to exceed the bounds of sane thinking. The unity we need now is a unity in bringing those who profess to lead us, and who ask us to follow them blindly, back once more to their senses.

Either that, or unity in creating new leaders, who are not given to vacillation because of petty political considerations; leaders who have a program, born of the wisdom and strength of the American people, and not of their weaknesses.

I refer to the perversion of the administration's socialistic ideal, whereby Americans have been advised, not to share with each other, but each in every instance, to get his own share; and a bit more, if he votes aright.

As a long-time member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have enjoyed the opportunity such membership provides for studying in detail the various factors of national defense.

It was on the basis of this hard-won knowledge that nearly 6 months ago I voiced the conclusion that the United States cannot hope to win a land war against the hordes of foot soldiers the Red colossus ultimately can muster in Europe and Asia.

Our hope of victory, as I said then, and believe now, lies in domination of the sea and air.

I continued to believe this, even when American troops stood at the Manchurian border. I did so because it seemed to me that Russia's necessity of keeping face in Asia would send the Chinese Communists into Korea. Obviously we lacked the military manpower to stay permanently in Korea.

For this reason, and for others connected with the imminent invasion of Yugoslavia by Bulgarian and Rumanian satellite troops, in a radio broadcast several weeks ago I offered some further conclusions.

It seemed to me imperative that we should withdraw all of our troops from the Asiatic mainland; that we should proceed as quickly as possible to arm Japan and the Philippines; that we should redouble the blockade before Formosa, and extend it to cover the entire Chinese coast; that we should give additional arms and economic aid to Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Army; and that so far as possible, we should support with arms and money the nearly 2,000,000 Nationalist guerrillas on the Chinese mainland.

It seemed to me imperative, too, that we must reach a realistic understanding with our Western European allies; that we should make it clear to them that we will not single-handedly defend their territory, but that we will help them defend themselves. They have the manpower, and lack only the arms.

I pointed out by implication that under present circumstances, should Soviet Russia move into Western Europe, even England would become quite untenable as a base for American operations. I pointed out further, that in such event, Spain alone would be available to us.

I did not urge that we desert our Western European allies. I did urge that we force them to realize and act upon the situation as it really exists.

Still further, it seemed imperative to me that we should permit nothing to delay the most complete preparations for the defense of the Western Hemisphere; that we make of the Americas, as Herbert Hoover said later, a veritable Gibraltar of military power.

And again it seemed to me that we must find some effective means of rapprochement with the Latin American Republics; that we must find some way of ending the present rude treatment accorded them by our State Department and by our delegates in the United Nations.

Most of us have heard of the fact that United States delegates declined an invitation to a cocktail party given by the delegates of a powerful South American country, on the score that they were too busy with the Korean situation. We have heard, too, that Vishinsky attended, and made friends by saying he never was too busy to fraternize with important people from South America.

It should be noted here, too, that some of the better informed commentators are saying that another even more powerful Latin American Republic is ready to ally itself with the Russians, in the event of a new world war.

Just before the Christmas holidays, I was gratified to hear former President Herbert Hoover, on a Nation-wide hookup, express ideas closely resembling my own.

In his position of eminence, as the greatest living American, it followed naturally that he should be attacked by the apologists for the Truman-Acheson foreign policy. They smeared him as an isolationist.

Parenthetically, I might ask: If Herbert Hoover is an isolationist, then what is wrong with isolationism?

The apologists, and particularly the former Republican, John Foster Dulles, in a radio speech said that we must continue to bear the burden for our Western European allies at any cost, because we must have bases in Europe, in order to retain domination of the sea and air. For the same reason, he advocated fighting on to the last man in Korea.

Dulles said we must be in a position to counterattack anywhere in the world, and thus keep the Russians off balance, running from point to point on the Soviet defense perimeter.

Now just what does Mr. Dulles think we did in Korea? And does he overlook the fact that our counterattack in Korea has proved the contention that we cannot hope to win land wars against the hordes of Asia, either in the Far East or in Western Europe? The latter, of course, unless and until the Western

European countries take steps to utilize their vast military manpower.

We can help them to arm, but we cannot do all of their fighting for them. We are 7 percent of the world's population, and we lack the manpower to fight everywhere.

Dulles, and others like him, seem to forget that our counterattack by land has left Korea a peninsula of scorched earth, where millions will starve. They forget that Russia now is in a position to take all of Western Europe within a few weeks' time.

From the battle front the American people are fed with optimistic communiqués, telling of the orderly withdrawals, the success of the amphibious operation at Inchon, and the possibilities of holding on in Korea indefinitely.

Yet the newspapers and the air networks are filled with letters and statements by returned soldiers describing Inchon as another Dunkerque, and telling the full horror of the so-called orderly withdrawals. It is my conviction that the American people realize the essential untruth and insincerity of those communiqués.

They sound too much like something dreamed up by the State Department. They sound too much like those communiqués from Berlin when Germany was losing in World War II—communiqués which said that German troops, as a matter of strategy, were advancing to the rear.

Nevertheless, Dulles and the other administration apologists, go on saying that we must have continental European and Asian bases, in order to retain control of the sea and air. Why is that so?

We already control the sea and air. We shall retain this control, unless we dissipate our wealth, and sacrifice the lives of millions of the flower of American youth—sacrifice our wealth and our youth in land wars initiated by the Kremlin and fought against overwhelming odds on the Kremlin's cwn terms.

To make such a sacrifice would be to court national degeneration and ultimate destruction of the last bastion of freedom on earth. And this sacrifice is unnecessary.

We have adequate bases for sea and air power in Japan, the Philippines, Formosa, and the isles of the western Pacific. Spain can be made available to us.

France and England show signs of understanding what they must do. And without any doubt Herbert Hoover's radio address, more than anything else, brought the understanding home to them. There is just a chance they may be able to act in time.

We cannot and must not—we have no need—to sacrifice millions of our ablest and best. Above all, Russian imperialistic communism must be contained by sea and air. It must be kept from our shores, until it falls of its own rottenness, as all dictatorships eventually fall.

And when all is said and done, the fact remains that this third world war, which is so close upon us, cannot be from our viewpoint a war for the survival of any particular nation, other than our own. It will be a battle for the entire world, and the chips of national destruction must fall where they may.

TVA's 17 Years of Progress Is Inspiring Story of Progress Toward National Security and General Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege in the past endeavor to keep this body abreast of the vast progress which annually is recorded in the yearly report of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Today I wish to comment once more upon the growth of the TVA as demonstrated in its seventeenth annual report. In reviewing the latest account of TVA activities it is more than ever apparent to me that the statesmen of other years whose vision made possible the building of this great public project were gifted with prophetic foresight. It is almost as though these men were able to see into the future and the tremendous war needs which only such a development as the TVA could meet—needs stemming from mobilization and the building of a vast and powerful military machine. TVA's contribution tc our war needs in World War II is an inspiring story in our history. Today, when TVA is stronger than ever—stronger, even, than in World War II—we may gain added security in the knowledge that its contributions to our national defense will be great and essential in our present hour of national crisis.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean of January 1, 1950, entitled "Seventeen Years of Progress."

The editorial is as follows:

SEVENTEEN YEARS OF PROGRESS

Like a favorite book that retains its original appeal no matter how many times it is read, the Tennessee Valley Authority's annual reports never fail to reward us with a feeling of satisfaction. The seventeenth such review, made public yesterday, is no exception.

As always the report is a story of progress—past, present, and future. It is an account of the amazing transformation that has been, is being and will be wrought in this great Tennessee Valley of which we are a part. It is an inspiring record of accomplishments that skeptics once said were impossible.

"The valley region today is stronger than it was in 1933, or than it was in 1940 when the Nation began to mobilize for World War II, or than it was when the war ended in 1945," the report tells us. "It is stronger in the control the people exercise over their natural resources. It is stronger in its own institutions."

Even those of us who have watched this strength grow during the last 17 years find its comparative measurements almost unbelievable. Yet, the facts and figures are there for all to see:

The region's power supply is 12 times as great as it was in 1933. River freight tonnage has increased from 33,000,000 ton-miles to 508,000,000 ton-miles. Flood damage along the Tennessee has been reduced by $45,000,000. Total power consumers have been boosted from 275,000 to 1,100,000. Electrification of 82 percent of all the farms in the valley has been accomplished, compared with only 3 percent in 1933. Fertilizer production research has revolutionized America's fertilizer industry. A long-term trend of erosion and soil depletion has been reversed. A great reforestation and timber management program has been inaugurated. And recreational resources have been developed into one of the Nation's greatest playgrounds.

The value of these gains is inestimable; the cost has been low. They have not been bought, as so many charge, with socialism, inefficiency, and ill-considered spending.

"Contrary to the widely disseminated notion that efficient management in the electric business is the exclusive attribute of private ownership, the publicly owned and locally managed distribution systems in the valley show cost of service averaging somewhat lower than those of the entire electric-utility industry, whether or not the cost of wholesale power is included," the report says. And it adds financial statistics which show an average 4-percent annual return on power investment for the 17 years of TVA operation.

Despite the progress already made, the report notes that the region is still far from attaining maximum development of its many resources.

"The broad programs launched 17 years ago need to be continued. But today the State and local agencies, supported by an improved economic base are better able to carry them on. They can carry on with less assistance from TVA, either material or technical and advisory, than they have in the past."

There is only one dark spot in the whole picture. Although the Authority's power system capacity has been multiplied nearly four times since 1940, the region is still far short of the power needed to meet expanding national defense demands.

"Further construction is underway on a fast schedule to keep abreast of the demand for power," says the report. It emphasizes the urgency of this construction by correctly pointing out that electric energy is the heart of the defense effort, without which the need for airplanes, guns, munitions, clothing, chemicals, and atomic weapons cannot be met.

In addition to expanding its own facilities, the TVA has urged development of the vast resources of the Cumberland River to help provide the vital power this Nation needs for its defense.

This power shortage is a challenge. Challenges, however, are nothing new to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Looking back on its nearly two decades of magnificent progress, we have no doubt that—given the congressional support it needs—the TVA will serve the Nation as well in this crisis as it has in times past.

Truman Drives United States to Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has been obvious to the most casual observer that the Roosevelt-Truman foreign policies would ultimately drive the American people to a hands-off policy of isolationism. Mr. David Lawrence has clearly expressed the views of many who believe that our present foreign policies are leading to a national disaster. Mr. Lawrence's article appeared in the Washington Star, January 2, 1951, and I am including this article as part of my remarks:

ISOLATIONISM LIKE AN EPIDEMIC

(By David Lawrence)

Isolationism is a very troublesome word in American politics and the sentiment which it represents is never overcome merely by denouncing its exponents. Nor is isolationism confined only to Republicans.

The late Franklin D. Roosevelt was at one time an exponent of isolationist doctrine. Although a candidate for Vice President in 1920 on a platform that favored American entry into the League of Nations, he reversed himself in 1932 to gain isolationist support for his nomination for the Presidency. When he became President he broke up the International Economic Conference being held in London in 1933 which might have laid the foundation for a sort of Marshall plan that might have buttressed Europe against World War II.

Isolationism is like an epidemic—it penetrates everywhere and within both political parties. As one who has consistently opposed it ever since the 1920's, the observation may be advanced now that isolationist policies are never defeated by denouncing their sponsors.

The real way to fight isolationism is to get at its causes and debate the issues vigorously. The momentum given to isolationism here in recent weeks came from Europe—not America. The sooner the Truman administration and those Republicans who are anti-isolation wake up to the fact that to millions of Americans it looks as if our allies have forsaken us, the sooner will the European peoples be told the blunt truths they need to know.

Another motivating reason for the growth of isolationism recently in America is the attitude of the United Nations itself. Failure to declare Russia an aggressor, failure to declare Communist China an aggressor, failure to deal firmly with the many violations of international law of which the Communists are guilty has weakened faith in the UN.

The American people, moreover, don't like double talk. They are not in a mood to listen to excuses and rationalizations as to why Communist China should have a seat in the UN. When the UN on June 26 moved against aggression and when the Red Chinese began to assist the North Korean aggressors the American people expected the UN to call a spade a spade. They don't expect certain UN member governments to flirt with the enemy and to encourage them by discussing the prospects of admission to the UN through negotiations. The British Prime Minister, after his visit to President Truman, made a fatal error in publicly reiterating Britain's interest in admitting Red China to the UN at the very moment when American boys were being slaughtered by an aggressor—Red China's armies in Korea. The way to combat isolationism is to unite behind principles and to uphold them sincerely, irrespective of expediency and material considerations. The moment a moral cause becomes tainted with materialism it loses its spiritual quality and begets selfishness, which is the main ingredient of the isolationist attitude.

Politicians, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, watch the trends of public opinion. The Associated Press survey last week end telling about the avalanche of letters to editors of newspapers shows how widespread is the dissatisfaction with European governments that have failed to send their proper proportion of troops to Korea. European isolationism has provoked American isolationism.

Politically speaking, isolationism in this country thrives on the oft-repeated remark that "Europe is playing America for a sucker." The best way to refute it is by facts. Unhappily, Europe's record of mobilizing manpower in her own defense in the last few years is bad. As long as Europe fails to perceive her own failures, isolationism will grow in America. But once Europe puts her shoulder to the wheel and stops talking about the idea that we are going to get bogged down in the Far East with American troops and money wanted by Europe, the sooner will American public opinion rally behind Europe's defense as it has done twice before in our history.

To say that aggression should be appeased in the Far East because we are powerless to fight it there is to admit a weakness that really doesn't exist. All our troops now committed in the Far East, in what may for some time to come have to be a holding operation rather than an offensive, would not be enough to defend even a small part of Europe if they were transferred there at once. If American air and naval resources cannot fight a holding operation in the Pacific while we assist in carrying on a major operation in Europe, it must be because Europe expects America to do the whole job and furnish the bulk of the manpower. That simply isn't in the cards, and many of the isolationists of today are those who feel that Europe hasn't done her duty toward the UN resolution on intervention in Korea, and if that's to be the course of history America had better protect herself by waiting within her own defense line for Europe to show a will to help us as allies.

The misunderstanding—for such it really is—can be cleared away. But the Truman administration is handicapped in not being able to proclaim American purposes persuasively to the world because at this moment European governments have not shown their willingness to make genuine sacrifices to resist Communist aggression no matter where it launches its attack.

Why the Shortage of Copper, Scrap Iron, and Other Materials?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving urgent requests from industries in the district, which I have the honor to represent, for copper, aluminum, iron, and steel scrap. Men are being thrown out of work because of the scarcity of material necessary to operate the industries.

The Truman administration has lost all sense of its responsibility to the people of the United States. I have listed heretofore in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the copper and other materials needed to keep our economy sound, which the administration has suffered and permitted to be shipped to foreign nations through the ECA. The tragedy of this inane program, however, is the reshipment of the copper and other materials by our supposed allies to Russia and Red China.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks a bulletin furnished by the able economist, Paul O. Peters, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS BULLETIN EXTRA,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1951.

On December 27, 1950, the National Production Authority issued notice No. 1, listing certain materials designated as scarce.

Among the materials listed were the following:

Building materials, including cast iron soil pipe, insulating materials, and cement.

Chemicals including benzene, glycerin, and methanol.

Iron and steel including pig iron and iron and steel scrap.

Lumber, plywood, and pulpwood.

Metals and minerals, including scrap.

Paper and paperboard materials and products.

The whole list is available in detail at page 9398 of the Federal Register for Friday, December 29, 1950.

On December 30, 1950, the National Production Authority issued an order prohibiting the use of copper in a long list of items used by civilians. The order according to Mr. William H. Harrison, NPA Administrator, was issued to provide copper for defense and defense-supporting needs. So American manufacturers and the consumers who buy and use their products will be denied the use of copper for such items as builders' hardware, gutters and downspouts, roofing nails, weather stripping, and numerous other small items in everyday use by the ordinary home owner.

Now comes the pay-off.

On January 2, 1951, ECA procurement authorization press release No. 1[illegible] announced the following new authorizations, which will be paid for with charity dollars wrung from the American taxpayers in the merciless process which is demoralizing and bankrupting this Nation.

For the Netherlands 920,000 charity dollars will be available to contract for copper and copper products in the United States between now and next May 31, with deliveries not later than next August 31. The money, at present prices, should supply nearly 3,000,000 pounds of copper and copper products. If this were not enough, another $255,000 in American charity dollars will be supplied the Netherlands to procure copper and copper products from Latin-American countries.

When will the Congress start an investigation of the agencies and offices of the Government that are siphoning off our scarce and critical materials, always of course being paid for with taxes levied on the American free competitive enterprise system?

PAUL O. PETERS.

Cut Down Official Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a timely editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News. The editorial follows:

CUT DOWN OFFICIAL WASTE

With the declaration of the national emergency we are taking leave for the indefinite future of easy peacetime ways.

We are leaving behind even the half-war, half-peace state of affairs that was our scheduled lot, before the belated dawning of realization that not years, but only months, may be left to us in which to prepare for a world war.

As we go on a war footing, in the hope that readiness for it yet may avert war, there is not one of us unaware of the sacrifices this must entail, for our young men first of all, but in terms of living standards, for everyone.

We are entering this period still burdened by debt incurred in the recent struggle to preserve our freedoms. We dare not add to that staggering burden of $256,000,000,000, (two hundred and fifty-six thousand million) the cost of the new mobilization. The price now set on our national security must be a cash price, to be paid in taxes heavier than we have yet known.

As we clear the decks for action, therefore, it becomes overwhelmingly compelling that the Government clear its own decks. On a war footing the Nation cannot afford a peacetime government.

National security will be a delusion except as it is built on the safe foundation of national solvency. Thus, apart from simple fairness to citizens who must bear the load, the Government's responsibility is plain. It cannot from now on in good conscience divert a single available dollar from the vital requirements of swift preparation for defense.

President Truman recognized the need to revamp the budget, which, he said, must be held to "the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort."

To state that proposition and to give it effect are two different things, however. It is the nature of government that every effort to drop the excess baggage of peacetime spending will be resisted, by the President's associates in the bureaucracy, by some Members of Congress and even by interested citizens themselves.

It is against appeals that this or that spending activity is in fact needed to support the defense effort that the people demand concentration of our precious fiscal resources on defense and nothing but defense.

To put government on a war footing—to pare away every dispensable bureau and outlay—is, in fact, the very beginning of defense. We cannot do less, to the jeopardy of our national solvency, without lending aid and comfort to the potential enemy.

Communist Goon Squads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I addressed to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, yesterday, and the article written by Victor Riesel, of the New York Daily Mirror, referred to therein:

JANUARY, 3, 1951.

HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: Your attention is invited to the attached photostatic copy of a clipping taken from the New York Daily Mirror entitled "Inside Labor," by Victor Riesel. It would appear that Communist goon squads are operating in our city streets in a manner reminiscent of Hitler's seizure of power in Germany. If permitted to continue, this movement would sabotage a vital part of our labor force, fasten a stranglehold upon the means of logistical support of our troops and allies abroad, and pose a threat to our national life.

I cannot urge too strongly upon you the necessity of taking immediate action to apprehend those persons responsible for endangering the national security. I am introducing a resolution in the House of Representatives for the creation of an investigating committee. It is intended that the committee study the situation and recommend to the House such measures, in addition to those now on the statute books, as are necessary to safeguard the national interest and at the same time preserve our heritage of freedom for the individual.

The transportation system and the ports are key factors in our defense. They must not be controlled by Communists and fellow travelers.

Sincerely,

LOUIS B. HELLER,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of December 18, 1950]

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

I can produce for the Federal intelligence agencies a band of merchant seamen who had to arm themselves recently with shotguns and stand off a night-long siege of Communist action squads, 500 strong, operating European style right in these United States.

And I know other good waterfront union Joes whom we'll have to visit in the hospital if we want to talk to them. They got their ribs smashed by a 25-man Red goon squad.

There's a method in all this mauling. If it continues we may yet see hundreds of ships tied up between our west coast and London, when we need every cargohold to carry arms to the world.

There is also a group of railway workers who say they can prove one of their regional chiefs signed the Cominform's international Stockholm peace petition. They'd like to know why he's still in a spot from which he can paralyze the hauling of steel, destined for emergency items.

My labor friends can point out some southwestern Communist leaders who used their union headquarters as a secret communication link with Mexico, Cuba, Los Angeles, etc.

In that night siege by 500, they were Harry Bridges' huskies. The sailors they hemmed in a wild night of window smashing, car slashing, and brickbat slinging belonged to the AFL's tough, but clean, Sailors Union of the Pacific. They were caught in their union hall, 440 Avalon Boulevard, Wilmington, Calif.

Through a night the 14 men and their leader stood guard with shotguns at windows, while Red squads smashed the front of the building, rushed to the adjacent parking lot and cut up tires, and gave up breaking into the hall when the sailors shouted they would shoot to kill.

The attackers were recruited on the water front by Bridges' specialists in rioting. The feud started when Bridges, for reasons known to the convicted perjurer himself, suddenly decided to challenge the 65-year-old right of sailors on certain coastwise vessels to unload lumber from decks to the docks.

Whatever else he is, Bridges is not stupid. He knew that attempting to seize jurisdiction of that bit of work could come off only through bloody violence. He knew his roving action committees, with from 25 to 300 sluggers assigned each detachment, would breed counterviolence as he sent them chasing sailors as far up as Oregon.

He knew a war between the AFL seamen and his pro-Soviet longshoremen could freeze many key ports.

But our loyal AFL sailors' chiefs, lanky Harry Lundeberg and husky Paul Hall, refrained from flying in their own special protective squads. They did not want water front civil war disjointing activity at ports which face the Orient.

Comrade Bridges understood the international implications of his maneuver, knew sailors' union officials the world over, especially in London and Western Europe, would rush to the defense of the American AFL water front workers; that the European dock wallopers would boycott ships of United States owners who yielded to Bridges.

He knew foreign seamen would refuse to sail vessels into those western United States ports where Bridges might win. Such pledges have been cabled in from London.

Bridges knew what he was starting.

That lefty railroad union leader who signed one of Moscow's peace petitions is in the Pittsburgh area. Those southwestern comrades lead a section of Bridges' new pro-Russian labor federation. Arizona phone records will prove they used their union headquarters as a communications link in a Red international network.

All this as we strive to meet a crisis that threatens our national existence.

Hoover, Kennedy, and United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of December 26, 1951:

HOOVER, KENNEDY, AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Former President Hoover and Joseph P. Kennedy, a former ambassador to England, have espoused the adoption of a foreign policy that would have the United States withdraw its military forces from Asia and Europe and conserve them entirely for the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Both men merit the attention of the American people when they speak on such matters. But in this particular instance, it is our belief that it would be folly and perhaps eventual national suicide, if their recommendations were followed.

Moreover, we disagree vigorously with Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy and all others who would have the United States pull out of Korea without a fight.

It may well be that the situation in Korea is not hopeless. Furthermore, we can only agree with Gen. MacArthur when he said that if the Communists are not stopped in Korea, then the chance of stopping them on the future battlefields of Europe becomes just that much more remote. On the other hand, it is likely that if the march of Communist aggression is stopped cold in Korea, the prospect of meeting it in Europe will be that much less, for Russia, with its eastern borders then vulnerable to attack by a combination of Nationalist Chinese, Koreans, American and possibly even Japanese military forces, would be much more hesitant about taking on a war in Western Europe.

Furthermore, if we yield Korea, Formosa will go before long and all Asia, including India and then the East Indies, will be ripe for a plucking by the Moscow-directed Reds. And then, it is only common sense that a Chinese Red army, freed from the necessity of further combat in Asia, would be moved under orders of Stalin to Western Europe to fight there for Russia.

It is possible that the situation in respect to Korea is not as bad as it looks, and that perhaps we should not be as afraid of the Chinese Reds as many of us are. By American standards they are poorly armed and trained, and while all of us appreciate the enormous size of the Chinese population, how many men the Chinese Reds can place in the field as effective fighting men is a big question.

If we are killing them off at the rate of 10 to 1, and if we have killed 100,000 of them up to now, as the battle reports in Korea indicate, then it might be our best policy to continue the battle in Korea, but only with the full-scale assistance of the 500,000 troops Nationalist China claims it can and will put in the field, if only permitted to do so. Not all Chinese are Communists by any means, and that is something that we should never lose sight of.

The present world crisis that is centered in Korea is not a battle between nations. It is a war of wholly opposite ideologies—on one side, communism and slavery; no the other, freedom and human dignity. We are living in an era reminiscent of the days of the Crusades. That is why we cannot adhere to the isolationism advocated by Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy said we should pull out of Europe, but possibly maintain the defense of Britain as an Atlantic outpost. How long could Britain, although bolstered by all the aid that we could give her, hold out against Red hordes poised on the other side of the channel? And after Britain fell, or even before it, the Red aggressors would be on the march in Iceland, Ireland, and Greenland, down through the peninsula of Spain and Portugal, to the Azores and north Africa, and next in the line of march would be the West Indies, South and Central America.

In the Pacific, with the Asiatic mainland under its domination, the Reds would concentrate on Japan, Australia, and the Philippines and, to the north, the Aleutians and even Alaska, which Moscow says the Czar never had any right to sell to the United States. How well would we fare under those circumstances?

As tragic as is the situation in which we now find ourselves, we have no alternative but to help all who are, or would be, our friends fight the Communists in both Asia and Europe. But we agree with Mr. Hoover that aid to Europe should be conditioned on the determination of the Western European nations to fight to the bitter end for their own survival.

And while we need all the aid we can get, we should not snub Spain. This nation fought the Reds once and is willing and equipped to fight them again. In respect to the Spanish dictatorship, we were not at all reluctant to take all the dictatorial aid we could get from Russia in the last war, and while we have no love for the present form of government in Spain, it does, at least, hate communism violently.

One salutary and very desirable effect of the Hoover and Kennedy speeches, however, is that they should awaken free Europe and other UN powers to the need of giving us more aid on the battlefield. Considerable less attention to the remarks of both men would have been paid here in the United States if the feeling existed that we, in this country, were not being let down in Korea by our UN allies, who give us plenty of support at Lake Success. And that certainly includes Canada, through which Russian armies would almost have to march to reach the United States.

Revolt Against Foreign Policy Inevitable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including an article by Dorothy Thompson that appeared in the Washington Star of last night:

REVOLT IN POLICY INEVITABLE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The overwhelmingly favorable response to ex-President Hoover's speech does not surprise this columnist. A swing toward isolationism was, in our opinion, bound to occur, the more violently because of the obdurate opposition of the administration and its Republican fellow-travelers to any discussion, even, of past and present foreign policy.

Some weeks ago, while I was traveling in the Middle East, I picked up a week-old paper containing an attack by Mr. Acheson on the "reexaminists," as disguised isolationists "incapable of any constancy of purpose." According to Mr. Acheson the desire "to reexamine our programs and to see whether we should have started them, was like a farmer who pulls up his crops in the morning to see how they have done during the night."

Well, many nights have passed since the spring of 1945 when the present foreign policy was seeded. The crop is now visibly above ground, and obviously it sprung from dragon's teeth. If fault can be attributed to the American people, it is that they postponed their "reexamination" too long, and that the articulate international clique howled down every critic—as this columnist has had occasion to know.

Even while the present United Nations was in the formative stage of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, to bring any criticism of its structure, or to speculate that far from assuring peace with justice it was more likely to lead to a series of private wars of unlimited objectives, essentially purposeless, was practically to commit lese majesty.

Yet, it was in March 1945, that I made my own predictions of the postwar world: "A grand scale Macedonia of Komitajt politicians, a perpetual devil's brew of desperatism and desperadoism; open to interventions by foreign-controlled parties, crossed and rent by ideological conflicts not of armies in the conventional sense, but of armed bands * * * given over to social convulsions, forced and voluntary migrations, separatisms, throwing up petty contenders with revolutionary followers * * * an era of perpetual wars, all fought in the name of peace."

This, and much else, I wrote in my diary then—and got it published only in January 1948, in that superior weekly of small circulation, The Commonweal.

The fact is that there has been no constancy of purpose because in 5 years nothing has been related to principles. Everything that has happened was, therefore, bound to happen.

It is the fruit of the seed: In the first step the assumption of peace based on a three-power alliance to keep late enemies and all future rebels suppressed; unconditional surrender—meaning the rejection of all restraints; the partition of Poland, Germany, Korea, and Palestine; the total disarmament of Germany and Japan and the disastrous weakening of Italy, within no framework of real collective security, thus creating vacuums of fatal weakness in the very heartland of the Eurasian land complex. In the second, the inevitable rift in the grand alliance and the attempt, then, to make the United Nations what it was never designed to be, and for the United States to accept, on behalf of this action, commitments beyond the power of any nation to carry out.

From the beginning every warning voice was accused of rocking the boat, threatening the peace, or being defeatist—as this column was defeatist about Korea. A little ordinary honesty, some frank confessions of error—these would have cleared the air and would have done far more to increase confidence than the policy of keeping skeletons locked in closets and insisting that behind all the improvisations was some wise, far-seeing plan.

There has been no wisdom and no foresight and now there is a popular revolt—also without wisdom or foresight—the blind revolt of the people who, at long last, know they have been morally betrayed.

Price Ceilings on Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BURT, IOWA, *December 28, 1950.*

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOLLIVER: Reports indicate the Government is considering the imposition of ceilings on meat. I farm and feed livestock, and therefore venture to give my views on this proposal.

There are now no governmental supports whatever to prices of beef and lamb. The old law of supply and demand establishes the price. Meat is now being produced in unprecedented amounts, and the supply is increasing. Possibly no other nation is so abundantly supplied with meats as the United States.

To many people meat prices seem high, but so is most everything else. Wages and other incomes are high. In 1940 our people spent only 5.5 percent of its disposable income for meats. The most they ever did spend was 7.1 percent in 1948.

The National Industrial Conference Board finds that, "in terms of dollars and cents," the price of round steak in 1948 was 370.6 percent higher than in 1914. Yet, in terms of work hours or work minutes, the 1948 round steak was 40 percent cheaper than its 1914 counterpart. Since then both wages and prices have advanced a little.

The producers of meat in this country are not unionized. There is no collective bargaining. When a farmer or feeder sells his meat animals he competes with each and every other farmer doing the same thing. He is in the same position as other laborers would be if there were no unions and each individual engaged in cutthroat competition with every other worker in selling his services.

It should always be remembered that the buying public regulates the price of meat. The farmer and feeder must accept as his portion what is left after marketing, processing, and distributing costs have been deducted.

In view of these facts, why should the Government attempt to steal, by means of ceilings, his products?

The consuming public demonstrates with its purchases that it is willing and able to pay for its food. There is no justification for the Government in stealing the farmers' products in order to give the consumer cheap meats. Such attempts immediately discourage the production of meats and soon effect to greatly reduce the meat supply.

We suffered that harmful experience during and after World War II. We had ceilings. Black markets sprang up. Legitimate meat all but disappeared from the retail stores. Many efficient packing firms were on the verge of closing down. The Nation's meat situation degenerated into a discouraging mess. Some leaders in their stupidity urged the President to go out into the country and forcibly take possession of all the livestock in the Nation, slaughter it, and thus placate a horde of voters with an orgy of low-priced meats.

The President publicly stated at that time he seriously considered committing such a shameful and brazen theft. The idea was abandoned only when it was pointed out that the Government had no adequate force and experience to perform that gigantic task of rounding up and caring for all those animals.

There are those who say we should cooperate and assist the Government after it has decided on a certain undertaking. I do not agree. If you were to see a stubborn and stupid person at the wheel of an automobile loaded with innocent people and attempting to drive off a 1,000-foot cliff, there is no point in cooperating with and assisting him. The sensible course is to either dissuade him or change drivers.

The livestock men of this country produce vast quantities of good meats. They are a minority group. Other people determine the price of their products. No good can come from despotic attempts to filch their produce by means of ceilings. That is one sure way to discourage production and reduce the supply. We tried that shameful steal once and failed miserably. Must we wallow in that morass of disillusion again?

Without ceilings and rationing, we already have at hand two very effective means of holding down meat prices:

1. Allow the producers to continue to increase the meat supply.

2. Reduce the consumers' expendable income—the Internal Revenue Bureau is about to do this by new and additional tax levies.

Very truly yours,

G. W. PATTERSON.

Within Proper Limits Wire Tapping Evidence Must Be Legalized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, near the close of the last session I introduced a bill to permit the use of evidence obtained by wire tapping in cases involving treason, espionage, sabotage, and other crimes involving disloyalty to the country. I have now reintroduced this measure.

In my judgment, this is one of the most important steps in the field of civil defense which can possibly be taken. Under existing law, traitors, spies, saboteurs, and those who would destroy our Nation are permitted to use telephones widely in their nefarious activities, while the FBI and other investigative agencies are precluded from using evidence against them which has been obtained by interception of their messages. This is certainly carrying the right of privacy to an absurd and ridiculous length. No nation can survive which does not meet problems threatening its very existence with more realism than this.

Protection is afforded by this bill against abuse through the requirement that a Federal judge must grant permission for the wiretapping in order to make the evidence obtained thereby admissible. This is to prevent an overzealous investigator from infringing on the legitimate rights of innocent and loyal citizens so jealously guarded under the American system guaranteeing freedom of expression.

If we are to cope successfully, however, with the Communist menace in this country, we must untie the hands of those charged with the responsibility of apprehending traitors or enemy agents who unfortunately infest our precious land. No time is to be lost. We should act at once.

It has been suggested in editorial comment, like that in the Washington Evening Star which follows below, that the bill should be broadened to include kidnaping and other crimes involving human life. I am not opposed to that modification; indeed would be inclined to favor it. The important thing at the moment, however, is haste and no argument over details should be allowed to delay the early enactment of legislation so vitally needed to save our country.

I have urged that an early hearing be granted on this bill and earnestly solicit those Members who agree to express their views emphatically to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the leadership which will accord priority to the various measures necessary to protect our country.

Also under permission granted, I include a letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star, which forcefully expresses the imperative need for this legislation:

WIRE-TAP BILL

If this "lame duck" Congress has done nothing else during its recent term, by its unanimous passage of a bill to give "the FBI the authority to make arrests without warrants in cases of felonies, especially those involving espionage, sabotage, and the national defense," it has earned its salary and the everlasting praise of loyal Americans everywhere.

Now, if the coming new Congress will match this in January by passing the Keating bill, or some similar bill, to allow the FBI to use wire tapping for certain purposes and under proper authority, it will provide one of the most vital defense measures that America has ever had.

No loyal, law-abiding American citizen need fear that the FBI will ever destroy his priceless rights or liberties. On the contrary, these rights and liberties are made all the more secure because of the FBI, as the record will prove.

We cannot expect FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and his men to give America the maximum security so vitally needed now if we are going to keep them handcuffed and shackled while we protect and defend Red spies, saboteurs, traitors, etc., with technicalities, red tape, and smart lawyers.

CHARLES F. MARTIN.

MINNEAPOLIS.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star]

TO LEGALIZE WIRE-TAP EVIDENCE

Although its sponsors assert that the pending bill to control wire tapping in Washington would permit use of wire-tap evidence in court, the fact is that the amended bill does not specifically authorize such use. Since introduction in court of evidence obtained by tapping communications has been definitely ruled out by the Supreme Court under the Federal Communications Act, there is need for Congress to spell out a positive grant of such authority to law-enforcement agencies.

The Neely-Darby bill, as amended by a subcommittee of the House District Committee, would outlaw all wire tapping in the District except that done by District or Federal officers in compliance with an order or warrant of District court. That is a step in the right direction. But the bill speaks only of interception of messages by law-enforcement officers. The subcommittee, in its report, said the measure "makes it clear that divulgence or any use of any information so obtained (by tapping wires) is not an element of the crime and thereby corrects existing law." It would have been clearer, however, to have written this authority into the bill in so many words, in view of the fact that the FCC statute bars divulgence of information obtained by wire tapping. The courts have held that divulgence includes use of intercepted messages in a criminal prosecution.

Representative KEATING, Republican, of New York, has introduced a bill which would abolish the absurd restriction on use of wire-tap evidence in cases involving the national security. This measure would legalize wire tapping and, of equal importance, evidence derived from wire tapping, where there is due cause to suspect enemy espionage. Permission first would have to be secured from a Federal judge.

The two bills cover different fields and both have worth-while objectives. The local bill is designed to ban indiscriminate wire tapping in the District while the national measure would authorize wire tapping anywhere in national security cases. The local bill should be amended, however, to leave no doubt as to the right of District police and other law-enforcement officers to divulge intercepted communications in court. And it would be advisable to amend the Keating bill to include kidnaping and other crimes involving human life.

Mrs. Norton Ends 26 Years in House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I take great pleasure in calling to the attention of the House an Associated Press article which appeared in yesterday's editions of the New York Times. It represents only the briefest review of the distinguished career of our beloved colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable Mary T. Norton.

I know that the regret is general in this House that she decided to bring her long and notable service here to a close. Our best wishes go with her in whatever she decides to undertake, for we feel confident her record of achievement has not been closed.

MRS. NORTON ENDS 26 YEARS IN HOUSE—LED WAGE-HOUR BILL FIGHT—MENTIONED FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POST

WASHINGTON, January 1.—"Fighting Mary" is taking down from her office walls the array of news cartoons that portrayed the high spots of her 26 years in Congress.

The dean of women lawmakers—Representative Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey—won't be answering "aye" when the roll call opens the incoming Eighty-second Congress Wednesday.

After winning 13 consecutive terms beginning in 1924, Mrs. Norton did not run for reelection in November. She was the Democrats' first Congresswoman.

She speaks of retiring and writing her memoirs. Accordingly, her office staff chipped in for a large new filing case. But the idea that Mrs. Norton really means retirement calls for a grain of salt.

Her eyes still flash as they did in those hectic days when as chairman of the powerful House Labor Committee she piloted the wage-and-hour bill to victory. And she is being mentioned for Presidential appointment as a member of the District of Columbia Commission.

LADY MAYOR OF WASHINGTON

That would not be a new field for Mrs. Norton, for she served 7 years as Lady Mayor of Washington when, the first woman to head a congressional committee, she was chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee.

It is difficult to imagine Mrs. Norton at a typewriter pounding out the memories of her lifetime of 75 years, for it is hard to keep her long in a reminiscent mood. She wants to talk about the present.

Fearless when convinced of her course, she introduced in 1928 the first resolution in Congress to repeal the eighteenth amendment when many politicians side-stepped the prohibition question.

A turning point in her career came in 1937 when the chairmanship of the important Labor Committee became vacant.

William P. Connery, Jr., of Massachusetts, chairman of the Labor Committee, had died and some rather worried men lawmakers found that Mrs. Norton, as the next Democratic ranking member, was in line for the top spot.

Despite the pleas and flattery of William B. Bankhead, the late Speaker, she refused to remain as District Committee chairman.

As hers was an industrial district she said she felt she owed it to her constituents not to side-step the responsibility.

Taking the Labor Committee chairmanship, instead, she championed the wage-and-hour bill, sponsored by the former chairman. It won after a 7-day fight on the floor.

Mrs. Norton—"Aunt Mary" as through the years she has become known to the press—has a record of firsts. Besides being the Democrats' first Congresswoman, she was the first woman chairman of a State political convention and first woman chairman of a State party.

It was her interest in welfare that got her into politics. Her only child, a son, died in infancy. To lessen her grief, friends suggested she help with an enterprise, then new in Jersey City, the Day Nursery Association, that cared for children while their mothers worked.

Her interest in civic affairs attracted the attention of political leaders.

The Tidelands Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Louisiana-Texas tidelands cases points up the necessity for immediate legislation by Congress. This is so because admittedly the opinion does not settle the issues involved.

The Supreme Court is composed of nine judges, two having recused themselves. While four out of the seven remaining jurists, in effect, held against the States, they did not finally determine the question of boundaries, title, and right to explore for the minerals. Here we have the anomalous situation of four members, less than a majority, of the highest Court of the land, announcing a previously unheard of doctrine of paramount rights of the Government to minerals without adjudicating exactly in what off-shore area the minerals are located, really without solving the question of the title to the minerals and admitting that under the judgment of the Court Congress must act before the Federal Government can exploit the minerals.

The boys in Korea may cry for oil, but they can have none under this decision. The States have proven that they are ready, willing, and able to continue to provide oil for the prosecution of the war, but the bureaucrats stand in the way. The irony of it is that these same bureaucrats are likely to use the war hysteria as a soap box to plead with Congress to implement the Supreme Court's decision with legislation authorizing the Federal Government to develop the tidelands area. The truth is that it would take years to survey and delineate the so-called marginal belt, to develop a leasing policy by the Federal Government, and to set up the necessary facilities to produce oil, while the States are prepared to continue operations without interruption, if the bureaucrats will only step aside.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of the Democratic members as well as a majority of the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee reported out a bill during the Eighty-first Congress to quiet the title of the States, and I believe that a large majority and probably two-thirds of the Members of this body were prepared to vote for the bill. For some reason or another the bill was not scheduled for action on the floor last year.

I intend to promptly bring up the bill again before the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and I am calling the matter to the attention of the House on the very first business day of this new Congress to alert my colleagues to this most important and far-reaching legislation.

In this connection, I make a part of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the December 14, 1950, edition of the Times-Picayune, entitled "Federal Tidelands Grab":

FEDERAL TIDELANDS GRAB

Last Monday's decision by the Federal Supreme Court in the Louisiana-Texas tidelands cases was not unexpected. Since a power-hungry agency of the Federal Government initiated the tidelands grab several years ago, majority rulings by the high Court have favored Federal seizure of those areas to which the coastal States have held and exercised title since the birth of the Republic. Transfer of that title by judicial interpretation and decree at this late day amounted to a reversal of precedent and national usage so novel and unexpected that the National Government finds it cannot exploit the grab unless and until Congress enacts enabling legislation.

Thus far the Federal lawgivers not only have refused to pass the miscalled compromise proposal to consummate the seizure, but both Houses once passed a bill restoring the tidelands to their original owners, the respective coastal States. That measure, vetoed by President Truman late in a busy session, might have been passed over the veto, but action was deferred and the opportunity to end the controversy in the right way was lost for the time being.

As the matter stands now, Congress alone can restore the rights of the States and prevent further encroachments upon those rights if the precedent therefor should be established in the tidelands case. A vigorous effort to restore the constitutional division and balance of State and Federal powers already is promised in the next Congress by Members of the Senate and House alike.

Highly significant in this connection was the adoption by the National Association of Attorneys General Tuesday of a resolution pledging support to the coming fight for a Federal bill restoring the tidelands to ownership and control of the States. Representatives from 43 States voted for the resolution despite long efforts of the Federal expansionists to break the solid front of the defense of their rights. The Governors and attorneys general, with few exceptions, recognize the tidelands grab as an encroachment which, once established, can be expanded toward ultimate breakdown of the State powers and rights whose progressive seizure by the Federal Government is the objective foreshadowed by the tidelands grab.

Adoption of the Rules of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adopt the rules of the Eighty-first Congress a debate developed upon the retention of the so-called 21-day rule which had been adopted for the first time by the Eighty-first Congress. The 21-day rule is the

provision whereby upon recognition by the Speaker the chairman of any committee may ask that a bill which has received committee approval and been referred to the Rules Committee and remained in the Rules Committee unacted upon for 21 days be brought before the House for debate and vote.

The advocates of the retention of the 21-day rule through parliamentary maneuver forced a vote on the main motion without granting to the opponents of the measure an opportunity to present and explain their amendment. The advocates of the retention of the rule were defeated and an amendment to the rules of the Eighty-first Congress was presented which reestablished the rule as it was, before the Eighty-first Congress changed it.

The advocates of the retention of the 21-day rule argued that the old system placed arbitrary and dictatorial powers in the hands of the Rules Committee which permitted the committee to block any legislation the majority of the Rules Committee did not wish to see passed. Furthermore, it was argued the Rules Committee through this great power served as a cloak behind which Members hid so that they would not have to express their views by vote on certain measures which were controversial and would hurt them before their constituents. The advocates further argued that abolishment of the 21-day rule was an attack on our basic democratic system and it thwarted the will and rule of the majority. The advocates pointed out eight measures passed by the Eighty-first Congress which the Rules Committee had not reported out, which were brought to vote through the exercise of the 21-day rule.

The opponents of the 21-day rule pointed out that it was passed in a highly questionable procedure by the Eighty-first Congress whereby all debate upon the matter was shut off and that actually the membership of that Congress had never had the opportunity to even read the 21-day rule amendment to the rules of the Eightieth Congress because Congressman SABATH, the administration leader, proposing the change, had not prepared printed copies of the proposed amendment, but submitted a typewritten copy which had been drawn up just shortly beforehand; also that the administration leaders of the Eighty-first Congress, with the flush of the 1948 victory and their substantial majority, did not even consult their own party members in forcing the amendment through.

The opponents pointed out that the author of the previous rule which had successfully operated for the past many years was none other than that great liberal George Norris, and was passed for the purpose of cutting down the arbitrary powers of the Speaker, as built up by "Czar" Cannon, for many years Speaker of the House, and placing these powers in the hands of a 12-man committee, the Rules Committee.

The opponents of the 21-day rule pointed out that far from having arbitrary power under the old rule there were three basic methods whereby the House membership could overrule the Rules Committee:

First. By petition of one-half the House membership.

Second. By the majority of the committee which had approved the bill taking the bill up on Calendar Wednesday. Calendar Wednesday comes twice each month the House is in session.

Third. By vote to discharge.

The opponents of the 21-day rule argued that far from being an undemocratic rule thwarting the wishes of the majority, the 21-day rule gave power to the Speaker, who could recognize whatever committee chairman he chose, and gave added power, and substantial power, to the chairman of the various committees, instead of to the majority of the committee.

The opponents further pointed out that the Rules Committee was composed of twice the number of members of the majority party as there are minority party members.

Both advocates and proponents agreed that a Rules Committee or policy committee, whatever terminology one cared to use, was necessary to the proper functioning of the House, inasmuch as the House committees approved three and four times the amount of legislation that the House membership could consider and vote upon intelligently in a session, and it was necessary for some committee to consider and study for decision what legislation should take precedence for consideration.

Congressman SABATH, again leading the advocates of the 21-day rule, argued that the rule should be kept because the President of the United States should enjoy the privilege of having the legislation he considered important and pressing considered first and that the membership of the Rules Committee, as constituted, would thwart the will of the President, the leader of the majority party.

Other advocates of the 21-day rule expressed concern over particular bills which they had sponsored and which the Rules Committee had not given the priority they thought the bills deserved.

I listened intently to all these arguments. The analysis of the arguments advanced, of course, has been put in my own words, and some of those who advanced the arguments will perhaps not agree with the construction I have placed upon them. I feel I have been fair, however, in my interpretation.

I voted against the 21-day rule knowing full well that the administration had already carried their arguments through the so-called liberal press to the people and that already they had succeeded in getting across the impression to certain persons that, first, anyone voting against the 21-day rule was illiberal, a reactionary, and desirous of thwarting the will of the people; second, that any Republican voting against the 21-day rule was thereby playing footsie with the southern Democrats. As a matter of fact, the advocates of the rule actually accused the Republicans of being a tail wagged by said advocates' colleagues from the South.

First of all, let me state that these arguments are in my opinion false and have been made to intentionally deceive the public. Actually, had the majority leader desired to bring matters before the House confined to the Rules Committee, he could have done so by bringing the matter up on Calendar Wednesday. As a matter of fact, the majority leader of the House has deliberately destroyed the effectiveness of Calendar Wednesday over a period of time through devious parliamentary methods. Not once did the advocates of the 21-day rule attempt to answer the argument of using Calendar Wednesday.

Second, the Constitution provides for a separation of legislative, judicial, and executive powers. Mr. SABATH's argument that the President, not the Congress, should decide what legislation it should enact is as dangerous as Mr. Truman's predecessor's remark to a Congressman to the effect that he should disregard any thoughts he might have upon the constitutionality of the measure the President was then anxious to have passed by the Congress.

Yesterday we Members of Congress all took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against domestic as well as foreign enemies. Too long have our recent Congresses been guided by expediency, forgetting what is good for the long pull in order to gain the immediate advantage. Too little have we heard discussion in these halls as to whether a particular piece of legislation is constitutional or otherwise. And, yes; I will say it, in the past Congress a bill of attainder which is expressly forbidden by the Constitution, was passed in hysteria without any real voice raised against it on the ground that it was a violation of the Constitution.

And the move to establish and retain the 21-day rule was more rule by expediency, more rule by person instead of rule by law. The advocates of the 21-day rule are not motivated by the thought that that is a better way to run Congress. They are motivated by the thought that they do not like the personnel of the Rules Committee.

What rule they really object to is the rule of senlority but they do not care to sincerely face the question of, "Well, what system is better?"

There is an old legal adage that "hard cases make poor law." As far as I am concerned, it applies here. On civil rights matters I, too, do not like the personnel of the Rules Committee. But I still respect orderly procedure and I am willing to fight my battles out fairly with the long view guiding me. I also respect the individual Members of this Congress and the individual members of the Rules Committee.

In essence, what we have here is a cheap, but cleverly hidden, political trick. The Democratic Party has been fooling the people entirely too long. The Truman administration publicly cusses out the southern Democrats and privately works with them and together they divide up the tremendous political spoils of this top-heavy Federal bureaucracy. What is the true thinking of the northern Truman Democrat, coming, as he frequently does, from the big cities where the gangster-gambler allied political machine dominates the scene and his political existence? Yes, in St. Louis it is Shenker-Callanan, and before that Bev Brown, Gully Owen, and Bob Hannegan, and in Kansas City it is Jim Pendergast going good at last, since his predecessor Binaggio was murdered in his Democratic ward headquarters, and before him Tom Pendergast. Nor is it Missouri alone—it is Kelly-Nash or Jake Arvey in Chicago, Crump in Memphis, and it was Hague in Jersey, Tammany in New York, Curley in Boston, and on and on.

Are these political machines interested in the civil rights of the citizens of this country? The basic civil right is the right to vote and have that vote counted fairly and equally with the votes of other citizens. These northern Democrats from these big cities, with these gangster ridden machines, reek of stolen votes. Votes is their god and they will apparently do anything to get them, including wreck the country. The leader of the Democratic Party coming from the Pendergast machine of Kansas City has not just once, but several times, expressed in action his views toward this basic civil right. He did so again the other day when he pardoned the boy wonder of Kentucky, Pritchard, who had been fairly and truly found guilty of the most reprehensible crime that can be committed in a republic, or a democracy—stealing votes.

No; this little by-play of the 21-day rule is a political stunt to make it appear to the public that the southern Democrats and the Republicans are in complete alliance, on all issues, not just on the issues of local self-government and economy, and battling socialism, on which I personally hope we are allied, but on the issue of civil rights upon which we are not allied. And, so long as I and other Republicans believe in the principles of Abraham Lincoln we will never, never be allied.

Safety Conditions for Natural Gas Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter I have received from the president of the Northeastern Gas Transmission Co. and my reply.

For the information of my colleagues I also wish to state that I have again filed the bill to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety conditions for natural-gas companies. It is H. R. 88.

The correspondence follows:

NORTHEASTERN GAS TRANSMISSION CO.,
Springfield, Mass., December 29, 1950.

The Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HESELTON: On December 21, 1950, the Springfield, Mass., papers carried an account of your introduction of a bill in Congress designed to prescribe safety regulations governing the operation of natural-gas pipelines.

As you know, Northeastern Gas Transmission Co. is now actively engaged in constructing facilities which will bring natural gas to parts of the State of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. It has also filed with the Federal Power Commission an application for authority to extend its authorized facilities so as to enable it to make natural gas available to the remainder of the New England area.

In view of the sentiments expressed by you at the time of introduction of the afore-mentioned bill, I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to explain briefly the safety precautions which are and will be taken by us in connection with the construction of our pipeline.

We do not, in any phase of our operation, lose sight of the fact that a major consideration must always be the safety of those who live or work near any of our lines, or who have occasion to pass over their locations.

All of our lines will be constructed of welded steel pipe. From the time such pipe is first rolled in the mills it is subjected to a series of rigorous and exacting engineering tests by the mill to determine its ability to meet prescribed specifications and to withstand the pressures which it will carry. Pipe is not shipped from the mills until we receive an inspection report by an independent engineering firm employed by us. Trained engineers supervise its installation and testing. Experienced personnel plan its route so that its proximity to dwellings and other buildings will be reduced to the fullest possible extent. In areas where it is impossible to route the line at great distances from dwellings thicker pipe than tests show are necessary to meet all safety standards is installed as an added precaution. At highway and other public crossings we install two pipes, one within the other. Once in operation, the line is continuously supervised by a staff trained in pipeline operation.

During the last war, a number of oil pipelines were hurriedly constructed under conditions of emergency. Some of these lines were converted to gas pipelines after the war, and a majority of the accidents in the industry may be traced to them. For obvious reasons, no accurate parallel may be drawn between such lines and those which are initially designed and constructed for the transportation of gas.

I should also like to call your attention to the fact that the pipeline accidents which have lately been so widely publicized are usually those which occurred during construction or testing and before the line was actually in use. While a certain amount of danger may exist during these testing periods, in order that the purpose of the test may be accomplished, it is possible to take every precaution for the safety of those concerned.

As a matter of fact, we cannot conceive of any safety precaution which is not now being taken by us. I shall be pleased to answer any questions you may have concerning any of these precautions or any other phase of our operations.

Respectfully yours,
NORTHEASTERN GAS TRANSMISSION CO.,
W. C. NORMAN, *President.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1951.

Mr. W. C. NORMAN,
President, Northeastern Gas Transmission Co., Springfield, Mass.

DEAR MR. NORMAN: Thank you for your thoughtful letter of December 29. I am very glad to have this placed in the RECORD today, with a copy of my reply. You have furnished me with most useful information and I am glad to know of the precautions taken by your company in connection with this very important problem.

I am not very clear as to your reference to the oil pipelines which were hurriedly constructed during the last war and which were thereafter converted to gas pipelines. It is my impression that none of these lines are operated by your company. However, their very existence today does seem to me to support the advisability of establishing a sound system for maintaining safe operating conditions and furnishes an added factual argument for the bill I have introduced.

I have no doubt but that your company has kept factual data with reference to any accidents which have occurred. I am requesting the Federal Power Commission to furnish me with all factual information it has and I had in mind the advisability of following up their report with requests to the individual companies for such information. I think it would be most important for these data to be analyzed in connection with any consideration of the bill I have introduced. It is my present intention to turn any such reports I receive over to the committee staff. It may well be that they or I will have further questions to ask after we have examined the information furnished.

I greatly appreciate your courtesy in writing to me.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

Amend Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we can get more democracy by less democracy. Hence, I am voting today as in former sessions against the motion ordering the previous question, which would foreclose all amendments and further debate. How can anyone call it liberal to vote for such a motion shutting off the democratic process at the start? To use one gag procedure is not the right way to eliminate another gag procedure.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is something between the two extremes of possible obstruction of meritorious legislation by the Rules Committee; and authority for one man, the chairman of a committee, to bring before the House whatever pet schemes he has managed to get through his committee. A workable middle ground could be obtained in two ways. One would be to amend the discharge petition rule so the number of signatures required to bring out a bill approved by a committee would be reduced from 218 to 150, as was the case before the Democratic Congress of 1931–33. The other way would be to amend the Calendar Wednesday rule so that no dilatory motions could be entertained by the chair.

Either method would limit the power of the Rules Committee of control rather than guide legislation, and yet prevent confusion and waste of time in dilatory procedures in considering bills not desired or thought good for the country by a substantial number of the House Members. I regret that the amendment

offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] to modify the Calendar Wednesday rule was not considered. I would have voted to abolish the 21-day rule of the Eighty-first Congress and go back to the previous rule with such an amendment.

As the matter stands, I must vote to retain the 21-day rule—it is the lesser evil of the only two alternatives we are permitted to choose between. But it is not an adequate answer, nor is return to the unamended rules of Congresses prior to the Eighty-first. We must continue to search for a better solution to the problem of eliminating gag rule by a few, without permitting either the ardent advocates or the bitter opponents of a measure to make a spectacle of this body and weaken public confidence in the legislative process.

America's Foreign Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely able and interesting article written by Mr. Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of Sunday, December 31.

This article is very timely and will be pertinent to the impending discussion of the very vital question of our foreign commitments and the best means to provide for our security.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE IS CLARIFYING THE ISSUES—FUNDAMENTAL DISAGREEMENT APPEARS OVER NATURE OF OUR COMMITMENT TO GO TO THE DEFENSE OF WEST EUROPE—CONGRESS HAS A PART TO PLAY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, December 30.—The mounting public dispute over the most effective measures to insure the security of the United States from the threat of militant world communism, and over the relation to that security of the land defense of Western Europe by pooled forces of the North Atlantic Treaty nations (which include the United States), is a useful reminder that this country is not yet committed to any detailed program.

The debate—recently stimulated by speeches from former President Hoover and Joseph P. Kennedy on the one hand and by John Foster Dulles and administration spokesmen on the other—reveals some areas of agreement and also some important differences. For example:

(1) The disputants agree that, as Secretary of State Acheson said to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 27, 1948, Senate approval of the North Atlantic Treaty commits this Nation to the principles of "continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid * * * to an obligation to help, but the extent, the manner and the timing is up to the honest judgment of the parties" to the treaty.

(2) All agree that the subsequent approval by Congress of the military assistance pact and the first appropriation therefor binds this Nation to provide its treaty partners with matériel, dollars for the purchase of more and at least as many members of our Armed Forces as may be required to supervise the allocation and use of this equipment.

NO PARTICULAR PROGRAM

(3) All agree that—again in the words of Secretary Acheson on the same occasion—the treaty does not bind the United States to any particular assistance program; or require it to furnish units for a Western European army in advance of aggression. (In fact, this subject did not arise in the hearings or congressional debates which dealt with the treaty and the arms pact.)

But the meeting of minds ends there and the serious disagreements begin, among them:

(1) The President, on his concept of his constitutional authority, has made a conditional commitment to the North Atlantic partners that is founded on the treaty "principle of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid." The condition is—once more the words of Mr. Acheson—that "no party can rely on others for its defense unless it does its utmost to defend itself and contribute toward the defense of the others."

(2) It is believed by many that, on this same concept of Executive power, the President intends to be the judge of when and whether this condition has been met or whether he can rely on its being met; and that he has the unilateral authority in any case to order the dispatch to Europe of such troops as he and his military advisers (chiefly Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, whom the President has authorized to act as supreme commander) believe to be required.

CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL

(3) But, since the integration of these troops into a land defense of Western Europe was not pledged either in the treaty or the arms pact, and Congress must supply funds for their maintenance, many in Congress and outside contend that the President cannot legally dispatch them for such a purpose without the formal approval of Congress. One passage in the record bears on this difference of opinion. It occurs in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations favoring the North Atlantic Treaty, but it was concerned only with military action following an aggression against one of the partners. This passage reads:

"Nothing in the treaty * * * including the provision that an attack against one shall be considered an attack against all, increases or decreases the constitutional power of either the President or the Congress or changes the relationship between them."

This disagreement over Presidential powers could become a very grave issue between Mr. Truman and Congress; and those who are questioning the practicability of the land defense of Western Europe with American assistance would undoubtedly challenge the exercise of this power if the President decided to exercise it without prior reference to Congress for its approval.

OTHER BASES OF DISCORD

(4) Another basic disagreement between the debaters is the land defense project itself. Considerable public and congressional doubt now existing would surely be removed if General Eisenhower pronounced the project feasible and necessary, and no one believes the President would proceed with it otherwise. But there still would be influential voices raised in the country for a defense program addressed primarily to United States security, somewhat like the program which was outlined by Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy.

(5) There is also fundamental dispute over American policy in the Far East, particularly with respect to measures for dealing with the Chinese Communists. Many, including Republican leaders, urge that the Chinese Nationalists be given military and other assistance to renew active war against the Peiping Government; that our troops in Korea be withdrawn to assure holding an American security line from Alaska, through Japan and Formosa, to Hawaii. The administration thus far has opposed both proposals.

These, plus the movement sparked by Mr. Hoover to demand stronger courses at Lake Success in dealing with Communist China, are the principal divisions on foreign policy being argued before the American people. The discussion is of as great importance as any in our history. The very listing of the issues establishes that. Also, the debate is of the essence of our democracy.

CHALLENGE TO CRITICS

But it has another indispensable value. Critics of Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy have charged they are preaching abandonment of a sacred commitment by the United States, the major premise being that the United States is pledged outright to participate in a land defense of Western Europe. If this misconception were not challenged, and General Eisenhower should conclude that the land-defense program is not feasible, the United States would stand before the world as a dishonored welcher on a firm pledge.

The facts, however, all clear in the record, refute the existence of such a commitment. By the treaty and the arms pact the United States Government, which necessarily includes Congress, is committed to its best effort to defend the North Atlantic area. Insofar as the Executive alone can pledge action by the United States, he has made a strictly conditional commitment to send such military contributions to the land defense of Western Europe as he may conclude to be practicable and serve the primary interests of national security.

That is all. But it does mark a revolutionary change in the foreign policy of the Republic up to 1950.

Inaugural Address by Governor Dewey, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the inaugural address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, delivered at the inauguration ceremonies held in the assembly chamber, State capitol, Albany, N. Y., on January 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the third time I have had the honor of taking the oath as governor of New York. Eight years ago when I first assumed the responsibility of governing our State, our country was desperately engaged in a war for survival. Only a year before much of our fleet had been sunk at Pearl Harbor; disaster had followed disaster and the forces of freedom were beleaguered throughout the world.

By God's grace the forces of freedom triumphed. But 4 years ago when I took this oath for the second time it was only an uneasy peace which had settled upon the world. Signs were already visible to all who would see that our late Russian ally was moving to take Hitler's place in a scheme of world conquest. Our National Government had just committed itself to the disastrous course of appeasement of Communists in China and abandonment of our Chinese allies. The Nation rushed for a normal life and escape from reality while the Federal Government allowed the mightiest force on earth, our naval, air, and ground forces, to disintegrate.

Once again we find ourselves at the start of a new State administration with heavy hearts and under the shadow of war. We are in a period of the gravest world tension. In the last 6 months, in conjunction with others in the United Nations, we came perilously close to losing a military action against a tenth-rate power, North Korea. When victory had been snatched from the jaws of defeat in Korea, we then found our gallant forces almost overwhelmed by the eruption of the hordes of Red China into open warfare.

Soviet diplomacy has today achieved one of its cardinal objectives in placing America in opposition to her traditional Chinese ally, while sowing seeds of dissension between us and other free nations of the world. Meanwhile, without engaging a single Russian regiment since the end of World War II, the Red conqueror has extended his domination beyond his own 200,000,000 people to include 800,000,000 people, one-third of all the people in the world. Today the Red Empire reaches more than half-way around the world, from the Baltic Sea and the middle of Germany, to the Pacific Ocean and the China Sea.

Once again within these 8 years the cause of freedom is beleaguered. Once again the call should be plain to freemen everywhere to band together and bravely live else they will fall apart and ignobly die.

This time the enemy who wars against us has new weapons in his arsenal. He and his satellites boast of land armies the size of which the world has never seen before. He has the largest air force in the world and vast power under the sea. He boasts of secret allies in every nation—hunger, poverty, confusion, war weariness—and in all too many lands, a lack of brave or inspiring leadership. He also has unprecedented underground armies in every nation, highly skilled in creating internal disunity and armed with propaganda, sabotage, fanaticism and treason.

The Red conqueror has still another advantage in the economic weakness of many free nations and in their desperate lack of arms.

One thing and one thing alone seems to stay the hand of the aggressor from waging an immediate, all-out war of conquest—our possession of the atom bomb. We believe we still have the lead in atomic warfare and apparently he shares that belief. How long that superiority will last no one knows.

One thing above all others is clear—the atom bomb will not continue to deter aggression unless we grimly maintain our priceless superiority in atomic warfare and also maintain invulnerable bases around the world from which to send the bomb.

If our own ideals of freedom in the world did not require it, the stark necessities of self-preservation would demand that we develop and keep strong, brave allies. We shall make united and mighty the forces of the free world, and swiftly, or we shall be soon isolated and left to die.

If as a Nation we continue our present course of self-indulgence, weakness, and vacillation, we shall have no one but ourselves to blame for the loss of our liberties and our national existence. All is not lost but all is in the gravest peril.

With only 7 percent of the population of the world we in America are outnumbered 14 to 1. But the free world still outnumbers the slave world by 2 to 1. If we provide the leadership in sacrifice, in hard work and in building overwhelming military force, others will again rally to our cause. We can start again rebuilding toward the powerful physical and moral position we held at the end of World War II.

In this unparalleled crisis, there is only one course for free men and women. There is only one road to survival. That is the road of hard-headed realism, of toil and more toil, of sacrifice and greater sacrifice.

We still have the mightiest industrial plant in the world and it is more powerful today than ever before. Much of the industrial might of Germany and Japan can also be mobilized—this time on the side of freedom—if we are swift and strong enough in action. The resources of the free world vastly exceed those of the slave world. There is no weakness of our cause which courage, hard work, and strong leadership cannot cure.

The physical resources to preserve freedom and even perhaps to save the peace are at hand. Only the will, the courage, and the clear purpose are needed. The duty to mobilize our strength before it is too late should be clear to all. For a decade the cause of freedom has echoed the tragic words "too little and too late." Let not these words be the epitaph of America and of our civilization. There is still time for action, but the hour is very late.

Here in New York we have a high obligation and unmeasured opportunity. By laying aside partisanship and selfishness we can set an example for the States and the Nation in self-denial and in hard work for the greater good.

I propose to you and to the people of New York a Spartan course for our State which I prayerfully hope will be followed here and in the Nation.

I pledge to you a State administration devoted to the primary objective of the defense of liberty.

I pledge to you a single-minded purpose in production for defense, in mobilization of manpower, and in preparation for civil defense.

We have done it before and we will do it again.

During these recent years we have blazed trails in social welfare, in slum clearance, and in public housing, in education, in advancing the rights of man, in medical care, in mental and tuberculosis hospitals, in modern highway transportation, and in recreation.

Foreseeing the tragic emergency in which we find ourselves, we have blazed trails, too, in leading the Nation in civil defense, in building a strong National Guard, and in preparation for a State guard, in vigorous economy in nonessentials, and in strong preparation in essentials. Just as we have led the way in peace and in preparation for defense, so we can move ahead now in preparing for the more perilous times ahead in total defense.

What we can do as citizens of New York we have a right to expect that others will do as citizens of the United States and of the free world. We have a right to insist that policies of vacillation, weakness, and cowardice be abandoned. We have a right to insist on courageous action and Spartan living. As citizens of the United States we want our Nation to live bravely, to resume at whatever cost our position of strength and leadership to preserve the rights of man.

Never in recorded history was the whole concept of decency and human freedom under such total challenge. Never was any people presented with a call to duty so clear or with so great a challenge to live nobly.

The blessings of freedom have brought to our land a potential power so vast that with strong leadership and high courage we can once again gather to our side the minds and hearts of free men everywhere. Once again we can, if we will, develop the overpowering force to stay the hand of the aggressor and make possible the lasting peace we have so long been denied.

There is within the soul of every free man the courage to achieve which 10,000 slaves can never match. With the inspiration of a just God and the courage to do His will we can live bravely and again secure the highest cause on earth, the freedom of mankind.

Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] regarding multiple sclerosis, as discussed in an article entitled "Reprieve," by Miriam Zeller Gross, which the Senator from Washington desires to have printed in the RECORD. I present the statement of the Senator from Washington and the article, and ask that they be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

I am particularly proud to present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD the article Reprieve, by Miriam Zeller Gross, which appears in the December 1950 issue of McCall's magazine.

I take great pride in calling this article to the attention of my colleagues because, first of all, it brings national recognition to a courageous effort in behalf of hundreds of suffering people, being carried on in my home city Tacoma, Wash.

Secondly, I am particularly proud because Dr. Hinton Jones has given his time and effort to establish a clinic at St. Joseph's Hospital in Tacoma, for the treatment of a disease heretofore considered hopeless, multiple sclerosis. This clinic is supported by private voluntary funds, and Dr. Jones volunteers his services in behalf of the clinic and the hundreds of sufferers who have found relief there. There has been no State or Federal assistance in establishing and running this clinic which, so far as I have been able to determine, is the only one devoted exclusively to the treatment of multiple sclerosis in the world.

REPRIEVE FROM A SENTENCE OF TORTURE AND DEATH

(By Miriam Zeller Gross)

Imagine yourself doomed to die from a mysterious, incurable disease. Your doctor has told you the blunt truth as he believes it: "There isn't any hope. Soon you will be in a wheelchair. As the condition progresses—and it always does—you can only take to your bed and wait for death."

Not a pretty picture, is it? Yet, only by putting yourself in the place of someone stricken by the terrible nerve-killer multiple sclerosis can you understand the despair it causes or appreciate the full significance of

the fight being waged against it at the M. S. clinic of St. Joseph's Hospital in Tacoma, Wash.

At St. Joseph's, multiple sclerosis is being arrested in one victim in six. Others get blessed relief. Many leave their beds for the first time in years. One man unable to move so much as a toe for 7 years walked again within a week after entering the hospital.

No cures are claimed. But a revolutionary new concept of the disease enables its hellish symptoms to be controlled, and promises a new lease on life for its victims.

Dr. Hinton D. Jonez, director of the multiple sclerosis clinic, says that attempting to cure this disease is similar to trying to revive a drowning person. Far advanced cases—like people who have been in the water too long—may be difficult or impossible to save. On the other hand, there is surprising hope for victims of multiple sclerosis provided, of course, that important nerves are not dead.

Nerves that appear dead can sometimes be revitalized. Two of Dr. Jones' patients, for example, had been diagnosed as totally blind. One had even received insurance benefits on the basis of total disability. Today both enjoy normal vision. Most of the more than 100 patients with whom I talked at the clinic told stories that hold the drama of people suddenly reprieved from a death sentence.

Take Mrs. Alice Meinert. This young mother was stricken shortly after New Year's Day in 1947. By May she could not get out of bed. For a year she grew steadily worse. Her father, who had made it his business to learn everything possible about the disease, heard about the new clinic in Tacoma. He urged that his daughter be sent there. But the attending physician pooh-poohed the idea, and, acting on his advice, Mrs. Minert's husband refused.

The father took legal action and gained custody of his daughter—a step accomplished through the far-seeing wisdom of Judge Chester A. Batchelor, of the King County Court, Seattle.

Four days after she reached the Tacoma clinic, Mrs. Meinert took her first steps in more than a year. One week later she walked from the house to the street and got into an automobile unaided.

Shortly after this, Mrs. Meinert's husband, angry because of what he considered high-handed interference by his father-in-law, brought suit to get the guardianship of his little boy.

Judge Batchelor again presided. The husband told the court that his wife's illness made it impossible for her to care for their child. She was bedridden and incapable of doing anything for herself, let alone the child. His statement was just completed when a door opened at the back of the courthouse. Alice Meinert entered, walked the full length of the room and took a seat near the front.

Mrs. Meinert told her story at the judge's direction, and she now has full custody of her little boy. Her condition has improved steadily. She does her own housework, looks after the child and appears in every way to be a well, happy woman.

Few people knew anything about multiple sclerosis (also called creeping paralysis or simply M. S.) until it took the life of the great baseball star Lou Gehrig. Today the disease is understood to be fairly common and far more prevalent than poliomyelitis, which its crippling effects resemble.

Most M. S. victims are between 20 and 40, in otherwise highly productive years. They may suffer a few weeks only or linger for years, constantly growing worse, helpless burdens to themselves and to their families. Often they are shunted into depressing institutions for incurables.

Symptoms vary but usually include a staggering gait, double vision, tremors and speech defects—which often unfairly label the victims as psychotics or alcoholics. Deafness, blindness, paralysis and mental changes occur as the condition progresses. Like some fiendish hit-and-run killer, M. S. may strike, allow the victim to recover partially, then strike again, repeating this performance over and over. The victim is weaker each time, until he no longer rises.

Jack Franklin's experience indicates the unhappy misunderstanding these people encounter. Jack was stationed at Dutch Harbor in the Aleutians when he suddenly noticed a numb spot on one leg. The numbness left, only to return in a larger area. Soon half his body lacked sensation. "I could have cut myself in two," he says. "One half had no feeling."

The examining physicians found nothing wrong. "Nothing but nerves," they reported. When his eyes failed, Jack was sent to an eye specialist at Kodiak. This man said, "Snow blindness plus nerves," and referred him to yet another island to consult a specialist for glasses. When Jack couldn't walk without staggering, he was discharged as a mental case and sent to a veterans' hospital. Happily, he is now at Tacoma and steadily getting better.

The miserable symptoms of multiple sclerosis sufferers are caused by damage to the myelin sheaths, or fatty coverings, which normally protect all nerve fibers. These sheaths are like the insulation around an electric wire. Just as damaged insulation causes short circuits, so injured sheaths prevent nerves from delivering brain messages properly. Messages distorted and weakened may finally stop entirely. The many scars caused by the body's attempts to repair the sheaths suggested the name "multiple sclerosis."

Doctors generally classify the condition among "nervous and mental diseases," although nobody has actually proved why nerve coverings disintegrate. Several years ago Dr. Bayard T. Horton, well-known allergist of the famed Mayo Clinic, became convinced that multiple sclerosis is caused by allergic reactions. Acting on Dr. Horton's advice, Dr. Jonez, also an allergist, followed the suggested treatment with a few private patients, with most gratifying results. When Sister Celine Magdeline inquired about the treatment, Dr. Jonez offered to donate his services if the Sisters of St. Francis, operating St. Joseph's Hospital, would provide clinic facilities. Thus the clinic started.

Dr. Jonez explains the new approach to multiple sclerosis in this way: Strawberries and other substances cause some people to get hives on the skin. The multiple sclerosis victim gets his hives on the central nervous system. Obviously hives on the brain or spinal cord—housed in bony boxes without much room for expansion—can cause terrific damage. Blood flow is cut, and nerves are robbed of oxygen and other life-sustaining materials. Small wonder that the sheaths and finally the nerves themselves sicken and die.

Whether this concept is correct or not, it seems to work. All who stick to the treatment for as long as 3 months show definite, measurable improvement, if not dramatic come-backs. Any improvement, however, can be evaluated only in terms of the previous condition.

You might wonder what Sylvia Fisher has accomplished if you saw her confined to her wheel chair day after day. But her happy brother will show you four crocheted doilies, each of finer thread and more intricate design.

"Maybe they wouldn't look like much to some folks," he says, "but they look mighty wonderful to me. For 10 years my sister couldn't even hold a crochet hook. Her hands were completely paralyzed when she came."

Such progress comes about through a four-way attack on the disease. Careful tests detect substances causing allergic reactions so that they may be avoided. Muscles wasted by disuse are rehabilitated through a combination of moist hot polio packs and especially designed exercises developed at the clinic. Distorted body parts are relaxed, and disease symptoms are controlled by two potent drugs. Last—and equally important to all the rest—is what Dr. Jonez calls "lots of TLC," or tender loving care.

Use of histamine in multiple sclerosis may well prove epochal, since this drug controls multiple sclerosis symptoms much as insulin controls diabetes. Like insulin, histamine is an important body chemical. It occurs in human blood and most tissues. While supplies remain constant in normal individuals, histamine varies greatly in allergy sufferers. Histamine, incidentally, must not be confused with antihistamine, the popular cold remedy, since it is the exact opposite.

Doses of the drug histamine, synthesized by industrial laboratories, increase the efficiency of blood flow and rush repair materials to wounded sheaths and nerves. Extra oxygen becomes available, and vital forces generally are stepped up, much like adding fighters to an exhausted army.

Men and women enjoying its benefits say that histamine makes them feel as if they could fly, instead of barely drag one foot before the other. If the prescribed dose is forgotten they get hungry for it, just as for food or water. The drug is dangerous if improperly used. Too much gives the worst headache known. Larger doses kill. Yet over 30,000 doses have been given at Tacoma, and a larger number at the Mayo Clinic (where histamine is used for a number of conditions), without bad results. At both places, however, doses are carefully tailored according to individual needs.

Proper dosage enables many who thought there was nothing ahead but invalidism and death to return to jobs and live normal lives.

Mrs. Albert Parker had been told her husband would never be able to leave his bed. But, through the help of histamine, Mr. Parker is now busily completing preliminaries for law study at the University of Washington.

Wayne Nelson is another. This ski instructor was having bad attacks of staggers and double vision—seeing two trees where there was only one. Sometimes he couldn't get out of bed, and altogether he feared he was through. Maintained by histamine, he is back at his chosen work in the mountains and participates once more in ski races and tournaments. "I'm fine so long as I take the histamine," he said.

Ordinarily administered by hypodermic needle, the drug can now be taken more easily by an electrical device. Dr. Harold A. Abramson, a New York City allergist, recently developed a method whereby histamine is driven through the skin by a galvanic current and absorbed into the blood. The necessary apparatus is inexpensive and so simple that a 14-year-old boy made a set for his mother now under treatment in Tacoma.

The clinic provides a place where people may learn to live comfortably with M. S. Here they discover curare—a drug with the unique quality of softening twisted, gnarled muscles and bestowing a blessed feeling of relaxation. Many enjoy their first night of refreshing sleep in months or years after the first dose. This drug, like quinine, comes from trees in the South American jungles. In addition to relaxing muscles, curare helps overcome one of the most distressing of M. S. complaints—incontinence of bladder and bowels.

Three years ago, before the clinic's great contribution was recognized, the unorthodox treatment pursued there was openly censured. At one point the mother superior was told no more interns would be assigned to the hospital unless the clinic was discontinued. The physician who related this story says the magnificent woman calmly replied that the hospital would have to get along without interns; the clinic would continue. She added: "Dr. Jonez gives these miserable people dry beds to sleep in, and that unprecedented attainment alone is enough for me."

The all too prevalent skepticism and hopelessness regarding M. S. is illustrated by an experience of the clinic's physical therapist, Mrs. Anita W. Preston. On assuming duties, Mrs. Preston wrote the head of an internationally recognized organization concerned with physical rehabilitation and asked for guidance. The reply expressed surprise that anyone would consider trying to revitalize M. S.-ridden muscles.

So, like Dr. Jonez, Mrs. Preston started pioneering. Her reward came a few weeks ago, when other physical therapists throughout the Northwest gathered to observe with astonishment the feats performed by men and women for whom they had been taught nothing could be done.

Only extraordinary achievement has kept the clinic alive in the face of a formidable wall of disbelief. But even the most stubborn diehards are impressed by recoveries like that of Mrs. Ezra Jennings.

Neurosurgeons were not certain whether Mrs. Jennings had advanced multiple sclerosis or a brain tumor. One specialist urged drastic brain surgery as her only hope. Her left side was completely paralyzed, and she was taken to the clinic in a wheel chair. After less than a month she was walking normally and gave the chair away. All traces of paralysis were gone. Mrs. Jennings called on the doctor who had urged a brain operation, and carefully grasped his hand with her previously paralyzed left hand.

Doubting Thomases like to say that the St. Joseph's treatment is largely psychotherapy. "Nothing but mental suggestion," they insist. This amuses Dr. Jonez. "Certainly we are guilty of mental suggestion," he says, "if that means we fight to uphold morale and prevent fits of depression."

Without doubt the director does inspire hope and confidence. There is no defeatism at Tacoma. One man said, "The very way Jonez greets you when you arrive seems to say, 'How wonderful that you have come to me. Maybe you're in pretty bad shape, but between the two of us we'll lick this thing.' He makes you feel like a very important person and that he's more interested in you than in any other individual—and you're certain you'll get well."

Happily, prominent physicians are now convinced multiple sclerosis victims have a chance at St. Joseph's Hospital, and are sending them there. The same holds true for Veterans' Bureau administrators, county medical society executives, and a host of welfare organizations. Representative THOR C. TOLLEFSON, of Washington, has introduced a measure in Congress which would provide Federal aid for the clinic.

No case is considered too advanced, and no person is refused, for lack of money. One of the wealthiest men in the Northwest took his treatment alongside of charity cases, without any distinction in care. Dr. Jonez himself has not accepted one cent, not even Christmas gifts, from clinic patients. Furthermore, he devotes most of his time to the clinic.

Pitiful stories are told by many who sought treatment elsewhere before going to the multiple sclerosis clinic.

Mr. and Mrs. Edwards saved $750—just enough to keep him for 1 month at a certain institution in California. Mrs. Edwards told me that they traveled 2,000 miles to this hospital only to be informed nobody as crippled as Mr. Edwards was admitted. Then they heard of Tacoma.

"What a relief," she said, with tears in her eyes. "We reached St. Joseph's Hospital, and Dr. Jonez said, 'Come right in.'"

One woman told of preparing to commit suicide after she was refused at one hospital after another. Only by great effort could she drag herself from one piece of furniture to another. She realized she would be bedridden shortly, and dreaded being a burden. When she heard about the place where nobody was refused, she found it hard to believe, but decided to investigate.

"After all," she said, "it didn't matter greatly in my condition whether I died at once or waited a while." That she can look back upon her near suicide in a matter-of-fact manner indicates the progress this woman has made.

The Brodeur family heard about the clinic one Saturday afternoon shortly after Mrs. Brodeur had undergone one more disheartening medical examination. The clinic sounded too good to be true, but anything was worth a trial. By Wednesday the husband had sold his business in Providence, R. I., and the family took its first plane ride, bound for Tacoma.

"Smartest thing I ever did," Mr. Brodeur says. "My wife hasn't made any startling recovery, but she's 500 percent better. I'm the nurse, and I ought to know. She'd been in bed 7 years. At least she's in a wheelchair now. We don't ask for miracles."

Sister Margaret Angeline may never walk again, but her feeling is of deepest gratitude. Anyone trying to evaluate events, she says, must remember that multiple sclerosis has been the despair of medical science ever since it was first recognized a hundred years ago. The mortifying nature of the disease makes people feel sensitive and apart. Soon they become social outcasts. "It seems almost too much that I am privileged to be in the one place where progress is being made," she says. And she feels privileged to put in long hours performing the secretarial duties of the clinic.

Father Robinson is a source of great inspiration to all at the hospital. Former president of Gonzaga University and provincial of the Jesuit Order for the four Western States and Alaska, this religious leader was advised 12 years ago that his condition was without hope. His consultant was a neurosurgeon of international reputation. And, indeed, the disease progressed without abatement until Father Robinson sadly performed what he feared was his last mass.

Crippling continued until he could neither sit nor lie in a normal position, and he reached the hospital kneeling in a car, the only way he could make the trip. Yet that same night he slept comfortably. Today, just a few months later, Father Robinson again says masses and goes forward with church activities.

For some unknown reason, multiple sclerosis appears to be activated by infections, pregnancy, accidents, or emotional upheavals—particularly the latter. One man became ill immediately after his wife ran away with all of his savings. Another suffered early symptoms when a beloved grandchild was threatened by a kidnaper.

A student at the University of Washington chartered a plane and flew home one week end to surprise the family. She reached the remotely situated ranch late at night, only to find it deserted. The family also had chartered a plane and flown to surprise her. Shortly following that experience she became ill.

Multiple sclerosis is more common and severe in cold, damp climates.

Barbara Shields, a 17-year-old freshman at College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, was exceedingly anxious to be a good athlete. Despite the fact she found it difficult to keep warm, she slept in a cold room and took cold showers. One night after an icy shower her legs became paralyzed. Other indications soon proved that multiple sclerosis had struck. The cause was quickly determined, and there is every reason to believe Barbara will hold the complete recovery she has apparently made. Her experience should be a warning to those who try to buck the natural inclination to keep warm.

It is difficult to report events at Tacoma. Even after you have visited St. Joseph's Hospital—observed everything with what you believe is a critical eye, and talked with the people—you still find the truth unbelievable when you try to write it. You feel like the research director of one of two industrial laboratories that had contributed close to half a million dollars in histamine and curare to the clinic. As he was leaving the clinic this scientist said in an awed tone, "I have seen it all, and reason tells me things must be as I have seen them. Still I can't believe it."

Defense of Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Robert P. Patterson relating to the defense of Western Europe which was published in the New York Times December 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENDING THE WEST—WITHDRAWAL FROM LEADERSHIP IN CHECKING COMMUNISM OPPOSED

(The writer of the following letter was formerly Secretary of War.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The news of the Korean retreat of the United Nations forces, composed in the main of United States forces, has brought on an insistence in some quarters in this country that we should withdraw our troops, not only from Korea but from everywhere overseas.

The reality of the peril from Soviet Russia is admitted, but the odds are said to be so heavily against us that from now on we should confine our defense efforts to the Western Hemisphere and the oceans on both sides. Otherwise, it is argued, nothing but disaster is in store for forces committed overseas, whereas it is claimed that we can make the Western Hemisphere an impregnable fortress, a Gibraltar.

The proposals for retreat vary a little in details. Mr. Hoover urges that we should not land another man or another dollar in Western Europe until the nations there have themselves raised and equipped armies in such numbers "as would erect a sure dam against the Red flood." In other words, we should not render assistance to Western Europe until such time as our assistance would not be needed. On the other hand, he would have us help defend Britain provided the British will cooperate.

But defense of Britain in the face of Soviet domination of the Continent 20 miles away would be a military impossibility in these days of guided atomic missiles. The reservation of Britain for special favors, therefore, would seem to have no meaning.

In substance the several proposals come to the same: evacuate and rally on our own shores. It is argued that the best place to wage war, if we must wage it, is on our own soil.

Consider the case of Western Europe. With the hostile intentions of Soviet Russia an acknowledged fact, is abandonment of Western Europe the best policy for defense of the United States? I submit that it is not.

FACT REPUDIATION

In the first place, the suggested abandonment would be a flat repudiation of the North Atlantic Defense Treaty. By that treaty the United States and Canada and 10 countries of Western Europe pledged their faith to give continuous mutual aid and to come to one another's assistance in the event of attack against any of them. Our Senate ratified the treaty in July 1949 by an overwhelming vote, Democrats and Republicans concurring.

Are we to turn our backs on that treaty? Would any people ever again put reliance on the pledged word of the United States?

Apart from treaty, apart from breaking faith with little Denmark, Norway, and the other nations which took a bold stand in signing the treaty in the face of threats from the Kremlin, a stand taken because of their trust in us, it requires no detailed argument to prove that on military grounds the defense of Western Europe is of vital value to our defense.

The nations of Europe that have not been flattened by the Soviet juggernaut—divided though they are by national boundaries and speaking different tongues—have in the aggregate 200,000,000 people. They are vigorous, productive people. They have an industrial plant of huge capacity, second only to that of this country. It is a workshop far superior to that of Russia and Russia's satellites, and the men in Moscow have yearned for years to seize it.

If those people and that industrial plant should be taken over by the Soviet Union and added to their present strength in men and materials, the United States would be in a position hopelessly inferior in virtually everything it takes to wage war. With Western Europe overrun, the fall of Africa and the rest of Asia would be a certainty. Africa's uranium, apparently the most abundant so far discovered, would no longer be shipped here to the United States. It would go to feed Russian atomic energy plants.

With the rest of the world arrayed against us, we could not maintain ourselves for long on sea, air, or land. Our military position would be desperate.

INVITING CONQUEST

In short, abandonment of Western Europe would be nothing but an invitation to conquest of our own country by Soviet Russia. It would play directly into the hands of Stalin, with his plan of divide and conquer, with his strategy of knocking off his opponents one by one. No wonder that Pravda printed the speeches of Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy in full.

Impatience over the slowness of the free people of Europe in strengthening their armed forces in face of imminent peril is understandable, though even here we must, in candor, make the acknowledgment that our own speed in mustering our military power has been nothing remarkable so far.

But a long step forward in the direction of combined defense of Western Europe was recently taken at the Brussels conference. General Eisenhower has been appointed supreme commander of the Allied Forces in Europe. Mr. Hoover's speech made no mention of these favorable developments.

It gets us nowhere to wring our hands and talk of retreating. If the United States, the leader of the free nations, the nation least exposed, talks and acts that way, who could blame the countries in Europe if they should fall away from the alliance?

The key to the situation, I submit, is the possession of military strength. We must attain it as swiftly as possible, at whatever cost. Our long lead in atom bombs, plus our power to deliver them by long-range air power, has deterred Soviet Russia from attacking directly so far, but no one can say how long the deterrent effect will continue.

What we need now is to supplement that strong asset with still more air power, also with more power to hold the lines of defense on the ground. With military strength in being and not merely on paper, we will find that most of our other problems so far as they concern Soviet Russia will be solved without undue difficulty.

In addition, we should collect as many allies as possible—Spain, a rearmed Western Germany, a rearmed Japan. Far from running away, we should extend our alliance to include all who have reason to fear conquest by Soviet Russia and have the will to resist.

For the peril from Soviet Russia is a mortal peril to free people the world over. Stalin will not stop until he is stopped. Bear in mind what he wrote in Problems of Leninism.

It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable.

In the dark days of the Revolution there were those who advised retreat. In the Civil War the Democratic platform of 1864 declared the war a failure, and that party went into the wilderness for 20 years as a penalty—a just penalty—for its lack of faith in the Nation.

Napoleon was defeated by a coalition. So was the Kaiser; so was Hitler. Stalin can be held in check by a coalition of the nations still free; or if he insists on war he can be defeated. But if the United States, the strongest member of the coalition, should pull out, then his prospects for conquest of the world, this country included, would indeed be the brightest they have ever been.

ROBERT P. PATTERSON.

The American Brand of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a striking statement made by Mr. Paul F. Watkins, the editor of the Herald-Progress of Ashland, Va., and which was republished in the Cosmopolitan magazine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If you don't like the fighting and feuding that goes with our American brand of democracy, there are two places you can go to find unanimity and peace. One of them is a land where everybody agrees on everything every time—or else. Where there is no candidate except the official candidate; no opinion except the official opinion; no policy, philosophy, or religion that is not prescribed for you. You are told what to think on government and world affairs, on art, music, literature, and science. And nobody ever grumbles or disagrees out loud twice. That's Russia. The other place where there is eternal peace and quiet and harmony is Wood Lawn Cemetery. The editor is in no hurry to go to either. (Paul F. Watkins, In My Opinion, Herald-Progress, Ashland, Va.)

Production of Nickel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Too Much Complacency," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 1, 1951. The editorial deals with the report of the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services. The subcommittee is headed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The editorial comments on the report of the committee on the nickel problem as it confronts us today.

I want to say in passing that the Senate is aware of the great work which is being done by the Subcommittee on National Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services. However, I think it is quite proper that I should comment on the floor of the Senate today on the courage, fearlessness, absolute fairness, and impartiality of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The committee under his leadership has been carrying out the promise we made at the outset of our work that we would be entirely impartial and fearless, and that we would let the chips fall where they may. I think the editorial comment on the subcommittee's report is deserving of the very careful attention of every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO MUCH COMPLACENCY

With nickel an indispensable item in our military stockpiling program, and most of our sources of supply outside the country, it is hard to account for the complacency which the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee encountered during an inquiry. Our experience in World War II showed the urgency of maintaining a large stockpile of this critical metal. At no time during that war were we able to keep more than a 2 months' supply on hand. Yet, with a new war under way in the Far East and a world-wide conflict threatened, the Senate group found that the Nation faces a serious shortage of nickel, with little immediate prospect of an increased supply. The nickel stockpiling program, the subcommittee asserted in a report, "has been conducted with far too much complacency."

Nickel has assumed even more importance in this emergency than during the late war, because of the development of jet fighters and bombers. Nickel is an essential ingredient of the tough steel needed to withstand the high temperatures of jet power plants. We are the world's largest consumer of nickel,

yet we produce hardly any worth speaking of. Our chief reliance is on a foreign monopoly, the International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd., which produces 85 percent of the world's supply of the metal. Efforts to induce this firm to expand production capacity to care for emergency demands have thus far brought no results. The Canadian supply seems to have reached a fixed level at a time when our war plants are seeking more and more nickel for planes and guns.

With this bleak situation staring us in the face, it would be natural to assume that every other possible source of nickel supply would be exploited to the limit. But Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's subcommittee was "shocked to discover" that the United States owns one of the largest nickel-producing plants in the world in Cuba, but it is idle. Built during the past war, the plant was declared surplus, and efforts were made to sell it—without success. Today, 6 months after the outbreak of the Korean War, plans for reactivating the plant still have "not advanced beyond the point of paper preparedness." Even more alarming is the fact that it will take about a year to repair the plant, staff it, and begin production of nickel in substantial quantities. The danger is that our enemies may not give us the time we need to do the things that we have neglected to do up to now.

Nickel is but one of a number of war materials which we have failed to stockpile in quantities sufficient to the needs of the present emergency. The subcommittee puts the blame not only on the Munitions Board but on the Budget Bureau, Congress, and the people as a whole. Senator JOHNSON aptly summed it up when he reported that the country's most critical shortage "is not one of nickel or wool or rubber or any other such commodity, but rather a shortage of bold planning." It will take bold planning from now on to rectify past shortcomings and meet the needs which loom so large ahead.

The Situation in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Topeka Daily Capital, issue of December 23, 1950.

This is a guest editorial written by Henry A. Bubb, Topeka, retiring president of the United States Savings and Loan League. It expresses the views of many of our citizens.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEAK UP, AMERICA

Following is a guest editorial by Henry A. Bubb, Topeka, president of the National Savings and Loan Association, presented as his opinion of the current crisis and what to do about it:

"Up until a few months ago most of us had high hopes for the success of the United Nations.

"We now know that when the United Nations originally agreed to resist aggression and uphold law and justice, it was only oratory. Most members did not mean what they said. All the time General MacArthur and his troops were driving northward in Korea, the general was being told through diplomatic channels, not to antagonize the enemy, not to liberate Korea, and not to complete his mission. His orders prevented him from sending planes to reconnoiter above the Chinese border. The general has described these restrictions as 'an enormous handicap without precedence in military history.'

"Possibly our brave men have not died in vain on the bloody battlefields of Korea, if in this critical hour the people of America will awaken to the irresoluteness of our allies and change our course to an impregnable United States at home, armed and ready to challenge any aggressor. If we build such a United States of America there will be no attack. If we continue to send all of our men to Europe and Asia, we are preparing for the greatest defeat ever suffered by a country dedicated to freedom and Christianity.

"Our allies, unfortunately, are weak, divided, and either socialistic or with a large part of their people communistic. As such, they will give up easily and then our boys will be overrun. Thus all men and material sent to foreign shores will be lost and the United States will be left an easy prey for the communistic armies of the world.

"Why not arm the Chinese Nationalists, the Turks, the Spaniards, and others who have been willing to stand up and fight communism—buy off Chinese Communist generals, who will in turn create civil war in China? By those methods the Communists of Asia and Europe will be kept busy while we build a strong United States, keep our boys at home, and protect the private-enterprise system which has made us the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

"To do this we must change our leadership. Unfortunately we have a President, at the most crucial time in the history of the world, who not only shows poor judgment, but is also showing signs of instability.

"I suggest that his own party surround him with a policy committee of the top men in our country. That committee should immediately clean out the State Department, starting with Secretary Dean Acheson, who has charted the suicidal course the United States has followed. Also General Marshall, whose policy led to Communist domination of China, should be retired along with other men who have been good generals in their time. The committee should enlist the services of great Americans, regardless of political affiliations, to save what we have left before we lose all.

"Tomorrow may be too late. It can happen here. Speak up, America—demand of your Congress to take immediate action."

Address by Ex-President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "It Seems to Me" written by Charles A. Sprague, and published in a recent issue of the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman. The article presents a point of view on the subject of our foreign policy which is considerably different from the point of view presented today by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I find myself in complete agreement with the point of view presented in this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

The policy recommended by ex-President Hoover Wednesday night has an appeal. He would have the United States avoid entanglement in Asia and make no commitments in Europe until Western Europe recruits its own sizable force. He would have the United States build up its defenses behind the moats of the Atlantic and Pacific to secure this as a Gibraltar of freedom.

That policy appeals to the same instinct which prompts a child to put his head under the pillow. He thinks to escape danger or discovery by hiding. In this age of planes and submarines the oceans are an imperfect security.

I fear that adoption of the course recommended by Mr. Hoover would give the world another Munich on even a greater scale. The forces of disunity in France and Germany and Italy would get such an impetus as to make impossible the recruitment which Hoover demands and the United States Government has been strongly urging. Desertion of Europe would invite a Communist overrun either by military action or political infiltration. All that Russia needs to round out world dominion on a scale not even dreamed of by Alexander and Caesar and Napoleon, but only by the mad Hitler is to obtain the industrial plant of West Germany and France and the Low Countries. Britain would be exposed to a greater menace than it was in 1941 and would exist largely by Russian suffrance.

This would leave the United States isolated, not only militarily but politically, economically, and morally. Its connection with the world community would be cut off. The nations of the Southern Hemisphere would be an inadequate and uncertain substitute for those of Western Europe for our association.

In the past I have warned against too wide a spread of our guarantles, not only for conserving our military strength but also for employing it in a vital area. For the United States that is first in Western Europe. We must not cast off Europe with an abrupt ultimatum such as Mr. Hoover offers.

Shipment of Rubber to Russia by Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an International News dispatch dated London, December 21, 1950, entitled "Britain Will Ship Russia $10,000,000 Worth of Rubber."

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN WILL SHIP RUSSIA $10,000,000 WORTH OF RUBBER

LONDON, December 21.—Ten million dollars worth of Malayan rubber now piled on the London docks is scheduled to be shipped to

Russia next month aboard the British steamer *Stanrealm*.

The transaction was confirmed today by a spokesman for the shipping company, J. A. Billmeir, which has chartered the ship to the Soviets. The spokesman told International News Service:

"It's just an ordinary business deal."

The rubber, a vital war material, will be loaded soon aboard the *Stanrealm*, which will sail for Odessa in January.

The spokesman added:

"There is nothing to prevent Russia from buying British rubber. We are not at war with them."

Hoover Commission Recommendations on Organization of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Halfway To Go," dealing with the recommendations of the Hoover report. I am, of course, pleased that the Citizens Committee finds that about half the program has already been embodied in 20 public laws and 26 reorganization plans. I suggest to the Congress, however, that although we may be one-half of the way along the route, judged numerically, I do not think we are halfway along judged from the standpoint of political difficulty. I believe many of the easiest plans came first. The pressures on the Congress will be even greater to defeat some of the plans still to come, as the implications of this editorial indicate.

In this year of crisis, with our very survival perhaps depending on our efficiency, I hope the Congress will more resolutely face up to some of the distasteful political decisions which must be made if we are to achieve the economy and efficiency in our Government recommended by the Hoover Commission.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALFWAY TO GO

The work already accomplished by Congress and by the Executive in putting into effect recommendations of the Hoover report is at once a cause for satisfaction and a challenge. Some very notable improvements have been made in the organization of government; in fact, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report says that about half the program has already been embodied in 20 public laws and 26 reorganization plans for strengthening the Federal structure. Most notable among them is the Military Unification Act, benefits of which have perhaps been felt sooner than anticipated. The Reorganization Act of 1949 enabled modernization of some 17 major agencies. Creation of the General Services Administration has vastly simplified governmental housekeeping problems. Many other major and minor reforms have been adopted. And, as the Citizens Committee points out, not the least beneficial effect of the report has been a reawakening of public interest in Government unprecedented in our times. In 21 States little Hoover commissions have been established, and the process is going on even in some major cities, including New York (the Gulick survey), and Los Angeles.

The challenge lies in the work still cut out for Congress and the administration if the full benefits implicit in the Hoover report are to be realized. Some important recommendations have not yet been acted upon: the proposal to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, for instance. Efforts that were made in this direction last spring were defeated. Some major improvements have been made in the Post Office Department; but the No. 1 problem here, mixture of politics with the appointment of postmasters, has not yet been solved. The Veterans' Administration requires a going-over. Unification of all Federal medical facilities should not be longer delayed. A crying need is establishment of greater control, from the standpoint of the general welfare, over water-development projects, with particular reference to the work of the Bureau of Reclamation and to the civil functions of the Army Corps of Engineers. There are many other equally important battles to be fought and won. Constant vigilance and constant pressure will be necesary to see them through to victory.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me a letter which appeared in the editorial column of the Anderson (S. C.) Independent on January 1, 1951, which was written by a South Carolina boy now serving with the American forces in Korea.

The author of this letter makes one statement that should awake all of us as well as all citizens of the United States. That statement is:

I guess a great general like Mr. MacArthur knows what he's doing, leavin' us here like this. But I sure wish I knew what it is all about. All I can say, whatever it is, it must be pretty doggone important to be worth so many lives, and so much suffering and all.

Such a letter as this should be a warning to all that petty politics and individual wars among the American people be brought to a stop. It should also be sufficient notice for this country to lay the cards on the table and prepare for the worst. I am glad to see that we are now starting our defense mobilization, and I personally advocate all-out preparedness. Let us quit playing around and work together for the sake of survival. If we are going to have to fight Russia, let us be prepared.

I see no need in continuing a half war. The lives of our young Americans are being exchanged for the lives of Chinese Communists inspired by Russia. Our soldiers could kill 10,000 Chinese a day for 10 years, and the Chinese population would still continue to increase. As I see it these side wars are not worth the price we will pay. Let us come home and build a defense that no country will dare attack.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Anderson Independent of January 1, 1951 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOXHOLE PHILOSOPHER

William C. Arbery, who is general manager of Carolina Detergents, Inc., brought to us yesterday a letter from a soldier in Korea; a boy by the name of Ben. We think this letter reflects the general tempo of thinking in these critical days; tells a story which everyone should know.

This is the letter:

"DEAREST MOM: Well old 1950 is about over and things are fairly quiet right now, but it sure is cold. Forty degrees below zero would freeze good old South Carolina right off the map, wouldn't it, Mom? But don't worry about me gettin' cold. We've been on the move for several weeks and up to about a week ago I didn't have my clothes off or have a bath or sleep much for over 3 weeks.

"They say we'll get warmer clothes sometime soon. Gee, I sure hope so, because this kind of weather just freezes your legs and arms if you stop movin'. I hear one fellow had to have both arms and both legs cut off. Boy, am I lucky. Of course, that wouldn't happen if we had the right kind of clothes, but you see Mom, they thought we'd all be out of here before Christmas. But something sure went wrong. Nobody around here seems to know just what. I'll tell you the Gospel truth, Mom, if I can't talk to you, I can't talk to anybody, and I've just got to get this off my chest. Why, I don't know who we're fightin' even. Is it the Russians, the North Koreans, or the Chinese? And who are we fightin' for? Some say we're in the American Army and others say we're in the UN Army. What is this UN, anyhow, Mom? I never gave it much thought as long as I thought we'd all be eatin' Christmas turkey together at home. We thought it was just about over, and then all of a sudden it seemed like millions of these crazy, screaming yellow men came at us from every direction. Seems like somebody would have known about it and warned us, but we kept heading right up to the border like there wasn't anything on the other side of it but pine trees. Seems to me that it would have been a good idea for somebody to have sort of scouted up ahead, though, don't you think so, Mom?

"Looks like we're outnumbered a pretty smart amount, and though we don't aim to move an inch, we just can't expect our lines to hold up against these thousands and thousands of doped-up maniacs. It's always the same, they come at us laughing, crying, yelling, screaming—they are not brave, Mom, they're just crazy drunk. I wish I was home. I guess a great general like Mr. MacArthur knows what he's doing, leavin' us here like this. But I sure wish I knew what it is all about. All I can say, whatever it is, it must be pretty doggone important to be worth so many lives, and so much suffering and all.

"You can hear anything over here. Some of the fellows got it out that Mr. Truman has been writing silly letters to people at home about things that would be silly even in peacetime. But Mom, I don't believe that kind of stuff. I know one thing, if I thought the President of the United States didn't have any more to do than that, in times like these, I'd sure be scared for my skin.

It's like Pa says, 'You can't run a ship without a good captain.' I don't know how these stories get started.

"But I know one thing, Mom, when I get old enough to vote I'm sure going to be careful who I send to Washington.

"Love to everybody, and don't worry; I feel fine.

"Your loving son,

"BEN."

Editorial Comment on Address by Ex-President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Invitation to Disaster," published in Washington, D. C., Sunday Star of December 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVITATION TO DISASTER

The fact that Secretary Acheson has seen fit to call upon the National Security Council as a rebuttal witness is a measure of the seriousness with which the administration views Herbert Hoover's call for a retreat from Western Europe. (The Security Council says such a retreat could lead only to surrender or defeat.)

Mr. Acheson and the others have good reason to be deeply concerned with the Hoover speech. For it was an appealing statement—a speech which was bound to evoke a warm and enthusiastic response from millions of Americans. But it was also a speech which may well have contained within it the seeds of our own destruction, and it is proper, therefore, to examine and reexamine it.

When Mr. Hoover said that he spoke "with a sense of deep responsibility," he was wholly sincere. He has passed that point in life when men may be tempted by some hope of personal advantage, when partisanship seems worth while merely for the sake of partisanship. In the Star's opinion, Mr. Hoover spoke as an American citizen whose sole concern in these dark times is to serve the best interests of his country. Nevertheless, this newspaper believes that the course which the former President has advocated is a course which, if followed at this time, can lead us only to disaster.

When the speech is boiled down to its essence, Mr. Hoover is saying that we should pull back from Europe unless the western Europeans build for themselves a defense capable of turning back a Russian attack. If anything is certain, it is that Europe, without our vigorous assistance and support, will never erect such a defense. And the alternative in Mr. Hoover's opinion, is to arm ourselves to the teeth and maintain our own defense, with the Atlantic and the Pacific as our outward bastions.

The first trouble with the advocacy of such a point of view is that it tends to frighten the Europeans into doing nothing. Without our help, they cannot and will not fight in any effective manner. If they do not fight, if they do not erect what Mr. Hoover calls a sure dam against Communist aggression, the overwhelming probability is that Russia will take over Western Europe. What then?

Mr. Hoover does not advocate that we fight in such an eventuality, but rather that, while pursuing our own rearmament, we adopt a wait-and-see policy.

What we should expect to see is a Russian exploitation and development of the skilled manpower and the industrial resources of Western Europe. Instead of having 160,000,000 people allied with us, they would be working for the Russians. Mr. Hoover says there is no more danger that the Russians could invade Washington than that we, with land armies, could reach Moscow. That is quite true. But what about the ability of Russia, once the resources of Western Europe are at her disposal, to launch an all-out, devastating atomic attack on this country? All that Mr. Hoover says on this point is that the atomic bomb is a far less dominant weapon than it was once thought to be. Maybe so. But the prospect of living for an indefinite future under the constant dread of an overpowering atomic attack is not an attractive one. At best it leaves with the enemy the initiative, the choice of the time and means of attack. And at worst, it invites the prospect that this country might be destroyed without any effective chance to fight back.

Mr. Hoover seems to think that his proposal offers hope, after the initial preparation, of reduced expenditures, a balanced budget, and freedom from the dangers of inflation and economic degradation. The Star fears that this is the sheerest wishful thinking. We would be faced, for one thing, with a loss of our foreign trade. That might not be too important. What is important is that, as the Russians increased their military strength after the conquest of Western Europe, we would have to increase ours. We would never reach the point where we could sit back and say that we are strong enough, that we do not need more and newer weapons. Instead, we would have to live indefinitely in an armed camp, and that, even without actual war, would sap our resources, cancel out our freedoms, and, finally, bring on the economic degradation against which Mr. Hoover warns.

Mr. Hoover cautions in eloquent terms against appeasement. But that which he proposes actually would be the greatest act of appeasement of all. It is true that if Western Europe does not take every possible step to insure its own defense, we probably will have to fall back to the line which Mr. Hoover wants us to occupy. But it would be a ghastly mistake to beat such retreat unless and until it becomes clearly necessary. The sensible thing for us to do is to try by every feasible means to encourage and help the Europeans to stand up to the common enemy. If they refuse to do that, then we must fall back. But let us not abandon this battle until we have really tried to fight it.

Many of the people who respond favorably to Mr. Hoover's counsel are also admirers of General MacArthur. Perhaps this is a good time to recall some advice that he has given.

More than a decade ago, when another ruthless enemy threatened the civilized world, General MacArthur wrote to a friend: "The history of failure in war can almost be summed up in two words, 'too late'—too late in comprehending the deadly purpose of a potential enemy; too late in realizing the mortal danger; too late in preparedness; too late in uniting all possible forces for resistance; too late in standing with one's friends."

That is the advice of one of our ablest military commanders. So let us not be too quick to abandon our friends and prospective allies in favor of standing alone.

Russia's Plan for World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Russia's Plan for World Conquest," written by Joseph Stalin, with introductory comments by the editors of Coronet as printed in the January 1951 issue of that magazine. This article gives the Russian dictator's nine-point program for world conquest as revealed by his recorded writings in the archives of the National War College in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S PLAN FOR WORLD CONQUEST

(By Joseph Stalin)

(Just like Adolf Hitler, the dictator of Soviet Russia has a carefully prepared plan for winning world supremacy. And just as Hitler did in his notorious book, Mein Kampf, so has Joseph Stalin written, in clear and unmistakable words, his blueprint for aggressive conquest—the Communist blueprint that is being followed, down to the smallest detail, in the Far East and elsewhere around the globe. Ironically, however, few people in the United States have taken the trouble to explore Stalin's writings and weigh their significance to the citizens of a free world. In order that there be no further unawareness of his long-range aims for the forcible spread of communism, here is the Russian Dictator's nine-point program for world conquest, taken from his recorded writings, which are now on file in the Stalin Archives of the National War College in Washington, D. C. Sentences in brackets have been inserted throughout the article in order to point up Stalin's plan in the light of today's critical events.—THE EDITORS)

Now that the Soviet Union has become a major power, the world is severed into two camps. The capitalist world is being disintegrated by internal antagonisms which are paralyzing it; on the other hand, our Socialist world is steadily growing stronger.

Lenin told us that once the Communist Party triumphed in our own land, the epoch of world revolution would begin, an epoch full of conflicts and wars, of victories and defeats—an epoch which would, in the end, lead to victory over the chief capitalistic countries.

This epoch covers a strategic period of years or even decades. In the course of this period, there must occur ebbs and flows in the revolutionary tide.

The Communist revolution does not develop along a continuous and upward line, but along a zig-zag path, by means of forward and backward marches. Our possibilities of success depend upon the relative strengths and weaknesses of friends and enemies abroad.

The weaknesses of the capitalistic world which we can use are its inexpressible antagonisms—antagonisms which dominate the whole international situation.

The first group of antagonisms consists of those between the workers and the middle

class in the capitalist countries; the second consists of those between imperialism and the liberation movement in colonies and dependent countries; the third consists of those between the war victors and the conquered countries; the fourth consists of those which have arisen among the victorious states; the fifth consists of those which have developed between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalist countries as a whole.

The trend of our foreign policy is determined by the conflicts and antagonisms of these five groups.

I

[The Korean war offers convincing proof that Soviet Russia has a long-range plan for attacking capitalism through its weakest point—the Far East.]

In 1917 the weakest part of the capitalist world front was Russia. Where is the front breakable next? Again at the weakest point. In India there are young and combative revolutionaries allied with the powerful movement for liberation. The forces of the revolutionary movement in China are immeasurable. They have not yet come into anything like full operation, but the future will show how vast they are.

The immediate task confronting the revolutionary movement in colonial lands is (1) to win over the best elements among the workers to communism and to form independent Communist Parties; (2) to set up a nationalist and revolutionary coalition of workers, peasants, and revolutionary intellectuals; and (3) to guarantee that leadership of the revolutionary coalition shall be in the hands of the workers.

It is obvious that each of these countries will need separate treatment. We must study all the special characteristics of the revolutionary development in these lands, and must educate the students from these countries in such a way as to be sure they will fulfill all the tasks assigned to them.

II

[Even though America is investing billions in Europe under the Marshall plan, Russia is convinced that capitalism abroad will inevitably collapse.]

Our country, a vast domain with very extensive markets and enormous supplies of raw materials, has been detached from the capitalist system. The loss of one-sixth of the world signified for capitalist Europe a restriction of production and a profound disturbance. Meanwhile, the European powers are threatened with the loss of their most important hinterland, the colonies.

Europe has been compelled to increase the burden of taxation, and to make the condition of the workers much worse than before. The temporary stabilization of capitalism has been mainly effected with the aid of United States capital. The European countries, while continuing to exploit their own colonies, have themselves become financially dependent upon the United States. Thus, the center of financial power in the capitalist world has been shifted from Europe to America.

III

[The recent history of internecine labor warfare in the United States reveals how cleverly Communist agents use unions to achieve their revolutionary aims.]

No country can, in these times, carry on war without the workers. If workers refuse to make war against our Soviet Republic, then such war becomes impossible.

Communists must go into the unions, work in them for 5 or more years if necessary—see to it that every Communist, without exception, becomes a member of an appropriate trade-union, there to work patiently and systematically for the solidarity of the working class in its fight against capitalism.

The support of our revolution by the workers of all lands, and, even more, by the victory of workers in a few countries at least, are indispensable preliminaries without which the final triumph of socialism cannot be assured. Should an attack on Russia materialize, we should be prepared to use every and any means in order to open the floodgates of revolution throughout the world, rallying the workers of capitalist countries and the people of colonial lands to the aid of the Soviet Union.

IV

[The fact that Communists try to take over American liberal organizations is not an accident; it is all part of Stalin's master plan.]

How will we bring the masses of a nation into the Communist program? We have fashioned a number of organizations without which we could not wage war on capitalism: Trade unions, cooperatives, workshop committees, labor parties, women's associations, a labor press, educational leagues, youth societies.

As often as not, these are nonparty organizations and only a certain proportion of them are linked with the party. But under special conditions, every one of these organizations is necessary; for, lacking them, it is impossible to consolidate the class positions of the workers in the various spheres of the struggle.

There is a veritable ant heap of independent organizations, commissions, and committees comprising millions of nonparty members. Who decides upon the direction that all these organizations take? Where is the central unit of organization that wields sufficient authority to keep them within prescribed lines in order to achieve unity of command and to avoid confusion?

The central unit is the Communist Party.

V

[Communists are always eager to support political "reforms," but their real purpose is not reform but the capture of America's apparatus of government.]

Among the masses of the people, we Communists, as Lenin said, are but drops in the ocean. We have a style of work that is peculiar to the practice of Leninism; it creates a special type of worker, a special type of party or state official, a special kind of style in public office.

Our task is to assign party members to the key points in the state apparatus, and to see to it that the apparatus is thus subjected to party leadership.

For the revolutionist, the revolution is everything, and "reforms" are only a means to an end. What we are concerned with are not the reforms, but the uses they can be put to. A revolutionist may sponsor a "reform" because he sees in it a means for linking up constitutional action with unconstitutional action—because he feels he can make use of it as a screen behind which he can strengthen his secret work.

VI

[The natural radicalism of America's younger people, especially students, makes them a major target for Communist indoctrination and manipulation.]

What is our youth technique? It is the education of young workers and young farmers in the spirit of Leninism, strengthening their conviction that our workers' state is the base from which the revolution in all countries will develop. Young people must be inspired with confidence in the leadership of the Communist Party of Russia.

Young Communists must be active in all domains of socialist construction work—in industry, agriculture, cooperatives, educational organizations, and the like. It is essential that the young folk should learn that our revolution not be regarded as an end in itself, but as a means toward the victory of the proletarian revolution in all lands.

VII

[The Communists encourage both monopolies and cooperatives under capitalism, because they can be more easily socialized than individual enterprises.]

The measures for strengthening socialism are: State monopoly of foreign trade, agricultural taxes, state purchase and sale of agricultural production, and an all-embracing plan for nationalization of industry, transport, and credit.

The state and the cooperatives, as well as the capitalists, are "traders," and when they have learned how to trade, they will get the upper hand over private trade (they are doing so already). Those who cannot understand this are not Leninists but liberals.

Great banks, as Lenin has said, are the state apparatus which we need for the realization of socialism, and which we take over ready-made from capitalism. When we do so, a unified state bank of the most comprehensive kind, with branches in every district and factory, will control production as well as distribution of products.

No, we are not liberals. We put the interest of the party above the interests of formal democracy. For us Communists, formal democracy is a trifle.

VIII

[The performance of the Soviet delegates at the United Nations is proof of how Russia likes to talk about peace, while actually promoting aggression.]

We Communists create slogans for the masses. Treaties embodying fresh groupings of forces with an eye to war are termed "peace treaties." The signing of them is always effected to the accompaniment of the pipings of peaceful alliances. Our preparations for a war are conducted under cover of paeans to peace. The opposition will not accept our proposals: that shows how genuine is their love of peace.

The Peace of Brest-Litovsk [1] is a model instance of this strategy. This peace enabled the party to take advantage of the discussions, to disintegrate the enemy forces, and to gather strength for an attack on the White Russians. Even the dullest have now come to see that the Peace of Brest-Litovsk was a concession which strengthened us while it wrecked the forces of international capitalism.

IX

[In Stalin's blueprint, war between Russia and the capitalistic world is inevitable: the only thing left to chance is the actual date of hostilities.]

As Lenin has said, a terrible clash between Soviet Russia and the capitalist states must inevitably occur. The forces of united capitalism and all their military technique are a mighty power, a very real power. Therefore we must try to take the enemy by surprise, seize a moment when his forces are dispersed.

We may consider that the time is ripe for the decisive struggle when all the class forces arrayed against us are in a state of confusion; when all are sufficiently embroiled with each other and have been sufficiently weakened in combats; when all the vacillating elements have exposed themselves before the people and paraded their utter bankruptcy. The ruling classes must be in the throes of a major government crisis, so that the government is so enfeebled the revolutionists can speedily overthrow it.

It is inconceivable, as Lenin has written, that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist side by side with capitalist states.

[1] The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed March 3, 1918, between the new Bolshevik Government and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria) at Brest-Litovsk, Poland, and marked the withdrawal of Russia from World War I.

Ultimately one or the other must conquer. A conflict is inevitable.

The main forces of the revolution must, at the decisive moment, be concentrated for an attack on the enemy's most vulnerable spot, at a moment when conditions are ripe. Always we have a clear and precise aim toward which we strive, for one of the great merits of communism is that nothing is left to chance.

Continued Advance of the American Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very provocative editorial published in the New Yorker of December 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year's end and year's beginning are the same moment in time. The lack of a decent interval at midnight never fails to produce a feeling of headlong and unrelieved adventure; the moment is completely elusive, has no reality. You could strike a gong, but the waves of sound would belong fractionally either to 1950 or to 1951. The in-between is soundless. Even a kiss is impossible to manage between years, and always takes place in either the long past or the uncertain future, or extends from one to the other. At the end of the windy year 1950, we are glad to report that the young tree that took hold and grew on the stone coping outside our window, well above ground and with only odds and ends for soil, withstood the hurricane; several nearby television antennas, with a much greater outward show of firmness, went down before the blast. It was a matter of being correctly rooted.

On awakening the other morning, we found in our Tribune an article by the brothers Alsop headed "Decline of this Republic," but after reading the article we did not think the headline fitted, or that the Republic is in a decline, or that such a headline serves a good purpose. The article should have been called Queer Goings On in Senate and House Regarding Acheson, or some such. The Alsops found that the bloodthirsty activities of the Republicans indicated a decay of American politics. But it seems to us that a Republic is not necessarily declining because a faction is busy trying to pry a public servant loose from his job. The governments that are in a serious decline, always, are those that do not possess either the machinery or the will to correct and alter their leadership and whose Secretaries of State are held safe against criticism. There lies the real decay. Name us the number of years a dictator has been in power and we will name you the number of years his regime has been in decline. A Republic like ours may, and often does, show tremendous confusion under stress and make colossal blunders, but it is the confusion of free choice and speech, and this is not decline but steady (though tumultuous) ascent. We look for a continued ascent of this Republic during the year 1951.

The headline of decadence is repeated in press and radio every day. It is an unnecessary additional burden that we saddle ourselves with. For 1951, we recommend that publishers ask their copy desks not to overwrite and ask their comment ors for great accuracy and a philosophical stance. So many things that seem new are old. The Republicans want Acheson's head because of the need for a scapegoat—one of the earliest of cravings. Politically, this is annoying and aboriginal, but not decadent. We shall presumably always have a few early men in Congress, as in any well-run museum.

For ourself we shall resolve not to overwrite in the New Year, and to defend and exalt those principles and quirks that have carried the Nation slowly up the long hill since it started: its gaiety, its resilience, its diversity, its tolerance of the divergent or the harassing idea, its respect for all men. Who is to say we are not greatly ascendant still? Because of fear Americans have lately compromised their essential position—have published blacklists, have permitted legislative committees to presuppose what is "American," have watched them hang innocent men and women on the gallows of the newspaper headline, have winked at the meddling of Congressmen in the conduct of the movies, have made the natural loyalty of the citizen ever so much more difficult by removing loyalty itself from the realm of free choice, have hinted that jobs belong chiefly to the confessed orthodox. For us 1950 will be memorable above all other years because it was the year we once found ourself hesitating to throw something in the wastebasket, from a fleeting dread that it might be seen and misconstrued. In that one blinding moment of hesitation the fresh air of America suddenly seemed contaminated with evil. The incident was absurd, and the feeling passed, but nothing is quite absurd that happens.

Insofar as orthodoxy has gained strength, our republic has lost strength. But the loss is neither irreparable nor unusual. It is the product of war clouds—a sort of terrible mist that gathers. Luckily, many of our strongest skippers see through it. For 1951 we wish our readers health, faith, the sure eye that sees through mists, and the patience and muscle for the ascent of the most beautiful hill there is.

Voice of America Programs Regarding Christmas Observance Throughout the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was very glad to receive from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, the Honorable Edward Barrett, a release describing Voice of America programs to the world on the subject of Christmas observance throughout the United States.

I am perfectly delighted to note this splendid subject matter of the Voice of America programs, because it has long been my contention, as expressed in numerous addresses on the Senate floor and in articles and releases, that it is by utilizing the vital power of spiritual light and truth that we can best contact the masses of the world. In other words, we have in dynamic Christianity the finest possible basis on which to anticate the efforts of the fanatic and godless Communist philosophy.

These Christmas programs beamed by the Voice of America apparently well reflected the diverse approaches with which the various Christian faiths approach the Christmas holiday and the diversity in which various nationality groups similarly approach that inspiring occasion. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the State Department release on this subject.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Voice of America will give listeners around the world a full picture of Christmas observance in the United States, the Department of State disclosed today.

Throughout the holiday week and special Christmas programs of music and features will be beamed in a score of languages to Latin America, the Near East, and to both sides of the iron curtain in Europe and Asia.

In the English service, programs will include the annual Christmas message by the President, traditional music by the Trinity Choir, sidelights of Christmas observances throughout the United States, documentary on American Yuletide celebration, music by American composers and vocalists, and dramatization of the Bible story.

Broadcasts in Arabic will include a statement by Mayor Issa Bey Bandak, of Bethlehem, special music, and a feature describing Christmas in America.

To Austria the Voice of America will broadcast greetings from Cardinal Spellman, Bruno Walter, Rudolf Bing, Mayor Impelliteri, and the Austrian Minister, Dr. Kleinwaechter; Christmas songs, greetings from Austrian exchange students now in the United States, a Christmas story, dramatization of The Littlest Angel by Tazewell, and a Christmas talk by Koganovsky.

Special music and features will be broadcast to Bulgaria, with additional programs scheduled on January 7, the date on which Christmas is observed in Bulgaria.

Broadcasts to Czechoslovakia will include interviews with Americans of Czech and Slovak origin, as well as special music and stories, a 15-minute recording from Bethlehem, Pa., and a feature of the observance of Christmas by displaced persons in the United States.

To France, the Voice of America will broadcast carols by the Barnard College Choir, special events from around New York, a cross-country montage stressing the religious aspects of Christmas, and special music.

German programs will include a dramatization of The Little Angel Without a Name, carols by the New York Liederkranz Choir, and a Christmas question-and-answer feature.

The Hungarian broadcasts will include special Christmas messages by Msgr. Fulton Sheen and the Reverend Samuel Shoemaker; Hungarian Christmas Mass held by Monsignor Mihalovics, Christmas songs by the Hungarian Displaced Persons Children's Choir of Bethlehem Home, Ligonier, Pa., and a feature on Cardinal Mindszenty, including his last pastoral letter, on December 26, the second anniversary of his arrest.

Italian broadcasts will feature Christmas stories, special event recordings from the Italian colony at Stamford, Conn., an American farm, Bethlehem, Pa., and New York; Christmas dramatizations and music.

Broadcasts to Poland will feature invocation by the Right Reverend Felix Burnat,

Christmas music and features, a Yule puppet show, and a dramatic presentation of Christmas in modern Bethlehem.

Rumanian programs will include a message from the Reverend Vasile Hategan and special features.

To the Soviet Union, the Voice of America will broadcast a message by the Right Reverend Bishop John, of the Russian Orthodox Church of Brooklyn, features on Christmas in America, and church music by the Russian Metropolitan Choir, and the Capella Choir.

Broadcasts to Yugoslavia will include a dramatized musical program and features on Christmas observance by Americans of Croat, Slovene, and Serbian origin, with music by orchestras of Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Chicago.

Programs for Spain will feature Christmas narration, greetings, and music.

Ukrainian programs will include a statement by Archbishop Matylav, of the Greek Orthodox Church of Philadelphia, carols, and a Christmas sketch.

To Latin America, the Voice of America will broadcast special features and music in Spanish, Portuguese, and English.

The Greek broadcasts will include two dramatic presentations and special Christmas features.

The Turkish program will feature a sketch of a Christmas visit to an American home by a Turkish student.

To the Far East, the Voice of America will broadcast Christmas music, dramatizations and features in English, Indonesian, Korean, and Vietnamese.

Do We Abandon Rome?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Do We Abandon Rome?" published in the Pilot, of Boston, Mass., on December 30, 1950, as a reprint from the Boston Herald of December 22, 1950, on the subject of the Hoover speech concerning Europe.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following editorial is reprinted from the Boston Herald of December 22, 1950:

"DO WE ABANDON ROME?

"What is this Europe that Kennedy and Hoover are willing to write off? It is 300,000,000 people. It is the mining and industrial facilities of the Ruhr, the wine of France, the cheeses of Holland, the olives of Italy. It is the Alps and the Riviera. It is the railroads and highways, farms and factories and schools. It is the Louvre and the canals of Venice.

"All these are tangible things. They can in a rough way be weighed against the calculated risk of American forces thrown into their defense.

"But what of the intangible things, the culture that is Europe's and that was our source? What specifically, of the Catholic Church?

"If communism takes over Italy, the Holy See will suffer a far worse fate than it did under fascism. Mussolini at least gave lip service to the church; communism is a new, intolerant atheism, with an old and unappeasable hatred for catholicism.

"The church would, of course, survive. But what of her millions of communicants? The church has outlived many tyrants and will outlive many others. But the loss of Rome would be an unthinkable tragedy, not alone for Catholics, but for everyone throughout the world who stands in danger of communism. With all its great spiritual and temporal powers, the church has fought the world's great fight. Whether we are Catholics or not, it is here our mighty ally.

"It is difficult to believe that the Kennedy-Hoover-Hearst school has given full appreciation to the implications of the surrender of Europe to Stalin's hordes. Europe is more than people or geography or works of man. It is the civilization from which we sprang; it is the faith in the dignity and freedom of man."

Excess-Profits Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, by request, that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a discussion of the excess-profits tax, which took place on the American Forum of the Air on December 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

(By Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming; Dr. Allen B. DuMont, president, DuMont Television Co.; Theodore Granik, founder and moderator, the American Forum of the Air)

ANNOUNCER. Should we have an excess-profits tax?

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the continental room of the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D. C.

Now, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. On Tuesday of this week, the House passed the excess-profits-tax bill. It is now awaiting report to the Senate from its Finance Committee.

Designed to curb "windfall" profits related directly or indirectly to the defense program and to produce at least $3,000,000,000 annually in new revenue, the bill calls for a 75-percent tax on corporation earnings classified as excessive. It would be retroactive to July 1.

Proponents of the measure say it is intended to reap money for defense, ease inflationary pressures, and take extraordinary profits out of war.

Opponents, however, have denounced excess-profits taxation as "an evil brew of inequity, exception, exemption, and privilege."

So the American Forum of the Air has invited two outstanding authorities on the subject to give us their views. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, one of the original sponsors of the proposal, and Dr. Allen B. DuMont, president of the Allen B. DuMont Laboratories, Inc., and chairman of the National Conference of Growth Companies.

Senator O'MAHONEY, how does an excess-profits tax take the profits out of war?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let me first say, Mr. Granik, that the bill passed by the House of Representatives will not take the profits out of war. That is a weak and timid bill. It proposes, as you have just said, to raise about $3,000,000,000 in revenue.

In 1944 the World War II tax bill raised about $10,000,000,000 in a single year. The excess-profits-tax principle, in my judgment, is misnamed. It should be called a high-profits tax.

If I can show your radio and television audience the chart which I have brought here this afternoon, I think it will demonstrate precisely what I mean.

Mr. GRANIK. Senator, do you want to show the chart?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Here we have a chart which shows corporate profits, taxes, and dividends from 1939 to 1950. Back in 1939, corporate profits before taxes amounted to a little over $5,000,000,000. During the war, in spite of the excess-profits tax, they rose to $25,000,000,000. After the reconversion period, following World War II, corporate profits before taxes reached a peak of $35,000,000,000 in 1948. And now they are ballooning to $42,000,000,000 in the third quarter of 1950. Corporate profits for the year 1950 will amount to about $37,000,000,000.

Mr. GRANIK. Let's hear from Dr. DuMont.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I just say this word, Doctor, first?

Chairman GRANIK. Go ahead.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The profits tax bill which passed the House merely provides that on that portion of the corporate profits about 75 percent of the best 3 years the corporations have experienced in '46, '47, '48, and '49, shall bear a tax of 75 percent, provided, however, that the total tax shall not exceed 67 percent.

Chairman GRANIK. Dr. DuMont, do you want to use the chart, too?

Dr. DUMONT. I would just like to comment on this chart that Senator O'MAHONEY has shown here. I think it doesn't really show the condition that exists because during this period of time, if you want to take 1939, for instance, the corporate income of the United States was $33,000,000,000. Well, we have had an expansion of business since 1939; and instead of the $30,000,000,000 corporate income we have, if you take, for instance, 1948, $189,000,000,000 of corporate income. So that, percentage-wise, this increase is not great.

If you take a look at it in another way, you will find that, percentage-wise, the dividends paid in this period were only 4 percent of the national gross income whereas they were 5 percent here. So that actually your curves should be way up here, and percentage-wise, this isn't important.

There was one thing that the Senator said that I was very happy to hear him say in that this should really not be called an excess-profits tax, if I get it right. We feel very strongly on that subject because growth companies are going to have to pay an excess-profits tax no matter what they do and they are being penalized for success. But certainly it would be very helpful if the designation "excess profits" were taken off the tax—and if Secretary Snyder in proposing it called it a "profits tax" rather than an excess-profits tax.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator, do you agree that growth companies are being penalized for success?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I haven't read the bill as it came from the House yet, because

I am not a member of the Finance Committee. But I will say this: That with respect to growth, the draft law pays no attention to the growth of the young men who are being drafted; and for the life of me I am unable to understand why the corporate owners of profit seem to be unwilling to permit profits to go to war with the soldiers.

Now, this bill that was passed by the House—and I am not speaking now of the growth companies, but I am speaking of the alternative that is permitted—provides that no excess-profits tax shall fall upon any part of the revenue which does not exceed 12-percent interest upon their invested capital provided that income is not above $5,000,000.

Now, I submit in all reason that a 12-percent income on invested capital is a very generous allowance to corporations which are now making the greatest profits that they ever made in all history.

Chairman GRANIK. Dr. DuMont?

Dr. DUMONT. Well, I will agree with the Senator that the companies are making substantial profits. But, as I pointed out before, percentagewise these are very much in line. I will go back again. I don't know whether most people realize, but the average corporation in this country, in 1950, made about 5 cents on a dollar sales or 5 percent. If we go back to 1929 we find that they made 6 cents on a dollar sale. It doesn't seem to me that that is an unreasonable amount for a company to make on the basis of the ratio of the profits to the sales.

I would like to get into this excess-profits tax from the standpoint of the growth companies.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Before you do that, Dr. DuMont, may I make this comment? It has been a favorite device of corporate management in defending its profits to try to compute the profits on the sales dollar instead of on the invested capital dollar. Now that results in complete distortion because you may make only 5 cents on your sales dollar, but if you sell enough people you may be making 25 percent on your invested capital. All in the world those of us who are supporting the theory of an excess-profits tax contend is this: That corporations which are now, as Dr. DuMont acknowledges, making the most extraordinary profits in history shall pay a portion of that for the defense of the country which makes it possible for them to make that profit.

Chairman GRANIK. Dr. DuMont?

Dr. DUMONT. Senator, I attended some of the hearings before the House and also appeared before the Senate Finance Committee, and I didn't hear any of the corporations there objecting to the payment of taxes. The general consensus of the people was that we had an emergency, that very great additional funds would be needed, and nobody questioned the amount of money that the Government set up.

The question and the problem is the application of a tax, and the excess-profits tax falls on a relatively small number of companies. In other words, it falls on approximately one company in eight. And primarily the companies that are hit by the excess-profits tax are the new companies, the growing companies, and the companies that have helped to a large extent in the expanding of our economy.

Chairman GRANIK. You feel that a flat levy on corporations will be more efficient?

Dr. DUMONT. That is correct.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In the first place, Mr. Granik, I do not agree with the statement that Dr. DuMont has just made.

I have here before me a table showing the excess-profits-tax returns for the year 1944, the last full year in which they were collected under World War II. Fifty-five thousand nine hundred and twelve corporations made excess-profits-tax returns. Of this almost 56,000 corporations, 43,719 had excess-profits-tax incomes less than $100,000, but they had only 7.8 percent of the total tax liability.

At the other end of the scale there were only 1,860 corporations with excess-profits-tax income above a million dollars, and they had 68.5 percent of the corporate tax liability.

It is the big corporations with excess-profits-tax income which, of course, is figured only after many credits are allowed in excess of $1,000,000 who are filling the country with propaganda against sending the profit dollar to war.

As for this suggestion about a flat tax, I want to point out that the corporations having an income of less than $50,000 pay 25 percent of its income in tax and surtax rates under the present law. The biggest corporation in the land pays only 45 percent. Of course, the flat tax is a boon to the big companies, and it is a burden on the little companies.

Chairman GRANIK. How about that, Dr. DuMont?

Dr. DUMONT. I would like to start from the last question and work forward. I don't see where the little company is penalized by a flat increase. The company that makes or has an excess-profits-tax credit or makes less than $25,000 a year only pays a 25-percent normal tax. So the proposed increase would be in the surtax of 20 percent. So any company making less than $25,000 a year would not be affected whatsoever.

I don't know what the definition of a small company is, but if you take a company making, for instance, $50,000, he will make out much better by an increase in the surtax than he would with an excess-profits tax. If the surtax is increased to, say, 20 percent, making a total tax of 55 percent, he will pay that on what he has over $25,000. But if you go to a 75-percent excess-profits tax, he is going to be hit a lot worse than he would on the increase in surtax. So it all depends exactly on the size of the company how this affects them. But I think, generally speaking, the smaller company will do much better on an increase in the surtax than by having an excess-profits tax.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I ask Dr. DuMont a question on that?

Dr. DUMONT. Yes.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The company with $100,000 income under the present law pays a tax of 40 percent. That is the normal and the surtax combined.

Dr. DUMONT. 42½. I think it is.

Senator O'MAHONEY. This is from the Finance Committee report that I am reading.

Dr. DUMONT. All right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Now, the individual with exactly the same income, $100,000, pays a rate of 52.8 percent. Can you tell me why a corporation with a $100,000 income should pay a profits tax, an income tax, at a smaller rate than the individual having the same income?

Dr. DUMONT. Well, I would rather turn it the other way and I would say, why should the individual only pay 42.5 percent? There is just as much logic in that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The answer to that, Dr. DuMont, is that we are in the middle of the twentieth century, the century of world wars. We are entering the third world war, and we must have the revenue if we are going to protect the capitalistic system.

Dr. DUMONT. There is no question, as far as the corporations are concerned, as to the amount of revenue the Government needs. It is simply a question of whether you are going to have this excess-profits tax that particularly hits growth companies. It is a tax on success and not a tax on excess profits.

I would like to show you here, before it is too late, the effect of this profits tax on a particular growth company.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to use the chart, there, Dr. DuMont?

Dr. DUMONT. I will go through it very rapidly. This chart happens to show the sales increase of the company that I am associated with. It has increased from 1946, $2.5 million——

Chairman GRANIK. Will you use the hand microphone for a moment?

Dr. DUMONT. To $60,000,000 in 1950.

Now, the assumption of a lot of people that talk about this is that the excess-profits tax and the tax bill only take into consideration a base period of from 1947 to 1949.

So, in effect, it is saying that there should be no growth in the United States past 1949.

Now, in the case of this particular company, during this period of time—may I have the next chart?

Chairman GRANIK. The next chart.

Dr. DUMONT. This is the profit for the company before taxes. Now, after taxes the company made between 1946 and 1950—the next chart, please—approximately $12,000,000.

Now, during that period of time, it wasn't a question of increasing the price of the product because the profits went up. It was because of an increase of facilities and an increase of manpower. This shows the growth of the people working for the company from 998 in 1946 to 5,000 in 1951.

The next chart, please. During this period of time when this $12,500,000 was made after taxes, let's see what caused it to be made. There was $22,000,000 invested in the business. We expanded our plant and equipment to the tune of $8,000,000. We increased the inventory by $10,000,000 and increased our accounts receivable by $4,000,000. So we had to go out and get additional funds of approximately $10,000,000 in order to do this.

Well, obviously, when you increase your plans and increase your number of employees, you are going to increase your sales. And it follows through that if you double your sales your profits should increase.

But with this bill they just practically clean out after 1949. May I have the next chart, please?

This last chart shows the condition where you have three companies, A, B, and C. They all made the same profit during the years 1947 to 1949. But company A made more money in 1950, and they are hit by the 64 percent tax. Company B went right along straight. They pay a 52-percent tax. Company C, which was on the downgrade, has paid no excess profits tax at all.

Now, the point is that you are picking out the companies which have increased, that have grown, and unnecessarily taxing them. If you are going to expand, you need funds just the same as the Government needs funds for this war. We cannot operate without funds, and if you are going to take them all away from us it is going to mean that these growth companies are not only going to fail to increase in size but they are going to have to curtail size, and I say it is not a good thing.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator?

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I say, in all sincerity and without the slightest degree of intent of being emotional about it, that casualties in Korea, the latest figures, amount to 32,000, of which 5,000 represent dead Americans. They have no possibility of growing. They have no possibility of achieving anything in the future. Their record is their heroism in defense of America.

Now, the excess-profits tax of which Dr. DuMont talks falls only upon profits, only upon the profits, not upon capital. We don't take the body of the corporation.

In this bill passed by the House, if the equity capital is less than $5,000,000, why then you are allowed a profit of 12 percent on that equity capital before there is a penalty of tax. If it is up to $10,000,000, then you are allowed a profit of 10 percent, and if it

is above that, a profit of 8 percent. That is why I say it is a tender bill.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take a question from the audience?

Dr. DUMONT. I would just like to answer the subject that the Senator has just spoken about. The one thing that is going to help this whole war situation is the increase of production, the increase of the tools for war. The reason that we did as well as we did in the last war was because of the great industrial strength of the country.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I agree with you.

Dr. DUMONT. If you are talking about the people that may be killed in the future, if you are cutting down your production——

Senator O'MAHONEY. There is nothing in this that cuts down the production.

Dr. DUMONT. There certainly is.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Witness the result of World War II. We outproduced the whole world with an excess-profits tax law very much more rigid than this.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take a question from the audience?

Mr. MOYNAHAN. My name is Moynahan of the National Association of Life Underwriters.

Chairman GRANIK. You are president. Go ahead.

Mr. MOYNAHAN. Senator, do you feel that it is possible to have an excess-profits tax that will not be inflationary?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Of course, I do.

Chairman GRANIK. How do you feel about that quick answer that the Senator gave?

Dr. DUMONT. Obviously, an excess-profits tax is inflationary. The very fact that it has a tendency to cut down production means that goods are more scarce and that prices are going to go up, obviously.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The facts of World War II completely refute that statement.

Dr. DUMONT. I don't agree with that.

Chairman GRANIK. We will take another question.

Mr. MCNAMARA. My name is McNamara. I am an accountant. My question is for Dr. DuMont.

In Time magazine of November 27, 1950, you are quoted as follows:

"I resent the threat of my Government taking legislative action that will stigmatize our profits under a completely false label. If this fictional legislation goes through I should feel that it would be my duty to myself, my company, and its stockholders, to see that there would be no excess profits on which such a tax might be levied."

Do you mean you would keep prices of your products and services at such a low level that no such profits would be produced or, if not, how would you accomplish it?

Dr. DUMONT. Certainly we don't aim to pay the highest excess-profits tax of any corporation in the country.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I interrupt? I would like to know first whether you actually said that.

Dr. DUMONT. Yes; I did say that, Senator. I feel that we would be forced, either by reducing prices or something along that line, to cut down our excess profits because I certainly wouldn't like to see it on my statement.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do you mean by that statement that you would increase your expenses beyond what they ought to be?

Dr. DUMONT. No, by decrease of prices.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well, the charge that an excess-profits tax is inflationary is based wholly upon the assumption that business management will spend money wastefully. Now, do you mean that your company would spend money wastefully rather than pay an excess-profits tax?

Dr. DUMONT. No; absolutely not.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I am glad to have you say that.

Dr. DUMONT. I meant that we would be forced to bring our prices down, and possibly because we didn't have the funds we couldn't produce as much.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Couldn't produce as much what, television sets?

Dr. DUMONT. No; war production. We were 100 percent war production during the last war.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The Government will pay you a good price for everything you produce for war.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take a question from the distinguished Congressman there from your part of the country, Senator, Congressman John Carroll, of Colorado.

Congressman CARROLL. I am asking Senator O'MAHONEY, in the face of constantly expanding national income, the highest in the peacetime history of the country, in the face of the greatest employment in the peacetime history of the Nation, when we appropriated $17,000,000,000, 3 or 4 months ago and an additional $18,000,000,000 for the Military Establishment whether it is not vitally essential that we have an excess-profits tax for three reasons: (1) On the doctrine of equality; (2) for revenue; and (3) as an anti-inflationary measure?

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is my judgment, and I feel very strongly that corporations, like individuals, should pay according to their ability to pay, and the excess-profits tax does precisely that.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that?

Dr. DUMONT. I don't agree that the excess-profits tax does that. I have looked over some of the largest corporations in this country, and I find that there is a very considerable number of them that are not going to pay a dime in excess profits.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Will you give me the specifications, Doctor, and we will put them into an amendment which will stop that.

Dr. DUMONT. Well, I am not offering any amendments along this line, but I think the straight increase in the surtax rate will pretty well take care of it. You don't hear any complaint of excess-profits tax from the larger corporations.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, I have heard about it. But what I know is that the profits before taxes have risen in this era of prosperity at a rate greater than either salaries or wages or the gross national product.

Dr. DUMONT. Not percentagewise.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes, percentagewise, too.

Dr. DUMONT. No.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, may we take our summaries now? Dr. DuMont, your summary, please.

Dr. DUMONT. I would simply like to summarize this way, that I believe the so-called excess-profits tax is an unsatisfactory way of raising additional revenue because—No. 1, it penalizes growth; two, it tends to keep small companies small, and protects larger companies; three, it distributes taxes unfairly; four, it is unnecessarily complicated; five, it is just an additional tax, and not fundamentally a tax on excess profits; six, it assumes all growth stopped in 1949; seven, it is inflationary and unfairly places a stigma of profiteering on many companies.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Dr. DuMont.

Senator O'MAHONEY?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Most of the reasons given by Dr. DuMont, I think, are without any basis at all. The reason we need an excess profits tax is because the Nation is in its greatest crisis. The Communist system seeks to destroy the system of private property. And if the owners of private property are unwilling to contribute substantially of their profit while the boys of this country are contributing their bodies and their lives, then it will be very difficult, indeed, to defend our way of life. We need the revenue to hold back the tides of Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

The dictators in the Kremlin expect the capitalistic system to wreck itself because of unwillingness to face the facts.

We must face the facts now and levy the taxes that will be necessary, first, to pay the expenses of defense; second, to absorb all free money so as to prevent inflation—and that is what such a tax will do—and, third, to prove to the boys who are fighting that profit dollars are standing by their side.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not a Moral Issue," from the Coos Bay Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT A MORAL ISSUE

Possibilities of a negotiated settlement of the Korean situation, however tenuous they may be, have for the moment taken the spotlight from the possible use of the atomic bomb. But the question is not dead any more than peace is an actuality in Korea. Whatever settlement may be negotiated with the Communists now or in the immediate future, it is not likely to last any longer than it suits their convenience or the democratic nations hold ready strength enough to ward off new aggressions. When that time comes, or if the fighting is to continue now, the question of the atomic bomb will again come to the fore. Then we hope people will recall words such as the following, written by Bruce Blossat of the Newspaper Enterprise Association:

"A prominent church organization declares that maybe it would be all right for us to use the atomic bomb if it is dropped on our cities first.

"This statement unquestionably represents a decision taken after prolonged soul-searching by leading churchmen. But unfortunately it falls into the standard misconception that the atomic bomb involves a great moral issue.

"It clearly does not. Except for the killing effects of radiation, the A-bomb differs from other bombs chiefly in the magnitude of its impact. The ways in which it kills are the ways all bombs kill. It simply strikes down many more people at one time.

"It is no more immoral to use an A-bomb than to use a pistol if the weapon is employed in pursuit of aggressive aims. That's the point; the real moral offense is aggression, for it is this crime which lets down the bars to violence.

"Once we are in war, it must be left to the discretion of our high command what weapons to use and when. That must be so whether we are fighting the Russians or the Chinese or anybody. There can be no rule that we are free to use the A-bomb against one enemy but not against another. Nor should we have to get anyone's permission to use it.

"And we certainly should not have to wait until the enemy employs it, for by that time it might well be too late for us to drop it with the most telling effect.

"Suppose for argument's sake that we should become embroiled in full-scale war with Red China. Our leaders should not yield to frantic calls that the A-bomb be promptly dumped on major Chinese cities. On the other hand, neither should they be deterred from using the weapon by heart-felt cries that it is 'inhuman.' So is a bullet.

"Their decision should be made on the basis of the military realities they then confront. The A-bomb is costly. We don't have an unlimited store. Is the advantage to be gained through dropping it sufficient to offset these factors?

"Can the same result be achieved more efficiently by other means? Or is the disposition of enemy resources such that the A-bomb's terrific concentration of force can be applied effectively?

"These are the types of questions military men would ask themselves in any big war. A final decision likely would have to be made by the President as Commander in Chief. But the ingredients of that decision should be military, not moral."

We hope the time will never come when the United States will feel compelled to use the atomic bomb. But should that time come, we may well be thankful that we have it and hope that it will be used in time.

W. J. C.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the recent convention of the North Dakota Funeral Directors Association, held at Bismarck, N. Dak., on May 26, 1950. I ask that, in printing, the names of the officers, executive committee, and district chairmen be also printed, together with the letter of transmission.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA FUNERAL
DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION,
McVille, N. Dak., June 29, 1950.

Mr. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator From North Dakota, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: At the recent convention of the North Dakota Funeral Directors Association held at Bismarck, the enclosed resolution was adopted and the secretary instructed to forward the same to you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

T. A. WONDER,
Secretary.

(Officers: Harold T. Anderson, president, Rugby; Almon B. Strong, first vice president, Devils Lake; Truman A. Dahle, second vice president, Mohall; T. A. Wonder, secretary, McVille; Russell A. Lee, treasurer, Lisbon. Executive committee: Alvin Berg, McClusky; Truman Knott, New Rockford; Frank Mischel, Dickinson. District chairman: northeast district, W. C. Adams, Crafton; northwest district, Oscar Hanson, Williston; southwest district, Alvin Klick, Glen Ullin; southeast district, Selmer Quam, Cooperstown.)

Whereas the American family has received the finest quality of medical care available in any country in the world, developed under our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance wherever tried has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards, and facilities, to the detriment of family welfare; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance wherever tried has taken away the family's right to choosing its own family physician; and

Whereas invasion of family privacy and violation of the patient-physician relationship has proved to be one of the most objectionable features of compulsory health insurance, wherever tried; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would result immediately in a tax of 3 percent on the income of the American man, rising within a few years to 6 percent and higher, creating a new tax burden which would reduce household budgets and bring down family standards of living; and

Whereas Government control of medical services, by gradually undermining free enterprise and establishing heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, would threaten national bankruptcy and encourage the spread of socialism, which would endanger the rights of our children to the individual freedoms which have been the American heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Funeral Directors Association does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designated for national bureaucratic control; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of North Dakota, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are therefore respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

THE NORTH DAKOTA FUNERAL DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION,
ALMON B. STRONG, *President.*
T. A. WONDER, *Secretary.*
MAY 26, 1950.

Pro-Reds in Our War Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, concerning this column by Mr. Victor Riesel, it certainly should be a warning to our Communist-softie administration. Surely, they will awaken to this threat, and I trust that they have been reading the newspapers of late about the man whom they have so stanchly supported, known to them as Mr. Remington, formerly a prominent official in the Commerce Department.

[From the Hollywood (Calif.) Citizen-News of December 29, 1950]

PRO-REDS IN OUR WAR PLANTS

(By Victor Riesel)

Add a prayer to the wing of the B-50 bombers soon to fly our GI's high in the sky. For the supersecret "Beirut" fire control unit was installed in these new flying forts by members of a pro-Communist union some of whose leaders have unashamedly said of the Korean War:

"Anyone with eyes can see only the hand of Wall Street in Korea—making cannon-fodder of American youth in a distinctly un-American cause. The Korean people * * * tried * * * to establish unity without a shooting war, but they were stopped by the American military government (operating as a branch of J. P. Morgan & Co.) and the so-called United Nations Commission for Korea * * * (let's) withdraw troops thrown hastily into Korea."

For years, I've monitored the Soviet world propaganda broadcasts and those words parallel almost line for line what Moscow's Red radio jams into the air waves every day.

Yet this union, the pro-Communist United Electric Workers, has its men in a score of hush-hush secret weapons departments of big plants punching out bomber fire controls, guided missiles, and jets.

A list of these departments reads like a classified military production digest on General Marshall's desk. This pro-Stalinist union has its people in the guided missile, jet propulsion, heavily guarded "Hartbes" project. Its followers work on automatic gun sights for B-36 bombers; turbogenerators for Navy vessels, where, according to CIO experts, "a slight deviation by changing the tolerances of the turbovanes" affects the machine's usefulness.

They have access to plants where control panels for aircraft carrier communications are built; where remote control turrets are put together; where electronic radar and sonar tubes and electrical equipment for aircraft bomb elevators and platform hoists are intricately woven into the very rhythmic pulsebeat of atomic-age war.

So now, let's get behind the scenes in at least one plant:

That's a secret atomic energy installation in Schenectady. There, in research laboratory Knolls I, right next to the ultra secret Knolls II, works one of this union's national leaders and shop stewards. Frequently, work for Knolls II is done in Knolls I—right under his nose. He has free access to everything—and I'm not here impugning the security system of the firm, nor the honesty and patriotism of any man. I just know that a procommie, whose union believes that the Soviet had nothing to do with the invasion of Korea where our GI's are being killed, works in such a plant.

Then there's an avowed commie who has drummed door to door for Daily Worker subscriptions and party petitions and has run commie meetings. He's in the maintenance division. Therefore, he has access to most of the atomic installations.

There are others, identified before congressional hearings as party members—and they can roam anywhere, including the power-press division, often punching out highly secret feeder parts for other sections. This could be drawn on and on—with building numbers, department sections, names, and addresses listed. But the story is the same everywhere.

Now, all this is in the General Electric Co. plants. But it exists in many other heavily guarded electronic centers. Why? Most certainly the General Electric Co. (head of which is Charles Wilson, the Nation's chief mobilizer) writhes just as intensely under the procommies as does the GI's electrical union which has been exposing this critical situation.

The answer in part comes to me from a high company spokesman, who says quite bluntly that GE "follows religiously the instructions of the competent Government agencies—including the exclusion or removal of certain persons from areas of contact with secret or classified research and production."

And this spokesman, Lemuel Boulware, company vice president, says:

"Consequently we feel it may be fairly concluded that anyone criticizing the employment of alleged Communists or others nearly equally dangerous to national safety, or anyone criticizing the act of recognizing, or willingness to bargain with any union certified to any employer, is criticizing not the employer but the competent Government agencies under whose legally authorized direction the employer is operating."

Now let's hear from the Government. It's certainly the boss.

The Significant Role Played by Civil Aviation in Air Transportation in the Korean Fight Against Communism Has Proven It To Be Our Second Line of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on innumerable occasions I have spoken on the floor of the House of the necessity for these United States to achieve absolute supremacy in the air with respect to civil as well as in military aviation. In addressing the House on Thursday, November 30, 1950, I said in part:

More than ever I am convinced that the only thing which has contained the Russians to date and prevented them from outright and direct attack has been our possession of a stockpile of atom bombs and our unquestioned ability to deliver them by air with precision and with dispatch.

Air power is truly peace power. Air power is everything within our Nation that has to do with the air. It includes our aviation production line, air education, commercial transport, private flying, maintenance facilities, and research laboratories as well as all branches of the Military Establishment for Air.

Mr. Speaker, a recent joint meeting of the Rotary and the Exchange Clubs and the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Mobile was addressed by J. H. Carmichael, president of the Capital Airlines, one of the major air transport companies in these United States. In this interesting and informative talk made with respect to air transportation this distinguished airman and leader of the aviation industry graphically told of the contribution being made by the air carriers of our country in providing planes necessary for the successful operation of the Korean airlift.

In discussing this secondary line of military defense with our former colleague, the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, now executive vice president of the Air Transport Association, he informed me that the initial contribution of the airlines of this country to the Korean airlift alone had already equaled about 70 percent of the total daily service of all commercial planes used during World War II.

Mr. Ramspeck further stated that during the first 4 months of the conflict the aircraft of the scheduled carriers made 596 round trip flights across the Pacific in operating almost 37,000,000 ton miles of lift and in doing so had transported upwards of 5,600 tons of military cargo.

CAPITAL SENDS ITS PLANES

Capital Airlines placed two of its four-engine ships into the lift in July last. They were returned in November but approximately 5 weeks later they were again doing service in the Pacific. These were aircraft which were converted in the company's hangars at the Washington National Airport. Wing and fuselage tanks were installed in order to increase the fuel capacity of the C-54's—standard commercial DC-4 equipment—from 1,800 to 3,700 gallons and their range from 1,650 to 3,300 miles. Over-ocean navigation sets were installed, as well as auxiliary oil tanks.

How well I recall participating in the exercises at the time Capital Airlines began operating in Mobile in April 1948. The increased use of its splendid service, both in passenger and cargo by our people daily contributes to the ever-expanding economy of our great Southland.

Mr. Speaker, because of the splendid contribution made by civil aviation to national defense in this present emergency, I am extending my remarks and including the outstanding speech by J. H. Carmichael, president of the Capital Airlines entitled "Air Transportation—Our Second Line of Defense."

Mr. Carmichael spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and you of the Mobile Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, and Exchange Clubs, it is needless for me to tell you that there are those who have opposed the investment which you, through your Government, have made in the development of the present air-transport system of our country. Many of those who objected to this investment were interested in protecting some special interest. Others, with the best of intentions, were motivated by an honest conviction that Government should not participate in private enterprise. During the many years of controversy on the issue of Federal-local funds in the air-transport industry, the opposition, well-intentioned or otherwise, have made their case before the court of public opinion with words. Today the air-transport industry is making its reply with action. In every 24-hour period 101,000 pounds of vital war material reaches our fighting forces in Korea as a direct result of the participation of the air-transport industry in the Pacific airlift.

We in Capital, as part of the air-transport industry, are proud of the part we are playing in supporting the Armed Forces in the present emergency. Nothing would please me more than to tell you today about Capital Airlines, because it is the subject we know best and in which I am sure you can appreciate I am most interested. However, as there is represented here today an important segment of those who form public opinion in Mobile, I feel it incumbent to make sure that you are aware of the contribution that the air-transport industry is making to the national defense—a contribution made possible by your partnership in the development of air transportation.

BUILDING A BRIDGE OF SUPPLIES

It is not exaggeration to say that your dollars and your interest in commercial aviation are helping to build a bridge of supplies from Mobile to Korea. Perhaps you're not conscious of the job you are doing. Sometimes we go along in a work-a-day world scarcely aware of the fact that we are contributing another link in the chain of national defense.

There are certain fundamental starting points on the road to possible world peace and national security. To begin with, transportation is the keynote of all modern society and enterprise. There would be no real advancement of commerce, of standard of living, no national wealth and certainly no national defense, without our modern systems of transportation.

We cannot take for granted the existence of our finest and most efficient transportation in the world. We must appreciate the fact that we have these great water, rail, highway, and air systems only because of the initiative and daring, the investment and risk, management and labor, which are possible under our free competitive enterprise. And we have them, too, because of public support.

Your investment in your airport has made it possible to join Mobile with the other great communities of the Nation. The airport here is a link in the chain of national defense. It is part of an airport system, now numbering 6,500, that has made possible the tremendous growth of commercial aviation in this country which today is proving its worth to the Nation's security in the Korean airlift.

Let's take a look at the record and see what the commercial airlines with your support are doing to aid the Armed Forces. On June 30, 3 days after the Red aggression, the military service requested the civilian airlines to temporarily step into the breach while the Military Air Transport Service could build its forces to take over the complete job.

The Korean emergency required immediate air transportation of personnel and critical materials to the far eastern theater and the air evacuation of dependents and hospital patients to the United States.

When the Reds moved across the thirty-eighth parallel, MATS had fewer than 60 four-engine planes assigned to the Pacific division. The service immediately assigned 40 additional transport planes to the Pacific division and called upon the civilian airlines for participation and support.

COMMERCIAL AIRLINES WERE READY

Three days after the military called upon the commercial airlines the first civilian carrier left the United States for the Far East.

Since then the airlines have sent 66 planes and many well-trained and experienced crewmen into action. Capital placed one of the first domestic transports into the airlift. The readying of these aircraft took priority over all other phases of our operations. Personnel operated on an around-the-clock basis to convert these airplanes for long-range military transport. The know-how of commercial air transport and its reservoir of trained manpower again backed up the military until its machinery could be geared to this emergency. This lag is the penalty we in a democracy pay.

Responding to the emergency, the commercial planes poured into the west coast with highly trained crews and began operations immediately. The military was not in a position to activate its planes with this dispatch as recent economies in the military services had skeletonized the personnel of the Military Air Transport Service of our country.

The value of this immediate availability is best evidenced by the statement made the other day by Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, commander of the military Air Transport Service. The general revealed that the 66 commercial planes moved as much tonnage in man and matériel across the Pacific as 148 military transports of the same types. He explained that this almost 3-to-1 ratio was due to lack of trained flight personnel in the military services for this highly specialized job. The recall of 1,100 Reserve flight officers will in the near future permit the military to assume full responsibility for this operation.

When the handful of American troops in Korea were trading space for time, time was priceless. The maintenance of the American beachhead was dependent on the ability of the transport services of the Nation to produce reinforcements in men and matériel before space ran out. Air transport met this immediate need for emergency materials when it brought this theater of war within 30 hours of our production centers.

Another miracle of transportation, admittedly less spectacular, has been the mobilization of our surface carriers and shipping. All of us, I know, were thrilled and those of you coming from a great port city such as Mobile must have taken particular pride in the participation in the Inchon invasion of the armada of over 300 surface vessels. The integrated mobilization of air, surface, and water transportation in the national emergency proves conclusively that the well-being of this country is dependent on the maintenance of all forms of transportation in a sound condition.

The combined efforts of the commercial airlines and military transport planes have produced amazing results. The lift is responsible for more than 100 arrivals and departures a day at Haneda Airport outside Tokyo. Airlift pilots are flying about 200,000 pounds of strategic materials a day across 10,000 miles of ocean.

GENERAL KUTER EXPLAINS USES

General Kuter has outlined the specific value of the support given by the commercial airlines to the Korean airlift. He has given three reasons why MATS called upon civilian air transport to supplement the military.

First, the use of commercial planes permits MATS to support the global mobility of the Armed Forces and retain transport facilities to overseas bases.

Second, it enables MATS to support movements of units of the strategic air command with aircraft drawn from MATS operations in other than the Pacific area. General Kuter pointed out that MATS aircraft has carried strategic air command personnel and cargo from the home base to new locations in both the Far East and Great Britain.

Third, it enables the military to meet the airlift requirements of the far eastern theater immediately while MATS is being built up.

General Kuter commented on the commercial airlines' part in the Korean airlift in these words:

"The civil air carriers responded instantly and wholeheartedly to the emergency and they have done a magnificent job." He added that they have demonstrated they are in fact a true air transport reserve and an auxiliary to the Armed Forces.

The participation of the air transport industry was in accordance with carefully drawn plans for wartime use of civil transport facilities in the interest of national security.

Korea has provided the answer to the critics of the public investment in air transport. Public opinion is best reflected in the editorial columns of our great newspapers. The verdict of how wisely the public's money has been expended in the development of its air transport system is evidenced by this excerpt from one of our country's great newspapers:

"Once again, as happened in World War II, it has been demonstrated that the people's money, well spent in developing our vast pattern of air transport, is paying a dividend of inestimable value.

"Once again, it is being shown that the American spirit of enterprise in competition, kept vigorously in the time of peace, spontaneously becomes a source of great power when united in the common cause.

"America is very fortunate indeed, in these days of doubt and anxiety, to have at her service a versatile and devoted facility like the pilots and crews of her commercial airlines."

Korea is a localized emergency and the headlines of today show that it is being contained. However, we cannot afford to adopt an ostrich-like attitude. The forces of aggression pose their threat to world peace over all the face of the globe. Unpleasant as the thought may be, we cannot discount the possibility of world-wide upheaval.

If the small group of men in the Kremlin who make Russian policy should decide tomorrow on further aggression by force elsewhere, we may be faced with the reality of global conflict. In this event, the value of air transport would again make itself felt as it was in World War II. The contribution of the commercial airlines made toward victory in World War II have been overshadowed by the more spectacular performance of combat planes. Much of the role was entirely withheld for security reasons.

CONTRIBUTED IN WORLD WAR II

One week after Pearl Harbor the War Department called on the air transport industry for an immediate secret movement of troops. Within 5 minutes after this official notification, airlines pilots in the air were ordered to land their planes, discharge their passengers, and proceed to military installations to pick up Army troops. These were flown to a South American country where enemy action was feared. All this was done without incident and without publicity and in accordance with a plan laid down in peacetime.

Rommel was stopped in Africa with tank ammunition flown to General Montgomery in airline planes. The Japs were prevented from securing a foothold in Alaska by men and supplies flown there by planes and pilots furnished by the airlines. From these unpublicized accomplishments in the early critical days of World War II grew the tremendous contribution of the air transport industry when the airlines flew the equivalent of 26,000 times around the world, including 3,000,000,000 passenger miles, and 850,000,000 ton miles of cargo. To reduce these astronomical figures, the movement of personnel alone would be the equivalent of moving the population of Mobile seven times to London. The contribution of the airlines in World War II was made by an infant and pioneering industry. In the present war emergency, the capacity of the airlines of today is many, many times that of 1941.

Among the employees of the airlines today are thousands of veterans of the last war. They were trained for the military service at the cost of $300,000,000. It would take more than 20,000 man-hours of training to duplicate their skills. Had it not been for the utilization of this manpower by the air transport industry, these skills would have been lost.

Acting under the impetus of public opinion, Congress has been zealous in promoting civil aviation. It is through this support—your investment in airports, your patronage of the airlines, and your interest that the air transport industry is the vital force in national defense that it is today. All of us—the airlines, the public, and your Government, local as well as Federal—are partners in welding and making strong this second line of national defense. Your investment in air transport has paid another dividend in Korea.

Shortage of Aluminum, Copper, and Other Essential Materials Closing Industries and Throwing Employees Out of Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, labor organizations in my district, as well as heads of industries are complaining bitterly because aluminum, copper, and other strategic materials needed to keep men employed in industry are being shipped to foreign countries. Moreover, they are incensed when they know that these materials, so essential to our economic stability, are finding their way into Russia and Red China.

The amount of aluminum, copper, and any other materials that could keep our industries moving along in a normal pace, as well as prevent unemployment, can be found in the bulletins which I am inserting as a part of my remarks.

We are following the same line of procedure that brought about Pearl Harbor and the sacrifices that our boys had to make in the war of the Pacific in World War II. I hope that those who are wondering why there is all this shortage of essential materials will read the figures which I am submitting. I may add that already the Truman propagandists are appealing to the children of the country to save copper pennies instead of using them for the purchase of candy.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting two revealing bulletins prepared by Mr. Paul O. Peters:

[From the Washington News Bulletin of December 26, 1950]

CIVILIAN USE OF COPPER TO COME UNDER NPA CONTROLS SOON

In Washington it has been announced that within the next few days controls will be slapped on the domestic use of copper, cobalt, and cadmium. It has been generally known for many months that our supplies of copper would not be adequate for civilian demands and an expanded rearmament program. During World War II, the War Production Board reporting on the use of copper in 1944, stated among other things, that under a controlled materials plan direct military and export requirements had absorbed 90, 69, and 71 percent, respectively, of the brass-mill, wire-mill, and foundry-copper and copper-base alloy products.

Recently the price of copper has advanced to 24½ cents a pound, comparable with a price of 29.19 cents the highest price in 1917.

In spite of the domestic shortages, it appears that over a long period of time it has been the policy of the European Cooperation Administration to issue procurement authorization to the Marshall plan countries for

large quantities of copper and copper products to be purchased in the United States, Latin America and Canada.

Continuation of this policy on the part of ECA may prove highly disadvantageous to the American free enterprise system, which furnishes the employment and provides the payrolls and profits from which the Government collects the taxes which makes an international charity organization such as ECA possible.

It is a shame to say it, but it appears there are some in the Federal Government and its agencies who actually appear to be dedicated to the proposition of foreigners first instead of America first.

As of October 31, 1950, under the Marshall plan our taxpayers have been called upon to provide the funds for procurement authorization for copper in the total amount of $325,500,000. Since that time new authorizations have totaled $15,113,000 for copper and copper products of which more than one-third originated in the United States.

The details of the reported procurement authorizations for copper and copper products are shown in the table which follows:

Recent ECA procurement authorizations for copper and copper products, with countries of destination and origin

Date of authorization	Country of destination	Country of origin	Amount of authorization
Nov. 24, 1950	Austria	United States	$200,000
Nov. 29, 1950	Germany	Do	1,000,000
Dec. 5, 1950	Denmark	Canada	52,000
Do	Trieste	United States	80,000
Dec. 6, 1950	Germany	Latin America	1,100,000
Do	Portugal	United States	28,000
Dec. 8, 1950	French North Africa	Latin America	410,000
Do	Netherlands	Canada	285,000
Dec. 13, 1950	Greece	United States	100,000
Do	Formosa	Japan	5,000
Dec. 15, 1950	Norway	United States	350,000
Dec. 20, 1950	Greece	Latin America	1,000,000
Do	do	United States	645,000
Dec. 21, 1950	France	Latin America	5,000,000
Do	do	United States	3,000,000
Do	do	Canada	1,200,000
Do	French North Africa	Latin America	570,000
Total procurement authorizations (17)			15,113,000

At the quoted procurement price of copper at wholesale, the authorizations should be sufficient to procure about 60,000,000 pounds, or 30,000 short tons of copper or copper products.

In 1945, the reported exports of copper totaled but 48,563 short tons, and the domestic consumption that year was reported at 1,542,403 short tons. Of the reported domestic consumption in 1945, the uses to which the copper was put is shown by the table following:

	Tons
Cathodes	238,719
Wire bars	562,404
Ingots and ingot bars	275,944
Cakes and slabs	163,023
Billets	108,985
Other uses	10,197
Stock piles	163,131
Total	1,542,403

At the end of 1945, it was reported the Metals Reserve held 565,710 tons of electrolytic and fire-refined copper in cathodes, shapes and "in process copper" all but a small part of which was in the United States with the remainder in Canada.

[From the Washington News Bulletin of December 28, 1950]

EXPORTS OF SCARCE NONFERROUS METALS CONTINUE AT HIGH LEVEL

The thirteenth quarterly report of the Secretary of Commerce required under the Export Control Act of 1949 reveals that large quantities of copper, lead, nickel, tin, zinc, and aluminum continue to be exported from the United States notwithstanding the fact that these items are in critical supply at the present time and prices have been advanced considerably in the past 6 months.

Exports of copper and copper products reported by the Secretary for the second and third quarters of calendar 1950 were as follows:

Quantities in 1,000 pounds	Second quarter	Third quarter
Copper matte, unrefined	2	7,878
Refined copper	67,781	42,649
Copper scrap	3,471	6,127
Copper pipes and tubes	1,128	1,501
Plates, sheets, and strips	375	297
Rods and bars	7,223	20
Wire and cable, bare	1,743	6,409
Total in 1,000 pounds	81,725	64,971

Excluding $47,000,000 in shipments for the second quarter under the mutual defense assistance program it appears from the report that a total of $29,210,000 of nonferrous metals and products were exported in the second quarter. The table following shows the quantities by value exported and the amounts exported under controls:

	Controlled	Total exports
Aluminum and manufactures	$2,550,000	$5,220,000
Copper and manufactures	15,972,000	16,728,000
Brass and bronze	921,000	3,771,000
Lead and manufactures	480,000	645,000
Nickel and manufactures	440,000	1,126,000
Tin and manufactures	255,000	287,000
Zinc and manufactures	376,000	1,333,000
Total	21,003,000	29,210,000
Iron and steel mill products	87,311,000	126,728,000

The Secretary's report indicates the need for an extension of the export control laws which expire next June 30. It also would be desirable for the Congress to reexamine our national defense programs with a view of meeting our own domestic demands before allowing any uncontrolled exports of nonferrous metals and manufactures in 1951.

Crucial Juncture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., January 5, 1951:

SHOULD WE STRIKE FIRST?

The idea of "preventive war" has been examined thoughfully and rejected by our leaders. They have spurned it on two counts:

1. There is really no such thing as preventive war in the sense that a war can be fought to prevent war.

2. Undertaking a war to get the jump on the enemy and prevent defeat is something else. But our moral position in the world will not allow us to take this step even though we know the Soviet Union is plotting our destruction. We must, the argument goes, wait for conclusive overt action by our prospective enemy.

Most of the speculation on this point, however, has assumed that if we were to strike first, we would hit well in advance of the first enemy blow, when he was perhaps giving no sign of immediate action.

An entirely new notion has now been injected into this argument by Father Edmund Walsh, S. J., regent of Georgetown University's foreign service school. His statement carries especial weight because he is a prominent Catholic educator treating a subject on which the church has strong moral convictions.

Father Walsh believes we may be fully warranted morally in striking the enemy first if we have positive, reliable information that he is about to hit us. He illustrates with the case of Japan in 1941.

The Japanese carrier fleet left a Jap port on November 26, 1941, bound for its crippling attack upon Pearl Harbor on December 7. According to Father Walsh, we would have been thoroughly justified in intercepting that fleet at any point in its course—had we known beyond doubt what its goal was.

Put simply, this is the right of self-defense and self-preservation, which is sanctioned both morally and legally by our democratic system. Primitive man could not be blamed for striking first when he saw an enemy fist coming at him. As the threat moved back in space, first through use of knives and then of the spear, the bow and arrow, and finally guns of ever-lengthening ranges, the danger remained immediate and real. In other words, it was close in time, though not in space.

Today the danger is from atomic bombs which may be carried by planes based 3,000 to 5,000 miles away, or atomic missiles fired from battleships or submarines poised many miles off our shore. But it is close as a barbarian's fist to his adversary's jaw.

Father Walsh reasons that Russia would not attempt an attack on us unless well armed with A-bombs, since she knows we would use such weapons against her instantly in retaliation. If she struck, she would strive for surprise, suddenness, and an absolutely crippling effect right at the start—to prevent our striking back.

Knowing this, for us to await the first blow is thus obviously to invite ruin and national suicide. As far as effective resistance by us goes, the first blow might be the only one necessary.

Father Walsh argues that we cannot take that gamble, that we cannot allow the enemy to strike first if we wish to survive.

Were we to adopt Father Walsh's thinking as our national policy, it would impose a tremendous strain upon our civilian and military intelligence services. We would have to count upon them to tell us when—for sure—the enemy was about to strike. We could not afford to be wrong, either way.

Our national leaders may contend that the burden on intelligence would be too great, that the risk of making a mistake would be colossal.

If that should be their conviction, it would seem incumbent upon them to devise an alternative policy which would guarantee to us the right to defend and preserve our Nation and our people while there is still time to save them.

What that policy should be is a matter for debate. The Nation can thank Father Walsh for the fact that this vital topic has now been reopened for discussion at the most crucial juncture in our national life.

My Brother's Keeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Dr. W. T. Smith, pastor of the First Methodist Church, of Peoria, Ill., entitled "My Brother's Keeper," and appearing in the January 5 issue of the Herald, published by the First Methodist Church:

MY BROTHER'S KEEPER

(By Dr. W. G. Smith)

The great debate is on. Mr. Hoover, in his now celebrated Gibraltar of the West speech, seems to have given expression to the feelings and viewpoint of many millions of American people.

Two facets of the matter stand out in importance. One involves the moral responsibility of America toward the people of Europe. The charge has been made that to follow Mr. Hoover's proposal would be to abandon people who desperately need our help. This, of course, involves the age-old question: "Am I my brother's keeper?" To which there is only one answer and that, of course, is the Christian answer. We are responsible for our brother's welfare. We are responsible, insofar as possible, for the well-being of people everywhere. And it is just as true of a nation as it is of an individual that he who seeks to save his life shall lose it and he that loses his life in sacrificial service shall find it.

But into this matter comes the question of sagacity and wisdom. What is the best way to help the people toward whom we feel a great moral responsibility? Is it to pour more men and resources, including military arms, into a part of the world where we are unable to maintain and defend them—where it is admitted that Russia can overrun them and capture them within 3 weeks if she so desires? Or is it the part of wisdom to shorten our lines, consolidate our strength, and prepare bases from which we can carry on the kind of contest for which we are best equipped?

The question also has to be faced as to the extent to which the people of Europe are ready and willing to help themselves. Thus far they have shown no vigorous interest in that phase of the matter.

The ultimate defeat of communism must be in the realm of ideology. The ideas which are embraced in and connoted by the word "Christianity" must be brought into head-on conflict with the ideas which are connoted by the word "communism." When that takes place and as that takes place, there can be no question about the gradual and final disintegration of communism.

It is for that we must strive, the while we do the so-called practical things which will prevent the maximum aggression of communism.

One other aspect of this matter deserves attention. It is rumored that Mr. Hoover's speech was made only after wide consultation with high military leaders and authorities, and that what he has said really represents their point of view, a point of view which is obviously at variance with that of the State Department and the White House. It is well known that military leaders do not express their own viewpoints. (Witness General MacArthur's recent attempt to do so.) It is their function to execute orders of their Government—

"Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die."

Mr. Hoover is not only a great statesman; he is a great Christian. He does not suggest the abandonment of the Christian philosophy or the Christian position. He rather points to the only way in which it may be possible for the Christian point of view to survive in this world.

Once again let it be said that that is realism. If there be those who care to call it isolationism, so be it.

Editorial Tributes to James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, two editorials from the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune of November 21 and 23, 1950, relating to the visit to Tampa, for the purpose of addressing the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, of Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa Tribune of November 21, 1950]

TODAY'S GUEST OF HONOR

Tampa, thanks to the State chamber of commerce, has as its guest of honor today a justly famous American, James A. Farley. Ever since his leadership in 1932 made Franklin D. Roosevelt the Democratic nominee and President, Mr. Farley has been both a national and international figure. His successful management of the campaigns of 1932 and 1936 stamped him as an able and resourceful party executive. He refused to go along in the third-term movement and there came a "parting of the ways" with his erstwhile political hero—but the fact remains that, but for Farley, Mr. Roosevelt probably would never have been President. All that, however, is now history. Relieved of the detail of party leadership, Mr. Farley has concerned himself with broader concepts of principle and policy.

Both his utterances and activities have been in promotion of a greater United States and a better world. Wisely conservative, he has deprecated undemocratic trends toward a socialistic state and consistently fought the advance of Communist and totalitarian ideologies and developments. In his foreign travels he has been a one-man "voice of America" whose sound advice has been heeded in many influential international circles. Tampa and Florida are happy and proud to greet and hear today "Jim" Farley, typical American.

[From the Tampa Tribune of November 23, 1950]

A SOUND THINKER

That eminent American, James A. Farley, was never on more solid ground than in his analysis of the recent election results, made in his notable address at the State chamber of commerce dinner.

Mr. Farley greeted with approval the trend shown by the election in registering the opposition of the voter to socialistic movements and proposals, to splinter parties and un-American alliances, to the political activities of labor leaders and to objectionable features of the Fair Deal. He was particularly impressive in his comments on the Truman civil-rights program.

"Most of the problems raised by the so-called civil-rights program," he said, "are gradually and peacefully being solved right here in the South. The gates of economic opportunity for all races are opening wider and wider, the right to vote is spreading to all, and disorders that once resulted in lynchings have been brought under control by the States and communities. To threaten the South with drastic Federal legislation is the last way to approach these problems. And we are a long way from that last way. To pass a law, especially a Federal law, is never the best way to correct an injustice. I say to those anxious people who are too ready to lift the threat of authority to leave recovery to the spirit of liberty."

More of the sound thinking evidenced by James A. Farley would serve the people well in Washington.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which was broadcast by me recently under the sponsorship of the Polish-American Congress, on the subject of justice for Poland.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(By Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN)

I am happy to speak to this radio audience today under the sponsorship of the Polish-American Congress.

For many years, I have taken a special interest in the activities of Polish-American groups and organizations and in the notable contributions which these groups have made and are making to American citizenship and to the American tradition.

I am especially pleased to speak to you today on the subject of justice for Poland. There is no subject closer to the hearts of all of use who today are devoting every effort of mind and body to the great world cause of freedom, justice, and security.

Basically, of course, the question of justice for Poland cannot be separated from the question of justice for all freedom-loving peoples, both for those already under the tyrannical heel of the Kremlin, and for those threatened with such a fate. We know that justice must be won for all peoples enslaved by totalitarian regimes which exist not by the consent of the people and for the sake of the people, but by naked force for the purpose of controlling and enslaving the people.

Poland, of course, has a special claim to our consideration in the great undertaking upon which we are now engaged. Since time immemorial, the light of liberty has burned as fiercely in Poland as in any country in the world. Surrounded and overshadowed by nations historically bent on stamping out freedom and on repressing the outpourings of the human spirit, the Polish people have struggled unceasingly in behalf of freedom.

This Polish tradition of liberty found brilliant expression in the 3d of May constitution of 1791, the most democratic constitution to have been promulgated in the Old World up to that time. This constitution, expressing the genius and the tradition of the Polish people, recognized the equality of all men, proclaimed religious liberty and

established by basic law the freedoms of thought and speech. This constitution, this charter of human liberty, was promulgated in Poland on the very heels of the American and French Revolutions. Thus Poland joined with the new American Republic in enshrining in basic law the ideals of human dignity and liberty.

The association between the American Constitution and the Polish Constitution, of Polish liberty and American liberty, was not one of mere coincidence in time. Historic contributions to American independence and to victory in our war of liberation were made by Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuscko and Gen. Casimir Pulaski, and by other Poles less renowned, who rushed to these shores as soon as they heard the thrilling call of men to arms in the battle for liberty.

We have not forgotten, and must not forget this circumstance. The least we Americans owe to these Polish heroes is to do all we can in this dark day to bring justice and freedom to the descendants of Kosciuscko, Pulaski, and their heroic comrades.

The Polish Constitution to which I have referred did not, of course, long endure. The tyrants of Prussia, Russia, and Austria could not tolerate this bold flowering of the human spirit. They could not permit, in close proximity to their territory, the spectacle of human dignity, worth, and freedom, this cultivation of the dangerous doctrine of democracy. And so Poland was extinguished as a nation.

Not until 1918 was Poland again free. But during all those years the Polish people continued to struggle, to revolt, to endure jail, torture, and death in the high cause of freedom. Thus for more than a century, the Polish people cherished the traditions of liberty, although they knew its practices only remotely, by memory and by reference.

Today Polish-Americans in this country have a double heritage of freedom. They share in the ideals of freedom common to every American and are at the same time heirs of the magnificent Polish tradition of freedom and the dignity of man. The Polish people, like the American people, have held aloft the torch of liberty throughout the years and through the centuries.

Today that torch does not burn openly in Poland. But I am sure it burns brightly in the hearts of the great majority of the Polish people. That flame which has survived the attempts to extinguish it by the tyrants of the past—by Catherine of Russia, Frederick of Prussia, and the Hapsburg emperors of Austria—will continue to defy the efforts of Stalin and his minions in Warsaw.

We in America believe in freedom and in independence for all the nations of the world. We have never deviated from our support of the position, first expressed as official doctrine by our great President Woodrow Wilson, that every people has the inherent right to determine its own national destiny. We believe this as firmly today as we did in 1916. And today we, as well as all the other freedom-loving peoples of the world, face the greatest threat to freedom and to our national survival we have ever known.

We are meeting that challenge. We are going to overcome the present dangers. True, these are only words. Our determination must be translated into action on many fronts, not only by the strength of our arms but by the strength of our ideas. It is and always has been my profound belief that the idea of freedom and of justice is the strongest idea ever conceived by man.

In all the history that we know, slavery has never been able to prevail over freedom. Tyranny has won temporary victories, but never the ultimate victory.

The present world challenge will require unlimited sacrifices from all of us. Victory in this struggle cannot be won by business as usual, politics as usual, or life as usual. We must be ready to struggle on every front and with every means at our disposal. But we shall prevail. I have no doubt of it.

Polish-Americans and all Americans—and all freedom-loving people everywhere—are united in a determination to dispel the black clouds of fear and aggression which now overshadow us. All of us wish to live in peace. Most nations wish, each in its own way and according to its own genius, to work out its own destiny in justice and in security.

In order to achieve a world order in which this will be possible, we must direct our every effort and our every energy toward the task of bringing freedom and justice to the world.

We shall achieve justice for Poland as we shall achieve it for all mankind.

Fewer Strikes for More People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, a most interesting editorial appeared recently in the magazine Partners, by its editor, Maurice R. Franks, who is also president of the National Labor-Management Foundation. Mr. Franks, himself a union member, presents an interesting suggestion under the heading "Fewer strikes for more people." I hope this article will lead to the presentation of an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act that will be highly beneficial both to labor and management. To assure the freedom we have enjoyed through the years, we should aim at unity and cooperation during these serious days.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEWER STRIKES FOR MORE PEOPLE

(By Maurice R. Franks)

One of the big questions of the day is: When are all these strikes going to stop? Well I, for one, don't know when all the strikes are going to stop. I don't even believe all strikes should stop. There are occasions when strikes are highly justified. But I'm convinced that about 90 percent of the kind we suffer from today would never even start if we had a little different approach.

Some day when you have nothing else to do, you might look into a strike in progress. Talk to the strikers. Ask them their reason for hitting the bricks. I'll bet that not more than a handful will be able to give you a comprehensive answer. The fact is they simply don't know. You may ask this one and that one if he voted for the strike. Some will say "Yes"; others will say "No."

UNION MEMBERS HANDICAPPED

The simple answer to this is that a goodly number of folks on strike have no means of knowing just why they are out, and many of their fellow workers are given a poor opportunity to vote for or against a strike.

Few union halls are equipped to accommodate the entire membership. It is physically impossible for all the union members to foregather at one time. Day meetings can be attended only by night-shift workers and vice versa.

This is just one handicap. Another is that, even though it were possible to assemble the entire local membership in one hall at one time, it would still be impossible for this membership to arrive at a sensible conclusion for the simple reason that in such an environment they are given the means of hearing only one side of the story—the union's side—and that side is, quite naturally, biased.

To look for an intelligent vote on a strike issue under such conditions is just plain silly. It isn't in the cards. Until something is done that will afford the membership the opportunity to hear both sides of the story—management's as well as labor's—we can only look forward to more and more labor trouble, much of it unnecessary.

When I examine the present labor law—the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly referred to as the Taft-Hartley law—I find nothing specific in it that will enable the worker to use his analytical ability on matters affecting his very livelihood. This is a glaring deficiency in the law. For until something is done to allow union members to consider both sides of the question before casting their strike votes, one way or the other, we can hardly look forward to a greater measure of industrial peace.

A PLAN FOR IMPROVED BALLOTING

If it is legally possible, I should like to see the Taft-Hartley law amended to the point of making it mandatory that, before a strike shall be instituted, the workers involved shall be accorded full means of analyzing both sides of the controversy.

In line with this, I suggest that the law be amended to require that before a strike vote could be taken, a period of 10 days must elapse from the date the union duly files its grievance claim. This would allow the union and the employer ample opportunity to present their particular arguments on the issue at hand to the workers involved. This period would enable both parties to make their presentation on paper, which could be mailed right to the home of the worker. This would automatically give the workers an opportunity to study the full situation as it exists and to decide for themselves whether a strike is or is not called for. At home and in sober consultation with the members of his family—each one of whom very likely would be directly affected by the calling of a strike—the worker would stand a better chance of judging the total situation before casting his vote for or against a strike.

Within a reasonable period after this was done, the union would be permitted to send out a strike ballot by registered United States mail, return receipt requested, to each and every person to be affected by a strike. This ballot would be returnable to a designated post-office box accessible only to a duly authorized representative of the union, a duly authorized representative of the employer and a duly authorized representative of the National Labor Relations Board.

The mechanics of the secret ballot would operate somewhat as follows: A member would receive an envelope addressed to his home and containing instructions as to casting his ballot. These instructions would tell him to execute the ballot according to his personal desire, voting simply yes or no on the strike issue.

The marked ballot would be sealed in a blank envelope and returned in the envelope addressed to the post-office box. On the back of the envelope bearing the post-office box number would be space for the worker's original signature, thus making possible a check against the registered mail return receipts in order to establish eligibility of the ballot so returned.

The secret ballots contained in blank envelopes would have to be opened and counted in the presence of the duly authorized representative of the union, the employer, and the NLRB.

After counting the votes in the duly authorized manner, the result of the balloting would be immediately made known through suitable notice.

If the vote is in favor of a strike, no work stoppage could yet be instituted. The law would require that a period of 80 days must elapse from the date the results of the strike are posted. This waiting period could be utilized by the disputants for the purpose of endeavoring further to resolve their differences.

UNION LEADERS MAY OBJECT

There is no doubt in my mind that this suggested plan of mine will create some controversy. Some people will assert that such a system of voting infringes upon the rights of the union worker—and especially upon the rights of the union leader. Labor bosses may put forth the argument that if such a system as this be required of the unions, it should likewise be required of all chartered organizations not coming under the Taft-Hartley Act—organizations such as the Masonic order, the Knights of Columbus, Rotary, and other clubs.

My answer to this argument is simple: Such organizations are not by their very nature expressions of economic power. They do not pull strikes or in any way injure the public. Their activities do not deprive you and me of our right to use the telephone or ride a train or street car. They don't throw picket lines around business establishments. No child, because of them, has ever been deprived of milk, no home of heat, no human body of nourishment.

This plan of mine, if enacted into law as an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, would, I believe, immediately provide the American worker with the possibility of using the powers of analysis the good Lord endowed him with. It would offer him the opportunity of carefully examining both sides of a potential strike issue in an atmosphere safely removed from the turmoil and confusion of a heated union meeting. Its immediate practical result would be fewer strikes for more people.

"American Superiority in A-Bombs, Taken Together With Our Long-Range Strategic Air Force, Probably Constitutes the Most Important Single Factor That Has Thus Far Deterred the Kremlin From Precipitating an All-Out War"—Editorial, Washington (D. C.) Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of last evening carried a most significant editorial under the heading "Russia and A-Weapons," having to do with United States Air Force superiority in the field of strategic bombing.

American, and the world's, leading military authorities have now come to regard the ability of the United States Air Force—with its long-range bombing planes land-based here at home—to deliver the atom bomb to any part of Russia as the greatest existing single determent to world-wide war.

Mr. Speaker, time, however, is now running out.

It is nearly 2 years since the Air Force brought the B-36 bomber into production. In the meantime, we have seen better weapons, as well as tactics, worked out for the defense of our country, and—it is only prudent to assume that the Russian Communists have also made improvements in both their offensive and defensive weapons and tactics.

I was glad to see the dispatch with which this House voted the new $20,000,000,000 supplemental appropriations for defense, and hope and pray that, in what appears today to be normal America—"doing business as usual"—the workers in the defense plants and on production lines will not forget that the country now stands on the brink of imminent and all-out global warfare.

The passage of increased appropriations for military defense by the Congress will not meet the situation. Neither will it be met by enacting "material controls" or "wage and hour controls"—necessary as these might be.

The only one answer to this problem—is the increased production of all materials necessary to prosecute modern war against Russia and all of her satellites, plus an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force, of sufficient strength to insure our defenses—with or without the benefit of any help whatever from the United Nations or any other source whatever.

Let us speed defense production on every industrial front.

It is because of the timeliness and logic of the editorial clipped from the Washington Star of yesterday that I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial reads as follows:

RUSSIA AND A-WEAPONS

It is a reasonably safe assumption that the United States still maintains a large lead over the Soviet Union in the field of atomic weapons, both as regards quantity and quality. As far as the immediate world situation is concerned, this particular American superiority—taken together with our long-range strategic air force—probably constitutes the most important single factor that has thus far deterred the Kremlin from committing an act of aggression direct and heinous enough to precipitate an all-out war calling for instantaneous and massive counterattack from us.

But how long will that deterrent really serve to deter? No one can be sure of the answer. The only thing anybody can be sure of is that there is not the slightest reason for complacency on the part of our own country or the rest of the free world. For the fact is that time is not on our side in this matter. As pointed out to the Senate Appropriations Committee by Chairman Gordon Dean, of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Russians undoubtedly are making an intensive effort to produce a big stockpile of A-weapons as fast as possible; nor would it be sensible to suppose that they are not capable of doing so. Further than that—and the authority for this statement is the distinguished Dr. Vannevar Bush, chief of our wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development—we should regard it pretty much as a certainty that they have been sparing no effort to develop radar, anti-aircraft artillery, jet-plane interception and ground-to-air guided missiles along lines calculated to nullify whatever countervailing superiority we may have at the present moment.

In other words, in terms of their ability both to deliver atomic attacks on American cities and to defend themselves from such attacks by us, the Russians are not letting the grass grow under their feet. As time passes, they are growing stronger and stronger in this respect, although now they may be highly vulnerable. It would be folly of the worst kind to assume otherwise. In quantity and quality, our arsenal of A-weapons may continue to be far superior to theirs; but this is a field in which the margin of superiority—after the competitors reach a certain point—tend to diminish in significance. Our military preparedness and strategy must be governed accordingly.

Lobbying: Its Nature, History, and Causes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the December 1950 issue of Rural Electrification magazine.

The article is as follows:

LOBBYING: ITS NATURE, HISTORY, AND CAUSES

(By Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, United States Representative, Pennsylvania, Chairman, House Committee on Lobbying)

"It should be remembered that the advantage will always lie with those interests which are best organized, best financed, and have the easiest access to radio, newspapers, and other mass media. For this reason, organized business has always gained the most from lobbying because it has all these requirements. Organized business has had another advantage. It has sought to prevent rather than encourage action by popular government and it is far easier to obstruct legislative processes than it is to create."

In a democracy, it is essential that individuals or factions have some lawful means by which they can lay their needs before their government. At core, the purpose of any free government, as opposed to that of totalitarian rule, is that people should be able to reach it; and at core, the purpose of what is called lobbying is that they should be able to reach their government with maximum impact and possibility of success. This, then, is basically what lobbying is.

For the past 100 years, the term "lobbying" has been in common use, and during that time the term has been given many definitions. Eighty years ago, "lobbying" meant direct, private pressure on legislators, and the word had a corrupt sound. Lobbying in the 1880's demanded this kind of definition but lobbying in the 1950's requires a new one.

DEFINITIONS DON'T FIT

The reason most present-day definitions don't fit is that they fail to recognize that modern pressure on legislative bodies is corrupt only in extremely rare cases, that it is, moreover, not direct but indirect, and that by and large it is the effort of a group rather than individual effort.

To our kind of government, lobbying is as natural as breathing is to the human being, and just about as complex. With so many voices with conflicting views clamoring to

be heard, the only means of securing a full hearing has been constantly to devise new methods and techniques by which the views of one group can be presented more effectively than those of that group's competitors. Thus, vigorous competition has made the science of lobbying an ever-developing profession.

For while modern-day lobbying is being streamlined with new techniques and methods being added, the old ones are not being abandoned. As an example, buttonholing of legislators by direct contact is still common practice. Groups, as well as individuals, very properly seek to acquaint legislators directly with their views on public issues.

But the present-day variations on this old theme of buttonholing a legislator are without end. Lobbying practice today has some groups making their views known by letters, telegrams, and phone calls. While some depend largely on personal contact with Members of Congress, still others think that they can best depict their particular cause of informing Congress by organizing delegations for marching in groups on that legislative body.

From the individual congressional side, Members are quite accustomed to being sought out not only in their offices, in the corridors of the office buildings, in their homes, but also in the cloakrooms and restaurants of the Capitol itself. Their attitude toward these approaches is realistic. They wish to be informed of all sides in a public issue, not only from constituents but from those outside their districts as well, so they welcome letters, telegrams, and telephone calls on a pending legislative matter. In an age where the actions of Congress directly affect the lives of so many congressional members are aware that these means of communications from the public at large constitute the lifelines, as well as the pipelines, of our kind of representative government.

HEARINGS DISPEL SUSPICION

And with the institution of open committee hearings in 1911, much of the suspected skullduggery on committee members by the old lobby barons, was banished. As in all democratic processes, open hearings dispel suspicion of bribery of committee members and at the same time affect the appeals of a lobbyist testifying before such a committee, where he would and is obliged, in the glare of the public scrutiny, to argue largely on merit.

Today, organized lobby groups perform a service function in many different forms to Members of Congress. As a first example of this service, lobbies furnish, in presenting their own views before congressional committees, the very raw material needed for representative legislative action. What human being serving as an elected Member of Congress, could be informed on all phases of the many questions of public interest that come before that body in the course of even a single session?

But in addition to the information services organized lobby groups give Congress on public issues, they perform other services. In the drafting of bills and amendments to bills, the preparation of speeches and other materials for Members, lobby groups perform not only a high service to the legislative process but further their own ends as well.

CAUSES EXPLORED

In the final analysis, lobbying remains a very practical problem with a number of very practical causes. First among these very practical causes is our splendid tradition of free assembly. We Americans are free to band together when and where we choose by constitutional guaranty. This tradition of free association has provided the essential materials from which our present system of lobbying has been built.

SYSTEM CALLED COMPLEX

Our system of government is, of necessity, complex with its separations of powers and this has also contributed to the growth of lobbying. We have all heard of the bottlenecks existent in government. But what is not generally known is that it is to these bottlenecks that pressure can be quietly and effectively applied. By research into the subject it was discovered that the aim of most lobbies is the prevention of governmental action and for that reason pressure exerted at every critical spot—such as a bottleneck—has meant a relatively easy amount of success for the lobbies under these circumstances.

Finally, lobbying has reached its present stature because our Government has always been sensitive to private demands. One piece of special pleading bred another with the result that the entire system of special interests has developed.

The theory that special interests applying pressure to Congress will cancel out another such group has been disproved. Instead it appears that rather than canceling out, the pressures on government have been piling up. Today there are 2,900 registered lobbyists and approximately 200 organizations filing financial reports under the Lobbying Act.

ADVANTAGE DESCRIBED

In addition, it should be remembered that the advantage will always lie with those interests which are best organized, best financed, and have the easiest access to radio, newspapers, and other mass media. For this reason, organized business has always gained the most from lobbying because it had all these requirements. Organized business has had another advantage. It has sought to prevent rather than encourage action by popular government and it is far easier to obstruct legislative processes than it is to create.

But it is not conceivable that responsible public policy would result if government yielded only to the strongest pressure. There remain today several vital questions concerning lobbies. What of those, which serve as a "front" for other groups whose true contributors are not always known? And what of those lobbies which spend large sums of money to influence elections?

RESPONSIBILITY NEEDED

Absolute responsiveness to group interests is part of our Government. But truly responsible representative government is quite another thing indeed.

While lobbying is natural in our system of government and should not be curbed, the outer limits beyond which lobbying is an offense against the welfare of the whole community have not begun to be charted.

Resolve To Go All Out for Freedom in 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, of Monday, January 1, 1951. This editorial was written by Jack Gore, the editor, who will be remembered as the writer of an editorial placed in the RECORD last year, Let's Remember the Sea Gulls.

The following editorial entitled "Resolve To Go All Out for Freedom in 1951" is timely and most convincing and I recommend it to the consideration of not only the Members of the Congress but to all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It will also be remembered that the Fort Lauderdale Daily News published a booklet containing a number of editorials and which was distributed to some of the Members of Congress. The above-mentioned editorial follows:

RESOLVE TO GO ALL OUT FOR FREEDOM IN 1951

What we American must resolve this New Year's day is abundantly clear. We must make ourselves as strong militarily as our resources in men and material will allow. For only in the full marshalling of our strength is there any hope of peace.

We must not quail at the hard sacrifices this task will impose upon us. No sacrifice, even that of our lives, is too great to make to save our liberties. Should the moment ever come when we would rather have bread than freedom, then our great adventure in human endeavor will be over.

We cannot thus abandon the field to the barabaric, unmoral totalitarians who today wear the dress of communism but are still the tyrants of old. We cannot forsake all that America has built, all that western civilization has been moving toward for centuries.

We must stand here, where we are. And we must stand now. To wait longer might mean we will never be able to stand against the force that could be arrayed opposite us.

It seems cruelly unfair that with the expenditure of so must treasure and so much blood in World War II, we were able to buy so little peace and happiness. Five short years, years of booming prosperity to be sure, but years marred by the dislocations of a war just ended and the fears of another that could start at a dictator's whim.

This may seem small recompense indeed for great sacrifices already made. But it must not be forgotten that we did save our freedom. We are not today the slaves of Hitler and Mussolini.

If we and all others in the free world are not to become the slaves of Stalin, we therefore must plunge ahead and do again—on a bigger scale—all the onerous and painful tasks that together spell the preservation of liberty.

None can escape this responsibility, nor tell himself his energy and ability are not required. Total effort is needed.

The quality of a nation's life is always measured by the sum of millions of individual contributions to its well-being. Nothing is lost in this accounting. Never is this more true or more meaningful than when a country is struggling, as ours now is, for its very survival.

Yuletide Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the special Christmas column written by A. L. Shultz, long-time political and feature writer and columnist of my State.

This article appeared in a host of Kansas newspapers and carries a message as well as a challenge for all of us at the beginning of this new legislative year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., December 20.—Yuletide prayers will be on millions of trembling lips throughout this usually happy holiday time in fervent supplication for deliverance from the chaos that threatens our beloved land and cherished heritage.

In all this Nation there is somber, serious meditation. It has supplanted the spirit of traditional Christmas cheer in the hearts of mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters everywhere. They sense an impending national tragedy. They are aware of the threatened loss of things they hold dear. Instinctively, dulled senses warn that for all practical purposes of sound leadership, Government in Washington has fallen apart.

This isn't anything new. Evidences of decay and deterioration have been increasingly apparent for months. Not until the walls of public confidence in Washington buckled and collapsed was there general awareness of the seriousness of it all.

Now there is a stark, barren spectacle of impending ruin. It is a horrible holiday thought. You don't like it. Nobody likes it. Yet at the approach to the new year, it is time for people to speak calmly, frankly, and truthfully to themselves and to each other. Never in the history of God-fearing people was tragedy displayed more starkly at an hour which so significantly calls for supplication for deliverance from impending catastrophe—possibly destruction of civilization itself.

In the hearts and minds of people everywhere there is sudden realization that small men have been called to great tasks for which they are not trained or equipped. There is awareness that selfish, greedy individuals with lust for position and power hold personal ambitions above the welfare of their country. Much of the failure should be charged to sheer ignorance and inability to appraise grave problems. It is all glaringly apparent now.

Tragic days in Korea brought the true story to every community in the land. Lives of American boys sacrificed in frozen passes in a strange land spelled the price of stupid mismanagement of our foreign affairs. Swaggering, self-satisfied, incompetent subordinates executed decrees of power-drunk policy makers. A supine public selected this leadership. All too late there is realization of the betrayal of that trust—through ignorance rather than design—perhaps. Yet the cost is the same.

Something in the indomitable faith and courage of the average American reflects a confidence that there still is opportunity to regain the world prestige and high standing which has been undermined. This awakening makes crystal clear that the men guilty of tragic bungling in Washington are not now capable of leading the country out of danger. Maybe through divine direction and a surge of public determination, the path to a new future may be opened. At this Christmas season and the turn of the year, millions of people will pray that the deliverance, which today seems so far away, may still be within reach.

There is one hope, maybe one hope alone. It is in the leadership of the new Congress which assembles in a few days. Solemn, serious acceptance of responsibility to stop this mad plunge to disaster may produce new, inspired, and capable men in this hour of danger. Those men who meet in Washington to write the Nation's laws face opportunity and responsibility. They alone can restore the heritage of honest, capable, courageous, and unselfish National Government. Those men can perform the miracle that will save America.

This column is in the same boat with 150,000,000 other citizens. We are bewildered and confused. In facing the impending crisis, we appealed for words of wisdom and the benefits of sound thinking by a man whose contacts throughout the Nation and around the world make possible a profound understanding of existing problems. A few paragraphs from his letter seem deeply appropriate.

"We are probably confronted with the greatest crisis in our national history," this man wrote in a summary that was free from rancor, but candidly tinged with a despair that burned at his heart. "The executive branch of our Government is in a state of almost complete collapse. What they will do through ignorance and viciousness, only God knows."

Then, in clear, thinking appraisal of possible remedies, such as only a man of great wisdom and deep understanding can offer, he added:

"Obviously, the key to the solution of all our ills depends on the Congress taking back its powers and assuming its responsibilities. It is absurd to vote vast sums of money to the administration without Congress being organized to supervise the expenditures. Congress is made up of 531 men, mostly well-meaning, but totally uninformed. The administration merely takes their money, is devoid of any sense of responsibility toward the Congress, and tells them to go to hell when they ask for information. The whole thing is just nuts."

There is no question as to congressional authority. But Congress must reclaim the things which once were that body's accepted prerogatives. It must hold those privileges high. Ruthless abuse of authority must never again occur under the White House roof. Secret agreements, trade pacts, and military and financial commitments must never again be made with foreign powers without congressional sanction. Congress which surrendered its authority, must reclaim its rights. It may have to fight for them, but an outraged and awakened America will be behind those 531 men and women. If they don't restore to themselves the right to safeguard against pillaging of human liberty and the economic stability of the Nation, the ideals of a great America are lost. That tremendous, but not impossible, responsibility will be on the shoulders of the new Congress which convenes almost with the turn of the year.

Keenly aware of the fact that freedom and economic security go hand-in-hand, this very clear thinking friend supplies another thought. This new Congress, he points out, may properly and wisely, set aside 2 percent of its appropriations for a screening of Government spending. Experts in all the fields of Government endeavor should be independently retained to supervise expenses—even to and including the military. That staff of commercial and financial experts would become the scrutinizing eyes of Congress.

Surely there is a way out of this dilemma. National collapse is no mere phrase with which to frighten voters and taxpayers. We are on the verge of it. Never since the days of Valley Forge has the Nation's future been so dark. It is this realization of impending calamity that will bring millions of holiday supplications for deliverance. The hope of salvation depends on the courage, clear thinking, and patriotic leadership of representatives of the people themselves—the new Congress.

Iowa Was a Better Place to Live in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bulletin of the Iowa Development Commission:

IOWA WAS A BETTER PLACE TO LIVE IN 1950

Life was a little better in Iowa, in 1950.

On the surface, it looked about the same. Babies were born, youngsters trudged to school, young couples were married and some of them divorced, paydays came as frequently as they ever do, people bought homes and cars and farm equipment. Life went on much as it always has.

But life was a little better than usual, it appears in the summing up.

More babies were born in Iowa, this year—680 more than last year, and 2,000 more than the year before. An estimated 40,577 infants joined the Iowa population during 1950. The 1949 and 1950 birth rates were 24.2 babies born per thousand population; 1948 births were 23.7 per 1,000 population.

The 1950 Iowa babies had a better chance to live through the dangerous first year of their lives, too. Iowa's infant mortality rate runs about 20 percent below the national average, and it dropped still another notch in 1950. Of every 2,000 babies born in Iowa, 1,963 happily celebrated their first birthday in 1950.

More Iowa youngsters went to school in 1950, but fewer of them trudged. Some 477,720 Iowans between 5 and 18 years of age were in public schools this year—an increase of 2½ percent. Six and a half percent more country pupils were riding school buses to town or consolidated schools—67,[illegible] this year, compared to 63,318 last year. And at least 10 percent more were eating hot lunches at school: Nearly 1,000 Iowa schools are serving hot lunches to some 137,500 pupils this winter.

Cupid was out-balting the grandies in Iowa marriages, in 1950. An estimated 26,732 couples took out Iowa licenses to love and to cherish, this year—1,[illegible] more than in 1949. Only 5,195 couples took their troubles to the divorce judge—[illegible] fewer than in the year before.

Paydays were no closer than usual, in 1950, but they came more regularly and the paychecks were bigger. Unemployment dropped to a 2-year low, and the average weekly paycheck was the biggest on record, in October of 1950. Average factory wage in Iowa, for instance, rose to $1.40 an hour, and employees put in an hour or two overtime, most weeks, to give them an average paycheck of $56.26.

More Iowans were becoming homeowners, in 1950. Sixteen thousand more residents filed for homestead exemption in 1950 than in 1949—475,122 of our citizens now hold deeds to their homes.

More Iowans owned automobiles, too. Motor vehicle registrations jumped the million mark in Iowa in 1950, and by the end of the year totaled 1,1[illegible]. Of these, [illegible] were passenger cars, and more than 1[illegible] had been purchased in 1950.

As usual, Iowa farms were the most mechanized in 1950. Iowa continued to rank first in the number of tractors and other labor-saving farm equipment.

And while life was a little better in Iowa in 1950, it was also a little longer. Iowans departing this life in 1950 averaged nearly 72 years of age, and had enjoyed at least

2 years more life than their friends who preceded them in 1940. Iowans can now look forward to a longer life than the residents of 44 other States—from 2½ to 3 years longer than the Nation-wide average.

IOWA GAINED A NEW INDUSTRY FOR EACH WEEK OF 1950

Iowa gained 52 new industries during 1950, the Iowa Development Commission announced this week, in summing up the year's activities.

Six hundred Iowa cities and towns now have industrial plants to help balance their surrounding agriculture, the Commission said.

Two years ago, when the last industrial survey was made, 566 Iowa cities and towns could boast industries.

This geographic spread of industry through Iowa is an indication of the continuing growth of manufacturing in the Tall Corn State.

Some 3,500 more Iowans went to work in industrial plants in 1950. In 1949, the number of industrial workers averaged 144,512. For the first 10 months of 1950, the average was more than 148,000. In October, the latest month so far reported, 149,400 Iowans were employed in industry.

Weekly payrolls in industry grew to $8,853,444 by October of 1950. The year previous, industrial payrolls were running $300,000 less: $8,532,523. Ten years ago, the weekly payroll in Iowa industry was $2,380,008.

Proof of the value of industry to a community came with the 1950 census. Ten industrial counties gained 89,000 resident population, which was 6,000 more than the 83,000 gain reported for the entire state. The 10 counties and their gains were: Polk, 34,844; Linn, 13,096; Scott, 13,359; Black Hawk, 16,565; Clinton, 4,714; Webster, 2,567; Pottawattamie, 3,617; Dubuque, 4,855; Wapello, 2,364; Des Moines, 4,252.

According to the 1950 survey of industrial plants, these counties have a total of 1,376 industrial plants. The breakdown: Polk, 374; Linn, 189; Scott, 140; Black Hawk, 182; Clinton, 81; Webster, 75; Pottawattamie, 87; Dubuque, 142; Wapello, 65; Des Moines, 73.

IOWA BUSINESS SETS RECORDS IN 1950; RETAIL SALES $100,000,000 OVER 1949

Nineteen hundred and fifty was a busting year for Iowa business, the Iowa Development Commission commented today.

As the midcentury year was closing, it looked as if retail sales would be from $110,000,000 to $115,000,000 ahead of 1949's record volume. Bank debits (transactions by check) were running 9.5 percent larger than in 1949. Life-insurance sales were the largest in Iowa history—11 percent above the average of the previous 5 years.

Construction in Iowa was adding up to 27 percent more than last year, and seemed likely to top 1948's record. Cash farm income was expected to surpass the 1949 total. Earnings in industry—both by employees and owners—were at an all-time high.

Iowa merchants' cash registers rang up $3,774,000,000 in the first 11 months of 1950, according to computations by the development commission's statistical staff. This total was $51,765,000 better than Iowa business in the same period last year.

In addition, Iowans bought $447,000,000 worth of merchandise outside the State—$60,000,000 more than in 1949.

The 11-month totals showed 1950 business $102,000,000 better than 1949, in Iowa. Christmas sales were expected to boost the difference somewhere over $110,000,000.

Sales-tax collections through November of 1950 totaled $40,639,539, an increase of a million and a half dollars, and 3 percent, over the same 11 months in 1949. Use-tax collections were $8,942,494, a million dollars and 12.6 percent above 1949.

Life insurance sales—a good sign that Iowans have money to save—were running 8 percent above the 1949 volume, which totaled $443,000,000. At best guess, 1950 sales were expected to top the 1947 record of $463,000,000. Life insurance sales in Iowa have been steadily increasing the last 35 years from a volume of $76,722,000 in 1914. Iowans now have $3,250,000,000 worth of life insurance in force.

In the first 10 months of 1950, Iowans spent more than twice as much on new houses—112 percent more than the 1949 10-month total. New industrial building added up to 38 percent more than 1949, in the same 10 months. All construction was 27 percent ahead of 1949, and was holding a lead over 1948, in which building activities set a record in Iowa.

Iowa had an undisputed lead in the annual farm-income race, as 1950 drew to a close. After finishing second in 1948 and a close third in 1949, Iowa farmers took an early lead in 1950 and maintained it through third-quarter reports. Iowa topped the billion-dollar mark in farm income at the end of 7 months. At the end of September, Iowa farm pocketbooks held $1,418,758. This was slightly below total income for the first 9 months of 1949, but economists expect better farm prices in the last quarter to push the 1950 total ahead of 1949. If Iowa's 1950 farm income is more than two billion, as anticipated, it will be the fourth straight year in that bracket.

IOWA IN THE 1950 HEADLINES—A BRIEF REVIEW OF FOOTPRINTS ON THE ECONOMIC SANDS

Iowa stepped into second place in farm machinery manufacture: Iowa factories turned out more than a quarter million dollars worth of farm equipment.

Best customers in United States grow on Iowa farms: In 72 of Iowa's 99 counties farm families spend $12,000,000 or more a year. That is the heaviest concentration of top-spending counties in any one State.

Iowa dominates export of hybrid corn: More than 400,000 bushels of seed corn from Iowa exporters was planted in Europe this year. Seedsmen said that is easily nine-tenths of the total export.

Iowa's not the range, but it's the cattle country: Iowans found they feed and sell more cattle than any other State and realize more income from beef.

Iowa a "white" State in unemployment map: Iowa's unemployment average dropped to 2 percent and less, while the national average was running 5 to 7 percent of all those employed. Iowa's variety of employment deserves the credit.

Farm income averages from $4.50 to $5 a month per acre: Iowa's total cash farm income, divided by number of acres under cultivation, revealed acre earnings of from $54 to $60 per year.

Iowa industries pay $5,000,000 a year in taxes: Iowa cities and towns have $5,000,000 more tax money each year from the $200,000,000 capital investment made by Iowa's 350 new postwar industries.

Iowa's highways on pay-as-you-go financing: Last of Iowa's primary road bonds were retired November 1. Iowa now is operating on a $60,000,000 a year road fund out of current tax income.

Iowa manufacturing grew 50 percent in 10 years: Iowa factories are employing more than 148,000 Iowans; 100 percent as many as in 1930 and 153 percent as many as in 1940. About one-fourth of all workers outside agriculture are now in industry.

Iowa leads the meat-packing field: Iowa packers handled 11.7 percent of all meat animals slaughtered in the United States through October of 1950.

Prejudiced Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of Max Lowenthal's book, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, written by N. J. L. Pieper, entitled "Prejudiced Smear," and appearing in the December 23, 1950, issue of the Saturday Review of Literature.

Mr. Pieper was head of the San Francisco field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation during World War II when I worked out of that office in the Counter-Espionage Division. He was my boss then and I still hold him in highest respect for his past accomplishments and for the work he is carrying on this very day. I know that you will enjoy reading Mr. Pieper's review as he expresses very well the feelings of those who really know what the Federal Bureau of Investigation stands for. The review follows:

PREJUDICED SMEAR

(By N. J. L. Pieper)

Biased, slanted, and patently prejudiced, Max Lowenthal's book is a base smear. It is the antithesis of an objective picture of the FBI by an author conservative in the most profound sense as heralded by his publishers.

Belaboring the FBI for imaginary violations of civil liberties for its alleged failure to protect the American people from spies, saboteurs, and criminals Lowenthal would have his readers believe the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover, guilty of dire acts, either by omission or commission. In his treatment of the FBI the author employs the technique of selecting quotes from public sources which best suit his own purpose but ignore the real record of the FBI and its accomplishments—accomplishments so sound and extensive that even the most prejudiced FBI-hater would admit them to be above question or reproach.

Lowenthal devotes two-thirds of his book to the Department of Justice's Investigative Unit from 1908 through 1924. This is all before Mr. Hoover became director. Yet Lowenthal implies that the activities of these years were chargeable to Mr. Hoover and G-men of present-day stature.

Lowenthal's misuse of numerous quotations from a great variety of sources—speeches, congressional committee hearings, and news clips—would have one believe that here is a factual picture of the FBI. Lowenthal must know that his tricky placement of material out of context, omissions of qualifying sentences or statements, even his padded reference pages, have had to be so presented to get over an implication where truth would not sustain his insinuations and accusations.

To answer the distortions of fact, half truths, false representations and inaccuracies in the book would require a new book. Let us, however, consider briefly the following examples.

Lowenthal dwells at great length on the Palmer raids, attempting to create the false impression that Mr. Hoover was responsible. A Senate Judiciary Committee absolved Mr. Hoover of any responsibility. Attorney General Harlan Stone, later Chief Justice, was one of the first to denounce the Palmer raids. It will be recalled that the Palmer raids occurred in 1919-20. Mr. Hoover was then only a special assistant to the Attorney General and was not assigned to the Bureau until 1921. He was named Director by Attorney General Stone in 1924. Had he felt that Mr. Hoover was accountable for the raids it is hard to conceive that the late Chief Justice Stone would have named him Director as he did.

Criticism of the manner in which arrests were made in the Detroit recruiting groups of Spanish loyalists gets considerable space. Notably omitted, however, is Attorney General (now Justice) Jackson's statement after investigation that the FBI had violated no civil liberties.

There is perhaps no greater authority on civil liberties in this country than Morris L. Ernst, who has appeared as counsel for the Civil Liberties Union in many important cases. One need but read Mr. Ernst's article published in the December Reader's Digest to see why Lowenthal avoids quoting this authoritative source.

Lowenthal makes a cheap implication when he holds out that the FBI wants to tap wires because it is too lazy to do its investigative work. He cites a California kidnaping. The facts here are clear in my mind. I was responsible for handling this case. The kidnaper was apprehended and the child was returned unharmed, because no single effort was spared. I asked Mr. Hoover for authority to monitor the telephone. Mr. Hoover went immediately to Attorney General Jackson. Here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoting Representative Hobbs, of Alabama: "Our great Attorney General did not hesitate. He immediately authorized the interception of the call. He assumed full responsibility."

Should the possibility of a solution by wire-tapping have been ignored in this case? Would a parent agree with Lowenthal? He makes so much of wire-tapping. Let us consider it. The FBI does not make policy; its job is fact-finding. The President and Attorney General make policy. The FBI's wire-tapping policy was established by Franklin D. Roosevelt in a 1940 directive, wherein he authorized and directed in such cases as the Attorney General might approve the use of wire-tapping in instances involving internal security. Attorneys General Jackson, Biddle, Clark, and McGrath have since adhered to this policy, which was reaffirmed by President Truman after he entered the White House. Some lawyers who should know better, including Lowenthal, raise the issue of illegality in the interception of telephone calls. Mr. Justice Jackson when he was Attorney General, in a widely published statement of March 20, 1941, stated: "There is no Federal statute which prohibits or punishes wire-tapping alone. * * * The courts do not stop people from tapping wires—no one has ever been or under present law could be convicted of that by itself. What has been stopped is the use of the evidence to enforce the laws against criminals."

The FBI has never attempted to conceal that it taps telephones. But each installation must be authorized by the Attorney General; the authority does not rest with the FBI. Its wire-tapping is not indiscriminate, and evidence obtained in this manner is not used in court. Lowenthal would have the reader believe differently, as would other critics of the FBI.

No one has fought harder against a national police than J. Edgar Hoover, yet Lowenthal falsely and without justification accuses him of aspiring to head such an organization. In May 1950 Mr. Hoover described the Communists as the most dangerous and one of the most powerful forces in the United States. But, says Lowenthal, "some informed authorities believe otherwise today as in the past." Events refute them.

After reading this book no fair-minded person can but ask the question: Why? Why should any individual write this way? What would impel someone to go so far from truth to smear another individual or organization, and why, as has been charged on the floor of Congress, should the author level his smear in 1950 as we are arming to repel communism?

I shall not answer that question, but the author raises one that I will answer: is the FBI "good enough, right enough, efficient enough to carry out its job?" It is.

A Bill To Outlaw the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me today and letters with regard thereto:

A bill to outlaw the Communist Party

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the date of the approval of this act it shall be unlawful for any individual knowingly and willfully to become or remain a member of the Communist Party. As used in this section, the term "Communist Party" means the political party now known as the Communist Party of the United States of America, whether or not any change is hereafter made in such name.

SEC. 2. Any alien who is found to be a member of the Communist Party shall, without delay, be taken into custody and deported from the United States.

SEC. 3. Whoever violates any provision of the first section of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., December 20, 1950.

Re H. R. 3290, Eighty-first Congress.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: The fifty-first national encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Chicago, Ill., August 27 to September 1, 1950, endorsed the provisions of H. R. 3290, Eighty-first Congress, copy of which is enclosed.

It is hoped you will reintroduce this bill when the Eighty-second Congress convenes and should you find that our organization can be of assistance toward its advancement, please feel free to call upon us.

With best wishes for a happy holiday season, I am

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

JANUARY 2, 1951.

Director OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COMMANDER: I am very grateful to you for your letter of December 20, endorsing the provisions of H. R. 3290 as introduced by me in the Eighty-first Congress. It is my purpose to reintroduce this bill in the Eighty-second Congress.

Let me commend you and your associates upon the splendid work you are doing and ask that you call upon me for any special service that I may render.

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

Address of Mr. B. M. McKelway at Welcome to Washington Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by B. M. McKelway at the Welcome to Washington dinner, January 4, 1951, Statler Hotel:

The opportunity within grasp of a speaker on this occasion is unique. It finds no duplicate anywhere in the world.

The opportunity is one that permits an ordinary, taxpaying citizen to address an audience which gains its distinction from the presence of so many newly elected and returning Members of a new Congress of the United States.

Many of these Members are fresh from triumphs won at the polls. They come bearing new mandates from the people. They come to assume awesome responsibilities of government, in a time of great trial.

It is possible that this prospect places them in a humble mood, a mood from which no doubt they will quickly recover, but which may make them momentarily receptive to advice.

In these circumstances, ladies and gentlemen, the temptations of a speaker are well-nigh overpowering. There you sit. Here I stand. There are available to you none of those wisely conceived provisions of parliamentary rule by which you can stop the speaker. You cannot note the absence of a quorum and demand a roll call. You cannot request that I yield. I have you, in other words, in a position that any one of millions of citizens of this country would pay a king's ransom to obtain.

Please take note, therefore, of the extent of the speaker's forbearance in visiting to the pleasant role with which he has been honored.

It is the role of one who, in behalf of citizens of the District of Columbia and the members of the Washington Board of Trade, congratulates you upon the electrifying judgment of the electorate and welcomes you to this, your own, city.

This role permits of no admonitions, no advice. We have no favors to ask, no projects to promote, and nothing to sell. What we hope for is your friendship, your understanding, your interest in the wise conduct of a local government of which, under our Constitution, you are exclusive legislative trustees. And what we look for is an opportunity to be of service to you as neighbors who share with you residence in our Nation's Capital.

You come to a city where, as Members of Congress, our local legislators, you are held in high respect. As citizens, with unrivaled opportunity to observe at close range the workings of Congress, we have developed a genuine appreciation of your problems, your labors, your methods, and the exacting demands

effort that underlies great legislative achievement.

If we at times seem indifferent, or even apathetic to the changing tides of political sentiment so quickly reflected in the changing personnel of Congress, it is because we have learned the curiously repetitive patterns of history.

We have learned to recover quickly from our grief at the defeat of old friends, for we know that the ultimate wisdom of the people will either send them back or provide substitutes in the form of new friends.

We have, likewise, learned to restrain our enthusiasm when that same wisdom of the people removes from Congress an occasional thorn in the side of the body politic; for we have learned that with every change of season, nature provides new thorns.

Every 2 years we stand here on the sidelines—silent witnesses to the phenomenon of a national election, and await the result with fatalistic fortitude.

We read the returns, we say to ourselves: "What hath God wrought!" And with this reverent ejaculation bid farewell to old faces and warm welcome to those who return or who, for the first time, have won their spurs in free and fair elections.

Experience has taught us that the people send good men and women, by and large, to Congress, men and women above the average in intelligence, accomplishment, and in their jealous regard for the public welfare and the institutions established to advance it.

Our experience, in this connection, goes back a long way in the life of our Nation, however brief it may be in the history of the world.

Last summer we passed the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the decision by Congress, reached on July 16, 1790, to establish in this area a seat of government, under exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress. It was a close decision, reached by the narrow margin of 32 to 29 in the House and 14 to 12 in the Senate. But it was a decision that held. And 10 years later Congress came to Washington.

Just a few weeks ago we passed the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of that first meeting of Congress in Washington. On that day, November 22, 1800, 138 members of the second session of the sixth Congress met for the first time in the new Capitol. Only a part of the Capitol building had been made ready for this event.

Members of that Congress lacked such bare necessities of life in legislative Halls as foam rubber cushioned seats, the soft glow of indirect lighting, the man-made miracle of regulated accoustics and the g'amour imparted by graceful draperies of fetching hue, hung from roofs that fabricated steel will not permit to fall down on the heads of those below.

President John Adams, who welcomed this Congress to Washington doubtless had this in mind when he said with prophetic optimism: "Although there is cause to apprehend that accommodations are not now so complete as might be wished, yet there is great reason to believe that this inconvenience will cease."

Ladies and gentlemen, those of you who have visited the newly decorated Chambers of House and Senate so recently prepared for your illustrious presence will agree, I believe, that inconvenience has indeed ceased. Period.

President Adams left to the Members of this Congress decision whether they would immediately exercise the powers over the District of Columbia vested by the Constitution in the Congress of the United States.

"It is your opinion," he said, "this important trust ought now to be exercised, you cannot err, while performing it, to take into view the future probable situation of the territory for the happiness of which you are about to provide. You will consider it as the Capital of a great Nation advancing with unexampled rapidity in arts and commerce, in wealth, and in population; and possessing, within itself, those energies and resources which, if not thrown away or lamentably misdirected, will assure to it a long course of prosperity and self-government."

That first Congress which met in Washington did not choose to exercise the trust imposed by the Constitution. There were other things to think about. Many years passed before Congress began to think of Washington as the Capital of a great Nation, or to provide for its development in accordance with that concept. But it is that concept which has grown deeper with the years. We find, in the beautiful city we know today, increasing evidence that Congress shares the pride of all good Americans in their Capital and is motivated by a desire to make its development symbolic of the achievements, the strength, and aspirations of a great Nation.

We, who live here, share with the Members of Congress responsibility for making this desire our living guide. I ask your indulgence in briefly examining some of the attributes of the unusual partnership which brings us together in that great enterprise.

Under the terms of the Constitution, it is you who make all the decisions. You tell us, for example, in addition to the Federal taxes that all Americans pay, the sort of local taxes we must pay. In this respect you have shown great ingenuity. We pay personal- and business-income taxes, real- and tangible-property taxes, sales taxes, use taxes, cigarette taxes, gasoline taxes—taxes on the oil with which we are anointed at birth and taxes on the casket in which we are laid to rest when, tired of paying taxes, we seek that total exemption found only in the grave.

More than 50 percent of the District's real property is exempt from any taxation, because of its ownership by Government and other privileged institutions, and other means must be found to make up in revenue what is lost through this extraordinary and increasing proportion of real property exemption.

The different sections of the country from which you gentlemen come prefer different kinds of taxes. So, when all of you are together in the legislative Chambers on Capitol Hill, there seems to be an irresistible temptation to apply here everything that each one of you has learned about back home.

The amount of money from these taxes has become quite substantial. This year, sitting as our local legislature, you will be called on to appropriate about $135,000,000 to support our local government and its undertakings. More than 90 percent of this money is raised through purely local taxes.

In addition to the decisions regarding local expenditures, you must enact all the legislation which enables the money to be spent, and in the course of a long session of Congress this legislation takes the form of scores of separate bills, dealing in minute detail with the many problems that enter into the conduct of a great metropolitan community.

This responsibility can be an onerous one, and we of Washington appreciate that fact. You are elected to Congress by the people of your districts, or your States. You naturally feel that it is to them you owe your primary allegiance. If your activities in connection with the constitutionally imposed duty of legislating exclusively for this Capital City appears to the voters back home to take too much of the time they feel belongs to them, you may be criticized for it. At least that is the theory, though in practice there are few men indeed whose constructive work for the Nation's Capital has gone unappreciated, here or back home. As evidence of that let me cite the happy circumstance which finds every member of the House District Committee of the Eighty-first Congress returned to the Eighty-second. There was one casualty in the Senate District Committee. But I do not remember that Senator Pepper ever attributed his defeat to anything he did for the District of Columbia. My recollection is that he attributed his defeat to Senator SMATHERS. No Member of Congress in recent years worked more conscientiously and more conspicuously for the District than EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois. What does he do? Goes back home and gets himself elected to the Senate. Do you need any further proof that work for the District of Columbia carries its own reward?

Members of Congress are subject to the often conflicting pressures of groups of voters back home, working through the industrious agents of these groups in Washington. These groups are forever seeking to have things done, or left undone, in Washington because of the possible effect on things they wish to have done, or left undone, back home. And you must often walk a tightrope between these pressures from abroad and the best interests of the people for whose Government you—and only you—are responsible.

We of Washington understand these things. It is because we understand them so well that we place extraordinary value on the services of Members who are assigned to the committees charged with direct responsibility for local government.

But the Members of Congress who win our undying gratitude are those who do not look for the hazards, but who seek the opportunities of service to the Nation which lie in serving the best interests of the Nation's city. Many of the great men in Congress have found that opportunity and have left with us cherished memories, permanently engraved on the cornerstones of the Capital's history.

As we understand you, so those whose service lengthens in Congress come to understand us.

They know we live under one of the most curious political contradictions to be found anywhere in the world—men and women whose accidental residence in the Capital of a Nation dedicated to the principles of self government are denied all means of participation in that Government.

They know that often we do not agree among ourselves. One of the sources of occasional annoyance on Capitol Hill is this inability to agree. In this respect, of course, we are not unlike other Americans, one of whose prized possessions is the right to disagree. The difference is that we lack here the normal means of resolving disagreement by electing representatives of our own choosing to speak for us in Congress. For as long as Congress remains in exclusive control of the American seat of government—a provision which I believe most citizens agree is wise—Congress is our local government and it is in Congress, rather than in one of its agencies, that we need representation.

Experienced Members of Congress know that there are two Washingtons.

There is the political Washington, the Washington that is a figure of speech or a state of mind rather than a physical entity. This is the Washington that governs a great Nation and which has become a sort of Capital of the world. It provides an arena in which there is a continuing struggle for power between antagonistic interests and ideas and where an occasional Christian is thrown to the lions to enliven the interest of the vast audience.

Being a great public spectacle, it attracts the usual retainers and concessionaires—the lobbyists, the pressure groups, the socially and politically ambitious, the climbers, the schemers, all staging their own little sideshows or hawking their wares on the fringes of the big show. This is the Washington most often pictured to the country—a confused, quarrelsome, gossipping, backbiting, meddlesome Washington, plunging from crisis to disaster, then climbing back to crisis again.

But there is the other Washington—the Washington of faithful public servants, of self-respecting American men and women in private employment. In this Washington there are more wage earners off than on the Government payroll. But whether off or on, they are found working loyally together at their jobs, proud of their city, proud of their country, ambitious for their children, supporting their churches, working for better homes, better schools, better libraries, better playgrounds, all of the things that go to make a better community and a better understanding of how to live together.

You will quickly learn to know that first Washington, for it is the Washington that you hear most about. It is the Washington which your people back home may resent and even fear, and you will want no suggestion from any source that it has infected you.

What we want you to know is that second Washington. For you will find that this is the real Washington—the Washington that is made up of your kind of folks, the sort of people you know back home and whose votes sent you here to Congress. The people of this real Washington make their homes here. They do not change with each new political crisis or election, here today and gone tomorrow. They do not think of Congress as an unwieldy, unpredictable, or undependable organism of big government. They think of it as a group of men and women chosen by the people to solve the increasingly complex problem of making successful a great experiment in representative government.

The people of this real Washington respect you. They want you to know them. For they believe that when you learn to know them you will think of them as friends and neighbors whose interests and whose destiny as a community are very closely bound up with your own.

Heartbreak Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 7, 1951:

HEARTBREAK HIGHWAY

Eighth Army troops retiring southward below Seoul are traveling a road they know—and hate. Down this thoroughfare last summer passed the battered regiments thrown into a doomed battle to check the North Korean advance. They retreated under a killing sun and in clouds of dust. The weeks went by and the reinforced United Nations troops marched victoriously forward. Now in the deadly cold of winter they are again being driven south. The dust is still there. As an Associated Press dispatch spoke of it, it is dust that "coated the face, clogged the nostrils, turned eyes into watery red slits, and filled the mouth with so much sand you felt your teeth were wearing away." Beside this tragic route lie the graves of many dead. American casualties alone have now passed 40,000, with a death toll, not yet brought down to date, of 6,761. No wonder the GI's call the passage south from Seoul Heartbreak Highway.

The Korean veteran in the bitterness which accompanies even an orderly retreat in the presence of overwhelming numbers of the enemy may well ask himself whether these dead have died in vain. It is hard for us at home who have not borne the burden of the battle to find any words to answer him. But if the time comes when the United Nations is strong in honor and in power to enforce its decisions, if the time comes when no weak nation is exposed to aggression, if the time comes when there is a world law of freedom and justice—then surely the nations will look back to the graves in Korea through an atmosphere no longer obscured by the dust of conflict and will say with certainty that the blood spilled in Korea was not wasted, and that out of it, even after long torment, there did come "a new birth of freedom."

Who Is Fighting the UN War?—United States Gets No More Aid Against Fresh Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the President deliver his first address to the Eighty-second Congress on the state of the Nation. Surely these are troubled days in which we live. Our people back home seem more alert and more appreciative of our plight than do Members of Congress or the President. While it is a fact that technically as a Nation we are not at war, in reality we are at war. Strictly speaking we are one of the members of the United Nations making our commitments in Korea; but, as a matter of fact, we seem to be practically the only member of the United Nations supplying either men or material in Korea. As members of the United Nations, we are, in a sense, partners in an undertaking. Partnership agreements are serious. Partners can make or break you. While we have hoped and prayed for the success of the United Nations, unless other members of this compact give immediate evidence of their intentions to carry a greater portion of the load, prospects are not bright. Attached hereto I enclose, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt from the January 12 issue of the United States News and World Report:

WHO IS FIGHTING THE UN WAR?—UNITED STATES GETS NO MORE AID AGAINST FRESH ENEMY

United States troops can't count on much more outside help for the next phase in Korea. Others have put up about all they plan.

Communists, in fighting men, hold almost a 2-to-1 advantage. And there are millions more where those came from.

On the other side, United States casualties alone are more than twice the total troops sent in by other UN allies.

The start of one more inning in Korea finds the line-up changed greatly on the Communist side, but virtually unchanged on the side of the United States and the UN.

A whole new team is thrown in by the Communists. Chinese now make up two-thirds of the Communist forces. North Koreans, mainstay of the Communist side in the first 6 months of fighting, take second place.

Communists, in land forces, have 444,000 men involved, as shown on the accompanying map. They have little artillery, few tanks, little air support. Their air arm has Russian planes with pilots of unknown nationality, probably Chinese.

UN combat troops total a little under 275,000. The bulk of these is provided by the United States. American combat forces in Korea number around 150,000. South Koreans come next with a strength of probably 100,000. American casualties are around 50,000 so far, and South Korean losses are very heavy.

No new troops are being supplied by UN countries, although Colombia is preparing to send a battalion later. Canada, which organized a brigade to fight in Korea, proposes to send most of it to Europe, instead. The Canadian battalion already in Korea still is undergoing training.

Britain is leaving her ground strength in Korea at 10,000, pointing out that her far eastern fleet has been serving as part of the UN naval forces almost since the outbreak of the Korean trouble. Australia has a ground unit of 1,500 in action. Turkey's force, originally 4,500, has suffered severe losses.

France has 1,400 soldiers in Korea. She says she cannot furnish more because of the war she is fighting against Communists in Indochina. Siam's unit numbers about 1,200, as does that of the Philippine Republic. Forces of Belgium and Luxemburg, New Zealand, Greece, and the Netherlands are smaller.

No other countries have furnished ground forces for the war in Korea, although some are giving naval or air support. India, with the third largest population in the world, has sent a medical unit, but no fighting men. A medical unit, not combat troops, has been furnished by Sweden.

Latin America is not represented at all among the UN ground forces at this time. Argentina, which spends a large part of her budget on a big and well-trained army, is keeping her soldiers at home. Brazil and Mexico, the two other big countries in Latin America, have good-sized armies, but no troops fighting in Korea. While some small countries have offered recruits, these offers have not been accepted because of the time required to train inexperienced men.

The United States thus, is furnishing the major part of the ground troops fighting the Communists in Korea. Although General MacArthur pleaded for help from other members of the UN, the 24,300 soldiers he actually has received from them amount to less than half the casualties suffered so far by American Ground Forces.

Change of Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, much misleading information has been put forth from administration sources on the action of the House in restoring to its Committee on Rules the

control it formerly had to direct the flow of legislation before the House. Radio commentators and newspaper columnists who follow the Fair Deal line would have us believe that this action gives the committee autocratic power over all legislation. This is not true, for it merely restores the rule that was adopted after the historic fight spearheaded by Senator George W. Norris, when he was a Member of the House, to take dictatorial powers away from the Speaker. The rule was in effect until the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress.

In operation it gives the Committee on Rules the power to consider the relative importance of all bills reported by legislative committees and schedule for action those that the responsible leadership of both parties believe should be considered. When the motion was made 2 years ago to change the rule by permitting committee chairmen to bring a bill before the House if the Rules Committee had not reported it within 21 days, I voted for it. Experience has convinced me that the change has not only proved costly to the taxpayers but could bring disaster to the Government's financial structure. As an illustration, I would point out that in the Eightieth Congress legislative committees reported bills that would have cost the taxpayers $20,000,000,000 more than the revenue estimated to be received by the Government in those 2 years.

In spite of the false propaganda on this subject there are two effective ways to bring legislation before the House without the approval of the Rules Committee. On Calendar Wednesday, which occurs twice each month, chairmen of legislative committees may bring up bills for consideration of the House that have been reported by their committees. Any Member who desires to have a bill considered may prepare a petition to have the committee discharged from further consideration of it and, when he has secured the signatures of 218 Members, a majority of the House, it will automatically come up for action. I am not willing to go back on the handiwork of Senator George W. Norris. It was his efforts which finally resulted in a change of the rules that took from the Speaker dictatorial powers. I am not willing that we should go back to that rule or to permit a small handful of radicals to disturb normal legislative procedures. While I did vote for the change in the rule 2 years ago, I now realize that experience has shown that it does not work. It was for that reason that I voted to restore the rule.

The Wisdom of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, this editorial from a recent issue of the Tidings, official weekly publication of the archdiocese, of Los Angeles. I concur wholeheartedly in the deductions therein. The editorial follows:

THE WISDOM OF THE PEOPLE

There is still the torrent of words in correct syntax and measured cadence, phrased impeccably. There is still the air of detachment, the aloofness of an ivory tower, the sustained calm as the columns crumble. There is still the icy disdain of the commonsense of the American people as it awakes in the swift surge of disaster. And Secretary Acheson pursues grimly the undeviating course which, with the shame of further appeasement, can only increase the gathering peril.

There must be no reexamination of policy, no searching of the national soul as our diplomacy scrupulously adheres to the evil commitments of Yalta, never revealed fully to the American people, never approved by our elected representatives in plenary session. How can the Nation hope for the blessings of peace from such perfidy, such dishonor? The friends we favored fast fade away in our plight, bored by our cynicism and sophistry. Only the brave souls of leaders, to whom we refused the badge of valor and the bond of fellowship, stand ready to aid us even in their helplessness of our own making.

The President must heed the will of the people as it rises in unanimous chorus over the land. This is the voice of a people inflamed with love for this land of sanctuary, in dread lest the noble temple of America be leveled in the dust, who know our roots in the story of the conquest of a continent, and who in the aid of freedom have by talent and enterprise and hard work and competence and wholesome living builded this Nation wisely and well. There are no echoes in this voice of traffic with an evil thing, of concession to cunning and injustice, of fellowship with the face of cruelty and slaughter, of unconcern with the fate of heroes, saints, and martyrs. This is the voice of the real America which must again prevail in the councils of the Nation.

For it is our mounting determination that our leaders must shake off the dust that has marred the noble facade of the temple of America since our disastrous recognition of Soviet Russia in 1933. We confess now that our own moral eclipse and lack of political insight and interest, made easy the infiltration by artful propaganda of something foreign to the American scene, and we reel toward disaster as the dizzying pattern staggers to its fateful culmination. It is not too late to purge the poison. There is yet time to return to the well-springs of strength. Repudiation of the evil is our high resolve and with it the calm appraisal of guilt both at home and abroad.

We can now make only spiritual reparation for our abandonment of the Baltics, our betrayal of the valor of the Poles and its glorious Christian traditions of a thousand years, our unconcern with the faith and freedom of the Balkans as they slipped into a new night of terror and tyranny. We take meager comfort in the fact that their fate was never submitted for approval to the generous heart of America, and can only wonder how supposedly Christian statesmen could have been bewitched by the illusory smile on the face of an atheistic despotism. As a people we begin to make spiritual reparation for the shame of Yalta and Tehran and Potsdam.

The people too look about to see what can be salvaged of the national honor. We give aid to Tito in the forlorn hope that tyranny will crush tyranny, unmindful of the democratic hopes and aspirations of the vast majority of the suffering Slavs and Croats. These in their sorrow cry out to us that tears water no crop, and that if there is drought that fills the land with famine, it is because a despotism no less crushing than the Kremlin's quenches the fires of hope and even of life.

We make as yet only hesitant approaches to enlist in our cause the valor of Spain. Poised below the Pyrenees is a people, alone in Europe, which has the will and the courage to defend the culture of Europe and the Christian faith, with scythes if necessary, and aid voted by Congress 6 months ago has been deliberately withheld by the President who has callously remarked that, even with the withdrawal in part of United Nations sanctions against Spain, it will be a long time before there is an exchange of ambassadors.

And our leaders ignore the will of the people in the Far East. Even while the hordes of Mao are dealing decimation and death to our forces in Korea, we still neutralize Formosa and immobilize the half million hardened campaigners of Chiang who, by a diversionary maneuver in south China, could not only relieve the pressure in Korea, but with the help of guerrillas on the mainland and aided by internal unrest, could rewin China to the circle of free nations. With China slave, not only Asia but the world is imperiled. With China free, the Red march is ended.

These are the deep-seated findings of the wisdom of the people as it searches its soul in the fearful crisis, and with neither recrimination nor hysteria America looks to its leaders for a clearer vision and a newer strength.

An Impossible Job for the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a news column by Father James Gillis, C. S. P., who calls attention to a situation that is impossible for the United States. I include it at this point and commend it to the membership of this House:

IMPOSSIBLE FOR ONE NATION TO REDRESS WRONGS OF WORLD—WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE WORLD

(By Father James Gillis, C. S. P.)

Some weeks ago in this column, under the caption "Resist aggression everywhere?" I discussed the obligation of the United States to remedy the wrongs and cure the ills of the world. On December 7, Walter Lippmann wrote on virtually the same subject.

If I had written after, instead of before him, I might have borrowed a quotation he made from a memorandum of Gladstone to Queen Victoria. It seems that in their day there were some Englishmen who thought that England should do for the world what some Americans now think we should do. Gladstone, though somewhat of an idealist, refused to take on any such impossible task. Lippmann quotes from what the Prime Minister wrote to the Queen in 1869:

"Is England so uplifted in strength above every other nation that she can with prudence advertise herself as ready to undertake the general redress of wrongs? Would not the consequence of such professions and promises be either the premature exhaustion of her means, or a collapse in the day of performance? Is any power at this time of today warranted in assuming to itself this comprehensive obligation?"

England was not strong enough in 1869 to undertake the general redress of wrongs.

Neither is America strong enough to do so in 1950.

The familiar sonnet by Emma Lazarus which was placed on the Statue of Liberty runs, in part:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me."

That could be said in good heart in 1895. I doubt if we would dare ask Europe and Asia to send us all their tired, poor, huddled masses today.

As far back as 1814 Thomas Jefferson, commonly considered the father of American democracy, wrote to John Adams his suspicion that the Canaille of the cities of Europe if permitted to come to our shores would pervert our American freedom to the demolition and destruction of everything public. Elsewhere he spoke with contempt and apprehension of the mobs of great cities which he said "would do to our form of government what sores do to the human body."

But that danger is as nothing compared with what will happen to us if, not waiting for the poor, tired, huddled masses to come to us, we go overseas to find them, feed them, clothe them, fight their battles for them, free them from the tyrants that oppress them.

It is beautiful, no doubt, to have a heart as big as the world, and it is understandably Christian to share one's goods with others. But I wonder what a parish priest would say, or a member of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, if a family in the parish were to impoverish itself by giving away more than it could afford, and if the father of that family borrowed money which he could never pay back, just to make himself a good fellow by handing out to others what he had borrowed, let us say from the church. Is charity synonymous with improvidence?

The civil law takes the control of money or the administration of an estate away from an incompetent trustee. But a government also can be extravagant and irresponsible. If it runs up a debt of $250,000,000,000 and keeps on pouring out other billions and tens of billions, scattering all over the world the resources which it is supposed to hold in trust for its own citizens, that government might well be declared unfit to function.

Such, I suppose, was in effect what Gladstone told Queen Victoria: "England is rich and powerful"—she was in 1869—"but she is not in a position to pay the debts of all the countries of the world, build their armies and navies, and fight their battles."

Mr. Lippmann suggests that Mr. Truman and Mr. Attlee take advantage of the principle handed down from Gladstone. I would go further and say that we at least should take counsel from common sense, not dissipate our resources and waste the lives of our young men in the mad effort to do what no other nation in all history ever attempted to do and what no nation is called upon to do—the impossible.

Moral Requirements in a Three-Pronged Peace Offensive—By the Reverend Dr. O. Frederick Nolde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, there was held yesterday in the Washington Cathedral a service of prayer and dedication for the Members of the Eighty-second Congress, sponsored by the Washington Cathedral and the Washington Federation of Churches. At this significant service, an address was delivered by the Reverend Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, Dean of the Graduate School of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, and director of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. I am sure many Members of this Congress will desire that this address be made available for their use and, therefore, I include Dr. Nolde's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MORAL REQUIREMENTS IN A THREE-PRONGED PEACE OFFENSIVE

As we move into the second half of the twentieth century, the horizon of a peaceful world seems far-distant and the path leading to it is darkened by low-hanging clouds of war. The hearts of many are gripped by despair, for they find no secure chart or compass for the road they must travel. For them two alternatives seem inescapable. The one leads to total global war and the prospect is terrifying. The other requires appeasement and, while the timid find it tempting, the courageous revolt against it and the wise reject it because they know that it merely postpones the evil day. Men are disposed to say with the Preacher of Old: "Vanity of vanities; all is vanity."

A mood such as this does not befit the Christian. In yielding to defeatism, men deny the faith of Christianity. The world picture is dark and no effort to relieve it by shallow panaceas is justified. Nevertheless, to every individual Christian there is available the eternal gospel of Jesus Christ with its assurance of forgiveness, of comfort, and of strength. Moreover, the truth of Christianity has meaning for every situation which man faces, be it in his personal experience or in the context of world relationships.

The greatest danger before us, too often unperceived, is that in frustration and fear we become preoccupied solely with personal and national well-being. On bended knee, our people and their representatives in government should pray Almighty God, not for safety and security as ultimate good, but for a new vision of service. Our national policy ought to flow from a profound concern for people—for all people in every land—with a penetrating understanding that our interests are best served when we serve the interests of others. With full recognition to our shortcomings, we must remember that the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, not to condemn but to save the world. These are eternal truths, and in them the moral imperatives which can give direction to a peace offensive find their source and their impulse.

THE CONTEMPORARY SCENE

The effective application of Christian truth for the healing of the nations requires its interpretation in the light of immediate realities. In a vast upsurging which began long before the First World War, peoples of every race, color, and creed are clamoring for equality of personal status and for a fair share of this world's material goods. We are caught in the swirl of a world-wise revolution. While some societies have been revitalized and over 700,000,000 people have attained political independence, the upsurge continues with undiminished force.

Competing to meet the demands of this world-wide revolution are two major systems—the one requiring uniformity of thought and practice under governmental coercion, and the other seeking to preserve individual freedom with responsibility. Whereas about one-third of the human race is currently under Soviet domination, it is significant to note that there is no country where the people have voluntarily accepted the system of Soviet communism. The United States, having lent economic assistance to a degree unequaled in history, is viewed with mingled feelings of gratitude for its generosity, jealousy because of its power, and suspicion as to its future intentions or demands.

The competition between the two systems of life—which could and should be peaceful—became an imminent and open threat to the peace with Russia's apparent willingness to use or to encourage force in expanding the area of Communist control in Korea. The United Nations authorized an international police action which has, on varying grounds and in various ways, been opposed and resisted by North Korea, by the peoples' government of China, and by the U. S. S. R. To the ideological conflict has been added a conflict of military power wherein the authority of the United Nations is challenged and flouted.

In response to the threat of Soviet military power the United States as well as other countries have undertaken a far-flung program of military preparation. The reality of the situation is that the world is divided into two armed camps and that governments which oppose the expansion of communism are making strenuous effort to build a military power sufficient for any emergency.

Moral decision as to the course we should follow in face of this explosive situation requires at least an attempt to forecast its prospects and dangers. Two possibilities seem to lie ahead. The first is that Russia will in the very near future start a third world war by direct or indirect aggressive action. The second possibility is that Russia, following known tactics of advance and retreat, will for a period of time so modify its effort to expand by force as to seem to make our military preparations foolish or unnecessary. I respectfully submit that grave peril awaits us if we do not reckon with both possible eventualities.

THE MORAL IMPERATIVE

The outlook is precarious, whether of global conflict in the near future or of long-drawn-out tension. Yet we dare not shrink from it. To us in our day comes the awesome and searching question which the Prophet Micah addressed to the people of Israel: "What doth the Lord require of thee?" Our national traditions and our profession, if not always our practice, make an evasion of that question unthinkable.

Two presuppositions provide the background from which our answer must be projected. The first is the conviction that God in His goodness makes available strength in proportion to the needs of the hour. Christianity was born and lived in adversity, and Christians have risen to greatest heights when confronted by the most critical tests. God will provide strength at this moment of history if we will only use what he places at our disposal. In the second place, we hold to the belief that even in this trying hour a third world war is not inevitable, and we must act accordingly. In accepting that view we do not delude ourselves. Recent events have considerably diminished the margin of possibility. We are on the brink of a precipice. To avoid being plunged into the abyss, we must explore to the full every possibility which that thin margin affords us.

Conscious of our true strength and discerning the goal of our immediate striving, what shall we now do? The full text of Micah's question offers a clue for the moral imperative as we face the dilemma of today. "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thy God?" In order to derive this timeless message a directive which relates to present need, I venture to propose that the people of the United States and their representatives in Government are called upon to manifest a dignified humility,

born of purposeful strength and not of weakness, dedicated to the service of all men in building economically healthy and morally free societies, and committed to the peaceful solution of world problems through international cooperation under the United Nations.

A THREE-PRONGED PEACE OFFENSIVE

Our task is merely begun when we frame a sweeping statement of our moral obligation. If the exposition of God's requirement is to be really helpful, it must be characterized by far greater precision and definiteness. At this point the Christian invariably encounters serious difficulty. He seeks to remain faithful to his highest principles and yet he knows that an evil situation thwarts their full application. Shall he risk an accommodation of Christian idealism to immediate problems in order to encourage and support attainable steps toward the ultimate goal? While some are loath to do this, I am convinced that we have no tenable alternative. We must fight the battle for peace in the context of an imperfect and evil world.

With this point of view, I propose for your consideration a balanced three-pronged peace offensive where emphasis is laid on our moral obligations in relation to actually existing military, economic-social, and political conditions. In doing so, I claim that while we cannot at this time hope to get sympathetic audience from Soviet-controlled areas, we can so govern our own actions by justice and good will as progressively to extend the area of our influence and ultimately win a hearing from those who now oppose us. Be assured that my propositions grow out of an appreciation of the heavy burden which our governmental officials are carrying in our behalf and the desire of our churches to share that burden with them in any appropriate manner.

I. Our military strength must be sincerely and steadfastly devoted to the cause of peace

We have to face facts unflinchingly. The United States and countries allied with it are bent upon building a military strength unparalleled in their history. With what attitude shall we as Christians view this effort? While there are some who believe that force should never be used, the preponderant majority reluctantly accepts the necessity of military strength to serve as a deterrent to aggression and, wherever aggression occurs, as a means of opposing it.

In taking my stand with the preponderant majority, I insist that we must clearly recognize the dangers in a situation where the world is divided into two armed camps, and particularly the dangers for which we may be responsible. If Russia should start a third world war—whether for purposes of expansion or in fear of our growing strength—the decisions is out of our hands. However, if Russia on strategic grounds exercises restraint for a prolonged period of time, we may through lack of forethought become an actual threat to the peace. In this latter event, knowing that the danger of aggression lingers even though dormant, we would nevertheless have no clear justification for using the military strength we have built. In our impatience and with our society geared to military action, we may then be tempted increasingly to risk or even to create situations which would give rise to global conflict.

Under these circumstances, the churches have an important, perhaps a determining, part to play. They must cultivate in our people the moral restraints which will keep military strength under control and indicate the direction to be followed in order that strength may contribute to peace. On moral grounds, participation in military preparations ought to be measured by the sincerity with which the following six commitments are made and the fidelity with which they are honored in practice.

1. We must not be the instrumentality of starting war—now or in the future, openly or under the wicked pretense of self-righteousness. If war should come, and God forbid that it may, it must be irrevocably thrust upon us by others than ourselves and every alternative recourse which our interpretation of God's will for man can entertain must first have been honestly explored.

2. We must keep military measures at every point to the absolute minimum which circumstances will allow. Those who resist the decisions of the United Nations should be denied the comfort and assurance of a pledge not to resort to drastic measures if their actions leave no reasonable alternative. At the same time, the hysteria which calls for the use of atomic bombs without full account of attending moral and political consequences must be curbed in season and out of season. All share in this responsibility to preserve calm determination—Government officials, press and radio, as well as people in every walk of life.

3. We must invite and encourage the use of the United Nations Peace Observation Commission at every potential danger spot throughout the world to deter aggression or to identify the aggressor when it occurs. The United States has expressed and must indicate readiness to expose its actions to impartial scrutiny.

4. In determining when military action shall be taken, we must accept a moral judgment to the extent that it is reflected by majority opinion in the United Nations. One hopeful factor in the United Nations decision to recommend military measures against aggression by North Korea was the emergency for the first time in history of international police action, imperfect though that recognizedly was. That new factor must be retained and improved. The day when any one country has the right by itself to declare war on another is past.

5. We must accept as a provisional goal a sufficient balance of military power-in-being to permit the peaceful competition of conflicting ideologies. Such a situation would be obviously precarious. Nevertheless, as an intermediate objective of military preparations, its preference to war justifies the risk.

6. We must work toward the ultimate objective—now and continuingly—of bringing all national armaments under international regulation and control. The United Nations has voted to merge its approaches to the international control of conventional and atomic weapons. It is not fantastic to hold that the futility of a progressively accelerated armaments race may at some point convince all parties that international jurisdiction is the only solution. At all events the effort must be made.

What does God require of us? If we accept the necessity of military strength—and that decision I insist is ours as human beings—our actions will more nearly reflect Christian principles by accepting such restraints and directives as I have proposed. Should they not be accepted, the unity of the American people in support of a military program will on grounds of conscience be difficult to achieve and to maintain.

II. In opposing totalitarian communism we must willingly constitute ourselves a continuing servant of the world in helping to build economically healthy and morally free societies

Military strength may give reassurance and time, but it will not in itself win the victory of social health and freedom. Over the past 5 years we employed the strategy of reinvigorating societies so that communism might not look attractive from within and that infiltration and subjection from without would involve the likelihood of popular resistance. That strategy was measurably successful, perhaps so successful as to prompt Russia's recourse to force. Shall we now forsake the very means which proved effective and put all our eggs in a military basket?

What will we have gained if, in increased military strength in Western Europe, standards of living over a period of time are so lowered that the prospect of communism again becomes inviting to the masses who do not reckon with ultimate costs? Or, if in giving air and naval protection to countries in the Far East, they continue to endure unaided the devastations of famine and the irritating knowledge that social conditions remain unimproved? We must constantly be alert to the danger of preoccupation with military measures to the exclusion or at least the neglect of affirmative measures which are right in themselves and, because of their inherent rightness, stand as a bulwark against Soviet communism.

ECONOMIC HEALTH

Insofar as economic health goes the problem obviously is to find resources for building the necessary military strength and, at the same time, to have available the means for economic aid. I trust you will not consider me unrealistic when I suggest a specific illustration, allowing that the mode and timing of its application require further study.

The Hebrews in Old Testament times practiced tithing, and many Christians have with modifications followed in that tradition. Our Nation has a religious heritage. Ought we not now as a people, inextricably caught in the web of military necessity, designate over and beyond what we are currently doing one-tenth of our military appropriation for specifically affirmative peace measures? This would mean that if we are willing to spend an extra $30,000,000,000 for negative means to secure the peace we would also be ready to spend an extra $3,000,000,000 for positive measures. The proportion may be too small, but the possibilities almost baffle the imagination. The United Nations technical-assistance program could be considerably strengthened and expanded. United Nations Peace Observation Commissions, adequate in manpower and literally scattered over the face of the earth, could be financed. Many other areas of useful expenditure could be cited, and, above all, we would be giving to the world at least a substantial indication as to our future intent.

To finance such a venture new or modified patterns which appropriately correlate military and economic enterprises should be imaginatively explored. If these prove unfeasible, I believe the American people would be ready to carry the added burden and may in fact be more prepared thereby to support military preparations.

MORAL FREEDOM

Insofar as freedom and human rights are concerned, we must steadfastly strengthen our domestic observance. In addition to long-standing problems, we encounter in the concentration of emergency powers the danger of approaching the totalitarian practices which we condemn in Soviet countries. Our people should flock to their churches to derive inspiration and strength from worship and study. They should freely but responsibly exercise their right of opinion and expression. They should above all respect the rights and freedoms of their neighbors. Our Government, in a manner far more impressive than heretofore, should lead the way in establishing international jurisdiction for the protection of human rights. Recognizing a common bond, be it of humanity or of faith, we should exhaust every means to get close to people behind the iron curtain, even giving consideration to a wholesale infiltration of the next session of the People's Peace Congress no matter where it may be held. We should support and enlarge a truth campaign that really rings true.

What does the Lord require of His people? One need have no qualm of conscience in calling for the fullest possible use of our resources, commensurate with other needs, in building economically healthy and morally free societies.

III. We must steadfastly seek such avenues of negotiation as will command the confidence of our allies and give to those who oppose us every opportunity for the just settlement of outstanding issues

Recent experiences show that negotiation tends to be successful, as in the case of the Berlin blockade, when a de facto settlement has already been achieved or is fairly certain of achievement. As we grow stronger, we must be careful to increase rather than to diminish our readiness to negotiate.

If we are to be diplomatically effective, domestic unity is an urgent requirement. The democratic right of criticism and dissent must be preserved, but opinion must be formed on the basis of merit. Our people want a bipartisan foreign policy, where representation characterizes both the formation and the administration of that policy. They have too much at stake to permit international issues to become the football of party politics and welcome the growing restraint which is sensitive to a condition of emergency.

Pride and face-saving tendencies must be rejected if negotiation is to produce results. We are grateful for the exercise of restraint and dignity in the administration of our foreign affairs. We must be constantly ready, on our own part and on our own initiative, to revise policies and decisions if sound reason therefor is at hand. Observation of international deliberations reveals how important are the tact and delicacy of method whereby a reversal of policy is publicly sponsored.

Beyond the domestic scene, the process of taking political and military decisions requires an alertness to the interests and self-respect of those who honestly support the United Nations. For example, without minimizing the responsibilities which ought to be met by western European countries, we must see the respects wherein their problems differ from ours. Is it not sensible to seek to heal the social sores in West Germany and to win friendship as a prerequisite to their cooperation in opposing communism? Have we reckoned fully enough with the implications of a divided Germany—as a replica of Korea and in face of what five more years of Soviet indoctrination will mean to its youth—and have we given sufficient thought to ways whereby as a minimum lines of communication could be opened between East and West Germany? Countries of the Far and Middle East, many of which have recently gained political stature, merit increasing responsibility for decisions, subject to their heeding our points of view as we show willingness to heed their points of view.

In my references to political negotiation, I have intentionally avoided the suggestion of technical solutions and have stressed factors of dignified human relations. Reconciliation is a fundamental principle of Christianity and reconciliation must become operative at the international political level through negotiations which are prompted by justice, mercy, and good will.

PRAYER FOR PEACE

It is my conviction that Christian testimony to the world of nations can move only in the arena where the issues are fought. Catastrophe not of our making may break upon us at any time and for that we must be prepared. Nevertheless, so long as there remains even a marginal possibility of averting total global war, we must wage an inclusive peace offensive where our spiritual as well as our material strength is devoted to the promotion of peace, dedicated to service in building economically healthy and morally free societies, and committed to international cooperation through the United Nations.

We must remain steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as we know that our labor in the Lord is not in vain. In our churches and in our homes, let supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

At this time, let us pray together the prayer for peace which the World Council of Churches has enjoined upon churches and Christians throughout the world:

Almighty God our heavenly father guide we beseech Thee the nations of the world into the way of justice and truth and establish among them that peace which is the fruit of righteousness. Amen.

A Momentous Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 7, 1951:

A MOMENTOUS SPEECH

Mr. TAFT's great speech in the Senate on Friday may have momentous consequences.

Most political speeches are quickly forgotten, but once or twice in a century a public man gets on his feet to say something which has a profound influence on the course of events. That happened, we know, when Lincoln in 1858 applied the momentous phrase from the Bible about the house divided against itself to the current political controversy. That text destroyed old parties and created new ones.

There is no parallel phrase in Mr. TAFT's speech. Taken as a whole, however, the speech may well shake men from their traditional party loyalties and shake the parties themselves to their foundations.

The great question dividing Americans today is concerned with the role of America in the world. There are those who hold it to be America's duty to devote all its resources and men and wealth to the task of world salvation. In pursuit of that idea we have fought two fruitless wars and are now engaged in another in Korea.

There are others, for whom Mr. TAFT speaks, who hold that the primary duty of the American Government is to employ our men and resources for the safety of our own people and the preservation of their liberties.

There are men of both views in both our political parties. The Dewey and VANDENBERG Republicans properly belong in Mr. Truman's camp. The KENNEDY Democrats properly belong in Mr. TAFT's camp. The question is how long members of the old parties can allow their traditional partisanship to bind them to the transcendent political issue of our times, the issue, as we said before, of determining America's role in the world.

The Republicans and the Democrats, alike, will have to make their choices. In Lincoln's day, the Democrats tried to be on both sides of the question and thereby lost the North and the country.

Just such a situation is developing again today. The people all over the country are aroused, as they have not been in many years, over the Korean fiasco and they see that it is the direct consequence of the Truman-Acheson-Dewey line of policy. They see, also, that unless the policy is altered, a much bigger and much more destructive war lies ahead.

Political parties, once established, are sturdy and it would be foolish, indeed, to suppose that they can be pulverized by a speech. It would be equally foolish to suppose that parties can survive which do not take a position on the transcendent issue of their times. On the decision which must soon be reached, everything we are and everything we have are at stake; and everybody who is of military age, everybody who has a son, and all of us who pay taxes know it. Parties which hide from this issue are certain to be discredited and must expect to disintegrate.

Mr. TAFT's speech will satisfy all Republicans except the more extreme world savers who follow Dewey. It went a little further in the direction of interventionism than some of us would go, but his doctrine is, if not wholly satisfactory, then so nearly so and so immensely preferable to Mr. Truman's that the choice is an easy and obvious one.

All in both parties who now recognize the folly of the Roosevelt-Truman line can and, indeed must, if they are honest, rally around Mr. TAFT. For the others, there is Truman.

Red Iron Curtain, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Communists who have been parading under the guise of being an American political party having any justifiable claim to such title have forfeited any such standing through the iron-curtain conduct of their fifteenth annual convention just completed in New York City.

In striking contrast to the open and public manner in which the two present-day major political parties carry on their conventions, the American Red conspirators have just concluded a conclave under supersecret conditions.

Circumstances under which the convention was held should convince some of our gullible Americans who tend to shed crocodile tears of sympathy when our authorities seek to crack down on the Red party, that this Red organization is a plot and not a party.

At the recent Republican and Democrat national conventions the press, radio, and television were able to give full coverage and place the sessions under the public eye. But not so with this Red convention.

The New York Times reports that it was not until the end of the first-day sessions that newspapermen were even advised as to the location of the secret convention but they were not permitted to attend. Their only source of news was from such press releases as the Communist Party chiefs had prepared by their henchmen. The convention moved on with utmost secrecy. So goes the conspiracy.

Reporters for the New York Mirror learned that the 200 delegates were dispatched to small secret meetings the night before the convention and given directions as to their security conduct during the sessions. They were not to use names in making notations about the convention deliberations. They were never to tear up and discard their notes in the vicinity of the convention hall. They were not to use telephones in the convention hall. Luggage could not be carried into the hall by delegates. Obviously, the Reds feared hidden microphones or concealed recording apparatus.

All of the Red officers who have been indicted and convicted in our Federal courts of conspiracy to advocate the violent overthrow of our Government were highly praised by the convention, according to the Red press releases. Furthermore, they were unanimously reelected. Special recognition was given the national secretary of the party, who has not only been convicted of the conspiracy but could not attend the convention because he is in jail for contempt of Congress.

Communists have long since lost any claim as an American political party, and we will do well to take a warning from this recent iron-curtain convention and recognize the organization for the conspiracy that it is.

Our Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

GREENWOOD, S. C., *January 4, 1951.*

Hon. BRYAN DORN,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are deeply concerned over present world conditions, and particularly the role that the United States is now called upon to take. We realize that the United States must have friends, and we are proud of the friends that we have. We deeply feel, however, that our Representatives in Congress and our United States Senate should be most careful in their votes and actions so as not to commit the Armed Forces of this Nation piecemeal throughout the world. Unless we are careful such a policy will dissipate our strength and might possibly render us impotent when and if we as a people are attacked. We would respectfully present that money, munitions, or armament might be replaced, but manpower cannot be replaced. We do not mean that friendly countries should not be helped for they constitute real defenses for this Nation. We do feel, however, that such aid should be given for the most part to those nations who seek along with our help to do something for themselves.

We respectfully present that we are for peace and for this country always. We should arm now, and keep our Armed Forces at such strength as to be able to defend this Nation at all times. We do feel, however, that we should be most careful in the commitment of our Armed Forces piecemeal on the field of battle in places throughout the world for such a policy might dissipate the Armed Forces of this Nation and leave us with inadequate forces to protect ourselves in time of need.

Yours very truly,

GREENWOOD COUNTY GRAND JURY,
By E. W. MILROAD, *Foreman.*

Articles by Arthur Krock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Mr. Arthur Krock, distinguished reporter, which appeared in the New York Times of January 4 and 5, 1951:

IN THE NATION—A WINDWARD ANCHOR FOR A POSSIBLE STORM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 3.—The anxiety in Congress over the constitutional issue which is presented by the Executive's conditional promise to help garrison Western Europe in advance of aggression found its first expression today in a resolution offered by Representative COUDERT, of New York City. The obvious objective, by asserting the constitutional view that Congress has the power to forbid the dispatch of American troops abroad, is to prevent a solely Executive decision with respect to Western Europe.

The simple and direct means invoked in the Coudert resolution to require the prior approval of Congress flows from the power of the purse. This is granted to Congress exclusively in section 8, article I, of the Constitution, that also empowers Congress to raise and maintain the Armed Forces. Mr. COUDERT proposes that no military appropriation, existing or hereafter made, shall be used to send additional troops abroad without the prior and specific approval of the national legislature.

A respected line of legal opinions supports the thesis that "Congress can forbid troops being sent out of the country"—the words of Elihu Root in a Senate debate on August 14, 1912. But Root also contended that, if Congress did not forbid, full authority for such an action was lodged in the President. Any action by Congress to forbid sending additional troops to Western Europe for its land defense (which, if the President had already ordered this, would create a constitutional crisis and irrevocably destroy the anti-Communist front) would be forestalled by approval of the real point of the Coudert resolution. It also has the merit of providing a method for the two coordinate branches of the Government concerned—the executive and the legislative—to act as one in the matter, and hence make affirmative action truly that of the United States Government.

THE PROSPECT OF JOINT ACTION

Joint affirmation is the extreme likelihood if General Eisenhower advises the President that Western Europe has met the condition of his commitment—that it must fully cooperate in its own defense—and that the project is feasible and essential to our own defense. Few think the President would agree to send the troops in any other circumstance, and few doubt that Congress would dispute a decision thus reached. But if the President sent troops for the land defense of Western Europe in advance of aggression without asking Congress for its approval, a growing number fear a violent and destructive dispute over jurisdiction.

The President has given no indication that he would take this step unilaterally; also, none that he would not. However, since the project was not even mentioned in the debates on the North Atlantic treaty and the first arms assistance bill, and yet Mr. Truman has made the conditional commitment, many in Congress are disturbed lest he might find the order within his concept of the powers of the Commander in Chief and the implied obligations of the treaty.

That is certainly possible, in view of the fact that the national peril is so much more plain than it was when the treaty and the arms pact were debated in Congress. And, if the President should conclude that the garrisoning of Western Europe in advance of aggression is necessary under his oath-bound liability for national security, and within his constitutional authority, history has made it very clear to Congress that its post facto challenge could be issued only in terms of refusing to maintain the additional troops, or by process of impeachment, or both. And surely there are few if any Members who would urge either move or count on the support, of the Nation if they did.

WHEN LEGAL SANCTION IS WANTED

The jurisdictional conflict reflected in Mr. COUDERT's proposal is embedded in the Constitution. Lawyers can and have argued it both ways. But Presidents who have asserted implied powers as Commanders in Chief have prevailed by making their interpretations faits accomplis. And most Presidents have expected Government lawyers to find the cover of the law for them and rarely have been disappointed.

When, in 1940, President Roosevelt decided to transfer 50 over-age destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for air and naval bases his power to do so was plainly limited by a law which required prior certification from armed service authorities that such material is not essential to the defense of the United States. But four prominent lawyers—C. C. Burlingham, T. D. Thacher, George Rublee, and Dean Acheson—removed the obstacle of the language. If, they said, the armed services authorities should certify that national defense would be served rather than hurt by the transfer it would be legal. Though Admiral Stark, then Chief of Naval Operations, had previously said that defense requirements would not permit the Navy to surrender even a rowboat, the President got the certificate the lawyers suggested and acted without prior reference to Congress.

Mr. Roosevelt used to complain—like many of his predecessors—of Government attorneys who told him why he couldn't do things instead of how he could—a grievance he asserted in 1933 by dismissing Mr. Acheson, then Under Secretary of the Treasury, for holding illegal the gold purchase plan. And once, when the War Shipping Administration declined a British request for ships on the ground that the law forbade it, the President asked, "If the Attorney General says it is legal, will you agree?" The desired opinion came next morning.

IN THE NATION—THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW OF HIS POWERS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 4.—It is one thing to say, as the President did at his press conference today, that he does not need the specific approval of Congress to send additional troops to Europe. It is quite another to assume from this broad reply to a general question that Mr. Truman will assign such troops for the land defense of Western Europe, in advance of Russian aggression, without seeking this prior approval.

He may act unilaterally, if or when the project of a Western European army with American units is approved by General Eisenhower on the basis of the surveys the General is about to make abroad as supreme commander of what as yet is a paper force. Or, because the project was not forecast in the Senate debates on the North Atlantic Treaty or in congressional consideration of the first arms assistance appropriation, and because there are evidences that Congress believes its prior approval is a legal requirement, the President may ask for it. A resolution submitted yesterday by Representive COUDERT, of New York City, requiring that no part of the current or future military budget be used for the dispatch or maintenance of additional American troops abroad, presupposes wide support of this position in the Eighty-second Congress.

If that shall prove true, and the test may be hastened by the casual appraisal of his constitutional powers which the President made today, it would seem to be the part of wisdom for Mr. Truman to associate Congress specifically with the land defense of Western Europe, in advance of aggression, as projected. If he goes to the Capitol on this errand with the backing of General Eisenhower, and few think he would execute the project otherwise, as few see any possibility that his program would be rejected.

THE DIFFERENT APPROACH

That is for the President to decide. World events, the response of our North Atlantic allies to General Eisenhower's notice today that they must make equal sacrifices with the United States, and the mood displayed meanwhile by Capitol committees which after all, control military expenditures will undoubtedly influence this decision. Wisely handled, the constitutional argument raised at the Capitol can be dissipated. Less wisely handled, it can be rejected by the President in the knowledge that Executives can and have often presented Congress with faits accomplis which have so deeply involved the Nation that Congress perforce has accepted them. Badly mishandled, the eventual procedure could evoke a constitutional crisis which would add to the national peril.

The form of the question asked the President left all this in doubt. Additional troops to Europe could be replacement in the Army of Occupation, supervising cadres of arms aid distribution and other units on similarly restricted errands. No tenable doubt exists that the President can do these things, and they are not covered in the Coudert resolution by any reasonable construction. Mr. Truman may have viewed the question in these terms. On the other hand, he may have accepted as a fact that his questioner was referring to the precise issue raised by Mr. COUDERT and others and intended his answer to be both general and specific, and a denial of Elihu Root's construction of the Constitution when he said, on August 14, 1912, that "Congress could by law forbid" sending troops out of the country. The future will resolve this opaqueness. A press conference, doomed to loosely phrased questions and off-the-cuff answers, is not the forum for ultimate clarification.

OTHER OBSCURITIES

Like everything connected with the twilight area of the Constitution which the current dispute once again discloses, even Root's confident declaration is subject to reservations. When the eminent New York lawyer said this in the Senate he could not have foreseen the day when the United States would enter by treaty into a peacetime military alliance with nations of Europe, as it did when the Senate in 1949 approved the North Atlantic compact. Also, no Senate in his day had bound the nation by treaty to such an instrument as the Charter of the United Nations, which requires each member if called on to furnish armed forces for service anywhere against aggression, after the making of certain military agreements. These agreements have never been made, but, if or when the American executive and legislative branches assent to them, Congress could not exercise as broad a power as Root conceded to it.

Incidentally, it is not generally understood that, in the absence of these military agreements, the United States was not legally obligated under the Charter to send anti-aggression forces to Korea or to send them anywhere else hereafter. This is the reservation made plain in article 43, chapter VII. In reply to another question today the President said that in Korea we are carrying out an obligation to the United Nations which we assumed when we signed (ratified) the Charter. But it is still a moral obligation, at the most. In June the Council was careful only to "recommend" the Korean action.

All of these points seem certain to be vigorously debated in this Congress, the vigor accentuated by the Coudert resolution and the President's off-the-cuff statements today. But they do not alter the historic fact that the Constitution has a twilight zone in which Presidents can unilaterally put the Nation irrevocably at war before Congress formally declares it.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in response to President Truman's message, I must say that there is one thing on which all Americans can agree, and that is that we had better build up our defenses at home and prepare to take care of the United States in case of a world conflict.

We are told that Russia is speeding up the construction of the waterway linking the Don and the Volga Rivers, providing water connection between the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea, the Baltic Sea, and the White Sea. That development will be of tremendous value to Russia in case of a conflict.

It will probably be constructed with some of the lend-lease or Marshall plan money supplied by the United States.

We have a similar and more important project in our own country, already authorized and partially constructed but which is being blocked by certain selfish interests. I refer to the slack water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, usually referred to as the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway. Leading Members of Congress, in both the House and the Senate, are urging the immediate and speedy construction of this waterway, on the ground that it is needed for national defense.

There can be no doubt that this is true.

This project will cut the water distance between our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and the Gulf of Mexico by more than 500 miles, and at the same time, provide an extra outlet to the sea. It will provide a slack water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes and all points on the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Tennessee, the Illinois, and the Missouri Rivers, and at the same time, save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

Perhaps the main reason for building the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway is in connection with the transportation of iron ore from Venezuela to the steel mills at Pittsburgh, Chicago, and other present centers of the steel industry.

A little known fact is that the present supply of rich iron ore from the Mesabi range in Minnesota is rapidly nearing depletion. It is not expected that present grades will last as much as 10 years longer. Some say it will be gone in three more years. Hence a new source of supply must be found. The American steel mills have feverishly searched for a new supply, expending millions of dollars in the quest. Only two sources have been found where the ore of the required richness can be obtained in large enough supply. They are:

First: Newly discovered iron ore in Labrador. This supply is in the coldest, most bleak, uninhabited section of the North American Continent. An expensive railroad 350 miles long will have to be built to exploit it, and in addition the St. Lawrence seaway will have to be built before presently operating steel mills can avail themselves of this supply. And, as everyone knows, the St. Lawrence waterway would be frozen up about 6 months of every year, while the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway would not be frozen at all, but would be open for traffic the year around.

Second. The other available new supply, which is said to be a far larger supply, and richer deposit, is in Venezuela. Both the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the United States Steel Corp. have staked out claims and purchased interests here. They have acquired large concessions. Experts state that known deposits of iron ore in Venezuela will supply American demands for a hundred years. The ore has already been carried to steel mills in Birmingham, Ala., and elsewhere, for smeltering and found to meet all requirements. So we know the Venezuela deposits will be used.

Here is where the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway comes in. The United States Steel Corp., Bethlehem, Republic, Jones & Laughlin, and other similar concerns have billions of dollars invested in presently operating steel plants at Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Wheeling, Gary, Ind., Chicago, and other points which will be practically useless and obsolete unless a newer and cheaper method of transportation is found. They will have to get this foreign ore, if they continue to operate. Railway transportation is too expensive, even if the railways had the facilities to handle this tremendous new tonnage. Waterways can haul bulk tonnages of this character—iron ore—at approximately one-tenth the cost of railway transportation. The Tennessee-Tombigbee is a natural for such transportation. The steel mills, most of them, are already alongside the Ohio River and other streams and lakes reached by this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway. In addition, it is a slack-water route—no swift river currents to fight.

If this ore were to be shipped on the Mississippi River, it would not only require approximately 1,000 additional miles to traverse, but the barges would have to fight the swift and treacherous currents of the Mississippi River for a distance of 869 miles. It woud cost considerably more to push these barges against this current, and slow down the progress of the two, possibly a week of additional time as compared with the Tennessee-Tombigbee route. In the Tombigbee there is a succession of locks and dams from Mobile to the Tennessee River, impounding water behind the dams in vast pools, almost as still as a millpond. When the Tennessee River is reached, the barges will float downstream from Pickwick Dam on the Tennessee to Paducah, Ky., on the Ohio. From that point upstream on the Ohio River to Pittsburgh, Pa., the Ohio River is controlled by locks and dams, providing more pools and still water for the barges to navigate in. Thus there will be slack water, or downstream navigation for these barges loaded with iron ore from Venezuela all the way to Pittsburgh, Pa.

From Paducah it is downstream 47 miles to Cairo, Ill., on the Mississippi River. Therefore, we will have a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Tennessee River, then a downstream route of 262 miles from there to Cairo, which will provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, and to all points between.

The same thing is true for vast tonnages of bauxite, the ore from which aluminum is made, coming from deposits in Dutch Guinea in South America to processing plants at Alcoa, Tenn., Lister Hill, Ala.—on the Tennessee River—and other aluminum plants in St. Louis, Mo.; Louisville, Ky.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and other points in that area.

The Aluminum Co. of America is today getting 95 percent of its bauxite from South America, and this project would greatly facilitate its transportation to the great aluminum plants along the Tennessee, the Ohio, the Mississippi Rivers, and the Great Lakes.

I appeal to the Bureau of the Budget to submit to Congress a request for sufficient funds to speed up the construction of this great project with all possible haste, and to the Committee on Appropriations to include an ample amount for this purpose in its next bill. We cannot afford to wait until our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb.

Communist China Aggression in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended are the editorials from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, both published this date, referred to in my remarks made on the House floor and appearing in the RECORD today:

[From the New York Times of January 8, 1951]

UN PUT TO THE TEST

In urging members of the United Nations to take a firm stand against Chinese Communist aggression in Korea and to call that aggression by its rightful name the United States is acting in the interest of the United Nations. The positions that the world organization takes and the degree to which it is willing to stand by its professions of principles will largely determine whether it can and will survive. If it surrenders its integrity now in the name of a supposititious expediency, it will have betrayed the purposes for which it was conceived and in its confession of impotence invited its own dissolution.

The reasons for hesitation on the part of many countries are quite understandable and they should be viewed sympathetically. They are deeply concerned lest the organization, or one of its major members, become involved in a war with Communist China. Some are likewise concerned lest a large United States commitment in Asia leave too little for purposes of commitment in Europe. The first of those two feelings is the more praiseworthy, but they are both very real.

The United States shares both of those feelings. This country does not want to see the battle for Korea develop into a war with the Communist Chinese or with anyone else. This country certainly does not want an overcommitment in any theater to the detriment of another point of need. Because of those attitudes the United States has expressed its willingness to explore all possibilities for a peaceful settlement of the Korean struggle. But that exploration must be realistic, both in the physical and in the moral sense.

Some of the delay in United Nations action has been caused by just such an exploration. There is a hopeful waiting to see if a successful peace formula can be devised. Some parts of the various formulas thus far advanced have been anything but realistic. Both the Asian-Arab bloc and the three-man truce committee, as well as Prime Minister Nehru in London, have suggested that as part of a general settlement there should be the establishment of a free and united Korea with nation-wide elections under United Nations auspices. There is nothing in the record to suggest that the North Koreans, the Chinese Communists, or the Soviet Union would consent to such a plan for the fraction of a second. To put it forward therefore as an objective to be gained, perhaps, by negotiation with Peiping (contingent, of course, upon Peiping's admission to the United Nations) is pure fantasy.

The Chinese Communists are in Korea today, more than a million strong, precisely to prevent the establishment of a free and unified Korea under United Nations auspices. They are fighting the United Nations on the battlefield, just as the Soviet Union has steadily fought the United Nations in the diplomatic arena, to keep the United Nations from carrying out, in Korea, the very purposes to which it is honorably committed. To assume that their admission to the councils of the United Nations will reverse this objective is to lose touch with reality. No Communists. Korean, Chinese, Russian, or American want a free Korea, and they are willing to risk a war to prevent it.

Likewise, they not merely risk but boldly demand the complete moral disintegration of the United Nations. The United Nations is told upon what terms it can capitulate in the face of aggression. It can admit its grievous and "illegal" error in denouncing that aggression in the first place and take the sponsors, abettors, and finally the partners in that aggression into its humbled bosom. The alternative is to be driven into the sea. If the United Nations does so capitulate it will have announced to the world that there is one moral principle of resistance to aggression when the aggressor is small and quite another and quite opposite principle of resistance when the aggressor is sufficiently powerful and arrogant. To make that admission is to put an end to the moral value of the United Nations Charter. If aggression against the free Republic of Korea was wrong last June it is wrong now and a million Chinese Communists can't make it right.

The United Nations, thanks to Soviet obstruction, does not have the physical force to counter any and all aggression. But it does have the moral obligation to remain committed against it. The present United Nations forces may be defeated in the field and obliged to retreat. That is no reason why the United Nations need be defeated in the world of morals and forced into oblivion.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 8, 1951]

THE UN MUST ACT

Spurred by growing bewilderment and doubt throughout the country, the State Department has undertaken a vigorous diplomatic offensive to get from the United Nations a statement that China has been guilty of aggression in Korea. Less could hardly be asked of an international organization which is, among other things, the standard bearer of the world's concept of right and wrong. An argument was possible directly after the Chinese intervention, and before the thirty-eighth parallel had been crossed, to the effect that the branding of China as aggressor would hamper efforts to achieve a truce. Even then, however, it seemed to us the proper course to keep the facts on the record straight, calling aggression by its obvious name, and proceeding to deal with the situation with patience and statesmanlike magnanimity.

Some hope apparently persists among non-Communist nations that, in spite of all, cease-fire arrangements can be worked out. Some fear exists that to name China as aggressor will be a prelude to all-out war. The hope is so slim as to be negligible; moreover, if the Chinese were to find it in their interests to call a truce, the charge of aggression would hardly deter them. As for the fear of all-out war, the definition of China's offense does not in any way commit the UN or the United States to such an engagement. With the aggressor recognized for what he is, it then becomes the task of policymakers to decide by what means and to what extent he is to be checked and punished.

Originally the charge of aggression was to be made by the Security Council; but the inevitability of a Russian veto where any of its satellites or minions are involved led to the provision which makes it possible for the veto-free Assembly to take up the issue. For the Assembly not to act would be a shock indeed. For it to act unconvincingly, with numerous abstentions, would be almost as bad. The need is for a decisive move—for an unequivocal statement which will have the effect of restoring to the international scene a reality of which protracted evasions have robbed it. For lack of such a statement the free world remains divided and confused, and the Chinese breach retains a shadow of wholly improper justification. For lack of it, too, the UN declines daily in men's opinion. The State Department, in presenting forcefully the United States point of view, is serving not only the interests of our country but of law and freedom everywhere.

A Program for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times of Thursday, January 4, 1951:

A PROGRAM FOR UNITY

In this time of stress and danger our country needs a program on which the American people can unite.

Many notable Americans have made constructive contributions to the current foreign policy debate. None of them has questioned the gravity of the world situation. None has denied the necessity of rearmament. Few, if any, have shown the slightest disposition toward appeasement of aggression.

The serious differences that do exist concern the adequacy of the measures being taken to meet the Russian challenge and the wisdom—or lack of wisdom—with which America's world policies have been conceived and carried forward.

The grave misgivings that do obstruct unity arise in major part from lack of confidence in the State Department.

This newspaper believes that the debate has helped to develop the essential outlines of a program which could have, because it would deserve, united and nonpartisan support.

American rearmament comes first in such a program. Defense officials should make fewer speeches worrying about how large, how fast a mobilization effort the people will support and concentrate on pushing forward the largest, fastest effort possible.

The State Department should fully consult the military and Congress before it makes any more basic strategic decisions with respect to such areas as Spain and Formosa. The diplomats have had too free a rein on matters of that kind.

We need allies, but we cannot safely continue to take it for granted that our allies will do the things necessary to become dependable partners in a crisis.

Our Government's commitments should be honored, where there is reasonable compliance with the terms of contracts by other nations party to them. But the record to date has not been reassuring and, at least until there is a new Secretary of State, the degree of compliance should be kept under survey by a congressional watchdog committee.

The administration can avoid future mistakes by submitting all agreements which have the force of treaties to the Senate for ratification, as the Constitution provides. Secret diplomacy has been responsible for many of our troubles.

Since the Chinese Communists insist on fighting, we should lower the barriers and let Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists fight them, and arm the anti-Red guerrillas on the Chinese mainland, as well. Placed on the defensive, the Red Chinese might look less tough. Our present policy tends to protect their rear while they attack Americans in Korea.

To avoid another Korea in Western Europe, we should insist that our allies go along step by step with us in forming the European defense force. Unless and until we have reliable allies in Europe and Asia, we should not consider sending American armies to fight on either continent.

Spain should be helped to arm and to build air bases behind the Pyrenees, without more delay. Japan should be permitted to begin rearming now.

No more money should be sent abroad during this crisis which does not contribute to containment of communism by military strength. Few of the point 4 projects thus far suggested can meet that test. They can wait while we strive to save the world from war, if that is possible, or to save our country if Russia forces war upon us.

And confidence in the State Department should be restored.

To restore that confidence, Secretary Acheson should go.

He has returned empty-handed from every international conference he has attended in the 2 years he has been in office.

His policy is caught on dead center between the Chinese Communists and the Chinese Nationalists.

He has opposed Dutch colonialism in Indonesia while supporting French colonialism in Indochina. By encouraging the British to recognize Red China, he has placed the United States at odds with Britain on China policy. By first giving away our bargaining power, he has placed the United States at odds with France on German policy.

He has just touched the Japanese problem, but that touch was enough to get us all snarled up with India and the Philippines. Where misunderstanding doesn't exist, he produces it. It must be a gift.

All of the money he has spent in Europe hasn't produced a single new division. Not one of the "situations of strength" he talks about has been built.

He is regarded as a soft touch abroad and has lost public confidence at home.

He inherited a sound bipartisan relationship with Congress and destroyed it by his inability to understand the meaning of teamwork.

The wave of "McCarthyism" which swept the Nation was a direct reaction to the exhibitionism he displayed when he refused to turn his back on Alger Hiss.

Our retreat in Asia dates from his appointment as Under Secretary of State in 1945, when he initiated our disastrous China policy.

Having made himself the principal obstacle to national unity, he has disqualified himself for further public service.

We need a Secretary of State in whose wisdom and ability the American people and Congress can feel it safe to place their trust.

Inflation Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith letter addressed to me by Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, together with a certain resolution approved by the voting delegates to the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation held in Dallas, Tex., December 11–14, 1950:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1951.

Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOEVEN: The inflationary threat created by our present defense program has become a matter of common knowledge. Firm and effective action is necessary to counter this threat. Counter measures obviously are being taken. The grave danger facing us on the economic front is the possibility that the laudable desire to check inflation will lead to adoption of the wrong measures.

Price, wage, and ration controls cannot prevent inflation. If we put our faith in such measures, we not only will fail to prevent inflation, but we will also sell the defense program short by starving the productive power, which is our greatest source of strength. In an emergency of long duration, such controls could destroy our free-choice economic system.

A part of the agitation for controls appears to stem from a misunderstanding of the situation we are in today. We are in a period of international tension which may last for several years. Our national policy is still (1) to present the outbreak of a third world war, and (2) to build up our national military and economic strength as rapidly as possible so that we will be able to win such a war if it proves unavoidable. We cannot estimate the probable duration of the present tension, or calculate when we may face the greatest test of our strength. Accordingly, we must adopt policies which will not only serve our present needs, but contribute to the rapid development of a much greater national strength.

Price and wage controls would hamper the development of the increased production we so badly need. This can easily be illustrated by reference to livestock and meat, although similar results can be expected if price and wage ceilings are applied in other areas of the economy.

Meat production is at a high level, but ever greater production is needed. The production of meat—particularly pork—can be substantially increased in the coming year if hampering restrictions are avoided. We have a large hog population to supply brood sows; we have the second largest supply of corn in our history; and we have the equipment and know-how.

Production, both of feed and of livestock, can be stepped up on an enduring basis. This is what we need in America. Farmers are ready to produce. The most effective steps which could be taken by Government to assure an adequate production of livestock would be to (1) make the fullest use of the outlook material of the United States Department of Agriculture indicating probable firm demand, (2) assure farmers that price and ration controls are not going to be put on meat, and (3) expand corn acreage allotments for the 1951 crop.

Price and ration controls on livestock and meat inevitably will mean less meat. Farmers must make many decisions which influence the quantity of meat they will produce. Price and ration controls cannot help but tip the balance on many of these decisions toward less production. Stepped-up production on an enduring basis is the consumer's best hope for adequate meat supplies and reasonable prices. Under a control system, meat might seem to be cheap in the butcher shops, but it would not be in the shops.

Experience has demonstrated that ceilings on meat invite black markets. Under OPA, black markets resulted in enormous waste of labor in legitimate plants; reduced volumes for such plants and consequent reductions in the taxes paid by them; loss of valuable by-products which were vitally needed; and creation of a public health hazard by the sale of uninspected meat.

Experience under OPA definitely proved that, even if more effective measures can be developed to cope with the black market, an army of administrative personnel would be required, both in Government and in the industry. Manpower is one of our most serious shortages; we cannot afford to divert thousands of workers from the production of goods to the administration of unenforceable and unworkable regulations.

In this time of national emergency, we are calling on you to support measures—such as (1) the elimination of all nonessential governmental expenses, (2) increased efficiency in government, (3) pay-as-we-go taxation, and (4) necessary steps in the field of monetary, credit, and fiscal policy—which action will really control inflation. In addition, it is only reasonable that we make greater use of techniques which have enabled our economic system to outstrip every other system of production and distribution.

It is because price controls are clumsy and inefficient substitutes for the automatic functioning of market prices, that we oppose such controls. Our policy in this regard is not taken with the idea of serving the special interests of farmers as a group; instead, we have firm conviction that our recommendations are in the general interest of all Americans. Price, wage, and ration controls have more in common with totalitarian principles than with the principles which support our free American system. Such measures cannot prevent inflation, but certainly would impair our national strength by interfering with production.

Our position on these vital matters is set forth more completely in the enclosed copy of a resolution Inflation Control, which was approved by the elected delegates from our member State Farm Bureaus at our annual meeting in Dallas, Tex., last month.

Sincerely yours,

ALLAN B. KLINE, *President.*

RESOLUTION ENTITLED "INFLATION CONTROL," APPROVED BY THE VOTING DELEGATES TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, HELD IN DALLAS, TEX., DECEMBER 11–14, 1950

The American Farm Bureau Federation has long urged that aggressive steps be taken in the monetary, credit, and fiscal policy fields to bring greater stability to the general price level. Since the control of monetary, credit, and fiscal policy rests in the hands of the Federal Government, under the Constitution, the problem is not one of delegating authority to the Federal Government in new areas. It is a matter of reshaping and coordinating policies in a field in which Government policy now largely prevails so that such policies will make a greater contribution to the development of a more stable price level.

Monetary, credit, and fiscal policies which affect the general stability of prices are in direct and impersonal as contrasted with the direct and personal controls that are required by specific programs designed to rectify the dislocations and injustices resulting from an unstable price level. Greater stability of the general price level offers the only opportunity for greater economic security without programs which require specific and direct controls on each farm, business, or individual.

The inflationary pressures generated by our present national-defense program make effective action to stabilize the purchasing power of the American dollar more urgent now than ever before.

Inflation cannot be stopped by price, wage, and ration controls. Such measures deal with symptoms rather than fundamental causes. They interfere with production; impair the flexibility of our economy; reduce our capacity to expand output; require huge administrative staffs; and invite black markets. We face an emergency of indefinite duration. In such a situation the premature adoption of price, wage, and ration controls could strangle our economy to the point of impairing our ability to fight an all-out war should such a conflict prove unavoidable.

American farmers have produced beyond belief in times of need and we pledge ourselves to ample production now. We believe that if we are given full information as to production desired, and if productive aids are made available to us, we can produce more food and fiber more efficiently if controls are held to an absolute minimum. We insist that we be given an opportunity to demonstrate our productive capacity without controls. If total war forces the application of price and wage ceilings, we will insist that they be applied on an across-the-board basis.

The present situation calls for a bold attack on the fundamental cause of inflation, which cause is an increase in the supply of money in relation to the supplies of goods and services available to consumers.

Most importantly, we must pay the bill. There is no possibility of controlling inflation without taxes high enough to get on a pay-as-we-go basis.

We must strive to meet increased demand with increased production wherever possible. To do this we must enhance the opportunity of individuals to be productive, and increase the length of the work-week. Strict Government economy is a must. Nonessential Government expenditures must be eliminated. Necessary Government borrowing must be planned so as to prevent an increase in the Government debt to the banks, because such an increase would both directly and indirectly increase the supply of money. To this end we urge that efforts to sell E bonds be intensified; that careful consideration be given to the desirability of offering additional inducement for holders to reinvest the proceeds of maturing E bonds in Government securities; and that steps be taken to prevent a further shift of non-bank-held negotiable bonds to the banking system.

The national debt should be so handled as to make the maximum contribution to price and economic stability, rather than to finance the debt at a minimum cost.

Monetary and credit policies carried on by the Federal Reserve System cannot alone achieve a stable level of prices. Yet they are an important factor and should be geared toward that objective. The Federal Reserve's authority to vary the member bank reserve requirments should be increased. If the inflation threat continues, reserve requirements for banks should be raised, with appropriate adjustments in the bank holdings eligible to be counted as reserves.

The Government's present policy of restricting the expansion of housing and installment credit should be continued in effect, with such adjustments as may be necessary from time to time to keep these restrictions consistent with the requirements of an effective program to control inflation.

We reiterate our recommendation that the Congress establish a bipartisan joint congressional monetary study commission, charged with the responsibility of making studies and submitting recommendations to the Congress on means of bringing greater stability to the purchasing power of money.

Why You Buy Books That Sell Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the January 1951 issue of the American Legion Magazine:

WHY YOU BUY BOOKS THAT SELL COMMUNISM

(By Irene Corbally Kuhn)

One day recently John Smith went into a Manhattan book store and asked for a copy of Seeds of Treason, the comprehensive, objective study of the perjury trials of Alger Hiss. The clerk, without looking up, said they didn't carry it. Why? She shrugged her shoulders. How should she know? They just didn't carry it. Not for sale and not in the lending library. What about that other book: the one by the fellow Senator McCARTHY got before the Tydings committee?

"Oh, you mean Prof. Owen Lattimore's Ordeal by Slander. Sure. Just a minute." She fell over herself in her eagerness to haul out a fresh copy. "Such a wonderful man. It's a marvelous book. You'll be glad you bought it."

Smith was impressed by her salesmanship, but after leafing through the book he left without buying it. The next day Smith had some business in a small suburban community. He wandered into one of those pretty little greeting-card-gift-shoppe book stores owned and run by a middle-aged widow, used to better days. The shop is her complete livelihood, and she has to buy carefully so as not to be caught with a stock she can't sell. All this our man Smith learned quickly. He's a friendly soul, the shop wasn't busy, and the owner was glad to have someone to talk to.

HOW A REVIEW AFFECTS BOOK SALES

No; she didn't have Seeds of Treason either. Why? Well, she depended on the book-review sections in the New York papers, the Times and Herald Tribune mostly—and the reviewers in those papers hadn't seemed to think much of the book. She guided her purchases of books, especially reorders, by what the reviewers said. She felt the "experts" those big important newspapers chose to review for them knew more about books than she did.

John Smith listened. Did she have a copy of that other book—Ordeal by Slander, by Owen Lattimore? Oh, yes, indeed, she had that in stock. The New York Times Sunday book section and the Herald Tribune both had given it all of page 1 and space inside, too; and both papers had reviewed it again on Monday. So, of course, she had ordered it. It must be a very important book, she continued, and she was planning to read it herself.

John Smith could be anybody. These two experiences have been duplicated with other books in other cities and towns for a good many years now. They represent only two techniques in the Communist master plan that embraces every known means of influencing and dominating the human mind.

In what that courageous long-time fighter against communism, author Eugene Lyons has called the Red decade—the 1930's—the people's or popular front phase of Communist activity outside Russia achieved phenomenal success. Our own American popular front, though never officially in power as it was in France and, briefly, in Spain, bored deep into the Federal Government and penetrated in various degrees the labor movement, education, the churches, youth movements, the theater, movies, the arts, publishing in all its branches. At its highest point, about 1936, the Comintern (it's now the Cominform), as the international Communist organization was known, had mobilized the deliberately conscious or the starry-eyed innocent collaboration of thousands of influential American educators, New Deal officials, social workers, social registerites, novelists, script writers, directors, publishers, editors, and the literati generally. Each phase of American life and activity could be explored almost endlessly for proof of the success of this sinister foreign propaganda that has but one aim: the destruction of free, capitalist

society and the conversion of thinking, independent men and women into plodding mindless slaves.

It is with but one phase of this intellectual cuckoldry of the Kremlin that we can deal in this article—the penetration of the book-publishing field and its essential attribute, literary reviewing and criticism. And in order to explore two subdivisions of the master plan, we invite the reader to return to John Smith and his experiences with the clerk in the Manhattan book shop and the suburban widow.

Books are published to be sold as merchandise, like shoes or sardines. Ironically, however, the avidity of the American mind for knowledge and information, the American passion for advancement and improvement, factors which stimulated mass production of books and made publishing big business, have also provided our enemies with one of their most valuable weapons. Books have become transmission belts for insidious propaganda for treason.

The American with something to sell gets it to his buying public chiefly through advertising and modern sales methods. It is as true of books as it is of candy, cosmetics, and cigarettes. But books, although they are frankly material, are also food for the mind and spirit. But unlike a new brand of soap which has to depend on paid advertising to sell it to the public, a book gets extra special free treatment. This is the review by the newspaper and magazine, the radio, and TV critics. The reviewer stands between the public and the publisher's product in almost the same way that a capricious or haughty head waiter mans the barricade and the plush rope at a swank eating place and decides what table he'll let you have, or whether he'll bother to let you in at all. The reviewer can hang garlands or garbage on an author's work. On the reviewer's integrity, even more than on his technical skill, depend on author's reputation and livelihood.

The importance of the reviewer then is evident, since the only news the public gets of a book is through the reviews and paid advertising; and paid advertising, more often than not, depends on the amount, kind and quality of the reviews. If the reviews are poor, the publisher won't put money into paid advertising. He can't afford to. He can afford it less if the book gets no reviews, which often happens. Depending also on the reviews is the extent of the sales effort expended on the book. Before the reviewer has given his verdict, the bookseller has had information about the book only from the publisher's representative, the naturally prejudiced salesman and a few other trade sources. No bookseller, not even the most industrious and conscientious ones, can read all the 8,000 to 10,000 new books that come out every year. He has to depend on reviewers' estimates of books more than on his own judgment and experience.

Proof of the importance of this is to be found in the recent victory of the American Legion in a controversy with the officials of the Brookline (Mass.) Public Library over circulating an anti-Communist book dealing with the Alger Hiss case—Seeds of Treason.

Local Legion officials had charged that the library had banned the book, which has been on best-seller lists since the start of its publication last April.

Recently, Arthur L. Endicott, chairman of the board of trustees, announced that the book had been made available to library patrons.

In explaining the library's earlier stand on the book Mr. Endicott said: "The selection of books was in large measure dependent upon the reviews which we have learned from past experience to be a satisfactory guide. Several of the reviews were not such as to induce the committee of our staff, which makes a preliminary recommendation, to purchase the book. The trustees are the final authority to decide upon the purchase of any controversial book."

However, Mr. Endicott revealed that following the Legion's determined stand on the matter, the trustees had decided to purchase the book for the Brookline Library.

This explains why book reviewers are important to the Communists, too. Their influence, if it can be won, can be used to enormous advantage.

The Communists were the first to see this, naturally, so it was imperative that if they were to control or dominate this important field of communications they spot their agents or sympathizers among the reviewers. Thorough strategists that they are, they don't rely on partial or even complete coverage of a single arm; they make use of the whole body of publishing.

LEFT-WING LITERARY NETWORK

In addition to spotting their own agents or sympathizers among the reviewers, they actually get active party members or cooperative fellow-travelers into publishing houses as editors or editorial assistants; they put their people into retail book outlets, in department stores, and bookshops.

And they have set up and control book-selling clubs, related trade-unions, etc. And, of course, the party has plenty of members and sympathizers among the authors themselves, always ready to follow the line in fiction or nonfiction work; to logroll for the other faithful and to be hatchet-men against anti-Communist writers.

Thus organized, they are able to work a parallel course of intensive propaganda for their aims and sabotage of everyone and everything opposed to those aims.

Whenever a book comes along that is potentially damaging to the Communist effort the entire strength of their forces is marshaled against it. They go beyond just book reviews; they bear down on the faithful and the naive in all other specialized types of writing; syndicated columns, editorials, etc., for it is through this group that public opinion is formed, convictions cemented, prejudices solidified, and hatreds whipped up.

Just this past summer, the syndicated columnist, Bob Considine, one of the country's best and most prolific writers, and a fearless one who calls the shots as he sees them, spoke about this field of specialized writing, which is his own, on a national radio network. He described it as the one which wields the greatest power; one, therefore, which should have a corresponding sense of responsibility. By and large he said these writers who are given such wide latitude of expression are with scant exception, fair-minded men and women. But he added:

"If there is any apparent antireligious feeling among these specialists in journalism, it will be found chiefly among the book reviewers of certain leading New York newspapers and literary publications.

"Here a rather shocking situation prevails," he went on. "If you write a book which steps on the toes of our home-grown left-wingers, bamboozled liberals or outright Communists, or their idols abroad, you can almost count on receiving a number of sour reviews—where the reviews hurt most.

"There are, of course, outstanding exceptions to this rule. But the average big city book critic sets himself up as a defender and champion of the legend that those who speak out against Communists and their pale pink carbon copies are automatically cheap sensationalists, warmongers, and unctuous serfs of Wall Street.

"Some of these book reviewers get away with murder, even though their reviews appear in newspapers and magazines which could not possibly exist—nor could the reviewers—under communism. Yet the reader of a fat Sunday newspaper can digest an editorial denouncing communism or shudder through such stories as the tortured confessions of clergymen and businessmen behind the iron curtain—and then turn to the book review sections and encounter some inbred critic beating to a pulp a book author who is trying to say the same thing.

"They seem to produce nothing, these critics. Their role is simply to belt one over any writer who has the industry and knowledge to produce an anti-Communist tome. Deplorably, few authors have any way of retorting, rebutting, or suing the critic for pulling the rug from under years of devoted work.

"We have book publishers, too, among them, some grown quite fat under our capitalistic system, who will not touch an anti-Communist book. Among these are some shrewd fellows who have sense enough to know that such books will be solidly battered by the critics and probably lose money. But there are others who seem to believe with the critics, and like them are Russia-firsters.

"I can speak with a little personal experience in this latter respect," Considine continued. "I had something to do with the editing of a book named The Rape of Poland, written by the exiled democratic Premier of Poland, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk. He gave a most detailed account of how Communists were able to seize that predominantly Catholic country with hardly the firing of a shot—except in the prisons of the secret police. The publisher who originally planned to produce the book actually asked Mikolajczyk to tone down his accounts of the tortures and murders inflicted on Polish patriots during the destruction of that country's hard-won liberties.

"Mikolajczyk, of course, refused to go along with this treacherous suggestion. He found another publisher—one with the courage to let the truth be told."

Mikolajczyk's book, the Rape of Poland, subtitled "Pattern of Soviet Aggression," was published, without censorship or distortion, by Whittlesey House, a division of the McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.

Poland was the first country on Russia's schedule of seizures by force—force of lying propaganda, fifth-column tactics, boring from within, all the techniques of oppression and suppression with the trade mark of the hammer and sickle, masquerading under the sickening euphemism of liberation. The Communists therefore ordered the heaviest attacks on books by Poles or about Poland that attempted to reveal the truth.

Still another notable book which fell into this category, was Defeat in Victory, by Jan Ciechanowski, published in 1947, a dramatic and moving account of Poland's last free days before the Communists took over. This died of neglect; deliberate, planned neglect.

THEY DIDN'T LIKE FLYNN

Sometimes the attack centers on the author, regardless of the book. John T. Flynn is one such victim, and the violence of the attack on him was all the greater because experience had shown that Mr. Flynn, with a long-established reputation as a writer, editor, critic, and fighter for principle, didn't scare easily and never quit. He also knew all the tricks and anticipated a great many of the moves charted and planned for his professional destruction. When he wrote the Roosevelt Myth, he submitted the manuscript to several publishers and discussed it with still others. This was the first time in his more than 40 years' experience as a well-known writer-editor that he had had to peddle a book manuscript. Some of the publishers were old friends and most of them who read the manuscript expressed great interest and approval—but—their lists were full; they couldn't get the book out in time really to profit from it; the paper situation was bad, etc., etc., ad nauseam. The excuses were as transparent as they were lame and weak.

Mr. Flynn found a courageous publisher in young Devin Garrity, head of the firm of Devin-Adair, that up to then had specialized chiefly in Irish books and other fine works in the general field. They published Mr. Flynn's book; and he was dodging the dead cats and over-ripe fruit of scurrilous and vicious criticism for months thereafter. Nothing daunted, he wrote another book, The Road Ahead. In this work Mr. Flynn says: "The real enemy we must identify and fight at every crossroad and at all points is the American edition of the British Fabian Socialist, who is engaged in a sneak attack here, as his comrades were in England, who denies that he is a Socialist and who operates behind a mask which he calls national planning." Mr. Flynn is eminently qualified by experience and study to hold and expound such views. There are not many Americans who know more about our history and politics than Mr. Flynn. And few of those who qualify can match him for his intellectual honesty. He believes, with millions of others not so articulate, that communism is merely socialism in a hurry. And he has not hesitated to say so and to fight this threat to our established American system. This is the key to his book, a warning that whereas the Communists are numerically weak here, millions who say they hate Communists are actually helping them at every turn. The Communist Party has been able to use the professional liberals to do their dirty work.

Mr. Flynn's book, The Road Ahead, by all the criteria applied to books should have had the widest attention from reviewers, especially in the nationally circulated Sunday book review supplements.

At this point Mr. Devin Garrity reports:

"We published the book and waited for the reviews, especially the Sunday New York Herald Tribune. After 2 months, when it seemed fairly certain there would be no review, I instituted some inquiries and learned that the review copy had been received and was on file, but that it had been marked for the silent treatment. No review was scheduled for it. We then bought advertising space in the Herald Tribune's Sunday book section and ran the excellent and fair review of Mr. Flynn's book which had been written by John Chamberlain and published in Human Events, a small Washington, D. C., publication of exceptionally high standing but limited circulation. The ad was set up purposely and deliberately, on our orders, to look like a legitimate review—which it was, although from another paper—and legal requirements were complied with by printing 'Advt.' at the bottom. We paid, I believe, $700 for the ad.

"The Herald Tribune then changed its position, probably as a result of the ad, because in 3 weeks, just barely enough time to hire someone to read the book and write a review—a review did appear—a smear job to counteract the effect of the favorable Chamberlain review we had bought the space to run."

THE ALL-OUT JOB ON WHITE

For a perfect example of the all-out, four-alarm attack on an anti-Communist book by another well-known anti-Communist author, W. L. White's Report on the Russians is probably the classic example.

W. L. White is the son of the William Allen White, the "sage of Emporia," an American newspaper editor in the best tradition of our country and his craft. Bill White has inherited the fighting heart of his father and his crusading spirit for justice and right. To his inheritance of craftsmanship, he has added a rich talent of his own that has grown with the years. He is the author of several books, among them the poignant Journey for Margaret, the stirring They Were Expendable, and Queens Die Proudly, all successful war books, widely read and acclaimed.

In the summer of 1944, when Soviet Russia was fighting Hitler and Nazi Germany, and we were fighting Nazi Germany and Japan, Mr. White, accompanied Eric Johnston, then president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, on a 6 weeks' trip to Russia. It was decidedly to Russian advantage to put aside its long-standing rule of secrecy and allow these American visitors to go about the country. It was wartime; Russia was being hailed as our great ally, and a real and extraordinary effort was being put forth by all Americans, even those of vast and bitter experience with the Soviets, to be fair and impartial in their judgment. Wasn't Russia fighting Hitler, too? Forgotten, far too quickly and easily by most, was the Hitler-Stalin pact, that cynically political marriage of convenience between two totalitarian despots. Forgotten were the bloody Moscow purges, the long record of sinister events under Stalin.

The White Book, recounting his trip through Russia, was published by Harcourt Brace, after condensation in the Reader's Digest, in March 1945. Where the publishers had confidently expected and with good reason, that it would sell 120,000 copies, the total was some 40,000 less. The book was first attacked by David Zaslavsky in Pravda and sniped at by the local American leftist press incessantly before publication. Before the review copies were out, Bennett Cerf predicted in the Saturday Review of Literature, that it would be the worst book of the year. It was then covered for that publication by a symposium of five writers. Three of these reviews, according to Mr. White, were amplifications of the line laid down by Comrade Zaslavsky and Mr. Cerf. The other two reviewers, Louis Fischer and William Henry Chamberlin, both of whom had spent more time in Russia than the other three, not only liked the book, but dared to say so in their reviews.

However, the book was so abused and the Stalinist operation against it so comprehensive, that reviewers for libraries and church organizations were suggesting, "Don't read this; it's a prejudiced book."

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., a Red outfit subsequently declared subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, led the attack with an elaborate, expensive, 32-page two-color brochure, which boldly purported to be "the truth." Ironically, the only paid advertisement this publication carried was "an official United States Treasury advertisement—prepared under the auspices of the Treasury Department and the War Advertising Council." Thus, the taxpayers' money helped pay for this widely distributed attack on a distinguished American author for his effrontery in telling the truth as he saw it on his tour of Russia.

The brochure itself merits close examination. It is black with a 2-inch margin of red down the right side. The cover is particularly interesting. A great blob of white with jagged edges like a burst of light, is overprinted with the legend, "The Book the Nazis Like," and all this is superimposed on a facsimile of the dust jacket of White's book, exposing it only enough to identify it and reveal his name clearly. Underneath this is another facsimile—a reproduction of part of the front page of Der Westkampfer (the West Front Fighter), the issue of January 30, 1945, with a dispatch from Lisbon about White's description of forced labor in the Soviet Union.

Now the interesting thing about all this is that Der Westkampfer was the front journal of Hitler's army—the German equivalent of the Stars and Stripes, which we circulated to our soldiers at the front. This was January 1945—the date is plainly seen on the facsimile—and the German paper was barred in the United States at the time. How was it that a copy of this publication was available to the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship for just this kind of propagandizing in the United States?

GANGING UP TO KILL A BOOK

The booklet is also noteworthy for the fact that on page 3 it carried the petition signed by 16 correspondents, newspaper, magazine, and radio, excoriating White for writing the book. Never before, to my knowledge, have writers joined in public condemnation of a colleague. Curiously enough, several weeks before the book was published, the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship cabled the Anglo-American Correspondents' Association in Moscow, asking them as a body, to join in a petition denouncing the book. George Moorad, who died in the 1949 plane disaster in India which took the lives of 13 newsmen, wrote to White from Moscow in March 1945 and sent the letter via diplomatic pouch so that it would be safe from inspection and confiscation by the Russian censor. In it he detailed the story of that cable. Here it is as he told it: The correspondents in Moscow met after receiving Edwin Smith's telegram from the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (hereinafter referred to as NCASF) and voted down the request—an action which considering their situation (they knew the Soviet Foreign Office had read the cable) took real courage. However, of the 18 correspondents present at the Moscow meeting, 7 cabled their individual willingness to sign a denunciation of a book they had not read. By writing, telephoning, and cabling all over the world to each of the many scores of correspondents who at some time had been in Moscow since the war began, the NCASF was able to collect 9 more names and released the list as "16 American Moscow correspondents" who denounced the book. Of the 16, several were British, Canadian, or New Zealanders. Others were journalistic curiosities who wrote sporadically for obscure Communist or fellow-traveler publications and could be called war correspondents only by stretching the term considerably. However, also on the list were several well-known names, including Edgar Snow and Richard Lauterbach, of whom more later.

The book was even reviewed by the Reverend Dr. William Howard Melish in the Churchman, although it is difficult to see what powers of clairvoyance the Dr. Melish, of Brooklyn, possessed that would enable him to judge the accuracy of reporter White's facts from trained first-hand observation in Russia. This is the same Dr. Melish who is notorious for his support and defense of Red fronts and fronters. He was assistant to his father, the elderly rector of the Episcopal Church of the Holy Trinity in Brooklyn, N. Y. Recently the vestrymen demanded the resignation of the Melishes. The rector, Dr. John Howard Melish, was removed by the Bishop of Long Island, James P. de Wolfe, after he had concurred; but the Melishes refused to obey the bishop's edict and have been stubbornly resisting the ouster in a series of legal moves in the courts and extralegal ones outside.

White's book was immediately followed by a spate of reporters' books on Russia, all ballyhooed either by their publishers or the NCASF, the Daily Worker, or the authors themselves as the answers to the dreadfully prejudiced White book.

MR. SNOW WIELDS THE AX

One of the hatchet men on Mr. White's book was Edgar Snow, long-time writer-editor for the Saturday Evening Post, and a signer of the petition condemning White's book. Mr. Snow has long been on good terms with the left. He was chief correspondent in the Far East in 1938 for the London Daily Herald (official daily newspaper of the British Socialist Party). The Saturday Review of Literature chose Mr. Snow to do the job on George Creel's latest book, Russia's Race for Asia, and Snow produced a highly unfair review.

Mr. Creel reports on his experience: "I took the matter up with the SRL and they printed my letter along with another column of rebuttal by Snow. Although the book was selling fairly well, the publishers went panicky and would not put out another edition."

What Mr. Creel wrote to the editor of the Saturday Review of Literature follows:

"Edgar Snow, in what purported to be a review of my book, Russia's Race for Asia, started off with an ugly sneer at my conduct of the Committee on Public Information in the First World War and then proceeded to berate me for 'errors of fact, judgment, and understanding,' the 'use of quotations out of context,' and other dishonesties. * * * I have always assumed it was the right of an author to have his work reviewed objectively, or at least with some reasonable degree of impartiality and dispassion. Also, that the purpose of a review was not controversy but critical assessment, with criticism based on firmer and higher ground than prejudice. If these are justifiable assumptions then what could be more unfair than to turn a book over to another author whose own writings give plain warning of a bias that will impel him to use his own review either for attack or attempts at rebuttal?

"When you handed Russia's Race for Asia over to Mr. Snow, you cannot have been unaware that for years, both in books and articles, he has specialized in presenting a favorable picture of the Chinese Communists. You must have foreseen the violence of his dissent to my charge that the Chinese Communist party was organized and financed by Russian agents, and that for a full 30 years it has been under Moscow's direction and control for the conquest of China and the subsequent communization of Asia.

"It could have been no secret to you," Mr. Creel continued, "that he would particularly resent my denunciation of those 'credulous liberals and fellow travelers' who have labored so faithfully to persuade American opinion that the Chinese Communist party is a purely native movement, led by agrarian reformers and born of a people's spontaneous revolt against corruption and oppression. All propaganda that I branded as the ultimate lie.

"True, certain metropolitan dailies have made a practice of this type of reviewing; the New York Times, for example, put Gen. Claire Chennault's book at the mercy of Annalee Jacoby, coauthor of Thunder Out of China." (Another apologia for the Chinese Communists.)

Mr. Creel in his last sentence, as much as in his entire letter reveals a common practice in book reviewing circles—a well-known Communist technique whether the practitioners know it or not. It is the double-action attack, the double-jointed double-cross, logrolling on the one hand, logjamming on the other. In short, a pro-Communist author gets a friendly, even fulsome review by a pro-Communist reviewer who may himself be an author, or by a fellow-traveling professor or self-styled expert. The author who is not in that company, who is writing against the Communist line, will usually be subjected to a reviewer who sneers, belittles, derides, and generally macerates both book and author.

REVIEWERS FOR THE NEW CHINA

Mr. Creel had another sample of this when the New York Times turned his Russia's Race for Asia over for review to Professor Nathaniel Peffer, of Columbia University, a frequent contributor to the Times Sunday magazine section and its Sunday book section. Professor Peffer has been an unremitting foe of Nationalist China and Chiang Kai-shek in virtually everything he has written since the Japanese surrender, in 1945. The New Republic gave Mr. Creel's book for review to the late Richard Lauterbach, former Times-Life correspondent and a consistent apologist for Russia.

When it became apparent to patriotic, clear-headed Americans who have made a lifetime study of communism that our hard-won victory in the Pacific might be lost by defaulting to propagandists, they tried to sound a warning. The war which China had waged alone against Japan from 1931 until our entry in 1941, was one which cost the United States the lives of thousands of young men and millions of dollars, which the young men who survived will be paying for during the whole of their lives. The Commie-hep American writers and others knew that the Chinese Communist leaders were Moscow-trained and Moscow-directed stooges bent on delivering their country over to Communist domination in return for the gauleitering privileges, if they could get them. These anti-Communist writers began to talk and write the warning.

But the organized Communist opposition got there first. All the resources of the Cominform were thrown into the battle for China. It was a battle that was waged in every country with cells, grouping into units, regrouping into cadres, moving relentlessly and purposefully, with diabolically effective propaganda to blanket the truth and kidnap the American mind, the anti-Communist mind, wherever it showed and smother all opposition by any and every means.

No better illustration of the effectiveness of that campaign can be found than a look backwards at China now from the tragically clear perspective of hindsight; and at our terrible adventure in Korea, all the more heartrending because it should never have been necessary. And while we're looking at the wreckage, let's take a look at the battle of the books, a battle which the Communists won through their involuntary helpers as much as through their dedicated party comrades.

The American people had no real knowledge of China. The leftists filled the vacuum with their own books, reviewed favorably by each other; and by deriding and denouncing all others who had a kind word to say for the lawful Nationalist Government of China or its leader and sworn enemy of communism, Chiang Kai-shek.

Who are some of these authors and reviewers?

We have just seen George Creel's estimate of Edgar Snow. In 1944, even before the war was over, Mr. Snow wrote People On Our Side, which Random House brought out.

He is the author of several other books and numerous magazine articles all tuned to the same note, one he has played for years since his journalistic tour de force when he went into Red China and emerged with the manuscript of Red Star Over China which Random House published in 1938.

Another of these authors is Guenther Stein, who in 1945 brought out the Challenge of Red China. This book was reviewed in the New York Times by the aforesaid Nathaniel Peffer. It was a glowing review. Thus: "The distinguishing characteristic of Communist China is not ideological, political or economical but psychological. There is something in Communist China that captures the imagination of all sorts and conditions of men. Emotional radicals, objective intellectuals, neutral correspondents, diplomatic officials, military officers, hardly given to excessive sympathy for radicalism regardless of occupation or class or previous attitudes and social convictions, they all come away from Yenan (then the capital of Communist China) ardent defenders if not enthusiasts. There is no record of any Occidental visitor who came away hostile." That is the effusive review; covering three columns in the Sunday book section of the New York Times for October 28, 1945, which Peffer gave a book written by a man who, with the recently deceased Agnes Smedley, was named by General MacArthur's intelligence officer in Japan as a spy for the Soviet Union.

As for the late Agnes Smedley, who wrote numerous flattering reviews of comradely books, she herself delivered a hefty volume which Knopf brought out in 1943 titled "Battle Hymn of China." The Chinese Communists were glorified in this one, not only in the text, but in artful juxtapositions of photos-and-captions. On one page, for instance, is a heart-moving photograph of a Chinese war orphan and a flattering portrait of Chu Teh, captioned "Father of the Red Army."

It was not until after the war was over, however, that the bumper crop of books on China and the Far East appeared, most if not all reviewed in a way that must have been highly pleasing to Moscow.

THE PROFESSOR FROM HARVARD

There was John K. Fairbank, Harvard professor, for instance. In 1948, Professor Fairbank wrote a book titled "The United States and China," published by the Harvard University Press. On the jacket of this book are comments that were secured by the publisher before publication for use in impressing the public with advance views of the experts. Blurbs such as these are aimed at knocking over the prospective reader.

The publisher's hope and intent is that the casual browser will be awed into buying the work. This is a common technique for heavy or serious books. On the jacket of Professor Fairbank's tome was Theodore H. White's assertion that this was "the best one-volume job on China I've ever read." Mr. White, formerly Time-Life correspondent, was only 32 years of age at the time, with 9 years' residence in wartime Chungking and no time at all in China when it wasn't at war. With Annalee Jacoby, a young women who was given a job in China after the death of her husband, a Time-Life man, he wrote Thunder Out of China. This was the first all-out attack on Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Government and the first big victory for Communist propaganda. Through almost 300 of its 325 pages runs the red streak of bias. As soon as the authors charge that "America's war had cut blindly across the course of the greatest revolution in the history of Asia," the bias is apparent.

Professor Fairbank's book was praised equally highly by the late Richard Lauterbach with a really fulsome statement, and by Owen Lattimore, with more brevity but with the same enthusiasm.

Now for Fairbank the reviewer, as we logroll along.

He was given three books on China to review for the Sunday book section of the New York Times. He returned the White-Jacoby compliment when he reviewed their book, Thunder Out of China. This was given the lead spot in the issue of October 27, 1946. Harvard Professor Fairbank thought the authors stated the issue very well when they said that if China were to go Communist, it would be because "Chinese Communist democracy" had succeeded in appealing to the people more effectively than the Kuomintang. Bitterly hostile to Patrick Hurley, our wartime Ambassador to China, and an admirer of the late Gen. Joseph Stilwell, Fairbank stated it as his opinion, in agreement with the Thunder authors, that the issue was not one of communism, but merely of good government. "Readers who believe that communism is an uncalled-for conspiratorial subversion," Mr. Fairbank wrote, "will have apoplexy from Thunder Out of China." Obviously, Mr. Fairbank is not one of those. Further, he says, "we have let our fears of Russia and communism, on which the right Kuomintang plays so skillfully, drive the Chinese revolution further into dependence on China and communism." This book, incidentally, was given very high praise as well by Edgar Snow, which should be enough to finish the description of it and make one

wonder why it got the favored treatment it did in the New York Times.

PHILIP JAFFE ON STAGE

On February 9, 1947, Mr. Fairbank reviewed two other books for the Times: China's Destiny, by Chiang Kai-shek, an edition authorized by the author; and an edited, unauthorized edition of the same book prepared by Philip Jaffe. Fairbank reviewed these together and managed to say nothing about Jaffe's known bias for the pro-Communist case in China, nor of his involvement in the Amerasia case in which Jaffe was fined for participation in the theft of secret documents from the State Department. The quality and political tone of the review is set by Fairbank's remark that what distinguishes the Communists from others in China is the former's emphasis on a better life.

For more log jamming Mrs. Jacoby appeared in the New York Times Sunday book section on December 16, 1946, as the reviewer of My Twenty-five Years in China, by John B. Powell, an American of unquestioned integrity who lost both his feet in a Japanese prison. Here she takes sharp issue with the author, who persists in calling the Chinese Communists "bandits." Mrs. Jacoby berates the author as a "reactionary" and insists that peace in China's civil war depends on "progress in negotiations between the Kuomintang and the Communists." She is especially contemptuous of Mr. Powell's suggestions that there is a "Red menace."

When another non-Communist book, this time on Japan, Japan and the Son of Heaven, by Willard De Mille Price, was reviewed in the Times of October 14, 1945, the reviewer was none other than Owen Lattimore, who criticized the book unfavorably.

When Lattimore's own book, Solution in Asia, was reviewed in the February 25, 1945, issue Edgar Snow was given the task. Between them they sold the readers of the Times book section the perfect appeasement-of-Russia program. Snow found the book "penetrating and comprehensive, yet a succinct and logical exposition of the main dilemmas which face us."

Two weeks later, in the issue of March 11, 1945, the Times again lent the book-review columns to that annoyingly persistent combination: a pro-Commite book on China reviewed, of course, by Edgar Snow. This time more than a full page was devoted to Harrison Forman's book, Report From Red China. This was obviously nothing but a propaganda pamphlet for the Soviet Union, which Snow calmly treated as a serious and objective report. Harrison Forman, the author of this book, is an explorer, lecturer, and newsreel man who has made films of the Chinese Communists. Typical of Snow's review of it was this appraisal of the Chinese civil war—"an internal struggle between the Kuomintang one-party regime of Chiang Kai-shek and all the anti-Japanese and anti-Fascist people's organizations * * * under the general leadership of the Chinese Communist Party." Typical of the book's bias was Forman's "testimony" that he had seen nothing to link the Chinese Communist Party with Russia. Snow could then declare the book to be of "considerable historic as well as contemporary value" and consider it a good day's work well done.

Neglected almost entirely, when it wasn't slammed and damned, was Freda Utley's Last Chance in China, which attempted to awaken the American people to the dangers that would face us if communism succeeded in capturing China. Mrs. Utley, as a very young woman, was a member of the British Communist Party and lived in Moscow for 6 years as the wife of a Russian citizen who was not a Communist. She worked as a specialist on far eastern questions at the Moscow Institute of World Economy and Politics. Her rapid disillusionment and why she came to regard the Soviet Government as a tyranny as bad if not worse than Hitler's, is related in her book, The Dream We Lost. Needless to say, the book was equally, if not more, lost than her later one on China.

Is it possible that Mrs. Utley is getting a "treatment"? As one who knows intimately and at first-hand the viciousness of the Soviet system, and the broad reaches of their policy for world domination, she represents a potent enemy to Communists, Russian and home-grown.

EUGENE LYONS KNEW TOO MUCH

As a matter of fact, the studied practice of ignoring, neglecting, or damning with faint praise books that sought to show the danger from Communist infiltration, began far back, the Red Decade, by Eugene Lyons, published in 1941 and mentioned earlier in this article, was the first really authoritative and informative book on the Stalinist penetration of America. At the time he wrote it, Mr. Lyons was editor of a national magazine and had behind him a successful record of best sellers in books and an equally distinguished record as a foreign correspondent and magazine writer. He speaks Russian, worked in Moscow for the United Press, and was the first American newspaperman to interview Stalin. The Red Decade, even more than his earlier work, Assignment in Utopia, earned the title of "Red baiter" for him and got him damned high and low by the intellectuals, the liberals, and the Russophiles. Most reviewers were displeased because Mr. Lyons' probing in the Red Decade revealed the infection among their friends, the intellectuals.

The fact that the New York Times book reviewing activities have been specifically examined at some length in this article should not be construed as an indictment of that paper alone. The New York Herald Tribune in both its daily section and in its Sunday supplement, Books, presents abundant evidence of favoritism of the left. In the late summer or early autumn of last year there appeared a perfect instance of the misuse of its columns to get over two gratuitous comments that are strictly Communist party-line propaganda of the hit-and-run variety whether the reviewer, the editor, or the unfortunate author realizes it or not.

(The current party-line is to sneer at all ex-Communists, to deny and insult their repentance. This is particularly necessary to the Communists because they must try to offset the damage done their cause by such sincere and repentant men as Whittaker Chambers, who testified against Hiss, and Louis Budenz, whose testimony helped convict the 11 top Communists in the United States. Another section of the current line, one which is always current as a matter of fact, is to encourage disrespect for simple morality; to glorify attacks on decency and suggest it is bourgeois and old-fashioned and so to be avoided.).

Buried back in the Sunday Book Section of the Herald Tribune was a review by an obscure reviewer, one Edgar L. Acken, of David Loughlin's novel, A Private Stair.

In a 50-line review these two bits appear: "At first we think we understand De Gastro, the seaman-electrician. After all, he is only trying to make some money in a slightly illegal way, a project an American reader can understand and even sympathize with." And this: "As for Allpike, the able seaman, except for his pathological lying, in which he reminds us of an ex-Communist who has seen the light, there is nothing about him which we can identify."

Or for another example, the Herald Tribune book section on September 3, carried a review of Public Opinion in Soviet Russia, by Alexander Inkeles, published by the Harvard University Press. The review was written by Clyde R. Miller.

NO RACIAL PREJUDICE IN RUSSIA

Miller is known for his pro-Soviet views. The most revealing passage in the review is this:

"Racial prejudice, once exploited in the propaganda of the Czarist regime (and of course, later by Hitler) has no place in the Soviet Union. This, in large measure, explains the fanatical zeal of the North Koreans and the Soviet's exploitation of the Korean situation among the colored peoples of the world."

This off-hand acceptance of the myth of race equality in the U. S. S. R. is a dead give-away. The supremacy of the Russian people in the racial melange of the country is by this time an article of faith; Russian culture and the Russian language are musts for other nationalities; excessive national sentiment on the part of any of the minor racial groups is treated as counter-revolutionary separatism. Actually, there has been a notable growth of antisemitism, under the official label of cosmopolitanism.

In any case, why did Miss Irita Van Doren, who runs the Herald Tribune book section, pick on Miller, of all people, to deal with a book on Russia? There are any number of American writers who have lived in Russia and are better able to appraise a book on Soviet propaganda.

Lewis Gannett, the book review editor and literary critic of the Herald Tribune, is himself an excellent writer, an experienced reviewer who is also an influential voice in the expression of Herald Tribune policy and a protagonist of many causes. He is mentioned 17 times in appendix 9 in the records of the Congressional Committee on Un-American activities.

Apropos of that it is interesting to read Mr. Gannett in his regular space in the Herald Tribune for January 1, 1948. In an easy mood, reviewing the literary scene at year's end, he says:

"Meanwhile, I hope that the old year has seen some competent talents—not geniuses—at work on two books which I should like to read in 1948. One would be a study of the history of congressional committees—how and when they arose, how they came to be outside the ordinary rules of law, what good—or evil—they have accomplished under what circumstances. I would also like to read a careful study of the invasions of civil liberties in and after World War I—the ousting of the Socialists, the deportations, the Palmer raids. It would give us a standard by which to gage our present moods. It would also be a colorful study. It could include the occasion when a noble senator shook his finger at a witness, Louise Bryand, and refused to let her tell what she had seen in Russia until she first swore that she believed in his 'God.'"

THE RUSSIANS GO FOR HOWARD FAST

On March 1, 1948, Mr. Gannett wrote: "They read American books even in the Russian zone of Germany. Eva Putnam reports in the New Republic that Howard Fast's Freedom Road, is being serialized in the Russian-licensed Berlin Vorwärts and that in response to an inquiring reader, the editor recommended other examples of 'progressive American literature'."

Mr. Fast is the red frontist who drew 3 months and a $500 fine for contempt of Congress not too long ago for refusing to state whether he was or was not a Communist Party member. Fast is "must" reading, the Daily Worker says. Last year he was in Paris at one of those phony Communist peace rallies telling the French that "the reign of terror is only beginning in America."

Mr. Gannett has never reviewed Seeds of Treason, the Victor Lasky-Ralph de Toledano book on the trials of Alger Hiss, although its value and importance and distinct literary merit and interest are unquestioned and its prepublication publicity was extraordinary.

The book has been on the best-seller lists despite this and other attempts to keep it out of the public eye.

On the other hand, Ordeal by Slander, by Owen Lattimore, a quickie done by the man Senator JOE MCCARTHY accuses of being the chief architect of our disastrous far eastern policy, got extra-special treatment from both the Herald Tribune and New York Times.

The two papers published on two successive days, Sunday, July 30, and Monday, July 31, a big blast of favorable publicity vindicating Mr. Lattimore and damning JOE MCCARTHY. This was not done in the news columns; the book columns obliged. Both gave Ordeal by Slander all of page 1 of their Sunday book review section, plus a breakover; and each followed this with a lavish plug for the defense with another burst of cheering next morning in the daily review columns.

The Herald Tribune Sunday review was done by John K. Fairbank, whom we have discussed before. His choice to review Ordeal by Slander is particularly brazen, because on page 208 of the book Lattimore related how Fairbank aided him in advance of his appearance before the congressional committee. "John Fairbank of Harvard sent out telegrams to a long list of far-eastern experts all over the country suggesting that they write Senator Tydings, the chairman of the committee," protesting naturally.

In any discussion of Communist infiltration of the book trade, the name of the Boston publishing firm of Little, Brown & Co. inevitably arises. The Lattimore book is advertised as an "Atlantic Monthly Press Book," but beneath this line is another, as follows: "Little, Brown & Co., Boston." The two are the same. They are the publishers of Howard Fast, and Albert Maltz, another well-known leftist, as well as others. The editor in chief is Angus Cameron, listed in Who's Who in the East as Donald Angus Cameron but better known simply as Angus Cameron. Since 1938 Mr. Cameron has been associated with Little, Brown, first as their New York editorial representative and then moving along into other jobs with them until today he is not only the top editor but a member of the board of directors and secretary of the corporation.

Mr. Cameron was a member of the National Committee for Wallace for President in March 1948, when Wallace had the backing of the Communists. The program of the Progressive Citizens of America which launched the Wallace candidacy, dated October 25, 1947, names Cameron as a sponsor. The New Masses, a Communist magazine, in its issue of October 14, 1947, reports that Cameron was a speaker at a protest meeting on behalf of Howard Fast.

Cameron was named in the 1945 catalog of the Samuel Adams School for Social Studies in Boston as one of the trustees. This school was cited on the official list of the Attorney General as Communist and subversive. He was a sponsor of the March 1949 conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. He was also a sponsor of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt (anti-Communist) Bill as late as April 1950.

Recently, Little, Brown & Co. added to its staff one Edwin Seaver, a real pink soulmate. Mr. Seaver was head of a department of the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker, the official Communist newspaper in New York, in 1935. Earlier in that year he had been managing editor of Soviet Russia Today. Mr. Seaver's Communist ties go away back, as far as May 19, 1930, when the New York Times listed him as one of the signers of a protest circulated by the John Reed Clubs. This makes him a pioneer in the Communist movement in America. Like Mr. Cameron, Mr. Seaver was a sponsor of the March 1949 conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Like Mr. Cameron, he was publicly for Henry Wallace when Wallace was the Communists' darling.

The lesson for the thoughtful reader? Q. E. D.

Report on Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an outstanding address delivered by W. H. Jasspon, of Memphis, Tenn., before the Memphis Rotary Club on September 12, 1950. Mr. Jasspon is an able and experienced observer and long familiar with European conditions. This speech was made upon his return from a European trip of several weeks duration during which he had access to many sources of information not ordinarily available.

I regard this address as a very constructive criticism of our past and present European policy, and although made 4 months ago, it is still pertinent and up-to-date. I believe that every Member of Congress will find something of value in this address and it is for that reason that I am inserting it in the RECORD.

REPORT ON EUROPE

We are exposed today to two deadly perils—Russian imperialism and internal inflation. Korea dramatized the danger of the one, but we have not been shocked as yet into taking effective action to avoid the other. I mention it only because the two are tied together, and in its own way, each can be equally disastrous.

Since the war we have given away billions of dollars in credits and grants in a sincere desire to speed recovery everywhere. We played no favorites. We sought no exclusively selfish benefit, except to the extent that we, like everyone everywhere, would gain from a rebuilt world at peace. We wasted billions in China and the Philippines. Even Russia has so far refused even a token settlement of its $11,000,000,000 lend-lease obligation. We loaned England nearly $4,000,000,000 upon the mistaken assumption it would restore their economic health, only to find that a large part of these funds were absorbed in liquidating old sterling balances, having little or no bearing on their own postwar recovery. Then came ECA. Even with all this help and other assistance besides, we have failed to make friends or influence people, anywhere in the world. I am to speak to you today about my reactions as to the position of Europe. My major interest over the postwar years has been mostly with the commercial consequences of all this postwar turmoil, but in view of existing conditions, I shall adhere largely to the political and social aspects which, at this moment, are of greatest significance.

The Marshall plan was a historic milestone in international relations. On the whole, it has been well administered, considering the political limitations to its operations. It assisted the rebuilding of industry which provided jobs for idle men and women. It distributed food in huge quantities to people who were hungry. Its efforts gave hope once more to millions who had lost hope. It revealed the weaknesses of age-old and outmoded customs of trade, and the implications inherent in unenlightened employer-to-worker relations, so common in Europe. It urged certain desirable and essential economic, social, and political reforms, in accordance with our own experience, only to be met with the insurmountable barrier that we were interfering with national sovereignty. Even the Communists joined in this political opposition. It played into their hands at that time.

ECA aid did buy some breathing space. It deserves the credit for having arrested the growing spread of communism, and halted its political progress. Unfortunately, this time has been wasted, insofar as building a defense against subversion, or in trying to correct the underlying causes which bring it about. In the United States, communism is as yet only an embarrassing nuisance, which has to be policed and held within strict limits. It can become a menace here only if and when our free institutions become crippled and impotent as a result of unwise management at the top political level. It is a real and continuing threat, however, in many countries of Europe. There are many reasons for this.

Vested interests exercise selfish and unwarranted power in many governments. They control production and prices through the cartel system, which eliminates competition while it maintains low wages, high prices, and higher profits at the expense of all the people. Very little social welfare and agrarian reforms have been undertaken. Tax evasion is often the rule rather than the exception, by those most able to pay (in some areas), again at the expense of the masses. Public office is too often a private, rather than a public, trust. Political leadership is frequently unstable, vacillating, and without the courage to make the changes they know are vital. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand, under such conditions, why poverty and low living standards exist and supply the fuel to feed the fires of communistic propaganda. Empty stomachs make poor political advisers. It is nothing new nor novel in history, where such circumstances have prevailed, for a people to surrender their political freedom for the promise of economic security, only to find that they have lost both in the end. Woodrow Wilson once said, "The history of liberty is the history of limitations of government power, not the increase of it."

When I left Europe at the end of July, I saw very little change in the attitude of the average citizen, or among government officials, from what it was before the outbreak in Korea. If anything, there was a Chinese atmosphere of hopelessness, but there seemed to be no particular alarm. There was certainly no evidence anywhere of a will to fight. In the First World War, France had a magnificent army and a great spirit. The soldiers were fighting for freedom and a better life. In the Second World War, there was a tragic and strange reversal of form. It began at the top, and filtered down through the ranks. The people had become disillusioned. Their status had not improved in the interval; if anything it had deteriorated. Today, 5 years after this second struggle, the workers are still the forgotten man. They want no part of another war. They cannot be good soldiers if they are forced to fight. They do not know who is for or against them, within their own ranks, thanks to Communist infiltration. It is well to understand their present frame of mind, in order to know why their lethargy continues even in the face of possible invasion. Yes, we reconstructed industry and made jobs, as I have said, but we could not rebuild the spirit of the men and women. This has to come from within. It is not strange, when you have seen all of this, to appreciate why our contribution to recovery

has been so sadly discounted or misunderstood.

I have been told on several occasions in France, we only helped to replace what we destroyed. The argument about liberation leaves the average Frenchman cold. He will tell you that Germany was already defeated. Many feel that if there is to be another war, it is our war, not theirs. They claim they have nothing to fight for. They have lost some of their love of country, because their country has done so little for them. They recall, that the period following the Armistice was not too bad. France saved lives. It had a sort of peace. It retained its colonies. No huge war debt was incurred. Oh, there were some inevitable inconveniences from the German occupation army, but on the whole it was not too hard to take. They might want to sit out another war, if they can, some of them believe, and some of them hope. One of my friends told me he housed a dozen Germans in his home in Normandy. They lived and ate with the family, drank wine along with their hosts, and conducted themselves in a most orderly manner. When the Americans came in, they took the place over, and the wine cellar was consumed in less than 2 weeks. This is the type of incident one hears. France may not be able to stay out of war, if it comes, but they will go a long ways to avoid it. Their help, whatever it may be, unless it becomes organized in advance along with other nations, will be too little and too late. Sabotage and fifth column damages are to be expected, and can be serious, especially in connection with factory production and transport. Some or all of these tendencies apply to many of the Western European bloc. It is not a happy prospect for us. We are only fooling ourselves if we count too strongly on European help. They want to be on the receiving end.

In England the situation is somewhat different. Here you witness an empire breaking up, under the surge of nationalism, which is evident in many thickly populated areas of the world. There has been altogether too much exploitation of the masses, for the interest and profit of absentee ownerships. England lives on international trade. It must import raw materials and food, to be liquidated by exports of manufactured goods. The Labor Government came into power because the people were restless under the impact of postwar confusion and disappointment. Socialism pledged itself to divide accumulated wealth into fair shares for all. It insisted there would be full employment regardless, something which is not entirely feasible in any dynamic society. It began to nationalize certain industries, and announced it would carry this policy into effect until practically all large industries were state-owned and managed. Capital was squeezed until it had very little more to give. Taxes were raised to a point where there was not much incentitve to earn and create. But austerity still prevailed. The people continued to queue up for their food rations, such as they were and are. After 5 years of this noble experiment, the great middle class sensed the fact that they are paying for such doles as medical services, and food subsidies; and still their situation had not improved. In the last election the Socialist Party did not even poll a popular majority—quite a change from their mandate 5 years earlier. The people, however, had not surrendered all of their political freedom to the Socialists and Labor, so they could again express themselves in a free election. Any one of you who has ridden on English or continental trains has seen what happens in a noncompetitive system. England is stagnant. A fine people have lost much of their initiative under socialism, which has achieved nothing that a properly directed free economy could not provide better and cheaper. Some will argue with merit that the status of the lowest classes has improved. But this trend was on the way even before the war, and would have had to be carried on by any government that was in power after the war. Here, too, we do not find the will to make further sacrifices, at the expense of their present poor living standard. The men and women are understandably tired of war and scarcity; they, too, do not want to fight. Until they think their homeland may be threatened you cannot expect much to be done. It is no accident that England continues to ship machine tools to Russia, nor is it a mere coincidence that Shinwell and Strachey were chosen to the two top political posts concerned with military affairs. They are not the types who can be expected to prepare in anticipation of a possible emergency, nor is their ideology too far removed from the philosophy of the Communist principle. At that, they probably echo the thoughts of the man in the street, who wants to be left alone, and who says, "It would be good for the Yanks to be taken down a peg."

We have a right to be disturbed when we continue month after month to talk about German rearmament, knowing it is a "must" in any organized European plan for a united defense. Informed sources no longer fear the possibility of creating another Hitler war machine. On the contrary, we may be forced to build a defense mechanism capable of facing a military force which might make the old German Army look like a police guard. France understands this and is not afraid of German rearming under any union of European nations. Commercial selfishness plays a part in the delay. Heavy industries want to make peacetime goods while there is such a large demand, rather than reconvert to defense production as long as their Governments do not seem anxious to force the issue. One would think indeed that the danger is remote rather than imminent. Some political leaderships fear the political effect of the strain on their own economy, if they prepare for protection. As if they would have any economy to save if invasion occurred. Everyone is aware that Eastern Germany has created a large so-called police force, trained and willing to march whenever the signal is given. The situation in Germany bears all the earmarks of a possible European Korea. The Russian zone is systematically and purposely ignoring the steady emigration of over 9,000,000 inhabitants up to now, to the west. This increases the critical unemployment and feeding problems in the allied zones. Russia rids itself of those who are not easily indoctrinated, and is able to filter into the west spies and saboteurs at will, ready to do their lethal work when the time is ripe. I hope we have put a stop to the dismantling process, but I am not sure. Some of our funds have gone into new plants, replacing those which have been moved out since our aid program has been operative, and is explained away by the statement that the removals were prior commitments. Does this make sense?

I think it is fair appraisal to say at this time that Europe, including England, seems more interested in trying to drive a hard bargain as to how much preparedness they can force us to provide and pay for, than to use the intervening time in getting that much ahead of the job. They are not even doing much to awaken public opinion as to what may be in store.

For the first time, we find Americans awakened and trying to compel the Government to take urgent action. In Europe nowhere is there a sense of hurry. Business is too good, and free governments seldom move faster than the people. This country should stop further aid for recovery. It should get hard-boiled. If we are not going to have real partners, let us find it out now. I think it is well to know that some of the hesitancy in Europe is due not only to ineffective leadership, but also to some uncertainty as to how far they can depend on us. They remember we stayed out of the two world wars until our own security and welfare were threatened. They are inclined to forget it was our blood and resources which finally brought victory. If they have misused it, we are not to blame, though a scapegoat covers up a lot of mistakes. We went to Europe's rescue after the First World War, creating a false prosperity here, and ending in the debacle of 1929. We helped them again after the last war, and we are still doing it, yet we are consistently needled for more. We know there is a limit, but the feeling persists we can be argued out of an unfair share now because we appear to be scared. This is not the sort of situation which makes for effective and forthright teamwork in a common cause. We need forceful statesmanship now—men who will make it crystal clear, what we have a right to expect. Europe is in greater immediate jeopardy than we are but because the danger is mutual, there must be a fair distribution of the burdens of defense.

In considering the gloomy picture in Europe, as I see it, the question of Spain ought to be touched on, briefly. It is difficult to become enthusiastic over Franco, but who can defend Tito, except that for the moment he opposes Russia? So does Franco. We play ball with one and condemn the other at the same time. This does not seem very realistic. It is part of the fuzzy thinking that has been prevalent in the State Department. Even Congress is tired of this sort of idealism, if you wish to call it such. They passed an unprecedented law recently authorizing a loan to Spain, as you know. One cannot approve of this method of making foreign policy, but it does illustrate a lack of confidence which is most deplorable. I am more than ever opposed to further loans or gifts without some return commitment. We have been played for suckers long enough. The cold fact remains, Spain may be the only place we can get a toe-hold in Europe some day. If you wish to argue you cannot trust them, I should agree, but I would answer by asking a question, Whom can you trust in the game of power politics? And I would answer that question—only those whose self-interests demand that they work with us. That is all alliances are anyway.

Much has been said upon the question of a western European union. The situation in Western Europe today is analagous to what would confront us, if some of our States were free to act in foreign policy, on their own. Desirable as this union is, and it must come some day, it is a vision for the future, the far distant future. Many differences—in language, even a detail such as weights and measures, and many more—make this proposal a hard nut to crack. The real stumbling block is England, without whose cooperation little can be accomplished. Their opposition is not one of just being stubborn. It is a matter entirely of a fundamental conflict of interests, which both the Labor and Conservative Parties recognize. On the other hand, however, all these countries, including England, would gladly join an Atlantic union, in my judgment, in which Canada and the United States would participate, provided we put up most of the money. But until this emergency passes there are more immediately practical tasks to perform.

Communism and a free society cannot continue to live together in peace. Russia and the United States had enjoyed what had been regarded as a traditional friendship over a long period. Their interests were complementary, rather than conflicting—until communism came into power. Their intensive campaign of hate is being directed principally against us. This is due only to the fact that the United States represents the most extreme example of a free and competitive society, which has actually improved the status of all its citizens. This

gives the Russian rulers grave concern for their own hides. Our living standards are the envy of the whole world, even though you and I know some part of it has been based on borrowed money and Government doles in various forms. The struggle to determine which type of society shall ultimately prevail is now under way. It may bring about war, or it could continue for some time in the form of economic attrition—the process which is now being forced on a free world. They have an idea that Americans cannot "take it," that we are too soft. We are soon to be put to the real test to determine if we will accept some austerity and forego some luxury without whimpering. We have come of age, but we wish to be treated accordingly. We want to be told the hard facts of life. We must stop, or be restrained from, living in a fool's paradise today, not tomorrow. We must demand resolute action from our political leaders, and the adjournment of politics for the duration. This is no time for such extravagance.

We are the most misunderstood Nation in the world, even though we have always done more than we promised. I have tried to state some of the reasons why Russian assurances continue to appeal to so many, in spite of the facts, which millions do not know—that all Russia has even given to the nations they have taken over are the shackles that have bound the masses into a modern form of physical and mental slavery.

We have been assailed as imperialists, and many believe it. Yet we voluntarily gave up Cuba. We voted independence to the Philippines, and then gave them over $2,000,000,000, which they have recklessly wasted. Has Russia ever released a dependency, or anything else but misery under a police state? Yet it presses on and on for more victims, more sources of production and manpower, in an endeavor to keep the Russian people contented with their lot. If they succeed, that little group in the Kremlin may remain in undisputed power, while they chuckle to themselves and marvel at the sight of a world in chaos, for which their evil genius is responsible. If we can make them fail, the Russian people will rebel against the yoke which binds them. We need political missionaries to fight lies with self-evident facts and truths. Communism is a force of ideas—terrible ideas, but with a nostalgic appeal to under-privileged everywhere. It can only be met by the practical application of other, and more personal ideas—ideals I should like to call them—which will create a superior life under individual freedom. This is the only sure way to conquer the menace which overhangs the world. Then we can hope to restore the dignity of the human being in a better society to be ruled by men, freely chosen, rather than enslaved by ruthless masters, whoever they may be.

Who Is on America's Side?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for America to find out who are her friends. Britain not only has recognized the Red Government of China, but apparently she is using our dollars to help build up Russia's war machine.

Not only is it appropriate to ask if Britain is on our side—we might ask are the Truman policy makers on America's side. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including an article written by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in the Washington Times-Herald for January 7, 1951:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

This will give you a bounce. President Truman is nicking us another $8,800,000,000 to supply arms and ammunition to the Atlantic Pact nations. The British are coming in for a huge chunk of this. They'll get hundreds of trucks, tanks, mobile guns, and everything else that their army, navy, and air force needs.

Untold thousands of tons of finished rubber goods will, of course, go into the weapons we ship to them: Tires, inner tubes, all kinds of rubber mats, buffers for radar, and other devices.

To help the British along, little Mr. Big is switching from the American market all the natural rubber he can get his hands on. Under date of December 29, the National Production Administration ordered a halt on all buying and distribution of natural rubber so the stepped-up military demands for the British and others could be met.

Next will come the scrap-rubber drives, wherein you'll be asked to toss on the street corner your old hot-water bottles and used tires that are too old for retreading with synthetics. In short, the standard routine.

Today, reposing on the docks of the Thames River near London is $10,000,000 worth of natural rubber. It will be loaded into the British steamer *Stanreal*. It was shipped to London from Malaya and would come in handily in the United States right now in making the tires, etc., we are going to send to Britain. But don't get the idea we are going to get it.

Not a chance. The British are loading it for shipment to the Soviet port of Odessa. The Russians are stockpiling natural rubber for war purposes, the potential war against us, and presumably the British themselves.

But British traders are not bashful about picking up a fast ruble. To Russia goes this immense load of the all-important stuff on which modern armies move.

For a new high in gall the British Government on December 28 asked the United States to share our stockpile of strategic metals to ease her shortage. We have been trying to stockpile rubber for 2 years.

While you are juggling that one let's take a look at the Government's idea of mutual help in building up strong defenses against Russia—which is the key gagline in the North Atlantic Pact. Since the end of the war British Malaya has been shipping tons of crude rubber to the Soviet Union.

United States rubber authorities have protested this time and again, but consistently get a brush-off.

The economic planners in the Truman administration, instead of using some sense, tucked British Malaya into the Marshall-plan-aid set-up and thousands of American dollars have helped restore crude rubber production in this and other British rubber-producing possessions.

In fact, John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co., says 80 percent of the world's crude rubber production is either financed to a large extent by Marshall-plan funds direct, or by those of other American funds, indirectly, through other Marshall-plan countries.

The British statement that shipments of natural rubber to Russia are O. K. since we are not at war with the Soviet Union must sound a bit discordant to British troops fighting Soviet-directed Chinese Communists in Korea and it certainly is a worthy topic for a quiz program here at home.

If we aren't now fighting the men of Russia and getting ready for the main bout, how come the Blair House boss wants us to spend $8,600,000,000 shipping guns and butter all over the globe? And how come also, those emergency rubber requirements for continental United States?

These are simple questions of fact, the British dachie to answer. In view of the wartime billions we sent to Britain for lend-lease, the postwar billions for economic aid and the billions for armaments now on the way, it would seem the British owe us a little something.

By choice I avoid the moral issue involved to point out in the space available here that maybe former President Herbert Hoover had something when he said we should hold up our men and arms for Europe until they show some signs of building up their own defenses and acting smart about Russia.

In the United States everyone is worried about France.

But at least the French Government, in November, banned the shipment of all strategic goods to Russia, especially natural rubber.

Background of the Twenty-eighth Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Background of the Twenty-eighth Division," written by Ray Carpenter, division historian, and published in the Red Keystone for December 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION

(By Ray Carpenter)

TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION ORGANIZATION DATE—SINGLE DIVISION REORGANIZATION OF 1919

Maj. Gen. John F. Ballenthin, Maj. Gen. George E. Snowden, Maj. Gen. Charles Miller, Maj. Gen. J. P. S. Oxnam, Maj. Gen. John W. Schall, Maj. Gen. John A. Wilej, Brig. Gen. Charles B. Dougherty, Maj. Gen. Theodore P. Bowman, Maj. Gen. Charles Dougherty, Maj. Gen. Charles M. Clement, Maj. Gen. Charles H. Muir (World War I member), Maj. Gen. William H. Hay, Maj. Gen. William G. Price, Jr., Maj. Gen. Edward C. Shannon, Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Maj. Gen. J. Gerardin, Gen., Maj. Gen. Lloyd D. Brown (World War II combat), Brig. Gen. James E. Wharton (killed after commanding division several hours, One Hundred and Twelfth Infantry Headquarters), Maj. Gen. Norman D. Cota, (World War II combat), Maj. Gen. Daniel B. Strickler (present commander).

NOTE.—Gen. George C. Marshall was an officer in Twenty-eighth Division circa 1904.

HISTORICAL BATTLE CHARGE OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY DIVISION

The Twenty-eighth Infantry Division is the oldest division in the Army Reserve of the United States.

1. War of the Spanish Succession of 1707. (a) Colonial service under the King of England.

2. French and Indian War of 1763: (a) Colonial service under the King of England.

3. Revolutionary War of 1775: (a) Brandywine; (b) Germantown; (c) New Jersey, 1775; (d) Pennsylvania, 1778–81.

4. War of 1812: (a) Federal service before Washington.

5. Mexican War of 1846: (a) Vera Cruz; (b) Cerro Gordo.

6. Civil War of 1861: (a) Wilderness; (b) Spottsylvania; (c) Cold Harbor; (d) Petersburg, (e) Shenandoah Valley; (g) Maryland, 1864; (h) Peninsula; (i) Manassas; (j) Antietam; (k) Fredericksburg; (l) Chancellorsville; (m) Gettysburg; (n) Virginia, 1861–64; (o) Vicksburg; (p) Appomattox.

7. Spanish-American War of 1898: (a) Manila; (b) Maloloc; (c) Porto Rico.

8. World War I of 1917: (a) Champagne; (b) Champagne-Marne; (c) Aisne Marne; (d) Oise-Aisne; (e) Lorraine; (f) Meuse-Argonne; (g) Ypres-Lys.

9. World War II of 1941: (a) Normandy; (b) Northern France; (c) Rhineland; (d) Ardennes; (e) Central Europe; (f) Central Pacific; (g) Western Pacific); (h) Eastern Mandate Islands.

10. Korean War of 1950: (a) Federal service.

UNITED STATES ARMY RECORD

Listed below are the record number of nine enemy divisions that attacked the Twenty-eighth Infantry Division on a 25-mile front during the opening engagements of the Battle of the Bulge, December 16, 1944. No division in American history had ever before engaged this total of enemy divisions at one time. By its holding actions, the Twenty-eighth Division performed one of the greatest feats in the history of the United States Army at a cost of 6,000 casualties.

1. One hundred and Sixteenth Panzer Division.
2. Second Panzer Division.
3. Eleventh Panzer Division.
4. One Hundred and Thirtieth Panzer Lehr Division.
5. Five Hundred and Sixtieth Volks Grenadier Division.
6. Twenty Sixth Volks Grenadier Division.
7. Three Hundred and Fifty-second Volks Grenadier Division.
8. Two Hundred and Seventy-second Volks Grenadier Division.
9. Fifth Parachute Division.

WE MET THEM ALL

In the European theater of operations the German Wehrmacht launched only four major attacks and the Twenty-eighth Infantry Division had a large hand in stopping and defeating each of them. Our beloved division fought strongly on the left flank of the Thirtieth (Old Hickory) Infantry Division at the first major German attack at Mortain when the panzers attempted to cut off Patton's Third Army by reaching the sea. The second major attack battered the Twenty-eighth in the Hurgan Forest inflicting nearly 6 000 casualties but the division retained much of the precious ground previously gained and stopped the One Hundred and Sixteenth Panzer and two German infantry divisions plus many small Kraut combat units.

The Twenty-eighth was the center in the largest German attack in the Ardennes when the division set an American record by single-handedly fighting nine enemy divisions at a cost of 6,000 casualties. Precious time was gained that allowed reinforcements to form behind the Twenty-eighth to eventually stop the Krauts. The German fourth attack at Colmar occurred at this time, and after regrouping the Twenty-eighth, recaptured Colmar and regained lost territory. From D-day to the end of the war, 90 German divisions made four major attacks on the western front. In its tours of combat along the front with the United States First Army, Third Army, Seventh Army, Fifteenth Army, and the First French Army, the Twenty-eighth Infantry Division fought half of the enemy divisions on the front and participated brilliantly in stopping all four German attacks. The Twenty-eighth Division says it again, "We met them all."

The 48 States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a report containing factual information of the 48 States, which was prepared by John F. Nave, national commander of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and sent out to all national, State, and local officers, posts, departments, and executive committeemen, including ladies' auxiliary.

The report follows:

NATIONAL DEPARTMENT,
ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR
VETERANS OF UNITED STATES, INC.,
Syracuse, N. Y., January 3, 1951.

Subject: Area, population, capital, flower, motto, nickname, and legislative session of the 48 States in the United States of America

To: All national, State, and local officers, posts, departments, and executive committeemen, including ladies' auxiliary:

1. Alabama (the Cotton State): Capital, Montgomery; area, 51,279 square miles; population, 2,832,961; motto, "We dare defend our rights"; flower, goldenrod; legislative session, meets once every 2 years on even years (example, 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

2. Arizona (the Grand Canyon State): Capital, Phoenix; area, 113,909 square miles; population, 499,261; motto, "Ditat Deus" (God enriches); flower, saguaro cactus; legislative session, meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

3. Arkansas (the Wonder State): Capital, Little Rock; area, 53,102 square miles; population, 1,949,387; motto, "Regnat populus" (the people rule); flower, apple blossom; legislative session, meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

4. California (the Golden State): Capital, Sacramento; area, 156,803 square miles; population, 9,300,000; motto, "Eureka" (I have found it); flower, golden poppy; legislative session, meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

5. Colorado (the Centennial State): Capital, Denver; area, 104,247 square miles; population, 1,159,102; motto, "Nil sine numine" (nothing without the Deity); flower, blue columbine; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

6. Connecticut (the Constitution State): Capital, Hartford; area, 5,004 square miles; population, 1,995,263; motto, "Qui transtulit sustinet" (he who transplanted still sustains); flower, mountain laurel; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

7. Delaware (the Diamond State): Captal, Dover; area, 2,390.2 square miles; population, 266,505; motto, "Liberty and independence"; flower, peach blossom; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example: 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

8. Florida (the Sunshine State): Capital, Tallahassee; area, 54,861 square miles; population, 2,250,061; motto, "In God we trust"; flower, orange blossom; legislative session meets once every 2 years on even years (example: 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

9. Georgia (Empire State of the South): Capital, Atlanta; area, 58,876 square miles; population, 3,123,723; motto, "Wisdom, justice, and moderation"; flower, Cherokee rose; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example: 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

10. Idaho (the Gem State): Capital, Boise; area, 83,354 squares miles; population, 550,000; motto, "Esto perpetua" (mayest thou endure forever); flower, syringa; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example: 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

11. Illinois (the Sucker State): Capital, Springfield, area, 55,947 square miles; population, 7,897,241; motto, "State sovereignty—national union"; flower, native violet; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

12. Indiana (the Hoosier State): Capital, Indianapolis; area, 36,291 square miles; population, 3,427,796; motto, "The crossroads of America"; flower, "zinnia; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

13. Iowa (the Hawkeye State): Capital, Des Moines; area, 55,586 square miles; population, 2,532,268; motto, "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain"; flower, wild rose; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

14. Kansas (Jayhawker): Capital, Topeka; area, 82,158 square miles; population, 1,774,447; motto, "Ad astra per aspera (to the stars through difficulty)"; flower, native sunflower; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

15. Kentucky (the Blue Grass State): Capital, Frankfort; area, 40,109 square miles; population, 2,845,627; motto, "United we stand, divided we fall"; flower, goldenrod; legislative session meets once every 2 years on even years (example, 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

16. Louisiana (the Pelican State): Capital, Baton Rouge; area, 45,409 square miles; population, 2,363,880; motto, "Union, justice, and confidence"; flower, magnolia; legislative session meets once every 2 years on even years (example, 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

17. Maine (the Pine Tree State): Capital, Augusta; area, 26,998 square miles; population, 847,226; motto, "Dirigo" (I direct or guide); flower, pine cone and tassel; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

18. Maryland (the Old Line State): Capital, Annapolis; area, 12,327 square miles; population, 1,821,244; motto, "Scuto bonae voluntatis tuae coronasti nos" (with the shield of thy good will thou hast covered us); flower, black-eyed susan; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

19. Massachusetts (the Bay State): Capital, Boston; area, 7,838.7 square miles; population, 4,493,281; motto, "Ense petit placidum sub libertate quietem" (by the sword we seek peace, but peace only under liberty); flower, mayflower; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954; etc.).

20. Michigan (the Wolverine State): Capital, Lansing; area, 96,770 square miles; population, 5,256,106; motto, "Si quaeris peninsulam amoenam circumspice" (If you seek a pleasant peninsula, look about you); flower, apple blossom; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

21. Minnesota (the Gopher State): Capital, St. Paul; area, 84,286.53 square miles; population, 2,792,300; motto, "L'Etoile du nord" (Star of the north); flower, moccasin flower; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

22. Mississippi (the Magnolia State): Capital, Jackson; area, 47,716 square miles; population, 2,180,905; motto, "Virtute et armis" (By valor and arms); flower, magnolia; legislative session meets once every 2 years on even years (example: 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

23. Missouri (the Show Me State): Capital, Jefferson City; area, 69,270 square miles; population, 3,784,664; motto, "Salus populi suprema lex esto" (the welfare of the people shall be the supreme law); flower, hawthorne; legislative session, meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

24. Montana (the Treasure State): Capital, Helena; area, 146,316 square miles; population, 559,456; motto, "Ora y plata" (gold and silver); flower, bitterroot; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (examples, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

25. Nebraska (the Cornhusker State): Capital, Lincoln; area, 76,653 square miles; population; 1,315,834; motto, equality before the law; flower, goldenrod; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

26. Nevada (the Sagebrush State): Capital, Carson City; area, 110,623 square miles; population, 156,445; motto, all for our country; flower, sagebrush; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

27. New Hampshire (the Granite State): Capital, Concord; area, 9,024 square miles; population, 491,524; motto, live free—or die; flower, purple lilac; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

28. New Jersey (the Garden State): Capital, Trenton; area, 8,204.37 square miles; population, 4,160,165; motto, liberty and prosperity; flower, violet; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc).

29. New Mexico (the Sunshine State—Land of Enchantment): Capital, Santa Fe; area, 121,666 square miles; population, 681,818; motto, "Crescit Eundo" (it grows as it goes); flower, yucca; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

30. New York (the Empire State): Capital, Albany; area, 49,576 square miles; population, 13,479,142; motto, "Excelsior" (higher); flower, rose; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

31. North Carolina (the Tar Heel State): Capital, Raleigh; area, 52,712 square miles; population, 3,571,623; motto, "Esse quam videre" (to be, rather than to seem); flower, dogwood; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

32. North Dakota (the Sioux State): Capital, Bismarck; area, 70,837 square miles; population, 520,935; motto, "Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable;" flower, wild prairie rose; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

33. Ohio (the Buckeye State): Capital, Columbus; area, 41,122 square miles; population, 6,907,612; motto, none; flower, scarlet carnation; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

34. Oklahoma (the Sooner State): Capital, Oklahoma City; area, 69,414 square miles; population, 2,336,034; motto, "Labor omnia vincit" (labor conquers all things); flower, mistletoe; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

35. Oregon (the Beaver State): Capital, Salem; area, 96,981 square miles; population, 1,089,684; motto, "The Union"; flower, Oregon grape; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

36. Pennsylvania (the Keystone State): Capital, Harrisburg; area, 45,045 square miles; population, 9,900,180; motto "Virtue, liberty, and independence"; flower, mountain laurel; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

37. Rhode Island (Little Rhody): Capital, Providence; area, 1,214, square miles; population, 713,346; motto, "Hope"; flower, violet; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

38. South Carolina (the Palmetto State): Capital, Columbia; area, 30,495 square miles; population, 1,899,804; motto, "Animus opibusque parati" (prepared in spirit and wealth); flower, yellow jessamine; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

39. South Dakota (the Coyote State): Capital, Pierre; area, 77,615 square miles; population, 652,930; motto, "Under God the people rule"; flower, Pasque flower; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

40. Tennessee (the Volunteer State): Capital, Nashville; area, 42,246 square miles; population, 2,915,841; motto, "Agriculture, commerce"; flower, iris; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

41. Texas (the Lone Star State): Capital, Austin; area 267,339 square miles; population, 7,500,000; motto, "Friendship"; flower, bluebonnet; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

42. Utah (the Beehive State): Capital Salt Lake City; area, 84,900 square miles; population, 550,310; motto, "Industry"; flower, sego lily; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

43. Vermont (the Green Mountain State): Capital, Montpelier; area, 9,526 square miles; population, 359,231; motto, "Freedom and unity"; flower, red clover, legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

44. Virginia (the Old Dominion): Capital, Richmond; area, 39,899 square miles; population, 2,677,773; motto, "Sic semper tyrannis (thus ever to tyrants)"; flower, American dogwood (cornus Florida); legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

45. Washington (the Evergreen State): Capital, Olympia; area, 66,977 square miles; population, 2,088,573; motto, "Alki" (bye and bye); flower, western rhododendron; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

46. West Virginia (the Panhandle State): Capital, Charleston; area, 24,262 square miles; population, 1,901,974; motto, "Montani semper liberti" (mountaineers are always free); flower, big rhododendron; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odds years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

47. Wisconsin (the Badger State): Capital, Madison; area, 54,715 square miles; population, 3,137,587; motto, "Forward"; flower, violet; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

48. Wyoming (the Equality State): Capital, Cheyenne; area, 97,914 square miles; population, 245,000; motto, "Cedant arma togae" (let arms yield to the grown); flower, Indian paint brush; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

Yours in comradeship,

JOHN F. NAVE,
National Commander, 1950–51.

Year of Responsibility and Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under consent accorded me by the House, I am including herewith a New Year's letter to the personnel in the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, from Mr. H. H. Bennett, who is the head of that agency. It is entitled "Year of Responsibility and Opportunity."

Mr. Bennett has spent a number of years in the Soil Conservation Service. He is highly respected in that position. The letter calls upon employees to join with him in doing a better and finer job in the coming year.

Mr. Bennett has set an example that could well be followed by the heads of other agencies in our Government. I think the membership of the House will be interested in reading the letter, which follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., January 1, 1951.

Memorandum to all Soil Conservation Service personnel.

From: H. H. Bennett.

Subject: Year of responsibility and opportunity.

This is New Year's Day.

Just a few years ago we all celebrated the victorious ending of a war. All of us hoped that it might be the last fighting between nations. We fought to preserve our liberty against the ambitions of men in other nations who wanted to impose absolute dictatorship over our thoughts, our actions, and our aspirations. We fought, as thousands of Americans had fought before—since colonial days—to preserve our right to govern ourselves as the majority of us saw fit without coercion, reprisals, or use of violence to ourselves and our families.

Now our country is faced with another emergency. An alien system—one that is completely opposed to self-government and the freedom of the individual—is in action against us. You know what is happening in Korea and at the meetings of the United Nations. You know that General Eisenhower has had to return to uniform. You have heard or read what the President and our leaders in Congress have said about the gravity of the present situation.

Once again we are confronted with the imperative need to defend ourselves, our liberty, and everything that Americans hold dear.

This is no time for debate. Americans now are in action now, as they were yesterday and will be tomorrow.

No one knows how long the present emergency may last or what proportions it may reach. But we do know that we must prepare ourselves for any development. To meet the increased requirements of ourselves and our allies we are going to have greater production of food, fiber, vegetable oils and oils, and wood products—all of which come from the soil. The surest way of increasing production and holding it at the necessarily high levels year after year for as long as may be required is by actual conservation farming over wide areas. Along with the cooperating farmers in soil conservation districts all over the country we in the Soil Conservation

Service demonstrated the value of conservation farming during the last war. Wisely planned and carefully applied systems of conservation farming not only resulted in large increases in production but protected the land at the same time. Farmers and ranchers were able to get larger yields with less labor, equipment, and fertilizer.

In war, as in peace, the land continues as our most vital and basic resource. Everything we do, all we share, and whatever we amount to as a great and vigorous people begins with and rests on the sustained productivity of our agricultural lands. Any undermining of this base undermines and weakens our Nation and all of its people. So during the year ahead—1951—you have a greater responsibility and a greater opportunity than ever before. Soil-conservation work must be speeded up. Once again it becomes an indispensable part of the basic defense operations of the Nation. And you and your job, important in peacetime, now become doubly important to the Nation as it begins mobilizing for the emergency with every resource we possess. What you are able to accomplish this year will not only bring results this year but next year and on into 1955 and 1960, when the need may be even greater.

We in the Soil Conservation Service have an unusual and indispensable service to give to the country. We have the knowledge and the experience necessary to work with farmers and ranchers on the land to protect it, use it wisely, and make it yield more year after year. In our work with soil conservation districts we are also helping to build and strengthen the American system of self-government at the very sustaining foundation.

Our land, our liberty, our self-respect, and our system of self-government—these are what we have fought for in the past and are determined to protect in the future. Every man in the Soil Conservation Service can help and help best by studying his job, sticking to it, and putting even more of his enthusiasm and determination into it than ever before. For my part I will be working with you and for you to the best of my ability all the way.

H. H. BENNETT.

Winning the Peace—The Economic Front—An Address Delivered by Paul G. Hoffman, ECA Consultant, Before National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., New York, N. Y., November 1, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent heretofore granted me, I am privileged to submit for the considered attention and thinking of the Members of this Eighty-second session of the United States Congress, the text of what appeared to me at the time I first read it, several weeks ago, as a written analysis I wished every colleague, yes, every American, to also read. The good and sound and international works by this author, already performed, make it unnecessary for me to say more about him. In his speech delivered as aforesaid, Mr. Hoffman said, as follows:

I am extraordinarily gratified to receive the Nobel Prize award this year for two very special reasons. California is my home State although for the past 5 years I have spent not over 2 weeks a year there. Capt. Robert Dollar is a legendary figure in California. His name is a symbol of high adventure. He was also a man of exemplary habits. He neither smoked nor drank, a fact to which my father frequently made reference.

At long last, I am heading home and I am bringing home the bacon in the form of the Robert Dollar award. You have no idea how impressed my fellow Californians will be.

Another reason why I am deeply appreciative of this award is that it is being given me by the National Foreign Trade Council because, rightly or wrongly, you have decided that I have made a contribution to the betterment of world trade. I hope you are right because I admit to a very deep interest in the restoration of world trade to a high level. I do not need to tell this audience how important world trade is to friendship and understanding between the diverse people who inhabit this earth. Nor how important friendship and understanding is to our chances of winning the one thing for which people throughout the world today are yearning—and that is a just and lasting peace.

I do not, however, propose to devote my remarks this evening to world trade. In the latter part of last June I underwent a serious operation. I realize that few people—if any—are particularly concerned about other people's operations, but I propose, nevertheless, to talk about mine tonight—or, rather, some of its after effects.

One of the important—to me—results of that operation was that I was compelled to lie flat on my back for 30 days—not even being permitted to read. I tried the daytime radio but gave it up. Reading and the radio both being out, I found myself in the unhappy position of having nothing to do but think.

At the time the Korean War had just broken out. No one knew what might come of it. World war III actually seemed a possibility.

Quite naturally, I started thinking why it was that we, the United States, always won wars but lost the peace.

The reason why we lost the peace after World War I seemed quite clear. True, we did toy with the idea of the League of Nations but most of us failed entirely to grasp the fact that if we were to win the peace we would have to fight for it with the same boldness, imagination, vigor, and dedication with which we had fought the war. Our failure to grasp that fact lost us the peace we might easily, then, have won.

The situation was somewhat different in World War II. Even while the war was being fought a great many people realized that if we were to win the peace we would have to wage a peace. The United Nations, the World Bank, the World Fund, UNRRA were the result of that thinking but even there we made one assumption that turned out incorrect. We thought that all nations wanted peace and would help to make that peace. We learned the hard way that this was not so. We learned that one nation—Russia—wanted not peace but the conquest of the free world.

The most persuasive question facing the world today is whether, under these conditions, it is possible to wage a peace and win it.

Even those who feel peace can be won hold divergent views as to how the peace should be waged. There are those who believe we can sit down with the Soviets and, talking things over, arrive at a workable compromise.

I have no objections to talking things over with anyone at any time. But I see no hope for a workable compromise now for the simple reason that Russia's aim today is not peace but chaos and confusion in the free world.

There is, I believe, ample evidence to support my views. Every peace offensive staged by Russia has been nothing more or less than a tactical move in a program to enslave the world.

There are those who believe that one way to win the peace is to engage in a preventive war. Here, again, I find myself in disagreement. I can conceive of nothing more damaging to the prestige of the United States than for us to engage in aggression no matter how much aggression seems to be justified. Furthermore, even from the standpoint of practicability, such a move, at the present time, could invite only disaster. We could drop bombs on Russia and, very probably, damage her extensively but Russia could set her 200 divisions marching toward the Atlantic with nothing to stop them but the 14 divisions now in existence. We would then face the task of liberating Europe at some later date.

There is a middle course offering, I believe, a reasonable hope of success.

We, the free nations, must unite in building up our armed forces to such strength Russia will not dare start marching.

While this is being done we must, concurrently on the political, economic, and informational fronts, take vigorous action aimed, first, at protecting the free world against internal aggression and, second, at keeping the Kremlin continually off balance.

The Marshall plan gave the Kremlin a shock. So did the toy balloons recently released in Western Europe to land in Poland, Germany, and the satellite states. So did the recent action of the United Nations to give the Assembly power to move to preserve peace even when the Security Council was rendered inactive by the use of the veto.

Just what is involved in building up our military defenses and the military defenses of our allies to the point where our united strength can keep the Kremlin from marching, I do not know. I have been told it will take, perhaps one hundred and twenty billions over the next 3 years with the amount declining considerably thereafter.

Included in this over-all figure there would be some thirteen billions to assist our allies in building up their war facilities and in meeting certain other military expenses.

In this connection my recent trip to Europe, where I conversed with numerous foreign ministers, left me with one very definite impression. If we are to have the whole-hearted cooperation of the western Europeans in such a program we must leave no doubts in their minds that in building up our military strength and in helping them to build up theirs, we have one aim and one only in mind—to prevent a war and not to wage a war. They do not want to have to go through another liberation.

On the economic front we must continue to extend economic aid to those countries whose continued economic strength is vital to the interest of the United States economy. This means not only those nations of Western Europe who need help but the Philippines, Korea, and certain other Asiatic countries.

The Marshall plan called for huge expenditures the first year but it must be remembered that the program was primarily designed to repair damages due to the ravages of war. Each year the program has cost us progressively less. In most of the Asiatic countries now being served by ECA the program is largely limited to the agricultural field where much can be done with very little money. The total program for this fiscal year for Indonesia, Burma, French Indochina and Thailand is less than $100,000,000. My guess is that economic aid to the countries whose economy is of vital interest to the United States should not exceed $3,000,000,000.

Success of the campaign on the political front demands, I think, great skill rather than many dollars. The same situation prevails in the case of the informational program. Here dollars are important but dollars alone will not be effective unless the program is carried out with imagination and boldness.

The total dollar cost of all three programs, economic, political, and informational, should not exceed $3,500,000,000 a year, or less than 10 percent of the funds proposed for defense purposes. But if the campaign is not waged effectively on these three nonshooting fronts, we may find we have left the back door open to aggression even if the front door is closed through military expenditures.

There are two questions which many of you, with good reason, are, no doubt, asking yourselves. You may have wondered why Russia does not start marching now * * * before we have time to build up our defenses.

That is a good question. I asked it of all the foreign ministers with whom I talked. The consensus of opinion was that Russia had no present intent of engaging in a general war. First, because we have better and bigger atom bombs. Second, because Russia still adheres to the Marxist doctrine that capitalism contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction. They have been watching the United States economy hopefully since 1946. They now feel quite certain that our proposed high defense expenditures and our aid to the other free nations will be our undoing.

I happen not to agree with that thesis. I even believe that the defense load may be the making of Western Europe.

Another reason given me by the ministers in support of their belief that the Kremlin would not, at the present time, march, is that the masters of the Kremlin are not sure they could digest the countries they would have to overrun—and to rule. It is probable that Stalin figures, too, that if he started a major war he and his pals might lose their jobs and, perhaps, their lives. They know what happened to Hitler and Mussolini.

Of course, there is always the possibility that Russia might blunder into world war III. She was close to it this summer, when she so completely misunderstood the attitude of the United States toward Korea. She just could not believe we would send our boys into Korea when, obviously, there was no material advantage for us in so doing. In their own peculiar amoral manner they reasoned that unless there was some material advantage to us in protecting Korea, we would salve our conscience by having the United Nations pass a few pious resolutions condemning the action of the North Koreans after they had taken control of the peninsula.

The second question in most of your minds is, I am sure, what will follow this stepped-up cooperative program, military, economic, political, and informational. Are we to live in a state of siege indefinitely? Is there any hope that Russia will change its course?

The answer is not clear. Winston Churchill believes that, negotiating from strength, we can, in a reasonably short time, work out a compromise with even the present masters of the Kremlin. Others pin their hopes on the situation in Russia today * * * as it is known to be. With 15,000,000 people behind barbed wire, they do not think the situation can continue indefinitely. They believe that in 3 years, 6, or maybe even longer, there will be a new regime in Russia, which will cooperate with the West * * * that the present men in the Kremlin will be replaced by those who will want to devote their attention and energies to building up their own country rather than to destroying others.

To sum it all up, the consensus of opinion was that there is a good chance that the Kremlin will not start its armies marching within the next 3 years. And that, as a consequence, we will have time in which to achieve, at a minimum, a workable compromise, and, as a maximum, a new and more liberal regime in Russia with which we can live in peace.

Russia's Challenge and United States Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Korean campaign may lead to a final struggle between Russia and the United States unless the United States quickly rebuilds its military strength sufficiently to persuade Russia to discontinue her aggressive manifestation of her rivalry.

I shall not attempt here to discuss all factors bearing upon this rivalry and our ability to cope with it short of war but I quote herewith some statements of historians, statesmen, and military leaders of a century or more ago to show an awareness at that time of the growing rivalry between Russia and the United States and noting the characteristics of the peoples of these two countries.

Alexis de Tocqueville, of France, in 1831, visited the United States to inquire into what was then hailed as the great experiment in constitutional liberty. Coming to North America shortly after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine, De Tocqueville was acquainted with the major currents of nations developments in Europe which, in view of subsequent events, he described with remarkable precision.

Writing about 1835 in his Democracy in America—P. F. Collier & Son, 1900, volume I, page 441—he summarized his views with unusual clarity:

> There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points: I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed, and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly assumed a most prominent place amongst the nations, and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.
>
> All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power; but these are still in the act of growth; all the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these are proceeding with ease and with celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the plowshare; those of the other by the sword.
>
> The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm; the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter servitude. Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

Just before the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853 between France and England on the one hand and Russia on the other, Lord Palmerston, British Foreign Minister for many years and Prime Minister for nearly 10 years, spoke of the character and its methods as follows:

> The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as far as and as far as the apathy or want of firmness of other governments would allow it, but always to stop and retire when it was met with decided resistance. In furtherance of this policy, the Russian Government has always had two strings to its bow, namely, fraudulent and dishonorable pretensions in negotiation, and treacherous secret aggression by its agents on the spots of operations.

During his famous Asiatic cruise, our eminent naval officer, Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, not only visited the Japanese Islands and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned. I am herewith quoting from a paper written by him and read by him before the American Geographical and Statistical Society as a meeting held March 6, 1856, in New York City, and published by D. Appleton & Co. 1856, page 25:

> It requires no sage to predict, events as strongly foreshadowed to us all point westward will the course of empire take its way. But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the extending of political empire—commerce, civilization, and christianity—we for it seems that the people of America will in some form or other extend their dominion and their power until they shall have trampled within their mighty embrace populations of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Stars and Stripes over the eastern shores of Asia, and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of frozen aggrandisement (Russia) stretch forth her power on the coast of China and Siam, and then the Japan and the Cossack will meet once more, as once of old, in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The irreconcilable exponents of freedom and despotism must thus meet at last, and there will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the earth—despotism, or rational liberty must be the fate of coming men. I think I see in the horizon the giants that are growing up for that dread and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought.

A review of these historical statements will undoubtedly be of interest today because of the great importance of full understanding of present issues in our foreign policy.

While most of the modern wars have been between "have-not" nations and "have" nations, indications point strongly to the possible final clash between Russia and the United States—the two greatest "have" nations. It will be very difficult to determine when or whether the "have-not" nations may have made their last great challenge to the "have" nations and when or whether one bloody rivalry between Russia and the United States may precipitate war between them. It is, indeed, higher statesmanship we need such discussion of our resources as may induce to cool temperately in the status of a "have-not" nation or any commitment that may deprive us of our power to control our

own resources as was done by the Harriman Commission report in November 1947, in placing the so-called Marshall plan on strategic grounds and as was done in the debate on the Greek-Turkish loans in the spring of 1947 in pronouncing our purpose to fence Russia in. Those policies not only committed us beyond our power to control our own resources but they swiftly and violently brought the rivalry between Russia and the United States to a head.

I sincerely hope we can still prove Commodore Perry's prediction wrong but it will require all the wisdom and good judgment we can muster to guide our Nation out of our present situation with success and without the disaster of Commodore Perry's prediction. I sincerely hope that the decisions of our leaders will be made with full understanding of the factors and characteristics recognized long ago by Alexis de Tocqueville, Lord Palmerston, and Commodore Perry.

The Basis for Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of December 26, 1950:

THE BASIS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

What should be the basis for the foreign policy of the United States?

President Truman, in what has come to be known as the Truman doctrine, says that it should be the containment of communism, that this Nation should fight communism anywhere, and if necessary everywhere, that it threatens the peace.

Former President Herbert Hoover says that the foundation of our policy must be to preserve this Nation and the Western Hemisphere.

There is an important difference between these two points of view. That difference is now being openly and widely debated for the first time in a silent decade.

The two views need not, of course, conflict always or in every particular. To fight Communist power in particular places can be an essential part of our own defense. The defense of the Western Hemisphere does not preclude, and may require, fighting Soviet power outside the Western Hemisphere. The two viewpoints can converge.

There is, moreover, similarity of purpose in the two views. The advocates of containment everywhere advocate it to save America. The objective of the others is also to stop communism from engulfing the whole world, including ourselves. They are all honorable men.

Nevertheless, the difference is vital, not for what is intended but for what results.

The Truman doctrine begins by accepting United States responsibility for defending all parts of the world from Soviet encroachment; this becomes primary policy. In effect, the United States becomes a nation without differentiated frontiers. The frontier becomes the gigantic circle around Russia's present sphere. And since the doctrine is to defend that circle everywhere, the relative values of the various points on the circle become lost. All points become more or less of equal value.

The next progression, an unintended one, is that the responsibility of other peoples to defend themselves gradually becomes secondary.

Their self-defense is, of course, definitely desirable. But since containment everywhere is viewed as essential to our ultimate safety, we soon think we must defend other countries regardless of their own efforts. And the other countries soon begin to think they do us a favor to let us defend them.

At this stage decision becomes confused. Korea, let us say, cannot be weighed on any balance. It is a point on the circle; it is a part of the general responsibility we have assumed; and so we fight for it whether or not it has great value in terms of the larger fight.

So long as the policy is to contain everywhere there is simply no standard to distinguish among Korea, Indochina, or the Rhine—all become Koreas if the Communists choose to make them so.

From this kind of thinking there is another progression—also unintended but also inevitable.

Unconsciously we begin to make the defense of this Nation a subordinate consideration in weighing any proposed action.

If the policy is to contain everywhere and there is a threat anywhere, what room is there to debate whether to fight this particular threat will strengthen or weaken our own defenses? Unless we are to abrogate the policy there is no choice but to fight the threat anywhere. Action is automatic. The United States has then no choice but to intervene in Korea—or any other place.

The Truman doctrine thus puts the defense of this Nation second in the minds of the men whose trust is the defense of this Nation.

With the defense of this Nation as the paramount policy all this is changed. From this premise, the cost of any action would be measured against the gain; the risks of intervention in any Korea would be measured against the risks of abstention.

Men would still differ in judgment. They would still debate the intervention in Korea, the rearmament of Germany, the reinforcement of Europe. All these things would still be difficult matters to decide. Even from the Hoover premise, men would differ on the Hoover proposals as to what is best or prudent in a particular place.

But in the debate men would have a common plane of reference—the safety and preservation of this country. There would then be something to measure against, there would be a standard for making value judgments, a balance on which to weigh military and political opinions.

The policy of containment leaves us no choices. By trying to contain everywhere we become vulnerable everywhere and we can be truly strong nowhere. In the name of saving the world this policy deprives us of the freedom to seek out what is best to save America.

The policy of putting the safety of this Nation first is the only one which offers us a way of wisely measuring our strength against the task—or, indeed, offers any way of measuring at all. Therefore it, and not the policy of containment everywhere, ought to be paramount in the foreign policy of the United States.

It may be argued by honorable men that this reversal of emphasis ignores morality. For in its application there may come a time when the United States, measuring what is best for her own safety, may have to make the harsh decision of abandoning temporarily some cherished bastion. And the greater obligation, it is truly said, is to preserve the world from barbarism.

To this we can only reply that there is in the world today only one power that stands in the way of that barbarism. So long as the United States stands, the way is barred. So soon as it falls, the whole world will be engulfed.

It will profit neither ourselves nor civilization to risk the destruction of that power in the name of saving civilization. To pursue in the name of morality a course which weakens the power of the United States would be the true immorality.

A foreign policy which puts anything ahead of the preservation of this Nation betrays the Nation and civilization.

Who's Being Isolationist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Who's Being Isolationist?" which appeared in the Pantagraph, of Bloomington, Ill., of January 5.

The editorial emphasizes the extensive aid, both economic and military, which the United States has already extended our allies to stem the tide of communism. And it raises the very important question whether those whom we have been helping have really sought to help make themselves strong. It is this failure of our allies to do their part that is forcing the United States to question the wisdom of our foreign policy.

At an early date I plan to say something at some length on this subject. I urge a reading of this editorial. It is thought-provoking, to say the least:

WHO'S BEING ISOLATIONIST?

Most Europeans and many Americans are accusing those who question our foreign policy of being isolationists. Such accusations are red herrings. This country's foreign policy always has been and always should be pursued with the welfare of this country foremost in mind. Any other policy is naive and absurd in this realistic world.

Have we been isolationist in the pursuit of that policy? In the last decade we have given Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Turkey, Canada, Greece, Australia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Ethiopia, Iceland, and India just under $52,000,000,000 to help them restore their economy and to try to assure them that they should be our allies. That does not include millions given to China, the Philippines, and South American countries. It does not include recent loans to Spain and Yugoslavia. It does not include billions poured into Germany and Japan.

Last June some 53 nations pledged to go along with us in a firm United Nations stand to stop aggression in Korea. These nations promised manpower and equipment to help stop the Korean Reds and to show the world that liberty-loving people would not tolerate international gangsterism. They first promised 33,000 men and later increased the promised number as the task in Korea grew more difficult.

To date we have thrown 140,000 men into Korea to help the 100,000 South Korean force. And to date these countries have supplied 30,000 men and some equipment. Just to keep the record straight, here is the latest published report of what countries have supplied what:

Australia: 1,000 men, two destroyers, one 75-plane Mustang fighter squadron.

Belgium-Luxemburg: 750 men, en route.

Canada: 1,000 men, three destroyers, one air transport squadron.

Colombia: one frigate, en route.

France: 1,000 men, one frigate.

Great Britain: 6,000 men, 2 patrol squadrons of Sunderland flying boats, 2 aircraft carriers with planes, 2 light cruisers, 5 destroyers, 3 frigates, 1 auxiliary vessel.

Greece: 800 to 1,000 men, 6 transport planes.

New Zealand: 1,100 men, en route, 2 corvettes.

The Netherlands: 650 men, 1 destroyer.

The Phillipines, 1,200 men.

Siam: 1,200 men, 2 corvettes.

South Africa: One fighter squadron.

Turkey: 5,200 men.

When President Truman hinted at using the atom bomb in Korea and when the UN policy in Korea brought resistance from China, these same allies began in effect to desert us both in and outside UN. We stand virtually alone in our policy toward Red China. The same nations not living up to their pledges in supplying men and equipment in Korea continue to recognize Red China, to supply her and to urge that she be seated in UN councils even though she defies every moral principle of UN.

This country is not isolationist. Its allies are becoming isolationists by abandoning the United Nations effort to halt aggression. And those are the allies to whom we have given nearly $52,000,000,000 in the last decade.

It is no wonder that our foreign policy is being questioned. It will continue to be questioned until it is revised to make more effective a close alliance with other nations who see the dangers of Communist enslavement of the world.

The wish of the American people is to have a strong alliance with strong free nations. Our foreign policy has not produced such an alliance. It has instead been a one-way street. It has resulted in a Europe dependent upon our aid but apparently unwilling to buckle down to save itself.

The question is not how we shall withdraw into ourselves, but how we can prevent other free nations from forcing us to have to take such a course as a final and extremely hazardous risk. If we make such a choice—and there is every reason to hope that we can work out an effective alliance capable of defending and willing to defend liberty—it will not be our choice, but Europe's.

Availability of Hunters for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JOHNSON CITY, N. Y., *January 4, 1951.*

Hon. ED HALL,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.

HI ED: I was going to write you before this time but for some reason or other I did not.

Say, Ed, I saw in the press about us hunters to defend our country in case of need or help on manpower.

In today's press I saw where some man down there opposed such a movement. You can tell that gentleman that I am 66 years old but still can kill a woodchuck at 300 yards. I ought to be able to kill a Red or rat at 500 as I can handle the rifle, the revolver, or shotgun and in very good shape.

I hunted in all parts of Broome, Chenango, and Tioga Counties and know every bit of the grounds thoroughly.

You tell that opposer not to get in front of me with my 30-06 at 500 yards or he will be a dead duck.

Do not forget to call on me on anything you like, and I will be there like Johnny on the spot. I like to hear from you.

Yours very respectfully,

PETER COTELAS.

P. S.—I have plenty of ammunition, too.

Citizenship Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, during these days when democracy is called upon to block the ambitious encroachments of communism, it is fitting that we should strive not only to preserve our democracy but also to improve and perfect it. In introducing today a bill to remove the restrictions which bar some aliens entitled to permanent residence from obtaining citizenship, I am seeking to accomplish what I know is the will of the majority of the Congress, and which surely would have been accomplished by the last Congress except for technical legal difficulties involving amendments to the proposal I have submitted today, and the Internal Security Act which was then pending in the Senate.

Many of our resident aliens now ineligible for citizenship are the parents of children who served with great distinction in the last war. The largest numbers are of Japanese descent, and if reason to bar them from citizenship ever existed, that reason most certainly does not exist today. Under the able guidance of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, the Japanese people have been able to find an outlet for their previously suppressed desire to become and remain one of the peaceful members of the family of nations. The bonds of friendship between the new Japan and the United States are growing in strength, and it is to our mutual advantage that we continue to strengthen our friendly relations with each other.

Of course, the international situation is not as important as our desire to demonstrate our attachment to the principles of justice by dealing justly with the almost 100,000 loyal Americans who have resided among us for many years, who have worked and lived as good Americans, sharing our benefits and our burdens, but who are, nevertheless, technically barred from ever being able to proudly say, "I am a citizen of the United States." I am sure this Congress will want to make it possible for these people to obtain their citizenship without further delay.

Senator Johnson Given More Power To Speed Up Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Daily Times-Herald of January 5, 1951:

SENATOR JOHNSON GIVEN MORE POWER TO SPEED UP DEFENSE PROGRAM

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's aggressiveness and ability have won for him two high party honors in the new Congress, those of chairman of the delegation from Texas and assistant majority leader in the Senate.

These positions and his chairmanship of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness make the junior Senator from Texas one of the principal leaders in Congress. His fellow Texans have cause to be proud of him.

But Senator JOHNSON has already made it clear that at this time he cares little for honors with something more than abundance of personal honors and that his chief aim is to speed up the steps that are being taken to prepare this Nation to meet the greatest crisis in its history.

The assistant majority leader in the Senate is known popularly as the whip, for it is his job to rally party members and spur them to action. The qualifications of Senator JOHNSON for this post are obvious and the fact that he has been chosen for it is gratifying to all citizens who appreciate the need for action. When he gives the word "go" he will speak as a leader of Congress who was preaching preparedness for war when almost all others leaders were thinking in terms of a minimum defense establishment and when the public was demanding cuts in Army, Navy, and Air Force expenditures.

There are still wishful thinkers in this country and abroad who are trying to convince themselves and others that the thunder of a gathering world war is only a false alarm and that we shall be safe from harm if we only boost production, attend actively to our own business, and vote regularly. But, as a matter of fact, the very life of this sovereign Nation is threatened and Senator JOHNSON is among those who are not blind to realities.

Many obstacles now stand in the way of steps to meet the world emergency. They include: Confusion in the ranks of leadership; thoughts about the next presidential election; hesitancy on the part of many citizens to make patriotic sacrifice; the difficulty of making reductions in Federal, State, county, and city expenditures that have no relation to the armament program; and the wave of isolationism that is sweeping the country because of the disunity and false hopes of our principal allies in Europe.

All these obstacles will retard the action of the new Congress. They will cause long and acrimonious debate while men die in battle and while our foes grow stronger and more arrogant. Maneuvers for advantage in the next presidential election will cause valuable time to be wasted. At least, all this neglect of the Nation's safety will prevail unless foresighted, courageous men in the Senate and the House do all they can to prevent it. It is a comfort to know that LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas is one of the top men in the Senate.

Reapportionment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Committee on Reapportionment of Congress of the American Political Science Association:

The Constitution of the United States requires the seats in the House of Representatives to be redistributed after each decennial census. The American Political Science Association's Committee on Reapportionment of Congress has been considering what may desirably be done in consequence of the census of 1950. The members reached six conclusions, as follows:

First, the size of the House of Representatives, which has been 435 for 40 years and is fixed at that number by the present law, should not be changed except as the possible admission of Alaska or Hawaii as States may require a few more seats for their Representatives. In order to prevent any State from losing Congressmen under the recent census, 74 new seats would have to be put in the Chamber. A House of 509 seems impracticable. The personal relationships between a Congressman and his constituents would be much the same, whether an average district is 295,000 (with 509 seats) or 345,000 (with 435 seats). And any slight gain in human contacts would be vastly offset by losses in effectiveness and operation which would result from a considerably bigger House.

Second, there is no reason for changing at this time from the mathematical formula in the present Apportionment Act of 1941, namely, the method of equal proportions. Mr. Willcox dissents from this conclusion because he believes that the results of the method of equal proportions do not meet the requirements of the constitutional provision according to their respective numbers as well as do the results of the method of major fractions. The other Members are satisfied that the present method of equal proportions is the best method of meeting the constitutional provision.

Third, all Members of Congress to which any State is entitled should be elected by single-Member districts, rather than at large. At present, if we disregard the four smallest States which have only one Representative, six Congressmen are elected at large. New Mexico and North Dakota choose all their Members in this way (two each). And two States with large populations, Ohio and Connecticut, have each one Congressman at large.

These are merely examples of a practice which has occurred in other States in the past and may be used more extensively in the redistricting just ahead, unless prohibited by Congress. Whatever the motives for it, the device of Congressmen at large is very objectionable. Sometimes it may enable a political party having a slight lead in the State as a whole to get more seats in Congress than it could obtain if all the Members were chosen by districts; this deprives the minority party of its just amount of representation. In any event, there is the gravest sort of inequality when most Congressmen represent an average district of roughly 350,000, but a Congressman at large from a State like Ohio or Connecticut represents millions of people.

In all the apportionment statutes from 1842 to 1911 inclusive, Congress required every State to divide itself into single-Member districts. This provision was omitted from the act of 1929 and subsequent legislation. The committee recommends that Congress enact new legislation reincorporating this desirable requirement.

Fourth, the committee is agreed that wide variations in the size of congressional districts inside any State are objectionable in principle and should be remedied in new legislation. The committee has noted with concern the great disparities in the 1950 populations of existing congressional districts. Take 350,000 as roughly the average in a district. In one State, there is a district under 175,000; 5 others under 250,000; 3 between 500,000 and 700,000; and 1 exceeding 900,000. In many States, the spread between 1950 populations in the smallest and the largest existing district in the State is two or three hundred thousand. Such situations, if continued, will seriously violate a basic principle of democracy, that every vote should have the same weight, as nearly as possible.

Therefore, the committee earnestly suggests new legislation containing certain express standards of equality and fairness, as hereinafter described, which each State is to follow in its redistricting legislation. In many previous apportionments through that of 1911, Congress has imposed such standards on the States by requiring the districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory and containing as nearly as practicable the same number of individuals. Such provisions about districting are authorized by the Constitution (art. I, sec. 4), which gives Congress a comprehensive power to "make or alter * * * regulations" of the "times, places, and manner of holding elections for * * * Representatives," and the Supreme Court has repeatedly dealt with these provisions without expressing the slightest doubt as to their validity.

Unfortunately, these standards were omitted from the statutes which governed the apportionments after the censuses of 1930 and 1940. The committee concludes that it would be desirable to reinstate them, and to express the standard of approximate equality among the districts with greater definiteness than hitherto.

The two concrete suggestions are:

1. That the standard requiring districts to be compact and contiguous, found in the 1911 apportionment statute and omitted in the 1929 statute, should be included in a new law.

2. That the statute should include a standard limiting to a certain percentage the deviation of any district within the State upward or downward from the average of all districts for the State; and that an effort should be made to keep the deviation of any district from the average of all districts for the State within a limit of 10 percent; but in any event such deviation should not be permitted to exceed 15 percent.

The practical effect of recommendation 3 would be to allow districts to vary over a range of about 100,000. This seems to make fair allowance for the practical difficulties which State legislators must face.

The particular percentages suggested are, of course, not essential, but the committee believes that some such specification of the permissible variations from equality is very desirable.

Fifth. The committee believes that the standards of approximate equality should be enforceable through an express sanction administered by Congress.

We feel that the statement of standards in the law will usually cause them to be observed. Our confidence in the legislatures and other appropriate authorities in the States leads to the expectation that they will, for the most part, faithfully obey the law of the land and establish districts for the next decade as Congress has directed them to do. Yet violations may occur, as has sometimes been the case under previous apportionment statutes containing standards. In these earlier statutes, Congress did not say what would happen to a State which divided itself in plainly unequal districts. Consequently, the unjust districting stood unchanged. Leaving any questions of gerrymandering to our sixth conclusion, we believe that departures from the percentage tests of approximate equality which we have just stated ought to be corrected and can practicably be corrected.

We rejected as undesirable several kinds of sanctions which have been proposed: (a) Any citizen might be given the right to question the districting inside his State, by a suit in a United States court. But the courts have shown great unwillingness to undertake the task of supervising congressional districts, and might deny any constitutional power to do so. Even if they consented to do the job, we do not think that judges are well suited to weigh the political factors which inevitably affect districting. Finally, litigation might easily drag out for some years, whereas the new districts ought to be settled before the spring primaries in 1952. (b) A State which violated the standards of approximate equality laid down by Congress might be penalized by a refusal to seat its Representatives until this State made its districting conform to those standards and held new congressional elections on that basis. This would probably make that State totally unrepresented in the House during one or more sessions of the Eighty-third Congress. Such a drastic punishment might be unconstitutional, and it was disapproved by the committee. (c) The State might be required to elect all its Congressmen at Large until it redistricted itself in accordance with the statutory standards. But the very same people who were responsible for the unequal districting might rejoice in having their Congressmen elected at large, because their party would thus choose the entire representation from this State in the House. And in any event, the committee considered this sanction to be wholly inconsistent with our condemnation of Congressmen at Large (in the third conclusion).

The only proper remedy for bad single-member districts is good single-member districts. The determination of approximately equal single-member districts is a political task, which ought to be performed by a legislative body. If the legislature of the State refuses to do the job, the only suitable alternative is for Congress to do it. Therefore, the committee agreed that the task of supervising and correcting districting inside the State should be in the hands of Congress.

This led to the formation of a detailed plan for the imposition of sanctions. Its main features are: First, the States should be required to do their own redistricting soon after Congress passes the Apportionment Act; this will give Congress ample time to consider whether this action by the States complies with the statutory standards of approximate equality. Second, the President should transmit the results of State redistricting to Congress and to all the States, with information showing how any particular State has violated the statutory standards of approximate equality. Since the President's statement will appear in the press, unequal districting will be subjected to the powerful sanction of publicity. Third, Congress may then take such action as it deems proper. Congress may order the State to do the job over again. Or Congress may redistrict the State itself.

In order to accomplish this plan, the committee recommends a schedule of steps to be included in Federal law, as follows:

1. January 3, 1951, to January 10 (1 week): The President reports to Congress factual data furnished by the Bureau of the Census indicating the apportionment of Representatives among the several States under the 1950 census and according to the formula of equal proportions.

2. January 10 to late January (15 calendar days): Congress considers the President's report, and unless it enacts a different apportionment within 15 calendar days, each State shall automatically be entitled to the number of Representatives indicated in the President's report to Congress. The Clerk of the House shall so apprise the executive of each State; and the President will transmit to the States the data concerning populations supplied by the Bureau of the Census. The members of the committee hope that, during the same period or very soon thereafter, Congress will enact legislation regulating districting inside the several States, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of this report.

3. Late January to late April (90 days): A period of 90 days will then be allowed for the necessary redistricting in State legislatures. In most States the legislatures will be regularly in session, and experience indicates that 90 days are a sufficient time for the enactment of the necessary redistricting laws.

4. Late April to late May (30 days): The President, on the basis of objective data furnished by the Bureau of the Census about the populations of the congressional districts newly established by the State legislatures, will report to Congress and to the States as to conformity to or violation of the standards regulating the size of a district.

5. After late May: Congress will take such action as it deems proper to correct unequal districting wherever it is shown by the President's report to exist.

The committee anticipates that it will seldom be necessary for Congress to redistrict a State. The possibility of such redistricting by Congress and the publicity given to grossly unequal State action will, we hope, be powerful incentives to make the States comply with the statutory standards.

Sixth, the committee discussed the problem of gerrymandering. It recognized that some gerrymandering is a serious evil, but decided against the recommendation of further sanctions at this time.

The members of the committee share the hope that the reestablishment of the statutory standards of compactness and contiguity, and the publicity of the report to Congress on the action taken by State legislatures, will restrain those legislatures from seriously abusing the power to redistrict for purely partisan purposes.

Zecharish Chafee; Bertram M. Gross; John W. Lederle; Robert S. Rankin; Laurence F. Schmeckebier; Walter F. Willcox; Arthur N. Holcombe, Chairman; James K. Pollock, President, Ex officio; Edward H. Litchfield, Executive Director, Ex officio.

In addition to President Pollock (chairman, department of political science, University of Michigan, former member Hoover Commission, and former adviser to United States military governor and high commissioner in Germany) and Chairman Holcombe (professor of government at Harvard University, former chairman of Appeals Board of the War Production Board, and author of numerous well-known volumes on American political life), the committee consisted of: Zecharish Chafee (Langdell professor of law at Harvard University, and long-time contributor to reapportionment literature), Bertram M. Gross (executive secretary, President's Council of Economic Advisers), John W. Lederle (director, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan), Edward H. Litchfield (executive director of the American Political Science Association, professor at Cornell University, and former United States director of civil affairs in Germany), Robert S. Rankin (professor of political science, Duke University), Laurence F. Schmeckebier (former chairman, Institute for Government Research, Brookings Institution, and author of standard reference works on reapportionment questions), Walter F. Willcox (professor emeritus, Cornell University, former president, American Economic Association and American Statistical Association, and long-time contributor to reapportionment literature).

False Rumors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Christmas Day I was very much impressed with an editorial in the Galveston News. It read as follows:

The public man's most useful possession is a thick skin, which will keep him imperturbable amid attacks just and unjust. For the private citizen in these days a most valuable attribute is skepticism about rumors.

Plenty of rumors are flying about, and there will be more. Tales will be told that the losses in Korea are several times greater than those revealed, or that persons high up in our military organization are Communist tools. These are rumors of the kind which in 1940 helped fill the roads of France and Holland with refugees, blocking the armies which would have defended them. Rumors were then the weapons of Hitler, as now they are of Stalin. Rumors and their cousin, slander, baselessly alleging treason in the innermost Government circles, have weakened national unity in a time of crisis, have discouraged our friends, and encouraged our enemies.

If you hear a rumor, pin the speaker down. "Where did you hear that? From whom? If you read it, just where did you read it? Are you sure exactly what the radio man or the magazine writer said?" If your informant cannot answer these questions positively, assume that the story is not true. Whether it is a willful lie or a mistaken idea is not the issue. Don't believe it until it is proved.

I used the foregoing in a radio program of my own and have subsequently mentioned it briefly on another program. How timely the admonition of the editor has proven is demonstrated in the following article which appeared in the same paper on January 3:

RUMOR OF SCRAP IRON FOR RED CHINA ERUPTS ISLAND

(By Larry Deister)

"There's a Chinese Communist vessel in Galveston loading scrap iron for China." That rumor was widely circulated here Tuesday.

But little of it proved to be true.

There was a Chinese ship docked in Galveston, but it did not fly the Communist flag. The *Haitee* was at pier 16-18, displaying the Nationalist Chinese flag.

The vessel was loading big white bales of cotton with not a sign of scrap in sight. As for its destination, it is going to the Far East, but its port was Kobe, Japan.

Officials on the water front checked the rumor, but found no traces of scrap iron in any of the warehouses or dockside piers. Not even an expected shipment to Galveston of scrap iron could be located.

The last scrap iron shipped out of the Galveston area was loaded in Texas City, and that mainland city no longer has facilities to handle scrap iron.

The local manager of a shipping agency said that instead of exporting scrap iron, most steel companies and the Government are carrying on a concentrated program of importation of scrap iron for making steel.

Montgomery County, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial published in the Washington (D. C.) Star on Sunday, December 31, 1950. I also wish to include an editorial in the Washington Post of the same date. Both of these articles are relative to the honor came to Montgomery County which was selected as 1 of 11 all-American communities that are well governed.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of December 31, 1950]

MONTGOMERY EARNED THE HONOR

Montgomery County well deserves the honor which has come to it with its selection as 1 of 11 all-American communities that are well governed. There is good reason to include this thriving Maryland neighbor of Washington among outstanding cities composing the 1950 good-government team picked by the National Municipal League. (The annual award idea was suggested a year ago by the Minneapolis Tribune.) Maryland's first and only county to adopt a charter form of self-government stands out as an example of what can be accomplished when the aroused citizens of a community decide to throw off outmoded governmental methods and reorganize along modern business lines.

Governmental reform is not easy to achieve, and Montgomery County was no exception. Resistance to change is to be expected from an entrenched regime. But the enlightened citizens of Montgomery County persisted in their fight, despite obstacles and disappointments, and victory finally was theirs at the polls, thanks to a fine display of civic consciousness and nonpartisanship. Today the county has an elected council that is responsive to the people who elected it and that is giving the city-like county a type of efficient government that other communities would do well to emulate. The business affairs of the growing county are administered by a county manager whose responsibilities and duties are similar to those of a city manager. The citation accompanying the award points out that Montgomery has readjusted the tax load, established a 5-year capital improvement program and a $20,000,000 school building program, improved the road system, raised teachers' pay and established citizens' advisory committees for various departments. Still further improvements are planned.

The progress already made has made the dire predictions of opponents of the charter movement look exceedingly silly. Fortunately, there is an increasing spirit of unity in the county behind the new government that is an augury of still further progress along the home-rule path. Montgomery's

neighbors share in the pleasure which the award brings to the county's citizens.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of December 31, 1950]

MONTGOMERY AN ALL-AMERICAN COUNTY

Montgomery County, Md., and Richmond, Va., today were placed on a team of All-American cities for 1950.

The "team" was named by a jury of veteran municipal experts at a national conference on government of the National Municipal League held recently at Buffalo.

The selections will be announced in the Minneapolis Tribune today in a copyrighted story by Rolf Felstad. Felstad writes:

"The fight for good city government is like a war. If you quit, the other side wins.

"Eleven communities whose citizens refused to quit, in some cases after years of failure, have been named to a team of All-American cities for 1950.

"The stories of the 11 are stories of rich men, poor men, housewives, lawyers, and pick-swingers, who got mad enough to stand up and fight for government by the people.

"All are proof that the American people can have good, honest, efficient government if they're willing to raise their fists instead of sitting on their hands.

"It's no coincidence, according to such league officials as Charles Edison, president; Alfred Willoughby, executive secretary; and John E. Bebout, assistant secretary, that more than half of the All-American cities have a city council-manager form of government.

"A particular 'baby' of the league, the city manager system now governs more than 1,000 cities, towns and counties.

"But even good city fathers can't prevent a city from becoming a political orphan, many experts pointed out. It also takes city uncles and city aunts—businessmen, housewives, lawyers, doctors, laborers—to keep government and the people heading in the same direction.

"Said Edison, 'Honest and patriotic citizens must be elected to minor political offices.' Unless these men, who form the backbone of local political organizations, are in power, properly qualified statesmen will not be elected to top national government positions.

" 'Too many of our leaders,' he said, 'are nothing more than third-ward boys blown up to look like statesmen.'

"Edison said he feared that the tradition of public responsibility has become rusty with disuse.

"Too many cities, the experts declared, still are paying a heavy toll for inefficiency, or winked-at booty to racketeers. But 11 cities, and many more which deserve honorable mention, are living proof that a citizens' army can win any war it wants to."

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.

For the first time, a county makes the all-American team.

Montgomery County, Md., in many respects is like no other place in the country.

For one thing, the county government rules both urban and rural areas. The two most heavily populated places, Silver Spring and Bethesda-Chevy Chase, are not incorporated and don't want to be.

For another thing, Montgomery County is a dormitory for Washington, D. C. If you work in Washington, it's quite possible you sleep in Montgomery County.

At one time, many of the residents weren't sleeping well.

For many, the partisan ruling machine had failed to pay off its bonds as they came due. Instead, it borrowed new money to pay old debts.

In 1948, aroused citizens, led by the League of Women Voters and the Civic Federation, got Brookings Institution to make a study. The institution recommended a home-rule charter.

A charter reform board was named in the early 1940's and got a new charter on the ballot in 1944. The voters rejected it.

The board tried again in 1948, put the charter over and sent both Republican and Democratic parties into such a state of shock that they didn't even put up a slate in the 1949 elections. The charter board's slate of seven swept into office and became Montgomery County's celebrated Cadillac council.

As county manager, the council named Irving G. McNayr, a tall, friendly southern drawler who looks like a former football player, and is.

The county's credit, McNayr found, was shot.

McNayr and the council:

Raised taxes and balanced the budget; set up a 5-year building program and a $20,000,000 school-building program; built 26 miles of new roads in 1950 where the top of any previous year was 8 miles; raised teacher pay; established citizens' advisory committees for various departments; put 6,000 off-street parking spaces in Silver Spring and planned 4,000 for Bethesda-Chevy Chase in 1951.

Two years ago, businessmen in Silver Spring started a move to incorporate as a city. The University of Maryland studied the proposal and asked in effect: "Are you crazy?"

The voters like their county government. They elected another Cadillac council.

Abandon Europe to Conquest Is Taft's Policy Once More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of January 7, 1951:

ABANDON EUROPE TO CONQUEST IS TAFT'S POLICY ONCE MORE

Senator TAFT has only added more confusion to the debate on American foreign policy. He scorns the title of isolationist. He declares that "our battle against communism is in fact a world-wide battle, and must be fought on the world stage." Yet in the next breath he refuses to face any situation that might require any extensive use of American land forces. He opposes our butting in by sending any troops to Europe. Recently he asserted that keeping the peace by holding three and a half million American men under arms for 10 years would cost as much as a Soviet victory.

TAFT speaks with an air of calm reason, but through his speech runs a torrent of contradictions. He finds no evidence that the Russians plan a military conquest in Western Europe, yet he admits the possibility of Communist infiltration or attack by Soviet satellites. His mind apparently makes no connection between this sort of conquest and direct Russian aggression.

He proposes an alliance with Britain, France, Holland, Australia, and Canada to develop an all-powerful sea-air weapon. He overlooks the fact that we already have an alliance with those countries, under the North Atlantic Pact, to do whatever is necessary to prepare against aggression. There are seven other members of that alliance. TAFT would evidently dump them out of the boat.

The Ohio Senator insists that we must honor our pledges, including the one to go to war if any Atlantic Pact nation is attacked. In other words, he is willing for us to come to the aid of Western Europe after it has been overrun, but not before. That is not good news for our European allies. It is not good sense. It gives Stalin the opportunity Hitler always sought, to divide and conquer.

TAFT expresses doubt that the projected army of a million men in Western Europe could defeat Russia, citing the failure of Napoleon and Hitler to turn the trick with larger forces. This is the same straw man Herbert Hoover set up and demolished in his recent speech. Hitler and Napoleon invaded Russia and tried to capture Moscow with vast land armies. Nobody at any time has suggested that the western allies should invade Russia with land troops. The army planned for Western Europe is entirely a defense force, as everybody seems to understand except TAFT, Hoover, and the Kremlin leaders.

The main flaw in TAFT's thinking arises from his willful ignorance on the subject of Europe. He has no understanding of the state of mind of the Western Europeans, who need confidence above all else. Nothing breeds confidence there like the presence of American troops. The people of Western Europe have no heart for forming great armies to fight off Russia if all America offers is a hail of atom bombs on their cities after they are occupied by the enemy. They want the assurance that American troops will be in there fighting by their sides to prevent a Soviet occupation.

Mr. TAFT goes always on the assumption that Europe is something we can take or leave. He "does not see any conclusive evidence that the Soviets expect to start a war with the United States." He fails to see that Western Europe is the one area of the world we cannot afford to let fall into the hands of the Soviets. With that great arsenal of production and skilled manpower at their disposal, the Soviets would soon be ready to start their war against the United States, and ready to win it.

It is well to remember what Mr. TAFT said about Europe on July 15, 1941: "I believe in the end that we could have a negotiated peace, but probably with a Hitler dominant on the Continent. Europe must work out its own salvation, and we have no power, even if we have the will, to be its savior." Today TAFT is ready to deliver the European Continent to Stalin as he was ready to deliver it to Hitler, with the false hope that we could hold bases in Britain under the fire of Russian guided missiles 20 miles across the English Channel.

Senator Martin Sensed Red Peril Early

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a pleasure to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Observer, Washington, Pa., entitled "Senator MARTIN Sensed Red Peril Early." The article shows clearly the discerning foresight of the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, in recognizing and taking action against communistic activities and infiltration in our Government many years ago.

SENATOR MARTIN SENSED RED PERIL EARLY

United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Washington, deserves a place on the scroll bearing the names of those Americans who early sensed the peril of communism and entered the lists to fight against its insidious growth in our homeland.

Always an ardent champion of those principles and traditions upon which our Nation was built, Senator MARTIN has fought to the utmost against the efforts to weaken the foundation stones of our Government.

The Senator has stated that his real awakening to the aims of the Reds dates back to the years immediately following the recognition of the Soviet regime in Russia by the United States.

He was brought face to face with the stern realities of the scope of the Soviet aims through the discovery that Communists were infiltrating into the armed services of the United States, including the Pennsylvania National Guard. Then, as now, the advocates of communism in uniform were using peace as the cloak to hide their real purpose—destruction of our American form of government.

Loyal Americans in the armed services of America tried to their utmost to offset the propaganda of the agents of Moscow but the task was difficult due to the fact communism had just been recognized and its advocates were being popularly received in many circles at Washington.

As a result of his support of 100 percent Americanism, Senator MARTIN was among those dubbed by the Reds, pinks, and their friends as reactionaries.

In the Aesopian language of the Communist cult, a reactionary is one who opposes the ideology of statism. Statism, in final analysis, is a return to Dark Ages, the era in which despotic kings and their followers used peasants to provide them with wealth and power. In that era people were pawns of the rulers as they are today of the ruling clique in Soviet Russia.

A descendant of pioneer settlers of America and a veteran of three wars, Senator MARTIN is a real patriot. He has refused to yield on the issue of Americanism to gain popular favor with radical groups.

His loyalty and faithful service to his State and Nation has met with the approval of Pennsylvanians. He has received the highest offices at their disposal, United States Senator and Governor. His record will bear comparison with that of any other public official of his time.

Dr. Nutt, Congressman Rich, War Heroes Get Grit Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN R. BUSH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from sharing with others the wonderful tribute that was paid to my friend and predecessor, Bob Rich, who recently received the Grit Publishing Co. award for meritorious community service, along with Dr. John B. Nutt, of Williamsport, Pa., and 12 Lycoming County, Pa., young men who have given their lives for their country during the period of hostilities in Korea. Mr. Rich is the first person outside of Williamsport to receive one of the individual awards. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following from Grit, one of America's greatest family newspapers:

DR. NUTT, CONGRESSMAN RICH, WAR HEROES GET GRIT AWARDS

Awards for meritorious community service which Grit Publishing Co. has presented annually since 1933 go this year to Dr. John B. Nutt, of 1102 Woodmont Avenue; Representative Robert F. Rich, of Woolrich, and 12 Lycoming County young men who have given their lives for their country during the period of hostilities in Korea.

The certificate presented Dr. Nutt pays him this tribute:

"For your selfless concern for your fellowmen, inspiration to co-workers, unheralded deeds in your profession, and solicitude for draftees."

Representative Rich is the first person outside of Williamsport to receive one of the individual awards. He is being honored because of his untiring work in behalf of this community and county, as well as his district and the Nation generally, during his long and faithful service in Congress. The citation on Mr. Rich's award reads:

"For 18 years of service to your fellow citizens as a conscientious and courageous Member of the Congress of the United States."

Presentation of certificates to Lycoming County youths who made the supreme sacrifice continues a policy which Grit adopted in the Second World War. Citations on the awards given to the nearest of kin read:

"In recognition of your patriotism, valor, and supreme sacrifice in the war against the forces of evil and aggression."

Resolution of Mayor and Council of Hagerstown, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following telegram I received from the mayor and council of Hagerstown, Md.:

HAGERSTOWN, MD., *January 4, 1951*:

Hon. J. GLENN BEALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas we are appalled and distressed at the conditions existing in Korea, and the maiming and killing of the members of the Armed Forces defending democracy against impossible odds; and

Whereas we hold Dean Acheson responsible for the disastrous circumstances in which our Armed Forces and our Nation find themselves; and

Whereas it is our opinion that conditions will become progressively alarming and disastrous unless the said Dean Acheson be removed as Secretary of State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and council of Hagerstown, Md., That it is vital for the preservation of our democracy that the said Dean Acheson be impeached as Secretary of State, and that Herman L. Mills, of Hagerstown, Md., be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey the sentiments of the said mayor and council to United States Senators O'CONOR and BUTLER and Congressman BEALL for immediate action.

HERMAN L. MILLS,
Mayor.

Texas and the United States Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one organization I came into frequent contact with on my trip abroad was the Foreign Service of the United States. In these days of international complications and foreign policy problems, it is a good organization to know something about.

The Foreign Service, of course, is the organization that staffs and runs our American embassies, legations, and consulates abroad. Whether you are in Tehran or Paris, in Belgrade or Stockholm, in fact, almost any place in the world, and you see a building with an American flag sticking up over it, you can be pretty sure you are looking at a Foreign Service post. It is the State Department's overseas arm, and has rightly been called the eyes and ears abroad of the American people.

One thing that surprised me about the Foreign Service was how many Texans there seemed to be in it. I have long known, of course, how Texans get around—though many of them give the impression that they would not live anywhere but in Texas. As I made the rounds of the capitals in Europe and western Asia, and touched base at the local American Embassy or Legation, I kept running into Texans. Charlie Gedney, second secretary and consul in Tehran, introduced himself to me and said he came from Granger. Well, Granger is up near Wichita Falls, so I said he was practically an Oklahoman, but he said an inch was as good as a mile if it was in Texas, so we shook on it.

When I got up to Copenhagen, there was a Third Secretary and Vice Consul who said he came from Brownwood. Ted Adams was his name. Said he graduated from Howard Payne. In London is one of the few career Foreign Service officers who are women. Miss Kathleen Molesworth from Mineral. I am told there are only 24 women career officers in the Foreign Service out of more than a thousand. The number of unhealthy posts, the marriage rules, the fact that if a Foreign Service officer marries an alien, he or she has to hand in his or her resignation; these factors have contributed to making it difficult for women to pass the strict entrance requirements. Miss Molesworth is one of the few.

I checked when I got back to Washington and found that there are 214 Texans in the Foreign Service. Some of

them are top men, like John D. Hickerson, from Crawford, a career officer who is now Assistant Secretary of State for United Nations Affairs; Fletcher Warren, from Wolfe City, former American Ambassador to Paraguay, now director of the State Department's office of South American Affairs. Some are just beginning as career officers, like Douglass Balentine, from Bigflat, now Vice Consul in Guatemala; John Burnett, from Bowie, Vice Consul in Kobe; Jack Howison, from Bogata, vice consul in Istanbul. There are more Texans in the Foreign Service staff corps, the noncareer officers and the essential clerical and stenographic clerks that staff our posts overseas. All together, 214 men and women from our State in an organization of approximately 7,000 Americans, plus an additional 8,000 local alien employees.

Before I went abroad, I knew something about the Foreign Service, of course, from my work with the House Committee on Armed Services. But on my travels I wanted to know more about how Foreign Service people live overseas, how they educate their children, how often they get home to the United States, and so forth. Also, just what they did in their jobs. So I got hold of a State Department pamphlet called The Foreign Service of the United States.

The pamphlet defines the Foreign Service as the field arm of the Department of State. It defines the service best by listing its functions. It represents the United States abroad; advises, protects, assists American citizens residing, traveling, or having interests abroad; negotiates treaties; observes, analyzes, and reports on trends of significance in the countries in which assigned; promotes and protects the foreign trade of the United States. The pamphlet also lists consular functions that might be more familiar to American citizens. The Foreign Service is responsible for the issuance of passports to American citizens abroad; the registration of births and deaths of Americans in their consular districts; the examination of foreign visa applicants; the protection of American shipping and seamen; the custody, administration, and settlement of the estates of American citizens or seamen who die abroad; the handling of extradition cases for the American Government; the supervision of quarantine and disinfection rules for foreign goods being shipped to the American market. In short, there is a lot of hard, routine work in taking part in what has been called America's first line of defense in peacetime.

A number of well-known Americans have served in our Foreign Service. Benjamin Franklin was our first Ambassador to France. Washington Irving wrote Tales of the Alhambra while stationed at the American Legation in Madrid. William Eaton, our consul in Tunis years ago led an army of 500 Greeks, Italians, and Arabs across the desert to capture Derna during our war with Tripoli in 1792. Howard Payne, who wrote Home, Sweet Home, was our consul in Tunis in 1842. After meeting Foreign Service officers living in Tehran, Belgrade, and other places, and hearing about some who had not been home in 6 or 8 years, I can understand how Howard Payne came to write that song. Nathaniel Hawthorne, author of the Scarlet Letter, and other great novels, was consul in Liverpool for many years; he is said to have written the Marble Faun while stationed there. Joel Poinsett was our first Minister to Mexico and brought back the plant now called after him, the Poinsettia.

Today there are 15,000 Foreign Service employees stationed in 294 posts in more than 70 different countries. It is difficult to give exact figures for the Foreign Service today. Seven posts have been closed in China during the past year due to Communist control of the mainland. At the same time we have opened new posts in Burma, Siam, and French Indochina. As a general redeploys his troops according to the situation, the State Department closes and opens posts. There may be 294 posts today but 293 or 295 tomorrow.

Some Foreign Service posts are in prominent places like Paris, London, Moscow. There are others, and these are in the majority, in less well-known spots, such as Tehran, Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan; Accra, on the African Gold Coast; Dares-Salaam, Tanganyika; Elizabethville, the Belgian Congo; Belim, Brazil. Tihwa, China, was the most remote of all our Foreign Service posts until it was closed this year. You may have read of the 1,600-mile trek over the Himalayan mountains that Consul Hall Paxton led in order to escape from the Chinese Communists into India. The party included six women and five children, and took 3 months. You may also have read of the tragic death of Vice Consul Douglas Mackiernan, shot by Tibetian border guards while following Paxton a few weeks later.

What kind of life do our fellow Americans live in the Foreign Service? It varies, of course, from post to post. In London or Paris, I found living conditions to be not much different from my own in Washington. But London or Paris are not average posts. A Foreign Service family will be assigned to a post like Paris or London only after many years in the less popular posts in the world. Let us examine the conditions in which American Foreign Service families live in a more average post, Tehran, the capital of Iran, which I visited on my trip.

Tehran sits on a barren plateau of the Elbruz Mountains at an altitude of 4,000 feet. It has a dry climate with a rainfall of about 10 inches per year, about the same as some parts of west Texas, and the temperature rises to above 100° Fahrenheit in the summer and goes down to near freezing temperature during the winter nights. The climate is generally pleasant and offers no particular hardship beyond possible respiratory troubles due to the prevalence of dust in the air. Serious health hazards do exist for American families, however, and the State Department's post report on Tehran lists the following prevalent diseases: typhoid and partyphoid, bacillary and amoebic dysentery, malaria, smallpox, whooping cough, measles, diphtheria, trachoma, typhus fever, tuberculosis, sandfly fever, and the insect-borne infection known as the "Baghdad boil."

The common distribution of water in Tehran is through a series of wells with connecting tunnels. The water is brought down from the mountains through these tunnels and brought to the surface just north of the city. It then passes down each street through a series of open gutters known as "jubes." Individual households obtain water by periodically damming the "jubes" to divert a sufficient supply into private cisterns. The water has, of course, been contaminated as it runs through the open gutters and thickens noticeably as it runs through the city.

Most Americans buy drinking water for their families from roving water carts or take home water from the chlorinated well in the Embassy compound. Jube water is used, however, for general house cleaning, the laundry, and the bathroom.

Most diseases caused by contaminated water can also be acquired from the food. It is the common practice of Iranian vegetable vendors to "freshen" their produce with jube water. All vegetables therefore have to be washed and either thoroughly cooked or disinfected before serving. In some parts of Iran, vegetables and fruits are still fertilized with "night soil" or handled by persons with infectious diseases. This also invites preventive measures.

The only American doctors in Iran are a medical officer assigned to the United States military mission in the country, a Rockefeller Foundation research worker, and a few medical missionaries who work some distance from Tehran. Since none of these doctors is officially available for Foreign Service personnel, local doctors have to provide whatever care is needed. There are, of course, no dentists or occulists other than native Iranians.

Housing facilities are few and expensive. Henry E. Grady, our present Ambassador to Iran, lives in part of the Embassy set aside for the Ambassador's residence but the majority of the staff have to locate quarters in the city itself. Rents average $150 a month for a small, unfurnished flat, and $250 a month for an unfurnished, three-bedroom house. Furnished quarters, when available, average 20 percent higher.

Church facilities for American Foreign Service personnel are plentiful. The American Presbyterian Mission maintains a community church in Tehran at which Protestant services of various denominations are conducted. There are also a number of Catholic churches, and several synagogues.

Education for the children of Foreign Service families is largely provided by the American Presbyterian Mission. For many years, the mission has maintained an English-speaking community school. Most of the teachers are American and instruction can be obtained from the second to the twelfth grades—in other words, through high school. There were about 200 students in the school when I visited it, including all American children in Tehran of school age. They have no football team, of course, but they play soccer among themselves and baseball and do plenty of hiking.

Recreational facilities for Foreign Service families are both good and bad. Motion-picture entertainment is practically nonexistent. The theaters are dilapidated buildings of questionable cleanness and show very old American pictures. One practice which does not help matters much is the practice of breaking into the showing at frequent intervals with slides flashed on the screen translating the spoken American words into Persian and Russian. These interruptions always come at the most exciting parts, I am told, so that the local audience will understand what is going on. In-between times, the audience drowns out the sound on the screen with a buzz of conversation and conjecture.

Other than movies, however, recreational facilities for Embassy personnel are plentiful. That is, if you like sports. There is plenty of open space for hiking and picnicking and hunting. Game is plentiful in the mountains and on the plateau, particularly wild boar, gazelle, duck, pheasant, snipe, and quail. For fishing there are a few mountain trout streams and a small amount of offshore fishing down in the Caspian Sea, a day's drive from Tehran. In the city itself there is an 18-hole golf course lying on the outskirts. The only trouble with it that I could see was that the terrain was pretty rugged and the course was totally bare of grass.

All in all, Tehran is a pretty average Foreign Service post. Living conditions are not so good as in Paris or London, nor so bad as they would have been had I visited more remote posts. The greatest draw-back that I could see was its distance from America. It takes 20 to 30 days to go out by boat to the Persian Gulf and then overland to Tehran. If you are shipping your furniture and heavy baggage on ahead of you, Embassy officials say it takes from 4 to 6 months to arrive. Once there, a Foreign Service employee might as well forget about getting home till his next home leave, 3 years hence.

The Foreign Service people I met, however, seem to like the deal. They are used to traveling around. To them Tehran is just another post among many. It may be the sixth or seventh in a long series of posts before 30 years' service rolls around and a Foreign Service officer can retire. Meanwhile, the family must get used to living in many countries and under all kinds of conditions. The children must become accustomed to being picked up every 3 or 4 years and carried on to another country, to another school, with another language to learn. The wife must become used to packing, unpacking, learning new marketing customs and how to get along with another set of servants. It is a traveling salesman's life in a way, with the whole family acting as salesmen for the United States. From what I saw of them, they are doing a good job.

Detroit's Two Hundred and Fiftieth Birthday Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, commencing January 1, 1951, Detroit will be the site of a year-long commemoration of that city's history. The celebration, which will be civic and cultural in character, has been planned by thousands of Detroit citizens during the past 2 years. In the present period of international unrest and recurring crises, the Detroit two hundred and fiftieth birthday festival will constitute one of the greatest public demonstrations of democracy and faith ever staged.

Detroit is one of the six oldest major cities on the North American Continent, and its cultural and economic importance to this Nation have long been realized. The citizens of Detroit are taking this occasion to dedicate themselves again to the principles of democratic living.

Originally, the Detroit festival was planned not only as a civic and cultural demonstration, but also to encompass a large industrial fair. As soon as the United States became embroiled in the Korean War, however, plans were cast to mobilize industrial units for the emergency. The people of Detroit immediately revised their festival schedule. Rather than a visual demonstration of Detroit's industrial progress through the years, they determined to show the world the vast potential American industry by means of production figures increased to meet the current emergency.

Detroit is the world's greatest production center and the arsenal of democracy. Here is concentrated the greatest force of mechanical and scientific production in the world. It is more than that, for within the city of Detroit over which we rejoice there is a feeling of friendship, brotherly love, peace, and contentment among the prosperous and productive people. Every phase of human activities, every great nationality and color are found within the boundary confines of this great city for which it has been known, not only as being dynamic but the city "where life is worth living."

The cultural and civil aspects of the festival have been enlarged. During the coming year, Detroit will present one of the greatest sports programs ever conceived. It will be the host for the National Open Golf Tournament, the big-league all-star baseball game, the American Legion junior baseball tournament, the men's and women's national AAU swimming championships, the men's and women's national gymnastic championships, and many other events of national importance.

During the summer, many events of international importance will take place in Detroit. The Detroit Institute of Arts will present a special exhibit titled "The French in America," for which materials are being sent from the greatest collections in France and England; a series of special concerts will be given featuring the music of France, England, and the United States; and, among the many other special events to be presented, there will be an international folk festival which will display the many cultures that have contributed to what is now the native American culture.

Ours is a great and wealthy country, devoted to the belief that freedom and democracy are necessary to progress. Detroit is a living example of the results of freedom and democracy. During 1951, the eyes of the world will be on that city. I believe that each of us, as Representatives of our individual States, should strongly endorse the Detroit Two Hundred and Fiftieth Birthday Festival and the principles upon which it is built.

The New Year in the World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Mr. Soterios Nicholson, from the January 7, 1951, issue of Atlantis, which I commend to the attention of the Members of the House:

THE NEW YEAR IN THE WORLD SITUATION

(By Soterios Nicholson)

WASHINGTON.—The year 1951 comes at a time when the free world is poised on the brink of decision: Whether or not it shall give the supreme effort to preserve its liberty from the danger of totalitarianism. As the world situation grows darker, the hopes of the peace-loving peoples in the world rekindle with a brighter and more anxious flame. The new year is a time to look forward and not back. The errors made in the past can be studied and acknowledged, but we can't waste time deliberating over them. If in the past we have failed to speed up our defenses in such areas as the Greek-Balkan region, or in Iran or in Western Germany, now is the time to make our resolution to foster preparedness throughout the world—at every key spot likely to be attacked by the Kremlin hordes.

New Year's Day in the United States is highly celebrated as the day which usherv in a new goal in life toward which we can set our sights. It is the day when resolutions, firm and resolute, are formed, the day when dancing and merrymaking continue into the early hours of the new year. It also is a day which marks the passing of an outworn, already superseded year. Thus, the sense of the new, the untried, is what spurs Americans to do the unusual, the difficult, yes, even the untried. And in Greece, the new year is the culmination of the period which begins in Christmas. It

is the day when gifts are passed among relatives and friends, a practice indulged in Christmas time.

This Balkan Nation, saddened many a New Year's Day by the burdens of war or hunger, finds itself this 1951 a country on the outpost, guarding democracy's frontier. That job is not an easy one, for, in addition, Greece must assure its people that they will have food to eat, a roof over their heads at night, and a future to look forward to—at a time when few hopes are alive in central Europe.

The road back for Greece has been a long and difficult one. That road has a turn in it which now is being reached. The coming year should tell whether the Greek people will have taken the right turn or perhaps taken a detour. Which road is the correct can be guideposted by the leading western countries, such as the United States and Great Britain. A year is almost a past friend. To all of us, 1929 and also 1930 were years which we remember as the depression acquaintances. The first was to have been celebrated as the greatest 12 months in the American history of prosperity. But, as it happened, the prosperity did not linger the full time but deteriorated into the famous economic crash and the beginning of the great depression. People wondered in 1930 whether that year would bring revolution and crisis in the United States.

But by the same token, the years 1918 and 1945 are remembered as having a peculiarly sweet and fond aroma. Those were the years when two separate and great world wars ended on a note of high optimism. It was to be the end of world conflict and bloodletting.

It is—and should be—our sincere desire that this year of 1951 will be the turning point of history, wherein the curse on humanity called communism is trampled under the boots of the masses of people who have been subjugated by the twentieth century tyrants.

The goal in every man's life is happiness and a measure of success for himself and for his family. And it is those thoughts which are asserted on the new year. Man, a strange creature even unto himself, is ever curious what tomorrow may bring. But, as it is in the world and as it ever will be in the history of mankind, the individual can have a part in what is to come. Greece's populace, whose roots sprang from the fertile forebearers who nurtured civilization and who has been one of its greatest champions, in this way can play a role in the history of the future world. With the aid of the free and unfettered world, the Greek Nation can look forward to many more years of peace and perhaps even eventual prosperity. But should the many resourceful and bastion nations fail to bulwark Greece morally, spiritually, and materially, and without delay, the days, months, and perhaps years will be heavily shadowed.

Courage—and faith—can topple the odds being stacked against the free Western World. The set-back to the United Nations that has been suffered in Korea can have mixed blessings by preparing us for the very worst. The New Year is being celebrated throughout the world with a trace of foreboding. For peoples the world over are asking one another the big question of: Are we great enough, do we have the know-how to meet the aggressor at the council table or on the field of battle and defeat him?

The answer to this indeterminable can only be in the affirmative; Democratic ways of life must give emphasis to the note being sounded by our leaders—freedom must not fail.

With the aid of God, the freedom-loving workers, businessmen, professionals and intellectuals, the diplomats and the politicians will forego the usual and normal luxuries which have become part of their way of life, and work together to make 1951 the most memorable year of all time. Only we—the free peoples of the earth—can make an ideal come true. Only we—the best fed people on the earth—can assure other nations, such as Greece, that they and their future generations are not being forgotten. Unstinted effort on every individual's part must follow the recapitulation made on New Year's Day. Ring in the New Year, ring out the old, we are crossing the threshold. May we have prosperity and peace.

World Government—Think It Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting as part of my remarks an article by Col. Albert G. Hulett, of East Orange, N. J., which appeared in the December 1950 issue of Sojourner. The threat to our Government through the program of world federalism must be brought to the attention of all the American people. The article in question is as follows:

BE OBJECTIVE IN YOUR THINKING ABOUT WORLD GOVERNMENT

Can we not derive inspiration and guidance for our thoughts and our inclinations regarding world government, as now being so adroitly advocated by United World Federalists, Inc., from the parable of the 10 talents which is contained in the New Testament of the Christian Bible? If anyone has forgotten that parable, I admonish him or her to reread it at once and then to think upon its implications. The lesson is very clear, namely, that only after succeeding in lesser things are we entitled to undertake larger and greater endeavors and responsibilities. Could anyone expect that one of our colleges would accept as a student any pupil who had failed to graduate from high or preparatory school? And, if any college were so foolish, would you expect such pupil to succeed in such higher educational endeavor?

Even a casual and superficial survey of human history will reveal that socially, morally, educationally, linguistically, and religiously, the world of today is as hopeless a mess of conflicting strata, beliefs, practices, and systems as it was 2,000 years ago. We may have made some progress, but certainly not enough to achieve a disappearance of these basic and vital differences and disagreements. Not only have we these differences, but we have a total incomprehension and misunderstanding of the mores of one group by those of any other.

We may talk grandiosely of democracy and prate that a long list of countries have embraced and practice democracy. But are we aware of the fallacy of such presumption? Upon the record, it appears that the United States, France, Great Britain, Finland, Italy, the nations of Central and South America, China, Japan, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and even Russia are democracies. Yet have they a similar constitution, political or social order, or comperable standards of procedure in government, or identical rights of the individuals therein?

Christianity has existed for well-nigh 2,000 years, and yet is it united today, or even making apparent progress toward such union? Protestantism, both in Europe and these United States, has been cognizant of the need and the vast advantage of achieving a single Christian church into which all believers in Christ might be joined. But has such been even approached, let alone attained, to this date? To some observers it may even seem that the more we try to attain union the more minority groups are born and the more bitter becomes the partisan wall between them.

Right within our own country, do we have a singleness of mind in legal matters, or governmental, social, or civic realms? Yet our 48 States and the District of Columbia are supposed to be existing and to be functioning under a single Constitution. Whether it be divorce laws, criminal procedure, property rights, or any other corner into which we inquire, we shall discover that we have not a single standard, but 49 different and widely dissimilar standards of right and of procedure amongst us.

These are examples of what mankind has achieved as to one talent, or—shall we say—as to successive single talents.

Yet the idealists, dreamers, impractical thinkers, and superficial persons who now vociferously and financially are supporting and promoting the program of United World Federalists, Inc., with its objective of immediate, single world government, would have you and me believe that mankind—though dismally unsuccessful in these simpler, and yet vitally basic undertakings—can now and immediately make a complete success of the establishment of a single government for all mankind.

To me, and to others who adopt a factual and objective approach to life and its living, such a grandiose and illogical proposition is wholly repugnant and disturbing. That such scheme is of Russian Communist origination requires much study to determine by actual proofs. A few who have the time and the facilities have certainly done so, but the mass of our citizens have neither such ability nor the leisure in which to parallel that research; nor have they been told all that might be said upon this score—and chiefly because of lack of money which would be requisite for such widespread dissemination of the truths.

Yet is such study or such dissemination necessary for our citizens to appreciate the impossibility of the successful achievement—at this time or at any forseeable future date within the lives of those now existing upon this earth—of a single world government, unless such be a despotism which is forced upon its nations and peoples as was the Roman Empire and other subsequent "fatuous answers to the yearning for universal peace"?

Can we not cause our people to recognize that, having failed in these necessary preliminary steps in the progression toward world unity, nor even now having the knowledge or means to their attainment, we would be fools indeed to consider for a moment the vastly larger, more intricate, and far more dangerous attempt to speedily bring about the creation of a single government for mankind?

Upon a dispassionate analysis of human accomplishment to date, the observer must become an apologist for the failures thereby disclosed, and also must conclude that mankind is not universally and generally ready for the college undertaking of world government, because the nations and peoples of this earth have not yet even finished the grammar school of their education in solution of domestic problems, let alone the high school of sufficient and proper collaboration between national governments and social systems, or religious sects.

Hence, avoiding any and all considerations of the details of this world government project, should we not label it as wholly impossible of attainment? And, even though we might yearn for some such eventual attainment at some far-distant future date, can we honestly aver that we can or should advocate any such scheme which must inevitably result in chaos and recession for mankind, should it be now undertaken?

ALBERT G. HULETT,
National Commander, Heroes of '76.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, I introduced House Joint Resolution 3 for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway in the interest of national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada.

Although this proposition has been before Congress for some time, the critical developments during the past 6 months have emphasized the necessity for immediate construction of this project. There is a vital and pressing need for the production of low-cost hydro power for our defense industries. This project will supply it in an area which has suffered from power shortages since the beginning of World War II. The Government is today making contracts for the establishment of defense plants in which it is forced to make allowance for high cost of power. Canada is in dire need of additional sources of power energy and if she is to make a large contribution for our mutual defense she must be permitted to take part in the development of the St. Lawrence River.

Through the development of this deep water navigation all materials needed for our expanded industries can be made available from continental sources without exposing our supply lines to enemy submarine action as in 1942.

Our expanded steel industry will require large amounts of iron ore imports. The Bureau of Mines estimates that for an annual steel production capacity of 125,000,000 tons, we shall need to import 64,000,000 tons of iron ore. It is inconceivable that this country should allow almost one-half of its steel capacity in the next 10 to 20 years to be dependent upon off-shore imports and made available only by our Atlantic seaboard and subject to attack by undersea craft.

There are certain vital materials that we must obtain from overseas, such as bauxite, petroleum, copper, and uranium ore which will tax our merchant marine resources and convoy duty. It would be folly to make one-half of our steel production and scores of other vital and critical essentials needed in war and peacetime dependent upon off-shore resources thousands of miles removed from the continent of North America.

There are sources of ore development on the continent in addition to Minnesota, Labrador, and eastern Quebec and Ontario. The development of the St. Lawrence seaway is an absolute necessity to bring Quebec and Labrador inland ore to our Great Lakes steel industry as well as to our eastern mills in large quantities.

The resolution I have introduced differs only slightly from the one I sponsored in the Eighty-first Congress and upon which the House Public Works Committee held extensive hearings.

There are certain revisions in section 2, which takes cognizance of the fact that the Niagara Treaty of Canada takes care of the expense of casual interest in the negotiation of this treaty.

In section 3, relating to tolls, passenger traffic is included along with cargo in the application of tolls. A maximum of 50 cents a short ton is passed upon bulk agricultural and mineral cargoes. The reason for this is that very large amounts of iron ore, coal, grain, and petroleum are expected to use the seaway and the revenues at a maximum of 50 cents a short ton would be enough to meet all the costs of the seaway including interest and amortization of principal.

In section 5, which calls for the transfer of the power facilities to the State of New York upon payment of the cost of the powerhouse, plus a share of the joint cost of power and navigation, one of the conditions of transfer has been expanded to spell out a policy that has been understood in administration circles that New England would share in the St. Lawrence power. It must be understood that any arrangement worked out by the executive departments will have to be submitted to the Congress for approval.

I call upon my colleagues from New York and New England, regardless of party, to support this bill because there is cheap power for them in it. I call upon my colleagues from the Middle West and the agricultural States because it is essential for continued prosperity and expansion of agriculture and industry.

I know that certain selfish and influential groups are opposed to this project. Eastern railroads, particularly those serving Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore are opposed to it because they hope to gain by stopping this low-cost competitive transportation project. I know that the power companies, too, in New York and New England are opposed to it because of the competitive effect of this low-cost power. I am sure, however, that my colleagues from those areas conscious of the source of this opposition will put national interest and the welfare of their constituents above misplaced fears of these eastern power and railroad companies.

Let me emphasize that completion of the St. Lawrence deep waterway will not only make of the Great Lakes States deep seaports of international importance, but will guarantee the permanence and growth of industry. More than that, it will preserve and make possible the expansion of the great defense potential so essential to our national existence. Significantly, the national interest, and more particularly that of the Lake States, is not centered upon power development or navigation alone, contiguous States, particularly those producing farm products of various kinds, cattle and grain, and even minerals, will be assured of cheap competitive freight rates which will project their products of mills, factories, and mines along with the fruits of our agricultural States into the markets of the world.

It will add prosperity to industry, banks, railroads, and to the millions of workers throughout the length and breadth of the land. It will stimulate not alone industry and agriculture but railroads and other forms of transportation.

A Mother's Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from a South Bend, Ind., mother, which is typical of the mail I am receiving from distraught parents in my district who are deeply concerned over the present foreign situation:

SOUTH BEND, IND., *January 4, 1951.*

Hon. Congressman CRUMPACKER:

We mothers of this country want this needless slaughter of our sons to cease.

Don't they have a right to happiness, education, and marriage, as you and I?

I have two wonderful sons who I have cared for tenderly, and love, and if you could sit for 1 hour and hear them talk of the dismal, hopeless future which is no fault of their own but is caused by the blundering present adult generation.

If our own country was attacked, we would all want to fight, but to keep sending our fine boys across the ocean every few years to fight their battles is sheer madness.

What has it ever gained? People are growing very, very bitter.

One commentator I heard recently said, and I quote, "We have made commitments which we must live up to; we must not lose faith with the rest of the world." To which I say, What utter nonsense.

I ask you, How much have other countries considered us? They want our money and our protection, but what have they done, or are doing? They haven't even tried to protect themselves. But, of course, our American boys must spill their lifeblood over Europe, sent over like cattle to be slaughtered.

My husband and I agree with former President Hoover, and many people believe as we do. My husband is a physician and talks to many people in the course of a day and, believe me, people want something drastic done about this present foreign policy.

Do not give the President any more power. He already has had too much; and what terrible mistakes he has caused. What a pity for this Nation that we could not have a real man and statesman as our leader.

I ask you, Congressman CRUMPACKER, as our Representative, to do all in your power to prevent these past foolish policies from being carried out further.

We mothers are praying for you and are looking to you for help.

Sincerely,

Mrs. D. W. FRASH.

Heil, Dewey!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column by Mr. Walter Winchell published in this morning's Washington Post. It is, I believe, a most thoughtful and intelligent discussion of Governor Dewey's request for emergency powers:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

HEIL, DEWEY!

Governor Dewey has asked the State legislature to declare immediately a defense emergency, which would give him the most dictatorial powers in American history. The Governor's request is marred by only two defects, both constitutional. Firstly, he hasn't the right to receive such powers; and, secondly, the legislature hasn't the authority to give them. All of the gentlemen involved swore to uphold the Constitution—and that old document was designed to stop any new-fangled dictatorship, however sugar-coated.

Getting right down to cases, the United States Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that after Congress has acted, in any given matter, the various States can't. Congress has passed a Civil Defense Act—and the State of New York is as much bound by it as any private citizen. The subject of civil defense is a national problem. Governor Dewey can no more declare a state of national emergency in New York State than he can conclude a separate treaty of peace with Russia or withdraw the New York National Guard from the Atlantic alliance.

New York State still being a democracy, it is proper for citizens to ask questions. Here are a few: The Governor's counsel states that the bill doesn't give the Governor any new powers he doesn't have. Then why pass it? The Governor's counsel states that the new bill simply defines the emergency. Does anyone seriously urge that an atomic attack has to be described by the State legislature before the United States Army can act?

The Governor, a very able lawyer, knows very well that the 15,000,000 citizens of New York State are also United States citizens. The United States Constitution protects a citizen from all governments, including the United States Government itself. The Governor asks the right to seize private property, including homes. The United States Constitution Bill of Rights and the New York State Bill of Rights prohibit it. The Governor's action not only supersedes the acts of Congress and usurps the President's power, but supersedes both Bills of Rights while doing it.

The Governor's bill constitutes the most amazing request ever made by an American executive. No President ever asked or even dreamed of asking for these powers. Americans will have difficulty believing their eyes. The Governor wants these powers: To confiscate all communications systems, newspapers, radio stations, public utilities, and transportation, to evacuate persons or compel them to remain, to conscript men and women into work battalions, to confiscate private property including homes, to take over the banks, to demolish or prevent demolishing of private buildings. The Governor can greatly simplify his request by asking that New York State be fenced with barbed wire. The only request not made is that all newspapers—on the day before seizure—print one uniform headline: "Heil, Dewey."

Even the most conservative newspapers in the State report that Governor's defense bill leaves New York State on the edge of martial law. Constitutionally, Governor Dewey cannot declare martial law in New York State except in case of actual invasion or rioting or rebellion within the State. It is beyond his powers to put New York under bayonet because of what he thinks is going on in international affairs. As a citizen he is entitled to his own opinion. But as Governor of the State he is absolutely bound by the rulings of the United States Government. This was decided not only in Philadelphia in 1789 but at Gettysburg in 1863.

Again constitutionally, there is only one Government of the American people in international affairs and that is the United States Government. To the extent that the Governor's bill contradicts the Federal bill, New York State is defying the Federal Government in 1951 as completely as South Carolina did in 1861. There is this big difference: The people of South Carolina backed their State government. The people of New York will fight Governor Dewey's bill through every court in the land—and a lot of other places which needn't be mentioned now.

The constitutional defects of the Governor's proposals are not the most outrageous aspect of the bill. The tragedy is that any American official would dare ask for such powers. No Trujillo has them; no Franco wields them; no President ever asked for them. Yet one governor out of 48 deems the emergency so great that he alone asks for them. Thus, New Jersey and Connecticut could be enjoying a free press under this law—while all New York dailies were seized by Governor Dewey. New York citizens could be working in compulsory labor battalions—while the rest of the Union was pursuing its normal life. And for even questioning the order of the Civil Defense Office a New Yorker, under the law, could be sent to prison.

This is more than a problem for the people of New York State. It is a challenge to every United States citizen and to the Government of the United States. The people of New York should not only protest—but the Congress of the United States should reprimand the Governor. Dewey has no more right to preempt the rights of the Federal Government than he has the right to grab control of the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

The Governor's bill is, of course, die-hard Republican isolationism at its tragic worst. Senator TAFT says we haven't the right to protect ourselves abroad. Herbert Hoover says we should fight only in the Western Hemisphere. Now, Governor Dewey thinks national defense is narrowed to New York State. The grim fact is that if this country had 48 different systems of civil defense—instead of one national and coordinated plan—the job of licking us would be 96 times easier for the Communists. For instance, Governor Dewey claims the right to draft all New York men and women. What happens to the Federal Government's powers? Does this mean the Governor, following Senator TAFT's isolationism to its logical conclusion, claims the United States Government can't use New York citizens for the civil defense of California? Or Minnesota? Or Louisiana? Nonsense, Governor, nonsense.

The shocking fact is that both New York parties are reported ready to call it a bipartisan bill. This would be laughable if it weren't so insane. Just where the legislature and the Governor think they get the power to make the rights of the people the subject of a political trade is something for which the New York voters are going to call them to account.

The Governor has been a good governor—but after this bill the country will sigh its deepest sigh of relief that he wasn't elected President. Whew! As President Truman frequently grins, the Democrats can look pretty bad until some Republicans open their mouths.

Here We Go Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, indicating that we learn little, no matter what the cost to us in manpower may be, I submit herewith the following from Collier's of November 25, 1950:

NEW TAILOR, SAME OLD SUIT

The chief purpose of this editorial—or, perhaps, this postscript—is to call attention to the report from two members of Collier's European team, which appears on page 22, under the title of "The Nazis March Again—This Time for Stalin." It is an illuminating and a disturbing account, and if you haven't read it already, you ought to now. Then if you are interested in our further thoughts on the matter, you can read on from here.

It is quite natural that most of us, in and out of government, have been thinking and talking about Korea and the Far East in recent months. But that preoccupation should not make Americans forget that Germany is potentially another Korea, only on a bigger and more dangerous scale. This situation is much the same as it was in the cozy period of the Hitler-Stalin agreement back in 1939, only then the Russians and the Germans were strong and mutually suspicious neighbors. Today Stalin is the undisputed boss of half of Germany, and he has been trying by every means short of war to control the whole country. One of those means is the increasing use of the remnants of Hitler's party.

The Russians aren't bothered by scruples. With a cynical disregard for consistency, they have perverted the Nazi philosophy to their own advantage. They flatter and pamper the former Nazis, and use them to subjugate the people of Soviet Germany.

Probably this strange performance doesn't strike the majority of Germans as being so very inconsistent, at that. For there isn't much difference between Russian communism and German nazism. In spite of superficial variations, they were cut from the same bolt of authoritarian cloth. The citizen of Soviet Germany is living in much the same sort of political world as the one that Hitler created, although physically it is much less comfortable. It is still a world of slogans and parades and uniforms, of phony elections, of strict discipline, spies, and secret police.

The American Government's tough job is to block the Russians' intention of seizing all of Germany, and at the same time to foster democracy and root out the still vigorous growth of nazism in its own zone. In trying to do this job the Government is at something of a disadvantage because it is honest.

American authorities are trying to create a unified, democratic Germany by legitimate means. They are trying to fulfill a promise to the Germans of eventual self-government, individual freedom, and a chance to win back

their country's place in the community of peace-loving nations. They are trying to fulfill that promise in spite of Russian opposition, the indifference and hostility of many Germans, and their own uncertainties and mistakes. It is a discouraging assignment, but the American authorities have not compromised with principles.

There doesn't seem to be any answer to America's long-range problem in Germany except to continue the country's education in democracy, even if it means an indefinite occupation. But it does seem that our Government might take more positive action against the immediate dangers that confront it. We think it ought to crack down on the neo-Nazi parties that have sprung up in the West. And we think it should arm Western Germany unless the Russians agree to disarm their so-called police forces in the eastern zone.

Earlier we said that Germany was potentially another Korea. But the problem of Western Germany, unlike the problem of South Korea, can't be settled simply by giving it tanks, guns, and planes. There is a grave risk in arming the West Germans—the risk that they might not fight well in a civil war for a free government that many of them apparently don't want, or the risk that they might go over to the Russian side.

But it is a calculated risk which, we believe, should be taken. A defenseless Western Germany is a rich prize which the covetous Russians are training their Nazi stooges to pluck for them. We can see no virtue in tempting further Soviet aggression by the same inaction that brought on the Korean War.

Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Monday, January 8, 1951:

INSURANCE SHOULD BE SURE

With the start of the new year 10,000,000 more persons than were covered before have become part of the social-security system of old-age insurance in the United States, this under legislation passed last August.

This means that 10,000,000 more persons, making a total of 45,000,000, have a direct, tangible concern in the financial stability of the system set up to pay the retirement benefits they have been promised.

The principal feature of that set-up today is a trust fund of more than $13,000,000,000 invested in United States Government bonds. That is a very large sum, accumulated during 15 years' operation of the Social Security Act.

But before the end of this century, Government actuaries estimate, it will take more than $11,000,000,000 a year to pay the old-age benefits established by the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act. In other words, every year there will be needed almost as large a sum as has been saved up during 15 years.

At one time it was thought that it would be difficult to find investment for a large enough trust fund to make old-age insurance actuarially sound. But there is no difficulty on that score now. Even if the trust account tomorrow could be built up to the $74,000,000,000 maximum it should reach in 1990, that would fund less than one-third of the Nation's public debt.

The trust fund, of course, is raised by payroll taxes on employers and employees. Those taxes started in 1937 at 1 percent on each. It was intended then that the rate should rise gradually to 3 percent each by 1949.

Actually the rate increases were postponed by various Congresses until the rise to 1½ percent on employer and employee was only made in 1950. The amendments passed last year extended that rate through 1953 and put off the reaching of a 3 percent rate until 1965.

What happens if the latter years of this century find the United States without a large enough trust fund to pay the old-age insurance benefits which workers have been told they were building up for themselves while they and their employers contributed payroll taxes?

In that case, workers and employers of that generation, besides meeting payroll taxes of 3 percent or more, will be asked to pay additional general taxes to meet the cost of retirement benefits which today's generation has promised to itself but been unwilling in practice to provide.

Is that playing fair with the next or the third generation? We do not think so. On the contrary, we think Congress and the Nation—while they are revising taxes for defense this year—ought to have the stamina and economic courage to raise the payroll tax to 2 percent for 1951, or at latest 1952, instead of waiting till 1954 for that set-up to take effect. Then, increases for succeeding years ought to be advanced instead of postponed.

This would be in keeping with the purposes of absorbing excess purchasing power to prevent inflation during the rearmament effort. It would pick up more of the burden in a period of maximum employment, and if it is not done now, when will it be done?

If America is in earnest about its promises of old-age insurance, it should take genuine financial steps to make that insurance sound.

It seems to us that a quickened rate of advance in the payroll taxes to assure old-age benefits is in the interests of a sound defense economy, will provide more surely for the retirement of present-day workers, and is the course of honor to be chosen rather than sloughing these obligations onto children now in the nursery.

The Situation as We See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Hon. J. B. Snider, former Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi and now editor of the Natchez (Miss.) Times, has undertaken the tremendous task of informing the readers of his newspaper regarding the brutal facts now facing the American people through a column entitled "The Situation As We See It."

In an article in the January 2 issue of the Times he warns the public that 5 years of war financing and limited civilian production are ahead of us. Mr. Snider is neither an alarmist nor a pessimist. He is realistic to the point of bluntness. If our diplomats for the past 40 years had been endowed with a small part of Mr. Snider's straightforwardness and old-fashioned Americanism, I have little doubt but that there would still be peace in the world.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the afore-mentioned article. It follows:

THE SITUATION AS WE SEE IT

(By J. B. Snider)

The new Congress will be organized Wednesday. Since June, when the present Korean War started, the retiring Congress has voted $37,000,000,000 for national defense. This in addition to the $14,000,000,000 that was appropriated by the 1949 Congress for the expansion of the military and naval machine in 1950.

Fifty-four billion dollars is lots of money. It is equivalent to $334 for every man, woman, and child, white and colored, in the United States. If a mother and father have two children their thought will be, well we certainly didn't pay four times $334. But that is only what you think—you did—or rather you will. Your family's part is $1,336 and will be paid by you. Of course the actual cash may be collected from General Motors, United States Steel, General Electric, Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Sears, Roebuck, and 1,000,000 other concerns but brother and sister you will pay it.

You pay it when you plank down 20 cents for a dime loaf of bread; or when you pay $16 for a pair of $4 shoes, or $300 for a $200 refrigerator, or $1,800 for a $900 automobile.

Just remember you pay it and will continue to pay it for the remainder of your life and your children will probably be paying for it all of their lives.

And this $54,000,000,000 is just a starter. It will probably be $80,000,000,000 in 1951 for 1952 and $100,000,000,000 in 1952 for 1953 and on and on. You can't figure out how the Nation can pay it? Well, you are no different from the bankers in Wall Street, members of the Federal Reserve Board or the 10,000 top bankers, financial authorities, and economists of this Nation.

Of course there are a great many people right here in Natchez who do not believe we are going to have a war. And they advance some pretty good arguments about it. They are certainly entitled to their views on the matter, and they have the advantage in an argument in that all of us devoutly hope they are right. Anything is better than a war provided the substitute leads to a lasting peace. We are not willing to go along with the idea of peace in an armed state always awaiting and expecting war. To us there would be no point in living under conditions of that kind. Unless a permanent peace plan can be worked out, we think we should get the thing behind us and then pray that we shall not forget the lesson we have just learned. That we will never again turn this Nation over to wild-eyed, long-hair visionary idiots who no doubt mean well but are responsible for this terrible mess we now find ourselves involved in.

But whether there is to be war or not, the little man on the street, the man who works with his hands, whether he drives nails, builds tires, makes paper pulp, sews garments, makes wallboard, sells groceries, shoes or drugs, automobiles or candy, can get himself set for a minimum of 5 years of war conditions.

It will take from 2 to 3 years to get the defenses perfected and will take at least 2 years to reconvert if we escape a general world war. So we have a minimum of 5 years of war financing and limited civilian production either way it goes.

But it is not going to be as bad—anything like as bad—as it could be. Remember that in 1945 more than half of the people of the world were hungry and at least two-thirds of

them were naked or at best in rags. The people of this Nation will always have plenty to eat, plenty to wear, and far more comfortable places to sleep than 90 percent of the other people of the world. We will always have more amusements.

We shall maintain our right to free speech and a free press, free religion, and the right to peaceful assembly and petition regardless of what happens anywhere else in the world. Along with these privileges we have the ability to produce the things that enables a nation to win a war far beyond the ability of any other nation. So on January 2, 1951, as we face an unknown future we have an assurance that we are capable of taking care of ourselves if given the right kind of leadership in Washington.

We are said to be the world's greatest Christian nation. When you look around you, of course, you can't help but wonder what goes on in other nations that we rate any such title. Because if we are to be rated by our individual observance of the commandments laid down and the teaching of the Lord Christ we lack a great deal of being a Christian nation. All of your life you have heard the statement that "in every national emergency the Lord raises up a leader." There is no question we need a leader right now—we need one desperately. But are we as a nation of people in position to ask the Lord to deliver us? What have we done to merit His support and protection? We are not trying to preach a sermon. This writer knows, and his friends know, that he is no better than any of the rest of you. We don't want to be hypocritical. We are not approaching this from a religious angle. We are merely thinking out loud. We believe that all of us are agreed that we need a leader and quickly. We need help and badly. The only thing that could intervene right now would be the work of a merciful Father who could take this bitter cup from our lips. But as we look around us, just as you can look around you right at this moment, we wonder what right we have to expect Him to intervene in our behalf? Perhaps you know. This writer doesn't.

Without this intervention you can prepare now for 5 or 10 years of the most intensive effort of your life, and we will be a lucky people if, when it is over, we have any vestige of freedom left.

How Right You Were, Mr. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday night in Passaic, N. J., in an address before the Passaic Dante Club and yesterday on the floor of the House, after the President's appeal for unity, I proposed that he immediately draft into the services of the Nation former President Herbert Hoover and Bernard M. Baruch. Today I find in my morning paper the timely appraisal of Mr. Baruch by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, International News Service economic commentator. Under the caption "How right you were, Mr. Baruch," Mr. Rukeyser says:

Bernard M. Baruch was a preeminently useful consultant to Presidents largely because of his remarkable sense of timing.

Unlike the academic mind—the so-called brain truster—Mr. Baruch has always had a facility for knowing the score early.

Not having a professorial mind, Mr. Baruch never waits until after the event to realize what has happened.

In the famous leak investigation in World War I, Mr. Baruch made it clear that in stock-market action he did not act on inside information about a peace maneuver but was motivated by his sixth sense in interpreting the significance of the word "but" in a published State paper.

Outnumbered by the Communist hordes, we must survive by recognizing human quality, not quantity.

The so-called academic mind is less creative, and is less nimble.

Survival in the competitive world and in stock-market speculation when turning points come requires a swiftness of decision and a special alertness.

It should be remembered that months ago Mr. Baruch issued a strong clarion call for all-out mobilization.

Mr. Baruch's argument was that at worst full mobilization will cost some money, whereas the alternative of possibly losing a war would be an irrecoverable loss and might end our tradition as a free nation.

With his maturity of judgment, Mr. Baruch this month became a stronger potential political influence than he has been in many years.

This situation springs from two factors.

First, recent events have demonstrated how right he was.

Second, the dominant position in the Eighty-second Congress of the Southern Democrats, who respect Mr. Baruch, over the Fair Deal Democrats indicates that Mr. Baruch's advice will be more actively sought. Certainly he is also respected by most Republicans.

As principal atomic adviser, Mr. Baruch tested the intentions of the Russians. When the Soviet Union turned down the Baruch formula for sharing atomic energy on a protected basis through provision for inspection behind the iron curtain, it was a signal that the United States of America had to prepare to rely on its own physical power. There was no justification for backing and filling in policy after that.

In recent months, routineers have whined at the high prices paid for tin, rubber, and wool from British Empire sources. But Mr. Baruch's approach was different. He publicly advocated buying England's wool and other raw materials when prices were low.

In taking such a practical and well-timed position, he was acting in accordance with his long experience as a Wall Street speculator. This fact should be underscored.

Mr. Baruch exemplifies the possibility of using intelligence to tie today to tomorrow.

He is an expert on the economics of survival, and he should be promptly summoned by a congressional committee to provide a blueprint for survival, including a business-like set-up for importing and exporting.

Mr. Baruch is very much in favor with the men in the Eighty-second Congress who control the Nation's purse strings.

The World Is Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting a short poem entitled "The World Is Mine." I do not know the author, but I do know that it carries a powerful message, and one that all Americans should heed. It reads as follows:

Today, upon a bus, I saw
A pretty girl with golden hair.
I envied her, she seemed so gay,
I wished that I could be so fair.
But then, when she arose to leave,
I saw her hobble down the aisle,
She had one leg and used a crutch.
And yet, she passed me with a smile.
Oh, God, forgive me when I whine,
I have two legs, the world is mine.

And then I stopped to buy some sweets.
The lad who sold them had such charm;
I talked with him—he seemed so glad—
If I were late 'twould do no harm.
And as I left he said to me,
"Please come again, you've been so kind.
"It's nice to talk with folks like you,
"Because, you see," he smiled, "I'm blind."
Oh, God forgive me when I whine,
I have two eyes, the world is mine.

Then, walking down the street I saw
A pretty child with eyes of blue.
He stood and watched the others play,
It seemed he knew not what to do.
I stopped a moment, then I asked,
"Why don't you join the others, dear?"
He looked ahead without a word,
And then I knew he could not hear.
Oh, God forgive me when I whine,
I have two ears, the world is mine.

With legs to take me where I'd go,
With eyes to see the sunset glow,
With ears to hear what I would know—
Oh, God forgive me when I whine,
I'm blessed indeed, the world is mine.

Where Are the Troops of Our Fellow Nations in the So-Called United Nations Army?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. "Where are the troops of our fellow nations in the so-called UN Army?" is the caption of a timely and challenging editorial in the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call of Monday, January 8, 1951. This editorial reflects the heartfelt sentiments of hundreds of my constituents who are parents of the boys in our armed services. The editorial follows:

WHERE ARE THE TROOPS OF OUR FELLOW NATIONS IN THE SO-CALLED UN ARMY?

David Lawrence in his famous column on Saturday backed up the Call's position in the now calamitous Korean campaign of the United Nations Army which except for our British ally is practically an all-American expedition of ill-fated retreat and slaughter, when he said: "The people know very little about the Korean War. They know only that tens of thousands of troops are engaged in war, and that while it is called a UN operation the troops of the United States comprise almost all of the UN forces in Korea. The American people have not been told why the other members of the UN have failed to send troops in large numbers since last June."

The fact of this failure is that there is no good or justifiable reason. Therefore the Truman administration, whose diplomats

failed to get troop commitments from the forty-some nations which voted to send a United Nations Army to the assistance of South Korea, seek to cover up the blunder with silence.

Now as a result of this failure to our democratic allies to reinforce our United States troops—as was naturally expected and would have been done had our delegates to the UN insisted upon it—we see our heroic but sadly outnumbered American boys being put to rout in far-off Korea, tortured and wounded and giving up their lives. And in the meantime not a single son of our wealthy South American neighbors or of our European allies, once again enjoying prosperity through the billions of recovery program dollars handed out by United States taxpayers, is on the way to relieve and refill the battered ranks of our so-called United Nations Army.

With the bloody slaughter of our stranded troops still mounting, it is high time for our United States delegates to the UN to start shouting bloody murder and demand that every member nation which voted in favor of Korean intervention by the United Nations contribute their proportionate share of troops to pull victory out of defeat in Korea. If the majority are unwilling to do that much now, after our Nation has borne the brunt of the onslaught for 7 months, and immediately, to rebuild the shattered UN Army, then they have no right to expect our country to send one more man, let alone the million necessary, to drive back the countless hordes of North Korean and Chinese Reds out of the smoking rubble of what was once the South Korean Republic.

There is no justice, there is no sense in making our boys go it alone, and before more thousands of them are killed in the attempt, we call upon our President and his self-appointed UN delegates to demand that reinforcements for the United Nations Army be mustered in at once from the other members of the United Nations; that a vote for such reinforcements be promptly moved in the UN Assembly; and if the majority vote against such troop participation that we then pull our own forces out of the cauldron of slaughter and save thousands of our finest sons from further military suicide 6,000 miles away from home.

Isn't it better to pull out now under such go-it-alone conditions, as we did from the Philippines early in World War II, and conserve our strength for the bigger crisis ahead, than to let ourselves be bled white in already ruined Korea and thus play right into Stalin's grasping hands?

The Call believes the majority of our citizens, if given a vote on the question, would agree with us overwhelmingly that it is.

Farm Production in the Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week members of the Maryland Agricultural Society Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., and affiliated organizations were privileged to hear the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] discuss matters of interest to the farming element of our country.

As a former Secretary of Agriculture, where his work was outstanding in the Nation's interests, the Senator from New Mexico is held in highest regard and respect by the farm people of our State, who greeted his remarks on this occasion with the utmost interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by the able Senator be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I accepted the invitation to come here today, I recognized that the Eighty-second Congress would be meeting in a sober mood to deal with serious problems. I had just reached a firm decision that I would not leave Washington for a speaking engagement while the Congress was in session. But I accepted your invitation for the reason that Baltimore is so close to Washington that I could cancel at the last moment if I had to and for the additional reason that when so much attention is being paid to industrial mobilization it might be worth while occasionally for a few friends of the farmer to examine at a meeting of farm organizations some of the problems that may lie ahead in the agricultural field.

I admit that I like to speak to conventions of State farm bureau members. You belong to a giant farm organization. The latest available figures which I have received indicate that upon the basis of farm families there are about 1,450,000 families in the American Farm Bureau Federation, possibly 420,000 farm families in the grange and 220,000 farm families in the farmers union. You represent, therefore, a tremendously significant segment of American rural life and an important part of America's mobilization for defense.

The hardest task these days is to read newspapers and magazines and not become slightly confused by conflicting information. For example, just as 1950 was drawing to a close there appeared in the Washington Daily News under date of December 28 an editorial which started off this way:

"The Defense Production Act of 1950—the law authorizing Government price-wage controls—actually forbids effective control of food prices.

"Farm-bloc Congressmen saw to that."

I was surprised and displeased by that statement. I was not conscious that farm-bloc Congressmen had had a thing to do with those sections of the Defense Production Act to which objection was being taken. I clipped the editorial, attached it to a sheet of paper, and said, "I'm going to comment on that when I speak in Baltimore."

A few nights later I picked up the issue of Newsweek for January 8 and read that one of the hottest fights in the new Congress will be over food-price controls. The article stated that "existing law frustrates such controls by exempting farm prices from ceilings until they reach parity. All but 9 of the 40 chief crops are thus legally entitled to healthy rises—up to 100 percent for potatoes, grapefruit, lemons—instead of the checks that might be indicated to stem inflation." I was tempted to take some pretty strong exception to that or at least to point out that if lemons were entitled to raise 100 percent because of the operation of the parity concept it was only evidence that parity does not work perfectly in every case. It doesn't work for grapefruit; it doesn't work for a number of other items, but by and large it is a useful yardstick.

Then I came to the next sentence in the item, and it read this way: "Congressmen representing industrial areas will battle with the farm bloc to amend the law so as to hold down food ceilings." When I read that I knew that I was going to have something to say about it at this convention. I rarely get in the mood to fight with the Congressmen from industrial areas, because I regard myself as representing every section of my State, industrial as well as agricultural. I hate to see a pitched battle take place between Congressmen who represent purely industrial areas and Congressmen who represent strictly agriculture areas. I say that because four-fifths of the population of the United States lives in towns and cities, and the one-fifth living on farms carry the burden of supplying food for all the rest of us. Any battle that puts four-fifths of the population against one-fifth is an unequal battle to start, and if it is not a necessary battle, it certainly is one that should not be undertaken or encouraged.

With that introduction, let's see how much truth there is to the steadily repeated assertion that farm-bloc Congressmen wrote into the Defense Production Act of 1950 a lot of language which makes it impossible to control food prices or hold them within reasonable limits. I wondered what the attitude had been of the farm organizations, particularly the American Farm Bureau Federation, so I checked back into my files and found that president Allan B. Kline, speaking in behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 3936, the companion bill to H. R. 9176 which is the act referred to, testified on July 26, 1950. His formal remarks were confined to section 412 of the bill which was a proposition to modify the existing sales policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation with reference to the sale of Government-owned farm commodities. President Kline spoke in opposition to that section and pointed to the basic rules of the present policy on the sale of Government-owned commodities as they were carried in section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. I was to some degree at least, an author of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and, therefore, I appreciated the fact that your president had believed it better to hold to those provisions than to introduce new and revolutionary ideas about the sale of Commodity Credit stocks.

Right there before I go any farther, I want to insert the thought that I have had some convictions on these Government-owned stocks for quite a little while. I spoke at the Western Region Farm Bureau Conference at Fort Collins, Colorado on June 17, 1950, and I started right out talking about farm surpluses. I reminded my Farm Bureau friends in the West that newspaper and radio accounts of Government price-support operations had tended to create the impression that agriculture was confronted with huge, unmanageable stocks of deteriorating farm commodities. So I tried to give my friends a few facts. I told them (and I am quoting now):

"Our so-called surpluses are not nearly as large as the public apparently thinks they are. We do have relatively large stocks of some farm commodities, but these stocks are not all surpluses. * * * We need reserves of food, feed, and fiber to meet unexpected requirements and to tide us over in years when we may have short crops due to unfavorable weather or other conditions. It is only when we have more than we need for current use and reasonable reserves that we can say we have a surplus. This situation prevails today for a very few commodities.

"Our present supply of corn exceeds a normal supply by only enough to last our population for 67 days. Our cotton supply exceeds normal by only enough to meet our domestic and export needs for 91 days. Our wheat stocks are above normal by only enough to meet our needs for 112 days.

"Reasonable reserves of storable farm commodities are the best insurance consumers can have against shortages and unreasonable

prices, because the prices of farm products skyrocket when supplies fall short of needs.

"A single year of the kind of weather we had in 1947 would wipe out our present reserve stocks of corn. The short 1947 corn crop caught us without adequate reserves. I am sure that everyone can remember the resulting difficulties. We had a feed conservation program. Even so the production of meat and other livestock products went down and prices went up. We had meatless days and poultryless days. Both farmers and consumers suffered. This was only 2 years ago—our memories are short, aren't they?"

That is the end of my long quotation.

That talk was made before Korea.

It has been interesting to me to note the changes in the words used to describe the Government-owned stocks of most price-supported commodities. At first they were labeled "surpluses"; then, "so-called surpluses"; later, "reserves"; still later "stockpiles," and now they have become "storehouses of strength."

From time to time we hear it charged that the farm program is forcing consumers to pay unreasonable prices for the necessities of life. These charges originate with the uninformed, with those who would abolish all price supports, and with those who want to convince consumers that they would get a better deal if some other system were substituted for price supports. Regardless of where they originate, the charges that the farm program is keeping food prices high in America are false. As a matter of fact, food is relatively cheap in this country.

It takes fewer hours of work to earn the money to pay for food in America than in any other major country in the world. In 1935–39, consumers spent 23 percent of their disposable income for food. Currently, they are spending 26 percent; however, they are eating better. If the American people ate the same varieties and per capita quantities they ate in 1935–39, that food which cost consumers 23 percent of their income in those years would cost them only 19 percent of their income today.

The fact that food prices are higher in dollars and cents today than before World War II is evidence that the value of the dollar went down during the inflation which resulted from the war. It is not evidence that consumers are worse off. As a matter of fact, when the increase in consumer incomes is considered, consumers are better off.

Consumers should expect to pay a fair price for food—just as they expect farmers to pay a fair price for the things they buy.

Now to return to the claim that farm-bloc Congressmen saw to it that it was impossible to establish effective control on food prices. This matter came to the floor of the Senate on December 19 last and Senator MAYBANK, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, testified that the committee, not any lobby, unanimously agreed on the price control provisions relating to agricultural commodities. That checks with my own observation. I know that I did not urge the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to take any action. I know that Senator AIKEN, the ranking Republican member of the Agriculture Committee, did not. I'm sure that Senator Thomas of Oklahoma, who was chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, made no special plea and so far as I could learn at the time, not a single representative of what might be called the farm bloc appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and asked that committee to do anything on prices.

The only time that any legislative proposal that appeared to be inflationary came before the Senate was when Senator YOUNG introduced an amendment fixing rigid 90-percent supports. I'm going to deal with that in a minute, but before I do, I want to add a few particulars concerning Mr. MAYBANK's testimony. Senator MAYBANK pointed out that he had requested the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to look into the law and facts so that whatever he stated was absolutely correct in every detail. He then read a prepared statement which is carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 12, at page 16743, and in that statement pointed out that all the committee tried to do was get a fair relationship between agricultural prices and other prices as they existed during the period from May 24 to June 24, 1950. The statement carries this rather important reasoning: "It would be manifestly unfair, for example, to fix a price on a farm commodity at a price existing today when that price had changed hardly at all over the last 6 months, while the prices of numerous other nonfarm commodities had been moved up from 25 to 50 percent in some cases."

The statement pointed out that in June 1948 when wheat was selling for $2.81, a 1-pound loaf of bread was selling for 13.8 cents. By October 1950 when wheat had dropped to $1.91 a bushel the same loaf of bread was selling for 14.7 cents. In other words, bread was selling about a penny higher and wheat was down nearly a dollar a bushel. The question naturally arose, who was reaping the profit out of inflation—the farmer, the distributor, or the processor?

I deal with this because I hope this audience will realize and in time make other audiences aware of the fact that an increase in the cost of living is not always caused by an increase in the price of farm commodities.

There is in the Defense Production Act a provision relating to the establishment of fair and equitable margins of profit for processors. That was a provision carried in the old OPA law and picked up in the new legislation. It is not there to protect farmers, and it was not put there by the farm bloc. It was inserted by Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia. I happened to be presiding over the Senate at the time this amendment was adopted, and I can recall that those who were urging and pressing it and particularly interested in it were not then concerned with the welfare of the farmer but were aiming at protection for the packing houses and produce dealers and the people who handled and processed the goods which the farmer grows. So I say to you that the things that are in the law which might be regarded as inflationary were not put there by farmers or at the request of farmers or at the request of the farm bloc or by the instrumentality of the farm bloc in the Senate or House of the United States.

I referred a moment ago to the amendment which was offered, which would have required rigid supports up to 90 percent of parity. I said I wanted to comment on that again, and I do. It just happens that when this particular amendment came to the floor of the Senate it seemed to have a good deal of support. That discussion is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 10, page 12868. I want to give these page references so that there can be no question as to what farmers' friends and members of the so-called farm bloc were doing at that time. One of the Members of the United States Senate asked Senator YOUNG a good many questions, and it looked as though the amendment might be accepted. For instance, I give you these words from one of the Senators because he used some different words later on. This particular Senator said: "Mr. President, I think the amendment is splendid, and I shall support it."

A few moments after he said that, I obtained the floor and raised a point of order against the amendment. I tried to point out that in my opinion the object of the bill was to control the cost of living and the object of the amendment was to raise the cost of living. I called attention to the fact that the bill started with proposals to protect consumers, wage earners, persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes and I insisted that the amendment was not designed to protect them but it was designed to do the complete reverse of that. While I was talking the Senator who had said the amendment was splendid and he was going to support it went through some papers on his desk and discovered that he had a telegram from the president of the Farm Bureau of his State. That telegram opposed the 90 percent rigid mandatory price support on basic commodities. The Senator was prompted to reread the telegram. The result was that when I had finished speaking against the amendment, that same Senator put into the RECORD the telegram from the president of the Farm Bureau of his State and that Senator voted against the amendment because he understood then that it was probably inflationary and had no place in the law.

I mention that as specific proof that Senators who are identified with farm legislation, and I am certainly one of them, were not trying to load down the law with inflationary items designed to increase the cost of living and push farm prices out of sight. I mention it also to bring out the fact that the State units of the American Farm Bureau Federation were going down the line trying their very best to keep the bill from being an inflationary bill, that way back there, long before many people were fighting inflation the farm organizations—particularly and sometimes single handedly the American Farm Bureau Federation—tried to hold down inflation.

I can just hear you saying to yourselves, "Why so much fuss about a little item in a newspaper story." Well, I think it's important that we hit these things as early as they show their head. I think it's important that the farmers of this country fight back when they are unjustly accused. I think it's important that the farm organizations let friend and foe alike know where they stand on these public questions and that they steadily say to every newspaper writer and radio commentator and Member of Congress that when the record is written they want to be sure that the man who writes it lives up to the divine commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

During the week end I read carefully the address of President Kline delivered at Dallas, Tex., on December 12. I like a great deal of what he said. There are some things in his address that I wouldn't agree to, just as there will be things in mine to which he would take exception. I don't mention his address in order to endorse it all but I mention it to make this point, that no one can read it and not be impressed with the fact that the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation is against inflation and is standing vigorously for those things which he thinks will help control inflation. I call your attention to the fact that as head of your organization he speaks out vigorously in favor of large production.

In that connection, I want to commend the Department of Agriculture for its action of the past few days in taking production controls off corn and wheat. It is probable that the action of the Department may result in the accumulation of extra large stocks of either corn or wheat and that this country may take some substantial losses because of that but there is no other safe way to play the situation. We cannot take a chance on being short of corn or wheat in days of emergency like these and the Department in my opinion was abundantly right in asking for increased production of corn and wheat, not only from the imperative consideration of our national defense and our need to have sufficient food on hand to take care of our economy, but also from the standpoint of our war against inflation because the very presence of large stocks of corn and wheat will do more to hold down

the prices of corn and wheat than all the laws passed by the Congress of the United States.

I want to remind this audience that I had a little something to do with the agricultural program at the time we were moving out of World War II. I know how hard it was to enforce price ceilings when we were actually in the war and when every patriotic impulse moved good people to live up to the law of the land, but I know also how impossible price ceilings became the very day that we had accomplished our purpose and the Japanese had followed the Germans into surrender. I heard stories and made personal investigations of what people had done who were violating the ceilings on cattle prices. I called particular attention one time to an individual operating in the State of Ohio who seemed able despite ceilings to buy every cow that was offered in an auction ring anywhere in that State. He paid higher prices consistently than everybody and is little slaughtering establishment was buying cattle away from every major packer in the United States. An investigator was sent out to check on this individual. The investigator came back to report that the little butcher was the stupidest person he had ever met, that he didn't keep a book, he didn't keep a record, he had no idea what his cattle were costing him, he had no idea how much he was getting for his meat and he couldn't begin to tell him whether he had or had not violated the OPA ceilings. I thought that the man running the little packing plant wasn't quite as stupid as the person who had investigated him, but anyhow his plant finally closed down, because we later proved he was violating the law of the land. The tragedy was that every time one plant was closed down for violations, two or three other plants stepped into existence and went even further with their violations. That is why many of us have believed that abundant production of agriculture commodities is the best price policeman we could have on our economic front.

I get off my subject once in a while in my enthusiasm to talk about some phase of this situation, and I suppose I ought to return to the address of President Kline to which I was directing my comments a few moments ago. Actually, however, leaders of farm organizations and Members of the Congress of the United States might be far apart on the question of when controls should be put upon agricultural prices. The one thing that I want to remind you is that there are very few commodities now that would be influenced by the imposition of price controls as the law now stands on the statute books. The two spots where controls would right now become effective would be (1) cotton and cottonseed and (2) livestock, principally cattle, lambs and veal calves.

I'm sure we all remember the difficulties of the last war. Every effort was made to work out an easy, fair, and equitable basis for ceilings on cattle and livestock products. We toyed with the idea of ceilings upon cattle on the hoof and we had to discard it because of the extreme difficulty of grading cattle in the stockyards of this country, to say nothing of their grading by thousands of butchers in smaller communities all over the United States. When we began putting the ceilings on dressed meat, the question always arose as to whether those ceilings were adequate to permit the fattening of beef in the feed lots of Kansas, Iowa, Indiana, and Ohio. I sat in conference after conference in the office of the economic stabilizers as they struggled with this problem of where to set the ceiling on beef in order that it might reflect an adequate profit to the individual who was fattening that beef and preparing it for the market.

One of the dangers always ahead is what happens if the margin is too low. You and I know that the skeleton of an animal and the hide around that skeleton are not beef. If the animal is sold thin, the American public buys little energy and food. But when that skeleton is put upon our pastures and allowed to pack a few hundred pounds of flesh around its bones and then is brought into a feed lot and crammed with nutritious corn, it makes beef and makes it rapidly. The skeleton weighs about as much one time as another. The gain made by the animal in the pasture and in the feed lot represents the production of beef.

If there isn't a price margin that permits that type of meat production to go on, then we only reduce the amount of beef available in the markets, and when we reduce it we make it subject to all the pressures of black-market operators everywhere in the land. It is only when we have a large number of cattle on the feed lots of this country being fed to substantial weights that we are able to take care of our demand for good red meat. I realize that the imposition of ceilings on livestock might for a time help in the control of prices in a few retail stores, but if the ceilings result in the elimination of feed lots and the marketing of beef that has not been brought to maturity, then we shortly will be worse off than we are at present. So we need to exercise great care in trying to put ceilings on meat.

Now, just a word about cotton. We are at a point in this country where it is necessary to restrict the exportation of our present cotton stocks. We surely need a crop of 16,000,000 bales in 1951. We could harvest 17,000,000 bales and not hurt anything. The probabilities are that we will be fortunate if we get 14,000,000 bales. We may have to carry over into 1952 and succeeding years the necessity of filling up the cotton reservoir which has been drained in these last few months.

What will produce a great crop of cotton is a price incentive. Already the farmers in my part of the world are pleading with me about fertilizer and insecticides and they are saying that they are not going to plant cotton if they are not assured a better supply of insecticides and fertilizer than now seems likely. The one thing that will tempt them to plant even if the insecticide market is still uncertain when planting time comes is the possibility of a good price and the probability that even if the crop is short the price will be good and that good price times low production will produce a total income which will still permit them to break even. If the price of cotton drops to a point that barely covers the cost of production, the farmer will shift to another crop that offers a better financial return. You can't expect him to gamble with the weather, gamble with the supply of machinery, gamble with insecticides, gamble with fertilizer, gamble with manpower, and then face the prospect of a price that barely permits him a chance to break even. He'll be looking for those commodities which present a chance to make reasonable and fair profits. He will be stimulated to supply the things we need most if prices on those things are attractive.

So I say that there are many items to be considered in connection with the imposition of restrictive limitations on agricultural prices. You don't get production unless you pay for it. When the Government asks for more steel or copper or automobiles or trucks or tanks or guns or planes, it negotiates a contract that gives a fair return for high endeavor. Production starts quickest and rolls fastest when the price is adequate. That same thing applies to the farmers of this Nation as well.

This talk is already reaching a length which I neither desired nor intended, so I will be brief in the things I have to say from here on. I had hoped today that I might discuss with you what type of legislation farmers might support. I can't do that in any detail but I can suggest to you a field for thought.

The Congress during World War II passed the Stabilization Act of 1942. It provided that the basic commodities—corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts for nuts—would be supported at 90 percent and cotton at 92½ percent for two full calendar years following the cessation of hostilities. That meant a period terminating December 31, 1948. But to that was attached additional Steagall legislation requiring that commodities where larger production had been requested be supported through loans, purchases, and other operations at not less than 90 percent of parity or a comparable price. That brought under the 90 percent requirement hogs, eggs, chickens over three and a half pounds, turkeys, milk, and butterfat, dry peas of a certain variety, dry edible beans, soybeans, flaxseed, and peanuts for oil, American Egyptian cotton and potatoes, including sweet potatoes. Certain other commodities, such as wool in naval stores, blackeyed peas and beans found their way into the list of commodities to be supported.

I voted for the Steagall legislation but I would want to look at it with a very cold and appraising eye if it came before the Congress again. We got ourselves in all sorts of complications because of the Steagall guarantees and I am not so sure that I would not this time prefer to give more in the marketplace during the emergency and not depend so generously upon loan and purchase programs after the emergency is ended. When I think of the troubles we went through because of the guarantee on potatoes alone, I shudder at facing it again.

Which brings me to the subject of agricultural subsidies. You will remember that we had certain subsidies on foods during the Second World War and the days that followed it. I had the unpleasant task of trying to take off some of those subsidies. A burnt child fears the fire and my fingers were burned many, many times by the events in the first few months after the termination of World War II.

The milk subsidies were particularly difficult. We were paying out millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for subsidies on milk in order that the price might stay low. Simultaneously we were piling up the cost of those subsidies in the shape of Federal debt to be paid after the war in the flush periods that were to follow. Well, the war has been over a good many years (or has it?) and we have not been paying back this subsidy cost. This very year we will accumulate an additional deficit. Next year the budget may be eighty-five or ninety billions of dollars. There are people who estimate that government income may be so low as to leave a deficit of thirty or thirty-five billions of dollars, maybe $40,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year.

All the time that we were paying out subsidies on milk to hold down the cost of living, we had economists telling us that we should have been skimming off more money in the form of higher taxes so that the war would have been to a greater degree on a pay-as-you-go basis. They wanted us to pay our war costs out of current earnings, wages, and profits. But we were granting subsidies and piling up a debt while we only talked about skimming it off through taxation. The trouble was we never got the skim and all we did was pay.

I remember that I saw some figures showing the cost of subsidies paid to farmers during the war years. I knew that no such expenditure had ever been made for any of the farm programs and I challenged the statement. I was assured that the figures came from the Comptroller General of the United States. When we pursued the matter, I learned the figures represented consumer subsidies on flour, milk, and cheese. Those

were charged against the farm programs and to the farmer, when actually they were purely subsidies for the consumer. That's why I hesitate to see subsidies now. I hate to see the farm programs charged with the cost of consumer subsidies as though consumer subsidies were devices by which the farmer gouged the consumer.

Therefore, I hope this time that it may be possible to go very sparingly on any agricultural subsidies. We should pay a great deal of the war cost as we go and not store up for future generations part of the food costs during this present emergency like we did during the war concluded only a few years ago.

I was in a gathering in Washington in the past 10 days at which high and responsible officials discussed the possibility that there would be such a gap between receipts and expenditures in our budget that we would have to resort to a Nation-wide sales tax designed to bring in ten or fifteen billions of dollars annually. I don't know whether that will come or not, but I say it's a possibility. If it does come, then I suggest to you that it would be foolish in the extreme to be paying out a billion dollars or $2,000,000,000 a year in subsidies on food in order to hold down the cost of living for the working classes of this country and then put back a transactions tax to bring in $10,000,000,000 when, generally speaking, the burden of a sales tax or transaction tax falls most heavily upon the working classes. It just doesn't seem to me to make sense to subsidize the cost of food to the extent of a billion or two billion dollars a year and then go back and add a tax of five or ten billion dollars a year of a type that would fall most heavily upon working people.

Therefore, I hope the farmers may have the support of working classes generally in opposing food subsidies and trying to make certain that the cost of food to the consumer is fully represented by the price obtained in the market place and that part of it does not come to the farmer from the Federal Treasury.

But farmers should continue to take the lead in demanding greatly increased taxation as a positive means to control inflation and to put our defense effort on a pay-as-you-go basis. The President in his address to the Congress on the State of the Union yesterday put this as the final point in his program: "A major increase in taxes to meet the cost of the defense effort." You should take pride in the fact that your Dallas convention 3 weeks ago led in that direction with these words:

"There is no possibility of controlling inflation without taxes high enough to get on a pay-as-you-go basis. Strict economy will reduce the total amount that must be raised by taxes, but increased taxes will still be necessary to balance the Federal budget. We stand ready to support necessary increases."

I congratulate you upon that stand.

Yesterday President Truman asked for extension and revision of the Selective Service Act. I hope that when that is done there will be adequate attention to the need for providing deferments and exemptions for key skilled workers on farms.

Right here I want to call your attention to another request contained in the President's message of yesterday. He asked for "improvement of our agricultural laws to help obtain the kinds of farm products we need for the defense effort." I am uncertain as to what he has in mind. I think the present law provides many ways to obtain the farm products we need. But as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I promise him the fullest cooperation to that end, and I am certain that you will join in that pledge.

Perhaps it might be proper to repeat a paragraph from the resolutions of your Dallas convention. I quote it to you:

"In the year ahead, the emphasis will be on increased production, and farm prices will be supported by the firm demand of a mobilizing economy. Under such conditions, the need for price supports, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas on certain commodities is greatly reduced. We believe that such programs should be suspended, as the law provides, and as conditions permit, but will insist that they be reactivated whenever the need for this type of program reappears."

If we hold down or eliminate farm program costs, our protection will be preserved for the days that follow defense mobilization, the days when we really need help.

Finally, I hope that farmers will set increased production goals. We need great crops of corn, wheat, oats, rye, barley, rice, and soybeans. We need 16,000,000 bales of cotton. We need to produce 105,000,000 hogs in 1951. We need to increase the number of cattle and calves on farms and see that beef production moves steadily upward. I doubt if we can anticipate in the near future any help out of Mexico. The recent report of another outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, while not serious, indicates that the border probably will not be open for some time and that the possibility of obtaining a half million cattle from Mexico to move onto our ranges for a summer and then to our feed lots will not exist for many years to come. We are going to have to raise our own calves and produce our own beef. It will take aid and encouragement from the Government if the farmers of this country provide red meat in the quantities we need.

Records are not achieved by Government edict. They can only be obtained by the planning and performance of the farmer. They require the leadership of the county extension agents, the State PMA committees, every official in the Department of Agriculture concerned with the production of crops, and the steady, persistent, persuasive influence of the great farm organizations of this land. The President told us yesterday: "Only by increasing our output can we carry the burden of preparedness for an indefinite period in the future." That means your farm output just as much as it does the product of the Nation's most vital factory.

Many times I have taken off my hat in tribute to the farmers and farm leaders of America. I hope this current emergency may give additional and everlasting proof that the farm organization, speaking for farmers, carrying to farmers the true story of the needs of this country, can make certain that the farm production pattern will measure up to our grave national responsibilities and place back of our Armed Forces and our factory workers the reserve of food which has won previous wars and can help in this hour to win a just and lasting peace.

Principles for Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me Tuesday evening, January 9, on the Capitol Cloakroom program of the Columbia Broadcasting System. In this statement I present some of the principles which I believe should be used in guiding us in making our foreign policy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, may I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the Columbia Broadcasting System?

Three and a half minutes on this great radio network is precious time. But I am sure that a half minute of it will not be wasted if I point out that our greatest safeguard against fatal errors is the opportunity we have in the American system to debate the policies of our Government, foreign and domestic.

Today tragic events are sweeping us onward to fateful decisions. The fearful questions before us are how can we avoid another world war and how can we win through to a just peace?

We know now that international communism seeks to conquer the world and that Soviet Russia has embarked upon an aggressive course. The tide of communism has already made great progress in Europe and Asia. More than 800,000,000 people are yoked in Communist harness.

Much of this Communist success was made possible by unwise policies followed during and after the war by the United States and our allies. Time does not permit detailed analysis of these measures, but our experiences in Korea and elsewhere have cast honest doubt on the wisdom and effectiveness of our recent policies. The question before the whole country now is what are we going to do about it?

I am not prepared tonight to offer any final conclusions. But I can state some of the principles which ought to guide us in making policies.

1. We cannot go to the extremes either of barricading ourselves in America behind a Chinese wall, or spreading ourselves so thinly throughout the world that we are committed everywhere and prepared nowhere.

2. With our limited manpower and resources, we cannot alone defend the free world. Other nations must cherish their liberties and their security highly enough to play a substantial part in their own defense.

3. We shall have to stop regarding world politics as a game of chance, and devise a practical strategy—political, economic, psychological and military—capable of meeting the Soviet threat in the most effective way. We do not have such a policy now.

4. We must end the dangerous neglect of our home defenses. Sea and air power are our strongest striking weapons and we should build both into mighty fleets.

5. We must make certain that we keep America financially and economically sound. This means a realistic rearrangement of our national budget so that we do not spend ourselves into ruinous inflation or tax our system into national bankruptcy.

6. Finally, our people are demanding an end to foreign policy by secret agreements and by Executive authority. Secret agreements and snap decisions by the President (as in the case of Korea) are responsible for our present difficulties. The people want no more of them. They want no more diplomatic double talk. The people know they are paying too high a price in blood and treasure for rosy dreams and wishful thinking.

The great national debate now in progress seeks a plan of action which makes sense and is within our capacity to carry out. The agreements we make with other nations must be clear and open. The administration must consult with Congress before fateful decisions are made and not afterward.

These are a few of the basic principles I think we must use to guide us in the dark days ahead. If we build upon them, I have full confidence in our ability to defend ourselves and lead the world to a just peace.

Declaration on Manpower by Association of American Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a declaration on manpower adopted by the Association of American Colleges at their annual meeting at Atlantic City, N. J., January 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION ON MANPOWER BY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES ANNUAL MEETING, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., JANUARY 10, 1951

PREAMBLE

The present national emergency is without parallel in our entire history. It will extend over a long period. It will require great sacrifice. Both from within and from without, it threatens our basic heritage of freedom.

The American college and university recognizes the gravity of the crisis and is actively aware that the national welfare must take precedence over other considerations. It is recognized that there is a present and presumably continuing requirement that essentially all able-bodied young men give service of a proper length of time in the Nation's military forces. As representatives of higher education, we recognize the importance of meeting this requirement to the full. We believe that all young men should share equitably the responsibility of national defense.

It is our conviction that the key to ultimate national survival is the wise use of manpower. In the immediate pressure to have now the men we need in the places where they seem needed, we must not lose sight of the long-range importance of providing a constant flow of trained persons to fill critical places 2 years, 5 years, 10 years, or more hence. Leadership of all types, political, economic, military, educational, and religious, will be even more necessary in the years ahead than today. Further, in a democratic nation we deal with men as individuals not as units in the mass. No effective manpower program will treat men in the mass without concern for their dignity as human beings and their individual differences. If we lose sight of this truth, the battle with totalitarianism has been lost at the start.

The American colleges and universities are and have been a vital source of leadership and spiritual strength. Hence these institutions are more necessary today than ever before. Their strength is the strength of our democracy from the largest university to the smallest liberal arts college. They must make a continuous contribution to the national welfare in every field of learning. Thus it is in the national interest that higher education be viewed as essential to the development of manpower resources.

PROPOSALS

The Association of American Colleges, representing more than 650 institutions of higher learning, therefore, strongly recommends to the Federal Government the following considerations concerning the relationship between military manpower and higher education:

I

In the education and training for the armed services and for the civilian war effort there should be no duplication of existing educational facilities. Before new educational facilities are developed by the armed services or other Government agencies a thorough survey should be made to see whatever existing facilities could more readily be converted and adapted to meet the particular need. Every effort should be made to bring the facilities of as large a number of educational institutions as possible into the defense efforts, both by increasing the existing number of ROTC's and by allotting other training programs to non-ROTC institutions.

II

We request that appropriate authorities take immediate steps to assure that students whose induction is now postponed will be permitted to apply for entrance, at the termination of their postponement or deferment, in any branch of the armed services in which voluntary enlistment is now permitted, regardless of any intervening action by the Selective Service System.

III

Since the shortage of trained personnel is becoming acute, and womanpower is an ever more important source of leadership in civilian service and in the professions, we urge adequate and immediate comprehensive planning to ensure the constructive utilization of the ability and training of all college women.

IV

A. In setting the age for entering military training and service we believe that the age for induction should be 19. A lower age should be adopted only when and as long as an emergency manpower shortage requires such lower age.

B. We endorse the present policy of deferring ROTC students until the completion of their college courses. We recommend that the number of ROTC units be increased. We endorse the legislation now before Congress to place on the same basis stipends and educational allowances for men enrolled in all ROTC programs.

V

Certain groups of students now enrolled in colleges and universities have progressed so far with their studies, that it is in the national interest to allow them to complete their course. Among the students to be deferred during the present transitional period should be:

A. Students in professional schools of theology, of medicine, dentistry, and related health fields, and in the graduate schools in mathematics, engineering, and physical and biological sciences.

B. All students who will have completed 2 years of undergraduate study in any curriculum by July 1951 and who are eligible to continue because of satisfactory standing in accredited 4-year colleges.

VI

An enrolled college student who reaches the age of induction while successfully pursuing a course of study, should have his induction postponed to the end of his academic year.

VII

If 18 year olds are to be subject to universal military service, we assume that it is unlikely that more than half could be inducted in the first year of the new legislation. To reduce to a minimum the uncertainty in the minds of prospective and present college students, it is highly desirable that those who are not to be inducted before the opening of an academic year should be notified that they will be able to complete that year before induction.

VIII

To maintain a flow of educated personnel as an important element of national strength, we recommend that after basic training a substantial number of properly qualified young men be furloughed to colleges of their choice for further education in all areas of learning before completing their required military service. In implementing this plan, special consideration should be given to a Federal scholarship or loan program, in order that no one who qualifies may be deprived of this educational opportunity for lack of means. We recommend that the administration of this program and the testing and other procedures of selection under it be entrusted to competent civilians.

IX

We recommend that the board of directors appoint a committee to take steps to present the views of the association to the appropriate officers and committees of the executive and legislative branches of the Government and to cooperate with other educational organizations having similar objectives.

X

As an association in which the majority of member institutions are small independent colleges, we recognize the fact that the present emergency seriously threatens the very existence of many of these institutions which represent a vital element in American life. While the foregoing recommendations are intended to provide full participation by these colleges, we are aware that their problems will be severe for a minimum of 2 or 3 years. We therefore urge governmental agencies, philanthropic foundations, and the American public to consider seriously the need to preserve these institutions for continued service beyond the period of the immediate manpower crisis.

Reduction in Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Friday, December 22, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I had addressed to the President of the United States, making recommendations for a reduction in nondefense spending.

I now ask for the inclusion in the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from the President in reply.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 2, 1951.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: I appreciated most highly your letter of the 22d.

I've always tried my best to make the revenue meet the expenses of the Government and had it not been for the action of the Eightieth Congress there never would have been a deficit in any year for which I have sent a budget to the Congress. Present conditions are such now, however, that it is necessary to tax until it hurts. Expenditures for the general Government have never been excessive or extravagant. It has been my privilege to help with the making of 10 budgets while I was in the Senate and I've made 5 since I've been President. I am now working on another and there is never

a figure goes into the budget message that I am not familiar with.

I am very highly pleased with your pledge of support in the present emergency. I don't think there has ever been any serious difference of opinion between us on the operations of the Government except maybe in some policy approaches on which we naturally would not agree.

Thanks very much for your kind letter.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

The UN Should Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The UN Should Act," published in the Christian Science Monitor of Tuesday, January 9, 1951. I believe this editorial expresses the opinion of the most temperate school of thought in America on the subject discussed in the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UN SHOULD ACT

The United Nations was built to stop aggression. That, in the service of maintaining peace, security, and justice, was its primary purpose.

If the UN is to be effective as a deterrent to militarism it must recognize aggression when it sees it and be willing to call aggression by its name.

Right now, with reference to the attack of Communist China on UN forces in Korea, there would be not levity but grim candor in reminding the members of the UN through paraphrase of Gertrude Stein, Aggression is aggression is aggression is aggression.

If the Chinese are not aggressors, why are British, Turkish, Australian, and other troops as well as American resisting them in Korea? Those forces need the backing of a UN declaration of position in the matter.

A declaration of position does not necessarily bind the UN members to any particular course of action, any specific sanctions against the offender. But it does put the world's moral conviction on record. And it lays the foundation for whatever effective action can be taken thereafter.

Some nations, notably Great Britain, understandably draw back from proposals of blockade, which might result in war on a broader scale. India, a member of the British Commonwealth, apparently still cherishes hope of a truce.

But if Chinese Communists have any disposition to negotiate instead of fight they will be just as ready to talk with a realistic UN as with an unrealistic one. Indeed Communists generally have shown more respect for an antagonist who calls a spade a spade than for one who shilly-shallies.

The UN Political Committee, or "little assembly," should proceed at once with adoption of a resolution designating the so-called Chinese People's Government as an aggressor for its intervention in Korea.

Thereafter, the matter of sanctions, such as blockade, embargoes, or nonrecognition of territorial gains, can be debated and determined on the basis of their wisdom and effectiveness.

There is need for Britons to understand the depth of American feeling on this subject, just as many Americans at times have argued with their compatriots for understanding of British feelings and responsibilities. It would become very difficult indeed to marshal any enthusiastic American sentiment for the UN if the UN now should allow Korea to go the way Manchuria, Ethiopia, and the Spanish Republic went in the 1930's.

We earnestly hope the membership of the UN will see the necessity of keeping the record honest and clear by calling aggression aggression.

West Europe's Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article written by a distinguished foreign correspondent of the Associated Press, Mr. Wes Gallagher, which appeared in the Washington Star of January 10. Mr. Gallagher has just returned from 10 years of foreign-service assignments.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST EUROPE'S MORALE CALLED HARDER PROBLEM THAN ARMS

(By Wes Gallagher)

NEW YORK, January 10.—Rearming Europe today is fundamentally a question of morale, not guns and planes.

A large part of Europe hasn't the will to defend itself.

On a grand scale, General Eisenhower is in the position of a football coach trying to instill the "will to win" in his team.

General Eisenhower must try to instill the "will to fight." Without it the United States can pour arms into Europe from now until doomsday without the slightest result.

This colors the way Europeans look on the East-West conflict and the way Americans look at it.

Europeans are no less conscious than Americans of the menace of Soviet aggression. The vast majority of French, Germans, British, Italians, and other Europeans have no more liking than Americans for communism.

They dislike the Kremlin rulers, poke jibes at Stalin privately and wish Russia never existed.

But they don't see that they can do much about the situation except commit suicide. And this is more than a figure of speech; I know Germans who keep poisons on hand and swear they will take them if overrun by the Soviet army again.

From the Baltic to Spain, Europe has been ravaged and bled white by recent wars. The torrents of blood shed touching every family have drained away that intangible called morale.

They know that any Soviet attack must be met in the heart of Europe. Whether the attack is held or not they know their homes will be devastated by battle and bombings. They and their sons and daughters will die by the thousands.

DIFFICULT TO CONVINCE

By experience they know that there are no winners in war. Even if they are on the winning side they know they will be too prostrate to enjoy it.

They still believe in freedom and wish with all their hearts they can keep it but have difficulty convincing themselves they can do it.

They want to stop the Russians, but without morale the dangers and sacrifices of rearming seem almost too much to bear.

There are scores of other factors complicating the rearming of Europe. But most of them would fade if the morale problem were settled.

This is General Eisenhower's big task. Tanks and guns are no good unless the soldiers and peoples behind them have the will to fight and use them.

There are exceptions, of course, among the European nations. Great Britain can be counted on to fight bravely, as she has in the past. British and American Army cooperation in Germany is wholehearted and unstinting on either side. Some of the smaller countries like the Norwegians also are prepared to stand and fight. Unfortunately they are not strong enough to tip the scales in the west's favor.

BRITISH POWER DIVIDED

Britain is forced to divide her might among sea, air, and land forces. She cannot make a large enough land contribution on the Continent to deter the Russians even with American and small-country aid.

European defense depends primarily on France and Germany and to a lesser extent on Italy. These are the only nations with the manpower and the strategic position among the Atlantic Pact powers to make a successful defense of the Continent possible.

France is depended on under the Atlantic pact program to supply the bulk of the ground forces needed in Europe.

France was beaten in the war of 1870. She was virtually beaten and bled white in the 1914–1918 war. In 1940 she was overrun in 6 weeks and put a resistance that at best must be described as feeble. Four years of morale-sapping occupation followed.

These scars cannot be removed overnight and they are still visible today. French morale is, perhaps, the lowest in Europe when it comes to rearming to the hilt and making a firm stand against the Russians.

GOVERNMENT IS SHAKY

France's position is further complicated by (1) a weak, divided government which is seldom able to hold power more than a few months, and (2) an estimated 6,000,000 Communists in the country.

In contrast to the other political parties the French Communists are a hard, disciplined core. They are ruthless. In a crisis they probably could seriously cripple any war effort with sabotage, resistance, strikes, and overt acts.

Just how large an infiltration the Communists have in the French armed forces remains to be seen. For the moment there are not many armed forces to count.

The French have three divisions in their army of occupation but only a fraction of these are ready to fight. Their present reserves in France proper are negligible and poorly equipped. The professional heart of the army is fighting in Indochina and cannot be counted on for European defense.

ITALIAN POSITION SIMILAR

France has plans to raise an army of nearly a million in the next 2 or 3 years. Even if the west has this long, the question remains: Will these forces have the will to fight?

Italy is in a similar position. During the last war the morale of the Italian soldier was notoriously bad under fascism. No one knows whether it would be any better under democracy. There is no doubt the Italian people are war weary and politically cynical. Although the Government is stable, there is a large and vigorous Italian Communist Party which has proven its ability to torture the country with disabling strikes when opportunity offers.

As an ex-enemy nation, Italy also has been largely disarmed and it will take time and money to rebuild her armed forces.

Western Germany with its 48,000,000 people and large reservoir of trained soldiers is eyed enviously by military men.

THE GERMAN ATTITUDE

I have been asked frequently: "Is it true the Germans really do not want to fight or are they just trying to get some concessions?"

After fighting the Germans in two World Wars and having a terrible time in beating them, western nations find it difficult to believe the Germans really don't want to go back into uniform again.

But the fact is the people as such do not. Those, particularly between the ages of 20 and 40, have had a stomach full of war. There is scarcely a family that has not lost at least two close relatives in the last war. Virtually all have lost their homes, their money, and their security.

On top of this, they are an occupied country, treated as second-class citizens, and largely through French fears they are being asked to rearm as second-class soldiers—pawns of nations that defeated them.

AWARE OF WEAK DEFENSES

The Germans are also military realists. They know the sad state of western defenses in Europe, compared to the six Soviet armies that rattle their tanks in the middle of Germany along the occupation border. They know that there is no such thing as a little rearming such as the Atlantic Pact has thus far proposed for them.

A little rearming would provide no defense and only leave them at the mercy of the Russians as an enemy, should the Soviets attack. They also know any attack would begin in the middle of Germany and devastate a country just now getting back on its feet.

There is no doubt a vote now for rearming would be overwhelmingly defeated if the West Germans were polled.

West German politicians are riding this antirearming tide to gain concessions from the west. Even if they got all the concessions they are asking it is doubtful if they could pull the voters on their side and convince them they must arm.

Should the west become stronger, offering some protection against the threat of attack, and should the west Germans feel themselves equal partners of the western nations, they might vote to rearm. No one can say for sure.

This does not mean the Germans would favor the Russians. With millions of dead and hundreds of thousands of brothers, sons, and daughters having disappeared into Russia as prisoners, the Germans hate the Soviets.

It is axiomatic that the closer the Europeans are to the Russians, the more they dislike them.

Germans say if the west really wants someone to fight the Soviets they should recruit eastern Germans who live under Soviet rule. It is true that west Berlin, which is completely surrounded by the Soviet Army, is the most belligerent and outspoken against them.

The Germans, like the rest of the continent, must be convinced that what they have is worth fighting for and if they prepare to fight they have a chance of winning without being wiped out in the process.

Under these conditions it is well not to be misled or interpret some European political statements as appeasement or collaboration with communism or just silly unjustified optimism.

It is probable the speaker does not really believe what he is saying but is like the small boy whistling in the graveyard. He hopes for the best but fears the worst.

A Slap on the Wrist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Slap on the Wrist," from the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., of January 10, 1951.

This editorial recites the finding of the National Labor Relations Board as to the policy of intimidation and violence practiced by the United Mine Workers against nonunion members in the coal strike of 1949, which discloses the method employed by the forces of John L. Lewis in bludgeoning nonunion miners into joining the union.

The National Labor Relations Board finds them guilty, but claims that it has no power to enforce any penalty. This Board always seems to have great difficulty in finding any authority to take definite and vital action when the unions violate the law. Certainly Congress should provide a remedy so that infractions of a law of this kind could be properly dealt with. Otherwise, the freedom and independence of the average worker is destroyed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SLAP ON THE WRIST

During last fall's election campaign in Ohio, John L. Lewis, with much huffing and puffing, announced that he would shut down the coal mines if Senator TAFT tried to talk to the miners. His men, he announced, were not going to serve as captive audiences for anybody.

Mr. Lewis takes a different view of captive audiences, however, when he or his lieutenants are trying to bludgeon nonunion miners into joining the United Mine Workers.

Here are some of the things the UMW goon squads were doing to nonunion men during the coal strike in 1949:

At about 8 o'clock on the morning of June 20 some 2,000 UMWA men went to the East Diamond mine in Kentucky, where 165 nonunion men were at work. A sheriff and a State policeman at the scene said they could not "try to handle" the union mob. So the nonunion workers were rounded up, some by force. Any who tried to leave were seized and compelled to stay at the scene. Then union officials addressed the workers, demanding that they join the union. He called for a show of hands from those who would sign up, and the men who did not raise their hands were cursed and threatened by the mob. Finally all of the nonunion men were coerced into indicating that they would join.

That afternoon the UMW caravan, 2,000 strong, went to the Homestead mine. Company officials asked the police to prevent the mob from coming on company property, but the officers said they were helpless. So the union men rounded up the outnumbered nonunion workers and held them under guard until the organizing speeches began. Again there was the demand for a show of hands, and when none of the nonunion men responded "an angry roar and boxing arose from the massed throng of UMW men surrounding the employees, and cries of 'We'll make them hold up their hands' and 'We'll come back and see them—,' were heard."

These incidents are taken from the report of the National Labor Relations Board trial examiner who took testimony in the cases, and essentially the same procedure was repeated by the UMW at one mine after another in Kentucky and West Virginia. The picture is clear. The weapons of the United Mine Workers are terrorism, mob violence, threats, and, in some instances, physical injury. Yet John L. Lewis has the effrontery to threaten a strike to keep his men from being held as a captive audience for Senator TAFT.

More to the point, however, is the attitude of the National Labor Relations Board. It has now upheld in substance the findings of its trial examiners, agreeing that the UMW and certain of its subordinate groups and officials are guilty of unfair labor practices. A cease and desist order has been issued, which means that the union has been told not to do it again. But beyond that there is no penalty—just a slap on the wrist. Board member Reynolds would have compelled the union to reimburse the nonunion men for time lost when they were driven from their jobs. But the majority would not agree to this, contending that the board lacked the authority to impose such a penalty.

It does not follow, however, that no useful purpose is served by a proceeding of this kind. At least a record has been made. And the next time Mr. Lewis begins to talk about his oppressed and downtrodden men, the facts as to how the UMW really operates will be on the record for the benefit of any one who cares to look at them.

Neoisolationism Is Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well-written and lucid editorial from the Miami Daily News. This editorial presents the other side of the argument to the one recently made by former President Herbert Hoover concerning our foreign policy. It merits the attention of those who desire a better understanding of all points of view on the momentous problem: What should our future policy be?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEOISOLATIONISM IS SURRENDER

Former President Hoover's pronouncement this week on foreign policy—in effect a call for a new foreign policy—has been named

neoisolationism. It is still closely akin to isolationism if the word has meaning. It is also surrender in advance of vast areas of the world to aggressive communism.

The Hoover thesis of concentration upon defense of the Western Hemisphere would surrender the entire Eurasian land mass to the Kremlin. There is a qualification: If West Europe first erected a sure dam against the Red flood, then Mr. Hoover would be willing to commit American soldiers and dollars further there. In other words, take the gamble out of the gamble in West Europe and Mr. Hoover will give it his blessing. This amounts to no qualification at all. The Hoover thesis virtually boils down to this: Holding the Atlantic Ocean with Britain as one frontier, and the Pacific Ocean with an armed Japan and other islands as the other frontier.

What does surrender of the Eurasian continents to aggressive communism mean? This is the home of 1,600,000,000 people, and it is the source of virtually all the raw materials the Kremlin-Peiping axis needs for eventual conquest of the United States.

At present Russia needs some materials to wage a war of conquest against the United States. At the end of its current 5-year plan, Russia is still expected to be one-third behind the United States in annual production of steel; one-half behind in coal. Most authoritative figures recently obtainable indicated that Russia intended by 1960 to attain a goal in steel and coal which would still be below our prewar output. This would no longer be a problem if we give the Eurasian continents to Russia. Most important weakness of Russian war matériel is oil. Ample oil can be found in Iran, Iraq, and elsewhere in the Eurasian land mass. Agriculture, transportation, go down the list of geopolitical assets which we would surrender with Eurasia, and it is incalculable.

But these raw materials would not only be assets to the Russians, but also they would be losses to the United States. Hoover made a point of the expectation that the United States could maintain supply lines to his island outposts in the Atlantic and Pacific frontiers. But could he be as hopeful of maintaining supply lines from these frontiers—supplies which would be badly needed to maintain the United States on an extraordinary war economy? The World War II search for the substitutes for rubber, hemp, and many other things previously imported from abroad would be duplicated in an even more desperate effort to match the enemy's boundless supplies.

Of course Western Europe—if we abandon it—offers Russia more than a storehouse of raw materials. Even more prized, perhaps the greatest prize of all Russian strategy for world conquest, Western Europe is the greatest concentration of industrial power outside the United States. There are the shipbuilding facilities, aircraft factories, arsenals, large cities, resources and expendable trained manpower for great armies that would swell the Communist hordes. The Middle East and the rest of Asia not now in the grasp of the Moscow-Peiping tentacles would contribute their own vast potential to the eventual show-down between the Eastern and Western Hemispheres. Even discounting this fantastically rich windfall to the Communists, which Mr. Hoover would do in order to concentrate on defense of the Atlantic and Pacific, consider the position of the United States, friendless save in the Western Hemisphere. This country would be without its powerful allies in World War II, unless it could hold an island fortress in Britain and one in Japan. But the latter consideration is hardly tenable. Neutralizing of Britain and Japan would not be difficult for the co-power of the Eurasian continents, not with the potential with which Mr. Hoover would endow it.

This brings up the final, and in some ways, most important default of all. In the degrading process of deserting Western Europe, we would become an amoral colossus pitted against another amoral colossus. We would have shorn ourselves of our honor and integrity as well as of our friends and allies. In running out on the plainly implied commitments of the Atlantic Treaty, the United States would have expended the last of what Wendell Willkie called the reservoir of good will throughout the world for America.

The superficial appeal of the Hoover thesis is understandable. It will attract superficial debate by superficial minds among both the Republican and Democratic Members of the Eighty-second Congress. It fits into the scurrilous attack on the foreign policy, now focused on Secretary of State Acheson. It will do as yet incalculable harm to the chances for a West European defense force under General Eisenhower.

But there is every reason to believe that the American people will not swallow neoisolationism any more than they swallowed isolationism in similarly attractive packages. President Truman said, following the Brussels conference, that the spirit shown there has justified our confidence. In answer to Hoover, he added, "Let there be no mistake about it—the unity of the nations of Western Europe and of the North Atlantic area is vital to their security and ours."

The President need not fear.

There is no mistake about it in the minds of the vast majority of Americans. Despite the failure of the United Nations forces in Korea to stem the Communist tide of conquest, they know the challenge has met its challenger in the President of the United States. They will respond to his leadership.

Perhaps former President Hoover has done us a favor in pulling aside the curtain on a vision corresponding to a nightmare, a scene borrowed from the pulp-magazine conceptions of Armageddon. It will attract lively debate in Congress, in public forums, and in the corner stores of America. It will do its measure of damage to the cause of unity of all free people everywhere.

But when debate has run its course—as assuredly it shall—Americans and free people everywhere will return to the grim reality and what to do about it. They will be immensely fortified by relief from the vision of a future that might have been.

Hemisphere Integration Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Mr. Harry F. Guggenheim at the University of Florida on December 8, 1950.

Mr. Guggenheim was formerly Ambassador to Cuba, where he served with great distinction. For many years he has been a student of conditions in the Western Hemisphere.

In my judgment, Mr. Guggenheim has made in this speech a very valuable and constructive contribution to the thought of the day—looking toward a solution of the great problems which confront us.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEMISPHERE INTEGRATION NOW

A foreign policy for the United States, which includes the political, economic, and military integration of this hemisphere is essential to our well-being, and possibly even our survival, as a free Nation.

The integration of the Western Hemisphere now is not suggested as a policy of isolationism or insulation from the rest of the world, or as a substitute for the role that we should play, say, in the North Atlantic Pact or the movement for a united Europe. It is an anchor that we should let go now to windward, in the best holding ground, before the storm breaks.

I speak as a citizen of the United States without office, and as a seeker of truth. My thesis rests on the following premises:

1. War is bestial and inhuman. It is a curse on the people of the world. There is, however, a greater curse, and that is national enslavement, which is the danger from a lost war.

2. Nationalist communism as presently practiced by the Politburo of Soviet Russia is an international conspiracy to overthrow non-Communist governments throughout the world. Should Soviet Russia be successful in this conspiracy, sovereign states will disappear under the dictatorship of Russia's imperialist Politburo.

3. The transition from the sea age of transportation to the air age has now developed to a stage where all nations are susceptible to attack and many to destruction from the air.

4. Neutrality is a luxury that weak states can only indulge in with the approval of strong states.

5. The United Nations and the organization of American states are aids, but not yet substitutes for foreign policy.

Franklin D. Roosevelt warned us in 1939 that our frontiers were on the Rhine. Europe still may be our first line of defense, but this hemisphere is our last line of defense. It is our inner citadel, and it must be made impregnable.

The age of the air has made this citadel vulnerable. In World Wars I and II we succeeded in keeping the lands of this hemisphere free from attack. That was only because we were in a transition period from the sea age to the air age.

Now we can no longer expect to keep this hemisphere from assault by air. We must prepare for its defense now before it is too late.

In our haste to accept world responsibility and assume world leadership, we have neglected our nearest neighbors in the Americas. Isolationism has kept us from them in the past, and our new foreign policy, which plummets us into Europe and Asia, keeps us from them now.

II

Before elaborating on the proposal to integrate this hemisphere, it is essential to examine briefly the present over-all foreign policy of the United States. The first purpose of any such policy is to maintain our integrity as a sovereign power. The second is, with enlightenment and consideration of others, to promote our national interests.

What is the new foreign policy that has been developing since the close of World War II? It is vague, confusing, and headed in three different directions at the same time:

1. We are attempting to assume, in a measure, the old role of Great Britain in maintaining the balance of power in Europe and in the protection of British trade routes in the Mediterranean and Near East.

2. The second course of our foreign policy flowed from the first. When we assumed

Great Britain's place in Greece, President Truman enunciated his doctrine in which he said, in part: "I believe it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." This is the policy of containing Russia.

3. There is a third part of our foreign policy which Edgar Mowrer has called the moralistic fallacy. "This is the belief," he says, "that in its dealings with foreign states or groups, the United States should be guided by the degree to which said states or groups conform internally to American standards." In other words, we are attempting to reform the world. Mowrer, describing how it worked in China, came to the conclusion that our diplomats were more eager to promote what they called the revolt of Asia than to secure a China impervious to Russian influence.

The first part of our foreign policy, an attempt to maintain the balance of power in Europe, is logical. Today, with our frontiers still on the Rhine, the balance of power in Europe is of vital importance to us.

The North Atlantic Pact, and the movement for a United Europe, stand in the way of Russian aggression. The United States has taken the leadership in the North Atlantic Pact. It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that this leadership is not where it traditionally belongs—with England and France. We can only help Europe; we cannot save her from Russian ideology or force. If Europe no longer has the will to make desperate and supreme efforts to preserve the essential freedoms the democratic world has cherished, she will succumb to the tyrants of Russia, no matter what we may try to do.

The second part of our foreign policy is the Truman doctrine—which is physically and financially beyond our abilities, and morally wrong in its implied righteousness. The Truman doctrine commits us to a world-wide policy of assistance, financial or military, on a scale we cannot possibly support.

The third course of our foreign policy, in which we require other states to conform to United States standards if they would have relations with us, is inevitably doomed to failure in the future as it has so notably failed in the past in dealing with such diverse ideologies as those of Spain, the Argentine, Guatemala, and China. The reductio ad absurdum of this doctrine would be to have no relations with any states unwilling to re-form themselves in our own image of white, male, Anglo-Saxon democratic Protestant perfection.

There is a lack of understanding of our long-distance economic goals. We drift into situations and international political crises which may be quite contrary to our national interests. For example, during the crisis between Arabs and Jews over Israel our policy shifted from quarter to quarter like a weathervane in a storm. At that time the public had an intimation for the first time that oil in the Middle East was one of the considerations of our foreign policy. How vital are these oil fields to us? Is a keystone of our foreign policy to prevent Russia's access to the oil reserves of the Middle East? If such a policy is necessary to our survival and national interests, and within the power of our resources, the public should be informed and made ready to approve such a policy.

We no longer believe that our national interests can best be served by an overbearing, selfish nationalism. In the principle of point 4 President Truman has proposed a plan for us to help less advanced nations to increase their productivity and well-being. But are resources for this purpose to be prodigally expended for all peoples over the earth who need our aid? Obviously, even our great wealth could not stand such a strain. Yet at the present time point 4 is an instrument of the Department of State, to be bartered for day-to-day diplomatic needs.

Our foreign policy is muddled because our national interests are obscure. Furthermore, while we are scattering ourselves to financial and military aid all over the world, we do not know whether our resources are great enough for our commitments.

What we require is a new, bipartisan agency composed of the executive and legislative branches of Government, coordinated with the State Department, to carry on a continuous appraisal of our national interests and national resources. Instead, in this time of crisis, we are staggering along with 30 major Government departments and agencies, of which 48 have interests in the field of foreign affairs. There are 22 interdepartmental committees coordinating work. It is an impossible and unworkable arrangement.

At a moment in history when the United States must undertake, through foreign policy, to lead the world away from wars toward peace, we have not set a course that even our own people can follow with understanding and approval.

III

The United States has a last line of defense in this hemisphere to which she will be forced back if our first line of defense in Europe fails. This line consists of our neighboring American states.

To disregard this line of defense and neglect the Americas may be our greatest national folly.

Our policy toward Latin America has been uncertain and vacillating. We have gone through periods of manifest destiny, imperialism, the big stick, dollar diplomacy, a tutorial policy, and an intervention policy. Finally, under President Hoover a nonintervention policy was practiced which Franklin D. Roosevelt put into words, expanded, and sold as the good-neighbor policy. The present administration adheres to the letter of the good-neighbor policy, but has no kinship with it in spirit. There is an apathy toward Latin America. As a result, we no longer enjoy the warm relationships built up during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

What course should our policy in Latin America take? I repeat that it should be directed toward the most complete political, economic, and military integration among all the states in this hemisphere that can be effected by diplomacy. We should make this our cornerstone of foreign policy, because this hemisphere is our last line of defense, and within it are deep national interests which have been neglected.

Latin America is an undeveloped and excellent area for essential industry. It is our only source of many strategic and critical materials. Of the 12 materials listed as strategic in 1942, 11—copper, manganese, chromium, tungsten, tin, antimony, platinum, mercury, iodine, sodium nitrate, and bauxite are available in Latin America. Nickel, the twelfth, comes from our friend and neighbor Canada. In addition, Latin America also produces oil, iron ore, fibers, foodstuffs, drugs, woods, natural rubber, meats, hides, and wool.

The population of the United States will reach its peak about 1970 according to students of population trends. Latin America, with a present population equal to our own, will still be growing in 1970. It may well outgrow the Russians, particularly if we are able, by the right sort of assistance, to raise Latin American standards of public health to match our own.

Potential industry, population, strategic materials and food are all here in our own hemisphere, for the survival of all of us, if we have the wit and the will to use them. Up to now, unfortunately, we have not shown an evidence of such acumen.

Take the case of Chile, which has about 30 percent of the world's copper. In most of the importance to us, when Lend-Lease was in operation, policy from Washington, Chile's diplomatic, was of Dorothy Lamour. The Chile, [illegible] the minds of the world is suffering from the destroying gnawing of inflation. Chile is barely other countries in Latin America, but social soil is fertile for Communist infiltration. If we let Chile down and withdraw through our own neglectfulness, then it is possible that Communists could take over the state. If Chile should then refuse to send her copper and nitrates to Russia, in violation of treaty, what would be the policy of our Department of State? We could never allow ourselves to be confronted by such a dilemma. We must bind Chile and all Latin American countries so closely to us that nonfulfillment will cease to be a threat.

We need sugar from Cuba, oil and iron ore from Venezuela, rubber from Brazil, tin and tungsten from Bolivia, copper, lead, and zinc from Mexico; lead and tungsten from the Argentine, vanadium from Peru, and platinum from Colombia. In emergencies we may have to rely on Latin America for rubber, hemp, cocoa, vegetable oils, and minerals.

The United States can, in my opinion, bring about integration in these ways: by diplomacy, economic ties, and military alliances.

First, by diplomacy. We must acknowledge the importance of good relations between the United States and the other states within this hemisphere. The division of Latin American Affairs within our Department of State should be raised in dignity and expanded in importance, to cope with the diverse problems so vital to all the Americas. To accomplish our great aims here in this hemisphere we must sweep the suspicions and hesitations of Latin America clean of prejudices and misunderstanding, while encouraging the many able men who also represent the [illegible].

Our diplomacy in Latin America should be rigidly directed to respect the sovereignty of all of the states of this hemisphere. Sovereignty can only be respected by strict adherence to the policy of nonintervention, including direct action or intrigue.

Finally, in our diplomacy, we should return to our ancient policy of recognition of sovereign states with elective governments, not as a weapon to force policy. That policy includes:

"(1) the new regime must appear to have control of the governmental machinery of state; (2) it must have the assent of the people without unreasonable resistance to the authority; and (3) it must be in a position to fulfill all its international obligations and responsibilities."

At the present time we are in the inconsistent position of carrying on full diplomatic relations with Communist Russia, Socialist England, and several dictators in Latin America—but we draw the line at dictatorship in Spain. A short time ago we withheld recognition of Peru because we disapproved of the Trujillo Position in the Argentine.

If we are not to intervene or meddle in the internal affairs of our Latin-American States, neither can the Iron Curtain intrigue in this hemisphere by means contrary to the basic policy of the Monroe Doctrine.

Russian intervention by means to spread communism should be forestalled by equal security measures and by free exchange of information. Between the agencies of the various nations cooperating with the task of maintaining domestic tranquility.

Second, the more that happens the more vigorous resistance of this hemisphere to protect all of its against security or economic aggression. The security for protection must begin in this hemisphere as we do the rest of the world in breaking down all the barriers to a free economy. As I said we should lead wherever possible, but we must protect

ourselves so long as restrictions are a part of the world economic order.

Specifically I propose that the United States, by bilateral agreements with other states of this hemisphere and through tariff adjustments, make possible now the sale of at least part of their surplus exportable raw products and eventually all of the surplus that we can consume.

The United States must reexamine its tariffs on the importation of raw products from this hemisphere and make concessions to further the end of hemisphere integration.

I further propose that the capital of the Export-Import Bank be increased so that economically sound enterprises in this hemisphere can be stimulated and expanded.

Third. We must forge the most comprehensive kind of military alliance for the protection of the countries of this hemisphere. Results from our foreign policy in the Eastern Hemisphere carried on at colossal sacrifice, are still uncertain. But leadership in a new foreign policy for the Western Hemisphere can achieve success at comparatively little sacrifice.

The policy for military integration has been so weakly pursued that today, 8 years after the Rio Conference, we are pitifully ill prepared to defend this hemisphere.

Within the last month events in Korea have reached a state of crisis. A week ago President Truman stated: "We are fighting in Korea for our national security and survival."

Does this mean that we have no alternative other than throwing all of our resources into the struggle in Asia? The time is late but perhaps not too late even now to reassess our foreign policy and change its course. Great Britain and France have clearly indicated their belief that we should do so, at least so far as Asia is concerned.

We must evolve from our present method of making policy to meet current crises. Foreign policy is not like a grain crop that is sown in the spring and harvested in the summer; it is like an orchard that must be carefully guarded and cultivated for years before it can bear good fruit. I feel certain that a careful reassessment of our foreign policy will reveal that our great national interests lie in this hemisphere.

IV

Today the national interests of the states of this hemisphere are naturally linked together. We are in mortal peril unless we bind ourselves together for mutual protection. Here in this hemisphere we can only escape the Russian menace by the most complete integration of our sovereign states that can be made practicable.

We no longer have the luxury of the Americas isolated by oceans, protected by the British Navy and illumined by the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine. The luxury of making and hurling resounding phrases in order to arouse the people to anger and bitterness, now no longer may merely achieve personal or political advantage; it may be a danger to the sovereignty of the state. The chorus cry of "Yankee imperialism" by South American demagogues and professional Latin-American intellectual "experts" from the north may have in the future a far more tragic consequence than creation of international disharmony. We can no longer permit ourselves flag-waving orgies, discriminations, trade barriers, and uneconomic policies under the name of nationalism when our urgent need is continentalism. In Latin America just and economic land reforms are overdue as are tax systems that support privilege and stifle progress. This is a late hour to kill by expropriation any more capitalistic geese that lay golden eggs before a new brand of golden-egged geese can be hybridized. And there is still time to establish the rights of the laborer before he receives the Communist kiss of death.

The integration of this hemisphere is feasible. It is practical. It can be almost wholly accomplished through bilateral treaties later to be supplemented by multilateral treaties when desirable.

The hope of humanity in today's bellicose world lies in international understanding, good will, and cooperation. We must extend the solidarity of family and community and nation beyond our borders. We must make a new approach to human relations among nations. I believe that this can be best achieved through first building a community of interests. Where can there be better ground to build this community than in this hemisphere, as a guiding light to world unity?

From the northern reaches of Canada to the tip of Tierra del Fuego people have settled this continent to escape injustice and seek opportunity. They are united in spirit but separated by artificial boundaries of a past age. Break down these barriers so that the people of the Americas can rise to a new level of human understanding and progress!

One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Anniversary of B'nai Jeshurin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on December 19, 1950, at the jubilee dinner of the Congregation B'nai Jeshurin, by Charles H. Silver, a very distinguished resident of New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I consider it an unusual privilege to greet you here this evening as chairman of the committee. We are celebrating an occasion of historic significance. The series of events which have taken place during recent weeks have been part of a continuous program marking the attainment of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of B'nai Jeshurin. I want to express my deep gratitude to my fellow members on the committee who gave of their time and effort in planning this event.

It has been said that 125 years is but a fleeting moment in eternity, but to us, mere mortals who think in terms of the Biblical threescore and ten, a century and a quarter represents a vast expanse of time. Indeed, the world has moved so rapidly and violently in this period that happenings in even 1 week seemed like an eternity in themselves.

B'nia Jeshurin came into existence 125 years ago. Throughout the years it has grown steadily and flourished magnificently. Like a mighty oak it has weathered the storms of wars and depressions. The boundless faith of our people, the courage of the Jewish pioneers in this country, the willingness to absorb the spirit of democracy have been the powerful forces which have enabled American Jews to hold to the teachings of their forefathers and their prophets; but at the same time they have never wavered in their loyalty and devotion to their country.

Recently a distinguished American writer, a historian, of our faith referred to the Jews as a pilgrim people. It is my understanding that a pilgrim is a wanderer, often seeking a haven where he may worship his God according to his conscience. Judge Brandeis once said, "The pilgrims had faith; we should have it, for the pilgrims had this noble and steadfast spirit."

It seems to me, my friends, that Judge Brandeis has summed up in one sentence the philosophy of our people. We have faith in our God, we have faith in the land of our adoption, we have faith in democracy and, above all, we have faith in the goodness and decency of human beings.

When we gave to the world the message "Love thy neighbor as thyself," we laid down the basic philosophy and teachings of dignified and honorable relations between individuals. We urge compassion, charity, and brotherly love. Had the world followed these teachings, there would have been no religious persecutions, no hatred, no wars, no atom bombs.

I say these things because we are celebrating the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of a congregation, whose sons and daughters have been part of the daily life of our city and our country, decade after decade, and whose spiritual leaders have poured out their eloquence and given their unstinted efforts not only for Judaism but also in behalf of a better understanding between people of all faiths.

That is the real significance of this anniversary. We are happy because today the congregation serves 1,000 families; that within the walls of its noble structure there gather men and women to worship their God and absorb the meaning of our religious belief.

It is indeed a noble and beautiful structure. It gives one a feeling of uplift to be there, yet we know that even if this structure were destroyed by the physical elements the spirit of Jewish teachings and ethics can never die. That is eternal.

On this anniversary we are not celebrating the existence of a splendid structure but the maintenance, over 125 years, of the Jewish ideal, an ideal that has held aloft the torch of brotherhood and love and that kept intact our people for centuries. Let us not forget that we gave to the world a system of ethics which has influenced the thinking and actions of all peoples down through the centuries. I say this not in a boastful spirit, but with a sense of humility and deep obligation.

B'nai Jeshurin is more than a congregation of the Jewish faith. Its interests are not confined to its own people. Its spiritual leaders and memberships have shown a deep interest in the affairs of the community and I am glad to say that this is also true of other Jewish congregations. We, who belong to B'nai Jeshurin, feel that we also belong to our city and to our neighbors. We extend to them the warm handgrasp of friendship and wholehearted cooperation.

And may I, finally, express the hope that we shall no longer be a "pilgrim people." Those of us who have enjoyed the blessings of this country know that our fathers who came here found a real haven. Perhaps it may be said that it marked the end of their pilgrimage. Others, however, were not so fortunate; the land of milk and honey was closed to them and the terror of Nazi persecution wiped out millions of our people. And those who were left became pilgrims wandering over the face of the earth, homeless, hungry, but still imbued with that beautiful faith which never left them. They were a sad but hopeful and gentle people.

And then there was opened to them the doors of a new republic—yet a country that was old and sacred and steeped in the traditions and customs and history of the Jews. The pilgrims moved on slowly toward this land, in endless lines—they are still moving—and this time they passed through the doors and were greeted with smiles and warmth by their kith and kin. They beheld with joy the faces of those who welcomed them to this refuge and they sought no more for they are a grateful and gentle people.

Is it too much to expect that the pilgrimage of our people is at an end? We as good Americans hope that it is. We who have had some share in the growth of B'Nai Jeshurin shall pray for them. We shall give to them cooperation and also full support to the new republic which has taken in these pilgrims by the thousands, the newest member of the democratic society of nations—The Republic of Israel.

And now, my friends, I come to a very pleasant part of my task, for I am about to present the man who will preside at this dinner and introduce the brilliant speakers whom we are to have the pleasure of hearing.

He is, shall I say, a product of B'Nai Jeshurin, and that in itself is something to be proud of. When he was elected a member of the board of trustees 37 years ago he was then the youngest member of the board, and he is the only member now alive who voted to elect Dr. Goldstein rabbi of the congregation.

That in itself, my friends, is a great distinction, for we know how well and wisely the board acted. In the intervening years our rabbi has become one of the outstanding leaders of the Jewish people.

You may begin to wonder, my friends, how old your toastmaster is, and I will let you make your own guess. But this I can tell you very definitely, when it comes to activity he has the stamina and courage and energy of a college freshman. American Jews may well be proud of him, for he has done splendid work not only in behalf of our own people but the entire community.

I have a very strong affection for him and I am very happy to present, as your toastmaster, Mr. Samuel Blumberg.

Washington Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with Secretary Acheson, entitled "Washington Front," written by Wilfrid Parsons, and published in the December 30, 1950, issue of America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON FRONT

(By Wilfrid Parsons)

The railroad yard workers went out on what their leaders called a wildcat strike, and the papers which carried this news also carried the story of the Republican congressional caucuses which voted for firing Secretary Acheson. There was more than mere coincidence in this. For one thing, there was the timing of both events. The yard workers went out just as millions were mailing Christmas parcels. The Republicans went after Acheson 2 days before he was to leave for Brussels for a conference which may well prove the most critical of our time. The yard workers apparently expected that the inconvenienced public would raise a howl of protest in their favor. The howl came, but against them. The Republicans apparently imagined they would rouse public opinion enough to keep Mr. Acheson from going to Brussels. Public opinion was immediate and sharp, in condemnation of the move, and Mr. Acheson went to Brussels.

The parallel between the two events is not so farfetched as it might seem at first sight. They are both parts of a new and alarming pattern. The yard workers struck against the Government (which now runs the railroads), in complete disregard of the public's comfort and of national safety. The action of the anti-Acheson Republicans (23 out of 43 in the Senate) was more complex, but was in the same direction.

One Washington paper called the anti-Acheson vote irresponsible, another called it reckless. It was both, of course, and very hard to explain. It is not yet clear why the Republicans acted as they did, especially since, as America noted last week (p. 355), their leaders had seemed to squelch the Ives resolution, timed as it was to appear just as the President and Prime Minister Attlee were sitting in with Mr. Acheson on delicate negotiations.

The easiest explanation, and maybe the best, is that the vote against Acheson was one of those backward-and-forward-looking things; backward to the last elections, forward to the next; in other words, partisan politics at the expense of the national welfare. But then, why the precise timing? Even if he had yielded, how would the President find a Secretary in 2 days, and be able to brief him for Brussels in time? As it was, Mr. Acheson left with his own and the Nation's prestige very gravely impaired.

An even greater puzzle is this: just what is the foreign policy of the 23 Senators? To be more tough with Russia than even Mr. Acheson has been? Or, to reverse present policy, on the ground that it is leading us to war with Russia? You can take your choice, but you can't have both. It begins to look as if too many Senators, in both parties, are, by intellect and training, incapable of handling foreign affairs.

Review of United States Shipping Events of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Review of Passing United States Shipping Events of 1950," appearing in the London shipping news. The article was prepared by the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., and it reviews the events in the American merchant marine for the past year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SHIPPING, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1951.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Matters,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Because it gives a running story of some of the high lights of events of interest in American shipping for 1950, I am enclosing herewith copy of an article which we have prepared for the British press at their request and will appear in London shipping journals in January. Obviously, these do not constitute all such events but just the high lights thereof.

In many of these events the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Matters played an outstanding part and the accomplishments would have been substantially less but for the constructive work of yourself and the other subcommittee members for which the shipping industry is duly grateful.

Very truly yours,

FRANK A. BAILEY.

REVIEW OF PASSING UNITED STATES SHIPPING EVENTS OF 1950

A review of the passing events of interest to American shipping during 1950 shows some substantial accomplishments, a number of interesting developments, and generally speaking, more activity and more general interest in the field of shipping than has been the case in recent years. This should be considered on the plus side, as a public or governmental awakening to the part which ocean shipping plays in the economic welfare and defensive armament of the Nation can only be stimulating and helpful.

The latest official reports showing that more than 80 percent of all military and troop-support supplies landed in Korea for United Nations forces were delivered by privately operated American shipping (14 percent by United States Government and 6 percent foreign) should constitute convincing evidence of the defense value of this industry.

For the past 2 years the principal shipowning associations have been advocating a long-range shipping legislative program which would stimulate the further building and operation of a merchant fleet under the United States flag, of a character considered compatible with the economic, commercial, and national-defense interests of the United States; and with the prominent part which it must play in world affairs in concert with other great powers and the United Nations. It is felt in maritime circles, and shared largely in other quarters, that the United States should have a merchant marine of size and characteristics sufficient to carry all of its domestic, and not less than one-half of its own import and export trade, on a fair competitive basis. While the United States has a substantial merchant fleet compared with recent decades, it does not yet measure up to standards which it is felt are required by this country in the present and foreseeable future. We are particularly deficient in vessels of passenger-carrying type, having only approximately half the number which we possessed at the beginning of World War II. These are the vessels which are to serve as convertible troop transports in an emergency. The long-range program was designed to aid in the achievement of these aspirations within the framework of existing law and strictly within the parity philosophy of equal economic opportunity, through Government aid in the foreign trades. While this bill was favorably reported by the appropriate shipping committees of both Houses of Congress, it unfortunately ran into opposition by the administration as to certain of its tax provisions, and the prospects of its passage before the end of the present session of Congress, is problematical.

Legislation was enacted regarding the reorganization of the administration of the Panama Canal, a separation of the transit and transportation activities from those of the military and of civil government, and an adjustment of the toll rate to cover only expenses which are incident to the transit of vessels. While it is not expected that the toll rate will be substantially lowered, this should forestall any increase within

otherwise might occur. The toll tariff will be equally applicable to vessels of all flags, including United States Government vessels, and the benefit will, therefore, accrue to all maritime countries.

Legislation was passed authorizing the Government to provide war-risk insurance when such insurance is not available in the private market. This is in the nature of a standby provision to permit Government insurance of this character when required and is highly desirable in these uncertain times.

Legislation extending the Marshall-plan and military-aid programs were enacted, and these contain the provision that 50 percent of such Government-aid cargoes shall be forwarded in United States vessels. There has been some criticism of this modest patronage by our Government. However, when it is realized that these aid-program commodities represent the generosity of the American people; that they largely displace commercial cargoes and that very little business would be offering to sustain the American services unless permitted reasonable participation, as was to be expected, the opposition has died down.

An act was passed known as the Port Security Act, under which the Coast Guard, by authority of the President, will take all necessary measures to avoid sabotage and subversive acts on vessels and in harbors, ports, and along water-front facilities of the United States. The importance of this measure at these uncertain times is obvious.

The merchant marine subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted probably the most extensive study of all problems relating to shipping which has yet been conducted by the Congress of the United States. Space will not permit us to enumerate the various subjects and phases which were explored. It is interesting, however, to note a few of the conclusions reached.

"That legislative measures and executive administration dealing with merchant marine matters be directed toward the progressive fostering and building up of the privately owned component of the merchant marine.

"That there be no fundamental changes in the 1936 act except such as are required to—

"(a) extend construction-differential subsidy aid to all vessels in the foreign trade;

"(b) to tramp vessels, on condition they engage primarily in foreign trade to and from the United States under such rules and regulations as will insure the unimpaired continuance of established berth liner cargo operations; and

"(c) clarify, through amendment to titles V and VI, those legislative standards necessary to insure the just determination of construction and operating subsidies and national-defense allowances.

"That for national-defense purposes, reliance be placed on a well-balanced American merchant marine.

"That in time of emergency, the fullest use possible be made of privately operated shipping organizations and maritime labor on such terms and conditions as will insure a return of just compensation for services rendered."

Shipping men felt that the report of the congressional committee was friendly and helpful.

During May of 1950, the President saw fit to reorganize the United States Maritime Commission under the Reorganization Act, and created a Federal Maritime Board of three members, and a Maritime Administration, both in the Department of Commerce. The Maritime Administration, broadly speaking, will have jurisdiction over all of the operational and administrative functions, and the Federal Maritime Board, again speaking broadly, will deal with the regulatory, judicial, and quasi-judicial functions. The Administrator is also a member and the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, thus tying the two organizations effectively together. The President also appointed to the chairmanship of the Board and as Maritime Administrator, Admiral Edward L. Cochrane, a retired naval officer of considerable reputation and well-established ability. While the new organization has only been functioning for a few months, there is evidence of an accelerated tempo and the expectation of smooth and efficient coordination and cooperation with the industry.

The President also created the Office of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and appointed to this important position, Gen. Philip B. Fleming, former Chairman of the old Maritime Commission, and authorized the establishment of a Transportation Council composed of all of the heads of transportation agencies under the chairmanship of the new Under Secretary.

During March 1950 the President requested the former Secretary of the Army, Mr. Gordon Gray, to make certain recommendations for charting our course in the field of foreign relations primarily on the economic side. While the President's request was not specific on the point, it was understood that Mr. Gray's report would be directed primarily, if not exclusively, to ways and means of closing the dollar gap with the Marshall-plan nations when United States Government aid under this program ceases. Inasmuch as United States imports now exceed exports, and the dollar gap is therefore, to all intents and purposes, closed, there was some surprise in the United States when the Gray report was recently released. Certain of the recommendations relating to shipping such as (a) that Government aid to shipping was justified only for national defense; (b) that preference to American ships of a patronage character should be withdrawn; (c) that even Army and Navy stores and supplies should under certain circumstances be transported by foreign-flag vessels; met with strong and almost violent objection in many parts of the country. Almost immediately a rebuttal statement was issued, signed jointly by a labor-management-veteran coalition.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, fired the first salvo at the Gray report. In an address to the Senate he said:

"As chairman of the Senate committee dealing with merchant marine legislation, I wish to serve notice that our committee will be alert, and will act to block any attempt by anybody to cripple such a vital industry as our merchant marine.

"The repeal of laws requiring that 50 percent of all Marshall-plan shipments move in American vessels would repudiate a sound congressional mandate."

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, also a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, joined Chairman JOHNSON in attacking the Gray report:

"I wish here and now to add my emphatic support to any action that may be taken by our chairman or by our committee."

Mr. Gray's recommendations regarding shipping are so far afield with respect to public sentiment in this country that it is not felt that they will have any important repercussions.

The federation has arranged by cable with the directors of the Suez Canal Co. for a meeting in Paris on December 7 to discuss the existing toll tariff at the Suez Canal. Increased oil production in the Middle East, and other resurgence of shipping in the area, has brought about unprecedented traffic and financial prosperity of the Suez Canal Co. Inasmuch as the Suez Co. has a publicly announced policy that its prosperity will be shared between its stockholders and its patrons, and inasmuch as the published statements of the canal company demonstrate the exceedingly prosperous earnings now being enjoyed, it is hoped and believed that the patrons may anticipate a reasonable reduction in Suez Canal tolls applicable to the ships of all nations. A delegation from the federation, headed by Admiral Edmond J. Moran, United States Navy, retired, met with the management of the canal company in Paris to explore this subject and to put forward the suggestions of the American shipping industry. The results are not yet known.

The new maritime administrator has just announced the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction by the United States Government, under authority of title 7 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, of a number of new fast cargo vessels which may be needed for national defense. These vessels are understood to be around 13,000 tons deadweight and of 20-knot speed. Bids will be asked shortly from American shipbuilders, and President Truman has requested Congress to make available contract authorization in the amount of approximately $126,000,000.

Admiral Cochrane has also announced that in cooperation with the industry, a small planning task force is at work under his direction to prepare an organization which would be required, similar to the British Ministry of Transport and the old United States War Shipping Administration, to take over and handle merchant shipping in the event of an emergency. Admiral Cochrane has also appointed 11 outstanding American shipping executives as an advisory committee to consult with him primarily concerning the plan so evolved, and in the selection of the highest type American shipping personnel which it is understood will be drafted from the industry by the admiral when the emergency occurs, and with the full support and consent of the American shipping companies.

There was a recent meeting in Washington of the North Atlantic Planning Board for Ocean Shipping, the understood purpose being to pool the shipping resources of these nations for their joint and mutual benefit in an emergency. Through initiation by the industry, and the good offices of Admiral Cochrane, the Secretary of State was prevailed upon to appoint three prominent American shipping executives as technical advisers to the American Government representative on the Planning Board. No details are available as the matter is considered of a confidential nature, but inasmuch as the industry's experience and talent was available in these discussions, it is to be assumed that the country's and the industry's interests were amply protected.

There are many other matters of importance concerning shipping which transpired during the very active year of 1950. Congress was in session for the whole year except for the fall election period; there was great international tension, and altogether the American shipping industry was extremely busy. What we have said hereinbefore may be considered only some of the highlight subjects dealt with during these extremely busy times.

Sales of Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "From the RECORD," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Thursday, December 28, 1950. The Cleveland Plain Dealer is one of the most widely read newspapers of the Midwest. The editorial concerns a speech delivered by our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE RECORD

"After listening to the patriotic appeals on the part of the President and other administration leaders, I was shocked this week to find that the administration, while calling upon the American people for greater sacrifices and expressing great concern with the threatening rising cost of living, was at the same time launching one of the greatest international bargain day sales of the twentieth century. * * *

"I wish to call particular attention to the fact that included in the bulletin (which advertised the sale) are 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, 100,000,000 bushels of corn, and millions of bushels of other grains. They are all listed as surplus. At the same time that they are being classified as surplus and nonessential, the Department of Agriculture is asking for greater production, and the Price Administrator has said this week he would consider setting price controls on such commodities in order to hold down the price.

"At a time when our country is being threatened by an outside aggressor, with the cost of living reaching an all-time high, with price controls being considered on all food and agricultural products, and at a time when every sensible and loyal American recognizes that we must conserve our resources, there is absolutely no possible justification for the existing policy of treating these inventories as surplus and nonessential.

"It is inexcusable that this administration, through the Department of Agriculture, while under the threat of war clouds, should continue stripping the American cupboard bare and distributing our resources to the far corners of the earth. * * *

"It is estimated that there are about 110 freight cars to the mile. If they were all put into one train they would make a solid train of surplus commodities reaching from Independence, Mo., to the White House. Instead of calling it the Missouri mule train, it should be called the international gravy train." (From a speech by United States Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 12, pages 16902 and 16903.)

In the same speech Senator WILLIAMS revealed that more than 50,000,000 pounds of American cotton, worth about $20,000,000, has been shipped directly from New Orleans to Communist China since the outbreak of the Korean War last June, and that other quantities have gone to Hong Kong, with Red China as the ultimate destination. WILLIAMS said he got these and other facts from Government sources.

This is a serious situation, inasmuch as cotton is one of the staples that are currently in short supply, due to a bad guess made by the Department of Agriculture.

What is more disturbing, however, is that WILLIAMS identified the seller of the cotton as the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This gives us the strange feeling of being on the threshold of a madhouse. Are we going to combat communism by arming and supplying our enemies as well as our friends?

The Constitution, Guardian of People's Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of an address delivered by a student of the University of South Carolina, Eugene Brantley, of Chester, S. C., at the annual fall rally of the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, last year. Since that time his ability to speak, as well as the text of this particular speech, have received much favorable comment. The address is entitled "The Constitution, Guardian of People's Rights." I think it would be well for the people of this Nation to read and reread the Constitution and realize every time it is read that the freedoms set forth must not be taken for granted.

I ask unanimous consent that young Mr. Brantley's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION, GUARDIAN OF PEOPLE'S RIGHTS

I stand before you today and speak freely and frankly about a Government document because my God-fearing forefathers won for me this cherished right and handed it down to me inviolate. I can criticize my country's faults and weaknesses, its merits, and its virtues, because of a piece of paper, the most significant in the lives of the American citizens today, the Constitution of the United States.

Because of this Constitution, I today enjoy the precious liberties enumerated in the Bill of Rights. These rights perhaps mean more to the citizens of this country than the Constitution itself, which provides for our governmental machinery.

For instance, you may change the Constitution by amendments, but our citizens would not allow the Bill of Rights to be altered. Take away one and you weaken all; take away freedom from your neighbor and enslave yourself; as the late William Allen White once said: "Freedom is the only thing that you cannot have unless you are willing to share it with others."

These constitutional rights are our fundamental articles of faith. They are the supreme law of the land. Yet anyone can understand this simple Bill of Rights.

Take article 1, for example, which sets forth in one sentence enough freedoms to make a dictatorship impossible. It states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people to peaceably assemble and to petition their Government for redress of grievances." This is a sound statement of sound fact.

Let's take the first part of this article: It says that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This statement gives the people their freedom of religion. Many years ago, a famous man was persecuted because he believed that the church and state should be separate. This man was Roger Williams, a New England minister.

The second part of this article gives us our freedom of speech. You men and women of this country may criticize the Congress, the President, or even the Supreme Court, provided you do not slander or libel individual persons. Benjamin Franklin once said: "Freedom of speech is the principal pillar of a free government. When this support is taken away, the constitution of a free society is dissolved and tyranny is erected on its ruins." Better words could not be found stating the importance that this freedom plays in a free democracy.

Another part of this article gives us our freedom of the press. It is hard for a country to call itself a free democracy, when its press cannot print true facts, criticizing its government. Americans have slowly built up this civil liberty.

No confiscation of your property, says the Bill of Rights, unless you are indemnified for it; no searching of your home without a warrant; no accusations by witnesses unless they can be produced in open court; and no subjecting you to trial twice for the same accusation.

The Bill of Rights promises you freedom from excessive bail, freedom from lawyers to obtain confessions, and freedom from unusual and cruel punishment. It gives you the right to a speedy trial, to a definite written accusation if you are being tried, and it gives you the right to have counsel.

The Bill of Rights promises much, but it is up to the American people to make those promises good. When people think and say what they think, this Government obeys, and the people should always have the courage to speak out.

Somewhere in this country almost every day, the Bill of Rights is being violated. Its most dangerous foes are not foreign dictatorships, but those of us who deny democratic liberties to others and do not carry out the duties that these precious liberties bring us.

In a study of the Constitution, we note the system of checks and balances which keeps the power always in the hands of the people. At times, Government machinery seems ponderous; it moves slowly, and, as is true of all great democratic nations, grave mistakes are made; but, the voice of the people, through their power of the vote—their constitutional right—corrects these mistakes, makes their wishes known, and remains the ultimate and final authority in our great land.

The voice of the people. These few words, in many respects, summarize the very essence and heart of the Constitution itself.

A careful study of the Constitution reveals the tremendous wisdom and foresight of the founders of this country. They looked into the future, dreamed visions and wonders of a great land to be, and thus constructed a conception of democratic government, with its individual powers, its States powers and its Federal powers, all relegated to their proper places, yet each working in harmony with the other for the good of all. Even the executive, judicial, and legislative bodies are so stated that no single one can function alone or with too much authority. The one single control to the changes and additions to this great Government documents is the voice of the people.

Today, this very same freedom, guaranteed to us by our Constitution, can become a weakness if allowed to be abused as some of the internal enemies of our country are attempting. Hiding under the cloak of free speech, enemies of the Constitution have taught and scattered seeds of communism

and socialism, have planted weeds of distrust, fear, and abusive practices among our people. These rank and horrible weeds, enemies of a free people, must be pruned swiftly wherever and whenever they are found.

The Communists prey primarily on the minority, the so-called down-trodden, and the less informed of our citizens. Thus, we who appreciate democratic government, must realize that active participation in government institution, and a deep sense of responsibility to our country, our State and our community, are the best means of stamping out any subversive tendencies that might show their evil heads.

The citizens of this country are all kinds of people. The foundation of our democracy, with the Constitution as its basis, rests upon the individual. Each individual must be taught the history of this country, its traditions, its democratic systems; for, upon this and this alone, rests the source of our strength as a free nation.

Let us study more, let us worship more, let us keep our priceless jewel, the Constitution, untarnished. We must protect this heritage of ours. The Constitution should have a special meaning for each of us.

To the worker in Carolina's cotton mills, to the farmer in the Kansas wheat field, to the longshoreman on the Great Lakes, to the miner in Pennsylvania's dark mines, to the clerk in the 5-and-10, to the broker on Wall Street, to the Congressman in Washington, to the lawyer in his office, to the fisherman on Maine's windy winter coast, to the trucker in California's sunny fields, and to the busy housewife in her bright cheerful kitchen—to each of these, the Constitution should have a special meaning. To every beating, pulsing heart in this great teeming Nation of ours, the Constitution speaks a special language. It is the last best hope on earth for a democratic way of life. It is the lighted torch, the way of life, that has long been the hope and dream of all mankind.

In the immortal words of Kipling: "Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget—lest we forget."

The Ordeal of Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Ordeal of Dean Acheson," written by Francis Downing and published in the December 29, 1950, issue of the Commonweal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORDEAL OF DEAN ACHESON

(By Francis Downing)

It may be a fact that Dean Acheson has, in the words of the Republicans, "lost the confidence of the country," and it may be that the removal of Mr. Acheson is in the cards. It may be admitted that if Mr. Acheson is compelled to leave office the Republicans will have won a victory.

What kind of victory they will have won, that their victory will be our victory, that the victory will have enhanced the prestige and valor of the United States, that our position in world affairs, our foreign policy, will be wiser, safer, sounder, more significant—all these are things not made plain to me.

They are not made plain to me because the attacks of the Republicans—including the latest resolution of the otherwise sensible Senator IVES—proceed from partisanship and a fundamental dishonesty. To put it clearly, they proceed from no criticism that rests on any plain bill of indictment. Stripped of the frenzied and floating vocabulary in which they are made, the criticisms come down to this: We are "in a mess"; Mr. Acheson is "soft on communism"; Mr. Acheson did not, or does not "get tough." I did not invent these charges. The first two are the words of Senator TAFT. The first phrase, "in a mess"—surely a subtle description of things, the obvious product of a careful and dispassionate, unvulgar mind—Mr. TAFT used on a CBS broadcast. Replying to the question put by the reporters on "Capital Cloakroom": "What can we do now?" Senator TAFT said, "I don't know." Preferring to discuss the mistake of stopping General Patton in Europe, or the mistakes made at Yalta (things for which, even granting TAFT's case, Mr. Acheson was not responsible) and being brought back to the question: How do we get out of our present situation? Senator TAFT said, "I don't know."

This is the position on foreign policy of a man so seemingly distinguished that he is one of the leaders of the Republican Party, is called "Mr. Republican," and is seriously regarded among the candidates for the presidency. What does he offer? Remove Mr. Acheson. What then? "I don't know." I submit that this is irrational, irresponsible, and undistinguished. I submit that no intelligent political party has a right to call on Mr. Truman for consultation with it, to call for a bipartisan foreign policy, and say that it is as free from knowledge about what we ought to do—as free even from ideas—as this man indicates it is.

On another network, Mr. Harold Stassen, also a flying contender for the Republican nomination, attacked "blundering internationalists" without naming them. He made it clear, however, that he did not mean the Republicans since he called them "freedomists," and alleged they have "a common-sense foreign policy." What does this consist in? Stassen would reverse the administration's Asiatic policy. What does that mean? How do you reverse it? What do you do that Mr. Acheson did not do, or not do that Mr. Acheson has done? Mr. Stassen gave no reply to that. He was making a speech to Republicans and they applauded. But nobody asked him these questions. He did say that he was in favor of the open door in China; and he did say that that meant we should not open the back door of China to Russia. He did say that we should "make essential decisions," and that we should develop "a dynamic opposition to communism," at the same time as he said we should stop "handouts at home and abroad." All these confusing and conflicting and undefined things Mr. Stassen added to Mr. TAFT's self-confessed ignorance.

But I point out that none of these things, nor all of them, is the basis of a foreign policy, and that all of them and none of them is a bill of particulars against Dean Acheson.

All the Republicans, including these two, have kind words for General MacArthur, or they did until recently, but there is no evidence that Dean Acheson has ever opposed General MacArthur, much less attacked him.

I have no professional brief for Mr. Acheson. If he ought to be removed, all I insist is that somebody make out an honest, documented case against him. Neither Mr. TAFT, nor Stassen, nor IVES, not to speak of KNOWLAND—none of these men is clear enough, nor quiet enough, nor legal enough to make out the copy. Any American on trial, whose words and conduct are impeached, has a legal and a moral right to more than rhetoric; he has a right to the indictment to which he is expected, and indeed required, to plead.

American soldiers have been moving slowly and perilously out of a Chinese trap in Korea. Does someone become so bold, or so morally crass, as to blame Dean Acheson for that?

But given that situation, Mr. Attlee flies to Washington to try to temper impulse, or anger, to oppose even a limited war lest we aggravate the Chinese into remaining Russia's ally. Mr. Attlee wanted, according to James Reston of the Times, "a negotiated settlement on all outstanding questions including Formosa, recognition, representation in the United Nations, etc."

And who, do you suppose, opposed the British Prime Minister on all this? Why Mr. Acheson opposed him. Obviously this is one more sign that our Secretary of State is "soft on communism."

What arguments did Mr. Acheson make to the British proposal? Let Mr. Reston answer:

"Mr. Acheson replied that he did not necessarily differ from Mr. Attlee's estimate of the future relations between Peiping and Moscow. Maybe one day they would split. He profoundly hoped so. The next 3 years, however, were the critical years, and therefore he did not believe it was wise to enter into negotiations under which he might merely exchange the important strategic island of Formosa for a few Communist promises in Korea that probably wouldn't be kept."

The fact of the matter is that we moved into Korea wholly unprepared for the consequences which are now upon us, and morally supported with some reluctance by our allies, and by them physically supported with very little because they had very little to give. Senator TAFT and his anti-Acheson Republicans, the fact is, had been unwilling to rearm South Korea, had sniped at the economics which the Marshall plan required, and had been hostile to our State Department's military assistance plan, ambiguous in their attitude toward German rearmament while attacking Acheson—as Time still is doing—for failure to get the Germans rearmed, though France's hostility to it was almost a declaration of open warfare.

This, I submit, is a statement of the facts, and a description of the total atmosphere in which Mr. Acheson was working.

That Mr. Acheson's estimate of the meaning of the Communist movement in China may have been wrong is, and will continue to be, a matter of historical dispute. But that this proved something loosely called softness toward communism is certainly not valid. It was not Dean Acheson who recognized Peiping; it was the British. The British, among others, wanted the Peiping government recognized and seated in the UN. It was Mr. Acheson who, up until this moment, at any rate, opposed this. It was Mr. Acheson who suggested that we should devise a foreign policy whose essence would be that we should lead from strength. But the strength from which he had to lead could not tumble over a chattering child.

It was not Mr. Acheson who swaggered irresponsibly and stridently through a delicately suspended diplomatic universe, nor proceeded in the belief that any bluster could, in the last analysis, depend for support on the atom and hydrogen bombs. Whatever else he did he acted as a diplomat is supposed to act; he thought that some things could be negotiated in a world in which Republicans attacked him for not being tough while Wallacites, Communists, and alleged liberals attacked him for failing to negotiate, a world in which a division among the western powers was building up, in which what is now, at last, out in the open, was then being softly whispered. All this had the effect of making the actions of Mr. Acheson provocative.

So that now such a reliable reporter as Mr. Reston can write that, "Indeed, the hard truth of it is—whether it is fair or not—that the United States is being charged by influential officials within the western coalition with having adopted a provocative diplomacy toward Peiping, with having stirred up forces that the United States could not handle and with proposing now to enter into a policy of limited war after limited negotiations.

Mr. Acheson is being blamed for our going into Korea as he would have been blamed had we stayed out of it. MacArthur's personal intelligence officer makes a fatal mistake in Korea, the Chinese pour in, we sadly and grimly retreat, and no one of the anti-Acheson crowd—not a single solitary one of them—rebukes MacArthur, or calls for Major General Willoughby's scalp, while their spiritual adviser and helpmate, Time magazine, after admitting the fact, and even calling it blameworthy, decides that the Willoughby lapse was not crucial.

This whole attack on Mr. Acheson, now put on the presumed ground that he has lost our confidence, is so ruthless and shameful in character that it has won even the recent rebuke of Governor Dewey.

Dean Acheson will fall, I have no doubt of that, pecked at by the cawing and sound-filled crows. But that he deserves better enemies in a more honorable contest I have no doubt of either.

The Pay-As-You-Go Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of January 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO DEBATE

Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, senior Republican on the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee, has taken issue with Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, on the question whether an $80,000,000,000 budget for 1951-52 could be financed out of taxes.

When a nation is suddenly precipitated into a fighting war without adequate time to prepare itself, pay-as-you-go from the start is, it is true, a luxury that can't be afforded. As Russell Leffingwell once put it, it would be "utter nonsense" for a country to send its boys off "to fight with their bare fists in order to finance a war prudently." In such a situation a country raises the money to equip its fighting men by the quickest and easiest means—which is usually by inflationary borrowing. Similarly, when a war or rearmament effort is undertaken at a time when the economy is depressed, as ours was at the outbreak of the Second World War, borrowing may be a virtue as a desirable instrument of reflation.

But neither of those conditions obtains today. We are not plunging into all-out war in one leap, but moving into a stage of preparedness from which we could quickly proceed to full mobilization. And we are doing so when the domestic foe most to be feared is inflation. The only real approach to inflation at this stage of economic expansion is on the demand side, through a reduction of purchasing power. And the most effective means for applying this remedy is through increased taxes. We should proceed without delay to round out the tax program on which we have thus far made only a beginning. If we do this we can keep tax receipts not only abreast of but ahead of Government expenditures, at least through the calendar year 1951, even with no rise in the national gross product.

It is academic to talk about an $80,000,000,000 rate of spending before 1952 at the earliest. It will be time to worry about that problem when it arrives. Meanwhile it is worth recalling that under the impact of the Second World War defense effort the gross national product, whose dimensions determine the yield of any given tax structure, expanded from $101,000,000,000 in 1940 to $194,200,000,000 3 years later. Our job now, fiscally speaking, is to get tax receipts out in front of expenditures at the start of the rearmament effort, and to keep them there so long as humanly possible.

Condemnation of Communist Chinese as Aggressors in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the need for such action on the part of the United Nations continues very urgent in the interests of all those who support and are deeply concerned with its effectiveness and future usefulness. The moral force of the UN and the preservation of this force so very important to world peace are further dealt with in the most realistic terms in the appended editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., January 9, 1951:

WITHDRAW FROM KOREA?

If Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, has made a correct evaluation in declaring that the position of our American and allied United Nations forces in Korea has now become "strategically futile," then Senator TAFT is on sound ground in advocating—as Tito also has advocated—that those forces be withdrawn from the country and assigned to tasks of a more fruitful nature.

The case for such a withdrawal—again assuming that the UN position is in fact "strategically futile"—can be argued very persuasively. Certainly, if nothing of value can be accomplished by a slow, fighting retreat to a defensive line designed to hold a bridgehead for a protracted period, the speedy evacuation of our troops would seem to be called for as a matter of common sense. They can be employed to good effect elsewhere. Our American divisions, for example, still are essential to the security of Japan, and elements of them can be used effectively in connection with the training of the Army we are now beginning to build up here at home.

With that said, however, certain reservations must be added. In the first place, there is at least some reason to believe that it may not be "strategically futile" for the United Nations to try to hold on in Korea as long as possible. True enough, short of an all-out war with Red China—which the free world does not want and which probably would set off a global explosion—there is virtually no hope that the UN can roll back the numerically superior Communists and unify the Korean people under an independent and democratic government of their own choosing. Even so, in both a political and military sense, a strong argument can be made against the idea that our allied forces should be withdrawn forthwith, regardless of whether or not they are capable of fighting a long delaying action at minimum cost to themselves.

In support of this argument, as against the Taft-Tito view, such considerations as the following may be cited: (1) If it can hold on by a slow, fighting retreat involving relatively small casualties, the United Nations ought to do so in order to win enough time to provide a safe haven for the great numbers of free Koreans who are in flight from the aggressors and whose fate will be grim if they are abandoned in a swift and sudden allied withdrawal. (2) There is a possibility—though exceedingly remote—that a long delaying action, inflicting heavy losses on the enemy, might persuade Peiping to reconsider its rejection of a cease-fire aimed at promoting an honorable negotiated settlement. (3) Before it quits Korea—if it must quit—the UN should punish the aggression there to the greatest extent possible. And (4) the longer the Chinese Communists can be pinned down in that theater, and the more their losses in men and material, the better the chance of upsetting their timetable of attack elsewhere in Asia, notably in Indochina.

Needless to say, if these and similar political-military considerations make sense, or if the UN command under General MacArthur and our own security agencies in this country regard them as valid, then it is too early to dismiss as strategically futile the effort of our allied forces to retreat slowly and hold on as long as they can in Korea. Actually, of course, the pressures being exerted by Red China's massive armies may make this whole subject rather academic by obliging us in the near future to undertake a hasty evacuation in order to avoid a disastrous Dunkirk. In that case, however, the world will have reason to recognize the withdrawal as a fighting withdrawal made with honor against odds too heavy, and in a theater relatively not important enough, to justify a battle to the finish.

Finally, if this withdrawal must be made—whether soon or a considerable time from now—the United States and the United Nations as a whole should carry it out in a way that will serve notice on all peoples that it represents a lost battle, not a lost war, and that the struggle to uphold freedom, decency, and the rule of law in the world will continue unabated regardless of the set-back in Korea. To that end, one of the first things that the UN ought to do—and it can hardly delay much longer without stultifying itself—is to brand Red China as a criminal aggressor. That, at least, will keep the historical record straight.

Father Louis J. Mendelis: Citation for Mission Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, selection of any citizen as the outstanding figure nationally in any worthwhile field

of endeavor is always a matter for heartfelt commendation. Such an honor has come to one of Maryland's best known and best loved clergymen, the Reverend Louis J. Mendelis, pastor of St. Alphonsus Catholic Church in downtown Baltimore.

A National Catholic News Service story in the last issue of the Catholic Review, quoting from an article in the Priest magazine, published in Huntington, Ind., summarizes the extraordinary record Father Mendelis has compiled in contributing to the dissemination of religious teachings during the past 10 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the news item from the Catholic Review be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIEST IS CITED FOR CHARITIES

HUNTINGTON, IND.—During the past 10 years St. Alphonsus parish in downtown Baltimore has contributed more than $500,000 to the missions.

The 1950 total of $66,608.66 breaks down to $2,569.43 for the general mission fund; $44,270.23 for specific causes, $19,775 in mass stipends. The $50,000 mark has been passed every year since 1943–44. The peak was reached in 1945–46, with $80,785.18. The $500,000 figure, throughout the decade, is divided as follows: Ordinary, $28,192.15; specific causes, $329,382.03; mass intentions, $176,849.

The editors of the Priest magazine, published here, which carries this information in its current issue, believe that St. Alphonsus Parish has set a national record. "If we could give an annual award to one of America's priests in the name of the Priest," they state, "we would certainly nominate Father Louis J. Mendelis, pastor of St. Alphonsus, Baltimore, as its first winner."

Truman Blasts Specious Reasoning We Can Become Island to Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Tuesday, January 9, 1951:

TRUMAN BLASTS SPECIOUS REASONING WE CAN BECOME ISLAND TO OURSELVES

President Truman in his State of the Union message summons the spiritual and material resources of the American people to meet one of the darkest crises in the history of the Republic. He demands that the new challenge to the free world be met in a way that conforms to the Nation's traditions—honorably and courageously—that there shall be no concessions to the aggressors, and no evasions of duty.

The tone of the President's message was one of confidence. It reflected none of the doubts and qualms and the fears that have been finding such disturbing expression in Congress and elsewhere since the war in Korea changed from triumph to disaster.

The Nation's enemy and the enemy of freedom throughout the world is Russia. President Truman has no hesitancy in placing upon Russia the brand of an aggressor nation and the responsibility for the fear of war and the necessity of preparing for full-scale war. He left no doubt as to the course we must follow for our own security and that of the free world.

All of the genius and the energy of the American people must be devoted to the purpose of building invincible power with two possible results in view. One is the possibility that Russia, witnessing this development of strength, may be restrained from taking the risks involved in war. The other is effective resistance if Russia, in an hour of rashness, decides to strike.

The means to the desired ends are familiar. There is to be no departure from the charted course, although Congress is urged to debate the issues in a responsible way, to maintain unity of purpose without any lessening of the vitality of the two-party system.

We bring to the new challenge to our security our traditional assets—moral courage, our sincere concern for the preservation of peace, absence of any desire for national advantage, and a production capacity unequaled by any nation on earth. There is no reason why we should retreat before the threat of world conquest by Russia.

President Truman demolished the specious reasoning of those who still cling to the delusion that we can become an island to ourselves, made safe by two oceans and island defense lines. With the continent of Europe under hostile control and its mines and fields and industries producing for Russia, our own survival would hang delicately in the balance and, at best, our economy and way of life would be transformed. We cannot, either as a matter of honor or of expediency, throw our allies to the wolves, regardless of whether they are in Europe or in Asia.

In its general outlines, the Nation's program for the crisis remains unchanged. Basic is the accumulation of the strength which alone impresses the aggressor. The President concedes that the members of the North Atlantic Alliance, including the United States, have not been sufficiently effective in preparing for war.

Europe is a part of our own defensive system. It must continue to be helped in the building of its defenses. In Asia, freedom is equally sacred and must be safeguarded. Korea remains as a tragic symbol of both the danger to freedom and the obligation to defend it.

It was to be anticipated that issues concerned with war and security would be of transcendent importance in the President's message. It dealt also with such domestic issues as improved agricultural laws, labor laws to "make sure that we have steady production in this emergency, housing, the training of doctors and nurses and the needs of elementary and secondary education."

The message dealt adequately with the demands of the crisis. It is to be hoped that it will have the effect of causing the American people to close ranks in the face of the effort by the Russian Communist dictatorship to take over the world step by step.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the question of United States foreign policy, entitled "Giant in a Snare," appearing in the current issue of Time magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIANT IN A SNARE

Despite the skill, authority, and sincerity of the participants, the great debate on United States foreign policy still rang hollow. Through last week all sides had been more clear and forceful about what they didn't want than about what they did want. The "internationalists" warned of the dire consequences of losing allies, and the "isolationists" of the dire consequences of trying to save allies. Nobody held out any happier hope than averting the worst. There seemed to be no architects of foreign policy around—just building inspectors.

On every wall calamity teetered: Korea, the strained United States budget, laggard Western European defense, the danger of German rearmament, the weakness of the Middle East and Africa, the limitations of United States atomic bombing, the possibility of atomic attacks on the United States. No doubt the inspectors were right. Disaster lurked in all these places, and in others too. The United States horizon, however, could not be ringed with nothing but catastrophe. Some of that smoke was in the eyes of the beholders.

THAT HELPLESS FEELING

Odd, perhaps unparalleled in history, was this obsession with danger by leaders of a nation as strong as the United States. The beaten and the besieged naturally think in terms of survival, not of opportunity. For them, there is good reason to forget that, in human affairs, to concentrate on survival is an almost sure way not to survive. No such excuse is available for the unbeaten, for those with wide freedom of action, for those who stand at the summit of power and responsibility. The United States still stands there.

Five years ago, none doubted the United States strength. Now doubts are everywhere. No neighborhood saloon lacks a master strategist who can prove that the United States is helpless against the Reds in Korea or Indochina, or Iran, or France. Such calamity-howling Clausewitzes are twice as thick in the Senate as in the saloons, twice as thick in the State Department as in the Senate, and twice as thick in the Pentagon as in the State Department.

Has the relative strength of the United States in the world changed that much in 5 years? Actually, communism has made two—and only two—major gains; the atomic bomb and China. These two gains, great as they are, do not cut the United States down from the world's first power to impotence. The United States has made some gains of its own during the past 5 years. Basic national unity has never been stronger. Mounting production has benefited all sections of the United States people (not a conclusive argument for capitalism, but certainly a timely reminder that capitalism is not finished). United States grants have helped put Western Europe on its postwar feet. And the United States has finally made up its mind about communism, which it had not done 5 years ago.

The United States is still a giant. What makes it feel helpless? The answer might be to find what is wrong with the great debate.

THE ABSENTEE PIED PIPER

In recent decades, the United States has taken more and more pride in not wanting much from the rest of the world. It gives thanks that it is not as other great powers were, exploiters, conquerors, oppressors. In the case of the United States, the boast is not altogether pharisaical. Nor is it altogether virtuous. The peculiar history of the United States accounts for its lack of drive to dominate other lands. It expanded by picking up (rather easily) almost empty areas on its borders. Its rise is a story of internal growth, which now shows no sign of slackening—thus confounding the European economists, both Marxist and conservative, who are certain that industrialized nations must reach out for foreign markets. For better or worse, United States business just hasn't reached out.

The United States also lacks another kind of drive that has marked some great nations. Having absorbed on the basis of mutual tolerance the people of so many lands and creeds, the United States has not and cannot have a master-race complex or a lawgiver complex.

Nevertheless, the United States is very much in the world. The made-in-America tag is on the revolution of mass production that is disturbing the world far more profoundly than the reaction of Soviet communism. Two hundred years ago, only a few individuals could achieve material comfort. After the industrial revolution, only a few nations could achieve it. But the techniques of mass production unleashed by the Americans 40 years ago promise comfort for all—and the promise is an honest one, technically redeemable. This promise runs through the world (especially through Asia) like a Pied Piper, leading men to drop ancient ways of life and follow it. But the American is not on the ground to organize the energy released by this promise. Neither hope of profit nor love of domination takes the American to the spot. He is content to be a Pied Piper on television.

The Communist, however, is on the ground; he leads those lured by the absentee Pied Piper back to misery and slavery.

The United States, without meaning to, has let loose the most dynamic force in the world. The United States cannot silence the Pied Piper of progress. It can only try to redeem the promise of his pipes.

Failure to understand this at home and abroad frustrates the making of United States policy and accounts for both the wave of antiforeign sentiment sweeping the United States and the wave of anti-American sentiment in Europe and Asia.

THE HAND-WASHERS

Though foreigners would gasp to hear it, the American thinks of himself as a stable, passive element in a disturbed world. The foreigner knows better: He knows that America is a prime mover in the world's convulsions. When the American takes a step in international economic affairs the non-American, who does not understand the peculiar United States economic background, suspects him of hypocritically looking for profit or trying to impose the American way of life. Similarly, the United States from time to time gets into these unreal great debates over internationalism versus isolationism, because the American is caught between his own feeling of passivity and the dynamic reality: That Americanism is a highly explosive force acting on the world.

Thus the great debate of 1919–20 frittered out in an ignominious United States withdrawal from responsibility. The great debate of 1939–41 was getting nowhere when it was adjourned—but not really settled—by Pearl Harbor. Even before that war was over United States leaders at Yalta were washing their hands of responsibility. They agreed to lines that excluded from United States influence millions of Poles, Czechs, Germans, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and Chinese. Franklin Roosevelt, who grew up in the tradition of the high-walled American citadel, wanted to call World War II "The Survival War."

The symbol of the citadel, the wall, the defensive line, dominates the thought of even the most thoroughgoing American internationalists. The American does not see himself leaping the seas, like the Athenian or the Briton, to bring order and progress to distant lands, and from there look on to other distant opportunities. When the American leaps the seas he digs a ditch. He makes a perimeter and says, "Don't step over this."

This accounts for an ingrained habit of United States foreign policy makers: Drawing loops on maps to show what we will hold. Last week the United States political air was fuller of loops than a Wyoming rodeo. Secretary Acheson had the biggest loop, although it was frayed and limp and the knot kept slipping. It went around Western Europe, but maybe not Germany, and maybe not Spain, and probably not Africa. A separate strand encircled Greece and Turkey. All of Secretary Acheson's friends agreed that Iran should be inside the loop, but nobody was doing much about putting it there. India was probably inside, although it had not been persuaded that it ought to be. China, including Formosa, never had been there. Japan was. Korea wasn't until the Communists attacked it, and then it was and now most of it isn't again.

Ex-President Hoover's loop is smaller. It leaves out continental Europe, takes in England and Formosa and Japan. Ex-Ambassador Kennedy's takes in only the Western Hemisphere.

Instead of a big loop, Senator TAFT has a lot of little loops, each protecting an island. Senator TAFT even has some doubts that Malaya, which is only about 200 miles across and has some 1,000 miles of coastline, can be protected by sea power. No reasonable American will argue against Senator TAFT's main thesis that the United States should emphasize its sea and air power. But TAFT's definition of sea power is the most modest since Noah's. The British Empire, based on sea power, managed to hold secure great land masses as much as 1,500 miles from salt water, because the British regarded the sea not as a moat, but as a road.

THE BORDERERS

The citadel or loop mentality also explains the present confusion at Lake Success over what to do about the Korean War. The trouble goes back to the drafting of the UN charter. UN's goal should have been to establish and maintain international justice. Instead of this bold positive program, UN's goal became the prevention of aggression, narrowly defined. Aggression, for instance, did not include the undermining of one state by the arms and agents of another state, as in the Chinese civil war. It meant only the crossing of a border by the official army of the aggressor.

The North Koreans were defiant enough to transgress even this restricted legal loop. The UN instantly reacted. But when MacArthur was chasing the Korean Reds toward the thirty-eighth parallel, an outcry arose that showed how deeply the border-crossing fetish had sunk into the western mind. MacArthur, it was held, would himself become an aggressor if he crossed the parallel in pursuit of the criminal force.

Here was a conception brand new to the long and fruity annals of jurisprudence. Under this conception, if the policeman finds that the dagger has penetrated the victim's flesh, it is permitted that he seize the criminal by the wrist and force him to withdraw the knife but he may not take the dagger away, much less arrest the criminal.

At the time, the UN did not fall for this—quite. But worse was to come. As MacArthur approached the Chinese-Korean border, some of the border-minded began to howl as if the whole Eighth Army was marching up their spines. Then the Chinese poured over the border—but that did not count because it was not official; the Chinese Communist Government said that there was nobody killing Americans in Korea but us volunteers.

Since then, the Korean war has been well looped up. There was the heroic and brilliant loop around Hungnam, and the two brilliant ones around Seoul, and next, apparently, will be a loop around Pusan. Perimeters, however, even brilliant and heroic ones, have only two military purposes: to get out of and to move forward from. Where is the United States going to move from its Pusan perimeter (or from any of the other perimeters drawn by the participants in the great debate)?

THE NONPROVOKERS

When its forces were hit in Korea, the UN reacted as no law-enforcement agency ever had before. It politely invited the Chinese Government to come to Lake Success. Then appeared the unforgettable General Wu the only man in history (so far) to have the exquisite pleasure of telling a world organization of 60 nations representing 1,945,000,000 people to go climb a flagpole. General Wu was not much interested in borders, loops, or perimeters. He placed his government in the vanguard of "all the oppressed nations and peoples of the East," who are struggling either against foreign rule or their own governments. He clearly implied Chinese Communist help to the Reds of Japan, Indochina, and the Philippines.

General Wu's country is flat on its back. It has no heavy industry and not enough food for its people. But Wu, unlike the participants in the United States great debate, did not seem worried about his country overextending itself. He was looking for opportunities, not for survival. What's more, the free world's analysts conceded to China a very good chance of making good on Wu's threats to Japan and southeast Asia.

Since then, the UN and the United States have totally ignored the plain military and political opportunity to hit lawbreaker China in the flank with air and sea power. To do so would be to cross the border of China, just assaud by a gang of outbreaks who have no respect for anybody else's borders. The UN has been concentrating on the danger of provoking the Communists. Judging by the Communist reaction to UN politeness, nothing provokes a Red as much as nonprovocation.

Another factor inhibiting action against the mainland of China is that it is not included in anybody's conception of the free world's citadel, or perimeter, or loop. In other words, the loops do not keep the enemy out; they keep the forces of the free world in.

The United States seems to be trying to adjust to the world as it is, instead of leading the world where it wants to go and striking at the enemy who stands in the way. As long as the United States is passive, every specific problem from Indonesia to France is "impossible." If the United States takes the initiative, most of the problems will be seen as opportunities. The closest Secretary Acheson has come to recognizing this is to say that the United States is trying to create "situations of strength." But a situation of strength needs to be used to create new and greater situations of strength.

SAMPLES OF ACTION

Here are some specific examples of how the passive United States attitude paralyzes policy:

Item: The Berlin airlift was a benevolent situation of strength. The United States accepted the gratitude and enthusiasm of the Germans, made no real effort to develop these into permanent assets. The airlift has become in German minds just a sentimental folk memory, like Santa Claus. Everybody is in favor of Santa Claus, but how many divisions can he raise?

Item: Marshall plan aid to France (as to other countries) created a magnificent situation of strength. The passivists stood back and admired it, a monument of American generosity, and made no effective positive use of it. United States policy in France has failed and is still failing to get what the United States wants—a France that can

and will defend itself. A weak-kneed French Government is the obstacle. Weak-kneed United States policy actually supports that Government.

Item: Greatest situation of strength of all is in the Anglo-American alliance. This endures but it does not advance. At the moment, it is beset by suspicion and recriminations on both sides of the Atlantic. The British hang back because they cannot see just what, if anything, the Americans are trying to do.

Item: Spain is anti-Communist and has the largest army ($72,000) in Western Europe. It guards the Mediterranean and is a bridge to Africa. The passivists ignore Spain because it creates no crisis. If Spain had a Communist revolution, the country would suddenly seem all important to Washington. But as an asset? No interest.

Item: Iran stands between the Russians and the Middle East oil they would like to have and which Western Europe must have to live. The passivists look sadly at Iran's internal weakness and shake their heads. That is not the only way for an American to look at Iran. Last month a Time correspondent talked to United States engineers in Iran. Some spoke in glowing terms of a future in which Iran could support 50,000,000 people and be a breadbasket for the whole Middle East. One said, "Damn, I wish I were 35 instead of 55. Then I'd have 20 good years left in me to see this country bloom the way our own West has done." A man who can look at poverty-stricken Iran and see the Imperial Valley of California in the future obviously has not got his mind on mere survival or perimeters.

OPPORTUNITIES EVERYWHERE

No matter how long or short the loops on the map are doodled, they will never be the right size for a United States fire brigade to put out all the fires the enemy can start on them.

The United States and its allies, however, have the power—if they have the will—to move forward and build up the strength and resolution of the anti-Communist world. Who can draw a loop around that world? It runs up to the iron curtain. It runs behind the iron curtain. Scores of millions belong to it in Poland and in Hungary, in China and in Russia. All of them are potential allies. All of them are opportunities.

Sermon by Rev. John T. Jasper on "De Sun Do Move"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last week the President and other Government officials attended a morning service in a local Presbyterian Church to pray for peace. That evening at the Statler Hotel a similar service was led by the Reverend Billy Graham, of North Carolina.

Implicit in those services is the Christian faith that if God could help Joshua and the children of Israel in their efforts to possess the Promised Land, He can likewise help the true believers of the present age to achieve the goal of peace.

But one difference between Joshua, when he appealed to the Lord for help and some of us who now appeal to Him for help, is the fact that in Joshua's mind there was not the least doubt about the ability of the Lord to render help, even to the extent of commanding the sun to stand still in order that the children of Israel would have more daylight in which to win a complete victory.

In verse 12, chapter 10, of Joshua, we read, "Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gideon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon'."

That incident in the history of the children of Israel furnished a theme for a powerful sermon by one of the greatest Negro preachers the South has ever produced, John Jasper, of Richmond. My father as a student at Richmond College heard John Jasper preach his famous sermon, "De Sun Do Move."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Sunday, December 31, in which that famous sermon is discussed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DE SUN DO MOVE," JOHN JASPER'S DEFIANT CLAIM, IS RECALLED IN ANOTHER YOUNG PREACHER'S THESIS

(By Betty Sessler)

One Sunday in 1878 a Negro preacher, powerful in voice and build, told his people that the sun had moved and proved it by the Bible.

That sermon was to become one of the most controversial ever delivered in Richmond. The Reverend John T. Jasper, a former slave, whose great oratory and conviction in God was known far and wide, preached it 253 times before his death in 1901.

"De Sun Do Move," which also showed that the earth is square, is coming into its own again.

For the first time in 40 years, the sermon, supposedly in the dialect as Jasper delivered it, has been reprinted in book form. Taken from a book by William E. Hatcher, it has just been published by Dietz Press.

And a young minister, whose own life in some respects parallels that of John Jasper, has written his bachelor of divinity thesis on the eloquent preacher of the nineteenth century.

AS A STUDENT, HE SHINES

Isaac James, a 36-year-old porter at Hotel John Marshall, has been working his way through school most of his life. Ever since grammar grades, shoeshining has helped him gain an education. Last June he received his bachelor of divinity degree from Virginia Union University.

At present, James is assistant pastor at Sixth Mount Zion Baptist Church, the same church that Jasper founded in 1887 at the height of his fame. But, as in Jasper's earlier days, James' preaching activities are not full time. He still works at the John Marshall on weekdays.

Also, like his predecessor, James is a tall man with a strong voice. Jasper was over 6 feet; James stands 6 feet 3.

Here the resemblance ends. People who heard Jasper say that his conviction in God transcended mere grammar—that his whole being became a burning flame. But Jasper was poorly educated and his grammar bad. James is a college-trained man.

In the thesis on the man he admires, James uses Immanuel Velikovsky's Worlds in Collision to indicate that Jasper might have found some support today in his contention that the sun had moved.

JASPER'S CITATIONS

Jasper said, and James has rewritten the sermon without dialect:

"Joshua showed in the sight of all Israel that the sun do move because he stopped it; that proved that the sun was moving and moving over Joshua and the Amorites and, of course, they were nowhere else than on this here earth; and consequently it was moving around the earth and after the battle was over, it began moving again in its regular course. There it is proved that the sun do move around the earth."

[The Dietz version quotes Jasper as saying: "I doan't read when it wuz dat Joshwa hitch up an' drove on, but I spose it wuz when de Lord tol' him ter go. Ennybody knows dat de sun didn' stay dar all de time. It stopt fur bizniz an' went on when it got thru. Dis is 'bout all dat I has ter do with dis pertic'l'r case. I dun sho'd yer dat dis part uv de Lord's word teaches yer dat de sun stopt, which show dat he wuz movin' befo' dat, an' dat he went on art'rwuds. I toll yer dat I wud prove dis an' I's dun it, an' I derflee ennybody to say dat my p'int ain't made."]

"Now the great fact of the sun's rotation may be illustrated by many powerful texts in the Bible. I shall confine myself to the most striking ones.

"Notice Malachi, chapter 1, verse 11, and that comes from God's own mouth and there can be no better authority than God's authority. With His own lips He said, 'For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name shall be great among the Gentiles.' What strikes us here is that the 'sun do move.'

"And take Ecclesiastes, first chapter, fifth verse: 'The sun also riseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to His place where He arose.' There's evidence that He arose"—And so on.

CONCERNING THOSE "CORNERS"

From Revelations, chapter 7, verse 1, Jasper said: "And after these things I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any trees. Now the four angels that stood on the four corners of the earth are an evidence that the earth is square, and not round, for anything that has four corners is not round but square."

[From the Dietz version: "I envite yer to heer de fust vers in de sev'th chaptur uv de book uv Reverlasuns. What do John, und'r de pow'r uv de Spirit, say? He say he saw fo' anguls standin' on de fo' corners uv de earth, holdin' de fo win's uv de earth, an' so fo'th. 'Low me ter ax ef de earth is roun', whar do it keep its corners? Er flat, squar' thing has corners, but tell me whar is de cornur uv er appul, ur a marbul, ur a cannun ball, ur a silver dollar.

["Ef dar is enny one uv dem furloserfuns whar's been takin' so many cracks at my old haid 'bout here, he is korjully envited ter step for'd an' squar' up dis vexing bizniss. I here tell you dat yer karn't squar' a circul, but it looks lak dese great scolurs dun learn how ter circul de squar. * * *"]

In explaining the sermon, James points out that Worlds in Collision, of recent publication, gives scientific justification for many heretofore unexplainable events in the Old Testament. Dr. Velikovsky, the author, spent 10 years in research on the book, during which time he studied excavated history, the ancient texts, the folklore, and the sacred writings of people all over the world.

Says James, the author "has marshalled facts to prove, for instance, that the sun did stand still while Joshua routed the foe, that rivers did turn to blood, and that the waters of the Red Sea rolled up on one side.

"He also points out that our planet now rotates from west to east. Ancient charts, however, seem to suggest that this was not always so. The change in the direction of the earth, as well as the other cataclysmic happenings in the universe were caused, the author suggests, by another planet or comet coming too close to the earth."

James adds, however, that Velikovsky does not say, as Jasper did, that the sun moved. Rather he states that the earth slowed down on its orbit, causing the phenomena recorded in the Bible.

"De Sun Do Move" shocked many of the colored ministers in Richmond. The Reverend Richard Wells, pastor of the Ebenezer Baptist Church, led a group which denounced Jasper and his theory very bitterly in a letter in the Richmond Dispatch. The Reverend Wells expressed concern over sermons on "the sun running around the earth and the earth standing still."

Jasper answered the attacks firmly. In the following Sunday's sermon, he said, "I'm not afraid to speak what I have to say, if I was going to be killed for it 2 minutes afterward. I stick to the Bible. I have taken nothing from it and added nothing to it."

The minister preached the sermon 253 times, "journeying to Charlottesville, speaking before the Virginia Legislature, which adjourned to hear him, and making a brief and not too successful trip to the North."

According to James, "De Sun Do Move" is considered by churchmen one of Jasper's weakest sermons. Unusually long, it ran 90 minutes. The first part was exceptionally dull. The text selected, "The Lord God is a man of war; the Lord God is His name," had little bearing on what Jasper was to say later. He used the sermon to prove God had power over the earth and sun and could do what He wished in regard to the elements.

The sermon was preached after one of Jasper's members and another man had brought the question to him. The two had been discussing whether or not the sun moved and could not settle it between them.

JASPER'S EARLY LIFE

John Jasper was born July 4, 1812, in Fluvanna County, the twenty-fourth child of Philip and Tina Jasper, who were slaves on the plantation of the Peachy family. His father sometimes conducted funeral services for slaves. Later John was transferred to Williamsburg.

In 1825, at the age of 13, Jasper was sent to Richmond and hired out to Peter McHenry for a year. He then worked for a year for a Dr. Wooldridge in Chesterfield County in the coal mines. The next year he returned to Richmond and was hired out to Samuel Cosby to work in a tobacco factory at Sixteenth and Cary Streets. He worked there for 6 or 7 years.

Following Cosby's death, Jasper went to work for Samuel Hargrove, a member of First Baptist Church and a deeply religious man. He later had a large influence in Jasper's life.

About this time came Jasper's first marriage which was annulled. He wed three other times, the second marriage ending in divorce and the third in death of his wife. His fourth wife survived him.

In his early life Jasper was described as living a gay and reckless life. He was popular with the women. There was no indication that he was inclined toward religion.

JASPER'S CONVERSION

James explains that Jasper's twenty-seventh birthday coincided with a celebration for the Fourth of July and all factory workers were given a holiday. In the midst of festivities in the Capitol Square, Jasper was seized with a conviction of his sins. For several weeks he fought the feeling and suffered from despondency.

Following the conversion, Jasper became a preacher but still was a slave. Illiterate until the conversion, he was taught to spell by an old slave named William Jackson and made rapid headway in reading the Bible. He could recite it almost word for word. The Bible, says James, became the source of all his knowledge and final arbiter of all his judgment.

Slave owners wished their slaves to be Christianized but insisted upon supervision by white preachers. Jasper first became known as a funeral preacher. Those who invited him to preach had to pay Hargrove $1 for each day he was away from the factory, with the exception of Sundays.

One time Jasper was invited to preach in Henrico County. Upon reaching the place, he was informed that he could not preach because of his race. Dr. Winfree, who had invited him, stated he wanted Jasper to preach and would stand the consequences of the law.

The white preacher also invited to participate, however, was so shocked to learn he was to share the pulpit with a Negro that he consumed 2 hours of the 2½ hours allotted for the service, leaving little time for Jasper.

James reports that people sat patiently during the first long talk. Jasper then spoke for 15 or 20 minutes, and greatly moved his audience. He was invited to preach many, many times after that.

FREEMAN AND PASTOR

Before the outbreak of the Civil War, Jasper was called to the Third Baptist Church in Petersburg to preach, on the third and fourth Sundays of each month. Under the law, however, he could not be an ordained minister; so a white man had to be named the official pastor of the church.

The end of the Civil War brought freedom for Jasper, but he was broke and jobless. For several months he worked on the streets of Richmond, cleaning bricks and helping with reconstruction.

He again was called to the Petersburg church, and a year later went to Weldon, N. C., where he organized the First Baptist Church, still in existence.

In 1866 Jasper came back to Richmond to start a church among his own people. The first was a shanty on Browns Island in the James River. Nine members of the church paid him $9 a week. People from all over the city came to hear him preach, and hundreds were baptized in the waters of the James.

Jasper moved his church several times, once to a stable and once to an abandoned carpenter's shop. Finally he found a church at St. John and Duval Streets, large enough to hold 300 people. The building had belonged to Presbyterians who sold it for $2,025 when the neighborhood changed from white to Negro. The debt was paid off in 3 years.

The membership grew so fast that in a short time an annex, costing $5,000, was built in the rear. As soon as the debt was paid the old part of the building was remodeled at a cost of $1,200. That debt, too, was paid off in a hurry.

Even this building was inadequate. When Jasper was more than 70 he started building a new church on West Duval Street at the cost of $20,000. This was Sixth Mount Zion Church, finished in 1890. The church had a membership of over 2,000.

Jasper died on March 31, 1901, the same day the old Jefferson Hotel burned down. Hundreds of people attended his funeral. Among those heard at the service was the Rev. W. E. Hatcher, a white minister from whose biography of Jasper the Dietz printing is taken.

So well known was Jasper that groups of all kinds paid their respects. According to James, Dr. F. W. Boatwright, chancellor of the University of Richmond, recalls that so many Richmond College men attended his services that the nickname "Jasper" was given to all ministerial students at the college.

The Strong Right Arm of Air Power—Report by Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the able and energetic Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, spoke at a regional meeting of the Aviation Writers Association held at the Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex. It was appropriate that Mr. Zuckert should have spoken before such a group, and in the great State of Texas. Texas is an air-minded State and a defense-minded State, and it is represented in this Congress by defense-minded men. The junior Senator from Texas, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, heads the "watchdog subcommittee" of the Senate Committee on Armed Services that is set up to find flaws, if any, in our spending program. The gentleman from Texas, Congressman GEORGE MAHON, is the chairman of the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations that screens the request for funds of the military services. No one ever questions the defense-mindedness of men of Texas.

There are many Air Force installations in Texas, and a number of important items of Air Force equipment are made in Texas. The big B-36, which carries the Sunday punch of our Air Force is made there. The B-36 is the intercontinental bomber that can deliver the retaliatory counterattack if an enemy dares to strike us. It is the backbone of our strategic Air Force which is our best hope of survival.

Mr. Zuckert spoke at Waco on December 2, at the end of the week that had seen the battle turn in Korea and the forces of the United Nations begin their withdrawal. It was a week of tension and of fear. It was the beginning of a grim period.

It is late to say what should have been done, but not too late to recognize what we must now do. The Air Force budget for the fiscal year 1951 is $14,000,000,000. This is more than the entire defense budget for the last fiscal year.

What this money will buy the Air Force is a start toward the fulfillment of the 34-group program. In the words of Mr. Zuckert:

This budget request provides for the procurement of the most modern planes designed to equip the Air Force. Even in last year's budget 31 percent was allocated to aircraft—47 percent of the new budget is given to aircraft and related procurement. Fifty-six percent of all our funds will go into

all the major procurement needed for our job.

Our 1950 budget provided for the ordering of 1,251 planes for about 1.3 billion. Under the new program we will have slightly more than five times that amount of money or 6.6 billion new money for aircraft and related procurement; more than the total Air Force budget last year.

Mr. Zuckert went on to name other items in the Air Force budget that are just as important as aircraft procurement. There will be 651,095 military people in the Air Force by June 30, 1951, in comparison with 411,277 on the same date this year. Paying them will call for an increase of 50 percent in the budget for that purpose.

There is a fivefold increase in the budget for industrial mobilization—for industrial studies and production tools.

There is a hundred-percent increase in the budget for research and development programs.

The sound principles of cost control through management control, established by Mr. Symington and Mr. Zuckert and maintained under the leadership of the new Secretary of the Air Force, Thomas K. Finletter, will serve the Air Force well in meeting problems presented by an increased budget and a rapidly increasing Military Establishment. It is the job of the Air Force to make every tax dollar count. Only by doing so can we make up for lost time.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all Members of this Congress may have the opportunity to review Mr. Zuckert's able presentation of the Air Force budget, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As Mr. Zuckert said:

The Air Force has not been deluded by Korea. Korea is neither the test nor the major problem. The Air Force knows that strategic air power is still the hope of survival. The great need is to be poised against the major force.

Maintaining that posture of readiness places on all of us tremendous responsibilities, Mr. Zuckert pointed out:

As individuals and as groups we must be willing to place less emphasis on our ideas about economic security; security now must be measured in the fundamental terms of life, liberty, and protection.

The remarks by Mr. Zuckert are as follows:

No other week in recent history has been as crucial as the week which draws to a close tonight.

We have watched three vital focal points: Korea, the United Nations, and Washington. Being in the latter city, I have felt the tension, known the dangers, and feared the worst.

We are in what we can call, without in any way being trite, a grim period. It is a period we have seen coming, you and I. But too many refused to admit 2 years ago, a year ago, or even 6 months ago, that it would come.

It is now upon us.

But we are not helpless. Certainly the week now ending has made even the most blind among us realize our danger. It has, even though that fact may have been forgotten in the hours of concern, brought us closer together.

It has given us a unity that, so very unfortunately, we apparently only reach in times of disaster, in times of danger. A unity which, if we could achieve it in untroubled times, would drive this Nation forward to the greatest period of wealth, prosperity, and happiness ever achieved in modern civilization.

It is ironic when you recall that just about 9 years ago we were plunged into World War II—9 years ago next Thursday. Think of that. And think, too, that this war has been over more than 5 years. Yet today we find we are in the same position, in many ways, as we were during that war.

And in one most important way we are in a position much more perilous. During the war we had a recognized enemy, we could vent our anger and channel our strength against that enemy. We were locked in combat, and that combat was the test as to whether we, and our way of life, would survive.

But in recent days we have been bounced around like a rubber ball. We are built up to one crisis, then we are lulled; we bound, then rebound.

And the hard cruel fact is that we may be in this position for 10, for 20, yes, even for 25 years.

We find no peace.

Yet you and I and all other people in this country still have faith. The same faith that inspired those men 9 years ago to fight on—even when so often outnumbered.

Lacking faith we would have, long ago, made one of two simple choices: either to blindly say there is no threat to our way of life and live accordingly; or, admitting the threat, immediately strike at its heart with only our fear for provocation.

Having faith we choose neither of those courses. Instead we have begun to build our strength and at the same time explore every possible avenue which might lead to peace; avenues which, during the last few weeks, have become fewer.

Our faith, however, has kept the most important peaceful means of achieving peace open to us, the United Nations. And, during the year which is coming to an end, we have seen the United Nations take long strides toward becoming a determined, quick-acting force for world peace.

We have learned, with a finality which should serve as a guidepost for generations to come, the fallacy of what Defense Secretary Marshall calls the feast and famine cycles in our military strength.

We are now paying the price of the post-World War II famine. And the price will not be painless and, as we look to Korea, we know it isn't bloodless.

The price, sacrifice, in blood and in dollars and cents, will go up—not come down.

We have, thankfully, refused to allow the Korean War or even the catastrophic Chinese situation to take our eyes from the focal point of world unrest. We know, and the evidence is ample to bear us out, that Communist Korea would never have started its aggression unless it had been needled by an imperialistic power bent on world conquest.

We know today that we are facing a real menace. It was this that brought forth the supplemental budget request of the Defense Department announced by the President this week.

The request to Congress asked for $18,000,000,000. Of this the Air Force's portion is approximately a little over $4,500,000,000. This brings the Air Force budget for the fiscal year of 1951 to $14,000,000,000. This is more than the entire defense budget for the last fiscal year.

As you are vitally interested in air power and the Air Force, I know you want to know what this Air Force request means.

In fiscal year 1950, we had 48 groups. Today, because of the Korean emergency we have additional groups in operation, plus, as was revealed in Washington yesterday, a program for 68 groups by the end of fiscal year 1951 and 84 groups by the end of fiscal year 1952.

This budget request provides for the procurement of the most modern planes designed to equip the Air Force. Even in last year's budget 30 percent was allocated to aircraft—47 percent of the new budget is given to aircraft and related procurement. Fifty-six percent of all our funds will go into all the major procurement needed for our job.

Our 1950 budget provided for the ordering of 1,251 planes for about one and three-tenths billions. Under the new program we will have slightly more than five times that amount of money, or six and six-tenths billions new money for aircraft and related procurement; more than the total AF budget last year.

Because of this comparison the budget request for aircraft procurement may seem high, but compare the rate of output under this program with 1944, during the height of World War II. In that year we were turning out eight to ten thousand planes a month; deliveries for all of last year would have been less than a week's production at the peak World War II rate. Under our program, if it is approved by Congress, the output will still be only a small percentage of the World War II figure.

The other items in this Air Force budget are just as important as aircraft procurement. The total 1951 budget, including the new request, contains a 40 percent increase for pay and allowances for Air Force personnel, necessitated, of course, by our growth. We will have next June 30, 651,095 military people in the Air Force compared with the 411,277 with which we started the fiscal year in July.

We cannot overlook the fivefold increase in 1951 budget for industrial mobilization. This breaks down into two parts: industrial studies and production tools.

The industrial studies are an integral part of the development of any modern industry or of any modern air force, it is, to phrase it simply, necessary planning for the contingency of an all-out mobilization. What will X number of factories need to turn out Y number of turrets, guns, or life rafts? We cannot plan for Air Force development while ignoring the capacity and the capabilities of the industries upon which we must depend.

And we cannot, certainly, ask them to assume the task of appraising their potential based on our own needs. We must help them with their planning and their development. We will have to concentrate on our tooling. Some special-purpose tools take 2 to 4 years to build. If we were forced into total mobilization next September or a year from September, we could not, overnight, build these tools. As for our general-purpose tools, our tool reserve saved from World War II cannot meet our plans.

Now we will have a start on building them. If they are never needed, will anyone condemn us for having been prepared? If they should be needed—and had not been ordered—what then?

We are in much the same position with our research and development programs. The budget for the current fiscal year, including our latest request, increases our spending on research and development by more than 100 percent over last year.

This is because air power, as you know, is in a peculiarly fast moving phase: the phase of jets, supersonic speeds, electronics and atomic warfare. Research is advancing into fields undreamed of a decade ago.

I have been talking about specific items. Now I'd like to say just a word on the overall budget. We have devoted a lot of time in the Air Force since 1946 toward better management of our resources. We are going to continue to work to make every tax dollar

count: We are, with all the training and ability at our command, going to make up for lost time.

The burden will be so great that we must drive ourselves to make sure that every dollar spent buys a dollar's worth of protection.

Let us not overlook that the money we are to be appropriated does not include funds for arming our allies under the Military Defense Assistance Pact. There are still policy problems to be settled at the international level before we will know the cost in dollars and cents.

Even with the evolution of the military assistance program we should not lull ourselves into a false sense of security. Even if our allies, or our potential allies, were fully equipped, fully trained and fully conditioned, psychologically, the defense of this country would still be primarily our job.

We must never forget that we can never match the hordes of communism, man for man. What we must do instead, is to make up for quantity with quality.

A program of this magnitude and I have talked mostly about the Air Force part of it—places tremendous responsibilities. As individuals and as groups, we must be willing to place less emphasis on our ideas about economic security; security now must be measured in the fundamental terms of life, liberty, and protection.

We will have to call upon more men and women for Government service, both in uniform and out of uniform. We are going to have to call for the help of more and more able men on specialized jobs. I don't need to tell you how hard it is to get the right men to fill even jobs that carry the prestige of Presidential appointment.

But, just as important, in many instances, are the jobs on down the line. We need ability in supply, we need it in maintenance, in procurement—we will need outside help particularly in the many activities on the business side of the Air Force.

Modern warfare has made obsolete the day when 50,000 men could go to battle with only a skeleton force of civilians completing the military structure behind them.

The very complexity of modern war, the very rapid change of weapons, demands the highly trained men and women in the factory, at the planning board and untaping the red tape around the stacks of paper work.

We need them, if I may repeat myself, as part of our drive to make up for quantity with quality.

On this same subject I'd like to pay tribute to a couple of fine men from this great State of Texas. The first is your junior Senator, LYNDON JOHNSON. Under Senator JOHNSON'S hard-hitting leadership the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is already doing a wonderful job finding the flaws in our spending program.

This may seem strange coming from me. After all, I'm one of the men who, in the end, has to take the rap for some of the mistakes the Senator's committee uncovers, and will uncover.

But I can't duck responsibility. We can't delude ourselves; certainly some of the mistakes Senator JOHNSON'S committee has turned up are too ludicrous to seem believable.

There have been mistakes, there will undoubtedly be more. But as far as it is humanly possible they will be avoided and, once pointed out they will be corrected.

The Air Force today, the whole preparedness effort is too big to be perfect. Every week, I and a lot of other people have to make decisions which add up to millions and millions of dollars, often under terrific time pressure. Sometimes we make mistakes; sometimes we act on other's mistakes.

Because of this a committee such as Senator JOHNSON'S is invaluable. Our Government was built on the system of checks and balances; during this present defense emergency the Johnson subcommittee will, I believe, prove to be a worthy successor to the Truman committee, a great money-saving check and balance.

The other Texan I'd like to mention along the same line is Congressman GEORGE MAHON. He is the hard-working and quietly efficient chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, which screens the request for funds of the military services. We respect, and his fellow Members of both Houses respect, his vigorous fairness born of his wholehearted desire to make our country strong at the least possible cost.

I would like to touch briefly on some particular phases of the work of the Air Force in Korea. From General MacArthur on down the Air Force has been praised for its all-out effort. Without Air Power we would have been pushed into the sea during the early days of that struggle.

That is not my statement. That is the statement of military men on the scene—men in services other than the Air Force.

Today we have evaluation teams on the scene to determine how well we did our job.

If these teams report mistakes, we'll accept their recommendations. The Air Force is flexible in its leadership and thinking; it can change and bend with the situation. It can move quickly to adopt new and better methods.

There has been criticism of tactical air support. But even many making criticism fail to realize tactical air support is divided into three phases: Air superiority—the air has to be cleared of the enemy so our fighters can live; interdiction of the battlefield; the cutting off of supply and communications. This is something the average front line infantryman doesn't see—because it happens in back of enemy lines—but it is what saves lives, and wins wars.

And finally, the third phase, which is, close support. That we do too. And we think we have done a good job of it. There are a lot of infantrymen in Korea who have said so, too. We believe that when the full report on our job is made the country will say "well done."

The Air Force has not been deluded by Korea. Korea is neither the test nor the major problem. The Air Force knows that strategic air power is still the hope of survival. The great need is to be poised against the major force.

A strategic air force with its atomic threat is our greatest defense factor today.

There is not now—nor is there in the foreseeable future—a sure, push-button defense for this continent. To say that there is would be false—and being false—it would be dangerous. We are constructing the best defense that research modern electronics and aircraft can buy. Our best defense is the strong right arm, the potential striking power of strategic air represented by the B-29, the B-50, the B-47 to come and the B-36 made here in Texas.

Nothing has happened in Korea to change that fact.

In conclusion let me voice a warning. I may not have been too optimistic tonight—but these are not optimistic times.

I must say this. There is no easy way out.

Right now we are only buying time.

How long we have to buy time, none of us here in this room knows.

If this were the war we might speculate. We could say, "Well, if we can gain objective X, then the war won't last more than 3 months or 6 months after."

We are deprived of the luxury of speculation.

The test, then, is whether we are willing to keep up the pace without the war to keep the pace for us.

With the help of God and the unity of our people, I feel that it can be done so that men may be free in a world without fear.

The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

I. KOREA

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker. President Truman had authority and power under section 2 of article II of our Constitution to order American troops into Korea. The power given to Congress in section 8 of article I of the Constitution to raise and support armies and to make rules for their government and regulation undoubtedly authorizes Congress to limit the use of troops, especially through restrictions on the expenditure of funds appropriated for their maintenance and their transportation, but there were no such limitations imposed by Congress prior to President Truman's sending of American troops into Korea. The President's obligation and liability for national security as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces necessarily leaves to him the matter of determining how far he must go within his powers to fulfill that obligation unless so limited by Congress.

The action of the North Koreans in sending armed forces across the thirty-eighth parallel in June constituted aggression in violation of agreements to which the United States was a party and President Truman could consider his action necessary to stop such aggression.

The lack of adequate logistical preparation for his move and the subsequent moving in of Chinese Communists did not cause his original move to exceed his power.

II. EUROPE

Unless Congress places restrictions and limitations on the use to be made of the Armed Forces of the United States before additional troops are sent to Europe the President as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces undoubtedly has power to send additional armed forces to Europe even though he intends them to operate there as part of a great international army. His part in building a large armed force in Western Europe in advance of aggression may be considered by him as necessary under his responsibility for our national security, especially in view of the comparative size and strength of Russia and her method of operation.

III. WAR

The power of Congress extends to all legislation essential to the prosecution of a war with vigor and success, except such as interferes with the command of

the forces and the conduct of the campaigns—*Ex parte Milligan* (4 Wall. 2 139); *Swaim* v. *United States* (165 U. S. 553).

Calling the war in Korea a police action should not change this principle.

IV. PUBLIC OPINION

Whatever remonstrance is made by Congress or the people against any decision made or action taken by the President within his lawful powers can only serve to influence him in his further decisions as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. The exercise of such influence by Congress and by the people can be far-reaching and quite effective and the views and the influence of the people are generally sound and very helpful. But there have been some noted results of the exercise of such influence that were not helpful in building our national security, for example, the rapid demobilization of our Armed Forces at the end of World War II and the rapid disposal of our supply of arms and ammunition in the years following. The error of judgment by the people in 1945 however should not be considered as proof that the people are today wrong who advocate withdrawal from Korea and concentration on the more rapid and extensive building of our Armed Forces. Be that as it may, the power to make the final decision is the President's and he can either accept or decline to accept suggestions.

V. AUTHORITATIVE VIEWS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S POWER

There has been surprisingly little authoritative writing on the matter of the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces but I gathered together a few statements of interest and included them in my debate in Congress on the proposed compulsory service legislation, August 14, 1940. I shall here repeat a portion of my 1940 discussion in the hope that it may be helpful to those who are interested.

Charles Warren, in his book The Making of the Constitution, at page 530, makes the following statement:

On August 27, 1787, another power suggested by the committee was granted to the President, without debate (so far as appears from Madison's notes) that of "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States." Such a power had been vested in the State governors in practically all the State constitutions; and in some the governor had few powers or functions other than military.

The foregoing statement explains why they did not debate the matter very thoroughly in the Constitutional Convention. So going back to the Constitutional Convention you cannot find any very great light on the division of power between the President and the Congress in the matter of national defense. The wording of the Constitution, of course, is quite general.

The annotations of the Constitution of the United States have few references therein to discussions by our Supreme Court of the peacetime power of the President. In some of these cases the statement is made that Congress has the power not only to raise and support armies and to make rules for their government and regulation but to declare war and that it has therefore the power to provide by law for carrying on war. The Court in these cases states further that the command of forces and the conduct of campaigns are powers derived from the Constitution, but inasmuch as neither is defined by that instrument, their extent must be determined by their nature and by the principles of our institutions. The Court states also that the power to make the necessary laws is in Congress and the power to execute is in the President, and each includes all authority essential to its due exercise "but neither can the President, in war more than in peace, intrude upon the proper authority of Congress, nor Congress upon the proper authority of the President"—*Ex parte Milligan* (4 Wall. 2, 139 (1866)); *Swaim* v. *United States* (28 C. Cls. 173, 221 (1893), affirmed 165 U. S. 553 (1897)).

Prof. Edward S. Corwin, on the President's control of foreign relations, states:

I conclude that the Presidential power under survey (the right to perform acts of war without congressional authorization where the question is as to his right to take measures which are technically acts of war in protection of American rights abroad) is somewhat analogous to the so-called right of self-preservation at international law. Theoretically the power is a defensive power and reserved for grave and sudden emergencies. Practically, the limit to it is to be found in the powers of Congress and public opinion.

Elihu Root, in a famous debate in the Senate in 1912, made the following statement:

In my judgment, there is no law which forbids the President to send troops of the United States out of this country into any country where he considers it to be his duty as Commander in Chief of the Army to send them, unless it be for the purpose of making war, which, of course, he cannot do.

Doubtless, Congress could by law forbid the troops being sent out of the country; doubtless Congress has not done it; and I apprehend that any Congress which undertook to do it would find a general protest from the people of the United States against depriving the Commander in Chief of the Army of the power to protect our citizens under those circumstances which exist widely throughout the world, in countries whose governments have not the power to maintain order within their jurisdiction. From time immemorial it has been the practice of civilized nations to send troops into those countries whose governments were too feeble or too ill-organized, too deficient in power to enforce their laws and protect foreigners.

This has primarily to do, of course, with protecting our own citizens abroad.

Prof. Clarence A. Berdahl, in his book, War Powers of the Executive in the United States, has the following to say:

An eminent authority [Elihu Root] thinks that Congress could probably by law forbid the troops being sent out of the jurisdiction of the United States in time of peace; but in time of war the authority of the President is recognized as being absolute as to where the war is to be conducted, whether to await the onslaughts of the enemy and wage a purely defensive war within the boundaries of the United States, or to send the Armed Forces of the United States out of the country to carry on an offensive war in the enemy territory, in the territory of an ally, or perhaps even in the territory of a neutral.

William Howard Taft, in one of his lectures on Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, had the following to say:

The President is the Commander and Chief of the Army and Navy, and the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation. Of course, the instrumentality which this power furnishes, gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. Under the Constitution, only Congress has the power to declare war, but with the Army and the Navy, the President can take action such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no option but to declare it or to recognize its existence. This was the charge made against President Polk in beginning the Mexican War. War as a legal fact, it was decided by the Supreme Court in prize cases, can exist by invasion of this country by a foreign enemy or by such an insurrection as occurred during the Civil War, without any declaration of war by Congress at all, and it is only in the case of a war of our aggression against a foreign country that the power of Congress must be affirmatively asserted to establish its legal existence.

What constitutes an act of war by the land or naval forces of the United States is sometimes a nice question of law and fact. It really seems to differ with the character of the nation whose relations with the United States are affected. The unstable condition as to law and order of some of the Central American Republics seems to create different rules of international law from those that obtain in governments that can be depended upon to maintain their own peace and order. It has been frequently necessary for the President to direct the landing of naval marines from United States vessels in Central America to protect the American consulate and American citizens and their property. He has done this under his general power as Commander in Chief. It grows not out of any specific act of Congress but out of that obligation, inferable from the Constitution, of the Government to protect the rights of an American citizen against foreign aggression, as in the Kotza incident, cited by Mr. Justice Miller in the Neagle case. In practice the use of the naval marines for such a purpose has become so common that their landing is treated as a mere local police measure, whereas if troops of the Regular Army are used for such a purpose, it seems to take on the color of an act of war.

Thus it would be difficult to explain the landing of our Army in Vera Cruz by force as anything but an act of war to punish the government of Huerta in Mexico for its refusal to render what was deemed by President Wilson as a proper apology for a violation of our international rights in the arrest of some of our sailors. This act was committed before authority was given by Congress, but the necessary authority for it had passed one House and was passing another at the time, and the question as to the right of the Executive to take the action without congressional authority was avoided by full and immediate ratification.

In Nicaragua in my administration an insurrection had led to the immurement of American citizens by insurrectos and the threatened destruction of American property. The President of Nicaragua, whom we had recognized and whose minister we had received, called upon us to protect our own citizens and their property because he was unable to render them the protection which their treaty rights gave them. This led to the landing of marines, and quite a campaign, which resulted in the maintenance of law and order and the elimination of the insurrectos. This was not an act of war because it was done at the request and with the consent of the lawful authorities of the territory where it took place.

Food Is a Weapon of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, in voicing the opinion of a constituent of mine, as well as many of the service clubs of Nevada, urgently contacting my office, I strongly recommend that all possible action be taken to draw attention and action of the administration to the immediate use of surplus food as an important weapon of war.

In time of war, food supplies are one of the most valuable tools for victory. Many wars have been won or lost on the single issue of food supplies. We are told that the Russians have been feverishly storing vast stocks of foodstuffs ever since 1945. And, if we become involved in a great war, the ultimate decision may well hinge on the extent of our reserves of food.

It so happens that our Government, in its tremendous price support and stabilization programs in recent years, has acquired vast stocks of all kinds of foods. We have purchased this food and now own it. Food commodities held in storage by the Federal Government are estimated as follows:

	Pounds
Dried milk	320,700,000
Cheese	106,100,000
Butter	191,800,000
Dried eggs	110,595,296
Beans, dry, edible	942,700,000
Peas, dry, edible	76,600,000
Rice, rough	7,500,000
Mexican meat	52,623,504
Grain sorghum	3,052,500,000

These stocks are spread in a hit or miss fashion throughout the Nation. They exceed food storage capacities and we have the incredible situation in which thousands of tons of grain lie unprotected from the weather and subject to spoilage. We also have the unbelievable situation in which one of the prime sinews of war—foodstuffs—is allowed to stand in great concentration without protection from sabotage. At this time much of this material is not under guard of any kind. Certainly food storage has always been a legitimate objective in wartime, and surely our food stocks will be one of the first aims of Communist sabotage in this country. This material should be placed under guard immediately. The damage could start at any hour.

We have been told that Russia may have the power to overrun much of Europe. Whether true or not, certainly it is the part of wisdom to have large stocks of food in Europe before warfare breaks and before submarine activity may sink much of it en route. This American surplus food might well be stored in Britain, and behind the Pyrenees Mountains in Spain. The outbreak of open warfare, if it comes, will place great premium on shipping space. The saving in time and space of having huge food storage already in Europe would be highly practical. It should of course be properly protected against sabotage and weather.

We are now preparing a vast civil-defense program on a Nation-wide basis. Certainly reserve food storage, using this surplus food, should be a part of this program. The dispersal of this food throughout the Nation would seem wise. The placement of it for use by communities most likely to be subject to attack, or along routes most likely to be used for civilian evacuation would be most timely. It should of course, be protected from the weather, animals, deterioration, and sabotage.

It is vital that we demand that our surplus food supply be protected immediately from sabotage, waste, and deterioration. We must further demand that large stocks of our food supply be shipped abroad immediately to those spots deemed most strategic by our military—not diplomatic—authorities, and given the same protection before mentioned. We must also demand that large stocks of our food supply be shipped and stored under protection in those areas of our own Nation deemed by our military authorities to be most likely to be subjected to enemy action, or to be used as routes and staging areas in possible evacuation of large elements of our population. Food as a weapon of war must be taken into consideration in our program of defense.

The Good Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is mentally refreshing and invigorating in these days of national and international stress and strain, when so many persons are voicing complicated procedures by which we may be able to escape from the dangers lurking around us, to be able to read an editorial direct from the grass roots of American thinking—an editorial so simple and fundamental that it can easily be understood and appreciated by all, and, an editorial which presents a most constructive way by which the people of America can protect their priceless heritage in the enjoyment of our inherent freedoms.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Eagle Valley Enterprise, Eagle, Colo., of January 4, 1951:

THE GOOD LIFE

For the first time since the American Revolution, with the exception of the War Between the States, the people of our country are faced with a stark test of faith. The conflict with world communism now is not to save the world for democracy, but to repel an enemy who is determined to destroy in our own land the Christian ideal of human dignity and individual liberty and the political system which upholds that ideal. Our faith and our strength is this ideal.

As a Nation, we came through World War II with little discomfort. Living standards have risen to record levels. So has the public debt, which is exacting its toll in depreciating money. However, it is evident that devalued dollars have not yet cramped our style. Last year, according to the Commerce Department, United States citizens spent a staggering $178,832,000,000. The fabulous American way is well illustrated in a current joke which defines a pedestrian as a motorist who has found a place to park his car. The list of American "haves" could go on indefinitely. Already there are 8,000,000 television sets in our homes—homes which are equipped with tens of millions of deep freezes, refrigerators, electric stoves, radios, washing machines, etc.

In retrospect after nearly two centuries of freedom and the boundless progress that only freedom could have achieved, it would be a wonder if we were not confused when suddenly confronted with the prospect of a fight for actual survival. But the time when we can afford confusion has nearly run out. These words of Lenin, uttered 30 years ago, are to be considered: "As long as capitalism and socialism remain we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism. We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealment and veiling of the truth."

This is the ruthless concept, backed by vast military force which is confronting America and the world. To meet it we will need more than arms and men. We will have to lay our sights on primary objectives and keep them there. We must forget the adolescent notion that material security is an unqualified right. The rights embodied in the American ideal are few and elemental. They include equality of opportunity, freedom of speech and religion, and the protection of private property. They are the tools with which the individual may achieve life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Our country was not founded to furnish glamorous offices for politicians, or to produce goods and services, or hand-outs of easy money—this country was founded to make men free. In the wealth of material comfort we have enjoyed so long, we have tended to forget the truth—we must return to the fundamental—this country was founded to make men free.

We must fight with all we have against our enemies outside. And, while we are undergoing all the sacrifices and trials that may involve, we must keep our people free. One of the greatest dangers from within is that we may grant so much unlimited authority to the Government that the system of check and balance which stands between us and tyranny will be permanently destroyed; economic controls should be imposed only if they are clearly necessary in the war effort—not control for control's sake, which is the essence of dictatorship. Control only tends to cripple productive capacity, and what is far more important, we will no longer

be a free people, we have lost the battle at home, through our own Government.

We cannot go on under the full Government control which had its birth 20 years ago—the aftermath of a world-wide war—and which has been nourished by the Second World War to be fattened on a third.

We Americans have come to a climactic phase in the history of the good life. It is our duty to hold together for future generations the framework of freedom which made that good life possible. We must push aside our selfish wish for greenback-lined pockets, presented to us by Government dole and return to the initiative of our forebears who established this country on a firm foundation of free enterprise, with the right of self-control.

Result, Minus Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year, by availing myself of a parliamentary device, I delayed for some time an additional appropriation of funds for the so-called House District Crime Subcommittee on the grounds that the chief legal counsel employed by them, a Hyman Fischback, of New York, was not doing a good job and that his past history indicated that he would not do a good job.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an editorial from the Washington Daily News of Thursday, January 11, 1951, which indicates that my fears at that time have been borne out.

I will have more to say about Mr. Fischback and the results of his alleged crime investigation at a later date.

The editorial follows:

RESULT, MINUS NOTHING

The Kefauver committee investigating Nation-wide crime pays its counsel, Rudolph Halley, $6,000 a year. The special House District Subcommittee which made an abortive investigation into a relatively limited phase of local crime has already paid its counsel, Hyman I. Fishback, $10,000 for services from October 26, 1949, to September 18, 1950.

In addition, Mr. Fischback was reimbursed $1,700 for money spent here on lodging, meals, taxis, telephone calls, and travel back and forth to New York, where he continued to conduct his private law practice. And he has presumably submitted another bill for $5,000 for professional services from September 18 to December 31, 1950, when the subcommittee made its report.

The Kefauver committee has smoked out a good many of the notorious underworld leaders and will send some of them to jail for contempt, if nothing else.

The Davis subcommittee smoked out a lot of warmed-over statistics and a goodly crop of platitudes about District crime conditions.

It quickly dropped its investigation into gambling when things began to get really hot.

There is reason to believe that the loose way the investigation was conducted scared off witnesses who gave confidential information. They backed away when they discovered their confidences had been abused.

In any event, the Davis subcommittee's final report turned out to be nothing but high-sounding double talk.

Net effect of this costly investigation seems to be that police department morale is at an even lower level than it was when the subcommittee first set up shop.

The subcommittee's own laxity is forcefully high-lighted by the slaying of the underworld "finger man," George Paul Harding, in the Hide-Away Club. This was one of the after-hours clubs investigated by the subcommittee as far back as last February.

Police officials admitted at the time that these places were "breeding places of crime." Yet, the subcommittee let 10 months go by without doing anything about it. Then it proposed a law to permit police to deal with these clubs as public nuisances.

That legislation is now before the new Congress, and it will take several months to enact into law.

The subcommittee—if it had been on its toes—could have pushed through such a law last year, and perhaps headed off yesterday's flare-up of gangsterism.

Vital Importance of the Community Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at the opening rally for the Good Samaritan Hospital building fund at Suffern, N. Y., on January 4, 1951:

VITAL IMPORTANCE OF THE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

Again and again, we Americans have heeded the sacred injunction that we be our brothers' keepers. Without question, we extend this doctrine to our fellow men of other races and other continents. We expend billions of dollars to sustain and rehabilitate whole nations of men—even those who were but yesterday our dread enemies. How much more ready should we be to do the simple needful things for our families, friends, and neighbors, to give unstinting support, for example, to those institutions which serve our common well-being—and especially our hospitals.

Too often, most of us know too little about our community hospital. Consciously or unconsciously, we may look upon our hospital as a place to stay as far away from as possible. But this is an old-fashioned attitude. All is not suffering in our hospitals today.

The modern hospital's purpose has been extended far beyond the alleviation of sickness or injury. So far, in fact, have its functions broadened that today they range from the prevention of diseases to the rehabilitation of the disabled and chronically ill. They are centers of health in our communities, invigorating the entire population of the areas they serve. It is up to all of us to see that they have everything they need to keep us healthy.

How the principle of preventive medicine works is illustrated by a story I heard recently, from a great author, about a 12-year-old boy who had developed a slight hoarseness, a mild impairment of his voice. The boy, though nervous, seemed perfectly well. At first his parents thought he had merely overstrained his throat shouting at a ball game. They were treating the condition with simple home remedies when, on a fortunate impulse following the suggestion of a neighbor, they took the child to the out-patient department of the local hospital. Here in the friendliest possible way, in a manner calculated to allay his timidity, the young patient was subjected to a variety of highly scientific tests. The diagnosis was serious—it was determined beyond doubt that the boy was suffering from incipient tuberculosis. Fortunately adequate steps were taken immediately and in 6 months he was cured. But for that timely visit to the hospital the infection probably would have spread and taken firm root, with perhaps fatal results.

It is not long since this new concept of preventive hospital care has caught on. Formerly, the hospital took care of the ill and injured who were taken to it. Today, it even takes care of those who haven't the sense to go to the hospital. Through its clinics and in cooperation with the medical profession, it goes out to schools and factories to prevent sickness and accidents. The hospital is, therefore, more than a building. It is a force working for the conservation of life and health throughout a wide area. The well-being of thousands of people and whole communities are its responsibility.

The doctors, the nurses, the latest technical equipment, the instruments of amazing delicacy and perception, the great stores of the modern "wonder" drugs, the numerous laboratories equipped to make elaborate and exacting tests, and last but not least, the faithful service and housekeeping departments are all part of your hospital armament—all important factors in the unceasing battle for your better health.

Better health for all is the goal we should all keep before us. It is the vision which medical progress and our modern hospitals are bringing to the present and future generations. In the glow of this vision, we should all readjust our own personal attitude and think of our own hospital not as a place of fear, not as a hostile stranger in our lives—but as a warm hearth and true friend.

Today, hospitals are also serving our communities as civilian rehabilitation centers. Until recently, the hospital had considered it had done its job for the bed patient when he was discharged and able to go home. The work of restoring him to the best possible health and vigor was left to nature and his family physician. In recent years, hospitals have recognized the need for special equipment and techniques to restore discharged patients to productive living, and, if possible, to their jobs. They are becoming aware of their community responsibilities in this new phase of medicine.

The Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine has approved the following recommendations with regard to the rehabilitation of the patient after his discharge from the hospital:

1. There is a crying need for a community rehabilitation service and center program. Large, highly specialized urban rehabilitation centers are necessary but are not enough, and in order to carry opportunity to the isolated disabled, a system of mobile consultant clinics in rural communities, and similar services must be set up, comparable to those which have been utilized in the care of crippled children and in the cancer program.

2. Certain activities can be carried on in smaller communities using the facilities that are available, but rehabilitation clinics, geographically located, must be established to carry out the specialized procedures that are necessary to the rehabilitation of those severely handicapped.

The best place for doing a direct and effective job of restoring the severely handicapped to usefulness is the modern hospital. It is ideally equipped to perform the function of bridging the gap from the bed to the job. It can turn patients who formerly would become public charges into self-supporting citizens.

And, if this country is plunged once more into the darkness of war, hospitals located near areas which may be strategic targets for "A" or other bombs will be vital links in the chain of civil defense. Our physicians, our nurses and technicians will know what to do for the sick and the injured. They will be able to care for large numbers from small but properly equipped bases beyond the bombed-out areas. This trained personnel is the most important single factor in defense against the total results of atomic bombardment, but they must have the tools to work with. Therefore, in preparing for the possible onslaught of war, our small city, suburban, and rural hospitals take on more than a local significance—they are vital to the defense of the Nation.

In the hospital the quality of service to all the people is basic. As bricks and mortar do not make good hospitals, neither does a sufficiency of beds. Medicine has come a long way since the "horse and buggy" days. Today a doctor requires the facilities of a modern hospital to give full and proper care. Essential to his work are the hospital's costly laboratory, X-ray, and other diagnostic facilities and equipment. He depends on its trained nurses and technicians. Today's medicine is a tripod. Remove any leg—the physician, the facilities, or the trained nursing and technical aides—and the structure of modern medicine collapses.

Hospitals that serve the small, urban community and the surrounding area bear the brunt of the constant attacks which disease and accident bring upon our population. Upon their number, capacity, and, above all, their quality, the health and safety of a large proportion of our people depend. Victims of acute illness and accident rarely choose a hospital—they go or are taken to the nearest. If that hospital is a good one, the victim has a much better chance of quick recovery.

It is said that every citizen is reached by service of his community hospital at least once every 8 years. It would appear to be good business to safeguard ourselves by seeing to it that the hospital which will serve us when we need it is up to date.

And speaking of good business, it may interest all of you to know that hospitals are our Nation's fifth largest industry. Like all the other leading industries, our hospitals when first established were largely financed by a few people. But even as industry generally is now recruiting capital from thousands of small investors, so have hospitals become dependent upon the gifts of all citizens in order to continue to serve their communities.

Some of you may wonder how I can speak to you with even a superficial knowledge of such a complex subject and one with which I am not usually identified. Well, for the past few years I have been devoting considerable time to the great New York University-Bellevue Medical Center development, a $32,000,000 project which is rapidly becoming one of the greatest medical centers in the world. It has been a good school and a refreshing experience. In the main, however, this center's services are comparable to those of the small community hospital. The difference is one of size and not of quality or scope of work.

If we all agree that what the hospital does for us is worthy and vital and irreplaceable, let us try to do something in return for the hospital. Let us see that the hospital has everything it must have to keep you and me and all those we love in as good health as it is possible to be in this last half of the twentieth century.

The Russian Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as a public service the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., reprinted in the New York Times on Thursday, January 11, 1951, an editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "The Russian Fear."

The International Latex Corp. in my opinion, is rendering a valuable service by calling public attention to expressions of opinion on important public issues.

The editorial is as follows:

THE RUSSIAN FEAR

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.)

A man may attack what he fears and destroy it, if he thinks he has the strength to do so.

But even a man who has that strength still does not like to be confronted by what he fears; a person who could easily destroy a mouse still may not like to meet up with a mouse.

There are many signs that what the men in the Kremlin fear most is an armed Germany; apparently they fear that more than the atomic bomb or the industrial strength of the United States. Considering what armed Germans have done to the Russians the fear is understandable.

One of the signs of the Russian state of mind is that they have issued a warning which intimates that they will retaliate against German rearmament; they have not otherwise made any threats to throw their military machine into action.

Our own diplomatic officials seem inclined to minimize the Russian warning. Those who may know the Russian mind better take the warning a great deal more seriously.

Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, who certainly is in position to know how the masters in the Kremlin think, in an interview with the United Press, counsels that the western powers think again on the German rearmament proposal.

The French have similar misgivings. It is true that the French are not enthusiastic about German rearmament for many reasons but that is not to discount their views on the Russian reaction. After all they have been dealing with the Russians both as friend and enemy for some centuries.

The Germans who have lived next door to the Russians for a long time also think the Russians will not stand idly by if rearmament takes place.

Once you know what a man fears you have a lever to move him. You can cause him to act hurriedly and irrationally. You can also by different procedure cause him to back up. Is it not then within the realm of possibility that the Russians would give something not to have Germany armed? We don't know. We do suggest that the idea may be worth consideration.

There are two ideas about the Russian intentions. One is that they mean to attack Western Europe. The other is that they believe their own propaganda which teaches that the non-Communist world will finally explode from its own internal stresses but not before these stresses seek an outlet in an attack on communism.

If the first view is right, that is if the Russians intend to attack, they will be moving shortly and it is highly improbable that the Germans could be armed in time to present any considerable obstacles to them.

But if the second view is right, that is if they expect an attack, we have a great deal of evidence that they might consider an armed Germany the provocation, the final evidence that their theories were indeed correct.

What can be gained from hurried rearming of the Germans we fail to see. The Germans are not ready for it and the United States and its associates are not ready, indeed not fully agreed.

We also fail to see what could be lost by a diplomatic probing operation to determine whether the Russians will trade something for an unarmed Germany and what they will trade.

It may very well be that they will trade nothing, that they are so confident of their power that they believe they can forbid German arming without giving anything in return. But even if that is their state of mind, the situation would still be better in that we would know more about Russian intentions.

The Western World, particularly the United States, has come to believe that the Russians hold all the trumps and that state of mind reveals all the weaknesses and the fears to the Russians. We have come almost to the absurd notion that the Russians have no weaknesses or fears of their own. Of course they have many.

We know that the Russians fear the Germans and we know that they have wholly misjudged the regenerative powers of the Western World.

Is it not possible to exploit the fear to win a truce in which the regenerative powers can do their work?

Repatriation of Army Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to the editor of the New York Times on January 5, 1951:

TO REPATRIATE ARMY FAMILIES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

There are many thousand families of service personnel in the European and other overseas commands who not only are in a dangerous spot for themselves but are a liability to the troops who must protect and evacuate them in case of trouble.

They should all be sent home willy-nilly, and many of them are desirous of going anyway, except that they have no place to go. Very few of the service families have any homes of their own. Very few could find space to live with relatives. The majority, if sent home ahead of their "sponsors," or heads of families, would be forced to go into the rental market at a most unpropitious time, and they can ill afford to pay the rents now demanded for the few vacancies available. The result is that they want to remain overseas as long as possible, regardless of the danger to themselves and to the United States troops protecting them.

Since the President has declared a state of emergency and has asked for all-out devotion to the war effort, would it be out of place for the Government to take over a sufficient number of recreation spots and make

available living space for dependents of personnel now overseas? Under the usual rule of charging the full rental allowance for adequate quarters, regardless of the actual worth of the apartment, the Government would not lose on the deal, the dependents would be taken care of within their means, and the only losers would be the wealthy individuals who would be somewhat restricted in their choice of places to play.

What I am proposing is, in effect, the establishment of dependent communities under Government operation, similar to the communities in which the dependents now live overseas. These communities would occupy apartment, court, or hotel space now used only part-time by vacationers who have permanent homes elsewhere. The persons eligible to occupy the centers would be families now overseas, who are returned to the zone of the interior in order to clear the overseas theaters of noncombatants.

Luxurious quarters and surroundings are neither required nor desirable, but adequate living space is a necessity and should be made available by the Government, since it certainly will never be provided any other way. If something like this is done, we overseas commanders will be relieved of a tremendous burden and worry.

Colonel, EUCOM.

OVERSEAS, *December 21, 1950.*

Is There New Hope for the People in the Eighty-second Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is a courageous editor in the great State of Oklahoma. He is Richard Lloyd Jones, of the Tulsa Tribune. In an editorial on January 6, 1951, Mr. Jones raises some questions and makes some statements that every Member of Congress should read. I commend it to your attention and insert it at this place in the RECORD:

OUTWIT THE MADMEN OF THE WORLD

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

A new Congress meets. The people hope. The November repudiation of the New Deal and Fair Deal rascality must be put into performance. Our sons must be saved from the tortures of increasing wars through the stupidity and arrogance of men who have been entrusted with our country's fate.

The new Congress meets. And the new Congress must know that the American people are tired of being lied to, tired of being regimented, tired of being pushed around, tired of taxes, and they are not going to lie down and die. The dilemma we face has been made for us by crackpot economists, alleged welfare leaders who have no conception of the nobilities and the integrities which alone can establish a sustaining social welfare.

It is impossible for even our bureaucratic betrayers to imagine George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln losing their courage and their character in any vodka conviviality with a Stalin.

Forty-three billion dollars. We wasted every dime of it on the European Continent. Beggars that they are, the more we gave those countries, the less they liked us, and they all used our benevolence to build more powerful our enemies. Much of our loss of respect by the European nations we attempted to pacify by purchase was due to the fact that what we did do, we did so badly. Our economic bureaucrats were slovenly in their attempted performance of their fuzzy-minded thinking. Fuzzy-mindedness became a popular pastime of those who have professed to be smart, and genuine intellects who were smart enough to comprehend the political fakery were so intimidated they had no courage to reveal the fakes.

So we rocked along with incompetency, and we had treachery, which in many incidences crossed the threshold into treason.

Culture is no more a matter of mathematics, irregular verbs, and parsed poetry than is the alphabet literature. Culture is measured by one's ability to participate in the refinements of human relations. For the last 15 years or more culture has not been the aim of our educators. Youth has been taught to admire men who sneer at nobility and who smear those who comprehend and would conserve our country.

Five years ago not one among us would have ever guessed that our country would meet its first defeat in Korea. Five years ago people would have asked, "Where is Korea?" We bought and paid for a peace agreement with Russia. Russia was to let Korea alone. Russia turned her guns on us in Korea. Russia does not know how to tell the truth, to trade honestly, or to have decent relations with any peoples. Yet she sits in the United Nations with power to veto human rights.

We have turned the new year. A new Congress now sits in our Capitol. We have thrown out a lot of the political fakers who were there. Have we enough Americans in this Congress to save us from the evil forces that we have condoned?

Who would have thought 5 years ago that the hillsides of Korea would be consecrated with crosses to commemorate the total sacrifice of our sons who were placed there by no wish of their own but by the flippant bartering of human rights at Tehran and at Yalta?

And now the political frauds who caused these crosses to consecrate Korean hillsides are trying to throw the blame on Gen. Douglas MacArthur. More meanness. Smear. He wasn't at Tehran or at Yalta. He asked for no backing of our billions to bungle the badly directed Marshall plan. He went into Korea because he was ordered to go there. And when he got there he had no weapons with which to fight. The money that was appropriated to supply those weapons had already been spent in the scandals of Fair Deal corruption. And so, to hide their shame, these bunglers now try to pass the blame to the man who was never permitted to go beyond orders and who, when ordered, was directed by the United Nations. We find its word worthless, its support worthless. We have let Russia make it powerless.

Our Department of State would not let the Chinese Nationalists fight with us. General Hurley could have saved this Korean disaster. But Marshall was sent to take his place and botch it up. So we gave the Reds the green light to make our cemeteries on Korean hills.

The new Congress is handed the accumulated bunk and betrayals to unravel. Some courts seem little impressed with treason. A strong America would have a field day with impeachments. Never did a Congress face a more exacting test than that which met last Wednesday.

Remember Lindbergh? When he visited Russia the iron curtain was not as tight as now. He saw all Russia's factories and foundries busy making war weapons. He came home to warn us. Then our officials began to throw mud at him. Smear patriotism.

Congress meets to cope with the confiscations that have been made on the private purses of the people. We are all going to get our income-tax blanks in a few days. And we are warned that about one-third of our honestly earned income has got to go to pay for the debts of the wars that were made by Roosevelt and Truman. Wars that could have been prevented. Shall we have more preventable wars? Or is there enough character and stamina in the new Congress to save the people from further liquidation?

The fumblers of the last Congress have warned us that we must be cheerfully prepared to accept a lower level of life than has been America's glory for a hundred and fifty years. We lived increasingly better, generation after generation, until Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Hopkins, Alger Hiss, and a lot of exalted "scholars" threw the switch, and buried us under an avalanche of taxes. Now we are told to like it because there is going to be a lot more of it. And our colleges are now dishing out that fatality as if a lower level of living were an exalted attainment.

The American people have no will to lower the level of their lives. We need educators who have the intelligence and courage to repudiate such infamies. It is up to the Congress to stop that concession to calamity.

The earth still turns upon its axis. The sun shines and the rains fall on fertile fields. Man's ingenuity has felled forests and tapped mines and scattered seeds on furrowed fields. He has reaped sewing machines, telephones, refrigerators, automobiles. We have shown the world how honest men can live. We have gone far in the material attainments. But we have gone back spiritually. The character caliber that made this exalted life has been smeared, corrupted. Its debauch has been bought and paid for. Paid for by the raid upon the taxpayers of the country.

Those who raid the people's private purses by usurious taxes are the foes of freedom. They are the enemies who are determined to lower the level of our lives.

But we have sent to Congress some men who have told us, "We are not going to lower the level of our living."

Only by sustaining our high level of living can we rid ourselves of our tax wasters in Washington and make again the great spiritual and physical power that the corruptible capitals of other countries will respect and fear.

Only by ever seeking a higher level of life can we hope to outwit the madmen of the world.

Resolution Adopted by Sunbury (Pa.) American Legion Post and Auxiliary Following the President's Declaration of State of Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted by Milton Jarrett Norman Post, No. 201, American Legion, of Sunbury, Pa., and the post's auxiliary, following the President's declaration of a state of emergency:

Whereas on Friday night, December 15, 1950, the President of the United States announced on the radio that he was declaring a state of emergency to exist in this country, which declaration was made official Saturday morning, December 16, 1950; and

Whereas the 1,700 members of this Milton Jarrett Norman Legion Post, No. 201, of Sunbury, Pa., and the 700 members of the auxiliary of this post, believe it to be part of their duties as citizens to express to the President their loyalty and their desire to be of service to the country; and

Whereas the said post believes that it is necessary to arouse the American people to a full realization of the seriousness of the problems at hand: Now, therefore, at a meeting assembled, be it hereby

Resolved, as follows:

1. The President of the United States should be permitted to assume the leadership of the country and politics and partisanship should be set aside in this time of emergency. In assuming such leadership, the President should call upon the very best qualified citizens of this country, who should be statesmen and leaders of public opinion and not merely followers. Any future recommendations for appointments to public office should be limited to loyal citizens and not those about whom there is any tinge of communism, no matter how small.

2. The scope and importance of the state of emergency declared by the President on December 16, 1950, should be made plain to all. There should be a definite statement of purpose of what is to be accomplished and what the leaders of this country are going to do as a definite national policy. Without details, there should at least be a national program that can be understood and followed by all who are willing to do so. If the condition of national affairs is as serious as indicated, every means of communication available should be utilized to emphasize the necessity for an unselfish and patriotic approach to this problem.

3. Our fighting men in Korea should have the complete support of every citizen in this country. No person's individual rights or wishes must be allowed in any way to interfere with the united support that these fighting men are entitled to.

4. It is time to turn to God for spiritual guidance in helping to solve our national problems and the President, as the leader of our Nation, should call for a united religious action in this regard.

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be submitted to the President of the United States and to our Senators from Pennsylvania and to our Congressmen from this congressional district, and be made public in the local newspapers.

Stop, Look, and Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, both the Congress and the American people are being confused by the conflicting statements, actions, and policies now coming from the top-ranking officials in the executive branch of the Government.

The Economic Stabilization Director and other administration spokesmen now tell us there will be no temporary or permanent across-the-board freeze of prices and wages any time soon, and indicate the present situation is not sufficiently serious to justify such an action.

The Secretary of National Defense tells us that it will be necessary to draft 18-year-olds, and to increase the period of forced military service to 27 months, as a part of a long-range program of building up our national defenses. Other leaders tell us we will be in a semi-war economy for 10 or 15 years, even though world war III does not come.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder and the President now tell Congress we must quickly enact another new tax bill—and raise at least $15,000,000,000 in additional revenue to balance the budget. It is generally predicted the President's budget requests next week will total at least $70,000,000,000, and probably more.

In the last few months Federal taxes have been increased by an estimated $7,700,000,000. This is in addition to the $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000, or even $25,000,000,000 more in taxes Mr. Snyder wants voted immediately. There is a growing demand for balancing the budget and paying as you go for the expanded defense effort, and, of course, if we are to balance a $70,000,000,000 budget at least fifteen to twenty billion dollars in additional Federal revenue must be obtained. If the budget is higher than $70,000,000,000, and some say that, regardless of what the President's budget message may contain, in the coming fiscal year we will have Federal expenditures of seventy-five or eighty billion dollars; and probably $100,000,000,000 in the fiscal year to follow. Then to balance the budget and pay as you go additional Federal revenues must be raised.

But, with President Truman, Secretary of Defense Marshall, General Eisenhower, and others telling the Congress and the country that it will take a long, hard pull for America and the other free nations of the world to build up their defenses against aggression, and in consideration of the slowness with which the funds already voted for military purposes can be spent, why all the present great rush and haste about enacting additional tax legislation? Why does the Secretary of the Treasury insist that we must hurry so much in levying and collecting new taxes when those in charge of holding down the inflationary trend and the cost of living by controlling prices and wages say there is no need to hurry?

Certainly before a new tax burden of another $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 or $25,000,000,000 is to be added to the $7,700,000,000 tax boost just voted, we should stop, look, and listen and be sure that we are doing the right thing in the right way.

First of all we should attempt to reduce or eliminate every unnecessary governmental expenditure. We should cut the fat out of the governmental structure. We should eliminate every civilian activity not absolutely essential to the health and safety of the American people. We should reduce the cost of our Federal Government to the very minimum. While that is being done, we should attempt to determine what is necessary and what is not necessary in the way of expenditures to meet the national emergency. Once that is done—but not until it is done—can we determine how much money must be raised to operate our Government and to meet the cost of our national defense program.

We should make certain that any tax legislation which is enacted will be in such a form and make only such levies as our economy can stand. A hasty, ill-conceived tax bill can easily wreck our national economy and do irreparable damage to our productive capacity and our national defense effort. We must not enact tax legislation which will interfere with, rather than benefit, our main objective—a strong national defense.

Before Congress acts on additional tax legislation, we must know for a certainty what further levies on individual and corporate earnings can be made without destroying incentive or lessening our productive capacity—for there is a limit on the tax burden any people can long pay or carry. We may find, as the majority floor leader of this House, Mr. McCORMACK, pointed out, that we cannot raise sufficient Federal revenue from income taxes on individuals and corporations, but will be forced to consider some sort of Federal manufacturers' or sales tax, or some method other than the income-tax plan to raise the revenues we need.

But certainly, above all else, this Congress has no moral right to increase the tax burden on the American people again and to compel them to make greater sacrifices unless the Federal Government itself first proves its good faith by eliminating every needless expenditure. If we are to have an austerity program for the American people, we should have an austerity program for the Federal Government. We should not increase taxes just to give the tax spenders more tax money to spend, but only to raise the funds absolutely necessary for the defense and security of those to whom this country and this Government actually belong—the more than 150,000,000 citizens who together constitute the United States of America.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor on the Justice for Poland radio series:

It is now completely clear that there can be no justice for Poland as long as it is kept behind the iron curtain.

In all the long history of oppression of the Polish people during the bitter years of occupation by the Russian czars and the German emperors, never were they so enslaved, never were they so cut off from the free world as they are today under the smothering dictatorship of communism.

I am thoroughly convinced that the people of Poland, in whom the spirit of freedom and

liberty has always burned brightly, cannot and will not submit indefinitely to the rule of their Communist oppressors. I am confident that whenever the opportunity presents itself, the Polish people will throw off the yoke of dictatorship and again seek the freedom and independence which is their right and their ultimate destiny.

Of course, right now there is very little the people of Poland can do to regain their freedom except to keep their hopes alive, and to maintain their moral and spiritual integrity against the onslaughts of Communist propaganda. Especially is this true of the younger generations who are compelled to attend schools where they are indoctrinated with Communist teachings which sneer at religion, make a mockery of human freedom, and glorify Soviet criminality.

In fact the only chance the imprisoned people of Poland have of learning the truth is from outside broadcasts which they are forbidden to listen to and from letters they receive from friends and relatives who have escaped from the iron curtain and are now living in exile in America and in the free nations of Europe.

It is therefore of the utmost importance that the exiled citizens of Poland never give up fighting for freedom for their beloved land and give encouragement to their countrymen at home to keep their faith and hope for eventual justice.

According to information received by the American Federation of Labor on conditions within Poland today, information that comes to us from secret but reliable sources, Polish workers are indeed enslaved to the Soviet war machine.

In the past, the American Federation of Labor had many opportunities to meet with and to work with the representatives of free Polish workers at international meetings for the advancement of labor standards and living standards throughout the world. We were deeply impressed on every occasion by the progressive policies and liberal viewpoint of organized labor in Poland. But today those leaders have been killed, imprisoned, or forced into exile, first by the Nazi invaders and then by the Russian oppressors who succeeded Hitler as the rulers of Poland.

As a result, Polish workers today have no free organization to represent their interests. They are compelled to work at jobs assigned to them by the puppet Communist government, at wages fixed for them by that government, and they have no voice in determining their own working conditions.

Of course, the Communists brazenly declaim that under their regime the workers are the masters. They even require the workers to belong to unions. But it should be emphasized that Communist unions are not free trade-unions. They are not unions freely chosen by the workers to represent them. The unions are imposed upon the workers by the Communist regime. Instead of defending the rights of the workers, the unions are used to police the workers and to enforce harsh discipline on any individuals who do not live up to the prescribed conditions.

A simple illustration of the effects of such perverted unionism can be found in comparing the workday in Poland with the standard prevailing in this country. In America the law says that workers cannot be required to work more than 8 hours a day, unless overtime is paid. In Poland, the law says workers must work at least 8 hours a day before they can be paid at all. The emphasis, you see, is completely reversed. Working conditions under Communist rule are just the opposite to what they are in a free land. Free workers, represented by free unions, decide for themselves the conditions of employment they will accept. But enslaved workers, herded into Communist unions, are told what conditions they must conform to under threat of heavy penalties for violation.

Those penalties are so dreadful that I hesitate to describe them. We have received detailed information on the forced-labor camps maintained by the Communists. Millions of captive human beings, whose only sin is unwillingness to bow down to Communist dictatorship, are consigned to those camps where the most brutal conditions prevail. The unfortunates who occupy the forced-labor camps rarely live long. They are killed off by hunger, by cruel punishments, and by sheer overwork.

The workers who manage to satisfy their masters and escape being sent to slave-labor camps have little to show for their hard work. Wages are pitifully low and living standards far below what the free world regards as decent; nor is the production of Polish workers being used to rebuild Poland or to strengthen its national economy. Most of the manufactured goods and farm products are siphoned off by the Communist dictatorship for use by Soviet Russia's war machine in its mad quest for world conquest.

Today even those nations which once were duped or intimidated into accepting Communist propaganda at face value now realize how counterfeit it is. By fomenting war while preaching peace for others, the Communists have exposed the cruel purpose behind their hypocritical mask. The whole free world is uniting against them.

Therein lies the greatest hope for the advent of justice to Poland. The Communist dictatorship cannot survive without constant transfusions of new wealth and new production gained from military conquest. As the free nations of the world unite to resist Communist aggression, the prospects of additional acquisitions to the Soviet orbit by revolution or military intervention become nullified.

In my opinion the Communist regime, if forced to rely upon its own production, wrung from unwilling workers, is bound to crumble and fall apart before too long. The defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet Union is a portent of what will happen in the future. When the time comes, the people of Poland, too, must be ready to liberate themselves from the Moscow noose.

Today Stalin is still able to suppress justice for Poland by sheer power. But the Polish people will never be converted into substituting communism for their faith in God. They believe, as they always have believed, in a God of justice, a God of mercy, an everlasting God who tramples the tyrants of a moment into the dust.

The free men and women of America and their compatriots in exile are praying today with the oppressed people of Poland that God, in His wisdom, will soon help them to overturn the tyrants and regain justice.

Criticism of Our National Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, every mail brings a number of letters to my office from people scattered all over the United States, and especially from my district, in which is expressed a sincere desire on the part of the public that Secretary Acheson be relieved of his position as Secretary of State, and that if President Truman should not see fit to request the resignation of the Secretary of State, the President be impeached on the grounds of incompetency or dereliction of duty.

Criticism of our national leadership is heard on all hands, and from people of all political faiths and religious convictions. The following letter from one of my constituents of Tulsa, Okla., is illustrative of the sentiments expressed in hundreds of letters I have received on this subject and to the same effect.

I quote the entire letter of my constituent to the benefit of those who may read the same. The letter follows:

Recent world developments seem to me to to be of such serious import that all Americans who are truly concerned with the welfare of their country should consider themselves under obligation to convey their thoughts relative to certain aspects thereof to their representatives in Congress with a view to urging them to use their best efforts to place our country in the strongest possible position to survive the crisis which is now upon us and which will undoubtedly assume vastly graver proportions in the not too distant future. Accordingly, I respectfully submit herewith for your consideration the following thoughts relative to certain conditions in the conduct of our national and international affairs which I believe place us in a disadvantageous and very dangerous position:

1. Our national administration continues to use units of our Navy to prevent the armies of the Chinese Nationalists on the island of Formosa from making an invasion on the Chinese mainland to oppose the Chinese Communists. How can it be anything but utter foolhardiness to withhold our permission for the Nationalists to undertake such a venture and for us not to give them every assistance possible in transporting their troops and equipment to the mainland for such an operation? Our present policy is in effect rejecting the material assistance of a willing ally and is actually using our fleet to assist an enemy who is now exacting a heavy toll in American lives in Korea.

2. The present Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, by his part in helping to place the Chinese Communists in power, by his espousal of the policy above-mentioned in item 1, and by numerous similar instances has raised serious doubts in the minds of his countrymen as to whether or not he recognizes communism as the enemy to all free countries which it obviously is. Mr. Acheson's motives are obscure, and it is difficult to understand if he is, in fact, a loyal American. In any event, he has lost the confidence of a great majority of the American people and refuses to take action which obviously is called for at the earliest possible moment for a firm handling of the Communist attacks in Korea and elsewhere. It is our opinion that if the President cannot be persuaded to remove him, action should be brought to impeach him.

3. Our policy in the United Nations and in regard to our principal European allies is still too soft spoken and too tolerant of deals, compromises, and appeasement in dealings with Communists. Our representatives should be instructed to state before the United Nations and to the several governments of Europe that this country does not regard this as a suitable time for them to continue "business as usual" dealings with Soviet Russia and Communist China, and that if they expect our assistance in defending their own countries against Communist engulfment, they must so demonstrate immediately by suitable actions, which in addition to the immediate withholding of any additional supplies to the Communist aggressors would also be pointed toward the immediate arming of their countries to the fullest extent of which they are capable.

4. The half-hearted and insufficient efforts toward rearming our own Nation should at once be superseded by complete mobilization, including activation at the earliest possible moment of the industrial capacity necessary to support an all-out military effort.

Doubtless you are receiving similar letters from many other loyal Americans who are sorely disappointed with our national leadership at this critical time and who are looking to our Congress to see that our Government will take steps necessary to insure our survival as a free people. I feel sure that we can count on you to do what you can to place the actions of our Government once again on a basis of sanity and honor.

Truman Incorrect—Canada Does Not Have Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message last Monday, President Truman made the following claim: "Our North Atlantic treaty partners have strict systems of universal military training."

This statement is seriously misleading. Our North Atlantic treaty partner, Canada, does not now, and never has had, universal military training.

Our partner, little Iceland, has no military organization whatever.

Mr. Speaker, misleading and distorted statements of fact are often found in political speeches. But it is deeply regrettable to find such inaccuracy in a state of the Union message, where every line is most certainly checked and rechecked for factual accuracy. I am constrained to believe that the President was not aware of the deceptive nature of this passage in his message.

Address of Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, last night the President of the United States defined the opposing world forces as those believing in a moral code and the individual dignity of man on the one hand; and on the other, those who look upon man as a mere, soulless component of the material universe. This broad definition is excellent because it excludes the narrow view that only Christians have a moral code. We Christians who have studied the ancient origins of our faith are appreciative of the great religious concepts which our Christianity borrowed from some of the more ancient religions, among them the great concept of the one Almighty God, which was and is part of the Jewish religion.

It is therefore logical that great Jewish leaders should see in the dialectics of materialism preached by Marxian Communists a threat to their ancient faith. This has recently been so eloquently expressed by Rabbi Dubin, of Los Angeles, that I should like to include in our RECORD a letter of transmittal from Mr. Harry M. Warner, one of California's most distinguished citizens, and a copy of excerpts from a talk of Rabbi Dubin, which Mr. Warner has been kind enough to send to us:

WARNER BROS. PICTURES DISTRIBUTING CORP.,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1950.

Hon. SAMUEL W. YORTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YORTY: On behalf of Mr. Harry M. Warner, president of Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., I am happy to present you with a recording of an address delivered by Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin, of Los Angeles.

Mr. Warner was so inspired by this patriotic anti-Communist message that he wants to make it available to all America if possible. He especially wants every Government official and legislator to hear it. A copy of the text is enclosed for your convenience, but we hope you will listen to the recording as the delivery adds to the power of the message.

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge this directly to Mr. Harry M. Warner, Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., Burbank, Calif.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. DORSEY.

CONDENSED VERSION OF TALK DELIVERED BY RABBI MAXWELL H. DUBIN, WILSHIRE BOULEVARD TEMPLE, BEFORE THE CONGREGATION ON ROSH HASHANA, THE JEWISH NEW YEAR

Last night we ushered in the new year. In Jewish life this period is called the Yomin Neroim, the awesome days, the days when the fate of the individual, so Jewish tradition tells us, is determined by God for the entire year.

It seems to me that there is a Yomin Neroim atmosphere, an awesome days atmosphere, for the entire civilized world today, but the fate of all civilization lies in the balance trembling and mankind is awaiting the decision.

Now this is not the place and there is not time to detail all the mistakes that the democratic nations and peoples made during the past 5 years since the war ended. But I do want to consider with you one of them, because it is the crux of the problem.

The first and the most fatal error that the democratic world made was our absolute failure to understand the true meaning of communism and the real aims and ambitions of Soviet Russia. We were led to believe in America that communism was a forward-looking social movement, led by great idealists who had a high code of social and international morality. We were sold the idea that Soviet Russia was a civilized country, determined to direct its international life in paths of peace and of progress. We were told that Soviet Russia had a government that would have respect for law and order that would have respect for its international promises and commitments and would devote its best interests to the welfare of its own people and to the peoples of other lands.

We Jews knew from the outset that all those statements and claims made by Soviet Russia were not true. We Jews knew the truth about the Communists and about Soviet Russia and we knew it through years of bitter experience and pain and blood and suffering and terrible horrors. We paid a bitter price for that knowledge. We know that the Jews of Russia, the millions of Jews who lived there when the revolution took place were the first ones to be liquidated by the Communists. They were sent to labor camps, they dug the canals, they were sent out to Siberia, and they died—by the hundreds of thousands—because the thing for which the Jews stood and stands—respect for human individuality—was not and is not wanted by Soviet Russia.

We knew the truth, but no one listened to us. When the Jews, during the rise of the Nazis, told the world that the burning of those synagogues in Germany was only a prelude to that which eventually led to the bombing of Westminster Abbey and the other English churches, nobody listened to us. So no one listened to the Jew when he warned the world against the aims and the ambitions of Soviet Russia. We warned the world even during the honeymoon period when Russia was working with us, not an ally—she never was an ally—we just happened to have had the same common enemy, that's all; we warned the world to be careful and to be wary, but no—we were just a voice crying in the wilderness. So Russia was treated by the nations of the world like a spoiled child that threatens to hold its breath if it does not get what it wants. We accepted her word, we had faith in her signature, faith in the agreements that were made. And what was the result? We are facing it now. Russia violated every promise to the Western World. She abused our trust, spread her power, seized lands, destroyed governments, developed fifth columns throughout the world, and poisoned the minds of millions of peoples against their native governments.

Well, 5 years too late, we of America realize and the world realizes the bitter mistake that was made. We have to rid ourselves, to rid every aspect of our lives, social and political and industrial and economic, of the Communist infiltration.

So we are at the brink of momentous days, you and I. The destiny of a world is in the scales and no one can tell of a certainty what is going to happen.

Officially, we are not at war because Congress has not said there is a war. But, factually, there is a war at this moment. There is a war, Russian-inspired, Russian-led, Russian-equipped, in Korea. Right now on Rosh Ha-Shono morning when I am talking to you, boys of this congregation—I know of two who are at this moment in battle with the marines in Korea—American boys are dying, newspapers are carrying casualty lists, homes are being broken, hearts of parents are being torn. Reserves are being called.

We are at war, and that war is being waged on two fronts. I am not concerned so much about the war in Korea if it does not spread, and, please God, it may not spread. That does not worry me very much because I know that that front is going to be cleaned up before long. But there is another front, the home front, and that front worries me. Because on this home front war has been declared on us by Soviet Russia. And that has to concern us. And it has to concern every man, woman, and child in America. Because you see, my friends, the whole character of war has changed. Wars are no longer fought only on the battlefield; and wars are fought not only by men, and yes, even women in uniform. You and I who are not in uniform, you and I today are just as much in the service as though we actually wore a uniform. Wars today are fought at home. Wars are fought in the laboratories, wars are fought in the factories. That is where Russia has declared war upon us. Her aim is to paralyze, her aim is to sabotage, her aim is to slow down the work that we in America are trying to do in order to prepare ourselves for the ordeal.

In the days ahead you and I have to be on guard, very much on guard, because attempts have been made and attempts will be made to befog the issue. You are going to be asked

to sign all kinds of protests and all kinds of proclamations. Be careful. Know what you are doing and if you do not know, ask. There are Government agencies to enlighten you.

Remember that this terrible scourge that we call communism must be stopped wherever we are going to meet it. And in that connection we have a twofold duty, you and I. We have a duty to our country, to America—and we have a duty to our faith, to Judaism, and to our coreligionists as Jews, and to all faiths, whatever they may be.

I returned recently from 3 months abroad. You have heard Americans returning from abroad recite the trite, the very trite words, but nonetheless true words, that America is the best, the most fortunate land in the world. And it is. Both materially and spiritually, there is not another land in the world as fortunate as America. The best proof of that is that people everywhere abroad, no matter where one goes, want to come to America.

Everyone wants to come here and few people want to leave America. Your best proof of that is that whenever a Communist agent is ordered to be deported from America to Europe, listen to the fuss that he makes about going back to his paradise of a homeland. He doesn't want to leave, he wants to remain here.

Now, here in America labor is better protected and better treated than anywhere else in the world, even in Socialist England. Labor enjoys more governmental benefits in America than it enjoys in Socialist England. That irks Russia, because Russia is supposed to be the fatherland of the proletariat. Russia is supposed to be the land where the working people have everything, Russia, and not America. Therefore Russia does not like us. For that reason every person who loves America, every person who makes a living here, every person who enjoys the way of life that is America, must protect it in the danger that now faces it.

As for the Jews, let us not forget this, my friends: That wherever Communist Russia has come to power, Jewish life has been destroyed. There is not a vestige of Jewish religious, economic, social, or cultural life left in Russia today, not a vestige; and even in Moscow the Yiddish daily, Heimish, which was nothing but a Yiddish translation of Pravda, has been eliminated. Yiddish writers have been sent out to Siberia. There is not a vestige of Jewish life in Russia today, and those few Jews who have been able to steal out from behind the iron curtain in Europe—from Rumania and Hungary and Czechoslovakia and all the rest of the Balkan countries—they tell us that the last traces of Jewish life are being eliminated behind the iron curtain by the Communists.

Now, remember this: Should—God forbid—the horrible thing happen and communism spread its influence over this country, then I say to you that the American Jewish community, which is today the largest, the most influential, the most powerful Jewish community in the world, will go down and will be destroyed even as have been the Jewish communities of Europe.

Therefore, for these reasons, we must be on guard. We must pledge ourselves to wipe out communism wherever and whenever we find it, even if it means cutting deep into our own family and social circles. My friends, there was in Jewish life, particularly amongst the orthodox Jews in days gone by, a weapon that was used to control the community. It is a weapon which, of course, we of the liberal Jewish group do not have and never have had, but it was a weapon in Jewish life. It was a weapon that was so horrible that even those who watched it being inflicted in the synagogue were terror-stricken, not to speak of the one who was subjected to that weapon. It was called the charem—ex-communication. So we, today, must take a page out of the book of those old Jews and apply that same weapon, that same punishment today—the punishment of ex-communication, of ostracism, of complete isolation from the community of any Jew who has become infected with the Communist virus.

The fate of humanity is lying in the balance and the slightest hair may tip those scales in one direction or another. It is a fact—a fact that faces you and you and you and me every moment of our existence today.

So we pray for life this morning. We pray that God may inscribe us and inscribe our dear ones and inscribe the world in the Book of Life. But there can be no certainty of life, there can be no certainty of a future for any of us if this dread thing continues to go on. It will affect you and you and you and every single member of your family and mine. So we pray to God this morning for life. We pray that this catastrophe may be averted; that untold millions of people may not be condemned to death through the horrors of another war. Grant us then, O God, Thy protection. Grant that this year that we have ushered in may be, for us and for all humanity, a year of life and not of death, a year of peace and not of war, a year of happiness and not of misery. Amen.

Genuine American Sentiments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, in the President's address to the joint assembly to the two Houses of Congress on last Monday, January 8, the President appealed to the Congress and to the public at large for unity. He invited debate, but requested every man among us to weigh his words and deeds.

It is my understanding that many of the leading citizens of the country were invited to attend a White House meeting with businessmen and Government officials to be held yesterday, January 11, to discuss problems facing the Nation.

Among those invited to the White House conference of yesterday was an illustrious citizen of the State of Texas, Mr. H. R. Cullen, of Houston. Apparently Mr. Cullen was unable to attend the conference. Instead, he addressed a letter to the Honorable John M. Steelman, Assistant to the President, under date of January 3, 1951, and it is my understanding that Mr. Cullen furnished each Member of Congress and many of the leading newspapers of this country a copy of his letter. I have heard many of my colleagues say that the letter of Mr. Cullen expresses their sentiments. It is a letter which demonstrates in no uncertain terms what the Members of Congress are hearing from the people in every mail. It is an expression of genuine American sentiments. The letter is timely and should be read by everyone interested in the future of this country and our Government. The Cullen letter follows:

HON. JOHN M. STEELMAN,
Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEELMAN: I regret that doctor's orders prevent my accepting the invitation with which you have honored me, to attend the White House meeting with businessmen and Government officials on January 11, to discuss problems facing the Nation.

The administration does well to call upon men of affairs of the Nation for counsel in the present crisis, for it desperately needs sound advice. If fact, if there is not a distinct change of course soon, I fear it may lead to catastrophe. Candor impels me to say, however, that I think our best hope in that direction lies with the new Congress, in asserting its constitutional authority and leadership in reference to making war, and wisely restraining the Government from excessive preemption of power.

One of the most urgent needs for the security of the United States is that you restrain the Communist fifth columnists who are working to destroy us and may do so any day in event of a Russian Pearl Harbor. Those who have been convicted of communistic treason are now running loose on technicalities obligingly agreed to by the courts, and are, no doubt, plotting more treason with others in or out of the Government.

At great expense to the American taxpayers, we provided the foreign Reds with a base of spying operations and a sounding-board, in the United Nations. There they have reviled us so violently and so repeatedly, without resistance or restraint on our part, getting world-wide publicity which they could not have gained otherwise, that many people over the earth have come to believe them.

It is time this Government stopped operating in favor of Communists at home, while getting our boys slaughtered by Communists abroad in a senseless fight which the United States entered in violation of the constitutional provision that only Congress may declare war.

Instead of knocking ourselves out fighting Reds wherever old Joe Stalin may decide to set them upon us, why don't we reverse the charges and try playing his game? Why not spend some of our money and effort arming and equipping the anti-Communists who are in the great majority in the countries now under the Soviet heel and thumb? With weapons and supplies which we should be able to get to them, I think we could induce some of the so-called satellite peoples to turn on their enslavers, and thereby promote an upheaval that would put Russia on the defensive, as we are now. Then Russia would have her hands full and would no longer be a menace to us.

We might have more effect against the Chinese Communists, at less cost of American lives, by supporting Chiang Kai-shek's trained Formosa army and his huge guerrilla following on the mainland; and by arming Japan.

These are some of the suggestions I would have respectfully offered at your White House meeting, if given the opportunity, for extricating the Nation from the perilous plight into which the administration's disastrous course has plunged us. If in order, I should be glad for you to read them to the group for consideration, in lieu of my personal appearance.

Because every Member of Congress and every American citizen is vitally interested in the statements that I have just made in this letter, I am sending a copy to all Members of Congress and to our leading newspapers.

Thanking you for the invitation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. R. CULLEN.

Bruce Barton Says: "Universal Military Training; We Should Stop, Look, and Listen"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January 7, 1951, Omaha World-Herald, entitled "Universal Military Training; We Should Stop, Look, and Listen."

BRUCE BARTON SAYS: "UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING; WE SHOULD STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN"

During World War II all of the trustees of New York's privately supported hospitals were summoned to an evening meeting where the Surgeon General of the United States Army told us why the Army must draft our nurses.

We had been warned in advance and, while each of us knew how desperate was the nursing need in our own institutions, we felt there was nothing we could do but go along.

But just before the end of the meeting we were given a big surprise. The commissioner of New York City's hospitals stood up and, addressing himself directly to the Surgeon General, said: "I have no patience with your position. You and your folks are responsible for your own troubles. You won't relax an iota your ridiculous age and educational requirements. Your management is wasteful and devoid of ingenuity or imagination. If you would take a trip through our city institutions and see how we have had to compromise and improvise and adapt our program to the demands of the times, you would be ashamed of yourselves. Go back and do half as good a job as we are doing, and you won't need this draft."

The Surgeon General had no answer. We never heard from him again.

Our military services are inefficient users of manpower. When Russia drafts five men, four of them show up in the fighting lines. When the United States drafts five, one or two of them fight; the others stay behind to wind and unwind red tape, fill out questionnaires, write memorandums, run mimeograph machines, etc.

The services, too, are lavishly extravagant with money and materials. The American people were shocked when Korea revealed that all the billions appropriated for national defense since the war's end had bought practically nothing in terms of planes, tanks, guns, or other fighting equipment. If the generals and admirals had been presidents of corporations the stockholders would have risen in their wrath and thrown them all out. But taxpayers are more tolerant than stockholders, and more lazy-minded.

All of the above is written, not in criticism or hope of effecting any change. War's business is to kill and destroy; and warriors throughout all history have been, and often have to be, careless of money and life.

I am writing simply to ask the American people to stop, look, and listen before they are stampeded into universal military training.

Many wise and patriotic men and women believe UMT is not only a powerful constituent of national defense, but a valuable contribution to the moral fiber of our people. To my mind it means putting the education of our boys, for a year or more, into the hands of men whose professional background is:

Don't question. Don't argue. Don't talk. Don't think. Never mind the cost. Do what you're told.

All I ask is full and free debate—not decision by fear or default, or by manifesto from Washington. If UMT is all to the good, why did so many of our forebears flee from Europe to escape it?

The Spiritual Significance of the World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following sermon entitled "The Spiritual Significance of the World Crisis," by the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D. D., minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., Sunday, January 7, 1951:

"For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant"—I Corinthians 7: 22.

I

When I go to church I want to find God. I do not want a reflection of the latest edition of the newspaper or the ideas of the most persuasive commentator. And when I hear a sermon I don't want a "pulpitorial"; I want to hear the word of God. It is to proclaim the word of God that the pulpit is installed. But the word of God is to be interpreted and proclaimed, remembering the injunction of the writer, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." The word of God as more than the mere words contained in the Bible are to be proclaimed. To that end this pulpit is established and to that purpose we shall ever be faithful.

We do want to find God in church and we sometimes say, we want peace of mind. There is a peace of mind or more accurately a peace of soul which rightly belongs to the Christian. It is the peace which comes from reconciliation with God through Jesus Christ our Lord. It is the peace which comes because the guilt and condemnation of sin are gone through faith in Jesus Christ our Lord. But there is another sense in which peace of mind would be immoral for the Christian. Should we mean by this phrase, release from striving or emancipation from wrestling with the great problems of our times, we would be denying our faith. Peace of mind in the sense of freedom from concern for the world does not belong to the Christian. Peace of mind as an escape from reality cannot be the possession of the Christian in the tradition of classical Christianity.

It may be that early Christians who were a subjugated people living in an occupied province of a vast empire in whose government they did not participate could for a while be detached from the concerns of their faith as it related to the world about them. Since they had no responsibility for government, they did not bear the obligations of maintaining law and order in any manner comparable to the modern American Christian.

In our Nation, whose roots are in the Hebrew-Christian tradition and especially since they are so largely the product of the Protestant Reformation, we must understand that there are spiritual values at stake in the present world crisis. There are spiritual values which we cherish, which are at the root of our very existence and which are in mortal peril. That we have not always been successful salesmen of these realities to the rest of the world, only emphasizes our need for understanding them and proclaiming them in this hour. The Honorable Charles Malik (not the Russian Jacob Malik), but the other Mr. Malik in the United Nations who is the minister of Lebanon, and a product of Presbyterian missions, has well said in referring to the United States, "If your only export is the silent example of flourishing political institutions and happy human relations, you cannot lead. If your only export is a distant reputation for wealth and prosperity and order, you cannot lead. Nor can you really lead if you send forth to others only expert advice and technical assistance. To be able to lead and to save yourself and others, you must, above everything else, address your mind and soul. Your tradition rooted in the glorious Graeco-Roman-Hebrew-Christian-Western-European humane outlook supplies you with all the necessary presuppositions for leadership. All you have to do is to be the deepest you already are." That is the challenge of the hour. These are not new challenges requiring new hypotheses. The basic need is understanding ourselves and clearly discriminating between our life and the counter forces arrayed against us.

I have raised these issues in such sermons as Freedom Under God, Do We Deserve Democracy, The Church and Military Measure for Peace, and Alternatives to Communism, which have, without solicitation, found their way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in reprints have gone around the world. Too often the church has remained silent when it should have spoken. Pastor Martin Neimuller asserted that the Evangelical Church in Germany remained silent too long and was unable to assist the best citizens of that country in dealing dynamically with moral realities in the last decade. The time is already here when we Americans, especially we Evangelical Christians must realize our peril. It is because I am a Christian and it is because I am an American I want my country in this hour to be a great spiritual bastion. The time is short for the spiritual awakening that is so necessary if we are to take the other physical actions which are imperative. As I understand the conflict of our age, I want to make it quite clear that I would rather die fighting the materialistic, atheistic forces now set against our freedom than to die under it.

II

We are driven by the exigencies of this hour to reappraise the spiritual issues in the present crisis.

Many have become so accustomed to thinking of communism as a Christian heresy which might be made orthodox, that they really haven't understood that it is in fact a heresy. Too many have been blind to the irreconcilability of the two philosophies of life now set in juxtaposition. Some have rightly entertained hopes that the leaders of communism in the world could be converted, radically modified, and thereby restrained in their world program. It is Christian to work for and believe in the conversion of all men everywhere to God in Jesus Christ. To this evangelical mission we must ever be faithful. We must never forsake the divine commission which has been given us. Indeed, conversion of leaders who threaten the peace and well-being

of the world is perhaps our best and almost our only hope of averting disaster. But here we must recognize a practical fact: namely, the inaccessibility of the leaders and many of the followers of communism today on the one hand, and the evangelical zeal of their own ideology with which they confront us on the other hand. The fact that not one in a thousand Chinese know what communism is, and refer to it only as the new order makes little difference in the crisis of the times. The world significance turns on the objectives of the persons in power. Not many hours ago, I spoke with an expert on Chinese affairs in the State Department who confirmed what I had long suspected, that the core of the new leadership in the new order of China is as ardently committed to the standard doctrines of Stalinism as the dictator himself and are increasingly behaving in like manner.

We may be thankful for those who have really appreciated the spiritual significance of the crisis of our age and especially its menace to our kind of freedom. We should be grateful to those discerning men, like John Foster Dulles who as a boy was reared in this church, and Henry L. Stimson, long an officer of this church, for their understanding of the dynamism of communism and the tragic predicament of our age.

III

Let us as evangelical Christians clearly understand the spiritual nature of the crisis. When you read the New Testament and trace the meaning of the Christian life through Christian history, you discover that our kind of democracy is created and sustained by Christian conviction and faith. In the verse which I have set at the head of this sermon, "For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant," it is suggested that the Christian is a freeman only because he has become a servant. He is liberated from the restraints of legalistic religion and legalistic government because he is committed in a higher loyalty to God. He is not free to do as he pleases; he is only free to glorify God. He is free under God's sovereignty. He is a freeman because he is captive to Christ.

"Make me a captive Lord
And then I shall be free."

The familiar hymn puts it.

Men are free on this basis because they are no longer in rebellion against God. Men outside of God require restraints and inhibitions, but men who are redeemed and who live under God can be trusted with their own destiny. They are free because they serve a higher loyalty. They are free only because there is a voluntarily accepted spiritual discipline. This truth is the crux in the matter. You can only have our way of life where men and women understand that it is derived from God.

1. The Christian begins by faith in God. God as a concrete reality, God as a personal being, God who is the sovereign ruler of the universe, who holds all creation in His hands, to whom allegiance is given, and to whom the eternal souls of men are accountable.

Communism rejects the reality of God and substitutes an atheistic and materialistic absolutism. Ultimate reality, communism asserts, lies in matter and matter alone. It teaches that there is no God above the movement and therefore it makes absolute a human finite reality. It capitalizes on the religious spirit, but it would be false to say it is a religion. In rejecting God, therefore, communism has no understanding of the corrupting effect of pride, self-centeredness, and the will to power within it.

2. Christianity proclaims the dignity and worth of individual man. The first thing we say about human nature is that man is created in the image of God, and that although man is a sinner, he may be restored to the dignity of his created state. The freedom which man has is his, not as a personal achievement, but as something which he has as a gift of God through creation. This conception gives Christians a different attitude toward their fellow beings. The only reason for treating other persons with respect and with any rights at all is that they are God's creatures with an eternal destiny. You cannot treat a man as a piece of machinery if you believe him to be a living soul—the creation of God. For the Christian the chief purpose of life is to glorify God who is the creator.

Communism rejects this conception of man and thereby devalues man. Man has value only in relation to and in service of the collective society. The chief end of man is not to glorify God but to serve the state, or some other collective entity. That is why they have no disturbed conscience in resorting to unbridled police methods, liquidations, concentration camps, and the other violations of human dignity which are part of the approved program.

At no other point is the difference so great as in the conception of man. Devaluing man there develops an intense class consciousness, vastly greater than anything we have known in the Western World and in Christian history. The proclamation of the dictatorship of the proletariat is itself an assertion of class consciousness. All other classes are denounced, only those approved by the party are tolerated. In Soviet Russia where this experiment has been tried longest you have probably the most class-conscious area of the world today. Communist propaganda talks about the people, but the people of that world does not include a great many people in this congregation. The people are ultimately limited to those who favor the Communist regime. All opponents, as has been discovered over and over again in the satellite countries soon become known as antidemocratic forces, or as enemies of the people; thus, they do not count. It is this devaluation of man as a person that leads to the tyrannies with which we are so familiar.

A great singer, Mr. Paul Robeson, laments our cruel and un-Christian race discrimination in America, and exalts the Soviet paradise into fantastic heaven which it cannot be. Let us grant that we must make our race relations and other social and cultural relations more Christian, but let Mr. Robeson understand that he has lost all sense of perspective and discrimination. We are at least striving to make our way more Christian and to put justice into our treatment of minority groups. Let Mr. Robeson and others understand that there is nothing in our life which so emphasizes differences of class or race that is in any way comparable to the treatment by Communists of the bourgeois or the capitalists who are hunted like animals and where persons who are deemed unorthodox are terrorized and liquidated and where millions are placed in concentration camps and slave-labor units, simply because they do not agree with the government.

Under that system there is vastly more discrimination between classes than there is under our way of life. We should recognize also that although communism professes a philosophy which says, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need" there is a greater differentiation between people in Russia than between people here. During my visit to Russia before the war, I was amazed to observe how great could be the incomes and fortunes of artists and writers in the propaganda agencies. And how lucrative were the incomes of plant managers and farm managers. The Stakhanovite movement is really an appeal to the profit motive and a spur to individual wealth, which awards individuals for piece-time work, honoring them with extra pay, with cultural and recreational privileges. Members of the party, administrators, social planners, factory and farm supervisors are made increasingly rich in contrast with the average Russian. At the same time in America, because of our system of taxation and response to benevolent enterprises, there has been a general lessening in the amount retained by those who have large incomes. During the period of the Russian experiment the average American level of living has phenomenally improved. Much more could be said to indicate what happens when you have a low estimate of man.

3. Christianity believing in God and having a high conception of man believes also in a fixed point of moral reference. Some things are eternally right and some things are always wrong.

Rejecting God and undervaluing man, communism has no ultimate standard of morality. For them there is no transcendent judgment. When the rulers of a nation thus disown God, they become responsible to no one but themselves and recognize no morality or conduct except that which achieves the party's ends. The absolute authority reposes in the leaders of the party. Anything is moral which furthers the party's objectives—even lies, deceit, and barbarism. In countries where this force has become dominant, lying and stealing and killing does not have the same moral meaning as it has to us. This fact is directly derived from differing views of reality and man. And this fact makes it difficult to come to any trustworthy agreement with them.

This is being sharpened with the passing of the days in China. The Communists have now provided themselves with authority to take over all private property, all business firms, foreign property, including that of churches, with police power exercised to the limit. The attitude toward human life, already well known, is only emphasized the more. We have learned that within the last 3 or 4 days, in order to depart from China, it is now necessary for an American, including a missionary to have a Chinese sponsor or guarantor. If, thereafter, the foreigner who has departed says anything uncomplimentary about the new order, or even if he doesn't, but is accused of doing so, the native sponsor or guarantor pays the price. Everywhere you note this absence of moral certitude in Communist practice. That is what makes peaceful and dependable negotiations difficult.

IV

We are called back in this hour to understand more clearly why it is we have these differences and to dedicate ourselves more resolutely to the faith which is ours. The time is short for a rebirth of spirit, which will undergird us for the struggle. But the Spirit working in us may make of us a greater force than we have ever dreamed we could be. Time and time again in human history, dedicated minorities have won the day. The spirit makes the difference. The Communists may outnumber us many times over. But if we have the faith we claim to have; if we really believe what we profess to believe, we shall be indestructible. The most important thing for us to do today is to set over against communism a more vital, a stronger and more Christian society. A tepid church and a half-hearted nation cannot possibly deal with the dynamism set against it. Vital and radically applied Christianity is called for. The Christian call is clear. It is to live by this faith in God, in man's dignity, and in moral certitude and to be willing and ready to pay whatever price is necessary to make it what it really is. The way of God for the sons of God.

Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in response to a questionnaire printed in newspapers of the district which I have the honor to represent, many answers were received. The bulk of the answers were received in the first week of 1951.

The questions and results in percentages are as follows:

Should the United States:	Percent Yes	Percent No
1. Abandon Korea, evacuating American troops and supplies as quickly as possible?	42	58
2. Increase our military forces in Korea, fight to the finish there, only abandoning it when and if driven out?	58	42
3. If we abandon Korea, should we agree to recognize Red China and abandon Formosa in return for cease-fire in Korea?	6	94
4. Send substantial military manpower to Europe?	62	38
5. Rearm Germany?	78	22
6. Initiate use of germ and gas weapons?	16	84
7. Atom bomb Russia now?	39	61
8. Cease Marshall-plan aid now	52	48
9. Cease North Atlantic military aid now?	21	79
10. Increase mobilization, taxes, controls (including rent, wage and price controls)?	90	10
11. Eliminate for this emergency when not connected with defense: road building, flood control, harbor development, soil conservation payments, etc.?	82	18
12. Eliminate farm prices support program?	80	20
13. Increase old-age assistance?	53	47
14. Increase working hours without overtime rates, establish 6-day week in industry and Government?	71	29
15. Allow railroad unions to contract that all employees must join unions?	12	88

Boxcar Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the shortages of boxcars in Nebraska and surrounding States is very acute several times a year. I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter from the Central Western Shippers Advisory Board together with a resolution adopted by that board. The letter and resolution are as follows:

CENTRAL WESTERN SHIPPERS ADVISORY BOARD,
Beatrice, Nebr., January 5, 1951.

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: While in regular session at Lincoln, Nebr., on December 11-12, 1950, the Central Western Shippers Advisory Board gave serious consideration to the railroad freight car supply and to ways and means of preventing troublesome shortages.

It was the consensus of all that the established practice of maturing Government grain loans uniformly in all States on April 30 has contributed materially to serious car shortages through causing heavy movement of old grains at the time new crops are harvested and offered for shipment. In the interest of lessening the impact of peak seasonal movements of grain, thereby relieving the strain on the freight car supply, the board went on record as recommending the staggering of maturity dates on grain loans predicated upon harvest dates of crops in the various areas.

Copy of resolution No. 3, setting forth the recommendation of the board in this matter is enclosed. Your favorable action in support of the views expressed therein is respectfully requested and will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

R. W. BAGBY,
General Secretary, Dempster Mill Manufacturing Co.

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE STAGGERING OF MATURITY DATES OF GRAIN LOANS IN LIEU OF THE PRESENT PRACTICE OF MATURING THESE LOANS UNIFORMLY ON APRIL 30 IN ALL STATES

Whereas the railroad freight car shortage is acknowledged to be as acute at the present time as it has been for several years in the past, and that apparently no definite relief is in sight; and

Whereas the existing plan for the maturity date of loans on all grain products has been established with an April 30 deadline, thus causing a unified shortage of cars for loading in all areas: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Central Western Shippers Advisory Board goes on record as recommending an adjustment of the maturity dates on grain loans to be predicated upon the harvest date of the crop in the particular area being considered so that, by staggering maturity dates, the car shortage in any given area might be more effectively controlled.

Elimination of Waste and Inefficiency in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star concerning the activities of the House Subcommittee on Overstaffing in Executive Departments. The report of this subcommittee is a major contribution in the unending struggle to eliminate waste and inefficiency from our Government. My distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, is entitled to full credit for the splendid manner in which his subcommittee has performed its functions.

The editorial follows:

ODD CASE OF THE ESQUIRE PICTURE

The House Subcommittee on Overstaffing in the Executive Departments was understandably curious about the odd case of the requisitioned Esquire magazine. Its study of procurement records of the Interior Department had disclosed that the National Park Service had invested $13.39 of taxpayers' money for one 50-cent copy of the August issue of the well-known magazine. The committee was not so much interested in the use to be made of the publication as the reason for the high cost.

In the course of the investigation, it was discovered that a park official wanted to cut out a pin-up picture of—believe it or not—Custer's Last Stand. So the ponderous procurement machinery was put in motion. Forms were filled out and signed, letters written, copies made, distributed and filed and all the other operations incidental to purchase of an item—large or small—were faithfully carried out. In due time (how long the subcommittee did not reveal) the National Park Service was the official owner of a magazine that could have been acquired in 5 minutes for half a dollar at a nearby magazine stand.

The Esquire transaction was only one of several that Chairman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS and his group delved into at Interior. There was the Bureau of Reclamation's order for $2.45 worth of paper drinking cups (for the Department's transport plane for executives) that cost the Government $17.35 in administrative expenses, a Fish and Wildlife Service item listed as costing 32 cents but actually costing the Department $18.78, and so on. The subcommittee found the procurement costs per item varying from $4.78 (for the Secretary's office) to $17.35 in the Reclamation Bureau.

Obviously something is wrong with such a system, or variety of systems. The subcommittee bluntly declared that procurement activities at department headquarters are wasteful and extravagant. This charge was made despite an apparent effort within the Department to reduce administrative costs in the procurement field. The Esquire purchase, incidentally, was made subsequent to an order to consolidate small items and to reduce the number of purchases of articles of small cost. These wasteful buying incidents are trivial of course, standing alone, but they are symbolic of the profligate attitude that prevails in too many governmental sectors. That such an attitude should continue to exist in some Federal agencies in time of national emergency is beyond understanding.

Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the N. Bend Tribune of last week entitled "Unfinished Business."

The editor of this well-known veterans' newspaper, Mr. Edward K. Inman, writes understandingly and comprehensively of the important problem now facing the Veterans' Administration in caring for disabled veterans of the Korean conflict with a hospital set-up that is inadequate and understaffed.

I want to urge upon all of you earliest priority of consideration for legislation that will provide sufficient hospitalization and treatment for disabled veterans of all wars. This is not a gift nor a grant; it is an obligation and duty we owe to those who are injured in defending our country. There should be no time lost in enacting legislation that will authorize the building of additional hospital facilities. The editorial follows:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

If it were not so tragically misleading we would have been amused no little at the recent statement of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., that his agency is fully equipped to take care of all veterans of the Korean conflict who are discharged disabled and cannot be returned to duty. We suppose that Gray was referring to some portion of that 27,000 reported wounded, who are not to be retained indefinitely for treatment and rehabilitation by the Department of Defense or who are not separated from service after maximum recovery from lesser disabilities, but, even so, the good general is either being misled by some of his own staff or he just does not know what he is talking about. Under the circumstances, and because the new Eighty-second Congress must deal with the whole question of veterans' hospitalization, we think it is timely to once more discuss here this very critical problem. We suspect that the Veterans' Administrator was merely parroting the convictions of his chief medical officer, Dr. Paul Budd Magnuson, and his crowd from the American Medical Association who have no desire to have former servicemen occupy hospital beds at Government expense under any conditions, and we believe we can justify that inference.

For purposes of accuracy suppose we once more review the facts and from them draw the only possible conclusions that can be found in these repeated assertions that the VA is equipped to hospitalize an indefinite number of disabled, and let us go all the way back to the beginning so that there can be no mistake about any of it. We were not here during the Civil War and the wars that preceded it, and we know only what we have read about the abject lack of facilities to care for the wounded. There are only a dozen Union veterans now living, and thanks to the vision of their younger comrades, they have available Veterans' Administration beds which will not be denied if or when needed. However, there are something under 100,000 elderly veterans of the Spanish-American War still living, who are entitled to have humane treatment at the hands of the VA and are not receiving it. As of November 30, 1950, there were an estimated 3,600,000 men surviving from World War I, who are supposed to have the right to hospitalization when they need it, and, omitting the potential list resulting from the war in Korea, there were almost 15,000,000 World War II veterans of record who could demand the same protection under given circumstances. Shocking as it may seem, there are available and building to take care of this load exactly 118,363 operating beds. And VA officials have the effrontery to say they can take care of all comers. They have "plenty" of beds.

Let's see what they do have. Ten thousand of the number just stated are not yet built. Operating, or capable of being operated, are 108,260, but Dr. Magnuson says he cannot use all of these because he cannot staff them with doctors, nurses, and other necessary personnel. Some 97,488 are occupied by veteran patients, or were on November 30. These hospital beds are made up of 31,170 general medical and surgical; 52,100 psychotic and other nervous cases; 12,978 tubercular; 832 obstetric and miscellaneous, and—mark this—408 in readiness or occupied by nonveterans. Also, there are 5,954 beds reserved for one reason or another, and 4,824 are vacant. How many of them are staffed we do not know, but these are the "plenty of beds" for Korean casualties. Actually the VA was renting 12,500 beds before last July when the Commies began their march of aggression, but at least some of them had to be turned back to the armed services. These off-the-cuff statements by VA officials make good reading, but the truth is that they are spotted for the purpose of propagandizing some veterans out from between the sheets—about which we shall remark further, later on.

As a matter of positive fact, this country is many thousands of beds for veterans short of its needs. Many readers will recall the mad building program that was started after World War I when the Government had not begun to anticipate its requirements and was caught with its pants down. Interested parties, especially organized veterans, were compelled to fight tooth and nail to get new and enlarged hospitals. It was found, obviously enough, that it takes years to build such facilities, and—note this—the presently built and proposed total of 118,363 operating beds above mentioned are fewer than were then expected to fill the anticipated wants of World War I veterans alone. Far from being able to care for any new crop of war casualties, no provision has yet been attempted for any of the 15,000,000 World War II servicemen, let alone those coming home from Korea or to come back from world war III. In January 1949, President Truman defied the Congress and cut back by Executive order an authorization for 16,000 additional beds at a then estimated cost of $237,000,000, but, despite the fact that 300,000 or more patients must be cared for in another 25 years, the AMA and its stooges in our own veterans' agency have been able to block passage of legislation to provide what everybody knows will be required if veterans' laws are not circumvented.

Should anybody have any doubt about what we have written here, we challenge them publicly to deny what is proven fact. As the VA has expanded and as its bureaucratic power has increased, it has defied the Congress, the representatives of the people, and it is giving orders, not taking them. The interests of the very veterans that the VA is intended to serve are being fouled up. This hospital-bed proposition is only the beginning of further encroachments upon the rights of men and women who have served their country in time of war. The whole truth is that it is planned to keep veterans out of the hospitals excepting for treatment of proved service-connected disabilities, and, after that is accomplished, we had better be prepared to defend other legal privileges. The boys in the saddle are up to their old tricks again, and our veterans had best watch out.

With long, long lists of applicants seeking to be admitted to veterans' hospitals, MAGNUSON and his kind accuse some of enjoying "hospitalitis." He states that there never will be enough beds to take care of everybody who wants them. While men of war die like flies outside VA installations because of a lack of beds, the brass there says "there's no room in the inn." Reports show vacant beds which General Gray's bosses say they cannot staff. MAGNUSON insists that no more will be built and orders the Congress, through the President and his Budget Director, to turn down legislative requests, and the Administrator joins him in saying "we are fully equipped to care for all Korean casualties." Follow these tactics through to a final end, listen to the publicized attacks on war veterans who need hospital care and cannot get it, and there is but one answer. Hospitalization for veterans without disabilities proved to be the actual and direct result of war is on the way out regardless of the menace posed to the public health by those who suffer from communicable diseases and mental disturbances. Those fine warriors who have saved this Nation from its enemies in time of war and who now need help in disablement and old age are turned away to be public charges under social laws designed to care for other unfortunates. Their services forgotten and deprecated by time and neglect, they are to revert to the economic scrapheap and die disregarded heroes.

This is not a very pretty picture, but it is what is in the mill. There is plenty of money to appease Communists, debate the state of the world, and feed and clothe all backward nations, but none for those who have made such things possible. We enjoin this new Congress to do something about it. We warn the spokesmen for war veterans to place the facts before the citizenry and demand that their legislators correct abuses by protecting those who have protected them. It is time to move, and move fast, if we are not for a third time going to have to treat war casualties in tents, in barns, and in poorhouses. This is a part of our unfinished business.

Colonel Lindsay Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Col. C. H. Lindsay, an outstanding resident of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent, has for many years been one of our most substantial citizens and has achieved distinction in many lines. He is the active manager of two large sawmills in Louisiana, owned by the Joyce interests, one at Ponchatoula and the other at my home town of Winnfield, La. It probably can be said of him that he has made a success of everything he has ever undertaken. He can do almost anything with wood or iron. I think he comes nearer to being jack-of-all-trades than any man I have ever known. He not only can operate large industries, but he can plan the construction from the ground up. His latest achievement was the construction of a large sawmill at my home town.

Recently Colonel Lindsay took on a new field of endeavor. In addition to his many duties and undertakings, he has contributed a number of guest editorials to a local paper. These editorials have been received with considerable interest. I believe the thinking of this outstanding businessman will be of interest to many others, and I am, therefore, including the following editorials prepared by Colonel Lindsay in the RECORD:

THE LIGHT OF LIFE

(By C. H. Lindsay)

The light of liberty is the light of life for mankind everywhere. It is a light which

has burned with ever-increasing brilliance and strength in this land of ours since 1776.

Today, as seldom before in all of our long and glorious history, that light and that liberty are imperiled. A deadly serpent has been loosed upon the American people. Already its deadly virus has seeped into government, commerce, industry, labor—into our schools, colleges, and homes.

The name of that deadly serpent is communism.

Communism, which has a thousand aliases, is the most terrible menace which has faced our people in all of our history. It is even now gnawing at the very vitals of our life as a Nation, and our lives as individuals. It would, first of all, extinguish that light of liberty which has guided us since the birth of our Nation; then it would enslave us and crush us under the domination of a cruel and wicked way of life.

There is only one sure and certain defense against the deadly virus of communism. That defense is the faith of the American people in our way of life—and their willingness to be ever alert against the insidious virus of communism. That defense is the faith of the American people in our way of life—and their willingness to be ever alert against the insidious virus of the communistic doctrine and to put down the serpent, to crush the monster with truth.

It is up to every man and woman and child of us who would preserve the American way of life.

The sacred light of liberty is the light that shall not and must not fail.

PREJUDICE—A TOOL OF COMMUNISM

(By C. H. Lindsay)

Prejudice is a weapon which most world powers seeking imperialistic goals have found most effective in the battle for power. Such techniques are now being employed by the Communist and are threatening the very existence of our democratic form of government.

It is the Red's aim to pit race against race, religion against religion, prejudice against prejudice and thus divide and conquer.

We know what has been done to stir up hatred for the avowed purpose of causing confusion, distrust, and disunity among the American people.

Thought and action are the redeeming features of our lives, so we must think and act every way possible to defend, by all means, our fundamental tenets of liberty, justice, and decency. This rests on all alike.

YOU CAN'T TRY COMMUNISM

(By C. H. Lindsay)

You either buy communism, or you don't. If you buy the Red package, you've bought it for keeps, you're stuck with the deal, no return goods, you can't change your mind.

Maybe America isn't exactly heaven all the time. We have our ups and downs, lately principally downs, but at least you can holler—without some party member beating your ears off. You can gripe without being liquidated. You can always throw your weight around, and sooner or later conditions will adjust for the better if you think right and act right.

So keep both eyes open for the oily comrade. When he tries to feed you—try communism—you know the come-back, say to him:

What do you mean try?

Why not try arsenic, or cancer, or leprosy?

How can you try something when you can't change your mind?

THE RIGHT TO CHANGE OUR MINDS IS THE RIGHT OF ALL AMERICANS

(By C. H. Lindsay)

Maybe you know the Declaration of Independence by memory, maybe you know every word of the Constitution, or maybe you don't, but every one of us should know American ideas like these:

In America, power belongs to the self-governing people.

Government has always and is now the servant, never the master.

In America, you can say or write what you believe.

If you think the Government is rotten, you can yell it from the house tops.

In America, you can always change your mind and keep on changing it. You can try this, you can try that, you can always say, this is no good, try something else. But not under communism, you don't think, you don't talk, you don't try anything, because you can't change your mind. The Communist member with the gun will see to that.

You do what you are told to do or else.

The Late Gen. Walton Harris Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial from the New York Times in tribute to the late Gen. Walton Harris Walker. I had the honor to serve under General Walker in his XX Corps of the Third United States Army through the entire period of the European campaign. The Eighty-first Congress is to be commended for its action in giving General Walker the posthumous rank of full general, which he so well earned on the field of battle.

A GENERAL GOES TO HIS REST

Nearly half a year has gone by since Lt. Gen. Walton Harris Walker took over command of the United Nations ground troops in Korea. These have been terrible months. General Walker saw his men pushed back almost to Pusan. He commanded, under General MacArthur, the bold and arduous northward advance. At the seeming moment of victory he had the heartbreaking task of surrendering dearly won ground before the overwhelming Chinese attack. Throughout the victories and the reverses he conducted himself like the great soldier he was. Men who had fought under him when he led the late General Patton's Twentieth Corps in the drive across France and Germany and into Austria recognized in Korea his skilled and dashing tactics, his sturdiness under difficult conditions, and his indifference to personal danger. General Walker had 19 awards and decorations. He earned them all.

When he died yesterday in an accident north of Seoul, General MacArthur had already recommended his promotion to the rank of full general. As General MacArthur said, "His gallantry in action has been an inspiration to all who have served with him and his loss will be keenly felt not only by our own country but by those allied with us in the cause of freedom on the Korean Peninsula." No doubt he would have preferred to die under enemy fire. But his death at that time and place was a true sacrifice to the country and the cause he served. An officer whose motto was to make training hard so that combat would seem easy, he had the affection and respect of his men. He will not be soon forgotten.

Champions Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward Tomlinson from the Washington Star of January 7, 1951:

CHAMPIONS SOLIDARITY—ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE MILLER TRIES TO MAKE AMERICAS INTO ONE FAMILY

(By Edward Tomlinson)

The one bright spot on the horizon of our international relations is Latin America. In spite of our indifference toward, not to say our neglect of them, in the years following World War II, the 20 other American Republics and the vast majority of their 150,000,000 people are wholeheartedly on our side in the bitter struggle against Russian imperialism.

More promising still, we are once again assuming a definite and positive leadership in inter-American affairs. Under the initiative of Assistant Secretary Edward G. Miller the State Department is finally going all-out to revive and restore our lost prestige in the nations to the South. On the heels of our reverses in Korea and the threat of aggression in Western Europe, Mr. Miller has not only been pressing the administration for a New Deal in hemisphere policy, but boldly assuming responsibility for its success or failure.

At the critical moment when the United Nations was reeling from the Russo-Chinese forces in Korea, he put forward the plan for an emergency consultation of the 21 American Foreign Ministers, the fourth such conference ever convoked. Both Secretary Acheson and President Truman approved this full-dress inter-American gathering.

Previously Mr. Miller had busied himself principally with strengthening the economic ties with the various Latin American countries. He had endorsed the return of Nelson Rockefeller, a former Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs, to Washington as chairman of the advisory board of the point 4 program. Realizing Mr. Rockefeller's interest in the industrial development of the Latin-American nations, and his prestige in the financial and business world, Mr. Miller welcomed his predecessor to the new job, which brings him in close collaboration with the State Department.

PITCHED RIGHT IN

Soon after the Assistant Secretary took office he tackled the ticklish Argentine question in an effort to ease the tension which had existed between our own and the Government of President Juan Domingo Peron for more than 6 years. Disregarding the critics, particularly anti-Peron labor groups in this country, along with a considerable number of leftist elements and even some of the liberal newspapers, he shouldered full responsibility for making an economic deal with the Buenos Aires regime. After months of the most tedious negotiation Peron agreed to lift many restrictions on United States-Argentine trade, in return for a $125,000,000 loan, or "credit." This agreement made it possible for the majority of United States firms doing business in Argentina to be paid in dollars for goods already sold in the country, and for other companies to remit their earnings.

Unfortunately, the Argentine agreement intensified the already critical attitude of Brazilians toward Washington. Officials in Rio had previously expressed bitter disappointment over what they felt was the failure of this country to lend more economic aid in the development of their industrial resources, in return for their collaboration during World War II. Whatever we may have thought about it, such a deal with their next-door neighbor, a country that had neither sacrificed anything nor cooperated in the great world conflict, seemed to even the most intelligent Brazilian like rewarding an enemy and turning our backs on a friend. Adding insult to injury came the charges of Senator GILLETTE's Agricultural Subcommittee that Brazilian coffee growers were largely responsible for the skyrocketing of coffee prices in this country.

With State Department approval, the Export-Import Bank and also the World Bank have granted a sizable list of loans and credits to Brazilian business firms, and also to the Brazilian Government for a number of hydroelectric and other industrial projects, amounting in the past 12 months to over $100,000,000. Recently came the announcement that more than three-quarters of a million dollars of point-4 funds have been earmarked for use in providing more scientific know-how and industrial techniques for the people of that country. This is one of the very first allotments made since the fund was voted by Congress.

SEES FOR HIMSELF

A large measure of the credit for easing economic difficulties between Mexico and this country, and the advance of $150,000,000 in new loans to the government of President Miguel Alemán in the past 6 months, can be ascribed to the efforts of the Assistant Secretary. This in spite of the fact that Mexico posed a very serious personal problem for him when he took over the direction of Inter-American Affairs a year and a half ago. He had hardly been confirmed by the Senate when he became the target of a campaign instigated by persons connected with the Mexican Government oil monopoly. Several Congressmen even took up the cudgels against him and repeated some of the charges in our own legislative halls.

These charges grew out of the fact that Mr. Miller championed a State Department policy against making government-to-government loans for the exploitation of oil resources in any country. The Department and Mr. Miller took the stand that there was no justification for using public money for risk enterprise so long as there is plenty of private capital available for such purposes.

Mr. Miller has made a point of personal, on-the-spot investigations of the problems existing or arising between this country and its neighbors. No other high official of the State Department, since the days when former Secretary Cordell Hull visited so many of the southern capitals, has been in more intimate contact with Latin American leaders in their own countries. Within the first 12 months after he assumed office he had visited and spent time in every one of the 20 republics.

Nor have any other policy-making officials of the Department in recent times been so well qualified to meet and deal with Latin officials of all the countries on equal terms. In fluent Spanish, Portuguese, and French, the three languages spoken in the various 20 nations, he has been able to converse with presidents, politicians, businessmen, and day laborers.

Close observation of the personnel of the Latin American division reveals that the chief deputies and assistants also are nearly all old hands in the Latin American field. Most of them are proficient in the different languages of the countries with which they deal. Thomas Mann, present Deputy Assistant Secretary; John Drier, one of those assigned to keep liaison with the Latins in the United Nations; Fletcher Warren, director of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, and others have served many years on the firing line, and are among the most experienced men in hemisphere relations.

No Time To Quit in Tidelands Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram:

NO TIME TO QUIT IN TIDELANDS FIGHT

The United States Supreme Court has entered a final decree transferring Texas oil-bearing tidelands to the Federal Government by a process which Senator CONNALLY brands with the bald term of theft. That means that insofar as court action is concerned Texas has gone down to bitter defeat in a fight in which it passionately believes that right was on its side. It means also that the one last hope of overturning the effect of the Supreme Court's decision lies in action by Congress quitclaiming the tidelands to the States on which they border.

The National Association of Attorneys General has voted to fight for such legislation. This help will be welcomed, for passage of title-validating legislation undoubtedly has been made more difficult by the high Court's decision. Unquestionably the attorneys general are motivated, at least in part, by the clear perception that the doctrine laid down by the Supreme Court in the tidelands case constitutes a threat to State-owned and private holdings in other States. As a dissenting opinion in the Texas case pointed out, the Court by the same reasoning could transfer to the Federal Government the ownership of inland waters or uplands deposits of iron ore or other minerals now in the hands of private owners or the States.

It was an astonishing dissent which Attorney General Wallace Warner, of North Dakota, took to the resolution pledging a continued fight for State ownership of the tidelands. Mr. Warner said that since the Supreme Court had decided the case, lawyers had no right to protest.

Since when have lawyers, the supposed servants of justice, given up the right to protest against injustice, however perpetrated? Since when has it become incumbent upon them to accede silently to a decision demonstrably based upon a glaring error of fact? Since when has the obligation been placed upon them to acquiesce in a summary judgment rendered without any hearing of evidence which unmistakably would have pointed out this error?

And what, in ethics or in conscience, bars them from seeking redress of injustice by means clearly provided for in our system of government and fully within its spirit?

Texans are not likely to be convinced that injustice is a thing to be accepted until every effort for its redress has been exhausted.

Restoration of Confidence in Our Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the House for its permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written to the New York Herald Tribune by a warm personal friend and constituent, Mr. Stuart A. Young. In his letter Mr. Young expresses the hopes and fears of many people in the country and it is not written in any spirit of partisanship. It is the fervent prayer of all Americans that we have unity in our thinking and in our actions during these days, but it is impossible to acquire that unity unless there is confidence in our public servants.

Whether we like it or not and whether it is justifiable or not, the awful fact remains that there is a lack of confidence in our foreign policies as determined by the Department of State, and it is imperative for the good of the country that that confidence be restored, and I am afraid that it can only be restored by a thorough overhauling of its personnel.

Mr. Young's letter follows:

JANUARY 9, 1951.

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

I am one of the many citizens of this Republic whose voice carries little weight in the solution of its problems or in the shaping of this high destiny. However, my forebears and my four children have fought (and some died) in defense of their country from the time of the Colonial Wars down to the present. No charge of isolation or lack of patriotism can be lodged against them, or any of them. They fought to preserve their freedom and independence of thought and action and the sacred guaranties under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States.

The voice of the American people who have these traditions to uphold should be heard and heeded in this crises. And their voice should be heeded in the halls of Congress where final authority rests to engage the American people in war. Was it the intention of the founding fathers to vest in the President power over the lives of our countrymen without prudent consideration of their will and opinion? Should such power be placed in the hands of a well-meaning but incompetent leader whose ability extends only to the field of partisan politics? Should secret treaties and commitments be made with foreign governments, concerning which the Congress and the American people have had little or no knowledge? Well, the answer is "No." Woodrow Wilson tried something of that nature at the conclusion of World War I, and because Congress did not approve, failed in his undertaking—and Woodrow Wilson was a great man.

The handwriting is on the wall. Let us get our boys out of Korea before they are utterly destroyed; they can be used to better advantage elsewhere. Resistance in South Korea will prove disastrous in the end, with ever increasing hordes from the north pouring down to the scene of conflict.

Let us reexamine our foreign policy to the end that before sending the flower of our youth to fight again in Europe, we shall be certain and not merely hopeful of cooperation from our allies. Otherwise, these boys of ours may be buried in foreign soil.

If we can rely on unity and cooperation among our allies, then our solemn prayer should be: "Godspeed General Eisenhower in his mission."

Let us recognize the fact that the political views of the Far East and of the West are totally different, and at this time impossible of reconciliation. Let us make every effort toward a peaceful solution, but not by way of appeasement or further loss of prestige. Russia does not want a peaceful solution. If she cannot attain her ends through the methods now being pursued, she will not hesitate to launch a third world war, when and where she wills. She should not be heard with her voice of slander and political propaganda either in the Security Council or the General Assembly. She has no place in the deliberations of free nations.

Let us arm to the teeth, but let us arm with only two thoughts: First, for our own preservation and defense, and next for the preservation and defense of those of our allies who feel unflinchingly as we do.

Let us look well before we leap, and let the people of this country, through their representatives in Congress, look well before we are all committed to a policy that may prove disastrous.

The question of the President's right under the Constitution to send troops abroad without congressional approval is academic and subject to debate; but his assertion that he has this vital and decisive right and presumably will exercise it, is presumptuous and insulting to the intelligence of the American people.

If the American people understand their commitments, if they believe in the righteousness of their cause, if they have confidence in the ability and judgment of their leaders, they will fight now and hereafter, as they have in the past.

The verities that prudence is often the better part of valor and that fools rush in where angels fear to tread, are still eternal.

Let the voice of the American people be heard.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, as the war clouds in Korea worsen, many of our friends in Colorado are worried and feel that immediate steps should be taken by our Government to supply our Armed Forces with all weapons necessary to strike at the enemy with force sufficient to drive them back into China.

As part of my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a petition signed by those who wish action to be taken now on this matter. I also include two newspaper articles.

PETITION

1. We, the undersigned, believe that an immediate decision must be made by our Government in the Korean situation.

2. We believe that our Government must either grant to our military leaders the authority to use every weapon and to strike the Chinese Communists at any target necessary to successfully carry out the Korean operation, or that all American troops in Korea should be withdrawn immediately.

3. We believe that the needless loss of life in this conflict which is due to our refusal to give complete support to our troops is morally wrong.

4. We believe that if there is a reason for the present policy of fighting in Korea with one hand tied behind our back, that the American people deserve to know that reason.

Barbara Martinson, Reuben A. Martinson, Jr., Robert D. Inman, Virginia C. Inman, G. A. Shomaker, Jr., J. J. Dolan, W. A. Cockle, Anna I. Cockle, Norene Velte, D. F. Velte, Dean A. Sanborn, Ernest Eggebrotin, Adda Catewell, A. A. Wukstron, Laverne D. Hayman, Albert W. Copeland, Mrs. Albert Copeland, Durland G. Skinner, Gerold C. Wickmann, H. J. Marin, Benjamin B. Weybrew, H. C. Klewere, Nellie Klewere, Merle June Green, Merll C. Green, Dr. Ernest Moore, A. O. Eserl, C. S. Higby, Charline K. Scoggin, Mrs. Henry Knudson, A. Engdahl, Milton E. Lewis, Mrs. Luther L. Higby, Mrs. Nancy White, John C. Horton, Byron Wells, George V. C. Shuger, Mrs. James B. Graham, James E. Watson, Mrs. J. E. Watson, Mrs. Wayne Biggs, Mrs. James Hackett, James Hackett, Byron L. Tankersley, Mrs. Vera L. Mathes, H. H. Pribbeno, Mrs. B. L. Tankersley, Mr. John Machesney, Mrs. John Machesney, Mrs. Ella M. Paull, T. S. Paull, Mildred Post, W. B. Post, Mr. J. R. Kennedy, Mrs. J. R. Kennedy, Mr. Joe Scheib, Mrs. Joseph Scheib, and Mrs. Carrie Williams, all of Boulder, Colo.; Harold Mullikin and Mrs. Harold Mullikin, Denver, Colo.; C. W. Parsons, Peryl Wade Parsons, Bethel L. Curtze, Gordon H. Curtze, G. C. Hayman, Dean Faulkner, Patricia P. Faulkner, Nilrose Heinemann, Donald G. Brotman, Henry P. Smith, J. A. Lunsford, S. L. Koch, Earl Pettigrew, Mrs. Earl Pettigrew, and Elizabeth Rawson, all of Boulder, Colo.; Mrs. Stuart Kastner and S. P. Kastner, Littleton, Colo.; C. C. Ireland, Mitchell, Nebr.; Mollie W. Hubbell, Thelma Driver, Mrs. W. B. Golliher, Mrs. I. S. Kendall, Edna Mae Kendall, and Katheryn Noelker, all of Boulder, Colo.; Mr. James T. Hacker, Sr., and Mrs. James T. Hacker, Sr., Lafayette, Colo.; Ferne King, Don Heinemann, Ruth E. Warden, Robert Roemer, Catharine Roemer, Marguerite Sherman, Grace M. Sherman, Argie Watson, Mattie Pribbeno, Lois McCray, Al McCray, and Mrs. Jessie McCray, all of Boulder, Colo.; Mrs. Essie Marshall and Mr. E. J. Marshall, Longmont, Colo.; George A. Walters, Lea Massman, Margaret Hightower, Alex Schneider, Asa C. Wing, Priscilla M. Hardifer, Isabel Moore, Luella Gifford, Margaret Flanigan, Grace and Joe Stapp, J. K. Stengel, Mrs. J. K. Stengel, Mrs. A. Engdahl, Lee Roy Shields, J. A. Hochstatter, Mrs. Frank Dolan, Frank P. Dolan, Mrs. Henry Smith, Mrs. David Morgan, Mrs. John A. Lunsford, Glen E. Powers, and Marianne Koch, all of Boulder, Colo.; John F. Simpson, Eldorado Springs, Colo.; Harry Driver and Chas. Ackerman, Boulder, Colo.; R. W. Jones and Mrs. R. W. Jones, Berthoud, Colo.; Lulu Rosengrant, Sarah E. Brenner, David Morgan, K. E. Brandt, Harold H. Close, Mary Anne Scheib, all of Boulder, Colo.

BOULDER PETITION ASKS KOREA WAR DECISION

BOULDER, COLO., January 8.—Petitions calling for an immediate decision by the Government on the Korean situation were being circulated in Boulder Monday by the committee for a decision in Korea.

The newly organized committee is headed by two young Boulder businessmen, Reuben Martinson, and Robert Inman. Martinson is the husband of Barbara Guild Martinson, sister of Marine Lt. John Guild, who was recently killed in the Korean fighting.

Mrs. Martinson and her husband have offered a $5,000 legacy, left her by Lieutenant Guild—to open a fund that would be used to promote a drive which through public opinion would demand a decision by the administration on the Korean problem.

FOUR PARTS OF PETITION

Here are the four parts of the petition:

"1. We, the undersigned, believe that an immediate decision must be made by our Government in the Korean situation.

"2. We believe that our Government must either grant to our military leaders the authority to use every weapon and to strike the Chinese Communists at any target necessary to successfully carry out the Korean operation, or that all American troops in Korea should be withdrawn immediately.

"3. We believe that the needless loss of life in this conflict which is due to our refusal to give complete support to our troops is morally wrong.

"4. We believe that if there is a reason for the present policy of fighting in Korea with one hand tied behind our back, that the American people deserve to know that reason."

URGE PRESIDENT NOTIFICATION

Besides circulating the petitions, the committee is urging all American citizens to notify the President or their Congressmen that an immediate decision on the Korean situation must be made by the Government.

And the committee is advocating that the people demand all-out use of American armed might in the conflict with the Chinese and North Korean Reds so the wasting of American lives may be stopped.

WHO IS FIGHTING THE UN WAR?

The United States News and World Report, in its issue of January 12, 1951, raises the question, "Who is fighting the UN war—United States gets no more aid against fresh enemy." The article says that the United States cannot count on much more outside help for the "next phase in Korea" and that "Communists, in fighting men, hold almost a two-to-one advantage. And there are millions more where those came from. On the other side, United States casualties alone are more than twice the entire number of troops sent in by other UN allies."

The news magazine said the Communists have a land force of 440,000 in Korea and that UN troops totaled 273,000, made up as follows:

United States	150,000
South Koreans (estimated)	100,000
Britons	10,000
Turks	4,000
Australians	1,500
French	1,400
Canadians	1,200
Filipinos	1,100
Siamese	1,300
Belgians	1,000
New Zealanders	900
Greeks	800
Dutch	400

The United States News article then concluded: "The United States, thus, is furnishing the major part of the ground troops fighting the Communists in Korea. Although General MacArthur pleaded for help from other members of the UN, the 24,000 soldiers he actually has received from them amount to less than one-half the casualties suffered so far by American Ground Forces."

Earl Michener Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement appearing in the Adrian Daily Telegram, of Adrian, Mich., on January 4, 1951, in reference to our former colleague, Earl Michener, of Michigan:

EARL MICHENER RETIRES

In the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress words of high praise were spoken by Democrats and Republicans alike in the House of Representatives for the service performed there over the years by Earl C. Michener. They are richly deserved.

Mr. Michener has served the Second Michigan District devotedly and sincerely. He has been especially close to his constituents, winning the support and admiration of his district in a way it has been the good fortune of few Members of Congress to enjoy. Yet Earl Michener has always been guided by his conscience and his country's interest.

If we were speaking a tribute in Congress to Mr. Michener's work as a public servant we would repeat what Edmund Burke told the British Parliament, back in 1774, about the duties of a representative. Burke said:

"Surely, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction to theirs; and, above all, ever, and in all cases, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from providence for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you not his industry only but his judgment; which he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

World War II Veterans' Benefits—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include part I of a summary of major World War II veterans' benefits, as carried in the December 19, 1950, issue of the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly:

ROUNDUP OF MAJOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS' BENEFITS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Basic eligibility requirements for all major benefits that VA administers for World War II veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries in the United States, its possessions and Territories, and in foreign countries are briefly outlined below. More detailed information may be obtained from any VA office in the United States, its possessions or Territories or from any DAV national service officer. In foreign countries, it may be obtained from any United States Foreign Service office.)

MEDICAL AND DOMICILIARY BENEFITS

Hospitalization: World War II veterans, if discharged or separated under conditions other than dishonorable, are entitled to VA hospital treatment, under the following priority system:

First. Emergency cases.

Second. Those suffering from injuries or diseases incurred or aggravated in line of duty during wartime service.

Third. Those who state under oath that they are unable to pay hospital charges for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities or illnesses. These veterans, if not in the emergency category, must wait until a bed becomes available.

Emergency patients may be taken directly to the nearest VA hospital. If possible, the veteran, or someone acting for him or her, should communicate with VA by telephone or telegraph.

In all other cases the veteran, his nearest relative, guardian, or representative, should fill in the proper form for hospital care. These forms are available at any VA office.

If admission to a VA hospital or home has been approved, Government transportation may be provided as follows:

1. Hospitals: To the hospital and, upon completion of treatment in service-connected cases, to his or her home. This service may be provided for non-service-connected cases if they are unable to pay for the transportation.

2. Homes: To a VA domiciliary home.

Domiciliary care: Domiciliary care is designed to provide a home for those veterans who have a chronic condition which incapacitates them from earning a living and who require minimal medical attention. Requirements for admission for domiciliary care are essentially the same as for hospital treatment. Transportation at Government expense as a rule is provided only for the initial admission.

The veteran, or his nearest relative, guardian or representative, should obtain preadmission approval from the nearest VA installation having facilities for domiciliary care.

Outpatient medical treatment: Outpatient medical care is available for veterans in need of treatment for service-connected disabilities.

Under this plan, eligible World War II veterans may receive treatment at VA hospitals or other field stations furnishing medical treatment, or from approved private physicians. Each veteran's eligibility must be determined by VA before treatment of this type can be authorized. Necessary drugs may be obtained from home-town druggists at Government expense by veterans who are authorized to report to private physicians for treatment.

Outpatient dental treatment: Veterans entitled to outpatient dental treatment may, upon VA approval, be furnished dental treatment by private dentists at Government expense. Here, again, the condition must be determined by VA to have been incurred in, or made worse by, the veteran's wartime service before treatment can be authorized. Preliminary examinations may be made in a VA dental clinic or, if VA dental facilities are not feasibly available, by a participating dentist. Treatment, if approved, may be completed in a VA clinic, or the veteran may be assigned to an approved private dentist.

Prosthetic service: A veteran's eligibility for prosthetic appliances may be established if (1) he has a service-connected or service-aggravated disability requiring an appliance or (2) if an appliance is determined necessary as a part of hospital treatment or domiciliary care.

Complete information and necessary forms for procuring needed appliances, equipment, and repairs are available at any VA office.

Examinations: Free medical examinations if required will be given veterans filing compensation claims. Veterans desiring to reinstate their national service life insurance may receive a physical examination free of charge at any VA medical office.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Eligible disabled veterans may receive education or training at Government expense, with tuition, supplies, and, in many cases, subsistence allowance provide by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 16, 78th Cong., as amended).

Eligibility: Disabled veterans are eligible if: (1) They had active service between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947; (2) they were discharged or separated under conditions other than dishonorable; (3) they have a service-connected or aggravated disability which would entitle them to compensation (even if they are not receiving disability compensation); and (4) VA determines they need vocational training to overcome their handicap. All four conditions must be met.

Length of training: Eligible veterans may get training for as long as is necessary to restore their ability to work, up to a total of 4 years. Veterans may apply for vocational rehabilitation at any time after their discharge but in time to complete their training by July 25, 1956.

Type of training: Before disabled veterans begin training, they will be interviewed by VA counselors. If necessary, they will be given a series of tests to determine their aptitudes and interests. This, together with a review of the veterans' past experiences, will enable the VA counselor and training officer to help the veterans decide the type of training they should get.

Eligible veterans may be: (1) Enrolled in schools or colleges; (2) placed in apprenticeship or other training on the job; or (3) entered in institutional on-farm training programs or other programs which combine school and job training.

Subsistence allowances: While in training and for 2 months after rehabilitation, the disabled veterans may receive subsistence allowances in addition to their disability compensation.

Basic monthly subsistence rates for disabled veterans studying full-time in schools and colleges are $75 without dependents, $105 with one dependent, and $120 with more than one dependent.

Basic rates for job trainees are $65 without dependents and $90 with one or more dependents.

Rates for veterans enrolled in combination types of training may be somewhat higher than the job-training rates.

Additional allowances may be provided, depending on the veterans' degree of disability and the number of additional dependents they have.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Eligible veterans may receive education or training at Government expense, with tuition, supplies, and in many cases, a subsistence allowance provided by the GI bill.

Eligibility: Veterans are eligible if: (1) they were in active military service some time between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947; (2) they served 90 days or more or were discharged before 90 days of service for a disability actually incurred in service; (3) they were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. All three conditions must be met.

Length of training: Eligible veterans may get a course of training not to exceed 1 year plus a period equal to the time served in the Armed Forces, between the above-mentioned dates, up to a maximum of 4 years. Veterans must start their training within 4 years from date of discharge or July 25, 1951, whichever is later, and complete it by July 25, 1956.

Type of training: Eligible veterans may choose their own course of training in any school or establishment approved by the appropriate State approval agency. Generally, the school must have been in operation on its own for at least 1 year prior to the date of the veteran's enrollment. Veterans may: (1) Enroll in schools or colleges; (2) take apprenticeship or other training on the job; (3) enroll in institutional on-farm training, or other programs which combine school and job training; or (3) select correspondence-school courses.

The law does not permit a veteran to take a course for avocational or recreational purposes. If the course is one which is frequently pursued for such purposes, the veteran must submit to VA complete justification or sworn affidavits that the course he wants will be useful to him in earning a living. Prior approval of VA must be obtained before he may start such training.

After a veteran has commenced a course he must at all times maintain satisfactory conduct and progress. If he wants to change from one course to another he first should consult VA, for the law has established some limitations on course changes.

Subsistence allowances: Veterans entering any type of training (except correspondence-school instruction) may be eligible to receive subsistence allowances.

Maximum monthly allowances for veterans studying full time in schools and colleges are $75 without dependents, $105 with one dependent, and $120 with more than one dependent.

Maximum rates for job trainees are $65 without dependents and $90 with one or more dependents.

Rates for veterans enrolled in combination types of training may be somewhat higher than the job-training rates.

These amounts are reduced for part-time courses and also may be affected by the extent of a veteran's earnings.

GI BILL LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS

A veteran who served at any time between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947, and was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after at least 90 days' active service (or for service-incurred disability in less than 90 days) may qualify for a GI loan.

Unremarried widows of men who served during that period and who died as the result of service may also qualify.

Three types of loans are permissible: (1) To purchase, construct, or improve a home; (2) to buy a farm, farm land, stock, feed, and seed, farm machinery, and other farm supplies and equipment, and (3) to buy a business or otherwise to enable a veteran to undertake or expand a legitimate business venture.

Under certain conditions, loans may be obtained to liquidate delinquent indebtedness incurred in connection with these three categories.

Normally, VA is not empowered to lend money to the veteran. He makes his own arrangements for the loan through the usual financing channels. VA then guarantees the lender against loss up to 50 percent of the loan, with a maximum guaranty of $4,000 on real estate and $2,000 on non-real-estate loans.

If the veteran has previously used none of his loan guaranty entitlement, his home loan may qualify for a guaranty of 60 percent of the loan with a maximum guaranty of $7,500.

Under certain conditions, VA also is authorized to make a limited number of direct, Government loans to veterans for the purchase or construction of a home in areas where private mortgage financing at an interest rate of 4 percent is not available.

The interest rate on GI loans normally may not exceed 4 percent per year on the unpaid balance.

In the case of all GI loans, VA pays the lender, for credit to the veteran's loan account, an amount equal to 4 percent, but not more than $160 of the guaranteed portion of the loan. This is a gift to the veteran and not a loan.

Veterans, and widows as well, have until July 25, 1957, in which to apply for GI loans.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

Any veteran who served a minimum of 16 days between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947, and was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after at least 90 days of total service (or for service-incurred disability in less than 90 days) may qualify for unemployment or self-employment allowances.

The period of entitlement is based on length of service between those dates, with the veteran receiving 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of such service and 4 weeks for each additional month. The major fraction of a month counts as a full month.

The maximum entitlement for unemployment allowances is 52 weeks, and for self-employment, 10⅔ months.

Eligible veterans may claim readjustment allowances during periods of total or partial unemployment or when self-employed and earning less than $100 a month.

A veteran has 2 years from date of discharge in which to claim readjustment allowances, but no payments may be made for any week which begins later than July 25, 1952.

Unemployment allowances: The veteran must be able to work and be available for suitable work. He must register for work with a public employment office, where he also files his claim. Unemployed veterans receive $20 per week. Partially employed veterans get $20, less net earnings during the week in excess of $3.

Self-employment allowances: Self-employed veterans also make application at a public employment office. They receive $100 per month, less any net earnings during the month, if they are fully engaged throughout the month, and for profit.

ARMED FORCES RECRUITMENT ACT ENLISTEES

The Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945 provided that persons enlisting or reenlisting in the Armed Forces between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946, may count the entire period of such enlistment or reenlistment as war service for purposes of GI bill benefits, regardless of the date the war was declared officially ended.

Such enlistees, therefore, may substitute the date that their period of enlistment ended in computing their benefits where that date is later than July 25, 1947.

Dating from the end of the enlistment period, such enlistees will have: (1) Ten years in which to use their loan guaranty rights; (2) the full period in which to accrue entitlement for education and training, 4 years in which to commence training, and 9 years to complete it; (3) the full period in which to accrue entitlement for readjustment allowances for unemployment or self-employment, and a maximum of 5 years from that date (or 2 years from discharge, whichever is earlier) in which to claim them.

Equalization of Disability Pension Tax Exemption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I append hereto the substance of two letters from the Pensioners Protective Association of America, Inc., which relate to H. R. 1198, the text of which is also appended, which I have introduced to exempt disability pension for Government workers disabled in the line of their duties and forced to retire. This bill is an effort to equalize the treatment now afforded certain Government workers on disability pensions, such as firemen and policemen.

From letter of March 16, 1949:

As you know several States now exempt from taxation disability pensions paid to retired Government employees for disability received in the performance of their duties. In a recent Federal court decision exemption was likewise extended to these retired disabled Government employees on the basis that the disability pension is equivalent to and in lieu of workmen's compensation benefits which are wholly tax exempt. Enclosed is a copy of the summary of the Washington, D. C., Federal district court case and also a copy of a letter from the Treasury Department, and you will note that the case and the letter refers to firemen and policemen.

We are having a considerable amount of trouble with the Treasury Department when the disabled Government employee is not a fireman or a policeman and applies for tax exemption on his disability pension. There are many cases where street cleaners, highway workers, and various kinds of mechanics and, in fact, office workers have been disabled in the line of their duties and are forced to retire. * * *

In fact, in a recent claim filed in behalf of a department of correction employee of the city of New York, a member of the New York Employees' Retirement System, who was injured on the job as a result of an accident and forced to retire in September 1942, had to battle with the Collector of Internal Revenue's office from March 1944 up to June 1948 to get any consideration on his case, and only after we intercaded in his behalf and were allowed to file a formal claim for him in July 1948 was any appropriate action taken, and finally in November 1948 the Bureau of Internal Revenue granted him tax exemption on his disability pension but refused to allow him any refund for income taxes paid on his pension for the year of 1944. There are dozens of other cases similar to his now pending for disposition.

We wonder would you be kind enough to consider this matter and, if you feel that these disabled retired Government employees are deserving of consideration, to sponsor a bill similar to the one in the last session of Congress to give them aid and relief from Federal taxation on their disability pensions.

From letter of December 28, 1950:

As you know, all the types of health, accident, sickness, workmen's compensation, and disability benefits are income-tax exempt and as all other types of social legislative benefits are tax exempt, we can see no reason why the Internal Revenue Code has discriminated against Government employees

to not granting the exemption to disability annuities paid to their employees on retirement (status of n.).

The text of H. R. 1198 follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the words "(including personal service as an officer or employee of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing)" the following: "except pensions, retirement allowances, and annuity payments received by such a former officer or employee from such source because of disability arising solely out of such employment."

World War II Veterans' Benefits—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include part II of a summary of major World War II veterans' benefits taken from the December 12, 1950, issue of the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly:

ROUND-UP OF MAJOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS' BENEFITS

DISABILITY COMPENSATION

A veteran disabled by injury or disease incurred in, or aggravated by, service during World War II may qualify for disability compensation. His scrvice must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Monthly rates range from $15 to $150, depending on the degree of disability, plus statutory awards for amputations, blindness, etc., up to a maximum of $360.

Veterans rated 50 percent or more disabled receive additional sums for dependents.

DISABILITY PENSION

A World War II veteran who becomes permanently and totally disabled for reasons not traceable to his service in the Armed Forces may be entitled to pension.

He must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after a minimum of 90 days service, or else discharged for disability in less than 90 days.

The veteran is disqualified if his income exceeds $1,000 a year if he is single or $2,500 if he is married or has a minor child.

The monthly rate is $60, which is increased to $72 after 10 years or when the veteran reaches age 65.

DEATH COMPENSATION

The widow, children, and dependent parents of a deceased World War II veteran whose death was due to service may qualify for death compensation.

A widow loses her entitlement if she remarries. The child loses entitlement, normally, upon reaching age 18.

Monthly amounts vary according to the number and relationship of the dependents. Examples are: widow, no children, $78; one child alone, no widow, $50; one parent, $30.

DEATH PENSION

The widow and children of certain deceased World War II veterans may be entitled to death pension benefits where the veteran died of causes not due to service.

Such dependents of a veteran who, at time of death, was receiving or entitled to receive compensation for service-connected disability are eligible. Otherwise, the veteran must have served at least 90 days (or have been discharged for service-incurred disability before 90 days of service) and, at time of death, had a service-connected disability of less than 10 percent.

The widow is disqualified if her annual income exceeds $1,000, or $2,500 if she had a child or children. A child with an income in excess of $1,000 per year is not eligible. A widow loses her entitlement upon remarriage, and children normally become ineligible when they reach age 18.

A widow alone receives $42 per month, with additional allowances for children. Where there is no widow, a single child is entitled to $21.50, with added amounts for more children.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

A veteran of World War II who served at any time between October 8, 1940, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, is eligible to apply for up to $10,000 of national service life insurance, whether or not he took out such insurance while in service or has since let it lapse.

He may get term insurance or any of six permanent plans available—ordinary life, 30-payment life, 20-payment life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, and endowment at age 65.

No one may at any time hold more than $10,000 worth of Government insurance, including United States Government life (World War I) insurance.

Term and permanent policies which have been allowed to lapse may be reinstated within 3 months from date of lapse, provided the insured is in as good health at the time of reinstatement as he was when the insurance lapsed. He must furnish the necessary information to establish that fact, preferably on VA Form 9-353 or 9-353a.

After 3 months of lapse, a physical examination is required. This will be given without charge at any VA regional office or hospital.

Term insurance may be reinstated by paying only two monthly premiums, but for permanent policies, payment of all premiums in arrears with interest is required.

CARE FOR DISABLED VETERANS

A World War II veteran who in service lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs at or above the ankle may be entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance at Government expense.

VA defrays the cost of the vehicle, including any special equipment necessary to enable the disabled veteran to operate it safely, up to a maximum amount of $1,600. For vehicles costing over $1,600, VA pays $1,600 of the purchase price.

Veterans have until June 30, 1951, to apply.

AID IN ACQUIRING SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING

A veteran of war or peacetime service who is entitled to compensation for permanent and total service-connected disability for loss or loss of use of both legs due to certain specified conditions such as to prevent him from moving about without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, may qualify for assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing with special fixtures made necessary by the nature of his disability.

Eligible veterans will receive Federal grants of not more than 50 percent of the cost of their homes up to a maximum of $10,000 with which to pay part of the cost of building or buying such homes, or to remodel existing homes for their requirements.

The grant also may be used to pay off the indebtedness on such a special home already acquired by an eligible veteran.

GUARDIANSHIP SERVICE

Incompetent World War II veterans, their minor dependents, and incompetent beneficiaries, are entitled to protection of their estates derived from benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration under acts of Congress.

Such protection is provided by the chief attorneys of VA regional offices, in accordance with State and Federal laws and VA regulations, acting under the direction and supervision of the legal service (guardianship) of the VA solicitor's office.

The chief attorneys maintain supervision over guardians appointed by State (probate and county) courts, as well as legal custodians recognized by VA in their respective jurisdictions.

BURIAL BENEFITS

Funeral expenses, up to $150, will be paid by the Government in the death of any World War II veteran discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Additional costs, covering transportation, will be allowed if the veteran died in a VA hospital or home, or while hospitalized at the expense of VA, or while in transit to or from a VA hospital, home, or regional office at the expense of VA.

All claims must be filed with the VA within 2 years from the date of permanent burial. These allowances are payable only to undertakers or to reimburse the person who paid the funeral expenses.

BURIAL FLAG

An American flag to drape the casket, which may be retained as a memorial by the next of kin, is supplied in the death of veterans who have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Such flags are issued upon application, by VA field offices, most first,- second-, and third-class post offices, and those fourth-class post offices located in county seats.

VA BENEFITS AVAILABLE OUTSIDE OF UNITED STATES

(a) United States possessions and Territories: Ordinarily, all VA benefits available to World War II veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries in the continental United States are also available to them in the United States possessions and Territories.

Certain exceptions are inevitable because of conditions peculiar to each area. For detailed information in any single case, check with the nearest VA office in the United States, or directly with the affected VA office in Alaska, Hawaii, the Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(b) Foreign countries: Most VA benefits are available to World War II veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries who are residing in foreign countries.

Benefits not available are readjustment allowances for unemployment and self-employment, and loan guaranties on properties or businesses situated in foreign countries.

Hospitalization or medical treatment is available only to a United States citizen-veteran residing temporarily in a foreign country who requires such care for a war service-connected disability.

The United States Foreign Service cooperates with VA in the administration of benefits available to veterans, their dependents or beneficiaries in foreign areas.

Any query originating in a foreign country should be directed to the nearest United States diplomatic or consular office in that country.

(c) Philippine Republic: VA maintains offices in the Philippines to administer VA benefits in the Republic.

World War II veterans in the Philippines and the VA benefits for which they are eligible fall into three groups. They are:

Group 1: World War II veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States, including members of the Philippine Scouts who enlisted prior to October 6, 1945.

Such veterans are eligible for all benefits that are available to veterans residing in any foreign country. (See (b), foreign country benefits above.)

Group 2: World War II veterans who enlisted or reenlisted in the Philippine Scouts between October 6, 1945, and June 30, 1947.

under Public Law 190, Seventy-ninth Congress.

VA benefit payments with respect to the military service of this group are limited by title II, Public Law 190, Seventy-ninth Congress, to compensation for service-connected disability or death, at the rate of one Philippine peso for each dollar authorized by law.

Provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, apply to this group only as such provisions relate to contracts entered into before passage of Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved March 27, 1946.

Group 3: World War II veterans who served in the Philippine Commonwealth Army, including recognized guerrillas, while such forces were in the service of the United States Armed Forces under a military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941.

VA benefit payments with respect to the military service of this group are limited by title II, Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, to compensation for service-connected disability or death, at the rate of one Philippine peso for each dollar authorized by law.

National service life insurance benefits apply to this group only if the NSLI contracts were entered into prior to the enactment of Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946.

APPEALS

The Board of Veterans' Appeals is available for rendering final decisions in all cases appealed to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, wherein a claimant has been denied benefits to which he claims entitlement. The Board has no original jurisdiction; its work is similar to that of a court of appeals. (Appeals arising under readjustment allowances are expected.)

What the People Are Telling Congress About the Removal of Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the sickening reports of continuous United Nations defeat in Korea and the outrageous waste of American lives parade before the Nation a ceaseless indictment of Secretary of State Dean Acheson for his complete failure to develop a foreign policy in the Far East which would have operated in the best interest of the United States, and of President Truman for his stubborn support of the Acheson policies.

For the first time in the history of our Nation, we have lost the initiative and have become the victim of the whim and caprice of Communist Soviet Russia and Red China. Acheson has blindly led us into this position aided and supported by President Truman.

Never before in our history have leadership and wisdom in high places been so lacking, and the Government been rendered so impotent as it is in this critical period due to the mistakes of the administration.

In these crucial days, we cannot accept incompetent leadership without question. The stakes are too high. The future existence of our Nation, the maintenance of our form of government on this earth, depends upon competent, courageous leadership in the United States now.

The people are awake to their danger, and are demanding the removal of Acheson as Secretary of State. And the voice of the people must be heard.

A recent survey reported to a late issue of the United States News and World Report entitled "What the People Are Telling Congress" tells the story of the vitous demand from the people. That survey which follows is worthy of attention of every citizen of the Nation.

WHAT THE PEOPLE ARE TELLING CONGRESS: "GET RID OF ACHESON" AND "LISTEN TO HOOVER"

The folks back home are writing their Congressmen:

"Fire Acheson." The mail is heavily against him.

"Follow Hoover." Mail on the former President's defense plan is divided, but more letter writers are for it.

Congressional mail, over all, shows voters are anxious, apprehensive. But it won't have much bearing on Truman policies.

If letters to Congressmen accurately express the voice of the people, two things are likely to happen:

Dean Acheson will be replaced as Secretary of State.

This country will tend to reduce commitments abroad as former President Herbert Hoover suggests.

The voters who write to Congress clamor for these two changes.

In actual fact, however, letters to Congress are not as influential as they often are supposed to be. The volume of mail is small in relation to total voters. Sometimes letters are inspired and follow a pattern. Sometimes they obviously come from cranks and are discounted.

Letter writers often are persons with just, long-standing viewpoints, or deep prejudices, who do not necessarily reflect the thinking of the people as a whole. Public-opinion polls show that the general public frequently is on one side of an issue and the comparatively few persons who write to Congressmen are on the opposite side. The Congressmen themselves, urged by letter writers to vote one way, often vote the other.

These writers, nevertheless, do give something of a clue to the thinking of the public. Senators and Representatives do pay close attention to views in the mail. They find, at the moment, thinking that can to some degree be measured.

Thousands of constituents in letters blame Mr. Acheson for setbacks in Korea and for those parts of foreign policy they dislike. They demand his removal. Congress cannot fire Dean Acheson, and President Truman insists he will not do so. Yet the anti-Acheson mail, although it has fallen off greatly, still is sizable.

Herbert Hoover's ideas on the role this country should play in the world now begin to rival the Acheson issue as a cause for letter writing. Mr. Hoover has suggested that the United States convert the Western Hemisphere into another Gibraltar, that it draw back from its guarantee to base its defenses on the Elbe River in Europe, unless Europe shows much more determination to defend itself.

Mail at first was almost entirely from pro-Hoover writers. Then second thoughts began to occur, and the majority in favor of his plan began to decline. But the edge, definitely, remains on the side of Hoover, as the tabulation on page 24 indicates. This tabulation is a rough measure of sentiment as mirrored by mail to Members of the Senate. It does not represent a letter-by-letter count but an appraisal by Senators and their assistants who keep track of the mail.

[illegible]

"Mr. Chairman, [illegible] Acheson and Truman [illegible] Hoover [illegible] Acheson." [illegible]

A simple working man, writing 10 pounds on a postcard to a Western Senator, says, however: "I feel certain that we need Acheson. The opposition is running true a smear campaign." Another complaint: "The opposition striking at Acheson for the political purpose has reached the crowning stage."

These letters, the figures show, are overlooked by most of the writers.

[illegible] Congress. Even [illegible] World War II, Congress [illegible] stand on the side of [illegible] Republicans and Democrats [illegible] Robert A. Taft of Ohio, a leading Republican and a leading critic of the [illegible] votes as issues for [illegible]

The United Nations Charter, [illegible] was ratified by [illegible] to 2, with a two-thirds majority required.

Fifty-three Democrats, 35 Republicans (including TAFT), 1 Progressive favored ratification. Two Republicans voted against ratification.

The North Atlantic Pact was ratified in 1949. The Senate vote was 82 to 13, with 18 votes to spare over the two-thirds majority. Fifty Democrats were for ratification, 2 against. Thirty-two Republicans were for it, 11 (including TAFT) against.

A foreign-military-aid bill was passed in 1949 by the Senate, 55 to 24, and by the House, 238 to 122.

Powerful President: The second fact often overlooked is that foreign policy is set by the President—not by Congress, not by people who write letters to Congress, not by a former President. Mr. Truman's policy is to keep on fighting in Korea, send more troops and arms to Europe, build up armed services at home. And he believes he has ample power now to move additional troops to Europe without asking Congress for more authority.

Existing treaty: The third fact that many people fail to see is that the United States, by formal treaty, by acts of Congress, already is committed to defend her European allies against attack. The North Atlantic Pact, in effect, says an attack on any member nation is an attack on all.

Thus, regardless of the viewpoint expressed by letter writers, Congress may be expected to keep on supporting internationalist policies and programs, and to send more, not fewer, American men into military service abroad.

FCC Examiner Linked to Reds by Radio Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Willard Edwards, from the Washington Times-Herald for January 10, 1951:

FCC EXAMINER LINKED TO REDS BY RADIO FIRM

(By Willard Edwards)

An attack upon the legality of decisions by Federal officials alleged to have Communist affiliations or sympathies has created a stir in Government circles.

This unique legal move could have far-reaching consequences affecting dozens of bureaus, particularly those of a quasi-judicial nature, which issue thousands of rulings affecting American citizens in every walk of life.

The question was put before the Federal Communications Commission last November 17. It was learned, in the form of a petition for construction permits by the Gretna and Lower Coast Radio and Broadcasting Co., Gretna, La.

LAWYERS GUILD NAMED

Reversal of an initial adverse ruling was requested on the ground that the hearing examiner was a member of the Washington board of directors of the National Lawyers guild, recently described by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as the legal bulwark of the Communist Party.

The committee recommended that the lawyers guild be placed on the Justice Department's subversive list and that the guild be required to register as an agent of a foreign principal. It recommended further that members of the guild be barred from Government employment because the organization was an arm of the international Communist conspiracy.

The request for rejection of the decision was stated in the petition as follows:

"The purpose of the FCC, as provided by Congress, is to serve the interest, necessity, and convenience of the people of the United States.

"TYDINGS' DEFEAT CITED

"International communism is a criminal conspiracy, having for its aim the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

"The majority of the people of the United States are opposed to international communism, in all forms and under all conditions, and they are particularly opposed to persons holding positions of trust in the Government who are even suspected of having sympathies for international communism.

"This statement is supported by the action of the people of the State of Maryland on November 7, 1950, in defeating for reelection Senator Tydings, chairman of a senatorial committee which is alleged to have 'whitewashed' certain governmental departments which it had been alleged contained employees who were Communists or had Communist sympathies.

"HOUSE REPORT QUOTED

"Every American is entitled to have his business with the Federal Government attended to by persons who are not Communists, who are not Communist sympathizers, and who are not suspected of being such."

The document then recites the House committee findings on the National Lawyers Guild and notes that the report identifies the FCC examiner as an official on July 1950, of the Washington chapter's board of directors.

"On information and belief," the petition states, "Chairman Wayne Coy of the FCC knew, or in the reasonable and efficient exercise of his duties should have known, of the affiliation of this high-ranking employee as a member of said guild and member of its board of directors.

"For the very obvious reasons set forth, Gretna and Lower Coast Radio & Broadcasting Co., Inc., is entitled to have the initial decision rejected and set aside and a rehearing ordered before a trial examiner who is not affiliated with the National Lawyers Guild."

Mass Hypnotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph W. Page, from the Philadelphia Bulletin:

MASS HYPNOTISM—PROPAGANDA MILLS SPEND HUGE SUMS TO SWAY CONGRESS AND PUBLIC OPINION

(By Ralph W. Page)

Conducting pressure upon Congress and public opinion has become big business.

The Buchanan House Lobby Investigation Committee reports that this synthetic opinion racket amounted to over half a billion dollars during the first 6 months of this year.

Ten organizations each spent over $100,000 bombarding Congress and flooding the country with their demands. The Committee for Constitutional Government (Fascist version) alone spent half a million.

The worst of this is not the effect upon Senators and Representatives. It is the impact of these gigantic propaganda mills upon the knowledge and judgment of the whole country.

Even if these richly endowed or mass organizations accurately and honestly presented their sides in current controversies they would be a menace—tending to drown out all other valid considerations. But almost without exception these lobby machines distort the record beyond recognition and hypnotize the public mind by endless reiteration of untenable propositions.

OTHER THREATS TO INDEPENDENT OPINION

Independent opinion is further threatened by enormous publicity funds in the hands of professional agents of such aggregations as workmen, farmers, managers, and doctors because it is assumed that all of the myriad members accept and support without question the biased and provocative partisan version of facts presented by the hired advocate.

Examples would fill a library.

The American Medical Association spent over $347,000,000 screaming that the proposed health insurance is socialized medicine under which no man could select his own doctor. Both assertions are false. But the repetition has convinced most physicians that they are gospel.

The only reason that the unions failed to produce a monolithic opinion in labor circles that Taft-Hartley is a slave-labor act is because the business publicity hounds spent twice as much to assert that it was a liberation.

A prime example is provided by the electric utilities industries. They consistently contend that the Government is enslaving the people and wasting their substances by generating electricity in such works as the Grand Coulee, the Hoover, and the Tennessee Valley Dams.

WATER RESOURCES REPORT BRINGS FIRE

Their latest is an hysterical blast at the report of the Water Resources Policy Commission. The Commission merely stated the irrefutable proposition that the water in a river basin should be so managed as to best preserve all of its necessary usages.

Since this categorically requires further Federal multipurpose dams, the chairman of the electric companies' public information program blandly broadcasts that the Commission obviously had failed to listen to the people and has written a report ignoring their expressed wishes.

In other words, the people are to believe that their interest and wishes are identical with the power interests who want no water policy whatever.

What About Unemployment Compensation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, late in the last Congress H. R. 8059 was introduced dealing with unemployment compensation. That bill died with the ending of the Eighty-first Congress, but that bill has been reintroduced in this Congress as H. R. 5225. Mrs. Elinore Morehouse Herrick has written an excellent analysis of that proposal. This should be of interest and the article is as follows:

"POLITICKING" IN SOCIAL LEGISLATION—FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT ON STATE FUNCTIONS IS CALLED PLAIN IN H. R. 8059

(By Elinore Morehouse Herrick)

The "politicking" in social legislation by Federal administrators is very disturbing. Only a week-end notice of hearings on H. R. 8059 radically affecting the unemployment compensation system was given recently by a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee. Although employers who pay the full cost of unemployment compensation were taken by surprise by these almost furtively announced hearings, Secretary Tobin and his cohorts were on hand with long prepared statements.

H. R. 8059 scraps the original concept of unemployment insurance as a way to cushion the shock of unemployment to the worker who loses his job involuntarily through no fault of his own. It would make payments to strikers mandatory, contrary to the policy of some States. Payments would be made to persons who quit their jobs for "good personal reasons." The entire concept of "suitability" of employment by which States have attempted to safeguard their funds from abuse is broadened to make payments to persons who voluntarily quit "unsuitable" jobs or who are discharged for cause. Even a person who is discharged for theft will get benefits. It would substitute uniform Federal standards for those which have been tailor-made by State legislatures to fit conditions in the various States. It would substitute Federal administration for State over the heart of the law, namely, the determination of the individual's right to unemployment benefits.

The statements of Secretary Tobin and Mr. Goodwin, Director of the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security, were interlarded with references to staff reports, advisory council reports, etc, etc., to bolster their arguments on specific points. These frequent references to reports of seemingly impartial groups conveyed the impression—as they were intended to do—that there was overwhelming and disinterested expert opinion in favor of their position. Yet the 1948 report of the advisory committee to the Senate Committee on Finance throws an entirely different light on the picture presented by the administration spokesmen. It states: "The majority approves the basic principles and arrangements of the present State-Federal system * * * the State is the proper unit to determine the benefit provisions which will meet the varying conditions in different parts of the country."

A minority report written by a labor man on behalf of five dissenters advocated a completely federalized system. That, it seems to me, is also the goal of the Secretary of Labor. In spite of the finding of the majority of the advisory committee that the States had improved their systems, Mr. Tobin told the House subcommittee "until there is some degree of uniformity established in respect to amounts and duration of benefits, individual States alone will be most reluctant to raise their benefit standards." This simply is not the fact, as State experience has proved.

Some further improvements in State laws should unquestionably be made which are included in H. R. 8059. For example, no one can quarrel with the thesis that involuntary unemployment lays as great a hardship upon the sole employee as it does upon the person who is one of several hundred in the shop. H. R. 8059 seeks to broaden the coverage, as has been done in the Social Security Act.

The bill would raise the taxable base from $3,000 to the first $4,800 of wages, the tax being solely paid by employers and not a joint contribution as in the case of old-age and survivors insurance. The cost to employers, therefore, would be increased greatly, and, as Secretary Tobin pointed out, "would be passed on to consumers." He estimates that the increase in costs of the proposed minimum standards would be about 30 percent for the Nation as a whole and for individual States will run from 10 percent to 90 percent.

It is when we come to the uniform high benefits, the introduction of dependency benefits into a wage system heretofore based on the degree of skill required and the amount and quality of work, and the criteria for disqualifying benefit claimants that the gravest questions of public policy arise, except for the overriding one of whether we should switch to a federalized system.

H. R. 8059 assumes a weekly wage of $60 and the single individual would get 50 percent or up to $30. A person with three or more dependents would get 70 percent of his wage or up to $42 a week. By the time the various authorized payroll deductions are made the $60 is dangerously close to the maximum benefit allowable. No one can tell exactly the extent to which this narrowing of the gap between take-home pay and unemployment compensation would lead people to ask themselves, "Why work?" We know that this happens. New York, Ohio, and California, to cite a few, have all had to follow up beneficiaries who were wintering in resort areas such as Miami Beach rather than looking for work—New Orleans seems to be the latest resort favorite for the unemployed.

If dependency benefits are paid as a means of making up part of the wage loss of the unemployed, the logical next step is to say that the family man should get a higher wage than the single man and the larger the family the higher the pay without regard to the quantity or quality of work. In countries where this has been tried industrial activity has been notably less efficient than here in America where workers enjoy the highest standard of living in the world.

By requiring that all States pay benefits for a flat 26 weeks the current practice of relating total benefits to past earnings would be destroyed. This would mean that an unemployed person could receive more in benefits than he received while working. Secretary Tobin thus does only lip service to the idea of distinguishing between the worker who is only casually attached and the one who is permanently attached to the labor market. Under H. R. 8059 both would get benefits for 26 weeks, regardless of the length of his past employment.

In discussing the proposed uniform standards for disqualifying claimants, Mr. Goodwin is surprisingly frank. There are three objectives: "To limit the reasons for which a disqualification may be imposed, to prohibit the reduction or cancellation of benefit rights for any cause, to establish a maximum period during which benefits may be postponed. * * * For example, a claimant could be disqualified only if he left suitable work without good cause attributable to the employer. Moreover, it makes the disqualification applicable only to those who leave suitable work because claimants should have the same right to leave an unsuitable job without incurring a disqualification as they have to refuse unsuitable work."

Remember that unemployment insurance legislation was intended to protect the worker from the full shock of involuntary unemployment incurred through no fault of his own. Mr. Goodwin carefully explains that the second objective of the proposed bill is to prohibit the cancellation or reduction of benefits for any cause. He makes it plain that an employee discharged for theft from his employer could have his benefits postponed, not canceled, but only if a court then convicted him of a crime. An employee who stole from someone else and was discharged because therefore his employer regarded him as a poor risk could draw benefits along with the honest man laid off because of lack of work. Not even the person who files a fraudulent claim will lose future benefits but will only have to wait longer to get them. Mr. Goodwin explains it thus: "A longer period of postponement is contemplated in those relatively few cases in which a worker has been disqualified for a discharge of gross misconduct connected with his last work that has resulted in a conviction of a crime or for deliberate misrepresentation to obtain benefits."

Who will interpret these uniform Federal standards? The Federal Government, of course. Thus Secretary Tobin or his agents will determine whether old or new employment is suitable, whether the personal reasons for quitting a job were proper. This comes about because the Federal Government would have the right to decide whether a State was in conformity with the Federal statute and to cut off the funds for administration in a nonconforming State. If this is not Federal control of the unemployment system I do not know what it is.

Secretary Tobin renews his fight on the Knowland amendment which would preserve to the States the right to have State courts interpret the laws before the Federal Government could intervene. Secretary Tobin told the House subcommittee that workers should not have to go to court to collect their unemployment compensation. With this any impartial person would agree. But this is not the real issue in Secretary Tobin's fight on the Knowland amendment. He cannot achieve his goal of uniform national standards if the States are permitted to retain their State laws and have them subject to review by State courts. He cannot require payment of unemployment benefits to workers while a State law subject to interpretation by State courts postpones or prohibits payments to strikers.

The attempt of Federal administrators to encroach upon State functions is made plain in H. R. 8059. Mr. Tobin admits that the costs of unemployment insurance are passed on to consumers. As one consumer I don't want to pay for the benefits given to a man who tried to cheat the unemployment insurance system or who quits his job voluntarily, or who quits for a good personal reason which Secretary Tobin is going to appraise. For the man who is involuntarily unemployed for a cause beyond his control I shall be happy to pay higher prices.

State Department Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the State Department; also I include the pertinent part of a letter I received from A. M. Willis, Jr., of Longview, Tex.:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 8, 1951.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have received your letter of December 26, 1950, acknowledged by telephone on December 29, with which you enclosed a letter from ——, who recommends careful consideration of the foreign policy advocated recently by the Honorable Herbert Hoover. Thank you for making —— ——— available to the Department for comment.

Basically, the United States is striving to insure the development of world conditions in which all peoples will be able to conduct their affairs in peace and with full protection for the fundamental rights and freedoms to which all men are entitled. Tragically, the achievement of this policy, which coincides with the interests of all free peoples, is being challenged by the leadership of the Soviet Government which, by maintaining great armies and persistently refusing to cooperate in measures to maintain peace either through the United Nations or otherwise, has created potentially dangerous situations and a sense of foreboding and tension throughout the world. The threat of Communist imperialism confronts not only the United States but all peoples who believe in the free way of life.

The present policy of our country is based on the concept that the security of each one of the nations of the free world is closely tied up with the security of all these nations. The great lesson of this century has been that this is the only policy which gives any hope of ultimate success. It is the national policy which has grown out of decisions of the executive branch, of the Congress, and of the people of the United States over a period of years. It has been put into action through our membership in the United Nations, through aid to Greece and Turkey, the European recovery program, the North Atlantic treaty for common defense, the program for assistance to underdeveloped areas and the mutual-defense assistance program, all of which have been enacted into legislation by the Congress and have had the broad support of the people.

A policy which would desert this concept of common security would reject the entire broad strategy for freedom. It would require the United States to isolate itself from the rest of the world and to try to survive alone. This deceptively attractive policy holds out a false promise of security, and the consequences of it must be understood clearly. It was discussed at some length by Secretary Acheson in his press conference of December 22, 1950, in which he reported on the Brussels meeting of the North Atlantic Council. A copy of his remarks is enclosed for your constituent's information.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. Acheson disclosed that the National Security Council, composed of the President, Cabinet officers having responsibilities in international affairs, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has repeatedly considered such a policy as that outlined by Mr. Hoover and has rejected it for many reasons. Mr. Acheson mentioned six of them, which are: (1) This completely defensive policy would enable the Soviet Union quickly to conquer the entire continents of Europe and Asia; (2) it would place at the disposal of the Kremlin military resources and economic power vastly superior to our own and give the Soviet Union a strategic position catastrophic to the United States; (3) it would enable the Soviet Union to develop power which could destroy our own and which would undoubtedly be used for that purpose; (4) this vast balance of power in favor of the Soviet Union would put us at such a disadvantage that it would be impossible to negotiate for a peaceful settlement of differences; (5) under such conditions the United States would have to accept whatever terms would be imposed or fight entirely without allies to maintain physical existence itself; and (6) physical existence—if that—would be all that is left, for the entire American heritage would be undermined.

I am also enclosing other material which may be of interest to your constituent, and I am returning the letter as you requested.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

LONGVIEW, TEX., *January 9, 1951.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I write in regard to the present debate on foreign policy.

As you know, this Nation and the world are in grave danger. There are certain men in the country like ——— and ——— who are seeking to disunite our people. To further discredit the administration, they have suggested that we should withdraw our help from Western Europe until the nations comprising that territory have themselves raised and equipped armies of such numbers "as would erect a sure dam against the Red flood." In other words, we should withdraw our help until no help is needed. To keep from being labeled "isolationist" they suggest that we help Britain to the extent Britain will cooperate. In our world of atomic-guided missiles, defense of Britain would be an impossibility with Russian armies completely in control 20 miles away. Therefore, this suggestion is meaningless.

Now, Congressman, I submit that if these men succeed in this policy, our Nation is doomed. The facts are that today there are 200,000,000 free people in Western Europe. The facts are that the land in which these people live contains an industrial capacity greater than that of the Soviet Union. The facts are that if Russia is allowed to get this industrial area for her own, she will then be able to take Africa, the rest of Asia, and then move into Latin America. The uranium we now get from Africa, which is vital to our atomic-energy program, would no longer come here, but would go to the Soviet Union to make atomic weapons to use on us.

In addition, Congressman, you are of course familiar with the North Atlantic treaty, ratified by the Senate in 1949. I have read this treaty and it is my understanding that in it the United States, Canada, and 10 Western European nations pledged their faith to give continuous mutual aid and come to one another's assistance in the event of armed attack. In view of this treaty, would any nation in the world be justified in putting any credence whatever in the written or stated word of the United States should the suggestions of ——— and ——— be followed? To be sure, Congressman, the peoples of Western Europe must help themselves. But they will not help themselves unless they are led, and there are only two nations in the world capable of providing that necessary leadership—the United States and the Soviet Union. Therefore, we must take the lead in helping those 200,000,000 people to provide adequate defenses for themselves.

History records, Congressman, that would-be dictators have only been defeated by a coalition of free nations. Napoleon, the Kaiser, and Hitler were all defeated by such a coalition. We cannot beat Russia alone. We need all the help we can get; Western Europe, a rearmed Germany, a rearmed Japan, Spain, Tito, and everybody who will fight if necessary.

As to ———'s assertion that the President does not have authority to send troops abroad, any student with a cursory knowledge of history knows that he is wrong. Presidents Jefferson, Polk, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt all exercised their constitutional right as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to use the forces of the United States as they thought necessary. In several instances the Supreme Court upheld that right and every attempt to question it was successfully refuted.

* * * They are either blindly ignorant or purposely trying to disunite our country in the interest of keeping alive their morally bankrupt political party. They ought to be exposed, and it is up to you and other people with brains to do it before it is too late.

Very sincerely yours,

A. M. WILLIS, Jr.

Fast Cargo Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent discussion on the floor of the House in reference to fast cargo ships, I include at this point in the RECORD the following quotation from an article by Vannevar Bush entitled "The Weapons We Need for Freedom," as reprinted in the Reader's Digest for January 1951:

> The day of the convoy may be over, and we certainly need to develop and build in quantity cargo carriers of such speeds at sea as to be immune to submarine attacks, and means such as we used at Normandy to land cargo in spite of mines. There is no point in discussing airlift when millions of tons of cargo must be moved thousands of miles, if it can be done by fast cargo ships virtually immune to submarine attack.

Extension of Time for Educational Courses for Ex-Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, together with other members of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress, I received this week a letter from the New England College of Pharmacy, of Boston, Mass., urging the early enactment of legislation that would extend the time in which ex-servicemen can start their courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and complete them.

As many of you know, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs issued a ruling last July that permits veterans who have started GI bill studies and interrupt them to go back into active military or naval service, to resume their training within a reasonable period following their release from active service, even though they get out after the dead-line date. Such veterans must meet three requirements: The conduct and progress in his GI bill course must have been satisfactory. The amount of training he may obtain after he gets out of uniform will be limited by his remaining GI bill entitlement. And his course may not extend beyond the wind-up of the GI bill program on July 25, 1956.

At the request of the New England College of Pharmacy, I am introducing a bill today that would extend the cut-off period for 2 years beyond the present requirements. Under existing law, the July 25, 1951, cut-off date applies to World War II veterans discharged before July 25, 1947. For those few discharged afterward, the cut-off date is 4 years from date of discharge. My new bill will take care of those veterans who have not initiated their training before reentering the military or naval service.

Following is the letter to which I referred above:

NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE OF PHARMACY,
Boston, Mass., January 4, 1951.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The New England College of Pharmacy, a nonprofit educational institution, incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts, which is fulfilling a crying need at the present time in Massachusetts; namely, the supplying of competent pharmacists, is humbly seeking your aid and assistance on behalf of the veterans and citizens of Massachusetts.

At the present time, and for the past 10 years, and possibly for the next 10 years, there will exist an acute shortage of competent registered pharmacists in our State.

Due to the limited facilities there are in the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Western Massachusetts School of Pharmacy, and the New England College of Pharmacy in regard to chemistry, materia medica, pharmaceutical laboratories, there is a shortage of available facilities to fulfill the present needs. Prior to this year all of the schools have had to turn away students because of this limited laboratory capacity.

Many of the veterans who had enrolled for the present year as freshmen have gone back into the armed services, having been in the Reserve. Other applicants who could have taken their places are also in the Reserve and have been recalled, especially the younger men. This has resulted in a situation that will create an injustice to these young men and women on their return from the service, inasmuch as the present law requires that they be enrolled and start their course by July 25, 1951. None of the three Massachusetts pharmacy colleges now have accelerated courses; their courses all start in September and October.

We cannot say when the present crisis will be terminated, so that these veterans can resume their studies. Pharmacists and pharmaceutical chemists in the large drug companies in the United States are in great demand and young men completing their courses can get an immediate position with salaries ranging from $65 per week in Greater Boston to over $100 a week in the Middle Atlantic and Southern States.

The board of trustees of the New England College of Pharmacy, because of the aforesaid situation, have voted to ask your aid in extending the time in which the servicemen can start these courses and complete them. For that reason, we are enclosing a proposed amendment extending the period of starting studies for 15 months so that the boys may start in September of 1951 and September of 1952, especially these boys who are now in the Reserve. This will protect their rights. If, in your wisdom, you think this time is too long or too short, we shall gladly accept any changes of date you want to make.

In any event, we respectfully urge and request that the entering time be extended until at least October 1, 1951, so that the discrimination against schools having regulation courses and not accelerated courses will not hurt the veteran.

May we ask you to introduce the enclosed amendment to cure this injustice, and we are sending a request to other members of the Massachusetts congressional group in Washington for their support.

Thanking you on behalf of our schools, the veterans who will be helped, and the public of Massachusetts who will be served by such an amendment, we are

Respectfully yours,

MARTIN E. ADAMO, *President.*
CONSTANTINE N. MERIANO, *Dean.*

Withdrawal From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1951.

Mr. ———,
Waco, Tex.

DEAR FRIEND: Your recent letter in which you suggest our withdrawal from Korea undoubtedly expresses a widespread and, I fear, growing view. I know that from the standpoint of purely selfish politics it would be smart for me to simply ride with the tide, but I cannot do such a thing when I feel that that tide is simply leading us onto the rocks.

I think we all naturally feel, without reasoning it through, that if we could but repudiate our world-wide commitments, that we could return to the relatively happy and secure days of the past. When we stop to think it through, every one of us knows that it is impossible to make such a return. The one thing that is inevitable in this world is change. The world has changed tremendously in your lifetime and mine. It has grown exceedingly small. As the time required to reach distant points has been reduced, their importance to us has increased.

Senator TAFT and Mr. Hoover say, in effect, that we should defend the United States only at our own shores and on our own soil. I am compelled to take exactly the opposite view. When considering the defense of America, I like to take a globe and look for that spot on the globe which is farthest from central Texas. I believe that that will be somewhere in the South Indian Ocean. If it were within my power I would try to start the defense of America at that spot. I fear that if the enemy were to march up the Little River Valley or over the Bosque Mountain, no amount of home-guard preparation could save us.

Of course, I realize that I have pictured two extremes, but I hope I have been able to picture the two basic philosophies which are in conflict. Certainly we must choose one of these two concepts in shaping our entire policy of national defense. If President Hoover and Senator TAFT are right, it will be possible for us to abandon the rest of the world to the Communists and live a contented, peaceful, and prosperous life between the two oceans and between the Gulf and Canadian borders. This is an intriguing prospect, and I think that I am sufficiently selfish to grasp it if I could believe that it was anything more than an illusion. I cannot, however, believe that we can allow more than 90 percent of the population, territory, and resources of the world to fall into communistic hands and survive as an island of democracy and free enterprise. On the contrary I think we would certainly succumb without the necessity of any communistic military invasion. I don't think any nation can survive the air age by living to itself alone.

I know you will say, "But neither President Hoover nor Senator TAFT contemplated going as far as you are suggesting." It is true that neither admitted that he was drawing the lines where I have drawn them, and possibly neither realized it, but it is not equally true that if we follow their philosophy, the boundaries will ultimately be exactly where I placed them?

Nor does it seem to me that the Senator and the ex-President clearly recognize that we are now engaged in a world-wide conflict of ideologies—a conflict between the idea of a godless communistic society on the one hand against a theistic (if not in all countries Christian) society in which the rights of property and individuals are recognized on the other—a conflict between dictatorship and democracy. This conflict is in my opinion now under way. It is much larger than a simply armed conflict between the United States and Russia. It involves every phase of existence. It includes diplomatic, economic, and propaganda warfare as well as armed conflict. Declared war between the two most powerful nations of the world, of course, overshadows the other elements of the conflict, but these other elements are nonetheless of tremendous importance and could greatly influence the outcome of the larger conflict. The fighting in Korea is a part of this larger conflict just as is our effort to aline the democracies of Europe on our side.

The question then arises, can we withdraw from Korea and expect the United Nations to survive? You will probably agree that such action would be as disastrous to the United Nations as was the failure of the members of the League of Nations to prevent aggression in Ethiopia, but you will probably say, as so many undoubtedly feel, that the United Nations has failed anyway, and that it is not worth saving. I agree that it has accomplished relatively little, but I cannot agree that it is not worth making an effort to establish collective security in this world. I know of no other way in which we can in age to come expect to bring about world peace. I, for one, am not going to quit working for world peace.

But it would not simply be the United Nations that would lose were we to now abandon the Korean peninsula to the Reds. Our own Nation would repeat the same mistake which Britain learned after Prime Minister Chamberlain attempted to appease Hitler through British acquiescence in Hitler's aggression. Mr. Chamberlain undoubtedly honestly believed, as did many more, that he had saved the lives of British boys, and he did save them for possibly 18 months. But the very next year Britain was engaged in the most terrible conflict in her long history, and the loss of British life was heavier than she had ever known.

Doubtless we could retreat from Korea with a minimum of momentary losses, but were we to do so, would we not openly invite communistic aggression in every other part of the world? Surely we could not expect the Communists to much longer delay a thrust into the middle eastern oil fields. Would we resist that aggression? Iran is much farther from American bases than is Korea from our base in Japan and the loss of American lives would conceivably be even greater than it has been in Korea. On the other hand, can we afford to allow the Communists to take this great supply of oil which is so essential to them if they are to carry on any long-continued conflict with America? Without additional oil Russia faces one of the same bottlenecks which did so much to defeat Hitler.

Surely, were we to withdraw from Korea, the Chinese Communists would be free to provide overwhelming forces to push the

French, British, and Dutch out of southeastern Asia, and to cut us off from our supplies of rubber and tin. Can we afford to let these resources fall one by one into hostile hands? Can we finally defend our own shores with the enemy in possession of these essentials of modern war?

Nor do I believe that the Communists would wait long after our withdrawal to attempt the conquest of Japan itself. Why should they if we showed that we had neither the power nor the disposition to prevent aggression in Korea? And how could we expect to have any friends or allies in Europe if we follow such a course? If we demonstrate to the world that we either will not or cannot resist the aggression that we said we would resist in Korea, how can the people of Western Europe, including the people of Britain, be expected to rely to any degree upon our assurance that we will help them resist aggression in Europe? And if they cannot expect a fulfillment of that pledge, is it not to their own selfish advantage to join with the Russians and avoid the horrors of another occupation and another "liberation?"

If you lived in Belgium, or France, or Western Germany, would you line up with a world force which had demonstrated its inability or its unwillingness to give protection to others who faced the same aggressive forces which threatened your independent existence, or would you follow the lead of Poland, Hungary, and the other satellites? And when the inevitable consequences of Korean withdrawal have run their course in Europe and Asia, are we not certain to find ourselves defending our homes and our institutions on American soil, and will there not be more American boys (and women and children too) who will suffer and die from such a war than would be endangered were we to stand firm in the distant parts of the globe?

I make no claim to be a military strategist, but I think it is clear that one of the great deterrents to Russian movement in the west at this time is the existence of a powerful American force in the Far East. If Russia can clear her eastern frontier from the threat of effective American retaliation, she will certainly be more likely to march in the Middle East or in Europe.

I know it is argued that we cannot afford to wear ourselves out with a series of fruitless engagements the world over. I recognize the force of this argument, but what course is likely to encourage new and additional outbreaks like the one in Korea? Is not American withdrawal the most certain guaranty that there will be more and even stronger thrusts of this kind into the free world?

As I see it, the answer is not to run. The answer is not appeasement. The answer is not isolationism. The answer is to accept the responsibility of world leadership, but let us become leaders not simply carriers of all burdens. Let us seek the assistance of those we lead rather than attempting to provide all of the manpower and the money for the defense of the entire world. Let us enlist Japanese to help us fight in the common cause in Asia and Germans for a similar purpose in Europe. I am, of course, talking about enlisting these men in the United States Army. I am not talking about any kind of deal with the German or Japanese Governments. We could strengthen our situation in Korea almost overnight if we would enlist Japanese troops, and there is no doubt but that there are millions in both Germany and Japan who would like the food, clothing, and pay of the American Army.

We could build a sufficiently hard core of military resistance in Europe to encourage the free nations of that continent to make a serious effort at self-defense if we would enlist 20 or 25 divisions of Germans. The situation is not hopeless. It simply requires that we take some practical and commonsense steps; that we forget some of the traditions of the military, especially their insistence on taking none but perfect physical specimens of American manhood in our Armed Forces. It requires that we recognize that we cannot be strong militarily unless we remain strong economically and that our economy is certain to crash if we cut ourselves off from contact with the rest of the world.

Possibly I should put it another way. We cannot afford to attempt to buy a few weeks or months of respite from the conflict at the expense of committing ourselves to policies that are certain to be ever so much more costly in blood and treasure in the years to come. I know that our people generally have not recognized the similarity between the present situation and the conditions which existed during the dark days of the American Revolution. You will, however, recall that a very substantial part of the population then sought to have Washington abandon the fight and to stop further unnecessary loss of life.

If the American people decide they cannot stand the sacrifices that resistance to communism impose upon us, then I think that we would do well to prepare ourselves for the inevitable destruction of our own institutions and the substitution of a communistic economy and a totalitarian government. I will not, however, believe that our people are incapable of understanding the issues involved or of meeting them courageously and intelligently when they understand them. I think that the great failure of the hour has been the failure of our Government to make our position clear to our people. I know that we failed in securing such an understanding after World War I and that our people swung to the isolationist viewpoint just as they are swinging today. I know that that failure led to World War II just as a similar course today will lead to world war III.

I can only hope that this time our people will more quickly grasp the vision of Woodrow Wilson than they did last time. I am sure that in the long run they will swing back and that they will repudiate the leadership of Senator TAFT and of ex-President Hoover just as they repudiated the leadership of Henry Cabot Lodge and Warren Harding as soon as they understood the ultimate issues involved.

I have written you at great length because I admire and respect your own opinions and also because I recognize that your letter does generally reflect a growing feeling among our people. I hope you will understand that I do not mean to put the question on a personal basis at all, nor do I question the sincerity or patriotism of anyone. On the contrary, I realize that none of us can claim to be able to foretell the future and that my position is based entirely on what I believe to be the long-time interest of America and of the world. If I am wrong in projecting the history of the past into the probable events of the future then undoubtedly we should give grave consideration to the suggestion that we might gain a present advantage by complete retreat from our effort to organize world sentiment and action against aggression. I don't question the sincerity of those who counsel immediate and complete withdrawal from Korea, but I think that only by discussing these great problems can the American people (and the American Congress) hope to arrive at a clear understanding of the issues involved and at a sound answer to these issues.

Let me thank you for your letter which has helped me to more clearly understand our common problems and for your interest in the affairs of our country. With all good wishes, I am,

Your friend,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman, Eleventh Texas District.

Presentation of Medals of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week the Army of the United States paid the highest tribute the American people can give to their military heroes. Five ground force soldiers, all either killed or missing in action in Korea, were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their valor far above and beyond the call of duty.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the account of the presentation of the Medal of Honor by President Truman, as reported for the New York Times by Anthony Leviero, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PRESIDENT CONFERS FIVE MEDALS OF HONOR—RELATIVES OF HEROES OF KOREA RECEIVE HIGHEST AWARD IN WASHINGTON CEREMONY

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—Relatives of five heroes of the Korean battlefields received the highest honor of the United States today from President Truman.

Pride and sorrow created an atmosphere of pathos as the Congressional Medal of Honor was conferred for the first time in this war. The heroes could not be there in the President's press conference room in the old State Department Building. Two of them were dead and three were missing. Their wives and mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters rose for them.

The relatives struggled as hard to smile as they did to hold the tears back. They managed the smiles, but the tears flowed. All five men were ground fighters, "the men who win the wars," President Truman said.

The citations of their deeds reflected the bitter nature of the fighting against great odds. The general had fought like a buck private—a brave buck private—to set an example. The GI's had displayed leadership qualities worthy of generals. All five had made the purest kind of sacrifice for their comrades and for a cause.

PRIVATE AND GENERAL

Pfc. Melvin L. Brown, of Mahaffey, Pa., slashing the heads of North Koreans with an intrenching shovel, the way the citation told it, was doing essentially the same kind of deed as Maj. Gen. William F. Dean.

Private Brown held off the enemy while his platoon took an important plot of terrain known as hill 755. He was perched atop a 50-foot wall firing away with his rifle. When he was wounded and his ammunition gone comrades below the wall tossed him grenades. When he had used these he drew out the shovel and cleaved the heads of 10 or 12 of the enemy as they mounted the wall.

General Dean's story is now well known. Trying to hold the key city of Taejon with a hopelessly small force, he fought tanks with grenades and inspired his men. That was early in the war when his troops had little combat experience.

The citation told all that he had done for his men and added that apparently he felt it necessary to sustain the courage and resolution of his troops by examples of excessive gallantry committed always at the threatened portions of his front lines.

Both Private Brown and the general are listed as missing.

SERGEANT AND LIEUTENANT

It was the same with the other three. Before a burst of enemy fire killed him, Sgt. (1st Cl.) Charles W. Turner, of Boston, covered the withdrawal of his platoon and thus enabled it to counterattack and rout the enemy. He did this by opening fire with an exposed turret machine gun of a tank. His accurate fire showed up targets for the tank's 75-millimeter guns, and his action caused the destruction of seven enemy machine-gun nests.

First Lt. Frederick F. Henry, of Clinton, Okla., saw his platoon disorganized by a heavy fanatical attack. He left his foxhole to rally his men and reform a defense line. Soon his men were delivering a devastating fire.

Though wounded, he ordered his own wounded men evacuated, took their weapons, ordered his platoon to withdraw and established himself as a one-man defensive position. As the citation said, "When last seen he was single-handedly firing all available weapons so effectively that he caused an estimated 50 enemy casualties." He is listed missing.

Master Sgt. Travis E. Watkins, of Gladewater, Tex., organized a perimeter defense when 30 of his men were attacked by an overwhelming force. He ran from foxhole to foxhole, giving encouragement and directions. When they ran short of ammunition he killed five enemy soldiers, dashed 50 yards beyond the perimeter and brought back their ammunition and weapons.

Paralyzed from the waist down, he ordered his men to withdraw, refused all food so they could have it, refused evacuation, for he considered himself in a hopeless condition that would burden them. He cheerfully "wished them luck" and his "aggressive leadership and intrepid actions" caused the destruction of nearly 500 of the enemy.

When General Dean's name was called, his family rose, Mrs. Dean calmly came forward for the medal inscribed "Valor." Anybody who knew General Dean immediately recognized his young living image in the West Point cadet in the front row, William F. Dean, Jr., his red hair as prominent as the shiny brass buttons of his uniform. He was with his grandmother, Mrs. Charles W. Dean, and his sister, Mrs. Robert C. Williams, both of Berkeley, Calif.

"I can't say this gives me pleasure because you'd rather have General Dean alive than to have this medal," said the President, his voice trailing off into a murmer that got lost in the grind of motion-picture cameras.

Tech. Sgt. Christopher C. Henry, wounded in Korea and lying on a stretcher, was among the relatives as his sister-in-law, Mrs. Lavon P. Henry went forward to receive Lieutenant Henry's medal. He had been flown here from Japan for the ceremony.

Private Brown's elderly father, Edward D. Brown, stepped up to hear the amazing story of his fight with the shovel, which Mr. Truman said was a "wonderful citation." Sergeant Watkins' widow, a pretty girl of 22, smiled bravely for a moment then wept as she received his medal but in a moment she was helping Mrs. Hazel O. Turner to a chair. Mrs. Turner was the mother of Sergeant Turner.

When he had presented all the medals and before he went around shaking hands with the relatives of the heroes Mr. Truman paid them a final honor. He said:

"At this point I want to pay tribute to the ground soldiers, the men who hold the ground and who fight from the trenches and from machine-gun nests, and who receive the first treatment which you have heard outlined in these citations. They are not the glamour boys of the services, but they are the men who win the wars and who make it possible for us to have freedom in this great Nation of ours."

To Prevent Creeping Socialism the People Should Have the Right To Vote on Valley Authorities Before They Are Established

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the United States is in danger today, in danger more serious than ever faced before. The average American citizen is aghast at the array of problems paraded before him on every hand, each vital to his independence and future welfare, each far reaching in effect. Decisions must be made by the citizen or for him through elected and appointed officials, and they are decisions which will be felt by the inhabitants of this land far beyond the life span of those who today are responsible for them.

On the international front our Nation has become involved in war in Korea. American casualties are measured in the thousands. We as a people are dedicated to the defense of our Nation against Communist aggression. We have been dedicated by the New Deal-Fair Deal internationalists to the defense of the world against Communist aggression for the protection of the democracies. But we hear the term, "democracy," loosely tossed around with regard to our allies, though many of these allies are already dedicated to the principles of socialism, different only in degree from communism with its attendant regimentation and dictatorial control—in effect governments which destroy independence and freedom of the individual in but a lesser degree than communism.

Americans are bewildered as they recognize some of the contradictory and grotesque facets of our international policy, but as long as the New Deal, through President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson, control the foreign policies of the Nation little can be done to improve our position internationally.

All criticism of foreign policy or suggested changes for future policy are skillfully warded off by tirades of name-calling in an attempt to brand all dissenters as isolationists.

No American today believes he can live within the borders of his own Nation secure and with no concern for the rest of the world. But an informed American believes that cooperation among nations calls for just that—cooperation of all involved—not for the depletion of American wealth and resources and American liberty and freedom merely for the benefit of other nations who refuse or fail to fulfill their obligations in the international cooperative partnership.

Through the Truman-Acheson administration we pour tax money overseas in the hope that it will buy a nebulous defense in Europe against Communist aggression, tax money which is earned by the sweat and labor of Americans and which today represents a sacrifice and lowered standard of living for every American family. And at the same time, the nations of Western Europe which have pledged cooperation with us only take limited and inadequate measures to bolster their own defense.

If the only danger to America came from without, serious though these threats be, we could hope for their eventual solution or resolution if we felt secure within our borders from threats to enslave our people and destroy the freedom upon which our Nation was founded and which we further guaranteed in the Bill of Rights within our Constitution.

But we are not secure within the boundaries of the United States. In fact have not been secure since the inception of the Roosevelt New Deal and its present counterpart, the Truman Fair Deal.

Creeping socialism is abroad stalking through the Nation, threatening the security and liberty of every home. The men who are insidiously boring away to establish it sit in high places in the Government. They are New Deal-Fair Deal appointees. They hold positions which can further their plans blueprinted to establish a socialistic state in America, a system of government control, Federal bureaucracy capable of regimenting the lives of every citizen from the cradle to the grave. Under the lying cover of promises of security and stabilized, controlled economy, Americans are being lured into a state of hypnotic acceptance of the welfare state. They are being enticed to sell their birthright for a mess of socialistic pottage that will, if accepted, place the shackles of collectivist society upon America.

Only an alert, informed, active public can combat this danger at home. Every plan for extension of government control must be examined not only for what it purports to accomplish but for the actual motivation behind it.

No major change in our form of government should be allowed by default. Any issue that will affect and change our form of government should be submitted to the people for their direct vote.

Today the socialistic planners are at work to accomplish one of the most important steps in their over-all plan for the socialization of America—Federal control of public utilities. To accomplish this they are working first for the establishment of the Columbia Valley Authority of the northwest, and then for additional valley authorities.

Some idea of the actual scope of a valley authority such as CVA and the socialistic planning behind it is contained in the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest by Leslie A. Miller, former Democratic Governor of the State of Wyoming:

How many people bother to read on when they see a headline about CVA? What's CVA? Oh, that means Columbia Valley Authority. Uncle Sam wants to build a lot of big dams to give the people in the Pacific Northwest cheap electricity. Well, what does it all mean to me?

The CVA means plenty to you. It is just one more step in an ambitious plan to socialize the electric-power industry as a big stride toward socialism. And while the Government may dig the arm out of some

distant State, it will dig the billions the project will cost out of everybody's pocket, including yours.

The Columbia Valley Authority, covering Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and parts of Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, and Utah, is just one of nine huge power authorities into which Washington is planning to divide the entire country. These authorities will embrace hundreds of huge power dams built and operated by the Government. They will produce all the hydroelectric power in the Nation and will sell it to no private electric distributors—only to Government-owned or State-owned utilities. The President, in May 1950, declared that "these benefits must not be diverted to private profits."

Holding in its hands the power by which almost all industry operates, the Federal Government will be able to dominate the industrial life of the Nation. Socialist planners inside the Government admit, privately, that they look upon the socialization of electric power as the key to socialization of the United States.

The unsuspecting American imagines we are safe from socialism because he knows the people will never vote for it. But socialism can be put over by a small minority. And the struggle now going on in the valley of the Columbia River is a good example of how it can be done.

Up in the northwest corner of the Nation are seven States, all or part of which make up an integrated economic region dominated by the Columbia River and its tributaries. Along these rivers 130 dams have already been built. Of these, 86 are hydroelectric power dams, 32 are irrigation dams, and 12 are multipurpose—for irrigation, power, flood control. Some were built by private companies, some by municipally owned utility systems, some by the Federal Government. All have been hooked up by high-voltage transmission lines to form one giant power pool. The States, cities, private companies, and Federal Government have joined in a voluntary arrangement under which power can be shifted from one locality to another to meet varying seasonal needs. This region has the Nation's most bountiful supply of electricity and the lowest rates—half the national average. It is handled by a body representing all the partners in the pool—the private companies, States, cities, and Uncle Sam.

Now let us see how a small group of men, inserting themselves in strategic positions in the Washington bureaus, have set out to grab the whole Columbia River power network for the Federal Government. The Government built and operates the dam at Bonneville, and it is through this that it finds itself in the present Columbia River power pool. The Government also has control over the Nation's navigable rivers, and the management of irrigation and power schemes heads up in the Reclamation Bureau in the Department of the Interior. If, therefore, a Socialist intriguer wanted a finger in this great power pie, the thing to do would be to get into the Reclamation Bureau.

This is what an old-time Socialist did. He is Stephen Raushenbush, who has spent years promoting Government ownership of power. He believes the first decisive step toward socialism is the public ownership of all utilities. He has written that the socializing program should begin with local and State ownership, then power authority, then complete nationalization. The program could be eased along gradually by a small group in the right positions. He wrote: "One good man with his eyes, wits, and ears about him inside a department * * * can do more to perfect the technique of control of industry than a hundred men outside."

In 1941 Raushenbush turned up as the chief economist and planner of the power division of the Interior Department. And he was not alone. There were two other good men—Dr. Carl D. Thompson and Dr. Paul J. Raver. Dr. Thompson, once research director of the Socialist Party, has written that when the Government owns electric power this will mean control of transportation and industrial production. Dr. Thompson was consultant to the Bonneville Power Administration from 1938 to 1947. Dr. Raver, also a Socialist, has been Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration since 1939. So we find these three men neatly placed in strategic spots for promoting their Socialist dream. When Raushenbush left the Department in 1947, the Secretary of the Interior told him: "We have relied heavily on you." That marks the degree of his influence.

Dr. Raver represents the Government in the Columbia power pool. But he does not like the way that pool works. He declares he wishes to revitalize the power program in the Northwest. By this he means pulling together all of the public ownership forces of the region around an agreed program of public ownership and acquisition of private utilities. He has refused to let private companies have long-term contracts for any part of the power produced by Bonneville dams.

The proposed Columbia Valley Authority will supersede the present power pool. It will be a monopolistic Government corporation, run by three men answerable only to the President. It will have autocratic power over the rivers and the power generated in them. It will control all natural resources, including land, forests, soil conservation, irrigation and water rights.

The three directors of this proposed CVA could spend money as they saw fit. They could buy and sell real estate and private utilities. They could regulate mining, lumbering, and fishing. They would be authorized to determine the size of farms and to dictate farm practices through their control of irrigation water. They could establish any business they might think desirable by calling it a "demonstration" operation. Their mission would be to plan the economic life of the whole region—"to establish a balanced and stable economic development." Add to these powers the Federal Government's control of credit through its numerous lending agencies, and you will realize what the word "Authority" means.

These planners have a theory that our division into States is unnatural. They believe the country should be divided into "economic regions." Dr. Arthur Morgan, who built TVA and was its first Chairman, wrote to the Senate Commerce Committee, saying that while he was chairman of TVA his colleagues were talking about the "Authority" gradually taking over the functions now being exercised by the States, towns, and counties, and that they had the dream that this might go on gradually as the "functions of the local authorities withered away."

Thus you behold the revolution that creeps over the land. But those managing it never disclose their intentions. They advertise, instead, the rich fruits they will bestow.

Opposition to CVA in the Pacific Northwest remains obdurate and up to now has been able to hold the Federal Government planners off. More than 200 organizations have protested, including irrigation districts, citizens' committees, Grange units, the Farm Bureau Federation, organized cattlemen, miners, lumbermen, and businessmen. The legislatures of Idaho, Oregon, Montana, and Wyoming have protested it. The governors of Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming have spoken against it, along with most of the Senators and Congressmen from that region. The opposition would be even more intense if more people understood this important fact: Under CVA, irrigation would of necessity have to take a back seat to power production, and private ownership of water rights, so precious in the west, would go by the boards.

In Seattle, Mayor William F. Devin, who is also head of the municipally owned power system, says: "This is not a fight between public and private power. This is a case of the Federal Government using phony gifts of our own taxes as bribes to rob us of our basic rights. * * * We are capable of developing our own economy. I say let us develop the Columbia River as our own responsibility."

This is precisely what the Federal Government does not wish that valley, or any other valley, to do. Once the Columbia River area is made over in the Socialist pattern, it would be followed by the Missouri Valley Authority and then the others, to blanket the Nation. Governor Langlie, of Washington, says: "The issue here is whether the people are to manage their own affairs or have them entrusted to three men appointed in Washington, D. C., and given almost unlimited power. What would be left of our State and local government when such an agency gets into full swing?"

The CVA project has been stalled for the moment. But it will be resumed in the next Congress. We must not forget that what is planned for the Columbia River Valley is planned ultimately for the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing the danger to the Nation resulting from establishment of valley authorities without due deliberation and examination, I believe that such projects should be created only after the people in the areas directly affected have expressed a desire for the establishment of such authority by vote in a free election, and I have introduced a bill for this purpose. The holding of plebiscites in the areas where a valley authority is to be established will permit frank and open discussion of the effects of such an authority upon the people and the extent of the socialization which would grow from it.

In April of 1950, a convention of 400 delegates representing the Utility Workers Union of America—CIO—condemned by unanimous vote the creeping paralysis of nationalization of the industry, and in their resolution added:

Control of the electric industry is the key to control of the major industries of the Nation. The Government is already in the utility business to quite an extent and, unless we are on our guard, will soon own most of it. This will be the first step down the socialistic highway. Then transportation, communication, steel, and the rest will follow to put an end to our American way of life.

I am certain that if the people of the Nation are given the opportunity to use the ballot in a direct election before establishment of additional valley authorities is allowed, they will vote against any further encroachment of the Federal Government which would destroy freedom and extend socialism in our Nation. The following is the bill which I have introduced to provide for a plebiscite before establishment of additional valley authorities:

A bill to prohibit the establishment of a valley authority in any State that would be substantially affected thereby until the people of the affected areas of such State have voted affirmatively for such valley authority

Be it enacted, etc., That no law establishing a valley authority (similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority) shall become effective within a State which in the judgment of the Governor or legislature any part of such State would be substantially affected by such law, if such law were to become effective within such State, until a certificate from the Governor of such State has been filed with the Senate (or with the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session) and with the House of Representatives (or with the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House of Representatives is not in session) stating (1) that an election has been held pursuant to the election laws of such State in those congressional districts which would be substantially affected by such law, if such law were to become effective within such State, and (2) that a majority of persons voting in such election have voted affirmatively to have such law become effective within such State.

Review Wire-Tap Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the Decatur (Ill.) Herald and the Washington Post dealing with the necessity for recanvassing our attitude banning the use of evidence obtained through wire tapping in the apprehension of spies, traitors, enemy agents, and others disloyal to our country:

REVIEW WIRE-TAP BAN

Heightened concern over the national security may lead, it now appears, to a review of the use of wire taps as a means of gathering evidence against spies, traitors, and saboteurs. Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, made the first step when he introduced a bill to permit Federal Bureau of Investigation agents to obtain Federal court orders for wire tapping, if national security appears involved.

Some modification of the doctrine which bans the use of wire tap evidence clearly is needed. Representative KEATING calls the rule absurd, and it certainly proved so recently when Judith Coplon's conviction for plotting to spy on this country for Russia was overruled on grounds that part of the evidence against her was gained by wire tapping.

The proposed change now becomes a matter of practical necessity. As the law stands, it permits spies to conduct their nefarious profession over American telephones. Government agents may suspect the tenor of the conversation, but are not authorized to listen in.

Permission to tap wires should be doled out sparingly, surely, for the private rights of the citizen must be guarded. The author of the bill, however, has provided against a possible danger of too free a use of the privilege when he asks that FBI men and military intelligence agents secure court permission before using the tapping system.

Fact is, the average citizen conducts business over the telephone of less importance than is ordinarily believed. If his conversation was really important, he would protest more vigorously than he does the party-line systems in use in all rural areas and in many city systems.

LEGALIZED WIRE TAPPING

Readers of this newspaper will know that it has long believed that wire tapping in any form is abhorrent to American principles of privacy of the individual. The country is now faced, however, with a sinister threat to its security. In the perpetual struggle to maintain a balance between civil liberties and measures to safeguard national security it may be necessary to yield somewhat on civil liberties in order to prevent the loss of both liberty and security. It is in this context that we believe that the bills to legalize wire tapping by law-enforcement officers under certain specified conditions should be considered.

Wire tapping where now carried on by Federal officials is patently against the law. The Federal Communications Act forbids the interception and divulgence of wire communications, and the Supreme Court has said plainly that this means divulgence even to another person in a law-enforcement agency. Present use of wire tapping by the FBI—a practice reportedly confined to espionage and kidnaping cases—rests on a flimsy, and in our view entirely unsupportable, authorization by the Attorney General.

At the same time there can be no question that wire tapping is going on. It is engaged in not only by Federal authorities, as brought to light in the Coplon case, but also promiscuously by "private eyes" and others. Disclosures before the Senate District Committee last summer showed that Police Lt. Joseph Shimon, acting in a private capacity, intercepted telephone conversations on a broad scale in connection with the Howard Hughes hearings. There are continuing allegations that wires of various governmental officials are tapped, and no one knows, in truth, how extensively wire tapping is carried on.

Thus, as a factual matter, the practice has outrun the law, and there seems to be no disposition on the part of Federal authorities to crack down, whatever the law says. The danger in this situation is that the continuing evasion of the law tends to bring disrespect for all law and increase the number of violations. The reason that this has happened, in our opinion, is a deep-seated feeling among law-enforcement officials and the public generally that wire tapping may be necessary to protect the national security or to save lives. In the wake of the Canadian spy trials, the Fuchs disclosures, and other evidences of conspiracy, anyone who would forbid law-enforcement officers the use of means necessary to arrest the conspiracy would take upon himself a terrible responsibility.

Hence, it seems to us, the best chance of preventing wire tapping from becoming a monster, is to channelize it into cases in which it is clearly necessary, and to provide stiff penalties for its unauthorized use. That is what the Neely bill attempts to do as respects Washington. It would permit wire tapping by District law enforcement officers only on specific authorization by a Federal judge, obtained in much the same manner that a search warrant is now obtained. The bill would require law officers to state under oath that a crime involving the safety of human life had been or was about to be committed, that wire tapping would lead to essential evidence, and that no other means were readily available. It is explicit in prohibiting wire tapping under any other circumstances.

This version is a distinct improvement over the original Neely bill, which did not restrict the categories of crime in which wire tapping would be permitted. That of course, would have been more than the camel's nose in the tent; it would have been the whole camel. It would have put any Federal judge applying the regulation under an impossible burden. The inescapable fact about wire tapping is that all telephone conversations involve two persons, and there is no way to limit the interception to the words of the person being sought.

For this reason it seems to us imperative that any legalization of wire tapping by Federal officers be also confined to cases affecting national security or human life, and that a Federal judge authorize it only after rigorous conditions have been met. There is justification, we believe, for such a law on a national scale along the lines of the Keating bill introduced in the last Congress. This sort of law, coupled with severe penalties for violation, could help protect the national security and at the same time remove fears that telephones were being tapped indiscriminately. The temptations to wire tapping, however, must be narrow and precise, and any law which did not contain careful safeguards could result in incalculable harm.

What's the Matter With Senator Taft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 7, 1951:

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH SENATOR TAFT?

("The President simply usurped authority, in violation of the laws and the Constitution, when he sent troops to Korea to carry out the resolution of the United Nations as an undeclared war." ROBERT A. TAFT, in the Senate, January 5.)

Is it Senator TAFT's purpose to outdo Senator MCCARTHY in irresponsibility? It begins to look that way. Almost every statement the Ohio Republican makes these days is more dangerous than the one before.

Consider only the most recent of the GOP leader's utterances.

On December 28, Senator TAFT said in an address in Cincinnati: "I have no great confidence in the judgment of the top military."

Yet it was not enough for him to attempt to undermine popular trust in one of the character of Defense Secretary Marshall, General Bradley as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the latter's associates, General Collins, General Vandenberg, and Admiral Sherman. Senator TAFT then went on to quote the top military as follows:

"They doubted if we could hold out in Korea or the Philippines. Now they have 200,000 Americans spread out across Korea and they think they can defend Indochina against 2,000,000 Chinese."

Thus, the Ohio Senator made no allowances for any of the problems involved in the supremely difficult Korean stalemate last June. Thus, he quoted for the benefit of his opponents on the field of home intercollegiate which he himself said he resented in secret from high military leaders.

Inevitably, Senator TAFT was questioned by reporters about this alarming statement. Thereupon he amended it to say that he did not mean to include in his vote of no confidence the command in the field. Presumably this revision was to exempt General MacArthur from his black appraisal of the competence of the Nation's top defense command.

That did not lessen the seriousness of what Senator TAFT had said. Actually, it made his remarks even more serious. For now he said in effect that General MacArthur was trustworthy and able, but that his assignment was hampered if not made impossible by General Bradley and other shapers of over-all military policy.

The man who is often called the Republican did not wait long before announcing

another vote of no confidence. When the new Congress opened last Wednesday, he accused the White House of deliberately holding up work of the session for perhaps 2 weeks because the Presidential state of the Union message was not immediately forthcoming.

Since the President speaks tomorrow and congressional committees had not been named anyway, this was a display of utter unreasonableness. The danger, however, was that some people would be misled into thinking that Senator TAFT had a fair complaint.

But it is the GOP leader's 10,000-word address to the Senate on foreign affairs which is worst of all. Speaking Friday, he charged President Truman with taking the United States into the Korean War without authority. He declared that the Commander in Chief has no right to send American troops to a European defense without approval from Congress. He repudiated the new assignment of General Eisenhower by saying that he did not think the United States should assume the leadership in the formation of an international army by the appointment of an American commander.

It is not necessary to comment on these dangerous assertions one by one. There are adequate answers to these points Senator TAFT attempts to make. The authority of the President as Commander in Chief to use the military forces of the Nation has been demonstrated repeatedly in history. Every school child knows that there were military engagements before Congress declared war in 1812. The course of President Polk in the Mexican War is an answer to Senator TAFT. So is that of Wilson in 1916 on the border and at Vera Cruz.

The American people, we believe, see these matters a great deal more clearly than Senator TAFT. They see, we believe, that the creation of a defense force in Europe is not to protect Europe alone but also to protect this country. They see that a defenseless Europe would be an almost certain invitation to Communist aggression. They see that a Communist-controlled Europe would doubtless foredoom Great Britain and place the United States in gravest jeopardy.

What has come over ROBERT A. TAFT that he does not understand this? Is he so eager to be the Republican standard bearer next year that he cares not what he says or the effect of his words?

If not, why will he say now what he chose not to say last June? Is it because he thinks it is politically smart to try to capitalize on the reverses in Korea?

The Truman administration has its faults, far too many of them. It should be criticized for its shortcomings. But it is our responsible Government. And it is recruiting men of unquestioned patriotism and ability to lead in creating a defense so strong that the Kremlin will not push the button to start world war III.

Mr. Republican should think twice before his next outburst. In barely more than a week he has done enough damage to last throughout his new 6-year term.

Good Neighbor Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Good Neighbor Day, an institution dedicated to good neighbor relations between people and nations, has attracted widespread and active support. In recognition of the importance of the good-neighbor spirit, the mayor of New York has proclaimed January 1, 1951, as Good Neighbor Day and set aside each Tuesday evening of this year, from 6 p. m. until midnight, as Good Neighbor Evening. Appended hereto is the Mayor's proclamation to stimulate this spirit of cooperation within the great metropolis of New York:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed a national emergency; and

Whereas world events daily remind us of the urgent need for harmony and teamwork, since we are all part of the greatest struggle for peace the human family has ever known, a struggle made more complex by the challenge of the Atomic Age; and

Whereas our great city is the composite of the toil, energy, blood, sacrifice, and intelligence drawn from all races, all peoples, and all creeds; and

Whereas the future of America depends upon whether we merely talk love of country or actually live it; upon whether we engage in unworthy strife here at home or stand shoulder to shoulder to achieve a glorious destiny; and

Whereas our destiny is inseparable from the destinies of the peoples of other nations; and

Whereas we are the home folks in the home city of the United Nations; and

Whereas the daily demonstration of the spirit of the good neighbor and the practice of the Golden Rule in our own city will inspire oppressed peoples, wherever they may be, to search for true freedom and for peace on earth; and

Whereas the practice of cooperation can be stimulated, implemented, and kept alive by holding good-neighbor meetings at stated, frequent intervals; and

Whereas the coming New Year will mark the nineteenth annual observance of Good Neighbor Day in America:

Now, therefore, I, Vincent R. Impellitteri, mayor of the city of New York, do hereby proclaim January 1, 1951, as Good Neighbor Day, and I further set aside each Tuesday evening of 1951, from 6 p. m. until midnight, as Good Neighbor Evening, and I call upon all agencies of religion, education, government, and community life, and all media of communication, to join together as good neighbors on the first day of the year and on each Tuesday evening, to foster brotherhood and teamwork among New Yorkers at home and abroad and to promote good will among all men, to the end that peace on earth may be achieved.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of New York to be affixed this 22d day of December 1950.

[SEAL] VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor.

By WILLIAM J. DONOHUE,
Executive Secretary to the Mayor.

Anticipates the Worst in Clash With Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial appearing in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on December 31, 1950:

ANTICIPATES THE WORST IN CLASH WITH SOVIETS—WRITER WOULD BRING HOME CIVILIANS IN GERMANY

(By Frank R. Kent)

As the year 1951 begins the state of the Nation seems almost incredibly bad. Perhaps as the months pass unity may be achieved and leadership developed. But, as of now, a great crisis has arisen, and from whatever angle viewed our inadequacy seems appallingly evident. It is all very well to talk about the duty of strengthening the national morale. But there also is the duty of facing realities. This we have not been doing at all, and every attempt to make us do so seems to promote discord and dissension. The attitude of the Soviet Republic and its satellite states toward us and our attitude toward them have become so openly and vehemently hostile that a titanic and catastrophic clash threatens.

If the grand smash comes, we cannot, of course, permit our faith in the ultimate triumph of America to be shaken, but there is no sense now in trying to paint a bright picture. In Korea the great bulk of our military land strength and the bulk of our Navy and Air Force are engaged in a hot, costly, and apparently hopeless war against the Chinese Communists, whose cause is savagely championed by the Soviets in the United Nations. Because of the Russians the efforts of that Organization to avert aggression and promote peace are dismayingly feeble. It is rounding out a 5-year record of almost complete frustration so far as progress toward its great goal is concerned. The continued vicious and terrific Russian propaganda against us, together with Soviet acts of unprovoked aggression, have compelled us to recognize the menace of a third world war, in which the survival of the Nation is at stake.

There, of course, is nothing to do except see it through to the end with the minimum of waste and blundering we can manage and an inflexible determination not to weaken no matter what the odds. In this connection there is one great basic fact which protrudes—to wit, our shocking military feebleness. This is not only admitted—it is proclaimed.

As for the western front in Europe, we have already told the world that if the Russians attack, we and our allies are in no position to make a successful resistance. We would be overrun. They outnumber us in equipped divisions, in tanks, and in airplanes—in everything but the atom bomb, and they have that in numbers about which we can only guess. So, what it amounts to is this—we are now unprepared to cope with an attacking Communist China in Asia or an attacking Russian Army in Europe. Nor will we be prepared for a year and a half to 2 years. The question then arises, if these are the facts—and they are not disputed—and if, as most believe, the fixed Russian purpose is to overthrow our Government by violence and destroy the capitalistic system completely, why does she not attack now?

Our intelligence about the real Russian intentions is so negligible as to leave us nothing to do but guess. The one sure thing is that we cannot afford to take a chance. It is just ordinary common sense to prepare for the worst. In brief, we should assume that an attack is imminent and inevitable and use every ounce of strength and every hour we have to meet it. There is now no excuse for disunity and poor leadership. There is no excuse for inefficiency and politics. Every possible protective step should be taken. One very obvious one is the step to remove from Germany the wives and children of American soldiers who obviously would be unable to reach safety in the advent of a Soviet attack.

We are no longer an army of occupation there. As rapidly as possible we are becoming an army of defense. A bill to send home these dependents was introduced in the House last week by Representative BURNSIDE, of West Virginia. It should be passed.

Blockade Again on in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the well-known columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star for January 5, 1951:

BLOCKADE AGAIN ON IN CONGRESS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Our emphasis on the defense of democracy everywhere in the world, and our desire to extend it wherever possible, naturally enlarge our interest in our own democratic institutions. In short, we look at ourselves more closely—or should.

It is, therefore, somewhat embarrassing that a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats in our House of Representatives has just delivered a smacking blow to democracy. This was done on the opening day of the new Eighty-second Congress by restoring to the Rules Committee the arbitrary power to pigeonhole bills approved by the appropriate legislative committee and deny the House the right to vote on them.

What the coalition effected was repeal of the rule—adopted by the Eighty-first Congress after the 1948 Truman victory—which removed this arbitrary blockade by permitting the chairman of any legislative committee to move for House consideration of bills approved by his committee if the Rules Committee failed to send such measures to the House floor after 21 days.

That can't be done any more. Again a handful of men can thwart democracy in the House.

The purpose of this undemocratic move is no secret. It is to keep social welfare and civil-rights measures from getting to the Representatives of the people in the House for a vote.

From the standpoint of their party's own political welfare it is a bit hard to see why the House Republican leadership again was maneuvered into this alliance with the anti-social welfare, anti-civil-rights southern Democrats. For it was the blockade of the Rules Committee—then as now controlled by the coalition—against a housing bill, combined with the hostile attitude of the House Republican leadership toward other social legislation, that had much to do with the party's 1948 defeat in the Presidential election. Many Republicans were conscious of the bad judgment of their leadership. Forty-two of them refused to go along and voted against repeal of the so-called 21-day rule.

As a practical matter, the blatant, overt coup hardly was necessary. Little social legislation and no civil-rights legislation had been expected from the new Eighty-second Congress. Emphasis will be on foreign policy and defense. Furthermore, the coalition now has enough votes, as a result of last November's election, to defeat measures it doesn't like openly on the floor, though the Rules Committee strangulation allows Members to duck responsibility.

The Republican action could be costly politically. For, because of its admitted aim, it will provoke resentment among millions of people, who whether Republicans realize it or not, now are fully aware of what dictatorial control of the House by the coalition through the Rules Committee bottleneck means to them.

They know because President Truman told them the story in simple language in the 1948 campaign, revealed to them the chicanery whereby bills for their welfare can be pigeonholed by a few men in the Rules Committee. This simplifies the task of special-interest lobbyists who can concentrate on this committee and not worry about the regular committees too much, and never worry at all about the House itself. By his campaign the President won support for removal of this blockade after his victory. It was the first thing done by the Democratic House leadership at his direction at opening of the Eighty-first Congress.

What had happened became clear once the President raised the curtain in the campaign. While the Republican Senate of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress had passed social legislation, including housing, increased minimum wage, Federal aid to education, the House leadership tied it all up. This became a mockery when the party, in its 1948 platform, advocated all these measures that the House leadership had stifled just before the convention. President Truman capitalized this on stumps all over the Nation. Labor unions told the story to their members through their union newspapers, as they are telling now of repeal of the 21-day rule and its meaning. This is not very helpful to Republicans in their effort to win back labor votes.

During the Congress just ended, eight bills were extricated from the Rules Committee and brought before the House for a vote by the 21-day rule. Beyond that, because of threat of its use, the Rules Committee itself moved to the House floor for passage the housing, minimum wage increase, and expansion of social security system bills.

Now the blockade has been raised again.

Speaker Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of January 5, 1951:

SPEAKER RAYBURN: ABLE, RESPECTED LEADER

Again it is Speaker SAM RAYBURN. There was no surprise in the election of the veteran Texas Congressman to preside over the House in the Eighty-second Congress, but nonetheless his choice for that high and responsible position makes history. Mr. RAYBURN becomes only the second Member of Congress in the Nation's history to be elected to the Speakership six times, equaling the record set by the magnetic Henry Clay, of Kentucky, in the first half of the nineteenth century. If Mr. RAYBURN serves out his 2-year term he will have clear title to the distinction of having occupied the Speakership longer than any other man, because Mr. Clay resigned twice as presiding officer of the House.

It is not, of course, length of service which counts, unless that service has been of high order and rendered fully in behalf of the State and its nation. This was answered fully by Mr. RAYBURN. He has served as Speaker and previously as minority leader in the House attests the high caliber of that service to his Nation and State.

The Speaker of the House at least a Member of Congress since 1913, and previously he was a representative for 5 years in the Texas Legislature and speaker of its house for 4 years. In 1948 he and Senator VANDENBERG were the recipients of the Collier trophy award for distinguished congressional service.

An impartial appraisal of SAM RAYBURN's statesmanship was given by Republican Minority Leader MARTIN upon the Speaker's election as Speaker Wednesday. Representative MARTIN declared that the Nation in a time of peril was most fortunate in having in responsible position a man who has "the courage, the integrity, the ability, and the fairness that he [Mr. RAYBURN] has." He pointed out that election as Speaker would not have been possible without Mr. RAYBURN's being a man of fine character and extraordinary ability.

The House afforded this appraisal by a tribute of standing applause as Mr. RAYBURN took the gavel and the office of Speaker. In that role, he will serve his House and State with the same selfless devotion, capacity, and zeal that have marked his almost four decades of service in Congress. Texas takes pride in this son who measures up fully to the standard of outstanding Americanism. The humility and firm resolve with which SAM RAYBURN accepted a stern responsibility again is a measure of his caliber as a servant of a free people.

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my comment on the President's state of the Union message carried on the Mutual network program Mutual Newsreel:

On the credit side, the President is to be commended for subordinating his domestic program to the critical needs of national defense and security. It is to be hoped that his future course, unlike the past, will demonstrate that he is willing to pay more than lip service to the principle that nondefense spending must be curtailed in order to maintain a sound domestic economy on which alone our national strength to resist aggression can be based.

It is also commendable that the President recognized that unity does not require complete submission by the minority to policies and methods advanced by the majority which are believed to be demonstrably unsound. We must, as he points out, keep our debate on a high level with our sights trained on only one objective, the safety and welfare of our country. But debate we must have in order that we may arrive at conclusions which reflect the true will of the people without whose wholehearted support any effort will fail.

In that connection I am disappointed that the President did not even mention the all-absorbing question of the moment whether he will consult with Congress before ordering large forces to be deployed in Western Europe. An assurance to that effect would

have gone a long way toward accomplishing that unity of purpose which he properly seeks.

Another regrettable omission in a message heard around the world is the President's failure to serve emphatic notice upon the United Nations and its members that we have a right to expect a much stronger demonstration of their willingness to cooperate in resisting aggression than they have yet indicated. This is a critical week for the future of the United Nations. I fear that our allies may read into his message with some justification an endorsement of what seems to many of us a significantly unsatisfactory showing to date. It is time to speak out plainly and tell them what we think.

We have never been at a point in our history where it was more important that Americans go forward together. There can be no question as to the goal of every one of us—a just peace and true freedom for the peoples of the earth.

There is unity on the question of the extent of national effort. No reasonable move should go untried, no necessary sacrifice should be avoided. There is unity on the proposition that every American must render every effort to resolve this crisis successfully, to achieve victory and to establish a real and just peace.

Thus, there can be no doubt that Americans in all walks of life stand together on these worthy objectives. In their accomplishment we Republicans will put our country first.

A Report to the Congress From the People of the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker and distinguished Members of the House, it is my privilege to again report to the Congress the views and feelings of the people of my district, the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama. This report from my people is tremendously important, in my opinion, because of the deep feelings they have expressed to me in this grave hour.

The serious world situation is uppermost in their minds, and let me tell you they have no patience with diplomatic niceties when their sons, husbands, and loved ones are being sent to war, some of them for the second time in the last decade, and many parents are receiving that dreaded telegram from the Adjutant General saying, "I regret to inform you." The people are facing the hard facts of life realistically and they expect our Government to act realistically.

The Ninth Congressional District of Alabama wants two-fisted, hard-hitting, intelligent leadership from the Executive, from the military, from the Congress, and from everybody in a place of public trust. Let no one forget this important fact as our people are being rallied to make greater sacrifices and greater efforts which are necessary for the protection of our country.

The people of my district are ready to go all out. They are willing and able to do whatever is needed to protect our country if given a reasonable plan of action and the fighting leadership which we must have to be successful. They want bold leadership, with a positive course of action toward a definite goal. They want the best brains in this country drafted to help the executive branch of our Government steer that course. Although the President has the chief responsibility for foreign affairs, my people feel that Congress should not just sit back and rubber stamp the plans and programs of the executive department. Charting the destinies of 151,000,000 American people in this shrinking, explosive world is too grave a responsibility for the Executive alone and my people expect Congress to take an active part in the formation of our foreign policy. The world's greatest deliberative body should deliberate on the world's greatest question—the question of bringing about peace—and come up with some realistic solutions to our dilemma.

My people have always been foremost in rising to the defense of our country in time of crisis when the danger and course of action were fully understood. They will not follow blindly. They want to know the whole truth about the dangers we face, the odds that are against us, and the reasons for the course we take.

The fact is—and we might as well face it—that we do not have the unifying, psychological bombshell of the tragic Pearl Harbor, and yet our danger now is much greater. We are already in a war for our freedom if not for our very existence. The odds against us are greater than they have ever been in the history of our country. Nothing short of an intelligent plan of action to fight the Communists inside and outside our country, backed by the full force of the people, will prevent our destruction.

It has been next to impossible for my people to reconcile the bitter reverses in a far-off land with what they have seen here at home. On the one hand they have suffered the loss of loved ones in Korea, the drafting of young boys, the rising spiral of inflation, and they have heard the warning about greater sacrifices to come. All this has added to their anxiety and their instinctive feeling that we face a terrible situation although the nature of the danger and a positive course of action have not been clearly outlined by our Government. On the other hand they have seen inadequately trained troops sent into combat without proper reinforcements, the publication of secret military data, enactment of half-way control measures, the lack of cooperation among the two political parties and the Executive in cleaning out the Communists in Government, talk about police action in Korea, the small amount of support from members of the United Nations, failure of the UN to brand Communist China as an aggressor, the insistence by England of UN recognition of Red China, and continued war shipments by the Allies to Russia and her war-making satellites.

Is it any wonder that great hope of a simple, easy solution was aroused in so many minds by the speeches of ex-President Hoover and Senator TAFT? They said much that I agree with, but they also left out some impelling facts about the world situation that must be taken into account.

It has been suggested that small United States garrison forces could hold out in different parts of the world while friendly nations rearm. This is impossible. The slaughter of our troops and the capture of friendly nations would be a certainty in an open military conflict. Who can trust the Soviets to stop military aggression of their own accord? It has been inferred that America can stand alone. Facts do not give much support to this theory. We may be forced into such an undesirable position, but it would be a short-sighted policy indeed to fail to help the development of economic, religious, and military resistance wherever we can find it. How else can atheistic aggression be stopped before it reaches our own shores? Our task will be increased a hundredfold if we try to go it alone.

We all agree, however, that first priority should be given to building up our own defenses. We must demand it. We must also demand greater effort on the part of our allies, if they are to expect continued assistance from us. Not one of these countries, with the exception of Turkey, has waked up to its own peril to the extent of taking adequate military action.

Withdrawal of our troops from Korea may be a military necessity and it may be the wisest policy in view of the prospects of being thrown into an all-out war with China. So far China, with 450,000,000 people, has unleashed only a small part of her military forces. She has millions more in reserve. Russia is using Korea as a proving ground for tactics and equipment in preparation for bigger things to come. These facts are clear.

The solution depends upon our overall policy regarding whether or not to abandon the entire Far East. If we do not abandon the entire Far East then all available forces must be used to stop Russia in that general area wherever and however it is militarily possible. The wraps must come off. Our fighting men and their families deserve this consideration. This would include strategic bombing wherever it is to our advantage. It would include the use of Korean guerrillas and troops, the estimated 1,500,000 Chinese guerrillas on the mainland, the 500,000 Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa who must be rearmed, the Japanese, and other friendly nations. All must be used in a way that is most advantageous to our cause. The results of this course of action would be to keep Russia from concentrating in Europe to keep these nations from rearming against her.

If we abandon the entire Far East, we must realize that this will mean the immediate collapse of Japan, a country that has no arms at this time but has great industrial power. Formosa and the friendly guerrillas in Korea and China would be helpless. The Philippines and Alaska would be seriously threatened so that the only effect would be to move the war zone closer home.

The same policy of withdrawal applied to Europe would mean the inevitable collapse of such industrial powers as Germany and England, along with the entire European Continent. This would hand over to Russia control of about 90 percent of the world's manpower, in addition to a combined industrial capacity comparable to ours, and backed up by the world's largest army—an army which is ready to go into action now.

In case of our withdrawal from Europe and the Far East either voluntarily or involuntarily, we could not count on anything but war coming to our own shores very quickly and in the most devastating form yet known to man.

The greatest deterrent to a world war now is the temporary advantage we hold in the quantity and quality of the atomic bomb. However, we must bear in mind that Russia can send over one-way, suicide, sneak A-bomb attackers and level some of our cities at this very time. The power of our A-bomb is not great enough to win a war alone and our superiority in this field is fast diminishing. We must strengthen ourselves immediately to make up for this loss.

Mr. Speaker, our people in the Ninth District are representative of America in that they have too much faith in our way of life, too much character, vitality and independence to bow to Russia. My people know down deep in their hearts that the forces of evil are not going to conquer the world ultimately. Atheistic communism cannot dominate the minds of men very long because such unfortunate people will eventually realize that they have been deceived by false promises. It cannot dominate the souls of men very long because man inevitably seeks a higher being. The religious peoples of the world and the freedom loving peoples of the world are slowly but surely lining up solidly against Russia for a showdown. But the number of us, both as individuals and as nations, who will be living to enjoy freedom again, is in direct proportion to the speed, vigor, and intelligence with which we tackle this task together.

The freedom of America was not easily won and it will not be easily defended. The safest course, Mr. Speaker, is bold action. I submit the following programs for immediate consideration and urge their inclusion in our emergency policies:

First. Bring in top leadership for Government service and set up a permanent advisory commission to the President, on foreign affairs.

Second. Initiate a full-scale debate in the House of Representatives on foreign policy, adopting a program that has the backing of our people which is so necessary for success.

Third. Mobilize all industry, catalog every citizen according to his capabilities for emergency national service, step up production and work to keep production lines rolling.

Fourth. Stop publicity and leaks of secret military information which have caused unnecessary loss of lives.

Fifth. Concentrate on the improvement of our military intelligence.

Sixth. Place a complete embargo on Russia, Red China, and Soviet-dominated countries. Put more pressure on all countries sending Russia war materials.

Seventh. Enact a plan for the Government to finance the war on a pay-as-you-go basis in the fairest possible manner. Cut out unnecessary nonmilitary spending.

Eighth. Effect across the board controls, including price and wage controls, to stop runaway inflation which threatens to wreck our economy.

Ninth. Mobilize and train the necessary armed forces as quickly as possible with particular emphasis on a permanent training program.

Tenth. Utilize the Japanese and Chinese nationalists in every possible way in the far-eastern war.

Eleventh. Speed up the mobilization of the Army of Europe, pressing into service German, Spanish, French, and Yugoslavian troops.

Twelfth. Let Russia know we will use the atomic bomb when and where it will do the most good.

Thirteenth. Improve our counterspy and espionage system and make use of DP's in this connection as much as possible.

Fourteenth. Develop a strong civilian defense program.

Fifteenth. Take the initiative of world leadership away from atheistic Russia.

Sixteenth. Ask for divine guidance as our country is being called upon to lead the free world in the most crucial period of our history.

A Comparison of the Funds Provided for Fire Suppression by the Forest Service and the California Division of Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, we are frequently criticized for overstaffing and overspending in Federal Government. This criticism is in the main, I think, justified, but in some places we spend a small amount of money compared to the responsibility the Federal Government has. As an illustration, I offer for the RECORD an editorial in the Lassen Advocate of December 27, 1950, which points out that the State of California provides about $10,000,000 for fire suppression, whereas only $7,500,000 is allowed for the entire Forest Service and another $6,000,000 for actually fighting fires as they occur, for all of the 160 national forests involving about 180,000,000 acres. It could be said, of course, that California has appropriated too much money for fire-suppression work by the State division of forestry, but I doubt it. The California Legislature has been careful in its expenditures, and the State has a balanced budget. In any event, I think this editorial is newsworthy in that it calls attention to one agency of the Federal Government which appears to be doing an awfully big job with a comparatively meager appropriation. The editorial referred to is as follows:

FOOL BELIEVERS

This isn't exactly forest-fire weather, but same interesting information on that line, always important in this area, came out in recent talks with State and United States foresters here.

The United States Forest Service is the poor relation compared to the State division of forestry when it comes to cash available for fire suppression. Uncle Sam or Congress is stingy with money for fire fighting, compared to the California State Legislature.

The State provides about $10,000,000 for fire suppression for the State division of forestry, compared to a meager $7,500,000 allowed the entire United States Forest Service for its protection organization and another $6,000,000 for actually fighting fires as they occur. That has to do for 160 national forests, protecting about 180,000,000 acres. The Lassen National Forest's share is $95,000 to finance its prevention organization; this does not include pay for keyhead personnel in the supervisor's office. It finances two fire-suppression crews, lookouts, and equipment.

Because of this, the Forest Service fire-suppression crews are only 3 or 4 men compared to about 10-man crews of the State in the area. It explains why the Forest Service has to call on lumber-company personnel to do most of its fire fighting and sometimes on the assistance of the State.

Formerly, Congress allowed a deficiency appropriation, which was like a blank check, to pay for suppressing actual fires, whose cost is unpredictable. This year they put on a ceiling of $6,000,000. Maybe the Congressmen will do a little volunteer forest fire fighting if another bad fire season turns up like last season.

Another curious facet of the picture is in financing costs of fire protection of private lands intermingled with national forests. The State pays the United States Forest Service for this protection. But the State legislature appropriates only enough so that the United States Forest Service gets paid about half as much per acre what the State division of forestry receives for protecting its acreage.

While we are a great believer in Government economy, it would be a pleasant surprise if Congress would use common sense and divert a few more million from some silly waste to the real service of the United States Forest Service. The State legislature recognizes the importance of protecting the resources from fire far more than does the United States Congress.

Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Rev. Harold John Ockenga, preached at the Park Street Church,

Boston, Mass., on December 3, 1950, entitled "The Answer to Communist Aggression":

THE ANSWER TO COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

(Text: "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him" (Isaiah 59: 19).)

I have read for our Scripture passage, Isaiah 10:5-12.

Communism is on the march, and it is marching to war. It is marching in China, Korea, Indochina, Japan, Germany, Iran, Greece, and other nations of the earth. We Christians of western culture had also better be on the march, and that right soon.

This struggle is more a struggle of light and darkness, of righteousness and iniquity, of God and Satan, than any other struggle which has taken place in history. I do not infer by that that there are no righteous people in Communist countries. No doubt there are many of them, but they do not have control. I do not infer that there are no wicked and corrupt individuals in our free West. There are plenty of them, and too many of them are in control. But the basis of our western culture is certainly founded upon the great principles contained in the word of God. Tonight, therefore, I want you to see that this struggle which is taking place in Korea, though it may not yet be world war III in all of its catastrophe and hideousness, is most certainly the prelude to and the first annunciation of that very thing.

In Korea we see the determination of Communist Russia to test the mood of the west, particularly the mood of the United States of America. Twice in 6 months wars have been launched by two nations—puppet nations—under the control of Communist Russia. The first, of course, was that in Korea launched by the North Koreans; the second was that in North Korea launched by the Chinese Communists. Both of them were open, naked, pure aggression. This is a test just as unquestionably the Japanese seizure of Manchuria or the German seizure of Austria and Sudetenland were tests of the mood of the days in which they occurred. By the reaction to them, these nations were encouraged to go forward or were warned to halt in their aggression.

At the outset, we must recognize that the things which are taking place in the world are not dissociated, isolated, fragmentised events. They are all part of one great world revolution which is being initiated by Communist Russia. I have made that statement from this pulpit many times. For many years I have tried to expound to you the essence of Communist teaching, the program of Communist strategy, the inevitable results of Communist dialectic. I have protested many actions of our Government from this pulpit and in messages preached in important meetings over America. We have been foolishly, almost imbecilically, maneuvered into a situation where American blood must now be shed against puppet nations with whom we have no quarrel, with the Koreans, with the Chinese, and soon, no doubt, with the Germans and with other nations of the earth. This has occurred in spite of the fact that the Communists announced in advance exactly what their intention was, but they were not believed by those in power in the United States of America. Now we are seeing the evidence of their intention and at long last our leaders have become aroused to what is taking place and to what is imminent.

In this Korean struggle, we Americans have for the first time actually reached a decision to check Communist aggression. Our borders are no longer on the Pacific and the Atlantic. They are in Berlin and Vienna and Korea. They are far from America because the stated intention of communistic Russia is world revolution. It is the conquest of the world. It is not to stop in Korea or in China or in Tibet (for there is no reason for taking Tibet unless India is to be threatened), or in Viet Nam or in East Germany. It is to move all over Asia and over Europe and ultimately, because of geopolitics, with these two continents in their control to overrun the whole world.

We have now come to the place where we recognize that it is essential to resist this evil thing called communism. Our approval and our support must be given to the Government in at last standing firm. Here I want to pause and speak as an American citizen. You as a citizen may not agree with me and that is your privilege; you as a Christian may not agree with me and that is your privilege; you as a member of Park Street Church may not even stand by me as the pastor of Park Street Church and that is your privilege. I want to say that I indict this Government for impotence, for irresponsibility, and for actual imbecility in the things which it has done. I spoke 3 years ago from this pulpit, pleading night after night in the fall of 1947. I wrote to the President of the United States, I wrote to the Secretary of State of the United States, pleading that our Government should not dismantle the industries of Western Germany and turn them over to Russia. I went to see the head of the Republican Party in Massachusetts in order to attempt to put some pressure on Washington to stop the permission given by Washington to the Russians to print money (American occupation money) which was redeemed to the tune of $560,000,000 by our Government in 1947 alone. I have tried again and again by public speeches, through organizations, and by protest to stop the betrayal of the Chinese Nationalist Government under Chiang Kai-shek by those in authority in our country. We were told in propaganda coming out of China by men of the breed of Lattimore that Chinese communism was an agrarian movement and that Chiang Kai-shek and his government were hopelessly corrupt. Now the whole world can see that the Communist movement in China was of Russian origin and of the same Soviet pattern and that Chiang Kai-shek was the one to whom we should have turned with confidence instead of selling him down the river.

I have spoken again and again against the turning of huge lend-lease materials over to Russia as we did, against turning Manchuria over to Russia, and turning North Korea over to Russia; in other words, against betraying one of our own allies in the great World War II. Of this betrayal we are guilty. The American Government stands indicted in its leadership for immoral acts and it is fully responsible in this hour for the conditions in which we find our own country and those which our young men are facing in Korea. The time has come, therefore, for us to speak with no uncertain voice upon these things. We must realize that the destiny of the whole west hangs in the balance now.

Our people have always rallied in the past in days of crisis and the will to resist is now universal. Dismay at any sign of weakness would sweep through the democratic world.

Let us remember that the Communists have nothing to restrain them from waging an aggressive war if and when they please. Communist morality is one of expediency and relativism, so that if it advances the Communist cause to launch a sneak attack upon the world, especially upon the United States, the Communists will do so, but we, who act upon law and moral order, or at least profess to do so in international affairs, we who have the vestigial remnants of a Christian civilization, cannot wage a prophylactic or a preventative war. We deplore hearing men like Secretary Matthews and Representative Walsh and Senator Olin Johnston and Harold Stassen and President Truman and others speak about our intention to use the atomic bomb. When such statements are joined with the fact that we did use the bomb in the last war they remove all moral restraint for Russia to use it if and when she pleases. Consequently, there is nothing to prevent a sneak attack being launched upon the great centers of American industry, communication, and intelligence at this very moment, according to Russian morality.

Do you realize that when Mr. Stassen interviewed Mr. Stalin on April 9, 1947, that Stalin said to Stassen, "Lenin is our teacher and we Soviet people are Lenin's disciples." What then did Lenin teach?

Lenin said, according to page 398 in the seventeenth volume of his collected works: "As long as capitalism and socialism remain, we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism. This is a respite in war * * *. There is no alternative left * * *. Either the Soviet Government triumphs in every advanced country in the world, or the most reactionary imperialism triumphs * * *. There is no middle course."

What Leninist propaganda calls reactionary imperialism is actually representative democracy and free enterprise which he hated. This was a derogatory term used by Lenin to refer to democratic culture. My friends, if you listen to the teacher of Communist Russia, you hear one tell you that Russia is out to dominate the world and to remove from the face of the earth any government which resists her purpose. In Lenin's last speech he said, "Gather strength and strike the bourgeois as is necessary. Strike it only in the chest when you are sure of victory."

Let the moment come when the Communist government in Moscow thinks that it can be sure of victory, the moment when it has wooed from us the Chinese, the Germans, the Persians, and others, let the moment come when they have bled us white by our struggling with their puppet soldiers, let them achieve the development of the atomic bomb and gather a stockpile, as probably they have done through the traitorism of those who have been employed by our own and the English Governments and then the moment will come to strike. There will be no moral restraint. There will be no intellectual restraint. There will be no political restraint. There will be no reason why Communist Russia should not in a moment of time try a sneak attack, as Japan once tried, in order to knock us out of the conflict. Thus in one fell blow Russia would remove the only dam which holds back communism from world dominion. The solitary obstacle to communism's conquest of the world lies in the 150,000,000 people in the United States of America.

How then are we going to meet this situation and what is the answer to communism today? I wish I had much time but due to the limited radio period I must be brief. Therefore, I would suggest three answers which may be given to aggression of Communist Russia. They are righteousness, reason, and resistance. Just three things. I announced these on September 14 to over 60,000 people gathered in the Rose Bowl in California and I have outlined them to you previously.

Mark you, first of all there is righteousness. I have suggested earlier this evening that our western culture, the culture of free men and free society and free enterprise and free ballot and free worship and free speech, has been built on one foundation alone. It is the Judaistic Christian tradition drawn from the Bible, developed through the long process of Christian history from the day of the collapse of the Hellenistic culture unto our present glorious civilization. This western culture is founded on three ideas which I can only mention but not expound. The first is the belief in God, namely, that God exists and that He has created the world and has made man in the image of Himself.

God is supreme. Second, there is a moral law. This is a moral universe which is dependent upon God and God's law. This law of God is shot through the universe. Third, individual men are of infinite value in the sight of God for they were created in the divine image and they have infinite potentialities for righteousness or for evil. On these three ideas, the entire culture of the West has been built. I know that there have been conflicts between what we call equalitarianism on the one hand and libertarianism on the other hand, but they have been balanced in equilibrium by Christian brotherhood. The pendulum has been swinging from one extreme to the other extreme, but it has been kept fairly well balanced in the center because of Christian teaching which infused righteousness and integrity in the lives of individual men so that they embraced neither extreme. This balanced culture has descended from various philosophical sources which I have not time to describe tonight. It is exemplified in what is called Christian civilization.

It is an anomaly that we of the Christian West should act upon the ground of moral law in international things while in our personal lives we have been repudiating this authority of divine law. It is essential for our Nation to turn unto God who says, "If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land." For divine deliverance, we must first of all have righteousness infused in the life of the people, for without it we have no answer to the problems upon which communism feeds.

The second answer to communism is reason. It is time we understood this business of communism. This summer I heard a professor make a speech in New Hampshire on the Korean situation. He is dean of the American School of Political Affairs and has taught political economy for 25 years. He opened his speech by saying that he had never had inclination enough to read the writings of Karl Marx. I was utterly dismayed. Here was a man who has been teaching young men for 25 years how to run the United States Government and he never had read the writings of Karl Marx. How did he have any right to talk about the Korean situation or about communism today? That is the trouble with too many of those in leadership in this Nation. They do not know what they are talking about. They do not know what communism is, what it aims at, what its dialectic is.

Let me tell you that communism is a religion. It is an atheistic, ruthless, fanatical religion which calls for sacrifice and for devotion to convert the world to its viewpoint. Communism is an integrated philosophy which binds its adherents together. Only 2 days ago the Communist leader of Germany warned the world that the nations in the Russian camp would not stand by and see American cannon used in Korea, but that they would unite in opposition to it as one man. Communism has developed a strategy whereby it can conquer a nation with a minority and then prevent the majority from staging a counterrevolution. People do not know what communism teaches. Yet the books on communism are in our libraries and could have been read by those in leadership in our Government. Therefore, we are facing an integrated philosophy having the vitality of a religion with the absolute ruthlessness of atheism which is out for world domination. If you contain communism in Korea it will break out in East Germany. If you contain it in Greece it will break out in Indochina. It is the same old underlying sore that is spreading like a cancer throughout the whole of the body politic of the world.

We had better understand that the antagonism of Soviet communism is directed toward the United States as the citadel of the philosophy of theism, of freedom, and of democracy. Only last week Mr. Wu, of Peiping, spoke 10,000 words filled with venom and hate against America. He turned every good deed we had ever done for China into an action of materialism of our own ends and for the exploitation of China. He is an illustration of how the Communists of the world hate America. They hate its Christianity. They hate its free enterprise. They hate its democracy and they are determined that this Nation will go down. We had better understand that fact very soon.

We need the light of reason thrown upon the United Nations. In a moral universe there will be no strength in an international organization which has no moral base, which does not believe in God and whose charter can be broken at will by those who want to break it because they have no moral scruples, whereas a nation which is a member and believes in God, tries to fulfill the requirements of that charter. Herbert Hoover was right in calling for a union of God fearing, moral nations of this earth to act together. Lake Success may very well prove itself to be "Lake Failure." The San Francisco Conference may well be the sunset of western culture instead of the sunrise of a new day. The United Nations Building in New York instead of becoming a building of unity may well be a Temple of Babel, a source of the division of the nations. Though we have subsidized the United Nations, we have seen it turn into a gigantic propaganda agency for the espousal and the promotion of causes that are contrary to our national interest and to the preservation of western culture. The day has come when we must recognize that giving our money, giving our sons, giving our substance to the nations of the earth must be conditioned upon moral grounds and upon international cooperation.

We need to understand ourselves also. Time does not permit that I speak about the sins of our own nature. We are no saints in this country and we need to recognize ourselves for what we are and for what must be done for us by the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Lastly I want to speak about resistance. We must have the resistance of an unwavering faith, of an unfaltering firmness and an unconquerable force. We must have faith in God and in his sovereignty if we expect him to intervene in the course of events by strengthening us for victory. Let us have done with the weakness of doubt.

Resistance comes from firmness. It was Mr. Lincoln who said, "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." Vacillation is interpreted as weakness. We as a nation must stand by our committals before God and the world, but we must stop committing ourselves to that which we cannot fulfill. Our failure in firmness in China has been vicious.

Lastly, resistance implies force. In the Scripture we hear words, "The war was of God." The Bible sanctions the use of force in the establishment of human government and the requiring of human life by that government, in the committal of the sword to the magistrate, in the establishment of police and of national defense. Those who are the heirs of Christian culture should have the Christian conviction of reenforcing right in the world. Unless we use it, democracy is doomed. Away with all weakness and, if an inevitable show-down comes between communism and the West, let us put our trust in God and be prepared.

If we are going to have God's blessing on our arms and we must and want to have it, then we had better begin to confess our sins, we had better get on our knees before Almighty God, and we had better do it soon. It will not be too long before this conflict and conflagration engulfs the world. Listen, my friend, the Lord intends us to be strong. The Lord intends us to stand up to evil and, when we have committed our way unto him, to do what is right and then, if necessary, to fight unto the end for those things in which we believe, trusting that God can intervene on our behalf.

How To Make Democracy Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a brief statement entitled "This Is My Idea of How To Make Democracy Live," by Helen Smith Lasseter, which I consider an excellent guide and worthy of consideration:

THIS IS MY IDEA OF HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

1. Be the best individual that you know how to be.

2. Look for God's image in others and try to reveal it in your own life.

3. Get the best education that is available to you so that you may make use of your skills and talents for your own well-being and the blessing of others.

4. Be the kindest person that you know how to be.

5. Do the best job that you know how to do in everything that you undertake.

6. Make the best home that you know how to make.

7. Find the place in your community in which you can render your best service and your life will be a living example of how to make democracy live and how to create a better world.

8. Invest in yourself, your fellow men, your country, and your Uncle Sam—buy United States Savings stamps and United States Defense bonds.

HELEN SMITH LASSETER.

JANUARY 9, 1951.

Information About Possible 1952 Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter I have received from the Department of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to questions which you raised in our telephone conversation of November 27, and also in reply to your letter of November 27, 1950, regarding what might happen to a particular county's cotton acreage allotment and the allotments for individual farms within the county, if cotton acreage adjustments should be required in 1952.

In our letter of November 24, 1950, we outlined the present provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, that would probably cause 1952 State

and county cotton-acreage allotments, if required, to vary from those established in 1950 (in many cases the difference would be substantial) even if no change is made in the national acreage allotment in 1952 from 1950. This is true because of changes in base periods and in formulas provided in the act for apportioning the national allotment to States and the State acreage allotments to counties. We have also discussed with you in previous letters that the provisions of the act do not include the acreage planted to cotton in 1951 in the base for establishing 1952 State and county allotments and, therefore, will not affect them.

Since farm cotton acreage allotments are determined primarily on a uniform county percentage of cropland, the acreage planted to cotton on a farm has little bearing on the allotment. The law provides that the acreage of cotton be used in determining minimum and maximum allotments in distributing the county allotment (less the acreage reserved by the county committee) to eligible cotton farms. Therefore, if all farmers in a county should double their cotton acreage in 1951 over 1950, the 1952 farm allotments may be changed considerably or none at all or somewhere between, depending on how farmers in the particular county vary their cotton acreage in proportion to cropland.

In view of the many factors affecting allotments as provided by law it is impossible to determine what the 1952 county and farm cotton acreage allotments would be, if required, until the provisions of the act have been applied in determining State, county, and farm allotments. Consequently, even though we assume that (1) there will be cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas in 1952, (2) the national allotment for 1952 would be the same as the 1950 national allotment, and (3) a particular farm or county plants exactly twice as much cotton in 1951 as was planted in 1950 it would still be impossible to determine the changes in any given county allotment or the farm allotments within a given county.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. McCormich,
Under Secretary.

The President's Message and a Republican Response

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of comment on the President's state of the Union message and the responsibility and opportunity of the Republican Party, carried on the NBC network program Pro and Con, January 12, 1951:

When the President addressed the Congress in his state of the Union message 2 years ago, his opening sentence was: "I am happy to report that the state of the Union is good."

Last year on a similar occasion he started off: "I am happy to be able to report to you today that the state of the Union continues to be good."

This year in a very different vein he started off: "This Eighty-second Congress faces as grave a task as any Congress in the history of our Republic."

The 1950 message, full of rosy optimism, said: "While great problems still confront us, the greatest danger has receded." The President then proceeded to devote 60 percent of his message exclusively to advancing his domestic program.

By contrast, this year only 4 percent of his message related to his domestic program and that only in the most generalized terms.

This is a powerful commentary upon the deterioration in world conditions during the past year. At the opening of Congress this year we heard a message dictated by a total reversal of all the assumptions of 12 months before.

The people of this Nation are terribly worried and justifiably so. We enjoy neither peace abroad nor security at home.

The people are disappointed, many of them incensed, over the indecisive, vacillatting and faulty leadership which has contributed so heavily to our present plight.

We Republicans must ask ourselves, What is our proper function as a minority party?

By its very nature a minority party is the proper vehicle for expression of opposition to the policies of the party in power. Indeed, with the rising tide of indignation in this country against the present administration, if our constitutional processes had been patterned after those of most European countries, we would have had long before this a vote in Congress to express confidence or lack of confidence in the administration. If that vote had been adverse, as I sincerely believe it would, the Truman wing of the Democratic Party would already be out of power.

That, however, is not the way our forefathers fashioned the framework of this Republic. For better or for worse, White House leadership will not change for two more years. These 2 years may determine whether our Nation can survive and our people remain free.

In an era so challenging, in the face of issues so far reaching, we Republicans are under a solemn obligation to the people to insure that all avenues of discussion are kept open and all sides of the weighty questions affecting the very life of our Nation are thoroughly explored and debated. Only thereby will we arrive at conclusions which reflect the true will of the people without whose wholehearted support any national effort will fail. At the same time we have an equally solemn obligation to keep our debate on a high level with our sights trained on only one objective, the safety and welfare of our country.

Too many administration spokesmen have advanced the thesis that unity requires that in these critical times we of the minority party subordinate our views and submit to the will of the wing of the Democratic Party which now controls the White House. Nothing could be more dangerous, nothing more fatal to the preservation of the vitality and strength of our two-party system of government. I was happy to hear the President himself repudiate this line of reasoning in recognizing that unity does not require complete submission by the minority to policies and methods advanced by the majority which are believed to be demonstrably unsound.

Nor should we of the minority remain silent if we believe that appointed officials of the Federal Government at any level, either because of questionable loyalty to their country, incompetence, or personality deficiencies have completely lost the confidence of the people to the extent that they can no longer effectively and efficiently lead them in the great effort to which our Nation is committed.

While carefully avoiding irresponsible charges and demagogic appeals, we have a duty to protest emphatically their retention in high positions.

But just as it is our duty as critics to be constructive, so it is the obligation of those holding ultimate power to give weight to that criticism without regard to partisan considerations. Both of us should seek, in these critical times, areas of agreement rather than of disagreement.

This requires greater opportunity for free and responsible discussion in the formulation of national policies. This must take place when those policies are taking shape.

It was a disappointment that the President in his message did not even mention the all-absorbing question of the moment, whether he will consult with Congress before ordering large forces to be deployed in Western Europe. An assurance to that effect would have gone a long way toward accomplishing that unity of purpose which he properly asks.

When General Eisenhower returns from Europe, it is to be hoped that his report on the prospect of building an international army for defense of the Atlantic community will be made to representatives of both parties at the White House.

The best way to make Members of Congress sensible of their responsibility is to keep them informed as to the underlying facts of our position in the world. This has not been done. Decisions have been made and Congress presented with the accomplished fact. Then the charge of causing disunity is made, if the wisdom of the decision be challenged. That must be altered if we are going to work in harness.

While I realize that consultations in advance give rise to many difficulties, nevertheless they point the only way to advancement of a foreign policy which will be widely understood and at least to a large degree insulated against the passions of partisanship.

We have never been at a point in our history where it was more important that Americans go forward together. There can be no question as to the goal of everyone of us—a just peace and true freedom for the peoples of the earth.

There is unity on the question of the extent of national effort. No reasonable move should go untried. No necessary sacrifice should be avoided. There is unity on the proposition that every American must render every effort to resolve this crisis successfully, to achieve victory and to establish a real and just peace.

There can be no doubt that Americans in all walks of life, regardless of party, stand together on these worthy objectives. In their accomplishment, we Republicans will put our country first.

Broome County's Sons Spring to Her Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for an all-out effort to build up America's defense of her freedom and liberties all over the world, we would defeat our very purposes of rearming if we let our vigilance lag for a minute here at home.

The fundamental principle of keeping free is preserving our direct election system. That is as important as any step

we will ever take in defending the ramparts.

There is now in the making in Albany, well hidden behind massive, closed doors, and the general alarums of preparatory legislation, formulas of reapportioning the congressional districts of New York State.

As I understand it, Broome County, which is one of the largest and most important counties in the whole State, will become a vassal state to be subjugated in importance to many lesser counties in remote sections. It will be fastened on to them as a sort of a geographical freak, most resembling on the map an alligator.

I pointed this out a month ago and was joined by leading Republicans in Broome who expressed their indignation that anything like it should be conceived.

Yet, the same source who gave me the original valuable tip, persists in telling that the experts of gerrymander are on the march, and that they have not swerved in their determination to cut up the Thirty-seventh Congressional District into sardine slices, thereby reducing our importance and prestige throughout the State to little more than that of a third-rate community.

If they succeed, the people of Broome County will receive secondary consideration in vital matters of civil defense; our GI's and our veterans will be pushed aside, and our citizenry will be relegated to positions of unimportance both in Albany and in Washington.

I cannot stand idly by and keep silent in the face of such a misfortune. The people of my home section deserve a happier fate than to be consigned to the political junk heap.

Last week, a glimmer of light appeared on the horizon when the Broome County Board of Supervisors passed, without a dissenting vote, a resolution by Mr. Harry D. Prew, of Binghamton's third ward, protesting any radical change in our congressional district.

Although this action was played down in news reports, it was significant and highly commendable both of Supervisor Prew in presenting the resolution and of the board approving it. I understand many members expressed strong feeling in support of the idea that Broome County should be the center of any district she is a part of.

I am happy indeed to see so many of Broome's loyal sons spring to her defense. Albany ought to take heed and see which way the wind blows.

To edify the gerrymander tacticians, I think I should make it plain that from a personal political standpoint, they will not affect me no matter what manner of district they throw Broome into.

As long as Broome is in the district I run in, they cannot defeat me in the Republican primaries.

They cannot build up majorities enough in a dozen other counties to offset the old home town.

There may be doubters of that statement now but in 1952 they will see that I was correct.

The Philosophy of Wilson and the World of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, a splendid and timely speech delivered by the Honorable Shane MacCarthy, political scientist and lecturer, Washington, D. C., at the Wilson day dinner celebration, December 28, 1950, before the Knox County Democratic Women's Club, at Knoxville, Tenn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Philosophy of Wilson and the World of Today

We gather tonight not in sentimental fashion to moisten our emotions in remembrance of a great leader of our Nation. Our aim is not to load accolades of praise on a President whose meritorious work for freedom, justice, and peace is being appreciated more with the maturity of time. It is not our goal to consume time by a monotonous recital of dates and occasions in the life of a great man. Rather shall we endeavor to drink at the fountain of political thought which was filled so freely and so brilliantly by the mind and pen of Woodrow Wilson.

Thirty-three years ago, in January 1917, a man slight of physical stature poised his frail being before the Senate of the United States and there differentiated between the concepts of "victory," which implied peace forced upon the loser, and "peace based upon equality and mutual pursuance of the common good." That man was President Woodrow Wilson. The warring nations heeded not his advice and 3 months later, in April 1917, recognizing that the wrongs being inflicted by the aggressor nations of that day cut deep to the very roots of human life, he solemnly asked for a declaration of war by the United States upon the Imperial German Government. In his grave request he said:

"Our object is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power. The menace to peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments, backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people."

How well and accurately these words of Wilson express the conditions of the world today. Two world wars have been fought and ended, concluded in so-called triumph for the democratic nations of the world, and yet we are seeking that elusive something called perfect peace. Since you are citizens of the noblest vintage, all picked and culled, you will readily agree that in this finite world perfection is not attainable. However, we may have a lasting peace among nations if we follow the prescription of the great feast we've just celebrated, for peace shall prevail and remain only among and between men of good will.

We meet at one of the most critical junctures in our national history and in the history of civilization itself. Out of our efforts at this very moment could generate the thoughts which, like beacon lights could stimulate the positive actions that are required to lead us out of the vacuum in which freedom and democracy are floundering today. Accordingly, I come not here to talk and remember merely to participate on your month's program; I do not desire to add gloom to pessimism or to create false hopes in minds already captured by wishful thinking. Rather do I hope by utilizing Wilson's thoughts and words to translate the impact of a world in turmoil into the context of what you and I as individuals can do and must do to aid civilization in this struggle for existence.

No more need be said about the goal of the Communists. Without a glimmer of uncertainly, we know that they seek world domination at any cost. This strategy remains unaltered regardless of the ebb and flow of tactical changes. In the achievement of their dastardly aims we have seen the laboratory of communism in the U. S. S. R. itself unfold before us a horrible panorama of slavery, torture, and godlessness. Those preaching the gospel according to Marx have accomplished nothing for the good of mankind, and yet, in their quest for power this negative factor is no deterrent. Onward they go stirring up fresh wars in the Devil's caldron of hates; proceeding under the false veneer of aiding humanity, when in reality human beings count for naught in their evil designs; enslaving nations as stepping stones toward achievement of world conquest; eradicating from life everything good, noble, just, and moral. While the death march of the Communists continues to grind its way toward total destruction of life and liberty, we of the free world appear to flounder in thought and to hesitate in the realm of indecisive action in counteracting this satanic force. Do we delay in diagnosing mortal illness when symptoms of disease appear? When thieves attempt to plunder and rob our homes and businesses, do we sit as bleacherites watching their machinations with indifference? Would we react with aloofness and unconcern if our material savings, which had been the product of patient toil over the years, were to be snatched by gangsters? Would we be unresponsive if evildoers were to spoil the moral character which we are attempting to develop in our children? For strength of body; for protection of home and business; for security of monetary investments; for the safeguarding of the character of our loved ones we would not allow apathy to make us lukewarm and detached. Then why do we not strip all issues of today of their verbosity? Why do we not dissipate the clouds that blind our vision? Why do we not realize that a weakened and war-weary world is sorely infected by the evil doings of one godless nation, and that the desecration of civilization itself is being checked by the existence of this country which is still strong and courageous—our own United States?

As we stand poised at this moment, let us realize that the battle for the survival of democracy will not automatically fade into oblivion. This struggle for the world now being waged is a contest to the finish, because the triumph of the forces enslaved would spell the doom of ours.

In this battle for life we look up with confidence to what we have, and to our capacity for engineering the triumph of good over evil.

"Democracy," said Wilson, "is the most difficult form of government because it is the form under which you have to persuade the largest number of persons to do anything in particular. But I think we were the more pleased to undertake it because it is difficult. Anybody can do what is easy. We have shown that we could do what was hard."

Not many years back our fathers marched into the heavens and brought down a segment of that power from above, and gave

to weak man the power to rule himself. We gave substance and form to the thoughts of philosophers and statesmen, and launched the great "experiment," by instituting a Government which derived its right from the consent of the governed. In so doing, we recognized that man—the individual man—was first, and that the state existed but to protect his rights. We openly acknowledged that man was greater than the state—the state has no immortal soul. Thus, the fundamental issue of the moment, the fight between God and Satan, is part of the continuous adventure in the art of governing mankind. In this fight, our country, by the grace of God, stands a free, prosperous, and strong Nation, ready for the morrow, realizing that no nation ever had greater responsibility for the future of the world, for the retention of freedom, than we have. We are the sample democracy, the window-dressing of the democratic concept, and if the light of freedom were to be quenched here, unborn generations would know only serfdom.

With such a profusion of storm clouds, are there any fair-weather signs which may kindle our hopes? Over the horizon which hides the future can we anticipate the rising of a morning sun which will shed its rays on a world of freemen? Is there any answer which will give to life in this finite world more than a temporary solace, more than intermittent peace, more than mere cessation of hostilities? Thank God that in response to these searching interrogations we can reply with a concrete and strong affirmative answer. In preparing ourselves to accomplish the desired end, the first basic premise is that the task belongs not to indefinite humanity but to definite human beings who are you and I. We fail before we start if we approach the solution by the thought of relegating action to the Government, to the military, to a political party, or to someone else. The strength of government, the power of policy is as strong or as weak as you or I make it. In conducting this individual crusade, we must condition ourselves by preparing our minds and our souls for the task ahead.

1. From our thinking processes we must eradicate confusion. It is fundamental to all action that we know, with accuracy, the essential facts which make us love the life we have and abhor the concepts which the rulers of the Kremlin would force upon us. Unless we think alike about the major problems of today, then all of our attempts to apply corrective remedies will lose their strength by dissipation and bewilderment.

2. It is essential that we eliminate uncertainty as to what we are striving to attain. We must recognize that this is not a mere battle of differing ideologies; it is not two systems selling their wares in the market place; this is not a competition between equals for control of humanity; rather is it a struggle for civilization. It is the death battle between truth, justice, charity on the one hand, and on the other, world servitude. Our God-given principles of life are not being weighed in a scale of international caliber to be matched against the atheistic pronouncements of Communists. If the pursuit of happiness is to remain a right of man, if freedom and liberty are to prevail and survive, if life itself is to win the struggle, then there is no choice as to the outcome—we must win.

3. In this struggle we must avoid timidity which will inevitably bring on defeatism. If we are afraid, it is a self-indictment of the ignorance we possess about our Nation and its people. If we are faint-hearted we do not recognize that truth and God are on our side in this fight against evil. If we don the cloak of a coward, we are easy prey for an enemy which has no fear for even a brave man. Those who rule by fear and seek to crush men by fear must be met by fearless people to whom liberty is even more sacred than life itself.

4. Trample underfoot the indifference which makes us unresponsive to our obligations. If we continue to enjoy the God-given benefits of freedom without a realization that these benefits carry with them militant obligations, then we are indeed selfish and myopic, unwilling to give the future the heritage that was bequeathed to us by past generations, and unaware that we could lose what we have by default.

When, then, will the arts of peace catch up with the powers of destruction? Not until each person individually realizes that it is his and her task always to wage the peace with the same unity of purpose so evident in time of war. Solidarity is a unique by-product of war. But must we be doped up by recurring crises to recognize this militant obligation for guarding and strengthening democracy?

THE ANSWER

I hope not. Thus, with confusion, uncertainty, timidity, and indifference expelled from our systems, we approach the combat with positive attributes of courage, confidence, resolution, and conviction which must be all cloaked in strength to produce the type of practical patriotism demanded by the challenge of today. Unless, however, we translate these concepts into practical action they remain mere words signifying no usefulness in solving current issues. Hence, if we are possessed of that quality of mind which meets danger and difficult situations with firmness of spirit; if ours is the self-reliance which strengthens faith in our cause; if we are resolved to wage the peace for a better type of life; if all our actions are guided by a persuasion in the righteousness of what we stand for; then, with the necessary aid of military strength, we have marshaled our resources to develop a formidable front against the forces of atheistic communism.

But, who will carry on this fight? The Government? The armed services? Let's get the cue for our answer from Wilson, who said:

"We overlook the fact that the real source of strength in the community comes from the bottom. Do you find democracy renewing itself from the top? Don't you find society renewing itself from the ranks of unknown men? * * * What you are constantly depending on is the rise out of the ranks of unknown men, the discovery of men whom you had passed by, the sudden disclosure of capacity you had not dreamed of, the emergence of somebody from some place of which you had thought the least, of some man unanointed from on high, to do the thing that the generation calls for."

Leadership in government is certainly essential, and the power of our armed services must be capable of dealing effectively with a regime that recognizes only military might. But the menace of totalitarianism which overshadows the world today can be diffused only by the individual man and woman. Again you ask, How can a solitary man influence the whole of mankind? Remember that mankind does not exist but men do. Since all our efforts to subdue the Soviet threat are premised upon the greatness of the individual life, how can the individual contend that he or she is too small to participate? On the contrary, freedom—genuine God-given freedom—will fail unless we relate the battle for freedom to our individual lives.

In the struggle of the hour, we are not merely seeking military victory which brings a peace that is no more than a cessation of hostilities; we are not striving for economic domination over commerce and trade; we are not attempting to extend an imperialistic strangle hold over nations. Our own goal is to see that mankind is not reduced to the level of the brute beast and living only in accordance with the will of a central oligarchy. Such a struggle demands the continuous participation of all men since each one of us is concerned about our own survival. Ladies and gentlemen, this fact is as practical as an adding machine and is as impartial as a traffic light.

The individual campaign I call for must be waged at four levels:

(a) In the home and office.
(b) In the community.
(c) In the State.
(d) In the Nation.

HOME AND OFFICE

One of the most sensitive target areas at which the strategy and tactics of international communism are beamed is the home. In their devilish crusade to subdue the world, much of the Communist power in the U. S. S. R. has been generated by their capacity to weaken the home and control the youth. Lenin himself said "Give me the youth for 8 years and I'll give you a Bolshevik (Communist) forever." By putting mothers into the labor force of the Soviet Union and training the children in state-supported schools, the infant minds have been indoctrinated with the philosophy of Marx, Lenin, and the police-state tyrannical thoughts of Stalin to the point where they fit into the scheme of Communist world conquest. These are the young people who now form the youthful leaders in carrying out Communist policies and undertakings. Well, indeed, does Stalin know that if the home is rendered unstable, the State will totter. Accordingly, you and I must live our lives in our homes and in our work surroundings in such a manner as to beget confidence in the system of which we are a part. Truth, morality, kindness, patience, love of fellow man, are integral parts of this blueprint. If these do not exist then our striving for victory is an empty struggle.

COMMUNITY

The lowest level of government in our democratic system is that of our rural or urban surroundings. Business interests and business rivalries are therein developed. Knowledge of the capacity of persons for leadership is a component of our daily associationships. Each community is a proving ground for testing the practicable application of ideas which strengthen our society. Accordingly, see to it constantly that you are giving to the community the full, unselfish contribution of your capacity for preventing evil and accomplishing good. In this way your efforts will shine as brilliant examples to stimulate similar undertakings in localities where the contagion of good will result in like benefits for others.

THE STATE

Not many years have passed since the fathers of our Nation, by divine providence, brought into existence one indivisible Nation composed of sovereign States and commonwealths. The power of their sovereignty, the capacity for continuation of the philosophy under which they were formed, their ability to avoid unhealthy rivalries must all be guided by you and by me who live in those States. The land of each is bountiful in its beauty and generous in its capacity, but these attributes are inanimate and do not possess the importance of a single citizen of any of those States. Therefore, you must be constantly on guard to protect and strengthen the policies of your State as a sacred unit in our democratic system.

THE NATION

The men and women who form our national and international policies come from the State, from the community, and from the home. They are not an isolated category of citizenry. They are chosen by us to carry the torch of liberty and freedom through ages dark and bright. They are our missionaries selected by us to speak our gospel and formulate our decisions. Why then criticize policies when we ourselves, by indirection, are the makers of those policies? When will we be men enough to recognize that the power in the Government is the power from our people? Immediately, therefore, we should close the gap between ourselves and our rulers so that we develop a oneness of thought, of purpose, and of action in the evolvement of our national and international policies. Don't just wait for election opportunities. The process of democracy is continuous and under our system the one elected is the representative of all. Accordingly, from us to our representatives and appointed officials should go suggestions and recommendations and from them to us should come explanations supporting their actions. This cohesion will bring about a teamwork for good that will forge strength in our national and international endeavors.

CONCLUSION

In all our endeavors let us be guided by the philosophy of the Declaration of Independence and of our Constitution. As Wilson said:

"My dream is that as the years go on * * * the world * * * will turn to America for those moral inspirations which lie at the basis of all freedom; * * *.

"I do not know that there will ever be a declaration of independence and of grievances for mankind, but I believe if any such document is ever drawn it will be drawn in the spirit of the American Declaration of Independence, and that America has lifted high the light which will shine unto all generations and guide the feet of mankind to the goal of justice and liberty and peace."

This philosophy explains that inalienable rights come not from the state; they are not derived from the majority vote of the people. They come to man from God. Hence, if they are taken away, the action violates the natural law, it violates the law of God. Therefore, the battle for inalienable rights means nothing if God is eliminated from our consideration. At San Francisco, however, one nation—Russia—succeeded in vetoing God from the deliberations and from the Charter of the United Nations. How, then, can we achieve a solidarity of peace for the worlds? How can we attain a brotherhood of men under the fatherhood of God when this fatherhood is not recognized? Hence, in the home, in the community, in the State, in the Nation, enthrone God in our individual lives, and let our actions be guided thereby. The words of Wilson are indeed appropriate for us tonight:

"This," said he, "is not a day of triumph; it is a day of dedication. Here muster not the forces of party, but the forces of humanity. Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try? I summon all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men."

Therefore, do not leave this chamber saying that you can do nothing. Do you want democracy to become a formless ideal, mocked by some conqueror who will relegate to it a place in history that never mattered much? Of course not. Therefore, as the scepter of world leadership is ours to wield, let us as Americans, as all Americans, as individuals, but, more important still, as individual Americans, go forward with unity of purpose and with enthusiasm for the opportunity which is given to us for doing good. Every ounce of our energies should shout for action at this challenge. Let us not bequeath to the future a task which we should face and do today and every day. This alone can save civilization. This alone can save the world.

God bless you.

Let's Remove the Ancient Figures From These Walls and Replace Them With Great Americans—Including Thomas Alva Edison

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, when we get around to moving these caricatures off the wall of the House Chamber, of course I shall want to put the figures of George Washington, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, James Monroe, John Adams, and other great Americans in their places.

I certainly want to remove that ancient figure of Hammurabi, who is said to have lived 4,000 years ago. I want to remove his picture and also that of Suleiman, who is said to have been an emperor of Turkey at one time, as well as that of the Spanish Rabbi, Maimonides, and other misfits, who have been dead from 500 to 3,000 years, and replace at least one of them with the figure of Thomas Alva Edison, in my opinion the greatest single benefactor mankind has ever known.

Mr. Edison probably did more for humanity than any other human being who has ever lived, from the dawn of civilization to the present day. He is one man who never served in public office whose figure I would like to see placed upon the wall of this historic chamber, in the place of one of those ghastly figures that now confront us.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the speech which our genial colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], made before the House several years ago on the subject of Thomas Alva Edison has now been reprinted in that great series of volumes "Modern Eloquence" and has been recognized by authorities on public speaking as one of the great deliverances of our time.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his compliment.

In that address, I was simply saying what I felt about Mr. Edison, the man whom I consider to be one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, benefactor that mankind has ever known.

That speech has not only been printed in the set of books called "Modern Eloquence," to which the gentleman from Iowa refers, but it is reproduced in several other volumes, one of which is "The Principles of Public Speaking," which is used as a textbook in many colleges, including George Washington University, and also in a book on public speaking called "You Can Make a Speech," by Hon. William Doll, former president of the Wisconsin Bar Association and a former instructor of public speaking at the University of Washington and also at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, at this point, my address on Mr. Edison as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, February 12, 1940. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Vreeland, knowing of my admiration for Mr. Edison, asked me to make a few remarks during the memorial services which were held for him here in the House. Owing to the limitation of time, he was able to yield me only 10 or 15 minutes, in which time I expressed, as best I could, my sentiments on Mr. Edison's life, work, and character.

That address follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my humble tribute to the memory of one of America's most illustrious sons. Yesterday was the ninety-third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison, our country's greatest contribution to the world's list of scientific men.

He was the foremost inventive genius of the age and one of the leading benefactors of mankind. He was the greatest liberator the world has ever known. By the force of his matchless genius, aided by his tireless energy, he struck the shackles of drudgery from untold millions of human beings and lifted the world into the light of a new civilization, the like of which humanity had scarcely dreamed.

He stands in history among the leaders of the men of genius of all time—Homer, Galileo, Michelangelo, Rembrandt, Mozart, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Columbus, Jefferson, Newton, and Marconi. Towering amid that great galaxy rises the immortal figure of Edison, in glorified silhouette against the horizon of the ages, sending a glow of radiance down the centuries to come, to cheer the hopes and fire the imaginations of scores of the future who struggle for the betterment of mankind.

It is unnecessary to attempt to magnify his virtues, to minimize his vices, or to clothe him with qualities he did not have. All that is necessary to commend him to the minds and hearts of peoples of all climes is the simple story of this earnest, patient man, toiling through the silent hours of the night to make the world a better place in which to live.

He was the greatest public servant of his day; yet he held no political office, he founded no political party, he advanced no new political creeds. Therefore an array of illustrious speakers volunteer to sing his praise or use his name as a rallying banner to further selfish ends.

He was one of the mightiest conquerors this world has ever seen; yet he waged no wars of human destruction, he fought no bloody battles, he stirred no fires of human hate nor pandered to the lower passions of the race. But he conquered the elements,

as it were, and gave to humanity the greatest ascendancy over the forces of nature the world has ever known. He brought the dawn of a new civilization—the electric age.

He never intentionally hurt a human being. Therefore no memorial has been erected to him in his country's Capital, no monument dedicated to his name, no blasing epitaph upon these historic walls proclaim his services to the world.

I sometimes wonder if we really appreciate the services of men of genius. They scale the heights and blaze the way to those sublime achievements that mark the milestones in the progress of the race, while men of talent dig in, solidify, and hold the gains and enjoy the progress that genius makes.

Have you ever thought what would happen if we should lose all that men and women of genius have accomplished for the world? What this land would be like? It would be a different world—cold, pulseless, monotonous, and silent. Our transportation system would come to a standstill, the telephone and telegraph wires would become useless obstructions, the lights would go out, the radio would be silenced, and all the machinery of industry, as well as that of commerce would cease to move. As has been well and wisely said, if you take from the world all that genius has given, "all the niches would be empty, all the walls would become naked, meaning and connection would fall from words of poetry and fiction, music would go back to common air, and all the forms of subtle and enchanting art would lose proportion, to become the unmeaning waste and shattered spoil of thoughtless chance."

It would be useless to attempt to enumerate all the things that Edison did for mankind. His greatest contribution was the invention of the electric light—the incandescent lamp. With that one act he did more to change the course of our civilization than has any other man who ever "lived in the tide of time." He not only lighted our halls, our homes, our streets, and our highways, but he gave us the spark that fires the gas that makes the motor machine possible.

He ushered in the electric age, and the motor age as well. He made possible the automobile, the X-ray, the airplane, the submarine, the moving picture, and the radio. He gave us a new system of overland transportation, taught us to navigate the air, and enabled us to roam with safety on the bottom of the sea. He eliminated time and space and aided us to see through objects that were formerly supposed to exclude all light.

He made possible mass production through new industrial machinery, and gave us that great multiplicity of electrical appliances that add to the comforts and conveniences of every home and every business establishment. He made necessities luxuries, and luxuries necessities, and enabled us to electrify the farm homes of America and to lift from the shoulders of burdened humanity the great weight of drudgery under which farm men and women have struggled since the beginning of time.

He tapped a source of wealth richer than the diamond mines of Golconda, more valuable than all the oil fields and all the gold and diamond mines of the modern and ancient world—a wealth that is inexhaustible, and one that will last as long as rains fall and rivers flow to the sea.

There is enough hydroelectric power in our navigable streams alone, that throughout thousands of centuries has been running waste and wasted to the sea, to electrify every home in America, including every farm house, and then have enough left to supply every conceivable establishment, if not every industry throughout the land.

His monument is in every house that turns an electric switch; his epitaph is written on every heart that beats in gratitude for the services he gave. He needs no pompous memorial to commemorate his life. He needs no monument save the eternal and indestructible substance of his own greatness to commend him to the consideration of all coming ages. His name will live and his fame will reach to the remotest times in which civilized man shall dwell upon the earth.

Someone has said that—

They are the truly great who, as the centuries slowly pass, are found by each succeeding race near to the heart of human love.

Centuries may come and go, empires may flourish and pass away, republics may rise and fall, but the work of Edison will endure.

When the monuments to lesser men shall have perished with the lapse of time, when this Republic shall have run its course and taken its place among the dead nations of the past, when in the distant lapse of ages yet to come, errant wanderers from different lands shall stand before the crumbling columns of this Capitol and look down across the ruins of the District of Columbia, the name of Thomas A. Edison will remain, unscarred by the wreck of ages and undimmed by the floods of time. [Applause.]

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, since the war started in Korea, White County, one of the small counties in my district in southern Illinois, reports to date 11 casualties, with two killed and one missing.

It is about time the President, the United Nations, and the State Department recognize we are in a war in Korea and not just a police action.

The people of White County and all of the Nation know too well that we are in war. That we are in a war in which the American Army has suffered its first defeats in our history, suffered these defeats because the administration changed its policy overnight and sent our soldiers into battle outnumbered 3 to 5 to 1, outgunned, and unprepared for sudden war.

The result has been 50,000 American casualties to date.

Strategically Korea has never been worth protecting. It is not worth the thousands of lives it has cost to say nothing of the billions of dollars in expense. We should not have gone into Korea, and we should take our troops out of there if possible, without further loss, to another perimeter of defense.

Yet, we read in the press this morning that those directing our foreign policy say we will stay in Korea. If that is the final decision then I would again suggest that the President and the United Nations immediately lift the embargo they have had against Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Government helping us, and permit them to join with us in an effort to relieve the pressure on the American soldiers, cause the Communists to fight on two fronts which would doubtless save the lives in the future of many of our American boys.

Wisconsin, America's Dairyland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the words, "America's Dairyland," appear on the automobile license plates of the State of Wisconsin. The figures bear out the statement. I set forth herein an article which recently appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison. Figures therein are taken from United States Department of Agriculture reports.

STATE DAIRY INDUSTRY WINS 14 UNITED STATES FIRSTS—TOPS ALL OTHERS WITH SIX TYPES OF CHEESE, 1949 RECORDS REVEAL

Wisconsin's dairy industry, from which the biggest portion of the State's agricultural revenue is derived, gave the State 14 first places in the production of milk and manufactured dairy products in 1949, according to complete figures available for that period in the Wisconsin and United States Department of Agriculture crop reporting service records.

Wisconsin topped other States in the production of Munster cheese, producing 95.2 percent of the United States total of 9,613,000 pounds; brick cheese, producing 90.7 percent of the United States total, or 16,367,000 pounds; Swiss cheese 59.6 percent of the United States total, or 48,271,000 pounds.

FORTY-NINE PERCENT OF LIMBURGER

In the production of Italian cheese, the State produced 50.4 percent of the United States total, or 27,771,000 pounds; limburger cheese, 49.1 percent of the United States total, or 3,526,000 pounds; American cheese, 46 percent of the United States total or 430,103,000 pounds; malted milk powder, 81.4 percent of the United States total, or 20,665,000 pounds.

Wisconsin produced 47.9 percent of the United States total of powdered whey, or 76,216,000 pounds; 36.4 percent of the powdered whole milk, or 45,648,000 pounds; 27.7 percent of the powdered skim milk, or 264,830,000 pounds; 27.5 percent of the condensed whole milk, or 40,912,000 pounds; 21 percent of the evaporated whole milk, or 578,578,000 pounds; 19.5 percent of the condensed skim milk (unsweetened), or 104,477,000 pounds; and 13.1 percent of the United States milk supply, or 115,566,000,000 pounds.

In all the above production figures, the State ranked first in the Nation.

In the production of cream cheese, it ranked second, with 27.2 percent of the total production, or 14,796,000 pounds; second on the production of condensed whole milk (unsweetened), with 13.5 percent, or 27,207,000 pounds; third on butter, with 11.9 percent, or 168,214,000 pounds; and third on condensed skim milk (sweetened), or 23,960,000 pounds.

TENTH PLACE ON ICE CREAM

Wisconsin took tenth place on the production of ice cream in the 1949 total dairy production figures, producing 3 percent of the Nation's total, or 16,690,000 gallons.

Iowa was first on the production of butter in 1950 but third in 1949. Minnesota took first place on 1949 butter production but rose to first in 1950.

Wisconsin's total production of cheese of all types during 1949 was 552,469,000 pounds, its total production of other manufactured dairy products was 1,379,496,000 pounds.

Figures presently available for 1950 production show that the State's production of butter had dropped 11.8 percent during the period, January-August, inclusive.

The State's production of American cheese during the above 1950 period had dropped 1.3 percent over 1949.

The price paid for milk to Wisconsin's farmers in October, latest crop reporting figures available, showed that those producing grade A milk for whole milk use averaged $3.60 per hundred pounds; for cheese making, the milk averaged $3.21 per hundred; for butter making, the milk averaged $3.49 per hundred pounds; and for condensery use, it averaged $3.44 per hundred pounds.

Milk prices in Wisconsin continued to lag behind the rise in the general price level during October, with milk prices paid to farmers up to October being slow to reflect a return to him in proportion to the rising feed and labor costs since July.

Here We Go Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a letter regarding the international situation from a constituent:

Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: Well, Joe, here we go again. World war III, and in a couple of weeks the eighth member of my immediate family leaves for military service. Counting my own army service and 7 years in selective service out of the past 10, my family will have had over 32 years in uniform or in direct war effort for Uncle Sam. Under the circumstances this must be so, and under the circumstances I would not have it otherwise.

The circumstances, however, are that we all were sold down the river at Yalta. And the pitiful and pathetic leadership we have had since that fateful day has put us a long, long way down the road to ruin. To me, it is no coincidence that every time we are at war there is a Democratic administration and a Democratic foreign policy in power. Would that we had a "Teddy" who spoke softly but firmly, and carried a big stick.

"The world has become a neighborhood," said F. D. R. "Hear, hear," said the puppets. So what? What if we don't like some of our neighbors, and they don't like us even a little bit. Even those to whom we give aid and sustenance mock us behind our back and will not thank us in the end. We have, and are still pouring unnumbered billions into futile attempts to feed and arm a Europe that can never be held against an all-out assault, and into other parts of the world that have no capacity to appreciate the gesture.

I just wanted to get this off my chest because your enemies have perennially accused you of being an isolationist. If you are an isolationist so am I, and so are thousands of others out here in the Middle West. I like my own children a little better than I like those in totalitarian countries, and I don't want my competence for old age dissipated completely by huge taxes to support the welfare programs both at home and abroad. I'm for America first, last, and all the time, even if it's selfish to think that way. The funny part of it is, Joe, that four life-long Democrats have voiced these same sentiments to me the past 10 days. If these are straws in the wind, then Truman and Acheson will go down together.

Letter and Questionnaire to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter and questionnaire which I propose to send out to the box holders in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska. The letter and questionnaire follow:

DEAR FRIEND: Each year I send out a questionnaire to the folks in the Fourth District, seeking reactions to problems before the Congress. My purpose is to stimulate a broader interest in government and to give people, who otherwise would not write their Congressman, a chance to express their views. I shall be very happy if you would return the enclosed questionnaire, stating your views. It would be good to have a letter from you, in which you go into considerable detail about the problems facing our country.

QUESTIONNAIRE

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

1. Should there be complete mobilization, including price controls, rationing, and wage freezes?
2. Do you favor universal military training?
3. Should the draft law have exemptions for farm boys, students, or other groups? Should 18-year-old boys be drafted?
4. Should we raise taxes and attempt to pay for the war as we go?
5. Should we eliminate the 40-hour week and overtime at extra pay?
6. Do you favor Federal aid to schools? Socialized medicine? Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law?
7. Should we eliminate farm price supports?

FOREIGN PROBLEMS

1. How do you feel about the United Nations?
2. Should we send ground troops to defend Europe and other parts of the world?
3. Should we withdraw our troops from Korea? Where would you suggest we take a stand?
4. How large an Air Force, Army, and Navy would you recommend?
5. Should Marshall-plan aid, and the point 4 program (aid to backward countries) be continued?
6. Should we recognize Red China?

Commitment of Armed Forces Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement by Hon. FIORELLO H. LAGUARDIA, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 10, 1951:

COUDERT'S RESOLUTION—REPRESENTATIVE REPLIES TO EDITORIAL CRITICISM

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

I am, indeed, sorry that your editorial comment of January 5 upon my resolution has secured a simple, clear-cut, and totally important constitutional issue by seeking to identify it with Mr. Hoover's recent proposals. I am not prejudging in any way, shape, or form the merits of Mr. Hoover's position. The substance of the resolution was originally drafted 6 months ago for use as an amendment for the armed services appropriations bill and therefore long preceded Mr. Hoover's speech.

The purpose of the resolution is to prevent the commitment of Armed Forces abroad in advance of aggression solely by Executive decision. It is just as simple as that and just as fundamental. The President, on the other hand, asserts precisely such power. I say that he does not and should not have it. If the President alone is allowed to send anywhere abroad, at any time, hundreds of thousands of American troops without a declaration of war by Congress, pursuant to the Constitution, then, indeed, there is little left of American constitutional government or freedom. Such power obviously carries with it, in fact, the power to determine war or peace and ultimate control over the lives and destiny of the American people. If the American people are ready to accept such a theory of Presidential power, then they can dissolve their Congress and prepare to accept government by Presidential decree.

Frankly, your editorial position is difficult for me to understand unless it be, in fact, predicated upon lack of confidence in the Congress—a lack of confidence in no way justified by the congressional record over the last 5 years in the field of foreign affairs.

I believe that Congress would be wholly derelict if it failed to insist upon the right to full participation in the making of decisions and the taking of actions which will determine war or peace and the fate of the American people. I, for one, do not intend to participate in any such abdication of responsibility.

Your reference to the Atlantic Pact seems to me misleading. In the first place, the United States' obligations do not come into operation before there is an act of aggression against one of the partners. Thus, before aggression, the Atlantic Pact does not in any way enlarge the constitutional powers of the President. Second, you concede that "the United States is not bound by treaty to any particular strategy in making its obligations. The broad decision as such a strategy might properly be debated." That is precisely what I ask. To secure the opportunity for such debate, however, it must be clearly recognized that Congress is entitled to full information and participation.

To say that such a course would constitute a security risk ignores the obvious impossibility of assembling substantial troop

movements across vast oceans to lands where every fourth or fifth person is a Communist sympathizer.

In conclusion, adoption of the resolution would provide a sure method of effective cooperation between the two coordinate branches of the Government—the executive and the legislative—and hence make affirmative action truly that of the United States Government and people.

P. R. COUDERT, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 5, 1951.*

A Correction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes before the House convened on January 4 I received a letter from an official of a well-known national organization which has conducted numerous research studies for many Members of Congress throughout the years. The letter called my attention to two original press-release copies of Gallup polls—one marked for release on December 20 and the other for release on December 22—together with the statement that neither had appeared in the Washington Post, which has the local publication rights for the Gallup poll, and that these particular polls should be of great interest to the Congress.

I had no recollection of having seen the printed reports of these two particular polls, although I am a regular reader of the Washington Post. Without checking personally, as I undoubtedly should have done, I inserted the reports of the two polls in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the statement they had not appeared in the Post and the comment that probably the unusually large volume of pre-Christmas advertising had prevented their publication.

On Wednesday of last week the Washington Post carried a reproduction of one of the Gallup polls referred to, as it had appeared on page 25 of the December 22 issue of the Post—which perhaps explained why I had missed it, inasmuch as such polls usually appear on page 1. I was later informed by a reporter and by one of the officials of the Post that both polls had been published, and since then I have been furnished with tear sheets from the Post showing both such publications.

Therefore, in the desire to be fair to my colleagues and to the Washington Post, and not wishing to do an injustice to that publication, I have asked leave to insert these remarks in the RECORD and to express my regret over the incident. While my original remarks on this subject were based on information I believed to be correct, I take full responsibility for the error, inasmuch as I had failed to check the information personally, as developments demonstrated I should have done.

Our American Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following full-page display article as copied from the Los Angeles Examiner, of Sunday, December 10, 1950, was reprinted from regular editions of that newspaper of December 4, 1950. It appears to have been an editorial. The thoughts therein expressed are in keeping with the sentiments expressed by our many newspapers and statesmen, as well as by what appears to be an overwhelming majority of the people of this country. I have obtained permission to insert this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of those who have not had an opportunity to read it elsewhere.

OUR AMERICAN DUTY

The blundering and disloyal foreign policies of the New Deal are taking this country into complete disaster—both military and economic.

Our sovereignty has been impaired by making us a virtual vassal of the United Nations, which disrupts our councils, and seeks to fly its mongrel flag over our public buildings.

Our wealth is dissipated to support socialism abroad and to defend alien peoples who are not willing to defend themselves.

The lives of our young men are being sacrificed in a desperate war which our purported allies are not trying to help us win on the battlefields and are conspiring to make us lose in the mazes of diplomacy—and duplicity.

For our own survival, it is imperative that we extricate ourselves from these destroying situations at once.

Without even inadequate support from others in the United Nations we are fighting almost alone against massed hordes on the Asian continent.

Continuing the war means only the slaughter of millions in a quixotic American attempt to conquer a vast and distant population.

First and foremost, therefore, this country should withdraw its Armed Forces from the invasion areas.

We should get our troops out of Korea as quickly as possible.

We should come home to our own country, reconstruct our defenses, and give heed to our own security and welfare.

This might be a defeat for the New Deal, which is responsible for our dismal plight.

It would not be a defeat for the United States, but merely an act of self-preservation.

Secondly, we should get out of the United Nations.

That organization has not sustained us in the war that we undertook in its behalf.

Instead, it has interfered with our operations.

Furthermore, it is conniving to admit the enemy into a privileged membership where the enemy could dictate peace terms.

Accordingly, the United Nations should let Red China in and leave the United States out.

Then let the United Nations see how it gets along.

This country has maintained the United Nations since its inception, with no return in loyalty or gratitude.

So let those who run the United Nations pay for the United Nations and fight its wars.

Finally, we should end our unrequited efforts to support and supply an ingrate Europe.

Even England, our supposedly stanch ally, has not genuinely backed us in our solitary United Nations war, nor assisted us elsewhere.

On the contrary, Marxist England formally recognized the Chinese Communist government, and collaborates with Marxist France in preventing an European rearmament.

Europe has intimated it no longer wants our martial help.

This is Europe's attitude; let Europe look out for itself, and see how Europe gets along.

Since obviously we stand alone, we should have the wisdom and courage to act alone.

For our duty is to protect our own people and to foster our own Nation.

Vital Service of Grass-Roots Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the December 30 issue of the Publishers' Auxiliary, there is printed a letter from President Truman to Mr. George H. Bechtel, editor of the Publishers' Auxiliary, relative to the President's attitude toward the weekly and smaller daily newspapers and their value at this time of crisis. In connection with the printing of the complete text of that letter from the President, there is also a news article contributed by Mr. Walter A. Shead, Auxiliary Washington correspondent. I ask unanimous consent that in the Appendix of the RECORD there may appear the copy of the President's letter and the copy of the news article relative thereto by Mr. Shead.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 22, 1950.

Mr. GEORGE H. BECHTEL,
Editor, the Publishers' Auxiliary,
Frankfort, Ky.

DEAR MR. BECHTEL: Our country today looks to its weekly and small daily newspapers for vital service in a critical period.

World developments have placed this Nation in the position of needing every bit of internal strength it can muster, if it is to survive in the form we know and love.

Traditionally, freedom of information has been one of our greatest sources of strength. Because our people have been able to get a full picture of the conditions in which they live—they have been able to act in the manner best calculated to improve their lot.

The American press has, since the earliest days of our existence as a free Nation, been largely responsible for the development and maintenance of this principle of freedom of information. The men who now edit and publish the hundreds of smaller newspapers throughout the Nation are the direct heirs of our great pioneering editors. It is essential that they carry on the great tradition they have inherited. They can allow no special interest of any sort to encroach on their time-honored freedom to print the news as they see it—and to express their honest opinions as they feel them.

We can be sure that, if the American people are given the whole and uncolored truth on every major happening and issue of the day, they will inevitably choose the most intelligent and effective course of action.

The weekly and smaller daily newspapers are in the best possible position to perform this service to the American people. They reach a broad cross-section of the American public. They are close to their readers, with whom they share a wide community of interest. Their writers and editors are frequently in close personal contact with their readers. All these factors tend to give what they print a high degree of credibility—and therefore to increase the degree of responsibility of the papers to their audiences.

I feel certain that in this difficult time the Nation's weekly and small daily newspapers will meet their responsibilities with all the skill and intelligence they can muster. In so doing, they will immeasurably increase the ability of the Nation to meet the serious problems it faces.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

PRESIDENT CITES VITAL SERVICE OF GRASS-ROOTS PRESS—LETTER TO EDITOR OF THE AUXILIARY EXPRESSES FAITH

(By Walter A. Shead)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman this week advised the weekly and small daily newspapers of America that our country looks (to them) for vital service in a critical period.

In a letter to George H. Bechtel, editor of the Publishers' Auxiliary, the President declared:

"The weekly and smaller daily newspapers are in the best possible position to perform this service to the American people. They reach a broad cross-section of the American public. They are close to their readers, with whom they share a wide community spirit. Their writers and editors are frequently in close, personal contact with their readers. All these factors tend to give what they print a high degree of credibility—and therefore to increase the degree of responsibility of the papers to their audience."

The President was responding to a letter from Mr. Bechtel, which sought the Chief Executive's words of advice and encouragement for the nonmetropolitan press.

His statement is exclusive with the Auxiliary.

"World developments have placed this Nation in the position of needing every bit of internal strength it can muster, if it is to survive in the form we know and love," the President declared.

"Traditionally, freedom of information has been one of our greatest sources of strength," he observed. "Because our people have been able to get a full picture of the conditions in which they live—they have been able to act in the manner best calculated to improve their lot.

"The American press has, since the earliest days of our existence as a free Nation, been largely responsible for the development and maintenance of this principle of freedom of information," President Truman continued. "The men who now edit and publish the hundreds of smaller newspapers throughout the Nation are the direct heirs of our great pioneering editors. It is essential that they carry on the great tradition they have inherited. They can allow no special interest of any sort to encroach on their time-honored freedom to print the news as they see it—and to express their honest opinions as they feel them."

Before expressing confidence in the nonmetropolitan press, the President declared, "We can be sure that, if the American people are given the whole and uncolored truth on every major happening and issue of the day, they will inevitably choose the most intelligent and effective course of action."

The President's confidence in the nonmetropolitan press was reflected in his conclusion: "I feel certain that in this difficult time, the Nation's weekly and small daily newspapers will meet their responsibilities with all the skill and intelligence they can muster. In so doing, they will immeasurably increase the ability of the Nation to meet the serious problems it faces."

Chapman Unjustly Attacked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a fine article entitled "Chapman Unjustly Attacked," which appeared in the December 1950 issue of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPMAN UNJUSTLY ATTACKED—BOTH PRIVATE AND PUBLIC POWER ADVOCATES ATTACK

Seasoned veteran though he is of many hectic campaigns, Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman must have been somewhat chagrined over the barrage and counterbarrage laid down on him as he took over the responsibility of the power needs under the Defense Production Act. The promptness with which proponents of private power attacked the aims and the ambitions of their public power rivals was rather surprising. There had not been time for anything to have actually been done before leading journals, representing the private utilities, began to warn the Secretary that the dangerous public-power group was going to try to use the national crisis as a means to further the extension of publicly owned power systems. Hardly had this warning been sent up for Mr. Chapman's consideration before leading daily papers, who have sponsored and supported public-power movements, became equally vigilant in warning the Secretary that he had put too many private power people on his committee and that he need not expect cooperation from this group.

UNITY NEEDED

These are but two illustrations that could easily be multiplied several times of the tactics being used by the contending parties. Secretary Chapman would be very justified in being quite disappointed over this attitude on the part of the utility industry, both public and private. The Secretary has a perfect right to expect the entire industry to help him accomplish his job of getting sufficient power generation for the defense of the country. It little behooves either the public or private groups to carry on their feud during a time of national crisis. We would like to be distinctly understood that what is being said in this article is just as much in criticism of the public group as it is of the private group. More important, it is an appeal to both groups to put first things first and see to it that the power industry meets the needs of our country.

BOTH SYSTEMS GROWING

Public and private systems have proven in more than one section of the country that they can live side by side and both have a profitable business without the necessity of crushing the other fellow. Most everyone familiar with the electric-utility industry knows where these illustrations are. It is not necessary to be specific in naming these spots. If we did undertake to do so it would be interpreted as a reflection on the sections that were not named, but we do not believe there's anyone in the electric industry who will deny this fact. If it can be done in one section of the country it can be done on a wide scale. Bear in mind that private utility profits are greater today than at any time in their history and also that there is more public power in the country than there has ever been before, and that more farms are electrified than have ever been electrified in the history of our country. Does anyone need to say any more on the subject of whether public and private power can get along without an actual bloodletting?

Federal Manpower Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement issued on December 15, 1950, by the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, and accompanying a resolution unanimously adopted by the board, which recommends that there be established forthwith a Federal Manpower Authority to develop a plan for the proper training and utilization during the national emergency of the tremendous resources America has in her youth. This statement embodies the specific recommendations of the regents for the cooperation under such authority of all the educational institutions in New York State, all of which are a part of the University of the State of New York and under the jurisdiction of the regents.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, N. Y., January 1, 1951.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL MANPOWER AUTHORITY RECOMMENDED

On December 15, 1950, the board of regents unanimously adopted a resolution that there be established forthwith a Federal Manpower Authority to develop a plan for the proper training and utilization, during the national emergency, of the tremendous resources America has in her youth, and issued the following comprehensive statement embodying the specific recommendations of the

regents for the cooperation, under such authority, of all the educational institutions in New York State, all of which are a part of the University of the State of New York and under the jurisdiction of the regents.

The board of regents further directed that a copy of the resolution and statement be sent by the commissioner of education to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Governor of the State, the New York Senators and Congressmen, and to every institution affiliated with the university.

The present challenge to our liberty and our national security is the most critical in our history. It is essential that those in a position of trust in the field of education assist in the development of plans for the best use of the manpower of this country. In recognition of this fact, the regents of the University of the State of New York desire to record their beliefs in regard to a basic policy for the efficient utilization of all our available men and women.

With the many demands that must be made on the citizens of this country, both for the maintenance of an essential military force and for the operation of our domestic economy, it is urgent that the Federal Government designate some agency, directly responsible to the President, to plan a program for the effective utilization of our total manpower and with the authority to put such a plan into effect. This agency should seek advice from the military, from labor, from industry, from agriculture, from education, and from other important groups that make heavy contributions to our national defense and security in order that an over-all program of manpower utilization may be conceived. The planning must be realistic and far reaching and must recognize the important demands of American democracy that are fundamental to military strength. The unity of purpose and the centralization of authority that is envisaged in this statement must be achieved at the Washington level at the earliest possible moment.

In such a national emergency as we are now facing it is urgent that all our resources be mobilized, including those of education. The educational resources of this country are the finest in the world, and they are at the service of this Nation. The State of New York with its 120 colleges and universities, its technical schools and institutes, and with its tremendous network of public and private elementary and secondary schools is ready to provide all possible assistance in this crucial period. It appears inevitable that this will mean some reorganization of programs and reassignment of staff.

The challenge of Communist arms to the democratic nations of the world is such that we must be prepared for any possible aggression. It would appear that the time has come when we as a Nation must request some form of universal national service from all our young men and women within certain age limits; this would mean a period of basic military training for most of our youth. Any training program that is developed, however, must be conceived with great care lest there be great wastage of our available human resources. Moreover, it is most important that every step be taken, both for reasons of economy and for efficiency, to make certain that any national training program will make maximum utilization of educational resources that are available.

During World War II, we learned that approximately 75 percent of the skills required by the Armed Forces were essentially the same as those needed in civilian activities. This fact makes it apparent that even a military training program should utilize to the full all permanent educational facilities, these facilities being retooled where necessary and supplemented only when required by the construction of temporary training facilities. A wise procedure in the use of educational facilities would be essentially the same as that followed so successfully during World War II in our industrial war production program, where existing industries were reorganized and expanded to meet the new needs required by war conditions. It is self-evident that the basic military training itself must be provided directly by military authorities, but most technical and general education programs can be provided best by organized education. Such matters of policy are emphasized for the purpose of utilizing to the fullest extent all our resources to the end that we may meet satisfactorily an unparalleled emergency.

We believe that the ideal set-up would envisage the return of young men and women, after a period of basic training, to the educational facilities in the neighborhood of their homes for the supplemental and fundamental educational programs essential to their training to meet all the necessary and varying needs.

In order that the policies enunciated above may be implemented at the earliest possible moment, it is our belief that certain definite steps should be taken now by officials of our educational institutions.

Renewed emphasis should be given to all programs that are concerned with physical fitness and the correction of physical defects. Our schools and our colleges and universities have a prime obligation to this country in emphasizing the importance of physical fitness along with academic attainment.

Upon every level of educational endeavor there should be renewed efforts to acquaint our youth with our American heritage and to provide a better understanding of the present international situation. To this end the regents have already appointed a committee that will assist the State education department in preparing supplementary materials for use in the schools, and are revising the program for the teaching of American history.

Urgent consideration should be given immediately by both our secondary schools and by our colleges to the desirability of providing accelerated programs. Acceleration upon the secondary level would make it possible for a very large number of young men to receive at least 1 year of college education before a possible call to military service, by enabling them to complete high school before they reach their seventeenth birthday. Any elevation in the educational level of our youth during this period, with the resulting gain in maturity of judgment, is important both for the young people involved and for the total welfare of this Nation. The accelerated program that is conceived would utilize the usual summer vacations and, in some instances, would make it possible for some young men to take slightly heavier loads during the regular academic sessions.

Secondary schools and colleges should take active steps to ascertain what they have to offer to the adult population of the communities in which they exist. For example, laboratory facilities might be utilized for the training of technicians in subprofessional areas. As a further illustration, World War II revealed critical shortcomings in our population in literacy, so much so in fact that the Army and the Navy had to provide special classes in reading and writing. The existence of such educational deficiencies should be a challenge to our schools. It is hoped that a Nation-wide program will be developed that will recognize the important contribution that our educational institutions can make during these times; in the meantime, each individual institution should be making an inventory of its facilities in terms of possible services that could be available, including the offering of preinduction training for military service and possible contributions to essential war industries.

Work of the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Chattanooga Times, Chattanooga, Tenn., on December 31, 1950. The report gives us an excellent summary of TVA's present work and also its potential with regard to adaptability to the defense effort. The article should be encouraging to us all and read with interest, for it shows the part TVA plays in our present way of life.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON TVA—CAPACITY OF TVA TOO SMALL, BUT AGENCY SAYS EXPANSION FOR POWER PRODUCTION IS MOVING AT FAST PACE

Power capacity of the mighty Tennessee Valley falls far short of defense needs and expansion is proceeding on a fast schedule.

Reporting this today, the Tennessee Valley Authority said the building pace aims at installed capacity of 4,900,000 kilowatts in 1953. This compares with 3,000,000 June 30, 1950.

Yet last year's TVA production of electric energy—the heart of the defense effort—was three and a half times that of 1940, when the Nation was on the brink of World War II, TVA said. It reached a total of 17,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

The agency's chemical facilities at Muscle Shoals, Ala., stand ready at almost a moment's notice to produce munitions.

Making its seventeenth annual report, TVA said that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, its power operating revenues were $58,-800,000, with net operating revenues of $27,-000,000 producing a return of about 7.75 percent on the average depreciated power investment. During the life of TVA, returns have averaged 4 percent.

TVA sold power at wholesale during the war to 95 municipal and 50 cooperative systems, which distributed it to 1,100,000 ultimate consumers.

By comparison, there were 275,000 consumers in the region when TVA was set up in 1933. Now 82 percent of the farms have electricity, where only 3 percent were served in 1933.

On the controversial subject of public versus private management efficiency in electric utilities, the report noted:

"The publicly owned and locally managed distribution systems in the valley show costs of service averaging somewhat lower than those of the entire electric-utility industry, whether or not the cost of wholesale power is included."

TVA, established as a Federal project for developing the Tennessee River Valley, is completing its eighteenth dam and serves an 80,000 square mile area. The report stressed that State and local agencies concerned with natural resources had greatly increased their activity along with TVA.

Per capita income in the valley has increased from about 40 percent of the United States average in 1933 to nearly 60 percent at present, TVA said.

The TVA reservoir system lowered two crests of a long flood of last January-February on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, the first by about 2 feet and the second by more than a foot measured at Cairo, Ill., the report said.

These reductions helped materially in averting use of the 200 square mile Bird's Point—New Madrid floodway, a rich farming area from which hundreds of residents moved out when engineers considered opening the levee, TVA related.

No major flood crests occurred in the Tennessee Valley, "but regulation averted about $800,000 damage at Chattanooga and lesser damage elsewhere along the Tennessee," the report said.

It estimated that flood damage totaling $45,000,000 had been prevented at Chattanooga since Norris Dam began operating in 1936, "equal to more than one-quarter of the total investment flood control" in the TVA system.

The Muscle Shoals chemical plants were built for munitions production in World War I, and today produce large amounts of fertilizers under TVA operation.

Ready for fast conversion to munitions production, the plants now have six large electric furnaces which can turn out munitions grade elemental phosphorus, compared with only four in 1940, TVA said.

Growing New England Industrial Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Growing New England Industrial Economy," written by Dudley Harmon, executive vice president, the New England Council, and published in the Washington Post of January 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWING NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRIAL ECONOMY

(By Dudley Harmon)

We have read with much concern the article Is New England Withering? written by Ysabel and Robert Rennie, which appeared in the Washington Post and was reprinted subsequently in the Hartford Courant, and which, in our belief, did injustice to our region.

Some of the things the Rennies said are true. New England has never had large material resources such as coal, oil, iron ore, etc. We are off the main line from New York to San Francisco, and the center of population is moving steadily westward as the great open spaces fill up with people and industries. Much New England money has gone into building the West.

However, many facts have been left out of the article, which, had they been included, would, we believe, have changed its conclusions considerably.

Federal census and other reports show, for example, that from 1939 to 1947:

(a) The number of manufacturing establishments in New England increased 33.3 percent; from 15,201 to 20,274.

(b) The number of production workers in New England increased 24.1 percent; from 947,412 to 1,248,325.

(c) The value added by manufacture in New England increased 68.1 percent; from $2,414,268,000 to $6,813,800,000.

Our New England population has increased as follows:

1930	8,166,341
1940 (3.2 percent)	8,437,000
1950 (10.4 percent)	9,314,453

Our per capita savings, in several categories, substantially exceed the national per capitas:

	New England	United States
Mutual savings bank deposits at end of 1949	$587	$128
Equities in life insurance	496	322
Government savings bonds	455	367
Private capital in savings and loan associations and cooperative banks	117	82

New England has a very high percentage in proportion to its population of homes owned and lived in by the owners; of telephones, automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and now television sets. These all point to a high standard of living, made possible by the earnings of our people in our industries.

The housing census of April 1950 showed 1,408,797 dwelling units in Massachusetts alone, an increase of 187,545 or 15.4 percent, over the 1940 count.

The generalization about wage rates is too sweeping. Wages are high in some cases and low in others. What really counts is unit product cost, which means wages divided by the number of units produced in the period for which the wages are paid. There is nothing incompatible in high wages and low unit costs. It is what you get for what you pay that counts. That the costs of New England products permit them to compete effectively is shown by the 68.1 percent increase in value added in New England compared with 67.2 percent for the United States as a whole.

Hundreds of millions have been spent in New England since VJ-day by our manufacturers for new machinery, buildings and entire factories, and have been publicly reported by American Machinist, Engineering News-Record and the F. W. Dodge Corp. Large expenditures are also planned for the early future by our industries, our utilities, railroads and other agencies.

The statement was made by the Rennies that New England's "natural disadvantages are so severe that the wisest course is for New England's skilled labor force to seek better opportunities elsewhere." If conditions were as bad as the article suggests, we think that the skilled labor force in New England would already have left to seek better opportunities elsewhere. In fact, however, there was a large in-migration into New England during the war years, and only part of the wartime gain was lost during the postwar years. New England had a net in-migration of 446,000 persons from 1940 to 1949. It also had a very small gain from 1930 to 1949. For the entire period 1930 to 1949, New England gained 5.5 percent of its 1930 population through in-migration.

That percentage was second only to the percentage for the Far West as a record of immigration. The up-and-coming Southeastern area lost 11.6 percent of its 1930 population through out-migration from 1930 to 1949, and the booming Southwest lost 7.5 percent during the same period. Admittedly, these figures relate to a long-time period, and to some extent they have been reversed by the experience of recent years. Nevertheless, it remains true that New England, along with other industrial areas, plus Florida and the Far West, has tended to attract migrants from agricultural and mining regions.

Migrants have followed job opportunities. It was also characteristic that the regions which gained through in-migration were those with above-average but relatively declining per capita incomes, while the regions which lost through out-migration were those with below-average but relatively increasing per capital incomes.

Despite the temporary surplus labor in New England during the recession of 1949 and the small recent out-migration, the region is not overpopulated, on the average, in terms of job opportunities. Surplus labor has already largely dried up and there are at present many shortages within the region, particularly for certain categories of skilled industrial labor. There are a number of recent examples of manufacturing concerns moving into New England from other States, and the relocations are not just to Connecticut. Under the circumstances, the Rennies statement would seem completely unjustified.

The statement is made that the Federal Government should show the same imagination that it did in wartime, when it encouraged the shift of millions of workers from labor-surplus to labor-shortage area. The article goes on to state that New England's high technical skills could be an asset to many new industries in the South and West. On the contrary, we believe that New England's high technical skills would be an asset or more of an asset in New England, for this area is already highly industrialized and will need all its present workers and more under the impact of defense spending.

In connection with the proposed New England steel mill, the Rennies declare that "every steel company which has surveyed the problem says (the New England mill) would be high cost and uneconomic." This statement is completely without foundation. Only one company, Bethlehem, has expressed a dubious view of the economics of the New England project, and Bethlehem's present share of the region's growing steel market is estimated to be 40 percent. Incidentally, of the net gain of 5,000 manufacturing establishments in New England between 1939 and 1947, over 2,000 were in metal working, and two-thirds of the 300,000 gain in manufacturing jobs was in the same field. At present about 40 percent of the region's manufacturing employment is in metal working.

In its application to the NSRB for a certificate of necessity for the New England mill, the New England Steel Development Corp. said: "Detailed and exhaustive studies and negotiations extending over the last 4 years have demonstrated that an integrated steel mill of the type described * * * is economically feasible and would have excellent promise of financial success. * * * Our findings with respect to the feasibility of this mill have been confidentially confirmed by presently operating steel companies."

Finally, a recent study of New England business prospects made by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston shows that if present upward trends are maintained New England's income by 1960 (in terms of 1935-39 dollars) will be $10,000,000,000 a year, as compared with $4,000,000,000 in 1939, and that its labor force will have increased by 32,500 a year to 4,500,000.

These facts and many others, mention of which space does not permit, directly contradict, in our opinion, the Rennies' contention that "New England's decline in the national economy has become a matter of public concern." The mere fact that other sections of the country are growing does not mean that New England is losing ground. We can demonstrate the contrary to the Rennies and anyone else, and will welcome the opportunity to do so.

The Place of Agriculture in American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at New Orleans, La., January 11, 1951, before the members' council of the New Orleans Association of Commerce and the Southern Farm Forum.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, events are now moving rapidly in the Capital, and Washington is a swirl of activity. Things have taken on a somber note since our recent reverses in Korea. Members of Congress and officials of the executive department alike are serious; they realize that these are indeed perilous times, and that we must proceed to full mobilization without delay.

A great portion of my own time has been taken up with matters relating to our Nation's agricultural program. For several months I have been acting chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and now in the role of chairman I shall be devoting the major part of my time in helping guide our Government's agricultural policies. In particular my committee will be studying and planning the role of agriculture in a mobilizing economy.

Farming is just one item in the great jigsaw puzzle of our national economy, but it is one of the key pieces to be fitted into the complete whole. And that is what I want to talk to you about this afternoon—agriculture at the crossroads of mobilization.

As we go into what might well be world war III our bins and cribs and warehouses are full. Before the 1950 harvest, we had over 400,000,000 bushels of wheat in the carry-over and 350,000,000 bushels of corn. We have surpluses of other commodities, too. Those same surpluses that last summer were the object of bitter criticism are now proving to be a comfortable backlog to be put to vital use in this emergency.

But in spite of this huge reservoir of food, American agriculture will have to expand and buckle down to work as never before. Already the flow of manpower to the armed services is beginning to pinch a little. It will get worse, far worse. President Conant of Harvard recently advocated the conscription of every male citizen for the war effort, and I believe it may well come to that. The American farmer will have to redouble his efforts and till his land and harvest his crops with less help, fewer tools, and less fertilizer. Our full cribs will melt away in the light of added demands, and it is only by a further increase in our output that we will be able to produce sufficient food and fiber for our needs.

The answer is efficiency. The efficiency of American farming must rise to meet the challenge of the coming period. As production goals are raised, so must yields per man-hour and per acre ascend. Something has to give if we are to remain productive but have less with which to produce. That is the test for the American farmer.

Today there is much talk of rationing, price controls, priorities, and allocations. I feel that part of my job is to secure for the American farmer the best deal possible at the conference table when materials and manpower are allocated. During World War II, the American farmer faced shortages of help and tractors and fertilizers and insecticides and all of the other things that are apportioned throughout our war-making productivity. He will face them again, and perhaps in greater severity, but so will we all, unless things take a turn for the better. As Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I shall endeavor to secure for American agriculture a fair share of the scarce items, so far as I am able. You have my solemn assurance that I shall battle to the utmost. For 13 years I have worked with the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and I have seen first-hand the vital necessity that the farmer bears to our economy, in peace and in war. Farming is basic, it is fundamental. I need not tell most of you this, but there are many people who would wholly subordinate the interest of the farmer to those of the manufacturer or the distributor, little realizing that the needs of each are coexistent and interdependent, one with the other.

What can the American farmer do to assist the mobilization effort? The economic and mobilization planners in our Government have not yet imposed controls to any substantial degree, but as I have said, they are in the offing. What is the farmer's role in this new era? First, the American farmer must cooperate with his Government to the fullest extent. Second, the farmer should make plans to step up his production all along the line. I may say parenthetically here that I believe that if the Government requests that farmers materially increase production, then the Government in turn has a moral obligation to the farmer to prevent ruinous prices that usually result from increased productivity. We need a big cotton crop next year. It was wise, I believe, of the Secretary of Agriculture to waive any production controls that might jeopardize a bumper crop. In clearing the decks for increased cotton production, the Secretary is recognizing the future need for more fiber. With the present wool shortage, cotton will be even more valuable to our economy. While on the subject of cotton, which I know is a subject dear to the hearts of most of you, I will say that if and when it should be necessary to reimpose acreage controls, I shall fight for recognition of the older cotton-growing areas, and for complete protection to our historical cotton-farming sections. This emergency must not be used as a vehicle to deprive the older cotton-growing areas of their fair share of allotted acreage.

Production at the highest possible levels will do much to inspire us for the future. It will serve to hold down prices all along the line, and it will serve to postpone the imposition of rationing and price controls. It is when there is not enough to go around that rigid curbs on buying and selling must be enforced.

The agricultural planners have not been unmindful of the impending needs of the farmers. The Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture has been given the job of looking after the interests of the farmer in the national-defense effort. I think this is to the advantage of the farmer. The Production and Marketing Administration is an established and operating agency, and its assumption of mobilization planning will avoid the experimentation and hesitation of a new agency. A number of other Government agencies have found it necessary to entrust their war and mobilization functions to new departments with untried personnel, but under the Defense Production Act it was a natural and desirable step to designate the PMA to handle the farmer's problems.

Since the same commodity and financial branches which handle the normal farm program services are taking on the additional defense activities, the farmers can continue to work with the same units and insofar as personnel workloads will permit, with the same people with whom they have been dealing right along. The same field offices and the same committees will be the ones to deal with on defense problems.

PMA has set up a few coordinating offices and staffs to direct the over-all operations, and to maintain working relations with other agencies and groups. These include an Office of Materials and Facilities, an Office of Requirements and Allocations, a price staff, and a group to watch the manpower situation. They are already working actively on the many special problems agriculture must face as our national mobilization goes forward.

The special job of those in charge of materials and facilities will be to act as a claimant agency for agriculture when any priorities are being established for the use of strategic materials and services. They are there to keep reminding everyone that farm production is defense production. If farmers are to hold production at the high levels needed, they must be assured—insofar as it is possible to do so—against crippling shortages of materials and facilities. They must also be given protection against the danger that the very production we are asking will not someday break farm prices to ruinous levels. This, of course, involves the question of sound price supports.

I have mentioned a few moments ago that I thought that careful planning was the keynote to efficient mobilization of agriculture. In my humble opinion, without it we are lost, foundering about in a sea of indecision, overproduction of some crops, underproduction of others, and general confusion. I would like to impress upon you here today that I feel that in war or peace, we should concentrate on reappraising and redrafting our farm plans and policies. We have a good, a basically sound, farm policy in effect now. Of that I am convinced. But as I have often said, it is not perfect. Far from it. We must not only revamp it to suit the changing tempo of the times, we must also iron out of it the flaws that are so readily seized upon by critics. I repeat: It is a good program; it is a sound one, but it needs refinements here and there, and we are working to smooth out the defects. In particular I am concerned with the price-support program for perishable commodities.

In handling price supports on what are termed the six basic commodities: Cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, peanuts, and rice, the Commodity Credit Corporation has over the period 1933 to date shown no loss, but instead has made a profit, when we consider the basic group as a unit. We should all remember this when we hear irresponsible criticism of the whole farm program. Price supports on storable commodities have formed the backbone of our farm program. Critics of the farm program should remember not only that over the past 17 years the Government has lost nothing on the program for basic commodities, but also should keep in mind that our national economy has benefited immeasurably by the stability and security that American farmers have achieved under it. The farm program has afforded us a relatively balanced and abundant production, and has put agriculture in its strongest position over the past 40 years. Price supports have proved themselves; I am convinced that they are not only sound and effective, but are absolutely necessary if we would avoid the boom-and-bust cycle of the past years.

It is with respect to the price-support program on the perishables that we must reexamine our plans and policies. This has

been the vulnerable spot of the program—the Achilles' heel of farm price supports. It is on butter, eggs, dried milk, potatoes, and other programs that we have taken the shellacking, financially, as our farm critics are so wont to point out.

The situation regarding surplus commodities is today not so critical as it was 6 months ago. The vast surpluses of dried eggs and cheese and butter that the Government has stored in warehouses and caves throughout the Middle West are now looked upon much more favorably by even our severest critics than they were before the Korean crisis.

Many proposals have been advanced as to how we can in normal times handle perishables and semiperishables. One plan, much publicized, was suggested by Secretary Brannan. Without question, Secretary Brannan was on the right track, in that his ultimate goal was the elimination of burdensome surpluses of perishable commodities. But, I do not believe he was even close to the solution. The cost of the Brannan plan would be exorbitant, and in addition it would depress the market for the commodities involved. The difference in price between the market and the support or parity price would have to be met through taxes and yet more taxes, which would eventually fall of course upon the consumers themselves. The Brannan plan would, too, take from the farmers the incentive to find the best markets for their crops, since they would know that regardless of what they received the Government would reimburse them up to the support price. If the Congress should fail to provide the necessary appropriations, the farmer would be left holding the bag, for once prices in the market place are depressed, it is extremely difficult to get them back up to where the growers can realize a fair profit.

But it is not enough to disagree with or challenge or criticize the present program or the Brannan plan. I will say this about the Brannan plan: It is at least an attempt at a solution. As Secretary Brannan has said, we should all try to develop a better mousetrap; in this case, a sounder, more practical method of handling perishables.

I venture to say that if I or you—or someone—does not come out with a practical idea, the Congress may go back to the idea of supports only on basic storable farm products.

I certainly do not presume to have the answer today. I do think that there are certain avenues that we might well explore more fully. For example, the school lunch program is a splendid outlet for perishable stocks. We might consider broadening it. And there comes to mind the thousands of people receiving direct Federal assistance under the social security laws. Could we not substitute for some of the cash payments we are now making, food that could and would be used?

I, along with other Members of the Congress, took the lead in granting Government agencies the authority to barter with foreign countries for the strategic materials that we now so sorely need. This could be developed far beyond its present infant state.

This matter of price supports for perishables and the more serious emergency occasioned by war in the Far East find agriculture prepared to meet them, although as I need not warn you, many problems lie ahead for American farmers.

The situation in which we find ourselves today, so far as agriculture is concerned, is a testimonial to the wisdom of the farm legislation which has been enacted over the past 17 years.

I am sorry to say that the objectives of this legislation are misunderstood in some quarters. Some critics do not understand that the present preparedness of American agriculture is directly related to the farm programs written by the Congress during those years.

No better example of this need be shown than the complaints that price ceilings on many foods are impossible because the Defense Production Act prohibits price ceilings on agricultural commodities at less than parity.

The Defense Production Act did prohibit price ceilings on agricultural commodities—and rightly so—at less than parity. However, in my opinion, this would not prevent workable ceilings on foods made from agricultural commodities unless, of course, the ceilings on those foods would necessarily result in less than parity prices on the commodities. In other words, if the ceiling price established for a processed food—or anything else, for that matter—made from an agricultural commodity, is not so low as to prevent the agricultural commodity from rising to parity, or would not serve to drive the price of the commodity below parity, such a ceiling on farm products can be put into effect now.

The reason for the provision which prevents price ceilings on agricultural commodities at a figure below parity is simple.

After all, what is parity? It is, simply speaking, a fair price for an agricultural commodity. It is arrived at by taking into account the costs of the things farmers buy in relation to the price for the commodities they sell. Parity price for an agricultural commodity fluctuates as the price of the things farmers buy fluctuates.

I feel that everyone will agree that farmers should receive parity prices for the things they produce. No nation can expect farmers to produce needed foods and fibers unless they get fair prices. This is particularly true in this time of emergency. We do not expect labor to work for low wages, nor industry to produce without reasonable incentives. Consequently, we should see to it that price ceilings do not interfere with the productive effort of the farmer. Let me emphasize—parity prices are fair prices—not high prices. Today only a few agricultural commodities are above parity. Among these are cotton, wool, cottonseed, beef cattle, veal calves, and lamb.

All of us will agree that the production of a sufficient amount of food and fiber is just as important in this crisis as the production of munitions. Both the military and the civilian population must eat and must have clothing to wear.

I am sure that when the reasons for the prohibition against less-than-parity prices are understood there will be an end to the criticism we have been hearing.

As a matter of fact, American agriculture would not be ready to do its part today if it were not for the fact that we have striven through our agricultural programs to get the farmers a fair price for their products.

Agricultural production in 1950, the third largest of record, just didn't happen. One of the big reasons was the incentives and protection given farmers under the Agricultural Act of 1949 and previous agricultural legislation. Under this legislation the Government fixed support prices on most agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity. Keep in mind that farmers were assured of price protection before hostilities began in Korea and before the international situation reached the crisis stage. If farmers had not had this protection, today we would not have the agricultural reserves we now recognize as priceless, nor would we have an agricultural economy in a sound and healthy condition, ready to do its part in the tasks which lie before us.

All of us realize that the emergency we face will necessitate many unpleasant things. Our boys are going into the armed services. Taxes are high and will go higher. Controls are in effect and still others are to come. All of us will have to make sacrifices.

The people, in my opinion, will make the sacrifices and be glad to do so if we can thereby prevent all-out war, or win victory if total war comes. But we must never lose sight of one very important fact. We are rearming to protect the American way of life. We are rearming to protect democracy. We are rearming to combat communism and to retain our freedom.

It must be remembered that we are not going to apply controls for the sake of controls. Price ceilings, wage ceilings, allocations, and rationing are hateful. We do not like them. We are accepting regimentation now in the hope that it will be for a temporary period and that thereby we will avoid permanent regimentation by a stifling tyranny of collectivism.

Consequently, we should reject vigorously every control that is not absolutely necessary. We want to retain as much of our freedom as we can. If the end result of our rearmament is communism, we will have made all our sacrifices in vain.

For example, I have opposed proposals for further regulation of the commodity exchanges by the Government. Charges were made that speculation on the exchanges was a major factor in causing price increases. There is no basis for these charges. The exchanges simply reflect the conditions which cause price fluctuations. They perform a valuable service for farmers and the handlers and processors of farm products. They are a part of our free-enterprise system. So long as the exchanges conduct their own affairs in an orderly and sensible fashion I will continue to oppose the extension of Government control over their operations.

There is another thing that I should like to tell you about this afternoon. It ties in with what I have said about shifting our farm production into high gear, and it ties in with our planning for a return to normal times if and when the present emergency condition subsides.

It is conservation. Conservation used to be a luxury with us here in America. It used to be a civic duty to conserve our national resources. It has now come to be an economic necessity.

The other day, Louis Bromfield, of Malabar Farm, in reviewing a book on conservation, said:

"From the very beginning of the Nation the exploitation and waste of our natural resources has set a record unequaled by that of any people at any time in history."

I long ago realized that on a long-term basis the only salvation for the American farmer was to conserve his resources in every manner in which he was able. And faced with the production demands of the next few years, this "must" becomes increasingly apparent. Every dollar and every hour spent in conservation practices comes back with interest. It has been recently estimated that, at current prices, for every dollar invested in, for example, Chilean nitrate, a farmer may reasonably expect a return of from $3 to $10.

Farmers here in Louisiana are taking to heart the lessons to be learned by conservation practices. Let me give you a few statistics. Last year Louisiana farmers used nearly 30,000 tons of superphosphate, over 7,000 tons of rock phosphate, 10,000 tons of basic slag, and almost 70,000 tons of limestone. They terraced over 2,000,000 linear feet of farmland, dug 2,500 stock ponds, and sowed 4,000,000 trees for reforestation. I am proud of the foresight that is being shown by our Louisiana farmers, for I know that they have come to realize that conservation practices not only make sense but will eventually make money.

Now let me get in some of the broader aspects of conservation. I refer to conservation practices encouraged by our Government in conjunction with its agricultural functions. The farmer cannot subsist the

great waterways and forests of the public domain, but the Government can, and, if I have anything to say about it, the Government will. Every year somewhere about the country great floods come raging down and destroy crops and homes and even cities. Damage is untold. The Mississippi flood of 1927 cost over $2,000,000,000 alone. Almost within shouting distance of us here this afternoon, the Mississippi flows placidly past this great city, awaiting quietly the floodwaters of next April and May, which can and well may devastate again thousands of acres of incalculable value.

Our natural resources must be conserved on a national level. The Federal Government is the only power capable or empowered to harness our great waterways and conserve the fertile farmland and the crops along the banks. With the crisis facing agriculture today, we cannot allow waste of crops that may feed our fighting men here or abroad. We must harness and distribute the waters of our rivers and streams. Back on the watersheds our farmers can do much to alleviate flood loss by carrying out conservation practices that help to keep the soil from going down the river. And by making water available to the arid lands of the West, the Government can make the deserts bloom.

A short time ago I traveled through some of the countries of the Middle East. I went by air, so that I was able to view directly the ravages of exploitation of the soil. I flew over Mesopotamia, the ancient region on the Persian Gulf, and saw first hand the land that was once the cultural and population center of the world. The Tigris and the Euphrates, great rivers of antiquity, are now only silt-choked canals. Desolation reigns today over this land once ruled by Alexander the Great. At one time the valley known as Mesopotamia supported great cities, fertile fields and 25,000,000 to 35,000,000 people. Now a scant 3,000,000 eke out an existence from the parched and impoverished soil. I learned that at one time the Euphrates carried down its upper topsoil so fast that its delta silted up at the rate of 150 feet a year. I flew over Persia, too, and I later talked with some of the Persian farmers. According to historians, Persia once supported 105,000,000 people; now a bare 15,000,000 exist on the bare and eroded land.

It is a question of time until a like fate catches up with our country, unless we continue to accelerate conservation measures. The longer we wait, the harder it becomes to retrieve the wasted and worn-out soils, and the more stringent our efforts must become.

And for another thing, we must not lose sight of the fact that conservation is good business. For, every dollar we spend on conservation comes home to roost, and with interest. I mean hard dollars and cents interest, not just the benefits that accrue to a State or a region containing a specific project.

Let me give you a few examples. There are seven western projects, the Salt River in Arizona, the Yuma project area in Arizona and California, the Boise project in Idaho, the Yakima project in the State of Washington, the Shoshone project in Wyoming, the Sun River project in Montana, and the Lower Yellowstone developments in Montana and North Dakota. The total cost of these was in the neighborhood of $134,000,000, yet during 1948 alone, these seven projects produced to the Treasury tax revenues in excess of $60,000,000. Since 1916, these seven projects have contributed more than $400,000,000 to Uncle Sam. Would any of you like to get in on the ground floor of investments like that?

Before closing my remarks, I want to emphasize that the farmer himself is not only a beneficiary of the conservation, price support, and other agricultural programs fostered by our Government, but also he is a debtor to them. He has a direct responsibility in making conservation work and in making price supports a success. This means that he must cooperate when necessary, or the entire structure will fall, and he will find himself again at the mercy of an era of ruthless economic warfare. I mean that the farmer must adjust himself and his crops to the needs of our agricultural economy; he must make adjustments in production and acreage from time to time; and he must employ the best and the surest methods to conserve the natural resources under his control. Farmers must realize that they might well adopt a little policing of their own activities, and there is no doubt in my mind that they have to hang together or they will hang separately.

Indeed, these are serious times. I well realize that Fourth of July orators have been saying this since 1776, but I challenge anyone to now disprove it. These are serious times for agriculture. The American farmer is one of those upon whom we pin our hopes for the future. I can think of no one more important. I can think of no one I believe less likely to let America down.

Acheson's Fatal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Acheson's Fatal Policy," published in the Portland (Maine) Evening Express of January 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON'S FATAL POLICY

The Dutch used to be powerful in the Orient. American diplomats helped to pry them out of Indonesia. We cannot expect the people of the Netherlands to be too fulsome in their praise of American far eastern policy, therefore (by this we mean the Acheson-Lattimore policy which has prevailed since the defeat of Japan in 1945—not the traditional American policy of the Treaty of Portsmouth and of the open door which was the rule until Roosevelt and Stalin sat down to cocktails at Yalta).

On the subject of this Acheson-brand American approach to far eastern problems, an article by Dr. C. Gerretson in the Amsterdam conservative newspaper De Telegraaf recently had this to say:

"Nobody who has learned to know China between both world wars can have any doubts as to the unique moral position which America, in contrast to the European powers, had acquired there for itself. This result of one century has been squandered in a few years by postwar Washington, especially by Acheson's fatal policy. Now China vociferously requests the ending of America's 'colonial aggression.' Is it completely without foundation that China now is talking about American aggression? American policy has tried to conjure Asiatic nationalism by eliminating every 'colonial' authority and every resistance to the unlimited expansion of Asiatic nationalism. That is why the Netherlands had to evacuate Indonesia. The Americans have achieved nothing else but playing a far eastern Asia into the hands of communism, which is incapable of effective autonomy, and nothing else but conjuring a new nationalist imperialism. Now America and the United Nations with America are being defeated by the spirits which America itself has stirred up."

One may dislike Mr. Acheson. One must nevertheless concede that he put over this new American policy so very adroitly that the great mass of the American people—the people who have been content to elect and reelect Democratic administrations ever since 1932—appear never to have opened their eyes to what was being done to their country's prestige in the Far East until the war, which Westbrook Pegler calls the Roosevelt Memorial War, burst upon them in Korea last June 25.

Now, some eyes are opening. But we still have Mr. Acheson directing American foreign policy. And it is now rumored (see today's Merry-Go-Round column by Drew Pearson) that if Mr. Acheson ever does relinquish his post, we may see him replaced by New York's Gov. Thomas E. Dewey—whose "adviser on foreign affairs" is John Foster Dulles who, like Mr. Acheson, has been on very good terms, in the past, with Alger Hiss.

The difference between Acheson and Dewey, in handling the foreign affairs of this Nation, would be not unlike the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. It might fool some Americans, for a while. It would not fool the watching world.

Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am enclosing an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of December 22, 1950:

CAPITALISM: NOTHING IS SUPERIOR EXCEPT BY COMPARISON

When we compare the conditions of nations and people in anticapitalistic countries with the security, prosperity, happiness, and well being of our people under United States capitalism, we appreciate our privilege of living in a capitalistic, democratic country.

The basic principle of the free, capitalistic system which we have developed in our country affords opportunity to the individual who is willing to use his talents to the extent of his ability and desire to produce—to accumulate something for investment in a home, a farm, in savings accounts, bonds and other securities, life insurance, the education of his children, and comforts of life—and become a capitalist.

The following facts give us a deep appreciation of what capitalism has done and is doing for our country and its people.

Private capital in the form of taxes and purchases of United States Government bonds made it possible for us to spend $330,000,000,000 in carrying out our part of the program in winning World War II. This, of course, is unimportant when we consider the loss of life and permanent and partial disability which our youth sustained and which cannot be measured in dollars.

Our participation in World War II has left us today with a national debt of $257,000,000,000, but on the credit side we find that our annual national income, at the current rate, is equal to 90 percent of our

total national debt. Of this total national debt, $39,000,000,000 are in Treasury obligations owned by Government agencies, so our net debt is slightly over $218,000,000,000.

The United States free-enterprise business system is operating at its highest level, furnishing employment to 62,000,000 people at the highest hourly and weekly earnings ever recorded. Stockholders and corporations, after paying the highest peacetime taxes in the postwar years, have had the highest net average earnings in history from their investment.

Our farmers had cash income from marketing last year amounting to $27,500,000,000, the highest on record.

Total farm assets of our country amount to slightly more than $127,000,000,000, against which there is an indebtedness of only $12,400,000,000. Thus our farmers have ownership equity of over 90 percent in their farms.

In nonfarm homes, counting apartment buildings with four or less families, and all valued at a total of $200,000,000,000, our home owners have an equity of $158,000,000,000—a substantial ownership of 79 percent.

Therefore, as a result of the opportunity provided by our free-enterprise capitalistic system, the people of our Nation have a free and clear ownership in their homes and farms of 83.4 percent.

Our people have savings of more than $136,000,000,000 in Government bonds and savings accounts.

An additional $97,000,000,000 are on deposit in commercial bank accounts.

Our men and women have a cash investment of $60,000,000,000 in life insurance policies.

A high percentage of our working people are provided with unemployment insurance, sickness, accident, and retirement benefits, financed by employers, employees, and Government. Others who are not covered by these plans and who find themselves in need are provided for by governmental and social institutions.

We are increasing our efforts to improve the standard of living of the people in the lower income brackets.

The United States, with only 6 percent of the world population and 7 percent of its land area, under its democratic, capitalistic system, before World War II, produced 47 percent of the world's manufactured goods, but what is more important, 90 percent of that production was consumed within our own borders. Today we are producing over 50 percent of the world's manufactured goods, of which a substantial percentage is for other countries.

Capitalism is backing freedom of worship and providing increasing educational opportunities by constantly giving more and more support to the two things upon which our democratic, cultural civilization depends—spiritual and educational values.

We have a permanent investment in churches and schools of $18,500,000,000 and are spending annually $8,000,000,000 for religious and educational purposes.

Membership in the churches is increasing at a much faster rate than the increase in the population, and in our Sunday schools at an even greater rate.

In the past 30 years elementary school enrollment has increased 13.5 percent; high-school enrollment, 146.1 percent; and college and university enrollment, 351.6 percent.

Our public-school expenditures per pupil enrolled have gone up from $48.02 in 1920 to $132.06 in 1947, or 175 percent.

Since 1920 the population of our country has increased 43 percent and the investment in school and college equipment has increased 571 percent.

Since the beginning of our industrial and scientific development in the early 1800's, the capitalistic system, due to individual freedom, initiative, and ingenuity, has given the world more of the comforts and conveniences of life than mankind had received in the previous 5,000 years of civilization.

Under this system our people as a whole are happy and united, are increasing their capital, and enjoying a fuller spiritual, cultural, and material life.

Today our scientific and industrial knowledge and experience in the various fields of peaceful activity are open to the rest of the world, and in this respect we have joined with other like-minded nations in contributing to the technical-assistance program of the United Nations.

No nation, no individual, no venture, no private or public institution, no program for the welfare of the people can progress without capital.

It is each individual's duty to contribute to the preservation, protection, and improvement of our democratic civilization on a basis which is sound and fair to all our people.

THOS. J. WATSON,
Chairman of the Board, International Business Machines Corp.

The Late Emil Frey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, again there is told in this obituary another chapter in the American story—an accomplishment of a Swiss emigrant boy to the land of opportunity—America. His factory as white and clean as a laboratory, which in fact it was, the largest cheese-making plant in the world, it made not only a delectable table delicacy for the millions who now enjoy it, but it made a new dairy outlet for hundreds of farms, new employment for many men and women in my district, it is part and parcel of the private enterprise system that is America and American opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the above-mentioned obituary from the Van Wert (Ohio) Times-Bulletin of January 11, 1951:

ORIGINATOR OF LIEDERKRANZ CHEESE IN 1893—MEMORIAL SERVICES WILL BE HELD SUNDAY AT 4 P. M.

Emil Frey, 83, inventor of Liederkranz cheese, died at 9:45 a. m. today at the Van Wert County Hospital following a year's illness. He had been a patient in the hospital since last October.

There will be an immediate cremation service. A memorial service, open to everyone, will be held Sunday at 4 p. m. at the First Presbyterian Church.

Frey had been a resident of Van Wert since 1926 when he and his associates moved their cheese plant here from Monroe, N. Y. He was a member of the First Presbyterian Church, the Masonic Lodge, and the Rotary Club. In 1930 he received a citation from the Pasteur Institute of Paris for his contributions to the art of cheese making. He was invited to become a member of the Inventor's Club of Washington, D. C.

With the death of Emil Frey, the world loses not only the man who invented an internationally known cheese, but also a central figure in the development of the world's largest cheese factory, Borden's Van Wert plant, for Frey was superintendent of the local plant from its beginning in 1926 until 1938, years during which it became noted as the only Liederkranz-producing company.

The story of Emil Frey and Liederkranz has been told and retold throughout Ohio, and especially Van Wert, as visitors came to the city and residents point with pride to this claim to fame.

A native of Switzerland and the son of a cheesemaker, Frey came to the United States in 1882, when he was 15 years old. For 6 years he worked in New York as a mechanic in a printing-press factory, then he went to Monroe, N. Y., to take up his father's occupation.

There he began work in a cheese factory, and because of his diligence was commissioned by a New York delicatessen operator, Adolph Todt, to try to develop a domestic Bismark cheese, because much of this delicate cheese spoiled in transit when it was imported.

Frey worked for 2 years with all types of curing processes, but before he got what he wanted, he turned out a gold-crusted, soft-ripening, spready cheese that proved to be more popular among the delicatessen customers than Bismark.

Mr. Todt served the cheese to the members of the Liederkranz, a famous New York singing society of which he was a member. The response was so enthusiastic that they decided to name his new discovery After the society, hence the cheese was christened Liederkranz, which is translated as a wreath of songs.

The foreign-sounding name is misleading, and until people know the history of the cheese, it is often classed with the various imported cheeses.

Frey manufactured his new cheese in Monroe for a number of years, but since that city is 50 miles from New York, and an increasing amount of milk supply was needed for that densely populated area, his company began a search for another location.

In 1925 Frey made his first visit to Van Wert. He was at first discouraged because of the lack of dairying here, but he found no better location in Indiana, Michigan, or Wisconsin, and came back to Van Wert a second and third time. With the cooperation of the newly organized chamber of commerce, and the assurance from farmers that they would raise more dairy cattle if a good and convenient market were available, Frey and his associates decided Van Wert would be the new location of the Monroe Cheese Co.

Frey had his troubles here. For instance, the closely guarded formula turned into nothing but a sorry mess in the new plant until the fixtures of the old plant, containing the proper bacteria, were installed. Trouble was overcome and after 3 years of operation in Van Wert, the Monroe Cheese Co. was merged with the Borden Cheese Co., and Frey continued as plant manager. He personally supervised the making of the cheese until 1938 when he retired, and was succeeded by Sylvester Young.

Even since his retirement, Frey continued to visit the plant and exercise some supervision over the manufacture of his invention. And throughout his life, Liederkranz has remained a part of his regular diet. In 1939, the fiftieth anniversary of the invention of Liederkranz, Van Wert and the Borden Co. paid tribute to Frey with a special anniversary celebration. Again in 1948, as the Borden Cheese Co. celebrated its centennial year in Van Wert, Frey was presented for his part in the company's success.

But throughout all the fame and praise one of Frey's personal characteristics has been his humility. The self-effacement has pushed aside praise for his accomplishments, being too busy doing things to talk

about himself. At most, he liked to look at his handiwork, and smile with satisfaction. He derived his pleasure from viewing the large factory, and riding through the county and seeing the large, modern barns so symbolic of a prosperous dairy industry which he helped to build.

Veterans' Education and Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter received from Robert S. Kelley, of Boston, Mass., containing information of great value to a large percentage of veterans of World War II. It follows:

JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS., *January 12, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: Reprint of paragraph 10035, Veterans' Administration regulations, dated April 1, 1950, paragraph 10035 states as follows:

Regulations concerning the pursuit on or after July 25, 1951, of courses of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended (pt. VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended)—July 25, 1951, is a critical date in the education and training program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Veterans who are eligible for education or training and who have not undertaken such training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as well as those who have commenced but have not completed their course, may be vitally affected by the July 25, 1951, date. In order that all such veterans may be made fully aware of the importance of the date and of its effect on the education and training program, this regulation is promulgated at this time for the purpose of providing all such veterans with ample advance notice so that their plans may be made accordingly.

This regulation applies to all courses of education or training pursued by veterans on or after July 25, 1951, under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended.

(B) The law provides that a course of education or training shall be initiated before the termination of 4 years after the date of discharge or by July 25, 1951, whichever is the later, and that such education or training cannot be afforded beyond July 25, 1956, except for those veterans who enlisted under the Voluntary Recruitment Act of October 6, 1945. Therefore, a veteran otherwise eligible must have commenced and actually be pursuing his course of education or training on July 25, 1951, or the date 4 years after discharge, whichever is later, except where his attendance is interrupted because of the normal interruptions for summer vacations, or other reasons beyond the control of the veteran.

(C) A course of education or training shall consist of such curriculum, program of study or training, or combination of subjects as are prescribed by the institution as constituting the course. When the veteran elects his course of education or training, is accepted by the approved educational or training institution as qualified to undertake and pursue the elected course, and commences such course, he shall pursue his course of education or training continuously until completion, except for conditions which normally would cause interruption by any student.

(D) A veteran may change his course of education or training only while in training and then for reasons satisfactory to the Administrator. A change of one or more subjects in the elected curriculum or program of training, including the dropping of a subject without replacing it with another, or the adding of a subject, or a change in the sequence in which the subjects are undertaken does not constitute a change of course of education or training. Advancement from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase within the course of education or training which the veteran is pursuing does not constitute a change of course.

(E) A change of course of education or training may be considered to be for satisfactory reasons when—

1. The veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present course and the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application; or

2. The course to which the veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude, previous education, training, or other such pertinent facts; or

3. A course to which the veteran desires to change, while not a part of the course currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from said course and will enable him to atttain his educational or vocational objective.

No additional changes of courses of education or training will be approved except for the most cogent reasons.

(F) When the veteran completes his course of education or training as defined above or discontinues his elected course of education or training, the law does not permit the initiation of another course of education or training.

In view of the fact that there are approximately 60 percent of the veterans of World War II in this Commonwealth who have not taken advantage of this law (Public Law 346, ch. 8) and whereas there are thousands of these veterans who are now employed in national defense industries, working in many cases 10 to 12 hours per day, 6 days a week and are not physically or mentally able to pursue further education or training due to these aforesaid situations, I would recommend most strongly that wherever the date July 25, 1951, appears in this law and its amendments thereto that same be deleted, no substituted added. In other words a veteran of World War II could at his convenience pursue a course of study until the termination of this law, namely, July 25, 1956. Also those that are now going into the service and have not enrolled are also eliminated.

Fraternally,

ROBERT S. KELLEY.

Sleigh Riding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Oh, What Fun It Wasn't," written by John Gould and published in the Christian Science Monitor January 4, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON WHAT FUN IT WASN'T—A DISPATCH FROM THE FARM

(By John Gould)

Before Christmas, 1950, is wholly forgotten by a forward-plunging world, may I ask again why "Jingle Bells" has become included in our repertory of "traditional Christmas music"? I think it's indicative of our times—a confused era when people sound the melody but pay no attention to what the words mean. The least I can do is register a protest in the aggregate.

At first, some years back, I was amused at this. Some youthful radio announcer said we would now have some Christmas music, and he slapped "Jingle Bells" on his perpetual-motion machine. He was confused. Perhaps he was up early that morning. Again this year, during a program that was presenting Yuletide music in great dignity, a radio station came right out and called "Jingle Bells" a fine example of traditional Christmas music. Anybody who listened to the radio much before Christmas must have noticed that Jingle Bells got quite a play.

It would have been no worse if "Sidewalks of New York," or "Annie Laurie," or "Who Threw the Overalls in Mrs. Murphy's Chowder" had been similarly interpolated thus into a sacred occasion. I have nothing against "Jingle Bells" as a composition of its own sort, but I give myself credit for being able to understand what the words are about. If I had the job of making up the agenda of a Christmas music program, it would never occur to me to include "Jingle Bells."

Some people may object that I am too precise, and that a certain inference is justified—namely, Christmas comes in December; snow is likely at that time in northern latitudes; and men are to be excused if they associate a crisp jaunt o'er hill and dale in a trim cutter with that season's dominant holiday. This is a certain kind of logic, worth about D-minus, and would infer that "The Last Rose of Summer" is a song about Milwaukee because they have a big greenhouse there. Besides, I think Christmas is still one thing we can be purist about.

I am not the world's greatest enthusiast for sleigh rides, which may enhance my feeling about "Jingle Bells" and Christmas. My substitute for this more horseless era, if anybody wants a sleigh ride, is to sit on a porch hammock in the teeth of a stiff northwest gale, thermometer about —10, with your feet in a bucket of ice water and somebody to throw snowballs at you. If somebody can jingle a string of bells at the same time, the simulation is complete. You are now enjoying a sleigh ride, and if Christmas pops into your head I will be surprised.

In the old days a sleigh ride was not necessarily a joyous event. I often wake up at night and congratulate myself that sleigh rides are not, now, an integral part of my life. I am not beguiled by recollective sentiment, as are some people who will object to my harsh treatment of the subject. It is one thing to be sweetly reminiscent, and quite another to face the actual ordeal. Our old Tantrabogus, our sleighing horse, was not—in winter—the sleek Currier & Ives type that lends a romantic touch to a moonlight jaunt. A sleigh ride had numerous sensitory nuances the romanticists seem to have forgotten.

First, of course, Tanty had a great coat of shaggy and matted hair that he wore in the winter. He looked a lot like a buffalo, except that he had a stout aroma of horse. I never knew a horse that smelled so much like a horse as Tanty did. He was a nice old fellow, but he was all horse. When we left the house and walked across the squeaking dooryard snow, the icy blash at our backs, and swung open the barn door, the horsy nature of Tantrabogus was overwhelming. The idea of a sleigh ride was instantly revolting—as if it hadn't been, anyway.

I recall how hard it was to fit the tug eyes over the ferrules on the sleigh—not just because the tugs were cold-stiff, but because our fingers were, too. People who, in fancy, still glide over winter's broad expanse of white seem to forget that the sleigh runners were usually frozen down. Also that the wind kept the snow blown off the driveway right by the mailbox, and that runners going over bare gravel make a noise this world should never hear.

There also seems to be a recollection that the jolly horse scampered along on winged feet, lending a wild perception of speed to the affair. Tanty wasn't like that. He picked up one foot, and then held within him a lengthy, labored, and complicated mental conference as to what he should do with it next. The order in which to lift and replace his feet was always a great problem with Tanty, and the wonder is he didn't fall flat, on his horse face while making up his mind.

All that ever happened was that going sleighing made us glad to get back. Many a time we got off the seat and ran on our own numb feet, boots frozen solid, while Tanty came along behind at his own pace. Then we'd run back to meet him.

There is a whole lore of lanterns under lap robes, and the foul smother you discovered when, in desperation, you plunged your cheeks in under for a moment out of the wind. What a lantern under a sleigh robe will do to the impounded atmosphere is something sleighing recollectionists don't mention. There were hot soapstones, too—and you could put bottles of hot water in your pockets to warm your hands, and then stop at farmhouses to refill them before they froze up and burst. That was sleighing.

Christmas is supposedly a time of spiritual joy. I prefer not to be reminded, at that time, of sleigh rides and jingling bells. Particularly when we have plenty of valid Christmas music.

Inaugural Address by Gov. Edward F. Arn, of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the inaugural address of the new Governor of Kansas, Edward F. Arn. In it, Governor Arn points up the gravity of the national situation, and brings to our attention the great Kansas potential of men and resources my home State has to offer.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. EDWARD F. ARN

It is with a special and urgent sense of responsibility that your elected State officials stand before you today and solemnly pledge to perform the duties which have been entrusted to them.

Your faith in your elected officials makes their public office a public trust. I accept that trusteeship with humility, and with deep gratitude.

I pray to God for the strength, preseverance, and sound judgment which I will need in the task to which I today dedicate myself as your Governor—for this an hour in our National and State history which requires the utmost in effort and devotion from all of us. We must not attempt to conceal nor to minimize the gravity of our situation. Free citizens have a right to demand truth and frankness from their chosen leaders—and it shall be my purpose to see that such demands are squarely met.

The stark truth is that we face a terrible challenge from a determined and powerful enemy. Our freedom, our institutions, our lives, are at stake. But it is a challenge that we can meet and overcome. Kansas and her sister States of our Union have the spiritual and material resources to resist and vanquish the legions of darkness which have set themselves against us in the world. We have a system of government designed to take full cognisance of our private initiative, our individual energies, and of our collective strength.

First, however, the need must be fully realized so that our slumbering power may be awakened and our forces marshaled. Security, at this midway point in the twentieth century, will not be maintained by halfway measures or halfway efforts on the part of men and women either in or out of public office.

It is to this grim international picture that the conduct of State government must be geared during these coming 2 years. To assume anything less would be dodging reality and inviting disaster.

We can be doubly thankful today for the progress which has been made in Kansas since the end of World War II. Remarkable gains have been achieved in our service to the people in such fields as education, welfare, public health, and highways. And this progress has been accomplished without in any way impairing our financial strength—present or future. Our house is in good order. We owe a debt of gratitude to all of those who urged this program of action and to the legislators who enacted it.

It would have been tragic if we had left these things undone, only to find ourselves entering into another period of wartime economy in which manpower and materials are short or unavailable. And that is the type of economy we face today. We must anticipate that it will gain in intensity from month to month. Along with restrictions on manpower and materials we can expect an increased burden of Federal taxation, making it untimely for us to consider any new or additional State taxes. All of these things show us clearly that we must put aside any thoughts of ambitious new programs, or of any but the most necessary increases in programs already launched.

We must hold the gains we have made in Kansas progress as long as it is humanly possible. We must not go backward. I do not intend, for my part, to let our State be guilty of any neglect of the men, women, and children who deserve and need our service and assistance—but, at the same time, we must examine each proposal with extreme care in the light of our existing economy and of our present national peril. We must ask if it is necessary, if it is practical, if it is patriotic. In our State affairs it will be far better to make an error on the side of caution than to stray too far the other way and do anything that would in any way endanger our security.

I intend to give special attention to those things which will enable our State to do its part in increasing our war potential—such matters as our production on the farm and in the factory, the condition of our highways, and the efficiency of our civilian defense. And I particularly urge all State employees to work to the limit of their energy and ability so that essential services may be provided with all possible efficiency and economy.

I firmly believe that all of us should resolve today to live henceforth through this era in a spirit of personal sacrifice. The least we can offer is to forego anything which might weaken our fighting front in either a cold or a shooting war. Each individual can search his own heart and determine what additional contributions he is prepared to make. If we expect and prepare for the worst, we will be better able to avert disaster and come again into happier days in a peaceful world.

Kansas has much to offer the Nation in war or peace—the bounty of our fields and of our industries, our truly American way of life, the vigor and the courage of our patriotic Kansas citizens, who so well exemplify the spirit of America here in the heart of our Nation.

With these things God has blessed us. Let us pray to Him that, whatever lies ahead, we may persevere and win out in His name, setting an example which will be worthy of our fathers before us.

Preparedness Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summation of statements of mine regarding certain measures which was prepared by my administrative assistant.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREPAREDNESS AGAINST COMMUNISM—RECORD OF SENATOR LODGE

Because so many queries are received regarding Lodge's anti-Communist activities, the following reference material has been compiled, taken entirely from official or published sources.

Soon after his return to the Senate in January 1947 Lodge began working for action and by vote for complete preparedness—military, informational, economic, and security-wise—in the fight against communism.

Part I of this pamphlet contains chronological excerpts from his preparedness record before the Communist aggression in Korea of June 25, 1950, beginning in early 1947, when he returned to the Senate after World War II.

Part II deals with the record after the aggression began.

PART I. PREPAREDNESS AGAINST COMMUNISM—PRE-KOREA

February 1947:

"I am constantly concerned with the problem of maintaining our armed forces. The common defense is one of the prime responsibilities placed upon us by the Constitution; and it is utterly vital, not only for American security, but for the peace of the rest of the world, that we maintain armed forces at a sufficient strength adequately to support our foreign policy" (Congressional Record).

"Senator Lodge has raised a series of questions about the theory and composition of

our Armed Forces. He is without doubt the best qualified Member of the United States Senate to propound such questions and to array the answers. He has come closest of anyone thus far in getting down to brass tacks as to the basic principles and policies which must underlie our national security"(Army Ordnance Magazine).

April 1947:

"We must be ready when the whistle blows" (Hearings on S. 758, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate).

"I hope that in the future we will seek to achieve permanent results by our expenditure of money and effort as the result of forethought and far-reaching plans, and not to be constantly surprised by a succession of expensive rescue parties in which we simply pour money down a rat hole and achieve no basic improvement. There is not sufficient money in the world and there is certainly not sufficient money in the United States to pursue such a course" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

May 1947:

"A consistent, decisive, and thoroughgoing over-all plan for foreign policy which will secure military, political, and economic conditions in the world, which will make peace and prosperity possible, and which, by making foreign peoples self-supporting, will obtain for us the markets and raw materials we need is essential. In other words, what is wanted is a foreign-aid program which will aid Americans" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The fact that we allowed so many of the war's painfully won gains to slip away between our fingers in the year after the shooting stopped must teach us once and for all what a crime we commit against ourselves and against humanity when we allow ourselves to become weak" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

July 1947:

"The amendment which I shall offer represents my attempt to provide an ever-ready Air Force of 70 peace-strength air groups. * * * The first priority for the national security of the country should go to the striking Air Force, and these are the figures which will give it to them, and I hope the Senate will adopt them" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

(This amendment was defeated.)

"Senator LODGE has waged an admirable, though losing, battle on the floor of the Senate to give the Army Air Corps the full striking force it contends it should have in the postwar period. The picture which Senator LODGE gave his colleagues of our demobilization-battered aviation spearhead as it exists today is not a pleasant one; except, perhaps, to any potential enemy" (editorial, Washington Star).

"Without unification we are doomed by the nature of future war, the first effect of which will be to disunite us tactically. I say with all the vigor and all the sincerity of which I am capable, without unification we cannot even begin to fight" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The adoption of an intelligent policy with respect to our diminishing raw materials of all kinds is of vital importance and can mean the difference between defeat and victory in case of war" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

October 1947:

"The time has come for us to indulge in some plain speaking and to set the record straight * * * I have just returned from Europe where every kind of untruth is circulated about the United States, and I assure you that much of it is believed simply because we never do reply * * * We must not hesitate, and we shall not hesitate, to broad-cast to the world the things which the enemies of human freedom in the world today are continually saying about the ideals which animate us here in America. For every lie they publish, let us proclaim the truth." (Columbus Day speech, Boston, Mass.)

November 1947:

"Certainly our words would not be heeded abroad if our military defenses were weak.

"There is no Nation-wide organization in being which is ready to deal with massive bombardment of our population centers and of our industrial and military establishments." (Report to the chairman, Foreign Relations Committee).

"We are at present 60 to 70 percent short of the minimum strength of five divisions which the Army requires in combat ground troops, not counting occupation forces" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The warning by Senator LODGE that our military defenses are seriously weak should not be ignored by Congress. Senator LODGE should know what he is talking about. He knows the military situation here and elsewhere by personal contact. His words on this subject merit serious consideration" (editorial, Boston Post).

"The experience of Senator LODGE gives weight in the public mind to his comments on the Nation's unpreparedness to meet any emergency" (editorial, Fall River Herald-News).

December 1947:

"We must be ready for the worst. War has become total, our defense must be total, too. * * * If Washington were hit, the President, the Cabinet, all Members of Congress, all records would be gone. A new Government and a new President should be ready to take over—perhaps in some bunker or cave" (open letter to Herbert Hoover, Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government).

January 1948:

"I rise this morning to express the hope that at this regular session of Congress the Appropriations Committee will not be bound by any short-sightedness or lack of understanding on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and that it will include in the appropriation bill adequate funds for 70 air groups. We must have an Air Force in being, an Air Force that is immediately ready, not a skeleton Air Force. Seventy groups are the minimum" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

(Although Congress voted funds for a 70-group Air Force, a Presidential directive reduced this by 28 groups.)

"Under the leadership of Senator LODGE, Congress raised the number of Army air groups from the 55 that the President wanted to 70" (Lowell Sun).

"There is no substitute for professional knowledge, and Senator LODGE has it where modern warfare is concerned. He is showing an acute and penetrating vision of what that means when he calls for an increase in air power. His voice should be heard with complete respect" (editorial, Boston Traveler).

"The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act is only a beginning, insofar as United States public relations abroad are concerned. Unless there is energetic, intelligent, and imaginative administration we shall not really hold up our end in the great debate which is going on over the world and in which we, whether we like it or not, are one of the two principal participants" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"While supporting the European-aid bill in principle, LODGE is readying a series of amendments designed to: Build up stockpiles of strategic materials this country needs in exchange for European aid, strip the program of all but bare essentials, put the privately hoarded assets of European nationals to work supporting the Marshall plan, force at least some unification of Europe and halt the drain of American vitality" (article, Washington Times-Herald).

"We all know that the program which we are confronting makes sacrifices on our part inevitable and we also know that the American people can make sacrifices and have done so in the past many times, but let us remember this: That whatever aid we send, we must never do violence to vital American needs. It must never be at the expense of the food and the heat and the clothing and the housing and the economic system whereby America lives and has its being. A strong America is not only necessary to Americans; it is vitally necessary to the world. If there is one thing that we must preserve above everything else, it is the strength and vigor of our country.

"If we are to deprive ourselves of badly needed oil, let us get back all of this oil from Middle-Eastern sources, just as soon and just as fast as Middle-Eastern oil gets into production" (speech, Columbia University, New York).

"We must get something back in return. If we are to send our machinery overseas, let there be a hard and fast agreement that we will get natural resources in return, such as bauxite, manganese, and iron ore, and many other things which we have not got in sufficient amounts in this country. Such an agreement enhances self-respect and minimizes the chances of bad feelings" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"We must be absolutely sure that all assets owned by foreigners are put into the service of this great cause, insofar as this can be done. If, as we are officially told, there are between $2,000,000,000 and $3,000,000,000 worth of gold in France, this gold must be put to work. If there are wealthy people in Europe, they should be taxed. If there are $8,000,000,000 worth of foreign assets held in the United States, they should be pledged in the operation of the Marshall plan, because the poor here in America must not be made to support the rich overseas" (speech, Boston, Mass).

March 1948:

"I have absolutely no responsibility for the lack of preparedness for peace which was shown at the conclusion of hostilities. I have no responsibility for the decisions made at Yalta and Potsdam * * * I am not a party to the tragic lack of foresight and the appalling miscalculations which were made at the end of hostilities and which account for so much of what is going on today" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"Your telegram so utterly distorts the truth and uses the phrases which we all love in so cynical a manner that I cannot hope by any reply of mine to make you admit the great wrong you are committing. Because of the fact that you once held a high office, your activities are interpreted abroad as signs of American disunion and are therefore a direct encouragement to the masters of the Soviet police empire to continue their campaign of extending the iron curtain" (open letter to Henry A. Wallace).

"I think we should realize that we are meeting in the shadow of a tremendous world emergency" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

April 1948:

"The Russian tactics of bullying and intimidation in Berlin demonstrate what a ghastly error and what a tragic miscalculation were made at the end of the war when we withdrew our troops from what is now the Russian zone of Germany. It also shows the pressing need for prompt military preparedness" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The Russians, believe me, are not smart enough to have singlehandedly created the Communists of Europe. Europe's chronic ills—overpopulation, maldistribution of goods and wealth, the failure of its educated class to provide leadership, the selfishness of its people—these are the facts which create communism.

"Fundamentally we face a political and human challenge of the very highest order. In spite of our great efforts and vast expenditures, we have been hugely unsuccessful in the battle for men's minds.

"An enthused America, speaking through its Government, can make American democracy an article of export. The Christian concept of the dignity of man is the strongest revolutionary force in the world. But because we lack imagination or understanding, we have allowed the materialistic and brutal verbiage of communism to gain a greater export currency than our own belief which springs from eternal sources—the job of stating our aims for ourselves badly needs to be done.

"This fight is fundamentally one for men's minds. The effort must, therefore, be made by ideas which appeal to the aspirations of men's souls. With such ideas we will win; without these, all the money and Cominterns and 'cloak-and-dagger' services in the world will fail.

"The belief which traditionally gripe us after every war that permanent peace will soon be definitely assured has never been a correct belief and is clearly an undependable doctrine today, although we still desire peace as fervently as we ever did and are willing to work and to sacrifice for it more intelligently.

"We are learning that in the present test of strength with Russia it does not pay to run away.

"Our ideas must emphatically mean that we do not uphold any regime abroad, no matter how corrupt, provided only that it is anti-Communist. At its best such a course would be stupidity; and at its worst it would be nihilism.

"We have it within our power to hold aloft a torch which cannot only rival but easily surpass communism and the other violent doctrines of the dictators as a brightly shining attraction to all the weary people in the world, young and old, who are looking for a way out of their misery" (speech, New Orleans).

May 1948:

"I object to being bullied or hornswoggled by any foreign state into weakening, if not destroying, our prime military asset—which is our productive capacity. * * * Our desire to be ready for the first blow in any future war must not force us to take steps which make it difficult, if not impossible, for us to win the closing battle."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

June 1948:

"I hope that this bill (Selective Service Act of 1948) is not merely a flash in the pan. * * * I hope that it is a forward step in a coherent, well thought-out military policy."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The purpose of the Vandenberg resolution is to show that we are in sympathy with the broad trend of strengthening the freedom-loving countries, but it does not commit us to anything definite. They must make the showing. If they make a good showing and if it is advantageous to our national security to help them, we shall help them. If the showing is not good enough, we shall not help them. It is the most perfect arrangement from the standpoint of American interest that could possibly be imagined. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

August 1948:

"We have never been in a world where there are so many loose pieces of dynamite lying around. Our country at the present time is going through the valley of the shadow. In addition to battleships, guns, and airplanes, we must keep our spiritual strength high and reaffirm our faith in our institutions" (Speech, American Legion Convention, Worcester, Mass.).

October 1948: "We should all realize that effective allies are indispensable to survival should we again confront the grim contest of war" (This Week magazine).

January 1949:

"We simply do not have the manpower to carry the whole burden of a future war alone.

"The factor which is at the bottom of every good military organization is the will to fight of the individual soldier. In Europe this will to fight depends fundamentally on the extent to which Europe unifies itself.

"We in Congress may be asked to help in setting up a Western European armed force and it might be strongly in the interests of the United States and of world stability generally for us under the proper conditions to give help to such a force. What are the 'proper conditions'?

"There is the question of whether the proposed pact is enthusiastically vouched for by one or more of our American military leaders who actually commanded foreign troops in combat in World War II and therefore knows from experience the realities of coalition warfare. The endorsement of staff officers, however brilliant they may be and however necessary their approval is, would not be enough. There must be approval by a former combat leader based on intimate personal knowledge of the provisions of the pact.

"There is the question of whether the reaction to such a pact in nonparticipating countries has been thoroughly anticipated and whether we are ready to meet such reaction.

"There is the question of whether there is a supreme commander on whom all the member nations agree and who really has got the power to command the Western European armed force. What is needed is not a chairman of the board, but a real general so that there is an unquestioned single authority.

"There must be a comprehensive, strategic and tactical plan in which definite assignments are given to all the military units which are members of this Western European armed force. This is absolutely essential if we are to avoid the typical Western European catastrophe in which the invader swoops down from the East and the western nations start a long debate as to who is to do what.

"The governments of the nations concerned must be strong enough to provide the foundation of civil power which is essential to the existence of a healthy military organization.

"There must be complete proof that the strategic plan for the defense of Western Europe is one which the nations of Europe are actually prepared to carry out insofar as pledging their manpower in regularly organized military units is concerned. Unless they are willing to pledge their manpower as we have pledged ours, and unless the men are presently and actually integrated into units, there is no use in our even beginning to send equipment.

"We must know how much we can afford to send abroad in relation to our Military Establishment and our own solvency" (speech, Baltimore, Md.).

"Senator LODGE wants a lot of questions answered: How much of the munitions will be made here and how much in Europe? Why can't considerable arms be manufactured in the Ruhr? How much aid has been extended to Europe since the end of the war? How much is proposed for the future? How is this aid going to be divided up among the participating countries? How many military units is each country going to have? How much manpower is involved in each year? What effect will this plan have on our own Military Establishment? What sort of organization will supervise this aid to see that the other countries for their part maintain effective self-aid? These are intelligent questions and ones that must be answered" (article, Boston Herald).

February 1949:

"To put the war-making power in the hands of other nations, or for us to underwrite nations over whose foreign policy we had no control would be a great mistake. I think it would be a mistake to take away from Congress the right to declare war on the part of our country" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"People like the Kaiser and Hitler are never as much embarrassed by words and phrases and good intentions as they are by their knowledge of the actual physical military means that are ready to be used in order to fight" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"In June of 1948 I made a speech which developed in some detail the fact that the United States had become a have-not nation in terms of essential raw materials. Since that time, the situation has grown worse and is causing concern to all the students of this problem. I wish that something could be done to arouse public sentiment to the dangers of the situation. If we lose our sources of material strength we will in many ways have dealt a real death blow to our country" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

March 1949:

"If, in a future war, we will have even fewer divisions on the front, does not that argue even more pressingly than ever before in our history that we simply must have allies, that we must have friends so that American boys will not have to carry the whole load by themselves?" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"I am interested in obtaining strategic materials to replenish our depleted resources. The provisions of existing law have been inadequate in this respect. The disclosures of the whole scheme is that it takes the RFC Administrator, with his hard-hitting organization and his bargaining position, and puts him into the existing strategic material policy of the Government."

July 1949:

"I believe we should furnish arms to Europe, but only with the understanding that we do not undermine our own defense, that we help only nations making maximum efforts to help themselves" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The North Atlantic Treaty is basically no panacea for security * * *. It by no means relieves us of the need for military preparedness" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

January 1950:

"I have very grave doubts if we should undertake military action in Formosa. I think we have got to stop the military aspect of communism somewhere, but I don't think that's the place. For a minor military success we might suffer a major loss politically and propagandistically" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

February 1950:

"We must continue to build our strength in every way that we can * * * then—and only then—will there be a real prospect of accomplishing results" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

May 1950:

"I believe that we should not send anything that is of military value behind the iron curtain" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"I do not think world war III is inevitable at all. But whereas 2 years ago we thought we might have 10 or 15 years in which to make everyone strong and self-reliant, I now think we probably have only three or four. We have lost time in which to get the free world on a firm footing" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"Let us consider the commitments of Europe under the North Atlantic Pact. I am very much worried as to whether they are proceeding fast enough, whether enough is being accomplished with respect to it" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

June 1950:

"The Congress of the world situation was largely self-imposed. * * * It is plain to me that the Western World, of which the United States is a part, must build up a very strong force. * * * In a very real sense, we of the free world should have been ready yesterday and should never have allowed the disintegration of our armed forces

in 1945 and 1946" (speech, Norwich University, June 12, 1950).

"The sole purpose of all loyalty investigation must be to ferret out disloyal persons. Mistakes have been made in the past and they must be ruthlessly corrected. Americans must stand together before the world menace of communism. The public is everlastingly right in its determination relentlessly to ferret out all disloyal persons and it is up to us who are in public office to work out an effective method" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"Those behind the iron curtain have been trained in a hard school. They understand only strength. America is going down a dark road strewn with dynamite. We must be in a position to show strength" (I Am an American Day speech, Boston, June 21, 1950, 4 days before Korean attack).

"The whole trend of events • • • forces upon us the necessity of being immediately ready. • • • Nations no longer take the trouble to declare war and give advance notice of an attack. • • • It seems to me that we are in one of those fateful moments in history when we have it within our power to make a decision whether we shall have World War III or whether we shall not" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 22, 1950, 3 days before Korean attack).

PART II. VOTING RECORD

LODGE voted for:

- The 1947 Military Unification Act
- The Greek-Turkish assistance program
- The 70-group Air Force (1948)
- The Selective Service Act of 1948
- Increase of funds for Voice of America and related programs (1949)
- Ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty (1949)
- One hundred million dollar assistance program for Spain (1950)

LODGE voted against:

- An amendment cutting down the duration of selective service from 5 to 2 years (1948)

LODGE personally was the author of legislation to:

- Provide for a 70-group Air Force (1947)
- Allow enlistment of selected qualified aliens in the United States Army (1947) (1948)
- Receive strategic materials for United States stockpile in return for ECA aid (1948)
- Establish a coordinated civil defense program (1950)
- Give congressional consent to interstate civil defense pacts (1950)
- Require Armed Forces to stockpile fabricated wool (1950)
- Clean out disloyal persons in the State Department (1950)
- Prevent shipment of strategic materials to the Communists (1950)

LODGE ATTACKED BY COMMUNISTS

The Daily Worker (official organ of the Communist Party), of February 23, 1950, commented as follows on LODGE's belief that disarmament talks between the United States and the Soviet Government would but falsely raise the hopes of the American people:

"Senator LODGE insults the intelligence of the United States by arguing that any Soviet-American peace negotiations would only bring war that much closer."

The Daily Worker of February 22, 1950, said:

"The trouble with the Lodge resolution is that it proposes to erect a beautiful building on a completely rotten base."

William E. Mullins, writing in the Boston Herald of December 6, 1950, observed:

"One of the pleasures of a visit to the United Nations is a first hand discovery of the 'ardent smiles' the Russians have for Senator LODGE. The Bay State Senator interviews them. They do not speak to him."

And Mr. Mullins wrote on December 7:

"The Russians dislike LODGE deeply."

Congress and Strategy in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 5, 1951, and also an editorial from the Washington Post of January 7, 1951:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of January 5, 1951]

CONGRESS AND STRATEGY IN CRISIS

A resolution has been submitted in Congress by Representative COUDERT, Republican, of New York, calling on the President to send no more American troops overseas without the prior consent of Congress. There may be anticipated a strenuous effort to get this, or some resolution expressing the same idea, adopted and made binding. Some soul searching by individual Congressmen, not related to political considerations, is in order.

This newspaper has long advocated that Congress be alert to its responsibilities as a check upon the executive branch of the Government. Such responsibilities by Congress are imbedded in the American tradition; planted there by the founding fathers, who wanted to make sure that popular government prevailed and survived. Part of such responsibility is the careful examination of any delegation of powers to the Executive; care in this respect is imperative for the successful carrying out of the people's will.

The President is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, but Congress, through its lawmaking prerogatives, has ultimate control of the over-all employment of such forces, except when it voluntarily and temporarily relinquishes such control. It has relinquished a great deal of such control, traditionally, in wartime. It voted the President extraordinary — indeed, dictatorial— powers over the military in the Civil War, again in World War I, and again in World War II.

The present proposal is, obviously, a step away from the centralization of military power. As such, it should be debated with utmost care, with maximum regard for consequences in the current world military-political situation.

It seems clear to us that the Executive must have considerable leeway in the present emergency, in respect to the deployment of manpower at the various outposts of American military strength. The American zone of Germany is clearly one of the most important of these outposts. The Executive, for these purposes, must be considered as embracing the whole hierarchy of military command, including not only the President but Secretary of Defense Marshall and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Within the limits of general policy as established by the people, the executive department has the responsibility for strategic and tactical operations concerned with the defense of the Nation, the waging of war, or preparing to meet threatened war. At the present time those responsibilities are great and grave.

We are doubtful of any procedure of Congress that would force the Executive to disclose before a congressional committee the military's secret plans for coping with the military situation facing the Nation. And we are doubtful of any blanket resolution that would cripple the Nation's capacity to move swiftly in its own defense.

We suggest, therefore, that this resolution—which is bound to be pivotal in American foreign policy—should be debated soberly and we urge particularly that no punitive partisanship should enter into the debate. A personal or political grudge against the President would be a weak and dangerous ground upon which to base judgment on a proposition as vital as this. If the proponents have a sincere case, they ought to be heard and their counsel weighed. But political guns should be checked in the anteroom for this debate.

[From the Washington Post of January 7, 1951]

WE ARE NOT THROUGH

It is a vast oversimplification of war to pronounce judgment upon every military action in terms of ground gained, cities occupied, fields won and losses inflicted, or even as engagements in themselves. Winner does not necessarily take all in a single victory in what is a global struggle that may last a decade. Britain in the heyday of its empire got accustomed to losing every campaign till the last. In the Crimean War a series of disasters made the country demand a scapegoat. Cardinal Newman's great pen gave the people one—themselves. This was not unkind, but was part of a larger explanation, viz, that Britain was a nation, not a state; therefore it was always unready in the initial stages of a military campaign. This is the case with our country in relation to the Soviet Union. Moscow is the capital of a state, not a nation, and it is a garrison state, always prepared for warfare, and thus having a preliminary edge on non-Communist nations.

Korea is the warning signal that after the recent war we were told we wouldn't get. Fortunately we are not as weak as we were in 1941 when we were compelled to stand by and see our Pacific strongpoints wrested from us, one by one. Our power upon the sea and in the air is such that no calamity of this kind portends. The enemy can strike no mortal blow across the water barriers. If behind these barriers which Providence has provided we proceed to build up the power the world situation requires, there will come a day when it will be possible to reassert the power of the right in quarters of the globe where it may now be defied with impunity.

In an interval bound to be marked with rebuff and reverse, it will be wise to remember the high purpose that led us to undertake the Korean operation. Whatever rough handling we get in this uncomfortable interlude, there will come a day when we, and those allied with us, will say of Korea, as Byron said of Waterloo:

Millions of tongues record thee, and anew
Their children's lips shall echo them, and say—
"Here, where the sword united nations drew,
"Our countrymen were warring on that day!"
And this is much, and all which will not pass away.

The Stockpiling and Rationing of Scientific Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include an interesting and informative address by Commissioner Henry DeWolf Smyth, United States Atomic Energy Commission, at the one hundred and seventeenth annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Municipal Auditorium, Cleveland, Ohio, on Thursday, December 28, 1950:

THE STOCKPILING AND RATIONING OF SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER

Nine days ago the President declared a state of national emergency. Such a declaration, and the facts behind it, naturally influence all our present thoughts and plans. Some of us are filled with emotion and can think only in terms of immediate action. This is not good enough. Regardless of the outcome of the situation in Korea, this country now faces the necessity of planning not only for the coming months but for the coming decade and the decade after that. We may not have to fight a full-scale war. We profoundly hope that we shall not. But we know now that we must prepare to resist aggression with all our strength for the foreseeable future. We shall have to increase greatly the Armed Forces of this country, using our material resources and our manpower in the wisest possible way. In every aspect of civilian life the first concern of each citizen must be the long-range value to the country of what he is doing. In the period ahead of us, no citizen can be deferred from national service in this sense.

It is not good enough to boast that we will fight for freedom. We must think for freedom, and this is much harder. As we prepare for possible war, we shall inevitably have to delegate increasing authority over our lives and actions to the National Government. At the same time we must be vigilant to maintain our fundamental rights of independent thinking, criticism, and free discussion.

THE DANGERS WE FACE

It has become clear that our survival is at stake. Not just our material survival, but our survival as a society of free men and women. If our cities are destroyed we can rebuild them. Our spiritual destruction would be still more fearful. It is not numbers, nor buildings, nor wealth that make a people great. It is their freedom and their vigor. We might lose our freedom, we might even lose our passion for it. This could happen through armed attack and conquest by our enemies, or it could happen from our own stupidity and short-sightedness. If we are forced into a major war we must remember that armed victory is only a means to an end and that the years after the war gage the reality of victory. If the means we use to win a military victory should destroy our moral position in the world, or our own self-respect, or change our free society into a totalitarian one, we shall not have won the war. On the other hand, if our hatred of war and our desire for peace lead us into the acceptance of an alien and barbaric conqueror we shall have lost more completely. We shall then have given up our freedom and be the serfs of a police state imposed by men who neither understand nor respect the ideals that have made us great.

A third danger remains. We may be drawn into a war for which we are not adequately prepared, and we may fight it less skillfully than it needs to be fought. It is to one phase of this specific danger that I want to address myself today.

SCIENTISTS AS TOOLS OF WAR

Men of science, traditionally peaceful, internationally minded, and nonpolitical have become a major war asset. It is important that they be used to the greatest advantage. Therefore, I am asking you as representatives of science to consider carefully how you and your fellows can be most useful to our country in the years to come. I believe that we are facing dangers so great as to make the comfort and convenience of any group trivial in comparison to the contribution such a group can make to our survival. For that reason I have chosen a somewhat grim title for this speech, "The Stockpiling and Rationing of Scientific Manpower." For that reason I am speaking of scientists not as men who enrich our culture but as tools of war needed for the preservation of our freedom. I hope you will understand why I am willing to consider the group to which I belong in this objective and impersonal way.

TWENTY YEARS OF TENSION

To plan the stockpiling and rationing of any war commodity requires some assumption about timing. If we are discussing how scientists can be used most effectively as tools of war, we must ask when such a war will be fought. This is a question Americans cannot answer with any exactness, for we will not be the aggressors. But it is now clear that if the free society of the west is to survive, we must be prepared to meet at any time a large-scale attack upon us or our allies. It may come soon or it may not come for years. In considering scientific manpower as a major war asset of this country, I assume a 20-year period of tension with the possibility of major or minor wars occurring at any time in that period. This is indeed long-range planning, but the events of the last 5 years have forced it upon us. We must now face these realities with courage and intelligence.

NATURE OF TOTAL WAR

The forces involved in a future war will be as important as timing. In every war this country has fought for the last hundred years, we have been able to crush our enemies by sheer weight of numbers and matériel. It is unlikely that we can do so again. In any future war we shall probably be outnumbered, and by men who are physically tougher than we are. Our natural resources may be no greater than those of our enemies. We may be fighting with much longer and more vulnerable lines of communication. We shall win only by being cooler, cleverer, and more skillful than our enemies, and by using the resources at our command with foresight and judgment. We must understand the nature of modern total war. Every citizen will be involved in it, whether he is in or out of uniform. We must get over the idea that men in uniform are automatically more valuble than the same men in civilian clothes. The men in uniform may be in greater danger, though even this is doubtful in view of the large number who are never in combat and the probable dangers to a civilian population in a future war. Each man's usefulness should be the sole criterion of his value to his country.

USE OF SCIENTISTS IN PREPARATION FOR WAR

On these assumptions as to the timing and nature of a possible war, how shall we best use our scientific manpower? First of all, let me say what I mean by scientists. For purposes of this discussion, I mean men who have had at least some graduate study (or equivalent experience) in the physical or natural sciences. This definition arbitrarily excludes most medical men and engineers, although much of this discussion applies to them also. Of course their value is comparable, but the problem of their use differs enough in detail to require separate treatment which I will not attempt at this time.

Based upon our experiences in World War II, I believe we can say that science contributes to our effectiveness in war and preparation for war at six levels. First of all, scientists are needed to provide fundamental knowledge, adding to our basic understanding of the laws of nature. In World War II, for the first time in history, we pushed our development of weapons close to the limit of our basic knowledge. Discoveries in science less than 5 years old were put to use in the atomic bomb and in other weapons. This may happen again, but only if there is new knowledge to put to use. Basic research is so near the furthest of knowledge that no specific use can be foreseen for any part of it, nor can it be specifically directed. But if there is doubt in anyone's mind about the military value of work of this sort, it should be set at rest by the Atomic Energy Commission. If secrecy permitted, I could give examples of postwar research in basic science that have already been put to use in our weapons program.

The second level where science is essential is intermediate between what is clearly basic research and what is clearly development. At this level possible utility is borne in mind in a general way and may discuss a choice of field but not a choice of problem. An example of this level is the study of certain areas of organic chemistry by chemists working for a plastics company or the study of ferro-magnetism by the physicists of the telephone company.

A third level of scientific usefulness is in applied research where a specific question is posed and an answer sought. The development involved may be that of a new chemical process, a new material or a new weapon, but always to meet a specific need.

The last stage in development work and a fourth scientific level is testing of prototypes under field conditions and getting into production. The amount of labor and capability required in this last stage is often very great and the cost correspondingly so.

Once new weapons are produced, they must have operators. Generally speaking, scientists are rarely required as operators, but experience in World War II proved that they were needed to instruct operators. They were also needed to interpret the actual use being made of weapons in the field so as to understand weaknesses which should be corrected and to explain the capabilities of the weapons to their military users. This work constitutes the fifth level where scientists are valuable.

Finally, but of great significance for a prolonged crisis, we must have new scientists educated. The education of a new generation of scientists cannot be done quickly. They must have a minimum of 5 years' special training, and in many cases 10 to 15 years of training and experience. To produce such men, we must continue to have teachers and universities.

NEITHER SCIENTISTS AS TOOLS NOR MEN AS TOOLS

These are the jobs we have to do—all of them necessary if the majority is to exist in the techniques and weapons of modern war over the next 20 years. All these levels of work have been started on among the last 5 years of peace. In the period now facing us, we can expect only to shift the emphasis or increase the effort on both. Some peacetime activities can perhaps be curtailed. These are most likely to be found in the middle of the spectrum that ranges from basic research to weapons development. For example, work on improvements of nonessential industrial products or processes certainly could be curtailed. On the other hand, applied research on weapons or on industrial processes bearing on weapon production needs to be accelerated. Vast sums of money will be available for the services for research and development. I hope this money will not be squandered on dubious things in triplicate or on library and scientists for pet projects that have little bearing on either science or war. Money does not create brains, nor can expenditures of millions of dollars alter the laws of nature. Our appreciation of these laws is still so great even in advanced fields like nuclear physics that basic research must go on. On the large scale I have suggested, our science in basic research is necessary to our survival.

All this adds up to slight curtailment and considerable expansion. It may sound as if I were recommending business as usual. I am suggesting that we cannot have war as usual. We cannot win another war by a mere outpouring of men and resources. We can only beat our enemies by being much brighter, much shrewder, much cooler, and more farsighted than they are. We must use our weapons and men more skillfully than they. In particular, scientific men are important because the novelty and effectiveness of our weapons depends on them. If we are to expand our scientific efforts, we must examine closely our stockpile of scientific manpower.

PRESENT SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER

Have we the scientific men we need? If not, can we get them, and how can we best use them? I could quote to you statistics that have been gathered by many painstaking studies in the last few years. These statistics show we do not have the men we need. But the lack is obvious even without statistics. We trained almost no scientists between 1941 and 1946; and since 1941 needs have developed, like that of the Atomic Energy Commission, which now employs directly or through contractors as many physicists as there were in the whole country in 1940. The lack is also obvious to anyone who has recently been trying to hire first-class senior scientists. Therefore, I will omit statistics at the risk of being considered unscientific by those who consider numbers less fallible than words.

Can we do anything in this period of emergency about the shortage of scientific personnel for war work? As I have suggested, some diversion from present industry is possible. For example, I will venture to single out two areas that might supply scientists. I suggest that most of the chemists from the cosmetics industry and most of the physicists from the television industry could have their abilities used in ways that would be more likely to insure the survival of this Republic. In such industries as these, a fair number of qualified senior scientists could be found and a considerably larger number of men who could work under direction.

Yet it is clear that taking men from industry will do little or nothing to strengthen the basic research which will continue to be vital. Nor will it furnish very many senior men capable of directing bold and imaginative work in weapons research itself. Evidently there is such a shortage that each man must be used wisely and more men must be trained in science by holding many students and teachers in universities.

The problem then is clear and has two parts. First, to use the scientists we have as effectively as possible; second, to train more. Before making some suggestions for the solution of these problems, it may be well to review how we tried to meet them between 1940 and 1945.

EXPERIENCE IN WORLD WAR II

Dealing first with the question of use, let us recall what happened during World War II. It is easy to say that we misused our scientific talent in that war. I hardly think that is a fair statement but certainly better use could have been made of them. Among the older men, recruitment for various projects was usually carried out by a kind of chain-letter system. The initial group brought in men they knew. These new men brought in their friends, their former students, or other scientific acquaintances, and so on. Had the supply been unlimited, this would have been an excellent system. In practice, however, different projects soon came into collision so that individuals had to choose between offers from different laboratories without having the necessary information to make the choice wisely. Not infrequently the advice of the top people in the Office of Scientific Research and Development had to be sought. Except insofar as it was counteracted by OSRD, this system tended to strengthen projects that had started early and were already strong. Vested interests were built up and it was difficult to man new projects or to deflate projects when they had essentially completed their missions.

This system also had the disadvantage of stripping men from universities and stopping basic research almost completely. Quite apart from the removal of students by the draft, it was psychologically almost impossible for a man to continue basic research, since there was no one to tell him it was important and the recruiting officers of every war-research project were continually telling him it was not. In the scientific community, the last war began in the summer or fall of 1940, but full mobilization was not reached until sometime in 1942 and lasted about 3 years. Nevertheless, its effects on training and basic research were very serious. In the period of sustained tension that may now be facing us, effects of the kind I have mentioned could be disastrous.

I have been referring to the scientists who were used as civilians in various war laboratories of the OSRD or the services, men who were above draft age or whose deferment was relatively easy to obtain. For the younger men, the situation was much more unsatisfactory. Either they were deferred by a process often painful and temporary or they went into the services.

When young scientific men were drafted or volunteered, they became enmeshed in a system designed to train and use men for combat. This is no place for me to discuss the wisdom of using military uniforms and ranks for the many jobs a modern war organization has, in which the work to be done is much more like civilian work than it is like fighting. I can only say that a research laboratory is probably the most inappropriate place in the world to have military organization. Fortunately, ordinary common sense usually came into play in laboratories such as Los Alamos where there was a large detachment of soldiers who were more familiar with slide rules than guns. The men were given positions and responsibilities determined by their scientific qualifications regardless of their scale of pay, or the color of their suits, or buttons. This is one reason our war laboratories produced results.

In general, the services did try to use men of scientific background in places where their training was appropriate, but there were many cases where such men were entirely wasted and many more where they could have been used more effectively. The Selective Service System was not designed with this objective in mind and could hardly be expected to function successfully.

On the whole, we can find little satisfaction in the methods of using scientists of any age in World War II. As for stockpiling, it practically stopped. Almost no new scientific men were trained between 1940 and 1945. In preparing for a possible future war, we must do better.

DANGER OF REGIMENTATION

When one tries to work out solutions of this scientific manpower problem, one immediately runs into a contradiction. It is a contradiction inherent in the nature of a free society and perhaps accentuated in the particular section of society made up of scientific men. Freemen cannot be treated like inanimate tools. They will do their best work if they retain initiative and responsibility, and this is above all true of men doing scientific research. We cannot have completely centralized Government control of science without losing much of the strength we are trying to preserve. At the same time, the country has a right to expect that young scientists of military age will be as much at the command of their Government as other young men of the same age. If we are to avoid the mistakes of the last war, we must propose a positive kind of service to replace the policy of deferment for young men in scientific work. No course of action to accomplish this will seem attractive to men used to complete freedom of choice, for science—like other fruitful products of men's minds—has known its best fulfillment in the free atmosphere of peace. But today we face a possible struggle for survival and so our first concern as scientists must be to ask how we can serve this country, and to accept whatever plan seems to fulfill that purpose. I urge you to listen carefully to the suggestions I shall put forward, and to improve upon them. They are not original with me, but I am responsible for the form in which I present them.

PROPOSAL FOR A SCIENTIFIC SERVICE CORPS

I propose the establishment of a Scientific Service Corps directed by a Scientific Manpower Board and based on a national roster of scientists. These organizations would be concerned only with scientists who have completed their education, not with students. Nevertheless, two categories are concerned; men of military age, normally subject to call for military service, and older scientists. Both categories would be under the general supervision of the Scientific Manpower Board and both would be listed in the roster. At present, only the scientists of military age would be required to join the Scientific Service Corps, and only the members of this corps would be subject to orders from the Scientific Manpower Board. For older scientists the Board would act in an advisory capacity only.

This Scientific Service Corps would be a civilian organization without ranks or uniforms. I believe it would be most effective if it were guided by that curious mixture of cooperation and discipline that characterizes most civilian organizations in this country. The principal function of the Board in charge would be to get the right man in the right job and often this man's own judgment should carry great weight. The Scientific Manpower Board, although a civilian organization, would need to have real authority over the members of the Service Corps. It would need power to keep them out of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or to put them in. It should have power to return men from military to civilian service or vice versa, or to shift them from one project to another, or to return them to universities. But I hope that most of the orders issued by this Board would be merely formal endorsements of voluntary agreements. Cooperation will serve us better than force.

For scientists not in the Service Corps, the Scientific Manpower Board would act only in an advisory capacity. With information on the full scope of national defense research projects, it could be an invaluable guide for men who wanted to be sure they were making the best use of their abilities.

The Scientific Manpower Board should be responsible to the President, not to the Department of Defense. The quality, wisdom, and powers of this Board would be the key to the success or failure of the whole scheme. Their ideal should be guided cooperation with the scientists, not rigidly organized direction of them. The Board members and staff would require access to complete information on all technical and scientific phases of our military activities and of the supporting civilian economy. They would also have to know the scientific community—not just the names and numbers in a card file, but the men themselves. This suggests the need for rezional branches of the Board.

STUDENTS

Turning to the question of stockpiling, that is, the training of new scientists, we have quite a different problem. Various schemes have been proposed for the deferment of students. Most such schemes do not make it clear that we are aiming at a positive goal, not a negative one. We are not interested in helping individuals escape the duty of military service just because they are bright boys or happen to have played with chemistry sets as children. We are interested in developing a group of men, with trained minds and disciplined imaginations who can strengthen the country over the next 20 years. That some of them will be doing very nearly what they would choose to do in peacetime is irrelevant except insofar as it may make them more effective.

Can we not have something more positive than draft deferment for brilliant students of science, medicine, and engineering? The continuance of their education in such times as these, implies obligation, not privilege. I propose a student scientific corps with enrollment beginning in the freshman year and continuing through graduate training. The requirements of native intelligence and industry in such a student corps would be high and the requirements of sustained performance higher still. Students who did not keep up would be continually weeded out. Men of excellent technical competence but lacking in imagination and originality would be carried only through their undergraduate training and then released to the armed services or to industry. Others would be continued through graduate training. Some recruits should occasionally be added to the student corps from the services or industry or project research to receive more education.

Administration of this student science corps should be, it seems to me, decentralized as much as possible. Professors in the universities would be best fitted to take the responsibility of making judgments within the established criteria. No amount of statistical data, intelligence tests, or examinations can replace the intimate knowledge a university professor should have of his good students. The student science corps or training program or whatever it is called should perhaps be under the general jurisdiction of the National Science Foundation. Cooperation with the Scientific Manpower Board and with Selective Service would be essential but the problems are sufficiently great and sufficiently different to suggest separate authorities.

EFFECTS OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

Although the programs I have discussed are intended to meet both short-range and long-range requirements for scientific manpower and are not meant to be dependent on the present system of recruiting under the Selective Service Act, they may appear in conflict with other proposed systems of recruiting for the armed services. One such system is the plan to put all 18-year-old men into military service. It is estimated that if these men were kept in service for 2 years, the country would have a total of 3,000,000 men constantly under arms and would shortly build up a large trained reserve. Once their period of service was over, these men could feel confident that they could pursue their education and begin their professional careers without interruption unless large-scale war broke out.

The first effect of this proposal on the training of young scientists appears to be bad. All men now 18 would defer their education 2 years with a corresponding interruption in the supply of engineers and scientists 4 to 8 years later. To some degree these effects could be counteracted by acceleration or by special training of men still in service or by reduction of the length of service for obviously talented men. On the good side would be the smaller probability of interruption for men already started on their professional careers. In the long run, that is, the 10- or 20-year period I have been talking about, these effects would largely disappear, with one exception—the dozen or so students of really outstanding brilliance who appear each year—and there are seldom more—might be lost to science or have their early and most productive years spoiled.

There is another danger. The young men who had been in service might be kept in some sort of reserve; in fact, they should be, or much of the point of their military service would be lost. However, they constitute a whole generation of manpower, the manpower that is needed for the innumerable civilian activities as essential to success in total war as the Army or Navy or Air Force. It would be wise to put the control of this reserve manpower in civilian hands at the highest level.

As to the use of mature scientific manpower, this 18–20 service proposal seems to have only secondary effects. It might relieve the pressure for direct military service on some of the younger scientists. In the long run, it might help stabilize the universities. It does not remove the need of a scientific Manpower Board, a Scientific Service Corps, or a student corps. While I believe the Scientific Manpower Board should be vested with great authority from the first, the proposed military service for 18-year olds might lessen the danger of too hasty and too arbitrary exercise of that authority.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

I have tried to put before you the problems of stockpiling scientific manpower and rationing it, in the best interest of the country, just as we would any other essential resource. I have proposed for this purpose a student scientific corps to insure a continuing supply of scientists. For men of military age, I have proposed a Scientific Service Corps to be directed by a scientific manpower board. For men above the age of military service, I have suggested widespread voluntary cooperation with the Scientific Manpower Board.

These may not be the best solutions to this problem, but they are possible ones. Any system to be established must obviously be flexible and subject to change with experience and with changing international conditions. Either the organization I have suggested, or a better one, should be set up now before we repeat the errors of the last war.

I believe there is real danger that nothing will be done or that a system will be set up and will fail. Scientists can best understand the nature of this danger. They know very well that a thoughtless bureaucracy with centralized control can threaten the independence, imagination, and clarity of mind needed for creative work. Scientists know also that a haphazard system of recruitment can lessen their value to the country. I suggest that the members of this audience and their associates throughout the country have a peculiar duty to work for the adoption of a sensible system for the wise use of scientific manpower, to talk to their friends of the need for such a system, and to make such a system work. You know what needs to be done. Give the foresight and leadership to achieve it.

Such questions as these cannot be left entirely to the Government. They are everybody's business. What John Curran said in 1790 is still true:

"It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

The Fair Deal, 1951 Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to cause to be reprinted in the RECORD an editorial from the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier which analyzes what was purported to be a state of the Union message delivered by President Truman a few days ago.

Without detracting in the slightest from the excellence of this editorial, I would like to amplify with respect to one sentence.

The writer says:

It seems that from now on every Fair Deal spending scheme will be disguised as a vital expenditure in the defense effort.

I would like to point out that in the last 2 years, whenever objection was raised to any free-spending measure, administration mouthpieces raised the hue and cry that it was necessary because of crisis, emergency, security, or defense effort. Those who have been doing their best to spend this country into bankruptcy and oblivion can well be expected to continue using their specious arguments in the Eighty-second Congress.

Following is the editorial:

President Truman trotted out his 1951 version of the Fair Deal before Congress, dressing it this time in a uniform and carrying a placard which read: "Let us have unity."

The President's task in this period is, indeed, difficult. It is easier to rally a people to fight a war than to cajole them into the sacrifices necessary for full-scale defense to prevent a conflict.

But the President did not give answers to some of the questions the American people are asking and his answers to others were so vague as to be meaningless.

He declared, for instance, that American troops are fighting in Korea because aggression in that country "is part of the attempt of the Russian communistic leadership to take over the world, step by step." Yet, if we are not proposing to drive the Communists from Korea, what is the use of fighting the present costly delaying action? Does defeat after defeat, withdrawal after withdrawal, salvage our pride and prestige more than a complete evacuation? The President gave no satisfactory answer to that.

Discussing the charge that Western Europe is not showing sufficient determination in planning its own defense, the President declared: "Their actions are answering this question." Are they? How many divisions does France have now compared to those she had in 1914 or 1939? "Our North Atlantic Treaty partners, together, are building armies bigger than our own," Truman declared. They should build armies much larger, since they have the manpower and the resources. They, moreover, are the ones directly endangered by the threat of Soviet aggression.

And in his 10-point legislative program the President spoke in such broad generalities that no one can know what he means. He wants "improvement of our agricultural laws." Does that mean he will again seek

enactment of the Brannan plan? He wants "improvement of our labor laws." Does he mean repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?

He wants "aid to the States to meet the most urgent needs of our elementary and secondary schools." Yet he asks for a major increase in taxes "to meet the cost of the defense effort." It seems that from now on every Fair Deal spending scheme will be disguised as a vital expenditure in the defense effort.

And the President failed to put the present arms program on a plane that is understandable to the public. "We are preparing for full wartime mobilization, if that should be necessary," he declared. But he added: "We are continuing to build a strong and growing economy, able to maintain whatever effort may be required for as long as necessary." That is hardly a concise expression of goals to set before the public in a state of the Union message.

The address will not aid the public or Congress to understand what kind of mobilization is being planned, nor will it win any converts to unpopular features of the administration's domestic and foreign policy.

National Referendum on National Defense and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a resolution presented by Alderman Milton Lundstrom, and adopted by a vote of 17 to 3 by the city council of Rockford, Ill.

This resolution deserves consideration by the Congress, and within a few days I expect to introduce a bill providing for this referendum. The resolution follows:

Whereas the world crisis becomes more acute daily, and it does not appear to have developed the unity within our Nation necessary for our defense; and

Whereas the present United States policy has become a matter of widespread division of public opinion; and

Whereas our representatives in Washington wish to know our desires and many citizens are looking for an opportunity to express themselves on the foreign policy; Therefore be it

Resolved, To secure the fullest expression of the people's wishes in this controversial matter, the city council of the city of Rockford urges and requests that Congress respond to the public will and initiate and submit at once to the people of the United States an opportunity, through a national referendum, to register their opinion on these two vital questions:

1. Shall the United States immediately adopt a policy to defend itself and its possessions and give limited assistance to free nations?

2. Shall the United States continue to follow its present world-wide foreign policy and lend unlimited assistance to free nations? Be it further

Resolved, That in case Congress does not act, within the next 30 days, to initiate this request for an early submission of this vital question to a national referendum, then the city council of the city of Rockford shall submit the same to the voters of Rockford, and the city council urges all other cities to initiate similar action so that the will of the people may be registered.

Resentment Against Unfair Tax Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I have received so many letters during the past 2 weeks from citizens representing all walks of life, protesting vigorously against tax discriminations, that I think this matter should be brought to the attention of the public. The following letter is a letter from one of my constituents, which I believe is deserving of serious consideration by the Representatives of the people in Congress. In this instance, as in the many other letters I have received, the people are complaining bitterly of the laws which Congress has from time to time passed, favoring the cooperatives and other organizations in the matter of tax liabilities.

It is quite generally contended that it is extremely unfair for a tax-paying private enterprise to be taxed to provide a loan, a subsidy, or the capital structure for a nontaxable, or a tax-favored competitor which may ultimately destroy or put out of business the tax-paying free enterprise which provided the money with which the tax-favored institution began business.

Resentment against unfair tax discrimination makes people furious. It causes them to want to revolt. After all, it is considered by so many as a method of taxation without representation, as we sometimes say. Tax discrimination seldom, if ever, can be justified, as between citizens, or groups of citizens within a given jurisdiction.

The following is a very interesting letter of the type I have been receiving from many of my constituents, and which, I think, will be read with much interest by those who are making a study of this subject:

The Congress has recently passed bills which substantially increase taxes upon corporations and some other forms of business organizations. It has passed an excess-profits-tax bill, designed both to increase revenue and to pacify those who desire increased inflation.

The Congress likewise has passed appropriations bills providing for expenditures of huge amounts of money—for defense, for foreign aid, for many other purposes, some sound, some unsound, some purely pork-barrel.

Income-tax rates for individuals were increased October 1, 1950. Still more money will be needed, meaning that individuals must be taxed and taxed far beyond present rates. Our Government must have more and more money, if for no other reason than to defend this Nation.

Now, since I and my neighbors, my employer and my fellow employees must be taxed in this outrageous fashion, what excuse is there for allowing some types of profit-making businesses to escape their fair share of taxes? Why should the cooperatives, many of which are big business, be permitted unfair tax advantages? Why should they be permitted to accumulate tax-free funds into huge surpluses with which to destroy the competition or even the existence of tax-paying enterprises?

Why should mutual savings banks; building, savings and loan associations; credit unions; and other forms of cooperatives enjoy freedom or relative freedom from taxes which other businesses and individuals must pay to protect the Nation which protects these cooperatives? Isn't this their country, too?

There is not and never was either reason or excuse for the tax advantages, tax freedom, of these purely profit-making enterprises. They do not distribute their so-called savings, nor are they required to pay taxes upon their incomes.

Already thousands upon thousands of young men are being called upon to give up their careers, their futures, or their very lives to defend this country. All citizens are being called to their duties of citizenship in this time of emergency and to pay a greater and greater share of the extraordinary and normal costs of government. Pressure already is being applied to the citizenry in the sale of United States Savings bonds—again the cry of patriotism is being raised to encourage people to buy these bonds whose value has been and will continue to be destroyed by a corrupt and financially illiterate administration. The old shell game come-on is being sounded again.

No one who desires this country to survive will oppose or attempt to evade a heavy tax burden for defense; he will not object to buying Defense bonds whose value he knows will decrease; he will not object to any sacrifices necessary to the preservation of America. But a great many of us do object to an unfair tax structure which permits co-ops and their ilk to escape the burdens we must bear. Must we all pay an unjustifiable high tax in order that these Socialist contrivances may continue to grab increasingly large tax-free profits?

My sore back is awfully tired of carrying a part of the load for these legally protected tax slackers, and I'd like to know what you propose to do about it. Are you going to try to put these leeches on the tax rolls or are you willing to let hundreds of millions of what should be tax dollars continue to escape collection?

Surely, if it is right and just for me and my employer to be taxed for that swindle known as social security, it is also right and proper to tax the co-ops for their share of Government expense like anyone else; or, if there no longer is any such thing as equality under the law, including the tax laws, what are we getting ready to defend? If there is to be one class which supports the Government and another which legally escapes that obligation, there is no point in fighting communism because we already are its victims.

Put all the legitimate burdens you want upon me, so long as they are my fair share, but since these burdens are congressional measures "for the common defense," as the Constitution provides, then, for goodness sake, make the burdens common to all those who are being defended, and that should include the cooperative enterprises which are engaged in business.

Yours sincerely,

(Name of constituent.)

P. S.—When mandatory price controls are put into effect again, do you believe the co-ops should again be made exempt from such controls as they were during World War II? Remember, when OPA controlled prices of every other form of business, the co-ops were legally free to pay or charge any price they desired or could get, and in numerous cases they monopolized sources of supply by paying more than OPA ceilings—payments made possible by tax-free profits. Will you be for or against such exemptions in any new price-control set-up?

Communicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was written by Mr. Albert J. Bates, of 523 North Locust Street, Hazleton, Pa., and appeared in the Hazleton Plain Speaker on Wednesday afternoon, January 3, 1951:

COMMUNICATED

EDITOR, THE PLAIN SPEAKER:

The recent address of former President Herbert Hoover in which he advocated making an American Gibraltar of this hemisphere has proven highly popular with a large segment of our population. After the First World War, as everyone will remember, this country extended so-called loans to Europe, notably France and England, which have never been repaid. And for this outpouring of American gold, all at the American taxpayers' expense, we were subsequently alluded to in many European quarters as being not Uncle Sam, but Uncle Shylock, for the reason that we had the temerity to suggest that just possibly these loans ought to be repaid.

It is no great wonder therefore that Mr. Hoover, and a large body of American thought should hold the view that we should send not one more dollar and not one more American soldier to Europe until that continent has demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt a will to both fight its own battles, and pay its own bills. Wealthy Nation though we are, there is most certainly a limit to the amount of money, in billions, we can throw down into the bottomless pit of European aid. Otherwise, we face national bankruptcy eventually.

However, in suggesting this old form of American isolation, in new dress, Mr. Hoover and those who think with him base their argument on the basic concept or premise that this country with a mighty navy and an expanded and equally mighty air force can indefinitely defend itself against communism on this continent. If this be true, then we have been a Nation of Simple Simons to have expended all that we have to date on the Marshall plan to aid and rehabilitate Europe. If this conception of Mr. Hoover's be true, we should pull out of Germany and Europe tomorrow, and out of Korea the day before tomorrow, wash our hands of Europe, wash our hands of Asia, and stay home, arming to the teeth.

Mr. Hoover's picture is attractively painted, but if his basic premise be true we have already fought two world wars foolishly and needlessly. For both those wars, World War I and World War II—as everyone ought to remember—were fought not to save any European nation, or group of nations. They were not fought to save western culture and civilization. They were fought solely to save our own skins, to keep them from coming over here. Them—in World War I, and World War II—were the Germans, and World War II of course the Germans and Japanese. Or, worded differently, we fought two world wars to prevent the forces of aggression from overwhelming Europe, and subsequently overwhelming us.

In both world wars this country remained on the sidelines, saying it was not our war until it appeared that the forces of aggression were going to overwhelm the rest of the civilized world. Then, fright and necessity forced us to take a part, not to save any one country, or group of countries, but to save our own skins—just that, no more and no less. This our responsible Government officials and every man in Congress knew. This we as a people knew, or at least all our more intelligent people.

We knew that if any dictatorial and aggressive government completely controlled the European land mass—Europe—that its military power would become so great that it could easily, in time, overwhelm this country, conquer this country, and reduce us to vassalage, to the role of a conquered people. Thus we entered reluctantly into two World Wars to save our liberties and our own skins. We did not enter for any noble and altruistic reasons such as saving anyone else. It was solely to save our own skins and preserve our liberties. Other results of our participation were incidental.

Every military man of any competence, from 1914 to 1951, has frankly admitted that this country could be conquered by any government or power, which had full control of Europe, and its vast steel mills and armament making and shipbuilding potential.

If this was true in 1914—and it was—and in 1941—and it was, it is much more true today. Russia in full control of the Ruhr valley, all the mills and factories of France, and in full control of English shipyards, could build an army so large, an air fleet so vast, a sea armada so huge, that she could conquer us easily. This is a fact beyond dispute, and it was the reason why we fought World War I and World War II. To prevent Germany from doing it.

When now Mr. Hoover presents his attractive picture of retiring to this hemisphere in a military sense, he is flying in the face of military fact. He is stating that this country can do something which no competent military man believes it can do—defend itself against a Russian controlled conquered world. He is advocating another Munich, to achieve peace in his time. If the course he advocates were pursued, it would be but a matter of time until we become a conquered people, taking our orders from Uncle Joe Stalin. Our liberties lost. Our way of life lost. Our high standard of living lost. All that we hold dear in life—lost.

One thing few of us question. No price is too high to pay for our liberty. The price will be high. The way will be long. Our present standard of living may be reduced 50 percent. It may take 50 years to restore the country to its present living standard. But if our liberty is lost—all is lost. Let us never forget that salient fact. If our liberty is lost—all is lost.

It is highly unlikely that we have the financial resources or manpower to defend both Europe and Asia. But we do not need Asia. It is not industrialized. It is backward and primitive. There are no or few vast armament factories which can be turned against us, if in Russian hands. But Europe is different. The steel-making potential of Europe, Russia, Germany, and France is greater than our own. Every military man in the Pentagon knows if we lose all of Europe we are three-fourths conquered, before a shot is fired at our shores. If this is not true, why did we fight World Wars I and II?

Europe must be held at all cost. Competent American military men would like to see a million Americans in Europe very much. But we have no million, not in arms, not in training. So we can but hope, and if wise, pray that we can get them there in time. In time to hold, until we can bear down upon our enemy with our full armed might and mobilized industrial potential. Before our enemy seizes the industrial potential and manpower of Europe and turns them against us.

And if we can but get them there, in time, our enemy may think twice about plunging the world into a war, the outcome of which is doubtful. But if we retire to our own unsafe shores our eventual destruction is unavoidable. If we can but get them there in time there may never be a third world war.

No one likes mobilization, controls, shortages, war. But if our liberty is lost all is lost. It was not bought cheaply, or kept cheaply. It was bought and kept with blood. Now, God willing, we can preserve our liberty by merely being prepared, by arming, by mobilizing—in time. And if we do so, perhaps this time we shall not have to pay a fearful price in blood to keep our liberty. Only one thing matters now, if we are to hold off this ghastly prospect of a third world war—speed, speed, and more speed. There is yet a way to peace, speed in rearming. But it is not Mr. Hoover's way, which is the way of our eventual destruction as a people.

Yours very truly,

ALBERT J. BATES.

Hon. Mary T. Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the accompanying statement is a splendid and proper editorial appearing in the Boston Post of January 3, 1951, entitled "She Served Well," relating to the outstanding service in this body of our friend, Mary T. Norton. We who served with Mary Norton will all agree with this editorial and more, and particularly with the last sentence of the same, "Her quiet, vibrant presence will be missed on the floor of Congress."

SHE SERVED WELL

For the first time in 26 years the name of Mary T. Norton will not be on the list from which the Clerk will call the roll in Congress as it meets for its eighty-second session today. At 78, the Congresswoman from New Jersey has well earned the retirement she decided upon last year when she announced her intention to withdraw from the field of active politics. Back in 1924 when she became the first Democratic woman to win a seat in Congress, there were those who looked with askance at her candidacy. They were the men and women who believed they had reason to question the wisdom of selecting a woman to carry on such duties.

The confidence she evoked from the start was reflected in 13 successive elections which saw her returned to the same seat. To her must go a lion's share of the credit for the passage of the controversial wage and hours legislation of 1937. Her quiet, vibrant presence will be missed on the floor of Congress.

Do People Know the Facts of Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Dowagiac Daily News, of January 8, comes an editorial written by Harry Whiteley, which accurately represents to a great degree the thinking of the thoughtful people of southwest Michigan.

Permit me to read that editorial:

CONFUSION IN FOREIGN POLICY

In the old days we used to call them jingoists, those folks who were forever wearing a chip on their shoulders and daring the world to fight us or egging our leaders to take on a war of their own. Today they are either isolationists or internationalists. There seems to be no middle path.

The internationalists or some of their extremists think we have to send our young men to war to save the downtrodden of the world. None of these people will do any fighting themselves. The isolationists think we can withdraw behind our own iron curtain and lead a monastic life safe and secure. They are equally wrong.

We are in the world, of the world, and have certain responsibilities, but these responsibilities do not go so far as to lead us to disburse our resources beyond a reasonable point or to assume responsibilities for others beyond our certain ability to carry them out.

It is a fine philosophy to think we are so big we can take on all the troubles of the universe but it is not a practical one. Certainly we can and should lead the way but we do not need to go to the extent the administration seems to desire, to the point where we involve ourselves in the internal alliances, trouble, and problems of each of the individual nations with whom we are associated nor do we have to accept their philosophies and follow their leadership beyond our depth.

That is what we have been doing and that is what we want to check. We think that is what Mr. Hoover and others have been talking about and we think that is what most of us believe. There is a definite fear that the administration is beyond its depth in internationalism and that gives rise to an equally spurious nationalism that calls for restricted measures. Between these extremes we are in great confusion of mind and proponents of each side are beclouding the issue with their oratory.

We have a civilian defense program financed to the tune of $3,000,000,000 and now Congress is working on a defense housing bill which is estimated could run to $3,000,000,000 more. What other crimes will be committed in the name of defense we would not know but the Treasury certainly will be well tapped.

Great Britain's Government is proceeding steadily toward the recognition of the Chinese Reds by all her Commonwealth members. Then would follow their acceptance by the United Nations. In spite of Chinese participation in the Korean War and its well-publicised aggression Britain proposes to throw this menace into the face of the United States while we are sending our young men to their death to save the world from communism. At the same time we are proposing a resolution before the UN to declare the Chinese as aggressors and apply the sanctions which exist in the constitution of that organization for just such case. British appeasement of Hitler in the last war evidently has made no impression on her present socialistic government. If she proceeds in this line, there is no recourse left the United States except to get out of the UN and withdraw from further expenditures of men and money to save Europe from the Reds.

Mr. Speaker, the editor might well have added, as another reason for getting out of the United Nations, the fact that, when the British succeed in having the Chinese Communists admitted to membership in the United Nations, that body will desist from being a forum for discussion, but will become a powerful minority which will continue to make world peace unattainable.

Why submit our destiny to an organization where there are those who are seeking to destroy us; where they can either learn of, or have a part in, making our foreign policy?

Isolation in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech prepared by Louis R. Columbo, a law student of Hazleton, Pa.:

ISOLATION IN THE FAR EAST

Once upon a time there was a cunning bear who spotted a honeycomb high on the limb of a tree. In reaching for the honeycomb, he found that he was some distance away, so he immediately began searching for something to stand on to enable him to reach it.

He first spotted an orange crate (Manchuria). Finding this not enough, he came across a barrel (China). Again he tried to reach that luscious morsel and again he found that he was still short of the mark. Disgustingly, he went in search of a means to achieve his goal and this time he had to be satisfied with a peach basket (Korea). Not finding any other isolated means by which he could reach his goal, this bear now has to revert to brute force.

He steals the prized box of firecrackers (Formosa) from Chiang Kai-shek. His next theft is MacArthur's footstool (Japan) upon which he places a coil of Manila hemp (Philippines). Now he is ready to make his final attempt to take into his possession the honeycomb (United States).

If this structure does not topple before the bear makes his final attempt to gain possession of the honeycomb, then the sting of the bees must be strong enough to withstand this clawing attempt or else.

What I have just stated in this tale is part fact and part speculation. If we are to follow some form of isolationism, there is no doubt in my mind that what I have speculated will come true.

It is my firm conviction that our policy should be anything but that of isolationism. If we are to prevent ourselves from being forced to form our first line of defense in California, and therefore, in all likelihood, have to fight for our survival on our own territory, we must arm Japan and send aid to Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa. We must also fortify the Philippines as well as Australia to the extent whereby we will have a strong defense line extending from Australia in the extreme south to Alaska in the extreme north. In this manner we will have a chance to stem the tide of the yellow hordes and the communism which they are trying to force upon us.

Munich-Minded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Washington Star of January 15, 1951, entitled "Munich-Minded":

MUNICH-MINDED

The latest proposal from the United Nations Truce Committee, which has been approved by our own Government, looks very much like a betrayal of the principles for which so much American blood has been shed in Korea.

The new plan is in five stages. These call for:

1. Arrangment of a cease-fire, with safeguards against its use as a screen to cover preparation for new aggression.

2. If and when a cease-fire occurs, consideration should be given to further steps toward restoring peace.

3. To permit the carrying out of the General Assembly resolution that Korea should be "a unified, independent, democratic, sovereign state with a constitution and a government based on free popular elections," all non-Korean armed forces will be withdrawn by "appropriate stages." Arrangements should be made in accordance with United Nations principles for the Korean people to choose their own government.

4. An interim administration should be set up.

5. As soon as agreement is reached on a cease fire, the Assembly should set up a committee consisting of representatives of Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China to try to achieve settlement, in conformity with existing international obligations and the UN Charter, of far-eastern problems, specifically Formosa and the the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

That is the smiling face of this truce proposal. But we should consider what lies beneath the surface.

Under the vague wording of this proposal all that would be needed to bring point 5 into operation is a cease-fire. What we are saying here to the Chinese is that if they will stop fighting we will sit down with them, the Russians, and the British and try to settle the questions of Formosa and their admission to the UN. And, having said that much, does anyone believe for a moment that we would not be obliged to agree to let the Chinese have Formosa and to admit them to the UN? We have said, bravely, that we would never enter into any settlement of the Korean question which rewards aggression. But if this proposal is not in contemplation a reward for aggression, what in the world is it?

At this point, one should turn back to article 3 of this proposal. Is its reference to a unified, independent, democratic Korea merely an expression of a pious hope which the authors know will never be fulfilled? If not, why the vague language? What is meant by the withdrawal of non-Korean forces by "appropriate stages"? Why is not the setting up of this independent Korea, with its free elections, made a condition precedent to any discussions under article 5? If the Koreans are not to be sold down the river, as were the Czechoslovakians at Munich, why does this proposal not lay down conditions to safeguard their independence in clear and unmistakable terms?

The answer, one may fear, is all too obvious. The Communists, first the North Koreans and then the Chinese, with Russia always in the background, launched this aggression to enslave all of Korea, not to set up there a free, independent, and democratic country. They have, by force of arms, virtually attained that objective. Who thinks they are going to turn back now? Who would have the slightest faith in discussions with them, looking to that end? The Chinese, of course, might agree to a cease-fire, if, as a starter, they are going to get Formosa and a ticket of admission to the UN. If these things are to come first, and if a decent political settlement in Korea is to be pushed back into the indefinite future, the effect would be to give the Communists precisely what they want. They might very well agree to that. But if the United States and the United Nations agree to it, they will have betrayed every moral principle on the basis of which our young men were sent out to Korea to fight and die.

It is clear enough that Korea, so far as the original UN objective is concerned, is a lost cause. Perhaps we have no alternative but to get out of Korea. But it is one thing to battle for a principle and suffer defeat; quite a different thing to compound defeat with self-stultification.

Great causes are not sustained by weak knees. Munich-minded men have never been able to achieve a decent peace. If any substantial number of the UN members are so intimidated by the Chinese Communists that, instead of being willing to indict them for the aggressors that they are, they are resigned to a shabby deal in Korea, that is their affair. But this country, in the Star's judgment, should have nothing to do with it.

Samuel Gompers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last October, John F. Henning, director of research, California State Federation of Labor, A. F. of L., paid a tribute to the late Samuel Gompers at the California State Federation of Labor convention, then being held in Santa Barbara.

I know John F. Henning to be a sincere, able man of great capabilities.

He is devoting his energies, as did Samuel Gompers, whom he eulogizes, to the fight to assure to all who work the right to a full life in the great American tradition.

Mr. Henning's speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, brothers and sisters of the American Federation of Labor, I am honored this afternoon to speak in tribute to Samuel Gompers, the centennial of whose birth we celebrate in the year of 1950.

Just 100 years ago this past January, the founder of the American Federation of Labor was born in an impoverished, congested neighborhood on the east side of London.

He was of a family of nine children, a family which knew well the heavy, depressing hand of economic exploitation. His father toiled for survival at the cigar-making trade amid the foul, wretched working conditions which identified the industrial life of nineteenth century England.

At the age of 10 years, and in the manner of the times, the young boy who was destined to become the very symbol of organized labor in the United States, took to what was then the dismal, discouraging work of his father. He entered the cigar-making shops of London.

Samuel Gompers never forgot the lessons of labor learned in those early days; no matter how great his later stature, he never forgot the people from whom he came. He never forgot the hungry men and women of his childhood. He never forgot the desperate workers nailed to the wall of poverty by those in ruthless pursuit of commercial gain.

In the year 1863, at the age of 13, young Samuel sailed with his family for what they hoped would prove the free, inspiring air of the new Republic. They sailed for the United States and the tenements of Manhattan.

Samuel Gompers soon learned, however, that the plight of the worker on the east side of New York was little better than the plight of the worker on the east side of London, and so from the day in 1864 when he joined the Cigar Makers Union, Local 15, in New York City, until the day he died in 1924 a man of national prominence and world renown, he dedicated his industry, his talents, and his life to the betterment of the working people of the United States.

Gompers was trained in a significant and challenging school of labor. In the sixties, the seventies, and the eighties of the last century New York was the preferred sanctuary of the political, social, and economic exiles who fled the Old World for the safety of America.

Thus the young Gompers came into daily contact with the disciples of almost every economic system known to the mind of man. He evaluated the various theories that were being espoused with crusading vigor in the New York labor movement, measured them in the light of his daily working experience, and then formed his own concepts—concepts which were to become the foundation stones of the American Federation of Labor.

Gompers developed in the labor world during an era of terrible test and trial. The employer powers of that phase of the nineteenth century enjoyed an almost unqualified advantage over the frail, disjointed movement of the day. With the advent of corporate wealth, capital, organized on national lines, was able to smash with ease and efficiency, the local, isolated efforts of labor.

And so Samuel Gompers, with the other wise leaders of his generation, advocated a national labor organization.

Gompers was familiar with the experience of the national labor idea. He knew that the first attempt had been made in 1534 with the organization of the National Trades' Union, an attempt which had proved abortive. He also knew of the first serious effort to found a national movement, an effort that had begun in 1869 with the coming of the Knights of Labor.

Now Gompers knew the intimate story of the Knights of Labor, for to him it was a living experience. He saw their errors and vowed that he would never walk their way.

The Knights of Labor provided a noble contribution in principle, in devotion, and in sacrifice to American labor. But Gompers, who had been trained in the grim labor school of New York City, knew that the Knights of Labor fell because they were poorly led. He knew that the Knights of Labor fell because they were led by men who had no practical philosophy of labor, by men who fought on every front and secured none.

The Knights of Labor were led by men who, at one and the same time, sought to establish industrial unionism on a national basis, reform the currency system of the Nation, impose an unwieldy, incoherent system of national political action, institute a series of land reforms in the West, and, finally, to found and manage an industrial cooperative society.

And mind you, during all of this, the Knights of Labor were engaged in a death battle with some of the most brazen bandits of our American industrial history. They were locked in mortal struggle, for example, with Jay Gould, the railroad financier, whose Pinkerton thugs, legalized gunmen, were terrorizing every railroad union in the land.

Essentially, then, the Knights of Labor fell because they were led by men who had ambitions beyond their capacity for action, and thus, when involved in those strike efforts which are often essential to the existence of the movement, they collapsed through sheer loss of wasted strength.

Samuel Gompers in his day saw the decline and fall of the Knights of Labor; he saw the ruins of the dreamer and the dreamers, and again—he was determined to avoid their failings.

Gompers appreciated with the leaders of the Knights of Labor that the destiny of the labor movement runs beyond the limits of collective bargaining, but he insisted that the movement of the nineteenth century must first achieve its fundamentals—wages, hours, and conditions of work.

He argued that the primary obligation of union labor was to place sufficient bread and butter on the tables of the working people of the Nation.

And now in our own time, because Gompers emphasized the essentials, some of the pseudo liberals have had the temerity to brand him a reactionary. Samuel Gompers was never that, for Samuel Gompers never sought to turn back the clock of history.

However, Gompers was first, last, and always a realist. Samuel Gompers pronounced that the labor movement of his day must learn to walk before it could hope to run; hence, the American Federation of Labor concept of first things first.

It is imperative, of course, that we remember in our present era that Gompers did look beyond the limits of collective bargaining. It was Samuel Gompers who gave to organized labor the command that in the political theater it must reward its friends and punish its enemies. Surely it is mockery to quote that pronouncement if labor is not organized for efficient political effort.

Looking beyond the zone of collective bargaining, Gompers desired a society in which, insofar as is humanly possible, every American would be well clothed, well housed, well fed, well trained, and well cared for, whenever in legitimate need.

Within the past 18 years of our national history, through the aid of a liberal political administration which has recognized and encouraged the respect of the rights of the working people of this Nation, labor has so extended its base of economic security that it is free at last to achieve that destiny which Gompers saw always on the horizon of the future. And so today we seek the full life for America.

If we would be worthy of our history, it is essential for us to remember that we must pursue that abundant life in the spirit of Samuel Gompers and the founding fathers of 1881.

Whatever stature, whatever position, we have today, we owe to the struggles of yesterday. In our march up the mountain,

social, and political fronts, we are obliged to remember the sacrifices of the American Federation of Labor men and women who, from 1881 until our time, struck and bled and died for the working people of this land.

We are the heirs of a superb tradition. We are the heirs of the American Federation of Labor workers of 1892 who fought the bloody battle of Homestead, Pa., against the tyranny of Carnegie Steel. We are the heirs of the A. F. of L. Danbury Hatters, who by their persistence and by their valor exposed the corruption of the company court.

We are the heirs of those of the breed of Andrew Furuseth, who, through his sailors, sent the call of liberty out to all the water fronts of the world.

We had great fathers in the labor movement. We must never forget them. We must never forget those American Federation of Labor workers who met in shacks, and shanties, and hovels and who there planned, and plotted, and schemed for the welfare and security of every man and women in this auditorium.

They faced overwhelming odds. They were hounded, outlawed, and persecuted. They looked across the barricades of industrial dispute in that nineteenth century and saw alined against them the power of organized wealth, a prostitute press, and a controlled government.

They looked at the odds of a thousand to one and they said: "To hell with the odds, and to hell with their wealth, and their press, and their political hacks. We have riches no money can buy. We have the sacrifice of our kind. We have our union, and the union makes us strong."

And so they maintained that inspiring struggle, the fruits of which we know and enjoy today. They built a movement which survived the criminal assults of nineteenth century capitalism and which has become in our day the largest free labor organization the world has ever known.

Surely it would ill become us ever to forget Samuel Gompers and the men who founded that movement with their heart, their brain, and their blood.

We stand today arrayed against great opposition, against organised wealth and commercial power. However, we are no longer frail. We stand today before the Nation 8,000,000 strong.

But however strong we are, or however strong we may become, God forbid that we should ever forget Samuel Gompers and the hungry, hunted men who built the American Federation of Labor.

Remember always, brothers and sisters, that if we keep faith with them, then, whatever the tide of battle, the last victory must and shall be ours.

The American Legion Has a Job To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the State commander of the American Legion of South Carolina, Mr. O. D. Freeman, of Loris, S. C., on Monday night, January 8, 1951, at Loris, S. C. The speech is entitled "The American Legion Has a Job To Do."

This speech bears upon one of the problems we are facing in the United States and, in my opinion, it would be worth the time of all of us to read every word of it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION HAS A JOB TO DO

We veterans who have fought in two wars, and especially those of us of World War I who recall the founding of the American Legion in Paris, France, in 1918, know that the American Legion was founded as a service organization. The first part of our preamble states that "For God and Country we associate ourselves together to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America, to maintain law and order, and to foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism." Although we veterans have fought and won two wars in the past 32 years, yet he have not lived up to our ideal of service, for we have failed to win the peace. The result is that the youth of America is engaged in another struggle in Korea and are being killed by the thousands and are being wounded and mangled for life. Although we are told by our Government officials that we are not at war with Russia or Red China, still our boys are being killed by the Chinese Communists.

We of the American Legion who have fought in two wars and know the hardships would like to point out to our policy makers that it is high time the American people woke up to the realization that the spread of communism throughout the world is bleeding America and weakening our resources, both material and manpower. V. I. Lenin, founder of the communistic government in Russia in 1917, at that time declared "the historical mission of the Soviets to be the gravediggers, the heirs, and the successors" to the governments of the world. Mr. Lenin further stated, and I quote from page 172, volume 10, of the Selective Work of Lenin, "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia. Then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack it. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands. Let us prove to the bourgeoisie there is not, nor can there be, a sphere or field of work that cannot be won by Communists"—end of quotation. We know our Government is under attack; the enemy is communism. We cannot sit idly by and let communism win. Therefore, we urge all our Representatives and Senators in Congress to act and act now. We are tired of the pussyfooting and dilly-dallying of our policy makers and we believe it is time to call Russia's hand.

Look at Russia's record. They have broken all their promises to the allied nations; to be exact, they have broken 69 treaties and have cast 47 vetoes in the United Nations. From 1939 to 1941, while Germany and Russia were on the same side in the European war, Communists sabotaged our arms factories and spied on our Government for Hitler as well as for Stalin. But when Germany attacked Russia they wrapped themselves with the American flag overnight and immediately demanded that we go to war for Russia's sake. Since that time when we took Russia in as one of the allied nations, America has supported Russia to the tune of $11,000,000,000. But let's take a look at the conquered nations across Europe and Asia. We see that the Communists rule more people than any other system of government on the earth—more people than any government has ever ruled in the history of the world. In fact, Mr. Stalin today dominates more people than the Allies liberated in World War II. Yet we allow Russia to be a member of the United Nations where they continue to block every effort for peace presented by the allied nations. And we people of America sit idly by and let our international policy makers tell us that peace is possible and that we are closer to peace than at any time during the conflict.

We of the American Legion fully realize and believe that we cannot make peace with such an aggressor; yet we are a peace-loving Nation and we pray that with the help of God an everlasting peace may come to the world. We do not want war, but knowing that every effort that has been made has failed, we now ask that our policy makers call the hand of Mr. Stalin and we further plead to our Senators and Representatives that the universal military training bill, which the American Legion has advocated and recommended for the past 30 years, be passed immediately and that America be rearmed to full wartime strength on the ground, in the air, and at sea. Our only hope to bring peace to the world is through strength. We have the resources and the manpower, but we must mobilize them immediately to stop the onrush of communism which is threatening our very survival. Instead of manufacturing materials so vitally needed for war, our factories are turning out their greatest quantities of civilian products, such as automobiles—in the past year the production of cars and trucks exceeded 1949's all-time record of 6,500,000 cars and trucks by 1,500,000. Automobiles and trucks were being turned out at the rate of 15 a minute when there are many of our American boys who lay in hospitals this very minute and who would thank God if they had two legs to walk on. On the other hand everything has gone up, including the wages of the industrial worker. Food prices have increased 9½ percent since the start of the Korean police action. Everybody seems to be confused, even the manufacturers and businessmen who went to Washington to try to find out what war goods they could make; they received the answer, "Wait until you hear from us." It seems that our policy makers are more confused than anyone else and do not know what steps to take. What are we going to do about the situation? We in the American Legion are getting tired of double talk and dilly-dallying and we ask for action for the survival of the American people. Unless our international policy makers can work and act in favor of the American way of life, for which our forefathers fought and died, then we ask that they be removed and be replaced by ones who can work and act for Americanism and the survival of the American way of life.

We of the American Legion are willing and ready to answer the call on the home front and on the battleground to stop this dreadful disease—communism—which is penetrating the heart of America.

The Third American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include therein an editorial from the Stuart News, of Stuart, Fla., on January 4, 1951, which is published in my congressional district.

The publisher of this paper is Mr. Edwin A. Menninger and the editor is Mr. Ernest F. Lyons. Mr. Lyons was awarded the Florida Press Association's "Oscar" for the best editorial in Florida in 1950 and I am glad to insert the editorial, The Third American, as further evidence and recognition of Mr. Lyon's outstanding ability as an editorial writer.

The following editorial entitled "The Third American" convinces one that as nations go we have only begun to live. In these dangerous and troublesome times some consolation can be gleaned from this editorial:

THE THIRD AMERICAN

Today a child was born. As you read this, he is beating his fists on his bed and squalling to high heaven. He is the third American.

He was born in a dark time, a time of crisis for his Nation, this America that he will learn to love, be proud to defend, help to build to even greater heights.

Right now he wants his mother, so we'll leave the third American and go back to another dark time.

It was July 4, 1776, when a band of brave men led an outraged people in the Declaration of Independence. We rebelled against England. We pledged our lives and sacred honors in a revolution against tyranny.

Dark, dark were the times. Homes were burned, fathers of families killed or wounded, and there were bloody tracks in the snow at Valley Forge.

A child was born—let's call him the first American—at the instant John Hancock's pen signed the Declaration.

The first American knew nothing of the troublous times of his birth, but he lived to see even darker days—the burning of the city of Washington by invading British troops in the War of 1812, and when he died, ripe in years and old in wisdom, the Nation was in its blackest hour. This contemporary of Washington and Franklin lived for 87 years and 4 months, dying a contemporary of Lincoln and Lee. The Civil War was raging. Brother murdered brother. Pillars of smoke told of burning homes and the flower of a Nation was falling under musket fire.

Dark, dark were the times.

And a child was born on November 4, 1869, when the first American died. Let us call this child the second American. He beat on his bed with his tiny fists and squalled, though he knew nothing of the troublous times.

He lived a full life, did this second American, and ripe in years and old in wisdom, he died today at the age of 87 years and 2 months.

In his dying moment, the second American feared for his Nation, target of communism spread across half the world.

Dark are the times, was his last thought.

And a child was born today at Martin County Hospital, the third American.

Not yet 1 day old, caring naught for the world's troubles, if he lives as long as the first and the second, the third American will see the year 2,038 roll around.

What a heritage is his.

He inherits a nation only two lifetimes old.

Within the span of two men, one of whom died only today, Washington's men whipped the troops of King George, Decatur said his famous words, Pickett charged at Gettysburg, the Maine was sunk, twice we conquered Germany, once Japan.

The dark has always been followed by the bright.

Just think how young we are: only two lifetimes between Patrick Henry's speech and the sprawling plants of today forming the hydrogen bomb. In two little lifetimes America has grown from 13 tiny colonies to 48 great States, with navies girding the globe. Though we lick our wounds today from the foolish Chinese, we know, and they will know, that like all oppressors of the past they will pay.

We're the youngest, most vital, most powerful Nation in the world. A lusty land where men are free—sprung in two lifetimes from some immortal words.

Gird yourself, young third American. Feel the youth that surges in your country's veins. As nations go, we've only begun to live. Old Russia, brazen with ancient cruelties, pretends to have been reborn in 1917—with all the oppressions of the Czars still in its character. The China of today is yet old, old China wearing a made-in-Moscow mask with all the old vices underneath. We alone are young in freedom, young in courage, girding now for another crucial test.

Put this down, remember it. Only 175 years and 6 months ago, when things looked darkest, the Thirteen Colonies rebelled, and defeated England.

Only 139 years ago, after the city of Washington was burned, we defeated England again.

Only 53 years ago the Maine was sunk. We defeated Spain.

Only 34 years ago German subs opened unrestricted warfare on United States shipping. We defeated Germany.

Only 10 years ago Japan sneak-bombed Pearl Harbor and Nazi Germany declared war on the United States. We defeated both of them.

Only 1 year ago Russia sicked the North Koreans on us, and we licked the tar out of the North Koreans.

Only 1 month ago Russia sicked satellite China on us—and we will beat the living hell out of both Russia and China before this shindig is through.

We're only two lifetimes old. We've just begun to fight.

Should there still be wars and rumors of wars when this third American reaches his allotted span in 2,038 * * * if, from his deathbed, the video screen shows interplanetary invaders approaching Earth, and dark is the picture, he may take comfort that this Nation still will be too young to die. There will be another squalling, fist-pounding infant to take his place in a Nation which even then will be only three lifetimes old.

A Nation which will have just begun to live.

Resolution of Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Polish-American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania, assembled at the Hotel Redington, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on Sunday, December 17, 1950, and letter of transmittal from Attorney Alexander J. Leffey, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., chairman of the resolutions committee. The above-mentioned follow:

The Polish-American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania, assembled at Hotel Redington, Sunday, December 17, 1950, hereby adopts and promulgates the following resolution:

Whereas on May 28, 29, and 30, 1948, a period when the United States of America was engaged with its Allies in resisting by armed force brutal, unprovoked aggression on Poland and other nations, by assembly of freedom, there assembled in the city of Buffalo many hundreds of leading American citizens of Polish descent. They met to organize into a cohesive, militant, and closely knit organization of national scope. They comprised delegates who were elected and sent to this conclave by hundreds of existing fraternal organizations, lay and religious associations, clubs, and societies and purported to reflect the attitude and views of the 6,000,000 American citizens of Polish background resident in the United States. Their objective was to devise ways and means whereby they might best assist the United States in the grave emergency and, coincidentally, provide aid and comfort to America's first Ally, the Republic of Poland, in a struggle for its very existence as a free nation; and

Whereas the said assemblage adopted by-laws which provided, inter alia, the following salient objectives:

(a) To implement the American war effort in such manner as to assure an early and successful termination of the struggle.

(b) To fully support the United States Government in its defense program and insure a just peace in accord with the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

(c) To coordinate the activities of its members in accordance with their obligations and responsibilities as citizens of a great, free Nation, through local branches of the organization in various sections of the country.

(d) To act as a liaison organization between representatives of the American and Polish peoples.

(e) To disseminate true and impartial information to the American people concerning the historical role which the Republic of Poland had played on the harness of great and free nations.

(f) To promote a closer understanding and greater cooperation between the democracies of the United States and Poland in cultural, ideological, sociological, and economic activities; and

Whereas from the date of its inception, the Polish American Congress, through its officers and local divisions in various sections of the United States, did give great material and moral support to our Government, dedicated all of its resources to the task of winning the war, and insofar as it was practicable to do so, warned and advised our policy makers of the ulterior purposes which motivated the activities of our valuable ally, Soviet Russia, who had already sown the seeds of the third world war by enslaving Poland in the incipient stages of its present ruthless program of world conquest, and who was even then building up its war-making potential at our expense while promoting our own destruction; and

Whereas shortly thereafter, representatives of our own Government participated in conferences with these international gangsters at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, where the liberties of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and other nations were bartered and sacrificed to them on the altar of appeasement; and

Whereas the betrayal of Poland, a nation of 35,000,000 brave and God-fearing people who had first unmoralizingly bared their breasts in defense of world freedom, shocked and outraged the hearts and minds of the membership of the Polish American Congress. They protested vigorously against this crime toward humanity and clearly predicted that by this betrayal we had unwittingly planted the seeds of another great world holocaust; and

Whereas, in the succeeding years, the warnings of the Polish American Congress that the world cannot survive half slave and

half free, have unfortunately proven to be well-founded. We now find ourselves unprepared militarily and economically and surrounded by the threatening, belligerent traitor, our alleged ally, Soviet Russia and its satellites who are spreading fear, death and destruction in the ranks of our own people and those of our friends within the framework of the United Nations; and

Whereas this Frankenstein monster has exposed its death dealing fangs and claws on the frontiers of many more free nations in Europe and Asia where American blood is being needlessly spilled and is threatening the safety and freedom of America itself in such an uncompromising manner as to prompt our President Harry S. Truman to declare a state of national emergency and order the mobilization of our manpower and resources in preparation to resist further aggression and defend liberty against the onslaught of these Communist gangsters wherever they might rear their heads.

Now, therefore, the Polish-American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania, hereby resolves:

(a) That His Excellency Harry S. Truman, our President and Commander in Chief be, and he hereby is, commended for the uncompromising attitude which he had manifested against the aggressive tactics of Soviet Russia and its Red collaborators in Korea and other parts of the world.

(b) Approval is registered of the current policy of our Government in facing the present emergency without thought of further yielding to the demands of predatory tyrants by more appeasement. Such policy is consonant with the long history of American courage in times of danger.

(c) That the United States and United Nations take necessary steps to insure the eventual restoration of freedom to Poland and all other enslaved nations.

(d) That the members of the Polish American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania pledge their resources and all of the facilities at their individual and collective disposal to the Government of the United States in this period of national emergency.

(e) That its membership hereby pledges unswerving loyalty to the Government of the United States and offers its services wherever the same may be needed in defense of our flag and all that it represents and particularly in tracing, rooting out, and destroying every evidence of communism in our mills and on our farms, in our mines and factories, in our schools, and our Government, wherever it may be detected.

(f) That all Americans be adjured to remain faithful in this time of national danger to the traditions of our forefathers by pledging their lives and their fortunes in defense of the freedom of our country and that of other nations within the framework of the United Nations, because the liberty of all is dependent on the freedom of each individual nation.

(g) That the membership of our organization redouble its efforts to obtain assurances for as many more displaced persons as possible before expiration, next summer, of the enabling legislation making it possible for them to seek asylum in the United States.

(h) That copies of this resolution be transmitted to our President, His Excellency Harry S. Truman, at the White House, Gov. James H. Duff, Governor-elect John S. Fine, the Honorable Blair F. Gunther, our representatives in the United States Senate and House, Charles Rosmarek, our national president, and distributed to the press.

WILKES-BARRE, PA., *December 19, 1950.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DANIEL: The Polish-American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania, a local unit of the national organization, whose headquarters are in Washington, D. C., held its annual meeting at Hotel Redington, this city, on Sunday, December 17, last. Approximately 150 delegates were in attendance. They represented various organizations, parishes, societies, and clubs within the environs of the northeastern part of this State. The local unit is a part of the national organization which purports to reflect the views of the 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent resident in the United States.

The assemblage adopted a resolution commending our Government for the uncompromising attitude manifested by it against the aggressive tactics of Soviet Russia and its Red collaborators in Korea and other parts of the world. In its resolution, this organization also pledges the lives and fortunes of its membership in defense of the freedom of our country and that of other nations, within the framework of the United Nations. It also points out that the world cannot exist half slave and half free, and that no permanent peace can be achieved in the world, unless the 35,000,000 people of the Polish nation that are held in subjection behind the iron curtain of Russian communism are liberated.

Congratulating you upon your recent magnificent victory in the election which returned you to your office as Congressman of our district, and praying God to guide your activities in Congress toward enacting legislation that will be beneficial to our own Nation and to free people throughout the world, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,
ALEXANDER J. LAFFEY,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.

Government by Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am so impressed with the vigorous fight which William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States, has been making to arouse the American people to the realization that government by treaty is a serious menace to America at this time, that I have decided to do something about it.

At the proper time, at a not too far distan date, I shall introduce in the Congress a proposed constitutional amendment which will forbid the invasion of domestic law by treaty unless specifically authorized by Congress: forbid the Congress to make treaties effective by laws not otherwise authorized by the Constitution, and forbid any fundamental change in our form of government, as now constituted, by the device of treaty ratification.

The text of the proposed amendment advocated by Mr. Fitzpatrick in the New Orleans States is now under preparation and discussion by some of the outstanding legal authorities on the subject. It has been the subject of study over a period of time by a special committee of the American Bar Association. It has been a subject to which Mr. Fitzpatrick has devoted many months of study and research and to whom should go the major credit for bringing the problem to the attention of the American people.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's crusade, and it has been a crusade, to awaken the American people to the dangers of government by treaty has been one of the finest contributions in many years to an old and honored profession. He deserves the support and the commendation by action, not only conversation, of every American who cherishes and believes in constitutional government. In this fight, I consider it a privilege to stand by his side and to be the instrument through which his high purpose shall be brought forcibly to the attention of the Congress and to the American people.

This is an opportune time to bring the matter into the open for complete ventilation. It is timely because at the moment there is serious disagreement among public officials on the highest level as to the powers of the Executive to commit the American Nation without specific action of the Congress or the power of the Senate, through treaty, to circumvent the Constitution, and destroy the very guaranties which are the essence of the United States Constitution and constitutional government.

From time to time I have placed before you editorials from the pen of Mr. Fitzpatrick on this general subject. Today I offer his latest and most poignant series which suggest a most affirmative approach to a solution of the problem. I, for one, wholeheartedly accept this affirmative suggestion.

Please note that while opposition to these proposed treaties, such as the Genocide Convention and the Covenant on Human Rights, is the main theme of these editorials because of the dangerous manner of their drafting, Mr. Fitzpatrick's approach is definitely not negative. His suggestion that the Constitution can be amended to allow us to enter into international compacts and still maintain our traditional rights and privileges is sound and a postive approach to international understanding.

Of particular and special interest to the Members of this body is the sixth editorial of this series which I submit to you.

In this editorial you will note that Mr. Fitzpatrick, under the title of "Government by Treaty: Are Americans Ready for It," observes:

> Under this concept the House of Representatives will have no voice in adoption of any domestic legislation contained in a self-executing valid treaty.

This means that as far as it is concerned, any treaty which has teeth in it—self-executing—as these have, and any treaty upheld by the Supreme Court—valid—the House might as well stay home.

I recognize that the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution is a long, hard, up-hill fight, but that principle for which we shall fight is well worth the battle.

I shall again come before the House when I introduce this proposed legislation to elaborate and discuss more in detail that which I have briefly touched on at the moment. In the interim I suggest that you read these editorials carefully and weigh their impact in order that each of you will be familiar with the subject when I again bring it to your attention.

Following are Mr. Fitzpatrick's editorials:

THE COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS: IT THREATENS BASIC AMERICAN LIBERTIES

In March 1949 this newspaper in a series of seven editorials pointed to the dangers in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in December 1948 by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The United States delegation voted for this declaration. It was said by its proponents to be merely a statement of aspirations and ideals. It was not intended to have any legal effect in the United States.

It was to serve as a blueprint for a Covenant on Human Rights which would be legally binding upon any country which adopted it. The Declaration was likened to our Declaration of Independence and the Covenant to our United States Constitution.

The Human Rights Commission of the United Nations drew up, during March, April and May of 1950, a Covenant which is near completion and which the Senate may be asked, in the next 12 months, to ratify as a treaty.

The New Orleans States begins today a series of editorials on this Covenant.

If the Senate ratifies it as a treaty, this Covenant will become the law of the land, and will supersede all State laws and constitutions where they conflict and will stand equal with the United States Constitution and laws of the Federal Government.

Students of constitutional and international law point out that the effect of the Covenant may be even more far-reaching than that. It may be held to nullify articles of the Bill of Rights.

There is much in the various articles of the Covenant which can be criticized. This series of editorials will discuss four articles only.

For these four articles—articles 2, 13, 14, and 15—strike at the very heart of the freedoms contained in the Bill of Rights while professing to guarantee wider freedoms for all the world.

These four articles endanger some of our most precious heritages:

Freedom of worship.
Freedom of speech.
Freedom of the press.
Freedom of peaceful assembly.

Each of these liberties has its inception in the first amendment to the United States Constitution:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

There are no exceptions to these rights in the United States Constitution. But the Covenant on Human Rights contains so many restrictions, executions, and limitations that these rights are transmuted from the bright coinage of liberty to the fool's gold of dictatorial statism.

THE COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS: WE CAN LOSE OUR RIGHTS THROUGH TREATY

The first amendment planted the seeds of freedom of worship, freedom of speech and the press, and freedom of peaceful assembly into the United States Constitution. But it took a long line of judicial decisions to firmly root them in constitutional law.

The courts early recognized some limitations on free speech; as an example, Mr. Justice Holmes put it this way:

"The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting 'fire' in a theater and causing a panic."

And, of course, there are laws of libel and slander to make certain that liberty of language is not license.

But as Mr. Justice Holmes also said of free speech:

"The question in each case is whether the words are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has the right to prevent."

Holmes was the father of the "clear and present danger" doctrine—a philosophy of the widest possible latitude in the interests of liberty. This doctrine has since his time guided our courts in decisions bearing upon free speech and a free press.

All of this is endangered if we ratify as a treaty this covenant on human rights. For if ratified by the Senate, it will become the law of the land, and may be held even to override the Constitution by the courts.

An American Bar Association committee, which had this covenant under study since its inception points out:

"Free speech and a free press are not in express terms guaranteed by our Constitution. It is only provided that Congress and the States may not pass laws impairing these rights; there is no similar express restriction on the Senate and the President in making, ratifying, and approving treaties."

The United States Supreme Court already has held:

That the treaty-making power extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations; and

That the treaty-making power is not subject to limitations imposed by the Constitution on the power of Congress to enact legislation.

If the Senate ratifies the covenant on human rights and the Supreme Court upholds it under the established principles outlined above, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of peaceful assembly may be destroyed by our own Government at any time by an official proclamation of a state of emergency. The covenant contains that power.

THE COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS: THE THREAT TO FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

The first amendment to the United States Constitution—article I of the Bill of Rights—reads in part:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof: * * *"

Those words are the cornerstone of freedom of worship in the United States; under their protection Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Christian Scientist, Hindu, and Moslem have been secure in their right and desire to worship their God as they chose. Agnostic and atheist have been equally secure in their right to question or to disbelieve.

Those words are unequivocal, given to no other judicial interpretation through the years than these:

The Congress can establish no state religion; and

The Congress is prohibited from interfering with religious worships or beliefs.

After the United States Constitution had been ratified by the States, fear of a strong centralized government arose. The Bill of Rights was written to allay these fears. But the prohibition against Government interference in religious worship did not lead the list of freedoms in the Bill of Rights by accident.

Freedom of worship was deep-rooted in the history and mores of the people, for those who believed in freedom of worship had helped found the country. It was a desire for religious freedom that brought the Pilgrims to Plymouth Rock, William Penn's Quakers to Pennsylvania, and Lord Baltimore's Catholics to Maryland some than a century before George Mason wrote the Bill of Rights.

This freedom of worship which Americans have recognized as the right of each individual is endangered by the Draft Covenant of Human Rights.

Paragraph 2 of article 13 of the Covenant on Human Rights reads:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

What effect will this have if this covenant is ratified by the Senate as a treaty? A treaty accepted by two-thirds of the Senators present becomes the law of the land. If the Supreme Court validates this treaty, it can nullify the religious freedom in the Bill of Rights.

The Committee for Peace and Law through the United Nations of the American Bar Association said in a report last September as the effects also would be these:

"We are confronted with a concept of the freedom of religion embracing the free use of limitations reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others. The purported agreement of church and state in Hungary is an example of religion under state regulation and control for public safety and order.

"The people of the United States are asked to approve those restrictions for others on the assurance that perhaps they will not apply in the United States. The persecuted brethren of any religious group in any country dominated by the Soviet must be assured that such persecutions are legal and proper under a covenant on human rights because the public safety and order of their state demand such protective action. Is this the message we shall send to persecuted worshippers in other lands?

"Today, when an atheistic theology of great power and proportions confronts the religious groups of the world, an organ of the United Nations presents the doctrine of state regulation of religion, a modification of the right of regulation, and complete destruction of the freedom of religion if laws based on alleged public safety and order of the state shall so provide."

For this danger to religion, among other reasons, the American Bar Association at its September meeting condemned the covenant in the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the American Bar Association is of the opinion that the Draft International Covenant on Human Rights as prepared at the March-May 1950 session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights is not in such form nor of such content as to be suitable for approval and adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations, or for ratification by the United States of America."

THE COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS: THREAT TO A FREE PRESS AND FREE SPEECH

Article 14 of the Covenant on Human Rights sets forth rights and privileges of speech and the press, and then limits them to a degree heretofore unheard of in free countries.

Similar restrictions are placed upon the right of peaceful assembly in article 15.

Article 14 reads:

"1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.

"2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing, or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.

"3. The right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health, or morals, or of the rights, freedoms, or reputations of others."

Article 15 reads:

"The right to peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary to insure national security, public order, the protection of health or morals, or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others."

And as if these limitations and restrictions on these vital rights were not enough, article 2 of the covenant gives signatory nations the privilege of canceling articles 14 and 15 among others "in the case of a state of emergency officially proclaimed by the authorities."

An American Bar Association committee named to study this proposed treaty asks of it:

"Is this not prostituting these fundamental rights to the readily invented emergency declarations of the all-powerful state?"

And says:

"The government could, for example, close down newspapers just as in other emergencies the President has closed down banks."

The Government could also close down universities and radio stations, seize and burn books and pamphlets, and disperse any assembly of citizens gathered together to question such steps.

Are these the "rights" a free people will welcome for themselves?

GOVERNMENT BY TREATY: A DANGER TO OUR BILL OF RIGHTS

Are opponents of these treaties alarmists, as is claimed by those pressing the Senate to ratify them, or are they presenting valid arguments?

Those opposed to the Covenant on Human Rights include the American Bar Association, the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalism fraternity.

Opponents also include jurists, both Federal and State; a growing number of newspapers, university presidents and law school deans and Members of the United States Senate.

These organizations and people, along with this newspaper which as long ago as March 1949 pointed to the dangers in the Declaration of Human Rights, believe the Covenant on Human Rights unacceptable to the American form of government as we know it.

But is there any judicial basis for their fears?

What has been the attitude of the United States Supreme Court in the matter of treaties?

Let's look at the record.

The Supreme Court has never expressly declared any treaty ratified by the Senate invalid.

The Supreme Court has upheld a law enacted to place teeth in a treaty after it had declared the same law unconstitutional before the treaty was ratified.

This instance of the Supreme Court ruling that the treaty-making power could be used successfully where the Constitution forbade the Congress to act is pointed to by Frank E. Holman of Seattle, a former president of the American Bar Association, in an article in the September issue of the ABA Journal, entitled: "Treaty Law-Making: A Blank Check for Writing a New Constitution."

Here's how it came about: In 1913, Congress enacted a Federal Migratory Bird Act. After its approval by the President, its constitutionality was questioned on the grounds that it invaded the reserved powers of the States, and the statute was declared unconstitutional in 1914 by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Shauver*. The Court held:

"That the National Constitution is an enabling instrument, and therefore Congress possesses only such powers as are expressly or by necessary implications granted by that instrument, is not questioned. Unless, therefore, there is some provision in the National Constitution granting to Congress either expressly or by necessary implication the power to legislate on this subject, the act cannot be sustained."

Supporters of the regulations governing the taking of migratory birds then sought the treaty route. The President concluded a treaty with Great Britain and the Senate ratified it.

A second Migratory Bird Act was then enacted. It was practically identical with the first, and it was attacked as unconstitutional also.

This time the Supreme Court, in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, upheld the law as valid since it was implementation of a valid treaty.

"This decision," Mr. Holman writes, "in effect, and really for the first time, opened the way for amending the Constitution of the United States by and through a treaty, because it proclaims that an otherwise unconstitutional law may become constitutional when, as, and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject and obtains approval of the Senate."

This is nothing more nor less than government by treaty.

We can lose such rights as freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of peaceful assembly if our Senate ratifies as a treaty the covenant on human rights.

GOVERNMENT BY TREATY: ARE AMERICANS READY FOR IT?

The people of this country are the inheritors of liberties gained at great cost through the centuries.

These liberties—such as religious freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of peaceful assembly—are endangered by such proposed treaties as the Genocide Convention, already submitted by the President to the Senate for ratification, and the Covenant on Human Rights, which is near completion in the United Nations.

These treaties invade the precincts of domestic law.

These treaties reduce the powers of the States while strengthening the powers of a centralized government.

These treaties strengthen the powers of the executive branch of the Government, thus weakening the historic balance of the legislative, the executive, and the judicial.

These treaties, if ratified by the Senate and upheld by the Supreme Court, can destroy utterly our Bill of Rights, and our form of government.

Mr. Frank M. Ober of Baltimore, 1949–50 president of the Maryland Bar Association, writes in the September issue of the ABA Journal:

"This argument (that the treaty-making power is almost, if not entirely, without any constitutional limit) has received strong support from the implications of a recent decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright*, where it is said 'the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution;' but are 'necessary concomitants of nationality.' If it be true that the treaty-making power is not derived from the Constitution, then it logically is not limited by its other express provisions or any other restrictions implied from that document. Hence, on that hypothesis, there would seem to be nothing that would logically prevent, for example, denying freedom of religion or of the press by treaty, or the cession of some of our States to a foreign government—"

Mr. Ober declares it seems doubtful that the Supreme Court "would press the Curtiss-Wright doctrine that far," but points out these dangers:

1. Supreme Court rulings on implied limitations on the treaty-making power "are vague at best," and "the Supreme Court has never expressly declared a treaty invalid, and has cast doubt on its own power to do so in the Curtiss-Wright case;" and

"2. There is some indication that the Supreme Court might decline to take jurisdiction to declare treaties invalid on the ground that they involve political questions, thus leaving treaties subject to the unrestricted power of the President and Senate."

This is government by treaty.

Under this concept the House of Representatives will have no voice in adoption of any domestic legislation contained in a self-executing valid treaty. It means a change in our form of government, for the House of Representatives was fashioned to make its Members more directly answerable to the people by election every 2 years.

Government by treaty means, in the ultimate, destruction of the Bill of Rights.

Are Americans ready for that?

GOVERNMENT BY TREATY: WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT IT

This newspaper is opposed to government by treaty. This newspaper is opposed to ratification of the Genocide Convention and the Covenant on Human Rights, because it believes them to be dangerous to our liberties and freedoms.

Members of the American Bar Association's committee on peace and law through the United Nations ask:

"Can we sacrifice fundamental principles of freedom on the altar of necessity for a compromise?

"For which standard of free speech and a free press will we be fighting under the banner of the United Nations—the standard of the covenant or the standard of the Constitution of the United States?"

Proponents of these treaties say that we must ratify theme to assume the leadership expected of this Nation in the conflict of ideologies and the battle for men's minds.

But is it leadership to endanger the rights of our citizens to meet upon the common ground of agreement with other countries whose nationals do not possess nor understand nor, in some cases, desire the rights we as Americans hold dear?

If the Government's policy is to set an example, then we recommend the example set by the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and Canada in refusing to approve the proposed treaty on public information because it included the same sort of general restrictions of public safety and public security that the covenant includes.

But if the policy of our Government is to agree to these lower standards on the premise that forsaking our own historic ideals is necessary in the interest of world peace and understanding, then there is a way to implement that policy of compromise and still maintain our own traditional rights and freedoms.

This can be done by amending the Constitution to—

Forbid the invasion of domestic law by treaty unless specifically authorized by act of Congress;

Forbid the Congress to make treaties effective by laws not otherwise authorized by the Constitution; and

Forbid any fundamental change in our form of government as now constituted by the device of treaty ratification.

The American Bar Association has authorized a committee to study this suggestion of amending the Constitution to protect our Bill of Rights. But until these three steps—or some equally acceptable safeguards—are adopted to prevent destruction of the United States Constitution through government by treaty, the Senate should reject summarily any and all treaties which are judged to contain unacceptable restrictions on and derogations of our rights as free Americans.

American Trade Council for Histadrut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, at a testimonial dinner in his honor given by the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut on Thursday, January 11, 1951, at the Hotel Waldorf Astoria, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am deeply honored and sincerely delighted to be here with you tonight and to respond, in the name of the American Federation of Labor, to the generous tribute embodied in this occasion.

I cannot help but feel, however, that this meeting has a deeper significance in symbolizing the unity of purpose and spirit that binds the trade-union movement of Israel with that of the United States.

Since the days of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 the American Federation of Labor has been active on the side of those who have struggled and sacrificed to bring the great dream of a Jewish national home in Palestine to reality. Both before and after the creation of the State of Israel the American labor movement has given all the material and moral support it could muster to this historic cause.

The American Federation of Labor could, in good conscience, do no less. Since the year of its foundation by an immigrant Jew, Samuel Gompers, the pioneering tradition and the moral and cultural ideals of the Jewish people have left an indelible mark upon our great organization. Jewish workers and leaders have presided at its birth, contributed to its education, pioneered in its development, and sustained and advanced it in its maturity. This is a debt which the American Federation of Labor can never fully repay—it can only hope to recognize it adequately.

The aims and ideals of the American Federation of Labor are identical with those which inspired the many brave men who gave their strength, energy, and even their lives that Israel may live as more than a dream. Together we stand for brotherhood, for liberty, for equal justice and opportunity, and for the sacred right of freemen to determine the course of their own destinies. These are the principles which raise mankind above the level of the beasts of the field.

These principles have been advanced to new heights by the creation of the State of Israel, by the influence of Histadrut as a force in its national life, and by the unity of action and purpose that exists between the labor movements of Israel and America. The American Trade Union Council of the National Committee for Labor Israel is one of the strongest of links in that chain of unity.

The American Federation of Labor is proud of its close fraternal ties with Histadrut. Histadrut has triumphed over the most formidable obstacles that any labor movement has even faced. It has brought order out of potential chaos, without compromising its democratic principles. It has inspired the free world by demonstrating in a vivid and practical way that security, welfare, and social and economic progress can best be achieved in an environment of freedom and democracy. We have gloried in its victories as though they were our victories; we have watched its progress as though it were our own.

And, in a very real sense, the progress of the workers and citizens of Israel is a measure of our own progress—just as the progress of any group of pioneers is a measure of the progress of the whole of human society.

It is a bitter commentary on the state of the civilized world today that there should be such a vast number of oppressed and dispossessed, from so many different nations, who should be compelled to wander so far to find a safe and congenial haven. It stands as the brightest episode in a dark era that the State of Israel, a small community of 650,000 people newly arrived at independence, offered such a haven to more than half a million persons in less than 3 years. The burden of settling these newcomers, providing them with housing, food, clothing, and work devolved upon Histadrut.

Histadrut has been the mainstay of the entire society of Israel. As a democratic institution of workers, it has been intimately concerned with the social and cultural life of the country as well as the economic welfare of workers.

In its relatively short span of existence, it has given workers an 8-hour day, employment through its own labor exchanges, seniority, family allowances, sick leave and vacations with pay, social insurance, and many other tangible benefits. It has developed its own system of schools to improve the level of educational facilities. With the great influx of immigrants, it has assumed the task of training new workers in the skills required for the expansion of the national economy.

In a country where capital is at a premium, Histadrut has established cooperative industries to help maintain a high rate of employment and production. Over half the hospitals and health centers of Israel were built and financed by Histadrut. Its housing cooperatives have taken over the job of providing low-cost housing, and have built more than half of the new housing. This in itself is a tremendous task considering the magnitude of the immigration.

These are all inspiring accomplishments. But the most inspiring aspect of this magnificent record lies in the fact that all of this was done without yielding to temptations, which surely must have arisen, to abandon the principles of liberty, democracy, and equality and to resort to authoritarian methods. Even in the face of crisis and danger, Histadrut adhered to the democratic principles upon which it was founded.

Its leaders were as scrupulous as regards the means they used as they were enlightened as regards the ends they sought. They adjured the insidious principle that the ends justify the means. The Jewish people have learned only too well, under the iron heel of totalitarian regimes of the past and present, that ends are inextricably bound up with means, and cannot escape their consequence.

No other group has suffered more bitter, first-hand experience of "man's inhumanity to man," in its most brutal and sadistic form, than have the Jewish people, throughout their history. No group has more nearly justifiable grounds for sanctimonious or retaliatory acts, when the tables are turned, than have the Jewish people. Yet no group has given a more soul-stirring demonstration of the principles of the brotherhood of all mankind, of magnanimity toward vanquished adversaries, than they have. Of the new Israel it can truly be said, in the terms of Paul, that there now abides "faith, hope and charity—and the greatest of these is charity." This, rather than area, population, or wealth, is the true measure of the greatness of a nation and of a people. If only the rest of the world would take note and guidance from this example!

Not only are Jews from every point of national origin or cultural and economic background accepted as equals in Israel, but likewise are the Arabs, with whom there had been incessant conflict when they were the predominant group. The first Arabs to participate in a truly democratic election did so in Israel—both men and women. The first compulsory education program for Arabs was in Israel. One of the greatest Arabic libraries in the world is being catalogued by both Jew and Arab in Jaffa. Palestine organized the Palestine Labor League. By working together, wage differentials between the Arab and Jewish skilled workers have almost disappeared, and the Arab unskilled worker's salary has increased from 120 to 150 percent in the last 4 years.

The opportunity of immediate benefit for the entire world lies in the triumph of Israel, its example, and its steady progress. The fact that the Jews have won their age-long struggle to establish a national homeland, and the example of the supremacy of tolerance, justice, and democracy there, should serve to counteract and reduce the intolerance, prejudice, and race hatred from which Jews living in other nations have suffered for many centuries.

It is the task of those, like ourselves, who believe in the rights of minorities, to fight for the defense of those rights everywhere, not only abroad but right here in our own country. Prejudice, intolerance, and discrimination are errors of human thought which even our own constitutional guarantees have been unable to eradicate. Just as American labor has helped in the establishment of Israel, the inspiring record of Israel will be of great aid to American labor in combatting intolerance and discrimination in this country.

All Americans should take pride in the fact that the President of the United States accorded immediate recognition of the State of Israel, thereby serving notice to the rest of the world that America stood squarely on the side of international morality and decency.

Now the rest of the world, in according recognition to Israel, has come around to the acceptance of an accomplished fact—the creation of a free nation that by force of justice, as well as of arms, has demonstrated its ability, its fitness, and its right to take its place in the family of nations.

There are many striking parallels between the birth and growth of Israel and that of the United States. The cause of Israel, like the cause of America, is for us more than a mere humanitarian one. It is really the

same cause as that which inspired the founders of American democracy—the cause of freedom, justice, and opportunity for the common man.

It is my fervent hope that the people of Israel can establish in Palestine an America of the Middle East that they can carve out of the desert a progressive, prosperous nation whose high principles and honest practices will serve as an inspiration to all the millions of oppressed, downtrodden, and subjugated peoples of the world.

We are now engaged in a great struggle against the Red beast of tyranny. The outcome of that struggle will determine the future of the free trade-union movement and of all free peoples throughout the world. The Jewish people know from the lessons of their past what the curtailment of liberty means in concrete terms. They know that liberty is not just a word or a high-flown concept, but a living, breathing thing, essential to a moral society. No one needs demonstrate to them that the world cannot continue to exist "half slave and half free."

Our mutual interest demands the unity of all free labor and of all free men. We must work together toward a united free world, where the dignity of labor and the dignity of man reign supreme.

We must all do our part to make sure that Israel remains as a shining beacon to show the people of the Middle East, of Eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa the way and the workings of a truly democratic society, and as a bastion of freedom in that vital part of the world.

Milwaukee Leads Great Lakes in Preparation for St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to explain how the city of Milwaukee has done a remarkable job in preparing its port for handling of heavy cargo after the St. Lawrence waterway is completed. The municipal port director of the city of Milwaukee, Mr. H. C. Brockel, has planned the port of Milwaukee with a keen foresight of the future use of this great port. The city of Milwaukee is to be commended for the fine work it has done in carrying out these plans.

I include herein an article written by Mr. H. C. Brockel which appeared in the November 1950 issue of the Nautical Gazette. This article shows how Milwaukee leads the Great Lakes in preparation for the St. Lawrence waterway:

MILWAUKEE'S BID FOR HEAVY CARGO

(By H. C. Brockel)

As a part of its considerable program of improvement, the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners has recently placed in service the largest heavy-lift gantry crane on the entire Great Lakes. Milwaukee has thus realized its objective to provide unencalled handling facilities, and continues to set the pace for the Great Lakes area in the field of harbor facilities.

Milwaukee has already won wide recognition for its aggressive program of municipal port development, and ranks as the first [illegible] port of the Great Lakes in terms of number of ocean sailings. From 80 to 90 ocean vessels will have taken on or discharged cargo at the port of Milwaukee during 1950.

For several years past export industries in Milwaukee and throughout Wisconsin and the territory west of Lake Michigan have been utilizing the port of Milwaukee to an increasing degree as an export gateway to Western and Northern Europe as well as to Canada and the Caribbean area. Milwaukee, often described as the "machine shop of America," is a major producer of heavy-type machinery, including cranes, shovels, excavators, turbines, generators, crushers, bottle washers, and other major industrial equipment.

Much of this machinery, even when knocked down for export shipment, involves lifts of single pieces ranging from 20 tons to 50 tons or more in weight. The Milwaukee municipal dock facilities, formerly equipped with 25-ton- and 30-ton-capacity cranes, were already outstanding on the Great Lakes, but excellent as these facilities are, it was found on occasion to be impossible to handle some of the heavy export pieces originating in the territory.

To correct this situation and to provide for the Milwaukee export gateway handling facilities equal to those of most seaports and excelling any other Great Lakes port, the Milwaukee Port Authority has placed in service its new heavy-lift gantry crane, which gives Milwaukee a facility unique among inland ports.

The city of Milwaukee contracted with the Clyde Iron Works, of Duluth, Minn., in July 1949, for the new heavy-lift crane, after receiving competitive bids from recognized manufacturers. Bids were taken on the basis of a complete specification prepared by the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners.

Prior to erecting the crane, it was necessary to reinforce the dock structure to carry the tremendous weight of the new crane, at a cost of approximately $25,000. The cost of the new crane, delivered and installed at the municipal open dock in Milwaukee, was approximately $100,000, and with incidental equipment and the dock-reinforcement work, the total investment in the new crane is about $130,000. The crane has a lifting capacity of 70 tons at a 40-foot radius, and a capacity of 15 tons at its full radius of 110 feet. According to the manufacturer, an overload of 50 percent or more will be required to tip the crane, which indicates that the new equipment could, on occasion, safely handle lifts of well over 75 tons within a good working radius for shiploading purposes. The followings is the radius-capacity table for the new Whirley:

Load radius and capacity

	Tons
40 feet	70
50 feet	51
60 feet	39
70 feet	31
80 feet	26½
90 feet	22½
100 feet	20
110 feet	15

The crane is equipped with a 100-foot boom and a 10-foot jib, giving it an extensive working radius. It will be used principally for loading and unloading cargo to and from vessels, for loading and unloading railroad cars, and for handling material in and out of open storage. Its long boom length assures adequaqte coverage of a considerable dock area and good penetration into storage areas.

The boom hoist line is a 13-part line. The single line pull on the main hoist is 18,000 pounds at a hoisting speed of 225 feet per minute.

The crane has four four-wheel driver trucks and has a ground travel speed of 90 feet per minute.

The crane erected weighs approximately 334,000 pounds and required more than 50 tons of counterweight. Its total weight installed is about 220 net tons. This large load, concentrated in a relatively small area under the wheel trucks, necessitated, as already noted, structural reinforcement of the dock area in which the crane operates.

The crane embodies the most modern features with complete one-man control; a so-called inching control for lowering heavy loads, and electrically-operated braker. Other interesting features include an extended operator's cab which gives the operator full visibility throughtout the entire work area, and a crane gage which indicates to the operator exactly what load is being lifted and when he is approaching his maximum capacity at any radius for any load.

The Milwaukee crane is unique from another standpoint, in that its track gage is only 20 feet between rail centers. Most heavy-lift cranes of this character operate on gages of 32 feet or more, but physical limitations of the dock structure necessitated a compact design on an unusually narrow track gage. The manufacturer successfully worked out his design to accomplish this objective. The gantry structure has a vertical portal clearance of 22 feet, permitting railroad locomotives to pass under the crane. The operator's cab is about 30 feet above ground level.

The crane is powered by electrical motors, 440-volt, 3-phase, 60-cycle. The hoist motor, travel motors, and slewing motor are independent of one another, with separate controls. Motors are General Electric and electrical controls are by Cutler-Hammer.

Official tests were run on the new crane after installation had been completed early in the summer. The crane equaled or exceeded all specification requirements with regard to travel speed, swing speed, hoisting speed, and capacity. Capacity loads were lifted at various radii and then lowered electrically through dynamic braking, and mechanically through use of foot brakes, to test brake adequacy and speed control. The results of these tests were entirely adequate.

After testing, the crane was officially accepted by the board of harbor commissioners, and has been utilized to load a number of heavy-lift cargoes during the current shipping season. A considerable volume of cargo involving lifts from 30 to 75 tons has been booked, to be handled during the latter part of the 1950 shipping season. Several thousand tons of cargo in the extreme heavy-lift category have already been scheduled to move via Milwaukee, thus assuring the new crane of a good degree of utilization during its first season of operation.

Milwaukee is the only port on Lake Michigan with heavy-lift handling equipment except for the Manitowoc shipyards, which have, occasionally, as an accommodation, made heavy lifts of export material originating west of Lake Michigan. Much heavy machinery from Chicago and other points in Illinois regularly moves to Milwaukee for export loading in the absence of any heavy-lift equipment at the port of Chicago. The Milwaukee port authority is confident that the new crane will serve as a magnet to attract heavy-lift export business from the States of Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

In addition to its important function of serving the export trade, the crane will be used actively for routine dock operations, loading and unloading lake vessels, handling pleasure craft in and out of storage, and for other local harbor work. It will, for example, permit installations of new engines in tugs and other types of vessels by topside loading, thus eliminating need for placing such vessels in shipyard.

The port of Milwaukee has gained considerable stature from the new installation, and Milwaukee port authorities are confident

that it will prove a wise investment not only in terms of prestige but in terms of new port activity. The crane has already proven a powerful economic factor in the Wisconsin area by aiding Wisconsin industries to bid successfully on highly competitive export business, with the assurance that heavy-lift items can be expeditiously handled to ocean vessels at a nearby port, thus eliminating costly rail hauls to shipping points on the seaboard. Several major orders have already been assured Wisconsin industries in highly competitive areas as a result of the combination of heavy-lift facilities, and frequent ocean sailings available via the port of Milwaukee.

In addition to its unique new crane equipment, the port of Milwaukee is in the midst of a port expansion program which will have involved almost a million dollars of expenditure by the end of this year.

Under construction is a new lake-front pier of special design, over 1,000 feet in length, which will be for the accommodation of tanker vessels. The new pier, which is of "open bent" design, will have as its sole function the carrying of pipelines from petroleum vessels to nearby marine storage terminals. Four lines of tankers are already committed to use the new pier, including Shell Oil Co., Cities Service Oil Co., the Texas Co., and Phillips Petroleum Co. The initial movement of petroleum through the new facility is expected to be at least 500,000 tons annually. The new tanker pier will cost $400,000. One hundred and eight thousand cubic yards of material were dredged from the Milwaukee outer harbor to provide two slips which will give deep water access to both sides of the new facility.

Another outstanding Milwaukee port project is a $200,000 program for the improvement of Maitland Airstrip, Milwaukee's unique lake front landing strip. The facility will be provided with a modern administration building, improved highway access, drainage system and new access road. The program, when complete, will place on Milwaukee's lake front an "air park" which will blend into the lake front park system.

Other projects in full swing include a new dock office building to serve the municipal harbor terminal, which will cost $60,000; a mile and a half of water mains for outer harbor fire protection, $100,000; industrial lease improvements, such as sewer, water and railroad facilities, to serve industrial developments on the Milwaukee outer harbor, $100,000.

The continued industrial utilization of the Milwaukee outer harbor is evidenced by the fact that the Texas Co. is completing its new marine terminal on the Milwaukee lake front, and the Phillips Petroleum Co. has negotiated a 20-year lease with the Milwaukee port authority for a 10-acre site for a new marine terminal.

The Moral Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 15, 1951:

THE MORAL ISSUE

On December 1, 1950, President Truman sent a message to Congress describing the crisis produced by Communist China's intervention in Korea. In this message he said: "The moral issue now is the same as it was in June. The aggression of the Chinese Communists is a direct assault upon the United Nations, and upon the principles of international law and order which are its foundation. By their action the Chinese Communist leaders have proved themselves lawbreakers in the community of nations."

Can these words be reconciled with the American acceptance of the five-point cease-fire proposal which the Assembly's Political Committee has sent ot Peiping? On the principle that no cease fire can be bad they can be reconciled. But the details of this action, fully considered, include much that must be a cause of regret and apprehension to all friends of the United Nations—that is, to all friends of peace, security and freedom.

The five-point proposal contains not a single syllable remotely suggesting any wrongdoing on the part of Red China. It contains not one word indicating that we or our friends are even mildly displeased with the government whose troops are at this moment trying to annihilate United Nations soldiers in Korea. The military defeat, the lost battle, could not be prevented. The courage of the wounded and the dead, the valiant efforts of the living have not been enough. But we do not have to accept a moral defeat. We do not have to submit—we cannot safely submit—to what General Romulo, in his impassioned speech on Saturday, described as "intimidation and blackmail."

At this moment the important point for us in the five-point proposal is point one, which calls for a cease fire. This means, if it means anything, that there can be no peace talks with Communist China until a cease fire is in operation—that is, until Communist China has ceased her aggression in Korea, or has at least desisted in her attempts to extend the area of aggression.

But what General Romulo was thinking of was point five, in which we would agree to sit with Britain, Russia, and Communist China on a committee to discuss Far Eastern problems, including, among others, those of Formosa and of representation of China in the United Nations. When President Truman ordered the Seventh Fleet into the Straits of Formosa on June 27, 1950, he laid down the stipulation that the determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan or consideration by the United Nations. Thus, on the record, we can consistently take up this question. But it ought to be clearly understood that we will not accept as good and righteous the forcible reconquest of the island by the Peiping regime, and that we will not vote for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations until she has given convincing evidence that she had abandoned her policies of direct and indirect aggression, in Korea and elsewhere. And for such evidence we may have to wait a long time.

We want no war, limited or otherwise, with China. Every humane instinct cries out against such a war, every sentiment of prudence demands that it be avoided. But let us have a care that we do not apply to great and powerful nations a different moral yardstick from the one we use in judging small and weak nations. We cannot prevent all wrongdoing in this unhappy world, but we need not condone it, we need not call it peace. Let us do all we can to bring about a real and lasting peace. Let us meanwhile avoid commitments we cannot fulfill. But let us not sell our souls. Let us not stand silent at Lake Success if Communist China presumes to attempt to dictate a conqueror's peace to a beaten United Nations.

The Indiana Plan for the Maintenance of National Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the Indiana plan for the maintenance of national manpower, as approved by the Indiana Conference of Higher Education. This proposal, drawn up by 30 colleges and universities in Indiana, is a careful study of the present manpower situation in this country; it offers suggestions for meeting the problems of the future, when the military will apparently make greater and greater demands on the Nation's manpower.

The suggestions offered in the Indiana plan will be, I believe, of great value to everyone studying alternate proposals on this vital issue. Here follows the Indiana plan:

THE INDIANA PLAN FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF NATIONAL MANPOWER

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

1. The American college and university recognizes the gravity of the present crisis in world affairs and is sensitively aware of the fact that the national welfare must take precedence over other considerations.

2. Charged with the responsibility of leadership in American thought and life we must constantly point to the clear and present danger of the short view which would seriously impair our tradition of freedom under God. We must proceed on the commonly accepted assumption that our present situation must be viewed as a long term phase of our national preparation for any eventuality. Though victorious in our conflict with an alien and vicious ideology we could lose so many cultural and spiritual values that our victory would be empty.

3. It is our profound conviction that in any plan of national mobilization we must maintain the values for which American colleges and universities have stood throughout their history as an expression of the heritage of our people. This means that definite and intelligent provisions must be made, even in time of national emergency, for the uninterrupted training of the leaders of tomorrow. The American college and university must make a continuous contribution to the national welfare in terms of supplying manpower needs in every field of learning during this crisis and beyond it. Thus it is in the national interest that every man pursue his formal education for as long a period as he is willing and able and so long as he can be spared from military service.

STATEMENT OF PLAN

Upon the basis of these principles we affirm our conviction that those sections of the present Selective Service law which provides for registration at age 18 with induction not before age 19 should be retained.

2. As soon as possible following age 19 each person shall be given a physical examination. Those physically and mentally acceptable to the Armed Forces who have completed at least two terms in an accredited college or university on a curriculum which

leads to an academic degree and desire to continue their formal education may do so on the following conditions:

(a) The proper authority of the institution where the student is enrolled shall certify to Selective Service:

(1) That the student has maintained an academic performance satisfactory to the educational institution attended and that such performance if continued will give assurance of graduation within two calendar years.

(2) That the institution has established a committee or committees whose duty is to counsel, guide and examine each student in this group with a view to determining the value of his continued education in terms of the national welfare and service.

(3) That the student is continuing in attendance on a round-the-year college calendar.

3. Postponement of military service shall not be extended beyond the twenty-first birthday except in cases approved by Selective Service.

4. If the needs of the Armed Forces become such that postponement of military service of all college students until graduation is no longer possible, induction shall be made of the oldest students first; those who are 20 years old shall be inducted before those who are 19.

5. Year-round college attendance imposes a significant additional financial burden on the average American family. Every American youth should be given the opportunity for the training to which his ability entitles him irrespective of his financial status. Therefore it is recommended that the Eighty-second Congress pass enabling legislation which will permit any qualified student who has reached the age of 19 to borrow from the Government up to $100 per month during the period he is attending college.

It is further recommended that interest on this loan shall be at a rate one-half of 1 percent greater than the going rate on long term Government bonds at the time the loan is made and repayment of the loan shall be made on the basis of annual payments equal to 25 percent of the participant's Federal income tax.

STATEMENT OF MANPOWER SITUATION

(This statement is based upon the most recent manpower figures which have been verified with responsible Government authorities.)

In his radio address Friday evening, December 15, President Truman stated that the Armed Forces of the United States will be increased to 3,000,000 or 3,500,000. To maintain a military organization of any such proportion will require that every young man who can meet the physical standards will be required to do a tour of duty in uniform.

Whether or not a plan of flexible induction can be worked out that will allow a young man in college to postpone his military service until he has completed his college education will depend upon the size of the military unit and the length of time served by each inductee.

The following analysis is made on the assumption that the term of service will be 2 years and that the numerical size of the Armed Forces will be either 3,000,000 or 3,500,000.

It is estimated that in all branches of the service there are at present approximately 1,200,000 career men. If total personnel is increased to 3,000,000 this means that approximately 1,800,000 will be noncareer men. If the average service of a noncareer man is 2 years, 900,000 new personnel will need to be inducted annually. Unless men of previous military service are to be called, these inductees will be taken from among those who are 20 years old and younger.

Approximately 1,800,000 men reach a given age annually. Of these about 750,000 qualify under present military standards for the Armed Forces. On this basis there are 3,750,000 qualified men between the ages of 19 and 23 who have not seen military service. By the time the Armed Forces have reached 3,000,000 about 1,200,000 of these will have been inducted. This will leave a surplus of approximately 2,000,000 men in the United States between the ages of 19 and 23 physically acceptable to the military who have not seen service.

Approximately 375,000 young men enter college as freshmen each year. Of these about 250,000 continue as sophomores, 200,000 as juniors, and 175,000 as seniors. This makes a total of 1,000,000 undergraduate men in college at any one time. Assuming these men attend an accelerated all-year-round college program 500,000 will not have reached their nineteenth birthday, 325,000 will be between their nineteenth and twentieth birthdays, and 200,000 will be over 20 and under 21 years of age.

This will subtract 500,000 from the pool of 2,000,000 eligible inductees leaving a surplus of 1,500,000.

If 900,000 men are withdrawn from this pool annually and 750,000 are added to it through age increase the pool will be reduced by 150,000 per year. On this basis it will take 10 years to absorb the surplus in manpower currently existing before bringing the demand for inductees to the point where young men will be unable to finish college prior to entering the service.

If the military force is built up to and maintained at 3,500,000 the numerical size of the pool after subtracting the men eligible for military service who are in college will be reduced to 1,000,000. The induction rate on the same formula will be 1,150,000 annually and the inroads on the surplus will be at the rate of 400,000 men annually. This will absorb the cushion of manpower reserve down to the 500,000 college students in about 2½ years.

It is clear, therefore, that sufficient manpower is available to sustain an armed force of 3,000,000 almost indefinitely and still allow all young men who desire and are capable to do so to complete their college training on an accelerated college calendar before reporting for military duty.

Even a military force of 3,500,000 men can be recruited and maintained for a period of a few years before encroaching upon those young men desiring to complete their education before going into uniform.

Tabulation of manpower resources.

Total men required for Armed Forces	3,000,000–3,500,000
Career men now in Armed Forces	1,200,000
Total men to be supplied by induction	1,800,000–2,300,000
Total men 19–23 qualified for induction	3,750,000
Surplus of qualified men 19–23	1,950,000–1,450,000
Total men 19 and 20 normally in college	500,000
Surplus men 19–23 if service postponement for college is granted	1,450,000–950,000
Annual inductions required to maintain Armed Forces	900,000–1,150,000
Qualified men annually reaching age 19	750,000
Annual reduction of surplus pool	150,000–400,000
Years until surplus is depleted	10–2½

Members of Indiana Conference on Higher Education: Anderson College, Ball State Teachers College, Butler University, Canterbury College, DePauw University, Earlham College, Evansville College, Franklin College, Goshen College, Hanover College, Huntington College, Indiana Central College, Indiana State Teachers College, Indiana Technical College, Indiana University, Manchester College, Marian College, Marion College, Oakland City College, Purdue University, Rose Polytechnic Institute, St. Joseph College, St. Mary's College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, Taylor University, Tri-State College, University of Notre Dame, Valparaiso University, Vincennes University, Wabash College.

War Jitters Grow on Campuses as Morale Drops and Many Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 15, 1951:

WAR JITTERS GROW ON CAMPUSES AS MORALE DROPS AND MANY QUIT

CHICAGO, January 14.—War jitters have hit college campuses across the Nation and many students are adopting a what's-the-use attitude, because of the uncertainty of world conditions and their own futures, a survey showed today.

Morale has grown worse since the Christmas holidays, schools reported, because of United States losses in Korea and the consultations students have had with their draft boards at Christmas.

The typical bitter attitude of soon-to-be-drafted students was summed up this way by Larry Kaufmann, a nonveteran senior at the University of Oklahoma: "Why study to be a soldier?"

Officials at many schools said they had made direct appeals to students to live as usual from day to day and try not to worry. But some admitted privately that they don't blame students for being jittery, when their draft statuses were so hazy.

The survey of more than 55 colleges and universities showed that many students had been called into Reserve units and that large numbers of students planned to enlist their mid-term examinations rather then wait to be drafted in June so that they might have their pick of the services. Some students just did not show up after Christmas.

SCHOOLS URGE ACCELERATION

A number of schools were urging students to double up on work so as to complete their education before entering service. Many men were reported to be heeding this advice and working harder to finish school or to keep their grades high in an effort to avoid the draft, at least for a while.

Many school authorities called for a clear-cut directive from Washington to take the burden of doubt off students' shoulders and allow them to study in some peace until they must enter the Armed Forces.

"We need a clearer outlook for students," said Willis Tate, vice president of the Southern Methodist University. "Many of the weaker students—those in the lower half of their class—definitely are studying less. After all, they've lost their incentive because of the present draft laws."

He said there was "much hysteria and misinformation" on the campus and indecision on the part of men faced by the threat of changes in the draft laws.

Dr. Guy Stevenson, dean of the Arts College of the University of Louisville, said about 100 men had left the college in the last month and this trend was causing other students to wonder if they should go too.

George Gibson, dean of men at the Georgia Institute of Technology, said the scholastic average had dropped slightly, partially because of the terrible turmoil at present.

"There's a bitterness among students I wish we could overcome," said William Powell Jones, dean of Adlebert College at Western Reserve University.

George Wadsack, assistant dean of admission at the University of Oklahoma, reported that 60 percent of the university's students had unsatisfactory grades at the end of the fall semester.

Deane W. Malott, chancellor of the University of Kansas, said a large bulletin board had been set up in the administration building to carry all the latest draft information.

Dr. L. L. Click, associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Texas, said about 400 students had dropped out of school to enlist but "in general all students who are staying seem determined to make their grades."

Charles McGurk, director of Ithaca College's School of Business, said: "The attitude of some students is, 'what's the use of studying if we've got to go into military service at any time.' Some feel that in enlisting they are getting something over with."

The dean of Duquesne University said a check had showed that 5 percent of the students had adopted a "don't-give-a-darn attitude" and were cutting classes and ignoring their studies. He said another 20 percent were the victims of worry and general tension, but were more confused than disinterested in their work.

J. D. Williams, chancelor of the University of Mississippi, said: "The uncertainty of the mobilization program has contributed to restlessness, impatience, confusion, frustration, and in some instances despair on the part of many students. Some seemed relieved when they actually were called to active duty."

JUNE ENTRY FOR FRESHMEN

Authorities at the University of North Carolina and Duke University suggested that students go to school around the calendar to finish their educations in 3 years rather than 4. Duke announced this week it would admit freshmen in June.

At Yale, Harvard, Dartmouth, Brown, and Princeton, a general unrest was reported. A Dartmouth spokesman said the school already had lost a sizable percentage of students through enlistments.

Students at Princeton said dormitory janitors had been asked to make a check to see just who had come back from the Christmas holidays. University officials there predicted their enrollment would drop to 2,000 next fall, a decline of one-third.

At the University of Florida, J. Hillis Miller, the president, scheduled a meeting of all 3,000 male students next month in an effort to combat the despondent attitude caused by the war threat and draft. Professors said grades in all except Reserve officer training courses had plummeted and the student newspaper estimated about 50 men a week were quitting school to enlist.

Isolation Is Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Coldwater Reporter, a daily newspaper published in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. This editorial written by Earle Davidson, publisher, well expresses the thinking of most of the people in southern Michigan regarding the situation in which we find ourselves today. The editorial, which follows, well points out that isolationism, used as a word to smear opponents of the Truman foreign policy is actually Americanism. Here it is:

GOOD EVENING—THE EDITOR'S CORNER

(By Earle Davidson)

The Korean debacle, in which the forces of the United States have received only token support from other members of the United Nations, has resulted in some mighty serious thinking on the part of Americans everywhere.

When President Truman ordered American boys to take up the fight in Korea, he embarked upon a mission which threw this country in a state of confusion from which it has not yet fully recovered. Nine out of ten Americans still think the President is constitutionally required to secure the consent of Congress before taking such a step.

With every announcement of mounting casualties in the Korean "police action," the people are now wondering just how far the Congress will permit the President to go in sending American youth to bleed and die in other parts of the world.

Not only has the President lost much of his popularity among the rank and file of our people, but at the same time the prestige of the United Nations has sunk to a new low because of its failure to share the load in sending fighting men to back up its vote in favor of the Korean "police action."

Americans are fast awakening to the fact that their country is the sucker nation of the world organization. By the same token, they are also awakening to the realization that the Truman administration, having been outsmarted in its diplomatic relations not only with Russia, but also with the enemies of Russia, is now attempting to raise a large force of American foot soldiers for another possible "police action" in Europe.

It is indeed regrettable that in this hour of trial we have such small minds at the top level of our Government. We have only ourselves to blame for that. Perhaps those thousands of Americans who stayed home on election day in November of 1948 will at long last see the folly of their neglect of duty.

With no firm basis upon which to argue their position, those in high places who are responsible for leading this country to the very brink of disaster now shout "isolationist" at anyone and everyone who dares to challenge them.

I suppose that, after this editorial sees the light of print, your editor, too, will be branded an isolationist.

Well, if failure to see either merit or justice in the sacrifice of thousands of American lives in far-off Korea while our so-called allies send only token forces to the battle is isolationism, if failure to see the reasoning behind the declaration of a national emergency in America when no other country in the world sees the necessity of doing likewise is isolationism; if a sincere desire to see this country become militarily and economically strong for the purpose of protecting our own people is isolationism; if opposition to a foreign policy which would break America's economic back and spill the life-blood of precious American youth over a confused world is isolationism; if seeking a respite from war for the mothers of America's young men and women, in whose eyes the suffering of World War II is still recorded, is isolationism; if all these beliefs may be properly added up to define an isolationist, then I pray to God, make me an isolationist.

But you and I know that to believe these truths is not isolationism. You and I know that in the absence of complete abdication of its duties by the Congress, the administration in Washington is limited in its powers over the lives—and deaths—of the American people.

It seems to us that the time has come for the Congress to reassert its prerogatives and reassume its rightful place in the determination of the steps necessary to insure peace.

President Truman and his government by crony should be forcibly reminded by the new Congress of its intention to represent the people in examining the administration's policy with regard to committing American forces in the defense of foreign nations not yet committed to defending themselves.

The new Eighty-second Congress could render no greater service to the American people at this time than to forestall the Administration's plan of garrisoning millions of American troops abroad—a course which can only lead to eventual war with Russia.

No, this is not isolationism. It is Americanism. Nothing is more sorely needed in this country today than a serious restyle of good, old-fashioned red, white, and blue Americanism. This is not to say that we should desert the United Nations. Some day that organization may become more than a hope as a deterrent to war. But until the time comes when the United Nations is an effective guarantor of world peace, we should keep our own stars and stripes flying in the top spot. Our Korean experience has shown us—and it should have shown Mr. Truman—that the United Nations banner is meaningless.

After all, what's wrong with the American flag anyway? Doesn't it today represent man's greatest bulwark for liberty and freedom? Haven't we had just about enough of global dogooding? Isn't it about time to get back home and look to our own defenses?

Americans generally are in favor of a heavy defense program. We want to make—and keep—our country the strongest nation, both militarily and economically, on the face of the earth.

The Russian problem can be solved in 10 minutes, merely by serving notice on the Kremlin that if its armies set foot on free soil in Europe they will have to fight America to win. Then, if Moscow ever gets foolish enough to disregard that notice, will be the time for us to go overseas—and look half out of Russia once and for all.

On the other hand, if we put a huge land army overseas merely as a show of strength such a step could only lead to disaster in one of two ways. Either we would break America's economic back in attempting to finance such an overseas force over a long period of years while Russia calmly watches us tax ourselves to death, or the very presence of such a force would touch off the war all of us are seeking to avoid.

It is to be hoped that the Congress will heed the will of the people in this instance and close ranks. Not one more American soldier should be made available for the defense of Europe than the nations of Europe are willing to put up themselves.

And these American forces should be kept at home until a clear need arises for their presence overseas. That's the kind of military strength America needs—a large potential that can be called up quickly in an emergency. Any other kind of strength will only weaken our economic system to the point where Russia will not need a war to win.

A Prayer—Capitol Hill Day, Calvary Baptist Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 7, 1951, Calvary Baptist Church, of Washington, with Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, minister, leading, devoted the morning service to Capitol Hill. Several Members took part in this service. They were Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin; Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas; and myself.

The theme for the morning sermon brought by Dr. Cranford, The Dream That Made America Great, was suggested by Representative NOAH H. MASON, of Illinois.

During these crucial days it is so important, Mr. Speaker, that we seek divine guidance as we attempt to resolve the tremendous and serious problems that face our Nation and the world. It is, I think, most significant that this great church in the Nation's Capital should devote this particular service, as the Eighty-second Congress began to convene, in the interest of the National Congress. With the belief that my colleagues share that view, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks and include the prayer that was offered at this service by my colleague, Hon. BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas:

PRAYER BY CONGRESSMAN BROOKS HAYS AT THE SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 7, 1951

Our Father, there are many things we would pray for this morning. Our deepest aspirations we cannot phrase, yet we know that Thou wilt hear even the petitions that struggle vainly in our hearts for expression.

Our thoughts are upon our Nation, its safety in an hour of great peril and its future, that its institutions might continue to be dedicated to the noblest ends. We who are a part of its official family are grateful for the friendliness which is so often evidenced by Calvary Church. May it be typical of the Nation; may the ties between the representative and the people be strengthened.

We thank Thee for the American heritage, for the system of government which we believe represents the best hope of conformity to the principles of Christian faith. We do not defend it as a perfect expression of Thy will, but we believe that precious spiritual values are inherent in it, and these we would preserve. Our Father, we ask, too, that as we contemplate the grandeur of America we may think of our country in relation to the world and measure its greatness in terms of highest service. May we never feed our sense of superiority nor glory in achievements of the past, as long as there are unfinished tasks to challenge us.

For the meeting of dangers help us to achieve unity, not from diluting conviction nor in the tolerance and perpetuation of error, but rather in the harmony of Christian brotherhood which keeps our hearts and minds upon the highest goals.

We pray for the world's peace, that peace which passeth may be the good fortune of our generation. Save us from a sense of futility; may the temporary conquests of evil not disturb us and may we continue to put our chief reliance in Thy leadership. In the laws that are to be made by the new Congress and the policies to be devised, may there be moral content and moral power. May we see in our failures the inexactness of human effort and help us to understand that we have failed only to the extent that we have not followed Thy plan for human life and destiny.

We thank Thee for the resources of good will that surround us. We have drawn so much from them, may we determine to contribute to them. And may such suffering as comes upon us as an inevitable experience never create bitterness. Our Father, spare us from little-mindedness and from the sins of cynicism and self-centeredness. May we live worthily before the world, though new fears and dangers press upon us. If we cannot have peace for our world may we have peace within. Give us tranquility for the decisions that are vital for our times.

We thank Thee that in this service the anxieties of the world may yield to the strength and power of Thy presence, and as the busy world beckons us to perplexing new duties may we go with the assurance that Thou art our refuge, that underneath us are the everlasting arms. We pray, our Father, not only for Thy favors but for Thyself.

Finally, our Father, we pray for our fighting men abroad. Comfort and heal them, and may there be nothing in our actions to create doubt as to our appreciation for their sacrifice. Forgive any lightheartedness or gayety that is based upon indifference to their plight or the needs of stricken people anywhere. We do not hesitate to ask that our men be restored to loved ones, unimpaired and buoyed by the consciousness of Thy care.

Help us to preserve in the world today those elements of love and compassion which made sublime the mission of Jesus. In His spirit we would pray even for our enemies; may reconciliation come with peace.

"In every change of fortune and down to the gates of death may we be loyal and loving to one another."

In the name of Jesus. Amen.

How Much Authority Does President Truman Want?—The United States Is Still Governed "by the Consent of the Governed"—Congress Should Be Consulted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, whether the President has the right to send American troops abroad is a question of legal right, and conflicting precedents confuse the issue. But while the debate goes on, the world burns.

President Truman has stated to the press in effect that he will do as he pleases about sending American troops abroad. This certainly is not a step in the right direction toward the unity above partisanship that President Truman has stated he desires.

If President Truman were sincere in his request for unity, he would not refuse to consult with Congress on the issue of sending troops abroad. He would ask the Congress to pass legislation approving such use of American troops and thereby give to the people's representatives a full partnership in the formulating of vital policies which may mean war or peace for the world. In his State of the Union message he said, "There shall never be a dictator in this country."

The following editorial by David Lawrence on this subject which appeared in a recent issue of United States News and World Report is appropriately titled "Quibbling While World Burns."

QUIBBLING WHILE WORLD BURNS

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman made an unfortunate mistake last week when he told the press, in effect, that, while he would consult Congress, he would do as he pleased about sending American troops abroad.

The question of legal right is at best a technical one. Strictly speaking, under the Constitution, Congress alone has the explicit power to declare war, while the President has the implicit right to use our Armed Forces to repel invasion as well as to protect American lives and property outside this country. The exact point at which the authority of each branch of our Government begins and ends has never been clear, and there are many conflicting precedents.

Mr. Truman is confronted with a resolution introduced by Representative COUDERT, of New York, who would have Congress forbid the appropriation of any money for troops to go abroad without the prior approval of both Houses. This is a congressional prerogative known historically as the power of the purse.

Should this resolution be pressed, the President says he will go to the people. Presumably this means that he will attempt by speeches to influence public opinion against the passage of such a proposal. This, too, is the President's right.

Most Americans, however, will be saddened by this exhibition of quibbling while the world burns.

In countries with the parliamentary system of government such a dispute could not happen. The national legislature is a part of the executive and the executive is a part of the national legislature. The majority party has the responsibility for a leadership exercised jointly by both the executive and the legislative branches acting together. This is because together they stand and together they fall. It is impossible for the executive and the legislative to differ without carrying the dispute immediately to the people. Then, as a result, the country gets either a new legislature through an election held for that purpose or else it gets a new executive, as the case may be.

This is responsible democracy. It is working effectively in Canada, Australia, and other English-speaking commonwealths.

When Mr. Truman speaks of going to the people to resolve an issue, he knows, of course, that the next presidential election is 2 years off. Such an issue as has arisen over sending troops abroad cannot wait that long to be resolved.

A fundamental issue of constitutionalism has cropped out. It goes to the worth of our own system in a crisis as compared with parliamentary systems where the people have a continuing voice in telling their representatives what they shall do.

What we need, of course, is a streamlining of the American constitutional system. It seems curious that with so many vital issues confronting us nobody in Congress has arisen to press for the passage of a constitutional amendment which will enable the American people to rule themelves. Such an amendment would provide for the President to resign if he cannot get a two-thirds vote of both Houses of else for Congress to resign and submit to a new election at once if the President and Congress cannot agree. There are many variations of this system, but the principle of responsibility runs through all of them.

In the absence of such a needed reform, it would be wiser if President Truman accepted the spirit of the parliamentary system which requires that the executive and legislative branches of the Government work together and act together. If Mr. Truman were to ask for specific approval of a broad program to send troops abroad to implement the North Atlantic Pact, it seems certain he would get such power. If the people, however, don't want to approve that step, the sooner the world knows it the better. To meet the issue squarely is to take advantage of an unexampled opportunity by the United States to show the world that both branches of our Government are united in support of the treaty obligations we have undertaken.

It is idle to argue that ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty didn't mean we were committing ourselves to send troops in advance of a war. The practical situation is that by sending troops abroad we help to prevent a war. To contend that the United States is not committed to send troops now is technically correct, but this is largely a quibble on the part of Congress.

Let's be done with all quibbling. The President should recognize that Congress is a part of the United States Government and is entitled to something more than polite or perfunctory consultation. Congress, as a coordinate branch of the Government elected by the people, is entitled to a full partnership in the formulation of policies that could mean war. There is no lack of machinery. It's the will to cooperate that seems lacking despite exhortations about unity.

Let us go forward together. It can be done—if grown men will cease to act as legalists and prima donnas at a critical moment in our history when we must take bold steps to avoid large-scale war.

God Saved My Life in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Saturday Evening Post of January 13, 1951:

GOD SAVED MY LIFE IN KOREA

(By Pvt. Robert L. Sharpe, as told to Bill Currie)

THIS IS THE FULLY DOCUMENTED FIRST-PERSON STORY OF WHAT HAPPENED TO A BOY FROM NORTH CAROLINA WHO WAS TAKEN PRISONER BY THE REDS—A RECORD OF SAVAGERY ALMOST WITHOUT PARALLEL IN OUR TIMES

(About the author: Pvt. Robert L. Sharpe, who has done so very much living in his 18 years, gave up a promising baseball career when he enlisted in the United States Army. He was best known in his home town, High Point, N. C., for having pitched a no-hit, no-run game in the Red Shield League, sponsored by the Salvation Army and civic clubs of High Point. He also pitched for his high-school team and played basketball. Private Sharpe enlisted on July 27, 1949, after his sophomore year in high school, and he was sent to Japan in February 1950. His father, mother, and three younger brothers—one only 18 months old—live in High Point. Robert aspires to be a professional soldier. Despite his experiences, he says he does not think the atom bomb should be used on the North Koreans.)

What happened to me while I was a prisoner of the North Koreans is no different from what happened to hundreds of others. Only I was spared to come back and tell about it. There has been a lot written about massacres and atrocities committed by the North Koreans. But I doubt that the whole horror of what it was really like has ever been recounted, or ever will be. As a matter of fact, in the time that I was a prisoner we experienced things for which there are no adequate words.

We landed in Korea on last Fourth of July for what we were told was to be a "police action." As we understood it at first, the South Korean Army was to do the fighting and we were to do the mopping up behind. But the "police action" business got to be a bum joke to us. In 2 weeks our whole battalion was torn apart, most of our men killed or wounded, and I was a prisoner in the hands of the Communists. As a medical corpsman, I arrived in Korea with little equipment and, of course, I was unarmed. But we heard of the massacre of the medics in the first battalion of the Twenty-fourth Regiment of the Twenty-fourth Division, so before we went into action we were issued an M-1 rifle and plenty of medical supplies. Men were so scarce that we medics threw away our arm bands, painted over the crosses on our helmets, and helped fight—carrying ammunition, moving equipment, and doing everything else that had to be done.

I was in G Company, Second Battalion, Nineteenth Regiment, Twenty-fourth Division. We had lost about a third of our men when we went on a volunteer mission to draw fire away from the surrounded first battalion. Our action enabled the first to fight back and rejoin the regiment. The rest of our battalion was in reserve and moved up to the line on the same day that we were coming back with the rescued first battalion. But because things were getting so hot, we were put off the trucks for the rear, and sent back into the line.

At that time we were sent along the bank of the Kum River. We didn't have an automatic weapon on our flanks, and we would have been wiped out if the North Koreans had tried to cross. But they didn't, and after 1 day they pulled us out and we started moving back. Our combat action had been sudden and tragic. The shock of violent death and suffering was too much, even in those early days, for some of us. Some of our men cracked up and were just crying shells of themselves before we reached our rest area 5 miles south of Taejon.

We were scheduled for a 4-day rest. But the North Koreans smashed across the Kum and after only 2 days we were sent back to the front to try to stop them. Morale was low and some of the men were drinking tank fluid. Others stole morphine from medical kits to bolster their nerves. Captain Bartz, our company commander, told us before we went in that the folks back home were counting on us and that we couldn't fail. When he got through, we were ready to fight to the last man. That's just about what happened. Captain Bartz and my platoon leader, Lt. Charles M. Matlock, of the Bronx, New York City, were the bravest men I ever saw. They had iron guts and knew how to make a man fight.

That we were fighting for the folks back home weighed heavily on our minds. The battle was fierce and bloody. In the confusion of fighting against heavy odds, our communications fell apart—even between the platoons of our company.

Communists were swarming all over the place and Captain Bartz ordered the company to fall back. But the runner didn't get to our platoon, so the rest of the company withdrew and left us surrounded—no way to get out. We finally got a message to abandon our position and it was every man for himself. We had to leave many of the wounded behind. I can still hear them screaming. I attended to all I could. But it wasn't much use, because the North Koreans came right along and bayoneted the wounded as they lay on the ground.

I found out the first day in battle that they had no mercy for the wounded. We had lots of casualties then, and when we were ordered back, one of our medics stayed with the wounded. Since he wouldn't leave, our chaplain wouldn't leave either. The medic got his—a bayonet through the neck—as he was trying to help a wounded man. The chaplain was bayoneted while he was on his knees praying beside a dying man.

Lieutenant Matlock led what was left of us into the hills. We thought we might circle back south and rejoin the American lines. It was a good 25 miles back to the American lines, and rough going because we were walking through rice paddies where the mud was sometimes knee-deep.

I think probably there were 15 of us left. We kept going until we came to a ravine, where the Communists in the rocks above us opened fire. It was murder. The fire came from all directions. Men fell and their shrieks could be heard even above the gunfire. I went face down in the mud and lay still, pretending that I was dead. The shooting finally stopped, and the Koreans came down to see if any of us were left. To make sure, they ran their bayonets through some, they kicked others, and they bashed others with the butts of their rifles.

But they didn't do anything to me. I was covered with blood anyhow, because I had been working on the wounded. My arms were soaked to the elbows. I had bent my head to listen for heartbeats in wounded men until my hair was matted with blood and it was dried on my face. They figured I was dead, I guess, because they set me up and pulled my belt off. Then another Korean unlaced my boots and left me barefooted. I never had another pair of shoes—except some grass slippers which I stole—until I was liberated. I walked nearly 400 miles without my boots.

The M-1 rifle which I had taken into battle was too clumsy with all my medical equipment, so I had swapped it for a carbine. But that was too much, too, so just the day before I had traded off the carbine for a .45 pistol. When the shooting started in the ravine I junked the pistol and the aid kit. Luckily the North Koreans didn't find either.

It was horrible lying there in the mud with all my buddies dead or dying around me. So I buried my face in the mud and lay there a couple of hours until the sun went down. I kept quiet until just before day, but then I crawled over to where I could get the pistol and the aid kit. I checked around to see if anybody else was alive. I found only three others. We drank some of the scummy rice-paddy water and got farther back into the hills to hide.

We didn't have anything to eat, so we tried grass, but that made us sick. We had to have food, and we decided to move at night, hoping to get back to the American lines. But I never could get the others to leave.

During the 4 days we hid out we read the Bible a lot and prayed much of the time. I always believed in God, and I believed that He could do anything. I believed that He could and would save us. We prayed hard and felt better because of it. God was our

only hope, and we tried to lay all our burdens on Him.

But we had trouble among ourselves. One of the fellows cried and carried on so that we were afraid he would give our position away. For a while we considered shooting him because we knew if he kept on we would be discovered. I'm glad, of course, that we didn't have to do it. We looked after him, and he got a little better, but we had to watch him every minute.

On the fourth day I was so hungry I didn't care if I got killed. The others wouldn't go, so I walked down alone. I went along a road and came on a farmer in a rice paddy, and asked him about some food. I think I just about scared him to death. He didn't want to have anything to do with me. But finally he agreed to give me something to eat, and took me to his little shanty on the mountainside. He and his wife gave me some mush—it was delicious to me. I got full, then kind of sick, and I was feeling mighty bad. The farmer kept urging me to go. I didn't want to get him in any trouble, so I headed back for the hills. But just as I got outside about two squads of North Koreans came running up, screaming and jumping up and down. They were in civilian clothes, but they had bayonets fixed, and they had hand grenades hanging all over them.

I had read about what the North Koreans did to prisoners; I jerked my pistol from the holster and put it up to my temple. I intended to commit suicide. But I just couldn't pull the trigger to kill myself. So I dropped down on both knees and waited for them to bayonet me. But it didn't come. They danced around me and whooped like Indians. Then one jerked me to my feet, slapped me across the mouth and asked if I understood Japanese. I told him I did, a little. So, right off the bat, he asked me what I thought of General MacArthur. I thought I had better play along, so I said I didn't like the general. He asked me about President Truman, and I said the same thing. Then he asked me about Henry Wallace, and again I said I didn't like him. It was a mistake, because I got cuffed around for that. But they didn't hurt me much. I became a prisoner.

While they walked me into Taejon, I thought about all the fellows who had been killed, and whose last words had been gasped out to me. Battlefield deaths aren't so dramatic as you see in the movies. Most of the time the fellows say something easy, like: "Well, I guess I didn't dodge that one," or "Get one for me, will you, doc?" I had a lot of 'em die in my arms, and I thought about 'em—I'm still thinking about them. And I was thinking that for a guy who had been 18 years old only a little over a month, I was getting near the end of a pretty short string myself.

One fellow I went to on the field had a bad chest wound. He was going; I could tell. But he kept pawing at his chest, thrashing around and crying, so I opened up his clothes. He had a big picture of a girl under his clothes next to his skin. She was a pretty girl, and the bullet that killed him had gone right through her chest too. I took the picture and rolled it up and put it in my kit. I was going to try to find her if I got back to tell her about him, but the North Koreans took the picture away from me.

As a matter of fact, they took everything I had. My shoes were already gone, and so was my belt. But they took my watch and my wallet, even my underwear. I slipped most of my money into my mouth. I'm glad I did, because later I was able to buy a cigarette butt for $10. Another fellow paid $200 for a half slice of bread.

They marched me through the streets of Taejon and showed me a whole arsenal of captured American weapons. Then they took me to a command post, where I was questioned. Not just the intelligence officer questioned me, all the soldiers did, and civilians, too. What they wanted to know most was where they could find Gen. Bill Dean. Of course, I didn't know, but they thought I did. They had the general's helmet liner with the two stars painted on it, and they had the silver stars from his jacket too. But they didn't have the general. From that, we figured that General Dean threw away his insignia to keep from being identified, and kept on fighting with the men until the end. [General Dean is still reported missing as this issue goes to press.—The Editors.]

They kept me around a couple of days, and then they sent me to a POW camp in Taejon. There were about 70 Americans there, about 25 of them wounded. They had had no medical attention, and there were no doctors or aid men in the prison until I arrived. There was nothing to work with, but I ripped up uniforms and made bandages and did the best I could to help the guys out a little. We didn't get much to eat—three rice balls a day. What we got was pretty hard to get down, and even harder to hold. The guards were rough, but their treatment seemed like Sunday School compared to what we got later.

During the 5 days I stayed there a lot of the men died, but their dying was easy beside the deaths of a lot of those who had to go later. It hurt me awful. I wanted to cry and hide myself, but I couldn't. I couldn't let down for a minute. My nerves, while still controllable, were almost to the breaking point. While we were there, I met Pvt. Edward Slayden, of Quincy, Ill. We became good friends and we swore never to leave each other. That promise cost me several chances to escape, for Slayden was later wounded. But I knew that had the situation been reversed he would not have left me.

After the 5 days we were told that we were being shipped to Seoul by train, where we would be placed aboard airplanes bound for the United States. I knew it wasn't true, but some of the men believed it. I tried to encourage it, because it meant hope. That's one way the Communists have of breaking a man. They beat you, starve you, and have you just about ready to die. Then they put out something hopeful. They pat you on the back, and then they drop the bottom out, and you're more hopeless than ever.

The train never showed up, so we started out to walk to Seoul. Between 50 and 60 men were able to walk; the rest were left behind. We moved at night, because the American planes were active against troops in the daytime, and while the guards were happy to have us strafed, they didn't take to it themselves. We walked only about 10 miles when we were picked up in trucks and carried to Chochiwon. We got there in the morning. But by this time I had lost track of what day it was.

They placed us in one of the few buildings left standing. Every day American planes came over and strafed. It was terrifying, and many of our men lost their minds as the bullets kicked up about us. We all tried to burrow into the concrete floor of the building. Some of the men tore the flesh from their hands trying to scratch their way to safety. But, miraculously, our building was never hit.

The march had hardly begun, but already death was everywhere. Rations had been cut to one rice ball a day. It was about the size of a golf ball and just about as good to eat. Once somebody brought in some green peaches. Oh, they were good, but they turned the insides of our men wrong side out. Dysentery hit and the men were mighty sick, passing blood nearly all the time. We were filthy and the place stank horribly. We were also crawling with lice, and though I must have picked a million off my own body, for every one I picked off there were a hundred I missed. It was all bad, but the dysentery was the worst part. One man had several feet of his entrails on the outside of him, and he lived for a while with his insides tied to his leg so they wouldn't swing when he walked.

We left Chochiwon on foot, and walked the round-about route to Chonan in about 4 days. It was forced march all the way. We had almost nothing to eat. The wounded and sick were left to die alongside the road—if they escaped being shot or bayoneted. The guards beat us, too, only not too much. They knew we had to walk. Too much beating meant we wouldn't be able to. The dysentery got worse all the time, of course, but they kept us marching.

The names of many of the men on the death march I remember very well, but most of them are still classified as missing in action. I have had lots of letters and visitors wanting information since I got back to the States. But I still think it wise not to circulate those names.

When we left Chonan, we all were getting much weaker. Sickness was getting worse. We walked about 20 miles. Then just outside of Osan they loaded us abroad a train and moved us to Suwon. There we stayed for 2 days, and of about sixty who had started from Taejon, I doubt if 40 survived. Finally we got to Seoul, the South Korean capital.

At Seoul we were joined by more than 300 other prisoners who had been sent back from all parts of the front. Among them was Capt. William Locke, who had married a girl from my home town, High Point, N. C. I talked with Captain Locke as much as we dared. I could have escaped with him later on the march but for my promise to Slayden.

The death march started winding its way northward from Seoul almost at once. The destination was Pyongyang, the North Korean capital. It was a peculiar route which we followed, carrying us many miles out of the way. There were 386 who left Seoul, but fewer than 100 ever reached Pyongyang. In a couple of days we were mighty hungry. After a while you get use to being hungry and it isn't so bad, but when you're just beginning to starve it's the toughest.

What made it really hard was marching through the farmlands where there was good food in the fields and apples and other fruit on the trees. They wouldn't let us have any. American planes strafed us daily and killed a lot of our men. But they didn't know they were doing it—and for those or us that lived, it helped a lot. When the planes came to strafe our column, the guards would run. That gave us a chance to steal food from the fields and eat while they were rounding us up again. I remember once I stole two pumpkins and ate them raw—I don't believe it took me more than 5 minutes. The guards fired over our heads a good deal to keep us in line. But by then most of us had lost any fear of death itself. We were more afraid of living another day like that.

The planes were terrible. The guards always cried, "Hongo," when the planes came over. "Hongo," means "Get down." The guards followed their own orders better than we did.

During our breaks, which came only when the guards got too tired to go on, those of us who were able tried to bury our dead. Most of the men who died went during the breaks. It seemed that a fellow could keep going as long as he was moving, but once he sat down his will couldn't keep him alive. We made little crosses out of sticks and said prayers over the graves. But the Koreans would laugh at us and kick the crosses down. God! How I hated their guts.

We finally got so it was almost too much effort to hit the dirt when the planes came over. We just stood in the middle of the road and waved. After a while the pilots figured out that we were American prisoners and didn't shoot, but it took a lot of lives before they recognized us. At Sariwon, on the way to Pyongyang, some of the sick were loaded into oxcarts because they couldn't walk any more.

Captain Locke, the only Air Force man with us, was about through walking because he wasn't trained for it. But when he saw American planes drop a wing and head for us, he cried for all the men to get off the carts. Not one moved except Captain Locke. The rest were too sick to move, so the Air Force shot them up without knowing they were Americans. But then it wasn't long before the Air Force quit shooting at us. Still, while one threat to our lives was gone, it meant we had to march in the daytime, because the guards then knew it was safe.

As I walked along I had plenty of time to think. I thought and prayed mostly about my mother and father and three kid brothers back home in High Point. I thought some, too, about our chances. I always remembered the Korean officer in Seoul who asked me what I thought of General MacArthur. By that time I was fed up with them, so I told him the General was just fine. He spit right between my eyes for that. I'll never forget it or him.

About 50 miles before we got to Pyongyang, Ed Slayden slipped into a field for some food. The guards shot him and he was badly wounded, but he made it back to the column and I practically carried him the last 50 miles.

That sounds like quite a job, and it was, but not a bit more miraculous than our escape in the end. The Koreans did everything they could to have us killed without actually doing it themselves. Still, we managed to stay alive. It was no accident. There is only one power big enough for that. I still know that God alone brought us through. God gave me strength to walk and half-carry Ed, and kept Ed alive even after he spit up blood with every breath.

Even after we got to Pyongyang, the Koreans tried ways of killing us. They starved us, beat us, and they threw hand grenades into the building where we were quartered. We threw them out again before they could explode. They took our Bibles and tore them up. But we kept on praying, and they kept on laughing.

Though weaker every day, I was still in much better shape than most of the men. Being younger and in good shape when it all started, I was able to stand the march better than the older fellows. Those of us who could, tried to bury the dead, but it was a hard job. Those North Koreans still kicked the crosses off the graves almost as soon as we put them up, but we put them up anyhow. We finally tried to find a bottle of some kind for every man who died. In the bottle we put his name and serial number, so, if the graves-registration men ever find them, they'll know who they are.

It is a little hard for me to remember just when we left Pyongyang, but one day we were told we were being moved to a permanent camp near the Manchurian border. Few of us could have walked any distance at all. Without mercy, the North Koreans beat the sick ones to get them on their feet, and clubbed them with the butts of their rifles—Russian rifles.

They loaded us aboard a train. It was getting cold then, and we had nothing but our fatigue clothes. Nobody had any real shoes and the grass slippers which some of us had stolen were not much help, so everybody had foot trouble. The train was made up of coal cars. It was night, and pouring down rain. We had a new set of guards—a bunch of South Koreans who had been "converted"—and they were just as mean as the North Koreans had been. They beat us and kicked us around. The surest way to get a lick was to show fear. You had a better chance if you could look 'em in the eye. Sometimes I could, sometimes I couldn't.

All night the train shifted back and forth. I don't think we made more than 10 miles that night. We were freezing. The next morning they gave us some hard crackers to eat. You couldn't throw one of them down and break it. More of our men died from exposure, pneumonia, dysentery, and exhaustion.

One of the guards was a pretty good guy—we called him John. He was American-educated, and he would have nothing to do with beating any of the prisoners. He even tried to slip us food. He was later shot because he wouldn't beat us or help shoot us in the massacre which was to follow.

They took us off the train in the morning. We walked to a ravine, where we sat down and rested all day. That night they put us back on the train, and then they made us get off again. This sounds like a simple order. But to some of our men, getting on and off a train was a great effort. The next day they put us back on the train and started shifting around again. When we got back on the train the third time we were in a regular passenger car—they picked it up after bumping into a deserted train which had been left standing idle on the tracks. The shifting forward and back continued—I don't think we moved over 25 miles in two nights. On the third day I left Ed Slayden in the rear of the car and crawled under the seats to the forward part to talk with Allen J. Gifford, from New Jersey. Allen was an old friend, my roommate in Japan before we went to Korea. We had a reunion as prisoners.

We talked for quite a while about old times in Japan and about the march. We talked about how hard it was to walk by the fields and orchards full of crops and fruit without being allowed to eat. We shared broken hearts over having seen pilots in planes who were within hollering distance of us, and yet couldn't help us.

Suddenly we went into a tunnel which ran through a mountain. The train stopped. We paid little attention—we had been stopping and starting for 3 days. The guards said something about food. That brought me up from under the seats in a hurry. They said we were going to near-by farmhouses to eat. Not taking a chance on missing food, I was the fourth man in line off that train. Some of our fellows had little bowls or pieces of cups they had picked up, so they brought them along. They marched us along the railroad track out of the tunnel the same way we had gone in. We walked through the brush to a little ravine. There they let us sit down. Those who had little dishes were cleaning them out and getting ready to eat. Then I heard a rifle bolt slide home and, a minute later, a shot.

The guy next to me pitched over on his face. He was dead. I screamed something in the way of warning, and hit the ground. Then all hell broke loose. They opened up on us with rifles, machine guns, burp guns and everything else that would shoot. The men were screaming and begging for mercy, and calling on God to spare their lives. But the Koreans kept on shooting. They raked the ground up and down with fire, cutting the screaming men to pieces.

I was on the ground almost at the first shot. Another fellow piled on top of me. He saved my life at the cost of his. They shot him all to pieces and his blood ran all over me. It was warm and sickening. I wanted to jump up and cry, but I kept still. The shooting continued. It seemed a very long time. In reality it was all over in about 15 minutes.

I had been hit in the right arm and the right leg, and I was losing a good deal of blood. But I lay still. The Koreans then made the rounds of the bodies. They stuck some with bayonets, and they broke the heads of others with their rifle butts. I could see the detail coming toward me. But they didn't hit me in the head—only in the chest. Though I had the print of the rifle butt for several weeks, there was nothing serious done to me then.

I was praying. Not out loud, but praying anyhow. I prayed that it would come quickly, that I would be dead without any more suffering. It hurt me more than I can ever tell, to think about those poor, helpless men who had walked and suffered all those miles, only to be shot down without a chance. I can hardly bear to think of it now.

Gifford was lying beside me. He was moaning that he was dying. I whispered to him to be quiet. He, too, lived through it all. He cried, "Don't leave me," over and over again. I tried to reassure him in whispers. Finally, all the Koreans left but one. Then he, too, left, and we were alone among all the bodies of our friends. It was the second time for me, but the fact that I had been through something like it before didn't make it any easier.

We waited quite a while, and then we found that there were four able to walk. Some of the others were alive, but we had to leave them behind because we were too weak ourselves to carry anyone along. It hurts me yet to think of leaving those fellows. But we had to try to save ourselves then.

We made for the hills, but we wouldn't go far. I ripped out a piece of my fatigue jacket and made a tourniquet for my arm. I managed to stop the bleeding in both my wounds. But I was so weak that I fell down, and it started again. Then I couldn't stop it, and I got weaker and weaker.

When the sun came up I was spitting up blood, and I was sure that I couldn't live through the day. We were all just about dead. I prayed hard most all day, for myself and for the folks back home. About 4 o'clock that afternoon we heard voices and people walking around, and we thought the Koreans had us again. The folks we heard were shouting for us to come on out—that we were free, and saved.

But we had been lied to and tricked too many times. We were afraid to answer at all for a while. Then when they kept calling, I yelled down, "Who is Betty Grable's husband?"

I was pretty well convinced that the folks we heard were Americans. But we were still cautious. I got up on my feet, feeling pretty dizzy, and hollered, "If you guys are Americans, come up here!"

We didn't have long to wait. In just a few seconds a big sergeant came up the path. I ran, fell, crawled to him, and dropped into him arms. Yes, I even kissed him. My prayers had been answered.

We were taken to an aid station, where our wounds were tended, and then evacuated to Japan. After a term in the hospital there, I was flown to the United States, and I spent a short time in a hospital on the Pacific coast.

When I landed in Korea I weighed 148. When I was liberated I weighed 98. I'm back up to 140 now, and feeling fine. I hope to make the Regular Army my career. But the entire muscle in my right arm is gone, and my right leg will never be exactly normal again. So I may not be fit for military duty, but I hope to be.

As I said before, we prayed a lot in Korea. But I had been taught to pray all my life, so it was nothing new to me. The fact that our prayers were answered, while wonderful, was no great surprise. God brought us out of there, and I want to tell the world that I know He did it.

Not So Self-Sufficient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, January 14, 1951, entitled "Not So Self-Sufficient":

NOT SO SELF-SUFFICIENT

In the debate over continuance of American aid to our democratic friends and anti-Communist associates abroad, most of the emphasis has been placed on their dependence on the United States and on our moral, political, economic and military obligations to help them. These countries do need our assistance; but sometimes we tend to forget that we, in turn, need theirs. In fact, when it comes to obtaining an adequate supply of certain vital raw materials absolutely essential to our military effort, the United States is now totally or largely dependent on foreign areas, and on areas outside the Western Hemisphere at that. Much-needed steps are being taken to establish with our allies a joint procurement policy for some of these commodities whose price has skyrocketed—tin and rubber, for example—and also to prevent them from getting into unfriendly hands. But the fact remains that the United States needs these raw materials; and if we were cut off from the sources of supply in Asia and Africa, we would be in serious straits.

It is precisely because of this dependence that we have embarked on a gigantic stockpile program. The strategic stockpile, more and more shrouded by the Munitions Board in military secrecy, is far from complete; yet Congress has already appropriated almost $3,000,000,000 for the purpose since 1946. But since no man can tell how large a stockpile of any given commodity would actually be needed to carry us through an emergency of indefinite duration, this device is at best only partial insurance against our lack of self-sufficiency.

We are, for example, stockpiling tin—an essential metal for military uses—of which we produce virtually none in this country. Most of it comes from southeast Asia. Formerly dependent on Russia, we now turn to Africa and India for manganese, indispensable in steel production. The United States produces about one-tenth of its own needs. We get chromite, necessary for high-speed cutting steels, mainly from Turkey and other far-distant areas. This tremendously valuable metal also used to come principally from Russia. Cobalt, the importance of which has shot up because of its use in making jet engines, is imported mainly from the Belgian Congo—the United States producing about one-ninth of its own consumption. The Congo is also our primary source of uranium, basic constituent of the atom bomb. These are only a few of the outstanding examples; but the list is, of course, not confined to minerals. One of our most vital deficiencies is in natural rubber. We produce none ourselves and import practically our entire consumption from Asia. Our synthetic rubber industry is growing; but for certain uses—truck tires, for example—a considerable admixture of natural with synthetic is essential. Silk, needed for specialized wartime uses, is imported from Japan; wool for uniforms comes from Australia and other distant countries. If shipping from South America were very seriously interfered with—as it probably would be in case of war—we would find ourselves short of many other vital products—for example, bauxite, the ore from which aluminum is obtained.

Some of these critical materials can, of course, be produced at great cost and with much expenditure of time and labor in this country. Vast deposits of low-grade manganese, for example, exist in the United States, and they are beginning to be developed with Government assistance through the newly created Defense Minerals Administration. Conservation of imported materials and substitution of one ingredient for another can prolong the use of existing stocks. But there are no substitutes for some items in certain uses, and even where substitution is possible it is likely to cause further dislocations, shortages, and disruption of war industry.

The brutal fact remains that there is no easy way out. The United States is not, and probably never can be, self-sufficient. While we could conceivably squeeze by for a considerable time under war conditions without access to the world beyond the Americas, we would be at a monumental disadvantage in respect to raw materials. For this reason alone—leaving aside for the moment all question of morals and politics, of strategic bases, and of industrial and economic power—our renunciation of the rest of the world and voluntary withdrawal to the so-called Gibraltar of the American Continent would be a policy as foolish as it is dangerous. We believe that if its advocates looked squarely at the facts as they are now and as they are likely to be for years to come, they would recognize the error of such a course.

Spies and Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorial comment from the Washington News and Washington Evening Star advocating immediate Congressional action to aid Federal investigative agencies in their efforts to apprehend and convict traitors, saboteurs, enemy spies, and other disloyal elements by permitting interception of their communications with one another. The editorials follow:

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of December 23, 1950]

SPIES AND LAWS

Congress has passed, at the Justice Department's request, a bill authorizing FBI agents to make arrests without warrants in cases involving espionage, sabotage, and other felonies.

Another bill, introduced by Representative K. B. KEATING, of New York, would legalize FBI wiretapping to obtain evidence against suspected spies and saboteurs.

Both measures result from the New York Federal Appeals Court decision which voided Judith Coplon's conviction for stealing secret Government information and giving it to a Russian agent. The court held that, although her guilt was clear, Miss Coplon had been deprived of the constitutional right to due process of law because—

FBI agents, who arrested her without a warrant, failed to prove as present law requires that this was necessary to prevent her escape.

The Government failed to prove that FBI wiretaps led to none of the evidence used in obtaining her conviction.

Present Federal law makes it a crime to intercept and divulge communications. Yet the FBI does intercept—does tap wires—in its work of protecting the country from spies, saboteurs, and other public enemies. It must first get permission from the Attorney General, who acts by authority of an Executive order issued by President Roosevelt in 1940. But if information the FBI obtains by wiretapping is divulged by its use as evidence in court, that can give a guilty spy basis for a successful appeal from conviction.

That is a ridiculous situation. If FBI wiretapping was essential to national security in 1940, it is more essential now. It should be legalized. Information obtained by this method should be made admissible as evidence. And safeguards against its abuse, and for the rights of innocent persons, should be provided.

The Keating bill proposes that the FBI be required to obtain wiretap permits from Federal courts, upon showing of good reason to believe that information thus obtained is necessary to proper investigations. This would seem a much better safeguard than the present requirement for permits from the FBI's boss, the Attorney General.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star]

"FOOLHARDY AND INEXCUSABLE"

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has used the right language to describe the handicaps imposed on American counterespionage agents by the anti-wiretapping provision of the Federal Communications Act. It is indeed foolhardy and inexcusable to continue to give spies and saboteurs the protection they now enjoy under section 605 of the law establishing the FCC. That section forbids interception and divulgence of communications. The Supreme Court has ruled that this bars the use in court of any evidence derived from wire tapping.

The committee, in its year-end report to the House, cites an anonymous case to illustrate the absurdity of permitting this legal restriction on prosecution of known spies and traitors to remain on the statute books. "The committee knows," the report states, "as do the intelligence agencies of the executive branch, the identity of an individual who has turned over secret and confidential information for the use of the Soviet Union. Proof of this traitorous act, together with proof that this individual perjured himself when he denied the accusation, is contained in the form of evidence which cannot be used in court because of a prohibition contained in the Federal Communications Act. The committee is aware that this is not the only case in which prosecution is affected by the act." (The report indicated that the case referred to is that of the mysterious Scientist X, said to have passed atomic information to Russia.) The committee expressed its horror at the immunity from prosecution conferred on such suspects by the much-debated section 605.

Congress has dilly-dallied too long with the wire-tapping problem. Surely there has been enough evidence of fifth-column operations within the past several years to convince any reasonable person of the grave risk of allowing spies to go free because of an ill-advised legal restraint on law enforcement. The cause of national security demands immediate amendment of the FCC law to enable the FBI and other intelligence agencies to listen in on spy communications and to use what they hear in court.

Hands-Off-Korea Advocates Lead Press Poll, 5½ to 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me to place extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following article from the Binghamton Press:

HANDS-OFF-KOREA ADVOCATES LEAD PRESS POLL, 5½ TO 1

The hands-off-Korea advocates have dominated the Binghamton Press opinion poll by a landslide margin of 5½ to 1.

The believers in a stay-out-of-Europe policy also have prevailed in the poll, but with a lesser show of strength. Their margin is about 2 to 1.

A tabulation last night showed that 663 readers checked off and submitted the poll ballots published in the Press.

Exactly 620 readers voted on the Korea issue.

Of that total, 527 readers, or 85 percent, said the United States should withdraw its troops immediately from Korea in order to provide a combat-trained corps for the big army of recruits now being built up in the United States.

This left only 93 readers, or 15 percent, who said the United States should keep its troops in Korea as long as possible to maintain a strong bargaining position in the hope a settlement can be negotiated with the Chinese and North Korean Communists.

The question of participation in Europe drew responses from 636 readers.

Of these, 417 readers, or 65½ percent, said the United States should refrain from sending men and arms to continental Europe. They believe the country would serve its own interests by strengthening its own defenses, with perhaps Great Britain as its farthest Atlantic outpost.

This left 219 readers, or 34½ percent, who said the United States should send men and arms to western continental Europe, provided that Europe itself assumes a fair share of the defense. They believe the United States thus would serve its own interests by deterring the Soviet Union.

Yesterday's tabulation showed approximately the same proportions as an earlier accounting, when only 212 ballots had been tallied. The later count showed just a slight strengthening of the "stay-at-home" faction.

About 100 of the readers had strong enough sentiments to attach notes to their ballots. In all but a few cases, these readers believe we should get out of Korea and stay out of Europe.

One reader advised adoption of this rule in international affairs:

"People are a great deal better off if they mind their own business."

Another said, with reference to Europe, that assignment of troops "should always be decided in Congress."

One reader summed up a feeling shared by several others this way: "We need more men like HOOVER and TAFT."

At least four readers suggested bitterly that the big shots in Washington should be sent to Korea. This, they said would halt war.

One reader came up with a slogan: "TAFT or MacArthur for President."

Another said:

"We should export all Russians and persuade all western nations to do so. The taxpayers should be willing to pay their way back to Paradise, U. S. S. R."

From the other side of the fence, an internationalist said the first published results of the poll must have "the local Communists jumping with glee."

He also said cryptically that "maybe you should have taken the poll" at Harpur College, and added: "I'm for Truman, Acheson, Dulles, Dewey and Austin."

Another internationalist said American troops should stay in Korea as long as General MacArthur advises it. This reader also said, "We should not leave our European allies in the bag."

Feelings ran strong on both sides in this barrage of notes.

One reader suggested simply that another poll be held on the subject: "Should we impeach the President?"

What Are We Waiting for?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, recent news dispatches from abroad, concerning which there has been almost no comment at all in the newspapers, may provide an explanation of the hysteria which marks the actions and the pronouncements of the Truman administration.

From the signs and portents plainly visible in these news dispatches from responsible representatives of the major wire services, one is compelled to wonder if the administration realizes, and dare not admit, that it is later than anyone had thought.

The President concedes that it will be late in 1952, or possibly 1953, before Uncle Sam's fighting muscles regain a respectable size and strength. He concedes that the same is true with respect to our Western European allies. He remains, as yet, unwilling to do anything about building up the strength of our allies and potential allies in the Far East.

Yet these news dispatches reveal an over-all situation that calls for no vacillation, no delay, and for the most strenuous efforts to speed up war production and to put our economy on a wartime basis.

One dispatch, dated about 2 weeks ago, told how Russian soldiers, munitions, and equipment have been pouring through Black Sea ports into Bulgaria. Later news indicates that at least seven new divisions have thus entered the satellite nation lying closest to Yugoslavia, with more on the way.

A later dispatch told how Soviet Russia, within the last week or so, has massed troops in excess of half a million men around Vladivostok, close to Japan and not far from our Alaskan frontier.

Dispatches from various sources, in the last 10 days, have told how Soviet Russia is stepping up the effort to enlist the sympathies of oil-rich Iran, and take that country away from the camp of the western nations. The dispatches indicate that this effort is meeting with considerable success.

Within the last week dispatches from Berlin have told how the Russians have reestablished in part the former Berlin blockade, whereby coal from east Germany is prevented from reaching west Berlin. This was done in an apparent effort to create the necessity of a new Berlin airlift, which would draw American planes away from the Far East.

The action in Berlin would seem to hook up directly with the latest dispatches, which say that the Chinese Communists have massed several thousand vessels at Amoy and Foochow in readiness for an invasion of Formosa as soon as weather permits. It would seem to hook up, too, with General Douglas MacArthur's belief that Japan will be attacked, when and if American troops are driven entirely out of Korea.

The reason for Soviet Russia's apparent attempt to draw American planes away from the western Pacific, it seems to me, is the fact that our planes are important in the blockade now being maintained between Formosa and the Chinese mainland. Also that Russian strategists know well enough that our air power would be the greatest factor in preventing an invasion of Japan.

When all of these things are added together, and to them is added the appeasement of both Russia and the Chinese Reds, now sought by Great Britain and some other members of the United Nations, the outlook for halting the early onset of a new global war does not appear rosy.

In view of this black outlook for global war by next spring, it would seem to any reasonable person that the present vacillation and delay, the tendency of the Truman administration to preoccupy itself with the partisan political aspects of mobilization and the change to a war economy, unless laid aside at once, can lead only to further disaster.

Governor's Message to the Thirty-first Session of the Legislature of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very profound inaugural address delivered by the Honorable Len B. Jordan, Governor of Idaho, at the convening of the thirty-first session of the legislature, on January 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE TO THE THIRTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF IDAHO, 1951

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and members of the thirty-first legislature. We are gathered here today in joint session to examine

the solemn responsibilities of legislation in Idaho for the next 2 years. If the world were at peace, the task ahead of us would still be serious. In a world torn with conflict the burden is immeasurably greater.

It is a time for standing together, for in days like these we must preserve every ounce of strength and conserve every resource against the uncertain future. There is no greater resource than unity among our people.

We need to plan with calmness and deliberation as opposed to snap judgments and hysteria. To do this we must be able to trust each other, not have to suspect motives.

None can say how long the period of international conflict will last; no one knows how deeply we may become enmeshed in the crisis. Each day's news brings more confusion, and more sense of heartbreak and terror.

Against this background of chaos we begin today to set up our own State problems for examination. I am not a person who speaks in generalities; I shall tell you plainly what I think.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

The people of this State must be warned not only of atomic attacks; they must be warned that saboteurs or special aerial bombs could spread infections among people, animals, and crops; and that colorless, odorless gases delivered by the same means could paralyze whole populations.

Local communities should be urged to build up their health agencies at once for defense against disaster from atomic, biological, or chemical warfare. Every city block and every county in this State should have a framework for defense set up for it.

Since all laws are better administered at the local level, we should have our civilian defense locally organized, thus to secure better functioning and better protection.

We must prepare all our resources and manpower for immediate mobilization if that becomes necessary. Up to now, our civil-defense program has been purely voluntary. Two officers from the Sixth Army Headquarters in San Francisco spent 2 weeks in Boise a month ago and assisted in setting up a civil-defense plan for the State, a plan to be integrated with those of neighboring States. Gov. C. A. Robins appointed Col. Phillip Doddridge as director. I concurred in that appointment.

Colonel Doddridge will have our plan ready for distribution sometime this week.

I have approved an emergency request for $10,000 to pay the administrative costs of his office for the 6-month period ending June 30. A similar administrative budget has been approved for the next biennium.

COST OF GOVERNMENT

The cost of government is always of major importance. In the midst of an undeclared war against an evil that threatens our very existence, and at a time when we have not yet recovered from a previous titanic struggle, our State revenues have reached their peak and are on the decline. Meanwhile our national debt has mounted to heights never before dreamed of. Our State income will be less this year and our Federal taxes to support the war will be much greater. This simply means that the State must spend less.

However, there is a measure of satisfaction in the fact that a substantial free balance remains at this time in Idaho's general fund. Government revenues can and often do shrink with amazing speed and Government functions cannot always be adjusted downward that fast. Obviously the safe course is to maintain a reserve or cushion of available funds to continue the essential services of Government during periods of lowered revenue. That is common sense.

The estimated free balance in the general fund June 30, 1951, should be approximately [illegible]. As your Governor, I recommend that $2,000,000 of this amount be set aside in the permanent building fund. This will protect the orderly program of construction at State institutions that the legislature of 1947 undertook.

The possibility of demands upon State government for large emergency expenditures for civilian defense or for major catastrophes appears to justify an appropriation of $1,000,000 from this free balance for such protection. Use of this money should be subject to the will and control of the legislature, but without the need of calling a special session.

The remainder of the free fund balance, in my opinion, should be preserved intact against unexpected shrinkages in State revenue between now and June 30, 1953.

It may be that the estimated general-fund revenues of $32,500,000 during the biennium is too optimistic. To arrive at this figure it was assumed that while excise-tax collections may show an increase, State income taxes will probably reflect curtailed profits with a consequent reduction of at least one-sixth in the next biennium as compared to that now drawing to a close.

A substantial part of the reduction in income taxes will be due to the imposition of increased Federal taxes on incomes. These become items of expense in computing State income taxes. In a State like Idaho, where agriculture is an extremely important income factor, the reduced net profit on major crops, such as potatoes, will be felt keenly.

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS

Budget requests for appropriations from the general fund as first submitted to me totaled $48,500,000.

The first revision of these requests still totaled $47,000,000, leaving a gap of $14,500,000 between that total and the estimated general fund revenues of $32,500,000, which sum does not include State ad valorem tax receipts.

The easiest and most comfortable course to close this gap would be to seek so-called new sources of revenue. However, I am convinced that there are no new sources of tax revenue. What may appear to be new sources are actually only new avenues of approach to the same purse from which must come all money for operation of all Government, local, State and Federal. That purse is in the hand of the individual citizen. It is he who must finally pay every cent of the cost of government while meeting with today's 50-cent dollar the increased cost of his own living.

I am resolved that Idaho shall not go into deficit spending during the coming biennium, and it is my earnest hope that the members of this legislature will join me in this endeavor. Our State is solvent. We must keep it solvent. Our people will have to get along on less and be proud to do so. They must put aside pleasant dreams of free spending and focus on reality. And they must be ready personally to share in the cutting down—it is each of us, not somebody else, who must reduce his ideas of what the State can spend on itself.

Deficit financing as a planned policy is indefensible. Every department of State government must cut out spending for nonessentials, and I promise you the Governor's office will accept the same austerities that are asked of other departments.

Practically $1 in every $4 requested from the general fund has been eliminated in scaling the budget down. It is my belief that the existing tax system in Idaho when operating at maximum effect can produce adequate revenue for the conduct of all necessary functions of State government, assuming that these same functions are also operated efficiently.

Budget cutting is not painless or easy. It is especially hard when you realize, as I do, that salaries must follow the rising curve of living costs. With this in mind, and in this time of high employment, I propose the economy of more efficient staffing of State offices. That is, we cannot cut salaries but we can eliminate personnel and insist that those retained do a day's work for a day's pay.

In facing the necessity of drastic cuts in the State budget requests, what government functions have the first claim on the tax dollars?

Few will dispute the statement that the humanitarian needs of our people have the highest priority. The unfortunate men, women, and children who find themselves on our relief rolls and in our custodial institutions must be cared for with preferment over other Government demands.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

I have made no cut in pensions and relief from the amount requested. This amount, while somewhat higher than that of the present biennium, is a revised figure. Living costs for recipients follow the same curve as do living costs for all other people. The deserving destitute must have more money to meet this rising figure.

Taking care of the relief load under this revised estimate will be possible only if the legislature will cooperate in clarifying certain public-assistance statutes so that exploitation of relief funds can be sharply checked.

The experience of a neighboring State indicates that it is quite possible to rid the relief rolls of elderly pensioners not actually dependent on the State. By so doing, more money should be available for the truly needy.

I urge your favorable consideration of legislation to attain this end.

EDUCATION: PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Education stands next in priority, and in that category public schools have the right to prior consideration over higher education.

The public school equalization request was for $9,000,000 from the general fund. A new transportation appropriation formula adopted by the State board of education at its meeting December 15, 1950, reduces State participation in public school equalization by an estimated $3,000,000, which action of the board I do approve.

I therefore approve the sum of $6,000,000 from the general fund for public school equalization as the State's full share in this program.

The transfer of the bulk of the transportation cost to the local level may require the upping of county or district levy limits for this purpose.

TEACHERS' RETIREMENT FUND

The budget request that three and a quarter million dollars be appropriated from the general fund to the reserve of the teachers' retirement fund does not have my approval. On the other hand, it is my recommendation that the legislature reappraise this entire problem, keeping in mind that you are free to alter any program set up by a preceding legislature in the light of two things: operating history and changed conditions.

It is conceivable that amendments to the Federal Social Security Act that have brought State and other local government employees under its coverage may be adequate for teachers as well. At any rate this possibility should have a full and dispassionate study, something that may not be feasible during a legislative session.

If there is even a remote chance that the State might some day be unable to keep up with the continuous increase in cash requirements for this program, this issue should be faced today, not later.

The present solvency of the fund and its adequacy to meet any existing demands upon it are not in question. But now is the time to determine our future course while existing reserves are adequate to pay back all personal contributions, provide for prior

service benefits and meet any transition costs that might be involved in modifying the program.

I repeat that I do not approve the budget request for $3,250,000 to be appropriated to the teachers' retirement fund.

HIGHER EDUCATION

It has long been clear to the thoughtful that Idaho is neither populous enough nor wealthy enough to support four institutions of higher learning.

It may come as a shock to some of you to learn that necessary adjustments have now been worked out between the State board of education and the university and State college jointly, to permit these two institutions to absorb the functions of the North Idaho College of Education and the South Idaho College of Education. The new arrangement would become effective at the end of the biennium, which is June 30, 1951, and I do so recommend, subject of course, to your approval.

Owing to military demands, curtailed enrollments are due at both the university and the college, and thus housing and classroom facilities would still be sufficient for absorption of students from the Lewiston and Albion institutions. It is my belief that the young people who choose education for their profession will have greater and not lesser opportunities under such a program. The greater scope at the university and at the State college should attract more men and women to the important field of teaching. No additional funds will be required by either the university or the State college to cover the expense occasioned by the proposed absorption.

I wish to touch here on the question of research work carried on by both our higher institutions. Some of this will have to be deferred, for resumption at a later, more prosperous period. Many activities that are justified in time of affluence must be reduced when revenues begin dwindling.

Along this line I recommend that the work of the agricultural extension service, admirable as it is, be made available only to those counties that feel it is of such value that they desire to bear half of the total cost.

PUBLIC HEALTH

I recommend particularly that you scrutinize the program for public health in Idaho. In the limited time I was able to give the subject, I became so involved in the intricacies of Federal matching funds that I cannot claim to see the picture clearly. I call your attention, however, to the mushrooming of public health requests during the past several years, and I raise the question, Where is it taking us?

SPECIAL FUNDS

Operations in State government that are financed from special funds are especially likely to be revised by legislative action. With this in mind, I have approved many special-fund budgetary requests on the theory that if they are not changed by legislative action, some revisions can be worked out through consultation with administrative heads.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

The position that State government should occupy in the field of law enforcement calls for careful study. Certainly one aim should be the acceptance of their legal responsibility by all county and municipal officials and law-enforcement officers.

I do not believe that our economy justifies specialists in law enforcement. In other words, State police will be expected to handle any phase of law enforcement.

To increase the efficiency of our State system, the special session last year provided for fixed and mobile checking stations. It requires 24 men to handle these stations, and I have approved appropriations to activate this work in addition to a force of 25 regular State police. This adds up to what should be a highly efficient group of officers, men who are more than patrolmen, and who are available wherever State law enforcement, rather than local, must be used.

I assume that the State went into the liquor business first for regulation and control, and secondly, for profit.

Profits from liquor sales are divided between the general fund of the State and the counties. Liquor-law enforcement, therefore, becomes a joint responsibility of the State and the counties. One-half of 1 percent of total liquor sales has been set aside and earmarked for liquor-law enforcement exclusively. The $100,000 per biennium thus raised should be made available to the Department of Law Enforcement to defray the State police cost of liquor-law enforcement.

Let no one construe these comments as implying a let down in that law enforcement which is the responsibility of the State.

HIGHWAYS

Few State government activities have the widespread effect that the construction and maintenance of State highways have.

Because of the large stake of the Federal Government in our State land area, we receive substantial sums each year from that source. However, one-third of the State's area remains in private ownership, and a heavy ad valorem tax burden for secondary county and municipal highways and streets is the result. Our mountainous terrain and our widespread, small population increases this highway burden.

It is clear that any increase in funds for highways and streets will have to come from some type of highway-user revenue, and that a larger share of the total highway-user taxes should be available to local units of government, especially to those local units that levy the maximum for road needs.

It is mandatory that the legislature determine which of two types of State highway administration shall be employed. If a single administrator is made responsible for a highway program that spends $30,000,000 a biennium, then the salary ceiling that follows such responsibility must be raised.

Or, if responsibility is to be shared by a group, there should be clearly defined duties and authority. A tremendous volume of pressure has developed through the State following the authorization by the special legislative session of a highway advisory board.

I have reached the conclusion that the present administrative set-up with an advisory board is unworkable. We need workable highway laws. I shall have more to say about this later. Long-range highway planning is always essential in the public interest. It was never more so.

Highway-user taxes have not kept pace with the needs for highway maintenance and construction. Through long-range planning the fiscal needs of the entire State highway program can be determined.

Highway-user taxes can then be adjusted to meet the costs of the program.

Particular attention should be given to equitable distribution of highway costs among the several classes of highway users. I believe each class of users should pay its share of highway costs in proportion to the use it makes of the road plant.

SLOT MACHINES

Limitations under which cities and villages of Idaho could permit or prohibit the operation of slot machines and punchboards were provided by the legislature of 1947. If the present legislature decides that these acts should be repealed because such gambling devices are undesirable under any circumstances, I shall adhere to the statement I made prior to election. That is, if a proper bill prohibiting slot machines and punchboards, either or both, reaches my desk, I will sign it.

Whatever you decide, I earnestly request that you do not allow gambling legislation to consume a disproportionate share of valuable legislative time.

OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING

There is evidence that a number of revisions will be asked in laws relating to occupational licensing. These will be presented for groups seeking to have the State regulate their professions and occupations but at the same time collect license fees which would be spent without State regulation.

Some of these bills will probably create the equivalent of closed-shop conditions in these occupational groups, and it is important that they receive close study to determine who is to prescribe the rules and regulations that will prevail.

CONSOLIDATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

As an economy measure to effect the saving of possibly $50,000 in Federal funds, which, however, are collected annually from Idaho employers, to provide an integrated program without duplication of effort and as a safeguard against further growth of Federal control over State operation, I recommend uniting the Employment Service and Employment Security Agency into one department.

This combined department would be directly accountable to the governor on administrative matters of State policy and for efficient handling of all job placements, including placements of farm labor, veterans—particularly disabled veterans—and teachers, and for prompt payment of unemployment-insurance benefits to those claimants who are entitled to them. Appeals would still be made to the Industrial Accident Board.

Such a consolidation has already been effected in 44 States and is recognized by the Federal Government as a single program. Administrative funds of the two present agencies are provided by a single congressional appropriation and are received by the State in a single check.

The tax rates supporting the reserve fund would be adjusted so that they will not exceed the minimum necessary to maintain solvency. An actuarial study which has just been completed indicates that benefits can be raised and tax rates reduced while maintaining a safe financial position.

Legislation incorporating these as well as some other desirable improvements, including such things as preservation of veterans' experience rating rights and strengthening fraud prevention in the employment security law, has been prepared for your consideration.

In all this talk of cutting down, some will argue that certain State departments will be deprived of funds now available under Federal grants or Federal aid.

Federal aid is a misbrand. All money that comes from Washington, D. C., originally came from Idaho or some other State. When it goes to Washington a good deal of it rubs off before it gets back. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, Federal participation means Federal regulation with all the involvements of bureaucratic red tape.

I am asking every State office to operate on less money than it has requested, or else accept the responsibility of justifying its increased expenditures before the proper committees of the legislature.

There are no exceptions to this rule. I am not asking other departments to do what I am not willing to do myself. Accordingly, the combined request for the office of the governor and budget director has been reduced substantially below the level of the past biennium.

SALARIES

Salaries of elective and appointive State officials in Idaho are much more uniform than are the comparable duties and responsibilities of the several offices.

If we are to keep on attracting capable men and women to the service of this state,

it will be necessary for the legislature to review and to take action removing the inequities of the system.

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Your committee on workmen's compensation and occupational diseases has completed its work well in advance of the opening of this session, and its report is before you for consideration.

It is desirable that this important study be given fullest attention by the legislature to the end that any action taken shall be for the best interests of all affected parties.

UNDERGROUND WATER

Regulation of water is no longer a problem limited almost entirely to surface water. Today we have not only underground water rights with which to deal, but we have rainmaking as an extra complication. The sooner underground water rights are controlled by legislation the less troublesome they will become. The problem affects agricultural, municipal, industrial, and other interests and should have your careful consideration.

DRIVERS' LICENSES AND DRIVER TRAINING

I urge you to enact a new drivers' license law patterned after the uniform code, a law that will help reduce the useless slaughter on our highways. It is clear that this kind of murder cannot be stopped by licensing alone, unless accompanied by driver education.

I believe every high-school student should be taught to drive safely, should be taught the law of the road and the rights of others, and that such a course should be virtually compulsory.

Such a course should not be limited, either, to the public school. Training on the law of the road should extend to adult classes so that individuals would know road laws before they are permitted to have a driver's license.

The Automobile Dealers Association, automobile manufacturers, and insurance companies have spent great sums for moving pictures on safe driving and are ready to cooperate with any program designed to save life on the highways.

NO STRAIGHT BALLOT

I urge the legislature to consider doing away with the straight ballot in our general elections. Under the present law, election boards are often obliged to make arbitrary rulings, rulings that may vary from precinct to precinct. This type of confusion should be stopped.

As a former member of the Idaho Legislature, I feel that I have some knowledge of what you expect of the Governor. I feel you are entitled to frankness and the clearest possible statement of my general policies.

It is commonly believed that you are also entitled to leadership, and when I say leadership, I do not mean dictatorship.

It is desirable that there be a full exchange of information between legislative leaders and the office of the Governor. By exchange I do not mean a one-sided giving. I mean a reciprocal connection.

When you examine the budget, you will observe that I have taken action in every case. On page 6 in the budget book under "Governor's action" you will see a column with the caption "Passed"—a column that could be used for "passing the buck." You will find no entries of mine in this column. Right or wrong, I have given you my best judgment on every request.

I wish to counsel you, as members of the legislature, to apply economy and efficiency in determining the value, the importance of, and the necessity for every piece of legislation passed.

I urge you to reject every piece of proposed legislation for which there is no desperate need.

I request you to eliminate all duplicate machinery in the operation of the State's business.

You must keep the proposed State budget within the present revenue available and reject all demands of pressure groups to increase the benefits of legislation beyond the capacity of the people of the State of Idaho to pay the bill.

We must reduce the tax burden in this State if we are to remain a solvent democracy while waging a new kind of war against totalitarianism.

By their ballots the people of the State have brought us in session here, and have assigned to us the trust of conducting their government through these important and troubled times.

May we be given the fortitude and the integrity to do what is right, in the best light that is granted us.

The Primacy of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the presidential address delivered to the American Political Science Association at its annual meeting in Washington December 28, 1950, by Dr. James K. Pollock, of the University of Michigan. I am advised by the Public Printer that the article will exceed the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $348.50.

In view of the fact that the address contains much food for thought respecting our Government, I make the request that in spite of the added cost, the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRIMACY OF POLITICS

(By James K. Pollock)

In presenting my valedictory to this distinguished association which has honored me by selecting me as its president, I should like to point out by way of introduction what has happened to this office, and therefore to me, during the past year. I have heard of one of my distinguished predecessors some 25 years ago who had little else to do as president of this association than work all year on his presidential address. This was important work, and I have no word of criticism of it. But the association has changed, and today it leaves to the harried wearer of its presidential toga little time to reflect about the status of political science and his own impact, if any, upon it. An active association life, now happily centered in our new Washington office, is enough to occupy the full time of your president, and universities as well as this association might well take note. Therefore, in presenting my own reflections to you this evening in accordance with the custom of our association, I do so without the benefit of the generous time and scholarly leisure which were the privileges of some of my distinguished predecessors.

Nevertheless I do base my presidential address today upon my own active participation in the problems of government, as well as upon my scholarly experience. I have extracted it in part from the dynamics of pulsating political life. It has whatever authority I may possess after having been exposed these 25 years to the cross-fire of politics, domestic and foreign, as well as to the benign and corrective influences of eager students and charitable colleagues. This change in the nature of presidential addresses reflects, I believe, the new role of the political scientist and the development of our profession.

I

As our association moves into a second half century of activity, I am impressed with the seriousness of our responsibility. As I see it, our responsibility is primary because politics is primary and central to every great problem facing us today. There is nothing new about the central importance of politics, for Aristotle long ago referred to politics as the most sovereign of the sciences and as the master science. In his Ethics he pointed out that it is "politics that determines what other sciences should be studied in states; which of them should be learned by each group of citizens; and to what extent they should be learned * * * observation," he continued, "shows that even the forms of capacity which are most highly esteemed—the art of war; the art of household management; the art of oratory—come under the control of politics." Considering the complexity of modern civilized existence, it is even more true today than ever before that political action is of primary importance. Little can be accomplished any more without reference to political processes.

Unfortunately, however, political scientists in their study of politics have not quite kept pace with the complex responsibilities which have been placed upon them. In the Greek city-state, responsibilities were few and of rather limited scope. In the modern world, our responsibilities are very broad and very compelling.

In the present state of national and international politics, a special responsibility attaches to Americans. Particularly in the last decade new duties all over the world have been thrust upon us. As a result of the war, the United States in various parts of the globe, is now performing services which a generation ago would have been thought impossible. Our role in the creation and in the operation of the United Nations is likewise of great importance. Our leadership in the programs of military occupation both in Europe and in the Far East have been a drain upon our resources and continue to pose serious problems for the United States. The unprecedented American economic aid and technical assistance under the program of Economic Cooperation has not only been a boon to world economic recovery, but has demonstrated to us the possibility of constructive action in raising the welfare level of human beings everywhere. More recently the point 4 program and our leadership in the North Atlantic Treaty organization, not to mention our fathering of programs intended to facilitate European integration and Philippine rehabilitation, illustrate the extent and complexity of our international activity, and the measure of responsibility placed upon us. Our country, in a word, has been doing something new and distinctive and has assumed a role heretofore unknown to us.

We have not always sought the leadership of these programs. This leadership has been thrust upon us and as a consequence we have not always done our best, although it is clear to me that our contribution has been very great indeed. In some cases it has been almost providential that we have had a Clay, a Hoffman, a McCloy, or a MacArthur to handle programs of great magnitude, complexity, and importance. Lacking the experience and the trained personnel to undertake great programs, we have often had to improvise and we have sometimes found that our intentions and our programs have been misunderstood and misinterpreted. Anyone familiar with our efforts to staff overseas functions knows only too well how few Americans are really familiar with the other cultures of the world, and capable of working with them in a constructive way.

Despite unprecedented American activity and generosity, both their country and the world are, unfortunately, still affiliated with tensions. Our period has been well characterized as "the twilight of warlike peace." We are now in the midst of great defense preparations at the same time that we are attempting to carry on life and business as usual. Everyone asks, "Will there be war? Shall we have inflation? Must we stand still in other areas while we are putting the country in a state of defense?"

II

It is in this atmosphere, in this crisis situation, that I am called upon to discuss certain critical areas of our politics and to emphasize the responsibility of political scientists with respect to them. Such a discussion, I believe, will serve to emphasize the primacy of political considerations. Let me speak first of the impact of our new world position upon our Government and our whole political life. Our new role in world affairs has placed new organizational requirements upon the State Department in particular but also upon the whole Government. In the words of the Report of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch:

"The executive branch today finds itself forced to develop positive foreign policies and programs involving not only the State Department, but many other departments and agencies as well and to deal cooperatively with other nations on a multilateral as well as a bilateral basis. The Congress, in addition, finds that the exercise of its traditional powers in the domestic as well as in the international field has made it a participant in the conduct of foreign affairs on an unprecedented scale.

"The problems of Government organization for the conduct of foreign affairs are, therefore, not confined to the State Department alone but involve the organization of the Presidency, the State Department and the Foreign Service, the departments and agencies other than the State Department, the interdepartmental relationships and the relationships between the executive and legislative branches."

In the good old days, the State Department might have to handle a crisis or two every year; but now Mr. Acheson is faced with a major crisis almost every day. If the crisis does not develop overseas, it is almost certain to develop in some portion of the Capitol. Adding to the complexity of the situation is the greatly increased size of the Government as a whole and of the State Department in particular. Our Foreign Office now is almost five times larger in personnel than it was 10 years ago and in terms of appropriation, nearly 12 times larger. In the interdepartmental field, there are more than 30 committees concerned with economic, social, military, and other aspects of foreign affairs. Of the 54 major departments and agencies in the executive branch, at least 46 are drawn into foreign affairs to a greater or lesser extent. Statutory interdepartmental bodies, such as the National Security Council, have assumed greater importance. Certain units, such as the Department of Defense and the Economic Cooperation Administration, are deeply involved with the administration of occupied areas abroad and with financial assistance overseas. The Treasury Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Commerce Department are important in international financial and agricultural matters, and also in connection with export control.

Congressional participation in the conduct of foreign affairs has become particularly evident in the expanding role of the House of Representatives in connection with appropriations for foreign programs. Under existing constitutional arrangements and structural provisions, the State Department has to operate under strictures and limitations which do not hamper any other foreign office in the world. When there is mutual cooperation and restraint between the executive and legislative branches, progress is achieved. But past experience points to the need of several significant changes if our country and our people are to play a significant and important role in world affairs. There, political considerations are primary.

Some of the necessary changes are organizational in character and have been dealt with adequately in the recent report to which I have referred. When the full effect of the reorganization of the State Department recently authorized by Congress has been felt, and when time has been given to allow the Department itself to work out the fundamental changes in its internal organization and personnel recently recommended to the Secretary of State—assuming always the support and sympathy of Congress—we will have a staff and an organization in our foreign office adequate to the traffic and requirements of our complicated world.

In two areas, however, we shall need to make important changes. One is in the administration of overseas affairs; the other is in the position of the United States Senate. On the latter point I should like to quote from the Report of the Hoover Commission on Foreign Affairs and then add a postscript. The report said:

"One serious procedural impediment to achieving satisfactory legislative-executive cooperation is the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds Senate vote for the confirmation of treaties. No thoughtful student of the conduct of foreign affairs can ignore the consequences of this provision. It is a serious trouble breeder between the executive branch and the Senate in that such an inherently rigid rule encourages circumvention by the Executive by resort to the procedures of executive agreements and joint resolutions. Attempts to use these procedures, in turn, involve friction between the Senate and the House of Representatives. An especially bad result is that the emphasis is directed to the question of whether the proper procedure is being employed, instead of to the substance of the issues before the Congress. The question of a change in the present requirement of a two-thirds Senate vote is deemed, however, to be outside the province of this Commission."

Speaking now as a responsible political scientist and not as a member of a Government commission, I should like to recommend that the power of the Senate over treaties be modified in the light of present world and domestic requirements. Many of my distinguished colleagues have previously recommended an amendment to the Constitution by which treaties should be confirmed by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress instead of by a two-thirds vote of the Senate alone. Such a change in my view is eminently fitting and necessary. It arises not from any desire to lessen the effectiveness of the United States Senate, but rather from the necessity of bringing the present constitutional provision into accord with the requirements of present international life, both at home and abroad. When one considers the speed with which international developments are moving today, not to mention the procedures of other countries with which we are now having close and friendly relations, it would seem reasonable to press at this time for a constitutional change. It is possible, of course, that difficulties between the Senate and the Executive in foreign affairs can be eliminated by other means, but I think it is doubtful.

With respect to the administration of overseas affairs, I feel a special urge to press for some prompt retooling of this aspect of our organization for the conduct of foreign relations. The Korean War and the Bell report on the Philippines have recently been added to the new problems of the ECA, the North Atlantic Treaty organization, and point 4, to emphasize how the American Government has developed vast overseas operating agencies to alleviate suffering and to ameliorate economic conditions all over the world. Among other things, these new activities require a new type of public servant. Without disparaging our military or diplomatic personnel, it is, I believe, quite correct to say that specialized administrative and technical qualifications are necessary for the successful operation of these huge overseas ventures. We have done, in my opinion, amazingly well under very trying circumstances. But I should be less than frank if I did not also say that the development of a corps of career men, trained for overseas operations, as distinguished from the training now provided for the foreign diplomatic and military services, is urgently required. The magnitude and importance of the problem is grasped when one recalls that there are now almost as many Federal civilian employees outside the United States as in the city of Washington.

Furthermore, it is no longer possible to have a unified foreign policy, if we do not have a unified administrative center in Washington under the policy direction of the State Department. The recent Gray report has shown very admirably how all aspects of American foreign policy, political, economic, and military, must be interlinked and a proper organizational home provided. It might be well to add that coordination and unification of all overseas administrative activities in Washington will be without full effect unless we achieve the same degree of unification under each of our foreign missions abroad. It is just as bad to have several spokesmen for America in a foreign capital as it is to have several of them in Washington.

We should also not forget that the appropriations for providing participation by the United States in international organizations and conferences exceeds the combined appropriations of the State Department and the Foreign Service. In the active international arena in which we are now very well supplied—not to say almost overwhelmed—with all kinds of functional organizations and international conferences, it becomes increasingly important that our Government should promote efficient arrangements and procedures for our activities in these international organizations. Otherwise, we will not get value received for our expenditures, and our foreign commitments will become confused.

Another factor of supreme importance is the close collaboration between the State Department and the Department of Defense. Similar close coordination between foreign and military policy now, I trust, happily on the way to realization, will avoid the blistering, the delays, and the fatal mistakes which characterized clashes between these two arms of our Government toward the end of the war and immediately thereafter.

Finally, if in addition to this improvement in the structure and operation of our foreign policy, we could at the same time achieve a more responsible and cooperative relationship between Congress and the State Department, we should then have the basis for a popular understanding and support of foreign policy which now seems to be lacking.

In a well functioning democracy, the people must also be supplied with policy formulation. As long, however, as the responsible agencies of the Government continue to pull

and haul and to confuse the public about the great issues confronting the world, there is little chance for the citizen to participate with any degree of satisfaction or confidence in helping to decide great international questions. All of these problems are of primary importance and they are political.

III

The reorganization of our conduct of foreign affairs is only part and parcel, however, of the much larger problem of adapting our whole democratic structure to the increased needs of the time. "We need," as John Gaus puts it effectively, "a theory of Government functions and one of the classification, recruitment, and education of the personnel to administer them that are reflective of the conditions of big democracy." I have not yet recovered, in fact I am not sure that I ever will, from the shock I received when I recently observed and scrutinized from an unequaled vantage point the whole vast, sprawling edifice of the Federal Government. It takes a man of great hardihood to look at, let alone understand, the budget of the United States with its thousand-odd pages. But the experience of being regaled for 2 years with all of the facts and figures relating to the organization and functioning of the huge Federal structure which spreads all over this country and all over the world, has naturally left on me some lasting impressions which I still find difficult to express.

Despite unprecedented achievements in reorganizing the Federal Government, much remains to be done. One trouble, of course, is that so much more than government in the formal sense is involved in Government reorganization. If someone, more statesmanlike than the average, is seminal and vital and penetrating in his proposals, he immediately encounters the entrenched and the selfish interests which consider themselves to be adversely affected by these recommendations. The great extravaganza which is staged every year in Congress, an extravaganza which the late Will Rogers one time referred to as "Rivers and Harbors" or "I'll Get Mine," is a case in point. Here again it is the politics of the problem, and not merely its administration, which must be solved.

Even when it is essentially a bureaucratic responsibility and opportunity, much pushing by citizens is necessary. I still catch my breath when I reflect on how the President, not merely President Truman, but any President, must decide great questions. Even the very smart Budget Bureau does not know, or finds it politic not to inquire, who is doing what and when and how in the President's office. The idea of a career staff secretary such as was recently recommended by our Commission after a careful, and if I may say so, highly realistic consideration of the problem under our constitutional system, apparently does not appeal to those immediately around the President. Like staff reductions, such proposals must often be pressed from outside the bureaucracy.

The importance of pressure-group opposition and bureaucratic neglect should not be minimized, as I will presently indicate. But it is very important to realize that the Federal Government has become so big and awkward that it is, in effect, out of control. So difficult is it to secure the cooperation of numerous officials and agencies involved in any program, and in all programs, that at any given time no one is on top of the heap. Bureau or departmental autonomy, statutory restrictions, overlapping jurisdiction, absence of coordination, poor staff services, and just plain bigness add up to a condition of lack of control—one might say free wheeling—which is the opposite of that responsible democracy which we seek to have. No political scientist has developed hydramatic control for Government machines, or if he has, it has not yet been adopted.

It is still a source of amazement to me that otherwise sensitive and intelligent men should continue to pile billion upon billion and bureau upon bureau without much thought of the administrative and political consequences. It is hard for me to believe that any thoughtful person could still think that it was possible for any one agency to attempt to write or even approve the position classifications in the entire Federal service. Or that the Congress of the United States should be so perverse and unlearned in the principles of financial administration as to continue to insist upon a system which runs counter to the almost unanimous views of those who have studied the question. It is disheartening and discouraging to find that even hospitals are bandied about with the same kind of financial and public abandon that characterizes the construction of a dam on Tombigbee Creek or the dredging of the Clatskanie. Even when the political scientist considers himself to be a sort of political pathologist and tries to view the whole scene with that scientific reserve and calm judgment which befits anyone whose appellation is scientist, he still feels like remarking with Ostrogorski that "God takes care of drunkards, of little children, and of the United States."

Perhaps as Herbert Emmerich remarks: "Our governmental institutions are better than we tend to think." But we must not forget that they are now assailed by new enemies and by reinforced old ones. At a time of national crisis we should not be tolerant of inefficiency, nor neglectful of popular control. A new compulsion is now present which should drive the Congress and the President to move with all speed in the direction of implementing the recommendations of the last few years which would put our house in order for any emergency.

I cannot hope in a few brief moments to summarize all of my deep reflections about executive organization and of the relation of Congress to it. But I do want to demonstrate how political considerations are of primary importance and to say that we have only started along the road of integrating our economy, our defense, and our resources. Despite the reorganization of Congress and the progress which has been made toward executive reorganization, there still remains a vast area of inefficiency, duplication, and lack of control which continues to be a menace to our free institutions. The great problem of executive-legislative relationships cannot be effectively tackled until both the executive and legislative branches are in such reasonable state of organization that one can think of having them work together successfully. As long as Congress fails to equip itself with adequate, nonpartisan staffs, and as long as it relies almost entirely upon seniority to select its leadership, and as long as the executive branch continues to consist of a congeries of unrelated services, dependent upon and limited by a nineteenth-century set of personnel regulations, just so long will the pattern of our Federal politics be one of oscillation between executive bureaucracy and congressional oligarchy.

With the pedagogs now rushing to Washington for Federal aid to education, I suppose it will not be too long until Washington, not content with generous grants to farmers and veterans, will be filled with strange new ideas of educational organization and expenditure, and one of the last fields left to the States and the localities will be dumped willy-nilly upon the overloaded shoulders of the Federal Government. Decentralization and deconcentration which seem to be our only salvation, will then become nothing but empty words. This would be fatal indeed to our democracy. As Charles Beard one time pointed out: "Unless our administrative system is so constructed and operated as to keep alive local and individual responsibilities, it is likely to destroy the basic wellsprings of activity, hope, and enthusiasm necessary to popular government and to the following of a democratic civilization."

There is not much use worrying about intergovernmental relations unless some effective limit is placed upon the power and activity of the Federal Government. No one can say with any assurance what the optimum load of the Federal Government can be. But it is my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that we are now attempting in Washington and through the Federal Government much more than can be efficiently administered or popularly controlled. I might suggest that we already have in the Federal Government unsolved problems of sufficient seriousness that we do not need to take on any more. For instance, in the very critical period ahead when national security will demand a large military budget, our time-honored devices for subordinating the military to civilian control, to say the least, are likely to prove to be inadequate. This whole field of civil-military relationships deserves the closest study and scrutiny. To involve the Federal Government in further new problems at a time when a question like this, so fraught with grave consequences for the future of our Republic, is pending and unsolved, would seem to be utterly foolhardy and irresponsible. Progress in coordinating diplomatic and military planning, at least at the top, could easily be shattered if Congress attempts to rely merely upon its control of the purse strings without insisting simultaneously upon what is necessary to develop firm lines of authority and accountability within the executive branch.

I cannot conclude my discussion of the labyrinth which is the executive branch, or the confusion in the Congress, without referring to the real menace of pressure-group politics as it operates in the Capital City. Harold Lasswell has not exaggerated when he wrote:

"National policy increasingly becomes a matter of deals made between national pressure group officials and the bureaucracy of executive departments and agencies. What the pressure organization is able to 'deliver,' more than ever depends upon what the officials of a centralizing government find it expedient to give."

It is deeply discouraging to the average citizen, as it is depressing to the trained observer, to find the public so frequently pushed around in favor of combinations of interest groups. "Aggression of groups and agencies against the people as a whole," as Mr. Hoover puts it, "is not a process of free men. Special privilege either to business or groups is not liberty." The unusual and plutocratic and extravagant atmosphere of Washington is in no small measure due to the unlimited resources of lobbies and special interests which find their outlet in some portion of the District of Columbia. This problem, although seriously affecting the whole functioning of the Federal structure of government, must be remedied elsewhere than in Washington. Thus I come to the next point of my discourse.

IV

One of the major problems of our democracy, after all, is how to strengthen and improve our political parties. We cannot exalt and enthrone the citizen without at the same time utilizing the politician. Under our form of government the politician operates within the framework of the two-party system, which, over the generations, has acquired a peculiar form and certain peculiar habits. The special form and spirit of our party system has determined the whole character of our government. Party politics is therefore of central importance. Sooner or later in every discussion of government and politics in this country, one must come back to the organization and functioning of our political parties. Party organization by itself is of crucial importance and although American political scientists are probably in advance of those in all other countries of the world in their understanding and analysis of party processes, nevertheless in the last decade we have tended to emphasize—some might say overemphasize—other aspects of our discipline. We now have it on the best of authority that "in democracy all social classes, all economic interests, all expertise, planning, and power are subordinated to politics." Until recently some enthusiasts had almost convinced us that there was nothing outside the administrative framework.

It requires little argument to demonstrate that effective popular government rests upon a proper functioning of the party system. In the United States, a basic prerequisite not merely to good administration, but to active citizen participation and control is a responsible two-party system. We know, however, particularly since the growth and change of the Federal Government in the last 25 years, that our parties and our politics have gradually become more and more confusing and frustrating, not merely to students of government but also to the sovereign citizens themselves. Alert to the great significance of this subject, our association several years ago created a special committee on political parties. That committee under the chairmanship of Professor Schattschneider has now, after the most commendable study of the problem, presented to us and to the country a keen analysis and a series of important recommendations. I commend this report to you and to the country, and express my deep gratification that it should have been completed and presented at this important turning point in our political development. I might add that having just come through, or one might say having just survived, another national election, we should be more than ever instilled with the strong desire of raising the level and improving the quality of party action. How to relate public action and public decisions to the legislative and administrative processes must ever remain before us as subjects requiring the most thorough and complete and constant study.

In this connection it is well to remember that graft, corruption, improper influence, excessive campaign expenditures, still constitute the Achilles heel of democracy. In the political arena as well as in the legislative and executive branches, we must be ever on the alert to detect and to ferret out influences and practices which interfere with the true expression of the popular will. The present investigation of the interrelation of gambling and politics conducted by one of our distinguished Members, Senator KEFAUVER, is an encouraging case in point. In public elections today more than ever is at stake, and as students of politics we must be more than ever active and alert to detect, understand, and explain to our fellow citizens the true import of political developments. Yes, politics is primary; everything else is supplementary and secondary. Although American political life is at times quite disorderly and confusing, it is still unique and ineffectual to attempt to solve legislative and executive and administrative problems as if they were separate and distinct from the party process.

V

I have now presented a series of observations about government and politics in the United States which are deemed worthy of particular attention at this time. I come next to a discussion of the place of the political scientists in our new political and governmental setting.

As I remarked earlier, our present situation has been aptly referred to as the "twilight of warlike peace." What we used to refer to as crisis government has become chronic. Emergency conditions have become the regular and normal thing. We, as political scientists, would be derelict indeed if we did not throw the light on ourselves and on our collective work to see if we are now doing as significant work as is required, or as we are capable of doing. "Have the scales fallen from our eyes and has the lead gone from our feet?"

I have spoken earlier of Aristotle's reference to politics as "the master science." But are we working today in relation to all the social sciences as if we were the master, the coordinating, the integrating discipline? I think not. I believe that we are not as vital and active and significant as we should be, and I want to express my own view as to the reasons for the academic restraint and reserve which up to this time have characterized our activities. Our contributions are urgently needed, and although political scientists as individuals are now active and important in the various levels of our political and governmental life, I strongly hope for greater and wider activity by our association.

Why are we so restrained? Perhaps our recent specialization and compartmentalization has weakened the significance of our work. Perhaps we, as a discipline, have a separation-of-powers doctrine which prevents us from cooperative work with brother political and social scientists. I realize, of course, the vastness of the subjects with which we deal and the natural modesty of political scientists to avoid the sweeping generalizations—and errors—which make some politicians and even members of other disciplines objects of pity or derision.

But after all, the political scientist is and must be a generalist. Just like the politician, as Paul Appleby puts it, "Is the preeminent, practicing governmental generalist," so must the political scientist who studies, and who we know is called upon to advise the politician, be a person who trains himself to deal with large, complicated problems. Acquaintance with all allied disciplines is necessary, for one can hardly be a generalist unless he is able to generalize from something—namely, the facts, procedures, and processes outside as well as inside his own profession. Even more necessary is the ability to take a set of facts and recommend a sound policy out of them.

John Gaus recently referred to economic and social policies which are "gaily—or grimly—urged today with almost no reflection" of administrative experience, and recalled how Margaret Cole frankly confessed to the neglect of political factors by a group of which she was an active member. "Gaily or grimly" is good, but with what grave consequences to our welfare. Government has more and more become so complicated that policy must be formulated, not by a specialist but by a generalist if we are not to become, even more than at present, a loose confederation of modern feudal interests. What we need is a political scientist who in the words of Sir Edward Bridges in his rede lecture "will be a good adviser in any field because he or she knows how and where to go to find reliable knowledge, can assess the expertise of others at its true worth, can spot the strong and weak points in any situation at short notice, and can advise how to handle a complex situation."

Of course, we must not expect the best thought and the best men in our profession to be automatically transferred to the posts in government where they could do the most good. Unfortunately in these days of impoverished research, inadequate travel, heavy teaching loads, and impecunious living, we must not expect too much. In fact, it is one of our most urgent problems to release the abilities of our most mature scholars to work on the new and the difficult and the enormous problems which beset our world. We must not send a boy to do a man's work. Neither must we kill off the great minds we have already developed, in commuting between Washington and our seats of learning. It seems that both universities and governments have neither the heart nor any proper realization of what is necessary to assure the availability and full contribution of leading minds to the processes of government.

Herbert Emmerich has pointed out how we must recognize "that no one of the serious problems of today and tomorrow can be answered by the specialized approach. The big questions of today and tomorrow are not just matters of public administration, or of international relations, or of administrative law, or of public opinion, or of political theory. They do not belong exclusively to any of the specialists in these subdivisions of our field. All the insights of the political-science disciplines must be focused on these questions with a view to getting complete, not partial, answers—and in time to have some effect on action. We must break down the jurisdictional boundaries which divide us within our own field, and the jurisdictional jealousies, and work at these problems as complete scientists."

I cannot agree with my dear friend, Charles Merriam, when he writes that "the weal or woe of mankind in the coming years rests very largely with administration and administrators." I think it rests with politics and politicians in the broadest sense of these terms. My belief is that any narrow specialization is inimical to the primacy of our subject and to the success of government in a free society. It is the complete political scientist skilled in the art and science of politics—not just in theory, in law, in administration, but in politics—whom I espouse, and on whom so much depends.

One of our colleagues, who is in a position to know, pointed out to me how most everything in government might be considered an economic problem. "Yet," he added, "when economists in Government get together to develop a new policy, what they really talk about and what they really think about is politics. There is nothing wrong with this," he concluded, "because they must develop policies that are possible; and politics is, above all, the art of the possible. The only trouble is the tendency to approach essentially political problems in an amateurish way because of a failure to recognize their political character."

One of my distinguished colleagues who will remain anonymous, has asked me, "Why the other social sciences with their glamorous new vocabularies are playing so vigorously in our own backyards, including those of sample polling and political theory?" The answer in part is that we have not sufficiently utilized the materials and techniques available to us in related disciplines. We have been somewhat deterred, it is true, by the horrible gobbledegook, particularly of the social psychologist, and we have had no desire to subordinate the substance to the technique. No doubt the other social sciences can help us. But the almost overwhelming problems of the modern world can only be solved by our most mature minds, and political science is the integrating and synthesizing discipline. The pulling together must be under our auspices. Economic and social problems occur in their most vital form in the political-legislative-administrative processes, and we must use other social sciences and accept a definite leadership in our relationships to them.

It was, I believe, our own Charles Merriam who provided the inspiration and leadership for social-science integration in this country. The first president of the Social Science Research Council, Robert Crane, was also a political scientist, and his present successor, Pendleton Herring, is also one of the stars in our political-science firmament. It is in no narrow disciplinary way that I would insist on the primacy of politics in determining public policy. I have seen something of

the mistakes which are made because too specialized minds are at times on top, and because a broad political judgment was absent. It is the task of the political scientist to synthesize everything which goes into the formulation and implementation of public policy.

I am not interested in jurisdictional conflict, and I believe in drawing more fully upon the anthropological, psychological, sociological contributions which are available to us on a basis of interdisciplinary exchange. But I would be less than frank with you if I did not assert that foreign and military policy is hardly the task of the nuclear physicist, and that power and bureaucracy and other similar concepts are being manhandled by the psychologists. Why? Partly because political scientists have not sufficiently used the other social sciences and partly because we are focusing too much attention on small problems without developing frontal attacks on large, significant ones.

Nevertheless, there are more practical and mundane reasons. The mere bigness of a problem, like legislative-executive relationships, for instance, is almost beyond the facilities of political scientists, unaided and unsupported, to handle. Without the generous support of the Carnegie corporation it would not have been possible to produce our recent report on political parties and the party process. With the Federal Government devoting a billion dollars a year to research, mostly in the physical and biological sciences, it is only occasionally that funds are available for those really seminal and significant investigations into our vast governmental and political structure which present conditions require. Political scientists and social scientists generally may, therefore, quite legitimately excuse themselves because of lack of adequate equipment and resources. The terrific and overweening development of science and technology has necessarily pushed us aside for the time being, but it will not be for long. An active committee in our association, headed by one of our greatly respected expresidents, Arthur Holcombe, will soon make our judgment and influence felt.

Perhaps the most favorable development of our times in its effect on human welfare is the activation of the policy and program of the Ford Foundation. The work of its study committee on which our president-elect served, has been correctly evaluated by Henry Ford II as "one of the most thorough, painstaking, and significant inquiries ever made into the whole broad question of public welfare and human needs." Their work and recommendations, which every member of this association should read, were accepted unanimously by the trustees, and there is therefore now in existence what never existed before in such ample form, financial support for large and significant research by political and other social sciences. No longer can we complain that resources are not available. The Ford Foundation can now redress the balance in favor of the social scientists.

I am tremendously impressed with the impact of this report upon our profession. It may well become the greatest boon to fruitful and constructive research and action in the political field we have ever had. As the president of this association, I salute this significant development and express our deep satisfaction that now for the first time in our history we have the possibility, if we are good enough, to assume our rightful place in making significant contributions to world peace, in the strengthening of democracy, and in the other areas for the advancement of human welfare.

In what I have said about the place of political scientists, and in the expression of my hopes and desires for a greater future for our profession, I would not have anyone think that we are not now playing a significant role through our leading members and in our research and teaching everywhere. Our vice president today is Ralph Bunche, recently winner of the Nobel Prize, and there are many others who are indispensable as advisers and participants in the decision of public questions at all levels of government.

But I still think that we must step up the significance of our work. Political theory, for instance, could do much today in the development of a more adequate concept and understanding of the democratic way. We have not contributed as much as we should to the practical solution of international affairs—perhaps in the latter case because we have gotten away from solid foundations in comparative government and international law. I also feel that we should not shy away from proposing remedial action once we have made our analyses.

Our training of political scientists leaves much to be desired. We should rethink and recast our graduate training programs so as to develop generalists who are acquainted with the other social sciences as well as with the emerging and pulsating political life around them. The new generation of political scientists must have a stronger sense of their important mission, they must be better equipped to understand and handle the procedures of other related disciplines, and they must be trained in the evaluation of large situations and in the solution of big problems. Perhaps I should say with Plato "that is the pattern according to which they are to order the state and the lives of individuals * * *, making philosophy their chief pursuit, but when their turn comes, toiling also at politics and ruling for the public good."

Nor have we included in our profession many who are interested and active in public affairs, those whose research contributes materially to the knowledge of political life, but who are not academicians, and those who teach citizenship to the large mass of our people who never attend a college or a university. If our research is to have the practicality which it requires, and if the results of that research are to have maximum application, it is indeed time that we associate these groups more closely with our profession.

Now that we have been able to establish an executive office here in Washington, it is up to the membership to consolidate our gains, coordinate our research, broaden our avenues of influence, enrich our teaching, and enlarge the participation of our professional membership. We have a deep responsibility as well as a unique opportunity in this troubled world. If we will reconsider our whole field and make such professional reorganizations as are required to bring us abreast of our new responsibilities, we can say with Henry Stimson:

"Let them learn from our adventures what they can. Let them charge us with our failures and do better in their turn. But let them not turn aside from what they have to do, nor think that criticism excuses inaction. Let them have hope, and virtue, and let them believe in mankind and its future, for there is good as well as evil, and the man who tries to work for the good, believing in its eventual victory, while he may suffer setback and even disaster, will never know defeat."

Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 on behalf of himself and other Members of the Senate.

As one of the cosponsors of the resolution, I have prepared a statement expressing some of my own views on it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a time when the nations of the globe are beginning an armament race it may be too late to propose a Senate resolution which seeks to explore the possibilities of a common meeting ground that would promote stability and unity of the democracies of the New World and the Old World.

There are many great developments—such as Russia's spread of communism over Asia—a continuing cold war in Europe—a United Nations that has developed into .. debating society when positive action is needed, and here at home a defense budget that will virtually make of this Nation a military dictatorship, reduce our standard of living, and make it difficult to ever regain the freedoms and liberties we now enjoy.

Surely there must be some alternative to a war of extermination or a program of more and bigger armaments.

In this present situation we must explore every avenue for a comprehensive solution of our security and economic problems. The most desperate necessity of our time is for the United States to assert the moral leadership of which she is undoubtedly capable, but which she has not yet fully laid hold on.

Our Nation is now going ahead with its superarmament program because, in self-defense, it must; nonetheless we stand committed to peace and the survival of man. There are those that contend that this proposal would require a world government—a government where nations would lose their identity—this I deny and am opposed to. We can have a federation of governments based on principles by which people can unite without impairing their local autonomy.

The resolution does not commit the United States to joining a union of Atlantic democracies. All it does is give the United States opportunity to show the leadership expected of us in the struggle to safeguard freedom.

This is an exploratory move. It may be too late. I believe that those of us responsible for the welfare of the American people can do no less.

The State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a radio discussion on January 7 between the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. This admirable discussion on the state of the Union took place on the American Forum of the Air, the famous radio program under the direction of the talented Mr. Theodore

Granik, one of radio's pioneers in the field of forum and discussion programs.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF THE UNION

Moderator GRANIK. Tomorrow, the Senate and the House of the Eighty-second Congress will meet in joint session to hear the President of the United States deliver his annual message on the State of the Union. With the Nation in a state of emergency, President Truman will outline the program he deems necessary for our security.

In 1951, hundreds of thousands of young Americans will be inducted into our Armed Forces. We on the home front will be called on to contribute more than ever before in self-sacrifice, higher taxes, and moral responsibility. Just over the horizon are price controls on foods, ceilings on wages, and a decline in our standard of living.

Today, on the eve of the President's address, the American Forum of the Air poses the vital question: "What is the State of the Union?" to two distinguished United States Senators, Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska, minority leader of the Senate, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, and formerly Secretary of Agriculture.

Senator WHERRY, what would be the main theme of your message, if you were President?

Senator WHERRY. President of the United States?

Moderator GRANIK. That is right.

Senator WHERRY. Well, Ted, first, before I answer that, would you permit me to say that I deeply appreciate the invitation to appear again on this program as now sponsored by the trucking men throughout the country. I know a lot of them, and I think it is a great program, and I am glad that they are sponsoring it. And if I have to debate a Democrat, Ted, I would rather debate with CLINTON ANDERSON than any man across the aisle. I respect him and have a deep regard for him and am glad to appear on this program with my good friend, CLINTON ANDERSON.

If I were President of the United States, and I were preparing a message to deliver to the people of the country tomorrow, and to the Congress, Ted, I would tell the American people about our foreign policy over there in Asia. I would mention the mistakes, the colossal failure, and I would tell them what I intended to give them in the future. I would do the same thing about Europe. I would take the American people into the confidence of the President of the United States relative to his program over there. Are we to commit foot soldiers to Europe? If we are, why not be frank about it? Why not tell the American people? Let us have a propledged partnership about what we are going to do in the foreign policy so that we can get complete unity.

Then I would tell them the plans that I might have. I believe the greatest contribution we can give to those countries that want to fight communism—and, believe me, I think communism is a threat; I don't agree with those who say it is not, whether they strike next week, or 2 months from now, or next year, or when, I do not know, but they have infiltrated into every country in the world, and they have infiltrated right here. And I would say, in the first place, to eradicate communism right within our own gates. I would prepare a great national security program armed to the teeth to defend America at home, and then I would extend that aid through mutual aid, through the air, and on the sea, to these free countries of the world who want to fight to stop the expansion of communism and have a free world.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator ANDERSON?

Senator ANDERSON. I think, Ted, that I would like to join right in the beginning in congratulating this program on its new sponsor. Naturally, I would have to admit that KEN and I are unusual in this respect, that when we say nice things about each other, we really mean it.

Senator WHERRY. That is right.

Senator ANDERSON. Sometimes on the floor they refer to a distinguished Senator and they do not believe that he is so distinguished, but KEN and I have that fortunate and pleasant experience, we mean what we say.

I think if I were to be making a state-of-the-Union report, I would remind the people of America, first of all, that there are some hopeful signs and there are some discouraging signs. I think I would remind them about our banks that are bulging with money and our factories which are operating at top speed, that the steel mills are working to capacity, and that in some areas of the country where steel has never been regarded as a possibility for manufacturing, New England, they are now pressing for plants because they believe the future is so promising that these areas will be able to sustain these mills for a long time to come.

I would point out that the farmers have had unusually fine growing weather, to be sure, but they have also had an opportunity to market their crops under extremely fine circumstances for years and that while they might encounter bad growing weather again, they have now the resources and ability to sustain them in temporary bad spells.

I would point out that workers are enjoying their best wages and unemployment is extremely low. In other words, I would say that our domestic economy is in very fine shape. Then I would say, of course, that the only clouds that exist are clouds outside our Union; that there are troubles in the world, and we are closely tied to that troubled world and that we cannot expect to escape at home the effects of warfare abroad.

Moderator GRANIK. What do you have to say to that, Senator WHERRY?

Senator WHERRY. That is quite an optimistic statement. If CLINTON would go on he would have to mention also that not only as a part of our economy are we confronted immediately with price controls and freezes of wages, but that we are also confronted with higher taxes and allocations, all of which goes on with this artificial economy that he has so eloquently and forcefully described.

Moderator GRANIK. When can we expect the allocations and controls?

Senator WHERRY. Some of the allocations are already on. The President of the United States, as I understand it, in his message—and, of course, this is what we expect in his message—will ask for price controls and wage freezes, and I have heard from the other side of the aisle that as to taxes, we have just begun to tax. We have really got to have a tax program to stop inflation and help pay the costs of this great defense program that is producing this artificial economy.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Anderson?

Senator ANDERSON. I would simply like to point out that I picked up a copy of a great New York newspaper on last Tuesday and I clipped a number of the headlines out of it. One reads:

"Labor and employers score greatest gains in history." The next reads, "Steel industry set for greatest year." "Gas reserves rise despite wider use." "Aluminum output geared to expand." "Handling devices are facing boom."

They are going to do $2,500,000,000 worth of business in 1951 against $1,000,000,000 in 1950.

"Retail sales gain foreseen for 1951."

If that is your artificial economy, I just want more of it.

Senator WHERRY. More cheap dollars, CLINTON; more taxes, more controls, more allocations, it all goes hand in hand. And if we are to stop the expansion of communism and protect the free economy and certainly if those powers are granted, those who operate this business with dictatorial powers and controls should not abuse that authority in this time of total mobilization to fasten upon the backs of the American people a controlled economy that cannot be eliminated whenever and if these emergencies cease to exist.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you think raising $50,000,000,000 in taxes will hurt business in any way?

Senator WHERRY. On the Appropriations Committee, we have adduced a lot of evidence. Some very, very high authorities in this country have stated, if I recall the figures, that you can only tax 40 percent of the national income. Others feel that all you can take away from the individual is 25 percent out of each and every dollar. I am not sure where the saturation point lies. But just as surely as we all here in America consider the future—and I believe that you have got to tax—I have been one who has believed in a balanced budget, but you cannot balance a $100,000,000,000 budget, on the taxes we receive now which are approximately $40,000,000,000 a year. And grant that we tax as much as we can, you get to the place, Ted, of the law of diminishing returns. It creates such an impact upon business that instead of doing more business you will do less business, and if you do it with cheaper dollars all you do is handle more money and you do not handle more goods, and, after all, it is production of goods that counts in total mobilization.

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I am only reminded of something that happened to me, and I think our experiences are sometimes helpful to us.

When I went on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives it was just when we were beginning in 1943 to have some terrific budgets. And a very eminent New York financier had just been down to Washington to assure everybody that if the national debt ever went beyond $50,000,000,000, you would close every bank in the country and every insurance company would go broke and our savings would be no good, and business would come to a standstill.

You can imagine my joy in being handed a copy of the budget and it ran $106,000,000,000. I saw the national debt at $200,000,000,000 and I saw it go to $250,000,000,000 and almost $300,000,000,000, and strangely not a bank closed its doors; not an insurance company went broke. None of the things that this eminent financier had promised happened, and I wondered if we all know the answers. Frankly, I don't, because I have seen a nation that supposedly had gone broke two or three times, still remain the most powerful economic pumping line anywhere in the world.

Senator WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that it is unnecessary to impose price controls at this time?

Senator ANDERSON. I would keep price controls away as long as I could. I am thinking particularly of a situation in the agricultural field which I know more about than I do about anything—if I know anything about anything. I know in the case of cotton we need 16,000,000 bales next year. If you put a price control on that at a low figure, with the shortage of insecticides and fertilizer, you are not going to have more than 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 bales of cotton and that would contribute more to inflation than perhaps turning it loose.

Senator WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that selective controls will work?

Senator ANDERSON. I never had much enthusiasm for that.

Senator WHERRY. If the Senator agrees with me on that, I think the Senator will agree

with me, if he is not in favor of selective controls, if price controls are imposed that price controls and wages should be extended clear across the board. Is that not right? If you have an effective price control in this country, should you not go clear across the board and impose controls on prices and also freeze the wages simultaneously?

Senator ANDERSON. I think there are some places where your production goes on regardless of whether control is on. I think there are other areas where you have to have a free market in order to get production, and I believe it is possible to pick out a few of those places without taking them all.

Moderator GRANIK. Let us get back to this foreign policy for a moment.

Senator WHERRY. Just one more remark about this inflation. I am interested in the economy. Let me ask this question: Does the Senator feel it is necessary to increase taxes to stop this inflation program?

Senator ANDERSON. Since you have asked a specific question, I will say I do think it is necessary to increase taxes. Again, I go back to experience, and I know that as a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House I was in favor of greatly increasing taxes in the last war on the theory that when you did make it closer to paying for the war as you went you reduced inflationary pressures, and I think now we are going to have to dip and dig a great deal deeper to get additional money there. I recognize that if you took all the money from those who had $25,000 you would not get very much, and, therefore, you are going to have to move in new directions, and you are going to have to have billions more in taxation, in my opinion, if you are going to be able to come close to paying for the present endeavors upon a pay-as-you-go basis, and I think we must go on that basis.

Senator WHERRY. You are in favor of levying those taxes this year to accomplish that purpose?

Senator ANDERSON. I am.

Moderator GRANIK. A while ago, Senator WHERRY, you referred to armed security at home, and then a foreign mutual aid sea and air policy. Didn't you advocate that in 1949, when the North Atlantic Treaty was pending?

Senator WHERRY. I certainly did. My feeling on that, Ted, is that the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty, when they were discussed, resolved themselves around what mutually might be termed, what we could best afford to give. What is the major contribution we can give those countries to not only render a defense for ourselves, but also for the free countries that want protection. I said then nearly 2 years ago, as I say today—and many others are joining in that program—that the United States should arm to the teeth. We should become masters of the air, and that is the greatest offense that the United States of America can have.

While we are preparing that, we are not only preparing our own defense, but when Russia strikes, if it does, it will be the major contribution we can give to those countries in giving aid to them at that time. We have first got to pulverize potential war-making power of Russia before you can go in—if you ever go in—and invade the land. So that it is necessary that we have mastery of the air to drop the bombs on the offense and to resist an air attack from Russia on the defense.

Senator ANDERSON. I do not think that trying to have the greatest air force we can have necessarily means that you must desert those allies we have been painfully trying to build up in the intervening years. As to our efforts in Italy and France, those countries were ready, and almost overready for communism and we were able to save them for a while. We have certainly saved Turkey and Greece, and by doing those things I think we have minimized the need for the type of all-out air force we might otherwise have to have a long time ago.

Moderator GRANIK. It is time for questions, but before we take any questions from our audience, here is an important message from the American trucking industry.

The ANNOUNCER. Highways and States are the arteries that nourish America as it races the clock to rearm itself. Over them moves the world's greatest fleet of automobiles, busses, and trucks. No other nation, friend or enemy, has perfected a bombproof transportation system such as America's highway transport. Today, the wheels roll over faster. But our street and highway system, once the world's best, is beginning to bog down under the traffic load. More than 40,000,000 cars, more than 8,000,000 trucks and busses. Highways and streets are bursting at the seams. Our interstate highway system is yesterday's miracle, today's hardened arteries, tomorrow's bottleneck. All highway authorities agree it is too narrow, too winding, too old for the full flood of motor vehicles as America moves to meet the challenge of 1951. More and better highways are needed today for a better, safer tomorrow.

Now, here again, is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. Let us take the first question from the audience. Go ahead.

Question: I am an agricultural engineer and my question is directed to Senator ANDERSON.

Moderator GRANIK. The former Secretary of Agriculture.

Question: Why were prices and wages not fixed by the Congress at the start of the Korean War so as to save the Government billions of dollars in increased costs of all materials necessary to carry on the war?

Senator ANDERSON. I cannot answer that question except to point out that in 1942, or 1941, I believe it was, an effort was made to pass what was known as the Gore bill in the House, commonly known as the Baruch plan, by which everything would have been frozen as of the date of entry into difficulty. It got about 35 or 40 votes. Those of us who voted for it were hopelessly in the minority.

Many people felt this time that if we are going to put controls on across the board, do it as of June 25 or 26. I was one of them. You could not possibly have had a vote to do that because a majority of the legally elected Congress feels otherwise. That is the best answer I can give.

Senator WHERRY. My feeling is that I introduced the amendment to do the very thing that the questioner asked, the Bricker-Wherry amendment, which, if enacted into general law, would have put a complete price control on across the board. My feeling is that the administration didn't want to control the wages at that time. What they wanted to do was let the wages increase and pay subsidies to roll back the prices. I think that is wrong. I think we should have done it the other way and if they are now going to put them on, while these wages have increased, and some prices, yet I am still of the opinion that the only way to have an effective price-control law is to have them clear across the board and freeze the wages simultaneously.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to reply to that?

Senator ANDERSON. I was just thinking of a program you had here 2 years ago in which Senator TAFT, Mr. Republican himself, was on the program and you asked the question of Senator McGrath whether Congress should grant stand-by controls, and Senator McGrath said yes. You asked, "What do you think, Senator TAFT?" and he said, "Of course not. It never was necessary."

Senator WHERRY. On what? Stand-by controls on what?

Senator ANDERSON. Price controls and allocations and all those things. It never became necessary until just before election.

Senator WHERRY. I am not saying now that the time to put on those controls is at this moment. I said if they are going to put them on the only effective price control you can have is one clear across the board. If the administration felt in total mobilization when this act was up in the last session of Congress that it was necessary to impose them, that was the time they should have put them on.

Moderator GRANIK. May I take a question from the young lady?

Senator WHERRY. That is what I would have done.

Question: I address my question to Senator WHERRY. I want to ask him if it seems right to him that we as mature people should stay at home in comparative safety while we send what might be termed a second children's crusade into the horrors of Korea?

Senator WHERRY. If I had my way about it they would not have been in Korea today fighting. That is, if we adopted the policies I advocated. Now they are there. The question is: How large an army do you want? I understand now that the army that is being suggested is 3,500,000 people. If we are to have 3,500,000 personnel, I want to say to the little lady, that if that prevails it will take in class 1-A every available man, including those 18 years of age. Would you agree with me on that, CLINTON?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator WHERRY. So that if it is necessary, if this demand is here, if this all-out mobilization is the policy, it will take them down to 18, regardless of how you feel about drafting 18-year-olds, and others staying at home. There will not be any other choice in the matter. That will be all that are left in class 1-A if that happens.

Senator ANDERSON. Anything you do in that nature is unpleasant. If you had to draft the 18-year-olds there are arguments against that. When you start moving up the list you start moving into people in college, young married couples, and then young married couples with children. And anything you do is unpleasant and probably the easiest is to move into the 18-year-old group.

Senator WHERRY. If I may enlarge upon the observation of the Senator, that is not the only thing. If we are to have three and one-half million in personnel, that is, military personnel, it is absolutely necessary with the classes that we have that we take everyone down to 18 to get enough out of 1-A to do the job; is that not right?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes; it is unpleasant, but inevitable.

Moderator GRANIK. We must admit that President Truman in the last election did a pretty good job of selling himself to the American people. What would you think of a meeting with Joe Stalin and trying to sell him on the necessity of peace in the world and eliminating some of this?

Senator WHERRY. I am in favor of discussing peace any time anywhere with anybody. If we can get a peaceful solution in an American Forum of the Air or get them at the Town Hall meetings, or any level, I am for it. The only thing is, I don't want any commitments made by the President that ought to come back and be ratified through the constitutional processes. I want the American people and Congress to be full-fledged partners in any agreements or commitments which he might make.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you think they would go along with him?

Senator WHERRY. I think he has the power to make an agreement and negotiate, but if they involve constitutional processes—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will agree with me—we ought to bring them back and have them ratified.

We don't want any more Yaltas and Potsdams.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator ANDERSON, do you care to comment on that?

Senator ANDERSON. As to a meeting with Stalin, on that I think after what Russia has done and is now engaged in doing in China and elsewhere, that I would certainly not want to see our President take his hat in hand and take Uncle Joe and say, "What do you now suggest that I do?"

Senator WHERRY. He might write him a letter, CLINTON.

Senator ANDERSON. That is a good point. I would just like to point out that that is the very crux of this whole story, if I may say so. Here is a President who feels outraged, and the only remedy he has in America is to write a letter. In Russia they do something else. In Russia he would have killed the man long ago. And thank God, we still have the kind of a country where, when the President of the United States becomes outraged, all he can do is write a letter.

Senator WHERRY. I hope he just keeps on writing letters, I think it is wonderful. The more letters he writes, the better chance we have.

Moderator GRANIK. We will take another question.

Question. I am a member of the Massachusetts State Senate. My question is addressed to Senator ANDERSON. For how many years can the Nation stand all-out mobilization before the private economy is destroyed?

Senator ANDERSON. That is a question that should not be asked of a New Mexico farmer and insurance agent. You have got to ask that of some great economist, and, confidentially, he cannot tell you.

Moderator GRANIK. The Senator says that leaves him out.

Senator ANDERSON. My best answer is that nobody seems to know what the capacity of the American Government is. Nobody seems to know what our great production machine can do. Certainly we ought not to try all-out mobilization as long as we still have a possibility of keeping away from the controlled economy.

I am glad to see we are trying to do a lot of these things without taking full control of production of this land.

Senator WHERRY. May I just point out, however, for the benefit of the questioner, that I sit on the Appropriations Committee, and although the Senator has foreclosed me because I am not a great economist, from answering this question, yet I do get a lot of information on the appropriations from just such characters as the distinguished Senator has mentioned. I would like to say to this member of the Massachusetts State Legislature that our budget this year, ending in July, will total $75,000,000,000 and that the available income of taxes is $40,000,000,000 on the present business that we are doing, and that the contemplated budget, including contract authority that has been suggested to the Appropriations Committee for the next fiscal year will be $100,000,000,000 and for the succeeding year after that it will be likewise.

So I agree with you: How long can we continue to support these land army divisions in Europe as a standby defense army, and whether to accomplish what Lenin once stated in 1924, "What we are going to do is to require the United States to spend itself into distraction."

That is the big question.

Moderator GRANIK. Now for our first summary, Senator WHERRY.

Senator WHERRY. Ted, I would sum up today's discussion in two phases. On the domestic front certainly there is not much disagreement between Senator ANDERSON and the junior Senator from Nebraska. I want to preserve the free economy of the United States of America. If we are to lead other nations out of this darkness into the light of a new day, the United States has got to remain spiritually and economically sound. Certainly, we start from that premise. For that reason it is my feeling that in this great debate on Mutual that we should have it in the Senate of the United States on any commitment made, that we should not commit ourselves to land forces until it is debated, and that we might determine the character of the aid the United States can afford to give to these free countries of the world in helping them, if you please, to eradicate communism from the world.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, Senator WHERRY.

Now, your summary, Senator ANDERSON.

Senator ANDERSON. I think, after discussion, it seems apparent that we are going to be greatly worried about the economy here at home, and I think we had better put our very, very best efforts into trying to have this work done on a pay-as-you-go basis. I think we need, therefore, immediately again increasing taxes. I think we need to constantly pare down our spending. When we talk about our work abroad let us remember that we must save Europe. We cannot afford to lose Europe. There are things that we say we cannot afford to do at home. I recognize it is hard to afford them. We cannot afford to lose that part of the world where democracy has always grown and where it can grow again with a very small amount of assistance from us. We have watched it in other areas. Italy seems to come into my mind constantly. We were able to save it. It did seem like quite an expenditure, but it is not too much if Europe can be saved.

Therefore, I hope that everything we do shall be done with one thought, that we do not want just America, we want Europe with us.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, very much, gentlemen.

Politics in Controls?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from the Readers' Column of the Los Angeles Times, which ably states the growing distrust in our present administration:

POLITICS IN CONTROLS?

There appears to be two reasons for threatened price control and rationing of meat. Neither has any connection with the supply or price of same.

The first reason looks like a Truman "red herring." By hitting at the people's dinner table our wily President sets up such an irritation that the monumental blunders of the State Department and the United Nations fade into oblivion.

The second reason is to make the Socialists now running our Government happy. The Truman gang is treating the tragic world situation as a heaven-sent opportunity to spread their philosophy of more and more control under the guise of the national emergency.

Mrs. JOSEPH SHELL,

LOS ANGELES.

Welfare of the American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion among people interested in legislation on Indian welfare over a joint resolution which passed the House of Representatives in the Eighty-first Congress, but failed to pass the Senate. The resolution is House Joint Resolution 459.

It was the subject of discussion by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in a recent issue of the Washington News.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article referred to and written by Mrs. Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL NOW ON HILL MAY STRIKE AT AMERICAN INDIANS

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Friday.—People who are dependent and are not fully able to defend their own interests are always an invitation to exploitation.

Even in our own democracy we cannot deny that this has been so. That is why most of us hope that the day will come when all American Indians will be sufficiently well educated to be allowed to enter into the stream of American life as citizens and to take care of their own business. That day, however, does not seem to be very close at hand. Education has been woefully bad where our Indians are concerned, and, as yet, they are far from being able to look after their own affairs.

It is well, therefore, that many people are interested in the welfare of the Indians. Some are interested in their purely artistic contributions, for the Indians have many expressions of their own art. But, for the most part, people are interested in seeing the Indians integrated into our national life and are working toward again making them full citizens in this land which once belonged to them entirely.

I am quite sure that the new Commissioner of the Indian Bureau, Dillon S. Myer, whom I knew and admired when he was in charge of the relocation camps during the last war, wants to do the best that can be done for the Indians. His experience, however, has not been long with this particular question and he has around him men with whom he has previously worked on other matters. It is possible, therefore, that interested people, wanting to achieve personal objectives, might present Indian affairs to Commissioner Myer in a somewhat misleading manner. In fact, certain bills which already have been presented lead one to fear that this may have been so. The fact that the Indians have been deprived of their right to choose their own counsel, a right which they long enjoyed, is a serious infringement on their liberty.

In certain States it always has been difficult to protect rights of Indians and the Representatives from those States quite naturally think first of the rights, or rather the advantages of the other citizens of the State. Now it looks as though an effort is

being made to hurry the Indian plan of self-development going on since 1929, and many fear that if the Indian bill presently before the Senate is passed the Indians and their interests will seriously suffer.

Perhaps it would be well for Mr. Myer to call together some of the organizations and some of the men in this country who have had long experience in dealing with our Indian minority groups. He might be able to clear up some of the misunderstandings that they have about his attitude, and they might be able to help him to a clearer understanding of the interests of the Indians as they see them. Many individuals in this country have been closely associated with Indian tribes over a long period. They have gained a knowledge and a feeling for the Indians that cannot be gained without much study and association, and I think they should be heard.

Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is inserted herewith from H. Bond Bliss, on the letterhead of Miami Life, Florida's most influential weekly, a letter addressed to the editor of the Miami Daily News, which reads as follows:

TOO LATE

To the EDITOR OF THE MIAMI DAILY NEWS:

In answer to Philip Wylie, I remember many of the events he cites in his attack on the Miami Herald and its confusion of policies. It is ironical for me, of all persons, to take up the cudgels for the harassed Herald. I cannot speak for the later years but I do feel responsible for his tirade against the isolationism of 10 years ago.

I plead guilty to writing isolation editorials in the Herald before our glorious entry into the Second World War to save America, the world, humanity, and freedom. I emphasized the same theme in my front-page column day after day and he derided me then. Wylie has always shouted for conflict, for other American men and boys going abroad to have their heads mashed and their legs mangled and increasing the crosses row on row.

Yes; I wrote and argued and fought for America first and always; for a strong and invincible United States, for a united Western Hemisphere that could defy the world, protected by two wide oceans; an America at peace, armed to the hilt, with navies and air forces, prospering and happy.

Yes; I remember those peace meetings. Communists and fellow travelers were among those who shouted to keep the United States out of war, until Germany turned upon Russia. Then they, like Wylie, yelled for intervention not to save this country nor democracy nor liberty, but to help poor Russia.

With the Communists joining the capitalists, the power-hungry statesmen and politicians and militarists, we isolationists, we Americans, became rather lonely, crying in the wilderness for peace in vain.

Yes; the internationalists and interventionists won. They won back in 1914 after the American people had voted for peace and were given war. We licked the Kaiser and his Huns to establish peace and freedom forever. And the wounded boys came back and also the veterans. The debts piled up. But did the world win peace and brotherhood? Instead it was given Hitler and nazism, Mussolini and fascism, Stalin and communism. Japan felt its muscles. That is what our intervention and internationalism accomplished. Wylie cannot blame isolationists for that.

Wylie should be very satisfied over the results. The United States saved Soviet Russia and Communist China.

Now there is the third world war. Now the United States really is in danger. Now there may be that fighting in American streets, about which Wylie prates. Now there may be bombs dropping in our cities, on our homes. Now the Red spies may be blowing up our industries, our utilities, our transportation, our Government. Never was this country in such grave peril as now. Never in our time was democracy and liberty so threatened.

That is the price we are paying for intervention, for internationalism, for striving to tell others what they should do on this earth.

Yes; I was an isolationist. Millions and millions of Americans today are wishing and praying they had been, that the United States had followed the wise advice of the forefathers.

It's too late now, Philip Wylie. It's too late to be an isolationist. We are up to our necks in internationalism—and the noose is hanging there.

H. BOND BLISS.

MIAMI.

Dr. Henry Bennett and the Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor regarding a statement of the able new director of the technical assistance program. The editorial follows:

LAND REFORM, NEW STYLE

The farmer under the American capitalistic system is far from being a downtrodden man, points out Dr. Henry G. Bennett, who has just taken office as Administrator of Technical Aid to Foreign Countries (the point 4 program). He believes it is incentive that makes the American farmer tick, and that more of it spread to other farmers would help feed the world.

This is a sound approach to what the point 4 program can do in its agricultural phase. Communism assumes that land reform can be accomplished merely by taking land, especially large holdings of it, away from its present owners. What results usually is that the peasant finds himself again a serf, this time on a collective farm, or the exactions of the tax collector become as severe as were those of the landlord.

The kind of rural capitalism America wants to encourage does not take pride in vast tracts under absentee owners; it is rather a system in which the owner-operator has both the responsibility and the reward for what his acres produce. To make this system function requires a considerable amount of knowledge and competence on the part of the individual farmer.

In fostering that competence among American farmers, the county demonstration agents, the experiment farms, and the agricultural colleges (such as Dr. Bennett headed) have been very effective. To share that experience with other countries will be mutually beneficial.

Views on Decentralization of Patent Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia on January 8, 1951:

Whereas tentative suggestions have been made to include the United States Patent Office in the so-called decentralization plan, which would result in its permanent removal to a city remote from Washington, D. C., and from all related agencies concerned with rearmament and the national defense effort; and

Whereas the records of the Patent Office accumulated in Washington over a period of more than 100 years include copies of millions of United States and foreign patents and a vast store of applied scientific and technical literature constituting the greatest single source of scientific information and knowledge available in the world and now accessible for immediate consultation and inspection by the various defense agencies; and

Whereas the records of the Patent Office are consulted almost daily by the representatives of the Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Government Patents Board, the patent sections of the Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, Justice Department Patent Section, Government research bureaus, such as the Bureau of Standards, and others having development procurement and contract problems involving inventions; and

Whereas such removal of the Patent Office under the decentralization plan would greatly hamper the activities of all defense agencies by making said records inaccessible; and

Whereas the relocation of the Patent Office under decentralization would destroy the efficient functioning of the Patent Office, through the loss by resignation of highly trained, experienced, and irreplaceable scientific personnel, who would not accompany the Patent Office to a distant location; and

Whereas decisions of the Patent Office for a great number of years have been reviewed by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and the judges sitting on these courts are highly trained in patent matters, the review of Patent Office proceedings would be seriously impaired by removal of the Patent Office from the city of Washington to a distant city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bar Association of the District of Columbia hereby goes on record as opposing the removal of the United States Patent Office from the city of Washington under decentralization and earnestly submits that it should remain where now located; but that if the Patent Office space is determined to be absolutely required by other defense agencies, the Patent Office should be included in the so-called dispersal plan (as distinguished from the decentralization plan), which would result in relocation of the Patent Office within a radius of 20 miles of the White House; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the chairmen of the Judiciary Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Director of the General Services Administration, and the Commissioner of Patents.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia at a meeting held in Washington, D. C., on January 8, 1951.

JUSTIN L. EDGERTON,
Secretary.

General Eisenhower Points the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am including an editorial by Anna M. Carlson, editor of the Lindsborg News-Record, of Lindsborg, Kans.

I think the Members of the House will be interested in the views expressed in this editorial:

GENERAL EISENHOWER POINTS THE WAY

At last there is a ray of hope piercing the dense fog of Washington's Fair Deal rearmament muddle.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower made his stand known last week on the eve of his departure for Europe, regarding the arming of European nations for defense. Preparing to leave for his combined European command he told a news conference that European democracies must make equal sacrifices with America if forces are to be built up capable of defending Europe and maintaining peace. The general stressed that if every sacrifice by America is not matched by the European democracies this thing cannot win.

General Eisenhower is undertaking a stupendous task. He will visit each capital of the North Atlantic Treaty organization nations during the trip he started Saturday to talk with the officials of the various countries and reassure himself that they are not working at cross purposes.

It will be a herculean task to make those nations understand that they must do their part. For years most of them have been holding out their hands to Uncle Sam for doles furnished by the American taxpayers. Most of those countries have made little effort to beat back from the ravages of war and defeatism. It has been easier to depend on the United States.

Now they are depending on the United States to furnish men, arms, and means to defend them in event of aggression by a powerful nation.

Happy landings, General Eisenhower, and may a divine providence help you make order out of chaos.

General Herr Says Use of Horse Cavalry as Part of Armed Forces Should Be Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the question as to the need of the horse cavalry as part of the Armed Forces is being revived. This has been brought about largely because of the situation developed in the Korean area. Maj. Gen. John K. Herr, a retiring cavalry officer, has given this matter a considerable amount of study. He has first-hand information because of his long service as an officer with the cavalry while a member of the Armed Forces.

General Herr has handed me a statement dealing with the problem, which he believes to be pertinent and of sufficient importance to call it to the attention of the Members of Congress. Under permission granted me by the House, I am including his statement, together with an article that appeared in the Detroit Free Press in support of the opinion expressed by General Herr.

[From the February 1948 issue of the Rider and Driver]

(By S. W. Taylor)

Mr. Frank M. Smith reported in the Washington Times that a strong plea for revival of the United States Cavalry was also made at the last hearing by General Herr. He quoted General Herr as saying that it was not true that horses were not needed in the last war and had read statements from General Patton and others that cavalry units would have been of great advantage in the North African and Sicilian campaigns. General Herr also said that General Wainright would testify as to the effectiveness of cavalry if he was called before the committee. General Herr placed before the committee a letter by Lt. Gen. Lucian K. Truscott, Patton's successor as Third Army commander, which held that if the United States had kept its horse cavalry, the bloody Cassino and Anzio battles could have been avoided and the Italian war possibly shortened by many months.

Col. Fred L. Hamilton, United States Army, retired, former Chief of Remount Service, told the committee: "I talked to German officers of the Air Corps and the ground forces and the mechanized outfits and cavalry outfits and almost to a man it was their opinion that they lost the war on the eastern front because the Russians had better horses. The horses were better and the German motor and mechanized outfits were helpless in the roadless stretches of Russia. To a man they were of the opinion that one of the major reasons for losing the war on the Russian front was the superb cavalry of the Russians, regular and irregular."

General Herr said in conclusion that he would like to submit to the committee a document which was restricted Intelligence Bulletin of May 1946, issued by the G-2 division (Secret Service) the Information Division of the General Staff. He read a part of it as follows:

"The U. S. S. R. with vast distances and few roads, and with severe climatic conditions during much of the year, has used horse cavalry to great advantage during World War II. By the means achieved the Soviets have justified the use of cavalry, not as a substitute for armor, but as an independent arm and as a supplement to armor and mechanized infantry in operations over severe terrain. Russian cavalry has great power in supporting weapons. The organization is so designed as to provide a small and mobile striking force with adequate support of artillery, mortars, and automatic weapons. Cavalry and tanks have been combined into a smooth working and effective organization."

Following the submission of the foregoing document to the committee General Herr and Senator MOSS carried on a conversation in which it was brought out that the United States horse cavalry was eliminated in spite of evidence as to its necessity. Their conversations in part follow:

"Senator MOSS. In other words, when you are dealing with military operations, in that part of Europe in which the Russian, Hungarian, Yugoslavian, and Polish Armies operate, you are dealing with military operations in which horses play a very important part.

"General HERR. Yes. There they play a part which is of increasing importance, and I wish to state right here that there is no truth in the popular idea that the cavalry is only useful in out-of-the-way places, where there are mountains and tough country, where vehicles cannot go. It is highly useful in any terrain in the world. A horse can go anywhere a vehicle can go, but a vehicle cannot go a lot of places the horse can go. The horse can go almost anywhere a man can go. It can transport its fire power over places where vehicles cannot go, and over good country where men can go, much faster than men can go on foot. It is a vital thing. No country which pretends to be well organized for war in all manner of terrain over the world, and in all kinds of weather can pretend to be able to fight in any theater of war where it may be called upon to do so, to the best advantage, unless it has the proper complement of horse cavalry and pack animals. The Chinese are finding that out right now.

"Furthermore, I submit and I charge and allege the War Department prematurely, unwisely, and mistakenly suppressed our cavalry in 1942, after I was retired as chief of cavalry, and changed the cavalry into other organizations and futile units such as the mechanized reconnaissance units, over my bitter protest when they started this thing. Not only that, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of War in June 1942, shortly after I was retired, inviting his attention to the dastardly sabotage of the American cavalry and calling on him to put a stop to it and quoting to him what the Russian cavalry was doing—that the results would be detrimental to our country; that we had a highly organized cavalry, though small, the best in the world, based on our Civil War experiences; that to do away with the grand cavalry now was criminal, almost because it could not be reconstituted during the emergency; that we would have need for it and use for it. I knew him well personally. I received a very kindly letter from him. I have the original on file. In that letter he assured me that he had a very kindly feeling for the horse, too. In the old days he had been with it and so on. But they just couldn't quite see where they were going to be able to use any cavalry in this war. He hoped I would not feel too bitter about it."

[From the Detroit Free Press]

HAY BURNER WARFARE

(By Royce Howes)

So what would be so odd about the cavalry horse coming back? As a matter of fact it wouldn't have far to come.

In World War II the Russians had an army of 600,000 horsemen and made astonishingly good use of it. Right now for that matter, the Chinese Reds in Korea are going into battle on Mongol ponies.

Of course, like the Germans, the Russians were not fully mechanized, and the Chinese aren't either. Our Army is, so the horse might not mesh quite so well, but it would have its uses.

I remember in the early days of the last war standing on a hilltop with the commander of a mechanized reconnaissance troop. We were watching his men and vehicles run off a maneuver in the broken brushy country below.

The troop commander kept moaning for horses, and pointing out the limitation of his jeeps and armored cars in such terrain. Even to the untutored eye it was plain that horsemen could scout that particular piece of landscape much more adequately.

It would have been smart to have kept a regiment of horse cavalry around somewhere, or at least a squadron.

A cadre with equine management and combat know-how would be available to lend a hand in such situation as the request from Korea has presented.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff had better get an ear to the ground. They might hear hoof beats.

Also, it may come about that one of these days Congress will demand to know who was so premature about turning the horses out to pasture.

Bill Ogan Went Through Hell in the Hungnam Retreat in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, while we know the news from Korea is censored, I think this letter written by Bill Ogan to his father, Carl Ogan, in North Powder, Oreg., tells the story clearly and graphically. The above-mentioned letter follows:

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12.

I probably don't have to tell you that we have just come through hell during the last 2 weeks. That I am alive is nothing but a miracle or the good Lord was surely with me.

I received 11 letters yesterday, one had a map asking me if that was the sector I was in. Yes, it was and there were two regiments of us, the Seventh and Fifth. We were surrounded by seven Chinese divisions.

We were cut off entirely except by air. They made drops for us every day: food, gasoline, ammunition, etc.

One week ago we started fighting our way out. There is no need telling we had many casualties. We hear now that there are approximately 1,000,000 Chinese troops trying to annihilate us. Our platoon, originally 43 men, came through with 13.

ONLY SEVEN LEFT

The weather was always below zero. Frozen feet and hands were not uncommon at all. My finger tips are still numb. My feet, well I don't know, I'm still walking. Our last lap yesterday we walked over the pass to a small town which had a railroad. We walked 16 miles. The staff sergeant and I were the only ones who made it all the way on foot, the rest of them fell out and rode on trucks.

NIGHT IN FOX HOLE

Three nights ago we were on a defense perimeter of the First Marines. About 3:30 a. m. I went on watch. We were standing one hour on and one off. I noticed the bullets were getting pretty close and was sitting behind the fox hole so I raised up to try to see. It was awfully dark and the wind was blowing right through me. There about 15 feet from the fox hole were five gooks. As soon as they saw me they threw a grenade. It hit in the fox hole but luckily it was a concussion grenade and not fragmentation. At the same time I opened fire. They fired a Thompson sub. I hit two and luckily again the bullets from the sub didn't get any of us. I picked up the sub the next morning about 2 feet in front of my fox hole. They were trying to go through our position but they failed.

We had several casualties but nothing like they had.

It was estimated the next day that there were about two divisions on the attack. The next morning there were five dead Chinese in front of my position. Later on during the night they moved me to another foxhole that the men in had been hit and there were seven dead "gooks" around there so I know I got my share of the "blankety-blanks."

FOUGHT WAY THROUGH

We pulled out the next day. We had to fight our way through road block after road block. Never have I seen as much Marine gear lying on the side of the road. Trucks along the side, all kinds of gear. It was surely different than anything I have ever seen or probably ever will see again. Anyway, we made it.

We are now back at Hungnam and are supposed to go aboard ship either today or tomorrow. Where we don't know for sure but some think we are going to Pusan. I hope not, but I am happy to just be alive and it will be a rest.

Our gunnery sergeant was killed. Sure was a good man. A mortar shell got him. Out of the original brigade there are seven left in our platoon.

FEW DAYS OF REST

We are sitting in tents today getting our back mail, getting some gear issued to us. Most of us lost most of our gear. It was either burned or lost in our withdrawal.

There is some talk of our old original brigade going back to the States, but I doubt it.

All my film was burned up back where we were cut off but I saved my camera and I have about eight pictures left to take. I am saving them for special occasions.

We go aboard am tracks today to board ships. I hear we are to take our tents and stoves so that probably means we will set up in Pusan or some place else for awhile.

About all for now. I made it through this so guess I can make it through most anything now. I feel pretty good but have lost a little weight. Will write again as soon as I know more.

BILL OGAN.

Hope: An American Export

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on November 16, 1950, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan delivered an excellent and thought-provoking address to the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities at its annual meeting in Washington. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPE: AN AMERICAN EXPORT

(By Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan)

It is a privilege for me to take part in another of your annual meetings and to discuss some of the matters that are of mutual concern to us in our joint effort to serve agriculture, the Nation, and the cause of world peace.

A great deal of the work in which we have mutual interest has been long established and continues through the years to merit all the care and attention we can give to it. From time to time we also enter jointly into new undertakings to improve upon the work that is already under way or to meet the challenge of changing conditions.

In accordance with a recommendation of the joint committee on extension programs, policies, and goals, annual meetings are now being held between the Secretary of Agriculture and the executive committee of this association. From my standpoint, at least, this is an important development. I am also glad that your committee on extension organization and policy is continuing to meet regularly with the director of extension work in the Department and with our Department committee on extension relations.

I am particularly happy with the progress that has been made by committees of State extension and experiment station directors and representatives of the Department in developing plans for an intensified and joint effort to strengthen the Nation through grasslands improvement. Grassland improvement holds great potentialities for improving the diets of our people, improving our soil, increasing the economic opportunities in agriculture, and strengthening our national defense. I assure you that we of the Department will be glad to cooperate with you of the land-grant colleges and universities to the extent of our ability in the proposed undertaking.

At your meeting a year ago, I discussed with you some of the promise and some of the problems of the point-4 program which President Truman had proposed.

The beginning of such a program, as you know, has since been authorized by Congress, and the first appropriation has been provided. Fortunately, we have all had considerable experience with the problems involved in technical assistance to other countries. It is vital that we pool our experience and resources in meeting the larger problems that are now before us. Our joint committee on agricultural services to foreign areas has made a good start. I am sure we can all look to it for real leadership and guidance.

All of us, necessarily, have been devoting a great deal of thought to this relatively new work, especially to the real objectives we seek. Obviously, point 4 is not an end in itself but is a part of the over-all effort of the American people to help build world peace.

When I accepted your invitation to speak here, I thought that I might contribute best by discussing agriculture in relation to the building of our national strength. However, as I thought more about it, my mind kept turning to the more fundamental question that is constantly in all of our minds: What can we do to achieve world peace?

So, with your leave, I should like to go beyond my scheduled subject and discuss agriculture's part in implementing our desire and determination to build a just and lasting peace.

Let us get into the subject by considering two questions: (1) What are the obstacles to world peace? and (2) What do we have to work with?

The first obstacle we think of is aggressive totalitarianism of the Communist variety. Korea has proved beyond all doubt that international communism is aggressive—and not just in the ideological sense but aggressive in the use of raw military power. Against military aggression there is only one immediate defense and that is military power. The United Nations, including the United States, have recognized the necessity for military power, have acted effectively, and are determined to exercise effective force as long as necessary.

That may be a long time, but force is only a temporary expedient—not the ultimate answer. The world has seen many great military powers rise and fall. True peace has not yet come. If force can be balanced with force without achieving peace, then logic demands that we look deeper for the real obstacle between us and peace.

So we come to this question: Is communism the basic trouble, or is communism the current symptom of an older, deeper disease?

It seems to me that communism is the symptom. Its leaders are capitalizing upon the misery, the wants, the unrest that have long existed. Propaganda-wise, they pretend they are not merely against something but for something better. They have convinced millions of people that this is so. That is the meaning of postwar Communist gains in Europe. It is the meaning of the Communist success in China, the nearly successful aggression in Korea, and the continuing Comunist pressure in many other parts of Asia.

We know that the Communist leaders are misleading their followers with false promises and lies. But many of the world's people do not have access to this fact until it is too late. They follow false hopes to their doom.

Hope lays hold on men's minds and stirs them to desperate action. Our first task is to understand this thoroughly because man's hope must be directed toward peace—not capitalized by aggressors as an obstacle to peace.

Americans above all others should realize what hope can mean in terms of constructive action toward freedom. Our national life began with a revolution, and it was not merely a military revolution but one based on ideas and ideals. It was a revolution that laid hold on the minds of men—in America and throughout the world. The American revolutionists were not merely insisting that Americans should be free and independent of Great Britain. They were insisting that all men are born to be free, that the rights of man are inherent, God-given, not subject to either bestowal or denial by temporal powers.

I have spoken of the American Revolution in the past tense, but it can be and should be thought of in the present tense. It is alive today, and the satanic appeal of communism need not prevail over the good and the true that is democracy expressing the God-given rights of man.

The two opposing ways of life are competing for the minds and hearts of men.

This, I believe, is the basic struggle. For us who are now living there is no escape from this reality. What we do—and what we fail to do—both will affect the lives of our children and our children's children.

Our record clearly indicates we will not shrink back.

Our leaders have made clear to the world that we seek no national aggrandisement. Our occupation of former enemy countries has been firm but not vindicative. We have provided foreign relief that saved millions of lives; strengthened Iran, Greece, and Turkey against Communist aggression; helped to establish Philippine independence; provided billions of dollars worth of aid to China, Korea, and certain other Asiatic countries; promoted European recovery through the Marshall plan; joined a program of mutual defense for the North Atlantic area; helped to organize and staunchly support the United Nations Organization and its specialized agencies; started the point 4 program, and promptly responded to the United Nations call for the military defense of Korea.

In all history, there is nothing remotely approaching either the high moral principle or the scope of this record.

Yet the peace is far from won.

In the struggle for the minds of men, totalitarian Communist dictatorship is drawing support from millions who by nature should be joined with us in developing a democratic way of life—a way or life based on inherent human rights, individual dignity, and brotherhood of the human family.

Man was born to be free. There can be no peace until mankind has won its freedom.

As we know from recent experience, the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism is at a critical point in Asia, and the outcome in Asia is of critical importance to the entire world.

Half the people of the world live in Asia.

Eight persons out of 10 in Asia are peasants.

Most of those peasants live in abject poverty. Few of them farm as much as four acres. Their tools are primitive. Their farms are so small that they would have no use for modern machines if they had them.

They have little part in world trade, either as suppliers or buyers.

Few Asian peasants own the land on which they toil, and few have had any hope of owning the land. Unlike United States tenants, they are completely dependent upon their landlords—politically, socially, economically.

Most peasants must turn over to their landlords most of what they produce—50 to 75 percent is common, and in certain parts of China it runs as high as 90 percent. Many have no security of tenure whatsoever. Some areas have laws to protect the peasant's tenure, but in many areas the laws are not enforced. Too often the landlord may turn the peasant off the land whenever he wishes.

The yields on much of the land are low, but the peasant is not much interested in improving it.

He is not greatly impressed by irrigation projects and other improvements when it is not his land that will be improved. He has little hope of gaining; there are plenty of peasants who will work the land in return for enough food to keep their families alive. Therefore, how can one peasant hope to be given more than he is now getting from his landlord. He has no incentive.

This is a major problem in the point 4 program.

Our technical assistance will do little good unless the family on the land welcomes and uses the knowledge. That, I believe, is a fundamental point recognized by all of you in extension work.

You will find some exceptions to the dark picture I have painted. But for the most part, the Asian peasant is landless, hungry and about as nearly without hope as it is humanly possible to become. That is, he has been without hope; today, it may be a little different.

All over Asia, Communists are spreading the word that the land is to be divided up. "Join with us," they say, "and the land you farm will be yours. Help us overthrow the present authorities, and you will immediately be a landowner. This is the only way you can ever hope to have your own farm."

There's more to it than that. The Communist propaganda uses words about freedom, dignity of the individual, and probably all of the other principles of democracy. The Communist claims are inflated like balloons, and are just as empty. But how can the peasant know that communism has never brought democracy but only dictatorship? How can he know that the so-called land reform of communism consists of transferring land from feudal landlords to a feudal government?

Hence, among at least half of the world's people the misery of the peasant is a basic obstacle to peace because it provides the "soil" in which communism or some other form of totalitarianism breeds.

An attack upon this problem is the most direct way by which democracy can win over communism in the struggle for the minds of men. That is the real hope for peace.

In meeting any problem, understanding it is the first step. The next is to take stock of what we have to work with.

Fortunately, we have many tools, and we have been using some of them.

But we can never make it too clear to the people of the world that the principles of the American Revolution guide American democracy and commit us to the cause of human improvement everywhere. The world must be led to understand that when Americans tax themselves to send aid abroad they do so because they want to help the everyday folks. We must continually make known the fact that we believe in freedom and dignity for all people.

It is terribly difficult to make these things clear in a period of chaos. Sometimes any kind of stability seems preferable to unpounded chaos, and our efforts to gain these are misunderstood. But we must make our position clear.

We should, by all means, make clear that our country has had experience in dealing with such problems as are faced by the farm people of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, South America—problems of land tenure.

Those looking toward Russia for a tenure pattern are looking in the wrong direction if they want progress and independence for their farm people. We must help them compare democracy and communism from the standpoint of both philosophy and performance. As to philosophy, communism from the beginning has opposed the private ownership of property. How can anyone hope that communism will suddenly adopt the freehold principle? Logic and experience require anyone to expect that the Communist pattern for agriculture will continue to be the government collective.

On the other hand, let our friends study Jefferson, who believed that a democratic nation should be a nation of freeholders.

Some of his ideas about agriculture may seem rather extreme, in view of the industrial development of modern society, but those ideas are a part of our national background.

It was Jefferson who said: "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if ever He had a chosen people, whose breasts he has made his peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue. It is the focus in which he keeps alive that sacred fire which otherwise might escape from the face of the earth. Corruption of morals in the mass of cultivators is a phenomenon of which no age nor nation has furnished an example."

(Jefferson would be shocked to see how communism today is corrupting the people on the land by exploiting their natural desire to own the bit of earth on which they toil.)

In 1820, Daniel Webster, who was to become a Senator and later Secretary of State, made this perceptive statement: "A republican form of government rests not more on political constitutions than on those laws which regulate the descent and transmission of property. Governments like ours could

not have been maintained where property was holden according to the principles of the feudal system, nor, on the other hand, could the feudal constitution possibly exist with us. * * *" He further declared that "a great subdivision of the soil and a great equality of condition" are "the true basis, most certainly, of a popular government."

Our friends in agricultural countries of the world should also be aware that there was in the time of Jackson a Senator named Thomas Hart Benton, who did perhaps more than any other man to shape the land policy of the United States. Listen to his philosophy:

"Tenantry is unfavorable to freedom. It lays the foundation for separate orders in society, annihilates the love of country, and weakens the spirit of independence. The farming tenant has, in fact, no country, no hearth, no domestic altar, no household god. The freeholder, on the contrary, is the natural supporter of a free government; and it should be the policy of republics to multiply their freeholders, as it is the policies of monarchies to multiply tenants. We are a republic, and we wish to continue so. Then multiply the class of freeholders; sell for a reasonable price to those who are able to pay, and give without price to those who are not."

Later the Nation did give land freely to those who would farm it.

I shall not attempt to trace the entire history of United States land policy. However, the facts show that the public made land available to farmers either freely or at low prices during our early development period, and that the public has intervened in many ways to keep the farmland in the hands of the operators. This is still the policy of our democracy. It is a policy which we commend to all nations in the interest of freedom and peace.

If you will pardon a personal reference, my own entry into the public service was connected with a national effort to preserve the American family farming system. I was employed by the Government to buy land on which farm people were unable to make a living due to a long period of low prices and a drought. The Government was helping some of the distressed people move to other locations where they would have a better chance, helping others improve the land and form economic farming or ranching units which they could pay for out of yearly earnings, and finding desirable uses for land on which people had no chance to make a living. I, of course, had no part in planning this program. I mention it because it has always seemed significant that such problems—problems of land and people—are regarded as public problems in a democracy.

Knowing how farm people feel about the land, it is no surprise to me that the Communists have made gains by promising land to the landless. But it is surprising that the whole world doesn't know and appreciate the great record that democracy has made in keeping the land in the hands of the people.

The American public has provided capital funds for cooperative farm credit associations and has legislated low interest rates and long terms for repayment of farm purchase loans. (Incidentally the Government capital in the Federal land banks has been completely returned and the banks are entirely farmer-owned.)

The Government in recent years, through Farmers Home Administration and its predecessor agencies, has supplied credit directly or insured private loans to nearly 2,000,000 American farm families who did not have adequate sources of credit. Many thousands of these loans made or insured by the Government have been made to tenants so that they could become farm owners. The same type of credit is being made available to farm families who want to improve their farms and to veterans who want to start new farms in areas opened up by Government reclamation programs. The same type of credit is being made available to improve farm housing.

Nearly every farm service offered by the United States Government is based on the public policy of promoting the welfare of the family-type farm. You of the land-grant colleges and we of the Department carry on scientific research and education so that the individual farmer may farm well and so that his family may live well.

The public shares with the individual farmer the cost of conserving the soil. The public finances administration of a crop insurance program through which the farmer may protect himself against ruinous crop failures. The public recognizes that the small individual farmer has no control over commodity prices, and therefore provides protection against ruinous prices. The public encourages marketing and purchasing cooperatives through which the individual farmer may gain the economic strength of many. The public supplies credit and other assistance to cooperative groups of farmers so that they can provide for themselves the modern services of electricity and telephones.

Anyone reading the history of agricultural legislation in this country will be impressed by the consistency of the philosophy behind that legislation. Probably without exception, the legislators advocated each act as a means of aiding and encouraging the individual farmer so that he could own his land, attain greater security, and enjoy a better life.

Another point should be noted: Our country recognizes no class barrier between land owners and land tenants. Every year many tenants become owners. Because tenants generally share equitably in production, they have a foundation of economic opportunity on which to build toward farm ownership.

In 1900 tenants operated about a third of our farms. By 1930, as a result of war-inflated land prices followed by a prolonged depression, the number of farms operated by tenants was up to 42 per 100. In 1948, however, the proportion was down to less than 28 per 100.

Our tenure system is far from perfect. I can, and frequently do, point out problems that need to be corrected. But, relatively, it is good, and our history indicates we will continue to make progress.

I am convinced that the increasing productivity of our agriculture and the growth of our industry alongside agriculture are due not only to our resources and science but also to the tenure system which provides an incentive for profitable production. Not so many years ago, 50 percent of our people lived on farms, as is true in Asia today. Now we have reversed the figures, and fewer than 20 percent of our people are farm people. Early in our history, one farm worker could supply food for himself and only about three other persons. Today one worker can supply 14 other persons. Without this change, our modern industry would be impossible, and without such a change modern industry is impossible in other lands. Without such a change, world trade is severely restricted. Certainly there is no market for modern tools and machinery where the farmers have neither land nor incentive.

I have dwelt upon our record in some detail because the details are more convincing than any general statement I could make. Many more details could be added, and I think it is our job to see to it that the leaders of all political factions in every country of the world know this record. There are some in every country who are eager for this sort of progress, and they should have the facts that strengthen their determination.

The worst error that could be made by such leaders would be to look to American democracy as merely the center of productive genius and to Russian communism as the spiritual center in the field of social organization. The Communist pattern offers only degradation. The democratic pattern conforms with the most deeply felt desires of mankind.

It is probably hard for people who have never been to the United States to appreciate the character of our agriculture and our agricultural philosophy. For that reason, I believe we must work harder at taking the story to the people of other countries in terms that they can understand. This is not merely the story of what democracy has done. We need not boast. The importance of these facts is that they tell what democracy is. Every representative of the United States Government in other countries should become expert in this task. We can also emphasize the truth about agriculture in our democracy, in our radio, visual and other foreign information programs—not with the idea that our pattern can be duplicated in detail but with the idea that the basic principles are universal and appeal to human nature everywhere.

We can also well afford to show representatives of other countries what our agriculture is like. We do have many such visitors from abroad every year. I should like to see the numbers increase.

Think what it could mean if a few hundred additional persons—representative citizens—from agricultural areas of India and Pakistan, for example, could visit United States farm people next year, to learn something about our farming methods and also about our strong attachment to family-type farming, individual liberty, and equality of opportunity. They would be able to give the lie in very convincing fashion to Communist propaganda in their own countries. They would also, I hope, find economic use for production techniques demonstrated here. Furthermore, they would understand that we are friendly in the deepest sense and on their side in their struggle to maintain political independence and improve living standards.

Let us also make it clear to all that the principles of American democracy are being applied in our foreign policy with respect to agriculture.

In the Western Hemisphere we have long been engaged in a program of technical collaboration with other American Republics.

This type of work is being extended to other areas of the world under the point 4 program.

We are participating wholeheartedly in the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, whose program is to assist the people of the world to produce enough food and to improve the lot of the agricultural producers.

Giving economic aid to China, the United States in 1948 joined with the Chinese Government in setting up the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction to decide how United States money should be used to help rural Chinese. Two Americans and three Chinese comprised the Commission. On their recommendation, the Chinese Government began to put into effect rent reduction and, in a minor way, land-purchase programs which had been authorized by law for a long time but never before used. It is estimated that 2,000,000 tenants in one province alone were benefited directly, even though the total cost to the United States was only a little over $200,000.

During our military occupation of that part of Korea which lies south of the thirty-eighth parallel, the United States sold to tenants at reasonable prices the lands which were formerly owned by Japanese landlords. This did not go far enough toward meeting the tenancy problem in Korea, but it was something, and it contrasted sharply with the much-advertised Communist program of so-called land reform in North Korea. There the tenants got a lot of propaganda but did not get title to the farms.

In Japan, under United States military occupation, a land-reform program has enabled more than three million farmers—well over half of all farmers in this country—to obtain land. About 90 percent of all cultivators of land in Japan are now owners. It remains to be seen whether Japanese farmers can hold these gains that have been brought about largely by Government order. Much remains to be done before anyone can be sure that lasting land reform has been achieved. But even at this stage, we can see good results. Reports indicate that the Communists are now able to make no gains in rural Japan. Thus, practical democracy is competing successfully for the minds of men in Japan, as it will everywhere it is given the chance.

Evidently, a little bit of land, a little bit of opportunity, can do for world peace something that great armies cannot possibly accomplish. It is something that happens inside a person. It is something that cannot be shot or chained.

However, communism is still on the march, and millions upon millions of people are in its path, subject to its lure. There is much to be done.

The United States alone does not hold the answer, but we occupy a position of leadership. This is not merely because of wealth and power but, more importantly, because our domestic and foreign policies represent the principles that can bring peace and well-being to the people of the earth. Beyond this, we have a record of unfaltering support to the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

Let us use our influence in the United Nations to keep the eyes of the world on the basic requirements for world peace, while we meet our military commitments.

Those countries that want to give opportunity to the tenants to purchase the land on which they work should not lack for support in the United Nations. The United Nations as an organization has credit facilities and the facilities for giving aid in technological, social, and economic fields. It is clear that these facilities can be used to help member nations increase their production by such means as irrigation and flood-control projects and livestock-disease eradication. It should be made just as clear that these facilities are available to help meet problems of social and economic organization. For example, a country planning an irrigation project may find that the benefit to the nation could be increased manyfold by seeing to it that the land to be irrigated is owned by many farmers rather than by a few landlords.

Other countries may find that the most pressing need is to assure the tenant a larger share of his production and gradually to pay for an adequate-sized farm. Such a country may want to draw upon the experience of other countries for guidance. It may be surprising, but it is true, that few countries have ever developed a system in which a tenant can buy land by making payments similar to rent.

Still other countries may be interested in developing agricultural cooperatives, which in some parts of the world have proved to be great aid to individual farm enterprise and a real weapon against communism.

Some countries may wish to improve their agricultural credit system so as to relieve their farm people of dependence on usurers. The Bell mission to the Philippines—of which Dr. A. L. Strand, of Oregon State College, was a member—found that the confused state of land-title records is a severe handicap to land ownership. I understand somewhat the same problem exists in other countries.

To such needs as those, as well as to help increase total production, it seems to me that the United Nations should give major attention, and that we, the United States, should continually stress such a policy.

In our administration of point IV work in our related programs of economic aid, we should practice the same policy, making it clear that our purpose is to help the peoples of the world to help themselves, that we are thinking of the great body of citizens in any country to which we extend aid, and that those governments which want to develop agrarian improvements on an orderly and fair basis will find us both sympathetic and cooperative. A large part of our effort, of course, must be to carry the practical techniques of production and the techniques of extension education to those who want to learn what we have learned. But let us not mislead anyone in this matter—let us not fool ourselves either: Technical know-how will not go far toward solving the food problem and building peace where a bad system of land tenure exists. We will do well to concentrate our technical assistance in those places where it has a chance to benefit the common people.

In the main, the chance to benefit is inseparable from the opportunity to own the land. Ownership of the land by the cultivator is the key to individual freedom and free government. To extend this principle is simply to extend a basic tenet of United States democracy. And I believe nobody has a greater interest in this than the people of the land-grant colleges.

I would not for an instant depreciate the value to the world of our techniques of production. But they are, of course, by no means all that our democracy has to offer the cause of world peace.

The greatest thing we have to export is hope—hope based on experience in democracy, hope based upon successful practice of the universal principles of the American revolution, hope that amounts to faith—mankind's faith in mankind. As a result of the American experiment, we know that man is capable of self-government, that his inherent rights are truly attainable, that the dignity of the individual can and must be respected.

We have military power, and we are increasing it, for the cause of peace. It is an essential expedient. But the basic contribution we are making is hope and faith in a future of freedom, justice, and peace.

In making this contribution, we have reason for both pride and humility. We can continue to be a source of hope and faith only so long as we continue to advance the principles which are the source of hope. If democracy is to be a continuing source of hope to others, democracy must continue to advance in America.

And our system of tenure must be strengthened here if the principle of operator-ownership of farms is to be the center of hope in the world-wide struggle for the minds of men. To put it another way, the peasant of Asia or the Middle East has grounds for a hope that far excels anything offered by a Communist collective as long as there is proof that the democratic principles, including free enterprise, really work for the benefit of farm people. But without the proof that is furnished by a strong American system of family farming—that is, farming by families who own the land they operate or can buy it if they wish—the well-spring of hope may go dry, with disastrous results throughout the world.

I believe that all farm organizations and all public institutions concerned with agriculture, including the land-grant colleges, can and will unite in a definite, vigorous program to strengthen family farming in America. I believe that the general public will support such an effort.

Let us work to strengthen our democracy in all its aspects. This is a task that challenges educators, Government, everyone. Let us live up to the ideals upon which our Nation was founded. These ideals can win the world. They are humanity's ideals—as different from communism as light is different from darkness.

Right now the world is choosing between light and darkness.

Let us make the light of hope shine brightly.

Monthly Benefits Assuming Basic Pension Rate of $50 per Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 01, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tabulation showing the monthly benefits which would be paid to those aged 65 or over under the proposal for a universal-eligibility social-security program I made last summer.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Monthly benefits, assuming basic pension rate of $50 per month—How to determine your citizen's pension

If your annual income is—	Your monthly citizen's pension is—	Your annual citizen's pension is—
0 to $600	$50	$600
$601 to $640	49	588
$641 to $680	48	576
$681 to $720	47	564
$721 to $760	46	552
$761 to $800	45	540
$801 to $840	44	528
$841 to $880	43	516
$881 to $920	42	504
$921 to $960	41	492
$961 to $1,000	40	480
$1,001 to $1,040	39	468
$1,041 to $1,080	38	456
$1,081 to $1,120	37	444
$1,121 to $1,160	36	432
$1,161 to $1,200	35	420
$1,201 to $1,240	34	408
$1,241 to $1,280	33	396
$1,281 to $1,320	32	384
$1,321 to $1,360	31	372
$1,361 to $1,400	30	360
$1,401 to $1,440	29	348
$1,441 to $1,480	28	336
$1,481 to $1,520	27	324
$1,521 to $1,560	26	312
$1,561 to $1,600	25	300
$1,601 to $1,640	24	288
$1,641 to $1,680	23	276
$1,681 to $1,720	22	264
$1,721 to $1,760	21	252
$1,761 to $1,800	20	240
$1,801 to $1,840	19	228
$1,841 to $1,880	18	216
$1,881 to $1,920	17	204
$1,921 to $1,960	16	192
$1,961 to $2,000	15	180
$2,001 to $2,040	14	168
$2,041 to $2,080	13	156
$2,081 to $2,120	12	144
$2,121 to $2,160	11	132
$2,161 to $2,200	10	120
$2,201 to $2,240	9	108
$2,241 to $2,280	8	96
$2,281 to $2,320	7	84
$2,321 to $2,360	6	72
$2,361 to $2,400	5	60
$2,401 to $2,440	4	48
$2,441 to $2,480	3	36
$2,481 to $2,520	2	24
$2,521 to $2,560	1	12
$2,561 to $2,600	0	0
$2,601 to $2,640		
$2,641 to $2,680		
$2,681 to $2,720		
$2,721 to $2,760		
$2,761 to $2,800		
$2,801 to $2,840		
$2,841 to $2,880		
$2,881 to $2,920		
$2,921 to $2,960		
$2,961 to $3,000		
$3,001 to $3,040		
$3,041 to $3,080		
$3,081 to $3,120		

[1] At this level and previous levels the monthly rate by applying for benefits, as less of monthly general education for the aged would overweigh value of benefits.

Potatoes Are Cheaper, Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief, following information derived from a recent news release of Guide-Post Research, Pittsburgh, Pa., reveals the housewives of the Nation have excellent reasons for their ever-increasing demands for speedy congressional action on the control of food prices, not only to stop the ever increasing price spiral, but also to eliminate price disparities. The statistics cover the cost of 11 typical market basket items in the Pittsburgh district super markets during the last year:

Guide-Post's regularly conducted survey of the prices of 11 typical items in Pittsburgh district super-markets, finds potatoes are down 20 percent, compared to January 1, 1950; flour costs the same, while all other items have increased; sirloin steak is up 16 percent, chuck roast up 32 percent, bacon up 14 percent, butter up 18 percent, eggs up 42 percent, soap powder up 19 percent, sugar up 4 percent, coffee up 6 percent, and vegetable shortening up 38 percent.

According to C. F. Ackenheil, director of the survey, the total cost of this typical market basket has moved up from $8.10 last January, to $9.30 today, an increase of 15 percent during the year.

The market basket still costs 1 percent less than the all-time high reached July 1948, but that is largely due to the fall in potato prices. Excluding the potatoes, the grocery price average is 2 percent above the July 1948 peak.

The decline in potato prices is the result of the Government dropping its price support which had kept them at an artificially high level.

Compared to 3 years ago, some peculiar things have happened to food prices. Pound for pound, steak and bacon cost just about the same in January 1948. Now steak costs 1½ times as much as bacon. Three years ago, butter cost 56 percent more than coffee. Now coffee costs 11 percent more than butter. Disparities like those and delay in food price controls pending congressional action are forcing housewives to change their menus to take advantage of the best food values.

But even with reduced demand for relatively high priced items, their prices do not drop.

Mr. Ackenheil says it appears that the Government has repealed the law of supply and demand.

The above comments are based on the data to be found in the following chart:

Grocery items	Jan. 1, 1950	Jan. 1, 1951
Pound sirloin	$0.87	$1.01
Two pounds chuck	1.08	1.42
Pound bacon	.56	.64
Pound butter	.69	.86
Dozen eggs	.52	.74
Box soap powder	.27	.32
10 pounds sugar	.93	.97
10 pounds flour	.93	.93
Pound coffee	.83	.92
Pound vegetable shortening	.54	.59
3 pounds potatoes	.79	1.00
Total 11 items	8.10	9.30

A Plan for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] made a timely and most interesting talk this morning to a group of Senators in the Senate Restaurant. In his usual scholarly manner he gave a brief review of the wars of Palestine, and then tersely and clearly applied the lessons of these wars and the times thereof to our present world problems. I feel that his remarks are of value to the entire membership of the Congress and to the people of the Nation, and therefore ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLAN FOR PEACE

A cynic has described the Old Testament as being a history of wars wrapped up in a prayer for peace. Many of the prophets prayed for peace but the principal prophecy was voiced by Isaiah about 600 years before the birth of Christ when he said: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

The new Jerusalem will be a city of eternal peace but the Jerusalem of Palestine has been the most fought over city in the history of the world.

In undertaking to give you this morning a brief résumé of the many wars fought in Palestine in fulfillment of the divine purpose that the lion of the tribe of Judah, designated by Isaiah as the Prince of Peace, was to be a descendent of Abraham to whose seed Palestine was promised as an inheritance, I wish to pose for your discussion the fundamental issue that now troubles the world: "Can we avoid world war III?"

Palestine is a tiny country with an area of 10,124 square miles, slightly larger than that of the State of New Hampshire. It occupies part of an ancient plateau extending from the desert shores of the Mediterranean on the west to an elevated tableland cut by the deep rift of the Jordan Valley, bounded on the east by the nation of Transjordan, on the north by Syria and on the south by Egypt. It varies from 28 to 80 miles in width and from north to south is approximately 140 miles in length.

This area, so important to us because it was the source of the Judo-Christian system of religion and philosophy on which much of modern western civilization is based, was important in ancient times because its strategic location made it the highway of commerce and of war.

Going back as far as we can into recorded history, we find evidence that the Canaanites, a Semitic people, probably invaded Palestine and settled there in the third millenium B. C. The Bible indicates they were there at the time of Abraham's arrival which is estimated to have been between 1935 and 1400 B. C. The Canaanites were in Palestine when the children of Israel, some 1,500,000 strong, invaded the land at about 1290 B. C. They were greatly feared by the Israelites because of their chariots of iron, but were gradually exterminated or absorbed by the Israelite tribes. David captured their remaining towns and after the time of Solomon, in the ninth century B. C., they disappeared from history. They left behind, however, part of their language, culture, and literary tradition, which influenced the writers of the Hebrew Bible.

Abraham, the great ancestor of the Hebrews, was a nomad who left his home in Ur of the Chaldees, eventually reaching the promised land of Palestine by way of Haran. His son, Isaac, and Isaac's son, Jacob, lived at peace with the Canaanites. Joseph, sold into Egypt by his brothers, rose to be its master and welcomed his father and brothers when famine drove them to the Nile. They continued to live in Egypt until a period probably 250 to 300 years after the time of Abraham when they were led by Moses, adopted son of the King's daughter, in escaping from a harsh taskmaster. They then wandered for 40 years in the wilderness until Joshua brought them back across the Jordan and into the promised land.

From the time of the Exodus (about 1210 B. C.) until 733 B. C. the Jews lived in Palestine. In the latter year a portion of the inhabitants of Israel were taken to Assyria as captives and shortly thereafter (721 B. C.) Israel was subdued to a tributary relation and more of the people were taken to Babylon as captives. This was the first captivity of the numerically most powerful branch of the divided house of Israel.

More than a century later (597 B. C.) a portion of the population of Jerusalem was deported to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar and in 586 B. C. an uprising among the Judeans led to deportation of the greater part of the Jewish people to Babylonia.

In Babylonia they were settled in various districts and given a good deal of freedom but some of their leaders looked forward to a change of rulership that would make possible their return to Jerusalem and the rebuilding of the temple. In 539 B. C., Cyrus took advantage of dissension in Babylonia and sent his armies against Babylon which fell without striking a blow. A proclamation was issued allowing the Jews to return to Palestine but they had become so attached to the country in which they were living that few availed themselves of the opportunity and for centuries Babylonia remained a center of the Jewish people.

During this period, from 538 to 332 B. C., Palestine was under Persian rule. Cyrus the Great established a rule of tolerance toward subject races and their religions and in 520–516 B. C. the temple of Jerusalem was rebuilt. The condition of the Jews in Palestine was described by historians as "wretched," however, until Nehemiah came to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem in 445–433 B. C. and to enforce observance of the law. It was he who said: "So the walls were rebuilt because the people had a will to work."

In 332 B. C. Palestine was conquered by Alexander the Great and in 323 B. C. it was brought under the Ptolemies of Egypt who ruled it until 198 B. C. Under Alexander the Jews were left undisturbed in their customs and religion and the high priest was the head of the state. The Egyptians merely used Palestine as a source of tribute to their treasury. Then, in 167 B. C. Antiochus the Great took possession of the country for the Syrians and a new period of intolerance began.

A revolt was led by Judas, later known as Maccabaeus, which gained for the Jews religious freedom in 163 B. C. and political freedom in 142 B. C. The Jews lived under their own kings and controlled an expanded territory until 63 B. C. when the Romans began their rule which lasted until 395 A. D. The Roman period was characterized by intermittent repression and religious freedom. From 37 to 4 B. C. the country was ruled by Herod the Great, who was a Jew appointed by the Roman Senate. He was succeeded by his three sons and, to satisfy their claims, the country was divided into three parts. After their deaths Palestine was placed under Roman procurators. A Jewish rebellion led to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Emperor Titus in 70 A. D. There were other Jewish rebellions in 115–117 and in 132–135 A. D. After the devastation of Judea in 135 A. D. Jerusalem was made a Roman colony and barred to the Jews.

This marked a turning point in the history of Palestine. The Jews had dominated or been a principal part of the country for 1,500 years, but after 135 A. D. they began to give way to the Arabs until in 1170 A. D. a Jewish writer recorded that there were scarcely 1,500 Jews in the entire country.

When the Roman Empire was partitioned between the east and west in 395 A. D. Palestine went to the emperor of the east and for the next 200 years there was comparative quiet, although along with the development of pilgrimages and holy places there was occasional persecution of the Jews who remained in the country.

Then in 615 Persia overran Palestine. It was retaken by the Emperor Heraclius in 628 but was lost again to the Moslem Arabs under Omar in 636. For the next 300 years there were rivalries among the Arab rulers of the country but their hold was not seriously challenged by outsiders.

In 1072 A. D. there was a Turkish invasion. During the First Crusade Jerusalem was captured (in 1099) and Godfrey of Bouillon was made King of Jerusalem. The Second Crusade (1147) undertaken to aid the weakening kingdom failed and in 1187 A. D. Saladin captured Jerusalem without destroying it. In 1240 the Mongols seized Jerusalem, massacred its inhabitants and plundered its churches. In 1290 Palestine was overrun again, this time by the Tartars, and in 1400 Tamerlane overran the country. Except for these brief periods of raids Palestine remained under Egyptian-Arab domination until 1516 when it was occupied by Sultan Selim of Turkey and became part of the Ottoman Empire. It remained in this status for 400 years, although the Ottoman rulers were challenged by a Druse prince who established a Lebanese kingdom early in the sixteenth century. It was taken by Napoleon in 1798 and by Mehemet Ali, a rebellious Egyptian viceroy of the Sultan in 1832.

During World War I Palestine became a battleground between the Turks and the Allied forces stationed in Egypt. The Turks were defeated and the British under General Allenby entered Jerusalem on December 8, 1917. A few days later British control was extended to all of Palestine.

The British held Palestine as an occupying power until April 1920, and from then until May 15, 1948, they continued in control as the mandatory power. The British then began their withdrawal in favor of the United Nations Commission which was to carry out the plan of partition between the Arabs and the Jews which had been approved by the UN General Assembly in November 1947.

Under the partition plan the Jews were given 5,550 square miles, the Arabs 4,550 square miles, and 74 square miles were left in the Jerusalem enclave, but it took another war between the Jews and the Arabs to establish the new Jewish state.

I have outlined for you the major wars fought in Palestine over a period of approximately 3,500 years. In the summary I did not include what might be termed minor tribal wars, as when Samson slew the Philistines with the jawbone of an ass and David slew Goliath with a slingshot, nor the instances in which the 12 Jewish tribes fought among themselves. Suffice it to say it was a period of constant turmoil, of constant warfare and bloodshed.

The significant fact that stands out from this record is that when God's chosen people obeyed Him He either gave them peace or victory over their enemies, and when they decided to go their own way and rely on their own right arm He let them suffer the consequences, which in many instances was disastrous war.

In one of his famous sermons Dr. Peter Marshall analyzed the qualities of the men Christ chose for his disciples and then drew the illuminating lesson that they became worthy of such a Master because he had changed their natures. History teaches and science confirms the teaching that human nature in all races and in all ages has been very much the same with a percentage of good people and a percentage of evil ones. History likewise teaches us that no nation has ever achieved lasting peace by superiority of arms. The historian Gibbon claims that the fall of the Roman Empire was due to the spread of Christianity which taught that the first allegiance of man was to God and not to the state but that viewpoint is successfully challenged by the modern historian, Arnold Toynbee, who clearly shows that the seeds for the downfall of the Roman Empire had been planted before the birth of Christ.

If our Nation can learn by experience, which Edmund Burke says no nation has ever done, we would be justified in asking God's help in the creation of an allied military strength sufficiently powerful to stay the hand of the Communist aggressors until members of the Christian faith have a fuller opportunity to reexamine the plan for peace proposed by the Prince of Peace—namely, a change in the hearts of men by divine and not by human power.

The Jews of the first century wanted and expected a messiah who would by force release them from bondage and crucified him when he said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." When Pilate said, "I find no fault in this man," the mob cried, "His blood be on us, and on our children."

In this emergency democratic nations may be able to assemble sufficient force to defeat the Communists on the battlefield. But such a victory would not settle the fundamental conflict between truth and error, between good and evil.

The thesis I should like to be able to sustain is that we labor in vain to build a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of spiritual force. Peace will, in my humble opinion, continue to escape the chancelleries of the world until it finds a home in the hearts of men.

Inaugural Address of Gov. John S. Fine, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, yesterday Pennsylvania inaugurated a new Governor, the Honorable John S. Fine. The impressive ceremonies at Harrisburg recalled that Benjamin Franklin, in the final years of his public service, was chief executive of the Commonwealth from 1785 to 1788.

Pennsylvania is proud of the part Benjamin Franklin played in establishing the greatness of the Keystone State. We are proud that upon the foundation he helped to lay there has been developed a great diversity of industry which serves the Nation in peace and war. It has won for Pennsylvania an enviable reputation as the arsenal of democracy.

We are proud of Pennsylvania's place in the history of our Nation and of the sacred shrines which stand on her soil as milestones in the progress of liberty and human rights on the American continent and in the world.

Every American reverts our monuments of freedom: Independence Hall, Valley Forge, Gettysburg, Fort Necessity, where General Washington first commanded troops in battle, the Fort Pitt Blockhouse, and Bushy Run.

Throughout his whole lifetime Benjamin Franklin preached the virtues of industry, self-reliance, and thrift.

Those qualities were emphasized by the new Governor of Pennsylvania in his inaugural address. He advocated a pay-as-you-go policy and the most rigid economies in all governmental expenditures excepting those that contribute to the national defense.

Because of its importance I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the inaugural address of the distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable John S. Fine.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. JOHN S. FINE

My fellow Pennsylvanians, you have entrusted to me the administration of the government of our Commonwealth for the next 4 years. I realize the tremendous responsibilities of these times, fraught as they are with the terrific clash of ideologies and the bitter conflict of beliefs and doubts—the belief in truth and God against untruth and denial of God. I humbly acknowledge the great trust of serving you at a time when we are engaged in a militant crusade for peace.

I begin my duties with mixed feelings, but no misgivings; happy to have the opportunity to serve, yet humble before the magnitude of the task. No man can lightly regard the grave responsibilities that today go hand in hand with public service.

We are living in a period that requires the most rigid economies in government, for other than defense and human needs, and demands a multitude of sacrifices on the part of each individual. This is the era of sacrifice, of strict spartan living, that freedom may survive in a world threatened with enslavement. We will, and we must, assume endless restrictions so that we and others may remain free—free to work, free to speak, free to worship. We face a temporary end to luxuries, a curtailment of necessities to a minimum.

The indomitable spirit that is an American heritage will overcome whatever obstacles we are called upon to meet. Reflection on past periods of crisis and peril leaves but one conclusion: America has always emerged from perilous times stronger in unity of spirit, in physical resources and in spiritual freedom. This is true because our objectives have been and has been dictated by justice and right, and not motivated by hope of material gains.

Our position today and the position of those who join with us is precarious, but far from despairing. We are at war and our Nation is in the beginning of a war economy. More and more restrictive measures, hampering industry and individual rights, are inevitable.

We are plagued by the festering sore of communism. Hordes of godless people are lusting for power and would destroy freedom and enslave the world. In this terrifying situation free nations everywhere look to our country to be the instrument of their salvation. We must see to it that they do not look in vain. We must not fail them. By the same token, they of other lands should not fail to give us in our common cause the fullest measure of every assistance of which they are capable.

If we are to successfully meet the challenge before us, there must be a submergence of selfish interests. We can coddle no favorites nor resort to narrow partisanship in our search for victory and peace. All of us in State government—Democrats and Republicans—must move constantly and confidently with single-minded devotion toward dual objectives: The welfare of the Commonwealth and the welfare of the Republic.

This is the most crucial time in our history. What we do or what we fail to do may determine the destinies of our Nation and of mankind; the preservation of religion and the survival of a world in which we would care to live.

We know there can be no security without freedom; without freedom there can come no true peace. America is the last sanctuary of freemen. It is the repository of those dynamic ideals which lead irresistibly to the triumphs of freedom if those ideals are not sacrificed by political and diplomatic expediencies.

We must strengthen ourselves in Nation and in State. We need, immediately, to place our economy on more stable grounds. The American people want and should have more enlightenment on what is expected of them. When Americans know the full facts—and often they sense them when they are not officially disclosed—the present challenge to agonized humanity will be wholeheartedly and successfully met. Our people have confidence in themselves, and properly so. We will not lose that confidence. We can add substance to it by accelerating sound preparedness at home and abroad.

As we in Pennsylvania face the possibility that the Korean conflict will spread into world conflagration, we realize that much of our energies and our deliberations should be devoted to the creation of a strong and integrated home defense. Protection of our people and our industry transcends all other considerations.

The civil defense commission in Pennsylvania has accomplished an early and sound beginning on the program of protection of life and property. Its work is proceeding speedily and with commendable thoroughness. Already we are advanced far beyond most other States. This program is going to be costly—how much we do not know. We must guard against overlapping and wasteful expenditures. Security, prudence, and utility will dictate the nature and extent of these expenditures.

It has never been said, and it will not now be said, that Pennsylvania ever failed to contribute in fullest measure to our national security. The people of our great Commonwealth are conscious of the burdens resting upon us. Our problems are critical, but they are not insurmountable. They are many, but they will lessen. There is no need for pessimism, no place for defeatism. This is the time for all of us to rededicate ourselves and our vast resources unsparingly to our National Government in its emergency.

Pennsylvania already has contributed to the Federal Military Establishment more than 16,000 National Guard men, including our justly famous and always revered Twenty-eighth Division. If the remainder of our National Guard is called up, we will need a strong State Guard to replace it. We are now building that State Guard. We shall not be found wanting. We will be ready for anything. We should immediately provide the means for the exercise of suffrage by our men and women in the service, no matter where they are stationed.

There can be no denying that the times demand that we husband our resources, enlarge our productivity, even conserve ourselves, that we may best assist in the emergency. We must—and we will—be thrifty. Frugality in everything except protection of our people will be the watchword of this administration. Where our people's health is concerned, we will not stint. We will not be parsimonious in educating our children. We shall not be rigid in our treatment of the unfortunates among our citizens; nor will this administration be wasteful with the people's money.

Due to the war larger expenditures than are currently made will in all probability be necessary to properly run the State's business. New taxes or additions to existing taxes are apparent. To keep tax increases to a minimum requires most careful study. We have to face these demands knowing there is no escape under present conditions. They exist and we must admit it. The plain fact is that a rise in the cost of government is inevitable in Pennsylvania, as it is elsewhere. Careful management and prudent administration will insure a lesser burden on the taxpayer.

Generally speaking, the increased costs of administration of our Commonwealth should be paid for on a pay-as-you-go policy. The costly errors which have plagued our generation with wars ought to be borne by us, insofar as it is possible. The costs should not be passed on to our children, as in all probability they will inherit less of the American way of life than was bequeathed to us.

As this administration begins, the general cost of living is up 74 percent over the cost of 1940, only 11 years ago. Building construction costs are three times as high. Public assistance grants per person are nearly two and a half times 1940 grants. These are but a few of many illustrations which show rising costs of living and higher expenditures for the conduct of the Commonwealth's business. Unfortunately, the prospect is that the costs are destined to go still higher.

These facts present a real problem to our financial planning for the years ahead. This problem is not ours alone; it is a problem common to all the States, though it is magnified in those States which like ours, must budget for 2-year periods. It must be remembered also that we have the expenses incident to civil defense, as yet uncalculated; our commitments to the soldiers' bonus; mandated salary increases for teachers; and State authority rentals. These costs add many perplexities to the problem.

Pennsylvanians have long been justly proud of our great material wealth. We have been, and are today, the arsenal of America. Our resources, our productivity, and our contribution of scientific and industrial leadership to the Nation and to the world are astounding and without parallel. We are predominant as a cultural center. Yet, with all, our greatest wealth, our most valuable possessions, are the 2,000,000 children and youth in our Commonwealth. Soon they must assume the responsibilities of leadership. To them falls the opportunity of perpetuating the American way of life. They must be prepared for that opportunity physically, mentally, and spiritually, that they will not fail.

Of greatest assistance to them is the school system. The school can be no better than the teacher. And the teacher must see to it that American history and Americanism above all else are properly taught and fully absorbed by our children. It is our bounden duty to give the best of everything to education. The cost of worth-while education, like everything else, has increased. Nevertheless, it is our obligation to provide the necessary financial support to meet these increased costs. We must continuously improve our school system; we cannot afford to do otherwise.

Our State must do everything it can to better the peoples' health. We propose to give without additional expenditures a reorganized and improved Department of Health dedicated to a full and thorough public service.

The interests of labor and industry in Pennsylvania will continue to be treated with sympathetic understanding. We must and we will see to it that they live and work in harmony with justice to each.

We welcome industry to Pennsylvania. In some sections we need a greater diversification of industry, and this administration will make every effort to obtain it. We seek expansion of industry already doing business here. We plan early attention, consonant with a war economy, to relieve the economically distressed areas in the anthracite and bituminous fields.

We have the greatest highway system in the Nation and in the world. Our turnpike across the State from Ohio to near Philadelphia was not designed as a military highway, but it is a superb one without parallel in the Nation. Completion of the Schuylkill Expressway will add to the turnpike's value and will be a boon to industry and to the Philadelphia area. Further plans call for the turnpike's extension in the west to Erie, in the east to the New Jersey border, and through the anthracite regions to the New York State line.

Pennsylvania's agriculture enjoys an enviable position among the States. While we rank thirty-second in area, we are thirteenth among the States in the value of farm products. I feel certain we will add to our productivity, and, where possible, the State will aid agriculture to gain this goal.

I believe it to be the duty of Government to encourage, not throttle, private enterprise. I shall vigorously oppose any move aimed at dwarfing the freedom of individual effort or strangling the American way of life.

Because of limited time, I have not approached many matters which will be presented to the legislature for the benefit of our people. These matters will be outlined later. However, it is fitting at this time that I reaffirm my faith in sound, efficient, and progressive government, administered with common sense.

As we face grim uncertainties we Americans need not fear for our strength. We must shun the counsel of despair. We must not listen to the voices of doubt or defeatism. The light of truth will dispel the clouds of confusion for those of faith and confidence.

Everywhere, the hearts and minds of men constantly yearn for freedoms denied. The march of freedom knows no divisional lines—geographical, religious, racial, or of color. This insatiable thirst of man to remain free or to regain his lost freedom is our most potent ally. It strengthens us and is devastating to the opposition.

True, it is disturbing that free men are temporarily thwarted in their search for peace by evil men who have renounced their God. But to men of stout hearts and firm faith it is a challenge for them to rise above their ordinary selves and fight with crusading enthusiasm for principles which are eternal—justice, equality, and freedom.

The way of right is the path to victory. If we have the will to boldly and confidently pursue it. Meanwhile, all of us must carry on for a greater and more secure Pennsylvania. It is the duty and responsibility of every Pennsylvanian, as it is the responsibility of all Americans, to buttress our Nation. I implore your aid and seek your prayers. I ask for God's help in meeting our manifold problems, confident that with His aid we will solve them to the advantage of all of our people.

Present Political Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, several weeks ago Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, delivered an address at Tampa, Fla., on present political trends. This address elicited widespread editorial comment, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various editorials dealing with Mr. Farley's address.

There being no objection, the editorial comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times of November 27, 1950]

AN OLD HAND AT THE GAME

James A. Farley was master minding for the Democratic Party when some of its present strategists were still school children. He may be no smarter than his successors, but he has had more experience than they have had. Furthermore, being out of party politics now, he can speak freely.

Out of his experience, he has drawn the conclusion that the attempt by unions to take over the Democratic Party is contrary to the idea of the two-party system. The unions are not broadly representative. This defect in their nature, as far as politics is concerned, was sensed by many Democrats in the 1950 election.

In Ohio, Mr. Farley believes, many Democrats voted for Senator TAFT because they wanted to salvage their party from the labor politicians who had taken charge of the anti-Taft campaign.

He believes, in other words, that the Ohio senatorial election was a show-down on the unions' bid for domination of one party in the two-party system and that the unions were licked.

Senator TAFT thereby was made the beneficiary of a decision far more important than a decision in an ordinary political contest. His successful candidacy settled a momentous issue.

In view of the fact the union politicians lately have been blaming their failure to win in Ohio and other States on many other things, including the war in Korea, it is interesting to know that an old hand at the game thinks the unionists helped to lose votes for the Democratic party's candidates.

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times of November 25, 1950]

MONEY WE HAVEN'T GOT

James A. Farley is, in the opinion of a good many Americans of both parties, one of the best political minds in the United States today.

Mr. Farley has been somewhat behind the political clouds the past few years, but appears to be emerging once more.

His comment on the recent elections is shrewd, sage, and to the point. Speaking some days ago he said: "The Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments won no honors in this election. We want to be a humane, progressive Nation, but we cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got."

That seems to hit the nail smack on the head: "We cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got."

Far too many of those who are superenthusiastic for the socialized schemes so widely and even wildly advocated these days appear never to think about where the money to make them work would come from.

The Government, of course, is expected to pick up the checks.

But the Government, as we have noted in these columns for some years now, hasn't a penny of its own. It has to get all its money from the people themselves.

"The recent elections," Mr. Farley declared, "clearly demonstrated that the voters want the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs."

Most students of current events agree, it seems to us, with Mr. Farley. Indeed, it seems difficult for any intelligent analyst of the voting in the recent election to arrive at any other conclusion. The Fair Deal trend to the socialistic heaven was given a rude jolt that even its greatest protagonist must have understood.

We have on our hands a world problem of breath-taking proportions. We will need a united and a prosperous and a productive Nation to lead the world out of the present dilemma in which it finds itself. If this Nation is to dabble in socialism, to try to be big-hearted with money we haven't got, what is to become of us on the international front?

Even if the majority of the American people were minded to try socialism—we do not believe they are—this is worst of all times to take a whirl at it.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of November 22, 1950]

JIM FARLEY'S WARNING

James A. Farley's speech last night to the Florida State Chamber of Commerce in Tampa sounds very much like the opening gun of a campaign to stage a political comeback. Clearly the former Democratic national chairman feels his party got its comeuppance from the voters and must revamp its strategy. It seems equally clear that he's willing to have a part in that job.

The election, as he sees it, was a warning of disaster for the Democrats—

If they become overzealous in courting labor leaders;

If they continue making alliances with splinter parties;

If they persist along the road to socialism and a welfare state;

If they try to expedite a natural trend toward liberalism by forcing civil-rights legislation on a reluctant public.

In Ohio and elsewhere, Mr. Farley believes, the voters made it plain they want a two-party system with each party bidding for general support, not selling out to pressure groups. America, he is convinced, wants no labor party as such. He thinks the way Ohio Democratic leaders turned over their party to the labor crowd caused many Democrats to cast protest ballots for Senator TAFT.

Similarly in New York where leaders of the Democratic and Liberal Parties made their deal, the rank and file rebelled. As a result, he argues, the Liberal vote fell below its previous record and Democrats flocked to an independent rather than their party's official candidate.

Mr. Farley also believes that Americans made it very clear on November 7 that they want no part of the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other crackpot schemes. At a time when the national economy must be built up to face threats from without, people do not want their money squandered on what he called unsubstantial experiments.

Altogether the former chairman gave the Truman strategists a thorough and well-merited going over.

[From the Hartford Times of November 27, 1950]

MR. FARLEY IS RIGHT

The moderation and common sense that the country has come to expect from James A. Farley are well exemplified in an address he recently delivered in Tampa before the Florida Chamber of Commerce. The former national Democratic chairman, with characteristic frankness, chose to speak in part on the issue of civil rights. That is a subject that some national Democratic leaders might prefer to touch lightly, if at all, before an audience in the South. But as it was handled by Mr. Farley, there was enlightenment and guidance for both the North and South in his remarks.

As a basic proposition, he declared that to pass a law, especially a Federal law, is never the best way to correct an injustice. "Free men in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense" he said "can generally be trusted to do what is right." Consequently, Mr. Farley would leave the correction of the denial of civil rights—and he did not blink the fact that they are frequently denied—to the sense of justice and common sense of the areas in which the problem arises. He pointed out that most of the problems are "gradually and peacefully being solved right here in the South."

Mr. Farley feels that "the gates of economic opportunity for all races" are opening wider and wider, that the right to vote is spreading, and that lynchings "have been brought under control by the States and communities."

All of that is true, to a degree. And Mr. Farley undoubtedly outlined the most effective—perhaps the only effective—approach to the problems. But there is still a question whether the opening of the gates and the spreading of the right of suffrage and the control of mass murder are proceeding at a rate consistent with the determination of the American people that they shall soon prevail without question wherever men live under the stars and stripes.

The answer lies either within the States of the South or in the hands of Federal authorities. Mr. Farley is right when he says corrective action should come from the local areas. The citizens there never tire in their insistence on State autonomy. But the thing that keeps up the stream in the movement for centralized attention to civil rights is the failure of local governmental units to meet their responsibilities.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of November 28, 1950]

FARLEY ON THE ELECTION

James A. Farley feels the election results generally showed a Republican trend, but were also "good for the Democratic Party," if it learns the lessons that will make for a better and more unified party and a better two-party system for the Nation.

We know of no Democrat better equipped to draw whatever lessons there may be in the election results, and to offer sound advice to his party, than James A. Farley. He puts first the lesson of Ohio and several other places where the CIO-PAC were particularly active, that neither of the two parties nor the workingman himself, nor the voters generally want an independent labor party.

He believes labor has sufficient leverage within the scope of the two-party system to protect and further its interests. Moreover, a political party loses its effectiveness when it lacks a universal viewpoint. "The interests of all the people must be considered in framing a philosophy or platform which an appeal is made to the voters."

Mr. Farley drew the further lesson that the voters want the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs, confronted as we are with a great peril in our foreign relations, with immense outlays and

heavy taxation. He referred specifically to the Brannan plan and socialized medicine, adding "other unsubstantial experiments." We want to be "a humane, progressive nation, but we cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got." Expenditures for nonmilitary purposes must be "cut to the bone."

He thinks the best way to help the farmer is not through a "two-pronged threat to the farmer and the taxpayer," as even the two big farm organizations regard the Brannan plan, but rather in helping him find the way to the market at less cost and with more efficiency. "Government aid in marketing, in lowering the cost of transportation, and in finding new uses for farm products is the way to prosperity with freedom."

If President Truman listens to Mr. Farley's advice on the civil-rights problems he will ask the southern leaders to solve them on a regional and a State basis, instead of playing political football with a Federal bill.

"To threaten the South with drastic Federal legislation is the last way to approach these problems * * * Freemen in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense can generally be trusted to do what is right.

"When we review the history of past years we see clearly that most of the problems raised by the so-called civil-rights program are gradually and peacefully being solved right here in the South. The gates of opportunity for all races are opening wider and wider, the right to vote is spreading to all, and disorders that once resulted in lynchings have been brought under control by the States and communities."

The earliest hint that Mr. Farley was parting with the philosophy still current in Washington was his break with President Roosevelt, presumably on the third-term issue, but in reality over the sort of "experiments" to which he now objects. His is one more voice calling upon the party to get back to its earlier sound traditions by abandoning the road that leads eventually to socialism. There are many other Democrats who agree with him, but few who speak with greater effect. That he has spoken will be good for the Democratic Party, if it takes his advice, and for the country as a whole.

Tactics, Not a Strategy, of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, ever since it was my privilege to visit the Ukraine DP camp in Germany in the summer of 1947 and to talk with the leaders there of the Ukraine insurgent movement, I have been profoundly interested in the Ukraine, and the great courage of its people, who have consistently resisted the totalitarian dictatorship of Soviet Russia.

In this connection I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, on the timely subject of "Tactics, Not a Strategy, of Freedom," which appeared in the January 4, 1951, issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, a publication of the Pan-American Ukrainian Conference.

This article contains certain concrete proposals for American policy toward Soviet Russia. I am sure all Senators will find these proposals interesting and challenging, and will admire the spirit which motivates them.

All who read this article will join sympathetically in its tribute to the courageous leadership of the late General Taras Chuprynka, commander of the still very active Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) which operates politically and militarily behind the iron curtain. All believers in freedom suffered a loss when General Chuprynka fell in battle with Russian MVD troops last March 5, 1950 in the western Ukraine.

When word of his death was recently received by the free world, his loss was mourned not only by Ukrainians, but also by Lithuanians, Croats, Slovaks, Poles, Hungarians, Georgians, Latvians, Cossacks, Turkestans, and many other who have known intimately the general cause for which he fought, and for which his Ukrainian insurgent army is still courageously fighting.

The people of America and the peoples of the free nations, who today are building our strength to preserve peace, cannot but be inspired and reassured by the heroism of these fighters for freedom behind the iron curtain, for whom there is no peace.

I ask unanimous consent that this commemorative statement by Dr. Dobriansky be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACTICS, NOT A STRATEGY, OF FREEDOM

(By Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky)

History, we are told, has its own dispassionate way of revealing the truth. And how powerfully, not to say brutally, true this is. For even before the closing days of World War II, the burdened populaces of the world hopefully heralded the peace of the future, while many of their naive and unrealistic leaders were feverishly engaged in laying anew the supposed foundations of international law and order—literally, and frankly, with outlaws participating. But far in the distance of the Carpathian Mountains, away from the momentary clamor of unbridled emotion and pious commotion, stark reality was being squarely and courageously faced. It was then, in May, that the unsung hero whom we are solemnly honoring tonight issued his famous proclamation to the underground Ukrainian Insurgent Army, fighting valiantly under his command against the forces of Red Russia. It was then that he proclaimed in no uncertain terms the basic truths that "The peace is not yet won" and, in a sense more important, that "In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone." In effect, it was then, in May 1945, that General Chuprynka, who, to the immense loss of the anti-Communist world, fell in battle this past March in the Ukrainian village of Bilohorscha, raised the cry of all freedom-lovers for concrete tactics, not a strategy, of freedom.

Never has this cry been more pressing than now. The so-called strategy of freedom, as was so exhortatively enunciated recently, is scarcely novel or instructive to those who have long been inspired by the ideals of freedom, whether they be in the comfortable confines of these United States or in the boggy regions of the Pripet Marshes. The time for mere statement of ideals and abstract virtues has definitely passed. Current conditions call for judicious consideration of not what we are striving for, but how we are to achieve it. What is urgently demanded is concrete, determining political action, not a sanctimonious contemplation of general principles coupled with a passive adaptation to determined circumstances. The so-called strategy of freedom is patently presupposed, but the positive tactics of freedom are yet to be efficiently composed. Composed chiefly in the living spirit of Chuprynka that "In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

The requisite tactics of freedom are clearly definable and so formidably within our pragmatic reach. To succeed in this universal struggle for survival, the first and basic tactic of freedom is to actualize our bipartisan leadership, a leadership in the international field that is intrepid and risk-taking, that knows intimately the substance and machinations of Russian Communist imperialism, that possesses the dynamic vision to see that in the end the peace cannot be securely won and everlasting until the tenuous foundations of Russian Communist imperialism and the politically unnatural Russian empire are reduced once and for all time. It requires a tactical leadership ungiven to timidity, appeasement, suicidal containment, and the superficial niceties of diplomatic play, all of which has led to the fantastic contradictions of fighting now a Communist China whom our State Department so blindly coddled, of being unable to bomb the very material bases of the enemy, of refusing in Korea the military aid of a chartered member of the United Nations, namely Nationalist China, and of vainly tolerating in the council of the free nations the notorious representatives of the only contemporary aggressor, Soviet Russia.

There are far-seeing men about who can implement this bipartisan tactical leadership, as witness the profound ideas of a James Burnham (The Coming Defeat of Communism). Of the capacity of a Chuprynka, who incredibly sustained organized anti-Soviet resistance these many years, and, let me emphasize, without any outside aid, this tactical political leadership is our only hope of averting a devastating world war III, a war which we will be saying was born of inexcusable blunders and contradictions, outmoded diplomacy, and timid containment. To overcome this frightful record and to steer our course away from world war III, this first tactic of freedom will surely be forcefully inspired by the Chuprynkan dictum that "In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

The second tactic of freedom is the dauntless functional use of one of the most powerful and precious principles of th American democratic tradition, the principle of self-determination. The tragic note of the current situation is the fearful refusal of our State Department to use this atomic ideological weapon against Russian Communist imperialism on the contradictory plea that such an act will be construed as an intervention in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. Construed by whom—the professional distortionists of the Kremlin? In the contemporary historical context, there is no substantial difference between Soviet aggression in Korea, in which we have intervened, and preceding military aggressions in the Baltic States, Ukraine, Georgia and numerous others which exist strategically close to the heart of the Soviet Russian octopus.

President Truman well observed recently that the Chinese people are being forced to serve the end of Russian colonial policy, but who with historical perspective can ignore the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union who have met this fate earlier? Yet—listen to this—I have been informed that the pathetic Voice of America deleted this observation of President Truman from the script beamed to various parts of the Soviet Union If this is true, then Almighty God will have to bless our America to overcome

the Soviet scourge. The Soviets intervene in every state of the world through their fifth columned Communist Parties, but we, behind the Maginot wall of containment, fear to build up our fifth columns of freedom. Only fearless tactical leadership can explode the ideological atom of self-determination when, as its first step, it will beam over the Voice of America to the enslaved non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union—"In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

The third urgent tactic of freedom is the rapid formation of allies who in one way or another have tasted the deadly poison of Russian Communist imperialism. The phalanx of anti-Communist power will not be so effectively established at traditional centers which have had little experience with Russian Communist imperialism and which will insularly seek to appease and appease the insatiable Russian imperialist appetite after the fashion of Munich and Yalta—only in the end to have American lives sacrificed at stupendous costs.

In the best tradition of "speak softly (and, I might add, briefly) and carry a big stick," American tactical leadership would depend as well on the big stick of a remilitarized Japan and Western Germany, the embracement of the Chinese Nationalist Army, and aid to anti-Communist Chinese guerrillas, the mobilization of a foreign legion consisting of Eastern and Central Europeans, and of the material support of Tito and anti-Communist Spain. Appeasement treacherously contains the seeds of ultimate American disaster. Nonappeasing forces must be tactically rallied in the spirit demonstrated by Chuprynka with the non-Russian undergrounds behind the iron curtain—the spirit that "In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

Coordinated with the third is the crucial fourth tactic of freedom, enormous aid to the underground systems behind the iron curtain. This can be done, and under courageous tactical political leadership would be done. Many in high places are fully aware that in the vanguard of this underground activity stands the Ukrainian insurgent army—the amazing UPA of the late beloved General Chuprynka, the UPA which has invincibly symbolized unyielding resistance for all the Communist-bludgeoned peoples behind the really unriveted iron curtain. Amply supplied with guns, medicine, photographic and printing material, the UPA and its existing allies would grow immeasurably, infiltrating the multinational Red army, harrassing the MVD and MGB, disseminating propaganda leaflets, and shaking the very psychological props from under the very center and heart of world Communist imperialism. Through this undermining tactic of freedom the possibility of averting world war III is by far greater. Through this cardinal tactic of freedom the peoples upon whom we shall basically have to depend will assuredly know that "in the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

In truth, the only real source of aggression today is not North Korea, nor Communist China, but Soviet Russia, the spawning ground of international lawlessness. To eliminate aggression elsewhere with minimum loss of American lives and resources logically necessitates a prudent concentrated attack on the sole instigator of all serious aggression today. Time is in the outlaw's favor, but the powerful elements of fearless Americanism, resistance, and less costly victory are in ours. The time is now for tactics, not an already known strategy, of freedom. Bold leadership, the ideological use of self-determination, spirited alliances, and underground operation—these are the winning tactics of freedom. It is these tactics that the gallantry, infinite courage, and unappeasing wisdom of General Chuprynka, that great pioneer in the modern anti-Communist cause of freedom, so brilliantly exemplified. By these tactics America can victoriously fulfill that uncanny Chuprynkan promise that "in the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone." These tactics of freedom will serve to insure the preservation of American freedom and the regained freedom of others, for the two are inextricably interwoven.

Regulations on Indian Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we have thousands of original Americans—the Indians—within the United States. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter relating to regulations on Indian counsel, written by Alden Stevens, secretary, Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., of New York, which was published in one of the local newspapers last week.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGULATIONS ON INDIAN COUNSEL

The rights of American Indian citizens of the United States and Alaska are seriously undermined by new regulations governing contracts of Indian tribes with attorneys. These regulations, promulgated on November 9, 1950, by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, would so hamstring the Indians seeking counsel and the attorneys they retain as, in effect, to deny Indian people the right to counsel of their own choice and to a confidential relationship with such counsel. Inevitably, citizens of Indian affiliation will be prevented from securing the due process of law guaranteed by the Federal Constitution.

The regulations are minute and detailed. For example, they require that before a tribe may hire an attorney it must prove to the Commissioner its need for counsel—not in general but for the exact services he is to be asked to render—and its ability to pay the fees. They control the term and terms of the contract, the fees, and renewal conditions, making it mandatory, in the case of claims contracts, that fees and even expenses be wholly contingent, regardless of the desire and ability of tribes to pay set fees. They empower the Commissioner to control the amount of Indian legal business to be undertaken by any one legal firm, in effect frustrating the desire of Indian tribes to hire attorneys known to be successful in this special field. They require that a tribe hire a local attorney for general legal services, rather than one established in Washington, where they need him most. They even give the Commissioner, who is not a party to the contract, power to terminate it without cause and without advance notice—subject only to tribal "consent," a concurrence which itself is subject to many administrative pressures.

These regulations are not only a denial of constitutional rights and a grave step backward in the progress of American Indians toward full self-determination as citizens. The Association on American Indian Affairs, in a legal memorandum—submitted December 18, 1950, jointly with others, to the Secretary of the Interior—maintains that these regulations go beyond any authority given the Commissioner of Indian Affairs by existing law; that, in fact, they violate specific rights of Indians under present law as well as public policies established by Congress. The association maintains, for example, that the obsolete 1872 law on which the Commissioner bases his authority does not apply to Indians who are citizens, as virtually all American Indians now are, and that Indian tribes organized under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 and related statutes are specifically guaranteed by those laws the right to make their own attorney contracts.

Although issued in November, these regulations are still subject to veto by the Secretary of the Interior. Unless revoked, they will open a new period of arbitrary bureaucratic control of the daily lives of American Indians, to their detriment and that of the Nation. We ask your help in arousing Americans of good will to appeal to the Secretary of the Interior to reject this invasion of American Indian rights.

ALDEN STEVENS,
Secretary, Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

NEW YORK.

Where Shall We Look for Leadership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the December 29 issue of United States News and World Report there appears an editorial by Mr. David Lawrence entitled "Where shall we look for leadership?".

This is one of the finest editorials I have read in a long time, and I think there will be many who will find in it an expression of the thoughts they have held in their own hearts.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial may be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE SHALL WE LOOK FOR LEADERSHIP?

(By David Lawrence)

Hundreds of millions of people today live in fear. Among them, however, are legions of youth who are not afraid to die—who are not afraid to give their all for a great cause.

People at every age level, however, are bewildered. They need leadership. They look back at World War II and feel it has not accomplished its main purpose—to emancipate mankind from slavery. Military victory was achieved but no peace.

Humanity is not unwilling to make further sacrifices—to finish the job. If military means constitute the only way, free peoples will accept that way.

But millions of persons feel there must be some other way besides war. That's why there is wavering. That's why the will to fight has been dormant in countries which made sacrifices before. By some governments, unfortunately, this reluctance is misconstrued as a readiness of peoples to surrender vital principles—to accept the easy way out.

Such a course does not mean peace except for a brief moment in history. War is brought nearer when there is a compromise on principle—an appeasement of those who are faithless to their pledges and promises.

To seek to curry favor with them is only to stimulate their insolence and encourage further aggression.

It is time for clear thinking and deliberate planning.

We must first designate our real enemies.

Our enemies are not the peoples of Soviet Russia or the peoples of the so-called iron-curtain countries.

Our enemies are not the peoples of China or of North Korea or of Siberia.

What is more important still is that our enemies no longer are the people of Germany and the people of Japan.

We need to examine the status of peoples rather than the status of governments who claim to represent them.

Our primary obligation is to humanity—to the innocent peoples who are the victims of governments that seek to exploit peoples and make cannon fodder of their youth.

Once we have the courage to make this differentiation—to make the case clear to all peoples—the road becomes clear.

The Soviet government has forfeited its right before mankind to represent the Russian people. So has the Communist government of China forfeited its right to represent the Chinese people.

We compromise with truth, we appease, and we bargain with evil when we try to deal across the table with tyrannical and despotic governments which have demonstrated an unwillingness to fulfill international obligations. This is an inescapable truth. However painful to the policymakers, it is the underlying truth on which world policy must be based.

The record for expulsion of Soviet Russia from the United Nations is conclusive. It is idle to say that we will thereby be denying ourselves a means of communication. There is no value in continuing communication with an enemy of freedom—an aggressor government.

We must have a bold policy that applies first the great instruments of moral force—renunciation of evil governments. Until we have shown that we will not compromise with truth, that we will not yield to expediency or fear but will deal firmly with the source of the infection in today's troubled world, we will be temporising.

Let us not be deterred by the cry that to rearm morally or militarily may offend enemy governments. If war must come, let us face it as our forebears have faced it before.

Above all, let us seek help in the only place where mankind has an abiding faith—in the leadership of God.

Prayers to Almighty God will not avail, however, if we are not ready to face truth within ourselves, if we are not willing to purge ourselves of the sins of materialism which so often cause us to seek the easy ways of expediency rather than to accept the hard ways of duty and sacrifice. Prayer is a two-way line of communication. We must give ourselves to service if we expect guidance in return.

When we are willing to clean house of evil at home, we will be strengthened to resist evil abroad.

In this Christmas season, we are usually reminded of the great teachings of Jesus. We are inclined, however, to overlook our own sins and, with self-righteousness, focus on the sins of others.

As we bow humbly and ask for divine guidance, we shall find the leadership we seek. Our temporal leaders can be inspired to greatness and we shall follow them dutifully. But there must be among allied governments and among peoples allied with us a readiness to face truth and to accept truth. We shall not win by selfishly withdrawing into our own boundaries and asking for protection solely for our own territory while ignoring the attacks on freemen elsewhere.

We are our brothers' keepers—everywhere that mankind calls for human help. For in saving others, we shall save not only our bodies but our souls.

The Road to Bipartisanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on December 7, 1950, Holmes Alexander, noted Washington columnist, wrote an article for a syndicate of newspapers on the subject The World Crisis Stems From Many Errors. This article created a sensation because of the fact that it quoted from a Senator on the Democratic side, a Senator close to the Pentagon, the White House, and the State Department, on the reasons why President Truman ordered our Armed Forces to intervene in the war between North Korea and South Korea.

Subsequently, on the 20th of December, the same writer wrote another article entitled "The Road to Bipartisanship." The Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, under date of December 20, published Mr. Alexander's article.

These two articles are in a sense related, and should be read together.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article dated December 20, which appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

The other article to which I referred has already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 20, 1950]

THE ROAD TO BIPARTISANSHIP

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Historians looking for significant American dates could jot down December 13—the day that Mr. Truman began a series of meetings with congressional leaders of both parties to discuss wide areas of foreign policy and national defense. The occasion—if Mr. Truman doesn't backslide—could mark a return to the history treaty-making and war-making powers of Congress.

As a recent example of what's at stake, let's go back to last June 27 when the Korean war officially began. On the afternoon of that day Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, entered the Senate Chamber while Majority Floor Leader LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, was reading the White House proclamation which kicked off the ill-fated police action. The following dialog is lifted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

"Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I came into the Senate late. Was the document referred to by the Senator from Illinois a message to the Congress?

"Mr. LUCAS. No; it is a statement by the President which was given to the (White House) conference and also to the press of the Nation.

"Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that the action taken is a step which in effect is war. It may be that is the very thing we ought to do. But it seems to me that this should have been called to the attention of the entire Congress.

"Mr. LUCAS. What would the Senator from Utah do if he were President of the United States?

"Mr. WATKINS. I would have sent a message to the Congress."

We have here the gist of the argument that Mr. Truman—like his predecessor at Yalta, Tehran, and Cairo—has taken over the powers of advice and consent which the Constitution gives to Congress.

It will not do to write off WATKINS as a head-in-the-sand isolationist. He is, in fact, a very good example of a reexaminationist. Elected to the Senate in 1946, WATKINS began by voting for the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan at a time when bipartisanship was in full force behind the leadership of Senator VANDENBERG. WATKINS began to shy away from White House foreign policy at exactly the time VANDENBERG withdrew from the scene because of illness and Secretary Acheson assumed office at the resignation of General Marshall. This time coincides roughly with the introduction of the North Atlantic Pact and the downfall of Chiang Kai-shek in Asia. On the day after the Lucas-Watkins debate, Senator (Mr. Republican) TAFT also complained that the White House had failed to seek advice and consent on its Far East policy. TAFT said:

"It should be noted that there was no pretense of consulting the Congress. No resolution has ever been introduced asking for the approval of the use of American forces in Korea. My own opinion is that there is no legal authority for what he (Mr. Truman) has done."

Most of this legalistic criticism was drowned out in the cheers that acclaimed Mr. Truman's boldness and in the early din of battle. But, one result of the Korean disaster has been to reexamine the Constitution and—possibly—to restore bipartisanship after a considerable lapse. The White House conference of December 13 marks the first time that Mr. Republican has been consulted in the role which earned him that title.

No one should suppose, however, that the change-over will be instantaneous and complete. The President has a short temper with critics, both musical and political. Those of us who attend his press conferences have seen a marked change in the man since 1948. He is given to outbursts which cause his neck to swell and his face to go crimson with rage over seemingly inoffensive questions.

It is hard to imagine that he will take closed-door criticism in a spirit of sweetness and light. His Republican consultants, too, are angry men with tempers just as trigger-ish as that of the President's.

But at least a situation is developing which will give both sides the opportunity to practice the bipartisanship that both have preached. Come good luck or bad in the days ahead, the country will have a chance to benefit from two-party planning and two-party responsibility.

A Letter From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in your remarks to the House on January 3 you expressed a conviction that everyone now living lives in the most dangerous time anyone ever lived in since the founding of our Republic. You called for unity and for working together in order that we might make ourselves strong to assure

the preservation of our Republic and of civilization itself.

The expression of your feelings about these things closely parallels my own. There is need for a universal recognition of the dangers before us. There is need for oneness of purpose to do whatever may be necessary in the interests of preserving our Nation, our principles, our lives, and our freedom.

Although we are a peace-loving people, during our brief national history we have become involved many times in war and in each case we have been a unified Nation impelled by noble ideals. We have never lost a war, but at the conclusion of fighting, certainly of World Wars I and II, we failed to achieve peace. I wonder whether this may have been due to the sacrificing of some of those ideals on the altar of expediency.

It may be that we, as a Nation, are not without responsibility for the present plight of the world. Appeasement has gotten to be a nasty word, but how often have we sidestepped our responsibility for world leadership and permitted other nations to disregard their commitments, to exploit weaker nations, and to engage in acts completely contrary to the principles by which we live and for which we fought. If in fact we have not ourselves been guilty of appeasement do we not have a measure of responsibility for standing idly by and permitting it? In effect have we not been an accomplice?

In Korea we are meeting our responsibility. We are paying a great price, but it may well be that the price we pay there in measuring up to our obligations and standing by the things in which we believe may save us from more dire consequences which otherwise would follow.

Our young people in the combat areas today recognize the part which they are playing in the fulfillment of the obligation of the United States and the United Nations to a civilized world community. That this is so is exemplified by a letter which a young Army lieutenant in the Korean theater wrote on Christmas Day to his family in my district. I know this fine young man intimately. He exemplifies all of those high attributes of character, loyalty, and devotion to his God and his country which have been the basis upon which our Nation has become great. Lieutenant Bowers' letter was printed on the editorial page of the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch for January 13. Our young people in Korea have put aside selfishness, petty jealousies, and offer their lives that we may fulfill our obligations to the world, to ourselves, and to posterity. We at home should do no less. We must make our maximum contributions. Any sacrifices which we make or any adjustments which are required in our mode of living are minor when compared to the contributions which they are making.

I want to read the article and the letter:

[From the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch of January 13, 1951]

A SOLDIER'S GLIMPSE OF WAR'S MISERY AT HUNGNAM

The letter below is from First Lt. Thomas D. Bowers, United States Army, son of Mr. and Mrs. G. H. Bowers, of Norfolk. Lieutenant Bowers, a graduate of V. M. I. in 1949, is a member of Headquarters Battery, Thirty-ninth Field Artillery Battalion, of the Third Division, and the letter was written on an LST in Hungnam harbor during the evacuation of marines and other American forces and some 100,000 Korean civilians. The Third Division had been the spearhead of the drive to clear the way for the historic retreat of the First Marine Division and part of the Seventh Infantry Division from northeast Korea. The letter is reprinted here by permission of Lieutenant Bowers' family because of the spirit of selflessness displayed by an American soldier. The letter follows:

CHRISTMAS DAY.

DEAREST FAMILY: Yesterday we loaded the last of our vehicles and personnel on LST 799 and pulled out into Hungnam harbor. We are very much overcrowded, but very happy to be warm and alive, and although this is not like any Christmas I ever spent before, I have much to be thankful for.

Christmas is passing for us without my hearing even a Christmas carol, and I believe I miss that more than anything—other than being with all of you.

We are going to Pusan, but we would feel much better about it if we knew where we were going from there. Although I haven't been here long, I've seen an awful lot, and I know that these must be the most pitiful people in the world. And they have fewer people to feel sorry for them than any other group on earth. I saw thousands and thousands of these forlorn creatures wait patiently days on end in the most cruel cold weather just to be shipped out of here in the holds of ships where few other human beings would or could be forced to stay even for a short while.

These people are the victims of cruel circumstances. They are afraid of their communistic Chinese friends and turn to us for help. When I saw them cut the line the morning that we—the Third Division—made a dash for the LST's, there were as many waiting then as there had ever been. Women began screaming and throwing themselves on the ground. They begged and pleaded, but it was of no avail.

In particular, I saw a little girl who had lost her parents; evidently they had been loaded out and she had been lost in the shuffle. No one could quiet her, and there was nothing to do. She looked about 12 and was at the age when she was probably most dependent on her parents. To be cut off like that, helpless, in a world so mixed up and so hard for her to comprehend, makes one stop and think.

There are literally millions of stories I could tell like this one, but it would take weeks to write of them and more paper than I could borrow. The only reason I wrote of this is because it starts your mind to racing and thinking a million things. First of all, how lucky we are, both here and in the United States. In the United States we hope nothing like this ever happens—and yet you can't help but think it must have been the same in the Civil War.

Here, for us, it is often very discouraging. But we look at scenes like this—and know that things might be worse and we draw new courage. I think even now of our own family and I wonder what would happen if any one of us were cut off for some unforeseen reason from the rest of the family. How helpless we would be.

Well, there's nothing else right now that I would like to write about, but I've got a million thoughts and ideas which I'll never forget. Although I'd love to be home and I sometimes want to quit or give up, I'd never trade this experience for anything in the world. I've always had a secret desire to see if I could live like this, and to test my courage, and I am getting self-confidence and satisfaction I could get nowhere else on earth.

I took my first bath today in over a month, and once again I realized that "cleanliness is next to godliness" in that it all happened on Christmas. Please don't worry about me, but pray for me. Hope to see you soon.

Love to all,

TOMMY.

Facts Prove Mr. Hoover Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a fine editorial from the Livingston Manor Times, one of the most outstanding and courageous weekly newspapers in my district:

FACTS PROVE MR. HOOVER IS RIGHT

Former President Herbert Hoover seems to have caused considerable of a disturbance in Truman administration circles with his plea that the United States should concentrate on turning this hemisphere into a Gibraltar and stop sending men and money to the western European nations.

After all, let us look at a few cold facts and it would appear we are being taken down the river for another sleigh ride to rearm Europe at the United States taxpayers' expense and fight her battles with American boys.

In this country we are now raising an army of 3,000,000 men, which is a small number compared to the more than 12,000,000 we raised, equipped, and armed in World War II, at much less expense than we are paying at present. We also actually armed Europe at American expense. We have recently been aiding Europe to the tune of $10,000,000,000 and although Europe is in the best shape she has been in for some time, we are requested by Mr. Truman to keep on.

France asks financial aid and American manpower in Indochina, but France has an armed force of only 650,000 men, and the facts are significant that in World War II France had an army of 5,000,000 men. In World War I France had an army of nearly 8,000,000, and not only equipped them but aided in outfitting American troops. It is also interesting to note that France today is at least 25 percent communistic.

We will now take Great Britain, without considering Canada. England has a token force of men under arms, but in World War II she raised and equipped an army of 4,563,000 men, and Canada supplied an additional number of 780,000 men.

Italy has been given enormous aid by this country and has actually given no aid at all to us. In the World War II Italy had an army of 4,000,000 men. Let us look at some of the other countries included in the Atlantic Pact and their war effort in World War II.

Australia supplied 680,000 troops; Turkey, 850,000; Greece, 414,000; Yugoslavia, 500,000; New Zealand, 157,000; Netherlands, 500,000; Japan, 6,095,000; Spain, 850,000; and Germany, 10,000,000. This is not all of them.

Already Mr. Dean Acheson, our Secretary of State, has committed this country to an army of 200,000 men in Europe, but is leaving General MacArthur with a force of less than 180,000 men, most of them Americans, to hold off a force of 1,600,000 Chinese Reds in Korea.

We believe that Europe is in even better condition than she was before World War II,

and that her resources of manpower are just as large, and the facts printed here have never been refuted.

Why, then, more American aid unless certain people high in our Government are working to drain American resources and manpower to their lowest point, to make us a push-over for an aggressor nation? Why were 17 shiploads of munitions for Nationalist China dumped in the sea without being delivered, and by whose orders? Why are we at war in Korea without the consent of Congress? After all, 50,000 American casualties is a lot of men.

Our only hope of stopping these very peculiar incidents lie in the incoming Congress, which may be able to bring reason and order out of chaos, corruption, and, if we may say it, "treason."

Valuation of Gold by Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include two letters, one from the Director of the Mint, Mrs. Ross, which is self-explanatory, and the other, a letter of comment from Mr. Frank Lilly, director of the mines and research bureau, of Spokane.

I feel that these two communications pose a mighty interesting and serious question in our troubled times. The above-mentioned letters follow:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1951.

Hon. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HORAN: This is in further reply to your communication of December 16, 1950, enclosing a letter from a constituent asking two questions regarding the valuation of gold.

The first question reads:

"Would it be correct to say that Great Britain is getting our gold on the basis of the value of $35 an ounce that we have set and, in turn, giving that gold a measure of value in their economy equivalent to $102.17 an ounce?"

The answer is that it would not be correct to say that Great Britain gives gold a measure of value equivalent to $102.17 per ounce. Great Britain values its monetary gold at a figure in pounds sterling which is equivalent to about $34.72 per fine ounce.

The figure of $102.17 is apparently arrived at through the mistaken application of a legal parity rate (suspended since September 21, 1931), instead of the current exchange rate, for the British pound sterling.

The second question reads:

"If this is true, and we are getting only the equivalent of $35 for each ounce of gold that goes abroad, wouldn't it be good sense to place a higher measure of value (price) on our gold so that we could get more goods and commodities for it—particularly in view of the fact that our imports are increasing at a tremendous rate?"

Since the initial hypothesis—that Great Britain values its gold at the equivalent of $102.17 an ounce—is incorrect, the conclusion of the question is not established. On the contrary, to devalue the dollar to the equivalent of $102.17 per ounce would seriously aggravate inflationary pressures and be interpreted by the public of this and other countries as meaning that this Government has broken faith with regard to stabilizing the value of the dollar and of their savings.

Very truly yours,

NELLIE TAYLOR ROSS,
Director of the Mint.

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 10, 1950.*

Hon. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALT: Thanks for the copy of letter that you received from the Director of the Mint in reply to the question on gold which I suggested that you ask.

This reply from the Director of the Mint dodges the question because it goes without saying that it is the use that is made of a thing that determines its practical value. I am wondering how the Treasury can explain the fact that we lose gold when Great Britain devalues if this devaluation does not, in fact, give gold a higher measure of value in Great Britain.

It was Great Britain's devaluation in September 1931 which, in giving gold a higher measure of value, caused our gold to flow to that country; and this, in turn, caused President Roosevelt to increase the price of gold here so as to meet the British figure.

On this point I quote from a statement by the Honorable FRANCIS CASE as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1939:

"It is evident that a great deal of confusion exists in the minds of the Members of this House with respect to the gold situation, for the statement has been repeated frequently that the only reason that we are paying $35 for gold is because of an act passed by Congress and a proclamation made in 1934. Anyone who will take the opportunity and the trouble to review the history of the price of gold during the year preceding the passage of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 will be disabused of that idea.

"The price of foreign gold prior to the Gold Act of 1934 was not $20.67 an ounce. The average price for gold in London for the month of January 1934, immediately prior to the President's proclamation under the Gold Act, was $32.87 an ounce.

"On different days in the preceding months it had been higher. For instance, on November 15, 1933, it was $34.91, and the average for November was $33.10. And after the United States accepted the situation and paid $35, the London price has exceeded that on several occasions. It averaged $35.18 in September 1934, going as high as $35.37 September 4. In more recent years also the price has also bounded above the price offered in the United States.

"Gold was going out of the country in 1932 ($446,219,397) and 1933 ($173,455,507). Our stocks were depleting before the advancing world price of gold. In 1933, an embargo was declared to stop the outward flow; later the RFC went into the foreign market to outbid the buyers. Finally, it became a matter of self-defense that we should act to pay what the world was paying in order to maintain and build up gold stocks here."

During this period, 1932–1934, when the London price was higher on a United States equivalent basis, Great Britain was getting its trade balances paid in gold at $20.67 an ounce and in turn using the gold at a higher measure of value in her economy. And she is doing the same today.

I think it goes without saying that, if the London prices of gold in 1933 and 1934 as given by Senator CASE had verity then, they have equal verity now because in each case the United States equivalent of the London price has been calculated on the basis of legal monetary parity.

I cannot tell you how much I appreciate your cooperation in my efforts to clarify this matter of the disparity between the gold price in the United States and other countries. Frankly, I think the Treasury Department is hiding its head, ostrich-like, in the sands on what is really a very important matter. Certainly the loss of over a billion and a half of our gold within the last 6 months is a serious matter.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

FRANK.

Hardships Facing Armed Forces in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, an example of the hardship facing the fighting forces in Korea is exemplified by the letter written to his wife and son by a marine sergeant of Ansonia, Conn.

It is shameful that the men fighting for survival against overwhelming odds should lack adequate facilities and food. The full story is contained in the accompanying clipping from the January 11, 1951, issue of the Ansonia Sentinel.

WHAT CHRISTMAS MEANT TO ANSONIA MARINE SERGEANT IN KOREA AFTER WITHDRAWAL FROM CHOSIN RESERVOIR—EXTREME HARDSHIP MEN OF FIRST MARINE DIVISION UNDERWENT IN WITHDRAWAL FROM CHOSIN RESERVOIR AREA IS VIVIDLY DESCRIBED IN LETTER TO HIS WIFE

The extreme hardship which men of the First Marine Division underwent over narrow, snow, and ice-coated roads in subzero weather in the successful withdrawal of troops and equipment in the Chosin Reservoir area, in Korea, is interestingly told in a letter written by ——— ——— to his wife ——— on December 26, which was received today. The men of the First Marine Division and the Forty-first Royal Marine commandos of the British Army were highly commended in a division memorandum, Operations in the Chosin Reservoir Area, dated December 19, 1950, by Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Smith, commanding general of the First Marine Division.

CHRISTMAS IN KOREA

The letter written by ——— to his wife and son ——— follows:

"Because of the international date line, today is Christmas back in the United States, so let me wish you both a very holy and merry Christmas Day.

"I attended Christmas mass at midnight and also on Christmas Day, when I went to confession and communion. Somehow I'm contented that I was away this Christmas because I now understand the true meaning of the holiday. With all the wickedness in the world, we who believe in Christ still have a precious thing to fall back upon and no matter where I am on Christmas Day, I'll always remember to rejoice because of our Lord. No matter what happens, one always finds peace with God and for that reason I for one am thankful. Be sure to bring our son up in a manner in which he will be able to understand and appreciate the things it took me so long to learn.

"I received your most precious letters and Christmas cards. I only wish you had more time to write more. Those short letters, although appreciated, don't give me a chance to take a second breath. I just want to sit and read and read about you because, my dearest, I miss you terribly. I keep myself busy so that I don't have time to think, because I doubt if I could stand things."

AN EMPTY FEELING

"Knowing how wonderful you are and how much fun and trouble our son is at this time, leaves me with an empty feeling. I used to think of the days when I could play with our child and he'd appreciate and know who was playing with him. I still do and I picture you sitting on the couch saying and just saying 'tak-tak' at our actions.

"Now by the time I get back he'll be grown and I'll never have the chance to live that part of our lives. Being a father is something I'm very proud of (you of course already know that). I only hope that this war will end soon so that maybe I can get home and throw him around a little.

"As it looks now we'll be here for some time. For a while we thought they were going to take us to Japan and eventually the States because as Marines our job was finished a long time ago along with the fact that we are in a pretty darn run-down condition. At night I almost cry when I hear the men cough and know that there isn't much anyone could do about helping them. I never saw so many men that are sick, partially sick or have something wrong. Apparently we can't be spared because we are not leaving.

"After Hagaru-ri we thought we'd really have a good rest, get some good food, etc., before going back, but our conditions for rest are very poor and our food is terrible. I'd rather eat C rations than the stuff they are giving us. For the 4 days before Christmas we had hash and dehydrated potatoes. We had an excellent meal for Christmas, though. I don't mean to be a griper, as they call them, but looking at the matter from a broad viewpoint, we're in a sad shape. The food for one thing in the area we live in should be much better, our living conditions could be better, and the sick, well, they could stand some better conditions, too.

"Now that we have a meal under our belt we must be ready again because we are moving again soon. Just like around Thanksgiving, by the time you get the letter, we'll probably be on the lines and you'll know our whereabouts when you read the paper."

PEOPLE AT HOME KNOW MORE

"It's a funny thing how little we know ourselves about our lives. Today at mail call one of the fellows got a letter from home and his wife said that the news in the paper was that the First Marine Division will not come back to the States and instead are going back up to the lines. Tonight we were officially informed of the fact. It seems that the people at home know more than we do."

TRADITION OF OLD GLORY

"It's a funny thing, ———, we saved everything we could in our withdrawal from Hagaru-ri and came back in a manner that upholds the tradition of Old Glory. We didn't get panicky and run like the others. We did our job and knocked ourselves out doing it. So what? Here we are again.

"All I can say is that even though we are not up to strength physically, tactically or morally we'll perform our task, no matter what. I hate the thought of going back just like everyone else, but if they need us, and there isn't anyone else, I'll go in good faith and spirit just like always.

"We are the only outfit that can be depended on to do their job according to orders."

——— enclosed a commendatory letter from Major General Smith on the successful withdrawal of the First Marine Division.

In closing his letter——— writes "Well, darling, this will be all for tonight. Maybe tomorrow I'll have some more. Depends on how I make out with the day's schedule. Haven't been feeling well and our training starts tomorrow. You see we never stop or forget about our professional duties."

The Marine Corps Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following supplementary statement before the House Armed Services Special Subcommittee on Reserves:

MARINE CORPS RESERVE
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

It seems desirable to place on the record certain background facts regarding the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve in order that Korea and its impact upon Marine Reservists and their families may be understood.

1. It was not the fault of the Marine Corps that its two divisions were badly understrength, or that the great bulk of the Fleet Marine Force was in the United States when the hostilities began in Korea.

2. Nor was it the fault of the Marine Corps that it had to mobilize its entire ground reserve of organized units in order to supply needed combat troops for Korea. The Commander in Chief authorized this extraordinary measure and the Marine Corps carried it out.

3. It was no fault of the Marine Corps that enlisted men in the Reserve went for a time without dependency allowances.

Solutions to these three above matters rested outside the Marine Corps and the Marine Corps Reserve, namely, with the Congress and the Department of Defense. It is essential to mention this for the record, for much of the criticism made of the corps by relatives and loved one of Reserves has been based on the above problems. Had there been a strong enough ready force in being outside the continental limits of our country, Korea may never have happened. It is certain that it never would have gotten far in July of 1950 had we been able to put ashore one or more reinforced divisions of marines.

4. There has been some criticism of the Marine Corps because young reservists were fighting in Korea within a few weeks of mobilization. The criticism has not been general, but usually in scattered localities where casualties have been reported to the next of kin.

After the Joint Chiefs directed the Commandant to get a full strength Marine division to Korea as soon as possible, the Marine Corps organized ground reserve was mobilized and arbitrary training standards set up for overseas use of reservists. Generally if a man had attended 48 drills and 1 summer camp or 24 drills and 2 summer camps or had World War II experience, he was considered properly trained under the emergency conditions. There were some slip-ups and some few reservists were sent to Korea without what might be termed desirable training and experience. However, even after the Inchon landing training of many troops went on in Reserve areas while assault units were fighting out in front.

The state of readiness and training of the Reserve is evidently high when only a few weeks after mobilization orders, the Marine Corps could land more troops in Korea than there had been in the entire Fleet Marine Force in June when hostilities began.

One last comment, the morale of the organized aviation units of the Marine Corps Reserve and the fighting efficiency of the Marine Corps itself has been lowered by refusal of the Joint Chiefs to permit an increase in the number of Marine tactical squadrons at a time when they could be used to great advantage.

Submitted by:

Maj. WILLIAM P. MCCAHILL,
National Executive Director
(For the National Council).

Portraits in Relief in the Redecorated Chamber of the House of Representatives at the Opening of the Eighty-second Congress, January 3, 1951, Described and Explained by Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, that which constitutes the decorations of the Chamber of the United States House of Representatives is naturally of interest to every patriotic American citizen. As I took my seat on January 3, 1951, as a member of the Eighty-second Congress, and observed the redecorations of the Chamber in which I have already worked for 4 years, I realized that some 23 relief portraits, appropriately arranged around and near the ceiling line of the Chamber, were about persons distinguished in history, several of whom I knew relatively little.

Since it will be my privilege to again sit as legislator the next 2 years in this Chamber where these relief portraits of these 23 historic characters are to be daily present, I asked the Library of Congress to give me a brief comment about each of the characters represented by these medallion portraits, or reliefs, so that I might know who is in my presence by "proxy." I am also aware that no doubt all other Members of this great legislative body are likewise interested; as well as all other citizens of our great Nation. Therefore, it is with pleasure that I share the following information from the Library with you:

The redecorated Chamber of the United States House of Representatives features a series of medallions portraying 23 historic characters. These individuals were chosen as representative of the great lawgivers of the world who contributed to the American law system. The one and only inscription that accompanies them, appearing behind the Speaker's desk, reads:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day may not accomplish something worthy to be remembered."

The subjects of these relief portraits were selected by the Architect of the Capitol, after consultation with many authorities and approval by the Special House Roof and Chamber Committee. A biographic sketch of each of these great men is attached hereto.

The statements given above and the list of subjects have been provided by the office of the Architect of the Capitol. The sketches summarize salient—and apropos—material found in the Encyclopedia Britannica (1942 ed.) and the first and second editions of the Columbia Encyclopedia. Articles in these

sources were found to complement one another, and material from both sources was used in every sketch, with the exception of Pothier, who is not listed in the Columbia Encyclopedia. The pronunciation notes are taken from the Merriam-Webster unabridged dictionary, second edition.

The Architect of the Capitol has released a statement that serves to explain why each man was chosen for inclusion in this group. It is attached as an appendix to this report. Some of the material therein does not appear in the following biographical sketches because it does not appear in the sources used in their preparation.

(George L. Saxkley, History and General Research Section, January 11, 1951.)

HAMMURABI FLOURISHED CIRCA 2100 B. C.

Hammurabi was a great king of Babylonia. His military and political achievement of establishing a central and efficient government at Babylon is regarded as one of the most far-reaching events in ancient history. Henceforth Babylon was to be the political and intellectual center of west Asiatic history right down to the Christian era.

Hammurabi's name is particularly associated with the great law code which he was declared to have received from the sun god, Shamash. This is one of the greatest of ancient codes. Promulgated for the use of the courts throughout the empire, it is particularly strong in its prohibition of defrauding the helpless. It is genuinely humanitarian, although one savage feature is the retributive nature of punishment, which follows "an eye for an eye" literally.

MOSES FLOURISHED CIRCA 1400 B. C.

The lawgiver of Israel and the founder of her nationality and religion, Moses stands out as one of the greatest figures in history.

From his infancy, according to Exodus, there were constant signs of God's selection of Moses to lead His people. His leadership in the Exodus and his prominence in the great covenant at Sinai are well known and documented. It was he who welded into one people the various kindred tribes under his leadership. But further details must be a matter of conjecture.

Not only the Ten Commandments, but the whole Mosaic law as found in Leviticus, Exodus, and Deuteronomy are ascribed to Moses. However, close study of the Bible makes it difficult, if not impossible, to accept the tradition which accredits to him every detail of Israel's legal and cultural institutions. Even the earliest code of laws in the Bible (Ex. xxi: 23) is simply a local and national form of the civil law common to Babylonia, Assyria, and the Hittites, and was probably adopted by Israel after the settlement in Canaan.

LYCURGUS FLOURISHED SEVENTH?–NINTH? CENTURY B. C.

Lycurgus is the reputed founder of the Spartan constitution. According to a standard hypothesis he lived in the seventh century before Christ. He may be a mythical figure.

Tradition represents Lycurgus as finding Sparta the prey of disunion, weakness, and lawlessness, and leaving her united, strong, and subject to the most stable government which the Greek world had ever seen. To him we may attribute the unification of the several component parts of the state, the strict military organization and training which soon made the Spartan hoplite the best soldier in Greece, and above all the elaborate and rigid system of education.

His subordination of the individual citizen to the all-powerful state has been the model of subsequent police states, but it has yet no parallel in the history of the world.

SOLON, CIRCA 638–559 B. C.

Solon was an Athenian statesman and lawgiver. His amatory poems and patriotic and didactic verse won him inclusion among the Seven Sages. He led the Athenians in a victorious military campaign. But his enduring renown rests on his economic and constitutional reforms.

Solon was elected archon at a time when the nobles held unchecked all the governing power of Athens and the new capitalists virtually owned the entire peasant class. Receiving the unlimited powers of a dictator, he annulled all mortgages and debts, put narrow limits on the amount of land anyone could add to his holdings, outlawed contracts in which a person's liberty was pledged, and put limits on the amount one might spend on various functions, such as funerals. Other state controls included those over exports, education, the use and sinking of wells, bee farming, the planting of olives and figs, and the cutting down of olive trees.

Solon's new constitution laid the foundations of the Athenian democracy and paved the way for its later developments. The assembly was thrown open to all freemen. He erected a whole new law code that tends toward democratization. His reforms were characterized everywhere by a moderation that made him the model of Greek statesmen.

GAIUS, CIRCA, 110–180 A. D.

Gaius was a celebrated Roman jurist of the second century A. D. Of his personal history very little is known. Indeed, it is impossible to discover even his full name, Gaius being merely the given name.

Gaius is remembered for his Institutes, which contributed materially to our knowledge of early Roman law, and on which much of Justinian's work is based. The Emperor Valentinian named him, along with Papinian, Ulpian, Modestinus, and Paulus, as one of the five jurists whose opinions were to be followed by judicial officers in deciding cases.

Besides the Institutes, which are a complete exposition of the elements of Roman law, Gaius was the author of several other works. His interest in the antiquities of Roman law makes his work valuable to the historian of early institutions.

PAPINIAN, DIED 212 A. D.

Papinian (Aemilius Papinianus) is generally considered to be the greatest of Roman jurists. He was magister libellorum and afterward Praetorian prefect under the Emperor Septimius Severus. An intimate friend of the Emperor, Papinian accompanied him to Britain and became the guardian of his two sons. In 212 one of these brothers, after committing fratricide, had Papinian put to death.

Papinian was noted not only as a jurist of wide learning and great comprehension but as a stern moralist. His works are known to us through the numerous quotations of them in the Theodosian Code and in the Digest of the Corpus Juris Civilis (see Justinian). The constitution of Theodosius II and Valentinian named him the principal of five jurists set up as authorities to be cited in future decisions of the courts (see Gaius).

JUSTINIAN, 483–565 A. D.

Justinian I (Flavius Anicius Iustinianus), surnamed The Great, is the most famous of all the Emperors of the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire. He recovered Africa from the Vandals and Italy from the Ostrogoths, but met with less success in fighting Persia. He insisted upon the supremacy of the Emperor over the church, not only in matters of organization but also in matters of dogma. He engaged in various important controversies about dogma but never succeeded in creating unity.

It is as a legislator and organizer of the law that Justinian's name is most familiar to the modern world. His greatest accomplishment was the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, which has influenced all subsequent legal history. Finding the law of the Roman Empire in great confusion, he ordered the preparation of this work—consisting of the Codex Constitutionum (a collection and revision of the imperial constitutions from the time of Hadrian), the Digesta or Pandectae (a revision, abridgment, and rearrangement of the classical jurists), the Institutiones (a handbook for students), and the Novellae (the new laws instituted by Justinian). The Corpus was not a codification but a consolidation. Thus regarded, Justinian's work may appear to entitle him and Tribonian to much less credit than they have received.

TRIBONIAN, DIED 543 A. D.

Tribonian (Tribonianus) was a famous jurist and chief legal minister to the Emperor Justinian. Under the command of Justinian, he directed the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, the most important collection of Roman law and the basic document of modern civil law.

It is not possible to determine exactly what Tribonian himself contributed to the Corpus Juris Civilis. In all likelihood he wrote a large part out of his encyclopedic knowledge of Roman law. Of the four parts of the Corpus he was the most important editor of the Digest, Institutes, and Codex. Of the Novels (the new laws) he must have been a principal author, as chief legal minister. Tribonian was probably not a juridical thinker, like the great five jurists (see Gaius), but his knowledge of Roman law and his somewhat pedantic erudition was absolutely essential to the great project that he directed.

MAIMONIDES, 1135–1204 A. D.

Maimonides (Rabbi Moses Ben Maimon, or Rambam) was born in Spain and migrated to Cairo, Egypt, where he became the greatest of all medieval Jewish scholars. He produced a great commentary on the six orders of the Mishna (where he was the first to enumerate the fundamental dogmas of Judaism), a collection of discourses, a work on logic, a treatise on the calendar, several medical books—including an important work on hygiene—and the great philosophical work, Moreh Nebukim (Guide for the Perplexed). (The Mishna is the text of the oral law, in contradistinction to the Scriptural, or written, law of the Jews.) In the latter work he explains the esoteric ideas in the Bible, formulates a proof of the existence of God, expounds the principle of creation, and elucidates baffling metaphysical and religious problems. The work has dominated Jewish thought and exerted a profound influence upon Christian and Arabian thinkers.

The greatest scholastic work of this savant-physician-philosopher was the Mishna Torah, a classified compendium of the Jewish law. This attempt to organize and systematize the vast mass of Jewish oral law became a reference book for laymen as well as rabbis and judges.

GREGORY IX, 1145–1241 A. D.

The papacy of Gregory IX (Ugolino Conti de Segni) was largely devoted to hostilities against Frederick II, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Gregory systematized the medieval inquisition. His zeal for the extirpation of heresy made him generally disliked. The people of Rome, disapproving his temporal power, exiled him for a part of his reign. He died as Frederick was invading the papal states.

Gregory ordered the condensing of five compilations of decretals into a single collection. (The decretals are papal decisions and decrees to be considered authoritative and binding in future decisions.) The editor, Raymond of Pennaforte, did not attempt any original work, and the Pope had no idea of codifying the whole of canon law. However, the collection was an important step toward codifying canon law.

INNOCENT III, CIRCA, 1161–1216 A. D.

Innocent III (Lotario de' Conti de Signi) was elected Pope at the age of 37. The effective assertion of world power is the characteristic feature of his pontificate. Working from a theory that since things of the spirit take preeminence over things of the body, and since the church rules the spirit and earthly monarchs rule the body, earthly monarchs must be in all things in subjection to the church, Innocent effectively exercised his ideal that the Pope is the political ruler of the world.

Innocent's exalted ambitions were eventually their own undoing, and had the effect of setting almost every resolute Christian prince automatically against the church. The triumph of his pontificate was the fourth Lateran Council (1215), a great assembly of States that did little more than listen to and endorse the decretals read by the Pope.

The Pope's interest in law was active: he constantly held court, with a good name for impartiality. He instituted ecclesiastical reforms, centralizing the administration at Rome and his authority within the church exceeded that of his predecessors. Innocent is remembered for his abrogation of the Magna Carta. Supporting King John, against the barons who demanded the great document, Innocent declared it null as a forcibly exacted promise.

SIMON DE MONTFORT, CIRCA, 1200–1265 A. D.

Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, spent the most active part of his life giving skillful and ruthless support to, then leading revolts against, Henry III of England. At the "Mad Parliament" of Oxford he headed the opposition. In civil war he became master of England, which was placed under a constitutional government. De Montfort was practically dictator after his victory on the battlefield at Lewes, in May 1264. However, he promulgated a scheme for establishing a thorough parliamentary control over the executive. He was killed in a resurgence of civil war.

Simon is an important figure in the history of legislative bodies because the great parliament which he summoned in 1265 was a revolutionary assembly that established an important precedent: it contained not only knights from each shire to represent the rural nobility, but also representatives from the towns and boroughs. He left a heritage in the precedent he had established in championing the cause of the nobles and the people against the King and in calling the parliament of 1265. For years after his death he was revered by the commons as a martyr.

LOUIS IX, 1214–1270 A. D.

Saint Louis, or Louis IX, King of France, was an accomplished knight, physically strong, fearless in battle, heroic in adversity, of imperious temperament, unyielding when convinced of the justness of his cause, energetic and firm. He stands in history as the ideal king of the Middle Ages. Here was an ascetic who gave charity to over a hundred beggars daily, yet safeguarded the royal dignity by bringing them in at the back door—and by a courtly display greater than ever before in France. He made presents of haircloth shirts to his friends and went on two crusades. He was canonized in 1297. His reign was comparatively uneventful.

Louis was active in arbitration, adjusting territorial claims, imposing peace upon warring factions of his nobility, and settling succession disputes in neighboring countries. He simplified administration, improved the distribution of taxes, abolished the judicial duel, and sought to introduce uniform Roman law. The English barons (see Simon de Montfort) submitted their quarrels with Henry III to him, but his judgment in favor of the king led to civil war and the victory of Simon at Lewes. This judgment, known as the Mise of Amiens, was a flat denial of the parliamentary reforms known as the Provisions of Oxford. However, it expressly declared that the decision was not to invalidate the privileges and liberties of the realm of England, which had existed before the time of these provisions.

ALPHONSO X, 1221–1284 A. D.

Aphonso the Wise, or Alfonso X, King of Castile and Leon, ruled from 1252 until he was deposed by the Cortes in 1282. He is perhaps the most interesting—though he was far from being the most capable—of the Spanish kings of the Middle Ages. As a ruler he was weak, unstable and obstinate and he ruined the economy of his lands while endeavoring to secure his election as emperor of the Holy Roman empire.

El Sabio (the Sage) is called the father of Castilian prose. Under his patronage and editorship a number of vast works were undertaken, including Las Siete partidas, the earliest known Spanish-vernacular chronicle, valuable compilations from Arabic sources such as the Alfonsine Tables in astronomy, an illustrated book of games, and one of the greatest collections of medieval poetry and music. Under his patronage the flow of oriental culture into Western Europe was greatly accelerated.

Alphonso showed legislative capacity and a very commendable wish to provide his kingdoms with a code of laws and a consistent judicial system. He was largely responsible for the Siete partidas, a compilation of Roman and canon law which was promulgated by his grandson, and other codes: the Fuero de las leyes or Fuero Real and an Espejo de Fueros.

EDWARD I, A. D. 1239–1307

Edward I, King of England, failed in the chief ambition of his life, the conquest of Scotland. (He did humiliate Scotland by removing the coronation stone of Scone to Westminster.) Yet, his conquest of Wales, his legislation, and his triumph over his barons, his ecclesiastics and the greatest of French medieval kings indicate the strength and permanence of his work.

Edward is remembered for the developments in law and constitution that have caused him to be called the English Justinian. Before he became king he appropriated some of Simon de Montfort's ideals. The general effect of his work was to eliminate feudalism from public life. The Statutes of Westminster I and II formulated much unwritten law. The Statute of Mortmain was a landmark in his struggle with the church, resulting from his dislike of authority not emanating from himself. The Statute of Winchester established police and militia regulations. Westminster III, also called Quia emptores prohibited subinfeudation.

Thus Edward brought within the formulated law the gains of a century of common law, supplementing them. He gave a tremendous impetus to the development of law and courts, and built up the central administration.

Some important developments were wrung from Edward against his will. The parliamentary constitution of England was established as the result of his convocation of the model Parliament of 1295. "What touches all," ran Edward's writ of summons, "should be approved by all, and it is also clear that common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common." This action marks a tremendous forward step in the development of a powerful representative body. Two years later, the rising hostility of his subjects, barons, merchants, and clergy forced Edward to issue the confirmation of charters granted by John and Henry III, including the Magna Carta.

SULEIMAN, 1494–1566 A. D.

Suleiman the Magnificent was the most fortunate of Ottoman sultans. He lived during the most glorious period in the history of Islam and ruled without a worthy rival. He inherited a well-organized country, a disciplined army and a full treasury. Although his campaigns were not always wisely and prudently planned, they added great territories to his realm. In his days Turkey became a first-rate sea power and attained the culminating point of her glory. Suleiman is remembered for his encouragement of learning and the arts. He wrote verses and it is from his time that historians date the rise of the occult influence of the harem on Turkish political development.

In Turkey, Suleiman is known as the lawgiver. His claims to renown as a legislator rest mainly on his organization of the Ulema, or clerical (religious) class, in its hierarchial order. The judges belonged to this class, but all executive and administrative power remained outside it, in the hands of the military. Suleiman's administration was, relatively, one of the best of his time. His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame. However, his record of magnanimity was marred by the murder of his two sons, at the insistence of his favorite wife.

GROTIUS, 1583–1645

Hugo Grotius, or Huig van Groot, was a Dutch jurist and humanist. He strove vainly to reunite the Christian sects and the European countries. He wrote valuable works in theology, history, and classical study, but his fame rests chiefly on the De Jure Belli et Pacis, which he prepared in Paris after fleeing life imprisonment in his native country.

Concerning the Law of War and Peace, the De Jure Belli et Pacis, is a systematic study of the bases and principles of positive natural law. Though not the first attempt in modern times to ascertain the principles of jurisprudence, it went far more fundamentally into the discussion than any one had done before. The work is startling in its originality and in the scope of its consideration of international law and international ethics. One of the great masterpieces of legal literature, it is usually considered to be the first definitive text on international law.

COLBERT, 1619–83 A. D.

Jean Baptiste Colbert was a statesman who did much for France. Nevertheless, his rule was a very bad example of overgovernment. He did not believe in popular liberty. The parliaments and states-general received no support from him. The technicalities of justice he never allowed to interfere with his plans. He trafficked in public offices for profit.

Colbert became the chief power in the administration of Louis XIV, where he cleansed the financial administration ruthlessly. His ambitious scheme of encouragement of industry and trade involved subsidies, state planning, and rigid control of every detail of production, including quality and price. Similar policies were applied to agriculture. His greatest and most lasting achievement was the establishment of the French marine. (To supply oarsmen for his galleys, he required judges to sentence as many persons as possible; the convict, once chained to the bench, was seldom released at the expiration of his sentence. Colbert never thought of the long agony of those who filled his needs.) Colbert extended his scheme of paternalism to the arts and literature. His industry was colossal; he even found time for the improvement of the breed of horses.

Colbert reformed certain aspects of the legal administration and codified ordinances.

POTHIER, 1699–1772 A. D.

Robert Joseph Pothier was a French judge and professor of law. He paid particular attention to the text of the Pandects, or Digests, of the Corpus Juris Civilis (see Justinian, Tribonium, etc.). His Pandectae Justinianae in novum ordinem digestae is a

classic in the study of Roman law. He wrote many learned monographs on French law and much of his work was incorporated almost verbatim in the French Code Civil.

BLACKSTONE, 1723–80 A. D.

The fame of Sir William Blackstone rests on his Commentaries on the Law of England. His career in Parliament, to which he was elected first in 1761, was somewhat inglorious, as he disliked attendance there. In the 10 years of his judgeship he administered the law satisfactorily but attained no special distinction. He inaugurated courses in English law at the British universities, which had previously confined themselves to Roman law.

The Commentaries of Blackstone have been regarded as the most thorough treatment of the whole of English law ever produced by one man. Whether it is owing to its literary graces, or to its success in flattering the prejudices of the public to which it was addressed, the influence of the work has been extraordinary. It may be more correct to regard it as a handbook for laymen than as a legal treatise. Yet, it has been used as the standard textbook in English law for generations.

The fame of Blackstone is greatest in the United States, where the Commentaries was, for many years, almost the only source of knowledge of the English law.

MASON, A. D. 1725–92

George Mason exercised great influence in local and Virginia legislative bodies. As a member of the Virginia convention, he drafted the Virginia Constitution and the famous Bill of Rights, a radically democratic document which had great influence on American political institutions. This great work was extensively copied by other American States and had some influence on the French declaration of the rights of man.

Mason was a member of the Federal Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787 and took an active part in drafting the Constitution. However, he objected to the large and indefinite powers given to Congress, the compromises on the tariff and slave-trade issues, and failure to include a bill of rights. He refused to sign the Constitution, and, with Patrick Henry, he led the fight in Virginia against its ratification. Failing in this, he suggested amendments, the substance of several of which was afterward embodied in the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—to the American Constitution.

Mason believed that local government should be kept strong and central government weak; his democratic theories have had much influence in Southern and Western States.

NAPOLEON, A. D. 1769–1821

Napoleon I, Emperor of the French, was a spectacular military genius of unlimited ambition. One of the greatest conquerors history has ever known, he made France paramount in Europe, rearranged its map, and set his relatives upon its thrones.

In France, Napoleon consolidated the results of the Revolution and sought a new conservative balance by his reforms. He centralized the administration, established the Bank of France, inaugurated financial reforms, made peace with the church, and instituted legal reforms to pave the way for the Code Napoleon. His excessive centralization made the state supreme over the entire people—a system singularly favorable to statism.

The Code Napoleon, sometimes called the Code Civil, was the first code of French civil law. It embodies the private substantive law of France, fusing the preexisting Germanic and Roman civil law applied in France with additions resulting from the French Revolution. The code has been in force, as changed by legislative amendment, since it was first promulgated. Still in force in Belgium and Holland, it has served as a model for—and has exercised the greatest influence in—many other countries. The Spanish civil code was largely based on the Code Civil, as were the civil codes of most of the South American states, Quebec and Louisiana.

JEFFERSON, 1743–1826 A. D.

Thomas Jefferson is the outstanding apostle of American democracy and one of the greatest liberals of all time. He held a great range of public offices; he was prominent in many, and foremost member of several, of the most important deliberative and legislative bodies in American history. He is famous for many contributions to the American democratic system, as Governor of Virginia, member of the Continental Congress, Minister to France, Secretary of State, Vice President, and President.

Jefferson was the chief inspirer and most ardent worker for reforms embodied in a revision of the laws of Virginia. These included the statute for religious freedom—the first law of its kind in Christendom, abolition of primogeniture and the repeal of the laws of entail. Here, he was the first American statesman to make education by the state a fundamental article of democratic faith. He gained his greatest fame as author of the Declaration of Independence. As Vice President and Presiding Officer of the Senate, he wrote the influential Manual of Parliamentary Practice, which is still used in both Houses of Congress.

In Jefferson the Nation had a great scholar and philosopher, who was at the same time one of her most competent political managers—a leader with unlimited faith in the people. The ideas he advocated have become the very foundations of our Government. His importance as a maker of modern America is unequaled; it can hardly be overstated.

APPENDIX

RELIEF PORTRAITS IN MARBLE OVER HOUSE GALLERY DOORS

The relief portraits on the upper walls of the House Chamber are of men noted in history for the part they have played in the evolution of what has become American law. There has grown a great body of judicial tradition and a mass of legislation embodying the rules and standards by which the American people, regardless of State lines, are content to guide their lives.

The colonists brought to this country the common law of England, its concepts of property, liberty, and justice, but they took pains to make themselves free of governmental tyranny. But though our law is mainly derived from the British system, it also owes something to French law, and both of these great systems derive from Roman law, and the laws of earlier peoples.

These great lawgivers, in chronological order, are:

Hammurabi, the first King of Babylonia, reigned about 2067–2025 B. C.: The great law code bearing his name is recognized in legal literature as, perhaps, the earliest surviving, naturally characterized by its primitiveness.

Moses, circa 1571–1451 B. C.: Hebrew prophet and lawgiver. Amongst all lawgivers, founders of states and teachers of mankind, none has excelled Moses, who transformed a horde of slaves and wanderers into a nation, disciplined a race, and breathed into it its character. To him is attributed the delivery of the Ten Commandments.

Lycurgus, circa 900 B. C.: Legislator, traditional author of laws and institutions of Sparta (by present standards a harsh code).

Solon, circa 594 B. C.: The great Athenian lawgiver, author of constitutional and legal reforms.

Gaius, circa, A. D. 110–180: A celebrated Roman jurist, probably a native of the eastern empire. He was the author of numerous works on the civil law, the most noted being the Institutes.

Papinian, circa, A. D. 200: A Roman, remarkable not only for his juridical genius, for his independence of judgment, lucidity, and firmness, but for his sense of right and morality by which he frequently rose above the barriers of national prejudices, and merited the highest veneration of succeeding centuries.

Justinian, 483–565 A. D.: One of the most important events of the reign of this Byzantine emperor was the publication of the Justinian Code, the body of the Roman law compiled and annotated, the most important of all monuments of jurisprudence.

Tribonian, circa 500–547 A. D.: A Byzantine jurist, he was head of the commission which codified the laws under Justinian.

Maimonides, 1135–1204 A. D.: Jewish philosopher of Cordova, he compiled a systematic exposition of the whole of Jewish law as contained in the Pentateuch and in Talmudic literature.

Gregory IX, circa 1147–1241 A. D.: Author of a compilation of decretals on canon law; during a critical period he accomplished much in maintaining the remnants of Roman law.

Innocent III, 1161–1216 A. D.: A profound student of canon and civil law, his accomplishments during a dark and critical period of human history were much the same as those of Gregory IX—preservation of the remnants of Roman law.

Simon de Montfort, 1200–1265 A. D.: Celebrated English statesman, he originated the first appearance of the House of Commons of England.

St. Louis, 1214–1270 A. D.: King of France, author and mise of Amiens.

Alphonso X, the "Wise," 1221–1284 A. D.: King of Leon and Castile, he was the author of the code "Las Siete Partidas," the basis of Spanish jurisprudence.

Edward I, 1239–1307 A. D.: King of England, founder of the parliamentary constitution of England and eliminator of feudalism from political life. "What touches all should be approved by all, and common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common."

Suleiman, 1494–1566 A. D.: "The lawgiver," Sultan of Turkey, reformer and improver of civil and military codes. "His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame."

Grotius, 1583–1645 A. D.: Dutch statesman, Advocate General of Holland and Zealand. Author of "De Jure Belli et Pacis," first treatise on international law.

Colbert, 1619–1683 A. D.: French statesman, codifier of the ordinances, reformer of the French legal system.

Pothier, 1699–1772 A. D.: French jurist, author of "Digest of the Pandects." He assembled and codified the remnants of Roman law, and the prevalent French law.

Blackstone, 1723–1780 A. D.: A celebrated English jurist, professor of common law at Oxford; his Commentaries on the Laws of England, had considerable influence on the importation and adaptation of English common law in this country.

George Mason, 1726–1792 A. D.: He drafted the Virginia Declaration of Rights, 1776, was a member of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, but led opposition to the ratification of the Constitution until the Bill of Rights was inserted in it.

Napoleon, 1769–1821 A. D.: He appointed a commission which produced the Code Napoleon, and saw that it was enforced. It is prevailing law, even now, in Louisiana, quite influential in Florida, New Mexico, and California.

Thomas Jefferson, 1743–1826 A. D.: Third President of the United States, he was author of the Declaration of Independence and of the Statute of Virginia for religious freedom.

Index

	Page	Appendix page
Alphonso X	14	27
Blackstone	19	28
Colbert	18	27
Edward I	15	27
Gaius	6	23
Gregory IX	10	24
Grotius	17	27
Hammurabi	3	24
Innocent III	11	26
Jefferson	22	28
Justinian	7	25
Louis IX	13	26
Lycurgus	4	25
Maimonides	9	26
Mason	20	28
Montfort	12	26
Moses	3	24
Napoleon	21	28
Papinian	7	25
Pothier	19	27
Solon	5	25
Suleiman	16	27
Tribonian	8	26

(George Kackley, History and General Research Section, January 11, 1951.)

Connally Rebukes State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. James Reston that appeared in the New York Times today:

CONNALLY REBUKES STATE DEPARTMENT—SENATOR PROTESTS—CONNALLY COMPLAINS HE WAS NOT CONSULTED ON CEASE-FIRE VOTE, QUESTIONS ACHESON AIDES—TWO DENY UNITED STATES APPROVAL OF UN RESOLUTION WAS SURRENDER TO COMMUNIST CHINA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Senator TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told the State Department today that he wished it would stop making major foreign-policy decisions without consulting his committee.

In a meeting with Assistant Secretaries of State Dean Rusk and John D. Hickerson this morning, the administration's principal foreign-policy spokesman in the Senate complained that he had not been consulted before the United States voted in favor of the latest United Nations cease-fire appeal to Communist China.

To read about this decision for the first time in the newspapers, and then be confronted with a horde of angry associates in the Senate, said Mr. CONNALLY, was a peculiar method of trying to keep the State Department and the Congress in step.

QUESTIONS JUSTICE OF APPEAL

Moreover, Mr. CONNALLY indicated, he had reservations himself about the justice of the United Nations appeal, which proposed that a Korean cease-fire should be followed by negotiations with Communist China on the future of Formosa and the question of who should represent China in the United Nations.

It was said in the Senate that the United States approval of the United Nations resolution was a surrender to Red China and the start of a maneuver to give Formosa to Peiping and to seat Peiping in the United Nations. Messrs. Rusk and Hickerson denied it was anything of the sort.

The United States, they said, was trying to maintain unity in the United Nations on the problem of Communist China. It was the overwhelming sense of the United Nations that another effort should be made to bring a halt to the fighting in Korea. The United States also was urged to agree to discuss the Formosan and United Nations representation questions, if the cease fire were carried out.

It was entirely wrong to assume from this, however, Messrs. Rusk and Hickerson added, that the start of discussions meant a "sell-out." We had been discussing many things with the Communists for years without surrendering to them.

PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT STRESSED

The United States was obligated under the United Nations Charter, they pointed out, to try to settle all disputes by peaceful means. We had been "discussing" the question of who should represent China in the United Nations—the Nationalists or the Communists—for months. We had also agreed some weeks ago to discuss the future of Formosa with the Chinese Communists at the United Nations, they declared.

Secretaries Rusk and Hickerson added that if the United States had failed to go along with the United Nations cease-fire appeal, some United Nations members would have feared that Red China would have had one more excuse for rejecting the resolution—namely that the proposals put forward by the United Nations were not accepted by the United States.

By accepting the resolution, however, the State Department aides said, one last clear and fair attempt to end the war had been made, and if it were rejected by Peiping, then the other members of the United Nations could scarcely have any excuse for not going forward with a clear condemnation of Red China's aggression.

The representatives of the State Department and several members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee differed on the obligation of the State Department to consult before last week's vote. Mr. Rusk said it was the policy of the State Department to consult with the Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee whenever there was any change in the basic policies of the United States Government.

NO POLICY CHANGE ADMITTED

The vote for the cease-fire resolution, however, did not signify or imply any change in our basic policy toward Communist China, Formosa, or the questions of representation in the United Nations. These policies remained the same. If Red China accepted a cease-fire in accordance with our terms, we would discuss the other questions, but that did not mean that we were prepared to turn Formosa over to Peiping or bring the Communist regime into the United Nations.

The United States voted for the cease-fire resolution in good faith, Mr. Rusk and Mr. Hickerson observed. It would, of course, enter into any negotiations in good faith. It was not simply maneuvering on the cease-fire resolution in order to get the other members of the United Nations to go along with our condemnation of Red China as an aggressor, but if Peiping did not accept the cease-fire—both thought it would not—the path for all members of the United Nations, under the Charter, would then be fairly clear.

Mr. Rusk said he would try to keep in closer touch with the committee in the future. He pointed out, however, that while it was easy to explain any basic policy change on such questions as our policy toward Formosa, it was difficult, if not impossible, to keep Senators informed of all the rapid acts of negotiation with other nations at the United Nations.

He told the committee members that the United States would press for action as soon as possible if Peiping did not reply favorably to the cease-fire appeal. Our idea was that maybe by Thursday a reply should be received, but if it was not, he felt confident that the United Nations would be ready to take up the question of condemning the Peiping regime and studying the question of what to do about the aggression.

The meeting was not stormy, as has been reported. However, Mr. CONNALLY, an artist at Texas diplomacy, conveyed to the visitors in his own way that a little less "sudden diplomacy" sure would ease his pain.

A Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and at the suggestion of a mutual friend, I include at this point in the RECORD a striking prophecy made almost 8 years ago on May 24, 1943, by Hon. George Holden Tinkham, who served with great distinction in the House of Representatives for 28 years from the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. Tinkham, a Republican from a Democratic district was never defeated.

Over the years he has traveled in almost every country in the world. He has always been a student of foreign affairs and of economics. He is held in high regard and affection by those who served with him in the Congress.

CRAMERTON, N. C., *May 24, 1943.*

You say that you would like me to give you my view on the present and of the "shape of things to come" as I should if I were talking to you personally. Here they are for what they are worth:

As early as 1933 I saw coming another great war in Europe, and so stated in a speech I made in Congress at that time. By 1936, I had decided that war was inevitable, would come soon, and would last at least 5 years, perhaps longer.

Looking ahead at that time, as serious as the war seemed to me, what would inexorably follow in the political and economic spheres, both nationally and internationally, seemed very much worse. In the long view I saw, after a postwar boom, universal poverty, undiluted bolshevism, and Red revolutions and more bloody wars rampant, we not to be excluded.

At present I see a Bolshevik Russia, with the largest victorious army in Europe, dictating the peace, a partially bankrupt and semi-Bolshevized England cooperating in an alliance, the United States being allowed to finance that alliance. I see the Western Hemisphere and the Pacific being left to the United States, with England cooperating when and where she wishes. All this will be nothing but cynical, brutal power politics—and of course all dressed up in saintly clothes and made to bear the hypocritical mien of alleged democracy.

If out of this there eventuate leagues or federations, they will be mere puppets of a naked power alliance.

In relation to the revolutions and wars which I saw and still see in the long view, let me remind you that it was out of poverty that followed the last war that Lenin, Mussolini, and Hitler came to power. The end of this war will see the whole world, including ourselves, very much more impoverished than after the last war.

I recommend that you read the second part of Oswald Spengler's The Decline of the West, in my opinion the ablest book written since 1900. In 1919, before the rise of Mussolini and Hitler, in a penetrating historical analysis, he predicted many things which have come to pass; for example, that democracy and money were having their unbelievable final triumphs and would shortly collapse with the coming of the Caesars. Certainly, that is exactly what we have witnessed and are witnessing here and throughout the world.

It might be well for you to also read the Outline of History by Wells. He has another interesting point of view, although it is not so different as far as money is concerned.

Let us look at our own economies for a moment. The financing of ourselves and the world during and after the war means an eventual Federal debt of between two and three hundreds of billions of dollars, and perhaps much more, dependent somewhat upon the length of the war, sums equal to if not more than our accumulated wealth.

I see much greater taxation from old and new sources. I see nearly everything subsidized, nearly everyone pensioned or "bonused"—the cost of all of which to come from accumulated wealth and business being put on a socialized collectivist basis so as to meet the cost. That would mean the end of the American system of economics.

I see ahead the progressive fall of the purchasing power of the dollar, probably a radical fall, conditioned somewhat by the length of the war. I think I see in time the value of gold much enhanced. Paradoxically as it may seem, I see perhaps the Canadian dollar and the Argentine currency, as well as some other South American currencies, better refuge for money than dollars, since they have better control of their economics, including their currencies, than we have.

A grim picture, I have painted, I know, but you asked for it.

Believe me, with every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM.

The Medway Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, the text of a Christmas message from William Montgomery Bennett, national director of the Medway plan. Included also is an explanation of the objectives of this organization.

Mr. Bennett is a sincere worker for international cooperation, and is to be commended for his untiring efforts to secure friendship among the peoples of the world. The above-mentioned follows:

THE MEDWAY PLAN FOR HUMAN REHABILITATION AND WORLD PEACE,
Woodbury, Conn., Christmas, 1950.

Mayor Pierre LePortier, Comte de Bagneux, Abbe Amiard, and to All Plan-Medway Comité Associates in France.

GENTLEMEN: The great day of the Medway plan is still before us. Its work is not done. It has hardly begun as yet. It must not be diverted by war or transient events however important. Its eternal work is peace and the preparation for peace.

These are critical, formative days for us all. At last a clear demarcation between free democracies and Russian slavery stands defined. All hope for understanding and toleration between the two ideologies has been swept away by the ruthless men of the Kremlin. It is now a fight for survival.

The governments of the Western European and the American nations are belatedly seeking to meet the threat of war. The peoples of those lands have at last awakened to danger. They are on the march. In very truth World War II has never ceased. The defeats of Germany and Japan were but way-stops on Russia's schedule for world domination. Just as Hitler openly told his aims in Mein Kampf, Stalin from the first has given a clear statement of his over-all objectives. In neither case has the world credited those blackhearted dictators with meaning what they said. The plain fact is that France, England, the United States, and the peace-loving countries of the United Nations are in an undeclared war with Russia. This we must face. The forces of hatred still challenge the forces of human brotherhood; the minions of darkness still wrestle with the children of light.

A deeper degree of understanding and friendship is needed between the men, women, and children of France, Britain, and America, so that a fuller confidence in their unselfish devotion to truth and spiritual values will exist as a bulwark for mutual defense. The united west will trumph over their foes not alone through armed might but through a common faith in freedom, human rights, the rule of law, and the blessing of world peace under the one God.

And now I give you the message that the Medway Plan Associates in America wish to give to the people of France. It is a very important message. I ask that you take steps to make it widely known. This is the message:

"There sings in the hearts of all true Americans a song of deep appreciation, of affection, and of sympathy for all the people of France. We Americans hark back to Lafayette and de Grasse and their great love for the little America of the early days. When we recall our first steps toward freedom we remember how liberty was born in France. Deep in our inner selves we feel that your people and ours have raised their eyes to the same horizon of freemen to claim those rights which the Creator fashioned for all human beings. Americans and Frenchmen will never give up those God-given rights.

"There is no shadow of doubt but that all Americans will stand shoulder-to-shoulder with France to guard and guarantee her life and freedom. There may be dark days when politicians differ in policies. Those will pass. But in the hearts of our people there will be no deviation and the best that we in America possess will be joyfully placed on the altar of liberty that France shall live.

"We, here, pray that all Frenchmen will stand steadfast as our friends and brothers. Friendship is never bought; it is earned. Friends are won by love. France earned America's friendship for all time in the American Revolution and America will never fail France.

"Our peerless Eisenhower, backed by our mighty resources and our unswerving determination, goes to France to fight with all the freedom-loving nations to save our ways of life; to establish truth, honor, human rights, and liberty for all men. Let France be assured there will be no let down in that fight until the eagles of victory perch upon our united banners."

That is Medway plan's message to the people of France. The basic principles of the Medway plan cannot be assailed or denied by any man. They are spreading around the earth. Men grasp them as they would a chalice filled with the holy wine of love. Men realize that only when those principles prevail will there be amity throughout the world.

Accordingly, on behalf of our great host of Medway Plan Associates, I confidently call upon you to press forward with unflagging zeal and unflinching courage. Victor Hugo wrote that no earthly force is so great as an idea whose time has come. The time of Medway plan has come.

With warm Christmas greetings, I have the honor to be,

Faithfully,

WILLIAM MONTGOMERY BENNETT,
President, the Medway Plan.

THE MEDWAY PLAN FOR HUMAN REHABILITATION AND WORLD PEACE

(By Dr. Charles R. Joy)

A RAINBOW OF HOPE

A huge, rusty gun rises above the battered ruins of the old Atlantic wall, the great bastion built by Hitler along the Channel Coast of France to prevent an Allied invasion. Storm clouds mass behind it, black and threatening. A gust of wind, a rush of rain, and then—the rainbow.

Back again in Strasbourg, this is a vivid memory of a recent visit to a little fishing town in northern France. But it is more than a memory. It is a symbol of our hope. The shattered remnants of the old war remain; guns and walls and mines, widows and orphans and mutilated children. Now a new conflict in eastern Asia threatens many parts of the world, the dark clouds lowering in the heavens, driving winds and rains beating down upon us in scattered showers, but there, vibrant in glowing colors overreaching all earth's sorrows and its pains, is the rainbow of man's eternal hope. To this rainbow the unique Medway plan adds its bit of light and color. It stretches in beauty from land to land and binds the people together in love and hope.

THE BASIS OF PEACE

Councils and parliaments, charters and treaties, codes of international law and leagues of united nations will never of themselves create a world of peace. These are but the channels through which a river of life must flow; the empty chalice into which the wine of love must be poured. There are many who cry peace today when there is no peace; many who, behind the form of law, conspire to break the law; many who would organize an idea in order to destroy it. Men put their confidence in external things and artificial forms because faith and love are absent from their hearts. But peace is an inward quality. It is born in the mind and in the soul. It is profoundly spiritual and religious.

The world has never sought peace early enough. Peace is usually a frantic, postwar dream. Former enemies meet with all the old hostility in their hearts to sign it. Wartime allies, sometimes with little in common except their hatred of a former foe, meet to organize it. It is obvious that upon such a basis a lasting peace cannot be found or made.

THE LONG VIEW

Jesus looked beyond the present moment. He cherished a dream of a richer world. He preached a future messianic kingdom. He was not deeply concerned with immediate problems. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." There in brief compass was his attitude toward present and future. There are temporal things, things of today to which we must make our adjustment. But there are things that are of God eternal in the heavens, and these are the important things. To the divine law, to the future heavenly kingdom our loyalty is due. In the end the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our God.

THE MEDWAY PLAN

The Medway plan believes that the essential thing is a will to peace which is based on friendship and understanding. It pins its faith upon the spiritual forces that move in the hearts of men—forces which, eventually, will produce a world conscience wherein the cornerstones are honor, human rights, the moral law, and rule by law. The Medway plan is not an organization, in the ordinary sense. It asks for no contribution and carries on no financial campaigns. It is what its name suggests—a simple plan for individual action freely offered to all those who would help to build a world at peace, either through their individual efforts or through voluntary cooperation with others. To such as these the Medway plan makes its suggestions and offers its assistance through its voluntary workers, who are known as Medway Plan Associates.

THE CHILDREN FIRST

The Medway plan begins with the children. They are the leaders, the educators, and the voters of tomorrow. If the children of one land come to understand the children of other lands they will grow into adult citizens of a world community where war is unthinkable. The Medway plan therefore attempts to bring the children of America into helpful contact with the children of other lands through correspondence and through the gifts of simple essentials of life. It is an exciting thing for a child in a war-torn country to find a new friend in that America which he has always thought of as the wonderland beyond the seas. And little hearts reach out to little hearts, binding friendships are formed, and the future of the world made more secure. It is the business of the Medway plan to facilitate these friendships. It has long lists of names and addresses available. Perhaps the children will lead us into the promised land.

THE ADULTS NEXT

It is the deep conviction of the Medway plan that every individual should make his contribution to the peace of the world. Those who make no such contribution strengthen by act of omission the evil forces that at present dominate the world. The Medway plan has suggestions for those who would like to help but do not know where to begin. It is ready to put Americans in touch with individuals and families abroad who need encouragement and a little help. During the past 3 years many thousands of Americans have found a way into the hearts of stricken families in the war-torn countries by this method of free adoption. This is the final, convincing argument for democracy.

TOWN SPONSORSHIPS

The Medway plan facilitates, also, the adoption of community by community, and many American towns and cities from Maine to California have sponsored sister communities in France, Austria, Italy, England, and Germany. This has resulted in bulk shipments of supplies—food, clothing, medicines—to provide immediate relief, and, more important still, the establishment of personal friendships. The many letters of gratitude attest to the enduring consequences of this plan. But there are many more such communities that await the evidence of loving concern. The work of building a world of peace has only just begun.

THE RESULTS

More than 200,000 American children and adults are now in regular touch with a corresponding number of persons in Europe. Over 150 American communities have adopted European towns under the Medway plan program. About $2,000,000 worth of relief supplies have been sent abroad to date. Eighty information centers are being established overseas, stocked with material telling the story of a friendly, democratic America. This is a remarkable record of short-time accomplishment by a group of devoted persons working without compensation because of their loyalty to the future peace of the world.

INCEPTION OF MEDWAY PLAN

The Medway plan was founded and developed by Mr. William Montgomery Bennett, of Woodbury, Conn., and Charleston, S. C., a retired industrialist and economist, who is now giving all of his time and work to the promotion of true freedom and world peace. In this he is ably assisted by chapters of Medway Plan Associates of which Mrs. Gertrude Sanford Legendre is chairman. Mr. Bennett was formerly director of church services for the British War Relief Society and for Bundles for Britain. He founded and directed the Interfaith Group for World Peace Under God, the purpose of which was to secure spiritual representatives as advisers in the organization and development of the United Nations. He also founded and is chairman of the National Religious Council composed of a hundred leaders of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths. But Mr. Bennett's heart is in the Medway Plan for Human Rehabilitation and World Peace.

THE MEDWAY PLAN INVITES YOUR COOPERATION

This, then, is the Medway plan, a simple, flexible, personalized, integrated program for constructive action. The plan cooperates wholeheartedly with other relief agencies, particularly with the National Medical and Surgical Relief Committee, with the Pestalozzi Foundation of America and with CARE. In turn it invites the cooperation of all men of good will, who want to help and do not know how. Here is a way by which everyone, whatever his means, can have a part in building the brave, new world of the future. He can at least write a letter of friendly good will to someone. He can send a CARE package of food or clothing. He can become, perhaps the Medway plan associate in his community and help organize it for the sponsoring of a town abroad.

St. Francis of Assisi prayed that God might give him strength to leave a bit of love in every place where he found hatred, to leave a little joy wherever he found sadness. That can be the privilege of all those who cooperate through the Medway plan, and a new rainbow will rise about the outmoded symbols of war—a rainbow of faith and hope and love.

Additional information will be gladly furnished.

The Medway Plan, head office; Woodbury, Conn.

Offices also at 1 Wall Street, New York City; 20 Montague Street, Charleston, S. C.; Chenedoult, Orne, France; Salzburg, Austria.

Address of Erle Cocke, Jr., National Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an address delivered by Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion at the National Press Club in Washington on yesterday. We of the South take great pride in the splendid achievements of this young American. His forthright statements in this message leave no doubt of the vigor or of the quality of the leadership he imparts to the Legion. I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that he was introduced on yesterday by Radford Mobley, president of the National Press Club, and one of the leading newsmen of this or any other city. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Press Club, guests. I am glad to be here not only for the personal pleasure of meeting with the Capital's press, but for the pride of knowing that you do honor to the organization I represent.

The American Legion, throughout its history, has enjoyed splendid relations with the press, and I consider it one of my responsibilities to keep it that way. Wherever I have gone across the country, I have found large numbers of your colleagues who are also active Legionnaires. And I think you should know that we feel the press has had a good deal to do with pushing American Legion membership ahead of the total a year ago.

I am especially glad for the opportunity to lay before you at this time The American Legion's position with regard to the current emergency. That position reflects the thinking of 4,000,000 men and women at all levels and all places in our society—men and women with a common background of service in the Nation's Armed Forces during war.

The question of how best to meet the challenge of communism is being debated hot and heavy at the present time.

The debate, it seems to me, will serve a good purpose—provided it is held above personal and partisan levels, and provided it does not end in filibuster. To argue for argument's sake at this moment is dangerous. To argue for partisan advantage would be unpatriotic.

Certainly, we agree that there must come a time—and soon—when the people will have to accept and actively support the policies of our national leadership. In order for this to come about, I believe that both sides will have to give ground.

The administration should lead the way by frankly admitting that mistakes have been made. Nobody expects an administration to be 100 percent right, but everybody resents the attitude that never owns up to a wrong.

Isolationism in this country died in 1941. There are signs now of its revival. If the trend takes hold, it will be because the American people were left with no place else to go.

It isn't a question of whether or not large numbers of Americans should be disillusioned. The fact is that they are disillusioned, and disappointed, and discouraged by what they believe to be inconsistent and unproductive foreign policies.

In 1947, President Truman declared that it would be the purpose of this country to support free nations everywhere in resisting communism. You called it the Truman Doctrine, and it won popular approval. Best of all, it worked; Greece and Turkey proved the experiment.

In 1948 came the Marshall plan to spend American dollars and know-how in rebuilding the economy of Western Europe. And again, the people applauded and the plan worked.

But then came the sad awakening. With the rout of the Nationalists in China, it became apparent that, while combating the Kremlin on one side of the world, we had delivered it into power on the other.

The State Department then asked us to believe that the Reds in China were not really bad people, that they wanted only land reform. Most of us refused to swallow that one. The fact that it was offered at all is, in my opinion, a grave indictment of the State Department's policy makers.

United States approval of the UN's ceasefire plan for Korea impresses our organization as being one more link in a chain of misadventures in the Far East. Appeasement is a cloudy word, but I think it can be applied with all of its original meaning to that action. What can be gained by voluntarily surrendering the cause for which we went into Korea. It's a little late to be making a gift of that country to the Reds under terms that would preclude us from punishing them.

Whether we pull out of Korea is a decision for the military to make. The American Legion favors holding that ground as long as the effort is vastly more costly to the enemy than to us.

We submit that the failure of a majority of United Nations members to join the United States in branding Communist China an aggressor has done more to foster isolationism in this country than all of the speechmaking in Congress or out of it. The UN cannot long endure the reputation of penalizing little aggressors while letting the big ones get away. It is tagging itself with precisely that reputation today.

Chiang Kai-shek's offer of 30,000 troops to fight in Korea has gone begging for 5 months. There is talk now of sending over reinforcements from this country. I submit that it would be a grievous error to commit another GI into that battle while ignoring the ready assistance of the only Chinese Government recognized by the United Nations.

In the event that the UN does not act against the Chinese Reds, we believe it will be necessary for the United States to take that action alone. Regardless of the outcome in Korea, we should blockade the Chinese coast and give all possible aid in weapons and military advice to the forces on Formosa and the guerrillas within China itself.

Committing large numbers of American troops to the defense of Western Europe is admittedly a risky proposition, one that deserves the most careful study and which the President—again in the interest of unity—should discuss with the Congress.

Two basic concepts must be borne in mind.

First, Europe cannot stand against Russian attack without substantial American ground forces.

Secondly, no amount of American men and weapons can hold Europe unless those countries contribute a maximum military effort on their own hook. You simply cannot defend a country that will not defend itself.

Now we are not ready to admit that this is the situation in Europe today. General Eisenhower went abroad for the express purpose of sizing up that issue. And the American Legion is prepared to accept the general's judgment. To attempt to settle the question on any other basis seems to me a dangerous break with realism.

After all, why have we undertaken such a huge and costly rearmament effort? If we are going to be candid about it, not primarily to save Italians or Frenchmen or Germans from capture by communism. And certainly not for reasons of charity. We are doing it because it is necessary for the security of our own country, our own homes, our own lives.

The Hoover plan, in our judgment, combines extreme pessimism with exaggerated optimism. It leads from his premise that Europe cannot be defended to the conclusion that the Western Hemisphere, alone, can be defended.

I think everyone would agree that the time may come when communism will have to be battled from the Americas. That is a possibility. Mr. Hoover's proposal would make it a certainty. He is asking us to concede all of Europe and all of Asia and Africa at a time when there is a reasonable chance of keeping powerful resources of those continents in the fight.

When you consider that retiring to this hemisphere would leave the Kremlin in control of seven-eighths of the world's peoples and more than half of the world's industry, you have to believe that the Americas under that condition would be considerably less than a Gibraltar.

All in all, it would appear that Mr. Hoover—out of the very best of motives—has come up with an untimely recipe for national survival.

With regard to Mr. Taft, frankly, I am confused as to which side of the plate the Senator is batting from. He has established himself in a very short period of time as the top switch-hitter in the foreign relations league.

One week ago—and speaking in this room—Senator Taft disclosed that he wasn't at all certain that Stalin intends to attack in Western Europe. In 1948, the Senator gave that same reason for opposing Universal Military Training. And 10 years ago, in early 1941, he said it was asinine for anyone to suppose that Japan would make war on the United States.

I think the veterans of the country, particularly those of World War II, can be excused for respectfully discounting Mr. Taft's knowledge of dictators' intentions.

The Senator from Ohio also warns that our going into Western Europe with troops might provoke attack. That may be. But if we are agreed that communism is an aggressive, imperialistic force bent on world conquest, then at some time and place we must take a stand. I believe the time is now and one priority place is Western Europe.

One good effect of the great debate has been to get the people thinking—a great many people who otherwise might have coasted along unmindful of the issues. We should make certain, however, that in all the excitement we do not make the mistake of falling for an easy way out.

The idea of concentrating on sea and air forces—with a relatively small Army—is a case in point. This old chestnut was pretty well buried by World War II. I am sure that the 8,000,000 ground troops who helped bring victory to America in that war do not consider they were either unnecessary or unessential. And I am equally certain that our ground forces in Korea feel they are doing an important job.

History shows that every major war has brought forth new and more destructive weapons. And the need for manpower has gone up with every war. Atomic bombs hastened the surrender of an already-beaten Japan, but who can guarantee that Russia would react accordingly? Unless we come up with planes and ships capable of storming hills and taking away the enemy's guns, we had better leave those jobs to the foot-soldier and train him to do them.

The really encouraging side of the present situation is the degree of unity already expressed on the need for building and maintaining powerful armed forces. Where they should go and how they should be used are live questions. But for the first time in our history, short of declared war, the American people are convinced that military preparedness is most essential.

How do we go about it?

The President has announced a goal of 3,500,000 men in uniform by July. I look for the figure to reach 5,000,000 in 1952, unless there is all-out war, and maximum mobilization would then be in order. If Russia does not attack, mobilization will probably level off at approximately 7,000,000 in 1954.

To our way of thinking, the build-up in manpower should be limited only by the ability of the armed services to absorb new recruits. We cannot gamble again on time to train while we fight. For every man of service age who was ready to do battle on Pearl Harbor day, there were 10 who had no prior military experience. The year that it took us to mount our first major offensive in North Africa would not be ours to waste next time.

The American Legion will support a program of universal military training and service as the best and fairest means of filling out the armed services.

I believe that congressional action on the UMT feature of this plan is as important a security step as the Nation will be called upon to take. No other move could do so much to guarantee that the strength being mustered now will outlast the emergency. If UMT is not enacted, we will be well on the way to repeating the old mistake of sprinting to a dead stop so far as national preparedness is concerned.

Certainly, every qualified young man can expect to undergo military training and service during the next 10 years. Bearing arms is going to become as much a habit of American life as studying in school and paying taxes, and not only will the Nation be more safe but the people will be stronger and better citizens because of it.

We hear a lot about the great sacrifice involved in youngsters giving up their time and careers for military service. Personally, I believe that most young men neither need nor want that type of sympathy. Military service in these times is the first obligation of citizenship. But beyond that, and equally important, it is an opportunity for the individual to increase his own chances of survival.

The compelling factor of this stage of mobilization is speed. We need to build up the fighting services with the finest available fighting stock. To do that, we must draw heavily, it seems to me, on the 18-year-old age group.

The American Legion does not presume to have sure-fire answers to all of the problems I have touched on here today. But I am convinced that on one essential point, we have caught the will and the hopes of the majority of the people. That is a deep and abiding belief in the future of this country—and in the capacity of 150,000,000 Americans, pulling together, to come up with honorable and workable solutions.

Leading a Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very worth-while letter appearing in the New York Times of January 14, from the Honorable Herbert Pell, a distinguished New Yorker who formerly represented the Seventeenth New York district in the House:

LEADING A FREE WORLD—SURVIVAL OF CIVILIZATION SAID TO DEPEND ON ERA OF PEACE

(The writer of the following letter, formerly a Member of Congress and State chairman for the Democratic Party, served as Minister to Portugal and as the American member of the UN Commission for Investigation of War Crimes.)

HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y.,
January 10, 1951.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I am for peace. I am for minding our own business. I am particularly opposed to a policy which boils down to an effort to impose American ideas and customs on other

nations. This does not mean that we should not recognize the duties and responsibilities of our position.

We must properly understand the situation of the United States. This country is the leader of the free world, which is a very different thing from being the free leader of the world. We are the first of a group of associates. We cannot act as the master of slaves, as the paymaster of hirelings or as the dominator of satellites.

The nations on our side are weaker and poorer than we are, either because they are smaller or because they have suffered more, but they are not slaves, servants or sycophants; they are free nations and can be led by their willing consent or not at all. We cannot treat them as tools to be broken in our interest. When we assume the burden of leadership we assume at the same time a responsibility for the interest of those whom we lead. We cannot offend their conscience or sacrifice them for our own gain.

ECONOMIC SURVIVAL

Intelligently, we must recognize that the United States cannot be alone in the world. It cannot long remain prosperous in a company of ruined nations. So much is obvious. For a good many years to come the core of individualist economy—if that economy is to survive at all—must be a prosperous United States. It is manifest that we cannot as a nation continue as the leader and the bulwark of a civilization based on the assumption that peace is the normal condition of mankind if we persist in a policy of military adventure or turn ourselves into an armed camp.

If the United States is to be the first nation of the future, if we are entering on the American century, let us hope and do what we can to make it so that the period of our leadership will be a period of peace, amity, and prosperity rather than a time of subordination for the world under the rule of a people themselves oppressed by the tools of their dominance.

Peace is the only possible base for our civilization. It was built on peace, and without peace it will die. War will ineluctably end the customs and the outlook and the way of life, the ideals and the national purposes which we inherited from our fathers to be held as a sacred trust for our children. Peace is not always easy to maintain; at the present moment its maintenance is, and will be for some time, extremely difficult. As Governor Dewey once said, "We must wage peace."

HISTORY OF WARS

Twice in our time we have seen that total war (and there really is no other kind possible) decides nothing, settles nothing, answers nothing, and leads to nothing. Winner and loser, both are vanquished. Is there a single nation on earth that got, by any imaginable system of accounting, a net gain out of either of the two wars we have lived through?

Today, does any sane person believe that a conflict with Russia will mean anything but mutual destruction and ruin? Do we hope to overrun Russia as Germany was overrun and occupy it as Germany was occupied, and then build it again, as we are doing in Germany and Japan, into something very like what it was before? What do we plan to do with a victory?

It is manifest that a war with Russia will end in a collapse of common exhaustion. The representatives of a shattered Russia will meet the emissaries of a worn and exhausted United States and devise a means by which both can survive without continuing mutual slaughter and destruction. Is there any person in the world who imagines any other result possible?

The real difficulty lies in the fact that the negotiators on both sides fear disapproval by the politicians at home.

I do not know how it is in Russia, but in the United States today every person who dares to express the obvious fact that compromise is better than the best conceivable result of any possible war—which is the real belief of thinking Americans—finds himself attacked and stabbed on all sides by men sitting safely in public offices, who know very well that come what may they will be safe from any enemy.

OPPONENTS OF COMPROMISE

Here, there, and everywhere you hear them shouting against compromise, calling the world to witness that their only desire is to shoulder a musket and face the wicked foe. It is only the superior quality of their patriotism that prevents them from selfishly indulging this wish. They must for the good of the Nation remain in public office while they cheer on the envied heroes.

They have the effrontery to attack as cowards all who disagree with anything they shout. The whole thing is contemptible. How much courage does it take for a Congressman or a Senator to yell for blood? Does a district attorney show a high quality of bravery when he howls against compromise? Right or wrong, no question of courage is involved. How much courage does anyone think it would take for me, 66 years old, living on an ample income quietly in the country, to clamor for gore, to demand the sacrifice of a million men 40 years younger than I am and then end my heroic address with a bitter note of regret that my years or my grapevines prevented me from joining the brave boys whom I envy?

Such words do not come from the mouths of heroes or of patriots but from the lips of self-seeking politicians hoping to ride into office on a wave of excitement that will conceal their own shortcomings. I have been in politics for 40 years. I was a Member of Congress 10 years before the oldest soldier drafted was born, and I know.

Most of the political shouters think they are backing a winning horse—that's all. Twenty-five years ago thousands of American politicians attacked the Catholics to get the Klan vote. Today they follow McCarthy. Twenty years ago they said as they drank their bootleg liquor, "There's one more election in prohibition." Today, safe behind desks, they think that war and hatred will keep their snouts in the public trough in 1952. It's as simple as that.

I am for peace. I am on the side of the angels of God, who sang, "Peace on earth, good will to men." They were not popular with those who filled the inn and crowded Mary into the stables, but they were right all the same.

Why not negotiate now, while the young men are still alive?

HERBERT PELL.

High Cost of Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, just to let the consumers of the East know that the high cost of bread cannot be fastened on the farmers who raise wheat, I submit an original statement from one of the best farmers in my area. The letter follows:

WILLISTON, N. DAK.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: I bought a loaf of bread today for which I paid 20 cents. It contains less than 1 pound of dry wheat flour. I also sold a load of No. 1 wheat at the elevator for 3 cents a pound, and then the consumers blame me for the high cost of living.

I buy the land at a high price, spend big sums for improving the land, pay high taxes on it, buy thousands of dollars' worth of high-priced machinery, furnish the seed, hire high-priced labor, etc., to grow and harvest the wheat and bring it to market. And then somebody else takes that wheat and grinds it into flour and bakes the bread, and all I get is 3 cents, 7 percent, of the final cost to the consumer for the bread. Why is not that fact mentioned oftener when Congress is arguing ways and means of how to lower the cost of living?

Happy New Year.

O. S. ELLEVOLD.

P. S.—If you start figuring General Mills' Puffed Wheat, it looks 10 times worse.

Don't Penalize Parenthood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a column by Albert W. Spiers, editor of the Michigan City (Ind.) News-Dispatch, which appeared in that newspaper on January 15.

Commenting on plans for increasing taxes to help pay for the expanded defense program, Mr. Spiers presents a most convincing argument against any across-the-board cut in dependency exemptions. Lower exemptions, he points out, would place an unfair share of the tax burden on families with children. A fairer method would be to leave exemptions unchanged while boosting the levy on taxable income.

Mr. Spiers' point is well taken, and, I hope, will be considered by the Ways and Means Committee when it begins formulating a new tax bill next month. The above-mentioned follows:

The new tax plans of Truman and company will deal a low blow to parents who are struggling to raise good kids in tough times.

Let's write our Congressmen.

Here's the gimmick: Truman wants to raise income taxes mainly by lowering the $600 per exemption, perhaps as low as $400.

That sounds fair and simple, but let's see how it works with two families of identical income.

Mr. and Mrs. Joe Doaks like kids. They have three, and make continual sacrifices for them. Only when income taxes are calculated are those tykes a budget blessing. The Doaks live in a house that is perpetually battle-scarred, but always warm, happy, and rambunctious.

Mr. and Mrs. Joe Iceberg decided long ago not to have costly kids. They like the comforts of life for themselves, so their home, while lacking warmth and noise, is neat, modern, and fitted with all the latest conveniences.

Both the Doaks and Icebergs make $5,000 a year. With their two exemptions, the Icebergs now pay about $600 a year to Uncle Sam. The Doaks, having five exemptions, only pay about $250—a difference of $350,

which is little enough when the real cost of raising children is considered.

Comes costly war. New taxes must be imposed, new sacrifices made. Who should make these sacrifices—the Doaks, who already are fulfilling their obligation to God and society by struggling to raise three fine youngsters, or the Icebergs, who live selfishly in cold personal comfort?

You know the answer, and so do I—but the tax men don't.

Let us now cut those tax exemptions, as Truman suggests, to $400 each.

We now have added $400 ($200 for each of two exemptions) to the taxable income of the Icebergs. At roughly 25 percent, that will cost 'em $100 more.

But we have added $1,000 to the taxable income of the struggling Doaks, and that will cost them $250 more.

In other words, under this plan the family with three children will bear two-and-one-half times as much of the new tax burden as the family without children.

Should that be? Or should the shoe be fitted to the other foot?

That could be done easily by leaving the $600 exemption unchanged and boosting the levy on taxable income. Let's try that on our two families.

The Doaks now have a taxable income of roughly $2,000—their $5,000 less $3,000 for five exemptions at $600 apiece. Their $250 bill is a shade less than 15 percent.

The Icebergs' taxable income is $3,800—their $5,000 less two $600 exemptions. Their $600 tax bill is a shade more than 15 percent.

Now raise taxes 20 percent.

The Doaks will now pay 35 percent of $2,000, or $700.

But the Icebergs will pay 35 percent of $3,800, or a healthy $1,330.

We have increased the Doaks' tax bill $450 and the Icebergs' tax bill $730—and brother, that's the way I like it. The Icebergs, by any measure, are better able to make new sacrifices than the Doaks. They have chosen not to make sacrifices for children. It delights me to force them to make sacrifices for America.

Servicemen's Wives and Infants Neglected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD, a timely editorial from the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press dealing with the necessity for a maternity and infant care program for the wives and infants of the men in the Armed Forces. The editorial follows:

SERVICEMEN'S WIVES AND INFANTS NEGLECTED

The emergency maternity and infant care program (EMIC), inaugurated back in 1943, should be reestablished by necessary legislation at Washington if we are going to remove a hardship that falls upon the wives and infants of men in the United States service.

This program was administered by the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, through State agencies, and it did a magnificent job. The program was available to the wife and infant of an enlisted man serving in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay grades of the Armed Forces or of an aviation cadet, providing without cost medical, nursing, and hospital maternity service during the prenatal period, childbirth, and for 6 weeks thereafter, and medical and hospital care for the infant during his first year.

After July 1, 1947, there was a gradual termination of this emergency, and the latest dates on which care could be provided was July 1, 1948, for mothers, and to April 20, 1949, for infants. At the present time there is no such program, and need for a similar program for wives and infants of servicemen is even greater than it was during World War II. The quarter allowance for dependents now varies with the pay grade and the number of dependents, as follows:

Pay grades 1, 2, and 3:	
1 dependent	$85.00
2 dependents	107.50
Over 2 dependents	125.00
Pay grades 4 and 5:	
1 dependent	127.50
2 dependents	127.50
Over 2 dependents	145.00
Pay grades 6 and 7:	
1 dependent	147.50
2 dependents	147.50
Over 2 dependents	165.00

The serviceman could, of course, send to his family additional sums from his pay.

Let us point to the local situation today, and every taxpayer will realize the need for this agency program. During the months of November and December a record was kept of local pending confinements of wives of servicemen. Up to this time 12 have been recorded, and it is reasonable to assume that there are as many more that have not been brought to the attention of the Red Cross or to any other agency. In many instances hospitalization insurance was forfeited with termination of husbands' employment, and at the present time payment of confinement bills is arranged for directly with the doctor and hospital by the wife. Every month that this continues without a new emergency maternity and infant-care program it will work a hardship on many of the families of men in the service.

If an application is made to Army Emergency Relief, Navy Relief, or Air Force Society, depending on the branch in which the head of the family serves, it is handled on a loan basis and deducted by allotment from the serviceman's pay. There is no local agency, other than the Red Cross, which will pay for such confinements. It would be interesting to learn what support the county medical association will give a new program.

Our point is that we can do no less for those fighting in Korea and who are in the service in other portions of the world than to give them a program similar to the one which was in force from 1943 through April 20, 1949. It should be resumed and immediately. The United States Department of Labor issued a folder back in October of 1945 which outlined the various services of the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care program:

1. It is for wives and infants of men in the four lowest pay grades of the Armed Forces and of aviation cadets, regardless of family income, race, or length of residence.

2. It provides medical, nursing, and hospital services—not cash payments—to the wife.

3. It provides services without cost to the men, their wives, or families.

4. It operates in every State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

5. It is administered by the State Health Departments under plans approved by the Children's Bureau.

6. It depends for its success in each State on the cooperation of physicians, hospitals, nurses, clinics, and public-health agencies.

7. It provided care for about 850,000 mothers and about 110,000 babies during the 30 months it was in force.

This is a subject that should call for immediate action, and our Representatives in Congress and in the Senate should hasten to enact a program similar to that which was discontinued or replace it with a new measure covering the various phases that we have mentioned. If we are going to build the morale on the home front, if we are going to give our fighting men with dependents at home something to build up their morale, the best way is to provide ways and means in the nature of care and medical treatment for the dependents here at home. If we want to make a wife or a mother feel that the Government is interested in her welfare, this is the surest way to proceed.

The Cost of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig, of January 15, 1951:

THE COST OF FREEDOM

The Nation today was given the estimates on the cost of preserving freedom against the encroachment of totalitarianism. Mr. Truman's budget figures are, of course, approximate. None can foretell the course of events. But they are grim reminders of the sorry plight of a world which twice in a generation fought to eradicate the very condition that faces us today.

No American can be happy over the leadership of the free world which now is ours. It is a costly honor—costly in effort, blood, and treasure, but it is inescapable. Paradoxically, this Nation, grew to strength and power through wars which weakened most of the other nations. Perhaps we grew in spite of wars, or because the wars were fought on other people's grounds. In any event, the torch of freedom is in our hands and if we fail there will be no other to take it up.

The President's determination, that this country shall do everything possible for its security cannot be logically challenged. All of us want peace and security. Estimates of cost will, in time, be tested in committee inquiry and congressional debate. But the cost of government for the years ahead will be heavier than we ever have known in peacetime.

Mr. Truman has offered a Federal budget for the fiscal year starting next July 1 of more than $71,500,000,000 and will propose increased tax rates to meet it in full. If approved the tax load will require $471 from the average person in fiscal 1952, or $1,884 in Federal taxes for the average family of four. Since approximately one-half the Federal revenue comes from personal income taxes, it would mean $235 from each person next year, or about $940 for each average family in direct Federal income taxes. Many, of course, would pay much less and many would pay more than the average amount.

A Federal sales tax is certain to be asked. This would be in addition to the present sales taxes in many States. It could be collected with less work as a tax on goods at the source, although the total revenue would be smaller than if taken at the retail level. Still, a tax of 3 percent might yield five billions annually. It still would leave the heaviest burden for the income tax field.

Sales taxes hit harder at the small income citizens and income taxes strike harder at big incomes. In the present situation all will have to pay more.

The Budget fixes probable Federal spending next year at seventy-one and one-half billions, as compared with an estimated forty-seven and one-fourth billions for the current fiscal year. It estimates also that higher production will bring higher incomes so that the current Federal revenues of forty-four and one-half billions would rise to fifty-five billions next year even with no rate increases. This year's anticipated deficit of more than two and one-half billions will increase the Federal debt to two hundred and sixty billions, a staggering figure which we should not contemplate increasing.

Even with the higher national income, next year's deficit probably would amount to sixteen and one-half billions unless taxes are increased or new ones levied. Mr. Truman will ask Congress to raise in taxes sufficient funds to put the defense program on a pay-as-you-go basis. To do this, we will have to pay one-third higher taxes than at present, with at least 27 percent of the national income going into the Federal coffers.

This is a huge sum. Plans call for forty-one and one-half billions, or 58 percent of all Federal revenues, to be used for rearming and for seven and one-half billions to be spent in military and economic aid to our allies. Thus almost forty-nine billions or 69 percent of all Federal funds would be used for defense, leaving a little more than twenty billions for domestic purposes.

The welfare of all the people and the preservation of their national existence calls for speedy rearming with as little waste and error as possible. Although the domestic costs are relatively small, they afford the most debatable fiscal points. Mr. Truman's apparent attempt to inject his Fair Deal, checkmated in the Eighty-first Congress and largely repudiated at the polls, may endanger the worthy portions of his program. Certainly no effort should be made under the cover of national distress to sneak such things as FEPC, Federal health insurance, and the Brannan plan through the back door under the cloak of national defense.

There are ways in which the domestic costs can be reduced. They will make only a small dent in the tremendous budget, but every million saved will help to ease the burden. Several members of Congress tried unsuccessfully in the last session to reduce ordinary costs. Now these savings must be made. We shall pay billions for defense, but we can't afford a cent for waste.

Universal Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in the present critical state of affairs throughout the world it is most vital that our country have the benefit of the thinking of leaders in every walk of life. One group which has been organized with this thought in mind is the Committee on the Present Danger, which includes among its membership a number of college presidents and leaders in the professions and in business.

One of the proposed programs for government which this committee considers urgent is the adoption of universal military service. A statement on this matter presents the reasoning behind it in such convincing terms that it deserves to be brought to the attention not only of the Members of the Congress, but of all our people.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement from the Committee on the Present Danger be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 12, 1950.*

STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

The acts of naked aggression by powerful Communist forces in the Far East constitute a grave threat to the survival of the United Nations, and a peril to the very security of these United States, which cannot be mistaken, cannot be ignored.

The members of the Committee on the Present Danger, making this statement, believe that the hour is at hand when our country must mobilize its manpower and resources on a scale great enough to meet the real and present danger, and that scale is very great indeed.

We confront the actuality of the assault by vast Red Chinese armies on the United Nations forces in Korea. We confront the condition of military weakness in Western Europe, a condition seriously worsened by recent shocking developments in the Far East. We confront the fact that in these circumstances American power is far from adequately mobilized. We confront the fact that we can find no safety by withdrawal from overseas and by attempting to make the North American continent impregnable—that would be a counsel of despair and defeat.

Even in this crisis we totally reject the idea of a preventive war. Nor do we accept the idea that war with the Soviet Union is inevitable—unless the Soviet so wills it. On the contrary, we believe that the great objectives of our foreign policy and military policy—working in common with the other free countries in the United Nations—should continue to be the attainment of an enduring peace, looking toward a condition in which the beginnings of world disarmament may be made. But we are convinced that there is no hope of accomplishing these objectives so long as the military position of the free countries remains as weak as it is today.

The aggressive designs of the Soviet Union are unmistakably plain. Its Asiatic ally and satellite has launched an all-out attack upon the United Nations forces in Korea. In Western Europe the ability of the United States Air Force to inflict heavy damage on Russia's strategic centers has been the chief deterrent to a full-scale Communist attack. Radical improvements in defense against air attack, together with growing ability of the Soviet Union to produce atomic bombs, is progressively weakening the effectiveness of this restraint. Unless an adequate supplement for the atomic potential of the United States is brought into existence the time may soon come when all of continental Europe can be forced into the Communist fold, and the British Isles placed again in even graver peril than in 1940, at sacrifices in blood and wealth that the Kremlin would accept. No scruples of conscience will stand in their way.

In our view, the necessary supplement to our present atomic leadership is an allied force in being strong enough to furnish effective resistance to military aggression. Such a force in readiness to execute the decisions of the free countries assembled in the United Nations would make those decisions respected. That force does not exist. To meet the need, it must be promptly built. To create it, the United States must take the leadership. The European nations will make the greater effort required only if the United States takes a firm stand beside them, provides the balance of the equipment needed, and, most important of all, makes a powerful contribution of troops.

Our part will call for greater sacrifices than any our people have yet been prepared for. Since our contribution will include forces in Europe and in the Far East, as well as a strategic reserve in this country, the total program will of necessity be a large one, calling, we believe, for a total United States armed force of at least 3,500,000 men.

Also, the danger of an all-out war is so serious that all of our young men must have military training. But universal military training alone is no longer an adequate solution of the problems which now face us because it does not provide a force in being.

The time has come for a new concept that universal service in defense of our freedom is a privilege and an obligation of our young men. To accomplish this with the least interference with education, with business and professional careers, and with family life, this service should commence at the age of 18 or upon graduation from high school, whichever is later. Two years of such military service, including training, will be necessary, and the program should embrace radically broadened standards of fitness.

We recognize that many detailed provisions interpreting and applying these principles remain to be worked out, and we expect shortly to present concrete proposals.

The above program would, of course, be a supplement to the selective service law, not a substitute for it.

But in addition to providing military manpower, this country must expand the program for equipment and supplies far beyond goals already announced. This will be a hard task, calling for development of the strongest possible organization to supervise our military procurement here and abroad. It will require submission to economic controls more exacting than those now in effect, particularly in the field of credit, Government and private. It will also render necessary a sharp reduction in Government spending for nondefense purposes.

The doubt is not whether such a program is too arduous. The doubt is whether it is arduous enough. Certainly it is not nearly as drastic as the conditions which make it necessary. The price is high, but we believe it must be paid. It is, in our judgment, the only chance of averting a war of world dimensions, or of assuring victory if, in spite of all efforts to maintain the peace, the Soviet Union insists in precipitating world war III. We shall at the least have created strength which may convince the 14 men in the Kremlin that further aggression will not pay.

The Committee on the Present Danger has been formed in the American tradition by civilians acting on a nonpartisan basis. It will enlarge its membership and strive to further the above purposes. To this end we are already studying certain specific problems, and will from time to time make reports to the public dealing with them.

The bitter fact is that our country has again been thrust into a struggle in which our free existence is at stake, a struggle for survival. We have no time to lose.

Julius Ochs Adler, Raymond B. Allen, Frank Altschul, James Phinney Baxter III, Laird Bell, Lewis H. Brown, Harry A. Bullis, Vannevar Bush, Will L. Clayton, James B. Conant, R. Amaral Cutler, Harold W. Dodds, Charles Dollard, Edward S. Greenbaum, Monte M. Lemann, William L. Marbury, Frederick A. Middlebush, John Lord O'Brian, Robert P. Patterson, Howard C. Petersen, Stanley Resor, Robert E. Sherwood, Robert G. Sproul, Tracy S. Voorhees, Henry M. Wriston.

Emergency This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, among us who are not painfully aware of the apathy and complacency of our Nation toward the menace which threatens our very existence.

In this hour of crisis many eloquent and forceful voices have been raised in an effort to awaken the Nation. Among these the voice of Mr. Donald J. McQuade, the national commander of the Catholic War Veterans, raised an intelligent and unspectacular appeal to our people, should merit our attention.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Commander McQuade's call to action, Emergency This, which appeared in the January 1951 issue of the Milwaukee County Vet, and commend it to the Members for their careful consideration:

EMERGENCY THIS

(By Donald J. McQuade, national commander of CWV)

It becomes apparent as the critical stages of the present global situation wends their ways, propelled by basic materialistic and atheistic programs of complacency and anti-God idealism, that we, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, white and black, man and woman, have come to the end of the proverbial rope. This endangers not only our lives but the lives and well-being of our children; not only our religion, but all sound Christian ideals; not only our American way of life, but the only progressive hope of the suppressed peoples of the world.

WE ARE COMPLACENT

We need not go far to find the use of materialistic and atheistic programs; need not analyze the mind of the self-styled atheist; need not question the attitude of our neighbors; but definitely ask ourselves what we have done with the gifts of liberty, freedom, and justice. Have we used our freedom individually, to stanchly defend and promote true Americanism as only a private citizen can, or have we been materialistically complacent in our duties to God, to our country, and to one another?

WARNINGS ARE IGNORED

Throughout history the severest struggle of mankind has been to obtain liberty in keeping with his dignity as a human being and so necessary for the fulfillment of his most sacred aspirations.

Yet during the world wars our people have too often stated openly, "Why are we fighting? What do we owe this cause?" Yes, and today, even in the face of utter domination and complete destruction of our ideals—at any time we have been warned, may come the claw of the hammer and sickle to disjoint the links of a free unity and in its stead proclaim a slave state—we are still complacent. Where? Not in Poland. It has happened there; not in Czechoslovakia, it has happened there; not in Yugoslavia, there too it has happened. For none of these conquered territories is there fear, but for the articulate and carefully-laid plan of control and domination of these United States.

MUST REJUVENATE OUR IDEALS

The iron curtain is not able to keep from our minds, our hearts, and our bodies the sting of terror and loss of ideals that Russia is continuing to expound. Yet, in the face of this peril that could befall us, Americans still find themselves liberal with their liberty, free with their freedom, and irreligious with their religion; for example, our Supreme Court upholds godlessness as a part of liberty and anti-Americanism as a part of freedom, and our churches during special prayers for peace continue to be unattended.

The tenets necessary for the period which we are experiencing will go down in history as mere words, if there is not an immediate rejuvenation of the ideals upon which our great Nation was founded. We must vigorously move to restore the faith to our people in God as the Supreme Ruler and Guarantor of inalienable rights.

The news of the hour will not allow us to be presumptuous. At once we must make ourselves and our families ready for sacrifices that we have never known, to assure for our own generation and the generations to come the continuance of life with inalienable rights.

APPLY CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

There is a crying need for the stoppage of the disconcerting decay that is occurring within. Americans must overnight refortify themselves with the knowledge of the principles of Christ and of our country, and a sincere demonstration of them. Our children must be taught the principles of restraint and discipline; the mother and father to respect their sacred contract; employers to take an honest interest in the rights of employees; employees to take cognizance of the rights of employers; and all of us, to consider and appreciate our basic liberties in the light in which they were bestowed upon us by the Creator.

TAKE A DETERMINED STAND

In complete trust that Americans and other free people of the world still have within them the native ability to defend and protect their liberties, we believe that the threatening fangs of terror with which Russia is striking, will give us, who can be called upon to be the world defenders of freedom, a new and invigorated will. Only through sacrifice, sweat, and determination, and with the help of God, will freedom be restored to suppressed, helpless people, and will freedom be protected in our loved land. Only then can we ourselves enjoy real progressiveness in the fear and love of God and progressiveness in the American way of life.

ALL MUST COOPERATE

Many of us will be recalled to military status. Our leaving will cause certain sadness and sacrifice to our wives and mothers of our children. Our women may be mustered to bolster our defense. Our industry will be called upon to produce untold quantities. Our scientists and technicians will be found working far into the night. Our Government officials will be bound by a deeper sense of responsibilities and keener consideration of decisions. No room for profiteers. No basis for strikes. No realm for politics. No place for the weak. No time for the slacker. Emergency this.

You've Been Cold for as Long as You've Lived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the article by Jim G. Lucas, Scripps-Howard staff writer, which appeared in the January 17 Washington News.

This report relates in realistic language the hardships endured by our combat troops in Korea. The article follows:

YOU'VE BEEN COLD FOR AS LONG AS YOU'VE LIVED

(By Jim G. Lucas)

SOUTH OF WONJU, January 17.—It's the cold, the awful uncompromising cold, that gets you.

There's no describing it. Some people call it "frostbite."

Frostbite, hell. That's not the word when the flesh falls from a man's feet. Not when the toes swell and burst out of the shoes. Not when the hands turn black and the finger joints swell as big as a baby's elbow.

Somebody ought to be able to describe what the men are going through day after day on these wind-swept mountains in central Korea. Up here where it's 32 below zero. Where the winds cut like a razor. Where men haven't been out of clothes for 15 days. Haven't taken off sweat-soaked socks. Haven't been by a fire for 2 weeks. Haven't had a real sleep.

NO WAY

There ought to be a way to tell you about it but I don't know how. Not with words like frostbite. Not with any temperate zone words I know.

I'm not writing about myself. I'm cold all right. But I'm not sleeping in the mountains tonight. I'm sleeping in a valley where it is 21 below. Where at least I will have a fire and lights. My rations will be warm. And when I go to bed it will be inside a warm sleeping bag with a roof overhead. When I get up tomorrow I'll have dry socks and shoepacks. The all-night fire takes care of that. And I will have slept. That's important. A man needs sleep.

Up in the mountains it's different. I know. I was there this afternoon. I came back because I couldn't take what those men are taking. Just getting there was different. Three to five hours over the worst mountain passes in this part of Korea. Icy roads. Narrow horseshoe curves. Stalled trucks. Steaming convoys. Wrecks. And always the cold. The awful bitter, uncompromising, relentless cold.

Over by the mortar platoon I watched a weary young lieutenant greet a handful of replacements. The kids obviously just recently arrived from the States. Now they were in a terrible new world. A war they had been reading about was concentrated right here. They couldn't have come at a worse time. Twenty-five yards away heavy mortars were firing salvoes. Jets were strafing nearby hills. Artillery was going all-out.

"You men probably have been wondering why we forgot to give you sleeping bags." The lieutenant wanted to sound hard, but only succeeded in sounding tired.

"O. K., I'll tell you. You don't sleep at night up here. Get that? You'll have no sleeping bags. We got them but we shipped them back. Those things are death traps. Zip yourself up in one and what happens? I'll tell you. Some Chink slips in and slits your throat while you're trying to uncorset yourself."

"Don't get me wrong," the lieutenant continued. "Don't get scared, damn it. Scared men are dead men. You got a good chance of getting out of here alive. Keep your eyes open and most of you will get out in one piece. Only remember this: No sleeping. That's all."

The night comes and these kids all in fox holes. The holes are not very deep because the frozen ground is too hard. There's a little rice straw on the bottom and each man has a single wool blanket. You've seen the type. They sell them in war-surplus stores. Probably you appreciate how much protection one blanket offers when it's 32 below. It snows and the wind roars.

ATTACK AT DAWN

Usually—around dawn—the Reds attack. Sometimes it's only a probing patrol. But other times—like this morning—it's four or five companies. Some men tell me they welcome that. It gives them a chance to get the blood circulating again. Sometimes somebody gets killed. But what the hell?

Lots of these kids have troubles which are their own fault, of course. They haven't changed socks when they could. They haven't washed their feet. They have done a hundred things they shouldn't and failed to do a hundred things they should have. So their feet begin to crack and bleed and before they know it, they've had it.

These kids have been at grips with the enemy for 17 days and 17 nights. They never let up. They never can rest. They never can relax.

THEY'RE STILL FIGHTING

But they're not complaining any more than soldiers always complain and they're still fighting. It may be their fault, but you have got to admire the way they take it.

It's just that godawful cold. That bitter, uncompromising cold. You've forgotten what it is to be warm. You just know you're cold. That you always have been cold. As long as you have lived you've been cold.

Extension of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, Congress will have to give early attention to the question of extending and strengthening rent control in order to prevent inflation and injustice during the emergency. In this connection, I believe the attached article from the Peoria, Ill., Star, of December 21, 1950, will be of interest to all Members since it graphically describes the useful work being done by the rent advisory boards throughout the country:

RENT DISPUTES ADJUSTED BY ADVISORY BOARD'S WISDOM

(By Theo Jean Ahrends)

To bring a landlord and tenant face to face (and particularly when one has filed a complaint about the other), is a nerve-wracking possibility.

Despite the danger, the Peoria Rent Advisory Board continues to confront landlords and tenants on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month, armed with the Federal Rent Act of 1950 and a sense of equity.

Giving their time (sometimes as much as 4 hours each evening), the members of the board review decisions rendered by the rent control office and then make what they consider a just recommendation to Area Rent Director H. S. Hellman, who also gives his time to the hearings without pay. Any landlord or tenant who complains he has not had a fair hearing has certainly not been before this board.

On a typical review evening a week ago only two board members and Mr. Hellman could be present. Those waiting to be heard were told this was not a quorum but were asked if they wished to go ahead. They did.

First to come into the brightly lighted rent office from the dim corridor of the post-office basement was a stoutly built young woman, in this case the landlady, who was appealing an order to refund $300 to the tenant, a dark-haired young man accompanied by Attorney Hudson Sours.

Why had the young woman charged above-ceiling rent? Why, specifically, had she charged $65 a month? The board wanted to know. The house payments had been $35 a month, she said, the installment payments for storm windows were $20 a month and by adding $10 a month to make up the annual taxes, the rent added up to $65 a month.

Moreover, said the young woman, she had kept only one room in the house for herself; the tenant had four rooms for his family. She had kitchen privileges only on the week ends when she brought her two children home with her. It was at their (tenant's) invitation that I used the house freely; I used to baby-sit for their kids.

LOST INVESTMENT

Now the house was gone, too, sold for $6,000, although it had cost $7,500 and she had added $3,000 worth of improvements. Suddenly the young woman spoke out in a tear-tight voice, "I have just this to say. In the first place I don't know where I'd get the money if I have to pay it. I'm not asking anyone to help me. I'm supporting two children and working to do it. But I haven't asked the Government or anyone to help."

Murmurs of reassurance went around the room. Then attorney Sours asked, "Would you be able to pay $50 or $60 if you had, say 3 months to pay it?" She would. "Then if that's agreeable with you (to the tenant), let's say $50 in 75 days."

Not all cases solve themselves. Into the landlord's chair next came a thick-set, short man in overalls and striped shirt, a brown cardigan sweater buttoned tightly about him and his former tenant following close behind. Both sat down, in chairs not more than 2 feet apart, facing the board.

The charge again was overcharging. The man who owned the house on Bigelow, read Mr. Hellman from the original complaint, had charged his tenant $23 a week for 16 weeks, and then $18 a week for 10 weeks. The house was originally registered with a $40 a month ceiling, later increased by the rent office to $60 a month. Overcharges amounted to $158. The tenant wished to collect.

While landlord and tenant and board members listened, Mr. Hellman read more. A rent office inspector had made a report on the house. It read, "Structure poor, about 50 years old, exterior in need of painting; interior in need of paint, one room not furnished, other furnishings sparse, linoleum on floor—no scatter rugs, private bath, old fixtures, old refrigerator—runs constantly, doesn't freeze."

The landlord, by definition, had a house in the classification of "zone 5," wherein the rental range was $50 to $55 a month with heat and water furnished and garage. But his tenant had paid $92 and then $72 a month and paid his own utilities. On his own account to the board he had also fired the furnace and mowed the lawn.

Why?

DESPERATE FOR HOUSE

"Because I moved in in the winter when I had to have a place to stay. I was living in another place owned by him (the landlord present), a one-room concrete floor apartment. It was cold and I had a little boy who was sick and I was desperate for a place to stay."

Were there any extenuating circumstances for the landlord? His attorney pointed out that the tenant had his brother staying with him while he paid the $23 a week, and that the landlord reduced the rent to $18 when the brother left. (It was still $8 above the ceiling set.)

Board Chairman Clarence Hillyer wanted to know if four was above the occupancy limit for the kind of apartment. "No," answered Hellman—checking through his code—"six is the limit."

"That's not all," interposed the tenant. "When he told me to move out he said he was going to move in (a legitimate reason for eviction). But I think foul tactics were used to get me to move out. He hasn't moved in yet."

There was also the question of a receipt. The rent office had one for $23 signed by the landlord. He had signed it under pressure it seemed. "Why do you object to signing a receipt for money you receive as rent?" asked Hillyer. "Just never got in the habit of it," the landlord returned. (Signing of receipts, with amount indicated, not just "paid in full," is required by rent law.)

Since the landlord was a "repeater" in offenses, Hellman pointed out, the board was not bound by the refund indicated and could penalize the landlord up to triple damages. But after both tenant and landlord departed, members decided for a $100 refund. The tenant, could if he wished, refuse to accept and take the case into court where he might collect triple damages. The board hoped the settlement was "equitable."

COMPROMISES

The board had convened at 7 p. m. By 10:45 p. m. it had also considered a case on Aiken avenue where a landlord had failed to register with the rent office and when finally registered had refused to reduce his rent from $60 to $40. He said he had to have $30 or sell the house. The board compromised at $50.

In the case of a house on South Bourland, the bank seeking relief was asked to turn in D-1 forms, showing actual expenditures, and D-106 forms, showing fair net operating income needed. A landlord, protesting that his rent increase was not yet sufficient to cover his added costs, was asked to file the D-106 form.

One landlord, who told the board his tenants had agreed to the increase he sought because they understood about the rising costs of maintenance and repair, was referred to a later meeting, the board taking the position that both parties should be present.

Close to 11 o'clock, the men who had put in eight hours of their own work before coming to the rent office, closed their briefcases and shrugged into their overcoats. To give both landlord and tenant a chance to "explain" personally what could not be told adequately on paper, it had taken almost four hours.

Members of the local advisory board are currently—Jack A. Coney, John H. Strawhun, Byron E. Huston, Clarence G. Hillyer and Daniel E. Horan. For Mr. Hellman it was only one of six such evenings a month. He meets with the Macomb-Canton board once a month; with Galesburg board on two Friday evenings a month and with the Bloomington board one Monday evening each month.

Confusion Confounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a splendid thought-provoking article, written by Louis Bromfield, the noted agriculturist and author. This article appeared in

the January 15, 1951, issue of the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal:

In Washington we are certainly suffering from a confusion compounded of confusion and tragically the confusion finds its way into the hearts of all of us. It seems to me that much of the confusion arises from hypocrisy, dishonesty, and the deliberate and calculated misuse of words. Instead of dealing with realities and truth, the administration and in particular the State Department is dealing with a fog of illusions, shifty maneuvers, and deliberate deception.

Each time that I read in the newspapers or hear over the radio the term "United Nations forces now fighting in Korea," something turns over inside of me. Why does this hypocrisy exist? The war in Korea is between American forces and those of Soviet Russia and her puppet China. All the supplies and expenses are furnished by the American people. Not 1 percent of the troops are supplied by the other nations included in the UN. Why does the administration insist on referring to a full-scale tragic and disastrous war as a police action when it is war being fought by us virtually single-handed?

What, indeed, has the UN turned out to be but an agency which has shilled and shalled and hamstrung our efforts in a bitter war. Our State Department and our military leaders, hamstrung first of all by President Truman himself, cannot fight an all-out war. They must await the consent and decisions of the UN made up of other countries playing both ends against the middle, while our own American soldiers are being frozen, wounded, and killed. We cannot bomb the supply sources and lines in Manchuria without the permission of the UN. This will never come so long as European nations want to continue their trade in war materials used against us and Great Britain wants to protect Hong Kong from attack as a port out of which she is making money while we pay in lives and expense.

What is the UN anyway? It is not the only world alliance of nations. There are two—the UN and the Cominform nations. Soviet Russia, under a plan worked out by Alger Hiss, Secretary of State Acheson and others, has the power to veto and block nearly all decisive collective action. Soviet Russia and her satellites all sit on the UN which even invites an aggressor nation like Soviet China to present its utterly destructive case. None of our side sits in on the Cominform UN. We admit Yugoslavia and reject Spain. And not only are we as a nation and the UN as an organization hamstrung by the Soviet group but confusion is created by every nation which wants to save itself at the expense of the United States. The philosophy seems to be, you protect us but don't do anything rough which might involve us in a war. Just fight a war with one hand tied behind your back and we'll be safe.

In the Western Europe that remains free there are approximately 330,000,000 of people. In the United States there are 150,000,000, yet President Truman drafts ours sons and brothers with the avowed intention of sending them to Europe to defend these 330,000,000. We have already contributed about fifty billions to the economic welfare of these 330,000,000, and we are expending more billions to arm them, yet they make very little effort to defend themselves. The Labor Government of Great Britain clearly places its mangy Socialist ideals above the welfare of the nation and the free world itself. It insists upon nationalizing the vital steel industry and throwing it into the confusion and inefficiency and bureaucratic management in the midst of the worst crisis the western world has ever known.

Washington tells us that aid to Great Britain under the Marshall plan has ended and in the same breath tells us that we are paying two and a half billion to Great Britain to help her arm. What kind of silly double talk is this? What difference does it make to a Government on the verge of bankruptcy whether we call the two and a half billions Marshall-plan or military aid? It's all in the same pot, and we American citizens pay it while we draft the best of our young men to do the fighting not only in Asia, but, if Truman has his way, in Europe as well.

Truman cries "Wolf! Wolf!" and declares an emergency when there is no emergency save the unpreparedness which grew out of the politicking and inefficiency of his own administration and the high command of the Armed Forces, which spent fifty billions in 5 years to achieve a state of unpreparedness. It is not possible to cry "emergency" again and again and again. What, therefore, happens when a real emergency arrives?

What is it we are trying to do? Whither are we bound? Why do we go on calling Communists in this country Communists instead of what they are—a Soviet Russian fifth column of saboteurs. We cannot meet any situation or even save ourselves so long as we deal with hypocrisies, deceits, and secret agreements designed to sell the American people a bill of goods under false pretenses. Or is all this because Stalin, before the whole world, has made fools of certain high officials at the very top of our Government?

Suspension of the Import Tax on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H. R. 256, providing for the suspension of the copper-import tax for the duration of the national emergency.

The following editorial from the December 22, 1950, issue of the Waterbury, (Conn.) Republican, and the accompanying letter from the C. R. Norgren Co. of Denver, Colo., are particularly pertinent to the need for rapid enactment of that legislation.

EXPLANATION DUE

We hope that every Member of the United States Senate who voted against suspension of the copper tariff when it was brought up again Wednesday is prepared to answer for his action.

Every Senator who voted against the copper bill should be prepared to explain why he was willing to approve a measure which will add millions of dollars a year to the cost of defense material.

Each Senator who shouted his opposition in the voice vote that killed this legislation should be ready to explain his willingness to risk a shortage of strategic materials at a time of national emergency in order to satisfy the political demands of the copper bloc.

The legislators who killed the chances of the Connecticut copper measure should be ready to explain why they favored a policy which risks diverting South American copper to users who won't necessarily be helping the United States in a military showdown that might confront us any minute.

They should be prepared to explain why they favor a policy which is designed to deplete American copper reserves rather than to conserve them against a time of even greater need.

The opponents of the copper bill should have some explanation of why they were willing to support a policy which helps the Reds in South America by driving a diplomatic wedge between the United States and Chile.

Unless the state of world affairs begins to show some improvement pretty soon these economic Pollyannas are going to have some tall explaining to do.

C. A. NORGREN CO.,
Denver, Colo., January 11, 1951.

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Representative, Connecticut, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I have been informed that you have been actively striving to eliminate the import duty on copper which was reinacted this past summer. I have written many Congressmen and Senators with respect to this matter and those of us in industry are totally at a loss to justify import duty on copper which is in short supply and which is selling at the highest price in history.

On the contrary, we feel that copper should be brought in here in the greatest possible abundance from every source on earth in order to reduce the drain on our own natural resources. Copper is not an expendable item in our economy. We only have a few producers of any consequence in the United States. Marginal mines should not be considered as a source to fill the breach. The best they could possibly do would be a token tonnage, and, although I am fully in favor of developing these mines to see what their capabilities are, we know that they cannot be great.

Most of all, we are concerned with the fact that if we go on treating copper as an industry to be protected under prevailing prices we are merely hastening the day when we will become a mineralogical desert so far as this strategic material is concerned. Patriotically, the thing to do is to exhaust every foreign source of supply and conserve our own. Then, too, the addition of the 2-cent import duty is terribly confusing. Because of the short supply and world demand the importer merely adds the 2 cents so that we receive invoices for domestic copper on a net basis and imported copper plus 2 cents, which, of course, makes cost accounting a very difficult problem.

Then, too, to further support the validity of bringing in all of the copper we possibly can is the fact that copper is definitely being sold on the black and gray market and we are asked by people, whom we had assumed to be perfectly respectful, to pay as much as 10 cents a pound more for this material when they purchase it from the hoarders. The same reasoning applies to zinc, tin, and lead. It is a sad commentary on the intelligence of the American people when they do not treat these compelling matters dealing with the ultimate preservation of our economy in a manner that makes just a little sense.

We are commending you highly on your efforts and sincerely hope that you will have some success in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,
C. A. NORGREN CO.,
CARL A. NORGREN,
President.

Waste by Nondefense Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, presents dismal prospects for the taxpayers of this country who are now faced with the certainty of additional sharp tax increases in the near future.

No one familiar with the attitude of most of the nondefense agencies since last June had any reason to expect that they would voluntarily accept the President's assertion in his message of January 8 that, "it, the Government, must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities." But it is shocking to learn of the determined resistance of certain Federal agencies to anything resembling ordinary prudence, to say nothing of rigid economy.

A glaring example is contained in the Department of Agriculture's proposals for the continued purchase of wholesome food commodities.

It intends to use $323,975,000 in the period between July 1, 1950, and June 30, 1952, to buy unknown quantities of butter, cheese, dried milk, and eggs.

It estimates the payment of $38,402,657 just to store these four commodities during that period.

It expects to take losses on sales of these commodities in the amount of $81,093,000.

This $443,470,657 would pay for the construction of the new large aircraft carrier in the bill passed by the House today, for 30 modern Navy fighter planes, and 85 modern Navy attack planes and still have enough to construct a heavy cruiser and two new-type destroyers to accompany the carrier.

I hope and believe that the Appropriations Committee will bring this kind of insane and inexcusable waste to an abrupt end. But I think this would be even more certain if an aroused public were to make its voice heard by the executive department.

I do not have the slightest doubt that further study of the budget will reveal demands of many other Federal agencies not even remotely connected with our national defense and security. It is a difficult task to ferret these out in the 1,495 pages of fine print in the budget. But it must be done. The public is entitled to the full facts as to this continuing flagrant indifference and "government as usual" policy.

Genocide Outlawed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat entitled "Genocide Outlawed":

GENOCIDE OUTLAWED

The last war produced no more horrible chapters than the Lidice massacre, the Nazi gas-extermination camps, the "selective" sterilization programs. The Korean War, where a group of American prisoners were slaughtered at a general's direction, indicates the urge to mass racial killings will recur with every new conflict.

As of yesterday, however, genocide for the first time is a crime under international law. Ratified by the twentieth nation 90 days ago, the United Nations measure is now in force and requires signatories to pass laws providing imprisonment or death for persons convicted of killing or inflicting bodily or mental harm on a racial or religious group.

No one stands above this law. It applies to rulers, public officials, private citizens or any group. Nations which do not ratify need not set up enforcement machinery, but they are obligated to obey the injunction against killing, on penalty of being cited before the UN and the international court of justice. Nations refusing to act against genocide can be cut off from UN services, including the World Bank.

More than any other one man, credit must go to Raphael Lemkin, a Yale law professor whose Polish parents and 47 relatives were slain in the gas chambers of Auschwitz. Reared on a Polish farm, he rose to be public prosecutor in Warsaw. He quit in 1933 to practice law privately and to campaign against the genocide—he coined the word—he had seen in World War I.

He pleaded before the League of Nations and in the European capitals without result. With formation of the UN, he persuaded delegates of Cuba, Panama, and India to present a resolution calling for a treaty against genocide. Lemkin supervised, without official status, the drawing of the treaty, then saw it adopted by the general assembly on December 9, 1948. Even Russia and the satellites went along probably for propaganda reasons. None, however, has ratified the convention.

Today, Lemkin, at 49, is broke, in debt, and in bad health; but jubilant at his victory. He holds no hope this generation will see strict, universal enforcement of the law, but he is convinced the third generation will. When that day comes, let us hope, he may get the acclaim he deserves.

Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in connection with remarks which I made today regarding a bill to permit the President to veto single items in appropriation bills, I include two editorials, one from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and one from the Rochester Times-Union, calling attention in a forceful and effective manner to the imperative need today for drastic reductions in nondefense, nonessential expenditures.

The editorials follow:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle]

IF FAMILY RUNS WILD ON SPENDING—WHATY

Papa is the nominal head of the house and he has a few extravagances. Mama is the one who controls the purse. She is a warm-hearted person with several children and a host of relatives who look to her for some financial help.

Papa earns $3,500 a year and he manages to keep some of the money for himself. He likes fancy neckties, an occasional snort with the boys and he is a sucker for all kinds of fishing gear. Mama looks on with a tolerant eye but she cannot resist the pleas of the children or the plaintive wails of those relatives. The result is that papa has a troublesome note in a finance company; he's in arrears on several household purchases and he's getting something of a reputation as a week-end cadger at the factory. If he keeps on this way, and if he is able to continue his borrowings, he will die a bankrupt.

He might, of course, make the big decision, decide to quit his little extravagances, exercise his authority as head of the family, and see to it that mama doesn't have such a free hand with the purse. That's a difficult decision. It means he would miss his recreations, some old friends would drop him, and mama would be fit to be tied.

Right there we have a picture of the Presidency and the Congress. The administration has its extravagances. It makes all sorts of fair-weather friends by free spending. Congress, the mama, has the finest, sleekest lot of hanger-on relatives you ever saw. They have it good.

Papa faces a crisis right now. He is loaded down with expenses he cannot control. He is afraid to ask mama to cut her expenditures. The two are headed for bankruptcy and don't know what to do about it.

When we prepared for World War I our national debt was about $1,000,000,000. It was forty billion when we started into World War II. As we rally for defense of the country again, the debt is more than two hundred and fifty billion.

Most of the time in the last 20 years we have spent more money on Government than the Government could collect. This year our budget is about $60,000,000,000. Next year it could go as high as $75,000,000,000. Taxes of all sorts will be increased but we will have a deficit of at least $25,000,000,000. If we were to continue such deficits over a period of 10 years—and that is possible—we would have another debt of $250,000,000,000, doubling what we already owe. No dribbling about who owes whom will ever erase the fact that in interest charges alone we would face a staggering yearly cost.

Now the only place the administration can save is in nondefense spending. The Budget Director will tell you of fixed charges—pensions, interest, and the like. If you were to ask him about those nondefense costs in agriculture, in superwelfare activities, in foreign relief, he might smile wanly and say that, of course, he couldn't control those figures. Mama, the Congress, runs that program and she just can't bear to cut off the nephews, cousins, uncles, and aunts who have been depending upon her all these years.

If you think it is time to operate a common-sense financial program, go to the Congress with your demands and suggestions. If you think mama is a trifle nutty, tell her so. If enough of us tell her so she'll begin to believe we might be right. And if she has not gone completely, financially insane she might try to mend her ways.

[From the Rochester Times-Union of December 27, 1950]

AS WE SEE IT—TRUMAN LEADERSHIP URGED IN FINDING DEFENSE MONEY

Defense spending will take $75,000,000,000 next year. The most optimistic guess on revenue, including new taxes, is about $51,000,000,000, leaving a gap of $25,000,000,000.

Since defense spending at this rate or higher will continue for a protracted period, steps to close this $25,000,000,000 annual gap must be immediate and drastic.

Unless the free world's guns and tanks are backed by a sound economy in the United States, neither the spiritual nor physical force to resist communism can be mustered.

Soundness has to be attained by deep and immediate cuts in non-defense spending.

The President has said that it will be cut "to the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort."

Taking his cue from that, Senator BYRD in a letter to the President last Friday proposed that a beginning be made with cuts of $7,000,000,000 in domestic civilian programs including the postal deficit, by curbing the notorious, extravagant use of civilian manpower by the armed forces, and by cutting to one-half billion the foreign economic aid programs which are scheduled to end next year anyway.

But this is the least important part of Senator BYRD's letter. These immediate steps would close less than one-third of the gap.

Federal spending is so enormous because the total is an accumulation of commitments made by laws setting up programs that become a continuing drain on the Treasury from year to year.

Senator BYRD therefore suggests to the President that his budget proposals recommend to Congress action to "repeal, reduce, or suspend" enough commitments to meet the need. He calls on the President to exert his leadership for joint legislative-executive action to close the money gap.

This is what to do and how to do it. Reductions in non-defense spending of the size and scope required can be made only by reexamining all the commitments made since the Federal Government started to mushroom. This reexamination cannot be effective without the leadership of the President.

The security of the United States and the free world is as dependent upon financial soundness at home as upon strength in the field.

China's Red Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Father Raymond J. De Jaegher, from the Freeman for January 8, 1951. Father Raymond De Jaegher went to China from his native Belgium in 1930. From 1937, when the Communists occupied the country of An-Kwo—Hopeh—he had ample opportunity to know their generals and to observe their methods. After 2 years as a Japanese prisoner during the war he returned to his mission. Since leaving China in 1949 he has lectured widely in Europe and the United States on social conditions under the Communists. The article follows:

CHINA'S RED ARMY

(By Raymond J. De Jaegher)

Every soldier in the ranks of the Chinese Communists believes it is his mission to liberate the world from "imperialism." First, the fight of Mao Tse-tung's armies was directed against Japanese imperialism; then against Chiang Kai-shek and the National Government of China, represented to them as "imperialistic." Now the Red Chinese hordes have been loosed against alleged American "imperialism" in Asia. The enemy held before the Chinese Communists by their leaders has changed his guise like a chameleon, according to directives from Moscow. But always these soldiers are prepared for an international struggle, to create not only a "new China," but a new world.

The tactics of the Chinese Red armies reminded me of mercury. Strike a pool of mercury on a table, and it will seem to be destroyed as a unit. But soon the droplets, scattered in all directions, will roll back together again.

Before an enemy superior in number or armaments, the Communist troops would scatter very fast. Then they would reassemble immediately after the departure of the enemy. If the enemy is not strong, speedy mobile units will arrive in far greater number than the opposing forces, will strike unexpectedly, and will always win the battle. The Chinese Communist soldiers are trained for swift action in guerrilla warfare.

Once I visited General Lu Cheng-Tsao in Chen Wei (Po-Yeh) in the early morning. His forces consisted of about 50,000 men of the Central Hopeh's armies. In one night they had assembled from the southern part of Shulu some 100 lis (35 miles) to the south. Already units were set up in villages all around, and were linked with the general by telephone.

The secret services of the Chinese Reds were very good. They always knew the exact force of the Japanese along the railroads and highways, and all about the enemy's city garrisons, even if he changed his units very often. When they saw the Japanese concentrating their strength for a mopping-up operation, the Communist forces would move into the mountains or other parts of the country where the enemy had only small garrisons at that time.

When the Communists attacked, it was always in overwhelming strength, greatly outnumbering their opponents. They would fight until the enemy had no more ammunition and would be obliged to surrender.

The formation of the armies was significant. First always came some elements of the civilian population that the Communists wanted to finish off; these men were poorly armed. For example, to take strategically important Kao Pei Tien, along the Peiping-Hankow railroad, the Communists tied local peasants together by their arms in threes—even some women—and gave them a few grenades to throw in front of them when they were marched against the enemy. These poor people were sacrificed just for the purpose of wasting the enemy's ammunition.

Behind the masses of the people came the "min ping," the local militias. The Reds always give some military training to their civilian populations. The best among the village militias will be taken into the regular army, where the danger is not so great and a soldier's family enjoys many advantages. Hence the boys in the villages will work hard to improve their militia.

Bringing up the rear are the Red shock troops, who arrive at the end of the battle to deliver the final blow. Their attack is launched only when the first two groups have been practically annihilated or have found a way to slip out of the danger zone. By this time the enemy has been surrounded, and cannot get further supplies of ammunition except by air—which is very difficult when a contingent has only a small space in which to defend itself. The shock troops I saw were composed of very young men, strong physically and well equipped. They are trained in mountain bases from which reinforcements are sent continuously to keep the units at the same strength.

The Communists used to send word before an attack, warning of their strength and announcing that the enemy would be permitted to retreat if they left behind part of their ammunition. Many times I have seen boxes of ammunition left for the Reds by the Japanese, particularly at Ta Ly Ko Chwang and at Ta Wu Niu, both in the district of An-Kwo.

Most of the great battles for the possession of Chinese cities were fought during the night—to prevent action by planes—and at some distance from the city. For example, the battle of Peiping, one of the fiercest in North China, took place in two small towns between Peiping and Kalgan; the combined Communist forces numbered ten times those of their adversaries.

The three qualities that the Communist leaders praise most in their soldiers are: Yeh Yen, eyes that can see during the night; Tieh Kiao, feet strong as iron, trained to travel fast; Chen Hsien Tou, a stomach that requires little food.

The officers of China's Red Army are nearly all Communist Party members, accustomed to obeying rigid party discipline without a word of discussion. Only party members can be promoted quickly. The officers live on the same level with their soldiers, except that they have more responsibilities. When there is no fighting, officers must meet with their men every day to give them special ideological training, explaining why they are fighting for a new China. Most of the soldiers are peasants who have left their homes for the first time and have no desire to fight. But they are systematically indoctrinated with the idea that they must battle for a great international cause. Infiltration of the Nationalist armies by secret agents helped bring about the Communist victories. During the war against Japan these agents were sent in large numbers to "volunteer" for service with Chiang's armies. They even penetrated the national military academies, where they showed ardent patriotism and tried to work themselves up to key positions—from which they could spy and propagandize. Inside the armies Communists created cells to spread propaganda.

Here is an example of the effectiveness of this Red under-cover work: Immediately after VJ-day, Gen. Sun Lien-Chung, commander of the Eleventh War Zone, came to Peiping to accept the surrender of the Japanese Army in North China. He was appointed governor of Hopei Province. A brave officer and an honest man, he had won important victories over the Japanese. But Communist elements had worked hard among his staff. His chief of military operations, Gen. Sie Che-Yuan, was in the service of the Communist Party. And at the head of the planning committee for Hopei Province was Yu Sui-Ts'ing, a former Protestant pastor who was linked with Gen. Li Chi-Shen, now a prominent Communist.

Gen. Ch'eu Fong-Ch'eng, who served under General Sun, had a leading Communist Party member as his chief of staff, but was unaware of it. This chief of staff had all General Ch'eu's bodyguards replaced by Communists who could take control of the provincial government in Paoting, where General Ch'eu was garrison commander.

Such men in high positions under General Sun were responsible for all his defeats in north China. When these activities inside headquarters were finally discovered, it was too late. Most of the territory under his command in Hopei Province had been lost, and even a part of the territory in the strategical triangle of Peiping, Tientsin, and Paoting. An important railway junction controlling four provinces, Shih Chia Chwang, had been lost, and Generalissimo Chiang was obliged to remove General Sun from his command. More than 2,000 generals and officials were on the inside of this vast Communist plot.

The same tactics were used by the Communists in Mukden and Tsinchow, which led to the disaster of the national armies in Manchuria. The fall of Mukden was China's Stalingrad; its loss marked the beginning of Communist victory.

In the battle of Peiping in 1948–49 the over-all commander of North China's armies, Gen. Fu Tso-Yi, had strong support from the people. It is true that he made a few mistakes in the great battle of Peiping and Kalgan. But a major reason for his defeat was

the fact that one of his trusted generals, who had been with him for 20 years, was a top Communist, Gen. Teng Pao-Shan, who revealed his true identity to his commander in the midst of the battle. General Fu also discovered too late that his secret code officer was a Communist.

Through their secret agents the Communists always knew the exact strength of the National armies and of the neighboring garrisons. They then surrounded these small garrisons and took them one after the other with all their forces. They treated the Nationalist prisoners well. Giving them a few dollars, they would send them back home or to the National armies just for propaganda purposes. The Communists also distributed cards, telling the Nationalist soldier or officer that if he would come over to them with the card and his weapons, he would be welcomed and given the same grade and position in the Red Army.

Mao's men had a high-sounding slogan, "Chinese will not fight Chinese," and another, "No more civil war," which they used in their attempts to demoralize the National armies. But they never pointed out that the Communists had been the first to attack the National troops and the first to wage civil war.

A slogan the Chinese Communists use among themselves, however, is: "To win, three-tenths military strength is needed, and seven-tenths political and propaganda strength." Communist newspapers, books, and leaflets were left by the Red propagandists among the troops of the National armies in a continuous effort to break down morale.

The National Government of China allowed Communist newspapers to be published in Chungking, the Nationalist capital, but never would the Communists allow a Nationalist newspaper to be published in Communist territory. Communists everywhere preach about the freedom of the press, but they do not practice it. In China they had "bamboo curtains" from one Communist region to another, and kept strict control over publications in their regions. But if the free Chinese wanted some control over Communist publications, all the Reds and their sympathizers in that region would protest against "imperialistic and oppressive measures taken against freedom of thought."

A young Catholic boy of Tunglu bought, shortly after the war with Japan, a copy of Chiang Kai-shek's book, "China's Destiny." The Communists discovered that he had the book and immediately executed him as "a special agent of the Kuomintang."

A top Chinese Communist once said to me: "We Communists have three great enemies; first, the United States of America; second, the Catholic Church; third, Nationalist China under Chiang Kai-shek." But he immediately added that within China the order was not the same, but should be classified: first, Chiang Kai-shek; second, the United States of America; third, the Catholic Church. All the Chinese Red leaders whom I met from 1937 up to 1940 have always recognized that they owe their highest allegiance to Soviet Russia.

Unity Is Built on Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following excellent editorial by Mr. Cliff Ziegler from the Carlton-Yamhill (Oreg.) Review of January 11, 1951:

UNITY IS BUILT ON CONFIDENCE

President Truman has declared a state of emergency. We are told that communism threatens our very existence as a Nation. He asks for unity and singleness of purpose in fighting aggression.

With this we are in complete accord. For some years now we have been fighting over controversial domestic questions: the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, CVA.

If we are to win the big war we must stop these little wars. Therefore, for the sake of achieving unity, we propose that the President issue a statement that for the duration of the emergency all plans to put these ideas into effect will be dropped.

In fact, we as American citizens should demand this pledge from him. It is our right and it is his duty.

This is no time for petty politics or petty politicians. We cannot afford to be Democrats, Republicans, or New Dealers as long as a state of emergency exists.

Regardless of the merits their advocates claim for them, America has grown great without the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, or the CVA. It can exist a few more years without them.

Inasmuch as they only serve to divide us, let's put them on the shelf for the duration.

The Army's View of the Air-Ground Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Army has recently published a review of what the air-ground team has been accomplishing in Korea, and a prediction of what it will be able to accomplish as the result of the present buildup of our Armed Forces. In these days in which we still hear criticism of the United States Air Force for what it did or did not do in Korea, it is interesting to learn what the Army thinks about the Air Force. The article I refer to makes that very clear. The Army thinks the Air Force is great.

As an Army man myself, I have been surprised at the attacks on the Air Force made by a lot of people who ought to know better. The air-ground team in World War II was a winning team, with a know-how developed from months of hard campaigning. The air-ground team that is operating in Korea is also a great team. The Army knows it, and says so.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me the latest issue of Officer's Call, a magazine published monthly by the Department of the Army to furnish materials intended to assist commanders in maintaining the highest standards of integrity and professional ethics, and to inform all officers on significant military matters and national and international events. The latest issue of Officer's Call is devoted to just one thing—the article on The Air-Ground Team.

This article is a review of what has happened in Korea, including the difficulties that result from the peculiar nature of the Korean fighting. The article points out that one big lesson Korea holds for Army officers is that we generally require a fuller understanding of how to use tactical aviation. The Army and the Air Force, even before Korea, initiated a joint training program that calls for participation by every combat battalion in the United States in a type field exercise involving close air support with live bombs. The Korean situation disrupted the program but it has put new emphasis on the need for this type of training. The recently established Army air support center at Fort Bragg, N. C., will do much to bring about the widespread understanding of the doctrine and application of tactical aviation.

One of the most helpful things about this article in Officer's Call is that it points out the fundamental relationship of tactical aviation to ground warfare. The airplane, used tactically, is a new weapon for the queen of battles. Just as the infantry had to develop cooperation with the artillery, and mutual confidence founded on understanding of each other's problems and capabilities, so the Army today is developing the principles that must apply to the use of tactical air support. "We always use the most economical means to do the job," the Army says. Air support can be that means. "We are today," says this review, "on the threshold of opportunities in the field of air-ground development such as we have never before encountered." I am glad to find this recognition of the value of Air Force support to Army operations expressed so clearly and forcibly by an Army spokesman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article on "The-Air-Ground Team" from volume II, No. 9, of Officer's Call, an official publication of the Department of the Army.

The article, with illustrations omitted, is as follows:

THE AIR-GROUND TEAM

In its never-ending quest for weapons of greater mobility, range, and firepower, our Army is placing increased emphasis on the airplane to support ground troops.

The airman and the soldier have made great strides in learning to work together. But both agree on the need for continued improvement of doctrine and techniques to exploit fully the combat potentialities of the air-ground team.

During World War II, the air-ground team came of age.

As the war progressed, tactical air support played an increasingly important role in the success of ground troops. To be sure, not all air-ground operations were perfect. But there is no denying that support from the air gave the ground forces an added powerful punch that speeded our victory.

Members of the air-ground team knew how to work with each other and what to expect from each other. Ground commanders were accustomed to count on prompt, efficient air support when they needed it. This support was often as smooth-working as artillery—which is saying a lot.

A priceless ingredient of air-ground operations in World War II was teamwork based on know-how built up during months of hard campaigning. The practical knowledge was the sum of many skills, disseminated widely

among the agencies that made up the air-ground team.

After the war, a combination of factors permitted only limited training in air-ground operations. Army combat units and tactical air support units had little opportunity to work with each other.

When the Korean fighting began, practical skill in applying air-ground techniques had all but diminished to a lost art in comparison with late World War II standards. Moreover, initial shortages of critical equipment, key men, and other deficiencies tended to hinder smooth air-ground operations in the early days of the Korean campaign.

Fortunately, we were able to overcome these disadvantages—often through hurried improvisation. Despite handicaps, the air-ground team developed in Korea has taken a heavy toll of the Communist enemy.

AIR-GROUND ACTION IN KOREA

In Korea, air power has supported ground troops in virtually every way possible. Because of our immediate air supremacy, the Air Force assumed a close support role almost from the start. Air support was especially welcomed by those ground units whose normal artillery had not yet arrived.

Weather permitting, ground troops received almost continuous bombing and strafing support. As fighting progressed, our amphibious and airborne landings were screened with fighter and bomber protection. Troop carriers flew soldiers to and from Korea (the first ground units arrived there by air), transported paratroopers, and brought in cargo rivaling the amount of the Berlin airlift.

Most of the infantrymen and tankers who have fought up and down the rugged Peninsula of Korea are now combat veterans. They know that their own skill and courage plus that of their artillerymen and other ground units played the biggest part in stopping the Korean Communists and then striking back. But they also know they could not have succeeded without real air suport.

Many of our doughboys fighting in Korea have never met a pilot—unless one was shot down and landed in their lines. They do not know the airmen as they do the artillerymen and the tankers. But they have gained a real appreciation for what our fliers have done and are doing. Day and night—sometimes actually around the clock—Allied air power has blasted the Communist army. Korea is today dotted with the wreckage of Red trucks, tanks, and guns. Against heavy odds, many Allied ground attacks have succeeded largely because of air suport.

Soldiers fighting in Korea appreciate what the term "air support" means. Along with their own fire support, they have learned to count on it when they size up a job. They have learned, too, their own responsibility for the success of air-ground operations.

SOME AIR-GROUND DIFFICULTIES IN KOREA

Our top military leaders share the front-line soldiers' enthusiasm about what the airmen have done in Korea. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, summed it up early in September after a visit to the combat area:

"Like the Army, the Air Force had to switch from peace to wartime operation overnight. Gen. Walton Walker testifies that, but for what the fliers did those first few days, we would have lost Korea."

This is typical of what other observers have said about air support in Korea. They praise air units operating there. This does not mean, however, that air operations have been perfect, any more than the Army's have been. General Collins went on to explain:

"At the beginning, there was confusion over air support. But with the inevitable early creaking, the situation has steadily improved. Special Air Force teams rushed from the States to coordinate close support of ground troops; we now have one with each American division and have assigned others to Republic of Korea units. Now the system works."

EARLY DEFICIENCIES

Many of the "kinks" in the early Korean air operations stemmed from the same sort of difficulties the Army faced on the ground. Far East air groups were there to support the occupation. Initial shortages of trained men and communications equipment to work with infantry units existed partly because of the occupation mission, and partly because of budgetary ceilings which had limited the programs of all the services. At any rate, recently authorized budgetary increases for our Armed Forces should correct deficiencies of this kind.

Other difficulties grew out of the peculiar nature of the Korean fighting. For example, the first several weeks involved a delaying action on our part. Although not new in our thinking, this difficult operation has been relatively rare in our experience.

This is one of the problems that developed: the bomb line set for our own troops' safety actually proved a disadvantage in a fluid situation where the enemy, always probing for weak spots, could get between it and our own positions. (A bomb line is a precautionary line designated by ground troops beyond which air attacks may be made without clearance from ground forces.) Here the enemy was relatively immune until the bomb line could be lifted or special permission to bomb inside it could be obtained. While points of contact seesawed along a line marked by deep salients, the conventional bomb line became a somewhat unrealistic safety measure. This and similar difficulties have emphasized points which will need consideration in improving our air-ground techniques.

WE NEED PRACTICE

One big lesson Korea holds for Army officers is that we generally require a fuller understanding of how to use tactical aviation. Specifically, every combat troop leader must know what targets are appropriate for tactical aircraft and how to get air support. We need to understand also the limitations of tactical aviation and under what circumstances we cannot expect air support at all.

An obvious corollary is that we need actual practice—as much as we can get—in working with the air-control system used in obtaining and insuring the accuracy of air strikes.

KOREA MAY NOT BE A PROTOTYPE

We should be careful against extending the lessons of Korea too far. The fighting there has been a special type of warfare. The Korean Communists have used an odd combination of old and new weapons, old and new tactics. We have used many weapons of World War II, and the tactics our combat veterans knew have had to be modified at times. Future fighting in which we may be involved will not necessarily be like that in Korea.

Another thing to remember is that in Korea we have been almost unopposed in the air: This has permitted an unusually large part of our air strength to be used in close support of ground units. Further, in the limited geographical area involved, even the bombing of targets farthest removed from the battle area has been largely tactical. Certainly strategic bombing, to the limits of its present capabilities, has not been involved.

Korea has given us a good test of our air doctrine and techniques but not a complete or conclusive test.

STRATEGIC AIR POWER

In this issue we are concerned primarily which tactical aviation and what it does to assist ground troops. But we cannot understand its role without having some knowledge of what strategic aviation can accomplish. The two overlap in a number of ways.

For this reason we need not become involved in complicated attempts to define each category. The distinction is sufficiently clear for our present discussion if we think of these differences: strategic aviation includes aircraft and other facilities intended primarily for long-range bombardment with the most destructive types of weapons; tactical aviation operates at shorter ranges, generally using smaller aircraft and less powerful weapons against a wider variety of targets. Strategic air strikes at sources of enemy strength; tactical air denies effective application of his strength in a given battle area.

Besides the functional relationship between strategic and tactical air power, there are two additional aspects of strategic aviation which touch on our discussion. First, we are today devoting a very material part of our war potential to the building of a strategic air force second to none. This obviously affects the size of our tactical air forces. Second, a successful strategic air campaign, though it may not quickly bring about a decision, can contribute greatly to the ultimate success of our land and naval forces by weakening enemy means of resistance.

TACTICAL AIR IN EUROPE, WORLD WAR II

When we think of "air support of ground troops," many of us may visualize fighter bombers screaming down on an enemy strong point, blasting it to rubble, and thus clearing the way for the tactical success of infantry and armor. This type of close support is quite naturally the first concern of the embattled doughboy or tanker. But it is by no means the only kind of support tactical air gives to ground troops. This becomes evident when we review the air offensive in Europe during World War II.

We know the story of the German Luftwaffe. From the high point of its might in 1940, it was turned away over England by the Royal Air Force, and then gradually beaten back and reduced in strength by the growing Allied air offensive. By early 1944 the turning point was passed. German aircraft production was no longer able to keep up with losses. Hitler largely wasted the rest of his air strength on tasks of secondary importance and thus helped reduce the Luftwaffe's effectiveness.

In the last few months before the Normandy invasion, more and more of our fighters and shorter-range bombers concentrated on German-occupied airfields in France. The Luftwaffe's remaining power was rapidly destroyed. By D-day it was impotent against the Allied landings. One of the primary objectives of our air campaign had been achieved; at the time of the invasion and afterward, we enjoyed almost total air superiority in Europe. Most of our tactical air forces in that theater were able to operate thereafter in support of ground troops.

During the last few weeks before D-day, our tactical air forces also systematically knocked out rail and highway bridges along the Seine River from the English Channel to the outskirts of Paris. As the invasion began, more bridges were cut to the south and east of Paris.

SUPPORTING THE BEACHHEAD

A large part of the German armies were thus cut off in western France and separated from their sources of supply and reinforcement. Trapped in this area, they were subjected to a terrific pounding from fighter-bombers. Rail lines, trains, and convoys within the area were blasted so that movement by day was virtually impossible, and night movement was difficult. This series of air operations, designed to isolate the battlefield, made possible an Allied buildup in the beachhead much faster than the German commanders could assemble forces to counter it.

When our buildup reached sufficient strength to permit a breakout, the air forces

again played a major role. All available aircraft blasted an area along the St. Lo-Periers road about 6,000 yards wide by 2,500 yards deep. The blow fell on July 25, 1944. More than 1,500 heavy bombers dropped about 4,800 tons of bombs on the target area; approximately 400 medium bombers and 350 fighter-bombers worked it over with napalm and fragmentation bombs and strafing.

This unusually heavy air effort on a target immediately in front of friendly ground troops is hardly a typical mission. Yet it is illustrative of many hundreds of strikes—most of them on a smaller scale—delivered in close support of Allied army units in World War II.

THREE MAIN TASKS

The events we have just summarized demonstrate the three main objectives of our tactical air forces: gain and maintain air superiority—isolate the battlefield (also called interdiction)—and give close support to ground troops.

These three types of activity, sometimes given numerical designations and referred to as phases of an air campaign, have been the subject of occasional misinterpretation. Let's see if we can clarify them.

In the first place, all three phases may be going on at the same time. At least initially, a large part of our tactical air strength in a theater probably will be engaged in countering the attacks of enemy planes. This air defense complements the more aggressive missions aimed at seeking out and destroying enemy aircraft and air facilities. These tasks contribute directly toward gaining air superiority, and their ultimate objective is not reached until enemy air power is destroyed.

Our air superiority is by no means a concern of air forces alone. If the enemy controls the sky, our ground forces also must operate under great handicaps.

This does not mean that our aircraft concentrate solely on gaining air superiority while enemy planes contest us for control of the skies. The decision as to how much air effort will be allotted in a given period to air superiority missions and how much to isolating the battlefield or close support activities is made after weighing the facts. Phases overlap; we do not wait for one phase to end before we start another. Even during the fight for air superiority, for example, conditions may be such that aircraft also may be used in close support fighting.

Additionally, the term "air superiority" is a relative one. The degree of air superiority necessary for success varies with different operations and different conditions. It may mean control of the air for only short periods in specific areas. It may mean control over only a part of a combat area.

For example, consider the critical phase of an amphibious attack. When troops are disembarking and coming ashore, we need a much greater measure of air control over the segment of hostile shore involved than would be necessary after the troops have secured the beachhead. Another difficult operation demanding a high order of local air superiority is the capture and buildup of an airhead.

RECONNAISSANCE AND AIR TRANSPORT ROLES

Besides the actual combat operations of its fighters and bombers, tactical aviation has other important functions.

One of these, reconnaissance, is a continuing, day-and-night job. Modern fast reconnaissance planes cover areas far beyond the range of the ground soldier's patrols and observation posts, or even his liaison planes. Besides actually reporting what they have seen on their flights, reconnaissance pilots take photographs of several kinds, day or night. Also, through the use of special electronic equipment, limited reconnaissance can be carried out in bad weather. Both air and ground commanders benefit from the information these missions obtain. It has been said that up to 90 percent of an army's tactical information of the enemy is gathered by reconnaissance aircraft.

Although troop-carrier units usually are not a part of a tactical air command, air transport support may be vital in directly furthering land operations. Normally, troop-carrier units are theater forces and are not assigned to tactical air forces except in some cases for administrative purposes. This assignment under theater command permits their exploitation for strategic as well as tactical missions.

AIRBORNE NEEDS

Airborne warfare demands large numbers of passenger-cargo type planes. An army today must always be ready to exploit opportunities to react to emergencies requiring use of airborne troops. Once these troops are committed, they must be supported by air until relieved or reinforced overland.

We also are relying more on air transport in carrying out other ground operations. This is one of the ways we hope to make up in mobility what we may lack in total manpower and other resources. Troops and equipment as well as urgently needed supplies often can reach their destination in time only if moved by air. The vital role of air transport in the Korean campaign offers the most recent example.

Then there is the great morale importance, as well as the practical military value, in evacuating wounded men by air, taking them quickly to areas where the best medical care can be provided. Time saved means lives saved.

These jobs and many more are carried out by the troop carrier units assigned to the theater. The Army is now organizing its own special light air-transport forces. Army helicopter companies are being formed for the speedy movement of men, equipment, and supplies.

TACTICAL AIR ORGANIZATION

To exploit the speed, range, and versatility of aircraft, Air Force organization stresses the principle of flexibility. In general, units are standardized but may vary greatly in strength and composition. An air commander enjoys considerable latitude in organizing his forces for a mission. Moreover, as operations progress, he usually modifies this organization to meet changing requirements.

In our typical theater setup for combat operations, a single headquarters—that of the theater commander—directs all Army, Navy, and Air Forces assigned to the theater.

Each army group in the theater is usually supported by a tactical air command. The latter's headquarters is located with that of the army group and controls all its tactical air units according to the dictates of the common mission of the army group and the tactical air command.

Each field army is supported by a tactical air force. Again, the two headquarters are together, and close coordination between air and ground action is effected. Incidentally, this is normally the lowest level at which air commanders are physically present and working directly with ground commanders. All missions of the tactical air force are controlled from this point in much the same way that fire missions of artillery batteries are controlled from their battalion fire direction center.

At levels below the Army, there are air control agencies to help coordinate requests from subordinate units and to guide planes to their targets. There are also officers to insure air-ground coordination.

TACTICAL AIR FORCE

A tactical air force normally has these major components:

A headquarters which controls all operations and integrates them with those of the supported army.

An air control group for control of planes in flight.

A reconnaissance wing, including about 10 highspeed aircraft specially equipped for day and night photography and electronic (radar) reconnaissance.

Fighter aviation, which may include one or more all-weather groups (usually 36 planes each) and 2 to 8 fighter-bomber groups (equipped with jet or conventional fighters—total planes may vary from 250 to 800).

In addition, there are communication, engineer, transportation, and other units.

Detailed discussion of our newest aircraft's technical characteristics is not appropriate here. However, for our present purposes, we may think in terms of fighter planes with speeds ranging from a minimum of 185 to a maximum of 700 miles per hour, armed with 6 or more .50 caliber machine guns and carrying two 1,000 pound bombs or about twenty 5-inch rockets, or various combinations of rockets and smaller bombs. These aircraft may be used for air combat or strafing and tactical bombardment missions within a combat radius varying from 300 to 500 miles, depending on the type of plane and how it is loaded.

These data, purposely given in very general form, are useful only as reflecting in a general way the capabilities of our tactical air forces.

CLOSE SUPPORT MISSIONS

We are familiar with the artillery plan that usually accompanies a division or corps operation order. In this plan, provision is made for using every gun according to its range and effectiveness against targets in priority of their importance to the over-all commander's plan.

In the same way, the field army commander and the tactical air force commander work out a plan each day for the most effective use of air support during the next 24 hours. This close air support is integrated with the fire and movement of ground troops. Requests of lower units for air strikes in support of their contemplated operations are incorporated into the over-all air plan.

These lower-unit requests, plus necessary reconnaissance missions, often take most of the aircraft allocated for close-support missions. The rest are retained for close support on request. They are designated to operate on call of the joint operations center (JOC)—staffed by officers of the field army and tactical air force headquarters jointly—at the field army-tactical air force headquarters.

AN AIR STRIKE REQUEST

The front lines ask for an immediate air strike like any other fire-support request. Probably the front-line commander or an artillery forward observer initiates the call.

If the weapons under the control of the fire-support coordination center (FSCC) as the direct support artillery battalion cannot fire the mission, the request is sent to the division FSCC. Determining that an air strike is necessary and not having planes on air alert under its control, the division FSCC asks for an air mission by sending a request over a special net to the joint operations center (JOC). If planes are overhead on an air alert status, the procedure may be shortened. Division FSCC would probably be able to give these planes the mission by working through the G-3 air.

Corps monitors this net and could cancel the request if it is so desired. Corps silence means corps approval.

Decision to fly the mission is then up to the JOC. The air-ground operations section receives the request. If approved—normally depending on priority of effort—the request is given to the combat operations section as urgent. After accepting the request, the combat operations section issues an attack order to a tactical air unit.

Word is sent back to the front line that the mission will be flown, the estimated time

of the attack, and the type and number of planes.

The aircraft are guided to the target by a control and direction system. The tactical air control center (TACC) gets the flight under way. It is the operational headquarters for control units which will guide the flight to the target.

After the planes are airborne and moving to the target, a tactical air direction center (TADC) takes over and directs them to a tactical air control party (TACP) near the front lines. The TACP brings the planes onto the target. If the TACP is unable to direct the planes visually, a tactical air direction post (TADP) takes control, brings the planes to the target, and "fires" the mission by electronic rather than visual means.

Working with front-line units are experienced combat pilots. These forward air controllers usually are assigned so that at least one forward air control party is with each forward infantry regiment. They may operate from vehicles, or they may be aloft in light planes. In either case, their job is similar to that of forward observers in controlling artillery fire.

ARTILLERY AND TACTICAL AVIATION

We have already found the analogy with artillery convenient in describing some features of tactical aviation. This is worth pursuing further. There are important differences as well as similarities between the two forms of support.

For example, tactical aviation uses a wider variety of weapons than does artillery. These normally range from multiple .50 caliber machine guns to 1,000-pound bombs, and they are available in many combinations for different types of missions.

Tactical aircraft have ranges up to hundreds of miles. The effective range of our largest field artillery pieces is about 20 miles. But this difference may be reduced greatly by the advent of guided missiles, which will extend the striking range of ground weapons considerably beyond that of our present artillery.

THE TIME ELEMENT

An air strike requested on targets of opportunity (as distinguished from preplanned missions) normally requires more time than would an artillery fire mission on the same target. There are exceptions, of course, as in the case of planes immediately overhead on an "air alert" status. A forward air controller can direct such planes onto a target in a matter of seconds.

As a rule, however, a ground commander requiring air assistance must allow time for transmitting his request, processing it at the joint operations center, issuing orders to the air squadron, and briefing pilots. This briefing is very important. Any error of 500 yards is easy enough for a pilot to make at upward of 500 miles per hour; yet this distance may place his bomb load on friendly troops instead of on the enemy target.

In addition, the planes may have to be "run up" and readied. And unless someone has foreseen the mission with uncanny accuracy, bomb loads already on the planes may have to be modified or changed completely for the specific mission requested.

The time factor involved in "immediate" support means that, generally speaking, artillery fire offers a much quicker means of attacking emergency targets.

AVAILABILITY

Artillery is available for targets within its range 24 hours a day, in all types of weather. Tactical aircraft, on the other hand, are seriously curtailed by bad weather.

In general, air support is more powerful but also more expensive and is seldom available as generously as artillery support. As much as the front-line doughboy would like air support constantly over the battlefield, there will be times when he will have to get along without it.

Air-force tactical aircraft must be based on prepared airfields which include relatively large fixed or semifixed installations. Artillery requires positions protected from enemy small-arms fire. But these positions require no preparation, and they may be located in most any type of terrain over which the other ground arms can move.

There are times—particularly in "special operations"—when close-support aircraft may be the only means or the most effective means of destroying or neutralizing a target. In the early, critical stages of an airhead, for example, fighters and bombers will be the commander's major "artillery" support. Supporting planes are especially valuable in combating enemy tanks, the major threat to airborne soldiers. Likewise, during the initial part of an amphibious landing before artillery is ashore and emplaced, aircraft may be the only effective means of silencing enemy howitzers hidden in defilade from flat-trajectory naval guns. And both in pursuits and in retrograde movements the role of aircraft support as column cover and long-range fire power becomes increasingly important.

RULES OF EMPLOYMENT

Two simple rules governing employment of artillery as well as other ground weapons have a logical application to the use of tactical air support.

The first has to do with where we place a weapon and who controls it. The greater the range and versatility of a weapon the farther back we place it, and the higher up in the command system is its control retained.

The second concerns selection of weapons. We always use the most economical means to do the job. If mortars can handle a target, we spare the artillery; if only light artillery is needed, we hold back the medium artillery; and so on. We try not to waste our resources by using a sledge hammer to break eggs.

Applying these rules to tactical aviation, we see the logic in placing our air units and air control agencies where they can best be employed in furtherance of the common air-ground mission. We can also see why controls are set up to see that air strikes are not used against targets the artillery can handle.

TEAMWORK IS ESSENTIAL

One more analogy with artillery may prove helpful to us in understanding tactical aviation. The teamwork between artillery and its supported arms, which we take for granted today, did not always exist. Many years ago, there was a period in our Army's development when artillery-infantry cooperation was inadequate. There was lack of mutual confidence founded largely on ignorance of each other's problems and capabilities. It was not until the forward-observer system was established that a common sympathetic approach to fire-support problems was achieved. When members of the two arms lived together and fought side-by-side, these problems quickly disappeared.

Despite difficulties, air and ground units usually worked well together during World War II. They have done the same thing in Korea. In both cases, cooperation grew in an environment where the common goal was urgently clear and when airmen and soldiers lived and fought together.

Our air-ground doctrine and techniques have advanced rapidly in the few short years since air power came of age. Future common problems which airmen and ground soldiers may encounter will find ready solution in the same spirit of mutual respect that brought our infantry-armor-artillery team to its present level of effectiveness.

TODAY'S OPPORTUNITIES

We are today on the threshold of opportunities in the field of air-ground development such as we have never before encountered.

Our first postwar statement of air-ground doctrine was published in Field Manual 31-35, Air-Ground Operations (War Department, 1946). Since then, analysis of World War II lessons, and study of postwar technical developments have continued. The Tactical Air Command and the Army Field Forces, which have worked together on these studies, have just published jointly a Training Directive for Air-Ground Operations (September 1, 1950). This directive amplifies FM 31-35 and will be used for training within the Army and the Tactical Air Command. After the doctrine and techniques set forth in this directive have been tested in field operations, a final version is expected to be published jointly by the Departments of Army and Air Force.

Even before Korea, the Army and the Air Force had initiated a joint training program calling for every combat battalion in the United States to participate in a type field exercise involving close air support with live bombs. Although the Korean situation disrupted this program—partly because of the emergency movement of units—we may look for renewed emphasis on this type of training in the near future.

The Army has established at Fort Bragg an agency known as the Army Air Support Center. This center will help the Chief, Army Field Forces, in conducting air-ground training, in determining Army requirements for tactical air support, and in promoting joint consideration of doctrine, procedure, tactics, and other matters affecting air support of ground troops.

These developments, together with the build-up of our Armed Forces, offer us a chance to recover much important ground lost since the end of World War II, when our combat-trained air crews and air-ground staffs, with the know-how they shared, were dissipated.

Our goal should be to develop throughout our combat echelons the practiced skill best exemplified recently by the air, infantry, armor, and artillery elements in Korea, who earned their places on the air-ground team.

Teamwork and mutual understanding are of the essence.

Left Hand, Right Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that our Republic has suffered approximately 100,000 casualties in Korea under the United Nations, aided and abetted by President Harry S. Truman, the final act of perfidy and betrayal is to be consummated.

First came conspiracy between the executive department and the United Nations to put the United States into war—now comes bribery and cowardice by the conspirators to trade the lives and liberties of Formosa to Red China. Next by way of insult to our dead in Korea, the Red murderers are to be given a seat on the Security Council of the United Nations.

I voted against the United Nations when it was organized. The moving spirit in the creation of the United Nations was Alger Hiss. It has served his subversive purpose of giving aid to Russia in her communistic drive for world domination.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Wednesday, January 17, 1951:

LEFT HAND, RIGHT HAND

General Collins, the Army Chief of Staff, has announced from Tokyo that American forces are in Korea to stay and fight and that new forces would reach the front within 2 or 3 months.

This statement followed within a day United Nations approval, with the concurrence of the American delegate, of a plan to end the conflict by giving the Chinese Communists in Korea everything.

By this deal, we would withdraw our forces, together with those of other UN members, and Communist China would do likewise. A plebiscite would then be held in Korea. Inasmuch as the North Korean Communists would be left in possession of the ground, the populace would be under its thumb. Communist China and Russia, as well as Great Britain, which recognizes the Chinese Communist regime, would certainly have an influence in supervising the election.

Nobody can doubt that the result would be that Korea would vote in a Communist government, just as happened in Poland under similar circumstances.

CONFLICT OF ABSURDITIES

As collateral undertakings, the United States and UN would agree to give consideration to Communist China's demand for the island of Formosa and for a seat on the UN Security Council. All of the evidence makes it clear that both demands would be granted.

If our diplomacy is ready to concede Korea to the Communists, and to throw in Formosa and a UN seat as extra inducements, why is our Military Establishment planning to stay and fight?

It may be said that this military decision is announced as a means of inducing Communist China to accept the UN appeasement deal, which Russia, in Communist China's behalf, has said is unacceptable. Why should we try to press the Communists into a deal that is so greatly to our disadvantage? Why, if our spokesmen have signified disposition to write off Korea, should the military expect to convince anyone the fight is worth carrying on?

Since the Truman administration has admitted its willingness to get out of Korea, why does it not simply get out?

Why expend one more American life in its temporary and futile defense?

In its latest brainstorm, the administration proposes to give the place up and to fight for it to the end. Can anyone carry absurdity beyond this?

Rights Without Responsibilities—A New Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Enquirer, published in Cincinnati, Ohio, on January 2, 1951.

It is difficult to believe that the Office of Education would circularize American colleges and universities appealing for publicity on a declaration of human rights at the taxpayers' expense. Nevertheless, this apparently is true.

This document, as indicated in the editorial, sets out the New Deal and Fair Deal philosophy of influencing people to believe they can have something for nothing, that the Government owes them a living, and that they have no obligations nor responsibilities of their own. Such propaganda appeals to the weakness of people and not to their strength. This indeed is the welfare state on which the present and recent administrations have fattened and retained their power.

In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground (Genesis, 4: 19).

The editorial follows:

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Once in a while it happens. Not often enough. But once in a while somebody with a sense of reality and faith in the stuff that built America will shake himself free from the present welter of moral obfuscation and take a swing for the jaw.

It happened not so many days ago. Earl J. McGrath, Commissioner of Education at Washington, circularized American colleges and universities appealing for publicity on a Declaration of Human Right.

It reached the wrong man, or we should say the right man, when Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, received his copy. The Tennessean's reply merits at least a footnote in American political and social history. Wrote Mr. Branscomb to Mr. McGrath:

"I have your form letter asking that we publicize as much as possible the Declaration of Human Rights. I read it * * * with much interest. I presume you are merely carrying out the responsibilities of your office in pushing this declaration. May I say, however, that this declaration is an immoral document. It lists 6 pages of rights for everyone with only a brief, vague, and almost apologetic reference at its close to duties to the community. The demand for rights, however, is detailed, specific, and extensive. Article 25, for example, reads: 'Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing, medical care, and necessary social services, and the right to security.' All of this without the slightest reference to any obligation involved.

"I call the document immoral because morality chiefly consists of the assumption of obligations and duties to others by every individual. To insist upon 29 articles of rights which everyone is encouraged to expect from others, without a comparable insistence upon obligation, is merely to encourage the moral weakness of our times. What I miss is even one little phrase, perhaps at the end of article 25. I would have thought that so wise and distinguished a commission would have added to this long list of rights, including that of an adequate standard of living, the phrase: 'Provided the individual endeavors to render to society such services as are within his capacity.'

"This document may be good politics, but those like yourself in high and responsible office need to give attention to developing a sense of obligation in this America of ours in addition to the universal cry for 'my rights.' If you do not do it, this great country of ours is headed for disaster.

"Your letter offers to send material advertising this Declaration of Human Rights. Do you have available also something that promotes a sense of social obligation and public duty? Yours sincerely, Harvie Branscomb, Vanderbilt University."

We do not know what reply the Federal Commissioner of Education made to the Nashville educator. We hardly know what reply he could have made, in good conscience.

Declarations of human rights are idealistically unassailable. The very conscience of the United States Constitution is its Bill of Rights. But Chancelor Branscomb uses a fitting word when he describes as immoral a declaration which describes the more abundant life as the right of every human—without compensating effort on his part. Opportunity is a true right. Dependence upon society is not. That is the worst failing of the welfare state—it devolves into the "gimme" state.

What About Rationing and Price Control for Meat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Omaha World-Herald on January 10 published an editorial dealing with price control and rationing of meat. I believe this discussion merits the consideration of Congress, and I wish to include that editorial in my remarks. It is as follows:

THE FIRST BIG TRY

"We don't know to what extent meat prices can be controlled, but as soon as we can we'll make a try at it, and it will be a big try."

The words quoted above were spoken by Alan Valentine, Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency, in an interview published in U. S. News and World Report.

This will be the second big try at controlling meat prices. The first was during World War II, and most Americans remember how that one turned out. Meat was driven out of the butcher shops and into the black market, and frequently even those who had coupons—which were the real money of that era—couldn't buy a pork chop or a pound of hamburger.

This time, says Mr. Valentine, the "big try" will involve "strict rationing, and probably subsidies."

The subsidies, presumably, would be paid to stockmen as an incentive to them to raise more animals and to sell them into the legal market instead of the black market. In effect, the Government would pay a part of everybody's meat bill, subsidizing the rich as well as the poor.

This is the same subsidy plan which is used in Great Britain and other Socialist countries, where it is one of the standard devices used for bringing everybody—both producers and consumers—under the protective wing of the government.

As a matter of fact, is there any good reason why meat should be controlled and rationed? Is there an actual and inescapable shortage of meat in this country?

We think not.

It is true that meat production has slumped a little in recent years, but that is because of too much Government interference, rather than too little. The price-support program, which keeps the prices of various cash crops and peacetime unnecessarily high, tended to discourage the raising and feeding of animals—because there was no longer the old inducement to send corn to market on four legs. If price supports of all kinds were

wiped out now, and farmers were given incentive to raise what the consumers want, rather than what the bureaucrats want, there would be a quick upsurge in the production of meat.

The long-standing threat of meat rationing and price control also has had a depressing effect on recent production. Feeders, remembering their experiences during World War II, have been slow to take a chance.

If the Government would wipe out price supports now, and if it would assure farmers and livestock growers that there would be no meat controls in the future, we think beyond question America would produce all the meat it will need. And the total cost would certainly be less than the cost of the control-and-subsidy scheme.

Why doesn't Mr. Valentine adopt that common-sense approach?

For one reason only, and he states it quite candidly. The great unions—particularly Walter Reuther's auto workers—are demanding price control over meat before they will accept stabilization of wages.

So apparently the tedious story of World War II is beginning all over again. One control begets another, the freezing of one aspect of the economy demands the freezing of others. Presently, if the process continues unchallenged, the Government will be running everything and the decrees of bureaucrats will be substituted for the decisions of the free market.

In other words, America will be ruled by totalitarianism. And we doubt if that is what the people think they are fighting for.

Mr. Valentine, and his superiors in the administration, and the Members of Congress, should reflect long and prayerfully before they make the first big try.

We Must Control Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the 30-day price freeze recently recommended by Michael DiSalle, Price Stabilization Director, has been turned down by the office of Defense Mobilization. The American people are entitled to more prompt and more vigorous action to stop the rapid rise in the cost of living. The President's budget message has stated that the bulk of new taxes must come from the middle and lower income groups. If this is so, it seems to me that rising prices are already destroying the ability of these citizens to contribute more taxes to the defense program without reducing themselves to poverty. No one has a right to take advantage of this emergency to extort unconscionable profits from our people and the evidence is becoming quite clear that this is what is being done. There can be no excuse for some of the increased prices placed upon articles that were already in stock when the emergency developed, and yet many employees of merchandising establishments have offered me unmistakable proof that they were ordered to mark up such merchandise. The situation this country is in calls for patriotic responsibility and for equal sacrifice—not reduced living standards for some and huge profits for others. The people are getting impatient and rightly so. Perhaps the last Congress should have made price controls mandatory instead of leaving the matter to the Executive's decision. If the Executive does not act soon, it is imperative that Congress take the lead in bringing prices down. The failure to act now will cause new rounds of wage increases followed by new rounds of increased prices which means higher defense costs and then higher and higher taxes. We cannot afford to permit the economy of this nation to drift toward chaos.

Will the Public Stand for the Persecution and Prosecution of MacArthur?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those who recall the trial of Billy Mitchell, because he had the courage to do what was patriotic and heroic, can begin to see the handwriting on the wall so far as General MacArthur is concerned. The smear artists are now sharpening their poisoned pencils in an effort to place the blame for the cruel and unnecessary slaughter of our boys in Korea on one of the greatest generals that this country has produced.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article which may be of interest to those who admire and respect General MacArthur who, after his hands have been tied by the State Department, has performed miracles in leading our forces:

MAC WANTED TO ABANDON KOREA IN 1945, RECORDS HERE REVEAL—CALLED YANK POSITION UNTENABLE IN FACE OF SOVIET STRENGTH NORTH OF PARALLEL

(By Walter Trohan)

General MacArthur had plans to withdraw from Korea as soon as the first American soldiers set foot on the peninsula at the close of World War II.

Buried in War Department records are documents attesting MacArthur's apprehension of a Soviet advance into South Korea in September 1945. The general recognized the position as untenable and was prepared to withdraw American occupation forces.

Details of the story of the cautious American occupation and withdrawal plans were disclosed as sentiment mounted in and out of Congress for withdrawal of pounded American troops in Korea.

KOREA DIVIDED AT YALTA

Korea was divided into the United States and Soviet zones of influence at the 38th parallel as the result of secret deals at Yalta calculated to bring the Soviets into the war. These secret deals have resulted in communization of China and the Korean war.

In the final days of the war 178,000 Japanese troops were stationed in Korea under Lt. Gen. Yashio Kozuki. Plans were drawn at Potsdam for attack in Korea by Soviets from the north and Americans from the south.

The end of the war made attack unnecessary, but the 38th parallel was established as the dividing line for surrender of Jap forces to American or Russian troops. It was hoped after the surrender Russians would withdraw along with American troops and leave Koreans to select a government by a free election.

MAC ARTHUR CURBED

On August 6, 1945, MacArthur advised the War Department that his intelligence reported 60 Soviet divisions in Manchuria, where the Soviets were given a foothold by a secret Yalta agreement. In the current war MacArthur was barred from crossing the North Korean border for reconnaissance purposes and thus was hampered in gathering intelligence on Chinese Communists.

The Tokyo radio announced Japan's readiness to surrender on August 14, 1945. Formal surrender was concluded 2 weeks later on September 1.

Soviet troops started into Korea at the time of the surrender. Some 100,000 Red soldiers, under the command of Col. Gen. I. M. Chistiakov, occupied Korea down to the thirty-eighth parallel.

MacArthur feared Soviet forces might move down from the dividing line and receive support from the divisions in Manchuria. When American forces were landed, vessels were held off South Korea to take them off in the event of a Soviet move southward.

REDS SPEED TO PARALLEL

The Twenty-fourth Corps, under Lt. Gen. John R. Hodges was landed in South Korea beginning September 8, 1945. His forces comprised 72,000 troops. When Americans reached the thirty-eighth parallel they found the Reds already there.

Japanese forces which surrendered to American troops were shifted to Japan. The fate of the Japs captured in the Soviet zone has never been made clear.

Efforts to unite the two zones by negotiation failed. The United States placed the Korean question before the United Nations. The South Koreans held an election filling 200 assembly seats and leaving 100 open for North Korea. Two-thirds of the Koreans lived in South Korea before the war.

Moscow announced withdrawal of its troops from Korea in December 1948. However, the Soviets refused the United Nations access to the zone. North Koreans later barred access to the zone.

The United States withdrew its troops from Korea in January 1949. At that time it was recognized that the position in South Korea was untenable in the face of attack supported by Communist China and Communist Russia.

A Way to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, we are now engaged in what has been termed the "great debate" on foreign policy. Prior to the statements of many of the leaders of various schools of thought, an editorial appeared in the Wooster (Ohio) Daily Record of December 27, 1950, titled "A Way to Peace." Many requests for reprints of the editorial were received by the publisher. It was more than apparent that the article reflected the views of the people of the great agricultural and industrial area in which it was printed. It is apparent, I am sure, that Ohio's distinguished senior Senator has expressed the views of the people of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the above-mentioned editorial:

A WAY TO PEACE

Everyone has a right to have a peace plan, for this is going to be nobody's private war.

We have to start toward peace from where we are. Therefore we have to begin with a few fundamental principles.

No. 1. We can't live other peoples' lives for them. We must be content with this. We can tell them, inform them, guide them, be kind to them, set them a good example. But we'll have to stop about there.

No. 2. People are going to have to endure the kind of government they permit to exist. Freedom exacts a high price in suffering and human life, but it must be paid by the people who win the freedom. It is impossible for freedom to be forced in from the outside.

No. 3. We cannot in the foreseeable future wage a successful land war against Communist Asia. We simply haven't the manpower. Even though we were to win a battle in the field we could never impose our kind of government on the Asiatics. They will have to make their own government. It can be like ours if they want it, or it can be something else. It must be what they want or are willing to endure.

No. 4. With our naval power we can prevent invasion of Japan, Hawaii, the Philippines, perhaps Formosa and Australia. With Britain's help we can stop Russia at the Channel, if we can't stop her before.

No. 5. An alliance with Canada and Mexico can protect this continent.

No. 6. In our opinion we should set up no general European army, for the simple reason we are merely setting up a target for Stalin to knock down. Instead we should encourage the individual nations of Europe to rise to their own defense with their own separate armies. Given enough time, this kind of program might fill the power vacuum now in Europe. General Eisenhower should be only a consultant, channeling ordnance where it is needed. No defense of Europe can be undertaken unless Europeans are willing to do most of their own fighting—at least for the next decade. We should, of course, lend our material help to the individual countries.

No. 7. At home we must keep our economy sound but we must rearm as rapidly as possible, coordinating our efforts with Canada, which may well bear the brunt of the first attack if and when it comes.

No. 8. We must keep the UN going, never ceasing to try for international understanding, always hoping that somehow it might be reached.

No. 9. We must embark on the most gigantic sales program undertaken in the history of the world. We must try to sell peace to the people of the world, through the use of international radio, leaflets, and all the avenues of diplomacy. We must try to sell people on our idea of freedom. We must encourage people to revolt against tryanny, to demand their rights of free speech, free thought, and unoppressed worship. If we can keep them (the Commies) occupied at home they'll be less likely to start something away from home.

No. 10. The Christian forces of the world must go to work. They have a way which changes men's lives. Thousands of martyrs have died proclaiming this way. Many more may have to. A renewed Christian movement, given time, might possibly avert the almost certain disaster which seems to lie ahead.

The one hopeful thing about this holiday season is the fact that we are not yet at war. By an intelligent, vigorous, peaceful program we might yet avert it.

Patriotic Women Speak Out for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, these are perilous times for our Republic. The people back home know that something is wrong. They know that the administration has pursued and is pursuing policies that unless changed will lead to disaster.

The mail that I receive on this subject is not only heavy but it is evident that the people are aroused. Many of my colleagues report the same thing from their districts. I wish to extend my remarks by including a telegram received by me yesterday from Mrs. Edwin S. Towle, president of the Richardson County Republican Women's Club. The telegram is as follows:

FALLS CITY, NEBR., *January 16, 1951.*

Congressman CARL CURTIS,

Washington, D. C.:

The Richardson County Republican Women's Club composed of 71 members are resolved that we are in favor of (1) withdrawing out troops from Korea but if the Government keep them there we blockade Communist China; (2) no more troops be sent to any other countries without the approval of Congress; (3) no more police actions be undertaken until the other United Nations are willing to furnish their proportionate share in money and troops; (4) defense production being accelerated; (5) taxes not being increased until nondefense spending has been cut to the minimum; (6) this being read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MRS. EDWIN S. TOWLE,

President.

4-H Members Aid War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, all of us realize the necessity of military preparedness in today's world. No one knows how long this period will last or how much of a sacrifice it will demand. We know for certain that the price will be paid by each and every one of us. For some it will be military service. Others will face shortages in materials needed to carry on their business. All of us will be asked to pay for defense.

The agricultural extension officers are doing an excellent job in getting services and information to our farm folks. Their primary objective is to promote conservation and better methods of farming. This is a long-range program just as our preparedness is a long-range program, both essential to our Nation's life.

The 4-H division of extension service has had many good results among our young farm folks I have had students in class who have received this training, and I feel that many of the good qualities they exhibited came from this experience

Their pledge is one, which if followed by everyone, would solve many of our problems It calls for clearer thinking, greater loyalty, and greater services, to the club, the community and the country. These are the things we must have to survive the present struggle

Conditions today will undoubtedly bring shortages in many of our food items Farmers can perhaps best aid in relieving these conditions by producing more of the products they use in home consumption The program each farmer should follow would be to produce his own meat, poultry, and dairy products as well as fruit and vegetables.

Farm production of poultry and dairy products for home use has been carried on by most of our farmers. Those farmers who are not now doing this will find it a well paying sideline.

The main point in producing more meat, fruit and vegetables would be to increase the amount preserved for winter use. The 4-H members and farm wives in this way can make a major contribution to the war effort.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Economics Club of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, January 17, it was my profound privilege to address the Economics Club of New York, one of the Nation's outstanding groups of distinguished business leaders in the fields of finance, industry, banking, and so forth. At that time I discussed America's obligations at home and abroad in the present world crisis.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech which I delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR COUNTRY'S ROLE IN THE WORLD CRISIS

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin, member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

It is a profound privilege to address this outstanding group of leaders of American industry. I should like to talk to you tonight about leadership itself—leadership which is the great obligation of our American people in this hour of world decision.

YOUR BURDENS AND MINE

Frankly, my friends, there was a time when I was much younger, when the thought of facing men who represented the great corporations of Wall Street might have given me a little country boy, some concern, and yes, even a bit of fear. But now that I have been elected three times to the directorate of the

greatest business in the world, your Government and mine, I have no such concern.

Why, the great companies which you represent are as pygmies compared to the gigantic institution which I am supposed to help direct—the United States Government with its 2,500,000 employees, its $260,000,000,000 debt, and its gigantic budget, to say nothing about the powers we exercise over you.

CONGRESS MUST MEET CRUCIAL PROBLEM OF SECURITY

Big government is here to stay, and the basic problem of your big Government and mine is—the problem of survival which confronts us. To meet that problem of survival, it is essential that your government and mine drop ballast, so to speak, get rid of excess responsibilities and functions. It is essential that it concentrate on the big challenge facing the Federal Government, namely, national defense and security.

THE TWO BIG QUESTIONS

"Will the United States be ready—adequately ready—if war comes?" There is the great question mark.

"Will Europe unite to defend itself?" There is the subsidiary question.

TRIBUTE TO FELLOW SPEAKERS

It is an honor and privilege to share this platform tonight with two such outstanding spokesmen of American industry and American labor as my old friend and fellow alumnus of the University of Wisconsin, Mr. Harry Bullis, president of General Mills, and the distinguished president of a great railway labor organization, Mr. George Harrison.

I DO NOT ASSUME UNJUSTIFIED ROLES

Now, some folks, in talking on the topic of national security, assume one of three roles, but I reject all of these roles tonight:

1. A "Monday-morning quarterback"; or
2. To be considered a prophet or the son of a prophet; or
3. An armchair general.

I do, however, try to bring in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on which I serve, something which I should like to consider common sense, which you will remember Dooley said was "the scarcest commodity on the market."

DANGER OF SYNTHETIC THINKING

Unfortunately, there has been a tremendous lot of uncommon sense spoken about foreign policy. There has been a lot of wishful thinking, or synthetic thinking, as I call it. We have built up a mass of illusions, delusions, and myths which have put some people in a fool's paradise when they think of this problem.

It is absolutely absurd to conceive, for example, of an America supposedly secure behind a Chinese wall in the contracted world of the atomic age. Similarly, it is ridiculous to think of America crawling into a shell, waiting until the enemy has devoured all of its foes, and then waiting till that enemy pounced at our own shores.

This, my friends, is an hour for right thinking—on your part and mine—an hour for decision. But it is a time, too, for prayer and faith which must result in moral and spiritual rebirth in individuals and nations. Yes; we must have faith which is, as Paul said, "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen." We must have faith if the world is to advance toward solving the problem of peace.

THE THREE GREAT JEWELS

As a people, you and I know that we are the custodians of three jewels of great price. Those jewels are:

1. The Judaic-Christian religion teaching the unity of the spiritual man with God.
2. The political idea, a constitutional Republic with a Bill of Rights and with three separate and coequal branches of government, serving as a check and balance on one another, and finally,
3. The American economic way, the system of private initiative, of private enterprise, of private profit, the system whereby a man can take his chances of being either winner or loser of the fruits of his labor.

THE STATIC VERSUS THE DYNAMIC MIND

If we are to preserve these true jewels, we must be adequate to every emergency of the atomic age. Obviously no man knows what the future holds. Obviously, too, America's whole concept of foreign policy can be shaped by overseas events even more than by our own decisions. If we are to figure out the shape of those overseas events and be adequate to meet them, we must clear the cobwebs from our minds and change static minds into dynamic minds.

One of the significant faults of our times is that we are constantly thinking of world war III only in terms of World War II. We are constantly trying to appraise the future almost exclusively in terms of the past, instead of keeping our minds fresh, open, and capable of visualizing new things. The hydrogen bomb, guided missiles, jet propulsion, and other instances of modern invention can completely change our concepts.

Therefore, we cannot and should not use the yardsticks of the past unless we are sure that the circumstances of the past are really similar to those of the present. It would be a mistake of course to adopt Buck Rogers-type fantasies of what will come. But it would also be a grave error if we allowed static concepts to stifle our thinking.

RUSSIA WILL TEST THE UNITED STATES PERIMETER

The next great world crisis will come when Russia seeks once again to test the perimeter of western defense. The big question of course, is as to where that test will come. If Russia chooses to unleash her Balkan satellites against Marshal Tito's Yugoslavia, then we ourselves will not necessarily be in an all-out world war III. But we will give aid in every way possible to Marshal Tito short of actual troops. If, however, Joseph Stalin and the leaders of the Politburo should unleash the satellite armies for an invasion of Western Europe (where we already have occupation troops) or Greece or Turkey, then the fatal die would have been cast. There is universal agreement that America would then be in world war III.

BOLD, TRUE AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Well, my friends, we come to the nubbins of the discussion tonight.

My basic theme is this: America's role in the world crisis must absolutely be one of bold, far-seeing, intelligent leadership—political, military, economic, and spiritual leadership.

But what precisely is a leader? A true leader among men, as among nations, recognizes his inherent responsibilities. He does not shirk or shrink timidly from them. A true leader fulfills his pledges and commitments such as we have solemnly made under the United Nations Charter and the North Atlantic Pact. He does not go back on his word.

A true leader does not, however, dissipate his resources as we have so unfortunately. Rather, he concentrates his energies and facilities on first things first. That means that if we are to be a leader, we must basically defend the American Continent itself. But to the extent of our facilities and resources, we must simultaneously help lead the Western European nations so that they, together with us, can work out the common defense.

Remember this point: No true leader allows himself to be baited into a trap the way we have blindly fallen into Russia's trap in Korea. Now, the Russians undoubtedly are preparing for us still bigger traps to come. So the question is, "Will we have enough wisdom to keep out of those traps?" And—"Can we set a few political and other traps of our own?"

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Now, how can we demonstrate leadership? Where and how do we go from here? Let me make certain specific recommendations:

1. First of all, I renew my recommendation for the immediate appointment of a high-level United States board of counter-revolutionary strategy. Let's beat the Reds at their own game. This board, composed of the best experts we can get, would be designed to stir up trouble behind the iron curtain by shipment of: (a) Arms; (b) silver bullets (money) to dissident elements in Russia and her satellites. Yes; let us give the Russians a taste of their own vile medicine—sabotage and insurrection, thus giving hope to the slaves of the Kremlin and giving it something to think about at home.

NO APPEASEMENT OF CHINESE REDS

2. I recommend that the Secretary of State immediately issue a forthright and unequivocal declaration that we will remain 100 percent opposed to admission of Red China to the United Nations. It would be absurd for us to reward international aggression by admitting of another Red "Charlie McCarthy" to the United Nations.

Appeasement of the Reds simply will not work. We must remember that the road to war, like the road to hell, is paved with good intentions—good intentions of trying a policy of complete timidity and weakness. In other words, we as leaders must stand up for principle in the United Nations, in the Congress of the United States, and in our individual lives, even as our heroic boys are fighting for principle on the road to Pusan tonight.

MORE VOLUNTARY CENSORSHIP NEEDED

3. I recommend that America immediately tighten her voluntary censorship. I know our newspapers, radio stations, and magazines are eager to cooperate to prevent the further "leaking" of crucial defense information. It is absurd that we continue to publish so recklessly the details of the location of our atomic plants, the news of new weapons, etc.

REVISED MILITARY TRAINING

4. I recommend that the United States Congress proceed to reevaluate our entire program of military training and that we pattern our future policies along the lines of the Swiss system of universal training. Under this system, as you will recall, the emphasis is not placed on a huge standing army. Instead, emphasis is placed on a large well-trained, well-equipped reserve force adequate to meet whatever challenge arises.

You and I know that America cannot hope to match in numbers the mass armies of the Soviet Union. And so, as much as we might otherwise deplore the idea of universal military training, I believe that the time has come for every able-bodied young American to recognize that he is going to have this national obligation:

(a) He must contribute a certain period of time directly in our armed services; and

(b) Thereafter, he must contribute a certain number of weeks for several years to Reserve training. In that way, every young American will be able to go to his battle station instantly if necessary.

MORATORIUM ON NAME CALLING

5. I recommend that a national moratorium be declared on name calling. To smear a man as an "isolationist" or a "globalist" or any other name does not contribute to public thinking and enlightenment. In a critical situation like this we need diversity of views so that we can get every possible angle of the situation explored. Actually, there is far more agreement on fundamentals between the recent major speeches in the foreign-policy debate—far more agreement than superficial observers believed possible.

MOBILIZING OUR FRIENDS

6. Next I recommend that we mobilize every possible friend among the nations just as the Soviets have so effectively mobilized their satellites. What does this mean concretely? Just this:

(a) We must secure a complete military agreement with Spain. It, aside from all other considerations, possesses the largest available land army in Western Europe. (It is, of course, totally inconsistent for us to deal with one totalitarian government—Yugoslavia—and to refuse to deal with another—Spain.)

(b) Now, as regards Germany and Japan, we must assist these two nations to become strong bastions of defense—to become military assets rather than liabilities.

(1) Germany and Japan should be given their independence.

(2) We should help provide them arms.

(c) In relation to Germany and her neighbors we must stress the absolute necessity of greater political, economical, and military unification in Europe. Only when these countries have made genuine progress in eliminating their age-old fears, hatreds, and jealousies will they be able to stand as one against the common threat. German troops must in particular be integrated into overall European defense forces.

I recognize that we are taking a calculated risk in revitalizing Germany and Japan, but it is a risk that we must take, while putting up various safeguards.

We will await with deep interest the report which General Eisenhower will bring back from his visit to Europe. We trust that he will bring a favorable report on the possibility of genuine military unification, utilizing German and other manpower.

REEVALUATING FOREIGN POLICY IN MILITARY TERMS

7. Next, I recommend that the Joint Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees and Armed Services Committees go into executive session with the finest military brains of the United States Army, Navy, and Air Force. Let them find out the significance of (a) the long-range Russian snorkel submarine fleet; (b) the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb; and (c) other modern weapons—the significance of all these in shaping foreign policy.

A LOOK AT THE WORLD SCENE

Let us pause briefly to look about us on the world scene. We see many things—the heart-rending American retreat down the Korean Peninsula, the failure to date of the United Nations to adopt the resolution designating the Chinese Government as an aggressor, the use of the UN forum by Russia and Chinese Communist spokesmen as a great propaganda pulpit.

And yet we see facts in our favor—the defeat of Russian intrigue and infiltration in Greece, the strengthening of Turkey, the continuing resistance of Marshal Tito's Yugoslavia, the tremendous success of the Marshall plan, which together with Europe's self-help has rejuvenated the western part of this continent economically and has given the basis on which to resist. It is helpful to know that universal military training is in effect in Western Europe, that France has just agreed to increase its military budget by 75 percent, has agreed to set up 10 modern divisions by the end of 1951, and has consented to German rearmament. Even previous to Korea, Britain was spending a larger part of her national income on arms than was America. There is unrest in Russia and dissatisfaction and unrest in the satellite states. We must never forget, moreover, that of the four great world industrial centers three—Japan, Western Europe (including the Ruhr), and the United States—are still free from Russia (which possesses the fourth great industrial center).

Now, let us return to my final specific recommendation.

ANTI-INFLATION FIGHT

8. My friends, we must not, of course, forget the crucial economic front with which you gentlemen are particularly concerned. I recommend that Congress and the executive branch apply an all-out anti-inflation program. Why? Because we must recognize that our country faces two great dangers: (a) The danger from without—the Kremlin; and (b) the danger from within—inflation, insolvency, and national bankruptcy.

In order to meet the inflation problem we have to do the following:

(a) Secure greater efficiency, especially in Government procurement. The tens of billions of dollars appropriated for the Armed Forces must not be regarded as a "gravy train" for extravagance. The cost of war matériel and war training should be cut wherever possible in order that we don't blow our economy out the window in the effort to keep America safe. The chiseler and the grafter should, in effect, be court martialed.

(b) Congress and the Bureau of the Budget and the President must cooperate to cut nonessential expenditures. We will never succeed in achieving this unless we all agree that all of us must make sacrifices in peacetime services. So long as Government continues its own nonessential spending, inflationary forces will grow stronger.

(c) The Federal Reserve Board should use its power to further tighter credit.

Those, then, are my specific recommendations. But now, friends, there are a few basic propositions on which you and I should agree.

BASIC PROPOSITIONS

First, one of the foremost needs of the hour is to secure greater bipartisan understanding and cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of Government. We must recognize that in the present situation two constitutional principles are in conflict with one another. On the one hand, the widest possible powers are given to the President by our Constitution for the direction of United States foreign policy. This may include the President's right under the North Atlantic Pact to put as many troops as he wants on the Continent of Europe at any time without asking the consent of the Congress.

On the other hand, the Congress of the United States has its own constitutional powers and has the vital power of the purse, so that if it wanted to, Congress could strangle any executive policy, by a specific act or by holding back appropriations.

Under conflicting circumstances like that, we might have an irresistible force meeting the immovable body. That is why I feel that it is so essential that we do not dally in endless argument as to who has the power to do what. When a fire is raging in your house, you don't get into a quarrel with the firemen as to who has the authority to carry the water hose. Both Congress and the President are, after all, merely servants acting on behalf of the Republic and there must be mutual reason and judgment, rather than futile bickering.

I do not want to see the Congress stubbornly stalemate the President into inaction. However, neither do I want us to hand over to the President the entire making of our foreign policy, which would be an unwise, unsound, and undemocratic procedure.

Second, while we are protecting America from the grave danger from without, let us not forget that we must protect her, as I have repeatedly said, from the dangers from within. The American Constitutional Republic, with its checks and balances, can be destroyed not only by Communist sabotage but by other qualities of looseness and immorality in Government.

Let us never forget, therefore, the absolute necessity of maintaining strong, sound, independent legislative, executive, and judicial branches. So long as we comprehend and preserve our system, America will shine like a lighthouse through the darkness. All mankind will see its beacon and its hopes will remain high. But if that light goes out, then the faith of mankind will be lost.

CONCLUSION

In a previous serious hour of history, let us remember that Abraham Lincoln utilized three great safety valves, and they were:

1. A wonderful sense of humor;
2. The power of prayer; and
3. A selfless devotion to the Republic.

We, too—you and I—can utilize these same three safety valves in this great hour of confusion and crisis, and become personally more adequate to serve God and country.

With true faith and courage, we must boldly pursue our course. We need the Lincolnesque qualities and, yes, the qualities that enabled men like Christopher Columbus to proceed in the face of all obstacles. When I look at the head table here and at this outstanding audience, I see men like your distinguished President—Juan Trippe—whom I consider to be a modern-day Columbus. He has been forging ahead to open up new continents—new frontiers—in the field of aviation travel. He has added impetus to the progress of civilization. Today we are better prepared because of Juan Trippe. Let us, therefore—you and I—and our nation as leaders—military, economic, political, and spiritual leaders—likewise move forward to man's brighter horizons. Then America will be ready for what comes. May it be peace.

May I recall the words that the Lord said to Moses when the Israelites came to the Red Sea: "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." Let that be to all Americans the watchword: "America, go forward."

Assignment of Ground Troops for Service in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Veto on Troops Could Cripple United States Policy," by James Reston, which appeared in the New York Times on January 15. I believe that this article merits the careful consideration of Members of Congress and the public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS VETO ON TROOPS COULD CRIPPLE UNITED STATES POLICY—WHERRY RESOLUTION POPS UP THE PROBLEMS, SUCH AS FILIBUSTER BY ISOLATIONISTS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 15.—The big argument about who commands the Commander in Chief in this country will reach an interesting point in the Senate this week when Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska, tries to gain a temporary veto over sending more United States troops to Europe.

Mr. WHERRY himself has written a resolution that probably will be sidetracked quietly into the deep freeze in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. But in the meantime it helps illustrate why the President opposes any veto, temporary or otherwise, on what he insists is his constitutional right to order troops wherever he likes.

The resolution states:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United

States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by Congress."

TESTIMONY OF ACHESON

Mr. WHERRY can point to various reasons why Congress might expect to be given a veto over the dispatch of more troops to Europe. Secretary of State Dean Acheson specifically told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee before the North Atlantic Treaty was ratified that there was absolutely no reason to believe that the United States would be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist.

Moreover, the first act in implementing the North Atlantic Treaty—the policy of sending substantial quantities of arms to Europe—was submitted to Congress for approval, and Mr. WHERRY no doubt will argue that if the President submits the question of sending more guns to Europe, his obligation to submit the question of sending more men is even greater.

If the President were to agree to submit the question to Congress, however, as he has been requested by one of the most distinguished Democrats in the Senate, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia; specifically, if he were to agree to be bound by the decision of Congress in this matter, he could find himself in an almost impossible situation.

Suppose, in the interest of national unity, the President agreed to stand by the decision of the Congress and Congress approved the Wherry resolution. Then the President would be bound not to send more ground troops into the European area pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by Congress.

POSSIBILITY OF FILIBUSTER

Under such circumstances a handful of men in the Senate could prevent the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by Congress through the simple expedient of a filibuster.

The President could then appeal, in any crisis that might develop, for release from his pledge, but a few determined isolationists in the upper Chamber—and those who remain are determined—could defeat the appeal simply by talking.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower could return from Europe with a recommendation that we send more troops. He could convince the House and the vast majority of the Senate and the country at large, but if he could not convince the isolationists, the Senate could not respond to his recommendation or release itself from its vote in favor of the Wherry resolution.

No such series of events, of course, is likely to happen. Mr. WHERRY will argue for his resolution, but the President will not agree to be bound by the Congress' decision. In fact, the administration is confident that, if a vote were taken, Mr. WHERRY would lose. But what worries the administration is the precedent that would established by agreeing to let Congress have a veto on the President's authority to move troops about as he feels necessary in order to preserve the security of the Nation.

COULD WHEN CURBS

If Congress can forbid the President to send ground troops to Europe, they ask, why could it not forbid the Commander in Chief to move American ships and planes around the world as he sees fit?

Moreover, what would be the position of the President, under such a precedent, not only now but in the future?

The Wherry resolution, if passed by Congress, would certainly stand before the world as a legislative rebuke to the President, but it probably would not change the military situation in Europe one way or another.

In other circumstances, however, the need of this or some future President to move United States troops to Europe in a hurry might be urgent, and if at that time the President were laboring under the precedent of Congress' right to block emergency action of that kind, essential action might be prevented.

For the time being the administration wants to avoid a difficult parliamentary situation before General Eisenhower completes his survey and returns from Europe with his report.

In the last analysis, it will be this report that will probably decide the issue, and not the judgments of either the President or the Taft-Wherry bloc in the Senate.

Threat of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there is so much hysteria evidenced at times among our people with regard to the threat to United States security which communism presents that I believe it most desirable to give widespread publicity to views which, in their saneness and soundness, make a worth-while contribution to discussions on the matter.

The January issue of Boumi Temple News, AAONMS, of Baltimore, contains an address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, captain of the outer guard of the Imperial Council of the Shriners of North America, before the members of Rameses Temple, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, on November 8, 1950, which reviews in thoughtful fashion the threat which communism poses to American security, and a well-reasoned philosophy regarding it.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stringfellow's address be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESPONSIBILITY

I should like to express my grateful appreciation to your illustrious potentate, S. Titchener Smith, and through him to every member of Rameses Temple, for the honor which you have accorded me in naming this fine body of candidates the George E. Stringfellow class. This manifestation of your friendship and esteem will always be cherished.

Only the imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America is authorized to speak for our great fraternity, and I would have it understood that I speak as an individual and reflect my own thoughts.

Amongst all liberty-loving people will be found the hosts of freemasonry, ever alert to the trust of good citizenship. The doctrines that prompted our affiliation with the fraternity are those upon which your country and mine rest. Our profound belief in the Almighty God, our love of liberty, our native sense of service to our fellow man, our fundamental antipathy to tyranny qualifies us for association with the craft. We are Shriners because, foremost, we are inspired by philosophy and the code of Masonry.

The foundation of every institution of freemen is faith in the Supreme Being. The Golden Rule has ever been our common statute; it is the thesis of our craft.

We must live by its precept if we are to live freemen, and that we may so live our forefathers gave their lives.

Without faith in God, every disillusionment would resolve into despair and inevitable decay.

Communism, a godless ideology, seeks the destruction of Masonry. Communists recognize that millions of God-fearing Masons throughout the world are a threat to their atheistic efforts. Emphatically, we are. Our threat must be effective. Our loyalty to the principles of our order and to mankind must guide us in every effort to keep their atheistic propaganda from harming our freedoms.

We must courageously face the enemy with a solidarity heretofore unknown, lest he divide us. He has infiltrated governmental and fraternal bodies. His power is great; we dare not temporize with it if we would remain free men. With the courage characteristic of our Masonic forefathers, inspired by belief in God, we must exercise every good effort to resist its threat.

Hostility, tyranny, and oppression are creatures of some cunning human failing. Such characteristics are fostered by the selfish motives of nonbelieving minds, averse to the duty man owes to his fellow being.

Bereft of faith in God, all dictators exercise their tyranny, unrestrained by the dictate of the Golden Rule. Their pattern is to impose upon an oppressed people the fallacy that religion intercepts progress and the common good.

The atheistic philosophy of subordination is promulgated amongst their youth, and, as such youth grows into manhood, it blindly accepts that delusion as a method of life.

The tyrant, however, is aware that man instinctively craves freedom, and, with warrant, fears that such instinct at some time will overthrow tyranny.

His scheme is to dominate. He subjugates individualism; engenders hatred of democratic nations and institutions, and descends to that which inevitably destroys his entire scheme, suppression of the right of free worship.

For a time the sordid scheme prevails. He conceals from the people of his land the manner in which free people live, and numbs their reasoning by sophistry. So that he may set himself up as all powerful, he restricts the lives of his citizens until their urgent needs cause submission to the straining point; rebellion is inevitable. He recognizes that he cannot terrorize where religion prevails; he must afford no refuge of faith and reason, for faith and reason would resist oppression.

When tyranny has sufficiently subdued, misled, and embittered its masses, it sets out to divide peoples of other lands.

The Soviet has dumped her spies and sneaks into every country of the world. She has invaded lands that had hoped to recover from the affliction of two world wars, has, without mercy, taken control and enslaved the people thereof, scorning the reprimand and warning of the free democracies. She sneers that hers is the democratic form of government, yet incarcerates, tortures, and purges any subject, men of the cloth, and others who challenge her chicanery.

She has subdued the spirit of her own people and those of her satellites.

Nor can we outwit her unless we know the manner in which she thinks.

We are engaged in a cold war with an enemy skilled in the use of every psychological weapon, who scornfully questions our right to resist the stupid puppets it has driven into aggressive invasion.

Communists are shrewd enough to realize that they cannot dominate unless they destroy the dignity of men. That must not be. As they encourage dissent and strife, we must proclaim faith, hope, and peace. They seek to liquidate the modern world. Our efforts must be bent upon upbuilding mankind in the image of his God.

Let us encourage others to emulate our efforts. So long as we proclaim, with all the good within us, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men, we shall muster strength sufficient to overpower their hideous program.

Ours must be the firm belief in the right of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Such has always been the credo of all selfless human beings.

The philosophy of your Government and mine springs from the rights reserved to our people, free from political mandate. Let our loyalty be the result of understanding the basis thereof.

We must intelligently comprehend democracy, be well informed of its activities, so that we recognize and combat undemocratic activities. We cannot vacillate in our attitude toward subversive conduct of those charged with our security. We speak of government by the majority; let the right of suffrage be exercised by a conscientious majority.

Honorable, patriotic public service is ever our duty. As Shriners and as private citizens, me must, by the practices so profoundly advocated by our fraternity, establish that the right to live and worship in freedom is the right of mankind.

Sincere convictions unless practically applied are of no avail; true idealism, unless crystallized into cooperative conduct toward one's fellowman, is like tinsel upon an inanimate body. Inspiration for good is impotent unless pursued; sound ideas are fiction until exercised.

Without an attitude of idealism man suffers defeatism, hope is nonexistent, faith a comfort unknown.

Sound thinking, upright men throughout this world must lend counsel and aid to those who need guidance.

Where false philosophies arise, it is our task to enlighten the ignorant. We are our brother's keepers. Ours is the obligation to sustain propriety and honor through all adversity.

In the words of the Honorable Lester Parsons, Canada's Foreign Minister, "We must guard freedom by wisdom as well as by arms."

It is of great moment to this world that despots be frustrated in their wickedness; it is of greater moment that we so conduct ourselves that all human beings understand our way of life, as God-fearing, freedom-loving people. Such is our destiny. We cannot avoid that responsibility.

God grant us the courage to change the things we can change, the serenity to accept those we cannot, and the wisdom to know the difference. Grant us the courage to support those things we believe to be just, even though their survival may at times seem hopeless.

Our Foreign and Military Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the concern and alarm of the American people over the present national crisis is dramatically underscored by the record volume of mail now reaching my office and, I am sure, the office of every other Member of Congress, on the subjects of our foreign and military policies.

Because they are typical of the thinking in my State and the letters and telegrams which I am receiving, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where's Our Leadership?" which appeared in the Thursday, January 11, issue of the Cedar County News, published at Hartington, Nebr., by Mr. Fred Zimmer; and a telegram forwarded to me by Mrs. Edwin S. Towle, of Falls City, Nebr., on behalf of the Republican Women's Club, of Richardson County, Nebr.

There being no objection, the editorial and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cedar County (Nebr.) News of January 11, 1951]

WHERE'S OUR LEADERSHIP?

There are a lot of things about this Korean War that the common man does not understand, and it makes the ordinary citizen wonder whether the administration does either.

For example, it is hard to understand why we should be so afraid of making Russia mad. She is already fighting us, at least indirectly, if not directly. It is equally hard to understand why we should not want the Chinese Nationalists to help us in our battle against the Chinese Reds. The Reds are fighting us with everything they have in Korea, so what more could they do if America gave the Chinese on Formosa the go-ahead sign.

As matters now stand our Navy is preventing the Nationalists from invading the mainland of China, which in effect is protecting the Red rear while we fight the Reds on the front.

This is a war of manpower. The Americans can produce more war material than the Red nations, but the Reds have the edge in manpower and the production of manpower. It appears that the policy of not allowing the Chinese Nationalists to use their 350,000 well-trained troops, plus another million guerrilla fighters on the Chinese mainland, in our behalf is utter folly.

True it might make Stalin mad to think we had finally come to look at the matter with our eyes open, but he will do all in his power against us anyway. The Reds do not love us and never will, and any half-hearted measures we use in fighting them will not improve matters.

Then there is the situation of not bombing the factories, bridges, and other supply bases for the Chinese Reds in Manchuria. If we cannot fight with both hands in this battle we had better retire entirely and not continue to waste men and materials because we refuse to use both hands in this life-and-death battle.

Then there is the atom bomb. This is a terrible weapon, but if its use will bring an end to this war, and the rumors of war then it is worth the toll it takes.

The American people for the most part realize that the real villain in the world today is not Red China, or North Korea, but Russia. If we want to stop this thing we are going to have to stop Russia. As it is she is egging on China, Korea, and there may be others, so that we will waste away. When Russia feels we have been weakened enough that she can step in and take over, she will be right at our throat, make no mistake about that.

What kind of leaders do we have that cannot see what the common people have already figured out? Why should they wish to go on with this appeasement policy in regard to Russia and China? Have they forgotten what happened when we tried to settle the strife in Europe by appeasing Hitler? We had to fight a long, bloody war just the same.

The Government talks about the people doing without, tells Americans they must tighten their belts, that more and more money must be spent for defense and that more and more men must be drafted. Yet the powers in Washington have not tightened their belts. They still go on trying to do business with Russia and the Reds. Before the start of World War II there was the popular phrase, "You can't do business with Hitler." That same phrase can also be applied to Stalin and his Red allies.

It's time something was done, and what must be done should start in Washington. If our leaders start being real leaders they will not have any trouble getting the American people to follow and back them up. It is time for action. Realistic action, not based on political expediency.

If our leaders will not or cannot give us the type leadership we need, then it is time we exercised our right to remove them and put someone at the helm that knows how to steer a ship.

FALLS CITY, NEBR., *January 16, 1951.*

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,

Washington, D. C.:

The Richardson County Republican Women's Club, composed of 71 members, are resolved that we are in favor of:

1. Withdrawing our troops from Korea but if the Government keeps them there we blockade Communist China.

2. No more troops be sent to any other countries without the approval of Congress.

3. No more police actions be undertaken until the other United Nations are willing to furnish their proportionate share in money and troops.

4. Defense production being accelerated.

5. Taxes not being increased until nondefense spending has been cut to the minimum.

6. This being read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MRS. EDWIN S. TOWLE, *President.*

Tax Exemption for President and Congress Should Be Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tax Exemption for President and Congress Should Be Eliminated," which appeared in the Winchester Evening Star, Winchester, Va., on Monday, January 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX EXEMPTION FOR PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Sound-thinking Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has introduced legislation to repeal tax exemptions now permitted on allowances granted to the President, the Vice

President, and Members of Congress. He branded as "unfair" the special $50,000 tax exemption of the President, the $10,000 to the Vice President and Speaker of the House, and $2,500 to each Member of the Congress.

The President only last week stated that Americans must be taxed "until it hurts." Every right-thinking American is willing, we believe, to pay his full share of whatever tax burden might be necessary to strengthen our Military Establishment and to fulfill essential functions of government. But those who call for "taxing until it hurts," and those who vote for such taxes, likewise should feel the full pinch. It is completely wrong, in our opinion, for the President, the Vice President, the Members of the Congress to enjoy a privileged status in the tax field. Virginia's Senator Byrd led virtually a lone fight against this several years ago.

If there ever existed any real logic for establishing such a privileged class, that logic has completely disappeared with recent events. President Truman has not been bashful in making recommendations to the Congress in every field of legislation from socialized farming to unprecedented budgets. We would applaud were he to recommend that his own tax exemption be removed, along with the tax exemption of the Vice President and the Congressmen. If it is necessary to tax until it hurts none should be exempt. And certainly not Government officials who already have shown too little concern for the taxpayer's dollar.

Tribute to Lt. Harry E. Sutton and His Platoon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of December 22, 1950, recounting the gallant exploits in Korea of Lt. Harry E. Sutton, of New York City, and an infantry platoon which he commanded.

Lieutenant Sutton long was a member of the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Coast Artillery Regiment of the New York National Guard, which was called into the Federal service in 1941. As Governor of New York, I had the honor of organizing this regiment, which is one of the finest of the New York National Guard. I am very proud of it. Lieutenant Sutton has served with distinction during the Second World War as well as with our Armed Forces in Korea.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO UNIT HAILED ON HUNGNAM STAND—PLATOON LED BY BRONX OFFICER STAVED OFF MOST SERIOUS THREAT TO BEACHHEAD

WITH THE UNITED STATES THIRD DIVISION IN KOREA, December 20.—A gallant Negro infantry platoon fought off the most threatening approach yet to a Communist breakthrough into the Hungnam beachhead.

The United States unit was led by Lt. Harry E. Sutton of 1100 Franklin Avenue, the Bronx, New York, when the North Koreans made their wild charge.

The Red assault disintegrated when each United States soldier was down to his last ammunition clip of eight bullets. That's how close the Communists came to penetrating at least the outer United Nations defense ring.

The savage battle of "Sutton's Ridge" began before dawn Monday. The United States counterattack ended Tuesday noon.

Since then the United States troops have shifted positions. The story now can be told without endangering security.

A famous Third Division regiment was holding part of the hilly eastern flank of the beachhead. Lieutenant Sutton's platoon was assigned to a long, three-humped ridge.

Lieutenant Sutton has been a soldier a long time and an infantry lieutenant 5 years. He spotted his men in strong points on the three ridge nipples and along the World War I type trenches that civilian workers had gouged in the frozen earth.

He was worried. Fresh North Korean soldiers—reorganized, reequipped, and fanatic—were on the next ridge line over. On his right flank they had strong-pointed a hill that surrounding crags masked from United States artillery.

At 7:45 a. m., Monday, the Communists struck. Crawling up the bare windswept ridge came three groups of 20 men—one group on each flank, one dead center. Just a small attack, but made by ferocious men who would not stop even when wounded.

The United States soldiers moved back and forth in their old-fashioned trench, picking off the Reds.

"But they kept coming and coming," Lieutenant Sutton said. "All day small groups of them kept coming. We would wipe out this bunch and before we knew it the Reds were back again."

The Communists from the ridge-line opposite tried to pin down Lieutenant Sutton's men with fire so the assault groups could reach the trench line. The Reds were firing captured United States Browning automatic rifles, machine guns, and Garand rifles.

Master Sgt. Tyler Collins, of Malone, Fla., stood bolt upright and picked off seven Communists. A bazooka man killed 10 with a single shell. But the Reds kept coming for more than 11 hours. Finally at 7 p. m. there was a break.

"We have licked them," the GI's told each other jubilantly.

Shortly after small arms began again from the opposite ridge. There was no assault this time, just the continual bark of snipers' rifles through the long, frigid night.

At 6 a. m. Tuesday the Reds assaulted Sutton's ridge. From the ridge opposite the center of the line came a fierce wall of fire.

A suicide enemy force struck up the slope against the left flank.

Lieutenant Sutton was not too worried about these two fronts—the massed fire power of United States artillery could hit there.

But from the hill on the right—masked from the guns by the other hills—the main force of the enemy was assaulting in the darkness. The Reds were coming down a precipitous slope, tying short fiber ropes on scrub pines and lowering themselves.

With flashing bayonets they burst into the strong point on the last of the three nipples on Lieutenant Sutton's ridge. The GI's there fought desperately. Later, in one fox hole, Lieutenant Sutton found two dead North Koreans and the body of the United States soldier who had killed them before he died.

Once inside the trenches the Reds turned the United States soldiers' own machine gun down the ridgeline.

Pfc Elijah Whitley, of Toledo, Ark., replied with his Browning automatic rifle, silencing the machine gun. Along the ridgeline, Lieutenant Sutton and his men rolled hand grenades down the slope. In the breaking dawn they could see the Communists crumple and tumble down the slope and then see new men replace them. Bodies were strewn crazily on the slopes.

"We gave them everything we had," Lieutenant Sutton said.

That was enough. The last fanatic charge disintegrated.

Reinforcements reached the United States line. United States mortars thumped down on the enemy-held right-hand ridge nipple. Lieutenant Sutton led a counterattack. The enemy was driven off it and Lieutenant Sutton's men again held all of the ridge.

MRS. SUTTON VOICES PRIDE

Holding her 8-month-old daughter, Linda Louise, in her arms and flanked by her other child, Harry E. Sutton, Jr., Mrs. Vadnie Sutton could only say last night: "I'm terribly proud of my husband." Through the day, she had heard over the radio and read in the newspapers about the heroic exploit of her husband, First Lt. Harry E. Sutton.

Neighbors crowded her small apartment and offered congratulations. Mrs. Sutton, born in this city, said her husband had been with the United States Army for 10 years.

What Are We Trying To Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What Are We Trying To Do?" written by Louis Bromfield, and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of January 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO?

(By Louis Bromfield)

In Washington we are certainly suffering from a confusion compounded of confusion and tragically the confusion finds its way into the hearts of all of us.

It seems to me that much of the confusion arises from hypocrisy, dishonesty, and the deliberate and calculated misuse of words.

Instead of dealing with realities and truth, the administration and in particular the State Department is dealing with a fog of illusions, shifty maneuvers, and deliberate deception.

Each time that I read in the newspapers or hear over the radio the term "United Nations forces now fighting in Korea," something turns over inside me. Why does this hypocrisy exist? The war in Korea is between American forces and those of Soviet Russia and her puppet, China. All the supplies and expenses are furnished by the American people. Not 1 percent of the troops are supplied by the other nations included in the UN.

Why does the administration insist on referring to a full-scale tragic and disastrous war as a police action when it is war being fought by us, virtually single-handed?

What, indeed, has the UN turned out to be but an agency which has shilliled and shallied and hamstrung our efforts in a bitter war.

Our State Department and our military leaders, hamstrung first of all by Mr. Truman himself, cannot fight an all-out war. They must await the consent and decisions of the UN, made up of other countries playing both ends against the middle, while our own American soldiers are being frozen, wounded, and killed.

We cannot bomb the supply sources and lines in Manchuria without the permission of the UN. This will never come so long as European nations want to continue their trade in war materials used against us and Great Britain wants to protect Hong Kong from attack as a port out of which she is making money while we pay in lives and expense.

What is the UN anyway?

It is not the only world alliance of nations. There are two—the UN and the Cominform nations.

Soviet Russia, under a plan worked out by Alger Hiss, Mr. Acheson, and others, has the power to veto and block nearly all decisive collective action. Soviet Russia and her satellites all sit in on the UN which even invites an aggressor nation like Soviet China to present its utterly destructive case. None of our side sits in on the Cominform UN.

And not only are we as a Nation and the UN as an organization hamstrung by the Soviet group, but confusion is created by every nation which wants to save itself at the expense of the United States. The philosophy seems to be "You protect us but don't do anything rough which might involve us in a war. Just fight a war with one hand tied behind your back and we'll be safe."

In the Western Europe that remains free, there are approximately 330,000,000 of people. In the United States there are 150,000,000, yet President Truman drafts our sons and brothers with the avowed intention of sending them to Europe to defend these 330,000,000. We have already contributed about $50,000,000,000 to the economic welfare of these 330,000,000 and we are expending more billions to arm them, yet they make very little effort to defend themselves.

The labor government of Great Britain clearly places its mangy Socialist ideals above the welfare of the nation and the free world itself. It insists upon nationalizing the vital steel industry and throwing it into the confusion and inefficiency of bureaucratic management in the midst of the worst crisis the Western World has ever known.

Washington tells us that aid to Great Britain under the Marshall plan has ended and in the same breath tells us that we are paying two and a half billion to Great Britain to help arm her. What kind of silly double talk is this? What difference does it make to a government on the verge of bankruptcy whether we call the two and a half billions Marshall plan or military aid? It's all in the same pot, and we American citizens pay it while we draft the best of our young men to do the fighting, not only in Asia but, if Mr. Truman has his way, in Europe as well.

Mr. Truman cries "Wolf! Wolf!" and declares an emergency when there is no emergency, save the unpreparedness which grew out of the politicking and inefficiency of his own administration and the high command of the Armed Forces, which spent fifty billions in 5 years to achieve a state of unpreparedness. It is not possible to cry "Emergency" again and again and again. What, therefore, happens when a real emergency arises?

What is it we are trying to do?

Whither are we bound?

Why do we go on calling Communists in this country "Communists" instead of what they are—a Soviet Russian fifth column of saboteurs?

We cannot meet any situation or even save ourselves so long as we deal with hypocrisies, deceits, and secret agreements designed to sell the American people a bill of goods under false pretenses.

Or is all this because Stalin, before the whole world, has made fools of certain high officials at the very top of our Government?

Warning to the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Warning to the Northwest," published in the McMinnville (Oreg.) Telephone Register of December 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARNING TO THE NORTHWEST

Oregon Senator WAYNE MORSE's call for investigation of the Federal Government's procurement procedure and policies should sound an ominous warning to every small community and business firm in the Pacific Northwest.

The demand came after several days of intensive and frustrating investigation by the Oregon Senator, his staff, and Edward H. Lay, of McMinnville, as to why Lay and similar small manufacturers in the Northwest were not getting an opportunity to make competitive bids on Government orders. The group searched the files of every major procurement office in Washington, D. C. They found the Lay firm listed in the index files, but in no case did they find the name carried through to the bid lists. This was in spite of the fact that Lay had made numerous attempts to get on the lists and had filled out several times all necessary papers to be placed on the lists.

The investigation uncovered the fact that there were no small firms in the Northwest on the bid list. With exception of a few major concerns, which can afford to maintain representatives in Washington, D. C., the entire Northwest is out in the cold at the present time as far as defense contracts are concerned.

The effect of this situation on the economy of our area is not hard to realize. The United States is already involved in a real war in Korea. We have underway a tremendous mobilization program to prepare the Nation for total world war, which Government officials apparently believe is possible if not probable in the near future.

The best word available out of the chaotic situation in Washington indicates that full controls would be in effect now, over all United States production, if the Government were ready to administer the burdens such controls demand. Unless there is a real easing of the international situation, which looks out of the question at the moment, we probably will see severe curtailment of civilian production during 1951. Little effort is being made to protect small-business investments in the rush to rearm the Nation.

It is obvious that our Northwest communities will suffer severely if war production does not take up some of the slack that curtailment of civilian production and distribution is going to leave. We may have major industries in metropolitan areas, such as Portland's World War II shipbuilding, to employ manpower, but even that is not progressing too rapidly. There seems real reluctance in Washington to increase war industrialization in this area.

If we have a shutdown in many lines of civilian business, our area will lose population to districts that are humming with war orders. We are going to see the Northwest's economy set back immeasurably. It is a situation that the people of the Pacific Northwest must not tolerate.

Senator MORSE found that specifications on many products the Lay Co., in conjunction with some 20 other firms, sought to build were drawn so as to completely eliminate western woods. The hardwood interests of the East and South had the full inside track and would have continued to hold that advantage had not the demand been made after Mr. Lay's trip into Washington. Oregon lumber production, purchased under a separate agency, was not affected.

* * * The people of the entire Northwest should make intensive efforts to see that their Washington representatives immediately get behind a program to increase defense production in this area. We have the materials and manpower. The items we could make would go directly overseas from here, relieving cross-country transport snarls.

The situation is vital to every Northwest community that wants to continue a healthy economy. There is nothing like widespread demands from the people to awaken Washington delegations to their responsibilities, and such demand should be made—and fast. Small-business firms, as MORSE pointed out, are not able to maintain contact men in Washington, D. C., or make frequent trips to the Capital to make personal contact for a chance at Government orders.

Californians recognize the problem and spend untold sums maintaining large staffs in the Capital. Large corporations, such as the automobile manufacturers, keep huge crews at work there. We cannot afford such outlays to protect the interests of small business in the Northwest, but its continuation is just as vital to this section as to any other. We must demand that our Representatives shoulder the load and see to it that this area is not forgotten.

Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

MIDCENTURY WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 18, 1950

At the concluding sessions of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 4,620 delegates with voting privilege adopted the following recommendations:

PLEDGE TO CHILDREN

As its closing action, the conference unanimously adopted the following pledge:

"To you, our children, who hold within you our most cherished hopes, we the members of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, relying on your full response, make this pledge:

"From your earliest infancy we give you our love, so that you may grow with trust in yourself and in others.

"We will recognize your worth as a person and we will help you to strengthen your sense of belonging.

"We will respect your right to be yourself and at the same time help you to understand the rights of others, so that you may experience cooperative living.

"We will help you to develop initiative and imagination, so that you may have the opportunity freely to create."

PREAMBLE

Believing in the primacy of spiritual values, democratic practice, and the dignity and worth of every human being, and recognizing that these are essential to individual happiness and responsible citizenship, we have come together to inquire—

How the necessary mental, emotional, and spiritual qualities may be developed in children, and

How the physical, economic, and social conditions favorable to such development may be secured.

And having found that children require, for their fullest development—

Regard for their individual worth and sensitive respect for their feelings, from all who touch their lives.

Loving care and guidance from mothers and fathers, who have a sense of the privilege and responsibility which parenthood involves, and who have confidence in their capacity to rear a child.

A secure home that is free from want, and dread of want, and provides all family members with a satisfying physical, aesthetic, social, and spiritual environment.

A community whose citizens are dedicated to establishing the values and practices that make life meaningful and abundant for children of all colors, creeds, and customs, and to cooperative endeavor for the expression of these values and practices in daily living.

Full access to health, educational, recreational, social, and religious services and programs, directed toward the well-being of all they serve.

Concern on the part of all citizens for all children.

Devotion to the pursuit of knowledge and the wide application of that which is known.

If they are to grow in—

Trust in themselves and others.

Independence and initiative coupled with a true sense of being related to others.

Satisfaction in bringing individual and share tasks to completion.

A sense of personal destiny, of the responsible parts they will eventually play as parents, workers, citizens.

The capacity for the love that underlies the family and that ideally comes to embrace all mankind.

Creativity that brings into being new life, new relationships, new values, and new things of beauty and usefulness, and cherishes them for their worth.

Integrity that sees each life as personally meaningful within the period of history in which it is lived, and in relation to enduring values.

FURTHERING HEALTHY PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN AND YOUTH

The conference unanimously passed the first group of 25 recommendations, as amended from the floor.

1. The expansion of research on development and adjustment, and that such research include longitudinal studies of relations and factors that affect behavior and adjustment. In this way there will be provided a continuing understanding of infants, children, and youth and a sound basis for practices. We further recommend support by public and private agencies in extending research pertaining to healthy personality.

2. That the citizens of every community accept responsibility for providing and sustaining adequate programs and facilities with professional personnel for education, health, recreation, and social services. In the development of such programs full and appropriate use should be made of all voluntary and public resources.

3. That schools for professional workers include in their curricula instruction in human growth and change and in family counseling, together with practical experience.

4. That ways and means be found for the formal and informal in-service education of professional people and that promising practices be widely disseminated.

5. That education for parenthood be made available to all through educational, health, religious, and welfare agencies maintaining professional standards and by properly qualified individuals.

6. That nursery schools and kindergartens, as a desirable supplement to home life, be included as a part of public educational opportunity for children provided they meet high professional standards.

7. That children be provided with opportunities that are wide in range and challenging in nature, emphasizing exploration, participation, and social experience in an environment that is rich and stimulating; and that expectations of achievement should be in harmony with each child's ability and growth.

8. That appropriate public bodies set minimum standards for agencies and institutions providing foster care for children, whether foster day care or full-time care, and provide for the authorization or licensing and supervision as to maintenance of standards.

9. That all States establish standards for the hospital care of mothers and children, in order to assure the quality of care which modern science knows how to give; and that these standards take into account the importance of avoiding unnecessary distress and anxiety.

10. That specialists and agencies take every opportunity to foster and increase parents' feelings of satisfaction and self-confidence; and that material concerning the growth and development of children be made as reassuring and nontechnical as possible, and not hold up false standards of perfection.

11. That elementary, secondary, college and community education include such appropriate experiences and studies of childhood and family life as will help young people to mature toward the role of parenthood.

12. That one department in each State government whether it be welfare, health, or education, working in close conjunction with the other departments concerned, set up all-inclusive minimum standards for all day-care center nursery schools and kindergartens.

13. That appropriate public bodies establish minimum standards for licensing or authorization with respect to plant, program, and staff, for all child-care and preschool groups.

14. That there be authoritative exploration of methods of improving the economic situation of children in families with inadequate incomes, giving particular attention to family allowances, tax exemptions for children and expenses of working mothers.

15. That development of new housing facilities give special attention to health, recreational, and social needs; to the extent that private industry does not provide suitable housing; for low-income families, that such housing continue to be developed by governmental agencies.

16. That programs for children and youth with handicaps be expanded to provide for physical, mental, emotional, and occupational needs.

17. That local boards of education accept full responsibility for planning and providing adequate educational programs and services, including special services, to meet the needs of children with physical and mental limitations; and that State departments of education accept responsibility for leadership service in realizing this objective.

18. That guidance and counseling services in schools, employment offices, and youth-servicing agencies be strengthened and extended; and that such services take into account emotional factors involved in vocational adjustment and aptitude for specific jobs.

19. That children of migrant and seasonal workers be given all the protections and services available to other children, with special regard to transportation, housing, sanitation, health and educational services, social benefits, and protection under labor laws.

20. That school lunches be provided and that children unable to pay for their lunches be furnished them free, without being differentiated from the children who pay.

21. That restrictive eligibility provisions be eliminated from public assistance programs so as to provide assistance to all children in need.

22. That Federal grants to States for public assistance be varied with the financial ability of the States but sufficient to protect children's personalities from the ill effects of inadequate income.

23. That racial segregation in education be abolished.

24. That it be made possible for qualified youth to obtain college or university education which would otherwise be denied them because of inability to pay.

25. That, as an aid to the economic stability of children and their mothers, the old-age and survivors insurance program be further extended to cover workers not presently included and to make benefits more adequate; and that similar improvements be made in State unemployment insurance laws.

In addition, the Conference adopted a motion from the floor to include the following in its recommendations:

"That churches of various faiths coordinate, strengthen, and expand their religious services and activities for people of inadequate income."

FURTHERING HEALTHY PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE FAMILY, THE CHURCH, THE SCHOOL, AND OTHER SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

1. That there be a comprehensive study of the present body of law relating to children and families and the methods of implementing such laws; and that the study shall include laws that serve to impede the progress of Indians in the fields of social and cultural advance.

2. That law schools include courses on family law and the relationship of the law to other professions, and schools of social work include courses in the law and its philosophy.

3. That standards be developed for juvenile services by police departments.

4. That, in accordance with State-wide standards, courts of superior jurisdiction, with judges qualified in the law with an understanding of social and psychological factors, and with qualified probation staff and auxiliary personnel, be available for all cases involving children with problems that require court action in rural and urban areas.

5. That the preventive and treatment functions of social agencies, police, courts, institutions, and after-care agencies be coordinated so as to insure continuity of service.

6. That more emphasis be put on the effects of recreational activities on the personality of the individual; and that in all neighborhoods where children and youth reside there should be provided recreation centers under professional and voluntary supervision.

7. That youth have an equal chance with adults to participate in planning and carrying out recreational activities; and that, as a practical aid for such planning, States be encouraged to study and establish official State boards of recreation to provide counsel and information assistance in recreation matters to communities, particularly small towns and rural areas.

8. That States and other appropriate public bodies establish and enforce standards covering the employment of youth in all occupations, such standards to include minimum age and wages, as well as hours of work, night work, protection from hazardous occupations, and provisions for workmen's compensation; and that, under these conditions, employers in cooperation with labor be urged to provide appropriate work experience for youth on a part-time basis.

9. Prompt action should be taken at the national level to provide funds to supplement those of States and localities, and to stimulate the early development of adequate local health service throughout the country, such action being particularly needed because of the physical and mental effects of mobilization and war on the mothers, children, and youth.

10. That a continuous program of education regarding the role of social service in adoption be carried on for the general public and for the professions involved to the end that effective safeguards be achieved for the protection of the adopted child, his natural parents, and his adopted parents; that existing legislation be strengthened, and if need be, new legislation enacted to assure such protection; and that qualified adoption agencies, local and State-wide, voluntary and public, be strengthened and developed to further assure such protection.

11. Further Federal aid should be provided to the States for educational services, in tax-supported public schools, without Federal control, to help equalize educational opportunity—the issue of auxiliary services to be considered on its merits in separate legislation.

12. That all professions dealing with children have, as an integral part of the preparation, a core of common experiences on fundamental concepts of human behavior including the need to consider the total person as well as any specific disorder; the interrelationship of physical, mental, social, religious, and cultural forces; the importance of interpersonal relationships; and the role of self-understanding; and emphasis on the positive recognition and production of healthy personalities and the treatment of variations; and that lay people be oriented through formal or informal education to an understanding of the importance of the foregoing concepts.

13. That steps be taken at National, State, and local levels to improve the facilities and increase the output of professional schools preparing persons for services to children.

14. That an inquiring attitude be maintained toward all services, with appropriate provision at all levels for continuous scientific study of needs, objectives, alternative methods, and effectiveness of programs.

MAKING MORE POSITIVE THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGIOUS, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC FORCES ON PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

1. Recognizing knowledge and understanding of religious and ethical concepts as essential to the development of spiritual values and that nothing is of greater importance to the moral and spiritual health of our Nation than the works of religious education in our homes and families and in our institutions of organized religion, we nevertheless strongly affirm the principle of separation of church and state, which has been the keystone of our American democracy and declare ourselves unalterably opposed to the use of the public schools directly or indirectly for religious educational purposes.

2. That there be further study of the underlying causes of broken homes and increasing divorce.

3. That we support the full program recommended by the President's Commission on Civil Rights because it represents our faith in and practice of democracy and we further urge prompt steps to eliminate all types of racial and religious segregation and that this conference through its most appropriate channels appeal to the Federal Government to abolish segregation in the Nation's Capital, making Washington the world's example of a truly working democratic absence of discriminatory practices on the basis of race, creed, or color.

4. That to insure the welfare of all children the following specific measures be taken to provide a well-rounded comprehensive housing and community development program:

A. Maximum emphasis should be placed on maintaining standards adequate for health, comfort, and decency in both private and public housing construction.

B. That the construction of 810,000 low-rent public housing units should proceed at full speed in order to provide much-needed housing for low-income families now living in slums.

C. To meet the needs of middle-income families who are ineligible for public housing, that there be developed a cooperative-housing program specifically geared to the needs and income of middle-income families.

D. That our national housing program should meet the requirements of families not only in every income group, but also in every type of community, rural and urban, and families of every size from the largest to the smallest.

E. That the slum clearance and urban development and redevelopment program, now getting under way with Federal assistance, be supported as an integral part of over-all community planning.

F. That the need principle be regarded as the prime criterion in providing defense housing facilities in a period of mobilization.

5. That specific efforts be made to bring lower income groups up to a higher income level and to increase their real income by providing a greater variety of community services. (All expansion of services should include children in all the States and Territories.)

6. That in view of television's unprecedented growth and its potential as a medium for mass education, the television industry and all educational, health, and social agencies seeking to use this medium accept their great social responsibility; and further that this principle apply also to the other mass media of communications.

7. That the Federal Communications Commission reserve television channels for noncommercial educational television stations so that some part of the limited number of frequencies to be allocated by the Commission may be reserved for educational uses and purposes.

8. That all groups concerned develop and maintain programs for protecting the healthy personality of children living under the stress of defense preparation.

9. That in the present emergency the sacrifices demanded should be shared by all individuals and groups in the population and that the services of men with physical and other disabilities be utilized in some capacity without the use of categories, such as IV-F.

10. That more and better educational opportunities be made available for young adults in civilian and military life.

11. That schools, labor, industry, and other community agencies involved and the military services improve and expand their personnel, evaluation, placement, and vocational guidance and counseling activities to serve the interests of the young people and to promote the over-all development and utilization of our total human resources.

12. That provision of adequate allowances be made for wives and children of servicemen.

13. That the participation of children and youth in times of community stress should be in agreement with their stage of development and designed to minimize their anxieties.

14. That governmental and voluntary agencies work to meet the needs of wives and children of the personnel in the Armed Forces moving to new communities, to insure their absorption into community life and the provision of adequate housing, health, educational, spiritual, and recreational services to meet their needs.

MOBILIZING CITIZENS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CONDITIONS AFFECTING THE PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH

1. That community groups and community leaders reexamine their attitudes and procedures in the light of findings of this conference, and make appropriate adaptations and changes.

2. In order to insure proper assessment, creative planning, and appropriate action with respect to meeting the needs of children and youth, that communities undertake the following tasks on a continuing basis:

A. Develop broad community interests.

B. Obtain the broadest possible community sponsorship.

C. Obtain where necessary technical assistance in planning and carrying out the program.

D. Initiate or organize studies and gather facts that are focused on specific problems according to priorities.

E. Interpret the facts, and inform the community as to their significance.

Since goals and methods are closely intertwined, that in undertaking these tasks the methods used be based on the following principles:

A. People as individuals and as groups should be helped to help themselves. Professional workers should find their role in giving such help.

B. It should be recognized that differences and stresses may be present and can be utilized positively.

C. There should be broad-based participation of all groups without discrimination as to age, sex, race, creed, national origin, or economic levels.

D. Fact-finding should be used as part of a total educational process.

E. Channels of communication between individuals and groups should be provided for the purpose of not only furthering common social objectives but also for the improvement of relations between groups.

F. Since the community is served by both public and private agencies, which have a common concern for meeting the needs of children and youth, the endeavors of both in planning, assessment, and financing should be utilized.

3. That greater emphasis be placed by the various professions on utilizing methods and seeking new means of bringing the parents into participation in thinking and planning with and for their children.

4. That professional workers should be trained in such a way that they will have an understanding of and respect for other professional skills and contributors in order that they may work together to further community growth. Some of the ways that this might be achieved are:

A. In all levels of undergraduate education, that students receive broad preparation in the knowledge of human growth behavior, and motivation which ought to be common knowledge for all students. This would also serve as a background for professional education.

B. In schools preparing for professional work, that there be included in the curriculum both through the classroom and field experiences opportunities for cooperative work as problems common to all professional interests.

C. The practicing professional worker further his training by seeking, utilizing and promoting opportunities to relate to and participate with other professional and citizens

groups in resolving problems of the individual and the community.

D. That orientation programs be planned for all professional persons and interprofessional groups in the community.

5. Participation in planning in the community should begin in the schools and in other institutions in order that children, youth, and adults learn the importance of voluntary participation and responsibility for community leadership.

6. All interested groups should work in partnership to recruit, train, and use volunteer leaders for community programs, with special attention to using young people in appropriate ways.

7. Since citizen participation is essential for effective community services for children and youth, when not already provided, citizen advisory boards and similar groups representative of the community be established for public services as well as private and that every effort be made to enable and secure participation by a cross section of the citizenry. That educational institutions and other groups emphasize the importance of participation by volunteers as a basic factor in citizen responsibility.

8. Communities foster cooperative community councils representative of all community interests to study and advance better conditions and opportunities for young workers.

9. Citizens be encouraged to support adequate appropriations and qualified staff to administer and enforce basic legislative standards of States, and other appropriate public bodies, covering the employment of youth.

10. That more energetic efforts be made by both public and private organizations for support of selective recruitment and training of professional workers and for an extensive program of scholarships.

11. Recognizing that youth has rights and responsibilities for better community living, that progressive opportunities be provided for youth to participate vitally in community activities and planning in order that youth may early have the preparation and experience for leadership and community service. Further that the professional workers accept their responsibilities to stimulate the community to see that these opportunities are provided for youth.

12. That youth representatives be placed on community boards of various agencies in order that they may participate in the planning, developmental, and operational phases of the total community programs.

13. Immediate vigorous, and continuing work be undertaken to provide for the organization and financing of National, State, and local programs which would put the conference recommendations into action.

RESOLUTION ON FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM

Whereas the President of the United States who called this Midcentury White House Conference has stated that "essential for the progress of mankind" and the preservation of "our own liberty as a Nation" are "ways to help our children and young people become mentally and morally stronger" and develop into the "self-reliant individuals" which are the strength of our democracy; and

Whereas the President has urged that "in the days ahead—we will have to make special efforts to see that children get a fair chance at the right start in life" and has asked this Conference to proceed immediately toward such goals; and

Whereas over 100,000 citizens in all States and Territories have studied ways of improving the well-being of children in their own communities; and

Whereas the White House Conference has so dramatically demonstrated the pressing need for the better application of that which we know and that which we assume to be good as well as the importance of filling by further research the wide gaps in our knowledge of human and social behavior; and

Whereas the follow-up on the recommendations and implications of the findings of the Midcentury White House Conference depend upon the fullest partnership of voluntary and official effort; and

Whereas this White House Conference has demonstrated the need for more effective communication between the national, State and local levels; and

Whereas there is need to establish a continuity of effort in follow-up; and

Whereas the national committee of the White House Conference, its advisory councils, and delegates in attendance at the December meetings have recommended that machinery be authorized to implement follow-up: Be it

Resolved that this Conference recommends approval of the following principles in effecting appropriate action in follow-up:

1. The chief operating group upon which the responsibility for follow-up should fall will be existing organizations—national, State, and local.

2. That chief purposes of the follow-up effort should be to disseminate the findings of the Conference, stimulate action on its recommendations, and promote research designed to fill the gaps of knowledge which the Conference has brought forth.

3. That the participation of youth and the inter-disciplinary approach demonstrated in this Conference should be maintained and further developed.

4. That the formation of a national committee is important as an advisory and consultative group. Such a committee should work through all the groups which have a primary concern for the well-being of the Nation's children and youth. It should be made up of individual citizens asked to serve in their own right rather than as representatives of organizations or interests and determine its own methods of financing.

5. That provision for continuity be implemented by (a) including on this new committee five selected members from each of the present advisory councils wishing to participate in follow-up, members from the presently organized committee and members at large; and (b) by providing for State and local follow-up organization.

6. That on-going activities should be effected by this national committee through an advisory council for participation of national organizations and an advisory council for State and local action and through such technical committee as may be indicated and should provide for appropriate cooperation with governmental groups at all levels.

7. That it is understood that the national committee here proposed would of necessity have discretion, within the framework of the purposes herein set forth, to make such changes as will assure the attainment of the objectives of the Midcentury White House Conference.

8. That authority for setting up this follow-up program be given to the national committee of the Midcentury White House Conference.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the December 21, 1950, issue of the Manchester Guardian Weekly discussing the Marshall plan. The editorial provides clear evidence again of the effectiveness of the Marshall plan. As I have said so many times and now repeat, I consider the Marshall plan, on the economic front, to be the greatest contributor to checking the spread of communism throughout Europe.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARSHALL PLAN

It is not the failure but the success of the Marshall plan that has led to the suspension of further aid to Britain. In 5 years we have had first a loan of $3,750,000,000 and then allocations of nearly $2,700,000,000 under the European recovery program. Now, 18 months before the close of the 4-year plan, the sterling area is earning a surplus of dollars—and not, as is commonly believed, because of abnormally high raw-material prices. Higher export proceeds have accounted for something like one-fifth of the unexpected change-over from dollar gap to dollar surplus. Lower imports account for the major part, and this reduction has been brought about partly by devaluation and partly by the ability of growing British production to take the place of dollar goods. Marshall aid has been a vital component of recovery. Ordinary words of thanks are inadequate to meet the occasion. We can only say that the American people have proved themselves to be farsighted as well as generous, and the first is much rarer in this world than the second. Success is worth more than gratitude. Here is one of the most brilliant successes in the history of international relations. All concerned have reason to be pleased with themselves. Statesmanship has been applied to the ending as well as to the starting of the plan. The abrupt close of lend-lease at the end of the war did untold harm to western unity; this time the ending is to be gradual and sensible. Goods in the pipeline will be paid for, though some heavy industrial equipment will not arrive until 1952. Commitments under the European Payments Union will be met. Promises which led this country to undertake financial risks abroad will be kept. In fact, the whole apparatus of the Marshall plan remains in being, and this country remains a full member. The marginal activities, like the Productivity Council and the Fulbright scholarships, will continue. If there should be a set-back to the sterling position the present agreement will be reviewed. All this is highly satisfactory. We shall not, of course, do without American aid altogether. We depend on the United States for our defense, and we expect to receive some help toward the cost of rearmament, particularly the cost of imported raw materials for defense production. The amount to be allotted to Britain—and the form of it—remains to be settled by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The need will depend a good deal on the prices of the raw materials we need, and these in turn depend on the joint planning of raw material supplies which Mr. Attlee proposed in Washington. News of these unsolved problems will be awaited with some anxiety. But nothing can diminish the great news of today. We may be excused for feeling like a man who has paid back a large loan to a friend. Marshall aid to Europe has meant a contribution of £88 from every American family; and the vast majority of Americans are not so well off that the extra tax burden has come easy to them. We salute the American taxpayer and hope he has got value for money. We have done our best to give it to him.

Let Us Face the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I see from the press—Wall Street Journal, January 18, 1951—that the United States Treasury will soon ask owners of $1,100,000,000 of series E savings bonds that mature in 1951 to hold on to them a few more years. At the present rate of depreciation of the purchasing power of the dollar I am sure the interest that the holders of E bonds will ultimately receive will vanish into thin air. Why not stabilize the value of the E bonds and all other United States bonds by cutting down unnecessary, nonessential and nondefense expenditures of the Truman spendthrift administration. The road to the repudiation of United States bonds and the devaluation of the dollar is being greased by the Truman spenders.

The citizens who doubt this drab picture ought to study the proposed budget authorizations for expenditures during fiscal year 1952 compiled by Paul O. Peters. Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting the compilation of Mr. Peters:

Proposed budget authorizations for expenditures—fiscal year 1952

[Compiled by Paul O. Peters, from the budget for fiscal 1952]

Description	Recommended in 1952 budget	Proposed for later	Total
Appropriations recommended:			
Legislative branch	$73,234,906		$73,234,906
The Judiciary	26,483,240		26,483,240
Executive Office, the President	35,331,215		35,331,215
Funds to the President	45,476,271	$11,180,000,000	11,225,476,271
Independent offices	7,091,727,259	510,000,000	7,601,727,259
Federal Security Agency	1,886,373,558	235,000,000	2,121,373,558
General Services Administration	148,211,400	1,000,000,000	1,148,211,400
Housing and Home Finance Agency	37,730,000		37,730,000
Department of Agriculture	993,043,560		993,043,560
Department of Commerce	933,640,925	129,400,000	1,063,040,925
Defense Department, military		62,510,000,000	62,510,000,000
Defense Department, civil functions	641,950,000	170,000,000	811,950,000
Department of the Interior	619,558,473	8,000,000	627,558,473
Department of Justice	156,831,000		156,831,000
Department of Labor	231,291,500		231,291,500
Post Office (general fund)	521,374,000	[1] 361,374,000	160,000,000
Department of State	283,646,376	30,000,000	313,646,376
Treasury Department	6,494,013,482		6,494,013,482
District of Columbia (contribution)	12,000,000		12,000,000
Reserve for contingencies		200,000,000	200,000,000
Appropriations, total	20,232,317,156	75,711,026,000	95,943,343,156
Reappropriations: Department of State	625,000		625,000
Authorizations to expend from public debt receipts:			
Independent offices		1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000
House and Home Finance Agency	250,000,000		250,000,000
Department of Agriculture	689,000,000		689,000,000
	939,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,939,000,000
Reappropriation of authorization to spend from same fund	None	None	None
Total authorizations for expenditure, 1952	21,171,942,156	76,711,026,000	97,882,968,156
Contract authorizations, fiscal 1952:			
Housing and Home Finance Agency	100,000,000		100,000,000
Department of Commerce	520,000,000		520,000,000
Department of the Interior	1,000,000		1,000,000
	621,000,000		621,000,000
Deductions:			
For liquidation of prior contract authorizations:			
Legislative branch	5,000,000		5,000,000
Funds appropriated, President	44,476,271		44,476,271
Independent offices	379,700,000		379,700,000
General Services Administration		180,000,000	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4,000,000		4,000,000
Federal Security Agency	164,930,000		164,930,000
Department of Commerce	618,626,925	125,000,000	743,626,925
Department of Defense		2,510,000,000	2,510,000,000
Department of the Interior	38,575,000		38,575,000
Department of Justice	360,000		360,000
Department of State	3,000,000		3,000,000
Deductions (subtract)	1,239,768,196	2,815,000,000	4,073,768,196
Net proposed appropriations and contract authorizations for fiscal 1952:			
Recommended in budget	20,553,173,960		
Proposed for later		73,896,026,000	
Grand total new funds			94,429,199,960

[1] Deduction for proposed postal-rate increase to reduce deficit.

SUMMARY

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the Budget requests for appropriations and authority to obligate the Government totals $87,459,449,977.

The proposed requests for fiscal 1952 total $94,429,199,960.

In 2 years the administration wants to spend $181,888,649,937.

The cost of operating State and local governments for the same two fiscal years is estimated at $41,000,000,000.

All government cost would be, under the present proposed spending for the 2 years, $221,888,649,937.

This huge amount represents more than 50 percent of the reported total national income for 1949 and nearly 50 percent of the reported average national income for the first half of the calendar year 1950.

The spending program for fiscal 1952 if approved by Congress will accelerate the inflationary trend, increase taxes, boost the public debt to new levels, and generally disturb the functioning of our entire economic system.

It is indeed time to reexamine our ability to spend and tax the people for the many international adventures included in Mr. Truman's plans for the fiscal year 1952.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Letter From Jesse H. Bond to Hon. Wayne Morse, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a very interesting retired professor of business administration of the University of Oregon who does not always agree with the junior Senator from Oregon on economic and social legislation, but who, nevertheless, is always stimulating, even in his disagreements, and helpful in his contribution to the discussions of economics. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting letter I have recently received from him in which he sets forth some of his views on important issues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE, OREG., *December 6, 1950.*

DEAR WAYNE: The time has come, it seems to me, for all men who think of themselves as civilized to reflect with humility and honesty on the fact that fish and animals get hooked and trapped by going full tilt after what they want, without seeing their situations whole. The more we become specialized and therefore limited in our first-hand knowledge, which is what happens to civilized men, the more we seem to become impatient when anyone attempts to acquaint us with unpalatable facts.

Fortunately or otherwise, my own first-hand experience, as well as my academic training, has been extraordinarily wide. I have been through the mill from child laborer in a market garden to landlord and small capitalist. My studies have included physics, chemistry, mathematics, sociology, political science, law, economics, accounting, and business management.

Just now, it appears to me, organized labor is in desperate need of considering some unpalatable facts, only two of which I shall here mention.

First, we must now and probably for several years, possibly a generation or more, produce more guns and less butter. If we try to preserve our butter production undiminished, we shall fall short of the necessary production of guns. The necessary sacrifice of some of our butter ought to be shared by all of us and not shirked by any large number, of course. There are two possible ways of approximating this result roughly, but no way of doing it perfectly. One of these ways is to ration the butter, the other

is to allow the price of butter to rise as the unavoidable scarcity grows in the markets.

Organized labor gives notice that, as the price of butter rises, wages must rise accordingly or even anticipate rising prices. In the absence of rationing, this amounts to a demand that labor escape all sacrifice of its butter consumption and pass the decline in standards of living on to Roxie Erb and other people on fixed, or partly fixed, incomes.

In this connection I suggest you glance over the National City Bank's monthly letter for November 1950, pages 123 to 126. It gives in full a letter from a CIO economist and gives what seems to me a deserved and soundly reasonable reply.

The second item is best introduced by a little personal experience. On my farm are buildings which would cost me over $20,000 to replace, yet I am allowed to charge depreciation only on $7,000, the original cost in dollars of pre-World War and predevaluation purchasing power. If I should have to scrap these buildings, even after recovering in depreciation the whole $7,000, I would be out anywhere from $13,000 to $18,000, with a set of buildings no better than the originals were when they were built. In other words, I must make extra profits of $13,000 to $18,000 before replacement because my income each year as reported and as taxed will have been substantially overstated. To put it another way, inflated replacement costs are an additional or ex post facto tax on income previously earned. To say it still differently, inflated replacement costs are a levy upon working capital, and they could ruin a business entirely if its debts are large. They reduce the ability of management either to pay dividends to their stockholders or to resist excessive demands by organized labor.

I quote from Poor's Investment Advisory Survey, November 25, 1950, final page: "There are some significant things which balance sheets do not show. In the case of steel, one of them is that present replacement costs of plant and equipment exceed $250 per ton of ingot capacity; and that if adequate depreciation reserves were set up on that basis, under present tax laws, the earnings of the industry would look like depression figures." On a recent calculation, the stock market prices of the common stocks of the eight largest steel companies were valuing their plant and equipment at from $36.32 to $87.42 per ton of annual ingot capacity. No, neither my wife nor I own any steel stocks, but we do own some other stocks, enough to enable us to get the investor's hard-headed and realistic point of view.

From that point of view, let's look at the 10,000,000-ton addition to annual ingot capacity which the administration is pushing the steel industry to make, and which must cost very close to $2,500,000,000, or even more since the most recent increases in steel wages and material costs. The requirements in the amount of working capital, or revolving liquid capital, will also be substantially increased.

It is extremely unlikely that such increased annual ingot capacity will be valued on the stock market at a higher rate than existing capacity. To be generous to the critics of steel profits, let us say the market value of the steel stocks might rise as much as $900,000,000. In other words, steel stockholders are being asked to spend between $250 and $300 to add $90 to the market value of their investments. One billion six hundred million dollars or more is thus destined to be taken from stockholders and poured into the inflation rat hole.

Where is this money coming from? Certainly not as a gift from Government, for that would be political suicide for any legislator who might dare to vote for it. Certainly not from new collections from the stockholders, because that would be asking them to throw away at least the $1,600,000,000 from their existing bank accounts, if not more. Eventually, loans or no loans, the whole $2,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 will have to come out of profits, or from one of the two sources mentioned above, which seem out of the question on any voluntary basis. And, mind you, it must come out of profits after taxes, which means that the steel industry must add at least some $5,000,000,000 to the selling prices of its products in order to retain the $2,500,000,000. Not a dollar of this $5,000,000,000 can be added to stockholders' dividends. Additional profits must exist, if working capital is to get necessary increases and fair dividends are to be paid.

Profits on this necessary scale, reported under present corporation income tax regulations, are bound to appear fabulous to anyone who takes the statistics of steel company profits at their apparent meaning, which CIO economists and officers choose to represent as valid, either knowingly or ignorantly. They put the steel industry, and others, in a false and vulnerable position before the jury.

The CIO handling of statistics, as I have observed it, has been an enthusiastic and even bitter use of half-truths wherever they can be used to favor their own interests more than whole truths, at least as I see them. By whatever extent they succeed in raising wages on the claim that they should be paid out of profits without raising prices, they raise replacement costs for steel making plant, make higher depreciation charges necessary, make increased working capital a necessity, make expansion possible only with still larger profits, cut down the proportion of profits which can be paid in dividends, and prepare a situation in which they can again argue for higher wages to be paid out of profits without raising prices, all by using statistics in their apparent meaning which, by Government rules, ignore existing replacement costs. Every investor regards these Government-ordered profits as phony, if he knows his facts as given by such impartial fact reporters as Standard & Poors. That is why the prices (they pay for steel stocks) value equipment with a replacement cost of $250 as low as from $32 to $87. These profit reports in the steel industry are phony in my opinion because they are subject to substantial ex post facto reduction when depreciated equipment is replaced at inflated costs.

This ex post facto reduction of past earnings probably hits the steel industry harder than any other because of the high rate of depreciation of equipment under the tremendous heats and pressures. This high rate of physical depreciation would not be so serious, if it were not for the unusually large investment in plant per dollar of output in finished steel.

In any sound theory of the price system, in my opinion, the remedy for high profits is expansion and competition in the particular industry. But in order to stimulate expansion and competition, the high profits must not, in the opinion of critical and careful investors, be mere overstatements required by law in the face of rising costs. In order to perform their stimulating function, profits must appear to be genuine and not subject to inevitable and substantial reduction for years after they have been earned, reported, and taxed. Why should investors put money into new plants when they can buy three times as much steel-producing capacity in the stock market for the same money?

In other words, by the standards of prudent investors, genuine profits are too small, not too high. These apparently high profits are made to appear so only by Government tax regulations which make no allowance for the fact of increasing inflation of replacement costs of plant and equipment, which hit the steel industry below the belt, in my honest belief.

To ask the steel industry to reduce its genuinely small profits through higher wages without raising prices, and at the same time asking it to finance an expansion to the tune of $2,500,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 to raise annual capacity for ingot production by 10,000,000 tons is to take another long step toward making free enterprise impotent and ready for the scrap heap. Then we shall all have less liberty and a lower standard of living, but, praise God, no one will make profits, either genuine or phony. Or should I praise Marx?

Yours earnestly,

JESSE H. BOND.

It's Time To Reexamine Foreign Commitments That Threaten United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "It's Time To Reexamine Foreign Commitments That Threaten United States" delivered by the distinguished former United States Senator from Kansas, Arthur Capper. Senator Capper, elder statesman of Kansas, is recognized as the No. 1 citizen by the people of our State.

He was a member of this distinguished body for 30 years and during much of that service was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, which gave him an opportunity to become familiar with our international problems.

His suggestion that we reexamine our foreign commitments at the present time, I am confident, meets with the approval of the people of Kansas.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME TO REEXAMINE FOREIGN COMMITMENTS THAT THREATEN UNITED STATES

In the days ahead, as we work out, the hard way, foreign and domestic policies that can enable America to survive, there is one important point which we cannot ignore.

That point is just this:

We must start from where we are today.

We cannot start from 1900, nor from 1914, nor from 1941. Nor even from 1945.

We have to start from now, whether we like it or not.

Nations and peoples are like individuals in that respect.

They, like you and I, on any today are where all our yesterdays have placed us.

Our Nation today is just exactly where our national leadership, over past years, has placed us.

And our decisions for today, and our programs for tomorrow and for many tomorrows, inevitably will have to be based on that understanding.

For instance, we cannot change the fact that we are engaged, our men are engaged, in a losing battle in Korea.

That is an inescapable fact.

We cannot change the fact that we have occupation forces in Japan; that we have occupation forces in Germany.

Neither can we escape the fact that we, through our leadership, at times without our consent, even without our knowledge, have made certain commitments to other nations and other peoples.

We have made commitments under the Marshall plan; legally for a definite period ending in 1952; perhaps morally for a longer period.

We certainly have approved the Charter of the United Nations, through ratification of that Charter by the Senate as a treaty.

We have committed ourselves, also in a treaty duly ratified by the Senate, through the Atlantic Pact to defend certain other nations in the so-called Atlantic community, in case they or any of them are attacked.

We cannot escape the fact that we have accumulated a national debt that is approaching the $300,000,000,000 mark, and all that that implies.

Nor can we refuse to recognize as a fact, getting back into the field of domestic affairs, that we have made certain commitments to many of our own people: the aged, the unemployed, the farmers, the veterans.

What other foreign commitments and entanglements we have been committed to through secret agreements, we have yet to learn.

I could go on for a long time, reciting things done yesterday, promises and commitments made yesterday which cannot be ignored in our decisions today and our plans for tomorrow.

I would say furthermore, that the commitments we have made, to nations outside and overseas, and commitments made to our own people, should be kept—should be kept to the limits of our ability to keep them.

But I also say the time has come to reexamine a number of these commitments, and reexamine the policies which led to those commitments.

If upon reexamination it is decided that certain of those policies are leading the United States to destruction, and the people of the United States toward the loss of their freedom and their birthright, then these policies should be changed.

And I say further that if upon reexamination into all the facts and factors in the case, that certain commitments cannot be kept, then we should retract those commitments, upon due notice, and with due regard to obligations that other nations and peoples have undertaken upon the strength of those commitments.

And if, upon this reexamination, it develops that our leaders have made unauthorized commitments, have adopted unwise and unsound policies—then we should change that leadership as quickly as is possible.

I am perfectly aware that we cannot live our yesterdays over again. The decisions we made in our yesterdays, the things we did in our yesterdays, are past, cannot be unmade and undone.

But we can, and should, so conduct our affairs that those wrong decisions and those wrong actions, are not made over again.

We cannot escape the evil consequences of the unconditional-surrender policy, the Morgenthau plan, the agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

But we ought not to continue the policies and programs—and the leadership—which gave us those policies and those unfortunate agreements, and which have reduced us to our present and very unpleasant situation.

Because what we do in the field of domestic affairs right now is so largely dependent upon our policies in the field of foreign relations, I repeat today the assertion I made nearly a year ago, that Secretary of State Dean Acheson should resign.

I say the men of Yalta, those that are left in the State Department and other branches of our Government—these men of Yalta must go, before the Congress of the United States, with the backing of the people of the United States, can cooperate with the President of the United States in effectuating a sound foreign policy.

I think, myself, it is unfortunate that the determination of many phases of our foreign policy, and of our actions in world affairs, are no longer even measurably under our own control.

Ten years ago the United States was in position, to a much greater extent than today, to determine its own foreign policies.

Today many of our decisions and our actions, whether we like to acknowledge it or not, are being made for us by Soviet Russia and by Red China.

Others are being made for us by the United Nations, by Britain, by France, by other member nations in the North Atlantic Pact—it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that some may be made by the peoples of Germany and Japan, which as of today are not really nations at all.

For the foregoing reasons, among others, I believe it is a healthy thing that Herbert Hoover and Joseph P. Kennedy, and Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, have called for a reexamination of our foreign policy in such a way that the American people can hardly dodge facing the issue.

My regret is that this was not done sooner.

I believe that even those who do not agree with the basic contentions of any of these three men, are in substantial agreement that the so-called big debate they have started is a healthy thing for the Nation and for the world.

For instance, I note this language in the President's message to Congress on the state of the Union which I quote:

"I ask the Congress for unity in these crucial days," President Truman said.

"Make no mistake about my meaning," he continued. "I do not ask or expect unanimity. Only by debate can we arrive at decisions which are wise, and which reflect the desires of the American people. We do not have dictatorship in this country, and we will never have one in this country."

That was President Truman speaking. I believe I will quote three more paragraphs from his message, as follows:

"When I request unity, what I am really asking for is a sense of responsibility on the part of every Member of this Congress. Let us debate the issues, but let every man among us weigh his words and deeds. There is a sharp difference between harmful criticism and constructive criticism. If we are truly responsible individuals, I am sure that we will be unified as a government.

"Let us keep our eyes on the issues and work for the things we all believe in.

"Let each of us put our country ahead of our party, and ahead of our own personal interests."

That ends the quotation from the President's message, and I want to say, my friends, that I agree 100 percent with these sentiments there expressed by President Truman.

And I hope every member of Congress, and of the President's Cabinet, and the White House staff from the President down, keeps those words in mind, and conducts himself accordingly.

And now a few words from Senator TAFT's talk at the National Press Club last Tuesday, taken from the transcript of that speech—which I also quote with approval:

"I have only one perfectly confident view, and that is that we ought to have a policy; the policy ought to be submitted to Congress and determined. If we want to get unity in this country we have got to tell the people what it is they are expected to sacrifice.

"We are going to have to ask people to reduce their standards of living. We are going to have to ask them to get along on 90 percent of what they got along on last year. And nobody in this country is expecting to do it today, because they don't see the necessity of it and don't understand it. We are going to ask them to give up their boys probably for 2 years' service, every boy in the United States, even on a minimum basis."

That ends the quotation from Senator TAFT—and also my time on the air.

Another Munich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter entitled "Another Munich?" written by Clarence E. Singleton, of Astoria, Oreg., to the editor and published in a December issue of the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER MUNICH

To the EDITOR:

Shades of Chamberlain and Daladier. Will fools and diplomats never learn? Must Washington become another Munich?

We are now faced with a political equation all too similar to another which most of us remember far too well. Twelve years ago it was Chamberlain, today Attlee. Then it was Daladier, now Pleven. They met in Munich, those early appeasers. Now they plan to meet in Washington with the same illusion that they will effect "peace in our time."

That black day in Munich they talked of avoiding a second world war by appeasing Hitler and his stooges in Czechoslovakia. Now they dream of avoiding a third world war by appeasing Stalin and his stooges in China. We even have a repetition of a demilitarized Sudetenland in the British plan for a similar zone along the Korean-Manchurian border. It is almost unbelievable that men in high places could ever again consider such a plan.

This policy nearly spelled death to civilization and freedom as we know and love it the last time. Historians generally agree, however, that a bold and determined stand at Munich may well have prevented that Second World War.

In one direction lies certain eventual defeat. The other offers at least a hope. It is time, yes, far past the time, that we the American people and the other democratic nations on this globe started treating international outlaws as such instead of meeting with them as honorable members of society, bargaining with them as if they had something to offer, and losing ground at every turn in world events.

CLARENCE E. SINGLETON.

ASTORIA.

Communist China an Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, Mr. Constantine Brown, a journalist of high attainments, has contributed such worth-while views in an article published in the Washington Evening Star of Friday, January 12, that I feel the entire membership of Congress and the American public would be immeasurably benefited by reading it.

In a forthright manner, he makes a factual presentation of developments concerning the proposal that Communist China be named as aggressor in the present Korean conflict. Feeling that Mr. Brown is to be complimented for the clarity of his thought and courage of his expression, I earnestly commend this article to general reading, and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UN MEMBERS STILL EVADE ISSUE

(By Constantine Brown)

The Chinese Communists are continuing their relentless drive in Korea.

Our military leaders feel confident that as the Chinese lines of communication are lengthened our strategic position will improve, so long as we have our present mastery of the air.

But from the political point of view it has become questionable whether we should hold the Pusan beachhead. Some of the 53 nations which approved the police action against the Korean aggressors last June now are shaking in their boots and fear to label the Chinese Reds aggressors.

Under these conditions our continued stay in Korea would be an American, not a United Nations operation.

The American delegation at the United Nations for nearly a month now has been asking our associates to declare the Chinese Communists aggressors.

A number of old-fashioned diplomatic subterfuges were used by Britain and her associates to prevent our resolution from coming before the body which last June ordered the police action. In spite of our pleadings, and discreet but clear warnings that the attitude of the appeasers may destroy the effectiveness of the United Nations, the member nations are still evading the issue.

The British and Indian Governments are urging us to get together directly with the Peiping puppets to find an equitable solution to the present problem. In other words, these governments feel that because the Chinese Communists have, by their armed intervention, succeeded in preventing United Nations forces from accomplishing their mission, we should hoist the white flag and go hat in hand to ask Mao Tse-tung for forgiveness.

It is understandable that the European governments, like others of the remaining free nations, should be worried about the present military potential of Russia and her satellites. It is equally understandable that the European nations should want everything that America has of military value poured into Europe, where the Red land and air forces are far superior to what the western nations have ready for defensive purposes.

It is difficult, however, to understand why they believe that abject surrender to China, such as they propose, would improve the present situation. It is difficult to understand how the free nations, which are pledged to support the United Nations to the limit, can hope that this organization can survive by condoning aggression.

The North Korean attack last June and the intervention of the Chinese Communists last November were planned in detail in the Kremlin. The presence of Soviet officers and of the latest types of Russian war materials is ample proof of Moscow's designs, even for the most determined wishful thinkers.

It is hard to conceive how the British and Commonwealth Prime Ministers can imagine that by yielding to Moscow's puppet Mao we do not actually surrender to the Soviet Government.

Napoleon's great victories were due as much to his military genius as to the fact that he was fighting coalition armies belonging to countries which had divergent interests.

Will history repeat itself? There is a desperate need for unity between the free nations. From the political point of view, the United Nations represents the best place where such unity could be achieved. It was put to the test factually last June, when the case of the North Korean aggression was presented to the free nations.

They ordered military measures and we assumed 90 percent of the burden in manpower and 100 percent of the burden in financial expense of the police action, which so far has put us in the red to the tune of more than $14,000,000,000.

This, to be sure, does not include the nearly 8,000 killed Americans, whose value cannot be estimated in dollars. But we played our part faithfully, in the hope that our adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter would consolidate that unity among the free nations, without which the Kremlin's imperialistic aims will be easily achieved.

Waste in Nondefense Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, further study of the Department of Agriculture's demands for the expense of its huge nondefense food-hoarding plans reveals a shocking indifference to the tax burden placed on the American people and to the imperative necessity of "rigid economy in its—the Government's—nondefense activities."

In terms of the uses to which this wasted money could be put in the purchase of equipment for our Armed Forces, it is nothing short of a tragic scandal.

In the period between July 1, 1950, and June 30, 1952, that Department insists it will spend $79,142,217 just to store butter, cheese, dried milk, dried eggs, dried beans, dried peas, potatoes, rice, turkeys, and grain sorghums.

At current costs this money would build 100 of the new Navy antisubmarine attack planes and still leave $14,142,217 with which to purchase ammunition for them.

Such flagrant refusal to recognize the relative requirements for our national security is a clear example of the government-as-usual attitude pervading all too many agencies of the executive department here. I am confident that Congress will not give its approval to such demands. But I am also convinced that a widespread expression of opinion by the American public as to its attitude toward such proposals will bring a quicker end to them than is possible through the procedures available to Congress.

"The Peace of Which the Russian Communists Speak Is in Reality Nothing but Conquest—Their Conception of Peace Is Our Conception of Slavery—Some Day There Will Be Peace in the World—A Peace in Which All Men Will Be Working Together To Build a Happier, Fuller Life for All"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again I bring to the attention of this House a teledocumentary sent over the air last Sunday afternoon by the National Broadcasting Co. entitled "Battle Report, Washington."

It was this week's version of what the Honorable John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, acting in cooperation with Ted Ayers, producer-director of the National Broadcasting Co., conceived to be the primary subjects, not yet discussed, in which the American people currently find great interest.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that I know of no program sent out over the air that is more informative, more intriguing, more thought provoking, or better presented than are the broadcasts, through which Mr. Steelman presents various Cabinet officers, military leaders, and other heads of Government, in frank, open, and candid discussion of the problems which confront the Nation, and particularly those problems which come under their personal administration.

On Sunday last, Mr. Steelman presented four top defense officials from the Department of the Interior concerned with our natural resources: Mr. James Boyd, Director, Bureau of Mines, and Administrator, Defense Minerals Administration, who spoke on the mineral production in its relation to the economic needs of both our military and civilian life; Mr. Bruce K. Brown, Deputy Administrator, Petroleum Administration for Defense, who discussed our petroleum resources; Mr. Clifford B. McManus, Administrator, Defense Power Administration, who spoke on power; and Mr. Charles W. Connor, Administrator, Defense Solid Fuels Administration, who spoke on coal and other solid fuels.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to conceive of a half-hour television program more chock full of information of inestimable value, not only to the Members of this House but to every citizen throughout the length and breadth of this land. I repeat that Mr. Steelman is rendering a most marvelous service to this Nation by his weekly rendition of Battle Report, Washington, over the National Broadcasting Co. network on Sunday afternoons, as produced by Ted Ayers and commented upon by Robert McCormick of NBC.

It is because of these facts that I am extending my remarks and including therein, for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this, the twenty-second edition of Battle Report, Washington.

The program was as follows:

Mr. MCCORMICK. Entering the House Chamber to address the new Congress this past week, President Truman tied the state of the Union to the state of the world. And once again NBC television turns its cameras on both for your twenty-second Battle Report.

Washington—moving forward on the job of expanding our defense, as in Korea, our troops fall back before overwhelming Communist aggressors in a hot war where temperatures are almost 30 below.

Today, Battle Report features a special and revealing appraisal of our mineral-resource strength, so vital to the victory we seek. You will hear, too, from our former chief of ECA in Greece—but first, a statement well worth pondering from the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Since we last met another eventful week has passed into history, and again we have seen how shallow are the Soviet claims that they desire a just peace. We saw with our own eyes how another effort to end the struggle in Korea was blocked in the United Nations by the representatives in the Kremlin.

But even this blatant act, which all the free world could see, did not silence the clamor of the Communist propagandists. They still claim that the Soviet desires peace. But the peace they speak of is really conquest—the confiscation of all property and complete subjugation of all men everywhere to the tyrants in the Kremlin. Their conception of peace is our conception of slavery.

Today, there are already many millions under the Communist yoke. They own nothing. They work long hours in return for scarcely enough to keep body and soul together. And, they are denied the privileges of reading or hearing anything except what their masters decree. Never in the darkest days of slavery in the Western World were any people so completely subjugated or so ruthlessly ruled.

Needless to say, these millions have not been told how another effort to bring about peace has been thwarted by their leaders. In place of the truth they have been given more poisoned words of hatred, they have been told that the men and women of America not only hate them, but are planning to make war against them. I assure you this is not an exaggeration. Hour after hour, every day in the week, Soviet broadcasting stations repeat this vicious lie, and preach the doctrine of hate.

But some day the truth will become known. Some day the suffering, cringing millions who are now feeling the lash of the tyrant will know that we are their friends—that we wish to help them as we are helping millions of others to bring economic security and peace to the world.

Some day there will be peace in the world—a peace in which all men are brothers—not suffering together—but working together to build happier, fuller lives for all.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Korea against this flaming battlefield, American soldiers fight a delaying action as they retreat southward toward Pusan. Latest dispatches from the war front describe the United States Second Division beating off repeated Red banzai attacks. An Eighth Army spokesman reports a menacing Chinese-North Korean build-up east and southeast of Wonju. Obvious purpose—an attempt to trap the Second Division. Meanwhile, our troops launch isolated counterattacks coordinated with heavy bombing strikes to impede the Communist advance. All this news is evidence, if we need it, that there will be no easing of the demand for materials to support our fighting troops. But the average American housewife—according to the recent report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers—will still lead a life of luxury compared to any other country. For our economic output has increased by half in the 10 years since Pearl Harbor, the traffic jams in our streets alone testify to the tremendous outpouring of goods after a decade of intensive economic growth, but when Pearl Harbor jolted us, we were just emerging from 10 years of depression and partial recovery. American production not only supplies us with cars, but fills them with gas for us. And our productive capacity, in the opinion of the Council, is the free world's great advantage that offsets Russia's advantage in manpower. We have but to look at the trucks that daily carry the product of our enviable industry to the four corners of the land to know how fortunate we really are. But don't get the Council wrong. They don't mean we can coast through the critical days ahead with life as usual. Guns need steel, and to get that steel we must, say the experts, "beat many of our plowshares into swords." They remind us that 45 percent of our total output went to defense purposes in World War II, went into tanks like these, and into planes and battleships. "There is no bargain price," say they—and I quote—"on aircraft, tanks, and guns—giving things up will be involved, because we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. But we must stop eating so much cake when the aggressor are so many divisions." These are words for all of us to think about, America, as we face the demands ahead that are sure to be made upon our Nation's natural resources, treasures that we must convert into war goods if we are to win in this all-important battle of ideologies. Battle Report is fortunate today, in being able to bring before its cameras for you, four top defense officials from the Department of the Interior concerned with our resources, the sinews of our defense.

On minerals, you will hear from James Boyd, Minerals Chief; on petroleum, from Bruce K. Brown, Petroleum Head; on power, from Clifford B. McManus, Power Administrator; and on coal, from the Solid Fuels boss, Charles W. Connnor. Here we go, then, for the Nation's first television report on its mineral resources.

Men and machines probing the earth for the minerals we need to support our rapidly expanding mobilization. As men go down to the sea in ships, so today—in the face of world crisis—must men march into our mines to dig out more of our raw, precious ore than ever. For a report of the enormity of this task, we focus now on John Boyd, head of the newly created Defense Minerals Administration.

Mr. BOYD. In normal times the United States consumes half of the minerals production of the world. We use four times as much steel and copper, and three times as much lead and zinc, as all the rest of the world put together. With an enormous rearmament program underway, our need for mineral raw materials is greater than ever before.

Few people realize the difference a few ounces of a mineral as little known as mica can make. Without it, neither tanks nor jeeps nor trucks can operate. Most people have never seen a piece of manganese, but without it our present steel production would be impossible.

World War II caused a tremendous drain on this country's mineral resources. After VJ-day, our expanding economy increased the demand for minerals still further. Even before the outbreak of fighting in Korea, we found domestic output of a number of basic minerals insufficient to meet demands, and we had to step up our imports from abroad.

Before Pearl Harbor, for example, we produced in this country virtually all the copper, lead, and zinc we could use, and we had some left over to ship abroad. In recent years, however, we have had to supplement American production of these metals with imports from foreign countries.

To help assure that adequate supplies of mineral raw materials will be made available to meet the growing needs of the country's industrial machine in the present emergency, the Defense Minerals Administration was established in the Department of the Interior.

Our job is to help industry step up the output of domestic mines all across the board, from antimony to zirconium. In addition to expanding our own productive capacity, we are seeking to bring in from abroad those minerals which are in short supply or which, like tin or nickel, we do not have in any quantity at home. Moreover, we must try to discover new deposits of ore and encourage the development of our known but hitherto unworked deposits.

Government geologists and mining engineers stationed in the various mineral-producing areas of the Nation are ready to help those who are seeking Government assistance. They are examining ore deposits, mines, quarries, mills, and smelters where new operations or increased production appear feasible. They are available to advise small mine owners and prospectors. Later on, if necessary, we may set up procurement depots in the principal mining districts, as was done during World War II, where mining operators can bring their ore to sell to the Government.

All these steps are urgently needed to make sure that we have enough mineral raw materials to meet the demands of our mobilization program and of our civilian economy.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Deep into the earth, too, must we go for the oil needed to power our trucks, ships, planes, and tanks. Lost in the dim past is the title "Oil for the Lamps of China." Now the call is for oil to defend our troops against the invading Chinese in Korea. What are our war requirements? How will it affect every car owner? Here with the facts is Deputy Administrator Bruce K. Brown, of our Petroleum Administration for Defense.

Mr. BROWN. During World War II we built a bridge of ships across both oceans and transported millions of men and countless tons of food and munitions to the fighting fronts all over the globe. Over 60 percent of the deadweight of this enormous tonnage was petroleum.

That figure will give some idea of the importance of oil in fighting a war. Our military services depend 100 percent on liquid petroleum to drive their ships, planes, tanks, and trucks.

In addition, oil and gas provide over half of the heat and power we use in the United States—for heating homes, for producing electricity, for refueling our automobiles and trucks.

Total domestic demand for petroleum this year—that is, civilian and military requirements together—amounts to well over 7,000,000 barrels a day. This is one-third more than we were using in 1945, at the peak of World War II.

To meet this demand, petroleum is being produced from over half a million wells in the United States, some of them 3 miles deep. To keep up production we'll have to drill about 44,000 new wells during 1951. This will require almost 2,000,000 tons of steel for pipe and equipment. If we can get the steel and other materials, we can get the petroleum.

Since the Korean War, began 6 months ago, requirements for aviation fuel for the military services have sharply increased. Although the production of aviation gasoline is a tricky job, military goals are being met, and the petroleum industry is being geared to meet further increases in military needs.

What every automobile owner wants to know, of course, is what the outlook is for motor gasoline for civilian use. Some reduction in the octane ratings of gasoline sold in the coastal areas of the country will be required in order to build up our national supply of tetraethyl lead. The Petroleum Administration for Defense in the near future will issue an order limiting these ratings. This reduction in the quality of motor gasoline will not, however, affect engine performance on most automobiles and will work no real hardship on anyone.

I see no need to ration gasoline in the present defense economy. Although the Armed Forces need large amounts of petroleum, the military uses less than 5 percent of our supplies. We can do a whole lot more mobilizing without really straining petroleum facilities.

Mr. McCORMICK. Matching our needs in oil and minerals, America, is our fast-increasing demand for power—electric power—much of it born of the streams of our Nation, harnessed by our huge dams. As our turbines spin out this invisible strength, and our high-tension lines make a reassuring pattern against the sky—we focus next on our Defense Power Administrator, Clifford B. McManus.

Adequate electric power is one of the fundamental needs of the rearmament program. That power must be available if our defense production goals are to be realized. It is the job of the Defense Power Administration to see that it is obtained—not only wherever needed, but on time.

In this endeavor we are counting on the whole-hearted assistance and cooperation of the entire electrical power industry of the Nation. This includes some 3,000 organizations, both private and public, as well as approximately 1,000 rural electric cooperatives.

It is the responsibility of the Defense Power Administration to quarterback this great team in the electric power phase of the defense effort.

Fortunately, the electric power systems are in better shape to meet the present production emergency than they were in 1942. Because of unprecedented peacetime demands, they have continued to expand their facilities and increase their capacity since the end of World War II.

The United States enters this emergency with a greater electric power capacity and a greater electric power potential than any other nation. In order to meet the demands for power to produce tanks and airplanes and weapons, still greater expansion will be required as quickly as possible. The electric power industry is not one that can mushroom over night. It takes time to produce the heavy equipment necessary to manufacture and transmit electric current. It is imperative, therefore, that nothing be allowed to hinder or delay the electric power expansion contemplated for national defense.

Upon the Defense Power Administration rests the responsibility of funneling electric power where it is most needed for defense work; of scheduling essential electrical materials or equipment in order that they may be delivered on time; of screening the use of scarce electrical construction items and seeing that they do not go into unessential, nondefense projects; of contriving in every possible way to squeeze the last usable kilowatt out of our power plants.

Without adequate power our defense effort would be severely handicapped. I am sure that the electric power industry will meet the challenge.

Mr. McCORMICK. And finally, add to this roster of essential defense resources coal and other solid fuels—American coal, vital to supporting our European allies as well as ourself. As our mines give out with more coal than ever before, the question still remains, Will we be able to meet the defense demands upon our coal production? Listen to the answer from Charles W. Connor, Administrator for Defense of our Solid Fuels Administration.

Mr. CONNOR. Our coal resources have always been one of the vital foundations of our economic strength in peace or in war. In peace coal is our most important single source of energy, supplying half of our total demands. In a national emergency, such as we face today, the needs for coal expand rapidly. The extent of these requirements is underlined by the fact that it takes 6 pounds of coal to make a pound of smokeless powder, 2 tons of coal to make a 1-ton bomb, and 220 tons to make a modern tank. The expansion of our electric power industry will require huge additional amounts of coal, and steel expansion will put pressure on our supplies of high-grade coking coal.

In addition to the expanded needs of our own defense economy we are being called upon to ship vast amounts of coal to Western Europe. This year our coal exports probably will be the third highest in history, since Western Germany and Great Britain, Europe's traditional coal supplies, are unable to keep pace with the needs of the Marshall-plan countries. To meet the increased demand and to relieve the shortage of shipping facilities, additional ships are being made available to carry coal to Europe.

Despite these huge demands on our coal production, I am sure that the American coal industry can meet the test. Fortunately we have abundant coal reserves. In an emergency we can greatly expand our coal output. During World War II we supplied coal at a rate of about 620,000,000 tons a year. Today our coal industries are prepared to mine 650,000,000 tons annually, enough to meet even the vast requirements of a total war.

If we are to reach and to maintain peak production, however, we must be sure that adequate transportation is available, that a steady flow of essential mining machinery is maintained, and that adequate mining manpower is on hand. A substantial number of additional open-top coal cars are required to move coal from the mines to consumers. The car-building program is moving slowly at present, but is expected to reach 10,000 cars a month by June 1951. This program must be pressed if the emergency coal needs of our economy are to be met.

Because of this transportation bottleneck and because coal cannot be stored at the mines, stockpiling of coal by industrial consumers and home owners is an important phase of our defense effort. Hoarding coal is patriotic.

Coal shortages would drastically handicap our entire rearmament effort. The Defense Solid Fuels Administration is working cooperatively with the American coal industry to make sure that we have enough.

Mr. McCORMICK. In Korea, the resources of which the officials you have just heard have reported, must often purposely be expended as part of our scorched-earth policy, a policy to deprive the enemy of whatever must be left behind as we are forced to withdraw southward. This is what our NBC front-line cameramen saw as they pictured the evacuation of Kimpo airfield. Going up in flames are huge stocks of fuel and petroleum jelly bombs which couldn't be moved. This business of seeing that the enemy gets nothing that can be helpful to him is not new to modern warfare. In World War II the Nazis—as shown here—carried it to the point of running railway trains over cliffs, blowing up bridges and often demolishing, as they estimated, any structure that might give shelter to the enemy; Korea but echoes all this.

Countries like Greece—filmed here—know the problems this poses when peace returns. The World War II destruction it suffered imposed a heavy strain upon its people—orphaned children and homeless adults both. Only when American help came did Greece begin on the long road back. We hear next from Paul R. Porter who was there as chief of our Economic Cooperation Administration aid, and serves now as ECA's Assistant Administrator for Program—Mr. Porter.

Mr. PAUL R. PORTER. A fine example of how American aid has combated communism is found in Greece, where communism virtually has been halted cold.

Three years ago there was chaos in that country, and communism thrives upon chaos. Greece had gone through long years of war and occupation, with severe damage to its ports, railroads, highways, communications, industries, and housing. Liberation did not bring peace, because the Communists purportedly began a Kremlin-sponsored war for the conquest of Greece.

Then came American aid—military and economic. Fighting on Greek soil came to an end in August 1949—the immediate threat of Soviet conquest through revolution was averted * * * and the hard task of reconstruction began in earnest. Today the Greek economy no longer is in a state of near paralysis. Agricultural and industrial production have surpassed their prewar levels. Ports and railroads have been repaired. Modern highways have been built. An ambitious electric-power program is under way. Inflation has been checked and there is a greater degree of financial stability. The hundreds of thousands of refugees, uprooted by the guerrilla war, have been helped to return to their home areas. The Marshall plan helped them to a new start in life with materials to repair damaged homes, and with seeds, tools, and farm animals. Today per capita food consumption is as high as it has been in modern Greek history.

Efforts of the Economic Cooperation Administration also have been directed to modernizing productive facilities of the country, through technical-assistance programs, new methods in agriculture, and work with labor unions.

Communist influence, which a few years ago was dominant in the Greek trade unions, now is a minor factor. New infiltration, however, remains a constant threat. The ECA labor officers in Greece have helped strengthen democratic practices in the Greek trade unions and in doing so have weakened Communist propaganda among workers.

While much progress has been made, a great deal remains to be done. A part of the future plan is directed toward tax reform, cheaper credit, cheaper transport and further removal of trade barriers. Despite the historic poverty of the country, I believe Greece can become self-supporting within a few years. The people are richly endowed with courage and intelligence. They are thrifty and hard working. The natural resources of the country are not large. However, a comparatively modest investment in productive facilities and technical training will permit a substantially greater production, and a higher standard of living.

The Greeks know how the Marshall plan has improved their lives and their security. They are on the side of freedom and appreciative of American aid. The Greek people will play an increasingly more effective role in the partnership of free nations as economic recovery progresses.

Mr. McCORMICK. Thank you, Paul Porter. That "partnership of free nations"—America—the goals of that partnership were stated in clear and ringing tones by President Truman in his closing remarks to Congress last week. Battle Report's own cameramen were there. And that you may not forget what it is we're fighting for, let us recall the President's words again:

"This is our cause—peace, freedom, justice. We will pursue this cause with determination and asking divine guidance that in all we do we may follow God's will."

Thus the Nation looks from Washington on this second Sunday of this year of decision, 1951.

Moral Rearmament and Its Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as an extension of my remarks, I am pleased to include an address by D. Hayes Murphy, president of the Wiremold Co., Hartford, Conn., to the employees of that firm on January 5, 1951.

As Members of Congress we are familiar with the work done by Moral Rearmament, having been sufficiently impressed to authorize the appointment of congressional observers to its international convention.

Mr. Murphy tells an inspiring story of the results of Moral Rearmament in labor-management relations, a story which may be repeated time and time again as this movement becomes more widespread in its adherency.

The address follows:

When I went to Washington last week I took with me a letter addressed to the Office of Defense Mobilization. This letter stated that in Wiremold we have a loyal, patriotic group of people who know how to work together as a team and who are ready to serve our country. It contained a summary of what we did in the last war and what we are doing now to try to get some Government orders. It was signed by Morris Johnson for the union and by me for management. This letter is on file in the Office of Defense Mobilization, with a copy in the Office of Small Business Administration. It will not get us any business. We will still have to dig up the orders ourselves. But it will do no harm.

What I want to talk with you about is quite another subject:

Mrs. Murphy and I have been spending several days in Washington attending the Moral Rearmament convention.

Moral Rearmament (MRA) is a philosophy based on what you and I know to be right—things that we have been taught ever since we were children.

MRA is the practical application of these principles—and here they are:

THE FOUR MORAL STANDARDS UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF GOD

1. Absolute honesty.
2. Absolute purity.
3. Absolute unselfishness.
4. Absolute love.

Certainly there is nothing new about that. But what is new is to see the miraculous changes that result when these moral standards are actually applied to our problems.

There were about 500 delegates and others at the convention. They came from many countries—most all the countries except those behind the iron curtain. There were people from all walks of life—people in high positions, people in low positions—rich and poor, black and whote, labor leaders and management leaders—military leaders—political leaders, coal barons and miners—all with one idea in their minds and in their hearts. People of all religions were there but they all agreed on the four moral standards. MRA just makes people better—whatever their religious beliefs or even if they have none.

Here is evidence not only of what can happen but of what did happen:

For 16 months the United Air Lines have been on the verge of a strike and the bitterness on both sides was intense. A pilot named Larry Shapiro was the labor leader—a very clever fellow. He sat on the platform on one side of Dr. Buchman, the convention chairman, and Mr. Patterson, president of United Air Lines, sat on the other side. Also present were Mr. Fallon, personnel manager, and about 30 pilots of United Air Lines.

Shapiro was the first speaker. For 16 years he was a pilot and 2 years ago was elected president of the Air Lines Pilots Association. He told us that he was a very bitter expert in damning management and could twist into the negative any company policy, no matter how sound and well intended it might be. He had charge of grievances and considered it his job to create dissension and bitterness whenever and wherever possible. He met planes at the airfields and solicited grievances from pilots and stewardesses and magnified them.

In the course of the negotiations there were five bitter days of hearings with lawyers and experts on both sides chewing the rag over 101 grievances—each side cheering for the other side to say something that they could be crossed up on—and getting nowhere. At this stage of the proceedings Shapiro went home one day to think things over quietly by himself.

He had attended an MRA conference in Los Angeles some time before and it occurred to him that the application of the four moral standards was the answer. He knew that the whole affair between pilots and United Air Lines was dead wrong—there was nothing to lose, so he decided to try it. He went to the personnel manager with the idea and Mr. Fallon asked him if he had been hypnotized—he couldn't believe that Shapiro the agitator could be sincere in his admission that he had been causing as much trouble as he possibly could and now wanted to make amends and cooperate. President Patterson of United Air Lines heard of it and sent for Shapiro, and they had a heart-to-heart talk. Sure enough, Shapiro was a changed man and they went to work together to clean up the mess.

After Shapiro finished speaking, Patterson spoke and gave the same story from his standpoint.

The result is that the 101 grievances were boiled down to 11—not grievances but problems. Eight of these have been solved and they are sure they will settle the other three. These are problems which cannot be settled by management alone and cannot be settled by labor alone but must be settled by both working together. There is no other way.

Example: One of the demands was that the pilots be guaranteed a day off each week. This was changed from a grievance to a problem, the problem being "How can the pilots be assured a day off without interrupting United Air Lines' service to the public?"

Shapiro said that this new philosophy is the answer not only for the United Air Lines but for the entire airlines industry and for the world.

Another example of how the four moral standards under the guidance of God work is their influence on Communists.

Communists, as you know, infiltrate into every organization, schools, churches, labor unions, etc. They used to infiltrate into MRA but what do you suppose happened? I don't think you could ever guess. Believe it or not, these Communists themselves were converted and are now working for MRA. There were five of them, all former Communist leaders, at the convention at Washington and we heard their most amazing stories.

Communists have now been forbidden to infiltrate the MRA for fear that more of them will find a better philosophy and join the movement.

Mr. Ed Perry, of West Hartford, arranged for Mrs. Murphy and me to have dinner with two of these ex-Communists and, with the help of an interpreter, we carried on one of the most interesting conversations we had ever participated in.

Two of the ex-Communists whom we met had gone to a moral rearmament meeting at Caux, Switzerland, to see what it was all about and get some arguments against the movement. They stayed so long that one of the most trusted Communist Party members was sent to bring them back. Did he bring them back? No; he did not. He also found an idea that was better than the Marxist or Communist idea and is now also working for MRA.

You see, the moral rearmament movement is not against anything except the opposites of the four moral standards—dishonesty, lust, greed, and hate.

All this is first-hand evidence. We saw these men and heard them talk. One of them said, "I am a revolutionist and this MRA is a far bigger revolution than communism because it is for the good of everyone—not just one class. I will spend the rest of my life fighting for it."

The settling of the United Air Lines' problems and the conversion of Communists were only two of many wonderful things that have happened as a result of changes that occurred in human nature.

Before I went to Washington I could not see how world war III could be avoided but with this evidence of how industrial disputes can be settled and Communists can be changed, I now have hope. But we must change ourselves first and we must change fast.

There was a lot of talk about change and guidance. One of the Communists said that the first two English words he learned were "change" and "guidance."

A labor leader from the docks of London said he was so changed after attending an MRA meeting that when he came home his dog bit him. I have a dog and when I came home I watched her behavior very carefully. She wagged her tail, took a sniff, and looked puzzled. If I can read a dog's mind, she was thinking, "Yes, that's the old man all right, but he's got a strange smell about him. I guess he's got religion."

To illustrate what I mean and to start with myself, I have an apology to make and it never would have occurred to me to do it if I had not had this MRA experience. I hope

Eddie Goulet is listening because the apology is for him. When he was in my office a while ago, he made a remark that irritated me and I made an angry retort. I shouldn't have lost my temper, and I am sorry.

This MRA story is a big one. It is a world-shaking story and much of it is in a new book just off the press called "The World Rebuilt," by Peter Howard. It tells the actual experiences of many of the people we met in Washington. In order that all of you and some of our other friends may read it for yourselves, I ordered 500 copies which will be distributed as soon as they are received.

I intend to talk more with you about MRA and in the meantime let us all give some serious thought to the four moral standards under the guidance of God. Just think what would happen if we applied them in our shop, in our homes, in our country, and in the world:

Absolute honesty.
Absolute purity.
Absolute unselfishness.
Absolute love.

Proposed Expenditures for Fiscal Year 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A247, I inserted as a part of my remarks a table showing the proposed budget authorizations for expenditures in the fiscal year 1952. It now appears that the Ways and Means Committee will be called upon to find new sources of revenue to take care of nearly $11,000,000,000 in deficiency and supplementary appropriations which are President proposes to submit to Congress for the fiscal year 1951, ending next June 30.

If these appropriations and authorizations are approved by the Congress, the total for fiscal year 1951 will reach nearly $87,500,000,000. This is by far the largest peacetime budget in the history of the Republic. These figures of proposed expenditures by the Truman New Deal spenders point unerringly to the necessity of cutting out nonessential and nondefense items in the proposed budget.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks the table prepared by Mr. Paul O. Peters:

PROPOSED BUDGET AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES—FISCAL YEAR 1951

(By Paul O. Peters)

(Compiled from the budget for the fiscal year 1952)

Revisions in the appropriations, contract authorizations, together with proposed supplementary requests for appropriations, run the total budget authorizations for Federal expenditures during the fiscal year ending next June 30 to the record peacetime total of $87,459,449,977. The details are shown by the table following:

Description	Authorized or enacted	Proposed for later request	Total
Appropriations:			
Legislative branch	$69,592,721	$200,000	$69,792,721
The judiciary	25,304,665		25,304,665
Executive Office, the President	20,373,553		20,373,553
Appropriated to the President	8,077,460,729	210,000,000	8,287,460,729
Independent offices	9,095,323,710	168,345,848	9,263,669,558
Federal Security Agency	1,725,876,450	25,187,500	1,751,063,950
General Services Administration	3,253,564,444	190,000,000	3,443,564,444
House and Home Finance Agency	60,700,000		60,700,000
Department of Agriculture	906,264,514	6,000,000	912,264,514
Department of Commerce	822,741,909	20,750,000	843,491,909
Defense, military functions	41,865,060,336	10,000,000,000	51,865,060,336
Defense, civil functions	983,792,500	450,000	984,242,500
Department of the Interior	666,750,594	2,450,000	669,200,594
Department of Justice	151,330,200	643,000	151,973,200
Department of Labor	235,637,300	3,000,000	238,637,300
Post Office (general fund)	466,376,176	174,135,500	640,511,676
Treasury Department	6,342,426,710	20,000	6,342,446,710
State Department	325,574,287	100,000,000	425,574,287
District of Columbia (contribution)	10,800,000		10,800,000
Reserve for contingencies		50,000,000	50,000,000
Total appropriations	76,086,940,888	10,951,581,848	86,038,522,736
Reappropriations: Enacted	780,573,151		780,573,151
Authorizations to expend from public debt receipts	1,833,698,457		1,833,698,457
Reappropriation of authorization to spend from same receipts	6,262,000		6,262,000
Total, authorizations	77,715,494,496	10,951,581,848	88,668,076,344
Enacted contract authorizations:			
Legislative branch	100,000		100,000
Independent offices	312,650,000		312,650,000
Federal Security Agency	181,088,000		181,088,000
General Services Administration	125,000,000		125,000,000
House and Home Finance Agency	127,000,000		127,000,000
Department of Agriculture			
Department of Commerce	877,125,000		877,125,000
Department of Defense	1,418,285,000		1,418,285,000
Department of the Interior	41,097,000		41,097,000
Department of Justice	700,000		700,000
Department of State	1,000,000		1,000,000
Total, contract authorizations	3,085,245,000		3,085,245,000
Reappropriated authorizations	103,214,141		103,214,141
Total	3,188,459,141		3,188,459,141
Grand total	80,904,953,637	10,951,581,848	91,856,535,485
Deductions for liquidation of prior contract authorizations	4,369,885,508	27,500,000	4,397,085,508
Total	76,535,068,129	10,924,081,848	
Total, new obligation authority, fiscal 1951			87,459,449,977

There it is in black and white: More than $76,500,000,000 already authorized to be spent in fiscal 1951 or obligated during this fiscal year, plus new obligations for which requests are yet to come in this fiscal year of nearly $11,000,000,000, minus the deductions to pay former obligations, and the net new obligations total nearly $87,500,000,000.

If the Congress (and the people they represent) continues to appropriate and authorize expenditures in such stupendous amounts, the American competitive free-enterprise system will soon fall before the authoritarian state and socialism will be enthroned in the United States.

It appears there is much truth in a study made by Link and Freiberg in 1949 (quoted in Leonard E. Read's book, Outlook for Freedom), which showed that 75 percent of the American people believed themselves to be against socialism, yet 66 percent of them favored Government measures that fell within their own definitions of socialism.

This report will be followed in a few days by a report on the projected expenditures and contract authorizations for fiscal 1952.

Tax Deals of Ike and Harry Insult Us All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I think these individuals should practice what they preach:

TAX DEALS OF IKE AND HARRY INSULT US ALL

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK, January 19.—Taxing until it hurts is a relatively empty phrase, since I never knew a man to squirm with pleasure when suddenly chopped off at the hip pockets, but as an individual you find it easy to resent the use of that phrase in Harry Truman's mouth.

The man wants another sixteen billion extra. This drives the annual tax nut to beyond 70,000,000,000 skins. These dollars come, directly or indirectly, from individuals. I am an individual. You are an individual. And so is Harry S. Truman.

In his recent budget speech Mr. Truman has exhorted the people to pare another necessity off the weekly cash outlay in order to meet the fresh demands of Government and defense. I will be pleased to break out the peeler and pare with the other kids, but in this instance I want it unanimous.

Unanimous includes Mr. Truman, who knocks off a cash grab of 50 lovely G-notes each and every year—gorgeous thousand-dollar bills because they are subject neither to scrutiny, account, nor the itching palm of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The way we heave the scratch around, I do not care if they pay Harry a million a year, because the lumps of being President demand a big salary. But tax him they must.

As the symbolic man—as Mr. America, as the leader, the boss, the mirror of us all—the fellow has just plain got to be subservient to the laws that govern us all, or admit that no American can subsist on his earnings.

If Mr. Truman draws a gun, in a fit of anger at a critic, and shoots him dead, then you would expect the law to take its course, with an indictment of murder, a trial by jury, and a just and honest sentence by a judge who awaits the beck of the 12 good men. This is law—"all men are created free and equal."

Saying he survives his term, Mr. Truman will have been able to squirrel away $300,000 of nontaxable money for the 4 years, outside his salary, expenses, and perquisites such as yachts, trains, cars, planes, and such familiar truck. Nobody else alive can line up that much from earned income under the current tax structure.

Except, of course, General of the Army Eisenhower, who was allowed a capital-gains interpretation on about $750,000 revenue from a book he wrote about the war. Other ex-soldiers who wrote books got slashed for the regular earned-income percentage.

Both Truman's free $50,000 annually, and Eisenhower's allowance of capital gains represent a gross insult to the other people who work at all trades, pay taxes, and now are told to take another reef in their belts.

Declaration on Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a meeting of the presidents and representatives of the Association of American Colleges was held recently at Atlantic City, N. J., and out of this meeting came a declaration on manpower, a very carefully prepared statement. I believe it reflects the views of the heads of our great body of independent colleges throughout the country.

At the present time Selective Service and the armed services together are insisting that boys in college will not be permitted to voluntarily enlist in the armed services and select the branch of their choice after an official preinduction notice of physical examination has been sent to the boy in question. He is permitted to finish out the school year, but at the conclusion of the school year he must enter the service and has no opportunity to make a selection. I believe that the armed services has made a grievous mistake in this respect. Hundreds of boys are leaving college in order to enlist in the branch of their choice, and those who are remaining in school are often unsettled emotionally and not prepared to concentrate on their studies to the best advantage. College boys should be permitted, I think, to select the branch of the service they desire and I believe that the situation that exists at the present time should be looked into carefully.

The statement on manpower which I herewith ask to have printed as a part of my remarks touches very definitely on this subject. The statement reads as follows:

DECLARATION ON MANPOWER BY THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES ANNUAL MEETING, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., JANUARY 10, 1951

PREAMBLE

The present national emergency is without parallel in our entire history. It will extend over a long period. It will require great sacrifice. Both from within and from without. It threatens our basic heritage of freedom.

The American college and university recognizes the gravity of the crisis and is actively aware that the national welfare must take precedence over other considerations. It is recognized that there is a present and presumably continuing requirement that essentially all able-bodied young men give service of a proper length of time in the Nation's military forces. As representatives of higher education, we recognize the importance of meeting this requirement to the full. We believe that all young men should share equitably the responsibility of national defense.

It is our conviction that the key to ultimate national survival is the wise use of manpower. In the immediate pressure to have now the men we need in the places where they seem needed, we must not lose sight of the long-range importance of providing a constant flow of trained persons to fill critical places 2 years, 5 years, 10 years, or more hence. Leadership of all types, political, economic, military, educational, and religious, will be even more necessary in the years ahead than today. Further, in a democratic Nation we deal with men as individuals; not as units in the mass. No effective manpower program will treat men in the mass without concern for their dignity as human beings and their individual differences. If we lose sight of this truth, the battle with totalitarianism has been lost at the start.

The American colleges and universities are and have been a vital source of leadership and spiritual strength. Hence, these institutions are more necessary today than ever before. Their strength is the strength of our democracy, from the largest university to the smallest liberal arts college. They must make a continuous contribution to national welfare in every field of learning. Thus it is in the national interest that higher education be viewed as essential to the development of manpower resources.

PROPOSALS

The Association of American Colleges, representing more than 650 institutions of higher learning, therefore strongly recommends to the Federal Government the following considerations concerning the relationship between military manpower and higher education:

I

In the education and training for the armed services and for the civilian war effort there should be no duplication of existing educational facilities. Before new educational facilities are developed by the armed services or other governmental agencies, a thorough survey should be made to see whatever existing facilities could more readily be converted and adapted to meet the particular need. Every effort should be made to bring the facilities of as large a number of educational institutions as possible into the defense efforts, both by increasing the existing number of ROTC units and by allotting other training programs to non-ROTC institutions.

II

We request that appropriate authorities take immediate steps to assure that students whose induction is now postponed or deferred will be permitted to apply for entrance, at the termination of their postponement, any branch of the armed services in which voluntary enlistment is now permitted, regardless of any intervening action by the Selective Service System.

III

Since the shortage of trained personnel is becoming acute, and womanpower is an ever more important source of leadership in civilian service and in the professions, we urge adequate and immediate comprehensive planning to insure the constructive utilization of the ability and training of all college women.

IV

A. In setting the age for entering military training and service we believe that the age for induction should be 19. A lower age should be adopted only when and as long as an emergency manpower shortage requires such lower age.

B. We endorse the present policy of deferring ROTC students until the completion of their college courses. We recommend that the number of ROTC units be increased. We endorse the legislation now before Congress to place on the same basis stipends and educational allowances for men enrolled in all ROTC programs.

V

Certain groups of students now enrolled in colleges and universities have progressed so far with their studies, that it is in the national interest to allow them to complete their course. Among the students to be deferred during the present transitional period should be:

A. Students in professional schools of theology, of medicine, dentistry, and related health fields, and in the graduate schools in mathematics, engineering, and physical and biological sciences.

B. All students who will have completed 2 years of undergraduate study in any curriculum by July 1951 and who are eligible to continue because of satisfactory standing in accredited 4-year colleges.

VI

An enrolled college student who reaches the age of induction while successfully pursuing a course of study should have his induction postponed to the end of his academic year.

VII

If 18-year-olds are to be subject to universal military service, we assume that it is unlikely that more than half could be inducted in the first year of the new legislation. To reduce to a minimum the uncertainty in the minds of prospective and present college students, it is highly desirable that those who are not to be inducted before the opening of their academic year should be notified that they will be able to complete that year before induction.

VIII

To maintain a flow of educated personnel as an important element of national strength we recommend that after basic training a substantial number of properly qualified young men be furloughed to colleges of their choice for further education in all areas of learning before completing their required military service. In implementing this plan, special consideration should be given to a Federal scholarship or loan program, in order that no one who qualifies may be deprived of this educational opportunity for lack of means. We recommend that the administration of this program and the testing and other procedures of selection under it be entrusted to competent civilians.

IX

We recommend that the board of directors appoint a committee to take steps to present the views of the association to the appropriate officers and committees of the executive and legislative branches of the Government and to cooperate with other educational organizations having similar objectives.

X

As an association in which the majority of member institutions are small independent colleges, we recognize the fact that the present emergency seriously threatens the very existence of many of these institutions which represent a vital element in American life. While the foregoing recommendations are intended to provide full participation by

these colleges, we are aware that their problems will be severe for a minimum of 2 or 3 years. We therefore urge governmental agencies, philanthropic foundations, and the American public to consider seriously the need to preserve these institutions for continued service beyond the period of the immediate manpower crisis.

People Should Begin Bearing Down on Congress To Remember Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Press Register of January 17, 1951:

PEOPLE SHOULD BEGIN BEARING DOWN ON CONGRESS TO REMEMBER THEM

United States Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, served on the so-called Hoover Commission for reorganizing Federal bureaucracy. This service gave him an opportunity to get a close-up view of the costly lost motion in present-day Government operations.

A statement just made by Congressman BROWN emphasizes the vital importance of reducing wasteful spending in these days of greater demands for national defense funds.

"Certainly," he says, "before a new tax burden of another $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 or $25,000,000,000 is to be added to the $7,700,000,000 tax boost just voted, we should stop, look, and listen, and be sure that we are doing the right thing in the right way.

"First of all, we should attempt to reduce or eliminate every unnecessary governmental expenditure. We should cut the fat out of the governmental structure.

"We should attempt to determine what is necessary and what is not necessary in the way of expenditures to meet the national emergency.

"Once that is done—but not until it is done—can we determine how much money must be raised to operate our Government and to meet the cost of our national defense program."

Congressman BROWN insisted that we should make certain that any tax legislation which is enacted will be in such a form and make only such levies as our economy can stand.

He warned that a hasty, ill-conceived tax bill can easily wreck our national economy and do irreparable damage to our productive capacity and our national defense effort.

Mr. BROWN made the point that there is a limit on the tax burden any people can long pay or carry. It is imperative that Congress consider this fact in connection with tax legislation. Mr. BROWN should have the unanimous support of his congressional colleagues in keeping this point in mind and giving it proper consideration.

It is the feeling of Congressman BROWN that Congress "has no moral right to increase the tax burden on the American people again and to compel them to make greater sacrifices unless the Federal Government itself first proves its good faith by eliminating every needless expenditure."

He insists that Congress "should not increase taxes just to give the tax spenders more tax money to spend."

Whether they fully realize it today or not, the American people are going to need the protecting arms of many Congressmen CLARENCE J. BROWNS this year. Without this protection, they will stand exposed to an exorbitant new Federal tax raid and the continuation of profligate policies in the use of Federal tax money.

Let no American taxpayer kid himself about that.

Mr. Truman has submitted a Federal spending budget of $71,594,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. A United Press Washington dispatch says "many Democrats and most if not all Republicans" agree with Representative JOHN TABER, member of the House Appropriations Committee from New York State, that billions of dollars could be sliced from the President's budget figure.

United States Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has a term for the Truman-proposed budget. He calls it "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

These reports on sentiment in Congress are encouraging to the hard-hit taxpayers. But the taxpayers had better not go to sleep at the switch. They had better start bearing down right now on their Senators and Representatives in Congress to please remember them.

Lost: American Way of Life, If Russia Overruns Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include an article by Mr. J. A. Livingston in the Washington Post of January 11.

Mr. Livingston is a writer on business and economic conditions in the Washington Post. His enlightening and instructive article, Lost: American Way of Life, If Russia Overruns Europe, is the viewpoint of a man well qualified to analyze the situation which would occur if we withdrew from Europe, as has been proposed by some prominent Americans. And it is a viewpoint that to my mind has not been sufficiently stressed.

The article is as follows:

LOST: AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE, IF RUSSIA OVERRUNS EUROPE

(By J. A. Livingston)

The defense of Europe is more than a matter of real estate, more than economic resources—coal, iron ore, steel. Yes; and it's more than human beings—Frenchmen, Germans, Belgians, Hollanders—cold-blooded though that seems. It's a defense of a system, a culture, akin to ours, and built over centuries. Once lost, that way of life would be irretrievable. For the United States would be isolated—intellectually, economically, politically, and militarily.

And that's something for former President Hoover, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, and Members of Congress to ponder: How far can we let Russia go? In his state-of-the-Union message President Truman emphasized the military consequences of a Russian conquest of Europe. He said:

"If Western Europe were to fall to Soviet Russia, it would double the Soviet supply of coal and triple the Soviet supply of steel. If the free countries of Asia and Africa should fall to Soviet Russia, we would lose the sources of many of our vital raw materials, including uranium, which is the basis of our atomic power. And Soviet command of the manpower of the free nations of Europe and Asia would confront us with military forces which we could never hope to equal."

But the economic consequences are even more important. It's surprising that Republicans like Hoover and TAFT, supposedly business-minded, don't see them. Stalinism is Hitlerism by a different name. We fought Hitlerism as a military threat to the United States. Beyond that we fought Hitlerism as a dagger at our economic heart. Now Stalin poises the same dagger.

If Russian commissars took over European factories, Stalin would have a new workshop—to make tractors as well as tanks. That workshop would change our way of life, our method of doing business.

Just as Stalin directs Russia's military might to a predetermined, ruthless end, so could he direct Russia's workshop. American industry would be up against something unprecedented: Integrated, directed, unmitigated, and "uneconomic" economic power. In America wages, hours, and prices are determined by what the traffic will bear, by competition. No one man nor one company controls a major market.

But in Russia, Stalin rules the economy by fiat. Wages, prices, and hours are set willy-nilly by the state. Economics—costs—don't count. Stalin has no dividends to pay, no creditors to satisfy, no union leaders to appease. He's the sole stockholder, creditor, and union leader rolled into one.

He could undersell American corporations anywhere—merely by dumping French or Belgian or Italian or German man-hours, materials, and technology on world markets at any price he saw fit. He could even raise the standard of living of the Russians while doing it, because: First, he'd have a new source of slave labor; second, by reducing military output at home only a little to produce civilian goods, he'd be able to increase the levels of consumption by a great deal.

If America wanted to do business with a Stalinized Europe it would have to be done by barter. That's the way Russia deals. Interchange of goods and services—as we learned it from Western Europe—would be out. America would be pushed into a narrowing ambit. We'd have to deal with Canada and South America largely. And would Stalin, supposing he made no war, let us have that chunk of commerce for our own? Hardly. He'd dump in competition.

American corporations would be confronted with Stalin-determined prices on locomotives, farm machinery, electric generating equipment—in selling to Chile or Brazil. American corporations, with dividends to pay, with capital to preserve, could not stay in the struggle for Latin-American markets. Or the United States Government would have to subsidize them to compete with dumped man-hours.

Our system of free men and comparatively competitive markets—at least, undictated markets—could not survive in a world in which Stalin throttles competition. That, it seems to me, is the issue involved in the defense of Europe.

Isolation — retirement — is easy. Stalin would gladly confer it on us. But how unsplendid it would be. We'd hate it so much we'd fight to get out of it. And in such a fight, without allies, we'd be less prepared, while Stalin would be better prepared. That's the issue Congress must face—and former President Hoover—and Senator TAFT.

Trends Show Big Increase in Oregon Income by 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Trends Show Big Increase in Oregon Income by 1960," written by Paul W. Ellis, associate professor of economics, University of Oregon, and published in the November 1950 issue of Oregon Business Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRENDS SHOW BIG INCREASE IN OREGON INCOME BY 1960 [1]

(By Paul W. Ellis, associate professor of economics, University of Oregon)

Oregon's income will increase 90 percent by 1960 if recent trends continue. This conservative estimate, which augurs well for the future of business in the State, is based on current trends and data now available from a large number of reliable sources.

The same trends if continued would also produce an increase of 31 percent in employment, and 32 percent in the commodities and services that can be purchased by the average man, woman, and child in the State.

In spite of these clearly discernible trends, however, certain possible obstructions to their continuance may arise. Both the trends and the threats to their continuance, will have differing effects upon the industrial balance of the State, with some industries suffering severe restrictions and others as yet unknown or little known in this area achieving new places of prominence in our economy.

Oregon income payments were $2,112,000,000 in 1949 before the deduction of $15,000,000 for unemployment compensation and old-age insurance taxes (see table I).[2] On the basis of current trends these payments will increase by an average of $173,000,000 per year through 1960, when the total will be $4,014,000,000. The 1949 figure includes $1,361,000,000 of wages and salaries, $437,000,000 of proprietors' income, and $394,000,000 of other income payments, including rent, interest, dividends, old-age and unemployment benefit payments, and relief payments. By 1960 the figures will be $2,667,000,000 wages, $787,000,000 proprietors' income, and $560,000,000 other income payments.

Annual estimates are presented in table I for the convenience of those who may wish to use them for business plans for shorter periods. The 1960 estimates are used as a basis for determining the figures for the intervening years. Accordingly, the annual figures represent the results of annual increases for each year equal to the average for the 11-year period. It is not to be supposed that growth will follow such an even pattern, but no adequate body of information exists which would show the fluctuations from year to year satisfactorily. Chart I [omitted from RECORD] gives a graphic picture of the estimated growth. It is important to note that part of the growth will be slower during the 1949–55 period than for the 1955–60 period because of the limitations of available electric power. At the same time, the productivity of the lumber industry is expected to decline because of depletion of timber resources, especially in some of the Ponderosa pine regions. Chart I [omitted from RECORD] and table I depict steady changes each year, not because steady change is to be expected, but because there are no adequate bases for estimating irregularities. Annual estimates therefore do not reflect any study of the timing of power expansion, the timing of the termination of logging operations, a major war, or other events that will influence irregularity of growth.

The crucial elements in the picture as a whole are the trends in the lumber and wood-products industries, on the one hand, and development of new manufacturing industries on the other. The future of the lumber industry even within this 11-year period is dependent upon the amount of standing timber available for lumber and the rate of growth of established forests—both very controversial questions. The figures in this article are based on the higher of two estimates prepared by the United States Forest Service.[3] This estimate was chosen because projections or forecasts usually underestimate rather than overestimate future economic productivity. However, even these higher estimates of 1960 lumber production make it apparent that the industry will suffer such a very sharp curtailment of production and employment as to create serious problems of adjustment in many Oregon communities. The creation of satisfactory alternative employment in the 11-year period, while absorbing additions of immigrants and young people to the labor force, will be a big task. This problem will be correspondingly greater if the lower 1960 estimates of lumber employment are realized.

TABLE I.—*Oregon income payments, 1949–60* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Gross payrolls [2]	1,361	1,407	1,614	1,732	1,846	1,965	2,080	2,199	2,316	2,433	2,[illegible]	2,667
Agriculture [3]	61	63	65	68	70	72	74	76	79	81	83	85
Mining	4	5	5	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	8
Manufacturing	428	466	508	549	590	632	673	714	756	797	[illegible]	[illegible]
Contract construction	83	91	98	106	114	122	130	138	145	153	161	[illegible]
Utilities [4]	158	171	185	199	213	227	240	254	268	282	296	[illegible]
Trade	308	327	351	374	398	421	445	469	492	516	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance [4]	43	46	51	54	57	60	64	67	70	73	76	79
Government and service [5]	303	326	351	376	403	425	448	474	499	524	549	575
Proprietors' income	437	469	501	532	564	596	628	660	692	723	755	787
Farm	142	148	153	159	165	171	176	182	188	193	199	204
Trade	140	152	165	177	189	201	214	226	238	250	262	275
Service	78	85	92	98	105	112	119	126	133	140	147	154
Other	77	84	91	98	105	112	119	126	133	140	147	154
Other income payments	294	319	349	367	391	415	439	463	487	512	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	2,112	2,255	2,466	2,631	2,809	2,976	3,149	3,322	3,496	3,669	3,841	4,014

[1] Before deductions for social insurance taxes.
[2] Includes forestry and fisheries.
[3] Includes transportation.
[4] Includes insurance and real estate.
[5] "Government" not elsewhere classified. About 28 percent of Government employment is represented in other classifications.

Sources: All estimates and projections by Paul W. Ellis unless noted in the text. For detailed discussion of 1949 estimates see the Oregonian, Apr. 16, 1950, city news section, p. 15, or Oregon Business Review, June 1950.

Achievement of the high level of income and employment indicated above is largely dependent upon the establishment of new manufacturing industries in the State. This point cannot be emphasized too strongly. We cannot make a living by buying and selling to each other or by taking in each other's laundry. Accordingly, we must expect the commodity-producing industries—manufacturing, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, mining, and construction—to continue for some time to account for a probable minimum of perhaps 44 percent or more of the total State employment. At present this percentage for Oregon and for the United States is about 46 percent. Other industries are very largely secondary, in the sense that they cannot expand much except as expansion of the commodity-producing industries justify. These secondary industries include wholesale and retail trade, transportation, and other utilities, finance (including insurance and real estate), service, and government.

In Oregon, mining, forestry, and fisheries are almost negligible elements of our economy. Agriculture employs about 36 percent more of our labor force (16.9 percent) than is employed in the Nation as a whole (12.5 percent). In the present article, the forecast for agriculture is based on a Department of Agriculture study which estimates a decline in agricultural employment in the State by 1960.[4] Construction accounts for about 7 percent of our total employment at present as compared to 6 percent for the United States as a whole. As long as we continue to expand our population at a

[1] This article is a revision of the 1960 projections published in the Oregon Business Review for July 1949, presenting a more complete discussion of the underlying trends and conditions. It appeared with variations, in the Portland Oregonian for October 22, 1950.

[2] The United States Department of Commerce estimate is $2,095,000,000 after deduction of these taxes.

[3] Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, North Pacific Division, Review Report on Columbia River and Tributaries, Appendix N, pt. 3.

[4] Ibid., Appendix N, pt. 4.

greater rate than the Nation as a whole, we can maintain a higher proportion of our population building residential and commercial structures to serve the expanded population. The projections assume that the 7.3 percent which prevailed in 1947 and 1948 will continue through 1960. If this estimate is in error, it is probably too high. On balance, then, any major changes in the figures for 1960 and the preceding decade must be in the direction of either a higher level of manufacturing or a lower total of production.

Oregon as a manufacturing State falls somewhat below the average of the other States, with 23.4 percent of total employment in manufacturing in 1948 as compared with a national average of 26.2 percent. Moreover, more than 50 percent of Oregon manufacturing employment has been in lumber, and only about 20 to 22 percent has been in industries other than lumber, food processing, paper, and textiles. It is the expansion of this other manufacturing that must be depended upon to support the expansion of Oregon income and employment depicted in this article. And that means increasing employment in such industries from 27,500 in 1949 to 84,600 in 1960 (see table II). Obviously, if lumber holds up better than is assumed in this article, then other manufacturing will not need to expand as much in order for the State to achieve the estimated levels of prosperity.

There are important obstacles to such a rapid development of new industries, but prosperity in 1960 depends on overcoming them. The solution of this problem must be found in new industries established by immigrants to the State, by present residents, and by nonresident corporations.

The reasonableness of these conclusions is tested in part by the data of table II. In addition to actual employment in 1948 and 1949, this table gives the industrial balance of employment as shown by its percentage distribution. The normal distribution for the State is probably indicated by the 1948 percentages, which differ only very slightly from those of 1947. Earlier figures must be discounted as a guide to the future, because of the great changes resulting from World War II and the great expansion of available electric power in the last decade. The table also shows Oregon percentages compared with those of the United States as a whole. Finally, the table provides three projections of employment by industry to 1960.

The income estimates for 1960 are based on the employment estimates of the last column of table II. It will be noted that, for the Nation as a whole, only mining ranks very much higher than in Oregon, though manufacturing, finance, and government and service are also relatively more important in the United States average than in Oregon. Perhaps some observers would want to give these greater weight in their 1960 income projections. Oregon, by comparison with the Nation, devotes a relatively higher proportion of her labor force to construction, utilities, and trade. When and if population growth in Oregon approaches more nearly the national rate, we should expect all three of these industries to employ more nearly the proportions that prevail in the country as a whole. This observation applies with particular force to construction and trade, both of which could easily become overexpanded in a growth period, in relation to more permanent prospects for the economic balance of employment in the State. During periods of rapid growth by immigration, there is more demand for residential housing, furniture, clothing, and other items of retail trade than prevails when and where immigration is less important. Oregon can continue to develop its construction and trade industries at a higher level than the Nation as a whole only for a limited period.

TABLE II.—*Oregon employment by industry, 1948, 1949, 1960*

	Thousands of workers		Percentage distribution			1960 projections		
			Oregon				Based on population projections	
	1948	1949	1948	1949	United States, 1948	Based on 1940–48 trends	Using United States 1948 ratios (thousands of workers)	Using Oregon 1947–48 ratios [1] (thousands of workers)
Agriculture [2]	99	101	16.4	16.9	12.5	113	99	[3] 100
Mining	2	2	.3	.3	1.7		13	2
Manufacturing	142	132	23.4	22.0	26.2	198	207	193
Food	19	19	3.2	3.2		24		[3] 23
Lumber	82	74	13.4	12.4		101		[3] 65
Paper	5	5	.9	.9		7		[3] 12
Textiles	6	5	1.0	.9		10		8
Other	30	28	4.9	4.6		57		85
Construction	43	40	7.0	6.6	5.8	56	46	58
Utilities [4]	59	59	8.3	8.3	7.3	79	58	69
Trade	124	127	20.4	21.1	19.2	185	151	167
Finance [5]	17	19	2.9	3.1	3.4	24	27	23
Government and service [6]	130	130	21.4	21.7	23.9	180	188	177
Total	606	599	100.0	100.0	100.0	835	788	788

[1] Projections for agriculture, food, lumber, and paper are obtained on other bases (see text).
[2] Includes forestry and fisheries.
[3] See note (1).
[4] Includes transportation.
[5] Includes insurance and real estate.
[6] Government not elsewhere classified. About 23 percent of Government employment is represented in other classifications.

Sources: Oregon 1948, 1949, Oregon State Unemployment Compensation Commission; United States percentages computed on Department of Commerce estimates of "persons engaged in production"; 1940–48 trends are unedited computations in Wesley C. Ballaine, "Oregon Employment," People, Jobs, and Income on the Pacific Coast, 1949–60, except, however, that "government" has been revised.

Trends of employment growth in recent years would, if continued, produce significantly higher levels of employment than those used in the estimates for agriculture, lumber, utilities, and trade, and significantly lower levels in paper and "other manufacturing." Such trends, with certain modifications and analysis by Prof. W. C. Ballaine, were published last year in People, Jobs, and Income on the Pacific Coast, 1949–60, issued by the Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations.[5] The writer used the Ballaine employment projections for an earlier set of 1960 income projections which were published in the same book.[6]

Agriculture, food processing, lumber, and paper estimates for 1960 are taken from or adapted from studies made by the United States Department of Agriculture for the Corps of Engineers of the Army,[7] and are made on a somewhat different basis than those for other industries—the estimates for which are based on the 1947–48 balance. The results for all except paper are substantially lower than would have been developed from the 1947–48 ratios.

Higher standards of living in 1960 are best measured by increases in per capita income payments. With an estimated population of 2,097,000 in 1960 (estimate by Prof. Elon Moore and Mr. John F. Staehle, in People, Jobs, and Income on the Pacific Coast, 1949–60),[8] our average income for every man, woman, and child should rise from $1,448 in 1949 to $1,914 in 1960. Since all 1950–60 figures are in terms of 1949 prices, this means a 32-percent increase in average incomes in the 11-year period.

The computation of these income estimates was based upon a number of fundamental assumptions, which must be recognized. First of all, it is assumed that there will be no full-scale war and that the gross national product of the United States will rise to $375,000,000,000. This increase would be consistent with recent trends of increases in productivity per man-hour, decreases in hours of work per week, and increases in the labor force.

Population in 1960 is assumed to follow the middle Moore and Staehle estimates. It is also assumed that the percentage of the Oregon population in the labor force in 1960 will be the same as in 1949. If the recent tendency for the employment of women to increase is continued, the projections will be correspondingly below the attained income. Unemployment of 5 percent of the labor force on the average throughout the year 1960 is also assumed. If President Truman's attitude toward unemployment in 1949 is characteristic of that of succeeding administrations, governmental policy might be utilized to keep this figure down to 3.5 or 4 percent, in which case again attained income will be higher than shown in table I.

The agricultural employment figures are based on 1930–45 trends in relationships among numbers of people living and working on farms, numbers of farms, and the amount of cropland, as well as on declining trends of farm population. Trends in the net income of proprietors and other income payments are based on trends in wages. This is not a satisfactory procedure, but no better assumption seems available. No allowance is made for deductions for old-age and unemployment insurance.

[5] See also Oregon Business Review, February 1949.
[6] See also Oregon Business Review, July 1949.
[7] See notes 1 and 2.
[8] See also Oregon Business Review, May 1949.

"Let's Get Going, Harry"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial written by my good friend, R. M. Beer, of the Ashland Times-Gazette. I recommend this editorial for the reading of all:

"LET'S GET GOING, HARRY"

(By Robert M. Beer)

It's not an easy trick to be in Europe for 6 weeks and come back with all the answers. I wrote an editorial a few weeks ago which was radio-teletyped from the cruiser *Des Moines* while still at sea—3 days from Norfolk and 1 day ahead of the Dewey and Truman speeches.

What I said then still sounds pretty good to me. The "Truman letters" have indicated that our President appears to be both impulsive and vindictive. He seems to lack the stature of a director under these grave circumstances, as evidenced by his reactions to petty affairs. As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, he has terrific influence without curtailment of his plans short of actual war. Congress has sole power to declare war and Congress is made up of the men we have placed there to represent us.

Why, then, shouldn't our President seek the counsel of nonpartisan people to help him in this bedlam?

There are two reasons why he doesn't ask Senator TAFT or Tom Dewey to select someone to confer with him. No. 1 reason is political, of course. No. 2 reason is that the Republicans have no one who represents a solid thought on the answer.

I think the Republicans can take plenty of blame for this situation. My small voice suggests a meeting of the opposition party, not to ridicule the President or the State Department but to designate a spokesman who will sit with the President and his Cabinet and offer to help. I don't see how the administration can turn down such a proposition at this stage of trouble.

The United Nations can do no more than reflect public opinion in regard to the countries of this world. In that respect they do well. A united America can accomplish the same thing if we all get our heads together and decide whether we should get out of Korea and defend Western Europe or piddle around in a section of the Pacific that means the loss of our boys in utter futility.

The defense of Western Europe is No. 1 in my estimation. Western Europe will determine the division of the world. If we lose the Mediterranean countries we have lost Willkie's "one world." Why not shoot for it? If we lose we still should be able to unify and defend our own half.

Europe is a mess. I told you so in the articles that were written while I was away. Eisenhower can't unify Europe in 6 months when it has been impossible to do it through centuries. I think it's a shame to send these old veterans on an assignment that defies fulfillment. The Sixth Fleet, with Admiral Ballentine and 20 ships can't defend Europe if the Soviets want to go south. Neither can Ike organize things over there to stop them. The losing side doesn't win allies. Small states go with the winner.

I suspect that there is a very good reason why we have not left Korea and dropped the bomb in that area. There's a slip-up some place; we're not ready, even with the atom.

What is wrong? Don't we have a right to know? Continuation of this sort of dawdling and hoping for peace only gives the enemy more chance to get ready for the push through Europe. While we spar around in Korea and lose men Russia is enhancing their position. Chinese and Americans are dying, not Russians. Delay is fatal to us.

I sincerely believe that spring will bring further encroachments upon the free states that will surely provoke war by pure insult and challenge.

It may be another 50 years before this world becomes compatible. In the meantime we dare not lose our principles by being the savior of Japan and A-ia. At this half century we need the judgment of the best brains in America—not politicians and diplomats—but the opinions and advice of men who can think realistically.

I'm not advocating the use of the big bomb in Korea or Russia but I believe that we should at least consider the possibility, providing all of us hear, read, or see such a thing discussed through radio, newspaper, and television. Participants in that discussion should represent all factions so that the final decision can be made with the knowledge that everybody has a hand in our destiny.

Let's get going, Harry.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the membership of the House to a joint letter written by four members of the board of directors of the Park Region Publishing Co., of Alexandria, Minn. The Congress has the tremendous responsibility of formulating a foreign policy which all of us hope will prevent a third world war. In order to formulate such a policy the views and expressions of responsible, thinking people throughout the Nation should be solicited and studied carefully by all of us.

The letter follows:

PARK REGION PUBLISHING CO.,
Alexandria, Minn., January 6, 1951.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSEN: As common, ordinary citizens of our great democracy, we are generally content to let our elected representatives and officials and their administrators handle the affairs of the state, trusting their ability and wisdom to make decisions for the welfare of our Nation, the United Nations, and the world as a whole. However, in view of the very apparent and serious mistakes which have been made in our foreign policy during the past several years, mistakes that have involved us in a costly and bloody war, we feel that we cannot sit idly on the side lines without raising our voices against a policy which if continued will undoubtedly ruin our economy, jeopardize our freedom, and cause our young manhood to be sacrificed and slaughtered.

It is apparent that the so-called police action in Korea was an administrative and military blunder and has led to the involvement of our troops with the Chinese people. The Chinese people and the American people have a tradition of mutual understanding and friendship and we should not, we cannot, allow our Government to further provoke the Chinese people, as this policy will only lead to a prolonged war with staggering losses of materials, resources, and men and would eventually benefit Russia.

Some diplomatic action must be taken before it is too late to withdraw our troops from Korea and terminate the futile effort to carry out a United Nations idealistic policy without proper and adequate participation and support of all the United Nations.

A more realistic policy in our foreign commitments must be worked out by our diplomats or by Congress. We cannot afford to fight communism in places of their choosing and in methods of warfare which they prefer and in which they excel.

We must by force of circumstance expect to grant some concessions in order to get out of this precarious situation. This should be done, and it could serve as a costly lesson for our future benefit.

If certain interests have been allowed to pursue a course of aggression and greed in the Far East, that may have been a contributing factor in some of our difficulties, but this should terminate, and we should rather turn to the Prince of Peace for patterns of policy in dealing with people and nations.

We trust that you will consider the contents of this letter and use your influence to get some action that will lead to a peaceful solution.

We have contacts with hundreds of people every week and we know that we are expressing their sincere sentiments as well as our own.

Very truly yours,

S. O. WOOLLSCROFT,
ARTHUR L. PETERSON,
FRED J. POERION,
THEO. G. WIESLER.

Drafting of 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, that the question of drafting our 18-year-old youths into the armed services is a timely and controversial one is evidence by the tremendous amount of letters being received by the Members of Congress. Out of the many letters I have received, one in particular has a serious appeal, and I include in the Appendix of the RECORD

this letter from Dr. M. J. Horsch, president of the West Virginia Institute of Technology, Montgomery, W. Va.

The letter follows:

WEST VIRGINIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Montgomery, W. Va., January 2, 1951.

The Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: I believe that I voice the conviction of a great many thinking Americans when I say that I trust that when Congress finally reaches the point where it deems the emergency so acute as to force upon immature 18-year-olds the moral shock of combat training and combat, it will first have forced upon us—every one of us—an equivalent sacrifice. To permit business as usual, profits as usual, wages as usual, working hours as usual, luxuries as usual, riotous living, and all the rest of our current souped-up ways of life as usual—and at the same time risk the destruction of the moral fiber of our 18-year-olds by exposing them, en masse, to a shock to which they have not the maturity to adjust themselves—would be a travesty upon American democracy.

When it becomes necessary, then let it come; but let us not call it necessary in the face of what is currently asked of the rest of us.

Whoever contemplates coming out of the present emergency one nickel richer than when entering—whether corporation, worker, management, merchant, or professional man—either doesn't understand the situation confronting us or doesn't deserve to be called American. Let's keep our values straight, and put priorities where they belong.

Respectfully,

M. J. HORSCH.

Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial entitled "Betrayed," by J. Robert Smith, editor of the Carmi Democrat-Tribune, at Carmi, Ill., which, in my judgment, is a powerful editorial expression of the composite thought of the people of the great Midwest with reference to our foreign policy and the Korean War.

He packs a lot in a few paragraphs worthy of your careful consideration.

The article follows:

BETRAYED

Every soldier who has been killed in Korea, every man who has been wounded, every one who has suffered frozen feet, every man who has been shipped to that devastated land has been betrayed by the United Nations.

Every man, woman, and child in America who has paid the price of tears and inflation and crushing taxation has been betrayed by this sorry successor to the ill-fated League of Nations.

Every person who has been called upon by Truman to work harder and longer has been betrayed.

This organization has finally showed its true colors—yellow. This spineless group of appeasers has voted to give Red China a seat in its Security Council in exchange for a cease-fire in Korea.

Our own delegate, Warren R. Austin, strung along with the appeasers—so it's time for him to resign.

It's time for Dean Acheson to get out.

It's time for a house cleaning in Washington.

If Red China should accept the UN proposal, the United States should walk out of the United Nations forever when the Red delegate comes to take his seat. Then we should tell them all to get out of this country and hold their appeasement sessions elsewhere.

The UN is an unholy alliance which has been a sounding board and instrument of communism.

What has it got us?

Over 40,000 casualties in Korea.

We're sick and tired of fighting and carrying on a war under a godless banner—and that's what the UN flag is.

Let's get back to sanity, with Old Glory as the only flag for which we'll work and fight and die for.

Pfc. James W. Ogden, of Norris City, didn't lay down his life in Korea so that his mortal enemies might be admitted to the United Nations.

Sgt. Carl Sheraden, of Burnt Prairie, was killed in Korea thinking he was fighting a war to destroy communism—not to reward it with another seat in the Security Council.

Security Council?

Whose security?

Not ours.

Oh, how can such little men in high places make such stupid blunders?

Cooperative International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 1725, a bill to establish a Commission on Cooperative International Relations.

The nations of the world are presently experiencing the most dynamic, political, economic, social, educational, and spiritual upheaval in history. The movement is both evolutionary and revolutionary. It is not, as in the crises of the past, limited in area to specific countries or regions, but is universal in compass. It blazes forth the fact that in truth we live in an interdependent world.

The Lord did not ordain that a patterned educational process, or constitutional government, or the industrial revolution, burst upon all segments of the globe simultaneously. Nor did He place all of us in temperate zones or regions of plenty. The result is a historic unbalance of progress. This unbalance is vivid to the mass of less fortunate, and the difficult task of satisfactory equalization is pressing. The unfulfilled wants and aspirations, the hunger, the ignorance, and the fear of peoples shriek for gratification, help, and guidance.

The problem is the proper directing and containing of these demands toward a common good.

The tragedy is that, while one group of nations would solve these problems by the tenets of the Golden Rule, another would exploit misery by false promise and untruth, and, succeeding, end by making a degraded mockery of mankind.

The selfish, the false, the reactionary phases of this agitation must be analyzed, publicized, and curbed lest the orderly processes of progressive history yield to universal chaos.

While we were preaching the freedoms, people were starving. Russia promised the multitudes abundance. The iron curtain expanded. Not until our aid programs backed up our philosophies did we check the Soviet onslaught. Curbed, like a spitting monster at bay, this menace has added to false promise a bitter campaign of hatred, vilification, and abuse, attempting thereby to delude masses into allegiance through doubt and fear of our motives.

Many have appraised the Gemini of Russian expansionism and communistic atheism. But multitudes, especially in the backward areas, are confused between the two diametrically opposed ideologies of east and west.

The battle is for the minds and hearts of men. It is the cold war—democracy versus dialectic materialism; freedom versus slavery.

Our present strategy is a campaign of truth by the use of three media—the press, films, and radio. Russia's weapon is the propaganda lie, disseminated by every accredited and discredited means. The consequences would be catastrophic were Satan's weapons to prevail and the balance of power swing weightedly toward Russia's might. In the counterbalance rests humanity's hope of averting Armageddon.

We are presently spending upward of $100,000,000 in our international psychological campaign of truth. To present to the peoples of other countries a picture of the American people, their ideals and way of life, we have an educational exchange program and employ the press, publications, radio, motion pictures, educational films, and libraries as information media.

Assuming that these collectively are effective, the questions remain: "Are they accomplishing the objective of retaining for us the initiative in the cold war? Are they convincing and adequate? Are they reaching the masses? Are these methods quelling doubts and fears, answering untruths, and turning peoples toward our democratic orbit? Finally, are we utilizing all known techniques or are we failing to use our greatest dynamic scientific American weapon, the show-how technique, to wit, television?"

While we should doggedly continue attempts to penetrate the iron-curtain countries with truth, hopeful for the day when their peoples will break their chains, our greatest emphasis must be to save the peoples of the free nations from being drawn into the reeking morass.

But we cannot convince the masses of the benefits of our way of life by the written word when they cannot read. Nor can we show them films depicting the American process by means of mobile units when there are no roads to reach them, or guerrillas bar the way. We cannot tell them our story by the radio voice when they have no receivers, and cannot, in any case, understand the strange dialects spoken from remote transmitters. Static, too, does strange things in tropical areas, and the Russians jam the air waves over all like sorcerers apprentices possessed. The history of most peoples has never known democracy or the meaning of the freedoms, and we speak vainly to them when we use these terms.

Like Americans, people everywhere want to be shown. This is especially true in remote areas where tradition persists and custom defies change. These people, presently, might well quote from the Holy Script and say:

> There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world and none of them is without signification. Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me. (I. Corinthians XIV: 10 and 11.)

Our compulsion must be to give meaning to our words for "saying is one thing, doing, another." If ever a proverb were useful to save civilization's process, now is the time to put to work the time proven adage that "seeing is believing." And we have the technique for proving that "One picture is worth ten thousand words."

But, as we show our way of life and simultaneously explain it, we must be certain that it is adaptable to the mores and ways of life of the viewers. Self-gratulation has been known to create envy, resentment, and resistance. The have-nots are ever skeptical of the haves. And, while the masses of the free peoples of the earth have not much materially, they cling tenaciously to their pride.

Two-thirds of the peace-loving free peoples of the world live in economically undeveloped areas. Their problem is to realize their full human capabilities. The basic job is one of education. Our contribution is to help them to help themselves, but we cannot prevail by distant preachment. Our humane task is to provide a mass means for them to speedily educate themselves; to swiftly rid themselves of their many plagues; to curb contagion and infant mortality; to give them technical skills; and to show them by making available our store of technical knowledge how to raise their agricultural and industrial output. And we can only do this by giving them the means of mass communication so that their leaders, with our help and guidance, can visually show their peoples, and, while showing, explain the how and the why of change and progress.

There is but one way of certain and speedy achievement, and that, by establishing national radio-relay television networks in the free countries of the world.

THE INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States and other free nations of the world have a common concern for the material progress of these people, both as a humanitarian end in itself and because such progress will further the advance of human freedom, the secure growth of democratic ways of life, the expansion of mutually beneficial commerce, and the development of international understanding and good will. (Bulletin No. 3719, Department of State, January 1950.)

INTERNATIONAL TELEVISION

The progress of electronic science has been phenomenal. The age of the telegraph pole and of wire lines is passing. The airways have become man's means of communication and understanding. A single air channel will inevitably bring to the eyes and ears of people everywhere around the globe spot news events, the meetings of the United Nations, the opera at La Scala in Milan, the monkey dance of Bali, an American election, and the secret films of life under the Soviets. Motion pictures, the best of live talent wherever in the world, historical films, and educational shorts will at once amuse and create a sense of good humor in a somber world.

But, besides the audio and the video, this same single air channel can relay to us, in our several languages, a newspaper by facsimile, as well as teletype, telegraph, telephone, multiplex, and many other services.

The one must requirement to accomplish this end is that there be established universally accepted scientific standards for transmission and reception. It would be the greatest single tragedy in historical cooperative endeavor were any nation or nations arbitrarily or for greed to establish a system differing from all others, breaking through transmission relays and precluding reception.

Free competitive world markets for electronic devices, including television transmitting and receiving equipment, must not share the fate which followed upon the invention of electricity. Then, selfishly determined interests in certain areas fixed upon differing voltages from standards in other countries and frustrating competition cartelized the world.

A NATIONAL RADIO-RELAY TELEVISION SYSTEM

It is proposed that a television network be established at strategic points within a nation. Each station would act as a link in a relay chain to permit integrated network operation of all stations throughout the area. When desired, each station could be operated independently to provide a local broadcasting service in its zone or district. All stations in the system would be situated on elevated points at suitable locations, selected to provide completely reliable transmission to adjacent stations under all weather conditions.

To insure satisfactory relay operations, the stations forming links of the network chain would be placed 50 to 125 miles apart, at elevated points where strong signals could be received from adjacent relay points. Such a network would constitute a complete, integrated audio-video intercommunication system, and would not be subject to jamming techniques.

COMMUNITY RECEIVERS

To reach the populace effectively with provable "show-how," large screen projection television receivers will be used. Manufactured for a single reception channel, their cost will be moderate. They will be adaptable for use wherever people assemble, both in and out of doors. A single television blackboard will be in operation both day and night—teaching children the three R's, health, duty, and freedom during school hours; showing mothers practical sanitation, diet suggestions and food values, child care and home nursing during their free hours; and demonstrating to fathers that 2 feet of wood added to a hoe will enable them to do twice as much work, and that a longer handle attached to a sickle makes a scythe.

This system will make practical the aspirations of the point 4 program and give peace-loving peoples the benefits of our own costly lessons and of our store of technical knowledge.

It will give practical answer to Secretary Acheson's concern, recently expressed, viz:

> We desire only a world in which we can live in peace. This is one of our outstanding preoccupations—how to break through this barrier of tangled words and make it unmistakably clear to all people everywhere that the purpose of our efforts is a peaceful world.

Television, our "show-how," will give the world our know-how, and with knowledge will come experience and, with experience, confidence and faith in us and in our doctrine.

Excess-Profits Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *December 22, 1950.*

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you because I think you are sincerely interested in trying to solve our national and international problems, and that you will take the time to read this letter.

This is merely a suggestion, but sometimes a fellow gets a viewpoint when he is close to the job, which you may not get in Washington.

First, let me say that I am heartily in agreement with you in advocating increased taxes, even though the thought is not pleasant, but I am a realist and know that the bill must be paid. I am also a businessman, being president of Llewellyn Laundry and as such I am subject to the ordinary temptations as I am just an ordinary human being. By temptations I mean that it is the nature of a person to immediately try to figure out how he can come out best when there are any changes made.

I am talking about the excess-profits tax. I am certainly not talking against it. I will go along with whatever program you recommend. What I would like to see is that the excess-profits tax show not credit inefficiency. Such a tax can work very much like a cost-plus arrangement if it is not set up properly.

Let us take a Fitzsimmons like signal. The way the excess-profits tax is proposed, everything my company makes over $25,000 will be taxed 77 percent. (Believe me, I am not complaining.) Now, I do not think I

am any better or worse than the average businessman, therefore, my thinking may be typical. If I reach the excess-profits brackets, will I become careless in the operation of my business? Will I hire more people than I really need, because it is only costing me 22 percent to do so and it will make life easier? Will I try as hard to maintain my present efficiency in the plant? In case the war situation becomes worse, I really should drive my people harder to help the cause along, but again, will I do so with most of the incentive taken away? Will I spend more than I should for advertising? I could go on citing examples, but I am sure you are familiar with all of them.

I offer a solution which I think will enable us to maintain our efficiency, yet give you the taxes you need. We businessmen are no different than other types of people in one respect—we, too, are looking for security. We may not have these lush years forever. We are not happy when we think of those years when we lost money and when we think that the same thing could happen again.

Here is my proposal. Go ahead with your excess-profits tax. Make it as stiff as you want. You will find businessmen more patriotic than some people in Washington think. However, in order to maintain efficiency, say to the businessman: "We will set up this excess-profits tax which we take from you as a credit against any year in the next 10 years that you show a loss, provided this loss is not due to neglect or mismanagement." For example, if in 1951 you take $10,000 as excess profits and if some year before 1961 I show a loss in my business, you will take care of me out of this $10,000. This seems fair, because the businessman may feel he is taking care of you now—you do the same for him when he needs help.

Let us hope that we will never need this credit. Let us hope that in the next 10 years business will be good. But there may come a time when we have a bad year. Giving the businessman this assurance of future help will, I am sure, save the country millions of dollars, because you will have created a reason for us staying efficient. We will consider the excess-profits tax as insurance.

Frankly, I do not think there will be much reason to use this credit, but is it not true that if business conditions would get bad, that the Government would step in in some way to help business. So you see Government will be helping anyway, so why not now use this idea as a means to have efficiency in business during wartime?

As a plus value, this idea will preserve what I think is a prime American idea, to constantly get more efficient. Maybe we can even run a war period efficiently if we try hard enough.

Yours very truly,

E. A. MALL.

American Indians in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article having to do with the services of Indian men in our Armed Forces. They have given distinguished service in the two World Wars and many hundreds of them are even now on the battle line in Korea. This article, from the Poplar Standard of Poplar, Mont., was written by Mr. James Archdale, a prominent member of the Fort Peck Tribe of Indians, who conducts a weekly column in the newspaper entitled "Jim Says."

The article follows:

In more than two wars American Indians have taken part. In World War I some 17,000 young Indian men enlisted and fought. In World War II some 23,000 enlisted and some were in the draft and served from buck privates to the top commissioned officers, generals and colonels, captains and lieutenants.

They have been honored from the Congressional Medal of Honor down to every decoration on the calendar.

This writer has been informed that proportionately the Indians of Montana, 7 reservations of about 20,000 Indian population, stand at the head of all races in the United States of 93 per thousand.

These facts are irrefutable and stand out like some say a sore thumb, but many people come to me and ask me, after the United States Government has worked so hard in the 1860's, the 1870's, and the 1880's to stop the American Indian from fighting for his own country, and defending it against white encroachment on Indian domain, how can we or our boys be fighting in Korea helping the South Koreans fighting their own people?

Indians have signed peace treaties never to take up arms again. How can we be made to fight people that we do not know, and hence have no right to fight?

I think it was that great Nez Perce Chief Joseph once declared to General Miles and Howard "from where the sun now stands I will fight no more, forever" and I suppose his young men are fighting in Korea too.

Oh! You say we are fighting for the four freedoms; we are fighting for freedom and liberty, but my friend you go on some of these Indian reservations and see some of these Indian soldiers how they live, see their homes, see their living conditions, and see how much freedom they have gained or won for themselves and their people. On the Fort Peck reservation, alone, we have some 400 vets that served in two wars.

Many of them cannot get even Government loans under the GI loans. Big farmers who already made their life stakes in farming get all the acreage allotments, and our poor Indian GI's couldn't get a start, let alone getting loans for the purchase of farm machinery. The draft never misses Indian boys if there are any around. They tell me if you are a farmer in an essential business you cannot be drafted; in other words, you are exempt. Maybe that's the reason our boys are indirectly kept from the farms and the draft boards seem to have a pretty good eye for our boys. They even took our underage boys to fight. I have two nephews over there and I lost a boy in the last war, our only boy.

Up-State New York Loses Its Hide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, every time somebody in Albany tries to cover up their real plans of scuttling the Thirty-seventh Congressional District, he sticks his foot in his mouth by making a lame excuse.

It is now pretty obvious that the boys have just one objective and that is to keep sitting Members of the New York State congressional delegation in the dark as long as they dare without giving them any idea of the composition of the new, distorted districts for 1952.

The most recent kidding we have taken comes from some State senator who says the committee on gerrymandering has its hands tied and cannot do any more on the vital question of reapportionment until the Census Bureau in Washington makes available their figures.

For Albany's information, I have personally conferred with census officials here and they assure me that preliminary figures by counties are now ready. They went a step further to convince me by placing these figures in my hands.

The only difference between preliminary and final figures, they tell me, is that in the final check there will be a few more added who happened to be away on vacation when the census was taken. They emphasize that the difference between preliminary and final figures will be only slight.

Therefore, I charge that Albany officials are deliberately stalling on the job of reapportioning for 1952 with the ulterior intent of keeping us on the hot seat in a state of uncertainty as long as they can.

The committee's duty is to make available to the general public within the next few weeks their recommendations for the new congressional districts.

The State legislature will fall short of its responsibility to the people of New York State unless the reapportionment bill becomes law during this session which will end in late March.

Why should they pigeonhole this all-important question which is the very basis on which free American government is founded?

In resorting to further delay they are preventing the people of our State from getting a clear-cut picture of their most important subdivision of government, namely, the congressional district, which elects the men who serve in our National Congress. This means the people will not be able to elect their own representatives with care and deliberation.

The question is not so complicated that they cannot work it out in a few short sessions and then it will be out of the way. They have been discussing it for months behind closed doors. All they have to do is consult the population chart of each county and add up the totals.

But, unfortunately for the people, they are playing politics and will make everybody suffer before they settle their petty logrolling.

I learned today from excellent authority that they are trying to do a job on up-State, and to deprive that great section, not of one Congressman but of two.

They cannot get away with it without my squawking and squawking loudly. Why should the tail of the Empire State wag the dog?

I call upon the committee in charge of this gerrymander and upon the State legislature to get busy and submit the reapportionment question to a vote right away before they pack up and go home, as they always do up there, in early spring.

As for my own standpoint, I know they are fixing to do a job on me and I want to prepare for the worst. I suppose other New York State Congressmen would like to hear their fate, too, at least those who, like myself, do not have the good fortune to be in on the grapevine.

When the legislature reapportioned the State for 1944 elections there were men among them with enough integrity to insist that the design of the new districts be made public more than a year ahead of the election itself.

Why are not they decent enough to do the same thing today? What are they afraid of? What sleight of hand are they indulging in to perpetuate chaos and confusion at the very time they should be trying to create calm?

The boys in Albany owe it to the people of New York State and to good government and to sane, straight thinking to get down to business. Get the reapportionment job off the agenda so they can clear the way for problems of civilian defense.

Unification of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I introduced a House resolution which called upon the House of Representatives to express their belief that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland, unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland should, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary. Although hearings were held before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs early last year, it was not possible to obtain final action by the committee so that the resolution might have been considered on the floor of the House.

Today I am again introducing that resolution in the hope that the matter may be brought before this body and affirmative action be taken during the present session of Congress. The desirability of such favorable action by the House of Representatives is not subject to question, any more than the justice of Ireland's demand for unification can be questioned. The United States has always proclaimed the rights of small nations to independence and the free determination of their own form of government without the outside interference of any other nation. By the passage of my resolution the House can again proclaim our championship of the rights of small nations.

In the unsettled condition of the world today, with war in Korea and an uncertain type of peace existing throughout the rest of the world, many suggest that the Irish situation be soft pedaled or neglected. But it is because of this very unsettled world situation that I feel that at least the disturbing situation in Ireland should be remedied without delay and the threat to peace in this small country be eliminated, so that full attention can then be given to other situations.

I need not emphasize at this time the fact that partition has been in existence in Ireland for a period of only 30 years. Nor need I discuss the long history of Ireland's struggle against Great Britain in her efforts to achieve complete freedom and independence. The fact is that the British have recognized Ireland's right to freedom by granting to the 26 counties of Ireland their full independence under the Government of the Republic of Ireland. In doing so, however, Great Britain withheld this right from the people living within the small six-county area in the northeastern section of this island. An attempt has been made to picture the people of the six counties as of a different race or nationality, and that section of the country as a distinctive and unique area, having no natural ties or relations with the rest of Ireland.

The utter fallacy of this attempt is only too self-evident if one but studies a map or reads a line of the history of Ireland. No geographic barriers separate this area, no different customs distinguish these people, nor are any different racial strains to be found here than in the rest of Ireland. It was out of the northern section of Ireland that her greatest champions and warriors in behalf of freedom have arisen, while the leader of the British union faction, Sir Edward Carson hailed from Dublin. The geographic unity of the nation is too apparent, and the historic unity of the people too well settled to be subject to debate.

Only two factors demand a division of Ireland. The one is the desire of Great Britain to maintain a foothold in Ireland in keeping with her age-old imperialistic policy of domination of other nations. The other is the desire of large landholders and powerful industrialists to maintain their personal control of the government and the people in that area. The United States can endorse neither of these excuses, but rather must protest against the unjust suppression of the will of the people by Great Britain, and the enslavement of both the government and the people to the whims of a small group of industrial monopolists and large landowners.

The unification of Ireland will put an end to the centuries of strife that have disturbed the peaceful development and growth of Ireland, and will bring a sound economy to both sections of the nation, which is not now attainable. The elimination of the contention between the Irish and the British will be achieved and a new era of friendly cooperation and good will would ensue. I am confident that the British Government itself would be happy to see the Irish controversy satisfactorily ended, and I am sure that the urging of Britain to bring about unity, through the action of our Congress, would provide the British Government with the necessary impetus to bring this about.

The very unsettled condition of the world situation in Western Europe particularly justifies our interest and concern over this situation. Divided Ireland has been forced to abstain from joining the Atlantic Pact nations in cooperating for the defense of Western Europe. Vetoed by Russia, Ireland has been denied a seat in the United Nations, mainly because of her strong anti-Communist sentiment amongst the people and on the part of the Irish Government. Yet European defense may well hinge on the role that Ireland would play in the event of active warfare once more in Europe.

We have been told by American generals that the use of bases in the six-county area of Ireland was vital, and that without them we would have found the invasion of France far more difficult. If that be true, then the use of all 32 counties in Ireland would be far more effective, and would be made available, undoubtedly, were the Government of the Republic of Ireland to have full control and jurisdiction of the entire territory of Ireland. Moreover, so long as Ireland is excluded from the defense of Europe in all our planning, the same may not be true of the Communist attackers, once they engage in open warfare in Europe. Instead, they may well plan the active conquest of Ireland, which is being omitted from all our rearming programs and defensive strategy for Western Europe. A defenseless Ireland is an open invitation to aggression and attack, yet Ireland is denied participation in the Atlantic Pact solely because of the partition of the country. Without the means of arming herself adequately, Ireland would be unable to share directly in the battle for the defense of Europe, and would be unable to ward off an attempted invasion of her shores.

It appears to me that our military planning is short-sighted if we continue to disregard the strategic position Ireland occupies in Western Europe and its usefulness as a base of operations for the supplying of European troops. The position of Ireland as the most westerly portion of Europe is too vital to military strategy, so far as the United States is concerned, for it to be disregarded and ignored by our military planners any longer. To cope with possible European warfare, our planning must be thorough and complete and must be carried into effect in advance of need. The usefulness and importance of Ireland to any such planning cannot be denied, if the words of our generals following the last war had any truth in them regarding the value that bases in the six counties had in the victorious outcome of the war.

Any weakness in our battle lines in Korea has been made the point of attack repeatedly by the enemy. The same weaknesses in the European line of defense will become the point of attack. The division of Korea became the occasion of war in the Orient. Let not the division of Ireland prove the encouragement to Russia for war in Europe as well. Instead, I trust that this House will give favorable consideration to my resolution calling for the unification of all Ireland, and that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will make that possible by itself taking early action on the resolution. Further hearings are not needed

following the excellent hearings of last year when the committee considered the various resolutions introduced by several Members of this body.

At those hearings last year, the great interest in this situation as far as the American people are concerned was most clearly demonstrated. From every section of the country representatives appeared to express their approval of the proposal that the House of Representatives express itself regarding the unification of Ireland. Only the concern over the outbreak of war in Korea hindered final action during the last session. I trust that now the necessity for speedy action in completing the defense program for all of Europe will cause equally speedy action to be taken on this resolution. The sooner the unification of Ireland is accomplished the sooner will she take her rightful place amongst the European countries. Always a force for freedom and right, Ireland has repeatedly shown herself in full agreement with the American efforts to rehabilitate and reconstruct Europe. Once her full freedom and independence has been achieved, Ireland can become a strong force in the councils of Europe, where leadership is sorely needed and vigorous anti-Communist ideals are so essential. I urge prompt action on this matter and request that the Members of this body join with me in urging the unification of Ireland at this time.

The resolution referred to follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

Whereas in the intervening 30 years the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

United States Now a Garrison State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article by Dorothy Thompson that appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star entitled "War Declarations Seen at End." It is Miss Thompson's belief that the United States has now become a garrison state through the United Nations' concept of peace. This is a matter that should have the prompt attention of all Members of this House. The article follows:

WAR DECLARATIONS SEEN AT END—UNITED STATES HAS BECOME A GARRISON STATE THROUGH THE UN CONCEPT OF PEACE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

At his last Thursday's press conference President Truman declared he had untrammeled right to send United States troops anywhere in the world. He thus answered the challenge of Senator TAFT and other critics that he obtain congressional approval before furnishing troops under North Atlantic treaty obligations. The implications in his remarks were that he had no requirement to obtain congressional approval except for a formal declaration of war, and he has previously declared the action in Korea not war, but the carrying out of obligatory UN commitments.

If we continue to interpret those commitments as Mr. Truman interprets them, it is unlikely that there will ever again be formal declarations of war. All future wars will be police actions, initiated or restrained by the President alone. We actually do not know on whose advice the President suddenly decided to lead the UN into action in Korea while the Russians were absent from the Security Council, whose members, under the Charter, are charged with responsibility for such action, and protected against it by the veto.

Our spokesmen have fallen into the habit of referring to the UN as though it were only that part of the international organization associated, under American leadership, to resist aggression everywhere. By votes of countries in the Assembly the United States commands a majority. However, wars or police actions are not settled by majority votes of governments, many of them of puny states, but by mobilizable populations, weapons, and political and psychological factors adding up to morale. In terms of these factors, the world, as represented in the United Nations, is fairly evenly divided into two hostile blocs, and the war in Korea is not a UN campaign but a struggle within the UN itself.

If Mr. Truman's viewpoint on UN obligations is, indeed, the only correct interpretation of the UN Charter, it would follow that those who aid and abet aggressors should be thrown out of the international organization. But that Mr. Truman's interpretation is dubious is illustrated by the fact that none of the great powers can be dismissed over its own veto. And at San Francisco the United States was as intransigent as the U. S. S. R. in insisting on the veto.

Our leaders—and Mr. Truman was President—wanted the veto to protect the United States from possible military commitments against the interests of, or in areas of indifference to, the United States. It is not logical or even truthful for the same leadership now to invoke obligations which, as a primary framer of the Charter, they took studious pains to avoid.

The fact is that the UN was never designed to bring sanctions against any great power. It was designed to act only by unanimous great power consent against small states that might threaten the peace. Under the Charter, small states can be coerced into accepting UN disciplines and restrained from waging war, thus abandoning a primary sovereignty in favor of great powers who are not compelled to abandon it.

The foreseeable result was the clustering of small states around such great powers as might represent and protect them and the ending of small-state independence or neutrality; with the further danger that clashes between small satellites of hostile great powers might draw the great powers themselves into war, fought, of course, in the name of peace.

These criticisms of the United Nations are not made with hindsight. They were made by this column in 1945, when the outlines of the Charter first appeared as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. But then, as now, anyone who expressed doubt in the United Nations was branded as rocking the foundations of peace.

Today the universal peace promised through this universal body is patently a mirage. So are the universal freedoms.

Through the UN concept of peace, we are becoming a garrison state under a virtual dictatorship.

Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, through Mrs. Ada B. Holt, district president, I had the great privilege of delivering a speech in Statuary Hall on the occasion of the anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee, whose character as a great American looms larger with each passing year.

The speech follows:

Madam President, and friends—

Who is the happy warrior? Who is he
That every man in arms should wish to be?

It is, the poet tells us—

The generous spirit, who, when brought
Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
Upon the plan that pleased his boyish thought.

If ever words so beautifully uttered might be fittingly applied, they seem consummated in the memory of the man we gather this day to honor. Once more we pause to observe an anniversary which becomes ever more precious, ever more meaningful, to the great Republic which without partisanship, without political or geographical bias, without stint or limit, east or west, north or south, today gladly and proudly unites with one accord of heart and voice to salute the blessed memory of Robert Edward Lee. For it is a blessed memory. It is more than that: It is a most precious heritage, ever purifying the national tradition, ever stimulating the national conscience, ever sustaining the national pride. If at the time of his passing, 80 years ago, the figure of Lee was already seen to be emerging from the mists of blind and passionate partisanship, whether from the one side or the other, to take on the majestic proportions of one of the heroes of history, how much clearer is our perspective today! He is like the mighty mountain which one must see from afar before one can fully appreciate its grandeur.

In evaluating the life of Lee one is at once struck by the enormous importance of his ancestry and background. It is impossible to escape it. Lee was himself a man of the gentlest simplicity despite his innate dignity. He would have been the last to claim any preference or prerogative because of his name and birth. The fact nonetheless remains that the soil which nourished this rare genius and the long line of high-born, distinguished and, above all, honorable ancestors whose blood coursed through his veins gave, beyond any question or doubt, a cast to his mind, an elevation to his spirit, and the deep-rooted—so deeply rooted that perhaps he himself was never wholly aware of it—fundamental, instinctive preference to the sane, the wholesome, and the true. He

was drawn to the right as the needle is drawn to the magnet. He spoke the truth by instinct.

In his old age an enterprising genealogist undertook to chronicle the Lees and the general commented:

"I am very much obliged to Mr. So and So for the trouble he has taken in relation to the Lee genealogy. I have no desire to have it published, and do not think it would afford sufficient interest beyond the immediate family to pay for the expense. I think the money had better be applied to relieving the poor."

"Which does not mean," adds one of his most eminent biographers, "that he was not daily and hourly conscious with pride that he belonged to the Virginia Lees, a name writ as large as any in the history of the country and transmitted to him with an honor which it was his constant care never to tarnish. From the first Richard (Lee) down, the Lees had always been doing something useful and often something great, and they were distinguished by the friendship as well as by the admiration of Washington."

If Lee was indeed proudly, and properly, conscious of the noble heritage transmitted to him on both sides—by Carter no less than by Lee—he was unquestionably profoundly influenced by his family's—especially his father's—close relations with General Washington. To have Light Horse Harry Lee for a father and George Washington for that father's intimate friend would be enough to make an indelible impression on any sensitive boy. Think of the tales he must have heard of the great and soul-stirring times when the War for Independence was being won. Think of the anecdotes of days when buff and blue were in the saddle. Think of the former brothers in arms who must often have stopped at the house on Orinoco Street over yonder in Alexandria to pay their respects first to the gallant, ailing general, and later to his widow. Can anyone doubt that there was a grave but eager-eyed boy in the background? I dwell on this aspect because many of my audience, being mothers, can appreciate the force of the old saying, "Just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined."

Lee's own mother was evidently a woman of the highest character and it is to her even more than to the distinguished father from whom he was separated so young that Lee owed the formative influences of his early life. Soon after the father's last, sad departure on the hopeless quest for health Mrs. Lee lapsed into invalidism and though only a small boy at the time Lee took much of the care of her and her household. To this is probably due in large measure the steadiness and high sense of responsibility which marked him so early in life.

In 1825, when he was 18, Lee, through the influence of some of his father's old friends, entered West Point. There he was noted for his temperance and self-control which seem doubly creditable to him when we read the statements of the Superintendent of West Point at the time in a report to President John Quincy Adams as to the dissipation generally prevalent among the young men. Being duly graduated in 1829, he immediately received appointment in the Engineer Corps, then the elite of the service. In June 1831, he was married to Miss Mary Custis, the great granddaughter of Martha Washington, and from thenceforward to the tragic day in 1861 when he left it forever, Arlington, with all its hallowed Washington relics, was to be his home. There followed long, busy years on engineer and garrison duty in various parts of the country ranging from Georgia to New York and from Washington to St. Louis. They were not dramatic years but they were eminently fruitful. Such important tasks as superintending the fortifications of New York harbor, adjusting the boundaries between Ohio and Michigan, problems connected with the control of the Mississippi constituted a notable series of constructive achievements.

But it was the war with Mexico that first showed unmistakably the promise of the rare military genius which later was so magnificently to flower. In view of the tragic divergence of a future day when each man was to find himself on opposite sides of an unbridgable gulf the testimony of Lee's old commander, admirer, and beloved friend takes on poignant appeal. The following formal testimony of Gen. Winfield Scott, the good "Old Fuss and Feathers," is of unusual interest, for in it we behold the first lightning flash of the genius which was one day to dazzle the world. Appearing before a Senate committee of inquiry into the conduct of the war, General Scott declared with characteristic vigor in speaking of Lee's now classic reconnaissance before Vera Cruz over a lava tract into which no man had dared venture before:

"I had dispatched several staff officers * * * who had, within the space of 2 hours, and after dark, successively returned * * * and reported to me that each had found it impracticable to penetrate far into the Pedegral during the darkness. * * * Captain Lee, * * * having passed over the difficult ground by daylight, found it just possible to return to San Augustin in the dark, the greatest feat of physical and moral courage performed by any individual, in my knowledge, pending the campaign." Again we have Scott's written praise of "the gallant and indefatigable Captain Lee, who was as distinguished for felicitous execution as for science and daring." We have also the testimony from a brother officer that General Scott exclaimed in his downright way one day after the war:

"If I were on my death bed tomorrow, and the President of the United States should tell me that a great battle was to be fought for the liberty or slavery of the country, and asked my judgment as to the ability of a commander, I would say, with my dying breath, let it be Robert E. Lee."

Prophetic words: A little more than a decade later when the future of the Nation seemed dark, indeed, it was General Scott, then approaching his end, who earnestly recommended to President Lincoln that Robert E. Lee should be given command of the Union armies.

But this is not, ladies, a military history of Lee the general. I leave that where it belongs—to military experts and to such great biographers as Douglas Southall Freeman. Nor is it the place nor the occasion to sound the trumpets of military remembrance. This is not a day of battle triumph; it is a day of dedication—for a renewal of the spirit in the wellsprings of a noble past. So I invite you to consider Lee the man.

One of our more amiable, and very human, traits is so to idealize our great leaders—once, be it strictly noted, they are safely dead—as to magnify them out of all proportion, which process does not in the least add to their true greatness and makes posterity not a little ridiculous. In short, if man, as Sabatier says, is "incurably religious," he is also a born hero worshiper—as Carlyle very well knew. It is a perfectly natural, perfectly normal, and, as I said, very human characteristic. Nevertheless, it has to be guarded against; that is, if we wish to preserve the true lineaments of the man we admire.

This is what kept Washington a frozen monument behind a veil of ice making him thus secretly odious to generations of rebellious school boys until at last a generation arose which knew not Parson Weems; the American sense of humor triumphantly burst through and presented us with a very human Washington we increasingly love and admire and feel close to. Does any lady here object to learning that the Father of Our Country turned out to be very human indeed? Does anyone here think him the less great in that without relaxing the pursuit of virtue, he was not averse from pursuing the fox? I confess that I, for one, was delighted to discover in a charming pamphlet that the youthful Lee spent many vacations at his birthplace: that through the fields, woods, and swamps of Stratford-on-the-Potomac he hunted deer, fox; shot wild duck, partridges, and geese; he fished, rowed, sailed; rode horseback, skated in winter, and tramped through old Westmoreland from dawn to dark.

It is good to know these things—to know that Lee's boyhood was a happy and normal one, with plenty of opportunity to let off boyish steam. There are many indications that to the very end of his life he was not without a touch of impish humor which, while it never left a sting, gave ample proof that its owner was in intimate touch with the reality of his fellow men.

Woodrow Wilson, in his Robert E. Lee, says:

"It is true that we do not think entirely correctly of Lee in supposing that he was compact entirely of gentleness. No man whom you deeply care for or look to for leadership is made up altogether of gentle qualities. When you come into the presence of a leader of men you know you have come into the presence of fire—that it is best not incautiously to touch that man, that there is something that makes it dangerous to cross him, that if you grapple his mind you will find that you have grappled with flame and fire. You do not want sweetness merely and light in men who lead you; and there was just as much fire in Lee as there was in Washington. In Washington it was more upon the surface, but it was not more truly present. Every man who approached Washington had the singular impression that he was in the presence of a man of tremendous passions. He was always well in hand; but you knew that the man himself was aware that he was driving a mettlesome team, which he had to watch at every moment to avoid sudden run-away, when circumstances were exigent or exciting.

"You did not get that impression when in the presence of Lee. I have only the delightful memory of standing, when a lad, for a moment by General Lee's side and looking up into his face, so that I have nothing but a child's memory of the man; but those who saw him when they were men and could judge say that you got no impression of constrained and governed passion such as men got from General Washington. But whenever General Lee was in the field no one dared cross him, no one dared neglect his orders, no one dared exercise a dangerous discretion in the carrying out of his commands. There would flare in the man a consuming fire of anger; those who were in his presence felt it was dangerous so much as to breathe naturally until it was past. There was something of the tiger in this man when his purpose was aroused and in action. It would immediately recede; quiet gentleness would come again, that perfect poise, that delightful sense of ease as he moved from one purpose to another; but you would not forget that moment of exposed fire—you would know that you had been in the presence of consuming force."

And so the long tranquil years passed by filled with active duty, happy family life, healthy children romping through the fields and woods of Arlington. During most of this time Lee was stationed at remote outposts where his wife and children could not follow him, and this seems to have been the only cloud on a singularly calm and sunny period. Perhaps he was storing up strength and serenity against a time when we would have great need of them. As the dread questions so many had lightly raised in decades gone by and from which sober men both North and South now were beginning to shrink even from thinking of, began to press down upon men's consciousness, we have occasional glimpses of Lee's interest and concern in the swift-moving events which were crowding everything else off the national stage. Here it should be stated with due emphasis

that it was then, and always thereafter remained, Lee's firm conviction that a soldier's profession had no part with politics. You all know that by a strange coincidence the John Brown raid occurred while Lee was on furlough at Arlington. Lee was ordered to take charge of the troops in putting down the insurrection which he did with coolness and precision.

As events rushed inexorably on, however, Lee foresaw that sooner or later he and every honest man would be forced to choose. He shrank from the prospect. Neither party satisfied him. Each seemed to him unreasonable, headstrong, utterly inconsiderate of the rights of the other. In December 1860, he writes:

"Feeling the aggression of the North, resenting their denial of the equal rights of our citizens to the common territory of the Commonwealth, and so forth, I am not pleased with the course of the Cotton States, as they term themselves. In addition to their selfish, dictatorial bearing, the threats they throw out against the 'Border States,' as they call them, if they will not join them, argues little for the benefit or peace of Virginia, should she determine to coalesce with them. While I wish to do what is right, I am unwilling to do what is wrong either at the bidding of the South or the North."

And again, in January 1861:

"As far as I can judge from the papers, we are between a state of anarchy and civil war. May God avert from us both • • • I see that four States have declared themselves out of the Union. Four more apparently will follow their example. Then if the border States are dragged into the gulf of revolution, one half of the country will be arrayed against the other, and I must try and be patient and wait the end, for I can do nothing to hasten or retard it."

It is perhaps as well at this point to make clear once more Lee's exact attitude toward secession. I take the liberty of quoting from his great biographer, Douglas Southall Freeman:

"During the later months of his second period of duty in Texas, the secession movement began. Lee had no sympathy with it. With him, a Whig, warmly devoted to the Union, the political and economic arguments for Southern independence did not weigh. He knew little of constitutional law, and the few slaves he had owned in earlier years had died or been manumitted. The question with him—a question he hoped he would never see brought to an issue—was simply whether his first allegiance was due his State or the Union. He answered it without mental debate: In case Virginia seceded, the traditions of his family and its long association with Virginia instinctively determined him to cast in his lot with her. He stated this repeatedly before he left Texas, and said at the same time that he regarded secession as revolution. It was not until the discussions of wartime campfires had acquainted him more fully with its constitutional basis that he accepted the doctrine of secession."

In April 1861, Lee was still at Arlington awaiting orders. On the 18th of that month he had one of the most memorable interviews in American history at the home of Francis P. Blair—now temporarily occupied by the President of the United States. There he was unofficially offered command of the Union Army with the undoubted knowledge of Mr. Lincoln who was advised by Lee's old commander, Scott. We have the account in Lee's own words written after the war in reply to a correspondent who wishes to know whether Lee had ever sought or desired command of the Union forces.

Lee writes:

"I never intimated to anyone that I desired the command of the United States Army, nor did I ever have a conversation with but one gentleman, the Honorable Francis P. Blair, on the subject, which was at his invitation and, as I understand, at the instance of President Lincoln. After listening to his remarks, I declined the offer he made me to take command of the army that was to be brought into the field, stating as candidly and courteously as I could that though opposed to secession and deprecating war, I could take no part in an invasion of the Southern States. I went directly from the interview with Mr. Blair to the office of General Scott, told him of the proposition that had been made me, and my decision."

Two days later Lee sent in his resignation to Scott expressing in an affectionate letter his heartfelt regret at separating himself from the service "to which I have devoted the best years of my life and all the ability I possessed," and adding, "save in defense of my native State I never desire again to draw my sword." Almost immediately, the State having already seceded, Lee was offered and accepted the position of commander in chief of the forces of Virginia.

In his memorable Lee Centennial Address which, perhaps, did more than all that had gone before to bridge the gap between North and South, Charles Francis Adams, grandson and great-grandson of Presidents of the United States astounded both North and South by the unequivocal declaration, "I hope I should have been filial and unselfish enough to have done as Lee did." Strange words from an unexpected source. But they foreshadowed the day, now happily long since arrived, when northern eyes could see the great commander in a just and proper light.

As I stated earlier, this is not the time nor the occasion to comment on the military phase of the great life we commemorate today. The fearful struggle which engulfed the Nation in a sea of blood and anguish is only made bearable to think upon—especially to southerners—by the memory of the great leader who rose, first to transcendant military glory and then after military defeat, rose to heights of moral grandeur which will enshrine him forever in southern—no, no, American hearts! Here was that "Happy Warrior"—

"Who, doomed to go in company with Pain,
And Fear, and Bloodshed, miserable train!
Turns his necessity to glorious gain.

• • • • •

Whose powers shed round him in the common strife,
Or mild concerns of ordinary life,
A constant influence, a peculiar grace;
But who, if he be called upon to face
Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
Great issues, good or bad for human kind,
Is happy as a lover; and attired
With sudden brightness, like a Man inspired;
And, through the heat of conflict, keeps the law
In calmness made, and sees what he foresaw;
Or if an unexpected call succeed,
Come when it will, is equal to the need:
He who, though thus endued as with a sense
And faculty for storm and turbulence,
Is yet a Soul whose master-bias leans
To homefelt pleasures and to gentle scenes;
Sweet images! which, wherese'er he be,
Are at his heart; and such fidelity
It is his darling passion to approve;
More brave for this, that he hath much to love:—
'T is, finally, the Man, who, lifted high,
Conspicuous object in a Nation's eye,
Or left unthought-of in obscurity—
Who, with a toward or untoward lot,
Prosperous or adverse, to his wish or not—
Plays, in the many games of life, that one
Where what he most doth value must be won:
Whom neither shape of danger can dismay,
Nor thought of tender happiness betray;
Who, not content that former worth stand fast,
Looks forward, persevering to the last,
From well to better, daily self-surpast:
Who, whether praise of him must walk the earth
For ever, and to noble deeds give birth,
Or he must fall, to sleep without his fame,
And leave a dead unprofitable name—
Finds comfort in himself and in his cause;
And, while the mortal mist is gathering, draws
His breath in confidence of Heaven's applause:
This is the happy Warrior; this is He
That every Man in arms should wish to be."

Diversion of Water From Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following letter which I received from Mr. John W. Cunningham, of Portland, Oreg., relative to the proposals to pipe Columbia River water to California:

PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. WALTER NORBLAD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORBLAD: I have been very much interested in the newspaper accounts of the exchange between President Truman and you regarding the diversion of water from the Columbia River. This project has impressed me as an absurdity from the start. It is something that could be disposed of finally through a very short and inexpensive engineering study of the fundamental factors. The thing that burns me up is that an elaborate and costly investigation and report is to be made. A local engineer has been assigned to this. I believe him to be competent, and have little doubt regarding his final conclusions. I cannot blame him for accepting a high-salaried job, but as a taxpayer I consider the whole study boondoggling of the worst sort.

It should take an engineer only a few days to make the basic calculations on pipeline size, frictional resistance, horsepower required, and pumping costs, which I am sure would show the fallacy of the scheme regardless of the original construction cost.

Some people no doubt think such a project feasible by comparison with the long-distance transmission of petroleum products and natural gas. There is a tremendous difference in the value of the commodity. For water an average sale price is 10 cents per 1,000 gallons. Gasoline is worth around $250 per 1,000 gallons, or 2,500 times as much. This makes quite a difference in the allowable cost of transportation.

While I have no doubt as to the ultimate outcome of the project for diverting Columbia River water to California, those of us who are interested in the Northwest do have a real cause for worry that California may steal our power supply. The Columbia Basin is the greatest reservoir of undeveloped power in the country, and our premier resource. The possibility for industrial development is unlimited, and industrially this section can go ahead of California. The transmission of power 500 to 1,000 miles has not yet been accomplished, but is right around the corner. It could be done right now if there was occasion for it. It would be inherently unfair and a calamity to this area if our power, produced at Government expense, were taken to California to further their industrial development.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. CUNNINGHAM.

Confusion in Administration Ranks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including the following newspaper article by Mr. Constantine Brown, well-known columnist, that appeared in last evening's Washington Evening Star:

ADMINISTRATION RANKS CONFUSED—EXECUTIVE BRANCH FOLLOWING OWN POLICIES WITHOUT CONSULTING SPOKESMEN IN CONGRESS

(By Constantine Brown)

There is utter confusion in the ranks of the administration. The executive branch, taking its cue from the attitude of President Truman regarding the participation of legislative bodies in major foreign affairs decisions, is following its own policy without consulting administration spokesmen in either the Senate or House.

The Democratic leadership in the Senate, while trying to keep the party line intact, is angered by this neglect on the part of the State Department. This became evident last Tuesday, when Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, lashed out at representatives of the State Department over acceptance of the truce terms at the United Nations. Senator CONNALLY previously has gone to bat for the policies of the State Department, even when he personally doubted their wisdom.

Neither the White House nor the State Department keep as closely in touch with the temper of the country as do Members of Congress. The important debates now taking place on the floors of both Houses, and the anger voiced by some Members of Congress over some features of our present foreign policies spring not only from personal convictions, but also from the unbelievably large volume of mail received by Congressmen from all parts of the country. These letters and telegrams express fears and doubts about the way in which our foreign policies are being conducted.

The decision to intervene in Korea last June was approved almost unanimously by Congress. The mail received in the Senate and House has given an 80 percent endorsement to President Truman's decision to send forces to repel the aggression.

However, the State Department's decision to accept the idea of the truce proposal—rejected yesterday by the Chinese Reds—which in effect would have given Russia and China a complete political victory met with unprecedented indignation.

The Nation has accepted our losses so far in Korea without murmur. They were considered inevitable in a campaign intended to back up the fundamental principles of the United Nations and at the same time help our strategic position in the Pacific.

Now, after we have had more than 50,000 American casualties and are some $14,000,000,000 out of pocket, the State Department's willingness to accept a truce which would have given a full political victory to the aggressors is beyond the patience of the American people.

Senators of both parties cannot easily digest the argument of our foreign policy-makers that Warren Austin was ordered to "go along" with the authors of that sordid deal because the State Department wanted to abide by the decision of the majority in the UN and because the Department was convinced beforehand that the Chinese would not accept even these favorable terms.

Democratic and Republican Senators argue that while expediency may be proper on occasions, it is inexcusable in a matter involving fundamental moral principles. They also argue that the other explanation given the Senate by the State Department that "talking with aggressors does not mean accepting their terms"—is equally fallacious and hollow.

If we had become involved in a deal such as that presented by the UN, because this Government could not afford to take a minority position in the UN, there would have been no way to escape accepting the terms of the truce we had already endorsed.

The country would have wanted to know, Congressmen say, why we had undertaken a police action and then, when faced with inevitable military difficulties, backed out and, in fact, surrendered. The political consequences of such a surrender would have been more far-reaching than the military setback.

Withdrawal from Korea, if dictated by strategic considerations, is understandable and desirable. But a surrender—which is what the "truce" plan meant in its provision that we sit at the same table with the aggressors and arrange for "peaceful conditions" in Asia—would have placed the whole of Asia in Russia's lap. And Asia is vital to our security in the struggle with the Kremlin.

A Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Crittenden County Times, West Memphis, Ark., for January 5, 1951:

A WELFARE STATE

The records of the sheriff and collector of Crittenden County will reflect that his collections during the year 1950 amounted to $761,039.54. This sum is not so large when one is advised that it represents everything that is to be collected in the county for roads, hospitals, drainage, schools, and the operation of all the county offices, including the police protection of the citizens and the operation of all courts.

But there is another item that is gigantic, stupendous, in fact it is colossal. We refer to the $690,400 that was given away and handed out in the name of public welfare in Crittenden County during that same 1950.

Is it possible that during good times, high prices, and scarcity of hands to make our crops and do our labor that the public needs to distribute such an immense sum in charity? How could there be any need for Red Cross or any of the other agencies that make annual demands for relief funds upon our populace in the face of this melon-cutting? We import foreign labor, haul pickers from across the river, beg for household service, and still we must, it seems, pay people not to work for themselves.

The fact is this: Our people are asleep at the switch; we are not taking enough interest in what is going on before us. We are not mindful of the fact that a welfare state would likely lead to ruin, to communism, or something just as distasteful, and that we are placing a penalty on honest labor.

Why should the taxpayers pay some carefree mother for taking care of a houseful of illegitimate children? Why should she not work for herself and children if she is able? Why should we pay for the keep of housefuls when the party responsible is wandering about telling others "the Government is taking care of the children."

It is a sad state of affairs. A lack of interest leads to such. Should we not advise, even insist, that our representatives in the coming legislature fight for some new method of seeing that requirements for welfare aid are stricter?

The rolls are obviously too large. While we do not blame those who operate the county department and who are people doing an assigned job, there are no doubt some in the upper strata of the welfare organization of the Nation and the State who work to keep lists of recipients large in order to insure a large number of jobs for themselves as employees.

We will never condemn honest charity or relief to those who are unable to help themselves. In fact, we will ever be ready to join in it. But we have a bad situation here and certainly the same situation exists elsewhere. It's a condition that needs looking into.

What are we, as citizens and as taxpayers, going to do about it?

Organization of the Committee on the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I herewith insert in the RECORD the organization of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Four regular subcommittees have been formed, together with two special subcommittees, the special subcommittees being the Special Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power and the Special Subcommittee on Reapportionment. The assignment of Members to the subcommittees follows:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

1. General jurisdiction over judiciary bills as assigned.

2. Special jurisdiction over immigration and naturalization bills.

Mr. Walter, chairman; Mr. Feighan, Mr. Chelf; Mr. Gossett; Mr. Graham; Mr. Fellows; Mr. Case.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2

1. General jurisdiction over judiciary bills as assigned.

2. Special jurisdiction over claims bills.

Mr. Byrne, chairman; Mr. Frazier, Mr. Rodino; Mr. Machrowicz; Mr. Keating; Mr. Goodwin; Mr. Jonas.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3

1. General jurisdiction over judiciary bills as assigned.

2. Special jurisdiction over patents, trademarks, and copyrights; also, revision of the laws.

Mr. Bryson, chairman; Mr. Ramsay; Mr. Willis; Mr. Rogers; Mr. Reed; Mr. Boggs; Mr. Crumpacker.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4

1. General jurisdiction over judiciary bills as assigned.

2. Special jurisdiction over bankruptcy and reorganization.

Mr. Lane, chairman; Mr. Wilson; Mr. Jones; Mr. Forrester; Mr. McCulloch; Miss Thompson; Mr. Hillings.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. Byrne, chairman; Mr. Chelf; Mr. Willis; Mr. Reed; Mr. Goodwin.

Enemies in Our Midst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received one of the most thought-provoking letters since coming to Congress 2 years ago. Unquestionably, the thoughts expressed in this letter are echoed by every mother and father whose sons and daughters are soon to be called into service to protect our country from those who would destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of this body to the following letter:

CANTON, S. DAK., *January 15, 1951.*

Representative HAROLD O. LOVRE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After talking with and hearing the cry of a large group of South Dakotans, together with the incessant cry in my own bosom, I take pen in hand to utter a protest on the laxness with which our Government permits the destroying Reds to stay within our borders.

I believe the adage of "God helps those who help themselves" is very true. Is it not a mockery to prayer and national prayer days to pray for peace and yet let 50,000 enemies stay within our gates? Is there any country on the face of the earth that, knowing a large group of destructive peoples and a menace to their freedom, would feed, nourish, house, and only talk about such enemies without doing anything or taking action against them? Is there anyone who thinks at all who doesn't realize where fires started in hotels one after another had their origin or the destruction of large warehouses, instigated strikes, dissension in large measure among the working classes, and all manner of other unnecessary evils come from? True, any country will have its problems, but "it was never so here" in our country in such measure until the "isms" rose up on the face of this earth. Shall we sit by and idly wait for the end until more men and women have filtered into our Government chairs to sit and draw fat pay envelopes and pass on all necessary secrets vital to our national safety to those who would conquer us and enslave us? If a small percentage of these are discovered, what about the taxpayer's money for long, expensive, drawn-out trials? I am a mother of two boys, one soon 18, the other 21, and must I sit idly by listening to the radio and reading the newspapers how these would-be conquerors are right in our "camp" undermining and spreading disease and what not? Shall we mothers and fathers who have raised loving and good sons send them out to defend our country and those we send to Washington at taxpayers' expense only sit idly by and talk about this destructive army here in the very land we send our boys out to defend? Believe me, I'm only voicing the heartcry from thousands of mothers and fathers who feel the same way. Many of them only wring their hands, hoping for the best, and patiently waiting, but many more are praying for action from our Congressmen to do something about it. They may say, "We don't do things that way in America," and yet isn't one of our initial laws to the very point on that? If I remember my civics since schooldays, there should still be something on those good old books that says, "Anyone writing or speaking against the President or Government, etc."—it doesn't finish with saying "feed them, nourish them, assist them, and let them stay." Let's not wait until they have so weakened us at home that we have no power to resist. And what about sending our boys to Europe? Shall we send our strength in every direction to police the world and endanger our own freedom? Has Congress degenerated to such a weak force in our land that they can't take action to insure safety, peace of mind to the people, and confidence in the men we send and pay to take action? Mr. and Mrs. America are truly expecting it, and I feel I have a right to expect that the Reds in the United States of America be locked up where we don't have to fear them. Somehow it doesn't seem right to send them back to their own country at this time to be a potential force for their own country with their secrets and manpower to be used against us. The church today is saying, "Wake up, America." What does our Government say? Actions speak louder than words. Let's strip these within our borders of their power and then take it to the Lord in prayer. How can we expect God now to answer our prayers for peace and safety when we block the prayer avenue with such obstacles in its very path?

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN UREN.
Mr. JOHN UREN.

What Are the Real Reasons for Halting Potato Dumping?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press dispatch from Presque Isle, Maine, is another example of the confusing and apparently improvised operations of the Department of Agriculture in its food hoarding and food destruction program. The lack of clearly stated reasons for this halt in dumping of potatoes gives rise to natural speculation as to the real reasons. It may be that greater export needs or greater Army needs or both offer the sole explanation, but I shall submit some comparative figures from the official Department reports which may disclose also reasons to which no public reference has been made.

First, I shall include here for the record the dispatch:

UNITED STATES ORDERS HALT IN DUMPING OF HUGE MAINE POTATO CROP

PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE, January 17.—Dumping of surplus potatoes from Maine's 61,000,000-bushel crop has been ordered halted by Washington, a Commodity Credit Corporation representative said today.

Edwin A. Bates, CCC purchasing representative, said the telephonic order did not specify the reason but it was believed there was a likelihood of greater export and Army needs.

The Washington action affects "on-farm disposal" through which, Bates said, about 5,000,000 bushels have been diverted to date to fertilizer or livestock usage under the price-support program. The program will continue insofar as movement of Government purchased potatoes is channeled to starch factories, school-lunch programs, institutions, and export.

Bates estimated that approximately 30 percent of the Maine crop has been disposed of so far either through regular market channels or the price-support program.

Under price supports, which are scheduled to expire this year, the Government pays the farmer $1.15 per hundredweight for surplus spuds and he, in turn, buys them back for 1 cent to use them either as fertilizer or for livestock.

A year ago, a halt in "dumping" as the disposal action is generally called, came in May when heavy export orders for Western Germany came in.

To cope with the Maine surplus problem, agriculture experts have recommended an acreage reduction next year.

Maine potato carload shipments are lagging far behind this year as compared with a year ago. To date only about 6,300 cars have moved out as compared with nearly 15,000 a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1949, the Department had no potatoes on hand. By November 30, 1949, it had purchased 590,090,100 pounds and had disposed of 589,889,100 pounds at a loss to the American taxpayers of $5,850,344.40.

I do not know and have not been able to find out how much of that loss was due to "dumping" or other destruction.

On June 30, 1950, the Department had no potatoes on hand. At that time we were in Korea. Despite that, the Department had purchased by November 30, 1950, 1,360,636,500 pounds and had disposed of 1,272,281,800 pounds at a loss of $13,091,657.29.

The Department ended up on June 30, 1950, with a loss in potatoes of $75,887,619.68. That created widespread indignation.

It is more than possible, it is probable, that in November, as it was running 124.0 percent ahead of its extravagance and waste of the last fiscal year, the Department at long last realized that it was facing a major scandal if the full facts became known.

Whatever the facts are, they should be made public. I hope and believe that the proper Committees in Congress will see that this is done. The American people and the Congress should have this information promptly.

At the Pistol Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, January 18, 1951, entitled "At the Pistol Point":

AT THE PISTOL POINT

The answer of the Chinese Communist Government to the proposal of the United Nations for a cease-fire in Korea is that it will cease fire when, as, and if the spoils of a successful war are handed over to it.

This is the clear meaning of the Chinese Communist reply, whatever efforts may be made in certain quarters to gloss over it. For the Chinese Communists say, in so many words, that the United Nations plan for a cease-fire first and negotiations afterward cannot be agreed to. They say that the negotiations must come before, and not after, any cease-fire is arranged. They indicate that if the cease-fire is actually to follow the negotiations, then the negotiations themselves must first result in terms which they regard as satisfactory.

What these terms would be we are told again, specifically, in this latest note of the Peiping government. They are three in number: First, all foreign troops must be withdrawn from Korea and "the solution of the internal affairs of Korea" must be undertaken "by the Korean people themselves"; in the existing circumstances, with North Korean troops already established well to the south of the thirty-eighth parallel, and with great numbers of "volunteers" all set to come down from Manchuria to reinforce them, this means simply handing over South Korea to the North Koreans and their masters. Second, the protection of the American Seventh Fleet must be withdrawn from Formosa. Third, Communist China must be admitted to the United Nations.

These are the terms. They are to be discussed in China, and not at Lake Success. And unless and until they are granted Communist China makes it clear that it will keep its pistol pointed at the head of the United Nations.

Since the second week of November, when General MacArthur reported the invasion of Korea by large numbers of organized Chinese Communist troops, the United Nations—collectively, and despite the efforts of individual spokesmen of individual nations—has marked time while the armies of these Chinese Communist forces multiplied. The question of the Chinese Communist invasion has been debated at great length; not a single resolution has been adopted to describe and condemn this invasion as a breach of international law. A cease-fire commission has been established by the General Assembly; it has addressed five different communications to Peiping; in not one of these five communications has it remotely suggested any wrongdoing on the part of the Chinese Communists. In fact, it is fair to say that the Cease-fire Commission has seemed to act on the premise that it was its duty, somehow and to the best of its ability, to use its good officers to settle a quarrel between two outside parties—Communist China and the United States—when the whole truth of the fact is that if this is anybody's war it is the war of the United Nations.

Meantime, while nothing was done at Lake Success, all manner of excuses have been offered—individually, to be sure, but from high quarters in nations which were quick enough to act when only North Korea was the aggressor—excuses serving by one means or another to palliate the offense of the Chinese Communist government. First it was said that that government was concerned only about the safety of the power installations on the Yalu River. Then it was suggested that it simply did not understand the way of westerners, and took natural alarm at the northern moves of western armies. Then, when the western armies were no longer moving northward but retreating southward, it was argued that, after all, the solution of the problem had been approached from the wrong angle; nothing could be done to clarify the issue without admitting Communist China to the United Nations. And meanwhile the Communist Chinese armies have been marching, marching, marching.

And meanwhile, too, young boys from the western nations have been fighting in Korea, fighting and dying in Korea, facing odds that were too great to be overcome, beating their way back southward along mountain roads in zero temperatures, leaving large numbers of their comrades behind them.

What are these boys doing in Korea? Are they there through some ghastly mistake? Or are they there, in the cause of the United Nations, and at its command, to resist an aggressor?

If the second explanation is the correct one, as we believe it to be, then it is high time to identify the aggressor.

It's Not Funny—It Can Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the President persists in his New Deal program although Congress has consistently rebuked him. He is calling for additional billions for defense, yet asks for billions more for socialized medicine and other socialistic schemes.

Mr. Speaker, a friend who is editor of the Delavan Enterprise, wrote a thought-provoking editorial that appeared on January 3, 1951. S. Robert Andersen looks ahead to 1975 and what he sees sends chills down my back. It is not funny nor is it fanciful. It can happen here if the New Deal program is finally consummated. It is up to the people. I am including the editorial at this point:

RAMBLING AROUND

(By S. Robert Andersen)

Here all of us are, facing the first January of the last half of the twentieth century. Within a few weeks after you receive this issue of the Delavan Enterprise I shall be observing another birthday. Since I was born in the nineteenth century, before another 25 years roll by I may be old enough to write reminiscences. So this month let me be old and cantankerous and pessimistic, and imagine that I am already 24 years older. Would I, perhaps, be writing notes like these?

January 1975: I can remember clearly how, back in 1950, nearly every family had an automobile. People were putting television sets in their homes. New houses were being built by individual families. No one used ration coupons for anything, although some had been used during the Second World War, and then people knew what they were. All meat and grocery stores and industries were then owned and operated by private individuals and companies, who competed with each other on price and quality.

February 1975: A farmer friend of mine was arrested today and they say he will be sent to jail for 2 years. His sow raised a litter of nine pigs, but he reported only eight to the Meat Administration. He had managed to hide the other one from the farm inspector, but someone found it out when he butchered the pig. He had hoped to give his four youngsters a little home-grown meat. The Meat Administration says that not nearly enough meat can be produced or imported, and that the ration must be reduced to a half-pound per week.

March 1975: The 15th was the date set for the tax reports to be made to the Federal Government. They are still paying off the interest in the national debt which was so greatly enlarged during the Second World War and in the fight against Russian imperialism. No effort has been made as yet to pay off any of the principle yet on our tax rate, which has risen since 1950 to the point where we all must pay the Treasury at least 65 percent of our earnings. The higher incomes pay proportionately more. The cost of our Government has risen through the years because of the need for additional bureaus to handle the controls set over our national economy.

April 1975: I was visiting on a friend's farm the other week end. Their hens, encouraged by spring, laid a couple of extra eggs. It would have been nice to have two fresh eggs for breakfast again, but it has become too dangerous to try to dodge the law. Besides, for many years now one egg a week has been the allowance, and we have gotten used to getting along. We never appreciated our good fortune when it was possible to have two eggs and bacon, too, every morning for breakfast, and even cream for our coffee. I remember how sorry I felt for the English back in 1950, when they had only one egg a week.

May 1975: I went down to the Lumber and Building Administration today to apply for three two-by-fours to brace up the front porch. Had to fill out three sets of application blanks, six copies of each, and to draw a diagram to show just where the piece would be used. The inspector will be around next month to make recommendations which will be forwarded to Washington. The clerk in charge of the office said that I could expect quick and favorable action on a minor request. He said that I could expect to make the repairs before cold weather set in this fall.

June 1975: This morning I stood in line until noon before the Health Administration offices. Wanted to get the tooth pulled that has kept me awake most of the 3 nights. I couldn't get in to see the clerk. Long ago, before we had this free medicine for everybody, one could generally find a doctor or dentist fairly quickly. They took a personal interest in our troubles. Now they just jot our number down in the book and hurry us through, if we get to see them at all. The dentists nowadays seldom have the time to fill teeth and must make application for filling material through the Health Office. Each applicant must be examined by the district office.

July 1975: The Fourth of July reminds an old fellow of his younger days, when we celebrated or not, according to how we felt. Today, as is usual now, everybody had to appear in town to listen to the official program and watch and hear the President make his speech on the municipal television. He ranted about freedom like his father used to do, but what he says and what he does are two different things. The administration keeps the populace happy on holidays by giving free shows over the television sets. The show usually consists of a military review of our Army which shows the people how strong our Nation has become. The fireworks display and other celebrations remind me of the days of Hitler when he resorted to such dramatic spectacles to keep the people emotionally pent up.

August 1975: The Lumber Administration refused my application for three two-by-fours. They said it was improperly made out.

I was instructed to report at their office to initiate new applications. My son ended his 2 years of compulsory military training today and will be coming home soon. He will have to continue his training here at home with one of the home training units that meet once a week at the local armory. Every summer the home units must go on a 2 weeks' maneuver period in the northern part of the State. This period constitutes the worker's vacation for his job. The women have to serve their time with the Armed Forces also but they only have to enlist for 1 year, and they are exempt from summer maneuvers if they have children.

September 1975: I have been trying to figure out in my mind just when these present conditions had their beginning. Some say it was when the Government bought all the railroads. Next they took the coal mines, then the steel mills, then the truck hauling business, then the whole petroleum industry. They said they had to have the mines and the oil business to get fuel for the trains and trucks, and the steel mills to get enough steel for everybody. Just try to buy some now. Now the Government runs nearly every kind of business, just as Russia did when I was a young fellow. Then production started going on down, and the country has been getting poorer ever since.

October 1975: I think the beginning was further back. It might have been about 1936, when the politicians discovered they really could buy votes in quantities with borrowed public money through the WPA and other things. Some of the younger people now can't remember when we used to have elections. The situation began to get out of control in 1948, when the ballot boxes were stuffed. We had several elections after that, but people lost interest in voting when the politicians gained control of a unified union vote. We don't have any unions today with the Government running things.

November 1975: Have been busy reading the history of the twentieth century and have come to the conclusion that our freedom began to be lost in 1913. That was the year the income-tax amendment was ratified. The idea would have been all right, probably, if it had contained a provision that no more than one-fourth of any ordinary man's earnings could be taken in taxes and no more than half of the biggest incomes. Since there were no limits on taxes, the politicians eventually discovered that there were no limits on the amounts they could spend. They kept taking more and more from everybody to give more free help until no one could save. Then there had to be still bigger pensions for us old people and more Government services of every kind. No one could save up enough for investment, so the Government said it would have to take over business.

December 1975: Kind of hard to be cheerful at holiday time. Can't help remembering the great days when every American out of jail was free and full of hope for the future.

The Government Conservation Administration ruled that only one large community Christmas tree would be permitted and no individual trees for homes could be had. This ruling was supposed to be temporary, but it was made over 5 years ago. The Government said that it had to preserve the forests. The Government took over control of all forests many years ago and have been in the lumber business ever since the Lumber and Building Administration was formed.

Are my reminiscences exaggerated? I hope so. But I have mentioned nothing that doesn't happen today in England or Russia. And the United States of America has been faithfully following the English route.

Victory or Defeat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pride in including an inspiring address delivered by Rev. William J. Schifferli, assistant pastor, Holy Redeemer Church, Rochester, N. Y., and Monroe County chaplain of the Catholic War Veterans, on Armistice Sunday, November 12, 1950.

Father Schifferli's courageous, inspiring address is one of the finest expositions which has come to my attention of the menace of communism. As we all know, the patriotic organization for which he spoke, the Catholic War Veterans, is one of the most militant and effective forces in our country today against the godless, totalitarian ideologies parroted by those traitorous or misguided elements whose first loyalty does not lie with their own country which has nurtured them and bestowed on them its richest blessings.

In these times when men must stand up and be counted, challenging words like those of Father Schifferli stand out like a beacon pointing the way to victory over the evil forces which would destroy us and the ideals for which our Nation stands.

His address follows:

VICTORY OR DEFEAT?

At least twice in every year, our busy and active Nation pauses in its many affairs to give thought to its faithful dead, its heroes and patriots who heard the call to arms, who arose to defend our country, who struggled and sweated and suffered and died for our country's cause. The memory of these men, and their living comrades, who happily were not called upon in God's providence to pay the fullest measure of their life in the cause of right, is held sacred in the throbbing hearts of a grateful people. Their deeds of heroism and valor sound a stirring call to loyalty, and should be set before the youth of the Nation as a shining example.

Cynicism, doubt, bitterness, selfishness, have no place in the hearts of youthful Americans, and unless they are cleansed from the consciousness of a young generation, they will sap the strength of character, the will to win, the desire for freedom, and the determination to fight, yes, and to die, if necessary, to uphold the glorious traditions of our heritage of freedom.

On Memorial Day and on Armistice Day, we pay the tribute of our reverence, our love, and our gratitude to the high courage and daring self-sacrifice of these patriots who did so much and dared so much for the good of our country. These men and their glorious deeds are in our hearts and our minds. We, whose lives are surrounded by the fruits of their sacrifices and lapped in the delights of a life of freedom won by their devotion, can little realize the intensity of the terrible struggle, the upheaval of lives, the shock of war, the pain and horror and fear of those great conflicts. The human mind has the tendency to forget pain, so that even in the consciousness of those who fought, the horror of those battles has lost its sharpness of image, and the great healing power of time has tended to soothe and lull to forgetfulness.

But we would indeed be faithless to those who died for us, were we to expunge from our memory all that they did. Memories rich and rare which make us all purer and stronger and better, crowd in upon the heart as we recall the matchless valor of American hearts and the deathless glory of American arms. Well do we know that the service which they rendered to their country cannot be measured in terms of human precision. The sacrifice was enormous and the prize for which they fought was beyond price. Small, indeed, is the mere memory of their valiant deeds, nor can we keep faith with them were we only to recall on special occasions their glorious courage. A memorial to these men would be a hollow and fruitless thing unless in our daily lives, in our every thought and action, we took care and planting for the preservation of that country and those ideals for which they sacrificed all. We must beware lest the palms of victory become, through our own lack of vigilance and care, the ashes of defeat.

There is at work today in the caldron of America's thoughts, a virulent poison, introduced by elements foreign to our country, fostered by traitors in our midst, encouraged by some of the so-called intelligentsia who are so deluded in their naive false idealism that they fail to realize that they themselves will be among the first victims of their vicious system. This poison is called communism.

We might wonder how an intelligent informed people like Americans, who live in a country of plenty and are blessed with more material possessions than other people in the world, who dwell in a vast and gracious land, can possibly be deceived by this monster. But let us face facts. In spite of our educational system, there are many people among us who are not intelligent. God gives to us talents in varying degrees. In spite of our press and radio, there are many people who are not well informed. Furthermore, many are open to the danger of being swayed by propaganda, for we know that if a person is told a thing often enough, he begins, although incredulous at first, to believe it. In spite of our vast economic resources, there are many people who live in misery and want. Even our own fair city is not without its slums.

Into a body politic, weakened by these ills, the virus of communism, with its false promises, with its mastery of the lie and deceit, with its evil, malignant, cancerous doctrines, this virus makes a gradual progress which will, if not checked, in time corrupt the entire body politic.

There are those of us who say that it can never happen here. But we say that it can. We have witnessed, since the conclusion of this last world-wide conflict, the fall of country after country into the orbit of this enslaving monster. Under the guise of democracy, under the banner of liberation, the forces of this monster have infiltrated many countries. The sufferings and poverty of a people are played upon. Promises are made that conditions will be better. A few positions of power in the country are captured by Communists. And it is then that the poison begins to take its toll. It begins by a discrediting of communism's enemies; then their elimination is next. All organs of information and thought fall under the monster's control. All weapons and means of liberty's defense are seized and taken from the people. A police force then begins the terrible reign of terror. On any door, at any hour of the night, comes the dreaded knock of the secret police, and the poor victim is spirited away, never to return. Is his fate the torture chamber? The vast slave camps? The uranium mines? The

concentration camps? Or is he to be so drugged and tortured until his mind is misshapen and he becomes putty in the hands of soulless beasts to be molded as those beasts see fit, and then pitilessly and mercilessly exhibited in a so-called court of justice which makes a blasphemous mockery of its very name?

This has happened in our "enlightened" age, to peoples we once helped. Poland and Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Hungary, China—the list grows, the dead multiply, the tortures increase. Gradually, the glow of freedom on this globe is dimmed. Never before in the history of the world have so many people been reduced to the condition of slavery, slavery of the body, slavery of thought, slavery of the soul. Yes, it happened to others; it can happen to us. Can we imagine in such a world of tyranny a gathering like this worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our consciences, dedicated to the remembrance of a throng of dead heroes, who lives and deaths were for the cause of liberty and justice?

Our dear America is a Nation which has never lost a war. From the War of Independence through World War II, from 1775 to 1945, victory has been ours on the battlefields of the world. The ground of many nations and countries has trembled under our marching feet and rumbling tanks; the seas have foamed under the prows of our mighty ships; the air has roared with the power of our air armadas. And the glorious symphony of the power of our arms has been exerted, not in the enslavement of peoples, not in aggression, not in a drive and search for world imperialism, not in a selfish bid for power, not in the destruction of freedom, but in the cause of liberty and justice for all.

We have never lost a war. And so we say that victory is ours. Yes, victory has been ours. But now, 5 years after the cessation of hostilities in the world-wide conflict, 5 years after the destruction of our enemies, 5 years after the armies of our foes were destroyed, killed or captured, and disarmed, 5 years after their fleets were riddled and sunk, 5 years after the horrible fury of the atomic bomb burst like a portent of the future, like an Apocalyptic scourge in the skies, 5 years after, where is our victory?

We see nation after nation falling to the scourge of communism. We see our former friends drawn into the camp of the future enemy. We see our former enemies, countries we conquered by force of arms, flaunting insults in our faces. We see our consulates closed, our businessmen imprisoned as spies on trumped-up charges; our Government representantives in foreign lands forced to flee for their lives and be covered with public humiliation. We see the world organization established for the preservation of world peace, the United Nations, mocked by the Reds in Korea, who without provocation, launched a war of aggression. We see our youths, insufficiently trained, without the proper materials for war, forced to retreat and to die in South Korea. We see our armies, apparently victorious in the bloody struggle, met by hordes of Chinese Communists, for whose very existence we are in a measure to blame. We see our efforts for peace, tranquility, and order among nations consistently blocked by a power whose avowed purpose is the creation of chaos and anarchy, and the ultimate overthrow of our Government, indeed, our very way of life.

If we are to face facts, we must admit that much of this has been our own fault.

An astounded world looks on and says, Is this America? Is this the victor? How far can we be pushed? How many insults shall we take? Can it be that some of our men in high positions tolerate this because they are sympathetic to the vicious ideology of communism? Is this victory, or is this defeat?

We are a peace-loving people, and we avoid to our utmost, war. But how many unarmed planes must we let be shot down deliberately in the Baltic? How many Americans murdered? How many imprisoned? How low must we grovel in humility to avoid war? We decry war, we hate and fear war; but we say, better war and glorious death in defense of liberty, than life as a slave to a totalitarian state.

Let America bend every effort to solve peacefully the problems of the world; let us be sympathetic and understanding of other peoples. But let us be inflexible in our love for, and our defense of, liberty. Let us keep faith with our honored dead. Let us perpetuate the ideals for which they died. Let us act, not like the vanquished, but like the victors.

Faith, Not Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following verse composed by George D. Case, of 1014 South Main Street, Horseheads, N. Y., which recently came to my attention and which deals with our current national and moral perplexities. I commend it to those who are as sorely troubled as I:

We are in need of faith, not fear,
Faith that builds wisdom.
Let the changing year
Bring us leaders, wise in thought
With prophetic vision, who can lay
A path for us to follow day by day,
A road that ends, not in defeat
But constant gains, as it is meet
For those who love but do not hate,
Let us mark the path before too late.
We are in need of strength, not waste,
Strength of our son, our daughter,
Our future lies in those, who in our
Half-thought acts, we slaughter.
In name of liberty, we slaves
Of politics and greed, boast of our skill
But find our only creed is fight and kill.
We are in need of God, not guns,
To give more wisdom to our deeds,
The power that Nature holds for us to solve
Is great beyond our needs.
We have but to set our minds and hearts
And ask the way. We have to only
Bow our haughty heads and pray,
Why should we cede that man is wise.
From God's great tower, what is his size?
We are in need of wisdom, not device,
Wisdom to know if we are right,
Then right will reign. If wrong, go on and fight,
For we are foolish, weak and vain,
Fools who take the hardest way
When all we need is just to pray
And ask the greater power that be
To guide our way to make men free.
We are in need of standards high
That others may gage their virtues by.
What we need is greatly less
Of dishonesty and selfishness.
Aye. What we need is strength of right,
Prepared—but never have to fight.
Is it too much to ask, that we
Make this our goal for liberty.

—*George D. Case.*

JANUARY 1951.

Pfc Melvin L. Brown, of Mahaffey, Pa., Awarded, in Absentia, the Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the community of Mahaffey, Pa., made front-page news on January 9 when one of its native sons was awarded in absentia the Nation's highest decoration for valor—the congressional medal of honor.

The official citation of the War Department reads in part:

Brown was seriously injured during this action and has not been heard from since this attack.

Melvin L. Brown was a typical American youth who enlisted in the Army 2 years ago and who is truly representative of the millions of American teenage boys now in the uniform of their country and on the alert to defend this Nation against any threat to its security.

The people of Mahaffey, Pa., as well as the great Keystone State realize that Private Brown's service to his country made him a national hero and that a grateful Nation owes young men of his resourcefulness and courage an eternal debt of gratitude that cannot be paid by mere tribute alone. Every American citizen owes a portion of that debt to our fighting men and the only payment that can be made on such an obligation is continued interest in the servicemen of this Nation so that they may be provided with every possible means of assistance in defending this Nation. This obligation is also in effect when they return home as veterans and resume their places in civilian life.

I should like at this point to insert the following editorial that appeared in the January 11, 1951, issue of the Clearfield Progress, Clearfield, Pa., and which is an eloquent tribute to the gallantry of Pfc Melvin L. Brown:

A SAGA OF AMERICA

Clearfield County in general and the little town of Mahaffey in particular has reason to feel proud of one of its sons this week. He is, of course, Pfc Melvin L. Brown, the 19-year-old Mahaffey youth who enlisted in the Army 2 years ago and who was awarded, in absentia, the Nation's highest decoration for valor, the Congressional Medal of Honor, in a White House ceremony Tuesday morning. To win the Medal of Honor, Private First Class Brown "distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty," according to the official citation.

It happened at Kasan, "the walled city," last September 4. Pfc Melvin L. Brown, a member of Company D, Eighth Engineer Combat Battalion, took a position on a retaining wall approximately 50 feet high. Only 3 days before, he had written his parents that he was driving a truck but expected "to be back in the lines soon."

Not many who serve in the Nation's Armed Forces ever win the Medal of Honor. Still fewer return to receive it in person. Here are a few statistics to prove the point: Only

427 men received it in World War II—258 Army, 57 Navy, 37 Air Force, 79 Marines, and 1 Coast Guard; since March 25, 1863, when the first 6 medals were awarded, only 3,041 have been presented.

"Enemy superior in number started climbing the wall just as Brown's last round of ammunition was expended and he was wounded by enemy fire," the citation said. "Realizing the vital necessity for holding, and without concern for his personal safety, though wounded and without his rifle, Brown continued to throw his few remaining hand grenades into the enemy, causing several casualties with each grenade."

No records are available, but Pfc Melvin L. Brown is doubtless the first Clearfield Countian ever to receive the Congressional Medal. We've had heroes in every war and there are many well-decorated veterans in our midst today. But it remained for a 19-year-old youth to top them all. And probably no one gives him more credit than those heroes of World Wars I and II who also distinguished themselves "above and beyond the call of duty."

"When his supply of grenades was exhausted, his comrades from nearby foxholes commenced throwing hand grenades toward his position. On several occasions the grenades were thrown short of his position. When this would occur, Brown would leave his position and retrieve the grenades, exposing himself to enemy rifle and machine-gun fire."

We haven't any idea what kind of a boy Pfc Melvin L. Brown was when he enlisted at the age of 17. We suspect he was a typical teen-ager; in trouble occasionally, eager to grow up, sometimes critical of the older folks' ideas. But he was typical of his age. No better and no worse than your son or mine.

"However, the enemy continued their climb and Brown, taking his entrenching tool (a small shovel) from his pack, waited until the enemy, one by one, peered over the wall, delivering each a skull-crushing blow across the top of the head. Brown's conspicuous performance in knocking from 10 to 12 enemy troops from the wall and his outstanding personal bravery served as an inspiration to his comrades, delayed the attack and enabled his platoon to repel the enemy."

When the chips were down, Pfc Melvin L. Brown came through, just as any American boy will do. He wasn't old enough to vote, by law he hadn't yet reached manhood on that fateful September 4. But he did a man's job so well that his comrades and his Nation have awarded him the highest honor possible. Even in their sorrow and hopes, how proud his father and his mother, his brothers and his sisters must be of Pfc Melvin L. Brown. It's a thrilling, inspirational chapter in the saga of America that he has written.

"Brown was seriously injured during this action and has not been heard from since this attack."

It was early in October that Pfc Melvin L. Brown was officially listed by the Defense Department as "missing in action." That's how the record stands now.

Publicity for Draft Deferments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, last fall a number of American Legion posts of the Fourth District of Iowa adopted a resolution urging the enactment of legislation that would require selective-service boards to make public the names of all draft-age men who are granted deferment, with the reasons given for such deferment.

In order that all Members of Congress may have the benefit of these views, I include in the RECORD a copy of the resolution on this subject adopted at a meeting of the Monroe County (Iowa) American Legion organization, consisting of Howard Cessna Post, Albia; Chester Bishop Post, Lovilia; and Richard F. Ward Post, Melrose.

The resolution follows:

Be it resolved, That a list of names of men deferred under the present selective-service law be published, with reasons for such deferments.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include a report to my constituents upon the President's budget for the next fiscal year.

This week the President submitted his 1952 budget, calling for appropriations, contract authority, and loans of $93,400,000,000, of which he hopes to spend $71,500,000,000 in the 12 months beginning next July 1. His estimate of receipts, which many consider quite optimistic, falls $16,000,000,000 short of $71,500,000,000 to be spent and he asks that this amount be made up by new taxation.

For several reasons, the budget message was most unsatisfactory as a guide for future action of the Congress. In the first place, the President said it is not a firm statement of how much he hopes to spend but only an estimate of what he may be able to spend. The military and foreign-aid programs, which take up $73,800,000,000 of the total, are still so indefinite that he was unable to give any break-down of them. The possibility is that spending may be a great deal higher than the budget indicates if the military finds it is able to increase the speed of production of the things it orders. It will be a very great task for the Appropriations Committee to conduct hearings on the military and foreign-aid programs while they are so indefinite. The same considerations apply to the $1,200,000,000 requested to expand production facilities, including the construction of Government owned and operated industries, none of which are described, and the $273,000,000 requested for wage- and price-control programs which are not yet formulated.

The $48,000,000,000 for defense—out of $62,000,000,000 to be obligated—is 90 percent greater than is being spent this year, and compares to $13,000,000,000 for this purpose last year. The $7,000,000,000 to be spent in 1952 for foreign aid—out of $11,000,000,000 he asked us to obligate—is 58 percent more than is being spent this year. No details have been given as to how much will be used for military aid, how much for ECA or how much for the point 4 program. All foreign aid programs have been lumped together. From the message it is fair to expect that a large share, perhaps as much as $3,000,000,000, is for economic aid and point 4.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Economy advocates in Congress were premature when they applauded the portion of the state of the Union message in which Mr. Truman said the Government "must practice rigid economy in its nondefense spending." There is little evidence of such economy in the budget message. Senator BYRD characterized the message as "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility." Certainly it is disappointing to see the old Truman spending programs reappear under the guise of national defense. Among those for which he asks appropriations once again are:

Government construction of industrial plants, $1,200,000,000.

Federal aid to education, $300,000,000.

Socialized medicine, $275,000,000.

Brannan plan farm subsidies.

Increased unemployment compensation.

Restoration and extension of rent control.

Fair Employment Practices Commission.

St. Lawrence seaway, $20,000,000.

In addition, we find that the budget for slum clearance is to be increased as a defense measure, that Federal grants-in-aid to States are $500,000,000 greater than this year, and that the supposed economies, such as the falling off of veterans' benefits, would have happened anyhow in many instances.

Aside from the added cost of these nondefense proposals for new Federal spending, it is disappointing that the President intends to press such highly controversial issues, some of them outright socialistic, at a time when we are striving to establish policies which all Americans can support in united action. The budget message makes no contribution to unity.

THE DUTY OF CONGRESS

Presented as we are once again with a budget based upon the philosophy that there need be no limits on Government spending except the desire of the administrators to spend, it is once again the duty of the Congress to review carefully the request of each department and agency and to save wherever possible the wasteful or needless spending of the taxpayers' dollar. People who are willing and even anxious to do their part, through their taxes or otherwise, for this war effort will not continue in that frame of mind when faced with evidence that their effort is being wasted.

I believe, and others share my view, that we can cut another three billion from the domestic programs including those already in effect and those new programs which are not essential to our war effort. It seems that we can and it is necessary that we should eliminate a very large part of the economic aid for foreign nations unless it contributes directly to the war effort. Perhaps another three billion can be saved here.

Despite the optimistic statements of Mr. Truman, it is going to be very difficult and even dangerous to increase greatly the tax burden on American individuals and industry. Unwise taxation can destroy us. Every effort should be made to balance the budget through higher levies and more fair distribution of the tax burden, but only after every nonessential dollar has been wrung out of Government spending. Strict limits must be placed upon nondefense spending, and where limits are impractical in the Defense Department we must exert every effort to improve the efficiency of the armed services so that we will get a dollar's worth of security out of every dollar spent.

The national debt now stands at $257,400,000,000. The President expects it to increase to $260,000,000,000 by June 30, the close of this fiscal year. With a $71,000,000,000 spending program and a tax load that already stands at $55,000,000,000, it behooves every official of the Government, both in the administration and in Congress, to devote his honest efforts to the preservation of our financial soundness.

RESOURCE PROGRAMS

The budget as it affects resource agencies shows some reductions and some increases. A reduction of $9,000,000 is provided in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, almost all of which is in construction work. However, the funds for health, education, and welfare are increased $3,000,000. The Bureau of Land Management budget request is $9,000,000 greater than its appropriation for the current year. The message explains that better management of range lands is required for greater food production. A sizable decrease in the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture is explained by the rise in farm prices which has wiped out most of the expense of the farm price-support program. The reclamation program suffered the greatest cut, a total of $141,000,000. No new projects are to be started in Montana, and only seven new projects in the Nation, all for hydroelectric power—none for irrigation. Funds are provided to continue and complete other projects, including several of the Yellowstone pumping units, Canyon Ferry, and Hungry Horse. No construction funds are recommended for Yellowtail.

The Appropriations Committee of the House will start hearings on the budget message next Monday, and the Ways and Means Committee has already started tax studies.

Protest by Blackfoot-Piegans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the following communication I have just received from a group of Blackfoot-Piegan Indians which I am calling to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs with the request that they give the petition every possible consideration:

BROWNING, MONT., *January 16, 1951.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We landowners and full-blood Blackfoot-Piegans oppose resolutions 65-50 and 66-50 passed by the Blackfoot Tribal Business Council on January 4, 1951, in regard to leases. We still want the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to work with us in regard to letting leases and permits to the highest bidder outside or in the reservation. No one except the council members knew anything about the resolutions passed by the council. A petition signed by full bloods and landowners opposing the resolutions and a copy of the resolutions will be mailed you shortly. We still want the protection of the Indian Commissioner. If the council sends a delegation to Washington to support their resolutions we would appreciate your help and support in sending a full-blood delegation to oppose them. Please give copies of this wire to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Secretary of Interior.

Louis Plenty Treaty, George Bullchild No. 1, James Whitecalf, Sr., Juniper Old Person, Joe Calf Robe, Mike Day Rider, Paul Old Chief, James Kicking Woman, Phillip Many Hides, Joe Bear Medicine, Joe Young Eagle, Rose Kicking Woman, Maggie Many Hides, Robert Many Hides, James White Calf, Jr., John Little Plume, Paul Many Hides, George Old Person, Fish Wolf Robe, Jim Morning Gum, Joseph Old Chief, Joe Morning Gum, George Talks About, Peter F. Blackface, Maike Bad Old Man, Chewing Black Bones, Henry Morning Gum, Under Chief Coward, Mary Chief Coward, Tom Bear, Short Face, John Bird Earrings.

Resolution of Kansas Oil Men's Association Opposing Increased Federal Taxes on Gasoline and Motor Oils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am enclosing the following copy of a resolution adopted by the Kansas Oil Men's Association at its convention in Wichita, Kans., on January 8, 1951:

Whereas the present gasoline-tax law provides for the automatic elimination of 1 cent per gallon of the present State gasoline tax at 12:01 a. m., July 1, 1951; and

Whereas there is sufficient reserve in the State treasury at this time to amply take care of road building and maintenance under present plans for some time: Be it

Resolved, by the Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention assembled at Wichita, Kans., January 8, 1951, That we will actively oppose any legislation extending this tax. We also urge that the counties and cities be provided revenue out of the license fees from cars and trucks. We also oppose any increase in Federal taxes on gasoline and motor oils; be it also

Resolved, That a copy of the above resolution be sent to our National and State Senators and Representatives.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE,
WM. B. DALTON, *Chairman.*
LAVERNE HEITMAN.
J. J. SCHROEDER.
C. C. ABERCROMBIE.
JIMMY O'CONNELL.
C. A. ELMBORG.

A Mother Speaks on Foreign and Domestic Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mrs. Fred Dooley, Adel, Iowa:

ADEL, IOWA, *December 8, 1951.*

Mr. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: First I wish to congratulate you on being there to start with the Eighty-second Congress, and you have certainly got a job to do and the whole world is anxiously waiting to know just what the next move is.

I have listened to news broadcasts and read every article on the world situation that I can get my hands on. I call it war and I don't see how it can be called anything else, but some of the high officials say they have to move so carefully for fear of starting world war III, call it what they may, it's sure one big mess although stronger words would express it better.

Boys dying by the thousands, tortured, crippled for life, and mentally ill, while the UN continues to argue, argue, and call for cease fire, they have been doing that now since the start of the war, and who is paying any attention? No one. The boys are still fighting the war while what we thought were intelligent men continue to argue and get nowhere; it doesn't look as though the UN were doing anything; just stalling for I don't know what.

There are boys after boys in Korea writing home wondering what they are doing in Korea. Why hasn't there been a blockade set up a long time ago? What good does it do to fight when the French, and, I believe, British, continue to send supplies that will help Red China?

Why didn't the other countries send more men?

Why did the United States have to furnish most of them?

I don't understand just why the atom bomb hasn't been dropped. I have read a lot of conflicting stories why, but I thought that was why it was founded and made, to save lives, but it seems it's just to be talked about.

We'll soon have a son in this conflict, in fact, a matter of days, then when you drop to the 18-year-olds, in a couple of years our last child will be in; that's one more thing I wish to write you about: Why drop down to the 18-year-olds, they have had so little of life; some of them haven't finished high school yet. Why don't you leave it 19 as the low age. God only knows that's young enough to warp a mind and that's what war does, and take up to 35 years; their life is half over or nearly so and there

are then after men who evaded the World War II, hurrying out to rent more land, buying more cows, a scramble for more brood sows to keep out of the service, and they got the job done. Now they are over 26, so are in their glory.

I can tell you about one fellow in our neighborhood. This is the story.

He knew, to stay out of the service, he had to have more land, so he buys a farm, has cattle and hogs, works hard, his wife had a, and still has, a very good-paying job in town.

As soon as the war was over, the cattle were sold, also hogs, he converted the barn to a hen house, and has made good money at it, of course it's much easier to feed hens cafeteria, one doesn't have to get up so early and can chore early and be on one's way.

But with cattle and hogs—well it's really a chore when snow is deep, bedding to haul, tank heaters to keep going and barns to clean, setting up all night with sows having pigs in January and February or even March to save their young, and just why they pick the wee hours of the morn to have their young is something they keep to themselves but that's the way it usually happens.

But that's beside the point, the above fellow says he has paid for his farm with the high prices and his wife's high wages (they have no children) and he now can retire if he cared to and live off the rent of his farm—but all over the bloodshed of boys who were his age, but were town boys or farmer boys whose father didn't see fit to farm more land, or boys who had a desire to do their part. Mr. CUNNINGHAM it is not fair—especially now I heard on the radio they or one Congressman suggested cutting the boys' wages down to $10 or $30 a month while fellows like the above are doing so well.

Believe me those soldiers are earning every cent of their money, what are they going to have to come back to if the wages are cut back to the above.

This news report said they were not paid to go to school, well the Army or any branch of it is anything but a quiet, peaceful school, the training doesn't hurt them but it is what they have to go through after their training. Some of the fellows in Congress should go through what those kids are if they think it is such a snap, the ones that are thinking that way, I am sure you wouldn't be one of them.

Why isn't Nationalist China turned loose on the Red Chinamen, they perhaps know just where and what to do with them.

If there hadn't been so many mistakes made before hand, we wouldn't be in this mess.

Why did F. D. Roosevelt give Manchuria, the railroads and important ports and the right to arm to Russia? It seems to me he should have moved heaven and earth to have saved that.

It seems a shame to take the veterans who fought in World War II back to fight again; they won it once and we didn't have men smart enough to write the peace, I think it alright for the ones that were taken in late and didn't do any fighting and have their training, but those who have seen actual fighting and then not to take the ones who didn't see any kind of service.

Every group I'm in, be it neighbors or friends, all express fear of our leadership, they aren't afraid of America, but it's of our State Department and President, I sincerely do hope this Eighty-second Congress can give us some strength to hang on to and know what is planned for the future. Why have prices been let run wild, why the groceries are terrible, every week they go higher and higher, I'm sure that is not necessary.

Last June before the Korean War, I bought some sheets. Today that same sheet is $1 higher. No, I'm not buying any, I can make some sheets out of mash feed sacks, they won't look so pretty but they can be just as clean as the high-priced sheet that I feel isn't necessary.

Don't you think its about time to make Europe buckle down and do something for themselves; are we going to play another Korea and furnish most of the men while they supply the Reds with important materials?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, I've tried to put this down on paper so that you can understand the way not only I but the thinking of many of our friends and neighbors. Believe me, I am always urging them to write their troubles to you, but they have the idea, a Congressman does what he wants to and doesn't pay any attention to our little whims, but I assure them that's the only way you have of knowing our desires and if you are good enough to vote for, they should have you fighting out their wants in Congress.

Oh, yes; I nearly forgot. I say why not make the Jehovah Witnesses and Con (can't seem to spell it now) objectives go for combat the same as the rest of our boys. Neither do our boys believe in war or killing or any other boy, but they are going any way. I feel as though you will do your very best to do the right thing during the Eighty-second Congress.

Yours truly,

MRS. FRED DOOLEY.

Administration of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it now appears that the Taft-Hartley Act will be law and that organized industry and labor will have to operate under the provisions of the law for some time to come. Of course it is assumed, that from time to time the act will be constructively amended. However, there is little chance, if any, for Mr. Truman to bring about the repeal of the act any time during the next 2 years. What the public may do in the November 1952 election, insofar as electing a President and the personnel of the House and Senate, that will bring about the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act is too far in the distance to forecast or predict with any degree of certainty.

Recently there appeared in the Saturday Evening Post a statement by Mr. Robert Denham, who for a long time was closely affiliated with the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act. The two closing paragraphs of Mr. Denham's statement read as follows:

One of our most important Government agencies, exercising wide influence over a large segment of our economy, has been captured by a crew who apparently intend to operate it without heed to the orders of Congress—to substitute government by men for government by laws. The Taft-Hartley Act is being interpreted by a board which my experience leads me to believe is too partisan to give it fair application. And the board's subjugation of the general counsel has removed the counterweight which Congress provided.

For the present the only remedy the country has lies in the courts. I am convinced that a real solution requires not only amendments to the law that will make explicit the intent of Congress but replacement of the entire board, the general counsel, and key officials with persons who believe in the act and are capable of applying it.

These words from Mr. Denham appear to me to be a direct and specific warning and words of counsel to the people of the United States if they will only give serious consideration to what Mr. Denham has said. Therefore, I have submitted them to the RECORD to call to the attention of the many readers who have an opportunity to peruse the pages of the RECORD.

Parents Must Realize Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times when the impact of the world's ills lies heavily upon each home, thereby causing uncertainty, doubt, perhaps even despair, it is heartening to find an example of courage equal to need.

We are all aware that our sons were not raised to be soldiers and that there is no inherent dedication of American life to the horror of war. Yet there are some who so subscribe to this as to forget that, conversely, our sons were not raised to be slaves nor dedicated to spineless acquiescence to the domination of the world by a godless dictatorship. In the course of human events those who were raised in freedom, have often had to fight for its preservation. This day is another of great peril. The world is rushing headlong to somewhere. Only courage and sacrifice equal to the peril will steer the course to freedom—a freedom for us, the world and for our unnumbered sons and daughters who are to follow. Such a courage, such a dedication to the preservation of liberty, shines out in the article below; which I include under leave to extend my remarks:

[From the Durango (Colo.) Herald-Democrat of January 9, 1951]

PARENTS MUST REALIZE FACTS

Until recently Douglas Larsen, NEA Washington correspondent, conducted a reader column of questions and answers on service problems. A high percentage of the inquiries were from women, mostly mothers of boys who faced a service call.

More often than not, these queries seemed to add up to: "How can I keep my boy at home?"

The other day, however, Larsen got a letter of a different sort. Like many of the others, it was from a mother—this time of two boys. But her questions didn't have the same tone. Indeed, they didn't really seem like questions at all. They were more a challenging message, a message that every American might listen to in these times.

Here's how this mother feels:

"Q. Have only two sons whom we love dearly and for whom we have entertained great hopes. One, now studying for his doctor of philosophy, expects momentarily a call from the Naval Reserve. The other was in the Marine Corps 3 years * * * He started back to college only to be recalled to the Marines last September.

"Is there any possibility that these boys will not be allowed to fight for their country and continue to make sacrifices for a land which has given them so much?

"Is there any danger that these boys will be infected by the loose talk of selfish and unthinking Americans into letting down the men who suffered and died in Korea, and their brothers in humanity who are held in the harsh chains of slavery all over the world and cry out to them for help?"

Mothers and fathers everywhere in America could well ponder these words. For there are disturbing reports from many sections that lots of boys of draft age do not understand either the peril the Nation faces, or the justice of their being called to help meet it.

Many young men have the notion they are being asked to shelve their individual plans and hopes and perhaps risk their lives because a few men charged with the conduct of our foreign affairs have committed some mistakes.

Certainly mistakes have been made. And no matter who holds high office in this country, they will probably continue to be made. Never infallible, human beings are particularly not so when confronted with a world so complex it taxes the greatest minds to the very limit.

But the basic things we have to remember is that our peril is not primarily a product of such errors on our part. Our danger is being contrived in the Kremlin by a group of men who are bent upon conquering us, one way or another, if not now then later.

Even if our top-rank leaders had not made a single major mistake, the peril would be there. For Russia's purpose is unalterable. It is the Soviet Union, not some willful or unintentional slip by an American official, that has plunged us into this crisis. Our avoidance of mistakes might have changed the shape of Russia's plans. But it would not have changed the plans.

If all parents can grasp this overriding fact as does the mother quoted here, then they will understand why their sons are needed. And they can make they boys see it is right to put aside personal plans until the safety of their Nation and the whole free world is assured.

Whenever the Country Is Faced With Pestilence, Plague, Famine, or War the Advocates of the Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway Come Forward and Say: "Here Is What the Country Needs"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, whenever the country is faced with pestilence, plague, famine, or war the proponents of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway come forward and say: "Here is what the country needs."

In the earliest state of this never-ending controversy, it was claimed the waterway would make bananas cheaper to midwesterners, then the agitation turned for years around the contention that Midwest farmers could send their wheat to Europe at cheaper transportation costs. Now the amount of wheat they can export to Europe and the price they receive is fixed by international agreement. Now the project has become essential to national defense as a means of bringing ore in from Labrador and Quebec over an inside, secure route protected from submarines.

The facts are that for several years American steel companies have been looking around for foreign high-grade iron-ore supplies to supplement, not replace, the low-grade ores of the Mesabi Range, which are in seemingly inexhaustible supply, to take the place of the diminishing high-grade ores of that area. The Mesabi Range or Lake Superior area is still to be our main reliance for so long as man can see.

The Labrador-Quebec deposit, in which six of the smaller steel companies have invested, is only one of three main sources of outside supply which American steel companies are working. United States Steel and Bethlehem have gone to Venezuela, while Inland Steel and the Cyrus S. Eaton interests are developing deposits near Port Arthur, Ontario, which is on Lake Superior. This ore is, indeed, now moving over the Great Lakes the same way the Mesabi ore moves. Both the Venezuelan and this source near Port Arthur are easily of equal importance with the Labrador-Quebec project.

The promoters of the Labrador-Quebec project do not plan to bring out any ore before 1955 and then only 10,000,000 tons annually as compared with our annual needs of 100,000,000. Lacking the St. Lawrence waterway, which would take 7 years to build, they have announced they intend to bring it to Midwest steel centers over presently available transportation facilities, including the 14-foot St. Lawrence canal system. They have announced this ore would favorably compete in price with Mesabi low-grade ores.

It is a commentary on the alarm about our domestic supplies of ore that this Labrador-Quebec ore has got to compete with the low-grade Mesabi ore or it will not be sold.

Now, should the deeper St. Lawrence waterway be built, the promoters of the Labrador-Quebec project would be in a better competitive position, which makes the waterway important to them, a fact which is, however, not the same as being important to national defense, or in the national interest. Indeed, should the project be authorized by the Congress, I am quite sure you would find that the defense officials would not allocate the necessary scarce materials and manpower to the building of the project. It is not a national defense item.

It is not generally understood that there is now a St. Lawrence waterway, 14 feet in depth, and that foreign vessels move over it in the 7 months of the year when the Great Lakes are not frozen over, to Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit, and other lake ports. The highest tonnage ever handled in a year was 9,500,000 tons. This system has a capacity of at least 5,000,000 additional tons and this could be greatly increased with the expenditure of a few million dollars. However, in 1948 and 1949 the tonnage handled dropped to around 7,500,000. So it is proposed to build a deeper waterway, one of 27-foot depth. This would permit additional foreign vessels to use it, but less than 9 percent of American flag tonnage could use it. Thirty leading American oceangoing ship operators have said they would not use the proposed 27-foot waterway and are opposed to the project.

When the New York Barge Canal was being agitated years ago it was claimed it would handle 25,000,000 tons annually. The highest it has ever handled is 5,000,000 tons.

As to the proposed hydroelectric plant in the St. Lawrence River, a part of the dual project, it would be another big public power plant, but no bigger than any one of four plants now operated by private utilities in New York State. Its capacity would be no more than 10 percent of New York's present consumption.

For years the battle cry of the proponents has been that just a little bottleneck in the St. Lawrence River presents Great Lakes ports from becoming ocean ports. Every Great Lakes port is in itself a bottleneck in that every port using the proposed deeper system would have to have its harbor, entrance channel, and slips deepened.

Small Business and Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under the heading "Small business," by C. Wilson Harder, there has been presented some observations which are of interest to many people. I herewith submit them for the RECORD:

SMALL BUSINESS

(By C. Wilson Harder)

Watch for investigation of tin plate situation, especially if the recent order curtailing tin usage results in small canners and packers having difficulty in getting tin cans.

Among other questions will be this one, Why, when the tin reduction rule was announced, did ECA Bulletin No. 1937 announce almost concurrently that through the Marshall plan, $900,000 worth of tin plate secured in United States of America was given to French North Africa? This equals an entire year's supply for 15 to 20 medium small fruit and vegetable canners.

During World War II many small food packers lost markets to big corporations because they could not obtain sugar.

Yet, with the Nation presumably on the verge of a global war once again, Agriculture Secretary Brannan reduces the amount of sugar that can be marketed in the Nation during 1951 to 8,000,000 tons, or 700,000 tons less than used in 1950.

There is no shortage of sugar. The ruling was made to stabilize prices, the Secretary says.

Housewives who paid 4 cents per pound for sugar in 1940 will continue to pay 12 cents or more. If total war comes, the sugar trust will once again determine who will stay in business. This upholding of monopoly by bureaucracy will get close scrutiny in Congress.

Alcohol befuddles many, but in high officialdom alcohol seems to especially befuddle.

That's the substance of a Senate preparedness committee report on the amazing deal whereby Schenley secured a Government industrial alcohol plant in Kansas City valued at $2,505,000 for $700,000.

A month after Korea, the Government Surplus Administration opened bids for the plant. Schenley won with an offer $701,000. Three days later Senator JOHNSON, chairman of the committee, and Jess Larson, GSA head, conferred. Three days later a freeze order was issued. But on the same day, August 17, GSA wired Schenley acceptance, who took possession of the plant on August 23. No one knows yet how it happened.

But this is known. The synthetic-rubber program needs one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and thirty-five million gallons of alcohol.

On the first request, Office of Rubber Reserve did not receive a gallon from distillers. For the last 2 months of 1950, 10,000,000 gallons were requested. Prices ranged from 90 cents to $1.25 per gallon. So the Government bought French alcohol at a price of 48½ cents per gallon. Senator JOHNSON will undoubtedly carry this probe further. Watch for developments.

Mr. Speaker, the distribution of tin plate, which is referred to by Mr. Harder, is just a continuation of the most interesting study of the diffusion of the substance of our people to the other parts of the world, and against which such diffusion our people are so bitterly protesting, and it is, of course, evident that the citizens of the United States are very much concerned and that they have many questions in their minds about the general program.

Mr. Harder refers to sugar, and insofar as we can presently determine, there will be ample stocks of sugar for all the Western Hemisphere with this sugar being produced in the Philippines, which have a free market to the United States, and the domestic sugar industry, consisting of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the United States sugar beet and sugarcane areas in the continental United States, together with the foreign production of Cuba. The crop recently harvested in the continental United States was one of the largest on record and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are increasing their production and now that the Philippine producers are getting back into the harness, we can expect substantial tonnage from that area. Cuba's output is also on the increase most all the time. So, with this momentary ample production and the Sugar Marketing Act, with the flexible powers of the Secretary of Agriculture, there is no reason for us to assume that there will be a shortage of sugar, or that prices will be excessive, unless the White House and the State Department come to the conclusion that this sugar should be given to other nations of the world.

ALCOHOL AND INTOXICATING LIQUORS

Mr. Harder submits some observations with respect to alcohol. In this general connection, and as we face enormous tax liabilities I wish to direct the attention of the Congress to the large distillers, importers, wholesalers, alcohol cookers, the cheapest chiselers — the barrel boys—and the alcohol profiteers who ship into this country foreign-produced spirits moving in the bottoms of small schooners.

Many of these operators, to which I refer—outside of the so-called big four—are the boys substantially constituting and working with the mobs. I am afraid that in many instances the big four plays ball with many of these operators, hand in glove, and that the mobs substantially control all of the imports worth mentioning.

From a tax standpoint, our people who can financially afford to drink expensive imported whiskies and wines can probably afford to pay almost any price that the traffic will bear, and the other citizens, less fixed financially, can, during this war period, be content to drink domestic beverages.

Why not have the control machinery of the Government, during the emergency period, issue rules and regulations limiting the advertising of these imported and domestic liquors to a simple announcement of the brand and the name of the manufacturer with nothing else in the ad, and also limit the size of the ad? Naturally the distillers' group would kick about such a regulation, but, after all, when the people are making the contributions which are now being made, and which would have to be made, it certainly cannot be successfully argued that imported and domestic intoxicating liquors are a necessity, or that they substantially contribute to the protection and defense of the United States and the ideals and institutions of our people.

With respect to the revenue, I would recommend that the tax on all imported spirits be returned to the original scale of $5 per proof-gallon, plus double the rectifying tax on all blended spirits, the contents of which is an alcoholic mixture, regardless of whatever name same is called. In order to conserve alcohol for the war effort, the tax on blended spirits—domestic—could be raised to $1 per gallon and let this apply to all beverage spirits, wherever the source.

Distillers' licenses could be raised to $25,000 per annum, having all affiliated or tied distilleries pay an annual license of $50,000 per annum to distill alcoholic beverages, and increasing the wholesale license to $10,000 per annum.

In addition, a floor tax on the stocks of all dealers should be assessed immediately upon the signing of such a tax measure. And certainly we could afford to have a much heavier tax on cabarets, and this due to their nonessentialability during the war emergency. Along with this, a substantial increase in the penalties for illegal distilling, and thus make the penalties so severe that no loyal American citizen would dare carry on such an operation.

In view of the shortage of shipping, we should prohibit such facilities being used for the transportation of beverage spirits and provide that failure to comply with such a regulation should make the vessel liable under the Anti-Smuggling Act and subject to forfeiture of vessel and cargo.

We have a shortage of cooperage and we should not provide cooperage and other types of containers being used to hold alcoholic beverages and licensed for export from the United States without very special permit granted by the Secretary of the Treasury. The tax on all imported wines and liquors not classified as imported spirits, should be returned to its original scale, plus 50 cents per bottle—$61 per case—with the internal revenue tax on alcoholic beverages to be raised to $12 per proof gallon from the present $9.

If we are to face a period of price controls and rationing, we can well afford to limit the profit margin of the distillers and fix the price of alcohol on the basis of the value of the material used, such as grain, black molasses and vegetables, and thus bring this industry into a position where it must make its contribution, instead of leaving it free to carry on its destructive work. Here is a chance to raise some revenue.

Finally, we will unquestionably face great difficulty, insofar as our supply of rubber for all purposes is concerned. In dealing with the synthetic-rubber production, alcohol is one of the great, basic needs. Mr. Harder points out that prices range from 90 cents to $1.25 per gallon as quoted by our local distillers, but that our Government purchased from the French alcohol at a price of 48½ cents per gallon. Such price levels are of great interest to our people.

A Tragic Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of World War II one of the chief concerns of our military intelligence was to keep a close check upon activities of the fifth-column groups throughout our country. Although our country was aware of the constant building of Communist-front organizations during this time, this alien ideology was thought to be of far lesser importance in protecting the American way of life. After the ending of hostilities, and with the beginning of the period of rehabilitation and reconstruction, we soon became more aware of the constant necessity of maintaining an eternal surveillance on Communist organizations which always have had as their objective the complete destruction of our way of life and our form of government. Now, with Russian imperialism casting its eerie shadow on freedom-loving countries the world over, all thoughts and efforts are centered thereon, and people in their search to find weapons to combat this enemy slide over to the other extreme and uphold the ideology of fascism which is just as much of a menace to our democracy as is communism. Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country and think through the issues at hand rather than listen to and be swayed by prejudiced propaganda. The following editorial from the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel of January 10, 1951, cautions the American citizen to watch out for the less publicized opponent of today who may be the enemy of tomorrow. I include it under leave to extend my remarks:

A TRAGIC ERA

We have all faith that our military might, coupled with that of our allies, will save the free peoples from the Communist aggressors. But we confess that our democratic way of life may not survive this era of suspicion.

It is a sad and tragic thing to watch Americans losing faith in themselves and in one another; to see us come to the place where neighbor spies on neighbor; where friends suspect one another of disloyalty because their opinions differ. Trust in one another, with tolerance of opinion, has been one of the distinguishing features of the American way of life.

But to such a state have we come that mistrust and intolerance are menacing our most treasured heritage—the freedoms guaranteed us in the Bill of Rights. Ironically this situation, this atmosphere of suspicion has been created by the agents of the two most anti-American forces in the world, communism and fascism. There have been many among us who have fallen for the Communist line as its proponents presented it as the cure for all our weaknesses. On the other hand there are equally as many others who have been taken in by the Fascists, who promulgate the doctrines of Hitler while claiming that only they can defend Americanism from the Reds. The truth, of course, is that neither of these ideologies, nor their insidious native agents, are concerned with curing our weaknesses nor defending the American way of life. What they both seek is destruction of that way. Yet so subtle have been their respective propagandists that presumably intelligent Americans have fallen for both lines, and in so doing are serving these enemies of our Nation.

For well over a century and a half our American Government, our way of life, has persisted and defended itself from outside foes. How terribly tragic it will be if we let it be wrecked by our own stupidity; by not realizing that there is more than one alien ideology seeking to weaken us through stooges who claim to be trying to save us. Not less deadly to our American way of life than the 11 Communists leaders, under conviction of treason, are some leaders of fascism in our country who are using certain patriotic organizations as their fronts (however innocent these groups may be) to divide our citizenry and weaken our Government, that some Nazi-Fascist man-on-horseback may take over, either before or after the Red aggressors are defeated.

National Security Has Long Rested on Our Atom Bombs and the Undisputed Ability of the United States Air Force Long-Range B-36 Bombers Land-Based in the United States To Deliver Them Anywhere on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I recently came upon a highly thought-provoking article in the Freeport Journal-Standard, of Freeport, Ill., telling of the tremendous achievements made by the Department of the Air Force under the administration of the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter.

The article headed "Air Force team reports progress" carried a Washington date line and was written by Marquis Childs, one of America's best-known authors and news columnists.

Mr. Speaker, the name of Thomas K. Finletter is not a new name to the Members of the Congress and all others concerned with Government here in Washington. For more than 10 years past, and at a great personal sacrifice to himself, Tom Finletter has given unstintingly of his time and largess to the solution of some of the most vexatious problems that have ever confronted our Government and country.

Mr. Speaker, we who know him know that America has no finer citizen nor, indeed, one possessed of a more judicial mind that Thomas Knight Finletter—eminent soldier-diplomat, barrister, lecturer, teacher, author—a man of tremendous vision and one who, by his proven executive abilities in the handling of our Air Force, has marked himself preeminent in administration of one of the principal departments of Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fortunate that we have such a man as Tom Finletter to head up the forces and the destinies of our great Department of the Air Force at a time when it is being called upon to spend billions of dollars.

It is indeed no happenstance, however, that he has serving with him, and as his first assistant, still another great American—a great actionist, engineer, and business executive—Mr. John A. McCone, of Los Angeles, Calif., and who served with Mr. Finletter on the President's Air Policy Commission. It was once said of Mr. McCone, that there was no man in these United States more capable of thinking a problem through to its ultimate conclusion and long-time effect than John A. McCone, now the Assistant Secretary of Air.

Mr. Speaker, more now than ever, I am confirmed in my belief that the only thing that has contained the Russians and kept them from opening a global war on the continent of Europe has been our possession of the atom bomb and our B-36 long-range bombers.

Mr. Speaker, I have, on more than one occasion in addressing this House, stated that we in the Midwest know that the first line of defense of these United States is manned by the United States Air Force. The American people have never been afraid, nor are they today afraid, of coastal attacks by a nonexistent Russian surface navy. Neither are they afraid of Communist tanks rumbling ashore in these United States, spearheading infantry attacks against our great centers of population.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, from the Chesapeake Bay to San Francisco, and from Maine to Mexico are, however, in deadly fear of Russian attack that can come out of the sky.

The merest school child knows that the immediate peace and security of these United States rests upon our possession of the atom bombs in our stockpiles, and the proven ability of the United States Air Force great intercontinental long-range land-based bombers to deliver the bombs almost upon a moment's notice.

They also know that our B-36's can fly straight on their course to drop these bombs, and at the one time, not alone upon all strategic points in Russian territory, but upon any possible advance of the Russian hordes of infantry that stand with bristling bayonets on the border of Western Europe.

This article from the Freeport Journal-Standard tells of the splendid work accomplished in behalf of our Nation's defenses by the Finletter-McCone Air Force team.

It tells of the speed-up in the construction of the continental defense radar warning system, of the tremendous aircraft procurement program that is now rolling, of the air bases reopened, and of the pride of the Finletter and McCone team in the new B-47 and B-52 long-range high-speed jet bombers—greater, if such a thing could be possible, than is the B-36 itself.

Because of the exigencies of these times, the strain placed upon our Nation's economy due to the dangers of war, and the great part being played by these two preeminent Americans, I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this clipping from the Freeport Journal-Standard.

The article reads as follows:

[From the Freeport (Ill.) Journal-Standard]

AIR FORCE TEAM REPORTS PROGRESS

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON, December 30.—In this the winter of our discontent it is not difficult to find causes for complaint. The chorus of recrimination rises as though Washington were a wailing wall and the source of all the ills of mankind.

It is therefore news—under the man-bites-dog definition—to report a field in which progress is being made and men are working with a minimum of snafu. Directing the rapid expansion of the Air Force is a team that is pulling together effectively and efficiently to do one of the two or three most essential jobs in the rearmament program.

Secretary of the Air Force is Thomas K. Finletter, a New York lawyer, who has served in several previous Government assignments in connection with the last war and its aftermath. As Chairman of the President's Air Policy Commission, he recommended a 70-group air force, and the maintenance of an expanded aircraft industry.

He has believed all along that preparedness to meet the threat of Soviet expansion should move at a much swifter pace. Consequently, when he accepted the post last April, he was prepared to push as hard as possible for an expansion of air power.

TANGLE WITH JOHNSON

Louis Johnson, then Secretary of Defense, was still plugging for economy in the defense budget. But this did not inhibit Finletter, who came in with a more or less independent mandate from the President. The retiring Secretary of the Air Force, W. Stuart Symington, had tangled with Johnson repeatedly on the issue of economy versus expansion.

Last February 1 in a speech at Baylor University in Texas, Symington called for a reappraisal of America's defense budget, pointing to the radically altered situation created by Russia's having exploded an atomic bomb and having built an air force capable of delivering such bombs against American targets. But this served chiefly to quicken the

feud with Johnson. Symington felt so frustrated that there was nothing to do but get out.

Without the handicap of having engaged in previous controversy, Finletter came in as a new boom. However, he has a show-me kind of skepticism which is like an X-ray. This was applied in salutary fashion both to military claims and pretensions and civilian red tape and reluctance.

RADAR WARNING SYSTEM

One of Finletter's first aims was to speed up the construction of the continental radar warning system. He was told that the money simply wasn't in the budget for such a speed-up. His answer was that somehow the money would be found.

Finletter's partner is Under Secretary John A. McCone. McCone is a successful businessman and engineer who was also on the Air Policy Commission. He has drive and organizing ability to a high degree without any of the bluster sometimes associated with those capacities.

McCone is pushing through an aircraft-procurement program that has begun to get rolling in a big way. Within 2 years the number of air groups will be approximately doubled for a total of 84. This is on the basis of reopening plants that were closed or partially closed at the end of World War II. By constructing new plants it is estimated that 168 groups could be created by the end of 1952.

Already 25 air bases have been reopened since June. Soon the personnel of the Air Force will be nearly double the 412,000 in the service at the time of the Korean attack.

The pride and joy of the team of Finletter and McCone is the big new B-47 jet bomber. Units equipped with the B-47 will be ready by the end of 1951 or perhaps even earlier. While its actual cruising speed and range are still secret, it is known that it will travel at 600 miles and over and carry the atomic bomb at that speed.

THE SUPERSONIC WORLD

Finletter flew in the B-47 the other day. He sat at the controls and reported later that he was a bit startled when the pilot told him to make a 180° turn with the plane traveling at hair-raising speed. Beyond the B-47 is the B-52 which is an even longer jump into the supersonic world.

According to advices believed as trustworthy as most, the best long-range bomber the Russians have is an improved B-29. They are believed to be working on a B-36 type. But the important fact is that the improved B-29 can carry a Russian atomic bomb to targets in the United States. And the Air Force has never tried to conceal the fact that a certain number of those bombs would get through any defense now in sight.

But the retaliation to be meted out by a greatly expanded Air Force would be terrible. The threat of this retaliation will, it is hoped, keep the peace in the coming critical months while the land power of the North Atlantic nations is being built. If that is the outcome, thanks will be due in no small part to the production drive of the past 6 months. It is an example that could be followed in other fields where defense production has lagged.

What Can We Expect from the UN?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, our people are greatly concerned over the failure of UN to extend any worth-while aid to us in the Korean war. Talk is cheap. What we need is less talk and more active participation. Before any future commitments are made by this Nation with respect to Korea or elsewhere in the world, we are entitled to know to what extent the UN can be depended upon to do its part.

I include as part of these remarks, and in accordance with consent granted, two well written and thought provoking articles by Ivan H. Peterman, recently appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer, reading as follows:

UN PREPARES TO REPEAT HISTORIC LEAGUE RUN-OUT

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

NEW YORK, January 9.—United Nations, despite President Truman's brave declarations of continued faith and support, is preparing to run out on its responsibilities exactly as did the League of Nations. The Manchurian episode is about to be repeated, and old man Hagel, the German, was quite right when he said:

"We only learn from history that we do not learn from history."

Thus the crowd which cheered, approved, and did everything but finance or contribute troops to the American effort to stop Red aggression, is now hustling behind the curtains, mounting a "face saver." This will take the form of another phony cease-fire about the time UN's forces are forced to evacuate Korea, and since there will be no further GI targets, the victorious Mao Tse-tung mob will agree.

Then, the truce committee of Iran's Nasrollah Entezam, Canada's Mike Pearson, and India's Sir Benegal Rau, who huddled with Mr. Wu and still confer amiably with Mr. Malik, will propose (with the Asian-Arab bloc) that United Nations proceed to supervise unification of Korea, under Red gun muzzles.

If there are any flowers left over from the graves of 15,000 dead Americans by that time, you can send them to the blue monolith at Forty-second Street and Turtle Bay, N. Y. And if Trygve Lie wishes, he can instruct the janitor, who spelled out "UN" at Christmas, to arrange the skyscraper UN headquarters' lights in "RIP."

This is the United Nations which wasn't going to appease or give in. But Dr. T. F. Tsiang, the gritty Nationalist Chinese who for 2 years has taken their cold shouldering, truthfully told the delegations yesterday they were "connivers in crime" if they persisted in the new approach, which is no less than total surrender to Moscow-Peking aggression.

Sir Gladwyn Jebb, with an eye to Commonwealth leaders' discussions in London, asked the political committee to adjourn until tomorrow, before broaching any condemnation of Red China. The United States wants such a gesture now, but it would be so heavily abstained from as to lose us more face. Our UN pals have lost all their starch since last June 25.

At the same time, it is evident now would be the time to toss a smashing blow behind Mao, on the Chinese mainland. Apparently lots of revolt, uprising, sabotage, and economic trouble have broken loose, especially in the southern provinces.

Six Chinese newspapermen, some of whom had been feeding information to British papers and services in Hong Kong, have been shot in Canton and Shanghai. You see little about such things in the press. Hong Kong papers didn't print a word. In fact, Hong Kong is terrified—lest the Reds move in and take over. The Overseas Press Club has protested to UN—whatever that is worth.

Nearly all missionaries are moving out now. The freeze of United States assets, plus the blockade now going into effect, are pinching the Red marauders. Stuff is being moved mysteriously in Manchuria. It could be another liberation by Joseph Stalin, or it could be Red preparation for all-out war—going underground.

Ferocious hate-rallies against Americans are part of a patriotic movement out of Peking, aimed at tightening inner control of China. If Chiang Kai-shek's regime had 1,500,000 to 200,000—the latter number anxious to flee also, but prevented by the military jam. He described homes, villages, towns, and cities in ashes—with no shelter, food, or much hope of assistance for the silent, sick, terrified miles of refugees carrying their only chance for survival on their backs.

But Colonel Limb's speech was not only a supplication, it was one of the bravest challenges ever offered to UN. Once more Korea asked only for weapons with which to fight to the death their Red oppressors. President Syngman Rhee repeatedly requested half a million rifles to aid the fight.

Now one of the strange things about this screwy war in Korea, is that since last June, over 6 months, we have had opportunity to arm and instruct literally hundreds of thousands of the embattled Koreans. I don't mean to say we should have attempted full-scale division or even regimental organization along the United States approved plans. But what was wrong with establishing a flock of our own guerrillas?

One of the exasperating features of the way our Government proceeds against Russia's proxy armies, is its failure to exploit obvious opportunities. The cry for weeks and months has been: "But they outnumber us."

Outnumber us, why? Because we have from the start, declined to put the South Koreans on a full military footing. In the beginning, at the advice of the Lattimore-Rusk school of bum guessers, we armed them without ammunition, with rifles that had no bolts, with light mortars and lighter artillery which could not stop old-style tanks. We put public relations officers in charge as military and field instructors, and we wondered why the hard core, long prepared and fanatic North Koreans ran through them at will.

Since then the South Korean has been toughened by privation, and with many an Asiatic, has had his eyes opened to the massive snare and slavery of Russian-imperialist communism. They are, as Colonel Limb told UN, "prepared to fight in the valleys, in the mountains, in the snow, ice, by day and night—until their last breath is gone."

He said 500,000 are ready this minute. They will fight with anything—rifles, Sten guns, grenades. They will go in as guerrillas, climb the mountains our men cannot yet negotiate, to meet the Reds on equal footing.

Gen. Robert B. McClure, relieved yesterday as commander of the United States Second Infantry Division, put all this into a statement which may or may not have caused his removal. He reiterated that Americans prefer to fight where they can utilize mechanized vehicles, bring fire power to bear, and eliminate the bushwhacking business at which nobody can match the Red Chinese, the Russians, and the other experts at assassination-style warfare.

Furthermore, he might have added, to arm these Koreans—and if we still don't trust them we can, as the Germans did throughout the Second World War, place our own squads behind them, with proper orders—isn't any costly task. We gave Sten guns to the resistance all over Europe. Why not now, to our Asiatic friends?

But more pertinent, there are whole arsenals of captured Japanese arms, rifles, and ammunition, mortars, and machine guns in Japan. We won't need all of that to rearm Japan. We could save plenty of GI's and Koreans by putting it in the hands of able-bodied refugees who now only add a feeding

heard. He made perhaps the greatest speech by any aggrieved government, since the unanswered cry of China before the League of Nations, 1931.

There must be close to 10,000,000 people running from extermination by the Communists mingled in and ahead of UN's retreat, he said. He told how Seoul dwindled overnight from 1,500,000 to 200,000—the latter number anxious to flee also, but prevented by the military jam. He described homes, villages, towns, and cities in ashes—with no shelter, food, or much hope of assistance for the silent, sick, terrified miles of refugees carrying their only chance for survival on their backs.

But Colonel Limb's speech was not only a supplication, it was one of the bravest challenges ever offered to UN. Once more Korea asked only for weapons with which to fight to the death their Red oppressors. President Syngman Rhee repeatedly requested half a million rifles to aid the fight.

Now one of the strange things about this screwy war in Korea, is that since last June, over 6 months, we have had opportunity to arm and instruct literally hundreds of thousands of the embattled Koreans. I don't mean to say we should have attempted full-scale division or even regimental organization along the United States approved plans. But what was wrong with establishing a flock of our own guerrillas?

One of the exasperating features of the way our Government proceeds against Russia's proxy armies, is its failure to exploit obvious opportunities. The cry for weeks and months has been: "But they outnumber us."

Outnumber us, why? Because we have from the start, declined to put the South Koreans on a full military footing. In the beginning, at the advice of the Lattimore-Rusk school of bum guessers, we armed them without ammunition, with rifles that had no bolts, with light mortars and lighter artillery which could not stop old-style tanks. We put public relations officers in charge as military and field instructors, and we wondered why the hard core, long prepared and fanatic North Koreans ran through them at will.

Since then the South Korean has been toughened by privation, and with many an Asiatic, has had his eyes opened to the massive snare and slavery of Russian-imperialist communism. They are, as Colonel Limb told UN, "prepared to fight in the valleys, in the mountains, in the snow, ice, by day and night—until their last breath is gone."

He said 500,000 are ready this minute. They will fight with anything—rifles, Sten guns, grenades. They will go in as guerrillas, climb the mountains our men cannot yet negotiate, to meet the Reds on equal footing.

Gen. Robert B. McClure, relieved yesterday as commander of the United States Second Infantry Division, put all this into a statement which may or may not have caused his removal. He reiterated that Americans prefer to fight where they can utilize mechanized vehicles, bring fire power to bear, and eliminate the bushwhacking business at which nobody can match the Red Chinese, the Russians, and the other experts at assassination-style warfare.

Furthermore, he might have added, to arm these Koreans—and if we still don't trust them we can, as the Germans did throughout the Second World War, place our own squads behind them, with proper orders—isn't any costly task. We gave Sten guns to the resistance all over Europe. Why not now, to our Asiatic friends?

But more pertinent, there are whole arsenals of captured Japanese arms, rifles, and ammunition, mortars, and machine guns in Japan. We won't need all of that to rearm Japan. We could save plenty of GI's and Koreans by putting it in the hands of able-bodied refugees who now only add a feeding and care burden to outnumbered UN forces.

In short, do we want to win in Korea? Or are we just going through some motions, waiting to appease and negotiate it all away—as per the last 5 years?

We Can Win If—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, believing as I do that the establishment and maintenance of a strong United Nations is essential to world peace, I am naturally disappointed in the attitude taken by many of the members thereof. It is almost unbelievable that our own Nation was left alone to present the resolution the House passed at our last meeting condemning Red China as an aggressor.

It still appears that most of the fighting, dying, and spending in the prosecution of the Korean War is being done by the United States. Attached hereto is a timely editorial from the current issue of the United States News and World Report:

WE CAN WIN IF—

(By David Lawrence)

We can win the battle of nerves and prevent war. But to do so we must not be afraid of war. It will take something more than phyaical courage, more than big airplanes and big aircraft carriers and big armies and big bombs.

It will take moral courage—and in this we are more lacking than in arms.

It will take moral courage not only for the United States but for our allies—because in this they, too, are sadly lacking.

Why is this so?

Maybe it's the materialism that surrounds us, maybe it's the illusory belief that creature comforts—the luxuries of a high standard of living—are as precious as life itself.

Maybe there are too many of us who think that the only law of compensation is that which is reflected in the weekly pay envelope or the coupons on the bonds or the dividend checks.

Maybe there are too many of us who think that peace means just plenty to eat and drink—high profits and high-wage levels—and that taxes and economic controls are simply devices invented by the devil to interfere with our American way of life.

Maybe the so-called isolationism which has cropped up recently is a sincere manifestation of the belief that Americans do not owe anything to any other nation in the world by way of arms or economic help and that the good Lord doesn't care whether we share what we have with any other peoples—indeed, whether we concern ourselves at all with the poverty of other peoples.

But, if so, there's something wrong with this age in which we live.

Is it the governments or the peoples?

Certainly in Europe and Asia the passive acceptance of a rule of tyranny behind the iron curtain indicates that many persons apparently prefer despotism and life in slavery to freedom and the risks of death.

Certainly on this side of the iron curtain there are many persons in Britain and France and Germany and India and even in the United States who are ready to discard principle and moral standards in exchange for some paper agreement that temporarily, at least, gives them a promise of continued existence without fighting.

Isolationism isn't just an American phenomenon. It is to be found in all countries where the prime desire is to protect one's own interest and offer as little as possible to protect anyone else's interest.

There can be no effective program of collective security on that basis. The UN has all the machinery needed to express international policy. But the defect isn't in the mechanism—it's in the members who are failing to live up to their responsibilities as partners in a world alliance. Mutuality of obligation and reciprocity seem to be the exception rather than the rule. Moral courage is rare.

What is it that the Communists have that we don't have?

They have imagination, boldness, and courage born of a fanatical devotion to a cause.

If some human beings can exhibit courage to carry out a diabolical cause like communism, why can't other human beings exhibit courage to carry out the greatest moral purposes that man could possibly have?

The truth is that we are dawdling along on all sides—we sacrifice principle and deviate from moral standards in the UN, and we do the same thing in our parliaments and our congresses. Our elected leaders play selfish politics, snarl at their opposition, and trifle with moral standards—preferring expediency to principle.

Whatever it may have been that caused the decline and fall of Rome or the extinction of great empires and republics in ancient days, we do know that governments are as frail as the individuals who compose them and the constituents who elect them.

We can win—we can prevent the big war. But it will take resoluteness. And resoluteness means moral fiber, and not craven surrender to materialism.

Resoluteness means a spirit that is ready to fight against evil and to make collective security a reality instead of a mythical goal.

Resoluteness means courage in high places and a forthrightness in expressing moral purposes to the peoples of all countries—whether or not their governments are allied with us. He who is right within himself is thrice armed—in body, in spirit, and in the inspiring example he sets to others. Our Government is not right within itself—and neither are all our people right within themselves. Too many would acquiesce in hypocrisy. Too many would condone evil. Too many would sell their souls for a mess of pottage.

We are less ready to do battle on the moral front than on the military front. We can win—but only when we build up the moral courage that comes from a sincere desire to make sacrifices for the cause of human freedom everywhere that it is gravely challenged. We are our brothers' keepers.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Project Should Be Abandoned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway project is before the Eighty-second Congress. Already proponents of the economic monstrosity have introduced legislation on the subject.

We who come from the great State of Pennsylvania or from other coal-producing areas as well as coastal towns are opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway project as vigorously as we were when it was first proposed many years ago.

In support of our opposition to this project, I call your attention to a statement on December 20, 1950, made by Mr. Carroll Huntress, eastern vice president of the Republic Coal & Coke Co., of Chicago, in an address before the Rotary Club of Detroit, Mich.

The address of Mr. Huntress is packed full of facts that should convince any person that the St. Lawrence seaway project should be permanently shelved. The address is as follows:

A CERTAIN INALIENABLE RIGHT

It is a real pleasure to be here in this company of alert progressive men. Your committee advises that the program today is intended to focus on the public-utility industries. We are using the phrase in its broad and proper sense, to embrace electric and gas supply systems, telephone and telegraph systems, bus and trucking systems, railroads—all of those businesses which serve the whole public and which exist only by virtue of public franchise.

Although not in the employ of any of those industries, I have had a keen interest in them since the late thirties, when I had the privilege of assisting Wendell Willkie in his historic rear-guard fight against the Tennessee Valley Authority. That fight did not succeed in salvaging all the investment in the electric companies that were put out of business; but it did, I believe, serve to help keep alive, in the minds of the American people, some realization of the important public issues at stake.

You people of Michigan are fortunate in that most of your public utilities are in that type of ownership which, for want of a better word, we call private. Of course, there is nothing so very private about ownership that is divided amongst tens of thousands of investors, in industries whose services are completely under the surveillance of public regulatory commissions. But the ownership is private in this sense, that all the investment in these companies has been voluntary; that the investors have some degree of control over the properties; and that any investor is free to withdraw from the business at any time, by selling his securities to someone else. So it has come about that the people of Michigan have at their service several billion dollars' worth of public-utility properties that have been built without any burden whatever to the public treasuries. Not only that, but these industries are among your largest taxpayers, and all the rest of the taxpayers benefit from this sharing of the tax burden.

The reason I emphasize these two features of the so-called private ownership of your public utilities is that these industries are favorite targets of the Socialists—not only the sincere Socialists but also the political opportunists who think they can use Socialist methods without putting on the Socialist label. In Great Britain such industries were the first to be nationalized. In the United States there is a concerted drive to nationalize electric power. About one-fifth of the supply of that power in this country now comes from plants owned by Federal, State, or local governments or their agencies—principally Federal as to the plants themselves but not as to the distribution systems.

This huge development has used large amounts of public funds raised by taxation and public borrowing. There is a sad contrast between the situation of a taxpayer who is compelled to contribute to the cost of building public works without hope of any direct personal return and that of a voluntary investor who puts his savings at the disposal of a business with some hope of compensation and with reasonable prospect of being able to recover his savings when he needs them.

Now that we are all getting a first-hand acquaintance with inflation, it is becoming plain enough that the taxpayers not only suffer losses as underwriters of projects whose costs are not wholly recovered from project revenues. They are hit in another way, too, when the Federal Government borrows money for public works or any other purpose. That is the biggest single factor in the pressure toward shrinkage of the dollar—especially when the borrowing follows the present fashion of calling on the country's banking system. Beyond all that, the ownership of a public-utility system by a government or by a governmental agency always enjoys tax exemptions not enjoyed by business enterprises. This in itself places added burdens on the tax-paying public, for the taxes have to be levied on somebody. So I think you people of Michigan have been wise in leaving most of your public utilities to function as self-supporting, taxpaying enterprises, rather than as governmental units.

But I must call your attention to the fact that those who connive to expand governmental activities into all possible fields are itching to get a real foothold in this part of the country. At present they are trying to exploit your very natural interest in the proposal to construct a deeper waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. They hope, with your help, to create, through the dual-purpose project, a new center in the Northeast for the growth of Federal electric-power systems and a new bludgeon with which to make life tougher for the railroads.

Some of you may be surprised to hear the St. Lawrence project spoken of in those terms. I am sure no one in this room has favored the project on grounds of leftist political ideology. Those of you who have favored it no doubt felt that it would be a good thing for the city of Detroit. But I suggest that you take notice of the consistent energetic support that has been given to this project, for many years, by the left-wingers in Washington. I don't think they are doing it out of love of Detroit.

Their motives have shown up in the recent tug-of-war between President Truman and New York's Governor Dewey over the question of building the St. Lawrence hydroelectric power plants in New York and Ontario without the deeper ship canals and locks. New York and Ontario have made a dicker to do that at their own expense, if permitted by their respective Federal Governments. They point out that it would not interfere with later construction of the navigation works, whenever the two countries might want to build them. But New York has been unable to get approval of its plan in Washington. The Federal administration seems determined not to let the power project slip out of its own hands.

Perhaps you thought the Federal Government was going to sell the power plant to New York, anyway, should the combined power and navigation project be built. That is the pretended plan; but it is a phony. The St. Lawrence legislation now before the Congress says a few kind words about transferring the power project to New York, but it leaves all the necessary arrangements for such a transfer unsettled until after Federal construction gets under way. The busy little Federal planners know how to handle that kind of set-up. The power plant would be built and finished while arrangements for its transfer to New York were being discussed, endlessly. Then the plant couldn't be left idle. It would have to be put into service as a Federal power operation. Then it would be ready to become a key point in that visionary Federal power system for the Northeast that is so dear to the hearts of Washington's planners, a system stretching from Niagara to the Bay of Fundy.

There is a sound principle summed up in that old proverb, "When it toucheth thee then thou smartest." Four years ago, before a congressional committee, R. L. Ireland, Jr., vice president of the Hanna Coal & Ore Corp., Cleveland, testified in opposition to the St. Lawrence project, as follows: "We have reviewed the St. Lawrence seaway as to its effects on our Labrador ore interests and we have come to the conclusion, after again reviewing the whole situation, that our interest in this big ore body up there is far greater without a seaway than with a seaway—if you can bring in cheap raw material, what use will you have for cheap raw material if the end product is going to have to compete with cheap finished products? We have got to protect our standard of living in this country; and, failing to do so, we merely bring our economy, which is developed so greatly in the Great Lakes Basin area, into competition with all the cheaper foreign goods that could be brought in by such a seaway." That statement is as timely today as when uttered and I commend it to labor and management in this great industrial city, lest they be touched and then smart; a debacle devoutly desired by certain left-wingers determined to disrupt our economy.

Last month, I understand, the mayor of Detroit, in an address before this club, spoke of plans to put the harbor of Detroit into shape to take care of oceangoing vessels over the proposed 27-foot canal. Surely the mayor must have had reference to foreign-flag ships, for less than 9 percent of United States flag tonnage, fully loaded, can transit a 27-foot canal—the depth designated in an agreement made with Canada 18 years ago. That was admitted at the House Public Works Commitee hearings last May by General Fleming, then Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. Furthermore, letters from 30 leading American steamship companies appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1947, in protest against the project and stating they would have no use for it were it built.

It might be well for your mayor and your Congressman, GEORGE DONDERO, to get together on this matter. The latter knows how few United States flag ships could move over the proposed canal; knows that the sole purpose the waterway would serve, other than accommodation of the smaller-type foreign-flag ships, would be extension of the Great Lakes system to the lower St. Lawrence, so that lake carriers could load Labrador ore at Seven Islands. He knows that, because he said at the House hearings last May, and I quote, "There is no sense in deepening any ports except those used for iron ore." General Pick, chief, Army engineers, concurred in that statement at the hearing.

Reference to iron ore calls to mind a question asked of me by a member of this club. He inquired about the recent fervent appeal of your Congressman, JOHN DINGELL, for the launching of a holy crusade to save dynamic Detroit from becoming a ghost city. That catastrophe, your Washington representative claims, is in the cards unless the St. Lawrence canal is built pronto to provide for the movement of Labrador ore to Midwest steel plants. Such propaganda about Detroit and other prosperous lake cities to me appears puerile. One wonders why the chambers of commerce are not up in arms. The worst of it is that this propaganda is being disseminated in the face of the greatest expansion ever to take place in the Midwest steel industry and Great Lakes fleet construction.

There is no more ghostliness about the Labrador ore investments than there is about the lake ports. The conclusion, a few weeks ago, of financial arrangements between the steel operators and insurance companies for development of the project was marked by a statement from an operator-spokesman who said, of the presently contemplated annual production of 10,000,000 tons, that plans called for bringing in 5,000,000 tons up the present 14-foot St. Lawrence canal system; 3,000,000 tons by rail from Montreal to the Pittsburgh and Youngstown areas; and 2,000,000 tons by ocean route to Baltimore and Philadelphia. What is more, he said the delivered price of the Labrador ore will compare favorably with that of ore shipped from the Lake Superior district. A high railroad official stated a few days ago that American and Canadian railroads can and will take care of all west-bound ore shipments offered them at Montreal. Congressman DINGELL must now be in a quandary to fashion another battle cry. Commencing with bananas, which were to be brought cheaper into the Middle West via the waterway, the dictionary has been pretty well pruned, during the 30 years of active agitation for this project, of names of commodities that might be promoted. But let us not be harsh on our lawmakers. It is a fallacious belief that man thinks intelligently or acts rationally in the political field.

There remains one threadbare string on the St. Lawrence bow, which the proponents continue to strum. We hear much about the necessity for the navigation features and the power capacity of the project as instruments of national defense. The project would represent an ideal objective of aerial warfare in a polar attack, particularly in the light of the bottleneck features of transportation to and from the Great Lakes Basin. It is not the point that anything that can be built can also be destroyed. The point is that to thus tie up the waterway would tie up its vaunted transportation program and bottle up in the Great Lakes any boats built for ocean use. For 5 months, ice does the bottling. On November 29, according to the Associated Press, "Senator TAFT said he did not believe the St. Lawrence proposal could be classed as a defense project."

As to the need of electric power for defense industries, the St. Lawrence project is about the slowest conceivable way to provide power. Its completion would take 6 or 7 years. Steam plants are built in less than half the time. The electric utilities in New York, as well as in Michigan and elsewhere, are meeting their challenge in the present war as they did in the last one. As to the period of World War II, former Secretary of the Interior Krug said, "Power was never too little or too late." As to the national power situation today, James W. Parker, president, Detroit Edison Co., said on August 13, "It is good; and don't let anyone tell you otherwise." Of the situation in the State of New York, Alexander M. Beebee, president of the Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., recently said, "The need of such developments as the St. Lawrence because of a claimed shortage of power just is not true."

As to the need of transportation for defense purposes, the record of the railroads in World War II stands out as one of the greatest achievements in American industry. These words of Clarence F. Lee, spoken during that war, when he was chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, tell the story, "In all the world no job is being better done than by the American railroads." And today, against odds, they are doing a great job. However, the present efficiency of the railroads cannot be maintained, if subsidized competition grows increasingly severe. Despite their efficient operation, the railroad earnings, due to that competition, are insufficient to attract investment of new capital necessary to keep pace with national transportation requirements.

While we are on the subject of subsidy, a North Carolina project is illustrative of the absurd lengths to which that practice is being stretched. Federal funds in the amount of $3,849,000 have already been spent in the dredging of a channel in Cape Fear River for the sole benefit of a single oil company. Washington was shocked recently when this case was exposed before a congressional committee. But the Cape Fear River project is a pigmy alongside the St. Lawrence proposal which contemplates expenditure of over a billion dollars in the dredging of a channel primarily to benefit six steel operators. The proposal, mind you, is not designed to enable those operators to ship ore under competitive conditions; for such conditions already exist, as the operators admit. It is planned principally to give them an advantage over their competitors through a subsidized waterway; for tolls, if ever imposed, would fall far short of self-liquidation. The Cape Fear case is bad enough. The St. Lawrence affair, in that it would push eastern railroads toward bankruptcy, might lead to a national calamity. The present danger of nationalization of the railroads lies not in a conscious choice of the voters but rather in the indirect result of conditions, brought on by subsidized competition, which would make it impossible for the railroads to do the job.

Should the railroads be forced into bankruptcy, the Government would have to take them over. They would not go out of business, for no carrier or group of carriers can supplant them as the backbone of the Nation's transportation system. The economy of the country is built around the railroad freight car. Nationalized railroads would then be in direct competition with all other forms of transportation; which means that Government would take over those other forms, as has been done in Great Britain. From nationalization of transportation to that of many, if not most basic businesses would be but a short step, as Great Britain has shown us. This is the all-important fact, namely, that the problem is much larger, broader than the future of the railroads or the electric power industry. It concerns the very life of our free economy.

The fathers of the American Republic, in their great Declaration, found that men had been endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; among which, they listed three. They apparently did not feel it necessary, specifically, to list one which for generations had been the principal subject of their declaration of the rights of man—namely, the right privately to possess and enjoy the fruit of one's labor; an inalienable right on which life itself, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in a very real sense were believed by them to depend. Today this inalienable right is being whittled away—whether at Moscow, Peiping or Washington. There is but one way to resist usurpation of the inalienable rights of men, and that is to resist each individual attempt of overreaching government to appropriate, to itself, those things inalienable in the people, whom government is supposed to serve. It is for that reason that unnecessary collectivist devices like the St. Lawrence canal and power project should be opposed, even though a statistician's dream might seem to show that they can be made to pay their way.

I have referred to the drive to collectivize the power industry. When that has been done, might not the production of aluminum and magnesium by the use of electrical energy also become communized? Should a subsidy be given to the steel operators, by way of the proposed ore transportation route, would it then be terrifically difficult to carry out a suggestion as to which a broad hint has already been made in a most exalted place, namely, that of communizing the steel industry? And when aluminum and steel have been communized, how about the industrial products into which those raw materials enter? The producers in this area know what that would mean.

Gentlemen, is this fantasy? On December 8, 12 days ago, the president of the American Bankers Association, JAMES E. Shelton, charged that the American people have been led down the road to ultimate political and economic enslavement. The Foundation for Economic Education just recently put out a graph showing the growth in Government ownership of wealth (land excluded) from 1902 to 1946. This graph shows that, as of the year 1946, over 20 percent of the total wealth of the country (exclusive of land) were in the hands of Government—a percentage over three times as great as the 6 percent Government ownership shown for the year 1902.

So much for the ownership of the wealth of the people. So much for the destruction of that inalienable right. But your Government and mine goes even further: "Practically every business, large or small, is affected by some form of governmental licensing control." Those words, gentlemen, are not mine. They're quoted from page I of a publication of the United States Department of Commerce entitled—and God save the dimension—"Small Business and Government Licenses." Not the Gargantuan steel industry, not the automotive industry, not the railroads, not the power octopus—this is small business, that is now acknowledged to be under not merely governmental regulation, my friends, but governmental licensing control. Is it fantastic to say that we have got to look to the safety of a certain inalienable right?

NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE
PROJECT CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1950.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You have been a stanch friend of the opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, and we appreciate it.

We are wondering if you would mind putting the enclosed speech and statement by Mr. Huntress, our chairman, in the RECORD.

It is not our desire to load up the RECORD, but there have been several incorporations lately by proponents of the waterway, which we think should not go unanswered.

Thanking you very much, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CARLISLE BARGERON,
Publicity Representative.

STATEMENT BY CARROLL B. HUNTRESS, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT CONFERENCE

Those frenzied proponents of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway who are loudly sounding doomsday for Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, and the Great Lakes area unless 10,000,000 tons of Labrador-Quebec ore can come into the country in a particular way, are doing their area a serious disservice. One wonders why the chambers of commerce are not up in arms against this type of propaganda because it is certainly not the way to get new investments and new industries.

However, what is worse is that this propaganda is being pursued in the face of the greatest expansion to take place in the Midwest steel industry and Great Lakes fleet construction in years.

The American Ship Building Co. in its magazine, the American Ship Builder, tells about that company's having plans on the drawing board for five freighters, discusses other Lakes shipbuilding activity and says:

"The decision of lake operators to start the long-awaited rebuilding of the fleet reflects great faith and optimism in the future and it sets at rest rumors that the Great Lakes region was doomed to obsolescence because of the exhaustion of high grade hematite deposits in the Lake Superior region.

"The decision to build new ships, to enlarge the ore-carrying capacity of the fleet, indicates that there are rather adequate

quantities of high-grade ore, or that the use of lower-grade ores is feasible and economically possible. These low-grade-ore reserves are known to be tremendous."

The Cleveland Press of November 17 reports that three steel companies, Republic, Jones & Laughlin, and American Steel Wire, plan to spend $150,000,000 for plant expansion in Cleveland alone. Several weeks ago Inland Steel announced an expansion of its East Chicago, Ind., plant to an additional capacity of 750,000 tons; about the same time National Steel announced its plan to spend between $25,000,000 and $30,000,000, mostly on the expansion of its plant near Detroit.

On July 19, United States Steel, whom the propagandists cite in support of their argument that the steel industry is headed toward the Atlantic seaboard because it has bought the site for a plant in New Jersey, announced it was increasing the capacity of its plants in the Chicago and Pittsburgh districts by 1,860,000 tons. Similarly, two of its Lakes carriers announced they were immediately beginning construction of four large Lakes carriers to cost more than $20,000,000. Early in the year, the largest ore carrier, the *Wilfred Sykes* which cost $5,000,000 was put into service by Inland Steel.

The whole agitation about Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago et al. becoming ghost towns sprung from the small group of steel operators who have invested in the Labrador-Quebec ore and want the subsidized waterway to help them with the competitive costs of their relatively small kitty of ore in the 100,000,000 tons which we use annually.

Now it seems that not only is it nonsense about ghostliness being in store for Lakes ports but also it is evident that the absence of the St. Lawrence waterway will not even mean ghostliness for the Labrador-Quebec investments of the steel operators.

Charles R. Hook, chairman of the board of Armco, one of the companies interested in the Labrador-Quebec project, was quoted in the Chicago Journal of Commerce of October 19 as saying this ore could be brought in over present transportation facilities at a reasonable cost but, of course, it would be more reasonable over the St. Lawrence waterway.

Now, George M. Humphrey, president of the M. A. Hanna Co., of Cleveland, and leader in the Labrador-Quebec enterprise, announced in the New York Times of November 16, that present plans call for bringing in 5,000,000 tons annually over the present St. Lawrence canal system, 3,000,000 tons by rail from Montreal to the Pittsburgh and Youngstown areas, and 2,000,000 tons by ocean route to the Baltimore and Philadelphia sections.

"The delivered price," said Mr. Humphrey in the New York Times of November 16, "will compare favorably with that of ore shipped from the Superior region."

You can bet your boots that the insurance companies, with which the Labrador iron ore interests had just closed a financing deal for the building of a railroad from the ore fields to Seven Islands on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, were convinced of this.

Aviation Corps

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I led the fight in this House during World War II to permit men who did not have a college degree to fly our fighter planes. After much agitation, I succeeded in prevailing on the flying services to abolish such a silly requirement and let down the bars. As a result, all Americans were admitted to our flying services, and victory was ours.

Today thousands of eager, patriotic young men find themselves denied the right of becoming aviation cadets solely by the accident of being born into families who did not have enough money to send them to college.

This is class discrimination at its worst and goes on the shaky premise that the boy who did not go to college is unqualified to fight for Uncle Sam flying a combat plane.

There are more boys who have the technical know-how to fly but who are automatically disqualified by such a ruling than there are those who are eligible. Just because a boy did not go through 2 years of college does not mean he lacks the mental keenness, the high intelligence, and mechanical ability which are the prime requisites of a good fighter pilot.

I repeat, to bar these countless thousands from our aviation cadet schools solely for the reason they did not attend a college for 2 years is building a serious caste system in the American fighting forces.

The only fair way is to base requirements on sound mechanical knowledge, physical and mental alertnesss, and general technical proclivity. In so doing, boys who may not have been lucky enough to attend schools of higher learning will be able to become aviation cadets just as readily as their more fortunate comrades.

The President has called for a gigantic air force, and Congress has voted even a larger one. How can we approach these demands if we shut off the chief source of manpower for such an important unit of our armed might?

There is only one answer. Lift the unnecessary restrictions that bar so many enthusiastic applicants for training as aviation cadets and build the greatest air forces ever known. The bill I am introducing today will accomplish this.

Kremlin Is Grateful to Lattimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, never let it be said that the Kremlin is ungrateful for services rendered. Owen Lattimore, the long-time State Department adviser and propagandist of the Communist line, has just received more of the acclaim that is due him for his part in turning China over to the Communists and putting them in a position to make war on our troops in Korea. Most recently Lattimore's specialty has been to peddle the Communist gospel that Red China should be admitted to the United Nations.

For this and other devotion to the cause, the Soviet magazine Novy Mir in a recent issue praised Lattimore to the skies as "an outstanding far-eastern specialist of the United States Department of State" and "one of the few collaborators of Acheson who is actually acquainted with conditions in the Far East." Lattimore also knows, according to the Soviet magazine, that colonial peoples "who are shot at from American guns see more and more clearly that Russia is their true friend."

When an alleged American who has spent several years on the Government payroll and has had the ear of top Government officials holds views of that kind, the American people are entitled to know the facts so they may judge for themselves exactly where his loyalty lies.

At this point I am placing in the RECORD the full text of an article about Lattimore in the January 8, 1951, issue of the new magazine titled "The Freeman," which is published at 240 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.:

THE KISS OF DEATH

The Kremlin recently decided it was high time to give Owen Lattimore a friendly pat on the shoulder. This was done in the characteristic, clumsily devious Bolshevik manner. In the authoritative magazine Novy Mir for November 1950 appeared a long and exceedingly favorable review of Dr. Lattimore's book, The Situation in Asia, published in 1949. The review is prefaced by the familiar statement that since the liberation of Europe and Asia by the glorious Red army there has been a wonderful resurgence of the Asiatic peoples against their Anglo-American exploiters.

Novy Mir calls Dr. Lattimore "an outstanding far eastern specialist of the United States Department of State," "one of the few collaborators of Acheson who is actually acquainted with conditions in the Far East," and "a bourgeois with a sober approach to far-eastern problems."

"Lattimore's views," says the review, "are entirely different from the wild, nightmarish views of American reactionaries." The Johns Hopkins professor is presented as understanding the true nature of Soviet democracy, and as knowing that it is Soviet propaganda which attracts the Asiatic peoples. He also knows, according to the Moscow journal, that colonial peoples "who are shot at from American guns see more and more clearly that Russia is their true friend"; that it is "sheer madness to oppose the admission of (Communist) China into the UN."

Emphasis is laid on the high esteem in which Owen Lattimore holds the Soviet Union and everything Moscow stands for. "The utterances of this bourgeois American observer," says the magazine, "are an indictment of the ruling circles of the United States, and of the entire postwar policy of the imperialist camp." Novy Mir is pleased to note that Dr. Lattimore's indictments are directed exclusively at the United States. He indicts America's intervention in the civil war in China; he indicts our policy in the Philippines, Japan, Iran, Indochina and elsewhere in the East—Far, Near, and Middle.

The review ends with a strong condemnation of the United States Government for not having followed the course outlined by Dr. Lattimore. The ruling circles of the United States, Novy Mir maintains, have refused to accept the advice he has so magnanimously given. This saddens Moscow no end.

ARGUS.

Mr. Martin in Minute-Man Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Register, of Mobile, Ala., on January 16, 1951:

MR. MARTIN IN MINUTE-MAN ROLE

It is not necessary to always agree with him, or to always agree entirely with his views on a given subject, to appreciate the presence in Congress of a figure such as Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Particularly in the face of conditions which now exist, the country can count it a stroke of good fortune that Congressman MARTIN of Massachusetts is a Member of the House. This is illustrated by a statement he has just issued.

As Robert Barkdoll, of the United Press, sums it up, Congressman MARTIN's "ire was aroused by Mr. Truman's annual economic report and an accompanying report from the President's Council of Economic Advisers." Mr. Barkdoll adds that "he (Mr. MARTIN) said the council spelled out the 'blueprint for socialism' at which Mr. Truman only hinted."

These remarks are attributed to Congressman MARTIN by INS in its report on his statement:

"In the name of the national crisis, it is planned to transform America into a completely socialist economy.

"The pattern of control and regimentation which the council's report contains is nothing short of a blueprint for socialism. * * *

"Critical times call for critical and conscientious action. The determination of the socialist planners to reach their goal by taking advantage of the situation is a disgrace."

Congressman MARTIN called increased taxation the "touchstone in this socialist blueprint."

According to INS, Mr. MARTIN said the average American now pays more than 25 percent of his income to Federal, State, and local governments in taxes, and went on to add:

"With the additional staggering increases proposed, American citizens will find themselves turning over to the Government between one-third and one-half of all they earn so that the Government may spend it for them.

"This can only lead to less independence for the individual and more dependence on government—exactly the socialist goal."

The Nation needs "minute men" like Congressman MARTIN on guard in Washington to keep an eye open and be ready to speak out.

Apropos of Interoceanic Canals: Atomic Bomb and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of my remarks in the RECORD of March 16, 1950, entitled "Interoceanic Canals: Modern Arms and National Defense," I included a condensation of Dr. Vannevar Bush's book Modern Arms and Free Men, as published in the February 1950 issue of the Reader's Digest.

In that work Dr. Bush, though fully recognizing the terrific destructiveness of the atomic bomb, emphasized that the development of other modern weapons, namely, radar, proximity fuzes, and fast interceptor planes, might again place the defensive warfare in the ascendant and result in the reappearance of the deadlock on land, as was experienced in World War I.

In support of his thesis that the powers of defensive weapons are increasing with respect to the offensive use of the atomic bomb, Dr. Bush recently made an important statement with respect to the present war crisis. It should go far in allaying any hysteria or exaggerated interpretation of the importance of any single weapon, however powerful. It effectively emphasizes at this time the need for disciplined thinking on questions of national defense, the avoidance of oversimplifications, and the need for a well-proportioned program toward a balanced defense.

To make this statement, as published in the Washington Daily News of December 18, 1950, readily available to the Government and the Nation, I am extending my remarks to include its full text:

OUR A-BOMB EDGE IS FADING FAST

(By Dr. Vannevar Bush)

(Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, has joined with Harvard President James B. Conant, former Under Secretary of Army Tracey Voorhees and a score of other prominent Americans in forming the Committee on the Present Danger. Their purpose is to put forward the idea that America needs a universal-military-service law providing 2 years' training for every young man on reaching age 18 or on graduation from high school, whichever comes later. In the following statement Dr. Bush gives his reasons for thinking that this drastic proposal is necessary.)

In any consideration of atomic warfare today there are several factors that must be borne clearly in mind.

First, there is no question that Russia has produced an atomic bomb.

Second, having produced one, there is no doubt that Russia can produce more in time, and can make a stockpile. I do not know how many. I do not know their rate of production. But we certainly must conclude that they are now engaged in producing a number.

Third, I would point this out to you: There are many evidences that defense against the atom bomb is mounting.

BOMBING PLANES CAN BE STOPPED

Toward the end of the war you may remember that German jet planes came in against our bombers. If Germany had produced jet planes in quantity, they could have stopped our bombing. The Germans' mistake was that they concentrated on trying to produce terror weapons like the V-bomb.

Since that time, faster bombing planes have been developed, and means have been developed for bombing from higher altitudes.

On the other side of the picture, the jet planes have been developed for greater speed and greater range. Ground-controlled guided missiles have also been developed, and proximity fuzes.

They are all very powerful things to stop bombers with. That is why I say the defense against delivery of atom bombs is mounting.

At some time, in my opinion, Russia can build such a defense that we would have exceedingly great difficulty in delivering A-bombs on their primary targets.

We might still reach their secondary targets. But whenever Russia feels that she could impose upon our bombers such attrition that we could not undertake to bomb primary targets, then at that time we must have other means of stopping the Russian armies.

TV, BUT NO RADAR

It is my belief that we in this country have not given the attention to these things that the present danger demands. For instance, we have built a great television network. At the same time, Russia has been building much more of a radar defense network.

I realize the value of a TV network. It means enormous power in conveying to the public important events of the day. What I am saying is that in the last 5 years we have built a TV network and that we have not built a radar network.

I think we had better get busy. Fortunately, we are awake now, after Korea.

I think that the principal reason the Russian armies have not moved is our possession of the A-bomb. I think that after Korea, none of us should have any illusion that the Russians have been held back by any other scruples.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

We should have no illusion that they are paying any attention to anything except what their power can accomplish. If they have not moved across Europe in the last 5 years, I think it has been because of our possession of the A-bomb.

I think the effect of this superiority of ours is decreasing with time. By the time it has decreased far enough, the bomb alone cannot prevent a holocaust.

We must have other means—an Army in being capable of holding the line.

I believe also that this job of holding the line in Europe cannot be done unless the other countries put their armies on the front simultaneously. It cannot be done by America alone. Western Europe must be aided and armed for that purpose.

Program, Priority, Personalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the London Economist of January 13, 1951:

PROGRAM, PRIORITY, PERSONALITIES

When Parliament reassembles in 10 days' time, it will be clear that the political climate at last permits the rearming of the country to be treated with the seriousness it deserves. The assumption of last summer that there was a low limit to the amount of safety that the country could afford has been tacitly, and may soon be openly, abandoned. Ministers, Members of Parliament, and responsible citizens are all frightened, and all calling for action; so much has been achieved by Mao Tse-tung. But not all the old inhibitions have been shaken off; the direction has been changed and the pace quickened, but it is still plodding. The Government still

gives the impression of tired men making unwilling efforts.

Yet if ever, in the field of public policy, there was a disagreeable necessity that will be over the quicker the more energetically it is tackled from the start, it is this unprecedented effort to insure peace through strength. If it is done in sufficient measure and in time, there will be no war, if it is botched and bungled, the effort may be in vain. Those who hate the necessity for rearmament most should be the most insistent on it now.

What the country should require of its rulers in the next few months can conveniently be summarized under three heads—a specific program drawn up to meet the necessities of the situation, the grant to it of enough effective priority to insure that it is carried out, and the emergence of personalities strong enough to give the public confidence that the policy will attain its objects.

PROGRAM

A specific program—a promise to raise and equip forces of stated size by a stated time—is needed for two opposite, but by no means contradictory, reasons. The first of these is to make it clear that the British people are in earnest and mean to play their full part in the alliance of the free nations. The clamor that has arisen in America, accusing America's allies of making an inadequate effort, is manifestly unfair, at least as far as the United Kingdom is concerned. Every country's effort has been inadequate, but British achievements will compare favorably, by any test, with those of the United States itself—as, with their usual fairness, the sober American publicists are pointing out. But backward-looking self-justifications are not very convincing. The major contribution that the British Government can make to the hardening of mutual confidence among the Allies, on which everything else depends, is to come out with a clear, specific, and impressive statement, couched in terms that anyone can understand, of what they propose to do.

But if this first purpose of a specific program is to be able to show that it is big enough, the second purpose is to be able to demonstrate that it is not unlimited. Public opinion in this country, though increasingly determined, is fatalistically so. There is a sinking feeling that the whole horrible business that this generation has known twice before is beginning again, a conviction that, however mildly it starts, it will inevitably cumulate until the burden is intolerable. If full war comes, this will indeed happen. But if war does not come—and the object of the policy is to prevent it—then what is now planned is only a fraction of what the country went through between 1939 and 1945. At the height of the war in the middle of 1943, there were 10,200,000 men and women in the forces in civil defense and in war production. A specific program of rearmament could be turned into a similar figure of manpower required; one may guess that it would come out at about one-quarter of the 1943 total. This is still an enormous waste of effort. But how much more rational it seems to ask the people to make the effort of a quarterwar to insure their safety than to allow them to believe that there will be a steady drift back to all the home-front miseries of total war.

PRIORITY

The program once drawn up, it is very easy to declare that nothing shall be allowed to stand in its way. Most people are now ready to say that; but very few of them realize what is meant by it. An article on a later page illustrates some of the hurtful things—not really important in the national life as a whole, but certainly inconvenient and unpopular—that will have to be done to get the needed number of men into the armed forces. At the other end of the scale, it is equally clear that sacrifices of wealth will have to be made, and it follows that the largest sacrifices will have to be made by those who are still comparatively wealthy. But those who make their sacrifices in person and those who make them in money have a right to ask two things of the politicians. The first is that nothing shall be asked beyond what is necessary and useful. There is perhaps little risk of too many men being called up. But there is a very great risk of too much wealth being conscribed. A capital levy is a prime example of a device that would squeeze an ounce of real benefit to the community out of a ton of sacrifice by capital owners. Giving defense priority means abjuring acts of class warfare such as that. The second thing that the public has a right to ask of the politicians is that they, too, shall sacrifice something There are already hints that it is impossible to reduce other forms of government expenditure to meet the rising cost of defense This means, of course, that the citizen is going to be asked to make all the necessary cuts in his own personal expenditures, the reduction of which seems fully as impossible to him as cuts in grants and subsidies seem to Mr. Gaitskell. The budget will be a very clear test indeed of whether the Government is really determined to give defense an effective first priority.

PERSONALITIES

The burden even of a quarter war will not be borne unless the people have confidence in their leadership. The figures of the latest Gallup poll published in the News Chronicle on Tuesday are most illuminating. Mr. Attlee's personal popularity has risen since October by two points; he enjoys a clear majority of approval. But the stock of the Government as a whole has slumped in the same period by no less than 7 percent, and is now at its lowest ebb.

Unfortunately it is precisely in the most crucial departments that confidence is lowest. Public opinion has been very kind to Mr. Bevin, since it admires the gallantry of his fight against illness. But the safety of the realm is involved. Mr. Bevin, to put it bluntly, is no longer equal to his work, and it is imperative that in these critical months the country should have a Foreign Secretary who is fully alive and awake and capable of inspiring confidence both at home and abroad. The quartet of defense ministers also inspire the reverse of confidence. Mr. Shinwell has done very much better at the War Office and the Ministry of Defense than he did at the Ministry of Fuel and Power. But he is a controversial figure, an embittered and embittering man; his "tinker's cuss" speech is not forgotten; and it is not for him that sacrifices will be made beyond the call of duty. Lord Hall and Mr. Arthur Henderson are nonentities; and Mr. Strachey is perhaps the most distrusted figure in the Government. Taken together, it can be said of these four that they may not frighten the enemy, but they certainly frighten the British public.

No Prime Minister has ever had a clearer duty than Mr. Attlee has to replace these five of his colleagues by men who will inspire real confidence, not only in the Labor Party but in the country as a whole. If there were in the Parliamentary Labor Party reserves of talent to be drawn on for the purpose, the Prime Minister's task would be easy. But there are not; one needs only to listen to the names that are put forward for the Foreign Office in current speculation to realize how very restricted, how almost nonexistent, is the choice. It is therefore necessary to go outside the ranks of the party. Even this, however, does not by itself make a coalition of the parties strictly necessary—certainly not a coalition in the ordinary sense, a sharing of the patronage of office among the stalwarts of both the major parties. There are strong personalities among those servants of the state who are not active politicians. There is among the ambassadors at least one who would make an admirable Foreign Secretary; there is among the retired service chiefs at least one excellent Minister of Defense. But it is not to be supposed that personalities of this sort would take office in a partisan Cabinet still bent on such spasms of doctrinaire spite as the nationalization of steel. At the very least, a party truce is necessary if there is to be real leadership. And if the best men are to be sought for the job, it would be wrong to exclude active Conservative politicians just because they are active Conservative politicians—and just as wrong for them to exclude themselves.

We shall be told that this is not practical politics. But if practical politics is to continue to be the order of the day, the writing on the wall is clear. Labor's popularity is slumping, and with a fuel crisis added on top of the burdens of defense, it will clearly slump further. Is it really in Labor's interest that it should limp on, steadily losing its moral authority, until in the end it is forced into an election which, after such a performance, might well be another 1931? Can it conceivably be in the country's interests? Is it not far better to admit that the British nation is once again in grave peril, and that not only its manpower and its wealth need to be called upon without exemptions, but also all its resources in the art of government? The three p's—program, priority, personalities—will not combine with party; they will with patriotism.

Conservation and Use of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the President's Water Resources Policy Commission has prepared a comprehensive report on the immense advantages flowing from the conservation and use of water.

The proposed reservoir at Falmouth, Ky., is one of the important flood-control projects in the program of flood control for the Ohio Valley. Shortsighted opposition has prevented the construction of the reservoir which would mean so much to the people of the region.

The beneficial effects which would accrue from the construction of this reservoir are graphically shown by the following article written by Glenn Thompson, the able Washington representative of the Cincinnati Enquirer:

WASHINGTON.—It may be that Congressman JOE B. BATES, of Greenup, Ky., is unwittingly doing Greater Cincinnati a very great favor. The redoubtable Democrat, Mr. BATES, did not have this in mind. But, if legislation now being written by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission and soon to go to Capitol Hill should ever become law, it may work out that way. There are two proposals for development of the Licking River, a river that flows up through Kentucky, between Newport and Covington and into the Cincinnati Harbor.

One calls for flood control only. Under this, the Army engineers now seek to build Falmouth Reservoir, some 30 air miles up the Licking from the foot of Sycamore Street, and Cave Run Reservoir, 50 air miles farther upstream. Both are authorized as part of the comprehensive plan for flood control in

the Ohio Valley. Falmouth would cost $18,500,000; Cave Run, $9,500,000. But, when it comes to money, they don't get it. The fact that Mr. BATES is the explanation.

The other plan for development of the Licking calls for a high-level project and production of hydroelectric power.

Besides high dams at Falmouth and Cave Run, there would be small reservoirs at Boston Station and Pool's Creek. Cost is estimated at $51,885,000. This plan would provide not only flood protection but an estimated $3,106,000 worth of hydroelectric power a year.

The Kentucky General Assembly in 1943 went on record against power development in the Licking.

Before that, the district engineer at Louisville and the division engineer at Cincinnati had approved the high-level plan, including power. It came on here to the board of engineers for rivers and harbors. In view of the general assembly's opposition, they disapproved the high plan and approved development for flood control only.

Mr. BATES doesn't want even this.

"My people," he says, "want to farm—not peddle fish."

Arguments that a low-level dam at Falmouth would displace only 325 families change him not at all.

"That is some of the best bluegrass land in the country," he says. "Families there have been living on it for 150 years. They don't want to move."

Now here is where the President's Water Resources Policy Commission comes in. It has just made a voluminous report after a year of work. Its purpose was to devise a national policy that would make the best use of all the water resources of the Nation. It hopes that Congress will write the policy into law.

Considerations in water use include these: Flood control, irrigation, municipal water supplies, industrial supplies, ground water recharge, recreation, power production, pollution abatement, navigation, soil conservation, and fish and wildlife propagation.

The policy calls for consideration of both the national welfare and of the region's development in the use of any river.

Army engineers, great builders of flood-control works, consider the various uses of water in designing a project but final authority remains in their hands, and their major interests are flood control and navigation.

If Congress adopts the proposed national policy, each great valley like the Ohio would be considered as a unit. Each of the interests listed above—flood control, power, pollution, etc.—would be represented on an interagency committee charged with planning development of the water use in that valley. Each project would have to fit into the valley plan.

The committee would have to decide such questions as: Does the central Ohio Valley need the additional power that the Licking could produce? Would it be produced at an economical cost?

It would decide whether the valley should supply some water for northern Kentucky municipalities. (Domestic water supply, in fact, has first priority under the policy.) It would consider the Licking dams as a possible source for industrial water.

Greater Cincinnatians might pause right here and consider that last. Because their faucets seem to run freely, they are often unaware that their region is hampered by a shortage of industrial water. But this is no secret to some leading Millcreek Valley industries which have foregone expansion plans because of the shortage and which are now working vigorously to find new supplies.

These Greater Cincinnatians might note that the Government recently dropped five Greater Cincinnati sites from consideration for a new $11,000,000 Quartermaster research laboratory. A major consideration was inadequate water.

Recently the Atomic Energy Commission disclosed that a tremendous new production center is to be located near Paducah, Ky. Greater Cincinnati might not have wanted it. Nevertheless, a major reason for the choice of the western Kentucky site was the availability of a great clean water supply from Kentucky Dam.

On the interagency committee the clean-river people would, of course, be represented, probably through the United States Public Health Service. The Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission would have its say in the plans. So would State and local health authorities.

Here is the kind of problem they might take to the committee: Regulated release of impounded water can be used to dilute river pollution. Would such release from the Licking be an economical means of reducing pollution in the Cincinnati Harbor and reducing the cost of sewage treatment by Greater Cincinnati communities?

So all-inclusive would be the water policy that it might even include mosquito control. The commission's report points out that the life cycle of the anopheles mosquito can be broken by shifting the water level in a reservoir. Think of everything, don't they?

Kentucky would hardly overlook the recreational possibilities in the Licking. It has been quick to develop play areas beside the many dams already built in the Commonwealth and it would be unlikely to miss this one so close to a populous center.

Well, would the new policy force Kentucky to accept high-level development of the Licking if it still objected?

The answer is "No."

The further answer, however, is that, if opponents of what was regarded as proper development of a river were strong enough to prevent it, no development at all would be undertaken. Future possibilities of a water resource would not be destroyed by improper development.

Morris L. Cooke, chairman of the commission, thinks another thing might occur.

"I believe," he told me, "that if you could show the people of a region the full use that could be made of a water resource, if you let everybody in on discussing it as you plan the development, and then if you tell them definitely what you are going to do, this one this year, that one 10 years from now, nearly all opposition would fade away."

That probably will not be enough for Mr. BATES. Meanwhile he goes ahead preventing the Licking from being developed for flood control only. Maybe he will prevent development long enough for Congress to adopt a real national water policy.

Economy Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include a comment from the National Republic Bulletin on the appropriation record of the Eighty-first Congress in comparison with that of the Eightieth Congress:

ECONOMY NOTE

Total appropriations and contract authorizations approved by the Eighty-first Congress, which expired January 3, were $135,300,000,000.

That's a lot of money to be spent in 2 years. The first session, in 1949, approved $46,400,000,000 in appropriations and $6,600,000,000 in additional contract authorizations.

The second session, 1950, passed appropriations aggregating $78,800,000,000, then added new contract and loan authorizations to the tune of $3,200,000,000.

The Republican Eightieth Congress, so roundly denounced by President Truman in the 1948 presidential campaign, approved total appropriations and contract authorizations (1947 and 1948) in the amount of $73,700,000,000.

So the Truman economy program comes out here: For every $1 spent by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the Democratic Eighty-first spent $1.85—enough to wipe out the Treasury surplus of $9,200,000,000 left by the Republican Eightieth, and then to run up an additional deficit of $5,000,000,000 to January 1, 1950.

Obviously the American people must find some way to bring the Truman squanderbund under effective control. At the present spending rate, the country can't afford even to wait for the next election. It will have to press down on individual Congressmen.

Resolution of Hodges Bible Class, Main Street Methodist Church, Greenwood, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

BOARD OF STEWARDS,
MAIN STREET METHODIST CHURCH,
Greenwood, S. C., January 9, 1951.

Whereas the Hodges Bible Class of Main Street Methodist Church, Greenwood, S. C., realizing that our country is faced with the probability of a war that will involve all nations and peoples of the world; and

Whereas the United States of America has been blessed in the material things of life far superior to other peoples; and

Whereas other nations of the world are looking to the United States of America for leadership; and

Whereas our Government, municipal, State, and National, are stressing material progress and preparedness and are neglecting the moral and spiritual life that is so essential to permanent progress and adequate preparedness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. That our municipal, State, and National Government, and particularly our legislative and executive departments be reminded of our foundation principles on which this Nation was built, with a resolve that we will not ask God to be with us in this fight, but that we will fight on God's side and with His guidance assist in bringing our world to a sense of its obligation to God and to our fellow man.

2. That the members of the Hodges Bible Class pledge themselves to the support of the principles hereinabove enumerated.

3. That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the executive heads of our city, State, and National Government and to the Members of the United States Senate, the Congressman of the Third Congressional District, ministers

of the General Assembly from Greenwood County, and members of the city council, Greenwood, S. C.

4. That a copy of this resolution be released to the press, with request that it be given wide publicity, and particularly to the Methodist Advocate, the Index-Journal, the Columbia State, Greenville News, Washington Post, and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

W. K. CHARLES,
E. H. BOWEN,
L. C. BRADY,
Committee.

Princeton University Provides an Aeronautical and Allied Science Research To Be Named for James V. Forrestal, Late Secretary of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is pleasing to note from a news article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, issue of January 9, 1951, and made a part of these remarks, that the laboratories and 800-acre tract on the east bank of Lake Carnegie formerly occupied by the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research have been purchased for $1,500,000 by Princeton University. According to the announcement of Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of the university, accompanying the purchase the facility will be converted to a $3,000,000 aeronautical and allied research center to be named for James V. Forrestal, late Secretary of Defense. This is a deserving honor to Mr. Forrestal, who gave so unselfishly of his ability to the service of his country, and, also recognition of the important part that science is taking in providing for our security as a Nation and the welfare of our people. President Dodds and the officials of Princeton University are to be congratulated for providing this important research facility.

The news article to which I have referred reads as follows:

PRINCETON BUYS $1,500,000 SITE NEAR CAMPUS AS SCIENCE CENTER

PRINCETON, N. J., January 8.—The laboratories and 800-acre tract on the east bank of the Lake Carnegie formerly occupied by the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research have been purchased for $1,500,000 by Princeton University.

Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of the university, who announced the acquisition today, said that the facility will be converted to a $3,000,000 aeronautical and allied science research center to be named for James V. Forrestal, late Secretary of Defense. By spring the research program underwritten with Government and private contracts totaling $1,000,000 will begin.

The property, including 2 three-story major laboratories, 12 single-story buildings, and 26 family dwellings will be enhanced by the transfer of equipment from the crowded research buildings on the 1,200-acre university campus adjoining the tract.

Dr. Dodds said that "the opportunity for rendering a public service in this time of national emergency through an expansion of our existing research facilities was so obvious that our board of trustees voted to negotiate for the purchase of this property."

Although it was understood that the money for the purchase was to come from current university funds, Dr. Dodds said that the university had received assurances of support from various agencies. Existing equipment at the university and new apparatus purchased under the research contracts will bring the value of the facility up to $3,000,000, it was said.

In addition the center will be used in connection with the university graduate-research program, Dr. Dodds said, and would in no way diminish the university's standing as a fine arts institution.

According to officials of the Rockefeller Institute, the property had been appraised by Army engineers to be worth $1,750,000 and the Army Quartermaster Corps was considering buying it. When the institute decided to vacate the site in 1947 and concentrate its research at its York Avenue plant in New York City, the New Jersey tract was put on sale for $3,000,000.

JET STUDY PLANNED

The institute began its work in New Jersey in 1914 in the investigation of animal diseases and in 1931 added the study of plant diseases. The institute was founded in 1901 by the late John D. Rockefeller, Sr., as a philanthropic corporation.

Dr. Dodds said that in making its plant and property available to Princeton, the trustees of Rockefeller Institute took into consideration the perpetuation of the property for scientific use under the university's aegis.

Specific projects to be located at the center will include Project Squid, a program of supervised and correlated research into rocket, ram-jet, and pulse-jet aeronautical power plants being carried on in six eastern universities.

The Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Jet Propulsion Center, and departments dealing with problems of chemical flow and aeronautical engineering will also be transferred to the new property, it was said.

PURCHASE HASTENED

Dr. Dodds said that for more than 6 months the university has considered the question of how it could best organize its engineering and science departments to make a maximum contribution to the national defense effort and at the same time preserve and build the university's potent as a source of scientific knowledge useful to the broad ranges of the wants of mankind. The national emergency hastened the decision to purchase which it was understood will put the research program at the university ahead 2 years.

It was understood that the center will be named for Mr. Forrestal, who was a member of the class of 1915 and a charter trustee of the institution, because the late Secretary was instrumental in developing the vast aeronautical research program when he was Secretary of the Navy and later as the first Secretary of Defense.

Korea GI's Hate Brave-Talking Politicians Most

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of January 18, 1951:

KOREA GI'S HATE BRAVE-TALKING POLITICIANS MOST

(By William Chapman)

SOMEWHERE IN CENTRAL KOREA, January 18.—American GI's in Korea are getting hopping mad about this war.

And their wrath is directed at one general classification: the politician.

Get two or more GI's to talking over their troubles and by the time they finish all the blame has been heaped on the politicians.

The politicians are responsible for prolonging the war; for failure to bomb Manchuria; for the failure of new equipment or replacements to arrive on time.

"Wait until we get home," they threaten. "Those politicians sit around and say, 'We will not leave Korea.' Why don't they come over here and then say 'We'?"

These men—once so near to victory—have now lost the burning urge to fight. They honestly doubt that they would gain anything if they took all of Korea—and their officers know it.

There is no low morale in the ordinary sense. The GI's continue to do their jobs like the well-trained soldiers they are. And they will fight as long as they get orders to do so.

But they believe someone is trying to save face at their expense and they don't like it.

Anniversary of an Iowan's Pioneer Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I called the attention of the House to the impressive display at the entrance to the Navy Building at Eighteenth and Constitution Avenue commemorating the first successful landing and take-off of an airplane from the deck of a Navy ship 40 years ago. Iowa is very proud of the achievement of one of her noted sons who was the pilot of the Curtiss biplane in that flight.

I am including in my remarks today two newspaper items from Iowa, one that appeared in the Marengo (Iowa) Pioneer-Republican of January 18 and the other item that appeared in the Des Moines Register of the same date:

[From the Marengo (Iowa) Pioneer-Republican of January 18, 1951]

EUGENE ELY, NATIVE SON OF IOWA COUNTY, MADE FIRST PLANE LANDING ON A SHIP 40 YEARS AGO TODAY

Forty years ago today, January 18, 1911, Eugene Ely successfully flew a Curtiss biplane to an improvised platform aboard the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* anchored in San Francisco Bay. His landing was the first ever made on a ship.

After spending 1 hour aboard the *Pennsylvania*, Ely took off and flew back to his hangar near San Francisco. He thus completed the first shipboard landing and take-off from which has evolved the present 600-mile-per-hour precision carrier jet maneuvers which characterize fleet operations off Korea today.

Mr. Ely, holder of aviator's license No. 17, met his death in a plane he was piloting at

Macon, Ga., on October 19, 1911. He was buried near his birthplace at Williamsburg, Iowa. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross posthumously in 1933 for his pioneer aviation efforts.

BORN NEAR WILLIAMSBURG

Ely was born before the days of the automobile or the airplane, on October 22, 1886, on an Iowa farm 6 miles east of Williamsburg. His father, Nathan D. Ely, was later an attorney and served as a colonel in the United States Army during World War days. His mother was Emma Harrington, a resident of Williamsburg.

When he was about 9 years old Eugene moved with his parents to Davenport, where he attended the city schools. While yet in his teens "Gene" became deeply interested in automobiles and went to work in a local garage. Presently he was recognized as an expert driver and mechanic. Leaving Davenport, young Ely found employment in the town of Cosgrove in Johnson County, where he became chauffeur for Father Smyth. Ely held the automobile speed record between Iowa City and Davenport.

CHAUFFEUR FOR FATHER SMYTH

The story is told that some years later a resident of a nearby village and a friend of the young chauffeur, not having seen him about for some time, inquired of Father Smyth where Ely had gone. The priest hesitated for a moment, and then with his distinctive Irish brogue, replied: "Ah, yes, Ely, Ely, I remember him well. He became entangled in the snares of a woman. He's married now." Ely was indeed married, and his bride was Miss Mabel Hall, of San Francisco, Calif.

Meanwhile Ely had taken up his residence in California, where he was engaged in the automobile business and was known as an expert driver. In a short time he was conducting an auto stage line from northern California to Oregon.

JOINED CURTISS SCHOOL

It was while he was thus engaged that his inquiring and mechanical mind became interested in aviation. He joined the school which Glenn H. Curtiss had established probably sometime in 1909. In this new adventure he soon became recognized as a leader in attempting to master the air. "No one had a clearer or cooler head, no one more thoroughly understood the mechanical requirements of aerial navigation." Recognizing him as a daring and skillful aviator, Curtiss induced Ely to join the Curtiss Exhibition Co. in 1910 and become one of the leading demonstrators of the Curtiss-built airplanes. It was in this capacity that he performed his epoch-making feats of flying to and from the decks of naval vessels.

Two months after a spectacular exploit from the deck of the cruiser U. S. S. *Birmingham* in Hampton Roads, Va., Ely was in San Francisco participating in another naval aviation experiment. Glenn H. Curtiss, who had trained several Army and Navy officers at his flying school in California, was anxious to demonstrate the value of aircraft in warfare. Again with the cooperation of the Navy, Ely made a 12-mile flight in a Curtiss biplane from Selfridge Field to the deck of the cruiser *Pennsylvania*, which was anchored in San Francisco Bay. Thus the feasibility of flying from shore to ship was demonstrated.

CANVAS TO STOP PLANE

For the purpose of accomplishing this landing a special platform had been erected on the stern of the vessel, and canvas shields had been stretched on each side to catch the machine if it should slide off the platform. Special arrangements were made to stop the airplane after it landed.

Ely left the field about 10:30 a. m. on January 18, 1911, climbed 2,000 feet, and crossed the San Bruno hills at a great height. He then headed straight for the warship. At the proper point he shut off his motor and glided down for a perfect landing. He had so little trouble in performing this feat that he believed he could do it 9 times out of 10 under moderate weather conditions. Although floats had been fitted beneath the lower plane on each side of the center section, this proved to be an unnecessary precaution. The aeroplane was brought to rest by means of a score of ropes stretched across the platform above the two rails which ran its entire length. These ropes were attached to sandbags at each end, and they were found to act as an efficient brake in checking the momentum of the machine.

LANDS ON "PENNSYLVANIA"

The flight of 12 miles was made in 13 minutes. Soon after Ely took off from Selfridge Field, the sailors in the fighting tops of the warship anchored amid the dense shipping in San Francisco Bay sighted him as a tiny speck above the hills. The speck grew larger as it rapidly approached and the surface of the biplane was outlined against the sky. As it neared the harbor Ely's aircraft descended rapidly until, when he flew over the *West Virginia* and the other small vessels, he was only 150 to 200 feet in the air. At just the right moment he shut off his motor and glided down to the platform on the stern of the *Pennsylvania*. He struck this 32 by 127 foot platform 25 feet from its outer end, which sloped downward 4 feet in 10.

After a reception of about an hour on shipboard, Ely returned to Selfridge Field the way he had come in 16 minutes.

[From the Des Moines Register of January 18, 1951]

ANNIVERSARY OF AN IOWAN'S PIONEER FLIGHT

Forty years ago today a daring Iowan made aviation history with the first successful airplane landing on the deck of a ship.

Today over Korea, carrier-based Navy Corsairs scour the battle fronts in a manner that Eugene Ely probably never foresaw in his wildest dreams.

Yet he was one of the pioneers who made carrier-based flight possible.

Ely's historic flight took place January 18, 1911, when he flew a 50-horsepower pusher Curtis biplane onto an improvised platform resting on the deck of the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* anchored in San Francisco Bay.

He was 25 at the time.

Ely was born on an Iowa farm 6 miles east of Williamsburg in 1886. His father later was an attorney and served as an Army colonel in World War I.

TO DAVENPORT

When he was 9, Ely moved with his parents to Davenport, where he attended the city schools. While in his teens, he became interested in automobiles and went to work in a local garage.

He soon became known as an expert driver and mechanic. He held the automobile speed record between Iowa City and Davenport. He attended and graduated from the State University of Iowa at Iowa City.

TURNS TO AVIATION

Later, the youth moved to California, married, and turned his inquiring and mechanical mind to aviation. He learned to fly, and early became associated with another aviation pioneer, Glenn H. Curtis.

Recognizing him as a daring and skillful aviator, Curtis induced Ely to join his company in 1910 to demonstrate Curtis-built planes.

On November 14, 1910, Ely successfully flew a Curtis biplane off the deck of a cruiser at Hampton Roads, Va. This prepared the way for the first airplane landing on a ship at sea.

A description of his famous 12-mile flight from Selfridge Field to the deck of the *Pennsylvania* in San Francisco Bay went as follows:

"Ely left the field about 10:30 a. m., climbed 2,000 feet and crossed the San Bruno Hills at a great height. He then headed straight for the warship. At the proper point he shut off his motor and glided down for a perfect landing."

STOPPED BY ROPES

The plane "was brought to rest by a score of ropes stretched across the platform above the two rails which ran its entire length. These ropes were attached to sand bags at each end, and they were found to act as an efficient brake in checking the momentum of the machine."

An observer on the ship wrote:

"We sighted Ely as a tiny speck over the hills. The speck grew larger as it rapidly approached and the surfaces of the biplane were outlined against the sky."

TWO HUNDRED FEET IN AIR

"As it neared the harbor, Ely's aircraft descended rapidly until, when he flew over the other vessels in the bay, he was only 150 to 200 feet in the air. At just the right moment he shut off his motor and glided down to the platform on the stern of the *Pennsylvania*.

"He struck the 32-by-127-foot platform 25 feet from its outer end."

THE FLYING CROSS

After a reception on the ship celebrating the success of the flight, Ely returned to Selfridge field the way he'd come—by flying from the ship's deck.

Eight months later he was killed in an airplane crash at Macon, Ga., on October 19, 1911. He was buried near his birthplace at Williamsburg.

For many years his exploits remained unknown, but 19 years later—in 1933—the United States Senate awarded him posthumously the Distinguished Flying Cross. It was received by his brother, Col. N. D. Ely.

Velvet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Robert C. Ruark's column of January 18, 1951, entitled "Velvet":

VELVET

(By Robert C. Ruark)

"Taxing until it hurts" is a relatively empty phrase, since I never knew a man to squirm with pleasure when suddenly chopped off at the hip pockets, but as an individual you find it easy to resent the use of that phrase in Harry Truman's mouth.

The man wants another sixteen billion extra. This drives the annual tax nut up to beyond seventy billion skins. These dollars come, directly or indirectly, from individuals, I am an individual. You are an individual. And so is Harry S. Truman.

In his recent budget speech Mr. Truman has exhorted the people to pare another necessity off the weekly cash outlay in order to meet the fresh demands of Government and defense. I will be pleased to break out the peeler and pare with the other kids, but in this instance I want it unanimous.

Unanimous includes Mr. Truman, who knocks off a cash grab of 50 lovely G-notes each and every—gorgeous [illegible] bills because they are subject neither to

scrutiny, account, nor the itching palm of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

This is a fee the gamblers describe as "off the top," meaning that it is literally in large coarse bills and, therefore, is not liable to the tax take. It is the exempt tip they voted Harry a couple of years back, and which he eagerly endorsed.

The way we heave the scratch around, I do not care if they pay Harry a million a year, because the lumps of being President demand a big salary. They can give him another million in expenses, if needed, and no squawk. But tax him they must.

As the symbolic man—as Mister America, as the leader, the boss, the mirror of us all—the fellow has just plain got to be subservient to the laws which govern us all, or admit that no American can subsist on his earnings.

If you and I are to be taxed until it hurts, then Mister Truman has some aches coming, too. Such as making that tax-free, nonaccountable $50,000 a year—which he receives in addition to his salary and equipment and travel and entertainment expenses—subject to the same laws on income that afflict everybody else in the land.

If Mr. Truman draws a gun, in a fit of anger at a critic, and shoots him dead, then you would expect the law to take its course, with an indictment for murder, a trial by jury, and a just and honest sentence by a judge who awaits the back of the 12 good men. This is law—"all men are created free and equal."

The free and equal business includes Presidents, and it works both ways. For the boons you accept the penalties, and it seems to me you cannot except in any case, including the case of the President of the United States. Soldiers pay taxes on their earnings, too, you know.

Saying he survives his term, Mr. Truman will have been able to squirrel away $300,000 of nontaxable money for the 4 years, outside his salary, expenses, and perquisites such as yachts, trains, cars, planes, and such similar truck. Nobody else alive can hive up that much from earned income under the current tax structure, which the beamish boy is shouting to increase.

Except, of course, General of the Army Eisenhower, who was allowed a capital gains interpretation on about $750,000 revenue from a book he wrote about the war. This meant only a 26 percent deduction for a one-shot author. Other ex-soldiers who wrote books got slashed for the regular earned-income percentage.

Both Mr. Truman's free $50,000 annually, and General Eisenhower's allowance of capital gains, represent a gross insult to the other people who work at all trades, pay taxes, and now are told to take another reef in their belts.

We'll haul taut joyfully, if it applies to all, but if they tax me 'til it hurts, I want the hurt spread out to everybody. Including President Truman. Including General Eisenhower. We're all in the same business. American citizenship.

"No" Is Red China's Answer to UN Cease-Fire Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Mansfield News-Journal, Thursday, January 18, 1951. I certainly recommend this editorial for the reading of all:

"NO" IS RED CHINA'S ANSWER TO UN CEASE-FIRE PROPOSAL

As expected, the Chinese puppets have uttered Russia's "No" to the United Nations proposal for a cease-fire order in Korea. The Red-manipulated Peiping government came back with five-point counterproposals. If these proposals were translated into eventual action they would mean that United States forces withdraw from Korea and Formosa and that Red China be admitted to the UN.

In other words, the diplomats are right back where they started.

On the actual fighting front, American forces under the UN flag made a few gains early this week. But no one is deceived. Our men have been forced back headlong from the Manchurian border.

General MacArthur has been maligned because he is not winning a war which he knew it was folly to start—and which he is expected to fight under the polite rules laid down by impractical Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

A recent letter from one of the fighting men on the Korean front told his parents, "I am feeling pretty bitter." And small wonder. Americans are ordered to let the enemy bring up all the supplies he wants to the Korean border without interference. Americans are not permitted to attack sources of supply in Manchuria.

Secretary Acheson's reasoning is that we must not get involved in a war we are already in.

On the other hand, if recent UN advances were to mark a turning point in the Korean war; if, by some wild stretch of imagination, United States troops with token assistance from their allies were to drive all the Chinese out of Korea and redefeat the North Koreans—then what?

The vast Communist machine would stand ready to infiltrate or conquer Korea again at the first moment our attention was directed elsewhere.

The truth of the matter is, President Truman has involved this Nation in a pointless war. We now have three choices: get out of it as best we can; go on fighting an endless limited action in Korea with thousands of Americans giving up their lives; or becoming involved in a world conflict starting in Asia. Even Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson recognize that the real enemy is Russia. But they choose to fight Russia with words and her puppets with American lives and wealth.

The Kremlin no doubt finds this quite amusing.

The Resolution To Declare Red China an Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, at its Friday session this House by an overwhelming bipartisan vote adopted a resolution calling upon the United Nations to declare Red China an aggressor in Korea.

The unity displayed in the House on this vote will have a great salutary dual effect. It will show the Nation that we are cognizant of the serious crisis which we face and are willing to act promptly, decisively, and courageously as the occasion arises. It will also serve a second purpose, namely, it will show the rest of the world that the Americans are united when it comes to matters affecting our national security.

There is no doubt that there is a genuine bewilderment abroad about the events inside the United States. People abroad seem to sense a deep and frightening split within our country on basic issues confronting America and the world.

We need more frequent positive assertions to aid them in understanding us and to bolster their confidence in our leadership and in our unity.

Even with our tremendous military strength we need the people of the world genuinely on our side, and we need to state and prove more clearly what our side stands for. Our effort must center around a definition of American purpose—clearly but imaginatively conceived and spoken. That purpose must not be theoretical, but visible.

We must first understand and make it clear to all the people of our country and to our friends and prospective allies, that our fate in the world and the fate of human freedom is tied up with that of other free nations and peoples.

We must have a strong military force to guarantee our security and to redeem our peace pledges under the United Nation Charter. Our job is peace. It is peace without appeasement, but it is not war, unless others cause that war.

As our President so ably stated in his address on the state of the Union, our cause is peace, freedom, and justice. But more precious than peace are freedom and justice.

The war to maintain peace and to allow freedom to survive cannot be won by arms alone. It has to be won by capturing, first or ultimately, the loyalties of people to freedom and peace. To do so first, is best and less costly in terms of bloody sacrifice.

We must take a fair and realistic view of the attitude of the European nations in the present crisis which we face. Theirs is a grim prospect. Their lands may well be our battlefields. We must make it clear that we know it too, and that this knowledge is an inherent element of our strategic plan to persuade them to drop reluctance to accept American leadership.

We do not need to dramatize the dangers of communism to Europeans. They have had first-hand opportunity to understand and dread those dangers. Their fears are based, rather, on the doubts as to our willingness and ability to act firmly to protect the ideals which we profess.

Our capacity to lead the fight against communism or any other form of totalitarianism will be judged not so much by what we say, but by what we do; not so much by our anxiety over human rights and freedoms as by our determination to act to keep those freedoms safe and healthy, wherever they are threatened throughout the world.

And in this connection, Mr. Speaker, may I say that much of the doubt and hesitation of the free European nations

results from our failure to speak up clearly, and act when the rights of the free and liberty-loving people were trampled upon in Poland and in the other countries beyond the iron curtain.

When Soviet Russia flagrantly and brutally violated its pledges under the Yalta and Teheran agreements—agreements in which we made commitments which we never should have made—and when it enslaved millions of Poles and other peoples who believed in freedom, democracy, and in the leadership of the United States and its allies, then it became our solemn duty to act by condemning the act of aggression, just as we did Friday in the case of Korea and Red China. But we failed to act, and those peoples are living today under a brutal tyranny and are suffering unbelievable acts of persecution. Regardless of that, however, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that those peoples have not yet lost faith in our leadership and may be counted on again to take up arms and overthrow their yoke of slavery if and when the occasion arises.

We have lost much time and ground in our battle to save ourselves and civilization. But we can still regain that ground and succeed, if we determine to act firmly, boldly, and decisively to defend the high and lofty principles to which we have dedicated ourselves.

Should the 18-Year-Old Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the young editors of the University School News, which school is located in Cleveland, Ohio, wrote an editorial for his paper which appeared January 12, 1951. Since the Congress is giving consideration to the drafting of 18-year-olds, I believe the Congress should give consideration to the thinking and expressions of this group. They certainly are entitled to express their views.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the above-mentioned editorial:

SHOULD THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE?—EDITOR SAYS "YES"

The papers recently announced that the Defense Department intends to ask Congress to permit the drafting of 18-year-olds. We're back to the war period where we exchange our June high school diploma for an army suit and helmet. We have to defend our country—it's part of our economic and political system. Yet, come to think of it, do we get to choose the leaders who determine those political and economic policies? Do we, who must defend this great country and its political leaders, get to decide who should be the officials to make those policies which may or may not involve us in wars that could or could not ruin our own lives and future?

In other words, this editor advocates that 18-, 19-, or 20-year-olds be permitted to vote.

If we are forced to sacrifice our lives for democracy—which is all very well—then we should be permitted to choose that democracy's leaders.

In the State of Georgia 18-year-olds are permitted to vote, and today the State has two Senators who are two of the most capable and highly respected in the United States Senate.

All in all, if we defend our political institutions, then we should be able to confirm or vote them out. Do you agree?

Federal Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will be called upon shortly to raise additional revenue for national defense and necessary Government expense. The following is an editorial taken out of the Huronite, a daily newspaper, printed and published in the city of Huron, S. Dak., which requires the careful consideration, not only of all the Members of Congress, but of the American people generally.

The editorial is as follows:

TALK OF FEDERAL SALES TAX

With $16,500,000,000—23 percent—of President Truman's $71,600,000,000 budget for 1952 to be met by new taxes on borrowing, or both, talk of a Federal sales tax is heard again throughout the land. President Truman is said to oppose the proposal at present, and his Council of Economic Advisers opposes a Federal tax on mass consumption items as "an inordinate burden on low-income families." But Senator BYRD (Democrat, Virginia), recipient of the President's recent "Dear HARRY" letter, says the Government must "enter new fields of taxation—probably such as a retail sales or transaction tax." When the chips are finally down, the administration may have to choose between a large deficit in 1952 and sales taxation.

Except as a measure to pull in sorely needed revenue in a national emergency, a sales tax—ordinarily opposed by retail business organizations and by farm and labor groups—would be looked upon by most Members of Congress as too unpopular for enactment. Even in the depression year of 1932 a Republican administration was unable to obtain approval of a sales-tax measure. President Hoover had asked "an extension for a limited period of the many special excise taxes to a more general manufacturers' excise tax." The Senate voted 58 to 27 against; the House, 223 to 153 against.

Opponents of sales taxes call these measures regressive; that is, they are said to fall hardest on those least able to pay. Earlier in 1932, 4 months before he unequivocally recommended a manufacturers' sales tax, Under Secretary of the Treasury Ogden Mills had told the House Ways and Means Committee the tax bore no relation to ability to pay. At that time he opposed the tax also because of "the great administrative difficulties involved and the almost inevitable pyramiding of the tax in the course of successive sales."

In 1948 the Democrats considered the idea of a Federal sales tax unpopular enough to warrant the charge that the Republicans had elaborate plans to enact one. Senator BARKLEY, candidate for Vice President, challenged Governor Dewey to tell the country whether GOP plans contemplated "the levy of a general sales tax by the Federal Government in addition to those now levied by the States."

Some evidence that the line-up against a Federal sales tax may be cracking is furnished by a recent statement by Ralph W. Button, chairman of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, who said: "Such a uniform tax is the only way left to let the public know what they're paying." The National Association of Manufacturers, which has long favored a Federal sales tax, recommends for the period of defense and partial mobilization "a uniform excise tax on all end products of manufacturers except food and food products, to replace all existing excises except those on alcoholic beverages and tobacco."

Present excise taxes, the NAM points out, include not less than 20 classes of goods taxed on the basis of the final manufacturers' price. An over-all tax on all consumer products except food at a rate of 5 percent, according to NAM estimates, would produce the $4,000,000,000 in revenue realized by present excise taxes in 1949. In addition, the NAM proposes a special defense tax rate of another 5 percent, to produce $2,500,000,000 of additional revenue for defense purposes.

Great Britain's purchase tax is essentially a manufacturers' sales tax. Current rates are 33⅓ percent of wholesale price for necessities; 66⅔ percent for semiluxuries; 100 percent for luxuries. At retail, these rates sift down to 25, 50, and 75 percent, respectively. The rate (wholesale) for luxuries shot up as high as 125 percent at the peak of the postwar austerity program.

Promotion of a Federal sales tax, however, is going to come right smack up against the fact that the new income tax to be levied is aimed at the $2,000 to $4,000 income group which—as a group—has the greatest reservoir of money to go after. Individually, members of that group will be hard hit by the 1951 income tax and putting a Federal sales tax on top of that will be imposing a real financial difficulty.

In the face of that it will be very hard for the administration to argue in behalf of continued unabashed spending for so-called Fair Deal measures as FEPC, Federal medical insurance, and the Brannan farm subsidy plan. It is hard to see the logic in any argument that those plans would help the very economic bracket on which the administration plans to place the greatest tax increase this year to pay for it.

Public Liars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Bruce Barton from the Washington Star of January 21, 1951:

PUBLIC LIARS

(By Bruce Barton)

Simeon Strunsky, with his charming mixture of wit and wisdom, once wrote an essay against Public Liars. He denounced the weighing machine which stands with such disarming stolidity in the railroad station, inviting your penny, only to give you the wrong weight or no weight at all. He arraigned the crooked thermometer outside the drugstore door. What a travesty of justice, he exclaimed, to be betrayed by a courthouse clock. What a horrible blow to a

trusting heart to be lied to by a weather vane atop the steeple of a church.

Like Mr. Strunsky, we Americans always have hated public liars, men or machines. Schoolboys were raised on the story of George Washington and the little cherry tree: "Father, I cannot tell a lie."

The greatest figures in our history—Jefferson, Adams, Lincoln—never questioned the Biblical test of an upright man—one "that sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not."

Today public lying has become almost the rule rather than the exception. And the idealists, the reformers, the professional friends of the people are, on the whole, worse than the old-line politicos.

Fiorello LaGuardia was a great liberal whom no reporter wanted to interview unless there were a witness present. Franklin Roosevelt's reign gave birth to the cynical phrase "conditioning the public mind"—meaning, "tell 'em only what, and only as much, as you think will promote the policies which you, in your superior wisdom, have decided are good for them."

Consider the recent performance of New York's Mayor O'Dwyer. In the face of a gambling scandal he resigned without warning, to be hidden away by President Truman in the Embassy in Mexico City. The New York papers then printed the record of eight separate public denials by him that he ever would resign, all of them issued in a few previous weeks. He deserved to be thrown out of public life. Instead, he was promoted.

This, I think is something we ought to get mad about. We ought to keep a boxscore of all the lies told by every important public official and every seeker after public office. A lot of us, regardless of party, would be glad to vote for the candidate who had lied the least.

Is Our Bill of Rights Still Potent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Timken Essay Contest, of November 17, 1950, was sponsored by the Timken Roller Bearing Co., of Canton, Ohio, for boys and girls who were regularly attending the junior or senior—grades 11 and 12—classes of high school and were children of Timken employees.

Its purpose was to instill in these children who will be entering the business and industrial world in the near future a fuller realization of just what the American way of life as lived through the Bill of Rights really means to everyone.

In entering the contest, the students naturally had to do a good amount of research on the subject and this studying no doubt made a more lasting impression in their minds than their previous exposition to the subject.

The entries were limited to less than 1,000 words and were judged on literary style, contents, and evidence of original thought and imagination applied to the subject.

The contest was judged by a five-man board of men not connected in any way with the company. They were: Right Rev. Msgr. George N. Habig, pastor of St. Peter's Catholic Church; Rev. Willard I. Hackenberg, pastor of the Trinity Lutheran Church; Rabbi Lawrence H. Charney, of Shaary Torah Congregation; Judge George N. Graham, Stark County Common Pleas Court; Clayton G. Horn, editor in chief, the Canton Repository.

Prizes awarded were in United States savings bonds as follows: First, $300; second, $200; third, $100, and 10 additional prizes of $50 each, totaling $1,100.

Winner of the contest was Joyce Ann Urbach, 16-year-old junior at McKinley High School, Canton, Ohio. She is the daughter of Harley J. Urbach, works engineer for the company. The essay follows:

UNITED STATES BILL OF RIGHTS CAN SAVE FREEDOM

(By Joyce Ann Urbach)

We, the youth of today, are growing up enveloped in the problems of war and peace. We cannot remember a time free from war or the threat of war. We look to the future, not with a bright, eager expectancy as our parents did, but with doubt and hesitancy at what we see. Just what does lie ahead in this world left to us by our elders?

For a century and a half the Bill of Rights has stood as a magnificent signpost of personal freedom, but it can only point the way. The road to freedom we must travel ourselves.

Americans have sometimes stumbled on this road, but they have always surged forward with a driving force. They have been inspired by the knowledge that what they were working toward was the best form of government yet established on this earth * * * a government of freedom and equality.

For twenty-odd years now there has been an outside force trying to turn us from our rocky road of freedom to the smooth road of communism—smooth because it is effortless just to drift along with the masses. Men acting as mechanical robots with all precious free spirit gone.

Will the Communist plan succeed, or are the people of this country beginning to realize just what has been happening? Many people are now aware of this outside threat against our freedoms, but what about the threat from internal sources? Is our Bill of Rights in danger of violation in our own Government? Are there certain stumbling blocks set out on our road to freedom that seem to flash red as a warning sign?

For the past 18 or 20 years, our Government has lived by deficit financing. Debt destroys confidence, inertia sets in, and socialism is just a step further. The Government steps over the line between democracy and socialism when, through spending and debt, it levies taxes on private business to the extent that companies cannot carry the tax burden and continue to grow. It is absolutely astonishing to know that $10,000,000 a year is used to operate Government-owned automobiles. Can this be anything but mismanagement of our money? Our generation will have to carry a terrific burden of taxation largely due to the unwise spending of our predecessors. This is, in form, a curtailment of our liberties and may be considered unjust taxation on us.

Two bills that may come to the new Congress when it assembles are the Brannan plan and the bill for socialized medicine. We are teetering on the edge of a precipice when the Government ceases to regulate and begins to manage. So long as men are free to choose their own work and develop their chosen fields America will march forward and prosper.

The Brannan plan would, in substance, tell the farmers what, when, and how they can grow their crops. Are not such controls infringement of personal freedom?

Socialized medicine means the Government would tell us what doctor we could call and tell the doctor what people he could serve. These things must not happen. We must keep our freedom of incentive. Because of this our country has grown great and will continue to grow in all things that better our standards of living. This freedom distinguishes America from any other country. It's a freedom we must save.

Freedom of speech is a very precious heritage. It gave a man the right to say in Cleveland that some day, "We—meaning the CIO—will be able to tell the press what to print and what not to print." By exercising one right he abused his responsibility to another. If the press ever becomes controlled by any pressure group we will have completely strayed from our freedom road.

Freedom of the press came to the aid of our freedom of speech when General MacArthur was not allowed to give his recent address, but it subsequently appeared in the newspapers. It has been truly said, "A state which dwarfs its men in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands, even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

According to the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights the really flagrant abuse of the Bill of Rights is in regard to the Negro situation in the Southern States. There are seven States in the South with poll taxes that keep the majority of the Negroes from voting. There are many records of unfair and prejudiced trials held in southern courts.

This minority race in our country suffers from many discriminations because of color. Where even a small section of our people suffer the loss of their rights as set down by our early leaders, our ideal of democracy is not completely realized. There should be constant effort to make the Bill of Rights a living experience of all our people regardless of color.

These are a few of the threats to our freedom and security. Notice that they are stumbling blocks which can be rolled away. They have not yet become permanent barriers on our freedom road.

There are and always have been two kinds of government—without consent of the people and with consent of the people. Because our fathers suffered under the first, they chose the second. They believed in democracy and freedom; we believe in it too. We must back our belief with positive action. Believe, act, think American, all the way.

We, the youth, in order to have faith in the future must come to the conclusion that our Bill of Rights is still potent.

We must know that the American people will not let us down.

We want to know that they are aware of the existing threats to the basic freedoms, and will see to it that we have the chance that they did.

We should have the opportunity to enjoy all the liberties granted under the protective framework of our American Constitution.

It will then become our responsibility and privilege, with the help of God, to defend, preserve, and pass on to future generations our most sacred heritage—the American way of life.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I included in the Appendix of the RECORD, a report and a number of signatures on a petition concerning the wishes and desires of constituents of the Second District of Colorado, particularly Boulder, on the war in Korea. Today I include additions to the petition and a clarification of the objectives of the organization:

COMMITTEE FOR DECISION IN KOREA,
Boulder, Colo.

Your signature has been noted on the petitions signed at the public meeting held Sunday, January 7, 1951.

As you know this demonstration by the people can be effective only if it is Nationwide.

You can help by forwarding the enclosed petitions to your friends and relatives in other localities in the Nation, telling them of the campaign and urging a public meeting in their community.

When writing to your friends or relatives, we suggest you include the following explanations:

1. A legacy of $5,000 received from a service man killed in Korea, is being used to urge people to demonstrate their opinion to Congress and the President.

2. A few statements should be included about the letter which set off the venture and the public meeting in Boulder which followed it:

3. The purpose of this group is not to form public opinion, but to bring it into focus.

4. The urgency of immediate action cannot be overstressed; events in Korea demand it.

5. We seek a decision in Korea around which American people can unite.

6. Originals of the petition should be returned to this committee; we recommend that certified true copies be sent to your representatives in Congress.

The most important action to be taken, however, in addition to completing the petition is—a letter or telegram to President Harry Truman and congressional representatives. Now is the time to revive our democratic heritage of action.

COMMITTEE FOR DECISION IN KOREA,
R. A. MARTINSON, *Chairman.*

SIGNERS OF THE PETITION

Ralph Nielsen, Frank R. Burton, John E. Anderson, Harry M. Nordlok, Strasburg, Colo.; Donald W. Jackson, Byers, Colo.; Henry Fruhling, Niel I. English, Elmer Hopper, O. E. Brown, Mrs. Zylpha Brown, Strasburg, Colo.; Mrs. Zylpha Snavely, Byers, Colo.; Miss Martha Belanga, C. J. Linnehus, Mrs. C. J. Linnehus, Strasburg, Colo.; George F. Tegeler, H. Strot, Everett Douglass, Richard T. Bothwell, Wiggins, Colo.; Henry Lebsock, Brush, Colo.; G. L. Bothwell, Jesse Bernard, Robert C. Larson, Wiggins, Colo.; C. L. Maritt, Burney Sloan, Strasburg, Colo.; H. E. Bryson, Denver, Colo.; Mrs. Vern Rice, Strasburg, Colo.; R. W. Helling, Limon, Colo.; Donald Rin, Armal C. Hanson, Vernon D. Whelden, Emma Ehlers, Dal E. Gabbert, Strasburg, Colo.; D. R. Baldwin, Denver, Colo.; Doris White, Mrs. James Warren, H. H. Kruse, A. Dorothy Peacko, Strasburg, Colo.; Lohma Palmer, L. J. Tippett, Byers, Colo.; Martha A. Nordloh, John H. Nordloh, Reed L. Nordloh, Strasburg, Colo.; Courtland Rybicka, Bennett, Colo.; Claude H. Baxter, Robert Rice, Richard Rice, Vern Rice, Betty Rice, Jean Rice, Beulah Barrois, Wanda Barrois, Strasburg, Colo.; Roy Hinkle, Marvin Hinkle, Nell Hinkle, Lucille Hinkle, Wiggins, Colo.; D. Mitchell, Strasburg, Colo.; Robert Ehrlich, Weldona, Colo.; Mrs. I. L. Wirth, J. L. Wirth, Wiggins, Colo.; Raymond Minaem, Byers, Colo.; Fred Poston, Henry G. Bartholomew, P. R. Hamilton, Charles B. Nordloh, Erushel O. Nordloh, William P. Nordloh, Ellen Belle Nordloh, Mrs. P. R. Hamilton, Chuck Landon, Strasburg, Colo.; Lyle Ingersoll, Platteville, Colo.; Floyd Price, Strasburg, Colo.; William C. Beck, Bennett, Colo.; Joan Klein, Donald Price, Neva A. Burton, Lina V. Gluter, Leon Birney, C. H. Wilson, Earl Ennis, Eugene Berney, Strasburg, Colo.; Bobbie Adams, Lucille Palmer, Clifford Orusby, Junior Gordley, Byers, Colo.; Ed G. Sobert, Beatrice Luke, T. J. Weddell, Marian Weddell, Strasburg, Colo.; Loren A. Guy, Deertrail, Colo.; Chester D. Derby, Walter L. Best, Byers, Colo.; Russell Pote, Strasburg, Colo.; Howard Fox, Denver, Colo.; Victor D. Wright, Strasburg, Colo.; Otis Fitch, Burlin Pitts, Byers, Colo.; C. E. Finkbeiner, Little Rock, Ark.; B. J. Wawak, Bigelow, Ark.; Freeman Scott, Sanford L. Scott, James G. Wassin, Oryly Luse, Strasburg, Colo.; H. McLaughlin, Denver, Colo.; Frank Nyback, Strasburg, Colo.; Clifford Smith, Byers, Colo.; C. Oudukirk, Strasburg, Colo.; Russell W. Wood, Joe Andreotto, Denver, Colo.; James W. Sounsen, Wallace B. Black, J. W. McLaughlin, Raymond L. Zybeck, L. M. Montgomery, Dorothy Driscoll, Gene Rice, Joe Tibebon, Chuck Bates, Strasburg, Colo.; William F. Guye, Bennett, Colo.; B. L. Moorehead, Strasburg, Colo.; Robert M. West, Wheatridge, Colo.; Harold D. Carmichal, Indian Hills, Colo.; Theodore Billinger, Brighton, Colo.; Mrs. Nell Bradley, Walter Llewellyn, Mabel Llewellyn, Fred Beitler, A. W. Stahl, Ralph W. Williamson, William J. Kerksiek, Ross Bliss, Karl M. Luke, Charles T. Heinricy, John E. Williams, Roy H. Punk, L. W. Burchfield, R. L. Beitts, Rubert A. Haugen, John Schmidt, Craig Miller, H. M. Mermenge, Frank Roberts, J. H. Ferguson, Lee Cooper, J. A. Hart, Gunnor Herskinel, Oliver Hibbs, Cecil M. Cook, Philander B. Rice, George Michell, R. H. Bauman, J. L. Pinzenseham, Phillip E. Pinzenseham, J. R. Rhine, Otto Engelbrecht, Benney Sloan, John Nordloh, Jr., Willis I. Young, Strasburg, Colo.; Chris Voldin, Byers, Colo.; A. P. Wagner, Strasburg, Colo.; Ben Wolden, Jr., Byers, Colo.; Halver Walden, Spring Valley, Minn.; O. L. Johnson, Denver Colo.; Glen Clark, Robert Beutels, Ross Perry, Byers, Colo.; C. L. Huston, J. W. Weddell, E. A. Meller, Audrey Cooper, May Cooper, Naonis I. Young, Elsie Kerksiek, Ethel Pinzenseham, Fannie Morehead, Strasburg, Colo.; E. D. Trour, Deertrail, Colo.; Richard Vansyou, Walter Vansyou, Lydia Beitz, J. O. Beitz, W. H. Scott, Byers, Colo.; J. D. Rogers, Strasburg, Colo.; James E. Hunter, Bennett, Colo.; Herb Barr, Byers, Colo.; Lyle L. Butler, Strasburg, Colo.; Arlie Manen, Byers, Colo.; Ed Savard, Arthur E. Phillips, Wilmer Pimberton, Strasburg, Colo.; Tom Pemberton, Agate, Colo.; George Williams, Floyd R. Hamilton, Bill Pinchock, Strasburg, Colo.; A. W. Henderson, Watkins, Colo.; N. Scheure, L. W. Podoll, Aurora, Colo.; E. B. Zimmeurs, Denver, Colo.; Walter Schroth, Joseph R. McElroy, Bub Bordner, Alvin Young, John Clair, Georgia E. Clair, Harold B. Tuffs, Barney Stoffel, Sr., Tom Brockman, Glen Lascasta, Barney Stoffel, Jr., Bennett, Colo.; Phil Tann, Greeley, Colo.; Norman Toft, C. R. Shuer, G. W. Hanlon, Ralph Hanlon, Roy Hanlon, Alvin Tedesko, Bennett, Colo.

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials and an article relative to the excellent address made by former Postmaster General James A. Farley to the State Chamber of Commerce of Florida in November of last year be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The first is entitled "Farley Looks at November 7," and appeared in the Bridgeport Post on November 24, 1950. The second is entitled, "Mr. Farley Woos the South," and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on November 23, 1950. The third is in a column headed "Reflections says Farley makes a diagnosis," and appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle, November 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bridgeport Post of November 24, 1950]

FARLEY LOOKS AT NOVEMBER 7

From all sections of the country political pundits have been having their say about the election on November 7, in varying degrees of importance.

Perhaps the most significant analysis has come from James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman, who in two elections successfully presented Franklin D. Roosevelt to the voters of the country, and then broke with him on the third-term principle. Mr. Farley has always been outspoken about principles, in and out of politics.

Although not active politically since then, the former Postmaster General still knows more about the Democratic Party, and the men and women who make up that party, than any other citizen. There is no question about his qualifications to speak on the effect of the November 7 results on the party which he led to power.

Defeats of union-endorsed candidates clearly indicate that the country does not want an independent labor party, he told the Florida Chamber of Commerce. "The principle upon which this Nation rests is that individuals vote as individuals, not as members of blocs. They vote their convictions through the party of their choice, and that party represents all interests, business and agricultural, labor and capital," Mr. Farley said.

There are many lessons to be drawn, he said, which may not only make for a better Democratic Party, but a better two-party system for the Nation. He has always been a stanch believer in the two-party system and has often pointed out that it would be an error for labor unions to form a party of their own. The Ohio election proved beyond doubt how the people, and workingmen themselves, feel about a labor party. Yet, he noted, there has been great danger that labor would do this through union political organizations set up in districts and in States.

Such a development would be contrary to the theory of government under our American two-party system, since it would allow the elimination of policies by one issue and by one group in the community. It was this fear, he believes, that drove many Democrats into the Taft column in Ohio.

In his clear and frank appraisal of the results, he does not believe that people prefer to support third, or splinter parties, of which there were two in New York State. He scored the Democratic Party for allowing the Liberal Party, though less radical than the American Labor Party, to move in and dictate candidates. He pointed out the perils to European stability because of the multiplicity of parties.

He believes the election carried a warning to the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs for at least the duration. He mentioned specifically the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments. They won no honors in the recent election, the former chairman said, declaring that we want to be a humane progressive Nation, but we cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got.

Mr. Farley urged the abandonment of the proposed Federal civil rights legislation, because the problems cannot be solved on a Federal basis. They belong to the States or to the region, and he finds the Southern States solving their problems in this regard successfully without the heavy hand of law.

Mr. Farley's talk was filled with common sense, and if the Fair Dealers have any of that rare commodity, they will agree with him and change their partisan tactics. If they don't, Democrats will continue to vote with the more conservative Republicans, just as they did in Ohio.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 23, 1950]

MR. FARLEY WOOS THE SOUTH

James A. Farley, one may assume, did not journey all the way to Tampa just to hear himself talk. The former Postmaster General's address before the Florida Chamber of Commerce covered a variety of topics, but the references to civil rights appear to have a special purpose. It must have been pleasing to southerners to hear the former national chairman of the Democratic Party say that "most of the problems raised by the so-called civil rights program are gradually and peacefully being solved right here in the South." While Mr. Farley's position may not utterly coincide with that of the Dixiecrats, it is certainly the complete opposite of everything that President Truman and the Democratic Party profess to advocate. Mr. Farley was giving the audience what they wanted to hear—that Federal legislation is the wrong approach, that Mr. Truman really ought to sit down to friendly chats with the southern leaders, and that good people can be trusted to do the right thing.

The trouble, from the South's viewpoint, is that Mr. Farley holds no position within his party. He speaks merely for himself, but the Farley opinion in political matters commands respect. And when Mr. Farley says that his party is pretty much wrong on civil rights, it is logical to assume that he is prepared to push the challenge. Just what he proposes to do is not plain, but the evidence has been mounting for some time that this Democrat would like to get back into some seat of political power. Perhaps Mr. Farley is convinced that a swing to the right is on, and calculates that the South is just the place to try out. As a political analyst and tactician, he is among the best. It is easy to imagine that Mr. Farley would like to direct a conservative turnabout in the Democratic Party. How he could ever sell the southern idea of civil rights to the big-city Democrats is a trifle obscure, but then the expert politician is always good at hybridizing.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of November 30, 1950]

HEFFERNAN SAYS FARLEY MAKES A DIAGNOSIS

What was in an editorial this commentator wrote in May of 1931 is beyond recall. But in his files he finds a letter in which James A. Farley wrote: "When I am again in Brooklyn I shall drop in and say hello to you, as I believe a personal chat would enable me to give you some information as to what I am trying to do around the State." In what he was trying to do then he was conspicuously successful.

Nineteen years, heavily freighted, have passed into hectic history since that letter reached my desk. Mr. Farley has been around the State, around the Nation, and around the world. He has learned much. His recent speech to the Florida Chamber of Commerce encompassed much of what he learned.

It was good medicine. The political doctor made an excellent diagnosis and prescribed medication.

"Somehow," said Mr. Farley, "I feel, as a Democrat, that the results generally, while they indicated a Republican trend, were good for the Democratic Party. That party still holds the Presidency and it still holds both Houses of Congress. There are some Democrats who are disappointed.

"And there are some who were never real Democrats who were deeply disappointed. But out of the lessons of this election we can draw some wisdom that may make for a better and more unified Democratic Party and a better two-party system for the Nation as a whole. I shall mention a few of these lessons."

It is not too difficult to identify those who were never real Democrats. Some of them transcended the bounds of democracy in the train of the leader in whose cause Jim Farley entered the political lists 19 years ago. Some of them went down to defeat in the recent election.

After touching briefly on the revolt of the workers against the labor bosses, notably in Ohio, Mr. Farley held up as a warning to honest liberals the danger of bloc or splinter parties which had reduced France to impotency when Hitler attacked and which now make difficult her decisions in the matter of rearming Germany.

We can pass his approval of the inclusion of Spain in the western alliance, and his plan for raising defense funds.

Mr. Farley's views on the outstanding issues of the late campaign might well receive consideration from Mr. Truman if he has in mind the conciliation of many interests, particularly those of the South. Thus:

"As we turn from parties to issues there is another real lesson in this election. Confronted as we are with a great peril in our foreign relations, with immense deficits and heavy taxation, the voters have made it clear that they want the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs for at least the duration. The Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments won no honors in this election. We cannot be big-hearted with money we don't have.

"This election and the primaries in the South that preceded it showed further that this country has no desire to follow Socialist Britain in adopting socialized medicine.

"Freemen in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense can generally be trusted to do what is right. I say to those anxious people who are too ready to lift the threat of authority to leave recovery to the spirit of liberty."

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD three excellent editorials respecting a recent address by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of November 23, 1950]

FARLEY GIVES ADVICE TO FELLOW DEMOCRATS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, November 22.—Probably the sagest of the political observers of our times is James A. Farley, who, after twice piloting a Presidential nominee to success at the polls, nevertheless parted from that same individual on a matter of principle—opposing a break in the third-term tradition.

What Farley says now in analyzing the recent election is particularly significant and revealing. For it is the opinion of a man who, more than any other outside of public office, knows what the Democratic Party really means to its followers and what it can mean in pursuing a course that might be termed sound instead of unsound liberalism.

The man who not only served in the late President Roosevelt's Cabinet as Postmaster General, but who led the Democratic National Committee is certainly entitled to speak about the Democratic Party as an institution.

"First," says Farley concerning the last election, "it showed in Ohio and in several other places that neither the Republican nor the Democratic Parties, nor the workingman himself, nor the voters generally want an independent labor party. I have many times made myself clear on this subject.

"Since labor unions became an effective force in our economy, it has been suggested by some that labor might conceivably form a political party of its own, with the avowed objective of presenting its aims through the medium of a platform sponsored by an independent labor party.

"I want to say that I am definitely opposed to such an idea because I am a firm believer in the two-party system.

"The great danger since the two big labor federations have set up their own political organizations is that in many districts and in some States these organizations might well supplant one or both of the regular parties. The result of this would be the elimination of policies by one issue and by one group in the community. That is quite contrary to the whole theory of government in this Republic under a two-party system. The fear of that in Ohio I know in this year's election drove many Democrats to vote for TAFT. And it is also clear that thousands of union members refused to be told how to vote by the political arms of the unions and voted for TAFT in protest."

This is a frank exposition by one who knows the trends in party fortunes and the changing attitudes of voters. Farley, however, not only refers to what happened in Ohio, but in his latest speech—made in the deep South at Tampa, Fla.—he calls attention to the way the American Labor Party, which he says "came to be heavily influenced by Communists," ran a ticket in New York State that was thoroughly buried by the regular party vote. He adds that he is happy to note that the outlook is very dark for third or fourth parties in this country.

The former chief of the Democratic National Committee condemns also the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments and calls on the President to summon the leaders of the South to solve civil-rights problems on a regional and State basis.

"To pass a law," he remarks with reference to this issue that has aroused the South, "especially a Federal law, is never the best way to correct an injustice."

What Farley says to his fellow Democrats and to the Nation will be discussed widely. For it is the beginning of a very important dissent against new dealism and fair dealism which has been smoldering for some time, but which is now coming to the surface as the independent Democrats, forced to choose between radicalism under the Democratic banner or antiradicalism in the opposite party, are voting in favor of Republican candidates. Thus they do not hesitate to leave their party for the time being—at least until the Democratic Party can get back on the track again.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Post of November 23, 1950]

BELATED ADVICE

A suggestion that is as sensible as it is belated comes from James A. Farley.

In an address at Tampa, Fla., Mr. Farley said President Truman should abandon his civil-rights program and leave the problems involved in it to be handled on a State and regional basis.

Mr. Farley is a former Democratic national chairman, and he spoke as one pained over the split in the party. He plainly realizes that the cleavage has arisen mainly from Mr. Truman's insistence on his so-called civil-rights program, despite the South's unyielding opposition to it.

Said Mr. Farley: "The President might as well, in the interest of national as well as party unity, summon the leaders of the South to solve these problems on a regional and State basis."

Mr. Farley misses an important point. The South's position is that Congress has no constitutional authority to enact measures such as the FEPC and anti-poll-tax legislation. To do so would be to trample on the rights and powers reserved to the States. There is no call to summon southern leaders. As a Missourian, however, Mr. Truman could feel free to urge his State legislature to pass such laws.

The Democratic Party under Mr. Truman's dictation has pressed for his civil-rights program as a matter of politics. It has been motivated by a desire to win the votes of Negro and other blocs in doubtful States. Consequently the administration may not heed this warning from Mr. Farley: "To threaten the South with drastic Federal legislation is the worst approach to improving Negro-white relations." The Fair Deal is either blind to that danger, or considers it of less consequence than getting votes.

For all that Mr. Farley's approach to this subject is a sound one, it comes late. His words might have meant something had they been uttered earlier—and in the North. Unless his school of advice prevails, the President is going to continue to urge passage of the legislation so obnoxious to this section. And Mr. Truman has already said he will recommend his program to the new Congress. He evidently isn't in the market for good advice.

[From the Savannah Evening Press of November 22, 1950]

MR. FARLEY'S GOOD ADVICE

James A. Farley, who in the field of politics has a reputation for knowing whereof he speaks, has given President Truman and the others who preside over the policies of the national administration, some good advice. Acceptance of Mr. Farley's advice by Mr. Truman would be a manifestation of the President's sincere interest in a program which up to this time appears on the face of the record to be largely designed to catch the votes of some big pressure groups.

Press dispatches quote Mr. Farley as having said in a speech in Tampa that the so-called civil rights program of President Truman is taking the wrong approach in seeking to achieve results by threatening legislation against the South, that the proper and productive approach would be through inviting those who know the problems best to solve them on a regional and State basis.

Mr. Farley spoke emphatically against what, regardless of the names they may be called by their sponsors, are 1950-model force bills directed primarily against the South. Mr. Farley puts his faith in freemen in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense rather than in edicts and fiats. Such men as he describes, he goes on to say, "can generally be trusted to do what is right." And in the South they have been doing just that, working steadily in the direction of fairness and expanding opportunities.

Tremendous strides have been made in the South in race relationships, and this section has more in this regard to point to with pride than have some other sections which have a very sorry performance and which have deceived people by pointing to their laws, laws that actual conditions prove mean virtually nothing. In the South, where the problems are well understood, people of good will have been leaders in bringing about greatly improved conditions, and the progress is continuous and cumulative. The greatest dangers that the good work faces are the politically inspired force bill attacks and the misguided efforts of pressure organizations.

Mr. Farley has a clear conception of how an ever-growing better relationship is to be nurtured. We repeat, he has given the President some excellent advice.

Recommendations for Preventing World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely and able article by our former colleague, Hon. Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, as it was printed in the Durham Morning Herald, of Durham, N. C., on Sunday, January 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS A STEP TOWARD PREVENTING WORLD WAR III—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

(By Frank P. Graham)

CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR

Christmas 1950 and the New Year 1951 have come with their heritage from a great past and their hopes amid the darkness which broods over the peoples of the earth.

In the nearly 2,000 years since the first Christmas there have been transmitted to the keeping of our generations the Hebraic, Greek, Latin, Catholic, Protestant, scientific, industrial, democratic, European, American heritage of human freedom and humane hopes yet unfulfilled and now imperiled in this world.

In the reorientation of America as part also of the Pacific-Asiatic world, it is of concern to us that in the East the spiritual heritage of the oldest civilizations is being uprooted by conquerors who would exalt the ideology of one generation and the quick ruthless methods of the police state above the wisdom of hundreds of generations. The need for reform is large and imminent in the East and the West. The East and the West need the values of creative cooperation in reform. This cooperation will be more creative when based on a mutual respect for the deep spiritual heritage of historic peoples, a decent regard for the truth above the falsehoods of hate as the basis for fair relations, the freedom of the human mind as the creative source of progress, and the dignity of the individual and the moral autonomy and enterprise of the human spirit as the basis of enduring freedom and reform in this crucial age.

In the womb of the mid-twentieth century are a-burning the spiritual, economic, social, political, scientific-[illegible]-[illegible], and spiritual forces which maybap dominate the destinies of peoples for generations. The modern economic framework of production and communication, which encompasses the earth with its dynamic power, [illegible] up ideas, depressions and wars anywhere and involves, and sometimes engulfs, peoples everywhere.

Dictatorships have risen through and for the concentration under one central political control of the police state all the powers of production and communication (1) for its mastery over the bodies and minds, the work and life, the hopes and the spirits of the people; (2) for the subjugation of the free peoples; and (3) for the domination of all the peoples of the earth.

The spiritual heritage of a great past and the humane hopes for a freer and better world in the west and the east are both now in peril. In two hemispheres the peoples, with both despair and hope, look from the background of centuries gone into the years ahead pregnant with war or peace, freedom or slavery for hundreds or millions of people across the earth. The world-wide crusade for freedom and peace must climb from the valleys of weakness and fear into the hills of courage and power.

In the midst of the global gloom of the closing days of 1950 Christmas came with its ray of hope in a darkening world. Nearly 2,000 years ago a Child was born in a lowly manger in a little country in Asia near the sea which yet joins with hope the east and west. Glad tidings came in the darkness before the dawn. With the Child was born the hope of peace on earth and good will toward men. The Child became a man and lived and died for the brotherhood of all men and the fatherhood of one God. Jesus and the prophets and saints, east and west, taught the Golden Rule and human brotherhood: one God, one family, and one world of freedom, justice, peace and good will among men, unfulfilled to this hour.

I. THE YEARNINGS OF THE PEOPLES FOR PEACE

1. In the United States: In the United States today the mothers and fathers in homes, the sons and daughters who dream their youthful dreams of homes of their own, the people on farms, in factories, stores, mines, and upon the seas, the people in cities, towns, villages, and the countryside, in schools and churches, want peace. They would have peace, they are sure, if only the cruel dictators of the Soviet Union would stop their aggressive tyranny and let the people have peace.

2. In the Soviet Union: In the Soviet Union, the mothers and fathers in homes, the sons and daughters, who dream their youthful dreams of homes of their own, the people on farms, in factories, stores, mines and upon the seas, in cities, towns, villages, and the countryside, want peace. They would have peace, they have been led to believe, if only the Fascist warmongers in the United States would let the people have peace.

3. In other nations: In other nations of the earth the mothers and fathers in homes, the sons and daughters who dream their youthful dreams of homes of their own, the people everywhere as they work and love, dream and hope, want peace. They would have peace, hundreds of millions of them believe, if only the Soviet Union and the United States would let the people have peace.

4. The people of all colors and creeds, races, and regions: The yellow, brown, red, black and white peoples want peace. The Buddhists, Hindus, Confucianists, Shintoists, Moslems, Jews, Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Protestants, believers and unbelievers, want peace. The people of North and South America, Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia and the islands of the oceans and seas, want peace. All the peoples of the earth, who in this generation, have suffered through a world war, a world depression and another world war, yearn and pray for freedom and security, justice, and peace.

II. THE UNIVERSAL YEARNING OF THE PEOPLES FOR PEACE CONFRONTED WITH THE HIGH POTENTIALS OF THE WORLD FOR WAR

Against this time for universal good will, in the face of the universal desire of the peoples for peace, and despite the unresting efforts of the Government of the United States and other governments, the nations are confronted with dictatorship, imperialism and aggression.

1. The ways of dictatorship: The Communist dictatorship has made war on religion, subjugated the freedom of the mind, the freedom of representation in parliaments, the freedom of association in churches, corporations, labor unions, cooperative societies, fraternal and civic organizations, has broken treaties; blocked the unification of Germany and Korea; subjugated by methods of the police state nine nations and parts of two nations; sought to sabotage the recovery of Southern and Western European nations; stripped Manchuria, poisoned the minds of hundreds of millions of people with falsehoods and hate; crushed the freedom to struggle for freedom; enslaved increasingly more millions of people in enforced bondage than were ever held in slavery at any time in history; segregated 200,000,000 people behind the iron curtain; vetoed the international control and inspection of atomic power; blocked the international efforts and procedures of the United Nations for peace; and has gone far in a program of aggression and imperialism for the domination of the world.

2. The ways of freedom: With all its unfair but decreasing discriminations, injustices, failures, and frustrations of freedom and democracy, the United States has preserved the freedom of religion, the freedom of the mind, and the freedom of association; has advanced the freedom to struggle for freedom by which more millions of Negroes in the last 85 years in the United States have made more progress than any like number of people in any like time in modern history, revealing, against many handicaps, the innate capacities of a great people for self-development in an advancing democracy; liberated the Philippines; has, against both the Dutch and Communist imperialists, thrown its weight on the side of the independence and freedom of the 70,000,000 Indonesian people; has, against both the French and Communist imperialists, favored the autonomy of the Indochinese people; has favored the self-determination of peoples in Israel and the Near East, in Southern Asia, Korea, West Germany, Northern and Western Europe, and Great Britain; offered to give up its then monopoly of atomic power for international control and inspection; helped to facilitate the procedures and cooperated with the purposes of the United Nations against aggression as the best hope of freedom and peace in the world.

3. No appeasement of aggression: Standing on the brink of the abyss of another possible world war between dictatorship which, with all its pretenses, would crush the freedom to struggle for freedom, and the democracies, which, with all their faults, would preserve the freedom to struggle for freedom, some free nations are still torn by the opposite pulls of appeasement and resistance to aggression. In the present complex world situation resistance to aggression in Korea or anywhere may lead to global war. Appeasement of aggression leads no less surely and even more disastrously into another world war.

Not backward from a Dunkerque to a Munich, but forward. In resisting aggression in Korea the United Nations risked the military disaster of a Dunkerque to avoid the moral disaster of a Munich. If the recently victorious United Nations forces should be driven off the peninsula, the way would not be backward to Munich but forward with the United Nations for the ultimate triumph of freedom, self-determination of all peoples, justice and peace under the laws rather than by the wars of nations. In the present situation, whether we appease or resist, drift or plunge, or stand aside in isolation, the world potentials are so heavily charged that a local spark may become a global conflagration.

In the global dilemma of the universal yearnings of the people for peace and the high potentials of the world for war, it is only through heroic efforts of the Government of the United States in cooperation with the other governments of the United Nations, persistent against great odds, that a way may be found to make effective the people's passion for peace against the aggressors' will for war.

The free peoples must stand resolutely together against appeasement of aggressions and any surrender to the universal domination of a world totalitarian state.

III. MEANTIME, MOBILIZATION OF THE FREE WORLD FOR COLLECTIVE SELF-DEFENSE OF HUMAN FREEDOM

Meantime, the United States, and all the nations of the free world, East and West, must mobilize their economic, military, scientific, democratic, human and spiritual resources for the cooperative self-defense of their democratic existence and the self-determination of peoples. Denunciations, armaments, plans, and pacts—essential as they are—are not enough. The American people, in democratic and moral answer to fascism and communism, must relentlessly keep up the struggle against imperialism, privilege, monopoly, and discriminations, and take the next step toward fulfillment of our American dream and our spiritual hopes for the freedom and equal opportunity for all people in a free and federated world.

The free peoples must stand together in defense of their commitments to the freedom of the human mind, the dignity of the human being, and the moral autonomy of the human spirit against a monstrous tyranny which seeks to subjugate all peoples in the expanding dominions of a world police state.

IV. THE OPPORTUNITY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

In such a complex and desperate situation, where may the people of the earth look for the implementation of their universal aspiration for peace? Not to the capital of any one or two nations. That way alone is the isolated way to war. Rather to the capital of all the nations. The way of international cooperation is the only way to enduring peace. The only international agency available for the balanced information and action of the peoples of all nations is the United Nations. With all its failures and frustrations, with all the need for amendment to its Charter for a federated world, the peoples of the earth still look in hope to the United Nations dedicated by the noble principles of its Charter to stopping aggression, preventing war, promoting freedom, and maintaining peace in the world.

1. The General Assembly is the only world forum of all the nations:

More democratically and organically the people now look to the General Assembly with new hope in the recently and overwhelmingly adopted procedures for uniting for peace. In the General Assembly are represented 60 nations which include the overwhelming majority of the people of the continents and islands of the earth by their own self-determination.

In the midst of the almost unsolvable dilemmas on the edge of a world catastrophe, whose burdens are now heroically borne by the statesmen of the free world, time does not wait for amendments to the Charter, for stronger ways, better days, more democratic governments, or nobler people. To amend the Charter the United Nations must now save the Charter and itself from destruction. To become more democratic the people must save the freedom to be a democracy. Freedom and democracy begin at home but without resistance to the aggression and tyranny of the totalitarian police state, freedom and democracy would have no home in which to grow. The people of the world, as imperfect as we all are in our human and inhuman ways, are the only people available in this fearful time. Now and soon is the only time left. The General Assembly is the only world forum of all the nations. The Assembly of the delegates from 60 nations is the most representative of the organs of the United Nations. It is not subject to the veto in its own jurisdiction. It is the only agency in existence in this confused and yet hopeful world which has a chance of enlisting the attention of most of the peoples of the earth for making effective their hopes for peace.

2. A majority vote of the Security Council on a procedural matter not subject to the veto can lift the dispute from the Council agenda and free the Assembly to make recommendations:

It is recognized that, in accordance with article 12 of the Charter, the General Assembly cannot make a recommendation concerning any matter on the agenda of the Security Council. Nevertheless, since putting a dispute on the agenda of the Council is a procedural matter not subject to the veto, a majority vote of the Council can remove a matter from the Council's agenda and thus make it a matter regarding which the Assembly can make recommendations.

Now is the time and the General Assembly is the agency to make findings and recommendations for the principles and procedures toward the settlement of a crucial dispute. This further attempt to settle this dispute is another effort to prevent a total global war, which would engulf the peoples of the world in the killing of scores of millions of people across the earth and the fateful destruction of the civilization accumulated from all ages and inherited from all peoples. As a starting point of the discussions for settlement of the dispute in Korea, the Renville principles themselves suggest their own applicability to the Korean dispute.

V. THE RENVILLE PRINCIPLES

The Renville principles already approved by the United Nations in the Indonesian situation are a possible starting point for the consideration of principles and procedures for the Korean situation.

The Renville principles are substantially the following: (1) Military provisions for cease fire, a truce, a demarcation line, demilitarized zones on both sides of the line, and the withdrawal by stages of all non-Korean armed forces under the supervision of the United Nations; and (2) political principles with provision for internal security, civil liberties, free trade, transportation, communication, economic rehabilitation, plebiscites or other forms of free elections, and convention of delegates elected on the basis of population, for framing a constitution for a free, independent, and united Korean nation under the supervision of the United Nations for the self-determination of all the Korean people and their admission as an independent member nation into the United Nations.

These Renville principles and procedures, modified and adapted to meet the Korean situation, could be the ways and means of substituting ballots for bullets and of substituting law and the self-determination of peoples for war and the self-extermination of peoples.

VI. THE REJECTION OF FAIR PRINCIPLES AND OPEN PROCEDURES FOR THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES WOULD REVEAL TO THE PEOPLES OF THE EARTH THE DESIGNS OF DICTATORS FOR AGGRESSION AND WORLD DOMINATION

If, in the face of the publication of the findings and recommendations for the truce and the principles and procedures for the settlement of the international dispute, any nation—and specifically the dictatorship behind the puppet government which refuses substantially to accept them but determines heedlessly to go on its way of defiance, aggression, and war—would thereby make its position of recalcitrance and aggression dramatically known to the great majority of the peoples of the earth. Above the false propaganda of dictators and beyond the reasonable question of free peoples, such a position would make clear which government is recklessly bent upon aggression and war for the domination of the world. Any such government, in flagrant disregard of the yearnings of the people for peace and in rejection of the recommendations of the only existing international agency based on full and open discussions in the only world forum, brands itself as an outlaw before the judgment bar of mankind. Such an outlaw nation, exposed before the world, would have to take the consequences of the combined economic, political, military, and moral self-defense of a free world in carrying out the principles and purposes of the United Nations as the best hope of fulfilling the yearnings and prayers of the peoples for freedom, justice, and peace under law.

While some wait for universal disarmament, a limited world federal government, world law, and a world police force, for the prevention of aggression and war, there must be mustered now on the side of human freedom against aggression not only more people and more bombs but also a greater faith. In the moral potentials of the United Nations fully utilized is more ultimate power than in the explosive force of atomic bombs.

The muster of the effective power of the General Assembly for human freedom and the self-determination of peoples might prevent war and thereby avoid the use of atomic bombs against aggression. The world's potentials for war and self-destruction of peoples must be brought under the control of the United Nations' potentials for peace and the abundant production by peoples. To the large executive power and influence of the Security Council, presently subject to the paralysis of the veto, must be added more promptly and effectively the moral power of the General Assembly of all the nations, which can, without a veto, make recommendations to the Security Council and to member nations—with the peoples of the world looking on with their hopes and listening in with their great moral power.

The yearnings and prayers of the peoples for freedom and peace are universal. The potentials for war and self-destruction are world-wide.

The time to save freedom and peace is desperately late. The only agency which can now possibly express and muster the moral power of mankind for freedom and hope and peace is the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The peoples of the world, under God, to save themselves and their civilization, shall have a rebirth of freedom and faith in the effective power of the moral opinion of mankind, mobilized by the General Assembly of the nations of the earth against tyranny, aggression, and war.

VII. THE ULTIMATE TRIUMPH OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE MORAL LAW THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION BY WHICH DICTATORS MUST FALL, EMPIRES CRUMBLE, AGGRESSION FAILS AND FREEDOM PREVAILS IN GOD'S GOOD TIME

Undergirding the power of the free world and the principles of the United Nations would be the universal yearnings of the peoples of the earth for peace and the world-wide assertion, through the General Assembly, of the moral sovereignty in the minds and hearts of the peoples as a part of the structure of God's universe. False propaganda in the face of the truth will eventually become as chaff which the wind driveth away. All peoples will yet rise in self-determination through the knowledge of the truth which will make them free. The light of liberty will yet shine through the iron curtain of men's minds. The warmth of human brotherhood will yet melt away the iron curtain of men's hearts. The people's hopes for freedom and peace still fly their flags high in the Western World and across the eastern seas. Against the ultimate sovereignty of the moral law which runs through the universe, the history of nations, and the minds and hearts of the people who pray for freedom, justice, and peace, empires will crumble, dictators fall, and aggressors make war no more.

THE BIRTH OF THE CHILD

With the birth of the Child the idea of the fatherhood of one God, the ultimate sovereignty of the moral law, and the brotherhood of all men, became flesh in Jesus, Son of God, Brother of Men, Scourge of Wrong, and Prince of Peace. He was Son of man who had not where to lay His head, lived among men, ministered to the poor in body and sick of heart, was crucified and rose again in redemptive and spiritual power to resist aggression, tyranny, and injustice, and to bring peace and brotherhood on earth in the great adventure of the human spirit in our earthly pilgrimage toward the kingdom of God.

Charles E. Wilson, Director of Office of Defense Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, when Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, testified before the Committee on Small Business, I was happy to be able to tell him that I had had at least a dozen messages from businessmen from all over the country telling me that his appointment, in their opinion, was the finest appointment the President could have made to the great and heavy responsibilities which he has assumed over the economy. The President is often lambasted for his appointments, but now I think we should pay tribute to him for the unusual men who appeared before the Small Business Committee yesterday, including Gen. William H. Harrison, Mr. Jess Larson, and Mr. John D. Small. We should also congratulate these men on the patriotism which prompted them to accept their tough positions.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wilson's testimony before the committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I believe that all Members of Congress will be interested in this foreshadowing of what lies ahead. In the question period after his prepared testimony, I discussed with Mr. Wilson his closing paragraph. Unhappily thousands of businessmen are now faced with annihilation because of material shortages. Mr. Wilson agreed that allocations are urgent, and, as with wage and price controls, must be enforced at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Wilson sounded a cheering note for small independent businessmen who are "on the ball vigorously seeking business." He said that such businessmen "got it," and pointed out that regardless of the size of the vessel, "cream comes to the top." This is the theme which I struck in Bridgeport in the first clinic sponsored by the Small Business Committee for small independent businessmen held last July 17, 1950. The problem of government is not to pamper and spoon-feed the manufacturer, regardless of his size, but to assist those with ability and enterprise to bring to the war effort their creative talents and capacities. Mr. Wilson pointed out the needs for sales skills, as well as engineering and production skills. When he said this, I think he must have been mindful of those thousands of Connecticut independent manufacturers among whom he lived as one of the leading citizens of Bridgeport for some 10 years prior to his appointment as President of the General Electric Co., when he was in charge of the great General Electric operations centered in Bridgeport.

I have suggested to the Small Business Committee an expansion of the small-business clinics, and I plan to work out such clinics once more in Connecticut in April. I suggest that those Members of Congress who come from manufacturing States, and who have not taken advantage of this idea developed by the Small Business Committee, should investigate it at once.

There being no objection, the testimony of Mr. Wilson was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. E. WILSON'S TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

I am pleased to appear before you today to discuss some of the problems small business faces in the defense effort.

As you know there are certain basic factors inherent in such an effort. Among these are time, integration, and expansion. Clearly, we must achieve our defense requirements as quickly as possible. We must, within a minimum period integrate our production resources, both large and small, into the defense effort. While this program is being carried forward we must expand our productive facilities thereby increasing our defense potential and at the same time decreasing the strain upon our civilian economy.

In any accelerated defense program there is, unfortunately, a time lag in some instances between the curtailment of civilian production and conversion to defense production. In an already tight economy stockpiling and production for defense must have first call on materials needed to combat the threat of foreign aggression. To assure our military requirements, it is necessary to curtail the use of scarce materials and provide a system of priorities and allocations. An unfortunate result of this in the early stages is hardship to some individuals. On an overall basis hardship cases decrease with the increase of defense contracts at work in the economy. We are particularly aware of this problem and are moving as promptly as possible so that dislocations may be held to a minimum. The individual hardship cases, however, are a matter for consideration by the particular operating agencies.

In this connection it might be helpful if I briefly describe the present organization which has been set up to carry forward our defense efforts.

As you know the Office of Defense Mobilization was created within the Executive Office of the President. The Director of that Office is charged with the duty, on behalf of the President, to direct, control, and coordinate all mobilization efforts. These include production, procurement, manpower, food, transport activities, maintenance of a sound economy, and foreign aid. In discharging these functions the Director is assisted by an advisory board known as the Defense Mobilization Board. The membership of this Board includes the heads of various executive departments and agencies having responsibilities connected with the national defense.

The Office of Defense Mobilization does not perform any operating functions. Its job is to determine over-all policies and to coordinate the activities and programs of the mobilization effort. It is our duty to keep the machinery of defense mobilization running smoothly.

The Defense Production Administration is the programing agency for the production phase of the program. It will perform functions incident to the determination of production programs required to meet defense needs and will establish procedures to accomplish such programs. In this connection the Administrator secures the production plans of all agencies and estimates manpower requirements to meet them. He is charged with responsibility concerning the expansion of productive facilities and it is only upon his authorization that the General Services Administration can make purchases to promote expansion of productive capacity and supply. He also is the certifying authority for tax amortization for emergency facilities.

In connection with expansion, the Defense Production Administrator is responsible for the direct loan program under which loans may be made to private business enterprises for the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes or the production of essential materials. Under the provisions of the Defense Production Act this program is limited to those cases in which financial assistance is not otherwise available. I believe that to the extent possible these direct loans should be utilized to integrate small businesses into the production effort and therefore applications from small business will receive careful consideration.

Insofar as food is concerned, the Defense Production Administrator determines with the Secretary of Agriculture how the available supply is to be divided between industrial and other uses. In the event of any differences between these agencies the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization will make the final decision.

In addition this organizational arrangement separates programing and operating procedures over priorities and allocations. The Defense Production Administrator will determine the over-all production priorities and will decide when curtailment of civilian production is necessary. The priorities and allocations orders, however, will continue to be issued by the various operating agencies subject to the direction and approval of the Administrator. Thus, the Secretary of Interior will continue to have jurisdiction over petroleum, gas, solid fuels, and electric power. Any problem the public may have concerning these materials should be taken up with the appropriate agency within the office of the Secretary of Interior. These agencies are the Petroleum Administration for Defense, the Defense Minerals Administration, the Defense Solid Fuels Administration, and the Defense Power Administration. With respect to food and food facilities the Secretary of Agriculture has assigned the operating functions within his Department to the Production and Marketing Administration. Insofar as transportation is concerned, such matters are handled by the Defense Transport Administration.

The Secretary of Commerce is responsible for all other materials. In order to discharge this responsibility, he has established in the Department of Commerce the National Production Authority, which has within it an Industry Operations Bureau with industry divisions. Applications for adjustment in individual hardship cases are handled initially by the particular industry divisions within the Industry Operations Bureau. You will notice that the various orders of NPA contain a statement to the effect that any person affected by the order may file an application for an adjustment or exception on the ground of extreme hardship, or that enforcement of the order against him would not be in the interest of the national defense program. To aid in meeting the problems of small business, a small-business office has been established in NPA.

In the procurement field the responsibility of the Office of Defense Mobilization relates to general policies and coordination among the procurement agencies so that, among other things, the demand for raw materials may be channeled, the maximum use of tools and machines attained, and definitive supply and requirements estimates procured. Although the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Defense Production Administration are directly concerned with procurement policies and programs, the actual contracting is done by the Defense Department and the procurement agencies of the Government. For the present any problems of this type should be taken up with the appropriate procurement agency.

The Economic Stabilization Agency handles price control and wage stabilization. When such controls are imposed there may be individual instances requiring adjustment. As the Agency is establishing procedures to handle these matters, any problems concerning them should be referred there.

The Congress, in the Defense Production Act of 1950, has expressed its concern over the difficulties that may face small business in the mobilization effort. In section 701 it has specifically stated that "It is the sense of the Congress that small-business enterprises be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of this act." In order to carry out this policy, it has provided that information concerning the activities of the various agencies under the act shall be made available to small-business enterprises. It has also provided for representation by small- and medium-sized businesses on industry advisory committees; for the establishment of procedures so that small business may receive such exemptions from the act as may be feasible, and for the expeditious handling of all requests, applications, or appeals from small business.

You may be sure that we are making every effort to carry out this legislative intent. Through arrangements with the Secretary of Commerce any citizen can procure from any one of more than five thousand offices throughout the country cooperating with the Department of Commerce and the Government purchasing agencies information regarding Government procurement. These offices comprise local chambers of commerce and civic groups. The purpose of this wide dissemination is to give small business every opportunity to participate in the defense effort. Specifically it includes a daily report of practically all proposed Government purchasing through competitive bids. With respect to negotiated contracts these agencies have available a weekly report showing the prime unclassified contracts awarded. The report, which lists the items, quantities, and contractors, is disseminated so that the small-business man may solicit subcontracts for components. In this connection the information office also advises him of the facts he should supply a prime contractor when seeking a subcontract.

I believe that small business must be given every opportunity to participate in the defense program. True, some small-business enterprises may not be able to underbid large firms or in some instances only a large manufacturer may be able to supply the needed quantities. In such situations, however, the prime contractor is being encouraged to subcontract. The Secretary of Defense is of the same view and has issued a statement of policy to the effect that in procurement the military departments should pay particular attention to:

(d) The fullest possible use of small-business concerns.

(e) The utilization in negotiation of competitive and multiple awards, whenever possible.

(f) The aggressive encouragement or requirement of subcontracting by prime contractors.

I heartily agree with these principles and propose to see them carried out to the fullest extent possible.

With respect to the advisory committees I plan to assign the Defense Production Administration the responsibility of coordinating the utilization of such committees by the various agencies so that there will no longer be overlapping committees from particular industries. I shall also request the Administrator to prepare, insofar as possible, uniform procedures for representation on and use of advisory committees. In this request I shall specifically ask him to consult with the Attorney General and the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission concerning those problems.

Provision has also been made for exemption for hardship cases and some of the metals orders contain specific exemptions for small business. There is no doubt that special provision should be made for expeditious handling of all requests, applications, and the like whether they be from small business or any other segment of the public.

One of the main problems concerning small business is integration into the mobilization effort. In my opinion we can accomplish this in several ways. Among these is the direct loan program through which we can assist and encourage small business to convert to defense production and, if necessary, expand productive facilities. In undertaking such a program we must, of course, see to it that small business receives its fair share of prime contracts. In those instances where this may not be possible, we must continually encourage subcontracting to smaller enterprises. Then, too, efforts can be made toward pooling of manufacturing resources by smaller manufacturers in order to handle prime contracts. Although this is not specifically mentioned in the law, I believe that within the scope of section 708 of the Defense Production Act governmental agencies may under appropriate conditions enter into voluntary agreements for so-called production pools.

These then are but a few of the efforts which should be made to carry out the legislative intent of the Congress concerning the contribution of small business toward accomplishing the purposes of the act. In order to insure the implementation of this policy, I am directing the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration to lend encouragement and support to small business through the Small Business Office of the National Production Authority. It will be their duty to determine methods and set up procedures by which small-business enterprises can be integrated into the defense effort. In this connection all the agencies having operating functions in the mobilization program would be requested to adhere to these principles in the issuance of orders curtailing production or use of materials by business enterprises with a view to insuring that small-business concerns will not be disproportionately affected by such orders. Moreover, I believe that the other small-business programs such as direct loans for small business, assurance of equitable treatment in the issuence of prime contracts and the encouragement of subcontracting can be appropriately centered in this official.

Undoubtedly the steps which have been taken so far with regard to this problem are in the right direction. There are many advantages in centering this activity in one office. Not only does it allow for realistic study and programing but it also gives the small-business man a central office to which he can appeal for expeditious action.

President Truman, in his state of the Union message, pointed out that our program calls for increased "capacity to produce and to keep our economy strong for the long pull." This phase of the program is essential to meet the threat of Communist aggression. As a part of this program we must have vigorous small-business enterprises capable of participating in a united effort for defense. The more effective and energetic these enterprises are the stronger our economy will be.

I appreciate that once a business disbands it is practically impossible to recreate it. The engineering skills, the labor force, and the management are soon dissipated. Such losses are detrimental to our economy and steps must be taken to avoid them. In the administration of the mobilization effort we shall make every effort to keep such casualties to a minimum.

Final Peace Rests on Espousal of Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the article Final Peace Rests on Espousal of Christianity. Mr. Paul E. Belcher is one of Akron, Ohio's, most prominent citizens. Although he is of the opposite party of that which I am a member, my observations of the past have proved to me that neither party has a monopoly on stupidity or intelligence. I will appreciate your comment regarding the article which follows:

[From the Akron (Ohio) Business Analysis of January 15, 1951]

FINAL PEACE RESTS ON ESPOUSAL OF CHRISTIANITY

(By Paul E. Belcher)

The concept of armed isolation for the Americas has received increasing attention during the last few months. The idea has different meanings for different people. Some would only avoid future involvement on the mainland of Asia. Others would include all of continental Europe in the ban as well. There are those who would abandon all territory they believe to be indefensible, but no more. Still others would return immediately to our side of the protecting oceans, here to construct an invincible continental fortress, if that is possible.

Last June our Government was confronted with the necessity of choosing a line in the Orient on which the spread of communism would be resisted. For better or for worse, that choice was then made. Some modification in its details may have been, or yet may be, impelled by our experiences in Korea. But otherwise the die there has been cast.

More recently, tentative lines must have been officially affirmed for Europe. Amendments in these lines may be forced upon us by future developments, the fortunes of war, or irresistible logic. Nevertheless, the overall pattern of this phase of our foreign policy would now appear to be fairly fixed as to Europe. It has already been implemented by the selection of General Eisenhower as supreme commander and by sending additional American troops to Europe.

Originally, we had two choices available to us. They represented the extremes viewpoints. We might have retired to our own shores. Had we done so, our problems and costs would have been one thing. Instead, we elected to make our stand as far away from home as was then possible. In consequence, our logistics, foreign commitments, economic requirements, costs, taxes, and everything else will be quite another matter.

Each possibility held out its group of advantages. Neither was devoid of risks and detriments. A decision between them involved selecting positions offering the most benefits and the least evils. The national interest, and only the national interest, as seen by men in authority, was determinative of the issue. So it must ever be.

If world war III is eventually inevitable, several fundamental questions must be resolved. For instance, where shall the battle fronts be initially established? We invite them to be on or close to this continent by permitting the Communists to absorb the rest of the world. We keep them as far away from home as we can by attempting to draw our battle lines first in distant lands.

Shall we make it as easy or as tough as possible for the enemy to reach America? Obviously, the greater the distance between their bases and our strategic centers, the more difficult their bombing missions become. By the same token, the greater the opportunity we give ourselves for successful interception of their efforts. In any event, we are likely to suffer bomb damage when the next war is fought.

Shall we add to our problems of successfully destroying the enemy's cities, factories, and other essential concentrations? Certainly not if we can help ourselves. Yet the farther these targets are from our airfields, the more difficult our bombing assignments will become. That we would forego this kind of attack is senseless.

If Communist nations must be occupied by our ground forces to stop their aggrandisement—and how else can it be done—from what point should we undertake that job? It would seem that the less territory we had to conquer before we reached the heart of our opposition, the better off we would be. The risk of being pushed back or cut is an accompanying military gamble.

Shall we rely solely upon our own manpower for the forces with which to fight Russia or shall we also use the manpower of other nations to the fullest extent possible? The latter expectation becomes impossible of achievement if foreign populations on which we might draw are permitted to fall under the domination of the Reds. The 150,000,000 people of the United States should array themselves alone against the Communist hordes only as a last resort.

Now it may be argued that world war III is not inevitable and, hence, that none of the foregoing questions is pertinent. True, indeed, but who, in the light of world events of the present and the immediate past, wants to run that risk? We ought to seek diligently and long for acceptable peaceful solutions of the world's problems. We must never forget that a single dictator can start a war.

The hope of ultimate peace rests on the espousal of the precepts of Christianity by all peoples. So long as national leaders and the masses from which they spring regard human life as freely expendable, the individual as nothing, might as right, morals and ethics as weaknesses, the means to every end as immaterial, solemn commitments as voidable, liberty and justice as meaningless—just so long will the threat of war becloud this earth. The work of the ministry is not yet finished.

Perhaps the Communists would not overrun the lands we were unwilling to defend. Perhaps, but history indicates quite the contrary. Not once have they failed to absorb every country they could conveniently swallow. They are not likely to change their ways at our request. A more reasonable assumption would be that they might seize all of Asia and Europe despite everything we have time to do.

Some would not undertake anything we haven't, or think we haven't, the strength to do if challenged. Appeasement readily springs from this philosophy. Nothing was ever accomplished on its foundation. Such a show of weakness invites disaster. The Kremlin understands nothing except force. The A-bomb is still the most potent force yet harnessed by man, and we have it.

Every people should certainly aid in its own defense. Each ought to have a separate interest in that endeavor. A people's contribution to that cause, its will to fight, its unity with others similarly engaged, the training of its personnel, and the adequacy of its material are all essential to success. Our own national interest should well dictate that we assist in this effort of others beyond

ordinary limits, even perhaps, in the face of possible early military reverses.

There is no assurance in the impregnability of any part of this globe. Powerful air and sea arms with isolation might be enough to save us and then, again, they may not be. We have no exclusive right or ability to construct the implements of conflict. Many wars have been commenced against nations fully armed. Seldom have any of them ended in a draw. Less than a rounded preparation for possible war in every sphere with every conceivable weapon hardly seems appropriate to present exigencies.

Regardless of where we establish our lines of resistance, the economic cost of the period ahead will be truly astronomical. To be sure, the cost of preparation for any particular defense will differ from that of any other. No one can accurately measure any of these costs in advance. We may be eventually bankrupted by the effort we must make but that effort must still be made. No cost could possibly equal the cost of ultimate defeat.

The underlying motive of all we shall do is the national interest. Naturally, each of us has his own opinion of what that is, from time to time, and how it can best be served. Those opinions should be expressed and discussed. They will be diverse, however, even when predicated on identical understandings of the facts. Yet some particular policy must always be determined and followed.

Responsibility for all determinations of policy rests finally upon the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Both branches of Congress must frequently act. Every decision will not be right and many cannot be hedged. Once a course is laid out, its alternatives will usually be over the dam. But right or wrong, our salvation depends on carrying out all decisions made in the national interest with singleness of purpose. Note well what has happened to every people who disregarded this requisite to their continued freedom.

NO WAY OF AVOIDING INFLATION

The Economic Stabilization Agency has a tough job before it. Over-all prices have not been effectively frozen by the Government. Certain automobile companies have caught it in the neck because the administration was piqued. Gradually, mandatory price ceilings will be established over the principal components of war goods. Similar treatment will be accorded many items comprising the basic costs of living. Eventually everything may be covered. But practically everything is presently subject to voluntary controls.

That really means that each seller whose product or service is exempt from mandatory controls must judge for himself what he will do about his selling prices. Each knows pretty well what the Government wants. He has his conscience to deal with. His sense of patriotism must be satisfied. The threat of eventual controls, either with or without price roll-backs, constantly impends. These deterrents are often powerful but seldom compelling over long periods.

In spite of them, uncontrolled prices will climb. The volume of money prevented from entering the legitimate markets for goods under control—for lack of enough such goods to absorb all of that money—will compete for goods available for purchase outside those limitations. Here, the law of supply and demand will operate under the sole restraints of an honor system. A considerable variety of goods and services may be had on these markets for months to come.

Existing law does not authorize the Government to clamp fixed price ceilings on everything. The prices of farm products may be tied, at best, to prices farmers pay—parity—or to agricultural price peaks during the month preceding June 25, whichever is higher. Such items as real estate, professional fees, utility rates, insurance premiums, the publishing business, and others are specifically exempted from price control by and under the Defense Production Act of 1950. Of course, Congress could eliminate parity and extend the price control law to every present exemption.

The President could, and in due time undoubtedly will, impose price ceilings where he has not yet seen fit to do so: However, even when these events occur, human behavior will still interpose a serious impediment to the control of real prices. The natural laws of economics cannot be legislated out of existence.

Prices represent the exchange values of goods and services. Fixing those values in dollars and cents freezes real prices only if the composition and quality of goods and services remain unaltered. In practice, composition frequently changes and quality tends to deteriorate. This rule is not universally applicable but it usually obtains. To the extent that it does, real prices rise. Inflation then occurs in concealed form.

Substitutes must now be found for materials the civilian use of which has been curtailed. Regardless of the cost of the substitutes, no one claims that they are, in every respect, as desirable as the originals. Their use is dictated by the exigencies of our times. Products superficially resembling previous models and intended to satisfy identical needs come into being. This is especially true where price rollbacks have been invoked. Defense period models sell at prices in excess of what they would have brought if offered for sale in competition with goods they replace. Thus, despite price controls, do prices indirectly increase through decline in the composition of goods.

The war effort transfers much skilled help to war industries. The Armed Forces acquire a lot more of it. Replacement workers in civilian industries cannot be expected to put out products of the same quality as highly trained labor could have done. Rarely do they actually do so. Yet this fact is not reflected in price reductions. We continue to pay ceiling prices for the best products available. Prices just are not frozen, in reality, by the mere process of stating fixed figures on the price tags.

Price limitations in the face of excess money and credit produce black markets. These markets flourish because human nature tries to satisfy its wants whenever and wherever possible. The fact that such markets are illegal and that punishment may be visited upon those caught dealing in them adds its premium to the prices that would prevail in them if such markets were merely gray. Whatever is paid for goods and services on the black markets serves to increase the real level of prices regardless of the apparent readings of official price indexes.

This discussion should not be construed as an argument against price controls. Nor is it intended to make the Government's problems any more difficult of solution than they are. The control of prices is no simple undertaking. It has its limitations. It cannot accomplish the impossible. This is especially true of voluntary price control. The public should thoroughly realize the economics involved. The very strictest of Government price controls may postpone and conceal the immediate effects of inflation but it cannot stop inflation.

The Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of a remarkable letter from Gen. Lucius D. Clay, national chairman of the Crusade for Freedom. This is a report of what the people themselves can do when they recognize the urgency of a problem. Here is a concrete effort by the people to penetrate behind the iron curtain.

Of the $1,288,000 received in contributions for this Crusade, the great bulk came from persons who contributed a dollar or less. The people are developing an increasing awareness of the need to penetrate the iron curtain with truth and the principles of democracy and freedom.

The Russians called the Freedom Bell the "bell of death." This is a typical distortion of the Soviet propagandists.

General Clay's Crusade for Freedom is a two-way inspiration. We in Congress should encourage the citizens of this country to dedicate themselves to this purpose, and, conversely, I feel the people of America should urge the Government to dedicate itself to a similar purpose.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPIRE STATE BUILDING,
New York, N. Y., December 22, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENTON: Although some contributions and signatures continue to be received at national headquarters, the results of the Crusade for Freedom campaign are now substantially in. The number of signatures of Americans on the Freedom Scroll has passed the 15,000,000 mark—15,507,877. Breakdown by States is attached.

Total contributions amount to $1,288,000. With only a few gifts of over $1,000—largest gift was $2,500—the great bulk of this total came from small contributions of under $1.

I think we can all take just pride in this accomplishment.

Since all expenses of conducting the campaign were met from a special contribution to the National Committee for a Free Europe, the entire amount contributed by the public is now being used for the purposes intended—namely, the expansion of the operations of Radio Free Europe.

As you know, Radio Free Europe began broadcasting to the satellite countries on July 4, 1950, over a 7,500-watt short-wave transmitter located near Frankfurt, Germany. It now has under construction in Munich a powerful medium-wave transmitter, which should be on the air by late winter. It also has on order eight additional transmitters—thanks, in no small measure, to the support of the American public in the Crusade for Freedom drive.

There is no way, of course, in which we can accurately estimate the intangible values of the Crusade. The presence of nearly half a million Berliners at the Freedom Bell dedication ceremonies—100,000 of them from the Soviet sector—gives us more than a hint of what it meant, in terms of hope and encouragement, to those behind the iron curtain. High Commissioner John McCloy expressed his feeling that the event was comparable to the airlift in its effect upon the morale and confidence of the German people.

Without question, also, the campaign served to strengthen our own peoples' basic understanding and appreciation of the freedoms we enjoy.

It is my personal belief that recent world events make an intensified effort in this field of idea warfare even more important. We must build up our strength in this psychological field just as we are doing militarily and economically—in order that we can meet and turn back the menace of world Communist aggression. Speed is of the utmost importance. If we are able to do these things fast enough, we may be able to avoid full-scale war. The next 2½ to 3 years, in my opinion, will tell the story.

With respect to the future, a meeting of the executive committee of the Crusade was held on December 4. The organization has been incorporated and a committee is at work studying all of the ideas for a continuing program that have been sent in from the field. Our tentative ideas for 1951 will be forwarded for your comment in the next few weeks.

With deep appreciation and every good wish for the holiday season.

Sincerely,

LUCIUS D. CLAY,
National Chairman,
Crusade for Freedom.

FIFTEEN MILLION AMERICANS JOIN FREEDOM CRUSADE—CONTRIBUTE $1,288,000 TO RADIO FREE EUROPE

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Gen. Lucius D. Clay, national chairman of the Crusade for Freedom, today made public the results of the recent Crusade for Freedom campaign.

Although contributions and signatures are still continuing to come in to national headquarters in the Empire State Building, Clay announced that the number of signatures of Americans on the Freedom Scroll have passed the 15,000,000 mark (breakdown by States attached) and that total contributions exceed $1,288,000.

"I wish to thank, most sincerely, the thousands of Crusade workers throughout the country who have made this accomplishment possible," Clay said in a letter to field chairmen.

"Radio Moscow sneered that the American public was being forced to pay to join the Crusade. All contributions, of course, were completely voluntary. The great bulk of the total came from small contributions of under $1. Since all campaign expenses were met from a special contribution to the National Committee for a Free Europe, the entire amount contributed is being used to expand the operations of Radio Free Europe, the American people's 'freedom station' in the shadow of the iron curtain."

BUILDING NEW TRANSMITTERS

"Radio Free Europe began broadcasting to the satellite countries of Eastern Europe on July 4, 1950, over a 7,500-watt short-wave transmitter located near Frankfurt, Germany. It now has under construction in Munich a powerful medium-wave transmitter which should be on the air by late winter. It also has on order eight additional transmitters—thanks, in no small measure, to the support of the American public in the Crusade for Freedom drive.

"The presence of nearly half a million Berliners at the Freedom Bell dedication ceremonies—100,000 of them from the Soviet sector—gives us some idea of what the Crusade meant in terms of hope and encouragement to those behind the iron curtain.

"High Commissioner John McCloy has expressed his opinion that the event had a profound effect upon the morale and confidence of the German people—comparable, in this respect, with the airlift.

"Without question, also, the campaign served to strengthen our own people's basic understanding and appreciation of the freedoms we enjoy."

INTENSIFIED EFFORT MAY PREVENT WAR

"It is my personal belief that recent world events make an intensified effort in this field even more important. We must build up our strength in this area of 'idea warfare' just as we are doing it militarily and economically—in order to meet and turn back the menace of world Communist aggression. Speed is of the utmost importance. If we are able to do these things fast enough, we may be able to avoid full-scale war. The next 2½ to 3 years, in my opinion, will tell the story."

Clay stated that the Crusade organization has been incorporated under the laws of New York State and that a committee is now at work developing a continuing program for 1951.

Launched by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower on a Nation-wide broadcast on Labor Day, September 4, the Crusade offered the individual American citizen an opportunity to fight back against vicious Kremlin propaganda, and to help send the truth through the curtain. Almost overnight, thousands of local committees sprang up across the country, scrolls bearing the Declaration of Freedom[1] were circulated in all communities and the public began making contributions to Radio Free Europe as they signed.

Symbol of the Crusade—the massive 10-ton World Freedom Bell, inscribed with the paraphrase from Lincoln, "That this world, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom"—toured the United States from coast to coast, crossed the ocean on a DP transport and arrived in Berlin 2 days ahead of its scheduled dedication and ringing on United Nations Day, October 24. Its solemn notes were heard by millions of people throughout the free world over the largest international radio hook-up ever attempted. An estimated 450,000 Berlin citizens gathered hours ahead of time in Schoeneberg Platz to hear the former leader of the Berlin airlift say, "As this bell rings, may it strike a note of warning to all oppressors; a sound of courage to those called upon to defend their freedom; and a message of hope to those who are enslaved."

MOSCOW LIES

Moscow, as usual, lied to the Russian people about the event. Their controlled press and radio stated falsely that the people of Berlin ignored the ceremonies; that they called it a "bell of death," symbol of United States militarism contrived by the warmongerers, Eisenhower and Clay. The scrolls, they said, were signed by a handful of Government employees—policemen and firemen—who were forced to do so by threats from Washington. (The facts are that 2,000,000 American signatures were enshrined in the bell tower with the Freedom Bell on October 24. Thirteen million more will be added in special ceremonies in the near future.)

According to Moscow, barbed wire and a whole bevy of armed police were required to protect the speakers during the ceremonies. (Actually, the small force of city police was completely inadequate to handle the immense enthusiastic crowd.)

Also particularly annoying to the Kremlin was the presence of the UN flag, flown that day for the first time in Germany. "This is the same evil banner," Radio Moscow told its home-service listeners, "under which the United States cannibals are shedding the blood of Korean patriots." (This, though Russia is a member of the UN and on that day at Lake Success Vishinsky and Malik were conducting their short-lived peace offensive, which proved to be the prelude to Red China's attack on UN forces.)

BROADCASTS EXPOSE COLLABORATORS

The tones of the world freedom bell are now being heard 15 times a day as station breaks between the foreign-language programs of Radio Free Europe. The identification goes like this: Announcer: "This is Radio Free Europe." Sound: Four strokes of freedom bell. Announcer: "That was the freedom bell to remind you that you are listening to Radio Free Europe, your constant and reliable source of information."

In addition to news broadcasts, Radio Free Europe carries warnings regarding specific informers and collaborators, commentaries which point out deliberate falsifications in the Communist-controlled press, and programs of folk music, history, and literature banned by the regime. Very effective, also, are satirical sketches on the Soviet system and addresses by exiled leaders, well known in their homelands, speaking on present conditions of labor, government, religion, and economics.

Campaign signatures and contributions by States

State	Signatures	Contributions
Alabama	205,301	$10,979.11
Arizona	55,854	1,[illegible].29
Arkansas	100,983	451.39
California:		
Northern	898,174	67,995.68
Southern	672,188	95,486.65
Colorado	326,411	23,038.65
Connecticut	235,[illegible]	20,192.89
Delaware	50,[illegible]	2,[illegible].60
District of Columbia	55,308	2,140.31
Florida	425,[illegible]	12,[illegible].88
Georgia	802,032	65,542.22
Idaho	57,048	11,[illegible].20
Illinois	390,[illegible]	21,[illegible].26
Indiana	376,280	26,[illegible].43
Iowa	92,041	8,718.26
Kansas	143,[illegible]	()
Kentucky	4[illegible]	37,725.76
Louisiana	236,[illegible]	1,[illegible].23
Maine	261,034	6,084.[illegible]
Maryland	423,[illegible]	[illegible],641.07
Massachusetts	[illegible],361	12,479.13
Michigan	677,767	21,[illegible].[illegible]
Minnesota	158,040	[illegible],[illegible].05
Mississippi	130,822	6,308.68
Missouri:		
Eastern	303,[illegible]	44,[illegible].43
Western	105,[illegible]	[illegible].90
Montana	79,194	12,[illegible].74
Nebraska	38,703	4,[illegible].10
Nevada	70,917	6,146.32
New Hampshire	61,444	3,[illegible].39
New Jersey	1,011,470	23,187.57
New Mexico	106,814	4,[illegible].12
New York:		
Upstate	895,300	147,[illegible].26
New York City	[illegible],417	[illegible]
Nassau County	35,[illegible]	2,[illegible].[illegible]
Westchester County	72,000	6,[illegible].32
North Carolina	200,308	18,[illegible].95
North Dakota	26,171	4,[illegible].08
Ohio	1,153,[illegible]	22,[illegible].[illegible]
Oklahoma	[illegible],819	19,[illegible].[illegible]
Oregon	303,072	21,[illegible].09
Pennsylvania:		
Eastern	1,551,217	[illegible].84
Western	468,[illegible]	30,[illegible].[illegible]
Rhode Island	94,227	8,[illegible].74
South Carolina	148,141	5,[illegible].20
South Dakota	45,771	4,[illegible].[illegible]
Tennessee	[illegible],083	17,[illegible].75
Texas	671,[illegible]	[illegible].[illegible]
Utah	102,[illegible]	9,419.16
Vermont	44,338	3,796.93
Virginia	195,[illegible]	17,[illegible].38
Washington	126,[illegible]	[illegible].20
West Virginia	211,[illegible]	2,[illegible].59
Wisconsin	[illegible],204	4,[illegible].93
Wyoming	72,[illegible]	10,271.80
Unidentified and out of country		23,504.68
Total	15,507,877	1,288,044.89

[1] See western Missouri.
[2] Including Kansas.
[3] Including special campaign.

American Ground Troops in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Maryland (Mr.

[2] I believe in the sacredness and dignity of the individual. I believe that all men derive the right to freedom equally from God. I pledge to resist aggression and tyranny wherever they appear on earth.

BUTLER] delivered a very interesting address before the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., at the Washington Hotel on the night of January 20. He discussed the question of sending ground troops to Western Europe, and I believe his observations will be of interest to the Senate and the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address of the Senator from Maryland be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comrades, I'm happy to be here tonight. Truly so because I feel at home. And, I'll tell you why. Right now I'm going through an experience you and I know all about.

Remember when you were a rookie and were taking your basic? I'll never forget the first weeks I spent at camp. I remember how new everything was. How strange I felt. How many mistakes I made. How frustrated I felt.

Well, I'm going through the whole thing all over again. Maybe it's a little more refined where I am now. The top sergeants don't yell as loud as they did when I went to my first Army camp. The brass doesn't shoot me—all the time, but, I'm a rookie just the same.

Of course they don't call it that. They call me a freshman—a freshman Senator.

I came in with the newest class of Senators. You know they are all graded according to seniority. That is, first on how many years you've served in the Senate, then how many years you've served in the House of Representatives or whether you've been a governor of your State.

You know this is my first venture into politics. I never held any kind of public office before. So, my name is on the bottom of the list with a couple of other Senators when it comes to patronage, influence, and authority.

Now I'm not telling you all this because I need a crying towel or a slip to my chaplain. I asked for it when I asked the people to elect me Senator and no matter how tough it is or how tough it gets I'm going to stick to my part of the agreement.

I'm going to slug it out like every rookie that was ever born has had to do. But right now I want you and the people who supported me to understand what the score is.

As soon as I get a little more experience and maybe win a stripe or two I'll be able to help solve more and more of the problems now facing the people in this great country.

Right now I am a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. These two committees do extremely important work for Congress but they are not rated among the big committees such as Appropriations, Foreign Relations, Finance, and Judiciary.

Now of course I wanted to get on the important committees but old man seniority blocked the kick. I have a feeling however that things are going to be different in '52. Then I can move up to a more important position.

However, at the present time I can see where I'm going to have my hands full on the committees to which I have been assigned.

For instance on the District Committee I understand I will become in effect a member of the City Council of Washington. I think I'm going to like that. I know there are a large number of Marylanders working in Washington. Their problems can be handled through the District Committee.

And then there is another angle to this assignment—problems like atomic defense, sanitation, and transportation are so intertwined in this metropolitan area that they must be coordinated.

An atom bomb recognizes no State lines.

I intend to lend my efforts to see that District authorities and Maryland officials work hand in glove on all problems affecting this area.

Also I'm glad to have some say in running affairs of the Nation's Capital. Next to my home town of Baltimore I think Washington is the best city in the country.

And I know Washington is the greatest capital in the world today. I think it is beautiful. I want to do everything in my power to keep it great and beautiful.

As for my other committee, I feel that having had some experience with civil service I will be able to be of assistance in this field. I was a member of the City Service Commission of Baltimore, which is the civil-service commission of that city.

I am strongly in favor of an efficient Government. I do not want any drones on the public payroll. I do not want to see money wasted. Even before coming to the United States Senate I developed a great respect for the work of my colleague, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, in urging Government economy.

On the other hand, I want to see the civil-service system conducted so that the loyal Americans we are asking to handle the country's business are fairly and squarely treated. I know this is especially necessary as we struggle through the present emergency conditions facing our Nation today.

I do not have any legislation in mind to bring before these committees at the present. As a matter of fact, I am going to be very chary about introducing any legislation for several months. Not that I do not intend to take an active and vigorous part in the work of the Senate, it is just that I believe first we have too many laws on the books today, and, second, I intend to study very carefully the proposals now pending which are sponsored by the more experienced hands in my party.

For instance, the Senate is today engaged in a most important foreign-policy debate. It is a subject of such vital interest to every person living in the United States, and for that matter everyone living in the world today, that every effort should be made to give every viewpoint intelligent consideration.

I have not made any firm commitments on any of the various phases of the problem under discussion, and I shall not do so until the Senate debate is finally at an end. However, there are several points on which I have reached a conclusion on the basis of the present situation.

Right here I want to say that when I do make up my mind on the basic elements of our foreign policy I am determined to see this country stop the bumbling and fumbling that has brought on this present serious condition.

One of the aspects now under scrutiny is the avowed intention of President Truman to send more troops to Europe. There is a very serious doubt in my mind as to the constitutionality of this move without the consent of Congress.

I call attention to the following provisions of the Constitution:

"SEC. 8 The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; * * *;

"To declare war, * * *;

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, * * *."

Certainly, the very foundation of our Government will be shaken if the executive branch is allowed to usurp this power of the people placed exclusively in the hands of Congress.

Now on Tuesday the Senate is to vote on a resolution introduced by Senator WHERRY, minority leader. This resolution says simply:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States shall be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by Congress."

I have made up my mind to vote in favor of that resolution. I understand, however, that an effort will be made, probably with the consent of the minority, to send this resolution to the Foreign Relations or some other committee for hearings.

I have read in the newspapers that this move is being contemplated in order to give General Eisenhower time to get back from Europe and report on conditions over there. I don't object to this.

The question involved here is not whether troops are to be sent to Europe. It is whether a commitment should be made to send them prior to the time of the ratification of such commitment by the Congress.

My vote for the Wherry resolution does not mean that I am opposed to dispatching troops to Europe to become a part of an integrated international army. It is not necessary at this point to make that decision. All my vote means is that I am opposed to making operative any commitment in that connection by the President until the Congress or the people have had an opportunity to examine it.

I deem it appropriate to acquaint you with my present feeling on the principal question of whether or not we shall commit troops to Europe.

But, before doing so I want to emphasize I am not for running out on our Western European allies. I do not think that we can in all conscience repudiate the Atlantic Pact.

In that pact this Nation has given its word to aid our allies of the North Atlantic community, and if they face the murderous onslaught of an aggressor, I favor keeping our word.

However, it is worthy of note that when the Atlantic Pact was signed the Congress was told by Secretary of State Dean Acheson that our aid would consist of matériel, not men. Now, today, without consulting or even advising with the Senate of the United States, President Truman has apparently decided to expand and supplement the Atlantic Pact by sending ground troops to Europe. He depends upon his authority as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces to legalize this act.

The Wherry resolution merely asks President Truman to hold up any action implementing the Atlantic Pact until the Senate has decided the issue. Surely the country does not want the President to bypass the Senate on this very important facet of treaty making. It is clearly set forth in our Constitution that the Senate alone by two-thirds vote has the power to bind this country in treaty.

If the Atlantic Pact itself had to be ratified by the Senate, it logically follows that any extension must likewise be so ratified. I am tired of this Executive grab for power.

Let's call a halt on this move to place a standing army of United States troops in Europe as a part of an international army until all constitutional provisions have been met. After we put a curb on this impetuous act then will be time to hear from General Eisenhower.

I want to hear the general's opinion as a military expert on conditions in Europe. I want to know what European nations are doing about the threat of aggression that we are now rushing headlong to meet on foreign shores.

To return to the principal theme, I entertain the conviction that the first shock

of an attack upon a member of the Atlantic community should be borne by the country upon which the aggression is launched. However, I do not say that I am rigidly opposed to committing a limited number of American troops to an integrated international force for the purpose of absorbing the initial shock of such an aggression.

If our military leaders feel that the presence of some of our troops in Europe is beneficial to the attainment of the over-all objective of containing the aggression or ultimately reversing it, I would not object too strenuously. Such a course would give us command of bases from which we could bomb out the enemy's potentials.

In this connection I would like to direct your attention to the speech of that great and good American, ex-President Herbert Hoover. I think the meaning of his great pronouncements have been deliberately distorted.

Mr. Hoover, at the outset of his speech, said: "No appraisal of the world situation can be final in an unstable world. However we find our national path, we must constantly reexamine where we have arrived and at times revise our direction." He then pointed out that from his observations the free peoples of Western Europe were lacking in a will to defend themselves and that disunities were manifest.

But he also said: "We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of the defense of western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will, and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money."

I have the temerity to tell you that in my opinion what Mr. Hoover has said is that upon the basis of present appraisal, Europe hasn't the means nor the will to defend itself. That being so, our dollars, while making up the insufficiency in means, will not restore the will.

However, if upon reexamination it becomes apparent that the differences and disunities of the North Atlantic community have been resolved and a desire for freedom is apparent and the will to defend it is present then our former President would be the last man in the world to say that aid should be denied them.

Maybe the wish is the father to the thought. I hope that is what Mr. Hoover means, although at the moment, as I have said, I am prepared to go a little further and favor the dispatch of a limited number of troops to Europe in the hope that their presence there will bring new hope and courage to our Western Europe allies and wake them up to their responsibilities to themselves and the rest of the free world.

However, I do not believe in sticking our nose into situations where we will have to stand alone as a target from all sides. Let's find out what Europe is going to do first before we further pledge the resources of this country in a foreign policy, if it can be called that, that has again led us to the place where we must assume all the risks—a place where we stand to lose everything and win nothing. Look at our situation in Korea.

Do you think it could be worse? From what I read about it our top military men have said over and over again that our position on the peninsula is untenable. If that is so, why do we keep on fighting there? Why don't we get out before we sacrifice any more Americans to save face?

There are a lot of my people in Maryland who think we should never have gone there in the first place. There are a number of Marylanders who think we should get out now. They have been writing to me about it. I am certainly going to give close consideration to their arguments.

America is big and strong. America has the spiritual fortitude to take defeat such as we have suffered in Korea and to make a come-back. Everyone in life takes a licking once in a while. The courageous acknowledge it and begin over again. The wise look upon set-backs as a lesson on which to build success.

We may not like taking a beating, but as long as we fight for a righteous principle we have nothing to be ashamed of if we lose now and then.

Certainly if we are in an untenable position in Korea we should drop back to another line. We should regroup our forces in a position where our men will have a fighting chance of survival. We should not wait to be shoved out of Korea while our men are daily being mowed down by the weight of superior forces.

We know the Chinese forces are winding up to swamp our Army. We know that the refusal of the Communists in China to accept the terms of a reasonable cease-fire order means that they are determined to push the United Nations Army off the peninsula.

Unless the military strategists can increase our forces with help from other United Nations countries to an extent where we will have a fighting chance of victory, I am inclined to follow the pleas of the people who have written me on this subject and to demand our withdrawal.

Regardless of what action the administration orders in Korea and Europe, we are faced again with the demand to increase our Armed Forces. And again I reserve the right to make up my mind as to the necessity of this move after all the chips are down.

I want to be thoroughly convinced we need the tremendous number of men under arms the new program calls for before I vote to put our sons in uniform for 3, 4, or 6 years of their lives.

I am disturbed for instance about the proposal to draft youths 18 years of age. I think that age is too young. I enlisted the day after war was declared in World War I. I was 19.

Now I have two sons in draft age. One is eighteen and a half, the other is nineteen and a half years old. They will be drafted soon I know and they are thinking about enlisting even before they are called in the draft.

As I look at them I realize that it is time for them to assume their responsibility of defending the country in which they have lived their youth. I also realize that the shock and brutality of war will rest heavy on them if they are sent into the fighting. And I do not believe they would have been ready to do the part that is now being asked of them if they had been called when they passed their eighteenth birthday.

So I do not believe your sons or anyone's son should be called to make this sacrifice until they are ready to do the job.

And since my sons have passed their eighteenth birthday my reaction will in no way protect them, but perhaps I can throw my weight toward preventing unnecessary tragedy in thousands of other homes throughout the Nation.

I wish to make some reservation in connection with the stand I am taking against an 18-year-old draft. First, if this country was placed in dire straits and the very young and the very old were called upon to aid in defending these shores of ours I would not stand in the way of calling the youth of the country to its defense.

And if it is deemed necessary to build up a reserve for our Armed Forces by placing 18-year-olds in uniform to prepare them for active duty after they become seasoned I would be inclined to go along. For instance, if 18-year-olds were drafted with the specific provision that they would be given 6 months' training and not sent out of this country until they had been in uniform for another 6 months, I might be willing to vote in favor of such a draft.

In conclusion we want to be prepared certainly but we do not want to fall into the trap set by the Soviet leaders. By that I mean we do not want to spend our way into bankruptcy. Nor to adopt a program of Socialist government. We must protect our domestic economy.

We must begin now to cut down on non-defense Government spending.

We must keep America free.

Truman-Congress Amity Near

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Truman-Congress Amity Near," by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star, January 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN-CONGRESS AMITY NEAR—SPIRIT OF COOPERATION BETWEEN STATE DEPARTMENT AND LAWMAKERS ALSO WOULD HELP COMMON CAUSE

(By David Lawrence)

Relations between Congress and President Truman are getting better. There's a rift in the clouds and a bit of sensibility is beginning to appear.

Apparently President Truman doesn't seem to be brusque with Congress last week when he said, in effect, he would consult Congress but would do as he pleased about sending troops abroad. He said the reporters that maybe they didn't write the story the way he meant it. They, of course, wrote what they heard him say. Mr. Truman thinks the implications of his words were perhaps misconstrued or ignored.

These misunderstandings will occur. Mr. Truman is really not responsible when the reporting was unsound but that at times things don't sound in print as they sound when he says them. Maybe they ought to have a system of sound films to run into so that the exact intonation of voice could be recorded. Maybe the whole press conference should be put on radio and television so that the public—whose business is being discussed—can judge for itself which the inflections of a Presidential voice really mean.

As for Congress, there are signs that Senator TAFT is softening or clarifying his position, too. He wouldn't object to sending troops to Europe, he says, but wants Congress to spell out some sort of policy so that America will supply certain divisions and the other nations some divisions in proper proportion.

Anyway, there seems to be a convergence toward agreement. So far as foreign governments are concerned, they can properly derive from the modifications, clarifications, and explanations that the executive and legislative branches of the American Government are beginning to see eye to eye on the major things—they are agreed on what the diplomats call the principle, and there are-

just some slight details of difference on how the principle shall be applied.

Basically there never was any doubt that, if the President asked Congress for authority to station our troops in Europe as a part of our North Atlantic treaty obligation, he would get such authority by overwhelming vote. The legalists who told him a bad precedent would be created if he asked for such authority were giving Mr. Truman poor advice. The President of the United States can always act of his own initiative in sending troops out of the country if there is danger. He does not need to wait for congressional action. But where there is time, the words of the Constitution would seem to imply that he ask for congressional authority soon after he sends the troops abroad, if not before.

It may be stated also that a declaration which recognizes a state of war with Communist China, if submitted to Congress now, would pass by an overwhelming vote of both houses. Congressional sentiment is almost unanimous on the rejection of the phony "peace" proposal made by the Chinese Communists, and there is complete backing for the State Department in its efforts to obtain the adoption at the United Nations of a resolution condemning Red China as an aggressor.

Under the American system of free discussion, world policies are praised or criticized, or proposals for amendment are made publicly. Thus every official of the State Department knows what Congress is thinking about and, if not, members of the congressional committees are free to come in and talk about it or write in or telephone.

What is needed here mostly is to encourage a spirit of cooperation—to instill the feeling at the State Department that Members of Congress have a responsibility to their constituents and also to instill on Capitol Hill the feeling that the State Department will welcome advice. Having established the right kind of relationship between the two branches of Government, it then becomes essential for Congress to recognize that under the Constitution the conduct of foreign relations is an executive function and that the President and Secretary of State must make the final decisions and be held accountable for them to the country.

As one looks back on the somewhat clumsy performances of the last few days, one wonders how much it is all due to the deep-seated partisanship of the President himself, which distrusts the opposition party, and conversely to the distrust which the opposition party has with respect to Mr. Truman and his Secretary of State.

Contribution of Industry in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] regarding the contribution of industry in the Pacific Northwest in the present situation, together with a letter from Jack Hickman, president of Northwest Marine Industries, Inc.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY P. CAIN, OF WASHINGTON

One of the characteristics of a free people has always been that in times of trouble they voluntarily unify in a common effort in behalf of the Nation. This is true of American industry. I think it can be truly said that there is no section of our Nation or our economy which exceeds any other in its patriotism—in its eagerness to contribute in full measure to the national security.

I am proud, however, Mr. President, in being able to point out that the progressive workers, and industry of the Pacific Northwest have always been in the vanguard of our defense and war efforts.

Characteristic of this eagerness to serve the Nation is the Pacific Northwest marine industry, the industry which provided the oceanic highroad to victory in two world wars. That industry stands ready today to provide that same highroad to victory in the present mobilization effort of America and other free nations of the world.

Mr. President, I call upon the leaders of our Military Establishment to make full use of the ingenuity, the technical skill, and the patriotism of the men and women who design and build the ships of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from Mr. Jack Hickman, president of the Northwest Marine Industries, Inc., cosigned by Mr. John McNichol and Mr. John M. Haydon, of the Northwest Marine Industry Mobilization Committee, which constitute that industry's declaration of its readiness to serve in the present crisis in whatever capacity it can best contribute to the defense of America. I should like to call it to the attention of the Nation and the Nation's leaders by having it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NORTHWEST MARINE INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Seattle, Wash., January 11, 1951.

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: The membership of Northwest Marine Industries, Inc., representing the boatbuilders, marine suppliers, ship chandlers, marine manufacturers, and allied maritime industries of the Pacific Northwest, wish to voice through you to President Truman, the Chiefs of Staff, and the heads of the various Military Establishments, the sincere desire of this association to aid in any way possible in the successful conclusion of the present emergency, and to pledge that every ounce of skill, and all the resources of this association are instantly available.

Obviously, in the type of warfare which now appears imminent, the availability of skillfully constructed, rugged, seaworthy boats will be of prime military importance. Of equal importance will be a reservoir of skilled labor and properly equipped plants to build such craft. This organization knows that an unmatched combination of such skill, equipment, and know-how exists within its membership. We are anxious that this supply of manpower, knowledge, and tools be put to the proper use insofar as winning the current struggle is concerned. The industry which for years has built economical small craft for fishermen and commercial boatmen to withstand some of the world's most rugged and trying waters—as in Alaska and the Bering Sea—obviously will be able to do a real job for our Government and military in the present emergency.

It should be remembered that the work horses of the Navy were largely built in this area during World War II, among them air-sea rescue boats, harbor and seagoing tugs, salvage vessels, mine sweepers, and many other types of small and medium sized military craft. The recent award to a builder in this area, Tacoma Boatbuilding Co., Tacoma, Wash., of a contract to build five mine sweepers is an indication that the job this area did in the last war is not forgotten.

At present the geographical area covered by the membership of Northwest Marine Industries, Inc., has a boatbuilding, maintenance, and repair pool of thousands of trained, skilled men—especially in the wooden boat construction field—and a total of 351 yards in Washington, Oregon, Alaska, and British Columbia which are ready, willing, and able to be of service. Of these latter, 319 are yards for the building of wooden vessels and 32 are yards capable of building either steel or wooden ships.

In addition, the great maritime Pacific Northwest has manufacturing facilities for virtually every type of equipment used on a boat or ship, including such items as winches, Diesel engines, paints, radio and electronic communication and navigation equipment, remote controls, boilers, marine stoves, tanks, propellers, and many others.

In this same territory are located a number of the largest marine supply houses in the world. This area is also, with approximately 33,000 registered small boats, the second largest such district in the United States. It holds the same position in regard to the number of documented vessels in the area, with Juneau, Alaska, in the third position nationally.

In the interests of our Nation, this great maritime potential must be put to the most valuable use. We would appreciate your working with us as closely as possible, particularly in the matter of seeing to it that we are quickly informed of any possible ways in which our capabilities may be put to use. Your past interest in our affairs assures us that you will do so.

And may the membership of Northwest Marine Industries, Inc., repeat that all our skills, equipment, and manpower stand ready to serve in any way. All that is needed, now, is the word to swing into action.

Sincerely,

JACK HICKMAN,
President, Northwest Marine Industries, Inc.
JOHN MACNICHOL,
JOHN M. HAYDON,
Northwest Marine Industry Mobilization Commission.

Measures for the Defense of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on January 17, my able colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], delivered before the Junior Chamber of Commerce, at Alexandria, Va., an address in which he presented, among other things, several most useful facts with reference to the Organized Reserves of our Armed Forces. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Would that I could bring good news to you tonight. It is always popular and pleasurable to say those things which please the fancy of those to whom we talk, but under the present circumstances which exist in the world today, it would be futile and immoral for me to attempt to be gay or to be the conveyor of good news.

Today it is trite to ring the bell of gloom. The facts of this Nation's sad and dangerous plight have been intoned by grave and dour voices over and over again. To say that we face a long period of sacrifice, hard work and danger is to trespass on the obvious. Everyone who can read the headlines of any newspaper knows of these things, he knows of the critical and perilous situation that world communism has placed us in.

There is an old Chinese proverb which says "It is better to strike a light than to curse the darkness." Well, let's have some light on what we are trying to do today. What we must try to determine is, now that we are in this situation, what are we doing about it? Where are we going? What are the prospects for the future?

Now that the Communists have made it abundantly clear that they are not only willing, but intend to use force and military might where it will advance their cause, it leaves us only one course open—that of getting ourselves militarily prepared. What are we doing along that line would be the next question.

The President, day before yesterday submitted a budget message to the Congress calling for increased appropriations for the military by approximately $39,000,000,000 over that actually spent in the period from July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950. In that 1949–50 period we spent $12,303,000,000 for the military. The President's budget this year asked for $50,971,000,000 of appropriations for the 1952 fiscal year.

However there is a large difference between authorizing money to be spent, and having on hand military equipment and manpower. Large appropriations, big tax bills, won't by themselves stop an enemy bomber nor a battalion of Communists. The only true test of defense is equipment and manpower available for use, and on that in the words of Al Smith, "Let's look at the record."

In the past 9 months we have increased the size of our Armed Forces from 1,460,000 before the Korean invasion to a present-day strength of 2,367,000. The Department of Defense estimates that we will have in the armed services by June 1 of this year some 3,225,000 men, and it is anticipated that by January 1, 1952, there will be approximately 5,000,000 men in the Armed Forces.

These men are being placed through volunteers, Reserve programs and the draft. It seems to me as we progress in this matter of building our Armed Forces, that some changes are drastically needed in this matter of procuring manpower. For under present operation, each of us knows of many injustices which daily occur.

According to recent figures submitted by the Department of Defense to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, 28 percent of all the men between 19 and 26, eligible for the draft, have been rejected for one reason or another. In a breakdown of that 28 percent rejection figure, 13 percent were rejected for literacy or intelligence reasons and 15 percent for failing to meet the medical standards. This high rejection of manpower puts the heavy burden of defense more and more on the Reserves and creates a greater and greater pressure to start drafting veterans. Most of the Reserves today are inactive. At the end of World War II many officers were not discharged, but were automatically placed in the Reserve on inactive duty. Most of them have so remained. Others have evidenced their willingness by becoming weekend soldiers and flyers. Generally speaking, these men and the veterans—not in Reserve are the ones who carried the burden of the last war—they are the men who gave up from 2 to 5 years of their young lives to satisfy the appetite of the monster war. Most of today's veterans have had overseas' experience, many of them know, first-hand, of the anxiety and the danger of momentarily having one's life snuffed out quickly and painfully by an enemy bullet. Those youngsters of the last war—today's veterans—were the bulwark, the bone and the marrow of our successful fight against the dictatorship of Hitler. And today it is these men who are just now getting a delayed start in life. The majority of them are now married; they have small children and responsibilities; they are now beginning for the first time to get over the hump in the matter of earning a livelihood, and they are becoming an increasingly important part in the Nation's economic life. These men, veterans of the last war, except for their ages, are generally speaking, physically fit. They are good citizens, they are great Americans, their patriotism is beyond question, and they are ready and willing to take up arms again if there is an urgent need for them to do so. But they already know of the long wait at sick bay and in chow lines, the tediousness of policing barracks, the boredom of digging over and over again slit trenches, the driving of jeeps, the assembly and disassembly of M-1s, the monotony of close-order drill. They have already experienced that and more, and they do not want it again unless it is absolutely necessary. They would like to understand the theory of why a man should be rejected by a draft board because he has flat feet when they know, and he knows, that it would not interfere with that man's driving a jeep. They would like to know why a man who has a broken eardrum still cannot operate a car pool or drive a bulldozer. They would like to know why it is that a four-fingered man who throws a football with great accuracy on Saturday afternoons could not with equal accuracy throw a hand grenade or at least a shovel full of dirt. They would like to know why a man who has poor vision cannot issue shoes, or cook food, or be a general's aide. For as a matter of fact, every day these men who are rejected for some slight physical defect, do a similar or more difficult job in civilian life than that which they would be called upon to do in military life. Everybody in the military doesn't actually carry a gun, or fly a plane. The latest estimate, I believe, is that for every combat soldier at the front, there are seven other men behind him who arrange for his feeding, his health, his pay, his transportation, and all the rest.

The time has now come to more realistically consider this manpower problem and particularly the drafting of men. Men with certain physical defects can be used in specialized jobs, and the proper use of our manpower should be made by drafting men for specific jobs. It is not essential to have a perfect physical specimen plan meals, repair trucks, or code messages. Certainly the men who have already served overseas should not be yanked away from their homes, their new family responsibilities for the second time within a period of 10 years, at least not until those who can serve, even though suffering from a slight physical defect have first rendered their service and taken their turn at giving their time for their Nation. And so as the military program moves forward, as more men are taken into the Army, it seems to me essential that we change the present policy of calling up only those men who have no disabilities, and begin to realistically draft men for the job which they can do.

Another specific program of preparation for the future is that of seeking the support of allies throughout the world.

This is, in essence, the subject of the great debate, as the newspapers term it, which is now going on in the Senate. As I have listened for the past week to this debate, it seems to me that all sides are rather close together. All recognize the desirability of having active participating allies on our side when faced with a fight against a powerful opponent. The only points in issue are first—how far do we go in encouraging those Western European countries to become active participants in joint defense programs with us.

One group of Senators take the position that the United States should do nothing more to assist the people of Europe. They advocate no more aid or encouragement to them until they, over there, manifest a stronger will to defend themselves. The other group says that the people of Europe know they cannot defend their countries without our active, real, and practical help, and that we must encourage those countries to bestir themselves to action, by showing them we will help, by sending arms, equipment with which to fight, and by actually joining forces with them in a mutual defense program. This latter group argues that when and as this is done, the feeling of despair and hopelessness will disappear and a spirit of resistance and cooperation will develop.

For my part, I think the answer to this question could best be answered with a question. Which course of ours would make Joe Stalin happier? I think Stalin would be most pleased if we abandoned our former allies of Western Europe. Such a course on our part would be opening the door and inviting Stalin to step in and fill the vacuum.

It seems to me, it is our own self-interest to encourage those people of Europe to join with us as active allies and resist communism. This must be done practically and within our own limitations. But it should be done, for in truth, the people who want to preserve their way of life need each other in the face of Communist aggression. They, over there, need us, and we need them.

The other point under discussion in the great debate is an offshoot of the first.

Does the President have the authority to send troops to Europe without first consulting the Congress?

I think a strict technical interpretation of the President's authority would give him the power to send our troops overseas. But I think the President is too prudent not to submit the matter to the Congress in one form or another, for to do so would reassure the people of the United States and gain their better cooperation for future proposals and add much to the unity of the Nation.

However, it's my opinion, that for all practical purposes, the issue of troops going to Europe will be decided by one man—Gen. Dwight E. Eisenhower. If he recommends against it, no troops will go. If he recommends for it, I believe that they will go.

There are many other specific programs for the future which are today being worked on and in which we in Government and you out of it must take a vital interest, but time does not permit the discussion of them here. There is, however, one point I would like to briefly make in closing, and that is this: The battle in which we find ourselves unwilling participants is one in which the atomic will not necessarily be first nation with the biggest, most destructive war machine. This battle in which we find ourselves today is one in which the victor must not alone seek to control the bodies of men but must seek to convince the hearts and minds of men as well.

For the past 5 years we have allowed Communist propaganda against us to keep us

on the defensive, dodging, ducking, denying. The time has now come when we must move from the defense to the offense. A great selling job is called for, not only by the Government but by all the people of this Nation. We have the greatest commodity on earth to sell—freedom, democracy. And yet our efforts to sell them in recent years have been puny and ineffective. We must instill within our people and the people who represent us in Government a fervor and enthusiasm for democracy greater than that which the Communists feel for communism.

We must begin to send the message of the blessings of freedom out to every corner of the globe. We must be particularly interested in our neighbors to the south, for the Latin-American countries—all the nations of South America, are today of extreme and utmost importance. We must develop our relationships with them and develop their love of and desire for freedom, independence, and democracy.

This is not a one-man job. It's not alone the Government's job. It's everybody's job who looks hopefully to the future. But it particularly falls on the shoulders of the young people, for as you have longer to live, more to look forward to, your stake in the future is greatest. The challenge to freedom and opportunity should ring loudest in your ears and in mine. For we are the young people of America. The responsibility of keeping our lives free, our system of government intact, is rushing toward us.

And like those who have preceded us we must step forward and accept the challenge. That's the way with all God's creatures—as the aged wither and die, the young move up to replace them. This is our time on the stage, and the scene will be short, without rehearsals or repeats.

With our knowledge that men who are free to think, work and worship as they choose are always happier and superior to those who live on their knees under communism with their hearts and minds in chains; with our faith that right makes might; and with our willingness to step forward and meet this challenge, I know that the lamp of freedom and liberty will continue to burn brightly for generations to come.

The Proposed Cease-Fire Order in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial bearing on the United Nations Organization, which seems to have come to a dead-end in its discussions of a cease-fire order in Korea at the price of blackmail paid to the aggressor forces in Asia. So that the record on these points may be as complete as possible, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a most pertinent editorial on this subject which appeared in the Cleveland Press, one of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, on Monday, January 15, 1951. It is entitled "A Vote To Pay Blackmail."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VOTE TO PAY BLACKMAIL

The United Nations now stands ready to reward aggression by offering to give Formosa and China's seat in the UN to the Chinese Reds in return for a cease-fire order in Korea.

The old League of Nations had some sordid chapters in its brief history because of its cowardly retreats from aggression in Manchuria and Ethiopia. But it merely looked the other way, without condoning aggression by paying it tribute.

The latest UN act is one of infamy.

The UN cannot long survive this base betrayal of the very purpose for which it was created. The memory of every soldier who has died in Korea fighting under its flag will rise to haunt it. The day Red China is seated in the Security Council, this country should walk out. That much is due our honored dead.

No nation can have any faith in the idea of collective security as it is administered by the UN, because if it will sell out one government, it will sell out others. Indeed, if the Reds accept the bribe which has been offered them, what more can the organization be considered than a cat's-paw of aggression?

CHINA'S BETRAYAL

Protesting against the betrayal of Nationalist China, which is a member of the organization, its delegate, Dr. T. F. Tsiang said that Formosa was being treated as though it were a no man's land.

Actually, he said, Formosa is the home of free China, defended by an army of a half million men, the largest single unit of power against Communist imperialist aggression in the Far East. The proposed peace talks with the Reds, he added, pose only one question:

"How do you want Formosa, rare, medium, or well done?"

That is not funny.

The lives of 7,500,000 people, including permanent residents of the island and the refugees from the mainland, will be in jeopardy if Formosa is handed over to the mercies of the Peiping Reds. Many of these people on Formosa have been branded as war criminals for no other reason than that they have opposed communism.

Thus we treat our friends—the first government to offer its assistance when we took up arms in South Korea. And we are doing this at the urging of India, which proclaimed its neutrality in that crucial hour.

VOICE OF FREE ASIA

How will the free nations of Asia react to this perfidious act by the great powers? That question was answered on the floor of the United Nations by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines.

"How far, sir, can the United Nations keep retreating from established, sound moral positions without courting final disaster?" he asked.

"A retreat in the course of battle is understandable and sometimes inevitable, but a retreat from right principles while a battle is being waged for those principles cannot be justified on any ground whatever.

"My country knows the nameless terror and agony of war as few countries around this table do. Therefore, we understand the anxious desire of many delegates to exhaust every possibility of avoiding a general war. But we also know there is at least one thing that is worse than war itself, and that is the degrading enslavement that would surely follow an abject surrender before the threats of a fanatic and implacable aggressor."

The United Nations was saying to Peiping, he charged, "You may stop hitting and killing my boys so that we can discuss how to reward you with the gift of Formosa and a seat in the United Nations."

General Romulo warned the United Nations it would lose its reason for being if it resorted to appeasement in this situation.

"We have heard moving appeals to the free nations of the world to close ranks," he said. "But such appeals cannot be met by an admission of weakness and abject surrender. The march of Communist aggression cannot be arrested by a policy of moral retreat and surrender."

Indeed, doesn't the betrayal of Nationalist China and Korea put every free nation on notice that its best hope lies in making peace with Moscow on the best terms it can?

OUR SORRY ROLE

Where did the United States stand when the roll was called on this unhappy occasion?

Ours was a craven "Me, too" vote.

Warren R. Austin, the American delegate, supported the proposal to buy off the Reds, explaining that he did so in the interest of unity. Afterward, it was explained that Mr. Austin did not expect the Reds to accept the proposition, and then he would be free to revive his resolution condemning them as aggressors. Would he add as a second count of his indictment their refusal to accept a bribe?

We assume Mr. Austin was carrying out orders of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Nothing less than immediate resignation of both men could in any way relieve this country of even a small part of embarrassment caused by the indefensible position our Government has taken.

The administration first lost the initiative in the UN by failing to press for forthright action against Red China, then joined Britain and the other appeasement advocates in offering to pay blackmail.

That act is a virtual admission that the whole Korean undertaking was a miscalculation, and that Red China was right and the United States was wrong. The appeasement offer to which our UN spokesman consented cannot be appraised on any other basis.

We don't believe Congress or the American people will buy any part of it. They cannot forget the case of Private First Class Brown, who hasn't been seen since September 4.

That day, Pfc Melvin Brown, of Mahaffey, Pa., stood atop a 50-foot wall at Kasan, Korea, and beat back the enemy single-handed, while his platoon regrouped to repel the attackers.

Private First Class Brown fired his rifle until he ran out of ammunition.

Private First Class Brown hurled grenades until he ran out of grenades.

They still kept coming up that wall.

Private First Class Brown wasn't a man to let a little thing like no ammunition thwart him. He took his entrenching shovel and bashed those Reds over the head as they came up—delivering skull-crushers with his shovel to a dozen of them.

Last week at the White House President Truman presented a Congressional Medal of Honor to the father of Private First Class Brown.

"Outstanding personal bravery" the citation reads.

And a good solid American brand of personal bravery, that Private First Class Brown delivered atop that lonesome wall in Korea.

Private First Class Brown was in a position where he had to call a spade a weapon.

Countless hordes of Chinese Reds have swept down on the Private First Class Browns in Korea.

Our leaders and Allies are not in the position they put Private First Class Brown in, but they should be statesmen enough to call a spade a spade.

How Much Are You Willing To Sacrifice for Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an unusual editorial entitled "How Much Are You Willing To Sacrifice for Peace?" from the St. Petersburg Times of January 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH ARE YOU WILLING TO SACRIFICE FOR PEACE?

(I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost to maintain this Declaration and support and defend these States. Yet, through all the gloom I can see rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see the end is worth more than the cost.—John Adams, 1776.)

It is literally impossible for anyone to comprehend the full meaning of the $100,000,000,000 defense program for next year which President Truman has said will be necessary. Of that amount only $40,000,000,000 will be in cash; the remaining $60,000,000,000 will be in contract authorizations. Even thus broken down, those figures are beyond grasp.

The President's goals of 1,000,000 more men and women in the armed services in the next few months, and 4,000,000 more persons in defense production by the end of the year, are not quite so hard to understand. But what they will mean to us, in changing our accustomed living habits, we still have to learn.

This much is certain: Never in the lifetime of any living person if, indeed, in the history of the Nation—have the American people been called upon to assume so tremendous a burden. Never have we been faced with a program promising such austerity and sacrifice.

The road ahead will challenge every resource, will call for every ounce of moral stamina on the part of every citizen.

Were atom bombs today to fall on Chicago and Pittsburgh, or an enemy fleet to appear off our shores, or enemy paratroopers to drop in Alaska—or Mexico—then there would be no doubt about the response of the people.

If we were engaged in all-out war—even though it were not on our shores—no one would complain of working longer hours, putting up with rationing and price controls, paying heavier taxes, sending our young men and women off to war. In the face of disaster or its imminence, the American fiber is the toughest in the world.

But we are not now engaged in all-out war. There is disagreement in the ranks of democratic leaders the world over as to how imminent all-out war is. There is doubt as to whether Russia and its satellites want all-out war—either in the immediate future or for years to come.

Ironically, what we may find the most difficult thing facing us is not war but nonwar, since what we have and what lies ahead for a long time to come cannot be called peace.

The ultimate goal of our Nation, and of all free nations is, of course, peace—peace with freedom and justice.

It may be that we may achieve that goal only by victory in all-out war. Or, if we are strong enough and determined enough, we may win it without total war—perhaps even with no war at all.

But make no mistake about the cost of a nonwar victory. If we are to be spared the devastation and death of war—more terrible than ever before—then we must still pay the same price of taxes, toil, deprivation, regulation, discomfort, and sacrifice.

We can win the victory we seek without war. Totalitarianism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Because it is politically, economically, and morally wrong, no totalitarian system can long survive.

However, it is equally true that we can lose without war. We can lose if we are not willing to pay the price of being so impregnably strong that it is not necessary for us to fight. We can lose if, through the "Gibraltarism" of Herbert Hoover or the isolationism of Joseph P. Kennedy, or the equivocation of Senator ROBERT TAFT, we permit the rest of the world to succumb to the imperialism of Russia.

It is far harder to face and endure the sacrifices which will be needed for victory if there is no war than if we are plunged into a life-and-death struggle. The "rays of ravishing light and glory" which John Adams foresaw shine far brighter through the murk of battle and the smoke of dying cities than they do through the gray gloom of a nonwar which is not a peace.

Each of us—this day—ought soberly to face the facts and do some earnest soul-searching. We ought to realize just what we're up against. We ought to ask ourselves whether we are prepared for the task—and if we're not, then adjust our thinking, our plans, our hopes, and aspirations.

Let's take up some specific items:

Longer hours: With the stepped-up defense program and the drain of manpower by the Armed Forces most of us are going to have to work longer hours. Are you prepared to work 48 or, if need be, 56 hours a week—and take your overtime pay in defense bonds which can't be cashed until after the emergency is over, so as to fight inflation?

Shortages: Are you prepared to drive your present car for 5 years longer—do with your present radio and vacuum cleaner and washing machine for a long time to come?

Rationing: When rationing comes—as it will shortly—are you prepared to accept it freely and cooperatively, so that a vast army of enforcement agents will not be needed to combat the evil of black markets? Even if you know there is some cheating, will you, personally, shun the black market?

Taxes: Are you prepared—have you adjusted your budget—to pay perhaps half again or even double your present taxes?

Service: If you are a young man or woman apt to have your schooling interrupted by military service, will you go back to college after your hitch is up?

Politics: Are you willing to put the interests of the Nation—of other people, if necessary—above your own or your party's, so that we can be assured of a Government which will preserve democracy despite the temptation which defense regimentation will bring?

Production: If you are a manufacturer of steel, aluminum, rubber, or other critical products, or a producer of electric power—or a stockholder in such a company—are you prepared to help vastly expand the productive capacity of your industry without holding back for fear of postwar overproduction?

These are not all the sacrifices which we must make if we are to achieve victory; you can think of the others yourself. And the most vital question of all is this:

Are you prepared to do all these things—as you probably think you are—without the stimulus of war? Are you prepared to pay the price of peace for year after year—possibly for 20 years?

The gamble which Moscow will make—if it chooses not to precipitate total war—is that the American people and the other free people of the world won't have the courage and firmness of purpose to pay the price of peace. They will gamble that we haven't enough guts to take it year after year. They will bet on their ability to hold their rotten system together by the force and terrorism of police tactics until we succumb to our love of luxury and comfort.

There is no excitement, no fun, no glory in a nonwar struggle.

On the other hand, neither is there blood and tears, nor widows nor orphans nor devastated cities and a scorched earth.

Is it worth the price?

You—and you alone—have the answer to that.

Contribution of Farmers to the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made before the annual convention of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, at St. Paul, Minn., on Wednesday of last week. The address deals with the production of food, with the farm parity program, and also with Western European ideas on those questions.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am indeed happy to have the privilege of speaking to you at your annual Minnesota Farm Bureau meeting, and to meet again so many of my old friends. With many of you, I have been associated in farm organization activities for many years. You and I worked together in those frightful depression years.

In those days the farm organizations had much to do with obtaining improvements and enactment of farm credit legislation which enabled farmers to refinance their farm operations and stave off what appeared to be positive foreclosure for many a farm family. You also were instrumental in helping to write the farm-support legislation that has stabilized not only the agricultural economy but the very economy of every one of our Main Street merchants throughout the entire Nation.

Today we have legislation that permits us to deal with the farm questions and possible emergencies that may occur, due to the Korean crisis and the general possibility of complete and full mobilization. The Secretary of Agriculture can encourage increased production by incentive payments in any commodity of which we are in short supply. Likewise, we have the stabilizing factor in our agricultural program that prevents the producer, should he overproduce, against a drastic price decline that would spell ruin for him.

There is a need for strong farm organizations. For the past half century the number of people residing on farms have been on the decline until at present less than 20 percent of the Nation's population is engaged in productive farming. Because of

the small percentage of the Nation's population, you must be a part of a farm organization. You must speak as a unit and be represented in the halls of your State capitol as well as in the Nation's Capital.

I want to report to you, the members of the Minnesota Farm Bureau, that your officers, Frank White, your president; J. S. Jones, your secretary; and the board members are doing a commendable job representing the farm families before State legislative committees and testifying in your behalf. Yes, I have met them in Washington, appearing before congressional committees along with members of the national board of directors, and particularly such leaders as, first, Ed O'Neill, and now, in later years, Allan Kline, the presidents of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

GAINS IN FARM LIFE

There have been many gains in improving farm life. One in which the Government has had a large part is rural electrification. Anyone who has carried a lantern for many years doing chores, and has experienced the inconvenience and dangers of a kerosene lamp in his home, fully realizes and appreciates what rural electrification has brought to the farm home and the farmer. Rural electrification has brought not only safety, convenience, and the possibility of a modern home on the farm due to the automatic electrical water pumps, but it has provided the possibility of increased production to the farmer's poultry flock in the long winter months, as well as many other conveniences that I need not mention to you.

The farm organizations have also greatly assisted in improving the educational opportunities of the rural child by helping to bring about consolidations of schools and the establishment of school busses and improvement in highway conditions that make these school busses possible. The present State commissioner of agriculture, Mr. Clark; J. S. Jones, your secretary; and Dr. J. O. Christianson, of the school of agriculture, consented to serve on the educational study committee which I, as your Governor, organized here in Minnesota in 1945 to make a study of the over-all school question and to report back to the State legislature. The University of Minnesota, with its agricultural experiment station, has made ours a leading State in agricultural research. Dr. Peterson, of the university, is recognized the Nation over. The Minnesota State Legislature is to be commended for its foresight and support of sound legislation in this field and I know that Governor Youngdahl has a commendable record in support of research in the field of agriculture.

These important and constructive contributions are of utmost significance. The new frontiers of today are your experimental stations and research laboratories. The experimental stations are constantly improving the variety of grains and livestock, searching ever for higher yield and production, greater disease resistance, developing a product through improved methods of processing to broaden the consumer's demand. We have made improvements in breeding of new grass strains but we have much to learn still in this particular field and adequate appropriations must be made in order that this scientific research may be carried on. It has most generally been the practice of the farmer to use his poorer land for pasturing purposes, paying little, if any, attention to improving not only the variety of grass grown on this land, but the condition of the soil itself. Fortunately, however, much attention is being paid now to these questions through the research studies made at our National Research Center in Beltsville, Md., the agricultural departments of the University of Minnesota, the splendid educational and demonstration work carried on by the Extension Service and soil-conservation programs.

We are meeting here in this Farm Bureau convention today in a period of national emergency. I should like to discuss with you some phases of our agricultural problems and give you a report of my views, as your Senator, on our immediate obligations so far as Europe is concerned.

NEED FULL PRODUCTION

The Korean crisis and the threat of Communist aggression by Soviet Russia are causing this Nation to expand its military manpower and also to reactivate many war plants. This has brought about a tremendous demand for additional manpower and it has also increased the purchasing power of some individuals. This increased manpower, increased earnings, and the fear of scarcity are threatening this Nation with inflation. To meet this inflationary trend in food costs we must have increased production in agriculture in order that we may have an ample supply of food and fiber. Only an ample supply can hold down the inflationary trends.

The first problem that we are confronted with is the question of manpower. Our farms today are highly mechanized, and the machines require experienced operators. Those administering the selective service and recruiting of military personnel must study every phase of this manpower question and make deferments where deferments are necessary in order that we do not handicap our agricultural operations. They must recognize this need and make deferments of a sufficient number of competent farm workers that we may be able to continue the high production and even expand it in some commodities in the immediate future.

Together with building up our military strength and gaining full production in industry, we must have full production in agricultural products as a prime factor in the economic stability and strength of the Nation. Only if there is an ample supply of food and fiber from the farms can this country meet the grave crisis it faces. Agricultural production, already at high levels during World War II and during the postwar period, can and must be further increased.

The farmer's needs for machinery must be considered in the allocation of raw materials. The farmer must have adequate supplies of fertilizer and power. He must have assurance of a stable price structure.

In order to avoid controls and rationing of meat we must increase our production. First in poultry and turkeys, and next in pork. All this can be accomplished in the year 1951. I know each and every one of you farmers, as you have in the past, will try to save a greater number of pigs farrowed. Every little porker you are able to save will increase the meat supply.

Beef is a longer cycle, requiring more than 1 year. We had a splendid increase in 1950 in cattle by 3,200,000. Beef prices are above parity. We can increase the over-all poundage of beef if we can continue to encourage feeding, filling our feeder lots with feeder cattle, thereby producing greater poundage of meat per animal slaughtered.

FARMERS' SHARE LESS

There are those who feel that controls and rations are a necessity to avoid inflationary food costs. It has been most disturbing to many of us since the Korean crisis to see, in far too many instances, an unreasonable mark-up not only in food prices, but in other merchandise. I had a little experience one day in a grocery store in Washington. I remarked, "These prices have certainly gone up." The grocery clerk informed me that it was the farm support program that was the cause of it. I asked him a few questions, and all that he could say was that it was the farm price supports that had caused the rise in food costs. This propaganda has been going on across the Nation. I would say that the farm organizations need to do more of a job of public education relative to what effect farm support legislation has had on the retail cost of foods of all kinds.

Farmers' produce and commodity prices have not been excessively high. If we examine the entire price index, we would find some commodities slightly above parity, others below parity. For instance, wheat. As of December 15, 1950, it was 88 percent of parity. Corn was but 85 percent of parity. Of the nonbasics, butterfat per pound was but 81 percent of parity; milk, wholesale per hundredweight, 89 percent of parity. Beef-cattle prices were above; in fact, beef was at 141 percent of parity as of December 15. Hogs were only at 89 percent of parity. Lambs were 138 percent; live turkeys but 90 percent; chickens, live, 74 percent of parity.

Farm price supports have not been responsible for increased consumer prices during the present emergency.

Let us take a further look at the record. Of the consumer's dollar the farmer did not receive as much in the year 1950 as he did in the years of 1946 and 1948. On all food products, in June 1946, the farmer received 63 percent of the consumer's dollar; in July 1948 he received 52 percent; but in October 1950 he received only 48 percent. On meat products the farmer received 76 percent of the consumer's dollar in June 1946, but in July 1948 he received 65 percent, and in October 1950 only 63 percent. Poultry and eggs are the same. In June 1946 the farmer's share was 72 percent; in July 1948, 71 percent; and in October 1950 but 61 percent. Take bakery and other cereal products. In June 1946 only 31 percent of what the consumer paid was represented by the farmer's share; in July 1948 it was 30 percent; but in October 1950 it had dropped to 27 percent. For dairy products the ratio was 55 percent in June 1946, 59 percent in July 1948, and 55 percent in October 1950. For all fruits and vegetables the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar in June 1946 was 43 percent. It dropped to 36 percent in July 1948, and to 34 percent in October 1950. It is clear that the farmer has received for food products a continuously smaller percentage of the price to the consumer.

As we examine the records of our livestock population, all cattle, as of the last official report, we find that the total was up to 83,500,000. All cattle on farms increased by more than 3,000,000 animals in the year of 1950. We have had a steady rise in all livestock population in 1948 and 1949. Unless controls and rationing are reimposed, I am confident that increases will continue in the livestock population. Certainly the volume of meat produced will be on the increase if we can continue the movement of light cattle to feeder lots to be finished out, and thereby actually get the big poundage of meat per animal.

Many think that controls and rationing of food are an immediate necessity. I do not share this conviction. The immediate necessity is, first, there must not be any more undue mark-ups in the prices or excessive profit taking. Secondly, the purchaser must not hoard food stocks. There is no need for it. There is an ample supply of food and fiber to meet the needs if there is no hoarding. Many of the housewives have been buying unnecessarily, fearful that shortages would occur and that rationing would be reestablished.

MUST CONTROL INFLATION

Controls and rationing of food products at this time would subject us to a threat of black-market operations. Such black-market operations would deny the legitimate merchant the product to sell, but more especially, the very byproduct that is saved in the established slaughter yards that go into medical processes would be lost to the public. Likewise many of the hides, too, would be destroyed. Such were the experiences under control and rationing of meat and food products in World War II.

You folks, the producers, if granted favorable growing weather, will expand your production. You will do it first in poultry, as that can be done in the next few months. Next in pork, which can be accomplished within the year. Beef, however, requires a longer cycle. If the housewife will purchase the poultry we can avoid inflationary prices in meats in general.

There are several ways of help avoid inflation. Increased taxes for defense needs and control of consumer credit have been initial steps. The full effects of those steps have not yet been felt or noted. However, the increase in taxes and the credit controls as imposed by the Federal Reserve, have been effective as safeguards against inflationary trends. The tax committees of Congress are going forward, studying scientifically the entire tax question to make certain that we tax to the maximum of our ability to pay without jeopardizing the future of this great Nation, paying as much of the defense costs as our economy can stand so that the very men fighting today will not be compelled to bear the indebtedness incurred due to the conflict.

The Korean crisis and the unsettled world condition makes it necessary that we plan for further stabilization of our economy. We must consider most carefully the continued allocation of scare materials. We must determine whether price and wage controls on a selective basis are now necessary.

But I repeat, at this time our major problem in agriculture is to stimulate increased production without too much restriction in order to insure ample supplies of food and fiber and avoid the dangers which we experienced in World War II.

THREAT OF COMMUNISM

You and I are indeed very fortunate people to be citizens of the United States of America. We need to think and forever talk about the great opportunities of this land in order that future generations may have strong convictions of the greatness of our country as we inherited it from the founders and from our pioneer parents who blazed trails out across the wilderness of North America, establishing homes and little communities in the Territories that were later to be incorporated into States. We have achieved in America a standard of living higher than has been known to the average person in any country of the world in all of its history.

All of this and the freedom of man is threatened today by Soviet Russia and the atheistic, Communist ideology and philosophy which they are endeavoring to spread out over the earth like a dragnet to involve all.

Since the ending of World War II we have learned of mistakes, serious mistakes made by this Nation in secret agreements entered into and made in conferences, such as those held at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. This great Nation made a mistake when we permitted Russia to hold a corridor about the city of Berlin, thereby causing this Nation the great expense of the airlift in order that we could supply our sector of Berlin with foods and other supplies. We, likewise, made another serious mistake in later conferences that permitted Russia to enter into Manchuria, thereby giving Russia a control of all of the lines of communication and railroads which enabled the Communists to gain control of vast areas of China that eventually forced Chiang Kai-shek to flee from his country to Formosa. And now the Communists are demanding of the United Nations that they be recognized as a nation.

I joined with others in Congress in sponsoring a resolution, demanding that any agreements made in conferences by our national leaders must be made known or the full text of those conferences or agreements must be made available to Members of Congress in order that we do not make mistakes in this day comparable to some made in those secret agreements of years past.

I supported the Marshall plan. I fully realized that the war-torn and devastated countries of Western Europe needed our assistance in order that we could rebuild their economies, bringing hope and courage not only to the businessmen of those countries but to the citizens to fight against communism. I spent many weeks on the European Continent in the fall of 1949 to learn first-hand what we had achieved under the Marshall-aid program and also what we could hope to achieve and accomplish through the Atlantic Pact, and I am indeed grateful that General Eisenhower again has answered the call to duty and has gone to Europe to personally confer with the leaders of those countries, seeking information. We must assist, and give them the leadership, the incentive, the hope, and the courage that will create a will on the part of the leaders of those countries to develop a military strength that can resist Russia.

MUST GIVE AID TO EUROPE

The redevelopment of a military force on the European Continent is absolutely essential, I believe. It was for that reason that I supported the North Atlantic Treaty and, likewise, supported the appropriation that would assist countries of Western Europe to obtain the military equipment and modern equipment that an army should have. It has been exceedingly disappointing to me that the State Department and the military have been unable to develop the military forces that we hoped for and that the Atlantic Pact authorized. Let us hope that General Eisenhower will achieve what we have all hoped and prayed for.

I also feel that rearming and developing military strength in Western Europe will serve us militarily here in the United States for this reason: It is absolutely essential, I believe, to maintain air bases in countries of Western Europe. It would be exceedingly costly were we to build up a fleet of bombers, long-range bombers that could fly from this continent to Russia if it became necessary to strike effectively were we faced with an aggressive Russian warfare against our continent. Were Communist Russia to attack us by a fleet of long-range bombers, hoping to get enough planes through our line of defense, endeavoring, even though it be a suicidal flight, to bomb out our industrial centers and cripple our lines of communication, it would then be highly advantageous for us if we had a friendly relationship with the countries of Western Europe which were protecting our very air bases from which we could counterattack speedily and decisively, thereby destroying the enemy's ability to continue her attack on us. Such a national defense would be less costly in defense fighter planes to guard long flights.

If all of Western Europe were to fall to communism and go behind the imaginary iron curtain and we had no such military bases as I have just described, I think we would find it far more difficult, our long flights more vulnerable to air attacks, and certainly far more costly in the development of an aerial striking unit. It was for this reason that I have felt strongly that Spain offered certain military advantages, not only to the United States but to the European countries that are endeavoring to fight communism. I have felt that a recognition of Spain would strengthen our position. Spain certainly showed a friendliness during World War II. We have the question of the defense of Gibraltar that we must not lose sight of. The Pyrenees Mountains in Spain offer a protection against an invading land army as there are but few passes through there that would have to be guarded and, likewise, it offers certain security from air attacks.

CONFIDENCE IN EISENHOWER

These many questions have led me to the conviction that we have much to gain in the development of military units and a military strength in the countries of Western Europe. I feel confident that General Eisenhower will be able to achieve what we had hoped for in the Atlantic Pact when Congress ratified it. An army such as the Atlantic Pact really authorizes, will bring the German youth, the French, the Italian, the Belgian, the Scandinavian, and the British, as well as the Dutch, into a closer understanding and relationship which will enable those people to work together much better in future generations. The hatred is so evident in the breast of the youth of these foreign countries against the people of other countries. They have inherited it from their elders. It is still present, ready to flame into a bitter fire of hatred. I hope that that wall of hatred that has separated those countries in generations past can be torn down and overcome by such a military organization as is hoped for under the Atlantic Pact provisions and I am confident that General Eisenhower will be able to develop such armies from the manpower that is available in the countries of Western Europe, thereby not compelling this Nation to develop the necessary ground troops to guard the aerial installations and to give security to the countries of Western Europe against an invading Russian army.

Yes, we have the technical know-how to develop the strongest aviation strength on earth. We have the greatest naval strength on earth and we can continue it as such providing that we can keep the industrial potential of Western Europe and Africa on our side and on the side of free Christian people rather than in back of the iron curtain.

There is a great challenge in these problems at this critical time. I have supreme confidence that a united America will meet that challenge with the courage, the self-sacrifice, the hard work, and the faith that are required.

Omnibus Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a remarkably able statement by the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], which appeared in the Washington Daily News today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMNIBUS BUDGET BILL IS BLESSING TO THE TAXPAYER

(By Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

The prize of the economy advocates in Congress—the single, or omnibus, appropriation bill—is in jeopardy in this Eighty-second Congress after its trial run in the Eighty-first Congress.

There is a vigorous drive under way to abandon this system of putting all of the

appropriations in one big bill. The aim is to return to the expensive and obsolete method of having several separate appropriation bills.

I am against this movement. I am for the omnibus appropriation bill, particularly now when there will be such great pressure to pass appropriation bills hurriedly on the argument that we must act fast to get our defenses up.

I certainly see some weaknesses and shortcomings in the single appropriation bill as it worked last year. But surely the faults cannot be attributed to lack of speedy action or tardiness. The failures must be laid to House and Senate leadership. It's not a weakness of the system. It's a weakness of the men who legislate or, more accurately, appropriate.

In judging whether the single appropriation-bill system should be retained, we should review some of the arguments pro and con. The greatest argument in its favor is that since it puts all of the appropriations together, each Senator and Representative can know better just how much money he is voting to appropriate and lay on the back of the taxpayers.

That makes good sense. I remember when I was a housewife and had to operate on a household budget. There was just so much money available to spend for running the house and I had to keep that in mind to stay within the budget. The single appropriation bill performs this function for Members of Congress. It stands as a constant guide as to whether a balanced budget is being achieved or can be achieved and, if not, how much more we will have to raise taxes to get a balanced budget or bring the budget back into balance.

The single appropriation bill makes it easier for Congress to detect and eliminate duplicating and overlapping appropriations. It checks "pork barrel" logrolling. It gives the advocates of economy a much better chance of getting over-all reductions.

The record proves this. For the first time in 5 years the House last year made a sizable reduction from the amount reported out by the Appropriations Committee.

The big argument against the omnibus appropriation bill system is the time that it takes. That is an argument to be leveled more properly at those who control the calendar and the debate on legislation. They say it encouraged absenteeism. But attendance last year was better than average and disproves this argument.

Regarding attendance prior to the single appropriation bill, it was the spenders who made it a point to be present to get their pet projects through. In contrast, the best attendance last year was during roll-call votes on reduction amendments.

There are rough edges to the single appropriation bill system, as there are to any new system. All new systems need polishing up as experience dictates. That applies to the omnibus bill system. It should be retained and improved with revisions. It is one of our best hopes for efficient, businesslike operation of our Government on expenditures and taxes.

Draft of American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "We Agree, But," published in the Altoona Mirror, January 13, 1951.

I also ask that there be printed following the editorial a reply to the editorial which I wrote to the editor of the Mirror on January 17.

There being no objection, the editorial and the reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of January 13, 1951]

WE AGREE, BUT

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, former major general, former Governor of Pennsylvania, and now senior Senator from Pennsylvania, is quoted in a Washington, D. C., dispatch as favoring the drafting of 18-year-olds for the armed services. Senator MARTIN says the 18-year-old boy makes a grand combat soldier. "Older men are more likely to be set in their ways," he is quoted as saying.

The Senator should know something about both points. He is now 71 years of age and has something of a reputation of being set in his ways about a number of things. He served for a number of years in the Armed Forces and, according to the same Washington quotation, says he served in the Spanish-American War before he was 19 years of age. The 52 intervening years were spent for the most part either in the Army or in the service of the Government. He served Pennsylvania in a number of capacities and to his credit it must be said that he usually served Pennsylvania well.

So, we agree with the Senator that 18-year-old boys make good soldiers. But we must also point out to our Senator that 18-year-old boys make good in a number of other fields also and that it should be the aim of this Nation to give them an opportunity to make good in these other fields.

Eighteen-year-old boys make good students. This is the period in life when youth learns quickly and it is just about the age when most boys finish high school. After school most boys either enroll in college or start learning a trade or business. American parents want something better than Army training for their sons when they graduate from high school. They certainly don't want their 18-year-old boys to be trained for duty in foreign lands. They are not too keen about making them available for "police action" in another Korea. Nor do they want them sent to some other shore on the say-so of any individual.

Before the citizens of this Nation will agree to the drafting of their 18-year-old sons they want some assurances from Congress that this Nation is being operated as a republic. The popular notion around the country, as we get it, is that only the American Congress has the power to declare war. We do not believe that the American people want any more undeclared wars, where troops are sent in without the sanction of the Congress.

Mr. Senator, 18 years of age is a grand age for many things. At 18 most of us had grand illusions of a better way of life. We had higher ideals than those of us who are more advanced in years have been able to keep. We had a better knack of getting along with our fellows and just a little more of the joy of life than at any other time of life. The boy of 18 is standing on the threshold of manhood. Would you, Mr. Senator, advocate shortening that space of time for him? Would you have him grow up overnight? Would you teach him to hate and kill?

Is it too much of a boon for those of us who fall in the more humble stations of life to want to see our children have at least one or two more years in that last stage between boyhood and manhood? Do you advocate this lowering of the draft age in order to protect America, or are you, too, one of the international set that has lost faith in America's ability to defend herself? Do you believe that we must send more and more men to Europe to defend nations that up until the present time have shown little tangible evidence of the will to defend themselves?

America needs its 18-year-old boys. It needs its 18-year-old girls. There is a line of defense that is as important to our way of life as any army or navy line that has ever been thrown about the Nation in its hours of need. That line of defense, my dear sir, is the line of industrial and moral supremacy that has been nurtured by our free-enterprise system.

We are a great Nation because we have had the individual freedom to develop our lives as Providence intended them to develop. We are a great Nation because we know how to do things. The greatest advances of the past 50 years have been made by men and women who received basic training in fields other than the military during the formative years of life. America owes its No. 1 position in the world today to the men and women of science, of business, of education and to the boys and girls of yesteryear who were able to develop their talents in the formative years of life.

Where are we going to get the engineers, the technical experts, the doctors, the ministers, the merchants and, yes, the fine mechanics that are necessary to operate our complicated machines and gadgets of the modern world if we allow all of our youth to be siphoned off as soon as they finish high school?

Great technological advances have been made since our senior Senator was 18 years of age. In the world of manufacturing and business the advances have been most pronounced. The implements of modern warfare have been altered so rapidly that what was modern a year ago is ancient today and what we had 6 months ago may be outmoded tomorrow. Must we match the enemy, man for man, slug it out, toe to toe, or might we do better if we overmatch him with weapons so far superior to his own that even a reckless regard for life will not be able to overcome them?

America needs men who think in modern terms in its positions of great trust. War is no longer fought on the same level as it was back in 1898. There is no romance about war. It is a deadly business. It is serious business—too serious for the Congress of the United States to hand over to the decision of any one man or small group of men.

It will take courage, Mr. Senator, to face the charge of being an isolationist. It may take courage to regain the power that has been handed over to the executive branch of Government. It takes courage to take a positive stand about anything these days. It takes courage to be wrong occasionally. It takes even more courage to admit error. But it is going to take a lot of courage to get this Nation out of the trouble in which it has become involved. A lot of that trouble, Mr. Senator, can be traced to those of us who are past the middle years of life. How much of it can be laid at the doors of the 18-year-olds?

JANUARY 18, 1951.

Mr. HERMAN REIFSNYDER,
The Altoona Mirror,
Altoona, Pa.

DEAR MR. REIFSNYDER: I have a copy of your editorial of January 13 entitle "We Agree—But."

I appreciate very much indeed this fine discussion of one of the most critical problems ever to confront our country. Only by frank and free discussion can we reach decisions that truly represent the will of the people and will make the greatest contribution to the preservation of American ideals.

Present world conditions leave no doubt that we must prepare for full mobilization. Even if God spares us the tragedies of another world war, as we all hope and pray, it is my firm belief that basic training for every young man, excepting those physically unfit, is the foundation of any plan for building the defensive strength of our Republic.

For many years I have favored universal military training. I believe every American, regardless of his station in life, should be ready to defend his country. My contention has been that if everyone were given basic training, it would be a great arm for peace. In my plan of basic training, I would want to teach the youth of our country personal hygiene—how to care for themselves in peace and war—what America stands for and an understanding of the American way of life. Military instruction teaches the value of organization and that we must aid each other in all our endeavors.

Personally, I feel that if we had a good plan, backed up by the American people, war could be prevented. My own plan would be to build the greatest Navy and the greatest Air Force in the world. We would then have land forces—the best trained, the best equipped, and the most mobile the world has ever known. Back of all of that, we must have a rearmed, spiritual America—an America that is decent and obeys the laws and is willing to support itself. It would be a God-fearing America where the strong appreciate their obligations toward the weak.

The people of the United States have a right to know our commitments. My military experience convinces me that we have made commitments that we are unable to fulfill. We cannot fight a war all over the globe. In my plan I would want to join with other countries that also appreciate individual freedom. I see no reason why the Nationalist Chinese should not be fighting the Communist Chinese. I see no reason why our military strategy should be restricted by preventing the destruction of enemy communication lines, enemy dumps and reserve positions.

I don't want to see the American youth thrown into the battle. However, my own experience as a citizen and a soldier teaches me that in half a century America has thrown into battle its youth without proper training and without proper equipment.

Referring to my own position as a youth, my military work taught me self-reliance and my duty toward my comrades. I left college as a sophomore and I came back and graduated from college. I was handicapped physically for a while as it took me 6 years to regain my health and weight. It made a better American out of me and a better worker for myself and my country.

Again, I greatly appreciate your editorial. With kind personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

EDWARD MARTIN.

Courage of the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous censent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "We Are Americans; Let Us Act Now As Americans Should," published in the Saturday Evening Post last week.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE AMERICANS; LET US ACT NOW AS AMERICANS SHOULD

Reading the newspapers these days, a Communist agent might conclude that the American people were trying to scare themselves to death. Commentators vie with military experts to expatiate on our helplessness. It seems our equipment is nonexistent, our allies are no good, our guard is down, and our morale is hopeless. An innocent bystander might conclude that the Soviets had already won the war and that Americans were already working under the lash of the Red Simon Legrees in Siberian timber camps. Stalin might well conclude it was time to start marching, except that he might also suspect that such abysmal despair was a booby trap.

To be sure, there is nothing in our present state of affairs that justifies insouciant optimism. We are in a dangerous mess. But, after all, America has been in danger before this—but before this she has expected to survive the danger. For our part, we see no reason to justify the apparently widespread feeling in certain circles that this time we are sunk for keeps. Sacrifices we shall have to make, anxieties we shall have to face, and we may even have to repel an enemy from our own shores for the first time in 135 years. But these hazards ought to be faced with the confident understanding that we have assets as well as liabilities in the struggle, whatever it may turn out to be like.

First of all, of course, we have courageous and well-trained defenders, potentially numbering millions. The record in Korea is put down as a defeat. Nevertheless, the assignment as originally understood was brilliantly executed against heavy odds. South Korea was liberated, and the Reds were driven back to the Manchurian border. Only the intervention of the overwhelming Chinese Communist horde was capable of nullifying the United Nations exploit, under the command of General MacArthur. The Korean War suggests the risks in matching our limited manpower on the ground against the millions of Asia, but it also revealed the limitless courage, stamina, and resourcefulness of the American soldier. We cannot afford to forget that.

Nor can we forget that, in contrast to the plight of the Russian millions and the unwilling satellites of the Kremlin, we have something important to defend. Our industrial capacity and know-how have not yet been fully mobilized, but does anybody doubt America's ability to outproduce and outgadget the Russians, once a wartime tempo is achieved? It is our guess that the Kremlin, at any rate, has no illusions about this.

Even the undoubted advantage of the Soviet system in manpower need not appall us—unless we are determined to engage it exclusively on the ground. Let us not forget that when Hitler invaded Russia in 1941, his armies took as prisoners hundreds of thousands of Russians who swarmed over the German lines on the supposition that they were being liberated. If the brutal invasion of the Nazis was thus received, should we despair of the possibility that freedom and democracy may have at least as great an appeal? The bosses of the Kremlin are not so confident as we, shaking in our shoes, think they are. The Communist bosses of China are reported to be in serious trouble, and it could be worse when and if our State Department chooses to exploit it. A world in chaos poses tremendous problems, but America is not the only nation to face them.

Surely if "courage mounteth with occasion," that quality should be amply present now. Without vain boasting, or wishful optimism, or inane bravado, the American people can weather these storms, no matter what the experts say. General Eisenhower agrees. It is our opinion that, despite the pall of gloom which hangs over the insiders, the mass of Americans are facing what comes with firm hearts and realistic determination. They want to be sure their leaders are doing as well.

The Welfare and Safety of Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 18, Col. J. Carroll Cone, vice president of Pan-American Airways, delivered a very able and forceful address to the Women's National Democratic Club, here in Washington, D. C. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN UNITY AND BOUNDARIES

I thank you for your gracious invitation to be one of your speakers today and for inviting me to select my own subject.

This privilege tempted me to use it as an opportunity to talk about air transportation, but on second thought it became obvious that we might better devote this time to a consideration of the welfare and safety of our country.

Not only the United States but the entire free world is facing the greatest crisis in history. The manner in which this crisis is resolved will determine whether or not our children and children's children will live in a happy world, or whether they shall be virtual slaves of a foreign and brutal government.

These ominous clouds threatening our very existence can be dissipated only by the greatest determination and sacrifices on the part of every good American regardless of age, sex, color, politics, or religion.

Should we shirk our responsibilities and duties now—should we try to continue to make the same profits, enjoy the same luxurious and easy living—we cannot criticize other Americans for the same conduct.

If we all sidestep our duty in this time of dire peril to our country, we shall certainly be defeated, and then our march to the concentration camps, slave legions, and the firing squad begins. We shall have selfishly profited for a short time, only to realize later that our actions, or failure to act, constituted a crime against our country.

We cannot afford to profit in worldly goods, to enjoy easy living, while shirking our responsibilities to our fellowman everywhere, to our country, and to our God in times like these. "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul."

Our enemy has already proven his complete disregard for the dignity of man and for the teachings of our Maker.

International law is ignored, churches are maliciously destroyed, and the clergy imprisoned or killed. Women and children are brutally manhandled in every evil manner.

If we, our sons, daughters, and other loved ones are called upon to make the supreme sacrifice for the protection of the rights, opportunities and ideals for which our ancestors fought, we should go—nay, we must

go, and encourage to go—every person who can serve.

Always in time of national peril we talk about boundaries. Yet no one has ever seen a boundary or a borderline anywhere but on a map. The exact point at which our national claims end and those of some other nation begin is not visible to the naked eye.

Now I think that many of the border lines that circumscribe our private lives today are figuratively just as shadowy. Contrast our times with the days of the mercenaries—the Hessians, for instance, who fought for the British in our own Revolutionary War. They were paid to do a job. The British citizen felt little concern about the war and was only remotely conscious of its nature. War hardly impinged on his private life.

Even in our own Civil War—or the War Between the States, if you prefer—it was not uncommon for a citizen to hire someone else to take his place in the ranks of the draftees.

But in today's world it isn't possible to buy immunity. It isn't possible to delegate personal responsibility, or to provide a substitute for one's own active participation. The boundary between the fighting man and the production man, from the standpoint of importance in a war, is not easy to define. They are mutually dependent. Even the civilian who isn't engaged in production becomes a vital element in providing the capital that war requires.

The boundary where military responsibility ends and civilian concern begins is vague, and becoming increasingly so.

Methods of transportation, technological advances, even the explorations of the human mind in philosophy, are obliterating the old boundaries. Today, then, we are not fighting to preserve our coast line, nor our frontiers, nor our buildings. We are fighting to save something even less tangible but vastly more important.

We are fighting not to preserve our houses, but our homes. We are fighting not to preserve our industries, but a concept of life in which an individual can maintain himself and his kin with dignity. We are fighting not for our bodies, but for our souls.

Isn't that the essence of total war?

People close to the imaginative minds in air transportation are perhaps more conscious than others of our lack of protective boundaries. Time and distance were once on our side; now they are gone. We have observed how populations can change. We have seen, tragically enough, how in the process of change ideas are transported that are more deadly than cholera.

It is inconceivable to us that there can persist today in the minds of supposedly responsible leaders the notion that our shores constitute a defense, and that our responsibilities end with our geographical borders.

Total war takes no cognizance of boundaries or frontiers or established fighting lines. Total war enters and destroys the dwelling of the civilian. Even more importantly, it invades his mind.

The insidious, stultifying effects of that invasion are apparent today in the kind of leadership which insists that the concerns of other nations are not ours.

In retrospect we now recognize many mistakes—honest mistakes—we, as a people, have made. Some of the mistakes we have made at home in our lack of preparedness, in our failure to recognize the danger signs on the international horizon. The most hideous mistake we could now make would be to fight among ourselves, each accusing the other, destroying confidence in each other—Democrats or Republicans alike. We cannot continue to survive under the slogan of business or politics, as usual.

We must, as good Americans, close ranks and put up a completely solid front against our enemies, both domestic and foreign, and we have many dangerous enemies within the borders of our own land.

The President of the United States is the President of Democrats and Republicans alike. He is a good President, loyal to our country, patriotic to the nth degree. He has inherited many tremendous and baffling problems. He has had many heaped upon him by persons and by governments who would destroy us. The solutions are not easy. Some maybe are impossible, but political friend and foe alike must admit, if they are honest, that President Truman is struggling unceasingly, patriotically and heroically, to lead us out of the miasmic swamps of domestic and international discord to the sunlight of peace and freedom from fear.

We must lay aside all destructive criticisms that may add to our dangers; we must unify the efforts of every patriotic American. We must become ready for heavy sacrifices. We must do our utmost to safeguard the interests of future generations, and the continued existence of our great country as the "home of the brave and the land of the free."

The new burdens we shall be called upon to carry will be heavy, heavier than Americans have ever experienced. We shall be forced into a long period of austerity. Luxuries as we have known them will vanish. We shall have to devote every possible energy and asset to defense in order that we may not perish.

While individuals are tightening their belts, our Government must eliminate every activity or expense that is not required for the security of our Nation.

Waste in our homes, factories, in transportation, and in Government, must be eradicated. Fuel, power, clothing and food must be conserved. Our every energy and resource must be devoted to strengthening our ability to protect our country against numerically superior and merciless antagonists.

A Declaration of Dependence on Almighty God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a declaration of dependence on Almighty God, prepared and delivered by Dr. Albert P. Shirkey, pastor, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, Washington, D. C.

The people of America are accustomed to issuing declarations of independence, but it is most appropriate at this time that we should individually and collectively join in subscribing to this declaration of dependence.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF DEPENDENCE

(Proposed by Albert P. Shirkey, D. D.)

When in the course of human events the heart and soul of a nation's life (that part for which our fathers bled and died) is being attacked by subtle and insidious forces, it becomes the duty and obligation of that nation made so aware to make certain declarations.

This declaration becomes imperative first, to insure the continuation of our people in that kind of life that issues in good citizenship, happy home life, honorable business practices, the stabilization of education, and the production of philanthropic impulses. Second, to make our Nation aware that man does not live by bread alone and that life does not consist in the abundance of things one possesses. Third, to inform our own people and the peoples of the world that it is our firm conviction that the mainstay of our political, national, home, and individual life comes to its fullest fruition only when God is written upon the mind, heart, and conscience of a nation's life. It is this that holds us true to the highest and noblest ideals. The loss of these ideals breeds instability, unrest, injustice, bloodshed. Then, to be true to our place in the family of nations, it becomes our solemn duty to issue a call that will bring not only to our Nation but to the nations of the world, that poise which is the cherished possession of those who trust in God.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America in general Congress assembled, led by the President of our country, issue the following declaration:

We believe in God, and we hereby reaffirm our dependence upon Him. Woven into our national life is this confidence that we will not allow to be shaken. Upon our coins we have inscribed, "In God We Trust." We now call upon the people of these United States of America to write this afresh upon the spiritual tables of their hearts—to guard this faith as one would guard his life. We remind our people that this country was founded for the purpose of allowing each man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Throughout our history God has been the warp and woof of our national existence.

We believe in God. Democracy has been the outgrowth of this faith. It is this principle of government that we see fast disappearing in nations that have overthrown God. Wherever there is to be found reverence for God, the lowest have equal opportunities for life, love, and liberty, which are the cherished possessions of the more fortunate.

As lovers of liberty we declare that when God has disappeared from a nation's life, slavery in some form or another has ensued. The dignity and worth of human personality has been preserved only when men have been made conscious that they are responsible to the Judge of the Universe for their actions.

Thus, to preserve the life begun, protected, and fostered in our national history, we publicly make this declaration of dependence on Almighty God.

The Role of Labor in the War Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address of Mr. George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, and vice president of the American Federation of Labor, before the Economic Club of New York, January 17, 1951, at the Astor Hotel, in New York City.

Mr. Harrison is an industrial statesman who has honorably represented the interests of organized labor for many years, and I believe his thoughts should get careful consideration from every Member of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President and members of the Economic Club of New York, it is a great pleasure for me to be here to talk with you about some of the problems that are facing us today. It is a pleasure not only because I find such contacts always useful and enlightening, but also because the present national emergency demands of all of us that we try to reach as great a mutual understanding among the people of the United States as is humanly possible. The war in Korea has finally unmasked the designs and the program of the Communists; anyone who had any doubt before must know now that the dictator in Moscow is willing to risk world war in order to extend his despotic power. We should realize now, too, that there is no limit to that appetite for power. We can't satisfy that Russian bear with a little raw meat. The more he eats, the more he wants—and the meal he really has his eyes on is the United States of America. In the emergency that confronts us, the achievement of effective national unity is of first importance.

It is important that we Americans try to build up our national strength, as much as we can and as fast as we can. We must try to resolve our own differences of opinion, as much as possible, to understand each other, so that we can pull together in the difficult days that lie ahead of us. Unless we learn to stand together today, we may fall together tomorrow.

You will not expect me, I know, to tell you of the problems or desires of American financiers, industrialists, or businessmen. The men who speak for the owners of American industries assuredly need no help from me, especially before this group. You will expect me to tell you of the problems and attitudes of American wage earners; that I propose to do, as simply and directly as I can. It would not be any kindness to you, either, for me to pull any punches here; for your own good, and for the good of the country, you ought to know exactly what American workers are thinking, even though you may not like those thoughts.

Let me say, first, that the working people of this Nation are fully awake to the menace of communism. We have faced that threat in many forms, during the past 20 years, and American labor has never for one moment wavered in its devotion to our free American institutions. No part of the citizens of this country are more determined to combat Communist dictatorship in whatever form and wherever in the world it threatens than the men and women who work for a living.

That determination springs, first of all, from the belief that our way of life—based on human freedom to worship, think, and speak, and vote as we believe—is right in principle, and the only just basis for any civilization. Labor is for freedom and democracy, and we are opposed to all kinds of dictatorship. But we are also opposed to Communist dictatorship from the immediate and direct standpoint of our own interests. We know that our unions, our personal freedom, and our living standards could not and would not survive under Communist domination. Labor leaders, and every outspoken workingman, would share the honors of the firing squad with the leaders of business and industry if Communist dictatorship were to be established in America. We know that. We know, too, that the same results would follow if our domestic breed of Communists were ever able to overthrow our form of government. Whether communism were imposed upon us by foreign aggression, or in some fashion slipped over on us by any home-grown dictator, the effect would be the same.

Don't ever forget that fact or let any of the more rabid antilabor newspapers or columnists or radio commentators mislead you. American labor is anti-Communist; American labor knows far better than American business the evils of dictatorship and domination, the benefits of freedom and democracy. We know, because in the not distant past, American workers were denied industrial and economic freedom, and they lived under the power of some petty despots and dictators in American industry. This, perhaps, is as good a place as any to say bluntly that American labor will fight against the return of that kind of industrial oppression in this country, and will fight as vigorously to get rid of it in the spots where it still exists.

Let us look at the facts of our American situation frankly. In normal times we do a lot of fighting among ourselves; our basic way of living is that every man is supposed to have an opportunity to work his way upward, and the competition in every walk of life, if it is fair and free, is one of our ways of making certain that the able and upright man will gain advancement to positions of leadership. Down through the years, the struggles of individual men, and of groups of men, have brought great progress to us as a people. American workers have not only improved their standards of living, but they have gained greater leisure for themselves, and they have won a substantial measure of freedom and democracy on their jobs. Part of that came from their efforts as individuals, but the great progress of recent years has been accomplished by them through their labor organizations. It hasn't been done, either, without great effort; every gain we have made in wages or working conditions, every right we have won, and every protection we have thrown around our jobs have been over the vigorous opposition of many employers. Sometimes we have been able to persuade, with facts and arguments, but much more frequently what we have secured has come only because we have said, "This is what we want, this is what we have got to have, and this is what we are going to have." The progress of the American working people has been won over the resistance of the representatives of business and industry.

I am not here complaining about that resistance. We have been free to ask for what we wanted, and the employers have been free, and willing, to answer "No." What I do complain about, however, is the methods and tactics that have been used. In ordinary times, we can trust to the ultimate sense of fair play of the American people, and our own efforts at explaining the facts, to get things set right in the long run. But now, in the gravest national danger we have ever faced, I believe we have a right to expect that the business community will police itself a little bit, as we have been trying to police domestic and international labor organization. We do not expect the American employer to drop all opposition to labor progress, any more than we expect the sun to rise in the west tomorrow morning.

Before I explain what I mean let me give you the reasons for insisting upon fair play and broad-minded action from the representatives of industry. This world situation in which we find ourselves is not just a battle between nations or groups of nations. As the Russians and some of their friends are preaching it, this fight is what they call a class conflict. They insist that the world is witnessing a battle between capitalists and workers, between employers and labor. The Communists in the Kremlin tell the world that labor rules in Russia, and that Communist victory in every other country means labor will rule that country; more than that, they are shouting all over the world that the United States is a capitalist-ruled country, that labor here is oppressed and downtrodden, that the American Government is the tool of big business and stands for industrial exploitation and the degradation of the workingman.

That, of course, is the technique of the big lie. Hitler, I believe it was, said that if you tell a big enough lie often enough, it will be believed, because people will think you couldn't have the nerve to invent a really fantastic story. That's the Russian Communist method today.

Look, now, at the world situation. We are the main bulwark of democratic human freedom and private enterprise, but two-thirds of the world is still free from Communist domination. We are the No. 1 target of the Communists, but the No. 1 tactic of the Communists is to separate us from all possible friends and allies abroad. They seek, also, to win any possible support for their program from among our own political leaders and the working people. But mainly they are trying, in Germany, France, Italy, in all of Western Europe, to persuade the labor groups that Uncle Sam is a capitalist despot, that our way of life is fundamentally antilabor and proemployer. The Communists hold up Russia as labor government, and America as capitalist dominated. The real battleground of today is not just the rice paddies of Korea, it is the minds of the political leaders and the working people of Western Europe, and even of many in England and more than a few in the United States of America.

American labor is doing everything possible to counteract that Communist propaganda, in America and throughout the world. I need not tell you of the campaign within this country; you must have seen the news stories of the constant vigorous opposition to the Communist line and Communist people in all labor unions. Most of our labor organizations are free from any actual Communist influence, although there may be individuals who are still unbalanced enough to accept the Russian line. But in the international field we have been no less active and determined. We have succeeded in smashing the Communist international labor front; we have destroyed the Communist dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, and set up a vigorous and effective anti-Communist world organization. I think I may justly say that American labor leadership was primarily responsible for this action. In the fight we have been making, we believe we are entitled to the cooperation of American businessmen, to the extent, at least, that they will not in this emergency seek to evade their fair share of the sacrifices and burdens that are necessary to make our country strong and united so we can win this world struggle.

In the development of this Nation, the Government has uniformly and consistently done its best to aid American business. Labor has no objection to this principle, in general, that Government powers should be used for the benefits of the citizens. We believe, with the founding fathers, that governments are instituted for those purposes. The long record of land grants, of tariff laws, of governmental subsidies of patent legislation, of governmental loans and liberal Government contracts, the direct aid given by the State Department and occasionally by the Armed Forces in foreign affairs—all of these things illustrate and attest the devotion of the United States Government over the last century and a half to the advancement of American business interests. While businessmen, industrialists, and financiers have sometimes disagreed about what measures Government should adopt to foster and

help the business community, they have seldom taken issue with the idea that Government should offer such help. The great total of billions of dollars that has flowed from Government to industry, and the other direct aids that have been given, have been tremendous factors in our industrial growth. But I do not recall having heard such governmental assistance called socialistic, or communistic, or un-American, or paternalistic by the representatives of business.

Against this necessary background, I ask you to consider what is happening today. During the last year, and especially the last 6 months, the price level in America has risen sharply. Every American industrialist, practically, has shared in the wealth thus created; his debts have shrunk, his goods on hand have grown, in terms of his dollar situation. Every American workingman, every consumer, on the other hand, has suffered; his debts oppress him more, his weekly income buys him less. Billions of dollars of real wealth have changed hands.

What has been the reaction of the business community to this terrific windfall? The proposal to tax excess profits, for example, has met with an opposition that seems wholly incomprehensible in view of the facts. Business actually seems to expect that the new taxes, required in our national emergency, shall be secured from a Federal consumer's sales tax which will fall largely upon those same groups whose incomes have been shrinking under the impact of rising prices. And the business community, through its spokesmen, object to the control of prices to prevent profiteering, although they are responsible for raising prices and the inflation that has occurred. At this time when every American family is being called upon to give its sons to the Nation for military service these business attitudes are profoundly disturbing to American workers. It does no good to speak a lot of hard words in such situations, but we cannot avoid a feeling that too many business representatives are adopting and expressing a narrow, selfish, and greedy viewpoint in this national emergency. We do not expect a suspension of the desire for reasonable and fair profits; we do not believe the ordinary motives of economic activity can be set aside in this emergency without disrupting our industrial efficiency.

Labor knows the harvest that has been garnered by American business in the last year of rapid price increases, and the harvest that resulted from the price increases after the repeal of control laws in 1946. We know the rich gains to business resulting from the rapid amortization of war plants in the last war, and the sales of such plants in the postwar years. We see again the provision for 5-year retirement of plant to be used in the new defense effort. In the face of those terrific, those unprecedented gains by American business, we believe we have a right to expect forebearance, common sense, and national cooperation from those who own our industries.

We cannot reconcile the national emergency with the efforts being made not only to raise the price level still further, but, on the legislative field, to prevent excess profit taxation. The worst of it, from some standpoints, is that when the workers try to get enough wages to meet these price rises and to prevent undue hardship and suffering for their families some business men want to take away their fundamental liberty. The right to strike is as fundamental as the right of any businessman to buy and sell, as fundamental as any right protected by the contract provisions of the United States Constitution. It is as fundamental, and we believe more sacred; no man's property is as sacred as his personal liberty, his personal freedom. We cannot get around the simple fact that laws prohibiting strikes of workers in private enterprise take away one of the few great fundamental rights of every American citizen. We hope that the business community will rise to the level of dignity, common sense, and patriotism that is required of them if we are to preserve America and Americanism through the perils that lie immediately ahead of us. Since we all have a supreme stake in freedom, all of us must make our fullest contribution to its defense. With cooperation, labor and industrial management can get much of the additional production that will be needed for an effective military defense and relieve much of the inflationary pressures, but the place to stop price increases is where they originate.

The seller and the speculator fix prices, and if they won't stop raising prices they must be controlled. If prices are controlled, then we agree that wages should be stabilized in parity with prices. Taxes must be raised to get the revenues to pay for our rearmament and they should come from corporation and excess profits and individual incomes. We are opposed to a national sales tax because it does not attack inflation at its source—the price and profit level. Government spending for nondefense activities must be reduced, but this does not require curtailment of essential social services.

Postal services should be made self-sustaining and the charges should be raised to get the necessary revenues. There is no good reason why private business should be furnished parcel post services at a loss of $100,000,000 a year to be made up by the taxpayers.

I would like to see the advocates of private enterprise practice what they preach and agree to a correction of this unfair subsidized Federal competition with private transportation.

Soviet aggression constitutes a challenge to our free way of life. We can overcome that challenge if we stand together, as Americans have done in past emergencies. We must convince Soviet Russia that America has the will to fight and the strength to fight in defense of freedom and international justice. We must make the Soviet leaders understand once and for all that America is willing to live and let live in peace.

American wage earners face the future and its responsibilities seriously, but with confidence. We want peace and the opportunity that peace affords for new progress. But if we are compelled by circumstances beyond our control to wage another war, we are determined to let nothing stand in the way of victory—victory that will mean not only a better America, but a better and more peaceful world in our time.

This Way to Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Way to Suicide" which appeared in the January 22 issue of Life magazine. I completely share the editorial views regarding the unrealistic policies of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WAY TO SUICIDE

If we build our strength—and we are building it—the Soviet rulers may face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world. That is what we hope will happen, and that is what we are trying to bring about. That is the only realistic road to peace.

The foregoing words should be read and reread by every American. They were spoken last week by President Truman in his sixth message on the state of the Union.

On their face they are attractive and reasonable words. They reflect a hope of peace and a dread of war which endure in millions of human hearts.

These words of the President occur in a message which, but for them, would deserve to be applauded as a fine and forceful speech.

It may very well be argued that the President's words are a useful concession to the universal desire for peace, a necessary recognition of the European and Asiatic state of mind.

But these words of the President cannot be dismissed in so easy a fashion. They cannot be dismissed on any ground.

The President has shown too many times that he believes in the capacity of the Soviet rulers to face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world.

Mr. Truman's principal adviser on world affairs, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, has shown too many times that he believes in what he has chosen to call the possibility of coexistence, a cooperative peace, a cooperative relationship with the rulers of Soviet communism.

On the record the passage quoted here from the President's message must be taken for what it unquestionably is—a considered restatement, made in all good faith and with full conviction, of the major conception and major purpose underlying American policy.

THE FATAL FALLACY

Taken for what they are, these words of the President are mistaken and dangerous.

Taken for what they are, these words demand the attention and the talents of all the participants in the great debate over United States policy, a debate which has explored almost every aspect of the subject except the corrosive and fatal fallacy which the President preserved and restated.

The nature of the fallacy is clear. The fallacy is that those whom Mr. Truman calls the Soviet rulers are capable of arriving by their own decision, at a state of peace with the non-Communist world. There is no prospect whatever that they are capable of doing so. Not so long as they are the Soviet rulers. Not so long as the system which drives them to their conquests, feeds their purposes, and gives them their power is in being. Not so long as the vast complex of doctrine, nations, governments, parties, and men called Soviet communism is intact, undefeated, and undestroyed. Not until its power—its inherent compulsion—to harass, assault, and engulf the non-Communist world is effectively eliminated can there be any chance of peace in the world.

The defeat and abolition of Soviet Communist purpose and power are not enough; the forces of anticommunism must always have other and more positive objectives. But, to repeat, there can be no peace worth the name and no secure progress toward a better life and a better society everywhere so long as Soviet communism retains its power to obstruct all progress and to assault all non-Communist societies.

THE FALSE CONCEPT

Make no mistake: The President does not assume and require the defeat and dismemberment of the Soviet system. The official author of this fatal fallacy, Mr. Acheson, has recently said in so many words that "to subvert the Soviet Union"—that is to bring about the downfall of Soviet communism—is neither required for peace nor a proper purpose of American policy. When Mr. Truman speaks of enforcing peace through strength, he must, on the record of what he and his Secretary of State have said, be supposed to mean peace with the present rulers of the Soviet system.

Many Americans do not need to be told that this concept is false. With their minds, in their hearts, and in their bones they know that it is false.

Many others would like to believe in the possibility that Mr. Truman says he believes in. Many Americans do believe in it still. But their number lessens. Events visible to all, and the actual behavior of the Soviet rulers, make any belief in the possibility of peace with the present rulers of the present Soviet system more unreal with every day that passes.

There is something nightmarish in the spectacle of a President of the United States who at this late and awful hour refuses to perceive that the concept which he restated last week is false. There is something nightmarish, too, in the continued presence at the President's right hand of a Secretary of State who has so long cultivated this pernicious fallacy. It is terrifying, it is wrong, that this proud priest of coexistence with Soviet communism, Dean Acheson, should still be in a position to shape the President's most vital conceptions and statements of American policy.

Here, Life once more submits, is a real and present danger to this Republic.

So long as the nature, the purposes, and the capacities of our enemy are misunderstood and underestimated at the very pinnacle of American policy, what hope is there that our policy will make sufficient sense? What hope is there that American power will be fully and effectively mobilized? What hope is there that, once mobilized, it will be used to maximum effect and with adequate awareness of the tasks before it? What price "the great debate" over policy when the declared objective of our policy is founded upon so glaring a fallacy?

This fallacy is a source of weakness—a cancer—which only the President can eradicate.

He can eradicate it. He can at long last drive from his councils all who have sold and fed him on the pap of coexistence with Soviet communism.

He can drive from his own mind, and drop from his utterances, the paralyzing illusion that the rulers of Soviet communism as it now exists can be persuaded to peace or forced to peace.

He can perceive that the situations of strength on which he relies can be effective only if they are used to bring about the dismemberment of the Soviet Communist system as it now exists and to remove from the world the threat of Soviet power as it is now exercised.

He can perceive that peaceful, stable coexistence with Soviet communism is utterly impossible. To hold that it is possible, as the President holds when he talks of forcing or persuading the Soviet rulers to lay aside their plans, is to perpetrate a pietistic fraud.

THIS PRODIGIOUS EVIL

If coexistence with the present Soviet Communist system is impossible, is total war inevitable?

Maybe so. Maybe not. Given the pressures resulting from a full recognition on our part of what must be accomplished and a full determination to accomplish it, the Soviet Empire may start to change within and to crumble. No man can say just how the pure wickedness of Soviet communism will ultimately be banished from the earth, as some day it will be banished. But what no man has a right to say is that we can live peaceably and happily with this prodigious evil.

Meanwhile what must be said is that the Soviet Empire, far from retreating, will continue to expand unless it is opposed with all our strength and all our mind and all our will. That includes the steady, calm, and constant acceptance of the risk of all-out war.

The President said last week that his chosen road—the road to a contrived peace with the present rulers of the present Communist system—is "the only realistic road to peace."

It is not a realistic road to peace.
It is not a realistic road to anything.
It is the road our enemy wants us to take.
It is the road to our defeat.
It is the way to suicide.

Defense Program Seen Back Door to Fair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Defense Program Seen Back Door to Fair Deal," by Gould Lincoln, from the Washington Star of January 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE PROGRAM SEEN BACK DOOR TO FAIR DEAL—LABOR SUPPORT FOR TRUMAN GIVES BODY TO RUMOR

(By Gould Lincoln)

A growing suspicion that the defense program is to provide a back-door route to the Fair Deal measures, advocated by President Truman and the so-called liberal wing of the Democratic Party, is making itself felt in the National Capital. The alacrity with which some of the leaders of organized labor have gone to the front for President Truman's recent message on the state of the Union to Congress gives body to this hovering rumor. The labor leaders say "O. K. We are going right along with the President, especially on national defense." William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, amplifies. He points out that Mr. Truman in a message urged Congress not to overlook improvements for the long pull—and Mr. Green spoke particularly of national health insurance.

To Mr. Green, and, indeed, to all of the 100 percent Fair Dealers, compulsory national health insurance does not mean socialized medicine, or even placing many more billions of dollars on the backs of the taxpayers.

MORE REALISTIC VIEW

The man on the street seems to have a more realistic view. But the man on the street soon is going to be ground down by heavier and heavier taxes; and when he is, for the sake of national defense, he may be forced into a frame of mind friendly toward proposals for free medical service. That at least is what the Fair Dealers hope. They will tax him until he is unable to pay for medical care, and then tax him again to subsidize free medicine. It's a nice idea, for the Fair Dealers who want the Government to do everything, if it works.

Further, with the prices of foods going up to a point where the man on the street and his family are going to have a difficult time getting enough to eat, there is going to be a demand for Government subsidies to help keep these prices down to the consumer while at the same time letting the prices the farmer and the middleman get remain at higher levels. Then the Brannan farm program, with its production payments to farmers and its subsidies to the consumers, is going to be launched again—make no mistake. The administration promises that the Brannan plan will keep prices up for the farmer and low for the consumer may be as phony as the old medicine shows. But they will sound better, when the man on the street has been softened up enough. Here, too, the man on the street will have been taxed until he cannot buy food he needs for himself and family, and then will be taxed again to provide subsidies so he can get more meat and butter and eggs, etc.

CORRECT VIEW UNDECIDED

Washington also is trying to decide whether the Mr. Truman who addressed Congress last Monday and who soft-pedaled the Fair Deal measure gives the correct view of the administration's present attitude, or the Mr. Truman who militantly declared at his press conference on Thursday that the Fair Deal measures were not being abandoned at all. Mr. Truman made no plea to Congress to put through an FEPC law or other civil-rights measures—as he did with emphasis when he spoke to the last Congress. But at his press conference, when he was asked if the civil-rights program was being put aside for a while, his answer was an emphatic "No."

The idea has grown—immediately after the President's message to Congress—that he had decided not to press for civil-rights legislation now—or to seek a repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law. His recent letter to Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, asserting he believed they could cooperate, gave additional color to this belief. But when he was asked point-blank at his press conference about these things, the President gave emphasis to his assertions that these things had by no means been abandoned, even temporarily.

Organized labor leaders, who are opposing wage controls and demanding price controls, must have had some kind of assurance from the White House, it is said here, that the President still stands for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Otherwise they probably would have been yelling their heads off. Whether the Negroes are going to accept the Monday Truman, or the Thursday Truman, remains to be seen. Some hold that the Negroes are being sold down the river to bring about a rapprochement between Mr. Truman and the Southerners in Congress.

Analysis of the 1950 Gubernatorial Vote in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis of the vote in the recent gubernatorial contest in California between Gov. Earl Warren and James Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Warren's total vote was 2,461,754 which exceeds his 1946 general election vote (2,344,542) when he was the nominee of both the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Warren's vote exceeded Roosevelt's by 1,127,800.

Although California has 1,117,383 more Democrats than Republicans registered, Warren's margin of victory exceeded the Democratic registration majority.

Warren received 11 votes for every 6 votes for James Roosevelt.

A total of 73.32 percent of the registered voters in California voted in the election. Warren polled a greater percentage of votes than at any previous governorship election, primary or general, in which he was opposed. In his third bid for the governorship he polled a greater percentage of the votes than was cast for him in 1942 when he first ran for the office. In number of votes received he broke all previous records for both himself and all other candidates for office, including 1946 when he was unopposed in the general election.

Warren received 64.85 percent and Roosevelt received 35.14 percent of the votes cast for governor. In the primary election Warren received 60.75 percent of the votes cast and Roosevelt received 36.46 percent.

No other major party candidate in California history has ever been defeated as decidedly as was James Roosevelt.

Roosevelt was beaten by a greater majority than any major party candidate for governor or United States Senator in any State of the Union at this election.

Although 58.39 percent of the registered voters in California are Democrats, Roosevelt polled only 35.14 percent of the total votes cast for governor.

Roosevelt's total vote amounted to only 48.96 percent of his own party's registration. Warren's vote amounted to 126.58 percent of his party's registration.

Warren won in all 58 counties, among which were such counties as Fresno, Kern, Solano, Contra Costa, Kings, and Sacramento where registration is better than 2 to 1 Democratic.

San Francisco, with a registration of nearly 2 to 1 Democratic, gave Warren a majority of 93,514.

Los Angeles County, where the registration is better than 1½ to 1 Democratic, gave Warren a majority of 436,889.

Warren carried 22 counties by more than 2 to 1 and in 5 of these the ratio was more than 3 to 1.

Who Are the Isolationists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by A. Q. Miller, publisher of the Belleville Telescope, Belleville, Kans., entitled "Who Are the Isolationists?"

Here is a voice from the grassroots that could well be heeded by those who are prone to brand those who might disagree with them on our foreign policy as isolationist. The stark truth happens to be as Mr. Miller points out in this editorial and gives reasons why the common people of this country feel as they do about what is happening on the Washington level.

I commend it to my colleagues for careful reading.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO ARE THE ISOLATIONISTS?

(By A. Q. Miller)

According to the administration standard, an "isolationist" is anybody who disagrees with the foreign policy of the administration—a contradictory policy which has not only kept confused the people of this country but also our so-called friends and enemies throughout the world.

If a voice is raised in this country by a Congressman or a citizen, suggesting a change or improvement to make our foreign relations consistent and conform to the charter of the United Nations, some administration spokesman cries out "isolationist" and brands the individual an enemy of his country. Timid Congressmen and frustrated individuals do not have the courage to run the gantlet of hundreds of administration publicity hounds and therefore they acquiesce in policies which they honestly believe are detrimental to the best interests of the country.

The result is that the people of this country are committed in secret agreements by the State Department. Then Congress and the country are told what our foreign policies are. This is the thing that has aroused many loyal and courageous Congressmen and individuals to speak out and brand the policy as wrong and not in conformity with our Constitution.

These protestors declare that the Senate is the treaty-making body, and that Congress is the law-making body and the only authority which can declare war. Many Members of the next Congress which meets in January declare they are going to demand that the country go back on a constitutional basis.

In times of great national and international stress when administration leaders make commitments agreeing to appropriate money and supply our troops to fight on foreign soil without a formal act of Congress, those commitments do not conform to our so-called democratic principles and American way of life—and a few courageous souls have the temerity and courage to say so, thereby subjecting themselves to a "smear campaign" by politicians.

Because of conflicting and incoherent policies now existing between this country and a number of our allies under the United Nations, many demands are made that our foreign policy be examined and reviewed by Congress in order to know what commitments we have, but such suggestions are met by scorn and sometimes by harsh language. The administration rightfully demands unity in this country, but it does not hold out the olive branch and obviously does not recognize that unity is a two-way street.

Billions of dollars have been appropriated by Congress for national defense under requests by the President without knowing how the money would be spent. We find in a crisis that we are not prepared and our troops are not adequately equipped. We won two World Wars, the first to make the world safe for democracy and the second "a war to end war," and in both cases we won the wars and lost the peace. Now we are faced with another world war more devastating if it comes than the others.

People are frustrated at a leadership that has failed to keep us out of war. We have had nearly 20 years to build a structure of peace on a solid foundation and have failed. At San Francisco this country had the confidence and good will of practically every nation on earth, and we could have written into the Charter of the United Nations practically anything we wanted, but we followed the fatal policy of appeasement and gave Russia the veto power which completely destroyed the effectiveness of the Charter.

And since that time the record is replete with examples of vacillation and appeasement, which took us through the tragedy of Pearl Harbor and down to Korea and China, apparently without learning anything from experience or without a sound foreign policy. Frankly, our foreign policy has been so vacillating and incoherent that we have lost the confidence and friendship of practically all of the world.

India Starves Herself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "India Starves Herself," published in the Washington Post of January 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA STARVES HERSELF

A good deal of nonsense is parading under the guise of humanitarianism in the current clamor to send grain to India "with no strings attached." A correspondent in an adjacent column puts the finger squarely on the point. The self-defeating trade war with Pakistan has deprived India of large sources of food close to her own border. Even now food is available in Pakistan which would help greatly to alleviate the Indian crisis.

In 1940 Pakistan is said to have offered to sell India 600,000 tons of wheat. Prime Minister Nehru spurned the offer at the same time that he was importing it at greater cost. The same situation still prevails. To be sure, the Pakistan exchange rate is something of an obstacle in that Pakistan did not devalue her currency when other nations in the Commonwealth followed the devaluation of the British pound. Even so, India is paying far more for wheat from Australia, Canada, and Argentina than she would have to pay from Pakistan. A similar situation prevails with respect to cotton: India has refused cotton from Pakistan while buying it from Egypt.

This does not mean that the famine in India could be wholly alleviated by imports from Pakistan and nearby areas, or that the United States should not view Nehru's request for grain sympathetically. The famine is a very real thing. We believe that some help is warranted and that Congress should enable the Department of Agriculture to make some surplus American grain available. But it would be worse than foolish to overlook the fact that the seriousness of the famine has been heightened by the Indo-Pakistan war. It is made worse by the diversion of agricultural land to jute production so as to be independent of Pakistan. And India's financial position certainly is impaired by the immense drain of the army mobilized over the Kashmir dispute.

Now, it is said, is the psychological time to win Indian affections by a nonpolitical gift of grain. Whatever the merit in this argument, Congress would be sorely remiss if it did not insist on a quid pro quo. The plain fact is that India is not doing what she can to help herself. It is time for frank speaking on these points. We hope that Congress will answer India's call, but only on the condition that there be some realism in New Delhi.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The President's 'Strict Economy' Budget Begs for Congress' Knife," which appeared in the Deseret News, published in Salt Lake City, on Tuesday, January 16, 1951.

I believe this editorial merits careful consideration at this time by Members of Congress and by the public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S "STRICT ECONOMY" BUDGET BEGS FOR CONGRESS' KNIFE

While we beg a day to mull over the complicated detail of the President's $71,594,000,000 budget request which he laid before Congress yesterday, we can note such items as these:

If granted outright, without paring it down, that budget means $471 for every man, woman, boy, and girl in the United States.

There are only about 152,000,000 of us to carry this staggering load, including babes in arms, public charges, and persons incapacitated by age, disease, or crippling injuries from doing any kind of gainful work.

The next thing we can note is that there is a lot of fat stashed away in the mail-order-catalog-sized volume of budget itemization.

Despite his urgent admonition to every wage earner, housewife, business person, or private enterprise to practice the sternest disciplinary thrift as an aid toward meeting the national economic and fiscal emergency, Mr. Truman's proposed budget actually shows an increase in nondefense spending over the comparable items in last year's deficit monstrosity.

It was the fact that last year's was a deficit budget, when it should have been not only balanced, but overbalanced so that some headway, at least, might have been made toward reducing the national debt as a protection against the inflationary pressures which the present situation are increasing—it was that fact which made that budget monstrous in the truest sense.

Particularly since that budget could easily have been balanced not by raising taxes but by cutting unessentials out.

There is nothing more fruitless than crying over spilt milk—a practice which this newspaper deplores and tries its best to avoid.

But there is no greater folly than spilling the same kind of milk over again.

And unless Congress sharpens its knife to do a shrewd job of surgery on the unessential nonmilitary items in the budget now before it, the amount of fresh fiscal milk that will be spilt will be large.

Out of the $71,594,000,000 that Mr. Truman has asked, $41,421,000,000 is for military needs.

That 58 percent of the total we cannot discuss. For one reason, dictates of security kept it from being itemized; for another, Congress will not be too critical about its parts in any case, any more than will we, because in times of national danger parsimony which might hamper actually necessary national defense is unthinkable.

And so though the amount asked is enormous—little more than a billion dollars less for military purposes alone than the total $42,428,757,406 asked for all purposes in the President's budget last year, and more than twice the $20,427,000,000 which the President estimates will be spent to meet military needs this year—still whatever the appropriate congressional committees decide, after consultation with the appropriate experts and advisers, to agree on as proper expenditures for purely defense items, we are prepared to accept as correct.

It is the 32 percent of the new budget—23,112,000,000 taxpayers' dollars, a $1,622,000,000 increase rather than a five or six or eight or nine billion dollars decrease in the Federal Government's domestic costs, that particularly begs for the knife.

The remaining 10 percent of the budget is debatable. In fact it is already in process of debate. It is the proposed $7,461,000,000 budgeted for military and economic aid to foreign countries allied with us against the Red surge.

It may be that this is far too much, as one side of the Dewey-Hoover-Kennedy Dulles-Taft et al. debate argues. It may be that the amount suggested by the President and his advisers is exactly right. It may even turn out that it is much too little.

More than geo-political argument is involved in that question; certainly quite as important is, How much of a load can the American economy stand?

It is pretty certain that it shouldn't have to stand a good deal of the purely domestic 32 percent, the twenty-three-odd billion dollars included in the budget which Mr. Truman curiously claimed, in his accompanying message to Congress, exercised "strict economy in nondefense spending."

This newspaper tries not to be captious. We strive never to ask a question which is not posed in good faith.

But how, we query, could anyone make such a strict economy claim as we have quoted, on behalf of a budget which slips in under the guise of defense need, major portions of the discredited Brannan plan, an FEPC civil rights scheme, expanded Federal aid to State-supported schools, taxpayer-provided housing for certain special groups, a version of an item of socialized medicine, $20,000,000 to get a St. Lawrence deep waterway-public power project under way, and other such truly dubious matters as that?

It is such that we desperately hope Congress will examine coldly before raising the Nation's tax bill by the whole $16,500,000,000 that Mr. Truman's budget asks.

Lacking in Business Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, we have been requested by President Truman to adopt a spending budget in excess of $71,000,000,000.

This is a colossal amount of money for the American people to take from their salaries, wages, and incomes, and remit to the Federal Treasury. It will mean great sacrifices for all. It will reach into every home across the land. Those in the lower and middle income brackets will sacrifice most of all in direct payment and in reduced standards of living.

The Eighty-second Congress will fail in its duty to the people if it does not squeeze out every drop of water in this request. It must eliminate without fear or favor each item that is nonessential.

My State of Kansas has contributed much to the field of journalism. In the contemporary group of Kansas journalists Mr. R. A. Clymer, editor of the El Dorado Times has few equals in expressing convincingly and with clarity the trends of public thought.

His editorial on the Federal budget appearing in the El Dorado Times on January 17, 1951, is, in my opinion, one of the finest in its analysis of, and the public reaction to the President's request for money, that I have read.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LACKING IN BUSINESS SENSE

President Truman laid down a spending budget of $71,500,000,000 for the Government next year, in his address to Congress, and demanded that taxes be increased over their present swollen proportions by nearly $16,500,000,000 to balance it.

That, of course, as the mathematical sharps have already figured, means an outlay of $471 from every one of the 152,000,000 men, women, and children in the United States.

The impact of these sums on the country was startling, though every form of public propaganda has been employed to prepare the Nation for the blow.

More than half of the sum proposed would go to military needs, though no breakdowns were given on this score in the huge budget document—which is described as being of mail order catalog size. Reasons set forth for this were on the basis of security, and also "because estimates are still tentative." This last leaves room for the juggling—and no doubt upping—of figures, as military departments are notorious for having only hazy ideas of economy.

No reduction was proposed in non-defense spending. Instead, slight increases were noted in many of the items. Tucked away in the Budget text were all of the fair deal fair-haired projects—the FEPC plan for equal rights for Negroes, Federal aid to State schools, Federal medical insurance with a first-year tax totaling $275,000,000, housing for low-income groups, the main part of the Brannan farm program, and the St. Lawrence power-seaway project. The President blandly put all these on a defense-needs footing, though just how some of them can be accepted on that basis arouses burning curiosity.

The effect of the whole Budget was reassuring in no sense. In fact, it indicated to even the most casual reader that wild and lavish spending will continue under the present administration—even at a time of national crisis. The people of this country will more or less cheerfully produce all the money that must be had to meet the emergency. But they have a right to insist that

all frills be removed from Government operation, and that something like an honest attempt to conduct the domestic establishment on an economic basis be exerted. The President's budget, as proposed, offers no evidence whatever of any intention toward these two objectives.

What it does reveal is that this country suffers not a paucity of dollars, but of strong, sensible, business leadership at the top.

The World Situation and America's Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "If You Agree, Write Your Senator," which appeared in the January 4, 1951, issue of the Wyoming State Journal, published in my home town of Lander, Wyo.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF YOU AGREE, WRITE YOUR SENATOR

The present military conflict, with its ominous forebodings, has presented this country with a problem which is completely new in our military experience. For the first time we face the fact that our enemies, actual and potential, are superior in manpower to us and our dependable allies. This, indeed, is something *new* for Uncle Sam who has never lost a war.

In past wars, the situation was the reverse. Then the Western Powers had men in abundance, and the primary problem was to find time to equip and train and harden them for the final grand assault on the enemy. In World War II, Allied superiority in this field was tremendous.

Look at the situation now. On paper, the nations which have been going along with us in the UN represent most of the world population. But a statistic on paper doesn't do any fighting. Many of those nations have pretty well made it clear that they intend to limit their participation in the world conflict—and it is a world conflict now, whether or not war is formally declared by any power—to diplomatic negotiations and the writing of polite notes to the various chancelories. Others have been terribly drained of men—and of spirit and morale as well—by the other wars. Others still are so geographically situated as to be in the most imminent peril of national destruction.

Russia alone has about the equivalent population of the United States, England, Canada, and Australia combined. No one knows precisely how many Chinese there are; but the figure is somewhere in the neighborhood of 450,000,000, and the birth rate is high.

For many years there has been an optimistic theory that no one, the Communists included, could organize China, and create in China a really effective military force. The recent terrible trend of events has certainly demonstrated the danger of still holding to that theory. Mao is an able and resourceful man. It is probable that he has done more than any other Chinese ruler to suppress the debilitating official corruption that characterized Chinese governments of the past. He has exploited to the full China's old hatred and distrust of the west. He has made it particularly clear, if his acts and pronouncements mean anything at all, that he is solidly and without reservation on the side of Russia in the world struggle. And he has built an army that no informed man dare to regard with contempt. The Chinese Red soldier has had good training. He has morale and a sense of purpose. By Asiatic standards, he is well fed and well clothed. He has the fanatic, fatalistic courage of the Orient. And his name is legion.

Here is why it is so strongly argued—in this country, and by practically every European spokesman—that the west must use every reasonable means to avoid a full-scale war with China. Here is why more and more emphasis is being placed on the fact that the other western powers must, as Herbert Hoover has so ably pointed out, do a good deal more for themselves, militarily, than they have so far done. And if they don't do it, then the United States alone cannot hold Europe. And to say that we should not attempt to do so is not isolationism, as the weak administration in Washington now would have everybody believe, it is a matter of self-preservation and just good common sense.

We simply cannot carry the whole load, or the major part of it—we just haven't enough people. We will help to the full in the strengthening of Europe, but Europe must earn and justify that help by cooperating to the limit. No more American boys to Korea, or to Formosa, or to Europe until the European powers show that they are going to help themselves—that should be the stand of all Americans and Fremont countyans can help bring this to pass by writing or wiring now to their Senators, taking this stand. The time for half measures has passed.

Bank of North Dakota Sets Operations Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Bank of North Dakota Sets Operations Record," published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of December 27, 1950. I wish to quote one paragraph from the article as follows:

The bank manager, H. C. Bowers, in a report to Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, said that as of December 21 the net operating revenue is "in excess of $1,000,000." On the same date, Bowers reported, deposits in the bank amounted to $96,870,000.

I may say, Mr. President, that last year the bank also made a profit of nearly $1,000,000. This year the profit is more than $1,000,000. In my opinion that furnishes a direct answer to those who say that a bank cannot be operated by government when it is operated to take care of the interests of the people and is in reality not in competition with private banks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANK OF NORTH DAKOTA SETS OPERATIONS RECORD

BISMARCK, N. DAK.—The net operating revenue of the Bank of North Dakota for 1950, its manager said, will be the highest in the institution's history.

The bank manager, H. C. Bowers, in a report to Governor Fred G. Aandahl, said that as of December 21 the net operating revenue is "in excess of $1,000,000." On the same date, Bowers reported, deposits in the bank amounted to $96,870,000.

Bowers said that from January 1 to December 21 of this year, the Bank of North Dakota made 49 farm home administration insured loans for a total of $439,497, of which 18 loans were to veterans in the amount of $156,675. In the same period, he added, the bank made 52 GI loans for a total of $284,816.18 to assist veterans in buying or building homes, establishing businesses or engaging in farming.

The bank manager said thus far this year 17 title II insured loans for a total of $100,350 have been made to finance home construction.

Loans to school districts and municipalities so far in 1950 total $2,653,093, in the form of certificates of indebtedness, bonds, or warrants.

Bowers said securities covering loans and held by the bank of North Dakota on December 20 this year totaled $12,200,368.95, compared with $11,509,424.07 on December 31, 1949. So far this year, he said, loans made total $5,146,206.07 and loans paid total $4,455,261.19.

Cost of American Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sanity Gets the Brush-Off," published in the January 11, 1951, edition of the Concord Daily Monitor, of Concord, N. H.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANITY GETS THE BRUSH-OFF

Senator BRIDGES prodded General Marshall yesterday about our ratio of one fighting man to every four others in the armed services and Russia's ratio of four fighting men to every one in the armed services who does not fight. In effect, the General's answer was that part of the difference was in providing our men in the armed services with all the things which the Congress says they shall have in the way of recreation, and so forth.

There is no doubt at all about the American propensity for considering nothing too good for men in the armed services. We spend upon them lavishly, both while they are in service, and subsequently. The bill for veterans since World War II exceeds $25,000,000,000, for example, enough to produce a pretty good army according to anybody's standards except our own.

What we seem to have done is to forget first principles again. Liability for service to protect one's country is a responsibility which falls upon every citizen. It isn't just the country which is thus protected, either, for in this Nation it is our individual liberties which we preserve if we protect the country.

All war is wasteful. Hence the waging of war should be held to a minimum of expenditure in manpower and in servicing that manpower. Far from taking this attitude,

we in this country now go in for grandiose spending the moment war is mentioned.

We do a lot of foolish things. We are forever changing the style of uniforms at terrific cost. We provide sheets for the beds of fighting men. We conduct the most marvelous post exchanges, officers clubs, noncom clubs, recreational facilities for enlisted men, and so forth, that anyone could wish for. We pay our men wages far above any ever earned by fighting men of any other nation. We are excessively liberal with leaves. We go to extremes on military transport of all kinds. And, as Senator BRIDGES pointed out, we have four men serving every fighting man, many of the four-fifths of nonfighters living in greater comfort and with greater privileges than they enjoyed as civilians.

Our men are good fighters on fighting fronts. But they could and probably would be just as good and perhaps better if less pampered in so many directions.

Good soldiers or sailors or fliers need tough training, for their own good on battle fronts. They need the best fighting equipment, and that doesn't mean merely variety and quantity. It means quality, especially in guns, and so forth. Fighting men need substantial food. They need cigarettes, and they need beer, but beyond that their personal needs are simple.

We must, with our ingenuity and inventiveness, have the means to prosecuting war, or preparing for war, at far less cost than obtains, both in manpower and in goods. And one of the best components of a good defense against the world situation in which we find ourselves is to maintain Federal solvency.

The economic aspects of the period ahead are as frightening as are the prospects of another all-out war. Except for a slight pause in 1949 we have been inflation-bound now for almost 20 years, and the prospect is for worse inflation in the years just ahead. Yet virtually nothing is being done to counter this trend. Only today the administration decided against imposition of any further price controls for the time being.

Senator BRIDGES touched upon one source of our troubles economically when he questioned General Marshall. The whole subject needs exploration, and the general's fear of offending the fighting men in Korea by looking into the subject publicly is, we believe, ill-founded. They would feel better supported and less forgotten if they knew the Nation was practicing a little austerity at home, within the home-based Armed Forces as well as domestically.

Will anything be done? No. The matter will drop with the brief exchange between the Senator and the general. The Nation, under the leadership of the greatest something-for-nothing administration the world has yet seen, will rush ahead toward the ultimate doom it is inviting in the false name of national security.

North Dakota Mill Operation Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "North Dakota Mill Operation Praised," published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of January 8, 1951. I may say that the profit of the North Dakota State mill and elevator last year was more than $800,000.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA MILL OPERATION PRAISED

BISMARCK, N. DAK.—Management of the State Mill and Elevator was praised in explanation of the State requested appropriations made by Senator R. B. Morgan of Grafton, chairman of the senate appropriations committee at the 1949 session.

The statement explained that it was impossible for the budget board, the appropriations committee, or members of the legislature to intelligently pass upon the details of the operation of this complicated and technical business.

"It is our belief that the mill and elevator has had excellent management during the past 12 years, and its financial statements bear this out," the statement read.

"The administration of the bill has submitted to the budget board a detailed and comprehensive budget for the next 2 years, which is about 8½ percent higher than the budget of 2 years ago. Basing our judgment on other costs of doing business in other lines of business, it would seem that this increase is very nominal."

The total allowed for the present biennium was $2,193,820. An increase of $190,030 is requested for the present biennium, and the board approved the full request of $2,383,850, which is expected to accrue from the profits of the mill. R. M. Stangler is manager of the mill.

Support for the Troops in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the January 6, 1951, edition of the Evening Leader, of Manchester, N. H.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BACK UP OUR BOYS," BRIDGES DEMANDS

The soundness of Senator BRIDGES' reasoning in his demand that we either back our boys up or take them out of Korea is inescapable.

These brave boys have been slaughtered long enough as a result of diplomatic restrictions that have hampered their efforts. It is a hideous crime to send men to Korea to fight Communist aggression, and then refuse them the legitimate means to defend themselves against powerful enemy assaults.

Senator BRIDGES' labeling of the situation as ridiculous is putting the matter mildly. Our land forces, as he says, wage a total grim and bloody battle, hopelessly outnumbered by Chinese and Korean manpower. In such a situation, the normal requirement is to give the Air Force and the Navy a free hand to cripple the enemy's offensive strength. But what do we find? The Air Force is allowed to fight only half a war. It operates gallantly in support of our land troops, while the mission for which it is particularly prepared—bombing the supply lines and supply bases beyond the Yalu—is forbidden by the endless debates going on in the UN.

Meanwhile, the Navy, under orders to patrol the waters between Formosa and the China coast, serves as a protecting screen for the Chinese Communist armies in Korea by preventing a possible invasion of the China coast and the establishment of a second front to relieve the pressure on our troops in Korea.

In the face of this situation, President Truman's statement at his press conference that he has no intention of bombing Communist China, because it might bring on war in Asia, is positively idiotic. What is going on now in Korea, if it is not war? Truman's statement is more than idiotic. It reflects an indifference, an absolute disregard for the welfare of our boys whom he sent to Korea, and who are now fighting and dying in subzero weather on the frozen fields of that war-torn country.

Is this a face-saving gesture on the part of Mr. Truman, who is trying to cover up his mistakes by refusing to acknowledge them and to adopt alleviative measures? If so, it is a tragic fact. For these boys could defend themselves successfully if their hands were freed and they were given a fair chance. The three steps Senator BRIDGES asks are ordinary military protective measures. We should remove restraints on Chiang Kai-shek at once and permit him to open a second front on the China mainland. We should permit our Air Force to bomb Red China's supply bases and supply lines just as they would in any other war. We should blockade the coast of Red China and cut off her trade with the free world.

If the United Nations won't support these measures, then to hell with the United Nations. It is a broken reed anyway to which Truman clings. These are the plain, simple, legitimate demands of the situation in Korea. If the Government won't take them, then BRIDGES is right. The only alternative is to withdraw our men from Korea at once.

Hon. Warren R. Austin, Homespun American Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, historians will record the rugged courage, the high integrity, and the devoted sincerity of Warren R. Austin, the honorable, loyal, and capable United States representative at the United Nations.

His homespun Vermont philosophy, his strong and urgent voice has left no one in doubt as to what he meant or what the position of the United States was on many occasions. I have been proud of his representation of the Nation's best interest and welfare many times in the Security Council and the political committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

It is not only the plain, understandable words and logic he uses but the strong, convincing tone of voice he has when he speaks that carries weight and has more than once cut deep and shook the emotions of the apparently phlegmatic and immovable Malik of Soviet Russia in his debates with Malik in the Security Council about the Korean crisis.

The people of the United States are fortunate to have a man with the background, the stamina, and the sturdy Americanism as former United States

Senator Warren R. Austin to represent them at the United Nations.

How fortunate we would be if we had men of such high capabilities and attainment in some of the other vital high offices which are directing our foreign policy. We can be justly proud of our Ambassador at large, Warren R. Austin.

Here is a brief appraisal of Mr. Austin recently written by William R. Frye:

"SLUGGER" AUSTIN, FREE WORLD'S CHAMPION

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK.—The man who is guiding American diplomacy through some of the stormiest waters the United Nations has ever seen is a humble, devout, rock-ribbed Vermont lawyer who combines burning idealism with an uncommon amount of the good old-fashioned "hoss sense" which New England breeds.

He is Warren R. Austin, permanent representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations—known universally by the less resounding and more affectionate title of "Senator."

Among his aides he now has a new title. As a result of his knock-down-and-drag-out verbal battles with chief Soviet Delegate Yakov A. Malik in recent months, they call him "Slugger" Austin. The staff of the American delegation presented a pair of tiny boxing gloves to him for Christmas.

RANK OF AMBASSADOR

The Senator, or the "Slugger"—or, to be absolutely precise, the Ambassador, for that is his formal rank—spent 16 years, from 1931 to 1947, in the United States Senate.

Well before World War II, he was an outstanding internationalist, defending his world viewpoint from bitter isolationist attack. One of his prime adversaries in those days was Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, who later became a leader of bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. Austin is squarely on the firing line at the United Nations. Day after day he sits in the Security Council or the Political Committee of the General Assembly with Mr. Malik just two seats away (by alphabetical placement) and listens to the torrent of Russian abuse and vilification poured out against the country Mr. Austin so passionately loves.

NO OUTBURSTS

The Senator's lower jaw juts out, and his lips are pressed tightly together. His pinceness seems to glower. His face reddens. But when he speaks, it is clear that Mr. Malik has not succeeded in baiting him into some ill-considered outburst which could jar the delicate balance of American relations with India, Great Britain, or China.

His words weigh a ton, whereas Mr. Malik's are a dime a gross, and the Senator knows it.

There are two books which Mr. Austin uses constantly for reference, and he is thoroughly familiar with both. One is the Statutes of the State of Vermont, which embodies many of the great principles to which he is fond of referring—biting into the great with the rising inflection of a Senator and the relish of an orator conscious of dramatic effect.

"I LOOK TO THEE"

The other book is the Bible. Its pages are well thumbed. He often knows exactly where to turn for the right quotation. In speeches he delivers to children—the Senator makes time for talks to schools, Boy Scout groups, and organizations some diplomats would consider a chore—he frequently quotes from its pages.

"In seeing you off at the beginning of the trail of the second half of the twentieth century," he recently told a Scout group, "I give you the most precious wish that I possess:

"It is that you, in your sincere and earnest lives, may early realize in your fight for good and against evil that you are never alone; that your heavenly Father is constantly at your side, and that in every righteous endeavor you are upheld by His law."

Mr. Austin does not hesitate to invoke the same guidance and support for his own tremendously important endeavors on behalf of the United Nations and world peace.

His intimates say one of his favorite pieces of literature is the poem of Samuel Longfellow which begins, "I look to thee in every need, and never look in vain," and ends:

"Embosomed deep in Thy dear love,
Held in Thy law I stand:
Thy hand in all things I behold,
And all things in Thy hand.
Thou leadest me by unsought ways,
Thou turn'st my mourning into praise."

Bibliography of Material on the Proposed Columbia Valley Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of development of a feasible plan for the coordination of the Federal activities in the Pacific Northwest remains most important for both the region and the Nation.

For those who wish to study this problem, I ask that the bibliography of material on the proposed Columbia Valley Administration be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MATERIAL ON THE PROPOSED COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION

S. 1645, introduced by Hon. Warren G. Magnuson (for himself and Senators Kefauver, Humphrey, Chaves, Murray, Langer, Douglas, McGrath, Pepper, Sparkman, Hill, Green, Wagner, Taylor, Gillette, Johnston of South Carolina, and Johnson of Texas); Eighty-first Congress, first session; Senate document room, United States Capitol, Washington 25, D. C.; April 19, 1949. A bill to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands.

H. R. 4287, introduced by Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, and H. R. 4286, introduced by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, Eighty-first Congress, first session; House document room, United States Capitol, Washington 25, D. C.; April 14, 1949. Identical to S. 1645 above.

Columbia Valley Authority needed in Pacific Northwest, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C. Reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, 1949.

Better Government, Not Bigger Government, by Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C. Reprinted from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 11, 1949. Statement supporting the Columbia Valley Administration legislation.

The CVA bill (H. R. 4286) sets forth a new and better way of doing things already being done by the Federal Government in the region of the Columbia, speech by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, in the House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C. Reprinted from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 14, 1949. A discussion and section-by-section analysis of the CVA bill.

Question and Answers on S. 1645, To Establish a Columbia Valley Administration, extension of remarks by Hon. Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho, in the Senate of the United States. Reprinted fro mthe CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 9, 1949. Questions and answers on the CVA bill, section-by-section explanation.

President Truman calls for proposals on Columbia Valley Authority legislation, a resolution from the Columbia Basin Commission, of Washington, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Columbia Valley Authority Legislative Program, letter to President Truman from Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, and news article and editorial reprinted from the Washington Post and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 27, 1949.

The Truth About CVA, by Hon. Glen H. Taylor, United States Senate, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27, 1950, by Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana. Speech in Rupert, Idaho, July 8, 1950, explaining why Idaho needs CVA and answering arguments of opponents.

Introduction to a Columbia Valley Administration, pamphlet containing reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 13, April 19, and August 25, 1949, inserted by Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington. The pamphlet includes the following items: Message from the President of the United States to the Congress advocating Columbia Valley Administration; remarks of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON on the proposed Columbia Valley Administration; editorial comment—east and west; questions and answers on the proposed CVA; a section-by-section analysis of the CVA bill; comment on the comprehensive reports.

CVA Facts, extension of remarks by Hon. Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho, in the Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C. Reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 10, 1949. A discussion of the CVA and its relationships to present conditions; Hoover Commission recommendation, continuity of construction; the benefits of TVA experience, anti-CVA propaganda.

Private Power Lobby Opposes CVA, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., and reprint from Christian Science Monitor editorial entitled "The Valley Programs." Reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1949.

My Position on the Pending CVA bill, S. 1645, by Hon. WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, United States Senate, Washington, D. C. Reprinted from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 14, 1949. Speech by Senator MORSE in the Senate of the United States in opposition to the proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

Columbia Valley Authority Memorial Passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, a memorial passed by the Washington State House of Representatives urging enactment of CVA. Inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Columbia Valley Administration, hearings before the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, first session, June 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, July 13, 14, 15, 18, 29, August 1 and 2, 1949. Testimony for and against H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287, bills to establish a Columbia Valley Administration.

Columbia Valley Administration, hearings before the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, first session, May 27, 31, June 1, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, July 8 and 9, August 3 and 4, 1949. Testimony for and against S. 1595, S. 1631, S. 1632, and S. 1645, bills dealing with the development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin and the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration, and for other purposes.

For a Columbia Valley Administration, by J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., June 22, 1949. Mimeographed. Statement before the House Public Works Committee in support of H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287, which would establish a Columbia Valley Administration.

Fair Deal on the Columbia, speech of Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1949.

How a Columbia Valley Administration Would Operate, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., July 13, 1949. Mimeographed. Statement before the House Public Works Committee in support of H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287 to establish a Columbia Valley Administration, including an analysis of how a Columbia Valley Administration would operate if S. 1645, H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287 were enacted.

What CVA Means to You, the Columbia Is Our River. League for CVA, 3015 Sixty-third Avenue SW., Seattle 6, Wash., May 1950. Free. Booklet explaining why the coordinated development of Columbia River resources through a Columbia Valley Administration is important to the people of the Pacific Northwest.

Government by Authorities, a Program of Socializing Our Economy at the Source by Controlling All Natural Resources—Do You Want It? Natural Resources Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington 6, D. C., 1950. Five cents each. Pamphlet opposing regional and valley authorities of any kind.

Majority of Democratic State Legislators in Montana Support CVA, statement of support for CVA by Democratic members of the Montana State Legislature. Inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 16, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Blueprint for a Boom, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. Published in the May 15, 1949, issue of This Week magazine, New York Herald Tribune. Article outlining a means to maintain prosperity in the Pacific Northwest by developing region's resources under CVA.

Kilowatts Out to Sea, by Richard L. Neuberger, an article published in the June 21, 1949, issue of The Reporter, and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 7, 1949, by Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. Article outlining the pros and cons of the struggle in the West for adoption of the CVA.

Northwest, Peeling on the Columbia Valley, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL of Washington, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, 1949, from a reply published by the Washington Post.

The Magnificent Columbia, CVA: An Over-All Plan for the Valley: CIO Committee on Regional Development and Conservation, Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C., January 1950. Publication No. 178, 15 cents each. Pamphlet dealing with the planning problems of the Columbia Valley. Discusses the various aspects of planning and points out its relationship to union people and the need for an integrated program.

Fifteen Basic Objections to the Administration CVA Bills: National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., reprinted by Seattle Chamber of Commerce, 215 Columbia Street, Seattle, Wash. Lists 15 basic objections to the administration CVA bills.

Two editorials on CVA: Two editorials from the Prosser (Wash.) Record-Bulletin, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

CVA—A Business Proposition, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., August 19, 1949. Mimeographed. Address before the Young Men's Club of Tacoma, Wash., pointing out that the development of the Northwest requires effective management of the Government enterprises as provided by CVA and that the businessmen of the whole region will benefit.

Valley Authorities: Special number of Legislative Daily, Department of Governmental Affairs, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., January 10, 1950. A special edition pointing out the opposition to the CVA and to the valley-authority idea in general by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The Growing Need for CVA, by Joe Miller, published in the New Republic magazine of April 11, 1949. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 1949 by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Jackson and the CVA, address by Earl Coe, secretary of state, Olympia, Wash., reprinted in part in January 1950 issue of Oregon Democrat. Oregon Democrat Publishing Co., 428 Southwest Eleventh Avenue, Portland, Oreg.; 25 cents per copy. Statement favoring CVA.

Managing the Federal Investment in the Northwest, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C.; June 7, 1949; mimeographed. Address before Oregon Bankers Association, Portland, Oreg. A discussion of Federal investment and the economy of the Pacific Northwest, pointing out that CVA will create an economic base for further growth of business, industry, and agriculture.

Read for Yourself What CVA Means (full text of S. 1645, reproduced from the original with marginal comments). Pacific Northwest Development Association, 205 Multnomah Hotel, Portland 4, Oreg. Marginal comments on CVA bill by opponents to the measure.

CVA and Defense Production, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., July 31, 1950. Mimeographed. Speech before Chamber of Commerce Forum Luncheon in Pendleton, Oreg. Emphasizes importance of hydroelectric power and other natural resources for defense production. Shows how present divided system of Federal resources operations has contributed to delays in providing necessary electric power and how CVA would speed the job.

Coordinated Development of Pacific Northwest Resources, a resolution by the Southwest Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, 1949, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell of Washington.

Task Force Report on Natural Resources. Prepared for the (Hoover) Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. 1949. 50 cents. Analysis by experts employed by the Hoover Commission of present Federal system of river basin development and resources operation. Points out in detail deficiencies of present system and recommends consolidation and decentralization of existing agencies.

CVA—Order on the Frontier, by Richard L. Neuberger, published in July 1949 issue of The Survey, Survey Associates, Inc., 112 East 19 Street, New York 3, New York. 50 cents per copy. Article analyzing Columbia Valley Administration legislation in terms of needs of Pacific Northwest.

The Canadian Portion of the Columbia River Basin, speech by the Honorable H. W. Herridge, member of the Canadian House of Commons. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1949 by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Question and Answers on the Columbia Valley Administration Bill, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. Multilithed. Analysis of specific language of the CVA bills in relation to existing law and administrative operations, showing fallacies in some charges made by opponents of CVA.

How 27 Men Can Capture the United States, Pacific Northwest Development Association, 205 Multnomah Hotel, Portland 4, Oreg. Pamphlet charging that proponents of valley authorities would put the entire United States under socialistic government-corporation rule.

Why You Need CVA, League for CVA, 3015 Sixty-third Avenue SW., Seattle 6, Wash. Pamphlet supporting CVA.

CVA and Public Power, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., August 26, 1949. Mimeographed. Address before Progress Conference on Public Power, Spokane, Wash. Traces the fight for public power by the people in the Northwest against the private utilities and the present fight for a CVA by those who want cheaper power and better administration of our natural resources.

Northwest support of CVA, letters showing support of CVA by E. M. "Ed" Weston, president, Washington State Federation of Labor; Henry P. Carstensen, master, the Washington State Grange; Roy W. Atkinson, regional director, CIO; and Harold J. Gibson, president, Aero Mechanics Lodge No. 751, and president, Washington Council of Machinists, IAM. Also letter by John T. McCutcheon, Washington State Senator. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 18, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

The Press and CVA, by Richard L. Neuberger, published in January 1950 issue of Nieman Reports, volume 14, No. 1, Harvard Press, Cambridge, Mass.; also reproduced in part in March 1950 issue of Oregon Democrat, Oregon Democrat Publishing Co., 428 Southwest Eleventh Avenue, Portland 5, Oreg.; 25 cents per copy. A survey of the attitude of the press regarding President Truman's proposal for a Columbia Valley Administration.

Analysis of Charges Made by Various Individuals and Groups in Opposition to a Columbia Valley Administration, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. 1949. Multilith. Legal interpretations of passages from CVA bills to explain misconceptions underlying some attacks on CVA legislation.

Washington Machinists Go All Out for CVA, a resolution supporting CVA by the Washington Machinists Council, published in the May 12 issue of Aero Mechanic, official publication of Lodge 751, IAM. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

CVA Promotes Conservation, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. September 17, 1949. Mimeographed. Speech before Izaak Walton League of Oregon, Bend, Oreg. Points out why conservation agencies are strapped for funds and how the CVA will promote better conservation of fish and wildlife, soils, forests, and recreational resources.

Why the Northwest Needs a CVA, by Harold J. Gibson, published in the April 27, 1950, issue of the Machinist, International Association of Machinists, Ninth and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C. A short newspaper article outlining the backing of CVA by labor organizations and the prospects offered labor by CVA.

Pacific Northwest Trade Association Stand on CVA, letter from Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, to the Pacific Northwest Trade Association regarding its negative attitude on CVA. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1949.

People and Resources, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. August 26, 1949. Mimeographed. Address before the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, Portland, Oreg. Discusses the relationships between people and natural resources, the necessity for proper

management in order to bring balance to economic and social aspects of our environment, and how CVA can bring about this balance.

Excerpts From Analysis of the Administration CVA Bills (H. R. 4296 and H. R. [S.] 1645) by E. W. Rising, Pacific Northwest Development Association, 205 Multnomah Hotel, Portland 4, Oreg. Mimeographed. Explanation of opposition to CVA bills.

The CVA Area, a special edition of the People's Voice, People's Voice Publishing Co., 1205 Lockey Street, Helena, Mont. January 27, 1950. Price, 5 cents. Extracts from speeches, statements, and documents of public officials favoring CVA.

Newspapers on CVA, an editorial published in the Western News of Hamilton, Mont., in the issues of May 12, 1949. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1949, by Hon. HUGH D. MITCHELL, of Washington.

TVA—Model for CVA? by Malcolm Bauer, the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., March 17-April 1, 1949. Series of 16 articles written by city editor of the newspaper after a special month's study of the Tennessee Valley Authority, reporting on TVA operations in regional development in relation to proposed CVA.

Resource Management by the Farmer and His Government, by Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., December 12, 1949. Mimeographed. Address before the National Land and Water Conference of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill. A discussion of the relation between efficient management of farm resources by the farmer and efficient management of river basin resources by his Government through CVA.

CVA Legislation and Columbia River Development, letter sent by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee relative to CVA hearings, and Mr. MITCHELL's statement of testimony on CVA before the Committee on Public Works. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 13, 1949.

What About CVA?. Editorial in Nature magazine, American Nature Association, 1214 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. January 1950. Fifty cents per copy. Editorial favoring CVA as the essential basic approach to a broader and coordinated resource management program.

Private Utilities in Washington Help Finance Anti-CVA Groups, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington, showing tabulation of partial list of contributions by Washington utility companies to organizations opposing CVA. Inserted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1949.

CVA and Jobs for Lumbermen, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., September 22, 1950. Mimeographed. Address before Northwest Council of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, Portland, Oreg. Outlines the necessity for more complete utilization of timber so as to create new industry using the present waste materials and how CVA promotes stability of the lumber industry.

CVA Speaker's Manual. League for CVA, 8015 Sixty-third Street SW., Seattle, Wash. Materials primarily for the use of those asked to participate in discussion of CVA. Contains quotations from advocates, and material relating to the CVA issue.

League for CVA Terms Pacific Northwest Development Association Front Group for Private Power Companies. An editorial regarding CVA from the Oregon Teamster, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 22, 1949, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington.

More TVA's? by Willard R. Espy, in New York Times magazine, May 7, 1950; reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 6, 1950, by Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana. Article points out that valley authorities in Missouri and Columbia Basins only way waste, overlapping, and logrolling now taking place there are likely to be eliminated; valley authorities need not be a way to spend money but a way to get far more value for the money we are spending now; valley authorities act as a stimulus to free enterprise.

Workers and Farmers Fight for CVA, by Joe Miller, published in the December 1949 issue of the Butcher Workman, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago 6, Ill. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 27, 1950, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell. Article expressing the support of the workers and farmers of the Pacific Northwest for the proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

Area Included in Proposed Columbia Valley Administration. Geological Survey, Washington 25, D. C. 1949. Map showing the area included in proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

CVA Issues Reviewed by Northwest Writer, a series of four articles on CVA, written by Mr. Stub Nelson, of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, 1949, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington.

A series of three articles (separately titled) on forests, soils, and land problems related to river basin development, by Bernard Frank and Anthony Netboy, in the January, February, and March 1950 issues of American Forests Magazine, Society of American Foresters, 919 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. First article, Dams Are Not Enough, questions whether dams and engineering approach will solve water and watershed problems. Second article, Land Use—Key to Our Water Problems, points necessity of coordinated planning of watershed conservation and land restoration with river control. Third article, Mirage of River Basin Development, points out incomplete and uncoordinated status of present river-control programs, with notes on accomplishments and shortcomings of CVA.

Northwesterners Hold Round Table Discussion on CVA, article published in the Wenatchee World by Howard Ordway, reporting a round table on CVA held in Moses Lake, Wash. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Federal Administration of Natural Resources Programs, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., June 29-30, 1950. Mimeographed. A series of two lectures given at Great Plains Workshop, Montana State College, outlining the basic principles governing Federal administration of natural resources programs. Also contains a discussion of the administrative structure which inhibits efficient resource development and conservation. The situation in selected regions is noted and a number of possible solutions is reviewed.

CVA. This is Pioneering, 1950 Style, special issue of New Veteran, Oregon State Council of American Veterans Committee, 2 Southwest Brugger, Portland 1, Oreg. February 1950. Fifteen cents per copy. Considerations of the proposed CVA legislation by Oregon American Veterans Committee. Included are the following articles: The Press and CVA, by Richard L. Neuberger; the Farmer's Stake in CVA, by Morton B. Tompkins; A Union Man Looks at CVA, by Bill Way; the People and CVA, by Phil Dreyer; CVA and the Hoover Commission, by Sidney Lezak; Safeguards for Freedom, by George Holcomb; and others.

CVA Foes May Have Overplayed Their Hand, by Joe Miller, published in the CIO News of December 26, 1949. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1950, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Plan, Not Objective, Is Issue in Development of Columbia River. May 1949 issue of Rural Electrification Magazine, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. This is third article in a series published by Rural Electrification Magazine dealing with the present movement toward the full development of America's river valleys.

United States Chamber of Commerce distorts CVA issues, a letter from Mr. Lloyd B. Dysart, member of the Centralia, Wash., Chamber of Commerce to the United States Chamber of Commerce and an article published in Labor News on the negative attitude of the United States Chamber of Commerce on CVA. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, 1950, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Government and Water Resources, a symposium in the September 1950 issue of the American Political Science Review, published quarterly by American Political Science Association, 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wis. $2 a copy. Symposium contains the following articles: Congress and Water Resources, by Arthur A. Maass; National Executive Organization for Water Resources, by Gilbert F. White; The Valley Authority and its Alternatives, by Charles McKinley; and Water Resources and American Federalism, by Albert Lepawsky.

Montana Wants Early CVA Hearings, a copy of a resolution passed by the Western Montana Conference for CVA and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1950, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Long Beach Navy Shipyard Active Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on the floor of this great legislative Chamber, it was my privilege and honor to announce that the Navy had just informed me that it had been found that the inactive shipyard at Long Beach, my home city, had been found to be a necessary facility and would be immediately reactivated to its full capacity. The inactivation order was enunciated in September 1949. The reactivation ceremony and celebration will be observed at the Long Beach Navy Shipyard Thursday, February 1, 1951. In the meantime, however, some 2,000 employees are "demothballing" at the earliest possible date; peacetime employee list is about 6,000; the last war peak was about 16,000.

Following is a very appropriate editorial which appeared in the Long Beach Press-Telegram for Friday, January 5, 1951, clearly showing that the citizenry there readily comprehends the impacts and responsibilities arising from the shipyard being located there:

SHIPYARD REOPENING ACCENTUATES LONG BEACH'S VARIED DEFENSE ROLE

The mounting defense crisis has accomplished what Long Beach's most valiant efforts failed to do a year ago. The reactivation of the naval shipyards in many ways confirms the strong case presented by this community in opposition to the closure order of mid-1949.

It is useless now to discuss the question as to whether the shipyards should ever have been shut down. The happy circumstance is that the yard was not abandoned—that it

has been only closed and kept in readiness for rapid reactivation if ordered. The yard has been kept in an excellent state of repair, and a major project is under way to remedy the subsidence problem, which was given officially as the principal reason for its closure.

It will take time, of course, to restaff the facility and get it back into full operation, but the announcement to Representative CLYDE DOYLE's office indicates that there will be no lost motion in that direction. Locally there has been some puzzlement over the fact that the reopening was not started sooner, in view of the Korean War, the general defense situation, and the overloading of other west coast yards.

There is something about the presence of a closed facility such as the shipyard that is embarrassing to a community, no matter what the justification. Long Beach is naturally gratified that the naval shipyard, which had such an outstanding record during World War II and in the immediate postwar demobilization program, is now to make its contribution to the revitalized defense effort.

What the local effects of the shipyard reopening will be are still somewhat in the conjectural stage, naturally. It will, of course, carry a strong impact on the community in such fields as employment, housing, and general business conditions.

At present Long Beach has an unemployment roll of between 7,000 and 8,000. The minimum of shipyard employment is set at 3,500, and opening the yards will obviously cut the jobless roll sharply.

However, filling the shipyard's needs will not be simply a matter of hiring 3,500 persons from among those 7,000 to 8,000 unemployed listed by the State employment office. The employment office lists approximately 1,300 skilled and 811 semiskilled workers as unemployed. Among these, very likely, there are many potential shipyard employees. On the other hand, the unemployment lists contain numerous clerks, domestics, and so forth who wouldn't be available for shipyard work.

While large numbers of shipyard workers may be recruited from local manpower, it is believed many employees will come from outside. Observers expect some difficulty may be encountered by the shipyard in filling the more highly skilled and key positions. The decline in the construction boom in Los Angeles and in Orange County is beginning to throw construction men out of work. Many of the skilled workers—particularly those who have commuted to those areas from Long Beach—should find employment at the shipyard.

As for housing, Long Beach is far better prepared to meet the housing needs of a busy defense center than it was during the hectic days of World War II. In 1950 alone, approximately 17,000 new houses were constructed in this immediate area. There are at present nearly 4,000 vacant residential units in Long Beach. People are moving daily from in-the-city apartment to new housing in the big suburban tracts. Further, it is to be assumed that many of the men who will work in the shipyard are already residents here. All of this adds up to a much looser housing situation than existed in World War II days when from 5,000 to 7,000 men were employed at the shipyards.

The critical world condition that brought on the reactivation of the shipyard is not a welcome circumstance, of course, but it is gratifying that this community, through its reactivated shipyard, its airplane factories, air fields, ammunition and net depot, harbor, oil fields, and other facilities, will play an important role in the mighty defense effort of the free west. Making that contribution will require cooperation, sacrifice, and constructive solution of many problems. It is hardly necessary to say Long Beach will rise to the challenge.

EVENTS OF PAST 10 DAYS PRESAGE CHANGES IN LONG BEACH AREA, THEREBEING

Long Beach has just spent 10 of the most eventful days in its history—days whose activities foreshadow marked changes in the lives of local citizens.

Rapidly Long Beach has begun gearing for defense. The meshing may be heard in almost every area of local society.

Here are some of the developments:

The city heard that the naval shipyard here would be reactivated. Immediately, officials began receiving and processing applications for employment from skilled shipyard workers and stenographers and typists. Capt. Emmett Emerson Sprung, 51, graduate of the Naval Academy class of 1923, was appointed commander of the shipyard. And two of his key officers were to be Capt. Homer Dahlke, in charge of planning, and Capt. Charles Tooke, production. Only a few hours after announcement of reactivation of the huge installation, workers heard that the first big project would be the diking of drydock 1, which has handled many of the major ships of the fleet.

At the same time, Undersecretary of the Navy Dan Kimball announced in Washington that expansion of the Seal Beach Ammunition and Net Depot would keep pace with the reactivation of the shipyard here. Bids were opened on repairs to facilities at the depot, and the restoration goal was set at 90 days.

New naval trainee activities here were presaged by the announcement that the Los Angeles Naval Base, which had been on naval station status, would be reestablished as a base. Simultaneously, the Coast Guard announced its intention of expanding its activities in this area and called for new barracks facilities. Long Beach and Los Angeles harbor authorities announced they were perfecting security plans which will be coordinated with Coast Guard activities.

Douglas Aircraft revamped and strengthened its executive structure to meet the problems of accelerated defense production. A stone's throw away, at municipal airport and Los Alamitos Air Station, stepped-up air training activities were noticeable.

The civilian defense front hummed. The Long Beach Red Cross chapter launched a preparedness training program aimed at training 30,000 persons in this area in new first-aid techniques. Meanwhile, a training period began for civilian auxiliary police, officials hoping to recruit a force of approximately 1,000 eventually. The Chamber of Commerce pledged to gear its 1951 program to the needs of preparedness, while the Board of Realtors voted to offer their services, as a group or individually, to the director of civilian defense. Councilman Basil U. Carlsson suggested that some of the city's largest storm drains might be used as air raid shelters. The city tested a new air-raid-warning system, and immediately it was urged that 15 new sirens be purchased at once. City Manager Vickers said he would seek an ordinance providing for a Long Beach civil defense and disaster council, supplanting the present ordinance which provides for a disaster council, and giving greater emphasis to all aspects of defense.

As these events unfolded, Long Beach citizens experienced others which gave significance to the revitalized defense program. New casualty lists, some of them containing names of local boys, furnished a reminder of the front line which all these home-front activities must support. And the paraplegic ward at Long Beach Veterans' Administration hospital received Major Raymond Pepple, 41, of Seattle—the hospital's first casualty from Korea.

These things, and many others connected with defense, happened during a 10-day span.

Suddenly, in so brief a period, the atmosphere of national preparedness has come over this city, changing local aims and habits of thinking. Because of its coastal situation and its possession of valuable military and industrial installations, Long Beach is experiencing the metamorphosis more rapidly and more rigorously than most other cities in the country. Upon the shoulders of local people fall many of the initial responsibilities of the defense effort. They must accept the position of leadership which has been accorded them.

The Republic of Mexico Is Solving Economic and Social Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I was among the half-million citizens of the United States who visited Mexico in 1950. It was the most favorable tourist trade year in Mexico's history.

I was impressed first by the fact that there are two civilizations—the ancient rural society still resembling that of the eighteenth century and the other, a fast-moving and progressive urban life. Probably in no other part of the world is the contrast so striking. Mexico City has modern buildings and factories. Good roads, electric power development, and vast construction projects indicate that economic progress is welcome throughout the country and is rapidly affecting rural life. Cultural patterns are more resistant. Latin America is not likely to abandon all of its old-world practices, many of which have a special charm.

The contribution of the United States to rural improvement is notable. The Rockefeller Foundation, financed entirely by private funds, began an unusual research program in 1943 that has already brought revolutionary results. It is designed to increase improved yields of corn, wheat, beans, and other crops. Mexico's progress in corn production, for example, is demonstrated by the fact that in 1948 for the first time in 35 years it was unnecessary to import corn for its 27,000,000 people. Another program of great significance is the sanitation and health projects directed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, staffed by able American technicians and cooperating to the fullest extent with the Mexican Government.

My contact with the Government was confined to a single visit to the Mexican Congress. Through the courtesy of two members of the Chamber of Deputies, Hon. Teofilo Borunda and Hon. Mario Romero Lopetegui, I was privileged to observe proceedings during an afternoon session. I understand that an official delegation from the Mexican Congress will visit our body in 1951 for the purpose of returning battle flags taken by Mexican troops in 1847. There was abundant evidence that this Government's action in returning Mexican flags taken in the same engagement inspired great appreciation on the part of the Mexican people.

The Mexican people had a longer struggle for their freedom and independence than we. The revolutions of 1821, 1857 and 1867 produced many heroes and slogans, but the devotion which one finds everywhere to the principles of the revolution was inspired by the great upsurge of 1910 against dictatorship.

Mexico is proud of its history and makes full use of its archeological resources for the benefit of tourists. We saw impressive works of the Aztec Indians thousands of years old. And with the Spaniards came a genius for construction that we have not surpassed.

What of Mexico's future? There is hopefulness in every field of thought and action. Businessmen are quite impressed with the potentialities of trade with the United States and the benefits to flow to our own country. A new and valuable market is at our doorstep. The building of good relations through the agricultural and educational activities I have mentioned is a very important development. The United States needs Latin-American friends and Latin America needs us.

As I have indicated, the most prominent official activity of our Government is that of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. Its operations are carried out through the Mexican Government's agency, Direccion de Cooperacion Interamericana de Salubrida Publica. Our contributions since 1943 have been rather modest—$5,100,000—but the results have been enormous. As of May 30, 1950, the Direccion de Cooperacion Interamericana de Salubrida Publica has had under construction or had completed 46 potable water supplies in various towns within the Republic. There had also been installed 16 chlorinators to protect already existing water-supply systems. During the same period the agency had under construction or had completed a total of 22 municipal sanitary-sewage systems.

In the field of preventive medicine the following activities have been carried out: First, field investigations of such diseases as brucellosis, onchocerciasis, pinta, and malaria; second, training of public health workers within Mexico, in the United States, and in other Latin-American countries; third, promotion of disease control activities, with special emphasis on malaria, tuberculosis and typhus; fourth, promotion of general public health activities, including construction and equipping of health centers, and technical assistance in their operations.

The magnificent results attained by the American and Mexican Governments' program for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease are already well known.

In these two official programs and the research activity of the Rockefeller Foundation, a basis has been laid for a successful cooperative program under point 4 legislation. Its value in terms of the Western Hemisphere's defense is apparent.

Mexico's future depends partly upon the faith exhibited by privileged groups of both countries in the capacity of the rural population to achieve a higher level of living. Rural people have looked upon a more prosperous and satisfactory way of living and they aspire to reach it for themselves and their children. It will take a generation or longer to achieve some of the economic and social goals erected by Mexico's progressive leadership, but I am confident those goals will be achieved. In the meantime, I shall occasionally recall the half-pleading but bright little eyes of a baby hanging limp from the mother's shoulders in a village street.

Faith Can Master Fear—Mankind Can Learn To Live in Cooperation, Trust, and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by G. Ernest Thomas from the Miami Herald of January 16, 1951:

FAITH CAN MASTER FEAR—MANKIND CAN LEARN TO LIVE IN COOPERATION, TRUST, AND PEACE

(By G. Ernest Thomas)

(Out of a firm belief that the human spirit will prove supreme again, as it has in earlier crises, G. Ernest Thomas has written a new study of fear and its cure by faith. This is the second of six articles taken from his book, Faith Can Master Fear.)

A great principle which should be recognized by those who are in the grip of a fear of the future is this:

Men can learn to live together.

Much of our uncertainty for the future is centered about the international situation. We fear that nations will again resort to war. We fear the conflict of systems of thought which we assume to be incompatible.

The history of human fear indicates that this point of view has caused greater worry than any other. The earliest records of people who were filled with terror come from the civilizations which were dominated by the obsession that destruction was inevitable because men could not get along with each other.

When man came upon the earth countless ages ago he had to live in fear in order to survive.

Every day he met hostility from man and beast. He feared every savage who came out of the forest, perhaps sometimes just to look curiously at his neighbors.

It took thousands of years to convince man that he could trust the families on the other side of the hill and that he could serve his own best interest by joining with them to make a tribe.

It took more thousands of years before the tribe learned that it could best protect its interest by uniting with other tribes to form a larger unit.

It took countless generations before tribes could learn that their best security lay in the nation. It has taken centuries until the people of the world would even consider the idea of a United Nations.

Every step of the way fear has slowed man down. Yet the testimony of the ages is irrefutable. Man can learn to live together.

Much of our fear of the future will be dispelled if we accept this fact. The divisions which seem to make a cleavage between the peoples of the world today are minor compared with the severe handicaps to unity which already have been overcome.

It is true that the development of agents of human destruction has been so rapid that we do not have as much time to resolve our difficulties as people have had in former generations. We must quickly learn how to live together. Time is running out for us. The way of cooperation must be found.

The evidence of the ages indicates that a plan for cooperative effort will be found, and will be put into effect. Men can—and, we believe, will—learn to live at peace with each other.

Another principle which will help to dispel our fear of the future is this: The human spirit is supreme.

People for many generations have lived in abject fear of their future because they believed that weapons, or money, or government was supreme. Because they could not control the power of those weapons, or because they did not possess enough wealth, or because they had no part in the Government, they felt helpless and weak. They were afraid.

The Christian attitude toward life is closely bound up with the idea of the supremacy of the human spirit. "Man shall not live by bread alone," said Jesus. For Him the soul of man was of greatest significance.

How does that affect the attitude of the individual Christian who is confronted by a world in which his neighbors tremble constantly with fears of the future?

Just this: He knows God is the Father of all mankind. He believes man is made in the image of God with divine possibilities for life. He accepts the clear witness of our faith that the human soul is immortal. He does not understand all the mysteries involved, but he is aware that the noblest witness of the ages is Christ, and the voices of the greatest of the philosophers and the poets are united in proclaiming that man is made to live forever. He is immortal.

Such a faith in human immortality is a sure antidote for our fear of the future. Suppose the world is faced with dire uncertainties; suppose the civilization of this age is headed for destruction.

The Christian soul has within it the seeds of immortality. The blazing light of such a faith has the power to dispel even the darkest fear.

Fear of the future often is based on the idea that material factors are the ruling agencies in life. But courage often has been a more valuable factor than an army. Love frequently has overcome the strangling power of money. Brotherhood sometimes has been more useful than political might.

The human spirit is supreme. More often than we think, it can be victorious over the threats to security and peace which cause us to fear the future. If the human spirit cannot find the means to transform the world in which it lives, it still can seek a better country under the providence of a loving God.

Fear of the future plagues almost everyone who lives in this generation. We wish life might be different, we say, but the world looks dark. Rich or poor, highly educated or ignorant, American or Russia, we fear the future. In those moments when we are given to wishful thinking we long for some miracle to dispel those shadows.

John Bunyan, in Pilgrim's Progress, painted a picture of a world held fast in the strangling power of fear.

Pilgrim is made to say to his wife: "I am for certain informed that this our city will be burned with fire from heaven—in which fearful overthrow both myself with thee my wife and our sweet babes shall miserably come to ruin, except (the which yet I see not) some way of escape can be found, whereby we may be delivered."

You remember that Pilgrim began to run with his feet on the path and his eyes on the shining light which led to the wicket gate. On the journey he was not alone, for the Evangelist met him and guided him.

Fear of the future is well described by the experience of Bunyan's Pilgrim. But too few of us accept the light which Bunyan saw. If we walk forward with our feet on the path of righteousness, and with our eyes set on noble goals, we too will discover a strange power and peace to calm our frightened minds.

And on the journey we shall find that a divine spirit is leading us. Our fear of the future will have disappeared.

Benefits Available to World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly, January 16, 1951, entitled "Summary of Major World War I Veterans' Benefits":

SUMMARY OF MAJOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS' BENEFITS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Basic eligibility requirements for all major benefits that VA administers for World War I veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries in the United States, its possessions and Territories, and in foreign countries are briefly outlined below. More detailed information may be obtained from any VA office in the United States, its possessions or Territories or from any DAV national service officer. In foreign countries it may be obtained from any United States Foreign Service office.)

MEDICAL AND DOMICILIARY BENEFITS

Hospitalization—World War I veterans, if discharged or separated under conditions other than dishonorable, are entitled to VA hospital treatment, under the following priority system.

First, emergency cases.

Second, those suffering from injuries or diseases incurred or aggravated in line of duty during wartime service.

Third, those who state under oath that they are unable to pay hospital charges for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities or illnesses. These veterans, if not in the emergency category, must wait until a bed becomes available.

Emergency patients may be taken directly to the nearest VA hospital. If possible, the veterans, or someone acting for him or her, should communicate with VA by telephone or telegraph.

In all other cases, the veteran, his nearest relative, guardian, or representative, should fill in the proper form for hospital care. These forms are available at any VA office.

If admission to a VA hospital or home has been approved, Government transportation may be provided as follows:

1. Hospitals: To the hospital and, upon completion of treatment in service-connected cases, to his or her home. This service may be provided for non-service-connected cases if they are unable to pay for the transportation.

2. Homes: To a VA domiciliary home.

Domiciliary care: Domiciliary care is designed to provide a "home" for those veterans who have a chronic condition which incapacitates them from earning a living and who require minimal medical attention. Requirements for admission to domiciliary care are essentially the same as for hospital treatment. Transportation at Government expense as a rule is provided only for the initial admission.

The veteran, or his nearest relative, guardian, or representative, should obtain preadmission approval from the nearest VA installation having facilities for domiciliary case.

Out-patient medical treatment: Out-patient medical care is available for veterans in need of treatment for service-connected disabilities.

Under this plan, eligible World War I veterans may receive treatment at VA hospitals, or other field stations furnishing medical treatment, or from approved private physicians. Each veteran's eligibility must be determined by VA before treatment of this type can be authorized. Necessary drugs may be obtained from "home-town" druggists at Government expense by veterans who are authorized to report to private physicians for treatment.

Outpatient dental treatment: Veterans entitled to outpatient dental treatment may, upon VA approval, be furnished dental treatment by private dentists at Government expense. Here, again, the condition must be determined by VA to have been incurred in, or made worse by, the veteran's wartime service before treatment can be authorized. Preliminary examinations may be made in a VA dental clinic or, if VA dental facilities are not feasibly available, by a participating dentist. Treatment, if approved, may be completed in a VA clinic, or the veteran may be assigned to an approved private dentist.

Prosthetic service: A veteran's eligibility for prosthetic appliances may be established if (1) he has a service-connected or service-aggravated disability requiring an appliance or (2) if an appliance is determined necessary as a part of hospital treatment or domiciliary care.

Complete information and necessary forms for procuring needed appliances, equipment, and repairs are available at any VA office.

Examinations: Free medical examinations if required, will be given veterans filing compensation claims. Veterans desiring to reinstate their United States Government life insurance may receive a physical examination free of charge at any VA medical office.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION

A veteran disabled by injury or disease incurred in, or aggravated by, service during World War I may qualify for disability compensation. He must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Monthly rates range from $15 to $150, depending on the degree of disability, plus statutory awards for amputations, blindness, etc., up to a maximum of $360. Veterans rated 50 percent or more disabled receive additional sums for dependents.

DISABILITY PENSION

A World War I veteran who becomes permanently and totally disabled for reason not traceable to his service in the Armed Forces may be entitled to pension. He must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after a minimum of 90 days service, or else discharged for disability. The veteran is disqualified if his income exceeds $1,000 per year if he is single, or $2,500 if he is married or has a minor child.

The monthly rate is $60, which is increased to $72 after 10 years or when the veteran reaches age 65.

DEATH COMPENSATION

The widow, children, and dependent parents of a deceased World War I veteran whose death was due to service may qualify for death compensation. A widow loses her entitlement if she remarries. The child loses its entitlement, normally, upon reaching age 18.

Monthly amounts vary according to the number and relationship of the dependents. Examples are: widow, no children, $75; one child alone, no widow, $56; one parent, $60.

DEATH PENSION

The widow and children of a deceased World War I veteran who died of causes not due to service, in most cases are entitled to death pension benefits. The widow is disqualified if her annual income exceeds $1,000, or $2,500 if she has a child or children. A child is ineligible if his or her income exceeds $1,000 per year. A widow loses her entitlement upon remarriage, and children normally become ineligible when they reach age 18.

A widow alone receives $42 per month, with additional allowances for children. Where there is no widow, a single child is entitled to $21.60, with added amounts for more children.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE

A veteran of World War I who served at any time from October 6, 1917, to July 2, 1921, still is eligible to apply for up to $10,000 of United States Government life insurance, whether or not he took out such insurance while in service or has since let it lapse.

He may get term insurance or any of six permanent plans available—ordinary life, 20-payment life, 30-payment life, 20-year endowment, 30-year endowment, and endowment at age 62. No one may hold at any one time more than $10,000 worth of Government insurance including National Service Life (World War II) Insurance.

The veteran must furnish satisfactory evidence that he is in good health. Ordinarily, this is done by submitting report of complete physical examination which will be given without charge at any VA regional office or hospital.

AID IN ACQUIRING SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING

A veteran of war or peacetime service who is entitled to compensation for permanent and total service-connected disability for loss or loss of use of both legs due to certain specified conditions such as to prevent him from moving about without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheel chair, may qualify for assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing with special fixtures made necessary by the nature of his disability.

Eligible veterans will receive Federal grants of not more than 50 percent of the cost of the homes up to a maximum of $10,000 with which to pay part of the cost of building or buying such homes, or to remodel existing homes for their requirements.

The grant also may be used to pay off the indebtedness on such a special home already acquired by an eligible veteran.

Application for the grant may be made at any VA office.

GUARDIANSHIP SERVICE

Incompetent World War I veterans, their minor dependents and incompetent beneficiaries are entitled to protection of their estates derived from benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration under acts of Congress.

Such protection is provided by the chief attorneys of VA regional offices—in accordance with the State and Federal laws and VA regulations—acting under the direction and supervision of the legal service (guardianship) of the VA Solicitor's office. The chief attorney maintains supervision over guardians appointed by State (probate and county) courts, as well as legal custodians recognized by VA in their respective jurisdictions.

BURIAL BENEFITS

Funeral expenses up to $150 will be paid by the Government in the death of any World War I veteran discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Additional costs, covering transportation, will be allowed if the veteran dies in a VA hospital or domiciliary home, or while hospitalized at the expense of VA, or while in transit to or from a VA hospital, home or regional office at the expense of VA.

All claims must be filed with VA within 2 years from the date of permanent burial. These allowances are payable only to undertakers or to reimburse the person who paid the funeral expenses.

BURIAL FLAG

An American flag to drape the casket, which may be retained as a memorial by the next of kin, is supplied in the death of veterans who have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Such flags are issued upon application, by field offices, most first-, second-, and third-class post offices and those fourth-class post offices located in county seats.

APPEALS

The Board of Veterans' Appeals is available for rendering final decisions in all cases appealed to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, wherein a claimant has been denied benefits to which he claims entitlement. The Board has no original jurisdiction (except in claims of disabled emergency offices); its work is similar to that of a court of appeals.

Rejection of Reds by Koreans Sets Example for All Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to you and my other distinguished colleagues an editorial viewpoint as released by the editor of the Long Beach, Calif., Press-Telegram. This important daily is admittedly recognized and rated as Republican in editorial policy.

And as said editorial refers to an appeal for help written by B. C. Limb, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea, I also call to your attention the full text of the "appeal" to which the Long Beach editor refers.

The editorial was on Thursday, January 18, 1951.

REJECTION OF REDS BY KOREANS SETS EXAMPLE FOR ALL FREE MEN

Communist Chinese snubbing of the UN cease-fire proposal turns attention again upon the Reds' own major condition for cessation of hostilities—withdrawal of United Nations troops.

The United States is against such a retreat. Voluntary withdrawal from Korea, giving the Reds that territory which they really expect to get only at severe cost, doesn't make sense from either a military or a diplomatic standpoint. It doesn't make sense at this moment—and certainly it doesn't make sense from the long-range viewpoint.

Look at today's forum column, elsewhere on this page. You will find a powerful appeal for help written by B. C. Limb, who is the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Republic of Korea. Mr. Limb presents cogent arguments for continued United Nations participation in Korea. When he describes Korea as the "front line of worldwide democracy," he is reemphasizing the concept which led the United States and the United Nations to accept the challenge posed in June by the North Koreans.

Those who would abandon Korea now, hoping to end far eastern troubles, have a naive approach to the problem. They fail to consider the Kremlin's program—outlined in speeches by Communist leaders, recorded in books by Communist writers, and inherent in party doctrine—for domination of the world. The free world should have learned, after its experience with Hitler, that to ignore those fantastic programs of the dictators is only an invitation to trouble. Broadly speaking, the Russian Communists intend to dispose of all other existing types of government and set up in every conquered country a system of militant communism which would prevent counterrevolution. It's simply another totalitarian movement, in its way as bad as fascism and nazism.

These are the things you have to keep in mind when you speak of dealing with the Reds. Appeasing totalitarianism is the beginning, not the ending, of your trouble with it.

If this view is accepted, it is difficult to see how the UN can voluntarily withdraw from Korea, for the remaining question is a military one, and, militarily, the situation is far from the debacle stage. By withdrawing slowly and only under pressure, the UN forces make the enemy pay, and after the demonstration at Hamhung of its power to hold a beachhead by air and naval power for an indefinite time, the UN certainly should not agree to any terms which would give the Reds their heart's desire. Important military leaders believe the Pusan beachhead can be held, just as the Hamhung beachhead was held. In fact, this apparently is the line of reasoning which governs the campaign.

People who are faint of heart may take instruction from Foreign Minister Limb's countrymen. Millions of Koreans have abandoned their homes and endured horrible suffering in order to escape the Communists. Millions are crying for arms. Faced with choices, they have turned down the Reds. They entertain no illusions. They are willing to endure present hardships in order to avoid future slavery.

While the choice between opposing communism or appeasing it is not so immediately personal and dramatic to many other people in the world, that choice is nonetheless an existing problem for them. It exists for them now in the question whether the United Nations should leave Korea or stay there and fight. Stronghearted people know the right answer.

ABANDONING KOREA WOULDN'T AID WORLD FREEDOM CAUSE

EDITOR, PRESS-TELEGRAM:

Would it benefit the world cause of freedom to abandon Korea? It is freely suggested in these trying days that the democratic world should avoid being drawn into an extended conflict in Korea. It ought, according to this view, to disengage itself there in order to have more strength to employ in Europe. This view is clearly fraught with danger for the free world everywhere.

International communism has made clear its design to conquer the peoples of the Far East. It is in Korea that this design has, for the first time, been brought to at least a temporary halt. Now if Korea be abandoned, would not other Asian countries as well be left open to Communist conquest. Would it be deemed equally expedient to abandon the defense of Southeastern Asia, or of Formosa, or of India, or of Iran, or of Turkey, or of Greece? Is it not a simple fact that the union of the endangered peoples of the world can exist only upon the one solid assumption that all are equally precious to the defense of freedom?

The urgent need of the hour is manpower. It is the manpower of the Chinese Communists which brings so much defeatism to many men who are otherwise strong and honorable. This defeatism is a major cause to defeat. Fear has blinded them from a major source of victory.

The Government of the Republic of Korea has repeatedly and earnestly asked the democratic powers that weapons be supplied to it so that it can arm 1,000,000 of its young men who are already organized to fight and another half million who are still available to be mobilized for the struggle. Let us arm the Korean youth, who have the best reasons in the world for fanatical fighting spirit. Let us pour waves of our own upon the waves of the foe. These Koreans will show you how to turn the tide of war into a victory.

Thus far it is perfectly plain to all of us here and to the mothers and fathers whose brave sons are engaged in the battle front of Korea that this war is being fought more on political than upon military grounds. The enemy is being protected less by his own strategical plans than by the decisions that are made—or by those that remain unmade—in the capitals of the democracies. No war in history has ever been waged on such unequal terms as is the war in Korea. No enemy ever enjoyed such protection from his own victims as the Communist Chinese and their Russian cohorts are enjoying now.

For us to retreat is to die. And where we stand the front line of world-wide democracy is saved. Our advance is the advance of democratic freedom. We are all in this struggle together. Surely the struggle cannot be aided by fear, withdrawal, and abandonment. It can only be aided by the profound determination to stand and to win.

B. C. LIMB,
Minister of Foreign Affairs,
Republic of Korea.

The March of Dimes Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a beautiful tribute, in verse, to the March of Dimes campaign, written by Milford E. Shields, of Durango, Calif.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARCH OF DIMES

That swift, insidious breath, that void of fate
Called polio, that thirst unslaked and great
Draws life from children that is pure and fresh
And leaves them with a starved and withered flesh.
We cannot give them ours, though try we might,
For they are entities in God's high sight;
But we can give them elements of hope,
The utmost care within man's mortal scope—
Translate our dimes and dollars into love
And give for them with passion from above—
Let our love walk with them and buoy them up,
Their love will drink with ours from life's sweet cup.

—*Milford E. Shields.*

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the broadcast of Sunday, January 21, on the American Forum of the Air. Senator TAFT and I participated in this broadcast on the subject A Foreign Policy, What's the Answer? under the able chairmanship of Theodore Granik, pioneer in the development of radio forums, now in his twenty-second year of broadcasting. I was happy on the program to be able to congratulate him on achieving an NBC network sponsor. Representatives of the Motor Transport Association of Connecticut were on hand to applaud this sponsor, the American Trucking Association.

I told Mr. Granik and officials of the Association that from my long experience with the University of Chicago Round Table, for which I was responsible for nine years, I thought this type of program was not only most suitable for such a trade association, but would prove to be a most effective promotion and public relations instrument—in reaching key people throughout the country, and in developing public understanding and good will. Here is an example of an advertiser who, in benefiting himself, at the same time renders an important public service. Here is an example of enlightened self-interest.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FOREIGN POLICY, WHAT'S THE ANSWER?

Chairman GRANIK. The great debate rolls on in the newspapers, on radio, on television, and on street corners. Here are a few of the headlines in this week's news describing some of the developments:

"President invites backing of Senate on sending troops."

"TAFT would limit number of divisions."

"Military chiefs urge twenty-seven months' universal training for eighteen-year-olds."

"United States alone in branding China aggressor."

"Soviet claims France lies about defensive aim of Atlantic Pact."

So while the great debate simmers and boils in the Congress and in your homes, peoples everywhere are asking, "What is the answer to our foreign policy?"

We again pose this vital question to two distinguished United States Senators, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate, and Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, formerly Assistant Secretary of State.

Since their dramatic election campaigns, some have called Senator TAFT "Mr. Republican"; others have called Senator BENTON "Mr. Democrat," as his seat, contested even after the election, finally retained the majority for the Democratic Party in the Senate.

Senator TAFT, what are the the prospects of the President and you sitting down together to discuss our foreign policy?

Senator TAFT. Well, I made an offer, Mr. Granik, but it didn't seem to be greeted with very much favor.

Chairman GRANIK. What are the chances?

Senator TAFT. I don't think that there is anything to add to what I said before the National Press Club.

Chairman GRANIK. All right, Senator. Do you want to go on with the general subject of what is the answer to our foreign policy?

Senator TAFT. The great and over-riding purpose of a foreign policy should be to maintain the liberty of the people of the United States. The second is peace for the United States and for the world; a war only when it is absolutely essential to protect our liberty which is our first concern.

Today the great threat to liberty and the peace alike is Soviet Russia, which threatens the domination of the world through propaganda, infiltration, and military aggression. To meet that threat, the first necessity of our foreign policy is to build up and maintain a great sea and air force so that we may have absolute control of the sea and air throughout the entire world, a bastion of freedom for all, a means of access to every country in the world. If we maintain that control, it is inconceivable that the liberty of our people could be seriously jeopardized by Soviet Russia, and Russia knows it and is less likely to begin a war.

From a position of complete control of sea and air we can extend our power in many instances into continental territory, even to some extent on the Continent of Europe, but Korea should teach us that we should avoid any tremendous commitment on any continent in terms of American soldiers because we would be fighting Russia on their own most favorable ground; in a contest of manpower they can outnumber us in the end ten to one.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BENTON.

Senator BENTON. Thank you, Ted Granik, for that little phrase "Mr. Democrat." I will try to live up to that although I never expect to achieve the eminence that connotes the "Mr. Republican" that is attributed to Senator TAFT.

As I have listened to Governor Stassen and General Eisenhower, and John Foster Dulles, and other Republicans on the subject of foreign policy perhaps it would be fair to modify that phrase "Mr. Republican" and maybe call Senator TAFT "Mr. Fifty Percent Republican," or even sixty-six and two-thirds percent Republican.

Senator TAFT. I think the Republican Party in the end is a little more likely to support my point of view.

Chairman GRANIK. There is your answer.

Senator BENTON. The Senator has always been looking ahead, and I can see that he is looking hopefully ahead now. The wing of the party represented by your speeches, Senator TAFT, and by President Hoover's speech in the current debate, seems to me much too centered on military policy rather than foreign policy. By air and seapower, I feel that the particular viewpoint you represent is seeking a kind of nostalgic return to the nineteenth century kind of security. The New York Times, in reporting your first congressional speech, summarized this viewpoint by saying, "Senator TAFT said in effect what was needed now was a return on a greater and more modern scale to the balance of power, once preserved by the British Fleet."

I admit you are consistent on this, Senator TAFT. Back in 1940, you may remember saying that "the day of large armies is waning," but I deny, and perhaps this is the most important thing to discuss on this program, the soundness of what I will call a stockade psychology, a kind of return to the Alamo. I think the day when we can count on the stockade and "remember the Alamo," and rely wholly on our own resources, is a day that we should now put behind us. We must now seek the support of nations who want freedom and notably this means Western Europe. Further, we must give them faith and hope. The masses of people will not fight unless they have a chance to win, and unless we Americans give them faith and give them hope in our leadership and in our policy—we are going to find ourselves in the Alamo behind the stockade, and without the security which is sought by President Hoover and the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator TAFT, do you think Russia contemplates a military attack on Europe today?

Senator TAFT. Well, I don't know, and I don't know how we can tell. I do not think that there is any conclusive evidence that they do. They have had five years during which they could have attacked at any moment. They have not moved Russian troops beyond the zone of influence that we so generously gave them at Yalta. Of course, we have to assume that they may. We have to build up an army that can meet them. Incidentally, as far as sea and air power is concerned even the Joint Chiefs of Staff today give a good deal more money in this whole new budget to the sea and air than they do to the Army, so maybe they think the days of mass armies, the days when they were the predominant feature, are going by.

But I think we have to assume if Russia intends a military attack, I ask a question that no one has been able to answer for me, Why should they wait three years for us to build up a great army that will prevent such an attack? And not only that, if the army contemplated is great enough to prevent such an attack, it certainly has an aggressive threat against Russia. Why will they wait, Mr. BENTON?

Senator BENTON. There we are—back talking about military strategy and problems, Senator TAFT. I agree with this point, however, and this is where I welcomed your speech and President Hoover's speech—that war is much too important to be left to the generals, but I don't claim to have the answers on many of these military questions, and I certainly don't claim I know what the men in the Politburo are thinking about. I know they are able men, and I know that they are realists and you have asked for conclusive evidence that they don't plan to attack. Where is the "conclusive" evidence that they are not going to attack?

Chairman GRANIK. Senator TAFT.

Senator TAFT. I do not ask for conclusive evidence. I think there is none.

Senator BENTON. Of course, there is no conclusive evidence. People who are going to attack are not going to give you conclusive evidence they are going to attack. Further, I submit there is no conclusive evidence that they are not going to attack, and here is an illustration of the problem of risk and hazard involved in foreign policy.

Now, could I—on the theory that there is much evidence of Russian hostility—and on my doctrine that we are in a better position to resist it if we have as friends the French and the British and the Italians—may I take an Italian today and ask you to imagine how this resident of Florence or Milan pictures our policy when he hears the debate from the United States saying, "Let us put our confidence wholly in air power and sea power, in airplanes to bomb the land and destroy Milan if and as the Communists take over Milan"?

Senator TAFT. Oh, no, no; but to keep them out; as a matter of fact, sea power, if we furnish one hundred percent of sea power in Italy, if we helped them defend their borders, their Eastern borders, it would be almost as effective as soldiers and I don't know of any American who intends to send any American soldiers to Italy to help defend Italy, and nobody yet has suggested that program. So I think what the Italians are interested in is having their own army and having them

armed as we are willing to arm them and having our airplanes and our Navy in the Adriatic to help them defend themselves. Why, they are not asking for American troops in Italy, Mr. BENTON.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BENTON.

Senator BENTON. I would just as soon take a Frenchman or a German, Senator TAFT. You said in response to Senator FULBRIGHT's question on the floor of the Senate that with the Communist armies taking Western Europe on the assumption of war, taking over European production resources—that one purpose of our air power could be to bomb and destroy the Ruhr. Now imagine yourself, a resident of the Ruhr, reading in your German newspaper that we are building up this great air force to destroy your home and family. It may become necessary—I do not deny it might become necessary—but where is the hope for the resident of the Ruhr? How do we give him hope?

Senator TAFT. There is no hope either way for the resident of the Ruhr and the Germans today are refusing to arm because they know that, under the policy you are advocating, a great army in Germany means the destruction of Germany. Just look at the map. Here is the line of the Elbe they talk about defending. Why, you can't defend the line of the Elbe. Look. Here is the Russian Zone. The Russians are away over half way to the Rhine already. We can't defend the line of the Elbe. There isn't any defensible line in Germany except the Rhine, and if we choose the line of the Rhine, if we fall back to the Rhine, we would have to bomb the Ruhr as we did in the World War. The Germans know that the policy that we are advocating means the destruction of Germany, of course, because that is going to be the battleground between the European nations and Russia. Consequently, of course, the Germans today don't want to be armed. They don't want to assist in this project and today they are substantially refusing to do so. As a matter of fact, the line shows the tremendous difficulty of this project, a great international army led by an American, fighting in Germany.

Incidentally, as to bombing, how do you suppose that the French and British are going to defend Paris and London against Russian bombing? We are building or spending two and a quarter billion dollars building air shelters in this country for fear the Russians may bomb Detroit and New York. It is about ten times as easy for them to destroy Paris and London, when this war starts. So that as far as the project you are proposing here, it is a project which if war starts means the destruction of Europe. I don't care how it is, whether we do the bombing or whether they do the bombing, and war has shown in Korea that when that occurs, both sides do the bombing. All of the cities in Korea have been destroyed today.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BENTON.

Senator BENTON. Senator TAFT, I hope when I have been in the Senate as long as you have I will be as sure as you are on the answers to some of these highly complicated questions. Even our generals and leading strategists all over the world differ profoundly on how the next war will be fought. The only thing we know for sure is that it won't be fought like the last one.

Senator TAFT. Well, Mr. BENTON, I agree.

Senator BENTON. All we know for sure is that it is going to be different.

Senator TAFT. That is my point. This whole program is a program of fighting the third world war on the same lines on which the Second World War was fought, and my only objection is, I say, "Yes, I am willing to commit some troops to Europe. I am willing to help build up these countries and help them build up their own defense, but let us not put all of our eggs in one basket, let us not make that our main feature because maybe that is not the way we will want to fight the third world war if it comes, on the Continent of Europe, where the Russians can outnumber our manpower three or four or even ten to one, if they get the Chinese in.

Senator BENTON. I think that our troops in Europe must be judged by psychological grounds as well as by military grounds. General Eisenhower sees this very clearly, and I know your admiration for him as expressed just the other day, but you may not have noticed his remarks at the Dutch airport, when he repeated that "success is certain, and I repeat that success does not envision military victory, but it envisions the avoidance of war."

You do not find General Eisenhower in Europe announcing that there is no hope for the Ruhr. You do not find him going to France and to Italy and talking about the destruction of their productive facilities in the defense of the United States.

Senator TAFT. I say that is what will happen if you get a war in Europe. Now, the question, of course, the main problem is to bring peace. I think it is very important—and we are committed to this project in Europe to a certain extent—and I think it is very important that it should be made perfectly clear to Russia that it is not an aggressive attack, because that is going to incite the Russians to war when perhaps they have no idea of a military attack. I don't know about that.

In other words, if Mexico went communistic, and they sent a great Russian army to defend Mexico, we would be very dubious about the actual intentions of that army. So they will be doubtful about the intentions of this army.

Senator BENTON. Just a minute. That is the kind of talk that I think leads to great confusion on the part of the American people. We do not intend—literally nobody intends—to send the kind of army to Europe that can attack Russia. Russia is sitting there with one hundred and fifty or one hundred and seventy-five divisions, and it takes twice as many men to attack as to defend. Even the great power of Hitler couldn't conquer Moscow and Stalingrad.

There is not the slightest intention on anybody's part—and the men in the Kremlin know this perfectly well—of developing the kind of European army that can march through Russia into the Russian cities.

The purpose of sending troops to Europe is to give the people of Europe hope and faith that they can and should defend themselves, and to show them that there will be a fair sharing of burdens in the defense of the western world and in the defense of the western countries seeking freedom.

Senator TAFT. Well, now, that is all right, but in the first place, you have got to get this army there. If it could spring into existence overnight, I would say it would give them some hope. But they know it is going to take two or three years to do it, and the Russians are there, and I say, Why will they wait if they see that force gradually increasing in strength?

I agree fully; the intentions of this project are entirely pacific. I am only saying that to the Russians it may not look pacific. I am only saying that when you send over the conqueror of Germany as the head of a great army to be made up largely of Americans, the Russians are going to be suspicious. They are a suspicious people anyway. I hope we can do it in such a way that we can make perfectly clear that it is not an aggressive force, that it is not intended for that purpose. Let us not station the army on the borders of the German Zone or on the borders of Czechoslovakia.

I agree that the Atlantic Pact got us into this, and I am willing to go through with it. But, you say, we are not doing our share. In Europe we have already given twenty billion dollars to build up their economic strength, and we have increased their production forty percent over prewar, and we have already appropriated six billion dollars and we are willing to give any amount of money to give them the arms for their soldiers.

And we have given them a few divisions. And I am perfectly willing to commit a limited number of divisons at least to show our spirit. We know for any war in Europe we are now planning to do fifty percent of it anyway, under the present circumstances, and if we add a tremendous land army we would go up to ninety percent where we are in Korea today.

Senator BENTON. I think that there is a basic fallacy in your point. You are talking about Europe today as if it is a thing apart—we over here and Europe over there—and this fallacy applies to all of this argument about the Atlantic Pact and our obligations under it, and whether we have them or have not got them on sending troops to Europe.

The truth is that from the standpoint of American foreign policy, and the preservation of our freedom, the preservation of liberty and peace as you stated in your opening comments, Europe is an opportunity, and should be judged as an opportunity and not an obligation. The truth is that the Atlantic Pact provides us with an opportunity to help raise our own defenses in Western Europe, defenses which can help maximize the chances for peace and minimize the risk of Russian attack.

In the case of Czechoslovakia and other countries on which the Russians have moved in and taken over, the Czechs pacific intentions have certainly been no deterrent to Russian aggression. Senator TAFT, you may recall two or three years back when you remarked that the Communists, in taking over Czechoslovakia, were just consolidating the U. S. S. R. spheres of influence. I am afraid that that same kind of invitation can be invoked by the men of the Politburo if we don't have a strong Western Europe.

Chairman GRANIK. That is our dilemma. It is time for questions from the audience.

Gentlemen, there is a question. Go ahead.

Question. My name is Freeman Alberry, and I am with the staff of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and my question is addressed to Senator BENTON. If the United Nations fails to brand Communist China as an aggressor in Korea, will it have failed and should the United States withdraw from the United Nations?

Senator BENTON. May I precede my answer to that question by commenting on the interruption we have just experienced, and by congratulating you, Mr. Granik, on your achieving the goal of every radio broadcaster after twenty-two years—on finally achieving a network sponsor.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you.

Senator BENTON. The Motor Transport Association of Connecticut and the other State associations join in sponsoring this program.

My answer to the question of course is an unequivocal "No." We are going to have many, many set-backs in the development and strengthening of the United Nations. I have no sympathy with the people who are so willing to abandon the UN or to toss it casually over the left shoulder on one excuse or another or on one set-back or another set-back.

In the American Congress, as Senator TAFT well knows, progress is made through compromises. One problem in the United Nations is that you have a group of countries with which you cannot compromise, with which you cannot compromise without forsaking American principles. But because we cannot compromise on certain basic principles we

must not withdraw. Indeed we must never give up hope for the UN, a great new potential vehicle for collective action of the kind for which men have been longing for centuries.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator TAFT.

Senator TAFT. Well, I don't think we ought to draw out of the United Nations. I have been advocating for some time a proposal of amendments and a convention to try to amend it to make it an effective weapon as it was originally intended to be before Russia vetoed everything, and some method of eliminating the veto and improving the system. If this should fail, after a determined effort, because of Russian vetoing the attempt to change it, then I would withdraw from the United Nations, and try to set up an international body leaving Russia out.

Chairman GRANIK. Talking about weapons, there have been recent proposals to use the atom bomb against enemy troops. How do you feel about that?

Senator BENTON. I agree with Senator TAFT, I do not favor that policy. I concur with his statement of a few days ago.

Chairman GRANIK. Let us take another question.

Question. My name is Silvia Holtzberg, and I am a housewife. I am addressing my question to Senator TAFT. Is our recent foreign policy being pursued to save face as it were, or wouldn't a change save billions of dollars and thousands of lives?

Senator TAFT. Well, you are asking me to comment on the motives of the President and Secretary of State, and I never know what people's motives are. I think the policy could well be changed to save lives and billions of dollars.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BENTON?

Senator BENTON. I think I know something about Senator TAFT's motives.

I am sure that there are areas in which we could save billions of dollars, but I concur with Senator TAFT that that question in effect opens up the whole subject of our program, the whole area of debate upon our foreign policy. However, I admit I think Senator TAFT and I would disagree about money if we were debating about money. I have greater faith than he has in the strength and ability of our American economy to resist some of the attacks upon it over a period of years.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Granik, of course our economy can stand almost anything in all-out war. What we face here is something we have never faced before, though, and that is perhaps ten years of semi-mobilization, and I think it is most vital that we do not set up an armed force outfit so great that we can't handle it by paying for it as we go to prevent inflation and adopt a policy which in the end perhaps can eliminate controls, although they may be necessary in the beginning, and it seems to me vital that we must not destroy our strength at home in order to set up this armed force.

Now, what that shall be, I don't know. I think myself the army is very reasonable on the whole. I don't greatly differ from their general program of three million four hundred thousand men under arms, I think, and I think that that could be handled, but I certainly disagree with Senator DOUGLAS' idea of six million men under arms, and I think it would mean inflation and I think it would mean a steady increase in prices, devaluation of the dollar and weakening of our whole economic strength.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator, do you subscribe to some of the Republican proposals that the President replace Dean Acheson as Secretary of State?

Senator TAFT. Well, I subscribe to that, and in fact I was one of those who suggested it back when the Korean War began. That seemed to me to be a condemnation in itself of the policy which he had pursued.

Chairman GRANIK. How about the suggestion that Dewey be made Secretary of State, Senator TAFT?

Senator TAFT. I have no power to appoint Secretaries of State.

Senator BENTON. It is a lot easier to say who should not be Secretary of State than to say who should be. Entirely apart from whether Secretary Acheson should continue as Secretary of State, and, of course, I am a great admirer of his, and I am enthusiastic about his experience and his capacity, and I hope that he carries on, but entirely apart from that, a real issue that makes for tragic disunity in this country is the kind of scurrilous attack we have had on our Secretary of State, unwarranted by fact and unwarranted by any evidence whatsoever.

Chairman GRANIK. Will you continue on with your summary, Senator BENTON, please?

Senator BENTON. I hope that Senator TAFT, after this current debate is over, will speak again, Mr. Chairman, on one aspect of his key speech of early January to which he devoted only a paragraph or two. In this speech, he stated, "But I also believe we should adopt aggressive methods of propaganda. We have something to sell," etc., etc.

I feel that in our efforts to develop a strong foreign policy we in Congress should get over this phase of talking like generals and trying to outdo each other as military experts, and should devote ourselves to the problems of building a foreign policy emphasizing nonmilitary aspects—the great development of Point 4, for example, and the great strengthening and development of the Voice of America. I solicit Senator TAFT's cooperation with me in the Senate on the development of programs and appropriations toward that end.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator, for your summary.

Senator TAFT.

Senator TAFT. I fully agree we have to defeat communism in the minds of men, and any method that is going to be effective for that purpose I am going to support, and I did not develop it in my speech but I put it in because it must be a part of any program.

I think as a matter of fact there is a pretty wide agreement here on foreign policy and only some points of disagreement. I feel the question is, How we are going to defeat communism and maintain peace? I go along with the whole picture, except I think that the emphasis ought to be on complete control of sea and air so that there is no doubt of our position in that field, and so the Russians know it, and they know they can't conquer the world, and if they know that they are less likely to start to begin to conquer the world.

The only difference I have is that I think it is doubtful whether we should commit a great land army, seven hundred and fifty thousand men, fifteen divisions, to the Continent of Europe, because in the first place I think it is likely to bring war, and in the second place I don't know if the war is brought there, whether it is a place where we can win the war.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. You have been listening to another in a series of discussions on foreign policy. What is the answer? Our speakers have been Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, and Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Senator BENTON. May I say, Mr. Chairman, I didn't think that we can be conclusive, perfectly confident or perfectly certain. There is a real area of disagreement between us.

Senator TAFT. The question of a bomber getting through, that does not necessarily mean you haven't got control of the air, and yet if you get your control complete enough, it is going to be pretty difficult for a bomber starting five thousand miles away to successfully bomb a city in the United States.

Chairman GRANIK. Another question.

Question. I am Radford, and my question is addressed to Senator TAFT. The question is this: Why shouldn't the representatives of all of the governments of the world be entitled to a seat in the United Nations, particularly Communist China, even though it is Communist China?

Senator TAFT. Because we have now the Nationalist Government of China, which we have recognized, and we never have recognized the Chinese Communist Government as anything but a rebel government, and I don't think that we should do so.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator BENTON?

Senator BENTON. Well, I agree with Senator TAFT, but the spirit of the question is an interesting one, because if the Communist Government maintains control and establishes itself certainly and surely as the Government of China, there should come a time, in my opinion, when they should be represented. That will involve diplomacy, a trade, a deal, negotiations, and this is why we have diplomatic representatives and this is where the role of diplomacy comes into the conduct of our foreign policy. So, I agree with Senator TAFT on the immediate answer and I agree with the questioner on the ultimate goal. The ultimate goal is to work out a satisfactory and constructive negotiation that will strengthen the United Nations and solve this among many other complex problems with which the United Nations is today faced in Asia.

Senator TAFT. There is one more vital reason today, and that is that the United Nations ordered or asked their nations to go into Korea to resist aggression, and while they were there the Chinese Communist armies attacked them. In such a condition are we going to therefore reward them by admitting them to the United Nations?

Senator BENTON. I agree with the Senator on that.

Chairman GRANIK. We have another question.

Question. My name is Ray Hart. I will admit self-interest in this question, and as an ex-GI. Senator TAFT, are you in favor of drafting eighteen-year-olds, and if so, will you place any restrictions on their service?

Senator TAFT. I have always been opposed to drafting eighteen-year-olds, and I was before. The investigation we have made then seems to indicate that while probably a good majority of eighteen-year-olds were perfectly competent to be drafted, there were still a fair number who had not matured sufficiently so that they could be certain that they would not be injured by the experience in the Army. Of course, necessity is the last law, and if you are going to have to have three million five hundred thousand men you have to get the best method of getting them, and if by taking eighteen-year-olds you can avoid something else that might be worse, there may be an argument. I haven't analyzed the figures. I have felt myself, however, that there should be some restriction against any boy being sent abroad until he is nineteen years old.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator BENTON?

Senator BENTON. I think the nineteen-year-old boys in some parts of the country look younger than the eighteen-year-old boys in other parts of the country. I agree with Senator TAFT. It is too bad and it is tragic and difficult at eighteen or at nineteen to interfere with the chance for education of these young men. It is wholly a problem of weighing the necessity against the cost. That is what General Marshall and Mrs. Rosenberg are attempting to do. I am not on the committee exposed to the problem,

and I would like to hope we can avoid it. Reading the headlines it sounds to me as if we probably should not go any further than General Marshall has recommended in this area.

Chairman GRANTS. Thank you.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a radio broadcast on NBC, Friday, January 19, 1950:

The President's budget calls for new obligational authority, and that means appropriations—and that is what the budget is—of $94,500,000,000. There will be, according to his estimates, $80,000,000,000 remaining to be expended out of this and prior years' figures after June 30, 1952.

Included in the $94,500,000,000 is $62,500,000,000 for military functions and $9,500,000,000 for foreign aid of one kind and another. The nonmilitary operations of the Government are only reduced in cases where legislative programs are expiring, such as certain programs in the Veterans' Administration, or where enormous sums were provided, such as the stockpile job, and have not yet been expended or obligated.

There still is a huge increase in the Foreign Information Service in the State Department, headed by Mr. Barrett, which has so far proved utterly worthless in getting the position of the United States across to foreign countries. Here they are asking for $115,000,000, as against $34,000,000 expenditures in the fiscal year 1950.

I have made it my business to procure from them scripts of their broadcasts, on eight or nine different days since the 25th of June when the Korean hostilities began. Never once have they broadcast to foreign countries anything which in the slightest degree would make these foreign countries feel favorable to the United States or realize why we are taking the position and attitude we take on foreign relations questions. Most of their operations are so ridiculous and puerile that they would drive listeners away, rather than interest them in the United States and its programs. They seem simply to try to get off a lot of words, some of which sound like they were being placed in a bag and drawn out by lot. Frankly, I believe we need some kind of a propaganda service, but there is no sense in our spending more money on a service that is completely worthless. It would seem as though the administration would take interest enough in the war effort to realize the value and necessity of such a service. The longer the Congress continues to appropriate funds, only to have them wasted, the longer the State Department will continue to maintain the so-called Information Service on an utterly inadequate and worthless basis.

The President is asking for a $1,000,000,000 increase in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank and a $1,000,000,000 increase in the lending authority of the International Bank, at a time when we should be conserving every single item. Foreign loans should be used only in places where the war effort of the United States will be promoted. We should get over the idea of lending money just to help foreign countries when it will not contribute directly to our defense. The question of doing good in the world will have to be postponed if we are to have the resources to support our war effort.

The President is calling for a large item for the continuation of the ECA, when we have already this year provided $500,000,000 more than they are able to spend, even with the very liberal programs they have set up. Foreign relief should be limited to what is absolutely necessary to keep the people in other countries together and to what we can afford to pay out. Unless we get down to what we can afford to pay out, the expenditures are going to be so big that we will not be able to raise taxes enough to meet them.

Power projects stand out in enormous figures in the estimates of the engineers and of the Bureau of Reclamation. Many of these are in territories where the power costs, if all the cost factors are taken into consideration, make the power produced more expensive than steam. And this is especially true of the large dams in the Missouri River where they are unable to compete for cost with the steam plants placed beside the coal mountains of the Dakotas. Many projects are in territories where the dams will silt full in a comparatively short time and where they will be utterly useless for either navigation or power, as compared with their cost.

With very few exceptions, the President proposes to increase the number of personnel in the already top-heavy bureaus of the Government. Even in the Defense Department there is enormous waste. There are offices where large numbers of officers are gathered together with civilian personnel, doing almost nothing.

My information is that the building and rehabilitation of the set-ups for the armed services are being done on a very extravagant scale and under loose contracts which cost vast sums of money.

I cannot single out many things yet, because the requests have not been broken down.

Out of the $98,500,000,000 request for appropriation authority, only $21,008,000,000 is detailed. The rest is to follow later, and totals $76,700,000,000.

The President is asking nearly $300,000,000 to start off on subsidies to farmers, along the lines of the Brannan plan. This is ridiculous.

He is asking for a $290,000,000 spending program on Federal aid to education for the purpose of starting that program and getting the Federal Government committed to it in such a way that we could never get out.

He is asking for the construction of 75,000 public housing units which, very evidently, could not be built for under $600,000,000.

The President is also proposing medical aid to be operated by a payroll tax by the Federal Government, a start toward socialized medicine and an effort to break down the morale of our civilian doctors. How much it would cost no one can tell.

Amongst other New Deal operations, the President is proposing the FEPC, an effort to completely regiment and destroy the morale of the workers in industry. Those who think about it know that the passage of the FEPC is a declaration that the minority groups are inferior races and that they are unable to get a job without the decree of a Federal commission which will be composed of social promoters who know nothing about the problems of the industry involved.

In other words, the President wishes to promote every activity which would tend to demoralize our people in time of stress, and he is trying to sneak through a lot of these measures at a time when everybody should be giving of his best to prepare the United States to resist the efforts of the Communists in Russia to destroy the last vestige of freedom in the world.

America became great, and the opportunities of our people for a good life with a high living standard became possible, because our people were taught to work and produce, and the rewards of industry went to those with the greatest capacity to produce. The incentive of rewards has kept the individual production of individual workers in the United States at an increasingly high level, and that is what has enabled us to build up and improve the standards of living of our people. When we get to the point where we measure the rewards of our people and the pay that they receive on some other basis, than the ability of the individual, selected by the employer who is working for a big production, then we slow down the wheels of industry and the production for defense. For my own part, I think we should stop trying to socialize the United States and concentrate more and more on our war effort.

I think perhaps the best comment on the budget message is that the President, instead of promoting these socialistic and destructive measures and demands, should cooperate with the efforts that are being made to get rid of enormous expenditures and should quit attempting to distract the thoughts and efforts of the people from the thing that should be before them first at this time.

Question. The President suggested new taxes of sixteen billions to meet the deficit, do you think the budget can be cut much below his figure, and reduce the deficit?

Mr. TABER. The budget should be cut by three to four billion dollars.

Question. Is it possible to raise $16,000,000,000 more by taxes than present laws will yield?

Mr. TABER. A 10 percent retail sales tax, exempting food, would yield $7,000,000,000. That is the biggest figure that I can put my finger on. Other increases would very largely have to come out of the lower income tax group, because increased taxes on the upper brackets will not yield very much money.

Question. As a general practice, should we raise taxes to meet whatever the deficit may be—in other words—pay as we go?

Mr. TABER. If it is possible to increase taxes and balance the budget, it should be done. Otherwise, we're going to have a continuation of the inflation which Mr. Truman has steadfastly promoted ever since his inauguration. The dollar of 1945 purchased more than twice as much as the 1951 dollar. Big dollar figures in income are no good to the people unless they will buy something.

Question. You have referred to the difference between the seventy-one billions which the budget has earmarked for spending, and the ninety-four billions of obligational authority, which you say is the true budget. Does this difference mean still higher budgets in future years?

Mr. TABER. If we appropriate $88,000,000,000 in 1951 and spend forty-seven billions, we will have, including the carry-over, left over to spend in 1952 and subsequent years—$54,500,000,000. If we appropriate ninety-four and one-half billion and spend seventy-one and one-half billion, we will have left, on July 1, 1952—with odd figures that will be added—about $80,000,000,000. If we appropriate just as much for 1953 as we are being asked for 1952, very evidently the expenditure in 1953 will go up to ninety-seven or ninety-eight billion dollars, and we will have a continual increase in the amount we spend—so that there will be a deficit in 1953 of twenty-six or twenty-seven billion dollars, even if we increase our tax take by $16,000,000,000 now.

The Late William T. Cowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I have just received word that one of Montana's most distinguished pioneer citizens, Mr. William T. Cowan, of Box Elder, has passed away. For many years I have been privileged to know Mr. Cowan and I cherished his friendship and support. I join with the countless other Montana people who mourn his passing. I wish to include in the RECORD a tribute to Mr. Cowan written by Herbert C. Watts, Jr., editor of the Havre (Mont.) Daily News, and published in that newspaper January 19:

BILL COWAN: A REAL MAN

We like stories with a point to them and with a zestful flavor. Bill Cowan could spin a yarn with a degree of authenticity which could never be questioned. That alone would make him dear to us but there are so many other fine facets in the make-up of the late sage of Hill County which make us pause and say, Now there was a real man.

When we were notified yesterday that Bill had passed away we felt that for a moment at least, time had stopped, for Bill had represented all that is good for this old world. His name stood for good deeds, for interest and loyalty to his fellowman and for conscientious endeavor. He characterized those attributes which are the alpha and the omega of the perfect personality.

Bill always was in balance. What he had to offer in his energies and talents gained for him the admiration of all with whom he came in contact. Whenever problems beset him he tackled them as if his very existence depended on their answers. If he got his nose bumped in the process, his philosophy was "Well, I gave them a darn good run for their money."

One of our biggest regrets will be that we never did get around to chronicling some of the historical high lights of this area as related by Bill. A photographic memory equipped to give the facts in considerable detail, his descriptions were priceless. You see, Bill Cowan was raised in an age when life meant so much that people could take some time off and include the side lights which made any story worth listening to and absorbing.

All men are created equal as far as the Cowan line of reasoning went. That is, all have equal opportunities if they will take the brains that God gave them and apply them in self-betterment. He once told us, "Young man, anybody with a lick of sense can be rich. Most of us are born with a lick of sense or else somebody takes care of us at State expense in an asylum or something. I'm rich in a way. I don't mean as far as money goes. I mean in great friendships. That's what I mean. Uncle Sam can take my money away from me every year in taxes but he can't take away my friendships. So I have a lick of sense, I have good friends and, I might add, I have the satisfaction of helping this country of ours along in my own little way."

Some people have described Bill as a politician. He certainly wasn't a politician in the popular sense of a man throwing the curve for material gains. He was proud to be a Republican and was an indefatigable chairman of the Hill County Republican Central Committee and later as national committeeman. But his real politicking was built in working among all men regardless of party allegiance.

Everybody knows the background of Bill Cowan's stout fights for Northern Montana College and the Marias project. We are grateful for his foresight and the bringing into reality dreams of progress for this State which Bill dearly loved.

We can't be hackneyed in thought at this writing and state that Bill never had an enemy. Perhaps he had many. That makes no difference because he was a human being not an ethereal creature passing through the space of the years. However, he had the courage of his convictions and he stood up for his beliefs on his own two feet. When he was wrong he admitted it but he would often say, "Maybe there is a particle of truth in what I stand for and if so I'm not going to sit down totally licked."

That was Bill Cowan, merchant, stockman, State senator, community worker, friend of men, and forgive an oft-used expression, salt of the earth. We thank God that we had the joy of knowing him for what he was—a real man.—H. C. W.

Representative Norris Poulson Reveals Central Arizona Project Would Consume Vital War Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Arizona leaders have stated they once more will push for swift passage of the central Arizona project bill, S. 75, and that this year they will urge its adoption on the ground that it is vital to the national defense program.

To term this fantastic and nonessential project a national defense measure is to place it on a completely phony and deceitful basis.

The bill itself absolutely refutes any argument that the project would contribute to the national defense program. The promoters of this scheme will pretend that the electric power to be developed by the project—some 10 years hence—would be used by national defense industries.

Let me cite just one paragraph from the bill which shows that any national defense needs would be the last to get power from this project. I quote from page 5, section 4, of the bill:

Electric energy developed at any of the generating plants herein authorized shall be used first for the operation of pumping plants and other facilities herein authorized, and for replacement purposes, and the remainder thereof sold or exchanged to effectuate the purposes of this act.

In other words, surplus field crops, including potatoes, come first in this bill, and our national security comes last.

In addition, the authors of S. 75 have tried to becloud the real issues by adding a meaningless section to this year's bill, namely, section 15, which is intended to deceive Congress into the belief that the project would not be built if critical materials to be used are needed for the war program.

The fact is, that the principal materials which would be consumed by the project are steel, other war metals, concrete, machinery, and, above all, manpower—a vast number of skilled workers.

Do we need a finding by some bureaucratic agency that at this very moment steel, concrete, machinery, and manpower are critical materials?

Even though the central Arizona project used not one ounce of critical materials, it would inflict upon the taxpayers of the Nation an additional tax burden of more than $2,000,000,000. And that statement is based on the tax estimate made by Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman.

It is shocking that at a time like this, when we are faced with a war for our survival, that the Members of Congress should be required to waste one moment of their time in considering an outrageous project of this nonessential nature.

Fight for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, January 22, 1951:

WE REARM TO SURVIVE

Fellow Americans, we've got a job to do, a big job, and it's high time that we rolled up our sleeves to do the extra work required from all of us.

It's the job of protecting our homes and our families from the international outlaw who wants to take us over.

For the past 5½ years we gave in to him on this point and that point, hoping that reason would finally prevail and that he would mind his own business because he had enough work to do in his own enormous back yard to absorb all of his time and his energy.

We have found out, belatedly, that such a policy will not bring peace.

For every concession that we make the appetite of Russian imperialism becomes hungry for more.

The Russian Government has the mentality of a criminal, employing every element of fraud and force to take away from neighboring nations what they have built by honest effort. Think of this fact. It has more land and natural resources than any country in the world. And it knows that there is no combination of other nations that has the power or the intention of invading that land mass. Then, why isn't the Russian Government concerned with the development of its own country so as to raise the standard of living for the Russian people?

Basically it envies and fears the free way of life beyond its frontiers. It realizes that if its own people knew the truth of life in the United States they would demand the right to build such a life for themselves.

But that would lead to freedom and undermine the power by which the Communist minority holds the majority in bondage.

They must destroy us because they cannot compete with us out in the open.

Only 300 years ago this land of ours was a wilderness.

What happened between then and now?

Did a miracle occur whereby a nation of 150,000,000 people with all its homes and cars and schools and churches was dropped ready-made from a celestial assembly line upon the North American Continent?

The Reds haven't got the nerve to offer this propaganda line to explain our progress.

For that would admit that there is something divine at work here in the United States which is an incentive for men to build a society from which all benefit in varying degrees, depending upon the ability and the effort of individuals.

That miracle is freedom—the right to think and do, and experiment, and work, and produce.

We are limited only by the moral restraints of the Ten Commandments and the laws we make through our servants in Government, and not by the 10,000 curbs enforced by a tight and rigid group of tyrants who cannot be recalled or repudiated by the people for the crimes they have committed against the people.

The Communist leaders know that they cannot match the broad distribution of the good things in life that is a developing fact under free governments.

When millions of automobiles are produced in 1 year in the United States, they are not sold to the members of any one special class. Americans do not have to pass a Marxist test or produce a card showing membership in the Communist Party or any party in order to buy a television set. Republicans and Democrats debate fiercely, then vote a decision as to laws and appropriations. After that, they obey the majority opinion, and then worship in mixed congregations on Sunday.

Behind the Communist double talk we penetrate to their real purpose. The few want to gather into their hands the concentrated power that will completely dictate to the many. The devil himself wants to be God.

The pity is that communism lures the envious, the ones with twisted minds, and the gullible to follow the leaders who stop at the gate, exhort their followers to go in, and then lock the door of the prison behind them.

We the people of the United States are not attracted by this form of security.

The shell game of communism will not deceive us to our own loss.

And if they try to pull a gun on us to make a fast dollar and rob us of all that we have, we shall be waiting for them with a bigger gun aimed at them in order to discourage them.

Our job is to get that gun ready.

It won't be easy.

No sane person wants war. But as long as there are lawless elements in the community or the world we have no other choice than to establish an effective security force that will prevent aggression or punish it.

It will have to be a big gun, costing a fabulous sum in terms of money, brains, and manpower, both military and industrial.

We had hoped and still hope that the United Nations may be able in some measure to halt aggression.

On a more substantial basis, however, we must count on the efforts of ourselves and those nations allied with us in common defense under the Atlantic Pact.

Here are the facts that compel us to mobilize.

Communist Russia and its satellites control more than one-third of the earth. From Iran to Japan, Asia is threatened. Europe, from Turkey and Greece to Scandinavia, is open to attack. Communism is international in scope, and its goal is conquest of the world. The Soviet Union has rejected all offers of cooperation because it seeks to dominate.

As of the present, the Kremlin is attacking the outposts of the free world with troops of its satellite slaves, while the Red Army is being built up for the major assault.

Stalin plans to defeat us by one or a combination of two ways: (1) By forcing us to undertake such unbearable defense costs that the American economy will crack under the strain; (2) by all-out military force.

We know that we will not start a war, but can the same be said of Russia?

Soviet diplomacy is trying to involve us in an exhausting land war on the Chinese mainland.

At the same time it is trying to provoke misunderstandings among the United States, Britain, and France, that will splinter the unity of the free world.

What is the strength of this Nation which seeks our downfall?

The major war assets of the Soviet Union and its stooges include: A central position in the Europe-Asia land mass with vast natural resources. The population totals more than 700,000,000. It has powerful land armies; an air force that exceeds ours in quantity if not in quality; hundreds of modern submarines; and cells of traitors in every country including the United States.

Among the weaknesses of the enemy are: The low level of efficiency in the members of its armed forces, its industry and its agriculture; and the shortage of technically trained personnel. The transportation system is poor. Steel and petroleum are not sufficient to sustain a long war effort. And there are millions of people within the Russian sphere of control who would rebel if they had a chance.

In the planning of new and secret weapons, we are ahead of Russia. And we have the great industrial machine that can produce them in quantity if the holding operations give us time to work out these blueprints along the assembly line and to train people in the use of these weapons.

A favorite technique of the Reds is to weaken a neighbor for conquest by provoking civil wars. They tried this in France and Italy, but we countered this maneuver effectively by our Marshall plan aid which helped these Nations to regain production and provide income-producing employment for their people.

Communist propaganda makes headway in Asia where too many people exist in ignorance and poverty. But while we strive to offset Communist influence there as best we can, the main danger centers in Europe.

The Atlantic Pact, which will be strengthened by the military assistance program, is evidence of the importance of Western Europe in our foreign policy. If the resources of that highly developed area should fall into the hands of the enemy and, added to his own, should then be turned against us, what would be the result? We would be isolated and then slowly strangled. Looking at it the other way around the resources of Western Europe, coupled with our own, give us a decided edge. The defenses of this area must be strengthened without delay. Even then, our chief reliance would be the overwhelming number and quality of our weapons to overcome the masses of Soviet manpower.

A foreign policy to be sound must prevent war or, failing that, be able to win a war. Our Government cannot succeed in either unless it knows what is going on in the world. Above all, it must secure information concerning the strength, disposition and intention of the potential enemy. We, as a Nation, have been weak in this department. At the end of World War II, a central intelligence agency was organized to put all these functions under one head and to bring system to the job of digging up these vital facts and interpreting them correctly.

Our security demands among other things that our morale or spirit must be superior to the enemy's. To guarantee this, we must carry the psychological or propaganda war directly to the enemy's population. In the contest of ideas, the so-called Voice of America, beamed to the heartland of the Communist empire, is an important weapon. So far, however, its timid approach has turned up few results. We shall have to strengthen this program, pointing up the contrast between communism and democracy, showing the Russian people how they can better their lot, and encouraging them to overthrow those who enslave them. To do this convincingly we must employ the talents of those Russians who have escaped from communism, broadcasting the truth to their own people back home.

The A-bomb, long-range planes, saboteurs, and the possibilities of germ warfare all expose our civilian population to direct attack. The Nation has been slow to recognize this danger, because we have never had to cope with it before. Short of all-out war and complete mobilization it is up to the cities and the States to organize their civilian defense staffs and to train them in advance. We cannot afford to wait until after a surprise attack has hit us for proof that such an attack could happen. The best insurance is to be prepared ahead of time.

As one reads the daily papers, it seems that the mobilization of men and women for the Armed Forces and the mobilization of plant, materials, and skilled labor are all competing for priority.

This underscores the fact that the Nation with the best industrial set-up and resources, is more likely to deter an aggressor, or to defeat him if he plunges the world into war.

Manpower problems as a whole come first. We need men to make the weapons and men trained to use them. At the same time, we need workers in agriculture and volunteers for civilian defence.

The services of more and more women will be needed on a full- or a part-time basis.

Modern defense costs a lot of money. But the tax burden we shall be called upon to bear is light compared with the crushing burden suffered by those who have fallen under the iron rule of communism.

You and I can help to keep our burden from becoming greater by giving extra effort to our job, by avoiding waste in any form, and by resolutely avoiding the black market which would weaken the controls that will be imposed to hold the line on prices.

Look at it this way. Most Americans are working to give us the products and the services that we rely upon for our everyday peacetime needs. To this we must add those things and those services required for defense.

We can meet this larger order if all of us work longer.

I am confident that we can build up our defenses without suffering critical shortages of peacetime goods by working harder all around.

The American people are anxious to know what they are expected to do. I have tried to sketch in the dangers of the situation confronting us, and the steps that must be taken to protect ourselves.

Communism must be prevented from taking over other countries because the balance of power would shift to them, thereby placing us at a hopeless disadvantage.

Up to Korea, Russia had gobbled up plenty of this world's real estate and the people on it without meeting any military resistance.

For our own security, we must oppose Red Russia's expansion and let the Kremlin know that we are preparing to oppose it with power.

The wishful thinkers who cling to the hope that Russia will respond to the appeals of reason or morality, blind themselves to the record of communism. Stalin has broken so many agreements during the past few years, that I haven't got time to list them. The Reds are materialists, and the only thing that will stop them is the fact that we refuse to be tricked and that henceforth we shall arm to the teeth. The big gun that will inflict a mortal wound on communism if it dares to attack is the only deterrent that the Reds understand and respect.

The big gun of defense is what we must build and man.

It is not a course of our own choosing. We are impelled to it by stern necessity.

The sooner we arm the better will be our chance of avoiding a major conflict or surviving, if that grim test should be forced upon us.

I believe that under our present realistic policy the odds incline toward an uneasy truce instead of an all-out war.

An Issue for Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, just prior to the opening of the present Congress, it became evident to most of us that the adventure in Korea had failed. It became more than ever manifest that this country's foreign policy was leading directly to world war III.

Because of these things, Republican leaders in the other body planned a "great debate" on the subject of our foreign relations. Properly speaking, they proposed a complete reexamination of foreign policy, and a demand for an accounting from the Truman administration.

The attitude and actions of the President and his Secretary of State, had made it clear that bipartisanism in foreign policy was dead.

This, in itself, was a good thing. It was so because the former bipartisan policy never had been anything but Democratic policy, with some Republican leaders saying "me too."

A situation had arisen wherein those with the energy and courage to oppose the tragic blundering of the administration, were silenced for the most part by smear words, such as "isolationist" and "Fascist." In any event, their protests and criticism were ignored.

Therefore it seemed that the opening of a new Congress presented a favorable opportunity for opening up the whole subject of foreign relations. It seemed that some light at last might be thrown upon the dark area of administration concealment, with respect to its panicky vacillations, its failures properly to evaluate Russian intentions, and its impulsive and ill-considered use of such military power as remains to us.

And so the "great debate" was started. It has continued, rather sporadically, for nearly 3 weeks. But now it seems to have boiled down to a single question.

Does the President possess constitutional powers to send American troops in force to Europe, or anywhere else, without the consent of Congress?

The President sent our troops into the Korean debacle without the consent of Congress. And without the consent of Congress, the late President Roosevelt sent our troops to Iceland, just before the onset of World War II. Many still earlier precedents for such action exist in American history.

It is true, even, that many constitutional authorities of past years, have supported the contention that American Presidents do, indeed, possess such powers.

Nevertheless, I believe that a question still remains. Can the President send our troops abroad at his own discretion, any time and for any reason that seems to him valid? Or can he do so only when American citizens or American properties directly are jeopardized? That question, I believe, remains to be answered.

At the same time, it seems to me that the question concerning the President's constitutional right to send American divisions to Europe this year, without first obtaining the consent of Congress, is somewhat beside the point at this time.

The President acted without consulting Congress in sending our young men to fight and suffer and die fruitlessly in Korea. Plainly he acted on impulse, without due consideration, and without consulting even such poor advisers as he keeps about him. His action brought disaster.

Therefore, it would seem to me now, in view of President Truman's tragically irresponsible decision on Korea, that the real question at issue pertains chiefly to the responsibility of his actions in the future. Especially with respect to the decision on when, and if, and in what number our troops should be sent to bolster a faltering defense of Western Europe.

Can the President be trusted to use properly, with due caution and good judgment, those powers to which he lays claim in this connection?

One of the constitutional functions of the Congress is to serve as a checkrein upon the ambitions, or the possibly ill-judged actions, of the Chief Executive.

Is not this the time for Congress to exercise that curb on the Chief Executive which is implicit in the powers granted Congress by the Constitution?

This, I believe, is a question really worthy of debate.

Rabbi Maxwell Dubin, of Los Angeles, Speaks Out Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are awake to the danger of Communist aggression and of the design of Communists to spread their power and enslave the free nations of the world. They are alert to the dangers of sabotage within the United States as well as to the threat from foreign aggressors, and they realize that every American must join in a united effort to defeat the threats of aggression.

In a recent address delivered at the Wilshire Boulevard Temple, Los Angeles, Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin gave an inspiring message enumerating the reasons why every American must today be on guard against communism which is worthy of the attention of every citizen. The following editorial from the Hollywood Citizen-News high lights the vital message from Rabbi Dubin:

REASONS FOR BEING ON GUARD

Civilians are just as much in this war as though they actually wore a uniform, declared Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin, of the Wilshire Boulevard Temple in a recent sermon dealing with the "horrible thing" that threatens this country.

"Wars are fought at home," said Rabbi Dubin. "Wars are fought in the laboratories. Wars are fought in the factories. That is where Russia has declared war upon us. Her aim is to paralyze—to sabotage—to slow down the work that we in America are trying to do in order to prepare ourselves for the ordeal.

"In the days ahead you and I have got to be on guard, very much on guard, because attempts have been made and attempts will be made to befog the issue. You are going to be asked to sign all kinds of protests and all kinds of proclamations. Be careful. Know what you are doing and if you do not know, ask."

We have made many false assumptions in the past concerning the enemy, Rabbi Dubin pointed out. We failed to understand the real aims and ambitions of Soviet Russia.

"We were led to believe in America that communism was a forward-looking social movement, led by great idealists who had a high code of social and international morality.

"We were sold the idea that Soviet Russia was a civilized country, determined to direct its international life in paths of peace and of progress. We were told that Soviet Russia had a government that would have respect for its international promises and commitments and would devote its best interests to the welfare of its own people and to the peoples of other lands."

Such ideas should never have been accepted, the Rabbi said, as he pointed out how the millions of Jews who lived in Russia when the revolution took place were the first ones to be liquidated by the Communists. "They were sent to labor camps, they dug the canals; they were sent to Siberia and they died—by the hundreds of thousands—because the thing for which the Jew stood and stands—respect for human individuality—was not and is not wanted by Soviet Russia."

But the warnings of those who knew went unheeded, so "Russia was treated by the nations of the world like a spoiled child that threatens to hold its breath if it does not get what it wants. We accepted her word. We had faith in her signature, faith in the agreements that were made. * * *

"Russia violated every promise to the Western World. She abused our trust, spread her power, seized lands, destroyed governments, developed fifth columns throughout the world and poisoned the minds of millions of people against their native governments."

Rabbi Dubin hopes that now after 5 years of disillusionment we have awakened to facts. He referred to the fact that today behind the iron curtain "the last traces of Jewish life are being eliminated."

After 3 months in Europe, Rabbi Dubin reached the conclusion that everyone wants to come to America because "materially and spiritually there is not another land in the world as fortunate as ours."

The above few extracts from an inspiring address provide reasons enough for the Rabbi's declaration that, "we must be on guard."

The Price of Lettuce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the excessive mark-ups in the price of lettuce, a subject which was discussed January 19 by Gabriel Heatter, the well-known Mutual news commentator. He reported the average Nation-wide retail price of lettuce as 27 cents per head. If this price is correct, the people should know that the farmers last year received an average of less than 5 cents per head for their lettuce. That is still the price, although growing costs are about 7 cents per head.

We had in my district of California over 30,000 acres in lettuce. I am told that almost half of the crop on this acreage has been destroyed by frost, which will lower the supply and make the growers' costs greater. The farmers of my district will do all they can to get lettuce to the markets at the lowest possible cost.

Following is a telegram which the lettuce growers of my district sent to Mr. Heatter immediately after his broadcast:

EL CENTRO, CALIF., *January 21, 1951*.

Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS,

Washington, D. C.:

Your timely review of lettuce prices in grocery stores has opened possible channel for benefits to every household and prevent further injustice to farmers of lettuce. Through you it is possible to bring factual information to public and in these times this gesture would be welcomed by all. Your quotation of 27 cents per head of lettuce is reported to be accurate Nation-wide in chain stores as well as independent markets. The public will be interested to know that the farmer is now and has been for the past year receiving an average of less than 5 cents per head for his lettuce. Costs have averaged at least 7 cents minimum. The lettuce farmers have been and are now suffering their greatest financial losses because of the situation you have exposed. That is the excessive profits obtained because of excessive mark-ups over costs by those who retard consumption with high prices. This could be worked to better advantage with cheaper prices to housewives, causing greater consumption, thereby creating greater demand for farmers' lettuce which would increase volume and lower unit costs. Nothing new to axiom of supply and demand. Nothing new to larger volume and lower prices and same total profits for retailer. Nothing new to production being among greatest assets of our country. Your stand against profiteering is applicable to lettuce and would be one more of your noted public services. It touches every family and would be invaluable in establishing an understanding between producer and consumer. This becomes increasingly important when the retailer and the Government are getting what the consumer believes is going to the producer. The Imperial Valley Farmers Association in Imperial Valley, Calif., along with our neighbors in Arizona produce over 90 percent of the lettuce consumed in the United States and Canada.

IMPERIAL VALLEY FARMERS ASSOCIATION,
El Centro, Calif.

YUMA VEGETABLE SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
Yuma, Ariz.

Antisubmarine Ships and Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following comments as a preface to an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Daily News of December 21, 1950.

The most recent edition of Jane's Fighting Ships reports that the Soviet Union is building a powerful fleet of 1,000 submarines. Those of us from the Atlantic seaboard remember only too vividly the dark days of 1942 when Nazi Germany with a much smaller fleet of less advanced design than the deadly snorkel type submarine now being built by the Communists wrought terrible destruction upon our merchant shipping and threatened for a time to disrupt our entire war effort.

It took us many months of hard work to overcome the initial advantage enjoyed by the enemy submarines. Even today some of our beaches are darkened by the oil lost from the scores of tankers that were sunk 7 or 8 years ago by U-boats lurking off shore.

Our Navy is keenly aware of the menace of the submarine fleet being built by Soviet Russia. They need to be encouraged to meet it. If we are called upon to fulfill the obligations assumed under the North Atlantic Pact, the submarines which seek to cut our lines of communication across the sea may well be the most dangerous threat we will meet.

The Philadelphia Daily News in a recent editorial has deplored false economy which cuts into appropriations for the latest type antisubmarine ships and weapons which the Navy needs. Mr. Speaker, this is no place for economy. We must recognize the challenge of the submarine and prepare to meet it. It is not a phase of our defense effort we can afford to neglect even for a moment.

Two world wars have found us unprepared to deal with undersea warfare. It must not happen a third time. The warning given by the Philadelphia Daily News is, indeed, timely and important:

NAVY SHOULD HAVE ANY ANTISUBMARINE WEAPONS IT ASKS

Since the days of Commodore John Barry and Capt. John Paul Jones, the United States Navy always has been a major consideration in any plans for the Nation's defense. True, between wars, its personnel and ships and equipment have been reduced to proportions that other countries thought ridiculous. But when the shots were fired and the United States began to rebuild its Navy, the odds for victory increased apace. And quite often, the efficiency of the Navy represented the difference between victory and defeat.

Most military strategists admit the need for a strong Navy for they realize the American sea forces are, when at full strength, the Nation's first and greatest line of defense from attack abroad.

The gathering clouds on the international horizon have brought this question forcibly to the forefront of public attention.

In the First World War, the major threat to the lifelines of the United States and its Allies was the German submarine warfare, in which hundreds of vessels were sunk until the United States Navy went into action and immobilized the undersea wolves of Kaiser Wilhelm. In the Second World War, Hitler's Third Reich also tried to use the submarine but never was able to accomplish the destruction, either in scope or monetary loss, that the Imperial German Navy did because of the alertness of the American Navy.

However, the Nazis did considerable research on submarines and built the snorkel, the most powerful and fastest undersea craft ever constructed. And when the Russian Armies swept into the Baltic States, where the Germans had their shipyards and submarine pens, they confiscated the plans and models. They also made prisoners of the German scientists, naval experts, and architects who were engaged in the development and put them to work for the Communist war machine.

Since then, the Russians have been busily building submarines and today it is known they have a fleet of approximately 200 snorkels, whose range is more than 7,000 miles, which enables them to make a trans-Atlantic crossing and return without stopping. In addition, they have more than 150 other types they can use to harass shipping if they go to war. They also have 120 submarines under construction and plan to expand their underwater fleet to 1,000.

At present there are more than 100 of these Russian submarines lying in the waters off Japan and Korea. If Russia entered the Korean War, the havoc these subs could wreak to the Allied forces attempting to evacuate their hard-pressed troops would be catastrophic, except for a gallant stand by our never-give-up-the-ship Navy. They also could threaten the American defense line from Japan to the Philippines.

For these reasons Congress must give the United States Navy whatever it asks in the way of finances to build its own submarines and antisubmarine service to meet the gathering threat from the Soviet Union. Any secret weapon in process must be speeded to production at once, because the fleet of 200 Red snorkel subs presents a major problem. If these U-boats can be immobilized, the total defeat of the Russian Navy is certain, and the American Navy will have little difficulty in keeping the sea lanes open for American and Allied transports and supply ships.

The staggering sum of $3,000,000,000 was spent to perfect the atomic bomb, but if this weapon had not been developed, the loss of American lives in the invasion and subduing of imperial Japan would have been terrific.

So, regardless of the cost, the Navy, as the bulwark against foreign invasion, as the protector of the open sea and as the guard of freedom's forces abroad, must not be hamstrung in its plans to meet any threat posed by the Russian submarine fleet.

This period of national emergency is not the time for Congress to become penurious. Economy is one thing, but any penny-wise policy that will rob the Navy of any weapons it needs to put a foreign submarine campaign under control would be only pound-foolish in the end. Economy is a matter of saving with good judgment, not paring funds to a point where the remainder will not accomplish the full purpose of national defense required.

The United States Navy, today as in the past, is an integral part of America's protection and shares equally with the Army and the Air Force the responsibility for safeguarding American lives.

At present it is giving a remarkable account of itself in bombarding enemy positions in Korea from the sea to permit the ground forces to maintain their orderly withdrawals from dangerous areas. None can say how many American lives are being saved every time a shell from the U. S. S. *Missouri* explodes in Chinese Communist ranks.

Each branch of the Navy, likewise, is important to the effective whole. Without its carriers in the Pacific war, the Japanese Fleet would not have been driven back to its ports and destroyed forever as a threat to peace. Its transport service, its battle wagons and fast cruisers and destroyers have their special roles to enact in any action, and they must be brought to the fullest degree of efficiency.

But, at the same time, the submarine phases of the problem are emerging as most important. If the United States is to cope with what will be, in time of war, a major peril, not only to the surface craft, but to the coast-line cities as well, the Navy must be given the green light to develop whatever antisubmarine or other naval defenses they need.

To do otherwise would be depriving the Nation of a defense it may sorely need at a not too far distant time.

Victor Lasky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the television and radio industry is currently beset with problems rising out of the Communist menace. The industry has long been a target for Communist infiltration. Therefore, it is heartening to learn that the great pioneering network, the National Broadcasting System, is considering the appointment of Victor Lasky as a consultant and commentator. Mr. Lasky, as many of you know, is coauthor of Seeds of Treason and one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the Communist menace.

The noted radio editor of the New York Daily News, Mr. Ben Gross, has written a column about NBC's negotiations with Mr. Lasky, a staff writer of the New York World-Telegram and Sun. I am inserting it in the RECORD so that the Members of the House may have an opportunity to read it:

[From the New York Daily News of December 29, 1950]

The big headache, Who is a Communist sympathizer? What is pro-Communist propaganda? Trying to answer these questions is giving the radio and television networks a major headache these days. The problem has come to the fore again with the recent attack on commentator Drew Pearson by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. It also boiled over a few weeks ago when several hundred protests poured into NBC denouncing a program celebrating the Bill of Rights, with Melvyn Douglas, Burgess Meredith, and Kenny Delmar in the leading roles, as Moscow-inspired. The truth is that the broadcasters have become so jittery of late that they fear almost any offering save an innocuous song and comedy period might contain some hidden leftist significance.

To those who know the leaders of the broadcasting industry—most of them conservative Republicans and all of them patriotic citizens—the idea that they would knowingly permit their properties to be used for anti-American purposes is nothing less than laughable. But whether some of their employees—commentators, performers, and writers—are sympathetic to the Commie cause—well, that is a different matter.

The powers that be in radio and TV are hopelessly confused. They simply do not know the score. What they need is sound advice from experts who can tell the difference between a party-liner and one who believes in democratic principles.

So it's interesting news that NBC is considering the appointment of Victor Lasky not only as a commentator on the Communist movement but also as a special consultant on communism as it affects policy, programs, and personnel. Lasky, an able newspaperman and the coauthor of the most interesting book written about the Alger Hiss case, the best selling Seeds of Treason, is an acknowledged authority on the topic. He knows who the Commies are and what they are up to. But, at the same time, he's not one of those fellows who shout "Communist" at everyone in sight. For example, when the recent excitement over Anna Rosenberg hit the print, he immediately appraised the charges as being unfounded.

It seems to me that NBC is on the track of a good idea. And it's one that other networks might well copy.

Men in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Men in Politics," that appeared in the Scranton, Pa., Catholic Light on November 9, 1950, together with an editorial that appeared in the Boston, Mass., Post under date of November 13, 1950, entitled "Impellitteri's Victory." The above-mentioned editorials follow:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Catholic Light of November 9, 1950]

MEN IN POLITICS

A politician is a politician even after the election. Unfortunately, this fact is not always appreciated. And while everyone realizes that a man seeking office is a politician, entirely too few remember that he is no different and no better after he gains office.

Consequently, the candidates who lose are remembered as politicians. Those who win become office holders and remain such until the next election. But they're still politicians.

These latter, mindful of their status, should study remarks made recently by one of their very own, the Honorable James A. Farley.

Mr. Farley traces the Christian attitude toward political power back to St. Paul's remark that "there is no power but from God and those that are ordained by God." This, he avers, means that those who hold political power are in a sense ministers of God in the temporal order. Since their powers come from God, and since they act in His name, obviously any politician who dares use his office in a manner that is contrary to the laws of God or in a way likely to arouse His wrath is rushing toward an inevitable day of reckoning with a speed and a blindness awful to behold. And this applies to every politician, however great or small the office he holds.

To Mr. Farley, politics is an ancient calling. More than that, it is an honorable profession and a sacred trust. So long as God remains in the picture; so long as politicians remember that they are the servants not the masters of the people and so long as they do not lose sight of their only raison d'etre no one will quarrel with Mr. Farley's statements.

But what is the principal task, nay the only purpose, that even remotely justifies the existence of politicians? Again Mr. Farley supplies the answer:

"Always the common welfare is the goal. In a public order under God, neither the heads nor the members of the political parties should try to advance merely partisan or group interest. Self-enrichment is a betrayal of the sacred trust of the public officer in his office and of the political party in its power. It violates sound ethical principles and is an offense again good morals. We must never forget that it is the common good which is commanded by the natural law—that is, by the eternal law of God which we learn by examining human nature with our human reason."

Forthright as are these words, they are mild compared to those Mr. Farley uses in declaring that politicians have definite responsibilities. Oddly enough, no mention is made of responsibility or loyalty to the party. Mention is made, however, of responsibility to God and man. Politicians, he declares, "are responsible to God to keep a just account of their stewardship. They are responsible to man for the wise and temperate exercise of their God-given authority."

And yet who can deny that all too often no one is more completely forgotten than the people—unless it be Almighty God.

As Mr. Farley points out, the day will come when each politician must render an account of his works. He will be better prepared for that day of strict judgment by frequently recalling these final words of one who knows whereof he speaks:

"Let no one think that these are trifling matters. Let no one think that they are easy matters. Let no one think that they

are matters which can be responsibly handled except reverently and prayerfully under God."

[From the Boston Post of November 13, 1950]

IMPELLITTERI'S VICTORY

The victory of Vincent R. Impellitteri, the new mayor of New York, is entirely his and the people's. The machines were defied; the parties were defied; the bosses were defied. He performed a political miracle and demonstrated the strength of American democracy—the tough fiber that lies beneath the political encrustations. But a word of thanks goes from all to James A. Farley, who lent his name and prestige to Mayor Impellitteri's campaign. In a political squabble such as that out of which the three-cornered New York mayoralty fight developed there are a good many voters who, hesitant about the issues, will gladly put their vote beside the name of the man that Mr. Farley says is "deserving."

The Railroad Workers Tell Their Side of the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Wisconsin Daily News, Monday, January 22, 1951. This article was by W. P. Kennedy, president of one of the great railroad brotherhoods, namely, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, which I believe is the largest of the transportation organizations.

I know of no organization of men who have been more patriotic and who have done more in the industrial field for the country, both in time of war and in peace, than have the railroad brotherhoods. In rain or snow, in ice or sleet they man the transportation systems of this great Nation. They are ever patient, but among them at the present time is a bitterness that is clearly justified by the treatment that they have received at the hands of their employers who have made the Government their chief instrument. The following is an intelligent and factual statement of the case of the railroad brotherhoods, and I commend it to the House for their conscientious consideration:

THEIR BITTERNESS RUNS DEEP—THE RAIL WORKERS TELL THEIR SIDE OF THE STORY

(By W. P. Kennedy)

The men who battle the icy blasts of winter and face death every day on their jobs to keep the Nation's trains running are not getting a fair deal these days.

They cannot understand just why this should be. Haven't the Government, the press, and their employers been telling them how important and how valuable their work is to national welfare during these trying times?

If their jobs are so vital, if their contribution to our economy and to the defense effort is so necessary, why is it that 22 months of negotiations have failed to yield conditions of employment that are standard in practically all other industry?

This is shabby reward for the patience, responsibility, and the generally cool-headed manner in which the railroad man has always conducted his relations with his employer. And it has fostered a bitter resentment against our employers that has hitherto been unknown in the railroad industry. It runs deep. It is dangerous.

DISCRIMINATION CHARGED

Although practically all United States workers have now long enjoyed the standard 40-hour workweek with overtime on the sixth and seventh days, the railroad switchman and yardman are being denied this accepted American working standard. One million nonoperating rail employees (clerks, shopmen, boilermakers, machinists, etc.) have enjoyed the 5-day week with no pay reduction for almost 2 years. Why the discrimination?

Train crews, who operate the trains over the road, are seeking in addition to desperately needed wage-rate increases, improvements in working rules that are long overdue. These include away-from-home expenses, such as lodging and meals, and penalty pay for delays at the terminals that are the result of management bungling. There are some others, but these are two objectives that should be readily understood. They are accepted practices in all other industry.

As matters now stand, a majority of yard service employees work 7 days a week at straight time. They work that kind of schedule just to buy their families the bare necessities of life under today's soaring living costs, the biggest in United States history.

Steelworkers, auto workers, common laborers, in fact, most other workers have received four wage increases and some a fifth since the end of World War II. Trainmen have had three. Their last pay hike was in October 1948.

EIGHT RATE INCREASES

In contrast, the railroads have asked for and received eight general rate increases since the end of the war. They add up to 57 percent. They are hauling more freight and making more money than at any time in their history—and have just filed for still another rate hike.

Of course, we want the railroads to prosper, but we want and must have a fairer share in our contribution to that prosperity. The railroads are today hauling several times the freight of 25 years ago—and they are doing it with more than 1,000,000 fewer employees. This means that individual productivity has increased manyfold. Management refuses to share this increase with the men who make possible its improved financial situation.

Because of this attitude, the operating rail worker, who was once at the top of the list, has slipped to about thirtieth place in the scale.

For example, in Cleveland, BRT headquarters, yardmen's pay ranges from $1.34 to $1.64 an hour as compared to building tradesmen who range from $1.95 (for common labor) to $2.70; steel workers, $1.80 to $2.25, and machinists, $1.80 to $2.10. Many are paid bonuses over and above their regular rates because of labor shortages. They have all this plus double time on certain holidays, overtime after 40 hours, and many other benefits not included in our contracts.

We are glad our brothers in the A. F. of L. and CIO enjoy such conditions, but are not men engaged in the hazardous and important work of rail transportation entitled to at least as good a break from their employers?

THE MEN ARE BITTER

The restive and bitter spirit among operating rail workers, which broke out around the country a few weeks back in unauthorized strikes, is the result of management's absolute refusal to enter into collective bargaining in the usual and realistic sense as practiced in most other industries.

We have obeyed the Railway Labor Act to the letter—and have not violated its spirit. We came to the bargaining table, prepared to give and take in an effort to work out a satisfactory agreement of our differences.

The carriers came to the table to delay. At no time did they deal straight across the table. Their intention from the beginning was to take advantage of the endless delays afforded by the Railway Labor Act. They could stand the wait more than the switchman on the job. Each day the settlement was put off meant almost $1,000,000 in their coffers.

When the case finally went to a Presidential Emergency Board, we painstakingly and patiently presented the justification for our demands, backing them with irrefutable statistical and sociological data. That Board, comprised of men totally unfamiliar with the railroad industry and rail labor problems, turned in a report we could not accept.

FINDINGS NOT MANDATORY

Contrary to the general belief, Emergency Board reports under the law are not mandatory or binding on either party to the dispute. We rejected the Board's findings but did agree to use it as the basis for discussion and further negotiation.

The carriers retorted that it was either the Board's report or nothing. This has been their position in recent years. Its acceptance would amount to compulsory arbitration, a mechanism most repulsive to free enterprise and free labor. How can we permit strangers, unfamiliar with the complexities of rail labor-management relations to have the final say in such vital matters?

Our demands were first served on the carriers 22 months ago. By exploiting the Railway Labor Act and their loyal, responsible employees, the railroads have thus far managed to avoid a fair and realistic settlement.

At this point "realistic" means at least the 40-hour week with no pay cut and substantial wage raises to match those of the rest of labor, including the coal miners, who have been granted a 30-cent hourly pay hike within the last 11 months.

The recent White House proposal was turned down because, like the Emergency Board report before it, it would have given away conditions achieved in over 50 years of collective bargaining, and would not have granted the standard 40-hour week or a reasonable wage hike to help meet the burdens of the onrushing inflation.

Living costs are the same for the railroad man as the painter, auto worker, carpenter, or plumber, and he is entitled to the same treatment they have demanded and received from their employers.

MANAGEMENT STUBBORN

We are now trying again to reach an agreement with the carriers but we are up against a recalcitrant, stubborn, and greedy management that is using the Korean War to weaken our union and jam an unfair, unreasonable deal down our throats.

The railroad men's plight is desperate. That's why our thanks go to the Scripps-Howard newspapers for giving us this space to tell briefly our side of the story that in recent weeks has put the rail workers on the front pages.

Since we can't strike—the workingman's only real weapon—during the war emergency, and since the hand of Government has made no genuine effort to even the scales that are balanced against us, we are asking public opinion to come to our aid. Our cause is just. Our men are the 40-hour week and two pay rounds behind—and inflation is way ahead.

The "rail" deserves a better break than he is getting today.

Horses and Mules Needed in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of January 4, 1951. The editorial follows:

HORSES AND MULES

Col. John F. Wall, of Camden, S. C., is well known in Lexington as the author of A Horseman's Handbook on Practical Breeding and other books dealing with horses. For years, in connection with the United States Remount Service, he was in charge of breeding and purchasing horses for military use of the Government. Colonel Wall, in a recent interview with the Camden (S. C.) Chronicle, said:

"In the first place the only reliable source of information of enemy ground troops anywhere near the front is secured by other ground troops and cannot be relied upon if reported by air. This is true for the reason that a division of troops can be easily hidden between Lugoff and Blaney—or even more open territory, all day, and not be detected from the air. That division may then move by night with safety if reconnaissance by air is the dependence by his adversary. Unfortunately, we have depended much on reconnaissance by jeeps, and other motor military outfits. That worked very well in the parkway country of Europe and in some of the more rugged terrain. But in a rough tangled country such as our men have found in parts of Korea, a dismounted infantryman or a horseman is the safe reliant agency. They can go in the byways or across country. Ambushes are avoided that way. But our infantry has taken the lesson from our recent war in Europe. They are transported on trucks, while our horse cavalry has been eliminated from the Army.

"The G-2 in the Korean theater had to depend on the information he could secure. Had he had the old-time patrols of infantry and horse cavalry, his estimate could have been accurate.

"But information of the enemy and protection on the march from him is not the only place that we want to mention the horse and mule situation. Horse cavalry has been used effectively against our troops in Korea. It is indeed sad that men of the First Cavalry Division—a former horse outfit—suffered from such attack. I was a member of this outfit once myself. If any old-timers remain in it today, their estimate of their situation has been most adequate, I am sure. And all of us can see what a great assurance our troops could have had if adequate pack trains had been in Korea.

"Our good military leaders are not branch protagonists. I fully expect them to use everything against an enemy that they can muster. I expect them to organize horse cavalry units and plentiful mule pack trains. We don't know where we may be called upon to serve. The club, the slingshot, the horse, and the mule, too, will be taken from moth balls. They will never become museum pieces."

The comments of Colonel Wall are particularly timely. Much has been heard of the losses in Korea and of the need for horses and mules for pack trains. However, his references to the need for scouting and for cavalry for fighting and patrol are good. Colonel Wall offers no criticism. He is not the type to criticize, for he is, first of all, an Army man. But he desires to see the American forces equipped with all they need, including horses and mules which in such activities as those in Korea remain indispensable.

H. R. 1658 Will Provide a Nonvoting Delegate in Congress for District of Columbia and Other Changes in the District Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 1658 which I introduced on January 17 is similar to the bill introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by my colleague from Arkansas, Mr. HARRIS. The bill bears the title "A bill to provide for a Delegate in the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia; for a Board of Education of the District of Columbia to be elected; and for reorganization of the executive departments of the District of Columbia."

This bill, if enacted, will accomplish four things:

1. DELEGATE TO CONGRESS

First, it authorizes qualified electors domiciled in the District of Columbia to elect a nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives biennially with the same rights and privileges as the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii now have.

It has been a traditional practice of the United States to grant to areas which are part of the Union but not yet States the privilege of being represented in the National Legislature by nonvoting Delegates in the House. Alaska and Hawaii have such status and are so represented.

The District of Columbia has such a status. Organized Territories which are not part of the Union are occasionally given this privilege. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have this status. The former is represented by a Resident Commissioner in the House.

There is precedent for the District of Columbia to have a nonvoting Delegate in the House. From 1871 to 1874 it did have such a Delegate elected by the voters of the District. It was eliminated when the franchise was denied District voters under the temporary commissioner government in 1874, the beginning of disfranchisement for the District which has continued to date.

I believe that a District nonvoting Delegate to the House would be a valuable addition and materially relieve the workload on the rest of Congress. He would be familiar with District problems and act as its spokesman. He could introduce District legislation and check on its legislative progress. He would be the representative to receive petitions, consider grievances, and otherwise care for District residents—thus freeing other Members of the Congress from such burdens. He would be very useful in giving other Members the District viewpoint.

2. BOARD OF EDUCATION

In the second place, this bill creates an elective Board of Education for the District of Columbia with nine members. The existing school board and its functions would be transferred to the new board. The new board is also constituted as a Board of Vocational Education, and the functions of the Federal Security Administrator with respect to vocational rehabilitation in the District would be transferred to the Board of Education. The school board is authorized to perform appropriate educational and rehabilitation functions and policies and to appoint the superintendent of schools.

Members of the Board of Education under this bill must be qualified electors, resident and domiciled in the District. They may hold no other elective or compensated appointive office. Their term of office would be 4 years. The Board of Education would elect a president from among its members every 2 years and could remove him from office. The board would appoint a secretary and hold regular monthly and special meetings which would be open to the public, except for executive sessions. Vacancies on the Board of Education would be filled by appointment by the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

It has frequently been recommended that the Board of Education in the District of Columbia be elected. It is entirely within the tradition of local government in the United States to elect the school board. An elected Board of Education for the District of Columbia has been recommended by Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle who for 20 years was the able chairman of the school board here. The recent controversy between the District Board of Education and the superintendent of schools has revealed the weakness of the present appointed board.

3. ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

In the third place, this bill provides for a three-member Board of Elections for the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the President of the United States for staggered 3-year terms. Members of the Board of Elections must be qualified electors and residents in the District. The Elections Board would prepare and maintain a permanent registry of qualified electors and conduct the elections for Delegate to Congress and the Board of Education.

No person could register to vote in District elections under this bill unless he is a citizen of the United States, has resided or been domiciled in the District for 1 year, is 21 years old or over, can read and write the English language, is not mentally incompetent, and has never been convicted of a felony or has been pardoned.

Nomination to elective office shall be by petition, filed with the Board of Elections not later than 60 days before the election, signed by not less than 90 registered persons, and accompanied by a filing fee of $125 in the case of a petition nominating a candidate for the office of Delegate, or $25 in the case of a petition

nominating a candidate for the Board of Education.

Voting in District elections shall be secret, by paper ballot or voting machine. Ballots must be cast in the precinct where the voter resides. Absentee voting is prohibited. Provision is made for watchers at the polls, recounts, and contests. Interference with registration or voting is prohibited. Penalties are imposed for violation of the election laws.

Only voters domiciled in the District of Columbia may vote for a Delegate to Congress. Persons who are qualified to vote elsewhere are not disqualified from voting in District elections.

4. REORGANIZATION OF CITY DEPARTMENTS

Finally, this bill reorganizes the administrative structure of the District government. It consolidates the existing 42 departments of the city government along functional lines into 12 new departments, each headed by a Director to be appointed and removable by the Board of Commissioners, at salaries to be fixed by the Commissioners. Provision is made for the transfer of functions, personnel, property, records, and funds to the new departments. The 12 new departments under the Board of Commissioners would be: Health, Welfare, Recreation, Public Safety, Finance, Law, Public Works, Library, Labor, Commerce, Corrections, and Professional and Occupational Standards. The Board of Commissioners is also authorized to appoint an executive officer to serve at their pleasure and to perform functions assigned by them.

The administrative structure of the District government has grown like Topsy since 1873. New agencies have been set up from time to time in piecemeal response to local needs until today it has become a tangled jungle of overlapping, uncoordinated, and duplicating departments, boards, and commissions. Since 1920 a series of studies of the organization and operation of the District government have been made by congressional committees, Presidential commissions, citizen groups, efficiency engineers, and the Brookings Institution. All these studies have agreed that the administrative set-up of the District government is incredibly cumbersome, complicated, and confused. It is generally agreed that modernization of the administrative structure is long overdue.

Major Provisions of Proposed Amendments to the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

1. Policy statement is changed to correspond with the proposed UMST program.

2. Registration is required at 17 instead of at 18.

3. Induction is authorized at 18 instead of at age 19.

4. The term "trainee" is used for the first time, but such term is limited to persons inducted before attaining nineteenth birthday. A trainee must be given 4 months' basic training, and this period may be raised to 6 months by the President. Such persons cease to be trainees upon completion of initial period of basic training. Trainees may not be assigned to duty in a combat area or be permanently assigned to duty (other than training duty) at any installation located on land outside continental United States.

5. No overseas service is authorized for 18-year-olds until after basic training (4 to 6 months).

6. Twenty-seven months' service is required instead of 21 months' service (including those already inducted).

7. Eight years of active and Reserve service is required (instead of the present 21 months' active service plus 3 years of service in Organized Reserve unit or 5 years of inactive Reserve service) for those inducted after this amendment is enacted.

8. Eliminates authority to enlist voluntarily for 21 months in Army.

9. Does not repeal provision establishing general classification test score of 70 as minimum required for enlistment or induction. (Services no longer use GCT but use Armed Forces qualification test.)

10. Authorizes compulsory officer training upon completion of required training and service.

11. Release from active service is permitted for those who agree to enter organized units of National Guard and Reserve components.

12. President may reduce basic training pay of trainees to $30 a month.

13. President may increase basic training to 6 months and reduce 27 months' active service, and do this differently for different age groups.

14. Extends period of required service for doctors and dentists to 27 months and repeals section of "doctor draft law" which provided for annual deferment of optometry students and premedical, preosteopathic, preveterinary, preoptometry, and predental students equal to level of present attendance at colleges. (Such persons are to come from 75,000 to be deferred annually until June 30, 1954, by proposed amendment; or pursuant to section of the present law, not repealed, that permits President to defer students necessary for national health, safety, and interest.)

15. Repeals deferment of persons enlisting in National Guard prior to 18½ years of age.

16. College training:

(a) Until June 30, 1954, President authorized to relieve annually from active duty 75,000 men after they complete basic training (civilians selecting them), with a post-education civilian or military service obligation (to study medicine, science, humanities, etc., presumably at their own expense).

(b) ROTC or equivalent deferments are continued and expanded, with 2 years' active duty after graduation plus 6 years' reserve service required. Subsidy authorized with a year's additional service required in return therefor.

(c) Other officer candidate programs authorized for persons on active duty.

17. President's present authority to provide for deferment of persons engaged in industry, agriculture, etc., and those whose activity in study, research, medicine, science, etc.—necessary to national health, safety, and interest is not repealed. President may also continue deferment of men with dependents, and those mentally, physically, or morally defective.

18. Eighteen-year-olds' inductions are postponed until end of college academic year in which ordered for induction. High-school students' inductions are postponed until age 19 or until completion of high school.

19. Liberalizes and clarifies reemployment rights for persons enlisting for first time, and requires employers to grant leave for employees reporting for induction, and requires reemployment of those rejected.

20. The act is indefinitely extended; no termination date.

21. Extends for 2 years authority for involuntary call of reserves and doctors and dentists.

22. President is authorized to establish committee of five to eight civilians to advise him on basic training.

23. Voluntary rehabilitation through civilian agencies is authorized for those disqualified for induction so as to qualify them for induction.

24. Two-year extension of authority to extend enlistments for 1 year.

25. Removes limitations on size of WAC, WAVE, WAF, and Women Marines until July 31, 1954.

26. Suspends active duty personnel ceilings of the Armed Forces until 1961.

Resolution Declaring Communist China an Aggressor in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain my opposition to the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts last Friday, stating the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

My objection was based upon my impression that such action would be tantamount to a declaration of war against Communist China, and also that it would give the tentative consent of Congress to the ill-advised and tragic action of the Chief Executive in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a pacifist, nor a Communist lover. I think we shall perhaps always have wars so long as international "mad dogs" range around in the world. One does not placate such ravening beasts, even though deploring the fact the animal has hydrophobia.

But I am irrevocably opposed to the idea that any other power than that of the duly elected representatives of this great people should be given the power to commit us to war.

Looking backward from the vantage point of elapsed time, it now seems easy to comprehend that we should never have joined the UN. Conceived in sin, and born in iniquity as it was, a child of the warped and traitorous brain of Alger Hiss, committing us to admit the murderer, Stalin, as our bed-fellow, how could one expect anything else than what we got?

If the "blood of Abel cried from the ground to the ears of the Lord God," with what a roar must the blood of the scores of millions of Stalin's murdered countrymen ascend to the Father of all that is!

Advisory action through a league of free nations might be a good thing, but

I shall always be opposed to leaving the determination of our destiny to the devious minds of savage or barbarous peoples which form part of the present membership of the UN.

Tax Deduction for Mothers Engaged in War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House and particularly the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the Treasury Department, to a timely suggestion made by Mr. Kenneth Allen, editor of the Albert Lea Evening Tribune, of Albert Lea, Minn., with reference to the expenses of women workers who must hire someone to take care of their children while at work.

Under existing regulations of the Treasury Department these women are not allowed to deduct as a business expense the pay for those who take care of their children. Mr. Allen clearly points out the need for a change in the revenue laws and regulations of the Treasury Department so that such expenses may be deducted as a legitimate business item. Women are being encouraged to go into war production in the war emergency, and it is only fair and just for them to be allowed to charge off as a business expense such items of necessary expense. I am grateful to Mr. Allen for calling this matter to our attention in the following editorial:

[From the Albert Lea (Minn.) Evening Tribune of January 17, 1951]

WORKING GALS NEED BREAK IN TAXATION

Labor recruiters are finding their task of finding men for essential jobs becoming more difficult. There are fewer able men every day. So the usual stories about "scraping the bottom of the manpower barrel" are cropping up. And the Nation's lawmakers, with an eye on the headlines such proposals always get, are threatening to "draft the dames."

America's women demonstrated during the last two wars they can hold down jobs in industry on equal terms with men. They did good work. And a great number of them probably will go back to work when the situation in manpower grows more acute.

Women actually perform many tasks in industry better than men; particularly they do well in monotonous jobs that irk men. Women usually do not engage in shop politics, nor do they let a burning ambition blunt their output. Women are conserving of materials and are good housekeepers—traits appreciated in industry.

Women, once they get used to the idea of wearing slacks and hairnets, are safe workers. They are apt at learning rules and usually abide by them without question.

Oh, there is a lot to be said in favor of women in jobs. There's another side, too, but it need not concern us in this column today, because whether or not, a lot of women are going to be needed by the economy in a few more months.

The purpose of considering women in essential work was to point out an inconsistency in the income-tax structures. If the Government wants women to do their bit—and from every indication it does—then the Government should give the women a break in the income-tax-deductions column. When a woman, for instance, is forced to hire someone to take care of her children, this expense cannot be legally deducted as a cost of doing business. But her boss can entertain a colonel from the procurement section by taking him to a hootchy-kootchy show and that is considered a legitimate business expense.

The militant woman-righters, always ready to splinter a lance for the fair sex, should do something about these deductions for women who work. The idea would be a shot in the arm for labor recruiters because they would have a bargain to offer women.

And what woman can resist a bargain?

Ninety-five Percent in Poll Hit Korea War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Bob Considine, appearing in the New York Journal-American, showing the result of a poll he has taken.

This poll shows the overwhelming desire of the American people that our Ground Forces be pulled out of Korea. The Journal-American article follows:

NINETY-FIVE PERCENT IN POLL HIT KOREA WAR

(By Bob Considine)

A recent radio query of mine, asking listeners for their opinion on whether or not we should keep our forces in Korea, has now resulted in a response of about 7,000 wires, letters and cards.

About 95 percent of the responses, and they came from every State in the Union, recommend we pull our forces out of this still undeclared war. A great percentage of these messages are pretty bitter. There is sharp criticism of the President, Secretary of State Acheson, and the failure of other United Nations properly to share the burdens.

The theme of the responses seem to be "let's lose face and save lives." But several letter writers suggested, after hearing the way the vote was going, that the letters might be a vast Communist plot to sway official action.

ENDLESS MIXTURE

But that's preposterous. It is belied by the variety of the mail, both in text and geography. It comes in in an endless mixture, some of it dictated to secretaries by tycoons, some of it scrawled in pencil on penny postcards.

There was no pattern to the choice of words, as there always is when a writer is the target of an organized letter-writing movement.

I wired several officials in Washington, giving them the count on the mail and the margin in favor of withdrawing from Korea, and asked them to make some comment that would clarify the situation.

My point was that if this great proportion of the writers were for our getting out of Korea, they must reflect a very widespread public antagonism toward the struggle.

REPLY FROM MARSHALL

And that an explanation of some kind might satisfy the letter writers on why we seem determined to stay.

Defense Secretary George C. Marshall replied:

"Thanks for your information on letters you have received. Would like to oblige (with statement) but must consider the timing and frequency of my public statements, particularly as regards my appearances before congressional committees next week."

Secretary of War Frank Pace, Jr., wired:

REASONS THIS WEEK

"Since question of United Nations forces staying in Korea is not a matter for decision by Department of the Army, I feel statement by me on that subject would be inappropriate. Results of your mail poll were most interesting and I appreciate your requesting my views. Best regards."

Secretary of State Dean Acheson replied by phone through Bill Wood, in charge of the department's radio section. His point, in effect, was that he'd like to give a clarifying answer but felt he couldn't give it to a single reporter. Which makes sense even to this married reporter.

Mr. Acheson added something which might mean a lot, or little. He empowered his spokesman to say that clarification of our position in Korea will be presented early this coming week. The reasons why we will or must stay, or will or must leave, will be provided by appropriate officials in Washington.

Bill Wood said it was safe to assume that "appropriate officials" meant men in the political and military fields, as well as diplomacy. The Secretary, Wood continued had found the poll most interesting and had said, in effect, that it is things of this type that clarify the thinking of public officials.

CONNALLY SILENT

Senator TOM CONNALLY made no reply to the wire. But that may be due to the fact that he and every other Senator and Representative in Washington is currently swamped by mail of this general type which I received.

A check of congressional offices, some of which are inundated by the most mail the men ever received, shows that the mood of the people is consistent. People want this country to check its costly Korean adventure, after about 50,000 casualties and great loss of matériel, and they want it even though this happens to coincide with Soviet wants.

In addition they want us to encourage and equip the Chinese Nationalists to fight against the Chinese Reds. And, finally, and somewhat enigmatically, they want a big, well-trained army without the services of 18-year olds.

How these demands will be resolved seems about to be decided.

Our Present Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Hugh A. Murrill from the newspaper Greenwich Time, January 19, 1951. Hugh A. Murrill, of Pheasant Lane, Greenwich, a West Pointer who fought in both world wars, recently returned from a 7,000-mile business trip. Concerned at "the degree of frustration in the minds of the people," this former colonel in the general staff corps sat down and wrote a treatise on Our Present Danger. Mr. Murrill was a captain on the general staff in World War I. In May 1942 he returned to uniform as a colonel. He holds the Order of the British Empire Medal, the Croix de Guerre with Palms from the French Government, the Order of Leopold from the Belgian Government, the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, and two Bronze Stars. The article follows:

OUR PRESENT DANGER: CAUSE, EFFECT, AND FUTURE

WHERE ARE WE?

(By Hugh A. Murrill)

Our country is at war, and no amount of United Nations' diplomatic shadow boxing can obscure that fact.

We may be on the verge of world war III.

We have weak friends and a strong enemy.

The military strength against us is still growing faster than our own, plus that of our friends.

The crisis we are now in has been precipitated by continued aggressive and uncompromising action by the Russians as part of a long-range plan for world communism.

We have been slow to recognize the deep-rooted, ruthless determination of the Russian drive, with its terrorism, suppression, and intrigue.

We have been slow to appraise the uncompromising hatred of America that the Kremlin has set about implanting in the minds of both its own people and those of its satellites.

We have been reluctant to believe the Lenin-Stalin concept that communism and democracy cannot live side by side in a world of peace, and that the United States, as the leader of democracy, must be the foe of Russia in the struggle for survival between two irreconcilable ways of life.

In all international affairs, the Kremlin has consistently shown itself to be without scruple, honor, or integrity, and to regard only one law: the law of expediency.

So far, Russia has pulled the strings for puppets.

We have no guaranty that they will wait 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years, to move for the two things they want most:

1. The Ruhr with its coal, iron, and steel.
2. The oil of the Middle East.

They will move when they think it expedient, when they are convinced that military means will be more profitable than political means.

We may be certain that the only thing that restrains them now is their belief that they could not exploit either of these resources under atomic bombing by the United States strategic Air Force.

The only thing that will continue to restrain the Russians is the balance of power against them.

We must gather strength more quickly, preparing for the worst in the hope that adequate preparation and steadfastness will keep the worst from happening.

We did not get where we are crusading for western civilization.

We were pushed here by the hand of destiny and the Mongol character of the Russians who have sought out the United States as the major foe to be destroyed.

Withdrawal from Europe, withdrawal in the Pacific, would only strengthen the enemy, not in any way alter his determination.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

The United States and Russia emerged from World War II as the strongest nations of the world.

The technology of modern war itself had completely demolished isolationism as an effective policy for the United States.

Time after time, the war showed that no island, large or small, can be defended successfully if the enemy has adequate air, land, and sea power to isolate and attack it.

Singapore, the great island fortress which took 20 years to build, Corregidor, Truk, Okinawa, all fell to the coordinated attack of air, land, and sea forces.

Japan itself would have fallen to United States assault without the use of the atom bomb.

Anyone who was in England under V-1 bombardment from launching sites on the continent can visualize all too clearly the impossibility of holding the British Isles with the continent of Europe overrun by the enemy, and modern guided missiles added to his capabilities of attack.

There is no impregnable Gibraltar today, no island fortress secure against a stepping-stone advance, and coordinated attack by air, land, and sea.

Hence, any isolationist withdrawal to the North American Continent has become an impractical and futile policy for the United States.

It has become clear that the successful defense of America must begin far from our shores.

A further succession of events, whose potency we were slow to realize, pushed the United States forward as the leader of western civilization against communism.

These events were:

1. The defeat of Germany and the Yalta agreement, which extended the Russian occupation zone well west of the Elbe River, thus eliminating Germany as an effective force against Communist expansion.

2. The defeat of Japan and the Yalta agreement, which ceded to Russia the Kurile Islands, and the southern half of Sakhalin Island, strategically dominating Japan on the north, and definitely limiting her military capabilities, regardless of what type of peace treaty might later develop.

3. The weakening of the British Empire as a result of the strains imposed by World War II, the decline of sea power as a world force, and postwar government policies in England itself.

4. The too-rapid demobilization of United States air, land, and sea forces, to a state of virtual disarmament.

Such were the supporting events which led Stalin and the Politburo in February 1946 to reaffirm the Lenin doctrine that communism and democracy cannot exist in a world of peace and that communism must destroy its democratic enemies.

Since that time, Russia has bullied, blustered, and maneuvered by intrigue and force, to strengthen herself and weaken the United States.

It has become apparent that any further gains by the Soviet in the direction of the Ruhr, the oil of the Middle East, or the Japanese Islands, are a serious threat to the security of the United States.

We may not be able to contain Communist aggression everywhere, but in these three strategically vital areas, we must contain it.

When the Soviet launched their puppets in Korea, we reacted with decision and courage.

Why?

Because our Government rightly—if somewhat belatedly—became convinced that the real purpose of the Communists was to occupy the last remaining strategic area necessary to insure their dominance of Japan, from nearby bases on the mainland, supplementing their island bases to the north.

If Japan should fall to the Communists, Okinawa, the Philippines, and all of our island outposts in the Pacific would become vulnerable.

We know now that the Soviet cannot be deterred from their aggressive drive for world communism by conciliation or reason. They now see in America the last strong bulwark of democracy denying to them the final success of embittered years of planning and intrigue.

We must banish any wishful thinking that some stroke of diplomacy may produce a rapprochement between the United States and Russia.

The Chinese move to drive the white man out of Asia, United Nations from Korea, the French from Indochina, and at their leisure the British from Hong Kong are merely the opening gambits in the Soviet game.

They are determined to weaken and destroy us.

Grim necessity spurs us to strengthen ourselves quickly and to organize a balance of power against communism.

On the Soviet timetable it may be later than we think.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The hour for a larger mobilization of our military forces struck 6 months ago with the Russian move in Korea.

Events since the Soviet-engineered Chinese move have high-lighted our present danger.

In our security action, however, we must take thoughtful account of two factors:

1. The Russian flair for propaganda and subversion and the ability of the Communist Party to carry on political warfare in the United States and the democratic world.

2. The difficulties of sustaining partial mobilization in a free democracy over an extended period of time, even 5 to 10 years.

The Russians may elect to prolong the crisis we are in for a long time without risking a show-down. We must expect softening gestures, skillfully mixed with subversion and sabotage, to divert us from our program.

We must expect a calculated effort to bleed us white economically, in the hope of setting up internal stresses and strains in our political system.

We must recognize the difficulties inherent to a democracy in maintaining a steadfast course without the daily drama of a major war to keep us steeled in our purpose.

Six months ago the public reacted to our countermove in Korea with decision and courage. It was an immediate and understandable emergency.

Every day since then American commentators and columnists have poured out to the people an anguished and unending barrage of hysteria, pessimism, and criticism more powerful than the Voice of America, by which we try to reach the people behind the iron curtain.

To sustain a great national program of partial mobilization, to steel the people against hysteria and misinformation, the Government must reach their minds as well as their emotions.

First, we must have an agreed national policy defining the vital interests of the United States, and what we must do for their advancement and defense.

This basic policy must be clearly nonpolitical in character, not Mr. Acheson's plan, not Mr. Truman's, but a Security Council decision which the people can believe is an effective safeguard for our country.

Its basic framework must be explained and sold to the people.

Second, to implement such a policy, we must have a long-range program to do these things:

1. To increase our active military forces, in being fully trained and equipped, to such

strength as may be necessary to insure against a quick and easy Russian success in Europe, the Middle East or Japan, or other areas defined by our national policy.

2. To aid and hasten the build-up of the forces of our Allies, who have the will and physical capacity to resist Communist aggression. (General Eisenhower's job in Europe.)

3. To establish and bring to readiness the productive facilities to supply and equip both the forces in being, and the greater forces that will be required under full mobilization.

4. To build up basically trained Reserves suppementing the active forces, to insure the most rapid full mobilization of our military strength and powers of retaliation. If war comes, the initial Russian move will be a sudden "Pearl Harbor" blow.

5. To accomplish all of the above without destroying the essentials of Democracy that we are prepared to fight the Communists to protect, patriotic individual liberty and free enterprise.

The responsibility for the plan and mobilization of our forces rests with General Marshall, Secretary of Defense, a great soldier and a great American.

The responsibility for the mobilization of productive facilities has been assigned to able and rugged Mr. Charles Wilson. Mr. Wilson has already chosen experienced and able executives in General Clay, General Harrison, and Mr. Sidney Weinberg.

Before Mr. Wilson can really move to set up the facilities immediately required for equipping our active forces, and those ultimately to be required for full mobilization, the entire program must be crystallized and reduced to specific requirements.

We must assume that this is now being accomplished with the greatest urgency, and without too much dependence upon either our allies or the atom bomb.

Finally, there remains the vital matter of how to provide the reserve strength we must have ready for swift mobilization, without permitting the Russians to bleed us white by prolonging the emergency.

The type of conflict we are in will require the active assistance of every patriotic American.

Millions of our people now realize that in modern war, the trained have a better chance of survival than the untrained. The Selective Service Act, the draft, does not provide the reserves that we require for safety. It is full of inequalities and exemptions, and fails to kindle the spirit of national service that must underlie our program.

For an all-out war, all of our young men need military training.

It is time to supplement the Selective Service Act with a program of universal military training for every young man as a part of his basic education.

We know that the complex technology of modern war requires a longer period of training than a strong and crafty enemy shall give us. The period required for universal military training is stated by our experts to be 24 months, to begin at age 18, or upon completion of high school.

This would train from 800,000 to 1,000,000 young men every year.

There would be no exemptions except for physical or mental disability, because there are many technical requirements in the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, where extreme physical fitness is not essential.

The time has come for America to develop in its young men a spirit of national service. We must guard against the softer belief that the magical machines which flow from our production lines, will, themselves insure our security. It is the men who manage the machines, their skill and dominating spirit, that count most.

Universal military training is the only effective way to develop the reserve skills required to enable us to shift quickly to meet an all-out Communist attack.

It should become a part of our national security plan in 1951.

The people are ahead of our leaders on this.

In this time of danger, let us do quickly what must be done.

Get Forces Out of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address on the subject of the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea, and the helping of Japan to rearm, delivered by John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, on January 17, 1951, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, to the end that other Members of the Congress may have the privilege of reading it. It is very thought provoking.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET FORCES OUT OF KOREA, COWLES URGES, ADVOCATES HELPING JAPAN TO REARM

The most important thing in the world to Americans is freedom.

We believe that each individual has God-given, inalienable, natural human rights, and the basic right is freedom. While freedom is indivisible, its most important phase is freedom of choice; the freedom of the individual to speak as he chooses, the freedom of an individual to worship as he chooses, the freedom of an individual to choose one's own job, the freedom to choose where one wants to live.

Of course these various freedoms, even though they are theoretically indivisible, are of relatively differing degrees of importance. In an emergency we must voluntarily abridge some of our lesser freedoms in order to try to save our basic freedom.

We are having to give up, in large measure, our freedom of choice as to how we will spend, for example, our earnings or income. We have no choice but to pay the bulk to the tax collector.

In contrast with our philosophy of belief in the freedom and dignity of the individual, communism flatly rejects the idea that there are any intrinsic human rights. The Communists believe that collective society confers upon individuals conditional rights which may be withdrawn at the pleasure of the state.

Our philosophy and that of the Communists are completely irreconcilable, and I believe that our philosophy of individual freedom—our whole system of life—is now and in the years immediately ahead will be in greater peril than ever before.

BELIEVES RUSSIANS SEEK TO RULE WORLD

While I make no claim to any expert knowledge of Russia—I have only been there briefly twice, once in 1923 and once in 1937—I am convinced that the Russian leaders sincerely expect that communism will eventually conquer the world.

I believe that the fundamental law of the Communist Party is the enhancement of its power. I am convinced that the Communist Party will use any methods whatsoever to attain its objectives.

We are thus facing a dynamic international revolutionary movement with which historic Russian or Pan-Slav imperialist expansion has been fused.

The Russian leaders in their cold fanaticism regard every nation that they do not control as an enemy to be taken over or destroyed. We may have an armed truce for many years but there is, in my judgment, no possibility of a permanent accommodation or of genuine peace until and unless the Communist philosophy changes. That is the nature of the threat we are facing.

Perhaps some day the Communist philosophy will be modified. Perhaps some day the Communists will shed their imperialistic militancy. Only if and after that happens can the two systems exist side by side in the world without our always having to be ready at any moment for all-out war.

BETTER POLICY WILL COME FROM DEBATE

The current great debate over our foreign policy is the best thing that has happened in the United States in the last 6 months. It is giving the public a clearer understanding of the problem, and we will end up with a better policy that has much sounder public support.

Although the administration does not admit it, it should be obvious that our foreign policy is currently being substantially modified. The doctrine that we would, and could, contain Communist aggression wherever it took place anywhere in the world has been proved impossible of fulfillment. That policy has failed, and we are now forging a new and more realistic one.

Ever since we hastily dismantled our Armed Forces after winning military victory in World War II, our foreign policy commitments have been greatly in excess of our capabilities for fulfilling them. We were bluffing. We were endorsing notes at the bank without realizing that we might be called upon to make them good.

Fortunately we got away with our bluff in both Greece and Turkey. Had the Russians thought it wise they could easily have thwarted the so-called Truman doctrine at its very start. Russian satellites alone could have quickly taken Greece, and Russia could have conquered Turkey easily.

Our bluff fortunately was not called at the time when the Truman doctrine was first enunciated, and we are lucky today that Turkey is still with the free world.

I was in Turkey briefly last spring, and was told by men who should know that Turkey is now much better prepared than she was a few years ago and will without question fight if Russia attempts to invade her.

You will all recall, too, that Turkey sent several thousand ground troops to help us in Korea, and according to reports they fought courageously.

MARSHALL PLAN PROVES ITS WORTH

On the whole the Marshall plan phase of our postwar foreign policy was, I think, a magnificent success. I was in Western Europe just before the Marshall plan was started, and I believe Italy certainly and very probably France also would have gone Communist if we had not extended those countries Marshall plan aid.

But because we appeared to be successful with the Truman doctrine of containing Communist aggression against Greece and Turkey, we became overconfident and too inclined to make sweeping international commitments about containing communism everywhere.

Our bluff was called in Korea, and events have clearly demonstrated that the United States does not have the power to win ground wars against foes, whether Russian or satellite, whose manpower is inexhaustible and to whom human life means little or nothing.

The Korean war also demonstrated that while the United Nations may still be—and

I believe still is—our best hope for gradually developing world law and world order, most of its member nations, aside from the United States, are at the present time either unable or unwilling to furnish much military assistance toward suppressing aggression in remote areas.

Since Korea has no strategic value, I incline to the view that the sooner all American and other UN forces are evacuated from Korea, the better.

It is now accepted by everybody, I believe, that we do not possibly have the power to contain communism in every single part of the globe. Consequently, we must hereafter use our resources only where they can be used effectively and successfully, or where the loss that would result if we failed to attempt to stop aggression fully justifies our taking the calculated risk.

BALANCE OF POWER NEEDED IN WORLD

In his World War II strategy, President Roosevelt ignored one of the basic facts of history, namely that unless there is either a single nation or an effective world organization that is able to enforce law and order, a reasonable balance of power among the various nations is, always has been, and always will be essential to the maintenance of peace.

We did away with that balance of power by our destruction of Germany and Japan. We voluntarily opened up to Russia those areas which had formerly been influenced or controlled by Germany and Japan. The Russians naturally moved in to the vacuum.

The sooner we now make a genuine peace settlement with Japan and help Japan to rearm, the better. There is a deep-lying hostility between the Japanese and the Russians. Putting Japan back on her feet militarily is a calculated risk that I believe it would be wise for us to take.

If we can possibly avoid it, I think it would be a grave mistake for the United States to engage in even a limited war with Red China. The idea for our fighting a war against Red China was simply a naval blockade and some Air Force bombing may sound appealing in theory.

I fear, however, that no one can foretell where such a war with China might lead, and I think it would be a profound error for us again to send American ground troops anywhere in eastern or southeast Asia.

Possibly we can give some substantial unofficial assistance to the non-Communist Chinese war lords in their attempts to make civil war against Mao's Red China, but I question whether we should go further than that.

I think it would be a grave error for us to put American Ground Forces into Indochina to help the French or into Malaya to help the British. From people who have been there within the last month, I hear that the French position in Indochina is desperate.

I suggest that we might be wise to urge France immediately to offer the Indochinese full autonomy within the French Union or to grant them their complete freedom under a temporary United Nations trusteeship on the theory that there thus might be one chance in a thousand that Indochina would not go Communist, whereas it is absolutely certain to end up under Red control if the people think that the only way they can gain their independence from the French is through joining with the Communists.

In addition to suggesting that the French give the Indochinese their freedom, I think it would be beneficial if the British Government would announce officially that Malaya also would be given its freedom or be made a self-governing dominion within the British commonwealth at some specified future date.

Unless the British do this, and perhaps even if they do do it, I fear that they are going to have great difficulty in holding Malaya.

The United States is on the unpopular side in southeast Asia. The natives suspect our motives. The Russian propagandists charge that the United States has gone into Asia not only to support French and British colonialism, but also because we have similar imperialistic designs of our own. The slogan Asia for the Asiatics, has real appeal and the Communists are making full use of it.

Serious as the loss of southeast Asia would be to the free world, it does not compare in importance with what the loss of Western Europe would mean. Western Europe, including Turkey but excluding the Russian satellite nations, has a population of some 270,000,000 people, and approximately half as much income as the national income of the United States.

Western Europe has great industrial capacity. If Russia were to take over its iron and coal mines, its steel mills and its factories, our present huge margin of productive superiority over Russia would be enormously lessened.

Wholly apart from reasons either of honor or sentiment, our abandonment, or the loss, of Western Europe to Russia would make our own national security far more precarious.

ENGLAND WOULD FALL WITH REST OF EUROPE

If the Russians were to sweep over continental Western Europe, I don't believe the British Isles would be tenable. I was in England during the bombing of World War II, and I don't see how England could stand up under heavy sustained attacks of guided missiles, particularly if they carried atomic war heads.

We shouldn't ignore the disagreeable fact that if the Russians take Western Europe, probably England would be lost as well. I fear that those who express the contrary view are letting wishful thinking influence their judgment.

It is a grim picture, and I hope we won't find ourselves confronted with the unhappy task of having to prove whether or not those who optimistically predict that with Europe gone the Western Hemisphere could be made a Gibraltar of peace and security are correct.

In a recent speech, Senator TAFT again repeated that in his judgment the United States should go to war with Russia instantly if Russia attacked Western Europe.

I agree completely. So long as the Russians know that any attack by them on Western Europe would mean immediate all-out war between Russia and ourselves, and that the first of a long series of atom bombs would promptly begin to fall on Russia, Russia may be deterred.

Russia certainly now has sufficient military strength to enable her to occupy Western Europe to the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. She has had that capability for the last 4 years.

I suspect that the reason she has not moved is because she has feared that even though she were successful in occupying Western Europe she would probably face eventual defeat from the United States because of our superiority in atom bombs and our capacity to deliver them on Russia.

Whether that superiority will long continue is debatable. Perhaps Russia has not moved in Western Europe because of her appraisal of her own internal weaknesses. Perhaps she is having more trouble at home than the outside world knows about. We can hope that such is the case, but cannot rely on it.

WE CANNOT ABANDON EUROPE TO RUSSIA

Defeatism and war-weariness, plus Communist minorities, are so widespread in France and Italy that I personally question whether their military strength and, even more important, their resolution and will to resist, can be built up to a point where it is certain that with reasonable help on the ground from the British and ourselves the west would be able to stop the Russians if they attempted to overrun Western Europe.

Certainly the United States and the British cannot alone maintain sufficient divisions in Western Europe to stop the Russians, and any suggestion that we should attempt it is fantastic.

Nevertheless, despite all the arguments that have been advanced, it would in my opinion be an act of national insanity for us at this time to conclude to abandon Europe to Russia or to proclaim that we will not send another American division there.

It is entirely possible that the Russians may direct the Communist East Germans, whom they have rearmed, to invade West Germany under the guise of its being simply an internal civil war to unify Germany. We thus might quickly face a situation where the Communists actually were controlling the Ruhr although ostensibly Russia herself had not been involved.

If the United States and Britain, however, each promptly put two or three additional combat divisions into West Germany, we then presumably would have sufficient allied strength so that it would be clear that the East Germans alone could not take over West Germany.

EISENHOWER MAY WORK A MIRACLE

The Russians in turn might be deterred from using their own troops to help the East Germans invade West Germany, since the Russians would know that such action on their part would mean immediate all-out atomic war.

In other words, the sending by the British and ourselves of a very few more divisions to West Germany might prevent any possibility of the Ruhr's falling into Communist hands as the result of what pretended to be simply an internal German civil war of unification.

It is within the realm of possibility, moreover, that General Eisenhower will be able to rekindle the will to resist that is so desperately needed in France today.

It is at least premature for us to conclude that he can't perform that miracle. Perhaps he can. And if he can I think we should make every effort to help the west rearm. But certainly that program would not and should not involve the use of many American ground divisions.

General Eisenhower has had unique experience in dealing with the Europeans. Surely we can depend on his not recommending involving either American or other troops in an international army with himself as its commander if in his judgment the people of Western Europe are not going to demonstrate the will to resist and if the project is consequently doomed to failure.

Surely the American people should await Eisenhower's return from his European trip a few weeks from now and hear his recommendations and conclusions before making any final decisions as to what our future defense policy should be.

While the United States is in the process of hammering out its new foreign policy, one which I hope will be truly and not synthetically bipartisan in nature, we must not overlook another important fact. The men in the Kremlin are the ones who will determine the date when the war, if it comes, starts. It might be next week or next year, or it might not be for many years.

The Communist leaders may conclude that it is in their interest to stimulate our all-out mobilization without their actually precipitating war. They may believe that we will get bogged down in the quicksands of inflation and that our productive power will get so snarled up under economic controls that their chance of winning would be relatively better if they delayed for an additional few years. We have, therefore, to make an extremely difficult decision as to the speed and extent of our mobilization program. On this point, too, we should have wide and bipartisan debate before our policy is finally determined.

MEETING OF MINDS NEEDED ON POLICY

It is tragic that President Truman and Secretary Acheson did not welcome Senator TAFT's recent suggestion that he would be glad to sit down with them and work out a policy that both parties could support.

Actually there are many vital areas of agreement between the views Senator TAFT recently expressed and those of the Truman administration.

The administration should emphasize and try to expand them. I would guess that far wider agreement still could result from frank private discussions between the administration and Republican congressional leaders if a reasonable spirit of compromise on nonessentials and a desire for a meeting of the minds in the interest of real national security were evidenced by the administration.

And while we are trying to increase our national strength in a material way, we must steadfastly keep our faith in right principles, from matters of the highest importance to the lowest.

The nation that acts in accordance with principle has the best chance to find the strength and courage for ultimate victory. If a nation does not act from principle but only from expediency, unavoidable defeats may make its people despair and become defeatist.

We should increase our efforts to remove social injustices. If we fail to do that, we help the Communists' propaganda become more effective and thus lessen the likelihood that all of our people will continue to have the faith in our social system and the determination to preserve it that may be necessary.

In conclusion, let me repeat that I am not saying that war with Russia is certain, but rather that there can be no real peace in the world until and unless the philosophy that now motivates the Communist leaders is modified.

In the meantime, the best we can hope for is an armed truce, with the United States possessing such military power in being that the Russians may be deterred from starting a war in view of our terrible power of instant retaliation.

If the American people show wisdom and resolution, I have not the slightest doubt that we can and will permanently keep our freedom, which is more important to Americans than life itself.

Chinese Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, at a time when the Senate is hearing much about the question of how many divisions of troops we should send to Europe, it is particularly important for us to realize that the Armed Forces are only one instrument of national policy. Because it has been concentrated on military questions, this debate has drawn into the shadows, nationally as well as here in Washington, the nonmilitary methods of achieving our ends. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD, a story from Hong Kong in yesterday's New York Times about the rapidly expanding psychological activities of the Chinese Communists. At a moment when the Chinese Communists are flushed with military victories, we find the Peiping radio talking less about the fighting in Korea than about the propaganda victories they are winning on the Chinese mainland.

The news in this story is not that the Communists are concentrating on propaganda. The news is the colossal scale of the effort by which they claim they can reach China's 450,000,000 people with the party line within 24 hours, even in the absence of the big newspaper circulations or a large number of radio receivers. While their people are starving, they build radio networks and train propagandists.

When General Marshall returned from his mission to China I heard him say—and remember, his whole career had been devoted to the effective handling of Army divisions—that the course of history in China for the free world might have been altered by the use of radios and motion pictures on a scale hitherto unheard of.

When I made my first remarks on the floor of this Chamber last March, I think some of my colleagues were a little startled and perhaps unbelieving when I declared that China had fallen, not so much to Communist armies as to Communist propaganda. I commend this New York Times story to the Congress. Its moral for our own policy is obvious.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG RADIO NET AIDS CHINA PROPAGANDA—MANCHURIA AND NORTHERN AREA HEAR VOICE OF PEIPING—AIM IS TO COVER ENTIRE COUNTRY

HONG KONG, January 21.—According to the Peiping radio, Chinese Communists have built up a vast propaganda network through which the voice of Peiping will be heard by virtually half of China's vast population.

In North China and Manchuria, the Communists assert, the propaganda network already is showing results. Unofficial reports said branches of the gigantic network were being set up in other parts of the country.

When the nation-wide network is in full operation, the Communists will be able to make their line of thought known to the country's 450,000,000 inhabitants within 24 hours.

Peiping will be the nerve center of this propaganda network. From there the Chinese Communist policy makers will be able to transmit their speeches and the influential People's Daily in Peiping will be able to broadcast its editorials to even the smallest villages in China. This is the first time in Chinese history that rural districts have received such special attention.

SPECIAL TRAINING

The Communist New China News Agency disclosed that 8,000 party members in North China recently were mobilized to undergo special training in propaganda work. They form the nucleus of the propaganda network.

They were assigned to handle political indoctrination and supervise the "learning of current affairs" among 2,000,000 People's Militiamen in North China.

In Hopei Province alone more than 40,000 primary teachers were trained to mold students and lead local political activities in rural districts. The Province also trained 30,000 winter school teachers to conduct adult classes among farmers. The network also has 6,000 full-time propagandists to distribute material received from Peiping.

In the neighboring Province of Shansi winter schools for farmers have special newspaper-reading classes.

In conducting propaganda the Communists employ various forms, mostly vocal and visual. There are street-corner theatrical performances, Yanko songs and dances, singing story tellers, lantern slides, movies, cartoons, blackboard newspapers, and housetop loudspeakers, to relay Communist broadcasts.

NEWSCASTS COPIED

In Hopei as well as Shansi Province copyists in every county listen to Communist newscasts from Peiping and distribute mimeographed sheets which are used as textbooks for various winter schools.

In north China, according to the New China News Agency, the propaganda network handled the recent anti-American Korean aid movement so successfully that farmers whose minds previously were paralyzed now are responding warmly to the call of resisting Americans and defending the fatherland. Many have put down names to join the people's volunteers in Korea or to serve as stretcher bearers, the news agency added. They have also shown a high degree of enthusiasm in turning in grains to state granaries.

In Manchuria the Communist propaganda network is built on workers' schools where laborers attend classes after working hours. In the North Manchurian Province of Heilungkiang alone there are more than 34,000 authorized propagandists. In Antung City, which is across the Yalu River from the North Korean city of Sinuiju, 1,400 propagandists drum up feeling against the United States.

In the western Manchurian Province of Jehol 360 laborers attend workers' schools and 200,000 peasants attend winter schools where propaganda also is intensively conducted both in basic party lines and as current affairs.

Petition of the People's Lobby of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition of the People's Lobby of California:

To the President of the United States of America, Harry S. Truman, the Senate, the House of Representatives:

The board of directors of the People's Lobby of California organization, through its committee, passed the following resolution at its regular meeting in Los Angeles, Calif., Monday, July 17, 1950:

Whereas the United Nations Security Council has commenced proceedings involving the United Nations flag for war; and

Whereas such action by the UN violates the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas such action by the UN is unconstitutional and illegal; and

1. To exercise such interference among nations is illegal and violates article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, in which it states, "Congress shall declare war";

Now, therefore, it is the sense of the board of directors of the People's Lobby of California that (1) such proceedings as those above mentioned are of vital concern to the people and civic organizations; (2) all civic organizations should take all necessary steps to inform themselves of the issues involved and defend themselves against such usurpation of power by the United Nations Security Council by all appropriate methods including bringing the same to the attention of the Congress and of the people; (4) the matter should be retained on the board's agenda for further consideration, and should move actively to participate in this matter.

On July 7, 1950, the United Nations Security presented a resolution relative to, the use of the United Nations flag for war. Such use of police force power violates the UN Charter, and the resolution passed by UN July 7, 1950, is unconstitutional and illegal.

No American soldier should be permitted to enter battle and offer his services and life under any emblem other than the flag of the United States of America.

The United World Federalists favored before our State legislature the resolution which was passed favoring a world government. Our organization opposed the passage of the resolution and was partially responsible for securing its revocation.

The ground of our opposition was the effect of such world government in nullifying the provisions of our Constitution, that war must be declared by action of Congress.

If this is a trick to strengthen the UN into world government which would give mixed ideologies prestige, establish a precedent for police rule through the UN, it would be the first step to the last chapter where we would give up our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and our Republic of the United States of America.

The UN is exceeding its power to make puppets of our President, Senators, and the Congressmen. If we are not fighting for the United States ideals of freedom, then why are we fighting? If our boys and young women are induced to fight for peace with honor, we want it to be only under our own Stars and Stripes, representing the United States and the Republic.

The United Nations was set up for peace, not war. Why then should they be sent to foreign soil over the nation of Korea squabble? We oppose foreign entanglements and, most certainly oppose any entanglement that would create, or help to create world government and, the nullifying of the Constitution of the United States.

We request proper action on the part of our House of Representatives and the Senate to take such action as will make the action in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

The petition of resolution above is prayerfully submitted by the committee and patriotic citizen names attached and in behalf of the people of the United States.

Respectfully,

People's Lobby of California, now United Patriotic People, U. S. A., Los Angeles, Calif.; Clara McDonald, President; Dr. Charles T. Murdock, Vice President; D. B. Troth, Executive Secretary; Katie B. Gay, Mrs. Frances Tufts, Nicholas Kushch; Joseph Weldon Anderson; Mrs. Maude B. Jones, R. C. W. Priday, Joy A. Winans, Regina V. Farris, Michael J. Riedel, Annetta Heap, Clarence E. Burr, George D. Higgins, Margaret Wheeler Hess, Betty Henderson, Mary P. Cathey, Elsie M. Smoot, Helen Mary Lucas, Max E. Perkins, Mrs. Lucile Anderson, Homer A. Jones, Sr., Frederick L. Boon, Dr. Robert B. Anderson, Mrs. Ethel H. Richards, Anne G. Webb, Goldye M. Brierton, Mrs. Lou T. Downs, Russell P. Howard, Sam P. Fontano, Frank B. Hewitt, Amy E. Merrihew, Rae Eichman, E. L. Parker, Frank B. Obiquist.

Contribution of Small Business to Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article by me entitled "Small Business To Do Its Share," which was published in the Daily News Record on Monday, January 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS TO DO ITS SHARE—MANUFACTURERS, RETAILERS OF ALL SIZES READY TO SERVE IN EMERGENCY—INVENTORIES IN STORES SEEM AMPLE FOR AT LEAST 6 MONTHS

(By Senator GUY M. GILLETTE)

WASHINGTON.—The crisis confronting our country today may ultimately determine whether we, as a Nation, are to exist free or in bondage. It is difficult to overestimate the seriousness of the situation in which the entire world finds itself. Never before in our history has the need been greater for America to stay strong—and become stronger.

If we are to preserve our political democracy—the cherished ideals and institutions upon which this Nation was founded—we must bend every effort to maintain and strengthen our economic democracy. For our system of competitive free enterprise is one of the prime sources of our national vigor.

To stem the tide of aggression, the President has ordered mobilization of our manpower. Congress has blueprinted the effective use of our vast industrial potential. Now is the time to make certain that small business, the broad base of our great industrial and commercial pyramid, has the opportunity to contribute its full share to our war effort.

It would be folly for us not to profit by the bitter experience of small-business men in the early years of World War II. Unfortunately for many a small operator, it was then a question of too little and much too late. While our defense effort got under way in 1940, it was not until the middle of 1942 that official notice was taken of the thousands of small-business facilities which were being bypassed in the race for more and more production. For two critical years, small-business men waited outside the defense-production door for such subcontracting crumbs as might fall their way. Their plants lay idle. Their supply of materials dried up. Their skilled labor drifted away to larger plants, whose backlogs of orders were even then reflected in weapon shortages on the fighting fronts.

In an industrial mobilization program, it is customary to emphasize the role of manufacturers, since they produce the actual materials of warfare. We must not forget, however, that most retail establishments serve basic civilian needs and have an indispensable place in any wartime economy.

Moreover, retailing is essentially small business. Slightly more than one-half of the 3,670,000 business concerns in the country are engaged in retailing. And more than two-thirds of all retail establishments in the apparel, shoes, and accessories field employ fewer than four persons. In every neighborhood throughout the Nation, we find that the small retailer is the very heart of the business community.

During World War II, with its serious material shortages and rationing of civilian goods, many small retailers failed to survive. While their costs of doing business rose, the volume of merchandise they had to sell declined.

Today, there is hope that, at least for the next 6 months, the dislocations in our civilian economy may not be too severe. Inventories of consumers' goods on retail shelves and in industry warehouses, seem ample for several months to come.

In addition, with employment at a record high, the prospect of millions of dollars in overtime wages and a vast Government-spending program point to a continued brisk demand for merchandise, especially in the apparel lines.

What shortages develop will in all probability be spotty. Increased dollar volume should more than compensate for loss of sales through shortages. In fact, some retailers feel that dollar sales may exceed comparable 1950 figures by as much as 10 percent. This, unfortunately, will probably be attained through higher prices to the consumer, rather than by an increase in unit sales.

As nearly as can be foretold at this time, the heaviest demand seems likely to be in the accessories, ready-to-wear, and men's and boys' wear lines.

In their planning for the future, all businessmen, and especially the small-business man, must take into consideration the prospects of even higher taxes. It is clear that at this time we are able to estimate our tax needs only for short periods and within the shifting framework of our military requirements. Although we cannot calculate with certainty the exact amounts needed, tax policies in general will be governed by three main objectives. These are: (1) A tax load commensurate with our defense expenditures, (2) control of inflationary forces, and (3) expansion of essential civilian and military production.

Two provisions of the excess-profits tax just passed by Congress were designed to be of specific aid to small business. Under the old law, no minimum credit was provided. Now, any company earning less than $25,000 will not have to pay an excess-profits tax. In addition, new companies—those started since the beginning of 1946—will be entitled to a credit equal to their entire industry's average rate of return on assets during the base period.

The only way for our Nation to minimize the inevitable dislocations which will occur as the war-mobilization program gains speed is for business, Government, and consumers to work hand in hand. Our American retail trade has a splendid reputation for cooperation. It is gratifying to observe the readiness with which the cotton-textile industry and the men's-wear industry have pledged their cooperation with voluntary system of price controls.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am proud to be a member, plans to exercise every means at its disposal to assure that in the present race for defense production the vital interests of small business are not overlooked. In this regard, let us fervently hope that the bitter lessons of the last war were not lost upon us. If we cannot learn from so recent an experience, the road ahead will be rocky indeed.

We may well ask ourselves this question: How firm and enduring will the foundation of our cherished political democracy be if we allow our economic democracy to crumble? In some places in the world today even to be permitted to conduct a business is a privilege. In America it is a right. Now and in the perilous days ahead we cannot afford to take any chances with our traditional institution of free and independent enterprise. We cannot afford to ignore the needs of the small-business men, who, by their numbers, furnish the major portion of our national productive and service facilities.

America cannot be strong; America cannot stay strong—without independent enterprise.

Resolution Adopted by the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, January 19, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Senate Joint Memorial 2

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a department of natural resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the location of a United States Military Academy of the Air in Colorado

Whereas the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, has recommended the reorganization of the Department of the Interior and the incorporation of its functions and related functions concerned with the conservation and development of natural resources into a new Department of Natural Resources; and

Whereas it would be highly desirable that regional offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies be established in order to bring the Federal Government and its activities closer to the people; and

Whereas consideration is being given to the establishment of a United States Military Academy of the Air: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for—

(1) The creation of a new Department of Natural Resources;

(2) The location of a regional office of that department and of other important Federal departments and agencies in Colorado; and

(3) The location of the United States Military Academy of the Air likewise in Colorado.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado of the United States.

GORDON ALLOTT,
President of the Senate.
MELBERG H. CRESSWELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
DAVID A. HAMIL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
VINCENT CRAWSHAW,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Opposition to United States-Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Many Here Opposed to United States-Korean War," published in the Benson County, N. Dak., Courier of January 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL FINDS FOLKS THINKING AND CONCERNED—MANY HERE OPPOSED TO UNITED STATES-KOREAN WAR

There is a lot of opinion—some offered as expert; some just comment—to be heard on the world situation, how it affects us as a nation, and what we should do about it.

A lot of the comment heard on the air and available through the syndicated columns in the newspapers is regarded by some to be the reflection of special interests. Some probably is; some is not.

The Courier believes the real voice of America is the opinion to be heard on the streets, in the cafes and stores, and in homes where people on the grass-roots level congregate. These opinions, magnified thousands of times, are the real voice of America.

We present here 15 opinions on the current international situation from Benson County folks. The opinions were solicited for publication and are necessarily brief. They are not intended to be related to one another.

J. G. Johnson, Leeds plumber: "I think we should get out of Korea and get back to Japan and watch Europe more closely. We should furnish material to Europe, but there should be an understanding that they should attempt to defend their own countries."

Joseph Blegen, Leeds township farmer: "I've wondered what we were doing in Korea in the first place. I've asked and have yet to get a satisfactory answer. I think we should keep our forces closer to home—at least till we see how things are shaping up."

Harold Whalen, Knox merchant: "The State Department is right in withholding aid from the Chinese Nationalist Government under Chiang Kai-shek, whose government for years practiced corruption in keeping the peasants of China in a state of servitude. I think any American forces sent to Europe should be matched at least man for man by the European nations. I don't think we should help any Communist nation—Yugoslavia included; communism is communism, wherever it is. I think the American people should wake up to the dangers of McCarthyism." (Whalen observed conditions in China firsthand as an American pilot there during World War II.)

Nels C. Fosen, Springfield Township, farmer: "I am absolutely for getting out of Korea. I don't know what we were doing there in the first place."

Oscar Tufte, Leeds, merchant: "I think TAFT is closer to right than anybody so far. I think it is a mistake to stop Nationalist China from opposing Red China and also in not rearming the Japs. I think the Japs should have a land army only, but Japan could protect themselves and our bases, too."

A. E. Petsinger, Leeds, merchant: "I can't help but feel that we should draw back to Japan till they make up their minds what they are doing. I can't see losing a lot of lives in Korea for what seems to be no gain. I don't think we should send more than our proportionate share of troops to Europe."

Fritz Hove, York Township, farmer: "I don't think we ever had any business in Korea. We're just as much an aggressor as Russia would be in moving into Mexico in the name of peace. Rather than so much stress on rearmament, I think we should have more faith in United Nations. I think Red China should be recognized. They are a majority of the people there. A big army here could bring economic breakdown—and communism. Russia can't impose communism here."

C. T. Madsen, Maddock, creamery manager: "I feel we have our elected officials and their military staff, and we'll have to rely on their judgment and hope for the best. I don't feel that the State legislature was in position to judge on the Korean situation."

Palmer Larson, York, farmer: "I feel we should do our share, but I also believe the other nations seem to be expecting too much of us in manpower and finances, both in Korea and Europe. I think the next war will take longer to win than any before."

Matt Johnson, Wolford, farmer: "I'm afraid we are going to have another big war, and I think we can win it, but to say what has been right or wrong with what we have done so far is hard to say from what we know."

Mrs. Frank O'Connell, Brinsmade, housewife: "It's hard to know what to say. I have maintained that the United States has been the goat for the world in previous wars. I don't say that we should try to fight man-for-man with the North Koreans and Chinese. I'd say one American is worth five Reds, and we don't want to spend our manpower in that way. Maybe if we knew more, we could appreciate the situation better."

Mrs. Einer Skold, rural Leeds, housewife: "I don't think we should send all our men over to Korea to fight. I don't think it's worth it to lose as many men as we have. I think we should send help to Europe to fight communism before it gets to this country."

Miss Nora Jacobsen, Leeds, music teacher: "Way down deep in my heart I can't help but feel that we are not going to have an all-out war, that somehow, something will come to make those people over there change to be better able to reason, feel, and understand. I think we have all gotten away from the fundamental Christian principles."

John Johnson, Leeds, farmer: "I don't think we should pull out of Korea. That would be the same as giving up. It doesn't seem that it should be so hard to hold. European nations should have help."

John Burkhardsmeier, Leeds, cafe operator: "We'd be a lot better off if we'd mind our business and let other nations mind theirs. We had no business in Korea. Hoover is no fool."

The Good-Faith Sales Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article by Harold Fleming. The article is to be found in the Christian Science Monitor of January 15. It relates to the "good-faith sales rule" and it is worth reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD FAITH SALES RULE BY COURT HELD WEIGHTY

(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK.—The recent Supreme Court 5 to 3 decision in the so-called Standard of Indiana or Detroit gasoline case is considered by antitrust lawyers here as the most important high court decision on the antitrust laws since the Cement Institute (basing-point) case in 1948.

It is also virtually the first important antitrust decision in over a decade which has upheld the position of a large corporation against Government lawyers.

The other such decision was in the Columbia Steel case, allowing United States Steel to buy a west coast steel fabricator. But in its Columbia decision the court obliquely took into account the west coast's interest in getting in new eastern steel capital. Also the Columbia decision was 5 to 4, and the minority report contained Justice Douglas' famous remark: "Here is the curse of bigness." But in the recent Indiana decision Justice Douglas sided with the majority.

LEGALITY OF DISCRIMINATION

The original and basic issue in the case was the legality of good faith price discrimination.

A price discrimination under the Clayton Act of 1914 and its amendment, the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, merely means the giving of a lower price to one customer than to another.

The law prohibits such discriminations—but with certain exceptions. One is for quantity discounts when justified to the Federal Trade Commission on the basis of cost savings on large orders. Another is where the reduction is made in good faith for the purpose of meeting a competitor's price. Such was the Indiana case.

In this case the Indiana company sold gasoline to certain Detroit jobbers. A competitor offered these jobbers lower prices. Indiana met the lower prices. But this enabled some of these jobbers to undercut some retailers to whom the Indiana company sold direct.

GOOD-FAITH EXEMPTION

Some of these retailers complained to the FTC. The Commission ordered Indiana to quit granting these lower prices to these jobbers. Indiana replied that it had to make these prices or lose the business; that the cuts were made in good-faith competition. The FTC replied that the good-faith exemption was in section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, and so didn't apply to section 2 (a) under which Indiana's cuts were injuring competitors (i. e., some of Indiana's retail customers).

The court of appeals agreed unanimously with the FTC, but the Supreme Court has now restored to the law the meaning most people thought it had before the Indiana case. Said the Supreme Court majority: "There is nothing to show a congressional purpose * * * to compel the seller to choose only between ruinously cutting its prices to all its customers to match the price offered to one or refusing to meet the competition and then ruinously raising its prices to its remaining customers to cover increased unit costs."

RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE

There was, however, another aspect of the case, not dwelt on by the high court, involving resale price maintenance. The background on this is shown by the following quotations taken from chapter 5, The Forgotten Consumer, of a forthcoming book on the antitrust laws by Harold Fleming, to be published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., in February under the title "Ten Thousand Commandments."

"Long before World War I * * * a group of retail lumber dealers were angered by a number of wholesale lumbermen. The wholesale firms were edging into the retail business, and * * * not respecting the usual retail mark-up. * * * The retailers, however, felt that they had a fair and proper place in the business, including markup, and that it should be protected.

"At about the same time a leading patent medicine company, Dr. Miles, fell out with some of its distributors. They were not maintaining the retail price. * * *

"The Supreme Court had little difficulty in striking down both of these efforts at what is now called resale price maintenance. If distributors wanted to cut prices below the customary margins, that was all right with the Court. It was a form of competition, and it benefited the consumer. (*U. S. v. Eastern States Retail Lumber Association* (234, U. S. 600 (1914)), and *Dr. Miles Medical Co. v. John D. Park & Sons Co.* (22 U. S. (1911)).

"Much more recently the Supreme Court made a similar finding in the Ethyl Gasoline case. * * * It here again struck down resale-price maintenance. * * * Recently the Federal Trade Commission found resale-price maintenance to be a violation also of the Federal Trade Commission Act as an unfair method of competition."

"FTC REVERSES ITSELF IN DETROIT CASE

"[But] in an astonishing recent case—the so-called Detroit gasoline case—the FTC reversed itself in effect and required a big oil company practically to enforce resale price maintenance on certain of its jobber-retailer customers. What happened in the case was this:

"The Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, had in Detroit, what is called a 'dual-distribution system' * * * it sold, on the one hand, direct to several hundred retail gas stations; and, on the other hand, to four jobbers, some of whom not only sold to retailers but also sold at retail * * * direct to consumers.

"Standard sold to the jobbers at 1½ cents a gallon lower than it sold to retail-station operators. This was a tank-car price to the jobbers, and a tank-wagon price to the retailers. This was not a wide spread. In fact, a number of oil companies had been fined a few years earlier under the Sherman Act for holding the jobber-retailer spread at 2 cents. (C. R. 11366, 5, Western District of Wisconsin, 1936, companion case to the so-called Madison case (310 U. S. 150).)

"COMPETITIVE BATTLE AGGRAVATED

"One of these jobbers, however, selling at retail through its own service stations, often passed on some of this discount to the drive-in customers during some of the repeated price battles that raged in the Detroit gasoline business. And this tended to aggravate the competitive battle, pull down retail prices to the consumer, and hurt some of this jobber-retailer's competitors.

"The FTC thereupon ordered the Indiana Standard Co., among other things, to cease dealing with any wholesaler who [it] knows, or should know, will not maintain [its] price to retailers. And the court of appeals upheld the FTC in this, saying that Standard might, under the right to choose its customers, refuse to sell to wholesalers who sell to retailers below the price [it] makes to its own retailers.

"By odd coincidence, a somewhat similar case was tried in Milwaukee at about the same time, also involving gasoline prices but with a quite different outcome. * * * It was Detroit gasoline dealers who * * * precipitated this FTC price maintenance ruling. But meantime the State of Wisconsin was winning a case against price maintenance in Milwaukee. The Milwaukee Retail Gasoline Dealers' Association had sent bulletins to its members suggesting resale prices, which were adhered to by more than 90 percent of its members, while only 55 percent of the nonmember dealers to whom these bulletins were sent maintained the suggested price. The Wisconsin court found the association to have conspired to maintain gasoline prices, fined it $2,000, and ordered its charter dissolved.

"The Wisconsin proceeding was brought under a State antitrust law. This law and the action taken under it were in line with the original spirit of the Federal antitrust laws."

The Phillips Petroleum Natural Gas Rate Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is tremendous interest in the State of Wisconsin and throughout the Midwest in the long-pending investigation by the Federal Power Commission of alleged excessive prices charged for natural gas at the well-head by the Phillips Petroleum Co. Unfortunately, however, there have been no fewer than seven postponements of the hearing, all but one of which have been due to the company itself.

Now, we all recognize that the high cost of living is one of the gravest problems which America faces on the home front. Naturally the fuel element in that high cost must be controlled if we are to prevent further terrific inflationary pressures from developing in our already over-inflated economy. For this reason I was happy to act upon a sound recommendation which I had received from the new attorney general of the State of Wisconsin, the Hon. Vernon Thomson. This distinguished officer recommended that on behalf of my State, I contact the Federal Power Commission urging the setting of a day certain for the filing of evidence. I was happy to do so, not only in the interest of Wisconsin consumers but in interest of other Midwestern consumers as well, and more important, in the interest of the over-all national effort to hold the price line.

There is, as I have said, widespread interest in this subject, and for that reason in order that my position on behalf of the setting of a specific hearing date may be absolutely clear, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following items:

(a) The text of the letter from the attorney general of Wisconsin to me;

(b) The text of my reply to him;

(c) The text of my letter to Chairman Walgren, of the Federal Power Commission; and finally,

(d) The text of an illuminating editorial which appeared in the Wednesday, January 17, issue of the Milwaukee Journal.

There being no objection, the letters and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Madison, January 9, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In October 1948, the Federal Power Commission initiated an investigatory proceeding upon its own motion as to the status of the Phillips Petroleum Co. under the Natural Gas Act.

A copy of the order describing the basis for the Commission's action is enclosed herewith and is self-explanatory.

The respondent, Phillips Petroleum Co., is the exclusive supplier of natural gas to the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co., which in turn is the exclusive wholesale supplier of natural gas to Wisconsin distributing companies. The price of natural gas at the wellhead is a material factor in the composition of the price to the consumer in Wisconsin.

The contract between Phillips Petroleum Co. and the pipeline company is a subject of inquiry in this proceeding. It is interesting to note that the price of the gas supplied by Phillips Petroleum to the pipeline company was increased five times between the date the contract was first entered into and the date the first cubic foot of gas was delivered into our State. This, notwithstanding the contract was supposed to be an arms-length transaction.

It can readily be seen that unless some control is exerted over the sale of the gas from the supplier to the pipeline company, the regulation of the price between the pipeline company and the distributors becomes an empty and meaningless formality.

You are fully conversant with the Kerr bill which was vetoed by the President in the last session of Congress. The effect of that bill, among other things, would have been to nullify the basis for the present inquiry into the status of the Phillips Petroleum Co. It is my understanding that the cost of gas charged by Phillips Petroleum Co. to the pipeline company is approximately $5,000,000 per year greater than the amount which would have been permitted under the original contract. It is conceivable that if the matter goes to hearing and the State of Wisconsin prevails upon its contentions, a substantial saving will be effected to the consumer public in this State and in other States served by the pipeline company.

The Phillips Petroleum Co. has endeavored from time to time to postpone the hearing. It now relies heavily upon its participation in the national mobilization effort as the basis for a motion for indefinite postponement of the hearing. The State of Wisconsin does not wish to interfere with this company's participation in the national mobilization effort. However, by a motion being filed with the Commission this day, I believe we have suggested a procedure under which the public interest can be fully served and the respondent company's participation in the national mobilization effort can be fully protected. A copy of that written motion is enclosed herewith and is self-explanatory.

In your capacity as a member of the bar, and as as a representative of the public interest of the citizens of Wisconsin, I request that you study this matter; and if you share my conclusions as expressed in the enclosed motion for a definite hearing date, I request that you communicate with Chairman Wallgren, of the Federal Power Commission, and submit your viewpoint to him.

Respectfully,

VERNON W. THOMSON,
Attorney General.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 15, 1951.

Re Federal Power Commission Natural Gas case.

Hon. VERNON THOMSON,
Attorney General, State of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wis.

MY DEAR VERNON: I appreciate very much your fine letter of January 9 and enclosed materials setting forth the petition by our State of Wisconsin to the Federal Power Commission for the setting of a hearing for a day certain in the Phillips Petroleum case.

I have read through your letter and enclosures most carefully, and I should like to state now that I feel that Wisconsin is on completely sound grounds in urging no further postponement of the seven-times delayed FPC hearing. I shall, therefore, in compliance with your suggestion, immediately contact the Commission along the lines set forth in the enclosed letter to Chairman Walgren.

As you will kindly recall, I voted against the Kerr bill which would, as you say, have nullified the basis for the present inquiry into the status of the Phillips Petroleum Co. From all the evidence I have seen since my vote, I believe more strongly than ever that the natural gas companies must be controlled at the source of supply. Obviously there is tremendous pressure for cost of living increases all along the line, and I feel that the consumers of Wisconsin and other States are being squeezed enough already without having to worry about still further increases in natural gas rates.

Be assured, therefore, of my complete cooperation with your office toward the objective you have well stated. I shall be happy to receive your further suggestions and reactions.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 15, 1951.

Re Phillips Petroleum Natural Gas case.

Hon. MON WALLGREN,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you to express my complete support of the position adopted by the State of Wisconsin in urging that there be no further postponement of the Federal Power Commission hearing on the Phillips Petroleum Co. Natural Gas case.

I have endorsed the sentiments expressed by the attorney general of my State, the Honorable Vernon Thomson, in contending that no further postponement of the hearing is justified. Neither my State nor any other State would want to interfere with the participation by this company in the national mobilization effort; however, I do not believe that the hearing contemplated under Wisconsin's appeal would in the slightest constitute such interference.

I do not like to see "the national defense effort" or "the mobilization emergency" be used as a cloak under which any company seeking its own self-interest can justify any arbitrary action. Already the hearing has been postponed seven times and all but one of those times such postponement had been requested by Phillips.

I want to be fair to this company but I feel that it is infinitely more important that we be fair to the public interest as set forth by the Wisconsin brief.

I appeal to you, therefore, and to your fellow Commission members to immediately set a day certain under which the evidence would be presented in this case.

I feel that the Federal Power Commission owes an obligation to the consumers of my State and to the sovereign State itself. Already the price of gas supplied by this company to the pipeline company has increased five times between the date the contract was first entered into and the date the first cubic foot of gas was delivered into our State.

These facts, it seems to me, underline the imperative necessity for an immediate hearing. I do not presume to judge the merits of the case in detail because that is a matter for the Commission itself to determine; but I do presume, because it is my right as a United States Senator, to respectfully urge that there be no further stalling.

Looking forward to hearing from you on this matter, and with all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, January 17, 1951]

FPC REFUSES TO PROTECT USER OF NATURAL GAS; WHY IS THIS?

A year ago natural gas consumers won what seemed to be a great victory when President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill, which would have removed so-called independent natural gas producers from control of the Federal Power Commission.

There is disquieting evidence that the victory may have been hollow. The FPC, after winning the right to "control," isn't showing much interest in "controlling."

Long ago the State of Wisconsin and the city of Detroit asked the FPC to investigate alleged "excessive prices" charged for gas at the wellhead by the Phillips Petroleum Co. Phillips, which owns 12 percent of the Nation's natural gas reserves, is exclusive supplier of the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., one of the two wholesalers in the Wisconsin market.

Gas in the area served by the pipe line company is costing consumers $5,000,000 more a year than original contract agreements set because Phillips has made five successive price boosts, the State of Wisconsin claims.

The first hearing on the State's complaint was set for last March. It has been postponed seven times. On December 19 the FPC, at the urging of the Phillips Co., voted "indefinitely to postpone" the hearings. That, in effect, gave Phillips a clear field for setting any gas rate it desires. The decision to kill the investigation will be reconsidered, because one commissioner was absent when the vote was taken. But the 3 to 1 vote knocking the probe on the head doesn't lend much hope of reviving it unless one of the majority can be persuaded to change his mind.

The entire fight against the Kerr bill was based on the theory that unless gas prices can be controlled at the wellhead, controls by the FPC of pipeline rates and by the Wisconsin and other State public service commissions of consumer rates are "an empty and meaningless formality."

The wellhead price, as Attorney General Vernon Thomson, of Wisconsin, has pointed out, of necessity sets pipeline and consumer prices. If Phillips can raise prices at will the FPC and the State PSC are wasting their time—and consumers have no protection.

Phillips' argument against the investigation is ridiculous. The company has claimed that if it has to spend time defending itself at hearings the national defense and mobilization effort will be hampered. This is pure

holium. The defense and mobilization effort will be much more hampered if gas prices are allowed to soar far above legitimate levels and to add to the already high cost of living.

The FPC is charged with protecting the public. If it refuses Wisconsin's request for an investigation aimed at protecting natural gas consumers it ought to be investigated itself.

A New Congress Sits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New Congress Sits," published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader of January 4, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW CONGRESS SITS

While it seems more important to us in North Dakota that we have a legislature in session, we should not forget the national—and international—importance of the fact that a new Congress opened in Washington the day after our legislature opened.

What can we expect from this new national legislative body?

It seems to be the unanimous opinion of economic experts that we can expect more taxes, less and more expensive goods (inflation), and that on the whole it would be a very good idea if we could have avoided living during this next year. We shall have less of almost everything that goes into the American standard of living, and we shall pay more for less. We shall also pay more into the national treasury in taxes of all sorts. Not a very cheerful prospect being held out for us.

Some of those threatened things have already come to pass.

It was not necessary for the President to await the approval of the new Congress to put some of the things into effect. He had wartime powers already written into law that gave him the right to issue executive orders. But the Congress will have to implement (what a miserable word to use in this connection, but economists use it and seem to adore it) his program, whatever it might be or become. We might as well believe this, for there is not the slightest disagreement among experts about this.

Congress will have to give the President a lot of things he is going to ask for. Whether the Members like Mr. Truman makes not the slightest difference for the President is in a position that guarantees him his way in a lot of things, so long as there is a war threat hanging over the world.

There will not be much room in Washington, or in the national legislature, for politics as such. The welfare of the Nation is the concern of all of us, congressional Members included, and broadly interpreted, the aim of the administration must be the aims of the Nation, irrespective of political feeling of the person in Congress who must vote for or against what the President and his advisers propose.

The job of our State legislators may seem tough. But it is of little hardship compared to what the Members of Congress must do. What we do in our own State effects our own State principally, if not entirely. What Congress does affects not only the entire Nation, but the entire anti-Communist world.

The eyes of the whole world are on our national Congress and our President. What Washington does is of supreme importance.

Proposed Draft of Youths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Mothers and Youths Unduly Frightened About War Outlook," by Roger W. Babson. This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star and other afternoon papers of January 22, 1951, and I think it is well worth including in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTHERS AND YOUTHS UNDULY FRIGHTENED ABOUT WAR OUTLOOK, DECLARES BABSON

(By Roger W. Babson)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—I am not a military expert and cannot speak with authority as to what is to happen to our 18- to 22-year-old young men during the next few years. The plans and hopes of many homes, jobs, and colleges are completely upset.

Let me, however, add a little hope to frightened families. Men who know what the probabilities are assure me that the future is not as bad as it now looks. They insist that only a few more boys will be shipped to Asia. We will be willing to supply guns and munitions to enable the Japanese to protect Japan, to enable Nationalists to hold Formosa, and to give needed aid to the Philippines. But no more American boys will be sent to Korea, Indochina, Burma, India, or elsewhere in Asia.

Experts at Washington believe world war III, if it comes, will be fought mainly by the Navy and Air Force. They say it would be suicidal to depend upon numbers of infantry to meet the Russians, even in Europe. With the large number of Communists who infect each European country, it may be best to limit our help to Western Europe to supplying them with A-bombs. Therefore, I believe mothers and boys are unnecessarily excited. Americans seem unable to strike a middle course. They either ignore danger and insist on business, profits, wages, and entertainment as usual, or else become panic-stricken and go too far in the opposite direction.

I, therefore, strongly advise that parents and their youths avoid getting unduly excited. First, the chances are 3 to 2 that Russia will not risk a "hot war" for some time to come, and second, if only the present "cold war" continues, 2,500,000 young men in training would be a nuisance and handicap to all concerned. I, moreover, speak with some authority, having founded three colleges and graduated thousands of young men.

I further advise young men between 18 and 20 to quit listening to radio commentators who know no more as to the future than you, my readers, do. Go on about your plans for schooling or work the same as if no war is now probable. Then if you are called, it will be O. K.; while the chances are 50-50 you won't be called. When you go to work, get a job with some industry which is essential to the war program; don't be content to jerk sodas or drive a truck.

WAR WILL NEED BRAINS

The next few years offer a great opportunity for young men to become expert in some one line of work. The new defense efforts enable a young man to take tests and ascertain for what he is best fitted and how to train therefor. If you live in a small town where there are no industries, have your mother teach you to cook. This is becoming a real profession. Drafted young men who can qualify as trained cooks are always given good opportunities for advancement.

The trouble with parents and youths today is that they visualize the next war—if it comes—will be like the last war. This is a great mistake. We cannot lick Russia by numbers. Korea proved this. It was our intelligence forces that let us down. We can win by brains. If world war III comes it will be a conflict of superior intelligence. Hence, let our youth prepare to use their brains; while the poor Russians, Chinese, and other peoples are treated as cannon fodder. If General MacArthur had given more attention to the intelligence division of his Army and less to old-fashioned fighting customs, things would be different.

REMEMBER OUR RELIGION

Finally, let us parents not forget that God continues to rule in His Heaven and that, in the long run, the Russians can never win without Him. God is still our refuge and our strength if we will cease worrying and take each day as it comes. Let us give more time to reading our Bibles and less to television or radio. Perhaps God is using the Russians to again bring us to our knees and to make our young people—who have had things pretty easy—"stop, look, and listen."

McMahon's Plan To Express Amity Toward Russians Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article entitled "McMahon's Plan To Express Amity Toward Russians Hailed," written by David Lawrence, in his column Today in Washington, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCMAHON'S PLAN TO EXPRESS AMITY TOWARD RUSSIANS HAILED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator BRIEN MCMAHON's proposal of a resolution to be adopted by the Senate expressing friendship for the Russian people is the first sign of common sense that has come in a long while from officialdom here on the subject of moral force as a preventive of war.

The assumption that because armament has to be increased substantially to meet outbreaks of aggression, all other forms of

peaceful effort to prevent war need not be pressed is erroneous. Yet whenever military measures take the limelight these other methods of avoiding war seem to be sidetracked.

With two world wars to remind mankind that military conquest does not really bring peace, there have been equally erroneous assumptions current that military strength has become futile or unnecessary. The truth is that defense armament is indispensable, and so is an armament of reason and genuine friendship expressed by one set of peoples to the other.

THE CAUSES OF WAR

The Russian people are not bellicose by nature. They do not want war any more than do the people of the Allied countries. Inasmuch as all peoples would prefer the ways of peace to armed hostilities, the real question always is why there should be any wars. Generally they result from the acts of a dictator or of a small group of men—oligarchies, they used to call them in ancient days—who exploit whole nations and force the young to go to war by inflaming public opinion against other countries.

There is no reason to believe that, if the minds of the 200,000,000 people of Soviet Russia could be reached with genuine evidences of friendship, the rules of the Communist regime would have the power to take the steps of aggression which have now brought the world to the brink of war.

Like all other moves of this kind—and they are by no means novel—the question of methods and means arises. The United States has brought forth what is known as the Voice of America program. This project was for a long time in need of funds, but now has the money from Congress. What is lacking is the ideas that must go into such an undertaking to make it successful. Those ideas cannot begin and end on the bureaucratic level. They must come from the very top level of our policy makers. They must be part of national and international policy.

Today the Voice of America is just one of a number of bureaus in the State Department. It ought to be an important agency independent of any department and reporting directly to the President. It should have enough prestige to command the sympathetic support of Members of both Houses of Congress. It should be the "public relations" instrument of the Government itself in international relations. Few men who have been at the head of the State Department have ever been qualified to do this type of planning even if they had the time to devote to it.

But to occupy so important a role, the project must have Cabinet-level ranking and must be composed of advisers who are able to suggest major policies that will appeal to other nations, especially those behind the iron curtain. Strange, indeed, that nobody has put any official momentum behind the idea of a formal expression of friendship by the Congress addressed to the people of Soviet Russia or that other moves which can appeal to peoples behind the iron curtain should not have come before now from authoritative quarters.

MUST CAPTURE IMAGINATION

The Voice of America can relay messages and broadcast interesting scrips and carry a polemic technique to counteract Communist propaganda, but that's not enough. There must be ways to capture the imagination of the Russian people. That's why the suggestion by Senator MCMAHON is likely to prove more penetrating that all the high-sounding speeches of diplomatic phraseology that come forth so regularly as the only expression of American idealism.

But will such policies of friendship and other proposals get through to the people behind the iron curtain? The answer is that any event of sensational importance percolates through any man-made barrier. The persons who go and come across the border from the satellite states to the free world are constantly discussing these same issues. Word-of-mouth distribution of ideas still remains the most effective single instrument of communication the world has ever known.

Proposed Draft of 18-Year-Old Youths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter I have received from Frederic B. Terry, of Waynesboro, Pa., quoting an article by Dr. Charles S. Tippetts, headmaster of the Mercersburg Academy, at Mercersburg, Pa., regarding the proposal to draft youths of 18 years.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAYNESBORO, PA., *January 13, 1951.*

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Concerning the idea of whether or not the United States should lower the draft age to 18, Dr. Charles S. Tippetts, headmaster of the Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pa., has written pointedly in his Headmaster's Letter for the Mercersburg Academy Alumni Quarterly. His striking contribution to American thought in this matter follows:

"Again we have to decide whether or not to lower the draft age to 18. This should not be done unless we become involved in a major war, and even then with the provision that no one under 20 should be sent to the front. Our allies during the last war had stricter regulations about age than did we. We sent many a boy of 18 over as an infantry replacement after only a few weeks of training. Australia would not permit her young men to leave the country until they were 20; England did not let those under 19 go overseas until the last few months of the war. But we callously let 17-year-old boys join the Marines, the Navy and Coast Guard and be blown to bits. Look at the list of 17- and 18-year-old boys killed and wounded in Korea.

"Yet in Pennsylvania if we let a 17-year-old boy stand on a box and wash windows we are subject not only to a fine but to a jail sentence. We learned this at Mercersburg the hard way. But a 15-year-old boy can work on the roof of a barn, fall off and break his neck and it is perfectly legal, because it was a farm and farmers have lots of votes, and no one dares to say, 'No' to the farm vote. I saw a sign in the window of a liquor store the other day saying that no one under 21 could legally buy liquor.

"But it is perfectly legal in this 'civilized' country to kill boys under 21 by the thousands with bullets, bombs, and bayonets, and yet anyone selling them a drink will go to jail for a long term. When a distinguished lawyer and judge told me I should not say such things because it bred disrespect for the law, my answer was that if judges and lawyers want laws to be respected, they should pass laws that are worthy of respect. No other country in modern times except Germany and Russia has had so cruel and brutal a policy of throwing boys who are still children into the front lines to be killed as had the United States of America. Why their mothers and fathers stand for this I have never been able to understand.

"Cordially,

"CHARLES S. TIPPETTS."

To this statement by Dr. Tippetts the question should be appended: Why should anyone under 21 be subject to draft when he is denied the right to vote?

Sincerely yours,

FREDERIC B. TERRY.

Address by Assistant Secretary of Labor Ralph Wright, Representing the Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1951, there was a tremendous outpouring of Americans. They gathered at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in New York City to pay a well-deserved tribute to a great labor leader in the person of William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. Messages of good will and of high commendation came from many high and respected sources, including our own President, Harry S. Truman; the President of the State of Israel, Chaim Weizmann; United States Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas; the Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben Gurion; the Speaker of the Israeli Knesset, Josef Sprinzak; as well as from labor organizations throughout the world.

The dinner was sponsored by the American Trade Union Council of the National Committee for Labor Israel. The chairman of the dinner was Joseph Breslaw, chairman of the American Trade Union Council and vice president of the ILGWU. The toastmaster was Max Zaritsky, president emeritus of United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union.

In addition to addresses by Dr. John Steelman, assistant to the President of the United States; Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor; and His Excellency Abba S. Eban, Israel Ambassador to the United States; our distinguished Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin, sent his greetings by his Assistant Secretary of Labor, Ralph Wright, whose remarks follow:

It is an honor to represent Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin at this splendid testimonial of the American Trade Union Council to President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor. Secretary Tobin deeply regrets that the inordinately heavy press of emergency duties has kept him in Washington. He has asked me to bring you a message from him which I am glad to read to you:

"To the American Trade Union Council, National Committee for Labor Israel:

"I congratulate the American Trade Union Council on its great achievements and upon this most fitting testimonial to William Green. I am delighted to have this opportunity to pay tribute to him. This wise and noble leader, who has been president of the

American Federation of Labor for more than 26 years, is one of our greatest Americans. His lifelong, effective fighting for the cause of the common man has raised great economic monuments to his victories that will stand so long as there are freemen.

"So long as we have men like William Green labor statesmanship will continue to be a fact of tremendous significance in the life of America. The interests of labor have been widened with the years and William Green has been a part of these broadened horizons. He can always be counted upon to stand on the high plateau of national well-being and world advancement.

"That is why when William Green declares—as he did recently—that 'American wage earners face the future and its responsibilities seriously, but with confidence,' the country's spirit is lifted. That is why when he declares, 'we want peace and the opportunity that peace affords for new progress,' he expresses the heart's desire of the American people.

"William Green has contributed immeasurably to the improvement of our American way of life. He has always striven to make our democracy work ever better. He has led the fight to raise free trade-unionism to its rightful place in this country and in the rest of the free world. He has seen economic justice joining political equality to promote the good of all.

"On that account and for his great ability, kind and warm personality, and unimpeachable integrity we honor and love him."

I want to subscribe fully to all that Secretary Tobin has said and to add my own congratulations to the American Trade Union Council and to President Green for his outstanding leadership in the field of trade-unionism and for his equally outstanding service to his country. His is a record of service in both peace and war—a record of invaluable contributions to the welfare of the people of his own country and to the cause of economic justice and freedom throughout the world.

You meet here tonight to do honor to Mr. Green. You meet here also—as you have on other occasions—to help the free trade-unionists of Israel, a movement and a state which President Green has always aggressively supported. I warmly commend you and him for your unselfish activities on behalf of fellow workers in Israel—the world's newest democracy.

As we look upon the map of Asia, particularly in the Near or Middle East, we find that Israel is the only nation in that area which has been built from the very beginning on the same principles of democracy on which we in the United States have built.

Israel is probably the only country in the Middle East which has an effective free trade-union movement, a movement which owes much of its structure and character to the American trade-union movement and to a large degree to the inspiration and leadership of men like Mr. Green.

Israel as a nation faces gigantic problems. But I know that the people of Israel have the faith and the stamina and the will to win through. Histadrut, Israel's free democratic trade-union movement, will be in the vanguard.

American organized labor applauds Histadrut's contribution to the welfare of its members and to the State of Israel. This is shown by the important contributions which American labor has made to labor in Israel. Because of the importance of this help across international boundaries, organized labor in America will continue this program.

As President Truman said recently, "Our labor unions have already done fine work in communicating with labor in Europe, in Latin-America, and elsewhere. The story of free American labor, told by American trade-unionists, is a better weapon against Communist propaganda among workers in other countries than any number of speeches by Government officials."

Never in the history of the world was the cooperation of freemen so vital. These are critical times. We are in great danger. The peace of the world is gravely threatened by Communist imperialism.

When the freedom and security of freemen of good will is threatened by naked Soviet imperialism, then all freemen must stand together resolute against this threat. We must build our defenses to whatever is necessary to contain this threat.

This will entail much sacrifice by all of us. But we have the faith which will impel those sacrifices. We know that the stakes are high.

Free American trade-unions will never trade their democratic institutions and way of life for a life that is based on totalitarian concepts. American workers want no part of a mess of Communist pottage.

The American trade-union movement knows that the Communist claim that Soviet Russia is a paradise for workers is a mockery of the truth. Even if we should base our consideration on wages and working conditions alone, without thought for the precious God-given freedoms we possess, it is sheer madness for an American worker to consider for a moment changing places with the worker in Russia.

If America were transformed overnight into a Russian-dominated economy, I estimate that the American workers' wages would be reduced by approximately 86 percent. In other words, the American worker would have to give up four out of every five dollars to qualify for the low living standard of the Russian worker.

A Labor Department study shows that the Russian worker must toil 4½ hours for a pound of beef; it takes the American worker only 29 minutes—and you can bet that he will get better beef. The American worker earns a dozen of eggs in 27 minutes—for the Russian worker it takes 2½ hours, and so on.

The workers of America will never be sucked in by the red flame of Communist propaganda. Thank God for American organized labor, which stands as an impregnable bulwark against communism's false promises. Thank God for the leadership of men like William Green. American organized labor flatly and completely rejects the totalitarian philosophy of communism and its resulting low standards of living and suppression of individual liberty and initiative.

In midcentury the Communist war machine has drawn the issue of communism versus democracy. To maintain our freedom and security democracy must win. It will win through the work of organizations like your American Trade Union Council. It will win through the leadership of men like William Green, who has always stood like granite against communism, and whose rocklike strength is based upon an abiding and vigorous faith in the dignity and freedom of individual man. It will win through the efforts of such men because they know, as Emerson said:

"For what avail the plow or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?"

Red China an Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding Red China's aggression, published in the Pittsburgh Press on Thursday, January 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET A SHOW-DOWN NOW

Red China's rejection of the United Nations offer of Formosa and a United Nations seat in exchange for a cease-fire agreement in Korea has removed the United States from the predicament in which the State Department placed it by approving this infamous proposal at the outset.

That brings us back to the original proposition that Red China is guilty of unprovoked aggression by its attack on the United Nations forces.

This issue should be pushed to an immediate vote, and this country's future participation in the United Nations should ride upon the result of that roll call.

Our troops have no business in Korea if the United Nations will not support them with all of the resources at its command. This means reinforcements in men and equipment, as well as the organization's wholehearted moral support.

If this support is not immediately forthcoming, we should pull out of Korea, and pull out now.

So much for Korea.

Should this vote demonstrate, as now seems the case, that India and the Arab States, fronting for Britain, have captured the United Nations, to use it to serve their own selfish ends, let them have it. But let them support the empty shell that is left with their own money, without the United States as a member.

We cannot afford to be a party to so base a betrayal of the Charter to which we subscribed with such high hopes.

We should demand an immediate showdown in this issue.

The roll call on this question will be useful to us in deciding on our future relationships in the struggle against international communism. We cannot afford to go along with any nation which is willing to compromise with it. This is the time to ask them to stand up and be counted.

The stipulations in the Red's counterproposal to the United Nations' confessed willingness to sell out to them are so arrogant and insulting that they could only have been intended to humiliate the organization. The Communists not only name the members of the United Nations with whom they are willing to meet but insist that the representatives of those nations must come to China to see them.

Having arranged a set-up in which they would have an assured majority, the Reds demanded a free hand in Korea and withdrawal of all protection from Formosa, as well as the United Nations seat they were offered. This would be unconditional surrender, with the surrender given on Chinese soil, and delivered on bended knee.

Thus the appeasers have convinced Mai Tse-tung that he is a modern Genghis Khan, who can write his own ticket.

We should have no part of this ridiculous farce.

We should break, and break clean, with this whole situation and do it now.

But this break will come only if the American people demand it.

No such forthright action can be expected under the leadership of Secretary of State Acheson. He has worked throughout his tenure to bring about a situation where the Peiping Reds would be recognized as the legal government of China.

He has been willing to sacrifice the only friends we have in Asia with an army ready and willing to fight the Communists—the Chinese Nationalists. And the British have very good reasons for regarding him as the

best American Secretary of State Britain ever has had.

Mr. Acheson has repudiated the Reds' counterproposal in this instance, to be sure. But he is the same man who only last week consented to a deal which would have given them a seat in the United Nations and Formosa as a reward for their treachery.

If there has been any change in his attitude toward the over-all Communist problem in Asia, he has yet to reveal it by any positive action.

The only way to save this situation is to get him out of office, and this will be done only if the American people demand it with a voice which cannot be denied.

The UN Should Get All in or All Out of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, while the so-called statesmen of the United Nations debate what should be done about Korea, American boys are being maimed for life and dying there.

An editorial in the Chehalis Advocate, of Chehalis, Wash., shows how this so-called police action affects the life of one American boy—a story that could be repeated 45,000 times for that is the number of our Korean casualties.

While the so-called UN statesmen debated, this Chehalis boy, Pfc. Clyde Kennison, lost his foot in Korea which caused Don Ingraham, the editor of that newspaper, very appropriately to remark editorially that "The United Nations either should get all in or all out of Korea immediately."

Editor Ingraham's editorial from the Bee Nugget follows:

Pfc. Edwin C. (Clyde) Kennison, of Napavine, is home.

Clyde hasn't been away very long, just a little more than a year to be exact. But a lot has happened to him since he enlisted in the Marine Corps January 13, 1950.

First, he was sent to San Diego, Calif., where he got about 6 months of recruit training and that first stripe. By July he was in Korea helping the United Nations "police force" stem the tide of North Korean aggression.

Then, in August, he was in Japan recovering in a base hospital from a head wound suffered in the intense fighting in South Korea. By October, Clyde was back in action in Korea.

Now Clyde Kennison is home. He isn't back with his folks, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Woosley, of Napavine, yet, but he will be soon. Right now he's in the United States naval hospital at Mare Island. Last week doctors amputated his frozen left foot. They said his right foot probably would be all right although it, too, was badly frozen.

Clyde Kennison has been in the service only a year. It hardly seems possible that all this could have happened to him in such a short period of time. Why, it was only a couple of years ago that he was playing football for Chehalis High School.

Private First Class Kennison is a victim of policy, the policy this Nation is following in allowing its youth to be expendable. He, and thousands like him, from Lewis Counties all over America, have been sent out to fight and die in a half-way war. A war which our leaders do not choose to call by that name and refuse to allow to be fought in an all-out manner. We are engaged in a "police action." The enemy is engaged in total war.

The United Nations either should get all in or all out of Korea immediately. This country must not allow its men to be sacrificed while statesmen debate the advisability of permitting planes to bomb Communist China or of turning Nationalist Chinese troops on Formosa loose on the enemy.

Clyde Kennison has not been gone long, but he has been gone much too long to fight the type of war we are carrying on in Korea.

Re Panama Canal: Modern Weapons and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of my remarks in the RECORD of March 16, 1950, I included a condensation of a book on Modern Arms and Free Men, by Dr. Vannevar Bush, as published in the February 1950 edition of the Reader's Digest. In my remarks I stressed the application of Dr. Bush's ideas to the problems involved in the defense of the Panama Canal, or any other interoceanic waterway which may be constructed.

Another most timely article by Dr. Bush, entitled "The Weapons We Need for Freedom," was published in the January 1951 issue of the Reader's Digest. This paper is accompanied by the following biographical sketch of its distinguished author:

Vannevar Bush, former vice president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and dean of its School of Engineering, is one of America's foremost scientific military authorities. During World War II Dr. Bush was director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which coordinated the work of 30,000 scientists, engineers, and technicians, and was closely associated with the atom-bomb project. He is now president of the Carnegie Institute of Washington.

Dr. Bush, in the present instance, develops more fully the conclusions arrived at in his February 1950 thesis, applicable not only to the problems of defense of interoceanic canals but also to defense problems generally. He emphasizes that the solutions of such questions are never static between the weapons of offense and defense, and at this time those of defense appear to be in the ascendant, with the resulting tendency toward a deadlock on land.

This contribution should go far toward the maintenance of disciplined thinking on defense problems and the avoidance of hysteria. It emphasizes the point I have repeatedly tried to stress to the Congress, viz, that the defense of any part of the United States, including its industrial capacity, transportation systems, ports, and canals, is an over-all governmental responsibility of the Federal Government. It depends primarily upon active defense medium of our Armed Forces and not upon inherent features of design.

The full text follows:

THE WEAPONS WE NEED FOR FREEDOM

(By Vannevar Bush)

The grim events in Korea have aroused the United States and the rest of the free world from a perilous quietude. While we are now appalled at the cost in lives and treasure, the Red aggression in that country may prove in the long run to be a godsend, for it has served final notice that the Kremlin is bent on world conquest—by armed force, if need be.

If the free world fully heeds the notice—takes account of stock, ferrets out and corrects errors, pushes ahead full steam on sound lines, and keeps it economic balance—we can be ready for the eventuality of all-out war. Indeed, if we are ready, there probably will be no all-out war. It is a question first whether there is time for preparation, and second, whether we take full advantage of it. Hence we need to evaluate the means and techniques we will use if forced to fight with our full strength.

On military research and development we have not done badly, but we need to do better and to do it much faster. There is a race between offensive and defensive techniques in every field, especially in that of strategic bombing. We need to be in the lead both in means of stopping enemy bombers and in means of penetrating enemy defenses. There is a decided possibility that the defense may catch up, that radar warning nets, anti-aircraft artillery, ground-controlled interception utilizing jet-propelled aircraft, and ground-to-air missiles may make it increasingly impractical to penetrate to prime targets.

We must credit Russia with the ability to progress rapidly with all these. If the Red hierarchy becomes able, at some future date, to prevent the delivery of atom bombs onto its great industrial and administrative centers, the danger point will have arrived. At that time we must be able to stop their armies and to protect our own centers.

The ground-to-air guided missile promises to be the key weapon in a system of defense against high-altitude bombing. Traveling at bullet speed along a radar beam, carrying a heavy charge and a proximity fuse, such a weapon against the high-flying bomber can be deadly. It is not here yet, in quantity and tested reliability, but it can be, and it offers the greatest promise of the comparative immunity of key centers to high-altitude bombing. We should not let anything stand in the way of bringing it to full fruition at an early date.

While our means of strategic bombing have been well delevoped, neither we nor our allies are properly equipped with tactical air power. It is well accepted that when great armies clash on a well-defended line tactical air in quantity is essential to success. Russia has profited from the many examples of this in the last war, and has built tactical air extensively.

Our Navy and our Marines have their own air support for their missions. Our Army depends upon the Air Force for its tactical air support. It does not now have what it needs to do its job, in spite of the magnificent effort of the Air Force in Korea, for most of that was conducted with planes not specifically designed for the purpose. We must correct this defect as rapidly as the inevitable delays of construction will allow. There is no doubt that the Air Force, now facing the facts squarely, can meet the need, and will, with full support. With our support, our allies can do much, for they can build as well as we can, and less expensively.

The time may come when strategic air operations, even with the A-bomb or the possible H-bomb of the future, will not pay out. Any operation in war to be successful must do more vital damage to the enemy than it costs in men and treasure. If that day comes, and long before, we need to think of the A-bomb as a tactical weapon to stop great armies. It may even be true that we would be nearer right, all things considered, to think in these terms today. The tactical use of the A-bomb to break up concentrations of tanks, artillery, and masses of men may, in the long run, be more important than its strategical use. It would certainly be more salutary for the world.

The United States, at the end of the war, succeeded the British Empire as the world's greatest sea power—greatest in terms of a type of past warfare that will not come again. It may well be that World War II was the last in which the clash of great fleets will be a determinant, or in which the operation of great aircraft carriers will be of primary importance. We must face, if we fight a major war in the not too remote future, fleets of undersea craft, fast and of long endurance, armed with extraordinarily deadly weapons—torpedoes of greater range, speed, and subtlety than the world has hitherto known. We face attacks on our merchant fleet by guided bombs from the air. We face the modern submarine mine, which is exceedingly difficult to sweep. Mines placed from the air, arranged so that they can be swept only with enormous effort, vastly increase the power of an enemy to deny us ports. Air attack on shipping has potent aids in rocket weapons and guided bombs.

It is essential to our success in war that we maintain our transport over the seas. The Navy's mission is as important as ever, and its task is far more difficult, but this task has changed radically. We no longer build battleships to fight battleships. There is much question whether great carriers are now worth the cost of building, maintaining, and supporting them. The small carrier certainly has its place, to take air power to remote places and to fight submarines, and we may come to mosquito fleets of all sorts—agile, versatile, and hard to hit by torpedo or bomb.

A great part of the equipment with which we fought submarines in the past war was rendered obsolete when a torpedo appeared that could outrange underwater sound-detecting apparatus, and could home on its target by various means. The snorkel and the high-speed submarine, important though they are, are lesser threats than this.

The day of the convoy may be over, and we certainly need to develop and build in quantity cargo carriers of such speeds at sea as to be immune to submarine attacks, and means such as we used at Normandy to land cargo in spite of mines. There is no point in discussing airlift when millions of tons of cargo must be moved thousands of miles, if it can be done by fast cargo ships virtually immune to submarine attack.

The outlook for sea warfare is not all one-sided; there are many answers to the threats, many devices already built or capable of development; many ways of going on the offensive against the submarine, and of bringing down mine-laying or bombing aircraft, many devices in fact that have not been described and will not be mentioned here. It is against all these threats to our sea communications that the reorientation of our naval program inevitably must be directed.

Land warfare with mechanized armies, communication nets, radar-controlled guns and rocket-carrying aircraft is an extremely complex affair, fully as much so as war in the air or on the sea. It demands for success, therefore, active efforts in research, development, procurement, training, and the use of the most advanced weapons. A striking illustration of this matter is that of antitank defense. There has appeared a new antitank weapon of great power which can in time render the heavy tank largely obsolete. This is important, for the Russians are said to have 40,000 tanks, many of them heavies. Their whole doctrine of land warfare revolves about tanks and massed artillery to prepare the way.

But the day is coming when it will no longer pay to build heavy tanks, because they will be too vulnerable. And if they become practically obsolete our potential enemy will have to do a lot of reorientation and reequipping, which would probably take years.

The new antitank weapon is based on the principle of the shaped charge,[1] whose virtue is that it can penetrate a surprising thickness of armor—in fact, any armor a tank can carry. During World War II the bazooka fired a rocket which carried a shaped-charge projectile, and we have since built superbazookas which have been useful in Korea. We also have aircraft rockets that use shaped charges.

The trouble with the bazooka is that it is of short range and inaccurate. But a shaped-charge projectile has now been built that can be fired from a high-velocity gun, which can hit a moving tank at 1,500 yards with high probability of scoring with the first shot. Moreover, this type of projectile can be combined with the inexpensive recoilless gun which can be carried by a jeep or used as a squad weapon. About 200 such guns can be built for the cost of 1 heavy tank. They can also be built efficiently by our allies. The race between guns and armor has taken a sharp turn in favor of defense.

There are other opportunities for the sort of ingenuity and enterprise that produced this advance in antitank artillery. Land mines and means for laying them offer defensive possibilities. Defense against low-flying aircraft is full of chances for progress.

Such are some of the main lines of the change in weapons and techniques of war during the past 5 years.

We are now awake to the threats. We must move far and fast and use to the utmost the time that is still ours. Thus, if there comes another all-out war, can we and our allies defend the free world with confidence. Thus indeed may we hope to prevent an all-out war from occurring at all.

[1] A shaped charge is a piece of high explosive with a depression, usually cone-shaped, molded into its face. When the explosion occurs, the depression focuses the blast into a small, highly penetrating jet. The action is similar in some ways to that of a concave mirror in focusing the sun's rays to produce intense heat.

Fiftieth Anniversary, Division 18, AOH, Salem, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered at the fiftieth anniversary banquet, Sunday, January 21, 1951, of Division 18, Ancient Order of Hibernians:

Greetings: The Irish have come a long way in the first half of the twentieth century, both in the homeland that is called the Emerald Isle and in the sanctuary that we love and cherish as the United States of America.

It is no mere coincidence that our people have fought to win and to protect freedom, not only in the two countries that rank highest in our affections, but have also given so generously in life and in treasure helping other people to win their independence.

For the Irish have the sublime courage born of their sturdy Christian faith which practices its belief in the dignity and equality of all mankind as God ordained.

We resent injustice and cruelty in any form.

Perhaps that is why it is so difficult for us to forget the indignities and the sufferings that were forced upon our ancestors in the last century.

In the history of the Irish you will find that they were persecuted, time and time again, but you will never find that they were guilty of aggression against other races or creeds. They asked only to live their own lives in neighborliness with others.

The Irish believe that their land was first peopled by Greeks and others, a thousand years before the birth of Christ. About 500 B. C., some Celtic adventurers crossed into Ireland and conquered the natives. They brought with them that strong sense of kinship that left its mark on the Irish character. The relatives who made up the clan were considered as far more important than any state, and the men of Erin fought at the drop of a hat to protect the family unit from encroachment by any larger form of social organization. Before the coming of St. Patrick, good Irishmen after death were buried upright with faces turned toward their foes, ready for battle.

Christianity had come to Ireland a few years before Patrick, but the honor of converting Ireland to the faith which she has supported with complete loyalty, belongs to her patron saint.

St. Patrick was born in England, about 389, and as the son of a Roman citizen, he was named Patricius. As he grew up he studied the Bible with such persistence that he could quote much of it from memory. After he was captured by raiders and taken to Ireland, conversion came to him. His piety was all-consuming. Every day before dawn he got up and went outdoors and raised his eyes toward heaven. There were no rain checks in his devotion. Snow, cold, or storms were never permitted to interfere with his daily prayers.

Later, after much travel and study, he was made a priest. In 432 he became a bishop and was sent back to Ireland. From the Confessions he wrote toward the close of his life, we learn that on 12 different occasions he was seized by the pagan Druids and that each time he was in mortal peril. That he was saved to go on with his divine work was due to his confidence and his faith. He drew to his side countless men and women who dedicated their lives to spreading the good news that man was redeemed. His teaching was handed down from generation to generation with the result that the Irish consider it the highest of honors for their sons and daughters to take up the religious vocation. No other saint could match him in this, that alone he had converted a nation.

In the three centuries after the coming of Christianity Ireland became famous as the island of doctors and saints. Culturally, it was more advanced than any other nation north of the Pyrenees and the Alps.

There was such a thirst for education that poor scholars whose parents could not support them were educated by public funds. Most students were studying for the priesthood, for which mothers and fathers cheerfully worked themselves to the bone, happy in the knowledge that they were making the finest sacrifice of all.

The high achievement of Irish art in this period was the Book of Kells, the four gospels

in vellum, done by Irish monks in the ninth century. Nothing in Christian illuminated manuscripts can equal this prized possession of Trinity College in Dublin, which has been called "the work of angels masquerading as men."

As early as the year 748, an Irish monk, St. Fergil, suggested the possibility of another world and other men under the earth. Centuries after, Magellan sailed around the world, thereby vindicating the ability of the Irish to look ahead. For the rich imagination of this gifted race is not the least among its many talents.

There are few children whose lives are as eager and adventurous as those of the Irish, peopling the woods and the night with wonderful creatures of their own invention. A nation of individuals, kind and hearty in the rural loveliness of their land, and so full of life that it overflows into dreams that feed the stories, the poetry and the music of the world.

Brian-Boru, Emmet, Parnell, O'Connell, the martyrs of Easter Week, 1916, DeValera, Cosgrave, these are but a few in the long litany of great-souled Irish men and women who never surrendered to appeasement. Their passion for independence was twin to their supreme religious faith.

Would that Ireland were a member of the United Nations, to strengthen that organization with its high principle and its unyielding courage.

The international airport at Shannon and the big hydroelectric plant in County Limerick which provides cheap light, heat, and power for homes and industries throughout the land are examples of the progressive spirit that stirs in the newly emancipated nation.

You and I are proud of our forebears and the land that gave them birth. And we are proud of the outstanding contributions they have made and are making to the growth of our American civilization. For the United States was a natural home for the Irish, giving them the opportunity to develop the talents that are the genius of the race.

Wherever you scratch an American, from GI to President, you are more apt to strike a strain of rich Irish blood, for we are everywhere in the land and have been there from the start.

For proof, let us take a British source, which cannot be accused of favoritism toward the Irish.

On April 2, 1784, Lord Mountjoy, speaking to the English House of Commons said, and I quote: "I am assured, from the best authority, that the major part of the American Army (in the Revolutionary War) was composed of Irish. It was their valor that determined the contest. America was lost to us because of the Irish immigrants."

We realize, of course, that all peoples have made a contribution to the building of America, but on this special occasion we mean to high light the truly remarkable services rendered by the men and women of the Emerald Isle in making the American dream come true.

I must admit that I was surprised and pleased to discover that of the 3,000,000 population of the Colonies in 1775 about 1,000,000 were Irish. As we go down the names on the muster rolls of Washington's Army, we find that over 38 percent were as Hibernian as those to be found here tonight. This does not include many others who were part Irish.

From Concord to Korea, the honor roll of American heroes is star-studded with names as Irish as the shamrock. From Commodore Barry, father of the American Navy, to "Lightning" Joe Collins, present Chief of Staff of the United States Army, they lead the parade. Reverently, because it represents the summit of sacrifice, we recall the five Sullivan brothers who went down fighting with the cruiser Juneau in the battle of Guadalcanal. In the pages of American history you will find no greater giving than theirs.

Our people have been conspicuous, not only in defense of the United States, but as builders of its railroads, its schools, its factories, and its political institutions.

The freedom of the new land was made to order for the individualism of the Irish spirit and its ability to harmonize it with social order through the instrument of self-government.

Up New Hampshire way they tell this story, which is an example of the confident hopes and plans of the Irish for their future in the New World.

It seems that Margery Browne, from County Cork, was asked by a fellow passenger on the boat what she intended to do when she reached the Colonies. Without a moment's hesitation she replied:

"Raise governors for thim, to be sure."

Margery was as good as her word. She married John Sullivan, a schoolmaster, formerly of Limerick. In her old age, Margery Browne Sullivan used to say she had known what it was to do a man's work in the fields, "carrying in my arms the Governor of Massachusetts, with the Governor of New Hampshire tagging at my skirts."

Her son John grew up to become a celebrated general who, when the war was over, also knew how to maneuver his way in political campaigns. He became Governor of New Hampshire in 1786. His brother James, not to be outdone, became Governor of Massachusetts in 1807.

As political organizers, our people stand in a class by themselves. It is taken for granted that no one but an Irishman need apply for the position as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. In time the Republican Party will match this wisdom, and then their fortunes will undoubtedly improve.

As labor leaders, and as manufacturers, as judges, artists, and scientists, the ability of the race makes its presence and its creative power felt in the multiple human endeavors that fill the American scene.

In New England, we can point to tremendous progress during the past 50 years.

The active and inspiring teamwork of clergy and laity has accomplished wonders. Schools and colleges and hospitals dot the region as living testimony to the culture and good works without which our people would not regard their lives as meaningful.

What a noble Irishwoman—Charlotte Grace O'Brien—thought of her people was described by her in these words written in 1905:

"What nation has for ages made the greatest personal sacrifice for its religious life? The Irish. What nation has maintained purity of marriage? The Irish. What nation has humbly sanctified its family life through prayer and religion? The Irish. What nation has more tenderly regarded its duties to the ties of family love than these poor Irish?"

From this tribute she goes on through the Gospel Beatitudes to prove that the happy and friendly people from the green isle are blessed in the very ways that were pointed out by our Lord.

Because we are Hibernians, we treasure this legacy from the old country, and it is our purpose to keep these values alive in the new world.

As a man honors his father and his mother, so do we honor the land of our forefathers, whence we draw the life and the faith and the freedoms that we enjoy today.

There will always be a soft spot in our hearts for the "old sod," a pride and affection that we will transmit to the generations that will follow us.

In gratitude we will work, as we have always worked, to bring about the unification of Ireland, and for the day when it will win its rightful place in the councils of the United Nations.

Civilization falters, but it does not fail.

The history of Ireland is proof that no tyranny can crush a brave people. Centuries have come and gone since that golden age when she was the light of the world, teaching mankind the truths of this life and the faith in that eternal life for which this journey is but the preparation. Through countless decades her people suffered oppression that would have crushed a less hardy race. But the miracle of it is that the faith grew stronger with every indignity that it had to bear.

Today most of Ireland is free and independent.

And the complete redemption of all her counties is not far distant.

How Fair Is the Draft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article entitled "How Fair Is the Draft?" culled from the pages of Nation's Business of January 1951.

Today, with so much agitation over the question of drafting 18-year-old boys, it is well to have an enlightened statement such as this. It proves the short-sightedness of our military leaders in their attempt to get a 3,500,000 armed force. I suggest that the proponents of the 18-year-old draft approach the President's Committee on National Employ-the-Physically-Handicapped Week and the Vocational Rehabilitation Office for information on what can be done by handicapped people. It seems that our friends in the armed services are behind the times. Perfect physical specimens are needed where combat or arduous work are required, but not for the vast number of sedentary occupations in the Army.

HOW FAIR IS THE DRAFT?

(By Stanley Frank)

We can't say we haven't been warned. Complacency verging on arrogance cost us irretrievable lives and time during the last war and a hang-over of the same attitude is setting us up for another crisis all over again. President Truman had good firepower but erratic aim on October 25 when he called the high rejection rate of men found physically or mentally unfit in the draft "a disgrace to the richest Nation in the world." The President, referring to World War II statistics, mentioned a rejection rate of 34 percent—actually, it was 35.9 percent—but newspapers carrying his speech told a more alarming story.

Reports from local selective-service boards throughout the country revealed that 45 to 80 percent of the men called up since Korea had been turned down by the Army. The implication was clear: The draft was in trouble. The United States, committed by act of Congress and the North Atlantic Pact to a Defense Establishment of 3,000,000 men by June 1951, would fall far short of its objective.

Something, obviously, is wrong. Americans are the best fed, clothed, and housed,

the most thoroughly doctored and scrubbed people on the face of the earth. There is a direct correlation between a high standard of living and physical vigor and mental stability, but the figures don't add up. By our own admission, one young man in every three is a pantywaist or a psychoneurotic.

We must be better than the figures say we are. If we were not, we would have been licked decisively in two bloody wars. We are not as good, however, as the big wheels in the Pentagon think we are. A military axiom holds that a nation, or a coalition, faces certain defeat when one third of its forces in the field is eliminated by casualties. The United States is undermining its security by eliminating one third of its available manpower before uniforms are issued. That policy inevitably will catch up with us when, for the first time in our history, we and our allies are opposed by an enemy numerically stronger. It will be too late then to correct mistakes. Second chances are buried in the rubble that mounts with the increasing fury of all-out-war.

Who says one third of our young men are unfit to serve in the Armed Forces? The answer will come as a surprise to most citizens. The Armed Forces, which arbitrarily establish their own criteria, say so. The Army, Navy, and Air Force which, like all military organizations from time immemorial, complain—perhaps justifiably—that they do not have enough of everything they need, say they cannot use one youth in every three. And what is the basis for this strange contention?

Now we are getting to the heart of the matter and the answer no longer can remain unchallenged. The Armed Forces of the United States insist on regarding every recruit as a potential combat man. It is a concept as archaic as a cavalry charge with drawn sabers and as unrealistic as an umbrella in an air raid, yet our military leaders continue to adhere to it despite the experience of disastrous consequences. Their own elaborate tables of organization prove that the idea of training every volunteer and conscript for front-line fighting is utter nonsense.

The old saw to the effect that 20 men are needed behind the guy with the rifle is not a rule of thumb. Less than 5 percent of all the men in the Armed Forces in the last war saw, much less engaged, the enemy in combat. No more than 15 percent ever heard a shot fired in anger. Even in an infantry division fewer than half the troops are assigned to rifle companies. The overwhelming bulk of men in every army, navy, and air force, especially the American, is occupied with logistics and the technical aspects of modern war, a trend highlighted in startling fashion by comparisons of World Wars I and II. The total United States Army mobilized in April 1945 was more than twice as large as that mobilized in November 1918, but the strength of combatant ground forces was just about the same.

Another lucid example of the same sort of thing, but on a lower level, comes from Gen. Mark W. Clark, the Army field forces chief. The general has estimated that an infantry division of 19,000 men under the present set-up probably would call for 60,000 to handle the rear area service activities. The Red army has only five to six thousand backers-up per combat division.

What were all noncombatant GI's doing during the last war? They were hauling supplies, driving and maintaining vehicles, handling communications, sorting mail, making propaganda, guarding installations and supply lines, cooking chow, administering liberated and conquered territory, planning future operations, and keeping records in triplicate for still others to file. The million and one details that, while not so dangerous, were just as necessary to supply and maintain riflemen, tanks, ships, and planes, employed 95 percent of the men in uniform.

Few of those rear-echelon jobs required top physical condition, and every military organization in the world except the United States, has recognized that fact. The United States alone accepts only first-rate physical specimens, regardless of their eventual assignments. The result, of course, is that such men are diverted from the front lines, where strength and stamina are needed, to duties that can be discharged satisfactorily by the majority of men who are rejected.

No other nation is deluded by what Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, calls a philosophy of abundance—a polite way of saying the United States is dissipating its manpower with an overconfidence that smacks of insolence. Every other country, friendly or hostile, has three to seven classifications for conscripts according to physical capabilities. They operate on the theory that a job can be found in the service for any man of military age who is gainfully employed in civilian life. The United States takes men who qualify only for combat and discards the millions who can be competent clerks, truck drivers, mechanics, guards, cooks, and technical specialists.

Despite the manpower shortage, there still is not a general limited-service classification for draftees in the Army, the only branch now drawing on selective service to meet its authorized strength. The Navy and Air Force are getting enough volunteers to fill their needs, although they shortly will feel the pinch of expansion. The tragic lessons of the last war have been forgotten or ignored. We were at war for nearly 2 years in 1943 before all three branches agreed, reluctantly, to accept men who did not measure up to their physical and mental standards for combat. It was a short-sighted policy that eventually cost lives and unquestionably delayed the successful prosecution of the war.

As early as September 1942 the Army Ground Forces were short 330,000 men; the Services of Supply, 34,000; the Air Force, 103,000; and the mushrooming Navy was severely strapped. In June 1943 the manpower situation was so acute that 500,000 men were dropped from the proposed strength of the Army. Only then did our military authorities scrape the bottom of the barrel—as they condescendingly called it—but it already was too late. Three months after the invasion of Normandy, rear echelons were combed frantically and their rugged men in desk and administrative jobs were rushed to the front. GI's were sent into combat with insufficient training; a calculated risk—a euphemism for lives stretched to the breaking point—led to the Battle of the Bulge and the largest number of casualties suffered by American forces in any 10-day period of the war.

It would be fine if every young American in uniform could tear down a brick wall with his bare hands after a 20-mile march with a full pack. It would be even more wonderful if no young American had to wear a uniform at all, but such wishful thinking is as dangerous as the first hypothesis. We cannot afford the luxury of either one. The facts in the case are uncompromising and inescapable.

To maintain a defense establishment of 3,000,000 men, 800,000 new men a year are needed to fill the gaps left by completed tours of duty. During the 1940's, some 1,200,000 men reached the draft age every year. The United States then was cashing in on the prosperity of the 1920's, which, as always is the case in good times, produced a high birth rate. But this year, and every year until 1957—the most critical period of our relations with Russia, according to military and diplomatic authorities—fewer than 1,000,000 men will turn 18. We now are getting into the depression babies of the 1930's, when the birth rate fell to an all-time low.

You can't beat the percentages. If one third of the 1,000,000 youths reaching military age are rejected, the United States will not have the 800,000 recruits needed every year to keep its Armed Forces at the minimum level needed for the Nation's security—and the situation will get progressively worse, of course.

And that does not take into account the indeterminate, but large, number of talented young men who must be deferred for scientific and cultural study in college. We need them as much as combat troops to remain vibrant and progressive. A blanket deferment cannot be given, however, to every boy who wants to go to college. That will arouse justified criticism of a "poor man's draft." In these days of rising tuitions and increasing strains on self-sacrificing parents, college is, more than ever, an economic hardship. To excuse from military service every boy who can buy safety behind ivy will lead inevitably to the widespread abuses of the Civil War, when northern conscripts hired stand-ins for $300.

A committee of educators and professional men appointed by Hershey to make a 2-year study of the problem recently submitted a plan that proposes to give all high-school graduates aptitude tests and grant educational deferments to those in the upper 25 percent. If a boy cannot pay for college, he would be provided with a Federal scholarship. If boys so deferred do not maintain high grades in college the draft would get them.

There is another condition. After completing their educations, the bright boys must go into work that is "essential to the national health, safety, or interest." Doctors, teachers, physicists, chemists, and engineers fall into that category, along with economists, political scientists, and trained specialists in Slavic and Oriental cultures. But there is to be no deferment for dilettantes.

A quick estimate of the physical and academic deferments leaves a manpower deficit of at least 250,000 annually. Those are the harsh facts.

What is the solution? Reduce the strength of the Armed Forces? That's unthinkable in the present political climate. Expand the 19-to-26 age limit of the draft? The net will catch only veterans of World War II, who already have discharged honorably their obligation to the country. It is unfair to expose these men to double jeopardy. Uprooting them again will dislocate severely the Nation's economy, to say nothing of the emotional strains married men and their families will suffer. Lower the draft age to 18? That will solve nothing after the first year.

There is an easy, effective, and equitable solution. The chief drain on our military manpower pool is the rejection rate for physical and mental deficiencies. (Forget the 45 to 80 percent rates reported after the Korean campaign stepped up selective-service quotas. Half the men in the 19-26 age group were rejected during World War II. Exemptions for military service already rendered and enlistments accepted, not included in the statistics, threw the figures of last summer completely out of line.) Since the standards are substantially the same as in the last war, it is reasonable to assume that about 35 percent of the men coming up will be declared unfit again.

We cannot afford to eliminate one young man in every three. We need not lose more than 200,000 men a year if a reform, dictated by logic and necessity, is adopted.

The physical standards for induction must be lowered. It can be done without impairing the efficiency of the Armed Forces by the simple expedient of junking the outmoded notion that every conscript must qualify for combat.

Dr. Henry H. Kessler, who was in charge of the rehabilitation program at Mare Island in California during the war, believes 75 percent of the men rejected can be used for general—not limited—service if the present physical standards are lowered.

"It can be accomplished without fuss or bother," Dr. Kessler says, "in 6 to 8 weeks during regular boot training."

Dr. Howard W. Rush, chief of the Convalescent Service during World War II, mentioned on July 22, 1950, some specific jobs industry has found for the physically handicapped. "Dwarfs proved invaluable in the construction of airplane wings; paraplegics produced precision instruments; the blind proved that many assembly lines are operated as well by touch as by sight; the deaf showed that inability to hear can be minimized by written instruction, and cripples of every sort more than pulled their weight."

Look at some of the more common reasons for disqualification the Army still is applying in the current draft. A man is rejected if his feet are not good enough for marching. No consideration is given to the proposition that the man can be used in a desk job that involves walking only to the nearest filing cabinet, mess hall, and washroom. The minimum height requirement for the Armed Forces is 5 feet, 2 inches and the maximum is 6 feet 6. Lack of height is a definite asset to a mechanic in the cramped quarters of a tank, a jeep motor, or the fuselage of a plane. Excessive height can facilitate the handling of supplies in a quartermaster depot.

Men with perforated eardrums are rejected because poison gas is fatal to them. Gas has not been used as a weapon since World War I. Men who cannot see at 20 feet what normal vision sees at 400 feet are rejected. Sounds reasonable until you consider that visibility of 24 inches is all that is required to operate a typewriter.

The thousands of professional athletes who were classified IV-F during the war and continued making muscles provoked so much criticism among servicemen and their families that the Army made an official study of such exemptions. It was found that the majority of them were deferred for trick knees.

"Those fellows would be a liability on the battlefield if they threw their knees out of joint," an Army spokesman commented.

"Suppose they popped a cartilage in the Pentagon?" I asked.

The man changed the subject.

The United States would have no manpower crises, no agonizing shortages of combat troops, if an effort were made to use, rather than discard, every youth regardless of physical handicaps. Like all generalizations, this one must be modified. Although spastics and paraplegics can work in offices and release men for more rigorous duty, the problem of transporting and caring for them might tie up more fit personnel than were replaced. Men who must have special diets for organic gastric ailments also might complicate Army routine. Severe heart cases and a few other categories would have to be deferred. But as a basic proposition, every man of military age—the one material resource we cannot roll off assembly lines, for all our productive genius—able to live a normal life in civilian society should have a place in the Armed Forces.

Military people will howl. They will argue that establishing several classifications for physical capabilities demands as many different training programs. So what? Other countries do it. Sure, it means a lot of staff work. So what? For that matter, it is a palpable waste of time and money to give everyone under arms the intense training for combat only 5 percent needs. Further, setting up limited-service components to take care of supply, housekeeping, and bookkeeping chores will enable the brass to train more thoroughly the men who do the actual fighting.

Apart from military expediency, there is an equally strong recommendation for selective service that combines less selectivity with more service. Civilian confidence in the draft as a democratic, impartial process will get a boost.

There will be less uncertainty, less finagling for occupational deferments if every young man knows he has an unpleasant, but necessary, obligation to perform. As General Hershey says, "I haven't seen a draft questionnaire yet in which the guy said he shot people for a living." There will be less griping in the Armed Forces if everyone knows he is in the same boat with all other members of his generation.

History has conferred few favors on a generation born in depression, weaned on upheaval, and maturing now in the shadow of another war. It's tough to be 19 in the sixth decade of the twentieth century, but the very law that imposes sacrifices on a boy contains certain key words which are his only hope for the future. The law, enacted on June 24, 1948, reads:

"The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy."

The key words are, of course, "security," "free society," "obligations and privileges," and "fair and just."

Communism and American Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on August 25, 1950, a very distinguished citizen of my home city, Mr. Dave Beck, executive vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, made an address on the subject Communism and American Labor Unions, before the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco. I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately three pages of the RECORD at a cost of $246.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM AND AMERICAN LABOR UNIONS—HONORABLE DEALING BETWEEN LABOR AND INDUSTRY THE SOLUTION

(By Dave Beck, executive vice president, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, I am delighted to discuss with you today the subject of communism and American labor unions. Communism is not solely the problem of labor, however. As you know in the State of California, it is also a problem within our universities and in many other segments of our social and economic life.

All of us are deeply interested in meeting the problem posed by communism in America, and throughout the world. If we are to do this, however, we must first understand the reasons for the spread of communistic doctrine, how it is propagated, and to whom it makes its appeal. It will not help us to shift the responsibility, for personal advantage, to the shoulders of either labor or industry.

The organization with which I am identified, and which I have served for so many years, is the largest labor union in the world. It has a membership of more than a million men and women. It is made up largely, if not entirely, of people who are classified as unskilled. Yet we have no problem whatever with communism.

There must be a reason for this fact. It is because for more than 30 years in the history of our international union, its basic constitution—the law of the union—provided that a Communist shall not be eligible to membership. At our last national convention, here in San Francisco in 1947, we further clarified and broadened that provision by barring from membership all who are affiliated or associated with subversive organizations or groups of any kind, or who advocate any subversive philosophy.

Since we are a voluntary organization, we do not require positive proof that a man is a member of the Communist Party; we must simply satisfy ourselves that he advocates the philosophy of communism. If he does this, then for all practical purposes, he is a Communist, and we do not waste time in throwing him out.

There can be no compromise between Americanism and communism. Any attempt at compromise is an admission of defeat. Surely we have had enough of appeasement, of attempting to compose differences with those whom we know to be sworn enemies of our way of life. I believe that the greatest result that can come out of the situation in Asia is that we will bring sharply home to the attention of our people this outstanding fact: That just as we must carry life insurance for the protection of our families, and fire insurance on our homes and businesses, so must we carry national insurance in the form of adequate military preparedness for our Government and our free institutions and ideals.

More than 5 years previous to the last World War, in many talks which I made before business and professional groups and service clubs, I advocated as strongly as my ability would permit, that we maintain our Army and our Navy and our Air Force at the highest possible degree of strength and efficiency, regardless of the cost. There is not a man or woman in front of me today—not one—who if confronted with the choice of losing the life of his son or contributing his entire fortune, would hesitate for an instant. Of course, he would sacrifice everything of material value he possesses for his loved ones. Yet, we hesitated then as a nation to prepare to defend our rights and our way of life, with the result that untold thousands of our boys did not come back from that war, or returned maimed and broken in body.

So long as communism spreads its fangs across the world, we must be ready, we must be prepared to hurl the vicious beast back from our shores.

We must demand in these hours of national peril that men in positions of trust tell us truthfully where they stand on the question of communism. I have no time whatever for men in politics, or in labor, or in business, or on the faculty of any of our

universities, who refuse to take a positive stand on this question of communism.

It is a lot of tommyrot for members of university faculties to talk about interference with their academic freedom, while young Americans are making the great sacrifice on the battlefields of Korea to defeat communism and to defend free America. We are in an era of national emergency which has endured for a long, long time. World War II has not been officially ended. Thousands of men who gave up their peacetime ambitions for a period of years, who gambled their lives on the battlefields of Europe and in the South Pacific, are again being called into military service, while some of our theorists—exponents of what they pretend to call their constitutional rights—refuse to stand and be counted as Americans. They forget that the soldier, both in peace and war, lives under military law, not civil law. They blandly suppose that their rights would survive if communism should sweep this country. How wrong they are. American rights and all the liberty our forefathers fought to give us would be destroyed instantly and without trace if we were to prove unworthy to survive in this present conflict.

It was my privilege to travel to Europe a year ago and to speak as a representative of the American Federation of Labor before the British Trades Union Congress, and to visit some of the countries on the eastern side of the Atlantic. I had a private audience with the Pope at his summer palace near Rome. We discussed the problem of communism. I also conferred at some length on the same subject with Bishop O'Connor, who heads the North American University in Rome, one of the outstanding schools for the development of young men for the priesthood.

Both the Pope and Bishop O'Connor stated that it was where the common people were struggling against direst poverty that communism made its greatest advances.

Later we drove through the streets of Rome on a hot afternoon, just as the day was coming to a close, and we could look into the houses and see where 15 to 20 lived in absolute squalor in a single room. Down in Naples, as well as elsewhere in Europe where communism seemed to thrive, we found the same appalling conditions, and we could then understand something of the problem of communism and how it could appeal to those people. There indeed was a fertile breeding place for ideas which appeal to desperate men, to men who have lost their hope and their faith in themselves and in the future.

But these facts do not excuse men and women in American labor for tolerating communism. There is no such fertile ground here for the propagation of the Moscow doctrine.

The problem of communism in America is one which labor and capital must solve jointly. We are making definite and steady progress in this country toward the solution of the other problems of capital and labor. There is a constantly improving standard of living here.

If we want the truth, and I am sure that we do want the truth, we must not judge men and women in any phase of our social, economic, and business life by the actions of an individual, or of a few misguided individuals. We must judge industry as well as labor by the character and the conduct of the overwhelming majority. I can say to you positively, because I know whereof I speak: the working men and women of America want no part of communism whatever.

My friends, the strongest bulwark to restrain the sweep of communism must come from within labor. You cannot find Communists in the membership of the Kiwanis Club, or the Rotary Club, or the Lion's Club, or the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. Why? Because you people and others in similar organizations are financially successful. You enjoy a standard of living, you and your families and your associates, that does not permit the seeds of communism to take root. You and your families and your friends may not be wealthy but you are a long, long way from poverty.

We must recognize the fact, both in labor and elsewhere in America, that many of the evils, which once were destructive of our standards of living, and which made possible the fetid breeding grounds for communism, are no longer tolerated.

As we right the old wrongs and as we banish forever the ancient evils of squalor and poverty and substandard living, we will sound the death knell of communism in this country.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not lay the responsibility for communism and its growth in the lap of industry, because I know that men in labor, men in high place in labor, also have tolerated communism and have courted it. Neither do I condemn those who change their minds, and abandon that false philosophy, or any other evil doctrine. We are all members of this human family and we can all err.

Yes; there have been men in high places in labor who put their arms around the Communists and welcomed them, back in 1934, and even in later years. There was Philip Murray, for instance, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and Walter Reuther, of the Auto Workers. There were also many others whom I could name. They tolerated the Communists in their ranks, they invited them in, and they worked with them and trusted them.

There was also John L. Lewis, with whose philosophy and actions I do not agree in many, many instances. Lewis definitely is not a Communist, but he, too, tolerated them and their leaders.

Why did these men in labor consort with Communists? Because they believed they could use Communists in labor to accomplish their objectives more easily.

But they were in error. They made a serious mistake, and they are still trying to correct it and to live it down. They discovered, as will anyone who makes the experiment, that the Communists, as quickly as they could do so, using any and all methods, no matter how reprehensible, tried to take over their union organizations. That is the objective of Communists when they infiltrate labor unions and organizations of university professors and any other group in our social and economic life. The Communists cared nothing for the American toiler or his union; they sought places of authority so that they could promote the Communist party line. The Communists have no loyalty to America or Americans; their hearts and their loyalties are with the Kremlin. They will destroy a union or any other group if it will serve the ends of Russia. Their very thoughts are subservient to the Soviet dictators.

The chief goal of the Communist is revolution—violent and bloody revolution. He wants chaos and disorder and ruin for our country, for it is through such catastrophe that he hopes to take over and to rule America with an iron hand, destroying every trace of our democratic institutions, and blotting out our rights and liberties. Our American system of free enterprise is his especial enemy.

We of American labor believe in our free-enterprise system. We do not believe in it simply because it benefits those who have money invested in business upon which they may make profits. Not at all. We believe in free enterprise because we know that it has preserved our liberty and at the same time has given us the highest standard of living and opportunity the world has ever known.

Free enterprise, as opposed to communism and socialism, is in the interest of the vast, overwhelming majority of the people who toil for their living, both here and in other countries. I believe in free enterprise because it inspires initiative within men and women. It provides them with opportunities to rise above their environment and to attain any high place which their ability and intelligence will permit them to achieve. I contend that no system in the history of the world has ever made possible such progress for the working men and women, as free enterprise has accomplished for the American people. I have traveled somewhat around over the world and I do not know of a single, solitary country where the workingman lives under as fine conditions as he does in this land of free enterprise. Certainly no honest, intelligent man can think that communism offers more.

I have never known of a Communist, nor one who advocated communism—and I have watched them in action for more than 30 years—I have never known of one Communist who, of his own volition, has left this country to live in Russia. They fight deportation to Russia with all their might, and if they go to Russia, they fight just as hard to get back to this country.

In days long gone by, in Seattle in 1918, there was a general strike. I think that I headed the only labor organization in Seattle which voted against that general strike. I listened then in the Central Labor Council to men espousing the cause and extolling the wonders of Russia.

To hear them talk, you could put them off the boat blindfolded at Vladivostok and they could walk from one end of Russia to the other without bumping into a single obstacle. But not one of them went to Russia and stayed there. Why? Because no working man anywhere in the world can earn for himself and his family the benefits and security that he can receive as a matter of course under our system of free enterprise.

Among the men and women in this room today, successful men and women, the overwhelming majority were not born to wealth and position. They fought and they earned their way up to the places they now hold. The tragedy is that so many have forgotten the adversities and misfortunes they endured and overcame in the early days.

I represent an organization which, I believe, has as good wages, hours, and working conditions as any labor group in the world. We accomplish this by working with industry and within the framework of this Government, and by no other method.

I disagree with employers in many parts of the country almost every day, and undoubtedly I shall continue to disagree with them, but I will disagree with them within the framework of our American law and Constitution and in an effort to take from industry what I honestly believe the men and women of labor are entitled to receive. That, in my judgment, is the only way we can stop the spread of communism.

We can go back into the history of any industry and where we find the greatest number of Communists today we also will discover that in the days gone by the most intolerable conditions existed. Yet, communism is not the solution for these people.

Yes; we are making progress. There was a time when, in the midst of depression, there was nothing for thousands upon thousands of hungry men and women to do but get into the bread lines, or go to the soup kitchens. Those who have lived in San Francisco since 1926 have had the experience of seeing hundreds and hundreds of men and women in the bread lines. Does anyone think we can send men and women into the bread lines without giving tremendous impetus to the spread of communism?

We must take steps to keep men and women out of the bread lines in times of business depression. It is futile to expect all of the working people to accumulate financial resources on their own initiative

sufficient to provide insurance or some other form of protection to save them from destitution in such times of business distress. It therefore devolves upon this social and economic structure of ours to find the way to solve this problem.

I advocate that during the period of our working lifetimes, we set aside from our own earnings—not from the earnings of others but from our own—and out of the development of the resources and industry of this country sufficient reserve savings to prevent bread lines and poverty. Perhaps you will criticize this idea. If so, what do you suggest to solve the problem? For it is our problem, and it must be solved if we are to stop communism in this country.

It is possible, perhaps, that we may go too far in the direction of social welfare, but I say to you: As surely as you are in front of me today, we must continue social security, for if we do not we will one day stagger this Nation's industry under a pension load which it cannot possibly carry. We must take steps now to provide for future needs. You may argue whether or not there should be investment of security funds as we go along, so that money will be available out of earnings to meet future emergencies, but no one can possibly disagree when I say that we must solve the problem of destitution and poverty among our people. Otherwise this great structure of business will not remain as you and I want it. If, however, we follow the policy of preparing now to meet future needs of our people, we will never have much of a problem from communism in America.

We dare not try to compromise with communism, for there can be no compromise. Phil Murray learned, Walter Reuther learned, and John L. Lewis learned by bitter experience that compromise with communism is disastrous. Neither can we compromise with a Russian Government which follows and advocates the philosophy of communism.

I detest communism as much as any man in America. We must stop it inside labor because, as I said a few minutes ago, that is the only place where it can possibly find an opportunity to grow; that is the only place where destitute, poverty-ridden people may ever be found. It is true that some of the working people have made mistakes. They are not, in many instances, well educated. Add poverty to their other handicaps and we will have ground for communism to take root.

I say to the leaders of industry and business: Associate yourself with men of character, ability, and courage within the American labor movement and help to find the solution to these problems which cause unrest and which threaten to tear the very structure of our Government to pieces. Together we can find the causes, and the answers.

No man in labor today, who is worth anything to his membership, advocates the strike as the first step toward the solution of any dispute he may have with any employer. A 15-year old boy may be able to organize a strike, and if all labor respects the picket line, he may accomplish his objectives even though they may be absolutely wrong. That is not the road to industrial peace or to the proper solution of our problems, for wrong methods will not stand the test of time.

We need more men in the labor movement who have the courage to say "No" when that is the unpopular thing to say. We can find any number of men who are willing to say "Yes" if that seems popular. We need courageous men in our universities, on our boards of regents, directing the affairs of industry I repeat: We need them in the labor movement.

What shall we say of the man in industry who goes along for a period of time, dealing with honorable men and women in labor but who, when he sees that they are on the road to a solution of their common problems, double-crosses them and enters into an agreement, or creates a situation which strengthens and promotes communism? I have had that experience. I have worked with industry and helped to force the Communists into a corner and then I have discovered men in industry who were willing to take advantage of the opportunity to continue contractual relations with Communists and thereby give them a breathing spell in which to regain their strength.

That kind of dealing will not stand the test of time. Such leaders of industry will wake up some day to find that the leaders of labor, who proved they had the courage to stand up against almost unbearable pressure, have lost confidence in them and are unwilling to trust them again.

I have had some experience in saying "No," when it was extremely unpopular. I said it across the bay in Oakland a few years ago when a general strike was threatened. I told our people in Oakland that I did not care if we lost every member in the bay area, we would rather lose them than participate in a general strike, for all general strikes are revolutionary in character and philosophy. I say this not only to the Commonwealth Club, but I also say it to my own people. A general strike is revolution, and nothing but revolution.

My friends, when we in labor educate our people to practice honorable procedures, and when our people display the courage to stand up and be counted against communism, we do not like it when men associated with industry walk away from us when by so doing they can save themselves a few paltry dollars.

Double-crossing will not stop communism in labor or anywhere else.

Yes; we in labor have had associates who forgot and disregarded their duty and their obligations to God and man. Industry has had them, too. There have been men in both labor and industry who transgressed the law, who entered into racketeering schemes and combinations. I remember not too many years ago when a New York labor leader was sent up the river to Sing Sing. I also remember that the man right across the corridor from him was Mr. Whitney of the New York Stock Exchange. It is neither fair, nor just, nor even intelligent, to hold all men in labor and in industry and business guilty and to condem them all because a few have fallen by the wayside. I do not condemn the banking business because a banker occasionally forgets his trust. Nor should you condemn labor because, now and then, a labor leader proves faithless and foresworn.

How to meet the threat of communism concerns not only the people of America; it concerns all free peoples. Here in America the solution lies with those of us who are charged with the responsibility of striving and working together intelligently in this American system of free enterprise, under the finest government in all the world.

First, we must learn to understand each other. Those of us who direct the affairs of labor—to use the vernacular of the street—must have the guts to stand up within the ranks of labor for what we know to be right. Leaders of industry must also have that same qualification.

Industry cannot meet the issue by attempting to destroy the leadership of labor, for instance, by propagandizing the salaries which labor's leaders receive. That will not stop communism; that may build a Frankenstein to destroy us all.

If we believe in the philosophy of free American enterprise, and I believe in it—no man in this room believes in free enterprise more completely and sincerely than I do—then we must realize that if labor is to be represented ably and intelligently at the conference table, if it is to have leadership of high competence, based upon character, experience and brains, then, under our system of free enterprise, labor has the right—yes, the duty—to pay its representatives in accord with the same standards that industry has set for itself. I know an attorney in San Francisco, whose law firm receives a retainer fee of $250,000 a year to represent the interest of employers. Would any sane, fair-minded man insist that labor send a truck driver, earning $60 or $70 a week, untrained and inexperienced and with little knowledge of economics, or labor, or industrial problems, to sit across the conference table from this attorney? Would you think that fair? Does anyone believe that would solve our problems in America? No, it cannot.

There are a great many men in labor who could command much larger salaries if they were working for industry. Through the years industry has watched the leaders of labor carefully. Often, when it has found men of outstanding ability, it has offered them many times more than labor could afford to pay, and put them to work for industry. I offer no objection, for under our system it is each man's individual right to sell his services where and at a price that his own judgment dictates is to his best advantage and the advantage of his family. What I am trying to emphasize in this: do not tear down the outstanding leadership of labor which, under the test of time and in the crucible of action, has measured up to our American ideals. Do not tear such men down, for if you do, the consequences will come home some day to haunt you.

I wish that we had thousands of trained young men within the ranks of labor, not only in this country but throughout the world, striving for positions of leadership of whom there was not the slightest question as to integrity, citizenship, and belief in our economic system and our form of government. We never have trouble with that type of leadership in labor. Our trouble comes in labor from the men and women in positions of leadership who endorse communism, or through ignorance tolerate it. Communists believe the oath that they may take in a courtroom is not worth a snap of the fingers. They will place their right hand on the Holy Bible and swear to tell the truth, but since they do not believe in God, their oath is meaningless.

I am reminded of the university professor who says he is not a Communist, but who objects to taking an oath to that effect. My friends, I advocated within the American labor movement, within our own national convention, long years ago, that we stand up proudly and take the oath. For we are not Communists.

It is my opinion that a certain large percentage of those who object to taking the anti-Communist oath, or to signing such an obligation—and I want to make it plain that I am not referring alone to your problem in the California academic world—are more afraid of prosecution for perjury than of admitting they are Communists. I do not know what makes Communists among faculty members in our universities. It is over my head. But I want to make this statement: All crackpots are not in labor, there are a lot of them in the universities.

I had some small part, let me assure you, not only in getting rid of Communists at the University of Washington, but also along with my associates on the board of regents and in the president's office in initiating that action, and the Communists do not like it. I wish that I could say over the radio what I think about them.

My friends, we can solve the problem of communism in American labor only through honorable dealing between labor and industry.

Labor must come to realize that the man or woman who invests in business does not always find success and profits easy to obtain. I know there are many instances

where the owners or managers of business, from time to time, sweat blood simply to meet the payroll. All men in business and industry are not rolling in wealth. Labor must realize that fact. We have a right, under our system of enterprise, to earn a bona fide, legitimate, and reasonable return upon capital investment, if we have the brains and ability to do so. I also believe the owners of industry have a right to plow back into their business sufficient money for expansion and growth, so that more jobs can be created and greater production made possible, for out of such expansion and employment comes the wealth of our country and the ever-improving standard of living for all of our people.

Neither labor nor industry has a right to enter into collusive action or conspiracy, for that will not stand the test of time. It contradicts the right of the great consuming public.

In this system of ours free and open unregulated competition no longer exists in many fields of endeavor. A man cannot invest his money in a new railroad, an air transportation company, or a trucking company and take his own chance, in open competition, of making a reasonable profit. He must first obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity, or some other form of regulatory permit which tends to control competition. That is a development which has come about over a long period of time.

I say to you in conclusion, the greatest government ever founded in all the world is our American Government. Above everything else, above the rights of labor, or the rights of capital, or the rights of the individual, is our duty to our Government. We must always subordinate our interests to its welfare. Finally, if you want to solve the problem of communism in American labor unions, I beg of you to recognize character and ability and honorable dealing wherever you find it—in government, in industry, or in labor. Thank you.

Address of Hon. James C. Davis, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned over the current threat of war facing our country as well as its attendant domestic problems. We have all, I am sure, given extensive thought to the proper courses, both domestic and international, which should be followed in order to preserve our American heritage. On the evening of January 20, 1951, our distinguished colleague, Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, was invited to speak before the Atlanta Claims Commission at its annual banquet held in the Ansley Hotel in Atlanta. Congressman DAVIS' speech was, in my opinion, an example of the brilliant statesmanship which has characterized his three terms of service in the House, and deserves the attention of every conscientious and patriotic-minded American. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of Congressman DAVIS' address:

Three of the greatest problems Americans have ever faced lie immediately before us. They are:

First, how can we have peace?

Second, how can we preserve our institutions of individual liberty and free enterprise?

Third, how will we pay the tremendous costs involved in these efforts?

I believe strongly in the principle that where there is a will, there is a way. I further believe that there is a will in the hearts and minds of Americans, to avoid the awful catastrophe of a third world war; that there is a will and a determination to preserve our institutions of individual liberty and free enterprise; and finally, that there is a will to face up to the realities, and to pay the costs involved in these processes, huge and staggering though they may be.

That being the case, our questions, then, are not "Can these things be done?", but, "How will we do them?"

I am convinced that there still is enough American ingenuity and resourcefulness, that there are in this country still enough clear-thinking, energetic Americans, who can add two and two and get four for an answer, to work out plans to pull out of the difficulties which surround us, and do the hard work necessary to carry these plans through to completion.

I think there can be no question that we are engaged in a struggle for survival. We need then, to know, as best we can determine, exactly what confronts us. We cannot close our eyes to unpleasant facts, nor gloss over realities.

These are some of the facts we face today:

Our outstanding national debt is approximately $257,000,000,000, dangerously near the $275,000,000,000 debt limit we have set for ourselves. The purchasing power of the dollar is now 57.3 cents, if we take the years 1935 to 1939 as being a period in which the dollar averaged 100 cents purchasing power.

Where mistakes have been made, they should be acknowledged and not whitewashed. Many have been made. It was a mistake to disarm and to disband our forces.

We made many unwise, even foolish, concessions to Soviet Russia, which are now rising up to plague us.

One such mistake was to place Russia in charge of Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel. I believe it was a most serious mistake to make any concessions whatever to Russia to induce her to enter the war against Japan. That war had been won. Japan was at our mercy. We needed no assistance from Russia there. For no good reason we invited Russia to come over and share in the victory. We placed in the hands of her leaders the means to make for us the trouble in Korea, and in the Pacific area, which is now costing us so many American casualties and so much of our treasure.

We committed serious errors in making unwise and unnecessary concessions to Russia in Europe. Bungling decisions placed Eastern Germany under exclusive Russian domination. Further bungling placed Russia in the position where she can close up rail, highway, and canal transportation into Berlin at will, can stop the shipment of food and supplies into Berlin by all these means of transportation, and even make it necessary for us to transport coal into Berlin by air.

Plans to build up naval strength were discarded, and construction of a super aircraft carrier was canceled after the keel had been laid. This carrier was authorized by Congress and the money appropriated to build it. Construction of this super aircraft carrier has been reordered. Now it will cost many millions more, and will be delayed approximately a year and a half longer than would have been the case had the construction order not been canceled.

It was a mistake to dilly-daily with the question of price and wage controls until rising prices and inflation have already added some $3,000,000,000 to the cost of our defense activities. It is said that since June 25 rising prices have cost us equipment for 10 infantry divisions, 300 B-36 bombers, 2,250 F-80 jet fighter planes, and tanks for 10 armored divisions. Since that time lead has increased in price 48 percent, tin 82 percent, cotton 20 percent, hides 40 percent, shellac 30 percent, rubber 100 percent.

All this is costing the taxpayer additional money—money which could have been saved if prices and wages had been pegged down at the June 25 level, and held there. I and many others urged this action when Congress was considering price- and wage-control legislation. But the President said price and wage controls were not needed, and pursuant to that statement Congress passed a law which did not roll back prices at all, but simply laid the matter in the lap of the President, and authorized him to impose selective controls, when and if he deemed them to be necessary. He has not seen fit to impose them up to this time, although some $3,000,000,000 has been added to the defense costs up to December because of rising prices.

There has been much waste and extravagance in the operation of our Government. Last year I served upon a subcommittee which investigated overstaffing in Government agencies. We found in that investigation many instances of hiring employees who were not needed. We found, for instance, that one agency maintained a purchasing department employing 197 persons, to process purchase orders. Fifty percent of the orders issued were for less than $20 each, and the average workload was 2.4 orders per day, for the 197 persons, and half of those orders were for items costing less than $20. In one branch of the agency the average number of orders issued per person was less than 1 per day, to be exact, 0.9 of 1 order per day, or an average of 9 orders in 10 days. This was the average for the fiscal year 1949.

We found in another agency that in some sections employees went for days, and sometimes weeks, with no work whatever to do. They were instructed to charge up the time on the work sheet to the last project on which they actually worked, even though that project might have been completed days, and even weeks, in the past.

In still another agency, we found that it cost an average of $13.78 to issue a purchase order, and the orders were issued for items costing as little as 32 cents. One branch of the agency had an order issued to purchase a copy of Esquire magazine costing 50 cents.

We face the fact that American prestige has fallen greatly in world opinion, and undoubtedly has reached its lowest point within the past 50 and possibly within the last 100 years.

In 18 of the past 20 years the Federal Government has operated on a deficit basis. In only 2 of the past 20 years has the Federal Government operated within its income. They were 1947 and 1948. Our national debt has reached the figure of $257,000,000,000. This national debt is nearly twice the total assessed value of all real and personal property in the United States in 1940 as shown by the United States census for that year; 1940 was the last such calculation. The exact figure was $143,261,928,000. Our national debt is nearly twice that sum.

It is not my purpose, however, to enumerate the mistakes we have made. I am not referring to those I have mentioned merely to criticize. I mention them because they are a part of the background of our present condition. Sensible people profit by their mistakes. If we are sensible, and see our mistakes, we can shape our future so as to profit by mistakes of the past.

To plan and carry out our program, two things are of utmost importance, namely, wise leadership in the Government, leadership which will deserve and inspire the confidence of the people; and unity which will throw the united efforts of the people squarely behind our leaders.

The President calls for unity, and we have never needed unity more than we need it now. Yet he continues to obstruct unity by insisting upon his so-called civil rights measures and other radical legislative proposals which originated through efforts to cater to minority groups and left-wing elements, for political purposes. Among these are the FEPC bills, the Brannan farm plan, socialized medicine, repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and all the other provisions of the so-called civil rights bill and the so-called fair deal program.

In a backhanded effort in behalf of unity, the President left out some of these items in his state of the Union address to Congress on January 8.

Yet in the budget message, delivered a week later on January 15, the President renewed his demand for FEPC legislation. He reiterated his call for compulsory health insurance, which is the entering wedge to socialized medicine, for the principles of the Brannan farm plan, and for other portions of the so-called fair deal program which Congress has refused to enact into law.

These proposals do not contribute to unity. They create discord and disunity, and make it harder to perform tasks which are already difficult.

Rumors are rife that many of the lame-duck New Dealers, who were defeated for House and Senate posts in the 1950 elections will be placed in Federal jobs by the President. Rumors are also rife that while no effort will be made at present to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, efforts will be made to nullify many of its provisions by Executive order, and by writing provisions into Government contracts to accomplish the same purpose.

I venture the prediction also that although Congress refused last year to enact an FEPC bill, as it has consistently refused to do in the past, Mr. Truman will shortly flout the will of Congress and set up an FEPC commission by Executive order, and thus through Executive order place into effect provisions which Congress has over and over refused to enact.

Unity is needed in our defense efforts. But, unity does not consist of an unquestioning blind acceptance, without study and without examination, of every conclusion and policy advanced by the executive department.

That kind of unity is the unity of dictatorship. The great superiority of our form of government is in large measure due to the fact that the citizens have a voice in our Government, can participate in shaping its policies, and thus have real unity.

For the immediate future our task is to map out a program to win this battle for survival. For our own preservation, we are going to have to map out a program of action after mature consideration. When the program has been decided upon, we are all going to have to support it to the limit of our ability.

Taking up the first question, how to avoid a third world war, the broad over-all plan is to build up military strength as quickly as possible. Such a program appearing on its face easy to accomplish, in fact involves many complexities, and is fraught with many dangers. To begin with, it involves a staggering cost. Secondly, it brings a threat of runaway inflation. In building up military strength quickly we will have to feel our way at first. We could easily make grave and serious mistakes, mistakes which can be avoided by proper forethought.

Good men, men of ability, differ in their views regarding methods of building up military strength and regarding disposition of that strength. Diverse views are held, as to whether we should strengthen our forces in Korea, or strengthen our forces in Europe, or build up our strength and keep it in America; as to whether we should reduce the draft age to 18 years, or keep the present minimum of 19 years.

Reasons can be advanced to support each and all of these proposals. Much discussion has been had pro and con regarding them. Arrival at the correct answers involves questions both of foreign policy and domestic policy.

We found ourselves, through the action of President Truman, very suddenly involved in the Korean conflict. We have found that it was much easier to get in this conflict than to get out of it.

Our soldiers, comprising the great bulk of the so-called United Nations forces, have faced heavy fighting, cruel hardships, and mounting casualties.

With the entry of China into this conflict we are greatly outnumbered. We cannot afford to win that conflict on the basis of equal casualties. That would be no victory for us. We cannot afford to win it by exacting two Communist casualties for one of ours. It would be too costly for us to win it even on a casualty ratio of four to one. We cannot afford a victory at that price.

Apparently it is a part of Russia's plan to maneuver us into fringe wars with Russian satellites, wars which will destroy our manpower and use up our resources without Soviet Russia being called upon to fire a shot or send a single soldier into battle.

For practical purposes we are at war with China now.

There are three possible courses open to us, and necessity requires that we make an election which one or more of these courses we will follow. They are:

First, reinforce our forces in Korea with enough manpower and equipment to drive the Communists out of Korea. This possibility can be written off. We do not have the personnel and equipment required.

Second, withdraw entirely from Korea to Japan and abandon Korea to the Chinese and North Korean Communists; or

Third, withdraw to the Pusan area and hold a beachhead there while giving assistance to Chiang Kai-shek and his Chinese Nationalists so that they can fight the Communists in Korea and on the mainland of China.

I believe the last is our best course. I believe we should adopt it, and as soon as Chiang Kai-shek's forces can be placed into the field in Korea I believe American troops should be withdrawn from Korea and let the Chinese Nationalists fight the Chinese Communists.

While this is being done, I favor building up our military strength in the United States to a minimum of 3,000,000 personnel, and adequately equipping them with modern, effective planes, ships, guns, tanks, radar, rockets, and other necessary equipment.

Constitutional provisions and requirements should be strictly followed and adhered to in every stage, and at every step in our dealing with member nations of the Atlantic Pact, and with other foreign governments.

Our Constitution provides that Congress has the power to declare war, and to provide for the defense and general welfare of the country. It provides that the President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces when they are called into service. The President has recently asserted in substance that he has the power to send troops to Europe, without the consent of Congress; that he is willing to consult with Congress, but does not have to accept the opinion of Congress. What he means by that I do not know. But these important decisions should be the result of joint action by the President and Congress.

Whatever may be the tendency of the President, however, it is the duty of the Members of Congress, who are the direct representatives of the people, to assert their group, to insist on strict recognition of constitutional provisions, not as yoke to the attempts or efforts to usurp legislative functions either by the President, the military, or anyone else. Congress holds the purse strings, and can make its influence felt in all these matters, if it has the will to do so.

With reference to our obligations to other nations, the duty rests upon the other member nations of the Atlantic Pact equally to bestir themselves, to rise speedily increase their military strength, to also build up their personnel and equipment, and to recognize the fact that the protection of Europe from Communist Russia is their primary responsibility, and not the primary responsibility or obligation of the United States.

The other Atlantic Pact nations have lain only up to this time demonstrated a willingness to accept their part of the responsibility, and carry their share of the burden. They must accept that responsibility, and carry that share of the burden. Their proper relation to us is that of allies, not vassals.

For the time being, we have no more troops to send them, and we will not have troops to send them until such troops have been inducted and properly trained.

The time and circumstances of sending any more troops to Europe must be determined, to a great extent, by the action of the Atlantic Pact nations themselves from this time on.

It should be our policy, and should be made distinct and clear to the Atlantic Pact nations, that America will not defend a nation which will not defend itself; that these nations must prepare themselves to the limit of their ability with their own manpower and their own resources.

We have demonstrated our willingness to assist these nations by the billions of dollars we have poured into their economies in recent years. However, we cannot hope to send to Europe enough American soldiers to match the millions of men kept under arms by Russia and her satellites.

In the President's budget message sent to Congress Monday, he called for unity, for a spirit of dedication on the part of everyone, for more years of military service, for longer and harder hours of work, and for heavier taxes.

If the people respond to these requests for unity and sacrifice, and I have no doubt that they will respond, it is not asking too much of the Government to cooperate in bringing about this unity; and to cooperate in every possible way to lighten the burdens which will fall upon the people through increased military service, harder work, and heavier taxes.

We are called upon to burden ourselves with heavier taxes to raise additional sums estimated all the way from sixteen billion to twenty-five billion dollars per year. This is going to bring indescribable hardship to many of us. We are also called upon to furnish sons, husbands, and fathers for the military forces. This will mean separation of families, readjustment of life, and substantial hardship through discontinuance of business and other activities, for those who will eventually come back and pick up civilian life where they left it. Some will not come back. For them it will mean death, and to their families grief and despair.

Those who are to make all these sacrifices have the right to call for efficiency, good faith, economy, and the complete elimination of political considerations upon the part of the Government.

It is not necessary that the entire cost of financing this increased military program be provided by higher taxes. A considerable part of the cost of this program can be provided by cutting out unnecessary spending and by economy and efficiency in Government.

Federal employment increased from 1,014,000 in 1940 to 2,111,000 in 1950. There has been, and is now, considerable opportunity for economy in Government in cutting off unnecessary employees. I have already given you instances of useless and unnecessary employees on the Federal payroll.

Within the last few days experts in Federal employment and Federal fiscal affairs have pointed out where it is possible for the Government to save $7,600,000,000 per year. That statement is not a generality. They point out where the dollars can be saved, namely $3,600,000,000 through elimination of unnecessary nondefense spending, $500,000,000 through reduction of civilian employees, and a reduction of $3,500,000,000 in appropriations for foreign economic aid, which is being largely replaced by military aid, and which is due to expire a year from now at all events. Such a saving of $7,600,000,000 will tremendously lighten the heavy burden of additional taxes we are being called upon to pay.

If it is practical and feasible through economy and efficiency to save this money, it would be criminal not to do it.

At all times, but especially in this time of sacrifice, in this time of emergency, the Government owes a duty to the citizen to operate efficiently, economically, and without regard to political considerations.

The proposed saving of $7,600,000,000 is more than 20 percent of the entire proposed Federal budget for 1952. This budget of course will not be distributed upon the population on a per capita basis. If that could be done, the share of each man, woman, and child in this country of the Federal Government's 1952 budget would be $477, or for the average family of four persons, $1,908. If we save $7,600,000,000 by eliminating items which can be cut out, on the same basis the saving per family would be $180, which would cut the burden per family down from $1,908 to $1,720.

While some persons will pay more and some less than the figures above mentioned, this does give an idea of how the cost will fall on an average basis.

Certainly every effort should be made to reduce this budget one-tenth. It should be reduced even more, if possible. When the load of taxation is approaching the limit, every dollar which can be taken off is welcome relief. Every dollar taken off means an appreciable lightening of the burden. To accomplish this purpose, all nondefense spending must be reviewed and re-reviewed for the purpose of cutting it to the bone.

When General Eisenhower returns from Europe and makes his report upon the attitude of the Atlantic Pact nations, we will have reliable information from which we can determine what we may count upon from them in the way of military personnel and other resources. When this information is at hand, we will be in position to decide whether to send more troops to Europe, and if so how many, and when they should be sent.

Our security, I believe, requires that a practical, workable system of universal military training be installed. It is possible to provide, and a plan of universal military training should be provided, which will fit in with the educational plans and needs of our youth. Universal military training can be provided which will not conflict with educational programs, but which, on the contrary, will aid the youth of our country to obtain high-school education, as well as a college education for qualified and ambitious youths.

In conclusion, the situation today as I see it, stated briefly, is this:

First. We can have peace.

Our greatest hope for peace lies in quickly building up our military strength.

Second. We can preserve individual liberty and free enterprise. To do this we must prevent disastrous inflation. Runaway inflation would bring with it such regimentation that free enterprise would be destroyed. Payment for our military program on a pay-as-you-go plan will go far toward preventing disastrous inflation. Price and wage controls will help this effort.

Third. The cost of this program must be met by greatly increased taxes, by strict economy, and efficiency in Government, and by discontinuing all unnecessary nondefense spending.

Inaugural Address of James F. Byrnes as Governor of South Carolina in Columbia, S. C., January 16, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday last South Carolina inaugurated a new Governor—our former Member of the House, Member of the Senate, Justice of the Supreme Court, and assistant to the President of the United States—the Honorable James Francis Byrnes, a native of my city of Charleston, S. C.

Distinguished men from every walk of life journeyed to Columbia, S. C., to witness this ceremony. So astronomically stupendous was the crowd that it was impossible to estimate the actual number.

Many people in this Nation were disappointed because they expected our Governor to enter into a tirade designed to further add to the disunity of our people. Many were hopeful that he would add to the petty bickering which has rent and torn our Democratic Party in the past few years. Mr. Speaker, he surprised them all.

Our distinguished new Governor said what we South Carolinians knew he would say. He addressed his remarks to the protection of democracy in South Carolina, the Nation, and the world. He gave notice to all people that South Carolina would defend democracy in South Carolina and in the Nation. He rose to the true heights of his national and international figure.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Byrnes demonstrated his place among the statesmen of the world. In the days that lie ahead this Nation will hear more of Gov. James Francis Byrnes. He is a man who is not afraid to speak. He is a man who will speak. This Nation, Mr. Speaker, will be a greater nation because Governor Byrnes now commands a forum which few men in this Nation can hope to enjoy. His address was as follows:

The large percentage of votes received by me in the Democratic primary last summer, together with the many evidences of good will received since then, have made me very grateful, very humble, and somewhat embarrassed. I am embarrassed because I realize fully my inability to accomplish in the administration of State affairs what is expected of me. Even so it is my purpose and my determination to give to this State and its people the best there is in me.

Within the next few days I shall send to the legislature specific recommendations on a number of subjects. At this time I refer generally to a few.

I recommend that the legislature submit to the people at the next general election a proposal for a constitutional convention to draft a new constitution.

I recommend that the legislature ratify the three amendments to the constitution approved at the recent election, including the amendment repealing the provision requiring payment of a poll tax as a requisite for suffrage.

My investigation of the State government confirms an opinion I have long held, based on knowledge of the Federal Government, that the nearest approach to immortality on earth is a Government bureau.

A beginning has been made to effect the purposes of our Reorganization Act but we still have in the executive department more than 50 independent agencies and commissions. I urge that many of these be consolidated, and some abolished.

We are a law-abiding people. Criminal statistics show that in proportion to our population, we have fewer violators of the law than most States. However, we do have a few people who want to take the law into their own hands and regulate the morals and habits of others.

If a man violates the law he should be arrested by local officers. If they fail to act and complaint is made to the State law enforcement division, the offender will be arrested. If a man does not violate the law, no group of men has the right to assault him or to threaten and intimidate him.

I recommend that the legislature enact a law similar to the Alabama statute prohibiting persons over 16 years of age parading on the streets or highways while masked, and also to prohibit such persons entering upon the premises of a citizen to threaten or intimidate him.

In this State there can be but one government, a government of the people under law. There can be but one governor, elected by the people, whose duty it is to see that the law is enforced. I am going to be that governor. I do not need the assistance of the Ku Klux Klan nor do I want interference by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

If we demand respect for State rights, we must discharge State responsibilities. A primary responsibility of a State is the education of its children. We have made great progress in that field. We spend for education more money in proportion to the income of the State than is spent on an average nationally. While we have done much, we must do more.

It must be our goal to provide for every child in this State, white or colored, at least a grade school education.

We must grant an increase in the pay for school teachers, and we must improve our school transportation system.

We will never be able to give the boys and girls in the rural sections of the State the school buildings and equipment to which they are entitled as long as these facilities are furnished only by taxes on the real property of a school district.

Funds spent for school buildings by local governments should be supplemented by a State building program. This program will involve the issuance over a period of 20 years of bonds to provide $75,000,000 for school construction. I shall submit a special message to the general assembly on this subject.

Preference in construction should be given where the need is greatest. Fifty percent of the building program should be for schools for colored children. Construction should begin as soon as the national emergency permits.

One cannot speak frankly on this subject without mentioning the race problem. It is our duty to provide for the races substantial equality in school facilities. We should do it because it is right. For me that is sufficient reason.

If any person wants an additional reason, I say it is wise. Our Constitution provides there shall be separate schools for white and colored children. More than half a century ago the United States Supreme Court held that such a provision was not in conflict with the United States Constitution provided the facilities for the races were equal.

Last spring the Democratic administration in Washington caused the United States Attorney General to intervene in several cases and urge on behalf of the United States Government that the Court repudiate this decision and declare unconstitutional any law requiring separation of the races. The Supreme Court did not pass upon the question.

Cases are now pending in the lower courts in this and in other States which will go to the Supreme Court, in which the complainants follow the lead of the President and ask the Court to abolish segregation in all schools. We must assume the administration will again urge the Court to repudiate what is now the law of the land.

I am hopeful that the Supreme Court will deny this appeal. The Court appreciates the necessity for continuity of law and the evil results that flow from uncertainty as to the law. I am hopeful, too, that if in a given case there is shown an honest effort to provide substantial equality of facilities, it will favorably influence the opinion of the Court.

This is not a local problem. The races are separated in the schools of at least 17 States of the Union, as well as the District of Columbia, under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

What the leaders of the administration do not realize is that if they succeed in abolishing segregation they will thereby endanger the public-school system in many States.

The overwhelming majority of colored people in this State do not want to force their children into white schools. Just as the Negro preachers do not want their congregations to leave them and attend the churches of white people, the Negro teachers do not want their pupils to leave them and attend schools for white children.

Except for the professional agitators, what the colored people want, and what they are entitled to, is equal facilities in their schools. We must see that they get them.

Our hope must be that in this perilous period the national administration will not urge either political proposals or socialistic programs which are certain to divide our people. But let there be no misunderstanding. While we will continue to oppose such proposals, the governor of South Carolina and the people of South Carolina will loyally support the foreign policy of the Government of the United States.

In these days when the free world is threatened by a fanatical ideology, bent on world conquest, our duty to this Republic and to the world must be met with a display of unity. This is not only our duty; it is our great opportunity.

The last vestige of isolation left the shores of America on the wings of the plane that carried the first atomic bomb to Hiroshima.

That bomb brought an end to the war with Japan. The ending of that war brought to us the leadership of the free peoples of the world. Now when freedom is threatened, free men and women must stand together. We in America must give to them the leadership expected of us because we love peace and have the power to defend it.

In the defense of our common liberty, there is not place for political partisanship. At the water's edge, let us stand together. A united America is civilization's last clear chance for survival. A divided America is the greatest temptation to Soviet conquest.

We cannot meet the perils of this day with a Republican policy or a Democratic policy. We must have an American policy.

The President of the United States is responsible for the conduct of our foreign affairs. He cannot abdicate his responsibility. But in the exercise of that difficult task he needs and should have the cooperation of all loyal Americans, regardless of their views on domestic questions.

If we are to have a bipartisan policy, the President should consult the leaders of the minority political party before and not after basic decisions of policy are made. Once decisions are made, consultation is a sham.

A nonpartisan or bipartisan policy does not call for the suppression of honest debate and discussion. Neither the executive nor the legislative branch of Government has a monopoly of wisdom and virtue.

Responsible leaders can and should be assisted by constructive discussion of our foreign policies, but that discussion should be dispassionate and dignified—not demagogic and destructive. But these are not ordinary times and we should weigh our words.

In the United Nations Charter we pledged ourselves to resist aggression. When the Communists in North Korea invaded the South Korean Republic we redeemed that pledge.

We have borne the brunt of that fight. We were disappointed that the nations which voted with us to condemn the aggression did not contribute more troops to fight the invaders. But we discharged our duty. The North Korean aggressors were driven back and rendered powerless.

Then when the people of America were made happy by the hope that our boys would be on their way home by Christmas, we were confronted with another and totally different war of aggression. Communist China attacked the forces of the United Nations.

They have now invaded South Korea. The greatly outnumbered soldiers of the United Nations, fighting as valiantly as have any soldiers in the history of the world, are forced to retreat.

No army has ever fought with such crippling limitations. Our Air Force controls the sky but cannot attack the supply bases of the enemy in Manchuria. In effect, our right arm is tied as the enemy advances.

The United States has called on the United Nations to declare Communist China guilty of aggression. The governments that did not hesitate promptly to brand North Korea as an aggressor hesitate now to declare Communist China an aggressor.

As Chinese Communists daily kill the soldiers of the United Nations, the governments for which they die are fearful of offending China and the Soviets.

If the United Nations is unwilling promptly to declare China an aggressor, authorize our Air Force to attack the supply bases of the enemy, and join in blockading China, then our forces should be withdrawn from Korea.

I am aware that some of our allies fear if China is declared an aggressor and the Air Force authorized to bomb supply bases in Manchuria, it may provoke Russia to war. That is the counsel of fear which I reject. If Russia is ready and willing to make war on the United Nations, she will want no such excuse.

But if the time is approaching when Russia will be ready to go to war, then it is not wise to have our Army divided between Korea and Europe. To my mind western Europe is an indispensable first line in the defense of civilization. We should concentrate our forces in Europe.

It is said that Western European governments have not raised armies for their own defense. In view of our record, we should not complain. In March 1948, after Czechoslovakia had fallen, I made a speech at the South Carolina Military Academy urging that it was so clear the Soviets planned domination of the world, we should cease all nondefense expenditures and immediately draft men to increase our military forces. Many others made similar pleas. Little was done.

On the home front similar delay in freezing prices and wages will hamper the Government and punish the people. In the last war when I was appointed Director of Economic Stabilization I found that the failure to freeze prices and wages at the outset threatened the economy. Upon my recommendation President Roosevelt issued the hold-the-line order. That line was held. Every day it is now delayed, there will be more inequities, higher prices, and additional cost to the taxpayer.

It took Korea to awaken us from our slumbers. Now we must awaken our friends in Europe. We must impress upon them that the time has come to stop talking and begin acting.

Since last September we have been discussing with France and Britain what limitations should be placed on military forces recruited in Western Germany. That time should have been spent encouraging Western Germany to raise an army.

The German Republic that we sponsored should be treated on terms of equality. Only in this way can we expect men to have their hearts in a cause. More than a million of the German prisoners taken by Russia have never been returned. They constitute a million reasons why the people of Western Germany, if treated fairly, will fight with us. And they know how to fight.

Since 1945, France has used its influence to prevent Britain and the United States from sending an Ambassador to Spain. We should send Spain more than an Ambassador. We should send military supplies as rapidly as possible. Spain has more divisions of trained soldiers than any of the Western European governments.

We should seek the friendship of Tito and furnish military supplies to Yugoslavia. Tito has trained soldiers. They are brave soldiers.

We should impress upon Britain, France, and all of Western Europe that we want the American soldiers who fight in Europe to have the help of the soldiers of every nation willing to oppose aggression by the atheistic Communists of Russia.

The argument that additional troops should not be sent to Europe cannot be ignored. It cannot be answered by the statement that we must comply with our obligations. The Atlantic Treaty and the United Nations do not require us to act except in case of aggression. But there is a requirement more urgent than these—the requirement of self-defense. Self-preservation demands that we act before the Soviets strike.

If we wait until the Soviet troops invade Western Europe, it will be too late for us to send an army to Europe to be integrated with an army of Western Europe under the command of General Eisenhower.

The people of America have confidence in the intelligence and the integrity of General Eisenhower. If after investigation he is satisfied that the governments of Western Europe are ready and willing to make sacrifices and put armies into the field to defend their own freedom, the American people will accept his recommendation.

I hope Congress will then adopt an affirmative proposal that the United States should

furnish its proportion of that army of freedom. Congressional approval will restore unity. It will put an end to debate at home. It will put at rest one of the greatest fears in the minds and hearts of the people of Western Europe—the fear of a divided America.

I have no fear of what Congress wil do. The people of America do not want to sit on the side lines and permit Stalin to take control of all Europe.

They know that when the Soviets reach the shores of the Atlantic, their atomic bombs will be 2,000 miles nearer our shores. They know, too, that if we abandon Europe to the Soviets, we will abandon the air bases now available to us, from which, in case of aggression, we can send planes to drop bombs on Russia.

No man knows what the Kremlin will do. But I know that the Soviet leaders understand only the language of force.

A firm stand by a united people may deter them from war. A timid course by a divided people will certainly encourage them to make war.

Such a war would threaten the destruction of every vestige of our freedom—religious, economic, and political. I pray it will never come. But should it come, the Nation may rely upon it that the people of South Carolina will do their full part, fighting for God and for country.

Secretary of Defense General Marshall States His Basis for Draft of 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I heard the distinguished General Marshall, Secretary of Defense, who has again answered the call of our beloved Nation, testify and answer questions for 2½ hours.

The text of his prepared testimony as given to us in this public or open meeting of the committee is so important to all America and comes in connection with the study by the committee of H. R. 1752, which is proposed as an amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604 as amended). It is commonly called the universal military training bill.

I am sure having the full text of his testimony to read and digest will be of great value to all my colleagues as well as others also vitally concerned. It concerns the destiny of every moment of American life.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL MARSHALL BEFORE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1951

Today no voice is listened to in our troubled world unless it has adequate steel to support it.

The most effective contribution we can make to our own security and the preservation of peace is to provide clearcut unequivocal proof that we can, first, attain, and second, maintain, the military strength we need as long as world peace remains insecure.

The practical solution to both our immediate and our long-range problems lies in the adoption of a system of universal military service and training. The bill we have submitted to your committee would give us the authority to create the strength that is needed today. It would give us the authority to provide, for the first time, the assurance that our long-term requirements could be met on an adequate basis.

The first part of our job, that of building up our forces to the level made necessary by the existing crisis, must be carried forward rapidly. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have set 3,462,000 men as the goal we must reach by June 30. This is roughly 1,000,000 beyond our present strength, but we will have to increase our forces beyond this strength if the situation worsens.

The second part of our job, that of providing now for the maintenance of a strong military posture on an enduring basis, is equally imperative.

In the past it has been our habit after victory to emasculate our military power and leave ourselves impotent before the world—impotent to defend the peaceful principles that have always been in our American tradition.

If we give the other nations of the world any basis for believing that we may again weary of the need for keeping our strength at a high level, the inevitable result will be to encourage those who plot against us and discourage all of those who have made common cause with us.

It is the terrible and continuing threat of aggression that makes universal service and training the imperative response of our democratic Nation today.

Without such a program we would risk again having our defenses reduced in periods of complacency to a level far below our needs and then be obliged to race uphill again in turbulent, wasteful rearmament in the emotional resurgence after danger again becomes glaringly apparent. There have been too many such occasions in the past. That mistake we must now correct, and at the same time set our guard against its repetition. There must be no repetition of past invitations to disaster.

The speed and destructiveness of present methods of warfare makes it imperative that we place our security on a firm base. We should proceed with the development of our military strength in personnel on the same basis that we are arranging for matériel, to make possible a tremendously rapid expansion of our military forces in an effective manner whenever that becomes necessary.

The program we have developed is within our capacity to support through the years of tension that we may have to endure. It will permit us to meet our urgent immediate military necessities and also will set us on a course for the first time in our history that will give us a reasonable prospect of an enduring posture of military strength, and without bankrupting us in the process.

Under its provisions no man physically able to share in the common military defense will be free to stand aside and ignore his obligation as a citizen. The period for entering upon service and training would be the year between a man's eighteenth and nineteenth birthdays. This age is recommended because it represents the judgment of educators, industrialists, and others who are expert in their field, that this is the period in a man's life when there would be least dislocation if he is called up for service and training. Few men of 18 are married or have children; fewer probably have entered college or started on their life work. From the standpoint of the men and from the standpoint of the community—industry, agriculture, education, science, and family responsibilities, this appears to be the logical year in which the national obligation for military service should be fulfilled.

From my own experience I can state that men of 18 are among our best soldiers. They are brave; they are strong; they perform their duties with patriotic dedication and understanding. Thousands of them volunteer each year because of their eagerness to participate in the great mission of national defense. Then, also, when these young men come out of the Armed Forces, they are much better equipped, I am sure, to enter upon useful lives as good citizens in every field of civilian endeavor. I do not present this as a reason for calling them into service; it is cited as an objective fact well supported by the records of the millions of young veterans who are now making a tremendous contribution to our national life.

It is our desire, it is our intention that none of the men between the ages of 18 and 19 who are inducted at the start of the universal military service and training program would be sent into combat areas until they have passed their nineteenth birthday. I shall not go into the details of these plans. They will be outlined fully by Secretary Rosenberg and the military authorities. When you hear them, I think you will be satisfied that it is unlikely, barring a dire emergency, that anyone will be sent into combat before he is 19.

But I must say in this connection that I very much hope you will not impose a legal limitation barring the assignment of such men to combat duty. No one can foretell the character and degree of hostile action that might be launched against us, except that certainly it would be in a manner to gain the tremendous advantage of surprise, and certainly it would be utterly ruthless in conception and execution. In such a dire emergency we should be free to act instantly and as effectively as possible, that is, without strings attached. We must not be handicapped by limitations of virtually any kind at such a moment when our national existence is at stake.

There is one other phase of our proposal which I should like to bring especially to your attention. It is the recommendation to extend the period of service for men inducted through selective service from 21 months to 27. From a purely military point of view, it would have been desirable to request an even longer period of service than 27 months. Our forces need many specialists and technicians today, and it takes a long time to make them expert in their work. To return most of these men to civil life just as they reach the period of greatest value to the Government is a definite and really severe handicap to the efficiency of the military effort.

We realize that we cannot well insist on holding men simply because it is desirable from a military viewpoint, or because it would result in a considerable saving of tax funds by obtaining this increased return on the training investment. The important consideration is that the 27-month period represents the minimum term we consider consistent with the urgent needs of an efficient military organization in the present period of world tension. We feel that the 27-months period should apply until the continued operation of universal military service and training has enabled us to reduce our forces on active duty and to transfer a larger share of responsibility to the Reserve.

The bill allows for this flexibility. It authorizes the President to reduce the period of service whenever the national security permits. He could eventually withdraw the service requirement entirely, but the obligation for training would remain, so that young men would always be coming forward to build up a vigorous, strong Reserve. Such a system would give us, I feel, the kind of basic protection we need to keep us strong with minimum drain on our productive energies.

Universal military service and training is in the best democratic tradition. It is within our capacity to support through the years. It will permit us to build up our strength quickly in the present emergency. It will provide a system for procuring and maintaining a reserve of trained manpower. It will give us the enduring system of national defense that our country has always needed—a posture of strength to discourage aggression, a reserve of power to marshal in an emergency.

Why Americans Don't Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a new resolution for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to make a study of the problems involved in nonvoting, having sponsored a similar resolution in the Eighty-first Congress.

It should be noted that 1950 made an off-year voting record with 42,324,232 votes cast, which was still only 60.5 percent of the estimated eligible voters and 43.7 percent of the potential voters—over 21 years old.

In connection with the introduction of this resolution I am also releasing an analysis of over 600 responses received in answer to an article which appeared last fall in This Week, a Sunday supplement magazine, which asked the following question: "Why don't you always vote?" It is estimated that over 9,500,000 people had an opportunity to read this article. The replies came from all over the country and have been analyzed by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Nonvoters, based upon these replies, are found in six categories in order of size, as follows: First, lack of reliable information on candidates, 37 percent; second, voter has little choice in selecting a candidate, 25 percent; third, voting is too difficult, 14 percent; fourth, legal restrictions, 12 percent; fifth, political corruption, 7 percent; and, sixth, miscellaneous, 5 percent.

A typical reply from those who did not consider themselves well enough informed about the candidates to make an intelligent choice said, "The majority of people who do not vote have decided they do not know enough about the candidates running to vote for them."

The second group which was critical of the way the candidates were chosen was typified by the following reply from a businessman of Los Angeles, Calif.:

> I believe one reason for the low vote is that we are only rarely given a clear choice. The Republican and Democratic parties under our present setup are largely tweedledum and tweedledee.

Among the 14 percent who complained about voting processes being too antiquated and cumbersome, a New York City woman said that she had to spend a full hour in order to register to vote. Others complained that the ballot was too long and in the case of amendments to a State constitution or city charter too complicated for the ordinary voter. One California voter sent a sample ballot with sample literature all in fine print which would have taken an hour to read alone.

Among the fourth group of involuntary nonvoters the breakdown was as follows:

	Percent
1. For nonpayment of the poll tax	3
2. Failure to establish residence within the time limit to vote	3
3. Unable to get time off from work to vote	2
4. Away from home on election day	2
5. Unable to vote because of residence in the District of Columbia	1
6. In the Armed Forces	1
	12

Among the fifth group of those who did not vote because of political corruption a number of correspondents blamed lobbying, gangsters, and racketeers. In the miscellaneous sixth group most of those who wrote said they were unwilling to give vital statistics like their age to the registrar of elections or were afraid to get on the jury list by registering to vote.

The survey showed strong opposition to compulsory voting, generally on the ground that it would interfere with a free and considered decision. Ten percent of those who wrote suggested ways to improve voter participation. Eight different methods and the percentages of those making suggestions proposing them are listed as follows:

	Percent
1. Use modern promotion methods	22
2. Make the act of voting easier	21
3. Relax absentee voting laws	15
4. Enact a compulsory vote law	15
5. Supply unbiased, concise and clear information on candidates and issues	14
6. Allow a tax exemption for voting	6
7. Let election day be a national holiday	5
8. Relax residence requirements	2

Several vote-promoting schemes were proposed by the respondents; however, three striking ones are given here: A lady in Ironwood, Mich., suggests that spot announcements urging people to vote be broadcast over the radio—"perhaps as often as every 15 minutes"—on election day.

A pipefitter in Bensenville, Ill., proposes a national lottery for the twofold purpose of paying the national debt and encouraging voting. His idea is that a citizen would not be eligible for a lottery ticket unless he could furnish evidence that he had voted.

Since gambling seems to be an inherent part of the makeup of most people, such a lottery would draw on such instincts, forcing the people at the same time to vote.

A Chicago lawyer suggests that the Congress authorize and direct the Postmaster General to place in each mail box, the day before election, a reminder to vote, reading somewhat as follows:

TOMMORROW IS ELECTION DAY

> I am directed by the Congress of the United State to notify you of this election and earnestly urge you to exercise your precious right of citizenship by voting.

These responses also brought out what was being done in individual communities to stimulate voting. For instance, a woman in Los Angeles forwarded a printed card reminding her to vote. This card was sent, together with her monthly statement, by a public-spirited firm in that city. In Edina, Minn., 3,000 handbills, reminding citizens to vote, were published and distributed, as an exercise of good citizenship, by eleventh grade students of the Edina-Morninguide High School. A transportation union devoted the November issue of its monthly trade journal, the Motorman, Conductor, and Motor Coach Operator, to the importance of voting. A copy of this issue was mailed to Representative JAVITS.

In one case, a veterans' chapter memorialized the Illinois delegation in the Congress to support my resolution to authorize the Speaker of the House to appoint a select committee to investigate the reasons for nonvoting in the United States. Other individuals and groups sent manuscripts, literature, and pamphlets. Even a card game, called Goodideal was invented to stimulate an interest in politics and voting.

A survey of State governors which I made on this resolution in 1950 showed strong sentiment in favor of an investigation by the Congress of why more Americans do not vote.

I am going to work hard for passage of my resolution at this session and I have received encouragement from the leadership on both sides of the aisle as well as many Members since my resolution was introduced and the active discussion on the subject, which it has touched off, began. The United States is facing the most critical decisions in its history. We need the most voters to participate in making these decisions and we also need to show the best example of widespread public participation in making them to free peoples everywhere.

Is It To Be One-Man Rule?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in today's RECORD an article entitled "No One-Man Rule," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 23, 1951:

NO ONE-MAN RULE—IT WOULD BE IMPEACHMENT FOR PRESIDENT TO ACT UNILATERALLY IN HIS ROLE AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF ARMED FORCES

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

No sentiment in President Truman's fleets of the Union message to Congress aroused heartier applause than the declaration that we do not have and never will have a dictatorship in this country. That word never has sounded well in American ears. And now it is loaded with the odium of the tremendous crimes against humanity associated with the Nazi and Communist regimes.

Unfortunately the President's assertion that he possesses the right to send additional American troops to Europe without

consulting Congress has raised a specter of dictatorship and introduced an unnecessary element of doubt and division into the conduct of our foreign affairs. What is of primary importance in this matter is not what the President may have a right to do, but what is wise and expedient for him to do.

HIGHLY IMPRUDENT TO ACT ALONE

Assuming that the President, as Commander in Chief, possesses the constitutional power to send troops where he may see fit, it would still be highly imprudent for him to make an important policy decision, such as the commitment of considerable American forces to Europe, without assuring himself of the backing of the majority of the American people. Under our representative form of government, the only effective means of testing public sentiment is full, frank debate in Congress, with Government executive agencies making available all the information that can be revealed, subject to reasonable requirements of military and diplomatic secrecy.

Historically the President's powers as Commander in Chief are broad and have never been successfully challenged in the courts or by the more formidable process of impeachment. Nor has Congress ever attempted to thwart a Presidential decision by exercising its constitutional right to refuse appropriations which would be needed to uphold this decision.

However, the widest authority may be dangerously stretched by abuse. Some of the precedents invoked by the extreme upholders of Presidential power are legalistic, in the narrow sense of the word, rather than convincing in terms of broad policy.

There is no real analogy between Thomas Jefferson's action in ordering a few American naval vessels to take punitive action against Barbary pirates and President Roosevelt's inauguration of an undeclared naval war with Germany in the autumn of 1941. The first action involved no risk of involvement in a major war; the second did.

POLICE ACTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

It was an old practice, now happily abandoned in the interest of better inter-American relations, to land detachments of American troops, usually Marines, when riot or insurrection created danger to American and other foreign lives and property in some of the less stable states of the Caribbean area. But such police action, which seldom involved any serious casualties, is sharply differentiated in fact, if not in law, from the sending of a substantial American Army to fight in Korea.

After the United Nations itself, by its scuttle-and-run policy in the face of Red Chinese aggression, has destroyed the theory of collective security, there should never in the future be any question of sending American troops into combat as champions of some United Nations decision. And the North Atlantic Pact does not carry any automatic obligation for this country to station any specific number of troops in the European theater. When ratification of the pact was being discussed in the Senate, Senator HICKENLOOPER put the following question to Secretary of State Acheson:

"Are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist?"

Secretary Acheson replied: "The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute 'No'."

FREE AND FRANK DISCUSSION

It may, of course, be argued that the heightened tempo of Soviet aggression, as reflected in the shooting hostilities in the Far East, calls for a reexamination and readjustment of American commitments under the pact. But a new policy, such as General Eisenhower may recommend on his return from Europe, should not be slipped over by Executive order.

There should be free and frank discussion in the Senate and in the House. The risks of sending more troops to Europe, and of not sending troops to Europe, should be weighed and balanced in the light of the most authoritative available testimony on all the factors involved, military, political, and economic.

A decision to take an active part in the land defense of Western Europe will have far more authority for the American people and far more deterrent effect on any Soviet schemes for following up its 1950 moves in Asia with 1951 moves in Europe if it is approved, after free and fair debate, by both Houses of Congress. If it cannot command such approval, the decision should not be taken.

Rigid lines have not formed on this issue of defending Europe. Senator TAFT has been made a scapegoat in some circles for what is regarded as the dreadful sin of isolationism. But in his long foreign-policy speech in the Senate Mr. TAFT recognized an obligation to go to war with the Soviet Union if Europe is attacked and recommended a more militant policy toward Communist China than the administration has actually followed. He suggested a large number of spots far from America's continental borders where American sea and air power should be exercised in case of necessity and showed an open mind about "committing some limited number of American divisions" in Europe. Senator TAFT also declared:

"The threat of communism is real. * * * America must be the leader in the battle to prevent the spread of communism and preserve the liberty of the world."

SPECIAL OBLIGATION TO ACT TOGETHER

There is plenty of room for differences of opinion between the two main parties (and between groups within these parties) on issues of domestic policy. But in this critical period, for which no time limit can be set, Members of Congress and representatives of the executive branch of the Government should feel a special obligation to think and speak and vote with America's security and independence as the overruling consideration. No individual and no group can afford to make capital out of national peril. Every step in foreign policy should be judged, approved, or disapproved not because it is of Democratic or Republican origin, not because it may be labeled interventionist or isolationist, not because it can be tagged with some doctrinaire formula, but solely by its impact on the national safety and interest of the United States.

Dr. Townsend's Pension Plan Is Needed More Today Than at Any Time in Our History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, today those saboteurs of our home front, namely, the enemies of the elderly people and of their children, are exulting over the Social Security Act which Congress passed last year. They like to put tongue in cheek and say with mock satisfaction that so many more citizens are covered under this new measure than ever before.

They like to emphasize their belief that, now social security has been so perfected, it has completely abolished the need for further pension agitation in Congress. They say that, with their heroic efforts in behalf of security for the aged, there is no justification for the continued existence of sincere, patriotic groups which advocate real old-age pensions for all.

They take special delight in ridiculing the earnest, dogged attempts, to get universal justice for elderly people, of men like Dr. Francis E. Townsend, founder of the Townsend old-age insurance plan, and will tell you that the Government now has arrived at all his goals by the new improved Social Security Act of 1950.

Actually, there could be nothing further from the truth. We are still just as far from adequate old-age pensions for all as we were 50 years ago.

The only thing which the new Social Security Act has demonstrated is that it was designed to help many who do not need it. I can point to several of my acquaintances who are now drawing retirement under the new provisions but who have privately told me they could get along without it.

That leaves us, then, just as far from the original premise of bringing all Americans under a fair pension plan as we ever were.

I presume the main reason the Townsend plan has come in for attacks is that it is designed to help the American people. The man who advocates anything like that takes his life in his hands these days. It just is not the smart thing to do.

However, there is greater need for the Townsend plan today than ever before in history. There is more hardship and discomfort among elderly people today for want of sufficient wherewithal. I know because I receive thousands of letters from those living in my district.

Group pension systems have sprung up by the dozens, embracing the memberships of powerful groups which are sufficiently vociferous to gain the ear of Washington.

These groups had laudable and worthy objectives to blanket their members into lush pension programs. John L. Lewis presented a fearful enough mien to accomplish such a deed for his United Mine Workers. So have many others.

The fact remains, however, that justice has never been done to the great mass of the American people and the majority of them are still far away from suitable treatment in the all-important matter of old-age retirement.

The stock comeback to this one is, let their children take care of these unfortunates or send them to the poorhouse. Well, their chilren cannot even take care of their own families, and we are paying welfare institutions nearly as much to feed and house these senior citizens as it would cost to pay them a direct pension.

I realize the accent is off our domestic front and is concentrated almost wholly upon the subject of national defense.

Would it not, however, be a vital step in the direction of the sound economy we must attain to take these respectable millions of our population out of the pauper class by approving the Townsend plan now?

After all, they are the parents of all our taxpayers and the grandparents of our fighting men. We will be ignoring the Biblical exhortation, honor thy father and thy mother, if we fail to help them. And we will deprive the Government of a vast new source of income taxes, which these older people will gladly pay to carry on our national-defense program, unless we come to their rescue.

Clipping Coupons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 23, 1951, entitled "Clipping Coupons":

CLIPPING COUPONS

The going currency among the grammar school set along our street has been a popular cigarette coupon. The other day we discovered that one bright youngster—who doubtless will end up in Washington—had scissored all the coupons in two in order to ease a shortage of currency.

For a while he persuaded his hapless contemporaries to accept the new halves at face value and so managed to add considerable to his collection of cigar boxes, marbles, and other articles of wealth. Now we are beginning to see signs that it takes two halves to get what one once would, although since there is considerable haggling over sales it's difficult for us to fathom the exact price scale.

But on the whole our street's population has adjusted pretty well. We've noticed that adults also sometimes get confused by this two-for-one business.

Recently a distinguished officer of the Government spoke proudly of the fact that the Nation's gross national product—the value of all goods and services—had risen from $103,000,000,000 back in 1929 to about $280,000,000,000 in 1950. All this, of course, under an administration which if left undisturbed will soon give us a gross national product of $300,000,000,000.

Well, without a doubt this country has progressed tremendously since 1929. Industry and agriculture today produce much more of the good things than they did 20 years ago, but the figures which the good gentleman used are just about as meaningless as the cigarette coupon statistics along our street.

Just this week the Commerce Department mathematicians tried to straighten it out by adjusting the dollar figures to a standard 1939 dollar. The result gives quite a different picture.

For instance, using that unadjusted dollar figure it looks as though the country has increased its gross national product by 166 percent since 1929. Actually, the Commerce Department figures that the real increase since 1929 has been only about 75 percent, a gain that is satisfactory enough but hardly so phenomenal as some folks would have us believe. The Commerce Department frankly notes that there has been a 50 percent decline in the value of a dollar bill.

So what about that promised $300,000,000,000 gross national product? We suggest that it will be just as easy—and just as meaningless—for the Government to promise us a $600,000,000,000 gross national product. All that's needed is to cut the dollar bill in half again and the happy day will be here.

And if the people in Washington need any help, which we doubt, we know just the youngster who will show them how.

The House Abdicates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the January 22 issue of the Chicago Tribune and commend it to those Members of the House, especially Republicans, who last Friday supported the McCormack resolution calling upon the United Nations to brand the Chinese Communists aggressors in the Korean War:

THE HOUSE ABDICATES

The House of Representatives on Friday approved a resolution calling upon the United Nations immediately to declare the Chinese Communists authorities an aggressor in Korea.

It is impossible to imagine a more subversive resolution than this one. The only Members who emerged from the incident with honor were the few Republicans—among them WOOD of Idaho, HOFFMAN and SHAFER of Michigan, and SMITH of Wisconsin—who protested against the folly.

In contrast, Representative JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, the minority leader, joined in sponsoring the resolution and allowed it to come to a vote without consideration in committee or party conference, without serious debate, and at a session from which many Members were absent because they had been led to believe that nothing of consequence was coming up.

This resolution was subversive because it was directed against the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution says that only Congress may declare war. That implies a responsibility on the part of Congressmen to weigh the facts and the circumstances for themselves in the light of this country's interests and welfare. The House, instead, voted to delegate its responsibility to the polyglot collection of foreigners who constitute UN and who will not send their sons to fight in China, as we know from the experience in Korea, even if sanctions are voted. Nevertheless, the House says, this outfit should be encouraged to commit the young men of America to an expanded war in Asia.

Common prudence, reinforced by the appalling failure of the theory of collective security in Korea, should have warned against adopting the resolution. If there is one lesson which the Korean experience should have taught Congress, it is hereafter to follow our own constitutional plan and let neither UN nor the President usurp the power of Congress.

The snap vote in the House shows that one branch of Congress is willing to leave the fateful decision of war in China to UN. In the Senate, a substantial number of the Members (we hope not a majority) have shown by their speeches against the Wherry resolution that they are willing to leave the decision of participation in another European war to Mr. Truman.

The arguments for and against war with China can be discussed at another time. The important thing to bear in mind now is that decisions for or against war in China, Europe, or anywhere else, should be made by Congress and only by Congress. It is sheer folly to leave the determination to UN whose members do not intend to engage in the war if they declare it although some of them may be quite willing, for their own purposes, to commit us to it. It is just as great folly to leave the decision to Mr. Truman who has shown repeated evidences of having lost whatever capacity for sound judgment he may once have had.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has never had before it a clearer case of subverting the Constitution than was provided by the House itself in voting the China resolution.

The United States Marine Corps

REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a number of members of the House of Representatives are today introducing a bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We are being joined, in the introduction of this bill, by our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and upward of 40 other Senators.

The introduction of this measure is not something new. On June 30, 1949, and September 8, 1950, bills similar to this one were introduced by myself and certain of my colleagues in both the House and Senate. Furthermore, the House Armed Services Committee has recommended in its B-36 report that the Commandant of the Corps be made a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This action was unanimous. In addition, the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, stated on August 28, 1950, that he had set a goal for Marine Corps combat strength at 4 fully equipped war-size divisions and 26 air squadrons.

Mr. Speaker, we need a ready striking force, we need a force in being to lessen the drain on our reserves in the early stages of an outbreak, and we need a hard core of highly trained, efficient, and dependable combat troops. This means, in my opinion, that the Marine Corps must be expanded and the Commandant placed on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This bill proposes to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am inserting at this point in my

remarks, a copy of the bill being introduced today, a copy of a letter sent out to all Members of the House by my colleague, Mr. JACKSON of California, and myself, and a copy of my remarks made in the House on September 8, 1950:

A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 206 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows: "The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, and the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 400,000."

SEC. 2. The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are enclosing the draft of a proposed bill which we deem of such urgency and importance to our national security that we are inviting you to join us in its introduction. We recognize that, as former marines, we will be suspected of being a little prejudiced in our proposal. We freely admit the charge. However, the Congress has consistently over a period of years endeavored to insure our country having at its disposal the services of an effective, combatant Marine Corps.

Notwithstanding the Congress' intention which has been expressed in many ways, there have been continuing efforts on the part of certain of the other services to destroy the Marine Corps as an effective combatant force. The situation has now reached such a critical state that only through a clear and unequivocable directive from the Congress can we be certain that its desires, which are the desires of the American people, will be followed. The Marine Corps, proportionately, has never been a large organization. It has always been a most economical and efficient part of our fighting forces. There is every reason to believe that more than ever we need the combat ability which the Marine Corps has again demonstrated in Korea.

The reasons why this legislation is imperative at the present time are manyfold. Basically, it stems from the fact that while the other services are expanding tremendously in organizational structure, the Marine Corps is being held practically to the same level that it had at the start of Korean hostilities. The Army is being authorized a large number of combatant divisions, approximately 28 in number. The Air Force, which was only recently operating with 48 groups, is now being authorized well over a hundred. The Navy is expanding and breaking its combatant vessels out of lay-up at an extremely rapid rate. The United States Marine Corps which had two divisions at the start of the Korean war is being permitted to organize only one additional combat team. Its proven close-air-support squadrons are not even being expanded to the 24 squadrons which are required for the 2 divisions. They are being held at 21 squadrons.

This is not happenstance, it merely is an implementation of the philosophy which certain of the other services have been preaching for a long time. It is our firm conviction, as stated above, that this is not what the Congress has intended, and we intend to push vigorously for this legislation which we hope we can join in introducing.

You will note that there are two sections of the bill. The first provides that the Commandant of the Marine Corps will be a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This will place two voices trained in naval and amphibious matters in an organization which is now dominated by services that have little knowledge of, or interest in, the problem of naval warfare. Second, it will bring to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the voice of an expert in amphibious matters which, notwithstanding statements made by the other services as to its obsolescence, has proven again in Korea to be a vital part of modern warfare. Third, it will permit a Marine voice in the highest military councils of our country which should obviate the necessity of constant congressional intervention to preserve the Marine Corps.

The second section provides that the Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 4 divisions of ground troops with necessary supporting ground forces and 4 wings or 48 squadrons of Marine aviation. In order to make certain that the Marine Corps does not become too large or in effect a second land army, the total number of officers and men that can be in the Marine Corps at any one time is limited to 400,000. This is 85,000 less than their maximum strength in World War II. It is probable that they could maintain five divisions out of this total if so authorized by the Congress.

If this bill is enacted, we are convinced that it will insure a strong nucleus of ready troops, capable of performing in the Marine tradition. The military value to our country cannot be overestimated and it should result in a more economical Military Establishment.

We sincerely trust that you will join us, and many other Representatives have already indicated that they will support this legislation.

Faithfully yours,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
DONALD L. JACKSON,
Members of Congress.

H. R. 9623

(Extension of remarks of Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, in the House of Representatives, Friday, September 1, 1950)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today, in conjunction with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, who will introduce a similar bill in the Senate, introducing H. R. 9623, a bill to create, and assign duties to, the Office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a copy of H. R. 9623, which reads as follows:

"A bill to create, and assign duties to, the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

"*Be it enacted, etc.* That there shall be in the Department of the Navy an Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive the same compensation as the other Assistant Secretaries of the Navy. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be charged with the supervision of the United States Marine Corps and the coordination of its activities with other governmental agencies, and, in addition, such other duties as may be assigned to him by the Secretary of the Navy.

"SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 206 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows: 'The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, and the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 300,000.'

"SEC. 3. The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

On June 30, 1949, I introduced a bill to create the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps and to fix the personnel strength of the corps at not less than 6 percent of the combined personnel strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In this effort, I was joined by 55 other Congressmen and 4 Senators.

No action has been taken on this bill but, in the meantime, the House Armed Services Committee in its report on the B-36 investigation, recommended unanimously that the Commandant of the Marine Corps be made a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff so that the type of warfare the Marines were so skilled in—amphibious landings and close infantry-air support—could be given due consideration by all the Armed Forces.

On August 7, 1950, I urged, on the floor of the House, that the Marine Corps have a permanent strength of 300,000 men, which would include 4 combat divisions and 4 air wings and that the Commandant be given a place on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Chairman CARL VINSON, of the Armed Services Committee, on August 28, 1950, stated that he had set a new higher goal for Marine Corps combat strength—four fully equipped war-size divisions and 26 air squadrons.

Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the Committee on Armed Services in its unanimous recommendation that the Commandant of the Marine Corps be made a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am also in full accord with the statement made by the distinguished chairman of that committee that the Marine Corps should have four fully equipped war-size divisions. I do believe, however, that we should go further and enact permanent legislation to this effect and, at the same time, increase marine air strength to four full-strength air wings. To do this, in my opinion, it is necessary that the personnel strength of the Corps shall be maintained at not less than 300,000.

It is not necessary for me to go into detail concerning the difficulties in which the Marine Corps has found itself since the physical ending of World War II. I do not agree with General Eisenhower's contention, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1949, in which he states:

"I therefore recommend that Marine units not exceed a regiment in size."

Neither do I agree with General Spaatz, former commanding general, Army Air Forces, when he wrote:

"I recommend, therefore, that the size of the Marine Corps be limited to small, readily available and lightly armed units, no larger than a regiment, to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries and to provide interior guard of naval ships and naval shore establishments."

General Spaatz changed his mind though, because on July 17, 1950, he wrote in Newsweek as follows:

"Two or three Marine divisions, stationed at strategic locations, ready for quick movement to any part of the world, also are essential."

According to the Washington Star of August 13, 1950, the Marines were sent to Korea at the express desire of General MacArthur. It may be well to recall that according to the July 8 issue of Armed Forces, MacArthur, while Chief of Staff of the Army in the early

1930's, was a leading advocate of the consolidation of the Army and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks articles from the Washington Post under date of August 28, 1950, and the Army-Navy-Air Force Register under date of August 12, 1950.

"[From the Washington Post of August 28, 1950]

"VINSON SETS NEW MARINE GOAL; 4 DIVISIONS, 26 AIR SQUADRONS

"Chairman VINSON (Democrat, Georgia), of the House Armed Services Committee, yesterday set a new higher goal for Marine Corps combat strength—4 fully equipped war-size divisions and 26 air squadrons.

"We aim to get the money for that force, VINSON said.

"The new target is up by two combat divisions and eight air squadrons from an estimate advanced by VINSON only August 6.

"He predicted then that Congress will be asked in January for more money for defense, including $500,000,000 for the Marines.

"That sum was expected to permit the corps to increase its strength to 174,000 men and to have 2 fully equipped divisions and 18 air squadrons.

"It now has two divisions, organizationally. However, both were considerably under battle strength when the Korean War started. The size of Marine divisions fluctuates between a peacetime strength sometimes as low as 8,000 to 10,000 men and the huge units of World War II days when more than 20,000 men were in combat divisions.

"The manpower strength of the Marine Corps then was about 65,000 men and 7,000 officers, with about 16 air squadrons.

"When defense officials went to Capitol Hill last month to support their request for an emergency military appropriation, the Marine Corps' portion of the proposed new funds was $126,395,000. This was in addition to the $200,923,000 asked for in the regular 1951 fiscal year budget, or a new total of $329,318,000.

"The testimony given at that time indicated a manpower increase of almost 30,000 above the present level, or a new total of about 142,000.

"Just what the proposal for 2 more divisions may do to the 174,000-man enrollment goal mentioned by VINSON August 6 was not made clear. The amount it would cost was not stated.

"Along with his report of new plans for the Marine Corps, VINSON disclosed he intends to see President Truman to urge this country to step up its tank production by hundreds of millions of dollars.

"He said he has written Mr. Truman, Secretary of Defense Johnson, and top military leaders that the Armed Services Committee is much concerned over the present tank-procurement program."

"[From the Army-Navy-Air Force Register of August 12, 1950]

"FOUR MARINE DIVISIONS

"The calling to active duty this week of Marine Corps volunteer reservists, most of them battle-trained in World War II, to augment the Marine fighting strength should be a lesson to the American people that never again must this famous fighting organization be permitted to be reduced to less than four full divisions plus four Marine air wings.

"The Marine Corps mobilization announcement this week marked the eighth anniversary of the corps' first assault landing against the Japanese at Guadalcanal and the first major offensive by American ground troops in World War II. From that time on the Marines and Army troops made their assault landings at Tarawa, Okinawa, and Iwo Jima, all island stepping stones toward the ultimate goal in the Pacific war—Japan.

"All elements of the Armed Forces have acquitted themselves with great distinction in the fighting in Korea. It must be noted, however, with a special interest, the role the United States Marine Corps is playing.

"The Marines committed to Korea cannot compare numerically with the Army and Air Force units in that theater. However, the Marine team hit the beach fully combat-loaded under officers 85 percent of whom had World War II experience. Reports from the Korea fighting indicate that the Marines, within their limitation in force, justified the faith of the American people in this traditional fighting organization of our Armed Forces.

"More than 2 years ago the Marines were fighting desperately to defeat a plan that would have limited largest elements in the Marine Corps to a battalion. At that time the Marine Corps pointed out that no comprehensive training or cohesive operation could be carried out under a structure of less than divisional organization. After a strenuous fight they were permitted to retain two divisions and two air wings in a reduced-personnel status.

"The Marine theory in this discussion is more than justified.

"The Register believes that marine strength should be brought to, and maintained at four marine divisions and four marine air wings.

"Strategic and tactical evaluations indicate that the type of incident in Korea may break out at any time in any part of the world. The need for fast, mobile, self-contained units is evident. The cost of maintaining these divisions and air wings would be negligible compared to the risk undertaken in lives and money in not having them available.

"The other day in the House of Representatives, Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana, told his colleagues that the Marine Corps should be raised to a strength of 300,000 men. He also said that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should be made a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff instead of depending upon Navy representation. Marines are now fighting in Korea, and with the certainty that thousands of other marines will be sent to Korea within the next several months, it seems logical and proper that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should become a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If Marine Corps personnel is to be employed in operations, it is only proper that the Commandant of the corps should have a part in planning their employment in the national-defense scheme.

"A former marine, Representative MANSFIELD declared that 'the attempts which have been made to whittle the corps down to a guard unit must be stopped once and for all.'

"There are a great number of Americans who agree with the former marine from Montana."

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Armed Services Committee will give full consideration to the bill introduced by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and myself because we feel that the issue is important and that the Marine Corps be given the recognition and the security it has so justly earned throughout the history of our country.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1951.
The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: The Ways and Means Committee has granted an open rule on H. R. 1, a bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service. It is our understanding that this will come up on the floor of the House for debate on Wednesday, January 24, 1951. We of the Disabled American Veterans are hopeful this bill will pass the House as it was reported by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. From our study and research we are convinced this is the most constructive single piece of legislation to come before the House in many years.

The provisions of H. R. 1 are retroactive to June 27, 1950. This will insure that the designated beneficiaries of every man killed in the Korean conflict will receive $10,000, payable in equal monthly installments. This retroactive feature of the bill would include the dependents of the Pennsylvania and Tennessee National Guard men killed in Federal service soon after the outbreak of the Korean undeclared war.

The Disabled American Veterans is particularly gratified with the provisions of H. R. 1 granting a continuing gratuitous indemnity for veterans having a total service-connected disability rating, and with the provision granting Government insurance to veterans who are uninsurable by commercial standards because of service disability.

The inequities inherent in the present veterans' insurance laws are well known. They are best pointed up by the example set forth in paragraph 2, page 4, of House Report No. 6, Eighty-second Congress, which accompanies H. R. 1.

Another important feature of H. R. 1 is the tremendous administrative saving which can be accomplished if this bill is enacted. If such a law had been in force from 1940 to 1949, it has been conservatively estimated there would have resulted a saving to the Government in excess of $637,000,000 in administrative costs. In a time of national emergency, the saving in man-hours and money cannot be minimized.

The Disabled American Veterans urges your consideration and support of this meritorious legislation. We are convinced that its passage, as reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, will mark a milestone in progressive, beneficial legislation for the dependents of deceased service personnel, as well as the service-connected disabled veteran.

Very sincerely yours,
F. M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

Reds Can Land Atom Bomb on Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the privilege of being permitted to include for the RECORD an editorial appearing in Newsday,

published at Garden City, L. I., under date of Tuesday, January 23.

This editorial is one that should attract the notice and earnest consideration of the membership of the Congress.

Its heading, "No time to hide," is particularly in point and constructively criticizes weaknesses in our coastal defense set-up that are intolerable and challenge most earnest policy thinking and action. Also what is called for and demanded is an immediate re-evaluation of our present protective measures through the prompt revitalization of our United States Coast Guard.

A copy of Newsday was delivered to each Member of Congress and also to each Senator. The story, with photographs, describes the simulated landing and planting of an A-bomb right in the heart of New York City.

I should like to read a few paragraphs from the editorial and then I will insert its entire content. They are as follows:

Today's Newsday is sensational. We intend it to be.

Enactment of a Long Island invasion by saboteurs bringing ashore an atom bomb was more than a newspaper stunt, although we think it is a good one. Our purpose was to dramatize, prove, and warn readers and lawmakers of the ease with which the job can be done. It would be just as easy for agents of an enemy power. They too know the unguarded beaches of Long Island and the rest of the United States. It would be simple to reach New York City, Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, or Dallas, and plant real atom bombs just as Newsday's agents planted their simulated one in Times Square.

Nazi saboteurs who landed at Amagansett in 1942 intended to go to the Ohio River. Their teammates landed on the Florida coast south of Jacksonville. The Newsday saboteurs merely duplicated the Amagansett landing. They could have continued by train, plane, or bus to Pittsburgh or any city between here and the west coast. They could have left their bomb at any chosen target.

It is easy because we have no shore patrol on guard against surreptitious landings. No established or planned radar screen against air attack hinders them. Neither does the United States Coast Guard. For despite the declared national emergency, the Coast Guard is charged only with search and rescue, plus a few port security duties. It still operates in peacetime status for the Treasury Department. It awaits an executive order to put it under the direction of the Navy.

Franklin Roosevelt issued such an order before Pearl Harbor. Truman rescinded it on January 1, 1946. Since then the Coast Guard's authorized manpower has dwindled to one-sixth its full strength. Its improved equipment has been acquired only for search and rescue work. Last October Harry Truman tossed it $21,000,000, authorized an increase of only 5,000 personnel, and charged it with keeping the security of all vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities in the United States.

It is a fact, leaving aside a small appropriation of $23,000,000 for port security work, that not a dollar has been recommended by the administration for the revitalization of our Coast Guard. Not a dollar is presently available to permit the Coast Guard to get an organization going structured along lines similar to what we had in World War II and for an organization to give us complete and practical integration of the Coast Guard into our civil-defense set-up.

I have yet to hear of a single, solitary plan to accomplish the beginning of such an organization. Certainly if anything along these lines is afoot or undergoing study, the administration should appoint an expediter and get things going.

There are vital warnings and implications inherent in this object lesson that challenge and demand immediate and strong administration action. I want to reemphasize that in the billions that have been urgently recommended for defense the administration has seemingly been perfectly willing to keep the Coast Guard in a normal peacetime status. This is not a time of normalcy. The administration, for incomprehensible reasons—and while daily advising the country of the acute dangers it is facing—is doing nothing by way of concrete action in giving the Coast Guard the security duties that this great organization can so well perform. Certainly we all know of the outstanding record of the Coast Guard in World War II.

If we are to set up proper precaution measures against potential disaster the Coast Guard must be immediately revitalized and take its proper place in our coastal-defense set-up.

The editorial, in full, follows:

NO TIME TO HIDE

Today's Newsday is sensational. We intend it to be.

Enactment of a Long Island "invasion" by "saboteurs" bringing ashore an "atom bomb" was more than a newspaper stunt, although we think it a good one. Our purpose was to dramatize, prove, and warn readers and lawmakers of the ease with which the job can be done. It would be just as easy for agents of an enemy power. They, too, know the unguarded beaches of Long Island and the rest of the United States. It would be simple to reach New York City, Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, or Dallas, and plant real atom bombs just as Newsday's agents planted their simulated one in Times Square.

Nazi saboteurs who landed at Amagansett in 1942 intended to go to the Ohio River. Their teammates landed on the Florida coast south of Jacksonville. The Newsday "saboteurs" merely duplicated the Amagansett landing. They could have continued by train, plane, or bus to Pittsburgh or any city between here and the west coast. They could have let their "bomb" at any chosen target.

It is easy because we have no shore patrol on guard against surreptitious landings. No established or planned radar screen against air attack hinders them. Neither does the United States Coast Guard. For despite the declared national emergency, the Coast Guard is charged only with search and rescue, plus a few port security duties. It still operates in peacetime status for the Treasury Department. It awaits an Executive order to put it under the direction of the Navy.

Franklin Roosevelt issued such an order before Pearl Harbor. Truman rescinded it on January 1, 1946. Since then the Coast Guard's authorized manpower has dwindled to one-sixth its full strength. Its improved equipment has been acquired only for search and rescue work. Last October Harry Truman tossed it $21,000,000, authorized an increase of only 5,000 personnel, and charged it with keeping the security of all "vessels, harbors, ports, and waterfront facilities in the United States."

COAST GUARD TRADITION

Ironically the Coast Guard is 6 months behind other services in living up to its proud motto, "Semper Paratus"—Always Prepared. It can't be ready for this emergency until the President wakes up, or until Congress legislates it back to wartime strength of nearly 200,000, with suitable appropriations under the Navy.

Since Alexander Hamilton founded it in 1790, the Coast Guard has built a tradition comparable to that of the Marines. Its cutters raided France in 1797–1801. It sent the first United States ship to Alaska after the Territory's purchase—and has performed Alaskan duty ever since. It fought Seminole Indians in the Everglades of Florida. It pioneered (1904) in ship-to-shore radio. After the *Titanic* disaster it joined the International Ice Patrol, watchful for floating icebergs in the sea lanes.

In World War I the Coast Guard went on patrol and convoy duty; in World War II it again distinguished itself when it helped evacuate Singapore, landed marines at Guadalcanal and troops in North Africa and Normandy. It chased and sank subs off the Atlantic coast. Its loran stations guided planes that bombed Japan. Like the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard is an established and valuable arm of defense. It only awaits rebuilding for its specialized duty.

DESTRUCTION NEED NOT BE AIRBORNE

Defense planning emphasizes protection of the United States from air attack. Civil defense concentrates heavily on postdisaster activities. Newsday's invasion story demonstrates a blind spot in this thinking. Not only must the Coast Guard be restored to patrol the beaches. There must be extensive, organized assistance from civil-defense volunteers. Every precaution must be set against disaster before it strikes.

When the Coast Guard was at full strength, it took 24,000 officers and enlisted men to maintain patrols of 3,700 miles of United States waterfront. But we have 40,000 miles of coastline to watch—and only about 28,000 Coast Guard men in all.

Next Saturday noon, New York City will try out its new air-raid alarm. But mass slaughter and destruction endanger every United States city through these unguarded beaches of entry. There will be no time to hide from an atom bomb brought in by sea and planted. Will Congress demand that the President order the Coast Guard back to wartime Navy duty?

Increase in Personnel Strength of the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most ridiculous incongruities in the military picture today is the instance of suppressed Marine strength in the face of the tremendous military potential demonstrated day after day by the Marines in Korea.

The stepchild of the military department, the Marine Corps, lacks a direct voice on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The "policemen" of our fighting forces have not the authority to attain a personnel status even approaching World War II strength.

Unfortunately, the dominant services are unwilling to take on as an equal partner the ancient and honorable branch of the service which has performed with distinction since the founding of the Republic.

National security demands that Congress must take suitable action in view of the reluctance of the Defense Department to accomplish this desirable result. Therefore, I am introducing legislation authorizing four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land, combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, for the Marine Corps. The bill additionally provides that the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 400,000, and that the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The personnel status envisioned in this measure will be filled to capacity in a short time if enlistments are allowed to the Marine Corps. Never in history has it been necessary for us to draft young men for service in the Marine Corps, and this increase in authorized strength should bring about no exception.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., over radio station WSPR, 5:15 p. m., under auspices of Polish American Congress, Inc., Western Massachusetts Branch, Springfield, Mass., Sunday, January 21, 1951:

Poland is the largest and most populous country in Central-Eastern Europe. In the course of 10 centuries of their recorded history, the Poles were time and again forced to resort to arms in order to throw back into Asia the Mongol, Tartar, Turkish, and Russian invaders. As a result of these successful endeavors, Poland gained the proud title of "Defender of Christianity." Even in 1920, shortly after the First World War, when the Soviet armies were surging westward to join hands with the Red revolutionaries in Germany, it was the Polish Army which defeated them at the Vistula River, right at the gates of the capital, Warsaw, threw the Russians back within their own frontiers and averted for 25 years the sorry spectacle which we are witnessing now. In 1945, there was no Polish Army on the Vistula and consequently the invaders from Asia established themselves in the heart of Europe.

When in 1945, the Red army entered Poland, following the withdrawal of the defeated German Army, the Reds brought with them a government prefabricated in Moscow, and by the sheer force of their bayonets enthroned that government in Warsaw as the legitimate government of the Polish Republic. The same group of men with some variances is still in power in Warsaw and represents Poland in the United Nations and at the diplomatic outposts abroad. At the moment of their inauguration these men were entirely unknown to the Polish people. Long-time agents of the Communist Internationale, trained and educated in Moscow, they had no emotional ties with Poland and many of them were foreign-born. They operated under aliases and even the name of the acting president of the Republic, Bolesław Bierut, is a pseudonym composed of several aliases which he used in his career as Moscow's undercover agent in various European countries. It is of vital importance for the free Poles in this country and for the millions of loyal Americans of Polish descent that the American people do not confuse the Warsaw regime and its representatives abroad with the unfortunate Polish nation suffering in Communist slavery. Those servants of Moscow who under assumed Polish names follow the Soviet line in the United Nations, throwing insult after insult upon the great American Republic, do not speak for the people of Poland. The true Poles, in spite of years of slavery, feel toward you as the Polish Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski felt when he died for your independence at Savannah, Ga., in 1779.

That government of traitors and foreign agents is already in the saddle in Warsaw for over 5 years. It maintains itself in power by the ruthless application of police-state methods. The people live in an atmosphere of fear and terror. The secret police, known as the UB, trained by the Russians and manned in key positions by Russian experts, controls every aspect of life. Using blackmail and torture the UB recruited a network of informers, who are busy even in family circles, spying on their next of kin and denouncing them to the police for even the slightest sign of opposition to the Communist rule. Old established principles of judiciary and court procedure have been thrown overboard. Warrants of search and arrest are no longer required. Police invade homes at any time of day or night, abducting innocent persons suspected of disloyalty to their Soviet overlords. That's what Winston Churchill and Dean Acheson had in mind when they spoke about the "knock on the door at midnight." It is almost impossible for the free Americans to imagine this awful feeling of uncertainty which grips the hearts of the people in the Soviet-dominated countries when they hear a knock on the door; this atmosphere of fear; these mutual suspicions.

Today, more than 5 years after the cessation of hostilities, military courts are functioning in all major Polish cities, trying civilians accused of opposing or even criticizing the Warsaw or Moscow regimes. Hardly a single day passes without scores of Polish patriots being sentenced to long prison terms, deported to Russia, or executed. In addition to the overcrowded prisons and dungeons of the secret police, where people are kept for months and years without a warrant of arrest, and where those infamous "confessions" are wrung out of the defendants by means of torture or by scientific methods which weaken the will of the individual, the Communists are beginning to establish slave-labor camps, which in the Soviet Union constitute the basic labor force.

In the economic sphere Poland has already assumed the aspects of a welfare state carried to the extreme. Industrial establishments employing more than 50 workers have been taken over by the Government, practically without compensation for the individual owners. Smaller industries are now in the process of being nationalized. Wholesale and foreign trade are entirely in the hands of the state. Private retailers are gradually squeezed out of business by means of tax discrimination and unheard of chicaneries; large estates are administered by the state, while the small farmers are by ever-increasing pressure forced to join their holdings into Soviet-style collective farms. I am glad to say that here the Communists encounter splendid resistance, and the farm collectivization program is progressing very slowly. The free professions, doctors and lawyers, are losing their rights to private practice and gradually assume the character of Government employees. The engineers, technicians, and industrial workers are no longer permitted to choose freely their place and type of work. They are assigned by the state management to certain mines and certain factories. Labor unions are a tool in the hands of the Government and serve as propaganda machinery for health-ruining work contests of the type known in Russia as the Stakhanov production races. Strikes are outlawed. The penalty for the strikers is death from the hands of the hastily summoned battalions of the Internal Security Corps, a highly mobile uniformed striking force of the regime reminiscent of the gestapo elite guards of the Nazi regime or the uniformed special MVD troops of the Soviet Ministry of the Interior.

The Communist welfare state eliminates all means of independent savings and turns all citizens into Government employees. Thus, the Government controls the purse of each citizen and through it his political loyalty. In case of unrest or dissatisfaction with the Government among certain classes of population, among workers in a particular factory, or among certain professions, one stroke of a pen can drop the troublesome group from the Government's payroll and doom them to starvation, as there is no possibility of independent earnings. Private enterprise is dead in Poland, and freedom died with it.

The year 1950 marked a beginning of a 6-year economic plan in Poland, a plan which puts emphasis on the development of heavy metallurgical industry at the expense of consumers' industries and out of all proportions to the actual needs of the country's economy. The results of the new scheme will be disastrous from the viewpoint of the population's standard of living, but will aid substantially the armament industry of the Soviet Union. The plan obviously fits the grand design of the Soviets in regard to the economies of the satellite countries. The design can be characterized in two sentences—colonial exploitation of the subjugated nations and preparation for war.

The Communists do not limit themselves to the political and economic fields of operation. They have also invaded the realm of the spirit, and it is here where a silent but inexorable struggle is in progress between the apostles of hate and destruction and the Polish people who for centuries carried on the eastern approaches to Europe the torch of western Christian civilization. In this struggle for the soul of the people, especially the younger generation, the Communists are using all modern means of propaganda, including radio, press, books, pamphlets, theater, and moving pictures. From kindergartens to universities the young people are subjected to a constant barrage of Communist slogans, repeated parrotlike a hundred times a day. Textbooks have been rewritten, history changed, the past distorted, the present imbued with idolatry of the Soviet Union, the future—well, you can imagine the Communist vision of the future—universal peace with Josef Stalin as leader of mankind.

The Soviet empire, which stretches from Vladivostok to the River Elbe, is a huge factory of human robots, men with push-button brains, centrally operated by the Politburo of the All-Union Bolshevik Party in Moscow. You have had many opportunities to observe this new creature, the Soviet man. For 5 years now the delegates of Russia in the United Nations have been uttering the same speeches, repeating the same slogans, insults, waving the withered olive branch or saber rattling in tune with the switchboard operator in the Kremlin. Their minds

proved to be inaccessible to the most skillful and reasonable arguments of the western statesmen, their faces are blank, and so are their souls.

We are living in critical times in which the fate of our Christian civilization will be decided. Either law and order, western culture and the right of every nation and every individual to freedom will prevail, or we shall sink back into the darkness of the barbaric age.

I firmly believe that the country of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln will not fail in this hour of trial, that it will live up to its great traditions by championing freedom everywhere, and that ultimately, with our assistance, Poland, the defender of Christianity, will be reestablished as a strong and independent republic, a bulwark against aggression and the best guaranty for a durable peace in Europe.

Waste and Extravagance in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today I stood on this floor to call attention of the Members to a situation that could bring ruin to this country more certainly than an armed invasion by the Red hordes of Soviet Russia. That situation is the drain made on our national economy by waste and extravagance in the Federal Government.

Today, I want to call your attention to a story which appeared on page 1 of today's Washington Post. I would like to read the first two paragraphs of that story:

> From June 30 to January 1—the first 6 months of the Korean war—the Army Quartermaster bought almost $5,000,000 worth of potatoes for the armed services.
>
> In the same period another Government agency—the Agriculture Department's Production and Marketing Administration—bought $23,278,000 worth of spuds, and destroyed $22,130,000 worth.

If that does not shock you enough, perhaps the explanation I received from the PMA will. An official of that agency said that there really was not much point to the Department of Agriculture turning potatoes over to the Army because if the Army did not buy on the open market, it would simply leave that many more surplus potatoes which the Department of Agriculture would be obligated to buy.

Let us look at this potato business for a moment—a business that is pouring millions and millions of dollars down a rathole at a time when we are to be "taxed until it hurts" to provide for the Nation's defense.

The Department of Agriculture sets acreage allotments for these potatoes, but in spite of this, anyone, anywhere can plant all the potatoes they want to. Of course, if you plant more than your acreage allotment, you cannot sell the tubers to the Government, but you can sell them on the open market at a price supported by the Federal Government by purchasing potatoes and dumping them.

If this is not one of the most ridiculous situations ever to plague this country, I would like to know what is. This Nation, faced with the most severe test in its history, already billions and billions of dollars in debt, and challenged to an armaments race, is still throwing millions away in this asinine fashion.

This is the sort of thing that can wreck our country by the road of financial bankruptcy more quickly and certainly than the guns and bombers of Soviet Russia ever will. This is playing right into Russia's hands. This is what they want—to wreck the financial structure of the country so that communism can walk in without a shot ever being fired.

The story which I quoted earlier goes on to report that the distinguished Senator from my own State of New Mexico, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, urged Congress to either remove price supports from potatoes or change the law so that production could be curtailed. The present Secretary, Mr. Brannan, has joined in this appeal.

These supports will end with the 1950 crop unless Congress moves to reinstate them. I certainly hope and urge that the Congress bring this shameful situation to a halt as soon as possible.

TWENTY-TWO MILLION DOLLARS' WORTH WASTED—GOVERNMENT BUYING BOOSTS COST OF POTATOES FOR ARMY

(By John W. Ball)

> From June 30 to January 1—the first 6 months of the Korean War—the Army Quartermaster bought almost $5,000,000 worth of potatoes for the armed services.
>
> In the same period another Government agency—the Agriculture Department's Production and Marketing Administration—bought $23,278,000 worth of spuds, and destroyed $22,130,000 worth.
>
> The Quartermaster was buying the potatoes with taxpayers' money to feed United States soldiers.
>
> At the same time PMA was spending millions to keep potato prices at a high level. In other words, one Government agency was spending millions to force another Government agency to pay millions more for its supplies.
>
> The money PMA was spending to destroy potatoes so prices would go higher was ordered spent that way by Congress in each of the last three farm price-support bills. Both Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, and the present Secretary, Charles F. Brannan, have urged Congress for almost 5 years to remove price supports from potatoes or change the law so that potato production could be curtailed.
>
> Such supports will end with the 1950 crop—about June 30. The farm law still provides price supports for potatoes, but another law says they won't be paid unless potatoes are covered by marketing quotas, which Congress hasn't put into effect.
>
> PMA has bought and destroyed potatoes this year in 38 States. The largest purchases so far have been made in New Jersey, where $6,706,000 worth were dumped. Maine was second, with $5,118,000 worth destroyed.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, as a great admirer of General MacArthur I am most happy to insert in the RECORD this very fine article on this great American, written by Kyle Palmer, political editor of the Los Angeles Times:

ABOVE AND BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY

(By Kyle Palmer)

Next Friday, January 26, will mark the seventy-first birthday of a great contemporary American.

To what extent the good wishes of a grateful people can be conveyed to him will be determined by the extraordinary circumstances under which the event occurs, but it seems to me that the anniversary of the birth of Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army, soldier, statesman, patriot, calls for something more than passing notice.

Only the pages of history to be written by historians yet unborn will show the full scope of his greatness and render a full accounting of what he accomplished in a long life consecrated to the service of his country.

For unhappily it is true that only the perspective of time can supply the real measure of greatness in a man, it being our common infirmity that only through the passage of the years can we rid ourselves of the prejudices and emotions that magnify both the large and the little in our distinguished fellows.

Hero worship is not a part of the compliment of a newspaper reporter, and while factual conclusions concerning a personality may not at all times achieve absolute objectivity, good reporting entails careful avoidance of exaggeration either affirmatively or negatively.

And as one who has ever tried, although often failing, to be a good reporter, I shall set down a few considered thoughts and reflections concerning this remarkable man and what his life, his ideals, and his devotion mean and should mean to this generation of Americans and to the generations that will follow us.

Every American has a stake in the greatness of MacArthur; for, whatever may be its inspirations and horizons, his is the greatness that has made America great. In all the requirements that tradition has established, the stature of MacArthur meets the test; he is an embodiment of the virtues we most esteem, and many of the frailties that in him have seemed most pronounced are common to us all.

MacArthur's strengths and weaknesses have been the inspiration for lavish praise and extravagant censure; some have seen in him only the manifestations of nobility and genius, and others regard him as little more than a colorful and self-dramatized poseur.

Although no soldier or statesman of his day is better known to fame, none has been more remote from the ordinary and natural contacts that make such eminent figures still understandable and approachable as ordinary mortals of flesh and blood.

Thus Douglas MacArthur has become a living legend, and the man himself has seldom been revealed as himself.

If it shall be his lot, on that account, to strike no spark of enduring affection and

lasting gratitude in the hearts of his countrymen the fault will be in ourselves, for we shall have ceased to recognize and to cherish our own noblest and finest instincts and aspirations.

MacArthur has been a target for spite and jealousy directed from high places, but the field of his labors and the scene of his achievements in war and in statecraft were not the result of any plot or scheme by enemy or adversary. No exile he, for when he went to the far places in the Pacific his role and his task were self-chosen.

In the Philippines MacArthur may have seemed to the superficial eye little more than a retired American Army officer who had secured a soft berth in a comic-opera setting, one leading a life of tropical indolence and frustration.

But all the while, as he designed his impressive military caps and strode impressively in and out of drawing rooms and an endless round of social galeties, MacArthur "the magnificent" studied maps, studied potentials of war and peace, studied racial characteristics and the imponderables of nationalistic interest of possible friend and probable foe, weighed all of the factors that enter into victory or defeat.

He was our sentry, and steadily through the years he walked his beat. Fate, or chance, or the logical accumulation of influences brought to bear by intelligent calculation and unwavering determination fitted the general for the responsibilities he was called upon to assume, prepared the statesman for the unprecedented demands that would be made upon his magnanimity, his wisdom, and his capacities as a ruler of a defeated, proud and enigmatic people.

Let history render a verdict upon his military record and leave to the historian an impersonal evaluation of the monumental documentation of the allied occupation of Japan; it is more to the purpose of MacArthur's contemporaries to understand him in the simple terms of his status and identity as a citizen of the United States.

Essential to an understanding of MacArthur is a knowledge of the fact that he is, in the purest sense of the word, a patriot. Love of country has been the greatest passion of his life, directing his ambitions, controlling his motives, inspiring his undertakings.

As the soldier son of a soldier father, both distinguished in their profession of arms, Douglas MacArthur possessed a vision that extended beyond the objectives of military defensive and offensive operations.

Those who have known him intimately through the years, including some who regard him with adulation and some who retain a less subjective attitude, say that MacArthur has always thought in the larger terms of his country's honor, its security, and its welfare.

He has a gift for ostentation, which has caused many to scoff and others to doubt. But there is no ostentation in the soul of a man who now, above and beyond the call of duty, at risk of reputation and at personal sacrifice few would willingly match, still continues at his post.

The American people know very little of the facts relating to our military intervention in Korea. They know even less about the actual role MacArthur has played in that ill-starred undertaking. Evident from the first has been a determination on the part of some of our civilian and military officials in Washington to give MacArthur very little credit for any favorable developments in the war in Korea and to fix personal responsibility upon him for the reverses, surprises, and humiliations we have suffered there.

Again, let history decide the issue. No revelations or complaints have come from the general—other than his protests against the direct misrepresentations and malicious conclusions of a few journalistic gnats in Korea and Washington. His own generation may never know to what extent he undertook a mission and followed orders which, if left to his own devices, he could have avoided.

Certainly there is nothing in the long record of MacArthur's military dispositions, decisions, and actions that lends any color to the inspired insinuations and spiteful inferences that, even at 71, his judgment is not as sound as heretofore.

His accomplishments as head of the occupation forces in Japan will rank with the greatest achievements of the rulers of men through all history.

And it may be that the greatest fruits of his genius at some future date will mature in the form of a democratic Japanese people dedicated to the defense of the freedom of man. Should that complete reversal of a people's ideals, philosophy, and aspirations be attained, to Douglas MacArthur more than to any other man living in the twentieth century will the credit be due.

And none who know him as he is can doubt that he prepared himself for the task and carried it out faithfully and devotedly, not for personal aggrandisement or glory, but for the weal of the country of his birth.

It is unnecessary to think of Douglas MacArthur in terms of personal admiration and attachment to feel a sense of pride in the fact that he is a great American and that we, as fellow Americans, share in a heritage that has produced such a man.

General, many happy returns of the day.

What Did Hoover Say?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, many attempts have been made by writers, radio commentators and so-called political analysts to distort and confuse the logical statements made by former President Herbert Hoover in his recent speech on his views of our foreign policy. In almost every instance the criticism of Hoover's speech was an attempt to ridicule his statements.

Everyone knows now that the foreign policy advocated and followed by the administration has brought us humiliation, great losses of men and materials, and defeat. In spite of all the funds and help to rehabilitate many foreign countries, we have been making more enemies than friends. The prestige and dignity of the United States has never been so low.

But in spite of the failures of the administration to formulate a sound foreign policy, any suggestions that the administration should reappraise the international situation, and give consideration to suggested changes, meets with immediate and violent opposition. Apparently the Truman administration will tolerate no criticism, accept no advice, and if the Truman-Acheson policies should prove to be leading us down the road to destruction, there will be no turning back in spite of danger signals all along the way.

The proposals of Mr. Hoover were offered as the basis for a healthy discussion which might open a debate on foreign policy through which a re-evaluation of foreign policy might result in some vitally needed changes in our present foreign policy.

But the Truman forces immediately flung the epithet of isolationism to quell any rebellion against the Truman-Acheson foreign policy. Mr. Hoover, in fact, did not propose isolationism. He suggested that we build our air and sea strength for adequate defense of our own Nation, and that we assist Europe providing Europe cooperate with sufficient self-help to assure the success of our cooperative effort.

The following editorial by Rev. JAMES M. GILLIS, C. S. P., which appeared in a recent edition of the Tidings entitled "What Did Hoover Say?" gives an honest review of Mr. Hoover's proposals and of the unfair, malicious attempts that have been made to discredit one of America's great statesmen:

WHAT DID HOOVER SAY?

(By James M. Gillis, C. S. P.)

> Believe it or not there is such a thing as honorable political controversy.
>
> The first obligation of contestants in that kind of conflict is to recognize just what it is that the opponent is saying.
>
> You must not ignore his main idea, pounce upon some possibly dubious word or phrase, overemphasize it, and thus distract attention from the main point of his argument. That trick is an old one; it has been used in innumerable debates. But neither age nor usage can disguise the fact that it is a trick and a mean one.
>
> When Herbert Hoover made his recent speech on American foreign policy, he happened at one point to use the word "Gibraltar." Some of his opponents, either from malice or from inability to see what he meant, lifted the one word "Gibraltar" out of an address of some 3,000 words and flew off with it on a wild tangent of irrelevance.
>
> Gibraltar, they said is outmoded, obsolete like the Maginot line, and they went on to moralize on the stupidity of relying upon a Gibraltar.
>
> A slick trick but it won't work with those who read carefully and think correctly.
>
> Those who heard Mr. Hoover on the radio, or who took the pains to read his speech will remember that he said:
>
> "Any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion, through the quicksands of China, India, or Western Europe is sheer folly. That would be the graveyard of millions of American boys and would end in the exhaustion of this Gibraltar of western civilization."
>
> That, I submit, is something very different from a suggestion that we place our hope in an outmoded form of defense.
>
> Another device for damning Mr. Hoover's plan was the well-known use of the epithet. In this case the chief epithet was isolationism.
>
> Even President Truman accepted it in a press conference. The Alsop brothers in their column used the phrase "scuttle and run" to designate Hoover's plan and "crawling on the belly" to designate Joseph P. Kennedy's.
>
> BOSTON'S PIOUS LAMENT
>
> The Boston Herald in an editorial asked, "What is this Europe that Kennedy and Hoover are willing to write off" and went on to lament piously what would happen to the Pope and to Rome if we were to permit communism to take over Italy.
>
> The writer of that editorial found it convenient to forget that Italy was handed over

heels for Mussolini and hence for Hitler in spite of the encyclical against fascism; that only 2 years ago, in the face of the present Holy Father's warning and an avalanche of letters and telegrams from America, the Italians cast 8,000,000 votes for what was in effect the Communist ticket, and that there are still 2,500,000 members of the Communist Party in Italy.

If we are to help save such people they must at least cooperate in their salvation.

Even God cannot help those who won't help themselves.

The nastiest epithets of all against Hoover were those of the Aesops who wrote on Christmas Day, of the "squalid little men who would throw away the future for an hour's partisan success, the trembling gravediggers of freedom who would betray mankind for two more years' low taxes."

I take that to be perhaps the foulest insult I have ever seen, not only to Hoover and Kennedy but to millions of Americans whose only crime is that of doubting the wisdom of the men responsible for Korea.

FIFTY-ONE BILLION DOLLARS

To answer such wild utterances would be to repeat the mistake of clouding the issue.

Hoover said, "We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the Continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of defense of Western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money."

Speaking of money, we have sent into Europe since 1940 the sum of $51,764,500,000.

Of those dollars Britain received thirty-six and one-half billions, France nine and one-half billions, the Netherlands one and three-fourths billions and so on down the line, and we are on the point of spending another one hundred billions to arm Western Europe.

As I see it, what Messrs. Hoover and Kennedy suggest is in the first instance that we should get some military cooperation in return for such outlays.

To call that suggestion "isolationism" is wicked.

It is of record that in Korea the United States of America bore 90 percent of the burden and the other 52 members of the UN virtually nothing.

It is no wonder that the American people are coming rapidly to see and accept the Hoover view.

The New York Times in its carefully compiled Review of the News on December 31, reported that even Congressmen from the East, the so-called seat of internationalism find their mail running from 40 to 1 to 60 to 1 in support of the Hoover program.

The people seem to be wiser than some of the commentators.

Schick Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Whereas the former Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, now being used exclusively for domiciliary purposes by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the said veterans domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa is now being operated at less than one-fourth the capacity of the institution, resulting in inefficient, costly, and wasteful administration; and

Whereas thousands of veterans in the central United States are now urgently in need of hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and

Whereas many more thousands of disabled and sick veterans will soon be added, as a result of the fighting in Korea; and

Whereas the Schick Hospital should be opened to full capacity to provide care for the many thousand veterans and veterans-to-be, who are now in need of hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and

Whereas the Iowa Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly by Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, passed a resolution on February 3, 1947, requesting the Veterans' Administration to utilize Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and very desirable location for the permanent care of veterans; and

Whereas in the interests of economy and in the interest of the veterans of the central United States, we deem it advisable and necessary that the veterans domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, be used to full capacity; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has been deaf to the plea of veterans that the Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, be opened to full bed capacity thereby utilizing present existing facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States take immediate action to cause the Veterans' Administration to increase the use of Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, from the present limited 500 domiciliary beds to also include an additional minimum of 1,000 beds for hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and Gen. Carl R. Gray, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

O. H. HENNINGSEN.

We, W. H. Nicholas, lieutenant governor of Iowa, and Carroll A. Lane, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate and house of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa.

W. H. NICHOLAS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
CARROLL A. LANE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Joshua Evans—Half Century Banker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, this week many Washington people are paying tributes to a valuable citizen and an outstanding American. He is Joshua Evans who is completing a great history and service in banking. Among these tributes is an editorial in the Washington Post which I include as part of my remarks:

During his 56 years of banking in Washington, Joshua Evans, Jr., now retiring as vice president of the Hamilton National Bank, has sponsored many innovations in financial and civic affairs. But, even more, he has helped to break down the traditional concept of the banker as a cold, personally aloof community pillar. Throughout his career he has emphasized the human element in banking, both in his kindly service to individuals, and in his constant giving of himself to projects to benefit the District and the Nation. His reward is the deep affection of everybody with whom he has ever been in contact. Seldom has a businessman been so personally honored as he will be Wednesday night when national and local leaders pay him tribute at a testimonial dinner.

In some respects the career of "Josh" Evans, as he is widely known, has an Alger-boy quality. He came to Washington a youth fresh from the farm, became a runner in Riggs & Co., predecessor to the Riggs National Bank; learned to operate the bank's first adding machine; was the youngest man ever to become its general bookkeeper; worked his way up to vice president; in 1933 was one of the prime movers in founding the Hamilton National Bank. He wrote a paper, "The Making of a Bank Clerk," which attracted attention in national banking circles, and he helped to develop the American Institute of Banking of which he is a former trustee.

Yet, unlike the Alger boy of finance, Mr. Evans did not give himself to pursuit of a fortune. Rather he gave himself to the community, especially to helping to start new movements for its benefit, as the Community Chest, the Better Business Bureau, the Washington Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City, out of which grew the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and new municipal finance committee procedures in the Board of Trade. He also trained and helped many young bank clerks, now business leaders here and in other cities. Now, as he retires, he has the satisfaction of knowing that all of this has amassed for him incalculable deposits of friendship.

Don't Hide the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is very refreshing to occasionally read an article which shows how much real service to the American people is being rendered by one of the Government agencies which we authorized, and which our appropriations support. I read such a story in an advance copy of the National County Agent and Vo-Ag Teacher magazine, which is regularly distributed only to county agents, Vo-Ag instructors, Soil Conservation Service field men, and Farmers Home Administration supervisors.

I have seen many duplicates of the story throughout the Eighth District of Alabama. I am sure any Congressman could find them in his district as well if he visited our farms, as I had occasion to do when working on the legislation which eventually developed into the Farm Housing Act of 1949. It is with considerable pleasure, therefore, that I offer to the membership of this Congress

the full text of an article which describes the accomplishments and the successes which have resulted from some of our actions.

DON'T HIDE THE FACTS

Before you knew the answers yourself, did you ever walk past a United States Department of Agriculture office sign and wonder a little about the people representing that Department and the work they do? Of course you did.

It's difficult to believe, but it's true, there are people and many of them, walking by those signs every day and asking the same questions.

Whose job is it to give them the answers? The local office of that Department has been placed there by Congress, representing all of our people, to provide a type of needed assistance for farmers that they are not in a position to obtain elsewhere. It's their office—it's there for them. Their congressional representatives provided it for them.

At first glance it would appear that it's basically the farmer's job to let others know why this USDA office is there. But that's only part of the story. It's no one person's responsibility more than another's. It's also the job of the USDA worker—the county agent, the FHA supervisor, the Vo-Ag teacher, and other Government agricultural workers to let the uninformed know what that USDA office is doing and why its work is important.

What about the person who isn't a farmer or a Government agricultural worker? He also has a responsibility to learn the facts himself and to let others have the facts too.

As an example of why all of us should be interested in learning the facts and passing them on, let's look in on the work of one of these USDA offices and see the value of its work. This sign says: "United States Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration."

It is one of the many such signs locating an office in county-seat towns in every State and in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Merely by changing the name and showing a different list of duties it could be a story of any USDA agency.

The office behind that sign was set up to help low-income farmers in the area, but in helping this group it helps the entire community. Its principal purpose is to help farmers live better by farming better. But in accomplishing that purpose it creates more and better customers for the community's merchants, makes bank depositors of families who had never previously used a bank's services, brings new groups of people into the various community activities, raises the value of all property in the community by increasing the value and improving the appearances of individual farms in the area, makes it probable that more people will attend the community's churches and more children continue in school work, and creates tax revenue from individuals who once might have been a drain on the community's tax fund. How many taxpayers realize this? And naturally the taxpayer wants to know how all of this is done.

He should know that the principal method the Farmers Home Administration uses to accomplish this purpose is through credit to families unable to obtain needed funds from other sources. Actually, however, this is only one of the tools used, and credit itself seldom solves the individual family problems with which this agency works. The more important tool is supervision; something that is a long step removed from the industrial meaning of the word. As used in this case, supervision means assistance in effective farm planning, and guidance in the efficient carrying out of farm and home plans.

The easiest way to explain the work of FHA and how it has accomplished the near miracle of creating almost a million successful farm families from a group of farmers who once lacked sound farming experience or the efficiency and earning capacity possible by modern methods (or the work of any other U. S. Department of Agriculture office), can best be shown by citing a typical case.

This case, which can be duplicated in principle in every county in the Nation, is of Morgan O'Kelley, who visited Tennessee in April 1941 and found mountains covered with redbud, crab apple, wild plum, and dogwood. The scene started dreams pounding in the head of the impressionable Irishman, and before the visit was ended he had bought a small place 8 miles from Oakdale, Tenn. Not much of a place—50 acres, a two-room cabin without electricity and a spring at the bottom of the hill its only water supply, eroded fields covered with briars, sassafras, and black gum. For the next 3 years the O'Kelleys, back in Michigan, scraped and saved for the time when they could move to Tennessee and start making over that worn-out farm.

Dreams often fade out under the cold, unmerciful light of realities, and that was what happened to the O'Kelleys, when on December 21, 1944, they moved. The last part of their trip was over a sawmill road which quickly let them know how important to a farmer a to-market road can be. Their December view of the farm was a lot different from the beautiful picture it had presented when in bloom. The stark nakedness and the erosion and the briars loomed up as almost insurmountable obstacles. And the house—well, Mrs. O'Kelley insisted that something had to be done about that if she stayed in Tennessee.

Labor being impossible to find, or to pay for with their limited savings, O'Kelley tackled the construction himself and did a good job. But it used up all the money they had saved, and they needed additional money for seed, fertilizer, fencing, and tools. That was when O'Kelley first saw the Farmers Home Administration sign in the office in Kingston, Tenn.

Inside the office he found Henry D. Wattenbarger, agricultural graduate from the University of Tennessee, and a man whom Roane County farmers said "knew his farming and could help folks." Henry listened to O'Kelley's story and said he thought the FHA might help. First, however, it would be necessary for the county committee to approve O'Kelley as an applicant.

As part of his job, Wattenbarger visited the O'Kelley farm to see how the FHA could help. He walked over the briar-grown pastures and suggested that in addition to trimming, it probably needed lime and phosphate. On his pad he made a note to check with the county agent and have the soil tested, not only on the pasture land but in the eroded fields where row crops were growing. He pointed out ways to fence the fields to make them easier to rotate and work, suggested seeding legumes and grass to heal scars of washing. The livestock could be built up, too, by careful breeding and a balanced ration. The tools were inspected, and a note made on the pad that better equipment would have to be available if O'Kelley was to do much of a job of farming. The barn and poultry house would need reworking too; and O'Kelley's carpentry on the new home indicated that he could do the job himself if he had the money to buy materials.

The inspection completed, Mr. and Mrs. O'Kelley and Wattenbarger sat down together around the kitchen table to put down on paper the plan for O'Kelley's operations. For FHA's part of the plan, Wattenbarger promised to provide enough money to make the plan work. More, he would drop by the O'Kelley farm from time to time to help Morgan with any technical farming problems which might develop. He would see that the SCS, Extension, and other United States Department of Agriculture workers were told of O'Kelley's problem so they could help in their specific line.

Today the O'Kelleys claim they are at least 10 years ahead in getting to where we are because of the aid FHA and others gave them. The road leading past their farm has been graded and graveled so that they have easy access to market. They have a completely modern, seven-room house, three brooder houses, a laying house, a two-car garage and a shop, a new corncrib and tool shed. A nephew, living with them for the past 3 years, has readied himself for college and his work on the farm will make it possible for him to go. The eroded cropland now produces 75-bushels per acre corn. Most of the farm is in grass—good grass—and on it Morgan has almost year-round pasture for a small beef herd and the family milk cows. His 3 acres of strawberries produced over 100 crates for market last year, and he raised 1,000 pullets for market, too.

There have been 1,210 "O'Kelleys" who have been aided by Henry Wattenbarger in a similar way during the past 9 years. They have had different names, different problems, different farms, but each has found that the supervised credit available from FHA will help them with specific problems, and enable them to live better because they farm better.

These 1,210 families, scattered over Morgan, Roane, and Scott Counties, Tenn.—the territory served by Wattenbarger—make up only about 23 percent of the farm families in the area; but they represent the people who could contribute little to the community without this type of assistance.

Approximately $610,000 has been loaned in the three-county area, and this represents money coming from outside the district which is spent within the three counties. Most of it went to dealers who sell equipment, seed, feed, fertilizers, livestock, building supplies, or home furnishings. On the basis that a dollar coming into a community is spent 10 times before it leaves, the three-county area has had a turn-over of $6,000,000 as a result of this FHA activity.

Because this money was loaned to families unable to obtain credit elsewhere, it has made 1,210 customers for local merchants who might otherwise not have spent any or much money in the area. Because these families have learned to farm better and their farms are earning more money, the amount of actual spending has been far greater than is represented by the amount of money loaned. O'Kelley's 75-bushel corn meant five times as much income from his cornland as came from the 15-bushel average he had 5 years ago.

Children of families with little or no farm income seldom have the opportunity of attending school as long as they should. O'Kelley's nephew who gained an opportunity to attend college as a side-product of the FHA loan is only one such example among the 1,210 families served by Wattenbarger during his 9 years in the FHA office at Kingston. Other sons and daughters or close relatives of FHA families have been active in 4-H or FFA work when otherwise the opportunity might have been denied them, have completed high school or gone on to college, have trained themselves for occupational opportunities of the future.

The health of the entire family has been improved because the families have learned to grow, preserve, and use a greater variety of food, can spend more for medical services, and have learned lessons of sanitation and nutrition.

The churches in these three counties show the benefits of FHA aid to families in their district. A farmer who is earning a good income from his farm is usually a generous giver to his local church, but the farmer who must skimp every dollar cannot too enough left over to support adequately any

religious activity. The increased good farming by these families has improved their earnings and multiplied their donations to educational, charitable, and religious institutions.

Some not-so-readily apparent benefits to the entire community also deserve mention. When Wattenbarger first came to the Kingston office as an FHA supervisor, many of these families were welfare cases, and few helped support the community by the taxes they paid. With increased income due to their better farming, they have become taxpayers who help to shoulder the burden that might have fallen on other members of the community without this assistance from FHA. Then, too, the changed appearance which has settled over the face of FHA farms has improved property values not only of the farms where FHA has helped but of their neighbors as well. You just can't remove one eyesore from a community without improving the whole community by its removal.

During a typical World War II year—1943—these and families like them throughout the United States were able to increase, with FHA aid, their milk production 20 percent while other farmers increased production only 3 percent. Similar increases were made in egg, pork, beef, sugar beet, dry bean, soybean, and peanut production—each increase larger than the increases reported by BAE for all farmers. In the months ahead, if it becomes necessary again to increase food production, these families represent a group capable of answering the call quickly and effectively.

One key to the success of Wattenbarger and of the families who cooperate with him has been a very active county farmer committee which has worked with the supervisor to select families most likely to succeed with FHA aid. Before any loan can be made, this committee of three local farmers consider the applicant and his abilities. If the loan is to help the applicant buy or develop a farm of his own, this committee also visits the farm and decides whether this particular farm can be made successful with the combination of FHA supervised credit and family ability. Once the loan is made, the committee does not forget the family. Periodically it reviews the borrower's progress, and may from time to time recommend further aid, or decide that he has now qualified for private credit rather than still having a need for continuing with FHA aid.

On the basis of this committee approval, or the family's ability to repay their loans in full from farm income, almost 1,000 of these 1,210 farm families in the 3 counties have now "graduated." That is, they now go to local banks, PCA's or other private-credit sources for any further assistance they may need. Most of the banks and PCA's in the three-county area know that many of their clients of today are farmers whom they would have rejected as lacking adequate security a few years ago. But those families have climbed up the ladder of farm success since that earlier date, and today they are among the most prosperous farmers in the community.

Wattenbarger at Kingston is only one of 1,700 such persons throughout the United States. Collectively, since the program was initiated, the agency has provided supervised credit to almost 2,000,000 farm families. Today they are still helping approximately 270,000 of these families, and most of the rest have now paid their loans in full and are continuing to farm with the aid of their own resources and skills, using private credit for their present needs. Most of them, too, are continuing to practice the planned, diversified farming which started them up the ladder toward their present success.

But when we cite any such case, emphasis should be placed on the fact that like FHA in the O'Kelley case, there are other valuable USDA agencies providing some specialized form of assistance to farmers and the whole community wherever you see their signs. In every county, Extension and its county and home demonstration agents are providing sound farm- and home-management education to farmers and their wives and both extension agents and Vo-Ag teachers are giving farm children an opportunity to develop into the good farmers of the future. The Soil Conservation Service, through its technicians in farmer-organized soil conservation districts, are helping farmers to retain or rebuild the fertility of their land and to use soil and water more economically. Production and Marketing Administration offices provide incentives for farmers to put into practice the sound farm-management methods taught by other agencies, and help to regulate our farm production and our marketing methods so that both the farmer and the community benefit. Forest Service helps prevent forest fires which might ravage whole communities, and indirectly helps farmers to get more benefit from their farm woodlots. Experiment stations are developing more efficient methods, better lines of livestock, and better seed for farmers to use.

Each agency has it own sign, each has its own specific tasks and methods of helping farmers solve specific problems which exist on their farms, but all have one thing in common—they are helping to build a better community.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an essay entitled "I Speak for Democracy" by James McKinney Budd, of Opelousas, La., a junior in high school, which was selected as one of the best in a contest held among junior and senior high school students in Louisiana:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Does the average citizen of the United States of America appreciate his democratic way of life? Does he know its value and the rights guaranteed to him thereunder? Is he willing to make the necessary sacrifices in order that these rights may be perpetuated for himself and his posterity?

Upon the answer to these questions depends whether or not the democracy of America will be lost and engulfed in the "isms" that threaten to destroy the democracies of the world, or whether this Nation will emerge triumphant from this period of the world's history which is marked by socialistic, communistic, and individualistic trends of thought and action. Today nothing less than the preservation of our lives, our fortunes, our honor, and our American way of life is at stake.

Standing as we do today in point of time, far distant from the adoption of the Constitution, it is difficult for us to understand and appreciate what it cost. If we could go back across the years and stand beside the men who took part in the framing of this great instrument, we would better appreciate its meaning. They were fresh from a conflict that was brought about by misrule, and they had banded themselves together in a common cause to resist the injustices which were being heaped upon them. They willingly endured the hardships of merciless war, in order that liberty might be guaranteed to them and to their posterity. They paid that price in order that man might set up in a new world a new form of government—and time has proved the soundness of their reasoning.

Have the sacrifices of our forefathers been in vain, and will this experiment which started more than 150 years ago, be able to endure the vicissitudes which now encompass the nations of the world, or will the historians of future generations have to write that the greatest democracy of all times failed? No, this struggle for self-government and freedom will go on. Democracy lives in the hearts of all who pay the price of freedom, and who have the moral courage to resist oppression, class distinctions, and racial and religious discriminations, and are willing to champion the rights of all human beings. From personal freedom comes all the moral good and all the material wealth of this happy country; the richness of human living, and the always brighter vision of a better future which only Americans know. Let us never forget that personal freedom carries personal responsibility. The citizenship of America have taken upon themselves the responsibility of proving to the world that people are able to govern themselves. The history of the past with all its bloodshed, its heartaches, sorrows, its toil and sacrifices and those who come after us shall ever keep alive our form of free government. The heroes of the past cry out to this generation to save and protect it. It is the duty of every individual citizen, your duty and mine, to learn the meaning and value of the Constitution, and that for which it stands. Thus will we show our appreciation to the founders of the Constitution for guaranteeing to the citizens of the United States of America the democracy which we now enjoy, and for which many of our forefathers paid the supreme sacrifice.

To fulfill these ideals it is obvious that we must stand together. We are being forged into a new unit amidst the fires of envy and suspicion that now blaze throughout the world. In their ardent heat we shall, let us pray, through God's intercession, be purged of faction and division, and be purified of the errant humors of party and private interest, to be brought forth finally in the days that are to come with a new dignity of national pride and spirit. A pride and spirit beckoning all nations into a global democracy, wherein all will join hands and hearts in recognizing the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, which is basically the true concept of all democracy.

I speak for democracy—democracy at home and democracy throughout the world.

Progress on the Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the December 31, 1950, issue of the New York Times entitled "Progress on the Tennessee":

PROGRESS ON THE TENNESSEE

Although the Tennessee Valley Authority produces only a small percentage—perhaps 6 or 7 percent—of the total electric power output of the United States, it continues

to grow. Its latest report, made public yesterday, shows that the capacity of its power system has increased nearly four times since 1940. During the fiscal year covered by the report it produced 17,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which was 12 times as much as was generated in its region in 1933. Further construction now under way will bring the present installed capacity of 3,000,000 kilowatts to 4,900,000 by 1953. Of course, TVA's development is a part of the total power development in the country. The electrical industry, private and public, has made great strides. In 1933, for example, the average domestic consumer in the United States used about 600 kilowatt-hours. Average consumption now is 1,765 kilowatt-hours, but TVA's domestic consumers used an average of 3,079 kilowatt-hours during the last fiscal year. It should be remembered, of course, that TVA power for domestic consumption is sold to municipalities and cooperatives, who then undertake the retail distribution.

There will doubtless be argument to the end of time as to TVA's profits. The fact is, however, that the investment allocated to power in the TVA system brought in during the last fiscal year a net operating revenue of $27,000,000, or a return of about 5¾ percent on the average depreciated power investment. Some of these earnings have been repaid to the United States Treasury and a large sum—$111,000,000—has been reinvested in the power system. On the whole, it looks more than ever as though the Government's investment in the TVA's power facilities has been a sound one.

At the same time TVA is able to show increasing use of its 630 miles of navigation channel on the Tennessee River, with an estimated saving of $6,000,000 in transportation costs. Its flood-control system again reduced flood crests, both on the Tennessee and on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. It has carried on research in the production of fertilizers with advantage both to farmers and to private manufacturers. Test demonstrations, most of them in the Tennessee Valley but others in twenty-odd outlying States, have helped to conserve the land. Forests have been protected, malaria has been practically wiped out, there has been a great increase in recreational facilities, and State and local agencies have been encouraged to take increasing responsibility.

All in all, TVA seems to be established as a successful part of the American system. It has not destroyed either democracy or private enterprise in the Tennessee Valley. It has created a model which may be adopted, no doubt with many changes for use in other parts of the country.—From the Sunday, December 31, issue of the New York Times.

Who Said That?—"For Your Information the Marine Corps Is the Navy's Police Force"—The Marines Don't Believe It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House, and in fact most of the people throughout the Nation, will remember the now famous letter which I received from President Truman in response to my request that the United States Marine Corps be accorded representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. President Truman wrote me as follows:

AUGUST 29, 1950.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDONOUGH: I read with a lot of interest your letter in regard to the Marine Corps. For your information the Marine Corps is the Navy's police force and as long as I am President that is what it will remain. They have a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's.

Nobody desires to belittle the efforts of the Marine Corps, but when the Marine Corps goes into the Army it works with and for the Army, and that is the way it should be.

I am more than happy to have your expression of interest in this naval military organization. The Chief of Naval Operations is the Chief of Staff of the Navy of which the Marines are a part.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

Evidence of the widespread interest in the Truman-marine letter and the extent of its publication was brought to light in an Associated Press release of January 22 from Port Huron, Mich., which revealed that 20 Purple Heart Medals were forwarded to the President by 20 wounded Marine Corps veterans of the Korean action to forceably remind Mr. Truman of the error of his recent statement that the United States Marines are the police force of the Navy and have a propaganda machine almost equal to Stalin's.

Pfc. Donald R. Chatterson, a 20-year old marine veteran of Korea, who was wounded and is now on 30 days' recuperation leave at his home, gave the story to the press. According to Private Chatterson, he and 19 other wounded marines heard of the President's remarks upon their evacuation to the Treasure Island Marine Base at San Francisco and were so angered that they put their Purple Heart Medals in the same envelope and addressed it to President Truman.

Private Chatterson said he never learned whether the President got the medals. He was wounded twice in Korea, first at Inchon and later in North Korea.

The Associated Press report of this incident follows:

PURPLE HEARTS SENT TO TRUMAN BY 20 RESENTFUL MARINES

PORT HURON, MICH., January 22.—President Truman has 20 Purple Heart Medals—if the United States mails saw them through to the White House—to remind him of his since regretted remarks about the Marine Corps being the Navy's police force.

This was revealed today by Pfc. Donald R. Chatterson, 20-year-old marine veteran of Korea. Wounded, Private Chatterson now is home on 30 days' recuperation leave.

Hearing of the President's remarks upon their evacuation to the Treasure Island Marine Base at San Francisco, Private Chatterson said he and 19 other wounded marines were so angered that they put their Purple Heart Medals in the same envelope and addressed it to President Truman.

Private Chatterson said he never learned whether the President got the medals.

Besides describing the Marine Corps as the Navy's police force, the President accused it of having a propaganda machine the equal of Stalin's. He later apologized and expressed his regrets.

Describing fighting in Korea, Private Chatterson told a reporter: "It's like a horrible nightmare. You can't imagine what it's like."

He was wounded twice and lost 48 pounds. He now weighs only 90 pounds. First he was hit at Inchon. Later he was hit by machine-gun bullets in North Korea.

In Washington the White House said there was no record that the medals had been received and no comment.

Timid Forget United States Is Mighty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting and informative article written by Lester Allen, appearing in the Boston Post of January 21, 1951:

TIMID FORGET UNITED STATES IS MIGHTY—FEAR NEEDLESS BECAUSE NATION'S ABILITY TO OUTPRODUCE WORLD WILL SURELY DEFEAT RED FORCES

(By Lester Allen)

Beneath the hum of the furiously busy industrial centers of the United States a phrase from the words of a man now dead echoes faintly. "There is nothing to fear but fear itself."

That phrase uttered in the darkest days of the Nation's history, when confidence had fled and the national economy tottered, rallied the confused and divided American people to a superb effort. It bade them to raise their eyes from their own personal problems, look about the broad and fruitful land which was and is theirs and take heart.

Today, the potentialities of the same broad and fruitful Nation, the possibility that an outraged people will unify and rally to another supreme effort, prevents the masters of 735,000,000 people in Russia, China, and the satellite Communist states from attempting a direct affront to 496,700,000 people of North America and Western Europe.

NOT SO SIMPLE

The rule of thumb of Asiatic strategists is "We kill one capitalist soldier, they kill 10 Communist soldiers, pretty soon there are no more capitalist soldiers."

If, however, it were as simple as that the Soviet Union leaders would long since have sent overwhelming armies on the march.

Modern war isn't as simple as that. It must have a base of raw materials, heavy industry, electrical generation capacity, steel production. In modern warfare human cannon fodder spread over the land areas does not always mean victory.

STEEL HALTS STALIN

During the past week a significant figure was announced, not by the Government but by the American steel industry. The annual steel capacity of the United States is now 104,229,650 tons a year, a 28-percent increase since 1940.

In that figure may be found the answer to why Stalin doesn't launch the attempt to grab the world, for this steel capacity fused into an alloy with a unified and determined American people means the ultimate defeat of all the ambitious plans of the Soviet Union.

DEPEND ON STEEL

Even if the steel-producing capacity of the Soviet Union and its satellites were joined to that of Western Europe by quick

conquest, there would still be only 89,700,000 tons of steel annually against our 104,239,650.

All the other superiorities in the hands of the western nations arrayed against Communist aggression are dependent upon steel. Coal, petroleum, electrical output, horsepower output of engines for a mechanized age all depend upon steel. It is no longer "How many divisions have you?" but rather "How much steel production have you?"

TOPS THE WORLD

In the present state of American supply lines the Nation tops anything the world has ever known. But it is not self-sufficient. In order to continue at this level of industrial strength certain raw materials must be imported.

To guarantee a continued supply of imported raw materials a huge Navy and merchant marine is necessary, if war comes, to prevent a stoppage of our lines of supply. Thus the fortunes of the people of the United States are inextricably linked with those of the people of the other western nations arrayed against communism.

CAN WEAR REDS DOWN

With Western Europe security maintained we can go on indefinitely wearing down the strength of the Soviet Union, hamstringing its growing industrial strength, a growth secured only at an appalling sacrifice of a higher standard of living for the people of the Soviet Union and the satellite states.

It can be said without fear of contradiction that the average American doesn't know or appreciate the strength of his country and is inclined to underrate it, to make the task ahead seem more formidable than it is.

SACRIFICE LIGHT

A unified American people, dedicating their whole effort to removing the peril of communism forever from their lives, would have to make certain sacrifices not only in their standard of living but also in their economic status.

Yet the sacrifice would only entail going back to the living standards which prevailed in what has been looked upon as the golden age, the period between 1922 and 1929.

Never in all the world's history has so much power been used and not abused. It is a matter of great pride for Americans to consider how, with the means at hand, to become a dominant and dominating power in the world, the Nation clung to an idealism which is scorned by the exponents of total application of such power.

DO NOT UNDERSTAND

All that the American people have lacked in the performance of one of the greatest feats of unselfishness ever undertaken, the restoration of the economies of the nations of Western Europe after the ravages of war, is a becoming modesty.

Pride in our accomplishment has been mistaken for arrogance or evil intent to tie Western European nations to our wheels by political bonds in exchange for our generous aid. If anything, too few political agreements were exacted for the aid we have given.

EUROPE NEEDS US

It is true that Western Europe cannot get along in the face of the present danger without us. But we cannot get along without Western Europe. We are tied to Western Europe by bonds of blood, civilization, culture and commerce and it would be virtually impossible to sever those ties by a stroke of a pen or a gust of oratory.

The swarming armies of Asia, lightly armed, deficient in transport, are plagued by dependence upon the Soviet Union for the implements of war. Hunger always stalks those lands. It is a hunger that, with famine conditions, can only be alleviated by the generously aid good will of the nations of the West.

Today India, which has striven to play both ends of the political spectrum, faced the stark necessity of securing food from the United States to fill the gap in a deficient harvest. Millions will starve otherwise. The chief question is whether such aid to India would have political strings tied to it. Some experts say yes; others say it would be harmful to our cause.

The rice Christians of the Far East may find their counterparts in the rice democrats, who embrace our cause only for so long as they need food.

URGENT ISSUE

Yet, these questions are collateral ones. The most urgent question is adding the ingredient of national unity and individual faith in our cause to our substantial supremacy in production.

Perhaps the greatest lack in our striving for unity of purpose is that of faith in God, for it is freedom of worship that will first be obscured under the hammer and sickle.

CHURCHES CAN HELP

The churches of all faiths could perform a service to all humanity here in the United States by reexamining the requirements and the attitudes of militant faith. The centuries-long strife recorded in the Old and New Testaments and the utterances of the great prophets nowhere recommend a supine acceptance of cruel aggression and oppression. To fight for the right is a basic duty of all who worship God under any dogma or faith.

FEAR NOT JUSTIFIED

The intrusion of fear and uncertainty into our national life points to a serious deficiency in our moral fiber. Many churchmen of many faiths have a conviction that it is a lack caused by the conflict of materialism with worship. The dedicated and sometimes fanatic idealism of the past, attitudes like the abolition movement, seems not to be possible in a materialistic age.

It is difficult to reconcile our primacy in steel production with the sterility of religious feeling in the mass of the people.

SHUN COMMUNISM

But this much is certain, the perverted religion of communism, trumpeting up its holy wars against the capitalistic infidels, will never be accepted by the American people as the innovation that will cure all. They hold a sublime faith in themselves, and have only forgotten that such faith grew under the protection of faith in God.

Not long ago Henry B. du Pont, of the giant du Pont corporation, made a speech in Tulsa, Okla., in which he described how he would operate if he were a Communist saboteur.

LISTS STORIES

"The stories I would spread," said Mr. du Pont, "would sound very plausible to the uninformed. I would have all kinds of people going about telling their neighbors, for instance, that the big companies are bent on driving the little fellows out of business; that they arbitrarily fix prices; that they suppress inventions; that they make exorbitant profits; that they hold the power of life and death over small business. I would like that word 'power.' It sounds so satisfactorily sinister and I wouldn't have to explain what it means. * * * Then, if this program of propaganda resulted in legislation to break up large units of American business and to provide government ownership of basic industries, think of the delight back in the Kremlin."

INDUSTRY ACCUSED

Mr. du Pont should have gone on to say that the campaign has been carried out in just that way in the United States and that these things that he would do if he were a Communist saboteur have become current coinage in the United States.

Here is where the undercurrent of fear runs swiftest. These charges have been made against big industries. And big industries have failed to point out that they are only as big as their least important worker, that we could not be the world's largest producer of steel, steel that makes the difference between victory and defeat, if it were not for the skill of the sweating steel worker charging a furnace in a steel plant.

TUNELESS CHORUS

The equality of sacrifice which is a constant refrain in matters of taxation mean sacrifice of corporate profit as well as individual profit. The "leading down to the road to socialism" chorus has become rather tuneless, just as the "wave of the future" became hackneyed during World War II.

The American people produce these giant quantities because they are free, because they enjoy a high standard of living, because they have a genius for improvisation, and not because their concerted effort produces big corporations.

CAN SAVE WORLD

If the Chinese peasant understood one-tenth as well as the average American what the stakes are in this struggle they would be really formidable. We need unity and need it badly. We can achieve unity under a code of Christian morality.

We have the tools to work with. We have all that is needed to arm ourselves in righteousness so that a thousand years hence this second half of the twentieth century will gleam like a priceless jewel in history as a golden age. Rid of fear and linked in unity the American people can and will save the world from darkness.

National Council of Churches of Christ Supports Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is a resolution of the National Council of the Churches of Christ adopted at the meeting of the board on January 17, 1951, supporting United States food aid to the people of India. This is one of the first acts of this great new organization of the churches of the Protestant denominations. It is significant that it is an expression of humanitarian and high public policy in the outstanding tradition of the organizations which have combined together to create the new organization.

The resolution follows:

FOOD FOR INDIA

For many months the foreign missions conference and its India committee have been greatly concerned over India's desperate food emergency, knowing that millions of her people are not only underfed and undernourished, but many are at the point of starvation. We have worked closely with the department of international justice and good will and with other interested agencies and at the annual meeting in January 1950 and again in Cleveland last November the conference took action urging that ways and means should be devised by our Government to make available quantities of food in Government possession to the Government of India on mutually agreeable terms, toward relieving India's need. We further instructed the officers of the conference to arrange for consultation with appropriate Government officials looking toward this end.

Since the Cleveland meeting the need has been greatly emphasized by the request in mid-December from the Indian Government through its Ambassador, Madame Pandit, for 2,000,000 tons of food grains on the basis of a long-term loan. Our representatives went to Washington last week. Many vital contacts have been made. The question is now before our Government. The committee on relief and reconstruction services of the division of foreign missions took action last week, the United Council of Church Women took action at their biennial meeting last November. At a meeting of its executive board the division of life and work yesterday approved the draft resolution which is being brought to the general board today and which summarizes and brings up to date the resolutions of the several units, strongly urging affirmative and quick response on the part of our Government. We believe that action of the general board will greatly strengthen the resolutions of its several units.

We therefore bring for your consideration the following resolution:

"Whereas the Government of the United States has been officially requested by the Government of India to make available 2,000,000 tons of food grain to relieve the acute food shortage in that country; and

"Whereas such action on the part of our Government would be justified not only on humanitarian grounds but also for the reason that it would strengthen the bonds of friendship between the American and Indian peoples; Be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America recommend that the Congress and the executive branch of the Government of the United States take such steps as may be required to assist in meeting the present urgent needs of the Indian people for emergency food aid, and that this food be made available on such terms as may be mutually acceptable to the two governments."

Address by Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and address:

WARNER BROS.
PICTURES DISTRIBUTING CORP.,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1950.

Hon. LOUIS B. HELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HELLER: On behalf of Mr. Harry M. Warner, president of Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., I am happy to present you with a recording of an address delivered by Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin of Los Angeles.

Mr. Warner was so inspired by this patriotic anti-Communist message that he wants to make it available to all America if possible. He especially wants every Government official and legislator to hear it. A copy of the text is enclosed for your convenience, but we hope you will listen to the recording as the delivery adds to the power of the message.

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge this directly to Mr. Harry M. Warner, Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., Burbank, Calif.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. DORSEY.

JANUARY 24, 1951.

Mr. HARRY M. WARNER,
Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.,
Burbank, Calif.

DEAR MR. WARNER: Thank you very much for sending me a recording of Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin's address. I enjoyed listening to it, and I agree that the delivery adds powerfully to the potency of the message. I thought so well of it that I am today having the text inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Your attempt to bring the rabbi's address to the attention of all Americans and the expense and trouble you have gone to in undertaking it again proves that your active role upon the Jewish scene continues unabated.

With kind and cordial regards, I am,

Sincerely,

LOUIS B. HELLER,
Member of Congress.

CONDENSED VERSION OF TALK DELIVERED BY RABBI MAXWELL H. DUBIN, WILSHIRE BOULEVARD TEMPLE, BEFORE THE CONGREGATION ON ROSH HASHANA, THE JEWISH NEW YEAR

Last night we ushered in the New Year. In Jewish life this period is called the Yomim Neroim, the Awesome Days, the days when the fate of the individual, so Jewish tradition tells us, is determined by God for the entire year.

It seems to me that there is a Yomim Neroim atmosphere, an Awesome Days atmosphere for the entire civilized world today, but the fate of all civilization lies in the balance trembling, and mankind is awaiting the decision.

Now, this is not the place and there is not time to detail all the mistakes that the democratic nations and peoples made during the past 5 years since the war ended. But I do want to consider with you one of them, because it is the crux of the problem.

The first and the most fatal error that the democratic world made, was our absolute failure to understand the true meaning of communism and the real aims and ambitions of Soviet Russia. We were led to believe in America that communism was a forward-looking social movement, led by great idealists who had a high code of social and international morality. We were sold the idea that Soviet Russia was a civilized country, determined to direct its international life in paths of peace and of progress. We were told that Soviet Russia had a government that would have respect for law and order, that would have respect for its international promises and commitments, and would devote its best interests to the welfare of its own people and to the peoples of other lands.

We Jews knew from the outset that all those statements and claims made by Soviet Russia were not true. We Jews knew the truth about the Communists and about Soviet Russia and we knew it through years of bitter experience and pain and blood and suffering and terrible horrors. We paid a bitter price for that knowledge. We know that the Jews of Russia, the millions of Jews who lived there when the revolution took place were the first ones to be liquidated by the Communists. They were sent to labor camps, they dug the canals, they were sent out to Siberia and they died by the hundreds of thousands because the thing for which the Jew stood and stands—respect for human individuality—was not and is not wanted by Soviet Russia.

We knew the truth; but no one listened to us. When the Jews, during the rise of the Nazis, told the world that the burning of those synagogues in Germany was only a prelude to that which eventually led to the bombing of Westminster Abbey and the other English churches, nobody listened to us. So no one listened to the Jew when he warned the world against the aims and the ambitions of Soviet Russia. We warned the world even during the honeymoon period when Russia was working with us, not an ally—she never was an ally—we just happened to have had the same common enemy, that's all; we warned the world to be careful and to be wary, but no—we were just a voice crying in the wilderness. So Russia was treated by the nations of the world like a spoiled child that threatens to hold its breath if it does not get what it wants. We accepted her word, we had faith in her signature, faith in the agreements that were made. And what was the result? We are facing it now. Russia violated every promise to the Western World. She abused our trust, spread her power, seized lands, destroyed governments, developed fifth columns throughout the world and poisoned the minds of millions of peoples against their native governments.

Well, 5 years too late, we of America realize and the world realizes the bitter mistake that was made. We have to rid ourselves, to rid every aspect of our lives, social and political and industrial and economic, of the Communist infiltration.

So we are at the brink of momentous days, you and I. The destiny of a world is in the scales and no one can tell of a certainty what is going to happen.

Officially, we are not at war because Congress has not said there is a war. But, factually, there is a war at this moment. There is a war, Russian-inspired, Russian-led, Russian-equipped, in Korea. Right now on Rosh Hashana morning when I am talking to you, boys of this congregation—I know of two who are at this moment in battle with the Marines in Korea—American boys are dying, newspapers are carrying casualty lists, homes are being broken, hearts of parents are being torn. Reserves are being called.

We are at war; and that war is being waged on two fronts. I am not concerned so much about the war in Korea if it does not spread, and, please God, it may not spread. That does not worry me very much because I know that that front is going to be cleaned up before long. But there is another front, the home front, and that front worries me. Because on this home front war has been declared on us by Soviet Russia. And that has to concern us. And it has to concern every man, woman and child in America. Because you see, my friends, the whole character of war has changed. Wars are no longer fought only on the battlefield; and wars are fought not only by men, and yes, even women in uniform. You and I who are not in uniform, you and I today are just as much in the service as though we actually wore a uniform. Wars today are fought at home. Wars are fought in the laboratories, wars are fought in the factories. That is where Russia has declared war upon us. Her aim is to paralyze, her aim is to sabotage, her aim is to slow down the work that we in America are trying to do in order to prepare ourselves for the ordeal.

In the days ahead you and I have to be on guard, very much on guard, because attempts have been made and attempts will be made to befog the issue. You are going to be asked to sign all kinds of protests and all kinds of proclamations. Be careful. Know what you are doing and if you do not know, ask. There are Government agencies to enlighten you.

Remember that this terrible scourge that we call communism must be stopped wherever we are going to meet it. And in that connection we have a two-fold duty, you and I. We have a duty to our country, to America—and we have a duty to our faith, to Judaism, and to our co-religionists as Jews, and to all faiths, whatever they may be.

I returned recently from three months abroad. You have heard Americans returning from abroad recite the trite, the very

trite words, but none the less true words, that America is the best, the most fortunate land in the world. And it is. Both materially and spiritually, there is not another land in the world as fortunate as America. The best proof of that is that people everywhere abroad, no matter where one goes, want to come to America.

Everyone wants to come here and few people want to leave America. Your best proof of that is that whenever a Communist agent is ordered to be deported from America to Europe, listen to the fuss that he makes about going back to his paradise of a homeland. He doesn't want to leave, he wants to remain here.

Now, here in America, labor is better protected and better treated than anywhere else in the world, even in Socialist England. Labor enjoys more governmental benefits in America than it enjoys in Socialist England. That irks Russia, because Russia is supposed to be the fatherland of the proletariat. Russia is supposed to be the land where the working people have everything. Russia—and not America. Therefore Russia does not like us. For that reason every person who loves America, every person who makes a living here, every person who enjoys the way of life that is America, must protect it in the danger that now faces it.

As for the Jews, let us not forget this, my friends. That wherever Communist Russia has come to power, Jewish life has been destroyed. There is not a vestige of Jewish religious, economic, social, or cultural life left in Russia today, not a vestige. And even in Moscow, the Yiddish daily, Heint, which was nothing but a Yiddish translation of Pravda, has been eliminated. Yiddish writers have been sent out to Siberia. There is not a vestige of Jewish life in Russia today. And those few Jews who have been able to steal out from behind the iron curtain in Europe—from Rumania and Hungary and Czechoslovakia and all the rest of the Balkan countries, they tell us that the last traces of Jewish life are being eliminated behind the iron curtain by the Communists.

Now, remember this, should—God forbid—the horrible thing happen and communism spread its influence over this country, then I say to you that the American Jewish community, which is today the largest, the most influential, the most powerful Jewish community in the world, will go down and will be destroyed even as have been the Jewish communities of Europe.

Therefore, for these reasons, we must be on guard. We must pledge ourselves to wipe out communism wherever and whenever we find it, even if it means cutting deep into our own family and social circles. My friends, there was in Jewish life, particularly amongst the orthodox Jews in days gone by, a weapon that was used to control the community. It is a weapon which, of course, we of the liberal Jewish group do not have and never have had, but it was a weapon in Jewish life. It was a weapon that was so horrible that even those who watched its being inflicted in the synagogue, were terror-stricken, not to speak of the one who was subjected to that weapon. It was called the cherem, excommunication. So we today must take a page out of the book of those old Jews and apply that same weapon, that same punishment today, the punishment of excommunication, of ostracism, of complete isolation from the community of any Jew who has become infected with the Communist virus.

The fate of humanity is lying in the balance and the slightest hair may tip those scales in one direction or another. It is a fact, a fact that faces you, and you, and you, and me every moment of our existence today.

So we pray for life this morning. We pray that God may inscribe us, and inscribe our dear ones, and inscribe the world in the Book of Life. But there can be no certainty of life, there can be no certainty of a future for any of us if this dread thing continues to go on. It will affect you and you, and you, and every single member of your family and mine. So we pray to God this morning for life. We pray that this catastrophe may be averted, that untold millions of people may not be condemned to death through the horrors of another war. Grant us, then, O God, Thy protection. Grant that this year that we have ushered in, may be for us and for all humanity, a year of life and not of death, a year of peace and not of war, a year of happiness and not of misery. Amen.

Taxation Must Be Limited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the President, a few days ago, asked for a budget for the coming year of $71,500,000,000. To get this money, he asked for a $17,500,000,000 increase in income taxes in this session of the Congress.

In his budget message to the Congress, he made it plain that the great part of it would have to come out of the pockets of the small taxpayers and the laboring man. I quote:

Income tax increases should be imposed at all levels, but by far the largest part of the additional revenues must come from the middle and lower tax brackets. These are the brackets in which the great bulk of the income is located.

Those were the President's words.

High taxes bear especially heavy on the lower, middle class, and the laboring people because there are so many of them. Those paying on an income of $10,000 a year or less, pay over 63 percent of all income taxes. In addition to the income taxes, they have to pay local, county, and State taxes; and in addition to that they have to pay for hidden taxes in the cost of every item they buy. A great part of the wage earner's salary is now taken in Federal, State, and hidden taxes.

During the latter part of last year's session, we increased the taxes on the little fellows about 20 percent and on larger taxpayers as well. If we try to raise $17,500,000,000 in additional taxes, as recommended by the President in his recent message, we will place an undue hardship on them, and all taxpayers, which may wreck the economy of our country.

The rate is higher for those above the $10,000 bracket, reaching to the point where the Government takes an over-all top of 87 percent of the total earnings of the wealthy. Even with these high rates, the Government will only be able to get 23.3 percent from those earning over $25,000.

Mr. Speaker, if the President and Congress would take the entire personal income of our citizens earning over $25,000 a year, including the income of all the so-called millionaires in the Nation, it amount to $7,500,000,000. The tax program recommended by the President is dangerous to the entire economy of the Nation and will work an undue hardship on all of its citizens.

What the President should do first is to join with us Members of the Congress who know that with his cooperation and help the budget he has recommended could and should be reduced by $7,500,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, we should cut all unnecessary nonmilitary spending to the bone, and greatly reduce the administration's give-away policy to other nations. If we continue to follow this reckless policy of spending, our Government will be in greater danger of destruction from within, than it is from a foreign foe.

We can spend ourselves into financial bankruptcy and lose our liberty and our country, as Lenin, the founder of Russian communism predicted over 30 years ago. He said in substance, "We can cause the United States to spend itself into financial destruction, becoming an easy prey to the Communist form of government."

Reckless and unnecessary spending by the administration for the past few years has fed the fires of inflation, which has continued the rise in the cost of living, causing laboring men to ask for higher wages. The old-age pensioners, those with fixed salaries, and aged people trying to live on insurance savings are hit the hardest. When the laboring man gets a raise in wages, the high cost of living wipes it out in a never-ending cycle of inflation.

Government spending increases inflation, the cost of living, and threatens to bankrupt the Nation. The cost of Government should be cut to the bone before increasing taxes. When that is done, we should then increase taxes as much as our economy will stand, in an effort to balance the budget.

Pythianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of all my colleagues a very inspiring address on Pythianism. This address was delivered by Dr. Karl Applbaum, rabbi of the Bayside Jewish Center in Brooklyn, at special services dedicated to the Knights of Pythias, one of our better-known national fraternities. These services were held on Friday evening, December 22, 1950, with many members of the Knights of Pythias as participants in, and guests at, the services.

Dr. Applbaum is a past chancelor of Lodge No. 515, Knights of Pythias, and is very active in interfaith work. The text of his address follows:

Our services tonight are dedicated to those of us who have given of ourselves to the teachings of Pythianism. What is Pythianism? Are its teachings new? Our answer is "No." The basic teachings and concepts of Pythianism are as old as the teachings and concepts of our religion. Its best inspiration and lesson can be found in the story of Hillel.

This story relates that Hillel came to Palestine for the sole purpose of studying under the great teachers of the law. For 40 years, day and night, he kept himself busy with subjects that fascinated and thrilled him. His treasure hunt brought him far more than the average share of gems. Like many a modern student he earned his own way, taking a few hours off daily for chopping wood. Out of his small earnings he spent half on his education and personal needs, and the other half he gave to charity. At last he achieved his goal and became one of the greatest scholars of his day, and one of the outstanding teachers of religion in Jewish history. When he reached the pinnacle of success a Roman heathen came to him and said: "I have never studied the Jewish religion and I should like to start now." "It is never too late, my friend," said Hillel. "Very well, I do not have much time. I want you to teach me all you know about your religion in the short time that I can balance myself on one foot." "I wish, my friend, that you had more time. There is so much to learn. But, stand on your foot and I will teach you," answered Hillel. The astonished Roman balanced himself on one foot and Hillel said to him, "You shall not do to others what you do not want them to do to you. That is our whole Torah. The rest is all explanation." Subsequently the Roman was converted to Judaism and became a devoted disciple of Hillel, and for many years an ardent student of his academy.

The above concept is an example of what true religion represents. Pythianism stands for the same principles as religion, it is a religion, a way of life. One cannot understand or follow the principles of Pythianism unless he understands religion. If we are asked to summarize religion we can say that "Religion is a belief in God the Creator and His teachings, and the attempt to use these teachings to make ourselves finer human beings." A religious person must respect the rights and opinions of others—so does a good Pythian. Respect is the key word in religion. Even though we feel that our observances are the correct ones for us, we must not be bitter toward those who practice any other faith, or even a different shade of the same faith.

A religious person always cooperates with the group. Selfishness makes nobody happy, unselfishness makes everybody happy. That is one of the most important lessons of religion. Pythianism and religion stand side by side and say: "One cannot be a disciple of one group if he does not believe in the teachings of the other." No religion is worth anything if it does not show itself one way or another in actual life. Religion must be lived. "It is no vain thing for you; it is your life."

We can thus summarize religious life and say that in addition to all observances and rituals commanded to us, there must be as the basis—doing what is right at all times and in all places. Right conduct is the most important part of the religious life. It means to do the right in private and in public, in the open and in the secret, against all odds. Without upright conduct, no one can be said to live a religious life, no matter how much he prays and how many forms he keeps up. The real core of the religious life is found in purity, honesty, kindness, in industry, faithfulness, obedience, charity, and every other form of right doing. These are the real molds in which the religious life is cast. Without them, there can be no true and loving relation between man and God. "Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy."

It is with the above thoughts in mind that we Pythians have come here to pray. We know that Pythianism consists not merely in affiliation with the order, not merely in paying dues, but practicing the teachings and living with its principles. We fully realize that if there was more Pythianism in the world there would be less wars; if there was more understanding there would be less dissension; if more money was spent on education less would have to be expended on military training; if there were more disciples of Damon and Pythias there would be less soldiers in the armies of the world; if there was universal Pythianism we would not need universal military training; if more followed the teachings of Hillel there would be no need for guns and ammunition for war. Therefore, believing in all these things, we members of the Pythian order and our friends have gathered here this evening at a time when unrest fills the world, to pray for the day when our Heavenly Father, the maker of all flesh, will rekindle in the hearts of mankind the love of justice and fraternal love, in accordance with the principles of democracy and the spirit of brotherhood of man, when He will teach us to purge ourselves of prejudice, slander, and selfish endeavors.

We pray to Thee, O Father, to cast Thy countenance upon our beloved country, America. Shelter the inhabitants of its sun-kissed soil from anguish, humiliation, and gloom. May distress and reproach never entrench their spirits. May our country's educational institutions ever be the lighthouses of justice and freedom, the abode of equal opportunity and brotherly love. Make Thy divine prophecy soon come to pass, when nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning forks; when nation shall not lift sword against nation, nor shall they learn war anymore. Then will freedom flood the world and strife and discord disappear. Amen.

Stop—Look—Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank H. Lamb, manufacturer of machinery and author of several books, and at one time a member of the executive committee of Rotary International, published a half-page advertisement in his home-town newspaper New Year's Day in opposition to America's present foreign policy.

Scores of copies of Mr. Lamb's statement have been sent to me by citizens who agree with him, and they and he all are entitled to the fullest hearing on the statements made in opposition to our present foreign policy. I, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, am having the Lamb statement on foreign policy published in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that it may have the widest circulation possible among policy makers in the Government.

Mr. Lamb's statement follows:

STOP—LOOK—LISTEN

Parents of today and of generations yet unborn, are you raising your children for a normal life of work and service or to perish on some foreign battlefield?

Workers in field, factory, or office, are you laboring for a higher standard of living, the necessities of family and old age, or producing battle spoil to be spread around the world?

Businessmen, would you rather trade in or make articles for more human comfort and enjoyment for education, culture, and recreation or machinery, guns, bombs, poisons for the wholesale destruction of life?

Widows, orphans, aged, heads of endowed schools and foundations, all those depending on savings, annuities, bonds, fixed income or insurance, will you be able to live on the provisions you or others have made for your future, or will all your bonds, endowments, reserves, and assets be wiped out by an inflation that has already reduced the value of the dollar to half what it was a decade ago?

These questions and others equally as critical are being decided today with little reference to you and on superficial congressional consideration by an administration dominated by military men (Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and MacArthur for example) headed by a President prone to bombast and snap judgments ("We can lick old Joe" and some recent letters), and supported by a flock of columnists to whom war will offer opportunities for advancement.

FAILURE OF PAST FOREIGN POLICIES

Everyone questioning our policy will be branded as a coward, appeaser, or isolationist. Yes, I am an isolationist, if as I wrote in "The Creed of an American" on October 1, 1943, "by that term is meant an American that is opposed to this country's trying to politically, socially, or economically overlord the rest of the world." Seven years ago I stated, "I have no relatives to sacrifice or money to squander merely to preserve the British Empire or retain Hong Kong, Burma, or India." I wished no part in France's struggle "to support her rotten colonial government in Indochina or elsewhere." I sympathized with China but "her future government should depend on her own 400,000,000 peoples." Although Russia was ostensibly an ally, I was then "opposed to any underwriting of a dominating Soviet influence in after-the-war Europe."

Who in 1943 thought that we would spend many billions to support the British Empire and its Socialist government? Who dreamed we would think of sending American boys to die in the jungles of Indochina to support an oppressive French colonial rule? Who realized that we would make a calamitous surrender to communism in secret meetings of dictators at Tehran, Yalta, and Berlin? Who then thought Americans today would be advocating the dropping of atom bombs on once friendly Chinese civilians?

It is no sign of cowardice to resist warmongers who would send our troops to defend Western Europe against communism when the nations directly menaced are lukewarm and willing to do little for their own protection. The militarists would start us on a roarch to Moscow, the nemesis of both Napoleon and Hitler. Other jingoists urge the invasion of China, which nearby Japan could not conquer in 8 years of war—a nation that in 6,000 years of its history has been invaded but never really conquered.

The United States has supplied the decisive men, munitions, and wealth to win two world wars, and our success has vastly inflated our ego and swollen our national pride. But against the row on row of hundreds of thousands of white crosses in military cemeteries around the world, after the wastage of the greater part of the natural resources of a continent, loaded with a fantastic national debt of nearly two hundred and seventy billions, what have we gained? Nothing.

TIME FOR NEW DECISIONS

In many respects the world is worse off on account of our interference. We feel morally obligated to replace the property destroyed

by our armies. We have fewer friends among the nations today than at any time in our history. A billion colored peoples that once looked to us now class us as enemy No. 1, because it is our guns and men, our munitions and aid that the European colonial powers are using to suppress their efforts for independence.

"A world safe for democracy," and we are almost the only democracy left in the world. "The four freedoms," and we have less freedom than at any time since the Declaration of Independence. "A war to end war," and we are taxing ourselves to arm 50 nations, some of which may one day be aiming at us the arms we are now giving them.

The armies and industrial plants we so assiduously destroyed in Germany and Japan to make these nations powerless we are now insisting be replaced and rebuilt, mostly at our expense, to help us in a war against communism. Since August 1, 1945, we have appropriated over $49,500,000,000 for foreign aid—$323 for every inhabitant in the United States. At the same time many of our own public bodies lack money to build needed schools, libraries, suitable highways, and the necessary power and reclamation facilities for an increasing economy.

I was an original supporter of President Wilson's League of Nations but I am tired of a United Nations in which 59 do the talking and 1 has to pay most of the costs in money and men. Against America's Korean contribution of nearly 40,000 casualties already reported from at least 7 divisions of troops, and a cost of many billions of dollars, 14 only of the more than 50 other non-Communist United Nations up to December 15, have supplied 18,940 troops, 118 planes, 1 carrier, 4 cruisers, 15 destroyers, a few small naval units, some medical supplies and equipment, including 125 tons of cod-liver oil from Iceland and 400,000 jute sacks from India.

ARM FOR DEFENSE, NOT AGGRESSION

We are inviting national disaster if we permit the masters of the Kremlin during a period of years to involve us in a series of Koreas on the 10,000-mile perimeter of the Communist world stretching from Siberia west to the Baltic Sea. After a few of these fruitless invasions we would be so exhausted and impoverished that Moscow could then safely select the time and place of the final battle for supremacy.

The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are as wide and deep as ever and even more difficult for an enemy to cross because of the planes, directed missiles, and other provisions of a defensively prepared America. Those who would scare us by claiming the Russians could invade our homeland are trading on our credulity. Recall the supreme effort required by all the Allied nations in 1944 to launch the Normandy invasion across the narrow English Channel and the tremendous equipment and munitions the United States used in the recent landing on a practically unprotected Inchon Peninsula in Korea.

In the 1951 military budget now about fifty billions, at least 75 percent is for the expense of infantry, munitions, and equipment suitable only for invasion and ground deployment in Europe and Asia. The defense of American cities from the surprise suicide bomb attack is mostly on paper, we have no bomb shelters, only a fragmentary radar screen encircles the Nation and planes and antiair attack guns are inadequate. The Korean campaign has stripped the United States of most of the material required to repel invasion.

Our choice today is between a policy of forcible containment of communism to its present area in Europe and Asia and putting the defense of America in second place or subordinating the national defense the paramount object of our foreign policy and military preparedness. We can fight communism as a military power but we cannot stop the spread of communism as a philosophy, as a political or economic system by bullets. Our only defense against it in these realms is to make our own democracy work so perfectly that it will best serve mankind. We should have no fear of the verdict of the future in any such trial.

Reader, if you think that our first duty is to defend our own land, if you believe the oceans are still our natural line of defense, if it is your opinion that an American invasion of Europe, China, or other lands beyond the seas is inviting national suicide and sacrificing untold American lives, if you are willing to let other nations run their affairs and pay their own bills, and content for us to attend to our own business, then write or wire the Congress, both Senators and Representatives, your wishes. It is the only way your opinion can be registered. In this crucial hour of decision, you owe your country this service. Do it today and start a chain letter that will swamp Congress.

The voice of America arising from the parents of future cannon fodder, from workers and businessmen striving to maintain the standard of living, from the poor widow and the multimillionaire who stand to lose all through inflation, from every patriot, should flood Congress with an appeal to consider realities, to avoid bombast and to forget claims of superiority justifying the ruling of others and instead to arm America to make it so strong industrially, economically, and militarily, through the operation of a successful democracy, that we would never need to fear communism as an economy, envy it as a philosophy, or tremble before it as a military force.

We Must Untie the Hands of Our Law Enforcement Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a further editorial from the Washington Evening Star, which is performing a distinguished public service in pressing for the enactment of legislation to permit the FBI and other investigative agencies to intercept communications and give evidence regarding what they have learned in cases involving spies, saboteurs, traitors, subversives, and other enemies of our country.

The editorial follows:

FURTHER STUDY ADVISABLE

With due allowance for the partisan nature of their dissenting report, the Republican critics of the Senate District Committee's wire-tapping control bill have made a good suggestion in urging further study of the measure. The Republican minority asserted that the committee did not consider the possibility of conflict between the local bill and proposed national wire-tapping legislation. Both types of legislation, since they deal with the same basic problem of telephone eavesdropping, should be in accord, lest confusion develop later with respect to their enforcement in the District of Columbia. For both proposed laws would apply to Washington.

There is another reason, however, warranting further scrutiny of the District bill. While it properly excepts local police from the proposed ban on wire tapping in the District, it fails to state—as does the Keating national bill—that information obtained by tapping wires can be used as evidence in court. If it is wise to spell this out in so many words for the benefit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and military intelligence agencies, it is just as wise to spell it out for Washington police. If the national bill should pass with the right so specified and the local bill should become law without a positive assertion of evidence admissibility, some court might well wonder whether Congress intended to do more than authorize wire interceptions by police—as an investigative aid alone.

What is needed—and promptly—is legislation that will make clear the right of proper law-enforcement agencies, when duly authorized, to listen in on certain communications and to use the information so obtained as prosecutive evidence against spies, saboteurs, kidnapers, and similar major public enemies. As Representative FUSCOLO, of Massachusetts, recently commented, it is indeed an anomalous situation when such criminals cannot be brought to trial because of an ill-advised legal bar against the use of wire-tap evidence.

Korean Withdrawal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this point the reply I gave to the question, Should we get out of Korea? which was published in the January 21 issue of the Boston Sunday Globe newspaper. My statement follows:

The question of whether we should get out of Korea focuses attention on the practical decision that must be faced in determining just how much our obligations shall be allowed to operate against our own best interest strategically.

We originally entered Korea in recognition of our moral commitment as a member of the United Nations, to help repulse wanton and illegal aggression and promote peace in the world.

When the purpose of the police action, approved by the United Nations Security Council, was practically accomplished, hordes of Communist Chinese troops, obviously by preconceived intention, suddenly and unlawfully attacked United Nations soldiers, causing their retreat to such position that the safety and survival of the entire United Nations forces now appears periled.

According to the latest press releases, the Peiping communistic regime refuses to honor any cease-fire period except in compliance with their own blackmail terms, for, among other things, a seat in the United Nations and abandonment of Formosa.

Under these circumstances, if the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whose business it is and in whom I have substantial confidence, should recommend our withdrawal from Korea, because the overwhelming pressure of Communist forces may make a prolonged campaign in Korea strategically unwise, I would favor acceptance of their recommendation in order to save the further useless expenditure of the lives of American boys for an indecisive objective.

However, even though we and the United Nations should be forced to accept temporary military set-back in Korea, because of global strategy, I would be resolutely against any submission to the further humiliation

of capitulating to Red China's demands. After the utter contempt Red China has shown to us and the United Nations, any additional appeasement would amount to moral suicide.

Further concessions to either Red China or Soviet Russia would, in my opinion, be turning the United Nations into a tool of those who have flagrantly violated every truth for which it stands. Should the illegal attack on the Republic of Korea not be ultimately repelled in principle, there would seem to be no basis for fulfillment of the further aims of the United Nations, either in Korea or elsewhere.

Congressman HAROLD D. DONOHUE.

Voice of South Texas

REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN REGAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the times when our country is prosperous and at peace, the people back home seem to pay very little attention to what we do here and what we think about, but in times such as confront us today all our people take much more interest in the welfare of our Nation, the fight against communism, and so forth.

LLOYD M. BENTSEN, who became a Member of this body a little more than 2 years ago, has been writing a weekly letter home which has been published in the newspapers of his district, the Fifteenth District of Texas, which borders my district, mine being the Sixteenth. We each have about 500 miles of the Mexican border in our districts. The letters are published in the weekly papers throughout his district, and have been read with interest and considerable favorable comment. This last week the Valley Evening Monitor of McAllen, Tex., published an editorial commenting very favorably on the way the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] attends to his business and keeps the people informed. The editorial is as follows, and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the RECORD today in conjunction with these comments:

VOICE OF SOUTH TEXAS

Congressman BENTSEN, of the valley's Fifteenth District, this week gave his constituents a clear statement of his basic policy for the new session of Congress. It is a declaration each of them should read thoroughly. It appears in his weekly newspaper column.

In effect he says it is time for America to get up off its spit-and-whittle bench and go to work. Not only must the Nation rearm, but its vitals will be exposed if it does not organize and strengthen every possible ally it can find abroad. He cites encouraging acts in both directions, acts that have lately been multiplying, but he makes it clear he has no admiration for the tedious pace at which the Truman administration has gone about the defense program.

The citizens of Congressman BENTSEN'S district have every reason to believe that all of his activity at Washington during the forthcoming 2 years will find their root in the two beliefs he has enunciated; that the rearming task and the development of stronger allies both in Europe and Asia must outweigh everything else that comes up for decision.

Back home he will find willing support for such a program. Six months ago people in this part of the country were wondering why domestic restrictions were not being imposed so as to channel more of the Nation's production and intelligence into the war effort.

The Congressman's statement tells how he seeks out every available military expert, hears them, evaluates their information, and then does his "small part" to transmit such judgment into terms of congressional votes.

The valley's Congressman may play a modest part in Congress, but he is the one public official to whom thousands of people of south Texas feel they can turn most quickly for leadership on the national scene. In such a sense his actions transport with them the hopes and prayers of those thousands. To us in south Texas the measure of his responsibility is embodied in Mr. BENTSEN'S forthright declaration that we cannot retire to our own shores and expect to repel the invader; we had better beat him elsewhere while we can.

That is the issue at the core of America's current debate on foreign policy, and he has taken a sound stand on it.

About Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Iowa Development Bulletin:

ABOUT IOWA

Iowa now has 50 industries which employ more than 500 workers. Fourteen are engaged in food processing, including 11 which pack and process meat. Nineteen manufacture machinery, including construction machinery, farm machinery, electrical equipment and aircraft parts. The industries are located in 17 Iowa cities. They include the world's largest cereal plant, washing machine industry and wringer manufacturer, door and millwork factory, silvery iron factory, wheel tractor manufacturer, aluminum-plate rolling mill, fountain-pen factory, independent pork processor, single-operated packing plant, and manufacturer of portable rock crushers.

Iowa coal production the first three quarters of 1950 was running 22 percent over 1949. At the end of September 1950, Iowa mines had produced 1,566,000 tons of coal. In the same period in 1949, Iowa coal totaled 1,276,000 tons. United States soft-coal production in 1950 was up 4 percent over 1949.

Poultry and eggs bring in 10 percent of Iowa's farmers' annual income. In 1949, for instance, poultry and eggs taken to market sold for $187,000,000, and another $18,000,000 went into skillets and ovens on the farm. Cash farm income totaled more than $2,000,000,000.

Nearly all of Iowa's gently rolling land is suitable for farming. At present 97.7 percent of the State's total land area is under cultivation. Iowa contains 35,642,880 acres of land, of which 34,838,247 are in farms.

An Iowan is credited with inventing the tractor. In 1892, John Froelich of Froelich, Iowa, built the first gasoline tractor that propelled itself both backward and forward. Successful models were first sold commercially in 1913.

Iowa's farm land annually produces more wealth than all the world's gold mines combined. In 1949, for instance, world gold production was less than $1,000,000. Iowa's farm products sold for more than $2,000,000,000.

Iowa usually grows 20 percent of the United States corn crop. Iowa's 554,000,000 bushel 1949 corn crop amounted to 10 percent of the world's 1949–50 crop, and was as big as the combined corn crops of 12 European countries, excluding Italy.

One-fifth of all the butter made in the United States comes from Iowa cream. Iowa farmers sell more cream to creameries than farmers in any other State.

One-fourth of all the pork eaten in the United States comes from Iowa hogs. In 1949, Iowa's pork production was more than four billion pounds.

More saddle horses live in Iowa than in any other State. More than 200,000 light horses are stabled by Iowa owners. Only 2,500 are owned by training stables.

Iowa leads the Nation in the literacy of its citizens. In Iowa, 99.2 percent of the people can read and write—the highest percent in the United States.

There are industries in 600 Iowa towns, according to a survey made in 1950 by the Iowa Development Commission. Two years ago, 566 towns had industries.

Of the 100 skilled labor crafts in the United States, 98 are represented in Iowa industries. Only diamond cutters and seamen are not listed.

Iowa is served by 76 interstate motor freight lines, and 80 intrastate trucking lines. There are 170,420 trucks owned in Iowa.

More than half the families in Iowa own their homes. In 1950, a total of 475,122 Iowans held deeds to their homes.

Iowa gained 82 new industries in 1950. One-fourth of all the Iowans working outside agriculture are now employed in industry.

Thirty-six percent of Iowa's people live on farms, 43 percent in cities, and 21 percent in small cities.

Iowa has 27 foundries which cast aluminum, brass, bronze, and other nonferrous metals.

Iowa ranks fourth in railroad mileage. It is served by 13 railroads.

More than 90 percent of Iowa farms have telephones.

Iowa has 46 commercial radio stations, and four noncommercial stations.

Twenty Iowa radio stations are FM broadcasters, and three broadcast TV.

There are 55 gray iron foundries in Iowa.

Iowa has 315 public libraries.

What Really Is Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, "What is really wrong?" is a question that is asked thousands of times every day all over this country. I have just returned from a short visit to my congressional district and I found that practically every person that I met was tremendously interested in the situation here in Washington and in the country generally. They were unanimous in their condemnation of the policies now being followed by the administration here in Washington. This

sentiment is properly appraised in a very well-written article which was written by Mr. Gordon Bush, the publisher of the Athens (Ohio) Messenger of which he is the owner and very capable editor.

The article follows:

WHAT REALLY IS WRONG?

The most difficult thing to understand in America today is why it is necessary, as apparently it is, for the people to be so divided on the subject of foreign military policy.

They are not divided among themselves for all the differences of opinion as to the proper place to resist the spread of communism. That is incidental, and, in fact, a militarily strategic matter. We've got to believe that our military leaders know what they can or cannot do on this front or that. But beyond the problems of specific application, there is a universal dissention on the broad policy of foreign commitments.

You may think what you please of Taft, Hoover, Bridges, Wherry, and others leading the great debate, but you cannot discount them. They do represent our intelligent public leaders in the political field.

You cannot discount the information available to Truman, Acheson, and the administrative advisers, and, seriously, it is unsound to doubt their loyalty and fundamental desire to do the smart thing.

Between these two forces of opinion, stand nearly 600 Congressmen who would give their individual left arms to be right in such a dispute and to go down in history as formulators of a successful policy. They are common men for the most part not equipped with much more information than is the average thinking citizen, but they are in positions of responsibility that cannot be altogether ignored by all of them.

Outside these circles of influence and prominence stand the millions of American citizens who just don't agree with what has been done and with their understanding of what is to be done. Every letter to the editor, every curbstone conversation, proves this. If there is a substantial minority which does not feel like the articulate American citizen feels today, it is a strangely bashful group of citizens.

Charges are made on every hand, from the lowest commentators to the White House, which are unprovable yet the result of this bewilderment. That lack of unity, which may always be deplored, is not so much a difference of opinion as it reflects the failure to understand how those on the other side of the argument can have a case. Surely there is a serious lack of faith in the public, or the administration would not leave it so completely in the dark. That the public retaliates with lack of faith in the administration, is human nature.

Could it be that we are, now, like the great body of Germans as the outsets of both world wars, unwilling to embrace warfare and therefore to risk our Nation, but unable to do anything about it because of an autocracy at the top which is determined to lead the Nation to its doom?

Could we be standing on the edge of an era that will see the destruction of the United States of America because of twisted thinking in the leadership? Has our system of representative government been so despoiled by socialistic progress that we are no longer a people free to choose our governors and direct their performance?

It begins to look like it. If President Truman can commit troops and thereby begin wars, or merely encourage wars, at his own discretion—and he has said lately that he can and will do just that—is there no power left in our so-called democratic Government to stop him? Is Congress impotent, or bribed by Government spending into going along as the ox goeth to the slaughter?

What is the nature of America, its elected officials and its people that we should stand idly by while a new form of government grows in our midst and takes over our rights of sanction and decision? The United Nations has bossed the Korean war from the first, and now we can't even withdraw from it because of Indians and Ethiopians, Yugoslavs and Greeks, Burmese and Chinamen, Britons and Swedes deciding they will keep Uncle Sam in there pitching until they see which way the ball game is going.

Have we no national moral fiber of bullheaded selfishness, without which no nation can be respected? Are we so enmeshed in ideological hope that we cannot distinguish between servitude and independence? Is there no force of brains and determination left in Washington which even cares about maintaining the world leadership of America—leadership in the products and capabilities of the American people, if not in their seemingly stupid leaders?

How can these leaders be right when the people always think better than they do and are now united in the demand to stop monkeying around with our peace and welfare? Is there not a majority of citizens who would give up their Government doles, pensions, pay-offs, parities, for a continuation of the experience that has made this country the greatest place to live in all the world—up to this time?

Qualifications of a Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial Qualifications of a Commissioner, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on December 24, 1950, and another editorial, District of Columbia Commissioner, which appeared in the Washington Post on January 6, 1951. Both are complimentary to our former colleague, the Honorable Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of December 24, 1950]

QUALIFICATIONS OF A COMMISSIONER

Commissioner Mason's illness in recent months and the fact that his present term as a District Commissioner is drawing to a close serve to encourage speculation as to a successor. Among those being mentioned is Representative Mary T. Norton, whose long service as a Member of the House will end with the Eighty-first Congress.

Mrs. Norton is so well known in Washington, she has been such a consistently good friend of the District of Columbia and she is so able a woman in her own right that such an appointment would be generally popular. But the law which requires that a District Commissioner must have been an actual resident of the District of Columbia for 3 years preceding appointment and, during that period, claimed residence nowhere else, would seem to bar her.

The residence qualification, however, has been shown to be more apparent than real. In 1913 the right of Oliver P. Newman to hold the office of commissioner was challenged by W. J. Primell, a Washington citizen active in the work of the citizens' associations. He sought to have the attorney general and the district attorney bring quo warranto proceedings, but both officers declined. He then obtained permission from district court to bring such proceedings himself as a taxpayer and citizen in the name of the Government. The case was tried by jury, he won it in district court and in the court of appeals. But the Supreme Court reversed, holding that as a taxpayer and citizen Mr. Frizzell was not an interested party, and also holding that as officers appointed by the President and subject to his removal the attorney general and district attorney would not grant permission to a citizen to bring such proceedings and the Court had no power to do so.

The upshot of the decision was that there was no way to invoke the residence qualification in court and that discretion in the matter lies with the President and the Senate. Mr. Newman was confirmed, despite his lack of qualification as to residence, and served two terms. The reason for the residence requirement, of course, is to protect the people of the District against the President's use of the commissionerships as jobs for nonresident politicians. Most of the Presidents have abided by the spirit of the law, despite the evident lack of legal means to prevent an infraction.

As a Member of Congress, Mrs. Norton has made her residence in Washington for some 26 years—though obviously claiming residence in New Jersey. In itself, her appointment would be well received. As far as the law is concerned, however, her appointment would in effect render it meaningless.

[From the Washington Post of January 6, 1951]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONER

Mrs. Mary T. Norton's statement that she would not accept an appointment as District Commissioner if it were offered was characteristically public-spirited. Her whole congressional career has been marked by generous and statesmanly friendship for the people of Washington; and during her tenure as chairman of the House District Committee she worked earnestly to make this community self-governing. It would, therefore, as she says, be inconsistent on her part to take a position which in her own view should go to a Washingtonian. We wish that she were one.

But since Mrs. Norton is ineligible, we hope that the President will seek within the District the qualities of experience, intellect, and character which she possesses. We have no doubt that they are to be found among Washingtonians. They are most likely to be found among those who have been active participants in District affairs—and particularly among those who have been leaders in the effort to give the people of Washington full status as citizens of the United States. We submit to President Truman that anyone he chooses for the anticipated vacancy in the Board of Commissioners ought to be like himself, a wholehearted supporter of home rule.

Of the several candidates whose names have been put forward for the important post, two seem to us to be outstanding: Gerhard Van Arkel and Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle. Both are persons of high prestige in the community. Both have served it devotedly and understand its problems. Either could be counted upon to work faithfully for abolishment of an office which he or she would hold in trust until such time as the people of the District are free to choose their own governing officials.

Mrs. Doyle has been a distinguished president of the Board of Education. In that office she demonstrated real executive ability and a comprehensive grasp of local affairs. She demonstrated also, in contrast to her fellow Board members, a willingness to see the office she held placed at the disposal of the people in accordance with the home-rule legislation then pending. Mr. Van Arkel had a distinguishe: career in military service, and since then has been an extraordinarily able and vigorous counsel to the Senate District Committee—a post which has given him exceptional knowledge of all the District's problems. No other person suggested for the commissionership has worked so energetically for this community's emancipation. We urge the appointment of Mr. Van Arkel or Mrs. Doyle with full confidence that, if chosen, he or she would hasten home rule.

This Confused World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal circulates widely in the United States, and its subscribers on the whole, are a very capable group and a group whose patriotism cannot be questioned.

In a recent issue of this newspaper its editor discusses the national situation very logically and very convincingly. Because of the completeness of this editorial, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks. It follows:

THIS CONFUSED WORLD

Joe Stalin must be chuckling up his sleeve these days at the terrible mess he has created in the world. He has us so confused we hardly know whether black is black or white. For example:

By shifting his pawns properly, he got us entangled in a war. Yet we are not in a war, since we have declared war against none of the forces we are fighting. Neither have any of the other nations involved declared war.

Furthermore, the war is being waged from China by one side, and Japan by the second, neither of which is now at war with the other.

On the other hand, our leaders are now sitting down with Germans to plan revival of the German Army. We are, of course, still at war with Germany. At the same time, we talk of reviving the Japanese Army and Japanese war industry. We are still at war with Japan also.

We are tightening down the clamps of censorship for more military security in the Korean War area. Yet in Tokyo, where the allied generals plan their strategy, Russian officers come and go freely, and pass information on to the Communists freely. This is possible because Russia is a member in good standing of the United Nations, which is fighting communism in eastern Asia.

Because nobody wants this thing to spread beyond Korea, this is the only war in history in which one belligerent has a "safe base," like the kids have in a game of tag. The Reds simply step over into Manchuria, and presto! they are "safe." We will neither molest them there nor can we bomb their plants which turn out the shells which kill our soldiers.

To add a further twist to the situation, Great Britain, which is our ally and the recipient of the bulk of our billions in aid during the past 4 years, is diplomatically a friend of the enemy we fight. She recognizes Red China formally and urges that the latter be allowed to become a member of the United Nations. All the while, Red Chinese are killing United Kingdom soldiers daily in Korea.

Well, this could go on and on. But what's the use? The longer the list, the greater the credit to the Russians, who must be given top rank as confusers of the issue. This Nation never was in greater need of enlightened leadership.

Fight To Win or Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Fight To Win or Quit," which appeared in the Washington Daily News for January 22, 1951:

FIGHT TO WIN OR QUIT

General MacArthur says that the American Army fighting of Korea as the agent of the United Nations awaits political decisions from "the chancelleries of the world" on the problem confronting it.

That problem is the intervention of Red China, dating from October.

"Considering that the entire military might of Communist China is available against this relatively small command (the UN forces)," General MacArthur warns, "only by maneuver may it avoid hazards inherent in the great odds which it now faces."

That is a clear challenge to the gentlemen representing the United Nations at Lake Success to make up their minds what they intend to do. And it must be answered.

The American resolution branding the Reds as aggressors, which has been presented to the UN, makes no provision for sanctions against Red China and carefully avoids anything that might be interpreted as authorizing General MacArthur to strike directly at Peiping's homeland and supply bases. It is from China itself, and the bases there, that the Red forces fighting our troops are being supplied. But our troops have become the forgotten men in this war.

The Defense Department is trying to muzzle Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, who raised this same issue upon his recent return from Korea.

"We have been fighting distinctly under wraps since the Communists came into the war," General O'Donnell says. "I never thought I'd see the day when we would have to sit back with our hands tied. * * * If we're going to fight, let's not hit 'em light, for heaven's sake. It's time people knew that this is an all-out war."

That is mild to what the boys in the frozen foxholes are saying.

They have been let down. They know it. They want to come home.

They are tired of being shot at like sitting ducks, while the United Nations exchanges notes with the outlaw Chinese Government at Peiping.

The State Department seems determined to make General MacArthur the goat in this situation, just as it made former Defense Secretary Johnson the goat for the original debacle in Korea.

But it can't get away with that. The record is too clear.

The fault is not in Korea but in Washington, in London, and at Lake Success.

The weakness of American political leadership was demonstrated when it was unable to persuade any of the other great powers to join us in sponsoring the mild condemnation resolution presented to the UN.

Britain, Canada, and our other fair-weather friends will vote for this resolution on the show-down. But they'll do it with great reluctance. And they are not prepared to support any reprisal measures against the Chinese Reds. Yet this resolution would do nothing more than officially recognize a condition which has been fact for 3 months while ducking the question of what is to be done about it. So the resolution itself is an act of appeasement.

General MacArthur has been gagged and General O'Donnell has been called on the carpet, doubtless to be warned to make no more statements on the outrageous way the policy makers have bungled this whole affair. But the truth will out, despite gags and censorship. The record made at Lake Success is there for all to read.

Our Army in Korea has plenty of fight left in it, according to General Collins, the Army Chief of Staff.

But why should that Army fight when the cause it is supporting has been disowned by the organization it is representing? No effort is being made to reinforce it. Why should more men die on a mission that seems to have been abandoned?

The UN must answer these questions, or it will be faithless to the world which has placed its trust in it, and faithless to the men who have died fighting in its name.

Economic sanctions should be voted against Red China. Its ports should be blockaded. The bases from which it is supplying its outlaw forces should be bombed. Aid should be extended to the guerrilla forces fighting the Reds on the China mainland. The Chinese Nationalists should be encouraged to return to China proper so that the Reds will be forced to fight on two fronts. That is the way to carry on this war if there is any desire to win it.

It cannot be won by the present half-hearted measures.

If the UN doesn't intend to fight to win, then our troops should be pulled out and the whole enterprise abandoned.

If the UN will not face up to this issue, then our own Government must. We should fight to win or quit.

A Study in Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Sunday World-Herald, Omaha, Nebr., entitled "A Study in Confusion."

Mr. Speaker, those who will have charge of administering price controls, rationing, and all of the other measures to regiment the American people will do well to read this editorial. It might well be entitled "Lest We Forget."

If controls are fastened upon our economy, the Congress should reserve some strings to have them removed when they are no longer needed. The left wing element in this country is now using this emergency to fasten what they hope will be permanent controls upon the American people. This should not happen.

I commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues:

A STUDY IN CONFUSION

Word from Washington that the new crop of economic controllers probably will start by controlling meat must have brought back a flood of not-so-old memories.

For the average householder they were memories of red ration coupons, empty butcher trays, and strange portions of cow and hog anatomy that most had never set eyes on before. They were of meatless Tuesdays and Fridays, and sometimes five other meatless days as well. They were memories of a flourishing black market and a swarm of OPA investigators, more sinister than Mack Sennett cops but not much more effective.

For the livestock producers and the meat packers the memories were even more vivid. In its attempts to regulate this great industry the bureaucracy perpetrated one of the truly monumental snafus of World War II, the effects of which are being felt to this day. There are sheepmen who will tell you that the control program decimated the Nation's lamb flocks, changed the people's eating habits so drastically that the country never has gotten back to eating lamb as it did before the war.

The ups and downs of the cattle and hog industries were almost as frustrating.

A glance at the livestock market news of those days conveys something of the atmosphere of the times. When, for instance, corn prices were frozen in April 1944 the hog market was glutted for seven straight weeks, yet pork remained point-high and scarce in the butcher shops.

In September 1944 the Defense Supplies Corporation disclosed that the meat-subsidy program had cost $462,000,000, and 20 Midwestern Senators asked immediate elimination of the subsidies as the only possible means of stabilizing the market. Instead, Stabilizer Vinson countered with promises of higher support prices and an increase in the subsidy to packers. Within 3 weeks the supply of hogs had nevertheless slid to the year's low.

Two months later, hog prices skidded overnight from the official ceiling price almost to the support price. Spokesmen for producers blamed this break on the subsidy that packers received, regardless of what they paid the farmer. The packers blamed it on low meat ceilings and likewise berated the so-called subsidy. In December New York butcher shops were closed up and retail meat supplies were at an all-time low.

By January 21, 1945, the Government was juggling new ceilings on all meats, and the packers were still pleading for an end of their subsidy. It should go, they said, not to slaughterers but to the producers and feeders. The Government's answer: Another increase in the packer subsidy.

In April 1945 there was a new set-up designed to eliminate packers' financial losses, give housewives more meat. It consisted of $34,000,000 more in subsidies to packers, bringing the total cost of meat subsidies to $560,000,000 for the year. There was a crack-down on slaughtering on the farm and OPA hired 800 more black-market inspectors.

"If ceilings don't work now," said Economic Stabilizer William H. Davis, "animals will be allocated to federally inspected plants and all other slaughter declared illegal."

The ceilings didn't work, and on May 1 the meat controllers reached their ultimate in hand-outs—a fourth increase in the packer subsidy, and a $35,000,000 subsidy to feeders payable through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

By the time the war in Europe was over, the regimentation of the meat industry was complete—at a total cost of more than a billion dollars a year—and still there wasn't enough meat.

Looking back on it, a number of men who spent their lives in producing livestock and processing meat said they believed that only one control was clearly necessary. That was the one setting aside certain quantities of meat for the Armed Forces.

All the rest was a costly and futile exercise in trying to control a vital industry which, its leaders believe, would have produced more and distributed it just as fairly if the bureaucrats had kept their hands off.

Cuba's Strong Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein the following articles which appeared in the Michigan Times:

CUBA'S STRONG MAN IS SEEKING PRESIDENCY AGAIN

(By Antonio Torra)

With announcement of his candidacy for the Presidency of Cuba there is special significance now in the personal history of Cuba's strong man, Gen. Fulgencio Batista. Herein follows the biographical sketch of the man who rose from a humble station in life to the nation's highest office:

Fulgencio Batista y Zaldivar, former President (1940-44) of Cuba, now senator from Las Villas Province and candidate for reelection to the Presidency, was born January 16, 1901, in the Veguitas District, near Banes Village, in Oriente Province, a little over a year after the United States flag had replaced Spain's red and gold ensign throughout Cuba, marking the end of four centuries of Spanish colonial rule, and a little more than a year before the Cuban Republic raised its own single-starred banner as the Stars and Stripes were lowered.

A little over 7 years before his inauguration as President he took the center of Cuba's national stage as chief of the revolution of September 4, 1933, a type of revolution new to the Americas, and whose basis cannot fail to deeply affect the future of Cuban history.

The Batista family was a Catholic family. All Banes was out in Sunday best to attend the baptism of Fulgencio, first-born son of Belisario Batista, until shortly before a sergeant in the Cuban Army of Liberation, and of his wife, Carmelia Zaldivar, a local girl Belisario had married on his return from war. The baptismal ceremony took place at the little church of Fray Benito, humble as the village itself, the Batista family and all the country folk in the neighborhood.

In Catholic schools, rural schools, and at a Quaker mission school in Banes, young Fulgencio found his lessons easy to learn. Deepest pleasure for him was found in the tales his father told of the long wars to free Cuba, of the men who offered their lives, fortunes, and honors as rebels against Spain, and of the warriors and thinkers who had inspired them by words and example.

The former sergeant told his son of Marti, poet and apostle of Cuba's freedom; of Saco and Varela; of Caballero and the Maceos; of Washington and Bolivar; Lincoln and Morelos.

At 13 his first great grief struck Fulgencio—the death of his mother. At 16 he started out alone. At 20 he was inside the gates of Habana. April 12, 1921, saw his enlistment in the army. This term was for 2 years. May 23, 1923, he reenlisted for a 5-year term. After 5 years he won his plea for office duty. He served at general staff headquarters, Camp Columbia, winning in a class of 100 the position of staff sergeant stenographer, highest Army rank in those days for enlisted men. September 4, 1933, at the end an orgy of bloodshed and revolutionary acts, he took command of the island. Later he was made chief of the army, retiring December 4, 1939, to become the candidate of a seven-party coalition for the Presidency—and to win.

This election was destined to make history in all Latin countries. It was conceded everywhere that the election was honest and orderly. Women went to the polls. There was no coercion, no threats, no violence except in one or two spots where followers of candidates below the office of president engaged themselves. The huge vote, the tremendous majority accorded Batista, was a genuine expression from a people long oppressed in matters of the ballot. The election was a superb compliment to Fulgencio Batista. He has not been unmindful of it. His life thus far has been dedicated to the betterment of his people, and it will continue to be so dedicated. The road he has traveled to the top was a long, hard, tortuous one, understood best only by those who know what hardships and impossibilities confront the poor boy seeking to brush aside the limited horizon before him.

CHAMPION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE COMMON PEOPLE, THE IMPLACABLE FOE OF "REDISM," BATISTA IS THE "MAN OF THE TIME" IN CUBAN HISTORY

(By Antonio Torra, Habana, Cuba; and Ed A. Nowack, Lansing, Mich.)

Gen. Fulgencio Batista, former presidente of the Republic of Cuba, referred to approvingly as the "nonpareil" of Cuban political history, is facing public service responsibilities probably never before faced by a Cuban. A swiftly changing world has created problems of organized human living almost too great for men to cope with. Capitols of all nations seethe with intrigue. New sets of governmental purposes appear overnight.

Senor Batista's keen grasp of world affairs, the progress of United Nations, his appreciation of the panorama of international causes and effects equip him extraordinarily with qualifications as a world figure.

As guest speaker at Daytona Beach Rotary Batista lifted the iron curtain bruscuely. In part he said:

"I desire to make some observations about present world affairs which have involved us in a new tragedy of very grave significance. I refer, of course, to the war in Korea.

"Unfortunately the termination of the Second World War failed completely to bring peace and comfort to humanity. Instead, anguish and fears came out of the so-called peace. I find that the doubts and skepticism of the people are developing in many quarters into a feeling of weariness, fatigue, and a dangerous fatalism.

"We must fight such defeatism vigorously and constantly, otherwise our civilization will be destroyed.

"The hope of mankind that the nations could live in peace in spite of different ideologies supported by strong nations is in danger of being smashed.

"Instead of laying the basis for a friendly world certain nations put self-interests above peace.

"What we have today, after 5 years of temporizing is, in fact, another war.

"We of the Western World cannot, indeed, accept a world of peace if it is to be dictated by the Russian Kremlin. And since the termination of World War II we have an excellent opportunity to observe why we cannot get permanent peace.

"During these years Russia has reduced many sovereign nations into puppets—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary, East Germany. China is dismembered. Iran and Tibet are in immediate fear of reduction to mere puppet states.

"Russia seeks to take all of Asia and continue on until the world is hers. We do not need to speculate or guess any longer about Russia's plans.

"We have the best evidence possible—the tangible, cold facts to prove this. The fate of the puppet nations alone demonstrates it.

"The leaders of democracy, the people of your country and mine and all our allies, must face the awful fact, that I have just stated, that Russia is embarked on a program of world conquest. Fortunately the United Nations (or at least a majority of them) have come to realization of what is going on behind the iron curtain. Democracy has at last, through a decision of the United Nations to oppose Russian aggression, called a halt.

"But Korea, I fear, has become only the first battleground. Only time will tell whether the defeat of Russia in Korea will put an end to her ambitions.

"Whatever happens the destiny of the world is resting now only on two powerful nations, Russia and the United States. The fate of humankind is in their hands. On one side waves the red flag of tyranny; on the other shines the beacon of freedom."

True it is that Russia is playing a shrewd military game in forcing the United States to fight 6,000 miles from home, but Russia had better beware that she might carry the game too far.

So much for the external picture, particularly the workers, who are the big target of Russia, that Russia has used communism to wipe out the freedom of the Russian people.

"It is not necessary to explain that, like the Nazi system, the Russian regime also means slavery; slavary in respect to free thought; slavery in respect to religion; and, in the end, physical slavery. We know how the Russian dictators and the subdictators all the way down, treat the masses. They risk their lives if they express thoughts contrary to the Russian Government; they are sent into exile for minor offenses.

"They must sacrifice their welfare and the lives of their families for the benefit of the totalitarian regime. They are, I say, slaves. We must show the world, by example, that in our democracies we have real freedom, that no man is a slave.

"The burden of arming the democracies of the world has fallen upon the United States. It is a mighty load, of course, but what other nations in these days, can stand up against Russia?

"France's manpower was sapped in the First World War. Britain's was badly hurt in the Second World War. West Germany is an uncertain and a confused country; we do not know how far we can trust the Germans. Italy's power of resistance is weaker than ever and Japan's military strength is gone. The only world power to combat the Russian military machine is the United States.

"The rest of the United Nations look to her for support. But at the same time, all the democracies must prepare themselves as strongly as possible to help.

"It also behooves all democratic nations who can do so to help the struggling masses in the underprivileged parts of the world. They are entitled to live freely, with full protection of the law and to earn a decent livelihood. They are entitled to raise healthy families, to educate them and to prepare them to live their own lives. Overlook these unhappy masses and they become easy victims of Communist dialectic and materialist doctrine. Like everybody else the underprivileged wish a better standard of living, and above all, like everybody else, they want freedom. They want freedom of speech, freedom of thought and freedom of movement and they want democratic institutions because no man, however humble, wants to be a slave. We must help the poorer classes to attain a better existence so that they will fight for freedom and democracy for all people everywhere.

"The disgruntled and the dissatisfied of the world are quick to recognize, just as we do, that democratic systems have certain natural weaknesses, therefore, governments of the people and by the people should strive constantly to eliminate whatever errors we find, so that the great principles in your Declaration of Independence and Constitution, and the hope and need to enjoy the freedom and the rights which your people, my people, and all other freedom-loving people want, will live forever."

The Congress Has a Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial entitled "The Congress Has a Duty," published in the Chatham Courier of January 18, 1951:

THE CONGRESS HAS A DUTY

We are not surprised at the worriment of many Members of the Congress over the attitude of President Truman in relation to the disposition of our Armed Forces throughout the world.

Recently, the Chief Executive was quoted as saying that he would listen to the Members of Congress, but that he alone would determine where and in what numbers our troops would be sent.

We assume that the President took this position because of the fact that the Constitution makes him Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Yet we feel that there are grounds for every grave concern over his military judgment.

Last June he stated that our forces were in Korea as a "police action." We have never heard exactly what he meant by that, but we do know that American casualties to date number 50,000. We also know that not alone North Korea, but Communist China are fighting with all of their strength against the troops we have in that country. To most people that would mean war, but apparently it doesn't to Mr. Truman.

So many Members of Congress justifiably wonder just what his next venture will be and if he will undertake to circumvent the American Constitution which specifically provides that only the Congress has the power to declare war?

It is a serious proposition and unless steps are taken to restrict the authority of the President, we are very liable to find ourselves governed by the will and whim of a dictator who can send our boys to die wherever he chooses.

It would seem the time is now at hand when the Congress accepted its responsibilities which the Constitution clearly gives it and require the President to obey its mandates.

Congress Cannot Escape Its Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are prone to find excuses for failure to measure up to our responsibilities. When indignant constituents write in and complain about existing conditions, the Korean War, Mr. Acheson, drafting of 18-year-olds, and many other subjects, we attempt to evade direct answers to their questions.

As part of my remarks, I am including a copy of a letter written by a prominent constituent who refuses to accept congressional excuses made in response to a letter that he had written. He calls a spade a spade, and the Congressman's face was red.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 17, 1951.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to thank you very much for your note of January 3, including your form letter reply on matters of foreign policy, etc. I am pleased to know that you read my letter carefully and welcome the judgment of people in the State.

I wish to refer to certain statements in your form letter as follows: "We cannot dissipate United States resources."

With this statement I agree, and yet we find that Congress is doing exactly that. The hypocrisy and dishonesty of the President's State of the Nation speech is evidenced by the fact that he is calling for colossal additional sums to spend and throw away over the world under the guise of defense and fighting communism.

At the same time he has not made a single move to cut down the ridiculously high expense of our Government here at home.

He asks that the citizens of the country deny themselves "until it hurts."

What is he doing?

What are the Members of Congress doing?

What is the Government itself doing to deny itself to the point where it hurts?

The whole situation is absurd when you look at it from this point of view.

When the Government itself reduces the number of employees by 50 percent and cuts the domestic budget likewise, then it is time to begin to ask for additional sums for defense and similar purposes.

The real situation could be met without any additional taxes if a real effort was honestly made.

You say "The United States is carrying practically the entire brunt of the fighting

in Korea" and that this is a "lopsided situation which must never recur under UN jurisdiction."

Of course, the facts are obvious. As long as we are a member of an institution like the United Nations there will be the same performance; that is why this country should get out of it at once. The United Nations was conceived in dishonesty; it is wholly futile. Every sensible person knew that what has happened would happen when the test came. The United Nations has made itself ridiculous. It pretends to be fighting for peace—to be a peace organization and against aggression.

As a matter of fact it is, at the present time, rewarding aggression and making proposals and doing other acts which are nothing more than paying a premium for aggression. The whole situation is almost unbelievable.

You say "We must protect United States above all."

With this I agree, but we are not doing it; we are protecting everybody else, apparently, but not the United States.

You say, "America has made some solemn and binding commitments under the UN Charter and under the North Atlantic Defense Pact."

We did not make commitments to start wars illegally and unconstitutionally, nor to furnish 90 or 95 percent of all the forces under United Nations police action, yet we are doing it.

We did not make any commitments to supply land soldiers or land armies for Europe under the Atlantic Pact, yet the President is unlawfully and unconstitutionally attempting to do it.

Congress should stop this.

You say, "We as a people believe in the sanctity of the pledged word."

I would agree with this statement if you refer to the people, but I do not agree with it when you refer to our Government. Neither the Congress, nor the executive department, nor the judicial department, all three of whom have violated their oaths of office and their pledged word against the wishes of the people.

For example, they have violated the written word printed on our currency, and on our Government bonds, and have swindled the people out of thousands of millions of dollars by the most colossal swindle ever perpetrated when the United States went off gold and repudiated its solemn and not only pledged work, but its written word. It is idle to speak about honesty when every arm of our own Government is guilty of such conduct.

You say, "If we were to abandon Europe and Africa we would lose all of Europe's and Africa's (a) manpower, (b) production facilities, (c) essential raw materials."

Why do you use the word "abandon"?

If we stayed at home and minded our own business we would not abandon them; we would be doing the sound thing and the correct thing, and we would not lose either the manpower or the production facilities, or the essential raw materials. We would be highly respected by these nations instead of encouraging their contempt and hatred which we have been doing by our policies and acts. The actual facts are that Europe has (a) more people, (b) more production facilities by far, (c) more essential raw materials, (d) much more mechanical and productive and technical ability, (e) much better transportation, communications, both on land and sea, than exists in Russia.

Why then does Europe require any form of assistance from the United States?

If they want to change their system and adopt communism they most surely will; nothing that we can do will stop them.

If they do not want to they have all the facilities—manpower and everything else, far greater than Russia, and can easily stop Russia.

It seems silly to talk about trying to help people unless they want to help themselves, and even more silly for us to talk about helping Europe fight communism when we have done our best to insult and otherwise make ourselves obnoxious to the one country in Europe that is really fighting communism, and that is Spain.

You say "If we were to abandon Africa" (you use the word abandon which I cannot understand) "Russia would have a nearby base to unleash an attack on South America."

It seems to me this is a very far-fetched idea.

What would the United States be doing, and a great many others, if Russia were trying to make a base in Africa to attack the Western Hemisphere which you say would crumble. In fact you say the entire Western Hemisphere would crumble.

If there is any germ of truth or fact in your statement then we better get rid of our present executive department, the Commander in Chief and all the other officials of the Army and Navy and Air Force, and go out and hire some men who have real ability and brains to do the job.

The United States Commander in Chief, so-called, and the Defense forces, have had 10 times as much money to spend and have been spending it for the last 10 years, as any other nation, and if they can't protect the Western Hemisphere, we better get rid of them and do it promptly.

If Hitler, with all of his preparations, could not go 22 miles across the English Channel, how ridiculous it is to assume that Russia is going to fight its way 2,000 miles to establish bases in Africa from which to crumble the defenses of the Western Hemisphere another 2,000 or 3,000 miles away.

You say, "We long for peace but Russia has the decision."

This is a statement that I cannot understand.

You say, "Every thinking person knows that while America longs for peace, the decision rests in the Kremlin."

I consider myself a thinking person and I do not know any such thing, and I know of no other thinking person who believes it.

Anything that rests in the Kremlin in the way of power we, the United States, put there. We financed them, backed them up, and set them up during the recent World War, without our help they would today be a very poor fourth-rate power.

The facts are that Russia cannot fight outside of its own borders; her people will fight for their homeland but they will not fight outside of the borders of Russia for phony ideology like communism. Russia will be lucky if she prevents her satellites or her own people from assassinating the dictators who are controlling them.

We certainly must have a lamentably weak group of men in the Government of the United States if they are laboring under the delusion that world decisions rest in the Kremlin. Even Truman does not seem to believe this because he started a war of his own, privately, without authority, illegally, and unconstitutionally; he paid no attention to Russia's opinions.

You say "that in international relations the President is 'the sole organ of the Federal Government'."

There is nothing in the Constitution that said the President of the United States can make illegal and unsound commitments. It never was the intention of the fathers of this country or the writers of the Constitution to make the Constitution subordinate to some private or secret deal or conspiracy that might be made by the Chief Executive, and he is not "the sole organ of the Federal Government."

There is no arrangement that he can make with a foreign country of any consequence which involves commitments of the United States that does not have to have the approval of the Senate before it becomes a fact or effective. Even then any such proposal or arrangement or treaty is not to override or supersede the Constitution. Every sane person knows that it never was the intent of the Constitution or the people that made it to have the Constitution destroy itself by making treaties supersede, negative, nullify, or undermine any clause in the Constitution.

You say "the Congress must and will remain vigilant and on guard in its domain."

This is exactly what Congress has not done during the past 17 years. They have cheerfully ignored the oaths of office and obligations of the Congressmen during these 17 years by practically abdicating and allowing the Chief Executive to set himself up as a dictator. They have voted him the funds and the powers without necessity at any time, and they have passed laws the effect of which is to undermine the entire American system.

Instead of being "on guard and vigilant" they have done the opposite. They have collaborated with a Chief Executive and with the internationalist to undermine, to socialize, and to destroy America piecemeal.

I have written you a number of times as you know, and I have been hoping and hoping for 15 years or more that Cougress would become vigilant and get on the job that Congressmen are elected for.

So, if you really mean what you say in the last paragraph of your circular letter—

"Be assured we of the Congress are on the job," then I would be indeed very happy.

Yours very truly.

Selective Service Act Age Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, soon it will be necessary for us to pass upon the question of lowering the Selective Service Act age limit so as to include young men 18 years of age or thereabouts. It seems imperative that we must expand the provisions of the Selective Service Act in view of our great need for larger numbers in the armed services. Surely we are conscious of the seriousness of the situation. Personally, in view of all the circumstances, I would vote to include 18-year-olds rather than to call upon combat veterans who are fathers to reenter the service. I am very hopeful that conditions will change to such an extent that it will not be necessary to call the teenagers. If it appears we must include young men of tender years, then it is our responsibility to protect them—physically, mentally, and morally. As in the past, I expect to sponsor legislation which should and will limit the temptations to which our young boys will be subjected. In this connection, I include herewith a clipping from the current issue of the Clipsheet, as issued by

the temperance board of the Methodist Church:

EIGHTEEN YEARS OLD

The situation which confronts this country is increasingly serious. Men in whom the people have great confidence, have suggested the possibility that millions of the 18-year-old young men of America must be inducted into the Armed Forces under a new system of training and service.

The young man who is 18 years of age is perhaps at the most formative period of his life. It may be necessary that these formative years be spent in uniform but it is not a prospect which gives satisfaction to Americans; it is a terrible thing—but these are terrible times. One thing we should insist upon: that the influences which surround these young men and the example set before them, be in accord with the highest ideals of American life. Their service should not be demoralizing to them. The arrangement by which the Government cooperates with the brewing industry in making thousands of new friends and young friends at that, for the beer trade, should be set aside.

The Government would do well, in whatever system of recruitment and training it sets up, to follow conscientiously the advice of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training which was established in 1947 and which included Joseph E. Davies, Harold W. Dodds, Truman K. Gibson, Jr., Daniel A. Poling, Anna M. Rosenberg, Samuel I. Rosenman, Edmund A. Walsh, Charles E. Wilson, Karl T. Compton—a strong, wise, patriotic group. After 6 months of intensive study they issued a unanimous report recommending UMT and outlining (p. 73) some directions for its set-up.

All these directions were important, such as, for example:

(1) "The selection of men of character as commanding officers of the several camps."

And (2) "The selection, and proper training in the problems of an 18-year-old, of the officers and noncommissioned officers who will take part in the training."

But (7) "Limitation of the opportunities for purchase by trainees of any alcoholic beverages, including beer, through (a) prohibiting the sale thereof to them on any military, naval, or other camp reservation, or in any post exchange, ship's store, or canteen, (b) declaring off-limits to trainees all taverns, taprooms, and similar facilities whose principal business is selling alcoholic beverages, (c) soliciting the assistance of local communities in this program, and (d) making it a Federal crime knowingly to sell such beverages to any person in training."

Wise words uttered by wise men.

If the armed services are to have the whole-hearted support of Christian people, it is advisable that these words be heeded. Ruin of tens of thousands of veterans of the recent war, now caught in the terrible toils of alcoholism because they began the habit of drinking while in service, lies heavy upon the hearts of many millions of the best citizens of this country. Beer is the beginning—alcoholism, all too frequently, is the end.

Drafting of 18-Year-Old Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial legislative matters to come before the first session of the Eighty-second Congress is that concerning the drafting of 18-year-old boys. I can well understand the position in which the mothers of these young men find themselves, inasmuch as I am the father of three sons, each of whom began his service in the Armed Forces during World War II when he was of the age of 17 or 18. It is difficult to make a decision as to whether or not we should draft these young men, the cream of all crops, at this early age for the purpose of actively defending our country in the bearing of arms. But yet it is our bounden duty to protect our precious heritage—a heritage of freedom for all ages and made more dear because of the sacrifices of the loyal forebears of the United States. While making these decisions, it is very heartening to have such a frank, honest, unselfish, and sincere letter as that received from Mrs. Mardelle L. Clark, 4509 Elm Street, Chevy Chase, Md., which I include under leave to extend my remarks:

JANUARY 17, 1951.

Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that the congressional mail contains protests by mothers against the drafting or training of 18-year-old boys and that those against such a draft exceed letters in favor by about 100 to 1.

Perhaps the unfavorable ratio is partly due to the failure of mothers like me to express our opinions. As the mother of four sons and mother-in-law of a 20-year-old, I realize that I could find many reasons why not one of them should serve our country in its time of need, if I consulted only my own heart. Nevertheless, my second son, who was drafted in 1945 while in his freshman year at college, and who finally received his Reserve commission at the end of junior year, has been called into service and is en route to the Pacific destination to which his battalion was sent. He may some time be able to complete his education as a chemical engineer, but probably not for a long time. My third son was in the First Marine Corps Reserve unit which was activated. The oldest, married, and with a young son of his own, is applying for a Navy commission because the Navy gave him an education during World War II in the ROTC. The son-in-law will probably be drafted this year.

In spite of these disturbances in the lives of my dear children, I do not hesitate to say that, when my youngest son, who is now 16, reaches his eighteenth birthday, I shall not protest his entrance into military service. Our wars have not been won until the 18-year-olds were trained and put into service, and certainly in the present struggle, unless we win we shall have little to offer the boys of the future. Then, too, if any son of mine must fight, I want him to be sufficiently trained so that he can defend himself as well as fight for others. Any other way is slaughter.

As a Colorado voter, I am ashamed of the public utterances of some of our Senators. It would be well if our Congress considered what is best for our country and helped the protesting mothers to understand the need, instead of catering to their emotional outbursts in the hope of gaining votes.

Sincerely,

MARDELLE L. CLARK.

Spiritual Renaissance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article referred to me by Mr. Fred W. Barnacle, 1716 Northwest Thirty-fourth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla., which appeared in the Daily Oklahoman on Friday, January 5, 1951:

PRAYER ROOM FOR A NEW UN

(By Edith Johnson)

Would the Congress allow the founding of a plan to set aside one room for prayer and meditation in the new United Nations Building arising on the bank of the East River in New York?

It was THOMAS J. LANE, Representative from Massachusetts, who put this question in the House a few days before the Eighty-first Congress adjourned.

At a time when the American people are turning to prayer for strength and guidance, it is almost unthinkable that citizens of any belief or opinion should be permitted to defeat such a plan, nebulous as it may be.

Better late than never, a room for such purposes had been opened at Lake Success at the instance of United Nations Secretary Trygve Lie, as Mr. LANE reminded his fellow Representatives. The majority of people having an interest in spiritual matters and believing that there is power in prayer had assumed, therefore, that a similar room would be provided in the new building. That doubt has been cast over the issue, if one may call it that, comes to them as a surprise.

Whether opposition to this plan comes from representatives from the Soviet Union and Russia's satellites or whether confusion has arisen from sectarian differences within our own country is not, as yet, quite clear. In any event, a decision to rule out a prayer room would be regressive action.

Delegates to the United Nations conference in San Francisco remember that conference sessions opened with brief periods for meditation, this method accommodating people of all faiths, many of whom must have felt a need for clearer understanding of the problems before them and greater wisdom in dealing with them. But when the United Nations came into being at Lake Success and Flushing Meadow there seemed to exist a hope that atheist Russia might be appeased and the peace won the more easily if her delegates were not annoyed by any form of religious observance. So the matter was dropped until public opinion became a factor to be reckoned with and a place for meditation was set aside.

Now that there is no prospect whatever of appeasing Russia, Communist China, or any other nation living under the Red flag, surely some plan should be worked out to provide the prayer room. It should not require any great amount of courage for delegates to the UN who want it to ask for it, and it should not have to be urged by Members of the Congress.

Why, indeed, should not the United States establish a room in the new building in which Members could withdraw and pray?

Was not this Nation founded on Christian principles?

Are not all sessions of the Congress opened with prayer, each body having its own chaplain?

Do not all State legislative bodies follow a similar practice?

Is not the ceremony of inaugurating a President of the United States religious as well as civil in character? Is not this true also of the ceremonies when a governor is about to take office in his State?

Is not every witness brought into court commanded to lay his hand on the open Bible and swear that he will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help me God?

Is not the declaration "In God we trust" impressed on some of our coins?

What if Russian representatives should object? Have they not been in the business of objecting ever since the UN was organized?

As for the several religious bodies represented in the UN this hardly would be a time for the expression of sectarian narrowness, criticism or condemnation. Should there be any misunderstanding of this nature it should be cleared up readily among people of good will. The very name, United Nations, suggests, does it not, that the spirit of brotherhood should prevail?

Lay men and women who are in accord with the idea are free to say so. Ministers and priests can plead for it. Also the press and the radio.

No citizen is too unimportant to refrain from speaking up. And this includes the housewife whose voice never is heard in the public forum, the grocer's clerk, the mailman, the farmer, the brakeman on the railroad, the bus driver, and the porter on a pullman car. Students in high school and college certainly have a stake in the making of such a decision and they should be heard from. Who should have a keener concern for the development of events than they?

If, as many believe, the world is passing through a spiritual crisis and the most pressing need for the moment is a spiritual renaissance, provision for a place for prayer in the meeting house of the nations would present one answer to the forces of materialism.

Heroine Mary Frances Housley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the whole country was inspired by the heroic acts of Miss Mary Frances Housley, stewardess on the plane involved in the recent Philadelphia air wreck. The following is a clipping from the latest edition of Time magazine which tells the tragic and heroic story of this lovely young Floridian:

HEROES

TAKE YOUR TIME

Afterward, one passenger remembered seeing "the fence coming" and hearing someone yell: "We're going to crash." Within seconds, the National Airlines DC-4 was skidding along the sleet-coated runway of Philadelphia's International Airport. It ran off the runway, through a ditch. Its landing gear disintegrated, flames shot from a ruptured fuel tank.

Stewardess Mary Frances Housley threw open the door. Men and women rushed for it. One woman jumped with her coat on fire, tore it off and ran from the scene. Pretty, 24-year-old "Frankie" Housley stood by the door, coolly advising her passengers to "take your time." One panic-stricken woman crawled along the aisle away from the door and toward the nose of the plane. Another woman screamed, "Get my baby." Frankie could have jumped. Instead, she turned back into the flaming cabin.

When the wreckage had cooled, firemen climbed in to bring out seven bodies—five women, two infants. One of the women was heroic Frankie Housley. She was found lying in the aisle with the body of 4-month-old Brenda Joyce Smith in her arms.

Facts on Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, so many erroneous statements have appeared in the press recently holding the farmer responsible for the increased food costs that I think it is only fair that the House be given the facts. I include in the RECORD an article written by Mr. A. D. Stedman, farm editor of the Saint Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, which clearly states the farmer's position and think each and every Member of this House will do well to study it carefully. I would also like to commend it to the attention of the columnists who have, so far, painted only one side of this picture.

The article follows:

FACTS ON FOOD PRICES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

In the hubbub over rising food prices, millions of fingers are now being pointed in accusation. A concert of voices names the alleged offender. The Washington storekeeper, selling dollar-a-dozen eggs to Senator THYE put the bee on the popular culprit—the farmer, he said, and Government-supported egg prices. The baker, talking about higher bread prices, emphasized wheat and other ingredient costs.

The housewife, buying apples at 10 cents a pound; the soft drink consumer laying costs to sugar prices; even the cocktail hound soaking up highballs at 50 cents a drink while orating against milk prices at 18 cents a quart—all these lately have seemed agreed as to where the blame belongs. That is on the farmer, on the huge Government stores of food bought in supporting farm prices, and on the allegedly fantastic Government losses on farm purchases and farm subsidies.

But reasonable people will no doubt be interested in knowing the relevant facts, not on just one side, but on both sides of that story.

As to eggs, it is true that farm prices did advance rather sharply (28 percent) above the unusually low price a year earlier. The price has been steadily moderating from the peak.

But as a farmer and producer of eggs on his farm near Northfield, Senator THYE, talking to the Washington seller, had the facts first-hand about farm prices of eggs. Those prices on THYE's farm had been nowhere near $1 a dozen, but about 42 cents. The Government was supporting them, but stopped that on December 31. So in blaming dollar-a-dozen eggs on Government-supported farm prices, the Washington storekeeper was 100 percent wrong.

As to bread, not over one-fifth of what the consumer pays for his loaf goes to the wheat farmer. On December 15, wheat prices were up just 6 percent from their level a year earlier. That rise wouldn't account for a rise of one-fifth of a cent for a loaf of bread. All the farm ingredients put together, including lard as well as wheat, do not account for one-third of the consumer bread price. Almost two-thirds of the consumer price goes to the baker and retailer.

Recently one of THYE's colleagues, Senator MATHEWS, of South Carolina, made this statement: "In June 1948 the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel; the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread, 13.8 cents. But in October 1950, the price of wheat had dropped to $1.91 a bushel, whereas the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread had risen to 14.7 cents." Certainly the labor costs of baking, slicing, wrapping, and offering other services now demanded by consumers have been going up. But centering the blame for rising bread prices on the wheat farmer isn't in accord with the facts.

As to apples, the western farmer last autumn got 90 cents per 50-pound box, field run, delivered at the packing platform. That was 1.8 cents a pound to cover all his costs of growing, spraying, irrigating, picking, and hauling. The charges added by washing, sorting, wrapping, crating, storing, transporting, wholesaling, and retailing are what push the consumer price up to 8, 10, or 11 cents a pound.

As to sugar, the cost was actually lower in late December than it was on October 31, 1947, when sugar controls were removed. And the sugar price is so tiny an item anyway in the cost of a soft drink that it would be hard to find the effect of a 1-cent-a-pound sugar increase on a bottled drink.

The authentic facts about farm prices are available to all. They had, on December 15, risen 23 percent from the bottom a year earlier. Beef cattle and lamb prices were respectively 41 and 38 percent above their official parity or equality with general price levels. But milk, butterfat, grains, turkeys, and chickens were substantially below and potatoes, apples, sweet potatoes, and citrus fruits far below parity.

The recovery of farm prices accompanies a national jump to $206,000,000,000 in disposable personal income, after taxes. Have farmers shared unfairly in that income rise? They have not. Net farm income for 1950 was actually below that of 1949 and much below the 1947-48 peak.

A higher disposable national income normally raises food prices because people spend a rather uniform share of such income for food. The $1.60 per day wage increase just won by John L. Lewis, for instance, will enable his coal miners to help in bidding food prices up. But is that, or the fact that greater coal costs of transporting or processing food will push in the same direction, the farmer's fault?

One hour's average labor will buy more food in this Nation than in others and many times more than in any regimented economy in the world. As Senator THYE told the Farm Bureau, the farmer's share of each dollar spent by the consumer for food was only 53 percent in 1946, and has slumped to 48 percent today.

Folks with a real liking for facts on both sides may be shocked also to learn of the gross inaccuracy of much of the recent so-called news of farm price supports.

Last Monday afternoon a Washington dispatch from a usually accurate news agency was widely published which said that "there was a net loss on price supports last year of $1,600,000,000."

People have been stirred up by vivid descriptions of such vast losses, of mountainous food purchases, of waste, and of farm demands for subsidies. And farmers have been told by newspapers and newspapermen to throw overboard their price-support programs or put them in a stand-by status for the duration.

An excellently informed and truthful agricultural correspondent, Fred Bailey, of Washington, recently reported that "the campaign to make the farmer the goat on rising food prices is now well under way in the big city press" supported by some city Congressmen who want to roll prices all the way back to the farmer.

Here are facts: The $1,600,000,000 referred to in last Monday's story as net loss, wasn't loss at all, but was the total amount loaned. The net realized loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the year ending last June was $349,290,000. The net realized loss in the current fiscal year through November was $100,261,000.

Said John W. Haw, agricultural development director of the Northern Pacific, to the Farm Bureau convention: "In its report to Congress on June 30, 1950, the corporation showed a cumulative net realized loss * * * in 17 years of $636,040,401. The Corporation has turned over its capital many times in this period; yet the net loss has been less than 5 cents on each dollar invested." He said the job has been substantially accomplished with economy to the taxpayer.

The recent big losses and big waste have been on potatoes and eggs. Both of those purchase programs were forced by Congress over repeated protests of the executive branch and many farmers. And from both of them the Government now has withdrawn. As to subsidies, the farmers producing the perishables that the Government sought to subsidize are up in arms against them. As to the storable products, the Government's holdings of these are now widely acknowledged as being a vital protection of the Nation's safety in the war emergency and a check on inflation. More stockpiling of this kind is considered absolutely essential, as a munition of war and as a safeguard against runaway prices.

So there are facts bearing on both sides of the farm price story.

Labor's Approach to the National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hands the text of a forthright address delivered by one of America's outstanding labor leaders, Mr. George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, affiliated with the A. F. of L. Mr. Harrison delivered this address at the quarterly conference of the Economic Club of New York last Wednesday night, January 17, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Harrison's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR OPPORTUNITIES IN THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

(By George M. Harrison)

Mr. President and members of the Economic Club of New York, it is a great pleasure for me to be here to talk with you about some of the problems that are facing us today. It is a pleasure not only because I find such contacts always useful and enlightening but also because the present national emergency demands of all of us that we try to reach as great a mutual understanding among the people of the United States as is humanly possible. The war in Korea has finally unmasked the designs and the program of the Communists; anyone who had any doubt before must know now that the dictator in Moscow is willing to risk world war in order to extend his despotic power. We should realize now, too, that there is no limit to that appetite for power. We can't satisfy that Russian bear with a little raw meat. The more he eats the more he wants—and the meal he really has his eyes on is the United States of America. In the emergency that confronts us the achievement of effective national unity is of first importance.

It is important that we Americans try to build up our national strength as much as we can and as fast as we can. We must try to resolve our own differences of opinion as much as possible, to understand each other, so that we can pull together in the difficult days that lie ahead of us. Unless we learn to stand together today, we may fall together tomorrow.

You will not expect me, I know, to tell you of the problems or desires of American financiers, industrialists, or businessmen. The men who speak for the owners of American industries assuredly need no help from me, especially before this group. You will expect me to tell you of the problems and attitudes of American wage earners; that I propose to do, as simply and directly as I can. It would not be any kindness to you, either, for me to pull any punches here. For your own good and for the good of the country, you ought to know exactly what American workers are thinking, even though you may not like those thoughts.

Let me say, first, that the working people of this Nation are fully awake to the menace of communism. We have faced that threat in many forms during the past 20 years, and American labor has never for one moment wavered in its devotion to our free American institutions. No part of the citizens of this country are more determined to combat Communist dictatorship, in whatever form and wherever in the world it threatens, than the men and women who work for a living.

The determination springs, first of all, from the belief that our way of life—based on human freedom to worship, think, and speak, and vote as we believe—is right in principle, and the only just basis for any civilization. Labor is for freedom and democracy, and we are opposed to all kinds of dictatorship. But we are also opposed to Communist dictatorship from the immediate and direct standpoint of our own interests. We know that our unions, our personal freedom, and our living standards could not and would not survive under Communist domination. Labor leaders, and every outspoken workingman, would share the honors of the firing squad with the leaders of business and industry if Communist dictatorship were to be established in America. We know that. We know too, that the same results would follow if our domestic breed of Communists were able to overthrow our form of government. Whether communism was imposed upon us by foreign aggression, or in some [illegible] clipped [illegible] us by any home-grown [illegible], the effect would be the same.

Don't ever forget that fact, or let any of the more rabid anti-labor newspapers, or businessmen, or [illegible] persuade you. American labor is anti-Communist. American labor knows the horror from American business the evils of dictatorship and domination, the benefits of freedom and democracy. We know—because in the not distant past, American workers were denied industrial and economic freedom, and they lived under the power of some policy dictators and dictators in American industry. Then, perhaps, to us gave a place we say to my bluntly that American labor will rebel against the return of that kind of industrial oppression in this country, and will fight as vigorously to get rid of it in the same [illegible] it still exists.

Let us look at the facts of our American situation frankly. In normal times we do a lot of fighting among ourselves, our basic way of living is that every man is supposed to have an opportunity to work his way upward, and the competition in every walk of life, if it is fair and free, is one of our ways of making certain that the able and upright man will gain advancement to positions of leadership. Down through the years, the struggles of individual men, and of groups of men, have brought great progress to us as a people. American workers have not only improved their standards of living, but they have gained greater leisure for themselves—and they have won a substantial measure of freedom and democracy on their jobs. Part of that came from their efforts as individuals, but the great progress of recent years has been accomplished by them through their labor organizations. It hasn't been done, either, without great effort; every gain we have made in wages, or working conditions, every right we have won and every protection we have thrown around our jobs, has been over the vigorous opposition of many employers. Sometimes we have been able to persuade, with facts and arguments, but much more frequently what we have secured has come only because we have said, "This is what we want, this is what we have got to have, and this is what we are going to have." The progress of the American working people has been won over the resistance of the representatives of business and industry.

I am not here complaining about that resistance. We have been free to ask for what we wanted, and the employers have been free—and willing—to answer "No." What I do complain about, however, is the methods and tactics that have been used. In ordinary times, we can trust to the ultimate sense of fair play of the American people, and our own efforts at explaining the facts, to get things set right in the long run. But now, in the gravest national danger we have ever faced, I believe we have a right to expect that the business community will police itself a little bit, as we have been trying to police domestic and international labor organization. We do not expect the American employer to drop all opposition to labor progress, any more than we expect the sun to rise in the west tomorrow morning.

Before I explain what I mean, let me give you the reasons for insisting upon fair play and broad-minded action from the representatives of industry. This world situation in which we find ourselves is not just a battle between nations, or groups of nations. As the Russians and some of their friends are preaching it, this fight is what they call a "class conflict." They insist that the world is witnessing a battle between capitalists and workers, between employers and labor. The Communists in the Kremlin tell the world that labor rules in Russia, and that Communist victory in every other country means labor will rule that country; pure

than that, they are shouting all over the world that the United States is a capitalist-ruled country, that labor here is oppressed and down-trodden, that the American Government is the tool of big business and stands for industrial exploitation and the degradation of the workingman.

That, of course, is the technique of the big lie. Hitler, I believe it was, said that if you tell a big enough lie often enough, it will be believed, because people will think you couldn't have the nerve to invent a really fantastic story. That's the Russian Communist method today.

Look, now, at the world situation. We are the main bulwark of democratic human freedom and private enterprise—but two-thirds of the world is still free from Communist domination. We are the No. 1 target of the Communists, but the No. 1 tactic of the Communists is to separate us from all possible friends and allies abroad. They seek, also, to win any possible support for their program from among our own political leaders and the working people. But mainly they are trying, in Germany, France, Italy, in all of Western Europe, to persuade the labor groups that Uncle Sam is a capitalist despot—that our way of life is fundamentally antilabor and pro-employer. The Communists hold up Russia as labor governed, and America as capitalist dominated. The real battleground of today is not just the rice paddies of Korea—it is the minds of the political leaders and the working people of Western Europe, and even of many in England and more than a few in the United States of America.

American labor is doing everything possible to counteract that Communist propaganda in America and throughout the world. I need not tell you of the campaign within this country; you must have seen the news stories of the constant vigorous opposition to the Communist line and Communist people in all labor unions. Most of our labor organizations are free from any actual Communist influence, although there may be individuals who are still unbalanced enough to accept the Russian line. But in the international field we have been no less active and determined. We have succeeded in smashing the Communist international labor front; we have destroyed the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, and set up a vigorous and effective anti-Communist world organization. I think I may justly say that American labor leadership was primarily responsible for this action. In the fight we have been making, we believe we are entitled to the cooperation of American businessmen—to the extent, at least, that they will not in this emergency seek to evade their fair share of the sacrifices and burdens that are necessary to make our country strong and united so we can win this world struggle.

In the development of this Nation, the Government has uniformly and consistently done its best to aid American business. Labor has no objection to the principle, in general, that Government powers should be used for the benefits of the citizens. We believe, with the founding fathers, that governments are instituted for those purposes. The long record of land grants, of tariff laws, of governmental subsidies, of patent legislation, of governmental loans and liberal Government contracts, the direct aid given by the State Department and occasionally by the Armed Forces in foreign affairs—all of these things illustrate and attest the devotion of the United States Government over the last century and a half to the advancement of American business interests. While businessmen, industrialists, and financiers have sometimes disagreed about what measures Government should adopt to foster and help the business community, they have seldom taken issue with the idea that Government should offer such help. The great total of billions of dollars that has flowed from Government to industry, and the other direct aids that have been given, have been tremendous factors in our industrial growth. But I do not recall having heard such governmental assistance called socialistic, or communistic, or un-American, or paternalistic by the representatives of business.

Against this necessary background, I ask you to consider what is happening today. During the last year, and especially the last 6 months, the price level in America has risen sharply. Every American industrialist, practically, has shared in the wealth thus created; his debts have shrunk, his goods on hand have grown, in terms of his dollar situation. Every American workingman, every consumer, on the other hand, has suffered; his debts oppress him more, his weekly income buys him less. Billions of dollars of real wealth have changed hands.

What has been the reaction of the business community to this terrific windfall? The proposal to tax excess profits, for example, has met with an opposition that seems wholly incomprehensible in view of the facts. Business actually seems to expect that the new taxes, required in our national emergency, shall be secured from a Federal consumer's sales tax which will fall largely upon those same groups whose incomes have been shrinking under the impact of rising prices. And the business community, through its spokesmen, object to the control of prices to prevent profiteering, although they are responsible for raising prices and the inflation that has occurred. At this time when every American family is being called upon to give its sons to the Nation for military service these business attitudes are profoundly disturbing to American workers. It does no good to speak a lot of hard words in such situations, but we cannot avoid a feeling that too many business representatives are adopting and expressing a narrow, selfish, and greedy viewpoint in this national emergency. We do not expect a suspension of the desire for reasonable and fair profits; we do not believe the ordinary motives of economic activity can be set aside in this emergency, without disrupting our industrial efficiency.

Labor knows the harvest that has been garnered by American business in the last year of rapid price increases, and the harvest that resulted from the price increases after the repeal of control laws in 1946. We know the rich gains to business resulting from the rapid amortization of war plants in the last war, and the sales of such plants in the postwar years. We see again the provision for 5-year retirement of plant to be used in the new defense effort. In the face of those terrific, those unprecedented gains by American business, we believe we have a right to expect forbearance, common sense, and national cooperation from those who own our industries.

We cannot reconcile the national emergency with the efforts being made not only to raise the price level still further, but, on the legislative field to prevent excess-profit taxation. The worst of it, from some standpoints, is that when the workers try to get enough wages to meet these price rises and to prevent undue hardship and suffering for their families, some businessmen want to take away their fundamental liberty. The right to strike is as fundamental as the right of any businessman to buy and sell, as fundamental as any right protected by the contract provisions of the United States Constitution. It is as fundamental, and we believe more sacred; no man's property is as sacred as his personal liberty, his personal freedom. We cannot get around the simple fact that laws prohibiting strikes of workers in private enterprise take away one of the few great fundamental rights of every American citizen. We hope that the business community will rise to the level of dignity, common sense, and patriotism that is required of them if we are to preserve America and American-ism through the perils that lie immediately ahead of us. Since we all have a supreme stake in freedom, all of us must make our fullest contribution to its defense. With cooperation, labor and industrial management can get much of the additional production that will be needed for an effective military defense and relieve much of the inflationary pressures, but the place to stop price increases is where they originate.

The seller and the speculator fix prices, and if they won't stop raising prices, they must be controlled. If prices are controlled, then we agree that wages should be stabilized in parity with prices. Taxes must be raised to get the revenues to pay for our rearmament and they should come from corporation and excess profits and individual incomes. We are opposed to a national sales tax because it does not attack inflation at its source—the price and profit level. Government spending for nondefense activities must be reduced, but this does not require curtailment of essential social services.

Postal services should be made self-sustaining and the charges should be raised to get the necessary revenues. There is no good reason why private business should be furnished parcel-post services at a loss of $100,000,000 a year to be made up by the taxpayers.

I would like to see the advocates of private enterprise practice what they preach and agree to a correction of this unfair subsidized Federal competition with private transportation.

Soviet aggression constitutes a challenge to our free way of life. We can overcome that challenge if we stand together, as Americans have done in past emergencies. We must convince Soviet Russia that America has the will to fight and the strength to fight in defense of freedom and international justice. We must make the Soviet leaders understand once and for all that America is willing to live and let live in peace.

American wage earners face the future and its responsibilities seriously, but with confidence. We want peace and the opportunity that peace affords for new progress. But if we are compelled by circumstances beyond our control to wage another war, we are determined to let nothing stand in the way of victory—victory that will mean not only a better America, but a better and more peaceful world in our time.

Survey Shows No Reversion to Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the National Opinion Research Center:

SURVEY SHOWS NO REVERSION TO ISOLATIONISM

The American public shows no signs of a return to old-type isolationism according to a survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center during the first week of January 1951. Despite military reverses in Korea and recent criticisms of United States foreign policy by Hoover, Kennedy, and Taft, the American public continues to support aid to our allies and active participation in world affairs. As the new year began, the center's survey showed strong majorities of Americans backed such measures as the North Atlantic Pact and the shipment of military supplies to Western Europe while the proportion of the public which would stay out of world affairs was no larger than it was a year ago.

In answer to the question, "Do you think it will be best for the future of this country if we take an active part in world affairs, or if we stay out of world affairs?" 66 percent of the population advocated taking an active part while only 25 percent advocated staying out. These figures have changed little since this question on support for isolationism was first asked in 1942 and are unchanged from results for the same question asked in January 1950.

Questioned about the North Atlantic Pact—"an agreement with Canada and the countries of Western Europe, to defend each other against attack"—78 percent of the adult population expressed the view that it is a good idea. Only 1 person in 10 called it a bad idea. Similarly, 71 percent of the population approved of sending military supplies to the countries of Western Europe now, in order to strengthen them against any future attack. Support for this measure appears to have increased since the start of the Korean War, for in early June 1950 62 percent of the American population favored sending American arms to Western Europe.

Provided Western Europe works actively to build up its own defense, American opinion seems solidly behind the proposal to send American troops to aid in that defense. Almost two-thirds of the American population were not convinced that Europe is doing all it should in this respect, however. Thirty-six percent of the American public approved of sending large numbers of American troops to help build up the defense of Western Europe, though an additional 34 percent of the population would approve such a step if the countries of Western Europe increased the size of their own armed forces.

The military reverses in Korea were not without their effects, however. A majority of 55 percent of the population still answered "right" in January 1951 to the question "Do you think the United States was right or wrong in sending American troops to stop the Communist invasion of South Korea?" In September 1950 81 percent of the American population had answered "right" to the same question.

The figures cited above are derived from answers to questions put to a national cross-section of 1,500 American adults, 21 years of age and over, during the period from December 29, 1950, to January 8, 1951, by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago.

Ice Harbor Dam and Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that some of the spendthrift agencies of Government are going to wrap the American flag around some of these infeasible projects and declare that they are needed for the war emergency. The following editorial in the Astorian Evening Budget, of Astoria, Oreg., very aptly covers this subject:

TIME FOR A REAL APPRAISAL

A reader has sent us a copy of an editorial just published by the Contractors and Engineers Monthly, of New York City, dealing with the subject of nonessential Federal construction in these days.

It is so pertinent to the subject of Ice Harbor Dam for which a new attempt to get an initial appropriation is under way, that we can't resist the desire to publish it herewith.

The Contractors and Engineers Monthly is a trade publication of the heavy-construction industry, a publication obviously well equipped for sound comment on the Army engineers and their projects. The editorial, entitled "Time for a Real Appraisal," follows:

"One of the most thorough, soul-searching self-examinations ever made is due in the construction business, if that industry is to command continued respect. This is especially true on public works financed wholly or in part by taxes. The United States, faced with the responsibility of maintaining powerful armed forces for decades, perhaps, cannot and must not spend its financial strength on luxury projects whose conception in these critical times is unwise.

"The Bureau of Reclamation's central Arizona project always seemed to us to exemplify this theme perfectly. It is by no means an isolated example of the type of project which, if deferred indefinitely, would make the Nation stronger in her time of peril. At the present time the central Arizona project is pigeonholed in committee, but it may be called to the floor of the House for a vote at any time.

"Other projects, involving astronomical sums of money, are being promoted. Some of these undertakings are good and wise, but many could be held in abeyance or forgotten entirely. Whenever an agency has to strain for justification excuses, as the Corps of Engineers is sometimes doing on its small-boat and pleasure-yacht harbor-development projects, it is time for the construction industry to do some analyzing. Their worthwhile jobs can stand on their own merits; they do not require propaganda selling.

"It is not the purpose of this editorial to imply that all or even a majority of Federal agency construction jobs are unnecessary. Certainly the conception of certain dams is sound, even in these times, and some flood-control channels are undoubtedly needed. A first-class highway network capable of standing up under modern traffic is a crying necessity.

"But the world situation in itself can save the Nation from attack. When the only thing a bully respects is force, the only wise course is to create that force at the expense, if need be, of construction projects no longer justified in the light of the world situation. As Dwight Eisenhower recently said, 'It is time to get tough with ourselves,' and Contractors and Engineers Monthly would be something less than honest if it did not point this out.

"As a matter of fact, the voluntary cancellation of unnecessary luxury projects is the healthiest course for the construction industry to follow. The Nation's contractors have an enormous job ahead to construct installations for the growing Armed-Forces Establishment. Equipment manufacturers and distributors will be hard pressed to build and distribute machinery, and not a single unit should be used unwisely. The construction industry cannot allow itself to be spread too thin. It must remain strong and healthy to keep the Nation solvent, and the movement in this direction must come from within to be effective.

"Private hydroelectric power development projects at Kings River, Calif., and Roanoke Rapids, Va., are being blocked at this very moment by Government agencies which argue for Federal development at public expense. It is this sort of thing which should stop at once.

"For projects of this nature which are sufficiently sound for private-venture capital to underwrite should have the fullest cooperation from the administration authority. Projects which have to reach out for support like recreation to partially justify their enormous cost should be endorsed at least until the battle for survival (for which is currently fighting is over."

Housing in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. LOVRE, of South Dakota, stated in an extension of remarks on December 15, 1950:

Mr. Speaker, I can only scratch my head in wonder at the antics of the administration. In the hope that some of the other Members can help me out of this fix, I ask that the full text of the following press release be included in my remarks.

The press release mentioned was issued by the Housing and Home Finance Agency on December 2 with reference to progress made under the remote area dwelling program conducted by the Alaska Housing Authority under the sponsorship of the Housing and Home Finance Agency through the provisions of the Alaska Housing Act. Specific mention was made in the release of the loans which have been obtained by Eskimos in Alaska for construction or improvements of their homes, which are called character loans and are not in excess of $500.

Mr. LOVRE, in the course of his remarks, stated further:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything against the Eskimos but I note that while we here in this country are being called upon to accept less of certain strategic materials, the Eskimo who conforms to Bureaucratic edict can get corrugated aluminum roofing for his house. This at a time when we desperately need critical materials in the war effort.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. LOVRE and others who read his extension of remarks are interested enough in the subject to have the facts of the case presented to them.

It was Congress and not the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency who authorized in the Alaska Housing Act—Public Law 52 of the Eighty-first Congress, approved April 23, 1949—the Alaska Housing Authority to make character loans to individuals or cooperatives for the improvement, conversion, or construction of dwellings in remote areas to be occupied by such individuals or members of such cooperatives where the loan does not exceed $500 per dwelling.

This program was begun as but a small part of a much larger undertaking under the Alaska Housing Act for housing in Alaska to help meet the needs in urban areas of civilian workers serving

military activities directly or indirectly at our defense installations.

To obtain funds for the purpose of undertaking this program and other projects authorized under the act, the Alaska Housing Authority was authorized to issue obligations for purchase by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in an amount not to exceed $15,000,000 and it was specifically provided that such notes and other obligations issued and outstanding for the purpose of making character loans to individuals or cooperatives shall not exceed $1,000,000. An appropriation of $10,000,000 to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for loan to the Alaska Housing Authority for purposes authorized in the act was passed by Congress and approved by the President on October 10, 1949.

The remote-area dwelling program was first conceived by Father Paul C. O'Connor, S. J., chairman of the Alaska Housing Authority, who has spent 20 years of his life among the Eskimos in the remote areas of Alaska along the Bering Sea. On a necessarily limited basis, Father O'Connor had experimented with improvements to the typical Eskimo dwellings for the purpose of eliminating the extremely damp and unhealthy living conditions of these people. The ravages of tuberculosis and other diseases among this fine race have been partly attributed to substandard housing. These diseases were unknown among the Eskimos prior to the advent of other people. Father O'Connor's experiments with limited resources had proved quite successful and he was desirous of expanding these benefits which he was certain could be done on a self-help, nonsubsidy basis. He very definitely opposed any effort to attempt to place the Eskimos in expensive modern homes, but instead urged that improvements be made gradually. Hearings on the proposed Alaska Housing Act were held by the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees in March of 1949 at which time Father O'Connor testified effectively and in detail as to the nature, purposes and prospects of such a program. I believe Father O'Connor's testimony makes very interesting and informative reading for anyone interested in the Territory of Alaska or more importantly interested in the defense outposts of our country in which the Eskimo takes such an active part.

Special mention of Father O'Connor's testimony and suggestion was made in both House and Senate reports on the Alaska Housing Act, which strongly endorsed the insertion of the character loan provision in the legislation. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency report on the legislation stated:

> Your committee was also impressed by the special housing needs of the Eskimos. Living generally in damp sod huts, they have proved to be highly susceptible to tuberculosis brought in by civilization, and their death rate from this disease is nine times that of the population of the United States as a whole. Experiments have demonstrated that wood floors and roofs can be installed cheaply in their dwellings, which will protect them to the extent of greatly diminishing occurrence of the disease. Testimony was presented to your committee that in one Eskimo village where wood floors and roofs were installed, the incidence of tuberculosis was reduced by 80 percent.

During the summer of 1949 the Alaska Housing Authority conducted a larger experimental program of this character in the Eskimo village of Hooper Bay, on the Bering Sea, and demonstrated the feasibility of dwelling improvement or even reconstruction sufficient to satisfy the purposes within an amount of $500 for each such dwelling. This experimental program was financed out of limited territorial funds and was administered in the form of character loans to the individual natives in an amount not to exceed $500 for each dwelling and in the form of notes to be fully repaid within 5 years, with interest at 5 percent.

For the building season of 1950 the Alaska Housing Authority developed a program designed to improve or reconstruct dwellings for 170 families in 6 villages in the remote areas of the Territory. The authority applied to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for a loan in the amount of $70,000 to support its lending operations in turn to those 170 native families in individual amounts of $500 or less, payable in installments over a 6-year period, with interest at 5 percent. This loan was approved by the Administrator in April of 1950, and the program proceeded with the commendable success reported in the Housing and Home Finance Agency news release of December 2.

The Alaska Housing Authority has now had the experience of two seasons of this program. It should be noted that the program is intended to be self-supporting, without subsidy, and at the present time the outstanding notes are rapidly being repaid. The total tonnage of materials consumed in the 1949 period approximated 70 tons. The total tonnage of materials consumed in the 1950 program amounts to 421 tons. The actual tonnage of aluminum roofing came to 36 tons. These materials were ordered in April of 1950, many months prior to the present situation, with its emphasis upon critical materials. It was found that aluminum was more readily available than galvanized steel, which was originally ordered, and the aluminum was ordered because of its lighter weight, which was a factor in transportation, and because of its availability at that time. Metal roofing is used in this work particularly for the purpose of collecting rain water for drinking and domestic purposes of the Eskimo, which in itself amounts to almost life-saving benefits. Naturally, if aluminum roofing is not available it will not be used, but I believe emphasis should be placed and due recognition given to the fact that the aluminum roofing which was used was ordered almost 3 months before the Korean crisis started.

It is a tribute to the natives and to the Alaska Housing Authority that through ingenuity, initiative, and the cooperative self-help work on the part of the Eskimos it has not only been possible to achieve an improvement in their dwellings of such nature as to eliminate largely the previous unhealthful living conditions but also to construct a new dwelling fully sufficient for this purpose within the $500 limitation, particularly in consideration of the generally extremely high construction costs in these areas.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER B. McMULLEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill granting to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the present hostilities, and to their dependents, all the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to veterans of World War II and their dependents.

While this bill is general in nature, it authorizes and directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe regulations and provisions to make the act effective.

In my opinion, the passage by the House yesterday of House bill 1 was fair, fitting, and proper, and gives to the soldiers now fighting in Korea some benefits, rights, and privileges that the veterans of World War II do not have. However, in my opinion, inasmuch as the boys now fighting in the Korean area are doing so under conditions never before experienced in American history, namely, fighting under the United Nations in an undeclared war that has been called a police action, it is my firm conviction that it is proper for these men to be granted additional benefits and they should lose none of those given to veterans of World War I and World War II.

How You Lose Your Neck Saving Truman's Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is important that every sovereign citizen of this great Republic, especially the mothers and fathers with 18-year-old sons, as well as younger boys, bear in mind why this demand has been made by the Truman administration for this draft of the 18-year-olds.

Our replacements of men in Korea is 15,000 per month. Must we suffer and permit the continuous slaughter of American boys while the United Nations permits itself to be dominated by our supposed allies who sympathize with Russia and Red China in the military operations now in Korea.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the

RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 25 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

HOW YOU LOSE YOUR NECK SAVING TRUMAN'S FACE

Somewhere in Korea, as you read this editorial, an American in uniform will have been killed by an agent of communism. How does it happen that the American was there to be killed?

The official and public record is worth reviewing, just at this moment when the Congress of the United States has called on the United Nations to declare Communist China an aggressor in war.

A reasonable starting point is June 1, 1950, for it was in June that decisions were taken by President Truman and the UN—not the people of the United States of America—that have put us Americans out to be killed.

June 1: President Truman declares at a press conference he believes the world closer to peace than at any time in the past 5 years and the next day gives a gold medal to Veep BARKLEY "for distinguished service."

June 6: President Truman declares that "Government action in recent years has been the salvation of private enterprise," and accuses business of spending enormous sums of money to spread the "false" idea that his administration is promoting creeping socialism.

June 10: President Truman denounces Soviet Russia, compliments Europe for its "resolute expression of the will to be free and to unite in common defense," says the "cold war" will probably last for "many years to come." "Isolationism," he adds, "is the road to war and worse than that, to defeat in war."

We insert here a request that nobody call on us to balance the remarks of June 1 with those of June 10. We're just reporting what the man said.

June 20: Secretary of State Acheson gives the Governors' Conference, meeting at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., a 3½-hour open and closed review of State Department works and policies. The governors unanimously express satisfaction and gratitude. Acheson goes to Harvard to be anointed, June 22, as an honorary doctor of laws and there tells Russia off again.

June 24, 1950, 3 p. m., eastern standard time: North Korean army crosses thirty-eighth parallel, headed for Seoul, capital of South Korea.

June 25, 5:45 p. m.: Security Council of United Nations issues "cease fire" order and calls for troops.

June 27, 12 noon: President Truman orders General MacArthur to throw land, sea, and Air Forces in against the Reds, as per UN direction. He also reverses himself in the "hands off Formosa" policy, orders Navy to defend it, and promises weapons to the Philippine and Indochinese Governments.

The UN Security Council votes military sanctions against North Korea, meaning an agreement not to sell it munitions of war. Member nations promptly start selling to Red China and other Soviet stooges.

There follows a period in which the people demand to know how the Red Koreans were able to surprise and push United States forces down to the Pusan beachhead.

So such types as John Foster Dulles, who needs no introduction, explain that "we knew it was coming all the time, but we just didn't know when."

How that squares with Mr. Truman's June 1 declaration on peace we wouldn't know.

In no time at all Mr. Truman's dishonest phrase, "police action," is abandoned by all to describe the adventure in Korea by its right name, "war."

The Constitution of the United States says that only Congress can declare war for this Nation, but Mr. Truman and the UN don't mind that.

July 14: The UN flag is put above the United States flag and goes to battle that way, leading United States citizens.

August 28: Nationalist Chinese headquarters on Formosa announce that Red Chinese have crossed Manchurian border into Korea. United States airmen report shooting down Russian bomber.

September 15–16: United States forces, after fighting bitter retreating action in which UN nations send only token support, begin to spring back. General MacArthur leads Inchon landing that leads to quick victory.

September 21: President Truman says it is up to UN whether our troops will cross thirty-eighth parallel in rolling back the Red forces; says United States troops will obey.

October 4: UN cheers MacArthur on and, with India and Russia objecting, directs him to take "all appropriate steps." So he opens drive to clear Korea of Reds.

October 26: South Koreans in MacArthur's forces reach Manchurian border.

November 1: North Korean broadcast announces Red China has decided to send "volunteers" to help them. You know what has happened since.

Now, in New York City, the UN, which took full authority and control over United States soldiers when things looked good, doesn't know us any more.

Americans in uniform are dead from one end of Korea to the other. Congress has been held up to disgrace and ridicule. It deserves as much for supine submission to a President who said on June 1, 1950, that peace is nearer than at any time in the past 5 years, and on June 26 ordered, on his own, a "police action" in support of the UN that now is full war.

The citizens of the United States, who are paying for the very life and living of the UN, the so-called governments represented in it, and the people involved, have been made fools of before the world.

No wonder the mail to the White House and to Congress is the heaviest in history. Have you sent yours?

A Humiliating Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "A Humiliating Defeat" which appeared in the Washington Daily News for January 24, 1951:

A HUMILIATING DEFEAT

When the American resolution seeking to brand the Chinese Communists as aggressors in Korea was sidetracked by a 27-to-23 vote in the 60-member United Nations political committee the United States suffered its worst defeat in the UN's 5-year history.

This humiliating situation invites President Truman's personal attention, for it shows the extent to which our bargaining power has been traded away for nothing through the State Department's political ineptitude.

The defeat was sustained at the hands of the British, supported by India, France, Canada, the Asian-Arab bloc, and the Scandinavian countries—nations, for the most part, presumed to be our friends.

The Russians took no part in the proceedings, because Britain and India were carrying the ball for them. But Moscow must have found great satisfaction in this spectacle.

After all of the proud boasts about the united front against communism, and all the billions we have contributed to this bailiwick, the only nations voting with us on an issue directly involving Communist aggression were the Latin-American bloc, Greece, Turkey, and the Philippines—not one of them a member of the North Atlantic alliance.

The ingratitude of neutrals is proverbial. But a practical statesman makes due allowances for this factor and immunizes himself against it. Obviously, Secretary of State Acheson was not wise enough to do this. He let himself become a doormat stamp for the British Foreign Office and apparently got no assurance that Britain would back him when he needed support.

Just 2 weeks ago the United States approved the British-Indian proposal, which would have given the Chinese Reds the island of Formosa and a UN seat in return for a cease-fire agreement in Korea, on the understanding that if the offer was rejected Britain and India would support the American resolution. But when our resolution was called up those nations found a convenient excuse for voting to lay it aside in favor of another appeasement proposal.

When Britain votes against us rather than offend the Peiping Reds no better demonstration of the penalty of being taken for granted could be wanted. And the other fence-straddlers walked out on us to back the British.

Now the United States has been left almost alone in the position of opposing what our erstwhile allies presume to call peace. The Russians, who have been calling us warmongers, have been given new guns for their propaganda mills. And the ammunition they will use against us was provided by our so-called friends.

The unanimous votes by which the United States Senate has asked the United Nations to brand the Chinese Reds as aggressors "immediately," and to deny them a seat in the UN, should be a warning to the UN as a whole, and to our allies in particular. These votes reflect the attitude of the American people, as well as that of a body which must pass upon this country's future contributions both to the UN and to all of our overseas programs.

There's been too much of this tragic nonsense and double-dealing at Lake Success. This country is stultifying itself by being party to the proceedings. But our own State Department has been such a willing party to so much of the dalliance and procrastination that we must share the measure of guilt for the sordid spectacle the United Nations has made of itself.

Only the President can remove the United States from this compromising position. He can do that only by purging the State Department of all of the elements responsible for it, beginning with Secretary Acheson.

He should not wait another day.

The American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is both refreshing and inspirational in these days of intrigue and confusion to

come in contact with the sentiments which lie basically under our governmental structure and speak the devotion of those who in that earlier day carved out our Nation. Those who flung all they had in the balance and staggered through revolution to found our Republic. Those bold men and pioneer women who rode the slow oxcarts to the West and bought an empire with the bitter struggles of the frontier. These shaped a Nation and gave to the world that which, despite all its defects, has offered and still offers to you and me the largest way of life the human race has ever known.

Such a heritage is symbolized by our American flag.

I am impressed with a tribute to our flag, written by Charles Ulysses Gordon, whose great-grandfather served with Washington at Valley Forge and fought at Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the poem of Mr. Gordon on the American Flag:

THE AMERICAN FLAG

Hail! All hail! The American flag,
Glorious emblem of the world's greatest Republic.
Behold! The Star-Spangled Banner as she Gracefully rises to her post of duty
And gently flutters in the morning breeze
Across our native land and above the seas;
She proclaims her message of liberty and freedom;
Then softly, as the red, white, and blue sways,
Loyally we grant her our befitting salute.

Contemplate Old Glory as she lofty floats
On yonder mountain high, in the rising sun,
Piercing the warmly glowing azure sky.
From staff and mast she waves throughout the air,
Bestowing her choicest blessings on all alike.
Observe her resplendent above the stately Capitol dome;
Surely she belongs in every American home.
Worthy sons and daughters of freedom, she is yours
To acclaim, to honor, to defend.

Wave on! Wave on! O glorious flag,
Thy destiny is yet unknown.
Amid uncertainty and mounting strife,
Our Nation remains calm and serene.
Surrounded by vicissitudes of a troubled world,
She boldly asserts her established sovereignty.
Washington, Adams, and Jefferson wisely counseled
That America avoid all entangling alliances
And evermore maintain "freedom's banner" at her door.

From early sunrise until the close of day,
Triumphant, the Stars and Stripes are waving.
Symbol of a freeborn sovereign people;
Guardian of our Charter of Liberty,
Defender of our Union, peace and independence,
Sentinel of our honor and priceless heritage;
Patriotic protector of our Bill of Rights,
Supremely does our inspiring ensign proclaim:
The United States of America shall be forever free.

—*Charles Ulysses Gordon.*

June 14, 1950.

No Zeal for Nonmilitary Saving Shown in the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, any person who has analyzed the President's budget message will recognize therein a lack of sincerity in the remarks about economy in nondefense spending. Instead of reducing spending in nondefense items, the President requests an over-all increase in such spending. Then, too, the President has requested the Congress to embark on new spending plans in keeping with his irresponsible schemes. It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, for either the President or Members of Congress to simply talk about economy. It is high time that we—all of us in responsible positions—do something about it.

I set forth here, Mr. Speaker, a fine editorial from a recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal:

NO ZEAL FOR NONMILITARY SAVING SHOWN IN THE BUDGET

The President has given Congress a budget calling for appropriations of $71,600,000,000 for the year beginning next July 1. It is the fourth largest budget in our history, being exceeded only by the budgets for the three peak years of World War II.

The revenue of the Government for the new year is estimated at $55,000,000,000, which is the highest in our history but which falls short by $16,500,000,000 of balancing costs.

The public debt, which will reach $260,000,000,000 by the end of the current year, will thus pass $276,000,000,000 by June 30, 1952, unless we raise our already high taxes.

To balance the President's budget through the adoption of a pay-as-we-go policy—and everybody should admit that this is desirable—will entail a 30-percent increase in receipts. This means higher taxes in every category than we have ever known before and perhaps some new sources of revenue.

That, in brief, is the fiscal picture which the President paints. The whole matter is now in the hands of Congress.

Congress cannot well challenge the five billion nine hundred million which goes to pay the interest on the national debt. It will not challenge the four billion nine hundred million set aside for payments to veterans. It will go lightly in trimming the forty-eight billion eight hundred million asked for our own military preparation and for aiding other free nations to prepare.

The trimming, if there is to be trimming, must come largely from the many items which comprise the other twelve billion. While much of the expenditure here is for items related, directly or more remotely, to defense, there should be a fertile field here for some economies.

There is no evidence in the budget or in the budget message that the President has pressed for the sacrifices by Government departments that he has asked citizens generally to make and that they must make as consumer goods dwindle in supply and as taxes increase.

He speaks broadly of discontinuing projects and of not asking for new enterprises because of the emergency. Yet nonmilitary appropriations are up by more than $2,000,000,000 and the cost of general government is up by $100,000,000. In view of this, it is for Congress to determine whether Government services have been put on the same emergency footing of strict economy that is contemplated for the people.

It is not enough to get the water out of Government costs. It is essential that the services themselves be curtailed where that is possible without positive harm.

On the purely domestic side, the President asks for a reorganization of the financing of the Post Office Department and a rise in postal rates to make the Department more nearly self-supporting. He advocates separate accounting for Government and congressional mail and for paying postal subsidies to aviation out of a separate fund. Surely there should be no resistance to this reform.

He advocates a start on building the St. Lawrence waterway and six other power-producing projects. These proposals should be reviewed sympathetically for their defense potentialities.

The President then goes to three more controversial issues—educational aids to the States, some type of Brannan plan aid to farmers and medical care under social security.

Is there any reason why, having gone this far without them, we should now, in the throes of an emergency, start educational aids or a plan for emergency medical benefits under Government auspices? And is it not time to consider withdrawal of agricultural aids, rather than a modification of them?

The President admits that the farmer's financial situation will be good in 1952. He is disturbed, however, by the cost and waste of storing surpluses under the present aid system. Apparently the only choice he sees is a choice between support subsidies and direct subsidies. Congress should go beyond that and inquire into the need for any subsidies at all at this time.

This country is today committed to a policy of rapid development of its defense facilities and of defense facilities abroad which may be used in our common defense. That commitment calls for sacrifice—for a lower standard of living, for longer hours of work, for greater production in spite of the hardships incident to the task to which we dedicate ourselves.

It calls for vast expenditures—but it also calls for getting every ounce of fat out of the services of Government, and especially the nonmilitary services.

Every cent that can be saved leaves a cent in the pocket of some taxpayer. Every billion dollars that can be lopped off the costs, cuts a billion dollars off the new revenues which must be obtained to balance the budget.

There is little to show that the President's 1952 budget was conceived in that light.

Universal Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Universal Training," which appeared in the New Ulm Daily Journal, New Ulm, Minn., of January 13, 1951:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING

Substantially strengthened by the world crisis, the proposal for universal military training is before Congress again. Universal training is generally thought of as a device with which the Armed Forces could be kept always manned at the size authorized by Congress, and with which the largest possible pool of trained reservists could be maintained for emergency.

The plan sponsored by the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee would build a pool of reservists with 1 year of training, but apparently would compete with the regular services rather than aid them in the supply of men for actual service. Under this plan, every young man would be subject to training, but he would be in an isolated training corps, not a member of any regular service. Only 4 months of his year would be spent in actual field training; at the end of his year he would, unless he volunteered for regular service, go to the reserves.

Obviously this plan would not provide the regular services with much additional manpower. They would still have to get it from their present sources, volunteers and the draft. Their noncombatant manpower requirements would be enlarged, since they would have to provide the instruction and administration for the training corps. Even the value of the reserve pool would be questionable. A man with only 4 months of basic training and 8 months of class work would not attain a high degree of military skill, and what he attained would deteriorate rapidly after his return to civilian life. After 2 or 3 years, extensive refresher training almost equivalent to that given to raw recruits would be required for these reservists if it were necessary to call them into active service.

It is questionable whether anything would have been gained except a year's activity program for the youth of the Nation. If universal military training is needed to strengthen and support our armed services, it should be made certain that the plan considered for adoption would do that.

Patriot or Politician?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, action speaks louder than words. When the President appeared before the Congress to deliver his annual message on the state of the Union, he spoke of rigid economy in nondefense spending. Yet, paradoxically, his budget message requested increased over-all spending for nondefense items.

Rex Karney, the analytical associate editor of the Wisconsin State Journal at Madison, Wis., has written an editorial that the apologists for this administration ought to answer for the people of this country. The editorial is entitled "Patriot or Politician?":

PATRIOT OR POLITICIAN?

Even in an hour which he himself labels one of crisis, the President of the United States wallows about in the muck of cheap, dirty, partisan politics.

President Truman yesterday proposed to Congress a budget for next year of $71,500,000,000.

He asked that Federal taxes be increased by sixteen and five-tenths billions so the Government could operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. This would mean an assessment of about $471 a year on every man, woman, and child in the United States.

No one is much surprised by these figures, astronomic though they are. The ordinary citizens of this Nation have long been ahead of most of their public officials in recognition of the hard struggle for survival that is to be our certain lot.

And there are few citizens who would whittle one penny from the Federal appropriations that are really vital to our defense.

But what else does Harry S. Truman demand in the defense budget he presents to Congress?

He asks for the Brannan plan, an expensive political monstrosity on which even the members of his own party are divided.

He demands public housing for low-income groups, which can mean anything the President and his bureaucrats want it to mean.

He wants Federal aid to education.

He wants Federal medical insurance, a start on the same socialized medical program that was repudiated in case after case in the 1950 elections.

He demands a Fair Employment Practices Act, as controversial a proposal as any before Congress.

All these Mr. Truman demands in the name of "emergency" and "national defense."

It is true that military and international categories of the Truman budget account for about 70 percent of the total. It is true that the individual appropriations for the Fair Deal social experiments are relatively small in comparison to the total.

But Mr. Truman has no right, in this critical hour, to impose upon the American people one cent of spending and taxation that is not necessary to our national survival.

He has no right to allow his social philosophers to get their foot in the door with highly controversial programs now that will mean billions in expenditures and taxes in the years to come.

House Republican Leader JOSEPH MARTIN charged yesterday that Truman administration planners "are attempting to hitchhike free rides on the defense program for nondefense schemes."

He stated the case clearly and fairly.

Individual Members of Congress must now perform their constitutional duty of scanning the President's proposal carefully, and must eliminate the hitchhikers who can be classed only as excess baggage.

Tribute to Edison—Correction of an Oversight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] called attention to the fact that a speech which I made on Thomas Alva Edison on February 12, 1940, had been published in a set of books entitled "Modern Eloquence" which is generally regarded as one of the outstanding publications of its kind in the English language.

In response to his statement, I called attention to the fact that it had been published in several other volumes, including Principles of Public Speaking, which is used as a text book in many of the leading colleges of the country, including George Washington University here in the city, and also in a book on public speaking by Hon. William Dull, a former instructor in public speaking at the University of Washington, and also at the University of Wisconsin.

My attention has been called to the fact that I overlooked another great publication that carried that address. I refer to Vital Speeches of the Day, which published it on April 1, 1940, and which carries it in its permanent publication.

I regret this oversight very much, for I regard Vital Speeches of the Day as one of the most valuable publications of its kind in America, and one that I should like to see in the library of every college and every high school in this country.

In making my address on Edison, I had only a few minutes time in which to express my feelings concerning the man, whom I consider the greatest individual material benefactor of the human race.

When you look around, especially at night, you can realize what would happen if we should lose what Edison accomplished.

If all the lights were to go out, if all the electrical appliances were to cease to operate, and if all the motor machines that have been made possible by the spark of electricity that flows the one that moves them on, were to come to a standstill, then you would realize what we owe to Edison, the man who made it all possible.

Electricity is the greatest servant mankind has ever known, and the only one the man or woman of ordinary means can afford.

As I said, I am very sorry that I was not aware of the fact that my tribute to Edison was first published in Vital Speeches of the Day and that I therefore did not mention that great publication in connection therewith in my remarks on this floor on January 12.

The Wolf Creek Project of the Cumberland River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address on the subject of the Wolf Creek project of the Cumberland River Basin, which I heard delivered before the Rotary Club in Lexington, Ky., on October 12, 1950, by Col. Henry Walsh, District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, of Nashville, Tenn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator CHAPMAN, members of the Rotary Club, and guests, I want to thank you for your kind invitation and add that I welcome this opportunity of appearing before you today to talk to you briefly of the Wolf Creek project and the part this project plays in the development of the Cumberland River Basin and the surrounding area. I hope that it will result in mutual advantages to you, as well as to the organization I represent.

The presence of Senator CHAPMAN here today makes it much easier for me to present the plan for development of the Cumberland River, since I am sure that the Senator is thoroughly familiar with all the aspects of the plan. I might add too, that the Senator has been most active and influential in his support of the Wolf Creek project and in obtaining funds to continue construction of this project in an orderly manner.

You should feel that these projects I am about to discuss are your projects since it is the desires and the interest of the citizens of the area that are the initiating and propelling forces which cause the Corps of Engineers to develop our river basins.

The Wolf Creek project is an outstanding example of this type of development. We are proud of the Wolf Creek project for numerous reasons. First, let me say, this is truly a mammoth structure. The dam itself is over a mile in length. The concrete portion of the structure contains over one and one-third million cubic yards of concrete. The earth-filled portion of the dam contains almost 9,000,000 cubic yards of earth. The lake which is now being formed behind this massive structure will contain over 6,000,000 acre-feet of water. Compared on the basis of reservoir capacity, it will be the largest reservoir east of the Mississippi River. The power plant at this project, rated on installed plant capacity, will rank third in the eastern United States. Six units with a total capacity of 270,000 kilowatts will be installed in this plant. This is sufficient capacity to supply the electrical demand of Kentucky's 10 largest cities.

Besides the professional pride we have as engineers in taking a part in the construction of this structure, we are also proud of the role it occupies in the plans for the development of the water resources of the Cumberland River Basin. This comprehensive plan for the development of this area, which was authorized in its present form, by the Congress of the United States in 1946, provides for flood control, production of hydroelectric power, navigation improvement, pollution abatement, recreational development, and all related benefits for a full development of a great natural resource.

Of these many benefits, probably the most important in these days of potential power shortages and increasing demands, is that of hydroelectric power production. The plan for the development of the Cumberland River Valley provides for the installation of approximately 900,000 kilowatts of generating capacity, which will produce over 3,500,000,000-kilowatt hours of electrical energy annually. This plan utilizes every foot of drop in the Cumberland River between Wolf Creek and Nashville. Of this total installed capacity, the 270,000 kilowatts at Wolf Creek represents about one-third. The other two-thirds is installed at nine other sites. Wolf Creek is truly the key project in the development of the Cumberland River. The construction of the powerhouse is now being pushed at an accelerated pace. We expect to have the first generators in operation in September of next year.

Of almost equal importance are the flood-control benefits to be obtained from this plan. The Cumberland River Basin has had a long history of disastrous floods which have annually cost the citizens of the valley millions of dollars in flood damages. The plan, of which Wolf Creek is the key project, will give complete protection from flood damages from the Wolf Creek Dam site to the vicinity of Clarksville, Tenn., where backwaters from the Ohio River begin to be reflected on the flow of the Cumberland. In addition to the flood control for the Cumberland River Valley, this plan will also materially benefit the lower Ohio and Mississippi Valleys.

To obtain this flood protection, the plan as authorized by Congress provides for the control of the runoff from 11,000 square miles of the Cumberland River Basin. Of this total, over 5,800 square miles of the drainage basin or approximately 53 percent is controlled by the Wolf Creek Dam. The other 47 percent is provided by the Center Hill and Dale Hollow projects, both of which are now completed for flood control, and the planned structures at Stewarts Ferry, Three Islands, and Rossview. Here again, it is quite apparent that Wolf Creek is the key project in the plan.

Last July the governor of the great Commonwealth of Kentucky was honor guest at the closing ceremony of this massive dam. He issued an order for the placement of concrete in the remaining opening in the structure which started the formation of the Wolf Creek Reservoir. With the closure of this dam, complete flood protection from the site of the dam to the mouth of Stone's River just above Nashville, a distance of 255 miles, was provided. In other words, there is no longer a plan for flood control in this area; it is an accomplished fact.

Next in importance, and probably of major interest to many of you sportsmen, are the recreational opportunities afforded by this project. The reservoir will be 101 miles long and will have a shore line at top pool of 1,255 miles, which exceeds that of the entire State of Florida. The area of the reservoir for recreational use will vary, usually from 50,000 to 35,000 acres.

Because of the remoteness of the site it was necessary to construct an access road on both sides of the river at the dam, each about 4 miles long. Upon completion of the dam, these roads will be incorporated into the Kentucky highway system, and Route 35 will be relocated to run across the top of the dam, providing permanent access to this outstanding structure.

The location of this project, the topography of the area, and the inherent beauty of this reservoir will present a tourist attraction which will be unexcelled in this section of the country. The population within a 150-mile radius from the center of Wolf Creek Reservoir is estimated at over 6,000,000. Wolf Creek Reservoir can be expected to lure tens of thousands of visitors annually to its shores with resulting trade benefits to the surrounding area.

To properly serve the public in the use of these recreational opportunities, a master plan for recreational development has been prepared by the Corps of Engineers. This plan provides for the conservation of the natural resources, development of the recreational features for public benefit and management of the property for the greatest good of all concerned. In developing this plan, joint field investigations and conferences were held with the National Park Service, United States Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Soil Conservation Service, and all other Federal, State, and local agencies which have an interest in this work. It is the policy of the Corps of Engineers to utilize the technical knowledge of these agencies to the maximum extent in developing these related benefits.

The water of the reservoir will be crystal clear except in the upper reaches of the main body and major tributaries where at times of flood a muddy condition may prevail. Little, if any, pollution is anticipated. The clear, clean water and the rugged terrain in which the reservoir lies will create a lake of spectacular beauty. Fishing in the Cumberland River and its tributaries has always been good and it is reasonable to assume that Wolf Creek Reservoir will greatly improve fishing as has been true at Dale Hollow and Center Hill Reservoirs. It is safe to predict that this reservoir will become one of the outstanding fishing waters of the southeastern United States.

In the development of recreational facilities it is the policy of the Corps of Engineers to provide only those facilities necessary to assure the public access to the recreational features for use in a safe and healthful manner. Other Federal and State agencies, counties and towns and concession operators are encouraged to take over the remaining development for full use of the recreational benefits.

It is contemplated that the Wolf Creek Reservoir will be sufficiently impounded by the beginning of the recreational season of next year to permit recreational usage of the lake. In consequence, I have recently made award, after competitive bidding, of five dock sites strategically located on the reservoir. These dock sites are shown on this map [pointing to map] and are identified as the Burnside Marina, Greiger Hill, Jamestown, Lee Ford, and Parnell. These successful bidders will be required to make available to the public by April of next year boats, motors, food, bait and equipment, gasoline and oil, sanitary and electrical facilities, and boat moorage. Overnight facilities will also be available at all the sites by that date, with the exception of the Burnside Marina, which will be located at the city of Burnside. It is believed that these five facilities will provide service for the initial public usage of the reservoir. The flexibility of the master plan permits expansion of these facilities, however, as the demands increase.

Also in the initial development, action has been initiated to turn over to the Commonwealth of Kentucky two areas for development by the Commonwealth. The first, a 2,300-acre tract located off Highway 35, near Jamestown, Ky., for a State park site. It is understood that preliminary work has been initiated by the Commonwealth in the development of this site. The second site off Highway 90 between Otter and Beaver Creeks, will be developed for a Kentucky junior conservation camp. Both of these sites are also shown on the drawing.

Provisions have been made in the master plan for the ultimate development of nine parks and public day use areas, 20 commercial dock sites, 8 group camp sites, and 6 colony cabin sites, together with numerous locations which will be available for solitary cabins and private club sites. Many of these, however, will be developed only after public use has demonstrated their need. There is an apparent demand for the solitary cabin site use and efforts are being made to open some of these sites for development during the next year.

In addition to the projects I have mentioned three other projects, namely, the Old Hickory, Carthage, and Celina projects, have been authorized for construction between Nashville and the Wolf Creek Dam. These projects will harness a great power potential in this section of the river and will reuse the water from the Wolf Creek, Dale Hollow, and Center Hill projects over and over again. The Old Hickory plant will have an installed capacity of 100,000 kilowatts. The Carthage plant will be rated at 92,000 kilowatts and the Celina plant at 64,800 kilowatts.

I will not attempt a discussion of the Lower Cumberland since a study of that section of the river is now under way at the President's direction. I will state, however, that the original plans of the Corps of Engineers called for a high dam near Kuttawa, Ky., but the Governor of the State and the citizens of the valley objected to this proposal and an alternate plan of three relatively low dams for the Cumberland was authorized by Congress. This relatively low dam plan seemed to conform to the wishes of the majority of the citizenry at the time of submission of the report in 1945.

The question of costs and return from these projects is probably in many of your minds. I can assure you that this question of economic justification is always a basic one with the Corps of Engineers. The development of the Cumberland River Basin, however, has a very favorable benefit-to-cost ratio. For each dollar expended there will be returned in benefits $1.63 over a period of 50 years which is the normal period over which the projects are amortized.

The water resources of your area are being developed into a recreational paradise. Your interest in the development of these facilities indicate that you are aware of this vast potential. You undoubtedly will see a great change in the Wolf Creek area within the next few years. Should any of you have any questions about the Wolf Creek project or the over-all plan for the Cumberland, I will be happy to attempt to answer them.

I thank you.

Pensions for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, one of the greatest victories for pensions for the elderly was recorded in the vote of the people of Massachusetts on November 7, 1950. On a proposal to liberalize the laws of the State, the vote, as officially tabulated, was 918,555 yes, to 624,362 no, or a majority of 294,193. In all the history of the movement to take care of our elderly citizens, there has never been a more decisive and emphatic expression of the way the people feel on the matter.

In an article in the National Welfare Advocate, there is a complete analysis of the Massachusetts law. The article was written by William H. McMasters, of that State, who is the president of National Old-Age Pensions, Inc. It has been my distinct pleasure on occasions to have been the guest of this organization at their annual conventions, in Boston. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS VOTES $75 PENSION LAW—KILLS LOTTERY

(By William H. McMasters)

BOSTON, MASS.—On election day, the cause of old-age pensions scored one of the most decisive victories ever recorded.

The citizens of Massachusetts, although bombarded with vicious and false propaganda against a proposal to liberalize the old-age assistance laws of the State, overwhelmingly approved the new law and it is now the law of the Commonwealth, effective in June of next year.

Briefly, the law sets up a minimum of $75 per month for every elderly, needy person who can qualify for old-age assistance. Ten dollars more per month is set up for those who are blind.

The law wipes out the statutory provisions that compel children to contribute to the support of their parents who seek old-age assistance. The law reduces the age of eligibility from 65 to 63 years of age.

LOTTERY DEFEATED

At the same time the voters of Massachusetts overwhelmingly defeated the proposal for a State-controlled lottery, designed in some measure to finance the expected costs involved in the new law. No finer example of intelligent voting has ever been seen in any election, anywhere. The voters wanted their elderly neighbors to be taken care of in a more suitable manner. But they did not wish to resort to a State lottery in order to do it. The two questions were only related to each other indirectly. There was no legal connection. In reviewing the victory for the pension cause it might be well to analyze the exact situation.

The law was proposed in a petition circulated more than a year ago by the Massachusetts Society for Old Age Pensions, of which Charles C. O'Donnell is president. He was aided by National Old Age Pensions, Inc., of which William H. McMasters is president. Both of these pension advocates are members of the National Pension Committee, George H. McLain being its national chairman.

The idea of reducing the age of eligibility for old-age assistance was borrowed from the California law that was passed 2 years ago and repealed before it had a chance to show its workability.

Not one of the constitutional officers on the ballot in either the Democratic or Republican Parties came out in favor of the new law. Many prominent political big shots, who were very zealous for old-age pensions in former years, refused to open their mouths in this election. This was because the lottery question was linked up with the old-age assistance proposal by the enemies of both. By hammering away at the lottery law from every radio station, every newspaper and practically every pulpit in the State, they hoped to defeat both questions.

CAGEY POLITICIANS

So the cagey politicians ducked the issue and left it to the people. Candidate Coolidge, who headed the Republican ticket, came out against the lottery, thinking that it would get him some votes. He was wrong in his expectations. But neither Governor Dever nor Attorney General Kelly, both of whom have been benefited over the years by their advocacy of help for the aged, said one word in favor of the pension law or the lottery law. They were mute.

The only known workers for the measures were the members of the two pension organizations mentioned above, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, as always, and the officials of the American Federation of Labor. But this last endorsement was of no particular value, because they were so bitter against the lottery that it looked as though they were not wholly in sympathy with the pension proposal. If ever a cause had to fight entirely on its merits, the cause of pensions was in there pitching valiantly and with only the justness of its appeal to bring victory. But victory was the reward to the tune of more than a quarter of a million majority. The lottery was defeated by about the same vote.

Hardly had the vote on the referendum been tabulated before those who are trying to eliminate the elderly from our economic life are setting up obstacles to defeat the wishes of the people.

OLD WHEEZE

The most silly arguments are being advanced. The Boston Herald, spokesman for the monied interests, now says that the people did not understand what they were doing when they voted for increased costs and failed to vote for the lottery law. But the Herald shrieked to high heaven for the defeat of the lottery. The people agreed with them on the lottery, but they did not wish to let their elderly citizens struggle along, on the border line of starvation. Others, equally lacking the milk of human kindness in their character, are insisting that the law is unconstitutional. This is an old wheeze that never fails to be around when everything else fails.

Another vicious thing that has crept in is a fantastic figure as to the expected cost to meet the proposals of the new law. Of course the amount has been set so high that it is out of reason, but it has been thrown in to frighten the elderly and their friends. They don't frighten so easily these days. Little by little, their morale has been built up until they now feel that they are citizens in good standing and no longer mendicants sitting on the street corners with tin cups hanging from their necks.

I have seen this mental attitude change gradually over the years. The overwhelming victory, unaided and on its own, has put even further hope and courage into the heart and mind of every elderly citizen in the State of Massachusetts.

Fortunately, the provisions of our constitution on matters that have successfully been on the ballot do not admit of a repeal until one or more elections have been held. No quick repealer can be tossed at the voters of the State as was done in California. The people have passed a law under the constitution.

As for the question, "Where is the money coming from to finance this new law?" that is being leveled at us from every available source, the answer is that it will come from the same funds that now give a liberal pension to our legislators and others.

YOU CAN BET THEY WILL

It is interesting to note that there were several members of the house of representatives who have always voted against every pension measure introduced into the legislature, who were defeated for reelection. As they are now eligible for old-age pensions as former members of the legislature, it will be interesting to see if they accept this money from the Commonwealth, especially as they insist that money for more aid to the elderly needy is not available.

Any undemocratic effort to nullify and crucify the new law will be fought by the people of the State with determination. Just as they refused to have their intelligence insulted by fake propaganda and turned to their known friends for honest advice before voting, so they will stand by those of us who have fought the fight for so many long, hard years. Massachusetts will meet her obligations. I cannot refrain from reminding the readers of the National Welfare Advocate again that the battle of Massachusetts is one of our most momentous victories.

It will surely help the good citizens of California when their new petition is being discussed in Sacramento, after the first of the coming year.

Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri, Fills a Necessary Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial appearing in the Springfield, Mo., News Leader, issue of January 20, 1951. The editorial is entitled "Senator KEM Fills a Necessary Role," and emphasizes the splendid contribution that is being made by the distinguished senior Senator from my neighboring State of Missouri, who is one of the outstanding constitutional authorities in the Senate, and is rendering the Nation a real service in these critical times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR KEM FILLS A NECESSARY ROLE

Senator JAMES P. KEM, who was in Springfield for a visit last Friday, belongs to a race which, unfortunately, has been vanishing from the Washington scene.

We mean statesmen who still cling to the quaint notion that the Constitution of the United States is a mighty fortress looming larger and larger in importance as the bulwarks it guarantees us crumble to nothing in other parts of the world.

The latest example of congressional apathy to the Constitution was the shelving of Senator KEM's Resolution 371, in which he tried to force from President Truman a full report, to the Senate, of the President's recent talks with Britain's Prime Minister Clement Attlee.

Many blame our international troubles today on the arrangements made at Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta by Franklin Roosevelt and at Potsdam by Harry Truman, agreements never ratified by or even submitted to the Senate for discussion or approval. (Pegler calls the current conflict Roosevelt's memorial war.)

Closest the Senate ever got to an examination of the Truman-Attlee meeting was to read newspaper stories written from reports of their talks as relayed through the President's press representative.

Section 2 of article 2 of the Constitution states in unequivocal language that the President makes treaties "with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate."

Roosevelt behaved illegally and so did Truman in these talks with foreign statesmen when they made any secret agreement binding the United States to a course of action.

Time was when such audacity by a United States President would have been followed by impeachment as surely as night follows day.

Yet, there are fewer and fewer Senator KEMS in Washington.

May the good Lord help us when the time comes that there is none left. But by then, it may be too late to call on the Lord, since He helps those who help themselves.

Tribute to Millard F. Caldwell, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article paying tribute to Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., recently appointed Federal Civil Defense Administrator. The tribute is in an article by Crosby S. Noyes, and appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 23 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAN-SIZED MAN FOR A MAN-SIZED JOB

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Back in the days when he was collecting four letters at the University of Mississippi, 6-foot-3-inch Millard Fillmore Caldwell, Jr., earned himself the reputation of being a hard man to shove around. Today, carrying the ball in the national race for protection against an atomic attack, Federal Civil Defense Administrator Caldwell is keeping that reputation bright.

As he told worried Congressmen when he first came back to Washington to take over his new job, he is "quite contrary in the matter of pressure"—pressure that inevitably builds up around a man put in the position of creating a powerful new Government agency virtually from scratch.

The art in Mr. Caldwell's case lies in being contrary in a nice way, true to a gentle tradition of Southern courtesy. Admiring aides say that at such times a well-modulated drawl can work wonders, with lids half closed and a deeply bred charm providing the gracious camouflage for a mind already made up. The staff at civil defense headquarters gives him full marks on an indispensable quality of the successful administrator: "He's one guy who can tell you 'No' and make you like it."

There have been times, to be sure, when Millard Caldwell has said "Yes" against his personal inclination. One of these times was when, a few months ago, he told President Truman he would come back to Washington to take over a job that will certainly be one of the most important in the Government. Mr. Caldwell does not like Washington.

If you ask him, he will tell you he prefers the life of a small-town lawyer and banker; the pleasures of a small-town bird-shooter and fisherman—tastes which, in spite of a 1,000-acre farm near Tallahassee, the presidency of a Tallahassee bank, and a vocabulary spiced with sporting metaphors, he has indulged little in his 42 years. There have been other jobs to do.

Soon after he moved to Florida from his native Tennessee, as a young lawyer in 1925, his public service got under way. He followed the time-honored course from public prosecutor through the State legislature to the Congress, where he took his seat in 1933. Through four terms in the House, Representative Caldwell rose in authority and in the estimation of his colleagues to positions of leadership on several committees.

Then, one foggy February morning in 1939, his only son, 12-year-old Millard Caldwell III, was struck dead on Connecticut Avenue by a hit-and-run driver. A few months later, Representative Caldwell announced his retirement from Congress. He told friends he was leaving Washington for good, taking his wife and two daughters back to Tallahassee.

His retirement was brief. By 1945, small-town lawyer Caldwell was back in public life—running for State governor. He won, and in the course of his 4-year term attained the stature as an administrator that made President Truman pick him for the job he holds today. No less important, he won a high standing among his fellow governors, with whom he must deal directly as Federal chief of the decentralized civil-defense machinery.

Returning to Washington to take over his new assignment, Mr. Caldwell brought with him only one member of his Florida retinue—a private secretary, Lucy Gilbert. He explains that "Miss Lucy has been handling my personal affairs for a right smart time." The rest of the fledgling agency was already on hand, established in temporary headquarters on the seventh floor of a Connecticut Avenue office building.

The staff soon learned a few things about their rangy, tousle-headed boss. They found out that he likes to be called "the Governor" and that he believes in handling his business with little waste motion and smaller waste of words. They also discovered that a relaxed manner does not in every case add up to an easygoing office routine. They learned how a rule can be literally applied: "When the day comes that I have any spare time on this job, that's the day that a new man better take over."

Administrator Caldwell's day begins at 7 a. m., in the Wardman Park Hotel, where he is making his temporary home. If there is no breakfast appointment, he takes the opportunity then and while riding down Connecticut Avenue in a taxi to brush up on the news of the day.

Before 9 o'clock he is installed behind the large mahogany desk in his office, dictating one-paragraph letters to Miss Lucy and going over the stacks of applications from people offering their services and their wares in the name of civil defense. In handling these, he follows an inflexible maxim: To get the best people for the jobs that need doing, he is willing to beg, borrow, or steal. The others, no matter who recommends them, are out. "Before I'm through," he tells you, "I'll have the best organization in town."

Promptly at 9:15, division chiefs present themselves at the Governor's office for the daily staff meeting. Then follows a solid day of appointments with Government officials and military brass. They come to talk about the thousands of questions that will have to be asked and answered before Administrator Caldwell and the rest of the country can afford to relax. Problems of priorities in critical materials and personnel; of translating blueprinted plans into working organizations; of keeping Congress impressed with the urgent need for money to get started on a national stockpile of food and medicine—all of them take time.

That may be one of the reasons why Mr. Caldwell has so successfully evaded the public eye. He has not made a single speech since he took over, and he plans none. "Speeches," says the Governor, "consume a world of time with precious little effect."

Of the fare served him in the course of a working day, the toughest bites are reserved for lunchtime or dinner. Discussions go on far into the night. By bedtime, the Governor and the 110 men and women who work under him know they've done a day's work.

No one who appreciates the destructive power of the atom bomb will tell you that the progress made in civil defense up to this point is something to take comfort in. On both the local and national level we have a long way to go, and time may be desperately short. But those who know him seem to feel that one-time track star Caldwell is a good man to set the pace.

The Harvest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit extracts from an article in the Washington Times-Herald by Fulton Lewis, Jr., columnist, under date of December 31, 1950, as follows:

The British since 1940 got $36,248,000,000, and are coming up for another $2,000,000,000 this year.

France got $9,468,000,000; Netherlands, $1,168,000,000; Belgium, $666,000,000; Turkey, $294,000,000; Canada, $6,500,000; Greece, $1,217,000; Australia, $1,700,000; Sweden, $62,000,000; Norway, $224,000,000; Denmark, $175,000,000; Ethiopia, $1,000,000; Iceland, $10,000,000; and India, $200,000,000.

This, of course, does not include the billions and billions spent in Europe, and also in Asia, for occupation costs, the multifarious programs such as UNRRA, ECA, Dumbarton Oaks, Export-Import Bank, and other programs, and now Mr. Lewis states in the article above referred to:

At any rate, the United States is going to spend a lot more, probably another $100,000,000,000 to arm Western Europe.

There are a lot of experts who think most of this should be spent in the United States of America in maintaining and equipping the biggest defense Army in history. However, the decision has been made to spend most of it in Europe, and in the next 10 years we will know whether it is right or wrong.

Facts on Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Facts on Food Prices," written by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer of January 21.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ON FOOD PRICES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

In the hubbub over rising food prices, millions of fingers are now being pointed in accusation. A concert of voices names the alleged offender. The Washington storekeeper, selling dollar-a-dozen eggs to Senator THYE put the bee on the popular culprit—the farmer, he said, and Government-supported egg prices. The baker, talking about higher bread prices, emphasized wheat and other ingredient costs.

The housewife, buying apples at 10 cents a pound; the soft-drink consumer laying costs to sugar prices; even the cocktail "hound" soaking up highballs at 50 cents a drink while orating against milk prices at 18 cents a quart—all these lately have seemed agreed as to where the blame belongs. That is on the farmer, on the huge Government stores of food bought in supporting farm prices, and on the allegedly fantastic Government losses on farm purchases and farm subsidies.

But reasonable people will no doubt be interested in knowing the relevant facts, not on just one side, but on both sides of that story.

As to eggs, it is true that farm prices did advance rather sharply (28 percent) above the unusually low price a year earlier. The price has been steadily moderating from the peak.

But as a farmer and producer of eggs on his farm near Northfield, Senator THYE talking to the Washington seller had the facts first-hand about farm prices of eggs. Those prices on THYE's farm had been nowhere near $1 a dozen, but about 42 cents. The Government wasn't supporting them, but stopped that on December 31. So in blaming dollar-a-dozen eggs on Government-supported farm prices, the Washington storekeeper was 100 percent wrong.

As to bread, not over one-fifth of what the consumer pays for his loaf goes to the wheat farmer. On December 15, wheat prices were up just 6 percent from their level a year earlier. That rise wouldn't account for a rise of one-fifth of a cent for a loaf of bread. All the farm ingredients put together, including lard as well as wheat, do not account for one-third of the consumer bread price. Almost two-thirds of the consumer price goes to the baker and retailer.

Recently one of THYE's colleagues, Senator MATHEWS, of South Carolina, made this statement: "In June 1948, the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel; the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread, 13.8 cents. But in October 1950, the price of wheat had dropped to $1.91 a bushel, whereas the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread had risen to 14.7 cents." Certainly, the labor costs of baking, slicing, wrapping, and offering other services now demanded by consumers have been going up. But centering the blame for rising bread prices on the wheat farmer isn't in accord with the facts.

As to apples, the western farmer last autumn got 90 cents per 50-pound box, field run, delivered at the packing platform. That was 1.8 cents a pound to cover all his costs of growing, spraying, irrigating, picking, and hauling. The charges added by washing, sorting, wrapping, crating, storing, transporting, wholesaling, and retailing are what push the consumer price up to 8, 10, or 12 cents a pound.

As to sugar, the cost was actually lower in late December than it was on October 31, 1947, when sugar controls were removed. And the sugar price is so tiny an item anyway in the cost of a soft drink that it would be hard to find the effect of a 1 cent a pound sugar increase on a bottled drink.

The authentic facts about farm prices are available to all. They had, on December 15, risen 23 percent from the bottom a year earlier. Beef cattle and lamb prices were respectively 41 and 38 percent above their official parity or equality with general price levels. But milk, butterfat, grains, turkeys, and chickens were substantially below and potatoes, apples, sweet potatoes, and citrus fruits far below parity.

The recovery of farm prices accompanies a national jump to $206,000,000,000 in disposable personal income, after taxes. Have farmers shared unfairly in that income rise? They have not. Net farm income for 1950 was actually below that of 1949 and much below the 1947–48 peak.

A higher disposable national income normally raises food prices because people spend a rather uniform share of such income for food. The $1.60 per day wage increase just won by John L. Lewis, for instance, will enable his coal miners to help in bidding food prices up. But is that, or the fact that greater coal costs of transporting or processing food will push in the same direction, the farmers' fault?

One hour's average labor will buy more food in this Nation than in others and many times more than in any regimented economy in the world. As Senator THYE told the Farm Bureau, the farmers' share of each dollar spent by the consumer for food was only 53 percent in 1946, and has slumped to 48 percent today.

Folks with a real liking for facts on both sides may be shocked also to learn of the gross inaccuracy of much of the recent so-called news of farm price supports.

Last Monday afternoon a Washington dispatch from a usually accurate news agency was widely published which said that "there was a net loss on price supports last year of $1,600,000,000."

People have been stirred up by vivid descriptions of such vast losses of mountainous food purchases, of waste, and of farm demands for subsidies. And farmers have been told by newspapers and newspapermen to throw overboard their price-support programs or put them in a standby status for the duration.

An excellently informed and truthful agricultural correspondent, Fred Bailey, of Washington, recently reported that the campaign to make the farmer the goat on rising food prices is now well under way in the big city press supported by some city Congressmen who want to roll prices all the way back to the farmer.

Here are facts: The $1,600,000,000 referred to in last Monday's story as net loss, wasn't loss at all, but was the total amount loaned. The net realized loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the year ending last June was $249,230,000. The net realized loss in the current fiscal year through November was $100,261,000.

Said John W. Haw, agricultural development director of the Northern Pacific, to the Farm Bureau convention: "In its report to Congress on June 30, 1950, the Corporation showed a cumulative net realized loss * * * in 17 years of $636,040,401. The Corporation has turned over its capital many times in this period; yet the net loss has been less than 5 cents on each dollar invested." He said the job has been substantially accomplished with economy to the taxpayer.

The recent big losses and big waste have been on potatoes and eggs. Both of those purchase programs were forced by Congress over repeated protests of the executive branch and many farmers. And from both of them the Government now has withdrawn. As to subsidies, the farmers producing the perishables that the Government sought to subsidize are up in arms against them. As to the storable products, the Government's holdings of these are now widely acknowledged as being a vital protection of the Nation's safety in the war emergency and a check on inflation. More stockpiling of this kind is considered absolutely essential, as a munition of war and as a safeguard against runaway prices.

So there are facts bearing on both sides of the farm price story.

Owen Lattimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter by Eugene Lyons regarding the attitude of the Soviet press toward Owen Lattimore, published in the New Leader.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE LYONS CITES SOVIET PRESS ACCOLADE FOR LATTIMORE

NEW YORK CITY.

Those who read my recent article on Owen Lattimore (the New Leader, September 2) will be interested, I think, in this postscript. Though some of us don't approve of the gentleman's activities, they will be glad to learn that the Kremlin does, decidedly. It has just published a very long and laudatory review of the situation in Asia, Lattimore's next-to-last opus—belated, but neatly timed

for the larger Communist propaganda on the subject. The review took many pages in the November issue of Novy Mir, over the signature of B. Leontiev, and is being circulated in translations throughout the world by "Joint Press Reading Service, Moscow."

Mr. Lattimore is repeatedly identified as a "bourgeois" writer, since that gives added emphis to the miracle of his party-line judgments. But he is also described as one "who is considered an outstanding specialist on questions of the Far East by the United States State Department," as well as "a prominent figure of the United States State Department, one of the few collaborators of Acheson actually acquainted with the situation in the Far East." Novy Mir seems unaware of the formal findings of ex-Senator Tydings.

What Comrade Leontiev likes best about the Lattimore book is that, in explaining Asian trends, it puts in first place the great revolutionizing influence of the October Socialist revolution in Russia. As against "the wild, raving howls of American reactionaries," the Moscow review poses Lattimore's viewpoint: "Not Bolshevist propaganda, he says, but Soviet reality itself—the attainments of the Socialist revolution in Russia—this is what has aroused and inspired the peoples of Asia to a fight against their imperialist aggressors. * * * Lattimore acknowledges that in the eyes of all the Asiatic people Soviet democracy is the only complete, real democracy." In short, "the general conclusions to which Lattimore arrives attest to his realistic understanding of the situation."

These orchids from Moscow must be added to those already awarded by the reviewers of Lattimore books carefully selected by the "wild, raving" howlers who run our capitalist press in America.

EUGENE LYONS.

The Changing Complexion of Medical Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on January 3, 1951, at the one hundred sixteenth annual meeting of the St. Louis Medical Society, Dr. L. R. Sante, the society's new president, gave a very pertinent address entitled "The Changing Complexion of Medical Practice During the Last Half Century."

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts chosen from Dr. Sante's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHANGING COMPLEXION OF MEDICAL PRACTICE DURING THE LAST HALF CENTURY

(By L. R. Sante, M. D.)

I am mindful of the great honor which you have conferred upon me by electing me president of the St. Louis Medical Society. It is a distinction which can be accorded to relatively few; many better qualified must be passed by without such recognition; I would like to think of myself merely as their representative.

The primary function of the medical society is scientific; it would seem that the first duty of its president should be to maintain this function. The medical society is a meeting place for doctors, for the presentation of scientific papers in order to keep in touch with scientific advances in the medical field, and through discussion to evaluate new methods of procedure and new therapeutic agents.

The first half of the present century has wrought tremendous advances in the field of medicine, many epoch-making in character, which have virtually changed our conceptions of medical practice.

At the beginning of the century infant mortality stood at an unbelievably high rate. It is difficult for us to believe now that at that time one-fourth of all children did not survive to 5 years of age. Modern sanitation and improvements in infant feeding have done much to reduce the frightful infant mortality of yesteryear to the lowest point in the history of our Nation.

The Second World War has given impetus to many important medical developments. Perhaps one of the most important of these was the discovery that bacterial infection could be eliminated by the administration of drugs or antibiotics, such as the sulfa drugs or penicillin.

The advent of these agents alone has done much to change the complexion of medical practice. They have been called wonder drugs and, indeed, their action may be nothing short of miraculous.

The entire field of chest surgery has been so broadened that today exploration of the chest is undertaken almost as readily as exploration of the abdomen; cancerous growths or other affected areas may be excised or even an entire lung removed.

New methods of anesthesia, utilizing highly perfected anesthesia machines and numerous new synthetic drugs, have played no small part in the advances of surgical practice in the last few years.

In radiation treatment the developments have been remarkable. At the beginning of the century the effects of radiation on living tissue was known, but radiological practice was still in the stage of a medical curiosity. Today it has developed into one of the two most potent agents in the treatment of cancer.

This is a record of accomplishment of which the physician may well be proud. Wouldn't you think that the public would be anxious to preserve the system of free enterprise, under which such progress was attained? By and large, the public is fair; by and large, the rank and file of labor is fair; I cannot believe that they will permit saddling of the public with a compulsory socialized scheme of medical practice by an avaricious political machine. It is my opinion that, with the possible exception of the clergy, doctors as a class are among the most honest, sincere, and self-sacrificing group of men in the country. True, there are charlatans here and there, but there are renegades even in the ministry, and we do not condemn the entire profession because of the acts of a few. One would think that the public would be anxious to retain the direction of medical practice in the hands of the medical profession, which, under a system of free enterprise, has been able to accomplish such wonderful progress. One would think that the public would realize that no profession could accomplish its best work when hamstrung by the directives of lay workers. One would think that the public would recognize the political implication attendant upon the addition of a large number of jobs to the Federal payroll, which is already tremendous. One would think that taxes are already so high and the national debt so great that the public would be seeking methods of reduction of expenditure rather than means by which they will be materially increased. One would think that the public would think long and seriously before it attempts to add this additional burden on our poor, tired Uncle Sam when the country is in its present state of anxiety and confusion.

In recent years these political repercussions have done much to change the complexion of medical practice. Time and effort which should be devoted to medical practice and investigation have been diverted to political and economic considerations. Regular meetings have, of necessity, been set aside for the consideration of the economic phases of medical practice. Committees had to be appointed to keep informed on medical legislative bills in order to safeguard the freedom of medical practice. Constant vigil had to be maintained to prevent infringement of the laws against corporate practice of medicine.

The public at large will be most severely affected by all of this; hence it should give it most serious consideration and notify its Congressmen of its conclusions.

Recent elections in Florida indicate that the medical profession can become a potent political force when sufficiently aroused to the necessity of the situation.

The trend of recent national elections also seem to indicate that perhaps the public is doing some serious thinking and has begun to suspect that we cannot continue our orgy of extravagant public spending with consequent continuous pyramiding of our colossal national debt.

Nothing speaks to a Congressman with greater power than the votes of an aroused people. It is clearly the right and the duty of the medical profession to arouse our people and to instruct them of the dire results which will surely follow the political shackling of the American doctor.

Inflation and the National Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Wednesday evening, January 17, it was my privilege to address the New York Economics Club of New York. At that time, I shared the dais with two distinguished leaders, Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of General Mills, Inc., and Mr. George Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, affiliated with the A. F. of L. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. Bullis' powerful address entitled "Inflation and the National Survival." I further ask that preceding Mr. Bullis' address there be printed a list of the officers and board of directors of the Economic Club of New York, an outstanding organization founded in 1907.

There being no objection, the list and address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK, FOUNDED 1907

Officers: Juan T. Trippe, president; Eugene Holman, vice president; W. Alton Jones, vice president; John M. Schiff, treasurer; Iva Nichols, secretary.

Board of directors: Ellsworth Bunker, J. Luther Cleveland, Gardner Cowles, Ralph S. Damon, Virgil G. Damon, H. P. Davison, Eli Whitney Debevoise, Duncan W. Fraser, J. P. Grace, Jr., H. E. Humphreys, Jr., Devereux C. Josephs, Frank H. Lerch, Jr., Ralph T. Reed, Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., Mark Woods, Dwight Eckerman, executive director.

INFLATION AND THE NATIONAL SURVIVAL

(By Harry A. Bullis)

In the year 1861, the first year of the Civil War, our National Capital was threatened by the enemy. One dark night five men, among them the President of the United States, climbed the stairway leading to the tower of the Smithsonian Institution. Through the darkened windows they saw the low line of hills around the city.

The men flashed lanterns toward the hills. In the distance, lights flickered in reply. Thus was tested the means to signal an attack upon the city. At stake was the very survival of our Government.

In this year of 1951, exactly 90 years later, there is once again a lantern in the window. But this time its flashing signal is no mere rehearsal of a possible crisis to come. Today it speaks of a growing menace from across the seas. More important, it warns of trends within our own country that ultimately could undermine our productivity and create hardship everywhere.

NATION HAS TWO ALTERNATIVES

Monetary inflation is a form of national self-hypnosis by which we turn our faces from reality, and look instead toward a never-never land of easy money. We know the consequences. An unsound currency gnaws at our security just as certainly as a defeat on the battlefield. I wonder if we realize that there are only two roads before us. We can heed the warning signals, embrace the economics of sacrifice, and pay the price that must be paid if democracy shall live. Or we can continue on the road we have been following, spending billions of unearned and unreal dollars. This way leads to fiscal disaster.

The free world looks to these United States for leadership—economic, social, and moral. For inflation already has swept most of Europe, and the forces set in motion show little sign of slackening. Compared with 1939, Belgium's increase has been 277 percent, and it is growing. In Greece, living costs have increased nearly 30,000 percent. Italy has marked a 5,000-percent increase. In France, food costs alone were 1,800 percent higher last fall than before the war. In Finland, the costs of living are some 850 percent higher. The average Finnish worker pays 10 times as much for clothing now as he paid in 1939. It is exactly what Lenin ordered—the debauch of the currency. Just as inflation damages our Nation and our allies, so does it aid our common enemy.

In the United States, the cost of living has shot up over 75 percent compared with prewar. The trend continues. In 1950, the cost of living rose about 6 percent; wholesale prices rose 16 percent; the price of farm products at wholesale, 23 percent; and the prices of 28 important commodities rose 48 percent. The rise was fastest at the end of the year. In the second half of 1950, the rise in wholesale prices was at a yearly rate of 25 percent, a rate barely and briefly equalled only in 1919–20 and in 1946. If we are to save our own great white-collar middle classes from financial ruin, if we are to stay clear of the many other destructive forces of inflation, America will have to act promptly and decisively.

HOW INDUSTRY CAN LEAD

Industry is equipped to supply both intelligent action and leadership in this crisis.

The action should take the form of quick production for defense. Enormous production is needed right now. The world looks to us for the arms to halt Communist aggression. During the past 2 years the United States has expanded production and has greatly increased productivity when measured in output per man. We can do the same thing for defense.

The leadership is needed to control inflation. Business, in cooperation with government, can take the case for a firm money policy direct to the people, who must ultimately decide the issue. As the President's economic advisers pointed out recently, "To gain public support for stern policies requires that the public understand the reason why."

In this era of tension, any spark can start a conflagration. We are in limited war now. We may well be on the threshold of total war. It is difficult to exaggerate the crisis.

Only 5 years ago we ended the greatest war in history. We paid dearly for that victory, in tens of thousands of casualties on the fields of battle, and in tens of thousands of psychological victims within the borders of our country. We incurred a staggering national debt. But we stepped up our industrial plant in the process. The amazing fact is that we did the job with no more than a 28 percent rise in the price level during the actual war years. The controls of the war years suppressed inflation. But when direct controls were removed without bringing in the more general indirect controls, inflation burst into action.

Today our economy is roaring along, full throttle. In the case of automobiles and trucks alone, we produced last year over 8,000,000 vehicles. We built over 1,400,000 new housing units. We have the capacity to produce 101,000,000 tons of steel a year, or half the world's total. We are able to squeeze more agricultural production per acre out of our farm plant than does the rest of the world. A good wheat farmer in the West can produce 5,500 bushels of wheat with about 2,000 hours of work a year. In south China it takes the entire family working ineffectively to produce one-twentieth as much, as 275 bushels, with two crops a year. We have shipping in quantity, and war plants in stand-by condition.

Our productive plant is fully engineered, and ready for the job of rearmament. We hope we can substantially increase our gross national product so as to maintain our living standard in the process.

SITUATION DIFFERENT FROM 1941

But getting back again to that lantern in the widow—how about our economic springboard for the tests that lie ahead? Here the situation is far different. Ten years ago we were faced with the need for an enormous increase in output and we had large unused capacity to produce. Today we face a different set of conditions.

We need to divert a part of our fully loaded productive machine from civilian goods to war goods, as well as to convert and expand our plants.

We will recall that in 1940 our national output of goods and services was $100,000,000,000. Eight million of our people were unemployed. By taking advantage of this labor slack, and straining our economy, we pushed our total national output to nearly $200,000,000,000 a year by the end of the war. We spent $90,000,000,000 for war in 1 year. It was a gratifying process all around to put people to work. Today it is an unpleasant task to throw them out of work in order to create labor available for war unemployment.

Today we have no labor surplus. Our idle productive capacity is low, limited to war plants carried over from last time, and even reactivation of idle plants consumes valuable time, of which we have so little. Therefore, it is obvious that the only way we can produce all that we need for war is by producing less of other things—lowering our output of civilian goods. We cannot expect our national output of goods and services to be large enough to include as much civilian goods as we made in 1950 plus all the war matériel we shall need—war matériel for our own needs and to rearm and equip our allies.

Let us be realistic in this crisis. For the present, ours is a problem of diversion more than of expansion.

To look at this from another angle, in World War II we produced about 80 percent of war needs by expanding output. We produced only 20 percent by conversion or by cutting back selected industries to release their facilities and resources for war production. Today, with a comparable war effort, the figures might well be reversed. We should have to obtain about 80 percent of our military needs by converting existing industries and diverting factories, men, and raw materials to war production.

Obviously, this means taking goods away from the consumer. There simply will not be as much goods available for civilians.

But how about the money and credit supply? Unless courageous action is taken, there will be more money on hand than ever, and less consumer goods to spend it on. Here, in a nutshell, is today's stubborn problem. We are now confronted with the need to beat some plowshares into swords. If we do not limit the ability to buy the plowshares that remain—in other words, automobiles, new houses, appliances, and the life—their value will increase excessively.

This brings us to the crux of our discussion. How can we attain stability in our currency in this period of short-of-all-out-war economy and still provide for needs at home? How can we best protect our currency and at the same time put it to work for us?

FOUR RULES FOR SOUND FINANCE

Here are four specific suggestions that may point the way to a maximum production in a stable economy:

1. Overhaul the Federal financial policy and formulate a program—a total, tied-together program—that will restore confidence in the national credit.

2. Reduce drastically Government spending for all nonmilitary purposes. Ask the Government to save exactly as it asks us to save.

3. Continue and extend the use of indirect economic controls, and insist on flexibility in whatever direct controls are imposed.

4. Enlist the cooperation of industry to inform the people of the dangers of inflation and to explain the "economics of sacrifice."

STRENGTHEN FISCAL POLICIES

The first objective should be a program which will provide for paying as we go up to the limit of what the economy can stand and still remain strong and healthy. In the President's economic message to Congress on January 12, 1951, President Truman said, "We should make it the first principle of economic and fiscal policy in these times to maintain a balanced budget, and to finance the cost of national defense on a pay-as-we-go basis." In my opinion, we should muster the courage and the fortitude to pay currently for war costs up to one-quarter of our national production. In 1944 and 1945 Federal tax revenues averaged $45,000,000,000, or about 20 percent of the gross national product. This is not enough at the present time.

In 1951, gross national product will probably be about $300,000,000,000; 20 percent of this for Federal tax revenues would amount to $60,000,000,000. More exactly, the present system will produce about $55,000,000,000 in tax revenues at present tax rates. As the national product increases, we can get more tax revenue. If the costs of armament drive the total Federal budget up to $65,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952, we should get additional revenues by adding more excise taxes and lowering personal exemptions. Much as we dislike sales taxes, we might even have to have a Federal sales tax.

Any tax program should provide a reasonable and effective pattern for spreading the burden. Also there is a limit beyond which taxes should not go. And, if taxes exceed the critical point, they will take away the ability to expand production. There is a growing acceptance of the theory that the critical level of taxation, beyond which the forces of inflation are brought into play, is around 25 percent of the national income. Inflation has already robbed every American

of half of his savings, half of his insurance policies, and much of his earnings. How much more can we take away from the average man? Of course, how far people will go in economic sacrifices depends upon their faith and belief in the value of the cause and the effectiveness of the program to further this cause.

We all want to do everything that is necessary for the defense of the United States but we should be absolutely certain that what we are doing is necessary and that we are not building up excess military equipment which may become obsolete before actual all-out war occurs. General Marshall has been a steadying influence in this respect. Ever since he assumed the office of Secretary of Defense, several months ago, he has said that, until we know what is going to happen to us, we do not want to build up surplus production for the military and have large supplies of excess equipment. He wants an enduring solid program which the American people will be willing to carry out for a long period. I am also confident that General Eisenhower, when he returns from Europe, will present an intelligent and practical plan for the United States to follow in Europe. These military statesmen want intelligent preparations for defense, but they also know that we must not overburden our economy.

In anything short of a full-scale war, it is highly desirable that the revenues of the Federal Government equal or exceed total Federal expenditures. In other words, during this period of limited war, we should do everything we can to balance the budget by increasing taxes and by cutting down less essential expenditures. Only in this way can we keep our Nation, to the greatest possible extent, in the free private-enterprise basis.

If it happens that we get into a war that requires all-out effort, Federal expenditures will undoubtedly exceed our ability to pay as we go. In that case, the Government will have to borrow the additional money that it needs. The fiscal program should anticipate this contingency and should provide that such financing will not be done through banks where the effect will be to increase the supply of money. The extra funds needed should be borrowed from the people's savings on terms which will make Government bonds attractive to hold for income purposes over a long period of years. Short-term financing of war needs should be avoided.

REDUCE NONMILITARY SPENDING

The second objective should be sweeping economy in government—Federal, State, and local. With war on our doorstep, we should stop spending for public projects that can be postponed until the emergency has passed. National defense comes first—ahead of public buildings, housing projects, or subsidies to any segment of the population. If we try, we can reduce Federal expenditures for nonmilitary purposes by at least $6,000,000,000. The Government should set the example in the sacrifice of nonessential spending, and eliminate projects which require materials and manpower which could better be used for war production.

INDIRECT CONTROLS ESSENTIAL

We come to our third point. Assuming that we will have direct controls, we will still need indirect controls more than ever to curb the increase in buying power. We know that so-called direct controls—price and wage fixing, manpower controls, priorities, allocations, rationing, and so forth, will not alone do the job of stopping inflation. Wage and price controls and rationing hold prices down, but they do not shrink purchasing power or increase the supply of goods. Therefore, they do not relieve inflationary pressures but merely bottle them up and suppress them. They may heal the lesion on the surface, but the power to erupt builds up below and may be the more destructive when it does break out.

Government wa[illegible] and price fixing and rationing mean reg[illegible]enting housewives, consumers, workers, and businessmen. To enforce such direct controls will call for thousands of "OPA" and other Government officials paid for by the taxpayer. Businessmen will spend many precious hours learning the new rules of the game, and adjusting their businesses.

Prices made in a free market, by reflecting conditions of supply and demand, show where production should be stepped up and where it should be slowed down. Under price fixing, Government bureaus take over this function. During a long period of semiwar or even war, those bureaus cannot possibly guide and direct production as well as would the free market through many thousands of transactions. We are making this effort to preserve a free enterprise system for the simple reason that it is the most efficient system. One of its requirements is a reasonably freely operating price mechanism. We can alter or freeze that mechanism for the short run as we did in 1942. But to do so for the long run of this entire decade would be a mistake. If we do not wish prices to rise, then we should operate so as to have some prices fall. We should operate to have some prices go up and welcome the extra goods and manpower which we get in that industry as a result. Flexibility in price management should be our watchword.

In spite of these weaknesses, we are apparently going to have direct wage and price controls. When they are imposed, let's see that this time they are flexible. They should preserve enough leeway to permit inducements where needed to support production lags. There can be no rigid strait-jacket to contain an economy as complex as the one we have in our land. Direct controls at best must allow for administrative judgment that will get the job done in the best way in the shortest possible time.

Perhaps in a total all-out war, price controls might work. But in this "butter and guns" economy, if we are to have a long-pull, enduring program, we must depend on a tough fiscal and credit policy.

Our strategy must be to curb inflation at the source. This we can achieve, to a large extent, with indirect controls, properly and vigorously administered. These controls include, besides taxation, Federal debt management, interest rates, monetary and credit policies, and the controls of consumer credit and residential mortgage credit. We must curb private credit expansion in order to have individuals save more of their income and thus reduce market pressures.

If we must finance part of the war through deficits, we need a policy that will sell Government bonds to savings institutions and to the people instead of to the banks. We will thus syphon off surplus purchasing power and dry up super-charged reserve-credit inflation such as we had during the last war. The facts are that the public is so distrustful of Government money policies that more savings bonds are being cashed today than are being sold. This is a practice which we must reverse.

THE PUBLIC MUST BE INFORMED

The fourth point is in many respects the most important. Combined with proper tax policies, with a sound money policy, and with proper indirect controls, it will limit inflation.

I propose that industry, through the Advertising Council, the National Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and whatever other agencies are available, launch a Nation-wide campaign to call attention to the present-day lantern in the window—the danger signal warning of inflation. The Advertising Council just last week approved an anti-inflation campaign. This story must be retold time after time. The program must sell the economics of sacrifice. It must end the short-term money binge and expose the terrific monetary headache that lies ahead. It must show that by tightening our belts and adopting some Spartan principles today, we can reap the rewards of a more bountiful society and productivity in the years ahead. And at the same time we can protect what we have, and stand up and fight for freedom.

Government, industry, and labor can join together in this program. But we will have to move swiftly. There is no time to lose. Public opinion is in a state of uncertainty. Our enemies will employ every means to distort the facts and confuse us.

A recent survey by a leading research corporation emphasized the problem before us. People give strong backing to the war effort, but they do not yet believe that this means sacrifices—sacrifices now.

The interviewers asked, Shall we have a longer workweek? Sixty-three percent said there is no need for it, even on defense work. Thirty-four percent said eventually, maybe.

Higher taxes? Fifty-three percent said that increases would not be needed for some time. Fifty-nine percent turned thumbs down on a 5 percent increase in personal income tax.

The rest of the survey is in the same vein. People are not sold on the danger of inflation. But they can be sold. They will be sold if we set our minds to it.

President Truman, in his economic message to Congress on January 12, 1951, said in effect that, to fight inflation, the great middle working classes may have to pay $3 a week in extra taxes. This is because the middle classes will have to pay most of all future taxes. This workers' group should weigh the ultimate consequences of inflation as against taxation. Such inflation might mean that prices could easily rise to take $10 a week away from each worker. It comes, or rather is stolen, little by little. The facts are that having a higher tax bill is good business for the broad mass of the people—the great middle classes which today are mostly made up of workers' families.

PRODUCTION FOR SURVIVAL

The need for leadership in our country was never greater than today. Charles E. Wilson has the ability and the courage to reach the production goals. His tasks will be lightened considerably if we accept reality—if we embrace the economics of sacrifice and knuckle down to what I would call "production for survival."

In the coming months we might well use this term, "production for survival," as the yardstick by which to guide our decisions. If a project qualifies as production for survival, it should have A-1 priority. If it is anything else, it can wait, or serve as a stopgap until we can get to the main job.

The task of Charlie Wilson and of our military strategists, however, will be directly related to our success in building firm our money policies. Right now these policies are confused. The easy money policies of the past have proved to be easy politics. We have watered our fiscal resources, and we have taken successive deferments in meeting our obligations. The time will come, if we do not watch out, when we can no longer postpone meeting our debts. The final outcome would be either drastic inflation or a drastic capital levy. There is little choice between these two.

Given the facts, the American people have never failed to live up to the American heritage.

We can give them the facts on money, on inflation, and on the economics of sacrifice. If they understand these facts, they will support the proper remedies.

In the meantime let business, Government, and labor climb the staircase together and hang the warning lantern in the window. We can lead the Nation out of this wilderness of self-delusion and possible disaster to a broader vision of security and faith in our common destiny. We can do so with full confidence that the best is yet to come if we all keep working together.

Newspaper Poll on Korean and Russian Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, an outstanding Missouri newspaper, the Rolla (Mo.) Daily News, has completed a poll of its readers on certain questions relating to our foreign and domestic policies. Of particular interest are inquiries as to whether we should withdraw from Korea, and whether we and our allies should cut off trade with Russia. It is said to be the first newspaper in the Nation to poll its readers on these matters.

Edward W. Sowers, publisher of the Rolla Daily News, summarized the results of his poll in an article that appeared in the January 23, 1951, edition of his newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sowers' article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET OUT OF KOREA, KICK RUSSIA FROM UN, ROLLA OPINION

(By Edward W. Sowers)

The Nation's first newspaper to poll its readers, designed to obtain a composite of community opinion on such questions as the Korean War, draft of 18-year-olds, foreign aid, Russia in the United Nations, price control, and taxes was completed here today by the Rolla Daily News.

Exactly 508 readers of the News filled out ballots, answering 18 of today's vital questions. With 477 ballots counted last night, the Rolla community citizens voted 250 to 202 "to withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible."

The Rolla area people are sharply divided on the draft of 18-year-olds, the poll showing 239 favor drafting the teen-agers, while 212 would not draft them. The earliest ballots received were from worried mothers, many favoring compulsory military training but few want their young sons in combat at such an early age. Later, with more soldiers from Fort Leonard Wood and students from the Missouri School of Mines voting, the trend changed to a slight majority favoring drafting the 18-year-olds.

Price and wage controls were demanded by the Rolla ballot, 386 to 60. Asked if the honor system of price controls is working, 334 voted "no" and 62 "yes."

The Rolla voters are overwhelmingly sure that nondefense spending should be reduced, voting 340 to 59 for that. They are also equally sure that this Nation should prepare for all-out war and build its defenses. They voted 264 to 161 to prepare quickly for all-out war, and 258 to 68 to gradually strengthen our defenses. They are willing to raise taxes for defense, 326 to 79, but think taxes can be lowered for non-defense funds, voting 159 to 50 for less taxes except for defense.

DIVIDED ON TRUMAN

Seven of the straw voters strongly urged impeachment and removal of President Truman, while 15 or 20 wrote in their comment urging everyone to get behind our President and other leaders.

Rolla citizens would boot Russia from the United Nations, 232 favoring such drastic action, 216 opposing it. Two hundred and five would go so far as to break off diplomatic relations with Russia, while 213 oppose this. If left up to Rolla, the Chinese Reds would never get into the United Nations, as 365 oppose it while only 72 favor it. Likewise, the United States and the UN should cut off all trade with Russia and her satellites, think 327 Rolla voters, while 109 would not impose such economic sanctions.

URGED TO QUIT MEDDLING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Chiang and his Chinese Nationalists should get aid from the United States, believe 298 of those polled here, while 145 would have nothing to do with Chiang or any other foreigner. Many of the comments were caustic, strongly worded appeals for the United States to quit meddling in foreign squabbles. However, 292 voted to send troops to Europe, while 150 oppose sending any Americans to Europe or any foreign soil.

We should expect foreign nations to supply bulk of troops for any United Nations army, voted 359, while only 78 seemed to think the United States should bear the brunt of the international police force.

BALLOTS SENT TO SENATORS

The original ballots, including the comments, were sent to United States Senators KEM and HENNINGS and Congressman CARNAHAN in Washington today from this newspaper. It was added several metropolitan newspapers and national magazines had written expressing interest in the polling plan, and that some other newspapers have already started similar polls in their communities. Such a composite of public opinion on a Nation-wide basis should help Congress make decisions on the vital problems facing the Nation today.

Taxation of Mutual Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Mutual Insurance Companies Angered by NTEA Attack," published in the North Dakota Union Farmer of January 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES ANGERED BY NTEA ATTACK

CHICAGO.—The so-called National Tax Equality Association's new advertising campaign attempting to smear co-ops and all other nonprofit enterprises has stirred action by mutual insurance companies.

In a letter to insurance executives, American Mutual Alliance explains that the "highly organized large-scale effort to undermine the confidence of the American people in mutual fire and casualty insurance is gaining momentum." Purpose of the drive, it said, is to degrade mutual insurance "so that stock insurance companies can compete more effectively with mutual carriers. This involves such devices as asserting that there is something unpatriotic about insuring in a mutual company."

The drive is also designed "to high pressure Congress into rewriting the provisions of the Federal tax laws so that income taxes of mutual fire and casualty insurance companies will be increased in greater proportion than those of other businesses and so that the present exemption of the small mutual insurance companies will be wiped out."

The letter points out that mechanics of the campaign are being handled by the NTEA, "an exclusively propaganda organization, with offices in Washington and Chicago, which was set up in 1944 to fight the cooperatives. It is financed in part by stock insurance interests. Undoubtedly you are aware of the vigorous anticooperative campaign this organization has been waging since that date. But you may not realize that the campaign now is being directed against mutual fire and casualty insurance, as well as against cooperatives."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mutual insurance companies now pay in taxes 1 percent of their premium income or their additions to capital, whichever is greater, with an exemption for the very small companies of $75,000 of premium income. Mutuals say that if their premiums were as high as those of their competitors they would right now in many cases be actually paying more taxes than stock companies on the same volume.)

Why Not Talk Peace for a Change?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Why Not Talk Peace for a Change?" which appeared in the Hartford Courant of January 24, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT TALK PEACE FOR A CHANGE?

In America we hear and read such a constant torrent of words that we tend to dismiss most of them as futile. But words, and the ideas to which they give expression, have a vitality we must never underestimate.

Conditioned as we are to thinking almost exclusively in terms of divisions of men and tons of war production, a lot of us are likely to scoff when BRIEN MCMAHON rises in the Senate to propose a resolution of friendship for the Russian people. Many Americans would denounce any such gesture with today's swear word, appeasement. Others would consider it a new high in uselessness.

We can all admit that no Senate resolution of friendship is going to change the course of world events. Not by itself. But we don't know what the effect of an intensive, persistent, well-organized campaign to reach the Russian people by every means of communication would be. We haven't tried it. The Voice of America is attempting that job, still on a relatively minor scale. But how many Americans, let alone Russians, know just what it is doing, in what ways, and with what success?

The point is that 99 percent of our talk is about the prospects of war with Russia. That

subject fills our conversations, our newspapers, our magazines; it pours out of our loudspeakers; it occupies most of the time of Congress. We aren't warmongers, surely. But is it any wonder that we give even our friends abroad some anxious moments by our constant hammering at warlike themes? We know we must make a great national effort to build up our military preparedness. But shouldn't we at the same time redouble our efforts to make our underlying hopes for peace clear to the whole world?

Moreover, let us remember that propaganda does not consist of words alone. Here as elsewhere actions speak louder than words. What we do or do not do at Lake Success, for example, will go a lot further toward convincing the rest of the world of our peaceful intentions, or lack of them, than what we say in resolutions or through the Voice of America. We ought to think over why it is that we seem so alone in the UN—as witness not only India and the Arab nations, but Prime Minister Attlee's official cabinet statement in London yesterday, on sanctions against China.

Senator McMahon argues that the Communists, well aware of the universal desire for peace, scored a notable propaganda victory with their so-called Stockholm petition. He thinks we ought to answer it with something more conducive to peace than pictures of the best A-bomb targets in Russia, and talk of letting the Communists feel the lash. If we really want to satisfy our own consciences, and put at rest the misgivings of our friends, we'll follow Senator McMahon's advice. We can surpass the Soviet's battery of mouthpieces in one vitally important aspect: We can afford to tell the truth. Let us make sure that the truth is worth telling.

Declaration on Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, president of Notre Dame University, enclosing a declaration on manpower adopted at the meeting of the Association of American Colleges at Atlantic City, N. J., on January 10, 1951. I am informed that the declaration on manpower has already been ordered printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., January 16, 1951.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The enclosed proposals give, I believe, a practical and workable answer to the problem of manpower as it affects the world today. We would certainly appreciate your considered judgment in this matter, as well as whatever steps you might take to see that the declaration is brought to the attention of those responsible for formulating the forthcoming legislation.

This declaration of manpower was drafted at the meeting of the Association of American Colleges, held at Atlantic City on January 10, 1951. The following men are members of the special committee, mentioned in proposal IX: President James P. Baxter III, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; President Leonard Carmichael, Tufts College, Tufts College, Mass.; President John J. Cavanaugh, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.; President Arthur S. Fleming, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio; President Goodrich C. White, Emory University, Emory University, Ohio; Mr. Guy E. Snavely, executive director of the Association of American Colleges.

With renewed assurances of my gratitude for your cooperation and of a continued remembrance in my prayers, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
(Rev.) JOHN J. CAVANAUGH, C. S. C.,
President.

A Foreign Policy: What's the Answer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of the radio debate between the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on the subject, A Foreign Policy: What's the Answer? broadcast on the American Forum of the Air on January 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"A FOREIGN POLICY: WHAT'S THE ANSWER?"

(Radio debate between Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois)

Chairman GRANIK. Former President Hoover has launched the great debate. He has proposed a foreign policy quite different from the Truman doctrine. He wants the United States to pull out of Europe and Asia; to preserve this Western Hemisphere Gibraltar. He would cut off all aid to Western Europe until it showed spirit and strength in defending itself against Red Russia.

Administration leaders have called this isolationism, a wave of defeat and frustration, an act of appeasement.

Mr. Hoover announced yesterday that newspaper reaction showed nearly 3-1 support of his program.

With leaders in Congress and in your community divided in their views, with every American vitally concerned, the American Forum of the Air presents the first of a series of discussions on A Foreign Policy: What's the Answer?

We are highly honored and privileged today to pose this vital question to two distinguished United States Senators, both from the great State of Illinois but on opposite sides of the political fence: Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, one of the independent Democrats' spokesmen in the Senate; and Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, the new Senator from Illinois, who distinguished himself for many years as a Republican leader in the House of Representatives.

Now, Senator DIRKSEN, do you agree with Mr. Hoover's policy?

Senator DIRKSEN. First, Theodore, indulge me a moment while I throw a little salute to my distinguished colleague, PAUL DOUGLAS. Probably nobody campaigned any harder for my defeat than PAUL DOUGLAS, but he did so honorably and he did so fairly, and so, while we have differences of opinion, I do salute him as a great statesman and as a forthright American citizen.

And so now to your question: I agree very substantially with President Hoover, and even more so if I put my own interpretation on what I think he tried to say. I think that he has been misinterpreted, and the commentators and the columnists have taken a great many liberties with the Hoover speech; but if I can boil it down in 30 seconds, I think first of all, he assumed the worst possible condition, so that if freedom is going to have a beachhead, we have to make this hemisphere strong.

Secondly, I do not agree with the second sentence in your opening remarks, to the effect that he wants to pull out of Europe or Asia necessarily. I think he stated the whole case in two words when he said defense over in Europe is the "prime obligation" of those folks first, and thereafter we come into the picture. And with respect to Asia, of course, there he believes that we have followed a policy of appeasement; that the United Nations has failed very signally; that its discussions have been rather pious and rather foggy; and that we have to hew to a rather consistent and firm line of action.

And so, in the interpretation that I place upon Mr. Hoover's very significant and epochal speech, I agree very substantially with the former President of the United States.

Chairman GRANIK. And your distinguished colleague, Senator DOUGLAS?

Senator DOUGLAS. First, may I say it is a happy indication of the fundamental decency of American politics that, while Mr. DIRKSEN and I are representatives of opposing political parties, we are nevertheless close friends; and that while I did not exactly dance in the streets with joy when he was elected, now that he is a Senator I am very glad, indeed, to welcome him, and I am sure that he will have the same distinguished career here that he had in the House.

Now, my good friend, EVERETT DIRKSEN, has put a gloss on the Hoover position. Mr. Hoover's phrase was that we should not give "another man or another dollar" to Europe until after the European countries had erected "a sure dam against the red flood." Let us note that his phrase was until after "a sure dam" had been erected, when aid, therefore, from us would be no longer needed. The practical effect of Mr. Hoover's proposal would be to withdraw all our forces from the Continent of Europe and from Asia, and therefore to leave a vacuum. And since the struggle against world communism is a world struggle, that would mean that the other countries would not have strength enough with which to resist it.

Communism would take over all of Asia and of Europe, and then all of Africa; and we would be left alone, with the exception of perhaps the northern part of South America.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator DIRKSEN?

Senator DIRKSEN. I think Senator DOUGLAS falls into the same pitfall that has beset so much of the thinking about the Hoover speech. If I can summarize the first part of it, and of course, that would be the first part of our thinking on foreign policy, it would be that foreign policy, like charity, begins at home.

First of all, we have got to have a sense of mission; and what is the sense of mission of America? Well, after all, the ancient landmark is freedom, and I would devote myself to it, and I think President Hoover does, likewise.

Secondly, he assumes the worst possible condition. What assurance is there that we

are not going to be driven out of the Orient? What assurance is there that there is going to be that spiritual and moral strength that he talks about, which is necessary if the European countries are going to defend themselves? And so, he comes to the conclusion that freedom must have a beachhead, and that beachhead is the American Continent. That, to me, looks like sound and logical thinking, because you have to think all of the way down the road and encompass the eventualities that confront us at the present time.

That, then, is the first part of a foreign policy: It begins here at home with the thinking of our people, and he must assume the worst possible condition and prepare ourselves for it accordingly.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, we are all agreed, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we should defend freedom. We are all agreed that we should make America strong. But the question is, at what point should we begin to defend freedom.

Mr. Hoover would say that we should not defend freedom on the continents of either Europe or of Asia; we would only begin to defend freedom when America itself was directly attacked. And the island bases of which he speaks are to be used as merely screens, protective screens around the United States.

Now, my position is this: That this policy would be ultimately fatal to this Nation. It would mean that when the Communists had control of Asia, Europe, and Africa, they would have 2,000,000,000 of the 2,300,000,000 population of the world, and therefore, from a population standpoint, would outnumber us nearly 7 to 1.

They would have 100,000,000 tons of steel capacity in Russia and Western Europe, as compared to our equal figure, so that on an industrial basis they would be on a parity.

They would have virtually all of the rubber of the world, and they would have two-thirds of the tin, and they would have the major portion of the manganese, and they would have the vital sources of uranium. And therefore, when the ultimate struggle came, we would be alone, our backs to the wall, and the struggle would be very hard and the odds very difficult.

Therefore, we who believe in the opposite doctrine think that it is in the interest of America to help those nations which are willing to defend themselves, to defend themselves; provided, first, that they make an adequate contribution to their defense, and provided, second, that the places are accessible to our forces.

Chairman GRANIK. John Foster Dulles, Republican adviser to the State Department, says to abandon our European allies would be ruinous.

Senator DIRKSEN. Let us relate that to the Hoover speech. In the first place, President Hoover didn't say we should get out of Europe. If you go back and examine that speech, he says we shouldn't be blind to or unmindful of western culture on the continent of Europe; and secondly, of course, he believes in a frontier on the British Islands and in the British Commonwealth; and thirdly, if you go back and examine those words that he used, he says, first of all, the foundation of our policy should be the Western Hemisphere; and secondly, he says the prime obligation is upon them. He rests his case mainly, of course, upon the fact that the spiritual and moral strength and the willingness to defend themselves has not been manifest.

Look at the votes in the French Chamber of Deputies; look at the recent vote in Italy; look at the uncertainty and the fear and the drawing away over in Europe at the present time. They are in the line of fire over there, so to speak, and as a consequence, the first obligation is theirs. If they refuse to defend themselves, we could pour in all of the troops, all of the money, all of the munitions, but it would be like pouring it in a rat hole. And so there ought to be a manifestation as to whether those people are willing to stand up and be counted, for if they are not, then, of course, it gives point to the fact that more and more we should emphasize the strength of the American Hemisphere in time of test and great eventuality.

Chairman GRANIK. Is it pouring it into a rat hole, Senator DOUGLAS?

Senator DOUGLAS. No; and I think there is a great misunderstanding as to the degree to which Europe has rearmed and is willing to rearm. We compare our Armed Forces, for example, with the numbers in the armed forces in Great Britain, about three times as much, and we say that the British are not doing their job. But it is not a question of the absolute numbers under arms; it is a question of the relative proportions who are under arms. And I have worked out some figures on this which I think are very interesting.

Last year, out of every 1,000 in the population, we had 14 men under arms, Great Britain had 16 men under arms, and France had 16 men under arms.

As of March of this year all three of these nations will be on an equality—18 men per 1,000 population. So that on a relative basis, up to now, these countries have done substantially as much as we.

And in terms of amounts spent, namely, proportions of national income, at the present rate we are spending 8.7 percent of our national income for defense, the United Kingdom is spending 6.4, and France is spending 7.3. But Great Britain and France, in the budgets which they have just passed, have raised their proportions to 8 and to 9.7, respectively.

Under the so-called Brussels agreement, it is understood from press reports that all of the nations go up together, and when we finally reach the maximum of about 55 divisions, the United States will not be bearing more than about 20 percent of the total burden.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, Theodore, getting back just a moment to your earlier question as to what John Foster Dulles said, it just occurs to me that whenever we make a confession that we can't make it alone in this world if we have to, then we are on the highway to decay. I am not one of those who will ever make that confession, believe me, although it has been made in some high places, because there may come a day when we are out of Asia, and there may come a day when we are out of Europe, and then do we propose, in high places and elsewhere, to make the confession that because we have no people at our elbow that we are going to fail?

My motion is that when we make ourselves strong, we get allies in our corner, and they are willing to stay in our corner.

Now, with respect to this question of men under arms, I think it begs the point. The important thing is: What is the heart and the will of the soldier after you have put him in uniform and given him a rifle? You can give him the best weapons in the world, but if he follows a strange ideology, and there is no real spirit and no resolve and no determination, then he is only a 50- or 25-percent soldier. And what Mr. Hoover sought to emphasize was that will, that indispensable will, is the prime obligation of armies in Europe, and it is not alone a question of size.

Chairman GRANIK. Yesterday there was an announcement that Senator WALTER F. GEORGE joined Republican Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, in demanding President Truman submit to Congress the issue of sending more American troops to Europe. What is your thought on the issues, Senator?

Senator DOUGLAS. I agree with it. I think the President has the constitutional power to send troops abroad in his role as Commander in Chief, but I also believe that there is a sufficient division of opinion in the country, and since Secretary Acheson made a contrary pledge to the Committee on Foreign Relations so that the President should not exercise this constitutional right without approval at least by the Senate and possibly also by the House as well.

But I should like to have this resolution submitted in an affirmative fashion, namely, that the Congress or the Senate approve of the gist of Brussels agreement rather than in the negative form which has been proposed by Senator WHERRY and Representative COUDERT, namely, that we should not send troops until congressional permission had been given.

I think it is better to put the question in the affirmative rather than in the negative.

Senator DIRKSEN. I agree with that position, very substantially, and I would like to amplify it to this extent. Everybody I think who is familiar with our Constitution knows that it confers upon the President powers as the Commander in Chief, and those powers have never been delimited by the Supreme Court of the United States, and we don't know how far they can go, but we know that that power was conferred at the time when this country was a country of 3,000,000 people and it wasn't ranging far afield, and so the question is: Shall the President, because that power was conferred a long time ago, have authority to put us into an undeclared war and dispatch endless unlimited troops to all corners of the earth?

I think, in the interest of common sense, if for no other reason, there must be a full participation by the people's representatives in the Congress. Now, that ought to commend itself, I think, to good thinking and to common sense in this day and age, and we shouldn't be unmindful of the fact that when, as in the case of Senator CONNALLY, they recite 100 instances over the years when the President has used that power, I went back to take a look. Look at the casualties that were connected with those instances. Virtually none. Usually there were a handful of marines into Nicarauga, or some simple example.

But today we are playing for keeps, and it involves the lives of thousands and hundreds of thousands of young Americans, and the President shouldn't exercise that power lightly. I believe the time has come for full, fair, and, as Senator DOUGLAS has said, affirmative consultation.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I would like to make one qualification to this. I believe that the President should submit the issue to Congress, but I think that we of Congress have a reciprocal obligation to decide that matter quickly, and not prevent a decision by prolonged hearings before the committees or by a filibuster on the floor.

Chairman GRANIK. I will take a question from our studio audience. Do you have a question there, sir?

Question. I am Roger Hack, a student from the University of Illinois. This question is for Senator DIRKSEN. If we were to lose Western Europe through Soviet invasion, would it be possible to have enough strength on our part to check Communist power after such a great loss to the United States?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, the answer is simply this: What assurance is there that we might not lose Western Europe? And if that is designed, of course, as a comment upon what President Hoover said, I reaffirm, of course, that he said he wasn't unmindful of the need of saving western culture in Europe, but he believes that it requires a manifestation of will power over there. Will they do it? I don't know.

We are engaged in a great guessing contest today from President Truman and Dean Acheson on down, and they are trying to

guess as to whether the Soviet will move—will there be a war? They don't know. I don't know at the moment. But I do know we could come to the end of the road, and we would have to depend upon ourselves, and so I want this hemisphere to be strong against that eventuality on land, in the air, and on the sea.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator DOUGLAS.

Senator DOUGLAS. We are all agreed on that, but the question is at what points will we throw our strength to prevent facing the world alone? Now, Mr. Hoover's position is that he will not give any men or any materials to Europe until after Europe has already made itself so strong that it can resist Russia, and until after it has occurred—those are his very words. Now, the Europeans say, "If we have to wait for American aid until we have built up armies of millions of men, we don't think that we can bear this burden. We want some American aid."

Then Hoover says, "You can't have it until after you have made yourself secure." And the result is that we virtually cut ourselves adrift from Europe and tell them that we are not going to defend them.

Now, as I understand the press reports from the Brussels Agreement, the text of which, of course, has not been published, it provides for an ultimate European force at the end of 3 years in which there will be approximately 10 American divisions and a European force of approximately 5 times this amount. We go up together, and that is the immediate issue before the American people, namely, whether or not we will agree to the Brussels Agreement.

If we do not, I think we can be perfectly certain that the Communists will take Western Europe, and take it fairly quickly, and when that happens, while our defense is not impossible, I want to make that clear, it is not impossible, it will nevertheless be extremely difficult.

Senator DIRKSEN. I am not unmindful of all of the words in the Hoover speech, but I would like to read every word and every phrase in terms of context and the over-all purpose and spirit of that speech. And so there isn't any case of pulling out of Europe. It is a case of them manifesting some interest in their own defense, and then, of course, America will not be found wanting if that will is manifest.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I think this is a very happy interpretation that Mr. DIRKSEN has put on Mr. Hoover's speech. And I only hope that Mr. Hoover and his followers will subscribe to it, because if they do, then we will be extremely close to an agreement.

We, on the other side, do not want to defend Europe alone. We will not defend Europe alone. We simply say that if the other nations put up adequate forces, five-sixths of the forces, or four-fifths of the forces, we will join them and we will also help with our air forces and our sea forces. Now, that is what the Brussels Agreement, as I understand it, provides.

Now, the effect of the Hoover speech and the effect indeed of the TAFT speech has been to discourage and to oppose our taking part in the Brussels Agreement. That has been the effect.

Now, if Mr. DIRKSEN wishes to indulge in some characteristically able interpretation of the Hoover speech which permits him to pay homage to President Hoover and at the same time adopt the foreign policy of President Truman, why we are very glad indeed to welcome that.

Chairman GRANIK. I would take another question, but I know everyone wants Senator DIRKSEN to answer that.

Senator DIRKSEN. When all is said and done, let nobody forget that President Hoover was the first great American to stand behind the League of Nations long ago, and let it not be forgotten that he was for the League of Nations until it began to show signs of fogginess and failure. If they put up five-sixths, I am confident that President Hoover would go along, but he wants something more than what he called lip service, declarations, paper policies, consultations, and let us see the color of the money, and let us see the kind of troops they put up, and then we shall know what to do.

Chairman GRANIK. Talking about the United Nations, some of your colleagues feel the United States acceptance of a proposed cease-fire plan for Korea is a mistake, and that it is complete appeasement. Would you prefer a withdrawal from Korea and to keep our hands free in Formosa?

Senator DIRKSEN. As I examined the text this morning, I was frankly astonished about the language that was used, because I am of the opinion that it does constitute appeasement. And so there is the question, Do we go out or do we stay in? We haven't found out yet whether we are running a war there or whether it is a glorified police action. I have been waiting for the White House to say something about it finally. But first let us make up our minds what we are doing there.

Secondly, let us determine whether it is pride or official stubbornness or a matter of long-range policy that keeps us there, and if we can't find out, in Heaven's name, let us not slaughter any more youngsters over there when it looks as if they are going to run us out of the place anyway. [Applause.]

Senator DOUGLAS. I would like to answer Senator DIRKSEN's exhortation. [Continued applause.] Thank you very much. I should like to answer Senator DIRKSEN's question that we should make up our minds what we are doing there. We went into Korea at the request of the United Nations that the countries should come to the aid of a people who had been attacked. We went in there to resist aggression, and that is what we are doing now. I do not want to see us pull out of Korea under any negotiated agreement.

I wish the other countries had given us the aid which they should have given, and to which we were entitled, but I want to say this, that if we throw up our hands and abandon the effort in Korea and if we in the United States do that, and if the British do that as they have been doing, then it is good-by to the United Nations, and good-by to collective security, and I think the issue is sufficiently important that we shouldn't throw in the sponge. If we leave, let us leave honorably and under gunfire.

Senator DIRKSEN. Let me make one brief comment to that, and that is this: Is the moral effect over there worse when we take a sustained and continuous licking, or whether we do the sensible thing and get out and reform and reframe our lines the better to do a defensive job in the Orient?

Senator DOUGLAS. I am not a military expert and I don't believe my good friend EVERETT DIRKSEN is a military expert either and I am willing to be guided by the military experts in this matter, but I simply say that you never can be certain when you are taking a licking. Things may go against you for a time, but then there may always be a turn of events which enable you to come out on top.

When the military situation becomes hopeless, if it were to become hopeless, and if our generals thought that we should leave there, I would agree, but I do not want to have us leave prematurely, to leave in order to buy off the Communists, that is appeasement of the worst type, and I want to see us stick as long as we have a chance of continuing to fight for law and order.

Senator DIRKSEN. That simply presupposes this question: Do we stay on because MacArthur, a great soldier, wants us to stay on, or do we stay on because Dean Acheson and President Truman want us to stay on? That is all.

Senator DOUGLAS. I am not in the confidence of the General Staff, nor I think is Senator DIRKSEN, unless he has tap lines into the Pentagon which I certainly do not have, but I believe that General Bradley is the Chief of Staff of our Armed Forces, and General Bradley with the President furnishes our military leadership.

Now, I don't know what General MacArthur has been urging. If a military decision comes to that point, let it be made, but I should say it should be a military decision, and it should not be withdrawn because of moral weakness.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator DIRKSEN.

Senator DIRKSEN. I have no further comment to make except this: Is it a military policy they are pursuing, or is it a military policy in response to political and diplomatic policy over there? If it is the latter, then we had better think very seriously about getting those boys out of there.

Chairman GRANIK. Will you continue on, Senator DIRKSEN, with your summary?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, Mr. GRANIK, in summary, just let me say this: I subscribe very substantially to what I think President Hoover said in that very epoch pronouncement that he made to the country recently. I think as never before we are going to have to find out whether the people in Europe are going to stand up and be counted and make that one of the conditions of aid. We said so in the Republican policy for the campaign in Illinois in 1950, and I consider it to be a covenant with the people, and I mean to keep it.

In Asia I am in general sympathy with some of the things that Senator DOUGLAS has already said over the radio on other occasions, and that is that we use our natural allies, let us reweapon and reequip Japan, and let us do what are the realistic things over there, and then keep ourselves strong.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. Your summary, Senator DOUGLAS.

Senator DOUGLAS. It is very hard for me to find out precisely where my good friend, EVERETT DIRKSEN, stands, because he seems to agree to a double interpretation of Mr. Hoover's speech. If Mr. Hoover and Mr. DIRKSEN believe along with President Truman that they should give aid to Europe, if Europe will help adequately to arm itself and to defend itself, then I say that the great debate on foreign policy is moving to a very happy synthesis and agreement, and the discussion will have justified itself.

I hope very much that this actually is the case, because if Europe goes, if Asia goes, we lost seven-eighths of the world's population, and we lose a half of the world's steel, and aggression will be closing itself in around us. We will have to become a garrison state and the ultimate chances will not be as good as they might be.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. You have been listening to a discussion on foreign policy between Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The Christian Hope of the New Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely

sermon delivered January 14, 1951, by Dr. Earle B. Jewell, rector, St. Andrews Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERMON BY DR. EARLE B. JEWELL, RECTOR, ST. ANDREW'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH, KANSAS CITY, MO., JANUARY 14, 1951

Thirteen men stood in a valley at the base of a mountain. They were young men. They faced a world of terrible conflict. The race they belonged to was in slavery. The politicians had taken over the economic, the cultural, the educational program, and the religious rights of the whole empire. Men were in slavery. So much so that a soldier or an agent of the government could demand the personal service of any man to carry his bundles. A man had no freedom. There was no economic future. Men were discouraged, hopeless, and living a life of futility. But not these thirteen men. These young men stood at the base of the mountain. They had caught the vision of a better way of living. They had been taught, through a personality, the wonderful freedom and liberty of individual human personality. As they stood at the base of the mountain they were united in one conviction. They believed that men had a better day ahead.

Out of that group of 13 men, 4 men went up the mountain, Jesus, Peter, James, and John. On the mountain they had a tremendous and wonderful experience. They witnessed the transfiguration of Jesus. Peter said, "Master, it is good for us to be here."

The young men of our generation are in the valley of confusion and bewilderment and chaos. They too are facing a world that is soon to go into slavery, the slavery of the expediency of an economic and military dictatorship. The hands of the military dictatorship will rap on every cottage door in the land of America where there is a boy 18 years old. That young man will have no choice. His parents will have no choice. We are in the valley of economic dictatorship. The long ruthless spendthrift arm of the Government will reach into the pocketbook of every home and cottage and into every business and into every organization.

These past few weeks I have heard the heartbreaking cry from the homes of my people telling of the futile feeling their sons have about the future. I have been told that in 1 college over 200 college boys did not return to school this semester because of the uncertainty of the chaotic draft law. I have been told that there are certain young men who went back to finish their semester and yet came back home after they had been in college a week. I have a letter that tells me that young men in a certain college do not even get up in the morning to go to classes, they stay in bed and sleep, and their answer is "What's the use."

Surely we are in a terrible state of inertia. We are in a terrible state of demoralization. We are in a terrible state of our lack of faith in the future. We are in a terrible state in the lack of our faith in the purpose of God in the world. We are in a terrible state in the lack of purpose for human personality where we in America are allowing the fine young men of our homes to draw unto themselves a sense of futility about the preparation for the future of their lives.

What happened to Americans? What has happened to Christians that we can stay here in our peace and tranquillity and inertia without raising our own voice against the loss of the freedom of our American way of life? What happened to Americans in their sense of honesty and common decency when we do not add our voice of demand that our suffering and sacrificing boys be brought home from the futile war in Korea. Many military experts tell us we are going to be whipped and pushed out of Korea. Why should we leave our boys there to die? I can see why young men are full of futility.

You and I as Americans have forgotten the Mount of Transfiguration. We have forgotten the hopeful view of the future. When our young men see that we don't care and there is inertia on our part and we are indifferent to the suffering of other young men, they can't help but feel that we shall be so with them.

My heart bleeds for the young men of this generation. You and I got them into this situation. We got them into this position, year by year, by carelessly voting away our constitutional rights, until now the Constitution in America is nothing but a piece of paper framed in the halls of Congress. We definitely sold out our birthright as individuals and it is no wonder our young people have a sense of futility.

As Christians we have a different job to do. We must say "It is good for us to be here" for we know what freedom is, we know what liberty is, we know what courage is. All these things are born not in a heart of fear, not in a heart of discouragement, not in a heart that is full of demoralization; but in a heart that is full of faith, a heart that is full of courage, a heart that has great faith in the future, a heart that believes that this is God's world, a heart that believes that Jesus Christ is loving mankind and that his way of life is the absolute way of life. Unless we are willing to accept this gift of God we will never have the life of transfiguration. We shall be doomed all the days of our life. We become a defeated people

We dare ask the question of the three men in Washington who are responsible for our boys being in Korea, and who have the authority to bring our boys home from Korea: "How many sons of yours are in Korea?" I refer to the President of the United States. I refer to the Secretary of Defense, and I refer to the Secretary of State.

As we sit here this morning American boys are being killed. We indignantly ask "Why does God allow these things to happen?" Our young men have a sense of futility about returning to college. Our young men are discouraged about the future. We witness ambitious young men giving up their established new business because of the uncertainty of their status as a potential soldier. Surely the American voice should be raised against these prophets of doom and chaos. Let us encourage men as Christians to drown out the hysterical voice of the fearful and confused politician. We as Christians have hope. We do not believe in an attitude of futility. We believe that life is made for courage, for strength, for hope, and for a conquering faith in the future. We have been on the Mount of Transfiguration and say with a great voice "It is good for us to be here for we have heard the Master's voice."

Young men, to you I would speak this morning in these words: Go back to your school, stick to your job, do everything you can to develop your personality, do everything you can and take every opportunity you can grasp to develop your intellect and your minds and your sense of the beauty and the worthwhileness of life. I would say to you, stick to your school, stick to your jobs and develop the finest character you can, because if you do have to go to war then you will be better prepared to face what comes because you have had that much more development. And remember, your personality is eternal.

With a view like that you accept every day as a conquering experience. No person in this church this morning is sure that ere the night time comes that we will be in this world. There is not a parent in this church whose young people may go out in a car tonight, that can be sure this young person will get home again, because it is possible that somewhere along the line some adult may give liquor to teen age boys and girls. We have no assurance that tomorrow is going to come to us. Do we live today, therefore, in the sense that this day is futile? Do we live this hour as though it is foolish to try to develop or grow or have hope or courage or faith? Do we do that? No; you and I are living this hour to the full capacity of our potential because we do have hope in the future, we do have a secret belief that tomorrow will be better, so much so that we are willing to go through this day with all the courage we can.

To you young men I would say let's rise above the shadows, let's get out of the valley at the base of the mountain of futility, let's get up high on the mountain and say with all our faith, "Yes, I see a new day, I have a new vision, I believe there is a purpose in the world—God's purpose." Man is doing all he can to destroy it, but I believe there is God's purpose in the world, and because of that I say "It's good for us to be here."

I personally do not believe we are going to have a war with Russia. I don't know enough about it. I am in no position to speak, but I have faith in the future. I have far more faith in the future than I have faith in some of the neurotic, hysterical men who are trying to lead us down the road of destruction. And I have faith that you Christian Americans are going to rise up and revolt against the destruction of our constitutional rights, for they are fast being taken away from us and we are fast being intimidated to lose them.

My vestry can tell you that 2 weeks ago last Tuesday I was warned that if I did not keep still publicly and in my writings about world affairs that this church would be bombed. I point this out to you for one purpose—you can see how rapidly we are losing our democratic constitutional rights when the only free voice left in America, the only courageous voice left in America is the voice of the pulpit, and now they are beginning to take preacher by preacher to intimidate him into silence.

Ah, but I have been on the Mount of Transfiguration. I have said to my Lord time and time again, "It is great for me to be here." For I believe in God and His purpose for the universe. I believe in the future of the fine young men of our generation. I believe in the ultimate victory of right. And I believe, too, that there has to be a costly struggle in the heart and soul of every individual before that ideal will be realized. Ah, yes, get on the Mount of Transfiguration and hear the voice of God Himself as He says, "This is My beloved Son; hear ye him." And we can say, "Master, it is good for us to be here." We will not be intimidated. We will not run away from our responsibilities as Christians. We will help our sons get a sense of purpose.

It's an awful and terrible responsibility to stand here this morning and tell you people, some of you with broken hearts, you young people with a sense of futility, that there can be a better world, that there can be a new hope, and that there is assured victory of the right. However, there is a necessity of struggle and conflict for any individual or any group to grow and develop and be worthy of the name of Christian. That responsibility is resting now upon each and every one of us. "O Lord, it is good for us to be here, where from the mountaintop of our faith we have captured a new vision, we see a new world and a new day, we see the coming of Thy Kingdom upon earth because Thy Kingdom has been born in the hearts of suffering humanity."

Humanity is holding out their hands of faith and saying, "Lord, fill us with Thy spirit that we might be conscious of Thy presence, for a glorious new day lies ahead, the days upon the earth when we live in

faith and hope and courage, knowing that when the day is done and the curtain falls upon our time we still go on in the sense of victory because God has given to us the fulfillment of his promise of living forever in the land of his own Spirit."

Every experience we have, every development we can get for ourselves; our character, our personality, our strength, our hope, our faith, yes, young men, these things are eternal.

Stick to your schools. Stick to your jobs. Stick to your faith in the wonderfulness of the life in America. We are a free people, and by the grace of God, because we have been on the Mount of Transfiguration, we as individuals are going to keep that spirit of freedom and liberty aglow in our hearts, until some day united we will set the world aflame with the Christian hope of the new day. "Master, it is good for us to be here."

Military Policy in Korea and Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rolla, Mo., Says Quit Korea but Stay in Europe," which was published in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Thursday, January 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLLA, MO., SAYS QUIT KOREA BUT STAY IN EUROPE—POLL FAVORS TAX BOOST FOR UNITED STATES DEFENSE

ROLLA, MO., January 17.—The people of Rolla want the United States to get its troops out of Korea, but not out of Europe. They favor aid to Nationalist China and other foreign countries, but think foreign nations should supply the bulk of troops for any United Nations army. They want American defense preparation, and are willing to pay higher taxes for it, but not for nonessential Government spending. They want price and wage controls.

These are some of the early returns in a poll being conducted by the Rolla Daily News to determine what its 5,700 readers think of American foreign policy, Publisher Edward W. Sowers said today.

DO NOT HAVE TO SIGN

Last Friday the News began printing a ballot giving space for "yes" or "no" answers on 18 foreign policy questions. Readers were asked to fill out the ballots, sign them or not, as they wished, and send them to the News for forwarding to Missouri Congressmen and Senators.

The ballot also includes a space for writing comments, and this prompted at least three readers to demand the ouster of President Truman, although the ballots were presented on a strictly nonpartisan basis and Mr. Truman's name was not mentioned in the material relating to them.

SIX HUNDRED BALLOTS ARE IN

As of today an estimated 600 ballots had been returned, mostly from the 2,000 readers who live in Rolla itself. The bulk of the News' circulation is in the nearby rural area.

Following are the questions and the number of yes-and-no answers; the totals vary somewhat because a number of voters qualified some of their answers and such votes were not counted.

1. Do you think we should withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible. Yes, 157; no, 117.
2. Do you think we should aid Chinese Nationalists [Chiang] fight Chinese Reds? Yes, 186; no, 108.
3. Should Russia be excluded from the United Nations? Yes, 171; no, 123.
4. Should we admit Chinese Reds to United Nations? Yes, 54; no, 237.
5. Should we break off diplomatic relations with Russia? Yes, 141; no, 147.
6. Should we [and the UN] cut off all trade with Russia? Yes, 219; no, 60.
7. Should we send American troops to Europe? Yes, 171; no, 117.
8. Should we draft 18-year-olds? Yes, 126; no, 165.
9. Should we continue to send substantial aid to foreign countries? Yes, 162; no, 126.
10. Should we expect foreign nations to supply bulk of troops for any United Nations army? Yes, 243; no, 48.
11. Should we simply defend our sea bases with our air and sea power, and keep our armies out of foreign countries? Yes, 126; no, 171.
12. Should we hastily prepare for all-out war? Yes, 186; no, 105.
13. Should we gradually strengthen our defenses? Yes, 252; no, 27.
14. Should we raise taxes? Yes, 222; no, 72.
15. Should we substantially reduce nondefense spending? Yes, 173; no, 24.
16. Should we have price controls? Yes, 249; no, 38.
17. Should we have wage controls? Yes, 249; no, 38.
18. Is the honor system of price controls working? Yes, 16; no, 261.

Some of the majority opinions are somewhat contradictory. For example, questions 12 and 13 both drew "Yes" majorities, though adoption of either proposal would automatically exclude the other.

However, the trend of the response indicates that Rolla citizens favor some aid to foreign countries, but think America's commitment in Korea is foolhardy and that foreigners are not contributing their share to the UN forces there.

The Truman ouster demands were somewhat surprising in this city of 9,300, which has a predominantly Democratic population with Old South traditions, and a large cosmopolitan element drawn by the State School of Mines, two Federal agencies, and nearby Fort Leonard Wood.

The comment written by E. B. Aaron, a farmer, was terse and to the point: "Fire Acheson, impeach Truman. Reason: Incompetency. It might save our country. Two more years of this kind of leadership and our country will be Communistic."

PUT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FIRST

Another, who signed his ballot, "A Farmer," wrote: "Replace the President with a man who puts the United States of America before party or self."

"The President should be replaced with a man with less ego and more Americanism," wrote "Taxpayer," who added, "We don't want a socialistic government in the United States."

Former Representative W. P. Elmer, Republican, of Salem, Mo., who long ago predicted that the UN would be merely a debating society, had this comment:

"Quit meddling in other nations' affairs. Enforce the Monroe Doctrine. Look after the United States of America. Quit the United Nations; it is dead, a worse failure than the League of Nations. Quit picking a quarrel with Russia. Just get ready to fight if necessary."

Elmer signed his ballot, "William P. Elmer, isolationist."

To question No. 1, William B. Breuer, combat veteran and businessman, replied with an emphatic, "Hell, yes." His comment:

"Let's stop sticking our nose where it don't belong and daring someone to hit it."

Exemption of Cultural Institutions From Admissions Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article:

JANUARY 24, 1951.

Mr. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While we muster our resources and our physical energies to meet the threat of aggression which endangers our security as a Nation, we must not lose sight of the fact that in so doing we are apt to neglect many of the things which have made America the great Nation it is today.

In our young history we have made great strides in civilization. We are proud of the fact that we are a cultured people, and as such we have become the leaders of the free world.

Rightfully we are now arming to strengthen ourselves against the barbarism of war-bent states. In order that our extensive arms program may be financed, we must tap all practicable sources of revenue.

However, we must not, in the process of building strength to protect our cherished way of life, destroy those very cultural heritages we hold dear to us.

It is unfortunate but factual, that many of our cultural institutions—art museums, symphonic organizations, and opera companies, many the world's greatest—are suffering from financial troubles.

For many companies—the great Metropolitan Opera for one—there is a definite struggle for survival.

The Metropolitan Opera, one of our great national cultural institutions, has found it necessary to appeal to the public for funds to keep it operating. Faced with higher production costs and no possible means of increased revenue, one of the foremost cultural organizations of the world finds itself beaten at the box office.

For the current season, 1950–51, officials of the Metropolitan Opera estimate that its deficit will amount to approximately $400,000.

Immediate relief and assurance of continuance would be obtained by removal of the Federal admissions tax, imposed in 1941 as a war measure and which now approximates the annual deficit of the company.

Up until 1941, the Metropolitan Opera Association retained the full amount charged for its admission tickets. In 1941 the Federal admission tax was imposed. There have been no general increases above the 1941 ticket prices, but today more than 20 percent of all money taken in at the box office is channeled to the Government rather than to the Metropolitan.

In the face of continuously rising costs, the Metropolitan is getting less for what it offers the people than it did in 1941.

The four hundred thousand-odd dollars added to the Government coffers, hardly compensates for the tragic circumstance that may result—death of a great cultural institution.

Mr. Chairman, I myself am an opera lover, and I have always been interested in furthering culture in this country. I might add that I am also very much interested in budgetary requirements of Government and have for some time advocated heavier taxes to meet the costs of defense mobilization.

However, we are bleeding these cultural institutions of their finances. True, in so doing by building formidable armed strength, we protect their existence. On the other hand it is a case of selling a boy's pet rabbit to insure that there will be money to buy it food.

The leading cultural institutions of the country are being strangled to death by Federal taxes and ever-increasing costs of operation. No one can deny the great measure of pleasure and edifying relaxation they provide for the public. No one can deny that their suspension would be a loss to the country and the cultural world in general.

Therefore, when your great committee considers a new tax bill, I respectfully urge that such great organizations as the Metropolitan Opera Association be classified as exempt from Federal admission taxes, so that they may continue to bring to the people those cultural pleasures which have so largely contributed to make this the greatest civilized Nation on earth.

I respectfully request that your committee invite one of my constituents, Mr. George A. Sloan, of Greenwich, Conn., to a hearing, that he may present the case of the Metropolitan Opera and its dire need for tax relief.

Respectfully,

ALBERT P. MORANO,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Connecticut.

[From Opera News of January 8, 1951]

THE FACTS BEHIND THE DEFICIT—ONCE MORE, METROPOLITAN OPERA FACES A CRISIS

Today survival is our major concern. But it must also be recognized that along with economic, political, and physical survival is a matter of equal import, the continued existence of our culture.

The Metropolitan Opera, a national cultural institution, is today involved in a crisis of survival. Deprived of immediate relief from the Federal admissions tax, which was imposed as a war measure in 1941 (and now approximates the annual deficit) and burdened by the mounting costs of production, the Metropolitan must once more come to its public to state its case. Its future depends on the prompt and generous support of its friends, even to the point of personal sacrifice.

To understand the recurrent financial problem and its acute nature at this time, you are strongly urged to study the following statement and the financial report which follows.

I. FACTS OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURE

In the 1949–50 season, 131 Metropolitan performances in New York were sold to an average of 90 percent of capacity in a season of 18 weeks. The seating capacity of the Metropolitan is limited to 3,417. There were 56 performances in a 7 weeks' tour at which the average attendance was also at an exceptionally high level. With over-all operating receipts of approximately $3,000,000 (after deducting $454,000 paid out for Federal admissions tax) and contributions from all sources of $52,000, the deficit for the season amounted to approximately $450,000.

For the current season 1950–51, it is estimated that the operating deficit will amount to around $400,000. This estimate assumes that the percentage of attendance will be as high as in the previous season and includes the additional revenues from the combination of three first performances; also, the deficit will be reduced by approximately $120,000, representing voluntary contributions of a considerable number of subscribers in a generous response to the appeal made to them to donate an amount equivalent to the admissions tax. The Association is deeply grateful for this assistance and for donations from the Metropolitan Opera Guild and others who have made our fine productions possible.

The deficit for the past season and the prospective deficit for the current season will exhaust the cash resources unless replenished from other sources.

II. THE FEDERAL ADMISSIONS TAX

At the present time the Federal admissions tax is a major factor in the annual operating deficit of the Metropolitan.

Until 1941 the Metropolitan Opera Association retained the full amount charged for its tickets. In that year, as a wartime measure, the Federal admissions tax was imposed on the Association for the first time.

Since then there have been no general increases above the ticket prices of 1941, but today 20 percent of the money paid through the box office window goes to the Government rather than to the Metropolitan. Thus, the Metropolitan Opera, in the face of skyrocketing costs, is actually getting less for what it offers the public than it did in 1941. It is, therefore, the hope of the Metropolitan Opera Association that the Congress will restore to opera companies and symphonic orchestras the full exemption from the Federal admissions tax which they formerly enjoyed, and so remedy a condition which threatens the very existence of the leading musical institutions of the country. These cultural institutions are operated for the public benefit. They require philanthropic support to survive. Therefore, they should not be penalized by taxation.

Restoration of exemption from the admissions tax is essential to enable the Metropolitan to keep the annual deficits (which will be further adversely affected by the continuous inflationary trend of costs) within manageable proportions. This of itself, however, will not suffice to meet the present financial problem of the Metropolitan. Even if exemption were to be granted in the near future, it could afford only relatively little financial relief to the current 1950–51 season. Since the cash resources of the Association will be virtually exhausted by the deficits of the past and present season, it will be necessary to replenish these funds irrespective of any tax exemption granted in order to assure a 1951–52 season of opera of the highest artistic quality.

III. RISING COSTS

Production of opera of the highest artistic standards traditional with the Metropolitan, is at all times an expensive operation. The artistic policies of the Metropolitan as set forth by Rudolf Bing, our new general manager, are as follows:

"The Metropolitan Opera is and must remain predominantly an American institution. It also is—and we hope will remain—the world's leading opera house. As such, its public has the right to hear the greatest singers of our day—the greatest internationally as well as nationally. Under my management the Metropolitan Opera will continue its policy of furthering American talent and importing the best Europe and the world has to offer. It will continue to present to its audiences the masterpieces of the past, as well as those which living composers—Americans included, we hope—will produce; it will attempt to adapt its scenic, dramatic and visual aspects to more contemporary lines, and in short will strive faithfully to serve its faithful public."

For the presentation of the 18 to 25 operas in a season's repertory of the Metropolitan there is required an organization of some 800 persons, comprising about 100 artists, conductors, and stage directors, an orchestra of about 90, a large chorus, a ballet, a stage crew of about 85, and about 200 staff personnel, comprising scenery designers, various supporting technicians, and the administrative staff which directs the home season and the national tour.

The services of many artists are obtained in competition with concert theaters and with other major opera houses of the world, practically all of which are government subsidized. Furthermore, in the United States there is a direct relationship between the scale of ticket prices and the basic wage scale of artists. All employees are unionized. Accordingly, the basic wage scales paid by the Metropolitan are the highest prevailing anywhere in the operatic field, due to rising living costs and comparable wage scales in the United States.

IV. WHAT IS NEEDED

Constant study of economy measures is carried on. During the past year a committee, appointed by the board of directors, has made an extensive study of the possibility of building a new, modern opera house of adequate seating capacity which would provide higher revenue and higher operating economies and meet the increased public demand for opera. Another committee appointed by the board has been studying the possibility of complete rehabilitation of the existing house with a view to effecting major improvements backstage and in the auditorium and also looking to operating economies and additional revenue. Continuing consideration is being given to both of these possibilities, although action must be deferred until the present disturbing international situation becomes less ominous. Operating expenses are being kept to a minimum commensurate with the operating requirements of this great repertory company.

Indeed, for assistance in the solution of its serious financial problems the association must not only look for eventual relief from the Federal admissions tax but for the sympathetic cooperation of its subscribers, of other opera goers, of music lovers, and of the many millions of its broadcast audience—in sum, of all who recognize that the Metropolitan is a great institution, the continuance of which is essential to the musical and cultural life of the Nation.

GEORGE A. SLOAN,
Chairman,
Metropolitan Opera Association.

The FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Robert W. Dick, president of the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc., with which he enclosed an article in the December 1950 Reader's Digest entitled "Why I No Longer Fear the FBI" by Morris L. Ernst.

Because of my high regard for the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker,

I ask that this letter and article be incorporated at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In my opinion, the FBI and its Director are to be complimented for their outstanding achievements over the year—achievements to which many fine Montanans—personal friends of mine, have contributed greatly.

SOCIETY OF FORMER SPECIAL AGENTS OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, INC.,

New York, N. Y., January 22, 1951.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: This organization, which has been in existence since 1937, represents approximately 2,000 former special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Recently, there was a scurrilous attack on the work of that Bureau in a book entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation." We understand every Member of Congress was furnished with a free copy of this book by the publisher and/or the author.

The members of this society consider the book not only an attack on the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, Mr. Hoover, but also an attack on our entire membership, all of whom have formerly been associated with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The allegations and insinuations in the book that ex-FBI agents are labor spies are unwarranted, unjust, and without any basis in fact. In fact, the vast majority of our membership are either practicing attorneys or certified public accountants. The remainder hold responsible positions in industry and the Government. Several former agents are members of the judiciary and others are Members of Congress. All our members having been special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation certainly have first-hand knowledge about the work of the Bureau, and we wish to record our objections to this book in the strongest possible terms.

The book was presented to the public as an objective work and in the interests of national security. We are sure if you have examined the book, you will have found that it is neither. You have probably noted the author's tricky placement of material out of context and that he has compiled nothing but derogatory remarks. The author has failed to make any mention of the Bureau for the 14-year period between 1924 and 1938, and its outstanding achievements in that particular period.

We could comment upon the book at length but realize that the charge of prejudice could always be leveled at us because of our prior association with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is for that reason that we wish to bring forcibly to your attention the attached article appearing in the December 1950 issue of Reader's Digest by Morris L. Ernst, counsel, American Civil Liberties Union.

We have made no effort to determine when Mr. Ernst prepared his article for the Reader's Digest but are confident that it was a mere coincidence that it appeared in print about the time of the publication of the book, The Federal Bureau of Investigation. We are sure Mr. Ernst is free of prejudice and that his article is a complete refutation of the attack made in the book upon the Bureau. You will note Mr. Ernst states he has been studying the Bureau since 1939. When one who has dedicated himself to the preservation of personal liberties to the extent that Mr. Ernst has, gives his approval to the operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, you can be sure that such approbation was not lightly given.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT W. DICK,
President, Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc.

WHY I NO LONGER FEAR THE FBI

(By Morris L. Ernst, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union; author of The First Freedom, America's Primer, etc.)

I still remember my start of surprise when I read in the paper one morning in 1939 that J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, had asked the United States Attorney General not to endorse a law that would legalize a free use of wire-tapping. Why was Mr. Hoover opposing a law which would make his own work much easier? His own words, published soon afterward, gave me the answer: "I do not wish to be the head of an organization of potential blackmailers."

I had been hearing criticisms that the FBI was made up of "witch hunters" hounding loyal citizens out of their jobs on the flimsiest sort of rumor; that they tapped telephone wires indiscriminately, learning everybody's private business.

Ever since I read that newspaper item I have been studying the FBI. I would like to record here what I have learned.

As a liberal with a long record of aggressive fighting for the preservation of personal liberties, I am inclined to view all law-enforcement officers with a wary eye, and not without reason—too many times they break the law in the performance of their duties.

I grew up in New York where there was often a wanton disregard for the rights and dignity of human beings. Large numbers of newcomers to American freedom let the cops bulldose them. In their native lands they had been used to police brutalities, and in their new home they did not know that the laws protected them.

Such disregard of individual rights, expanded on a national scale, seemed to me a positive danger, for national police have almost invariably abused their power. It was therefore utterly confounding to me to discover that our Federal police agency was doing its work with a fervid insistence on respecting the rights and privileges of individuals.

When a skeptical person like myself reads that of all the trials in which the FBI was involved last year 97 percent ended in conviction, he is likely to have cynical reservations. And when he learns that 94 percent of the convictions were based on pleas of guilty, he is bound to ask: "How were these confessions obtained?"

Nazi and Communist courts have taught us that a plea of guilty may prove nothing more than that a man's will can be broken. One rarely hears such charges against the FBI. In our courts of appeal—where accusations are heard of unfair treatment and violations of constitutional rights—the charge is almost never raised against the FBI.

However, I did not rely on this indication alone, nor even on my study of case reports. I wrote articles in which I asked readers to send me any evidence they might have that the FBI had violated a person's constitutional rights. My scoreboard shows a remarkable absence of such accusations. On the contrary, all the evidence indicates that the FBI as a matter of unvarying policy has played fair with criminals and suspects.

This record is of profound importance because events in recent years have brought the FBI into quasi-political problems. Here the danger to personal liberties could easily become acute. The necessity for inquiring into political activities and associations is a new thing in our country. We began this Nation with a great gamble in our hearts—the conviction that, if all opposing viewpoints were allowed free expression, truth in the end would win out.

The progress of our country has so far justified our forefathers' faith in the potency of truth. But in the last 20 years a new enemy—and a complex problem—has arisen to confuse us. New political movements, by underhanded methods, seek to bypass the honest competition of ideas. We face an invisible underground where Fascists and Communists work furtively and zealously against our freedom and our ideas of decency.

Something had to be done about that, and the FBI had to do it. What was its task? To bring the facts up from underground so that all the people can know what is being plotted.

It is natural that loyalty investigations should give us qualms. We shudder to authorize wire-tapping and other forms of spying. But they seem necessary if we are to preserve our freedom. They have been forced upon us by the underground.

I am unwilling to ignore the danger of the Communist movement in the United States just because the Reds seem few in number. I saw my friend Jan Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's democratic Foreign Minister, in Prague not long before he came to his end. I know intimately the story of Quisling. I know how helpless democratic forces can be, if they do not protect their people against the secret discipline, the abominably careful scheming of totalitarian minorities.

The Communists could never win an election in the United States. They do not expect to do so. The Communist program, like the Ku Klux Klan, can grow only by stealth in dark cellars. J. Edgar Hoover was right when he stood firmly against a plan to outlaw the Communist Party when the first public outcry was made against the Communists. Why drive more of them underground? All that such an act could ever outlaw would be a name. The next day the same revolutionists would turn up under a new title.

Until Congress is wise enough to pass laws which force open operation of all mass movements, we shall have to protect ourselves against secretly organized attack. We can bring all subversive outfits into the open by requiring all mass movements to report to the Government the essential facts about themselves—the names of all their officials, the money they take in and from whom it comes, and how it is spent.

I suggest that the McCarran bill recently passed by Congress will not work because the Communists will either put their organizations underground or abandon them to start other organizations for the same purposes under other names.

The requirement to disclose essential facts is no invasion of privacy. The President's Committee on Civil Rights unanimously recommended that such laws be passed; represented on the committee are members of the A. F. of L., the CIO, and various minority groups. No decent organization hesitates to identify itself; why should any other kind of organization be protected?

Even without such laws, the FBI has handled delicate problems well. On Pearl Harbor Day the Bureau was able to advise the Attorney General of the basis for authorizing the arrest of some 16,000 persons. A few of the 16,000 became my clients. I defended them before hearing boards and was able to help free some of them. In every case there were fair hearings, with every consideration being shown to the defense.

And although I was the lawyer for certain acquitted suspects, I must admit that Mr. Hoover had a justification in picking up my clients; there was cause for suspicion, and no injustice was done.

One Jewish refugee was picked up because she had entertained one of Hitler's most potent underground spies. But it was easy for me to produce conclusive evidence that my client did not know her guest was a Nazi. She was set free, but the authorities had been right to bring her in for questioning.

Largely as a result of the trials of Judith Coplon and Valentin Gubitchev, there has been publicity and much argument about listening in, but both sides seem to overlook the real purpose of FBI wiretapping and its actual extent.

Once of the greatest liberals said in 1941: "I do not believe it—wiretapping—should be used to prevent domestic crimes, with possibly one exception—kidnaping and extortion in the Federal sense. There is, however, one field in which, given the conditions in the world today, wire tapping is very much in the public interest. This Nation is arming for national defense. It is the duty of our people to take every step to protect themselves. I have no compunction in saying that wire tapping should be used against those persons, not citiens of the United States, and those few citizens who are traitors to their country, who today are engaged in espionage or sabotage against the United States."

This statement was made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In fact he established the policy which has since been adhered to by the Attorneys General. Note, however, that FBI agents never undertake wire tapping on their own authority; permission must first be obtained from the Attorney General. Furthermore, wire tapping evidence cannot be used in Federal courts. Its only value to the FBI is in opening up leads for inquiry.

The loyalty investigation program has created a misconception about the FBI's function. Every American should understand that the FBI does not try Government employees. It merely serves various Government bodies as a reporting agency. When a reporting agency has the power to edit, it can make anyone appear a devil or a hero. But the FBI does not edit. It gathers the facts about a Federal employee and turns over its findings to the head of the department. And that is all it does, or can do, except that it frequently is able to save a suspect in his job when rumor is doing its best to get him fired. J. Edgar Hoover cannot fire a single person. His reports do not even contain recommendations. The FBI turns in all the evidence it finds—including unverified tips, rumors, gossip—everything. It adds comments and evaluation of their accuracy, and there its responsibility ends. It is up to the heads of administrative agencies to act.

It would be folly to ignore rumors, or even anonymous messages; an unsigned note was instrumental in sending the notorious General Meyers[1] to prison. Ditto for thousands of less spectacular examples. To abandon that policy would be to assign to Hoover's assistants the duty, and the power, to screen the reports. I should be very much disturbed if police agents were permitted to withhold evidence on their judgment of its value. Far better the present system—the complete reports go to the responsible official; everything is in the dossier, with a careful comment on each item, whether it is a fact, probability, or rumor.

In my study of the FBI it soon became clear that lies were being spread against it. For example, it has been said and printed repeatedly that agents in loyalty investigations demand to know whether a suspect reads certain magazines of leftist tinge. This charge is a lie. Whenever he hears of the statement being made, Hoover calls for the facts—and invariably everybody backs down. They "heard it somewhere," they "can't remember where." Directives to FBI agents specifically forbid such questions, unless the reading matter is published by the Communist Party.

Of course, some agents may blunder or offend. When that happens, write J. Edgar Hoover. He will see your complaint and it will be gone into thoroughly. I have personally checked about 100 such complaints and I have yet to find one piece of evidence of improper questioning by agents.

The real difficulty in loyalty investigations is that there is almost no way of proving that a person is a Communist. The suspect, if a party member, would deny it. Communist doctrine holds that it is right and proper to lie and cheat. This fact makes new techniques necessary.

Yet in spite of alarms and outcries, nothing oppressive has been done.

It surprised me to learn that, of 2,875,180 employees whose records were examined by the FBI, all but 12,825 were promptly cleared. This minority being further investigated, only 230 employees were finally dismissed. In 163 cases the employees appealed and were given their jobs back. One significant factor must be noted—1,474 resigned before their cases came up. Actually the FBI is now being criticized for not having found as many subversives as it should have.

A real smear campaign has been carried on against Hoover's work. Those who feared the Bureau, as I once did, will be glad to know the facts. The FBI is unique in the history of national police. It has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom. It invites documented complaints against its agents. It has zealously tried to prevent itself from violating the democratic process.

Among liberals I am by no means alone in this opinion. Awhile ago Roger Baldwin, formerly director of the American Civil Liberties Union, wrote to J. Edgar Hoover:

"It seems to me that your bureau has accomplished an exceedingly difficult task with rare judicial sense."

For me, that sums up the record.

[1] Maj. Gen. Bennett E. Meyers, former Air Force purchasing officer, convicted of inducing a former business associate to lie under oath about irregular war contracts in which Meyers was involved.

Proposed Withdrawal From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Henderson Plans Evacuate Korea Meeting Tonight," which was published in the Evansville Courier, Evansville, Ind., of January 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENDERSON PLANS EVACUATE KOREA MEETING TONIGHT—MAYOR SAYS PETITION TO DEMAND UNITED STATES TROOPS BE RECALLED

HENDERSON, KY., January 17.—Mayor Otis A. Benton said Wednesday morning that a mass meeting will be held at 7:30 p. m. Thursday at the Henderson courthouse for the purpose of drafting a resolution demanding the withdrawal of American troops from Korea "where they are engaged in a useless battle."

Benton said that unless the policies of the Democrats in power are changed, the Democratic Party will be destroyed. "The Democrats are on the verge of handing the Government over to the Republicans for the next 50 years unless we alter our course."

ASKS MOTHERS ATTEND

Benton said he is urging mothers of all soldiers, and all other women, too, to attend the meeting and speak for their rights.

"Our young men are being slaughtered in Korea in a battle. They know not for what they are fighting. Our own Leslie Powell has returned home and says the boys don't know why they are there."

WAS SECOND CASUALTY

Powell was Henderson's second casualty in the Korea police action. He was wounded at Taegoh, 17 days after landing at Pusan. He spent 5 months in Army hospitals and then was granted a furlough home.

The mayor declared that "Russia is in no condition to declare all-out war. They are short of a lot of things, one of the essentials being gasoline. They are out-smarting us by having us battle at a half dozen points in the world. They are weakening us by such tactics and find that we are first-class suckers."

The city's chief executive said that when the resolution is completed, it will be signed, and then sent to Washington, demanding that the American boys be removed from that troubled spot. "I hope that other cities will take such stands before it is too late."

At the meeting a civil-defense program also is to be established.

Free Prices, the Only Source of Ample Production for War or Peace—4,000 Years of Failure of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I want very briefly to give you a little sketch of 4,000 years of uninterrupted failure of price controls as applied in the experience of nations from the beginning of civilization. We have heard from time to time that our experience with price controls dates from Leon Henderson, or from 1942.

But our economic freedom has deep roots in our history and is supported by reason and experience. The president of Princeton, John Witherspoon, in a letter to George Washington, said:

> Fixing the prices of commodities has been attempted by law in several States among us, and it has increased the evil it was meant to remedy, as the same practice has done since the beginning of the world.

Is that really true? What does the experience of mankind teach about this fundamental issue, which touches the life of every man, woman, and child?

CONTROLS THIRD 4,000 YEARS AGO

The temptation for people in power to tamper with prices and production seems to be a very ancient human game. Thus, in the Laws of Hammurabi, King of Babylon—2285–2242 B. C.—we find wage controls for boatmen, reapers, threshers, shepherds, laborers, artisans, bricklayers, tillers, stone cutters, milkmen, and carpenters. Regulated also

were builders' fees and warehousing, as well as rental of cows in milk, calves, oxen, wagons, and freight and passenger boats. On the basis of historical evidence, we know that ancient history, throughout the changing centuries, is characterized by a never-ending succession of popular upheavals against tyrannical rules and regulations imposed upon the people from above. This continued strife reveals one of the fundamental themes of human history—a struggle between regimentation and freedom.

We find later laws in ancient history, like, for example, the Hittite Code—1350 B. C.—which was discovered in Baghaz Koi in Asia Minor, that attempted to establish provision for wages and prices. The very fact that such laws had to be abolished or drastically revised under popular pressure indicates that even in ancient times rulers met with deep-seated resentment against their attempts to block the activities and trade of their citizens.

ROME HAD FREEDOM

History tells us that the Roman Republic, under a constitution guaranteeing freedom, became the envy of the "barbarians" of other countries. Its soldiers were increasingly victorious in their conflicts with the half-hearted mercenaries of neighboring nations that enjoyed little freedom. The glory that was Rome extended throughout what is now Western Europe and northern Africa because Rome was the center of freedom. There were no planned economies. As Gibbon tells us, freedom, honor, and justice were universally recognized virtues. And the freedom of Rome extended to its colonies.

The recurrent famines of earlier days were experienced with less and less frequency. Rome gave the civilized world the highest standard of living then known to mankind. But what happened? The leaders reached out for power. The republic became an empire. At first the emperors were cautious. They talked freedom as they planned a police state. Gibbons says:

> Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the senate and the people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom. A feeble senate and enervated people cheerfully acquiesced in the pleasing illusion.

And so the people were fooled by bread and circuses. They looked to the government to supply more and more of their needs. Production declined everywhere. Prices skyrocketed.

ROMAN CONTROLS FAILED MISERABLY

Emperor Diocletian decided to maintain his popularity with promises to fix prices and reduce the cost of living. So in A. D. 301 he issued an imperial edict fixing the prices of commodities for the whole Roman Empire. His grandiose scheme was ushered in with a fanfare of benevolent propaganda. In fact, in the preface to the edict, the Roman Emperor shows an insight into the laws of psychological propaganda technique which is as startling as it is up to date. He assures his people that the coming economical control system is built on the highest motives of making the whole nation participate "in the blessings of that peace for which we have laboriously striven." He continues that in order to make this price-fixing system work, it is necessary for the rulers like "watchful parents of the whole human race" to help the people with remedies from above, and that such measures have become necessary, since humanity cannot achieve such good results by its own free action.

The edict goes on to explain how the people have become greedy; how exorbitant profits were being made; how monopoly was running wild, and the people, therefore, needed protection from foes within as well as foes without. The only cure was a complete over-all control of food, clothing, wages, and so forth. Reading the list of commodities which the Emperor asked his Chester Bowles of that day, Maximianus, to take control of, reads astonishingly like our own modern OPA lists: Farm products, dyes, needles, feathers, filling for upholstery, seeds, wine, oil, meat, poultry, fats, sea food, building timber, wooden posts, finished wagons, agricultural implements, and so on ad infinitum.

In order to enforce his imperial law, Diocletian built up a huge bureaucracy to administer his universal price-control system. A contemporary observer has characterized the situation in the following words:

> The number of ministers, of magistrates, of officers, and of servants who filled different departments of the state, multiplied beyond the example of former times.

The price-control police forces of Diocletian had as their legal weapon, severe penalties against any breach of the law. Death was the punishment for those who dared sell above maximum prices. Death also for the buyer who aided and abetted him. Death, too, for those who bought and sold illegal stocks. However, human nature being what it is, these penalties did not affect the general picture, and no bureaucratic machinery or legal apparatus could prevent a complete break-down of the law of supply and demand with all the economic and social evils resulting from it.

Economic historians of the Roman Empire find that a situation developed which was as tragic as it was prophetic. Because the scarcity of production was heightened by the interference from price-control laws, prices on consumers' goods in the actual market rose to catastrophic heights. The control system which was put into operation to combat inflation, in this manner actually created inflationary trends which broke the backbone of the economic life of a great empire. Everywhere the results soon became visible: Building and construction stopped entirely. The arts and sciences fell into decay to such an extent that modern historians can recognize immediately the crudity and puerility of the craftsmanship of this period. Artistic creativeness and inventive skill did no longer thrive in this new atmosphere of economic tyranny.

History goes on to point out that while the economic waste was incredible the trades sank to ever lower levels. Poverty was created among the broad masses, while the merchants and small entrepreneurs were impoverished into bankruptcy. Landowners and manufacturers, who were the hardest hit, lost interest in a system of economic slave control that took away the private inventiveness and enterprise of the human genius.

In the realm of agriculture the situation became so bad that the Emperor found it necessary to order the farmers and the farm laborers controlled by serfdom under state supervision. That this measure could only lead to a worsening of the agricultural situation is perfectly explainable by the well-known historical law, that soil tilled by slave labor never yields abundant fruits such as land cultivated by free farmers.

To meet this general extremity of national economics, the Emperor, therefore, naturally turned to the device which is as common as it is artificial, namely, of exorbitant taxation. Taxes and surtaxes multiplied in a hopeless effort to fill an ever-empty treasury.

Thus ends the only total price-control system which the history of the Roman Empire records. Diocletian alone, of all the Roman emperors, was foolish enough to attempt it. If he had listened to the history of his empire he might have observed how earlier attempts of partial price fixing under emperors like Tiberius, Commodus, and Alexander Severus all had broken down. However, like many panic-stricken tyrants in the history of mankind, Diocletian apparently fancied that, if the price-control system only could be made totalitarian and foolproof, it would work where partial attempts have broken down. He lived to see the tragic mistake of his economic tyranny over a whole nation's life, since his experiment ended with such a complete failure that the edict had to be repealed as useless and unenforceable. Soon after the poverty-stricken and indignant people forced his abdication, on May 1 A. D. 305.

The more serious lesson of this Roman price-control experiment is grasped, however, only if one realizes that its long-range effect on the Roman Empire was directly connected with the economic destruction of the greatest empire of ancient history. As the historian, Jules Toutain, has pointed out, the economic breakdown of the Roman Empire made it fall an easy prey to the attack of the barbarians who, a few generations later, poured in over the borders of the Empire south of the Danube and west of the Rhine. What had once been a proud and great nation had deteriorated into a mass of people which had lost both the productive initiative and the national self-esteem which make a people strong and healthy. One of the fundamental laws of national defense is that only a nation in which freedom has been preserved under law is able and willing to take up arms in defense of human rights and human dignity

Upon the grave of the Roman Empire the well-known historian, Samuel Dill, of Oxford, has written the following epitaph, which we may do well to remember:

> The system of bureaucratic despotism, elaborated finally by Diocletian and Constantine, produced a tragedy in the truest sense, such as history has seldom exhibited: In which, by an inexorable fate the claims of fancied omnipotence ended in humiliating paralysis of administration; in which determined effort to remedy social evils only aggravated them until they became unendurable; in which the best intentions of the central power were, generation after generation, mocked and defeated alike by irresistible laws of human nature and by hopeless perfidy and corruption in the servants of government.

It is not surprising that kings, who were notorious for their excessive egotism, should be found in the list of rulers bent upon price control. There is Philip IV of France who, in 1306, antedated Hitler's Jewish pogroms by six centuries, and who created a dire scarcity of wheat, bread, and clothing throughout his nation by his price-control system.

There are English kings, like Henry III and George II, who tampered with prices of grain and bread until Parliament rose up in indignation and repealed these royal price-control attempts.

There was Edward II, who, on an island like England, hit upon the ridculous scheme of safeguarding production level on sea food by a control system which was inaugurated as a benefit for the people, but actually turned out to be such an impossible flop that all fish disappeared from the markets in the British Isles.

FRENCH CONTROLS FAILED

A complete survey of ancient, medieval, and modern price-control systems proves that they created scarity instead of production and ill-will instead of cooperation. One of the most illustrious and meaningful examples of this historical law we find as we turn to the history of the French Revolution.

When the leftists of that day—the Jacobins—decided to destroy French culture and French enterprise, they made use of the old tyrannical medium of a violent price control. Being experts in revolutionary technique, they chose to place iron control upon 39 necessities of life under the agency called committee of public safety.

The picture of what happened to the French revolutionary price-control system runs true to pattern.

As one historian, Andrew Dickson White, wrote in 1876:

> The first result of the maximum was that every means was taken to evade the fixed price imposed, and the farmers brought in as little produce as they possibly could. This increased the scarcity, and the people of the large cities were put on an allowance. Tickets were issued authorizing the bearer to obtain at the official prices a certain amount of bread or sugar or soap or wood or coal to cover immediate necessities.

As another historian reports this era:

> Prices were fixed. Any attempt to profiteer on necessities was made punishable by death. To break all opposition, the terror was established. The tribunal revolutionaire began sending scores of innocent people to the guillotine every day. Between March of 1793 and July of 1794 nearly 3,000 people were executed in Paris and about 15,000 in the provinces. At Nantes three or four thousand prisoners were thrust into old boats that were sunk in the middle of the river; at Lyon they were shot down in groups of as many as 200 at a time.

The Civil War of the Vendee began in 1793. Insurrection against the revolutionary government spread into Poitou, Anjou, and Brittany. Threat of famine compelled the rationing of food. There was much discontent on that account. The Hébert group attempted to incite the famished people to an attack on the convention. Robespierre acted swiftly. Hébert and his chief lieutenants went to the guillotine. That was in March 1794.

Robespierre, then 35, became the uncontested master of the situation. From April to July 1794, his authority was unchallenged. He moved rapidly toward his goal of complete social equality. It was ordered that the confiscated properties of enemies of the republic should be given to deserving patriots. Saint-Just was charged with this distribution, and was authorized to revise the code of social institutions in the interest of pure democracy * * * trial by jury was denied to those suspected of conspiracy and the tribunal was authorized to make condemnations without the hearing of witnesses. Heads began to fall faster than ever. It was the Great Terror. In 45 days there were 1,285 executions.

The Great Terror was an expression of Robespierre's impatience to realize his ideal state. He wished to destroy all opposition to the establishment of social and economic equality. But he had overreached himself. The razor of the republic began to lose its popularity. The pitiless apostle of liberty, fraternity, and equality began to lose prestige. The word "tyrant" was murmured. * * * On July 28, 1794, Robespierre and his brother, Saint-Just, and 19 others were executed. That ended the terror, and it all but ended the republic. Democracy had followed autocracy to the guillotine. The death of Robespierre ended the dream of pure democracy and equality. No man dared to espouse the perilous cause that had brought death to its devotees. The Robespierre legislation in the interest of equality was either suppressed or ignored and, to the delight of the merchants, price control was abandoned.

All price fixers do not meet so violent an end as that of Robespierre but the wrath of the hungry and disillusioned people always descends upon them.

A sigh of relief and a new spirit of self-governed activities swept through France. The farmers plowed and planted, and during the month of July 1795 they could once again harvest their crops as free men after the disastrous and negative years of revolutionary price control. Liberty had conquered once more.

EARLY AMERICAN OPA'S

Coming now to the United States, we find the resistance to Government tampering with the laws of supply and demand greatest of all. A limited price control was attempted during the American Revolutionary War, but the alert and freedom-loving citizens, taught by experience, soon totally rejected this Government interference with the economic life of the States.

Led by Connecticut and Massachusetts, the New England States went in for regulating prices early in the Revolutionary War. This emergency measure was motivated quite as much by the fact that the Continental currency lost its monetary value as by the self-evident fact that British blockade created a severe shortage of consumers' goods. The inevitable result was that the 1774 price level soon broke down, and as early as the spring of 1777 Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire were forced to raise the level for maximum prices. In Rhode Island, however, the town of Providence objected strenuously. It directed its representatives in the legislature to fight such measures, as they created scarcity and produced animosity.

In Connecticut, Governor Trumbull warned in a public statement:

> If we affix a low price to provisions and articles of importation we shall find that the farmer will cease to till the ground for more than is necessary for his own subsistence, and the merchant will not risk his fortune on a small and precarious prospect of gain.

The good Governor was really advocating what later generations prefer to call controlled inflation, even though he must be excused for not knowing the modern devices of economic deception called farm subsidies and cost-plus contracts.

Soon the States, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, began to labor under keen misgivings, however, that the price control as such was a deceptive technique. This discovery led to an interstate convention being called in New Haven in January 1778. The war was still raging and the longed-for victory for independence still did seem far away. In a stampede of economic panic, the delegates voted, therefore, to adopt a price advance of 75 percent above the 1774 price level.

What was meant to be a radical cure threatened to become a disaster, since a run-away inflation soon began to encompass the national economic life. The Continental Congress very quickly realized that it had to reverse its policy in order to avert sure economic doom. In its meeting of April 8, 1778, it declared, therefore, to the sorely tried war-torn Nation:

> It hath been found by experience that limitation on the prices of commodities is not only ineffective for the purpose proposed, but likewise productive of very evil consequences to the great detriment of the public service and grievous oppression of individuals.

The courageous and wise pronouncement by the Continental Congress had a reassuring effect upon the States. In fact, so much so that price fixing was permitted to lapse for about a year. During this period, the American people discovered that price fixing could not serve as a safeguard against the heavy inflation which their just War of Independence gave them to carry as an additional price for freedom. They recognized this as an economic fact which proved that, measured in money values, they all were becoming poorer as together they were winning their freedom.

In 1779, the last brief attempt was made at price fixing as a remedy to control a deeply wounded war economy. On May 25, 1779, the town of Boston adopted a price schedule for 15 articles on a month-to-month basis. And in July of the same year, a State convention at Concord adopted a general price level, stipulating that "violators were to have their names published in the newspapers as enemies of the country." The background for this threat against violators

was, of course, the fact that the very outcome of the whole war hung in the balance.

Yet, even so, history records that penalties were rarely imposed. Indeed, the laws were, for the most part, not enforced. They remained, as Prof. Allan Nevins has pointed out, on the statute books.

And as soon as the fortunes of war turned, the States rid themselves of the fruitless and scarcity-producing price-control system, which they had grasped in a moment of panic. It is to the undying glory of the men and women of the Revolutionary period that a whole year before Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, all the States had already repealed their price-control laws.

Such was the depth of their belief in freedom as a producer of goods and services. Price control in America was over—not again to be revived for 160 years.

They fought not merely for independence. They fought for freedom and learned right in the middle of war itself that freedom produces more food and clothing and shelter than controls can produce. They emancipated freedom from Europe and European controls.

During the postwar period, under the Articles of Confederation, our colonial ancestors lived in an era of high prices. The unsecured revolutionary currency was issued in such quantities that "not worth a continental" became a popular phrase. The monetary situation interfered seriously with trade and tended to foment discord, distrust, and disunity.

It was in this atmosphere that the Constitutional Convention met in 1787. It is worthy of note that no delegate to this convention seriously proposed that our Government should have the power to fix prices. Their generation had learned that Government price fixing would not work and so this power was not listed among those delegated powers which the people gave their Federal Government.

To exercise such power now is sheer usurpation. It was the adoption of our Constitution with its limitation on control that brought the new era of food and shelter. We need to remind ourselves that this era started right here in America. Our example spread around the world until the world rejected freedom for many forms of collectivism. With that has come again the ghastly prospects of starvation and famine. That has been the rule of life throughout history except where for brief periods of time freedom of the people has been maintained.

This has always existed whenever land has been used in common and regulated by some central authority. The planned economies of lords, kings, and dictators have always resulted in famine and want.

Freedom, which is synonymous with ample food and shelter, is the first great achievement of modern times. Under the Constitution, Americans were free to own their lands, work out their own plans, and enjoy the fruits of their labor without regulations by authority or oppressive taxation. With this freedom has come agricultural science and invention of machinery, increased supplies of food, intellectual advance, improved means of communication, steam, electricity, and all the wonders that only the imaginative and creative minds and spirits of free men and women may comprehend for the future blessings of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has clarified one fundamental thing; namely, the fact that we are today witnessing the old, old fight between two contradictory political systems of government. On the one hand we have the advocates of government control over national life and national production. They willingly abandon freedom. To adopt price controls in peacetime would be clear proof that the European idea of government control and government domination and compulsion has moved permanently into the political philosophy and political life of this great Republic.

Those who do not believe that freedom will solve our economic problems should stop fooling themselves. They continue to talk about freedom, but they do not really believe in it. They give lip service to liberty, but the moment the test comes they call for continued and increased power for public officials.

Mr. Speaker, the test is here. The test has been long overdue. Are we going to give our people, and the rest of the world true statesmanship, built on first principles?

I am reminded of the words of a free American from the debate on price regulations of February 14, 1777, in the Continental Congress, where Mr. Benjamin Rush stated:

> The salvation of this continent depends upon the authority of this Congress being held as sacred as the cause of liberty itself. It becomes us, therefore, to be careful of the remains of our authority and character.

We know that what this Nation and other nations expect from the United States at this crucial moment in history is production and more production of vital materials of war, foods and clothing and shelter for consumption at home, and especially food for people abroad. The managed, controlled, and forced spirit of man will neither produce nor work nor fight nor make sacrifices necessary to win a war and rebuild a world civilization which was wrecked by an evil domination system which was built on absolute government control.

It is deplorable that 17 years of false indoctrination has dulled our sense of liberty, our passion for its products. Having won a complete victory over government-controlled systems in Germany and Japan, we too are in danger of continuing to follow the false philosophy of good coming from government interference, the Hegelian doctrine of the omnipotent state.

The Members of this House are the representatives of a free people against these prophets of doom and gloom and their fundamental philosophy of life and Government so completely out of line with truth and fact. I agree with Mr. Chester Bowles that "what is at stake is our entire economic future," only I believe that our future, as our glorious past, should be dedicated to freedom and faith and not to price control and fear.

We have had corruption and we have had our black markets because we have had man-made control instead of adherence to that fundamental law called the law of supply and demand. A natural law which is as inevitable and basic as the law of gravity cannot be set aside by any law even of Congress. Freemen meeting in a free market doing their free selling and buying proves to be far more honest in the long run than people who have Government officials looking over their shoulders every time they turn or every time they finish a product. Freedom is more honest than government and so much more productive.

Everything that is happening now points to the fact that if we now continue to substitute expediency for faith in freedom we are on the road to weakening more and more the central idea upon which the Republic was founded. We are on the way to corruption and disintegration. To guarantee that this catastrophe shall not happen to the last bastion of free enterprise or free economy in the whole world we must keep free from price controls and hold fast to our free country.

If we cannot read history so well or act so courageously as our forefathers in dealing with price controls, we can imitate them. Let us take a leap of faith in freedom if we would win the war, have food, clothing, shelter, and the good life.

Surely Democrats can remember back as far as 1946 when the evils of OPA elected a Republican Congress. The mistakes of history ought not be repeated within four short years.

Let's Call It War or Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an editorial from a recent edition of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier.

To my mind the writer of this editorial hits a high point of reason and logic when he says:

> Korea has no strategic defense value for the United States. The only reason for fighting there is to establish the principle of collective action against aggression. If the other nations of the UN are unwilling to supply sufficient troops to aid in establishing that principle, then it has failed and we should admit it. Then we can concentrate on our own defense, knowing that collective security is a myth.

Here is the full text of the editorial:

LET'S CALL IT WAR OR QUIT

The American public is deeply dissatisfied with the attitude of the Government in Washington toward the Korean War.

Seven American divisions are fighting Chinese Communists in Korea, yet Washington says we are not at war with Communist China.

Although the United Nations did not hesitate to call it aggression when North Koreans attacked, the UN has so far failed to brand the Chinese aggressors for doing exactly the same thing.

Although Washington says it cannot afford to reinforce our Korean armies because that would leave Europe open to attack, it refuses to utilize the 400,000 trained Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa. And remember, the Nationalists are members of the United Nations.

Although billions of dollars are being spent to create atomic bombs, Washington says we cannot use them in Korea or against Communist China because this is only a police action. To the men in Korea and their families back home, however, a casualty in a police action is the same as a casualty in a war.

Although Washington does not have any plans for the eventual liberation of Korea, it proposes to fight this costly, bitter retreat, apparently in the belief that it enhances our prestige to be driven off the peninsula rather than retire voluntarily from a war that we choose not to fight.

Apparently, however, not only the public at home is dissatisfied. Maj. Gen. Emmet O'Donnell, returning from command of Far East bombing, demanded that authorization be given for use of the atomic bomb. "If we're going to fight," he says, "let's not hit 'em light, for heaven's sakes. * * * I believe we should have cracked the Chinese Communists hard and smacked the hell out of them as soon as we had them identified."

The American people have no desire to get bogged down in a senseless war on the Asiatic continent against Chinese masses. But it is time to fight it or not fight it. It is time either to use the Chinese Nationalists and the atomic bomb in Korea or get out. It is time to establish military objectives that are worth fighting for.

Korea has no strategic defense value for the United States. The only reason for fighting there is to establish the principle of collective action against aggression. If the other nations of the UN are unwilling to supply sufficient troops to aid in establishing that principle, then it has failed and we should admit it. Then we can concentrate on our own defense, knowing that collective security is a myth.

If there is anything wrong with that analysis of the situation, then nobody in Washington has yet pointed it out. Fuzzy, inept leadership is defeating us as rapidly as the enemy.

United States May Expand Use of Philippines as Defense Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the American Aviation Daily of January 23, 1951, carries a very important article entitled "United States May Expand Use of Philippines as Defense Base."

The article follows:

UNITED STATES MAY EXPAND USE OF PHILIPPINES AS DEFENSE BASE

MANILA, PHILIPPINES.—It is generally expected here that the Philippine Islands will begin playing an ever-increasing role in far-eastern defense, although to date only Clark Air Force Base and the naval station at Cavite, under long-term lease, are the only evidences of United States military might in the islands. Vast majority of the 20,000,000 population is pro-American, some fiercely so, comprising the largest and almost the only group of friends the United States has in the Far East. There are many skilled workers in the islands suitable to man maintenance and overhaul bases.

Ever since the independent Republic was founded, July 4, 1946, the United States has kept hands off of the Philippine Islands Government, which currently is under severe criticism for being both inefficient and corrupt. But the arrival of additional United States forces, even though these will have nothing to do with internal affairs, will tend to stabilize unsettled conditions.

The Huk guerrilla activity has been on the increase but is not strong enough to be more than a continual nuisance. It is serious but not critical. It is bad enough in the island of Luzon, on which Manila is located, to curtail civilian travel, especially at night, except in the city and large populated areas. But outside of Luzon everything is calm and peaceful. The southern islands might actually be called prosperous, and only some localized tribal activity by the Moros (Moslems) in the far south disturbs the peace.

There are apparently well-authenticated indications that several Red submarines have been operating in the Philippine Archipelago and are presumed to be landing some arms and leaders for the Huks. Also, some aid has been coming by sea.

HUK GUERRILLA TROUBLE

The Huk guerrilla trouble has its origin in internal social and economic conditions, and the Government has done very little to eradicate the source of the troubles. The Communists, very few in number, have capitalized on the social unrest and are beginning to make headway. It is not believed that the use of force by an oppressive government is going to make much real headway against the guerrillas. The only real solution is economic betterment.

Ironically enough, the Huks have ample United States arms. Some of this equipment came as the result of generous and indiscriminate distribution of arms to Filipinos in 1944, when the United States invaded the islands and needed local help to oust the Japs. But GI's have apparently been selling United States equipment ever since. One Huk band seen recently had some very recent United States equipment. Filipino military men have not been beyond selling arms to the guerrillas. So, all in all, primarily through the United States, the Huks have large supplies of guns, ammunition, carbines, and machine guns. Some ex-GI's have been mixed up directly with the Huks.

United States Army and Navy officers have never exercised sufficient control over supplies and personnel, both here and in other areas, and the leakages are considerable. All such dealings have helped demoralize the Filipinos themselves and have lowered the United States prestige.

Generally speaking, Huk activity will not interfere with the greater use of the Philippines as an important "unsinkable aircraft carrier." Only a few wartime air bases are fit for use, but there is ample land available throughout the islands for new ones. Local aviation people hope the United States will install an aircraft overhaul base in the islands.

But the first job of the United States is to give economic assistance to the islands to stabilize the country, without offering support to a weak Government. Only by economic effort can the Huk situation be brought firmly under control.

Food Price Ceilings and Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have within the last week introduced a bill (H. R. 1778) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 in order to eliminate the arbitrarily high ceiling price requirements for agricultural commodities, including food. The imposition of price ceilings and the likelihood that certain agricultural commodities may have to be exempted gives additional urgency to the need for action on this legislation. The existing law requires the ceilings to be the higher of, first, 100 percent of parity; or, second, the highest market price in the base period May 24 to June 24, 1950. If the act is amended as I propose the ceiling price will be the actual support price—instead of the higher parity price, as now required—or the highest market price received by producers of any agricultural commodity during the base period. My bill would make it possible to establish immediate price controls on food and other agricultural commodities.

The Defense Production Act fixes ceilings at not less than 100 percent of the parity price used by the Government as a basis for price supports while the price supports themselves are only 90 percent of such parity or less. Wheat, corn, peanuts, butter, and milk are today selling at 10 percent or more below parity prices but as the law stands now price ceilings would mean a 10 percent or more increase in price on these major commodities. The ceiling price is made mandatory at a higher figure than the price at which the Government actually supports the commodity and regardless of the market price. Yet, under the present law, if the market price is higher—which is the case in beef cattle, lambs, wool, and cotton—then the higher price is the basis for the price ceiling.

I introduced a resolution on the opening day of the session—House Concurrent Resolution 4—requesting the President to exercise his power to impose price controls on cost-of-living items now. Price controls are essential and while we wait the cost of living is going to make new highs. This is already indicated by the fact that the cost-of-living index last recorded for the period ended December 31 registered a new all-time high. The confidence of the people of the country for the period of emergency and mobilization must be fortified by these controls protecting the standard of living and the integrity of their earnings. Clerical and office workers, Government employees and those receiving fixed incomes from annuities, estates, and retirement allowances, and so forth, are feeling the pressure very badly.

In addition the confidence of city consumers must be restored. The production of food must be encouraged and no

one wants to see a repetition of the collapse in farm values and agricultural prices of the 1930's. But in a time of maximum demand at high prices it would appear to be only just to the city consumer to adapt the farm parity price program and ceiling prices to the existing situation. Representatives of city districts can well favor fundamental assurances to agricultural producers provided that a fair balance is held between their needs and those of city consumers.

Korea Has Awakened America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, on December 20 I wired the Secretary of State to find ou who committed our forces to Korea without the consent of Congress—never, in my 6 years in Congress, have I had such a flood of mail, 98 percent approving my questions and demanding the answers for themselves. On January 3 he replied, in part, as follows:

The President, acting upon the unanimous advice of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made the decision to commit the United States Armed Forces in Korea, in accordance with the United Nations Security Council resolution to stop Communist aggression there.

Now, the President, again disregarding Congress, insists he has the power and proposes to order our 18-year-olds to Europe, or other parts of the world.

Floods of letters coming to every Congressman ask how we can fight Russia if we are trapped in Korea, or Burma, or Iran, or other parts of the world. It seems like utter madness. They remember that Germany, the best organized for war, lost 5,000,000 men. Russia lost 10,000,000 and still won World War II. Machines could not win against masses of men. They smothered the guns and tanks until they wilted in the heat of their own futile firing. Masses of dead bodies make bridges over barbed-wire entanglements. The United States and Europe together might lose 10,000,000 men in casualties in a land war; and Red China could lose 25,000,000 in casualties, and still win a land war. Obviously, world war III cannot be fought and won like Wars I and II were fought and won.

Besides, the people know this is a war between two dominant ideas: communism against freedom. They see these conflicting ideas in every country. They question how we can persuade allies of Communist sympathies to fight alongside of our masses of men against the Russian masses on land. Before we join forces, our people want to look squarely into the faces of our proposed allies for confidence. Without that our people cannot march their boys beside them in battle. They know that France has 200 Communists in her Chamber of Deputies, or one-third of the whole Chamber; another third are Socialists.

So, this ally, if General Eisenhower can persuade her to fight at all, will send an army alongside composed of one-third Communists, sworn to support Russia and world communism. Another third will be Socialists. What a choice. What a prospect is Italy? Look at England. She wants to make Red China respectable to sit at the table of the family of nations. She grows rich trading with Red China in the materials that spill the blood of our men and hers, too. That is the horrible picture of the infiltration that has taken place in dear old England since World War II. This is not Churchill's England we propose to fight with now. England is now a weak Socialist government, the weakest form known in warfare. She lacks capacity to act at once, like a dictatorship. And she lacks the creative and productive power of freemen.

No European army can be raised now for world war III which would not include a large proportion of Communists and Socialists. That means that every American boy, every American officer in a combined United States-European army such as proposed now, would be at the mercy of or greatly frustrated by Communists and Socialists. The soldier next to our boy, the messenger carrying important secrets, the sentry outside the general's door—all may be Communists. They have proved their ability to infiltrate everywhere. They destroyed Chiang Kai-shek's mainland army and smashed the duly elected republican government of China with the help of the United States Government, itself deeply infiltrated.

The Asia desk in our State Department so manipulated our military and fiscal aid since 1944 to China as to defeat her. She was one of the Big Four powers, one most honorably recognized by all for holding Japan in World War II. It was our own variety of Communist infiltration that helped to put the Red Communists in control of the mainland of China. This was contrary to the United States treaty obligations and our historic policy toward China. It opened the way for Russia to go through China to Burma for food—where she has wanted to go for a century. Only Japan stopped her. And now we have so completely destroyed Japan and Nationalist Free China that there is no organized resistance except, strangely enough, on Korea. We have reason for suspecting that our own infiltration manipulated that, too.

But it has boomeranged. It woke up the American people. They now persist, in increasing numbers, to ask—

First. Why the administration does not clean out the Communists in our midst so they cannot continue to influence military and political decisions

Second. Why do we not help with arms and planes and ships and know-how and with psychological warfare the free forces in China? "Why do not we help Chiang?" is asked a million times. Nobody answers.

Third. Why do we not help the free elements in Europe willing to fight like Chiang, in the same way?

Fourth. Since Europe has 250,000,000 population and greater productive capacity than she had before World War II, why does the President, in his message, now propose that the United States taxpayers pay 90 percent of the total Western World defense costs?

Fifth. Why do we not organize all the free elements in all countries in spite of all the infiltrated governments to strike the Bear by air and sea power, so as to destroy or greatly cripple him where he is? Why not strike his vital bridges and dams and railroads? There are only a few of them. His oil field? There is but one. And his factories for mass armed aggression? There are not too many of them and we know where they are.

Sixth. And why do we not send private and military and religious groups with ideas of freedom and means of liberation behind the iron curtain? Then the oppressed people themselves will help to overcome our common oppressors. We must unite the free people for action. They alone will throw off communism in their midst, in each country, in a kind of united action. Communist-infiltrated governments in each nation will never win again a mass action war against each other. Instead they will destroy each other.

Reducing the Federal Wasteline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD, an address which was given by the Most Reverend John J. Wright, D. D., bishop of Worcester, Mass., on November 3, 1950, over station WEEI, in Boston, Mass.

This address, entitled "Reducing the Federal Wasteline," endorses the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which I wholeheartedly approve, and I believe that Bishop Wright's message should be brought to the attention of all our citizens:

REDUCING THE FEDERAL WASTELINE

(By Rev. John J. Wright, D. D.)

Colonel SHERMAN. When the bipartisan Hoover Report was completed and submitted to Congress, Mr. Hoover said: "The burden now shifts from the shoulders of the Commission to the citizens themselves who must undertake a real and continuing responsibility." Under our form of government this transmission of responsibility from the Commission that made this monumental study of our Federal Government, to the shoulders of the citizens themselves—under our form of government—this was a very appropriate charge or challenge and all over the land this challenge has been met and the responsibility is being accepted by thousands of Americans who are interested in a more responsive and responsible Government. One of the best-loved citizens of our Commonwealth has graciously consented to help us by giving us a few words of encouragement on this subject of responsibility. I am honored to introduce to you folks his excellency, John J. Wright, bishop of Worcester.

Bishop WRIGHT. Thank you, Colonel Sherman. The Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report comprises a group of public-spirited citizens who are anxious to alert themselves and their neighbors to the need for regulating government if government is not to regulate us. They have suggested that you would welcome a radio talk on the moral philosophy behind this important report, a report prepared under the leadership of a distinguished American, ex-President Herbert Hoover. The Committee is in an excellent moral position to ask the cooperation of us all in behalf of their effort. First of all, they represent every segment of the community—they are non-partisan. Like the Hoover report itself, the local committee has been endorsed by members of every responsible American party. Speakers of every political persuasion have already appeared on this program. Their intent is in the public interest. Their principal desire is that citizens read, study and understand this authoritative survey of the growth of government administration in America, and of the possibility of curtailing the staggering costs of civil administration. Behind the Hoover report there is a well-defined philosophy, and that philosophy lies also behind the appeal of the Massachusetts Committee to our citizens. This philosophy is what some of us like to call "the philosophy of responsibility." In terms of the problem of increasingly costly and increasingly complex government, that philosophy takes the form of the contention that in a republic every citizen, however humble or obscure, bears his share of responsibility for government—for what government is empowered to do; for what government actually does; for what government costs; what government fails to accomplish.

The philosophy of responsibility, whether as applied to individual citizens or as applied to government itself, is beginning to emerge from a period of eclipse. For a generation or so, the philosophy of responsibility had lost something of its force, certainly in social thinking and, to a great extent, in political theory. There had always been a temptation among men to shuffle off accountability for failure or for incompetency in the face of complicated problems. Shakespeare described and refuted it when he said: "This is the excellent foppery of the world, that, when we are sick in fortune, often the surfeit of our own behavior, we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars: as if we were villians by necessity; fools by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves, and treachers, by spherical predominance; drunkards, liars, and adulterers, by an enforced obedience of planetary influence." But "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings." (Lear and Julius Caesar.)

The philosophy of responsibility, in modern times, has further suffered from the impersonal collectivist theories of society and of the state which have found favor during and since the last century, chiefly, of course, in the completely totalitarian regimes, but in some measure in every modern state. These linked human action more often to material forces, to group controls, rather than to spiritual personality, to individual responsibility, moral or civic. An earlier generation of devout and God-fearing people had recognized, for example, that there is a challenge in some environments and that there are limitations imposed by some heredities, but they still acknowledged that the generality of men remain free despite their environment, despite their heredity—free to change their environment and to improve the results of their heredity. But, more recently, social theory has followed new lines along which it has attempted to lead legal theory and political application. As against the old philosophy of responsibility, there has grown up the theory that misconduct is always abnormal, that what the law calls crime and what conscience calls sin are to be explained largely in terms of causes beyond the control of the sinner or the criminal. In political life, in the collective life of the civil community, this has taken the form of the frequent assertion that problems of expense, bureaucracy, and complication of government are beyond the understanding, let alone the control, of individual citizens, and that we are hopelessly engulfed in circumstances we cannot change.

The philosophy of responsibility, then, has been replaced by the philosophy of excuse, the philosophy of "what can we do about it" or "let George do it," which is the theory of ultimate irresponsibility. This loose philosophy has played particular havoc in the wildfire spread of government bureaus and the decline of individual responsibility on the part of private citizens. For more than a generation it has undermined the moral and legal and individual social responsibilities, upon which the stability of society must repose. Now, at any rate, it seems at long last to be coming out of its eclipse.

It is certainly good for civilization that the philosophy of responsibility should be reaffirmed and that the philosophy of excuse should be subordinated to it, cut down to size. Civilization was not achieved by any such philosophy as that of excuse, by any vagueness about accountability or about debts and how to meet them. Mankind did not emerge from recurring periods of social decline and even savagery by any such formula. Social progress has not been accomplished by swinging along with impersonal destinies, by riding the wave of the future, or by the blind operation of uncontrolled, biological, economic, or political forces. It has been achieved by the vision and determination, by the self-knowledge, self-discipline, and responsible action of single individuals and of individuals in groups who had not become cogs in the machinery of any group, including the state, but who retained a sense of the central importance under God of individual responsibility, individual personality—people who have been prepared to say, "I know what I am doing, I will change what needs to be changed, I am now beginning to do it."

This was the spirit of men like Lincoln. Lincoln did not call upon the state or any undefined political set-up to advance the American vision; he called upon the American people to do so, by individual self-dedication. "It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us: that from these honored dead, we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; and that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth." (Gettysburg Address, Lincoln.)

It was in this spirit that a great archbishop of my own church spoke in a generation which was more conscious of individual responsibility and of how even poverty, so long as we are free, is to be preferred to the riches of golden prisons. Archbishop Spaulding said: "Poverty is the north wind that lashes men into vikings. * * * What we call evils, as poverty, neglect, and suffering, are, if we are wise, opportunities for good. * * * If I am left alone, yet God and all the heroic dead are with me still. If a great city is my dwelling place, superficial life of noise and haste shall teach me how blessed a thing it is to live within the company of true thought and high resolves. Whatever can help me to think and love, whatever can give me strength and patience, whatever can make me humble and serviceable, though it be a trifle as light as air, is opportunity, whose whim it is to hide in unconsidered things, in chance acquaintances and casual speech, the falling of an apple, in floating weeds, or the accidental explosion in a chemist's mortar." (Opportunity, John Lancaster Spaulding.)

It is very easy for our generation, which has so many things done for it, to laugh at these valiant concepts of an age which had to do more things for itself, an age which was therefore more resourceful, more self-reliant, more imbued with the philosophy of responsibility, contemptuous of the philosophy of excuse. The whole history of human achievement gives meaning to the rhetoric of that generation and a test to the worth of those who indulged it, who taught their children and told their fellow citizens and trained themselves to recognize that they need not tolerate evil, that they can change things when these things become burdensome or become productive of evil. And so in our legislation, in our courts, in our social and political theory, we must recognize and make allowance for inadequacies, for unfortunate circumstances, but we must not place emphasis on excuse. We must always seek the affirmation of responsibility, of accountability. We must state the rules, rather than constantly find reasons why they do not apply.

We must recognize that the philosophy of responsibility enabled boys with withered legs to become useful citizens, leaders of their communities and masters of themselves—while the philosophy of excuse allows real intelligence and potential leadership to become instruments of society's confusion and our complete loss. Woodrow Wilson once said some wise things about the relationship of self-government to the kind of character produced by the philosophy of responsibility. He said: "Self-government is not a mere form of institution, to be had when desired. * * * It is a form of character that follows on the long discipline which gives a people self-possession, self-mastery, a habit of order and common counsel, a reverence for law which will not fail when they themselves become the makers of the law."

The Hoover report is in the spirit of that philosophy.

Colonel SHERMAN. I think you folks will agree that we have just received a splendid and inspiring message which should encourage us all to discard the philosophy of excuse which is so certain to breed indifference and apathy and accept in its place, a positive and militant participation in government on all levels, for we are bound to have as bad government as we will tolerate or as good goverment as we demand.

Our Skyrocketing Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I have caused to be reprinted here, from the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette, sums quite well the thinking of the people of Iowa on the subject of spending and taxes.

I would like to comment on one paragraph of this editorial in which Mr. W. Earl Hall, the writer, says this:

So far as our armed services are concerned, Representatives and Senators will be disposed to go along with those charged with this (military) responsibility. They won't quibble.

There is no question but what Congress will deal liberally with the military in the matter of appropriations for building the armed strength of this country. But I am one of those in Congress who insists that spending for defense is no more sacred than for items of nondefense; that the taxpayers are entitled to a dollar's worth of value for every dollar expended on the military. I have not forgotten that in four fiscal years immediately following World War II approximately $50,000,000,000 was appropriated supposedly to build and maintain the Military Establishment of this Nation. But when war broke in Korea, Members of Congress and the citizens of this country were appalled to learn that only about $8,500,000,000 of the $50,000,000,000 actually went into the development of a fighting machine.

In the light of this most recent experience Congress has the responsibility to keep a close check on all expenditures by the military.

Following is the editorial from the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette:

NO HITCHHIKERS, PLEASE—ON HIGHWAYS OR IN BUDGET

While the remotest precincts of public opinion haven't been heard from as yet, there has been a reaction to the President's budget message as augurs some close scrutiny of the fiscal program in the weeks and months ahead.

Expenditures amounting to $71,000,000,000 a year were proposed, with the bulk going for military services and foreign programs designed to add to the military strength of our allies.

So far as our own armed services are concerned, Representatives and Senators will be disposed to go along with those charged with this responsibility. They won't quibble.

On the question of aid to our allies, and what form it shall take, there will be some sharp debate based on some marked differences of viewpoint. But in the end, we won't be penurious.

It's on the domestic proposals calling for astronomical spending that Congress is going to bow its back. While not stressed, they're still recognizable as Fair Deal measures.

Our reference is to such things as the Brannan plan, the ghost of which supposedly was laid last November.

Likewise to public housing for so-called low-income groups, which can mean anything the bureaucrats want it to mean.

Likewise to Federal aid to education. Federal medical insurance—or socialized medicine to those more meticulous in their language.

These are not emergency measures. They're not a part of national defense. They were slipped into the President's budget message as camouflaged hitchhikers.

Highway thumb-twitchers are extremely unpopular at this moment. We've had tragic evidence that they are dangerous. Hitchhikers in a Federal budget need to be just as suspected and just as much scrutinized.

The budget called for a tax increase of $16,456,000,000. That's more than twice as much as the two last tax boosts and if adopted will send the Federal tax load to 27 percent of the national income.

And that's all right with us, and with the average American, we believe if there's assurance that spending for everything other than national defense in a perilous time has been cut to the bone.

Frankly, Congress doesn't think it has. And neither do we.

Roosevelt Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a distinguished American scholar, Archibald MacLeish, delivered a very important and inspiring address at the Roosevelt Day dinner held in Washington under the auspices of Americans for Democratic Action, last Friday, January 26, 1951.

Mr. MacLeish pointed to the failure of the American people and their leaders to grasp the true implications of the great social and economic upheaval which is gripping the world today. He noted the great strength of America which only a few years ago, under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, enabled our country to meet the most serious economic collapse and depression in our history. He told how we in America had met the threat of communism in the thirties by correcting the evils and pitfalls which had developed in our economy, and how we had proved that the alternative to economic slavery need not be political slavery. He said that merely to be against communism is not offensive, and pointed to the true course our country should pursue to meet the threat of communism and Soviet imperialism in the world today.

I ask unanimous consent that this able and inspiring address of Mr. MacLeish may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This day and the name that goes with it carry the mind back. They put the past beside the present. They ask hard questions of us.

There cannot be many here who do not remember what this country and this city were like 6 years ago today, when the name was still the name of a living man. Certainly there can be very few, here or elsewhere, who do not in their minds compare this city and this country as they are with what they were when Franklin Roosevelt was alive.

Six years ago, in the month of January, the United States was the greatest power in the world; materially speaking, the greatest power the world had ever seen. Its Armed Forces and the armed forces of its allies were fighting two wars on opposite sides of the earth against the two principal military nations of the age and were on the point of victory in one and within months of ultimate triumph in the other. In both these wars this Republic had provided far the greater part of the arms and munitions. It had provided the decisive manpower, the strategic plan, and the overriding purpose. It had demonstrated a productivity, an inventiveness, a force of will, a mastery of its situation and itself without precedent in the history of self-governing peoples or, indeed, of any people whatever.

Six years ago, in this city and throughout the United States, whatever the fortunes of the war on either front, men were joined in a common determination which they recognized and which expressed itself in action. They were allied with peoples elsewhere in a common cause which had not only military victory but lasting peace as end and aim. They believed in themselves and in the future.

Today they believe, it seems, in neither. Today, their victory scarcely won, the American people are being told by officials in Washington and journalists everywhere that they face a new world war—not, this time, for the achievement of a purpose of their own, but for the naked right to go on living—to survive. They are being told this, and they are listening. Bewildered and angry though they may be, they are listening. And, listening, they are coming to believe.

The question this day asks us—this day and the name that goes with it—the question this day asks is: Why? Why are we listening? Why are we coming to believe this? What has happened to us?

Well—what has?

The answer, if you read the run of the American press, is Russia. A nation which was our ally in the war, a nation which our productivity and the intervention of our arms saved from disaster, has, since the war's end, turned upon us, violated her commitments to us, poisoned the minds of nations and of continents against us, and openly confessed a purpose to destroy us if she can.

It is true that Russia has done all this. One would have to go back to the history of the petty principalities of the Quattrocento to find a parallel to the duplicity, the cynicism, the brutality, the pompous arrogance of the rulers of the Russian people. But all this, much as it is, is still no answer to the question. Russia was a Communist country in 1945 committed to the Communist dogma of the inevitability of the collapse of such an economy as ours. She was also a populous country with enormous armies in the field. And yet we did not fear her then. We did not think that if it came to war with Russia our struggle would be a struggle to survive. We knew the Marxist dogmas: They did not frighten us. Like Keats, who had the axioms of philosophy in mind, we thought the axioms of history are not true until they are proved upon the pulses, and our pulses did not prove the truth of Marx and Engels. No freeman's pulses ever will.

Russia has changed, of course, in these 6 years. Russia has grown impatient with the timetable of Professor Marx's domesticated Fate and has expedited it where she could by conspiracy and fraud and murder and the intervention of the political police. But she has not changed to something other than she was. She is still the nation we knew 6 years ago. And she is no more our potential master now than she was when the productivity of our people and the skill of our technicians kept her armies in the field and her planes in the air.

What then has changed if it is not Russia? Communism? Is it the capture of the Chinese government by Communists and the pressure of Communist propaganda and armed bands upon the peoples of southeast Asia which persuades us that we have now no choice but to stand with our backs against the wall?

It is true that the Government of China is Communist: That the most populous country in the world, having thrown off a corrupt, reactionary and brutal regime, has turned, not to self-government and individual freedom, but to Government by propaganda and the state police. But tragic as that development is for all who value civilization and freedom, it does not mean that the experience of the 6 years just past has demonstrated the truth of the Marxist dialectic or proved the inevitability of Communist domination of the earth.

On the contrary, the experience of the past 6 years has proved the opposite. It has

proved in France and throughout Western Europe that if communism is opposed by the weapons appropriate to the struggle against communism—by economic and social opportunity rather than by the bombs and bayonets the Republican adolescents would apply to the ills of Asia—communism cannot score its victories of desperation. If the last 6 years have demonstrated anything, they have demonstrated that the Marxist destiny, unlike the destiny the Greeks knew, is not inescapable when men of courage and resource make up their minds to fight it.

Only those who continue obstinately and childishly to regard the crisis in which we live as a military crisis to be won or lost by military weapons can fail to read the vast significance of that victory to which we give the wholly deceptive title of economic aid to Europe. When the history of our time is written, if we keep our courage long enough to leave a history, the battle fought in Western Europe with food and credits and materials, under the name of George Marshall and on lines laid down by the present Secretary of State, may well prove to have been one of the decisive battles of mankind.

No, it is not the irresistible spread of communism over the earth, or some Phoenix change in Russia, which has altered us in 6 years' time from a people who believed the future was our future to a people who talk of fighting for survival. And neither is it the shock of the Korean War and the discovery that Asiatic soldiers are men like any others. Only the old China hands of the Shanghai bars and the Senate lobbies ever doubted that they were.

The real change as always is neither in our stars nor in our enemies but in ourselves. It is not that Russia is all at once ten times more dangerous but that we see her so. It is not that the Marxist dialectic has proved the inevitability of its triumph, but that we do not believe, as we once did, in the inevitable triumph of the dialectic of freedom.

If we really wish to understand the difference between the Republic of this day and year and the Republic of the same day 6 years back, it is that alteration, the alteration in ourselves, we will examine. It is not, I think, a difficult alteration to measure. The difference is not Joe McCarthy or Herbert Hoover or Robert Taft or any of the rest of the timid or calculating men who have succumbed to fear in themselves or exploited fear in others for their partisan or personal advantage. Timidity is not an American characteristic—as those who attempt to live by it politically will learn. We are not afraid of Russia. We are not afraid of communism. We are not even afraid of those gastric and imaginary terrors which frighten the Senator from Wisconsin until every face he sees beneath the bed of his political ambition is Communist. McCARTHY has done incalculable damage to the tradition of decency and truthfulness and mutual respect upon which a free and self-governing society must rest—upon which this society had rested for 160 years before his time—but McCARTHY is not the author of the decay in American confidence. On the contrary, it is the decay in American confidence which made McCARTHY possible. Only a people who found themselves, 6 years after their greatest triumph, contemplating the possibility of disaster, and unable to account for the deterioration of their fortunes, would give a moment's thought to reckless and irresponsible accusations made without evidence and offered without proof.

The real reason for the change in the American situation is something considerably more fundamental even than the decay of a political morality. The difference between the United States in 1951 and the United States in 1945 is a difference in the Nation itself, in the inward being of the Nation, in the sense of purpose and direction which gives vitality and confidence to a life whether it be the life of a single human being or a nation.

Six years ago, and for a decade and more before that, the people of the United States had a common and a creative purpose. In the years of the war that purpose, made articulate and comprehensible by Franklin Roosevelt, was a purpose not merely to frustrate the designs of the dictators but to establish a new order of peace and freedom throughout the world—freedom to think, freedom to worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear. Prior to the war, in the decade of the thirties, the national purpose—the purpose at least of a great majority of the people of the country—was a purpose not merely to pull ourselves out of the last and worst of our business depressions but to create a society in which men could continue to live as men in dignity and freedom without paying the recurrent price of unemployment and the ultimate price of unemployability; a society which would demonstrate to mankind that free institutions and the practice of self-government are not impotent to deal with the problems of an industrialized world; a society which would prove that the alternative to economic slavery need not be political slavery, and that a free and responsible human being, thinking and acting for himself, is still a wiser governor of a nation than all the bureaus of the state police.

No one who was alive in this city 6 years ago or 16 years ago—no one who was conscious of the Republic in the months before the San Francisco Conference or the months of the emergence of the concept of the New Deal—can doubt, however cynical and sick he may be now, that these purposes were then alive and vigorous in the country, and that the confidence of the country in itself and in its future rested directly upon the universal recognition of the will to act. No one who is conscious of this city and this country today can doubt, either, that these purposes no longer shape our minds, and that our loss of confidence in our future and in ourselves, our desperate talk of struggle for survival, reflect that hollow emptiness at the heart.

Certainly our foreign policy reflects it. We liberals have harsh and often just things to say of that policy. We condemn its defensiveness, its dependence upon the Russian initiative, its reliance upon the concept of containment. Who, we say, can imagine the word "containment" in Roosevelt's mouth? But for all our scorn we know, or ought to know, that the defensiveness of our foreign policy is dictated not by the mentality of the Department of State but by the mentality of the country. The basic orientation of a foreign policy is inevitably determined by the orientation of domestic opinion. If a people thinks defensively about its life at home its foreign policy will necessarily be defensive. If the people of the United States fix their minds upon the preservation of something called their way of life, meaning the way they imagine they now live, or the way they like to think they lived before, their foreign policy will be directed to the preservation of the status quo elsewhere in the world or even to the restoration of some earlier and vanished status. By the same sign and for the same reason, if the people of the United States should again fix their minds upon the realization of a new and richer life for themselves and for the world, their foreign policy would inevitably become positive and vigorous as the policies of creative and purposeful countries always are.

The truth is that the place to remedy an unsatisfactory foreign policy is not in Formosa or Western Germany but at home. Until the country recovers a sense of national purpose within itself, until it shapes again its national will, its foreign policy must continue to be defensive and Russia must be left the initiative she has held since the war's end. Those who contend the opposite, those who argue that war considerations of American ends, American aims, must wait upon the realization of our aims abroad, and, above all, upon the awaking of this country for defense, delude themselves. Their assumption is unsound and the argument they derive from it is inconclusive.

The assumption supposes that the continuing crisis which afflicts our world is primarily a military crisis and the argument insists that in time of military crisis the unity of parties and opinions is the first objective of policy which must be secured at any cost. A national program within the United States aimed at the realization of American ends—freedom, economic as well as political; equality of opportunity and equality before the law—would, it is argued, divide the country, alienate powerful groups and leave us helpless before our enemies.

The assumption, however, supposes what is not true. The struggle in which we are engaged is not primarily a military struggle. It is primarily a political struggle, a social struggle, which the Russians are waging on their side by conducting a social and political offensive against our institutions and ourselves in every quarter of the world. To trust solely to military means to defend ourselves against such an attack is to lose the war before the battles can be fought—and, it may well be, to expedite the very disaster we seek to prevent. Until we can mount a social and political offensive of our own we cannot successfully defend ourselves, let alone prevail. But an American social and political offensive cannot be mounted to influence the rest of mankind until the American people have committed themselves to its realization in their own country. Merely to be against communism is not an offensive. It is not even a policy. It is a confession of political bankruptcy and intellectual collapse.

As for the argument deriving from that assumption—the argument that unity is the first requirement in such a time as this, and that no price is too high to pay for it, the answer is simple. The answer is that there is a price too high to pay for unity, and a unity too dubious to purchase at any price. The price too high to pay is the price we are now paying in the United States—the price of spiritual impotence. The unity too dubious to purchase is the unity we have acquired in return—the unity of the reactionaries of both parties in a common intention to paralyze the great creative American tradition of liberalism leaving the Republic without purpose or direction—leaving the Republic without anything but the bare-bone determination to survive which these blind men tell us we must now accept in place of all our hopes, our pride, our self-confidence, our courage.

No; it is time and past time to face the realities of our situation in this Republic. Everything—our determination abroad, our courage and stamina in the face of the terrible trial which lies before us, our eventual victory in that trial—everything depends upon our undertaking the achievement, not in the millennium but now, not after the struggle is over but to make that the struggle may be won—everything depends upon our undertaking again the achievement of the American dream of a truly free, a truly democratic society; a society in which men shall be equal in opportunity, equal before the law, not in word only but in body; a society in which all men may share the security which is now the privilege of some men only; a society in which the immeasurable human resources of a great and intelligent people may be released for the creative labor which is the dignity of human life.

Until we undertake that task we shall not regain the sense of national purpose which is our present and fatal lack. Until we have accomplished some part at least of what we propose, we cannot recapture from the Communists the political and social initiative which we must have to win the struggle for the future.

People like ourselves, liberals in politics and life, have one common professional deformation. We are reluctant to act. We understand very well—far better than the dogmatists of the two extremes—the real nature of a given political situation. Indeed it is our characteristic quality so to understand, for a liberal is by nature a disinterested man, a man who is more concerned with the human truth than with the partisan advantage of some preconceived opinion. But precisely because we see more clearly what must be done we are more reluctant, or so it seems, to do it. In the present critical situation of our country that weakness becomes something more than weakness. It becomes a kind of treason to our country and ourselves.

On this day and in this place we will do well, all of us, to remember that there was one liberal, the greatest of them all, who could not only understand what needed to be done but do it. There was one liberal who could act.

"The responsible man, death's hand upon
his shoulder,
Knowing well the liars may prevail
And calumny bring all his days to nothing;
Knowing truth has often been betrayed
By time that keeps it, as the crock taints
water;
Knowing nothing suffered or endured
Will change by one word what the worst
will say,
What those who listen to the worst believe—
The responsible man: teeth bad: sleep
Difficult: tired, tired, tired, to the heart:
Carries the day to the next day to the next:
Does what must be done: dies in his chair
Fagged out, worn down, sick
With the weight of his own bones, the task
finished,
The war won, the victory assured,
The glory left behind him for the others.
(And the wheels roll up through the night
in the sweet land
In the cool air in the spring between the
lanterns.)"

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, Before Executives Club of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered to the Executives Club of Chicago in Chicago, Ill., on January 26, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to come here again to speak to the Executives Club and to this magnificent audience. I still feel apologetic for the time that I had to cancel a speech here, but I remember that JOHN BUCHAN was kind enough to come and make a better speech than I could have made. I shall always be grateful to your members and to many other citizens of Illinois who gave me such enthusiastic support in my recent campaign in Ohio. Sometimes I thought that the people of Illinois were almost more interested in my success than the people of Ohio, but the final results in Ohio certainly question the wisdom of that judgment.

The victory of Senator DIRKSEN, in Illinois, and my own victory in Ohio showed that the people of this country still believe in sound, conservative, American principles of government; that they are willing to put the public interest ahead of any supposed class interest; and that they will listen to the arguments presented for a progressive program within principles of liberty and justice on their merits if they are clearly and forcibly presented. We can beat Santa Claus. The people in the great Middle West do not believe in socialism. While they respect the value of labor unions, they do not propose to let the bosses of labor unions dictate to the people as to whom they shall choose as their representatives in Congress.

But perhaps more than anything else these elections showed that the people had come to a complete lack of confidence in the foreign policy of the administration. I pointed out in every county in the State of Ohio the reason for the present dangerous situation in which we find ourselves. The leaders of our Nation were blind to the possible threat of communism to this country after the war was over. Hopkins and Harriman at Yalta seemed to feel that communism after all was a pretty good thing, even if we did not want it exactly in the form in which Russia had it. Nevertheless they accepted the idea that Russian communism was in fact democracy, when it actually denied every principle of American government. How far this was the result of the deliberate Communist infiltration into our Government, of which we are now aware, it is difficult to say, but its influence was evident. Our leaders blindly accepted the promises of Soviet Russia when Stalin had never kept a promise. They set Russia up in central Europe, in Berlin and Prague and Vienna, when as a matter of fact our troops could have captured both Prague and Berlin long before the Russians ever got there. We let them write the ticket for the Russian zone in Germany, which stretches half way from the Elbe to the Rhine, and gives them a predominating military position in central Germany. We did not even reserve a right-of-way to our zone in Berlin. We gave them a dominating position in Manchuria contrary to every honorable obligation to Chiang Kai-shek, who had fought the Japanese for years, and contrary to every principle of American policy since John Hay inaugurated the program of the open door in China. We gave Russia Japan's position in Manchuria, though we had gone to war because of Japan's aggression in China. For some years after the war this administration promoted the theory that the Chinese Communists were only agrarian reformers, and sent General Marshall to China to force Chiang Kai-shek to take them into his cabinet. When Chiang refused we cut off his supplies and ammunition at the most crucial moment and certainly were partially responsible for the defeat which he suffered at the hands of the Communists. Our policy invited the attack in Korea while we failed to arm the South Koreans. It is not strange that the people, seeing the fatal results of the foreign policy of this administration, have no longer any faith or confidence in its judgment or ability.

At the present time, because of that policy, we face the most serious external threat to its security and peace which this country has ever faced. I see now no alternative except to build up sufficiently large military forces so that we may be secure against any military aggression that the Russians may have under consideration. All the problems of this Eighty-second Congress depend very largely upon the decision which we make as to the size and character of the military forces that must be built up to meet the Communist threat which this administration itself has so largely created.

On January 15 I reviewed the foreign situation on the floor of the Senate and stated affirmatively the policy which I thought this country ought to adopt. It seems to me that we should develop the greatest and most powerful air force in the world so that we may dominate the air over this country, over the oceans that surround this country, and over as much of the rest of the world as we can. We should have air bases at strategic points in the world where they cannot be easily attacked. We have the largest navy in the world and we should be certain that we have complete control of both sea and air. These are the fields in which we can be supreme without unduly burdening the whole economy of the United States.

My proposal is no withdrawal to the American Continent. It is the establishment of a bastion throughout the world within a reasonable distance by air of every country in the world. Such a control gives us communication to all lands. It gives us access to all raw materials. It makes it possible for us to make bombing raids to all parts of the world against any nation which chooses to begin a war. It should enable us to defend everything in the way of islands or island nations that desire our aid. It should enable us to put land troops ashore in many places where we can successfully aid in protecting a strategic position such as the Isthmus of Suez or the Malayan Peninsula. It enables us to furnish arms assistance and even land troops if at any time such assistance seems to promise success to any country trying to defend itself against an unlawful aggressor and if at that time we consider such aid in our national interest.

Today we have a superiority in the air and on the sea, but it is not at all clear that that superiority is complete. There should be no doubt about our ability to defend Japan, for instance, or Formosa, from an attack across a hundred miles of open water, but unless we give unremitting attention to the job it is not at all clear that we are able to achieve even such a defense of friendly island nations.

I think it is clear that we cannot hope in time of peace to dominate the entire world on land as well as on the sea. Of course, we have to have a land army for many purposes. We have to have a land army to protect the United States, Alaska, and our air bases, and for use in many special situations, but I do not believe we can hope to build up an army, certainly in time of peace, which can overwhelm the millions that Soviet Russia and Soviet China may be able to bring against us. No one will accuse Walter Lippmann of being an isolationist, but he says in the Atlantic Monthly, out today:

"We and our neighbors in North America are outnumbered. We must take this truth to heart. We must write it on the walls of our council chambers. We must never forget it. The Communist coalition can raise more soldiers than we or our allies can ever have. These soldiers have weapons which on any battlefield in Eurasia are quite deadly enough to kill. Any policy which compels us to fight them, as we are fighting them in Korea now—across an ocean, within walking

distance of their own inexhaustible reserves, on terms of battle in which they are forever incalculably superior—cannot be anything but what it has turned out to be; a bloody entanglement."

I made my speech on January 5 partly because it seemed to me that the administration was tending more and more toward the theory that a third world war was finally going to be fought on the continent of Europe, and that a huge land army must be the principal concern of our military policy. I have been encouraged in recent weeks, however, by the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff seem to have accepted to a large extent the sea and air philosophy. I note that the more recent requests for manpower include about a million men in the Air Force, about 900,000 men in the Navy and Marines, and only 1,400,000 men—amounting to approximately 27 divisions—in the land army. They have come to recognize that this country in time of peace cannot be expected to support an unlimited army on land which, after all, is the most expensive of all forms of armed forces. They have apparently rejected Senator DOUGLAS' proposal that we put 6,000,000 men under arms, and Governor Dewey's proposal that we have a hundred divisions.

Even the army that is proposed seems to me somewhat too large and it will be a tremendous burden on the people of the United States. It will probably require 2 years' military service from every boy in this country. It will require a burden of taxation which will mean a substantial cut in the standard of living of practically every American. It means, at least for several years, price control and wage control. Nevertheless, I think it is within our financial means if we are prepared to make the sacrifice; and I do not regard it as beyond reason. But surely if we are going to have to have an army of this size for 5 to 10 years, the whole Military Establishment must be compelled to run on a more economical basis than it does today. Furthermore, if the tax burden is to be supportable there must be a substantial cut in nondefense expenditures. There is no excuse for the budget submitted by the President. Not only are the cuts negligible, but many Fair Deal ideas are added.

The greatest military question which remains in dispute is the proposed committing of American troops to the continent of Europe. I don't think most people understand the novel and radical nature of the proposal which has been made. Under the Atlantic Pact we undertook to join with 10 other nations to develop our individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack, presumably from Russia, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid. We also agreed that if an armed attack is made against any one of the parties to the pact, it shall be considered as an attack against them all, and that we will assist the party attacked by taking such action as we deem necessary including the use of armed force. I voted against the pact because I believed that it committed us to the giving of arms aid to European countries, and the building up of a coordinated European army.

Since we entered into the treaty we are performing our obligation to give arms generously, though we were told, at the time the pact was passed, that this was to be merely a little assistance to enable them to complete their local defensive facilities, and the implementation bill only looked toward the expenditure of half a billion dollars a year. Now the total appropriations have amounted to more than five billion, and as much more is contemplated at once in the new budget.

But we were assured that the Atlantic Pact carried no obligation whatever to send American soldiers to Europe. Nevertheless, the President has proceeded without authority from Congress to make at least a conditional offer to provide such soldiers, and some kind of an agreement, perhaps conditional, may have been made at Brussels. The original pact required a definite plan of defense before any aid was given, but it is now much more than a year since that pact was passed and the European countries have never agreed upon a definite defensive plan.

I think it is perfectly clear that the President has no right to enter into an agreement with foreign countries to set up an international army and commit American troops in time of peace to such an army on foreign soil. Many cases have been cited where the President has sent troops to foreign countries to protect American lives or property, but in all our history there is nothing comparable to the setting up of such an army and commitment of troops as is here proposed. The President is Commander in Chief of the American Army, but he certainly cannot delegate his powers as Commander in Chief to a foreign officer. It happens at the present time that General Eisenhower is an American, but he derives his authority not from the United States, but from 11 nations, and he could be replaced by them.

The only comparable action with which I am familiar is that of a military force under the United Nations' Charter. In the Charter it is expressly provided that this force shall be determined by an agreement. In the Implementation Act it is required that the agreement specify the number and character of the troops to be supplied and the circumstances of the contribution, and that that agreement shall be approved by Congress before the President is authorized to furnish American troops to such an international army. No such agreement was ever made because of Russian opposition, and so the President acted wholly without authority in sending an American Army into Korea as I pointed out in the Senate 3 days later.

In the case of the Atlantic Treaty under article XI, it is clearly contemplated that action to implement the treaty shall be taken in accordance with the constitutional processes of each government. The Foreign Relations Committee itself stated in so many words that the treaty in no way affected the basic division of authority between the President and the Congress as defined in the Constitution. It answered the argument that required action by Congress might delay action by saying: "The expression of the will of a whole people offers far more certainty than any commitment by a dictator. The action of the democracies in the past great war is concrete evidence of their ability to act with the necessary speed in the event of an emergency."

I have been shocked by the vehemence with which those who are determined to send troops to Europe have rushed to the defense of the President's power in violation certainly of the spirit if not the words of the Constitution. Apparently they do not trust the people or the people's representatives, and they are afraid that if the decision is left to Congress it might possibly decide that they would rather keep our boys at home. But the issue is now, at least partly academic since a number of Senators, including Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, stated that whether there is a legal restriction on action by the President or not, he has no moral right to act in view of the assurances given Congress to make a commitment to send troops abroad without submitting the question to Congress. Senator DOUGLAS said in the Senate on January 15, "the national interest requires that a clear decision on the issue be reached by Congress in some express way. The constitutional powers of the Government are shared powers, and the issue is too important and the dangers to our survival too great for the Executive to act without positive approval of Congress." Therefore we are assured that a resolution will be submitted on the question of sending troops to Europe.

Senator WHERRY submitted a resolution providing that the President should send no troops abroad for the purposes of the Atlantic Pact until Congress had acted on the question. The WHERRY resolution did not attempt to pass in any way on the merits of the proposal, but only to hold things in status quo until Congress could act. When the President assured the Congress that they would have an opportunity to pass on the question, the WHERRY resolution became of less importance because it had clearly accomplished its principal purpose. Therefore, Senator WHERRY was willing to have it referred temporarily to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services jointly.

But I do not feel confident that the administration is really going to present a legislative resolution. I am very much concerned that they may only contemplate a Senate resolution expressing the views of the Senate that the President shall have the right to commit any number of troops to this international army in Europe. In that case we would have to call up again the WHERRY resolution. In my opinion, the kind of agreement that apparently is being contemplated with these foreign countries regarding this international army has all the dignity of a treaty. Strictly speaking, under the Constitution, it should be approved as a treaty by two-thirds of the Senate. It can be argued, however, that since the Atlantic Pact is already adopted as a treaty, a supplemental agreement made along the same general line, even though it extends to a field not provided for by the treaty itself could be approved by Congress by a majority of both Houses. I believe that we should insist at least on a joint resolution, which is an act of legislation. I believe further that any agreement which is made with the other pact countries should itself be submitted to Congress and that the Congress should say yes or no to that particular agreement. I believe further that Congress should impose some limitation on the number of soldiers who can be stationed on European soil in time of peace. It is quite true that in time of war the Commander in Chief of the Army has the right to run the war, and Congress should not interfere, but I don't think the Commander in Chief has the right to commit the entire Nation in advance as exactly the kind of war which is going to be fought, and I don't think he has the right to tie his own hands or those of his successor by obligations to station any particular number of troops abroad. The Constitution confers on Congress the right to raise and support armies and to declare war, and on the Senate the right to advise and consent to treaties with foreign nations. Unless we are prepared to abdicate these constitutional powers and make the President a complete dictator over foreign policy, Congress must insist on its right to decide the questions involved in the so-called Brussels agreement.

I have not reached a definite view as to the manner in which the limitation should be imposed, but roughly speaking it occurs to me that we might provide that there should not be stationed in Europe and in Great Britain more than some specified percentage of our land Army and of our air Force. This seems to me a more reasonable limitation than a particular number of divisions or a particular number of men. It must be remembered that we already have nearly two divisions in Germany. I would myself prefer to make peace with Germany

and withdrew all troops. That is the logical conclusion to the strategy which I have outlined. But we are in Germany. We have signed the Atlantic Pact and, therefore, as I stated in my speech on January 5, I will not object to committing a limited number of additional divisions, providing the Europeans really show an interest, assume the initiative, and provide altogether an army which has some reasonable chance of success in defending Western Europe against the Russians if and when it is completed.

If the administration submits a resolution in completely general terms with unlimited power to the President, then there will be submitted a substitute resolution along the general and limited lines which I have outlined. Incidentally, I have not changed my position one iota from the position I took in my first speech, in spite of a lot of misrepresentation in the press.

I have been opposed to sending an American army to Europe, and I believe it is strategically unsound. It is more likely to bring about war than it is to bring peace. The formation of a great international army in Germany on the border of the countries which Russia regards as buffer states is certainly likely to alarm the Russians. They are a suspicious people at best and no matter how defensive our intentions are, they will feel that such an army is a threat to the satellite countries, if not to Russia itself. It is all very well to say that it is to be merely a defensive army, but today no army can be merely defensive. This is a day of mobile warfare, and apparently either you push your enemy back, or you are pushed back by your enemy. The defensive army cannot hope merely to defend a Maginot line of bazookas. It must have the weapons to make affirmative movements into the Russian line. So the Russians may regard it as a threat, as they certainly do the arming of Germany.

If the Russians do not intend a military attack, it seems to me that this program is very likely to change their intentions. If they do contemplate a military attack, why would they wait 2 years or 3 years until this army of 60 or more divisions is actually in being? I have asked that question of many generals and others, and I have yet to receive a reasonable answer.

I believe in that feature of the Atlantic Pact which notifies Russia that if they attack Western Europe they will find themselves at war with the United States. I think that is a real deterrent against their beginning a war in Western Europe. They know that we have airplanes with the atomic bomb. Mr. Churchill has stated that that fact is the only thing that has actually deterred them from war, but I do not think they will be deterred from war by the gradual building of a great land army in Germany.

It is said that we cannot abandon Europe. No one is proposing to abandon Europe. We have given them more than $30,000,000,000 of economic aid since the war ended. We have thereby enable them to build up their production to a point 40 percent better than it was before the war. We have given them, and are prepared to give them, unlimited arms aid to build up their own armies. Under the program which I have suggested, there would be several divisions of American troops at the front in Europe at the beginning of any war to assure them of our real interest in their defense, and that would be doing a great deal more for them than they have done for us in Korea. In fact, in any war with Russia we would be doing probably 50 percent or more of the entire job. But I object to getting in so heavily that before we get through we find ourselves doing 90 percent of the job, as we have had to do it in Korea.

Furthermore, it is dangerous to our survival to build our entire military policy on the success of a great land war in Europe. It is a long way from the United States. The Russians can always outnumber us many times in manpower. If the Russians have the atomic bomb—and we are now spending $3,000,000,000 in this country to build air shelters on the theory that they have—then surely they could bomb all the European ports, could prevent the delivery of heavy supplies, and perhaps in the end might cut off our troops from any possible escape from Europe.

One of the arguments advanced by the Army is that it would be easier to get six divisions out of Europe than the two divisions that are there now. That certainly is a defeatist policy. But when we consider what one atomic bomb might have done to our Army at Hungnam, however, the commitment of a tremendous American Army to European soil under present conditions is a dangerous undertaking which might result in the greatest military disaster this country has ever faced. Hitler and Mussolini brought about the destruction of their countries by overestimating their strength and committing themselves to ventures which they were unable to carry out. We think of this country as having always won a war and being in fact impregnable, but a foolish foreign policy can bring about the same kind of destruction for us as it has for many other nations throughout history. Certainly we should have learned in Korea that the commitment of armies to continental warfare against nations with a tremendous excess in manpower is at best a tragic error. Our casualties in Korea are closely approaching the casualties in the entire First World War. With this lesson before us, it seems almost inconceivable that we would lay any tremendous emphasis on a similar action on the continent of Europe.

I do not say that if we should get into a war with Russia, we might not in the end decide to fight a land war. I only object to our committing ourselves at this time, and to the manner in which a third world war shall be fought. If there is one thing that seems certain, it is that the third world war will not be fought like the Second World War, but the program of many of our military officers seemed to be based on the theory that it is going to be a kind of combination of the First and Second World Wars. With an impregnable sea and air bastion, with a tremendous striking power of air, no one can be absolutely certain that war cannot be won from the air. Certainly, Japan surrendered without our having to land a single soldier on the shores of Japan. We cannot be certain today, and we must not tie our hands.

As far as Korea is concerned, if our allies have run out on us as apparently they have, it seems to me that we have no alternative except gradually to withdraw from Korea to a defensible position in Japan, Okinawa, and Formosa. I question the wisdom of beginning any kind of an all-out war with Communist China as long as our troops are in Korea in such a vulnerable position. Should Russia start a third world war tomorrow, we would indeed have a difficult time to extricate our troops from Korea. Once we have withdrawn those troops, we can release Chiang Kai-shek from the restraints we have imposed upon him, and it may be that he can create enough diversion to occupy the Chinese Communists in south China and perhaps prevent the threatened offensive against Indochina, Burma, and Siam. He has the power to impose at least a limited blockade on the shipment of supplies to Communist China. We need commit no American soldiers and should not. I doubt very much if under those circumstances Communist China would see fit to declare war with the United States, and invite our bombing and blockade. But certainly we would be able to shut off the military supplies which have been reaching them in the past from the United States.

In conclusion, I wish to impress upon you the importance of taking an active interest in foreign affairs and bringing to bear the views which you have upon the Members of the Congress of the United States. I believe this debate has already accomplished a tremendous change in the foreign and military policy of the administration.

First, we have established the principle that constructive criticism is no longer treason, and that debate itself is meritorious. Heretofore, anyone who even questioned the wisdom of the administration's foreign policy was denounced as one giving aid and comfort to the enemy, destroying the unity of the country and an isolationist. Certainly the editors of this country, and the people have come to realize that the only thing that really gives aid and comfort to the enemy is to adopt a foreign policy which plays into their hands as has our policy in the Far East. It is now respectable to present one's own views on foreign policy.

Second, we have obtained at least qualified admission that Congress has the right to speak on a question as important as the commitment of an American army to the continent of Europe. This right is only grudgingly admitted, and it is not yet clear whether Congress is only to be allowed to talk and not to act. Public opinion should be brought to bear for the principle of the Wherry resolution, and the limitation of the President's power to send troops abroad.

Third, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the administration have apparently accepted the theory that there should be a long-range limit placed upon the total of our Armed Forces, and that that limit should be within the reach of our power to support it over a period of years without serious damage to our economy. I think the limit is high, but I think that we can conceivably find the taxes to balance the budget, and therefore we can hope to avoid inflation and the further depreciation of the dollar.

Fourth, the general policy of appeasing the Chinese Communists has apparently been reversed, although I never feel completely confident of our State Department. It seems, however, that the administration is now definitely committed against the recognition of Communist China, against its admission into the United Nations, and in favor of the denouncing of China as an aggressor. There still seems an unwillingness to criticize the British in spite of the fact that the British are really the leaders in the movement to appease a ruthless and unquestioned aggressor against the United Nations itself.

Fifth, and last, there seems to be some hope that we may at long last achieve the purpose of acquiring a new Secretary of State.

The Religion of Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on the 14th day of January 1951, Dr. Francis P. Gaines, president of Washington and Lee University, was the guest speaker at the Washington Cathedral here in the city of Washington, and delivered an eloquent and inspiring message on the subject The Religion of Robert E. Lee.

This notable address, and the inspiring manner in which it was delivered by Dr. Gaines, who is a worthy successor to the great Robert E. Lee as president of this outstanding university, made a profound impression on all the hearers. I think the address is of real value to all the Members of the Congress and to the American people, and therefore ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RELIGION OF ROBERT E. LEE

(By Dr. Francis P. Gaines)

No one knows Robert E. Lee who does not know that his life was dominated by religion and protected by it. The religion of General Lee, however, does not easily lend itself to analysis. It was never a matter of ostentatious parade and it did not involve the mouthing of many words. It was central in his soul but it was among the sacred intimacies of that soul. We may surmise, if we will, that his religion was a venture of pure faith. It was not the product of his speculation. He did not build his creed from the painfully collected conclusions of his logic. He was not among those souls who grope for their belief. Rather, he might modestly have paraphrased the words of St. Paul in saying, casting away reasoning and all high things that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God, I bring every thought into captivity unto the obedience of Christ. And this matter of bringing every thought into captivity under Christ was the supreme business of Robert E. Lee; and religion was closer to him than breathing and nearer than hands and feet.

Although we may not scrutinize too closely the motivations or the quality of his faith, we are permitted, since he belongs to history, to observe some of the fruitage in the life of this religious man, fruitage for the summer's glory and fruitage for the autumn's richness and fruitage which the winter cannot kill.

It was religion, I am confident, for example, that made more sweet the hours of his tranquillity, that infused with a singular tenderness of joy all the domestic relations, all the circles of friendliness in his life.

I remember one of the most beautiful letters to a young daughter-in-law of whom he was particularly fond. He was far away from home and he wrote this lovely girl, who was to die young, a playful letter, a somewhat lengthy, playful letter, but he closed with these words: "I send you some sweet violets which I have gathered; they are all I have for you; I hope they may retain some fragrance until they reach you. My eyes plead for relief this holy day but my heart stretches towards you with all its strength and hushes in silence its yearning."

The words that caught my mind were those two words "holy day" because all of the human love, all of the warm reciprocity of affection of which General Lee was greatly capable, all of these things were as if enveloped in the atmosphere of a holy day. They were religion to him.

If I may swing the pendulum extremely to the other end of his emotions, I would call your attention to the fact that religion constrained him in the fiercest moment of his conflict. As far as I know, he was never as excited or as determined as when he made the invasion of the North; he knew that was a crisis, and he knew that if he could triumph there he would strike a mighty blow; but some of his men did not behave as he wanted them to behave and he rebuked them in that famous General Order No. 73; and the basis for his rebuke was this noble phrase: "The claim of Christianity is as strong upon us when we are in hostile territory as when we are in our own." Thus, says the Massachusetts historian, Mr. Bradford, Robert Lee could pour something of Christian charity even into that intolerable hell which is war.

It was religion, too, I believe—his imitation of Christ, that set him free from hatred, the corroding poison of our human lives. You remember the story told by Baltimore's lovely citizen, Miss Bond. It was a great season at the White Sulphur Springs when the Southern element was predominant, and General Lee was there the lion of the hour. There came a Northern general. He happened to be especially unpopular and there was an unspoken but unanimous movement to snub him; General Lee rose dramatically and conspicuously to welcome him and to extend to him the courtesy of his great soul. As he walked back from speaking to this man a Southern girl, rather, partisan and probably petulant, said to him, "But General, don't you hate that man?" And General Lee said, "As in the sight of God I think I can say that I have never hated a human being." Why didn't he hate? Because the Sermon on the Mount filled his heart so full he had no room for the unworthy emotions.

It was religion, too, that gave General Lee the one quality that all men everywhere concede to him. There may be debate as to his political wisdom, let us say, in making the decision that he had to make at the moment of his great dilemma, and I have even read comments, though not many, that raise the question as to his rights in the final lifting of military chieftains, but I have never seen one person who denied him one quality, and that was a forthrightness and a strength of character almost without parallel. It was religion that gave him that character. May I ask you to remember that I am not talking about character in its narrow interpretation, in its defensive aspects as a force merely to resist. I am speaking of character in the great affirmative reaches of its possibilities. The best definition I have ever heard of character, I heard when I was a college boy—given to me by one of my professors—and this is character as Robert Lee personified it. "Character," said my mentor, "is an inner force (please remember those two words) that enables one to carry out a worthy purpose after the mood in which that purpose was born has passed away." All of us, I presume, have the mood in which worthy purposes are born. A great voice challenges us to higher endeavor; some loveliness of song such as we heard today penetrates unsuspected depths of our hearts; the glory of a sunset or a quiet moment beside a grave which brings us some supernal vision of holiness; or the pitiless remorse of our own contritions distresses us and disciplines us and we are in the mood for a great resolution Whether or not we sustain that resolution depends on whether or not we have character; and in Lee's case he had character, perhaps to live more consistently in fulfillment of the purposes of his best moment than any human being I have ever studied. Every moment was his best moment because the inner force to which I ventured to bring emphasis a moment ago, constantly unfailing, the inner force in his life was God.

And now if I may approach the drama of his life, I remind you that it was religion that enabled him to triumph over the black and bitter circumstance. For as objectively as we might measure, General Lee's professional career was a failure, and it was a failure of first magnitude. He surrendered an army in an open field; and surrendering an army he lost the nation which had vested its hopes in the army and in him. He lost his position; he lost his profession; he had already lost his property; he had known, by the way, the heaviness of personal sorrow, in his family; and then he lost his citizenship and was to die 5 years later, technically, at least, a paroled prisoner of war. And yet he rose, not in defeat, but, let us say, from defeat and through defeat and because of defeat, to perhaps our greatest example of triumph over disaster. There are many philosophies from the fatalistic to the pagan order, on how we might meet our bitter circumstance. Many writers thinking of General Lee recall Kipling's four lines in his poem If, which someone has entitled the catalog of ideal impossibilities:

"If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again from the beginnings
And never say a word about your loss."

But Robert E. Lee was no gambler with destiny, risking everything he had upon the whimsy of a chance. Horace, whom he loved, because he read him in the original, has a line that I frequently quote to my boys—"et res mihi, non mi rebus, subtungere conor," which I might translate—"I try to get on top of circumstances and not let them get on top of me." And that's good philosophy. Marcus Aurelius, whom General Lee greatly admired, made a statement which was one of the favorites of General Lee, "Misfortune nobly borne is good fortune." Not that misfortune can be nobly borne nor that we can develop a callousness to fate or a stoical acceptance, but that misfortune nobly borne is transmuted into that which is good and enriching for us; that through misfortune we become greater people.

These were the great pagan philosophies for the mastery of defeat but none of those was the secret of General Lee's success. He could say, as his Master once said in a moment of what seemed to be his defeat, "I have overcome the world." And Lee could say that he had overcome this world because he walked ever in the radiance of another world.

And if that were the drama of his life, this chapter is the lesson of his life, and again it is religion. It was religion that gave him a tremendous mandate for simple usefulness. If we stop to remember the life histories of his colleagues after the great defeat, we recall that they followed many different courses. General Lee did not criticize that man who went with energy to recoup his shattered fortunes. General Lee did not criticize that man who gave his remaining years to writing books that would justify his conduct and rationalize his ideas. He did not criticize any of them but no one of them had his way. General Lee wanted to work. Not to desert his people in that adversity but to help them, he sought some privilege of service to his day and to his generation. He did not seek rest because he was tired; and he did not seek affluence because he was poor; and he did not seek good companionship because he was lonely. He sought not ease and comfort and compensation; he was no King Arthur in quest of Avalon that there he might heal him of his grievous wounds. When one of his closest friends remonstrated with General Lee as he was working too hard and was overtaxing his energies, General Lee said, "We must work." That was a brave, brisk, energetic remark, wasn't it? But it wasn't what General Lee said. I posed an erroneous statement, hoping you might see the difference. General Lee looked at this man, a great man himself, and he said, "We must work the works of Him that sent us while it is day for the night cometh when no man can work." And if you can discriminate between

a perfectly commendable statement, "We must work" and a divine statement on another plane, "We must work the works of Him that sent us * * *" you know something of how religion was the motive and the compulsion of this man's life; and he took a little struggling Virginia college, even as offer after offer poured in upon him, offers of immensely more money and immensely less labor, and there he influenced through bright boys that tomorrow he would not see. And there he loved his countrymen with never a word of unkindness, loved them into a kind of reconciliation. And there he died, unafraid, and went to his God.

That is the lesson of his life. If the great gray spirit could speak to those of us gathered in this holy church, he would say, this is no time, not when all human values are at stake, freedom, justice, and the very concept that we are children of the Heavenly Father, this is no time to seek our fortune or our profits for our convenience. We must work the works of Him that sent us while it is yet day.

I think the most significant of the Lee stories is the one with which Dr. Freeman close his long and brilliant study. It was very near the end of Lee's life and a young mother brought to him her baby boy and held him up in her hands as sometimes the great Jewish mothers held their babies before the high altar. And the young mother said eagerly to General Lee: "Tell him something; or tell me something to tell him that came from you." It is the tableau of that moment that impresses my imagination. There was a little assemblage of three, almost symbolic persons. The old man, incomparable victor of life, now in the twilight shadows (and perhaps somewhere trumpets were beginning to sound for him on the other side); the little baby boy unawakened, with the strange pilgrimage we call life entirely before him; and the eternal mother, coveting the best for her own. The tired and thoughtful old man looked at the baby and answered six words, and answered slowly. That reply would have no meaning to the cynic, or the materialist, or the opportunist who feels that the world owes him a living. But it is full of a radiant illumination for all of us who welcome opportunity and who are willing to bear the responsibility.

Said the general to the young mother: "Tell him he must deny himself."

Allocation and Prices of Meat Products and Other Related Subjects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report prepared for the National Independent Meat Packers Association by Mr. Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council.

Mr. President, the total estimated cost of printing this article will be $410, as estimated by the Public Printer. Notwithstanding the cost, I believe that because of its unusual importance it should be printed in the RECORD, I therefore submit my request.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. FREDERICK M. TOBIN,
Chairman, Special Steering Committee,
National Independent Meat Packers
Association, Rochester, N. Y.:

Subject: Allocation and Prices of Meat Products and Other Related Subjects.

In preparing this analysis at the request of Mr. C. B. Heinemann, president of your organization and Mr. Wilbur LaRoe, your counsel, I have tried to be objectively analytical. I realize fully that the livestock industry processes more tonnage of raw materials than all of our American factories added together and therefore is the most important factor in our national income and economic welfare.

My conclusions are based on facts available to all and even though they may not be in accord with some of the confused theories in regard to meat production, processing, distribution and the price levels that prevail, I feel that an examination of the tabulations used in making this report will prove the accuracy of my analysis.

I have at all times tried to be impartial to all the groups directly interested in the production and distribution of livestock and its products. In my report I have separated them into four groups—the farmer or producer, the packer as the processor, the wholesaler and retailer as middlemen, and the public as the consumer.

CURRENT CONFUSION

The passage of the bill to give the President control of allocations and the power to establish price ceilings on meat and other products, reflects the confusion of the American public. The demands for price ceilings are primarily the result of a failure to evaluate the effect of price changes in our economy in terms of the real cost of living or the relative earnings per hour as compared to the retail price of meat and other products.

Most of the American public has very little knowledge of the facts relative to the transition of hourly wages and price levels that have taken place.

Therefore highly publicized and too often erroneous theories lead the public to demand congressional action. Thus we find the public suddenly aroused and excited and everybody blaming everyone else though conditions are such that the producer, packer, retailer, and consumer are all getting an equivalent share of the income generated by livestock production.

ARE MEAT PRICES HIGH?

Whether meat prices are too high depends entirely how the question is analyzed. If compared to the wage and price level that prevailed in 1939, the answer is yes. But, if analyzed in terms of supplies, current hourly wages and present national income, the answer is no. There is no reason to theorize about it because the record is available for a definite comparison. I will use a simple illustration of a pound of round steak and the hourly wage and show the relative ability to buy in 1939 and 1949.

Year	Round steak—retail price in 51 large cities	Average hourly wage, all industries	Pounds of meat for an hour of work
	Cents per pound		
1939	46	$0.566	1.22
1948	65.3	1.40	1.64
1951 (June)	[1] 80	1.454	1.63

[1] Estimate.

This comparison shows that the average worker could buy more meat for an hour of work in 1949 and in June 1950 than he could in 1929. The meat consumption records bear this out on an annual basis. In 1929 the per capita consumption was 130.4 pounds, and in 1949 it was 143.8 pounds. The fairness of this comparison is based on the fact that in 1929 and 1949 the public spent 5.5 percent of its disposable income for meat. The question may be asked why I have used 1929 as a comparison rather than 1939. One of the reasons for our confusion is a comparison with 1935–1939 prices. During this period we averaged over 8,000,000 unemployed, and it is therefore not a normal period.

To enlarge on this relative change in prices without any increase in the real cost of living, I will show the shift from 1939 to 1948.

[Millions of dollars]

Year	Personal income all groups	Retail sales all goods	Total payrolls all labor less social security
1939	$72,600	$42,000	$45,700
1948	$209,500	$124,000	$135,000
Percent increase	190	195	195.3

A fair analysis of this tabulation leaves no doubt in regard to labor as a group receiving its fair share of the increase in national income. It also proves the price of goods at retail was not excessive in ratio to income available for goods and that retail sales volume in dollars lagged behind the increase in wages and national income totals.

NATURAL LAWS OF EXCHANGE

Unless the natural laws of exchange which exist in our economy regardless of legislation are taken into consideration, price ceilings can very easily penalize some group in our economic cycle and prevent the very production which is needed to supply the dollar demand from other sources.

The reason for these laws of exchange is entirely mathematical. The pay received by each group for goods or services is their ration of the national income and is the extent of their demand at the market place.

In our economy as a whole, we have a total of about 60,000,000 civilian workers. About 50,000,000 are on the payroll and the other 10,000,000 are the operators of business units which direct the production of goods and services. Of this 10,000,000 business operations about 6,000,000 are the individually owned and operated farms which produce 70 percent of all the raw materials used in our production cycle.

The wages paid out to the men on payroll represent a cost in the production of goods, but they also represent a market for goods in direct proportion. Thus we find the retail volume correlating in proportion to the payroll and the initial price for raw materials.

The same ratio holds true in expenditures for meat. In the 5-year period 1925–1929, the retail value of meat was quite constant in percentage of disposable income, averaging 5.66 percent. In the following period 1930–39, the retail value averaged 5.83 percent of the disposable income. During the first period 1925–29, we had prosperity and we had depression in 1930–39, yet the ratios were quite constant because of the laws of exchange which determine that the prices paid also total the demand for goods. Therefore with three times the national income in 1949 that we had in 1939, we could expect at least three times the expenditures for meat at retail.

Using this positive expenditure for meats and the laws of exchange which determine the balance between wage income and retail expenditures we can easily check the relative price of meats in 1939 and 1949. The index of disposable income in 1939 was 105 percent of 1935–39 as 100. In 1949 it

was 250 percent. Dividing the 105 into 250, we find that round steak could have sold for 236 percent of the 1939 price level. The average price in the United States in 51 leading cities in 1939 was 36 cents. Multiplying by 236 the result is $0.857 as compared to the price of $0.853 which was the actual figure in 1949.

OTHER RATIOS

The constant ratios extend to many other fields in the same manner. To properly understand their operation and the reason for their existence it is necessary that we have a complete picture of our economy.

The gross farm income, 50 percent of which is made up of livestock, dairy and poultry production, is the gear wheel of our economy. For 25 years each $1 of gross farm income has generated $7 of national income. And whenever the gross farm income has fallen off $1, it has set the stage for a reduction of $7 of national income.

The inflationary or deflationary spiral can be measured quite accurately with this seven times multiple of gross farm production. For example, as the value of the farm products increases at the source, each handling process through our economic cycle, draws out more dollars through capital funds or bank credits.

Rural territory, towns of 2,000 and under have 48 percent of our population. Their income or buying power is in direct proportion to the value of farm products and other raw materials.

Economists as a rule underestimate the importance of this market. The population of New York State spends 50 percent of its personal income for goods, as compared to an expenditure of 70 percent for goods at retail by the citizens of Iowa.

Because of this factor rural territory is roughly the market for 50 percent of factory production. As a direct corollary, factory payrolls (production workers) and gross farm income rise and fall in direct proportion.

For example, from 1929 to 1932 the gross farm income dropped about $7,000,000,000 and the national income dropped from $87,300,000,000 in 1929 to $39,600,000,000 in 1933, or a loss in national income of $47,700,000,000. What was the effect of lower farm prices on the consumer in the Nation as a whole? In 1929 the per capita consumption of meats was 130.4 pounds and in 1932 it was 130.2. The percentage of disposable income spent for meat was 5.5 percent in 1929 and 5.9 percent in 1932. The drop in livestock prices and the price of other farm products shut off the stream of national income and forced our buying power to drop in proportion.

To the reader of this report this conclusion may seem unwarranted. There will be those who say that wages come first or capital expenditures come first. It really doesn't make any difference. The important thing is that our national income does follow the gross farm income up or down at an interval of about 6 months.

This was clearly illustrated in the drop in farm prices from 1948 to 1949. Everybody hailed this drop in prices with glee, not realizing the effect on our national income. The gross farm income dropped approximately $3,000,000,000. In the President's economic report to Congress in January 1950 the report gives the national income level for the last quarter of 1948 as $235,300,000,000. The 1949 income in the President's economic report for midyear in July 1950 gives the national income level for the last quarter of 1949 as $214,200,000,000, or $20,000,000,000 less than in 1948, or about seven times the drop in gross farm income.

During this period the hourly wage for all industrial labor advanced from $1.56, the average for 1948, to $1.40 in 1949. There was no reduction in taxes, transportation rates, etc. Therefore we did lose the $20,000,000,000 of potential income because of the drop in farm prices.

In like manner with the recovery of farm prices and other raw materials to the 1948 level, the national income level in the last quarter of 1950 will be at least $235,000,000,000 or about 10 percent above the national income level the last quarter of 1949. With the expenditures approximately an average of 5.7 percent of the disposable income for meat, this will mean over $1,000,000,000 more purchasing power for meats. With the current price level for raw materials, the increase in hourly wages now being granted and an increase in physical production, our national income by the second quarter of 1951 can easily rise to $260,000,000,000 or roughly $2,500,000,000 more available for meats than the last quarter of 1949.

Do we have the meat to satisfy this market? To those who think of meat production as a push-button industry, we will have, through an edict from some bureau in Washington. But livestock production is not a push-button industry. The supply of meat depends on feed and livestock numbers available to produce meat. It depends on a price which will pay for the increased production. This brings us to the first important segment of our livestock economy—the producer.

THE FARMER OR PRODUCER

Many of our theorists and social reformers think of agriculture as a way of life. This is also true of their thinking in regard to livestock production. Let's take a look at the record. We have a capital economy. Agriculture in the production of livestock and equipment required for production has a much larger investment than all the steel industry and automobile industry combined.

We expect to pay industry a fair price for all war materials or anything which it may produce in peacetime. Following the same principle in peace or war, the agriculture industry is entitled to a proper price for the livestock it produces and the products produced therefrom. The parity equation for agricultural prices is in reality nothing more than an average cost of production plus a normal profit comparable to the price to which every industry is entitled to and must receive if it is to operate and expand in ratio to the increase in population and technological improvement. Too often our social reformers forget that it requires a profit to create the new capital to invest in the expansion of a growing economy.

This conclusion that the livestock industry is a business is not a theory when we realize that today it requires about $6,000 of capital for a Corn Belt farmer to buy 25 head of yearling cattle and the corn and other feed which he requires to finish them for market. The farmer, of course, is interested in the welfare of the Nation, but he is also interested in his own welfare and that of his family. He is not going to feed livestock unless he is reasonably sure that he gets a proper return.

Because of this factor the present confusion as to price ceilings may tend to curtail the movement of livestock to the Corn Belt for feeding purposes. Good feeders are selling at $32 per hundredweight and the parity price for corn is $1.80 per bushel. The farmer cannot be blamed for hesitating with unknown threats of price ceilings in the offing.

One of the principal reasons for the meat shortage in the middle of 1946 was the sudden increase of 30 cents per bushel in the ceiling price on corn without a corresponding increase in the price of livestock.

FEED SUPPLIES

The most important angle in livestock production is feed. As I pointed out earlier in my analysis, the livestock industry processes more tonnage of raw materials than all our factories. Each animal is a factory, consuming grass, hay, corn, and many other feeds to sustain life and growth. The question that comes first is: How much feed do we have?

Again it is evident that the push-button operators in our Washington bureaus believe that by pushing a button, they can increase the feed supplies overnight. This doesn't happen to be the case. It takes acreage, soil, water, and sunshine to produce crops. No governmental agency can, through legislation or edict, control either of them.

Our supply of acres is no greater than it has been for the past 50 years. We have not, and cannot, add a single foot of land to the area covered by the United States. We have all told about 1,123,000,000 acres of improved and unimproved farm land. About one-half of this acreage is available for crops and the other half is mostly grazing land in areas where lack of rainfall, rocky territory, or soil conditions preclude crop production.

Of the 560,000,000 acres of cropland about 170,000,000 acres are used as permanent grassland or pasturage. We have available, after deducting orchards and other trees about 365,000,000 acres of cropland interchangeable for rotation of pasturage and tillable crops. The acreage available for crops has been practically static ever since 1929. New acreage brought in by drainage and irrigation has been offset by acreage taken out of production for factory sites, roads, suburban development and other purposes.

Our principal gain in acreage available for meat production has been in the shift from horsepower to tractors or mechanized power. About 50,000,000 acres have been made available for utilization as feed for livestock instead of power. The greatest part of this acreage has been used for an increase in the number of dairy cattle which indirectly, through veal, barren cows, aged cows, etc., furnish part of our meat supply.

A factor that may have repercussions in our meat supply is the relatively low price of fats and oils. The removal of the tax on colored oleomargarine has increased the competitive price situation as between oleomargarine and butter.

Butter is the production from surplus whole milk supplies. Removal of price supports on butter could curtail dairy production and in turn the meat production from that source.

The low price of fats and oils is a complete dislocation of real values. A pound of fat contains about 4,080 calories as compared to 1,275 in a pound of lean meat. Yet a pound of fat has been selling at 12 cents per pound as compared to 65 cents for round steak or lean meat. If the reverse were true, the consumer would be getting as many calories in buying fat as lean meat.

The high caloric food value of fats and oils should be highly publicized. Low-income families could do much to provide a better diet for less money through a greater use of fats with their high food content.

We have been able, through a combination of a good moisture supply and the utilization of chemical fertilizers, to increase the acreage yield of many of our crops. Whether we can continue the present yield per acre is a question that nature alone can answer. If we were to return to the average weather conditions that prevailed in 1925–29, our feed supplies could fall off 30 percent and this in turn would reduce our meat production 30 percent.

There is no way in which we can regulate the rainfall or the sunshine and realism should force us to realize that our meat production lies in the lap of God. We can, however, through a prudent operation of our economy, take the first step which is necessary for sufficient meat production, namely a reserve of feed crops to carry us over periods of low crop production.

If we keep in mind the simple fact that each $1 of gross farm income means $7 of national income and that livestock, dairy, and poultry products make up one-half of our gross farm income and in turn generate one-half of our national income, the cost of carrying such reserves becomes a minor cost in operating our economy. Good business judgment in providing for the physical volume of goods we need to create national income should force us to recognize the sound principle of reserve feed supplies.

LIVESTOCK NUMBERS

The next important factor is the number of factories we have to process our feed supplies. The human race with all its inventive genius has not been able to produce artificial beefsteak.

The numbers of cattle, hogs, sheep, and poultry over a period of years have kept pace with feed supplies and correspond quite closely to population growth. There has been some efficiency in feeding operations but not nearly as much as some people imagine. A definite picture of our ability to produce meat can be obtained from a comparison of the pounds of meat produced and the bushels of corn in relative periods.

On January 1, 1930, we had 61,003,000 head of cattle. On January 1, 1950, we had an estimated 80,277,000 cattle. On January 1, 1930, we had 55,706,000 hogs as compared to 60,400,000 on January 1, 1950. Our numbers of sheep dropped from 48,361,000 on January 1, 1930, to 30,797,000 on January 1, 1950.

At first glance to those who do not realize that our population has increased this seems like a surplus. In 1930 the census gave our population as 123,700,000 as compared to an estimated 151,000,000 at the present time. This represents an increase of 23 percent in population.

There is an old saying that the "proof is in the pudding." That also applies to our meat supplies. The actual pounds of meat produced when compared and all argument as to surplus, efficiency of feeding, etc.

In 1930–31 our meat production was 16,276,000,000 pounds of beef, pork, mutton, and veal. In 1949, it was 21,710,000,000 pounds. This represents an increase of 33 percent. With an increase of 23 percent in the population this represents an increase of about 11 percent in actual pounds of meat. This increase of 11 percent is quite in line with the average increase in per capita consumption for all products produced in the United States in the transition from 1929 income levels to the current income level. It represents roughly the net gain in our standard of living. It also approximates the increased per capita consumption of 130 pounds in 1930 to about 144 pounds in 1949.

The public has been led to believe that there will be ample meat production. The record would indicate that it will require a continued effort on the part of the producer if meat supplies are to be kept in balance with our population increase and buying power. The end factor in meat production is corn and in the following table are the figures of corn production and meat supplies during the 1942–49 period.

Year	Corn production, bushels	Meat production, pounds
1942	3,088,000,000	21,912,000,000
1943	2,965,000,000	24,482,000,000
1944	3,086,000,000	25,178,000,000
1945	2,993,000,000	22,667,000,000
1946	3,340,000,000	22,966,000,000
1947	2,935,000,000	23,430,000,000
1948	3,030,000,000	21,446,000,000
Yearly average	3,061,000,000	23,180,000,000

On the basis of a 7-year average of corn production and its transition into meat supplies, we find that it will require roughly about 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn to produce 23,000,000,000 pounds of meat.

With full employment at current hourly wages, meat consumption can be expected to be about 155 pounds. With an estimated population of 151,000,000 this would require an output of 23,400,000,000 pounds. Stated in another way, we have the potential production required to satisfy the demand if we have and maintain a proper price structure for the producer.

The other question in meat production is the number of factories or numbers of livestock to process our feed supply. In the next table I have set out the numbers of hogs and cattle on farms January 1 each year in the 7-year period when we produced the meat as shown in the previous table. I have omitted sheep because of their small part in meat production.

Year	Cattle numbers	Hog numbers
1942	76,025,000	60,607,000
1943	81,204,000	73,881,000
1944	85,334,000	83,741,000
1945	85,573,000	59,331,000
1946	82,434,000	61,301,000
1947	81,207,000	56,921,000
1948	78,138,000	53,028,000
Annual average	81,400,000	64,300,000
Jan. 1, 1950 (estimated)	80,277,000	60,434,000

This tabulation points out that we need to increase our cattle numbers about 1,000,000 and hog numbers about 4,000,000 to produce an average of 23,000,000,000 pounds of meat.

Relative production in the first three-quarters of 1949 as compared to the estimated production in the first three-quarters of 1950 are given in the next tabulation.

Production of meats—Beef, pork, mutton, and veal

[Millions of pounds]

Year	First quarter	Second quarter	Third quarter	Total
1949	5,787	4,734	4,813	15,334
1950	5,840	4,836	4,900	15,576

Increase approximately 2 percent from 1949 to 1950.

The record of meat production indicates that our current supplies 1949 and 1950 of about 21,700,000,000 are below the potential demand now existing with current payrolls and national income. This shortage plus the seasonal short supply are primarily responsible for the current outcry against the high price of meat. In all fairness to the consumer it should be pointed out that current prices are higher than the prices which prevail for other commodities. It is, however, not as great as the public has been led to believe. The price of all commodities in August (Bureau of Labor Index 1926—100) was 166.3 as compared to 174.6 for foods. The differential is roughly 5 percent, a very minor differential with the short seasonal supply of meats in July–September.

PACKER OR PROCESSOR

The packer serves the public as a buyer and processor of livestock as it comes to market. Very often the industry gets the blame for a shift in prices for livestock paid to the farmer and, on the other hand, is blamed by the consumer for taking out too great a profit margin.

One of the factors which confronts the packer is the dress-out from live weight to the dressed carcass. He has been unable to increasing the dressing percentage or the amount of steak per animal. The average dressing percentage of cattle and hogs for the period 1939–49 illustrates how constant this ratio is.

Year	Cattle dressing percentage average	Hog dressing percentage average
1939	54.2	75.1
1940	54.5	74.5
1941	54.9	75.4
1942	54.2	75.2
1943	53.6	75.5
1944	51.9	75.5
1945	52.8	75.8
1946	52.9	75.3
1947	52.6	75.9
1948	52.7	76.0
1949	54.5	76.2

In years of abundant feed the percentage increases slightly and falls off slightly in years when the feed supplies are low compared to livestock numbers. The change is very minor and as a result the effect of higher costs for livestock means an increase in dressed meat in almost the same ratio. This can be illustrated by a comparison of cattle prices and the price of round steak in 1942 and 1948.

Year	Average price for cattle at Chicago	Average price round steak at retail
1942	$13.70 per hundredweight.	43.5 cents per pound.
1948	$30.88 per hundredweight.	90.5 cents per pound.
Percentage increase	124	108.

The increase in live weight cost from 1942 to 1948 was 124 percent. On the basis of live weight cost with the same relative margin from packer to the retail counter the price of round steak in 1948 should have been 224 percent of 43.5 cents or 97.4 cents per pound. This proves that neither the packer nor the retailer was charging an excess margin of profit in 1948 as compared to 1942 with the average price at 90.5 cents per pound.

UNFAIR CRITICISM

In fact the record does not support the theory expressed by many, who have not taken a look at the facts, that the packer and the retailer are receiving an unfair margin between the farmer and the consumer. The tabulation below gives the percentage of the consumer's dollar received by farmers for all farm products over a period of years and also that of livestock as a special item.

Year	Farmers share of consumers dollar—all products	Farmers share of consumers dollar—livestock products
	Cents	*Cents*
1925–30	40.8	46.0
1935–39	40.0	47.0
1944	52.0	66.0
1945	54.0	73.0
1946	53.0	68.0
1947	52.0	64.0
1948	51.0	63.0

With the farmer receiving 63 percent of the consumer's dollar in 1948, as compared to 1935–39 average of 47 percent, the charge that there is an excessive margin for the packer and retailer is unwarranted.

I have pointed out that the packer has not been able to change the dressing weight. Therefore the increased percentage of the consumer's dollar to the farmer is due almost entirely to the increased efficiency in the operation of processing and distribution of meat.

Better methods of cooling and storage of meats have been an important factor in preventing spoilage and deterioration in the quality of meat.

The increase in canning of meats and a better utilization of meat in sausage and hamburger since the earlier period 1921–30 has also helped to reduce the operating margin between the packer and the consumer. There is no question that the benefit of this efficiency has been passed on to both the consumer and the farmer.

An important factor that has not been adjusted is that of capital investment. The increase in the price level since 1939 has been from 77.1 percent of the 1926 level as 100 to 167.5 percent as of September 1950. This is an increase of 117 percent. This in turn means that future capital investment in the packing industry and other businesses engaged in meat production will be relatively higher. When this adjustment is made the percentage of the consumer's dollar going to the farmer will decline to that extent.

The high percentage of the consumer's dollar received by the farmer during the war years would indicate that under price ceilings the margin between the farmer and the consumer was relatively low. A lower margin would tend to help create black markets in our system of processing and distribution. Individuals in charge of a business feel that self-protection comes first and if black markets are to be prevented care must be taken to allow proper margins in any program of price control.

The agricultural industry is carried on by about 10,000,000 workers, including unpaid family help. In the retail and wholesale trade, the 1949 employment was a little over 11,000,000. This illustrates that if these men are to receive a relative wage in our system of distribution, a proper margin must be maintained to provide the income to pay the workers in wholesale and retail trades.

BYPRODUCTS

In addition to meats, the packing industry has many byproducts such as lard, tallow, hides, etc. The relative prices of these products very often influence the price of choicer meats, such as steak, ham, bacon, pork chops, etc. For example, if lard prices are 10 cents per pound below the normal that should prevail in ratio to live costs, this loss must be recovered by increasing the price of other cuts.

At times the price of pork chops, for example, will be 10 cents per pound higher at retail because of a 10-cents-per-pound loss on the lard content in the dressed carcass. The retailer is also forced to make an adjustment in the price of salable meat to offset the loss from trimings of fat, bone, etc.

The relatively low price of lard and tallow has been an important factor in the last 18 months. Fats and oils have been selling at about 60 percent of the level for other products and the price of pork chops, ham, etc., has been relatively higher than the price which should have prevailed on the basis of live costs with fats and oils prices at a parity level.

UNEQUAL DISTRIBUTION

A very important factor which contributes materially to the public outcry against the price of meat is the unequal distribution of pork products in the marketing season. Hogs produce roughly one-half of our meat supplies. The Corn Belt is the heaviest producer of hogs and because of climatic conditions most of the pigs are farrowed in the spring thus having the advantage of warm weather and also summer pasturage. There is nothing the packer can do about it and he is confronted with 65 percent of the hog crop in the 7 months—October–April—and only 35 percent in the 5 months—May–September. This percentage ratio is a natural one and has been approximately the same for 50 years.

On the basis of 10,000,000,000 pounds of pork products this means an average supply of roughly 900,000,000 pounds per month in the period October to April and about 700,000,000 pounds per month in the period May–September. This is a natural problem and the only thing that can be done about it is to level off this supply differential with a greater supply of meat going into storage in the seasons of heavy production.

An interesting example of this factor occurred in 1949. The swivel-chair producers in Washington told everyone of the tremendous increase in pork supplies available in the fall of 1949 when in reality there was no reason for it. Much of this propaganda was put out in regard to the need of a price-support program.

Even the packing industry was misled and the price of hogs dropped to an average of $15.05 at Chicago in December. In addition, it brought about early marketings thus killing off the very factories which we needed to produce more pounds of meat. The average weight of hogs in September dropped to 215 pounds, reflecting the scare thrown into the producers by the announcement of a support price a little over $14 per hundredweight in Midwest markets for December. There was no excuse for a $14 support price with the parity price at $19 per hundredweight.

These premature marketings and the psychological factor of lower prices prevented some needed expansion in the production of hogs. We had the feed supplies to produce more weight on each animal and in turn more pounds of meat. The packer failed to level off this excess marketing through storage and on September 2, 1950, we find hogs selling on the Chicago market with a top of close to $25 per hundredweight or about $10 above last December.

There wasn't any reason for this extreme fluctuation in prices and it is up to the packing industry to work out ways and means to prevent such an occurrence in the future. The extreme change in prices confuses the farmer and the consumer. The retailer as a rule blames the farmer and the packer for the high cost of meat during the season of short supplies.

By the simple process of paying a fair and higher price in the latter part of 1949 and storing some of this meat, everyone would have been more confident of future markets, feeding operations would have been more stable, and the consumer would have been paying relatively less for meats in August and September this year. It would have materially reduced the demand for price ceilings and controls.

THE CONSUMER

The consumer is a reader of the news that goes out and, in turn, is put off over the radio. He has no way of knowing what is a fair price for meat at the retail counter and therefore is subject to propaganda written up by somebody who knows even less. Because of the psychological factor of lower prices and the rapid reduction in the quality of meat that isn't moved into consumption channels, a short buying strike on the part of the consumer or resistance to prices can be very detrimental to the producer, the packer, the retailer, and finally the consumer. In other words, we all pay for the mistakes.

There is no reason why the consumer cannot be properly informed. Our Government has the finest record of production of farm products, their processing and transition into consumer goods of any nation in the world. The records of dressing percentage and retail prices can easily be ascertained at any price level.

The consumer must be made to realize that if he wants 45-cent steak instead of 90 cents per pound, he will have to take a cut of 50 percent in his current hourly wage. This conclusion is the result of the simple fact that about 60 percent of the national income as an average is the annual payroll in the United States and if current wages are to be paid, then the consumer must be prepared to pay for [illegible] goods which have been produced with the payment of such wages. For example, [illegible] workers with an annual wage of $[illegible] receive a payroll of $145,000,000,000. This payroll cannot be met unless the price of goods creates approximately $240,000,000,000 of national income.

The consumer must be told that he cannot expect the farmer to produce the meat, to have the packer process it, and to have the retail trade handle it for him, except at a price comparable to the wage he demands.

The packing industry should take the lead in publicizing the facts as to the real cost of living, namely, that the consumer today is receiving more goods, per capita, than he did prior to World War II.

In 1930 round steak was selling for 38 cents per pound. The average annual wage was $1,368 and we had 8,000,000 unemployed because of too low a price level.

In 1949 we had an annual wage of $2,889. If the consumer wants 1930 prices to come back then he must expect to take a corresponding cut in his wage or income level. Current price levels and production will generate approximately $285,000,000,000. At 1930 prices levels, current production would generate approximately $106,000,000,000.

We can't have high income and low prices.

OUR NATIONAL POTENTIAL

In arriving at any kind of program of sound economics, either in peace or war, we should know first of all what we can do and the results which we can expect. I have pointed out that with current livestock numbers and feed supplies that there is no reason why, under the normal operation of our economy, we cannot produce the needed supplies of meat and at a price level competitive to consumer income.

In fact the [illegible] tabulation shows how the natural laws of exchange force a comparative price as income and price levels change.

Comparative price changes

[Index 1926 as 100—[illegible]]

Item	Twelve months ended [illegible]	Period June [illegible]	Percent [illegible]
Farm products	177.5	[illegible]	[1] 7.0
Foods	174.6	[illegible]	7.7
Livestock	[illegible]	[illegible]	9.0
Meats	[illegible]	241.4	7.0
Livestock and poultry	217.3	66.0	[1] [illegible]
Meats, poultry, and fish	240.2	73.7	[illegible]

[1] Note that the increase in the price of meat from June 1950 to August 1950 was the same as for all foods and that meat prices advanced less than live weight costs.

[2] Note how the laws of exchange maintain a relative price balance in a transition period from August 1939 to August 1950, 10 years of the most violent changes in the history of our economy. Both tabulations are based on the Sept. 22 issue of the Bureau of Labor's wholesale Commodity Price Index.

Both comparisons prove that there has been no excessive mark-up in wholesale meat prices when compared with the live costs which are determined by competitive bidding.

I have pointed out that our national-income level will run a minimum of $286,000,000,000 the last quarter of this year. As an illustration of the increase underway, I would like to quote from an item in the Wall Street Journal, page 1, September 20, 1950.

"Pay envelopes of production workers in manufacturing industries swelled to a high average of $60.26 weekly during August. The average workweek was 41.2 hours."

The hourly wage has risen from $1.40 per hour in 1949 to $1.454 in June 1950. Since then there have been some increases. In August 1949 the number of hours worked was 39.1 hours, as compared to the 41.2 hours as given in the item I have quoted from the Wall Street Journal.

A fact which is often forgotten is that the wage per hour is only part of the laborer's income. The number of hours is also important. The increased hours in August 1950, plus the increase in hourly wage, has increased the weekly income from $54.70 in August 1949 to $60.36 in August of 1950. This is an increase of a little over 10 percent per week. Note how closely this increase ratios to the price increase for livestock. In addition, we have had the reemployment of about 3,000,000 workers in industry and the military forces who were unemployed in 1949. As a result, the national-income level will be at least 10 percent above that of the last quarter of 1949, and this will be reflected in at least 10% increase in the over-all dollar expenditures for goods at retail, including meat products.

With the approach of the heavy marketing season the price of livestock may be reduced to some extent and will be reflected at retail levels. The buying power as indicated by current weekly earnings will mean an increased per capita consumption of meat. As I have pointed out, we have the feed supplies to produce the meat. This feed supply can be utilized if necessary by a proper price on livestock to induce the feeding of the grain to hogs and cattle which serve as a meat factory.

But should the price level drop like it did in the latter part of 1949 the hogs will not be kept on the farm for a longer feed and will go to market at too low a weight to bring about the meat production which our ability to consume will require. Failure to carry over a greater supply of meat from heavy marketings will cause prices to skyrocket next summer and bring on the rigid price controls which should be avoided.

On the basis of the record, there is no reason why livestock prices cannot be controlled through a voluntary program of production, processing, and distribution. Price ceilings do not produce a single pound of meat, and because of the many factors involved in pricing the many varieties of meat price ceilings can very easily curtail the very production we will require. A brief analysis of mistakes under the OPA and the problems inherent in fixed price ceilings might be helpful in arriving at a solution.

OPA PRICE CEILINGS

In establishing price ceilings under the control bill which has been passed by Congress, it is stipulated that no ceiling shall be placed on farm prices below the parity level, or the price in the period May 24 to June 24, 1950.

As I have pointed out, the parity equation is the average cost of production plus the average profit. It is arrived at by a comparison of the prices the farmer receives to the prices he paid. In the prices the farmer pays we have the wage level, the cost of raw materials, management and capital expense, taxes, and the average mark-up or profit that is included in the selling price of goods.

To establish this parity price as the yardstick without any flexibility will tend to reduce production. Our economy is widespread and has a great deal of variation. We have submarginal farms, submarginal business operations, and in many cases submarginal resources.

For example, we have the good farmer with good soil and then we may have a poor operator on a farm with poor soil. With the price ceiling at parity or the average price level, the submarginal operation will not produce unless the production is subsidized or unless the production can be sold at a higher price in the black market. We need the submarginal production to add to the total. The same is true in our business operations, both in the packing industry and our retail outlets. Subsidies are unsound in principle and operation.

FLEXIBLE PRICES

A much more effective program would be a support price at 90 percent of parity and a ceiling at 110 percent with an average of 100.

In fact that is exactly how our economy should operate in peacetime and the laws of exchange are continually trying to maintain the average of 100. In this connection it might be well to point out that with corn supported at 90 percent of parity, a market for livestock at less than 90 percent will tend to curtail production. As products are in short supply an increase of 10 percent in price will tend to increase production and at the same time cause the public to substitute some other product which may have dropped to 90 percent.

Under the long-time operation of our peacetime economy, the tariff was a support price and also a ceiling, shutting off imports when our price level dropped and serving as a ceiling when our prices advanced enough to attract imports.

In our economy we have approximately 35 key commodities, such as grains, livestock, metals, petroleum, coal, fiber crops, etc., that end up in the production of about 90 percent of all goods at the retail market level.

This is the gear wheel of our annual income cycle. I have pointed out that each $1 of gross farm income generates $7 of national income. This is the result of labor efficiency. We have about one farmer producing the raw farm materials for himself and six others. As these materials go through our economic cycle the labor cost for transportation, processing, distribution, service, finance, and so forth, is added on, resulting in the multiple of seven times.

The gross value of these farm products average about 14 percent of our national income. The important fact is that it is a practical constant in either peace or war.

In like manner total wage payments average about 61 percent of the national income as an average constant. The many changes that have taken place in the last 20 years have not changed these ratios. The raw materials and the hourly wages are the principal factor in the price of goods and services. Price ceilings on goods cannot be effective without price ceilings on the basic raw materials and hourly wages.

I have pointed out that the percentage of expenditures for meat are practically constant at an average of 5.7 percent of the consumable income. This is not an accident, but the definite result of the laws of exchange which I have mentioned. A similar pattern exists in all phases of our economy.

The items which have a constant demand because of the natural need for food and clothing bear a fixed ratio to the whole. This can be illustrated by a tabulation of expenditures for food, beverage, clothing, shoes, and tobacco, as compared to retail sales.

Year	Shoes, clothing, beverage, food, and tobacco	Retail sales, all goods	Ratio of column I to II
	Billions	*Billions*	
1929	$72.4	$117.0	69
1939	39.4	42.0	70
1949	85.5	122.5	70

In the same manner the real cost of food is about 23 percent of the national income as a separate item in the same 3 years set forth above. A change in the price level changes dollar expenditures but does not change the percentage of the national income spent for the necessities included in the tabulation. The reason for this constant ratio is a natural demand by nature to sustain life in the human body.

Thus we find that the natural laws of exchange and arithmetic will not permit a change in the cost of living in our economy as a whole through a change in price levels. Also, that there is only one way to increase our standard of living and that is through an increase in per man production of goods and services. Money is just the measuring stick. When prices fall below the parity level, reducing the price of food, unemployment follows. If those who remain employed were taxed to support the unemployed there would be no gain on an individual basis. Under our current philosophy of economics, when prices fall too low to create the income for full employment, they should be supported by governmental expenditures and charged to the national deficit. Very unsound economics but politically popular in some quarters.

This can be further illustrated by a tabulation of staple items with their cost in 1939 and 1949.

Comparison of weekly wages with retail food prices

Staple food items	Retail price 1939 [1]	Retail price 1949 [1]
	Cents	*Cents*
Loaf of white bread	7.9	14.0
Round steak (pound)	36.0	85.2
Chuck roast (pound)	23.4	55.5
Pork chops (pound)	30.4	74.3
Bacon (pound)	31.9	66.5
Butter (pound)	32.5	72.5
Sugar (pound)	5.4	9.5
Eggs (dozen)	32.1	60.6
Milk, quart, fresh, delivered	12.2	21.1
Lard (pound)	11.0	19.2
Total cost	223.7	487.5

[1] Retail prices, Bureau of Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, average price 51 leading cities.

NOTE.—President's Economic Report to Congress January 1950:

Wage per hour 1939 in manufacturing	$0.633
Hours worked	37.7
Wage per hour 1949 in manufacturing	$1.40
Hours worked	39.1
Weekly wages in 1939	$23.86
Weekly wages 1949	$54.74
Increase in average weekly wages 1939–49, percent	125
Increase in total cost of food items, percent	118
Buying power of weekly wages in 1949 as compared to 1939, percent	117.8
Buying power of hourly wages in 1949 as compared to 1939, percent	101.4
Time required to earn food items in 1949	3 hours 29 minutes.
Time required to earn food items in 1939	3 hours 32 minutes.

The tabulation illustrates the positive factor of these laws of exchange and unless we recognize them, we will be groping in the dark. Labor clamors for higher wages, the farmer for higher prices, thus causing a spiral in our price level while the real cost of living remains the same. Temporarily some group has an advantage because of the submarginal factors I have mentioned or a shift in the price of some item of goods or a wage increase in some industry. But over a period of years these adjustments have to be balanced by others throughout the economy as a whole.

Once we realize that we cannot change the total cost of living by lower or higher prices, we will become more willing to act with a definite objective.

A price range such as I have suggested could be operated through a voluntary program without the restrictive factors resulting from a fixed price level. The over-all effect of a flexible 90 to 110 percent price structure would be an average of approximately 100 for all goods.

If wage levels were kept in balance with the price index and stabilized, the inflationary effect of higher material price and in turn higher wages would end.

The next question is what should the price be? The hourly wage in all industries in 1942 was $0.853. In June 1950 it had risen to $1.454 or an increase of 70 percent. In 1942 the over-all price level was 98.8 percent of 1926 as 100. On September 5, the price level was 167.5, an increase of 69.5 percent. This illustrates how the buying power for an hour of work is much the same today as in 1942.

The current wage increase and higher prices for all raw materials will tend to force a price level on an over-all basis of 10 percent higher than now prevails. This in turn will generate 10 percent more income and it will require 10 percent more income to buy the same amount of goods. In addition it will reduce the current buying power of dollar savings 10 percent.

If the 35 leading raw materials were stabilized at an average of 170 percent of 1926 as 100 with a range of 90 to 110 percent and wages stabilized at current levels, we could expect a national income of $240,000,000,000 from current production. By utilizing our efficiency and increased labor force we can expand present production 20 percent. This would increase our national income 20 percent of $240,000,000,000 without further increases in our price level and would not be inflationary.

We can still further expand our production by increasing the hours of work per week. This will mean more output per man and give each man a greater purchasing power for a day's work. The economic problem confronting the Nation in either peace or war is to maintain price stability and a balance between raw material prices, hourly earnings and the price of all commodities.

WAR PERIODS

The inflationary factors in war periods is the result of heavier production and consumption of durable goods which average about 10 percent of consumer expenditures in peacetime. In World War II, we increased our durable goods production 230 percent from 1939 to the peak in 1943. In the same period, we increased our production of nondurable goods 61 percent. In addition we curtailed the sale of many items of durable goods, thus leaving the income from their production in the hands of the consumer.

This factor will happen in all wars and leave the consumer with too much buying power for nondurable goods, most of which are the items of foods, clothing, beverage, tobacco, and shoes. In spite of this excess income in the hands of the consumer, the Government in World War II subsidized the consumer, thus adding to the inflationary effect.

If these funds had been drained off through taxation and used to pay for the extra durable goods used for war purposes, we could have eliminated the increase in our national debt and much of the inflationary increase in price levels.

The following tabulation shows the national income for the three war years 1943–45 and the excess of national income over domestic expenditures for goods and services.

Balance sheet for 3 war years

Year	National income	All consumer expenditures for goods and services	Balance of national income above consumer expenditures
	Billions	*Billions*	*Billions*
1943	$169.7	$102.2	$67.5
1944	183.8	111.5	72.3
1945	192.7	123.0	69.3
Total			208.1
Personal taxes, 1943–45			57.6
Inflationary buying power			141.5

Under an economy as widespread as ours it is impossible to stop inflation with price ceilings unless this excess income is used to balance the national budget. If this income had been drained off, then the balance in the hands of the consumer would have been his ration available for consumer goods in the domestic market.

CURRENT MILITARY NEEDS

Current military needs do not present the economic problem of an all-out effort similar to World War II. In the case of meats, an expansion of 1,000,000 in the Armed Forces will mean additional meat requirements of roughly 100 pounds per year per man for those in the military service. The meat per man for our Army ration exceeds our civilian consumption by that amount. These requirements are so minor when compared to total production that there is no reason for the fear of our present military needs creating a shortage of food. The shortage, if any, will be in the production of durable goods. Even in the case of durable goods we can expand enough to take care of the needs without disrupting our normal civilian economy.

On the other hand there is no reason why wages and prices should be advanced above the present level. A proper realization by industry that increased prices and wages will merely increase the number of dollars required to buy the war materials and to exchange goods in our domestic economy should make them wish to cooperate in a voluntary program of price ceilings that can be publicly announced. Labor should forego any further demand for increased wages and the Government should levy the needed taxes to balance the budget.

CONCLUSION

After checking through the record of production of livestock and other factors, I cannot find any need for rigid price ceilings or rationing on any food product. The demand for price ceilings are primarily the result of a confused and uninformed public. I have not tried to set forth a specific program but, in my opinion, it would be a comparatively simple matter to handle the production of meat products and their distribution through a voluntary program which could be expected to stabilize prices and at the same time produce the needed meat supplies. If at any time you wish to have an outline of a definite program, I will be glad to prepare it for you.

In making this report I have tried primarily to set out the positive forces that are not being recognized in the consideration of the problems which we face. Our problem during a war period is no greater than it is in peacetime. A drop in the price level in peacetime can leave just as much wreckage as the inflation caused by war.

The dislocation is primarily monetary or a price factor. In a depression we lose none of our resources, our factories, our transportation, or efficiency. Stated in another way, it is impossible to go bankrupt from a purely economic standpoint. A depression can be prevented if prices are maintained at a level in balance with hourly wages and other cost factors. Inflation can be prevented by the same process. The record of our economy proves that we can produce the goods for either peace or war needs.

In the production of goods for either peace or war, the production of goods creates the income to buy the goods and pay for them. If the factors which I have called to your attention were generally known by the American public we could, by voluntary means, prevent either the depression of peacetime or the inflations created by war.

If our economy is operated on the basis of fact instead of theory we need have no fear of socialism or communism.

A proper price for raw materials, a relative wage payment to labor and a proper operating margin for industry automatically protects the freedom of all. We have the natural resources and our system of free enterprise can outproduce any other type of economy providing we maintain a proper price structure to create the dollar income to distribute and consume our production.

CARL H. WILKEN,
Economic Analyst.

SOURCE OF DATA USED IN THIS REPORT

1. President's Economic Report to Congress, January 1950.
2. President's Economic Report to Congress, Mid-Year, July 1950.
3. Statistical Abstract, United States Department of Commerce.
4. Survey of Current Business, National Income Supplement July 1947 and July 1950.
5. Agricultural Statistics, United States Department of Agriculture.
6. Bureau of Labor, Wholesale Commodity Index.
7. Livestock Market News, Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture.
8. Wall Street Journal.
9. Chicago Drovers Journal Yearbook.

How To Cook a Wild Duck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a brief article from the Louisville Courier-Journal under the heading "Ruby's report," and some comments thereon by me.

There being no objection, the article and Mr. CAPEHART's comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, down in Kentucky a new feud is brewing, the equivalent of Kentucky's bitterest and bloodiest feuds, which bids fair to attract national and international attention.

Since this new feud in Kentucky involves my running-and-losing cousin, I feel inclined to have a part in it.

Let me quote from "Ruby's report" in the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 9, 1951:

"RUBY'S REPORT

"JIM STEWART CHALLENGES MACLEAN AND RUBY TO WILD-DUCK COOKING CONTEST AND NAMES OWN JUDGES

"James G. Stewart, who has run second so many times he should write it James G. Stewart II, has issued a challenge. And, with typical Stewart temerity, he names his own judges. I quote:

"'I differ with both of you and Stuart MacLean on the proper way to cook a wild duck. If you were in the restaurant business featuring wild duck, you'd go bankrupt.

"'Your 3-hour boiling method for duck could only produce something called duck soup. Stuart, being a gourmet of the Henry VIII vintage, could only call the product of his 17-minute cooking recipe bloody duck.

"'It is a well-known fact that neither of you has ever personally cooked a duck. Stuart quotes his authority, Lewis Kaye, a nationally known cook who has been approved by Duncan Hines. You advocate the method of a woman who probably is using her greatgrandmother's recipe, whose only cooking utensil was a pot.

"'After many years of personal experimentation I will tell you the best way to cook a wild duck:

"1. Carefully pick the duck so the skin is unbroken. 2. Stuff with a quarter of an onion, a quarter of an apple, and make a highly seasoned sage dressing. 3. Lay bacon strips over the breasts and put in roaster in a quarter of an inch of water. 4. Sit in front of oven with hunting companions for 1 hour and baste frequently (the duck that is).

"I challenge you and Stuart to a taste test at your convenience, the test to be judged by Fred Crawford, manager of the Pendennis Club, and Harold Harter of the Brown Hotel.'

"Stuart and I accept the challenge gratefully, but there will be none of the citified kitchen help of the Pendennis or Brown, and not more than one of Jim's pals among the judges. Stuart suggests that each of us name one judge and one cook. Jim probably will elect himself to both posts. I'll name my cook later, but will take a real outdoorsman, a hunter and fisherman, for my judge—Gov. Lawrence Wetherby. Stuart probably will want Kaye to do his cooking and also his judging, but I think he and Governor Wetherby will agree that the test should be made at some camp or lodge untainted by the fumes of the big city."

On the basis of that report, it is no wonder that Jim Stewart, my running-and-losing cousin, always loses when he runs.

In the first place, how can anybody in Kentucky, or any place else south of Indiana, have good roast duck when it is not possible to get good ducks to begin with?

The Midwest duck flyway is through Indiana, and we bag all the good ducks on their way south. Kentucky gets only those we call seconds.

To prove that my running-and-losing cousin does not properly represent the family in this duck-roasting feud, I should like to challenge my good friends and colleagues, the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. CLEMENTS] to a duck-roasting and tasting contest to be held at the Pendennis Club in Louisville at any time—no holds barred.

Yes, I shall even submit to throwing into the feud the esteemed Vice President, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

My running-and-losing cousin, Mr. Stewart, outlines his method of roasting a duck to the delight of the most talented and temperamental gourmet. First, he says, pick the duck clean without breaking the skin. In Indiana we shoot them clean.

Then, he says, stuff it with onion and apple and sage dressing. The onion and apple, I take it, are to disguise the taste of a duck that was unwanted in Indiana. The same purpose, I presume, induces the use of bacon strips across the breast.

When we roast a duck in Indiana, we roast a duck.

Of course, I should be much happier if this feud were over fried chicken.

Conditions in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, recently Mr. R. H. (Bill) Fisher, of Salt Lake City, a veteran of World War II, delivered a speech before the Salt Lake Rotary Club which I think is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. While I do not necessarily agree with all of Mr. Fisher's statements and conclusions, yet the speech is so filled with thought-provoking and challenging ideas that it is well worth reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, I asked for the privilege of speaking to you today. I have wanted to say a few things to you ever since I got out of the Army. I spent 3½ years in the Army, so I feel that I know something about the workings of a controlled economy. Of those years, nearly two were spent in Europe, so I feel I know a little about the Europeans. And, for 4 months of that time, I was doing counter-intelligence work in Germany, and studying the people and operations of a police state. I was so impressed by the differences between Europe and America that I have wanted to talk to you about them ever since. You who have grown up in a free country can't imagine other countries, or other people. Gentlemen, the other people of this world—and this includes the so-called free people and free nations—are not like us. This is the only nation founded on the principle that the people are capable of self-government. We elect representatives. In other countries where elections are held, the people elect their masters. Here the individual is supreme. In all the other countries in the world, the government is supreme. In England and Canada, e. g., the people refer to themselves as subjects. Can you imagine an American cab driver or pipe fitter referring to himself as a subject of anyone or anything?

Now, this sounds like a small difference, but it is not. It is the reason our country is the greatest Nation on which the sun has shone. The trouble is a lot of us have forgotten, and a lot of us have never realized that it is this that has made us great, and a lot of us have been told for 18 years by a dilettante Groton and Harvard lawyer and an unsuccessful haberdasher that we were not capable of self-government, until we believe it.

Now, gentlemen, I have seen the slave peoples in action, and I believe in our principle and our way. I believe in it all the way, and I believe that for us to fear a slave nation like Russia is absolute nonsense. I say flatly and unequivocally that the United States is in no more danger of invasion by Russia—now, 5 years from now, or ever—than we are in danger of invasion by Argentina or by Mexico, and, if we are not in danger of invasion, the President's requests are nonsense. President Truman has said we must spend seventy-one billions for defense. He made better sense when he was corresponding with the music critic. The thousands of tanks and the three- to four-million man army which he asks for can never be, and will never be used for defense. They will be used just like they were in the last war—to reinstate or to continue in power one set of slave masters against another set of slave masters, to throw out a Kaiser Wilhelm so a Hitler can take over.

Now, most of us give lip service to the American way, and we will deride the inefficiencies of Government, we will cuss Government red tape, stupidity, and bungling. We will point out the disclosures in the Hoover report of criminal waste. We will swear about the Government's paying high prices for potatoes and eggs so that they can be buried in Kansas, and then the Government imports potatoes from Canada and eggs from China. We will rant about Government officials who know nothing about their jobs and who got these jobs as political plums. We point to England as a horrible example of what big government will do. We recall that Aneurin Bevan said in 1945 that it would take an organizing genius to produce a shortage of fish and coal in England, since England was practically built on coal and surrounded by fish; and that England is now short of coal and fish, thanks to the organizing genius of big government.

Now, gentlemen, think a minute—Russia is all government. Don't you suppose these things happen in Russia? I tell you they are one hundred times worse in Russia. We think our way is best, but we are afraid it's not. We here are not alone, however. Prominent nonpolitical figures everywhere are indulging in the same two-way thinking. Paul Hoffman, former President of Studebaker and now head of ERA, and Hansen Baldwin, the eminent military analyst of the New York Times, are two examples of people who are thinking and talking two ways at once. Hoffman says that the Russians have 15,000,000 people in slave camps and that the Kremlin can crack and fall anytime, but he is afraid of the Russians. Baldwin says that wars today are primarily clashes of nations in arms and he admits that we can outproduce all the rest of the world put together, but he is afraid of the Russians.

Now, just think this fact over. There are 150,000,000 people in our country and they do only 5 percent of the work. Machines do the other 95 percent. So here we have a Nation with a production of 3,000,000,000 workers scared panicky by Russia, a country that has 200,000,000 slaves. Remember, too, what Adam Smith said about slave labor, "Slave labor is the least productive and the most expensive of all labor, and must be, because if a man is going to starve whether he works or not, he does not work." Or, as the present day economists say, there is absence of incentive.

Now, I am not guessing or theorizing or wishing. Hitler had a slave state, and let's look at Hitler's record. In 1940 Germany terrified the civilized world by racing across France and completely subjugating her. What we forget is that the country that Germany subjugated was a nation, unlike ours, dominated by a minority. Government bureaucracy had taken its toll in France, and in no way was it a competitive free enterprise country like the United States. Besides, from a supply line or logistics point of view, this was not such a tremendous accomplishment. The entire distance traveled across France by the German Army was not much greater than from Salt Lake to Las Vegas, about 500 miles. Four years later when the German military production potential was still 100 percent, we invaded France, and we found that the great German military machine had 80 percent of its guns pulled by horses. We found that the relatively few German motor vehicles were not even remotely comparable to our jeep and big 6x6 truck. We found that they did have some excellent tanks, a few thousand buzz bombs and the famous burp gun, all good military weapons, but they did not have basic large-scale mass production, such as a free enterprise country has, and such as Mr. Baldwin says is essential in modern war. In fact, so limited was their production that, with all of Europe prostrate in 1940, and with all of Europe's production—French, Czech, Belgian, and Italian—enslaved and at their disposal, they did not even make an attempt to cross the 20 miles of water that separated them from England (we have 6,000 miles of water between us and the Russians). The Germans did not have the production for the ship bottoms and landing craft that would have been necessary to make the crossing. They did not have the production for the jeeps, trucks, weapons carriers, wreckers, mobile shops, portable welding sets, telephone wire, shells, supplies, and food for a successful invasion, if they could have reached the other shore. Later, in 1941, the Germans made their famous attack into Russia, another slave nation. They bogged down after about 1,200 miles because they couldn't maintain their supply lines, another term for production. One thousand and two hundred miles is about the distance from Seattle to

Los Angeles. Remember that in 1941 the Germans had been unhampered by preparing for war and war alone for 8 years. Now, compare this sad record with our own. In 1944 the United States, after two short years of preparation for war, was maintaining an army and a supply line in the Pacific islands six to eight thousand miles away. We were maintaining another army in Europe at the end of a supply line 3,000 miles long. We had armed and equipped a French Army. (I wish I had time to tell you about that French Army.) The British were using our long Toms, our trucks, and our planes. We had given the Russians one minor item of 80,000 giant 6x6 trucks, in addition to countless other vehicles, armaments, and food. In my 300 days of artillery combat, we plastered the Germans with a ratio of 20 artillery shells for each one that we received. Now, boys and girls, that's production, and it is only possible with a free people in a competitive enterprise system.

In our gun battery position south of Cherbourg in July of 1944, we one day received artillery fire from the Germans. Altogether 21 88-millimeter shells landed in our gun area, practically in my lap. Of these, only eight exploded and, of those eight, four more were low-order bursts. Examination showed that those shells were made in the enslaved Czechoslovak war plants. Now, gentlemen, again think a minute—the limestone that went into that steel had to be quarried with German policemen supervising, the iron ore had to be mined by unwilling Czechs with German policemen watching, it had to be transported on railroads with German policemen and spies watching to make sure it got to the steel mill. In the steel mill there was more supervision and spying necessary. The same was true of the fuses and of the shell casings and of the guns that fired the shells and, when they finally got the shells to the front, they only had 20-percent efficiency. That's how slave labor works and that's how it's working with the Russians. The more Russia takes over, the more she extends herself, the more policemen she needs, and the more she weakens herself. I believe that any nation which attempts production by slave methods loses rather than gains production.

Let me show you how a police state has to operate. For 4 months I was in charge of a small detachment in counterintelligence in Germany after the war. We made over 3,500 arrests of suspected Nazis and I interrogated many of the people arrested. One of these was the right-hand man of Sauckel. Sauckel was the Governor of Thuringia who was executed at the first Nuernberg trial. This man told me he belonged to 30 Nazi Party organizations. I said, "How did you ever get any work done?" "It was not easy" he said, "but it was necessary to belong. In Germany, any good party member belongs to at least 12 party organizations. He has to if he wants to hold any sort of government job, even janitor in a government office building." He explained some of the infinite ramifications of the empire safety system. Hitler wanted to do away with the people's rights in courts, so he organized the Gestapo, a secret state police. The Gestapo could arrest anyone, anytime, for any reason, and hold them without trial, and was responsible only to Goebbels and his boss, Hitler. Soon Hitler realized that such a powerful group could constitute a menace to him, and he organized another group, the criminal police, under Himmler. In theory, the Gestapo dealt with civil cases, whereas the Krepo dealt with criminal cases. Actually, their duties overlapped and one of their jobs was to spy on one another. There was danger of collusion between Himmler and Goebbels, so he set up a third secret police outfit called the border police, supposedly to deal with cases in France, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine, Holland, and so forth. Actually, this police force had as one of its main duties watching and spying on the other two. This played Himmler, Goebbels, and Goering off against one another. It also produced the interesting economic result that Hitler had one policeman to do what he wanted, another policeman to watch the first, and a third policeman to watch the other two, while the poor slave tried to produce enough to feed the three tax-eaters and have a little left over for himself. It's no wonder that a small farmer came to me in a village 1 day to ask if he could kill a pig. I said, "Whose pig?" He said, "Mine." I said, "Sure, go ahead and kill it, I don't care." And he said, "But where is the permission?" I said, "You don't need any permission. Just go ahead and kill him if you want to." The German walked off muttering something about it was a hell of a way to run a government that wouldn't even tell you whether you should kill a pig or not. Now, gentlemen, if your government is set up so that one man can't kill one pig without permission of a tax-eater, you are not going to get much production.

The Russian set-up is ever more unwieldly. Dan Connole tells about an engineer friend of his who was trying to assemble an American-made automobile plant in Russia prior to the war. The plant came knocked down from the United States with every beam lettered and numbered and its own sack of rivets and bolts attached to it. One day during the erection one of those things happened that happens dozens of times daily in every construction. A beam was set down 6 inches short of abutment with another beam. The engineer said to the crane man, "Move it over." The crane man said, "You told me to set it down there. My orders are to do what you say, but any changes have to be authorized by the foreman." The American got the Russian foreman and told him to tell the crane man to move it over. The foreman said, "Why wasn't it right the first time?" The American said, "We just missed a little. If he moves it over, everything will be okey." The Russian said, "It looks like a trick to me and, even if it goes all right, if I make an unauthorized change at your request, I can be reported for disobedience." The upshot of it was, gentlemen, that after much wrangling, the matter went clear to the Kremlin in Moscow and 3 weeks later an order came back that it was all right to go ahead and move the beam. River Rouge, Willow Run, and the Liberty ships weren't built that way.

My one experience with the Russians came shortly after the war in August 1945, when I crossed the American-Russian border with some 1,200 Russian slave laborers who were not at all happy to be going back to their original set of masters. In my innocence I looked forward to seeing the crack, well-disciplined troops of the great Russian force which had repelled Hitler's splendid army. To my amazement, I saw what looked like a rabble fleeing a stricken city. A column of Russian troops coming down the street consisted of an officer in an American jeep, an American 6 by 6 truck, and then cart after cart pulled by horses or oxen or pushed by hand. These carts were loaded with every describable kind of loot—mattresses, chairs, rugs, vases (no wash basins, however), and the military personnel was a helter-skelter melange of men and women, no two of whom were dressed alike, and no two of whom seemed to have the same type of small arms. A few miles farther on we came to a Russian airfield. The Russian pilots were stunting and showing off in one of the prettiest, trimmest little planes I had ever seen. I remarked to the Yank cub pilot who was with me that that was really a beautiful airplane. The Yank pilot said, "Well, it should be, it's the Bell Air Cobra P-39 which we declared obsolete in 1942 because it couldn't fight above 10,000 feet. We sent them all to Russia." (In the Korean fracas our observers also report seeing P-39s.) With these front-line troops that I saw that day, perhaps 50,000 in all, I never saw a Russian motor vehicle, armored or otherwise; I never saw a Yak or Stormovik plane. Maybe the Russians had them by the thousands, as the papers told us they did, but they didn't have them with their front-line troops.

Astonished as I was at the appearance of the Russians, I wondered how could this horde possibly have beaten the well-trained German Army, and then I remembered what a German tank captain, whom I had captured in my CIC work, had told me: "You Americans had a secret weapon that you didn't even know about. That was the big truck where all the wheels go" and he moved his fingers in circles to show what he meant. "Our trucks only had two driving wheels and we didn't have very many of them, and in the rain and snow on mud roads we just stopped or went by horse. You gave the Russians a hundred thousand of those big trucks and the gasoline to run them, so that they could go any place and we couldn't move to their point of attack. We knew where they were building up for an attack with your big trucks, and we couldn't get there to stop them."

Now, that's the way I saw it. I think certainly that the Russians can produce a few excellent tanks. They've already shown us that in Korea. Korea gives us so many conflicting reports that it's almost impossible to tell what's going on, but certainly we can tell that it is not a major war effort comparable to the last war. The Russians have also shown us some excellent jets, but, so far, 40 jets seems to be a large-scale air attack in Korea. At St. Lo in France, I have seen 3,000 Yank planes fly over me in one attack (incidentally, if I were a professional military analyst, I would predict that the Communist attack will bog down within the next 100 miles because of extended supply lines—meaning no production). As I said, I believe that the Russians can produce a few weapons, some of them excellent; but I think their chances of producing enough ships, enough tanks, enough guns, enough shells, enough trucks, enough supplies, enough food for a successful invasion of the United States are absolutely nil. They are nil now and they will become minus nil. The only way a slave nation can go is down.

I have deliberately left the question of the atomic bomb to the last, because I don't believe it deserves the attention it is getting. Mr. Truman and the Russians say that the Russians have the atomic bomb. Let us suppose for argument's sake that they do have it, and suppose that they have a few planes that will fly it to some of our major American cities. What are we going to do? We can't put an antiaircraft gun in every house and building in America. We can't make every house and building an atomic-bomb shelter. We can't make our country an armed camp on an everlasting 24-hour alert. The one thing we can do, we have done. We can have our own planes and our own bombs which can retaliate 10 to 100 times. The atomic bomb today is in the same situation that poison gas was in World War II. Germany did not use poison gas because we had so much gas ready to dump on Germany that the German people would have been up to their cabooses in Lewisite if the Germans had ever started. Stalin is far too intelligent to use an atomic bomb against this country.

Now, that's the way it looks to me. Russia can't hurt us, now or later. Now I ask you, gentlemen, does it make sense to bleed ourselves white for military production that can only be used if we send it overseas? Does it make sense for us to give, at our expense, arms in order to maintain the present masters of France against another set of masters, because every weapon we send to France means that the present French Government will have more money to spend in protecting

itself against the DeGaulle and similar factions who would like to take over the ruling of France? Does it make sense for us to fortify Franco as ruler of Spain on the outside chance that Stalin will take over Spain and rule it even worse? Can we continue perpetual occupation? Military government is not American government and soldiers do not teach the principle that the people are capable of self-government.

Now, what do I think we should do? Obviously, the first and most important thing, as I have said, is for us to quit being afraid of the Russians. Next, I think we should pull every soldier that we have overseas back to this country and get him into civilian clothes. It is my opinion that our military needs in this country are for a strong Air Force, but not a giant Air Force, a strong Navy, with emphasis on submarines, but not a giant Navy, and only enough ground forces for internal policing and officer training. I think we should make two internal reforms. I think we should get back on the gold standard so that the Government cannot render valueless our goods and services and property. I think we should adopt an amendment to the Constitution that would limit the Federal Government's power to tax, but these two items will have to wait until some other time when you will let me talk for still another half hour.

Now, gentlemen, in conclusion let me say this: We can never help ourselves or Europe or President Truman's backward nations of the world by military power or military expenditures. We can only hurt ourselves. If we are to help the world, we can only do it by education, by teaching the other nations of the world that the people are capable of self-government and that when the people have self-government their standards of living rise and there is no need for wars of aggression. Perhaps we could do this if we adopted the plan that the YWCA is doing in such a small way. You remember Mrs. Hurd of that organization told us that in occupied Germany, the YWCA is holding classes telling how the American way operates, telling about PTA's, League of Women Voters, Civic Betterment Leagues, chambers of commerce, telling how the elected officials are the servants and representatives of the people, rather than the masters. The Y is sending German men and women over here to study our system at work and to go back and teach the principle that the people are capable of self-government. Maybe this is the way. Maybe if it were done on a grand scale, it would bring what people want—peace to all. But certainly our present way will not bring peace, prosperity, or anything but hardship and bankruptcy. Gentlemen, get busy today, write our Congressmen and Senators, tell them that our foreign policy and our defense policy are nonsense. And, above all, gentlemen, quit being afraid of the Russians and fight to maintain our principle that the people are capable of self-government, so that this Nation, under God, shall not perish from the earth.

Money Wasted on Food Program Lost for Defense Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, according to the figures released by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the loss on the disposition of only 14 food commodities for the first 5 months of this fiscal year—through November 1950—amounted to $91,614,097.84.

The Department of the Army advises me that as of December 1, a 57-millimeter recoilless rifle cost $1,033. It is nothing short of a national disgrace that when the American people must carry so great a burden to produce and pay for vital equipment for our national defense, the Department of Agriculture throws away the equivalent of 85,000 of these rifles, plus $3,809,097 that might be used for ammunition, on an operation of this sort.

For the same 5 months, the Commodity Credit Corporation paid for the carrying charges on these same 14 items of food, $20,662,461.97. That would have paid for 1,000 radar sets at $16,415 and 900 ¾-ton trucks, with a balance of over $300,000, according to the Department of the Army estimates.

The total of the money lost in this period on disposition of these 14 commodities and the carrying charges is $112,276,559.81. That is an average waste of the taxpayers' money of $22,455,312 a month, or more than 100 light tanks, estimated to cost $200,341 each.

The detailed analysis of the Commodity Credit Corporation report follows:

	As of Nov. 30, 1950	
	Loss on disposition	Carrying charges
Butter	$20,016,887.67	$1,823,674.03
Cheese	7,497,151.54	1,315,263.25
Dried milk	13,962,071.26	2,196,257.37
Dried eggs	15,973,710.93	1,247,896.92
Irish potatoes	13,091,657.29	257,612.45
Raisins	8,195.49	5,812.34
Dried beans	3,133,998.50	1,902,569.13
Dried peas	303,006.80	317,848.07
Rice	[1] 137,453.21	154,191.99
Turkeys	34,025.84	27,683.71
Soybeans	103,876.15	85,742.80
Peanuts	2,055,844.65	138,201.32
Sweetpotatoes	701.33	698.83
Grain sorghum	15,570,423.60	11,131,004.76
Total	91,614,097.84	20,662,461.97

[1] Represents gain.

Surplus of Revenues in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ottawa Shows Heavy Surplus," which was published in the Gazette, Montreal, Canada, of January 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTTAWA SHOWS HEAVY SURPLUS—REVENUES $419,800,000 HIGHER THAN OUTLAY IN 9 MONTHS

OTTAWA, January 19.—The treasury reported today an accumulated budgetary surplus of $419,800,000 for the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, compared with $298,900,000 in the same stage of the preceding year.

It said the Government's revenues in that period totaled $2,048,100,000 compared with $1,836,400,000, while expenditures totaled $1,628,200,000 against $1,537,600,000.

For December alone, revenues were $261,100,000 against $199,600,000 in December 1949. Expenditures totaled $274,200,000, compared with $200,500,000.

Noting that expenditures were higher in the 9-month period, the treasury report said:

"If the special nonrecurring charge of $62,300,000 in 1949, due to the assumption of a portion of Newfoundland debt pursuant to the terms of union, is eliminated, the increase for 1950 over 1949 is $152,900,000."

HIGHER DEFENSE COSTS

"This increase was almost wholly accounted for by an increase of $135,300,000 in national defense expenditures and an increase of $15,400,000 in special expenditure due largely to payments arising out of the Winnipeg flood disaster.

"In addition, there was an uncontrollable increase of $9,200,000 in family allowances and one of $8,200,000 in old-age pensions."

The increase of $46,700,000 in December expenditures was more than accounted for by a jump of $65,000,000 in defense expenditures. Of the expenditure of $99,400,000 for defense, $56,700,000 was used to pay for equipment sent to Canada's North Atlantic partners.

The treasury said that of the 38 divisions of expenditure shown in its statement—excluding national defense—27 showed reduced administrative and general expenditures in December.

In addition to budgetary expenditures, there were nonbudgetary disbursements, totaling $500,000 in December and $68,800,000 in the first 9 months of the year. These outlays were for loans, advances and investments and were smaller than last year.

Internationalism in Action: 1940–50

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Internationalism in Action: 1940–50," published in the Columbus Evening Dispatch of Monday, January 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONALISM IN ACTION: 1940–50

On May 10, 1940, a new era opened in the affairs of the United States and the life of the American people. It was on this fateful day that Hitler's armies surged into western Europe. And although it was not apparent at the time, hindsight now shows that it was on this date that control over the destiny of the United States definitely passed into the hands of the interventionist internationalist group where it has since remained continuously until the present.

It is true that President Franklin D. Roosevelt had been trending in this direction in his conduct of foreign policy for some time. As early as 1937 he had indicated, in his "Quarantine Speech" at Chicago that he was intrigued by the idea of using the weight of American influence and possibly American

military power against the Nazi and Fascist dictatorships.

But after the successful invasion of the low countries, shortly followed by the fall of France, events moved at an accelerated speed to entangle the United States irretrievably in the newest troubles of Europe.

A national emergency was declared. The first peace-time draft law in our country's history was enacted. And, sometimes openly sometimes under cover, Mr. Roosevelt set in motion the many devious programs, commitments and provocative devices which were to culminate in the Pearl Harbor attack and the involuntary entry of the United States—a step he had long planned and hoped for—into the world conflict.

Now that a round-figure decade of control of the American destiny by the internationalists has ended and the Nation is heading into another 10-year span in which the outlook is even more uncertain and unpromising than it was in 1940, the time seems appropriate to look at the record, calmly, objectively, and without rancor; to sum up what the events of the 1940–50 period have meant to the American people and what their future looks like should they continue blindly to accept the leadership of the same group.

Before doing so, it may be instructive to analyze briefly the background of our 10 years under internationalist leadership; to point out how completely the thinkers of this persuasion have dominated American life and policy and have ceaselessly propagandized our people in favor of their point of view.

Since June 1940, the internationalists have controlled the conventions of both major political parties. They nominated Roosevelt for his third term in 1940 and a fourth term in 1944, and Truman in 1948. They blitzed the Republican Party into accepting Wendell Willkie, an ardent interventionist, in 1940. They nominated Dewey, another internationalist convert, in 1944 and renominated him in 1948. Whichever way the election had gone in any of these years, the internationalists would have had one of their own in the White House, so firm was their grip on the nominating machinery of both major parties.

There have been six Congresses elected during this period. In all of these the same internationalist influences have been able to check effectively any legislation of importance that could have greatly diminished America's wholesale appropriations for global causes.

The presence of a fervent internationalist in the White House brought about a bold and successful usurpation of congressional prerogatives. President Roosevelt in effect declared war on his own initiative long before America's formal entry. He followed this unprecedented step by handing American public funds outright to foreign governments and commercial interests. His actions went unrebuked by a Federal court system consisting overwhelmingly of judges appointed by the same internationalist President.

All three branches of the Government thus were continuously under internationalist control during the vital period here under consideration.

Since 1940, the internationalists also have enjoyed virtually a free hand in some of the Nation's mass media of information, culture, and entertainment and a majority representation in others. Let's look at the specific examples:

1. In the Nation's press the internationalist point of view has been supported by a majority of the important dailies. This includes many newspapers which have opposed the New Deal-Fair Deal on domestic issues. The press of the eastern seaboard and the South have been almost solidly favorable to the most belligerent internationalism and all it connotes. Virtually all the major columnists, from the gossip-mongers to the serious thinkers, have preached and still preach internationalism.

2. The radio, by reason of the life or death control exercised over broadcasters by the FCC, has been nearly 100 percent internationalist in its impact on the listening ear. Stations and commentators (except for participants on forum type programs) who have had the courage to express an opposite view, even in nonwar years, have been very few in numbers. Some individuals actually have been forced off the air by official pressure for pointing out the possible consequences of over-extending our commitments.

3. The internationalist penetration of Hollywood and the motion-picture industry also has been close to the saturation point. If there has been a single outstanding movie made in the past 10 years slanted in the direction of preserving the integrity of America or even mildly questioning the concept of Uncle Sam as guardian of the whole world's affairs, its title does not come to mind. Even the newsreels have the authentic global tinge that has colored an entire decade's thinking.

4. The legitimate theater has been even more abject, if that is possible, in its subservience, first to the principle of intervention and then to a militant internationalism and remorselessly severe in its criticism of the opponents of global experimentation.

5. The magazines published during the 1940–50 period have been adherents or converts to the prevailing internationalist creed, with few conspicuous dissenters. Here again the infiltration of periodical offices and staffs has been skillful and complete. The magazine reader of the past decade has been repetitiously bombarded with the idea that anything smacking of American self-interest is a sort of treason to future generations.

6. The success of the internationalist zealots has nowhere been more effective than in the book publishing field. The few books questioning the authenticity of America's rendezvous with global destiny which have seen print have been products either of minor houses or noncommercial university presses animated by the commendable wish to air all sides of the question. The big, successful major book houses have either been too timorous or too hamstrung by internationalist believers in their own organizations to touch anything contrary to the global viewpoint. And when books taking issue with internationalism have, by some miracle, appeared, they have been unmercifully smeared by global-minded reviewers, and often played down by retail outlets which regard them as sinister and reactionary.

7. The eager praise of internationalism in the Nation's public schools and universities is too well known to need comment. Suffice it to say that any youngster who finished his education in 1940–50 without becoming enrolled among the world-minded brotherhood is tough-minded and individualistic indeed. The impact of the war on those of this generation who served in the Armed Forces has, however, usually lessened their faith in the internationalist preachments of their school days.

8. Finally, the internationalists have made some of their most important and sweeping conquests in church organizations, particularly the large national denominational movements. Internationalism has been so identified in this field with hostility to war and with social progress that for practical purposes the terms have become synonymous, and the vast influence of these institutions has been diverted often and skillfully to opposite ends.

The greatest success of all scored by the internationalist movement has been the organization of the United Nations under American guidance and financial support.

In basic theory, UN is an organization to which no thoughtful seeker after world peace and security can possibly object. Into its service many devoted individuals have poured endless time and painstaking work.

If UN could be made to operate as those who have sincerely tried to make it work hoped it could, it would be recognized today as the greatest cooperative undertaking in human history. That it hasn't worked out that way is a matter of sorrowful record, and not by any means entirely the fault of the American internationalists. UN's failure to cope effectually with the hard realities of today's world situation is a bitter disappointment and, perhaps, bitterest of all to those who pinned on it the highest hopes.

So, we enter upon a fresh decade with the internationalists still in control; after 10 years (as we have seen) of either dominance or substantial control of almost every realm of activity in American life touching on public or private initiative.

Towering over all these factors, as we have noted, are the two most important of all: (1) Continuous control of the Federal Government; (2) unlimited access to the Treasury, resources, and manpower of the United States.

However, for the first time since 1940, the sentiment throughout the country which its foes loosely and unjustifiably call isolationist—sentiment which has either been shouted down, or smeared, or intimidated by what sometimes seemed universal scorn, again is making itself felt in calls for a reexamination of our international commitments and a scrutiny of our capacity to meet them.

The recent speeches of Joseph P. Kennedy and Herbert Hoover have evoked a growing chorus of approval throughout the country which now realizes the increasing disillusionment of the hopes raised by the outcome of World War II.

Men and women who have never subscribed to the implications of the internationalist doctrines are making themselves heard. There are many indications that the forthright analyses and proposed programs set forth by these experienced thinkers have given even some of the adherents of the global gospel themselves reason to pause as they realize the grave possibilities they have forced on their countrymen as a result of their past acts and decisions.

The followings on both sides of this new internationalist versus pro-American alignment cut across party lines. Mr. Kennedy is a Democrat, Mr. Hoover a Republican. The two most articulate exponents of the opposite side are State Secretary Dean Acheson, a Democrat, and John Foster Dulles, a Republican.

The question, as we launch into the 1951–60 period, which may very well be known to future historians as the decade of decision for America and the world, is: How do we proceed from here? Do we follow the same guides and the same advice implemented by the same policies, or do we make a radical change, recognizing the devastating conditions we face today as a result of following this leadership?

Isn't it time that those who may have brought us to this impasse, in the sincere belief that they were serving their nation and mankind, should give those who foresaw the probable result and spoke out against it at least a respectful hearing?

Shall an America burdended with crushing debt, militarily in danger for the first time in her 174 years, and rapidly becoming physically isolated in a threatening world by the hard logic of day-by-day developments continue on the same course, and still depend on the philosophy whose advocates apparently fail to recognize the point to which it has led us?

Is the internationalist leadership, which has had a clear field and almost undisputed sway for 10 years, adequate to the severe

challenge of our present plight? Shall we trust it to keep America safe and strong and to carry us through our current trials?

Can this leadership cope with a world situation in which stark, brutal force is now unleashed primarily against this Nation?

The American people must make this decision. It is a decision that they must make at least by 1953—if we are spared an all-out war that long—or which events may compel them to make sooner.

The decision must be considered, and it must be sound and right if the United States of America, as we have known it, is to survive.

Our National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the portion of the annual report by Mr. L. M. Giannini, president of the Bank of America, entitled "Our National Interest."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATIONAL INTEREST

As a nation, we enter the new year with the greatest need in all our history for inspired leadership, national teamwork, and exercise of profound wisdom.

Recent world events make it entirely clear that our efforts to live in peace will be successful only provided they have the backing of defensive strength so impressive, so mighty, that it discourages any acts of aggression, or even the inner ambition to march against free people.

Second sight reveals it was a mistake for us to have decimated our military strength following the armistice. We should have maintained it in a state of preparedness so effective that it would never have to be used.

In this world we can never go back to normal. We can only go forward to a new normal—in this case a new normal of defensive preparedness sufficient to win and hold our goal of peace.

And so we are now embarked upon the task of retrieving our postwar mistake of excessive demobilization. The cost will be high, but we are prepared to pay it.

We will pay the price through our sons and daughters in uniform. We will pay the price in higher taxes. We will pay the price in temporary shortages and other inconveniences.

I am convinced, however, that once our national economy has become adjusted to the requirements of an effective preparedness state, we can—if we possess the will—continue our way of life without sacrifice of any essential freedom. Once having established our national impregnability, we can maintain it permanently in every essential aspect and at the same time produce the goods and provide the services with which our living standard is fashioned. It will be a case of adjustment to a new tempo in all things, which, after all, has always been the basic pattern of our economy to a greater or lesser degree.

The immediate task will be easier, and our goal more quickly won, if labor and management work in harmony, if political expediency is retired to the side lines, and if the Federal Government sets the example for the people to follow in matters of economical operation and conservation of resources, including manpower resources.

From now forward, business and industry must make its manpower more productive. It is to be hoped the Federal Government will do the same shouldering its added tasks without further unnecessary inroads into the labor force, by bringing hours and other working conditions of Government employees into line with those which must prevail in factories and fields and stores and offices and homes.

On behalf of our bank, I wish to confirm that which you already know. We shall continue to promote thrift as a means of strengthening the fiber of our people and as a way of combating inflation. To add to the attractiveness of saving money, we have just increased our savings interest rate by one-third, from 1½ percent to 2 percent. Our resources and our resourcefulness will be adapted to the new needs and made fully available to business, industry, and Government, to facilitate the change-over to our new standard of defensive strength.

Respectfully submitted,

L. M. GIANNINI,
President.

Economic Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a timely statement on economic planning by the Honorable James K. Vardaman, Jr., member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. This splendid statement, which served as the basis for an article in the New York Times of January 21, clearly and forcibly points out the necessity for across-the-board controls and a program of adequate taxation. I strongly commend it to the favorable attention of the Congress and of the American people, and therefore ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT MADE IN NEW YORK ON JANUARY 18, 1951, TO MR. JOHN G. FORREST, FINANCIAL EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES, BY J. K. VARDAMAN, MEMBER, FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

I have thought for many months that the most serious problem with which the United States Government is confronted is the preservation of a sound American dollar. We can even accept defeat in military engagements and still survive as a nation so long as our economy and our money are sound. But without a sound dollar with a strong purchasing value in domestic and world markets we cannot survive as a nation with our present form of government, even though we may win all of our military engagements.

For some months it has appeared to me that the Nation should have at the earliest possible moment a complete pattern of strict, direct controls embracing allocations of strategic materials, rationing, price controls, and wage controls. These controls should be across the board, total in effect, and cover all classes of our personal and corporate population.

In addition to these direct controls there should, of course, be an adequate program of taxation, including a general sales tax; and there should be other fiscal, monetary, and credit controls sufficiently powerful to siphon off the backlog of surplus money to be automatically created by the direct controls.

It strikes me that we are simply deluding ourselves as public officials, and not being entirely fair with the American people, when we convince ourselves and lead the people to believe that voluntary agreements, as desirable as they may be in peacetime, and selective credit controls, over-all credit controls, and the highest practical tax assessment, will be sufficient to restore and preserve the purchasing value of the dollar and thereby protect and perpetuate our present form of government.

We must have organization and discipline in our civil population as well as the military, or else our whole structure is apt to collapse. The necessity for this discipline is emphasized by the probability of attack on the United States proper. In our present state of mind, panic would probably result from such an attack; whereas, if we begin immediately to accustom ourselves to discipline in thought as well as in action we will be much more likely to survive.

On the fundamental question of selective credit controls I feel now as I have always felt, that such controls are unwise. Actually they have little or no material effect percentagewise on the total national credit structure; but they do have a disastrous effect on the social attitude of the people, primarily because they do not affect equally all income classes and corporate groups. Factional opposition to these controls, some sound and some selfish, handicaps the over-all monetary and credit control function of the Federal Reserve System, because when the Board acts in these limited areas the populace and the congressional opposition become vocal and strong enough to prevent the Board being granted necessary additional selective and general control authority to meet its contemplated statutory responsibility in the monetary and credit field. In other words, distrust and loss of confidence in the Board's objectivity brought about by these pin-point, annoying and ineffective selective controls potentially weaken the entire structure of Board authority. I have always thought that the Board's contribution to our Nation would be much more constructive if the Board were more exclusively in the position of a high court and less in the position of a police judge and policeman.

Right or wrong, good or bad, the fact remains that regulations W, T, and X have not in the past, nor have they at present, stopped the inflationary trend and the flight from the dollar. They may be very good regulations concomitant to fiscal, monetary, and direct controls, but by themselves they appear to me to do more harm than good. And I speak from more than 20 years' successful experience which I enjoyed as a lawyer, banker, and businessman before becoming a member of the Board.

I believe that the people of this country have confidence in President Truman personally and will wholeheartedly obey and support a program of over-all direct controls. Enforcement machinery can well follow the imposition of the controls, and their imposition should not be delayed the months required to set up such machinery. Of course there will always be an appreciable percentage of chiselers and cheaters, black marketeers and other scum; but a vast majority of the American people are honest and law abiding and in this critical period when our very existence depends on our behavior I firmly believe that the population will largely police itself in these vital matters.

Having served more than 5 years in combat service with the Army and amphibious Navy in our last two wars I am convinced that the Armed Forces also have faith in the Presidency and in the American people. If they didn't have they couldn't do a good job in the field, and nobody realizes that better than the mothers and fathers and friends of armed service personnel, and those people will obey and help police any pattern of controls that may be necessary.

The Marines' Esprit de Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "They're Just Tougher," by Mr. Jim G. Lucas appearing in the Washington Daily News of Friday, January 26, 1951.

This is an uncensored report and, in my opinion, bears out the need for the legislation introduced by myself and 42 other Senators to strengthen the Marine Corps. What we needed at the time of the Korean outbreak, and what we need now, is a strong, versatile and effective fighting force which will always be ready for immediate action.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY'RE JUST TOUGHER

(By Jim G. Lucas)

(NOTE.—Reporter Jim G. Lucas appraises the weaknesses of our fighting forces in Korea in this uncensored article. Mr. Lucas has just returned to the United States after 5 months on the Korean battlefields. He has observed first-hand the lack of toughness, aggressiveness and morale which he reports, and has talked with men who felt cheated when they were ordered into the fighting from their relatively soft life as occupation troops. Other uncensored dispatches by Mr. Lucas will follow.)

The general pulled his box closer to the fire. "They're tougher than we are," he said.

Just that. They're tougher than we are. They can take more than we can.

"Over there," he continued, "they're walking around tonight in straw sandals. We say it can't be done. But they're doing it. We're so bundled up we can't move. They're just tougher than we are."

A lot has been written about the training of American troops. The first men into Korea came from Japan. They were accustomed—in varying degrees—to relatively soft living. There had been some field training, but no one contended it was enough. Many enlisted men never expected to fight. They'd simply taken up the Army's offer of security and retirement. Many were marking time to finish their education.

To be thrown into battle was the last thing they expected. Many felt deceived, cheated, abused. They made no secret of it. That doesn't mean all felt that way. There were good, hard, trained fighting men in our ranks. That they were able to hold any kind of a line—with the odds confronting them—is tribute to them and men like the late Lt. Gen. Walton Walker.

ARMY KNOWS IT

The Army now recognizes that fact. It probably recognized it all along. But the burden of garrisoning occupied territories imposed a new and different responsibility on its peacetime shoulders. Now, it says it's going to toughen up. Veterans of Korea will have much to say about how GIs are trained from now on.

There's a growing suspicion in Korea that we are overmechanized. Maj. Gen. Robert McClure, formerly commander of the Second Division, said recently we have become so mobile we have lost our mobility. Everything we sent to Korea, he said, was designed for war in the Low Countries of Europe. Maj. Gen. Frank Lowe, President Truman's representative in Korea, put it a little differently one night. But he meant the same thing.

"I am prepared to bet any man," he said caustically, "that there are more jeeps than fighting men in Korea."

No one took him up.

"The average American soldier," General McClure told a group of correspondents one night, "expects to ride to the battlefield, ride away, live—and if necessary—die on pneumatic tires."

BETTER TO WALK

One afternoon in central Korea, just outside Wonju, a battalion executive officer told me he'd sent his jeeps to the rear. The enemy, in considerable strength, was 500 yards ahead. He and his men knew there was a good chance they'd be overwhelmed. I asked if he didn't need motors for a getaway.

"That may be the trouble with our Army today," he answered. "Too many wheels. I was a company commander in the last war and I had two jeeps. I never saw them; turned them over to my supply and mess sergeants. Today each company has four. That's too many. It ties us down to whatever roads we can find and you can't find them here. Men fight better on foot. They have a better chance getting out if they walk."

Take any given area—particularly in the mountains of Korea—and you can spot the two or three avenues down which our troops can move. The enemy can spot them, too. But the enemy can fan out and move on us from any direction he chooses. The mountains are our roadblocks. They are his highways.

"We are roadbound," General McClure said. "Bound to tortuous, twisting trails which are easily subject to ambush and demolition. We are fighting in compartmentalized terrain and we haven't enough room to move about. Not with the kind of equipment we've been given."

But overmechanization is only part of the story. There's also the matter of discipline and aggressiveness. And many better officers and men quite frankly admit we could stand improvement.

Such a statement, of course, runs serious risk of misinterpretation. It is not intended as a reflection on the courage of the great bulk of our men in Korea. One war correspondent wrote, after Seoul, that the record of our Army had been one of panic and cowardice. In 5 months in Korea, I found nothing to support that kind of generalization.

But I am convinced that our Army at times lacked aggressiveness. After the Chinese came in, many men were interested only in getting out. That was true at the top as well as among enlisted men. Such things as "Pusan, Here We Come" appeared chalked on jeep sides during our retreat. One officer, at Hungnam, told me morale was never higher among his troops than after we began our evacuation. They thought they were leaving for good. No one ever talked of going north again. If it was said, usually as a joke, it was greeted by shocked silence.

Another officer, a lieutenant colonel and battalion commander, complained one night that he had many men who, over a period of weeks, hadn't finished firing their first clip.

"They'll go to the front if ordered," he said. "They'll get shot at. But they won't shoot back. They're not mad."

Again, it would be unfortunate to leave the impression this is true of all, or any major part, of our Army. But a chain is as strong as its weakest link. And one man can cost hundreds of lives.

Too often, the man in the ranks has little feeling of responsibility or teamwork. Frequently, he feels little responsibility even for his own survival. General McClure insisted that most frostbite and forsen feet cases were the victim's own fault. Men didn't change their socks, didn't dry them when they took them off. They'd been told how, but it was too much trouble. And it was too much trouble for their officers to push them. They were conditioned to expect someone else to look after them. Many paid a tragic price.

I spent Christmas night on a listening post 2 miles in front of our lines. We were in deadly peril. We could, at any moment, be surrounded and destroyed. One patrol 2 miles away did meet that fate.

To my dismay, the two soldiers with me laid down their rifles as soon as we reached our outpost and went to sleep. I spent most of the night trying to keep them awake. They not only slept, they snored. And the enemy was right in front of us. Our troops were 2 miles back.

Finally, in desperation, I threatened to report them. I did just that when we returned. Their commanding officer was unimpressed. He'd sent a couple of goldbricks on that patrol, he said, as punishment.

The idea of trusting my life to men with no more sense of responsibility frightened me as badly as contact with the enemy.

Later, the commanding officer conceded it was a deplorable situation. But he insisted it was not unusual. He pointed out that, technically, the men could have been shot on the spot and nothing could have been done about it.

"But can you imagine what'd happen to me?" he asked.

At the risk of special pleading (because I am a former marine), it is my observation as well as that of the majority of war correspondents that the marines offend less in this respect than the Army. The marines' esprit de corps is traditional. The idea that the other fellow depends on you to deliver the goods—that you are part of a team—is drilled into marines from the hour they enter boot camp. Among them, it is high treason to let the other guy down.

American Fighting Resourcefulness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Betting on Americans," which appeared in the Bozeman (Mont.) Daily Chronicle of January 18.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTING ON AMERICANS

Not so many weeks ago we heard a bigwig from Washington give a particularly depressing account of a briefing he had attended at the Pentagon a few days before. He said that one of the top officials—he didn't say who—wound up on this cheerful note:

"I would say that the odds that our children will not live under Russian slavery are no better than 50-50."

We've been thinking that over. And what we think is that we would like to bet every nickel we could beg, borrow, or steal on the American people at odds like that in any kind of contest you want to name.

Since when did this country start fighting shy of even-money gambles? When did we begin to doubt our ability to hold our own in any venture that offered us an even break.

A friend of mine says he is alarmed by what he takes to be a wave of defeatism that is sweeping the country. We'd be alarmed by it, too, if we really believed it went any deeper than just flannel-mouth talk.

We get no goose pimples from the warnings of those who point out that bombs probably will fall on the United States in any future world war, and those who wonder whether the American people have what it takes to stand up under the kind of pounding the British took in the last war. We are not dismayed by the thought that simply because we have never lost a war, in the commonly accepted sense, it doesn't follow that we will never lose one. The logic may be sound enough but the conclusion is preposterous. The Census Bureau could comb the country without turning up a single American who actualy believes the United States might have to knuckle under to any potential enemy now in sight.

Even so, we do seem to scare pretty easily these days. Too many professional crepe-hangers are figuring out how many divisions we could field in a pinch and assuming that the jib is up if somebody else could scrape up a few more.

What's become of the old Patrick Henry cockiness and the spirit of '76? Those hard-bitten old-timers used to think that a good American could lick any 10 foreigners. They thought nothing of taking on crack enemy troops with squirrel rifles and pitchforks.

Now we trembled at the thought of how many half-starved vagrants a potential enemy might be able to point in our direction. We wonder how our boys, who started making model airplanes when they were 10 years old, will do against butter-fingered peasants who only recently got the hang of the can opener.

It may be that our traditionally high opinion of American fighting resourcefulness leaned a trifle to the irrational side. But it has pulled the country out of many a tight hole. We needn't go around butting our heads into brick walls to prove what stout fellows we are. Nor need we take foolhardy risks with American lives just to save the faces of bungling diplomats.

But let's not mislead stupid aggressors into imagining that any live American is ever going to be a slave to any foreign dictator. That would be downright deceitful.

Gifts of Butter by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Since Korean War Began More Than 75,000,000 Pounds of Butter Given Away by United States," written by John W. Ball, and published in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 28, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would also call attention to the fact that on January 26 the Boston Globe published the price of butter in Boston, Mass., as being 75 cents a pound.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I have the power to yield to the Senator from New Mexico, I do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to say that I was informed by a man in the Department of Agriculture only last week that not only were as many million pounds of butter as the Senator from Massachusetts spoke of given away by the United States, but that during the past year many million dollars' worth of cheese were given away by the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am glad to receive that information from the Senator from New Mexico, and thank him for giving it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I have the power to do so, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Massachusetts also undoubtedly knows that since the end of the last war the United States gave away $20,000,000,000 to Europe for purposes perhaps less worthy than the one he has referred to?

The article referred to is as follows:

SINCE KOREAN WAR BEGAN, MORE THAN 75,000,000 POUNDS OF BUTTER GIVEN AWAY BY UNITED STATES

(By John W. Ball)

Uncle Sam has given away more than 75,000,000 pounds of butter—half of it overseas—since the Korean war started last June. Other millions were sold at one-fourth the Government's cost. The entire cost of the butter given away was about $45,000,000.

While Agriculture Department's Commodity Credit Corporation was handing out these supplies with a more than lavish hand, the Army Quartermaster was buying 20,000,000 pounds at full market price, or about $12,000,000. The Army, also bought more than 7,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine, for the use of all the armed services. It is now buying about 4,000,000 pounds of butter and 1,000,000 pounds of oleo each month to feed the ever-increasing armed services.

The Government's transactions in butter make one of the most fantastic stories in all the weird operations of the farm price support system.

Besides giving away millions of pounds of butter while the Army was buying it in increasing amounts each month, CCC now proudly boasts that it sold 127,000,000 pounds on the domestic market at 60 cents a pound, plus handling charges of not more than 3 cents and usually less.

The last of these transactions took place justly recently, all of them in the last few months. Some of these supplies allegedly went into the speculative market. The butter CCC sold at 60 cents a pound to American commercial dealers, was selling for 71 cents on the Chicago market a week ago and is now bringing around 69 cents.

The 60 cents that CCC got for its supplies—virtually all bought this year—was the price that the Government paid for the butter under the fixed, arbitrary terms twice laid down by Congress within the last 30 months in the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949. About 2 to 3 cents a pound was added for handling.

(The Government's price support program has cost more than $100,000,000 already this year, according to President Truman's budget message. It probably will reach double that figure by the year's end June 30. It cost one and six-tenths billion in fiscal year 1949.)

FIFTEEN-CENT PRICE TO ITALY

Here's the butter story step by step:

During 1949 and 1950 CCC bought 242,000,000 pounds of butter to keep consumer prices high and farmers happy.

Of this amount it sold 127,000,000 pounds to commercial dealers, in recent months at 60 cents a pound.

Another 5,500,000 pounds were sold last September to the Government of Italy at 15 cents a pound. (In the same month the Army bought 3,180,737 pounds for $1,963,066, or a little more than 61 cents a pound.)

About 51,000,000 pounds more was given free of charge plus freight costs to the school lunch program and to private or State charities. Estimates place the amount that went free of charge to domestic charities at about 40 million pounds.

Another 37,500,000 pounds was donated free of charge for shipment to foreign countries as follows: Israel, 18,847,350 pounds; Yugoslavia, 11,000,000 pounds; Germany, 5,400,000 pounds; Italy, 1,352,900 pounds; France, 547,250 pounds; Trieste, 278,000 pounds; Austria, 70,500 pounds, Tunisia, 55,000 pounds; India, 51,500 pounds; French Morocco, 44,000 pounds; Great Britain, 43,000 pounds; Greece, 31,525 pounds; and Norway, 22,500 pounds.

These foreign shipments were given free, freight paid to shipboard. Distribution was made in the foreign countries by welfare agencies, such as CARE, Jewish welfare groups, the Friends, etc. All such agencies were first approved for the donations by the State Department.

As of January 12, CCC had only 8,500,000 pounds of butter left. This, it reported, has been "committed," mostly for the school lunch program.

In the present fiscal year CCC has lost $24,000,000 on butter, in addition to the Army purchases.

The Government's Part in the Nation's World Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New York State Agricultural Society, the oldest of its kind in the United States, held its one hundred and nineteenth annual meeting in Chancellor's Hall, State Education Building, at Albany, N. Y., on January 24. The central theme for discussion at its conference was the Nation's World Responsibilities, with particular emphasis upon the citizen's part, labor's part, industry, agriculture, and the Government. My part of the discussion related to the Government's part in world affairs which I include herewith:

The building in which this meeting is held today and this auditorium awaken

treasured memories for me. While a law student in this city I was employed as messenger, clerk, and reviewer of regents' examinations here in the education department, and in this very chamber, Chancellor's Hall, some years ago I witnessed the inauguration of the commissioner of education of this State, a man whom I regard as the noblest soul I have ever known. I am honored to be the son of that man.

So it is a pleasure to me to be here among these many memories of yesterday, among old friends, and to be a participant in this gathering which is of real significance to our great State and to its men and women who, through their agricultural contributions, bring so much to the State and Nation and to the men and women of our Armed Forces, with whom I have long felt so closely allied as a result of my congressional identification with the Armed Forces for the past 14 years.

For any person to be asked to speak of the Government's part in the Nation's world responsibilities today, in such troubled and epochal times, and by such an important a society as this, in itself constitutes an honor and recognition.

I must in candor confess that I have deliberately accepted the invitation to be here in that spirit.

I have done so perhaps in some desperation. My choice seemed a little bleak. Either I could immodestly approach the problem as constituting recognition of an unusual sort, or I could submit to the overwhelming sense of inadequacy any reasonable person ought to feel in approaching a subject to this magnitude today.

In measuring our future today, I think all of us must recognize that the role of our National Government, perhaps for years ahead, will encompass virtually all significant areas of our economy and will penetrate deeply into all critical areas of this distressed and frightened globe.

It is, in fact, in keeping with many currents of present-day thought to say that the citizens of our land are impatiently demanding a greater role for our Government than—remarkably enough—Government itself appears ready to assume.

I think this yearning for governmental initiative and guidance in these times is not so extraordinary. There are unparalleled times. The problems we face internationally are not new among mankind, for they are the age-old problems of survival, of violence and bloodshed, of misery and despair, of revolutionary movements among downtrodden peoples, of despotism, of threats to all Christian values and concepts.

These are not the problems that make our times unparalleled. Neither is the sternness of the test in today's world accountable for public yearnings for greater Government energy and purposeful direction of national affairs.

The mark of our times is the vast complexity of the issues with which we must work, and the awful consequences if we miscalculate our course. Our national power has become so vast that once set in motion, like the great flywheel (and, unfortunately, slow to start, like the flywheel), it is a serious task indeed to arrest its motion.

So as citizens, lacking access to the factual data from which decisions of high public policy are derived, it is our right to demand wisdom, to demand initiative, to demand a great sense of responsibility, and to demand vision and statecraft on the part of our Government collectively, and on the part of our public leaders individually. Our people are making these demands upon our Government today in steadily increasing volume. The reason is clear. That reason is the official title of these remarks—the people have become acutely aware of "the Government's part in the Nation's world responsibilities."

And our people are demanding that the Government fulfill that part.

I think it is clear enough that the role of our Government is, in regard to international problems, to serve as the rudder on our ship of State. It is the instrumentality of the people of the United States through which they determine their direction in world affairs, and through which they give evidence of their collective meaning to the nations of the world. It is trite, but largely true, to say that the Government is only as courageous, as insistent, as idealistic, as far-sighted, and as wise as are the people themselves, for the Government in our society must always closely mirror the citizens, for better or worse, or surely collapse or be frustrated in its ventures.

But this fundamental tenet of our system does not absolve our Government leaders from their own responsibilities. They are not to be mere weathercocks responding helplessly to the public breeze. Not only do they have a responsibility for leadership in areas in which the people are not informed but our Government leaders also hold the awful responsibility for charting a course for the ship of state through uncharted and perilous waters, the citizens being in a position uncomfortably similar to that of the impressed seamen and having, oftentimes—some say especially so in odd-numbered years—just about as much to do with the direction of the vessel as does the impressed seaman.

In these circumstances we can see clearly the role of the Government in today's world.

It is to lead our people, in areas where they are inadequately informed and where for reasons of national security they cannot be informed.

It is to guide our Nation through the shadowy and threatening valleys which must be traversed if we are to reach the plains of an assured and lasting peace.

It is to harness and concentrate our power, economic and military, to bring the great potentialities of our land to bear when and where needed for the task before us.

It is to instill confidence and faith among other nations in the world in the ultimate conquest of tyranny by freemen, and to bring courage and determination to those to whom the cause seems so hopeless today.

And in these awesome undertakings, the Government must ever remain the tool of our free citizens, reflecting their collective will, for all that it does or attempts to do hinges upon how effectively this is done.

Of these obligations upon our Government today, there can be no doubt amongst any of us who love freedom and revere the type of society which has made our country the phenomenon of the ages, that the greatest test of all is whether or not we can prevent the world from bursting into flames that would ravage victor and vanquished alike. The spectre of the blinding flash of the atom bomb, the shattering roar of mighty rockets fired from aircraft or distant platforms, the hidden menace of bacteriological warfare and chemical warfare, the nightmarish prospect of the new and untold terrors of the hydrogen bomb, the frenzy and terror and hideousness of modern war, all this lies possibly, some say probably, before us, as our Government strives with all the means at its command to prevent the holocaust.

Yes; here is the prime role of our Government in the Nation's world responsibilities. To achieve peace—peace with honor—lasting, durable peace to permit our people and all of mankind to work for their betterment, freed from the oppressive fear of war.

How this can best be done is the central topic of our times, in and out of the Government.

It is the focal point around which the Congress revolves in all of its major deliberations.

I have felt for quite some time that this challenging problem has been compounded of far too much defeatism and bias to be soundly resolved. In the approach of many of us to this issue, I have sensed time and again that revulsion against war by many of our peace-loving peoples has led them to an attempt to deny the military facts of life through a sort of psychological escapism which we see commonly among children who find facing up to hard facts to be too distasteful. It is this sort of escapism that produces the inclination to consign Europe to her own doom and to take the apparently easier road of girding ourselves with moats of wind and water, leaving the world to simmer in its evil brew as if we were not also in the pot.

And from our inherited biases against things and peoples foreign stem our tendency to dismiss contemptuously the halting steps of Europeans to strengthen their own defenses. We tend to overlook completely how different it must be to be so situated as to have to look down the muzzle of a Russian gun which may go off while you are rearming than it is to counsel strong hearts and stout defiance from this citadel 3,000 miles away.

In making that observation, I do not mean to pose as an apologist for the inadequacies of our European friends. Neither do I desire to imply in any way that our people can be or should be content with anything but effort on their part comparable to that which our Nation is making in the cause of freedom.

However, it is one thing for the coach to stay on the sidelines, shouting to his battle-weary, bruised team, "They can't hurt us." It is far more meaningful if the coach makes the same comment, "They can't hurt us," when he too is in the fight with his team.

I feel, therefore, that we are a bit prone to deprecate the impact upon our European friends of their proximity to the mighty and truculent Russian war machine. I sometimes wonder how vigorous Mexico or Canada would be if England or France were exhorting them to arm against America, if our actions and attitudes were and had long been menacing toward those countries. My guess is that their rearmament effort would be halting and slow, or at least prudent.

To return to our theme. What is the proper role of our Government in dealing with this problem?

Our citizens of this great land must hope that our Government can weld the European nations and other freedom-loving nations of the world into a working, virile, determined and powerful team dedicated to the prevention of aggression in the world. That is the present obligation and effort. And I feel profoundly that all of us must pray that that effort is blessed with success.

You will note that I have not stated an alternative. I have emphasized the importance of creating a free world determination and concert of military effort. I have mentioned no alternative because the prospect is too fearful to contemplate. Contrary to the views of some others, my conviction, based on harsh military facts, is that ultimate destruction awaits America if we seek to go it alone on this tormented planet, consigning the vast resources and industrial capacities of the remainder of the world to the diabolical Reds.

Appealing though this plague-on-the-rest-of-the-world concept is, as an escapist mechanism by which to construct a more pleasant dream world than the facts warrant, it smacks too much of an effort to destroy the Russian bear by gorging him to death. I find it difficult to believe that this Nation, or any nation, can vanquish communism by giving it indigestion.

Neither can any of us look with anything less than dread upon the situation that would ensue if the Reds were permitted to place the resources and industrial complex of Western Europe into their own orbit to develop endlessly, remorselessly, day and

night, year in and year out, until the vaunted industrial supremacy of America became a nostalgic memory, or until America destroyed herself in the endless torment of an armaments race stupendous beyond belief.

Nor is security to be found in passive defense, as the annals of warfare amply demonstrate, and as ancient Rome found to her sorrow. Moats of wind and water become highways—avenues of approach—to the nation with superior air or naval fleets. I shudder to contemplate the disasters to be heaped upon future American generations if this generation should yield to the Reds the shipyards of France, Belgium, Italy, and England, along with their aircraft manufacturing capabilities, all of this potentially mighty strength supplemental to the Russian industrial system. Surely there could be no doubt that ultimately America would be crushed in the industrial effort this terrible competition would require; or, if our land gave up the race in order to preserve its economy, military conquest of our land could only be our ultimate reward.

Does this mean, then, that the role of our Government is simply to deny the industrial capacity of Western Europe to the Soviet Union? No, the responsibility is more serious than that. Our Government must, certainly, deny to the Soviet Union the industrial capabilities of Europe even in the terrible eventuality of Russian seizure of these areas. But the lessons of the last war are clear in this respect. Air power has severe limitations, as we see daily in the press accounts of the warfare in Korea. Not only is air power unable, of itself, to stop the advance of a powerful ground army, but it cannot scourge a nation to death by and of itself. All of us remember the Nazi's guided missiles launching sites late in the last war when America and her allies had complete air superiority. Despite innumerable bombing attacks, despite all that air power could do, it was only when the ground troops overran these sites that all of them could be put out of commission.

It would be no different in a future war. Should the Soviet Union overrun Western Europe, we could never wholly eliminate the industrial strength this victory would add to the Red military machine. I am reminded of the fact that in spite of the tremendous and innumerable bombing attacks on Nazi Germany from 1942 until 1944, German war production climbed steadily until American armies were at the frontiers and our air attacks were turned primarily to tactical purposes.

The harsh military fact, true heretofore in warfare, equally true today, is that a nation is defeated only when its military force, ground, air, and naval, is destroyed or rendered impotent. This demands a mighty ground force quite as much as a mighty air force and mighty navy. Much as we might wish it, there is no other route.

The only way I know to keep the military potential of Western Europe from being exploited to our ultimate disaster by the Reds is to keep them from overrunning it in the first instance.

That is our problem. That is the awful responsibility of our Government.

It cannot be accomplished by purchasing allies or by compelling the nations of Western Europe, by cajolery or economic pressure, to create armed forces. A military organization cannot be an effective fighting machine unless there is in existence a strong national determination and will to fight behind that organization. Neither can it be accomplished by America's manhood and American military machines alone. Our manpower is too limited; our national economy cannot endlessly withstand the strains such a policy would produce.

It can be accomplished only if the will of Western Europe to resist is sufficiently strong to rustle in European fighting forces the strength to stand up against the alien forces to the east. That will to resist must come from within those nations themselves. It cannot be obtained from America. Determination to retain national and personal freedom is not a marketable quantity; it comes from the national character and traditions.

But this does not leave our Government impotent and consigned to a wringing of hands while awaiting, hopefully, a resurgence of a European will to resist. There are positive steps our Government can and must take, and has taken. These steps include economic assistance within limits, nearly all of which, in my own view, has been given that should be. They include direct military assistance in the form of military equipment and advice where needed, this program still requiring considerable implementation in the future to be effective, and also requiring a much greater autonomy of military personnel in Europe and less State Department control. The effort also requires continuing encouragement of the European countries to confederate, to remove artificial restrictions on trade and commerce and military effort in order that a healthy European economy and military capacity can be built.

But more than this is also involved.

There is also involved the commitment of American military strength to Europe. The American fleet must have sufficient aircraft carrier strength to provide promptly air superiority where and when needed at vital areas in the Mediterranean, in and around the British Isles, and over the coastal areas of the European continent. The American Air Force must amass sufficient fighter strength in England, in Africa, and on the continent itself to withstand, in concert with our allies, the initial Soviet assault from the air should it be unleashed. Our Air Force must also maintain in instant readiness the bombing power required from British, African, and other bases to pulverize strategic Soviet installations in the event the necessity arises.

And on the ground the Americans must have sufficient strength to protect themselves adequately in the event of attack so that, if the need arises, at least they will have reasonable opportunity, in combination with the American Air Force and Navy, to be withdrawn before encirclement or total destruction.

These steps are essential to effective European resistance—to the resurgence of the vigorous European effort required to save Europe from conquest and to save America from the bleak prospects which retirement to our own shores presents. Our ground rule in rendering this military assistance to Europe must be to provide enough to make it evident to Europe that America has both the intent and the ability to stand with the Europeans against the Soviet Union on the European Continent, and that the American ability is sufficiently evident and promising as no longer to make the cause appear hopeless.

More of a contribution than this would be a disservice to our own efforts, for it would encourage Europe to a do-nothing policy which, leaving us to carry the burden alone, also carries seeds for the destruction of our land through economic collapse. Less than this will surely leave Europe so supine and fearful of moving to her own defense that all our great investments in the recovery of this part of the world will have proved in vain.

Acknowledgedly it is a fine balance we seek—a dangerous, a fateful balance. General Eisenhower at this moment is appraising its possibilities, promises, and risks, and all the world looks with extreme interest and concern to his report upon return from Europe. I have the utmost confidence in his ability. I believe in his integrity and objectivity, and it is my observation that the entire Nation respects his judgment. His message to our troubled land will have a heavy impact on public and congressional attitudes and activities for months thereafter.

It is well for all of us to keep foremost in our thinking in all of these efforts abroad these days that our motivation has been, is, and must in the future be the guaranty of our own national security. It is self-interest, not overweening concern over the future of others at this critical time, that underlies our national policies. Nations are never charitably motivated in their military efforts. We need have no cobwebs in our thinking in respect to our relations with our European friends during the critical months and years ahead. The cooperation we receive, if indeed we receive it, will not be the result of European fondness for our peoples. It will be produced from a desire for their own national survival. I digress to make this point only to remove the fuzziness in the minds of those who advocate the defense of this or that area in the world for emotional reasons, or because of traditional factors unrelated to the problems of today.

The tragedy of our times, as was so cogently pointed out by that magnificent American, Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, last October 16 in an address at the University of Washington, is that in the course of the last war, primarily as a result of our unfortunate and short-sighted addiction to the term "unconditional surrender," insisted upon by the late President Roosevelt at the Casablanca conference, we upset the balance of power in the world. More than that, and more deadly, we actually created power vacuums in Europe and in Asia into which armed strength surely would flow, whether it be our own, that of our friends, or the armed might of the Communist millions. These power vacuums, especially in areas as highly prized as that of Western Europe, inevitably draw the attention and efforts of other nations, and we find ourselves faced by this uncomfortable fact in both Europe and Asia today.

Our Government now must fill these power vacuums. We must do it by strengthening our allies, by strengthening ourselves, and also—and I emphasize this point—by bringing Germany and Japan back into the family of nations as counterweights in the balance against Russian aggression.

Only if we follow this course of action, only if we follow it with the firmest determination and dedication, only if we pursue this objective with a great sense of urgency, leaving behind business-as-usual concepts and, even foregoing the peacetime emphasis on orderly and efficient processes, can we hope to succeed.

All of these functions constitute the primary role of our Government in world affairs today. They are risky. They are fateful for mankind. I have not the slightest doubt that because of our faith in the Divinity, Who after all will dispose of these matters in His own way, regardless of our efforts—because of our devotion to freedom, because of our vast disproportion of military resources and industrial capabilities, and because the entire effort is so patently worth the cost, whatever it may be, we shall succeed.

Tom Sweeney Replies to Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the editor of the Wheeling News-Register and Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va., conducted a poll of his readers listing 10 queries bearing on the world crisis. One of the most interesting responses received was submitted by Tom Sweeney, of Wheeling, who served as a navigator in the Naval Air Corps during World War II. Prior to his military service Commander Sweeney was a member of the West Virginia Senate for several terms and was the sponsor of many constructive measures. He is an executive in the T. B. Sweeney Agency of the Equitable Life Insurance Co. In view of his political and business background and his extensive service in both the European and Pacific theaters, the proposals he offered will be of interest to the House. His response to the poll reads as follows:

EDITOR, THE NEWS-REGISTER,
Wheeling, W. Va.

DEAR SIR: As a nation we cannot allow ourselves to be bled white in a series of land actions throughout the world. On the other hand, can we afford to withdraw behind your Atlantic-Pacific-Hemispheric wall? We could have in 1940. Outside was a world divided, and we held the balance of power. In my campaign for the United States Senate in that year my foreign policy platform was the Herbert Hoover-Intelligencer-News-Register doctrine of today. It was sound, sensible, and rejected.

But the world outside has changed. And how confused have been the politicians who brought us to our present dilemma, is provided by the picture of our present leaders attempting to rearm, as allies, the very nations whom their predecessors called upon us to destroy. They have committed us so deeply that complete withdrawal would amount to flat desertion of those whom we may someday need as much as they now need us. Yet, like it or not, isolation without friends, will soon be forced upon us—unless we are willing to change the rules of the game.

And that is what I want now to propose we do. Why not a new kind of Monroe Doctrine—a new kind of war? Why would it not be meeting the dilemma with common sense, if our Nation declared to the world that—

1. We recognize that in the modern world fifth-column forces are a military arm of an aggressor as surely as its uniformed armies, and that such Communist armies (Russia's new kind of war) already exist within the borders of free nations all over the earth.

2. We stand ready to declare punitive war on such forces, or any forces of Communist aggression anywhere in the world, where representatives of a free people, wantonly attacked from within or without, ask for our protection.

3. Punitive war will be limited to: (a) Air, naval, or commando missions against the nerve centers and arteries of the aggressor without commitment of land forces to the invasion or defense of any soil beyond our boundaries; (b) enlightenment—not destruction—of civilian populations, even though such be already indoctrinated as our foes.

4. We will consult with and seek joint action with the United Nations, taking drastic action only where delay might be fatal.

5. We will press such war as a permanent condition; cessation of aggression, not victory over an enemy, being its intent.

Our immediate program, and my arguments to support it, would be as follows under such a doctrine:

1. Declaration of punitive war on Russia's puppet satraps in China and Korea.

2. Gradual withdrawal of land forces from Korea with naval and air units only remaining on our island bases.

3. Intense propaganda in China by radio and leaflets in language such as this: "If this were a bomb, you would not be alive. It could be a bomb, but it isn't, because we are friends who regret the loss of every Chinese life as we regret our own. Our only enemies are the leaders who have forced themselves upon you. They are not the heirs of your ancestors. They are just traitorous puppets of a foreign nation that wants to make your people bleed and die in battle while they sit back in hypocritical sanctity. You will be safe if you do not go near these foreign masters. But we must warn all that at any moment we may decide to annihilate 100,000 at a time. Do not die among those who serve them. They want only to make slaves of you. We want only to throw them out. Join the millions of your brothers who are helping us free China." (It is in this field that the Soviet world has won its greatest victories. Our propaganda has been mush. The ideals of democracy! To peasant millions such talk is incomprehensible, as academic as a treatise on paradise. As to that, how many Americans know what a democracy is? How many could explain why we are not a democracy but instead a Republic?)

4. Collaboration with Chiang Kai-shek and all other friendly forces within China. They would be legion. That is communism's great weakness. It rules by force of ignorance and fear. The iron curtain is the clue to its point of greatest vulnerability.

5. Continuous precision bombing of troop centers, enemy ships, and other isolated military objectives.

Such wars could be conducted on a dozen fronts from nearby bases for a fraction of what our Korean action has already cost in lives and materials, and without any risk of "losing face." Our pilots, naval, and intelligence personnel only would have to risk their lives. But they do, anyway.

This program would be based on a frank acknowledgment that we could not hope to conquer by invasion the land masses of Russia and Asia any more than they could hope to do the same to us. Man to man on their soil they can swarm over us like locusts. But at a distance and with weapons the odds are all on our side. Why play their game when we can make them play our game? I predict that the war of the future will be devastation at long range, and to prepare for it does not mean to draft huge armies. It means, on the contrary, to cut the Army to a reserve force, while building up our Air Force, our Navy, our science research, and the bastions of our Asiatic, Arctic, and Atlantic frontiers to the shores of Asia on the west and Europe on the east.

Of what avail a local civilian-defense organization? Of what avail a million men in uniform, or the world's best air force? Or the most modern radar equipment on the Great Lakes or the Hudson—if just one enemy plane carrying one atom bomb reaches our borders? Radar would tell you a plane is there. But it could not tell you whose plane. Unless detected on some far arctic shore, where any plane is a suspicious plane, it would be just any old airliner plodding its way unnoticed toward any destination. Do we have a radar screen extending from Alaska across northern Canada to Nova Scotia? Have we secret agreements with our neighbors coordinating such detecting devices? Do they even have the means to install any adequate system of warning?

I have long doubted it. A Senate committee recently returned from Alaska removed my doubts. I now know that our leadership, which seems never to see to the heart of a problem, has failed even in our own Territory of Alaska to provide any adequate mechanism of detection. To my mind immediate action on this point is imperative above even our action in Korea. For it is over the arctic that that little group of planes would come that could lay waste some morning in an instant to 10 of our greatest cities.

The objection is raised that if we waged this kind of incessant war against communism on all fronts, it wouldn't be long until Russia struck us such a blow. That would be our best break, but they won't for many years to come, because they know that today at long range we could give it back 10 for 1. The great weakness of a free people is that it cannot choose the time and place to fight. If we could strike with the cold calculation with which our enemies will strike us when they are ready, we would have put an end to the world's troubles in 1945 while we had sole possession of the bomb, a million men in Europe, and the land of our sworn enemy, already in ruins at our feet. Next best is, by honorable behavior, to provoke them into striking us before they are ready.

Such a program I think we could afford. It would give comfort to our allies (who know that we cannot support them forever) while forcing them into greater self-reliance; rain destruction on our enemies (where rebuilding would not be our responsibility); require no billions to put millions into uniform (our Army would be ready long before any enemy could land in force on our shores); strengthen our production might; and preserve and defend in depth, the great arsenal upon which, in the last analysis, the whole free world depends.

Sincerely,

TOM SWEENEY.

Natural-Gas-Line Explosions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H. R. 88, which I filed on January 3, 1951, and which has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I requested the Federal Power Commission to furnish me with such details as it might have with reference to explosions on natural-gas pipelines. This information has now been sent to me with a letter from Chairman Mon C. Wallgren, which is self-explanatory.

I have written to the several companies, with two objectives in mind: First, I believe it is important to have the accuracy of this data determined by the companies, since they obviously have full details in their files; second, I want to obtain any further information as to these explosions listed and as to any other explosions which may have occurred but as to which the Federal Power Commission has no information.

On the basis of the information now available, one conclusion seems to be clear—that such accidents have increased in frequency during the last 3 years. The tabulation shows 8 such accidents in 1948, 12 in 1949, and 14 in 1950, and it should be noted that the last of the listed accidents covers 76 line

breaks during the testing of section of pipe between Raritan and Rahway Rivers near Colonia, N. J.

The letter and tabulation follow:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, January 25, 1951.

Hon. JOHN W. HINSHAW,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HINSHAW: In response to your letter of January 5, 1951, requesting information concerning explosions on natural-gas pipelines, there has been compiled the attached tabulation containing a summary of all the information that has been received by the Federal Power Commission regarding breaks and explosions on interstate pipelines. This information has been gathered from various sources such as newspaper reports, letters, telegrams, conferences, and investigations. The Commission cannot vouch for the accuracy of the data nor can the Commission state that such data represents all the line breaks and explosions that have occurred in this country.

Many of the breaks listed in the tabulation show "no details" as to persons injured or killed. It is believed that in most of these cases no person was injured or killed and damage to property was slight.

If there is any other information you desire, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

MON C. WALLGREN,
Chairman.

Information received by Federal Power Commission concerning line breaks on interstate pipelines as of Jan. 12, 1951

Pipeline company	Location of line break	Date of line break	Number of persons— Injured	Number of persons— Killed	Size of line (inches)	Comments
Atlantic Seaboard Corp.	Tug River, Ky.	Feb. 21, 1947	(1)	(1)	20	Coupling failure because of strip-mine operation.
Virginia Gas Transmission Corp.	Hazel River, Va.	Jan. 14, 1948	(1)	(1)	20	Header failure caused by defective pipe.
Colorado Interstate Gas Co.	Northeastern New Mexico	May —, 1942	(1)	(1)	22	Wash-out caused by floods.
Michigan Gas Storage Co.	Muskegon River, Mich.	Dec. 7, 1947	(1)	(1)	(2)	Explosion in compressor station.
Pennsylvania Eastern Pipe Line Co.	Near Centralia, Mo.	Dec. 8, 1949	(1)	(1)	(2)	Complete interruption of gas deliveries east of Centralia compressor station where explosion occurred.
United Gas Pipe Line Co.	Dallas-Fort Worth area, Texas	Dec. 29, 1944	(1)	(1)	(1)	War plants shut down temporarily.
Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.	Valve 120-121, West Virginia	Nov. 23, 1944	(1)	(1)	(1)	Faulty pipeline weld.
Do.	Valve 119-120, West Virginia	Feb. 12, 1947	(1)	(1)	(1)	Rupture in pipe bend.
Do.	Valve 38-39, Tennessee	Mar. 27, 1947	(1)	(1)	(1)	Faulty pipeline weld.
Do.	Valve 104-105, Kentucky	May 26, 1948	(1)	(1)	(1)	Pipe ruptured by bulldozer.
Do.	Valve 52-54, Tennessee	July 12, 1948	(1)	(1)	(1)	Faulty pipe.
Do.	Near Greenville, Miss.	Dec. 4, 1949	2	2	26	Explosion at Mississippi River pipeline crossings.
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.	Walley, La.	Sept. 28, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Serious fires, some people injured, caused by explosions during testing.
Do.	Chatham, Va.	Nov. 2, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Do.
Do.	Little Rocky Hill, N. J.	Nov. 25, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Do.
Do.	Culpeper, Va.	Nov. 22, 1950	3		30	Explosion during line testing caused great property damage.
Do.	Norristown, Pa.	Nov. 28, 1950	2		30	Do.
Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.	Union County, Ark.	May 8, 1947			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Grant County, Ark.	Jan. 11, 1948			20	Do.
Do.	White County, Ark.	Jan. 17, 1948			20	Do.
Do.	Pike County, Ind.	Mar. 18, 1948			20	Damage to buildings settled for $18,000 due to defective pipe.
Do.	Pulaski County, Ark.	May 9, 1948			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Near Seymour, Ind.	Nov. 19, 1948	18		(2)	Explosion in compressor station causing $1,000,000 damages.
Do.	Near Beterville, Ind.	Jan. 13, 1949	2		(2)	Power failure caused fire in compressor station with $200,000 damages.
Do.	Adams County, Pa.	Feb. 9, 1949			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Jennings County, Ind.	Mar. 4, 1949	1		20	Defective pipe caused property damages of $26,000.
Do.	Craighead County, Ark.	Apr. 2, 1949			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Noble County, Ohio	May 5, 1949			20	Do.
Do.	Butler County, Mo.	May 12, 1949			20	Do.
Do.	do	May 24, 1949			20	Do.
Do.	Grant County, Ark.	June 28, 1949			20	Do.
Do.	West Chester, Pa.	July 15, 1949	1	2	24	Explosion blew up cover plate where men were working.
Do.	Johnson County, Ill.	Oct. 5, 1949			20	Nominal damages caused by defective pipe.
Do.	Montgomery County, Pa.	Dec. 14, 1949			20	5-inch crack in field weld.
Do.	Noble County, Ohio	Jan. 20, 1950			20	Defective pipe caused explosion with $12,000 property damage.
Do.	Pulaski County, Ark.	May 17, 1950			24	River eroded causing pipe to pull apart.
Do.	Perry County, Ohio	May 18, 1950			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Near Bethesda, Ohio	July 1, 1950	(1)	(1)	24	Explosion ripped up 12 feet of pipeline.
Do.	Near Jasper, Ind.	July 10, 1950	(1)	(1)	(3)	
Do.	Butler County, Mo.	July 18, 1950	(1)	(1)	(3)	
Do.	Adams County, Pa.	Sept. 12, 1950	(1)	(1)	20	Explosion occurred after hydrostatic testing.
Do.	Near Colonia, N. J.	Spring 1950	(1)	(1)	20	76 line breaks occurred during testing section of pipe between Raritan and Rahway Rivers.

[1] No details available.
[2] Compressor station.

Dr. Gordon Seagrave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Paradox," dealing with the case of Dr. Gordon Seagrave, published in the Columbus Evening Dispatch of January 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER PARADOX

The Gordon Seagrave case provides one more instance of a strange paradox in American official policy. Apparently the famed humanitarian Burma surgeon is to be allowed to languish, and perhaps die, in an oriental prison for treason against a government of which he is not a citizen. His family estimates he cannot survive a year of his 6-year sentence.

This callous indifference to the fate of individual American nationals is a product of the Roosevelt-Truman era. In recent years we have become so worked up over the horrible lot of Europe's displaced persons, who must be channeled to this country in wholesale lots; so engrossed in the raising of funds for alien unfortunates in the mass; so preoccupied with raising taxes to finance bundles for Britain, UNRRA, Marshall plans, and most recently, Yugoslav famine relief, that we have no time or room for compassion over the fate of our own citizens who are kicked around and mistreated by foreign governments, principally upstart regimes of dubious legality.

So Seagrave stays in prison. Robert Vogeler vanished into a Hungarian concentration camp—or worse. Angus Ward endured a year of imprisonment in a filthy Chinese Communist jail, captive of the same people who a few weeks ago lived in luxury in New York's Waldorf-Astoria while they commuted daily to Lake Success to defame and defy the spineless United Nations which, these days, makes American foreign policy.

Other American Presidents have met the problem of how to handle gangsters who seized American nationals. But Theodore Roosevelt's ultimatum, to the Moroccan bandits, "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead" now is only a forgotten line in the history textbooks. Or maybe it isn't—a lot of things have disappeared from American textbooks in recent years at the behest of people who can't see the American woods for the towering trees of the one-world doctrine.

Maybe it isn't possible to do anything about Dr. Seagrave. But it would look a little more decent and honorable and self-respecting if our global-minded State Department could focus its attention for a moment on an individual American citizen in distress and at least look into the case. So far as we know, this isn't being done and there is no intention to do so.

It's Happening on Your Own Front Lawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to describe combat conditions as I experienced them as an infantry battalion commander during World War II, but I always immediately realize how inadequate words are to tell the story fully. A patient at Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington, D. C., has written about his experiences in Korea and to me he has clearly related how the man in the foxhole feels.

Whatever I might say now would only detract from the story this infantry platoon leader has to say to every American. His letter first appeared in the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader and was reprinted in the Washington Star on January 24, 1951. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this letter which was written by Lt. Robert T. Fallon:

IT'S HAPPENING ON YOUR OWN FRONT LAWN

(By Robert T. Fallon)

I want to tell you something about a war.

I want you to imagine for a moment that it is a very cold, wet, wintry evening at about 10 o'clock. You have been sitting very comfortably by your fireside reading the evening paper. It's been a pleasant day, dismal outside, but warm and restful by the fire. You decide to step out on the porch for a breath of air before turning in. I'm sure you've done it often. But on this particular evening, a strange sight greets you.

There's a great hole right in the middle of your front lawn, and the dirt has been thrown up all around it, outlined sharply against the white, even snow. Squatting in the hole is a hunched figure.

Let me tell you something about him.

He's been in this area now for about 3 weeks, living in a dozen holes just like this one on your front lawn. The most apparent thing about him is that he is cold, and that's because out on your lawn it's about 20 degrees colder than where you're standing. Every now and then he'll grab his shovel and dig a little deeper in the hole just to keep warm. That's the only way he has, because he'll be seen if he builds a fire, and he may bring mortar fire into your living room.

He's been cold for a long time—and wet. He can't feel his feet, and he's getting worried because he's afraid they might be frostbitten. It's going to be a long night, and it's going to get colder.

He's very dirty. The grease from a hundred "C" rations is frozen to his parks and gloves, coating the 2 weeks' beard which covers his face. Soot from the small fires he dares to make during the day is all over his pants and boots.

But he's dirty all the way through. He hasn't changed his underclothes in over a month and he doesn't intend to for some time to come. It's too cold to go down that far. You can smell him, and it's bad.

He's pretty hungry, too. They didn't get his rations up to him until after dark and he couldn't build a fire to thaw them out. He'll have to wait until morning. A cup of hot coffee would sure taste good. He looks old with that beard and sort of hunched-over posture. But he's only about 19, though not like any 19-year-old you've ever seen.

You may wonder what he's thinking about as he sits there during those long solitary hours. Well, it's not much. Just how cold it is and again how nice that coffee would be. Maybe every now and then he thinks of home, but that's a long ways off and the cold, his feet, and his hunger are much more immediate. You'd be surprised how those three things can fill your mind.

You notice that he's cut a hole through your hedge and his rifle is sitting on the pile of dirt pointing in readiness through the opening. That's another thing he's thinking: When are they coming again? He gets a little scared out there all alone. He'd like to go over and talk to this buddy in a similar hole about two houses up, but it's not a good idea to go crawling around at night. He wishes they weren't so far apart but it seems they always have a big sector to cover with never enough men to cover it. It doesn't help being so far apart.

What would you like to do with this man? Ask him in to your fireside, get him a cup of coffee? Would you like to loan him your razor and let him take a hot shower? Give him a bed to sleep in instead of the dirt and cold of his fox hole? Sure you would. You wouldn't think twice about it. But I'm afraid you can't. There's some one on that hill over there who wants to get into your front door, and the man was told by his platoon leader that he's supposed to take care of your house and the one next door. So he can't come in and you find that you can't reach him. He's very far away.

But you come out in the morning and he's still there, huddled over his little fire, thawing out his hands and his rations, trying to get the feeling back into his feet. By this time the hole is pretty deep from all the digging and he's cut down a little more of your hedge. He's there again when you come home from work. While you are greeted by a comfortable fire in a living room, the soldier is getting ready for another cold night.

I have told you about this soldier, and placed him on your front lawn, because I want you to realize that every desolate hill that soldier defends in that far-off land is in reality your front door. There are people who want to get in to do you harm, and it's his job to keep them away. He's going to do his job and he's not going to ask you to do it for him. If he has to sit on your front lawn in the cold, that's just the way things go. He's not going to begrudge you the comforts of your fireside or your dinner table, but he'll be mighty bitter if he finds out that you're not doing your part of the job.

What is "your job?" Well, it's not really important what I happen to think "your job" may be. But I think it is important that you find out soon what it is and start doing it, for whatever it is, it's a vital part of a country's struggle for existence. Perhaps it would be more clear to you what your job is if you returned home tonight to find that hunched, shivering figure sitting in a hole on your lawn.

The Burma Surgeon: Will He Again Return?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the striking news account appearing in the current issue of Time concerning the trial and conviction of Dr. Gordon S. Seagraves in Rangoon, Burma, and the strong editorials that are currently appearing in the leading newspapers of the country confirms my feelings as expressed before this House on January 19, 1951, and in the words of one of the editorials appearing below, "Offhand it seems a very shabby reward to Dr. Seagrave for a lifetime of loving labor in the service of the Burmese people."

It is not my desire as I pointed out on the floor of this House on January 19 to create any misunderstanding or misapprehension, and for that reason I am glad to note that within the past 10 days many outstanding newspapers throughout the country have come to the support of this famous medical missionary, who has given so much to the Burmese people.

With the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks and include first, a brief, yet clear-cut factual news item from Time covering the trial of the Burma surgeon:

[From Time Magazine]

BURMA, SEA OF TROUBLES

Three months ago famed Medical Missionary Dr. Gordon S. (Burma Surgeon) Seagrave entered Rangoon's red-and-cream brick high court to stand trial for treason. Last week a crowd gathered to hear the verdict. Dr. Seagrave was brought into court from a comfortable United States Embassy bungalow, where he was allowed to stay after he became ill in Rangoon's crowded, noisy jail.

The three judges filed in, took their places on the bench. Seagrave remained standing. One of the judges began reading the tribunal's verdict: Charge No. 1, that Seagrave had given aid and comfort to the State's enemies by having tea with a Kachin rebel leader, allowing the rebels to play football on hospital grounds—not guilty; charge No. 2, that he had written a letter to facilitate the rebels' arrest of a Government commissioner—guilty; charge No. 3, that he had given medical help to rebels—guilty. Said the judge: "We must take a serious view of the gravity of the offense. * * * While the country was in a sea of troubles, the accused * * * acted in a manner prejudicial to the state and his act was like that of one—graphically described in the old Burmese saying—who pressed down with a pole

on a drowning man." The sentence: Six years' hard labor.

Seagrave did not flinch, but suddenly he looked older than his 58 years. For almost half his life Surgeon Seagrave had been giving medical aid to Burmese peasants, and then a crazy-quilt civil war, spreading around his hill-country hospital, had tangled him in bitter national rivalries. A Burmese reporter asked him for his reaction to the verdict. He replied: "Whatever some few do to me, I want you to know I still love the people of Burma." He added: "I sincerely hope the American people will not judge the people of Burma by the actions of a few."

Two Burmese nurses who had testified for Seagrave wept quietly. Seagrave patted their shoulders. His able Burmese attorney, U Kyaw Myint, who has served without fee, said: "I would like to appeal the case immediately. Will you sign the authority for me to do so?"

Said Seagrave: "But I hate like sin to keep imposing on you." With a smile, U Kyaw Myint said softly: "As a Burman, I think I owe it to you."

Seagrave signed the paper. Told that he could not return to the bungalow, but would have to go to jail, Seagrave muttered: "O Lord, I simply cannot sleep there." Up to this time Seagrave had flatly refused to consider deportation; now he was heard to say: "I think I would almost rather take exile from Burma." All of the Baptist missionaries in Burma were in Rangoon for a meeting, but only one of them was in the courtroom to hear sentence passed on their former colleague, who has operated independently of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society since 1942. As he left the courtroom, Seagrave turned to his loyal friend, Rev. Walter D. Sutton, and asked for his prayers. Said Seagrave: "God bless you. Don't forget to remember me upwards."

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the great host of friends of this courageous surgeon in the United States, and especially Mrs. Seagrave, who now resides in the Baltimore area, working as a receptionist to support their two sons, gratefully acknowledge the free legal counsel being extended Dr. Seagrave by U. Kyaw Myint, an able Burmese attorney.

Mr. Speaker, representative editorials that I have noted within recent days appear below. I ask that they be included as a part of my remarks, and feel that I express the feeling of the membership of this House, that Dr. Seagraves should be released because of the flimsy charges lodged against him:

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer]

A SHOCKING VERDICT

The surprising report that Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the famous Burma surgeon, had been found guilty of high treason and sentenced to serve 6 years in prison at hard labor must have shocked hosts of admirers in this country and throughout the civilized world.

Here was a medical missionary, educated at Johns Hopkins, who had given more than 25 years of his life to serving the Burmese people as physician, surgeon, and operator of a hospital. Doubtless great numbers of those people are alive today only because of the skill and the services of this American doctor who long ago devoted his life to the cause of Christianity and the relief of suffering humanity in a backward land.

He had been decorated by the United States Government and King George VI for his heroism during Gen. Joseph Stilwell's jungle retreat from Burma in 1942.

But in 1949 Burma was in the throes of civil war, conditions were chaotic and confusing. Rebel Kachin tribesmen captured Namkham, site of Dr. Seagrave's hospital and center of his work. That was in 1949. It was on August 20 last year that he was arrested at his hospital on charges of aiding the rebel tribesmen in their struggle against the Government.

The trial consumed 3 months and the verdict came as a complete surprise according to the Associated Press correspondent in Rangoon. As punishment for high treason, 6 years in prison at hard labor seems light, but it would be terrible punishment for the kindly gentle Burma surgeon who evidently was never intentionally or consciously guilty of treason or any other crime. As he is now 58 years of age, 6 years of confinement at hard labor would mean that his years of noble service to suffering people would have ended.

His attorney, a Burmese former judge, has given notice of appeal, and the final outcome will be watched with keen interest in this and other countries. But it is doubtful.

That such a good and noble man as Dr. Seagrave should have been prosecuted and declared guilty of high treason against a country whose people he served so long, so unselfishly, and so effectively seems ironical indeed.

The spirit of the man was indicated by the statement he made to reporters immediately after he had been sentenced:

"I sincerely hope the American people will not judge the people of Burma by the actions of a few. I bear the Burmese people no malice for this."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

BURMA SURGEON

It is very difficult for Americans to understand the trial and conviction of Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the famous Burma surgeon, who became one of the legendary figures of the Pacific war. He has now been sentenced to 6 years' imprisonment on two counts of an indictment charging him with encouraging treason against the Burmese Government. His only hope now lies in an appeal to the high court at Rangoon. To complicate matters further, Dr. Seagrave, although a native of Burma, is an American by parentage and nationality, and a medical missionary of the Baptist Church. When he and his hospital staff joined the late General Stilwell in the memorable retreat through the Burmese jungles and over the mountains into India, Dr. Seagrave was commissioned a lieutenant colonel in the United States Army Medical Corps. After the reconquest of Burma he returned to his hospital at Namkham near the Chinese border.

The details of his trial have been rather scantily reported by the American newspapers. The rebels whom he is accused of aiding are the Kachins of the Chinese border district and the Karens of the hill country. These peoples differ from the Burmans by both culture and religion. They are in a much more primitive stage of development, but Christianity has made more rapid progress among the animistic Karens than among the Buddhistic Burmese. A great part of Dr. Seagrave's medical work has been among such tribes.

Two years ago when Burma became an independent member of the British Commonwealth the Kachins and Karens rose in revolt against the new Burmese Government. There is no indication that these revolts were fomented or dominated by Communists, though both Stalinist and Trotskyite Governments were busily stirring up other revolts. The Karens, the most numerous and successful of these insurrectionary movements, sometimes made common cause with the Communists, sometimes fought against them.

In 1949 a combined force of Karens and Kachins made an incursion into central Burma and captured the city of Toungoo. During this advance Namkham was occupied by the rebel forces. Dr. Seagrave was accused of giving medical supplies to the rebels, of having taken tea with the Kachin leader Naw Seng, and with having permitted rebel troops to play football in the hospital compound. The rebels were subsequently routed by the Burmese forces, but Dr. Seagrave was also accused of having aided Naw Seng to escape across the Chinese border. Naw Seng is now said to have thrown in his lot with the Chinese Communists.

Most of these charges will strike Americans as rather frivolous; and, indeed, the Burmese court dismissed them all save the charge of aiding the rebels by giving them medical supplies. Since the rebels were armed and in possession, it is difficult to see how Dr. Seagrave could have refused them, even if he were not bound by the Hippocratic oath to help them. Another charge of which he was found guilty was that of having written a letter to a nurse. This letter is supposed to have somehow enabled the rebels to capture one Sao Hom Pha, a special commissioner to the Shan states.

We think it would be well if the Department of State which, through its Embassy at Rangoon, has been keeping in close touch with the Seagrave case would issue a clarifying statement concerning it. Offhand it seems a very shabby reward to Dr. Seagrave for a lifetime of loving labor in the service of the Burmese people. Meanwhile, it would be well to remember that Dr. Seagrave was convicted not under British but under Burmese law. In some quarters contrasts are already being drawn between the Burmese and American concepts of what kind of conduct constitutes treason, and much is also being made of the fact that Dr. Seagrave repeatedly asked for release under bail and was repeatedly refused.

Colonel Lindsay Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I recently placed in the RECORD some guest editorials by Col. C. H. Lindsay, an outstanding leader in the business world in our section. It is refreshing to see men of the caliber of Colonel Lindsay thinking and acting along the lines portrayed in his editorials. These editorials reveal Colonel Lindsay as a man of deep human understanding, possessing a great love of country and humanity. In this connection, I request that the following editorial be printed with my remarks:

DEMOCRATIC BROTHERHOOD IS A GREAT WEAPON AGAINST COMMUNISM

(By C. H. Lindsay)

Ever since the writing of the Holy Bible came the teachings of Brotherhood between men. Our present form of democracy was the outcome of these teachings. We were all taught to "love thy neighbor and do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Many citizens say they are Americans—they believe in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, but do they follow these teachings?

Money, power or appearance does not make you a good citizen. Only when you feel, act and are guided from your heart to help, aid, and assist your fellow man in the tasks of life.

Where is brotherhood when management and labor daily fight between one another; where is the teaching of "live and let live?" For in true democracy, labor and capital and management are essential to one another; without one the other suffers and progress for all is sadly neglected.

Brotherhood is the only weapon against the present evil of communism. We cannot have brotherhood when labor is fighting labor, management against labor, management against management and religious people against each other—all hindering democracy and furthering communistic doctrines.

Especially today, the Communist seek footholds in shipping, transportation, public utilities, newspapers, radio, labor and political offices; and thus, at the vital moment cripple our country's production, demand and supply, lowering our present living standards which is just what the Communists want so they can let us down to their standard and take over; then what kind of a life we would live.

We must deal fairly with all topics, giving mankind an equal chance of making a decent and honest living, regardless of other teachings which we have had, and will have, as time moves on. Brotherhood can only be obtained when we help and live peacefully with one another. As a guide to mankind, we must follow the teachings of our forefathers, who established our present free, American way of life.

Remember, democratic brotherhood must be daily practiced; personal gains against our fellow man laid aside. With the love of freedom, liberty, and justice in mind and with faith, hope, and fairness as our guide, we will be closer to the means of eliminating the satan of our present time—communism.

Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post there appeared an article written by Mr. Edward T. Folliard to mark an occasion of great historical significance which the Members will observe with great interest on tomorrow. I refer to the fact that on tomorrow the Speaker of the House will have occupied his position of high office longer than any preceding Speaker.

In this connection I wish to extend the felicitations and best wishes to our great Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, and to say that his continued useful service for many years to come is the wish and hope of all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

SAM RAYBURN'S TOPPING CLAY'S RECORD

(By Edward T. Folliard)

SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who is able to say that he's "one man in public life who's satisfied," makes history this week.

When he raps his gavel for order on Tuesday, RAYBURN will have been Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any man in the annals of the Republic. His service in that exalted office, which ranks third in the official hierarchy, will total 3,057 days.

It was Henry Clay who established the record that is about to be broken. The great Kentuckian served as Speaker over a period of 14 years (1811-25), with two interruptions. His total number of days in the chair, the Library of Congress has figured out, was 3,056½.

Physically, there would be little resemblance between the lanky, long-haired Clay and the stocky, bald RAYBURN. In reading about the one and thinking about the other, however, you come to realize that Speaker Clay had at least two attributes which also are to be found in Speaker RAYBURN. They were great personal charm and persuasive eloquence.

The greatest dissimilarity would seem to be in the matter of ambition.

Clay, as Speaker, had his eyes on the White House, and in 1824 began a long but vain effort to win the Presidency.

How RAYBURN feels about his place as No. 3 man, he described with much feeling at a recent gathering of Democrats at the Shoreham.

"I am one man in public life," he said, "who is satisfied, who has achieved every ambition of his youth. And so I am glad."

The story often has been told of how SAM, as a small boy, rode horseback for 12 miles to listen to Joseph Weldon Bailey, a mighty Texas orator. It was not long after this that he mapped out the stages of his career—to go to college, to the Texas Legislature, and then to Congress to start his climb to the Speakership.

SAM'S rise to high place, although marked by the partisan battling that is expected in a democracy, has been serene compared to the feud-ridden career of Henry Clay.

President Truman alluded to this at the afore-mentioned gathering of Democrats at the Shoreham. He had been talking about the cordial relationship between himself and Vice President BARKLEY and Speaker RAYBURN. And this took him back to an earlier time when Andrew Jackson was President, Calhoun was Vice President and Clay (having left the House) was a Senator.

"When Jackson was on his deathbed," Mr. Truman recalled, "someone asked him about the things he had left undone that he wished he had done while he was President. And he said one was that he should have hanged John C. Calhoun and shot Henry Clay. Well, now, there is no such parallel."

SAM RAYBURN came up from Bonham, Tex., to be a Member of the House in 1913. He was elected Speaker September 16, 1940, after the death of William B. Bankhead. Thereafter, as before, he demonstrated the truth of what had been said about him by his old friend and mentor, John Nance Garner.

"SAM stays hitched," Garner said, which was another way of saying that he lived up to his word.

RAYBURN was as completely devoted to Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was in the White House during the earlier part of his service as Speaker, as he is today to President Truman.

On April 12, 1945, Mr. Truman (then Vice President) was in Speaker RAYBURN'S office when he was called to the White House to be told that Mr. Roosevelt was dead. Thereafter some others gathered with RAYBURN, including William S. White, of the New York Times, a fellow Texan. White, writing about it later, noted that RAYBURN "wept silently."

"His heavy and very nearly immobile face was still in the shadows," the Times man wrote, "and the only movements upon it were small and barely visible traces of the tears. He swept them away roughly. * * *

"There, before friends, in words that are yet under the seal of that room, Mr. RAYBURN took an oath for the future. Its substance was that SAM RAYBURN—southern Democrat and all—had followed Franklin Roosevelt in life, and that SAM RAYBURN would follow Franklin Roosevelt in death."

SAM is a patient man, but he gets annoyed at the moaners and the groaners who say that the liberties of the American people are being destroyed. He says that has been the cry ever since Jefferson's time.

"Our liberties have been destroyed?" he asks. "In this land * * * everybody can say what they want to say, write what they want to write, speak what they want to speak, as long as in the doing of that they do not take away from the other fellow the same rights, the same prerogatives, and the same privileges to exercise the same rights * * *. That's how our democracy has been destroyed."

The Texan was a big help to President Truman in the 1948 election, and was credited with doing much in cooling down passions in the South.

Standing alongside Mr. Truman one night in San Antonio, he told a crowd that the Missourian had "shoulders broad enough, heart big enough, and a mind keen enough to do a good job for this sick and war-weary world."

More recently he asked for support of Mr. Truman, and said that if this was forthcoming, Americans could look forward "to the sunshine of a better day, of peace in the world that every good man and every good woman * * * is praying for tonight."

Speaker RAYBURN lives quietly when he is away from the Capitol, and is rarely to be seen in Washington's social whirl. When he does go out, however, he is likely to captivate those who hear him.

A month or so ago he attended a banquet of the Touchdown Club. SAM was accorded a tremendous ovation.

Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, using football jargon, gave this estimate of him:

"SAM RAYBURN is one of the great all-time All-Americans. When his party is in power he is a strong offensive player. When his party is in the minority there is no better defensive player. SAM RAYBURN has never had to call time out or have a substitute—he's a 60-minute player every day."

The most meaningful tribute that has come to RAYBURN—and one that ought to be heeded by Moscow—was delivered in the House on January 3 by a Republican, Representative JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

MARTIN, who became Speaker when the Democrats lost the Congress in 1946 and who probably would take over the gavel again if the Republicans were successful in 1952, called attention to the distinctive that lay ahead for RAYBURN on January 30. He said that no man could be elected time after time, as the Texan had, unless he was a man of fine character, of extraordinary ability, great fairness, and a parliamentarian par excellence.

"Those are virtues which we have in our Speaker," MARTIN said. "In this hour of confusion * * * of uncertainty * * * we have a man who has the courage; we have a man who has the firmness to do that which is right, to the end that our country may emerge a better country.

"We are sometimes misunderstood by our friends in other countries. We fight, we debate, we vote, and then we settle the question.

"They cannot understand that these are the practical principles that make for a democracy, a republic. They cannot see either that when our fight is over, that when we reach a decision, we are all united, we are all American but with one thought: To make America a better land for all our people."

Real Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Farmington Press, Farmington, Mo., entitled "Real Brotherhood":

REAL BROTHERHOOD

We don't see why it should be necessary to set aside a week as National Brotherhood Week, but anyway it has been done. And we are in full accord with the spirit of the occasion.

The world is sadly in need of brotherhood as anyone can see who reads the daily papers and listens to the radio. Lack of the brotherly spirit has plunged the world into war after war.

We can feel proud that the United States has done perhaps more than any other nation to spread the spirit of brotherhood and good will throughout the world. We have defended helpless nations with our blood and have helped, through our generosity, to feed and clothe millions in other lands. Often our motives have been misinterpreted, but in the main the peoples of the world look to the United States as their defender and help in time of trouble. And we have been sufficiently blessed in a material way so that we have been able to do these things.

But the enemies of our way of life take a special joy in pointing out the inequities that exist within our own borders. Their propaganda is full of the stories of lynchings in the deep South, racial discrimination in many of our States, our slums and our economic injustices. While we all know these charges are greatly magnified, we do know also that there is much work to do right here in the United States.

Every citizen should feel it his duty to do his small part in making democracy a living, breathing thing instead of just an abstract word. We can do it in many ways. For instance, we can do it by making sure that every child of every race and creed has the opportunity to make a good citizen of himself. We can help eradicate deep-seated racial and religious prejudices by refraining from teaching our children that they are better than children of other races or creeds. We can help by expelling such words as "nigger," "kike," "dago," and "hunky" from our vocabularies.

Instead of referring to our fellow citizens by these unflattering names, we think something more inspiring could be done. In Italy, for example, old world courtesy has evolved what we believe is an admirable form of address. When an Italian addresses a stranger, he often calls him "Paesan," which means literally, "countryman." We believe it would be a fine thing if all Americans of all races and creeds could call each other "countryman."

Considerable progress toward equality has been made in the United States and it is truly heartening. There are still some Americans of comic book mentality who hold strong racial views, but their number is fast dwindling. In the main, the big conflict is with ourselves in the attempt to eradicate from ourselves erroneous ideas which have been imbedded in us in early years—ideas which are purely emotional and have no scientific or moral foundation. It is hard, for instance, for a Southerner, steeped in the contrasts of the plantation house and the Negro shanty, to realize that Negroes have yearnings also to be respectable and to have nice things. Yet many Southerners are winning this conflict with themselves. And we congratulate them. It isn't easy to change years of attitudes but the right kind of people are trying and trying hard. In the end, they will be successful and democracy will be the richer.

We believe that the United States is slowly mellowing and will eventually achieve the heterogeneity found in older nations. When that day comes we shall be even stronger and more valuable to the world.

Louisiana Tidelands Ruling Confiscation, Kemp Asserts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, of January 27, 1951, by Mr. Paul Wooten, Times-Picayune staff correspondent, quoting statement of Hon. Boliver E. Kemp, attorney general of the State of Louisiana, in regard to the tidelands decision of the United States Supreme Court, as follows:

LOUISIANA TIDELANDS RULING CONFISCATION, KEMP ASSERTS—REHEARING SOUGHT IN PETITION BEFORE SUPREME COURT

(By Paul Wooton)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—In its decree in the Louisiana tidelands case the Supreme Court of the United States has acted illegally and unconstitutionally in confiscating lands belonging to the State. This accusation was hurled at the high Court by Bolivar E. Kemp, Jr., Louisiana attorney general, who also says the Department of Justice "dragged the sovereign State of Louisiana before the bar of this Court, seeking to deprive Louisiana of the lands under navigable waters within Louisiana's boundaries to which Louisiana has had undisputed title, possession, and physical control since 1812."

These statements are contained in a petition for a rehearing filed with the Supreme Court at 4 p. m. Friday.

"What is the basis for the decree?" Attorney General Kemp asked. He replied to his own question: "There is no basis whatsoever. It is sheer confiscation."

Unless fee simple title and property interests are to be transferred arbitrarily without a trial, or "subtly and by indirection," some clarification is necessary. It seems to Mr. Kemp that as the matter stands no one has a fee simple title or property rights to the marginal sea bed. He points out that the "honorable Court says Louisiana has no such rights, but it does not say that the United States has them."

If property rights can be transferred as some mysterious incident of paramount right, dominion, and power, "then," said Mr. Kemp, "the day of private rights, indeed of free enterprise, is gone." Continuing, he said:

"The decree of December 11, 1950, is utterly without precedent in the tradition of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. It completely denies that trial or fair hearing which is the prime requisite of procedural due process. Indeed, if such a decision arbitrarily transferring property had been made by an administrative agency or lower court, we have no doubt that this honorable court would reverse it in a twinkling. Unless different considerations are to prevail here, the decree should be vacated and the cause restored to the docket for reargument."

The Supreme Court was further denounced in this language:

"Without a trial and by the arbitrary application of unconstitutional power ideology, the property of the State of Louisiana, and in fact, of every other State in the Union, will be confiscated and nationalized by said decree. Further, the Court said by its very statement that the paramount power and dominion of the United States transcended those of a mere property owner, most certainly foreshadowed the doom of private property ownership in these United States, any time those in power in the Federal Government choose to extend nationalization and socialization through unlawful decrees which cannot be resisted ordinarily, but which should be corrected by the Court, itself, while there is yet time to do so."

The Court was accused of seeking to nullify the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and of initiating the theory of confiscation and nationalization which ignores property rights. In the opinion of Louisiana's attorney general and his counsel, the decree of the Supreme Court is unconstitutional, null, and void.

The Solicitor General has made no answer to most of Louisiana's contentions. Counsel for Louisiana think this is because he has no answer. However, the Solicitor General still has 10 days in which to make reply. There is interest in the legal profession here in seeing if one will be forthcoming.

We Can't Save Asia by War Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Justice William O. Douglas in Look magazine of January 16, 1951:

WE CAN'T SAVE ASIA BY WAR ALONE—OUR MILITARY LEADERS CAN'T FIX ASIA'S GRIEVANCES: POVERTY AND OPPRESSION—ASIATICS WOULD TURN TO US IF WE SUPPORTED REFORMS

(To combat communism in the Middle and Far East, says a distinguished jurist fresh from a personal inspection trip, we need more than military action. We need, he says, a political program.)

(By Justice William O. Douglas)

Military power alone will never stop the Communist advance in Asia.

Strong armed forces are obviously necessary at this critical juncture. But we have trusted too much of our thinking to the military. We must win people as well as battles if we are to stop communism.

The generals who plan our strategy are not equipped to deal with the forces that are stirring Asia today. For those forces are not the kind that can be stopped by main strength.

What is happening in Asia is a series of revolutions against oppression and poverty. The Communists whip them and accelerate them. But their origin is not Communist and they cannot be killed off.

They call for a political approach to the problem more than a military plan of action. They demand a great American program to support the aspirations of the Asiatic peoples, to help them achieve those aspirations as we achieved ours in 1776. Nothing short of that can save Asia from communism in the long run.

This became evident during recent journeys I made from the Middle East to Southeast Asia. Since my return, however, I have talked with an increasing number of people with ideas differing sharply from those I gathered on my trip. The matter is vital to our Nation. That is why, as a private citizen, I have decided to write this article.

I did not find on my journeys, of course, that military strength was not needed. If the United Nations had not intervened in Korea, it is my view that aggression would have been attempted immediately at many points along the southern border of Russia.

From sources deemed reliable, I satisfied myself that July 15 to August 15 was a crucial period in the Soviet timetable. I learned on my journeys that, had the Soviet Korean project been unopposed, a series of like aggressive moves would have been made along the whole of the arc from the Mediterranean to the Pacific.

For example, I reached the Soviet border in northwest Iran on August 18. Prior to August 15, there had been a great massing of so-called renegade Iranian and Kurdish troops in Russia along the Iranian frontier. They were well armed and led by a Kurd by the name of Barazani, an outlaw from Iraq.

Soviet satellites, indeed, were poised for action all along the southern borders of Russia. No Soviet troops would have been used. The uprisings or invasions, like that in Korea, would have been under so-called Nationalist auspices, leaving the forces of Russia herself ready for other ventures.

Events in Korea changed the Soviet plans. Invasion forces were withdrawn.

The effects of our defense of Korea, however, were only temporary. As we have seen, Communist forces along the southern rim of Russia have since grown stronger. For, apart from Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, the Communists remain the only ones in Asia who actively support the reforms the people seek.

The people of Asia have been seeking reforms for many years. Wendell Willkie saw revolutions on the make and heard their rumblings when he toured the world in 1942. Now in full swing, those revolutions are part of long historic processes.

Sun Yat-sen gave expression to them a generation ago. Mohandas Gandhi—who, though dead, is still the greatest power in Asia—espoused them. Every peasant who raised a hoe against a Maharajah and every tenant who defied the money lender and his extortionate interest rates was expressing the rebellion that has long been smoldering throughout Asia.

France went through a similar process in the French Revolution. We in America added to the turmoil of the age. We revolted. We threw off the colonialism that had been imposed on us. We threw it off by force of arms; and George Washington and all of our other forefathers who led the struggle were undoubtedly subversive influences by the British standards of that day.

WHY PEOPLE REVOLT

Our grievances were specific. They are all catalogued in the Declaration of Independence—taxation without our consent, quartering of soldiers among us, carrying people to far away England to be tried for pretended crimes committed here, and so on.

The peoples of the Middle East and Southeast Asia are today in the midst of revolutions founded on complaints as specific as ours were then and, to them, as important. These complaints are, in part, the following:

1. Ownership of land by a few. This region has a system of tenancy whereby the landowner leaves the tenant barely enough to live. That is partly a result of the sharecropping system which is used; it is partly due to a money-lending system whereby the landlord charges up to 40 percent interest on loans to the tenant. The tenant is bound perpetually by debt just as a serf was bound in feudal France or England.

2. Absence of schools for children.

3. A great lack of doctors, first-aid clinics, and hospitals.

4. A system of taxation under which millionaires pay little or no taxes.

5. Governments that are corrupt and elections that are rigged.

These are the great, burning issues in the villages from the Mediterranean to the Pacific. It is on these issues that the revolutions are based. These revolutions are in many instances directed by Communists. But there is not an ounce of communism in the issues themselves. There are indeed very few Communists in this region. Communism has very little appeal even to the hungry peasant. He wants to own his land—to be able to walk around it, fence it, and say, "This is mine."

He is not interested in having the state become even a bigger and more powerful landlord than the landlord he already has.

He wants his children to be educated.

When his wife gets a pain in her stomach and suffers the torture of the doomed, he can't stand by and watch her die. Yet there are no doctors or medicines in vast reaches of this territory.

The peoples in these areas like the Russian people but they fear Soviet politics. They do not want to be swallowed by Russia. They are intensely national.

These are not theories of mine. I have talked with hundreds of villagers across this wide belt of land that lies against the underbelly of Russia.

The Soviets, keenly alive to this condition, do not preach Marxism or endeavor to sell communism as a philosophy. In these areas the Communists preach straight reform. They inveigh against the injustices of land tenure, high prices, corruption in government, unemployment, and the like. They promise reforms; and the reforms they sponsor are cast in democratic terms: every peasant to become a landowner—public works to provide employment—minimum wages and maximum hours of work—price control—rationing of food—and the like.

This is an old technique. The Communists used it when they campaigned for votes in central Europe. When they gained political control, they changed their tactics. Then terror and force were used in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and the rest of those countries to impose a Marxist regime on them, irrespective of the will of the people.

REDS WIN BY DEFAULT

But these are matters not appreciated by illiterate peasants who are looking for escape from their plight. They are drawn to the leadership that offers reform. And the tragic fact is that in most of the countries in this area, the governments in power are either corrupt or conservative or colonial or all three. And the only party that offers reform is the Communist Party. That gives the Communists a tremendous advantage. They operate in a vacuum. They gain adherents merely by default. Peasants looking for a way out have no other place to go. And so the Red tide swells and swells and appears to be ready to overrun the earth.

Tactically, that offers tremendous advantages to Russia. She gains politically because of the growing power of the parties which she sponsors in these various nations. She also gains from a military point of view.

Every nation in which Russia gains a political victory produces an army to fight her battles. The Red Army is never committed. The only army involved is the national army of the new Communist nation. Yet when the United Nations moves, it must act on an increasingly wider perimeter, exhausting men and resources in a mounting effort to put down aggression. By these tactics, Russia gains in strength while the democratic world becomes steadily weaker.

That is why the problem of reversing the trend is primarily a political as well as a military problem.

It means taking over the direction of the revolutions of the world. America has special capacities for it. We ourselves are the product of revolution. By our act of revolting against colonialism and oppression, we set an example which to this day inspires the underprivileged of the world.

In their eyes we would play the natural role if we helped them attain the same degree of independence that we enjoy. Their wonderment is that we, who profess such high ideals, do not actively help them to find the freedom which we say we want all people to have. They are puzzled and bewildered when, instead, we throw our weight and influence and give our money and support ($2,000,000,000 of it) to corrupt and reactionary groups such as Chiang Kai-shek's.

FIRST NEED: IDEAS, NOT MONEY

The direction of these revolutions is not a simple task, but it is easier than it appears. It means, of course, much more than the withdrawal of economic, military, and moral support from existing corrupt and reactionary governments. If we stopped at that, we would leave the field largely to the Communists, for we would weaken the only core of resistance to their activities which presently exists.

Direction of these revolutions calls for positive, affirmative measures. There is in each of these countries a strong, liberal democratic group. They are the ones that need the backing of our diplomatic power.

Money is not so much needed as ideas. The need for money will come only after the political revolutions have been effected and the new democratic regimes have been stabilized. Money spent before reforms have been launched will be largely wasted. Without those reforms, the money will go largely to enrich the classes at the top, hastening the day the Communists take over.

It is unrealistic and evasive of the issue to say that America does not interfere with the internal policies and affairs of other nations. American influence makes and breaks governments. We interfere when we prop up a government with loans or with a military mission or with economic aid. We have been interfering for years and we must continue to do so if the tide of communism is to be turned.

The question is the nature of our interference. If we interfere by trying to keep in power corrupt and reactionary governments, two results will follow: (1) We will exhaust our financial resources, bleed ourselves white, and reduce irrevocably the standard of living of our people; (2) we will give the Communists continued opportunities to grow politically strong among the peasants on whose backs the American-supported governments ride.

There are two important prerequisites if we are to manage this venture successfully and direct the revolutions of the world into democratic channels.

First: Direction of these revolutions means complete divorcement from the Communist influence and an operation through democratic forces alone.

Once we tried to get the Communists of China and the Nationalists of China united in a government. That was sheer folly. The Communist technique is to destroy from

within. A coalition government that includes the Communists would inevitably work to sabotage that government and to establish for it a record of ineptitude and failure.

Second. If we are to give direction to and control the revolutions, we must make up our minds on the definite and specific issues that plague the peoples of this area.

Platitudes about democracy and freedom are not enough. In those poverty-ridden areas, phrases like that sound empty and fall flat. They are meaningless utterances on wave lengths already crowded with meaty subjects.

WE MUST BE CLEAR

Our program must be as definite and specific as it is on our domestic front. Our position must be clear on land reform, unemployment insurance, price control, taxation, food rationing, and all the other issues that are critical in the area.

We must be clear on these issues in order to decide what leadership we will sponsor, what measures we will finance, what governments we will support. And we must be honestly democratic in practical application of these reform measures. We must, for example, stand for a land-distribution program based not on confiscation (a Communist creed) but on just compensation to the landlords. There are also democratic standards to be applied in industrial and irrigation projects. One example will illustrate what I mean.

A TVA IN MESOPOTAMIA

There is a great need for a TVA on the Tigris and Euphrates. I have traveled those river basins and seen with my own eyes the service that flood control and irrigation could perform. Such projects, under proper management, could increase the productivity of the area, bring great prosperity to the masses, and produce a land that could support additional millions of people.

But unless it is done under a program of reform—including distribution of land to the peasants—it will work only to increase the hold that a few hundred men already have on these middle eastern countries. The result would be to accelerate the tide of communism.

If we openly undertake to manage these revolutions and direct them, we will at once enlist the support and enthusiasms of the peoples of this area. We will for the first time be identified with them and their struggles for liberty, not in words, but in action.

That would be a welcome relief. For in spite of Soviet propaganda, people in these areas do not believe that America has imperialistic designs on them. American missionaries and American educators have shown the selflessness of which America is capable. Unlike Russia, America has had no past record of gobbling up small nations or carving territory out of her neighbor's domain.

If these projects succeeded—and there is no reason why they should fail—we would have made tremendous gains.

We would have deprived Russia of the great political leverage she now has over the area. We, rather than the Soviets, would be the sponsors of reforms, the champions of the people. There would be no longer a political vacuum in which the Communists would operate. The people of the area would have a choice other than communism.

Land reform alone would establish a strong barrier to Soviet political activity. Land reform would not only deprive the Soviets of their most powerful propaganda; it would make each peasant a capitalist. No greater political barrier to communism could be designed.

Furthermore, we would have deprived Russia of the opportunity of organizing the people along her southern border for aggression. This would be of inestimable aid to our military. It would reduce the potential areas of conflict and reduce the strength of the enemy.

If we succeeded in all this, we would not, of course, be assured of peace with Russia. But we would have taken steps to contain her. She would no longer have troops of new satellites to fight her battles. The Red army might still sweep to the Mediterranean and the Pacific. But if it did, Russia would be fighting alone, not with native armies of border states professing liberation from American imperialism.

It is clear then, that what we must do is direct, not destroy, the revolutions that stir the Middle East and southeast Asia. And it will take an imaginative, creative undertaking—not a military one—to do it.

St. Lawrence Seaway a Costly Hoax: Forget It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 27, under the caption "St. Lawrence seaway a costly hoax: Forget it." My constituents and I are in accord with the views expressed in this editorial:

President Truman's renewed pleas for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, this time on the basis of defense necessity, should be shelved quickly and decisively by Congress. Even to debate this extravagant, impractical, repeatedly discredited venture would be sheer waste.

In his $71,600,000,000 budget message the President again trotted out this mouldy old joker—it's been hanging around since 1895—along with a lot of other costly nonessentials. A few days later, in a letter to the chairman of the St. Lawrence Deep Sea Waterway Labor Conference in Detroit, Mr. Truman said that in the present emergency the project has become urgent.

Furthermore, he added that, because our steel industry must be built up, the seaway was needed to bring in iron ore, not only from Labrador but from Venezuela, by a route well protected from enemy submarines. Just how Venezuelan ore would be protected on the long ocean haul to the mouth of the St. Lawrence wasn't made clear.

But what, precisely, is the seaway's urgency from a defense viewpoint? This high-priced waterway, connecting Great Lakes ports with the Atlantic Ocean, is ice-bound about 5 months of the year, rendering it useless for long periods.

To transport ocean tonnage to lake ports would require the building of some 50 dams. One enemy bomb that shattered a single lock could tie up the whole system.

A few years ago the expense of this vast spending project was figured at $642,000,000, of which Canada would pay $204,000,000. In 1946, when the seaway was debated in Congress without action, the cost was estimated variously at $750,000,000 to $1,500,000,000. Today's cost would be vastly greater.

And that isn't all. By diverting ocean freight, including iron ore, to the Great Lakes, the seaway would cause untold losses to eastern United States seaports, including Philadelphia. Projected steel plants along the Delaware will require a great deal of that Venezuelan ore the President talked about.

Revival of the St. Lawrence seaway hoax now, when this Nation is faced with defense necessities involving multibillion outlays, is thoroughly inexcusable. Congress should pay no attention to the seaway bills already introduced, and get on with real security needs.

Our Political Paralysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by Henry Hazlitt which appeared in the magazine Freeman, December 25, 1950:

OUR POLITICAL PARALYSIS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

If the military disaster in Korea had overtaken any nation with a responsible parliamentary government, there is not the slightest doubt what the result would have been. The chief executive and every member of his cabinet would have been forced to resign.

The next step would have been to set up a government that had the confidence of the parliament and of the people. But the indispensable first step would have been the resignation of the existing government. It would have had to go because its incompetence and unfitness had been demonstrated. It would have had to go if for no other reason than that it had acquired a vested interest in defending, covering up, prolonging, and compounding the very blunders that had brought about the crisis. It would have had to go because it had lost the confidence of the country.

And this would have been true even if its responsibility for the crisis had been less direct than is President Truman's responsibility for the crisis that confronts this country today. That responsibility is as clear and direct as it could possibly be. For it was on the night of June 26 that President Truman made the personal decision to throw American troops into Korea. In doing this he went against the long-considered judgment of nearly every military authority: that Korea was strategically untenable by our land forces if the hordes of Red China or Red Russia chose to dispute it.

In acting that night on the impulse of the moment, Mr. Truman disregarded not only this military judgment, but the American Constitution. The Constitution confers the power to declare war on Congress—and on no one else. Mr. Truman bypassed Congress with the fiction that the United Nations was only taking a police action in Korea. With the passage of time that fiction has become increasingly transparent. The police action has turned out to be a major war, with more casualties for us than the American Revolution. The United Nations turned out to mean in fact that 90 percent of the combat forces in Korea on our side, apart from the South Koreans themselves, were Americans. We have maneuvered ourselves into a preposterous situation, in which American boys do 90 percent of the fighting and dying, while our token-fighting or nonfighting allies in the United Nations tell us what we can or can't do with a victory if we ever win it and what we can or can't do even on the battlefield itself.

All this is the fruit of the theory, assiduously preached in the last 20 years, that

we should have one-man government in the conduct of foreign affairs. Previous fruits were Yalta and Potsdam, where Presidents made foreign agreements not only without the advice and consent of the Senate but without even revealing to their own people what the full agreements were.

President Truman's responsibility is of course shared by Secretaries Acheson and Marshall. It is General Marshall who was chiefly instrumental in trying to force Chiang Kai-shek to take the Communists into his government—an act which would have brought the triumph of communism in China far sooner than it actually came. The quality of Secretary Acheson's statesmanship was reviewed at length in the previous issue of the Freeman. I will repeat here only one item from that record. On March 20, 1947, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Acheson said there was no danger of a Communist defeat of Chiang Kai-shek. In a letter to the President of July 30, 1949, he said that "no amount of aid could have saved Chiang."

But merely forcing an unfit executive to get rid of unfit advisers, though it may be better than nothing, is not a step of first importance. The quality of a statesman is revealed in nothing more clearly than in his choice of advisers. He is not good or bad because his advisers are good or bad; his own wisdom or folly determines the advisers he chooses and the advice he follows.

In this country, whenever a crisis or a calamity occurs, we concentrate our attack on the advisers, rather than on the top Executive, chiefly because the advisers are the only ones we are constitutionally able to remove. Thus there are broadly two factions in the United States at this moment: Those demanding the dismissal of General MacArthur and those demanding the dismissal of Secretary Acheson. That General MacArthur is a military genius is beyond doubt: He proved it by his Pacific campaign in the last war and by the Inchon landing in the Korean War. That he has made serious mistakes in the present campaign is probable: He has made over-optimistic statements; and his forces were caught off balance when the Chinese attack came. But his defeat has been due primarily to the fact that President Truman assigned him an impossible task. The responsibility comes directly back to the President. Yet Mr. Truman can ignore, if he chooses, even the demand for the removal of Secretary Acheson as long as he is himself irremovable.

Nor can we take much hope in the process of impeachment. Since the effort to impeach President Johnson on purely political grounds, tremendous psychological and political resistance has been built up against the repetition of such an effort. Woodrow Wilson, in his Congressional Government (1885) explained what was wrong about our constitutional provisions in this regard:

"Nothing short of a well-nigh impossible impeachment can unmake a President, except four successions of the seasons. * * * A Prime Minister must keep himself in favor with the majority, a President need only keep alive. * * *

"Great crimes such as might speed even impeachment are not ordinary things in the loosest public service. * * * That which usually and every day clogs and hampers good government is folly or incapacity on the part of the ministers of state. Even more necessary, therefore, than a power clothed with authority to accuse, try, and punish for public crimes is some ultimate authority, whose privilege it shall be to dismiss for inefficiency. Impeachment is aimed altogether above the head of business management. A merchant would not think it fair, even if it were lawful, to shoot a clerk who could not learn the business. Dismissal is quite as effective for his purposes, and more merciful to the clerk. The crying inconvenience of our system is, therefore, that the constitutional authority whose prerogative it is to direct policy and oversee administration has fewer facilities for getting its work well done than has the humblest citizen for obtaining satisfactory aid in his own undertakings. * * *

"It is impossible to deny that this division of authority—between Congress and the President—and concealment of responsibility are calculated to subject the Government to a very distressing paralysis in moments of emergency. * * * In times of sudden exigency this—division of authority—might prove fatal—fatal either in breaking down the system or in failing to meet the emergency."

This paralysis of action has brought about in our political life a paralysis of thought. I hope I may be forgiven if I quote from a book of my own, A New Constitution Now, published in 1942:

"The constitutional restrictions on what the American people are able to do, affect what it is prudent for them to say, and this in turn unconsciously affects even what they dare to think. If the President turns out not to be the man best fitted to lead the country in a successful prosecution of war, if he bungles critical decisions badly and to the national cost, men fear to say so plainly. There is no immediate constitutional method of changing the executive, as there is in England. Therefore patriotic men fear that criticism which brings responsibility home too closely to the President can only divide the country without affecting the change necessary. But this fear, only partly conscious, has a further effect: It leads men to wishful thinking; it leads them to tell themselves that the situation can not be as bad as all that, and that the necessary changes can be effected by moderate arguments which do not urge a change in government but merely in the policies adopted by the existing government. Such a belief will continue to be held even though experience shows that the existing government will not modify its major policies, and may not even, however willing, know how to adopt and carry out the proper policies. The limitations imposed by a rigid constitution, in short, may pervert a nation's very thinking, leading it to a sort of national neurosis in which it refuses to face the truth about the situation that confronts it."

That we are close to such a neurosis now is indicated in the timidity not merely of Democratic but of Republican leadership in what everyone concedes to be one of the most serious crises in our history. Not only are the "responsible" Republican leaders not asking that Mr. Truman resign; they became afraid even to ask that Mr. Acheson resign.

The climax of this timidity was reached by Governor Dewey, the so-called titular leader of the Republican Party, when he declared on December 8: "This moment is not the time for further criticism." Not the time to criticize the policies that have brought us to the brink of disaster. When is the time? After the disaster has become irreparable?

The only answer to these questions is that this is, above all, the time to demand the removal or resignation of the men, and the instant and complete change of the policies, that have led us into this disaster. We have not, in fact, too much time left. It is later than Mr. Dewey dares to think.

Yet there have been many other expressions of this same psychosis. There was the strange article by Cabell Phillips, leading off the New York Times magazine of December 10. This article called upon all Americans to close ranks in a spirit of unity—behind precisely the leaders and selected means that have been discredited.

The argument ran: "Our common faith must, of necessity, be placed in our chosen leaders—the President and his chief civilian and military subordinates. In other words, our faith must be placed precisely in the group whose policies have already led us to the very brink of disaster.

"As individuals," the article conceded, "we may neither respect nor fully trust either those leaders or their policies." In other words, we must collectively have implicit faith in leaders and policies whom individually we neither respect nor trust.

Admitting that its self-contradictory argument might cause some perplexity, the article nonetheless continued: "But the—Truman—administration was put in power by the mandate of a democratic majority. That mandate placed in their hands the conduct of our military and foreign affairs." What is wrong with this argument is: (1) It neglects to mention that this mandate was given more than 2 years ago, when the American people could not foresee the disaster to which it was going to lead; (2) that last November 7, though they still had only a faint and uncertain intimation of the disaster that was coming, the American people considerably modified this mandate; (3) that there never was a mandate to Mr. Truman to usurp the power of Congress to put us into war; and (4) the argument misses the entire point that the American people, now that the disaster is upon them, are not being given the opportunity to renew or reverse that mandate.

The article went on: "We must accept the premise that our leaders are acting to the best of their abilities and to no other purpose than to protect our national interest." It is hard to believe that this argument was seriously intended. It is merely another version of the old Wild West saloon sign: "Please don't shoot the pianist. He's doing his best." The whole question is whether our present leaders have the necessary abilities, whether they know how to protect our national interest. We have seen the disaster to which their lack of ability and their good intentions have already led us. How much more disaster do we need?

I quote one final argument from the Phillips article about these leaders: "We may rightfully question their wisdom and try to influence their decisions. But once those decisions are made we are all, under the rules we live by, equally obligated by them." In other words, even if their decisions threaten to lead us to disaster, we must all go along with them and carry them out. It is better, apparently, to go down to defeat quietly under the old rules than to presume to change the rules. America, apparently, exists for the old rules, not the rules for America.

The New York Times magazine article, like Mr. Dewey's no-time-for-criticism statement, are examples of an intellectual paralysis brought about by the inflexibility of our present constitutional machinery. All such arguments reveal a lack of understanding of the very basis of two-party government.

The shutting off of criticism is the device of a one-party system and of totalitarianism. Is the opposition going to sit quiet, continuing to mumble incoherently about "bipartisanship" while acquiescing in every blunder, in order to tell us in 1952 (if we survive till then) that they could have saved us from these blunders if they had dared to speak out? Are those who recognize the administration's errors to be silent precisely at the moment when their constructive suggestions of what to do—which cannot be separated from their suggestions of what to stop doing—are most needed?

We are already beginning to see the logical fruits of the doctrine that we must trust the very people who led us into this crisis to lead us out of it. One is a demand that a "national emergency" be declared chiefly so that still more powers can be assumed by the leaders who have already demonstrated that they do not know how to use the huge powers already granted to them. Another is a demand for "total mobilization." This phrase

derives its seductive powers mainly from a misleading analogy, especially when it is interpreted to mean over-all allocations and rationing, price controls, and wage controls. These controls do not in fact help to "mobilize" the economy; they do not promote flexibility and efficiency and a quick transformation to a balanced production of war goods. They merely serve to tie the economy up in bureaucratic red tape.

Well, then, I may be asked, what can the opposition do? What can Congress do? Suppose it does pass a resolution of lack of confidence in Mr. Truman? Suppose Congress does point out to Mr. Truman that, though it does not have the power to remove him, the Constitution explicitly permits him to resign, and that his resignation is necessary to preserve the unity and serve the interests of the country? And suppose Mr. Truman then refuses to resign? Or suppose, even, that he does resign. That, under our present system, means ALBEN W. BARKLEY is President. Or even if Mr. BARKLEY also resigns, it means, under the existing Presidential Succession Act, Speaker SAM RAYBURN. Is there any good reason for thinking that either of them would be much better than Mr. Truman, that either of them would be remotely up to the tremendous world responsibilities that the task would impose upon him?

Most of us would feel forced to answer "No." Neither of these men is anything much better than an average political hack. Certainly neither could be regarded as a leader capable of inspiring the unity, confidence, and trust, not to speak of the hope and faith, that the country so desperately needs today.

But this is merely another illustration of the pass to which our existing constitutional machinery—plus our ill-considered Presidential Succession Act, and our irresponsible way of choosing leaders in Congress—mainly on the soggy principle of seniority—has brought us.

There are, it is true, conceivable ways out, without even amending our Constitution. Even under our existing (1947) Presidential Succession Act, it might be possible to persuade both Mr. Truman and Mr. BARKLEY to resign and to have the House choose temporarily in place of Mr. RAYBURN a Speaker more eminently qualified to act as President. But this man would have to come from the House's own Members, and the plan in any case would depend upon three great voluntary self-denying acts on the part of three different individuals.

It would probably be much better for Congress to submit immediately an amendment to the Constitution. Though this is usually regarded as a hopelessly time-consuming process, there is no good reason why Congress could not eliminate the loss of time hitherto regarded as inevitable. Congress has the explicite constitutional right to provide that an amendment be ratified or rejected by "conventions" of the several States. As part of Congress' specified right to select the "mode of ratification," it surely has the implied power (though it has never seen fit to exercise it), to provide that these conventions be elected and meet simultaneously at an early date set by Congress itself.

Nor would the substance of the amendment itself be difficult to outline. The Federal Government must be responsible and accountable at all times to the people. This means that the people must have potential control of their government at all times, and not simply at rigid election dates 2 or 4 years apart. The people must have the power, in short, to change their leaders at any time—above all in times of crisis when our very national survival may be at stake.

The way to make this practically possible has already been shown by generations of tested experience in, for example, Great Britain, Australia, and Canada. Congress should have power at any time to vote a lack of confidence in the Executive, who would then have the choice of resigning or of dissolving Congress. If he resigned, Congress could select a new Executive immediately. If he dissolved Congress, he would force every Member to go to the country for reelection, but he would himself have to stand for such reelection. If the Executive won the country's verdict, he would get a Congress pledged to support him; if he lost it, the new Congress could itself choose a new leader.

Only in this way can we assure continuous national unity, national confidence, national faith in our leadership. Only in this way can we make our leaders truly responsible and select the leadership capable of rising to a crisis.

It is so that the great countries of Europe have been able to act in a crisis. It was in the very midst of war, in 1917, when French morale was bad at the front and even worse at home, that Clemenceau, who had not hesitated to attack the failures of the previous government, came into power and led France to victory. It was in the very midst of war, in 1916, when the British people had ceased to believe in Asquith as war leader, that Lloyd-George took his place and led England on to victory. And it was in the midst of the last war that Winston Churchill displaced Chamberlain and rallied the nation to victory. Does anyone seriously believe today that England should have tried to keep the faltering Chamberlain regime in power in that crisis?

Is America alone to deprive itself of the ability to change its leaders in a crisis? Do we prefer to tie our own hands? Do we prefer the preservation of an outworn political machinery to survival? And are we sure that the effort to preserve this rigid, outworn machinery won't, as Woodrow Wilson predicted, prove "fatal—fatal either in breaking down the system or in failing to meet the emergency"?

Benefits for Veterans of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to grant certain benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the military, naval, and air operations against the forces of North Korea. To achieve this purpose it proposes to amend pertinent provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, so as to insure that veterans of the Armed Forces in the Korean War shall be entitled to the benefits accorded World War II veterans under those statutes.

I believe a measure of this sort is self-explanatory and needs no extended justification on my part. Surely, those men who have undergone the months of rigorous action, the privations, and heavy casualties of the war in Korea, are entitled to every legitimate benefit a grateful nation can extend. The benefits here dealt with are those already accorded veterans of World War II. The members of the Armed Forces in Korea, one of the costliest campaigns in our history, are veterans in every sense of the word, and surely entitled to treatment equalling that granted soldiers and sailors of previous wars.

I trust the committee and the Congress will give this measure their favorable consideration.

Factual Report Pierces Confused and Emotional Fog on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article, entitled "Statement on our Foreign Situation," by Ernest T. Weir, chairman, National Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.:

STATEMENT ON OUR FOREIGN SITUATION

(By Ernest T. Weir, chairman, National Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa., January 5, 1951)

Whether we shall have peace or world war has now become an immediate problem. It is the most important question confronting the United States and the balance of the world and will directly control all other internal and external problems of every nation. I decided to see how my European friends were thinking relative to this grave crisis and, consequently, have just spent several weeks in Paris and London consulting with men of affairs in whose experienced judgment I have great confidence.

Collectively, these men represent extensive and diverse economic activity. Individually, they occupy positions in which it is essential for them to have intimate knowledge of public trends of thought in the other countries of Europe, as well as their own. On previous occasions, I have found them to be highly accurate in their appraisals of European viewpoints and estimates of world situations. Following is a summation of their opinions which, I believe, represent prevailing thought in England and France and fairly reflect the attitude of Europe as a whole.

The paramount problem now, of course, is the situation in which we are involved with China. In the United States, China is being denounced as an aggressor and as a tool of Russian imperialism. Our friends abroad do not agree that this is the case. They believe that the present Chinese Government, which is avowedly communistic, truly reflects the present thinking of the Chinese people. But they do not believe that the Chinese Government is under Russian control. They have no doubt that Russia has influence with China, because countries that share the belief in communism naturally have close contact but point out that the history of China has been that of an independent people who have never submitted to control by any other nation. There is no natural bond between the Russians and the Chinese. From the Chinese standpoint, Russia is an occidental foreign power the same as the United States and other western nations, and even now, observers with long experience in China report a growing resentment among the Chinese over the presence of Russians in China. It would be a gross error if the United States, through avoidable action, should provide the

unifying bond that is now lacking between Russia and China by making our country their common enemy.

CHIANG KAI-SHEK IS FINISHED

The present Chinese Government is the result of the revolutionary fight which has been waged in China for many years and from which the Communist faction has emerged with total victory. As a result, they believe that Chiang Kai-shek is completely finished as a leader—that he has no influence in the affairs of China now and will not have in the future. In the opinion of our friends abroad, who know much more about China than we do, the overlord system which Chiang Kai-shek represented is completely ended.

From the factual standpoint, therefore, the present government of China represents the more than 400,000,000 Chinese—at least 20 percent of the world's population—and there is no apparent good reason why the United States should not have recognized this government as the representative of the Chinese people. If this had been done, it is felt, the present disastrous situation in Korea would not have developed. Our European friends believe that continued recognition of Chiang Kai-shek is unjustified by the facts of the situation and that persistence in this position simply stirs up additional resentment against the United States. England, of course, very promptly recognized the new government, feeling that this was the only course that would make it possible to deal with China in the future, and I am sure that this action by England has the endorsement of all the European countries.

SHOULD RECOGNIZE NEW GOVERNMENT

The feeling is that we also should recognize the new Chinese government and that such action will make possible negotiation of peace terms with China which otherwise may be impossible. Prevention of war in the East is a consideration of much greater weight than the maintenance of a position in Korea and Formosa which, in comparison with the major problems of the world at large, are certainly not of sufficient importance to justify war. I find that this is the universal position abroad.

Now as to Russia, the thinking is as follows:

Like everyone else, our European friends are puzzled regarding Russia's real objectives. However, I did not find a single person who believed that Russia would precipitate a war now or for some years to come—if ever. Naturally, in the absence of sure knowledge of Russia's intentions, they do not trust her and for that reason feel that definite and regular military preparations should be made both in Europe and the United States. They believe that this in itself would serve as an effective deterrent if Russia actually has aggressive intentions, because it would make clear the opposition Russia would have to meet in event of war. But I found nobody who believed that Russia now was at all prepared for war.

IRON CURTAIN HIDES WEAKNESS

They think that Russia maintains the iron curtain to hide weakness rather than strength, and this position is based on careful analysis of Russia's war-making potential as measured by its production of steel, oil, and other military essentials. In comparison with the production of similar materials by the United States and its allies, they can see no justification for the belief that Russia could carry on a war to ultimate success. For the prevention of war and, consequently, for the safety of the world, it is their position, therefore, that we should continue efforts to deal with Russia. By maintaining contact with Russia, we will have the opportunity to prevent the development of situations that might result in a war that is not desired by either Russia or the western nations.

The feeling is that the day-by-day attacks on Russia in our propaganda over the past several years have not been productive of good; that it certainly gives the Russian people the idea that we have no genuine desire for friendly relations but intend eventually to make war. Our European friends are convinced that this interpretation of our attitude has caused resentment toward us on the part of the Russian people, as distinguished from the Russian Government.

There is no question that we made grave errors in dealing with Russia during and after the war, and most serious among them was the division of Germany which turned Eastern Germany over to Russia. If this and other similar blunders had not been made, we probably would not have to be thinking now of the danger of war. But we cannot remake the past. We must conduct ourselves according to the situation as it is at present. And the wisest course, in European opinion, is to keep the door open to Russia and thus, while there is still time, do our part to prevent conditions of irrevocable hostility from becoming established.

MEET DIRECTLY WITH RUSSIA

Furthermore, there is the feeling in Europe that the United States should be willing to meet directly with Russia instead of insisting on contacts through the agency of the UN. This is due to practical recognition of the fact that the world's major problem is the issue between Russia and the United States. Certainly none of the other nations would resent this direct dealing, because they believe it holds the key to avoidance of war, and none of them wants war.

Getting back to the situation in the East as it is viewed in Europe, it is very evident that the Chinese do not understand us or our intentions and, consequently, are skeptical of our statements. To begin with, we definitely refused to recognize their government, making clear that we dislike it because it is communistic, and we indicate that this is to be our permanent policy. Then we went into Korea and, after driving the North Koreans back over the thirty-eighth parallel, kept on moving in increased strength with the announced intention of gaining control over the entire country. Of course, we stated our reasons for doing this, but our reasons mean nothing to the Chinese. As they see it, we are an avowed enemy of their government and are carrying on a mammoth drive to the Manchurian line. We say it is not our intention to cross the line, but they do not believe us, having no confidence in the statement of what they consider an avowed enemy. Consequently, it is entirely possible that they have determined—on their own and not because of Russian control—to drive us from Korea for what they regard sincerely as protection of their country's future position. If we do get down to negotiation with the Chinese, it is very likely that they will insist on our withdrawal from Korea and will also insist that the Formosa question be settled to their satisfaction. Against the background of the world problem as a whole, as was pointed out above, Korea and Formosa are not considered of sufficient importance to justify a continuing and growing war in the East.

PREVENT WORLD WAR III

Our friends in Europe feel definitely that we should make every effort to better understand the Chinese, to deal with them, and to prevent an open, declared war with China, because they have no doubt at all that such a war inevitably would develop into world war III. A war with China would offset to a major degree the military weakness of Russia mentioned above, and even though she did not promptly enter the war on the side of China—which she probably would not do—it would create the opportunity for Russia to stir up trouble in various parts of the world. There is a great deal of propaganda to the effect that the United States would suffer a loss of prestige if a peace were worked out with China on the above conditions, but this should be ignored, because now the all-important, basic necessity is no war in the East.

In connection with this eastern situation, I give quotations, taken from English publications, which illustrate the frame of mind of China's present leadership: On September 30, Chou En-Lai, premier and foreign minister of China, in a statement the substance of which was conveyed to the Indian Ambassador in Peking, said: "The Chinese people absolutely refuse to tolerate foreign aggression, nor will they stand idly by seeing their neighbors being savagely invaded by imperialists. Whoever attempts to exclude nearly 500,000,000 Chinese people from the United Nations," he added, "whoever sets at naught and violates the interests of this one-fourth of mankind in the world and fancies vainly that any eastern problems directly concerned with China can be solved arbitrarily, will certainly break his neck."

Also, "American imperialists aimed at annexing Korea, whence they could invade Manchuria * * * and finally the whole of Asia. History had proved that a conquest of Korea meant a threat to China's national defense." Consequently, "The only means of bringing imperialism to its senses was a resort to force, and the Chinese people must be prepared to deliver blows to the imperialists, taking the risk of extending the war."

As a further example of China's thinking, the present Chinese Government claims to be the "first independent Government of China insofar as it has abrogated the last remains of privileges enjoyed by the Western Powers. * * * Its desire to have a seat on the United Nations is fortified by the belief that it is indeed the inheritor of the special status whereby China is one—and the only Asian one—of the Security Council's veto-holding big five."

Also important is the following statement taken from the London Times:

"It is deplorably tragic for American statesmen to be so one-eyed as to imagine that everything in China nowadays is due to Moscow communism * * * and that America lost China through not giving enough aid to Chiang Kai-shek. Nothing could be further from the truth * * * the more military material the U. S. A. sent to China, the more military equipment did the People's Liberation Army receive as it came to them directly or indirectly from the Kuomintang armies. * * * The People's Government came into power largely due to the collapse of the KMT * * * the Chinese people showed increasing hatred and hostility toward this regime. * * * No sensible observer can see any alternative to the present Government either now or in the next few years * * * the People's Government is bringing better living conditions to very many people. There has now been much improvement in business, and many factories and shops are working that were not doing so 9 months ago. The present government is controlling inflation which the previous one did not. The KMT imported rice from abroad for China; the present Government has managed to get enough in from other parts of China. In contrast to the corruption under the KMT, government officials today live simply, on low salaries, work hard and serve the people. There has been a very marked improvement in the operation of railways. * * * Without a shadow of doubt, the new Government has won the allegiance of students all over the country, and this is a point of great importance in China."

MUST CONSIDER EUROPEAN ATTITUDE

In the above I have endeavored to give a clear picture of the opinions of men of wide knowledge and influence in Britain and France. Whether one agrees with these

opinions or not. It is impossible to ignore them because it is unthinkable that we should become involved in a war with Russia without having the principal nations of Western Europe as our allies. We cannot make the decision of war or peace alone and without consulting them. Hence we must know their attitude toward the great central problem which is at the heart of the crisis. We need not agree with all of the opinions of these European observers. But in the main they must be considered in forming our own policy.

Having obtained this brief view of the attitude of friendly minds in the nations which must be our allies, we may attempt a summary of what our own attitude ought to be.

It is certainly apparent that the great decision we must make now is the one regarding China. There is no doubt we made a serious mistake in jumping into Korea without giving due consideration to the long-range effect, and I would think that possibly the major part of this blunder was in going beyond the thirty-eighth parallel, where we could have stopped consistently.

In our decision and its effect on the world's situation, we cannot assume that we know the opinion of 400,000,000 Chinese people. We must think seriously as to what this opinion actually is, and then we certainly must be influenced by it once we have some real idea as to their beliefs. We say they are Communists. We, of course, do not like communism, but we cannot eliminate communism in the world by war. Certainly, we cannot ignore the fact that there are many people in the world today who believe, so far as we know, that communism is of value to them.

If we refuse to recognize and deal with the present Chinese Government because it is communistic, we assume the dangerous position of trying to tell the people of other important nations what kind of government they must have. As a matter of fact, we have done this very thing in the case of Spain through our refusal until very recently to have dealings with a Spanish Government that has been in existence for 13 years, solely on the ground that it is a Fascist government and, therefore, not to our liking. Such positions make us intruders in the internal affairs of other nations.

WAR TO ERADICATE COMMUNISM

No matter what claims may be made that our attitude toward China is the result of Chinese aggression in Korea, I think the fact is very evident that if the present situation results in extension of the war, it will be due to our refusal to recognize the Chinese Government because it is communistic. In other words, the war would be caused by our intention to eradicate communism. We certainly must realize that we cannot eliminate communism by war. On the contrary, I am sure that a third world war would increase communism, because the war would be so long drawn out and so disastrous that there would be a greater degree of dissatisfaction among the peoples of all nations than exists today. Therefore, the vital questions are: "Should there be a war?" and if the answer is affirmative, "What, precisely, would the war be for?"

EMOTIONAL APPROACH BARS CLEAR THOUGHT

Statements are coming out of Washington to the effect that we cannot stand for appeasement. This is an emotional approach that at other times has prevented clear thinking and practical decisions. Also, when some of our statesmen, in deliberation on these important world matters, take a position contrary to that held by the administration, attacks are made on them, such as the recent one by Senator Lucas, of Illinois, which he made while Republicans were in caucus to consider the Acheson matter. Senator Lucas told the Senate that the action of the House Members was "an invitation to Stalin to strike anywhere" and shouted that on the basis of the Republican action, Stalin is likely to conclude that this country is so divided that he can start new aggressions.

The Illinois Senator's position, of course, was based entirely on theory, not on facts. We have made vital mistakes in our decisions on world affairs, and they have brought us to the verge of a new world war. Those mistakes were not made because of any division—real or fancied. They were made through lack of the very deliberation, debate, and exposure of the facts to the public that the Senator calls division. Certainly it is far better—in fact, it is vitally important—that we have broad and thorough discussion on policy, even though this will produce disagreement, because it is the only way in which we can come to proper and safe policies and decisions supported by public understanding. It is perfectly ridiculous to say that because a lot of people in this country, who happen to include leading Republicans, lack confidence in Secretary Acheson and demand that he be replaced, that Stalin or anybody else in the world will be encouraged to attack the United States.

TELL THE PEOPLE FRANKLY

If an attack occurs, it will be for some much more substantial reason, yet this is the kind of propaganda that has been issued continuously and has been so confusing to the American people. I am convinced that one of the greatest mistakes has been the failure to tell the people of this country frankly what the actual conditions are. We should have more debates on these matters. We should cut out the secret diplomacy, which in the long run promotes war. After all, it is the people of the country who pay the bill with income, property, and lives. They should have more to do with the final decisions.

It is obvious that to meet this crisis successfully there must be unity among the American people. But unity is not the blind following of whatever the President may decide to do from day to day. We have had too much of that in the past and it has been a large factor in bringing us to our present predicament. Disagreement is not disunity. Disagreement, expressed in full and orderly debate, is the process by which all sides of a problem and all possible solutions are revealed to a free people. It is only through this process that the people of the United States can arrive at the general agreement on objectives and methods that will make real unity possible. The present is clearly a period of disagreement and debate.

Further comments on communism:

There is no sympathy in Europe for a war which would have the objective of driving communism out of the world or any section of it. On the other hand, there is the belief that we should be well prepared against military aggression on the part of Russia, the only nation from which they think there is any possibility of aggression.

I am quite convinced that we will have little, if any, support from European countries if a war should result with China as a result of our unwillingness to recognize the Chinese Government. In view of its position of great responsibility in the world, it is very apparent that the time has come for the United States to stop making offhand, spur-of-the-moment decisions and to quit trying to control people through propaganda and politics. Instead, we must get the facts and estimate carefully the long-range effect of any decision we make. The present administration and its predecessor have made decisions of the gravest importance to the country and the world entirely on their own. There has been no apparent desire for and certainly no effort to obtain the opinions of other groups. The so-called by-partisan movement has always been a farce, because the Republican Party and even nonadministration Democrats have been ignored. I believe that Republicans and nonadministration Democrats have a great obligation to take a strong position, to demand facts, and to refuse to support the administration on any proposal unless they are convinced that the facts clearly merit such support. The result of such a position will be a better perspective on the problems and a more thorough understanding of the necessities of the present situation. If this is done, it will give greater hope and encouragement to our European friends who certainly are not very happy today about the quality of our leadership.

To me, it is a favorable sign that more criticism of the administration and its decisions is developing over the country, in the press and otherwise. I have before me an article taken from one of the newspapers that is based on an interview with an unnamed United States Senator. The entire article is attached to this statement, but I would like to call attention to the following definite assertion:

"We should understand, better late than never, that the cheers which greeted Mr. Truman's bold act of last June drowned out solemn military warnings. The Senator of this interview attended secret military hearings where the Joint Chiefs of Staff plainly stated that Korea was useless to occupy and impossible to defend. These opinions were overruled by the President. It is as simple as that. He reversed both his Secretary of State and his military advisers * * * all of whom might properly have resigned in order to alert the country."

If this is true, it is a sad commentary on our Government. This statement should be investigated and the facts determined. If the President ignored the warnings of military advisers and on his own initiative and authority plunged this country into war, steps should be taken immediately to see that neither he nor any other man shall have such power in the future.

I am convinced that if the situation in the east is settled amicably and war is thus prevented, the world is ready to move forward into a period of great development, both economic and social, out of which will come improved standards of living for the peoples of many nations. In view of this great possibility, a war now would be particularly disastrous. This momentous decision—involving great gain or terrible loss for the world—is largely in the hands of the United States.

EXAMINE ALL THE FACTS

The Europeans with whom I talked are naturally influenced by personal and national interest, but to a much greater extent than most Americans, they are accustomed to thinking in world terms and on a long-range basis. Their opinions as to the proper course for the United States and the Western World in general differ markedly from the position taken so far by our leadership. What they advocate with regard to recognition of China and dealings with both China and Russia may be unpalatable to many, but we should think of two things in connection with this. In the first place, logic may be on their side, and we should examine all of the facts with utmost care to see if this is the case before we take action of any kind. Second, we need as many allies as we can secure, and we particularly need allies in Europe. We can hardly expect the support of Europeans if we act at variance with their wishes and without due consideration of their viewpoint. I am convinced that in their main thesis they are entirely right. Extension of the war in the east would be a tragic blunder. We are woefully unprepared; we would surrender to Russia the initiative to take the kind of action we most fear, and even in the event of ultimate victory in China, what would we gain? What we need and what the countries of Europe need is time, and in decisions on subordinate matters, we must not let emotional appeals such as prestige and no appeasement stand in the way.

Obviously, the United States should take every necessary step to build its military strength to the level that will guarantee the security of our country. It should never have been allowed to fall below that level and in view of the very large military expenditures in every year since the end of the last war, it is difficult for the lay citizen to understand how we declined to a position of such incredible weakness.

BUILD STRENGTH TO PREVENT WAR

But our policy in building military strength should be not to prepare for war but to prevent war. This also should be our policy in extending aid to the friendly nations of Europe. We should reinforce this policy of preventing war by our attitude toward the Communist countries. We should make it known to the world that so far as we are concerned the door is always open to the peaceful settlement of differences through negotiation. This policy should be applied now in the case of China on the question of recognition and the problems of Korea and Formosa.

If our efforts to establish a basis of world peace in this manner should be repudiated by the Communist countries, we will have lost little, because the plain fact is that we are now unprepared to do anything about the situation in a military way. On the other hand, we will gain much, because it will demonstrate to the world that the United States does not desire war and is not conducting itself in a manner that will make war inevitable. It is a widely held opinion in Europe that the present conduct of the United States will result in war, which helps to explain why we receive only half-hearted support from nations which are our natural allies. A clear demonstration now that peace is our sincere objective will be the best possible way to insure the full-scale, unreserved participation of Europe should the pessimistic fear of inevitable war be confirmed.

It is important that we arrive quickly at sound and practical decisions on United States' policy. We have lost ground with our natural allies. I regret to have to say that confidence in our leadership in world affairs has definitely declined, and this in itself will increase the confusion in thinking that already exists. It is a matter for our most serious consideration, because in this decision of world importance we cannot go it alone but must have the support of the European countries and as much of the world as is possible.

ERNEST T. WEIR.

P. S.—People in Europe are definitely opposed to use of the atomic bomb. In fact, I was quite surprised at the unanimity of this opinion. They believe that if the atomic bomb should be used there would never again be any feeling of security left in the world. The President's statement a short while ago that the United States was considering the use of the atomic bomb was in itself a bombshell in Europe and really frightening in its effect.

Presidential Power: The Issue Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Mr. Henry Steele Commager, professor of history at Columbia University, who is the author of America in Perspective and other books:

PRESIDENTIAL POWER: THE ISSUE ANALYZED—EXECUTIVE DECISIONS TO COMMIT TROOPS OUTSIDE THE NATION HAVE MANY HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

(By Henry Steele Commager)

The Republican high command has now launched its formal attack upon the Presidential conduct of foreign relations. This attack began with the demand for the ouster of Secretary Acheson—a demand which looks to the substitution of a parliamentary system of government for our Presidential system. It has now shifted to the Korean War and the fulfillment of our obligations under the Atlantic Pact. By sending American soldiers to Korea without congressional authorization, says Senator TAFT, the President has usurped power and violated the laws and the Constitution of the United States. Zealous that such usurpations and violations shall not continue, Representative COUDERT has introduced a formal resolution requiring congressional authorization before any American soldiers be sent out of the country in the future.

Whatever may be said of the expediency of the Taft-Coudert program, this at least can be said of the principles involved—that they have no support in law or in history.

Let us look first to the constitutional issue, for this has been urged, solemnly and insistently by both TAFT and COUDERT. It is, fortunately for us, not a new issue. It was discussed by the founding fathers. It arose, and was settled, in one administration after another—the Washington, the John Adams, the Jefferson, the Jackson, the Tyler, the Polk, the Lincoln, the Grant, the McKinley, the Taft, the Wilson, and the Franklin Roosevelt administrations. Time and again it has come before the courts, and time and again the courts have returned clear answers to the questions involved. It has been the subject of frequent congressional debate and of much learned commentary. It is so hackneyed a theme that even politicians might reasonably be expected to be familiar with it.

It must be admitted at once that the constitutional document itself says very little about this matter of the conduct of foreign relations and the exercise of war powers, and what it does say is couched in general terms. The Executive power is vested in the President, and he is required to take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. He is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. With the advice and consent of the Senate he may make treaties and appoint ambassadors, and he has the power to receive ambassadors and other public ministers. Finally, he is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and the term "laws" as we know, embraces not only statutes but treaties. To the Congress is assigned, explicitly, power to declare war.

What do all these words mean? Is the term "Executive power" a grant of power, or merely a description of an office? What are the obligations of the oath of office, and how far may the President go in fulfilling those obligations? As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces may he act independently of the Congress, or may he act independently if Congress is not in session? Do the laws that he is to execute embrace not only statutes and treaties but international law generally? And to what degree is his execution of these laws dependent upon congressional support and approval? And what is war?

These questions are not in fact as baffling as they seem. Our Constitution is not only the original document; it is also a century and a half of interpretation, a century and a half of tradition, practice, and custom. Questions similar to those which confront us today have come up again and again in the past, and the answers which history has given provide us not merely with precedents but with guidance.

Of all those who have directed American foreign policy none was abler or more learned than John Quincy Adams, and none gave more thought to the principles which should control the conduct of foreign relations. In his eulogy on Madison, Adams said:

"However startled we may be at the idea that the Executive Chief Magistrate has the power of involving the Nation in war, even without consulting Congress, an experience of 50 years has proved that in numberless cases he has and must have exercised the power."

This observation was both good history and good prophecy. On his own initiative Washington had proclaimed neutrality—a proclamation which might well have involved us in war with France. On his own initiative John Adams overrode his Cabinet and his party and sent commissioners to France to end the quasi war with that country. On his own initiative Jefferson, in theory a strict constructionist, inaugurated the war with the Barbary pirates. John Quincy Adams' successors, too, vindicated his judgment.

When France failed to provide money due the United States under the treaty of 1831 Jackson ordered the Navy to prepare for active service. Tyler, eager to consummate his Texas policy, disposed the land and naval forces so as to threaten Mexico. His successor, Polk, ordered General Taylor across the Nueces and thus precipitated the Mexican War—presenting it to Congress as a fait accompli.

Here was war by Presidential act. Polk's successors did not go quite that far, but that was not, perhaps, their fault. Thus in 1854, President Pierce ordered an American squadron to bombard Greytown, in Nicaragua, and the order was duly executed. Eventually the legality of the attack was brought before the Supreme Court, and Justice Nelson sustained it in words that are relevant today:

"Now as respects the interposition of the Executive abroad for the protection of the lives or property of the citizen, the duty must, of necessity, rest in the discretion of the President. * * * The protection, to be effectual * * * may require the most prompt and decided action. * * * The great object and duty of government is the protection of the lives, liberty, and property of the people composing it * * * and any government failing in the accomplishment of the object, or the performance of the duty, is not worth preserving."

At the same time Presidential policy threatened involvement in another quarter of the globe. In 1853 Commodore Perry sailed his squadron into Yedo Bay, overawed the Shogunate, and persuaded the Japanese to open their country to the Western World.

Even more illuminating was the conduct of Lincoln, the first President of that party which now seeks to constrict the Executive powers. Congress was not in session when Beauregard fired on Fort Sumter, and Lincoln did not think it necessary to call it into session for almost 3 months. Meantime he went ahead on his own. He called out the militia, organized an Army, and ordered an advance into Virginia, proclaimed a blockade, spent money as yet unappropriated—in short, he conducted war. Theoretically, to be sure, it was not war; it was an insurrection. But whatever interpretation might be placed upon such acts as raising an Army and invading Virginia, the blockade was an act of war in international law—and was recognized as such. Contemporaries confessed many constitutional scruples about Lincoln's actions, but there are few now who insist that he should have awaited congressional authorization for what he had to do.

In the post-Civil War years the examples of the exercise of Presidential powers that brought the Nation to the verge of war are so numerous as to be tedious. The most interesting come in the administrations of two distinguished Republicans, McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt. When the Boxer Rebellion broke out, the western powers determined to send expeditionary forces to rescue their nationals. Without consulting Congress, McKinley sent an American force of some 5,000 soldiers into the heart of China. This, he argued, involved no war against the Chinese nation and therefore required no congressional authorization.

The ebullient T. R. was even less troubled about congressional support for what he felt he had to do. Among other things, he "took" the Panama Canal, and his comment on that Executive act is illuminating: "I took the Canal Zone and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on the Canal does also."

Nor was this the only exercise of war powers by Theodore Roosevelt. Like his predecessors and his successors, he intervened in the Caribbean to restore order and secure American interests—in Santo Domingo, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Honduras.

It was the Republican Party which had traditionally favored a strong Executive, but in this principle of constitutional development Woodrow Wilson outbid his opponents. Woodrow Wilson was not unfamiliar with the Constitution. He had written learned monographs on it, and he had made the congressional and Presidential powers his particular object of study. Dedicated as he was to a policy of peace with Mexico, he did not hesitate to order the bombardment of Veracruz and the occupation of that city; 2 years later he sent General Pershing on an expedition into Mexico. Both of these were acts of war had Mexico chosen to regard them as such. It is relevant to note, too, that when in 1917 he asked for congressional authority to arm American merchantmen he was careful to add that he had the power to do this "even without special warrant of law, by the plain implications of my constitutional duties and powers."

Franklin Roosevelt's conduct of foreign affairs is fresh in our minds; it is doubtless a lively recollection of that conduct which inspires some of our present-day isolationists in their campaign for limitations on the Executive power. We need not rehearse here the details of the destroyer-bases deal or the shoot-on-sight order, or agitate anew the question of delegation of power in the lend-lease bill. It is sufficient to say that, notwithstanding the protests which greeted these and other acts "short of war," none of them was successfully challenged at the courts or in the larger political arena, nor has any of them been successfully challenged, as yet, at the bar of history.

All of these Presidential acts involved the danger of war. Many of them involved the use of American soldiers, sailors, or marines outside the territorial limits of the United States. Were they constitutional? Obviously the Presidents themselves thought so, and we cannot ignore the weight of that testimony. Congressmen protested, from time to time, but on no occasion did Congress repudiate Presidential power, or even refuse to sustain it by such appropriations as were required. What of the attitude of the courts, the final arbiters of questions of constitutionality?

Here, again, the record is impressive. To be sure, it is difficult to challenge an exercise of Presidential power directly; the courts will not entertain questions of a political nature. But one of the blessings of our constitutional system is that great issues of public policy are brought before the courts through private litigation, and we have therefore frequent judicial pronouncements on the nature of the Executive power. Perhaps the first of these was in the notable case of Martin versus Mott, where the magisterial Justice Storey held that it was for the President to decide when circumstances justified him in calling forth the militia of the States, and how he was to use that militia. The opinion is relevant to our problem today, for it illuminated the whole question of Presidential discretion in implementing the general terms of the Constitution.

Again in the hotly contested prize cases, involving the legality of Lincoln's blockade—and by implication of his powers to make war—the court held that it was for the President to determine when war comes, and that he is "not only authorized but bound to resist force by force." In the case of Neagle, in 1890, Justice Miller held that the phrase "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed" was not limited to the enforcement of acts of Congress alone but included "rights, duties and obligations growing out of the Constitution, our international relations, and all the protection implied by the nature of the Government under the Constitution." Even more illuminating is the opinion of the court in the recent Curtiss-Wright case. In the arena of foreign affairs, said the court: "With its important, complicated, delicate and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation. * * * It is quite apparent that if, in the maintenance of our international relations, embarrassment—perhaps even serious embarrassment—is to be avoided and success for our aims achieved, congressional legislation must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved. Moreover, he, not Congress, has the better opportunity of knowing the conditions which prevail in foreign countries, and especially is this true in time of war."

Most of these precedents, from Washington to Franklin Roosevelt, have involved the exercise of Presidential discretion under the general and ambiguous phrases of the Constitution. For the exercise of Presidential discretion under laws, the case is even stronger. Here the President is confronted not only by his obligation to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution but by his further obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Both of these obligations are involved in our action in Korea and in the commitment to the defense of Western Europe. For it is an elementary fact that must never be lost sight of that treaties are laws and carry with them the same obligation as laws. When the Congress passed the United Nations Participation Act it made the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations law binding on the President. When the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Treaty it made the obligations of that treaty law binding on the President.

Both of these famous documents require action by the United States which must, in the nature of the case, be left to a large extent to the discretion of the Executive. Thus article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty, binds all signatories "to maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack," and article 5 provides that each signatory "will assist the party or parties * * * attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area." If the Congress can deny the Executive the right to use troops or arms abroad, these phrases lose meaning.

It will not, of course, be denied that Congress may do just this—not by resolution, or even by law, but by control over appropriations. Congress has never yet failed to carry out a treaty obligation by denying money, but in theory it can do so. What we have here, then, is not so much a real danger as a theoretical one. Thus, in our constitutional system the three departments are equal and independent, but Congress could, by refusing to vote appropriations, put a complete stop to the entire machinery of the executive and the judiciary departments. It is not to be imagined that the Congress would ever so abuse its power, nor is it to be imagined that the Congress would be so lost to honor as to repudiate the solemn obligations of treaties.

Government Insurance Isn't Cheap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the magazine Tax Outlook, which was sent to me by one of the officials of the Disabled American Veterans:

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE ISN'T CHEAP—REPORT SHOWS IT COST TAXPAYER $5,600,000,000 IN 10 YEARS

(With the prospect of an enlarged military program engendered by the international situation at consequently greater but necessary cost to the taxpayers, the need to eliminate needless Government spending becomes greater than ever. In this connection it is of interest to note that one proposal that may be debated at this session of Congress is a revision of the national service life insurance program, which, according to a report of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, cost approximately $5,600,000,000 over a 10-year period. The committee in making its report public last year recommended Congress consider establishing a gratuitous life indemnity for all men serving in the Armed Forces "in lieu of, and not superimposed upon" the present program. It recommended, among other things, that if this was not done, the existing program be given a complete legislative appraisal. Because changes in the national service life insurance program, including gratuitous policies, were discussed in the last session of Congress, and may be debated in the new one, Tax Outlook herewith presents a major part of the committee's lengthy findings in the public interest.—The EDITOR.)

The national service life insurance program has not met the objectives of Government life insurance. It has failed to provide uniform protection in the form of income for the dependents of persons dying while serving in the Armed Forces, and it has failed to lessen demands for pensions.

Federal contributions for administrative expenses and benefit payments have cost the Federal Government from appropriated funds (through moneys largely raised by taxation), more than $5,500,000,000 in the last 10-year period.

[The survey carried through fiscal 1949. Since that date it is estimated costs may have risen to $6,000,000,000.]

There is no evidence that Congress has ever been fully or adequately apprised of the total cost.

The NSLI Act of 1940 was proposed and passed primarily to protect the equity value of the Government life insurance policyholders in the (World War I) United States Government Life Insurance Fund. In the event of a future national emergency, a fourth Government insurance program may be proposed. There is serious doubt that manpower to administer national service life insurance, or any other Government insurance plan, would be available in the event of a future national emergency.

The administrative and clerical duties performed by the various personnel of the Armed Forces relative to the maintenance of in-service national service life insurance policies has had and continues to have the effect of dissipating military appropriations and manpower.

In addition to the fiscal cost factor, during the war years, hundreds of officers and thousands of enlisted personnel devoted full time to in-service administrative duties. Cost to the armed services of administering in-service national services life insurance policies from October 8, 1940 through March 1, 1950, is conservatively estimated at $96,409,212.

A MISNOMER

Since October 8, 1940, more than 22,500,000 NSLI insurance policies have been issued. Three out of every four of all former NSLI policyholders have permitted their policies to lapse. Of the veterans of World War II, only one of six are covered by NSLI. About 25.9 percent of NSLI policies currently in force are held by in-service personnel. Only 78 percent of those currently serving in the Armed Forces have taken out this insurance. One out of every nine combat casualties of World War II had no national service life insurance whatsoever.

The use of the word "insurance" in characterizing NSLI operations is a misnomer. The paradox of NSLI is made clear when it is realized that the Federal Government underwrites the extra hazards of military or naval service only to the extent to which an individual was insured for normal civilian risk under the NSLI program. The insured having in force NSLI on a personal paying basis, generally speaking, is a condition precedent before the United States Government becomes liable for any death-benefit payments.

This condition presents an inequity and results in discrimination among beneficiaries.

[In the event death was determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be a "result of disease or injury traceable to the extra hazard of the military or naval service", the liability for payment of such claims was borne not by the NSLI fund, but by the Federal Government. During the war 88 percent of all deaths in the armed forces were determined to be "extra hazard." The Government paid not only the face value of the policies held by these individuals, but approximately 19 percent more than the face value or annuities (as a result of the policies)—plus 3 percent on the undistributed principal.

[Therefore the NSLI fund suffered no liability if the death was determined to be extra hazard. The Government assumed the cost of extra hazard only if the deceased had taken out NSLI and then only in the amount of the NSLI policy. Thus, attainment of the objectives of the act was dependent upon the economic predilections and sense of responsibility of the individual sailor, airman, soldier or marine.]

OLD TABLE USE COSTLY

The use of the American Experience Table of Mortality for calculating annuities was outmoded by 1940, and its use has had the effect of granting annuity payments considerably in excess of what more modern actuarial calculations would justify. Testimony revealed that the use of the table was deliberately adopted in order that annuity payments to beneficiaries of World War II would be no lesser amount than similar payments being made to beneficiaries of World War I casualties. The continued use of this table for calculating annuities can only be interpreted as a subsidy to the NSLI fund.

Through October 1, 1948, the use of this table has required the Government to appropriate to the NSLI fund in excess of $502,000,000 in annuity differential payments. There was and is no justification under accepted insurance practices to use this table for NSLI annuity calculations. The use of any annuity table without regard to the difference in life expectancy of male and female lives is contrary to modern insurance practice. Under the NSLI Act as presently written and administered, the total cost to the Government of a $10,000 face value policy may be in excess of $12,000.

Through the conclusion of the fiscal year 1949 (ending June 30, 1949), the total Federal contribution to the NSLI fund was greater than the amount collected from the insured in premium payments. On an overall average, an amount exceeding 75 percent of the total premiums paid on NSLI was returned to the insured in the form of dividends during the first 6 months of 1950.

(Currently, plans are being made for distribution of about $1,000,000,000 in a second "dividend" this year.)

TRUE COST NOT SHOWN

The present rate of interest (3 percent) paid on invested NSLI funds is considerably in excess of the interest rate being paid by the United States Treasury in securing adequate sums required to fund and refund the debt obligation and current expenses of the Federal Government.

Continuation of payment (of interest at 3 percent) is of questionable justification.

The insuring of aviation cadets under present applicable statutes—Government paying the premiums—is excessively costly. It would be tens of millions of dollars less costly to assure each aviation cadet in training that his dependents (in event of his death during training) would receive a gratuitous life indemnity from the Government of $10,000.

From 1941, a conservative estimate is that the premium costs to the United States have been in excess of $31,000,000. The Government by guaranteeing a gratuitous life indemnity of $10,000 to all aviation cadets would have saved well over $20,000,000.

The requested national service life insurance appropriations for administrative expenses cover only a portion of the total administrative cost of national service life insurance operations. The costs are at least twice the amount reflected for such costs in the annual budget request. The present budget procedures do not adequately inform the Congress or the taxpayers as to the true administrative costs of national service life insurance, all such costs being borne by the Federal Government. The direct cost of the VA offices of insurance for 1950 was estimated at $44,900,000, but figures submitted to the committee indicated that other factors involved raised the total administrative cost to more than $80,000,000. Adoption of a gratuitous system in 1940, it is calculated, would have saved about $213,000,000 in interest from the Treasury, $210,000,000 in interest for delay in settlement of claims, $30,800,000 in air cadet premiums, $59,000,000 in premium waivers, and a substantial part of the $360,000,000 spent for national service life insurance administration.

Controls Can Be Democratic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, over the week end just passed the Nation reentered a state of economic controls made necessary by the impact of mobilization and defense preparations.

This was, indeed, a most serious development—but a development which we as a Nation have discovered was necessary and essential. Now, as we undergo for the second time in a decade the application of Government controls, we may trust that the mistakes of the past be studied by our stabilization officials in order that they may be avoided, and that only fairness and equity to all people will result.

In the spirit of hopefulness that the application of controls may deal fairly with all, I ask that there be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Controls Can Be Democratic," by Mr. David Lawrence, which appeared in the February 2, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report.

The article is as follows:

CONTROLS CAN BE DEMOCRATIC

(By David Lawrence)

America is entering a new era of controls that may last as long as international tension requires a large military establishment—maybe for generations to come.

This means a substantial change in the economic life of the people of the United States.

But it need not bring an abandonment of the basic principles of free competition which have built up the greatest production machine the world has ever known.

There will be a temptation on the part of those theorists who have long desired state socialism in some form to urge that the emergency proves the need for a system of permanent controls over wages and prices, allocation of materials, and control of all credit.

For many years now the main battle between the radical liberals and the conservatives has turned on the extent to which government should intervene in the economic life of the country. The true liberal—Republican and Democrat—has, on the other hand, accepted the principle that, while some intervention is essential in emergencies, such as in time of great depression or great inflation, the real issue is not the extent of such intervention but the extent of its influence on the normal life of the Nation when the relatively brief emergency has passed.

Such a transition, however, is no longer the only problem because we are headed for an era which will not pass in 2 or 3 years. Normalcy may not be witnessed for decades to come.

We are confronted, therefore, with the need for making economic policy that can carry us through a long period of time during which we may totter constantly on the verge of war and yet not have large military operations or big-scale war.

To the Communist—and he is basically a champion of state socialism the capitalistic countries are doomed to failure because they scorn planned economy.

A few years ago there was a controversy in Russian periodicals over a book written by a Soviet economist who rather admired the way the United States controlled its capitalism during World War II and who ventured the belief that planned economy could be introduced successfully by capitalist countries. He was compelled under duress to take back much of what he wrote on the present that our war program was without merit anyway. But it is significant to recall that the Communists repeatedly use the phrase "planned economy" as a synonym for state socialism.

America is challenged now to show the world that, applying the fundamental principle of volition as opposed to coercion, democratic procedure as opposed to dictatorial decree, we can develop a coordinated operation in our economy and keep it free from the deteriorating effects of monopolies and cartels and the special privileges which a political government is tempted to set up under the guise of a war emergency.

Government, to be effective, must be honest and impartial, especially if it wishes to encourage equal sacrifice.

Where there is a choice between a policy that can preserve free competition and one that stifles it, the method of competition should be strengthened and not weakened.

Let America demonstrate that democracy can organize and operate through the voluntarism of its economic elements and that—without losing its freedoms—it can still outproduce the world.

"Captain Courageous"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article which I prepared after hearing the sorrowing announcement of the death of Capt. Don Gentile, a World War II ace of the American Air Force:

A blackened hole in the Maryland countryside where there lies embedded the twisted, flame-scarred wreckage of an Air Force T-33 jet training plane today marks the last landing place of one of America's most famous military heroes. To the ranks of the brave fighting men whose names are a glorious chapter in the history of our country there was yesterday added another marcher—Capt. Don Gentile, who plunged to his death while on a routine training flight which this ace pilot had scheduled to maintain his proficiency.

I had the good fortune to know Captain Gentile personally, and knowing this gentlemanly, reserved, and modest man made it hard to believe that his Air Force comrades could have nicknamed him the "Messerschmitt Killer." It is still hard for me to believe that this top European theater ace of World War II who was the scourge of Hermann Goering's Luftwaffe, could become, after donning civilian clothes, the family man and college student, typical of the many thousands of veterans who are beginning to make their mark in America today.

Captain Gentile had flown 350 combat hours on 183 sorties. He held some of the Nation's highest decorations—the Distinguished Service Cross with oak leaf cluster, the Silver Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross with seven clusters, the Air Medal with three clusters, and a Presidential unit citation. He shot 19 enemy planes out of the skys over Europe, and destroyed 6 more on the ground.

He was originally rejected by our own Air Force because he lacked certain educational requirements. He later transferred to the American Air Force after compiling an excellent combat record in the Royal Canadian Air Force, which he had joined out of his driving urge to get into the fight.

The American people are not ungrateful, and long after the details of his sky-borne exploits have been lost to memory, the name of Don Gentile will live on in the hearts of millions of Americans. Daring, brave, resourceful, he was everything American attributes to her fighting forces. As we offer our condolences to his bereaved family, his wife, and his three sons, Don, Jr., Joseph, and Pat, we recall to mind the words of President Roosevelt who once called this handsome Italian-American boy "Captain Courageous," and we pray that we may all partake of the heritage he leaves behind, a heritage of steadfast courage and devotion to country.

Victory for De Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the New York Times on January 15, 1951:

VICTORY FOR DE GASPERI

The Western cause was championed with impressive success in the Roman Senate on Saturday by Alcide de Gasperi, that remarkable statesman who more than ever has been giving proof that he deserves to rank among the greatest of the premiers that Italy has produced since 1870. It was a formidable display of leadership, but it would be wrong to think that the Italian response to North Atlantic defense was simply emotional and rhetorical. Italy has her dissenters, doubters, and obstructionists; her full share of neutralists and defeatists, of Communists and neo-Fascists. One cannot doubt, however, that the prevailing opinion among those who concern themselves with national policies is in favor of the Western democracies and of playing an active role in the defense of the West. Italy, after all, is the cradle of Western civilization; it is inconceivable that she should choose to throw open her gates to another barbarian invasion from the East.

The solid Senate vote of 161 to 92 for the Government's policy is only the latest indication of support for the democracies. On January 5 the Italian Cabinet announced that Italy would place three divisions at the disposal of General Eisenhower for the North Atlantic forces. More is undoubtedly coming. Last week, when the United States turned over three destroyer escorts to the Italian Navy, Ambassador Tarchiani pledged Italy's full cooperation for the common defense of the Atlantic community. "Our strength is now insufficient for the task, as is the case for all the rest of western Europe," he said, "but we are putting into it our firm will and our best resources so that we may raise ourselves and efficiently contribute to a European-American force such as will be able to assure peace by discouraging any assault."

Moreover, Premier de Gasperi was emphatic in rejecting the thesis that Italy can act as a bridge between Russia and the west. That is a dream nourished at various times in Britain, France and Germany since the war, and now we even have Marshal Tito dreaming up a Socialist third force. The fate of bridges is to be blown up when there are wars, and anyway Italy, as Signor de Gasperi said, does not stand halfway between east and west; she is on our side.

Cadet Corps of the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the early part of our participation in World War II it was necessary to expand the merchant marine tremendously in order to provide the ships which carried men and materials for our overseas operations. Many young men performed patriotic services in training and at sea in order that these ships might be manned.

When the fighting stopped and their services were no longer needed they were released and the service of the merchant marine has been since commended on many occasions. Many of those who served, however, hold the feeling that they are being singled out for further service in a manner which unjustly disparages the service already rendered. The viewpoint is rather well expressed in a letter from one of them, which I quote:

If in 1942 you attained the age of 18 and you found your country in a desperate situation and engaged in a world-wide war, you probably would be glad to help in any way you could. If in your investigation as to how best to render service, you were told by your Government that it had become necessary to form a separate branch of the armed services to not only press the then present conflict but to establish a maritime reserve which would put the country in a strong position for any future emergency, you would be interested.

With posters, literature and great enthusiasm you were asked to enlist in the new branch of the service known as the cadet corps of the merchant marine, thus distinguishing it from the former civilian merchant marine organizations. Accepting all the representatives in good faith you enlisted in the Naval Reserve, subject to call. Within 60 days you were requested to travel to a city quite some distance away at your own expense in order to complete your enlistment and take your physical examination.

You returned to school and in another 30 days you were ordered into service. You proceeded to your destination, which was a military establishment under complete military authority and operated along the lines of Annapolis as closely as that institution could be approximately. You were advised that you would have 3 months training at this institution and then have 6 months combat service at sea. At the conclusion of the combat service you were to return to a designated institution to finish your work and receive a reserve commission in the Navy. In the meantime, you received the rank of cadet officer of the merchant marine, a member

of the Naval Reserve, which rank was above a warrant officer and just below that of ensign. Until you received a commission you were paid $65 per month and found; no bonuses as has been wrongly stated.

After 21 months of service, with the war drawing to a close, you were told that the corps was overstaffed and that there was little likelihood of your being able to secure employment in the civilian merchant marine and unless you insisted on finishing the course, the Government would be glad to give you an honorable discharge, advising Selective Service headquarters that in the opinion of the Government you had rendered sufficient service to your country to be ineligible for further service.

Again accepting the representations in good faith, you received an honorable discharge and returned to your interrupted educational career, only to find upon the enactment of a new Selective Service Act in June 1948, that Congress in its infinite wisdom and not being able to distinguish between a duly constituted cadet corps and civilian merchant seamen, had decided that you had not done a thing in the service of the country and as consequence would be at the top of the list at the pleasure of General Hershey unless, of course, you chose to reenlist or marry.

If we are going to have a 3,000,000-man Army we are going to have to have a merchant marine. These boys, I know, will be glad to serve but they are entitled to veterans' status and they are entitled to follow up that branch of the service for which they are trained.

There are some four or five thousand of these boys, which is a negligible number so far as man-power needs are concerned, but each and every one of them is certainly entitled to simple justice and a recognition long overdue. I believe it to be the duty of Congress to rectify gross errors wherever and whenever possible and now is the time to do this job.

Eliminate the Causes of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from A. K. Gardner, chairman of the food and agriculture committee of the New England Council:

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
Boston, January 25, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: At a recent meeting of the food and agriculture committee of the New England Council, it was unanimously voted that—

"Inflation must be attacked by eliminating its causes, which are fundamentally too few goods for the money available to buy them.

"Abundant production is essential, but price controls discourage such production and rationing does nothing to increase the supply of goods. The oversupply of money in relation to the supply of goods should be adjusted as far as possible by placing our Government on a pay-as-you-go basis, by controlling credit and by other Federal monetary and fiscal controls aimed to eliminate the inflationary forces of our money supply.

"Unessential governmental expenditures must be eliminated and with a shortage of manpower for essential production, manpower must not be used for unnecessary or undesirable controls."

Because of the seriousness of the situation, it was voted to send the above statement to all members of the New England congressional delegation.

Very truly yours,

A. K. GARDNER,
Chairman, Food and Agriculture Committee.

Atomic Energy Is Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Lowell Mellett appearing in the Washington Star on January 20. Mr. Mellett points out very graphically the necessity of the Federal Government's financial participation in furthering the health and education of the Nation's children.

The article follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY IS NOT ENOUGH—NATIONAL DEFENSE ALSO CALLS FOR HUMAN ENERGY, WHICH MEANS HEALTH AND EDUCATION

(By Lowell Mellett)

People are funny. That includes the American people. If the President says that we need to spend $1,200,000,000 next year in the development of atomic energy we say it must be so; we can't afford to let anybody get ahead of us in atomic energy. But if the President says we need to spend a few hundred million in the development of human energy, we say that is nonessential and socialistic besides; nothing to think about in terrible times like these.

Yet the day is not in sight, regardless of the atom bomb or even of the projected hell bomb, when human energy will cease to be the real basis of national defense. Men still have to do most of the fighting, and that will be true for a long time to come. The biggest problem of our National Defense Establishment right now is where to find the needed number of competent young men to do the fighting. That's what the argument over the 18-year-olds is all about, as well as the argument over the deferment of fathers and other breadwinners who fought in the last war.

Human energy, applicable to national defense, depends on health and education. The Armed Forces reject the unhealthy and the uneducated. It would seem the part of wisdom therefore to reduce the number that must be rejected. That can only be done by improving the Nation's health and providing more education.

Of course, if the war is going to come next week and is going to end very quickly, nothing would be gained, so far as immediate national defense is concerned. But our defense program is not based on those two possibilities. It is based on the probability of war being forestalled for a year or two or three and of war lasting several years if it does occur.

In World War II the draft boards rejected 650,000 men and boys because of educational deficiencies. In other respects these men and boys were qualified for armed service. They were in good health. They were physically strong. But they fell short in schooling. They were either illiterate or had attained less than fifth-grade status.

Counting 15,000 men to a division, that means we rejected the equivalent of 40 combat divisions or twice the number of divisions we used in the South Pacific theater of war, the area from Honolulu to Australia to Tokyo and the islands between.

Now it is suggested that we may have been too exacting in our educational requirements and that we can meet our present needs in part by lowering the Army's standards. To meet an immediate emergency that might be a half-satisfactory answer. But not for the long pull. If our enemies are to be Russia and China, we cannot match them in numbers even if the Army accepts absolute illiterates. We can only offset our numerical inferiority through better equipment, better training and better leadership. That calls for education.

It calls for education at the elementary and secondary level, which can only be provided in many States through Federal aid. Last year the Senate passed a bill, Senator TAFT one of its authors, to grant $330,000,000 annually in aid. It was killed by a House committee. This week the House, without a dissenting vote, authorized $235,000,000 for a single warship, a supercarrier. The experts say, and they should know, that the vessel will be worth the money. But what do the experts say concerning the hundreds of thousands of boys who are not being educated sufficiently to become soldiers?

Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in the House calling for the establishment of a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia to honor the memory of the discoverer of America, who made his eventful trip across the Atlantic Ocean 458 years ago.

In addition to honoring the memory of Columbus, the grove of trees which will make up this arbor will also serve as a perpetual tribute to the many thousands of American boys of Italian descent who gave their lives during World War II for the preservation of American freedom and for the liberation of Italy from the Nazi and Fascist yoke.

The contribution of Italy and the Italian people to western culture and civilization is truly immeasurable throughout the history of mankind, beginning with ancient Rome and up to our own day. America is indebted not only to the intrepid navigator who in 1492 discovered this vast continent where our great Nation has been established and where it flourishes, but America is also indebted to her many citizens of Italian descent for their great contributions to our democratic way of life which they helped to build and develop in conjunction with all other Americans.

I trust that this memorial will soon be created to serve as a living symbol of

the friendship between freedom-loving people everywhere, and that it will strengthen the historic relationship between our own country and democratic Italy.

United Nations a Trouble-Making, Futile Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, United Nations from its inception has been a Delilah, and Samson's fate, if we continue to go along, will be ours.

The following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of this morning contains that suggestion:

We can't get very worked up over what is happening in the UN over Red China's military intervention in Korea. Anybody who doesn't consciously delude himself knows that the UN is a fake. Its only accomplishments to date are to serve as a sounding board for Red propaganda and to get Truman's chump administration into a war. On this matter you can take your choice as to who pushed whom.

Truman made a sucker play. He thought he was getting into a scrap with a neighborhood rowdy, but instead found himself up against a gang. He has been looking appealingly toward UN ever since to bail him out. That he is gullible enough to expect any assistance from that quarter is simply the measure of his stupidity.

The proceedings at Lake Success, though irrelevant and unreal, are enlightening, if not surprising. The rest of the nations which cheered us on into the Korean imbroglio and then left us to hold the bag have been continuing the double cross in the diplomatic arena.

FOOTY-FOOTY IN THE UN

Because of cold feet, and for other reasons, they don't want to get tough with the Chinese Communists. Mr. Austin, for the Truman administration, wants to call the Communists aggressors. Calling them anything you like isn't going to alter the mess in Korea, but the other countries can think of all kinds of reasons why a tag of moral leprosy should not be affixed.

Mr. Austin thought he just about had the crowd worked up to go along with him when the Indian delegate, Sir Benegal Rau, pulled a dispatch out of his pocket which, he contended, showed that Red China, after turning the UN down three times hand running, was willing to talk matters over.

Upon examination, it was found that the Red terms were the same as usual. If Communist China got everything she wanted, she would talk. She wanted to load the jury with her pals—Russia, Britain, and India among them—so there'd be no slip-up.

Mr. Austin wasn't buying any of this. Nehru, the boss of India, got very impatient with him and the United States. Clem Attlee told the British Parliament he might agree to calling the Chinese Reds aggressors, but he wouldn't go along on economic sanctions against them. That would be damaging to the empire trade, you understand, and, besides, Britain wants to hang onto Hong Kong.

Of course, while this tedious routine grinds along, Americans continue to get killed in Korea. General Romulo, of the Philippines, was the only speaker with sufficient candor to say that UN is utterly lost when it sacrifices truth and principle to convenience and fear. That is all very true, but when did UN ever demonstrate any attachment to truth and principle?

A more pertinent comment on the whole business is that of Senator KNOWLAND, who inquired: What if the United States should take 2½ months to recognize a Communist aggression in Europe?

That is the only comeback afforded this country by the nations which are running out on it in UN. The Korean War is not a total loss if it has opened American eyes to the untrustworthiness of America's alleged allies. If they can't recognize aggression, neither can we.

Instead of 2½ months, we ought to take about two and one-half centuries to discover the next aggression anywhere—unless it is directed against the United States.

We Are Called Upon To Make a Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Mr. Andrew E. Funk, Jr., editor of the White Haven Record, White Haven, Pa.:

WE ARE CALLED UPON TO MAKE A DECISION

For the past 2 weeks the people of our Nation have been engaged in a great debate, possibly the greatest debate we have ever entered upon, concerning what shall be this country's future policy in the face of a growing state of world unrest brought on by the surging tide of communism.

Within the last fortnight, a veritable broadside of personal opinions regarding our present position in Korea and possible plans for our future action in th face of the Communist threat, has been fired at the American people without discretion.

Unfortunately, most of these well-aired and highly publicized opinions have unwittingly given birth to a gnawing fear and uncertainty in the minds and hearts of a usually resolute people. Nor could the result have been anything else when these opinions were given expression by ruch men as Senator ROBERT TAFT and former President Herbert Hoover—men whose opinions otherwise have commanded the respect of the American public.

We do not profess to be an authority on American foreign policy, but we do feel deeply about this all-important issue and we are dismayed and disappointed to behold doubt, fear, and indecision take such roots in the Nation which we fought to defend against a similar though less menacing aggressor so short a time ago.

We would like to answer the Senator and the former president in the fine and oratorical phrases and with the grand and impressive words which they employ so expertly. But, we cannot. We must answer in the common language, but we will speak with the heart of a soldier.

To you, Senator TAFT, who have so innocently asked where President Truman derived authority to send American troops to Korea, we would answer you by asking where the authority was found that permitted General Washington to send troops on an invasion of Canada in 1775; that permitted President Jefferson to send ships to Tripoli to subdue the Barbary pirates in 1805; that permitted President McKinley to send troops and ships to oust the Spanish from Cuba and the Philippines in 1898; that permitted President Taft (do you remember him, Senator?) to send the Marines to Nicaragua to restore order there in 1912.

No, Senator, your question is at best little better than a poor attempt to cloak your own befuddled state of mind. We certainly do not blame you for being disturbed on this grave issue, but we do resent and abhor your poor sense of duty in giving voice to that doubt at a time when the American public is looking to you and your fellow statesmen, not for doubt, but for assurance; not for questions, but for answers.

To you, Mr. Hoover, who have so loudly and candidly displayed your personal fear and lack of understanding of the matters involved in this great issue, we would like to say that the lessons of the past 40 years have apparently failed to impress upon you not only the hopelessness but also the ridiculousness of attempting to seal ourselves off in a tight little ball apart from the rest of the world. You yourself have conceded that "any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion is sheer folly." By your statement you have admitted that we cannot match the manpower of the Communists, who at this moment have nearly half the people of the world under their control.

We also expect, Mr. Hoover, that you must realize that we have but one real advantage over the Communists and that is our capacity to produce the materials and weapons of war. Yet, knowing this, you propose that we abandon the industrial nations of Europe to the Red flood and thereby surrender to the Communists the one distinct advantage we have over them. With Western Europe as our ally, we can outproduce Russia and her Communist stepchildren by four to one, but if we lose the industrial power of Western Europe to the Reds we will barely be able to match Communist production.

Yes, Mr. Hoover, your speech proved quite a straw for the weak and fainthearted citizens of our country. But most especially did it please the Communists. As you probably know, the Russian newspapers liked it so well that they reprinted the entire speech. And well they might, for, if we pursued the course of action you advocate, the Communists would in all probability be in control of all of Europe in a short time.

And where would that leave us, Mr. Hoover? We would be alone in our tight little ball, separated from the rest of the world, outnumbered in terms of manpower by more than 8 to 1, cut off from our many distant sources of supply without which our great industrial machine would be sadly crippled. This is where the period of watchful waiting you propose would eventually lead us with our country waiting, almost without hope for the inevitable end.

We appreciate, perhaps better than you, Mr. Hoover, that the loss of American lives on foreign soil brings bitter anguish, but, as one who has fought and lived through such foreign battles, we cannot help but say with other soldiers: "better there than here." You toured Europe after World War II, Mr. Hoover. Did you so loosely note or easily forget what you saw? Would you care to see such scenes of destruction and desolation here in America? Would you care to bring war so near your home and loved ones?

No, Mr. Hoover, we cannot "give up" and abandon the freedom-loving people of the world to drowning in the Communist flood. We do not say that it is necessary to stay in Korea regardless of cost, but we do say that we should leave only when we are forced to leave and when we have made it absolutely clear to the whole world that we are being driven out, that we are not quitting.

We must prove to the world, even as our Nation's founders did, that there are some things far more worth fighting for than mere life or property, that the principles and ideals upon which our Nation was built are more than idle phrases; that they are living, vital concepts without which life could be but existence alone; that we believe, even as Patrick Henry, in "liberty or death."

Don't lose heart, America. Faith and courage are easy virtues when our schemes fare well, but they are genuine only when we can fly them in the face of adversity. Is temporary loss so great a blow to these qualities that we are willing to desert the very ideals and principles which gave us birth?

Our cause is right and just. Surely it is worth fighting for under less than favorable conditions, for, if it is not, then it is not worth fighting for at all.

Better to suffer the tortures of Hell for a just and noble cause than wallow in Paradise for a lesser one.

Stand up, America. You are called.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, the House granted permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therewith the first of a series of short sketches on each of the eminent lawgivers whose part in the evolution of law is commemorated by the marble plaques adorning the walls of this Chamber.

The House probably for the first time in history met for the transaction of business on January 1, 1951—New Year's Day, and it met for the first time in the new renovated and redecorated Chamber—renovated probably for the first time since it was built. There was some speculation as to the marble plaques which were viewed by the House for the first time, and a few days later a distinguished Member of the House arose in his seat and said:

In looking around the walls of this House, or, I should say at the ceiling, a stranger might think we were meeting in the Pyramids of Egypt, from the appearance of these antiquated figures. * * *

It is my intention to introduce a resolution to remove those ghastly placards, * * * and put the figures of great Americans in their place—those great patriots who helped to establish and build this Republic. * * *

Remember this is the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and not a sanctuary of antiquity or the tomb of King Tut.

I am sure the distinguished Member spoke in jest, for this great country, whatever its faults, is by no means provincial. These figures commemorate not the history of our country only, but the history of the world's civilization during the last 4,000 years, from the beginning of recorded history. It would be well to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these brief sketches of the men represented by these marble plaques which are being published serially by the Washington Post, and with the permission of the House I shall do so. The first sketch is as follows:

HAMMURABI: EARLIEST LAWGIVER AND KING OF BABYLONIA

Hammurabi (pronounced ham-oo-ra-be) was a great king of Babylonia. He reigned supreme for 43 years, from 2067 to 2025 B. C. He is a natural choice in any series on the world's eminent lawgivers.

The law code bearing his name is recognized in legal history as probably the earliest, and perhaps most primitive, surviving.

His code, promulgated for use throughout the Babylon empire, was strangely conflicting. According to historians, it was particularly strong in its prohibitions on defrauding the poor and helpless. But this essentially humanitarian legal dogma also carried the savage feature of retributive punishment. It advocated literal adherence to "an eye for an eye" treatment for wrongdoers.

The Hammurabi portrait was done by one of Washington's own sculptors, Thomas Hudson Jones, of 3612 O Street NW. Jones did the sesquicentennial medallion.

International Whirligig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the McClure Newspaper Syndicate of New York and written by John Fisher:

RUSSIA STEPS UP DRIVE TO FORCE POLES TO LOVE SOVIET MASTERS, BUT PATRIOTISM AND PRIDE NOURISH DEEP HATRED OF MUSCOVITES

(By John Fisher)

As the German international crisis thickens, Stalin is discovering that Poland has not yet been hewed into a submissive satellite, dependable in the event of war in Northern Europe.

Hence a new program of organized high pressure has been inaugurated "to deepen," according to Adam Rapacki of the Polish Politburo, "the feeling of love and esteem for the Soviet Union."

Previous synthetic solidarity gestures failed to erase bitter memories of Russian treachery to General Bor-Komorowski's World War II home army, the massacres of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest and more recent outrages. Poles—as they must—sullenly bow to police clubs and machine guns, but in their hearts they are still anti-Russian.

The latest instrument to influence Polish public opinion has been the Second World Peace Congress, transferred to Warsaw from England after London refused to allow the phony congress to meet there.

The ousted delegates poured into Warsaw and shouted themselves hoarse denouncing "Anglo-Saxon warmongers" and accusing America of "flooding Korea with the blood of children and performing all sorts of fascist bestialities."

DEMONSTRATIONS FULLY ORGANIZED

These malicious pro-Soviet fulminations were the most recent of several pep talks. Propaganda bosses in October ordered demonstrations everywhere to celebrate the thirty-third anniversary of the Russian Bolshevist revolution.

In September a National Peace Congress was held. About 25,000 local kick-off meetings preceded the climatic assembly in Warsaw. The stellar role at this hate fest went to Lt. Col. Yu Kan Buk, a North Korean officer, who regaled an audience of 100,000 with fresh lies about American aggression in the Orient.

In addition to these three major peace hippodromes, the month of November was reserved for local efforts to cement Polish-Soviet friendship.

Such superdoses of prolonged, high-pitched ballyhoo are deemed necessary by commissar pechologists because the Polish people, next-door neighbors to vulnerable Russia, show scant signs of adoration of their masters and display many indications that in case of war and the opportunity came they would give Russia the swerve.

Again and again at various mass meetings Red tub-thumpers urged their listeners to be on guard against a rising tide of "subversive activities"—open admission that Poles are not turning into Communists despite propaganda, bribes, and Red terror.

MORE LIQUIDATION THREATENED

Nevertheless the Beirut government, obedient to Moscow, uses every possible means to force its recalcitrant subjects to conform to the Soviet pattern. A recent Warsaw broadcast set as a goal of the new 6-year plan the "elimination of the capitalist element in our economy through curbing, expulsion, and liquidation."

Communists are absorbing the entire educational system so that hereafter youthful minds will be completely molded by the Reds. A commission of Russian and Polish Communist educators have injected the party line into all school textbooks, except histories.

This latter subject also is being doctored. But the visiting savants had some difficulties in persuading their Polish comrades to distort in Russia's favor the record of Polish victories over the Bolshevist armies in the local war of 1920.

College professors are held strictly accountable to political mentors on faculties. Most older students are not Communists. But party membership is on the up in lower classes, as high schools now are dominated by the ZMP, the Polish Communist youth organization.

A high-school student no longer can gain admission to a university unless sponsored by his local ZMP. College members of this order receive all the scholarships, free meals, inexpensive lodgings, and other advantages, and they run nearly all student activities, including state-financed vacation trips.

FIRM CONTROL OF FORCES

Equally powerful pressure is exerted to make Communist zealots of soldiers. Since iron-fisted Soviet Marshal Rokossovsky assumed supreme command, the organization of the Polish Army has been patterned on the Soviet Army system. The two top generals of the ground and air forces are Soviet citizens. In fact, the entire officer class is saturated with Russians. Promising young Polish officers are sent to military schools in the Soviet Union.

The equipment of the army was poor when Rokossovsky took over. He introduced a few Russian jet fighter planes and some modern artillery which is displayed for propaganda purposes. But most units are below combat strength and are armed with Polish, Russian, and German wartime left-over weapons.

Rearmament was not the most pressing problem. Rokossovsky found the army so indifferent to communism and so cold toward Russia that his chief efforts have been directed to indoctrination. Lectures on

Marxist ideology consume more time than even drill. Communist youth cells are being organized in every unit. The soldier's oath now reads: "I swear to stand steadfastly guarding peace side by side with the Soviet Army."

TRADITION OF PATRIOTISM

But even this concentrated indoctrination has not solidified the bonds with Russia. The Polish military arm has a long tradition of patriotism and pride. Most younger officers and their men resent taking orders from arrogant Soviet majors and colonels.

When United Nations forces in Korea commenced to demonstrate their hitting power, Polish soldiers in barracks sang old, tabooed Polish army songs filled with anti-Russian sentiment.

A rumor that Polish units would be sent to bolster the North Koreans sparked a surge of desertions. In July 200 Polish naval officers were arrested on suspicion of disloyalty to Russia. Moscow is so doubtful of the Polish Army that the Kremlin has recently heavily increased Soviet garrisons in Lower Silesia and Pomerania.

Polish antagonism for Russia should not be construed to mean an early peoples' revolt or a military mutiny. But so long as Poland has the power and the will to drag her heels, Stalin cannot count on reliable military support for his martial adventures.

Total Mobilization of Personnel, Partial Mobilization of Matériel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to find that the Federal Government is taking all steps necessary to recruit a full military force, and neglecting to keep pace in equipping those called to service with the materials of war. We find that Connecticut, the arsenal of America, is facing an industrial lag in a turnover from commercial to defense production. Cutbacks in the civilian use of copper and other materials in short supply make necessary the reduction of labor use on nondefense items. Yet the skilled labor in our Connecticut industries, and the Yankee "know-how" is not being utilized for the common defense. Defense contracts have not been awarded in sufficient number to take up the slack.

It would seem most necessary to take two steps to correct this situation. First, amendment of the copper order—M-12—to provide for the continued civilian use of this metal through June 30 instead of the date now set at April 30; allowing completion of items started on April 1 instead of March 1; second, greater defense contract authorization to Connecticut plants to enable a more rapid turnover from civilian production.

Included with my remarks are a copy of the letter I sent to Defense Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson on January 22; clippings from the Waterbury, Conn., American of January 22; and a letter received from the Thomaston Brass Workers' Union, Local 620. The above-mentioned follows:

JANUARY 22, 1951.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: In this period of national emergency the first thought of each citizen should be for the best interests of what will best serve the needs of the Nation. With this paramount in my mind I am calling a grave situation to your attention, affecting as it does the well-being of our citizens and the state of defenses of our country.

In the realization that the task confronting you is one of tremendous responsibility, I would be loath to add to the burdens of your office were it not for the serious consequences which might result from inaction.

The industries of this Nation, and I refer specifically to those in the Naugatuck Valley area of Connecticut, and their employees wish to participate fully in the mobilization of the industrial might needed for our preservation.

Paradoxically, the brass industries of the Naugatuck Valley find, in this period of generally full labor utilization, that Government restrictions and procrastination are leading to a period of less than full employment. To illustrate, I quote from the Waterbury Labor Market Letter of December 1950: "Although brass registered a slight rise (in employment), the outlook in this industry continued to be obscured by Government restrictions on copper supplies and uses * * * Although most industries reported added overtime which resulted in higher earnings, the brass industry continued to be hampered by shortages of raw material and shortened the workweek from 43.6 hours in September to 41.7 hours in December.". The Waterbury American of January 17, reported the following relating to anticipated increase in the public welfare load: "Mrs. Ruth A. Jones, welfare superintendent, warned the welfare board at its meeting yesterday that the caseload may increase because of lay-offs in industry due to shortage of materials." A compilation of opinion of many manufacturers in this area provokes the following statement: "The problem that most concerns the manufacturers consulted is that of the retention intact of sufficient working forces during the transition period. Your district, the Fifth Connecticut Congressional District, has perhaps the highest concentration of copper and copper-base alloy mills and fabricating plants in this country.

"These industries are a vital link in the chain of war production of thousands of items. Under the end use Amendment Order M-12 (Copper) civilian production of some 300 items must cease April 1. Since comparatively few defense orders have been placed to date in this area, volume lay-offs will be inevitable.

"The distress which will be caused by this transition unemployment is but one factor. Equally important is that many of those laid off will find employment in other areas and will not return to their old employment when they will be needed for work on Government contracts except on compulsion. The problem is intensified by two facts. First, Connecticut is a small State. As a consequence, labor is mobile. Second, the very presence of the United Aircraft in East Hartford and the proximate plant of the company at Southington, will cause brass industry skills to go there for employment. United Aircraft is now engaged in a vast recruiting program which will, it has been announced, result in a working force of some 33,000 persons.

"We now understand that the military units of the country are drafting their requirements of copper and copper bearing alloys and will have this program ready for submission to the NPA at a comparatively early date. At that time it can be determined somewhat more definitely just how much of the production of the brass mills and, in turn, how much copper will be required for defense purposes. It is presumed at that time that the time table will be established which will permit the copper section of the NPA to formulate its plans, and also the brass industry can work up its operating schedules.

"Until this has been done it would seem that the best way to help the brass industry would be to postpone the effective date of the orders which are now in effect. As the orders now stand, the brass industry is required to ship not more than 85 percent of its average monthly shipments based on the first 6 months of 1950 for so-called commercial use. We believe the figure for March is now set at 80 percent. No percentages have been set for the second quarter of 1951. Presumably these figures will be announced as soon as the military requirements are made known. In the meantime, the conservation order becomes effective on receipt of material by customers on March 1.

"It is now expected that the effectiveness of the conservation order will be quite drastic on the brass mills and unless an increased volume of orders for Government requirements is received, lay-offs are bound to occur."

To sum up, two conditions are evident; a sufficient number of defense contracts has not been awarded to this vital industrial area to compensate for the curtailed production of civilian goods and, the present plan to stop delivery on raw material (copper) for some 300 items not in process of manufacture by March 1 nor completed by April 30 will, if not amended, severely restrict employment in the brass industry.

I recommend, therefore, that considerable impetus be directed to the award of defense contracts to this area of highly-skilled labor without delay, and that an amendatory provision be made in the Copper Conservation Order (M-12) providing for dates of April 1 and June 30 instead of the present cut-off dates of March 1 and April 30.

Most sincerely yours,

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American of January 22, 1951]

MANUFACTURERS ASK DELAY ON COPPER ORDER

Waterbury area manufacturers are seeking an extension of the April 1 effective date of the Government's amended copper order which is scheduled to halt production of around 300 items of civilian goods.

Builders' and plumbers' hardware and cosmetic containers are among the products due to be halted. If the retrenchment program goes through with the present lack of defense orders, a serious employment dislocation is foreseen by manufacturers and labor leaders.

Charles L. Eyanson, president of the Naugatuck Valley Industrial Council, said today appeals in behalf of several valley concerns have been made asking Washington authorities to review this threat to the brass industry.

Scovill Manufacturing Co., Risdon Manufacturing Co., and Plume & Atwood Manufacturing Co. are but three of the firms that would be hit by the order which has already imposed restrictions on their operations.

Scovill's Waterville division is one of the Nation's largest manufacturers of plumbers' supplies. P. & W. and Risdon are extensively engaged in the making of cosmetics wares. So is the Eyelet Specialty Co.

These and other concerns are now functioning under the basic M-12 order which limits use of copper for civilian goods to 85 percent of the amounts consumed in the first 6 months of 1950.

Amendments to the order propose the discontinuance of a substantial line of products beginning April 1. Copper for remaining uses also is to be restricted to 80 percent. Mr. Eyanson said manufacturers are plainly alarmed over the outlook.

Since the Government proceeded with its cutback plans on civilian items the placement of defense orders has been discouragingly slow. Those received up to now will in no way occupy the services of employees working on civilian production due to be suspended, he said.

Last week the CIO United Auto Workers offered its services to management in efforts to persuade Federal defense authorities to gear the defense needs to an orderly conversion of industry in order to avoid short time and lay-offs for industrial workers.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American of January 22, 1951]

SQUEEZE PLAY HITS STATE INDUSTRY, CLAIM

(By Joe Alex Morris, Jr.)

HARTFORD, January 22.—Connecticut's manufacturers admitted today they are worried.

They say they're caught in a Government-directed squeeze play, which leaves them without enough defense contracts to maintain full employment. The squeeze is the gradually-tightening orders covering civilian use of raw materials.

Many accuse the Government of acting too hastily in applying controls. They say the Government itself doesn't know where it's going next in industrial planning. Without knowledge of an over-all plan for the economy, the individual manufacturer can't make his own plans.

Unless Washington acts soon, technological unemployment will hit Connecticut. Some prefer to call it bureaucratic unemployment. In some cases, particularly the brass and copper industry, this may happen in a few weeks.

Manufacturers say the crux of the situation is Washington's inability to decide on the speed and degree at which mobilization should proceed. Some comments:

The Connecticut Manufacturers Association: "The average State manufacturer is getting scared. He's losing his sources of materials, and is anxious to get into defense work."

The machine tool industry: "Washington doesn't know what to do * * * we'll need help from the Government soon * * * technological unemployment is going to come faster than before."

ORDERS BEING CANCELED

The brass and copper industry: "Cancellations of orders are pouring in. * * * The union is as worried as we are. * * * We can't get enough orders to use up the reduced amount of material we're allowed."

A small arms ammunition manufacturer: "We need defense orders fast or employment will have to be cut."

Naturally, there are two opinions on how the mobilization plan will work out, but Labor Commissioner John J. Egan sounds almost like a voice in the wilderness in the present situation.

Egan is optimistic. He thinks the conversion will happen soon, with Government contracts pouring in by March 1. There will be a minimum of technological unemployment, he believes.

That a serious mobilization has not occurred yet is illustrated by Government statistics. Only $61,000,000 in unclassified Government contracts was let to Connecticut plants during the final 6 months of 1950.

By comparison, a full 2 billion in war contracts poured into the State during 18 months of 1941–42. There are 200 State industries which did defense work in the last war, many with difficult conversion jobs facing them.

SQUEEZE PLAY

A State manufacturers association's official calls the situation a "national production authority squeeze play." The association is doing what it can to cut the change-over unemployment. Its current advice is this:

Some vital industries, the aircraft industry, for instance—are getting big contracts. The best thing a small manufacturer can do is advise these big companies that they are available for subcontracting. Once Government contracts make it worth while, the association plans to put out a weekly bulletin keeping its members up-to-date on work or help-wanted situations.

A vague sort of pattern is emerging out of the chaos of the present industrial situation. Big and small manufacturers are cutting down their variety of produce, and are sticking to the most essential of their products. Where at all possible, they're substituting non-critical materials in their wares.

Only one industry in the State apparently knows where it is going. The aircraft industry, principally the three divisions of United Aircraft Corp., is expanding. United plans to add 7,000 workers by July 1. The corporation has licensed two automotive manufacturers to produce its engines, and will soon open a big training school in Hartford.

A spokesman called it a selective mobilization of the aircraft industry. President H. M. Horner has said the industry is being projected into the pattern of all-out production. By midyear, United's employment will be about half the wartime peak of 74,000. The company is short of engineers and electronics specialists, and is advertising throughout New England for them.

Before all-out production can be instituted, the machine-tool and die industry needs at least one, perhaps 2 years to retool the Nation's plants. This isn't being done now.

Connecticut's tool industry is now only 20 percent on Government defense orders, one industry officials says. It has a heavy backlog of civilian work to do, but NPA restrictions are going to cut heavily into this.

The industry is getting special treatment from the Government, however. Orders must be relayed to Washington for screening before they are filled. This permits the Government to keep close tab on the industry, and officials expect some reallocation of orders in the future.

BRASS PLANTS HARD HIT

The brass and copper industry is without doubt the hardest hit so far. An NPA order forbids the use of many items made of brass and copper after April 1. The order is affecting manufacturers now. One producer reported order cancellations are pouring in.

So far, he said, the plant—one of the largest in the State—has kept full employment by "juggling." If the situation doesn't change within a few weeks, short-time will be instituted. The manufacturer said this way he hopes to keep his labor force intact for the expected heavy defense orders.

With the unions as worried as the manufacturers, this spokesman called for a 1-month lifting of the ban, and institution of a sliding scale for conversion to war production, similar to that of the past war. The industry is authorized to use 85 percent of its base monthly supply of copper in February, but can't get orders for even this much. Defense orders so far are only about 15–20 percent of the industry's capacity.

The arms industry, which can be converted in as little as 3 months to war production, "can't figure out why" it's not getting Government contracts, one manufacturer of small arms ammunition reported. Although the Government has reopened at least one huge arsenal and expanded others, this manufacturer has received only "a few, small contracts."

Plenty of civilian orders are obtainable for ammunition, but "critical shortages" of copper and brass make it impossible to fill them all. This one plant, which employed 15,000 during the war, just recently reinstituted a 5-day week for its 2,600 employes. Before that, they were on 4-day shifts.

POSSIBLE LABOR SHORTAGES

The future doesn't look as bleak as the present and near-future to industrialists. Everyone expects the mobilization program to start eventually.

When that happens, the shortage won't be one of materials, but of labor. The State labor department is working on long-range plans to put another 100,000 persons into industry, on top of the record 800,000 now working in the State.

Commissioner Egan doesn't think the manpower needs will be so critical in so short a time during the forthcoming mobilization, but says housewives and others will have to give up their normal routines for a longer time—possibly 7 to 10 years.

The labor department has made a survey of the State's employable 29,000 persons who are now jobless, and also of part-time workers. This time, the department hopes to keep the labor force more stable, and if possible, restrict one worker to one job.

Housewives and other persons not usually employed outside their homes will be urged to replace workers in nonessential industries. In turn, the labor department will try to get regular workers into defense production lines.

This is all long-range planning and speculation. Right now, producers are worried that the Government isn't going to permit them to produce—either for defense or the civilian economy.

THOMASTON BRASS WORKERS' UNION,
LOCAL 620,
Thomaston, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: The jobs of about 50 employees of the Plume & Atwood Manufacturing Co. plant in Thomaston, Conn., practically all of whom are members of this union, are seriously jeopardized by amendment 1 to NPA Order M-12, part 29, Copper and Copper-base Alloys: Subpart B—Use of Copper and Copper Base Alloys.

This order, which forbids the use of copper in the production of pen caps, pencil parts, lipstick containers and lipstick working parts, will cause the immediate unemployment of our members engaged in this type of production.

You have already received a communication from the Plume & Atwood Manufacturing Co. concerning this order, which goes into effect partly on March 1 and fully on April 30. On behalf of the employees involved, this organization wishes to add its objections to the order and request your assistance in obtaining its revocation on the following grounds:

First. The severe and unnecessary hardships which it will cause those who are forced out of employment, with no prospect of other jobs within the foreseeable future.

Second. The impossibility of finding adequate and salable substitutes in the manufacture of the products mentioned.

Third. The inflationary effect on our entire economy which will inevitably result from the banning of copper and brass in the production, not only of the items made by our plant, but hundreds of others also affected by the order. These include some of the most common household articles, the shortage of which will cause further price

increases, the growth of black markets, and hardships to the consuming public as well as the producing public.

For these reason, all of them basic to the welfare of the general community, we urge you to do everything in your power to bring about the revocation of this amendment.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES DIBESURY,
President, Thomaston Brass Workers' Union, Local 620, IUMMSW.

Sales Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in line with the speech I made on the House floor today, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton Press:

SALES TAX PROPOSALS

Federal sales taxes are under consideration as a tax component in meeting the President's demand for $16,500,000,000 in new taxes. President Truman is quoted as saying he opposes such taxes at present. But this is only pretense. He knows that Congress will not increase personal income and corporation taxes enough to provide $16,500,000,000. When this happens he will "reluctantly" approve a Federal sales tax.

Opposition to sales taxes always has been great, because they are regressive. They fall hardest on those least able to pay. Greatest of national emergencies alone justifies such taxation. Such a tax may be levied either at the manufacturer's or the consumer's level. If it is levied at the manufacturer's level, it is pyramided through the price of goods. The wholesaler, let us say, may take a 10-percent profit on basis of cost, as also may the retailer. The consumer in the price he pays gets nicked for more than the Government gets in taxes.

A sales tax collected at consumers' or retail level is difficult to administer, because of the thousands of establishments whose collection of the tax must be policed.

Federal excise taxes as they exist today, covering some 20 classes of goods, are in effect sales taxes. They are taxed on the basis of the final manufacturers' price. The New Deal and Fair Deal actually have sneaked in a sales tax while bellowing to the hills against sales taxes.

Such hypocrisy appeared in 1948 when Democrats were hollering that if the Republicans gained control they would enact a sales tax. Candidate for Vice President, Alben Barkley, challenged Governor Dewey to tell whether the GOP had plans for "the levy of a general sales tax by the Federal Government in addition to those now levied by the States."

Most present proposals for a retail sales tax put the levy at 5 percent, which it is estimated would bring in revenue of around $5,000,000,000 a year. Presumably, though not assured, food would be exempt. One proposal is that each individual would be exempt from these taxes up to purchases of $250 a year. To provide for such exemption coupons would be issued. It would mean that buyers would have to go about carrying not just ration stamps but also tax stamps. Such a prospect would loom because rationing, as in World War II, is an inevitable accompaniment of price control.

The Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday General of the Army George C. Marshall delivered an address at a ceremony dedicating the new Washington Post Building. Those of us in public life have an excellent opportunity to view the whole American press in operation and to study its impact upon every phase of American life. We have reason to be very proud of the American press and I am sure we will all want to join with General Marshall in congratulating the great Washington Post on its past achievements and in wishing it continued success. I am therefore including his remarks as a part of our RECORD:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY GENERAL MARSHALL

We are here to mark a milestone in the life of a public institution and to confirm our faith in the conception of a free press to which this newspaper is dedicated.

It is appropriate that the ceremony should take place in front of the presses that turn out the daily editions. The publication of a great newspaper like the organization of a military force includes an echelon of services in depth. The uninitiated see only the finished product, the newspaper itself, in the Army the man in uniform. But those who work on the team appreciate the printers, the layout men, the advertising men—the craftsmen of many sorts as well as the more obvious workers who take part in the enterprise, the editors and the reporters.

Those like me who understand military organization appreciate the deep echelons extending from the front lines back to the support and reserve, back to the drawing boards and the production lines in factories, all the way back to the American taxpayer and his intimate family circle. The art and science of logistics of backing up front lines with services and supplies may lack the glamour of duty at the front but they are equally honorable and indispensable. The military services often take for granted the vital contributions of their rear echelons, and apparently become concerned about them only when it looks as though there might be a failure in production. I think, therefore, it is a fine thing that the Washington Post has chosen to honor its logistics forces by holding this ceremony right here among the presses.

Those who work in these surroundings symbolize the strength and the spirit of American labor. You are engaged in the production of one of the most delicate instruments in America's arsenal for freedom, an independent newspaper.

I don't have to tell you here that a free press is one of the fundamentals of our democracy and none insisted upon it more firmly or more wisely than did the founders of our Government. There is an oft-quoted statement accredited to Thomas Jefferson, which is worth noting today. "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government," he said, "I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter." Now that may be something of an overstatement but it does illustrate the point.

There is another statement of Jefferson's, however, that I prefer to quote as more applicable to our present times. In a letter in 1799 he said, "* * * citizens * * * have a right to full information in a case of * * * great concernment to them. It is their sweat which is to earn all the expenses of the war, and their blood which is to flow in expiation of the causes of it."

No better reason could be set forth for the right of citizens to know about a war situation in which their sons are involved and I think both the press and the Armed Forces are keeping our citizens well informed during this period of great peril.

Out in Korea more than 250 correspondents are covering the operations and incidentally giving not only the American people but the entire world an intimate picture of the events taking place there. The courage, the suffering, and the spirit of our GI's, both in combat and behind the fighting lines, are made matters of public knowledge. At great costs to the press and at grave risks to themselves, the correspondents and photographers move freely in and out of the fighting lines to get their stories. They share the privations of the men in the field, expose themselves to similar dangers, and casualties among the corps have been very heavy.

Already 8 American correspondents have been killed, 19 wounded, 2 captured by the enemy, and 2 missing in action. Four correspondents, representing the British and French press, have made the great sacrifice, and four have been wounded. This ceremony offers me an opportunity to express deep appreciation of the devoted services of the corps of correspondents in Korea.

Relations between military censors and battle correspondents usually and quite naturally become strained. Differences are bound to arise. Both are interested in the freedom of the press, but each approaches the facts that make up the story with a different point of view. The reporter is concerned with information that will interest the American people who, in the final analysis, must work, fight, and pay for the campaign. The censor fears that some of this information may interest the enemy even more. The censor would err on the side of security; the correspondent, on the side of disclosure. It will always be hard to reconcile these opposite points of view.

There was a time when military men had little patience with the correspondent's point of view. To Lord Wellington, for instance, correspondents were anathema. During the Peninsula campaign he complained bitterly about newspapers and the detailed information they published about his order of battle and the morale of his troops. Sherman vigorously denounced correspondents on more than one occasion. He was rather famous for his attitude in this regard. Today there is no such hostility on the part of the military toward newspapers and correspondents.

All the way from the lines in Korea to the Pentagon the press is briefed daily by officers and furnished background information to help the reporters write with a full appreciation of the facts and factors concerned in the campaign. There are and there always will be points of friction, but I sincerely feel that the traditional gap between the censor and the correspondent has greatly narrowed. Censors and reporters are becoming more appreciative of each other's point of view and their joint responsibility. The result is more accurate and more interesting reporting for the benefit of all of us.

Reporting of news connected with activities in the Pentagon has been, I think, on the whole, fair and objective. The recent wide and accurate coverage of the manpower legislation which we have just given to the Congress has brought the issue squarely before the American people. The case for inducting the 18- to 19-year-old group has

been well reported and fairly. And speaking of fairness, I shall always remember with respect and great satisfaction the extraordinary care that the newspapers gave to the reporting of the inquiry into the fitness of Anna Rosenberg to serve as Assistant Secretary of Defense.

This is a free, democratic country, and will continue so because we enjoy the advantages of free and responsible newspapers produced under our American system of free enterprise.

I close with a quotation from the late Joseph Pulitzer, who said in 1904: "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together."

This dedication is good proof that our Republic and our press stand together and will rise to further heights of good government in the interests of the people.

ESA for Democrats Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an item from the Washington Daily News of Saturday, January 27.

Mr. Speaker, if the news item is correct, politics has reached a new low in the United States. John H. Hoover, who resigned a few days ago, was the enforcement officer for ESA. He resigned in protest because of Democratic political favoritism in handing out jobs in the price-control organization. It would seem that price control, with political flavoring, will be on every table in the United States.

While it is true the two top men, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston, are supposed to be Republicans, they are the lukewarm "I agree with your New Deal philosophy" type. Apparently, everyone above the $4,000 bracket must carry a New Deal label. The article follows:

IN THE OFFING

(A weekly size-up by members of the Washington staff of the Scripps-Howard newspapers)

ESA FOR DEMOCRATS ONLY

Economic Stabilization Agency (ESA) is being built into Nation-wide Democratic machine.

Democratic National Committee is in charge; is passing on candidates for every job paying $4,000 and up.

Committee asks Democratic governors, Senators, State chairmen, national committeemen, for names, sends them on to Price Administrator Michael V. DiSalle.

Party loyalty is a test. No Dixiecrats accepted and no one who opposed President Truman's renomination or otherwise offended top Democrats. Backing from potent party figures is required. Some appointees have price-control experience; most have not. Lists submitted by Republican officials aren't considered.

It's a contrast to procedure in OPA 10 years ago. Politicians weren't consulted, party labels weren't checked. One result: Constant attacks on OPA from Capitol Hill, constant threats to withhold appropriations.

A few Democrats in Congress worry about staffing ESA with party men from top to bottom because it pins responsibility for success or failure of new price-control agency directly on party. They're afraid it may be unpopular by next election. Same men refuse to sponsor candidates for district office, for same reason. But they're the exception.

Pay of new officials isn't fixed. They'll get $50 a day until Congress acts.

Here's sample of how the picking's done.

Regional administrator for Rocky Mountain States will be George Rock, president of Truman-Barkley club in 1948. Before Alan Valentine was fired, a five-man panel he had named picked another man.

New outfit's a haven for lame ducks. Already slated for jobs: Vernon Dwyer, Indiana State director, defeated Democratic candidate for Congress; Doc O. A. Noland, consultant to DiSalle, and father of a defeated Indiana Congressman; Herbert Meighan, defeated for re-election as mayor of Gadsden, Ala.; James G. Lyons, New York regional office, defeated for re-election to State legislature; Michael Howlett, Jr., Illinois temporary consultant, defeated for State treasurer.

Washington's full of party officials elbowing each other in rush to pie counter.

Statement by the Committee on the Present Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a statement by the Committee on the Present Danger. This committee is composed of outstanding citizens whose views merit the consideration of Members of Congress.

The statement follows:

A STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 7, 1951.*

Today General Eisenhower is scheduled to arrive in Europe to endeavor to create, and then to command, the free world's forces there.

As he begins this supremely important task, our people here are asking themselves how best to defend the United States, how to prevent a major war if possible, how to win it if it comes.

On these problems the Committee on the Present Danger ventures, completely without partisanship, to present its deeply held conviction: As he undertakes his new mission to Europe, General Eisenhower must be given full support by the American people. We must do this by creating balanced armed forces of great strength, and by giving the people of Europe a sense of our unity with them.

Certain facts are beyond dispute:

A menacing despotic power, bent on conquering the world, has twice in recent months in Korea resorted to aggressive war. But those attacks do not prove that Russia—which clearly directed both—will launch a major war. Much less do they prove that Russia is ready to start such a war at this time.

Europe is the next great prize Russia seeks. If Europe falls, the Ruhr with its coal and steel, the Atlantic ports with their shipyards, the whole industrial complex with 200,000,000 people possessing great scientific and technical skills, will be absorbed into the Communist empire against us.

The fall of continental Europe would remove any assurance that Britain would again be an unsinkable aircraft carrier and advance base. It may well mean the loss of the Middle East, the Mediterranean, and Africa. In such case, Russia would have the oil she so much needs, and the world's richest source of uranium—which lies in the Belgian Congo—would go to Russia to make atom bombs for use against us.

We learned belatedly in the First World War, and again in the second, that successful defense of the United States must be made in Europe. So in entering into the North Atlantic Pact, we sought to prevent a third world war by serving notice that an assault on Europe means war with the United States. And we fortified this position by keeping our troops in Germany and Austria, as well as by the Berlin airlift.

Fortunately our best course to prevent war now is the same as that required to win it if it comes—to make aggression unprofitable by restoring the power of the democracies. How the United States should do its part in this is in large part a military problem requiring the highest professional knowledge and experience. In this question our responsible military leaders are of one mind.

Only a few days ago, General Eisenhower expressed his faith that Americans can accomplish anything if they have unity behind their purpose. And he said that the defense of Europe can be made successfully "if there is unity among Americans and if their allies understand this." The depth of his conviction that the defense of the United States must, if possible, be made in Europe is proved by his sacrifice in undertaking his new task.

Many Americans are troubled by the thought that we will send large additional forces to Europe before we can be certain that other free countries will make the full effort necessary for success in the joint plan. But the practical question before us does not involve this risk.

Today we do not have anything more than token forces which we are in a position to send to Europe. Before any army of substantial size can be trained for such a purpose, General Eisenhower will have had an opportunity to determine that those people of Europe who love freedom as we do have the will and the stamina to make a real defense possible.

Even those who would now have us suspend all military and economic aid to Europe have not proposed that we withdraw our troops from Germany, Austria, and Trieste. They do not recommend that we fail to live up to our obligations under the Atlantic Pact. They know that to take those steps would be to give up at once most of that for which we have made enormous sacrifices almost every day since the dark summer of 1940.

So the real questions presently before us are whether this country should not prepare forces to be ready for use in Europe on General Eisenhower's recommendation, and whether we should give a convincing reaffirmation to the people of Europe of our unity with them and of our leadership in setting up an effective defense. If we are to do so, and this committee believes we must, our course is clear: First, to build up with the utmost possible speed balanced armed forces of great strength; second, to make it clear that we are prepared, when these are ready, to dispatch adequate forces to Europe at such time as General Eisenhower may decide that a proper effort will be made by Europe in its own defense and that the total forces—theirs and ours—can be effective.

Today one question stands clear before the American people: Shall we help create the

conditions necessary for the success of General Eisenhower's great mission? It is the firm conviction of this citizens' committee that in its own self-interest this Nation can and must do this now.

Committee on the Present Danger: Julius Ochs Adler, Raymond B. Allen, Frank Altschul, William Douglas Arant, James Phinney Baxter III, Laird Bell, Lewis H. Brown, Harry A. Bullis, Vannevar Bush, Will L. Clayton, James B. Conant, Robert Cutler, R. Ammi Cutter, Harold W. Dodds, Charles Dollard, William J. Donovan, Truman E. Gibson, Jr., Meta Glass, Edward S. Greenbaum, Monte M. Lemann, William L. Marbury, William C. Menninger, Frederick A. Middlebush, John Lord O'Brian, Robert P. Patterson, Howard C. Petersen, Stanley Resor, Theodore W. Schultz, Robert E. Sherwood, Robert G. Sproul, Robert L. Stearns, Tracy S. Voorhees, Henry M. Wriston.

Farm Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a very informative letter from an outstanding farmer of my congressional district regarding the number of displaced persons who have abandoned farm work after having been admitted to this country for placement on our farms. My constitutent, Mr. Howard W. Greiner, of Wellman, Iowa, states so effectively the situation that confronts him and his neighbors that I am including his entire letter of January 10 in my remarks so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read the situation as he has reported it to me.

The letter follows:

WELLMAN, IOWA, *January 10, 1950.*

Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: It is becoming more apparent every day that we farmers in Iowa and other States are facing a menacing situation, our labor shortage.

I am probably classified as an over-family-sized farm operator. I manage 570 acres here in Washington County, southwest of Wellman. Last year I sent to town over 224,000 pounds of pork, or approximately 1,600 head of hogs, all farrowed and raised on the farm. I feed 100 head of cattle and have other enterprises such as eggs, etc. The plans this year are for more, as our President requested. But the labor situation has me worried. I am sure you can see that I cannot operate like this without help. I now have two Polish DP families, having had one for nearly 2 years, and one for 14 months, but actually live in daily fear that they will pick up and leave us for city jobs. These DP's are all dollar shopping. Of the 10 DP's settled in this community, only 2 remain. The rest have gone to cities for factory jobs. Don't you agree that there should be some provision to keep these people on farms as laborers? They feel no obligation to us "for now we are in America, we do what we want," as one told me. Don't they owe America something? I have built for one family a new four-room house any American would be happy to own, pay them both $140 per month plus houses, meat, milk, eggs, electricity, etc., but they say that is nothing.

I am a veteran of World War II, a pilot officer, and was a German prisoner of war, but that is beside the point. My point is this: I am in the Reserves and may be called to active duty. I have a father incapable of manual labor, who could run this farm on a limited scale if I had to go, provided we could keep our help. But what could we do without it? Washington calls for increased production, but how can we at this rate?

After seeing Europe in the last war I agreed that the DP bill was all right, feeling that there are a lot of good people. But now I feel that these DP's are all money hungry, wanting to give America nothing and take everything. Can't you get these people back to the farms? They declared they were farmers in order to get here, as one said, "we no farmer, we no come." After dealing with them for 2 years I am afraid Uncle Sam made a big mistake. Some day the soup lines will be miles long in the cities and these DP's will be in front. Here is a potential labor force for farmers, but there will have to be some immediate freezing done somewhere along the line, or we will all want for pork chops and ham.

Can't we get a law to bring these folks back to the farms, and the farmers who sponsored them, who are being left holding the bag?

Hoping to hear from you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. GREINER.

Excerpts From Remarks by National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., of the American Legion, Before Meeting of National Executive Committee of Jewish War Veterans, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., Sunday, January 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, the national executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans held a meeting in the Statler Hotel in Washington.

Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., of the American Legion, made a visit to the group. He made a brief address, and in appropriate and well-chosen language dealt with some of the current problems of our people and our Government.

The substance of Commander Cocke's address follows:

There is no place in a fight for survival for fighting among ourselves. There is no moral or patriotic ground for any American to seek political or personal profit out of the present emergency. I believe that most Americans—including a great majority on Capitol Hill and in the administration—recognize these facts and are living by them. What we must do is use all of our personal and organizational influence to reduce the number of exceptions.

I say it is high time that sniping at military leaders by uninformed and inexperienced sources should be halted. No one is infallible; everyone makes mistakes, generals and admirals no less than Cabinet members and Senators. But the fact is that some of the very people who now serve to discredit our military leadership and discourage public confidence in it, were themselves responsible in less critical days for discounting the warnings provided by that leadership.

The one value which all of us share and revere alike—the country which provides our liberty and way of life—is in desperate danger. We must put away the differences that divide us and rally around that uniting cause. Personal bias and pet hates are expendable; the lives and freedoms of Americans are not.

People are not born biased. Prejudice is not inherited. To the extent that we in our time can expose and overcome these destructive habits, the next generation will be spared the temptation to adopt them.

Service in the armed forces is a great equalizer and a great teacher. Those of us who have served know what it means to live and work with the other fellow—all kinds of other fellows—and to find out that people are basically alike under God. I can't recall a single instance of a man's religion or family tree being held against him in the combat zone.

America has been described as the melting pot of the world's people. We will do well, particularly in these tense days, to realize that the melting process is not yet completed—and that each of us can perform an important patriotic service in that regard. One of the good byproducts of manpower mobilization, in my opinion, will be the opportunity afforded young Americans to better understand by association and mutual dependence the problems and background and thinking of their fellow countrymen.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times of January 15, 1951:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

In the global attempt to wipe out race murder the United States has placed itself unnecessarily on the side lines. The genocide convention of the United Nations formally became part of international law last week, 90 days after its ratification by 20 members, more than 2 years after its unanimous adoption by the 1948 Paris Assembly of the UN. Yet the American Senate is still unresolved about the pros and cons of the issue.

The United States has come close to lining up formally with those nations convinced that history has gone far enough without making it an international crime for either a nation or an individual to attempt the extermination of national, racial, religious, or ethnic groups. Last year ratification was urged by a subgroup of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Similar sentiment was expressed by a cross section of the population, led by President Truman. Yet the Eighty-first Congress, arguing over reservations, went into limbo without final action.

When adopted by the UN the genocide convention was heralded as a vivid manifestation of man's hopes. That such a pact was necessary has been demonstrated with tragic repetition throughout history, from the days the

Romans tossed Christian martyrs to the lions to a more contemporary period, the days of Lidice and the Nazi murder camps.

Now the United States is working round-the-clock to rally the west to preserve its freedom. Toward this end the new Senate can make a substantial contribution; it can ratify the genocide convention.

The Late Julius H. Amberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of his home community, Grand Rapids, the State of Michigan, and the United States have suffered the loss of an outstanding American in the passing of Julius H. Amberg. The tributes paid this truly great and fine person by our President, General Marshall, and others are examples of the esteem in which he was held.

President Truman knew Julius Amberg during World War II when he as a Senator from Missouri headed the Truman investigating committee and Mr. Amberg represented the Department of the Army before the committee as Special Assistant to the Secretary of War. The President's thoughtful message to Mrs. Amberg is as follows:

I have heard with a sense of deep personal regret of the passing of your devoted husband who will be long remembered as a faithful and efficient public servant. My heartfelt sympathy is yours.

Gen. George C. Marshall, presently Secretary of Defense, likewise paid high tribute to this great citizen. The general's respect for and appreciation of Julius Amberg is best shown by the wonderful message to Mrs. Amberg which reads as follows:

The death of Julius H. Amberg leaves me with a sense of personal loss.

As Special Assistant to the Secretary of War from 1941 to 1946, Mr. Amberg not only lightened the burdens of the late Secretary Stimson but he made some of my tasks much easier.

General Marshall had underlined the word "much" in the text as it was forwarded to Grand Rapids.

In representing the War Department before congressional groups concerned with the war program, he brought a personal integrity and a professional excellence that were of immeasurable value.

A Navy veteran and a public-spirited citizen, Mr. Amberg typified the American whose passing is a severe loss to the country.

A résumé of his very successful legal and civic career should be included in my remarks.

Mr. Amberg was special assistant from 1941 to 1945 to Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, who was a classmate at Harvard law school. They were editors of the Harvard Law Review.

During the First World War, Mr. Amberg served for a time as assistant to Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, who was then an adviser to the Secretary of War.

He began his career at Chicago in 1910 as an attorney for the Federal Trade Commission and opened a practice here in 1915. He was chairman of the Kent County Relief Commission from 1933 to 1936. Before that, he had headed the Committee of One Hundred, which surveyed relief problems and recommended changes in handling of the city's relief agencies.

Recently Mr. Amberg was chairman of a technical advisory committee of the Council of Social Agencies which brought about the Hamilton Hospital survey for Grand Rapids. He was president of the Michigan State Bar Association in 1939–40.

Several years ago Mr. Amberg, as a leading citizen in his home town, unselfishly led a successful recall movement for the recall of the incumbent in the office of mayor. This civic effort made willingly but at great personal sacrifice, undoubtedly contributed to his passing at a relatively early age.

Mr. Amberg has been eulogized by the newspaper in his home community. The Grand Rapids Press comments are as follows:

In the death of Julius Houseman Amberg Grand Rapids has lost one of its most distinguished and most effective citizens. Nationally he was known for the important services he rendered his country throughout World War II as special assistant to Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson in the years 1941 to 1945. His city and State knew him as a brilliant attorney with a long record of legal accomplishments to his credit.

Grand Rapids also knew him as a man devoted to the public welfare and the cause of good government. He was the best kind of citizen, who not only had ideas as to how public affairs should be handled but gets out to fight for them. He never sought public office, but time and again his community came to him for leadership in helping solve its problems. At the depth of the great depression of the 1930's it called on him to head a committee of 100 to survey the city's desperate relief problems of that period and to outline a decent, workable relief program.

Seventeen years later it again was to appeal to him to lead a civic campaign, this one for decent city government. The effectiveness of Citizens' Action from the time he accepted the assignments as its president up to the present moment has been due in no small measure to the time and effort he expended on its behalf.

Scores of persons will remember him as chairman of the Kent County Relief Commission from 1933 to 1936. To his office came a steady file of unfortunate persons in need of material assistance or advice. He had time for all of them. Hundreds had cause to be grateful for his attention.

Mr. Amberg's intense interest in the other person's welfare did not begin or end with his service on the relief commission. He was identified with the Community Chest for 30 years, including 5 years' service as its president. He served as chairman of a special council of social agencies committee which cleared the way for the Hamilton Hospital and health survey. He was trustee of Butterworth Hospital for 28 years and a trustee of the Grand Rapids Foundation.

These were some of the services he performed for the public. No man gave more unselfishly of himself or of his time and knowledge. It was Grand Rapids' good fortune to have him as a lifelong resident. And because he lived and worked here so long and so effectively, his loss will be keenly felt.

The Grand Rapids Herald editorial likewise paid high tribute to this outstanding citizen and is as follows:

Grand Rapids and the Nation lost an outstanding citizen when death came Tuesday night for Julius Houseman Amberg.

His untimely passing leaves a void not only in the legal profession, where he was a brilliant figure, but in the civic enterprises that gained by his guidance and dynamic leadership.

As Special Assistant to the Secretary of War in World War II he played a large role in marshaling the forces of victory, and the Presidential Medal for Merit was the Nation's token of appreciation.

It was in his own city, however, that he was most honored, not alone for his intellect and his achievements but for his character. Liberal, progressive, deeply concerned for his fellow men, he stood for principles above prejudice or partisanship.

Throughout his professional career here, Mr. Amberg, member of an old Grand Rapids family known for good works, devoted much of his time to social and welfare projects.

Among these were his chairmanship of the committee of 100 which surveyed relief problems and his service as chairman of the county relief commission in the depression days of the 1930's, the presidency of the community chest which honored him as citizen of the year in 1938, and his leadership of the Council of Social Agencies and United Hospital Survey Committee whose findings resulted in a hospital building program and other improvements now going on.

Although never seeking public office for himself, he was at times a leader in politics when his conscience dictated political action.

His death at the age of 60 cut short a life of great usefulness. He leaves the imprint of his sterling character and accomplishments on the hearts and minds of his fellow citizens.

It was my great privilege to be associated with Julius Amberg in the practice of the law. His achievements and his ability in his profession are well known, but those who worked with him as an associate perhaps understood and appreciated his great talents, his profound knowledge, and his superior integrity better than the public generally. The legal profession has lost one of its finest.

On behalf of the citizens of Grand Rapids and the multitude of Julius Amberg's friends throughout the Nation I consider it an honor to make permanent his records as an example for all future generations. He and all for which he stands has been and will continue to be an everlasting inspiration.

The Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power—A Progress Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

delivered by me before the New York State Bar Association, January 24, 1951:

It was only a year ago that it was my pleasure to address you gentlemen and to set forth the purposes and objectives of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power. The program of the subcommittee was at that time in its diapered infancy, still groping, still unweaned, still unsteady, and unsure. We have come a long way since then, not only toward understanding the issues and problems which are wrapped up in that all-embracing term "monopoly power," but also in discovering concrete remedies to fulfill the often thwarted purposes of the framers of the Sherman Act.

While the subcommittee has undertaken important economic studies to which it has devoted painstaking effort, I would like, first, to dwell upon its legislative activities. For this is a legislative subcommittee directed by the Congress to report "such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable."[1] It has been the main objective of the subcommittee to obey this mandate.

At the risk of being repetitious, I would like to discuss briefly what many people consider to be the most important piece of antitrust legislation in more than a quarter of a century. I refer to the Celler Antimerger Act,[2] which, after an abortive legislative history some two decades in duration, finally emerged from the Eighty-first Congress during the death throes of its last session and was signed by the President less than a month ago.

The muse of history possesses all the whim and caprice of woman. By what strange oversight the zealous and learned men who authored that ambitious statute, the Clayton Act, neglected to provide for all probable and possible contingencies when they came to its seventh section, I do not know. Nor can I find prescription for the myopic lenses through which peered those aging justices of the Supreme Court who could read in the clear language of the act words which prohibited one corporation from acquiring the stock of another competitor, but, insofar as the acquisition of assets was concerned, could discover no abiding intent or philosophy in an economic statute some twenty-six sections in length, incorporating by reference three other laws of historical importance, and running by its very terms, the lengthy gamut of the national economy, from banking to railroads. Why, too, Congress, for over 20 years allowed to go unheeded the persistent plaints of the Federal Trade Commission, the voices of two Presidents of the United States, and the repeated recommendations and reports of its own committees, I am at a loss to explain.

I fervently hope that this legislation, which bears my name, has not come too late. The growth of concentration of economic power in this country, despite the legislative barricades of the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and other antitrust measures, has been steady and unremitting. A report submitted to me by the Secretary of Commerce in December of 1949, indicated that in 46 major industries studied, four companies had already garnered more than 75 percent of the output. In 104 additional industries, four companies accounted for between 50 and 75 percent of total output.[3] As of 1946, one tenth of one percent of the total number of American corporations owned 49 percent of the assets of all American corporations, while 2 percent of the number owned 78 percent of the total assets.[4]

From one important standpoint, however, this measure has become statute at an appropriate time. Once more embarked upon a program of industrial mobilization, perhaps this time the nation will be able to prevent the concomitant growth of economic concentration which has in the past been a constant and faithful handmaiden of American military endeavor.

Between 1940 and 1947, for example, some 2,500 formerly independent manufacturing and mining companies ceased existence as a consequence of merger or acquisition.[5] Over 70 percent of the total number of firms merged or acquired during this period were absorbed by the large corporations which had assets of $5,000,000 or more.[6] A repetition of this phenomenon might well see the battle won but the victory lost. The Celler antimerger law has been a legislative attempt to overrule these economic precedents of history and to assure the preservation of a competitive economy. Its success has been entrusted to able hands.

Let me proceed now to some further legislative recommendations of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power. The more candid of the representatives of industry appearing before the subcommittee were quick to admit that the present criminal penalties for violations of the Sherman Act were completely ineffectual and inadequate.[7]

No better description of the futility of the present penalty of a maximum of $5,000 for each count in a criminal indictment under the Sherman Act has appeared than the statement of former Judge Simon Rifkind, a distinguished jurist, who will appear before one of the current sessions of this association. Said the judge, in imposing sentence upon six defendants in the case of *United States v. National Lead Co.*, on March 1, 1949:

"I cannot even go through the formula of looking the defendant in the eye and saying, 'Is there anything you wish to say before I pronounce sentence?' But I must confess that these amounts being substantially the maximum allowed by the statute, there is very little I can do or very little reflection that I can give this matter except perhaps to make the inevitable comment that a violation of the antitrust laws which persisted from some time in the early twenties to the 1940's, with respect to which the criminal liability is discharged by the payment of $5,000 a count, hardly seems to me to be the nature of penalty which is likely to discourage violations of the antitrust laws as far as the criminal laws are concerned but that is a problem for the Congress."[8]

The subcommittee, quick to recognize this debility in existing law, reported favorably to the full Committee on the Judiciary a bill which increased the criminal penalties of the Sherman Act from a maximum of $5,000 to a maximum of $50,000.[9] This measure was reported to the House[10] where it was passed under suspension of the rules on June 5, 1950. Despite the universally recognized need for this provision of law, H. R. 7627 met its death in the upper Chamber.

A similar fate befell H. R. 8763, another bill recommended by the subcommittee which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary[11] and which passed the House under suspension of the rules on July 17 of last year. This bill was not highly controversial and was introduced in order to provide for that highly clamored for clarification and uniformity in certain areas of the antitrust framework.

The first major aim of this bill was to amend section 4 of the Clayton Act so that the Government of the United States could sue in its proprietary capacity to recover actual damages suffered by it through violations of the antitrust laws. This section was an attempt to negate the holding of Supreme Court in the case of *United States v. Cooper Corp.*,[12] that the United States was not a "person" within the meaning of that term as used in section 4 of the Clayton Act.

Another section of the bill established a uniform statute of limitations 6 years in length and applicable to both private and United States damage suits resulting from violations of the antitrust laws. Not only did it appear anomalous to the subcommittee that a right of action bestowed by Federal statute should be governed, as it is today, by the limitation statutes of the various States, but there seemed to be a serious defect in a law whereby substantial rights were left to the hazard of statutes of repose ranging from 1 to 20 years in duration.

The final provision of H. R. 8763 tolled the statute of limitations in favor of the private suitor during the period in which the Government was instituting its proprietary claim as authorized by the first section of this measure discussed above.

One of the most interesting, as well as significant, aspects of the subcommittee's activities during its growth and development into one of the important facts in the world of antitrust was its economic investigations, first of steel[13] and then of newsprint.[14] The subcommittee was fortunate to have had, during this time, the services of Edward H. Levi, now dean of the University of Chicago Law School, as counsel. I seriously believe that his conduct of the two economic studies which I have mentioned constitutes a substantial contribution to modern economic and legal thought.

Permit me to go into the facts uncovered by these two investigations in some detail, because I fear that the results of these inquiries have frequently been not understood, or, if you will, misunderstood, by many observers. When the report of the subcommittee on its steel investigation was finally released, for example,[15] it was reported in the press that the subcommittee, hopelessly confused by the issues presented during its lengthy investigation, had emitted an amorphous report which was the aftermath of indigestion from too much iron and steel.

While this report had no legislative recommendations or conclusions and parenthetically it is neither the intent nor the province of the subcommittee to legislate with regard to each studied industry, I do not see how anyone who merely perused the aggregated facts contained within the pages of this report could have failed to be impressed by the results of the subcommittee's investigation.

[1] H. Res. 137, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949).

[2] Public Law No. 899, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950).

[3] Report, December 1, 1949, Department of Commerce, printed in hearings, Subcommittee on Study and Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 1st sess., serial 14, pt. 2-B, p. 1436.

[4] S. Rept. No. 1775, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950), p. 3.

[5] H. Rept. No. 1191, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), p. 2.

[6] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 1st sess., serial 14, pt. 1, p. 216.

[7] See, e. g., hearing, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 1st sess., serial 14, pt. 2-A, pp. 563, 676; id., 81st Cong., 2d sess., pt. 4-A, p. 605.

[8] Cited in H. Rept. No. 1906, 81st Cong. 2d sess. (1950), pp. 2-3.

[9] H. R. 7627, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950).

[10] H. Rept. No. 1906, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950).

[11] See H. Rept. No. 2467, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950).

[12] 312 U. S. 600 (1941).

[13] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pts. 4-A and 4-B.

[14] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pts. 6-A and 6-B.

[15] The Iron and Steel Industry, report of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., December 19, 1950.

The report pictures in minute detail the vast empire of the United States Steel Corp., extending from the bowels of the Mesabi to the peak of the Cerro Bolivar in Venezuela. This empire is served by more than 15 carrier railroads, over 1,500 miles of railroad trackage, 26 or more oceangoing steamships, and numerous barges and tugs. It has satellites engaged in the manufacture and production of supplies for drilling oil and gas wells, steel drums and barrels, structural steel products, fences, prefabricated houses, cement, wire products, and innumerable other products. For half a century United States Steel has dominated the iron and steel industry of the United States. In every facet of this complicated industry, one finds the presence of this corporation—ubiquitous, omnipotent.

The bible of the steel industry reads: "In the beginning there was ore." Look at the iron-ore supply of the Nation and you will find the United States Steel Corp. in possession of 51 percent of the ore reserves of the rich Lake Superior region from which emanates 80 percent of the country's iron-ore supply.[16] In 1946 it was estimated that the corporation accounted for 47 percent of domestic iron-ore production.[17] Some 12 or 14 steel companies resort to the ore-mining subsidiary of their competitor, United States Steel Corp., for iron-ore supplies.

The economic effect of this picture in the ore segment of the iron and steel industry was best summarized by the distinguished Secretary of Interior, Oscar Chapman, who said:

"I do not think it would make any difference whether you had 5 companies in the steel business or 500 companies in the steel business, if 1 or 2 companies controlled the source of raw material. The monopolistic features would be there in the controlling point, and it only would make a slight difference of distribution, and that is about all."[18]

Turning to transportation, a factor in the iron and steel industry which affects the accessibility of raw materials, the location of plants, the prices of ore and of finished steel, we again find the United States Steel Corp. a dominant element. As Representative BLATNIK, the Congressman from the Mesabi district, described this area of the steel corporation's power to the subcommittee:

"The key to the steel corporation's monopoly control is found in its ownership and operation of the only railroad which is available to haul Mesabi and Vermilion iron ore from the mines to the ore docks on Lake Superior, where the ore is relayed by ore boats to the steel mills of Gary, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh. This railroad is the 'captive' Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railroad."[19]

By owning the bottleneck of transportation facilities which serves the Mesabi Range, not only is the steel corporation's economic power over competitors enhanced, but it is in the fortuitous position of being totally unconcerned over what rates are established for the transportation of iron ore, because no matter how high the tariff, it is always paying itself.

In the production of steel ingots, which is the next stage in the evolution of iron into steel and steel products, we again find the industry under the hegemony of the United States Steel Corp. About a third of the Nation's capacity and production of steel ingots comes from the furnaces of the many plants of the corporation. Today, its ingot capacity is over twice that of its nearest competitor, Bethlehem, almost four times as large as Republic, and only slightly less than its four nearest competitors, Bethlehem, Republic, Jones and Laughlin, and National, combined.[20]

The corporation has also led the way in expanding into semifinished and finished products. It now has 42 percent of the total United States market in structural shapes, 49 percent of steel rails, 40 percent of wire rods, 41 percent of blanks and pierced billets for seamless tubes, and 60 to 70 percent of cotton ties. It is the leading producer in the industry of ingots, blooms, tin and terne plate, hot-rolled strip, strip for cold reduced black and tin plate, butt-welded pipe, galvanized pipe, seamless pipe and tube wire products including nails and staples, and wheels and axles.[21]

In many basic steel products, the corporation's participation in the market has been on the increase during the past decade. I mention only wire rods, tin plate, and cold-rolled sheets as examples. A factor of more significance, however, has been the great increase in the amount of hot-rolled sheets, the principal steel product consumed by fabricators, which has gone to the fabricating plants of the corporation rather than to independent producers. The percentage of hot-rolled sheets supplied to the corporation's subsidiaries almost doubled between 1940 and 1947, increasing from 5.7 percent of total output in 1940 to 10.5 percent by 1947.[22]

A partial list of finished steel products manufactured by the corporation includes wire clothes lines, door springs, garden tools, electrical wires, cement kilns, coal chemicals, barrel hoops, steel drums, nails, spikes, staples, and tacks. The total number of products made by the steel corporation is so great that Mr. Fairless, president of the corporation, preferred to "leave it at thousands."[23] Nor has the United States Steel Corp. been content to rule tranquilly over the entire steel industry. It has embarked upon invasions into such various alien fields as international steamship lines, cement, sulfate of ammonia, zinc mining, production of natural gas, and prefabricated houses.

I have attempted to portray here in rather broad strokes what is contained in much greater and more thorough detail the subcommittee's report on the iron and steel industry. But I think the consequences should now be stated in more explicit terms.

The real issue raised by these facts regarding the position of the United States Steel Corp. in the industry is not whether United States Steel is intentionally violating the antitrust law. While its past record indicates that it has participated in illegal schemes to fix prices, international cartels, and similar offenses, it has been no better or no worse in this regard than many of the large and important companies of the Nation. The essential question is one of monopoly power.

With the above facts laid clearly before the Nation by the hearings and report of the subcommittee, the United States Steel Corp. may no longer hide its light under a barrel, steel or otherwise. The corporation is a system of power, a large and spawning organization, a bureaucracy in the best sense of the word. Whether its power is characterized as "monopoly" or not is purely a matter of semantics. Whatever its name, it exists, in ease, to be seen and felt throughout the hamlets far and near of the country.

Has this agglomeration of power been for the best interest of economy as a whole? Certain evidence introduced during the steel investigation of the subcommittee suggests an answer. A study of the entire organization of the United States Steel Corp. under the aegis of the firm of well-known consulting engineers, Ford, Bacon, & Davis, in which the management of the United States Steel Corp. intimately participated, reached a number of significant conclusions. These findings, as summed up by Dr. George Stocking in testifying before the subcommittee, indicate that the United States Steel Corp. "was slow in introducing the continuous rolling mill; slow in getting into production of cold-rolled steel products; slow in recognizing the potentials of the wire business; slow to adopt the heat-treating process for the production of sheets; slow in getting into stainless steel products; slow in producing cold-rolled sheets; slow in tin-plate developments; slow in utilizing waste gases; slow in utilizing low-cost water transportation because of its consideration for the railroads; in short, slow to grasp the remarkable business opportunities that a dynamic America offered it. The corporation was apparently a follower, not a leader, in industrial efficiency."[24]

Whenever I attempt to express my analysis of the important factors in the steel industry, it is continually suggested that I am attacking the industry or its leaders. I wish to state explicitly that I am not criticizing the United States Steel Corp., nor am I in the least way reflecting upon Benjamin Fairless, its outstanding president. I have met Mr. Fairless and have found him a sincere, an honest, and an able man. The United States Steel Corp. has always been a patriotic company which has made significant contributions to this country in time of war and peace.

But I am pointing out a system of business organization in this Nation which possesses a great deal of economic power in many of the important crevices of the economy. With great sincerity, I am questioning whether this untold amount of power should rest in the hand of a small coterie of men, no matter how able. And I am suggesting, finally, that the centralization of private economic power, like the centralization of political power, results in inefficiency, red tape, bureaucracy, and waste.

I wish I were able to dwell upon the results of the subcommittee's newsprint inquiry as thoroughly as I have gone into its investigation of steel. In sharp contrast to steel, newsprint portrays a different system of economic organization of industry raising many important problems from the standpoint of monopoly power and the antitrust laws. But time will not permit this and I must refer you to the hearings and the subcommittee's soon forthcoming report.

While I am mindful of certain inhibitions precluding me from making full recommendations as a result of the newsprint inquiry prior to a full report by the subcommittee itself, I feel the conclusion is inescapable that the newsprint industry is one of the strongest and most powerful aggregation of monopoly partners extant.

This aggregation has absolute power to control prices, for example, to raise them or to keep them down. It has the power to prevent new establishments as competitors. There is an utter lack of social responsibility, lack of national or international

[16] The Iron and Steel Industry, report of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., December 19, 1950, p. 22.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pt. 4-A, p. 76.

[19] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pt. 4-A, p. 899.

[20] The Iron and Steel Industry, report of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., December 19, 1950, p. 50.

[21] Id., p. 57.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14 Part 4-A, p. 583.

[24] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pt. 4-A, p. 967.

responsibility on the part of the industry's leaders who thumb their noses at public opinion on both sides of the border.

Since over 80 percent of the newsprint consumed in the United States comes from Canada, and since there is presently no alternative major source of supply, the Canadians have the power of life and death over American dailies and weeklies. Their power is so great that they have prevailed upon the provincial Legislature of Ontario to pass a bill making it unlawful for any person to remove its records to a point without the borders of that province. In this way they have forestalled complete inquiry into their affairs by the executive and legislative branches of this country. Records of companies doing business in the United States have been spirited across the border and rendered impervious to our subpena powers.

The practices I have mentioned strongly point to the need of appropriate legislation which possibly might require as a condition precedent for doing business in the United States that any foreign corporation agree to open its records for inspection by a duly constituted judicial or legislative body in this country.

In these monopoly practices, the American newsprint companies are not without fault. They are coconspirators with the Canadian companies. I have accordingly asked the Attorney General to renew the antitrust proceedings which were begun by a grand-jury investigation only a few years ago. This investigation was interrupted through protestation by the Canadians to the State Department. My investigation into this industry, however, has received the approval of the Department.

I would like, however, to conclude by discussing the functions of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power in a mobilization economy. There is generally a tendency during an emergency program to forget about the consequences of monopoly power and to toss in the antitrust sponge with accentuated vigor. This attitude should be deplored because the preservation of the overall principles of the antitrust laws are in no way inconsistent with the objectives of an industrial mobilization program. I am sure that it was in the belief that the President issued his directive of September 29, 1950, calling upon the defense agencies in charge of mobilization to eliminate, insofar as possible, "any factors which may tend to suppress competition unduly, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power." *

I believe that this subcommittee can serve a useful purpose in the emergency period. Monopoly power must not be allowed to impede the defense effort. It must not be permitted to stifle independent enterprise which is eager to contribute to all-out production. It must not be allowed to mulct taxpayers through monopoly profits which add to the cost of a mobilization economy. It must not be allowed to utilize Government controls as a sanction for perpetuating old discriminatory practices. It must not be allowed to thrive and grow under Government auspices when there are others who can perform necessary functions with equal facility.

The economic areas I have just delineated are certainly within the province of this subcommittee during the existing emergency. I also believe that the long-range objectives of the subcommittee—of discovering the causes of and remedies for monopoly power—should not be lost sight of. We fight to preserve a way of life. With the battle over and the blood lost, fate would be more than ironic if she then decreed that the American way of life should go by default.

* Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pt. 6–A and pt. 6–B.

Hungers, Wars, and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address given by Philip W. Pillsbury, of Minneapolis, president of Pillsbury Mills, Inc., at Kansas City Chamber of Commerce luncheon on January 10, 1951:

HUNGERS, WARS, AND PEACE

Kansas City and its neighboring town of Atchison are my second homes. As most of you know, 25 years ago I spent 2 years living in your neighborhood. Twelve years ago I spent another half year living at the Muehlebach.

Even since I was a kid of seven I have been whipping a fly rod, catching fish in the rivers of this big area. I am just as much at home on the banks of the Mississippi where our flour mills use its power at Minneapolis, as well as at our feed mills at Clinton, Iowa. In the upper waters of the Ohio, our paper mills at Wellsburg are dependent on this same area, as are our flour mills and office here on the big "Mo."

You and I have a common bond together in that we live, eat, and help develop the great food basket of the world, but food is not our only bond. We are United States citizens, and our country not only needs leadership, but help right now.

While our Representatives in Congress debate the imperative issues of foreign policy today—with all the world listening, and dependent on their decisions—it is our right and duty and our obligation as citizens to think about these same issues and reach our own conclusions.

Here in Kansas City we are about as far away from Korea and the Kremlin and Europe as we can get—but not to escape, for we are intimately affected by our military operations, our national and foreign policies. Distance is like the old gray mare, she ain't what she used to be. It's only one hop, doesn't even take a skip and a jump with today's seven league boots, to reach from the Kremlin to the grass roots. We are not here to escape. There is no escape from our responsibility as citizens. Besides, escape has never been our way as a Nation—equality is our way, equality of opportunity.

Man's struggle toward equality of opportunity has been intertwined for 6,000 years with his struggle for bread. Man's hunger has caused wars. Man has fought other wars to still other hungers than that for bread. Mankind hungers for peace.

My business is the food business. I'd like to be asking each of you: "What do you think we can do to make food a tool for peace?"

After all, the whole world knows that Kansas City is the point of focus of the fertile Wheat Belt of the United States, our heartland and the breadbasket of the world. Food, agriculture, built Kansas City. It's the center of the wheat, hog, sheep, and cattle country, of an agricultural productivity unequaled anywhere in the world. But it took people with courage, vision, hungers, and ideas to turn this prairie sod into a breadbasket.

In the middle of this plenty, in Kansas City, we are sitting in comfort almost on the same thirty-eighth parallel that Time magazine's man of the year, the American fighting man, is crouched on half a world away, defending an American outpost and defending the American idea. A short century ago his grandfather was extending the American idea, making it come alive, as a frontiersman, as a pioneer, opening the country west of us, opening the great Wheat Belt that runs up and down the one hundredth meridian north far into Canada and south deep into Texas; that 200-mile-wide swath of prairie ready, fertile, and waiting to produce billions of bushels of wheat for man. And what is to the west of that American fighting man on the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea?

Ancient lands with fertile soils, much like the prairies west across the Mississippi were 100 years ago, but shut off behind an iron curtain, teeming with starving millions who yearn for our plenty and our freedom, as man always has.

Why this perilous, tragic difference? What can we do about it?

Three hungers make the world go round. These three hungers are the dynamics of the peoples of the whole world, East and West alike—hunger for food, hunger for freedom, and hunger for power.

Man has an instinctive hunger for freedom. But this instinct for independence stops short of license and demands equality of opportunity not only for self but also for the greatest possible self-realization for all persons.

This concept of freedom—our common but unique concept of freedom—produces an infinite diversity of thought among us but restrains no socially worth-while force. It is this concept of freedom and its unmatched release of human energy, not our raw materials, that is the secret of our productivity. Our freedom is the freedom of ingenuity, freedom to invent and to choose.

The genius of our freedom is characterized by a little story about what happened not so many years ago in a small town in the northern end of the wheat belt. Some fathers got their heads together to find a way to keep their young sons busy and out of the pool hall, got the boys to put on a minstrel show—and they made some money. Then the problem was, what to do with the money. It was about the time boys everywhere were all excited about wireless, so they put the money into some "ham" wireless equipment. There weren't many boys in this small town—but look what happened to two of them: One is Dr. E. O. Lawrence, inventor of the cyclotron. The other is Dr. Merle Tuve, inventor of the V. T. (proximity) fuze. Just a few small-town men, a minstrel show, a few boys—plus a vision of freedom beyond self for the self-realization of others.

Here's another angle. Great Britain is to be praised for pulling out of India. You and I say India is free, but—England failed to leave an educational system in India sufficient to teach the people the value of freedom.

A bare month ago when we had a hundred American women and girls baking together at the Waldorf-Astoria to help us find the best recipes in the country, his Highness, the Duke, and the Duchess of Windsor paid these hundred women a visit.

I was highly interested to see the Duke stop and talk with one of his former subjects, a Hindu girl. She is Mrs. Rukmini Krishnasqamy, wife of a Hindu student at the University of Ohio, and herself a doctor of philosophy in education. Her forehead bears the mark of her heritage—high position in her homeland, India, where electric ranges are barely known. Charming, brilliant, modest, and humble, she told us that their great national leader, Prime Minister Nehru, has asked her to return to India to establish high schools for all India's young people to educate them to the concept of freedom, to teach them how to achieve freedom.

Hunger for food is an age-old twin hunger to man's hunger for freedom. Man has always had to fight for food. For centuries, all over the world, man's very struggle for existence was largely for food. It was a battle of wits against the elements, animals, pestilence—and other men—for food. Armies with food won over famished armies and famished peoples. Food has often been the deciding weapon in war, in settling a peace.

Freedom, the release and realization of human energy, depends on food. If man has to work himself to exhaustion 13 or 14 hours a day just to provide himself with food, he has no time or energy for anything else. No food, no freedom.

In this country, more than any other and within the last 100 years, American ingenuity and inventiveness have rapidly reduced the time and energy required to produce an abundance of food. We have been able to do more about freedom—and out of freedom get the maximum release of human resources toward maximum self-realization.

On the contrary, in vast regions in Asia, millions will starve this winter and millions more work to exhaustion to keep barely alive. They have no time, no energy for freedom. They are simply so weak and exhausted physically that they are easy prey, and have been through the centuries of their hunger, to leaders with a third, threatening, and insatiable hunger—the lustful hunger for power.

With the growth and ever-increasing reality of human freedom in the free societies of the western world food has always been a powerful weapon, because it has given men energy to fight for freedom. Today, against the despots of the Kremlin, food can serve again as a powerful weapon if we have ingenuity enough to find the way.

Let's see for a moment what has happened in the past—it's full of clues to the future, to all mankind.

Life magazine, for instance, a couple of weeks ago reviewed for us the story of the decline of the Athenian democracy. The editors drew a parallel with the world situation of today. Athens in its hey-day was, like Kansas City, on the thirty-eighth parallel. Athenian democracy lost to Spartan military rigor, controlled thinking, and despotism.

Athenian democracy lost? Not really—the Athenian ideal and tradition of democracy and freedom to think has survived and lives a lusty life in most of the nations of the world today, and we have to be reminded who the Spartans were and how they lived.

A little later in history, Greek slaves taught their Roman masters. Through the Roman Empire and in spite of its despotism they gave the world new concepts of law and order—which give freedom to the individual. Meantime the stupid Roman emperors, vaguely aware of the urge for freedom among the slaves and their power, tried to appease them with panem et circenses—bread and the circuses—and the dross of that civilization disappeared into the past.

The concept of law, order, and freedom, and the seven free arts survived, lives in us all today.

Orientals—Attila and the Huns—overran much of the then western world, but did not conquer. All through the dark ages of the medieval, fires of freedom burned in men's hearts here and there, to emerge in a renaissance, a renewal of men's twin battle for food and freedom.

A tax on tea, taxation without representation, set off the American revolution by our food- and freedom-seeking founding fathers. They won independence for themselves, for the Nation, for us.

A little later, the people of France were starving, restive under taxes, confiscation of crops, the king's despotic hoarding and profiteering on grain. They put Marie Antoinette to the guillotine when she said, "Let them eat cake." Liberty, equality, fraternity began their rise again in France. Set back, to be sure, by Napoleon, but Napoleon, military man and strategist, leader and despot, fell back in utter defeat before Moscow. His men were starving, they were only fighting for Napoleon, not for freedom. Napoleon lost, freedom won.

In Europe, only a little while ago, foolish people turned to a Mussolini, a Hitler, who promised them arbeit und brut—work and bread. He unleashed the technical forces of hell on the emotions of man, and the modern technical forces of hell on wheels in war, but fell. Freedom won—but not quite enough. His hungry peoples, hungering for food, shelter and freedom, had too long a tradition of despotism. After World War I, the United States and Herbert Hoover had helped feed them. We had helped them set up a democracy, but we did not show them how to think democracy. We made the same mistake after Hitler. We must not make that mistake—anywhere in the world—again. We must fill the vacuum the despot leaves.

Or, let us ask, how did communism arise? Out of the twin hungers of the oppressed Russians under the Czars, after centuries of despotism. The Bolshevik revolutions of 1918 were the rise of people too-long starved for food and freedom. They have since succumbed as tools to their own slavery to the dictators of the Kremlin and their insatiable lusts for power. They are reported weary, disillusioned, hungry—almost ready to revolt.

At Bunker Hill one shot echoed for freedom around the world of that day.

Before and against the time threat of the blast that might echo doom for the world now our common job in the Western World is to do our best to fill the emptiness left in the hearts of the peoples who have revolted in their time for food and freedom, have been betrayed, but still seek.

There has always been time before, there may be now.

It was only in 1854 that Commodore Perry first penetrated the iron curtain aloofness of Japan and opened that Oriental nation—less than 100 years ago—to trade and fellowship with other nations. Long-term, the good of doing it must outweigh the evil. But, with centuries and dynasties of depotism behind them, any upsurge for freedom among the Japanese people must have helps to democratic thinking.

Mere American military discipline and administration will not do the job, if the Japanese are to become allies and an asset. This is true everywhere in the world our armed forces have gone—and withdrawn. Just when these hungry peoples were ready and waiting for—and we were almost ready to give—on the ground example of our most valuable, our priceless achievement, the twin concept of freedom and democracy, we have pulled out.

India and China were iron curtain lands, opened only recently to trade, then exploited by the western world. There, too, we failed to leave the true imprint of this concept, and we see these vast lands and populations—people—enmeshed by the lure of food and freedom via communism. Tibet, the Shangri la impenetrable except by a hardy few, has just been iron-curtained anew and with ease by the warring despots of the Soviet. Tibet? Think then of the buffer nations in Western Europe, so deftly maneuvered behind the Soviet iron curtain, yet all inhabited by people who yearn for food and freedom.

It is not hunger of people for food and freedom that keeps Asia and Western Europe apart—the east and the west of which Kipling predicted, "and never the twain will meet." It is the third hunger—lust for power—in a despotic few.

The latest report is that 15,000,000 will starve in the Orient this winter. They are of the people who thought, not too long ago, that they had destroyed their brutal despots for a brotherhood, for food and freedom—and got only new dynasts and dictators and less freedom and more misery. Their voices must still be crying, as in a wilderness, to be heard, but they know not what to do. These hungry peoples, throughout the world, people with hungering minds, must still be listening, yearning, hoping, as mankind always has.

All these peoples look to us—just as their ironclad despots fear their knowing the truth about us. That's why they have iron curtains, censorship, a party line.

That's why, like Hitler and Mussolini in their day, the iron-curtain men prostitute all the fantastic modern techniques of communication—rumor, newspaper, radio, even television, when they can—to distort, confuse, bewilder, split up and diffuse the strengths of the western world.

Our voice in no voice in a wilderness. It's a voice we can amplify by all our research and production and free creative thinking. It speaks, and can speak more, with instant impact even behind iron curtains, for there are no iron curtains to the mind. The blackouts of World War II could not black-out the dream of ultimate freedom in the minds of the underground patriots of France, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries. There are ways, and there is time—perhaps, if we are as quick about it as the American mind is quick about most things—to let the restive, even warlike peoples see the food on our tables, to let them learn of our strivings toward many freedoms, to let them see how we live together as friends and of showing them how to do it themselves.

To the masses in Asia Stalin and his henchmen promise food and land reform. The starving millions, hungering for food and freedom, listen and believe. They have no way of knowing the despotic plan of those who hunger for power to use them as fodder, as cannon fodder against the freeman of the Western World. The despots of the Kremlin fear our plenty, our productivity, our ideas, our ideals. That's why they draw iron curtains around their lands and their people. That's why they extend them around their satellite states.

It's up to us, as citizens, to ask our representatives to find and execute ways of combating the Kremlin promises of Asiatic land reform and food with our own food, with what we know about producing more food—and to do it quick. It does not mean tractors and gang plows and combines, now. It means things as simple as the next step from the forked stick to a plowshare. It means another ounce of food, perhaps, a day, for now, the difference between life and death. It might mean the difference between freedom and slavery.

Coupled with our productivity and military strategy—to defend the principle of a society of free and independent nations working together for self-realization—food might again be the leavening agent that will turn the tide against the tyrants of the Kremlin.

This is what we must ask Congress to do:

1. Enact realistic agricultural legislation that will strengthen the food-farm economy of the Nation.

2. Set up a competent bipartisan board to plan mobilization of and strategic use of food—and methods by which hungry peoples in other countries can themselves produce more food—as a weapon to prevent extension of this war.

This should be planned to make as much impact as possible as soon as possible as a preventive to further war. Methods of telling the whole world what we are doing should be employed to the hilt.

If this seems to require price controls and rationing, this decision should be reached and announced as soon as possible. But any such controls, to be effective, must be different from those of the last war. They must be controls that encourage, not tend to limit, production.

Latest estimates are that our breadbasket will have a carry-over of 450,000,000 bushels of wheat this year.

Do we have an equally adequate carry-over in terms of devotion to our freedom?

For with food comes release of energy for the cause of freedom—release of human energy powerful enough in the hearts of millions of people to defeat the evil hunger for power.

I apologize. I haven't really given you any real solution to beat this evil power that is closing in on our world. With all your help, we citizens of the United States must develop a creed far beyond the Marxian and the Mein Kampfs. I am not downhearted that this can't be done. I haven't been, ever since I heard Larry Gould, president of the Carleton College, point out that there had never been a cynical historian throughout history.

The world does improve.

Maybe our Congress has abrogated too much of their responsibility to too few.

Maybe you and I can really roll up our sleeves and help our representatives build a peaceful free world—not by giving away food, but by having a creed that teaches the hungering people:

"Come to us, be our friends. We know we have been the most disliked nation in the world—that is, next to communistic countries. You help us mend our ways and we will teach you how to produce more, both food and freedom. We will show you that only out of freedom comes the maximum release of human resources."

Concord Village, Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Judge Edward A. Richards, president of the East New York Savings Bank and president of Concord Freeholders, Inc., at a dinner of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board held Saturday, January 20, 1951, at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

CONCORD VILLAGE

Be sure that I appreciate this honor extended to me as president of Concord Freeholders by the Brooklyn Real Estate Board. Your purpose, I know, is to pay respect to the savings-bank stockholders of Concord Freeholders. It is only because I am at this time president of the corporation that this dinner is being given to me. Your plan and your purpose is to express appreciation to the savings banks who have joined together to do this good job for Brooklyn.

Concord Freeholders has existed now for more than 5 years. It was incorporated by savings banks to assist in getting for Brooklyn a civic center worthy of our borough.

That we may get dates a bit in mind, let me remind you that World War II ended in the second half of the year 1945, at which time Fiorello LaGuardia was mayor of our city, John Cashmore president of our borough, and Bob Moses coordinator of about every public improvement worth while.

Members of the board of estimate, doubtless prompted by John Cashmore, our borough president, decided that Brooklyn was entitled to, and should have, a better and more beautiful civic center.

Generally speaking, the area of the new civic center was to extend from Joralemon Street on the south to the bridge approach on the north, and from Fulton Street on the west to widened Adams Street on the east.

In that civic center was to be built a wonderfully fine supreme court building, a children's court, court of domestic relations building, and a welfare center, a public library, a Federal court building, and a high school to commemorate Gov. Alfred E. Smith.

Cadman Plaza was to be graded and parked and otherwise improved, and in the center of it a Brooklyn war memorial to commemorate the valor of boys from Brooklyn who gave their lives in World War II.

Borough President Cashmore and other members of the board of estimate, and Bob Moses, active in the whole scheme, appreciated the need of changing the character of the neighborhood to the east—that between Adams and Jay, Tillary and Sands, an area of about eight blocks, perhaps the oldest neighborhood, and in some respects, the most dilapidated area in all Brooklyn.

That was the property to be known as Concord Village, taken by the city as excess land in condemnation and sold at auction and bought by Concord Freeholders. It consisted of 107 parcels of land on which stood 98 dwellings, housing about 300 families and 50 stores and factories. The houses were very old; the tenants very poor. To properly exalt the civic center every building had to be destroyed and then the land redeveloped. The savings banks undertook that job.

Bob Moses was apparently assigned the task of selling the idea to the savings banks of buying that land and improving it. He proved to be a good salesman. One of the stipulations was that the large high-class apartment dwellings to be built would not cover more than 20 percent of the land and that the balance of the property would be nicely landscaped and parked.

It was on March 1, 1945, in the mayor's office in the city of New York, when the mayor, the borough president, and other city officials, Bob Moses, and four savings bank presidents entered into a gentleman's agreement to carry this deal through. The agreement bears the signatures of each member of the board of estimate, and of Bob Moses, as well as Elliott Eldredge, president of the Williamsburg Savings Bank; Philip Benson, president of the Dime; Fred Gretsch, president of the Lincoln, and the speaker, president of the East New York.

Promptly thereafter, the area designed to be used for the enlarged civic center, plus this excess land (now Concord Village) was acquired by the city of condemnation, and promptly thereafter a group of savings banks (14 in Brooklyn, 3 in New York, and 1 in Buffalo) agreed to provide funds to build the project. We then agreed to limit the coverage to 18 percent of the land area. The savings banks now interested in Concord Freeholders are, for the most part, the same group that originally undertook to do the job.

It is not always possible for a municipal authority, in the face of changing times and conditions, to carry through the plans of previous administrations. After Fiorello LaGuardia who, in my judgment, was in many respects a great mayor, came William O'Dwyer and, after O'Dwyer's resignation, and quite recently, came Mayor Impellitteri.

No one in this room need be reminded of the great changes that have come in the economic condition between 1945 and the present date. There has been a bit of inflation, and then a bit more, and then a lot more on top of that. Everything is up in value—except money.

The land needed for this enlarged civic center was acquired by the city 5 years ago, but none of the city buildings then proposed to be built have yet got beyond the planning stage and, in view of the present day worldwide outlook, may yet be a long time delayed.

The speaker has been president of Concord Freeholders since May 1949, prior to which time plans for seven buildings were prepared and filed. Early in my administration these plans were discarded and new plans drawn and filed. After careful study, and because of the lack of improvement in and around the civic center, the directors of Concord Freeholders felt that it should at this time do no more than to clear all of our land and build three 15-story elevator apartments on the north side of Tillary Street.

No one, however conversant with the rent laws that existed in 1949 and 1950, can appreciate the difficulty Concord Freeholders had in getting tenants to vacate these buildings.

Some years ago, and for 12 years, I was justice of the municipal court. At that time a warrant of dispossess meant just what it said. It mean get out. It does not any more. We now have a rent commission, the consent of which is necessary before a landlord can enforce a dispossess warrant. Ours is no longer a government of laws, but rather of committees appointed by the Executive. Whether or not that is justified, whether necessary, whether fair, right or proper, let others say, but I do say that by this means the Government has taken private property for private use without just compensation. That is probably an extension of the so-called emergency police power, but to same of us old-fashioned folks it seems like confiscation.

Now to get a tenant out it takes a final order of dispossess, the consent of a rent commission, and a few hundred dollars, after the court has directed his removal.

Notwithstanding that dispossesses were issued long before May 1949 when I became president, we did not get full possession for nearly a year thereafter. Demolition meantime had to be delayed.

The work of vacating these buildings required the services of an experienced organization. If it had not been for the fact that we were wise enough to employ the James Felt Co. and their staff of fine assistants to do the work, I do not know how he would have been able to make the progress we did, and to them I want publicly to express our appreciation.

I was not the first president of Concord Freeholders. Our old friend Phil Benson was president for several years. He was succeeded by Paul Connelly, one of Brooklyn's best builders and now president of the Fulton Savings Bank. Paul is well and favorably known to everybody in Brooklyn who knows anybody. Had his health been better, he would have continued as president of Concord Freeholders.

Our three buildings, now approaching completion, are 15-story elevator apartments and, because they occupy but 18 percent of the land, will have the appearance of being located in a fine park.

Let it be known that our savings banks are receiving no subsidy, nor concessions of any kind; no tax exemption; no aid in any way from the city, State or Nation. They are building the property as any investor would build any project and relying upon current rental values for a fair return on their investment. As nearly as we can figure it, these buildings with a normal vacancy will bring to the savings banks a net of 5 percent or less on their total investment after taxes and a proper charge for depreciation.

It is interesting to note that in 1945, at the time this project was conceived, it was assumed that these buildings would cost approximately $1,500 a room, and that the rentals could be from $18 to $20 a month per room.

The room cost of $1,500 once estimated has now become $3,500; the rent of $18 to $20 is now nearer $40. That may not be due wholly to inflated costs, but to some extent to the fact that all concerned believe that

on this site on Brooklyn Heights, next to this wonderfully fine civic center in New York City's best borough, we should have a fine type of building. There is already ample evidence that those who will occupy them will be glad to pay for their exceptionally fine appointments.

Savings bankers always remember, and must remember, that the money in their banks belong to depositors, and must always be safely and soundly invested. Our investment in Concord Village is safe and sound, and at the same time we are aiding the city in clearing up this area, and making possible a graceful and beautiful Brooklyn civic center.

We know we are building only three out of seven proposed buildings. God and Stalin willing, we will do the other four. I am personally very confident that these buildings will not only grace the civic center, but will prove popular with many of the best families in Brooklyn, and a fair and safe investment for the savings banks.

It is only occasionally that the law gives to savings banks the right to make such unusual investments, and when it does, the legislators usually provide for special attention by and approval of the State banking department, under whose jurisdiction we operate. That is true in the case of Concord Village.

At the time I became president of Concord, Elliott V. Bell was superintendent of banks, and our present superintendent, William A. Lyon, his deputy. I want to here publicly acknowledge the fine cooperation that we have had both from Elliott Bell and Bill Lyon. They have done more than just consent to our proposals—they have given every proposal prompt, careful and proper consideration and have been most helpful.

Unfortunately widened Adams Street, and the present condition of property to the west, is not today a very pleasant sight. City authorities expected to proceed faster. Perhaps some may wonder why, in these last 5 years or more, greater progress has not been made. Let me say to you that I think I know, about as intimately as any man, the trials, the tribulations, and the multiplicity of difficulties constantly confronting city officials. Let us all appreciate their difficulties and let us continue to have faith.

Barring an atomic bomb, I am sure you will be pleasantly astonished when you see the condition 6 or 9 months from now.

We Brooklynites are mighty thankful to the savings banks of Manhattan for the substantial help they have given this Brooklyn project, and more especially our thanks ought to go to the Buffalo Savings Bank, way up at the other end of the State, for their faith and confidence in us. We will not fail them. They have a safe investment.

The Savings Banks Trust Co. is a company wholly owned by savings banks. That company has undertaken to give guidance and direction to the financial problems involved in this development. They have thereby greatly helped the directors and the president in solving problems. To Gus Ihlefeld, president of the trust company, and to George Ficken, his able assistant, may I here say a word of sincere thanks and appreciation.

It has been said that a good executive is a fellow who knows how to get other people to do his work. I have lived long enough in Brooklyn to know the fellows who know how. Everybody in Brooklyn, who has had anything to do with the building trade in the last 30 years; knows Johnny Moran, formerly Brooklyn's superintendent of buildings. I was foresighted enough some years ago to take him into the employ of the East New York Savings Bank. When this job started, I made Moran supervising engineer. He has done a great job, both for the contractors and for me.

Our architects are Benjamin Braunstein and Alfred Ryder, men with whom I have worked for many years. Without their able and ever ready assistance, my days would have been longer and my work much harder.

The Paul Tishman Co. and the Sol G. Atlas, our builders who outbid seven other outstanding building contractors, have cooperated with the architects and with Johnny Moran, even though at all times they have not seen eye to eye.

We have had many applicants for rentals, and from many a conditional deposit on a lease. Up to the present time no leases have been signed and no definite arrangement made with tenants because, until now, we have not been able to be sure when we can give possession. Personally I want not to put a single tenant into any of these buildings until they are fully completed and ready, and until I can be sure that the tenants will not be interfered with in any wise by mechanics.

Tillary-Center building—the building that sets back in the middle of the block between Adams and Jay—will be ready for occupancy on March 1; the Tillary-Jay building by May 1; and the Tillary-Adams building before the first of July.

I know I am talking to a group of real estate agents and brokers—a group of the best. I want to say to you that while we have a renting agent on the property to take care of people as they come in to look at apartments, we are very glad indeed to have any of you send to us the right kind of prospects and we expect, of course, to pay the usual commission on the closing of a lease. Come, or send someone, around with your prospects, or have them present a letter of introduction when they call. We want to know before we rent that the prospect is yours.

And now, before closing my remarks, let me mention the fine cooperation which I have had from my old and dear friend Phil Farley, borough engineer, and all under him in authority. John Cashmore and the borough president's office would not be the same without him. And then let me also say that when nobody seems to be able to get a job done, and we get plumb up against it, we call Bob Moses on the telephone.

Mayors may come and mayors may go, but Bob goes on forever.

Price Controls on Meat and Meat Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a telegram from the Nebraska Stock Growers Association at Alliance, Nebr., addressed to Eric Johnston, the Economic Stabilizer.

Mr. Speaker, the meat-producing sections of the country are greatly disturbed about how far controls will go in governing the production, processing, and distribution of meat and meat products. I can remember that under the OPA controls, it took 600 words to define one particular cut of meat and there were dozens of cuts. If the Economic Stabilizer expects to control more than 8,000,000 items, the city of Washington will become the "District of Confusion" instead of the District of Columbia.

I have stated several times, that under existing circumstances in this country, price controls will not work. The people have no heart or confidence in what the administration is trying to do in foreign affairs. They have no heart for what is going on in Korea. They have grave doubts about the emergencies that this administration is constantly stirring up. Laws cannot be made effective unless they have the support of the majority of the people. There are too many leaks in the dam which is trying to hold back inflation. These leaks are caused by policies adopted by Government. The flood of printing-press money and spending beyond our means and income has gone on for such a long period of time that it seems doubtful the present orders issued by ESA will bring anything but confusion and less production. The orders issued for the so-called freeze will soon be as full of holes as a Swiss cheese.

The cattlemen of the country want to cooperate, but they realize that if controls are to be imposed upon their industry, the ultimate end will be less production. Increased production in all lines of endeavor is the keynote to our ultimate success in the present crisis. It does not follow common sense that agencies of Government should advocate increased production on the one hand and then, through controls and rationing, work in absolute opposition to the desired results.

Experience with the old OPA should have convinced the Government that flourishing black markets have already geared their machinery to swing into full operation the moment controls become a reality. That happened under the old OPA. It will happen much quicker now because these black marketeers have had some experience.

Our Government, through controls can strike a devastating blow to civilian morale. The controls advocated will do that to the livestock industry. The controls will take from the livestock and meat industries the necessary confidence and assurance they need for full production.

ERIC JOHNSTON,
Economic Stabilizer,
Washington, D. C.:

The Nebraska Stock Growers Association, representing the livestock producers of Nebraska, is greatly disturbed by the gravity of the situation confronting us and the everlasting threat of a program of controls.

Recognizing the need for stabilization of our economy, including meat prices and, at the same time, realizing the need for increased production of meat, we have for the past 4 months urged our Nebraska delegation in Washington to oppose controls. It is our sincere, honest judgment that these ends cannot be accomplished by direct controls, price ceilings, rationing or subsidies. It is our unanimous conclusion that controls on the livestock and meat industry are neither feasible nor practical.

Experience with price controls and subsidies during World War II are ample evidence that these controls are unworkable and will be detrimental to the whole economy. Price ceilings imposed now will have the effect of decreased livestock production which will become increasingly acute 2 to

5 years hence, at a time when the need for meat will probably be much greater than at present.

The only way to achieve stabilization is by increased livestock production. Organized farm and ranch livestock groups are certain this can be obtained if hampering controls are not imposed.

From our knowledge of the industry we represent and because we know the calamity that will result from adoption of a system of controls over that industry, but primarily because we as American citizens want to avoid these evil results and to do the things best for our country, we urge that no program of controls be adopted for this industry.

W. A. JOHNSON,
Secretary-Treasurer, the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, Alliance, Nebr.

Our One Asian Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, these are momentous times for the United States. Since the end of the Second World War we have given of our substance in order to help other peoples to rehabilitate themselves from the ravages of war. Through the Marshall aid plan and the European recovery program we have given tangible proof of our friendship and good will.

In Korea, American boys are fighting and dying to repel aggression, to give teeth to the otherwise futile provisions of the United Nations Charter, to give the world that collective security it needs in order to have peace. But Soviet Russia, bent on world domination, would not have it so. American success in Korea would spell the doom of Russia's aggressive plans. Hence, when victory was within our reach in Korea, Stalin saw to it that his satellite, Mao Tse-tung dispatched his Chinese Communist hordes to come to the aid of the North Koreans. Communist China committed a brazen and flagrant violation against the United Nations forces in Korea.

The United Nations in Lake Success should have immediately and without equivocation branded Communist China as an aggressor. The United States proposed a resolution to that effect. That was the test for us to find out who are our friends and allies in the United Nations, who are those who are willing to stand by us. A so-called Asian-Arab bloc was formed against us—12 of them—most of them we have helped. In the guise of conciliation and search for peace, that bloc proposed one resolution after another that if approved would have meant humiliation for the United States.

Fortunately, a voice was heard that stood for decency and justice, not a faint voice but a clarion call, the voice of an Asian, a Filipino, and he lashed out at all those who wanted appeasement, and he spoke the words of loyalty and truth. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Minister of the Philippines, who was last year's President of the General Assembly, took the floor again and again in defense of the United States and democracy, and every time he spoke he won America's heart, for he was speaking for the American people and for all those who love peace.

Mr. Speaker, once again the Philippines, in the midst of a crisis, has come to our help. In 1941, of all the subject peoples in Asia, only the Filipinos rallied to the defense of their sovereign Nation, the United States. Now, 1951, when 12 Asian and Arab nations refused to throw their lot with us, the Philippines did not only side with us but its spokesman valiantly, ably, and brilliantly led the fight in the United Nations to assert American principles of democracy and freedom and world security. How fortunate we are that we can count on such tried and true friend. In war, he fought for us in Bataan, Corregidor, Leyte; in peace, he is fighting with equal devotion in Lake Success.

Under unanimous consent of the House, I ask to have printed in the RECORD one of the latest speeches made by General Romulo before the United Nations, a rebuttal of the statements made by the representative of the United Kingdom and by members of the 12-nation Arab and Asian bloc:

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EXTEMPORANEOUS REBUTTAL MADE BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, FOREIGN SECRETARY OF THE PHILIPPINES, IN REPLY TO THE DELEGATES OF INDIA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, BEFORE THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, JANUARY 25, 1951

Mr. Chairman, I wish to reply to the statements of the two speakers who have just preceded me, the delegates of India and of the United Kingdom. I will speak frankly and plainly because no useful purpose can be served at this time by vague or evasive generalizations.

Is it a surprise to anyone that, as the delegate of India claims, Peiping should be disposed to accept this proposal? Why should Peiping reject a proposal which is cut exactly to the pattern of its demands?

It will be noted, first of all, that the draft resolution bases itself entirely on Peiping's reply of January 17. That reply, as is generally known, completely rejected the basic principle approved by the first committee, namely, that cease fire must precede negotiations. Peiping has stubbornly insisted that negotiations must come before cease fire.

This is exactly what this draft resolution seeks to accomplish. It proposes that the General Assembly establish a negotiating body of seven governments, exactly as listed and nominated by Peiping, to secure further explanations from Peiping of its reply of January 17 and make arrangements for a peaceful settlement of the Korean and other far-eastern problems, also exactly as demanded by Peiping.

Thus, instead of maintaining, as we should, the just principle of cease fire before negotiations, we are being led by an ingenious formula of words to reverse ourselves and capitulate to Peiping's demand of negotiations before cease fire. Indeed, the situation is even worse than this, for the committee will note the curious fact that there is no mention whatever of cease fire in the operative part of the draft resolution. The idea of cease fire has vanished altogether, and all that is left is elucidation, amplification, and negotiation at the pleasure of Peiping and on its terms.

This proposal has one undoubted merit—it has been drafted with extraordinary skill. On the excuse of seeking further elucidation and amplification of Peiping's intentions, we are being induced to abandon our basic principle of cease fire before negotiations, and we are supposed to like it and not to notice the difference.

I am afraid that what we have here is either an optical illusion or a feat of prestidigitation. In the beginning, we were quite sure that cease fire was there, and then suddenly it is not there anymore. It is like seeing a rope rise out of nothing and then disappearing in the thin air.

What has happened to create this illusion?

Last Monday, in the middle of the debate on the United States draft resolution, the text of an alleged clarification from Peiping was placed before this committee. That message vaguely hinted that Peiping might agree to a cease fire for a limited period so that further negotiations might be undertaken. The necessary doubt, confusion, and vacillation having been planted in the minds of some delegations by this so-called clarification, we are now confronted with a proposal which seeks to make capital of the resulting indecision that has made itself felt during the past few days.

But the committee will note that the draft resolution makes no reference whatever to Peiping's supposed clarification of January 22. Yet the existence of that message is implicit in the proposal. This is but another aspect of the optical illusion to which I have already referred. Since no such clarification has, in fact, been made to the committee, the operative paragraphs have no relevance to the preamble, and the draft resolution becomes an absurdity. We would, in effect, be saying to Peiping that, having noted its reply of January 17 rejecting the principle of cease fire before negotiations, we have decided to abandon that principle in favor of Peiping's demand for negotiations before cease fire.

The Philippine Government is firmly of the opinion that no resolution calling for negotiations on existing issues in the Far East can be entertained by this committee on the basis of Peiping's reply of January 17. We can give due course to such a resolution only if and when Peiping accepts clearly and without equivocation the principle of cease fire before negotiations. Any move, however artfully contrived, to propose negotiations before cease fire must therefore be rejected as a snare and a deception. I am confident that the majority of the committee will resist the dangerous sorcery of such proposals.

The Philippine delegation cannot agree with the delegate of the United Kingdom and consent to a proposal which would place the United Nations in the abject position of begging for one kind word or gesture of explanation from Peiping. Peiping is free to make any elucidations or amplifications that it wants directly to the United Nations. No new body or procedure is needed for this purpose. If Peiping undergoes a change of heart, it can even advance new or substitute proposals. Alternatively, the group of 12 Asian and Arab states can request Peiping to make such clarifications or to submit new proposals directly to the United Nations through the President of the General Assembly. But I do not believe that the group of 12 can properly ask the General Assembly to go around begging for such crumbs of hope and consolation as the authorities of Peiping may deign to throw in our direction.

The position of the Philippine delegation is clear. We maintain that, at this stage, the only resolution that can properly be considered by the committee is the draft resolution submitted by the United States. That proposal has been adequately explained and discussed. Indeed, it presents no difficulties of interpretation since it is plain and unambiguous and corresponds exactly to the facts. It recognizes Peiping's reply of January 17 for what it is—as a rejection of the United Nations proposals to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea, and then proceeds to do three things: It finds that Peiping is engaged in aggression; it calls upon the Peiping regime to cease hostilities against the forces of the United Nations and to withdraw its troops from Korea; it affirms the present United Nations policy of continued resistance to aggression in Korea; it requests a committee to consider additional measures to meet the aggression and to report thereon to the General Assembly; and it keeps the door open for a cessation of hostilities and the peaceful settlement of the Korean problem.

If we rule out the usual distortions of Peiping's allies in this committee, I believe it true to say that no serious challenge has yet been made to these clear and straightforward propositions. By directly assisting the North Korean aggressor, the Peiping regime is itself engaged in aggression. Who dares honestly to question this statement? I do not believe that the Asian and Arab states would challenge this statement because, as I reminded the committee the other day, they themselves condemned 2 years ago the military action against the Republic of Indonesia as a breach of the peace and act of aggression, and only last June supported the Security Council action on Korea. They may doubt whether it is prudent or whether it would serve a useful purpose to pin the label of aggressor on Peiping, but I believe they all concurred in the finding of aggression which is contained in the draft resolution and which was bluntly affirmed by the distinguished delegate of Iraq the other day when he declared that, of course, Peiping is actually committing aggression.

There are two misconceptions about this draft resolution that must be dispelled. The first was pointed out by the Australian delegation yesterday, and this is the notion that it provides for further economic, military, or diplomatic sanctions against the aggressor. The draft resolution does nothing of the sort. It authorizes no sanctions that are not already being enforced under existing resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. It is logical and it is prudent that additional measures to meet the aggression should be considered, but such measures will, at all events, require subsequent action by the General Assembly.

The second misconception is that this resolution would close the door to such negotiations as Peiping might be moved to undertake at a later stage. The last paragraph of the United States draft resolution makes sure that the door is kept open for any subsequent negotiations on just and honorable terms and in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The counsel of prudence of the Indian and United Kingdom delegation cannot go so far as to induce us to make the naive assumption that Peiping would reject the need for a peaceful settlement merely because we have decided to call a spade a spade. And it is equally naive to think that Peiping and its allies would be deterred from continued or further aggressions merely because we have desisted from calling a spade a spade. The aggressive plans of Peiping and its allies do not depend upon verbal affirmations or abstentions of this kind. Their aggressive aims are determined solely by a cool and objective calculation of profit and loss, benefit or disadvantage. If the free world cowers before the aggressor, he will press his advantage; but if we stand up to him, not only physically but with our whole moral strength, he will reconsider his ways and there is a good chance that he may be dissuaded from further aggressions.

May I tell my Indian and British colleagues that to us, to adhere to the truth, to stand by right principles—this is the highest form of morality among nations as among individuals. If the United Nations evades its clear duty and sacrifices truth to convenience and principle to fear, then it is utterly lost.

In my statement last Monday, I recounted a significant bit of United Nations history to show that 2 years ago, under the leadership of Prime Minister Nehru, 15 Asian and Arab states, including the Philippines, met in New Delhi to condemn the military action against the Republic of Indonesia as a breach of the peace and act of aggression. The words that were spoken and the action that was taken there have become part of the political heritage of Asia. I recall them today in reply to the statement made by the delegate of India. Especially memorable was the speech made at the opening day of the conference in which Prime Minister Nehru said:

"If open and unabashed aggression is not checked and is condoned by other powers, then hope will vanish and people will resort to other ways and other means even though these might involve the utmost catastrophe. One thing is certain: there can be and will be no surrender to aggression and no acceptance or reimposition of colonial control.

"It was not without deep thought and earnest consideration that we decided to hold this conference. Believing as we do that the United Nations must be strengthened as a symbol of the new order, we were reluctant to take any steps which might appear to weaken its authority. But when the will of the Security Council was itself flouted, then it became clear to us that we must confer together to strengthen the United Nations and to prevent further deterioration of a dangerous situation. We meet, therefore, within the framework of the United Nations and with the noble words of the Charter before us."

One could wish—and I am addressing myself to the delegate of India—that we might again hear today from New Delhi, in a similar situation of "open and unabashed aggression," words of the same import and equal dignity.

One felt proud to be in that gathering of the representatives of Asia and Africa, for we had met to reaffirm our common faith in the freedom and security of more than one-half of mankind. Though we had no armies or navies or air armadas, our moral position was unassailable and we took heart from the knowledge that justice was on our side. This was the high-water mark of Asian strength and solidarity and I cannot believe that it is the desire of any of the countries in Asia to fritter away the moral prestige and power that was firmly established there.

Mr. Chairman: And now, let me reply to the delegate of the United Kingdom. In my recent readings of history—for history is an excellent teacher in a time of confusion—it was perhaps inevitable that I should review the events that led to and followed the Manchurian conflict of 1931. It will be recalled that after a suitable incident had been started by Japan, the latter immediately undertook a major campaign for the conquest of Manchuria. The League of Nations dispatched the Lytton Commission in the hope of finding a peaceful solution. But the conquest of Manchuria was completed before the arrival of the commission.

The United States, though not a member of the League, gave full support to the organization in its effort to end the conflict. Public opinion in the United States was virtually unanimous in denouncing the Japanese action as an act of aggression, and Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson based his policy on the system of collective security which rested on the League Covenant and on the Paris Peace Pact of 1928.

The Lytton Commission, however, thought differently. It made all sorts of excuses for the Japanese aggression, including the statement that "in Manchuria there are many features without an exact parallel in other parts of the world." While advocating an autonomous regime for Manchuria, it concurred in Japan's claim than Manchuria was its "life-line," and expressed concern that Japanese legitimate interests there would be safeguarded.

The Lytton Commission, of course, reflected the policy of Great Britain, which at that time had an alliance with Japan. Its action afforded ground for the belief that General Tanaka spoke the truth way back in 1927 when he said that Japan had sounded out the European powers and had secured from them the pledge of a free hand in Manchuria.

Thus, in Manchuria, started the chain of Japanese expansionism and aggression which in 1941, ten years later, culminated in the Japanese aggression against Southeast Asia.

What does this bit of history teach us, Sir Gladwyn? A great deal, if we are willing to learn. Use the word Korea instead of Manchuria, and Communist China instead of Japan, in this context—the other protagonists are the same—and the parallelism becomes startling indeed. A new Lytton Commission is being set up to placate the aggressor and to recognize the fruits of aggression. How can anyone suggest that the results will be different this time and that the United Nations, by appeasing Red China, will reap peace where the League of Nations reaped only the continuation of Japanese aggression?

To the delegate of the United Kingdom I say: If Secretary Stimson were still living, one wonders what he would say to the Lord Lyttons of today.

Though Stimson is dead, the perceptive intelligence which enabled him to tag aggression and to oppose it from the beginning has not vanished. His spirit has spoken through the many delegations that, having sought a just and honorable settlement with the aggressor, have now the courage to affirm the truth and to stand by the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

True Now as Then

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is taken from the January 17 issue of the Anaheim Bulletin, a daily newspaper in my district. It says in simple language something we should all think about, and now more than ever, as we are about to start consideration of a tremendous budget request, and as we face increasing controls and proposed panaceas for our self-produced problems:

TRUE NOW AS THEN

Many things which were said years ago when the national and world situation were entirely different are as timely now as the day they were uttered. These bits of wisdom by Edward Everett Hale are a good example:

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

"You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

"You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.

"You cannot aid the poor by destroying the rich.

"You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling the wage payer down.

"You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.

"You cannot establish sound social security on borrowed money.

"You cannot help men permanently by doing for them the things they could and should do for themselves."

Power of Purse a Vital Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. George Sokolsky, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 19, 1951:

POWER OF PURSE A VITAL ISSUE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The quarrel between President Truman and the Congress may resolve itself into an inquiry into the constitutional question of the power of the purse.

Even on the Democratic side it is evident that supporters of the President's policies feel that he should not, at this time, raise constitutional issues which need not be raised. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, a supporter of Mr. Truman's war program, indicated that clearly.

The President's position, stated on January 11, is that he admits that Congress controls the purse, but that if Congress disagrees with him, he will go to the people.

Of course, that is precisely what Congress did in the last election: The whole of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate were then elected. By the only legal process available in this country the people were gone to and they made choices.

The Constitution is altogether clear on this subject:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

The power of Congress in the control of our money is absolute. Congress, in turn, is responsible only to the people, whose decisions are made at elections. The President may veto an appropriation bill, but he may not expend a cent unless Congress so authorizes him.

Ours is a government of limited and enumerated powers. No one can assert legal power: It must be granted either by the Constitution or by Congress. The money power is enumerated as belonging to Congress.

The object of this provision in the Constitution is to prevent a President from becoming a tyrant. After all, if he could raise and use money without restraint, he could govern as a dictator without authorization by Congress or by the interdicts of the Supreme Court. Our government would then be an autocracy.

Lord Bryce, in his masterpiece, the American Commonwealth, explains the congressional control of the purse as follows:

"If he were to engage in military operations—he cannot under the Constitution declare war for that belongs to Congress—the House might paralyse him by declining to vote the requisite Army appropriations.

"If he were to repeat the splendid audacity of Jefferson by purchasing a new territory, they could withhold the purchase money.

"But if, keeping within the limits of his constitutional functions, he takes a different course from that they recommend, if for instance he should refuse, at their repeated requests, to demand the liberation of American citizens pining in foreign dungeons, or to suppress disorders in a State whose government had requested Federal intervention, they would have to look on.

"To withhold the ordinary supplies, and thereby stop the machine of government, would injure the country and themselves far more than the President. They would, to use a common expression, be cutting off their nose to spite their face.

"They could not lawfully refuse to vote his salary, for that is guaranteed to him by the Constitution. They could not, except by a successful impeachment, turn him out of the White House or deprive him of his title to the obedience of all Federal officials."

In this phase of the debate, the Constitution looms large, for those who maintain that the so-called UN (90 percent American) police action is a subterfuge, insist that congressional control over the budget, peacetime or wartime, must not be bypassed by any device or subterfuge.

The issue is tremendously important. For if we are not fighting for constitutional government, what are we fighting for?

Unless Congress can control the power of the purse, this country may become a dictatorship. Does it matter by what name a dictator is called? Does it matter by what scheme and device the Constitution is bypassed? Does it matter how skillfully a legalistic mind discovers a loophole through which he can snare a trick? The effects are the same.

Therefore, the fight in Congress over this issue may go far afield. It may even lead to an inquiry as to expenditures during the past 20 years.

Col. C. H. Lindsay, the Miracle Man of Cypress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks I wish to include those which I made recently after a trip through a most picturesque cypress swamp in Louisiana.

There is a song about a dream walking and talking. Well, do you ever see a dream growing? If you had been with me recently, you would have been exceedingly privileged to have seen thousands of rare and very remarkable dreams growing. There in a picturesque Louisiana tidewater swamp stood giant cypress trees over a hundred feet tall, in all their majestical splendor.

This trip was arranged by Col. C. H. Lindsay, vice president and general manager of the Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co., of Ponchatoula, La. Many State and parish officials, two Congressmen, and business leaders and their wives from various parts of Louisiana boarded the log train which was to take them for a ride they would never forget, but long remember and cherish. All preparations had been worked out in the minutest detail to make the trip in comparative luxury and ease. Included in the trip were 57 from various parts of Louisiana; 15 from nearby communities; a total of 72 visitors on the train.

A NATURE'S WONDERLAND

This particular area of swampland is located just north of Lake Pontchartrain, which likewise is just north of New Orleans. Lake Pontchartrain was named by Iberville in honor of Count de Pontchartrain, who was then Minister of Marine in France and who arranged and organized the celebrated Iberville expedition to America.

As we jogged along the private railroad—owned and operated by the Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co. for its cypress logging operations—we soon found ourselves miles back in a beautiful swamp, truly a nature's wonderland. No women and few men, except logging employees, had ever been there before.

It was truly an awe-inspiring sight to behold. Colonel Lindsay, aided by a loud speaker system, began to tell the story of the growth of this genuine red tidewater cypress. Soon, as though we suddenly found ourselves in another world, we were looking at a cypress tree well over 2,000 years old. The record age of the oldest tree taken from this swamp was 3,960 years. Standing there and realizing that those trees started growing two, three, and four thousand years ago, is like manna from heaven for one's imagination.

Detail by detail, Colonel Lindsay gave us something that our fondest imagination could never even dream of. Here we were, riding on a railroad on log cars drawn by a steam locomotive on a railroad not built on solid ground but on imagination as Colonel Lindsay calls it; but, actually on no man's land, because there is no land, just 2 or 3 feet of water, then a slippery and disintegrating muck far more treacherous than quicksand. The track, which actually partially floats, goes down from 1 to 2 feet as the heavy train rolls over, and then bobs up again when the train has passed.

A FLOATING RAILROAD

All cross ties that hold the rails are made of cypress, otherwise they would rot away in one or two years, submerged in water.

So, you wonder who built such an amazing floating railroad? And how? Frankly, it is a magnificent accomplishment, especially when the comparatively low cost for this kind of expensive construction is considered. But, thanks to Colonel Lindsay, with his "Rube Goldberg" ingenuity, he personally invented and built this track-laying machine, the only one of its kind in existence. This machine is self-propelled, carries its own cross ties underneath, reminding one of the way a kangaroo carries her young, and lays—with only seven men working—80 feet of railroad a day. Without this machine, with three times as many men, only one fourth or 20 feet of railroad can be built per day.

The question came up of how similar cypress was logged before this railroad building technique was devised. Cypress logging previously was accomplished by a very expensive, often cumbersome and somewhat unsatisfactory pull-boat operation. Giant steam shovels on barges floated in by the nearest water inlet, dug large ditches through the swamp areas and the cypress logs were pulled out of the adjacent swamps by pull-boats and loaded on barges or tied together as logs and floated to the mill. This was most expensive, and in many instances, unsatisfactory.

Soon, in the distance, we saw steam flying in clouds. As we approached this area we saw a railroad spur, or side track, on which a steam-operated log loader was loading cypress logs, that had been cut and stacked on cars, to be hauled to the saw mill on this floating railroad.

TOONERVILLE TROLLEY UPSIDE DOWN

When the question was asked, "How did those logs get stacked or piled up that way?" Colonel Lindsay replied, "You will see for yourselves in a few minutes."

We did see for ourselves, because as we traveled on we were switched to another spur where we again noticed puffs of steam. Here was a most unique machine—another one of Colonel Lindsay's remarkable inventions—bringing out logs on an overhead trolley high in the air, reminding us of the so-called Toonerville trolley operating upside down.

In most logging operations, the logs stay close to the ground. The very opposite is true here. The so-called trolley wire is some 50 feet in the air. It goes back from the railroad some 600 feet. Giant log tongs, attached to a cable, roll back and forth on a giant pulley on this trolley wire. Workmen take the tongs back into the swamp where the logs are cut and attach them to one, two, or three logs. Then the steam from the machine on the railroad starts hissing and the logs are raised high in the air and rolled across the trolley wire, to be piled along the railroads so the loader we had previously seen could pick them up and load them on railroad cars. It would be impossible to drag these logs on the ground, due to the dense undergrowth of the swamp, so the log first has to be raised high in the air and then pulled on this elevated trolley wire to the railroad.

As the sun was going down, we turned around and started back toward Ponchatoula. One of the guests asked what Ponchatoula meant. Colonel Lindsay explained that it was an Indian name meaning an Indian maid's flowing hair.

It was fortunate that we were traveling by rail, because to walk back through that swamp would have been practically impossible. Only skilled trappers and hunters travel in this swamp by foot, and even they are limited to short distances daily.

A WORKER IN CYPRESS

One of the guests in our party mentioned that in his 45 years he had never seen anything like these cypress trees in this swamp. His companion countered: "And in more than 3,000 years these cypress trees have never seen anything like us."

It was not very long until I was seated in Colonel Lindsay's private office at the Louisiana Cypress Lumbering Co.'s mill in Ponchatoula.

In a way this office is as picturesque as the swamp that we had just visited, except in a completely different manner. All the walls are of magnificent cypress paneling. The office furniture, the venetian blinds, were all made of cypress. His telephone is on a unique sliding device—only one of its kind anywhere—that is made of cypress. The large steel safe, where the records are kept, is cleverly covered with beautiful cypress paneling and would grace the loveliest home as a prize piece of furniture.

Actually his office, its walls and contents, are all of cypress. My curiosity at this point was getting the best of me and I had to say, "Who made all of this astounding cypress work?" In a modest tone, Colonel Lindsay pleaded guilty. He had made it—and much more, I was later to learn—with his own hands in his own work shop, in what he called his spare time.

A REAL SUCCESS STORY

Right then and there my suspicions were about to unfold—this was one of the most unique and amazing individuals I had ever encountered—and Col. Claude H. Lindsay is an amazing man. His life and his success read like a Horatio Alger story, except that it is not necessarily from rags to riches, because he did not start out in rags and he is not rich, but rather his is a life of amazing accomplishments, he having begun at the bottom and climbed to the top rung of the ladder of success.

Forty-three years ago, in 1908, Colonel Lindsay started out with this same lumber company in Eros, La., as a kid, willing to do any kind of work. He was sort of a handy man around the mill, even though he was in his teens.

Two years later he was promoted to apprentice machinist and took to machinery like a duck takes to water. His rise was meteoric. He served for 4 years, then was promoted to shop foreman, and in 1918 received the promotion to master mechanic of all the mills this company operated, including its railroad, the Tremont & Gulf Railroad. In 1930 he moved to Rochelle, La., and was promoted to general superintendent of the Rochelle mill. In the comparatively short period of 22 years he had risen from a willing kid around a little mill to general superintendent of one of the largest mills in the United States.

Shortly thereafter this company decided to buy the mill owned by Joseph Rathborne Lumber Co., in Ponchatoula, and operate it under the name of Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co. Colonel Lindsay, in 1931, was given full responsibility for this operation. However, he postponed this operation—and wisely, too—because of the depression, until July 16, 1936.

HE PROFITED BY HIS MISTAKES

To get an insight into this man's thinking is to analyze this mill's operation. It was supposed to last for only 10 years, or to be finished or cut out by July 1946. This is practically the last large stand of ancient red tidewater cypress in the United States. Because of this scarcity, and the fact that it does not decay nor is it subject to attack by termites, its demand is greater than for any other kind of lumber. It is truly the "wood eternal."

Realizing this, Colonel Lindsay, profiting by years of experience, cut down the daily capacity of the mill and concentrated on getting the best grades possible by careful and improved mill operation.

"Unfortunately," he said, "In the olden days when we were cutting virgin long leaf pine, we didn't pay much attention to getting the best grades by skillful mill practices in sawing the logs, but rather the supply seemed unlimited, so the general idea was to cut the greatest number of board feet per day, regardless of making the best grades by skillful cutting. All the mills then did the same.

"So, naturally, I tried to profit by the mistakes the lumber industry made in the past." He not only tried, but he succeeded. He was the first person to ever cut cypress, pine, and hardwood, in the same mill. By doing this the company actually made more money and the mill, instead of cutting out in 10 years, has been operating 14 years, and many believe it has 10 more years to go—thanks to Colonel Lindsay.

Incidentally, Colonel Lindsay was the first lumberman to put an oak flooring plant as far south as Ponchatoula. Most lumbermen said oak flooring could not be successfully manufactured in that territory. Colonel Lindsay said it could and he did it.

A PERMANENT MILL

The new mill at Joyce, La., which cuts 80,000 feet daily of pine and hardwood is also under his supervision. Whereas it takes cypress hundreds and thousands of years to develop into a saw log, by contrast pine grows rapidly, making a saw log in from 20 to 30 years under favorable conditions. By selective cutting this mill will operate permanently because the pine timber on the lands owned by this company will grow faster than it is being cut.

Sitting in Colonel Lindsay's office and admiring the cypress paneling, the chest of drawers, filing cabinets, tables, and all other types of office gadgets all made of cypress, one's eyes are attracted to four pictures on the wall—each with a cypress frame around it.

"Those are pictures of the three generations of the Joyce family that owned this company." First came David Joyce, the grandfather; then, his son, William T. Joyce, who died in 1907; next, his sons, David and James S. Joyce. Now, there is only one living heir, who before her marriage to Doctor Kean was Beatrice Joyce. She is president of the Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co. and Tremont Lumber Co., and at present resides in Chicago, Ill. The holdings today of the Joyce Lumber organization include the Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co., at Ponchatoula; approximately 130,000 acres of pine timberland in north Louisiana; the Tremont Lumber Co., at Joyce, La., and Chatham, La.; and the Tremont & Gulf Railway Co. The Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co. and the Tremont Lumber Co.

are under the supervision of Colonel Lindsay.

A MOST VERSATILE MAN

You would think, with all this responsibility, that Colonel Lindsay would not have time for anything except running these massive operations. His son, Hubert, is assistant superintendent and is following in his dad's footsteps. But, Colonel Lindsay has time for many outside activities. To me he is the Will Rogers of the lumber business with his modest humor, his kindness, and above all else, his friendly feeling and genuine fondness for his fellow men.

In my book he is one of the best I have ever seen in dividing his time. He is not so big and busy in this vast operation as to lose his identity as a human being, who lives a relatively simple private life as a citizen of Ponchatoula, a town of 4,000 inhabitants. He and his delightful wife share an attractive home there in Ponchatoula. His benevolence and charities seem endless. He is one of the most public-spirited individuals any town or city could boast of. Pasadena may have its Rose Bowl, and New Orleans its Sugar Bowl, but he helps to see that Ponchatoula has its Cypress Bowl. He even makes the trophy, a giant cypress bowl, himself, in his woodworking shop in his spare time.

Many churches have elaborate cypress paneling and altars which he himself built and donated. The altar and pulpit that he built for the Catholic Church in Ponchatoula—he is a Protestant, but helps all churches—would make England's immortal George Hepplewhite turn over in his grave with envy. It is truly a magnificent accomplishment in cabinet making.

Hardly can you find a man more versatile. He personally helped lay out the football stadium there at the Cypress Bowl. He takes time off to annually present the cypress bowl to the winning football team. He developed 23 different kinds of cypress molding, known in the cypress lumber trade as CHL No. 1 to No. 23, inclusive. The only place in the world that has these 23 kinds of moulding is there in Ponchatoula.

It was Colonel Lindsay who recently designed, for the Joyce interests, the new mill at Joyce, La. This mill, just recently constructed, is one of the most efficient and finest mills in our Nation, thanks to the creative genius of Colonel Lindsay.

INVENTS GRATELESS FURNACE

In Chicago, on swank Michigan Boulevard, an ultra modern building designed by some of Chicago's leading architects, is being erected and many parts of the building have beautiful cypress paneling and molding, all designed by Colonel Lindsay.

A prominent engineer, a graduate of Georgia Tech, requested the blueprints from Colonel Lindsay of his drawings of grateless furnace, which he designed in 1930. This engineer said it was the finest precision drawing on this type of furnace he had ever seen. A hurried phone call in 1949 came from the distant Blind River, Canada, requesting Colonel Lindsay's original drawings on how to erect steam boilers with grateless furnaces.

The citizens of Ponchatoula decided that they would fix Colonel Lindsay once and for all, by promptly kidnapping him one night, via the strong-arm method, hustling him over to the schoolhouse. When they took the blanket off his head everyone was singing, "Happy Birthday to You." There were all the public officials, the high-school faculty, the coaches, and all the businessmen and their wives to celebrate in a gigantic birthday party.

Being extremely civic-minded, Colonel Lindsay has been most active in civic affairs. Two governors of Louisiana have honored him by placing him on their official staff as colonel. Mayor Morrison, of New Orleans, made him honorary member of his staff, and the New Orleans police force and the mayor extend to him, at all times, the courtesies of all municipal departments. He is a member of all lumberman associations, and an honorary citizen of Boy's Town. He is even an honorary deputy sheriff.

"You see those three generations of Joyces," said Colonel Lindsay. "They have all passed on. There is only one left—Mrs. Kean—but they, like many others of their kind, played a big part in making this Nation the greatest nation in this world. You see this organization just didn't happen. It takes many kinds of different individuals, each with different traits and abilities, working as a team to accomplish our success.

EACH MAN PLAYS A ROLE

"Take those men working in that mill, many of them can do things in the mill that I couldn't do. Yet, by the same token, they couldn't do my job. I could not do what those three generations of Joyces have done. Yet on the other hand they wouldn't have done what I do. They are needed, those employees are needed and I believe I am needed for the respective part that each of us has played in developing this organization.

"You see, those three generations of Joyces"—again pointing to those pictures—"they died at a comparatively young age. They had an insatiable desire for success. They lived hard and they worked hard. Many people would not have necessarily done that—they are not constituted that way. They would have done it differently, been satisfied to live a different life. But that is why those fellows named Joyce played such a big part in this organization. They made it possible to have this big operation. Without them there would be only a small operation or no operation at all.

"So, you see there are thousands of similar Joyces all over the United States, playing the same part in their respective organizations—each, of course, under his true name. Their determination, their uncanny skill in financing, their creative executive ability, all combined into one intent, caused me to be where I am, caused those workmen out there to have secure employment. They are happy. I am happy because we all play on the same great team. There are thousands of just such other great teams in America—some smaller, some larger. That is why we are the greatest industrial Nation in the world. God Almighty must have intended it that way."

UN Saved Temporarily Not by Its Own Wisdom or Courage or Integrity but by Red China's Rejection of Its Appeasement Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

RED CHINA'S REJECTION OF UN'S OFFER CLARIFIES UNITED STATES POLICY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Secretary of State Dean Acheson has been saved by outsiders from what might have been a disastrous course.

Red China has rescued American policy from the disastrous fix in which it would have been stuck had Mao Tse-tung and his comrades accepted the UN cease-fire offer. For that offer illogically combined an end to aggression in Korea with a discussion of the future of Formosa and of a seat for Red China at the United Nations.

By refusing and offering counter terms that border on the insolent or the farcial (according to the point of view), Red China's Foreign Minister Chou En-lai has taken our Secretary of State off a very hot spot. There is little doubt in my mind that, had the Chinese Communists been sly enough to accept, they would have provoked in the United States a furore that would have driven Mr. Acheson from the State Department.

In this case, it is proper to note that the State Department had foreseen, one may even say, had gambled on, the certainty of a refusal by Peking. Mao Tse-tung's answer justifies that gamble.

Had Mao accepted he would also have deprived the United Nations of what little authority it still possesses. Cynics and appeasers may consider smart that organization's readiness to negotiate with an outrageous aggressor. Most Americans are unable to see anything admirable in a readiness of the world police to hear from the criminal the exact terms upon which he is ready to desist from lawlessness.

UN AIM—PREVENT AGGRESSION

The Government of India may argue that the UN's primary aim is to lessen the punishment of aggression rather than to preserve world peace The Government of the United Kingdom and of some other countries, unhappily including Canada, may reason that since the law-abiding countries lack the strength to keep order all over the world, it is the part of wisdom to dicker and stall in the less important region, namely, in Asia.

Most Americans cannot see the wisdom of this. Those millions who cheered the formation of the United Nations at Dumbarton Oaks and at San Francisco did not do so in the expectation that they were merely creating a new diplomatic forum at which a number of countries, unwilling to help uphold world order, could diplomatically maneuver the United States into the acceptance of immoral policies detrimental to the security of the United States. I refer specifically to the policy of supinely turning over Asia piece by piece to communism.

Those Americans who most firmly support the United Nations have hoped that the international body would prevent further aggression by legalized police action. They understand that if peace is to be kept by progressive surrender to aggressors, this needs no international aggression—as Britain's

Chamberlain and France's Daladier demonstrated at Munich back in 1938.

THANKS FOR INSOLENCE

Our foreign friends, including our Canadian and British allies and those Indians to whom we are on the point of sending a large amount of wheat at a gift, might just as well learn now that the American people refuse to be a party to any further appeasement.

They may consider our insistence on the creation of enforceable world law to be a sign of our immaturity. They may scoff at and criticize our flat refusal to recognize what they call political realities in Asia.

Personally, I shall not mind a bit. Having noted how Nehru's Hindus insanely massacred Moslems merely because they were Moslems, and having seen how he refuses to patch up the insignificant Kashmir affair, I disbelieve in India's morality and in its love of peace.

Having unhappily lived through the inexcusable diplomatic blundering of British diplomats between the two world wars, I have small respect for their present political sagacity, particularly not when I see them repeating the same blunders in Asia.

Therefore, as I said before, I remain thankful for the unacceptable insolence of Mao Tse-tung and his friends.

NECESSARY FUTURE STEPS

From here on, it seems to me, our road is both clear and straight.

We should continue the war in Korea, if necessary by ourselves, until the Chinese get sick of being slaughtered.

We should refuse to discuss the future of Formosa so long as aggression continues anywhere in Asia.

We should rearm our friends on the island to make them proof against any sort of attack. We should not discourage them from taking the offensive against Red China whenever they feel capable.

We should further bolster Viet Nam in Indochina.

Finally, we should announce that under no circumstances will we accept an aggressor government as a member of the UN—preventing its entrance by our veto, if necessary.

And should these steps, as is likely, provoke new shrieks from New Delhi, Ottawa, and London, we should gently but firmly tell Messrs. Nehru, Pearson, and Bevin to go roll.

"The Nation's New Budget—It Calls for $71,000,000,000 in Addition to the Blood, Sweat, and Tears the Year Ahead Will Demand of Us, More Than Half of Every Dollar for Defense Alone—Against the Curtain of These Hard Facts, NBC Television Presents Dr. John R. Steelman and Your Twenty-third Battle Report"—Battle Report, Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the hundreds of letters of commendation I have received, no day passes but what some Member of this body speaks to me of the tremendous interest they find in the television broadcast, each Sunday afternoon over the National Broadcasting Co. network, entitled "Battle Report, Washington."

This, as you know, is the program sponsored by the National Broadcasting Co., on which—without the hawking of merchandise or a commercial of any kind—Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, presents top-flight Government officials to the television audience of this Nation. These, in turn, make direct reports to our people with respect to matters that come within their immediate jurisdiction as Federal officials. At various times in the past, not alone the Members of the President's Cabinet, but many other top-flight civilian and military officials of the Government have spoken on this program.

Last week, in the twenty-third Battle Report, Washington, Mr. Steelman spoke with respect to General Eisenhower's trip to Europe, and succulently summed up the task which lies ahead of the general by saying that—

Today, he must assess accurately what is available in Europe—what manpower is available—what material is available—and, above all else, what spirit is available, for the support of the free world.

Additionally thereto, Mr. Steelman presented a former colleague of ours, who once having represented the Third District of Florida, became the Governor of that State—and now bears the heavy responsibilities that go with the title, Administrator of our Civil Defense Administration, the Honorable Millard F. Caldwell.

In addition thereto, he presented the Honorable James J. Wadsworth, Acting Deputy Administrator; the Honorable George C. McGhee, the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs; as well as Pfc. Rufus McAdams, of the Seventh Division, K Company, Thirty-first Infantry, who was in the planned withdrawal from the reservoir in Korea to Hungnam a month ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to observe the tremendous interest and the will to do on the part of the Assistant to the President in rendering this splendidly presented and real service to the American people. Anybody who follows closely teledocumentary Battle Report, Washington, certainly is not alone in tune with the times, but well informed about the current matters of their Federal Government which are of greatest interest to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to learn that the famous Jones twins, on Wednesday, January 24, took off on a tour of the trouble spots of Europe and the Near East—where they will serve as camera correspondents for Battle Report. Inasmuch as they will cover any and all points of interest in the European and Near Eastern areas, we, in America, can look forward shortly to seeing their work.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind you that these are the young men, Gene and Charlie Jones, natives of Washington, D. C., who, after seeing action in the South Sea Islands of the Pacific in World War II, returned from that war to take up employment with the National Broadcasting Co. and various local daily newspapers.

Immediately upon the opening of hostilities in Korea last June, these two intrepid cameramen were hired by the NBC Television—and spent months at the front in Korea. There they shot some 25,000 feet of combat film, which pictures today constitute some of the finest top-flight pictorial coverage made of fighting in the Korean war from the very time of its inception.

One of those splendid American Jones boys was critically wounded at Inchon, where he hit the beach with the first wave, and who, despite his wounds, a mere 3 weeks later parachuted with his brother Charlie into North Korea with a portion of the Eleventh Airborne Division.

Mr. Speaker, you may be assured that the splendid service now being given the American people by the Honorable John R. Steelman, Ted Ayers, producer, and the National Broadcasting Co., will be further augmented by the pictorialization of the actual conditions that obtain in Europe today in all of the free nations in that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, in order to bring the Twenty-third Battle Report, Washington, of Sunday, January 21, to the attention of my colleagues and the millions of Americans who are as yet without television, I ask the unanimous consent of this body to extend my remarks and include the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That Battle Report is as follows:

Mr. MCCORMICK. The Nation's new budget. It calls for $71,000,000,000 in addition to the blood, sweat, and tears, the year ahead will demand of us—more than half of every dollar for defense alone. Against the curtain of these hard facts, NBC television presents your Twenty-third Battle Report.

Washington, where this week the House asked the UN to pin the tag, "aggressors" on the Chinese Communists in Korea. Korea, where our air power is now blasting away to stall the build-up for the expected new Red offensive.

Today, Battle Report selects from representatives of our diplomatic and fighting fronts, as well as from the field of civil defense, to paint a picture of the war as we see it, here in the Nation's Capital. But first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Five and a half years ago, General Eisenhower returned home from Europe after leading the allied forces to a glorious victory fought to preserve the dignity of mankind.

Two weeks ago today, General Eisenhower was again in Europe—this time to begin his fact-finding tour of the Western European nations who are pooling their resources once more to preserve the way of life cherished by democratic countries. The Supreme Commander of Allied Powers in Europe faces a difficult task * * * he must assess accurately what is available today, what manpower is available, what material is available, and, above all, what spirit is available for the support of the free world.

While General Eisenhower has been devoting all of his energies to tying the free world together for its common defense, the Communists have been employing their usual insidious techniques in an effort to discredit his mission and to destroy its successful conclusion. The Cominform is doing its utmost to foment anti-Eisenhower demonstrations throughout free Europe. Regardless of what

these Communist-inspired demonstrators are saying, they mean one thing: "Let us stay weak and defenseless and disorganized—so that we may join those happy and fortunate countries under the tyrant's heel behind the iron curtain." Though the Soviets may seem to enjoy temporary gains through such antics—subversion and strikes—they cannot seriously expect to fool people indefinitely.

At this moment, the Nation is responding to the urgent need for organizing an effective defense against attack on civilian populations. Telephone calls—letters by the hundreds—have been received here from individuals, from organizations • • • offering aid, demanding to help. Everyone wants to do something. Here are two men who can tell you what is being done about civil defense: Gov. Millard Caldwell, Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, and James J. Wadsworth, Acting Deputy Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration.

While the modern nation of Turkey is only a vest-pocket edition of the once far-flung Ottoman Empire, it continues to play an important part in world affairs. Today, George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, will discuss Turkey and the adjacent Kingdom of Greece, both vital in containing the avaricious ambitions of Soviet expansion, Greece in Europe, and Turkey, athwart the path to the rich resources of the Middle East. Also, Mr. McGhee will touch on some of the problems of south Asia.

The appearance here of one of our boys who has been in Korea is to me a dramatic and solemn occasion. Pfc. Rufus A. McAdams, of the Seventh Division, was in the planned withdrawal from the reservoir to Hungnam last month. He comes to us today from Walter Reed Hospital especially for Battle Report.

And, so again, we see what our Nation is doing on several battlefronts. May God assist us on each.

Mr. McCormick. Just this past week, the man to oversee our Nation's civil defense setup was confirmed by the Senate. Former Governor of Florida, and once representing its Third District in Congress, he now bears the heavy responsibilities that go with the title. Administrator of our Federal Civil Defense Administration, ladies and gentlemen, meet Millard F. Caldwell.

Mr. Caldwell. The Civil Defense Act, as recently passed by Congress and signed by the President, concerns itself with more than mere survival. It creates an active civil defense force which would enable our strategic target cities to recover quickly from an enemy attack and get back into the fight.

Ours is not a passive nation under such circumstances. We do not take attacks lying down. We are not people who run from trouble or hide from an aggressor. No foreign power has ever been able to make us do either of those things. No foreign power is strong enough to make us do them now—unless we let it.

The trained civil defense force that we need can only come into being, however, through the voluntary efforts of millions of Americans. Civil defense must begin with the individual and his local authorities; not with the Federal Government. As civilians, we must have the courage and determination to do what is expected of us. Quite simply, that means we must stick to our homes and jobs, no matter what happens.

Under the Civil Defense Act the Federal Government can lay down a blueprint for reorganization at regional, State, and local levels. It has already done so. The Federal Government can advise, guide, and consult with civil authorities who are charged with the responsibility of carrying out the national plan. It is doing so and has been doing so.

The Federal Government can also stockpile equipment and supplies, build, and operate a warning and communications system, set up training schools and courses, instruct, and inform the public, and supply matching funds for the building of shelters and the purchase of certain civil defense needs. All these things will be done as soon as possible, following congressional appropriation of the funds needed to implement the Act, which is expected promptly.

The passage of the Civil Defense Act did not, of course, automatically create and staff an operating organization. It merely established the legal basis for transforming civil defense plans into action. It now becomes my duty, as Administrator, to press that action along the lines already laid down—and to do it as quickly as possible. We have not a moment to lose.

As Administrator, I have only one ambition—to make the Federal Civil Defense Administration the best staffed, best run, most efficient and most effective agency in government. It has always been my practice in administrative posts to surround myself with the best people I could find. That will continue to be my practice in this post.

I am confident that the national program for civil defense will bring out the best of our national qualities if trouble comes. As a Nation, we are capable of great triumphs of individual effort and organizational skill. Neighborly help in time of disaster, which is the basis of the civil defense program, has always been a part of our national tradition.

Therefore, I have no hesitation in asking the full cooperation of every man, woman, and child in the defense of our homes. As the President said when he signed the Civil Defense Act, "No true American would want to give less than his best to that cause, and no one who knows the American people could ask for more."

Mr. McCormick. London well remembers the horror of its World War II ordeal by rocket bomb. The V-1's, shown here, sent over by the Nazis, called for every ounce of courage Britain could muster, plus a civil defense system that couldn't falter. While some of the rockets were shattered in the air by defense planes, many fell unimpeded to the ground to kill and destroy. Matched with the threat of the atom bomb which leveled Hiroshima and Nagasaki—the problems these memories pose for our civil defense are slightly short of terrific. What is being done now to protect our American cities? What specific action has been taken to date? Because you have every right to hear the answer from one of our top officials, we focus now on the Federal Civil Defense Administration's James Wadsworth, Acting Deputy Administrator.

Mr. Wadsworth. Six months ago, only 18 States had appointed civil defense directors. Today, every State, every Territory, and the District of Columbia, has a competent, full-time director with authority to act by legislation or executive order. That simple comparison is a fair measure of the progress we are making in civil defense.

There are other encouraging reports. Many of our strategic target cities have already inventoried their disaster resources. A number have tested their civil defense plans under hypothetical attack, or are ready to do so in the near future. All of our major metropolitan centers have civil defense organizations in being, and are working out mutual aid plans with nearby communities in cooperation with their State directors.

Enlistment of auxiliary policemen and firemen is under way in many places. Hundreds of doctors and nurses throughout the country have received instructions in radiological defense. Thousands of volunteer wardens have been trained in cities where civil-defense programs are well advanced. Transportation, communication, and utility systems have been checked and strengthened in critical areas. Existing buildings have been designated as air-raid shelters, or are being surveyed for that purpose.

On a national basis an air-raid warning code has been established. It is estimated that a few minutes of advance warning plus a well-organized civil defense would cut our casualties in an atomic raid by at least 50 percent. Specifications for radiological monitoring instruments have been issued to the States, with the Federal Civil Defense Administration offering to pool orders to reduce costs and insure high standards of performance.

To inform the public fully on what to do in the event of atomic bombing, a 32-page booklet has been issued under the title "Survival Under Atomic Attack." More than 5,000,000 copies have been distributed to date. A motion-picture dramatization of this booklet is now in preparation, and will be widely televised shortly after its first appearance in theaters throughout the country. Other public-information booklets will follow shortly and will be publicized in the same way.

A manual entitled "Health Services and Special Weapons Defense" has been prepared and sent to State medical officers. This 250-page volume deals with our defenses against germ and chemical warfare, as well as radiation sickness. Still another manual entitled "The Fire Effects of Bombing Attacks" has been issued for the guidance of fire-fighting services.

For the individual citizen who asks, "What can I do?", the American National Red Cross has mobilized its facilities and chapters in cooperation with the Civil Defense Administration to carry out three major activities in which anyone can take part, now. These are the first-aid programs, in which 20,000,000 people should be trained as quickly as possible; the blood-procurement program and the nurses'-aide and home-nursing program.

Perhaps more important is the growing rejection, by the public, of the "take-to-the-hills" attitude, which was in evidence a few months ago. We are beginning to realize, as Americans, that there is nothing to be gained by giving up our homes at the first hint of trouble. On the contrary, if we were to abandon our cities and surrender our production lines, we would lose a war for the first—and last—time.

Once that idea sinks in most of us will be determined to stand by our homes and jobs, no matter what happens. If we do that, our individual chances of survival are good. Our national prospects are certain. We will withstand any attack which an enemy might hurl against us—and come back to win.

Mr. McCormick. From these front lines in Korea—while men work out the problem of protecting us here at home—comes better news than we've heard for a long time. Our troops are no longer in retreat. In a series of counteroffensives—the first since we lost Seoul—they are suddenly lashing out at the enemy. Latest reports have the UN forces stabbing deep inside Red lines on three icy sectors. Wonju was reoccupied without opposition, and there is fighting now near Osan, 28 miles southeast of Seoul. Fortunately, America, we are not in this battle alone. Other nations, closer to the real enemy than ourselves, recognize this fight as theirs, too, and are assisting it as best they can. For some pertinent information on this score we turn our cameras now on the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, George Crews McGhee.

Mr. McGhee. Now, we'll take a look at the Near East and south Asia. This vast area of more than 500,000,000 people bounds Russia and Communist China on the south for 4,000 miles. This area has close ties with Europe and the west. What happens there is of vital concern to us and the rest of the free world. None of these countries are Communist. If they are attacked, they will defend their freedom.

The peoples of the Near East and South Asia are increasingly disturbed by the threat of Soviet aggression and by developments in Korea and China. They realize their vulnerability and their relative weakness. The strategic near-eastern bridgehead between Europe and Asia and Africa has been coveted by every would-be conqueror from Alexander the Great to Hitler. Soviet ambitions clearly include taking over, sooner or later, the inhabitants of the vast territory in the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean areas.

These lands contain great resources—half the world's oil, and important quantities of manganese, rubber, and other essential raw materials. They constitute almost half of the manpower resources of the free world. The Near East is, moreover, the gateway to the fabulous riches of the African Continent, the uranium of the Congo, the copper, chrome, and industrial diamonds.

I want to highlight the response of two countries in this area to the Soviet Communist challenge. I refer to Turkey and Greece. Both have extensive frontiers with the iron curtain. Both realize that their security depends upon the strength and unity of the free world. Both contribute to the defensive strength of other countries in the Near East for which they set as a shield.

Moreover, these two countries have voluntarily and enthusiastically supported the larger cause of collective security through the United Nations in Korea. Although Korea is farther away from them than it is from us, they realize that if aggression were not stopped in the Far East, the forces of aggression would soon turn to a new victim—perhaps to them. Their contribution to the United Nations forces in Korea has been outstanding.

For instance, the Turkish brigade of 4,500 men is the equivalent, population-wise, to 34,000 American troops. We have all followed with admiration the fighting prowess of the Turkish soldiers in Korea. A few weeks ago, they volunteered for a dangerous rear-guard action of great importance. Although surrounded, they accomplished their mission and heroically fought their way out.

As for the Greeks, they have courageously defended their homeland against Communist aggression. Since World War II, Greece has lost about as many men fighting Communist guerrillas in Greece as we have lost in Korea, although their national population is only 5 percent of ours. Greece sent to Korea her best troops, thoroughly trained in mountain and commando type warfare.

It is true that in some of the other countries of the Near East and South Asia, the governments have felt unable to make a contribution to the UN effort in Korea. This has resulted from various factors, but more because of a feeling of military weakness than from any lack of desire to support the UN. Some states have unfortunately not seen eye-to-eye with us on all details of handling the conflict in Korea, but they have, through their spontaneous cease-fire effort, sincerely sought to restore peace.

With the growing strength which is resulting from our own rearmament program, new confidence and hope will be given to our friends in the Near East and South Asia that they and the rest of the free world can be defended against Communist aggression. There is a growing recognition on their part that their own true interest calls for a step-up in their own efforts to strengthen their individual and collective defenses.

We must vigorously seek to increase such strength wherever we can. The potential of the free world is tremendous. It is great enough to assure ultimate victory in any conflict. If it is to be fully realized, we must achieve increasing mutual understanding and teamwork on the part of all the free nations.

Mr. McCormick. When the war in Korea is history, America—the story of it will lie long on many tongues. And among the tales that are sure to be passed down from father to son, are the bitter, heroic days that are summed up with two words "Changjin Reservoir." For it was here, entrapped in the frost-biting cold, and struggling against perhaps the most overwhelming odds that ever faced modern American combatants, that the GI—beating out his escape—wrote an unforgettable chapter in American military history. With us today is a young veteran of the Changjin Reservoir engagement. His name, Rufus McAdams. His home town, paradoxically, Winter Garden, Fla. His outfit, Seventh Division, Thirty-first Infantry, K Company. His rank, private first class, and his story, well—How did the battle start?

Private First Class McAdams. Well, Bob, the battle started when we first arrived at the reservoir. I was on guard from about 3 to 4 in the afternoon—I and a South Korean. Just about 10 minutes before I came off guard, I noticed a person coming down the railroad track and wondered if it was an enemy or one of our men which we we sent out about 200 yards down to the track as a machine-gun nest. Getting closer, I halted the man and found out he was one of our boys. The machine-gun nest had been overrun and he had been wounded during the battle. I and the South Korean took him to the medics. Before we had a chance to get back to our position, the enemy had already overrun our position, so we had to pull back and start fighting, too.

Mr. McCormick. And you didn't even know the enemy was anywhere near you?

Private First Class McAdams. No, Bob; we didn't know they were anywhere around. So, after fighting that night and the next day—for 4 days—out of our company of 260 men we had 60 men left who were able to fight.

Mr. McCormick. You mean 200 men were killed or wounded?

Private First Class McAdams. Two hundred were killed and wounded.

Mr. McCormick. In 1 day's fighting?

Private First Class McAdams. One day's fighting—and the night. After getting supplies from the air—we got most of the supplies, but Chinese got the rest. After fighting for 4 days, we decided our best chance was to try to get our wounded, and what men we had left, out. So we loaded our wounded on trucks and assigned guards to them and pulled out. After about one-half hour's travel, I got wounded for the first time in the left leg. Proceeding on for about another 2 hours, I got wounded again in the left arm. That's where we met the convoy. I was put on a truck for about 4 hours. After fighting our way through road block after road block, we finally got as far as we could with about 4 trucks out of the 20 we had.

Mr. McCormick. You mean 4 trucks out of 20 got through.

Private First Class McAdams. Well, we got through to the last road block. I don't think any of them managed to get through there. With one truck, we tried to get down and make a break down the railroad track and after about 100 yards the truck got hit. I was hit, too, and was thrown off the truck. Making my way back to where the other three trucks were and what few men were left, and the wounded—we finally tried, six men, to get back to where the marines were.

Mr. McCormick. Could I go back for just one second? These trucks were burned, you say?

Private First Class McAdams. Yes. After getting back up to where these three trucks were we noticed two trucks about 300 yards down the road. The Chinese had already poured gasoline all over them and set them on fire with wounded in them.

Mr. McCormick. You mean our wounded were burned alive in trucks?

Private First Class McAdams. Yes; they were, Bob. After seeing that and what few men were left, I and six other guys who were wounded decided to try to make our way back up to where the First Marine Division was. After going through the woods for about one-half mile, we came across a creek—I fell in and this caused my feet to get frostbitten like they are now. After going for about another half mile, we came to a Korean village, where we stopped to get some water and rest awhile. We found a security police, and he said he would guide us to where the Marine division was, so we left and went on our way. About one-half mile down the road, we came to where the road forked and we noticed that whatever was up there was having a little battle. So we decided we'd leave the Korean there—we didn't trust him any more. We went on up the road for about another mile—then we met the First Marine Division. I was sent to a station hospital—and then flew from there to Tokyo and then back to the States.

Mr. McCormick. One other thing. What about the cold? You should be a first-hand witness to that. Ladies and gentlemen, not only frozen feet, but frozen hands. Is it as cold as we hear it is?

Private First Class McAdams. It is, Bob. Sometimes it is from 10 to 20 below in the morning and afternoon.

Mr. McCormick. Do you ever get warmed up? How do you warm up?

Private First Class McAdams. Well, the only chance to warm up is to find a little brush and build a fire—and when you have time, and they're not firing too bad, you can warm up. Most of the men take turns getting out of the foxhole to warm up.

Mr. McCormick. Thank you very much, Private First Class McAdams. Not only from NBC and Battle Report, but also from your country.

Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another teledocumentary—this, then, against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your twenty-third Battle Report, Washington.

Muzzled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, spread over a period of years, I have made an effort to destroy the "yes man" psychology which hinders Congress, who represents the American people, from getting first-hand and straight-from-the-shoulder opinons from the military spokesmen of the Nation.

Among the many editorials supporting my efforts is the following one that appeared in the January 24 issue of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa.:

MUZZLED

Representative James E. Van Zandt, of Altoona, Tuesday called attention in a Congress speech to a growing tendency in this country to endeavor to pattern our thoughts and policies, and eventually probably, our actions and our lives, along lines laid down by the Central Government in Washington.

The Altoona Congressman's verbal attack was aimed at a "confidential directive" which he said had been issued by Secretary of Defense Marshall prohibiting officers of the armed services from speaking for publication unless they confine themselves "to the

bounds and policies which have been publicly announced by the White House, State or Defense Departments."

"JANNEY" said a similar directive in 1946 ordered officers to support in testimony before Congress only the budget estimates recommended by President Truman. Said Representative VAN ZANDT:

"No wonder we were unprepared for Korea."

And he recalled that a number of top-ranking military leaders were reprimanded or lost their posts because "they spoke their mind."

Said Mr. VAN ZANDT, "This yes-man psychology is the ruination of good government and especially of our national defense."

The truth of this indeed has been proved by Korea, and by our fumbling on the diplomatic front.

Mr. Truman obviously has been endeavoring to control the thinking of all our officers and governmental leaders. As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, he appears to think it is his right to direct the thoughts of every man under him.

It was obvious during the armed services hearings on unification and in the B-36 investigation that officers appearing as witnesses were reluctant to give their personal opinions. Those who did, as in the case of Admiral Denfeld, were demoted or fired.

Of what value is officer experience if all thought is to be guided by official directives?

The stultifying effects of the restricted unification hearings have been tragically apparent.

Freedom of our officers, and our other leaders, to think for themselves gives power to our country and our Government.

The authoritarian doctrine that the head of state can do no wrong, that policies emanating from the seat of government are sanctified, and not to be questioned, has brought one nation after the other down into the dust.

The defeat of Nazi Germany depended in the end upon many factors. But, one of the most important of all was Adolf Hitler's insistance upon using his own judgment, and in refusing to defer to the wisdom of his skilled officers.

Representative VAN ZANDT indicated that the latest "muzzle" to be imposed upon our armed services was the result of the strong public statement issued last week by Air Force Maj. Emmett O'Donnell, one of our top aerial strategists, who returned the other day from Korea, and criticized our restrictions in Korea, the mandate which prevents us from bombing or attacking China or Manchuria.

General O'Donnell said he favored use of the atomic bomb. It is likely that the general was so incensed by the bitter handicaps imposed upon us by the UN in Korea that he spoke out for the strongest weapon we have.

The American public, judging General O'Donnell's remarks on the basis of what we know about the Korean War, would agree with him, we believe.

It is an unfair handicap to place upon a fighting force to direct that they must not strike back at the enemy nation.

Red jet planes attack our forces from across the Yalu River border, and return there quickly. Once across that river, they know they are secure from attack. American planes may not chase them across that river, and may not attack them or their bases, once over the border.

Yet, these planes can emerge safely from their sanctuary and strike quick blows at us, then dash back to their haven.

The Chinese Red army is being supplied from lines and bases which could be destroyed * * * if our forces with the UN army were a free, American fighting force, instead of "policemen," to use Mr. Truman's term, serving a master, who apparently would be eager to get rid of them.

There Are Nearly 2,000,000 Guerrillas Fighting the Communists in China; Proper Aid by Us Could Make Them a Major Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the New Leader of January 22, 1951. Its author, William Caldwell, is a Washington news man and radio commentator. If it is right for Americans boys to be fighting Chinese Reds in Korea, why is it wrong to let or to help Chinese anti-Communists fight them on their own soil? Do we want to win in Korea, or don't we? If we do, then why not do everything possible to weaken the enemy. If we do not, then why should our Government ask Americans to die in fighting them? How long can this two-faced murderous policy be continued?

OUR SECOND FRONT IN CHINA

(By William Caldwell)

WASHINGTON.—A second front in China—effectively maintained and supported—could upend Stalin's timetable for Asia. It could prevent the capture of Korea and Indochina, the outflanking of Thailand, Malaya, and Indonesia, the isolation of Japan, and the complete neutralization of India. It could relieve American, British, and French troops for the defense of Europe, and cause new strains on Soviet war industry.

A number of public figures, including Senators STYLES BRIDGES and PAUL DOUGLAS—have urged the creation of such a second front by mounting an invasion of the Chinese mainland by Nationalist troops from Formosa. Actually, our potential second front in China already exists. It consists of nearly 2,000,000 guerrillas now actively harrassing the Communists in every corner of China. Peking has repeatedly claimed the destruction of these forces, but they have grown from less than 400,000 in September 1949, to 824,000 in January 1950, to 1,667,000 last August. These are the figures of Dr. T. F. Tsiang, Nationalist China's UN delegate; but on April 28, Christopher Rand of the New York Herald Tribune estimated that half the land area of China was in anti-Communist hands. The chief reason for the guerrillas' growth was also indicated by Dr. Tsiang, when he revealed last June that more than 15 percent of the resistance units were commanded by former Communist officers. Mao Tse-tung himself on June 13, while claiming that a million resisters had been rounded up since the withdrawal of the main Kuomintang armies from the mainland, conceded that there are still more than 400,000 bandits to be annihilated."

The underground forces received a great spur last fall when Communist Premier Chou En-lai announced a full-scale land reform for Central and South China. Chou said this program would involve "China's second fiercest class struggle"; the first, of course, was the setting up of the Communist regime, which took 22 years and untold millions of lives. Chou conceded this time that 200,000 bandits were still rampant, but claimed that the Reds had arrested 12,797 secret agents and unearthed 175 secret radio stations.

This was one of the more modest Communist claims of destroying the resistance movement. Radio Moscow on October 23 said that 20,000 "United States military intelligence agents" had been arrested. Pravda added that 2,000 radio stations had been seized. On August 16, the Communist news agency claimed the back of resistance had been broken in most areas of Central and South China, and that 210,000 guerrillas had been wiped out there in the past 6 months. Last winter, they claimed to have killed another 130,000 bandits in Honan Province alone. On August 8, 1949, General Teng Wen-yi, discussing the revolt of 170 village societies of Honan, declared that 240,000 guerrillas had just been wiped out in Honan, Hupeh and Anhwei Provinces. The most grandiose and most recent Communist claim of guerrilla annihilation came last November 15, when the Chungking radio claimed that 400,000 bandits had been liquidated in the previous 6 weeks. Chungking added, however, that "Kuomintang espionage agents will not stay down, but have become very active."

STRONG IN SOUTH CHINA

The area where anti-Red guerrillas are most numerous centers around the province of Szechwan in West China, but since mountain barriers prevent any effective link-up with other guerrilla forces, the most important underground groups are the ones in central and south China. The traditionally revolutionary provinces of Kwantung and Kwangsi in south China have been a subject of mounting concern to the Communist authorities. The Central and South China Military and Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party admitted last March that Lukfung County (in Kwantung, between Hong Kong and Swatow) was "infested with bandits" and that 14 Communist officials had been killed by the "Kuomintang agents." By last summer, Kwangsi Governor Chang Yun-yi was complaining that the people of the province had been "deeply affected by the deception and propaganda of reaction" and that there still existed the "feudalistic, anti-alien ideology of Pan-Kwangsiism." (The latter label is based on the fact that South China resents the Communist troops in the area, who come mostly from Manchuria and Shantung.)

The Governor of Kwangsi said spring uprisings had led to the slaying of 105 Communists. In a bitter report to Peking, he declared:

"The masses were incited into organizing insurrections, public grain stocks were robbed, rural workers were killed, local government offices were attacked and all sorts of evil acts committed."

With the withdrawal of large occupation forces to Korea, conditions have been getting worse for the Communists in Kwangsi and Kwantung. On December 29, 2,200 Russian advisers were sent to Canton, martial law was proclaimed in the city, and 7 new Communist divisions were dispatched to the Kwantung area. Within the city, a cultural purge was under way: six Canton newspapermen (along with two in Wuchow, Kwangsi province, and one in Shanghai) are known to have been executed as cultural special agents on December 1. A week before the proclamation of martial law, a Soviet plane at Canton's Pailyun airfield was destroyed, and Formosa claimed that in the 2 weeks ending December 6, the strategic Canton-Hankow railway had been damaged seven times.

Probably the most effective underground force is the one concentrated in inland central China in the Provinces of Honan, Hupeh, Anhwei, Hunan, and Kiangsi. The main Chinese railways bisect this area. The Communist news agency had reported peasant revolts in Anhwei as early as June 22, 1949; Communist Gen. Lin Piao declared

some time later that fuedal rule and the influence of bandits and Kuomintang agents is still very strong in the villages. In the year that followed, the Reds made several claims of destroying the guerrillas, adding up to a total of 380,000 annihilated. Wang Shou-tao, the Governor of Hunan, did admit last summer that many of our old and new cadres were lost.

ANTISABOTAGE FORCE

At the time, he claimed that there were only 13,000 guerrillas left in his province. But Peiping announced on October 24 that a force of 1,157,000 would be "recruited" to quell the guerrillas in these areas. Three days later, the Liberation Daily of Shanghai revealed that 200,000 troops were being "recruited" to fight guerrillas in northern Anhwei alone. And on November 14, the Peiping radio announced that Red China's regular 5,000,000-man army would have to be supplemented by an armed militia of 5,500,000 for the express purpose of combating "sabotage."

The guerrilla movement today has little to do with the political factors involved in the old civil war; it is based on direct experience with the Communist regime in power. According to Christoper Rand, "The unifying factor in the guerrilla movement is a resentment against the Communist regime—chiefly against its grain levies."

This resentment extends right into the Communist party and army. The party, which grew from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 between 1948 and 1950, had to launch an intensive period of "criticism and self-criticism" last summer. On July 26, the death penalty was established for "American agents." Formosa claims that on November 7 some 15,000 troops mutinied outside Wusih on the Shanghai-Nanking railway. On November 13, the party cracked down on Voice of America listeners. And on November 19, on the Honan-Hupeh border not far from Hankow, a full division of Lin Piao's Fourth Field Army is reported to have rebelled and joined the guerrillas. Of the Chinese soldiers taken prisoner in Korea, a great majority expressed their desire to join the Nationalist armies on Formosa.

Can the guerrilla forces within China become an effective second front? The answer lies with the United States. The guerrillas' prime needs are encouragement and equipment—mostly small arms and radio gear. Both of these could easily be provided by the United States. Our air drops enabled guerrilla forces in wartime Greece and Yugoslavia to develop into full-fledged armies. If the United States Air Force is restrained from officially aiding the guerrillas, military men here propose the formation of a new group of volunteer airmen, like Gen. Claire Chennault's Flying Tigers, to aid the guerrillas. But if the United States is not determined to surrender east Asia to the Mao Tse-tung regime, a program for the liberation of China would have to include:

Full-scale airdrops of arms, ammunition, and radio gear to the guerrillas, under the direct supervision of an American airman (General Chennault perhaps).

A twofold political program for the post-liberation establishment of an all-China constituent assembly under UN supervision and for large-scale United States and United Nations economic aid to the Chinese people. This program would have to be vigorously enunciated again and again through every possible medium to the people of China.

WORK WITH FORMOSA

Full representation for all guerrilla forces in the Republic of China Government on Formosa. While this reconstituted government should be readmitted to full partnership in the Far East, both we and the Nationalists should make it clear that it is an interim government, to be dissolved on the election under UN auspices of an all-China constituent assembly.

Pin-point non-atomic bombing of China's important railway and supply centers. This would have to be preceded by a long bombardment of warning messages to the Chinese civilians, urging them to evacuate these centers and/or join the guerrilla forces.

When guerrilla forces have attained critical military importance, American air and sea forces should assist the Chinese Nationalist armies to link up with the guerrillas by invading the mainland.

This program, which enjoys the support of increasing numbers of military men since the turn of events in Korea, would require considerable expenditures on the part of the United States. But, it is argued, greater expenditures will have to be made in Indo-China, Malaya, India, and Japan if communism is not stopped in China, and these efforts will have a much slighter chance of success. What is more, in those nations we might have to use large numbers of western troops; in China we would be availing ourselves of the largest anti-Communist force in Asia, without involving a single American foot soldier.

All of which leads to Washington's $64 question: What about Chiang Kai-shek? Will his popularity or unpopularity affect seriously any program for the liberation of China? Military men here point out that United States diplomats have been calling Chiang inadequate since 1944, and yet, in all of that time, have not been able to name a single other figure around whom non-Communist Chinese would rally. These military men still remember the ill-fated experiment with Li Tsung-jen in 1949, which considerably accelerated the disintegration of the Nationalists on the mainland. Quite possibly, new and stronger leaders may develop now, from the ranks of the resistance movement, if it is properly encouraged.

To offset the possible effects of self-seeking interests within the Kuomintang, and to put the Free China program on the broadest possible footing, it is urged that an outstanding American general, acceptable to the Pentagon and to the Chinese, be given full power over all American economic and military aid to the anti-Communist Chinese. For this post the outstanding candidate is Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, whose 1947 report on China now stands up as a model of sobriety and cool thinking. Such an appointment, combined with the constant reiteration of America's pledge to help China choose its own government, would offset any deleterious effects resulting from Chiang's alleged unpopularity and emphasize anew that the struggle against Stalin is one for all peoples.

In an era of tranquillity, the urgency of such a program would not be too clear. But with Lin Piao's armies driving our divisions down the Korean Peninsula and appeasement and neutralism sweeping the Orient, it has become clear that freedom must make a stand in Asia. The men and women best qualified to make that stand are the people of China, whose long and courageous resistance to Japanese and Communist imperialism entitles them to their just share in the fight for a free world.

Extend Reciprocal Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act will come before Congress this week. Since its original enactment, this legislation has proven to be a highly constructive step both for the economic welfare of our country and the improvement of good trade relations with other nations.

The Rules Committee has reported a rule for its extension and I hope Congress will extend our reciprocal trade agreements with an overwhelming majority.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune reflects a general endorsement given this legislation throughout the country:

EXTEND RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

The Reciprocal Trade Act is back before Congress for consideration. The 2-year extension voted in 1949 will run out on June 15. A 3-year extension is being sought now, and it ought to be approved.

Congress has approved the principle of reciprocal trade agreements seven times since the law first was enacted in 1934, so that it would seem an extension for an even longer period might be approved. The trade act has been called "the cornerstone of our foreign economic policy" and it is especially important that it be retained in the present international situation.

The reciprocal trade law never has come within the framework of the bipartisan foreign policy, but Republican support of it has been increasing through the years. Indeed, the GOP might claim some credit for originating the idea on the basis of flexibility provisions carried in Republican tariff acts prior to World War I.

When the reciprocal trade law first was enacted in 1934, only two Republicans in the House and five in the Senate voted for it. In 1945, when a 3-year renewal was voted, Republicans in the House divided 38 yeas to 140 nays, in the Senate 15 yeas to 16 nays.

Republicans were in control of Congress in 1948 and they gave a 1-year extension overwhelming support. However, the extension law carried restrictions, including the peril-point plan. In 1949, with the Democrats again in control, the act was extended in substantially its original form. The House Republican vote was favorable, 84 to 63, although the Senate GOP division was 15 yeas to 18 nays.

If the act is worth extending, it should be retained for at least 3 years. Anything less gives an impression of uncertainty not to be desired in our dealings with other nations.

Government Waste Contributes to High Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following material:

With the widespread interest in the terms and effect of the price order issued last Friday evening it is increasingly important to examine the operations of the Department of Agriculture in its food purchase and hoarding program. Surely no one will deny that the Department's activities have a significant effect upon

the prices of similar commodities in the open market.

The loss incurred by the Department on the disposition of five commodities and the carrying charges, as compared with the same operation last year, reveal astonishing increases.

The official figures follow:

	Loss on disposition		Carrying charges	
	Nov. 30, 1949	Nov. 30, 1950	Nov. 30, 1949	Nov. 30, 1950
Butter	$2,370.47	$20,016,867.67	$997,549.26	$1,823,674.03
Cheese	101.74	7,497,151.54	117,524.44	1,213,265.35
Dried milk	[1] 205,663.34	13,963,071.26	1,205,372.42	2,196,257.37
Dried eggs	828,919.22	15,973,710.88	920,657.07	1,247,898.92
Irish potatoes	5,350,344.40	13,081,657.29	1,391,675.14	357,612.45
Total	6,410,078.49	70,541,478.69	4,142,708.33	6,840,706.02

[1] Represents gain.

This is a percentage increase of 1,000 percent in loss on disposition of commodities; 65.1 percent in carrying charges; and 633 percent in the total of both items.

Surely it is of vital importance for the appropriate congressional committees to develop the full details of the Department's operations and, through legislation and limitations on appropriations, insure that these practices are eliminated.

The American Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the American Scholar, winter edition of 1950, written by Mr. Clinton Rossiter, which I believe will be of interest to the Members:

THE AMERICAN MISSION

(By Clinton Rossiter, associate professor of government at Cornell University)

The belief that God or providence or fate occasionally singles out a nation for some higher destiny is a striking example of the power of ideas in history. It sustained ancient Israel, the "holy people unto the Lord thy God"; it apparently helps sustain Soviet Russia, "the beacon of the toilers in every land." And surely the vigorous American conviction that God also chose this people to fulfill a historic mission has been a profound ideological force in our national development.

We seem to have been chosen for different missions at different times. The Puritan of 1640, the revolutionary of 1776, the Federalist of 1800, the expansionist of 1850, the Union soldier of 1865, the missionary of 1875, the imperialist of 1900, the idealist of 1917, the interventionist or isolationist of 1940—each of these has entertained his own surmise of the purpose for which America was called into being. Yet one solid belief has flourished from the beginning as the finest expression of American nationalism. This is the concept of the model republic, an article of collective faith that we may properly term the American mission.

It is a simple belief—comprehensible, viable, and endlessly serviceable. It assumes that God, at the proper stage in the march of history, called forth certain hardy souls from the old and privilege-ridden nations; that He carried these precious few to a new world and presented them and their descendants with an environment ideally suited to the development of a free society; and that in bestowing His grace He also bestowed a peculiar responsibility for the success of popular institutions. Were the Americans to fail in their experiment in self-government, they would fail not only themselves but all men wanting or deserving to be free. If such government could not work here, it could not work anywhere. America was to serve as a "testament to freedom." Or, to vary the analogy, it was to be the "laboratory of democracy," in which God could mix the best of all possible men with the best of all possible environments, and determine once and for all whether liberty was worth the pains.

The belief in the mission, in one variant or another, has been part of the American tradition since the first settlements. Great and remembered men, presidents and philosophers, and small and forgotten men, preachers and country editors, have stated and restated their belief in our unique responsibility for the defense of human freedom. Now, in a time when Americans are specially self-conscious and soul-searching about their obligations to other nations, the idea of the mission invokes our renewed attention. The progress of this idea is worth recording.

Massachusetts Bay was the nursery of the mission. Winthrop and Cotton, and a host of lesser men, looked upon themselves as latter-day Israelites, never doubting that God had brought them over the sea for a purpose higher than their own well-being. The kind of men they were, the trials they had borne, and the conditions under which they hacked out their wilderness Zion fostered a well-nigh universal assumption that this was not just an experiment, but the experiment, in the manner of society that God had ordained for his chosen vessels. The impassioned cry of William Stoughton in his election sermon of 1668—"God sifted a whole nation that He might send choice grain over into this wilderness"—was echoed in dozens of doughty books like Cotton Mather's Magnalia Christi Americana (1702) and Edward Johnson's Wonder-Working Providences of Zion's Savior in New England (1654), and in dozens of pioneer pulpits from Saco to Southbury.

Like all righteous people, the New England saints were prone to self-righteousness, and heavy upon the nonconformist lay the hand of the Puritan who felt himself in the hand of God. Yet there is something admirable about these colonists who believed so tenaciously in their moral-historic ascendancy over all other nations, however proud and mighty, and who could bring added vigor to their efforts by exhorting one another to repay God for His extra care with zeal in His service. In a simpler age, when the power of ideas was more visible than today, it was a matter of consequence that men believed, in the words of Jonathan Edwards, that America was called to be "the glorious renovator of the world."

Toward the end of the seventeenth century, the thoughts of more and more colonials shifted from piety to liberty, and the true American mission took widespread root. One of the first to express this thought was John Wise, of Ipswich, who ended his noble democratic preaching in 1725, as he had begun in 1675, by exhorting his listeners to give "recognition of what God has done for these famous English colonies" and govern themselves after the dictates of reason. At the same time, three further variations of the mission of America won popular acceptance: as asylum for the "miserable people on the continent or isles of Europe"; as future savior of the mother country in distress, and as greatest and richest of nations, destined by its splendor and spiritual elevation to carry all older nations in its orbit. The first two of these prophetic and hortatory sentiments were most eloquently proclaimed by Jonathan Mayhew, of Boston, in The Snare Broken, a sermon of sober rejoicing on the repeal of the Stamp Act. The mission of America as asylum was also vigorously advertised by such revolutionary figures as Franklin, Paine, Jefferson, and Freneau. The prophecy of untold future splendor was spoken by many Americans, but it remained for an Englishman, the estimable Berkeley, to voice, some 50 years before the Revolution, the grandest fancy of American destiny:

"There shall be sung another golden age,
The rise of empire and of arts. * * *
Westward the course of empire takes its way."

Despite these refinements and flights of imagination, the central idea of America's divinely appointed mission remained that of a people who by mere example would advertise liberty to all nations. This vision was a conspicuous arrow in the well-filled quiver of the great revolutionaries. For them spoke John Adams as early as 1765: "I always consider the settlement of America with reverence and wonder, as the opening of a grand scheme and design in Providence for the illumination and emancipation of the slavish part of mankind all over the earth." And he agreed with hundreds of other patriots that the defeat of the colonies would mean the defeat of liberty everywhere.

The American mission came to flower with the adoption of the Constitution. The "Father of the Constitution" reminded the Philadelphia convention that "it was more than probable we were now digesting a plan which in its operation would decide forever the fate of republican government," reason enough to aim for the best. Washington, too, was conscious of the mission. In his first inaugural address he expressed the conviction that "the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people." In his Farewell Address he hoped that the "free Constitution" would be worked in such a manner that it would recommend itself "to the applause, the affection, and the adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it."

The Jeffersonians were, if anything, even stouter believers in the higher destiny of the infant Republic. Jefferson, who had proposed that the seal of the United States picture "the children of Israel in the wilderness led by a cloud by day and a pillar by night," never wearied of saying that Americans had a clear responsibility for the promotion of liberty. In 1802 he wrote Dr. Priestley:

"We feel that we are acting under obligations not confined to the limits of our own society. It is impossible not to be sensible that we are acting for all mankind; that circumstances denied to others, but indulged

to us, have imposed on us the duty of proving what is the degree of freedom and self-government in which a society may venture to leave its individual members."

And just 10 days before he died, in the last of his exhortations, he could say of the Declaration of Independence:

"May it be to the world what I believe it will be (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all), the signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which monkish ignorance and superstitution had persuaded them to bind themselves, and to assume the blessings and security of self-government."

For all men in this heroic age, whether Federalist or Republican, merchant or "mechanick," pious or secular, President Ezra Stiles, of Yale, spoke as prophet of inspiration in the United States Elevated to Glory and Honor. If he foretold wealth and might and dominion, he did so only to remind his Connecticut listeners that God gave these good things to those who deserved them, in this instance to a people determined to prove to a doubting world that "a democratic polity for millions, standing upon the broad basis of the people at large," could be made to work. The American mission was an influential ideological force in the formative years of the Republic.

In the decades of expansion, most Americans lost sight of the interpretation of the Nation's mission formulated by Washington and Jefferson. This was the age of Manifest Destiny, a phrase of huge import coined by John O'Sullivan in his Democratic Review in 1845. The loudly voiced assertion that it was America's duty to expand without delay to its natural geographic limits obscured the simpler, uncombative beliefs of the founding fathers. Even the concept of America as asylum for the "huddled masses yearning to breathe free" was made to serve this muscular version of the national destiny. "If ours is to be the home of the oppressed," thundered Representative Duncan, of Ohio, in the debate over Oregon, "we must extend our Territory in latitude and longitude to the demand of the millions who are to follow us, as well of our own posterity as those who are invited to our peaceful shores to partake in our republican institutions."

Yet the idea of the model Republic had lost none of its appeal for more thoughtful men. Andrew Jackson reminded his fellow countrymen that "the eyes of all nations are fixed on our Republic," and in his farewell address observed that "Providence has showered on this favored land blessings without number, and has chosen you as the guardians of freedom, to preserve it for the benefit of the human race." No less convinced of this truth were his opponents, Story and Calhoun. Said the first of these, "We stand the latest, and, if we fail, probably the last experiment of self-government by the people." Said the second, "We may * * * do more to extend liberty by our example over this continent and the world generally, than would be done by a thousand victories." Representative Severance, of Maine, countered the shrill cries of the expansionists by urging that we "rather extend the 'area of freedom' by * * * our bright and shining example as a pattern Republic."

The philosopher and the poet joined the statesman in this persuasion. Emerson proclaimed his belief in the Nation's peculiar destiny: "The Office of America is to liberate * * * I wish to see America a benefactor such as no country ever was." He hoped profoundly that we would contribute "our peculiar and legitimate advantages to the benefit of humanity."

And, of course, Walt Whitman:

"For we cannot tarry here,
We must march. * * * We must bear the brunt of danger,
We the youthful sinewy races, all the rest on us depend,
Pioneers! O Pioneers!"

Politer folk preferred to hear this message from Longfellow:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!"

The mission was given one final prewar turn by the economist, Henry Carey. In his Principles of Social Science, published some 11 years after Marx had proclaimed the inexorable antagonism of classes, Carey called America to testify that the class struggle was not the inevitable consequence of an industrial civilization.

"Such is the true mission of the United States * * * to prove that among the people of the world, whether agriculturists, manufacturers, or merchants, there is perfect harmony of interests, and that the happiness of individuals, as well as the grandeur of nations, is to be promoted by that greatest of all commandments, 'Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you.' "

The fateful meeting of the great American and the great American crisis cast this antique doctrine in a new and vital role. Repeatedly Lincoln expressed the persuasion that the cause of free government everywhere hung in the balance of this epic struggle, and repeatedly this theme was hammered home in press and pulpit. For Lincoln the mission was an article of national faith, "felt in the blood and felt along the heart." His profound distaste for slavery derived to an important degree from his opinion that the mere existence of human bondage as a legal and social institution virtually destroyed our claims to be the model republic. On the road to Washington he dedicated himself to "that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time." And in his dramatic message to the special session of Congress, July 4, 1861, he made clear the historic purpose for which he at least could justify the letting of fraternal blood:

"This issue embraces more than the fate of these United States. * * * This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men."

He returned to this belief again and again, as if it alone had power to revive his flagging faith and give some semblance of moral purpose to a war that must have often seemed a senseless pageant of suffering and corruption. He confided to Hay, "For my part, I consider [that] the central idea pervading this struggle is the necessity that is upon us, of proving that popular government is not an absurdity." He reminded Congress that it was not alone the Union but "the last, best hope of earth" that we would "nobly save or meanly lose." And finally at Gettysburg he made clear that he had acted and "these honored dead" had fought so "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." Thus with the help of the American mission, did Lincoln sublimate into an eternal symbol the best remembered of the Nation's battlefields.

In the decades of industrial, continental, and finally overseas expansion that followed the close of the Civil War, the doctrine of the mission was twisted into several unlovely and almost unrecognizable shapes. The generation of high-spirited Americans who went a whoring after the false gods of imperialism likewise went a whoring on a swarm of idealistic but hardly democratic missions. Anglo-Saxony, the native version of the myth of the superior people, called upon Americans to ready themselves for inevitable triumph in the mysterious process of racial Darwinism. A close kin was the White Man's Burden, which a host of American Kiplings heralded as America's mission of the twentieth century. The belief in inevitable and God-given empire, an inflated version of Manifest Destiny, was voiced by Mahan, Lodge, Beveridge, and many others. Even the missionaries, especially those of the more vigorous Protestant groups, fell victims to this unattractive imperialistic trauma. "The taste of empire is in the mouth of the people," observed the Washington Post, "even as the taste of blood in the jungle." The true American mission was weak ideological meat for a people with Havana and Manila on their hands and minds. And the Isthmus of Panama. To Senator Morgan, of Alabama, the building of the canal had become "the proud mission of our Government and people, under a providence that is as peculiar to them as the founding of the kingdom of the Messiah was to the seed of Abraham."

The most dramatic proponent of these imperialistic notions was, of course, the rough-riding President. Roosevelt never doubted that the hand of God pointed out the high-road of international stewardship to the deserving American Republic. A weird but decipherable combination of democrat, jingo, missionary, and Anglo-Saxon, he had nothing but contempt for the argument that America should teach the world democracy by example alone. In the end, perhaps, the spirit of the age was more boldly heralded by his friend Beveridge, although Roosevelt would have been "de-lighted" to associate himself with these remarks:

"God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No. He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. Were it not for such a force as this the world would relapse into barbarism and night. And of all our race He has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world."

This was hardly the American mission as conceived by Washington and Lincoln.

It remained for Woodrow Wilson to hack away this jungle growth and lay bare the American mission in its pristine simplicity. Not only did he mount that rescue-party for freedom that Mayhew had foretold some 150 years before, but he created almost single-handed a pattern of high-minded values as the ideological support for American participation. And of these none was more exalted than the mission. He told Americans that this Nation had always been destined to lead mankind "in the assertion of the rights of peoples and the rights of free nations; as destined to set a responsible example to all the world of what free government is and can do for the maintenance of right standards, both national and international." Our immediate mission was to make the world safe for democracy; our ultimate mission was to show the world that democracy was worth saving.

The missionary urge, the call to duty that assigns the Republic a historic responsibility nobler than the mere defense of its own independence, lives on in a half-dozen recognizable forms. Harry S. Truman, Henry Luce, Henry Wallace, Francis Biddle, Eric Johnston, David Lilienthal, and Paul Hoffman are a few of those who have recently exhorted their countrymen in the idiom of the mission. Yet their versions, most of which look to the export of American ideas and institutions, are framed in terms of active proselytism. The true American mission seems to have lost its popular appeal—perhaps because there are now so many

other testaments to freedom, perhaps because it lends itself so easily to the discredited cause of isolation, certainly because those Americans who recognize our obligations to other nations appreciate that the force of good example is not enough in this savage world.

Yet it would be unfortunate were we to lose sight of the authentic American mission. If we must have a mission—and historically and spiritually we probably must, whether dictated by God or providence or sheer utility—why should it not be this humane and humble version of a universal trait of national consciousness? Admittedly it can serve as a cloak for the revival of the most short-sighted, ethnocentric stamp of isolationism, but only if internationally-minded Americans permit it to be stolen from their keeping. The American mission, a view of national destiny neither vulgar nor imperialistic, can certainly be squared with a healthy attitude of international cooperation. And at the same time it can continue to serve as a healthy spur to domestic improvement—in race relations, education, politics, labor-management relations, and all the other major areas in which we might, if we felt the world's gaze fixed upon us, be better Democrats.

And no matter what positive obligations we assume toward other nations, or what ideological adjustments we make in assuming them, it is inconceivable that this doctrine, which Ralph H. Gabriel ranks with the fundamental law and the free individual as one of the three leading articles of our democratic faith, could be cast upon the scrap heap of outworn American ideologies. If we are no longer the only testament to freedom, we can still be the most notable. America, which seeks to meet the vast problems of sectional, economic, racial, and religious diversity with democratic solutions, has much to teach by mere example. The American mission is yet to be fulfilled.

Communist Hungary's Anti-Jewish Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since Soviet Russia has embarked on a policy of anti-Semitism and mistreatment of its Jewish minority in Nazi fashion, the Communist satellite governments of Eastern Europe are following the dictates of Moscow by adopting similar policies toward their own Jewish minorities. A striking example is Communist-dominated Hungary, where the Jewish community of 160,000 souls has undergone a vicious campaign of political repression in recent years. Hungarian Jewry has been rendered destitute by the Communist regime, its religious and communal life has been subordinated to the state, and the flourishing Zionist movement among the Jews of Hungary has been outlawed and destroyed.

Not only have the Jews of Hungary been robbed of their rights and nearly all earthly possessions, but according to recent reports they are on the verge of wholesale deportations to the concentration camps of Siberia. Anti-Semitism is rampant in Hungary, the Jews and other religious minorities are regarded with suspicion because they look to America and the west as their last hope for eventual freedom.

The well-known magazine, the New Leader, in its issue of January 15, published an article Do Hungary's Jews Face Communist Liquidation? by Bela Fabian, himself a former victim of the Nazi concentration camps and a veteran Hungarian democratic leader. He is in contact with the underground now working against the Communist regime in Hungary and is said to have been the first to predict the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. His article follows:

DO HUNGARY'S JEWS FACE COMMUNIST LIQUIDATION?—SATELLITE REGIMES ARE ROBBING JEWS OF RIGHTS AND PROPERTY; WHOLESALE DEPORTATION MAY COME

(By Bela Fabian)

(Bela Fabian, himself a victim of Nazi concentration camps, is a veteran Hungarian democratic leader. He is now a member of the Hungarian National Council, with wide contacts in the Hungarian underground. He was the first one to predict (in the New Leader of January 1, 1949) the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.)

Gyula Peri is as large as a giant. In 1944 he and I had been deported to Auschwitz in the same cattle car. On our first night in Auschwitz, he intercepted with his huge body the blows intended for me. On December 10, 1948, he came to visit me in New York. He had just escaped from Communist-ruled Hungary.

"Why did you leave, Gyula?" I asked him. "You are no politician. Surely you could have lived inconspicuously."

"I did not want to live to see the sealed cattle cars again," he replied. "You will see, they will come again."

Although I have no illusions about the Communist regime in Hungary, I listened to Gyula's words with doubt. But very soon the information coming to me from within Hungary began to confirm my friend's expectations. All the events within Hungary point to the possibility that the cattle cars of deportation may soon be rolling out of the country again. A few months after my friend's visit, I got the first hint of what was coming.

On February 7, 1949, at 6 o'clock in the evening, Premier Matthias Rákosi received five delegates of the Hungarian-Jewish Public Office. All Hungarian Jews, both Neologue and Orthodox, were united in this organization. Ministers Gerö and Révai were also present. The delegation was led by Lajos Stockler, the president of the Jewish community of Budapest, and by Dr. László Benedek, its vice president.

The Jewish delegation entered Rakosi's majestic office at Akademia Street, which is furnished with works of art and precious antique furniture stolen from the aristocracy, and lavishly decorated with pictures and Persian carpets. Minister Joseph Revai received the delegates with these words: "Gentlemen, we are now among ourselves."

"Does this mean that we are among us Jews?" asked one of the delegates. He referred to Rakosi, Gero, and Reval, who are Jews by birth.

"No," Gero replied, "among us Communists. According to my knowledge, neither I nor my comrades Rakosi and Reval are Jews, we are nonsectarian; we are Marxist-Leninist-Stalinists. Our prayer is our work for socialism."

Stockler and Benedek approved this. But an elderly lawyer declared:

"We are here to discuss the following vital problems: the quick decline of city Jews to beggars; the growing hostility of the Hungarian Communist Party to the Jews, whether or not they are party members; the Government's new policy toward Zionism and against the emigration of Jews to Palestine."

To this Matthias Rakosi replied:

"Do you believe, comrades, that we Communists will give up our progressive economic policy because it does not suit the Jewish bourgeoisie, or because it is disagreeable for them, or because they feel themselves injured? Do you believe, comrades, that we shall make exceptions for your fellow religionists? That we shall do this when only the indigents and their sons, as well as the former members of the forced-labor battalions of the Horthy regime, are our sincere adherents? Do you believe that you really are the chosen people? A state within the Communist state? Do you believe we shall close our state-owned department stores, our socialized hotels, cafes, etc., which because of their low prices drive the Jewish businessmen into increasingly painful bankruptcy? Do you believe that we shall tolerate the old bargaining? If you came to discuss such problems, you had better go."

JEWS PROWESTERN, ANTI-COMMUNIST

Révai added to this:

"Don't you know that the Jewish bourgoisie is conspiring against us? And this together with the big landowners, big-business men, bankers, fired state officials, and priests. Not only here in this country but also on the other side of the borders. Vile Jewish jokes against the Communist regime are spread throughout Budapest. We have documents to prove that you Jews give money to the Mindszenty clique for the purposes of espionage, for the organization of 'Black gangs,' for the restoration of the throne of Otto Hapsburg, the king of rich Christians and Jews?"

Dr. László Benedek agreed. He said: "I am a Communist in the first place and a Jew only in the second place. I am on your side. The former wealthy Hungarian Jews are incurable. They are the enemies of the Soviets. They are the adherents of the west. They do not deserve anything but the whip, the jail, and bayonets."

Rákosi then explained the new official Communist stand on Zionism: "The present State of Israel is a nationalistic state, its government is hypocritical, by no means democratic, and has taken up the attitude of 'hurrah nationalism.' The present state functionaries are under American influence and, moreover, are in the service of the Western Powers preparing for war. You can find no traces of Socialist arrangements in Israel, either in politics, economy, or education. Ben-Gurion and Shertok are the puppets of Washington. We have good proof of this. The elections in January were a tragi-comedy. Eighty to ninety thousand voters were crossed off the lists. What kind of voters? Those voters who did not make a secret of their solidarity toward the Soviet Union. This is how this election result was obtained. An American bluff, which means a slap in the face to everyone who knows the political structure of the present State of Israel. I do not speak of the ingratitude of the government, which ought to thank the Kremlin for everything which was done for Israel in world politics and in the UN. We have recognized the government, which is corrupted to the bones. The Kremlin was the first to recognize the State of Israel. Only after that Truman came hesitatingly, because he saw that our policy toward Israel undeniably showed the generosity and sincerity of the Soviet Union. Only after that did Truman also act, followed by

all the chessmen of the Washington chessboard. But they still allowed Bevin to make a few little moves to exploit the recognition of Israel by the Kremlin for their anti-Communist agitation in the Arab States. I do not wish to speak of Israel having got their best weapons for this war from the Czechs through the intervention of Moscow. The members of the Government of Israel are simply scoundrels in the pay of Washington. They will live to see unexpected things. Those Jews who are Communists, that is practical political revolutionaries, will understand us. And those who do not understand us shall feel our impact."

Another delegate, an old Communist foreman in a great Budapest printing plant, who had been a Zionist for decades, said timidly:

"This is why we would like the Communist-trained Jews to lose less time than last year in going to Israel so that they can do their best for the revolution."

Rákosi replied:

"This, comrades, is out of the question. Comrade Rajk [this was before the Rajk purge—Ed.] has already explained our point of view to the Minister of Israel. Old and sick Jews can get out of the country, but only with their most necessary household utensils, without any other property. But workers we need ourselves. The young Jews must use their efforts and strength in this country."

"We inform you," Rákosi continued, "that the government will shortly dissolve by the stroke of a pen all Zionist recruiting offices, schools, organizations, denominational and nationalist underground movements. We shall tolerate no longer the Zionist machinations in Hungary. The Minister of Interior, Comrade Kádár, will remove this illness of Hungarian Jews by an operation."

After the death of Zhdanov in October 1948, it was no longer a secret that anti-Semitic instructions had arrived from Moscow to the Communist governments of all the satellite countries.

Shortly after my conversation with Gyula Peri, I received more news as to how these instructions were being acted upon. I received a memorandum from a former professor who miraculously escaped from a Transylvanian prison. By chance he was put on the same train in which Rumanian Jews were being deported. He described how the bodies of those Jews who perished on the journey were thrown out of the train, just as they had been thrown out of the cattle cars on their way to Auschwitz.

ASKED OLD NAZI QUESTIONS

The chairman of the 1949 Rajk trial, Vilmos Olty, formerly a prominent Nazi, posed the same questions to the defendants which were asked in Nazi times by Nazi judges:

"What was your father's last name? What was your grandfather's last name?"

By this he wished to demonstrate that the defendants were of Jewish origin. Rajk, who was well known for his anti-Semitic feelings, after having replied that his grandfather's name was "Reich," remarked at the same time:

"His name was Reich but he was an Aryan."

He confessed to everything except that he might be of Jewish origin. After the Rajk trial, 38 prominent Jewish Communists were taken from the party center to the secret police. Eighty others received heavy sentences. Still others disappeared without leaving a trace.

This was followed by an anti-Semitic campaign throughout the country. The campaign was directed by István Kossa, deputy general secretary of the Communist Party, and by a member of parliament called Joseph Gém. The latter, in a speech in Nyiregyháza, declared that the Jews were sabotaging the 5-year plan, that they sided with America and were the enemies of the Soviet Union. A few days later, the president of the Jewish community of nearby Tokaj and his wife were cold-bloodedly beaten to death in their home in broad daylight and in the presence of their child and their maid. This happened on February 19, 1950. A few hours after this crime, the president of the Jewish community of Miskolc and the rabbi of Miskolc arrived on the scene. They were immediately arrested, but released on condition that they would mention the murder to no one else. The next day, the Jews of Tokaj started to pack their belongings because they no longer felt safe and therefore wanted to flee to Budapest. They were told that if they dared to leave the community they would be interned immediately.

Was there any investigation of these crimes? There was not, and no one was surprised, because Laszlo Piros, who was responsible for the widespread pogroms in 1946, had just been named a major general. Piros only 4 years ago was a shoemaker.

Throughout the country today the Jews are being questioned in their homes by the secret police. "Have you got jewels? Have your relatives got jewels? Which of your friends has jewels?"

The interrogations are conducted as they were in Nazi times. At one such interrogation, conducted in the vaults of the Bank of Commerce in Székesfehérvár, when beating and torture were of no use, the secret police applied the old Nazi method of forcing religious Jews to eat bacon, strictly prohibited by the Jewish faith.

Illegal escapes through Czechoslovakia ceased in July 1949. A transport of refugees was brought back from Slovakia to Hungary, in July 1949, by a lieutenant colonel of the secret police named Kovács. The escapees received heavy prison sentences. Since then, refugees have been leaking through the Austrian border, heavily guarded by mines and barbed wire. More than half of these refugees are killed by mines or by the bullets of the guards. Nevertheless, these flights continue. Hungary's Jews know that Hungary and the Soviet Union have a common frontier. They know that 35,000 Jews have been deported from Lemberg and that almost the entire Jewish population of the Ukraine, of White Russia, and of the Crimea are being sent to eastern Siberia. When I mention these facts in the United States, I am often told: "There are no gas chambers in Russia." Those who say this do not know that the coal mines of Karaganda can be just as deadly as gas chambers.

DISBELIEVED NAZI ATROCITIES

In August 1942, Magr. Béla Varga, today the president of the Hungarian National Council in New York, smuggled out to Switzerland the microfilms telling the story of the Warsaw ghetto and of Auschwitz. At that time, the Western World was late in reacting.

Before the Nazis deported the Jews of Eastern Europe to Auschwitz and other extermination camps, they deprived them of their conditions of living. When the Jews were left without jobs and without bread, the Nazis simply declared that people without income or profession are a menace to society and must be removed. Today, the first part of this proceeding has been repeated by the Communists. Jewish businessmen, industrialists, lawyers, journalists, actors, and officials have nearly all lost their jobs.

Several months ago, I received a letter smuggled out of Budapest. The letter was written by a friend of mine who as yet hasn't been arrested; together we had fought against the Nazis before my deportation to Germany. "Do you remember," he writes "with what hope we looked toward the west in those days?"

Famine in India—United States Aid Urgent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the New York Herald Tribune of January 30, 1951:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

FAMINE AND DIPLOMACY

There may be some good reason—though it is not easy to think of one—why the State Department chose last week as the time to talk to Senator CONNALLY's committee about India's application for food. The Department, we have all been told, has been studying the famine which India must meet this year, it is strongly in favor of sending the food, it is well aware of the consequences of mixing up human misery with domestic and international politics. Yet the Department picked the present moment when the Indian-American disagreement over China is the hottest to approach Congress.

What happened, of course, was that the committee was cool, and the news was broadcast to India and to the world that the United States Government is withholding food from the famine-stricken masses of India because it disagrees with the foreign policy of the Indian Government. Is it possible that the Department did not know that this is what would happen if this subject was opened up last week? Why did it not wait until the issues at stake and the consequences had been explained fully to the leaders of Congress and until the crisis in the UN had subsided?

Let us hope that it was only bureaucratic insensitiveness which prevented the Department from realizing how Congress was feeling about India last week and how India would be feeling about America this week.

The problem of the Indian famine is grave and urgent, and what we do about that famine will have great and far-reaching consequences.

The main facts of the problem are as follows: There has been a crop failure in India during the last year which is due primarily to a combination of natural disasters in the different parts of India—to floods in some regions, drought in others, to the earthquakes in Assam, and to a plague of locusts. There are about 100,000,000 people who depend on rationed food, and they are already down to 9 ounces of rice or wheat a day. These rations cannot be sustained until the autumn unless the Indian Government imports about 6,000,000 tons of food grains, of wheat, millets, and rice.

Two-thirds of this amount, or 4,000,000 tons, the Indian Government has been able to procure and pay for—with some assistance from us. But 2,000,000 tons have still to be taken care of. It is known that we can supply this amount of food—mostly but not entirely in the form of wheat. The necessary ships are also available, though it may be necessary to use some ships that are now moth-balled. The cost is estimated at $100,000,000. The Indian Government wishes to finance this transaction as a credit, to be sure on easy terms. The State Department, after studying the over-all Indian financial

position, thinks it unwise that India go into debt for consumable goods. It is, therefore, proposing a grant, and that of course requires action by Congress. This is how the matter got to Senator CONNALLY's committee.

Let us hope the members of the committee will approach the question bearing in mind the fact that there is no doubt that India needs the food desperately and that there is no doubt that America has the food and can easily make it available. Under these conditions failure to provide the food can be due only to one reason—an intention to use the granting and the withholding of the food as an instrument of diplomatic pressure upon a government with which we happen at the moment to be disagreeing.

That is something we ought not to do. It is beneath us. We cannot, we must not, stoop to it. It is also something that we cannot afford to do. For it would illustrate too dramatically the propaganda of our enemies—namely, that American philanthropy undermines the independence of the nations which accept it.

Let us not defame ourselves by giving even a shred of justification to the charge that we could let people die of hunger because their government did not vote as our Government would like that government to vote. Let us not place between the people of India and the people of America, perhaps for decades or generations to come, such a terrible memory. Let us not for lack of imagination and experience do as a government what no decent American would dream of doing if it were his own personal and private responsibility to give or to withhold out of his surplus food for men, women, and children who are dying of hunger.

Let us rather buy with this food and this money the incalculable benefit of having proved to the whole world that we do indeed believe in freedom—and that we do not buy the consciences of our friends but only their good will and their confidence in our own decency. If ever there was a chance to justify our friends and to confound our enemies, it is here and now—by rising above all the petty feelings of the moment in order to play that part in the world which, when we are at our best, we find it a joy and a pride to be able to play.

Let's Use the Belasco Theater as a Service Center Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which would authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to lease to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the Belasco Theater Building on Lafayette Place with a nominal annual rental of $1, and to assume the cost of renovation and operation, as long as it is managed by the United Service Organization as a recreation center for service personnel of the United States and the United Nations.

The bill will, in normal procedure, be referred to the Committee on Public Works; and in deference to my friends on that committee I wish to explain that the bill I presented today is little more than a legislative draft. When I started going into the ramifications, I found that many public and private agencies are involved in any plans for a service and recreation center in Washington, and will wish to be heard. It may well be that any bill reported by the committee will be much changed in language.

However, I am convinced that the fundamental idea is sound, and that the use of Federal funds to maintain such a center in Washington can be logically defended.

Among American municipalities the city of Washington is unique in many respects. It is, as the Nation's Capital, the only municipality wholly dependent on Congress for appropriations. Probably no other municipality of such compelling interest to the men of the armed services is within traveling distance of so many men in military installations.

The appropriations required will not be large. It is estimated that restoring the stage and other facilities to the conditions existing when it was a famous World War II stage-door canteen will cost about $75,000, and that light, heat, power, and maintenance and janitor service will cost two or three thousand dollars a year. Neither the government of the District of Columbia nor any of the agencies serving the armed services personnel have available funds to defray these costs at this time—and the center is needed now. I hope the bill will be promptly and favorably received and studied by the committee.

Some Practical Thinking on the Price Freeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist and keen observer on economic affairs, Sylvia F. Porter, always seems to be able to express in a clear and simple manner the difficult economic problems with which we are faced and to comment upon them intelligently. Her brief column in the New York Post of January 29, 1951, concerning the recent price freeze is characteristic of her thinking on economic matters and is most timely in its presentation. I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress:

NOW IT'S UP TO US

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

The Government can't put 5,000,000 of us in jail if 5,000,000 of us decide to violate the law.

A few hundred law enforcement agents, operating out of only 55 key areas in the entire land, can't really enforce price ceilings if enough buyers and sellers elect to break the ceilings.

We are witnessing an insane economic race from which no American can emerge a winner.

We are watching a devastating attack on the dollar which can destroy our Nation and our security just as surely as a hydrogen bomb can blast our Nation and our security.

Now another half-way move—flexible controls on prices and wages—is being made to cut short the race, beat back the attack.

As a half-way move, it can achieve half-way results—but only if you and I, acting as individual buyers and sellers, as individual businessmen and wage earners, want it to achieve even this.

It can and it will accomplish nothing if you and I, acting as individuals, decide to wink at violations, cooperate in price-wage chiseling.

In fact, if we don't get into this act and get into it fast, the new stabilization will fail miserably and the result will be less than nothing, for there'll be only intensification of cynicism about the dollar's value.

There's no pious pontificating in what I'm writing here.

Our dollar is in a terrible trend.

To an increasing extent, where the cost of living goes from here depends on you. United we stand, divided we fall.

We must stop fooling ourselves about the delights of inflation. It is a disease. The glow it seems to bring to the economic face—to the profit report and the weekly pay check—is only a fever.

This disease has killed economies since civilization began. It can kill ours, too.

Even during World War II, when we had much, much tougher controls and rationing too, prices rose 15 percent.

Even when we were fighting an all-out war on two fronts, hundreds of thousands of Americans ghoulishly violated the law, played black markets, betrayed themselves and their land.

Now the new controls are flexible—and even that word is misleading, for flexibility is supposed to suggest something that can go two ways. In these rules, the flexibility is only on the way up.

We've wasted 6 months in talk and seen the cost of living rise month by month to the highest mark ever—81 percent above the level of prewar days.

We're still fumbling, and harsh as the control headlines may appear, the fact is the regulations are full of loopholes.

Worse still, the latest schedule I've heard indicates that officials view this as just another interim step, figure they can't put on a real freeze until late spring or summer because prices and wages haven't yet reached the right level.

So our only protection is our own understanding and my only prayer is that you're thinking more clearly than the politicians.

If thousands of businessmen decide to rush to the control agencies to yelp about inequities the stabilization will be a mockery in no time.

If thousands of wage earners decide to crowd their spokesmen for additional concessions, ditto.

If thousands of you decide to chisel, there aren't enough policemen to find you or jails to hold you.

It's that delicate, it's that touch-and-go.

As one individual, I can only emphasize the magnitude of the stakes, vow to do my best. How about you?

Pacific Pact and Organization for Far East Economic Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me for the New York Herald Tribune of January 30, 1951:

A DECISIVE FAR EAST POLICY—NEED AND VALUE OF A PACIFIC PACT AND ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAM ARE PRESENTED

(By Representative JACOB K. JAVITS)

A bipartisan group of eight Members (Representatives LAURIE C. BATTLE, Democrat, of Alabama; WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota; MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana; CHESTER E. MERROW, Republican, of New Hampshire; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut; CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and the writer) last week introduced in the House of Representatives a bill favoring a Pacific Pact. Two members of this group (Representative RIBICOFF and the writer) sponsored at the same time a resolution favoring a far-eastern recovery program implemented by an organization for far-eastern economic cooperation. Both programs of self-help and mutual cooperation, for defense and for economic development, are to be joined in by the United States. These efforts are to be considered in the context of the negotiation of the Japanese peace treaty for which John Foster Dulles also left last week.

The resolutions represent together an affirmative foreign policy for the Far East by the United States with the primary responsibility placed where it belongs, on the peoples affected, but with the United States backing them in their efforts in recognition of the fact that the eastern shore of the Pacific Ocean is the strategic frontier of the United States itself. This effort recognizes the adulthood of the free peoples of Asia and puts them on a parity in American consideration with the mature nations of Western Europe with whom we have developed the Atlantic Pact and the European recovery program. In such a framework of regional organization within the United Nations Charter, the development of Japanese military capabilities for the defense of the Japanese islands and of Japanese industrial production for the economic improvement so urgently needed by the free peoples of Asia, can proceed without the overhanging fear that a new aggressor Frankenstein might be created.

The North Korean and Communist Chinese aggression in Korea and the commitments undertaken by the United States respecting Formosa, the Philippines, and Indochina show the urgent need for collective action with full contribution by the powers in the Pacific area themselves in a Pacific area council, to guarantee their independence and territorial integrity against further aggressive action of the Korean type or by subversive tactics. Accordingly, regional pacts for collective self-defense which come squarely within article 51 of the UN Charter paralleling the example of the Atlantic Pact will, it is expected, provide an organization capable of coping with the Communist threat.

It is my conviction that a Pacific pact can do much to discourage further aggression. The principle of self-help and mutual cooperation implicit in the Atlantic Pact, and in a proposed Pacific pact, is one of the greatest contributions which can be made to a constructive foreign policy and to international peace and security. We see in this principle a decisive answer to Communist efforts to confuse the free peoples and lead them to their own destruction by charging imperialism and warmongering. The other free peoples have a right to fight for their freedom, and to share in the great responsibilities of meeting the challenge of communism; proper organization for such an effort is essential.

The sponsors of the resolution contemplate that the immediately eligible powers for a Pacific area council would be the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand and Japan. It would be the aim of the pact to include also Indonesia, Thailand (Siam), Burma, India, Pakistan and Ceylon, the states of Indochina and the Federated Malay States. Formosa would, of course, be a logical and essential addition for the defense of the Pacific Ocean area, but the terms upon which Formosa should join in and be represented should be determined by the other participants in the pact. This also applies to the participation of France, Great Britain, and Holland, which administer areas in that part of the world.

This position would assume no appeasement of the Chinese Communists, and therefore dispositions of our forces committed in Korea as military needs dictate. It would also imply an early peace treaty with Japan, giving her a framework of regional organization which would protect her neighbors while putting her in a position to defend the Japanese islands. The fact that we would not appease the Chinese Communists with Formosa, however, makes it vital that we must be more concerned than ever about democracy and free institutions in Formosa—economic development and good government there.

The resolution favoring the creation of an organization for Far East economic cooperation represents an effort to follow the policy of self-help and mutual cooperation so successfully developed with the European recovery program and which I consider to be the most enlightened development in American foreign policy since the Monroe Doctrine. It is a policy of improving the well-being of peoples in order to give them an incentive to fight of their own free will for a freedom which is valuable. It emphasizes the one strength of the United States which all admit and recognize: the strength of production of goods and services. While the Communists only promise economic betterment, the United States should help the free peoples of the Far East to deliver economic betterment.

A blueprint for the economic development of South and Southeast Asia, the Colombo plan, was developed by the members of the British Commonwealth at a meeting of the Cabinet ministers of the Commonwealth Governments concerned in the Pacific held at Colombo, Ceylon, January 1950. The 6-year program calls for £1,085,000,000, equivalent to about $3,000,000,000, which is needed from abroad for economic development in India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Malaya. The British expect to supply about $750,000,000 out of blocked sterling, leaving a net requirement of $2,250,000,000. An extension of the economic development program with others of the Asian countries which urgently require such development, it is estimated, would add to this figure for the same period another $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 required from abroad. The Colombo plan emphasizes the other sources than new investment from which such vast amounts of money may be drawn and points out that these are already largely being utilized to the maximum. These, for example, include, aside from sterling balances held in London by India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, loans of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and private investment.

It is pointed out that private investment has a great field but that public investment to improve food supply, health, education, and transportation is first essential to provide a sound economic and social framework which will encourage private investment. The role of the International Bank, though important, is recognized to be limited, as it must make reasonable banking requirements for its loans. The bank has already made loans to India totaling $62,500,000 for development projects and loans to Thailand (Siam) of $25,400,000 for such developments, but this must be compared to a minimal net capital requirement for India alone under the Colombo plan of £607,000,000, or about $1,699,600,000.

It is important to emphasize that the Colombo plan has limited objectives commensurate with the economy of means imposed upon the Commonwealth countries by their own economic problems and by the balancing between expenditures for armament and economic development required in any development plans which are now sought to be financed by any country including the United States. Hence, the Colombo plan promises an increase of 15,000,000 acres of land under cultivation, or about 3.5 percent; an increase of 6,000,000 tons of food grains produced per annum, or 10 percent; an increase of 17 percent of land under irrigation, adding 13,000,000 acres, and an increase of 67 percent in electric generating capacity. Lest anyone be deceived as to the extent of the improvement which this would make, it is to be noted that in the case of India it would mean approximately 20 kilowatt-hours of electricity production per capita, as against 2,296 kilowatt-hours per capita for the United States.

The need for economic development to give the peoples of the Pacific Ocean area and of south and southeast Asia a basis for resisting communism and seeking freedom and a real incentive to do so is certainly there. Living conditions in that area are as low as anywhere in the world, with annual income per capita in the range of $66 per annum, as against about $600 per capita per annum for Great Britain and about $1,700 per capita per annum for the United States. It is significant to note, for example, that in India there are 73,000,000 agricultural workers out of an estimated population of over 350,000,000, while in the United States there are only 8,000,000 agricultural workers out of a population of over 150,000,000.

It is this fundamental economic fact of chronic hunger and debased living standards in the whole area which underlies the great revolutionary ferment now in process in Asia and the appeal of the spurious Communist promises. It might seem easier from our point of view if we could, while we are so heavily engaged in military expenditure, by reason and argument show the people the fallacy of these Communist promises. But the conditions of the people in that area are so bad and a rate of over 90 percent illiteracy and other impediments to the spread of information add so much to the difficulties that this approach is not too promising for the short term when the greatest danger exists. Accordingly, direct economic improvement on the most basic level without political strings and with a maximum of self-help on the part of the peoples affected will prove to be the most effective weapon to win away the peoples of this area from the inevitable attraction that fake Communist promises of economic equality and improvement are now exercising. This is the basis for my own efforts and those of other Members of Congress to help India with the 2,000,000 tons of grain currently needed to avert famine there, though we deeply feel Prime Minister Nehru's political pronouncements on Communist China to be untenable and ill-advised, and though we were among the first to advocate UN action in condemnation of Communist Chinese aggression in Korea.

Let us not forget that India has a formidable army of 500,000, that Pakistan has a substantial army and that means exist in this whole area to withstand and hold back an armed Communist tide. It is the will and the morale which must be builded as well as the military means and all in recognition of the new day in Asia—the day of adulthood and self-reliance. This is entirely in accord with American tradition, and it is the purpose of the sponsors of the resolution for a Pacific pact and a Far East recovery program to galvanize the executive department into action before it is indeed too late.

New York: The Port With a Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Howard S. Cullman, chairman of the Port of New York Authority, before the annual dinner of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association at the Hotel Commodore on January 9, 1951:

I am here with you tonight for just one reason—to take a look at the Port of New York. You are the men whose business depends upon moving large volumes of export-import freight through the Port of New York safely, expeditiously and economically. The Port of New York Authority is an organization set up nearly 30 years ago to help do the same thing from the public angle. I understand your association is just 5 years older than the authority.

From some of the statements made by our competitors one might get the impression that the Port of New York is on its last legs. A trip up and down the water front discloses much that needs to be done, both in New York and New Jersey, and might lend some support to such statements. The comparison of new port facilities at other points along the Atlantic coast is embarrassing. However, the Port of New York has always been characterized by vigor. It has always been able to find the road to leadership, and I am confident that we will ultimately find the method and the resources to go forward with the program of modern pier construction that will assure the continuance of our preeminence.

We are currently handling over six billion dollars' worth of foreign trade a year. Back in January 1861, just before the Civil War, when the total trade of the port was less than half a billion dollars, Harper's Weekly commented that alarm had been created by threats of new commercial rivals to New York, but sagely concluded "It is very easy to open a port and to expect a great trade but it is very hard to create a rival to New York."

This is no time, therefore, for a Pollyanna attitude, either with respect to the international situation or the future of the Port of New York—far from it. We all have a hard job to do for the future. However, once in a while we need to take stock of both our strength and our weaknesses; to publicize just how much effective work is being done to insure the future supremacy of the port, and to do a little self-criticizing on what more needs to be done.

Last spring the Mayor of New York appointed a committee to review the future needs of the port. I was asked to serve as chairman of a subcommittee that had to do with the transport rates and other costs paid by the shipper, which in many instances are a handicap to competition for commerce. I am also serving on another committee which has to do with increasing the effectiveness of port promotion.

Although the reports of both these subcommittees are in semi-final form, they have not yet been submitted to the main committee for consideration, and hence I will not try to discuss them. I shall, however, give you some of my own views on both of these subjects.

As Al Smith would say, "let's look at the record." It is well known to you gentlemen, although not to all of the businessmen of New York, that transportation rates between the interior of the United States and the Port of New York have for many years been higher than to other ports. Responsibility for this situation goes back to the dim pages of history 50 to 75 years ago when the great rail transportation systems were engaged in a bitter rivalry. When they finally worked out a compromise peace treaty, New York ended up with the distinction of being the port taking the highest handicap, a sort of 10-goal man on the polo team.

Over the years our port has lived with these disadvantages in rates without too much pain because of our superiority in ocean steamship service, some offsetting ocean rate advantages, and the great magnetic force of a large banking, forwarding, and consuming area at the port.

In recent years, however, the rules of the game have been rigged against us in several ways. Since 1946 the percentage increase in rail rates has hiked our long-time port differentials to new levels of disadvantage. On export agricultural implements from Peoria, Ill., where New Orleans formerly had an advantage of $44 for a 20-ton carload, the difference is now $96. On the same commodity from Minneapolis, the New Orleans advantage under the normal differential of $32 a car was lifted to $120 a car, and Baltimore's prewar advantage of $12 was jumped to $20. On imports of burlap bagging to Milwaukee, New Orleans' advantage was increased from $19.50 to $51 per car.

The restoration of the normal basis of port relationships has been a matter of great concern to the Port Authority, to business interests of the port, and to the New York carriers. The Port Authority has carried this matter to the Interstate Commerce Commission every time a percentage increase came up. The Commission's orders have been clear that the inflated differentials should be readjusted to norm. Readjustment of these rates involves rechecking and republication of thousands and thousands of class rates. The carriers have delayed this action and shoved it aside. The New York railroads have restored the prewar relationships by the publication of special commodity rates on automobiles, agricultural implements, rubber tires, meats, grain, burlap bagging, cocoa beans, coffee, crude rubber, and a few other commodities for particular origins and destinations in the interior, but there are still many rates out of line. One of our most important objectives is to find a quick and simple way of restoring these relationships, disrupted since 1946, and the Port Authority is working constantly with the railroads to attain that objective.

Another disadvantage which has bothered us a great deal is the fact that at the Port of New York big pieces—machinery, large vehicles, and similar weighty objects—are subject to a heavy lift charge, when lightered to shipside. A piece of machinery weighing 20 tons from an inland point such as Springfield or Peoria, Ill., is assessed a heavy lift charge of approximately $20 at New York and no such charge is made at other ports—a disadvantage which has resulted in some substantial diversions of this type of business.

The Port Authority trade promotion offices in Chicago, Cleveland, and Washington have tried to overcome this situation by advising shippers on how to route heavy pieces to shipside by carfloat to avoid this extra charge, but such routing requires a minimum of six cars and does not help the shipper of consignments in lesser volume. A proposal is now before the New York carriers to eliminate heavy lift charges on pieces up to 25 tons, and to reduce the minimum requirement to one car in ordering a carfloat in lieu of lighter delivery.

At New Orleans, where heavy lift freight has to be handled through pier sheds or by lighter, in much the same physical manner as at New York, the railroads on October 10 last year abolished all heavy lift charges. This leaves New York as the only port where such charges are still in effect. We hope the railroads at New York will act promptly to meet the situation, since comparisons of 1950 with 1949 tonnages show a definite falling off in the proportion of heavy machinery moving through New York as compared to certain other ports.

There are other rate disadvantages at New York with which you gentlemen are very familiar, which are the subject of constant attention by the Port Authority. Nobody should assume for one moment that an active campaign is not constantly under way to improve our position ratewise as compared to other ports.

The Port Authority has just filed a complaint against five Swedish steamship lines which have been imposing an added charge of $1 per ton on wood pulp to New York, and will take the matter to the Federal Maritime Board. The New York railroads and the Port Authority are acting vigorously to abolish the long-standing disadvantages in rates and unequal free storage time on export grain from the Great Lakes area. The matter will probably have to go to the Federal courts but it will be pursued to a final conclusion.

Over the years attempts of Baltimore, Philadelphia, Albany, Boston, and the Florida ports to permanently widen the disadvantages on railroad rail rates have been beaten back. The attempts of the railroads serving the Gulf ports to extend their rate advantages east of Chicago, Indianapolis, and Cincinnati were successfully resisted.

All of this work requires the constant attention of skilled traffic, rate, and economic analysts, and the ablest attorneys we can find. Under its directive from the two States to intervene in proceedings affecting commerce of the port, the Port Authority alone is spending $200,000 a year in this work. Over the years we have had our experts assemble data and present testimony, and our attorneys file briefs and make oral arguments in 182 formal cases before the regulatory commissions having jurisdiction over rail, water, and motortruck rates. In recent years several score more cases have also been carried on before the Civil Aeronautics Board in the field of air transport. The over-all batting average has been good but the work must go on with undiminished effort as the competitive situation becomes sharper and sharper.

I welcome particularly the evidence in recent months of an aggressive attitude on the part of New York railroad carriers to assert their rights to compete on an equality with carriers serving other ports.

Part of the struggle is in the political field—other sections of the country, for example, are advocating an outpouring of funds to subsidize transportation operations such as the Federal Barge Line on the Mississippi River. Although the operations of these lines are costing the taxpayers of the United States as much as $2,000,000 a year, there are perennial bills in Congress calling for the expenditure of $17,000,000 more for purchase of new barge-line equipment and extension of operations to new points. This Federal Barge Line project was set up in 1924 as a temporary pioneering operation to be turned over to private enterprise when river channels were fully completed and adequate terminal service and rate structures established. Nevertheless, now 26 years later, the Louisiana delegation is spearheading an attempt to continue and to expand this line which, at the expense of the taxpayers, is maintining such low rates in combination with the Mississippi Valley railroads, that an exporter of agricultural machinery from Minneapolis has an advantage of $168 per 20 ton carlot via New Orleans as compared to New York. In close cooperation with New York and New Jersey Senators and Representatives these matters are being fought out in Congress.

There are many other facets of rate disadvantages, such as extra transfer charges at the port and special rules and practices by carriers and by labor which obtain here and not elsewhere, which require attention and concerted corrective action on the part of our business community, labor and political leaders to keep this port on a competitive basis with our neighbors and competitors. However, as long as we have a vigorous group of business and labor executives and vigilant public representatives to protect the interests of the port, I am satisfied that we can hold our own in the great American tradition of equality for all and special privilege for none.

I have been talking about some of the disadvantages under which we labor and against which we must continually fight. It would not be proper or wise to talk only about our ills. We have our strength and our attractions and we must in every way use them to build up the port. The unrivaled advantages of one of the great natural harbors of the world, a people skilled in business and transportation know-how, a preponderance of steamship and air communication to all parts of the globe, and an aggregate of machines and manpower not to be found in any other port, offer to all the world opportunities for prompt, safe, and efficient dispatch which do not exist anywhere else. Although the Port of New York is known in every part of the world, we must continue to tell every shipper, every passenger, every industrialist, of the specific facilities and services that he can find here. Furthermore, it is necessary that we understand his problems first hand and give him specific advice on how to make the best use of our great port.

To this end the Port Authority is now spending another $225,000 a year in a promotion program designed to reach the shipper at grass-roots level. We maintain in New York, Washington, Cleveland, and Chicago trade-promotion offices staffed by outstanding men who know the technique of transportation, traffic routing, and foreign trade.

Day after day, by personal visit, by telephone, by telegraph, and by correspondence they handle shippers' problems. Today it may be the next available sailing from New York to Genoa, Guiana, Cairo, or Capetown. Tomorrow, it may be the most economical way to ship a 176-ton steel press via New York to France. The day after, a way to consolidate 21 separate export consignments into one carload for piers serving nine overseas destinations, to eliminate local transfer charges.

You know their work, probably better than I do. Our files are full of appreciative letters citing the work of George Weiss in Chicago, Charlie Hafner in Cleveland, Lloyd Harvey in Washington, and our own home office under Lou Byrne. Their solid accomplishments in bringing back traffic to the port of New York need no further comment from me.

These men do not try to do the whole job. They cooperate at every turn with the railroad, steamship, motortruck, airline, forwarder and warehousing solicitors of New York companies, advising on new leads, working out expedited schedules, planning service combinations to attract new commerce.

We also extend the legs, arms, and voices of these men by circulation of thousands of maps, leaflets, special traffic advices, commerce bulletins, motion pictures, photographic-slide lectures, exhibits at conventions, trade fairs, and the like.

For 2 years we have been circulating to key shippers and transportation men each month several thousand copies of a magazine, Via Port of New York, which I believe is familiar to many of you. This magazine describes terminals, handling equipment, warehouses, and services of all kinds in an attractive photographic format. We salt this magazine liberally with illustrations of why it pays to ship through the Port of New York. I want to express publicly here the great contribution which members of your industry make to this magazine by furnishing the basic information out of your broad experience.

The excellence of this magazine is attested to by the comments we hear from all sides, including some of our competitors. Two weeks ago the foreign freight agent of one of the larger railroads commented, "Our traffic officials who have been receiving copies of your monthly publication, Via Port of New York, have been so loud in their praise of many of the articles contained therein that I recently circularized all of them to see whether those who were not presently receiving the publication would be interested." He asked that 65 names be added to the mailing list.

I should throw in as a closing note the fact that a vigorous campaign to remove rate handicaps and promote the advantages of the port must be backed up by an ever-increasing effort on the part of both private enterprise and public agencies to make our facilities economical to use and modern in every respect. If piers are not designed to eliminate traffic congestion and to provide adequate space for uncongested handling of freight, we cannot sell the port.

Wherever the Port Authority has been permitted to do the job, it has been able to go forward with a real program of modern waterfront construction. Thus, over the past 2½ years we have spent $8,600,000 at Port Newark, completing among other things two of the most modern and commodious cargo sheds in the port district. For 1951 we have budgeted another $2,400,000 to create additional terminals for efficient cargo handling and storage. As a result of the port modernization plan started in 1948 in this sector of the Port of New York, the number of steamship dockings have more than doubled and cargo volumes are up over 30 percent.

Expansion to meet the growing tide of passengers and freight, modern truck terminals and rail terminals, faster internal communication by bridges and tunnels across our waterways, are all elements in a modern and progressive port.

You will be interested to know that the Port Authority alone has constructed, financed by revenue bonds without cost to the taxpayer, over $350,000,000 worth of such improvements and has projects in progress or in plan for at least $200,000,000 more.

Yes, we have a port with a future. To assure that future, the Port Authority will continue to press with vigor its comprehensive program of port promotion and protection for which we are now budgeting at the rate of $600,000 a year. But to assure that future also, we must implement paper plans for the construction of modern port facilities with dollars and with the actual construction of modern facilities.

Grass-Roots Views on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Garden City Daily Telegram of Garden City, Kans., published an editorial in which it suggested that its readers take part in the debate now going on with respect to foreign policy by submitting their views on 22 questions covering matters of current interest with respect to that subject. These questions were exceptionally well drafted and covered the field so well that the answers which were received constitute an excellent survey of grass-roots opinion on the great issues affecting foreign policy which now confront this country.

In order that all Members of Congress and all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the opportunity to become familiar with this cross section of public opinion in western Kansas, I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of the editorial containing the questionnaire together with a news article analyzing the replies which were received:

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

One of the Telegram's readers, John Creigh, has suggested that the American people themselves should be participating in the current great debate on American foreign policy.

His suggestion is a crackerjack idea. The flow of the grass-roots sentiment into the halls of Congress is what made America great and keeps it great.

So the Telegram proposes to tabulate your yes or no answers to the following 22 964 questions on United States foreign policy and forward the results to our Senators and Representatives in Washington, D. C.

If you want to get in the great debate, take out your pencil and check off your yes and no opinions down this list. Then clip this list from your paper and mail it to the 964 question editor, Garden City Daily Telegram. Your opinions don't have to be signed.

If your husband or wife or other members of your family want to enter their opinions too, especially if they differ from yours, just total up the opinions and write in a number 2 or 3 in the yes or no column after each question instead of checking. That way the whole family can participate.

We'll give you your answers next week if you show by your interest that you want to participate in the great debate.

This of course is an experiment. It's also a challenge to our readers to determine if they have thought through the questions of the great debate closely enough to form definite opinions.

Get your pencils, here goes:

1. Shall we withdraw fom Korea? Yes ☐ No ☐

2. If we do, shall we attack Red China elsewhere? Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Whether or not we withdraw from Korea, shall we withdraw protection from Formosa? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Come what may, shall we try to hold Japan and the Philippines? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Do you consider the Western European front more important against Russia than the Asiatic front? Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Shall we offer Western Europe naval, air and war matériel support but require that part of the world to supply its own manpower? Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Shall we send to Western Europe heavy ground troop reinforcements? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Shall our aid to Western Europe depend upon what steps it takes to defend itself? Yes ☐ No ☐

9. Shall we allow Russia to occupy Western Europe and organize its people and resources? Yes ☐ No ☐

10. Shall we retire to our own hemisphere and adopt a purely defensive policy? Yes ☐ No ☐

11. Do you believe that whether or not Russia has the atomic bomb, the United States is strong enough to be relatively safe even though Russia has command of both Western European and Asiatic forces? Yes ☐ No ☐

12. Do you believe the United States, unaided, has enough men and resources to defeat a Red China-Russian alliance? Yes ☐ No ☐

13. Shall we try to raise in Asia a great foreign legion, drill it, arm it and use it as a major force to combat further aggression of the Chinese Reds? Yes ☐ No ☐

14. Shall we supply and furnish, with adequate naval and air support, the 500,000 soldiers of Chiang Kai-shek now in Formosa, aid them to invade the Chinese mainland, recruit additional forces and attempt to drive the Reds out of China? Yes ☐ No ☐

15. Shall we seek the support of every nation opposed to Russia, regardless of whether we approve of its rulers or its form of government? Yes ☐ No ☐

16. Shall we write off the United Nations? Yes ☐ No ☐

17. Shall we encourage a United Nations of free peoples opposed to Russia? Yes ☐ No ☐

18. Do you favor admission of Red China to the United Nations? Yes ☐ No ☐

19. Shall we follow the Baruch plan and demand that Russia agree immediately to go along with the United States in outlawing all atomic weapons and accept international inspection? Yes ☐ No ☐

20. Should Russia refuse, should we promptly make an attack upon her military potentials with our atomic bombs? Yes ☐ No ☐

21. Instead, shall we wait for Russia to manufacture an adequate supply of atomic bombs, enabling her to make a surprise attack on us if and when she chooses? Yes ☐ No ☐

22. Shall we rearm Japan as the most logical defense against Russia in the Asiatic Area? Yes ☐ No ☐

READERS JOIN GREAT DEBATE OVER FOREIGN POLICY—OPINION DIVIDED OVER STAYING IN KOREA

Garden Citians who want to speak their minds in the current great debate over United States foreign policy remain almost evenly divided today over whether America should withdraw its forces from Korea.

But in most other items of foreign policy, local citizens were pretty generally agreed.

They favored not getting involved with Red China elsewhere, but continuing to protect Formosa. They want to hold Japan and the Philippines in Asia at all costs and are in overwhelming favor of rearming Japan. The only question they are in 100 percent agreement on is that the old form of United States isolationism goes out the window. Every one opposes retiring to the American hemisphere in the present world crisis and adopting a purely defensive policy.

Garden Citians showed they aren't so hot on the Baruch plan of atomic control and are even less willing to attempt to cram it down Russia's throat.

They are firm believers, however, in Herbert Hoover's suggestion to boot the Soviet bloc out of the United Nations and continue that world organization solely as a union of free nations.

Surprisingly enough they oppose sending American ground troops to garrison Europe and they favor by two to one the recruiting and equipping of a great foreign legion in Asia to battle to the death with Chinese communism while American boys stay at home.

These are some of the interesting answers to the 22 $64 questions on foreign policy posed in a Telegram editorial last week.

There was a surprising response to the invitation to editorial page readers to join in the great debate. Soon the compilation of the response will be on the way to Washington to Congressman CLIFF HOPE and Senators ANDY SCHOEPPEL and FRANK CARLSON as Garden City's own grass roots opinion about Garden City's foreign policy.

There were 56 replies to the editorial questionnaire and in several instances whole families or two or more couples participated.

In one home family and friends sat up until 1:30 a. m. conducting their own great debate on foreign policy.

But as usual, Garden Citians found it hard in some cases to make up their minds in concise "yes" and "no's" to the questions.

One reader, signing himself An American Patriot, wrote a two-page letter explaining why he couldn't make it a plain "yes" or "no" to three of the questions. But he heartily endorsed the editorial survey idea and urged that it be presented again on other issues of national policy.

Another Garden Citian also sent along a letter suggesting a few more questions, such as whose side is England on—America's or Russia's. He made one interesting point.

"Furthermore, I really believe if we had honest reliable leaders that could be trusted, I think Russia would talk and make proper agreements," he explained. "If Americans have no faith in Acheson, how can Russia?"

One reader, instead of writing yes or no, penned "can't be done" to the questions of raising a foreign legion in Asia to fight communism and encouraging a United Nations of free peoples opposed to Russia. On four others he wrote opinions, not answers.

But getting back to how the answers totaled up.

GET OUT OF KOREA

In the most divided question of the 22, 19 (53 percent) favored United States getting out of Korea, while 17 wanted the Yanks to stay.

There were two other questions about which the readers weren't so sure.

Nineteen (56 percent) favored furnishing adequate naval and air support to Chiang Kai-shek for a Nationalist invasion of China from Formosa. But 15 (44 percent) said no to the proposition.

Twenty (57 percent) favored seeking the support of every nation opposed to Russia regardless of whether we approve of its rulers or its form of government. But 15 refused to go to such extremes. There was almost a split opinion, too, on immediately attacking Russia with atomic bombs if she refused to accept the Baruch plan and atomic-bomb controls, including inspections. Thirteen (45 percent) said yes to bombing Russia, but 19 (55 percent) said no.

For the other answers:

Twenty-five (80 percent) opposed the plan of attacking China elsewhere if we withdraw from Korea; only six approved.

STAY IN FORMOSA

Thirty (89 percent) opposed withdrawing our protection from Formosa, but four wanted to.

Twenty-nine (87 percent) said hold the Philippines and Japan come what may; five weren't interested.

Twenty-two (61 percent) considered the Western European front more important against Russia than the Asiatic front, but 14 didn't.

Twenty-five (78 percent) favored offering Western Europe naval, air, and war matériel support, but require that part of the world to supply its own manpower; seven said no to that.

Only 6 (19 percent) wanted to send Europe heavy ground-troop reenforcements; 26 (81 percent) said no.

About everybody agreed—35 to 1—that our aid to Western Europe should depend upon what steps it takes to defend itself.

Twenty-eight, however, were against letting Russia occupy Western Europe and only three didn't mind.

Everyone was opposed to retiring to our own hemisphere and adopting an entirely defensive policy.

Twenty-five (71 percent) agreed that, whether or not Russia actually has the atomic bomb, the United States is not strong enough to be relatively safe if Russia commands both Western Europe and Asia; 10 thought America still was safe enough under such circumstances.

Twenty-eight (82 percent) said the United States alone can't defeat a Russia-Red China alliance and must have allies; only six thought America could go it alone.

Twenty-three (69 percent) favor attempting to recruit a foreign legion in Asia to fight further aggression by the Chinese Reds with the United States providing the arms; 11 said no to that.

Twenty-one (63 percent) didn't want to write off the United Nations, but 12 did; 29 (89 percent) favored a United Nations without the Communist bloc and only 4 opposed.

By 30 to 4 they opposed admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Twenty-one (70 percent) were opposed to following the Baruch plan of atomic-energy control and demanding Russia agree to outlawing atomic weapons and accepting international inspection; nine liked Barney's idea.

Twenty-four (89 percent) are opposed to giving Russia time to manufacture an adequate supply of atomic bombs which would enable her to launch a sneak A-attack on the United States and only three said yes to giving her atomic time.

Twenty-five (73 percent) said yes to rearming Japan; nine said no.

Some left several questions blank, probably because they couldn't make up their minds.

But, all in all, Garden City proved it was mighty interested in the great debate.

Teaching of English in the Puerto Rican Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including a letter received from Dr. Pauline M. Rojas, director of the English section of the Department of Education in Puerto Rico. This letter points up sharply the difficulties encountered in the teaching of English in the Puerto Rican schools. The subcommittee which visited Puerto Rico last fall, and of which I had the honor to be chairman, centered its investigation on the educational problems of the island and found the teaching of English to be a severe one.

The letter follows:

GOVERNMENT OF PUERTO RICO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
San Juan, January 15, 1951.

Congressman KELLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KELLEY: We have read your committee's report on education in Puerto Rico and would like to congratulate you and the other members of the committee for your excellent appraisal of English teaching on the island. We are especially pleased with your acceptance of the basic assumption on which we are working; that is, on the assumption that English for our children is psychologically a foreign language and that for teaching it we need special methods and materials.

During the last 3 years we have been implementing the changes which you suggest as fast as time and resources permit. In the spring of 1948 we introduced the oral approach developed in the language training program of the Armed Forces during the last war. In applying the techniques of the oral approach we have been advised by Dr. Charles C. Fries, of the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan and have used his analysis of American English as the basis for the selection of the language content to be taught.

In the fall of the school year 1948–49, an administrative reorganization was effected and a program of orientation for teachers and administrators was begun. The number of supervisors at both insular and local levels was increased. Before 1948–49 there were 3 general supervisors of English and 24 local supervisors. Today there are 7 insular supervisors, not including the director of the program, and 65 local supervisors.

The new approach was implanted by means of demonstration classes, of which hundreds were given.

The next step was the preparation of materials. Unfortunately, there are no books for teaching English as a second language to public school children. In order to tide us over until we could write language textbooks suitable for our situation, the insular supervisory staff prepared and issued a three-volume teachers' manual. We were fortunate in having the assistance of Dr. Charles C. Fries and in being able to use his research. In the matter of procedures we were able to guide ourselves somewhat by the work being done at the English Language Institute and at Teachers College, Columbia. But, both of these two places work with educated adults, in small classes, with English speaking teachers, with the best in equipment, and in an English-speaking environment—conditions which differ greatly from those under which we work.

Our situation, as you know, is characterized by huge classes, lack of books and equipment, non-English speaking teachers, a Spanish-speaking environment, and a high percentage of economically and culturally underprivileged pupils.

In regard to the English of our teachers, we have done much toward improving it, but certainly, not enough. We need continental teachers but how to get them is a different matter. In the first place, our salary scale is so low that few teachers from the States are interested in coming down here and, in the second, our budget does not permit us to hire the number of teachers we would need if we were to make English teaching what it should be. It is well to remember in discussing the question of the proficiency in English of our teachers, that they are the products of our schools when everything was taught in English. Those who think that the pupils would fare better now if all subjects were taught in English might reflect on these things. The schools then were highly selective. Classes were smaller than they are now for pupils who could not get along in English were dropped. We had many English-speaking teachers, especially in the high schools. If our present teachers are representative products of such schools and such a system, surely a return to teaching in English under present school conditions would be no solution. Of course, to make the schools selective again and drop everyone who couldn't get along in English, as I understand is done in the high school of Hawaii, would be unthinkable in Puerto Rico.

We know that there would be a tremendous demand for English classes for prospective migrants and other adults but our present budget can not carry such a program. Business Education Service, a division of the Insular Board for Vocational Education, offers a few classes to policemen, waiters, taxicab drivers, and so forth, but those are the only adult classes we are able to offer.

We are pleased that you recognize that in spite of the many handicaps and limitations, much has been done to provide for better English teaching on the island. We are also glad that you realize that lack of economic resources is the principal cause of the deficiencies you encountered.

How can Puerto Rican English teachers be expected to speak fluent, correct English if they never have a chance to travel to the United States and how can anything but a very small number of them afford to make trips up north on the salaries they earn?

Again let me say that I think your report is accurate and fair and that we appreciate greatly the support you have given us.

Sincerely,

DR. PAULINE M. ROJAS,
Director, English Section
(By order of the Commissioner).

Forty-nine Years of Faithful Service—Joseph H. McGann, Sr., Chief Clerk, House Committee on Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, Joe McGann has today just completed 49 years of service with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and Public Works, having served as temporary clerk, assistant clerk and clerk of the former committee for a period of 45 years, and as clerk of the Committee on Public Works during the past 4 years. He has served under the following chairmen: Theodore E. Burton, Ohio, 7 years; D. S. Alexander, New York, 2 years; Stephen M. Sparkman, Florida, 6 years; John H. Small, North Carolina, 2 years; Charles A. Kennedy, Iowa, 2 years; S. Wallace Dempsey, New York, 10 years; Joseph J. Mansfield, Texas, 16 years; George A. Dondero, Michigan, 2 years; and Will M. Whittington, Mississippi, 2 years. He is now serving under the new chairman, CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, as chief clerk.

During his early service the appropriations for river and harbor and flood control projects averaged a little over $28,000,000 annually. He has seen them grow to $656,000,000, the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1951. Many changes occurred in the membership of the committees during his service. While the number serving on the committees varies from 17 to 27, he has served under 262 members.

Joe McGann came to Washington on January 31, 1902, for a temporary assignment of 2 weeks with the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and he has been here ever since. His service began with the Fifty-seventh Congress, and it is not known of anyone who was connected with that Congress who is here at this time.

Recognized as an expert and authority on rivers and harbors and flood control matters, he has served these committees well and faithfully for nearly a half of a century. Such a record is unique, and is a testimonial to his ability and devotion to his life's work.

The Real Deterrent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events, issue of January 24, 1951:

THE REAL DETERRENT

(By Bonner Fellers)

I

The logic of the December 20 broadcast by ex-President Hoover and that of the January 5 address by Senator TAFT is compelling. Nevertheless critics found in the addresses implications of a complete abandonment of Europe with all the resultant dangers from such a course.

These critics, however, have apparently misinterpreted the Hoover-TAFT position. It is true that both strongly opposed the administration's program which would risk ground combat in Europe against the full weight of the Red Army. Mr. Hoover said, "Any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion, through the quicksands of China, India, or Western Europe is sheer folly. That would be the graveyard of millions of American boys." But ex-President Hoover also urged: "Hold the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with one frontier on Britain (if she wishes to cooperate); the other on Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines." Thus Hoover clearly envisaged Britain as an air base to deter war in Europe.

The essence of the Hoover-TAFT position is a pragmatic, resourceful attempt to deter war, win it if war comes, and in any event avoid the slaughter of millions of our youth on the Eurasian mainland.

II

The principal reason given for the enormous European program, which the administration is determined to undertake, is that it will deter war.

But will it?

The contention is that the presence, by 1953, of 50 or 60 allied divisions will be the best possible war deterrent. But against these, Russia now could throw 175 divisions, some 25 of which are armored. British and our own intelligence estimates concede Russia can take Europe in a matter of days.

To offset European reluctance to provide manpower, it is proposed to rearm Western Germany. But Russia has been quoted in the press as having announced that she will fight if we rearm these German warriors. Our determination to rearm them, therefore, can scarcely be classified as a war deterrent.

Moreover, the stationing of American units supported by our Air Force in Western Europe—regardless of the peaceful purpose for which they are intended—can be interpreted with some justification by the Russians as an aggressive gesture.

What then is the true purpose of creating this collective defense force for Europe? The real hope is that it would act as a delaying agent until enough American manpower could be brought from the United States to turn the tide. In a recent speech, General Bradley disclosed the approved administration concept of the only way we can win a war: "I am convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that should this Nation be forced into still another conflict, we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground."

If victory for the free peoples of the world can only be gained "over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground," then it follows, irrefutably, that the free world has enjoyed its last victory.

It is true that World Wars I and II upset the world's balance of power. However, it is impossible for the United States to endeavor to restore this balance on the basis of manpower. Today there is no combination of free peoples willing to fight which can equal numerically the manpower of Russia and China. Russia can draw soldiers from China's vast reservoir of youth, merely by offering food, clothing, and shelter. We are irrevocably on the short end of a 3-to-8 manpower ratio.

If western powers are to survive in a war against communism, we must somehow manage to gain our decision by methods quite different from mass ground combat. Instead we must draw heavily, not primarily on our manpower, but rather on the genius of our people.

In one respect our genius, which is derived from our free system, lies in the capacity to exploit the weakest links in Stalin's armor—his dissatisfied home population. This weakness should be exploited by a full-scale psychological campaign against the Kremlin.

Instead, however, the presence of our forces on the Rhine gives Stalin a visible symbol, a unifying agent which tends to enlist support of all Russians behind the Kremlin.

Secondly, on the material plane, where does our natural genius express itself better than in air power?

III

It is right here, in this question of air power, that we can find the answer to the terrifying fact that numerically we cannot hope to right the world's balance of power. To succeed in a program of containment we must be able to strike quickly, not just on the European fronts but anywhere about and within Russia's far-flung borders.

Only air power has the range, speed and flexibility to perform such a mission. Infantry divisions are characterized by enormous ponderosity; they cannot be shifted easily from one front to another.

Until ranges are increased, the mass of our air power cannot strike Russia without the use of overseas bases. Let us make the assumption that air bases could be held in England and Spain. But the fortunes of war might easily deprive us of their use. Sound military planning must provide flexibility to meet just such a misfortune. Africa might be utilized as a huge north and south approach to air bases in Libya or Egypt, from which medium bombers and long-range fighters could strike deep into Russia. From the Mediterranean shore of Libya it is less than 2,000 miles to the Baltic. It is only 1,500 miles to Russia's chief source of oil—Baku, in the Caucasus.

Indeed it is Africa which offers the best available ground to offset the potential weakness of Europe and its periphery. A superior allied air force based in Libya could interrupt the supply routes leading from Russia into Europe. It would be a true deterrent to war, infinitely more effective in protecting Western Europe than all the infantry divisions we could station on Europe's eastern frontier.

As a matter of fact, in 1942 as United States Military Attaché to Egypt I proposed repeatedly a similar plan to the War Department. It was my thought that from Turkey—which later came into the war—our escorted B-24's could cut Hitler's supply lines between the Black and Baltic Seas. At this time the Nazi forces were overextended, pinned down, desperately attempting to crack the Leningrad-Moscow-Stalingrad line. Had Nazi supply lines been severed by air strikes, the entire Hitler effort would have collapsed. This concept was favored both by President Roosevelt and Assistant Secretary John McCloy but vetoed by General Marshall.

However, at this point, I should serve a warning. In 1942 the political situation in the Middle East and Africa was much less unfavorable than it is today. Much bitter history has been made since then.

We cannot hold North African bases, unless we enjoy the friendship of all the peoples in the Middle East. We must have these peoples' consent to use their bases. Hence on the diplomatic plane, constructive changes are absolutely necessary.

IV

Providing this political problem is solved, militarily we can hold bases in Africa. The difference between holding these and bases on the mainland of Europe lies in the fact that in Europe the bulk of the Red Army can be thrown against the land forces defending the frontier. Against African bases only a small fraction of the Red army could be brought to bear. These bases have the incidental protection of great natural barriers—the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, and a thousand miles of desert where the going is most difficult.

Attacks against African bases by the Red army would have to be launched over the long and vulnerable desert route or they would have to be airborne. Because of these natural barriers there is no way that the full power of the Red army can be used against Africa. Consequently African air bases can be defended by limited ground forces—provided we have sufficient air power to control the air above them.

If we neglect to take advantage of air bases in North Africa, Russia could move through this strategic area which is the easiest of all roads to the conquest of Africa. Then Africa and her vast natural resources, including uranium, would fall like ripe fruit into Stalin's lap. On the other hand, were we to lose the entire Continent of Europe, we could still hold Africa with air supremacy over Egypt and Libya.

Although our fleet could not safely operate in the Mediterranean until we won the battle of the air, supply of African bases by air is nevertheless feasible. Meanwhile our fleet could service bases on the Gold Coast of Africa. Air facilities already exist at Takaradi. During the war a number of landing strips were built between Takaradi and Khartoum. From Khartoum north to the Mediterranean is an easy flight.

Also, an air force operating from North African bases would be of enormous diversionary value. Attacks could be launched to draw the Red air force into combat over especially selected areas so that strategic bombers, from bases in North America, could make atomic assaults against critical areas deep into Russia.

More than anything else, Russia fears air power. It is the one weapon against which Russia's terrific ground forces, enormous distances, and winters are impotent. Stalin has amply demonstrated this fear of air power in his present program of engaging our ground forces by satellite powers so that his own war potential—heavy industries, hydroelectric power, oil fields, oil storage, and communications are immune from our air attack.

A plan to strike from African bases is in no wise an abandonment of Europe. Rather it is the surest way to prevent war and win it, with minimum punishment for our allies, if war comes.

Remarks of Hon. Dean Rusk on Television Show, Battle Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the remarks of the Honorable Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, on the National Broadcasting Co. television show, Battle Report, Sunday, January 28, 1951:

Today I wish to say a word to those who ask why we stay in Korea. It is a serious question—because men's lives are at stake—and it deserves a serious answer.

We are in Korea because we are trying to prevent a world war and the frightful destruction of life which such a war would produce.

The thousands who have died in Korea have sacrificed their lives in a struggle to prevent the millions of deaths which world war would surely bring.

The issue in Korea is aggression. We can face it, or we can run away from it. If we face it, we have a chance to organize the determination of the world against aggression, to show the aggressor that his crime will not be accepted and that his crime will not pay. If we succeed, the aggressor may hold his hand. If we run away from it, the aggressor will learn that there is great profit in crime, that he will not be resisted, and that his victims are weak and can be destroyed at will.

These are not theories but hard facts. We Americans have already had one unforgettable lesson about what happens when unbridled ambition goes unchecked. We have seen the world go down the trail from Manchuria to Ethiopia to Munich to Poland and, finally, to Pearl Harbor. We must not tread this path again.

Let us not be discouraged too soon. At the end of World War II the human race almost succeeded in doing what men have dreamed about for centuries, i. e., in organizing a world to keep the peace. Only one government stands in the way. That government is a dictatorship which has behind it considerable power. But the peace-loving world itself is strong and we cannot afford to give up our goal just when we have come so close.

We are in Korea because we cannot afford to leave Red China and its neighbors under the impression that the forces of Peiping are irresistible and that Red China's neighbors must now come to terms with communism at the cost of their freedom.

The vaunted power of Red China is being unmasked in Korea. Chinese soldiers do not relish the punishment they are getting from our guns and planes and ships. They are learning that their masters have tricked them into a war of foreign aggression. They are learning that their masters have put them into battle without provision for minimum care in case of wounds or sickness or frostbite. In other words, Red China is learning a great deal about the cost of aggression.

We are in Korea because we cannot abandon 20,000,000 gallant Koreans to communism. We and they have fought side by side against aggression for several months, sometimes in defeat and sometimes in victory.

We cannot now abandon our comrades to the fate which would be theirs if the Communists took over.

Further, we cannot leave our friends in the Philippines and in Japan under the impression that we do not take our commitments seriously and that we might lack courage in the face of adversity.

Our gallant force in Korea is fully able to take care of itself. We should not act like a defeated Nation when in fact we have not been defeated.

The willingness and ability of the entire free world to increase its strength and to join its forces to insure their mutual defense depends to a considerable extent upon the attitude of the United States. Our strength is increasing rapidly as is that of our friends.

If we can show that we have both the will and the ability to defend ourselves, the main attack may be averted. Our attitude in this situation may easily determine the course of history for years to come. That course may lead to peace or it may lead to disaster. This great Nation cannot let history say of us that we chose the road to disaster because we were unwilling to fight for peace.

Ethel May Ness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as you know, was the birthday of one of the greatest leaders our country has ever known—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This man was not only great as a President of these United States, but was outstanding in his fight against the dreaded disease of poliomyelitis.

It is only fitting, then, that I call to your attention one who, while not as great in the ranks of our country, is just as great in her struggle against the same distressing disease—polio. This individual of whom I am speaking is only 13 years old—very young to have to fight such an overwhelming force—but through her untiring efforts this little girl will receive tonight a diploma for completing her first phase of education. Yes; tonight Ethel May Ness, of 327 Chestnut Street, Kearny, N. J., a resident of my congressional district, will graduate from the Lincoln Junior High School of Kearny. I must say that such determination is surely an incentive for our youth of today, especially to those who know the sufferings of polio.

Ethel was admitted to the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Foundation Hospital at the Jersey City Medical Center, Jersey City, N. J., on September 26, 1950. The diagnosis was infantile paralysis. Three days after admission, her condition was so bad she could not sit up. The case was a little late in coming to the Sister Kenny clinic, as many cases of polio are. She was examined by Dr. Marvin A. Stevens, the medical director of the Sister Kenny Medical Foundation, assisted by Miss Valorie Harvey, chief technician of the foundation.

While all hope had been abandoned that this child would again walk, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that today, after just a matter of a few months at the Sister Kenny clinic, Ethel can take a few steps, and it is the hope that before long she will again be walking and playing along with the 84 percent of the patients who received treatment through the Sister Kenny hospitals and clinics throughout the Nation.

It has been my privilege to serve on several committees to help raise funds for this worthy organization, so that they can continue to lend a helping hand to the victims of polio. We in New Jersey have a feeling of security because of the closeness of the hospital in Jersey City. It is my sincere hope that it will be the realization of every State in the Union to boast of a Sister Kenny Hospital so that the thousands and thousands of polio cases, that are yet to come, can be helped.

I want to congratulate the Sister Kenny Foundation for the wonderful job they are doing for the people of America. There is no discrimination, as to race, creed, or color, when patients are admitted to the care of the foundation. Any patient who is referred by his physician, is admitted to any of the hospitals or clinics provided a bed is available. I would also like to extend my congratulations to Mr. Marvin Klein, of Minneapolis, Minn., executive director, Dr. Marvin A. Stevens, medical director, the Honorable Rex G. Williams, executive director of the eastern area, their chief technician, Miss Valorie Harvey, the Australian nurse who was personally trained and brought to this country by Sister Kenny, Thomas J. Duffy, the director of Hudson, Bergen, and Essex Counties, and to the thousands of graduate nurses of the United States, who have devoted their professions to the Sister Kenny Foundation.

However, tonight, let our thoughts stray to that little 13-year-old girl who will be celebrating her first victory in her wheel chair, when she receives her diploma from the hands of Dr. John Bossart, commissioner of education of the State of New Jersey, who is personally being sent by Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll to extend his congratulations and best wishes.

I, too, would like to publicly extend my felicitations to Ethel and encourage her, and the many like her, to be inspired by the great example of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Our Safety in Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to read and insert as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in the Daily Democrat News, in Marshall, Saline County, Mo. Rosier N. Haina, editor and publisher, is noted for his ability to express in clear and forceful manner the economic and international problems with which we are confronted and to comment upon them intelligently with sensible and sound suggestions on our policy and course of action we should adopt and follow. I commend the editorial to the attention of all Members of Congress:

OUR SAFETY IN PREPAREDNESS

For the last 4 or 5 years there has been constant talk of peace. The United States has done everything possible, even bordering on appeasement, to attain peace, and today we are much further from peace than when the talks first began. It would seem the prudent thing would be to stop talking peace and prepare for the war that seems inevitable. Peace can be accepted on short notice but it takes time to prepare for war.

Russia has stated repeatedly that communism and capitalism cannot exist in the same world and that they will not top until capitalism is overthrown.

Russia's strategy has been to divide and conquer and to date it has worked successfully. That country is now attempting to make a deal with Germany whereby Russia would withdraw her armies from Germany and turn that entire country over to the Germans to rule. Of course, that is just a ruse to weaken the western allies and it would only be a short time until Russia would occupy that nation, the best in all Europe.

The United States and her western allies cannot afford to let Russia occupy Germany for then the war materials that Russia needs so badly, steel, coal, etc., would be available in such quantities and with Russia's unlimited slave labor, she could never be defeated. Thus country after country—England, Africa, South America—would succumb to that overwhelming power.

There has been some criticism of England, France, and other western allied countries for not preparing more and faster for their defense. It must be remembered those countries are right now looking down a gun barrel in the hand of a ruthless dictator and are rightfully afraid to provoke Russia to march.

This country should start tomorrow to prepare for war and reach the peak as quickly as this country attained it during World War II. We lived through that struggle then and we can do it again, quicker and more efficiently. Why wait for another Pearl Harbor before preparing for war to the limit? It would be much better to reach the peak of the last war in preparedness and never use the war equipment and men than to be forced to defend ourselves when unprepared. If we could win a bloodless world war III by preparedness we could afford the financial loss, or rather the cost of the preparedness. We should be lavish in our expenditures for equipment that would save the lives of our boys.

Had we started several years ago to turn out thousands of tanks, bombers, fighters, artillery, and all necessary fighting equipment, we could today turn some of this equipment over to Chiang Kai-shek for a diversional war, could arm the thousands of Japanese who are already army-trained. The same would be true with the soldiers in Germany, England, France, and our other allies.

It has been said that Russia fears an armed Germany more than she does the atom bomb. If we could show an overwhelming force, it is possible Russia might decide that

it cannot rule the world and would accept a peace of our own dictating.

Should Russia decide to march in Europe before the United States is prepared there is no doubt she would reach the waters of the Atlantic within weeks. We must not permit that. She would have then all the war production she needs and we could not use the atom bomb, for that would kill our innocent friends along with the enemy. However, France, Belgium, and other countries should be warned that if they give up without a struggle as they did in World War II, their country will not be immune to A-bombing if the occasion demands such action.

Would you be willing to attack Russia without advance warning if you knew by so doing it would save the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys and millions of lives of others? Then the United States must do something that she has never done before, for this struggle is going to be one for survival.

Russia would not give the United States 30 days' notice of an attack. Instead it would come suddenly, without warning.

Russia is ready right now to march in Europe but as long as the Kremlin leaders see we are doing nothing but accumulating bombs they feel they can wait. If Russia believed we were ready and might do something now then Moscow would start immediately.

We are not in Korea because we are a belligerent nation and wish to fight for the fun of it, but we are fighting in Korea for self-protection by keeping communism from the United States. Our interests in Europe are for that very same purpose.

We must select the time and place to start world war III. When we learn that Russia is about to start to overrun Europe, we must drop enough atom bombs on her armies in Eastern Germany, on her industries in Russia, to deliver a knock-out blow until time can be gained to put a strong army in Germany. We must never have another Normandy Beach, Okinawa, Iwo Jima, Tarawa, and other beaches, as we did in World War II.

Should the western Allies ever penetrate the iron curtain the going should be easy, as 90 percent of the people of the Communist-occupied countries should join the crusade for freedom.

It has been reported that the Russian army and also the Red Chinese army live on the land they are invading. Just imagine a ruthless horde of men, unrestrained by military rule, overrunning a civilized country, allowed to loot and murder civilians at will. That privilege is about the only recompense they receive for being in the army. It has been reported that Red China intends to kill 100,000,000 of their people, possibly all old ones and political objectors.

It is believed that the United States has the capacity to produce about 10 bombs to every 1 the Russians produce, if they have such a bomb.

If this war is to be won with A-bombs, why delay dropping them until Russia has a sufficient quantity. If we had a thousand bombs today, two thousand would not be of any use to us, for a thousand should be more than enough to devastate Russia.

There has been some criticism of our entering the Korean War. Perhaps we shouldn't, but that shouldn't cause a division in our war effort here. If the United Nations can only cling to an entrenched beachhead at Pusan for a considerable length of time, many thousands of Chinese will be killed and at the same time prevent the Reds from starting a war somewhere else, which they would surely do, flushed with victory. That next country would probably be Japan, only 150 miles away and wholly unprepared without an army.

The people of the United States should realize they are now in an undeclared war of survival and it is up to us to save the world. It is folly to think that we could stand by and see all the remainder of the world overrun by communism and expect to withstand the combined forces of the world. The United States is the prize that is more important to Russia than all the remainder of the world.

The Draft's Lower Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 24, 1951:

THE DRAFT'S LOWER LIMIT

A basic question in the problem of achieving systematic, intelligent mobilization of manpower for the various requirements of the defense program is: Shall the minimum age for induction into the Armed Forces be lowered to 18?

Until that highly controversial question is answered by Congress, the size of the manpower pool from which the services will draw their necessary additional strength will remain uncertain. And so will the selective service regulations governing classification of men in the present draft-age span (19 through 25); and that, in turn, makes uncertain the volume of the labor supply for defense production.

We say that the minimum draft age should not be dropped to 18; that it positively should not be lower than the 18½ years suggested by Senator TAFT, and that it can safely remain at 19, barring this country's envelopment in a general war. We say that on the basis of objective considerations untinged by the emotional opposition to the drafting of 18-year-olds that is manifested, quite understandably, by so many parents.

One of the most important considerations is that too many youths have not reached true maturity at 18; too many at that age lack the physical and emotional development that is needed to make them of full value in military service and to permit them to profit, rather than be harmed, by a period in the Armed Forces. A far larger percentage of present-day, often excessively sheltered young men have, at age 19, the state of maturity required for military service, than possess it at 18.

Furthermore, the lowering of the draft age to 18 probably would not add to the Nation's potential in military manpower as much as the more rabid advocates of the 18-year-old draft have led us to believe. The plans to drop the minimum draft age by 1 year contemplate that inductions shall start at age 18 or on the completion of high school, whichever is later. If the Cleveland schools are a good criterion, and they should be, the average youth completes high school nearer the age of 19 than 18.

The average age of the young people who will be graduated from Cleveland high schools at the end of this semester will be 18 years and 9 months, we discovered. We also learned that of the youths beginning the final semester of high school last September, more were 18 or older than were younger than 18.

We are impressed, too, with unquestioned data showing that the military services can attain their planned goal in personnel by keeping the draft age limits as they are, 19 through 25, and still have a margin of reserve amounting to about 470,000 men.

And it should be pointed out, as the United States News and World Report shows, that none of our Atlantic Pact allies, nor our one great potential enemy, Russia, begins drafting men at 18. Here are the ages at which draft or general military conscription begins in various countries: Russia, 19; England, 18 years, 3 months; France, 20; Norway, 20; Italy, 21; Belgium, 20; Netherlands, 20; Denmark, 20; and Spain, 20. Does it seem reasonable to ask the draft to a lower age in this country than in countries whose existence is more immediately threatened by Communist imperialism than is ours?

We reiterate, then, our belief that the minimum draft age can safely be kept at 19. But, in revising the selective-service act, Congress should call on the Armed Forces to lower physical requirements, in the light of the fact that a goodly percentage of men in uniform perform noncombatant functions, and thus reduce the number of young men obtaining physical exemptions from service. Congress should also stipulate that all the manpower for the Armed Forces be raised by selective service, instead of by the chaotic method of part enlistment and part drafting. It should, however, permit men under 19 to volunteer—and be placed in the branch of service that can use them best and needs them most—if the facts in each case warrant a selective-service board's authorizing the enlistment.

Such a set-up as this would be a modified form of universal military service. It would postpone college education for most men turning 19 years of age and it would greatly deplete college enrollments, and that seems inevitable. But, in order to spare many educational institutions from utter collapse, provisions should be made for assignment to colleges, by the military services, of men in uniform who are selected for scientific and technical training.

Reducing Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee voted Monday to go back to the method of handling appropriation bills that was in vogue up until the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

I hope that now the committee will get to work on the budget estimates that have been sent to Congress by the President, and that the members will realize the serious situation that confronts the committee and the Congress.

The majority of the committee felt that there was greater opportunity for reducing appropriations with the method which they have chosen than existed in the single-package appropriation bill, and for some of the following reasons:

First. With the single package appropriation bill only one motion to recommit is possible and that hit effectively only one item in the over-all bill, whereas if you have separate bills for each department the motion to recommit on the separate bills can bring out for a separate vote the most glaring items in that bill which need to be corrected. The Congress can be put on record in each of the bills for or against unnecessary spending.

Second. The Congress can also, under the provisions for separate bills, have a separate vote on the passage of any one of the bills and, if it has been loaded with unnecessary spending, be put on record for or against the passage of that bill; whereas with the omnibus bill there could be only one record vote and Members would not feel free to vote against the enormous number of items in it, whereas this hesitation would not exist with the separate bill.

All of the cuts that should be claimed in the first and second session of the Eighty-first Congress were made by the subcommittees, with the single exception of foreign relief where the cuts were made mostly in conference, and in the final amendment which was adopted to the bill reducing it $550,000,000 and turning it over to the President to allocate. Of that $550,000,000, $75,000,000 in budget estimates have been sent up on one item alone, and other restorations on many other items so that what will be saved in the long run out of the $550,000,000 remains a big question mark.

What savings were made were not because of the omnibus bill. They were because of the action of the subcommittees. What we need in the Appropriations Committee is to build up in that committee a willingness and capacity to cut the appropriations. With that spirit it will be possible to reduce the bills by sufficient amounts so that it will be possible through increased taxes to balance the budget next year.

However, that is only a little of the situation that we are facing.

On July 1, 1950, we had left unexpended $13,500,000,000 according to President Truman's budget. He has asked for appropriations aggregating $88,000,000,000, making a total of $101,500,000,000. He estimates expenditures in the fiscal year 1951, in which we are now operating at $47,500,000,000, which will leave, on July 1, 1951, a balance of $54,000,000,000. His estimates of any obligational authority for 1951 total $94,500,000,000, which will make available for expenditures, if they are allowed, $148,500,000,000. He estimates expenditures in that year to be $71,500,000,000, which will leave a balance unexpended on July 1, 1952, of $77,000,000,000. If we have appropriations of $94,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1953, there will be available $171,500,000,000; and there would no doubt be expenditures of at least $90,000,000,000, so that if the Congress should this year provide additional revenues of $16,000,000,000, thereby providing for balancing the budget in the fiscal year 1952 we would still be short $19,000,000,000, to balance the budget in 1953.

This will increase the national debt beyond the statutory limitation.

The reason I am giving you this advance look at what might happen is to show that the United States Government, with the burden that it has assumed internationally, is rapidly spending itself into bankruptcy.

If we are going to survive, it is going to be necessary for the Appropriations Committee to drastically reduce nondefense expenditures and the appropriations for defense which are not necessary and will not contribute to the national security.

It means the most thoroughgoing effort at cutting appropriations that has ever been attempted in the Congress, and I hope that the committee will very shortly start work on its job.

Its job is to cut appropriations and cut out the fat which the department heads have inveigled the Budget Bureau into submitting to Congress.

We should not be spending any more time quibbling about procedure.

MacArthur at 71

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Times, Friday, January 26, 1951, concerning the birthday of a great American:

MACARTHUR AT 71

Again as so often in the past, Gen. Douglas MacArthur celebrates a birthday today surrounded by war maps and battle reports. It is his seventy-first, and perhaps the most significant birthday of his life. For it finds him, after one of history's greatest victories over one totalitarian system, and at an age when generals are usually in retirement, in the position of the first military commander of the United Nations, leading the forces of freedom in a struggle against aggression by another totalitarian system.

In some respects this new struggle must also be the most bitter of his life. For the moral and political imponderables involved in it have so circumscribed the freedom of military action that after snatching victory from initial defeat at the hands of one foe he has not only been forced to withdraw because of the intervention of another and mightier enemy, but has also been compelled to report that because of this new aggression he has been unable to achieve the objectives for which the United Nations entered the Korean war. This development, as is now known, was in the cards from the moment that the United Nations determined to resist North Korean Communist aggression by force of arms, and especially after it instructed General MacArthur to insure conditions of stability throughout Korea. Yet, in some quarters, efforts have been made to saddle almost the entire blame for this development, not on the new Chinese Communist aggressors, where it belongs, but on General MacArthur.

No doubt like most positive personalities, General MacArthur has the capacity of arousing both profound loyalty and sharp animosity, and military strategy is the favorite subject of dispute among generals themselves. But the mainsprings of the criticism leveled against General MacArthur may well be found in efforts of delinquent members of the United Nations to cover up the inadequacy or total lack of their military aid for an enterprise which they supported in principle but not in practice.

General MacArthur who, as Allied commander in Japan, has wrought a peaceful revolution in that country and saved his army in Korea from the onslaught of a superior enemy, to put it in a position to strike back again, can pass over such criticism with equanimity. So can the United States, which sponsors him. We therefore join with other friends in wishing him happy returns of the day and in expressing the hope that a kind destiny will preserve him in vigor and good health to advance the cause for which he and the free world are fighting.

Russian Crab Imports Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Government, after 11 long months of investigation, finally has acted to stop further imports into this country of Russian canned crab.

The Russian canned crab is produced and packed under slave-labor conditions in slave-labor camps. Costs were so low for the Russians that American fishermen and cannery workers could not and should not be expected to compete with this slave labor. It was a question of shutting off these Russian crab imports or our own American crab fishing industry, in which millions have been invested in boats, gear, and shore installations, being financially ruined.

One of those principally responsible for calling the attention of Congress and the country to what Russian slave labor has been doing to our crab fishing industry was Victor Riesel, whose column "Inside Labor" appears in 154 American daily newspapers.

Mr. Riesel now believes our Treasury Department should act to bar further imports of Russian furs into the United States, and I agree with him. These importations of furs are destroying our American fur industry.

In the first 10 months of last year Russia shipped into the United States furs valued at $19,599,919 according to figures I obtained from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Riesel's arguments as to why Russian fur imports of about $2,000,000 a month should be stopped were discussed by him in one of his recent columns. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Riesel's article herewith:

Now that we've finally shoved Soviet slave-packed Chatka crabmeat off American tables the time is now to get Soviet slave furs off the backs of American women, or there will be more razor-sharp shrapnel in the backs of our boys.

It took us a year. But we finally pressured our Government into admitting officially that the Soviets run slave camps; that the Reds use forced, convict, and indentured labor; and that faceless political slaves catch and pack the crabs sold to us for good old American folding money.

So, very quietly and very unnoticed, last Friday when virtually every newsman had

been mobilized to cover and try to understand the big wage and price freeze, the Treasury Department banned the importation of this delicacy from Kamchatka, land of the world's finest slave camps.

This is the first time any Soviet product has been barred from the United States. Okay. I will no longer crab over the red crabs. But the fact is that we didn't wait for the White House to move. Our A. F. of L. longshoremen have been sending the stuff back for months.

What we now want is for the Federals to close our ports to the $50,000,000 worth of other junk the Soviets are dumping here each year, so they can supply American dollars to their camouflaged agents across the world to buy rubber, copper, and steel for the Red war machine. The stuff is coming in boatloads. Each cargo hold is filled with $50,000 to $70,000 worth of furs, beads, stones, hats, and even religious items.

The labor leaders with whom I organized the original boycott are furious, but helpless. It took us a year to get crab meat barred. It took 6 months to force the weird Department of Commerce's Office of International Trade to stop sending stuff to Soviet China via Hong Kong.

How long will it take us to stop this other blood money from pouring into the hands of Soviet foreign trade commissars? But we're going to try. Here are the facts:

The dirtiest role in this business is being played by British merchants. My friends in the British Cabinet will attest that I've never criticized them unjustly. But now they're dirty. They're fronting for the Soviet foreign trade state trusts. Millions of dollars' worth of Red slave-skinned furs are first sold to British brokers. These traders then hold auction in London. There the furs are resold and reshipped to American (if you'll excuse the expression in this context) furriers.

To avoid our longshoremen's boycott the furriers send their stuff to Montreal in the east and to Vancouver and Seattle in the west.

Seattle is getting the biggest play today. Many a longshoreman there was trained by Harry Bridges and unloads the stuff for love as well as money.

The furs are then trucked from Canada, or packed into freight cars to complete their dollar trek from the original Leningrad auction to the New York fur market, via England. Jolly chaps, the British. All the while the big furriers, many of whom worked closely with the Communist-led furriers' unions in the 1936 days of the union's "Black Glove" gangster organizers, save face by saying they've bought the stuff from the English.

The anti-Communist labor leaders are helpless. It would take an army of investigators to track down the truck and rail shipments. Another army of organizers would be needed to convince the teamsters and freight handlers to let the stuff rot on the sidings as we did on the docks.

This trade runs into real dough. Scores of millions of dollars. Where does the Soviet spend it? Let's look at one item, rubber. We have figures for this war-vital stuff for the first 11 months of 1950. That's just about 60 days ago. In those 11 months the Russians bought 10,000 tons of raw rubber from the British. That's just about 20 times more than the Soviets picked up from them in all of 1949.

And just to make the Chinese caissons go rolling along, the Swiss are shipping aluminum ingots, iron, steel, and rubber tires, for example.

And the American dollar is the one thing those ghouls believe in. But the Russians have plenty. Obviously the time is now for our Government to say loudly, "The whole Red land is a slave camp. We want none of their goods. It has blood on it. So have the dollars our merchants of menace pay for it."

It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is wholesome and refreshing to know that at least one Federal Government agency is interested in saving some of the taxpayer's money. That agency is the General Accounting Office, headed by Lindsay Warren, the distinguished Comptroller General of the United States. In a letter addressed to all Congressmen under date of January 29, 1951, Mr. Warren gives the Congress and the country a splendid résumé of what can be done in reducing public expenditures if there is actually a will to do so. The letter is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 29, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: With the many vital problems before the Congress today, I know you don't have time to read annual reports of Government agencies. Anyway, ours is still in the process of printing. But, knowing of the interest of Members in the General Accounting Office, an agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch, I believe there are certain facts you will want to know. That is the reason for this letter.

The General Accounting Office is an independent and nonpolitical agency. It is a part of our system of checks and balances. It audits and settles the accounts and claims of the Government, and advises and assists the Congress and the agencies on matters relating to expenditures.

The Comptroller General is appointed for a term of 15 years and cannot be reappointed. He can be removed from office only by the Congress.

During recent years, when it seems the Government has been expanding beyond all reasonable comprehension, the GAO has proved that it is possible to reduce employees. In April 1946, the number of employees reached a peak of 14,904. There were 7,063 employees on January 1, 1951, a reduction of 7,841 in the last 5 years, of whom 779 were transferred to the Post Office Department. This has been accomplished through constant surveys of our work and the elimination of procedures which serve no useful purpose under present conditions.

For example, just recently I abolished the Accounting and Bookkeeping Division of the GAO. This division employed 325 people. Certain of the work formerly carried on by that division has been transferred to other divisions. However, it will be possible to carry out the work transferred with 61 people, making a reduction of 264 people and an annual salary savings to the GAO of nearly $1,000,000. There will be no loss of control of public funds. In fact, the revised procedures should enable the GAO and the Government generally to do a more competent job.

While practically every agency of the Government will ask for increased funds for 1952, the GAO will request less money than was made available to us for 1951.

A few statistics on our work in the last year: 25,300,000 vouchers audited; 492,000 claims settled; 318,000,200 checks reconciled; 12,400 decisions rendered to departments, agencies, claimants, and others; inspections made of 945 different Government offices; 34 comprehensive audits submitted to Congress (for the first time since the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 audits of Government corporations were up to date): 685 reports made to Congress and its committees; and 3,500 replies made to inquiries from individual Members of Congress.

The GAO is one of the few agencies that not only pays its way but in addition makes a substantial contribution each year to the Treasury. Collections from 1941 through December 31, 1950, total $718,100,000. This money had been illegally or otherwise improperly paid out and it is a fair statement to say that little of it would have ever been recovered except for the General Accounting Office. Collections are impressive, but also important is the prevention of illegal or improvident use of funds without waiting to collect back what has been paid out illegally.

The joint accounting program inaugurated in December 1947 by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and myself, is achieving remarkable success. As a result of the program and of legislation enacted by the Congress, accounting improvements and red-tape cutting are going forward with rapid acceleration.

The GAO is expanding comprehensive, on-the-site audits which bring about broader coverage, more effective results, less paper work, and reduced flow of documents into Washington.

During the Eighty-first Congress, the GAO supported the enactment of a number of laws which made possible some of the improvements just mentioned. Probably the most important are the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 and the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950. The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act, among other things, permits the elimination of certain procedures upon determination that the interests of the Government are otherwise protected. This made possible the abolishment of the Accounting and Bookkeeping Division mentioned above, but this is only an example. Many other benefits have resulted and will continue to come about. The revisions of procedures and improvements made have reached into every agency of the Government.

The Post Office Department Financial Control Act made possible the abolishment of the Postal Accounts Division of the GAO last November 15. The administrative accounting work which had been done for the Post Office Department has been turned over to that Department. The GAO should never have been given those duties in the first place. I have set up a new Postal Audit Division which will make comprehensive, up-to-date audits of postal financial transactions.

It is essential to our economic survival not only that the national defense be strengthened, but that it be done as effectively and economically as possible. On this score, the GAO bids fair to make a real contribution. We will not only audit defense spending, but will also concentrate to seek out excesses, waste, and extravagances in the defense program. At the same time, we will continue to keep a watchful eye on civilian spending to ferret out those extravagances and frills which our country should not and cannot now endure.

This letter is for your own information and no reply is necessary.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Workmen's Compensation To Apply in Case of an Atomic Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., in which they memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide workmen's compensation in the case of an attack by atomic bomb:

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION TO APPLY IN CASE OF AN ATOMIC ATTACK

Whereas an effective atomic attack on one heavily populated area, or even a single large industrial plant, could result in so many industrial injuries as to exceed the resources and ability of a self-insurer or an insurance carrier of workmen's compensation insurance to furnish compensation benefits and might well exceed even the powers of an entire State to provide such benefits: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this council memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such action so that adequate provisions may be made for the protection, medical care, and indemnity to the workmen of this country and their dependents in case of an atomic attack; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of Congress from Erie County.

This resolution, if enacted into law, certainly would aid the area in which the attack took place in its rehabilitation work and at what I believe would be less cost financially. I feel it would also bring the people as a whole to a consciousness of their responsibilities.

Educational Short-Change of the Nation's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, every United States citizen should consider the long-term meaning of the New York Times educational survey conclusion that 3,000,000 children are being short changed in their education because of inadequate buildings, the lack of teachers, the assignment of poorly trained teachers, and the dependence on double-time or part-time sessions.

With record-breaking enrollments everywhere, I think the country must consider educational needs as defense needs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the January 21 issue of the New York Times editorial page entitled "Education in Review":

EDUCATION IN REVIEW—PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS ALL OVER THE COUNTRY FACE EMERGENCY BECAUSE OF MOBILIZATION

(By Benjamin Fine)

Because the needs of the national mobilization program are so great, American public schools during the coming year will be seriously handicapped in their operation. The construction of many school buildings will have to be postponed, and consequently there will be more overcrowding. There will be shortages of teachers, and school systems will have to accept poorly trained personnel. Morale among teachers is low because of their income.

These serious problems confronting the Nation's schools were emphasized last week with the publication of the New York Times' annual survey of educational conditions in the 48 States and the District of Columbia. The schools have not yet made up for the losses they suffered during World War II. And now, with another emergency facing them, educators throughout the country are deeply concerned by the potential effects of the mobilization program. Some of them even use the word "havoc."

This latest in the series of annual Nationwide surveys by the Times revealed a condition that is disturbing in its implications: 3,000,000 children are being short-changed in their education because of inadequate buildings, the lack of teachers, the assignment of poorly trained teachers and the dependence on double-time or part-time sessions. The States report that despite everything they have been able to do thus far, large numbers of pupils are simply receiving an inadequate education.

Serious as the situation is now, it is destined to become worse because of the inevitable rise in enrollment that results from the high wartime and postwar birth rates. In the current school year the public elementary and secondary schools have 900,000 more pupils than they had a year ago—just about the largest single gain in any 1 year in recent times. The public schools now have a registration of nearly 26,000,000. For the next 10 years—perhaps for longer—enrollment will increase by 500,000 to 1,000,000 annually.

IMMEDIATE STEPS URGED

Educators everywhere recognize the significance of this record-breaking enrollment. They realize that schools already harassed by overcrowding cannot readily add 30 to 40 percent to their enrollment and continue to provide the same kind of education they have been offering. They emphasize that immediate steps must be taken to plan for the future. Otherwise, they warn, within 5 years we will have 6,000,000 children receiving inadequate education instead of the present 3,000,000.

This year's survey also points up the seriousness of the teacher shortage, especially of competent teachers for the lower elementary school grades. All of the States and the District of Columbia reported that they were unable to find all the well-trained teachers they needed for their elementary schools. Nine States also reported that they could not find enough qualified teachers for their high schools.

More teachers are employed this year than ever before in school history. During the past year about 20,000 teachers have been added to the staffs, bringing the total to 960,395. Yet school administrators are quick to point out that the personnel increase has barely been large enough to meet the needs of increased enrollments. Moreover, the present teaching staff still includes 75,000 with emergency or substandard certificates.

AVERAGE SALARY IS $2,867

Teachers' salaries remain the fundamental factor behind the teacher shortage. Salaries rose during the year, but not nearly enough to keep pace with the rising cost of living. The average classroom teacher now receives an annual salary of $2,867, or $55 a week gross pay. This is an increase of only $62 a year over the average salary for the school year 1949–50.

Signs of discontent are evident all over the country, with morale at perhaps its lowest point since the end of the war. In New York City high school teachers are still refusing to take on any extracurricular duties; in Minneapolis the teachers are seriously considering a strike.

The financial problems are enormous. In the face of rising inflation, school boards are having a desperate time getting enough funds to construct new buildings and to maintain those they already have. The Nation's public schools are now paying the record sum of $5,000,000,000 for their schools, an increase of $350,000,000 over last year.

MORE FUNDS NEEDED

Yet, school administrators insist that the $5,000,000,000 can hardly buy as much as the smaller appropriations did in years past. They say twice the present allocation will be needed if the children are to have an adequate education.

And they are deeply worried by the question: Where is the extra money to come from? They realize that defense needs will cut deeply into any extra funds that they might otherwise have expected from their communities. They are giving up hope that Congress will appropriate the $300,000,000—just a drop in the bucket, anyway—that President Truman recommended last week.

The Nation's most pressing needs for the improvement of education were epitomized in this list from Pennsylvania: (1) An accelerated building program; (2) sufficient elementary-school teachers specifically trained for elementary-school work; (3) an adequate school-financing plan at the local level; (4) guidance and vocational information; and (5) enrichment of the instructional process through wider use of audio-visual aids and other apparatus.

CONDITIONS BETTER THAN LAST YEAR

Despite the handicaps and the needs of the Nation's public schools, administrators are not entirely discouraged. On the whole, conditions are better now than they were 5 years ago, or even last year. The Times survey showed, for example, that the schools expended half a billion dollars last year for new buildings and repairs. If the schools could maintain that pace they would lick the congestion problem.

What does discourage school men, however, is what they consider the indifference of Government—Federal, State, and local—to the importance of education, even in a time of national emergency. They believe that if the three levels of government fail to recognize the schools' needs the schools will suffer disastrously. For that reason they urge that education be given a high priority during the coming year. This would mean, for example, that building materials now in short supply be allocated on a priority basis for schools. It would mean that communities must recognize the essential requirement of maintaining a competent teaching staff with a high esprit de corps. That, of course, means higher salaries.

Whose Side Are They On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, "What kind of a war are we fighting in Korea, anyway?" asks Robert Boyer, editor of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa., in an editorial in the January 27, 1951, issue of that newspaper. The editorial follows:

WHOSE SIDE ARE THEY ON?

Indications are that Congress is being pressured to the point where it will approve the sending of any number of troops to Western Europe recommended by Mr. Truman and General Eisenhower.

And, it is expected that the General will recommend the defense of Western Europe, when he makes his report to the President and Nation next week. After all, General Eisenhower's orders apparently were to lay the groundwork for an international army, not primarily to discover if he could raise one.

But, the question persists, Does Western Europe have the will to resist?

Former President Herbert Hoover raised this question. So has former United States Ambassador to Britain, Joseph Kennedy.

Without the will to resist, without the spiritual force necessary to fight communism, any army raised in Western Europe, regardless of its size, would be worthless.

The question for Americans to decide then, within the next week or so, is: Shall we be sending American armies into a wasp's nest of Reds and apathetic Western Europeans?

Here is an indication of what we mean.

From London Friday came a dispatch quoting the liberal News-Chronicle newspaper as saying that if Gen. Douglas MacArthur "only knew how to keep his mouth shut, he would stand a good chance of going down in history as a great commander."

Said the paper, "As it is, posterity will hardly be able to avoid the view that he was a political menace of the largest caliber.

"It is not for him, a serving officer, to say that there can be no turning back in the war against communism in Asia. He, therefore, should not say it.

"Nor should he, while half the world is hoping that some way of negotiating with China will be found, take the opportunity of remarking loudly that he will give the Chinese a bloody nose in South Korea."

Now that is no less than a bitter insult to Americans, most especially to Americans whose sons or brothers or husbands are fighting in Korea.

Those Americans are fighting the Chinese, one of the most brutal enemies of modern times. They are fighting on behalf of the UN.

Yet, Britain, a major UN member, gives evidence time and again of showing extreme disinterest in the war with China, even, as in the case of the News-Chronicle, some sort of sympathy for the Red Chinese cause.

The British paper criticizes the American commander because he says his forces are going to give the enemy a bloody nose.

What kind of war are we fighting in Korea, anyway?

Since when has the commander of any nation's forces been prohibited from criticizing the enemy?

General MacArthur exhorts the free world to fight to the end against communism, and the British paper says he has no business to make such a statement.

Perhaps this is not typical of the British press reaction.

But is is indicative at least of a vein of feeling in Britain and throughout Western Europe—France with her known 5,000,000 Reds, Italy with her 8,000,000—Reds who sabotage, spy, murder, and stand ready to form a fifth column in the rear of any American armies we send to France.

These are things every American should take cognizance of, so that perhaps ultimately we can inject the stabilizing factor of strong public opinion into our top echelons of government.

That factor has been missing, unfortunately, for many years. As a consequence, inept men have bungled affairs so badly that now they know not which way to turn.

They must know the terrible risks of Western Europe. Yet, their irresponsible commitments have us in so deeply that they can find no safe way to extricate us, so, they propose to wind up by commiting hundreds of thousands of American boys to the doubtful defense of an area which itself admits it is practically indefensible, because it lacks the spirit to fight against what it considers the inevitable—Soviet communism.

We need more than a 2-week flying trip to General Eisenhower to convince the American people that western Europeans will stand and fight Russia.

Blue Star Mothers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement regarding the Blue Star Mothers of America.

This organization is a fine, patriotic body serving the best interests of America at all times. I have personally attended meetings of the Blue Star Mothers of America and I know of the high and patriotic motives that actuate their activities.

In order that the country may be informed of the attempt of another organization, bearing an almost identical name, to capitalize on this patriotic organization, I am inserting a statement in the RECORD and urging all Members of Congress to read it:

STATEMENT BY MRS. GEORGE P. TAUSMAN, JR.

The executive board of the Blue Star Mothers of America announced today that it will take action to prevent the use of its name by an organization branded by the Justice Department as subversive.

The announcement was made following a special meeting of the board in Washington. The board members voted unanimously to instruct its national president, Mrs. Lee C. Scott, of Willoughby, Ohio, to take whatever action is necessary to restrain the National Blue Star Mothers of America from further use of that name.

Mrs. Scott said that her organization, Blue Star Mothers of America, was organized immediately after Pearl Harbor as a patriotic service organization to unite all mothers who had sons or daughters in the armed services in the United States of America into a permanent organization. "This organization," said Mrs. Scott, "is nonpolitical, nonsectarian, and nonprofit, and shall not be used for personal or partisan purposes. Its membership of more than 10,000 is composed of mothers of servicemen and women."

Mrs. Scott said that the other group, which has been branded as subversive, later assumed the Blue Star Mothers name, adding only the word "national." It is the National Blue Star Mothers of America which has been placed on the Attorney General's subversive list and which has its headquarters in Philadelphia. Because of this similarity of names, Mrs. Scott said, many sons and daughters of members of the original organization have been discriminated against. A Milwaukee boy was returned from the Great Lakes Training Station because his mother was a member. A boy hospitalized in Japan wrote home advising his mother to discontinue her application, and families have been refused employment in industrial plants in Ohio because their mothers belonged to the original group. Mothers who formerly were recognized by the Special Service Directors in VA hospitals were refused admittance to the hospitals because of this confusion in names. Later, when the matter was taken up with the hospital superintendents, they wrote letters of apology for their error, because the Blue Star Mothers of America had been reinstated by the Justice Department as being an eligible group.

Letters have been received from the Attorney General's office and also from the office of the Justice Department regretting that the similarity in names of the two organizations has caused confusion and embarrassment to the Blue Star Mothers of America.

Mrs. Scott added that we have in our membership such eminent women as the Honorable FRANCES BOLTON and the mother of Gen. Mark W. Clark.

Other resolutions adopted at the executive board meeting were: To support H. R. 910, the amendment to the Public Health Service Act providing a program of grants and scholarships for education in the field of nursing sponsored by Congresswoman BOLTON, Twenty-second District of Ohio; also to support every phase of General Marshall's civil-defense program; to express approval of General MacArthur's command in the Far East; and to support universal military training.

The Blue Star Mothers of America subscribed to a plaque dedicated to the Unknown Soldier and was presented to Colonel Williamson, commanding officer of Arlington National Cemetery by Mrs. Scott. The plaque was placed in the trophy room of the amphitheater in Arlington. A short memorial service was conducted by the board at the graves of two lieutenants, sons of Mrs. Margaret Meyers, of Columbus, Ohio, a member of the Blue Star Mothers of America.

Our Political Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item:

OUR POLITICAL INVASION

Marquis Childs, one of the outstanding Washington correspondents, puts into print something not published often enough. He says, in part:

"As to Korea, the basic fact which must always be remembered is that military commanders never believed that the Korean Peninsula was defensible. They went into Korea because it was decided at the top political level that it was vital to sustain the United Nations as a force for collective security in the world."

On the same day comes the news that American casualties in Korea totaled 40,176 as of last Saturday—and that report probably was at least a week old. Of this number, the roll of dead was 6,761.

Is this a high price to pay to allow President Truman and Secretary Acheson to save face with United Nations by maintaining a "police action" in Korea?

And what, then, would the price be if they admitted it was war?

Is it any wonder that the run-of-mill people of America, whose families are paying this price, are more and more approving the views of Messrs. Kennedy and Hoover?

Public Housing Flop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Malden (Mass.) Evening News:

PUBLIC HOUSING FLOP

Remember that public housing program the social reformers said was absolutely necessary to supplement private enterprise in curing the ills of the have-nots? The program was to subsidize 135,000 low-rent units annually for 6 years. Now it is revealed that only 11,100 such units have been started since July 1949. As is usual with social planners, all they could cook up was a batch of highly extravagant designs. Then the costs of building material and labor began to go up and up. The money allotted by Congress was limited and the planners found themselves stymied. All of this is a lucid sidelight on the operations of the Government in business. It always progresses more slowly than private enterprise and is more costly. Both the ill-housed and the taxpayers ought to wonder why it ever seemed a good idea to go in for public housing.

Men at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ivan H. Peterman from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 28, 1951:

MEN AT WAR—TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION GI'S RATED TOPS BY ARMY, CIVILIANS

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

CAMP ATTERBURY, IND., JANUARY 27.—A 24-truck Army convoy swung off the up-State Indiana highway and parked in front of the roadside diner late at night. Forty-eight GI's wearing the red Keystone patch hopped out, filed quickly inside and sat down. A hardened, hungry lot, they filled the place. The nervous entrepreneur and his waitress began taking orders.

"Ham and egg sandwich; coffee, please." Someone put nickels into the juke slot. They listened to the music while the orders were served.

Half an hour later they filed past the cashier, paid, and resumed their trip. But as the last one pocketed his change, the diner boss couldn't hold back comment:

"Sergeant," said he, "my compliments to your men. When you came in, I got a scare. I figured about $300 worth of damage, loss of a couple of hours' business, and maybe a scuffle or two. But you're all right. Tell your commander his soldiers are welcome anytime anywhere on this route."

The Twenty-eighth Infantry Division likes that incident. It ranks with editorials in the Indianapolis papers praising its conduct and the resolutions of surrounding church and clergymen's groups stating that never before in this Midwest training area has there been a finer grade of American soldier on view.

Deportment, courtesy, and unbelievably good conduct are only part of the Twenty-eighth's mounting reputation. Right now it's the biggest division in the Army—well over normal strength of 19,000, with plenty more coming in. Its commanding general, Daniel B. Strickler, of Lancaster, Pa., until recently Lieutenant Governor, just conducted a basic training efficiency test that brought quick inquiries from all sections of the United States Army.

Lt. Gen. Matt Eddy, commanding our forces in Europe, wrote for particulars so he might consider them for use with occupational troops. Every enlisted member of the "Bloody Bucket" outfit took the test. There were 90 sections on 18 different subjects—weapons, map reading, compass, signals, reconnaissance, chemical-warfare protection, combat problems, military courtesy, character, and educational-intelligence affairs, down to fundamentals like properly policing a barracks. Every GI was scored on every question. A grade of 60 was passing; 80 was excellent; from 90 up was rated superior.

And what was the Twenty-eighth Division's performance? Well, 98.9 of the men passed, and the division average—for 19,000 men—was 92.2 percent. No wonder local papers write editorials, that ministers say nice things in sermons, and conservative Indiana folks are happy to invite Keystone wearers into their homes.

"I'm proud of them," says General Strickler, of whom the State of Pennsylvania should say the same thing. For Strickler and his National Guard staff have done a job that amazes the Regular Army, so that a steady stream of draftees are arriving for the same type training. That is why the Twenty-eighth remains here, preparing thousands more as its own are indoctrinated. Strickler and company, veterans of two world wars, are teaching the kids how to fight and win and come out alive. It's the nearest thing to actual combat this correspondent has seen. It's tough, it's cold, it's fatiguing, and it's necessary. Don't worry about your boy if he's had a course with the Red Keystone.

"One reason is we're getting remarkably fine, intelligent men," Strickler said. "Gen. Mark Clark, head of the United States Army Field Forces, has seen to it we get as good or better than any of the services. They aren't picked over, rejects. Or those considered suited only for ground slogging. They are a cross of America's finest between 19 and 25 years of age. A serious, hard-working, disciplined crop.

"We call them 'fillers,' not replacements, these days. The Army has allowed us to apply many lessons learned in the Hurtgen and Ardennes. We are also looking at what has happened in Korea and telling the men how to be ready for guerrillas, infiltration, and night surprises."

His chief of staff, Col. James G. Mackey, now of St. Davids Apartments, Wayne, Pa., and the assistant commander, Brig. Gen. Thomas L. (Zeke) Hoban, of Scranton, were never so enthusiastic at Indiantown Gap. General Hoban, who fought through the hedgerows, Hurtgen, and the Bastogne Bulge in Europe, thinks today's GI is the smartest he ever helped train. They, along with Lt. Col. Oliver W. Robbins, G-1, from Paoli; Maj. Alvan Markle 3d, the G-2 from Ardmore; Lt. Col. Richard A. Dana, Annville, Pa., the G-3 in charge of training; Lt. Col. George I. McLeod, Villanova, the G-4; and Lt. Col. Albert G. Branyan, Merchantville, N. J., the adjutant general, form the Twenty-eighth's headquarters staff.

All operate from one of the modest frame buildings which awaited the division on its arrival from Indiantown Gap last September. Quarters are of the plainest; indeed, the Twenty-eighth headquarters sometimes were as well housed during the Second World War's hectic moves. General Strickler occupies a tiny bungalow; Brigadier and Mrs. Hoban, and the Artillery officer, Brig. Gen. Guy O. Kurtz, of Denver, Colo., have about the only other cozy quarters on this huge reservation, which is some 35 miles south of Indianapolis.

The division occupies "subdivisions" of barracks, laid out along wide, paved drives. The barracks are all frame, standing on cement pillars and the biting Indiana winds, which are colder than anything in Pennsylvania, cut under the floors. The soft-coal boilers are forced to maximum to warm the high-ceilinged, two-story interiors. The furnace broke down in the senior officers' barracks my first night here, and I nearly froze stiff under six blankets. It got down to 7 degrees during the night, an accustomed temperature since last November.

But few are kicking about housing, food, equipment, or even the hours. They get up 6 a. m. to 7, and the job of soldiering goes on around the clock. Day training usually ends at 5 p. m., but night missions, firing drills, patrol practice, keep the GI's and officers in the field and woods sometimes 2 and 3 days. They sleep in the open or under pup tents, or group beside small fires in the brush.

"But we don't cry," said Sgt. Dave Derents and Sgt. Bill Bass, of the 155-mm gun crew I visited last night. "It's still better than Korea."

Derents lives at 4306 Lieper Street, Bass at 2235 North Mole Street, Philadelphia, and both are with the One Hundred and Eighth Field Artillery Battalion. Their sentiments were seconded by Joe Duda, of 1432 North Coley Street, and Gunner Ralph Carter, also of Philadelphia.

The main deficiency is in company and field grade officers. The Army just hasn't enough. Draftees are being inducted faster than officer schools, West Point, and the Reserves can provide commissioned personnel to train them. Then, too, a great many of the Twenty-eighth officers are attending technical schools all over the country.

One productive routine begins the moment a recruit or draftee arrives at Atterbury. He's not treated as a raw recruit. There's no "riding" or "breaking in." No rough stuff. The Army is polite. The older GIs are actually sympathetic and make the new guy feel at home. "What the heck," they say, "we're all greenhorns at this, except the veterans or guardsmen who had combat, and they're not happy over the prospect of more war. So we make the best of it."

One has to admire such common sense and quiet facing of facts. Bewildered, confused by the topsy-turvy events and mystifying

high-level developments of diplomacy, these citizen-soldiers deserve a nod for their forbearance.

When the newest bunch—say 200 to 400 newly uniformed from the the induction centers—comes to join the Twenty-eighth's organization, they get, first of all, a briefing by Strickler. It's part of old combat-day stuff, when the Twenty-eighth had to reform its riddled ranks after Mortain, after Hurtgen, and again after the Ardennes.

"We bring them to the assembly area and I welcome them to the outfit, explaining its traditions, records, and our pride in it," Strickler said. "They're made to understand that they're now one of us and the Twenty-eighth's mission is explained. At present it's full training. We distribute their weapons, assign them to units. Then follows 28 weeks of training and of basic. As you know, we're starting unit teamwork now, lasting until May."

Strickler wants every bloody bucketeer to be curious.

"I want you to know what, when, how, why, and where at all times," he tells the men. "If your're in doubt, ask. Keep asking till you get the answers."

Next advice is: "Be a soldier." No twenty-eighth man looks sloppy. They swing along like those grim lads you saw in wartime movies. They're told they're proved superior to the 46 percent who flunk the draft physically. Their mental qualifications are stressed. The patriotic duty is made clear. There is no smirking or sniffing at the flag or country in a United States training camp.

Finally, the matter of good conduct, proper language and dignity is explained and enforced. There are no profane, vulgar GI's out here, no swaggering or drunkenness or messing around in the city and towns. Saluting, military courtesy, and respect for fellow citizens is universal. I've not met so many polite people since the war ended. I've heard more "thank you, sir," and observed more regards for the amenities in 3 days here than in 3 months at the United Nations sessions in New York. No fooling.

The Twenty-eighth Division soldier proceeds head up, gloved hands swinging briskly, not stuffed in his pockets. He is alert, keen on orders—a sentry stopped the general last night, refused him passage when he didn't have the password—and pretty well aware of the serious job that lies ahead, if aggression continues.

This was frankly surprising, for I expected a brooding, resentful soldiery, disgusted with our failure to button up victory in 1945. Instead, these kids are philosophical, aware and, more amazing, they apparently are much better oriented on what it's all about than their predecessors in two previous wars. Few America ns ever know for sure what's ahead, but these at least are going to be doggone well prepared when and if it happens.

The Twenty-eighth Division has blueprinted that preparation in the present emergency. The Army is pleased, and the whole country should be proud. Says the Indianapolis Times:

"As a soldier's town of long standing, Indianapolis tends to judge men in uniform by the way they behave away from camp. The judgment on the men of the Twenty-eighth is that they are soldiery gentlemen. On pass, most of them appear to be alert, neat, courteous young men and not given to displays of toughness which some servicemen in training seem to think marks them as future Medal of Honor winners.

"As for real toughness, we've confident the Twenty-eighth will be as tough an outfit as any enemy ever faced, if it has to go to combat. Meanwhile, we're proud to have Major General Strickler and his men as our neighbors."

Titoism in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 30, 1951:

TITOISM IN ITALY

Significant cracks are beginning to appear in the Italian Communist Party. Two of its former stalwarts have resigned from it. Both members of Parliament, they are Aldo Cucchi and Valdo Magnani, the latter distinguished for having organized what is regarded as the most effective Red regional unit in Italy. They have broken away because they found themselves unable to stomach the traitorous Cominform dogma that all comrades, no matter what their nationality, must be more loyal to the Kremlin than to their own native lands.

Mr. Magnani, with Mr. Cucchi supporting him, has definitely washed his hands of that idea. He has done so not merely by resigning from the party but by publicly declaring that every Italian, without exception, should consider it his first and highest duty to defend our fatherland if the frontier should be attacked from any direction whatsoever. In other words, if the attack should come from the Soviet Union or one of its satellites, then Italy's Reds, as patriots owing allegiance to their own country above all countries abroad, must battle the attacker as bitterly and as steadfastly as they should any aggressor of any ideology.

This is what the Cominform inveighs against as the crime of nationalistic communism. It is the kind of communism under which Marshal Tito has declared Yugoslavia's independence of Moscow, with the result that the Soviet Union has marked him down as one of its most dangerous enemies. He is dangerous because he has become the leader of a potentially far-reaching schism in the Communist world, on both sides of the iron curtain. Now the schism has struck Italy's Red organization, the biggest in Western Europe. Next it may strike in France, and in due course, let us hope, in the satellite lands. It is a thing that could shatter all of the Kremlin's imperialistic dreams and ambitions.

Selling Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, if we could win the war of ideas, all-out war may never prove necessary. Our Government has never really faced up to this challenge. Discouragingly small sums of money have been granted to our Voice of America program, and the recent Republican-controlled Congress denied even a token appropriation to continue the program which was doing as fine a work as possible with its limited funds. Fortunately, the Eighty-first Congress appropriated enough money to reinstitute the program and it is now continuing, but is still far too limited in its scope.

Mr. Henry L. Johnson, of Seattle, Wash., is one of a great number of people genuinely concerned that America should do a better work in the field of spreading democratic ideas and explaining democratic objectives. Following is a letter from Mr. Johnson which I believe will prove interesting to every person interested in this vital subject:

NORTHWESTERN MUTUAL FIRE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Seattle, Wash., January 18, 1951.

Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MITCHELL: The events of the past 6 months have caused many Americans to do more serious thinking than they have ever done before about their country, its security, the manner in which it is being governed, and its foreign policy. Most of us, and myself in particular, have been very derelict in our duty of letting officials in our Government know our views. I, for one, am going to correct that situation.

One field in which our Government has failed miserably in the past few years is the field of propaganda. Russia has made a big part of her gains throughout the world through the clever use of propaganda. The surprising thing is that they have been able to accomplish this in spite of the fact that their propaganda consists almost entirely of lies and falsehoods.

We, in the United States, have developed advertising to a point far in advance of anything any other country has ever known, and yet our Government has apparently ignored its possibilities for use in the war of ideas. Our most obvious and apparently our main effort along these lines has been the Voice of America which has had to fight for its very existence ever since it was inaugurated and has never had sufficient backing to do a thorough job. It could be made very effective.

What is needed is an aggressive propaganda or advertising department to spread democratic ideas and a free way of life, and expose communism, in every corner of the globe. The best advertising and diplomatic brains in the country should be mobilized for this purpose.

Costs should not even be considered. An expenditure of $1,000,000,000 for this purpose might very easily accomplish more than an expenditure of $10,000,000,000 for armaments or atom bombs. Such a program could conceivably weaken communism to the point where a world war could be avoided.

We have the truth to tell the world and if we spent as much time and effort telling it, as Russia has telling its lies and falsehoods, we would strengthen the Western World tenfold.

One thing the American public cannot understand is why we permit Russia to malign and slander our officials, our citizens, and our Government daily in all parts of the world without making a vigorous effort to counteract these lies with the truth. If people hear only one side of any question, that is the side they are going to believe, and the reason many of the backward people around the globe have accepted communism is because that is all they have heard. There has not been an effective propaganda program for democracy and the free way of life.

We have delayed far too long in this matter. We should take action immediately. We must depend on our elected representatives to see that programs of this kind are put into action and properly carried out.

Very truly yours,
HENRY L. JOHNSON.

Letter From Mr. and Mrs. William J. McLean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, many families in our country are still bearing unusually heavy burdens and contributed too heavily in the cause of our common defense. To such people we all owe a debt of gratitude which we cannot possibly pay.

Recently I received a letter from Mr. and Mrs. William J. McLean, who are residents of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon which I represent. Of their four sons one was killed in action in World War II, one served through that war and fought in the European area, one was ready for embarkation to Europe when the war ended, and one boy now 18 years of age they think may be drafted. It is small wonder that these parents, this family, having suffered so much from war, are embittered and have lost faith in our Government leaders.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include, at their request, the letter I received from Mr. and Mrs. McLean:

JANUARY 21, 1951.

Hon. HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLSWORTH: The enclosed Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters was awarded to Capt. William J. McLean, who was killed July 26, 1945, a few days before the end of hostilities with Japan.

A brief history of our family. Mrs. McLean and myself have been registered Democrats ever since we have been able to vote. My mother raised two sons, myself and my brother Frank. We both served overseas in World War I. My brother has never been heard from since the end of World War I. We never could get any information from the War Department as to whether he was discharged or what happened to him.

Mrs. McLean and I raised four sons. Three were in World War II and the other boy was about 9 years old at that time. One served in the Pacific area as a pilot and after numerous combat missions, was killed as stated above. One served in the European area and returned from the service. The other boy was at the point of embarkation for Europe when hostilities were over in that area.

Bud, the boy that was killed, wrote to his mom and said, "Mom, if anything happens to me, it will be to keep Mickey from the necessity of ever fighting on foreign soil." That promise was made in good faith and now Mickey, the 9-year-old boy, was 18 on January 17, 1951, and apparently is going to be drafted to serve in world war III.

I would like to know what we have accomplished in fighting World War I and World War II and the so-called police action in Korea. Mrs. McLean's only nephew, old enough for service at the present time, has been missing in action in Korea since July 10, 1950.

If our country is sincere and would take the profit out of war and quit trying to protect interests on foreign soil, maybe the American way of life would lead along the road to peace.

I respectfully request you to read this letter to any of the committees who will take action on the present recommendation to draft 18-year-olds and, if necessary, to read it before Congress itself, and then we further request that you return the enclosed medal to Mr. Truman to dispose of as he so desires, as we feel that this country has betrayed the memories of the boys who have died in service to their country.

Yours very truly,
WILLIAM J. MCLEAN.
EDNA B. MCLEAN.

Walnuts: Black Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Missouri Conservationist, a magazine published monthly by the Missouri Conservation Commission. The article is entitled "Walnuts: Black Gold".

WALNUTS: BLACK GOLD

(By Merrill V. Nipps)

Walnut kernels, picked out by hand, were for many years a small source of income to Ozark farmers. Some sold their own kernels; others sold to produce dealers who in turn sold to nut brokers in cities. Many small operators, produce dealers usually, would sell walnuts in the hull to farmers and buy back the kernels, setting a price so that women and children or shut-ins in the home could make a dollar or so a day. This grew into a sizable business until, in 1941, a walnut kernel dealer in Fordland, Mo., handled more than 500,000 pounds of kernels, buying from other dealers as well as from farmers.

About this time things happened. The food and drug department started cracking down on home-cracked walnut kernels due to the danger of spreading disease. The Wage Act was passed requiring processors to pay a minimum wage, thus complicating further the walnut business. It was along about this time, too, that we went to war and needed black walnut shells for gas-mask filters.

I came here from Philadelphia about the time the war started to get walnut shells for making activated charcoal to be used as filters in gas masks. Lined up with a nut processor at Gravette, Ark., who said he would process all I could buy or ship to him, I pegged the price at $1.25 to $1.35 per hundred pounds for hulled, dry, sacked black walnuts and started every produce and feed dealer in Missouri to buying them. That winter of 1941 was the first time there had ever been an unlimited, guaranteed market for black walnuts. We got over 4,000,000 pounds that season. Shells were shipped to a plant in Chicago. We sold the kernels as our profit.

The business was continued and has grown until now, in a good year, we buy 12,000,000 pounds of black walnuts. More recently other plants have sprung up, one at Stockton, Mo., and another at Sulphur Springs, Ark. Each of them bought over a half-million pounds of walnuts last year.

Farmers are becoming more and more conscious that this is a sure cash crop for them and are gathering more walnuts every year. Last year they got from $3 to $3.50 a hundred pounds for them as compared to slightly over $1 a hundred in 1941.

As walnut kernels were produced in larger quantities, new uses for them have been found. Main outlets today are in the bakery, ice cream, and candy industries. In our factory at Gravette, we can crack 100,000 pounds of black walnuts, and clean, pasteurize, and ship 12,500 pounds of kernels in a two-shift day.

The forestry division of the conservation commission and the college of agriculture of the university are urging farmers not to sell their immature walnut trees for logs, since, over a period of a few years, they are worth far more for the nuts they bear. They are good income possibilities to individual farmers. I have personally gone out and, with the help of three or four boys, picked up and hulled 3,000 pounds of walnuts in a day. At $3 per 100 pounds, that would be $90. I know of one farmer living near Walnut Grove, Mo., who sold more than $750 worth in one season, bringing in from 500 to 2,000 pounds of walnuts each week end. During the fall of 1946, the dealer in Walnut Grove bought for us over 500,000 pounds of walnuts, paying the farmers in his area some $15,000. That is a good income from one small area.

Missouri is by far the biggest walnut-producing State in the Nation, the heaviest producing area being within a hundred-mile radius of Springfield.

Walnut kernels are rich in protein, 1 pound having as much protein as 5 to 6 pounds of beef. Ordinarily native black walnuts will produce from 12 to 15 pounds of kernels per 100 pounds of hulled nuts. The 12-pound figure is about average for machine methods.

Grafted name-variety nuts will produce from 25 to 35 percent kernels. I planted 12 in 1943 that at present are not 30 feet tall, but are bearing large crops of nuts each year. They respond richly to manuring and cultivation. I firmly believe that 10 years from now my walnut orchard will produce more money per year than a same size orchard of apples or peaches. And it is much less expensive to maintain. Walnut trees planted in a pasture do not impede the grass. In fact, wherever you see black walnut trees there is fine blue grass, for the tree doesn't shade heavily and the outer hulls of the nuts serve as soil feeders.

A warning to farmers who plant walnut trees—keep stock away from them until the trees are way up there. Livestock eat the foliage like nobody's business.

Lately many people are having native walnut trees of medium size top-worked. To do this cut off all limbs down to stubs and then bud or graft on small cuttings from name varieties. It is surprising how fast the tree recovers and soon you have an adult tree bearing name-variety nuts.

There is absolutely an unlimited market now for all the black walnuts the farmers have or can find anywhere. Next season prices probably will be as high or higher than ever before. The nuts are clear profit just for picking them up and hulling them. A quick easy way to hull them is with a home-made trough installed under a jacked-up rear wheel of a car.

Black walnuts can be a million-dollar industry in the Ozarks. We're already more than halfway there.

Aggressor Tag To Hurt Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a well-considered and informative article written by David Lawrence and appearing in the Washington Star of January 29, 1951:

AGGRESSOR TAG TO HURT REDS—FAR-REACHING CONSEQUENCES ARE EXPECTED WHEN UN APPROVES LABEL ON RED CHINA

(By David Lawrence)

Passage this week of the resolution by the United Nations declaring Red China to be engaged in aggression will lead to consequences of a far-reaching nature. These may be outlined as follows:

1. The war with Red China will go on until Communist China takes the initiative in stopping hostilities. America is weary of the palavering with Chinese Communist leaders about a cease fire.

2. Because Red China is an aggressor, she cannot be admitted into the United Nations until the Communist regime has been completely purged of any further tendency toward aggression and pledged herself to make reparation for damage done to Korea. This means that in all probability Red China will not get into the UN for a long time and perhaps not at all, especially if another government of substantial strength should emerge to challenge Red China's claims to recognition.

3. With Red China declared an aggressor, Great Britain and other governments which have recognized the Peiping regime will be in a position to withdraw such recognition. Otherwise they would be in the embarrassing position of carrying on diplomatic relations with an aggressor regime.

4. The United States by agreeing to limit the war to Korea has not foreclosed the opportunity on a subsequent occasion to demand that the UN permit the bombing of Manchuria as a means of ridding Korea of aggression.

5. Measures of economic and naval blockade of Red China will be brought up for discussion later on, but as long as the fighting inside Korea is indecisive there is no immediate pressure for the adoption of further penalties against the territory of Red China.

6. A large vote mobilized behind the American resolution will be regarded throughout the world as a symbol of unity and particularly as a manifestation of the will to cooperate with America, the absence of which for several weeks has had such a depressing effect on public opinion in America.

But when all these effects are appraised the question still remains unanswered: What is going to be the outcome of the whole Korean episode?

The probabilities are that the answer will come on the battlefield rather than in the UN or the realm of diplomacy.

American air power is now so substantial that air raids of a saturation type can be conducted on a scale comparable to that which was inflicted on Germany during the last war. Thus, 250 of the B-29 bombers carry a tonnage equivalent to that of 1,000 of the B-17's, which did such extensive damage in Germany. When the newspapers used to report a 1,000-plane raid the American people got the impression that the maximum amount of damage was being done. Something of the same sort is going on right along in Korea, but the American public isn't aware of it as yet. Possibly it is because there has been a noticeable soft-pedaling on the extent of the damage being visited on large areas. Undoubtedly many civilians are being killed, too.

"Napalm," which is the deadliest of the fire bombs, rings the enemy troops. When they infiltrate behind our lines, our ground troops signal the Air Force the positions of the enemy and everything within the circle is pounded to pieces or burned.

The tragic truth is that the Red Chinese are taking some awful punishment. Their crack army cannot indefinitely take such heavy losses. They will need these trained troops for battles in the interior of China. Incidentally, Russia isn't risking any of her armies while Red China is bearing the brunt of the Korean struggle. The casualties on the UN side are relatively low due to the defensive campaign being waged and the utilization of counteroffensive moves on a hit-and-run basis. This kind of campaigning can go on for a long time. It could happen that the Red Chinese will be begging for a cease-fire without any conditions very soon, and the UN will then have a free hand to discuss or negotiate whatever it pleases.

As time goes on, terms will grow stiffer because the Red Chinese have had their opportunity to end the bloodshed and have insisted on a victor's terms instead.

It is being asked, of course, on many sides: "What will all this accomplish?" The only answer that seems at the moment to be acceptable is that if the Korean episode does prevent a third world war by impressing the Communists that the free world will fight aggression wherever it arises, the sacrifices made will have been more than worth while.

Governor Dewey's Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, Democratic State chairman of New York, which, in my opinion, is most timely in view of the submission by Governor Dewey to the New York State Legislature of the highest budget in the history of New York State:

There is no excuse for Governor Dewey's misleading statement regarding the new Federal budget.

Mr. Dewey has taken it upon himself to blast the President's allocations for domestic affairs—a portion of the national budget which amounts to only 17 cents out of every dollar. It may be, however, that Mr. Dewey in issuing this statement is seeking to divert attention from his own inflated budget.

Since Governor Dewey took office, the budget of this State has more than doubled.

Under Governor Dewey, the State's debt is greater than it was at the end of the depression of the 1930's. This despite the fact that he has been reaping the most tremendous revenues in our State's history.

The vast increase in administrative expenditures under Governor Dewey can most easily be seen in a department by department comparison of Governor Lehman's last budget with Governor Dewey's 1950 budget. Typical examples are:

Department of commerce: from $223,860 to $2,042,492.

Department of audit and control: from $1,116,160 to $3,314,019.

Department of civil service: from $561,115 to $1,068,290.

Department of conservation: from $3,155,095 to $8,355,031.

Department of state: from $813,767 to $2,229,335.

Department of taxation and finance: from $5,955,545 to $13,022,027.

About the only economies made by the Republican Governor in his last budget were slashes of $6,739,000 in aid to dependent children and of $1,069,000 in aid to the aged.

The soaring expenditures under Governor Dewey are no doubt due in great part to the vast increase in public employees. From January 1943 to last October the number of persons employed by the State has skyrocketed from 59,215 to 78,120—a 49.6 percent increase. This has caused a jump of 188 percent in the State payroll, from $7,280,000 a month to $20,000,000.

These are but a few examples—enough, however, to indicate where Mr. Dewey should display his talents for economizing and sacrificing.

We shall be interested to see what economies and sacrifices will be found in Governor Dewey's forthcoming budget.

The Frog Story and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cottage Grove (Oreg.) Sentinel of December 14, 1950:

THE FROG STORY AND SOCIALISM

In some parts of the United States there is in circulation a frog story, which illustrates how a new governmental theory which advocates either socialism or communism can get a foothold in a democracy. It shows how we can embrace the creeping socialism or communism. If a frog is dumped into a pail of scalding water he will immediately jump out or conversely if the frog is dumped into a pail of icy water he will jump out immediately. But if the frog is put into a bucket of tap water and the water is gradually heated or cooled, the frog would remain in the bucket of water until he is cooked or frozen beyond further struggle.

Socialism is not being fed to us all at once, but slowly like the process of cooking or freezing the frog. The process has been going on now for 10 or 15 years and is coming from nowhere but our National Capitol.

Playing With Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a well-considered and timely editorial, Playing With Fire, appearing in the Boston Post of January 28, 1951.

As a matter of fact, every right we possess under the Constitution can only exist if the United States of America continues to exist.

PLAYING WITH FIRE

Back in September 23, 1949, President Truman made an announcement which stunned America and rocked the free world.

He stated publicly he believed that the American people to the fullest extent consistent with national security should be informed of developments in the field of atomic energy.

His information was this: "We have evidence that within recent weeks an atomic explosion occurred in the U. S. S. R." The headlines shouted, "Russia has A-bomb." It was something the American people should know.

There was no hysteria or stampede in the United States. Outwardly the citizens of our land, in the traditional way, took the awesome news in stride. But inwardly they began to rearm. The honeymoon was over.

No longer was the United States sitting on top of the world with a weapon which could win any war and knock off any would-be conqueror. We had been asked to move over on our preferred seat and make room for our foe, our greatest and most determined foe. Once more, broadly in the matter of weapons, Russia was equal with America.

Since then there have at times been doubts propounded by certain thinkers and public orators whether Russia really has the bomb. But the belief that President Truman knew what he was talking about overrides those quibbles.

Let us assume Russia has the bomb as the American people have been informed and ask these questions: Do the American people know the exact date that bomb went off in Russia? Do they know exactly in what part of Russia the test was made?

The reason we raise these questions is this: Everyone in the wide world knows today that the first explosion has occurred at the Atomic Energy's new testing grounds in Nevada. Everyone also knows that the detonation occurred last Wednesday night.

If anyone doubts that they will have to doubt the word of Governor Russell, of Nevada. He announced it to the world. Pressed, the public relations man at Las Vegas, on authority from Washington, confirmed it.

Furthermore, the world was publicly informed that the explosion was a "dry run" to test communication and other facilities on the bombing range in Clark County.

Now that the American people know that, what do they know?

We doubt that President Truman wanted everyone to know about it because he said he would only give information consistent with national security. We do not know if such information now given out upsets national security, but we cannot see how it helps.

For one thing, there are the Russian spies in America whom we daresay are as busy ferreting out our atom secrets right now as they were during World War II.

We hardly expect that a Russian spy, so engaged, would bother right now checking through Vermont or Illinois. It would seem a matter of common sense, and Russian spies have lots of that, they would be heading for Nevada.

Unfortunately, they will not be wearing black whiskers and Russian caracul caps. They will not be walking into bars demanding vodka or roaring the Internationale.

They will look like other American citizens because in the guise of American citizens they are working for Russia.

As a member of the free press we are against censorship. But since the free press can only exist if the United States of America continues to exist, in times of grave national emergency there must be some restraint for safety's sake.

If we have war secrets Russian spies would die to know about, why hand them to them on a platter?

This Way It Began

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] has told today a story that touches the heart of every one of us of the Congress as well as every mother and father throughout the Nation.

A 13-year-old girl, Ethel May Ness, of 327 Chestnut Street, Kearny, N. J., was stricken with polio on September 26, 1950, diagnosed as the dread spinal paralytic type. Practically all hope had been abandoned when she was brought to the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Foundation Hospital at Jersey City, N. J.

Tonight Mr. Speaker, this young lady graduates with her school class at the Lincoln Junior School of Kearny, N. J., not yet fully recovered but well enough to be brought to her school and to stand up long enough from her wheelchair to receive her diploma from the hands of Dr. John Bosshart, New Jersey's State Commissioner of Education sent to Kearny by the Governor of New Jersey, Alfred E. Driscoll, to officially represent him in congratulating this young girl who continued in hospital her studies under the direction of Mrs. Ramm of the Jersey City Fund of Education.

The attention of the Nation will be on this young lady tonight when she receives her diploma. Congratulatory letters have been sent her by New Jersey's Governor Driscoll, Senators Smith and Hendrickson; Congressmen Sieminski and Lart; also from the United States Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, the honorary chairman of the Sister Kenny Foundation and House Minority Leader Martin.

Our colleague, Mr. RODINO, himself has taken the time to go to Kearney to personally participate in the exercises for Ethel who despite all obstacles continued on with her studies so as to graduate with her class.

Mr. Speaker, this story of her faith in God that she would get well and her determination to keep going is a tribute to our children of America and a challenge to all of us in these days of troubles and anxiety that where there is a will there is a way with God's help.

Mr. Speaker, we of Texas, perhaps more than any other State of the Union, have suffered from polio. California and North Carolina too have had epidemic after epidemic, of this dread crippling disease.

Our colleague Mr. PRIEST, from Tennessee, introduced a bill in the Eighty-first Congress to provide for Federal research into polio and other crippling diseases. This bill was approved by the House Interstate Commerce subcommittee but died in the last days of the Eighty-first Congress. I sincerely hope he reintroduces this bill in the Eighty-second Congress. Mr. Speaker, the only bright spot that I have seen are the results of the reports of the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Foundation hospitals and clinics wherein 84 percent of their admitted cases walk out on their own limbs.

At this time I would like to compliment the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Foundation, its Mr. Marvin Klein, the executive director; Marvin A. Stevens, M. D., their medical director; Miss Valerie Harvey, chief technician; Rex G. Williams, eastern regional director; and Thomas J. Duffey, assistant regional director, and all the others who day by day work so that others may walk and live and play.

I join with my colleague from New Jersey in his sincere hope that one day every State in the Union will have a Sister Kenny Foundation Hospital, so that the thousands of polio cases yet to come can be helped and cured by the method of this great Australian nurse, Sister Elizabeth Kenny.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude these remarks with the story "This way it began":

THIS WAY IT BEGAN

"Infantile paralysis. No known treatment. Do the best you can with the symptoms presenting themselves.

"McDONNELL."

Elizabeth Kenny, 23-year-old Australian nurse, looked at the telegram again, then moved away from the lonely pool of light by the telegrapher's shack toward the hitching rail where her horse stood in tired patience.

The time was 1909; the place, Australia's isolated outland. Elizabeth Kenny had hoped that Dr. McDonnell, her mentor, would be able to help. But the dread term "infantile paralysis" even in a cryptic wire message dashed that hope completely. Or should have dashed it completely.

But riding back toward sickness in the bush-country hut, Nurse Kenny dwelt not on frustration but upon the terrified mother who waited, upon the child, her patient, given into her hands by the circumstances of isolation. She saw again the 2-year-old tot contorted by pain, her knee drawn up, her heel twisted outward, her arm drawn tightly beside her chest—the symptoms, puzzling to Nurse Kenny, which had sent her post haste to the nearest town astride the saddle horse she used to reach outlying districts. The symptoms which Dr. McDonnell had correctly diagnosed over a telegrapher's thin strand as polio. "Do the best you can with the symptoms presenting themselves."

And now young Elizabeth Kenny rose up in her stirrups. Galloping through the night, she kept repeating those helpless words in a growing pattern of rebellion and fury. No known treatment? Tell that to a child in agony?

But there was no further time for thinking; the situation demanded action—and quickly.

At the hut she flung herself from her horse and strode into the sick room. Working with desperate haste she tried warm salt in a bag, and then a linseed meal poultice, but twisted pain remained. Then she tore a woolen blanket into strips and wrung them out in boiling water, wrapped the strips around the painful parts. She repeated this process until amazingly, unbelievably, pain stopped. The child slept.

Nurse Kenny went wearily outside and stood close by a giant tree fern, hearing faintly the bark of a dingo, and in the distance a raucous kookaburra. She knew she had won. Perhaps * * *?

During the next few weeks Sister Kenny treated similarly five more cases of polio in her area, then reported back to Dr. McDonnell.

"Do you mean to tell me they recovered?" asked the doctor skeptically. "Without deformity?"

"Why, yes," said the young nurse. And she showed him, and the other doctors of Australia, and later the medical men of America too. And today—because a girl nurse in Australia's bush country refused to bow to orthodox medical dictum—thousands of children, and adults, too, are spared the hideous crippling of a dread disease.

This way it began.

United We Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, James Patrick McGovern, a former captain in the AEF during the First World War, and a member of Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, has composed a poem which affirms the worth, the honor, and the soul of mankind, which I now present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

UNITED WE STAND

What love of country and of Government
Can plant our flag on far Korean heights
When greed and hate and ignorance are blights
By which our soldiers' minds and hearts are spent?

If communism is the tyrant's lust
For power veiled behind a Judas' guile,
What are those righteous leaders with their smile
Whose god is votes, whose lie "In God We Trust"?

Our fathers in their wisdom framed the state
With Christian virtues, which they sanctified;
The Congress, Courts, and President allied
Are balances they held inviolate.

Never was the need for unity
So crucial here, abroad, as freedom's name
Is desecrated in the blood-guilt flame
Of communism's far-flung treachery.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

When May A-Bomb Be Used?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this article which I am inserting, taken from the Los Angeles Tidings, the official Catholic newspaper of that area, certainly brings to our minds the seriousness of the use of the A-bomb. I recommend its careful and thoughtful reading:

WHEN MAY A-BOMB BE USED?

(By Rev. Robert F. Coerver, C. M., professor of philosophy, St. Johns Seminary)

When the Chinese Communists launched their unwarranted and overwhelming assault against our troops in Korea, the hue and cry was raised in this country to retaliate with the use of the atom bomb.

This demand was heard in both the House and the Senate, from several military leaders, and from many a Mr. Average Citizen in the street. The possibility of using the atom bomb in reprisal was given impetus in a remark from President Truman.

However, in a later interview, President Truman seemed to express the sentiments of our national conscience when he sadly shook his head at press reporters and stated:

"It is a terrible weapon. It should not be used on innocent women and children who have nothing to do with this military aggression."

Thus President Truman recognized, as we all do, that the use of the atom bomb has certain ethical implications.

MORALITY OF WARFARE

Before discussing the ethical aspects of the atom bomb, it might be pertinent to say a few words about the morality of modern warfare. I do not intend to raise here the question: Can any modern war be morally justified? The overwhelming majority of moral theologians, I am sure, would answer that there can be a justifiable modern war.

The church teaches that the rulers of a nation may not declare war against another nation unless (1) they are sure that they are in the right; (2) they have first exhausted all peaceful measures of bringing about an end of conflict; (3) they have good reason to believe that the benefits achieved by their victory will not be outbalanced by the evil consequences of the war.

I accept the position that modern warfare can certainly be justified, especially in view of the defense of our spiritual possessions and the threat of enslavement by a godless, tyrannical power.

Our question deals rather with the morality of a given means (the atom bomb) made use of in the prosecution of a war which itself is justified.

BOMBING OPERATIONS

Bombing operations in modern warfare are divided into two classes, tactical and strategic.

Tactical bombing missions are those in which the enemy is directly engaged. For example, bombing troops in the field or enemy troopships at sea.

Strategic bombing missions are those in which the enemy is not directly engaged but which are a part of an over-all strategy to reduce his military effectiveness prior to direct engagement. For example, enemy munitions factories behind the lines.

Precision or "pinpoint" bombing is a bombing assault in which the target is a specific, assigned, definite target—such as a factory, shipyard, railroad center. Tactical, strategic, and precision bombing, in a justifiable war, present no moral problem for they do not differ radically from the use of long-range artillery fire. They are a necessary concomitant of modern warfare.

MAY A-BOMB BE USED?

The question arises: may an atom bomb be used in tactical precision bombing?

The answer seems to be certain that an atom bomb could be used in tactical operations such as against an enemy fleet at sea or enemy troops in the field.

Here we presume that the harm of the bomb and its destructiveness would be limited to combatants. There seems to be no difficulty as to the use of the atom bomb in this case.

May an atom bomb be used in strategic precision bombing? The answer is twofold.

1. If the target were entirely military or munitions, such as a town or city which is exclusively dedicated to manufacturing bombs or munitions, with practically no civilian personnel, then the atom bomb could be used. Oak Ridge or Los Alamos might be cited as examples. In this case, atomic bombing could be justified.

2. If the target were a munitions factory in a large city, surrounded by civilian homes and residential areas, the use of the atom bomb would be questionable. If the target were one of supreme importance whose destruction was essential to the winning of the war and the atom bomb was thought to be the sure means of destruction, in this case, it seems that the atom bomb could be morally justified even though it is foreseen that thousands of noncombatants might be killed or severely wounded as an indirect result of the bombing.

The destruction of such extremely important objectives would seem to justify the concomitant and indirect deaths of so many civilians.

Father Connell, moral theologian of Catholic University, gives two examples where such might be the case.

(A) The destruction of the building in which all the war lords of the enemy are gathered.

(B) The destruction of the factory where the enemy is making his own superbombs.

Even in these cases there is some hesitancy on the score that precision bombing by high explosives might do just as effective a job without the consequent death of nearby civilians.

OBLITERATION BOMBING

If the target is not of vital importance, then, a fortiori, it is difficult to see how the atom bomb could ever be used in strategic bombings where it is foreseen that many thousands of civilians will die in consequence.

However, precision bombing, like modern warfare, has tended to become uncontrolled. Gradually, the targets become less defined, less limited, and whole areas become the targets. This brings us to the important question, the heart of the matter, obliteration bombing.

Obliteration bombing is defined as the bombing of industrial centers of population in which the target to be wiped out is not a definite factory, bridge, or munitions plant, but a large area of a whole city, comprising one-third to two-thirds of its whole built-up area, and including by design the residential districts of workingmen and their families.

This type of bombing occurred during the last war and is likely to occur in this next war. For these compelling reasons, the following discussion of its morality is necessary.

Some proponents of modern, total war have attempted to justify obliteration bombing on the score that in the changed conditions of modern warfare, there is no longer a dividing line between combatants and noncombatants, soldiers and civilians.

According to their logic, in total war all citizens are mobilized. Men not actually in the army are munitions and defense workers, war-bond purchasers, and contribute to the war effort. Women are drafted as plant workers, and even children are classed as war potential.

NATURAL LAW

Since all citizens are mobilized, then, it follows that all citizens of a modern warring nation are subject to bombing. Therefore, obliteration bombing is lawful.

It seems to our way of thinking (and also in the practically unanimous opinion of theologians) that such an opinion is untenable.

We shall refute these claims in the following discussion of two questions:

1. Do the majority of civilians in a modern nation at war enjoy a natural-law right of immunity from obliteration bombing?

2. Does obliteration bombing necessarily involve a violation of the rights of innocent civilians?

In answer to the first question, it is fundamental in the Catholic view that to take the life of an innocent person is always intrinsically evil, that is, forbidden by the natural law.

Catholic theologians have never abandoned the distinction between innocent and guilty—they still maintain that it is intrinsically wrong to kill directly the innocent civilians of the enemy country.

This principle was recognized by President Truman when he said: "The atom bomb should not be used on innocent women and children who have nothing to do with military aggression."

Pope Pius XII spoke recently in behalf of innocent civilians when he said. "These weapons (atomic) hit not only armies but often wipe out private citizens, children, women, the sick, and holy institutions."

Actually, then, who are noncombatants in a modern war, and do they constitute a majority of a nation?

Noncombatants would be all men, women, and children who are not engaged in the immediate and proximate prosecution of war work.

Even in wartime, there are hundreds of occupations which are not directly connected with the war effort.

Taking the United States as an example, the present population is estimated to be around 150,000,000. If we went to war, the top number of men in the Armed Forces would be from 10 to 12 million. If we would allow another 40,000,000 for those individuals who are employed in munitions and defense works, that would leave a total of 100,000,000 or two-thirds of the population, none of whom would be giving in any sense immediate cooperation to the armed prosecution of the war. These figures would be validated by the estimates of the War Manpower Commission made during the last war.

Thus, two-thirds of the population cannot be considered combatants, or guilty of aggression, or deserving of violent repression.

Do the majority of civilians in a modern nation at war enjoy a natural-law right of immunity from obliteration bombing? The answer is an emphatic affirmative.

Now, let us proceed to the question whether obliteration bombing violates the rights of innocent noncombatants?

TERROR OF WAR

One of the principal motives of obliteration bombing, as expressed by military men during the last war, was the terror, devastation, and demoralization carried to the core of the warring nation.

It seems impossible to make civilian terrorization, or the undermining of civilian morale, an object of bombing without having a direct intention to injure and kill civilians.

The principal cause of civilian terror is the danger to life and limb which accompanies the bombing raids. If one intends the end, terror, one cannot escape intending the means of obtaining the end, namely the injury and death of civilians.

Obliteration bombing includes, then, the direct intention to kill innocent noncombatants and as such it cannot be justified.

The indiscriminate bombing of civilian cities carried out in the last war and envisioned in the next war, is immoral.

True, such bombings are often cloaked under the guise of military necessity, but military necessity can become a mere catchword and an excuse for every sort of excess.

"THEY DID IT FIRST"

The argument is advanced that "they did it first, therefore, we can do the same thing to them." The answer to this objection is simply that two wrongs do not make a right. This is elementary morality. And if we abandon morality in war, then we must abandon it in peace, since morality is not something to be put on and off like a cloak, at one convenience.

Another argument is that obliteration bombing will hasten the day of defeat and bring about quick victory. The answer to this objection is the cardinal principle of morality: The end does not justify the means. If this principle is abandoned, then all morality is abandoned and anything can be justified.

The final question that might arise is this one: Suppose Soviet Russia should atom bomb our civilian cities, what recourse would we have against them?

The answer is that we could retaliate with all the forces at our disposal, including the atom bomb, but within the limits already suggested.

Of course, this last question is an academic question at best, since it is difficult to conceive of our military leaders thumbing through manuals of moral theology and international law before dropping bombs in retaliation.

This is not to say that our military leaders do not have moral consciences; it only asserts that they are not sufficiently acquainted with the niceties of distinction to give the matter weighty consideration.

The conclusions of this article can be briefly stated. First, modern warfare can certainly be justified. Second, the atom bomb can be used in both tactical and strategic precision bombing missions under the conditions stated, namely, as long as there is a proportionately grave cause. Third, obliteration bombing is an immoral attack on the lives of innocents.

The atom bomb, therefore, may not be used in obliteration bombing.

These opinions would seem to be justified from the voice of the Popes, the opinions of theologians, and the Christian laws of justice and charity.

One Public Official With Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a letter written by an irate tenant to a member of the Los Angeles city council, and the latter's reply.

We in public office receive many letters similar to Mr. Rinehart's, but very few of us have the nerve to answer the way we would like to, as Councilman Don Allen has done in his letter.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 22, 1951.

MY DEAR MR. ALLEN: I am coming to you for assistance. You seemed so eager to remove rent control that I feel you might be as anxious to help people find new places to live. Perhaps you would have a vacancy in some of the apartments you apparently own.

I am a Federal employee and my salary is fixed by Congress, and I am still in the low salary brackets. Too, I do not make $600 per month from the people for misrepresentation.

The apartment I live in is a small single apartment. It's rent was $95 a month. It is really worth $38.50 but I told the landlady I would pay $40 per month. However, she raised the rent to $45 which I cannot afford to pay. She also adds $5 per months for television use.

Too, she did not give a full 30-day notice as I believe the law required. Those notices were dated December 21, 1950, but postmarked December 27 and received December 28, 1950. And so we have had to pay the increase early. I called the rent-control office for information but was advised that the office had been closed.

What protection do you offer? I am a war veteran of World War II and might possibly be called again. But are we going to be fighting for the right of people like you—to deprive us of a decent place to live at a decent price?

Yes, I've been looking for a place to live but without success. I saw one place renting for $50 per month about which I considered calling the health department as being unfit for human habitation, but considering the vile state of our city government, I considered it would be a waste of time.

I am glad to see that elections are coming up soon and we will have the opportunity of expressing our disapproval of the action of you and other councilmen who railroaded the removal of rent control.

This is not an accusation because I haven't any proof, but there is a grave suspicion that you and other councilmen did benefit in some financial manner for rent removal. How much was it?

Disrespectfully yours,
PAUL E. RINEHART.

CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
City Hall, January 23, 1951.

MR. PAUL E. RINEHART,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Your recent letter of January 22, 1951, wherein you state you are coming to me for assistance, and then you start off by saying I was so eager to remove rent controls that I would be anxious to help people find places to live in. I have been anxious to help people find places and have been successful in doing so, but for people who are decent and worthy of such help.

Further, you say you are a Federal employee, and your salary is fixed by Congress in the low brackets. Then you make a crack to the effect that you do not make $600 a month off of the people by misrepresentation.

If you are a Federal employee—and I do mean if you are—your salary has been increased since 1940 by more than 25 percent or 30 percent or even 50 percent.

I also note that your landlady has added $5 a month for television use. Now isn't that just too darn bad. I know property owners who cannot even afford a television set and many who cannot even afford a small portable radio.

You ask what protection do I offer. What are you looking for—something on a silver platter? I also am a war veteran and a father of a World War II veteran who has just been called back into service. So what? Who is fighting for what—the right of who to deprive who of a decent place to live at a decent price?

I am glad that you note elections are coming up soon. Yes; each one has a right of expressing disapproval of actions, but you might consider your remarks to be of the criminal libelous nature when you say the councilmen railroaded the removal of rent controls. This matter was under consideration by the council for some 16 months before we took the action.

Then you wind up by saying that there is a grave suspicion that I and the other councilmen did benefit by the rent removal and you ask me how much was it—but still you ask me for assistance.

For your information, I am sending a copy of this letter to the United States Senator, the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, and Congressman NORRIS POULSON. If we taxpayers and citizens have to have such an impertinent misfit sitting at the public trough, I am going to see if some action cannot be taken to remedy the situation. I certainly will begrudge every bit of the income tax I need to pay to the Federal Government for helping to support an individual like you. Your attitude is a serious reflection upon the decent, fact-minded, and hardworking Federal employees with whom I am acquainted.

Sincerely yours,

DON A. ALLEN,
Councilman, Seventh District.

All-American Canal Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Senate Joint Resolution 6 of the California State Legislature:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6, RELATING TO THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL PROJECT

Whereas the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057) authorized the construction of the All-American Canal and made provision for Imperial irrigation district, a political subdivision of the State of California, to assume the care, operation, and maintenance of said canal upon the completion thereof; and

Whereas said act also granted the right to said district to utilize the power possibilities on said canal, the net proceeds therefrom to be applied against the district's obligation to repay to the Federal Government the construction cost of said canal; and

Whereas pursuant to the provisions of said act, before any moneys were expended by the Federal Government on or for the construction of said canal, Imperial irrigation district entered into a contract with said Government under date of December 1, 1932, by the terms of which said district was granted the right and required to assume the care, operation, and maintenance of said canal upon the completion thereof and also the right to develop the power possibilities thereon; and

Whereas the main All-American Canal has been completed and has been in operation for a number of years and the Secretary of the Interior has transferred the care, operation, and maintenance to Imperial irrigation district of all of said main canal except the upper section thereof, being that section from and including the diversion works on the Colorado River at Imperial Dam down to and including the Pilot Knob check and Pilot Knob wasteway; and

Whereas Imperial irrigation district has proceeded to develop the power possibilities on the section of the All-American Canal which it is operating and in connection therewith has acquired and is operating a complete power system serving the needs of all consumers of electric power in Imperial County and in Coachella Valley, Riverside County, Calif., served with water by the said canal but to date said district has been prevented by certain Federal departments from developing the power possibilities at the Pilot Knob site on said canal, which is the most important and valuable power site to said district on said canal; and

Whereas over the past years, Imperial irrigation district has requested the Secretary of the Interior to keep faith with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the district's contract of December 1, 1932, and turn over the care, operation, and maintenance of the upper section of said canal to said district and grant permission for said district to develop the Pilot Knob power site (without expense to the United States); and

Whereas the water treaty between the United States and Mexico dated February 3, 1944, grants to Mexico the right to receive a portion of its water by means of the All-American Canal and Pilot Knob wasteway, such water to be carried from the point where the latter empties into the old Alamo Canal to the delivery point on the international boundary; and

Whereas the amount of such water to be so delivered to Mexico is but a relatively small proportion of the total annual flow of the All-American Canal and need not interfere with the district's operation of the canal nor the development of power at the Pilot Knob site; and

Whereas the United States does not have the right to the use of any of the capacity of the All-American Canal for such supplying of water to Mexico but Imperial irrigation district does have surplus capacity in said canal down to Pilot Knob which it proposes to use in connection with the development of power at that point; and

Whereas to remove any question as to possible conflict between said treaty and said district's contract, and also in a spirit of cooperation, said district has, by a proposal submitted to the Secretary of State in December 1947 offered to make available without cost to either the Federal Government or the Mexican Government capacity in the All-American Canal down to the end of the Pilot Knob wasteway and to transport to that point the water necessary to fulfill the requirements of said treaty under rules and regulations therefor to be promulgated by the Federal Government: *Provided*, That the upper section of said canal is turned over to said district and it is permitted to develop the Pilot Knob power site, as provided for in said district's contract of December 1, 1932; and

Whereas after concurrence by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice, the Secretary of State accepted said district's proposal in principle, subject to a clarification of wording, and did so notify said district by letter dated August 4, 1948; and

Whereas for reasons unknown to this legislature, despite such acceptance the Secretary of State has recently turned the matter over to the Secretary of the Interior to decide who shall operate the upper section of the All-American Canal and the latter has announced that the Bureau of Reclamation will handle such operation, without giving any valid reasons why and in total disregard of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the district's contract of December 1, 1932; and

Whereas Imperial Irrigation District has already suffered large financial losses caused by the Federal Government's refusal to permit said district to develop the Pilot Knob site and the Nation has lost hundreds of thousands of barrels of fuel oil used to generate power which otherwise would have been supplied by the Pilot Knob plant had the district been permitted to build it, which situation should be remedied without further delay; and

Whereas this legislature believes that the Federal Government should take every reasonable means to observe and keep faith with the contracts it makes with its people and that this principle is particularly important at this time of world crisis when our form of government is on trial before the world; and

Whereas this legislature believes in the principle of local control of public works to the greatest extent practicable, subject only to such reasonable rules and regulations by the Federal Government as may be necessary to protect the Government's investment in such works: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State of the United States be memorialized to uphold the principles of our form of government in its dealings with Imperial Irrigation District under the terms of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the contract with said district of December 1, 1932, and the treaty with Mexico dated February 3, 1944; and be it further

Resolved, That said two secretaries be memorialized to proceed under the principles of the proposal made to the Secretary of State by Imperial Irrigation District in December 1947, in accordance with the acceptance thereof by said secretary as stated in letter of August 4, 1948, to said district, to the end that said district be permitted, without further delay, to assume the care, operation, and maintenance of all of the main All-American Canal and to proceed with the development of the power site at Pilot Knob; and be it further

Resolved, That the attorney general of California, the State engineer, and all other officers of the State of California be and they are hereby directed to use all means within their power to carry out the objectives of this resolution and to assist Imperial Irrigation District in accordance therewith; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General of the United States, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

The Dinosaur Dam Sites Are Not Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article from a magazine entitled "The Living Wilderness," which was written by U. S. Grant 3d, the President of the American Planning and Civic Association. This article concerns the preservation of some very unique geography, which has been set aside under the Antiquities Act as the Dinosaur National Monument. I commend it to my colleagues in the House, especially those who are anxious to preserve for posterity one of the most unique pieces of land in the world. The article follows:

THE DINOSAUR DAM SITES ARE NOT NEEDED

(By U. S. Grant 3d, President, American Planning and Civic Association)

The Trojan horse in our national park system, model 1950, is now driven by electricity supplied from water power impounded behind great dams.

In most cases such dams are doubtless economically justified, and their construction may be expected to prove beneficial; but in some cases the dam builders have a preference for a location where they would destroy other existing and irreplaceable values that are the heritage of the American people. Such a case confronts us now as we face the threat to our national park system posed by the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects in the Dinosaur National Monument.

Like the cynics of half a century ago, these dam-builders know the price of everything but the value of nothing. When the fancy strikes them they must have their way. Then they trot in their Trojan horse, secretly pass through the wall established by law to protect the natural wonders and play places of the American people, and by an intensive campaign of propaganda "sell" the local inhabitants and their leaders the project. The final step is then to persuade Congress by a well-organized pressure group; that it is necessary pro bono publico to legitimize the violation of the law in a particular case and authorize an exception to a policy explicitly stated in a law adopted after years of consideration to protect our heritage.

Of late years, with the popular recognition of the need of our air regions for more water and of the benefits of cheap power to their communities, the frequency with which such projects are espoused and fought for has become alarming. The proposal to include in the upper Colorado basin program the two dams and reservoirs proposed in Dinosaur National Monument has thus had its precursors, but none has been so serious as this one which has already been embodied in three bills in the Eighty-first Congress—H. R. 8980 and 9014 and S. 3639—and will be further pressed in the next Congress. Most of those who are pressing the inclusion of these two projects are persuaded—honestly, of course—of four wholly erroneous claims, alleged by the dam salesmen who have done their job only too well: (1) That the crying need of northeastern Utah and the Bonneville Basin for more water cannot be met without the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs; (2) that without these two reservoirs the amount of water for the lower Colorado River Basin, stipulated in the interstate agreement, will not be forthcoming; (3) that without them there will be less water impounded and less power produced; and, finally, (4) that the cost of the entire upper Colorado River program will be substantially increased if these two dams are eliminated and others substituted for them.

All four of these claims are disproved by the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation itself, although the Bureau for reasons not evident has continued to press for the inclusion of these two projects in the program and has apparently persuaded the Secretary of the Interior to approve its recommendations.

The construction of these two dams will destroy the character of a unique national monument having special scenic, geological, archaeological, and recreational values.

If the American people wish to preserve this God-made wonder for the inspiration and enjoyment of themselves and future generations, they must act now.

Immediate popular support of the opponents of the projects is needed to prevent authorizing legislation.

Such support can be given with the knowledge that dam sites exist in other places in the upper Colorado system which will give equivalent or better results at no substantial increase of cost and, probably, as far as conditions are now known, at less cost.

By prohibiting any water power developments in our national parks and monuments, the 1921 and 1935 amendments to the Federal Power Act, adopted after full discussion and debate lasting over 15 years, established a well-considered policy of the Government to protect the interests and heritage of all the people of our country—and the enjoyment of the citizens of other nations who come here to see and appreciate the wonders nature has given us—against just such attempts as are now being made for the temporary benefit of relatively few.

Such an established policy—and I emphasize it is to protect not only the rights and interests of our generation, but also the inheritance we should pass on to future generations—such a policy should never be violated just to make easier or a few dollars cheaper the storage of water and the production of power for the benefit of a limited area. When the needed benefits can be obtained at alternative sites, and more economically at these sites, the violation of the national park system should be unthinkable.

The natural features of Dinosaur National Monument are many and unique. If the proposed dams are built, the unique character of the river and canyon will be changed; their special value will have been destroyed forever for the particular kind of recreation and inspiration they in their natural state can give. Let no one say that the dams and reservoirs and power plants will afford better and more recreational facilities. Such facilities as they will afford will be different, of a kind encountered on all the hundreds of other reservoirs proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and by other agencies, and they will exist equally whether these two reservoirs are built or their equivalents are located elsewhere.

Our industrial civilization is creating an ever greater need for the average man, woman, and child, to reestablish contact with nature, to be inspired by and appreciate the wonders of nature, and to be diverted from the whirling wheels of machinery and of chance. There is an ever-growing craving to be eased of the anxious tension of the factory and the city. Moreover, our population is growing rapidly. The national parks and monuments now developed are already overcrowded, with more than 30,000,000 visitors reported last year. More must be developed for the teeming generations to come. It would be a crime to destroy this unique value which we have inherited, and cut off our heirs with a shilling—a few acre-feet of water and a few kilowatt-hours which, it must be emphasized, can be provided elsewhere.

The preservation of this monument of nature's grandeur, with its prehistoric record, will in no way disregard the needs of the people in the Colorado watershed and the Bonneville Basin, for their needs can be met by reservoirs outside the national park, without the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

The notion that the central Utah requirements are to be provided and can only be met by the Echo Park Dam is entirely erroneous; actually, the Bureau of Reclamation's program itself calls for these needs to be met by a diversion from Flaming Gorge Reservoir outside the monument.

Equally mistaken is the notion that the 23,000,000 acre-feet of storage, needed to provide the average annual flow of 7,500,000 acre-feet at Lee Ferry, as required by the interstate contract, cannot be got without this storage in the monument. The fact is that the capacity now proposed for the Glen Canyon Reservoir alone is estimated at 26,000,000 acre-feet.

Turning to financial estimates, we note that the Bureau of Reclamation reports indicate a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.73 to 1 for power alone; and for combined benefits a ratio of 1.89 to 1. Evidently, where there are so many possible dam sites to choose from, to save the irreplaceable values of the Dinosaur National Monument, we can well afford the selection of a slightly less profitable location for the additional storage required without substantial reduction in the economic justification for the Colorado River project as a whole. This is manifest from the fact that the present project utilizes only 10 dam sites out of some 81 possible dam sites indicated in the Colorado River report of 1947. (The Colorado River: A Natural Menace Becomes a National Resource; Interim Report on the Status of Investigations, etc., United States Department of the Interior, etc., H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess.). While, of course, many of these 81 possible sites will prove impracticable on further examination and local survey, it is evident there are plenty of substitutes from which to choose.

Evidently many red herrings have got into the upper Colorado.

Although the selection of substitutes will have to be made by the Bureau of Reclamation and any outsider must approach the problem with much diffidence, suggested substitutions are, nevertheless, here proposed to show that there is an adequate solution for doing without the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs, based on information and data contained in the Bureau of Reclamation's own reports.

In brief, what is here suggested is: (1) Construct in the initial stage of the Colorado River project two dams now planned for a later stage—Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain—and thus omit the Echo Park Dam from the initial stage, and (2) plan for a substitution of three dams—Desolation, Bluff, and New Moab—for the Echo Park and Split Mountain combination contemplated for construction in the national monument during the second stage. The advantages and costs of these alternative proposals are carefully considered in the following discussion:

Five reservoirs are now recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation for immediate construction "in the initial stage of the Colorado River storage project." Four of these are the Flaming Gorge, on the Green River above the Dinosaur National Monument, to provide for the diversion of water to Utah; the Curecanti Reservoir, on the Gunnison River; the Martinez, on the San Juan River; and the Glen Canyon Reservoir, on the Colorado River just above Lee Ferry. The fifth now proposed is the Echo Park Reservoir, which would be created by a dam across the Green River just below the junction of the Yampa and the Green, in Dinosaur National Monument. The Echo Park Reservoir would flood the canyons of both the Green and the Yampa.

The results will not be harmfully affected if the Echo Park Reservoir is omitted and the Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain Reservoirs are in its place incorporated in "the initial stage of the Colorado River storage project." They are now included in the second stage of the project, to which the Echo Park Dam would be postponed.

The Echo Park Reservoir is estimated to provide for 6,400,000 acre-feet of gross water storage and 1,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year—annual firm power, which is expected later to be reduced to 666,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

TABLE 1.—*Reclamation Bureau proposal and suggested alternative in initial stage of Colorado project*

Reservoir project	Gross storage of water	Annual firm power	Estimated approximate cost
	Acre-feet	*Kilowatt-hours*	
Gray Canyon	2,000,000	1,018,000,000	$178,000,000
Cross Mountain	5,200,000	335,000,000	49,100,000
Total	7,200,000	1,353,000,000	227,700,000
Echo Park	6,400,000	1,200,000,000	128,400,000
Gain	800,000	153,000,000	
Additional cost			99,300,000

The Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain Reservoirs are similarly estimated to provide for 2,000,000 and 5,200,000 acre-feet of storage, respectively, and 1,018,000,000 and 335,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year, respectively—or a total together of 7,200,000 acre-feet of storage and 1,353,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power, an increase of 800,000 acre-feet of storage and 153,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year above the estimates for the Echo Park Reservoir. (See table 1.)

It is evident from this comparison that the substitution of the Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain projects, outside the monument, for the Echo Park proposal that would destroy the monument, will give even greater capacity in both storage and power during the initial stage of the project.

The additional cost of this substitution in the project's initial stage—as is shown in the following paragraphs—will be compensated for in the later stage of the project by the savings in costs and the added returns in power and storage from the substitutions of other dams outside the monument. And it is to be remembered that the Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain Dams are to be built anyhow—later if not in the initial stage. In the long run their construction as here suggested would thus involve no additional expenditures at all.

The second phase, or stage, of the Colorado River storage project, has also been planned to include a dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. This is the Split Mountain Dam which would create a reservoir in Split Mountain Gorge and Whirlpool Canyon, a reservoir that is to be so used in conjunction with the Echo Park Reservoir as to make the two dams eventually into what might be called twin projects.

As the project enters the second phase, the power production of the Echo Park installation, it is expected, would reduce to 666,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, while the Split Mountain would provide for 720,000,000 kilowatt-hours—a total of 1,386,000,000. The Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs would store 6,400,000 and 335,000 acre-feet of water, respectively, a total of 6,735,000 acre-feet. These two dams are now estimated to cost, respectively, $139,400,000 and $67,000,000—a total for the two together of $206,400,000.

The data of the Bureau of Reclamation show that for these two dams that would so seriously damage the national park system there could be substituted in the second stage, three alternatives—Bluff, on the San Juan River; New Moab, on the Colorado; and Desolation, on the Green, immediately above the Gray Canyon Reservoir—so close, in fact, that the data for these two proposed projects in their present state include some overlapping.

The Desolation Dam is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation to provide for 900,000 acre-feet of water storage and 433,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year; its construction cost is estimated at $33,000,000. The Bluff and New Moab Reservoirs would, respectively, provide for 3,000,000 and 3,965,000 acre-feet of storage, produce 289,000,000 and 845,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year, and cost $19,000,000 and $95,000,000. Thus this combination of alternatives would provide for 7,865,000 acre-feet of storage and produce annually 1,567,000,000 kilowatt-hours, at an estimated construction cost of $147,000,000.

These three substitutes—Desolation, New Moab, and Bluff—would thus provide for 1,130,000 more acre-feet storage of water and 181,000,000 more kilowatt-hours of power per year than would the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs combined. And the three substitutes would together cost an estimated $59,400,000 less than the two dams now proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation for construction within the national monument.

These comparisons of storage and power-production potentials and costs are summarized in table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Reclamation Bureau proposal and suggested alternative in second phase of Colorado project*

Reservoir project	Gross storage of water	Annual firm power	Estimated approximate cost
RECLAMATION BUREAU PROPOSAL	*Acre-feet*	*Kilowatt-hours*	
Echo Park	6,400,000	666,000,000	$139,400,000
Split Mountain	335,000	720,000,000	67,000,000
Total	6,735,000	1,386,000,000	206,400,000
ALTERNATE POSSIBILITY			
Desolation [1]	900,000	433,000,000	33,000,000
Bluff	3,000,000	289,000,000	19,000,000
New Moab	3,965,000	845,000,000	95,000,000
Total	7,865,000	1,567,000,000	147,000,000
Increase from alternates	1,130,000	181,000,000	
Savings from alternates			59,400,000

[1] Including some overlapping with Gray Canyon; see text.

The saving thus shown in estimated costs, and the increased storage and power to be obtained, if compared with the expected results from alternative proposals for the initial stage, would seem to indicate a net increase in costs of $33,900,000 that is, $85,300,000 minus $59,400,000), together with a 1,930,000 acre-feet increase in storage and a 331,000,000 kilowatt-hours increase in power. However, such a comparison would ignore the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to build the Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain projects anyhow—in the later stage even if they are not built as alternatives to the Echo Park project. This means that their added costs during the initial stage would simply involve an earlier expenditure of some $68,300,000, rather than an increased one. The fact is that the total alternative program here proposed would result ultimately—not only in preservation of the monument—but in an economy in expenditures and a greater return in power production and water storage.

If we can project ourselves into the future, then, we can make the total comparison shown in table 3 between the Bureau's program and this one alternative possibility we have suggested.

When probable costs are compared, the ground is less firm, of course, than when we are dealing with storage and power-potential estimates. Such cost estimates as exist were made in different years, which means that they are based on different construction-cost levels. In any case, such estimates are not very reliable until after extended investigations of sites, foundations, character of rock, and soil, etc. Nevertheless, such estimates as do exist regarding costs very definitely favor these proposed substitutes rather than the objectionable Echo Park and Split Mountain projects.

Evaporation and silting will be somewhat higher for the alternatives; but the increased storage possible should compensate for the former. The soil conservation work now going on in the Upper Colorado watershed will reduce the silting appreciably while these dams are being built and filled. Moreover, the Moab Dam will reduce the amount of silt reaching Glen Canyon, so that the over-all reduction of storage by silting will not be appreciably increased.

TABLE 3.—*Summary of Reclamation Bureau proposals affecting monument and suggested alternatives*

Reservoir project	Gross storage of water	Annual firm power	Estimated approximate cost
RECLAMATION BUREAU PROPOSAL	*Acre-feet*	*Kilowatt-hours*	
Built first: Echo Park	6,400,000	[1] 666,000,000	$139,400,000
Built later:			
Split Mountain	335,000	720,000,000	67,000,000
Gray Canyon	2,000,000	1,018,000,000	178,000,000
Cross Mountain	5,200,000	335,000,000	49,100,000
Total	13,935,000	2,739,000,000	434,100,000
ALTERNATE POSSIBILITY			
Built first:			
Gray Canyon	2,000,000	1,018,000,000	178,000,000
Cross Mountain	5,200,000	335,000,000	49,100,000
Built later:			
Desolation [2]	900,000	433,000,000	33,000,000
Bluff	3,000,000	289,000,000	19,000,000
New Moab	3,965,000	845,000,000	95,000,000
Total	15,065,000	2,920,000,000	374,700,000
Increase from alternates	1,130,000	181,000,000	
Savings from alternates			59,400,000

[1] During the initial stage Echo Park's annual firm power is expected to be 1,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours, but this will reduce to 666,000,000 when the later stage has been reached. The present table makes a comparison between completed projects.

[2] Including some overlapping with Gray Canyon; see text.

In spite of such compensation, the proponents of the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams make much of their claim that using the alternate sites would involve evaporation losses which would be 350,000 acre-feet a year larger than at the reservoirs they want.

Hard as it is to believe, to avoid this somewhat vaguely determinable evaporation loss (which can be compensated for in any case), they are asking the Federal Government to violate an area of the national park system and sacrifice the possible advantages of the alternates here proposed.

Moreover, there is a very real doubt as to whether excess water enough will be available in the upper Colorado River Basin to fill all the reservoirs proposed after meeting the year-to-year local requirements. This is an additional and conclusive reason for postponing construction of the two dams in the Dinosaur National Monument until it is shown that they are needed and can be effectively operated.

There are, of course, other alternatives than those here considered—and other combinations of alternatives. The important fact to demonstrate and emphasize is that it is not necessary to invade the national park system in order to realize the objectives of the Colorado River storage project. Even if alternatives would cost much more than reservoirs within Dinosaur National Monument the alternatives should be chosen rather than destroy the unique irreplaceable wilderness resources of the monument. When actually, it is seen that such alternatives can be constructed at less cost, considering the added storage and power gained, there should be no tolerance for a moment of the failure of the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with plans for these alternatives.

The hard fact is that the Bureau of Reclamation—despite the laws safeguarding the national park system from such dams—has already made site surveys in the national monument and has done other preparatory work (including propaganda) to such an extent that it does not want to make similar studies of alternative sites.

Conservationists throughout the country can, in this instance, defend to the full their national park system confident that preservation of the Dinosaur Monument entails no sacrifice of other benefits.

To sum up, in conclusion, let us emphasize:

1. The Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams are not necessary for the successful and economical development of the upper Colorado Basin, or for compliance with the interstate compact, or to furnish the proposed diversion to the Utah Basin. The claim that these dams are so necessary is definitely in error.

2. In fact, substitutes may be found which will not only furnish more water storage and more hydraulic power, according to the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation, but will cost less for the results attained.

3. The Dinosaur National Monument contains natural, geological, archaeological, and recreational features that are unique and irreplaceable. These are treasures which our generation holds in trust for posterity. There is a moral obligation upon us to preserve them undamaged for our grandchildren, our great grandchildren, and for their children.

4. Such recreational features as could be developed in connection with the reservoirs would be equally provided on the substitutes and would be just what is found at every one of the thousands that already exist throughout the country; the unique educational and inspirational values would be destroyed—and quite unnecessarily—if the dams are built in the monument.

5. Our growing population needs more national parks and national monuments and more places of special interest displaying the variety of natural manifestations. Every visitor to such a park is a better citizen afterward, and we need good citizens. Any reduction in the extent or character of our parks would be a step contrary to the public interests.

6. If these dams are allowed to be built they will constitute precedents for again repeatedly violating in the future a wise policy, established by Congress with the Department of the Interior, to prevent just such wanton destruction of irreplaceable values.

7. The injury will be to the whole country and to future generations not here to defend their heritage; the benefits are claimed for a relatively small number of local inhabitants and their communities—but this is all due to a misunderstanding; the benefits can be had just as cheaply or more cheaply without these two dams and reservoirs. There are really no valid reasons for them; it is just that there is always a temptation to grab a park for any other purpose and public opinion has been stirred up under a misunderstanding, and then it is human nature not to want to give up a cause which has once been espoused.

Education and the American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD the text of two addresses and a brief statement in connection with the eighty-fourth convocation of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, held on October 20, 1950, at Albany, N. Y. The theme of the convocation was "Education as the guardian of the American heritage," and the two major addresses were delivered by Dr. Charles Franklin Kettering and the Right Reverend Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, two outstanding personalities in American life. I am certain that my colleagues will find these addresses both timely and interesting:

EDUCATION AS THE GUARDIAN OF THE AMERICAN HERITAGE

REGENTS' STATEMENT OF THE CONVOCATION

The eighty-fourth convocation of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, held in Chancellors Hall, State Education Building, Albany, N. Y., is now part of our history.

The theme of the convocation, "Education as the Guardian of the American Heritage," proved a most attractive one, judging from the enthusiastic crowds which attended each of the sessions and stirred the various speakers to deliver addresses which, without exception, were notable and provocative.

The convocation was held on October 20, 1950, and the three afternoon sessions were designated, respectively, higher education, elementary and secondary education, and adult education.

The Senate Chamber was filled to capacity for the session on higher education to hear, under the chairmanship of Regent Moot, the addresses of Dr. Irwin Edman, Johnsonian professor of philosophy, Columbia University; Brig. Gen. Ames T. Brown, New York State director of selective service; Dr. Everett N. Case, president, of Colgate University and president of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York; and Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, associate commissioner for higher education.

The Capitol Room at the Hotel Ten Eyck was not large enough to accommodate the overflow crowd for the session on elementary and secondary education which, under the chairmanship of Regent Eastman, listened to addresses of Col. Lawrence Wilkinson, director, New York State Civil Defense Commission; Dr. Samuel Flagg Bemis, Sterling professor of diplomatic history, Yale University; and Dr. Harry V. Gilson, associate commissioner for elementary and secondary education.

In the Cathedral Guild House a large audience attended the session on adult education under the chairmanship of Regent Macy, and enjoyed the reports of the two youthful community ambassadors, Theodore Rhoades, who was sent to the Netherlands, and Dora L. Bertoglio, who was sent to Italy, and the addresses of Dr. Kenneth Powers Williams, professor of mathematics, University of Indiana, and Dr. Edwin R. Van Kleeck, assistant commissioner for adult education and special services.

The evening session found Chancellors Hall crowded to its utmost capacity, and it was then that the convocation, which was under the chairmanship of Chancellor Wallin, swept to a dramatic climax in the addresses of Dr. Charles Franklin Kettering and the Right Reverend Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen.

Dr. Kettering's message was primarily one of hope—a resolute call to educators to inspire youth to face the future with dauntless courage in their own abilities and unshaken confidence in the resources of America.

Monsignor Sheen's message was primarily one of faith—a clarion call to educators to reaffirm in youth the pioneering spirit of our founding fathers, their trust in God, and their recognition that from Him come their inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The board of regents felt that these two addresses, going as they do to the fundamentals of the democratic way of life, are so valuable and timely that they should reach a much larger number of readers than the formal publication of the proceedings of the convocation, and, therefore, has provided for the separate publication of such addresses in this brochure.

The regents call upon educators and all others who would keep the American heritage constantly to reaffirm such faith and hope in all who seek their ministering services—faith in the Creator, faith in this great country of ours and her democratic processes, faith in fellow man and faith in self; hope in the future of America and of mankind, so that youth, fortified by their instruction and example, may overcome all dangers, difficulties, and discouragements, and press on to achieve the goal of youth's most cherished dreams.

To that faith and hope the regents join a message of charity, that youth may be taught and may fulfill their life's mission with malice toward none and in the spirit of that brotherhood which instinctively recognizes the dignity and the privileges of all, irrespective of race, creed, or color.

Thus will our eighty-fourth convocation, while remaining a part of our history, continue as a vital force guarding the American heritage.

ADDRESS OF CHARLES FRANKLIN KETTERING, DIRECTOR AND RESEARCH CONSULTANT, GENERAL MOTORS CO.

Gentlemen, distinguished guests, the ladies. I am delighted to be here. I have no prepared talk because your situation in this convocation is so different from anything that I had been acquainted with, and further, if I had attempted to write something, it would have been inadequate when I got on the ground.

I thought I would like to talk to you for a minute about a different point of view in education. I have been an inventor all my life, and I thought you might be interested in how an inventor looks at education and what is the difference between an inventor and a scientist.

I was asked the question last winter: "What is the difference between an inventor and a scientist?" My explanation was rather simple. I said a scientist is really something very special. He is like the strings in the loom that go lengthwise, and if you made a hammock of that type, it would be difficult to sleep in. The inventor puts the strings in the other way.

A study made a number of years ago said the more education a man has, the less likely he is to be an inventor. Now the reason for that is quite simple. From the time the boy, or girl, starts in school he is examined 3 to 4 times a year, and, of course, it is a very, very disastrous thing if he fails. An inventor fails all the time and it is a triumph if he succeeds once. Consequently, if education is an inhibition to invention, it is due entirely to the form by which we rate things and not because of any intellectual differential.

I can take any group of young people, any place, and teach them to be inventors if I can get them to throw off the hazard of being afraid to fail. Because failure is just exactly like the steps that lead up into this great education building. You fail because your ideas aren't right. You shouldn't be afraid to fail, but you should learn to fail intelligently. By that I mean, when you fail, find out why you failed, and each time you fail it will bring you up nearer to the goal.

It is very interesting that most people look at problems as being complicated. We cannot solve the complicated problem. Consequently, we have to analyze it and bring it down to the most elementary things in the world. We have had a motto in our research laboratory that reads: "This problem, when solved, will be simple," because every

one we have ever solved has been simple. We don't think anybody can solve a complicated one.

There are two general types of knowledge in the world. There is the knowledge about people, and there is the knowledge about things. Things are much older than people. Nature was here for millions and millions of years before the people were here and we sometimes, in our scientific approach to the thing, get the idea that we can tell nature what to do. We read in the paper about the great discoveries that have been made. Well, those are discoveries, but we shouldn't get excited about them. If they hadn't been there, we wouldn't be here. And so I think that because over the past few hundred years we have been able to understand some of the phenomena of nature we have become egotistical as to how much we know about nature. Of course, a knowledge of nature is science. We have developed a thing we call research and we perhaps overestimate what it is because a researcher is simply an amateur; he is going to do something for the first time, and that is all the amateur does. The researcher is a professional amateur. He is professional in that he knows that he is going to have a lot of trouble with the problem and it isn't going to be a very good solution when he gets it, because the work of an amateur is never very good. So we have tried to set up a method of describing these elemental things. That is why I say I can take any group of people, any place, and I can get a good result with them if they don't try too hard and if we can analyze the problem.

The word "design" is a very bad word. We don't design very much of anything. We make it so it will work. Right after this last war some friends of mine from Europe came over and they were amazed at some of our developments in Diesel locomotives and Diesel engines in general. The type of engine they looked at was quite unconventional. They said, "How did you get yourself into the state of mind that you could design such a cockeyed engine?" "But," I said, "we didn't. We built a single cylinder engine and we gave it half a dozen pistons and said, 'You try these out. See which one you like the best. Here are some valves.' We let the engine try them out." I said that if the engine wasn't any good, we didn't design it. We made it the way it wanted to be, to show how much smarter the engine is than the engineer. These parts run 30 times as long as anybody thought they could be made to run. But we let the engine pick them out. The engine is a pretty smart piece of machinery if you let it talk to you.

In science we need to listen to the problem. We have one motto in our laboratory: "Let the problem be the boss"—because it's the only thing that can be the boss. We have the idea that if we have a couple of Latin and Greek synonyms set up, that is a good substitute for knowing how. I have been working on a problem called photosynthesis, or why the grass is green, for many, many years. I think we are going to find out some day. We have made more progress in the past 3 years than in the past 50 or 60 years.

The oldest plant we have in this universe is the little blue-green alga which grows on ponds. Blue-green alga goes back to prehistoric days. Its appearance hasn't changed. It has a mind of its own and goes on being a blue-green alga. A friend of mine picked up a little book and sent it to me air mail. The particular thing that had interested him was that in this little book it said it had been definitely proved that the active principle in blue-green algae is phycocyanine. I read this and I immediately grabbed the telephone and said to one of my associates, "Send me the structural formula of phycocyanine." I didn't get a reply. So I called him up again, and he said nobody knew the formula for phycocyanine. I called several well-known book stores, Brentano's in New York, and Kroch's Book Store in Chicago, and said, "What can you get me on this subject?" They couldn't get me very much. So when I got back to my home in Dayton I thought I would look it up in the Oxford unabridged dictionary. Sure enough, there it was. Phycocyanine. Phykos is the Greek word for algae and cyanine is the word for blue. So I went out, walked around the house and came in the same door.

I was walking past the International Business Machines Co.'s office the other day and saw in the window display something representing the old Tower of Babel. As you know, when the people tried to build the tower to heaven the Lord confused their tongues. Don't think that tower is gone—we are confusing the tongues today—so if any fellow in any line can understand anything in any other line, he is not well educated. Yet nature made all. It was all here, all developed, before any words were in existence at all. Consequently, take the problem and try to find out what it is. You have had no trouble in learning to talk to the problem. You don't need to know Greek, nor any Latin, but you do need to know how to ask and how to recognize the answer. A great many people say that the trouble with the inventor is that he is a cut-and-try artist. We never thought we were that bad. In the East you call it trial-and-error. That is because you are older and more refined than we are out West. It isn't either of them. It is when you cannot make the calculations at all. We try to find out what those factors are by experimental evaluation, which is a tremendously different thing from cut-and-try. The inventor is constantly stumbling onto something. I used to tell this story. If this room were very dark and there were a chair in the middle and we all sat around the wall, we could philosophize as to where it was, but the fellow who got up and walked around and stumbled over it would find the chair. One fellow puts it this way: "There is one thing proven, that nobody ever stumbled into anything sitting down."

In the introduction of the new college presidents and the new superintendents of schools here, it was mentioned in the remarks of both of these gentlemen that there are opportunities which exist today in the whole world of education. There never was such an opportunity in the history of the world for people to know things. Therefore I have been trying to work out the idea that this is the age of opportunities unlimited. A great many people are quite distressed; a great many people are worried, and the reason for it is that there are two types of things—the current confusion, for one. We have a war, and I think there are some elections coming up. Those are the confusions of the day. They are the current distractions, but they haven't anything to do with the long-range type of things that we need to do, and therefore if we plan some of these long-range things—there never was such an opportunity to do, never such an opportunity to understand, never such an opportunity to find out. We live in a world of fear and despair. If you listen to some commentators and Communists, you will find that out. I have been very fortunate in that I have never been able to read very much, so I have been spared a lot of that.

I was talking before the American Broadcasters Association not long ago. I said I wished I had a business of my own. I would put on 1 hour a week, the Happiness Hour, and tell what wonderful opportunities we have in this country. We talk about exhausting the lands. We are talking about people going to starve to death. I don't know whether you know it or not: I have been in the automobile business all my life. I have built a lot of engines. Everybody always said that we are the people who are ruining the world. I admit the streets are getting pretty full. I asked a very good friend of mine, "Why are you worried about people starving to death?" "Well," he said, "we are exhausting the land." I said, "Just wait a minute. We can feed about 200,000,000 people in this United States of ours without very much trouble. In the past 25 years the horse population has gone down 18,000,000 and for every horse you don't feed you can feed four and a half people."

Without farming one more acre of ground you can feed 70,000,000 more people. I know it is a little hard on the horses, but then * * *. Nevertheless, he came back and said, "Of course, you are going to exhaust your oil and your petroleum, and so forth." I said, "Suppose we do. Let's be realistic. Let's find out at what rate we are exhausting those things."

I don't like to live in this atmosphere of despair. It is hard on a person. It makes one nervous. Just where are we in the picture? Well, we got some figures together. Here is what we find. Only 5 percent of the coal has been taken from the mines. We still have 90 percent of our petroleum in the ground. We have 90 percent of our natural gas. We have all of our shale oil, which is perfectly enormous in quantity. Out in Colorado there is one rock that contains six or seven times as much oil as we have ever used. It is interesting to know that shale oil is made up from the remains of those little algae that I was talking to you about. It takes 8,000 years to lay up an inch. There is one rock out there 500 feet deep, so you see they weren't in a hurry about it.

Our whole source of power comes from the sun. I think we know how much our agricultural colleges have done. We don't have to jump at this thing. We have fuel in sight for 1,500 years. I think we can raise enough fuel on an acre of ground to run an automobile. Incidentally you use up the weight of your automobile in fuel per year. That would be about 2 tons. The people in Maine who have had their quotas reduced in potatoes are raising 20 tons to the acre. Of course, there is a lot of waste. The only way we use it is by fermenting it into alcohol, and that is the wrong way to do it. I do not mean from the social implications, but because a pound of alcohol has only 12,000 or 13,000 heat units while a pound of petroleum has 19,000. So there is no advantage in making it that way. You want to make it the other way, but we don't know how to make it the other way yet. Nature made this fermentation process automatically. There is nothing to worry about, but our point of view to the whole situation is that we can answer any questions that you need to ask if we do them in a nonegotistical way, if we don't want to become authorities.

A fellow said to me, "Inventors have no respect for authority."

I said, "We do have respect for authority, and the authority we have respect for is the fact and that is the only authority in the world. Nature will answer your questions for you. Nature will do these things for you if you don't try to edict it."

You haven't any idea how many people want to say, "That is the way it ought to be done." It ought to be done the way it will work. So, people can learn things today as they never did in the history of the world. It doesn't necessarily have to be a formula. We have this great pneumatic tire industry. We think it is one of the greatest mechanical inventions that has ever been made. It isn't mentioned in any textbook in any engineering school. The reason, they say, is that we have no formulas for it. You have to study low-pressure steam boilers because we have the formulas, but they don't make those any more.

I have read about the integrating machines—these wonderful calculating machines. We got our tires by using a kind of integrating process. We put them out and tried them on all automobiles under all kinds of conditions. They have to be pretty good. We try them out on all the roads and all the people of the world. It is the biggest integrating machine we know of.

So, you can abide by these simple approaches. Do you want to do a thing? What is the best way to do it? Let's start. Remember you can't start finally. You have to start as an amateur. You have to learn how.

One time I was talking with an industrialist who said, "You fellows do a very, very poor job in your research. Your things are never very well done."

I said, "I will go down to the music store and get you the finest violin that you have ever seen. Will you attempt to play a recital in Carnegie Hall right away with that?"

He said, "No."

I said, "The fellow who plays in Carnegie Hall starts when he is a kid and he practices all through the years."

The great trouble with us is that we want to edict our ideas into completeness instead of having them grow. Ideas grow like corn. You get the idea started and if you don't become politic about it—people say it has to be this or that. It doesn't. It can be this and that in any ratio, in any proportions you want.

I would like to congratulate this great State of New York on its educational system because it is doing here what everybody is trying to do—integrate the thinking—and everybody has a right to think as he wants to. You are trying to open the road.

From an inventor's standpoint, we think the question of procedure is more important than knowledge. You have to know how to analyze a problem. You don't have to know much to do that, because you can get everybody else to do it. Let me give you an illustration. If you were building a house and you went separately to a carpenter, a bricklayer, an electrician, and a plumber, you wouldn't get a very good house. If you took a plan, you would get a good job. The procedure, to the inventor, is like the plan of a house. We have developed laboratories which are known as problem analysis laboratories.

I have a friend who is a very brilliant man. He is quite old. One of his recreations was to work these big jig-saw puzzles. He had a table set up in his house in a room he used for this particular purpose.

He said, "I can work these in half the time anybody else can."

I said, "That is the research procedure you are using. We don't get puzzles that easy. Let me give you the kind of problem we have. Let me take three pieces out of three other puzzles and stir them into your box and see what you can do with that one. You can't solve the problem until you find out what pieces don't belong to it, and what ones you don't have."

That is the thing we have to do all the time in trying to solve the problem. We have to do something about it. Let's find out what the thing is that we want to do something about. If you do that, you can write your ticket, and you will underwrite it every time, because your success will be greater than your anticipation.

ADDRESS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR FULTON J. SHEEN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH

Mr. Chancelor, Dr. Kettering, members of the Board of Regents, your Excellencies, friends, I always consider applause at the beginning of a lecture a manifestation of your faith. If it comes in the middle, it is a sign of hope. And if it comes at the end, it is always charity.

Dr. Kettering said that he had no prepared speech because he did not know exactly the nature of the group which he was to address. I have no prepared speech because I know the nature of the group that I am to address.

Dr. Kettering was telling us the difference between invention and education. Dr. Kettering said that invention was research. If you copy anything out of one book, it is plagiarism. If you copy it out of two books, it is research. If you copy it out of six books, you are a professor.

Dr. Kettering was speaking of nature as a teacher, which, indeed, is right. No man ever sits down before nature and tells it how it ought to work. He is passive before it. There is a note of submission, resignation, respect and obedience in which he says, "Be it done to me according to Thy word." While Dr. Kettering was developing that theme, there came to me the idea that that is just the way we all ought to be before the will of God. As we sit passively before nature, so we submit to God's will. Apropos of God's will, it is certain that we are to be educated. Which brings me to my theme of Education as the Guardian of the American Heritage.

We begin now by defining terms. What is the American heritage that we have to defend through education? The American heritage, I think, is respect for human rights and liberties. That brings up this next question: Where do we get our rights and liberties which we have to defend? They have a source. Where do I get the right of free speech? Where does the board of regents get the right to educate? Where do you get freedom of conscience, freedom of religion? Do you get them from the State of New York? If you got them from the State of New York, the State of New York could take them away. Do you get your rights and liberties from the Federal Government in Washington? If you got your rights and liberties from the Federal Government in Washington, the Federal Government in Washington could take them away. They are taking almost everything else away. And they could take away your rights and liberties.

Our founding fathers had to face this question, and it was one of the very first that they answered. They looked around the world for an answer. England was saying that rights and liberties come from Parliament, and the new French school was saying the rights and liberties of man come from the will of the majority. But our founding fathers knew very well that if your rights and liberties came from the will of the majority, the will of the majority could take away the rights of the minority. After all, the majority is the custodian of minority rights.

So they sought for some basis and ground of human rights and liberties, and they found it and set it down in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence: It is a self-evident principle that the Creator—the Creator—has endowed man with certain unalienable rights. Unalienable rights. They cannot be taken away. And among them is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Then, finally, when the Bill of Rights was drawn up, article 9 was written. This article reads: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

A cow has no rights. Neither has a pig. No animal has rights except by association with a human. We alone have rights, and that is because we have transcendental ends, because we have an immortal soul and because this soul was created by God. Just as soon as education, civilization, and so-called culture, alienate themselves from this divine basis of human rights and liberties, there is tyranny. If you have ever read the Soviet constitution you will recall that there are 118 articles setting up a totalitarian system before there is a mention of the word "right." I think the constitution reaches either chapter 9 or chapter 10 before you find out that one of your first rights is the right to work. That is a duty, not just a right. And then when it comes down to the more basic rights which we take for granted, they change the wording of the constitution and begin to use the weak word "recognize." Rights are no longer guaranteed. They mention in article 125 freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, but on what condition? On condition that they are used to rupport the totalitarian system.

The American heritage is concerned with rights and liberties, and rights and liberties do not come to us from a dictator. They do not come to us from a state. We do not have them because they are socially expedient. Otherwise a political power might some day determine that they were not expedient. But they come to us from beyond this world, and perhaps one of the difficulties that we are in, in the international order, is trying to preserve these rights and liberties which are the great fruits of civilization, without also keeping the roots.

If you wish to keep your light and heat, you must also keep your sun. If you wish to keep your perfume, you must keep your flowers. If you wish to keep your forests, you must keep your trees, and if you wish to keep your rights and liberties in education, you must also keep your God. That is the American heritage.

How does education preserve these rights and liberties? Education preserves them by developing first of all reason or knowledge, secondly, freedom, and thirdly, character. These words are used often very loosely.

Reason has undergone a tremendous transformation in the past two or three hundred years. Reason always used to mean ends, goals, purposes, and destinies. And then men lost sight of their destinies. Reason began to be used almost exclusively for technical purposes and to discover means. Now reason is being used in some parts of the world solely for planning.

Socialism is the forcible organization of a chaos that was created by egotistic reason. Socialism varies in direct ratio and proportion with the decline of reason and responsibility. One of the reasons today why people are becoming constantly, increasingly frustrated is because they have lost the meaning and purpose of life. There is nothing that so much undermines the minds of people as the loss of meaning of life. After all, if we do not know why we are here, why go on living? One of the reasons why an inventor can go on experimenting and be sure that there is going to be a right result sometime is because there is a great Logos and reason and purpose behind the world.

If education is to guard our American heritage it must ever keep in mind the meaning and purpose of life, namely, that we were really made for God as well as for this earth.

Freedom has undergone a great transformation, too. Freedom, or liberty, can be understood in three ways. First of all, freedom can be called the right to do whatever you please. If freedom is the right to do whatever you please, then freedom is not moral but physical. Certainly you can do whatever you please. For instance, you can turn a machine gun on your neighbor's chickens. But freedom does not mean the right to do whatever you please, because that is nothing but power and it leads to anarchy and tyranny.

As a result of the confusion that was produced by so many people in the world thinking that freedom meant that right to do whatever they please, there began a reaction. In nazism, fascism, and communism we had a new definition of freedom. Freedom is the right to do whatever you must. For example, Engels, who helped Marx write his Communist Manifesto, actually gives this example: "If I drop a stone from my hand, that stone is free because it must obey the

law of gravitation. So you are free to the extent that you obey the law of the dictator." That is the philosophy behind communism. Here are the two extremes of communism: The right to do as you please and the right to do whatever you must.

In between both is what American freedom must be, and the freedom that education must preserve. Freedom is the right to do whatever you ought, and ought implies purpose and law. We are free in the law and not outside of it. We are most free when we obey the nature of things, not when we disobey them. I am free to drive an automobile in traffic on condition I obey the traffic laws. I am free to draw a triangle provided I draw three sides. I am free to draw a giraffe on condition I draw a long neck, not a short neck. Many people want to be free from everything, but you are free from something only for something. Freedom is not negative. It is positive.

A rich man went up to a taxi driver and said, "Are you free?"

The taxi driver said, "Yes. I am free."

The rich man left, shouting, "Hurrah for freedom."

It was meaningless to the taxi driver because if he was free, he was free for something. Our American heritage implies a memory. A heritage is a tradition, and just as you cannot think without going back into the storehouse of your memory, so, too, civilization has a memory, and our country has a memory and a tradition. That tradition is freedom within the law and not outside of it.

Finally, education preserves the American heritage through the development of character. Character to some extent is a little different from education. In education you always take what is best in a pupil. For example, education would never take hold of me and teach me to be a singer. I was telling someone at dinner tonight that when I first instructed Grace Moore, she said after the first 10 minutes, "You have a wonderful voice." I said, "If I do have a wonderful voice, why can't I sing?"

She said, "Have you ever tried?" (What priest hasn't?)

She said, "What is your favorite duet?"

I said, "Anges Pures from Faust."

She said, "Let's sing it."

Well, we sang it. It goes up about eight octaves each verse. She finally stopped and said, "You are right. You can't sing."

Education lays hold of what is best in a person but I think that character lays hold of what is worst. It takes hold of a falling and by very skillful manipulation and training turns it into a perfection. St. Paul said, "Power is made perfect in infirmity." Sometimes the part of the house that is repaired is the strongest part in the end. There is a tendency today in certain quarters to believe that character is made by some single act in the past, and so you go back to the day when you were locked in the closet during the terrible thunderstorm when your aunt Mamie called. That was the day you began to hate your mother, and you grew up with that terrible hatred and all the complexes that you have since are due to that one single instance. Character is not made by a single act in the past. Character is made by what is called the habitus. Habitus in Latin is a virtue and is made by repeated acts directed toward a certain end or purpose. If the end is bad, then you have an evil character. If the end is good, then you have a good character.

If I sat down to play at the piano it is possible, if you gave me a selection to play, I might hit a right note. Ed Wynn was once talking to someone who boasted that he knew operas very well. Ed Wynn struck one note on the piano and said. "If you know operas so well, from what opera does that note come?" So if you gave me a selection to play, it is possible that I might hit one right note, but if a great artist like Rachmaninoff sat down to play, it is conceivable that he might hit a wrong note. But you would say Rachmaninoff could play and I couldn't. You would not be judging by the individual act. You would be judging by the habitus. A good tennis player might sometimes make a very bad stroke. A person who cannot play tennis might sometimes make a very good one, but there is the habitus in one and not in the other, and habitus is developed through the will and not through knowledge.

There is apt to be the assumption of Socrates in education that the only reason people are bad is because they are ignorant, and if you give them enough education, they will be good. Oh, no. Sometimes education can make clever devils instead of stupid devils. Not every doctor of philosophy is a saint, nor every doctor of divinity. I am both, and I am not a saint. We ought to be, but we are not. We have the knowledge. Most of the saints never had a doctor of divinity degree nor a doctor of philosophy degree.

Ignorance is not identical with evil. Evil comes from the will and from bad choices. That is why the preservation of the American heritage requires a certain amount of discipline. Is education forgetting it? How little of memory work there is in modern education. And those of you in the audience who, like myself, are over 30 years of age will remember when we went to school, that we had to do considerable memorizing. Memory has to be trained when we are young. It is a very good discipline. Spelling is a very good discipline. Then there are moral disciplines. There is nothing that develops character like a pat on the back, provided it is given often enough, hard enough and—low enough. All the education in the world will not make good citizens unless, as I say, we keep in mind the purpose of life and also train the will of our young. That means that we have to decide what is the purpose of education. The purpose of education is not merely to train for a democracy. That we must do, but that cannot be the final end. The purpose of education cannot merely mean to earn our economic living. The purpose of education is the training of the whole man, body and soul. In order to understand how to educate a man, you must know what a man is. Our world is oscillating between two extreme solutions of man. We have the optimistic solution that made every man a saint, and the idea that man is naturally good, progressive and that through the forces of evolution and time alone, he will go on and upward until he becomes a kind of a god.

Remember how it was 20 or 30 years ago? Now no one believes in it. What has happened to our philosophy of progress? Look at the rapidity of wars. The interval between the Napoleonic and Franco-Prussian Wars was 55 years, from the Franco-Prussian War to the First World War was 43 years, and from World War I to World War II it was 21 years. All this at a time when man had all the material conditions essential for happiness—this is not necessary and inevitable progress.

The world swept to the other extreme and fell into this terrible despair which Dr. Kettering condemned so rightly, the despair, for example, that is registered in the philosophy of Sartre that man is made for nothingness. Man came from nothingness but he was not made for it. Sartre just put nothingness on the wrong end. This is the essence of Sartre's philosophy. He said, "Anything that negates my ego is nothing. But you negate my ego. Therefore, you are nothing." The result is that today there is a pessimism and a despair about man.

Education cannot fall into either of these extremes of optimism or pessimism. Rather we have to realize that we are all not saints and we are not devils, either—that we are just human beings who can be very weak. Our weakness can take one of three directions, and the psychologists of the world have recently rediscovered them. Not one of them discovered all of them but each one discovered a third. The three instincts that we have in us that are not wrong, but that can be perverted, are the instinct that belongs to our body, which is sex, the instinct that belongs to our mind, which can be egotism and know-it-all-ness, and third, the instinct that is related to things—avarice, greed, and material selfishness. Freud rediscovered sex. Adler, with his inferiority complex, discovered egotism, and Jung discovered avarice and the philosophy of security. These instincts of body and of mind and the instinct to control things are not wrong. They are God-given. They are right, but they have to be watched and controlled and channeled. Body has to be controlled and channeled into marriage. Things have to be controlled for the common good. Mind has to be controlled toward fraternity, spirit of generosity and humility, and all of these are necessary in the development of character. If, then, education is to preserve the great American heritage, it will train the will as well as the intellect. It will keep God and it will also stress discipline in education.

America is now perhaps at one of its greatest moments of generosity. We have many failings, indeed, and we are living in a time when we are cursed by the nemesis of mediocrity. But let us also count our greatness. We are, under Providence, the secondary cause for the preservation of the freedoms of the peoples of the world. We have been the pantry of the world. We are feeding the world. We are in danger of attack but if that attack comes, may we as educators recall our founding fathers and the source of our rights and liberties. May we see the fulfilment of the words that Moses wrote. "As the eagle stirs among her young so does God stir among the nations." Moses noted that the eagles built their nest high in the mountain alongside of a crevice. When finally the mother eagle had hatched her young, she would stir in the nest and finally push one reluctant eaglet over the edge. The little bird would use its wings for the first time—wings that were all too feeble to bear its weight—and he would fall and fall and fall down to what must have seemed to its little eyes certain death on the precipice or in the chasm below. But just before it would crash, the mother eagle would swoop out under it and gather the young one on its giant pinions and then sweep it up into the air. Then it would fly from under the eaglet and repeat the process until finally the little bird learned to fly.

And as the eagle stirs among her young, so does God stir among the nations. We have had material security. Now the nest of America is being stirred by God, and we are being made conscious that there are other worlds and other peoples besides those in our own nest. Sweet Providence is now pushing us over the edge of this nest of ours and in the uncertainty of feeding the other nations of the world and preserving their freedoms, it may seem that we are crashing to death below. Just as that eagle gathered up her young, may God who stirred our nest also swoop down under us and bear us up again, as education, conscious of its American heritage, does more and more to preserve the foundation of all rights and liberties; under God to Whom we give all honor and glory forever.

A Government of Laws and Not of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on January 27, 1951, the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] delivered an address before the Maryland State Bar Association in Baltimore which richly deserves the attention of the Members of this body, and of all the people of our country.

In most scholarly fashion the Senator from North Carolina reviewed the legal aspects of American freedoms and guarantees, freedoms and guarantees which at this moment are threatened as perhaps never before in the history of this great Republic.

An outstanding audience, including many members of the Maryland judiciary and leading authorities in many fields of legal endeavor, was privileged to hear the address. Judge Levin C. Bailey, of the first judicial circuit of the State, is president of the Maryland Bar Association. Judge Stedman Prescott of the sixth judicial circuit acted as toastmaster at the dinner.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of the distinguished Senator be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS AND NOT OF MEN

The people of America are concerned, as rarely ever before, with the paramount problem of their freedom and the question of national survival. They wish a defense that will preserve to us and to our posterity the freedoms that have come to be regarded as commonplace in America. The people are thinking about the history of those freedoms.

The founding fathers set a course and followed a path designed to furnish us a correct pattern for life and liberty in a democracy. And, that was done when the concept of democracy was not nearly so well understood in the world as is true today. From their studies and efforts they evolved a government of laws and not of men. They knew the dangers of a government by an individual.

The history of dynasties and tyrannies was well-known, and it was their purpose to prepare for us a path of progress in national life that would afford the people the greatest good and freedom. They abhorred the tyrannical abuses of governments based upon the concept of the divine right of kings or despots.

We have then our form of government under a written Constitution, whose virtues have many times been proclaimed. Our Government was designed to prevent the possibility of a dictatorship ever arising in America controlling the lives and liberties, or dedicating the activities of the people to unwise objectives.

In a nation where the people are to such a great extent homogeneous, it would seem unnecessary for such a constant cleavage to exist between the Congress and the executive department as sometimes appears. That there have been obstructions coming from all three of our departments—legislative, executive, and judicial—cannot be gainsaid.

But, behind and above all the conflicts has been the determination that despots should not rule the people of America. History is replete with the story of despots in many lands overrunning the will of the people and subjugating them to their dictates. Such was never contemplated in America. And, with that feeling, it is my purpose to discuss briefly with you the duties and responsibilities of the three coordinate branches of our Government, and particularly the duties of the legislative and the executive.

You, as lawyers, are as familiar with the Constitution of the United States as am I. But it is well indeed to have a recurrence to fundamental principles now and then, in order that we may keep clearly in our minds just what our type of government is supposed to be.

The legislative branch was given the responsibility and the duty of legislating the will of the people into the written law of the land. The executive branch was allotted the duty of executing the laws of the land under the Constitution. The judicial branch was charged with interpreting the laws, and holding a check rein, so to speak, upon any unwarranted exercise of powers by either the legislative or the executive.

It is nothing new in the history of nations that conflicts have arisen between the legislative on one hand and the executive on the other. But, we in America have been able to avoid the results that have sometimes overtaken other nations. It was with a profound understanding of human nature that those philosophers of government who organized our system, and knew the history of governments in the past, provided that the elections of Congressmen should be every 2 years, so that the people might have a chance to frequently express themselves upon public questions and policies. Those philosophers of government also knew that many times in the past the people have been exploited by their rulers, when those rulers were unrestricted in their activities, their whims and caprices.

It must be conceded, I think, that dictators and despots have for the most part come from executives who have been given too much power, and have abused that power. Our Constitution placed restrictions that now apply and as such are generally respected by our legislative and executive departments, but not always.

It was the executive, Kaiser Wilhelm I, who brought about the Franco-Prussian War. We do not have to think far back to realize that it was Kaiser Wilhelm II who projected the holocaust upon Europe which we know as World War I. We would not have to search our recollection to remember that it was Hitler who brought the Second World War upon Europe, along with Mussolini, both executives who became despots and dictators. That war was in spite of the efforts of representatives of constitutional, democratic governments to prevent it. Nor can we forget the so-called Imperial Japanese Government, represented in the person of a ruler possessing power in both the temporal and the spiritual realms, who startled the world with the dastardly depredations upon a peace-loving people at Pearl Harbor on that Sunday morning so well-described by our past great President as "a day of infamy." Nor can we forget the other despotic characters in history.

These lessons of history justify the wisdom of our founding fathers in creating a government of, for, and by the people, whose wish should be expressed and heeded through their chosen representatives. Undoubtedly the legislative branch of our Government has made many mistakes, but generally those mistakes have been made in devotion to the interests of the people, in trying to protect their rights and liberties. The activities and mistakes of Congress, as egregious as they may have been, have always been in the open and not in secret.

All the world knows each day what Congress is discussing, and what its Members are thinking and planning. People of all walks of life have equal opportunity to express their views. They do not have to be on guard against secret deals such as were made at Yalta. The secret deals of the past are undoubtedly responsible for our present situation. The people applauded when President Wilson proclaimed in his memorable message that there should be open covenants, openly arrived at. Yet we have seen this Nation of people knowing little about agreements made in their name and which have so materially affected their lives and well-being. It was not the legislative branch of the Government that made the deal at Yalta. It was the executive branch.

The people have a right to know of commitments by the executive branch with respect to duties and obligations that may be placed upon them. We are a people with a missionary spirit and zeal, that sometimes seems to prompt us almost to the point of meddling in the affairs of others. I believe it was something like that in the mind of Nehru which caused him to speak out against our Nation in the last few days, even in the face of the fact that he is expecting millions of tons of grain from this Nation to preserve the lives of his people. There can be no doubt but that we are well-wishers to all the liberty-loving and freedom-seeking peoples of the world. And yet, there can likewise be no doubt that our motives are suspected and our efforts, at times, unappreciated.

We cannot hold one man, or even two, responsible for our recent diplomatic mistakes. Many were responsible, including some in the legislative branch. It does appear that maybe there was too precipitate action.

It is not my purpose tonight to censure or to blame, but to call attention to the fact that in this hour of national seriousness we should remember, and indeed we must remember, that the problems at hand are those that must be dealt with in a spirit of conciliation and of mutual understanding between the executive and legislative branches of our Government. Mistakes will be made, and while we should not stop to cry over spilt milk, nevertheless it will be well for us to keep an eye upon those who may have had such an unsteady hand as to do the spilling, lest they may again do likewise.

War means death to millions of men who have the same right to live, to bask in the sunshine of freedom, and to breathe the air of liberty, as you and I do tonight. It should be entered into only after careful consideration and joint action by the executive and legislative. Our Constitution was planned to avoid precipitate action by any branch of our Government. It was contemplated that discussion and debate in Congress would bring out the correct facts on every situation before our Nation proceeded with warlike activities.

Entering upon the shores of Korea was a terrible mistake. We went there in high spirits and with great hopes of what we could do for human freedom. But the hopes for that achievement have long since vanished in the minds of most of our people. Who can say what would have happened with respect to the Korean situation if Congress had had the opportunity and had debated the question and the dangers with which that expedition was fraught. If we

had gone into Korea after such a full and free discussion, we would have had a collective feeling of responsibility.

If we had stayed out after such a discussion, then probably we could have avoided our present dilemma and saved the casualties that now amount to approximately 50,000 American boys. We need the collective wisdom of the branches of the Government to be exercised for the benefit of all. In the present period all chips should be removed from all shoulders, so that we may approach the problem with a clear and open mind.

Let us, therefore, examine the duties, under the Constitution, with respect to the making of war—for that is what we have. Let us do so dispassionately. Let us forget for the present the usurpations of authority by executives of the past that can and probably do furnish impelling precedents.

We know that the first part of our Constitution, article I, provides for legislative powers, and that those were the first powers to which the founding fathers gave consideration. In section VIII of that first article there was provided that—

"The Congress shall have power * * * to provide for the common defense."

And then we go to those paragraphs in section VIII which provide for the authority that is given to the legislative branch and known to all of us as the war-making powers. I quote them in order that we may have them clearly in mind tonight:

"(11) To declare war.

"(12) To raise and support armies.

"(13) To provide and maintain a navy.

"(14) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

"(15) To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

"(16) To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States. * * *

"(18) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

A consideration of the meaning of those sections would seem to indicate rather clearly where the powers for making war rest, but in spite of the arguments that have proceeded for these last several weeks, I do not believe that I have seen quoted in any discussion the foregoing provisions from the Constitution.

Then there is the provision, in article II, for the executive power, which says:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America."

As you will note, nothing is said therein about the powers of the President, but merely that the executive power, as that may, of course, have been interpreted by one or another group, was to be vested in a President. Then there comes section II of article II, which provides:

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

Neither of those sections gives the Executive any power, either as President or as Commander in Chief, to make war, as does section VIII of article I spelling out the powers of the Congress. I do not know of any provision in the Constitution that appears to counteract the provisions which have just been cited.

We do know that paragraph 2 of section II of article II provides that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." And it is, of course, correct to say that the Atlantic Pact was approved as a treaty in which the Senators concurred and to the extent that such treaty placed a duty upon the United States Government of helping to defend the freedom of our allies.

I do not understand, though, that that treaty gave to the Executive any additional war-making powers, or that the right of Congress to declare war, if indeed we were to go into war, was abrogated in any respect. In fact, I understand, that the Secretary of State "categorically denied that the pact had for its purpose or its intent the sending of American troops to Europe to meet any possible defense prior to an armed aggression"—and I am quoting from a speech made by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] in the Senate of the United States on January 22. In connection with that speech there is listed fifteen interventions by the Armed Forces of our Nation which have been cited as precedents, to support the claim of executive authority to send into foreign countries armed forces without the approval by Congress.

Those 15 interventions prove interesting reading and show the disparity between police actions and all-out war: Naval hostilities with France, 1798; Jefferson's expedition against the Barbary pirates, 1804; the Seminole War, 1817; Polk's occupation of disputed Texas-Mexican border territory, 1846; intervention in Samoa, 1840–41 and period subsequent thereto; the use of naval forces in China, 1891; Boxer Rebellion in China, 1900; Theodore Roosevelt's intervention in Panama, 1903; intervention in Santo Domingo, 1940; in Nicaragua, 1899, 1910, 1912, 1926; the intervention by Marines in Haiti, 1914; President Wilson's intervention at Vera Cruz, 1914; the Santo Domingo intervention in 1916; the effort to pursue and capture Pancho Villa, 1916; the intervention in Russia, Archangel, Siberia, in 1919.

Those instances were police activities but not war such as we have in Korea today. The largest number of troops, as I understand, involved in any of those expeditions was in China in connection with the Boxer Rebellion, and upon that occasion there were less troops involved than we have already had killed in Korea. Certainly we cannot say, then, that there are any precedents for the Korean operation.

We do have treaty obligations which should be carried out in defense of the Atlantic Pact, but in accordance with law. There was an open covenant, openly arrived at, and the executive branch of the Government as well as the Defense Department has a right to expect from Congress cooperation to the extent necessary to a proper fulfillment of our treaty obligations, having in mind the proper interpretation of that treaty by the Congress itself.

It has been said that "a frank confession is good for the soul." Would it not be in order for those responsible to admit their mistakes and join in an effort to do that which will properly carry out our treaty obligations, and yet be responsive to the will of the American people? Should we not proceed in accordance with our constitutional provisions whose terms we have sworn to uphold? Dissatisfaction is rampant amongst the people, and that should make us pause and think, but should not prevent us now from having a clear understanding of the rights and duties of the respective departments of our Government.

I shall hope that we may be able to see an end to political partisanship and bickering, and party adherence merely for the sake of such. Rather we should see a complete understanding between our branches of government undisturbed by personal pique. But that is a two-way street and the elected representatives in Congress are entitled to exercise their governmental duties without abuse or side-stepping by subordinates in the executive department.

May we be so guided that America may remain a beacon light of freedom to all the world, and that, in the words of a famous American, "Liberty shall not perish from the earth."

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, to the Republican Club of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on January 29, 1951, to the Republican Club of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is always a pleasure to find the Republican Party operating vigorously at the seat of the Government, exercising a personal influence on those who determine the policy of government. Those nonvoters certainly did a great job in bringing in through absent voters' ballots those many people here who have been wise enough to retain a residence in the great State of Ohio.

I am delighted to join with you in honoring the new Republican Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, who won this year because they are fighting Republicans. The addition to our membership in both Houses is an augury of victory in 1952, and their enthusiasm will step up the determination of those of us who perhaps have been here too long for our own good.

The year 1950 was a great Republican year. While the ultimate results were not so favorable as in 1946, nevertheless the victories in individual States were more impressive and more promising. In 1946 the result came somewhat from temporary issues; in 1950 they represented a victory of principle. Now is the time for all Republicans to begin to plan the campaign of 1952 and the best way to start is to find the reasons for some of the huge majorities in many States in 1950.

First, it seems to me clear that the people have responded and will respond to a straightforward appeal for progress under the basic principles of American freedom which are the foundation of the Republican Party. I believe if that appeal is presented in behalf of liberty, justice, and equality at home and independence and peace abroad, they will respond to that appeal more than to any socialistic promises and programs. The issues in the recent election included the Brannan plan supposed to appeal to the farmer, socialized medicine supposed to appeal to the millions of middle-income and lower-income families, and the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law supposed to appeal to the members of the labor unions. If those suppositions had been correct, the Republicans would have lost by large majorities, because most of the candidates took a head-on position against all of these three programs. They did not lose. New Deal victories in recent years had created the impression that you couldn't beat Santa Claus. They had created the impression that a man can successfully promise the farmer high prices and the consumer low prices at the same time; that people can have free medical service and many other free benefits without paying any increased taxes; that government could give the people something for nothing. Now we know that the American people need not be fooled by that kind of philosophy.

I was particularly impressed with the attitude of the labor union member in Ohio. The officials of all the great labor unions combined to purge me from the Senate in order to prove the power of the unions in politics and secure the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. They made no headway with their own members. The union members voted in what they considered to be the public interest. The American workman still regards himself as an American citizen first and a union member afterward. He does not respond to an appeal based on the claim that he is the member of a particular class, has only a class interest, and that somebody is trying to discriminate against his class. He believes, as we believe, that America is not divided into classes, and that there is no division line which separates the interest of one man from that of another and no boundary which cannot be easily crossed by any American boy. In Ohio certainly, he rejected a purely class appeal.

The same thing is true of the farmer in his rejection of the Brannan plan which had all the elements of demagoguery dressed up in a palatable and attractive form. The people rejected socialized medicine, I believe, because they have an instinctive distrust of the efficiency of Government service.

Socialism and communism are based on a class appeal. They are based on the theory that only government will protect the interests of different classes and that control of all activity must be concentrated in a great central government. That principle the people of America rejected in 1950, and will reject in 1952 if we do a proper job of publicity and organization.

But the affairs of government in which we in Washington have such a tremendous interest are a good deal further from the people than we realize, and the majority of the possible voters do not follow the issues in politics and government as those of us who are in political life imagine. Consequently, we must not only adhere ourselves to basic principles, but we must present those principles in the most effective way to all of the possible voters. We have a tremendous job of publicity and propaganda, and we cannot rely on old methods. We need every kind of publicity—radio talks, columns, magazine articles, speeches, pamphlets, and a steady barrage of material to the columnists, commentators, and newspapers, upon whom so many of the public rely for argument and information. In addition to publicity, we need organization; that is, we must ask those who are concerned about sound progress in government to organize groups among their friends and extend the scope of their interest. We must finally ask thousands of volunteers to go from door to door to present oral arguments and written pamphlets.

Left-wingers are first-class propagandists. They outnumber Republicans on the lecture platforms, in writing books, on the radio, and, I think, particularly in pamphleteering. The Communists taught the labor unions and others how this propaganda job should be done, but the political organizations have lagged far behind. The American people fundamentally believe in American principles.

Every program presented by our friends or our opponents should be analyzed and tested on the basis of whether it promotes liberty in the long run or destroys liberty; whether it favors special interests or special groups, or whether it holds the scales of justice evenly and impartially as government should do. The Republicans present a program of progress in increased production, in standards of living, better education, public works that are worth while, sound principles of finance, but they must tell the people why their program will achieve permanent results, and why the Fair Deal proposals can only lead to inflation, socialism, and complete Government control of the lives of our people.

But I believe the decision last November was probably more affected by the concern of the people over the foreign policy of the United States, and that in 1952 also, that may well be the determining factor. In spite of the President's recommendations in his budget message, I doubt if this Eighty-second Congress will embark on any new ventures in domestic policy. The interest of this Congress, and very likely that of the people in 1952, is centered on this problem of meeting the threat of Communist aggression. In the last campaign, the Republicans for the first time attacked directly the past foreign policy of the administration. We pointed out that the present power of Russia and its ability to threaten the security of the United States arose out of that policy. We pointed out that Communist infiltration into the Government, into Hollywood, into labor unions, and into the intelligentsia of the colleges and the writing profession. At Yalta our policy was largely dominated by Hopkins and Harriman. Both of them, like many other Government officials at that time were apparently convinced, perhaps by deliberate Soviet Communist design, that communism was another form of democracy. They took the position that Soviet Russia was a peace-loving democracy, as much interested in liberty and justice as the American people themselves. For anyone brought up in American schools and conversant with the history of Lenin, Trotzky, and Stalin could have come to that conclusion, it is difficult indeed to understand. But they did.

They accepted the promises of Stalin that he would establish freedom in Poland and other countries, although he had never kept a promise and was as much of an aggressor in Poland as Hitler was. They set him up in control in Berlin, Prague, and Vienna, and American troops were turned back from Berlin and Prague because of the agreements made at Yalta. The administration established Stalin in Manchuria contrary to every principle of American foreign policy since the days of John Hay, and contrary to our obligation to our ally who had so long fought the Japanese. They encouraged the Chinese Communists. They tried to make Chiang Kai-shek take Communists into his cabinet. They cut off the ammunition and supplies which he needed at the most crucial period. In effect, they notified the Communists that we would not intervene in Korea, and wholly failed to arm the South Koreans, except with small arms, for fear apparently that they might attack the Communists in North Korea.

They intervened in Korea without even consulting Congress on the call of the United Nations, knowing well that Russia would veto all subsequent action. In spite of the most liberal policies of assistance for 5 years, costing our taxpayers billions of dollars, the administration apparently obtained no promises from England and France that they would back us up in the east even against all-out aggression by Chinese Communists, an aggression not only against the United States but against the United Nations. It is not strange that the people suspected the influence of communism and resented the weakness of the State Department.

Today the administration's foreign policy is chiefly dominated by a wavering uncertainty. We don't know exactly the size of the Armed Forces considered to be necessary. We don't know the extent of the burden of taxation or of drafting of boys. The people are certainly prepared to meet any sacrifices that are necessary either in taxation or in the drafting of men or in Government controls. But they want to be certain that they are necessary and why they are necessary. They certainly want an all-powerful Air Force and complete control of sea and air to protect our own safety. I believe they will acquiesce in the drafting of as many boys as are necessary for that purpose and for a land army of reasonable size. They know as well as everyone else that we cannot assume to run the world. They know that if we take on commitments heavier than we can assume, we may well bring this country to disaster.

If the people are going to be asked to cut down their spending, they would like to be certain that the Government will cut its nondefense spending. If we must have a huge Army, Navy, and Air Force for a good many years, they would like to see all of the frills cut off from those services, and the same results accomplished with more economy and good sense in the obtaining of munitions, supplies and equipment, and in the use of personnel.

The detailed program to be presented by the Republican Party can hardly be determined until there is more crystallization of opinion, but I believe that our policy must be based first on the maintenance of the independence of the United States, and second, on peace unless that independence is threatened. It must be based on assistance within our capacity to assist those nations which are willing and anxious to battle communism at home and abroad. It must be based on a program which maintains America as the mighty fortress of liberty, unassailable from without and strong and sound within. It must maintain the economic soundness of this country and increased production as we go, and this both for our own interest and for the interest of those who are closer to the Communist menace. We must, therefore, avoid inflation and the waste of our resources. Foreign policy is to a large extent the application of sound principles to hundreds of situations that arise from day to day. It requires sound underlying principles, but also good sense and judgment in their application. Perhaps because the present administration has failed to understand the principles, they have surely lacked judgment in their day-to-day decisions.

In foreign policy as in domestic policy, we must present our case to all the possible voters of America. We must meet head-on any truckling to Communist sympathizers in the United States, any appeasement of Russia which is likely to lead to more aggression, any waste of our resources with the idea that we can buy the support of nations who, of course, will not be bought. Our affirmative policy must be definite on the particular problems before us at the time; but founded always on a strong America, and cooperation with those nations who are willing to join with us in meeting the greatest threat from without to our own security which we have known since the Revolutionary War.

Development of the Nation's Potential Water Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Development of the Nation's Potential Water Power, delivered by me yesterday at the REA convention in Cleveland, Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATION'S POTENTIAL WATER POWER

As I offer my greetings to you assembled at this REA convention I speak as one whose support for rural electrification and its achievements, is a matter of record, and I am happy to be with you in this fellowship.

The man speaking is not the only Tobey who is interested and concerned with the well-being of rural electrification, for my son, Attorney Charles W. Tobey, Jr., is counsel for the New Hampshire Electrical Cooperative. This cooperative has many of my friends among its officials and members, and is a living memorial to the ideals and sacrifice of the late Bill Neal, of Meredith, N. H., whose tragic death was a shock and a profound loss to the good people of New Hampshire and to farmers all over the United States.

Friends, I am an old-fashioned Theodore Roosevelt "bull moose" Republican, a man of progressive political instincts. To my mind, the creation and development of the Rural Electrification Administration, and its system of rural electrical cooperatives, expresses one of the very best examples of the possibilities of the Federal Government's constructive role, in the economic and social progress of our great country.

The chief basis of our great national production and high standard of living is a truly competitive, free-enterprise system. I underline the thought "truly competitive." The dynamics of our society rejects a static existence or a status quo psychology. As we work long hours with a strong and free spirit, we know, given equal opportunity, that we can aspire to better ourselves in the spiritual, mental, and material values of life. That hope and that goal is ever with us, one and all, and is the American inspiration. Communists and Fascists take note.

In any system of economics and government, perfection is not attainable, and our capitalist free-enterprise system is no exception. Chinks and cracks exist, both because of the imperfections of man and a natural selfishness and grasping of private corporate interests, which sometimes manifest themselves when they are in a position to dominate and monopolize a segment of the economy of a locality, a State, a region, or the Nation. What economists call perfect competition, which implies the automatic competitive distribution of goods, to each of us according to ability and need, is a mirage however pleasant to contemplate. With the culmination of the industrial revolution in the United States, and the disappearance of the American frontier, the Federal Government was forced by circumstances, and the extremes of wealth, private economic concentration, and monopoly, and the protection of the equality of opportunity for its people to enlarge its sphere of operations far beyond the Jeffersonian concepts, which were developed in an agrarian economy and based on the premise that a man could go west if he wanted to start anew.

And so today, in the great industrial and atomic age, the individual may find himself without a job in the factory or without the resources or private credit to properly develop his marginal farm, all due to factors entirely beyond his control, to change or better himself by hard and earnest work. Thus, your Government has stepped in, sometimes spasmodically and haphazardly, but always at the will of the people as a whole, and helped to provide and equalize opportunity, and protect the individual from private monopoly, and the disastrous extremes of inflation and depression, which sometimes spring from the private business cycle.

I support this concept as a matter of principle, although we in Congress have a duty to balance and check the Executive by prohibiting Federal control over the economics and day-by-day activities of private industry and agriculture, while at the same time encouraging and aiding private economy where it is needed and desirable. To be concrete and specific in modern-day terms, I have cosponsored and fought for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which is now the law of the land, and voted and worked for the decentralized Taft Federal-aid-to-education bill. On the other hand, I stand against the compulsory-health-insurance bill and the controls envisaged under the Brannan farm plan. There is all the difference from Dan to Beersheba between these programs, enacted or proposed for your Federal Government.

The housing and education bills provide financial aid to local communities on a decentralized basis, with minimum standards, to equalize opportunity for the people as a whole, in fields where private industry cannot make a profit, and shouldn't be expected to, or where the local communities alone cannot meet the need from their own resources. The socialized medicine bill and the Brannan plan, in contrast, are based on the principle of Government control at the central level, which ultimately would have an undesirable effect on the consumer and the farmer. The problems of health and farm standards have been, and will be, approached in other ways, without loss of initiative, by coordinated programs of encouragement and aid where needed, but without Federal control. This is the essence of the American Government in action and should be accomplished within a sound budgetary framework at all times.

As I noted a moment ago, the development and execution of the REA program is a shining example of what can be done, by the wise use of Federal aid and encouragement, to help people to help themselves. By use of minimum standards, the REA has been able to chart its course of aiding electrical cooperatives to build power lines, distribute electric power, and bring light and energy to thousands of farmers and rural homes, throughout the country. This program has involved contracting for large purchases of power from private utilities and in some cases the construction of generators by the cooperatives themselves.

What was the genesis and background of this program? What were the needs and the circumstances which made the program a necessary and legitimate area of Government concern?

It arose from one major factor and a host of interrelated results. First of all, it has long been a clearly discernible economic fact, that the private utility business sometimes tends by its nature to be monopolistic, with economic and social evils that threaten the consuming public. The industry rarely, if ever, feels it advisable to run competing lines to bid for the consumer's purchase. Instead it has tacitly divided up the available territories, consolidated its position in highly marketable areas, and, at least in the old days, charged what it can get for this vital and constantly necessary service in an industrial age.

The recognition of the public's stake in electric power was recognized by the establishment of State regulatory commissions. But although helpful to the public, by making the utilities justify proposed rate increases with economic facts, and by licensing intrastate construction and consolidation, this type of regulatory approach is, at best, a palliative, not a cure for the public's concern. Also, later establishment of the Federal Power Commission to license interstate utility construction was based on the same approach.

But there is nothing in this type of governmental regulatory approach at the State and Federal levels which ameliorates the lack of this vital service of electric power in vast portions of our country, particularly in thinly populated areas. As a matter of policy, private utilities have lagged, in expanding their kilowatt production, and decreasing margins of profit. Rather they have limited their operations to populous places and the main highways of commerce in the best farmlands. Only at prohibitive cost would they expand to the byways of our Nation, where farmers toil to produce our grain and fowls. It was uneconomic, they said, and with a degree of truth, up to a point.

Therefore, when harried and overworked State public service commissions were presented with reams of facts on costs, they tended to go along with increased rates without increased service. You see, there was nothing with which the commissions could compare the cost and service factors because the utility in the area had no competition, no urge for efficiency and increased service. In other words, no yardstick was available and the consumer was the loser.

But what of the basic needs of the farmers and rural folk who wanted desperately the miracle of kilowatts and horsepower to apply to their farm tasks and farm homes? Private industry was failing them completely. And as more rural youth left for town and city life after World War I, there was as much or more work to be done, and less people to do it. Wasn't large-scale use of electric power essential to preserve and expand further the farm economy which, if anything can be so called, is the basic prop of our Nation? The answer was "yes," and Congress made it an area of its concern, and rightly so.

You who are here, the experts, architects, and beneficiaries of the REA program, know the details of the development of rural electrification far better than I. The results speak for themselves and need no elaboration. Suffice it to say that the expansion of the REA system in our rural areas has been a stimulant for private utilities to expand to areas previously considered not profitable; it has been a strong factor in reducing rates in areas where consumers have realized the benefits of cooperative effort; and above all it has made countless farm homes the recipients of all the many joys and workloads of electricity which have long been taken for granted by town and city dwellers.

Do there exist today any doubting Thomases as to the values which have accrued to people in rural communities, from the extension of rural electrification? Go out in the hinterlands of America and ask the farmer who now has eliminated a large part of his labor in the care of cattle and poultry and increased production thereby. Ask the farmer's wife how she evaluates the adequate water supply pumped into that home and outbuildings by electricity, with the consequent saving in physical fatigue. Ask the housewives in rural areas what it means to them to be saved the back-breaking work of doing the family laundry in the old tubs in place of the electric washing machine. Ask the rural families of the Nation what it is to have an adequate supply of good lighting throughout the home and outbuildings, doing away with the fire hazards in the use of kerosene and the tedious care of lamps.

The truth is rural electrification has meant emancipation from back-breaking, toilsome daily work to men and women in rural life. There are millions of people across the country who rise up to call it blessed.

Yet, no private utility, to my knowledge, has failed or been forced to reduce its overall profits as a result of REA activity. Indeed, they are in a more prosperous state than ever before, in areas adjacent to rural electrical cooperatives. That's as it should be, and more power to them. With a tremendous defense effort a very necessary part of our lives today, we need every single kilowatt of installed central-station power capacity we can possibly achieve, keeping in mind and balancing other critical uses, for our public and private defense dollars.

Rural electrification and the ideal of social service it exemplifies is as old as the history of this Nation; as indigenous, as American as the granite of my own State of New Hampshire—it isn't socialism.

While it is as modern as the latest New York play on Broadway in the comforts and conveniences and pleasures it is bringing to the farm, in its essence it is merely another form of continued self-help, which is the American way of doing things.

If I may speak as a Republican, rural electrification is an idea and an ideal that the great commoner of our party, whose birthday we will celebrate next month, would have understood and fought for. Born and raised on a farm, teaching himself, as every schoolboy reads, by lamplight and firelight, drawing his water by hand from a well, Abraham Lincoln would have known what electrict light and electric power means to the farmer and to the farmer's wife.

Lincoln—the true Lincoln—has always been my idol.

He had political imagination to know and enough human heart to feel that the test of men in public life is the degree to which they organize the materials available to society in their time, so that the economic and scientific progress of every age can be transmuted into less drudgery and more living for every man and woman.

In his own way he led the battles for the REA's of his own day. As a Member of Congress and as President, before his energies were swallowed up in the Civil War, he was in the forefront of the fight for internal improvement, for building roads and canals with Government funds, so the country could be bound together with communications and the farmer could bring his produce to market. Lincoln was in truth and in fact the father of the farm-to-market road in his time. He would have tried to be the father of rural electrification, if it were possible in his time.

His theory of government was based on the axiom that government is the mechanism by which we, the people, combine to help ourselves. You may remember these word of his:

"Why * * * should we have government? Why not each individual take to himself the whole fruit of his labor, without having any of it taxed away, in services, corn, or money? Why not take just so much land as he can cultivate with his own hands without buying it of anyone? The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves. There are many such things; some of them exist independently of the injustice in the world. Making and maintaining roads, bridges, and the like; providing for the helpless young and afflicted; common schools; are instances."

Rural electrification is just that—neither less nor more.

Lincoln believed in no socialism; you and I believe in no socialism. But Lincoln and you and I all believe in what my fellow Yankee, Justice Holmes, called the socialization of luxury—that society should use its best brains to contrive to multiply the luxury of the few today into the happiness of the many tomorrow.

In our time rural electrification, in concrete terms of labor saved, has brought, more than any other movement, the relief of drudgery for many and the increase for many of the capacity to live more as we want Americans to live.

All of us who have had any part in creating it, all of us who have had any part in sustaining and extending it, can be proud of the old American tradition in which we act.

This leads me into a broader field, the development of our Nation's potential water power. I do not believe it is unsound to say that whole civilizations have been built on water, land, and people, and as the recent report of the Water Resources Policy Commission reminds us, "when (this) combination ceases to be infused with a moral relationship between man and man, and man and nature, civilizations decline and give place to new combinations of these elementary values."

I don't have to remind you how important the rivers of New England were in turning the wheels of our early-day manufacturing plants. Nor do I have to recall to you at length the role of our middle Atlantic rivers, as they carried the increased burdens of our early national commerce, and made possible the beginnings of other great industries. And of course, the continuing saga of the great Mississippi-Missouri-Ohio River network, as well as early and modern commerce on the Great Lakes system at our backs here today, is a part of the daily lives of a great proportion of you in this assembly.

But it behooves us—all of us—to think deeply how much water and its resultant electric power, irrigating aids, navigation possibilities, and countless other uses, can mean to us directly and indirectly in our everyday lives, whether we live on a farm or in an eight-story apartment house. You and I take so many things for granted when things are going right. But we can least of all succumb to this attitude in the potential development of our Nation's water power, and the conservation and husbanding of our natural resources. The right policies and programs, private and governmental, just don't happen. We must plan, analyze, and give careful thought to the best possibilities, and then we must fight for them.

While developing my thoughts for this talk today, I have been doing, on a limited scale, just what I advise—some basic research and thinking. I have referred to the report of the Water Resources Policy Commission, volume I of which was issued on December 11, 1950, entitled "A Water Policy for the American People," and I will again in a moment. Magazine articles, speeches, and other informal sources are always useful fodder. A new book, published only last week, called Water, Land, and People, is aggressively critical with challenging and sweeping ideas, as the authors contend that a water and soil crisis is upon us now. They point out that a dam built 30 years ago at Elephant Butte now finds itself with 20 percent of its capacity filled with silt, due to generations of abuse of the soil. The authors remind us that Lake Mead, above the Hoover Dam, is already filling with silt. They make the statement that two-thirds of the 10,000 largest reservoirs in the country have an estimated useful life of less than 100 years.

To go on. The first report of the Water Resources Policy Commission is well worth the time and trouble of any citizen who is concerned theoretically, or practically, with the use of our Nation's water resources. The Commission has made some 70 policy recommendations for Congress and the people to consider. Among others is the proposal for a Federal Board of Review, appointed by the President, with the confirmation of the Senate, which would evaluate proposed water resources developments, and coordinate the many activities of the Federal agencies in an orderly manner. Another suggestion is a new law specifically directing all Federal agencies to apply the same standards and methods to the evaluation of all river basin programs. These two recommendations, along with certain others on program planning and evaluation, are eminently sound and would have the effect of eliminating the duplication and throat cutting, for example, between the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The avid competition between those two agencies for power and their respective theories of development have echoed through the halls of Congress, and the taxpayer has been the loser. See the Hoover Commission report on this subject for further reference.

At first glance, there are many of the 70 recommendations made by the Water Resources Policy Commission with which I do not agree. That's not surprising, due to the scope of the subject covered, and due to the great emphasis the Commission puts on its solutions, without having the tremendous competitive demands on the national budget and defense programs within its viewpoint. The Commission does make a bow in the direction of the present national emergency from time to time, and they point out rightly that these very defense needs accentuate, not diminish, the need for changes in evaluation, program planning, and for certain projects. Aside from being disturbed by the philosophy of the Commission in some of its reasoning and recommendations, I question the necessity of some of their urgings, in view of competitive defense needs alone. But I do call attention to the conclusion of the Commission's summary of recommendation where they summarize their views under the label "Critical Decisions." Here they have made a valiant attempt to get their long-range and short-run ideas into focus, and I commend them for it.

Some of the questions covered by the War Resources Policy Commission in great detail include:

1. Surface and ground water.
2. Flood management.
3. Land reclamation.
4. Domestic and industrial water supply.
5. Pollution control.
6. Inland and intercoastal waterways.
7. Hydroelectric power.
8. Recreation.
9. Fish and wildlife.
10. Conservation education.

Each and every one of these questions has been and is the subject of intensive study and action by private industry, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. However, I shall limit my remaining remarks to two of these subjects—inland waterways and hydroelectric power. In so doing I am going to plead the case of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, which by every standard is right and vital for the well-being and future success of our great country.

As we look back on the history of our country in every field of endeavor and action, we can see that, by and large, those things which benefited the majority of the people have eventually come to pass. Yes; there may have been years and perhaps decades of pulling and hauling, backtracking and sidestepping, but eventually, when the people as a whole have found out where their interest and their future lay, no selfish interest, however determined, has stopped them. Thus have come vast political reforms, spectacular economic advances, and a steady lifting of

the level of society. And so the fight goes on in all walks of life and for every conceivable objective. That is the backbone and vitality of our great American democracy.

I have touched in a general way today on my subject, the development of our Nation's potential water power. Now I want to use the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a concrete example of what can be and must be done as a part of the pattern of water-power development. I am the sort of man who feels he has to come to grip with a subject, fight for what he believes in, and call a spade a spade. That's part of my nature. So I use the St. Lawrence seaway as an example of a development which is part of the American vision, just as the Cumberland Road, the transcontinental railroads, the Panama Canal, and the Grand Coulee Dam are the realized dreams of the past.

But for some decades this great project, which has been carefully planned to the last engineering detail and which will be eventually self-liquidating to the last red cent, has been stopped cold in its tracks by one of the most cleverly organized, and carefully conceived, lobbies in the political history of the United States. Our long-term national defense, the economic growth of our good Canadian friends, the future of heavy industry and commerce of our own great Midwest, and the electric power hunger of our industries and consumers in New England and New York, are all tied up in the success of the St. Lawrence seaway. And yet organized minority interests, afraid to face competition or lower power rates, are unable to put the safety and future of the country first, have muddied the waters, misled many people and exerted tremendous political power.

These efforts must be exposed for what they are and the force of public opinion brought to bear. All of you here can help in this effort to start a counter grass-roots campaign of truth about the St. Lawrence project. In politics we often need a series of backfires, to deal with heavily financed and selfish interests. We have been defeated in Congress again and again, but we have just begun to fight. I plead with you to give us a hand in arousing the country in behalf of its long-term future and self-interest.

Let us take a look at the background and history of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, as well as some vital statistics. The seaway, when completed, would give access to ocean-going ships to an inland sea, the Great Lakes system outside our windows, which is by all odds the business center of commerce in the world. Do you realize that more yearly tonnage passes through one of its bottlenecks, the MacArthur locks at Sault St. Marie, than passes through the Panama, Suez, Manchester Ship, and Kiel Canals combined? Think of it, this vast reservoir of commerce which would be tapped and made available to ocean trading. The proposed seaway would, in effect, give the United States and Canada a new seacoast more than 8,000 miles long with ports such as Montreal, Toronto, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and Milwaukee. When construction is completed, a 27-foot ship channel would be guaranteed from Duluth on the western end of Lake Superior to the Atlantic Ocean, 2,650 miles to the east. With the Great Lakes, the deeper parts of the St. Lawrence River, and the already constructed canals and locks at various points already available, nature and man already have done more than 95 percent of the job.

The twin to the completion of a ship canal is the great hydroelectric power project, which is planned down to the last blueprint for construction on the St. Lawrence River. This 3,200,000,000 horsepower station would be located on the international boundary between Barnhart Island and the Canadian mainland, near Massena, N. Y. More about Massena in a moment.

The amazing thing about this project is the natural favorable even flow of water which is provided by the Great Lakes. Whereas the maximum flow of the Columbia River at Bonneville Dam is 33 times the minimum, the maximum of the Tennessee River at Wilson Dam is 115 times the minimum, the spread at the proposed St. Lawrence powerhouse is only 2.2 to 1. There would be no dry months when large amounts of generating capacity stand idle, nor would it be necessary to build standby steam plants, such as Congress is asked to approve at TVA. This natural reservoir which is provided by the Great Lakes, reduces to an absolute minimum the size of the reservoir, that must be built immediately above the power station, above the proposed Long Sault Dam. Millions of dollars of construction costs for huge control systems which have been built in other areas, are thus saved by the kindness of mother nature.

Try to let your imagination visualize the vast good which would be reaped by the Midwest, Canada, my New England area, and the defense and security of our country as a whole. Never was a project contemplated in our history which could mean so much to so many people. Yet it has been stopped cold in its tracks.

The cost? That is one of the most incredible facts of all. The total cost of the program, both the seaway and the power project combined, would amount to only $802,566,000 in terms of 1948 construction costs. In other words, well less than a billion dollars would be spent over the approximately 5-year period of construction and, most important of all, the seaway and project would be self-liquidating over a period of 40 years. This "pay-for-itself" principle will be accomplished, through tolls for the seaway, and sale of electric power by the power project. The complete and detailed story on costs and all other imaginable charts, surveys, engineering problems, and so on, has been brought up to date by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a committee report issued March 2, 1949, which is available to the public.

Before leaving the question of cost, it might be pointed out that the United States share of the $800,000,000 cost will be $573,000,000, over the 5-year period, the remainder being charged to Canada. Don't jump to conclusions, however, because the Canadians have already spent $132,000,000 for construction of the Welland Canal and improvement in the Thousand Islands section, these costs being incurred in terms of 1935 dollars. Our good neighbor to the north went ahead in good faith, feeling we would honor the terms of our treaty and agreement with them for St. Lawrence construction, but I fear they are beginning to despair at our ability to keep our word.

What is the history of our long efforts to consummate this great project with the aid of our Canadian friends?

Back in 1895, looking for cheap transportation into the heart of the continent, the United States and Canada set up a Deep Waterways Commission to study the seaway problem. This body reported favorably, the first of a long, long series of bodies to do so. In 1909 a boundary waters treaty established an international joint commission which went to work in detail on the St. Lawrence seaway and power situation after World War I. It held hearings in cities across the United States and Canada and filled 60 volumes with testimony. The joint commission reported favorably, causing President Coolidge to appoint a United States commission in 1924 with Herbert Hoover as chairman. At the same time, beginning in 1924, a joint board of engineers developed complete plans for the project, which since have been revised continually and kept up to date. These commissions and the engineers reported favorably, with the result that a seaway treaty was signed by Canada and the United States in 1932.

At that time most naive people thought that the weight of evidence and study was so great, and the public interest so clear, that the treaty would be approved by the Senate. But they were figuring without knowledge of the great power of organized self-interest. These railroads, commercial interests, and utilities who feared expansion of competition, and were against lower rates for the good of the consumer, marshaled their forces and carried the day. The final vote was 46 to 42 in favor of ratification of the treaty, but, as you know, the Constitution requires two-thirds of the Senate to concur in approval of treaties.

But the fight for approval continued, while Canada stood by ready to go, and actually constructed the Welland Canal linking Cleveland's Lake Erie with Lake Ontario. In 1941 the Roosevelt administration negotiated a seaway agreement with Canada. This agreement, by eliminating certain policies of a treaty nature, would only have required a majority vote of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Various resolutions implementing this agreement have been introduced in the Senate and the House and long hearings and favorable reports by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate resulted in 1946 and 1947. The House Public Works Committee held hearings in May of 1950. The cost estimates and other details were brought up to date by the Senate committee in 1949. But only once has the Senate voted, in 1943, and that time the resolution was returned to the committee, on motion, by a majority of the Senate for further study.

But still we fight on. Now the Members of Congress, and those of you who will help us defeat these grasping selfish interests, who have neither the ability, nor the vision, to see beyond their own high profits to the greater good of the country, have a new and unanswerable argument. If we are to properly meet the enormous challenges of increased production and expansion of capacity necessary to lead the free world against the world-wide Communist menace, we have absolutely and incontrovertably got to have the transportation facilities and hydroelectric power which would be provided by the project. In other words, the St. Lawrence seaway has assumed the clear-cut dimensions of a national defense necessity, both to the United States and our friend and ally, Canada.

Don't get me wrong. If we were to become involved in a war with Soviet Russia tomorrow, that would be one thing. We most probably could not engage in 5-year projects, however desirable, if we were actively battling for survival. But, as we marshal our manpower and resources, for a period of semimobilization in what General Marshall has termed a period of "prolonged tension," stretching for 10, 15, and perhaps 20 years, we must plan and program to increase our supplies of raw materials, expand our industrial capacity, and increase our production for the long haul ahead.

Already Russia is far ahead of us in making the best use of internal waterways, and is challenging us in hydroelectric power. Take, for example, the network provided by the Don-Volga River Canal, which links the Black, White, Caspian, and Baltic Seas, and you can see what I mean. But we have one great margin of superiority, which we must maintain at all costs. That, of course, is our overwhelming and overpowering production of such vital items as steel. We must have the vision and courage to increase this margin by all possible means. Don't forget for one moment that Stalin himself, in happier days, expressed absolute amazement at our ability to produce in World War II. The Politburo has a healthy respect for the strength of our industrial sinews, and they are working their slave labor day and night, to try to narrow the margin of our superiority.

In concrete terms what must we do? We must tap every source of iron ore to replenish the almost bankrupt Mesabi Range. Although we may hope that beneficiation will help the quality of the quantities of taconite available there, the high costs of such treatment make it almost prohibitive for large-scale industrial use. But we are lucky. In addition to the quantities of South American ores which will be brought into our Atlantic ports, the M. A. Hanna Co., with headquarters here in Cleveland, and the Hollinger mining interests of Canada have uncovered and are prepared to exploit huge deposits of high-grade iron ore in Labrador. The problem is to get huge quantities to our inland steel mills at reasonable cost. The answer? You guessed it, the St. Lawrence seaway. If work is begun this year on the project, its completion should coincide with the opening of large-scale production of the Labrador mines. This is a good example of capitalistic democratic planning, inspired by a stroke of luck.

We who have championed the cause of the St. Lawrence project for many, many years, welcome with open arms the conversion of the Hanna interests and certain other steel companies. We can use their help, and they tell me there is nobody as zealous as a convert.

To use one more concrete example, we must expand and expand and expand our production of electrical energy, the driving force behind all great industries. This should be done quickly, in areas where it will do the most good and where it is desperately needed. No greater need exists than in the power-deficit areas of New England and New York, and there is where it will do the most good, in our skilled metal industries.

During World War II in 1942 the War Production Board had an expert survey made as to the power-deficit areas of the country from the point of view of the national war effort. This survey was headed by Mr. J. E. Moore, who was then Deputy Director of the Power Division of the WPB. Was he a so-called Government bureaucrat? Oh, no; he was, and, I assume is, once again, an official of Electric Bond & Share. He could hardly be accused of bias against the private utility industry.

At any rate, the results of the survey were expressed in a chart entitled "Areas of Power Scarcity and Surplus in the United States of America," and marked "Confidential." Although the original of this chart later disappeared from the files of the War Production Board, I have seen a photostatic copy. As shown by the chart, the worst power scarcity existed in the Niagara, N. Y., area. Think of it, right next to a God-given water supply of unexcelled potential. The next worst power-deficit area included all but a minor fraction of New England, as well as Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky.

Another facet of the power need for defense purposes is the aluminum plant at Massena, N. Y., owned by ALCOA. This is the exact site of the proposed St. Lawrence power plant. You can remember how vital Massena aluminum was to our World War II effort. Yet ALCOA, even with its vast resources to carry along a marginal operation, was forced to discontinue production of aluminum there in about 1947. They gave as their sole determining reason the prohibitive cost of power, which I believe is the largest cost factor in the manufacture of aluminum.

There is a sequel to the Massena story. Late this fall the Federal Government, through its agent, the General Services Administration, made a series of contracts with ALCOA, Reynolds, and Kaiser to expand their production of aluminum for the defense effort. ALCOA agreed to reopen the Massena plant, where the power must be transmitted from several hundred miles away. In its contract with ALCOA the Government had to agree that all the cost of electrical energy above 5 mills per kilowatt-hour will be added to the contract price. Since it requires 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce a pound of aluminum, this means that the product of the Massena plant will cost the United States not less than 5 to 6 cents a pound above the contract price. Think of it. And right at the site of a power plant which would have been finished long ago but for the selfish interests who oppose it.

One final argument directly related to our defense and security. Our neighbor, Canada, is potentially one of the world's greatest areas for industrial expansion. We are vitally concerned with her well-being in these troubled times. She is our closest friend and ally.

The vast richness of Canada's natural resources is evident, even though only a small percentage of the country has been thoroughly explored. Quantities of high-grade iron ore lie on the Labrador-Quebec border; extensive oil fields and trillions of feet of natural gas have been discovered in the prairie provinces. Canada has titanium, and it has a virtual monopoly of nickel, used to harden steel. It has gold, lead, zinc, and other metals in quantities as yet undetermined. Unfortunately, many of Canada's natural riches lie so far from markets that they are at present almost useless. Their development depends on transportation, which today is Canada's greatest problem. And the most urgent of Canada's transportation needs is the St. Lawrence seaway.

Will you join us, one and all, in this crusade? Will you spread the gospel of the St. Lawrence seaway? You have both a duty and a privilege.

In conclusion, I want to leave you with a bit of my philosophy which applies to the political, economic, and social problems of our day. As applied to the development of our nation's potential water power, I hold that when Almighty God has placed upon the face of the earth bodies of water which science and the ingenuity of man can develop and transform for electric power, transportation, and good works for all the people, it is an economic sin if political and business interests are allowed to stand in the way for purely selfish reasons. The only qualifying test should be the economic soundness of the proposed projects and the availability of public funds, apportioned under a sensible budget. The good of the people as a whole is greater than any part.

So much for my attitude toward water-power development. But I have one final thought as to my general philosophy of government.

I am one who was brought up to, and still does, believe sincerely and genuinely in the principles of free competitive enterprise, and the profit system, when and if it gives just consideration to human needs, as it carries on in its operations. I hold that business and finance, and parties and government, are all-important factors in our American life, and I want to do all I can to improve them and build them up, but I also hold that even more important are people, and that these four equations I mentioned are not an objective in themselves, but should be judged, in the last analysis, as to their effect upon the lives and fortunes and happiness of people. I am not alone in this thought. Many authorities have expressed it far better than I can, and I recall the words of former President Herbert Hoover, who well said:

"We aim to set up in this country a human society, not an economic system. We aim for increased production and greater efficiency, but to the end that we may have happier home life in America."

That aim is real, and in my heart, and I commend it to you.

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, at a Kansas Day Republican Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on January 29 last, in my home State of Kansas, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] was the speaker at the annual Kansas Day Republican banquet. I ask unanimous consent that the address he delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since June 25, 1950, there have been 46,201 American casualties in Korea. The blood of the 46,201 which has consecrated the mud of the Korean valleys is only a small drop compared to the American blood which may well be shed in the days, weeks, and months just ahead.

Let me tell you of one of the 46,201 young men.

On the afternoon of November 29, a typical, young American boy, Bob Smith, of Middleburg, Pa., climbed the slopes near the Yalu River and took up a defensive position on the Changjin Reservoir. Before a red dawn broke over the mountains of Manchuria on November 30, much western blood and eastern blood had mixed in the Yalu River. As that cold red dawn broke Bob Smith was lying in a gutter near the Changjin Reservoir. Three cold bloody dawns he saw break, as his bullet riddled body lay in the gutter covered only by a raincoat. One morning the Chinese Communists, the agrarian reformers, overran the area. He played dead and they stripped him of his shoes and most of his clothing. Wounded and half frozen, after 3 days Bob Smith dragged himself to a nearby hut with a few other wounded sons of American mothers. Eleven days later a group of marines, having learned of those wounded soldiers, slugged a bloody path back through the ring of Chinese Communists and rescued them.

Bob Smith is home today, but his hands and legs are still in the hills beyond the Yalu River.

Each of us whom you, the American people, have sent to the United States Congress, if he is doing his duty, will be working long days and nights, examining the minutest detail of our foreign policy that cost Bob Smith his hands and legs. We shall be examining the planners and their planning to discover whether the blood of those 46,201 American boys shed in the past 8 months has been well spent or whether it has been wasted—to find out whether some of the agony, blood, and tears promised the American people for the future can be avoided.

For some time now we have been attempting to expose those who have been leading us along the road to disaster—leading us along a road which will be strewn with Bob

Smiths—a road watered with the tears of American wives and mothers; wives and mothers who are again being forced to travel deep into the valley of darkness and despair.

We have been damned from hell to breakfast for exposing those responsible. In fact, the left-wing cabal of press and radio have accused me of almost everything but murdering my great-great-grandmother. Take my word for it, ladies, I don't enjoy this task. It is a dirty, disagreeable job, but a job which must be done.

When I was a boy on the farm my mother used to raise chickens. From those chickens the groceries for a large family were supplied, as well as mother's Christmas money. The greatest enemy the chickens had were skunks. In order to protect mother's chickens my three brothers and I had to dig out and destroy those skunks. It was a dirty, foul, unpleasant, smelly job. And sometimes after it was done people did not like to have us sit next to them in church. But we learned early in life that the jobs that most badly need doing and are left undone are more often the most difficult and unpleasant jobs.

And, I intend to devote my efforts to digging out a much more dangerous brand of animal in our Government. This I intend to do regardless of the high-pitched squealing of those left-wing bleeding hearts of the press and radio. This I intend to do as long as I am in the United States Senate.

There is no reason on God's earth why this should be a fight between Democrats and Republicans. Those who have been betraying us can't honestly claim the label of Democrat or Republican. When they profess to be Democrats they are insulting the millions of good loyal Democrats in this Nation. Every thinking American knows that there will be neither a Democrat nor a Republican Party if the sell-out continues and the Communists win out.

Keep in mind, please, that the Communist fight is not a Russian fight. It is only being directed by Russia at this time. Keep in mind that 10,000,000 Russians have had the guts and nerve to stand up and fight atheistic communism to the extent that they are doomed to Siberian slave labor camps. So don't make the mistake of thinking that this is a fight between the Russian people and the American people. It is a fight between international communism and western civilization.

This is the Armageddon foretold in the Bible—the fight between the forces of good and evil, a fight between the forces of light and darkness, the last titanic struggle between atheistic communism and Western civilization.

Let's not waste time discussing whether or not we want war. We are at war. It is not a war of our own choosing. We did not start it. We can't stop it. Only the Kremlin can call a halt and the leaders of the Kremlin have decided not to. This war can end only with victory for Western civilization or the death of Western civilization. Therefore, let's be done with this senseless drivel about whether we want to fight a war. We have no choice. Our task is to decide how we can win the war with the least amount of death and destruction.

The active phase of the war between international communism and our Western civilization commenced over 33 years ago when the Bolsheviks took over Russia. It is now entering its final stage. During that 33-year period the Communists have been steadily moving forward on practically every front. During the past 5 years communism has been racing forward to the staccato beat of time—like a forest fire in dry woods.

There have been many phases of this satanically clever Communist war against civilization. One important phase was directed toward gaining control of the key agencies of our Government by placing Communists and their dupes and stooges in key spots in our Government. They made fantastic progress in the early thirties at the time we recognized Communist Russia. This was the time that the Hiss-Remington-Pressman-Witt-Acheson group started to work their way into key spots in the Government. So great did their power in Government become that Alger Hiss, as you recall, was appointed the very top man to misrepresent this country at the United Nations Conference. Men like Harry Dexter White, a known Communist agent, drafted many of the postwar plans for Europe. Men like Remington were in charge of shipments of war materials to our friends and enemies.

Before discussing the personalities responsible for Communist victory and impending disaster for this country, let us briefly review the Communist plans for world enslavement. There is nothing secret about those plans. They are just as public as were Hitler's aims in Mein Kampf. The plans were publicly expressed by Lenin, publicly approved by Stalin. Their first task was the creation of a Red China. As Lenin said: "He who controls China controls the world." The brains of the Communist Party for years proclaimed to their loyal workers that one of their two major tasks was to work for the creation of a Red China; that this was a necessary prelude to the creation of an entirely Red Asia and a Red Pacific, which could wash our western shores with its communistic, atheistic erosion, and then the plan for world enslavement could enter its final stage—the creation of a Red enslaved America.

The final stage of the battle has arrived. It is with us tonight. If we are to take advantage of every possible opportunity to win even at this late date—even after tremendous Communist victories—it is necessary that we examine the reason for the Communist victories to date and their plans covering the immediate days, months, and years ahead.

Let's first examine the record and see whether Russia has been successful in her plans to control our foreign policy by her agents, her dupes, and her stooges in key spots in our Government. Let's look at the cold record and find out to what extent Russia has been able to twist and pervert our foreign policy. This we must do if we hope to win in the final stages of this Communist war against us.

The statement that there are those high in Government who are doing the work of Communist Russia must not be lightly made. It should be made only after deep study. It must be made only when he who makes it is willing to submit the proof of what he says.

Let us do that now. Keep in mind as we examine the mistakes of the past, as we examine the work of those who have brought us to the brink of disaster, this proof is examined not for the purpose of punishing those who have betrayed us. Much more important work is at hand. It is done so we may get rid of those individuals—remove them from positions of power and replace them with good, loyal, intelligent Americans in their place.

Lenin and Stalin long stressed that the turning point in world revolution would come when China was conquered by communism. William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in this country, in December of 1945 said, "The war in China is the key to all the problems of international communism."

Now let's see how closely the State Department plans tied in with the plans of Lenin, Stalin, and Foster: A short time after Foster's statement, General Marshall was sent to China with secret State Department instructions, which as a soldier, he obeyed.

Those instructions to Marshall were (1) place an embargo on ammunition to the Chinese troops fighting communism; (2) force the anti-Communist troops to withdraw from Kalgan Mountain pass to Manchuria, making it possible for the Chinese Communist forces to move freely and obtain arms from the Russians; and (3) force Chiang to reduce his army by more than 1,000,000 men, many of whom after 8 years of war, having no occupation, were forced to enlist with the Communist forces. Nineteen hundred and forty-six dragged by. Marshall came home. The Communist army—grown from 300,000 to 2,000,000 men—armed, trained, directed, and even officered by the Soviets—was ready for the offensive by late 1947. But the Marshall embargo made it impossible for the Chinese troops fighting the Communists to get ammunition from either America or England—the only sources of supply.

Marshall was given the job of cutting off all arms and ammunition to the forces fighting communism in China, if they would not agree to take the Communists into partnership. Marshall did this and commented, "As Chief of Staff I armed 29 anti-Communist divisions. Now, with a stroke of the pen, I have disarmed them."

At the time the Acheson group was writing the secret instructions under which Marshall was, in his words, disarming 29 anti-Communist divisions with a stroke of the pen—at that very moment, according to documents supplied by Ambassador to China Patrick Hurley, this same group was "openly advising the Communists to refuse unification * * * unless the Chinese Communists were given control"—a weird, traitorous double-deal, if ever there was one.

Here the treason of Yalta was brought to full bloom. Here was signed the warrant condemning to atheistic communistic slavery 400,000,000 of our allies who fought so well with us during the entire war. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who have been dying today in the hills and valleys of Korea. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who will die tomorrow in the jungles of Indochina. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who will die on the sands of Iran the next day. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who will die in the streets of Berlin and Paris the day after that, unless the clamor of the American people becomes so great that the President is forced to get rid of the crimson clique which has such a hypnotic Svengali-like influence over him.

And lest you think that this sell-out was made in error, let me quote from the Secretary of State's own words last January before a National Press Club audience in referring to the Communist victory. He said: "A new day has dawned in Asia."

About 30 days before that his chief lieutenant and architect, Owen Lattimore, had referred to the Communist victory over our friends and the enslavement of 400,000,000 of our allies as the opening of limitless horizons of hope.

In the article written by Acheson's adviser, which I hold in my hand, from the July 17 issue of the Compass, he praises the State Department for having succeeded in letting China fall without letting the American people know we pushed her. At that time he also said: "The problem in Korea is the same as in China; that is, to allow her to fall without letting the American people know that we pushed her."

And so the blood of 46,201 American boys is part of the price we pay for this great task of allowing China to fall to communism without letting the American people know we pushed her.

Before discussing the proposed sell-out of 1951, let's just take a few brief minutes to discuss some of the typical personnel who are doing the planning for us in the State Department and in the United Nations.

When you hear of the sell-out of American interests in the United Nations and the State Department, keep in mind that these are just a few of a vast number of individuals like them.

[Cases given but omitted from prepared speech.]

Now, let's take an example of one of the top planners of the State Department, if we may.

[Cases given but omitted from prepared speech.]

I dislike taking your time, on these individual cases because we could recite like cases all night, but I think that it is important for you to have a few of those typical cases in mind so that you can better understand the entire dangerous picture as it develops.

Let's examine more closely the sell-out of 1950 and 1951. At the time our troops moved into Korea there was issued to the Seventh Fleet one of the most fantastic wartime orders that you or I will ever hear of. Prior to this order to our Seventh Fleet, Chiang Kai-shek, who leads the forces who are fighting communism in China, was rather effectively blockading the main Communist ports of China. He had on Formosa over half a million Chinese soldiers. The Communists had about a quarter million soldiers on the mainland opposite Formosa. One reason why the Communists kept a quarter of a million troops opposite Formosa was to protect against a possible landing on the China mainland by Chiang's anti-Communist troops. So the State Department drafted an order to the Seventh Fleet, ordering it: Number 1: to break Chiang Kai-shek's blockade of the Communist ports. Number 2: to prevent any landing by Chiang on the China coast—a tremendous service, of course, to the Communists.

Immediately the quarter million Communist troops which had been stationed opposite Formosa on the China mainland, moved north to the Korean border. Secretary Acheson stated in his recent broadcast early in July or August that he was fully aware of the fact that those Communist troops were moving up toward Korea.

Now there might have been some reason for that fantastic order to the Seventh Fleet before the Communists started shooting Americans, but certainly no reason on God's earth for its existence after they started shooting American men. Let me repeat that order to you. We said to the Chinese Communists: No. 1: We will keep our friend and your enemy from blockading the Communist ports. We will allow war material to flow into Communist China—war material now being used to kill Americans. No. 2: We will not allow Chiang Kai-shek to attack the China mainland. So you may move your Communist troops northward into Korea. So we find the incredible picture of Truman issuing a State Department order—an order to our Seventh Fleet to aid the Chinese Communists.

The one bright spot in this dangerous picture is that Truman himself is not part of the Acheson-Lattimore-Jessup-Service crowd. Truman is a loyal American. He doesn't want communism to win out in this country any more than you and I do. Unfortunately, however, he is a man of great stubbornness and a small mind—a man who is being operated by puppet strings pulled by the Acheson-Jessup crowd, but if the pressure from the American people becomes great enough, there is hope that he will yet clean house.

So much for the bungling of the past. Let's examine what must be done if we are to win this war with the least amount of death and destruction. Today we are considering drafting 18-year-old boys—today we are actually calling back into service men with wives and families—men who served in World War II. While this is being done, Chiang Kai-shek, who heads the anti-Communist Chinese forces, has offered us the use of his troops—500,000 of them stationed on Formosa. He says: "If your State Department and the United Nations will only say the word, we will give you half a million trained troops to fight the Communists. Give us the weapons of war and we will give you another million Chinese guerrillas now on the China mainland. They are willing and eager to fight the Communists." But the State Department and the United Nations say, "No, we want this war fought by American boys." The old Yalta crowd says, "No, we won't use those Chinese because they were resisting the advance of communism in China while we were aiding the Communists." They say, "No, we will draft a million and a half American boys instead." The United Nations chimes in and agrees that only the sons of American mothers can fight and die. Spain has offered to give us a million men within a matter of weeks if only we will say the word. But the Yalta crowd which still runs our State Department says, "No, we don't like the Spaniards because they fought against communism during the years that we were coddling it. We will draft another million American boys instead—18-year-olds and boys with wives and families."

Now, what to do. The answer is obvious. We must make a direct about-face and first kick out the entire Yalta crowd—replace all those architects for disaster with good, loyal Democrats and Republicans—Democrats and Republicans loyal to America. Next use the manpower of our allies; use the anti-Communist forces on Formosa; use the anti-Communist guerrillas in China; give them the tools of war so they themselves may strike the Communist chains from their wrists and ankles; use the manpower of Spain to create a powerful army in Western Europe; give them American weapons so they may do their own fighting.

Above all—now and forever—discard the tortured reasoning of the Yalta crowd that only the sons of American mothers must fight and die in this last final showdown struggle between international, atheistic communism and western civilization.

If this Nation and our civilization is to live, then the rallying cry of the American people should be: Get rid of the entire Acheson-Jessup-Yalta crowd—get rid of all of the Pied Pipers for disaster.

It follows as the night follows the day that when the crimson clique in our Government engineered the Communist victory in China, they signed the death warrants of every young man who has died in Korea. At that time they condemned the Bob Smiths to live out their lives with no hands and no legs.

Bob Smith has no hands for us to shake today. He has no feet on which to walk to a hero's welcome—not tonight—but some day he will have artificial legs and when he does he should walk straight to the headquarters of the United Nations. He should walk to the office of the Secretary of State.

He should say to him: "Mr. Secretary of State, as I fought up the slopes of the Changjin Reservoir I was met by Communists firing rockets from horseback—a reincarnation of the horsemen of Genghis Khan.

"Mr. Secretary, do you still think that they are agrarian reformers?

"Mr. Secretary, up until a few months ago you felt that the anti-Communist forces on Formosa should all be turned over to Communist China. Do you still think so, Mr. Secretary?"

He should say to him: "Mr. Secretary, you have never fought in the cold so you cannot know its bitterness. You have never felt the shock of a bullet, you cannot know its pain. But 46,000 of us have faced those combined killers, Mr. Secretary, because you and the Yalta crowd sold China out to the Communists."

He should say: "Mr. Secretary, do you still think you were right when you ordered the embargo on arms and ammunition to our friends in China to the end that communism swept over all China? If you think you were wrong, tell us when you discovered it, will you, Mr. Secretary?"

He should say: "Mr. Secretary, do you think the communization of China and the resulting war in Korea was an accident, or was it the handiwork of traitors and are they still doing the planning, Mr. Secretary?"

He should say to the United Nations: "Gentlemen, why do you dawdle and debate while 46,201 men are crippled and die? Why the uncertainty over whether killing 46,201 of our men is a friendly or an unfriendly act?"

Perhaps we, the American people, tonight should say to the President: "Mr. Truman, perhaps God wanted Bob Smith home even without his hands and legs. Perhaps he wanted him home to face the stubborn and the unwise and the traitorous man who betrayed him. Perhaps that is the reason for his suffering. He is the symbol, Mr. President, which may bring an end to the blunders, the stupidity, the cowardice, and the betrayals."

Bob Smith is the symbol of the courage we need. He is the symbol of the honesty we do not have. He is the symbol of the honesty which we must regain if our civilization is to live.

Importance of Navy in War Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered in Norfolk, Va., on January 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The war in Korea has proved one thing beyond any shadow of doubt. It has proved the Navy cannot be relegated to the limbo of the blunderbuss.

Korea has made it certain that our actual and potential enemies are Red China and Russia. Korea has made it clear that we cannot hope to match these enemies with foot-soldier manpower alone. Korea has demonstrated that their type of fighting, characterized by the mastery of infiltration, half way around the world is no target for strategic bombing.

In short, Korea has proved that the Navy is still not only our first line of defense but also our first requirement for offense.

This is not to say that the Air Force and the Army do not have vital roles or that they do not rate the stature of integral parts in our military force. They must be made just as invincible as the Navy.

But those who a short time back were talking about the "fancy Dans" of the Navy and the policemen in the Marine Corps have eaten a lot of salty words since Korea.

It was the Navy and the Marine Corps that were thrown into the breach when the Red Koreans were overrunning the thin United Nations line early in Korea, and it was the Navy that went to the rescue at Hungnam.

Since Korea, the Navy, with the aid of chartered merchant ships, has hauled more than 127,000 passengers, 1,400,000 barrels of oil and gasoline, and 3,000,000 tons of cargo

across 6,000 miles of water. In 4 months Navy cargo would have filled 101,000 freight cars. That would be a solid train stretching from Norfolk almost to New Orleans.

In the type of warfare which we must anticipate it will be only with sea power that our numerically inferior forces can expect to strike at times and places of our choosing. It will be with overwhelming sea power that we can hold back significant numbers of Red troops which must be kept in reserve against seaborne invasion.

Sea power and air power are our only weapons by which we can seize and sustain initiative. Without them we cannot gain the initiative, and we cannot hold initiative without open sea lanes. Moreover, diversified air attack depends upon sea power and its carrier-based planes. If and when war should come we cannot win until we gain control of the timetable and assume and hold the initiative.

At Pusan and at Chungjin Reservoir, when our land troops were in desperate need of support, light carrier-based Navy and Marine fighter planes held the enemy down and in check until our ground forces could rest and regroup to fight again. In Korea the Navy was called upon not only for amphibious support and air cover but even the heavy artillery of the battleships found a place in 1950 warfare. In fact, under seaborne fire power every man at Hungnam was evacuated by sea, with equipment and stores, without casualty.

The Government has recognized both the importance and the significance of sea power in the struggle which confronts us. The House of Representatives this week has passed the bill authorizing new naval construction to supplement existing tonnage, and the conversion and recommissioning of World War II ships from the mothball fleet. One hundred and seventy-three vessels, totaling 500,000 tons displacement are included in the 1952 shipbuilding program, which will be before the Senate Armed Services Committee in the next few days, and 130 of these vessels will be combatant ships. Construction of the 60,000-ton aircraft carrier will be authorized by this bill. This huge carrier will be an expansion and an improvement on the *Midway* and *Essex* type, but smaller than the carrier which was previously started and scrapped at Newport News.

In addition to the proposed new tonnage, a total of 240 ships of all classes have been taken out of reserve since last June and placed in the active fleet. Many of these reactivated ships are already in service, and many of them have been modernized to include latest developments.

The ship construction bill now before Congress authorizes the conversion of 291 more vessels of practically all classes, including aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, guided-missile ships, picket vessels, and submarines converted for antisubmarine warfare.

We are faced with a Federal budget this year, short of war, approximating $75,000,000,000. Unless we reduce nondefense expenditures or raise taxes even higher we are faced with deficits as far as we can see at the rate of $25,000,000,000 a year or more. These will be superimposed on top of a Federal debt already a quarter of a trillion dollars. When we started World War I the debt was $1,000,000,000. When we started World War II the debt was $41,000,000,000. When we started this one we shall be laboring under the handicap of a debt such as no other nation has ever survived.

We have got to have an army of the maximum strength, and to overcome superior numbers we must be superior in skills, weapons, and mobility. The quality and quantity of the Russian Air Force is unknown and for this reason we must assure that ours is superior in all respects. To assure our own defense and to keep open the only road to offense which must be taken before victory can be won, we must have a Navy such as we have never had before.

Faced with debt and taxes and the cost of materials and labor such as they are today, we cannot meet these requirements unless we get more than a dollar's worth for every dollar spent for the Army, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Navy. And then we must eliminate every dollar of nonessential Federal expenditure.

Even when this is done it will be necessary to increase the tax burden still further to pay as we go. Any other course will jeopardize our fiscal security.

Obligation of Americans to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by former United States Senator Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey, on January 25, 1951, when he was the principal speaker before the American Coalition of Patriotic and Civic Societies of the United States at their annual meeting in the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C.

Senator Hawkes has said a number of things in his speech which the American people should take time to understand in this critical era facing our Nation. There are a number of important points in the speech, but in my opinion one of the most important things he had brought out is the fact that this Nation has fought in two World Wars, and carried the larger part of the burden of those wars, with great loss of men and wealth. Those wars were each fought to victory for the cause of free men, but the victory seems to have been only a physical victory. Neither of the two great victories has done much good for peace and the cause of free men.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let me say no man living knows the answer to the thousands of distressing problems which have been created for the people of this country and the people of the world by large groups of self-seeking politicians and dictators whose interest seems to be personal power first and the people's welfare second, if there is any welfare left. It is too late for any of us to lose our patience and temper, or to cease striving for a sense of humility. No one can hope to be all right or to find the other fellow all wrong in a situation of mad confusion which faces the people, due to the concentration of power in a centralized government, which power has either been unwisely voted or improperly seized by those in authority. Mass confusion, in the minds of the people, has always preceded the downfall of any great government or organized effort of man.

In attempting to appraise our commitments of every kind, made to foreign governments or groups of governments, and their commitments to us, and in trying to ascertain the billions of dollars we have given away in the two world wars, and since the cessation of actual fighting in 1945, up to the time of the Korean "event," plus the billions of dollars we are yet obligated to put into the foreign situation, I am unable to find a man in Washington or elsewhere who would even attempt to evaluate the situation. Practically all who are in a position to know considerable about the situation recognize and admit that the loans or gifts, whichever you wish to call them, will eventually be charged off to profit and loss.

I think we should stop making any further commitments abroad, and (1) appoint a committee of the ablest lawyers, statesmen, economists, accountants, and financial minds of the country to take an honest, nonpolitical, nonpartisan inventory of our present economic and defense equipment and abilities; and (2) this committee should list all of our commitments and show all the gifts and loans, with their total sum, since World War I. Then we should determine whether it lies within our power to fulfill all the commitments made or promised in good faith and whether the nations to whom the promises were made can fulfill their part of the commitments and if they have acted in complete good faith.

Then we should try to find out whether the mothers and fathers of the United States are in favor of having their boys sent all over the world to fight battles in which I, personally, believe there is no way to do more than win a physical victory here and there without any of the fruits of peace and good will to follow the physical victory. Americans forget too soon and forgive too often. Woodrow Wilson, a great and distinguished American, who took us into World War I, was elected for his second term, in which we became embroiled in foreign alliances, by this slogan, "He kept us out of war." I remember the posters all over the United States of a mother standing with her hand on her son's shoulder, saying "My son, vote for Woodrow Wilson, he kept you out of war." I will not analyze the right or wrong, but just take this look at the facts.

Right here I would call your attention to two of the cardinal rules of equity, which are fundamental in all human relationship:

1. He who asks equity, must do equity.

2. He who comes into equity, must do so with clean hands.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to his third term principally through a campaign speech he made in Boston, when he said to the mothers and fathers in the United States the following: "I say to you again and again and again, that your sons will not be sent to fight on foreign soil." It is quite reliably reported by those who heard the speech, and I was one of them, that the words which were later found inserted in the manuscript "unless we are attacked" were not used in the speech when it went to the ears of millions of Americans. My only purpose in reemphasizing this fact is that it convinces me that our American people never wished to be drawn into the wars of foreign nations which have been going on for centuries.

Both Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt will probably occupy a distinguished position in history and were beloved by millions of our citizens. That does not change the fact that the people did not want their sons sent to foreign soil and did not want to become involved in foreign entangled alliances. Certainly it is true that none of us know what George Washington might say today to the American people in a farewell address, but I want to ask every American to think carefully as to whether the morals, the character and the spiritual development of a vast part of the world justified or justifies us in changing our position of living under our American way of life and contributing all within our power to help

others to find the way of improving their lives and freedom. As one American, to those who are willing to listen to what I say in good faith, my answer is, that we have entered into partnership and alliances with political powers, leaders, and dictators whom no intelligent American citizen would choose as a partner in his life's work.

Perhaps we are moving too fast. Perhaps we are forgetting how the tide of good has come in over the last 2,000 years only to recede to points further away from our objective than they have frequently occupied over the centuries gone by.

I ask you if any one in this room feels that this world is better after World Wars I and II than it was before World War I, when the Constitution of the United States was supreme with us and the American flag occupied first place in our hearts, minds, and souls.

A relatively small percentage of our people appreciate that a treaty made, executed, and ratified with a foreign power, takes precedence over our Constitution and the law of the land. A relatively few of our people have made the understanding of government important enough for them to realize that when we go into a world government, that we have lost control of our own affairs and have become just a part of a muddled, confused world. A world whose selfish motives and objectives dictate their vote. If socialism and communism are predominant, then we have thrown our fine system and way of life, in a kettle of international dictatorship, there to become part and parcel of the conglomerate whole, where the state is master, and man its puppet or serf. Then there will be no leader of freemen left to hold the light of liberty and opportunity aloft, to lead others out of the darkness and despair brought about by rulers who have all the iniquitous qualities of the worst kings and emperors of the past, regardless of the name by which you call them.

Perhaps power-seeking politicians and leaders are trying to change the quality and character of humanity faster than it can be changed. Perhaps they are hoping to accomplish by force and subsidy those things which can only be accomplished by spiritual development and decency of purpose on a voluntary basis in keeping with the spirit of the Golden Rule. Perhaps they are trying to change humanity by force faster than God ordained it should be changed. A human life is but the wink of an eye or the break of a wave as compared to the known time of the past. I am not saying that some day the world may not be right for world government, but I am saying if we try to force it on the people of the United States in view of the conditions confronting us, and considering the character of the people of the world now, we will destroy the greatest accomplishment of mankind in the history of the world. I refer to the American form of government and way of life.

Regardless of what any one may say or how much it may hurt the feelings of some people in the world, I claim that the United States of America has been the greatest charitable organization ever known in the history of the world in its attempts to do good for others without seeking anything material in return. I also claim that, in our great zeal to do good, we have overpromised ourselves, or agreed to things which, if pursued, will wreck this greatest charitable organization in the world.

If any great charitable institution within our borders were to become emotional or over-zealous in promising to do things which its board of directors and contributors found could not be done without destroying the institution, then it is my opinion, that board of directors would be forced to take inventory and reappraise its powers and the relative importance of the things it would like to do. Then the members of the board would be forced to say, "We have undertaken to do more than is possible with our manpower and material wealth without jeopardizing and destroying our whole effort in charity." I think they would be courageous enough to say we have over-estimated our power to do good, and they would be compelled to adjust themselves to the doing of things within the limits of their known, or at least their probable income and manpower. Thus they would preserve their great charitable institution to do good within the scope of its ability.

No decent American ever wishes to defy the law of his country. No decent American ever wishes to evade military service required to protect and preserve our great country. But, if we are a free people, every American should have the right without smears or reprisals to say openly how he feels our welfare and purpose in life are to be best served and accomplished. If, because we are in a great emergency—if, because we are involved in some kind of a war that our leaders do not call war, if, because we are on the brink of a great war, possibly engulfing the world, we stop the citizen from expressing his honest, patriotic views, then, indeed, have we become a dictatorship where those in power in the Government are the masters and the people its puppets.

Right now I would not attempt to appraise who is responsible for the dilemma in which we find ourselves. Nor would I urge others to do so. Two great world wars fought to victory by the men in the field. Two great opportunities for the establishment of peace or ways to peace forfeited or bungled away by the political leaders because selfishness could not be made into intelligent self-interest, and our leaders compromised principle.

I often think of the admonition I gave to our political leaders and the leaders of the world, in the speech I made before the GI Forum in Rome, less than 3 weeks after VE-day. I had had conferences with Winston Churchill, and a delightful visit with His Holiness, the Pope—four other Senators being present. The substance of what I said was this. We have spent probably $200,000,000,000 to get an Army of 3,400,000 of the best trained and equipped American soldiers on the European Continent, and to assist our ally, Britain, in getting 785,000 of the best trained and equipped British soldiers on continental Europe. Then I asked the question, Why shouldn't we announce to the world in simple unambiguous language, the objectives for which we fought the war, and our objective in securing peace, before we take this great Army back home, and ship the equipment to other parts of the world? All I wanted to do, was what any plain, ordinary, American citizen should have wanted to do. For making that statement I was blasted by the socialistic, communistic, New Dealish sympathizers as a warmonger. Now I am receiving letter from the most distinguished men in the country, saying that I was one of the few people who saw the picture clearly and expressing great sorrow that no heed was taken of that speech except by the smear artists and character assassins. The only object I have in referring to this—which is water over the dam—is to prove that all we have thus far done is to win physical victories and bungle away the peace. Why should we expect the political leaders now in power in the world, to do a better job if we win another physical victory, after the loss of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our fine young manhood.

No, I reiterate, they should call to arms, all of their available manpower, to defend themselves, before we take another step with land forces into the foreign arms. I do not mean we should fail to support our boys in Korea or in Europe. But we should think well about maintaining land forces for our own soil, and the return of our men from Korea, in an orderly way. I would adopt some sane program for pretraining our youth for armed service in case of necessity and not call upon them to fight wars without training. I would build and equip an armed force for the defense of our country, and it seems to me that Senator TAFT's figure of a million and a half men over-all, with a backlog of trainees, should be ample for this purpose.

Then an appraisal and inventory of our resources, manpower, and abilities to do things, should guide the American people and their Representatives in Congress as to how far we can go with any degree of safety in the future.

As one American, if I had the power, I would make the saving of the United States my No. 1 job. I would change the slogan which has led us into the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives, the crippling of hundreds of thousands of more lives and put us on the brink of national insolvency. That slogan is, "We must save the world if we would save ourselves." I don't believe it to be true. I agree we should save the world, if we can, but I would make our new slogan, "We cannot save the world unless we save ourselves."

I would ask those in authority to truly appraise the atomic bomb and not distress and terrify the people with imaginary things that may never happen, neither would I overemphasize the importance of dangerous things that may happen. Certainly, what General Bradley said is true, "We may be bombed." But we will never be overcome, as a nation of freemen, except by great land force, landing on our own shores, and greater than we can combat. Hitler had one of the greatest armies in the world and he got to the shores of the English Channel. England was on her knees, crippled from tensions and ruthless attacks from the air. Hitler didn't dare attempt to cross the Channel—22 miles. Russia would have to bring a man force of tremendous magnitude some 4,000 miles if she started from home, and some 3,000 miles if she started from the shores of our former allies in Europe. It is inconceivable that she could transport a large land force either across the Atlantic Ocean or across Siberia down through Alaska. We can likewise bomb, providing we spend all that is necessary to be supreme in the air and maintain supremacy on the sea.

I said on the Senate floor almost 5 years ago that Russia would never need to precipitate an open war with us in order to accomplish her objective of destroying our way of life. I made this statement on the basis that we were and are spending ourselves into national bankruptcy, and national bankruptcy would sound the death knell of the free-enterprise system. I agree with what Abraham Lincoln said when he was 29 years old: "No power on earth can ever land a force in this country to overcome us. As a nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide." Tolerance, patience, equity, and justice in our dealings amongst ourselves are the things required to build national unity. If we can build complete unity no one can overcome us. Then we will set an example to the world which free men can follow if they are willing to pay the price of liberty.

Our people favor air and naval supremacy, but they are opposed to our sending millions of men to fight on foreign soil side by side with people whose political philosophy and economic objectives are certainly not stabilized and unified any more than all of their morals and character are stabilized and unified.

What if these countries who are leaning strongly to socialism should change their course, while a vast army from here is on foreign soil?

Yes, I would take an inventory right now regardless of what the world might think of us. The better people of the world would thank us later for having done it.

When I was on the Air Policy Board of the Congress I told the committee and the high command of the various branches of the armed services, that I would vote for any amount of money necessary to make us supreme in the air and on the sea as fast as we could lawfully and intelligently spend the money.

I would not say now what we should do to help other nations, who believe sincerely and are on record as being in favor of the freedom of the individual. I would let them know their Uncle Sam cannot do their job for them no matter how kind his heart is. The best work of all men in the world has been done when mother necessity stood back of them with a broomstick and, particularly, when self-preservation was their objective.

I hear Americans say, "Wouldn't you send even 10 divisions to Europe or to Asia, just to show good will?" My answer is, if you send 10 divisions anywhere and the vast hordes of any nation, which is our enemy, is putting them and our supposed full-fledged allies to rout, then, in the name of decency and honesty we will have to send many hundreds of thousands, or millions more as is necessary to support them, protect them, and save them. We can't just send our boys around the world, and, if they fail, let them be massacred. No war can be conducted under the direction of the United Nations, which takes 2 or 3 months to give a go-ahead signal in every case, except where they voted to resist the Communist advance from North Korea and we furnish 90 to 95 percent of all the aid given to the South Koreans. I voted for the United Nations and it may yet serve a purpose, but when our fine ally, Great Britain, is holding Red China by one hand, while patting us on the back and asking for more help and more favors, and up to date, has refused to vote Red China the aggressor, it does not seem to me to justify the sending of our fine boys to all quarters of the earth to fight battles for what we believe in, but apparently not the things in which the present British Government and some others, believe in.

Let us not forget that England has not shown her colors yet in regard to Red China becoming a member of the United Nations and thereby further contaminating it with communism.

Of course, every decent American would help feed those in need and deserving, even if it means sacrifice at home.

Of course, every decent American wants to keep his promises within the limits of his ability, but the bankruptcy law, which helps individuals, who have overreached themselves and failed, does not help nations who do the same thing. Of course, every decent American is interested in lending aid and help to nations who truly believe in the cause of freemen and who, themselves, are willing to pay the price to fight to the limit of their ability for that cause; therefore, I would be in favor of giving all possible help in the air and at sea to such nations, so long as that does not jeopardize the life and the preservation of our American people and their system of freemen.

Ex-President Hoover did the people of the United States and all the decent people of the earth a great service when he made his radio address on December 20, 1950. The gist of his speech meant to me this—we cannot save the world unless it first does everything in its power to save itself.

We must stop where we are, take an inventory of our assets and liabilities in this world mess, then if not too late, make certain we save ourselves, otherwise all will be lost.

Why should we not consider Spain as an ally, in our great need to protect the lives, liberty, and property of the American people? Spain, protected by the Pyrenees Mountains, with 400,000 men now in arms ready to fight communistic aggression and probably 1,000,000 more men who soon could be in arms, should have our consideration as an ally and a protected base for Air and Navy. Think carefully of some of the allies we now have in and out of the United Nations before we ignore this available ally.

In closing, I think every American mother and father should make it their duty to notify their representatives in Congress and in the executive branch of Government how they feel and what they expect of their elected and appointed representatives. It is not a question of right to speak, but duty to speak. I would urge that it be done now, so that these representatives may understand, and be encouraged by the wish and will of the people. I would urge the people to carry that wish and will through to the next election, for if the people sit idly by and watch their rights destroyed one by one, and, later try to arise to action, they may find they have lost the power of action.

If the people are masters in this country of ours, they must act like masters, because when a master abdicates to his servant, he is no longer the master, and the dove of peace, and the flower of liberty, will have vanished and faded away.

"With malice toward none and charity for all" let us build unity and strength in the land of the free, and thus create an example for the world to follow. An example that may spell peace on earth.

The Way of Justice the Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who has been called out of the city, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the sermon delivered on Sunday, January 14, 1951, at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., by the Most Reverend Joseph F. Flannelly, D. D., auxiliary bishop of New York.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"And the fruit of justice is sown in peace, to them that make peace." (James III: 18.)

When the author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus discussed friendship, he first cautioned the chosen people against seeking direction from fair-weather friends, selfish companions, and deceitful counselors. Secondly, he advised continual contact with a holy man who feared God and had real sympathy for them. Finally he said, "But above all these things, pray to the Most High that He may direct thy way in truth."

Some 200 years later, the Eternal Son of God, having come to earth, revealed the power of prayer in the Sermon on the Mount, declaring, "Ask and it shall be given to you: seek and you shall find: knock and it shall be opened to you."

It is therefore something more than precedent or tradition that has brought you, the members of the judiciary, the Congress, and the bar, here today. Directed by the divinely inspired word and invited by the Son of God, you have come here to pray for guidance in the way of truth. Ever conscious of the sacred trust imposed upon you by your high office, and particularly anxious about the grave problems of this fateful year of 1951, you have come to ask for that divine help without which we can do nothing.

Thanks be to God that you do stand and knock, through prayer, at the heart of God, for the guidance and assistance indispensable to the fulfillment of your office the settling of the difficulties of God's suffering children. If you continue to knock, the way will be opened to you. This is the promise of the God-man.

Prayer will direct you in your solicitude for the safety and preservation of America. Prayer will strengthen you in your service, as jurists and legislators, as advocates and counselors, to the millions of men and women who are America. Prayer will support you in the fulfillment of your noble vocations. God has given you these vocations for the benefit of His creatures. In legislative chambers and in courts of justice, it is your vocation to represent and plead and protect the cause of every individual living under our flag. What is this cause? Is it advancement in the material and physical order?

Is it better health and more wealth for the individual?

Is it more power and wider influence for the Nation? Not at all.

These things are the effect or fruit of our cause. Our cause is spiritual.

Just 6 days ago the President of these United States of America declared, "This is our cause—peace, freedom, justice." Today and forever let us proclaim that this is also the cause of all God's creatures, peace, freedom, justice. In this, they were created equal. Unfortunately, instead of peace and freedom, there is war and human slavery, because some do not understand that peace was promised by God's angels to men of good will only, that men of good will are those who accept God's eternal principles and live by His law; that peace is obtained not by the victories of fighting men over fighting men, but rather by the victory of men over the world, the flesh, and the devil, over injustice, selfishness, and godlessness. In one word, there is war and there is human slavery because there is injustice. Fully comprehending the price of peace, our President, in his state of the Union message, further said, "But more precious than peace are freedom and justice." In this sentence the President was briefly re-echoing the convictions of our founding fathers. In the preamble of the Constitution, they gave us the reasons for that document, which we hope and pray will live and function until the end of time. For the sake of continuity may I presume your indulgence and state these reasons? "To form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. * * *

"To secure the blessings of liberty." Well, did the patriots understand that liberty and freedom are part of every man's God-given nature? Since every creature was thus endowed by Heaven, they knew that only one force could gather these sovereign creatures into a more perfect union: that that force must also come from heaven. Despotism could club men into slavery. Only justice could unite them for peace. This they knew to be a sound principle of eternal truth and so, for the safeguarding of man's freedom and for the promoting of peace, they established legally, in the Constitution, this principle—the absolute necessity of strict justice. This was the cause

of our fathers. This is our cause. This must always be the cause of America, justice.

By the divine plan, justice is necessary because of the nature of man, in his fallen state. Man is composed of a soul which can think and determine freely what acts will be performed by his other component part, his body. Unique as man is in the order of creation, and with mastery over the lower orders, albeit, he is not self-sufficient. He depends upon God, directly, for his existence and he depends upon God indirectly insofar as he is assisted in his living by his fellow creatures. He depends upon this human assistance not only in the material order but, what is more important, in the moral order.

In addition to their physical and intellectual birthrights, all men are born with moral rights. When a man exercises these moral rights he is projected beyond himself to intercourse with his fellow men, and thereby he becomes dependent upon them in greater or less degree. His freedom and his peace depend upon how justly he is treated by his fellow men. And, of course, the same natural law which gives a man his rights imposes upon him the obligation to respect the rights of every other creature of God.

In this intercourse of fallen humanity, conflicts as to rights and obligations are quite probable, because of men's varying temperaments, unrestrained appetites, and self-satisfying judgments. Since order is Heaven's first law: since "all things must be done decently and according to order" (I Corinthians 14: 40), order was required, an absolute and unchanging rule for human behavior was necessary. The Omniscient Creator of man established that order by the moral virtue of justice. And coming from the mind of God, justice adheres to truth which is eternal and immutable. Since truth is absolute and unchanging, so also is justice.

Justice is quite properly termed the "social virtue." It constantly directs every creature to give to every other creature whatever is his due. It constantly directs every creature to give to society and to any division of society, whatever is its due. Likewise, it constantly directs the community, the Nation, and society to give to every one of God's creatures whatever is his due. Justice, therefore, preserves inviolable the God-given freedom of every individual man. And justice cements individual men into society which in turn protects the individual man from any injustice which would rob him of his freedom and thereby destroy his peace. Justice is verily our cause.

As creatures of God every one of us has the strict obligation to pursue justice in all our ways. "Know ye not," warns St. Paul, "that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God."

As jurists, legislators, and lawyers, there rests upon the conscience of every member of your honorable bodies the additional obligation of holding the scales of justice even. To society, to the country and to every individual, justice must be done. And you are the essential instruments of that justice.

The law which insures justice is enacted by you who are Members of the Congress. The rights of man, who is the very material of society, are defended by you who are members of the bar. And you who are the most estimable members of the bench, you are the principal instruments of justice. You make the judgment. You stand between freedom and slavery, between liberty and despotism. It is yours to translate words into deeds; to put the law to work; to make justice concrete.

As a fruit of this holy sacrifice of the mass, we pray the holy spirit of God to infuse in your soul His seven gifts. May His wisdom and counsel, understanding and knowledge further enlighten your intellect so that you will see and pursue and procure justice always. May the fear of the Lord and piety enkindle in your hearts an even greater love for justice. May fortitude ever strengthen your will to enact in the Congress laws only for the common good, and to seek and render in our courts only strict justice. May the most high God direct thy way in truth.

Finally, as Americans, let us all pray for the grace to cooperate with those seven gifts of the spirit, especially in the doing of individual justice, justice of man for man and justice of society or government to every individual creature. This is a moral obligation; this is a patriotic duty.

There is nothing that renders the soil more fertile for atheistic communism than individual injustice. Need I say that atheistic communism is the most deadly enemy to society and civilization; the greatest enemy of freedom and peace; the most insidious enemy of our constitutional system of government; the only enemy of the United States of America. Our battle is not against flesh and blood. Our battle is against the false principles of men and women who hate God and deny the sanctity of His creatures. These satanic principles can be conquered by the eternal principles of God.

It was under the guidance of the Holy spirit of God that our forefathers established this Nation upon the firm and unchangeable foundation of justice.

This Nation will continue to survive; will grow nobler and greater; and will increasingly share the blessings of liberty with the other nations in God's world, provided that every man, woman, and child of us, under that same Divine guidance practices justice.

Only when every individual, in any nation, private citizen, or public servant, pursues justice can that nation possess justice and enjoy its fruits—freedom and peace. "Justice," says the Book of Proverbs, "exalteth a nation; but sin maketh nations miserable."

The natural law and the inspired word of God directed our forefathers along the way of truth to justice. They followed that way, wholeheartedly, and so the United States of America was born. If this Nation is to survive, God and America demand of us that we follow that same way—justice. It is the only way to peace. In the words of our Holy Father's Christmas message, "The way leading to true peace is long and hard, and impeded by briers and thorns." But we receive this consolation and assurance from the inspired word of God that "when the ways of man shall please the Lord, He will convert even His enemies to peace."

The American Stake Inside Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this morning the New York Herald Tribune published an interesting article entitled "The American Stake Inside Europe," written by the distinguished historian, John Gunther. This article merits the earnest consideration of every Member of the Senate and of the public generally. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN STAKE INSIDE EUROPE—RUSSIAN CONTROL OF THE CONTINENT AND ITS DEPENDENT AREAS WOULD CRIPPLE STEEL INDUSTRY OF UNITED STATES AND MEAN LOSS OF ATOMIC SUPREMACY

(By John Gunther)

The grand abstraction "Europe" means more than Chartres or Shakespeare; it means steel, the fabric of modern man. Europe and its copious dependent areas do not merely connote richness in history and culture akin to ours; they connote strategic—and explosive—raw materials like uranium.

The price of the loss of Europe would be grievous to America and the Americans. If Russia becomes Europe, if Europe becomes part of a Communist master state, the point can fairly be argued that the United States as it exists today could not survive.

Emotion and one of its illegitimate children, fear, dominate so much of our discussion of foreign policy that issues become milky. Even those who speak in the name of strict American self-interest are sometimes tempted to forget what that self-interest is. It is time to bring forward some statistics—statistics of the crispest.

But first—

Most statesmen advocating isolationist policies today deny vehemently that they are isolationists. This has a certain quaint significance. The very word has become so tainted that even archisolationists want to avoid being blackened with it. In actual fact, millions upon millions of perfectly good patriotic and reputable Americans would like to be isolationists—if only isolationism could be made to work. The chief reason that it is impossible these days as a practical policy is the obvious one of history—the world has changed.

It is extraordinarily interesting that several American leaders, who seem to be living in the age of Beowulf, are still isolationist about Europe though interventionist about the Far East. They are willing to fight communism in Asia, with American forces, but not in Europe. This is as if a man should, let us say, take out fire insurance for one wall of his house and not the other.

But let us proceed to consideration of what Europe means to us in blunt, specific, economic fields, in terms of bread and butter. The conception that the United States, in peace or war, could be self-contained, self-sufficient, is as mischievous as measles. What would we lose if we lost Europe? What would Russia gain?

First, steel. Production of steel in the United States in 1950 was 96,700,000 tons; in the Soviet Union and its European satellites, roughly 31,000,000 tons; in Western Europe (including West Germany) 46,000,000 tons. The Ruhr-Saar area is, as everybody knows, a crucible in which the fate of whole nations may be forged. Adding American to Western European steel, we get 143,300,000 tons, as against a Russian figure of 31,000,000—a comfortable superiority. But suppose the Soviet Union makes war; suppose Western Europe should be lost. That would transfer the Western European steel production to the Russian column, and we would have only 96,700,000 tons as against 77,000,000—not so comfortable.

Closely allied to the question of steel is manganese. Steel without a component of manganese is, for most important uses, about as valuable as a compass without a needle. Practically no manganese deposits exist in the United States—nature is capricious—and though some could be developed in northern Minnesota and the Gun Flint Range in Canada, this would take some years. Our chief sources of supply for manganese, Russia itself excluded, are the Gold Coast, Morocco, and India. Whether, if Europe were lost and seaways imperiled, we could continue to import substantial amounts of manganese from these areas is uncertain in the extreme. But I have heard it said by experts, if the United

States should lose its accessibility to manganese, 60 percent of our steel industry would have to close down. This would mean, since steel is an octopus, that 60 percent of automobiles would close down, 60 percent of machine tool production, 60 percent of coal, and a formidable lot else. The consequent unemployment in the United States might rise to 30,000,000.

CONGO SUPPLIES URANIUM

Second, uranium, on which the production of atomic energy depends. Now it happens that most of the uranium in the world available to us lies in the Belgian Congo. Suppose the Russians should march into Western Europe, suppose that we were not in a position to beat them back, and suppose that Brussels became overnight the capital of a Belgian satrapate of the Soviet. This would certainly seek to deny us its uranium. We would have to jump all the way to the Congo with strong armed force and jump there fast. Maybe we would get there in time; but maybe not.

If we did not seize the Congo deposits it would be impossible for us to continue for long production of atomic bombs. Conversely, and perhaps more importantly, Russia would suddenly gain all the uranium she so hungarily lacks and desperately wants.

Third, returning to the strictly European scene, it is instructive to compare the present production of some other massive and critical commodities. Take coal. American production of coal is roughly 650,000,000 a year; that of Western Europe roughly 500,000,000 tons; that of the Soviet Union and its 250,000,000 tons. Suppose Russia takes Europe. That will give Russia a coal production, according to these figures, superior to our own. Or take electricity. The United States has the capacity to produce roughly 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power annually; Western Europe 225,000,000,000; the Soviet Union 125,000,000,000. Add Western Europe to Russia, and she will be running us neck and neck.

THREAT TO OIL STOCKS

Again in this field, oil. Western Europe itself does not produce oil. But geography is the most implacable of masters; if we lose Europe, or if Europe loses itself, the Middle East and the Mediterranean will almost certainly be lost too. At the best, our gateway to oil in the Persia-Arabia area will be impeded; at the worst, we will lose the solid billion of barrels this Golconda produced every year.

The United States, even in peacetime, is not self-sufficient as to oil; we have to import large quantities. If the Middle East were lost, there would still be sources in Venezuela and the Caribbean. But even this route might be endangered in a global war.

A modern society can no more exist without the bone and calories provided by steel, coal, electricity, and oil, than a puppy can exist without water. If Europe were removed from us our position in these elemental commodities would be severely prejudiced. From an opposite point of view shortages in steel, oil, and uranium are a principal reason why Russia does not make positive war. The chief deterrent to war by the Soviets is not merely our possession of the atomic bomb; it is the American industrial potential as a whole. Stalin knows that what won both World War I and World War II was, in the last analysis, the productive capacity of the United States. But, today, if we cripple this capacity by permitting Europe to be lost, we might find it more difficult to win.

RAW MATERIAL STOCKPILES

Fourth, stockpiling of strategic raw materials. The story of this is little known, partly because of security reasons. But some details are still publishable. The United States has begun to store up reserves of strategic and critical materials—60 to 70 commodities in which we are either totally deficient or very largely dependent on foreign sources. The list includes items from newsprint to the cobalt essential to the manufacture of much electrical equipment; from asbestos to mercury, without which detonators cannot be made.

It comes as a shock to learn that the United States is 100 percent dependent on external sources for tin, chrome and cordage fibers; 27 percent for zinc and copper; 92 percent for both manganese and cobalt; 73 percent for tungsten; 34 percent for lead; 51 percent for rubber. Then there are multifarious items like platinum, silk, mica, graphite, cinchona bark, industrial diamonds and jewel bearings, in which we are wholly or in large part dependent on imports from abroad.

Now Europe itself, the continent does not supply us with all these materials. Its role is, however, substantial. Most of our imports of mercury come from Italy, platinum from Switzerland, chromite from Turkey, sperm oil from Norway. As to tin and rubber they arrive predominantly from Malaya. Malaya is not in Europe, but it is in European hands, and if we should lose Europe we would have to take on the job of defending it ourselves.

FOUR-BILLION-DOLLAR GOAL

The total value of our stockpile is approximately $1,500,000,000 as of the moment; our objective is to reach $4,000,000,000. So we are still dependent on sources abroad (mainly Europe) for essential commodities valued at the gigantic sum of $2,500,000,000.

ECA has bought and stockpiled enough rubber for 7,000,000 automobile tires so far. Recently it bought in London and Amsterdam $5,300,000 worth of industrial diamonds, $6,700,000 worth of sisal, more than a ton of platinum from England, $800,000 worth of sperm oil from Great Britain, 500,000 ounces of quinidine from the Netherlands, 19,800 tons of Madagascar graphite, $500,000 worth of Danish cryolite (used in the electrolysis of aluminum), and quantities of fluorspar (a flux for steel) from Italy.

Another field little known is that of development projects put forward by ECA. American teams are prospecting for copper, manganese, lead, and zinc in the Sahara. We are working hard to restore the ancient lead and silver mines in Greece. Recently a converted zinc plant in Italy was put into operation. We are working on cobalt in Rhodesia, industrial diamonds elsewhere in Africa, chrome in Turkey, and miscellaneous mining developments in places so far afield as New Caledonia, Sierra Leone, and Tanganyika.

THE SHIPPING SITUATION

Fifth, shipping. The fleets of our allies in Western Europe comprise not less than 35 percent of the world's total merchant tonnage. Some of it, if Russia takes Europe, might manage to get away to our shores. Some might not.

Sixth, trade. One does not even need to mention that if Europe were lost, Americans would have to go begging for British woolen goods, Scotch whisky, Belgian lace, Swiss watches, Italian olive oil, French wine and perfumes. As to our export trade, roughly 30 percent of the total—almost a third—goes to Western Europe. The margin this represents means, as is well known, success or failure to many American industries, like the movies.

Above and beyond this, the loss of Europe would be almost certain to disrupt our commerce on a world level. And consider what it might mean to Latin America, which would presumably be our only hinterland if Europe disappeared. Latin America has commercial ties to Europe of the closest. Several things might happen in connection with, let us say, Argentina's prodigious crop of beef.

MANPOWER AND BRAINS

Seventh, manpower. I do not mean merely that Western Europe has what is probably, next to our own, the most numerous and best trained reservoir of skilled labor in the world. One may likewise skip over the fact that the experienced civil service, the bureaucracy, of Western Europe would, if it could be made to work, be of immense X value to Soviet conquerors. Nor need we mention the over-all fact that, if the population of the 10 Atlantic Pact countries in Western Europe were shifted from our side to the Russian column, the Soviet constellation would be augmented by the terrific bulk of 178,010,000 people—more than the total population of the United States.

But consider brains. Consider leadership in scientific know-how, in industrial research. Think of the work that was done in Norway on heavy water. The sulfa drugs were discovered in Western Germany, and penicillin in the United Kingdom. British research gave us the jet airplane engine; similarly British ingenuity gave us radar. Where would our defenses be today without radar and jet propulsion? Similarly British inventors did the pioneer work on magnetic mines and antimine devices. As of today the Belgians are working hard on small arms and automatic weapons and the French on infrared photography amongst much else.

RUSSIAN LAG IN RESEARCH

Now it is striking fact that, whereas the Russians have signal capacity to adapt scientific procedures and to put quickly into mass production items that somebody else has invented, they do not do so well in pure research. The intellectual climate in Moscow is not good for that. They are copyists, not innovators. Hence it behooves us to guard well the manpower trained in the great European tradition of faith in science and independent, individualist research.

Eighth, one might go into all manner of strategical and political implications. But they are hardly part of our specific story. One might at least mention, however, the pertinent fact that, when continental Europe was overrun by the Nazis, the Europeans awaited and welcomed us as liberators. But, this time, few Europeans have much desire to go through the onerous process of which liberation may—or may not—be the triumphant end. They largely and emphatically prefer not to be occupied in the first place. There is no glamour to the idea of liberation any more. Moreover it will be much more difficult to organize resistance movements in Europe now than in 1941–1945, if only because a Russian occupation will be even more severe than was the German.

Also in this field one might mention Latin America again. The pull of a Communist Europe on several South American countries could be magnetically strong, even though the rank and file of Latin Americans detest communism.

EUROPE'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Finally, one should have a word on what Western Europe has done for itself in the last year or so. It has become a kind of parlor game to malign the Europeans, but all things considered they have made a substantial contribution to their own survival. Take one figure only—that during the second quarter of 1950, the industrial output of 10 Western European countries was at an all-time high—24 percent above the prewar level.

All things considered it might be wise for Americans to turn their criticism inward, instead of across the narrow belt of ocean to the European bastion. Much that a sound European would find incomprehensible goes on in Washington—muddle, greed, panic, and confusion.

The world will be a safer place for all when we recognize a fundamental truth: Europe needs us—but we need Europe too.

Inflation and Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent letters; one in regard to the important subject of inflation, the second relating to medical care, which I have received from a distinguished West Virginian, Judge Harlan M. Calhoun, of the twenty-second judicial circuit.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
Moorefield, January 29, 1951.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I want to express the view that the inflation of the present day is a grave problem. And by inflation I refer to the cost of all the essentials of life. I sometimes wonder if persons in authority are aware of the gravity of the simple problem of making ends meet financially for the average American family. With some exceptions, people of my acquaintance find it almost impossible to live on income available. In more cases than I like to realize, it means using up savings, or in the absence of savings, simply going more and more into debt. I believe this situation prevails more now than at any other time since the depression.

I believe this unfortunate condition obtains to an alarming degree among salaried people and other persons on fixed incomes. They are caught, in the present scheme of things, in a two-way squeeze. First, incomes within this group do not rise, and have not risen with price levels as among other groups; and second, persons within this group are hit the hardest by every raise in taxes, and particularly income taxes. I do not believe it is an exaggeration to say that salaried persons pay several times as much income tax as persons in other groups with comparable incomes. The reasons for this are fairly obvious and I shall not undertake to detail them. For instance, I would say that a school teacher in Hardy County pays several times as much income tax per $100 income as the average farmer, or independent businessman.

This hardship to the individual is only one small part of the problem created by the inflationary price level. For instance, a bond issue for school building purposes recently voted in Hampshire County will not now build the schools. There is no other money to supplement the fund, and the money cannot be used for any other purpose, such as to build a part only of the schools. Again, we find that our $50,000,000 bond issue for building secondary roads in this State will build comparatively few roads. As you well know, the cost of maintaining and equipping the Armed Forces essential to world peace and freedom is almost more than the national economy can be expected to stand. This means that if necessary governmental functions and services are maintained at their former levels, more and more taxes must be levied. And I venture the assertion that the average American is now taxed about as much as the traffic will stand.

And who profits by the present scheme of high prices, ceilings, supports? Frankly, I hardly know. I do not believe it is the average American, whoever he may be. If the wages of a laborer are doubled, and the cost of his living is doubled, he does not profit. He has gained nothing, perhaps has lost nothing. But, meantime, the millions who have not had the benefit of the doubled income are penalized. Their income, in effect, is cut in half and, meantime, their taxes are raised. I am afraid that more people than we realize at first blush are among those living on such reduced incomes. The average American cannot be expected to build and pay for a home today. If the tendency is as alarming as I believe it to be, there is a danger that few people will be able to buy refrigerators, radios, electric appliances; and I believe there is a danger of purchasing power being lessened to the extent, in normal times, of creating a surplus of everything available for sale, with consequent closing of factories and unemployment.

I am much of the opinion that if all prices and incomes were now as they were at the close of World War II, all individuals would have more spending money. I am quite certain that the Government could buy a tank for a much, much lesser cost, and consequently the demand for public revenue would be eased in proportion.

I am not an economist. I do not undertake to suggest a remedy. But, I do say that the matter of inflationary prices today is an extremely acute problem for the average citizen as well as for the Nation, and I fear that we are caught up in a self-perpetuating spiral which must be stopped in some manner.

Very respectfully yours,
HARLAN M. CALHOUN.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
Moorefield, January 2[illegible], 1951.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I believe the problems relating to medical care and treatment are extremely grave problems. In fact, I believe certain aspects of this problem are little short of a national disgrace.

In connection with our efforts to get a 4-year medical and dental college in this State we have become acquainted with some rather startling facts. Briefly stated, I refer to the fact that the American Medical Association will not accredit a medical school unless it conforms to certain standards. Among other requirements, there must be a hospital of certain specifications. Furthermore, there must be so many beds in the hospital per medical student. The required costs are almost prohibitive. All in all, the effect is to create a virtual "closed shop," so far as the medical and dental professions are concerned. One of the saddest, and at the same time one of the most provoking, things I have been called upon to contemplate was the recent spectacle of thousands upon thousands of veterans who were denied admission to dental and medical schools. They had fought for their country. They had the desire, and with the aid of the Government, they had the ability to complete the prescribed courses of study.

There were more than the usual number in recent years because of the GI benefits available for the schooling of veterans. But it is a perennial problem. Each of us knows many, many very deserving young men who have the desire, the means, and the capacity for becoming doctors and dentists. Yet, in this land of free enterprise, they are denied the privilege. The situation is all the more shocking because of the fact that national health is an important public problem. I, personally, see no reason why, in this land of wealth and opportunity, one should, in small towns such as mine, be required to sit for hours in a doctor's office simply to consult him about a cold; or why one should be required to make an appointment with a dentist months in advance. If such a situation should prevail in the garage business, enterprising Americans, in this land of opportunity and free enterprise, would simply open up other garages nearby so that the public could be served. But, under the existing system, free enterprise is nullified, and in a field so vital as the national health. In the towns and counties of this area, I believe there are not half as many doctors as there were 30 years ago, partly because, competition being virtually nonexistent, the doctors go to the larger cities where greater incomes are available, and partly because there are so few of them.

I have spoken of the problem as a grave one in relation to the public health. As we all know too well, it is also a grave problem in this very hour with reference to national safety. I am quite certain that in this section of our State, no doctors can be spared to the Armed Forces, with due regard to the health and welfare of our citizens. Probably more of them are available in the larger cities. Nevertheless, this system which I consider pernicious, selfish, and unnecessary, strikes at two very vital points—our national safety, and our national health. I know that many doctors share this viewpoint and deplore it. I trust that we may never have socialized medicine; but if we ever have it, it will be only because members of the medical professions make it the only apparent alternative.

The cost of medical care is another problem which is inherent in the scarcity of medical men. I am quite certain that the public health is hampered because so many people feel that they cannot afford medical treatment or hospitalization at prevailing costs.

I feel that the Federal Government should tackle the problem. I believe it has the constitutional right to do so because the problem so affects the national defense, as well as the health and welfare of the people. I believe the Government could well establish medical schools in conjunction with its very fine veterans' hospitals. I believe, also, that a single school might, under Government direction, be made available for the benefit of two or more States acting jointly, with the cost thereof to be shared by the States, possibly with the aid of Government subsidy. I have understood that in certain instances, two or more States have combined their resources for this purpose. Or, in any event, in view of the serious nature of the problem, I feel that the Federal Government should see to it that medical and dental schools are made available to meet all reasonable demands, even if it be totally at Government expense.

Finally, I feel that the Federal Government should set up its own standards for such schools, adequate in every respect. And if the American Medical Association fails to approve such standards, I believe they will, nevertheless, be sufficient in the eyes of the American public.

Very respectfully yours,
HARLAN M. CALHOUN.

Indians See Peril in Rule on Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it has always been my contention that the American Indian can take care of himself. I ask unanimous consent to have

inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Indians See Peril in Rule on Lawyers," written by Dorothy L. Pillsbury, and published in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 30, 1951]

INDIANS SEE PERIL IN RULE ON LAWYERS

(By Dorothy L. Pillsbury)

SANTA FE, N. MEX.—Thousands of American citizens may have their rights, inherent in the Constitution, jeopardized if new regulations of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs are approved by the Secretary of the Interior, according to observers here.

These citizens are Indians of the United States and Alaska. The regulations concern the hiring of attorneys by Indians to represent them in lawsuits.

These regulations, although more or less in effect previously, were put in written form and circulated November 9, 1950. They were drawn up without consultation with vitally interested groups, both Indian and white.

In the opinion of many here they offer one advantage in that they are a definite, written statement of policy and procedure by the Indian Department, in approving or disapproving the employment of attorneys by the tribes. Even when the Indians pay their legal representatives from their tribal money, their selection is largely circumscribed in the new regulations.

METICULOUS OPUS

The document outlining these regulations is a long and meticulous opus. It seems quite evident here that the document is the work of men unadvised by either the Indians, themselves, or interested groups of whites—such groups as the Association on American Indian Affairs of New York City, headed by Oliver La Farge, of the New Mexican Association on Indian Affairs headed by Mrs. Charles Dietrich, or the National Congress of American Indians headed by John C. Ranier.

The points covered require that before a tribe can hire a lawyer to represent them it must offer proof that it actually needs a lawyer and why. The why cannot be in general terms, but must be an exact statement of the exact services needed.

CORK OF CRITICISM

This seems doubly strange when, at the same time, the tribe's ability to pay the legal costs must be verified. In other words, American citizens whose ability to pay has been proved must have their attorneys handpicked for them by the Commissioner. The Indian Department would be in control of the terms of the contract, the fees, and renewal conditions.

The regulation that is arousing the most criticism here is the one that in the case of claim contracts, fees, and expenses must be wholly contingent on the attorney's winning the case. This is the case even if the Indians have the financial ability and wish to pay customary fees. Many of these claim contracts involve expensive travel and research on the part of the attorney.

It is felt that few skilled and experienced attorneys would undertake such expenses on the distant possibility of being reimbursed for heavy expenses when the suit is won—if it is. Many attorneys look with disfavor on contingent fees, feeling that they are contrary to the ethics of the American Bar Association in that the attorney thereby becomes a partner in a law suit.

These regulations empower the Commissioner to control the amount of legal business to be undertaken by any one legal firm, thus blocking the natural desire of Indian tribes to hire attorneys who have shown their ability in successful suits in a given field. To some observers this hints that the Department is on the lookout for lawyers who are "yes" men.

It also is recommended that a tribe hire a local attorney for general legal services rather than one, say in Washington, where often he might be of the most value to them. The Commissioner also is given the authority to terminate a case without cause and without advance notice, subject to tribal consent, which consent might easily be brought about by administrative pressure.

TIMING NOTED

No informed person denies at this time the need of some of the Indian tribes for the supervision and protection of the Indian Department.

The Navajos are a case in point. But this latest regulation of their legal affairs is thought by many to amount to a denial of the contract.

General Fellers on Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an editorial that appeared in the Sunday Times-Herald, January 28, on the subject of Air Power. The editorial refers to an article by Gen. Bonner Fellers that appears in the current issue of Human Events. He refers to a recent speech by General Bradley that seems to indicate that our military policy is to fight a ground war at the expense of American lives. This should not be the policy, according to General Fellers, who contends that if war comes we must win it in the air. The editorial follows:

AIR POWER

The ruins of Berlin and Tokyo are monuments to one fact that nobody can deny: It is bad business to lose a war. It always was bad business to lose a war, for that matter, but the worst that ever happened in the past was child's play compared with the worst that happens to nations that lose a modern war.

Now, cities are not just sacked. They are blown up. Individual soldiers do not have much opportunity to run down conquered streets and cut throats. The bombers have been there ahead of them to fill the street with broken bricks and bodies not even worth looting.

War, as presently practiced, is played for keeps and the looser is pulverized. Out of World War II and the heavy bomber development there grew a rule that is worth remembering. It is:

"We no longer waste time milking the cow dry. We just kill the cow and she goes dry for good."

In other words, why waste time trying to defeat a nation by killing its young men and destroying its material wealth out on battlefields if you can go over their heads and literally blow the nation up, behind them?

The war in Korea, which has so far been confined to battlefields, has caused many people to forget that business of killing the cow instead of trying to milk it dry. But the principle is still there, and the security and survival of the United States are contained within it.

Which do we want to do, get in a milking contest with Russia or develop the power to kill the cow if we have to?

THE TRUE PURPOSE

A clear-thinking and clear-writing military man has summed up the challenge very neatly in the latest issue of Human Events, the weekly journal of analysis.

The writer is Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, formerly on the staff of General MacArthur, and now director of veterans' affairs for the Republican National Committee.

Writes General Fellers:

"The principal reason given for the enormous European program (the Eisenhower paper army) is that it will deter war. But will it?

"The contention is that the presence by 1953 of 50 or 60 allied divisions will be the best possible war deterrent. But against these, Russia could now throw 175 divisions, some 25 of which are armored.

"British and our own intelligence concede Russia can take Europe in a matter of days. * * *

"What then is the true purpose of creating this collective defense force for Europe? The real hope is that it would act as a delaying agent until enough American manpower could be brought to turn the tide.

"In a recent speech General Bradley disclosed the approved administration concept of the only way we can win a war:

" 'I am convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that should this Nation be forced into still another conflict, we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground.' "

To that declaration of administration policy, General Fellers submits this conclusive opinion:

"If victory for the free peoples of the world can only be gained over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground—then it follows, irrefutably, that the free world has enjoyed its last victory."

It is perfectly true that Europe alone has enough manpower, counting bodies as bodies, to outmatch Russia, alone. But look at Europe. The politicians who hold office there can't even agree on the time of day. They are so ridden with hatred and jealousy of one another they continue to quarrel on the very edge of the volcano.

How many Europeans will follow these maniacal grafters to a war, even if the maniacal grafters could agree on what to do? And when Russia puts Chinese troops into her force, where are they, then?

RUSSIA WINS ANY MILKING CONTEST

Clearly, in any milking contest, a war fought to see which side can pile up the most dead bodies in open fields, the United States of America has nothing to gain in Europe. Says General Fellers:

"If western powers are to survive in a war against communism, we must somehow manage to gain our decision by methods quite different from mass ground combat. Instead, we must draw heavily, not primarily on our manpower but on the genius of our people."

The supreme genius of our system, in war, is our air power. General Fellers outlines a plan to develop that in advance of war so that Russia may fear the death of the cow, and so abandon a contest in which she is inferior.

The plan supposes first the fullest possible striking power in the air, and bases for it in Africa and the Middle East, beyond reach of Russia's land-based armies or undeveloped air capacity.

"However," adds the general, "we cannot hold north African bases unless we enjoy the friendship of all the peoples in the Middle East. We must have these peoples' consent to use their bases. Hence, on the diplomatic plane, constructive changes are absolutely necessary."

Everybody knows this is perfectly true. Do we go on shoving young men into Europe to be killed in a milking contest with Russia, or do we build weapons and friendships that can protect the peace?

Criminals Who Get Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an excellent article entitled "Criminals Who Get Away," written by the outstanding writer Donald P. Wilson, when he was a research psychologist at Fort Leavenworth Penitentiary. This article appeared in the February issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIMINALS WHO GET AWAY

(By Donald P. Wilson)

I

The psychopathic personalities that fill our prisons are the least influential members of criminal society. It is an easily demonstrable fact that few of the smart operators are in prison; they are still operating on the outside. It is the dumb operator who gets caught. It is no wonder then that the convict thinks very little better of our conscience on the outside than we do of his. Many of his gripes are legitimate and a great shame on society.

There were three specific reasons why most of the convicts I knew in the penitentiary were not penitent:

1. The capriciousness of the written law and its interpretation.

2. The corruption of law enforcement.

3. The respectability of the white-collar criminal.

The six convicts who served as my assistants at Fort Leavenworth illuminated these reasons for me. Some of their arguments were warped by rationalization. Some were true and shocking.

The sheer cumbersomeness of the body of written laws is one of its vulnerabilities. Over 375,000 new State laws have been passed in the United States in the last 30 years, and these are in addition to the more than 1,000,000 then existing State, municipal, and Federal laws and ordinances. They are too numerous to enforce. Therefore you are a criminal only if you get caught. The trick is not to get caught: this is a convict's concept of society's concept of a criminal. You hear it on every side. "You know the difference between me and the guy on the outside? I got caught." A man is punished not for his crime but for getting caught. This view implies that crime is not an absolute moral offense, but a legal caprice.

Not only does the decade in which you commit an act determine whether you are a criminal, but the place where it is committed as well. A law which appears on the books in one State may not appear on the books of another, so that by an act you become a criminal in one State but not in another. If the offense appears on the books of both States, the disproportionate sentences of the two States are sometimes staggering. Two men in different States are guilty of arson. The prisoner in Alabama is in for 1 year, the prisoner in North Carolina for 40 years. Perjury carries 4 years in Connecticut, 20 years in New York, life in Maine, death in Missouri, $500 and 40 lashes in Delaware. West Virginia punishes bigamy 16 times as severely as incest; Wyoming and Colorado punish incest 10 times more severely than bigamy.

Another practice that feeds the convict's belief that crime is not absolute, but relative, is the fine system—$5,000 or 3 years; $300 or 90 days. Though debtors' prisons were theoretically abandoned a century ago, 57 percent of those who are in prisons, jails, and penitentiaries are serving sentences because of debt—they cannot pay a fine. Many of the remaining 43 percent would gladly have paid a fine, but they had the bad luck to be sentenced by a judge who didn't levy fines.

It would be difficult to persuade a prisoner that a fine represents punishment in the sense that imprisonment does. Why, he would ask, does every man who can, pay? And why, when a fine is imposed, does the money go into public coffers instead of into some form of restitution for the offense committed? One man pays a fine and goes home to his family. Another goes to prison, and he and his family are ruined.

England and Scotland have solved the problem of fines by the simple expedient of installment payment. Imprisonment for nonpayment of fines in England exceeded 80,000 in 1913 but dropped to 11,000 in 1933, the latter representing largely unemployed and paupers. It seems odd that America, with its mania for installment buying, has not applied this concept to its courts. Nearly a fourth of American imprisonments for inability to pay fines are for amounts less than $10, and 60 percent for fines of less than $20. The fact that laws change in point of time, and have become too cumbersome to be prosecuted, may simply be the toll of civilization and the caprice of the written law. But the matter of fines versus sentence is considerably more sinister in its implications. Is a man to pay for his crimes or his poverty? For his crimes or for getting caught?

II

Other evils affecting the convict are stool pigeons, false arrests, bail bonds, and fixed sentences—rackets which go hand in hand in many large cities in a sorry parade of justice. While there are not many innocent men in penitentiaries, the prisoner's frequent complaint, "I been framed," cannot be too quickly dismissed. One estimate claims that nearly a third of the prison population are serving time for offenses they did not technically commit. They are in on false charges. Either the offender agreed to plead guilty to a lesser charge in exchange for a fixed sentence, or he was actually framed by a stool pigeon in the employ of the police.

The procuring of a fixed sentence is called bargaining. If the district attorney's office knows its case is weak, it may assure its conviction records by throwing a scare into the offender, urging him to plead guilty to a lesser offense in return for a lighter fixed sentence and thus avoid coming to trial. This sounds good to the uninitiated. The offense may be one that the offender actually did commit in the past, or it may represent an unsolved case on the police blotter.

This procedure accomplishes several things. It increases the conviction records of the district attorney and those of the police department. The offender gets off with a lighter preagreed sentence, and often the fixing attorney and all concerned are the richer. A notorious case involved a highjacker who looted a truck of $30,000 worth of silk. The charge was armed robbery, subject to a sentence of ten years to life. The highjacker pleaded guilty to petty larceny, was fined $1 and given 1 year in prison.

A major stumbling block in the way of a convict's developing a respect for the law is society's approval of the stool pigeon.

The stool pigeon in the pay of the police and vice squads in most of our large cities is a common device in effecting false arrests. It is a practice used frequently to apprehend the small-time criminal who otherwise eludes the police. The stool pigeon is given marked money or stolen goods to place on the person of a victim. The victim is then immediately frisked by detectives or police lying in wait. What possible defense can such a victim make?

Sometimes the stool pigeon is paid, and is protected in the continuation of his own pickpocketing or dope peddling racket as long as he is valuable to police in his snitches.

England uses no stool pigeons, yet she convicts 70 percent of her offenders. In 25 years, from 1860 to 1885, England closed 137 of her 193 local prisons through reforms in penal concepts. In another quarter century, from 1910 to 1934, the British Commissioners of Prisons reported that annual prison receptions fell from 186,000 to 56,000. They further reported that these results were attributed to reforms in the criminal law; reduction of long sentences; abolition of solitary confinement (1921), useless labor, and the rule of silence; the introduction of school courses, concerts, and constructive labor; installment payment of fines; and the assignment of the feeble-minded to hospitals instead of prisons. Thus by avoiding recidivism England closed 31 more prisons and has now but 25 on the whole island. She reduced imprisonment 81 percent and crime 43 percent by these reforms. Scotland's record is even better.

The stool pigeon system has many friends among authorities. Most American penitentiaries still defend and use it. Certain it is that as long as the system of giving immunity and protection and money to informers is used, no better system will be devised. That there are better systems should be quite apparent.

Another nefarious practice in some of our big cities is the bail bond racket involving police, bondsman, attorney, and sometimes judge. Texts in criminology explain one type of shakedown in this racket, wherein thousands of innocent nurses, shopgirls, wives, and landladies are paying vice squad members dearly to avoid the publicity growing out of a threatened or false accusation of prostitution.

The racket operates by the stool pigeon placing marked money in plain view, in payment for the alleged immorality, and "escaping" just as the raiding vice squad detail appears on the scene. The woman is then booked on the false charge and released on bail. A shyster attorney agrees to fix the case and keep it out of the papers for an amount, usually a percentage of her bail bond, which in turn may be based on her savings account book or other collateral. If she pays the fee, which is split between the parties involved in the fix, the false charge may be dropped. Or sometimes she is repeatedly "bled," and when she can't continue to pay, she is convicted on the original false charge. A prison term will usually shut her up. Men too are paying heavily to avoid publicity on a false homosexual charge engineered by the vice squad. A citizen would have a rough time battling the perjured testimony of the police in a jury trial.

Other easy preys to false arrest and casual conviction without trial are convicts like two I knew at Fort Leavenworth: Weary Willie, whose chief pastime was riding the rods, and the man with an I. Q. of 33. These are sometimes picked up by the police as a convenient way to close a case lingering on the blotter, and the convict finds himself in prison before he knows what has happened.

Sanford Bates, the former director of the Bureau of Prisons, himself reported the case of an ignorant mountain boy whose conviction was railroaded by a Federal marshal after getting the boy to "plead guilty of not doing it" on the day the revenuers raided a still. "Ah jes' pleaded guilty to not bein' dar, but heah ah is."

In England there is no racket in bonds. Charging for bonds is a criminal offense. Bond may be supplied by friends or any freeholder who will hypothecate his property for the defendant, but no fee may be charged and no reimbursement made.

The practice was not exploited in America until this generation. Now a bondsman has legal protection and is a very busy man. There are, of course, bondsmen who are honest businessmen. But there are bondsmen who are not. If a bondsman is implicated in a fix, he is either at the police station when the victim arrives, or he is phoned by the policeman making the arrest and arrives in a matter of minutes. He sometimes arranges for the hiring of an attorney for the bewildered victim, and procures a financial statement from him or her, so that the bail bond figure can be arrived at by a judge who is in on the fix. Although a bondsman's fees are now set by law, he can always refuse to write the bond in the absence of a bonus, especially if he is tipped off regarding the amount of valuables taken from the victim for safekeeping by a desk sergeant.

Less than 2 percent of forfeited bonds are collected by courts, yet the courts still accept millions of dollars in worthless bonds annually. Of more than $10,000,000 in forfeited bonds in Chicago courts alone during a 5-year period, less than 1 percent was collected. One bondsman, who himself had been arrested 12 times, had forfeited $30,000 in bonds within a year; yet the courts accepted $670,000 more in bonds from him within the same year. He secured them with a $24,000 piece of property on which there was a $31,000 mortgage. This was his only traceable asset, although he netted from $80,000 to $100,000 annually in his bail racket.

Obviously a man who is out on bail has a better opportunity of preparing for trial than a man in jail. The difference between freedom and conviction may be bail, just as it may be one's ability to pay a fine.

Much has been written and documented about the lawless police in many of our large cities, in the use of the third degree, illegal search and seizure, arrest without warrant, holding of persons incommunicado, beating and brutality, and other violations of the Bill of Rights. The offender's first contact with a judicial society is the police. If that contact is constructive and just, the possible salvage of the offender is greatly increased. If that first contact is sadistic and stupid, the hostility of the offender is directed toward all society through the police, because to the offender the police represent society.

In a study of the annual arrests in the major cities of the United States, 47 percent of them are shown to be false, unwarranted, or illegal, and to result in dismissal without charge after interrogation.

Criminals quickly learn to plead guilty to almost anything to avoid the third degree. The fact that the rough stuff is frequently delegated by the police to private detectives, who in most States are not supervised, bonded, or inspected, fools nobody—certainly not the convict. A cartoon which hung in our office for months showed an exhausted police sergeant and two patrolmen dragging a much beaten suspect into the captain's office, stating that the prisoner had finally confessed to murder. "Fine," said the captain, "now hold him until we have a murder."

That there are unimpeachable police departments, district attorneys, and judges throughout the country cannot be disputed. But equally indisputable is the fact that corruption in law enforcement bodies as it has existed in the United States in the last 30 years is a greater threat to a citizen's confidence in and a convict's respect for the law than the open flagrancy of the underworld, which at least is not committed by oath of office to law enforcement.

The fate of the jury system in the United States is another of the sad preoccupations of all our big legal minds. Although through the Bill of Rights and the Constitution we are committed as a people to the right of trial by a jury of peers, less than 10 percent of our cases ever reach a jury. This right is completely and unconstitutionally abrogated by the Army and Navy in the court-martial and in the operation of the growing corps of secret police in America. In Massachusetts only 1.7 percent of cases reach the jury; in New York, 4.7 percent; in Chicago, 3.7 percent; and in St. Louis, 13 percent. About half of these fail of conviction.

The reasons for the inoperability of the right of jury trial are several. Few people can afford the cost of a court trial. Those who can afford it face crowded court dockets which sometimes result in the defendant's serving out his sentence in jail before he can come to trial. A judge cannot try a plea of not guilty; it must be tried by a jury. In the light of the above obstacles it is small wonder that most cases are settled by the defendant's bargaining for a fixed sentence—pleading guilty to a lesser charge and getting the whole thing over with. But suppose the citizenry suddenly began to exercise their right of jury trial. With the intolerable number of laws on our statute books, municipal, State, and Federal, there would hardly be citizens enough in our Commonwealth to sit as jurors.

III

Few of the prisoners at Fort Leavenworth Penitentiary complained that they shouldn't have been serving time. If they were not guilty of the crime for which they were convicted, they freely admitted they they were guilty of others that were never detected. Their attack was on the cupidity of the law that convicts one man and protects another, and on the immorality of society which, having attached a price to almost everything else in life, has also hung a price on crime.

But the last frontier to yield to rehabilitation in the convict's mind is the knowledge that society has hung a price not only on crime but on respectability as well. And this in the form of the white-collar criminal. By this term is meant the man whose antisocial practices flourish with society's approval as well as its protection.

We as a people have become supine about graft and politics going hand in hand. Occasional protest meetings are held, but at elections the same gangs are too often put back in power. The graft and fraud in the regimes of Big Bill Thompson and Anton Cermak in Chicago, Jimmy Walker in New York, Boies Penrose and the Vare brothers in Philadelphia, and the Pendergast machine in Kansas City left the prisoners in the penitentiary shaking their heads over all the diligence displayed in rounding up the petty thieves and forgers.

The box scores of personal bank deposits of police and prosecuting attorneys during these regimes were common knowledge in the penitentiary. Probably the record is held by an attorney for the zoning department in New York City during Walker's mayoralty. The attorney deposited $5,250,000 to his own account in 5 years. A Kings County, N. Y., sheriff banked $520,000, the sheriff of New York $360,000, and his deputy $662,000 in the same period of time. A minor employee of the New York bureau of standards was making $25,000 a month for 12 years on false weights. Currently the Kefauver investigation, Murphy's housecleaning of the New York Police Department, and the grand jury's inquiry into police payoffs in Los Angeles are cases in point.

Our national business philosophy of getting something for nothing; our admiration of the rugged individualists who boast that they can do anything as long as they do it cleverly; our crooked practices which are considered "good business" or "sharp business"; and our rationalization that graft and crookedness are all right "if they don't hurt anybody" are criminal concepts, whether exercised on Wall Street or behind a gunman's mask.

A discussion of abstract criminal character as a cause of crime would be more supportable if these conditions in our national life did not exist. Whom do we mean when we say criminal? The gangster, the white-collar criminal, the corrupt police? Or the small-time criminal who is too often made the scapegoat for his more spectacular brothers? When the man in prison sees society give respectability to the white-collar criminal, and sees law enforcement bodies give protection to big-time criminals, it is not surprising that he looks upon crime not as a moral offense but as a competitive profession, and upon his punishment as gross discrimination on the part of both society and law.

Crime is with us always, on many levels, in many forms. The proportion of the problem it poses is not reflected in the number of crimes on our books or convictions on our police blotters or prisoners in our penitentiaries. It is reflected in the attitude of our people toward what crime is. For what a nation comes to agree upon as being the nature of crime is what determines the nature of her criminals.

Most of us would heartily agree that respect for law is essential to a Nation of peaceful communities. But in order to command respect, the law, both in interpretation and enforcement, must be constant, unimpeachable, and equable. It is no news to the American people that we have been undershooting that precept for the last 30 years. How could fear of punishment deter crime in the thirties, the era of the gangsters not yet closed, when an offender had an 85 percent chance of escaping arrest, a 93 percent chance of escaping conviction, and a 99 percent chance of escaping punishment?

If constancy, integrity, and equability are not reflected in the law, all that is left to respect is the cop's night stick and his third degree. This kind of respect can quickly turn to contempt, both in the law-abiding and the lawless. It is an affront to human dignity and resourcefulness.

Our most serious problem in crime is not the run-of-the-mill convict in a penitentiary. It is the criminal at large who remains so with the knowledge of the populace. It is not reasonable to expect the reformation of small-time criminals, while gangsters operate with political and police protection. The smalltime criminal then becomes only a red herring thrown to the public to feed the illusion that justice is being done. Organized crime could not survive without protection. The small-time criminal knows this, so does the big-time criminal, so do his protectors. So do you and I.

Spain Expects Larger Defense Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

entitled "Spain Expects Larger Defense Role," appearing in the Christian Science Monitor for January 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPAIN EXPECTS LARGER DEFENSE ROLE

(By Arno Doach-Fleurot)

MADRID.—As Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower flew over Spain on his way from Lisbon to Rome there were few in Spain who did not wonder what the general thought as he looked down on the snow-covered plateaus and sierras of Spain.

Even though this country is not a member of that Atlantic Pact, whose military power General Eisenhower was examining, he was doubtless asking himself how Spain could be fitted into European defense.

For Spaniards of all opinions know that today they have more military power than was formerly the case. Their army and fleet were once negligible compared with those of France and Germany, but this has now changed.

OUSTING OF COMMUNISTS

The Spanish Army consists of about 600,000 men with rifle-stage training who could be mobilized at once. It could cover the Pyrenees line of defense. But if the emergency arose, the army could be swelled to 2,400,000, all troops with some military training and with an officer corps which has been rebuilt and augmented ever since the end of the civil war by generals who fought the civil war to a successful conclusion.

It also has been the business of these same generals and their staffs to eliminate all subversive activities in the army and in the country. At times military courts have sat almost constantly trying Communists who either in the ranks of the army or as agents sent from abroad have either tried to organize a Communist movement in the country or to break down discipline in the army.

The Spanish Army has not, in consequence, entered this critical period of history with its ranks weakened by defeatism. It has the normal qualities which reflect the national will to fight and repulse invasion.

There are, of course, in Spain the same differences of opinion as always on the dictatorship of Generalissimo Francisco Franco, but before the threat of invasion there is a solid front.

Yet the Spaniards know that their army could not of itself and in its present state of armament resist very long even with the natural defense line of the Pyrenees, and no matter how heroic the resistance.

EYE ON THE UNITED STATES

Under these circumstances they have been asking themselves how they are to save themselves, and to them General Eisenhower has come to symbolize the will to fight, while the United States is seen as the one source of power and arms that make victory possible.

But they ask, how are they excluded from the Atlantic Pact to get those arms.

The return of an American Ambassador to Madrid and the renewal of diplomatic relations have led them to believe that the diplomatic way is now open. Both governmental circles and the public foresee a new period in American-Spanish relations out of which somehow will come an association in defense.

This idea has not simply come out of the air. There has for some time been a difference between the American attitude toward Spain and that of the European members of the Atlantic Pact. The American Navy has undoubtedly done the most to make the Spanish people feel that the United States is interested in them and their country.

ENTERTAINMENT BY SPAIN

For a year and a half, beginning with the visit of the American Fleet at the end of the Atlantic maneuvers in September 1949 to the Spanish naval port of El Ferrol, there has been a number of definite acts on the part of the American Navy in connection with Spain, the most recent nearly a week of official entertainment of a portion of the American Fleet at Barcelona.

During all this time the two other principal naval powers represented in Spain, the British and the French, have made no such friendly moves.

On the military side, the development of friendly relations has been less evident to the public, but it is generally known that many high-ranking officers of the American Armed Forces have visited Spain, while Spanish officers have visited the American Armed Forces in Germany.

So the conviction has grown in Spain that the United States will put aside political considerations, take an even broader view of European defense than that offered by the Atlantic Pact, and take full advantage of Spain's strategic position.

ANTICIPATIONS LISTED

And once the United States goes into the defense of the Iberian Peninsula, Spain expects it to be thoroughgoing. The Spaniards anticipate in detail:

First, a treaty or a series of treaties such as already exist between the United States and Portugal, giving the United States the use of Spanish naval and air bases.

In exchange they expect Spain to receive the arms and equipment making it possible for Spain by itself to meet any ordinary emergency, and, in the event of great emergency, to have the American Army, Navy, and Air Force cooperating with theirs in the fullest possible manner. In short they anticipate that the United States, by treaty, will work as closely with the defense forces of Spain as it is preparing to do with its fellow members of the Atlantic Pact.

In practice this would mean the development of all the naval bases on the mainland and in the strategic islands of the Mediterranean and Atlantic; the outfitting of the Spanish Navy with all modern devices, the development of the military airfields scattered about Spain until they could handle anything in the air; and the furnishing of all the modern arms the Spanish Army is prepared to use effectively.

The idea is that Spain will become a huge military base, the central control position on the western Mediterranean and Atlantic, in liaison with an equally heavily armed and garrisoned north Africa, outfitted, if it were to come to that, as the principal point of departure for the reconquest of Europe.

The Government Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Most Powerful Lobby," published in the Oil City Derrick on January 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOST POWERFUL LOBBY

In this period of talk and investigations of lobbying and related activities by private business, it may be of interest to review what the Hoover Commission task force on Government publicity and propaganda had to say.

Federal operations in the fields of publicity, public relations, and dissemination of intelligence cost the taxpayers about $105,000,000 a year, it found. Every Federal agency maintains its public relations staff. It also said, "In many cases, public relations work is concealed entirely from routine accounting review, principally by the device of carrying publicity operatives on the roll as supervisors, administrative assistants, and technical experts."

How potent is the Government lobby? Congressman Harness, who headed a committee which worked 15 months looking into Federal pressure groups, said "Everyone in Congress is keenly conscious of the tremendous power of this Government propaganda machine, for he comes in direct personal contact with it every day. He lives with the lobbies, good and bad, which constantly seek to influence the course o. legislation, and he can hardly fail to know that the most powerful, most persistent of them all is the Federal lobby. It works around the clock every day of the year."

There is one more point of importance. Lobbyists for private interests must register with the Government, and their connections and purposes are known to all concerned. The political lobbyist knows no such restriction. He goes merrily on his way, seeking to drum up support in favor of this scheme or that, and the taxpayers foot all the bills. This represents the continuous drive of an official aristocracy to extend its powers and privileges.

The Basis for Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "The Basis for Foreign Policy," published in the Wall Street Journal of December 26, 1950. I urge every Member of the Senate to give careful attention and study to the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASIS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

What should be the basis for the foreign policy of the United States?

President Truman, in what has come to be known as the Truman doctrine, says that it should be the containment of communism, that this Nation should fight communism anywhere, and if necessary everywhere, that it threatens the peace.

Former President Herbert Hoover says that the foundation of our policy must be to preserve this Nation and the Western Hemisphere.

There is an important difference between these two points of view. That difference is now being openly and widely debated for the first time in a silent decade.

The two views need not, of course, conflict always or in every particular. To fight Communist power in particular places can be an essential part of our own defense. The defense of the Western Hemisphere does not preclude, and may require, fighting Soviet

power outside the Western Hemisphere. The two viewpoints can converge.

There is, moreover, similarity of purpose in the two views. The advocates of containment everywhere advocate it to save America. The objective of the others is also to stop communism from engulfing the whole world, including ourselves. They are all honorable men.

Nevertheless, the difference is vital—not for what is intended but for what results.

The Truman doctrine begins by accepting United States responsibility for defending all parts of the world from Soviet encroachment; this becomes primary policy. In effect, the United States becomes a Nation without differentiated frontiers. The frontier becomes one gigantic circle around Russia's present sphere. And since the doctrine is to defend that circle everywhere, the relative values of the various points on the circle become lost. All points become more or less of equal value.

The next progression, an unintended one, is that the responsibility of other peoples to defend themselves gradually becomes secondary.

Their self-defense is, of course, definitely desirable. But since containment everywhere is viewed as essential to our ultimate safety, we soon think we must defend other countries regardless of their own efforts. And the other countries soon begin to think they do us a favor to let us defend them.

At this stage decision becomes confused. Korea, let us say, cannot be weighed on any balance. It is a point on the circle; it is a part of the general responsibility we have assumed, and so we fight for it whether or not it has great value in terms of the larger fight.

So long as the policy is to contain everywhere, there is simply no standard to distinguish among Korea, Indochina, or the Rhine—all become Koreas if the Communists choose to make them so.

From this kind of thinking there is another progression, also unintended but also inevitable.

Unconsciously we begin to make the defense of this Nation a subordinate consideration in weighing any proposed action.

If the policy is to contain everywhere and there is a threat anywhere, what room is there to debate whether to fight this particular threat will strengthen or weaken our own defenses? Unless we are to abrogate the policy, there is no choice but to fight the threat anywhere. Action is automatic. The United States has then no choice but to intervene in Korea—or any other place.

The Truman doctrine thus puts the defense of this Nation second in the minds of the men whose trust is the defense of this Nation.

With the defense of this Nation as the paramount policy all this is changed. From this premise the cost of any action would be measured against the gain; the risks of intervention in any Korea would be measured against the risks of abstention.

Men would still differ in judgment. They would still debate the intervention in Korea, the rearmament of Germany, the reinforcement of Europe. All these things would still be difficult matters to decide. Even from the Hoover premise, men would differ on the Hoover proposals as to what is best or prudent in a particular place.

But in the debate men would have a common plane of reference—the safety and preservation of this country. There would then be something to measure against, there would be a standard for making value judgments, a balance on which to weigh military and political opinions.

The policy of containment leaves us no choices. By trying to contain everywhere we become vulnerable every here and we can be truly strong nowhere. In the name of saving the world this policy deprives us of the freedom to seek out what is best to save America.

The policy of putting the safety of this Nation first is the only on which offers us a way of wisely measuring our strength against the task—or, indeed, offers any way of measuring at all. Therefore it, and not the policy of containment everywhere, ought to be paramount in the foreign policy of the United States.

It may be argued by honorable men that this reversal of emphasis ignores morality. For in its application there may come a time when the United States, measuring what is best for her own safety, may have to make the harsh decision of abandoning temporarily some cherished bastion. And the greater obligation, it is truly said, is to preserve the world from barbarism.

To this we can only reply that there is in the world today only one power that stands in the way of that barbarism. So long as the United States stands the way is barred. So soon as it falls, the whole world will be engulfed.

It will profit neither ourselves nor civilization to risk the destruction of that power in the name of saving civilization. To pursue in the name of morality a course which weakens the power of the United States would be the true immorality.

A foreign policy which puts anything ahead of the preservation of this Nation betrays the Nation and civilization.

Sale of Surplus Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the New York Times of January 29, 1951, carried an interesting story on the revenue realized by the Treasury from the sale of surplus ships since the end of hostilities of World War II. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELLING THE SHIPS

For 5 years, after it became evident that the Nation would have a tremendous surplus of merchant shipping left over from the frantic wartime building project, we have been disposing of tonnage to all comers. The final report of Vice Admiral Edward L. Cochrane, Federal Maritime Administrator, makes interesting reading. It is particularly gratifying since it relates the flow of money back to the National Treasury.

Since the Ship Sales Act of 1946 the old Maritime Commission and its successor agency, the Maritime Administration, have sold to American and foreign buyers 1,960 surplus ships for $1,728,821,057. Other money has been returned to the Government for charter hire of Federal tonnage. Not counting the cost of extra tooling and new shipyards for the unparalleled wartime building program, the 5,500 vessels constructed cost about $13,000,000,000; we still have more than 1,800 vessels in the reserve fleet. Most of them are Liberty ships, the misnamed ugly ducklings. The finer ships are in operation, owned by United States-flag operators who bought, out of the disposal program, a total of 847 carriers. Few ports in the world have missed seeing the C-type freighters, high-quality ships with records of excellent performance.

It might appear to the layman that, with ships waiting in mothballs, we are ready for the next emergency, but that is a dangerous assumption. We need new ships for two reasons: we cannot afford to let our war-built fleet grow obsolescent in a block, for competitive reasons; and for our next emergency we must plan with 20-knot enemy submarines in mind. Admiral Cochrane has already called for bids on fast new freighters that can speed great distances without convoy. To build the first 50 of these craft will cost but a fraction of the money recaptured in the bargain sales program. And in war or peace they will earn, as did the valiant Libertys and other standard ships of the Second World War, the last dollar of their cost and keep.

The Proposed Increase in Tax Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, several days ago I received a very ably written letter from Mr. Oscar H. Curry, one of my constituents in Riverton, N. J., dealing with our tax problem.

Since the letter offers some thought-provoking suggestions, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I hope all Members of the Senate will both read and heed some of the admonitions contained in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVERTON, N. J., *January 15, 1951*.

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: The administration is indicating that it intends to ask the Congress to increase personal income tax rates in the middle- and low-income groups 30 percent. I wish to protest such action because it will not produce the required income the Government needs and will accelerate the already serious inflation trend.

Personal income taxes at present are producing about twenty billions of our Federal income; an increase of 30 percent will increase such receipts only six billions. Such an amount principally collected by payroll deductions will be considered an increase in cost of living by labor and be the stimulant for another round of wage increases; increasing the cost of Federal expenditures and leaving the budget in as unbalanced a position as it was before. Experience has proven that increases in wages to adjust for cost-of-living rises produce a perpetual-motion inflation.

Gross corporation earnings are running approximately thirty billions per year. The administration indicates it will ask an 8 percent (47 percent to 55 percent) increase in the corporate tax rate. Such an increase is again insignificant when compared with the Government's requirements for additional income. Such a tax, too, would be inflationary since it would remove much of the stimulant (profits) to be gained from economical operation. This would result in increased costs and establish the basis for increased selling prices which would become the foundation for another round of wage increases—again, perpetual motion inflation.

The proposed increased taxes (six billions from individuals plus two and a half billions from corporations) would produce but eight and a half billions of additional revenue, less than half of the amount required to balance the budget. This, once more, will react to violently motivate the forces of inflation in our economy.

If a subversive were given carte blanche control over our entire economy, he could not concoct a more lethal device for our destruction than the administration tax proposals.

As an alternate, a national defense tax of 10 percent on consumer expenditures should be proposed. Such a tax will add between eighteen and twenty billions to Federal income which is sufficient to balance a Federal budget of seventy to seventy-two billions. It should be assessed only at the consumer level and should be collected as a tax at the time payment is made. It thus would not be a hidden tax and the individual would be mindful of his contribution to the national defense. The Congress should insert in the legislation that this national defense tax could not be used as basis for wage or price increases. Cost-of-living data would not include this tax since the law should specify that quoted prices may not include it.

A national defense tax of this nature would not be inflationary since it could not be used as a basis of supporting wage and price increases. It is flexible to the Federal budget requirements. Such a tax would penalize all alike and it would yield a further tax on the higher income group which cannot be reached by the administration's proposals (consumer expenditures increase as a consumer's income increases).

Another factor to be considered is the probable effect of the tax on the individual. The administration's proposal for individuals would increase the amount withheld from the employee's pay; in addition to its inflationary reaction, such a tax would discourage the individual in an all-out defense effort. It would lessen his willingness to work longer hours because the withholding would seem to reduce his pay for such effort. If the worker did not suffer the additional withholding, he would have the discretion of paying or not paying the national defense tax by restricting his expenditures (another inflation brake).

It is my opinion, the most potent enemy we face is not communism but inflation. If we defeat inflation, we will defeat communism because communism could not stand exposure to the prosperity offered by our democratic ideals. I strongly urge your support of a national defense tax based on consumer expenditures.

Yours very truly,

O. H. CURRY.

Lewis Schwellenbach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which is in the nature of a short and very fine biography of one of the most distinguished former Members of this body ever to serve in the Senate of the United States. He was a Senator from my State and a former Secretary of Labor—Mr. Lewis Schwellenbach. I commend the reading of the article to all those who served with him and those who loved him.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. SECRETARY

(By Harry J. Martin)

Our United States Government has three branches, executive, legislative, and judicial. To secure a high position in any one of these departments is something, but to be a member of each, in the short period of a dozen years, is worthy of considerable mention. Our great citizen, Lewis B. Schwellenbach achieved this quite unusual record. He became a United States Senator, a United States District Judge and a United States Secretary of Labor.

I first met Lew when he was a young practicing lawyer in Seattle, active in his American Legion and, subsequently, its commander, in the early twenties.

Born in Minnesota, Lew grew up in Spokane and later made a good record at the University of Washington law school. He was King County chairman of the Democratic central committee from 1928 to 1930. He was an unsuccessful candidate for governor in 1932, when Clarence D. Martin was nominated and elected, but when 1934 rolled around, Lew was a candidate for the United States Senate. He defeated John C. Stevenson in the primaries and downed Republican Reno Odlin in the finals and was off for Washington, D. C. He and Harry S. Truman met at the swearing-in ceremonies and became friends. Here Lew spent a hectic 6 years and broke his friendship with Senator Bone.

Lew was a great speaker and really enjoyed the Senate. Vice President Garner assigned to him some difficult jobs in the world's greatest debating club and he always made good. He was a great favorite among his colleagues. For instance, on one occasion he appeared at the Young Men's Democratic Club's annual banquet in Seattle and brought with him Senators Truman, of Missouri; Minton, of Indiana; and Chavez, of New Mexico; and I recall Senator Minton saying, "Whenever any issue comes on the floor of the Senate we always know where old Lew stands."

Like most lawyers, Lew had a yearning to be a judge; so when a vacancy showed up Schwellenbach accepted F. D. R.'s offer to be United States district judge in Spokane in 1940, and during Judge Schwellenbach's term in Spokane a Seattle lawyer took occasion to follow his work there. He told me that nowhere had he read briefs more profound in their reasoning.

In this district judgeship Lew served until his friend, Harry S. Truman, became President in 1945. President Truman urged Schwellenbach to accept a place in his Cabinet—that of Secretary of Labor.

This job was a tough one. During the 10 or 12 years prior to Lew's taking over, because of the war and other conditions, the Labor Department had become sadly decentralized. Secretary Schwellenbach set himself to the task of reorganization and worked like a Trojan. During this period he made several trips home and I had brief visits with him. He looked well, I thought, despite reports of ill-health. He kept up his confining work and, with no advance news of his illness, the radio flashed the report of his death.

After a service in Washington, D. C., Lew's body was brought to Seattle by air. The old Trinity Church was crowded to the doors. At Washelli Cemetery all the old party people from Governor Wallgren down were on hand. A soldier blew taps and I recalled all the life Lew had crowded into a few short years and thought, "What price glory?"

Northwest Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Governor Speaks for Idaho." This editorial has to do with the activity of one C. Girard Davidson, a former Under Secretary of the Interior, as he goes in and about the State of Idaho on a problem which is of profound interest to the people of the State of Idaho. Written and printed by Idaho's oldest newspaper, the Idaho Daily Statesman, of Boise, I commend it to my colleagues for interesting and intelligent reading regarding a problem which must be met head-on in the State on Idaho.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNOR SPEAKS FOR IDAHO

Governor Jordan may be occupying the limelight presently from the fact that he is a sharp man with a pencil but there should be no overlooking of his stand on water and natural resources. Here the Governor is for Idaho's best interests all the way.

Interviewed Tuesday following a meeting in his office attended by water users and C. Girard Davidson, a former Under Secretary of the Interior who is now making a special report to the Secretary of the Interior on northwest power development, Governor Jordan laid it on the line. He's for private development, with private funds which would pay State taxes. He is opposed to Government socialism and the blind theory that the Federal Treasury is a bottomless pit. The Governor is one of the hard-headed type of men who knows that every dollar the Federal Government has to spend is taken from you and you in taxes.

Mr. Davidson, who has been coming to Idaho for several years in behalf of the Columbia Valley Administration (Authority) and who now seems to be operating with a new approach, but still under the steam of Federal cash, knows perfectly well that Idaho wants no part of any scheme he happens to favor. Not enough Idahoans agree with Mr. Davidson's dreamy ideas to make a quorum for a poker game and Mr. Davidson just isn't going to be able to sell more Idahoans with any honeyed approach. Fact of the matter, Idaho doesn't consider Mr. Davidson either an authority on Federal resources or even a resident of the western country where the resources remain free. He can come here the rest of his life and he will only determine Idahoans more and more that what he has to offer is exactly what we do not want, now or any time in the future, "wah or no wah."

The fact that Mr. Davidson found this out from Governor Jordan (which we are confident he did) will neither stop his effort or

cut him loose from spending your tax money for his campaign to choke something down Idaho's throat that the State simply won't swallow.

Every time Mr. Davidson comes to Idaho he will bring along the old CVA giant in his eye. Defeated in the main idea, he now has substitutes. Fortunately, Idaho remains on guard. To remain a free Idaho it can never stop.

Russia: The Giant on Clay Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian Bulletin for January 15, 1951 contains a pertinent editorial on the vulnerability of Communist Russia. Our Government should be exploiting the suggestions contained in it which I insert at this point:

THE GIANT ON CLAY FEET

On a number of occasions this publication endeavored to point out that Soviet Russia, despite its superficial show of strength and its geographical extent, is not as strong as it appears. If only to help dispel the pessimism and defeatism that threatens to become widespread in America, we must again declare that unbridgeable weaknesses are to be found in Russia's economy, industrial output, social and political structures, and above all, in its predatory nature. It has become essential that the entire west recognize and assess these weaknesses. It has also become essential that the west capitalize upon them by all means to the fullest extent.

The economic and military strengths and weaknesses of Soviet Russia are ably summarized in a booklet edited by Mr. John F. Stewart, chairman of the Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, Scotland. The booklet itself is a compilation of reports presented by the various delegates of the peoples subjected by Soviet Russia at the Congress of Independence Movements, held June 13–14, 1950. The delegates came from such countries as Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Caucasus, Kazakia, Croatia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Serbia, Turkestan, and Ukraine.

Upon the basis of these reports of conditions in the countries under the Soviet heel, it is definitely established that Russia is not invincible, that the west has too long been misled by what reduces to Russian propaganda, and that the power Russia possesses has been built up mainly through utter misunderstanding of Russia's nature and methods by the west.

ATOMIC BOMB NOT ENOUGH

The consensus of the reports is that Russian aggression will not be deterred by the threat of the atom and hydrogen bombs, but by a new faith of all freedom-loving peoples and a renaissance of religion and of national idealism. Otherwise the ideal of materialistic communism will prevail by default.

At least one opportunity for the renaissance will arise at the time that Soviet Russia launches an all-out attack upon the free world. If the west can draw fresh strength from its roots, and confront the Kremlin fearlessly, Soviet Russia is doomed to ultimate defeat and destruction. The very fact that it oppresses millions of alien peoples, breeds the germs of this destruction.

But the west must be extremely wise as well, should it wish to win these peoples to its side. The appalling blunders committed with respect to them prior to the present Soviet-American crisis must not be repeated.

THE POWERFUL WEAPON IN OUR HANDS

When war comes, or preferably before, the oppressed nations must receive unequivocal recognition of their existence as national and ethnic entities, and above all, of their inalienable right to the fruits of freedom and national self-determination. Then, fired by patriotism and the love of their native soil, these nations might muster armies of millions.

By giving full and unreserved support to the non-Russian peoples, we would be striking at the very base of the Russian totalitarian structure. Apart from the question of manpower, these nations possess great natural resources and economic wealth. Without such, Russian imperialism would be deprived of its impetus and power. The coal, iron, manganese, and wheat of Ukraine, the mineral ores of the Crimea, the petroleum, manganese, and subtropical products of the Caucasus, the nonferrous metals and the coal of Turkestan, the petroleum and metals of the area between the Volga and the Urals, and the timber of Byelorussia—all these riches are now being devoured by the Russians in order to extend and solidify their totalitarian imperialism.

In agriculture, too, the non-Russian countries possess superiority in the cultivation of sugar beet, cotton, silk, tobacco, tea, rice, and citrus fruits. Ukraine alone produces over 75 percent of the sugar of the entire U. S. S. R., while Turkestan produces 91 percent of the cotton, the remaining 9 percent being produced by Azerbaijan, Crimea, and Southern Ukraine.

As a result the non-Russian countries have tremendous industrial potentialities. For the nonce, however, their products are funneled into Soviet Russia's armament plants and workshops.

MILITARY POTENTIAL

From the military viewpoint, Soviet Russia's power is extremely sensitive to any outside influence, since the great majority of its armed forces are unreliable and in fact can be turned against Russia by proper political and psychological handling. It is certain that millions of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Caucasians, and others, once assured of a free and decent life in a liberated land, will not fight for Moscow. It is foregone that they would fight against it.

According to the proceedings of the Congress, in the event of war, there will be over 10,000,000 militarily fit Ukrainians in Ukraine and outside it; half of them may be put in the Soviet armies and the other half used in the other branches of the Soviet apparatus. But whether in uniforms or in working clothes, these people will be with us, as will the other non-Russian peoples, because they hate Soviet Russia's enslaving hand. Hating Soviet Russia and craving their freedom, they constitute an overwhelming force, which the West must strengthen and utilize fully in order to destroy Soviet Russia and thus save itself.

From the geopolitical viewpoint, the non-Russian nations present a highly significant picture as well. Most of them lie on the periphery of the U. S. S. R., and hence are accessible to the armies of the west. The Carpathian basin, populated chiefly by Ukrainians, offers the crossing the strategic roads leading toward the east, south, and northeast.

Ukraine's geopolitical position, protruding into the heart of the European territories now under Soviet Russia's control, opens the way toward the Don and the Caucasus, while her river system connects the land with the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. This but underscores the highly important position of the non-Russian countries, among which Ukraine, because of its population, natural resources, and its geopolitical significance, is the most outstanding.

In the light of these facts, as attested to by the spokesmen of the oppressed nations, Soviet Russia becomes something less than an invincible enemy. While the iron curtain has served to shut out the west from the inmates of the cemetery of nations, it has also performed the no less vital function of shutting off Soviet Russia from our view.

For our own survival, it has become imperative for us to riddle this curtain with truth and to assure enslaved peoples of justice.

Only then will the Giant on Clay Feet assume his proper and puny stature.

Tribute to a Great World Figure: F. D. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it is no exaggeration to say that in all history there has been no one man so beloved in his lifetime by the millions upon millions of human beings who toil and struggle unknown to fame or distinction, and so bitterly hated by the thousands of specially privileged creatures who, in Jefferson's memorable phrase, "ride booted and spurred upon the backs of the people," as Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Because of the near-idolatry bestowed on the magic name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt by the common people everywhere, and perhaps too because of the insensate hatred of the same name by the secure few, our late President has already assumed, in the folk memory of the people, a halo of deification which he himself would not have liked.

We think of him now in company with the greatest of men—with Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, with Moses, Solon, Aristotle—though he has been gone from us only five short years.

DYNAMIC CHAMPION OF LIVING DEMOCRACY

Franklin D. Roosevelt was the apotheosis of the best kind of American pragmatism. He was the dynamic champion of a living, growing, expanding democracy. He held out as an attainable ideal, as have other great Americans, the hope of realization of the opposed but complementary goals of the democratic way of life: freedom and equality.

The genius of this great American was the genius of a great America: to make things better, but not to destroy what was already good.

With the noble political idealism which animated the founding fathers and the succeeding exponents of freedom and equal opportunity, he combined a charm of personality seldom equaled by the sons of man.

MEMORABLE TRIBUTES

Of the many tributes to Franklin Delano Roosevelt which appeared to mark the observance of his birthday on January 29, it seems to me that the

column by Walter Winchell, published in the Washington Post of January 30, most happily and memorably caught the Roosevelt spirit.

Like so many of us, Walter Winchell's own life and philosophy was changed and shaped by the Roosevelt impact. F. D. R. had a tremendous gift for formulating the unformulated thinking of millions of people, and for those with articulate gifts of expression the collision of ideas was often pyrotechnic. A whole body of American literature was founded on the reaction of eager intellects to the Roosevelt leadership.

It is with real gratitude to Walter Winchell for his Roosevelt column of 1951 that I insert the article in the RECORD:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

F. D. R.

Historians frequently evaluate leaders solely on the basis of their public records. The resulting portraits have the quality of marble statues—impressive but cold. History, of course, is not a mere compilation of dates, speeches, treaties, and charters. It is composed of people equipped with human frailties and attributes. And these characteristics often play a major role in domestic and international decisions. To understand history it is necessary to understand the personalities of those who make it. Newspapermen call it human interest. Franklin Roosevelt was intensely personal. He always translated abstract principles in terms of human problems. His genuine affection for people was his most conspicuous characteristic. And the feeling was cordially reciprocated, not only by his friends but by millions of strangers.

F. D. R. once noted that his discussion with mill-workers gave him a deeper insight into the meaning of an economic depression than theories expounded by economists.

The many-faceted Roosevelt personality defied the analysis of his closest friends. However, there was an apparent trait they could all detect: His supreme self-assurance. F. D. R.'s infectious smile was not a vote-getting ornament; it reflected his inner warmth. He was an innate optimist. Even during the darkest days of the war he never succumbed to despondency. His jubilant spirit was continually unfurled—and he carried it like a banner. "Some people see clouds and think of storms," he once remarked. "But I have seen clouds form beautiful sunsets."

Despite the torrent of books, the architects of the Roosevelt story have scarcely sketched the foundation. There remains a mountainous mass of material for historians to assess. For 37 years F. D. R. saved everything, from a youngster's postcard requesting an autograph to crackpot letters. His administration was completely documented. Even the thousands of Christmas cards he received were neatly filed.

Tragedy is the handmaiden of agony, but it also inspires lasting exaltation in those who triumph over it. The most tragic incident in F. D. R.'s life had its blessed aspects both for himself and our Nation. His lengthy bout with polio gave him time for contemplation and an opportunity to forage his philosophy. The physical affliction amplified his spiritual power. He emerged from his illness with a deeper sense of humility, patience, and courage. Roosevelt's malady gave him a wider understanding of the social and political ills burdening humanity. The strength he lost in his legs he gained in heart. A man of great personal valor, he had one fear. It stemmed from his infirmity, which prevented mobility. He dreaded being caught in a fire.

His gregarious nature revolted against pompous frills which impeded friendly relations. F. D. R. cut through the icy exterior of diplomatic formalities by dispensing with customary stilted speeches of greeting for new envoys. He welcomed them as friends with light-hearted conversation.

Never in history was there a closer personal relationship between the heads of two nations than the friendship between Roosevelt and Churchill. It was based on mutual respect and affection. A striking illustration of their informality is this merry tale: Churchill once emerged from the bathroom stark naked as F. D. R. entered his bedroom. Winston quipped, "The Prime Minister of Great Britain has nothing to conceal from the President of the United States."

He was a devoted father until the pressing responsibilities of the war years forced him to neglect his paternal duties. Momentous official problems devoured almost all of his energy and most of his time. Consequently, he was almost completely cut adrift from his family. F. D. R. was aware of the loneliness attached to the stern functions of high public office. He went into the public domain. And his family became the American people.

He was one of the fortunate few who was completely fulfilled in his job. He frankly reveled in public adulation, and the political give-and-take increased his zest for life. He accepted the honors and drama that come with the Presidency with almost childlike exuberance. And he faced challenges with the confidence of a champion. Of course, what his friends described as confidence—some foes called arrogance.

His remarkable political acumen was rooted in his knowledge of human nature. When he was New York's Governor he arrived at his office accompanied by a friend. A number of men were in the anteroom. He paused as he passed through and offered an ancient quip. His friend later remarked that it was a very old joke.

"I know," Roosevelt chuckled. "But I wanted to find out which of those fellows wanted favors. They were the ones who laughed."

He had a passion for simplicity. F. D. R. slept on an iron bed with a thin, hard mattress and used an old gray shawl for a blanket. He was a moderate drinker and a small eater. Chain-smoking was his chief vice. F. D. R. originally intended becoming a midshipman, but his father dissuaded him. Of such minor quirks of fate is history made. He loved the sea, and took great pride in his seamanship. Next to stamp collecting, his pet hobby was conversation.

Roosevelt's jaunty spirit was expressed in his love for humor. He relished the company of witty companions. F. D. R. could define his political tenets in a single crackling line: "I am not trying to muzzle the upper dog. But I want to take the underdog off a leash."

Fearing it might disrupt his close attachment with his mother, F. D. R. did not tell her about his courtship until the date the engagement was announced. He had known Eleanor (a distant cousin) since he was four. Their marriage attracted wide attention. President Theodore Roosevelt gave the bride away. She was his niece.

He was a devout man who knew many Bible passages by heart. He once explained why he did not worship publicly more often. "I can do anything in the goldfish bowl of the President's life, but I'll be hanged if I can say my prayers in it. It bothers me to be looked at by all the tourists in Washington when I go to church."

Here is one of history's little known ironies: While serving as Assistant Navy Secretary he formed a friendship with another Government official, which lasted several years. They had numerous ideals in common and spent many happy weeks together traveling through the United States and Europe. His companion's name, Herbert Hoover.

This was F. D. R.'s reply to a reporter who asked him to explain his philosophy: "I am a Christian, Democrat, and human being." And the greatest of these was his warm humanity. It isn't just his statesmanship and leadership that millions miss. What made the grief of his passing so deep and lasting was that he took so much of you—and left even more—of himself.

Freedom is such a beautiful American word because it contains the inspiring letters: F. D. R.

Lost 400,000,000 Allies in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Freda Utley in Spotlight points out a few salient facts about the fall of the Nationalist Government of China. Chiang Kai-shek was our friend, and still is, but in 1946 Stalin tried to steal him from us by promising the return of industrial machinery that had been stripped from plants in Russia. In spite of this promise, which was a considerable inducement, Chiang Kai-shek refused to do business with Russia. On March 5, 1946, he rejected the Soviet offer. It was Truman and Marshall, however, who put an embargo on the shipment of military goods to China, with the result that the Chinese Communists overran China.

Members of this body should be interested in this article. It is an answer to the State Department's propaganda picture: Why Korea? The answer to that question is found in a review of events in China since 1946, and prior thereto to the Yalta Conference in 1945. The article follows:

HOW WE LOST 490,000,000 ALLIES

(By Freda Utley)

A fitting epitaph for the tomb of United States interests in the Far East is either "Too little and too late," or "They knew not what they did." Whichever inscription one chooses, the record shows that it was ignorance or political ambition or Communist sympathies in the State Department which brought China behind the iron curtain. It was the United States which first put Soviet Russia in a position from which Stalin could dominate China. At Yalta, President Roosevelt not only broke pledges to Chiang Kai-shek to return Manchuria to China. He also secretly agreed to let Russia step into Japan's shoes.

Chiang never once doubted that he should be loyal to the west. He fought Japan single-handed for 5 years before, by the tragedy of Pearl Harbor, he became America's ally. Yet, far from winning the friendship of America, he lost the much-needed bulwark of American aid. It was perfectly clear that the official American attitude was not one of interest in the survival of China as an independent nation opposed to communism. What critics of Chiang did not know, or did not want to know, was that he had every opportunity to play Stalin's game and save China by at least staying on as head of a puppet government.

The story of Stalin's efforts to win Chiang Kai-shek over to his side has never been made public in America. In a supreme effort to appease the United States, Chiang and his foreign office were silent when by shouting aloud they might have saved China.

In January 1946, just as General Marshall was launching his mission to compel the Nationalist Government to accept the Communists into their ranks on the latter's terms, Chiang Kai-shek's son, Chiang Ching-kuo, was in Moscow conferring with Marshal Stalin. At this time the Chinese National Government was facing the refusal of the Red Army in Manchuria to observe the terms of the 1945 Sino-Soviet Treaty. The Soviet Government had promised noninterference in China's internal affairs and would "render to China moral support and aid in military supplies and other material resources, such support and aid to be given entirely to the National Government as the Central Government of China" (Chiang's government).

China paid a high price for that promise. She had to give up Port Arthur and give Russia joint ownership of the Manchurian railways. The Soviet never even pretended honoring this agreement. Its representatives in Manchuria declared they would transfer responsibility "to whatever existing military authorities" they found on the spot. The only "existing military authorities" were, of course, Chinese Communist forces.

It was in this situation that Chiang Kai-shek sent his son to talk with Stalin. Chiang Ching-kuo had spent many years in Moscow. He had a Russian wife and on the whole he was friendly to the Soviet Union. Stalin was not at all unfriendly to young Chiang. He proposed that if the Nationalist Government of China would collaborate with Soviet Russia against America, he would instruct the Chinese Communists to submit to Chiang Kai-shek and enter a coalition government in which the Kuomintang should maintain its ascendance. Provided American influence and business interests were excluded from Manchuria, he would return the billion dollars of machinery removed by the Red Army in Manchuria and thus restore Manchuria as the workshop of the Far East. Specifically, he proposed that all Manchurian industries be monopolized by a joint Sino-Soviet authority.

Shortly before Stalin made this offer to Chiang's son, the economic adviser to the Russian commander in Manchuria formally submitted the same proposal. Chiang Kai-shek's representative in Manchuria was handed a list of 154 plants, comprising 80 percent of Manchuria's heavy industry, which Stalin suggested should be jointly operated by Russia and China. The list included airfields. The Sino-Soviet corporations to be set up were to operate for 30 years with a 50-50 share for Russia and China. China was warned that if Russia's proposal were rejected the Red Army would remain in Manchuria. On January 21, 1946, the offer was renewed in Chungking.

These offers were not published in the western world. When I was in Chungking and Shanghai, in this critical period, I tried to persuade the Chinese Foreign Minister, Wang Shieh-chieh, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek himself, that China's one hope lay in revealing the truth to the American public. I got nowhere. Wang Shieh-chieh said to me: "The Polish Government protested and look what happened to Poland. It is better to be patient and make sacrifices than to risk extinction by protesting. Since we ourselves cannot fight Russia, we must do what America wants, hoping that the United States will restrain Russia if we do everything which America wants us to do."

I must confess I had no answer to this argument. Perhaps China can be condemned for the inadequacy of her foreign policy. Perhaps she should have been realistic and not trusted us so implicitly. But how can we explain our betrayal of our own interests in the Far East?

Apparently Chiang Kia-shek was confident that America would support China if the Communists attacked in violation of the terms of the treaty. So, on March 5, 1946, he rejected Stalin's offer. His reward was General Marshall's embargo on arms aid to Nationalist China. Cornered, he again accepted Stalin's invitation to visit him in Moscow in late September 1946. But when Gen. Nikolai Rushchin, the Soviet military attaché, made it clear that no compromise with Russia was possible unless China agreed to exclude America from Manchuria, Chiang canceled the visit to Moscow.

Over 2 years later, General Rushchin, now Soviet Ambassador to China, admitted that Chiang Kai-shek's failure to visit Moscow in 1946 was due to the Generalissimo's loyalty to America, for he said that Chiang had decided not to visit Stalin because of "the return of General Marshall to China with his pockets stuffed with American checks."

This accusation was, of course, ridiculously untrue. Far from bribing Chiang to resist Soviet enticements, Marshall had clamped an embargo on American shipments of arms and ammunition to China in an effort to force Chiang to come to terms with the Communists. Chiang Kai-shek's loyalty to America ruined him and his Government. Because he refused to agree to the exclusion of American interests from Manchuria, this territory was converted into the base for Communist operations, first against China, then against us in the Korean war. Throughout this period of warfare against Nationalist China, the Communists received powerful assistance from some 65,000 Korean troops, under Li Hung-kwang, and trained by Russian officers, some of whom were veterans of Stalingrad. The fighting abilities of the North Koreans, who killed or wounded nearly 40,000 Americans in 1950, were due in large part to their experience in fighting our Chinese allies.

Substitute for Blood Plasma Discovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the wonderful discovery recently made at Marquette University. As a result of the experiments in the Marquette University Medical School, it now appears that it may be possible to substitute okra for blood plasma to replace blood losses in patients suffering from shock, burns, or bleeding.

If this use of okra proves successful in human beings as it has already proved successful in dogs, medicine will have made great strides for its simplifying the methods of assisting people who need external supplementary blood supplies.

I include herewith two articles, one which appeared in the January 28 edition of the Washington Evening Star, and another which appeared in the January 28 edition of the Milwaukee Journal:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 28, 1951]

SUBSTITUTE FOR BLOOD PLASMA MADE OF OKRA FOUND EFFECTIVE

MILWAUKEE, January 27.—A substitute for blood plasma made of okra, a green vegetable plant, was announced tonight by Marquette University.

Dr. John Hirschboeck, dean of the Marquette Medical School, said the discovery was made by Dr. Hiram B. Benjamin, anatomy instructor. The substitute of powdered okra, he added, has been used successfully in dogs and is being purified to meet the standards of the Federal Food and Drugs Act for trial on human patients.

Plasma, the liquid part of blood before clotting, is needed to replace blood losses in patients suffering from shock, burns, or bleeding. Whole human blood also is used.

Dr. Benjamin, experimenting with okra in the treatment of ulcers, made his discovery while working on a test dog. The animal was under anesthesia after a previous experiment in which it was bled. A huge injection of the okra product into the dog's blood stream revived the animal. Subsequent experiments with dogs confirmed the scientist's theory.

Okra is a green vegetable very common in the Southern States. It grows 2 to 8 feet in height and bears pods 4 to 6 inches in length.

According to Dr. Benjamin, the substitute for plasma was prepared by grinding the pods and then removing the waxes and fats with ether and alcohol.

Unlike human plasma, the okra substitute need not be refrigerated for storage.

Working with Dr. Benjamin in the development were Dr. Harry K. Ihrig, vice president in charge of research at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; Walter Zeit, director of Marquette's anatomy department; and Ronald Roth, a Marquette student.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 28, 1951]

BLOOD PLASMA SUBSTITUTE DEVELOPED AT MARQUETTE—PRODUCT IS MADE FROM OKRA BY SCIENTIST AT UNIVERSITY—TESTS INDICATE ADVANTAGES

A cheap and limitless source of lifesaving blood plasma has been discovered in a commongarden vegetable by a Marquette University Medical School research team.

The Marquette researchers found in okra—the gumbo in chicken gumbo soup—a substitute that is said to be better than the original.

Plasma is the fluid portion of the blood before clotting. Administered as a transfusion to victims of shock after injury, surgery, bomb blast, or other tissue damage, it is an invaluable aid to survival. Heretofore, its only source has been whole human blood.

SAME BENEFICIAL EFFECTS

In tests on animals, the okra substitute appears to have the same beneficial effects as plasma.

It does not carry a harmful virus as some plasma does.

It is stable, and can be stored for long periods without refrigeration.

It can be prepared as a powder for storage. Less than an ounce of the powder, mixed with sterile salt water, is the equivalent of a quart of plasma.

It can be produced with existing facilities in drug-processing plants and some food-processing factories.

DISCOVERED BY DR. BENJAMIN

The plasma substitute was discovered by Dr. Hiram B. Benjamin, a member of the anatomy department staff at the Marquette Medical School. He was helped by Dr. Harry K. Ihrig, formerly a physical chemist at the Globe Steel Tubes Co., and now vice president in charge of research at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. Dr. Donald Roth, Slinger, Wis., a chemist, who is a medical student, also assisted. The research was coordinated by Dr. Walter Zeit, head of the anatomy department.

The need for plasma or a substitute in the event of an atomic bomb attack has been haunting civil defense officials. American Medical Association and Red Cross experts have agreed that it would be all but impossible to stock pile enough human plasma.

Whole blood, plasma or a substitute is needed frequently to replace fluid lost from the blood stream. For this reason, a plasma substitute might be a lifesaver if kept in police squad cars. Officers trained in transfusion technique could use the substitute at an accident scene before an ambulance arrived.

HAS SEVERAL ADVANTAGES

The okra substitute seems to be just the thing that civil defense officials have been seeking. In Milwaukee alone, doctors have estimated that about 300,000 units of plasma would be needed urgently the first 24 hours after an atomic bomb was dropped on the city. Such amounts are not available; if they were, the cost would be too high to buy them.

Dr. Benjamin was doing research with okra for treating ulcers about 2 years ago when he first saw the possibilities of the vegetable as a plasma substitute.

He was making a standard research test to determine how much of a drug it takes to kill an animal—the minimum lethal dose, test. The test dog, "Annie Okra," had been bled for a previous experiment and was under anesthesia when Dr. Benjamin injected a dose of the okra product into the animal's blood stream.

Instead of dying, Annie began to come out of the anesthesia and recovered remarkably. It was then that the doctor conceived the idea that the okra substance might be an excellent plasma substitute.

USED AS SOUP THICKENER

Okra is a kind of hibiscus; its botanical name is "hibiscus esculentus." It grows to a height of 2 to 8 feet and bears pods 4 to 6 inches long. Powder made from the pods is used for thickening soups, and the seeds sometimes are roasted as a coffee substitute. Okra is the second largest crop of the south. It grows as far north as Wisconsin, where it is raised by home gardeners, but not commercially.

Dr. Benjamin made the plasma substitute by grinding up the pod and removing the waxes and fats with ether and alcohol. The remaining material was suspended in water, then purified. The plasma powder was made by precipitation or freezing.

REMOVED 72 PERCENT OF BLOOD

Okra "plasma" is a complex sugar—a polysaccharide. Unlike the Swedish plasma substitute, dextran, the molecules of the okra product are of uniform size. They are large enough so that they are not excreted from the body, but not so large that they damage body cells. The chief difficulty with dextran is the high cost, a result of tight patent control by a Swedish firm. Dextran, on which the Pabst Brewing Co. is doing research, is excreted by microorganisms ordinarily found in the sugar-refining process.

In Dr. Benjamin's work with dogs he removed as much as 72 percent of an animal's blood and brought about its recovery with the plasma substitute. In one experiment a dog stopped breathing for 5 minutes—as close to death as is generally thought possible—and was brought back. It would have died without the transfusion.

A dog's normal blood pressure is 150 to 160 millimeters of mercury. Dr. Benjamin reduced this to 27 millimeters by bleeding and kept it there for relatively long periods. The animal's heart was fluttering and it was close to death. Transfusion with the okra product saved the dog.

MARQUETTE MAY GET PATENT

Drs. Benjamin and Roth were helped in preparing the powder form of the substitute by Darwin Kaestner and Joseph N. Jacquse, chemists at Lakeside Laboratories, Inc., of Milwaukee.

Dr. Benjamin has applied for a patent on the "plasma." If it is granted, the patent will be turned over to Marquette, which will license manufacturers of the product and control its quality. Marquette would receive royalties, which would be used to finance research at the university.

Dr. Benjamin is a native of Austria. He was graduated from the University of Rochester (New York) and from Marquette Medical School in 1930. He practiced privately in Milwaukee and served in the Navy in World War II. After his release from service he entered Marquette graduate school and in 1949 received a master of science degree. Since then he has been a full-time member of the anatomy department staff.

Assistance for Domestic Mines Essential for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending seriousness of world conditions and also the lackadaisical attitude of our own bureaus relative to the national stockpile, the lack of strategic metals, and the lack of help given to our domestic mines, I have today sent the following letter to Mr. Harrison. It is my hope that every Member of the House of Representatives will read this message and support me on legislation which will recognize our western mines and our national defense:

JANUARY 31, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
Administrator,
Defense Production Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRISON: As a Member of Congress from a mining State I am fully aware of the problems and needs of small-mine operators and the basic requirements of any Government program that may be conducted for the purpose of obtaining maximum production from the mines and undeveloped mineral deposits of the United States.

Although the Defense Production Act of 1950 provides the President with broad powers to encourage and expand exploration, development, and the production of minerals and metals from domestic deposits, I am alarmed and discouraged to find that the defense-minerals program as it is now planned and functioning is not intended to be an all-out program to obtain the maximum production of strategic and critical minerals and metals from domestic sources.

I call your attention to the policies outlined by Dr. James Boyd, Administrator of the Defense Minerals Administration, in an address before the annual members' meeting of the American Mining Congress in New York City on December 5, 1950. These policies, in effect, exclude probably 95 percent or more of the active and potential small-mine operators from obtaining any materal assistance under the defense-minerals program.

One policy announced in the DMA press release of December 5, 1950, that automatically excludes small mines from consideration and participation under the production program conducted by the DMA, is as follows:

"The applicant for certification of a purchase contract * * * will be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Defense Minerals Administration that ore reserves * * * are available and adequate to fulfill the requested contract, and the applicant will be required to satisfy the Defense Minerals Administration that he can meet a firm delivery schedule."

Few small mines, especially those that are inactive, have sufficient developed ore reserves to obtain a negotiated contract of any consequence or duration and probably fewer still could satisfy the DMA on the matter of meeting a firm delivery schedule.

Those familiar with small mining enterprises know that such operations, in comparison to the larger enterprises, generally are conducted on a hand-to-mouth basis. Financial limitations, size of operations, and the physical characteristics of many small mine-ore bodies are handicaps that generally make it impractical if not impossible for most small mines to develop known ore reserves more than several months ahead of ore extraction. This, in turn, prevents small-mine operators from estimating their future mining costs, average grades of ore, rates of production, and potentialities with any degree of accuracy. It was found that most small mines operating under the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc during World War II, when presenting data in support of their requests for premium-price assignments invariably, and to their great disadvantage, underestimated future operating costs and overestimated anticipated grades of ore and rates of production.

You probably realize that the amount of currently known ore reserves at a particular property is not of itself any indication whatsoever of the potentialities of a mining property and its ability to produce under an appropriate incentive system.

Dr. Boyd also announced in the DMA press release of December 5, 1950, that—

"Projects to be approved by the Defense Minerals Administration must, in its judgment, show definite promise of yielding material * * * in amounts that will significantly improve the mineral supply position for national defense."

It is a foregone conclusion that this policy also would exclude all small-mining enterprises from the benefits of incentive assistance under the defense-minerals program. While the production of any one small-mining operation would be insignificant insofar as improving the mineral supply position of the United States, the total production obtainable from several hundred or several thousand small mines under an incentive system adapted to their needs would be considerable.

Based on the experience record of World War II and the known requirements of small-mining operations, it appears conclusive to me that in order to activate and obtain substantial amounts of minerals and metals from thousands of small mines and undeveloped mineral deposits in the United States it will be necessary to effectuate methods of assistance adaptable to the needs and abilities of small-mine enterprises, as follows:

1. For small copper, lead, and zinc mines, an incentive program similar to the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc as it was conducted and administered at the termination of the plan on June 30, 1947, but with necessary improvements.

2. For small mines producing minerals and metals other than copper, lead, and zinc, purchase programs patterned after those conducted by the Metals Reserve Company of the RFC during World War II, with their retarding and objectionable features removed.

3. Exploration assistance and liberal development loans as were provided during and following World War II. However, this type of assistance would prove of little value to most small mines without the programs proposed in items (1) and (2).

In view of the current minerals and metals shortages, the still greater shortages in prospect for the future, and the growing list of orders and regulations cutting back and controlling the use of minerals and metals,

I find it impossible to reconcile the fact that the Federal Government has not embarked upon an all-out and effective program to obtain the maximum production of minerals and metals from the mineral deposits of the United States, both large and small. What is being done is too little and it is fast becoming too late.

In order to improve the mineral supply position of the United States to a much greater extent than is otherwise possible and as a matter of equity, I strongly urge that present policies and methods of administering incentive assistance to the minerals industry by the Defense Minerals Administration be changed from those designed to favor and assist only the larger and more substantial enterprises to policies and methods which encourage and readily enable full participation by small mining enterprises.

In my opinion either the passage of H. R. 976 or S. 240, Eighty-first Congress, as an amendment to the Defense Production Act, or drafting its text in the form of an Executive order to be issued under the broad authority of that act, would promptly cure most of the ills which beset mineral production at this time. Had this been done last September, the present mess the Defense Minerals Administration has gotten us into would have been avoided.

Many Members of Congress are becoming highly incensed at the situation. Should there be no intention of correcting the conditions which I have brought to your attention, I would appreciate receiving a full explanation for the reasons involved. In the event that material changes are to be made in the defense-minerals program, I would like to be fully informed of the same.

Yours very truly,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman From Nevada.

Ambassador Robert Butler Resigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised of the resignation as Ambassador to Cuba from the United States of the Honorable Robert Butler. His resignation is a great loss to our foreign service and Cuba has lost a real, understanding friend. In spite of his resignation I hope the future will find Mr. Butler soon again in the service of our country, especially during the present crisis. Before and during the war this great American has contributed much to our Nation's cause. In peace he has been one of our outstanding industrialists. Those of us who have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Butler extend to him much happiness in whatever future pursuits he may follow. Our Cuban neighbors have learned to love, respect, and admire Mr. Butler during his service as our representative in that country. This admiration is reflected in the following three editorials which I insert as part of my remarks:

[From the Diario de la Marina, Habana, Cuba, of January 31, 1951]

[Translation]

DEPARTURE OF AMBASSADOR BUTLER

The news of the day is the resignation of Mr. Butler who, for personal reasons, has given up his high position as Ambassador of the United States of America to Cuba. Being a distinguished engineer and industrialist and leader in naval construction, it is natural that he would feel it necessary to give his services to his countrymen along those same lines which, in the past have included the very important Farragut Naval Training Station, the second largest in the United States, which Mr. Butler constructed for his country shortly after Pearl Harbor. He also built the great chemical arsenal in the State of Alabama.

Now, faced with further totalitarian aggression, equally as traitorous and with the same sinister dangers of a third world war, it is natural that this diplomat should want to give his best services to his country which also, in a sense, means serving the community of free nations which are now mobilizing their intelligence, will, and resources for the international defense of liberty and for the rights of man.

Yet, for Cuba, the absence of an Ambassador of such high personal and cultural qualifications as those possessed by Mr. Butler, will be sad. He has gained the friendship, the confidence, and the esteem of all real Cubans. When loyalty and a spirit of cooperation and reciprocal service is used in the cultivation of good relations between countries, there is also gained a harvest of understanding and sincere friendship. That is what occurred when Mr. Butler took his first diplomatic post in Australia. In Canberra they called him "an Ambassador to and from," referring to his fine work so that the people of the United States should know the people of Australia better. He has done the same thing with exceptional success in Cuba. This was rightfully recognized by Dr. Carlos Prio Socarras when he said at the University of Villanova that of the Ambassadors to Cuba none has been as good as Ambassador Butler.

The President expressed regret over the departure of the Ambassador of the United States to Cuba, calling him also the Cuban Ambassador to the United States. He reiterated the same sentiments of the Ambassador's good will which inspired his reputation in Australia.

Some of the fruits of the Ambassador's diligent work have been in the sale in 1949 of the surplus sugar which was sold in London and paid for with American dollars. He was able to accomplish this with the cooperation of our representatives. President Prio also called attention to the incident when the statue of Marti was profaned, and the action taken by Mr. Butler in the name of his country when he offered profound expressions of regret to the apostle. He did this without waiting for instructions from his chancery.

In cultural and economic fields we have found Ambassador Butler always cooperating and offering efficient suggestions drawn from his technical abilities to Cuban engineers with the hope that his suggestions could be used for the development of constructive plans for the country in an effort to stabilize and expand its economy on permanent foundations. Mr. Butler also showed his good intentions toward Cuba, leaving his permanent seal at the University of St. Thomas of Villanova, which college recently honored him with an honorary degree. He was also honored by them with homage at a dinner.

These private universities, the wings of the future of Cuba, along with the official universities, have in the rapid and great development of St. Thomas of Villanova University a very high example. That is why, Ambassador Butler, looking toward the cultural improvement with the idea of establishing firm and realistic foundations, has made the important suggestion that chemical industrial engineering be made part of the curriculum of the university because of the high importance these professions would have on the expansion and diversification of the country's economy. This advice is timely and sound. It might also include mining engineering.

A man of enterprise is aware of the fact that greater employment and permanent prosperity for a more generous material life are to be found through technical progress and research in the development of national resources, together with the spiritual and moral uplifting of the community and contributing to more employment and permanent prosperity.

The above are a few phases and a few facts which illustrate the personality of Mr. Robert Butler. Both place him among the good and sincere friends of Cuba. And the Cubans will look upon his departure with the same reciprocal feeling of friendship.

[From Informacion, Habana, Cuba, January 31, 1951]

[Translation]

OUR ADIEU TO MR. BUTLER—HE IS A GOOD FRIEND OF CUBA—HE FULLY UNDERSTOOD OUR PROBLEMS

The Ambassador of the United States in Cuba, Mr. Robert Butler, for personal reasons, as is announced by the White House, has resigned his diplomatic post to return to private life. His letter of resignation addressed to President Truman, as well as the latter's reply accepting it, which we published in yesterday's edition, are not only two examples of human documents but in the text of both letters it is stated once again and the mutual understanding that exists between Cuba and the United States is recognized. Mr. Butler, up to the last moment, has served further to strengthen this solid and constructive friendship between both countries.

What may be considered as Ambassador Butler's last official appearance was his attendance at the banquet of the father who directs Villanova University, which was tendered to the President of the Republic, Dr. Prio Socarras, for having sponsored and promulgated the law authorizing private universities, the bill which led to the law having been drafted by Dr. Angel Fernandez Varela. In addressing this gathering the chief of state, with his customary generosity and serene spirit of justice, made a brief summary of Mr. Butler's activities in Cuba, emphasizing that, in his opinion, he has been the best representative of the United States here, in spite of the fact that there have been other ambassadors who have done a wonderful task for the benefit of both countries. After referring to different matters in which the participation of Mr. Butler was final and served the just aspiration of Cuba in her relation with the United States, he spoke the following words which are the greatest homage that can be rendered an American diplomat:

"That is why it is to be regretted that the Ambassador of the United States in Cuba, and what is more, the Ambassador of Cuba to the United States, is leaving us. I am at least consoled by the fact that Ambassador Butler is surely going to render greater services in his country and whatever he does or wherever he lives, Cuba can count on a good friend. And that is why I do not bid adieu to a friend, but to a brother."

The activities of Mr. Butler here have evidently been very advantageous for Cuba, since he was smart enough rapidly to become acquainted with our character and immediately realized what the basic needs of our country, in its relations with the country that he represented, were. His action and his words on different occasions have been the subject of our editorial comment. That is why we believe that the words spoken by the chief executive in publicly bidding adieu to Mr. Butler are the result of something that is true and are due to a full recognition of Mr. Butler's activities in Cuba, of his desire to bring our country as close as possible to his own and to obviate the difficulties that might exist in an economic order so that when financial transactions were entered into, especially in connection with sugar, they would not be detrimental to the future of our main national industry.

With a foot already in the stirrups, Ambassador Butler called on President Prio. In his statements following his conference, which we also published in yesterday's edition, the American diplomat once again proved that he was a good friend of Cuba and that he was fully aware of its internal situation as regards its possibilities in case of war. Referring to the United States, he said that his county was "perfectly aware of the fact that, in the event of war, the United Nations should be faced with the extreme emergency of a war. Cuba is not in a position of furnishing large military forces and maintain order within its own frontiers to control the subversive elements that might exist within the country. It's cooperation with the United States should primarily be in the economic field.

Those words reflect the true internal situation of Cuba in the event of a war, and it is very proper that the same were spoken by such an impartial criterion as that of the representative of the United States. That is why Ambassador Butler, who knows our problem so well, is departing from Cuba and leaving behind him a trail of sympathy and affection and a memory which time will not be able to obliterate.

[From the Habana (Cuba) Post of January 31, 1951]

A GOOD FRIEND LEAVES

When Ambassador Butler leaves Cuba about a fortnight hence, after having resigned from the diplomatic service, Cuba will miss a good friend.

Practically from the moment of his arrival Mr. Butler began his efforts to aid Cuba's industrial development. Many people, particularly members of the press, will recall his showing of a color film taken in Australia which depicted what that country from "down under" had done to develop its agriculture and industry. Mr. Butler's words seem still fresh, "That can be done here too."

From that moment the departing Ambassador, who has had ample experience and success in the industrial field, has been constantly striving to aid Cuba in its economic development. His interest in furthering production of kenaf is outstanding. An album of mills for the industrialization of kenaf brought the query, "Do you think that would be successful here?" "Why not?" was his rapid answer, demonstrative of a deep conviction that Cuba can produce and industrialize the fiber necessary for making the bags for its sugar crop as well as for other articles.

It is not only in the industrial field that Mr. Butler has endeavored to help Cuba. He has, since he came here striven unceasingly to make Cuban-American relations still better. He has had some difficult problems to solve, and solved them superbly.

Officials, businessmen, and the Cuban people regret the Ambassador's departure. How he has endeared himself to officials is exemplified in President Prio's remarks at a dinner tendered the Ambassador Monday night by the priests and officials of Villanova University, whose establishment he aided. The President called him, "my brother" and went on to relate how, at a time when Cuba felt gloom under a surplus of sugar on hand, Mr. Butler was instrumental in getting credits for soft currency countries to purchase Cuba's surplus. This was of great benefit not only to producers of sugar, but to the Cuban people at large whose dependence on sugar is practically absolute.

The social world will also miss the Ambassador, who with his charming and talented wife and their simpatica daughter made many sincere friends.

We feel that though Mr. Butler will leave, he will always think of Cuba and that at every opportunity will endeavor to be of service to this Nation.

In thus taking an interest in Cuba's welfare and lending aid wherever possible, Mr. Butler has proven an able diplomat and served his country well. For he has further intensified that traditional friendliness of the two peoples which some elements under influences inimical to democracy would destroy.

We wish Mr. Butler, and feel convinced that it is also the wish of all Cubans, that he may attain the same large measure of success in any new enterprise as he has in diplomacy.

Waste and Inefficiency in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER:

Waste and inefficiency are still the watchwords and battle cry of the Truman Fair Deal.

At a time when the people of America face the greatest burden ever imposed upon a tax-paying public, we find the bureaucrats seeking to embark on another boondoggling expedition which will nullify every sacrifice made by the people during this New Deal-Fair Deal created emergency.

The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress balanced the Federal budget for the first time in approximately 20 years and reduced Federal taxes to permit the flow of risk capital. The Republican Eightieth Congress realized the necessity for a strong military defense and provided funds for a 70-group Air Force; it recognized the need for adequate housing facilities and sought to ease the critical housing shortage. Each of these accomplishments has been scuttled by President Truman and his army of double-talking, power-mad bureaucrats.

This is the same type of bureaucracy that killed little pigs, plowed under row after row of cotton, thus creating a scarcity through which public money could be paid in subsidies for the patent purpose of buying votes.

Today, in the midst of what President Truman chooses to term a "great emergency," it is still politics and waste with his administration. Never was there a more crying need for housing facilities in view of our industrial and military expansion created by this present crisis.

In the face of this need comes the latest instance of the Truman gang's waste and inefficiency. It is a recommendation of William Henry Harrison, National Production Authority Administrator, that the property of the Lustron Corp. of Columbus, Ohio, be turned over to the Navy Department to be used as an assembling plant for the North American Aviation Co.

The North American Aviation Co. is now beginning occupation of the buildings adjacent to Lustron for construction of airplanes. I am advised further that North American Aviation Co. does not even hope to be in production for a period of 16 to 18 months. As a matter of fact, I am told the company cannot be tooled and ready to start operation in less than 12 months.

At a time when housing is one of the most critical problems facing our country and while mothers are writing to me about their sons who are in training in the Air Force at Larkland Air Base, Tex., and other fields, and who are sleeping in tents in near zero weather, Mr. Harrison's proposal constitutes inexcusable and wanton waste of public money.

The North American Co. requires only 200,000 square feet of space for additional production purposes, yet Mr. Harrison would revert to WPA days and plow under approximately 900,000 square feet of floor space and destroy millions of dollars worth of valuable machinery which could be utilized in turning out 100 prefabricated houses every 24 hours.

Defense agencies today are spending $30 per square foot for houses outside the confines of the United States. The Lustron Corp. proposes to construct similar houses, which require no upkeep, for $25 per square foot, a saving of $14 per square foot to the American taxpayer.

It is almost impossible to imagine the stupidity of a proposal to waste this floor space when it cannot possibly be put in use for approximately 18 months.

I wonder how many similar projects are in the making. If that is a pattern the multibillion dollar budget request of the administration will be only a small ante in our international poker game.

There is another crying need in this Nation, in addition to housing and military preparedness. That is the need for competent leadership. And when and if that leadership is obtained, we must remove the shackles that are placed on it by underlings whose patriotism is exemplified only in a revival of the "tax, spend, and elect" theme.

United States Government Asked To Buy Almonds Crowded by Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Enterprise Record of January 24, 1951:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ASKED TO BUY ALMONDS CROWDED BY IMPORTS

SACRAMENTO.—Faced with continued heavy imports of Mediterranean almonds, the California Almond Growers Exchange has petitioned the United States Department of Agriculture for assistance to the California almond industry under section 32 of the AAA.

D. R. Bailey, general manager of the grower-owned exchange organization, personally filed the application in Washington Tuesday. It calls for a diversion purchase of almonds displaced from normal trade channels by excessive importations. Bailey pointed out that imports during the past 60 days have been greater than in any like period during the past 25 years.

Earlier in the season, in its recommendation to the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the marketing of the 1950 crop, the Almond Control Board had expressed the opinion that the State's entire production could be marketed successfully provided imports were held at or below a season total of 5,000,000 shelled pounds.

Imports have already exceeded 7,240,000 pounds of shelled almonds, and have been entering the United States at the rate of approximately 500,000 pounds per week during the last 2 months. Unless the rate of importation during the first 4 months of the 1950–51 crop year is curtailed, the season's

imports will reach a total of 18,000,000 to 20,000,000 pounds of shelled almonds.

Imports for the week ending January 18 totaled 497,444 shelled pounds, with approximately 485,000 pounds of this total originating in Spain. Until last week imports from Spain have not been a factor in the domestic market during the past two seasons, and exchange officials here attributed the significant increase to the removal of the countervailing duty on Spanish almonds on November 16.

Subsidies paid by the Spanish Government to almond exporters had led to the imposition of the countervailing duty in November 1948.

In addition to the present application for the diversion purchase of almonds, the growers also have before the Tariff Commission a petition for import quotas. An interim report published by the Commission on November 24, 1950, stated that the effects of imports on the domestic market were under continuing investigation.

Can We Stop Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following toastmaster talk by Dr. C. O. Watkins, reprinted from the Sidney (Mont.) Herald:

CAN WE STOP COMMUNISM?

(Toastmaster talk by Dr. C. O. Watkins)

You have heard many times that communism is a people's movement. Our society is made up of a great number of people's movements.

If we are to understand communism, we must know more about the basic nature of the people's movements. The term, "people's movement," in itself means little.

All people's movements can be divided into two types—free movements and ideological movements. Each type has some particular purpose it hopes to accomplish. They differ only in the basic method used to accomplish that purpose.

Communism is an ideological movement, and if we are to stop it, we must learn more about the basic nature of such movements. What are some ideological people's movements?

There is socialism, there is Christianity and other spiritual movements, there is the Townsend movement of a little different nature, to mention only a few.

What are some free people's movements? Our labor unions, our service clubs; in fact, any movement which does not have a firm ideological basis.

All ideological movements have one thing in common: They are all constructed around ideas. In the frailer movements these are ideas thrown together rather loosely, but the stronger ones have a firm, well-defined, ideological core, usually in the form of a philosophical teaching or doctrine. One of the basic weaknesses of an ideological movement is that its ideas by which a purpose is to be accomplished are regarded as more important than actual accomplishment of the purpose.

Free social movements are built around a given purpose, but there is no sacred way or fixed ideological formula that must be used to accomplish that purpose.

The strength with which we have built our great society is found in this fact. But also, it is the same facts which make us weak in warding off the threat of the Communist scourge today. We lack the unity of a society built around a firm ideological core.

To understand communism, it is best to pick out another ideological movement with which to compare it. Then, you must start forgetting much you know about your way of life.

We can use the Christian movement for comparison, if you will keep three important differences in mind:

1. Christianity is a spiritual movement while communism is a social one, thus in a temporal realm.

2. The missionary methods of Christianity were based upon casual experience or what we call the empiric method. The missionary methods used by communism to condition Marxist minds are scientific and perhaps were developed in the laboratories of the Pavlovian institutions of Russia.

3. You must keep in mind that the ultimate effect of the Christian movement is good. The ultimate effect of the Communist movement, if it succeeds in capturing the world, will be tragic and carry our society back to the level of the Middle Ages, perhaps in but one century.

That statement can be well supported by logic and historical fact, but to do so would take time. For now, I ask you to accept it. If you will keep these three points in mind we can use the Christian movement for our comparison, so that we might understand communism better.

Now start forgetting. Forget national boundaries if you want to understand communism. The only boundary communism knows is between the minds of the Marxist and the non-Marxist.

Christianity knows no national boundaries; it knows only the boundaries between the Christian and non-Christian. Forget national, State, and local governments as you know them. In communism, they govern nothing because the teachings of Marx is the governmental authority. The national, State, and local governments are only police forces. Their function is only to enforce the Marxist doctrine.

The Christian church has the same type of government. There the teachings of Christ are the actual authority. The function of church government on all levels is but to preserve and carry out the teachings of Christ.

If you would understand communism, forget the importance of democracy. The system by which the government is formed under a Communist society is unimportant. The government governs nothing, anyway. They perhaps are, or at least could be, democratic and it would change matters but slightly. Most church governments are democratically selected, but it is unimportant. In communism, as in the church, only those are elected to office who are ardent supporters of the central doctrine because it is their responsibility to preserve and carry out its teachings.

I could go on drawing parallels, but what you want to know is: Can we stop communism, and if so, how?

To answer that question, let me ask you some questions. Could we stop Christianity if we wanted to? How would you go about stopping Christianity? Could you stop it by armed force? Could you stop it by diplomacy? Could you stop it by a treaty? Could you expect your civil government to stop it? Could you stop Christianity by any of the methods now being used to stop communism? Doesn't history tell us that Christianity has already withstood all of these?

Yet we know that Christianity was stopped. Like a fire, it spread half way around the earth and then came to a sudden halt when it reached the Moslem and Hindu people's movements. It was stopped by these other strong people's movements. In 2,000 years, there has been but little Christian penetration of the Moslem or Hindu lands.

Christianity filled a great spiritual vacuum that existed throughout half the world. Today Marxism is filling an ideological social vacuum because we do not give the formula of our way of life ideological expression. Despite the great need of military might today to defend ourselves from military aggression, no amount of military power will fill that vacuum.

Here I make my first point: The only way to stop the Communist people's movement is by building another people's movement in the area of social government. In short, we must build a people's movement to protect our way of life.

If we are to build a people's movement, what kind of an ideological core will we build it around? For the past 800 years, we have had uninterrupted social progress. There must be some basic reason for our great progress in the foundations of our social structure. Some ideas that exist as a foundation to our way of life which we are today unaware of must be the answer. What has been the secret formula of our 800 years of uninterrupted social progress?

So far as I know, our basic formula does not even have a name. But it has been our method for the past eight centuries to find the solution to every social problem through free investigation and experimentation, to repeat the process again and again, to find yet better solutions, and all without regard for any preconceived ideological social doctrine. Using this formula, we have learned to solve social problems better than any other people in history, and until today, hardly any among our people suffers indignities or inhumanities. That formula is supported by logic and 800 years of history. That formula is the sleeping giant which is the ideological foundation of our way of life.

My second point is this: Today, we must raise that formula to the level of a primary principle and build a people's movement around it. If we do not do this, it will be replaced by Marxism.

If my construction is right, and I believe it is, we have determined certain things:

1. If communism is to be stopped, we must build a people's movement.

2. If we are to build a people's movement to stop communism, we must build it around those basic ideas which are the foundations of our way of life.

3. If we are to build a people's movement to stop communism around these sleeping giants, we must do it soon.

Comparison of Draft Age and Length of Military Service in Atlantic Pact Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the thinking people of America are deeply concerned about the future of our Nation. The women of America are aroused as never before. The people, and the women of America in particular, are justified in their concern, and may I say their resentment, of the mistaken policies of the party in power that has brought us into the most dangerous position our country has faced in its history.

Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter from a woman in my district, typical of many letters I have been receiving, which, in an able and intelligent manner, expresses, in my judgment, the voice and thinking of millions of American women. The Members of Congress must find the right answers to as many of these questions as possible in the interest of our Nation.

The letter follows:

Hon. Congressman CHARLES VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VURSELL: Several months before and on November 7, every woman in this community and district left their household duties and helped elect our present Senators and Congressman, because we knew we were putting into office men who would stand up and debate for what issue might come up for the betterment of this district, State, and Nation.

These same women, who have read, done research work, and pondered over our present crisis, are now asking our Congressman and Senators to stand up and fight for an issue which is not only a serious matter for today but for our future generations, and that is, Why is the United States furnishing two-thirds of the manpower in the fight in Korea? Why should we furnish men for the whole UN? Why should the cream of our Nation leave school to make an Army so great that it curtails the future generation, who will be our future leaders?

The following compares the proposed Defense Department with those of the Atlantic Pact nations:

Nation	Draft age	Service
		Months
United States	18	27
France	20-21	18
Italy	20-21	12
Denmark	20	12-18
Norway	12	9-12
Belgium	20	12
Netherlands	21	12
Portugal	21	12
England	18	24
Luxemburg, Iceland, and Canada (volunteer system).		

Are we following the footsteps of England or are we still the land of the free? If we take these boys at the age of 18 years out of their scholastics how many will return and finish their education—the percentage will be very, very few.

Already more boys have been killed in Korea, for time duration, than in any other war. Are we going to make fodder out of our youths? World War I—4,744,000 participated—131,000 deaths. World War II—16,535,000 participated—409,000 deaths. Compare this with today's deaths. Stop, ponder, and think over this not for a few minutes, but by the hours.

We, as Americans, have always been proud because we believed in the education of our youths; yes, in some cases more than their financial status could stand without sacrifices elsewhere, so that our children could be able to pick their vocation in life, whether it was a teacher, preacher, lawyer, scientist, druggist, dentist, or doctor—he was free to pick his choice. Are we blindly going to stumble into the standards of Europe where they know nothing but turmoil and wars?

They have no choice as to who is elected as the President nor any other leader of our Government. Should they be forced to give up their future plans of life, selecting their future vocation, when they are not considered old enough nor intellectual enough to give their vote as to who the leaders of our Government will be until they are 21 years old?

The people proved to you on November 7, 1950, that a change was needed; let's not let these people down, nor our forefathers, who gave us the land of the free, home of the brave; so let's fight for what we know to be right. * * *

Is Anna B. Rosenberg, an Austrian-born woman, going to tell you and the rest of the United States how to run our Government without a fight? No; I know you better than that.

Please weigh every measure pro and con, hour after hour, before you give your final answer. You know what we and the whole of the American people want. Don't be influenced by anything but your good, sound judgment. What does the future hold if this is not accomplished?

Yours very truly.

Reduce Expenditures Before Increasing Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, before levying heavier taxes, or even before we look for new sources from which to get the additional billions we need to balance the budget, we should give serious consideration to reducing nonessential Federal expenditures. Both the Hoover Commission and Senator BYRD have pointed out where $7,000,000,000 of Federal spending can be lopped off from nonessential Federal expenditures. Senator BYRD in his recent letter to the President offered his complete cooperation in any move to reduce the expenditures of the Government; and in that letter he spelled out in minute detail just where and how the reductions could be made without in any way hampering or hindering the national defense.

Should we not insist that these reductions in the nonessential items of the budget be made before we consider adding additional taxes upon our already overtaxed people? A reduction of $7,000,000,000 in Federal spending would go a long way to make our task of trying to balance the budget less difficult, and at the same time it would be much easier upon the overburdened American taxpayer. We should give the proposed $7,000,000,000 reduction in Federal spending priority over any new or additional taxes in our effort to obtain a balanced budget.

THEN AND NOW

In 1940 we had 4,000,000 individuals paying personal income taxes; today we have 52,000,000 people making personal income tax returns to the Government. In 1940 a married couple with no children had a tax-exemption allowance of $2,500; today the exemption allowance is $1,200. In 1940 the tax rate in the lowest tax bracket was 4 percent; today the tax rate in the lowest bracket is 20 percent. In 1940 the top corporation tax rate was 19 percent; today it is 47 percent, with an excess-profits tax added on top of that. In 1940 Uncle Sam collected a total of $4,000,000,000 in income, corporation, and excise taxes from the American taxpayers; today Uncle Sam collects a total of $55,000,000,000 from these same three tax sources.

Ten years of New Deal bungling in both domestic and foreign affairs has made these changes in our tax burdens.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks on the need for reducing Federal expenditures, I include the following statement from Senator BYRD on the same subject:

HOW TO SAVE $7,000,000,000

(By Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia)

When the President said that nondefense expenditures would be cut "to the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort," I pledged my full support. He told news correspondents that he welcomes my support but had not examined my data because he did not believe I knew much about the budget. I may not know much about his budget, but as Governor of a State which lived within its income, and as a United States Senator for 18 years and active in the exposure of unessential Federal activities, my acquaintance with governmental economy is much longer and more intimate than the President's. He will need all the help he can get to keep us from financial chaos.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder forecasts for the coming fiscal year expenditures of some $75,000,000,000. Including new taxation already enacted, Federal revenue may reach more than $51,000,000,000, and, assuming conditions short of total war, we shall have an annual deficit of nearly $25,000,000,000. It is appalling to contemplate continued $25,000,000,000-a-year deficits. They must be wiped out or greatly reduced by more tax increases and by deep cuts in expenditures nonessential to defense.

Few rivers and harbors, public roads, and reclamation projects are essential to the defense effort. The Post Office Department, which has an annual deficit of more than half a billion, should be self-supporting, as it was during World War II. About 25 percent of the domestic-civilian budget is for State aid: public assistance, housing, education, agriculture, civil airports, business promotion. At this critical period, the extent to which these items help the defense effort must be the controlling factor. Most of them are tied to long-term statutory commitments, and Congress and the President should agree to legislation which repeals, amends, or suspends those commitments. Some domestic-civilian programs must have more money for activities which tie in with defense. These include control and allocation agencies, labor training, revenue collection, and the like. In data I submitted to the President, these increases added up to some $625,000,000, and no reasonable person would deny their necessity. But their inclusion must not swell the total of nondefense items. Instead, that total should be—and can be—cut by at least $3,600,000,000.

In my long study of Federal fiscal affairs, I found that excessive civilian employment was the key to extravagance and inefficiency. Today's worst offender is the Department of Defense, where there is one civilian employee for every two men in uniform. At the peak of World War II, the ratio was one civilian for every five uniformed persons. Should the Military Establishment cut its estimate of 1,250,000 civilian employees by 150,000, the saving would be a half billion dollars.

Neither at home nor abroad are give-away programs defense essentials. Foreign economic aid, which this year is $3,000,000,000, is due to expire a year hence and already has

been withdrawn from Britain. Meanwhile, the billions since appropriated for military aid overlap ECA programs at many points. In the new budget, ECA should not exceed commitments already made, and this would mean a reduction of $3,500,000,000.

The savings I have outlined total $7,000,000,000. They can be made if an enlightened public opinion makes itself heard. Officials who impose austerity upon the American people must also practice it. If business as usual is out, the same must hold for spending as usual. If readers will express their convictions on this possible saving of $7,000,000,000 of taxpayers' money, they will be giving helpful guidance to their Representatives in Congress.

RESUMÉ OF SENATOR BYRD'S DATA FOR REDUCTIONS IN DOMESTIC-CIVILIAN BUDGET ITEMS

Figures in table below are exclusive of all military and related items such as atomic energy, merchant marine, stockpile, Coast Guard, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Also exclusive of ECA, veterans' costs, and public debt interest.

Domestic-civilian expenditures by major functions (compared with war, postwar, and new emergency fiscal years)

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories	War peak, 1946	Postwar period, 1948	New emergency— 1950	New emergency— 1951	Suggested budget, 1952
1. Welfare, health, security	1.0	1.9	2.2	2.3	1.3
2. Housing and community facilities	—.2	.1	.5	.5	.....
3. Education and general research	1.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
4. Agriculture, including CCC	.8	.6	2.6	1.5	.8
5. Natural resources	.2	.6	1.2	1.2	.4
6. Transportation and communication	.4	1.0	1.5	1.5	.4
7. Finance, commerce, industry	.1	.1	.1	.3	.4
8. Labor	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
9. General Government	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.3
Total	3.6	6.1	9.4	8.5	4.9

In fiscal year 1946 we were descending from peak military requirements. In the coming fiscal year we shall be ascending in military requirements. The total of suggested reductions for domestic-civilian program expenditures for the coming fiscal year would be approximately 35 percent higher than in fiscal year 1946.

GENERAL COMMENT BY ITEMS

1. Most welfare reductions would be in public assistance and construction grants to the States. Contributory social-security system would be unaffected. The total of this item, after all reductions, is nearly one-third higher than at the end of war.

2. Calls for elimination of all but essential defense housing which would be financed from returns from housing loans of previous years.

3. Includes increase for scientific research directed to the defense effort.

4. Reductions principally in Commodity Credit Corporation's price supports. If food subsidies are imposed, as in World War II, price-support receipts should meet the cost as they did then.

5. Major reductions are in nonessential-to-defense public work by Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation. Remaining total is twice figure of World War II.

6. Decreases would be in nonmilitary highway and airport construction. Also elimination of postal deficit. Increases provide for navigation aids and regulation of transportation and communications necessary to defense effort.

7. Reduced sums for ordinary activities, but increases provided for export and domestic controls along with those covered in "General Government" item.

8. Figures cover 1946 level of activity with increase for labor training.

9. Provision is made for increased immigration control costs. Also for civilian control incident to current conditions and for increased Federal retirement costs.

Using All Man (and Woman) Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER B. McMULLEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Petersburg Times of January 30, 1951:

USING ALL MAN (AND WOMAN) POWER

Defense Secretary George Marshall caused considerable commotion when he told the House Armed Forces Committee that there weren't going to be any more 4-F professional athletes. His manpower assistant, Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, hastily assured the alarmed moguls of pro baseball, football, etc., that "there aren't going to be any special rules about athletes."

That's probably as it should be, but General Marshall's statement made a lot of sense to most people. It's perfectly obvious that any man in good enough physical condition to make a living as a professional athlete could do something useful in the armed services, or in some civilian defense job.

This is no reflection on the professionals who were IV-F's in the last war, or are so classified now. Most of them didn't ask for it. But it is a reflection on the classification rules.

At present out of every 100 men in uniform in any of our services, only 23 are actually in combat units. The other 77 are in various service, supply, communication, transport, and administrative jobs.

In contrast, the Russians are able to put 80 out of every 100 men in their armed services into combat.

Secretary Marshall is aware of this huge discrepancy, but he says there is little we can do about it and still have our fighting troops the best armed, best fed, best supplied, and best transported in the world. And this, of course, is our great strength.

However, at a time when we are on the verge of drafting 18-year-olds and obviously are going to be severely strained for manpower both in uniform and in industry, it seems appropriate again to raise the issue of filling as many as possible of those 77 out of 100 noncombat jobs with persons who can't fight, so as to free the physically fit for combat duty.

There is a natural reluctance on the part of professional military men to include in their regular personnel anyone with physical handicaps or limitations. They like to feel that a supply sergeant, yeoman, clerk, or storekeeper can, if necessary, be shoved into a shooting job.

Since our particular type of warfare, however, has become complex, and so much of our uniformed personnel necessarily is at all times engaged in noncombat work, new concepts have to be accepted.

Gen. Lewis Hershey, Director of Selective Service, insisted all through World War II that the Armed Forces standards were far too rigid and that many, if not most, IV-F's could be used in some capacity. He's still saying the same, even louder, and we think it is time he was heeded.

If the strait-jacketed military mind can't get the idea, this is a perfectly justifiable spot for Congress to step in. Maybe it doesn't need to legislate. In this instance it might be sufficient just to investigate.

It is certain that the public would take much more kindly to the 18-year-old draft—which we believe is imperative—if the people were certain that the only IV-F's deferred were those who literally were completely useless to the armed forces.

To a lesser extent that goes for using as many women as possible in uniform. And here legislative action by Congress is needed, since at present the number of women permitted in the Armed Forces is limited by law.

Despite the fact that women themselves repeatedly have indicated by public opinion polls that they are willing to be drafted, our chivalrous males—at least in Congress—probably aren't up to that yet.

To the extent that they are willing to volunteer, however, women ought to be allowed in the WAVES, WAC's, SPARS, and Marines to the full extent of their usefulness. Here again the "old pro" military need a lot of prodding. Although the ice was broken in World War II, there are still a lot of jobs the girls can fill which cause the old pros to shudder to admit.

For instance, early in 1944 the Navy experimentally assigned five WAVES to the Naval Air Combat Intelligence School. Considered among the toughest of all Navy schools, there was little expectation that the WAVES could make the grade.

As it happened, however, four of the five finished in the top quarter of the class and the leader, an understanding miss, eased up in the last couple of weeks to permit a member of the stronger sex to nose her out for the coveted No. 1 spot.

There never was another WAVE assigned to this school, despite the fact that at least a third of the work of ACI's could have been done by women.

Tough as things are and will be for a long time to come, the Nation simply cannot afford the extravagance of unrealistic chivalry, needlessly high physical or mental standards, or rigid and outdated military concepts which waste our man and woman power.

We're up against the most enormous military manpower pool in the history of the world. The only way we can hope to hold our own against it is by the fullest utilization of the skills and abilities of every man and woman in the Nation.

United States Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "United States Budget," which appeared in the Ashland Times-Gazette, Ashland, Ohio. I suggest the reading of this article:

UNITED STATES BUDGET

Most people will agree that there is nothing we can do but go along with the Truman budget from the standpoint of strengthening our military defenses.

But there is no reason why Congress cannot make some rather drastic cuts in all sections of the budget dealing with nondefense items.

No legitimate arguments can be presented for any major reductions in budget items dealing with defense expenditures during the emergency.

Do you recall that President Truman, in his state of the Union message, stated that nonmilitary expenses should be reduced?

That statement doesn't jibe with the increased requests for funds for nondefense items in the budget.

The American people will be grateful to Congress if steps are taken to slash these exaggerated requests. It is possible, we believe, to chop several billion dollars from budget items such as housing loans and subsidies, public works, farm subsidies, welfare and public assistance, and the Veterans' Administration.

It appears that the President is making an effort to push some of the Fair Deal proposals through under the guise of the all-out defense program.

It is up to Congress to see that some of these uncalled for expenditures are eliminated.

We should operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. If we can save several billion by reducing nonessential expenditures, it may mean that the new tax bill can be held considerably under that $16,000,000,000 figure estimated by the President. Isn't it worth some effort?

Sticking It Out Is Matter of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, most arguments of any importance have at least two sides. This, of course, applies to political matters especially, and all the more so to those involving international relations.

Recently we have heard a great deal about the desired necessity of pulling out of Korea. One of the outstanding papers in my district recently carried an editorial entitled "Sticking It Out Is Matter of Principle" in which the other side of this question is well set forth. Believing that we should have all of the thinking on this matter in particular, I am inserting with my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the Herald-Democrat, published in Durango, Colo.:

STICKING IT OUT IS MATTER OF PRINCIPLE

The "new phase" of the Korean War now has proceeded far enough to make it plain the United States is not simply conducting an orderly withdrawal in prelude to a final evacuation of the peninsula.

We're fighting to hold as much free Korean soil as we can—as long as we can. At least, in the words of Chief of Staff General Collins, that is our present intent.

Insofar as this keeps a substantial proportion of our trained combat troops tied down and thus unavailable for duty elsewhere, the policy may actually be viewed by Russia as an advantage on her side.

But evidently the leaders of this country believe the gain to Russia is outweighed by the gain to us.

First of all, we are continuing to exact a high price for aggression. Our defense of key positions south of Seoul has cost the Chinese and North Korean Reds dearly. Surely they understand that if they wish to push us off the peninsula it is not going to be a quiet walk.

Secondly, by staying in Korea we are standing by our declared friends, by a free people in distress. The fledgling Republic of Korea is virtually a ward of the United Nations; more than almost any other, it is entitled to protection from the countries which assisted at its birth.

To get out of Korea without being driven out by overwhelming enemy forces would be to tell nations in both Asia and Europe that it doesn't pay to side with us, that when the chips are down we'll desert them. We'd be saying, in effect: "You'd better make the best terms you can with the Communists. You can't count on us in the long run."

This we decline to say. And so we go on fighting and dying there, as we have for 6 months past. Short of all-out involvement with Red China, we intend to stick—if we can. We insist upon showing the Reds up as the bullying gangsters they are. We intend to give them no free soil on a platter.

In other words, the high principles that led us to enter Korea in the first place are still valid reasons for being there.

It is regrettable that the United Nations has been so slow to suport us in the Chinese phase of the Korean War. But it's hard to grasp the reasoning in the argument we should leave Korea if the UN refuses to condemn China as an aggressor.

If the UN will not do so, that will be bad, both for us and the UN. For it will gravely weaken the UN as a peace agency. But the situation may be made worse if we should then proceed ourselves to abandon the principles we are asking the UN to espouse.

No matter what the UN does or does not do, we must maintain our status as the rallying point for the noblest aspirations of freemen. Other peoples' failure to live by high principles is no excuse for our own failure. We are still the great torch-bearers of liberty. That's why we're in Korea.

Effect of Inflation on Bond Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in which he quotes the remarks made by Senator SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, on the effect of current inflation on the value of bonds:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Perhaps the most puzzling of the many inconsistencies of national labor union leaders is the unwavering regularity with which they cheer every new spending plan concocted by Mr. Truman's so-called economic planners.

Socialized medicine, the Brannan farm program, Federal aid to education, socialized housing—anything that comes along.

Their idea, of course, is that in those programs the Government is giving the worker something for nothing. So it's good policy for the union bosses to support them.

The truth is that the cost burden, in every instance, falls directly on the rank-and-file wage earners of the Nation—which means the union members—and if we get into an era of wild inflation, which currently seems a sure bet, the worker will be among the hardest hit.

Economists agree that excessive Government spending is the most powerful of all inflationary forces. It increases the Government's drain on available materials, and at the same time pours additional money into the hands of the public to bid for the short supplies left for civilian consumers.

And it is incontrovertible history that in periods of inflation, wages and salaries always lag far behind prices. They always have and always will.

The heaviest damage, however, falls on the capital holdings of the unions: The retirement and pension funds and social security plans into which members have been contributing for years.

The dollars they contributed are still there, but the inflation that already has worked into our national economy has cut the value of those dollars to the extent that they now buy only half of what they did 10 years ago.

In short, the pension payments which the union members have been looking to to take care of them in their retirement days, will provide only half the actual living that they paid for.

A good line on what happens to dollars when the Government keeps dipping into the taxpayers' pockets is to get out your war bonds and add up what they are worth today.

With the mint working overtime to produce defense dollars, Senator ANDY F. SCHOEPPEL, Republican, of Kansas, did just that. Here is what he has to say:

"I am sure that many of you patriotically bought these bonds in 1940 with the dollar that would buy you 10 loaves of bread and four or five pounds of beef.

"As an example, let's suppose that you bought in 1940 a $100 bond for $75. It matured in 1950 for $100. You are required to pay an income tax on the $25 profit, leaving you a net of perhaps $85 which will not buy you as much as $40 would in 1939 in the way of requirements in life."

SCHOEPPEL, back in the early twenties was an all-America football end at the University of Nebraska who helped stop Notre Dame in the days of the famous Four Horsemen. He can't tackle the value of the dollar that has already vanished; but he does think something could be done to stabilize the dollar at its present level to prevent its value from falling even lower.

As a starter he points out—for the benefit of the new Congress—that the Eighty-first Congress that just went out of business doled out $30,000,000,000 more in Federal funds than the much-maligned GOP-controlled Eightieth Congress.

The Kansas Senator says that if the spending for nondefense projects keeps up, the Government is going to have to print more money.

Some of the economic planners now are talking about again reducing the gold content of the dollar, which may sound like pretty fancy fiscal talk, but it actually is a simple matter.

Prior to 1934 you could take your dollar bill to the bank and get 23.22 grains of gold. In 1934 the Government reduced this to 13.71 grains, and then printed 3,000,000,000 more dollars, deflating your dollar by statute. Later the New Deal hit on the formula of increased taxing and increased Federal spending.

Now the Government is getting nervous and wants to tamper with the gold content of the dollar again.

If it does, it means that the printing presses will roll again, which in turn means sealing

into our money system a new and permanent reduction in the buying value of the dollar. So the union members take a further licking on their savings.

Watch the bosses, though, when the Eighty-second Congress takes a look at the Truman spending proposals in the weeks to come. They are already set to give the big hurrah, and anybody who fails to go along with them will be a "vicious reactionary"—or worse.

Carl Sandburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on Carl Sandburg by Robert Blake Kimble:

CARL SANDBURG

(By Robert Blake Kimble)

In the March 1914 issue of Poetry magazine there appeared this poem:

"CHICAGO

"Hog butcher for the world,
Tool maker, stacker of wheat,
Player with railroads and the Nation's freight handler;
Stormy, husky, brawling,
City of the big shoulders:
They tell me you are wicked and I believe them, for I have seen your painted women under the gas lamps luring the farm boys.
And they tell me you are crooked and I answer: Yes; it is true I have seen the gunman kill and go free to kill again.
And they tell me you are brutal and my reply is: On the faces of women and children I have seen the marks of wanton hunger.
And having answered so I turn once more to those who sneer at this my city, and I give them back the sneer and say to them:
Come and show me another city with lifted head singing so proud to be alive and coarse and strong and cunning.
Flinging magnetic curses amid the toil of piling job on job, here is a tall, bold slugger set vivid against the little soft cities;
Fierce as a dog with tongue lapping for action, cunning as a savage pitted against the wilderness,
Bareheaded,
Shoveling,
Wrecking,
Planning,
Building, breaking, rebuilding,
Under the smoke, dust all over his mouth, laughing with white teeth,
Under the terrible burden of destiny laughing as a young man laughs,
Laughing even as an ignorant fighter laughs who has never lost a battle,
Bragging and laughing that under his wrist is the pulse, and under his ribs the heart of the people,
Laughing!
Laughing the stormy, husky, brawling laughter of youth, half naked, sweating, proud to be hog butcher, tool maker, stacker of wheat, player with railroads and freight handler to the Nation."

This was a song of a city. An American song. A song so thoroughly Yankee Doodle that those Americans whose ears were tuned for European music failed to recognize it. But for those whose eyes were for Lincoln, for those whose ears were tuned to the great poet of Lincoln's day, here was a new song coming over the ridges, a new song by a new Whitman, the poet of our day. As he came closer, as they got to see his face and to hear his music better, he says, "There was puzzlement as to whether I was a poet, a biographer, a wandering troubadour with a guitar, a Midwest Hans Christian Andersen, or a historian of current events."

And no wonder. Little chance that we would recognize all these in one man. He became our great American poet; he gave us our greatest monument of biography in his six-volume Abraham Lincoln; he went about our land, singing and playing his guitar, singing to us about ourselves; he told tales and sketched our daily lives in rhythmic verse. All this in one man? All this is Sandburg.

Mr. Sandburg was born in Illinois on January 6, 1878. His parents were Swedish immigrants and as a boy he had to do many kinds of work. When the Spanish-American War began, he enlisted in the Army and served in Puerto Rico. After the war he worked his way through Lombard College. He became a newspaper man, then a free-lance writer. In 1914 he won the Levinson prize for his poetry. In 1919 and 1921 he was cowinner of the Poetry Society of America prize. In 1928 he was Harvard's PBK poet. During World War II he performed many services among the OWI foreign broadcasts and the commentary for the United States Government film Bomber. He stands now, dean of American poetry, beloved and honored by his people.

The people, yes. He loves the people. Especially the plain, the simple; especially the toiler and hand worker. For they are he.

"I am the people—the mob—the crowd—the mass.
Do you know that all the great work of the world is done through me?
I am the workingman, the inventor, the maker of the world's food and clothes.
I am the audience that witnesses history. The Napoleons come from me and the Lincolns. They die. And then I send forth more Napoleons and Lincolns.
I am the seed ground. I am a prairie that will stand for much plowing. Terrible storms pass over me. I forget. The best of me is sucked out and wasted. I forget. Everything but Death come to me and makes me work and give up what I have. And I forget.
Sometimes I grow, shake myself and spatter a few red drops for History to remember. Then—I forget.
When I, the People, learn to remember, when I, the People, use the lessons of yesterday and no longer forget who robbed me last year, who played me for a fool—then there will be no speaker in all the world say the name: 'The People,' with any fleck of a sneer in his voice or any far-off smile of derision.
The mob—the crowd—the mass—will arrive then."

Mr. Sandburg likes the language of the people. He uses it. He talks to us in our own tongue. And that is good for he has much to say, and often much to teach us; as when he asked me once:

"Can you bewilder men by the millions
With the transfusions of your own passions
Mixed with lies and half-lies
And then look for peace, quiet, good will
Between nation and nation, race and race
Between class and class?
Who are these so ready
With a hate they are sure of
With a perpetual and considered hate—
Who are these forehanded ones?"

Finally, when we have read these poems, when we have lived in the pages of his great life of Lincoln, when we have heard his own voice say, "The people, yes," we want to honor him and on his birthday to tell him that we love him. But we find that we cannot honor him without honoring ourselves.

Kansas Celebrates Ninetieth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Mr. Fred W. Brinkerhoff, editor of the Pittsburg Headlight, entitled "Kansas at 90." I also wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House that Kansas, during the past 90 years, has developed into the largest wheat-producing State in the Union and ranks high in all agricultural pursuits. In addition to this, our State has developed its industrial potential. From a cultural standpoint, Kansas has always been one of the outstanding leaders in education and religion. We are proud of our citizens and their accomplishments. The editorial by Mr. Brinkerhoff follows:

KANSAS AT 90

Kansas is starting on the last decade of its first century. Ninety years ago the struggle between two different economic and social ideas had been decided in blood and suffering on these prairies that comprised the territory of Kansas. The fight was to get control of the new State that it was conceded would be admitted to the Union. On one side were those who were against human slavery and wanted to wipe it out both as a social and as an economic menace. On the other side were those who believed that a very vast section of the country, meaning the South, could not exist except for slavery. The question had been in politics since the founding of the Republic. It had grown as a menace to a continued Federal Union for half a century.

The whole question was brought out across the Mississippi River and was dropped into Kansas Territory. The antislavery forces in New England and in the North generally set out to populate Kansas with settlers who would fight and vote for a free State. The South did not take strongly to the idea of putting permanent settlers into Kansas because the South did not have potential settlers. It did not have people to spare. It put its reliance on the influence of the power of neighbors, particularly the neighbors in nearby Missouri. It does no violence to history to say the southern statesmen set out to win Kansas by intimidation, and they used ruthless Missourians for that purpose. Thus for several years free State settlers in Kansas and political emissaries from Missouri engaged in bloody struggles which finally came to an end as the free-State population built up and overwhelmed the good neighbors on the east.

After its struggles to write a constitution, Kansas finally obtained one that would pass. Congress passed the act admitting Kansas under a free-State constitution, and the State came into existence January 29, 1861. When that happened, the country was moving swiftly into the great Civil War. The

arguments and debates and conflicts of 50 years over slavery had been brought to a heading in the Kansas question. And so Kansas could not escape them and cannot escape now, its significance in connection with that great war.

So Kansas was a famous State on the first day of statehood. It has pretty well maintained its place during these 90 years. It has been an independent roughneck part of the times. It has been somewhat cultured and refined at other times. It has generally been decent, and always it has been patriotic. But never in its history has it been too timid to step forward, too bashful to speak up, or too cowardly to do what it thinks it wants to do. It has produced fakes and fakers in its time. It has indulged in a good deal of flapdoodle, and it has been embarrassed by many freaks. But all in all, up one side and down the other, Kansas has been sturdy and robust and rugged, which, finally, when added to a fair degree of common sense and honesty and decency, will make up a wholesome public.

The people of Kansas make Kansas. The wheat fields, the vast pastures, the oil wells—these and scores of other natural assets are incidental. Kansans have made Kansas out of resources God gave the State and out of the resources they wrought themselves—and of a spirit that is their own creation.

Robert Gordon Sproul, Champion University President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the January issue of the California Monthly. It concerns "Bob" Sproul, who last June 30, 1950, completed 20 years of service as president of the University of California.

President Sproul, when appointed, was referred to as the administrative type of president. His 20 years of administration have certainly brought the University of California to the pinnacle of success. Whether he is a scholar or not, he appreciates and understands scholars, and no president—no matter what his background—could have created a better academic climate than President Sproul has created for scholars by his skillful administration. Lincoln was not a great scholar of English, but his Gettysburg Address is pointed to as a model of perfect English.

Californians are prone to be a little optimistic—some rudely call it boastfulness—about the products of our State. The author of the article referred to has expressed my view of our hero in his last sentence.

This is the article, which I commend to my colleagues who wish to know about the great men of today:

PRESIDENT ROBERT GORDON SPROUL

It is scarcely necessary to identify the picture appearing on the cover of this issue of California Monthly as that of California's first citizen, Robert Gordon Sproul, 1913. But it may be news to most that on July 1 last he began his twenty-first year as president of the university, and thereby shattered the long-standing presidential endurance record for the Golden Bear course established some time ago by his greatest predecessor, the beloved Benjamin Ide Wheeler.

This is quite an achievement for a young fellow trained in civil engineering who as an undergraduate functioned as drum major for the band, and ran the 2-mile for the track team. It is not easy to administer the largest university in the world for 20 years and do it to the satisfaction of 23 fellow regents, not to mention what is perhaps the largest, finest, and most discriminating company of scholars at any university in the world.

There are some 900 years of tradition behind the concept of a great university, and every faculty with any pretensions to greatness knows that it must carry a torch for the fundamental principles involved. There is often a tendency to view with alarm any president who has not had an early background of teaching and research, because he might fail to understand the teacher's approach or to appreciate the importance of the intangibles upon which greatness rests. Faculties have usually preferred to select a scholar as president and take a chance on his administrative ability.

This procedure worked with fair success in past years, but in the present day of very large, highly complex universities, a president without administrative experience or skill would soon find himself too snarled up to even think of greatness.

The more one reflects upon such facts, the more he comes to appreciate what Robert Gordon Sproul has meant to the University of California, and to know why the faculty and the regents have consistently joined forces to hold him whenever attractive opportunities to go elsewhere presented themselves.

It was outstanding administrative skill, demonstrated as cashier, comptroller, and vice president, during the years 1914 to 1930, which won for Robert Sproul the confidence of the regents. It was his consistent deference to the opinions of the academic senate, and his ability to represent the university brilliantly and successfully on every public front, which won him the respect and loyalty of the faculty. He not only demonstrated an understanding and appreciation of true greatness in a university, but he provided the practical ability to maintain and increase that greatness.

It has been his privilege to count as friends a tremendous number of those leaders who control sources of support, both public and private. No man could have had a greater test of loyalty than was provided by the unfortunate loyalty-oath controversy.

On occasion "Bob" Sproul has smilingly said that he would never have survived the demands of the presidency without the Latin which he learned in high school from Monroe E. Deutsch, 1902. Later, of course, he was bolstered by having 15 universities confer doctors' degrees upon him, honoris causa, including the far-famed academic Emily Post, Harvard. If the truth must be told, his success results from nothing more than an extraordinarily friendly personality and a wonderful sense of humor, backed up by a remarkably clear and quick mind, a phenomenal memory, an inexhaustible store of energy, and a larynx of commanding quality.

When "Bob" Sproul became president in 1930 there were a good many people who felt that the concept of a single great university for the State of California, however desirable it might be, would soon be destroyed by a lack of confidence on the part of southern California in any institution closely associated with northern California for almost two-thirds of a century. If any single factor is responsible for the survival of the University of California, it is the confidence which "Bob" Sproul has won personally from the thoughtful and far-seeing leaders in the South.

All-University Week End, a modern California tradition, sprung straight from the core of the university-family philosophy, is an annual tribute to President Sproul, that philosophy's strongest advocate. It was significant, then, that students, faculty, and alumni chose those few days last year to celebrate his twentieth year as president. This was the second major tribute among innumerable smaller ones that has been paid to "Bob" Sproul by students and alumni. In 1946 they awarded him the "highest honor at their command," the alumnus-of-the-year award, for his "manifold services to university, State, and Nation."

This brief sketch cannot hope to cover the subject of President R. G. Sproul. For a complete list of honors and achievements see "Who's Who in America." We prefer the epitome coined by the late Prof. Dixon Wecter, who said that God doubtless could have made a better university president than Sproul, but doubtless God never did.

My Visit With Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article I wrote recently about Yugoslavia for the Methodist Laymen's magazine:

MY VISIT WITH TITO

(By Congressman LAURIE C. BATTLE, of Alabama)

Arriving in the United States last November after 6 weeks in Europe, including several days in Yugoslavia, I felt humble and thankful for the privilege of living in this great land of ours.

It is very difficult for Americans to comprehend what life in Yugoslavia means today. Yet it is extremely important from the standpoint of improving our relations and in getting a realistic glimpse of Stalin's difficulties, economically, politically, and militarily as he tries to enslave the world by taking over one nation after another. Since the Dictator, Marshall Tito, broke with the Kremlin the iron curtain has been rolled back beyond Yugoslavia's borders—the only instance of such a roll back to date. By comparison with the iron curtain which has been drawn tight between Yugoslavia and Russia, there is only a lace curtain between Yugoslavia and the West. Like some of Russia's satellite countries in the Balkans, Yugoslavia is suffering from the drought of last summer, in addition to internal collectivist policies which are not bearing fruit. All told, an extra hard winter is in prospect and pressure from the Soviets is mounting.

In traveling through the city of Belgrade evidences of Tito's break with Stalin could be easily seen. In one section, where a new area of the city was being developed, a series of skeleton structures loomed against the sky. These buildings could not be completed because the supply line of materials from Russia had been cut off. Most of the shops were bare. We learned that a bar of soap, if one could be found, would cost us about $8. After visiting in a little home along the roadside I gave the lady of the house a 25-cent script pencil with the words "U. S. House of Representatives" printed on it. She had given our group some apples which

we did not want to take because we knew that she and the several colorfully but simply dressed children needed them. Upon my return to the Embassy I told about our embarrassment at accepting this lady's hospitality when we could not return her kindness. I was quite surprised to learn that the 25-cent pencil which I gave her was worth several dollars because pencils are practically unobtainable in Yugoslavia.

These two examples will give you an indication of the great poverty of the people of Yugoslavia. Of course, the average person does not have the money to buy such luxuries as soap and pencils, so it is necessary to resort to barter for these things if they can get them at all. I understand that economic conditions of other nations in that part of the world are not too different.

We also visited one of the collectivist farms and stopped to talk to men, women, and children working in the fields as we rode through the countryside. I was amazed to find so much good will being expressed toward America because I had expected an outright hostile attitude. I learned that many of the people have relatives in the United States and that a lot of them hope to be able to come to this promised land or make it possible for their children to come to America. Except for the Communist leaders sent out to run the collectivist farms, I do not believe the average person knows anything about Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism, or any other kind of political philosophy. They impressed me as being just simple, poor, hard-working people who have never had much of a chance in life.

The high point of our visit to Yugoslavia was an hour-and-a-half interview with Marshal Tito. Representatives FISHER, of Texas, CHATHAM, of North Carolina, and I made up the congressional group. We were accompanied by George Allen, our Ambassador; Colonel Wilson, of the United States Air Force; and Allen Moreland, of the United States State Department. Leaving the American Embassy, where members of our subcommittee were staying, we went a short distance down the street to Tito's home, if it can be called that. Sentries bristled from every vantage point. Several sets of well-armed guards ushered us into Tito's room, which was very spacious and handsomely decorated. The marshal sat behind a long desk at the far end of the room. A huge mural depicting a sixteenth century peasant uprising covered the entire wall behind him. On Tito's left was a bust of a very familiar Communist leader which interested me a great deal. Through the interpreter, I asked the Marshall about it, and he made it very clear that it was a bust of Lenin and not of Stalin.

Tito is a mild-mannered man with a commanding personality. He is about 5 feet 11 inches in height, and rather heavy set. His build, square jaw, steel-blue eyes, and graying, wavy hair all give him a trim appearance. The marshal's manner is very direct and he exhibited a good sense of humor to us. In evaluating him as a person, however, we remembered that Tito was Stalin's No. 1 pupil for many years and is now the dictator of a Communist country. In fairness to a man who has been very ruthless at times, it must be recognized that since his break with Stalin he has helped to stop the Red-inspired Greek war, his representative in the United Nations has departed considerably from the Soviet Party lines, and he has expressed a desire to settle such international problems as returning Greek children to their homes and reestablishing the railroad system from Salonika, Greece, to Belgrade, Yugoslavia. This is important to remember along with things that are not so complimentary to him.

Tito always talked through an interpreter. Yet every time the interpreter made a mistake the marshal would catch him up instantly. I believe he understands English much better than he might have us think, and certainly he understands English better than we do Serbian.

Our group questioned Tito sharply about whether or not the United States could place confidence in his break with Stalin. We asked him point blank if the break was permanent and if he would go back into the Soviet fold. Although I have certain reservations concerning Tito's answers, nevertheless he assured us that his break with Stalin is real enough and that the only relationship Yugoslavia wants with Russia is the relationship between two friendly countries which would necessitate Stalin giving up his aggression. One of my reservations is the natural distrust of a Communist dictator, and another is the fact that Yugoslavia may be forced back into Stalin's camp for economic survival.

We asked Tito why Russia had not taken Yugoslavia over militarily. He said there were several reasons. In all of his answers he seemed very self-assured and forthright. The first reason he gave is that the Soviets miscalculated as they always do in thinking that Yugoslavia would crack up economically. Tito said they were not going to crack up and surplus food from America would be a big help in avoiding this catastrophe. Second, Tito said he has thirty divisions which are well trained for fighting in the mountainous terrain of Yugoslavia. Hitler found this combination quite an obstacle in his drive to conquer the Communists. He said Stalin knows that these divisions could tie up at least 30 Russian divisions and hold them off long enough to start world war III. The marshal had no doubt that the Allied Nations would join in the fight against Russia if Yugoslavia was attacked. Despite the fact that practically every young man I saw in Yugoslavia had on a military uniform, Tito insisted that he does not have too great a percentage of his boys in the armed forces.

One of the most significant statements that Tito made was relative to Yugoslavia's obligations in the United Nations. In response to a question which I asked him, he said that in the future Yugoslavia was going to uphold her responsibilities in the UN whether or not she was attacked first. Previously he had said only that Yugoslavia would fight anybody that attacked his country. But there, for the first time, he made the statement that Yugoslavia would fight under the auspices of the UN regardless of which nation was attacked first. We thought perhaps we misunderstood, or were having interpretation difficulties so we questioned him further in this matter. There was no misunderstanding. He stuck to his original statement. His reasoning went like this: There will be no such thing in the future as a bilateral war. In the world of today, if two great nations get into a war, it will soon spread into a global conflict. Despite his strong desire to remain neutral and avoid entangling alliances with foreign countries, Tito said he realizes that no nation would be able to stay out of such a conflict.

There is no doubt about the dire effects of the drought and the need for food in Yugoslavia this winter. I asked Tito if he had plans for the distribution of food in case the United States granted this request. He said yes, that he already had a system whereby he takes surplus food from the breadbasket of Yugoslavia and distributes it through his agents over the entire country. Of course, the army and party members get priority in this distribution, which strengthens their hands. Tito said he would expand this system if this request was granted and that his people would know where it came from and would be appreciative. In fairness to him, I understand that information about previous assistance from the United States was disseminated widely by press and radio throughout the country.

The $38,000,000 worth of surplus food which has just been granted by Congress to communistic Yugoslavia in her hour of need is a long chance. A chance that Yugoslavia will appreciate our Christian, charitable act and not fight us; a chance that this assistance will help to keep Tito from being forced back into Stalin's camp, or from being overthrown by Stalin's henchmen because of economic chaos; a chance that Yugoslavia's 30 divisions can remain independent from Soviet domination; a chance that Yugoslavia will help to stop those who would conquer the world.

This humanitarian act and calculated military risk might save thousands of American lives. The cost is nothing by comparison with the bloodshed, misery, and money that would be necessary to stop Russia in an all-out war, even without these additional 30 divisions. Yugoslavia's forces are larger than any in Europe, and they are dwarfed by Russia's army.

Yes, Yugoslavia has a communistic government, but Russia has the aggressive communistic government that is determined to enslave the world. Not that Tito has or ever will give up communism, or that we would dictate Yugoslavia's form of government, but here we have the only country that has been able to defy the Soviets, emerge from behind the iron curtain, and drop aggression. A helping hand in this instance would encourage other satellite countries to do the same. The forces of good must be receptive to those who will break with the Kremlin, and try to convert them to become active members in the family of nations for the cause of peace.

The phenomenon of an independent Yugoslavia deep in the Russian orbit is particularly important to us today because the world situation is so grave. We are facing a king drawn out struggle for our freedom if not for our very existence. The voluntary or forced withdrawal of our troops from Europe and the Far East would mean Russian domination of about nine-tenths of the world's population. The additional industrial power gained by the Soviets would be disastrous for most of the free nations of the world, and would certainly bring a horrible war to our own shores. I mention this because some Americans advocate voluntary withdrawal and because such a course is well within the realm of necessity based on present comparative strength, if Russia goes all out in the next few months. In such a situation our task would be multiplied a hundredfold.

In conclusion, our Nation cannot survive if each of us goes his own selfish way like the average Frenchman who refuses to participate in his Government or strengthen it, thereby making a mockery out of democracy. There is nobody to accept the responsibility of world leadership except the United States unless we meekly turn the gavel over to Soviet Russia to bring about a living hell on earth. Of course we are not going to do that. We must develop stronger leadership backed by an active, well informed public in order to weather this storm. It is necessary to see that our friendly allies strengthen themselves and to bolster the faltering wherever possible. We should encourage and cooperate with the individuals, groups, and nations that are trying to throw off the treacherous yoke of Soviet domination. Above all, we must make ourselves stronger physically, mentally, and spiritually.

Stalin faces great difficulties, too. He cannot take an aroused United States from within or from without but his capacity to cause destruction and suffering in the world is even greater than Hitler's. Even the Red Bear will have acute pains of indigestion in trying to assimilate people and nations that hate her.

Aggressive, atheistic communism will not win out. It cannot dominate the minds of men very long because such unfortunate people will eventually realize that they have been deceived by false promises. It cannot dominate the souls of men long because man inevitably seeks a higher being. It cannot use the bodies of men long because its course is the path of self destruction. Atheistic communism will not dominate the souls, minds, or bodies of men in the long run because the religious forces of the world are lining up against it. But the number of us, both as individuals and as nations, that will be living to enjoy freedom again is in direct proportion to how quickly and with how much intelligent vigor we tackle this task together. "The ox is in the ditch" and we must all pull together to get on higher, safer ground.

Where the Soldiers Are Coming From

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly all Members of Congress are receiving letters protesting conscription of our manpower for a war abroad. Typical of one class of those letters is the following:

ST. JOSEPH, MICH., *January 18, 1951.*

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have never written to you before, but I just have to express my feelings now. How can they put a young married man, who just got married to escape the draft and whose wife is able to go to work in class 3 and a young man who is the only child of a widow in class I-A? My husband died when my son was 3½ years old. And during the depression days we had to drop his insurance, and when he died I had to pay a large doctor bill, funeral expenses, and besides lose our little farm. No Government agency stepped in then to ask how I would be able to raise him, because I had a house in town on which we were hardly collecting enough rent to pay the taxes. I was lucky to get my job back which I had before I was married. I didn't make much, but enough to raise my son. When he was 12 years old he got a paper route and has been helping me ever since. But I kept on working and now when I can hardly work any more—I am nearly 52 years old, they want to take him in the draft. It seems to me that draft law should apply the same to only sons of widowed mothers as it does to young married men. The shop that I worked in closed down last year but I was lucky for one of my age to get another job, and only because I had a sister-in-law working in this shop and she put in a good word for me. I have had a nervous stomach for years and most days I just have to force myself to go to work and if they take my son from me I just won't be able to go to work.

My nephew is in Korea in a fox hole and thinking of him makes me nearly crazy. If this war would be on our shores we would all be doing our utmost, but why our boys should always be sent to other countries to fight I just can't take. But I still say a boy who is the only child of a widowed mother should have the same consideration as these 19- and 20-year-olds who only got married to be deferred.

Hoping I will get your opinion on this problem, I remain.

P. S.—My son is working in a newspaper shop and never made enough until this last summer after he went away to a linotype school. He only made 75 cents an hour before; now he makes $1.15 an hour. That's why I had to keep on working.

The Proposed Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, thinking Americans everywhere have become alarmed, and I think properly so, over certain aspects of the tremendous Federal budget sought in the Eighty-second Congress by the administration. This alarm has not been eased in any degree by the Presidential tax message presented today. Concern of the people does not revolve primarily about the vast sums required for essential defense efforts, but rather from the apparent unwillingness of the administration to reduce substantially the spending for activities of the Government in no way connected with our defense responsibilities.

Like most of my colleagues, I have received many thoughtful letters on this subject from informed residents of the district I have the honor to represent. Under permission granted by the House, I am including for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of these. It comes from an informed citizen, Mr. Frank R. Mills, publisher of the Hoopeston (Ill.) Daily Chronicle-Herald. What he has to say could be read with profit by every person serving in government, whether in the legislative branch or in the executive. His letter follows:

THE CHRONICLE-HERALD,
Hoopeston, Ill., January 26, 1951.

Representative EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: The proposed budget has just crossed my desk, and although I do not claim to understand all its features, I am no end alarmed and perturbed with the increase for civilian purposes.

No doubt you have studied it closely and can explain what people in Washington are thinking about. It's all I can do to abstain from profanity, and if I had the Truman gift for vulgar expression, could tell you in a more colorful way how I regard this proposal for increasing wasteful spending.

However, I know you to be an intelligent individual, and will understand what I mean, when I say I do not like it. It's all wrong. It stinks to high heaven. This is no time for a politically expedient plan to build votes.

Last week, I sent my boy to the armed services. He's only 19 and so I want him to have the advantage of the best training he can get, the best equipment possible so he can fight a good fight. I most certainly do not want his efforts hamstrung by high expenditures for farm subsidies, when every morsel of food can be sold at astronomical prices, or for fair employment boondoggling when every man who will work has a job, or for so-called socialized medicine while our doctors are going to war, or any of these other swindles now being perpetrated on we yokels out here in the sticks.

It is high time we get back to basic principles. Why subsidize until prices climb out of sight, and then put on ceilings? The second might be unnecessary without the first.

I am willing to believe you have made a personal sacrifice in going to Washington to serve our country. Why not make this sacrifice pay off in benefit to the folks you represent? Let's cut out this back scratching and vote trading. Stand on the principles of your own belief and those of the people back home desperately looking to you for wise leadership.

This is an opportunity for you to go on a record against, or for, this vicious spending. The people at home you represent will be very definitely interested in how you vote.

Best regards,

FRANK R. MILLS,
President.

Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Mills has to say clearly represents the thinking of great numbers of our people in the present tragic hour. Congress must accept the responsibility so far evaded by the administration. Nondefense spending must be pared to the bone. There must be no "government as usual" until we have won our battles against our enemies on the military front, and on the economic front.

A New Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the American Coalition has for years been one of the best champions of patriotism and liberty in the whole United States. Organized and supported for years by Capt. John B. Trevor, of New York, this organization cemented together many of the leading patriotic organizations into a great movement whose influence has been felt all over the country.

Recently this great organization adopted a set of resolutions under the caption of "A new declaration of independence."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include these resolutions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN COALITION AT ITS ANNUAL CONVENTION IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 25, 1951

A NEW DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

(Submitted by John W. Finger, president, American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Societies)

Whereas on July 4, 1776, the United States of America became a free and independent nation by proclamation of their legal representatives assembled in Philadelphia; and

Whereas this independence was established in international law by the valor of American soldiers under the inspired leadership of George Washington and for nearly two centuries has been maintained by the blood of American citizens shed upon many battlefields and the guardianship of American statesmen who thought patriotically of America first; and

Whereas under the benign influence of independence these United States have not only developed a "more perfect union" according to the ideals of the founding fathers but have offered to other peoples the precepts and the example of representative constitutional government "with liberty and justice for all"; and

Whereas Almighty God in His great munificence has permitted this Republic to prosper in the enjoyment of the fruits of

agriculture, the applications of science and invention and the arts of industry, and to become the friend and benefactor of afflicted mankind everywhere; and

Whereas because of alien-minded theories, base betrayals, false counsels, mendacious propaganda, unintelligent executive leadership, and subservient legislators the Nation has been misled into international complications and warlike situations which endanger its very existence at a time when pagan forces are attempting the extinction of freedom, religion, and civilization throughout the world; and

Whereas it is obvious that the compelling duty of Americans to God, to humanity, and especially to our own citizenship is to reestablish our independence and to conserve our resources of materials, of manpower, and of moral law in order that "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth":

Now, therefore, we as citizens of this Republic do hereby declare, and call upon the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the several States to declare:

1. That the United States must again become a free and independent Nation.

2. That it shall be the policy of these United States to avoid entangling alliances which diminish or imperil our sovereignty and independence, and to remain forever free of any involvement in any form of foreign regional or world government.

3. That armed services shall be fully maintained, to guard our independence and territory from invasion or aggression.

4. That, except in case of attack requiring immediate offense, no part of the armed services shall be engaged in any hostilities save only by authorization of Congress, as the Constitution requires.

In pursuance whereof, we as citizens further declare:

1. That the Congress of the United States, in commemoration of the Declaration of Independence and fulfillment of the oath of its Members to support and defend the Constitution, should immediately renounce this country's mistaken adherence to, and any participation in, the United Nations and should withdraw all financial support of that organization.

2. That our Armed Forces which have been sent to war on the continent of Asia without a constitutional declaration of war should be immediately recalled from that action.

3. That a joint committee of Congress should be selected by vote of the Members of both Houses to conduct a complete and public investigation of all aspects of our international relations and affairs since 1940, and to propose necessary or advisable protective and remedial measures.

Finally we call upon the legislatures of the several States to support these declaratory recommendations by making suitable addresses to Congress.

A REPORT TO THE AMERICAN COALITION ON OUR PRESENT SITUATION

(By John B. Trevor, president emeritus)

There is no provision in the Constitution of the United States which gives any justification for the belief that the founders of our Republic ever conceived of the possibility that the Government which they established would drain the resources of the United States of its manpower, its money, or material to reconstitute and rehabilitate foreign nations and, above all, surrender its independence to a foreign agency. Nevertheless, that is exactly what our Government has done, is doing, and proposes to go on doing to an even greater extent than it the past.

As a Nation we have, like foolish children, violated every admonition handed down to us by the Father of our Country in respect to dealings with foreign nations and involvement in the eternal quarrels of Europe. We intervened in Europe in 1917 to make the world safe for democracy. One of the fruits of our follies on that occasion was to leave Russia in the birth pangs of a political system which has been at war with civilized society ever since their early constitutions boldly advertised that fact, and the policy of the infamous regime which so came to life has never belied this profession of faith.

Another fruit of our naive conception of foreign relations was sponsorship of the League of Nations. The League did not fail, as alleged, because the United States did not adhere to the covenant, but rather because England was determined to destroy the preeminence of France as a military power and re-create Germany as a counter weight in the councils of Europe. The English politicians did destroy France and did re-create Germany to fight the Second World War.

We intervened again in Europe because no one in Washington had the vision to prevent a crisis arising at a time when the opportunity to avert a new war was presented.

According to the United States Statistical Abstract of 1935, the accumulated money costs of our first intervention was $41,000,000,000. Then, for reasons not disclosed, the Government ceased to publish the ever rising totals of the cost of this war.

The money costs of our second intervention was over $330,000,000,000. On both occasions our intervention saves France and England from defeat, but the cost to us in money has not stopped. From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1950, we have paid out in grants, aids, or loans to foreign nations $31,400,000,000.

Everyone recognizes that our military victory was overwhelming, and yet through childish folly, ignorance, and possibly even treason, we are in the midst of a hideous and unnecessary war, with the possibility that we may end on the verge of a world cataclysm.

Under these circumstances, it is vital that the people of the United States assert their sovereignty through their Senators and Representatives in Congress.

In the determination of the policy which we should pursue there are certain indisputable facts which must be borne in mind. Prior to World War I in 1914, the French budget for her military and naval establishments totaled $343,000,000, and provided for the maintenance of a peace-time army of 846,000 men or 56 divisions. Between April 3, 1948, and June 30, 1949, the United States—excluding all other grants of aid or loans—subsidized France through ECA in the amount of $1,313,000,000, or almost four times the amount provided by the French Government for national defense before the outbreak of the First World War.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, France received through ECA more than double the cost of her military and naval budget in 1914. Let us now examine what France has done for herself in the way of European defense during that period:

On December 17, 1950, the New York Times published a map of Europe on which is printed the distribution of Western European troops as compared to Russia's, and in the text of the explanatory article underneath this map, it states that France maintains in Germany "three under-strength French divisions" and goes on to say, "Beyond this, in the first line of defense, are two French divisions in France."

The facts in regard to Britain are very similar to those which have been related in regard to France. From April 3, 1948, to June 30, 1949, the United States supported the British Government in the amount of $1,619,000,000, or approximately four times the sum budgeted by the British Government for national defense just before the outbreak of the First World War. In the following year, through ECA the United States gave the British Government twice the amount of her national defense budget in 1914.

It is now pertinent to consider what Great Britain has done for herself in the way of European defense:

The article to which reference has been made, published in the New York Times of December 17, states that the British have contributed two first-class divisions to the defense forces of Western Germany, and the map accompanying the article indicates that the United Kingdom has retained two divisions in garrison for home defense.

There are good grounds for the belief that the factories of both France and England are in better shape now than ever before to provide war matériel for the rearmament of the forces of their respective Governments, but these factories have not been so employed, but rather in the production of war matériel which has been shipped to the active and potential enemies of the United States.

A review of the past histories of both England and France suggests that they, with their increased population over what it was in the prewar period, are well able to build up for themselves substantial forces to oppose an assault by Russia, if they so desire. The difficulty which confronts us in the United States is that England now has a form of government which is based upon an ideology similar in many respects to Russia; and the willingness of the British to commit themselves to a united defense action against Russian aggression is by no means definitely established.

Likewise, the French, who put up a magnificent defense against the Germans in 1914, collapsed in a disastrous fashion when assaulted the second time, upon the outbreak of the Second World War. There is evidence to show that the professional army of France in this war lived up to the highest traditions of its history, but the reserves were so infiltrated with Communist officers and Communist soldiers in the line, that the defeat of France followed in short order upon the opening of the attack.

We must consider this fact and, while it is impossible to state exactly to what extent France is permeated with Communists now, there is ground for the belief that possibly two-thirds of the reserve officers are of doubtful quality, and perhaps one-third of the line troops may be directly or indirectly influenced by the Communist leaders.

If the résumé of Western European troops, compared with Russia's, as set forth in the map accompanying the article in the New York Times on Sunday, December 17, is accurate, the anti-Communist forces in Europe, excluding the United States, that is to say, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Yugoslavia, together with Belgium and Holland represent an aggregate of only 52 divisions against a total force of 235 divisions under the control of the Soviet high command, that is, including contributions from the Eastern European satellite states.

That is the picture of the situation we face. And under the circumstances, it is suggested that the American coalition adopt the following resolutions:

"Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That, in the absence of any evidence that France and England have any force in being at the present time adequate for the defense of Western Europe, the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, urge upon the members of all associated societies and other patriotic citizens that they impress upon their Senators and Representatives in Congress to hold the Military Establishment in Western Germany to a mere token force, and at the same time provide for planes, pilots, and ground crews, together with naval equipment in sufficient force to assure our superiority in the air and on the sea, together with such land forces in

American possessions as shall be necessary to meet any situation which may arise; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, hold that, unless the powers signatory to the United Nations Charter discontinue supplying our enemies with war matériel, and immediately contribute reinforcements to the armies engaged in the Korean War equal in proportion to their population to those contributed by the United States, steps be initiated by our Government to withdraw the United States from membership in the United Nations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, urge the members of associated societies and all patriotic citizens to impress upon their Senators and Representatives in Congress the necessity of an immediate reappraisal of the whole economic situation here and abroad, with the understanding that the economic resources of the United States are not inexhaustible, and that unless all proposed expenditures, not absolutely essential for the maintenance of Government and the building up of an adequate military machine, be stricken from the budget proposed by the President, there is a strong possibility that the Communists will destroy us without having to fire a shot.

"COMMUNIST CHINA

"*Resolved*, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, approved Senate Resolutions 35 and 36 introduced by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and action of a similar character:

"1. That the United States 'should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea,' and

"2. That the Communist government should not be seated to represent China in the United Nations, and in addition, the imposition of such economic sanctions as may be necessary.

"TREATIES

"Whereas under recent court decisions a treaty and even a diplomatic note not approved by the Senate may nullify and render inoperative those guarantees of states rights and individual liberty which are embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and especially in those amendments which are known as the Bill of Rights: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, calls upon the members of its associated societies to urge the President of the United States not to negotiate and the Senate not to consent to any treaty or other international agreement which may in any way infringe upon or affect the domestic laws and institutions of the United States or the rights of the several states or of individual citizens, and calls upon both the President and Senate to re-examine all international agreements heretofore entered into, and to take steps to abrogate all such treaties or agreements which can in any way affect the rights of liberties of the States or their citizens.

"GENOCIDE

"Whereas the Senate of the United States has been asked to approve the convention against genocide which has been devised in the United Nations; and

"Whereas this convention is a piece of proposed international legislation which is intended to supersede our domestic law; and

"Whereas genocide, or the destruction of races or groups of people, is defined in the convention as the destruction or persecution of national, religious, and ethnical groups; and

"Whereas the convention originally contains the words "political groups," but these words were deleted on the motion of Soviet Russia, so that the persecution of a political group could not be penalized as genocide; and

"Whereas the convention was also amended on the motion of Soviet Russia to make genocide the persecution of national, ethnical, and religious groups as such, consequently it would be possible for any nation, brought up on charges of genocide following group massacres or group persecutions, to plead that the persecuted groups were not persecuted as such, but as individuals, guilty of political crimes, and under the convention political persecution would not be genocide; consequently, the convention is so devised that it will not prevent and will not punish the crime of genocide in those nations where genocide is now practiced; and

"Whereas under our Constitution the convention against genocide will become the supreme law of the land if approved by the Senate; and may subject American citizens to prosecution in alien courts, and outside the laws of the United States, even for offenses which are crimes under our domestic law and are properly prosecuted in our own courts; and

"Whereas the Convention Against Genocide would amount to an abrogation of the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it hereby

"*Resolved by the American Coalition in annual convention assembled*, That it is opposed to the approval of a treaty accepting the convention against genocide as now submitted for approval by the United States Senate.

"COMMUNISM

"Whereas communism is inimical to the best interests of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled this 25th day of January 1951 do hereby approve and endorse provisions of Senate Resolution No. 7, or a similar measure, authorizing the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of the administration, operation, and the cause for the difference of interpretation of the Internal Security Act of 1950 by the Departments of State and Justice and other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States.

"INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

"*Be it resolved*, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled this 25th day of January 1951 do hereby wholeheartedly and most enthusiastically support the Internal Security Act of 1950."

What Has Happened to Our United States Savings Bonds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are beset by many problems in these trying days of peril. One of the most serious of these is the dwindling value of United States savings bonds purchased in response to the pleading of the Federal Government during World War II.

Under permission granted to me by the House, I am including for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received only today from a resident of our congressional district who asks the pointed question as to who or what agency of Government can or will do something to support the buying power of United States Government bonds. The author of the letter, Mr. W. O. Peirce, 843 East Penn Street, Hoopeston, Ill., has this to say:

HOOPESTON, ILL., *January 31, 1951*.

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENISON: I understand that our Government has departments representing agriculture, labor, etc., which departments support wages and living costs. Please let me know the name of the Department of Government to which I can appeal for some support to the buying power of United States Government bonds.

Since I have been retired I do not have wages, and do not have a farm. Unfortunately my principal saving is in Government bonds and I must depend very much on these and on a retirement pension for a living. This pension is small.

I bought these bonds during the past 10 years, including all of the E bonds I could afford in addition to regular purchase of payroll savings bonds during the World War II. I still have most all of these bonds, which I now regret.

On September 18, 1941, the Secretary of the United States Treasury at Washington wrote me a letter urging me to start buying United States bonds periodically for a sound investment. His letter was addressed to me and included the following:

"I should like to urge you to start buying United States bonds periodically. * * *

"This is an opportunity to serve your country while making a sound investment for yourself."

Signed H. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury.

He also mailed to me at that time a pamphlet, O-200689, which I hold, urging me to "Buy a Share in America" and stated that—

"Investment in Government bonds is one of the best known ways of building future security for yourself and dependents."

Now that these bonds are soon to start maturing it is a very great disappointment to me to find that the investment was only 50 percent sound, and that the security was only 50 percent as secure as was promised me by the United State Government. The administration, which, I regret to say, is the Government, has manipulated things so that these bonds will buy only one-half as much as they should, therefore, they are worth only one-half as much as they should be.

This appears to be a gross misrepresentation on the part of the Government and is the next thing to, if not actually, the crime of obtaining money under false pretense. The fact that it has been a common practice does not make it lawful.

The laborer and farmer are not being deceived by being supported in receiving lots of dollars while the Government permits its dollars and United States bonds to sink toward the worthless point, which is being done every day by permitting prices, wages and living costs to go higher and higher. This is exactly what is desired by Moscow and all Reds and Pinks, and is being done by our present administration. If the Reds have something so good why don't Washington let us know what it is so that we can all be for them.

I trust that you will advise me what steps can be and will be taken for justice in this matter.

If not, I propose to investigate thoroughly in an effort to recover some of the lost "security" and "sound" investment which was urged upon me by our United States Government.

This injustice to those who were persuaded to "invest" their previous 100-cent dollars

for United States bonds, pensions, and life insurance can be made right with these dupes by bringing down prices and wages, both of which go together. This would reduce all costs and expenses in every line and would assist the Government in financing its present war program and all of its other expenses under this new enormous budget. This program would also reduce your salary—and the President's, which might be a good thing.

I should greatly appreciate hearing from you soon, if anything, and what can be done in our behalf, or if it will be necessary for us to organize and start something ourselves.

Yours very truly,

W. O. PEDICK.

Mr. Speaker, the author of this letter speaks in the language of the great body of American citizenship, and I find myself in agreement with his contention that we must act with courage not only to defend our interests as we are doing from a military standpoint, but we must act with equal courage to fight the common enemy—inflation. We must tighten our belts or the noose of inflation will tighten around the neck.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the second and subsequent short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

MOSES: THE GREAT JEWISH LAWGIVER, PROPHET, AND MEDIATOR (CIRCA, 1571–1451 B. C.)

Moses is the great Jewish lawgiver, prophet, mediator, and leader of the Israelites from Egypt to the eastern borders of the Promised Land. Moses stands out as one of the greatest figures in history.

One congressional historian wrote: "Among all lawgivers, founders of states and teachers of mankind, none has excelled Moses, who transformed a horde of slaves and wanderers into a nation, disciplined a race, and breathed into it its character."

Not only the Ten Commandments, but the whole Mosaic law are attributed to Moses. Some critics hold that his authorship of the Mosaic law is highly questionable.

The Moses plaque was done by Jean deMarco, of New York City.

LYCURGUS: FOUNDER OF THE SPARTAN CONSTITUTION

Lycurgus is the reputed founder of the Spartan Constitution. He flourished, according to tradition, in the seventh century B. C. He may be a mythical character.

Lycurgus is said to have found Sparta the prey of disunion, weakness, and lawlessness, and left her united, and subject to the most stable government the Greek world had ever seen.

The law giver is credited with uniting the several component parts of the state, the rigid military organization and training which made the Spartan youth the best soldier in Greece. He also is the reputed father of the elaborate and strict system of education in the Spartan world.

Lycurgus' subordination of the individual to the all-powerful state is without parallel in history.

This plaque was sculptured by C. Paul Jennewein of New York City.

SOLON: THE ATHENIAN LAWGIVER (639–559 B. C.)

Solon, who lived from 639 to 559 B. C., was the first Greek clearly known to history. He was an accomplished poet, but is known especially for his economic and constitutional reforms.

The law giver, with almost unlimited dictatorial powers, curtailed feudal rule by annulling mortgages, putting limits on the amount of land an individual could hold and outlawed contracts in which a person's liberty was pledged.

Other state controls, instigated by Solon, included those over exports, education, use of wells, bee farming, and cutting down olive trees.

Solon then reformed the Athenian Constitution, thus laying the foundation for the Athenian democracy.

The Solon plaque was done by Brenda Putman of New York City.

GAIUS: THE CELEBRATED ROMAN JURIST

Gaius was a celebrated Roman jurist of the second century A. D. History books are skimpy on his personal history.

The jurist is remembered for his "Institutes," which contributed materially to our knowledge of early Roman law. Gaius was one of five jurists whose opinions were followed by judges on deciding cases.

Gaius was a conservative in his thinking, advocating strict adherence to ancient law and resistance to innovation.

His interest in the antiquities of Roman law makes his work important to students of early institutions.

His plaque was done by Joseph Kiselewski of New York City.

Justice Alfred Budge, "Grand Old Man" of the Idaho Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Idaho has just lost one of her great leaders, Justice Alfred Budge, who adorned the Supreme Court of Idaho for 34 years with courage, integrity, and honor, but in passing he has left Idaho a rich heritage in an equally distinguished family consisting of his widow Ella Hoge Budge, who was selected as Idaho's Mother of the Year in 1950, and eight children, one of whom is my colleague from the Second District of Idaho, the Hon. HAMER H. BUDGE. The following article from the Coeur d'Alene Press, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, of January 25, 1951, describes briefly the distinguished career of Judge Alfred Budge:

FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE BUDGE IS STRICKEN

BOISE, IDAHO.—Former Justice Alfred Budge, "the grand old man" of Idaho's Supreme Court, died today. He would have been 83 in February.

Budge served a record-breaking 34 years on the supreme court bench before retiring December 30, 1948. He was the first jurist to retire under the 1947 judge's retirement act.

He was the father of Representative HAMER BUDGE, Idaho Representative from the Second Congressional District.

Justice Budge entered a Boise hospital last Saturday. His son, HAMER, is expected to arrive in Boise today from Washington.

WROTE NEARLY 1,800 OPINIONS

Justice Budge, who wrote nearly 1,800 opinions during his 34 years on the supreme court, served in public life for 54 years. He served 12 years as a district court judge before being appointed to the supreme court November 28, 1914, by Gov. John Haynes. He was reelected continuously until his retirement.

During his 46 years on the bench, he missed only one term of court. A back injury prevented his attending the final supreme court term in 1948.

Many of the famous decisions in Idaho legal history were handed down by Justice Budge and many a University of Idaho law student has come away from one of Justice Budge's many lectures there with a clearer understanding of ethics of law and appellate procedures. His father, who lived to be 95, was one of the University of Idaho's first regents.

Justice Budge was a close personal friend and business partner of former Gov. Frank Steuenberg and was with Steuenberg at Richman, Utah, on the night before an assassin's bomb killed him December 30, 1905.

Mrs. Ella Hoge Budge, whom he married in 1892 at Paris, Idaho, was selected as Idaho's mother of the year in 1950. She survives along with eight children: Dr. Alfred Budge, Jr., Boise; Dr. Bruce Budge, Boise; Representative Hamer Budge (Republican, of Idaho), Boise; Drew W. Budge now living in Mexico; Walter L. Budge, Salt Lake City; Mrs. Wayne C. (Ina) Courson, Ontario, Oreg.; Mrs. William F. (Ora) Cleary, San Francisco; and Mrs. John R. (Belva) Baker, Walnut Creek, Calif.

ON MISSION ABROAD

Justice Budge was born in Providence, Utah, February 24, 1868, but the family moved to Paris, Idaho, when he was very young. When he was 18, the Latter-Day Saints (Mormon) Church called him into missionary service. He went to Geneva, Switzerland, where he learned to speak German fluently. After learning the language he walked across Switzerland, preaching as he went, and continued walking into Germany.

He spent 3 years in Germany before being arrested in Nuremberg on a charge of preaching a faith hostile to the government. He appealed his case to the supreme court at Munich. Hearing that the conviction would be upheld he quietly left the country and reentered Switzerland.

It was this experience which turned him toward law practice. He was graduated from the University of Michigan law school and was admitted to the Idaho bar in 1892. Two years later he was elected district attorney for the fifth judicial district in 1894. He was elected Bear Lake County attorney in 1898.

In 1902 he became district judge at Pocatello and served continuously until his appointment to the supreme court in 1914.

SETS SERVICE RECORD

Three years ago Justice Budge, in an interview, said he didn't know of a jurist in the country who had served as long as he did. He served six terms as Idaho supreme court justice, an honor which is rotated yearly among the justices.

Justice Budge was a member of Oriental Lodge No. 60, A. F. & A. M.

More Evidence That Chinese Communists Are Antireligious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if there is any lingering doubt in anyone's mind of the intentions of the Chinese Communists to destroy all expressions of Christianity, the recent report of Father George M. Carroll, Maryknoll missioner and chaplain with the South Korean Army, showed that not a single one of the priests who were laboring in Korea and were captured by North Korean and Chinese Communist forces, has been heard from. Some of the priests have been hanged and two native sisters have been beaten to death.

I wish that everyone here in the House will take note of the comment of Father Carroll as to the nature of these Communists. Said Father Carroll "these Communists are not men, but devils".

I include herewith an article which appeared in the January 28, 1951 issue of Our Sunday Visitor:

A LETTER FROM KOREA—REDS WANT TO STAMP OUT ALL RELIGION

PYONGYANG, KOREA.—"Korea has lost between 60 and 68 priests in this war, including missioners," reports Father George M. Carroll, Maryknoll missioner serving as chaplain with the South Korean Army.

Father Carroll was stationed here before World War II halted Maryknoll work in North Korea. When he returned recently, after an absence of nearly 10 years, he could find no trace of the native Korean priests who had replaced the American missioners in 1941.

"Bishop Francis Hong and every single one of his priests have been taken, and no word has been heard of them," said Father Carroll. "It is greatly to be feared that they are all dead, although no bodies have been found. Since their hair was cut and they had on ordinary Korean clothes, it would be difficult to identify them."

The bodies of a French priest, Father Joseph Cadars, and an Irish Columbian missioner, Father Anthony Collier, have been found and identified, Father Carroll said. In the Huanghaido area a Korean priest, Father Andrew Chun, had been hanged, and two native sisters had been beaten to death. A third sister who was beaten is not expected to live.

Father Carroll learned definitely that Bishop Patrick J. Byrne, M. M., apostolic delegate to Korea, had reached Pyongyang in a weakened condition, but then was moved to an unknown destination by his Communist captors. With him were his secretary, Father William R. Booth, Maryknoll missioner from Rockville Centre, N. Y., and a French missioner. Also missing are 17 American, Irish, Australian, and French missioners; 9 French, Belgian, and Korean sisters; Bishop Hong and his 15 Korean priests, plus an indefinite number of priests from the Huanghaido area.

"These Communists are not men, but devils," commented Father Carroll. "They have done things that are fiendish. At Andong, in North Kyungsang Province, they took the door off the tabernacle, painted a bull's-eye on the back wall, and used it as a shooting range. They took all the vestments, holy pictures, sacred vessels, crucifixes, and burnt them. At Taejon, where so many were murdered in the prison, and at the Franciscan Monastery, many victims had their hands tied with strips of cloth from the vestments stolen from churches.

"In Kangkei they took the blessed sacrament out of the tabernacle and held it up, mocking it. They told the people to look and see—there was no man there, that it was only the priest deceiving them. They took the host and stamped on it and desecrated it. These Communists were definitely haters of the church and churchmen. The Protestants suffered just as much, if not more, than we Catholics did. All religions were equally hateful to them."

Credit, Production, and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the mass-production line, so familiar to our people in industry and those in agriculture who use the products which flow from that line, is the wonder of the world, insofar as supplying the material needs of mankind is concerned: Even General Eisenhower has recognized this fact.

This mass production and distribution is possible only because we have a market here in the United States. This market in turn is possible only because we have a system of economics and private enterprise which recognizes the fact that the man and woman who produces, is entitled to share in that production, and thus a distribution of the dollar value of goods to the payrollees who are employed by those who first lived simply, exercised thrift, accumulated savings, and then invested those savings in the buildings, machinery, and machine tools and in the form of productive capital, thus making it possible to employ the people who constitute the payrollees.

Some contend that there are those in high Government circles who seek to obtain absolute control of the installment credit which makes it possible for individuals to obtain the use of these goods prior to the accumulation of the necessary savings to pay for the goods. Should the control of such credit be obtained and then sufficiently withheld from the consumers, both the production and distribution of consumers' durable and nondurable goods would drastically decline and we might face a terrific economic recession or depression. In this connection, when I addressed the House, January 25, 1951, I pointed out that—

In 1939 all consumer credit totaled $7,000,000,000 as compared to $20,000,000,000 in December 1950. This is an increase of 185 percent. Credit extension in 1939 when compared to total retail sales of $42,000,000,000 in 1939 was $1 of credit for $6 of sales. In 1948 total retail sales were $123,800,000,000 with a credit extension of $14,300,000,000 or $1 of credit extension for each $8.40 of retail sales. In fourth quarter of 1950 total retail sales were running at a level of $136,000,000,000 and consumer credit extension averaged $19,600,000,000 or $1 of credit for each $7 of sales.

I will concede there have been abuses of installment credit, but to say that it is a major cause of inflation is nonsense and a smoke screen behind the real attempts to do away with it.

A group of responsible retailers years ago recognized some of the abuses in the installment-credit field and banded together and formed the Retail Credit Institute of America. This is a group of public-spirited retailers who have spent their own money and time in educating the public and weeding out the abuses in retailings' own back yard. The institute has earned the respect of the country and deserves the recognition and protection of the Congress.

Again referring to my remarks on January 25, 1951 where I dealt with the question of increased payrollees, increased productive hours, increased production and increased national dollar income, I pointed out that, let us say in 1952 we could attain an annual national dollar income of about $360,000,000,000 at the present price level.

Executive director of the Retail Credit Institute of America is William J. Cheyney, a former professor of economics. Mr. Cheyney made an address before the National Appliance and Radio Dealers Association in Chicago on January 15. Mr. Cheyney pointed out that a few administration spokesmen have brought on the inflation which we now face by scarce statements of shortages of certain goods.

This could be offset by statements predicting an abundance of materials for civilian use and by following this up with all-out civilian production, just as we are doing with items needed for war. Mr. Cheyney feels that there is no conflict between a simultaneous maximum production both for war and civilian use.

He also feels that the American's extra cash, if any, would go into war bonds if the Government made this proposition sufficiently attractive. I am including the following partial text of Mr. Cheyney's speech in the belief that the thousands of molders of public opinion who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will want to study his remarks:

I am led to believe by scrappy data that among the many lines of consumers' durables, those which you handle are enjoying about the best continuing consumer demand. This is understandable. The administration at Washington day by day is practically telling the American people to buy electrical appliances, radio, and TV now or never. The President personally notified each housewife the other day that there will be 50,000 airplanes and 38,000 tanks built each year from now on, requiring the ingredients now put into your product lines, and indicated that soon the result would be drastic shortages in the stores.

I can imagine no more powerful sales talk than this for stampeding markets could be devised by the most lurid advertising genius in America. I must admit, too, that I think the result is both disastrous and pitiful—tragically so and unnecessarily so.

Are the American people such unthinking mobs that they cannot be called upon to cooperate? Is it necessary to treat them with the psychology which says, "It is our intention to cut off your sources of supply. Run, therefore, to the nearest store and buy everything you can lay your hands on which contains steel, aluminum, and copper, because within a few weeks we shall eliminate the supply, issue ration cards, apply stringent

controls, because we know you haven't the brains to be treated any other way."

It seems to me the President could have told us something like this: "We are going to need in our mutual self-defense 50,000 airplanes and 38,000 tanks a year. This will take millions of tons of steel, hundreds of thousands tons of aluminum, copper, etc. As your elected representatives, we the Government, ask: Are you willing to contribute, each one, as many pounds of these metals as you can to the common pool in our common defense? Will you look over your mechanical equipment in your homes, make sure it is in good order? Will you refrain from buying any household mechanical equipment containing these certain ingredients just as long as you possibly can—as long as your present equipment will serve you well—to give us the tanks and planes we need?"

I believe the American people would cooperate if they were asked to contribute their share in this way. Never have we been asked to help except in vague, politically tinged terms. Always we are told we are to be regulated. Why in the world the President of the United States should ask every buyer to rush to the markets and clean out the retail and wholesale stocks of electrical appliances, radio and televisions, despite the fact that millions of the buyers already have usable equipment, is more than I can see.

This faulty approach is the result of mediocrity in the advice the President receives, from people who do not understand markets and marketing, and even less understand the feeling and potential cooperation that lies in the average American family.

On the subject of prices, it is obvious that the present propaganda program of the administration is doing more to pressure prices upward, by stampeding customers into the markets, than any other single price pressure factor. Prices are nothing more than the interplay between the supplies we have and public demand for them.

On one side of the picture today the administration has made a sound move. It has set up an organization under the leadership of Charles E. Wilson, until recently president of the General Electric Co., to bring efficiency and speed into the procurement of defense matériel by the Armed Forces. No one better than Mr. Wilson can ascertain the sources of all necessary ingredients for these defense products and every businessman and citizen stands ready to help him and his associates.

The fact remains, however, that this country is not at war and that in the hit-and-miss type of international relations that have developed, we are face to face with a situation which cannot in any likelihood be altered for 10 more long years. Even if we have a war with Russia, it will be a 10-year war, and not a war of quick invasion. Whichever side is the victor, such a war would bleed both sides white for many, many years to come.

Every economist, including those in the administration, admits that when one considers 10-year periods, the only fundamental answer to a question of inflation, price, and supply lies in a tremendous output increase. Price controls as we have known from the past do not strike at the source of inflation and the price problem—merely dam up a flood which sooner or later must break through. The only long-term answer is increased production, particularly in the areas where because of mobilization needs, shortages of material, manpower, and production may occur. This is a problem lying in part directly at our doorstep. It cannot be solved by price control, rationing, wage control, taxation, or savings programs.

It is my judgment that the President should quickly appoint a commission consisting of a number of the Nation's most brilliant industrialists and marketing experts, with the sole responsibility to find ways and means of increasing our supplies of these most necessary and potentially scarce ingredients.

I have on my desk pamphlets issued by investment analysts pointing out that the stocks of certain industrial concerns are "good buys" at the moment, because these plants have found the way to double or triple their present production. This means they have found sources of materials and new manufacturing efficiencies to offset manpower loss problems, and expect to be able to give to this country tremendously increased output. To the extent that this sort of thing could spread to hundreds of plants, we see a direct cure to both the price and the scarcity dangers we face.

A commission of properly chosen men, respected by all Americans in and out of business and industry, could multiply by hundreds, perhaps by thousands, the number of such concerns, some of them small, some larger, which could increase their own, and in the aggregate, the Nation's industrial and extractive output. This is a big nation with terrific raw-material potentials. In it are men and firms whose output has not been taxed as yet. In it are raw materials which have not been mined or extracted to anything like their fullest potentials. Furthermore, the world too is large and there are sources of raw material in nations not likely to be at war, materials which could be available if we set about scientifically and systematically to find them, eliminate the bottlenecks which restrain their production, and export to the United States.

Most of us in and out of Government have a sleepy idea that, left to its own devices, each industrial enterprise will search the world and country over individually, and thus obtain every last ounce of iron, aluminum, copper, and all the other ingredients it needs so badly.

It is my opinion, however, that in a time of stress like this, this voluntary search cannot possibly be more than 50 or 60 percent effective. Even during the last war at the height of the conflict there were untold resources available, but there was never the properly constituted, highly respected authority specifically commissioned to do the one specific job of finding these missing ingredients.

To set up powerful agencies for military procurement is an obvious need. It has been done. I hope and believe it has been done well.

But for the good of our entire economy, let us call upon our Government to do what it has never done successfully before, i. e., the job of assisting industry—not through bureaucratic, low-level controls—but by the means I have sketched broadly above, carried out to the full extent of the hundreds of ramifications an exploration of the idea makes obvious.

We have used neither efficiency nor foresight as to the Government's responsibility to help industry increase its production. Thus far we have played with special tax exemptions, and capital loans, but the problem remains: "How shall we find new sources of missing ingredients, raw materials, machinery, and manpower, in a gigantic way?"

The three major antidotes for inflation are: Increased production, savings programs, and taxation. I have discussed the first. Our administration needs no help when it comes to imagination about taxing, so I shall skip this one.

In inducing the American people to save by buying E-bonds in 1950-51, we are failing utterly and miserably. We have a wonderful product to sell, but it looks to the American people like a Cadillac car without its chrome, its bumpers, headlights, and windshield. It lacks the vital clinching appeal.

The way E-bonds are offered to the public smacks, too, of misrepresentation. The public is catching on.

Since it is tremendously important that we drain off purchasing power, not just that of the people who buy on credit—but of all of us—and since the E-bonds obviously are the means to do it, I suggest we untangle our bungled packaging and selling of this product.

Here is the problem:

1. If kept for 10 years the bonds pay 2.9 percent. The income from them is taxed. So far for the average workingman the 2.9 percent is only 2 percent. He can do better in a building and loan association.

2. The Government has calculated all along that it never actually will pay this 2.9 percent in the aggregate. And at the beginning the little people bit. They didn't realize that the softly spoken 10 short years are in reality a lifetime when lived out. Now these people have learned that they will have to redeem their bonds after the second, third, or sixth year for family emergencies, hospital bills, to buy homes, and for many other reasons. They know now that Uncle Sam without saying so has intentionally prepared to pay them not the promised 2.9 percent, but closer to 2 percent, or 2.4 percent—even this taxable.

All this could be changed. The bonds could be made popular again. The buying power of the working people could be drained off in savings made to look, and be, real and worth while, and at little cost to the Government.

I urge that an E-bond saving plan be offered to the little people of the country.

1. On which the interest rate is constant through the years, that the Government be intellectually honest—not rely on the fine print to prove legal honesty.

A man's dollar is just as vital to the Government in 1951 as it is in 1958. For every American who must in emergency redeem his bonds, there will be another to pick them up—if the rate is sound and unvarying. There should be no penalty for lending hard-earned money to the Nation. A 6-month holding period might be reasonable, but with interest.

2. The little people must be made to see that they are offered a good bargain—that it is worth while to forego present purchases and to save.

I suggest a 4-percent interest rate, and to prevent those with larger funds from dipping into the Treasury for this bargain package, I suggest that the maximum purchasable quantity of these little bonds be limited to $500 per month. A $5,000 limitation per month on these securities is ridiculous. Confined to $500 per month and kept nonnegotiable as now, the net new cost of the 4-percent rate to the United States would be negligible. I do not suggest that this income be made tax exempt. Therefore, close to one-fourth would come back to the Treasury.

We may have forgotten that the pressure of the cash buyer is more volatile and more inflationary than that of the credit buyer today. A soundly conceived savings bond program will take the pressure off all types of consumer demand, not just off the credit market, as is the purpose of the ill-conceived credit control method of today. All credit controls can do is to channel demand from one area into another. They cannot eliminate it. The effect is about zero upon the major inflationary picture. A soundly conceived, well-sold E-bond program is an entirely different matter.

We can expect Americans to live under strict regimentation for just so long. If our present situation is to last 10 long years, I am quite certain the pure and simple control approach, that was only partially effective in its last experiment will only succeed if accomplished by outright dictatorship; and the loss of all we have any reason to fight for.

Fear of Deportation Drives Aliens Toward Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following newspaper article by Ted Mrozowski, of the Citizen, of Hamtramck and North Detroit, Mich., entitled "Fear of Deportation Drives Aliens Toward Communism," which appeared on January 25, 1951:

FEAR OF DEPORTATION DRIVES ALIENS TOWARD COMMUNISM—150 GIVEN PAMPHLETS AT MEETING

(By Ted Mrozowski)

Fear of deportation is making many aliens and naturalized citizens easy prey for pro-Communist influences.

This is the conclusion I reached after attending a meeting arranged to protest the detention by the United States Department of Justice of John Zydok, 54-year-old waiter, who is listed as financial secretary of the Russian section of the Communist Party here. He was arrested last October under provisions of the Internal Security Act.

Held Friday at Yemans Hall, 3014 Yemans, the meeting was sponsored by the Polish-American Defense Committee, John Zydok Defense Committee, the Michigan Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, and the Civil Rights Congress.

I entered the unheated and dreary hall after buying a copy of the Daily Worker, being sold in the lobby by an elderly and heavily-mustached codger. Even before I was seated, a handful of literature was given me by a person who later was introduced to the audience as one who is facing deportation.

The literature—expensively printed booklets—dealt primarily with harangues on the injustice of the trial of the 12 Communist leaders in New York.

At no time during the meeting, which lasted nearly 3 hours, did the audience exceed 150 persons. Most of those present appeared to be foreign-born, although there were several Negroes in the audience.

It should be said that not once was there any verbal expression of pro-communism during the meeting, but the same cannot be said of the issued literature. One of the pamphlets, issued by the National Non-Partisan Committee To Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders, lists as its officers Paul Robeson, Howard Fast, and Harold Christoffel.

I should say that most of the audience seemed to be interested in only one thing: The answer to all this talk they have been hearing about the deportation of aliens. They are apprehensive and fearful of what is in store for them. They are looking for comfort and consolation. They want to know the answers. Did they get them? Decide for yourself from what transpired.

On the stage behind the speaker's stand was a huge sign with the large printed letters: Free John Zydok. Around the sides of the room were posters, some of which read: 50 Detroiters Face Deportation Proceedings—Fight Deportation Hysteria—McGrath, Jail Lynchers—Protect Use of Steel Pigeons—Reporting Is a Police State Procedure.

The entire program was in the English language and I got the impression that much of what was being said was beyond the comprehension of most of the audience. The chairman introduced several speakers, but the main personality was Abner Green, executive secretary for the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

He painted a bleak picture of what the foreign born can expect if the Justice Department is not stopped (as he put it) "in its drive on noncitizens."

He labeled the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service as the "enemy of the people," and advised the audience not to answer its questions if called downtown.

"If they ask you for the time of day, don't tell them. Don't even tell them if the sun is shining if they ask," he said.

I felt that this was all wrong. This would only instill fear and distrust of the authorities and was a deliberate summons to defy a legal agency. Green engendered additional fear when he said that 3,400 more aliens face deportation.

Sneeringly, Green told how Federal Judge Thomas Thornton ordered Zydok kept in that dirty, filthy Wayne County jail. Judge Thornton, when ordering Zydok held, said, "Zydok's evasiveness convinces me that he is willfully participating in the Communist movement."

The half-understanding audience was told that they might be roused in the early hours of the morning and taken into custody for interrogation; they were told that they would have to prove their innocence rather than the accuser proving them guilty; they would be held without bail, and denied the right to ask for an attorney.

What did this meeting accomplish besides painting a dreadful picture for the audience? The chairman read a resolution which he offered to the audience for action. It was adopted without a dissenting voice. The resolution called for the immediate cessation of all deportation proceedings; repeal of the McCarran Act; and a protest against the jailing of Zydok.

The chairman called for the formation of a delegation to go personally to the Federal building and urge the dropping of the case against Zydok. He also asked all who could to harass the Immigration Service with telephone calls to secure better jail accommodations for Zydok.

Something then happened which I hardly expected. The audience was asked to help pay for the cost of aid to Zydok and others. The chairman asked for voluntary contributions of $20, $10, $5, and $1 bills. He got some of each. In the end, a basket for small change was circulated around the room. I passed it up.

I'm sure that if I were a noncitizen, I would walk away from the meeting with the thought that America is no longer free and that the only thing for me to do is to resist its leaders.

It is here that the real task lies. There are thousands of good, loyal, conscientious noncitizens who are being given a distorted version of America. They can easily become innocent victims of subversive groups, if not immediately reassured by their Government that they have nothing to fear.

Public Favors Thorough Rechecking of All Classes of Draft Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Knoxville Journal of January 28, 1951:

PUBLIC FAVORS THOROUGH RECHECKING OF ALL CLASSES OF DRAFT SELECTEES

Congress is on a spot on this question of lowering the draft to include 18-year-olds that its Members won't succeed in getting off of unscathed politically, no matter how they vote.

There is a natural reluctance on everybody's part to bring young men of 18 into the service except in the face of real necessity. Yet the alternative held out by the manpower experts upon whose facts Congress has to rely is not acceptable either. That alternative is to call back into service substantial numbers of the 2,530,000 men now exempt from the draft as veterans. Among veterans of all wars there is a feeling, for which there is some justification, that, except in a national emergency, no citizen should be forced to participate in more than one war until all those who have become eligible since his war was concluded have taken their turn.

But while Congress and the country is coming to a majority conclusion on the 18-year-old issue, there is one thing that most citizens, and especially veterans, are agreed upon.

Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, last week denounced what he called the horrible practice of the Defense Department, through selective service, of too readily deferring men for failure to pass too rigid intelligence tests. Congress also directed the Defense Department to crack down on selectees classified as IV-F's.

The conviction is widespread that the military authorities, through selective service, have been altogether too choosy about their material in the past year. The heavy percentage of those rejected, on intelligence tests and those for physical fitness, support this view. Whatever Congress may decide about the 18-year-old issue, there is definite sentiment in favor of abandoning the theory that only the most intelligent and only the perfect physical specimens shall be included in the draft. Unless the armed services have changed in a revolutionary manner since most of us were in them, there is still productive work for the uneducated, the stupid, and even those who are only fair physical specimens.

Available Manpower and the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a resolution adopted by the Mississippi Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars a few days ago at Jackson, Miss.

The resolution speaks for itself, but it is inserted herewith in the RECORD for the information and guidance of the members of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, as well as for the Members generally.

In the present controversy as to where the needed men should come from, it is well that those charged with this important duty should give consideration and study to the resolution.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the President of the United States has declared a state of emergency, prices and wages have been frozen, and young men are being drafted for defense of our way of life; and

Whereas there is much controversy as to who shall or shall not be drafted, adding to the confusion which exists in the minds of our people: Therefore be it

Resolved by the council of administration, Department of Mississippi, Veterans of Foreign Wars, meeting in regular session at Jackson, Miss., January 28, 1951, That our leaders should be reminded of the vast pools of manpower now untouched, as follows:

1. Those who were exempted from military service during World War II as being essential to industry, and who are still in an age bracket which would not preclude their being used for combat duty, and whose places in civilian life could be taken by qualified combat veterans of World War II who have been trained since the termination of that conflict;

2. Those who hurried to marry after the passage of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (even though they have become fathers since that time). These men have as much to fight for as any group in the United States.

3. Those who were rejected for minor defects as late as a year and a half ago, and who have not been screened again to determine their fitness for service;

4. Those who were trained during World War II in the V-12 and ASTP programs without prior combat service, and who have not repaid the Nation for their education by active service; and

5. Those who had short periods of service in the United States as members of the armed services just prior to the conclusion of World War II: Be it further

Resolved, That we doubt whether it would be beneficial to the interests of our Nation to exempt so-called superior students in colleges. Under the training programs for World War II veterans, many men have acquired college educations and from what we learn in the press, these men have made the best marks in college work, when taken as a group. Therefore it seems that the country has acquired a reservoir of brains, and further exemptions of students might injure morale; be it further

Resolved, That our Congressmen and Senators and all persons in responsible positions be urged to study the possibilities of the above-named groups as sources of military manpower, so that the principle of equality of sacrifice shall prevail; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be handed the press and the radio.

Do We Have Adequate Domestic Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a broadcast of Sunday, January 28, on the American Forum of the Air. Senator MUNDT and I participated in this broadcast which reviewed the question, "Do we have adequate domestic security?"

This is a question which merits the study of every loyal citizen of the United States, and I believe the American Forum of the Air, under the leadership of Theodore Granik, has rendered a significant service to the country in developing this question and seeking an impartial answer to it.

Theodore Granik, I may add, has focused public attention on the many vexatious problems of our time and through his broadcasts has helped in their clarification and in many cases in their ultimate solution. The broadcast on Sunday takes me back 22 years when I participated in the first broadcast of the American Forum of the Air. Since that time I have followed with much interest the growing scope of the program and the public enthusiasm it has aroused. It is an exhibition of the American and democratic way of life.

The broadcast follows:

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the continental room of the Wardman Park Hotel, in Washington, D. C.

Each week at this time the American Forum of the Air presents special guest speakers, so that you in your home may enjoy authoritative discussions of the provocative and vital topics of our time.

Now to bring you this week's program, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. President Truman has just appointed Admiral Nimitz to report on how best to protect the Nation's internal security without imperiling our individual freedoms. His announcement has focused attention on a dramatic article entitled "The FBI Wants You," appearing in the February issue of Reader's Digest, America's leading magazine, which tells its millions of readers how they can cooperate in the tremendous job being done by the ever-watchful FBI.

But with American mobilization proceeding at top speed there is increasing need for us to be alert against the increasing danger of sabotage, and the question arises ever more imminently: "Do we have adequate domestic security?"

We pose this question to two congressional authorities on the subject, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, coauthor of the Mundt-Ferguson bill, which is part of the internal-security bill passed by the Congress, and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Now, Senator MUNDT, do we have adequate domestic security?

Senator MUNDT. Well, Mr. Granik, I don't believe we have to worry much about the answer to that question. It seems to me it is just as obvious as the red ink in a proverbial New Deal budget. The answer is: "Emphatically no." We do not have adequate security in this country now.

I think we need go back only as far as the news of the last 2 weeks to demonstrate the veracity of that point. Within the past 2 weeks, for example, the Senate Judiciary Committee has constructed a subcommittee, to be called the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities, so that the Senate for the first time will have a committee to be a companion to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which has such a distinguished record over in the other body.

The other development in the last 2 weeks is even more recent, when President Truman appointed the so-called Nimitz Commission, also to check up on the security situation in this country.

It seems obvious, therefore, that either we have to have new and more legislation on security, or we have to have better and more vigorous enforcement of the legislation we now have—or we must have both—in order to get adequate security, domestic security, in America.

And certainly with a war raging in Korea we are not justified in spending billions of dollars to fight communism abroad until we take every conceivable measure to protect our domestic security at home.

Moderator GRANIK. Congressman CELLER?

Representative CELLER. Of course we must adequately protect our domestic security. Whether we have or whether we have not adequate domestic security is difficult to say.

One might ask, "How high is up?" One might ask, "How much armament should we have for external defense?" Those questions are difficult to answer. We cannot adequately tell until some emergency arises.

This is certain: We have 54,000 dues-paying Communists in our midst, and probably an equal number of crypto-Communists, and many more Communist sympathizers. There is evident danger from those sources. We must prepare and arm our hearts, minds, and muscle against the danger.

But we must learn to face that danger without hysteria. We must not develop herd excitement. We must be careful in our tracking down Trojan horses and fifth-columnists that we do not lose our birthright of freedom.

The President very wisely stated, "We must guard our freedom well, guard it from armed assault, guard it from subversive infiltration, guard it from internal suppression of rights, guard it from the deadly imposition of conformity."

I don't agree with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Dakota, that it is well to leave investigations as to whether we have adequate or inadequate security to a congressional committee.

If I may just cite the reasons: We have had investigations, and they are not without political import. The political import is of such a nature that it does more harm than good. And therefore I applaud to a great degree the appointment of the Nimitz Commission by our President. I believe it is an act of statesmanship, and I am sure that Admiral Nimitz and his committee will view this whole subject objectively and without any political bias.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I see no conflict between us on that score. I am in favor of bringing into focus all of the legitimate methods that we can to eliminate the dangers to our domestic security.

First, I would say that the FBI should head the list. Then we have the Central Intelligence Agency. We have the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We now have the new Senate Committee on Un-American Activities. We have the President's Commission, and it is comprised of some very fine Americans. It seems to me, incidentally, that the test about the President's Commission is a simple one. It should be clear that it is a good Commission and is established for legitimate reasons; provided, the President makes available to the Senate and the House Committees on Un-American Activities the same facts, the same files, the same evidence, and the same records, that he proposes to make available to his own Commission.

Moderator GRANIK. Congressman CELLER?

Representative CELLER. I don't think there should be that duplication. I am of the opinion that politically biased senatorial and House of Representatives committees have abused their privileges when they have received confidential files from Government sources. And I would not want those privileged files made available and public. It would be highly dangerous. There are many

Government employees in this room who, if you would allow those files to be made public—files containing written notes of rumors, unfounded observations, and if you would publicize them—would be gravely and unfairly injured, just like the harm that was done to Mrs. Pearl Buck, who was refused the right to speak before a high school in this very city because the Superintendent of Schools said he had to clear her name with the Un-American Activities Committee files. And the files of that committee of the House were looked at for information about her. There were many unfounded and ridiculous charges against Mrs. Pearl Buck in those files. She wasn't called to refute them, to appear before the committee, and she was deprived of the privilege of answer. This woman—a Pulitzer prize winner, a Nobel prize winner, a woman of great renown, of great talents—was not privileged to speak before an audience in this city.

Senator MUNDT. I wonder if we can get the train back on the track for a moment. I never said at any time, Mr. CELLER, that we should have these files made public. I said that if this Presidential Commission was established in good faith, then the same identical facts, files, and records should be made available to the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities and the House Committee on Un-American Activities as are made available to the President's handpicked Commission. I deny emphatically that the President's Board is going to be any more patriotic or any more trustworthy than the Members of the House and the Senate. I quite agree that some records should not be made public, but they should be made equally available to the legislative body as well as to a body established by the Executive for the alleged purpose of checking up on the executive branch of Government.

Representative CELLER. From my experience of 28 years in the House, I will say to my distinguished colleague that there is nothing secret—and the gentleman was a distinguished Member with me—there is nothing secret in Washington. It is like the story of the old lady who said, "I can keep a secret, but the people I tell it to can't." There is where the difficulty stems from. There is nothing secret in the House Office Building and the Senate Office Building, or in the Senate or the House itself. The minute anything is developed there it is made public, because there are many ways in which reporters can get the information. They get a piece here and a piece there, and then you have it blared out in the newspapers, and then you have accusations by headlines, which is a very dangerous thing.

Senator MUNDT. My experience in Congress goes back only 12 years, not 28 years. I don't know what happened in the preceding 16 years when we had Republican administrations, but in the 12 years that I have been down here under a Democratic President, the Executive has continuously withheld information from the Congress. So certainly there have been no such leaks from Congress in the last 12 years.

Representative CELLER. The fault, of course, lies on both sides of the aisle.

Moderator GRANIK. Let me ask this question of Senator MUNDT: We all have confidence in the FBI. Wouldn't it be better to place our emphasis on aiding that well-established organization with new personnel, and so forth?

Senator MUNDT. It is not a question in my mind of "either" and "or." Certainly we should strengthen the FBI. We should give it every last man it needs and every last dollar it can wisely use. But there are certain things that the FBI cannot do. It cannot, for example, conduct congressional hearings. It cannot, for example, call people in and bring folks in the administration in, if necessary, to find evidence and make it public. The FBI is denied, by the very way in which it is constructed, the making of any facts which it discovers public.

So if you are going to discover a man like Alger Hiss or W. K. Remington, who is now being tried, you are going to have to have in addition to the FBI some other commission, some other body—and I think it is wise to have both a Presidential commission and a congressional commission—provided the President isn't going to say, "I will give my commission all the facts and keep these congressional committees operating in the dark." Obviously that would be a fraud and a deception.

Representative CELLER. I yield to no man in my admiration for J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, and I believe we must strengthen the arm of the FBI to track down the Communists and those associated with the Communists in the interests of our internal security. And to that end, only recently I offered a bill, as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, giving the officials of the FBI, with the sanction of the Attorney General, the right to tap wires. I will be severely criticized for that, Senator, as you know; but I believe, in the cases of espionage and sabotage and subversive activities and matters involving our internal security, the FBI has heretofore been greatly hampered by its inability to use the evidence it has obtained by the tapping of wires. I hope that that will be over, and that the FBI will be able to better track down these malefactors with that right.

Furthermore, in the last Congress I offered and successfully had passed a bill which would avoid a repetition of the mistake made in the Coplon case, where there could not have been made an arrest without a warrant. In cases of that sort, my bill—which is now a statute—provides that the FBI shall make arrests without warrant. We have always given that right to United States marshals. Why not the FBI?

Moderator GRANIK. Senator?

Senator MUNDT. I concur completely in both of those bills and congratulate Mr. CELLER on his good work in that connection. It surely is a tragedy to have a situation such as the Coplon case, when there is no question about her guilt, and she is still running around loose, still able to engage in Communist conspiracy, because of some legal technicality that has crept into the statutes. I congratulate my former colleague on his good work in that connection.

Moderator GRANIK. Congressman CELLER?

Representative CELLER. I want to say also that no one has made the Nation more alert to the danger of communism than my friend here this afternoon, Senator MUNDT.

Moderator GRANIK. Congressman, let me ask this: Do you favor the repeal of the Internal Security Act?

Representative CELLER. I do not favor the repeal of all the provisions of the Internal Security Act. There are some provisions in my mind which in my view, as a lawyer of many years standing, I will say are unconstitutional. For example, if the 11 Communists are declared, by affirmance of the Supreme Court, to be guilty of a violation of the so-called Smith Act, which act makes it a crime to teach—without overt acts except teaching—the overthrow of the Government by violence, which the Communists undoubtedly do teach, then, if, under the McCarran Act, Communists must register as Communists, you will force them to incriminate themselves, which is in violation of the Constitution.

Moderator GRANIK. Will the Senator answer that point?

Senator MUNDT. I want to point out that I agree with one point that Mr. CELLER is approaching, and that is that in connection with the present Internal Security Act there are some changes that need to be made. In my opinion they are not changes that need to be made legislatively. They are changes that need to be made by the Attorney General's Office, so that he will administer the act properly. And I would like to suggest that he administer that act in conformity with the very good advice given him by my colleague, Mr. CELLER, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, in his address in New York just last month, when he pointed out that the present difficulties in the Internal Security Act with regard to bringing people to this country on visas grows out of a distorted, perverted, and strained interpretation made by the Attorney General.

In that speech my colleague said that the Congress wanted to close our doors to those who are Nazis or Fascists or Communists actively, knowingly, and willfully helping in the penetration of the most appalling crimes ever recorded in human history.

In my opinion, and I repeat it once more, the Congress certainly wanted the administrators of the law to look at the record of the individual himself, and not to classify him automatically as a component part of any objectionable group. I think it utterly idiotic, under the Attorney General's recommendation, the keeping out of a 3-month old baby from Spain because, the Attorney General says, Congress intended to keep out those kinds of people. Obviously that is an effort, a deliberate effort in my opinion, to discredit a good piece of legislation with the American public.

I congratulate you, Congressman CELLER, on your splendid advice to the Attorney General in that speech, which I have studied very carefully.

Representative CELLER. I will say that in the New York Times this morning Attorney General McGrath denied there was any such attempt to keep a 3-month-old baby, born in Spain, out of this country.

Senator MUNDT. The baby was kept out, maybe by intent or maybe by accident, but it was kept out because of an erroneous interpretation of the act.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for questions from our audience, gentlemen.

Now for our first question. Young lady, you have the first question from the audience?

Mrs. SHERWOOD. My name is Claire Sherwood. I am a housewife, and my question is directed to Congressman CELLER. Is any effort being made to combine with Canada on a cooperative system of antisubversive control in view of easy border crossing?

Representative CELLER. I understand there is liaison between the Department of State and appropriate officials of Canada in that direction. I cannot give you the details at this juncture.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that at all, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. No; because that involves matters of military security which are best not discussed in public. But I can say that there are some efforts being made in that direction.

Moderator GRANIK. We will take another question. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. BART. My name is Ray Bart. I am a writer. My question is to Senator MUNDT. How do you propose to counteract the tendency of human nature to be fascinated and attracted by anything that is forbidden?

Senator MUNDT. I think the best way to counteract that, Mr. Bart, is to make the general public understand the dangers involved in eating that kind of forbidden fruit. I live out in the great State of South Dakota. Out there we have a pest known as the rattlesnake; and it is forbidden by human nature to play with the rattlesnake because you get hurt if you do. I think if we can make people understand that playing with communism is even more dangerous than playing with a rattlesnake, that particular proclivity of human nature will not worry us any more.

Moderator GRANIK. Have you gentlemen thought out a program for internal security? Or do you want to comment on the last question?

Representative CELLER. I will answer your question. Yes; I have thought out a program for internal security; and I agree with the Senator that we must make the people of the Nation conscious of the danger, and we must build up barriers from within by education and by example.

I understand, for example, that the Munitions Board—and I note in the audience the distinguished Vice Chairman, Mr. William VanAtten, of that Board—has been entrusted with the program of spreading the gospel of caution against negligence and prohibition against loose talk throughout the Nation. And they are, by educational processes, infusing the Nation with the idea of being careful and of reporting any suspicious circumstances to the FBI. They are urging slogans like those successfully used during the last war, like, "Button up your lip, the enemy is listening."

They, in addition, are watching the focal points of production, the power plants, and the arsenals and the warehouses and the bottlenecks of strategic production, the airplane plants and the atomic energy plants, to see to it that there will be no infiltration of subversives or fifth columnists or spies and the like.

Every mill, mine, and factory is a potential Communist fortress. The Communists want to know all about those mills and the factories, and every workman on the work bench must be alerted to the peril. If they are properly warned and educated, that will build up to a great and measurable degree of internal security.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I think those are all good suggestions. I think it would also be very helpful if in every high school in America, a course could be taught in capsule form—short and to the point—on what is right with America so that young Americans growing up could come to understand that there are some things in this country we have got to protect and defend if we are going to stay free.

I would also like to see such great organizations as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and many other fine patriotic service organizations conduct simultaneously throughout America a Know Your America Week, in which you have all kinds of displays and programs and editorials and motion-picture shows and pageants pointing out those things about America which are strong and fine and fundamental and good, because I think that if the average American comes to appreciate those things sufficiently it will help make him alert against communism and less inclined to go for the forbidden fruit that my friend suggested in his question.

Moderator GRANIK. May we have another question?

Dr. GIGLIOTTI. My question is for Congressman CELLER. I am Dr. Gigliotti, the national chaplain of the Veterans' Association, and I am from Mesa, Calif. The question is: If the recent results we have had abroad with our intelligence is a sample of what we have at home, how do we know that a fifth column isn't operating in our midst to destroy us?

Representative CELLER. There is no doubt, in my humble opinion, that a fifth column is operating. I mentioned before—and the Senator will vouchsafe what I said—that there are many Communists, crypto-Communists, neo-Communists, Communist sympathizers, and Coramunist-front organizations, all bent in the direction of having a huge fifth coluan to weaken our industrial might, weaken our military, and thus give aid and comfort to the Kremlin.

As to the military intelligence abroad, I don't care to give any opinion now. At some subsequent time, I might.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. The doctor from California is a great friend of mine, and I would like to assure him that certainly there is a very formidable fifth column operating in our midst now. As a matter of fact, this article in Readers Digest which gave the genesis to this program today points out that the FBI considers there are 500,000 dangerously disloyal people in America now, every one of whom is a potential and many of whom are actual spies.

Moderator GRANIK. Another question. Go ahead, Congressman CELLER.

Representative CELLER. I might say that in all of this we must be careful that there are no character assassinations, that there are no purges, so-called, that we don't discourage scientists because of vexatious and most annoying inquisitions from doing a good job for the country. We don't want any witch hunts. We don't want any besmirching of character. We don't want to have too much conformity because that is dangerous to the Nation. We don't want men and women labeled Communists because they don't conform. We don't want them labeled Communists because they are unorthodox in their political views or because they refuse to abide by the political status quo. That is the danger that we must also be conscious of. We must have a wise balance between security, on the one hand, and freedom, on the other. Then we will have a perfect condition.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I would like to say, of course, that I concur in all of those pious objectives. But the real danger today is not that we are going to have a witch hunt, not that we are going to have hysteria—the big danger is that we are going to lean so far over backwards that we are not going to be able to stand up and fight.

Representative CELLER. I think it is dangerous too. For example, to give one illustration of what foolish fears can lead us to say and do—in the House of Representatives only recently one of our Members rose to state that he was troubled by the fact that on the walls of the House appeared plaques commemorating the great law givers of all ages like Gaius, Justinian, Moses, and Hammurabi, and Solon. He added that he didn't want any of these "foreigners" here. "Why couldn't we have Americans?" I do not give the exact language. I do give the import.

He indicated that he had a fear, that he didn't like these foreigners—these old foreigners who were law givers—and he wanted to have the walls stripped of them. That is the attitude that I am fearful of, that kind of distrustful provincialism which will give us a herd and animal instinct which, when we cannot get rid of, we want wise counsel to prevail.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I still think the great danger in this country comes from the fact that we have some 500,000 disloyal people in this country, most of whom have not yet registered, or come out in the open so we don't know who they are. We must control and curb this communistic conspiracy at home.

Now, we have to do this thing wisely and we have to do it without hysteria, but the main thing is that we have got to do it, and we haven't been able to do it up to now.

Moderator GRANIK. One last question.

Mr. RADFORD. My name is Alton H. Radford, and I work for the Government. My question is directed to Senator MUNDT. Is it a safe policy to divulge our domestic security measures to the general public and thus risk giving this information to our enemies?

Senator MUNDT. It depends on kind, of course. If we are dealing with some kind of espionage case in a munitions plant, if it is like the earlier question involving our neighborly relations and cooperation with Canada, I would say no. If it is the matter of focusing public opinion upon the dangers of communism and how it operates so that the average American can detect what is happening in his own organization and his own neighborhood, I would say emphatically, yes, we should do that. The danger then is that we fail to give sufficient publicity to the threat of communism at home.

Representative CELLER. In that connection there is a provision in the McCarran Act which provides that the Secretary of Defense must publicize a list of the names of all defense plants or plants having subcontracts for defense work so that Communists will not be employed in those plants. But that is an aid to Stalin. I think that is one of the provisions we must rip out of the McCarran Act.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for our summaries. Senator MUNDT, please.

Senator MUNDT. Just a statement about what is and what is not in the so-called McCarran Act, which I think is not foolproof, that it is not a compulsory mandate for the Secretary of Defense; and the best test of that is that he is not using it now. It gives him the authority to use it if he wants to. I don't believe my colleague is holding that the Secretary of Defense is in defiance of the law.

I think the most important thing we have brought out this afternoon, in summary may I say because a great many people are listening in on this program, is that I think it is important our people watch the papers mighty carefully during the next few weeks to see whether or not the President's commission to check on subversive activities in the executive department is going to be given the opportunity to function in a fashion which is going to get results. It is comprised of some mighty fine Americans. If the President gives the Senate and the House committees the same facts as he gives them, we shall certainly have a fine arrangement. But every American should be skeptical of an arrangement which would permit the President's Commission to be privileged to have access to the facts, files, and records and denies the same evidence to the Senate and the House. That would be a very bad miscarriage of justice.

Representative CELLER. The Communist Party covertly and overtly would use all means to overthrow our Government. Not only its members, but its sympathizers, who are its dupes, would unwittingly do the same. They constitute a Trojan horse of disloyalty.

The American people must beware their mealy mouthed sweet words of peace, democracy, brotherhood. The knife they would plunge into our backs is coiled in their slogans. But our response to the danger must be without hysteria, without excitement that leads to scapegoatism, witch hunts and vigilantism.

We cannot allow individual rights to be swept away. They are as sacred as internal security. There is no internal security if our constitutional rights are destroyed. We must strike a balance between security and individual rights.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on "Do We Have Adequate Domestic Security?" Our speakers have been Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of of New York.

Quit Bluffing, California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Arizona Daily Star on Thursday, January 25. The editorial deals with facts and is concise and to the point concerning California's tactics in regard to the Central Arizona project bill, which has again been introduced in both the Senate and the House in the Eighty-second Congress.

QUIT BLUFFING, CALIFORNIA

As the Eighty-second Congress begins work, Arizona has again introduced her central Arizona project bill, and California has again started her tactics of delay, confusion, and pure bluff.

The program to bring 1,200,000 acre-feet of main stream Colorado River water annually to the farm lands in central Arizona which needs it so badly has been defeated in past Congresses by these tactics. Unless Arizona is able to expose California's bluff defeat may again greet the bill.

The bluff goes something like this: California has in the past made loud and self-righteous demands that the Supreme Court decide the issue of how much water belongs to which State. Behind these demands was the old plan of delaying the issue.

First, California had no justifiable issue. Since the bill had not passed, no threat had been made on the Colorado water which she considered her own, and there was nothing for the Supreme Court to decide. California had no grievance to take before the Court.

Second, her plea for a Supreme Court decision was so handled that the matter would have had to wait 2 years before the Supreme Court would even take a look at it to decide if it could make a judgment.

Arizona, anxious to have the matter settled, wrote into the present bill an amendment which provides for Supreme Court settlement of the issue, answering California demands.

The amendment provides that, after passage of the bill, the irrigation portion of the project would be held up for 6 months, giving California that time to file suit before the Supreme Court and have the issue decided.

Should the Supreme Court decide in favor of California, the power program of the project, which California wants, would be completed and the Arizona plea for water would be rejected.

But California was bluffing about wanting Supreme Court action on the issue, and she is still bluffing.

The following is an excerpt from an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday:

"The logical way to look at the matter, it now seems, is to press for a Supreme Court settlement of the basic water dispute between California and Arizona. * * * California has contended with indisputable common sense that the matter of who owns the water should be determined before any further projects are authorized."

The catch occurs in the last six words, "before any further projects are authorized." Unless the central Arizona project bill passes, authorizing this project, there will be nothing for the Supreme Court to decide. California will have no threat of loss to take to the Court.

If California truly wanted the Supreme Court to decide, she would help Arizona pass this bill, the amendment in which gives her 6 months to sue before that court.

The Times, in its editorial, makes no mention of the fact that this amendment is part of the bill. Instead it states:

"Admittedly the Supreme Court of the United States is the only agency that can settle the controversy. Arizona has attempted to side-step this fact by 'bulling through' the measure with sheer political pressure."

Obviously California, while pleading for Supreme Court action in the matter, is determined to prevent the issue from reaching the Supreme Court.

Why? Because the legal history of the Colorado River controversy gives Arizona unquestionable right to the water she seeks for the central valley. California knows that, and knows that once the Supreme Court hears the case the matter will be settled once and for all in the favor of Arizona.

Price and Wage Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, price and wage controls are an ever-growing problem among the people of the United States. Skyrocketing prices are about to destroy the purchasing power of the dollar, destroy the effectiveness of our defense program, and are increasing the confusion and destroying the faith of our people in the Government.

The Economic Stabilization Agency has no mean job. It is a stupendous task that Agency has undertaken, but at least the Agency can be frank with our people. If a definite date for price and wage setting or roll-back had been set months ago, with the admonition that the producer, middleman, and consumer must beware and act at his own risk, we would not be facing the situation we face today. In this connection, I include the following sensible letter on the subject from an outstanding young attorney from my South Carolina district:

JANUARY 27, 1951.

Hon. J. P. RICHARDS,
Member of Congress,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RICHARDS: This letter to you was prompted by the wage and price controls just announced yesterday by the Economic Stabilization Agency. I have just returned from a trip to a local supermarket here in Lancaster. The result, this letter.

I have been buying the groceries for our home for a long time and am fairly familiar with the price of food as far as the consumer is concerned. Since I have been buying the groceries, we have been getting the same foods week after week and, I might add, trying to live on a very close budget.

Prices have been increasing steadily since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. The payoff came today when there was an increase of approximately 10 percent over the prices of last week. They were marking up the prices of certain articles while I was in the store today. It is an outrage.

And the worst part about it is the fact that when price controls were announced from Washington, the prices adopted as the maximum amounts were those in existence on certain articles on January 25, 1951, which prices are at the highest level in the entire history of these United States.

I've heard the old story that to roll back the prices would disrupt the entire economy of the country. If something is not done to roll back prices, the economy of the country will be disrupted because of the fact that there is less money in the hands of the wage-earner than at any time in recent years and the buying power of the almighty dollar is only one-fourth that of pre-World War II.

There are 150,000,000 consumers in this country that are being affected by the high cost of living. There would be at greatest 1,000,000 meat packers, producers, canners, and the like, who would be affected by a price roll-back; and the only ones who would suffer would be those who have been speculating on the price of commodities due to the war effort.

Something can and must be done about it. I have stated my views and the views of other consumers with whom I have talked concerning the utterly stupid move on the part of the afore-mentioned agency in setting the date which it did as the date to set up price-control standards.

Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit Urging the Immediate Construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the resolution approved unanimously by the Common Council of the City of Detroit at its formal session of January 23, 1951.

This resolution urges the Congress of the United States to give its immediate approval to the agreement between this country and Canada calling for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The present period of international crisis and tension is the background against which there appears, with increasing clarity, the vital importance of this long-considered project to the maintence of our national security in the troubled days which lie ahead. It is essential that we preserve intact the productive industrial pattern of this area of the great Midwest, and in the opinion of most of the experts who have set down their views on the subject, the St. Lawrence seaway is the only practicable way to accomplish this highly desirable end.

The unanimously voiced opinion of the common council of the great city

of Detroit expresses the urgency of beginning this construction immediately, and I respectfully offer it here for the consideration of every Member of this body.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas Detroit's great mass-production machinery supplied a major portion of the implements of war during the last world conflict to force the principle of democracy into submission and the city earned the title of "The Arsenal of Democracy": and

Whereas for the third time within a generation, Detroit factories are being called upon to convert her factories into producing arms in a preparedness program to preserve the liberties and security of freethinking people; and

Whereas the entire Nation and all freedom-loving peoples of the world having a common interest in stopping an aggressor nation that is presently challenging the security of the world, has a stake in Detroit's ability to produce the necessary goods; and

Whereas Detroit, the largest steel-consuming area in the country, is gravely concerned about there being an adequate source of iron ore available to produce the necessary steel at a reasonable cost; and

Whereas a sizeable portion of the steel industry that must find a new source of ore in the near future is developing fields in Labrador and Quebec and the Department of Defense has stated the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is now essential to our national defense because it would provide greater access to additional sources of high-grade iron ore in Labrador and Quebec; and

Whereas there are grave doubts whether the required Labrador and Quebec ore can be secured by existing transportation facilities in view of the perennial freight-car shortage every fall that disrupts the free flow of goods; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has also stated the seaway would be of distinct advantage in the event of a national emergency because it would make available additional shipbuilding and repairing facilities; and

Whereas the Department of Defense claims the inland route from Laborador, free from enemy submarines, would require less protective measures than open-sea routes, because of the high defense priority already accorded the area; and

Whereas the National Security Resources Board points out even greater amounts of foreign ores must be imported if the demands for steel are to be met and that only as a last resort would any attempt be made to bring this ore in over the open-sea routes and concludes that the power and navigation produced by the project is extremely important to the national security; and

Whereas the President of the United States has decreed the St. Lawrence seaway project to be vital to the defense needs of this country and other democracies of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the interest of the defense of this Nation and in the interest of the security of free people here and in other countries, that the Common Council of the City of Detroit wholeheartedly support the St. Lawrence seaway project and urges the Congress of the United States to give immediate approval of the agreement with Canada calling for the construction of the project; and be it further

Resolved, That this Common Council urge the Michigan State Legislature to pass a concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to give immediate approval to this important defense project and to call upon other State legislaures to take similar positive action; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Governor of the State of Michigan and to the Michigan Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

Someday You May Be President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. H. L. Hunt, a well known and very successful businessman of Texas and the Southwest:

SOMEDAY YOU MAY BE PRESIDENT

(By H. L. Hunt)

Do you remember when you heard this as a child? How many mothers in all walks of life have said it to their sons. How many teachers in public schools have encouraged their students with this challenging and really startling statement. Though said millions of times, it was always new. It was an intriguing thought. Inspired by it, young men of high ability in the past have given up chances to build a fortune for themselves for a life of public service. However distant, indefinite and slim their chance to be President, it was for them always a goal within the range of possibility. It was a possible reward for high integrity, honest ability and recognized usefulness, and they were willing to give their best.

The belief that every boy has a chance to be President has always been a part of national thinking during the 170 years of our history. Limiting the tenure of the President to 8 years is not only in keeping with our national tradition, it is of the essence of American democracy. Nearly 4 years ago both the Senate and the House adopted a constitutional amendment to effect this. A two-thirds majority vote was required. Since the adoption of this amendment by Congress, 24 States have ratified the amendment. Ratification by 12 more State legislatures is required. There has never been a constitutional amendment ratified unless it was ratified within 4 years from the time of its adoption by Congress.

The third-term precedent which, by usage and custom, had served the purpose of limiting the President's term in office was one of the great casualties of World War II. In those tense and uncertain days the American public chose to continue its war leadership.

From this time on every President, regardless of party, will be persuaded by the hangers-on which they accumulate to continue to serve their country, to force their renomination and attempt to force their reelection as long as they may live. A salutary situation would promptly result from the limitation of the President's term. Many prominent statesmen and up-and-coming lesser figures in public life would be seriously considered as presidential and vice presidential timber, their qualifications and availability studied, and perhaps their names appear in public opinion polls. For example, Texas would be bragging on and boosting its SAM RAYBURN, Governor Shivers, Senators JOHNSON and CONNALLY, ex-Governors Moody, Allred, Stevenson, Hobby, Congressmen GOSSETT, FRANK WILSON, and other outstanding Members of its delegation in Congress, the partisans for each saying that they would make great Presidents, which most of them would.

Oklahoma's Senators KERR and MONRONEY and its other favorite sons would come in for greater recognition and fuller influence. Enthusiastic appraisal would be made of leaders throughout all of the States.

The South, which has not had one of its residents elected to the Presidency for 103 years, would have a vastly better chance to be so honored.

A President, upon being renominated, personally selects his Vice Presidential running mate. This custom further closes the door to the Presidency for men of outstanding ability.

Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming have not ratified. The legislatures of 22 of these States are now in session.

The limitation of 4 years tenure in the governor's office is a part of the Constitution of many of the States which have failed to ratify the constitutional amendment. This limitation of the governor's tenure has served them well, and there is not a single State in the Union which has it whose people would consider for a moment giving it up.

Let us look at the score. The Democratic incumbent Truman is exempt and unaffected. The amendment is truly nonpartisan, nearly noncontroversial, and much to be desired. The legislatures are in session, and one might think ratifications will surely be voted. But find out, by talking to your friends, either in or out of public life, how much they know about it, what they think about it, and what they are doing about it. You will likely be appalled at the stupendous indifference which you encounter and realize that this wonderful constitutional amendment may die through inattention and inertia.

The Ground Hog and the Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am moved to again remind my colleagues and the country that we are celebrating groundhog day, and out of consideration of the presence in my congressional district of the slumbering ground hog of Quarryville I can do no less than once more emphasize the prognocticating powers of this great marmot.

In extolling the virtues of this noble animal I cannot help but give way to righteous indignation at the base canard which has been leveled at this profound prophet of portentuous events by the National Geographic Society. Happily this slur on our peerless predictor has been ably answered in a news item which appeared in the Coatesville (Pa.) Record, which I am privileged to include in this statement, as follows:

CAN'T SLUR GROUNDHOG'S FORECASTING SAY QUARRYVILLE LODGE OFFICIALS

The entire membership of the Slumbering Groundhog Lodge of Quarryville let go yesterday with a bitter blast at the National Geographic Society, Washington, D. C., which recently attempted to discredit the groundhog's position as a weather prophet.

Charles F. Hess, chairman of the board of hibernating governors, declared for the entire lodge, "The scurrilous attack on the wisdom, integrity, and inclinations of the groundhog recently issued by the National Geographic Society is deeply deplored by the Slumbering Lodge of Quarryville. Geographic Society members may know geography but they just do not understand groundhogs."

Among the charges leveled by the society was a statement that the groundhog "refuses to work on the one day it is expected of him."

"Never in the 42 years of official groundhog-watching has our patron saint failed to make his appearance," snorted Hess.

Groundhog day, 1951, will be the forty-third observance by the Quarryville Lodge. "Of course, we will see the groundhog," declared Hess.

The Geographic Society also deplored the fact that a calendar day is named especially for him.

Hess, expressing amazement that the Geographic Society should be so small, declared, "Why shouldn't there be a special day named for the groundhog, when he has been a respected member of society for many thousands of years?"

Dr. Rhys Carpenter, a lodge member and professor of Archeology at Bryn Mawr College, issued this statement:

"I have succeeded in tracing the time-honored practices of the groundhog through the past 3,000 years of European cultural history, and I am in possession of evidence suggesting his possible primal rise on the paleolithic horizon, roughly 50,000 years ago."

"With such a background of antiquity to his credit," declared Hess, "the groundhog would be attacked only by such interests as would destroy the cherished legend of Santa Claus."

Hess noted trimphantly that three of the honored members of the Quarryville lodge are shaping the destiny of the United States in this crucial time.

He spoke of the significant contributions being made by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Charles E. Wilson, defense mobilization chief. Heading the country is President Harry Truman, another honorary member of the lodge.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the friendly rivalry which has always existed between the respective hibernating prognosticators of Quarryville and Punxsutawney I am pleased to report that my esteemed colleague from the Nineteenth Pennsylvania District [Mr. GAVIN] has agreed to an armistice for the duration of this present emergency. While each of us will continue to insist on the superiority of his local prognosticator we recognize that it is essential that we unite for a common effort in this crucial period. Henceforth we shall issue joint reports and predictions which will be based on the omens observed by our subterranean seer and, in addition, have determined that all material thus assembled shall be made available to all agencies of Government, particularly the State Department which, while its collective head has for so long been buried in the sand, has never had the sense to look into the earthy cloister of the humble woodchuck in order to determine when it is advisable to come in out of the rain.

We are moved also to point out that as the designer and builder of the original air-raid shelter our Government could do worse than call in this accomplished artisan to direct our defense against atomic warfare. Certainly calling upon his sage advice could not help but bring to the councils of state a refreshing departure from the vacillation, uncertainty, evasion, and befuddlement which for, lo, these 20 years has marked a Government of the people but which has all too often apparently been against them.

That "Wall of Separation" and the Public School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the January 1951 issue of the Catholic World. This magazine is published by the Paulist Fathers in New York.

The article, entitled "That 'Wall of Separation' and the Public School," was written by Rev. J. E. Coogan, S. J. Father Coogan for the past 14 years has been director of the department of sociology of the University of Detroit and, since 1947, chairman of the Mayor's Interracial Committee, a part of the Detroit City administration. Father Coogan writes for many magazines.

The article follows:

THAT "WALL OF SEPARATION" AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

(By J. E. Coogan, S. J.)

The Catholic hierarchy of America in its November 1948 annual meeting startled many critics by its forthright condemnation of Mr. Justice Black's version of the Supreme Court decision in the Everson and the McCollum cases. As remarked in America (April 24, 1948, p. 50) the Justice had written into our Federal constitutional law the revolutionary principle that the first amendment prohibited both the Federal and State Governments from passing laws in behalf of religion, even though without sectarian discrimination. The American system required a wall of separation between church and state. These decisions, the hierachy declared, paid scant attention to * * * history.

In view of the obvious truth of the bishops' charge, it is difficult to explain the surprise their words provoked. There is no need to go outside the field of tax-supported public school education to find countless examples of Government cooperation with religion throughout the history of these United States.

Everyone is aware that colonial American tax-supported education was religious in content and control. The adoption of the first amendment by no means emptied public education of its religious content. As Conrad Moehlman, professor of the history of Christianity, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, says in School and Church: "Well into the nineteenth century the churches were directing the progress of education, and local ministers concerned themselves about proper teachers, teaching, and morals, expecting financial support from the Government."

So beyond dispute is the religious character of public education well into the nineteenth century that Horace Mann is commonly though mistakenly said to have begun the work of secularization when made the secretary of the board of education in Massachusetts as late as 1837. The fact is that as Mann indignantly protested, he was the foe, not of religion, but of sectarianism in public education. One such denial Mann wrote in his reply to a secularizing charge made by a Boston minister (Raymond B. Culver, Horace Mann and Religion): "You accuse me before the world of being opposed to religion in our schools. I regard hostility to religion in our schools as the greatest crime which I could commit against man or against God."

Dr. Culver's own studied conclusion regarding Mann's attitude toward religion in public-school education is emphatic:

"Horace Mann was opposed to sectarian doctrinal instruction in the schools, but he repeatedly urged the teaching of the elements of religion common to all of the Christian sects. He took a firm stand against the idea of a purely secular education. * * * Far from taking religion out of the schools, Mr. Mann sought in positive fashion to * * * devise a constructive, nonsectarian program of moral and religious education which would be in accordance with the terms of the law. It was largely due to his advocacy that the Bible was almost universally used in the schools before he resigned the secretaryship. He abhorred the idea of a purely secular curriculum."

For many years after the Revolution the most religiously significant text—perhaps after the Bible itself—in New England tax-supported schools was the New England Primer. First published between 1687 and 1690, its circulation was enormous. Arthur Jackson Hall, in his Religious Education in the Public Schools of the State and City of New York, shows that the Primer was still much used after more than 150 years, by which time 3,000,000 copies had been sold. But for the public schools of the country as a whole, outside of the Northeastern States, and beginning over a hundred years ago, the instrument of overwhelming importance for religious indoctrination in the public schools was the well-known series of seven books (the first a primer) called the McGuffey Readers. During the period 1836 to 1920 an estimated 124,000,000 copies were sold, the high point of their use being about 1880. Because of the altogether special place these Readers had in American public-school education a discussion of their religious content seems worth while.

In his historical series, Our Times, Mark Sullivan says, "At all times and in every respect, the McGuffey Readers had a strong flavor of religion." Richard D. Mosier in his Making the American Mind, says as the result of his own study of the Readers: "As the research proceeded, it soon became apparent that the McGuffey Readers were consistently stressing a few basic ideas, playing upon a few major themes. * * * The continuity of the basic pattern of ideas is * * * quite the remarkable phenomenon of the whole series."

Quite the most characteristic portion of this basic pattern is religion. This element is found early in the primer itself and grows in variety and force through the succeeding six Readers. As an evidence of this development we have but to turn to the last of the Readers; we use here the edition of 1857, reprinted by Henry Ford in appreciative memory of his own McGuffey school days. Religious references occur throughout, borrowed widely from English literature. Some single citations extend through several pages. To give a few typical excerpts covering the chief points of the scheme of salvation: We have (from Everett) God's existence shown in the sunrise:

"I am filled with amazement, when I am told, that, in this enlightened age and in the heart of the Christian world, there are persons who can witness this daily manifestation of the power and wisdom of the Creator, and yet say in their heart, there is no God."

But the God of the sunrise is shown in the Reader to be everywhere:

"See where the mountains rise;
Where thundering torrents foam;
Where, veiled in towering skies,
The eagle makes his home:
Where savage nature dwells,
My God is present too:
Through all her wildest dells
His footsteps I pursue."

Service of this God alone is shown to make life worth while; to cite a few of the many lines given of Heber's Life, a Mighty River:

"Shall we not think ourselves henceforth as wayfaring persons only, who have no abiding inheritance but in the hope of a better world, and to whom even that world would be worse than hopeless, if it were not for our Lord Jesus Christ, and the interest we have obtained in His mercies?"

In a manner to send shudders through the Freudian frame, self-conquest over animal nature is promised the victor's crown:

"He hath wrestled with Self, and with passion striven;
And to him hath the Sword of the Spirit been given—
Oh! crown him! for his foes—his sins—are slain."

The Hebrew Psalmist too is called to testify to God's goodness to such as fear Him:

"Fret not thyself because of evildoers,
Neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity;
For they shall be cut down like the grass,
And wither as the green herb.
Trust in the Lord and do good;
So shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed.
Delight thyself, also, in the Lord,
And He shall give thee the desires of thy heart."

That after death comes the judgment is solemnly affirmed:

"Before that assembly, every man's good deeds will be declared; and his most secret sins disclosed. As no elevation of rank will then give a title to respect, no obscurity of condition shall exclude the just from public honor, or screen the guilty from public shame."

To life's faithful pilgrim comes the promise of heaven for sorrow bravely borne:

"There is bliss, there is bliss, in the regions above,
They have opened the gates of the sky;
A spirit has soared to those mansions of love,
And seeks for admittance on high;
And friends long divided are hasting to greet,
In a land where no sorrow may come,
And the seraphs are eager a sister to meet,
And to welcome the child to its home."

As the prospect for the impenitent, McGuffey holds out Milton's Satan, Sin and Death.

The McGuffey readers easily make mention of Christ and salvation through Him. A telling apologetic for Christianity is cited in this sixth reader as from John Marshall, Chief Justice of the United States. The Acts of the Apostles are used to tell the story of St. Paul before King Agrippa, where the king confesses, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian;" and Paul answers: "I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am, except these bonds."

Although the McGuffey readers were compiled for tax-supported schools largely Protestant, the readers were remarkable for the absence of things offensive to Catholics. At times they went out of their way to discredit bigotry. The following tribute from Irving to Columbus, plainly labeled Catholic, is illustrative:

"His piety was genuine and fervent. Religion mingled with the whole course of his thoughts and actions, and shone forth in his most private and unstudied writings. Whenever he made any great discovery, he devoutly returned thanks to God. * * * All his great enterprises were undertaken in the name of the Holy Trinity, and he partook of the holy sacrament previous to embarkation."

Not content to sing the praises of religion, the Reader deplores the consequences of its absence. The disastrous outcome of secularism is prophetically foretold in Observation of the Sabbath:

"No man can preserve his own morals, no parent can preserve the morals of his children, without the impressions of religious obligation. If you can induce a community to doubt the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures; to question the reality and obligation of religion; to hesitate, undeciding, whether there is any such thing as virtue or vice; whether there be an eternal state of retribution beyond the grave; or whether there exists any such being as God; you have broken down the barriers of moral virtue, and hoisted the flood gates of immorality and crime."

Champions of the secular school as alone American evidently should be told that they are scarcely of yesterday. The public schools of our founding fathers and nation builders alike were inspired with the story of God and His relations with men; of God in nature, of God in revelation old and new; of Christ and Salvation through Him. Why, then, should the secularizers be provoked by the Catholic hierarchy's condemnation of Mr. Justice Black's version of the Supreme Court decisions in the Everson and McCollum cases? Those decisions, indeed, paid "scant attention to * * * history."

What, No Red Herring?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Burlington Free Press which is quite to the point.

It does seem that there is at least a moral obligation on the part of the President to once and forever disavow the red-herring charges that he has leveled against all efforts to eliminate Communists and fellow travelers who are or were employed in the Federal Government.

The editorial follows:

A PRESIDENT SPEAKS

After considerable criticism of the man in the White House, we would be shirking the interests of fair play if we did not remark on his apparent change of heart shown in a speech last week in which he said there was no difference between Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolino. Now, that took a long time to sink in. A lot of simple, little people have known that for years.

Even though press services, including the friendly greatest daily in Wisconsin, report that the President added the name Stalin last, and we quote "almost as an afterthought," the ring of truth has at last been heard in the words of the Nation's leader.

Now, if he will just explain what a red herring is in his vocabulary, and admit that Acheson, Lattimore, Service, and that motley crew of Red-loving foreign-affairs experts might have been just a teeny, little bit wrong about simple agrarian reformers and the oriental problem, there may be hopes for the man yet.

The Sixty-ninth Birthday Anniversary of President Roosevelt, January 30, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to know our beloved late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, having been introduced to him in 1915 by the then Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Josephus Daniels, with whom I had worked in the William Jennings Bryan presidential campaign in 1896. I was tremendously impressed with his tactful and diplomatic manner in discussing a Chicago matter I had presented to him that had been submitted to me by the Honorable Carter H. Harrison, II, mayor of Chicago. Mr. Harrison now 90 years of age, called on me the other day in Chicago and, recalling that meeting of 35 years ago, commented on the statesmanship and personality of the then young Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is unnecessary for me to again restate the splendid services performed and ability displayed by Mr. Roosevelt in many important conferences and trips he made during World War I. Following the war, I was further impressed with his personality and charming ways during the course of the Democratic National Convention in 1920 and with the great speech that he delivered in nominating the Honorable Alfred Smith, of New York, for the Presidency. Notwithstanding his eloquence and strong appeal the nomination fell to our former colleague, Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio.

At that convention, as chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Cook County and as a member of the platform and resolutions committee of the convention, I had the privilege of consulting with the leaders of the Democratic Party in selecting candidates for the Vice Presidency. The committee came to the conclusion that Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, would be the strongest candidate for that honor. I recall that it was suggested that I visit the New York delegation, which I did. I did not find the members of the delegation in good humor, due to Mr. Smith's failure to obtain the presidential nomination. My instructions were to see them and to ascertain whether, in view of conditions, they would be satisfied with the nomination of Mr. Roosevelt for the Vice Presidency. Unfortunately, the leaders of the New York delegation were not friendly to the suggestion and I reported back to the leaders that were awaiting my return to the speaker's platform for the result of my mission. After my report was made, they insisted that I return for a further conference. Since I was well acquainted with a majority of the New York delegates, I was urged to prevail upon them to agree. After some argumentation they finally concurred that it would be agreeable if the convention would nominate Mr. Roosevelt as running mate to Governor Cox. Unfortunately for the country, Cox and Roosevelt failed to win the election.

A few years later, however, the great State of New York elected Mr. Roosevelt as Governor and in 1930 he was reelected. On the evening of his reelection, being unsuccessful in reaching him on the telephone, I sent him a telegram assuring him that by reason of the tremendous majority he attained in his great victory he would become the next President of the United States. I have been told by many persons who were present that the telegram was read and received with a great deal of enthusiasm.

During 1931 the Republican newspapers, as was their wont, began to publish many articles derogating Mr. Roosevelt's health. Later in the year I had the opportunity to see him in Albany. When I entered his office, he struck his desk with his fist and asked: "A. J., how do I look?" I frankly stated: "You look wonderful." I then asked him: "How do you feel?" He replied: "I feel better than I look." He then began talking about the coming Democratic convention and from that day on, until he was nominated, I had many conferences with him, Colonel Howe, and his campaign manager, Mr. James A. Farley.

Unfortunately, I failed to prevail upon the Illinois leaders, Mr. Anton J. Cermak, Mr. Edward J. Kelly, and Mr. Patrick Nash to cast the State's vote for him on the second ballot. However, I obtained their promise to do so on the third ballot. Before Illinois was reached on the roll call of States on the third ballot, Mr. RAYBURN, our present Speaker, representing Mr. John N. Garner, of Texas, whose name was also before the convention as a candidate, in conjunction with Mr. MacAdoo, of California, cast their respective States' votes for Mr. Roosevelt, before the Illinois and Indiana delegations had an opportunity to do so.

Late in the afternoon on the day that he was nominated, Mr. Roosevelt requested me to conduct the campaign among the naturalized foreign born and those of foreign descent, as I had done in previous national campaigns. I actively carried on this campaign to the day before the election.

Due to the failure of the Hoover administration, the country suffered its worst financial panic and business depression in the history of our Nation. It fell to Mr. Roosevelt immediately after his election to devise legislation and other means that would provide for reconstruction and to facilitate the recovery of business from the catastrophic conditions that confronted the country.

Time will not permit me to again describe in detail President Roosevelt's continuous activity and effort to find ways and means to rebuild our commerce, to bring about the reemployment of the 16,000,000 workers who were unemployed, to save our commercial businesses and banks, nearly all of whom were insolvent or on the brink of bankruptcy, and to save hundreds of thousands of our citizens from losing their homes and farms. The country thankfully and even prayerfully appreciated his great services and accomplishments to restore the entire Nation to normal conditions.

President Roosevelt in his second term as in his first term advocated and recommended the enactment of many progressive and helpful laws. Unfortunately, in 1940, when the world was thrown into turmoil, he was obliged to devote his ability and statesmanship to the approaching dangers that threatened to engulf the entire world.

In 1938, President Roosevelt made a speech in Chicago in which he called attention to the dangers facing our country. He was assailed by many people, but he firmly persisted, from time to time, in acquainting the country with the seriousness of changing world conditions, and was thus subjected to further attacks. He keenly felt these unfair criticisms. No President before him and, I hope, no President in the future will ever be subjected to the trials and tribulations that confronted him during those trying days.

While no President up to that time had served more than two terms, many people who had the interest of the country at heart felt that no one was better qualified, informed, and with a wider knowledge of world conditions than President Roosevelt, I am pleased to say that I was one of the very first who urged him, notwithstanding the precedent of no President serving more than two terms, to continue to serve the Nation for a third term. In fact, I stated that he owed it to the country, and to himself, to do so.

Unfortunately, differences arose between the President and Mr. Farley, who felt it unwise for the President to accede to the demands of a large majority of our citizens to continue for a third term. The fears of Mr. Farley were not well founded because the President was reelected to a third term, again with a tremendous majority.

In 1944 the United States was in the throes of war, and I again urged him and insisted that he continue in the Presidency for another 4 years, not only in the interest of our own country but that of the world. Had I known then of the condition of his health, I never would have urged him to be a candidate for reelection, but he was brave and courageous, and against the advice of some of his friends, made the campaign in the most inclement weather, which, no doubt, affected his health. He was again reelected in 1944, but the great strain of his effort to bring peace to the troublesome world and to eliminate future wars told on his strength, and his condition did not improve. He continued with all his resourcefulness and the strength he possessed in the tasks that faced him until, upon the insistent demand of his family and physicians, he sought rest at Warm Springs, Ga., in the hope of recouping his health and strength. But even there he never ceased in his effort to strive to bring about peace and improved conditions in our country to his dying day.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that on the day of his death one of his secretaries, the son of my old friend, Josephus Daniels, Mr. Jonathan Daniels, who had arrived that morning from Warm Springs, came to my office with a request from President Roosevelt that I should endeavor to obtain the reporting of a rule by the Committee on Rules for the consideration of the then pending fair-employment-practices bill. I have reason to believe that it was the President's last request. During our conversation that day Mr. Daniels assured me that the President was improving and hoped shortly to return to Washington to resume his work. Unfortunately, while I tried to comply with his request, I was unable to do so.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that anyone in the history of our Nation or of any other nation was more sincere or devoted to improving the welfare of the common people than was President Roosevelt. I further believe that no man was more beloved and respected than he, and when the report of his passing was reported throughout the world, the whole universe mourned his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that as long as our Republic endures the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the sacrifices he made for the welfare of our country will be remembered and will remain ever fresh in the minds of our people.

Escape Under Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the so-called escape clause of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade provides that—

If as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of the obligations incurred by a contracting party under this agreement, including tariff concessions, any product is being imported into the territory of that contracting party in such increased quantities and under such conditions as

to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting party shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the obligation in whole or in part or to withdraw or modify the concession.

This is the escape clause that has been publicized by the Department of State as the guaranty that American producers have a remedy against mistakes made in reducing the tariff. An analysis of the clause will soon reveal how loosely and defectively it is drawn and why, in good sense, it is deceptive to describe it as a remedy.

In the first place, the actual or threatened injury must have resulted from developments that were unforeseen and must be attributable to a trade agreement or similar obligation. The first half of this criterion, namely, that the developments that caused the injury were unforseen, creates some doubts of interpretation as well as of intent.

Assuming, for example, that foreseen rather than unforeseen developments should lead to injury, would relief be denied? The language of the clause so indicates, for it would appear that if the injury was foreseen and was not guarded against or avoided by refusal to make a concession, such as a duty reduction, the injury must have been intended; and if it was intended, no remedy would be available; for the remedy extends, by the language of the clause, only to those instances where the adverse developments were not foreseen.

The question naturally arises whether the injury would be any less damaging to the producers concerned if it had been foreseen by someone in the administrative agency that made the agreement.

If foreseen injuries are to be without remedy, the further question arises whether trade agreements may lend themselves to punitive measures aimed at particular industries. Whether intended or not, under this clause an administrative agency could deliberately destroy an industry and at the same time strip the complainant of a remedy precisely because the damage was foreseen. But this is not all. Should the injured party then seek a remedy under section 336 of the tariff, which provides for a cost-of-production study and offers a method of increasing the rate by 50 percent, he would find this avenue closed. The provisions of section 336 are not available with respect to any item that has been made the subject of a concession in a trade agreement.

The Tariff Commission has taken note of the extremely awkward wording of the escape clause in the matter of "unforeseen developments." In the Procedure and Criteria With Respect to the Administration of the "Escape Clause" in Trade Agreements—revision of February 1950—the Commission states that—

The construction which the Commission places upon the words "unforeseen developments" is that when imports of any commodity enter in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers, this situation must, in the light of the objective of the trade agreement program and of the escape clause itself, be regarded as the result of unforeseen developments.

In other words, the Commission, confronted by the plain wording of the escape clause, simply side-stepped the language and elected to read common sense into it.

The second half of the first criterion, which requires that the injury complained of must be attributable to a trade agreement as a condition of escape, is also restrictive. The attribution of economic effects to particular causes, such as a trade agreement, is, to say the least, an uncertain but heavy burden to place upon a complainant, and leaves him on an unstable footing since his allegations can be denied by attributing the alleged effects to other causes. The complainant has then no answer because his allegations, by their nature, are not subject to proof. This leaves him completely in the hands of the agency hearing his complaint. Under these conditions the scope of the agency's discretion is very wide indeed.

Once more, the Tariff Commission found it necessary to relax the restrictive effect of the clause. In the "Procedure and Criteria" cited above, they say:

If the increase (in imports) was, even in part, the result of the concession, that is sufficient, since the language of the escape clause clearly does not require that the concession be the sole, or even the chief cause.

Thus in two instances the Commission has found it necessary to substitute its own interpretation for that of Executive Order 9382 which contains the official wording of the escape clause. There has been ample opportunity to revise the clause since its first inclusion in a trade agreement in 1943 and even since its appearance in the executive order dated February 25, 1947, but this has not been done in any remedial sense.

While the interpretations of the Tariff Commission just cited, have materially improved the administrability of the clause, the fact remains that no delegation of power should be so loosely and poorly drawn that an administrative agency, in order to avoid a wholly absurd requirement, must deliberately read something into the order that it does not say, or brush aside something that the order clearly states.

Another requirement for escape laid down in the clause is the condition that the quantity of imports must have increased and that such increased imports are entering under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury.

This, again, is a compound condition: Imports must have increased and must be entering under certain conditions.

Once more the Tariff Commission found it necessary to make its own interpretation. Of the increase in imports it says in the Procedure and Criteria, cited above, that—

This means that imports under the trade agreements must supply a larger share of domestic consumption than they did during a previous period.

Of course, that is not what the escape clause says, but only in that light does it meet the dictates of common sense. This latter the Commission no doubt felt impelled to supply. The framers of the clause had apparently overlooked the condition where domestic consumption declines while imports remain as high as before or decline less than domestic consumption. This oversight was repaired by the Tariff Commission's interpretation, by which the word "relative" was inserted to modify the word "increase," so that actually imports need not increase in order to afford a basis for escape. They might even decline, so long as they declined less than domestic consumption.

However, despite the improvements of the clause by administrative interpretation, very serious defects remain in it. These appear to be quite beyond the reach of interpretations even as liberal as the Tariff Commission has been willing to supply.

It has been noted, for example, that the increased imports must also enter under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious damage. The only conclusion to be drawn from the linking of increased imports to the condition of their importation is that it was done to foreclose the possibility of an escape if there has been no increase—or relative increase under the Commission's interpretation—no matter how much injury might be inflicted otherwise; that is, in the absence of an increase. There was little that could be done about this through the medium of interpretation.

Yet it is easily conceivable that severe damage may be caused by imports even though they have not increased, either absolutely or relatively.

This would not only be possible but highly probable in a buyer's market. It is not necessary that imports take a higher percentage of the market than during a previous period in order to inflict damage on domestic producers. The determining factors are the domestic economic situation and the prices at which imports are offered in competition with our producers. Injury is not merely the result of an upward trend of imports. Changing domestic economic trends have as much bearing on the effect of imports, if not more, than the trend of imports themselves.

A given volume of imports may work great havoc in a buyer's market while the same volume would produce little or no competitive pressure in a seller's market, where, of course, demand is strong in relation to supply. Imports that have fallen to a small percentage of domestic consumption, even as low as 2 or 3 percent, may cause much more damage than imports that formerly equaled 10 or 20 percent, if competitive conditions in the domestic market have in the meantime changed to a buyer's from a seller's market.

The escape clause takes no account of such a distinction between domestic market conditions. It simply assumes that imports cannot produce injury unless they take a larger share of the market than during some earlier period. Actually there is no necessary relationship between present injury from imports and the volume of imports 5 or 10 or any other number of years ago.

Many of the present trade agreements were made while a seller's market prevailed in this country. This was a time when consumer demand was stronger than supply. Under these circumstances, dating of the trend of imports from the time of the trade agreement—as a means of determining whether imports have increased under its terms—is irrelevant to the question of injury. If a trade agreement was signed at a time when a seller's market prevailed, neither the volume of imports nor the tariff rate remaining on an article after a concession has been made, had any competitive meaning. Domestic producers could not satisfy the entire demand even at the high level of prices. Competitively it was a matter of indifference whether imports supplied 1 percent or 25 percent of consumption. It was equally immaterial whether the rate of duty was 1 percent or 25 percent.

When thereafter—as happened in a large number of cases—the seller's market reaches its end and is succeeded by a buyer's market, the volume of imports that the market absorbed successfully during the period of shortage offers no clue to the volume that can be absorbed under the new condition without injury; nor does the tariff rate that was in effect during the period of the seller's market indicate the level that may be appropriate in a buyer's market.

Therefore, to insist that applicants for escape from injury show an increase in imports since a particular trade agreement was entered into, is to impose an unjustifiable and meaningless condition upon those who allege injury. Imports may not have increased and yet serious injury may threaten or actually be in course.

The increased imports that must have occurred, in order to justify an escape, must, as already stated, also enter under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury. This means that it is not enough to prove an increase in imports alone. It must be shown that the imports are entering under such conditions as to inflict damage or threaten it.

The escape clause throws no light upon the kind of conditions that would be taken into consideration. However, market conditions, such as a buyer's market, might be regarded as suitable for consideration; as might also the relative price levels at which the imported products were being offered.

This requirement—of proof that imports are entering under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury—is sound in itself and would be acceptable but for its linkage with the preceding condition which requires that imports must have increased. If this conjunction were dissolved and the conditions of importation made an independent consideration, the difficulties and deficiencies of the increased-imports requirement would be overcome. This effect could be produced by changing the "and" to "or" in the clause that provides "and under such conditions" so that it would read "or under such conditions."

An escape could then be justified by showing that imports are entering under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury, whether or not they had increased. In other words, it would be possible to deal with the only part of the problem that has any meaning.

Since the conditions are not defined in the clause, it is, however, not clear how much weight is to be given to the volume of import trade as such, in relation to domestic consumption. There is a strong tendency to dismiss imports lightly as a source of injury if they are small in relation to domestic consumption.

That such dismissal may not be justified becomes clear when consideration is given to the possibility that the imports may compete with a particular variety of items in a broader classification, or in a particular market area, and may therefore offer heavy competition in the narrower field. Thus, imports of textiles may be small in relation to the domestic consumption of all textiles but may be much higher in relation to a particular kind of textile product or in a particular market. Acute injury may thus be suffered by the producers of the particular item or by those located in a particular area while other segments of the textile industry, or those in other locations, may experience little or no foreign competition.

Perhaps more important, however, than this consideration is the possibility of injury out of all proportion to the relative volume of imports. This may occur, as already indicated, when the domestic market is on the surplus rather than the shortage side, and particularly at the end of a seller's market, when prices are high while demand begins to falter.

If imports are offered at prices below the domestic levels under such circumstances, no large volume of such imports is necessary to produce widespread and serious injury. Domestic producers will seek to reduce their high-priced inventory as rapidly as possible in the hope of averting a heavy inventory loss through falling prices precipitated or accelerated by low-priced imports. Inventory is most readily reduced by producing less, that is, by allowing sales to move stock from the warehouses while replenishing at a greatly reduced rate. Reduced production, of course, calls for a curtailment of employment, either by lay-offs or reduction of the workweek, or both. The damage may be all the greater if domestic producers do not know how large a supply is available abroad for shipment to this country at low prices, or if they know that a large supply is available.

If the imports flow in, as feared, and find a ready market domestic prices will fall and profits will be reduced. The pressure on employment and wages will mount steadily and the lay-offs may become permanent. It will be difficult to plan future production, and, as long as the threat remains, there will be no plant expansion and a minimum outlay for new machinery and equipment. This is not the road to an expanding economy.

If the threat or fear of increasing low-priced imports does not materialize, damage will nevertheless result because of the uncertainty about the potential. What domestic producers reasonably anticipate or fear, rather than the fact, which will only subsequently reveal itself, will determine the extent of the injury.

Clearly, the possibility of escape should not be limited to any preconceived level of imports in relation to domestic production or consumption. Imports amounting to 5 percent or less of domestic consumption may produce more injury than a volume that takes 20 percent or more of the market.

Thus it is neither the fact of increase in imports nor the share of the market captured by imports, alone, that determines the likelihood or degree of injury sustained. Equally or more important are the domestic market conditions, relative price levels of imports and domestic products, extent of the available foreign supply and possession or lack of accurate information by domestic producers with respect to the foreign supply and its trend.

The foregoing analysis has demonstrated quite amply the serious need of a revision of the escape clause. An examination of the administrative provisions of the clause will show that they are equally in need of change.

The Tariff Commission is the agency vested by Executive Order 9382 with the authority and responsibility of administering the escape clause. While the Commission is the appropriate agency for carrying out this function, the grant of power and discretion is entirely too broad. It is left to the judgment of the Commission, for example, to determine whether an investigation should be made to determine the merits of an application for relief. The Commission, under this grant of power, has dismissed most applications brought before it, without a single word of explanation.

Even when the Commission makes an investigation, it need make no explanation of its denial of a remedy. Again it is under no obligation or mandate to make public its findings or expose its reasoning.

The grant of authority to the Commission is obviously designed to confer arbitrary and irresponsible power upon this agency, wholly out of keeping with good principles of government. The need for a revision is clear.

Penalizing Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, for those who are willing to serve in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of Defense is certainly discouraging the hundreds of thousands who have enlisted in the Reserves. Up in my district, one Myron J. Smith enlisted in the active Naval Reserve on October 26, 1945, was honorably

discharged therefrom on August 1, 1946, then enlisted again for four additional years and in July 1950 again enlisted in the Naval Reserve for four additional years.

After all of these enlistments in the Naval Reserve and his desire to serve in the Navy during war or emergency, the selective service inducted him into the Army on October 30, 1950. He was sworn into the Army and is now stationed at Fort Knox, Ky., in spite of all his objections with selective service of his being enlisted in the Naval Reserve from October 26, 1945.

Further on January 17, 1951, he received orders from the Navy to report at Great Lakes Training Center on May 9, 1951, the service in which he has been continuously in since October 26, 1945, but he is now in the Army at Fort Knox, Ky. I have taken this up with the Armed Forces here in Washington, and it seems that this is an erroneous induction by selective service. Yet, he is in the Army and the Army has no inclination to discharge this man who has been in the Naval Reserve for nearly 6 years previous to this erroneous induction.

Mr. Speaker, what did it mean when the Congress passed the Unification Act? The Army, the Navy, and Air Corps are supposed to be under the Secretary of Defense, yet the Army takes and keeps a man who wants to serve in the Navy and who has continually been in the Naval Reserve since October 1945.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of respect and allegiance can the parents of young men of this country have for the military when the Secretary of Defense permits the same old brass to violate its agreement with citizens after asking them to go into the Reserve forces of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why this young man who wants to serve in the Navy and enlisted in the Reserves at the request of the Navy, should not be immediately discharged from the Army or transferred to the Navy by the Secretary of Defense. Such confusion and violation of promises to citizens by the various branches of the Armed Forces should be made good. The Secretary of Defense should protect those who have long before their time enlisted in the Reserves.

Mr. Speaker, the services should not be permitted to violate the rights of a citizen who has enlisted in the Reserves and the Selective Service should be ordered not to forcibly induct those who have enlisted in the Reserves.

Federal Aid Means Loss of Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News of January 30, 1951:

FEDERAL AID MEANS LOSS OF FREEDOMS

A State legislative proposal which would open welfare records to inspection by those other than members of county welfare boards, has once again directed attention to the fact that to receive Federal aid also means to receive Federal dictation and consequent loss of freedoms.

The Federal Security Administration has given a strong hint that $20,000,000 of subsidy to Indiana's welfare program might be cut off if the names of persons getting State aid are made public. In other words, if the State of Indiana does not do exactly as the Federal Government dictates in the conduct of the Hoosier welfare program, Indiana may lose the millions of dollars now donated federally to the program.

A law which would open public-welfare records to inspection would undoubtedly result in a reduction in the number of persons now receiving such aid. For one thing, such a law would help to uncover those cases in which both individuals and entire families have been discovered, through special investigation, to have been receiving public funds, while at the same time receiving money from regular jobs in amounts sufficient for support.

Hoosier Day Columnist Frank White recently declared that "This threat (the one made by the Federal Security Administration) points up graphically some facts about our drift to a welfare state. * * * When a State accepts Federal money, there goes hand in hand with such subsidies controls and telling us how to run affairs. Furthermore, you can't collect taxes, send the money to Washington, and get back as much as you send."

Columnist White adds that, "There is too much governmental red tape and expense involved. Welfare costs are rocketing even in our boom wartime employment. Hundreds of names of those getting State welfare aid would be taken from the welfare rolls were the secrecy removed. We are entitled to know where public tax money goes, since we pay the tax bill."

Federal officials tend to push aside any accusations that the Nation is solidly on the trend toward an all-out welfare state. But the facts prove that these officials are only talking fast to evade being pinned down by a fact. The people of the United States are arming themselves to beat back the forces in the world which would rob them of their freedoms, and yet there is too much to show that there are those who, through government policy at home, would rob the people of those same freedoms. Federal aid means loss of freedoms.

A Boondoggler Objects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, once a boondoggler always a boondoggler seems to be a firm and fixed habit with a spendthrift New Dealer, Representative CECIL KING, of California, seems to resent any criticism of President Truman for his unsound policies which have brought the Nation to the brink of financial disaster. I will say this, however, that Representative KING has been consistent in his ardent support of the New Deal spending, wasteful program. Now that the unsound fiscal policies of the Truman administration and its inordinate waste has placed a crushing tax burden upon the people and has by its every move brought the evil of a ruinous inflation upon the people, Representative KING, of California rebels against any criticism of the disastrous course he and his President have followed.

I gave out an interview after the delivery of the President's tax message. My colleague, Representative KING, reminds me of the big 16-year-old boy who was weeping and howling imprecations. When asked what was troubling him, he sobbed, "Ma is weaning me." It may be tough for my friend to be weaned from his wild and reckless spending of the taxpayers' money, but if he fails to join in a program of economy, his constituents will wean him from public office.

I am inserting under leave to extend heretofore granted, the statement of my views and references to President Truman's tax message, of which Representative KING objects.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL A. REED, OF NEW YORK

I am opposed to the President's recommendation for a two-package tax program. Everyone agrees that we are close to the bottom of the tax barrel and therefore any new taxes can be levied only after careful consideration of the administration's entire tax program.

Either the administration has no such over-all program to raise the $16,000,000,000 or the President's tax message is so politically clever as to amount to down-right dishonesty. The administration should immediately disclose its complete program to the American people or confess that it is impossible to raise $16,000,000,000 without disastrous consequences.

In my opinion this tremendous tax increase is unnecessary because President Truman could save approximately $6,500,000,000 if he had an honest desire to reduce nonmilitary expenditures to a minimum.

I am unalterably opposed to presently raising $10,000,000,000 on the assumption that we will raise a subsequent $6,000,000,000 unless it becomes clearly imperative that we raise $16,000,000,000.

I think that the most important single task is to prune out unnecessary spending. The American people are tired of shelling out their hard-earned dollars to support scatter-brain socialistic schemes of the Fair Deal administration. They are also tired of supporting thousands of Fair Deal bureaucrats on the public payroll.

I strongly oppose consideration by the Congress of additional taxes for this administration to squander until the congressional appropriation committees have cut the fat out of the President's budget. I do not want them to deprive the military of necessary funds. But I do expect them to eliminate Mr. Truman's pet socialistic program, I do expect them to reduce the Federal payroll; I do expect them to put a crimp in our worldwide WPA. In short I expect them to cut nonessential expenditures by $6,500,000,000 or $7,000,000,000. After these reductions are made, we will then be in a position to deal with taxes on the basis of the information we will have on hand.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that the New York Times in an editorial under date of February 2, 1951, which shows how futile it is to stop inflation when President

Truman by his many and inept moves encourages inflation.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I insert the editorial as a part of my remarks:

A VICTORY FOR INFLATION

On Wednesday the members of the Federal Reserve Board were summoned to the White House for a conference with President Truman. Yesterday the White House press secretary announced that the Reserve Board had "pledged its support to President Truman to maintain the stabilization of Government securities as long as the emergency lasts."

What does this mean? Apparently the administration would like to have the country believe that the White House has merely stepped in to arbitrate a minor difference between the views of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve over the proper pattern of interest rates for Treasury financing during the defense program. Mr. Snyder, if one may judge from an interview he gave out on Wednesday, would have the public believe that this is a defeat for "the bankers," and a victory for the taxpayers, who, he says, will profit by lower interest charges on the Government debt.

But if this is a victory for the public, then we can only say that the public is likely to find it one of the most dearly bought victories in its experience. Let no one delude himself with the belief that it is the bankers who are going to bear the cost. It will be the American people as a whole who will foot this bill—the little people, who will see the yield on their savings further diminished; the Government, the biggest buyer of goods and services in the country, through increased cost of the rearmament program, and the taxpayer who provides the money for the Government.

To state the matter in the simplest terms, what has happened in this case is that the President has called in the men who are charged with the responsibility for seeing that the country's monetary policies are conducted with the best interests of the Nation as a whole in view, and has ordered them to take their orders in the future from the Secretary of the Treasury. We can recall offhand no instance where the independent central banking system in a democracy has been subjected to similar public degradation. And we can recall no instance, under any form of government, in which the central bank, once made a captive of the exchequer, has functioned otherwise than as an engine of inflation.

General Eisenhower's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, rarely has a Nation awaited with more hope and more confidence the answer to questions of national importance than did our country wait upon General Eisenhower and the answers which he brought to an anxious Nation from his tour of European capitals. General Eisenhower did not fail in his mission—he did not fail to fulfill with integrity, intelligence, and understanding the national mission upon which he embarked. He brought home the information which we as a Nation sorely needed—in so doing he has perhaps rendered as valuable a service to peace as any one man in recent years.

General Eisenhower's report is both encouraging and realistic. He has stressed the need for effective cooperation among democratic allies. In this connection, the Christian Science Monitor in an editorial entitled "Eisenhower's Answers," from the issue of February 2, last, has concisely and clearly summarized these answers and I ask that a copy of this editorial be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

EISENHOWER'S ANSWERS

General Eisenhower in his report to Congress has answered the chief questions the American people have had about the defense of Europe.

His answers carry all the weight of a first-hand investigation by a man who through his professional services and personal qualities has won the confidence of the American people in superlative degree. He has approached the questions frankly from the standpoint of the good of the United States. Isolationists will not find it easy to attack his answers as those of a do-gooder or just another Europe-lover. Let's take his testimony:

As to the importance of Western Europe to America:

"The Western European complex is so important to our future * * * that we cannot afford to do less than our best to make sure it does not go down the drain."

As to whether the United States' allies will defend themselves:

"There is a spirit to resist. There is a determination to do their part—to take the risk."

As to timing:

"There is not a moment to waste."

As to the purpose of rearming Europe:

"We are going to build for ourselves a secure wall of peace. * * * What we are trying to do cannot honestly be considered by any nation as a threat to its existence."

As to a sound attitude toward the Europeans:

"Have patience with our allies. * * * Some of their problems are very great."

As to the effect of abandoning Europe:

"If we were left standing alone, isolated in a world of communism, our system would wither away."

The Eisenhower report will leave little ground for die-hard opposition to early and ample aid in the defense of Europe.

One of the things we like most about General "Ike's" statement is his reminder that military power is more than a matter of men or weapons, or even of productive capacity. It depends also on courage, on purpose, on faith, and on willingness to work together.

The core of the problem of Europe's defense is right in these moral and spiritual ingredients. With them the physical power can be mustered. Those who take a negative line and say, "We won't supply another man or dollar until you prove you can defend yourselves," miss the point. The Eisenhower approach is positive: "Here's what we will contribute to the common effort. Now, what can you do?" Can anyone doubt that this confident, cooperative attitude will evoke a better response?

General Eisenhower is insistent that Europe must help itself; indeed, that it must do the larger part of the job. But he perceives that to spur that effort Europe needs hope, the assurance that it will not be deserted by America. We trust that his magnificent presentation of the case will persuade Congress and the public to give that assurance—unmistakably and promptly.

The Strike of Switchmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very splendid editorial entitled "Strong Words Are Not Enough," published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 4, 1951. This has reference to the railroad strike, and is directed to the President.

My own thought is that Congress should take authoritative action to prevent strikes of this character which threaten the security of the Nation and are in violation and defiance of solemn contracts entered into by the union, and in utter disregard of the public interest. Several measures could be adopted. One would be to deny further bargaining rights to any union for its membership where it authorizes or tolerates a strike in violation of its contract. If the union cannot control its members, then it should not be given power and responsibility to represent them. The present "sickness" strike is nothing more than a dodge or subterfuge, as has been demonstrated previously. The situation demands vigorous action. This editorial also suggests another possible remedy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRONG WORDS ARE NOT ENOUGH

The President, who said not long ago that he believed in calling aggression by its right name, now has done some plain talking about the railroad strike. But in this matter strong words are not enough.

This strike is steeped in dishonesty, and is doing a great deal of damage, both materially and morally, to the country.

The switchmen who have walked off their jobs are not sick, and every one knows it. This is simply a transparently dishonest device to escape the consequences which might befall them if they went out openly on strike. This is a serious matter in itself. For if men will not deal honestly in such matters, how is it possible to enter into any agreement with them that merits confidence?

Of greater moment, however, is the damage to the country that this strike is doing. Mr. Truman says that it is "directly injuring our national security." Men engaged in defense work are being laid off as a result of the strike and defense plants are being shut down. Food and clothing destined for our combat forces in Korea are tied up in shut-down yards. In a few more days, the results will be calamitous.

There are those who make excuses for the strikers. It is said they have not had a wage increase since 1948, and that is true. But it is their own fault. Last June, after extensive hearings, a presidential fact-finding board recommended an increase of 18 cents an hour. The railroads accepted, the workers refused. Later, the railroads, trying to avert a strike, raised the ante to 23 cents an hour. The union still refused. Then came the White House intervention. This resulted in an apparent agreement on 25 cents an hour, plus cost-of-living protection, plus

other benefits. This was signed by the union representatives, but was later rejected. Others say the railroad presidents should be compelled to negotiate with the union presidents. But what is the point of this? The railroad representatives have had full authority to negotiate and their agreements have been kept. It is the union representatives who have not acted in a responsible manner, and who, as the President says, apparently signed the White House agreement in bad faith. So what purpose would be served by bringing the railroad presidents into the picture?

What is obviously needed in this situation is some means of holding the unions responsible for the acts of their members. If the unions cannot control their members in matters that come within the province of the unions, then they have no right to function as the representatives of the men.

How this can best be done is a difficult question. But some means of doing it must be found. The Government cannot call on all other Americans for heavy sacrifices in the name of the national welfare, and permit a handful of irresponsible strikers to pursue their own reckless and selfish aims. That not only cripples the national effort in a material sense; it will, if tolerated, certainly destroy the national morale. It is not enough to denounce this strike, or even to find some way of patching up the dispute. The President, as Chief Executive, should start now to provide the machinery that will compel, not some, or most, but all Americans to serve the interests of their country on even terms. All unions today enjoy a privileged status under the law. If this privilege is going to be abused, as it is being abused, it must be revoked.

The Golf Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have taken note of the recent controversy concerning the operation of public golf courses here in Washington with a good deal of interest.

It is not my intention to discuss the problem at this time, but under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following correspondence which, in my opinion, should receive the close attention of the Committee on Public Lands:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1951.*

DEAR SIR: The story of golf in the District is one that reflects great credit on the operators of the courses from the taxpayer's standpoint, because to this present moment their operation has cost the taxpayer not 1 cent. While there is a continuing deficit in every branch of the Government the golf courses have returned a profit to this same Government. While the District recreation chairman, Harry Wender, asks each year for increased appropriations for his department, the golf courses, under private management, have paid their way. In doing this they have kept green fees way below the green fees of other municipalities throughout the United States.

Many people believe that the Government built the courses and maintains them. The facts are that the courses, in part, were built by the present management of the courses from personal funds. The present operator of the courses risked his own finances in building the courses and was repaid from fees later collected from the players. Year after year during the early stages of golf-course building the District Recreation Commission manifested no interest in the golf courses whatever. During those days when the present operator of the courses was setting up the finest public golf courses in the country, the District Recreation Commission occupied itself with other matters. It was only when wise management started showing a profit that the District Recreation Chairman started casting anxious eyes at the local golf courses.

The golf courses are on Department of the Interior property. The swimming pools are on the Department of the Interior property. The tennis courts are on Department of the Interior property. Mr. Harry Wender does not want his recreation department to operate the swimming pools—he just wants to operate the golf courses. The golf courses show a record of wise management and continuing profit under private management. The swimming pools, once operated by the present operator of the golf courses at a considerable profit to the Government, are now operated by a quasi governmental agency and are showing a continuing loss. The Recreation Commission has always reached into the pockets of the taxpayers for funds for all operations under their command, while the private operator of the golf courses has put money into the taxpayers' pockets. Anacostia golf course was once operated by a quasi governmental agency, but again a continuing deficit forced the management to turn the golf course over to the present operator, who again turned the operation into a profitable venture.

No one on the Commission knows anything about the operation of golf courses, yet newspaper accounts reveal that Mr. Harry Wender has already predicted the profits for the future under his management. As Members of Congress and other businessmen know, meeting a payroll from profits and wise management is slightly different than meeting a payroll from a congressional appropriation. Mr. Wender is an optimistic soul. He sees only a profit for the future in District golf. Mr. Wender has never investigated the operation of courses in other cities under municipal management. If he had investigated he would find that with few exceptions all the cities operate their courses at higher fees and at a loss to the taxpayers. Yet, undaunted by lack of knowledge of the subject, Mr. Harry Wender has already indicated he proposes to reduce the rates to the golfer.

Citizens who will have to pay the bill for any of Mr. Wender's mistakes in management are asking where the money will come from if the golf courses show a loss under governmental management. Mr. Wender certainly isn't going to foot the bill. Mr. Wender thinks it is easy to get money out of Congress for deficits, so he is reported to be not uneasy about the future if he can get control of the courses.

Should Congress in its wisdom decide to loan Mr. Wender money to purchase the courses some time in the future, it should first examine the entire recreation program. It should set up a policy that would require the Recreation Commission to take over the pools and tennis courts too. It should put the parks under the Recreation Commission control, because the parks and the bridle paths are as much recreation to some people as golf is to others. Mr. Harry Wender doesn't know anything about the operation of these things either, but there may as well be a big deficit as a little one. The taxpayers will never know the difference.

No one, including the Recreation Commission Chairman, Mr. Harry Wender, knows why the Recreation Commission wants to operate the courses. The Commission can't submit a record of profitable management in other ventures. They can't show that present fees are too high. They can't show that the courses are not in good condition. They can't show an excess of employees in the operation of the courses. They can't show anything except a desire to get control of golf in the District. The golf courses under municipal management in other cities show that city employees play the courses at no cost in most cases. The courses become a private playground for officials and political cronies of those in control of the courses. This is one reason why the courses show a loss.

When the Recreation Commission decided they wanted to operate the courses they learned that the present operator could not be attacked on the basis of wise management. They decided that the personal smear angle would produce the best results. All sorts of charges irrelevant were put forward, but they fell flat before an onslaught of facts in the hands of the present operation of the courses.

The most significant statement coming out of the hearings on the transfer of the golf courses to the Recreation Department is the following:

"It is indicated that it was the intention of Congress that the Recreation Board should operate the golf courses. This is obviously inaccurate, since section 3 of article II of the Recreation Board Act specifically provides: 'That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as affecting any rights under any existing lease or leases lawfully entered into by any agency mentioned or affected by this act, nor shall anything in this act contained be construed as affecting the right of any such agency in the future lawfully to enter into leases of land or premises under its control for recreational purposes.' At that time, the golf courses were being operated by my company. By this provision, therefore, the Congress recognized and approved the continued operation of the golf courses by private concessioners.

"The Chairman of the Recreation Board has led the committee to believe that it was the intention of Congress to use the trust funds for operating the public golf courses, in addition to the other activities of the Recreation Board. Had this been true, in 1942 when the Board was created, the Congress of the United States would certainly not have placed a limitation of only $500 as the total which would be advanced to the Superintendent of Recreation at any one time to be used for the expenses of conducting the activities of the Board. While this amount has since been raised to $2,000 it is still obviously impossible to operate the public golf courses, which do a gross business in excess of $500,000, on any such arrangement as was set up under the act creating the Recreation Board.

"In 28 years we, the present private operators of the golf courses, have paid the Government over $191,000, which was deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, District of Columbia, and have spent for capital improvements over $240,000. All of these capital improvements either are now or will become the property of the United States. We have done this, and still have given the golfers the cheapest rates in the United States where the courses have been self-supporting."

Respectfully,

JOSEPH C. HEALY.

RECREATION BOARD,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1951.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALLE: Thank you for sending me your letter of January 19 requesting comment on a communication from Mr. Joseph C. Healy under date of January 15 concerning the operation of public golf courses in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Healy writes under a lawyer's letterhead with Covington, Ky., offices, but with a post-office box address at the Franklin Station in Washington, D. C. It appears that Mr. Healy is an employee of the Department of Justice residing in the National Capital area, and is therefore one of the general public for whom the public golf courses should be operated. His letter, however, indicates that he is poorly informed as to the history of the golf courses in the National Capital parks and also as to the reasons for the creation of the District of Columbia Recreation Board and the functions vested in it by act of Congress.

The letter will be dealt with paragraph by paragraph in order to point out its inaccuracies. The statements made in the following comments are based upon information set forth on the records of the Recreation Board and in a Brief History of Golf Courses in National Capital Parks, a mimeographed statement presented by the Department of the Interior before the Subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee of the House in May 1949.

PARAGRAPHS 1 AND 2

In paragraph 1 Mr. Healy states that the operation of the golf courses "has cost the taxpayer not one cent." This statement is obviously intended to convey the impression that public golf in the National Capital parks has been operated by the present concessioner without cost to the taxpayer.

Paragraph 2 further states "that the courses, in part, were built by the present management of the courses from personal funds."

Of the 81 holes available for play Mr. Leoffler's various companies have built 27 holes. The 18 holes at Rock Creek were built by the Welfare and Recreational Association (now Government Services, Inc.), a semi-public organization. The nine holes at Fort Dupont were built and paid for out of profits due the United States, and the remaining 27 holes were built from appropriated tax money.

There are five clubhouses at the various courses. Those at East Potomac, Anacostia, and Langston were built with tax money. The house at Fort Dupont will be completely paid for out of United States share of profits. Under one contract Mr. Leoffler was required to make some alterations to the oldest of the buildings which is used as a clubhouse at Rock Creek. The major maintenance of these clubhouses is paid out of tax money and the National Capital Parks Office expends large sums annually on other items in maintenance and improvement of the golf courses.

It is implied that the Recreation Board will request public appropriation to help meet the cost of operating the golf courses. There is a firm understanding between the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of Interior that no direct appropriation will be requested for operating the golf courses. The advance requested by the Recreation Board in the 1952 budget estimate will be repaid out of funds received from operation of the courses.

Paragraph 2 contains the statement, "Year after year during the early stages of golf-course building the District Recreation Commission manifested no interest in the golf courses whatever."

The Recreation Board of the District of Columbia was created by act of Congress April 29, 1942, and held its first formal meeting on June 1, 1942. The public golf courses had then been established for 22 years. During the first year of its existence, fiscal year 1943, the Board sought transfer of the golf courses upon expiration of the then existing contract, due to expire December 31, 1943. Due to war conditions and the short time available for obtaining the necessary funds, an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior was not reached and Mr. Leoffler received a new contract for 5 years to December 31, 1948.

In January 1948, a year before expiration of this new contract, the Board opened negotiations to obtain transfer of the courses, but despite repeated requests the National Capital Parks Office did not furnish the information as to history of receipts and disbursements and other information necessary to justify a request by the Board for an advance of funds to permit taking over the courses.

During the summer of 1948 the golfers using public courses held meetings and drew up complaints on the poor condition of the courses. As a result of these protests and the introduction of a resolution by Congressman RIVERS, of South Carolina, an investigation was made by the Subcommittee on Recreation and Parks of the House Public Lands Committee. Hearings were held beginning March 29, 1949. The information requested of the Department of the Interior by the Recreation Board was not furnished until February 1949, after the contract with Mr. Leoffler had expired. When the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation learned that there had been no audit of Mr. Leoffler's books since the beginning of that contract on January 1, 1943, they directed that an audit be made. After the submission of the audit report, the committee recommended that the golf courses be turned over to the Recreation Board. Mr. RIVERS introduced a bill directing this transfer.

On August 29, 1949, there was finally negotiated a basic agreement with the Interior Department permitting the Recreation Board to conduct programs on all areas under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department except the swimming pools and stipulating that supplemental agreements must be made for operation of the golf courses. The swimming pools were not included as the Interior considered they should be subject to a separate agreement. Throughout the negotiation of these agreements the Board has been assured that the present Secretary of the Interior desires to turn the golf courses over to the Board. The final supplemental agreement with the Interior for the operation of the gold courses has now been drafted, has received the approval of the District Commissioners and the national park authorities, and is the basis of the request now before Congress for an advance of $275,000 to be repaid over a period of years from the golf receipts.

PARAGRAPH 3

Mr. Healy suggests that all recreation facilities in the National Capital parks should be transferred to the Recreation Board. The organic act creating the Recreation Board, Public Law 534 (56 Stat. 261), authorizes the Board to conduct a broad and varied program utilizing the public facilities "in major recreation centers, playfields, athletic fields, playgrounds, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, swimming pools, beaches, golf courses, community centers, and social centers in schools, parks, or other publicly owned buildings, as well as other recreational facilities which may be agreed upon between the Board and the agencies having jurisdiction over such facilities." The Recreation Board stands ready to assume the responsibility vested in it by Congress for the operation of all public recreation facilities in the District as rapidly as agreements can be reached with those agencies which have jurisdiction over the property where such facilities have been constructed. The Recreation Board does not own any land but operates on properties owned by the United States, by the District of Columbia government, including buildings and grounds assigned to the Board of Education, and by various public and private agencies. The Board does, however, in entering into these agreements, hold to its basic authority to determine all questions of general policy relating to public recreation in and for the District of Columbia. Any delay in the transfer of recreational facilities or in the completion of agreements between the Board and other governmental agencies is due only to differences of opinion as to the full authority of the Board in predetermining policy.

PARAGRAPH 4

Paragraph 4 questions the knowledge of the Board (Commission) about the operation of golf courses. Under authority granted by the Board, the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of the Recreation Department, the Chief of Operations and a representative of the Budget Officer of the District of Columbia have personally inspected and investigated the operation of other municipally owned and operated golf courses. The Superintendent is recognized as one of America's top recreation officials. The Assistant Superintendent is an engineer with excellent analytical abilities. The program staff of the Recreation Department is thoroughly trained in all phases of recreation work. Under the Recreation Board, direction of the golf courses would be placed in the hands of a thoroughly competent golf expert of recognized experience and ability.

No promise has ever been made to the public by me or the Recreation Board that rates would be reduced. The Board proposes, if and when it receives the operation of the golf courses, (1) to pay back its indebtedness on a clearly established schedule, (2) to be sure of a constant program of rehabilitation and improvement of the courses, (3) to extend existing courses and develop new ones, and (4) to give the public the benefit of whatever savings are accomplished by canceling out the "profit" payment now paid to the private concessioner. If, with the efficient operation and improvement of the courses, it is found possible to reduce rates, then, of course, this will be done. We would expect the public golfers themselves, through appropriate representation, to assist the Board in determining the extent to which improvements and extensions should be made before considering rate reductions.

PARAGRAPH 5

The statements of this paragraph have already been met in citing the firm agreement between the District and the Department of Interior that public appropriations will not be sought to operate the public golf courses.

PARAGRAPHS 6 AND 7

Congress has already set up in Public Law 534 a procedure by which the Recreation Board is authorized to accept the operation of all public recreation facilities subject to agreements between the Board and the agencies having jurisdiction over such facilities.

It is because the Board takes seriously the charge laid upon it by this law that it continues to seek the transfer of the golf courses.

PARAGRAPH 8

The writer refers in this paragraph to a "personal smear angle." This allegation is without basis, as at no time, either in its communications and conferences with Interior officials or in its public acts, has the Board or this writer made any personal charges against the present operation of the courses.

PARAGRAPH 9

Paragraph 9 quotes several paragraphs of the testimony of Mr. Leoffler before the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the House Public Lands Committee. This quotation indicates very clearly Mr. Leoffler's lack of understanding in regard to the operation of the trust fund of the Recreation Department and the authority of the Interior Department and of the Recreation Board to enter into agreements for the improved operation of public recreation facilities. It is the opinion of the writer that the really significant statements coming out of

the congressional hearings were made in the audit report of the Department of the Interior. These include:

(1) That the bookkeeping methods of the concessioner are "an indication of a lack of understanding as to modern methods of accounting."

(2) That in spending the rehabilitation reserve "individual job cost records were not maintained, making it difficult, if not impossible, to determine with any degree of accuracy the correct cost of the various projects."

(3) That the electric vending machines, only method of checking actual receipts "were disconnected or disregarded in accounting for number of tickets sold."

(4) That ticket "rolls, in many cases, were not entirely used up before a new roll would be started. Thus the effectiveness of using ticket numbers as a control of cash is diminished."

As to the trust fund of the Recreation Department, the advance of $2,000 allowed for the trust fund is made by the District of Columbia and serves as a form of petty cash fund. Large expenditures for pay rolls, etc., from the trust fund are made according to the regular disbursement procedures established by the District Auditor and the General Accounting Office. If the item carried in the budget now before Congress is granted the Board will have a cash operating fund of $100,000.

It is believed that it would have been in the interest of good public service if Mr. Healy as a Government employee and resident of this area had availed himself of the opportunity for clarifying numerous impressions and statements he has made. The offices of the District of Columbia Recreation Department and Board are always available to provide data and information on public recreation services and facilities in the District of Columbia.

We are attaching a significant document, Compendium of Significant Factors Relating to Transfer of Operation of the Public Golf Courses to the District of Columbia. This compendium is a chronological listing of various events and developments which briefly illustrate the problems and difficulties which have beset the Rrecreation Board in discharging the mandate given to it by the Congress in Public Law 534.

Also enclosed is the original correspondence that you requested be returned to you.

The writer makes no response to Mr. Healy's frequent personal references, as it is assumed that any statements attributed to or directed at me in fact concern the Recreation Board.

This opportunity to comment on Mr. Healy's letter is deeply appreciated and we trust that you will call upon us for any additional information you may desire.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. WENDER,
Chairman, Recreation Board,
District of Columbia.

To End the Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing on the editorial page from the Washington Post of Saturday, February 3, 1951, entitled "To End the Strike":

TO END THE STRIKE

The White House has properly taken account of the great public interest in the restoration of full railroad service in its statement condemning the trainmen's strike. No one can contradict the assertion that "while the unions did not ratify the (December 21) agreement, that does not give them the right to strike against the Government. Their obligation is to remain at work while they use whatever democratic processes are available to settle their dispute."

But court action, however necessary, will not settle the basic issue or restore harmony to rail labor relations. Nor will strong language. The mere fact of governmental control of the railroads implies an obligation upon the administration to see through the intervention it has begun. Yet in the current phase the administration so far has done nothing to bring top rail executives and union leaders face to face.

It became apparent shortly after Christmas that the agreement with the four major operating unions reached through the mediation of Presidential Assistant John R. Steelman was not going to work. The carriers charged the unions with repudiating the agreement; they hold—and the administration apparently agrees—that the contract signed December 21 was binding and must form the basis for any further discussions. The unions, on the other hand, maintain that no contract is firm until it is ratified by the members—and this contention has a solid history in labor relations. It is true that the contract agreed to by management provided a more generous wage raise than that recommended sometime ago by a Presidential emergency board. Union members, however, maintained that this was not enough in light of the fact that the dispute has dragged on almost 2 years; moreover, they objected to the provision enlisting Dr. Steelman as arbitrator for a 3-year period.

Whether or not there was bad faith on the part of the union leaders, whether or not they withheld from members certain items they had agreed to, the very fact of a strike attests the intensity of feeling. Undoubtedly union politics are involved, but an impasse exists and a way out must be found. Maybe Dr. Steelman has done all he can, but union heads have not seen him since January 18. Nor have they seen any top railway executives since December 21. What has set in, apparently, is much the same sort of stalling that took place after the Government seized the railroads last summer. If anyone expects this sort of treatment to cool the union feelings, it has had quite the opposite effect.

Although, according to Dr. Steelman, it was the unions who first sought his help, the plain fact is that they have lost confidence in him. Nor is it possible to see how the National Mediation Board can do much about the hot potato that was thrown back into its lap after White House intervention failed. Point one in any new attempt at governmental intervention, it seems to us, ought to be the recognition by President Truman that a new mediator is essential. The insistence of a management spokesman that this is mere "union propaganda" does not, of course, meet the issue, for confidence is a necessary prelude to workable agreement. There ought to be plenty of experienced men of the caliber of Dr. William Leiserson, former chairman of the Mediation Board, or Senator WAYNE MORSE who would be acceptable to both sides.

Governmental assurance that the wage freeze would not apply because of the history of the dispute would be a big help to a new mediator. But his fundamental job would be to end the dealing through intermediaries and get railroad presidents to sit down with union presidents and face the issues. That, in our opinion, is the only way to get both sides to cease bickering over petty grievances and start thinking of a lasting settlement in the national interest.

Appointment of Price Enforcement Directors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members of the Congress, I have viewed with concern the manner in which regional and district price enforcement directors are being appointed throughout the country. I have been particularly alarmed over the fact that the director named for the Los Angeles area is a left-wing Democrat who has consistently supported the socialistic philosophy of many of the radical thinking individuals in the present administration.

It is imperative that politics be kept out of our national defense program if we are to succeed in facing the demands of the present national emergency. The appointments now being made by the Price Director of the Office of Price Stabilization indicate that despite the national emergency, it is still politics as usual insofar as the Truman administration is concerned.

I am including an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of February 4, 1951, which points out that the political pork barrel is the main consideration in the appointments being made by the Director of the Office of Price Stabilization. The editorial follows:

NO BEST REPUBLICANS

Price Director DiSalle has denied that political pull is the magic formula for getting jobs in his Office of Price Stabilization. "It makes no difference whether a man is a Democrat or a Republican," Mr. DiSalle said, "we pick the best man we can get."

If that is the case, the Republicans must be a pretty sorry lot, or else they are not looking for jobs.

A check of OPS appointments reveals that 11 of 13 regional price enforcement directors are Democrats of one sort or another, and that 29 of 34 district directors are Democrats. The others who could be reached said they had no party affiliation, or refused to reveal it. Apparently there are no Republicans in the crop, or, if they are any, they are either afraid or ashamed to admit it.

This may be just a coincidence, as Mr. DiSalle's statement suggests. But it looks as though the OPS is rapidly becoming a haven for deserving Democrats whose services are not in demand elsewhere.

Will the United Nations, the Truman Administration, and General MacArthur Never Profit by Sad Experience?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is more than a favorable possibility that if the United Nations troops stop at the thirty-eighth parallel, the war in Korea will come to an end. It probably would have ended before if we had stopped at that parallel. We did not do it, and that weakened our argument that all we wanted was to drive the invaders out. It was finally left to General MacArthur and he proceeded across the line. The result was that we suffered the greatest defeat in the history of the United States.

Now again the papers report statements that indicate that we are not going to stop this time. Unless the United Nations or this country will insist upon going no farther, MacArthur will probably go right ahead and embroil us in an all-out war with China. When we crossed it before, General MacArthur went up to the front lines to watch his great and final —"clean 'em up by Christmas"—operation. He took some good photographs and got a lot of publicity, but the result was a major disaster.

Does anyone think it is good policy to allow him to repeat this mistake? That mistake brought anguish to thousands of homes in America. If the United Nations does not stop it, we can. Has our administration the wisdom and nerve to say "No" when the time comes and not be bound to obey the commands of a vascillating, incompetent, and unnecessary body. The people of the United States never voted any authority to this debating society that strips us of our sovereign power. Any claim to such authority is clearly unconstitutional. The people of this country still rule, or do they?

Federal Bureaucracy and Public Unmorality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an address by the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, commissioner of social welfare, State of Vermont, before the Rotary Club at St. Albans, Vt., on January 15, 1951.

Speaking from the standpoint of over 30 years' experience and participation in public affairs, Mr. Simpson said he had witnessed the steady erosion of American character and much of this has been encouraged by accelerating Federal bureaucracy and public unmorality, emanating in the Nation's Capitol.

Mr. Simpson continued as follows:

In spite of a national emergency more serious than any which has ever confronted the American people, the tentacles of the bureaucratic octopus are still reaching out to entangle us.

There has been no real halt in the creation of a welfare state. We know, moreover, that conditions which are wrecking the financial stability of both State and Federal Government are bringing war and want back to keep their everlasting companionship with man.

For 15 years I have resisted and fought Federal domination and control of State government. Because of our resistance we have avoided the crushing costs which have been imposed on other States. In the State of Washington, for example, the per capita State fund cost of public assistance has reached the sum of $91.54. This is an average of $366.16 for every family in the commonwealth. In Vermont the per capita cost is about $11.

During the past few months as a result of the passage of the Social Security Act of 1950, we have been enticed to adopt all the impractical, expensive and burdensome rules, regulations, and policies we have successfully resisted in the past. They would double our administrative costs to no good purpose and within 4 years add at least another million dollars to our biennial State budget. What can we afford: Where will it end?

One part of Government makes policies which increases prices, exhausts life savings, makes it difficult for a man to support his family, encourages divorce, desertion, dependency, and delinquency. Another part of Government is trying to catch up with the situation at greater and greater expense, and never the twain shall meet. Irrespective of location or conditions, cold weather or warm, each person on assistance must conform to a standard according to the Federal bureau. A standard item for food, a standard item for fuel, a standard item for lights, clothing, and medical service. They would destroy initiative and thrift. If one raises a garden or a pig it must be changed for a standard garden or a standard pig. So why raise a garden or a pig? Why work anyway? Truly those whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.

And yet, the lure of Federal funds held out by the socialistic planners at the Nation's Capitol is a difficult bait to ignore, even when you know you are going to be hooked. Every State Administrator is bewitched, bothered, bewildered, and bedeviled by this unholy use of our own money.

The enemies of the Republican form of government and the democratic way of life are not all in Korea or Moscow. Some of them are here in America, insidious, persevering, and destructive. If successful, they will impose ultimate and complete regimentation in the United States of America.

We were led into a sense of false security by little men. It will require strong leadership, heroic measures, and such sacrifices as we have never known to save ourselves from disaster.

Why do we not have in Washington men of sufficient vision and courage to call a spade a spade and tell the people the truth? I have faith in their ultimate good sense and moral strength to fact momentous issues.

As chickens come home to roost, we are beginning to realize that no person is immune from the consequences of inflation and a crushing burden of taxation.

We must put iron into our democracy. Democracy creating its own world was hard and grim and poor. Democracy in years of national peril has been rich and soft and quarrelsome. Government has been actuated by selfish political motives. It failed tragically to make a peace. It failed dismally to prepare for war. These things are true. At a time to come, at a place not foretold, the life of liberty will be won or lost in an hour of trial. What happens thereon hinges on fate—will have been determined beforehand, by work done in the arsenal, in the shipyard, in the factory, on the farm, on the tank assembly line, a few man-hours or less. Liberty cannot be saved in its holiday clothes.

In his message to Congress in December 1925, Calvin Coolidge said:

"The functions which the Congress is to discharge are not those of local government but of national government. The greatest solicitude should be exercised to prevent any encroachment upon the rights of the States or their various political subdivisions. Local self-government is one of our most precious possessions. It is the greatest contributing factor to the stability, strength, liberty, and progress of the Nation. It ought not to be infringed by assault or undermined by purchase. It ought not to abdicate power through weakness or resign its authority through favor."

Calvin Coolidge may or may not have been a great President. That is for history to decide—but he was sound in his fundamental faith in the things which had made this a great nation. His feelings ran deep and and did not swerve. He was intelligent, he was wise, and, above all, he was honest. He possessed qualities very much needed in America today.

Welfare Needs Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star of February 3, 1951:

WELFARE NEEDS INVESTIGATION

A bipartisan committee to investigate the entire system of welfare in Indiana is being proposed by members of both political parties in the general assembly. We hope such a committee will be established. Enough evidence has been brought before the legislature to make it clear that the administration, the policies, the personnel, and the secrecy existing in the State welfare department need a thorough housecleaning.

It has taken a long time for the abuses and extravagances in welfare to come to light. There is still much that is hidden because of the iron curtain of secrecy imposed by Federal regulation and by State laws enacted under pressure by Federal bureaucrats. But the increases of expenditures in times of unprecedented prosperity have made it obvious that something is decidedly wrong in State welfare.

Welfare has become virtually an end in itself in Indiana. It is run by people who

are accountable to nobody but Federal officials and who are not bound by budgetary restrictions imposed within the State. They seem to believe that their prime duty is to put as many people as possible on relief in order to expand the scope of their own power and influence.

The Star agrees with Representative Jess Andrews who said on Wednesday that "what lies beneath the surface (of welfare activities) will shock the State if it can be brought into the open." We hope that members of both political parties in the assembly will join together in the public interest and establish a bipartisan committee that will bring all welfare activities out into the open.

Our Foreign Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Alf M. Landon:

I speak today not as a Republican. Obviously I cannot speak as a Democrat. I speak as an American citizen.

In recent speeches Governor Dewey, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Dulles—an American delegate to the United Nations—Senator Taft, and Governor James Byrnes all predicated the military policies they advocated on political policies.

Ordinarily that would be true. Eventually no military action is an end in itself. It merely provides the opportunity for negotiation and diplomacy. But we are now in a situation where our foreign policies depend on military events immediately confronting us.

Our decision to stay in Korea and our ability to do so completely alters the world political situation.

It forces definite and immediate act'on—either by the United Nations on our resolution branding Red China as an aggressor—or by ourselves in the realization that the grand idea of collective security has refused to work in a war-troubled world once again. It should be plain by this time to the members of the United Nations—and the Atlantic Pact—that doubts and questioning as to the value to America of our continued membership in both—are rapidly increasing in the United States.

We should make it plain to the United Nations that the adoption of our Red China Communist aggressor resolution does not mean that that is the end of it. We should make it plain that irreparable damage will be done to the grand idea of collective security—unless that resolution is fully supported when adopted, by concerted action, by other members of the United Nations, by the imposition at least of immediate economic sanctions and blockade.

There is too much strategic material like steel—petroleum products, and rubber—being supplied the Communists by our allies whose cause we are fighting in Korea.

There is no question that great quantities of strategic material are getting to Russia and its satellites. Europe is leaking them just like a sieve.

Of course, implicit in that policy of economic blockades is support for the national government of China—as soon as the United Nations faces up to its responsibility and duty of branding the Communist Chinese as an aggressor.

In asking for that resolution by the United Nations, America is only asking for a normal function because the United Nations was set up as an organization to prevent aggression and uphold peace.

All our diplomatic moves in the United Nations have set the stage for support for the official government of China.

After favorable action by the United Nations on the pending aggression resolution—thereby relieving the United States of any charge of imperialism in Asia—I favor lend-lease to the nationalist government and taking the fetters off Chiang Kai-shek.

Our military defense of Korea must have been upsetting to the Kremlin's timetable of world conquest—as we had practically invited them in there by our previous statements by the Secretary of State and the President that Korea was not of military value to us.

There are no railroads left in Korea. It is doubtful if the Chinese armies can live off the country. The only way they could be supplied with food and ammunition is by trucks. There is no production of trucks, automobiles, tanks, or airplanes in China. There is no rubber in China or Russia. The only available supply to both is from southeast Asia. There is no petroleum in China. Therefore, the only supply of gasoline available to Communist China is from Russia and England. There is not enough oil in Russia to fight a long war. Even to supply the Communist Chinese just with gasoline for the Korean campaign and to resist the forces of our officially recognized government of China is a drain on the petroleum supplies of Russia.

Therefore, instead of the forces of the United Nations being pinned down in Korea, the Russians are pinned down there. They cannot abandon their Chinese Communist satellites.

As a matter of logistics, it is easier for us to supply the United Nations Army on the tip of Korea by water—with our available ships and mechanical equipment—despite the greater mileage involved—than it is for the Communists to supply their forces on the tip of Korea by trucks.

Russia is also short of steel which further complicates its problems of supplying their Chinese satellites with not only motor vehicles and airplanes and fuel to run them, but also with guns and ammunition.

She might get the steel essential to fight a long war by seizing the Ruhr.

But the question of the essential petroleum supplies is not so easy.

The only place Russia can get the crude oil to supplement her own supply is from the Arab States. We are undoubtedly prepared to destroy the Arabian wells, pipelines, and refineries in the event of hostilities. But the oil is still there in the ground. The problem of getting the crude production back is not so great. But that of transportation and refining is. After they get the crude oil back to the top of the ground, they would still have the enormous job of getting it into the refined product and transporting it where they could use it.

Therefore, gasoline is as much of a vital item to Russia in fighting a war as the atom bomb itself.

The total number on hand and her annual rate of production of the atom bomb by Russia are unknown but her weakness in petroleum and steel and rubber in sufficient quantities for warfare is well known. Of these, the greatest of all is gasoline.

Therefore, instead of its being to Russia's interest to keep us involved in Korea, it is to our interest to keep Russia involved there.

Russia is being hurt a lot more than we are in Korea.

With all the Reds' shortages in war potentials, it's really costing them bitterly to stick with this Korean adventure. They thought it was going to be a short and cheap victory; instead, Russia is paying through the nose and now the Communist Chinese are beginning to do the same thing.

In the last few weeks they have really been hurting. They are on the receiving end in a big way.

Of course, they have vast manpower resources. But even with their millions—it still is very damaging to lose a couple of armies as they are now in the process of doing.

The plain matter of fact is that the Russians and Chinese Communists are suffering very severely in Korea and will continue to do so to an increasing extent as time goes on.

In other words, time is now playing into our hands.

Naturally, it is costing us something, too, but a lot less than it's costing the Commies. General Collins told the Senate Armed Services Committee the other day that our losses have been amazingly small.

It is our Asiatic policy that I am more concerned with right now rather than with our European policies, because it is there that we find ourselves at grip with Communist aggression.

There is another reason for concentrating on the job we have on our hands in Korea. That is that Russia, traditionally and by policy, has always tried to avoid a two-front war.

By staying in Korea through our superior fire power with a minimum of casualties to the United Nations Army, we relieve the Communist pressure on Indochina, India, and even Western Europe.

The United States has a greater industrial productive capacity and greater natural resources than any combination of the present Communist territories.

The Communist world, lacking necessary productive capacity for war, faces the vital necessity for the quick seizure of the industrial plants intact of Western Europe.

The question of how intact they would be is undoubtedly one of the reasons the Kremlin gangsters are hesitating to plunge into war.

Another reason is the growing revolt throughout the Communist territories by patriots fighting for freedom.

What is known as the underground movement should be vigorously and persistently encouraged and supported everywhere by all anti-Communists.

Another reason the gangsters of the Kremlin are hesitating is being daily demonstrated in the air battles over Korea.

Either the Communist's jet planes do not possess their boasted superiority or their pilots are no match for our American boys.

Either way, we are licking the pants off the vaunted Communist air forces to confound the prophets of gloom and doom.

Our patient efforts through the debates and discussions in the United Nations should enable all the peoples of the world to see and understand that the Communist Chinese are the true aggressors and its failure to brand them as such is the way to war and chaos.

The great idea of collective security is facing its supreme test. If it is to work, it must be all for one and not one for all.

Therein lies the great value of Mr. Hoover's last address to the country. To dismiss his talk as isolationist is simply an attempt to get away from realities.

The essence of his talk as I understand it is that you can't save people who are unwilling to make an effort to save themselves.

It seems to me the crucial thing we are up against is the lack of a will to fight for their own freedom in the western democracies.

People who are so lost to justice, the rights of the individual, to international friendship, to working out their own destinies and their own reforms in their own ways, all the basic elements of what we call the democratic processes, that they haven't the guts or the heart, whatever the reason, to resist the iron-curtain gang, are a grim warning to us that it is time to make a cold reckoning of what we have in the way of collective security and then base our course on that.

If it means pulling in our horns in this place or that place, then that is what we have to do, for to do otherwise is to court sure disaster.

In other words, it is not our job to contain communism so much as it is our job to marshall the forces of freedom-loving people everywhere, to preserve the way of life, for which we are paying, and will continue to pay, a tremendous price.

We have already been grieviously hurt because of ineptness, stupidity, and working at cross purposes.

We have been kidding ourselves with a lot of words and huffing and puffing but it is too late for that mumbo-jumbo stuff and longer.

It is time we realized that fully and clearly.

I believe our national administration is on the right track in staying in Korea. I believe our national administration is on the beam in giving the United Nations time to brand the Communist Chinese as an aggressor. But I also believe the American people will not endure much longer the vacillation of the members of the United Nations and the failure to shoulder their share of the load.

The world political picture is completely altered by our decision and our ability to hold Korea. It may be altered for the worse or the better. But it is being completely altered. And I believe it will be for the better. Because, if for no other reason, out of the confusion and division in the United Nations will come a clear and logical policy for us to follow.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from two very dear friends of mine, Mr. and Mrs. A. B. Rosson, of Austin, Tex., who have asked me to read their letter to the membership of this House. Both of them are not only aged citizens, but are deeply interested in a fair and equitable program which will provide an income to our aged citizens without impairment of their dignity as American citizens.

I am glad to read the letter to you, not only because they are friends of mine, but because under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, they are entitled as a fundamental right to petition this Congress and their Government for consideration of their beliefs and their problems. I ask for your very careful consideration of their suggestions. The letter is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In compliance with the wishes of Townsend members in this community, I am respectfully requesting that you devote as much time as possible to the active promotion of the principles of the Townsend plan.

You must certainly be aware of the suffering of our aged citizens who are compelled to exist on an average of $42 per month old-age assistance, or $26 per month old-age insurance. Compare this income with the $150 per month which our Government suggests is the amount required to provide a decent standard of living. How are these people supposed to live? And now the cold hand of poverty knocks even louder on their doors with the latest increases in living costs making their meager incomes even less adequate in terms of food, clothing, and shelter.

It would seem that this problem is important enough to rank first on your list of congressional duties. As voters in your District we are asking that you use your influence to stop this injustice by actively supporting the principles of the Townsend plan, which guarantees dignified retirement on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Very truly yours,

A. B. ROSSON.
Mrs. A. B. ROSSON.

Are Farm Prices Too High?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement released to the press of this date by Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. This statement and the accompanying figures based on data prepared by the committee staff answers many questions which are of widespread interest in the field of farm and food prices. I urge that it be read and studied by every Member of Congress.

ARE FARM PRICES TOO HIGH?

Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, said today that those who are pointing the finger of blame at the American farmer for high food prices are demonstrating nothing but their own ignorance of elementary economics and price relationships.

Rather than farm prices being unreasonably high, he said, the January 15 price report just issued by the Department of Agriculture shows that most farm commodities are bringing less than a fair return to the farmer as measured by the parity index, less than the legal minimum price as established by the Defense Production Act and the Price Control Order of January 26, and far less than many of those same commodities were bringing to the farmer in 1948.

When the Department of Agriculture announced that the January 15 parity index stood at 110, many persons, including some who should have known better, immediately jumped to the conclusion that all farmers were receiving 110 percent of parity for all of the crops they had produced in the past year.

The principle of parity is very simple—it means merely a fair price for what the farmer sells in comparison to the cost of the things the farmer buys. The computation of this parity index for 172 different agricultural commodities is, however, a complicated mathematical process, one about which the average consumer or the average farmer knows very little.

The average consumer is not to be blamed therefore, when he accepts the written or spoken statement of those who should know what they are talking about, that a parity ratio of 110 means automatically that all farmers are getting 10 percent more than a fair price for everything they sell, although such an assumption is far from the truth.

If the people who make these statements would publish the complete facts and figures as released by the Department of Agriculture, everyone, consumer and farmer alike, would be able to see that the parity ratio has been pushed to its high level by only five or six commodities and that the great majority of the commodities farmers sell and consumers use are still bringing less than the parity price to the producer. Following is a complete table of parity ratios for the major agricultural commodities on January 15, 1951, as computed and released by the Department of Agriculture:

Effective parity prices for farm products and average prices received as a percentage of effective parity prices, United States, Jan. 15, 1951, with comparisons

Basic commodities:	
Cotton	125
Wheat	89
Rice	104
Corn	90
Peanuts	85
Designated nonbasic commodities:	
Potatoes	56
Butterfat	91
Milk	95
Mohair	---
Wool	[1] 158
Honey:	
Comb	---
Extracted	---
Other non-basic commodities:	
Barley	86
Beans, dry edible	86
Cottonseed	[1] 150
Flaxseed	---
Oats	92
Rye	---
Sorghum grain	72
Soybeans	107
Sweetpotatoes	79
Grapefruit	42
Lemons	75
Oranges	35
Apples	78
Beef cattle	141
Chickens, live	80
Eggs	82
Hogs	97
Lambs	143
Turkeys, live	[1] 91
Veal calves	148

[1] Unofficial estimate.

It will be noted that out of this whole list only cotton, rice, wool, cottonseed, soybeans, beef cattle, lambs, and veal calves were selling at prices above parity on January 15, 1951. Every other major food commodity was selling on that date below parity and some commodities very important to the consumer were selling far below parity. Potatoes were bringing farmers only 56 percent of parity. Dry edible beans, an important protein food, were selling at only 86 percent of parity. Sweetpotatoes were only 79 percent of parity; grapefruit 42 percent of parity; oranges 35 percent of parity; chickens 80 percent of parity; and eggs 82 percent of parity.

The prices of those few commodities which were selling above parity on January 15 were at that level not because the farmer has placed that price tag on his product, but because the buyers, representing 150,000,000 American consumers have placed that value on what the farmer produced. It should be clearly understood that unlike the manufacturer of automobiles, tractors, shirts, and millions of other products, the farmer does not place a selling price on his commodities.

The marketing of agricultural products in the United States is the one great free market left anywhere in the world. The farmer produces the commodities and offers it for sale. He doesn't put a price on his product. He sells it for whatever the consumer thinks

it is worth and is willing to pay. As a matter of fact, most of the commodities which are now selling above parity and a great many of the other major agricultural commodities are sold at open auction at prices over which the farmer has no control whatever.

When a farmer ships a load of cattle or hogs to the market he loses control over the price of these animals the minute they are unloaded at the stockyards. He receives for his investment and his labor in those animals the price that the buyers representing 150,000,000 consumers are willing to pay when the animals are put up for sale. If the farmer doesn't like that price, his only recourse (and even that may not be available to him under many circumstances) is to load the animals back onto the truck or freight car and bring them back to the farm in the hope of a better price later. This is obviously a costly and difficult procedure which can easily result in further loss and is seldom resorted to.

It should be unnecessary to point out that the farmer also has no control over the processing, handling, and marketing charges and the wholesale and retail mark-ups placed on a commodity after it leaves his hands—and that these charges contribute substantially to the retail prices against which consumers complain.

If, on the other hand, American consumers don't think the farmer's produce—let's say specifically, meat—is worth the price at which it is selling, they can bring that price down overnight by refusing to buy meat at the prices quoted. Poultry, eggs, dairy products, beans, fish, and beefsteak all contain high quantities of proteins in nutritious and palatable form. They are all selling below parity (except fish, for which there is no parity figure) with the exception of beefsteak and the relatively high price of beef, compared to the other protein foods, indicates the clear and understandable preference of American consumers to get their proteins in this form, instead of in some of the cheaper but equally nutritious protein foods.

As long as there is a reasonably adequate supply of beef—which there will be as long as farmers are left free to produce in abundance—the price of beef and other meats will continue to reflect not what the farmer would like to get for his animals, but what the consumer thinks it is worth in comparison to the other protein foods.

The price of cotton—another one of the half-dozen commodities that is pushing the parity ratio up—is the clear result of the supply and demand situation. The increased demand resulting from the defense program coincided last summer with the smallest cotton crop for many years. If farmers have the labor, machinery, and fertilizer they need, they will produce the 16,000,000-bale cotton crop the Secretary of Agriculture has requested for 1951 and take care of the cotton-supply situation.

Cottonseed—another commodity pushing the parity ratio up—is utterly insignificant in the cost of living and is, in fact, chiefly an added cost to farmers who use cottonseed meal for animal feed.

The price of wool, which stands in the vicinity of 150 percent of parity and helps to push the whole parity ratio up, means little to American farmers. We import more than two-thirds of the wool used in the United States and the price of wool on the American market is the world price—not the American farm price.

Many of the other woods important to the consumer are marketed like livestock, by open auction on a free market with consumers alone setting the price.

Everyone remembers the tremendous surge of prosperity after the war as the American economy shifted itself back into high gear for civilian production. Economic activity, civilian industrial production, incomes, prices, and many other indicators of economic conditions rose to new heights, reaching a top about July 1948.

At that point there began a leveling off in economic activity, as production caught up with consumption. Some prices fell off sharply—among them the prices of farm products. Nonagricultural income in the United States continued upward—from $164,575,000,000 in 1947 to $185,722,000,000 in 1948; $185,980,000,000 in 1949; and $198,000,000,000 in 1950.

The net income from farming followed the general trend for only 1 year—from $18,724,000,000 in 1947 to $19,169,000,000 in 1948. In 1949, however, net income from farming fell to $15,934,000,000 and dropped again in 1950 to $14,600,000,000, the lowest since 1945. In 1947 there was 19.3 percent of the population living on farms and the net income from farming was 10.1 percent of the national income. In 1950 the farm population was still about 18 percent of our total population, but the net income from farming had declined to a mere 6.8 percent of the national income.

While farm prices and incomes were falling, however, employment and wages continued upward to new highs. Average weekly wages of industrial workers went up from $53.37 in June 1948 to $64.15 in December 1950, an increase of more than 19 percent.

In spite of the sharp increases which have occurred in recent months in the price of beef, cotton, and the few other commodities which have pushed the parity ratio upward, the prices of most farm commodities are still sharply below the prices farmers were receiving for those same commodities in 1948, and retail food prices have just reached that level.

The following table, compiled by the committee staff and not previously published, shows the farm-price situation clearly:

Average prices received by farmers for farm products, Jan. 15, 1951, United States, with comparisons

Commodity and unit	1948 mid-month average prices	Legal minimum prices Jan. 15, 1951	Average price Jan. 15, 1951
Wheat, per bushel....dollars..	[1] 2.81	2.25	2.09
Rye, per bushel.....do....	[1] 2.47	1.75	1.48
Rice (rough), per hundredweight.....dollars..	[2] 6.58	5.36	5.55
Corn, per bushel.....do....	[3] 2.46	1.71	1.54
Oats, per bushel.....do....	[1] 1.27	.954	.882
Barley, per bushel.....do....	[1] 2.06	1.48	1.27
Sorghums, grain, per hundredweight.....dollars..	[1] 3.77	2.90	2.10
Hay, per ton.....do....	[3] 24.50	23.30	22.60
Cotton, per pound.....cents..	[4] 35.27	32.96	41.31
Cottonseed, per ton...dollars..	[5] 95.00	71.00	101.00
Soybeans, per bushel....do....	[1] 4.11	3.00	2.90
Peanuts, per pound....cents..	[6] 10.06	12.8	10.9
Flaxseed, per bushel.dollars..	[1] 6.71	4.54	4.25
Potatoes, per bushel....do....	[7] 2.05	1.76	.986
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel .dollars..	[8] 2.65	2.47	1.94
Beans, dry edible, per hundredweight.....dollars..	[1] 11.00	8.92	7.69
Peas, dry field, per hundredweight.....dollars..	[4] 6.51	5.40	3.51
Tobacco, per pound.....cents..	[9] 50.6	------	44.9
Apples, per bushel....dollars..	[10] 2.83	2.77	2.17
Grapefruit, per box (equivalent on-tree returns for all methods of sale)....dollars..	[8] 1.01	1.96	.83
Oranges, per box (equivalent on-tree returns for all methods of sale).....dollars..	[11] 1.56	3.55	1.26
Lemons, per box (equivalent on-tree returns for all methods of sale).....dollars..	[11] 3.65	3.26	2.37
Hogs, per hundredweight .....dollars..	[11] 27.40	20.00	20.00

[1] January.
[2] February.
[3] March.
[4] May.
[5] July.
[6] November.
[7] April.
[8] August.
[9] October.
[10] December.
[11] September.

Average prices received by farmers for farm products, Jan. 15, 1951, United States, with comparisons—Continued

Commodity and unit	1948 mid-month average prices	Legal minimum prices Jan. 15, 1951	Average price Jan. 15, 1951
Beef cattle, per hundredweight.....dollars..	[1] 25.20	3.80	27.00
Veal calves, per hundredweight.....dollars..	[2] 26.40	28.20	30.80
Sheep, per hundredweight .....dollars..	[3] 10.50	12.00	15.20
Lambs, per hundredweight .....dollars..	26.10	26.40	30.00
Butter, per pound.....cents..	[4] 72.0	--------	61.1
Butterfat, per pound....do....	[4] 67.7	74.0	70.2
Milk, wholesale, per hundredweight.....dollars..	[5] 5.13	4.62	4.06
Milk, retail, per quart (sold by farmers directly to consumers).....cents..	[6] 19.4	--------	19.6
Chickens, live, per pound .....cents..	[7] 32.7	30.2	24.3
Turkeys, live, per pound .....cents..	[8] 51.4	38.6	33.9
Eggs, per doren.....do....	[9] 5.3	51.5	42.6
Wool, per pound.....do....	[10] 50.7	56.2	88.0

[1] January.
[2] May.
[3] July.
[4] November.
[5] August.
[6] December.
[7] September.
[8] June.

This table will bear close study by anyone who is truly interested in the matter of farm prices. It shows clearly that while a few commodities are higher today than they were in 1948, most of the major farm commodities are selling today far below their 1948 price. Out of the 35 major commodities listed on this table, only 9 were priced as high on January 15, 1951, as they were during 1948. These commodities are cotton, cottonseed, peanuts, beef cattle, veal calves, sheep, lambs, retail farm milk, and wool. Of these, cottonseed, peanuts, and retail milk (milk sold by the farmer direct to the consumer) are up only minutely over their 1948 price.

On the other hand, a comparison of the 1951 prices (shown in column 3) with the highest mid-month price of 1948 (shown in column 1) disclosed that many important consumer commodities are selling today far below their 1948 level. Potatoes are about 99 cents per bushel compared to $2.05 in April 1948. Sweetpotatoes are $1.94 compared to $2.65 in August 1948. Wheat, the basic ingredient of bread, was $2.09 on January 15 of this year compared to $2.81 in January of 1948. Chickens are 24.3 cents this January compared to 32.5 in August of 1948. The farm price of eggs on January 15, 1951, was 42.6 cents compared to 48.3 cents in November 1948. Oranges were bringing farmers only $1.26 a box this January, against $1.96 a box in September 1948. How many nonagricultural commodities can you buy today for less than they cost in 1948?

Contrary to what appears to be the general belief, the price of hogs is 25 percent lower today than it was in 1948—$20 per hundredweight on January 15, 1951, compared to $27.40 per hundredweight in September 1948.

Column 2 of the table shows the legal minimum prices or ceilings which may be established for agricultural commodities under the Defense Production Act and the recent price control regulation. Study of these ceilings will indicate that they, too, are generally below the prices farmers received in 1948; so that even if the price of farm commodities should now come up to these ceilings, farmers would still be receiving a lower price for many of these commodities than they were receiving on a free market in 1948.

Suspension of the Copper-Import Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the short supply of copper continues to plague American industry. The trade barriers erected against the importation of this vital metal by the Eighty-first Congress is threatening the economic stability of the Nation.

I have received from the United States Independent Telephone Association a copy of a letter written to the Honorable ROBERT DOUGHTON, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. This association represents 5,700 independent telephone companies in the United States—most of them in rural areas. Their continued operations are essential to the maintenance of our communications system. The utter foolishness of the import tax on copper becomes more evident daily as essential industries feel the pinch of low copper inventories and increased defense orders.

The letter follows:

UNITED STATES INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to tell you of the vital interest which the independent segment of the telephone industry has in the matter of suspension of import taxes on copper. There are two measures now pending before your committee upon this subject: H. R. 256, by Congressman PATTERSON, of Connecticut, and House Joint Resolution 37, by Congressman MILLS, of Arkansas.

The 5,700 independent operating telephone companies which provide telephone service in 11,000 urban and rural communities throughout the United States are under mandate, by the laws of the States in which they operate, to furnish service of such quality and to such extent as will best serve the public interest.

These companies are confronted with unprecedented demands for telephone service. Copper is one of the essential materials used in the manufacture of wire, cable, switchboards, and numerous other equipment items which are needed in order to meet these service demands.

Independent manufacturers and suppliers producing the various equipment items used by independent telephone companies in furnishing service are experiencing increasing difficulty in obtaining copper in sufficient quantity to meet their needs. The situation has become so serious that it is a matter of considerable concern.

One of our manufacturers has written us that "the present emergency and the heavily stepped-up requirements for copper for defense and essential civilian purposes in the communications industry has made it all the more necessary that relief of the copper shortage be pursued through every available means. Our supply of copper has been extremely tight, and, aside from the military requirements covered by DO ratings, we have had to fight for every pound of copper and brass which we cannot do without in the production of telephone equipment."

Another manufacturer has written: "It is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain copper for the purpose of manufacturing components and equipment so vitally needed in the communications industry."

Another manufacturer has written: "Our requirements for copper-base alloys are far in excess of the material allocated to us and this condition in the future will not improve but, conversely, will grow progressively worse."

Still another manufacturer has written: "Vigorous action should be taken to increase the supply of copper in order that the vital communication and electronic industries may be furnished equipment to insure adequate communication facilities during the national emergency. It is our belief that the comparatively insignificant loss of import tax revenue from copper is far offset by the strengthened position which added communication and radio apparatus within our country affords us during this time. As copper is absolutely vital to the communications industry and even more essential in radio and electronic apparatus which we are presently under contract to supply for the defense program, we strongly urge that the import duties be promptly suspended."

In a report by the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate presented on January 15, 1951, the following reference to copper appears: "Even if the Korean situation had not developed, there would not have been sufficient copper to meet the demands of the civilian economy, no less the additional demands of the military programs. In light of this situation, certain actions are required to bring into balance the available supply of copper with the over-all United States demand, which includes military, stockpile, and civilian programs." (Rept. No. 2, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 19.)

Suspension of import taxes as called for in the pending measures above mentioned would increase the supply of this critical material and thus assist not only in the military stockpiling program but in maintaining essential telephone service. The Senate Interstate Commerce Committee several years ago reminded the country that "adequate communications facilities and the maintenance of a strong, cohesive, and far-flung communications system are as vital to the prosecution of the war as is the production of guns, airplanes, tanks, and ships."

Our association hopes, therefore, that you will do everything you can to bring about early and favorable consideration to this important legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE S. BAILEY,
Executive Vice President.

Our Ruling Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is in a period of economic and military mobilization—a critical time in which the cooperation and sacrifice of all Americans will be required.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, this administration continues to play politics as usual. Politics as usual for this administration, I might add, is quite a bit of politics. Those who act high and mighty about criticism, certainly ought to at least try to keep themselves above those things which merit the just criticism of the American people.

I cannot condemn too strongly the prevailing practice of placing into the hands of men chosen by the spoils system the power over critical matters affecting our country and our daily lives. I submit herewith a very pointed editorial which recently appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis.:

OUR RULING CLASS

Wilbur Elston, a Minneapolis Tribune staff correspondent in Washington, reported the other day that "price control offices being set up around the country are becoming a haven for defeated Democratic candidates and other Democratic politicians."

Everywhere, Mr. Elston reported, the answer is the same:

Top jobs are being cleared with the Democratic national committee, Democratic Senators and Congressmen, and State Democratic leaders.

The same practice, Elston discovered, "will be followed in staffing regional civilian defense agencies." The organization being set up to patrol wages likewise will be staffed by the party faithful.

It would be too much, of course, to expect the Truman administration to abandon its "politics as usual" slogan in the national emergency. After all, these emergency jobs are not covered by civil service regulations. And the pay is too good—$50 a day for consultants and $20.20 a day for public information men—to be wasted on the common people.

Elston cites specific examples of how the party hacks are being taken care of.

The defeated Democratic candidate for Congress from Minnesota's second district gets the district price assignment.

The defeated Democratic candidate for Governor of South Dakota will be a regional legal adviser.

A former Democratic member of the Montana unemployment compensation becomes an assistant regional price director.

Al Loveland, the defeated Democratic candidate for United States Senator from Iowa, will be Iowa district price consultant.

The regional director in Chicago is the defeated Democratic candidate for Illinois State treasurer.

The regional director for the Rocky Mountain States will be the man who in 1948 was president of the Truman-Barkley club. (A 5-man panel had recommended another man.)

In California, a defeated Democratic congressional candidate was named price consultant for the Los Angeles district.

Others slated for or already appointed to the well-paid jobs include a former Democratic Congresswoman from Connecticut; a defeated Democratic congressional candidate in Indiana; the father of a defeated Indiana Democratic Congressman; and a Democratic New York State legislator who was turned down by the voters.

In Wisconsin, of course, we know the story.

Carl Thompson, Democratic national committeeman and patronage boss who was defeated for governor last fall, was offered one of the $50-a-day jobs. For reasons of his own, he rejected it, but will name his own successor.

Tom Fairchild, the defeated Democratic candidate for United States Senator, also was taken care of. He has been offered the district legal counsel's post.

Most citizens know that the days ahead require personal sacrifice. Most responsible citizens are ready to cooperate in the national effort to control wages and prices, and to get our civilian defense establishment in working order.

The Truman administration is making a mistake by using these necessary Federal programs as instruments of politics.

This country simply doesn't like a ruling class. And our citizens have a particular hatred for a ruling class when membership therein is limited to members of the political party in control.

That sort of thing is too much like the very political philosophy we are fighting against.

Anti-Inflation Policy Backed by Economists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, every one of us is anxious to protect and strengthen the American economy so that the Nation can come through the current and future period of high governmental costs in a sound state. The manner of accomplishing this involves some differences of opinion. Because I believe the information contained in the following article, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, will be useful to all of us, I am asking that it be included in our RECORD:

ANTI-INFLATION POLICY BACKED BY ECONOMISTS—RESEARCHERS' REPORT CALLS FOR FULL TAXATION, CURBS ON BANK CREDIT

(By Alfred Friendly)

Four of the Nation's leading economists yesterday gave firm backing to the administration's taxation and price-wage policies for inflation control, but took sharp issue with the Treasury's pegged-price program for Government securities.

They supported, instead, a view associated with the Federal Reserve Board that private credit extension should be cut through tightening of bank reserves, although this entails higher interest rates on Government bonds.

The economists stated their views in a report prepared for the influential Twentieth Century Fund, a research foundation endowed by the late Boston merchant, Edward A. Filene.

The team of experts was headed by John M. Clark, professor of economics at Columbia University. Other members were Theodore W. Schultz, chairman of the economics department of the University of Chicago; Arthur Smithies who holds the comparable post at Harvard; and Donald H. Wallace, director of the graduate program of Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

Their study, one of the most forthright and uncomplicated to appear on the economics of the defense program, had as its basic theme the argument that direct controls on wages and prices can only be supplementary to, not substitutes for, the measures that attack the real roots of inflation.

The three basic methods, their report said, are:

1. Pay-as-you-go taxation to cover completely the costs of the defense program and regular Government expenses.

2. Limitation of bank credit, even at the cost of higher interest rates on Federal and other borrowing.

3. A truce on customary contests of bargaining power and pressure among the interest groups of labor, business, and farmers.

The report emphasized that the present situation was quite different from that at the outbreak of World War II. At that time, what was demanded was intense economic efforts of relatively short duration. Now, what is needed besides a rapid build-up of armed strength is a state of military readiness that may have to last for the indefinite future.

In World War II direct controls were necessary and worked, for the short term, with some effect. But now, the economists said, "price control must have far better support from fiscal, credit, and debt management policy if it is to have a chance for survival."

The report insisted that inflation cannot be controlled if excess demand for goods is allowed to compete for the limited supply.

The report said, "Inflation is, among other things, a sign that the country is giving divided support to the national effort. If we are willing to appropriate money for defense, but unwilling to take it away from ourselves, we are trying to escape the basic fact of diversion of resources, and the necessity of initial curtailments of civilian supply.

"We are supporting national defense with one hand and sabotaging it with the other."

Principal conclusions and recommendations of the four economists:

Taxation: "It is both possible and necessary to depend on taxation to finance the defense expenditures and to remove the bulk of inflationary pressure." The minimum objective should be an increase of tax revenues by $16,000,000,000. Of this, corporations can pay 4,000,000,000, through higher normal rather than excess profits rates; personal income tax should yield nine to ten billions; and the rest should come from excises.

"From a standpoint of absorbing purchasing power, there is a case for heavy excises on all goods in short supply."

Monetary and credit policy: "The Federal Reserve System must be enabled to tighten bank reserves." It failed to follow a restrictive credit policy since the outbreak of the Korean War, but if it had, it could have blocked the monetary expansion that occurred since then and "prevented much of the inflation."

The policy of not letting rates on Government securities rise has deprived the Federal Reserve of its major weapon to tighten bank lending. "It is long past time that this shortsighted policy be abandoned," even though reviving the Federal Reserve's power in the open market "would doubtless involve some increase in Treasury interest payments."

Wage and price controls: Some increases in wage and price ceilings will be necessary to obtain desirable increases in output. Therefore, "rigid adherence to the original frozen prices and wage rates would be undesirable and indeed self-defeating."

"It is clear that some upward drift of the average of commodity prices and wage rates is probably unavoidable."

Flexibility is seriously hampered by the provision in the present law providing that ceilings on farm products cannot be fixed at prices less than parity.

Rationing: Consumer rationing will probably be required for some commodities, such as meat, but the rationing device should be used most sparingly, particularly because it is so "very expensive in manpower" in its administration.

Social security: Now is an appropriate time to increase the size and coverage of the social-security program, because "increased payroll taxes will absorb purchasing power, and the prospect of increased benefits will create a sense of security in the future that is now badly needed."

Government economies: "The possibilities of economy in the nonmilitary field are frequently exaggerated. We doubt that the most rigorous economy could achieve a reduction of more than one or two billions from the budget estimates of 1951–52."

Col. Justice M. Chambers, USMCR—A Deserved Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the issues of war or peace in our world today are determined by political leaders. The issues of victory or defeat, however, are determined by the fighting man on the ground, in the air, or on the sea. Historians and statesmen may well tell of grand strategy and campaigns won or lost, but in the final analysis it is the leadership and heroism of officers and men on the scene of battle that really turn the tide.

For this reason, it is well today that we pause a moment from our solemn responsibilities of meeting a new and greater danger to a free world and pay tribute to a man among men, a hero among heroes, whom we of the Congress have been privileged to know and respect these past 4 years.

I refer to the staff advisor of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who recently received the Congressional Medal of Honor from President Truman for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life and above and beyond the call of duty.

Colonel Chambers was known and loved by Marines under his command as "Jumping Joe" because of his ever constant activity, his tireless and persistent training schedules, and his almost superhuman powers of endurance, both in and out of combat, from Guadalcanal to a narrow escape from death at Iwo Jima.

We of the Congress are particularly aware of Colonel Chambers' great contribution to his country in peace as staff advisor of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Maryland should be proud that one of her sons is the two hundredth marine to receive the Congressional Medal and the eightieth in World War II.

The blue rosette with the white stars has replaced the blue and white bar in his coat lapel. The Navy Cross previously awarded him is now replaced by the Medal of Honor for which he was originally recommended. Gen. Clifton B. Cates, Marine Commandant, who first made the recommendation brought additional evidence into the reexamination of his recommendations.

This evidence is most interesting. It reveals that while commanding the Third Battalion, Twenty-fifth Regiment, Fourth Marine Division, Colonel Chambers was as responsible as any one individual could be for securing the right

flank of the Fifth Amphibious Corps' Iwo Jima beachhead. This evidence shows that Colonel Chambers utterly disregarded his own safety under enemy plunging fire on his exposed flank that caused more than 50 percent casualties the first day among his officers and men. It further shows that he was seemingly everywhere at once on the shifting black sands of tortured Iwo Jima during the most dangerous hours of this amphibious operation.

The high ground flanking his battalion was an impossible military threat to the security of the entire Marine beachhead. By example rather than by command, Colonel Chambers succeeded in winning the key heights and anchoring the right flank of the two Marine divisions making the initial landing.

Bravery and leadership by this fighting Marine son of Maryland, who lives with his wonderful wife and family at Rockville, was no accident. It was the result of long years of training, of hard work. If any man can be said to have led a charmed life, it is Col. Joe Chambers.

Wounded on Tulagi during the Solomons landing, he received the Silver Star for heroism in directing the defense of a battalion aid station while he was a seriously wounded patient.

He commanded the Third Battalion, Twenty-fifth Marines across Roi-Namur, Saipan, and Tinian. Suffering from blast concussion on Saipan, he talked his way out of the sick bay to lead his battalion through the Tinian campaign for which he received the combat Legion of Merit.

Some simple arithmetic gives Joe Chambers three Purple Hearts, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, and the Medal of Honor, not to mention five combat stars and three Presidential unit citations. He is one of the few marines in a corps of heroes who wear three stars on the coveted Presidential unit citation.

Recently the Nation was pleased to see President Truman present Colonel Chambers with the Medal of Honor in the presence of the entire Chambers family, including Marine recruits Peter and Paul, twin sons aged 7 months. The twins made such a fuss over President Truman that they made the presentation front page news across the country. We have all seen pictures of the proud and happy father holding the twins while a beaming President tries to disengage himself from the chubby fingers of one of the twins.

Newspapermen have called this one of the truly fine human interest stories of the year. It was more than that. It was a perfect illustration of how our democracy works. It was a beautiful reminder of the importance of the individual and of his family to our society. And, it could not have happened to a nicer guy.

Last June, Colonel Chambers marched down New York's Broadway at the head of the Fourth Marine Division Association of which he is president. During the past year he has been named first vice president of the respected Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association. He is also active in Maryland civic and State circles.

Colonel Chambers has made several important contributions to the work of the Armed Services Committee, of which he is one of the valued staff workers. He served as staff counsel in Germany last year in connection with the Malmedy investigation and recently accompanied a group of Senators on a special inspection trip to our Alaskan frontier. He has also visited many American camps and bases on assignment from the committee. Always his keen legal mind and capacity for almost constant work have resulted in signal service.

Colonel Chambers has trained and trained well for a life of service to our Republic. His retirement from his beloved Marine Corps because of wounds has not quenched his will to serve others. On such men as this has our country depended since the American Revolution.

Born 42 years ago in Huntington, W. Va., educated at Marshall College there, at George Washington University, and National University, Colonel Chambers came up through the ranks of Washington's Fifth Marine Reserve Battalion during the days of peace. This year he rounds out 20 years of marine service. That service has been in the highest American and marine tradition.

That the Members of the Congress may understand what lies behind the blue and white rosette on this man's button hole, I am proud to repeat the citation read by the President of the United States:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to Col. Justice M. Chambers, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and trepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as commanding officer of the Third Assault Battalion Landing Team, Twenty-fifth Marines, Fourth Marine Division, in action against enemy Japanese forces on Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands, from 19 to 22 February 1945. Under a furious barrage of enemy machine-gun and small-arms fire from the commanding cliffs on the right, Colonel Chambers, then lieutenant colonel, landed immediately after the initial assault waves of his battalion on D-day to find the momentum of the assault threatened by heavy casualties from withering Japanese artillery, mortar, rocket, machine-gun, and rifle fire. Exposed to relentless hostile fire, he cooly reorganized his battle-weary men, inspiring them to heroic efforts by his own valor and leading them in an attack on the critical, impregnable high ground from which the enemy was pouring an increasing volume of fire directly onto troops ashore as well as amphibious craft in succeeding waves. Constantly in the front lines encouraging his men to push forward against the enemy's savage resistance, Colonel Chambers led the 8-hour battle to carry the flanking ridge top and reduce the enemy's fields of aimed fire, thus protecting the vital foothold gained. In constant defiance of hostile fire while reconnoitering the entire regimental combat team sone of action, he maintained contact with adjacent units and forwarded vital information to the regimental commander. His zealous fighting spirit undiminished despite terrific casualties and the loss of most of his key officers, he again reorganized his troops for renewed attack against the enemy's main line of resistance and was directing the fire of the rocket platoon when he fell, critically wounded. Evacuated under heavy Japanese fire, Colonel Chambers, by forceful leadership, courage, and fortitude in the face of staggering odds, was directly instrumental in insuring the success of subsequent operations of the Fifth Amphibious Corps on Iwo Jima, thereby sustaining and enhancing the finest tradition of the United States Naval Service."

Report of Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the 1950 Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District report which has been sent to me by Mr. Rutland Cunningham, the very able chairman of the board of supervisors. The conservation of our soil and water resources is of real importance to the welfare of our country, and the splendid results achieved through this program in northwest Alabama are of outstanding significance. Mr. Cunningham and the district supervisors are to be commended for this splendid report:

ANNUAL REPORT OF NORTHWEST ALABAMA SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1950

To the People of the Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District:

This report is made to you for the purpose of giving you an accounting of the year's progress in the five counties which comprise this district. The Northwest Alabama District is made up of Lauderdale, Colbert, Franklin, Lawrence, and Morgan Counties.

The Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District has been in operation for 8 years. It is very satisfying to know that in the times we are facing, when agricultural productivity will be much needed for the defense of our way of life, the soils of this district are more capable of that needed productivity.

As in past years, we have promoted the new crops that seem to have the best possibilities for use in conservation farming.

Kentucky 31 fescue had its north Alabama beginning through the Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District. In 1946 we secured fescue seed from soil-conservation service nurseries to plant two 5-acre seed patches. As a result of farmers seeing this fescue and hearing about it through the district program, the acreage mounted each year. In 1950 farmers of the district planted approximately 25,000 acres of fescue. This is more pasture grass than was ever planted in any 1 year.

Caley peas are an excellent reseeding winter legume. We secured our first 100 pounds of seed in 1943. Over 500,000 pounds of Caley peas were planted in the district in 1950.

There have been similar increases in acreage of button clover, rescue grass, Lespedeza bicolor, and other new crops introduced by the district.

In 1950 we brought in additional new conservation crops on a field trial basis. Among the more promising are hairy Indigo, Wilmington Bahia grass, Tangier peas, Ala-Lu clover, and Hillsboro strain of white clover.

We appreciate the fact that the soil-conservation service nursery division is always on the lookout for new plants which show

promise in soil conservation, and that they produce these plants, or seed, and provide them to us for observational plantings.

In 1950 you, as cooperating farmers, did a fine conservation job. You, 463 of you, made application for complete soil and water conservation plans. The technicians assigned to us by the soil-conservation service completed plans for 402 of you. They helped 38 of you to revise your old plans. They helped you apply soil-conservation practices that were new to you or which required special technical know-how.

You did more in 1950 than in any previous year. At the present time, there are 2,543 of you cooperating with the district. You own 201,250 acres of land in the best section of Alabama.

You planted 15,579 acres of pasture in 1950. This was two and one-half times as much as you planted in 1949. You planted 64 percent more sericea in 1950 than you planted in 1949. You established 47 percent more sod waterways. You did 28 percent more drainage; built 67 percent more farm ponds; planted 52 percent more wildlife borders; established 32 percent more soil-conservation crop rotations; and planted 380 percent more trees. Your other accomplishments were outstanding. You harvested more seed of soil-conservation crops than ever in the history of Alabama.

You did a fine job on your farm. You have demonstrated that a sound conservation program results in increased production and protects the soil at the same time.

We hope you will share your soil-conservation know-how with your neighbors. Encourage them to take advantage of the assistance offered by the soil-conservation district.

It would be impossible to list all of the folks that helped the district and helped you in doing this fine job. We do feel that the newspapers of the district should have a large share of the credit. They have constantly kept you informed through special soil conservation news articles and pictures.

As a farmer in the district, you are entitled to certain advantages that you may not have known about. By cooperating with the district you have access to the many facilities that are available to assist you with your erosion control and land use problems.

You can get a written soil conservation plan made on your farm with the help of qualified technicians. This plan will contain an aerial photograph of your farm which shows the capability of your soils to produce crops without damage to your land. Your plan will contain a map of your farm, showing the best use for each acre of land. You will be given specific recommendations for establishing and maintaining the conservation practices that you and the technicians decide are needed for your farm. If you need help in doing some of the new or difficult conservation jobs, the technicians will come out to your farm and help you.

There is no charge for this assistance. When you voted in, and organized, the Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District, you created a Government subdivision of Alabama to secure this assistance for you. We hope you will take advantage of this assistance.

We are your five district supervisors. We are responsible for the proper management of your district.

However, we need your help. We are very busy on our own farms. All of us are farmers. We are also busy in other worth-while activities working for the farmer, including the REA electric cooperatives, Farm Bureau, and PMA committees. We are interested in the welfare of all your farmers in the district.

We enjoy working as supervisors of your district. We are not paid for our services. We do district work because we love the soil. We have seen the tragic destruction of our soils and its terrible effect on the people of our district. We have seen some of you harvest much greater yields as a result of your conservation work. We pleasantly anticipate the day when all of you will reap the great benefits that are yours through your district program.

With the help of the agricultural agencies, we made a careful study of our district this year and determined the conservation needs for each county. The combined efforts of farmers, businessmen, and all agencies and organizations are needed to do this conservation job, which is so necessary to sustain our Nation.

We ask the cooperation of all agencies and individuals in doing this important conservation job.

W. RUTLAND CUNNINGHAM,
Chairman, Florence, Ala.
JOHN M. LILE,
Leighton, Ala.
M. G. GLASS,
Route 5, Russellville, Ala.
J. W. COUNTS,
Mt. Hope, Ala.
A. D. SAMPLE,
Hartselle, Ala.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the sixth, seventh, and eighth short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

PAPINIAN: ANOTHER ROMAN LAWGIVER

Papinian, who died in A. D. 212, is generally considered to be the greatest of all Roman jurists. He was master of the rolls and later praetorian prefect under the Emperor Septimius Severus.

Papinian was known not only as a jurist of great comprehension but as a stern moralist. His works are known to the modern world through the numerous quotations in the Theodosian Code and in the Digest of the Corpus Juris Civilis, which has influenced all legal history.

He was the principal of five jurists set up as authorities to be cited in future decisions of the courts.

The Papinian plaque was sculptured by Laura Gardin Fraser, of Westport, Conn.

JUSTINIAN: COMPILER OF THE CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS (A. D. 483–565)

Justinian (A. D. 483–565) is probably the most famous of all emperors of the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire. He captured Africa from the Vandals and Italy from the Ostrogoths. But it is as a legislator that Justinian's name is most familiar in the modern world.

His greatest contribution was a huge volume entitled "Corpus Juris Civilis" which has influenced all subsequent legal history. The work was a consolidation of the imperial constitutions from the time of Hadrian, a collection of opinions of the classical jurists and many new laws instituted by Justinian.

Justinian undertook the work after finding the Roman Empire in great confusion.

His plaque was done by Gaetano Cecere of Fredericksburg, Va.

TRIBONIAN: ANOTHER ROMAN JURIST WHO CARRIED ON JUSTINIAN'S WORK

Tribonian, who died in A. D. 545, was chief legal aide to Emperor Justinian. Under the Emperor's command, Tribonian supervised the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, the most important collection of Roman law and the basic document of modern civil law.

Historians surmise that he wrote a large portion of the document from his own vast knowledge of Roman law.

Tribonian probably was not a juridical thinker, but his background of Roman law was absolutely essential to the great project he directed, scholars say.

The Tribonian plaque was sculptured by Brenda Putnam, of New York City.

Rewriting the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, herewith is reprinted an article in the Wall Street Journal written by Garet Garrett on a subject so important that I sincerely believe it is worthy of the attention of every Member of this Congress:

The twelve most ominous words of legal meaning uttered in our time came from the Appellate Court of California last July. On striking down California's alien land law on the ground that it was in conflict with an international treaty, that court said unanimously:

"The United Nations Charter has become the supreme law of the land."

A Japanese person, insisting upon his right as an Asiatic to own land in California, had appealed from the State law to international treaty law and had been upheld. It is understood that the case will be carried to the Supreme Court for final decision.

Our form of government is involved in this question: Can the Constitution of the United States be superseded or rewritten by international treaty?

In an academic way that subject has been debated for many years; but now suddenly for reasons that will appear, it comes to have alarming urgency.

The California court stood on the Constitution. The Constitution says that treaties made by the President, the Senate concurring, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution, or laws of the State, to the contrary notwithstanding.

THE COURT'S DECISION

In a constitutional manner the United States subscribed to the United Nations Charter, as a treaty. Ergo, the Charter of the United Nations becomes the supreme law of the land. As simple as that. So the California court decided.

When the phrase that makes a treaty the supreme law of the land was written into the Constitution it was all right. An honorable nation must keep its word at any cost. It continued to be all right so long as treaties with foreign countries touched such things as boundaries, port amenities, fishery rights, and bird migration. It is a very different matter when international treaties begin to touch our internal social and economic arrangements, our civil rights, and our domestic laws. Certainly the founders who wrote the Constitution never imagined that such a thing as the United Nations Charter would ever become the supreme law of the land.

And it is not only the Charter of the United Nations. The noblest single industry of the United Nations is to invent covenants and conventions and propose them to be adopted as treaties by the member nations. These covenants and conventions are designed in every case to implement or give teeth to articles of the Charter which, as they stand, represent only ideal intentions and are not in themselves mandatory. Thus we get, for example, the International Covenant on Human Rights, which will come presently before the Senate for consent, and the Genocide Convention, which President Truman has already placed before the Senate with an urgent plea for ratification. These treaties, if they are ratified, will become the supreme law of the land.

A VERY FINE POINT

Whether the International Covenant on Human Rights would supersede our own Bill of Rights is for the moment a speculative question. But whether it would or not, all legal minds agree that it would enable Congress to enact laws which otherwise would be unconstitutional. Here is a fine point, and yet not too fine for the layman.

In 1913 Congress passed a migratory bird law. A year later the Supreme Court said the law was unconstitutional because the subject of migratory birds belonged entirely to the States and Congress could not legislate about it. But those who wanted the law were persistent. They persuaded the President to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain to regulate the killing of migratory birds, and when it had been ratified Congress passed a second law, almost exactly the same as the first one, and this second law was upheld by the Supreme Court on the ground that it was to implement a treaty.

Frank E. Holman, formerly president of the American Bar Association, said:

"This decision in effect and really for the first time opens the way for amending the Constitution of the United States by and through a treaty, because it proclaims that an otherwise unconstitutional law may become constitutional when, as, and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject."

SUPREME COURT'S LAST WORD

That stands as the Supreme Court's last word in the matter. There is no sign whatever that it has changed its mind.

If you make a logical projection of that decision you will come to some startling possibilities.

For example, the Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of people peaceably to assemble." So our Bill of Rights makes these three freedoms—freedom of worship, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly—untouchable. The Congress is forbidden to pass any law about them at all.

But the International Covenant on Human Rights says:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are purquant to law and are reasonable and necessary."

It says:

"Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression * * * subject to certain penalties and liabilities and restrictions, but these shall be only such as are provided by law and are necessary."

It says:

"The right to peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary."

OPENS OTHER AVENUES

Suppose this International Covenant on Human Rights were ratified as a treaty. Then, on the ground that the purpose was to implement a treaty, would the Supreme Court say the Congress could pass laws about religion, free speech, and freedom of assembly, which, according to our own Bill of Rights, it is forbidden to do? Unless the Supreme Court should change its mind, the answer is yes; and it may be noted that the Supreme Court has never yet invalidated a treaty.

A commission of the American Bar Association was appointed to study this question and it concluded that the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights would prostitute our fundamental and inalienable rights "to the readily invented emergency declarations of the all-powerful;" that "the Government could close down newspapers just as in other emergencies it closed down banks," and that it "presents the doctrine of State regulation of religion, a codification of the rights of regulation, and complete destruction of the freedom of religion, if laws based on the alleged public safety and order of the state shall provide."

There is then the Genocide Convention. It is already before the Senate. Genocide means race murder. Who is not against race murder? The State Department's representative at the United Nations, addressing the General Assembly on the day the convention was approved, said: "The denial of the right of existence of entire human groups is the subject matter with which this convention deals."

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

As in so many cases, the preamble is unobjectionable. That is a feature of the technique. The truth nevertheless is that this Genocide Convention is so curiously and obscurely phrased that hardly any two legal minds could agree on what it means. Yet if it is ratified it will become the supreme law of the land. It defines genocide as any act committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such. So far you follow it sympathetically. Then it proceeds to describe the acts, and they may be such among others as (a) killing members of the group, and (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group.

Try making an application of this description to the happenings of everyday life. The murder of a Negro for any reason might be called genocide. Imagine the many acts in hotels or restaurants or in regions of the South where segregation is practiced that might be construed as causing mental harm to members of a racial group. Nobody could be sure from a reading of the text how, when, or under what circumstances the provisions of this convention might overcross our domestic laws. It defines a new crime and persons or groups of persons (though apparently not a state) may be guilty of that new crime. The representatives of the United States on the legal committee of the United Nations agreed on this interpretation: "If an individual is murdered by another individual or by a group, with intent to destroy one of the groups enumerated in article III, the international crime of genocide is committed, as well as the municipal law crime of homicide."

And the State Department has said that the convention "is designed to ensure international liability where state responsibility has not been properly discharged."

Thus a race riot in Detroit or the lynching of a Negro anywhere would become the concern of international law, and American citizens might be brought before an international court to answer for it.

ANOTHER CONSTITUTIONAL BYPASS

So far, the most revolutionary departure from American tradition is in the North Atlantic Treaty, ratified in 1949, which voids the constitutional safeguard that only Congress can declare war. By this treaty we are bound to regard an attack upon one of the other 11 signatory nations as an attack upon ourselves, so that if 1 of the other 11 is attacked for any reason we are, ipso facto, at war, whether or not otherwise we should wish to be. It is under an unexpected construction of this treaty that the President now assumes the right to send an American Army to Europe, without the consent of Congress, just so it will be there if 1 of the other 11 nations is attacked.

Besides all that, the North Atlantic Treaty obliges us to strengthen our "free institutions," whatever that may mean. Certainly we should strengthen our free institutions, but how strange that we should undertake to do it under an international treaty.

The zealous internationalists say disarmingly that a treaty after all is not mandatory; it does not execute itself. After we have ratified a treaty, then we may decide for ourselves whether or not to pass a law to implement it. This, however leaves out such facts as—

1. Once a treaty has been ratified the pressure to implement it by law will be very strong, and we shall be accused of bad faith if we don't.

2. The nondiscriminatory articles of the United Nations Charter were not supposed to be mandatory, nor was it believed that they could touch matters which we held to be subject to domestic jurisdiction, and yet they were used to strike down California's alien land law.

3. A treaty within its own terms may oblige us to pass the implementing law. The Genocide Convention does that. It says: "The contracting parties undertake to enact * * * the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the convention."

CAN STRUCTURE OF LAW BE CHANGED?

So the question stands: How far can the structure of the American Government be changed by international treaty?

A former president of the American Bar Association goes so far as to say that lawmaking by treaty is "a blank check for writing a new Constitution." You will find his conclusion set forth in the September 1950 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

The American Bar Association has appointed a commission to consider an amendment of the Constitution to forbid the invasion of domestic laws by treaty unless specifically authorized by Congress, and to forbid Congress to make treaties effective by laws not otherwise authorized by the Constitution. A similar proposal to amend the Constitution in that manner will appear presently in Congress. The intention has already been announced.

Until we know for sure what we are doing, would it not be prudent to keep some of these treaties on the ice? It is much easier to get in than to get out. We cannot get out of the North Atlantic Treaty until the twenty-first year. Article 13 of the treaty reads:

"After the treaty has been in force for 20 years, any party may cease to be a party 1 year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the United States of America, which will inform the governments of the other parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation."

So you have the great oddity that in order to get out after 20 years the American Government would have to notify itself and then deposit the notice with itself.

The Martinsville Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star of Sunday has a very illuminating editorial entitled "The Martinsville Seven," which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article presents the facts which are sadly overlooked or ignored in the wild propaganda circulated by Communist newspapers and writers and given credence innocently by others who are ignorant of the facts in this case. A reading of this editorial will prove most enlightening.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARTINSVILLE SEVEN

The case of the Martinsville seven affords an instructive lesson in the uses of propaganda.

Two years ago a white woman was raped in Martinsville, Va., and seven men, all Negroes, were brought to trial for the offense and convicted. The Virginia Supreme Court said that "one can hardly conceive of a more atrocious, a more beastly crime."

The evidence showed that the woman, wife of a Martinsville merchant, had gone into the Negro section of the town to collect for clothing that had been sold. In the course of the mass assault she was bitten, scratched, and suffered serious internal injuries. She is still under medical care.

All of the seven men made written confessions. Four of them testified in open court and gave details of the assault. Among the witnesses for the prosecution were a Negro boy, a Negro woman, and the wife of one of the defendants. So there was no substantial question as to their guilt, and, indeed, the attorneys who represented the men on appeal have not contended that they were innocent of the crime.

Nevertheless, after all seven had been sentenced to death (four have been executed and the three others are scheduled to die tomorrow) a tremendous campaign in their behalf was under way.

This campaign falls roughly into three phases: First came the strenuous efforts in behalf of the condemned men by their attorneys. The case was carried through the appellate processes of the Virginia courts and taken twice to the supreme court. The theory of the appeal was that the men had been discriminated against because of their race, and this rested on the contention that only Negroes are sentenced to death for rape in Virginia. It was not a meritorious appeal, and the courts uniformly rejected it. Still, a lawyer has a right, and a duty, to do all that he can in behalf of a client.

The second phase took the form of apparently sincere appeals to Virginia's Governor Battle for clemency. One such appeal came, for instance, from the president of the Richmond Ministerial Union. Appeals of this sort may seem to manifest a greater concern for guilty men than for the victim of their crime. Nevertheless, they are legitimate exercises of the right of petition.

It is the third phase that should be a matter of concern for all people, white or colored.

This phase was a propaganda campaign headed up by the Communist Daily Worker and the Civil Rights Congress, which is on the Attorney General's subversive list. The truth means nothing to these people. But they saw in the case of the Martinsville seven an opportunity to stir up racial discord in this country and to blacken the reputation of the United States abroad. And they did a masterful job of it.

These propagandists saw to it that Governor Battle was swamped with telegrams and protests, many of which were published in the Worker. From Red China came a cable signed in the names of three organizations. It said that news of the imminent executions had aroused the deepest indignation among the Chinese people, and added that the confessions had been extracted by inhuman torture and later repudiated by the accused in open court. This followed the line of material that had been put out by Civil Rights Congress.

In Moscow, all of the leading papers published a summary of a letter of protest signed by 30 Russian writers, composers, and scientists. Another protest came from Bucharest and there were still others from groups in England.

In this way, the case of men guilty of a brutal crime, men found guilty after receiving the benefit of all the safeguards afforded by American justice, becomes an instrument to be used in discrediting the United States abroad. And there is no doubt that the instrument has been used effectively, for the people in other parts of the world will hear only the Communist version. They will never have an opportunity to know the truth—certainly not from the Communist propagandists.

There is one other aspect of this matter which is entitled to some serious consideration.

Virginia has a drastic antilynch law, and there has not been a lynching in the State since the law was passed more than a quarter of a century ago. That law is respected by the people of Virginia because it rests on the eminently correct proposition that mob violence is intolerable, that any person, white or colored, who is accused or suspected of crime is entitled to a judicial trial.

The case of the Martinsville seven presents the shoe on the other foot. The vicious, lying propaganda, the march of hundreds of demonstrators into Richmond, the picketing of the White House—all of these things were designed to nullify the judicial process and to coerce elected officials into reversing or modifying the judgment of the courts. Of course, the effort did not succeed in this case. But the intent was there, and that should be a matter of some concern. For the position of those who still would resort to mob violence will be strengthened in direct proportion to the extent that pressure groups may succeed in interfering with the judicial function or in nullifying a judgment of the courts that has been rendered after a fair trial.

Joseph H. McGann, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that Joseph H. McGann, Sr., chief clerk of the House Committee on Public Works, has recently completed 49 years of service with the committee. "Mack," as we affectionately know him, came from Cleveland, Ohio. He has served and is serving faithfully and well. He is always gracious and courteous and is willing to share his expert knowledge of the functions of the committee with all.

I congratulate him on his achievements, both for himself and his country, hoping that he will have many more years of satisfying service.

Unwarranted Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Jamestown Sun, of Jamestown, N. Y., in its issue of January 20, published an excellent and very penetrating editorial on the subject of Government expenditures for public assistance. This editorial points out that the defense program and the increased tempo of mobilization may increase the public assistance load rather than lighten it.

I ask unanimous consent to have this fine editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNWARRANTED CRITICISM

In an editorial which it entitles "Curiouser and Curiouser" the New York Herald Tribune of Thursday took President Truman to task on his budget because the section of it providing for social security, welfare, and health will cost $2,600,000,000 during the fiscal year of 1952. Of this amount $1,302,000,000 is earmarked for public assistance, more than three times the amount spent annually in 1943 through 1946.

The editorial raises the question, "Why should this hugely augmented sum be anticipated as needed for public assistance when we are already in a period of unprecedented full employment with a severe labor scarcity in the immediate offing?"

Then the editorial goes on to explain that we have just extended social-security old-age benefits. It assumes that "the tail continues to wag the dog."

We would, perhaps, have passed up comment on this editorial position under ordinary circumstances. The amount of money actually is small compared with the rest of the budget. But the attitude shown here is one that we have found common among many people in our own community.

The Tribune editorial cites Mr. Truman's explanation as being that the amendment to the law authorized grants to "totally and permanently disabled persons and greater aid to dependent children, plus medical care for persons receiving public assistance."

It doesn't consider this a sufficient cause for the increase. And it isn't a sufficient cause.

The Tribune editorial assumes that the bulk of the funds expended by public assistance go to persons who might find employment at times such as these.

That assumption is an error which can be confirmed by even a casual inspection of the rolls of any local department of public assistance.

There are a few facts about public assistance which can't be repeated too often.

The first is that the public assistance rolls during the past several years contained few employables, and these few have remained on the rolls for only short periods.

The second fact is that there are quite a few people who have come to the public assistance rolls in spite of the fact that they had made provision for old age. The attrition of inflation and, in many instances, misfortune, have wiped out their source of income. There is no longer any excuse for perpetuating the fallacy that the public assistance rolls are made up of the loafers, the improvident, and the indigent.

A third fact is that the people on public assistance rolls are living longer because they are getting better care. Medical costs have gone up. They need more medical care. All the related costs of public assistance have increased.

A fourth fact is that as the defense program gets going more elderly people will need help, not fewer. There is no indication that prices will not continue to rise. War casualties and industrial hazards will remove means of support from many elderly people.

A fifth fact is that during the period of conversion to military necessities, we can expect in the United States some sharp and sudden increases in unemployment in specific areas. This unemployment may be temporary, but during that period of unemployment, a man's dependents have to live.

It is quite evident that, far from being reckless about the provision for public assistance in the new budget, the President's advisers in this field were extremely cautious in the right, but perhaps unpopular, direction. They show an understanding of the problem that will be facing people on the public assistance rolls, and they don't want to impose upon them unnecessary hardships.

Some of your best friends are on the public assistance rolls. The only reason you don't know it is that public assistance today is not administered as poor relief, but in a way to protect recipients from those who regard our elderly people as wards of charity who should be clean and properly humble and grateful for being permitted to live.

Prices Received by Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the League Reporter for February 5, 1951:

FIGURES SHOW FARMER MAKES LESS ON MOST ITEMS THAN HE GOT IN 1947

Here's proof that farmers aren't responsible for high food prices.

The figures below show farmers were getting less for nine of the most important crops last December than they were 3 years earlier.

For only two crops—cotton and wool—were farmers receiving more last December than in 1947.

Although meat prices are not included in the list, corn, wheat, oats, and rye are. As cattle and hogs eat corn and grain, the prices of these four crops have a lot to do with the cost of meat.

Look at these figures, all official ones from the Agriculture Department:

Price received by farmers

Commodity	Dec. 15, 1947	Dec. 15, 1950	Difference
Wheat.....bushel..	$2.79	$2.08	−$0.76
Corn.....do....	2.37	1.45	−.92
Oats.....do....	1.18	.85	−.33
Rye.....do....	2.45	1.37	−1.08
Flax.....do....	6.66	3.59	−3.07
Soybeans.....do....	3.69	2.70	−.99
Rice .....100 pounds..	6.42	5.32	−1.10
Butterfat.....pound..	.88	.59	−.29
Eggs .....dozen..	.59	.51	−.08
Wool.....pound..	.42	.80	+.38
Cotton.....do....	.35	.40	+.05

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter to the editor written by Dale D. Dorman, Jr., of Graham, Mo. This letter was printed in the Maryville (Mo.) Daily Forum and a copy was sent to me by Mr. and Mrs. C. C. James, of that city. I believe the letter is of interest as showing the thinking of many people regarding the Korean War.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAHAM, MO., *January 27, 1951.*

MARYVILLE DAILY FORUM,
Maryville, Mo.

EDITOR, DAILY FORUM: It is said that while Nero fiddled, Rome burned. Today, while the United Nations fiddles, Korea burns.

Today the United States, with 90 percent of the UN forces in Korea and 90 percent of the casualties, is letting the United Nations, which includes many of our enemies, as well as our questionable friends, decide when and where Americans are to battle, to fight, and to die.

After America has poured out $42,552,000,000 to foreign nations since the end of World War II, we yet today have far fewer true friends than we had at the war's end. When, oh when, will we learn that we cannot buy friendship?

Our Government is still talking of spending more billions in Europe, even though there is little doubt but what Russia could sweep over Europe at her own discretion. Then why is she waiting? Russia's waiting for our Marshall plan to place more and more American industrial equipment and war materials there before she attacks.

At the close of World War II, only 5 years ago, Russia, with starvation and bankruptcy, was held up only by an infusion of $11,000,000,000 of lend-lease and other billions of relief from the United States. Of course, the murderous treason of giving Russia half the world at Tehran, Potsdam, and Yalta also helped.

Red China, too, was down and out when General Marshall visited China in 1945 and tried forcing Chiang Kai-shek to take the Communists into his national council and army. Marshall, it seems, even delayed shipments of arms and ammunition to Chiang until he accepted the Communists. Where's Chiang now? On an island in the Pacific. And where's Marshall now? Secretary of Defense in Washington, D. C.

Yes, who built the menacing power of Soviet Russia anyway?

A foreign policy which places anything ahead of American peace and freedom is betraying our great Nation. Yet never before have a free people been so deliberately deceived, so ruthlessly exploited, and so hideously betrayed. Today, America, once the land of the free and the home of the brave, is engulfed by foreign interests until we are reduced to the role of a feeding trough for an international Gargantua.

But if one opposes these insane acts of treason, he is termed by these so-called diplomats and fools as an isolationist. If we were to follow these global war rats they would call us all isolationists by saying we refused to give them enough power to meddle in other nations' affairs—because we had been too stingy in opening our pocketbooks—because we had never given them enough control over drafting our manpower, wasting our resources, and freely spending away our wealth.

It is this Communist-Fair-Deal-global conspiracy which would destroy us, and the governors of some of our most populous States have also joined this internationalist conspiracy for destruction.

It is time Americans took a stand for America.

Acheson and Marshall should be fired, and the wrath of the American people should force such action. Every last dime of foreign hand-outs should be halted, for friendship can only be secured by convincing other nations of our common interests.

The United States should immediately withdraw from the defunct United Nations, an organization which has only berated, obstructed, and paralyzed our forces, and which has refused to take action against the death, tragedy, and despair which Red China is causing in Korea.

America, and all nations which we are capable of defending by our air and sea power, must be defended; but not another dollar, not another dime, not another penny should be spent to aid the suicidal, foolhardy plans of the so-called internationalist-Fair Deal-Communist traitors in draining American resources, American wealth, and even American blood into the crevices and gullies of the earth.

Very truly yours,

DALE D. DORMAN, Jr.

A Protest Against Defeatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Protest Against Defeatism," published in a recent issue of the Newark, N. J., Star-Ledger.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROTEST AGAINST DEFEATISM

This is a protest against defeatism.

There is near-total defeatism in the doctrine that we can survive communism only

by sweeping militarization, rigid regimentation, and the thoughtless sacrifice of our Nation's youth.

We are willing to go along with this fearful program if it is the only way to fight communism. We would, in other words, make a fine distinction between outside communism and self-imposed communism.

We do not believe our situation is quite that desperate, and we protest the horrible defeatism of a leadership that is sadly lacking in imagination, faith, and confidence.

Defeatism arises from: (1) Exaggeration of the enemy's strength; and (2) belittling of our own strength and resources.

Our leaders have erred both ways.

Communism's drive for expansion and world conquest is born of the desperation of weakness, but has been generously nurtured by the fabulous errors of our policy makers in Eastern Europe and Asia.

The land of prison labor camps, government-by-terror and total secrecy is no less hollow than the late Adolf Hitler's thousand-year Reich.

Nor are we the weakling nation that some recent behavior would indicate us to be.

If some of our statesmen reflect weakness by their hysteria, we still possess the greatest production plant in the world, the most resourceful industrial management, and the most adaptable workers, not to mention the atom bomb and its related weapons.

Before we agree to sink to communism's level, let us see whether it is still not possible to wage the good fight—for peace and freedom and prosperity.

If it is an inescapable necessity at the moment that we scoop up precious manpower for the Army by steam-shovel methods, let us at least make it clear that in the near future we will have a thoughtful policy to make the most of every American individual and conserve our youth and our civilian values.

If it is really essential that at this moment we price control, wage control, and regiment our economy, then let us at least make it clear that we are working on plans to escape those un-American evils by an imaginative, hopeful program for expanding production under restored freedom.

The way to real victory—the victory for peace, freedom, and prosperity—is in showing ourselves, our friends, and our enemies that we have the will, the ability, and the resources to produce enough to support both military power and civilian life.

If we prove we can do that, there will be no war. For no enemy will dare to attack an invincible power.

When we announce that we can arm ourselves only by giving up our freedom and prosperity, we virtually declare ourselves half-beaten and thus encourage the enemy to make war.

Temporary retreat to regimentation may be inescapable because our policy makers have allowed events to take us by surprise.

Emphasis, however, should be on the temporary and limited character of any controls and sacrifices of freedom.

We must have a plan for expanding and improving civilian and military production and conservation of the individual in a free economy.

To achieve this goal, we should first overcome a childish obsession in Washington with excess profits. The Government, it seems, is prepared to make a thousand new black-market millionaires rather than see a single corporation earn excess dividends.

Obviously, it is far more important to stop inflation with stepped-up production than to play to the galleries, and to the pirates of the black market, with unsound taxes.

Tax incentives should be offered to any enterprise, whether it manufactures for the military or civilian, that is willing to expand and improve its plant to produce more and to produce efficiently.

If we offer industry and labor stimulating rewards for more and better production, we will astonish ourselves and the world, including our enemies, with our invincible power.

Just as we need to restore freedom as soon as practicable to stimulate production we need to restore freedom of discussion to stimulate wisdom.

There has been, to be sure, some regard in the administration and the Supreme Court for the civil rights of small and repressed minorities.

We also need some respect for the right of large minorities and majorities.

There is abroad in this land an hysterical and destructive intimidation of criticism and free discussion. We are being told that if some dissident statesman makes a displeasing statement, whether foolish or wise, all Europe will desert us and let the Kremlin's hordes walk to the Atlantic coast.

Let's stop that nonsense. If our alliance with Western Europe is that delicate, we should know it now. We don't believe that America should give up the right and the duty to debate its own fate for any consideration.

It is the rankest defeatism to argue that we must subdue decent and honest public discussion.

This country needs a program for the future in harmony with its dynamic past. We need a program to achieve security by strength and freedom and prosperity.

It is well enough to be prepared to make sacrifices and to die. But we do not want to make sacrifices for a dismal future and to die for the love of death.

Out of Washington has come as yet no clear program for the American way of overcoming the obstacle of belligerent communism. The people want such a program. It must come.

"Perfectionism" and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann, the distinguished columnist, recently published a series of columns, whose conclusion was roughly the same as that of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], namely, that collective security was unworkable. The Washington Post of January 22 carried an excellent commentary on that position by the Honorable Benjamin V. Cohen, one of our great authorities on international law and a member of the American delegation to the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cohen's reply to Mr. Lippmann, as published in the Washington Post, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PERFECTIONISM" AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Benjamin V. Cohen)

It is with deep regret that one finds Mr. Walter Lippmann, in his column of January 15, agreeing with Senator TAFT that collective security is an unworkable principle and that we should develop our own military policy and our own policy of alliances without regard to the nonexistent power of the United Nations to prevent aggression.

Both Senator TAFT and Mr. Lippmann seem to forget that under the Charter of the United Nations all members have agreed: (1) To settle their international disputes by peaceful means; and (2) to refrain in their international relations from threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations (art. 2, pars. 3 and 4).

So long as we adhere to the Charter we are not free, as Senator TAFT has suggested, "to engage in our own wars when we think we should engage in them." So long as we adhere to the Charter we are not free to use the United Nations as a mere diplomatic weapon in the cold war and disregard our obligation to refrain from the use of force except in defense of law.

The very first purpose of the United Nations, as stated in the Charter, is:

"to maintain peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of peace." (Art. I, par. 1.)

As long as we adhere to the Charter we are obligated to exercise an honest judgment as to what we can do to carry out this purpose. If the Security Council acts—but it cannot act without our approval or acquiescence—we are bound to carry out its orders. If the Assembly recommends, we are not bound to act, but we are morally and legally bound to exercise an honest judgment, giving due weight to the United Nations recommendations, as to what action on our part would be best calculated to further world peace and security.

The Assembly's recommendations are not subject to great power veto. The uniting-for-peace proposals adopted at the last session of the General Assembly provide effective means for the voluntary cooperation of member states in carrying out United Nations recommendations for the maintenance of peace and security.

We may go further, as we have in the Atlantic Pact and in the Inter-American Security Pact, and assume somewhat more specific obligations to maintain peace and security in certain areas as long as these arrangements do not conflict with the Charter. But we have no right to forswear concern and responsibility for world peace and security. To do so would not only be to emasculate the Charter but to invite the Soviet Union and its allies to move in wherever we are not prepared to give in advance specific guarantees.

The power of the United Nations in respect to collective security is not nonexistent because its exercise depends upon the good faith and voluntary cooperation of its members. The power of the United Nations in respect to collective security is not nonexistent because its exercise by military sanctions is not always practicable. The United Nations provides greater possibilities for uniting the moral and material strength of the law-abiding nations in maintaining peace and resisting aggression than can be secured by any system of alliances outside the framework of the United Nations.

But both Senator TAFT and Mr. Lippmann are in favor of abandoning the principle of collective security under the United Nations because it cannot be universally enforced. This is like asking the American people to abandon the Bill of Rights because it is not, and possibly cannot be, fully enforced everywhere in the United States. This is forsaking the good because it is not perfect.

The United Nations does not demand the impossible. It does not demand the use of force in every case. It does not demand abortive action to save face. In some cases only conciliation and mediation may be practicable. The United Nations demands only that its members individually and collectively exercise their best and honest judgment as to what will advance the cause of peace, security, and law in the world, taking into account not only the situation of immediate concern but the whole complex of the world situation.

It would, however, be a grave mistake to think that we could abandon our obligations to work with other nations in the United Nations to advance the cause of peace, security and law and still have the great moral support of the United Nations for action we take independently of the United Nations. It would be a grave mistake to think that other nations in the United Nations would support us in any effort to use the United Nations as a diplomatic weapon for our own purposes.

It is well to remember the warning of President Roosevelt in his last message of January 6, 1945, on the state of the Union:

"Perfectionism, no less than isolationism or power politics, may obstruct the paths to international peace. Let us not forget that the retreat to isolationism a quarter of a century ago was started not by a direct attack against international cooperation but against the alleged imperfections of the peace.

"In our disillusionment after the last war we preferred international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see and think exactly as we did. We gave up the hope of gradually achieving a better peace because we had not the courage to fulfill our responsibility."

Imprisonment of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, this week marks the second anniversary of one of the most despicable crimes in world history resulting in the imprisonment by the Communists of His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, prince primate of Hungary. This fearless churchman was sentenced to life imprisonment and is now broken in health for no other purpose than to stifle his condemnation of Communist doctrines. In commemoration of this occurence the Maryland Action Guild, a group of patriotic Americans, arranged for a special religious service presided over by the Most Reverend Francis P. Keough, D. D., archbishop of Baltimore. A most appropriate sermon was preached by the Reverend John L. Bazinet, S. S. Because the sermon is so challenging to free men of all religions it merits reading throughout the length and breadth of the United States and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

This morning, my beloved, you pay honor to a man who stands forth, indeed shines brilliantly, as a symbol before all religious-minded men in our age. That man, a churchman as you know, is the prince primate of Hungary, His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. You recall that 2 years ago, on February 8, 1949, to be exact, after a series of criminal farces including arrest, charges, drugging, torture, forced "confession," trial, His Eminence was sentenced to life imprisonment by the atheist stooges of Moscow wielding power in Budapest.

In Cardinal Mindszenty you see a symbol, a sign of the ferocious fight of the godless Communists against men of all faiths, and of no faith, but with conviction that freedom and justice are treasured values, a precious heritage of mankind. His Eminence in his suffering, you will agree, focused the attention of distracted men and women all over the whole civilized world.

Thousands of other unhappy victims, as you read in your papers and heard over your radio, had previously been tried on trumped-up charges, sentenced unjustly and most severely, but it was left for the cardinal like a hurricane to jar the most apathetic, the most skeptical, the most deaf and blind to the realities of your life in the mid-twentieth century.

Because we could not see close up the hatred of Red atheism for religion, more especially for the Catholic Church, you will admit it was hard to believe. In the person of their imprisoned primate of Hungary you saw close up, you drew back in blanched horror, you faced the living drama, the stark struggle of our times. See what happens to a strong man behind the iron curtain. The clash, you note, was public, undeniable, clear-cut, absolute. Amplified echoes of a little-known cardinal's Golgotha on a hardly understood spot of crucifixion, Budapest, stormed through the known world: London and Rio de Janeiro, Paris and Buenos Aires, Rome, Madrid and Peiping, Tokyo and Washington, New York and Baltimore.

He is after all a cardinal. What man or woman among you could then fail to heed? "Now, indeed," you must have reasoned, "is the time to rise from sleep."

For in fact the imprisoned cardinal-archbishop stands as a symbol. And you know what a symbol or sign is. On your way to this cathedral this morning you may have passed symbols of danger or safety, the mechanical green-and-red light flashing at the street corners, automatic signs; maybe the lifeless white arrow pointing out the right road for you; likely enough, too, the embodiment of law in the blue-coated officer on traffic duty, an indication of public power; even, perhaps, the Stars and Stripes hoisted on buildings, symbol of our country so dear to the hearts of us all.

But men by their acts can be signs, too, symbols of deep meaning, deeper maybe than we care to see without close inspection. Yet you will allow, my brethren, that men and women can hardly be automatons—lifeless, mechanical signs of anything really precious. By their thinking they stand for something or against something. By their speaking they make clear their beliefs and courage; by their acts also when such are free, and above all by what they are willing to suffer for, to risk their lives for—in all these you recognize men for what they truly are.

So with the cardinal-archbishop of Esztergom, whose very name, Mindszenty, stems from the root words meaning "all saints." Hence by his very name as well as by his eminence's thinking, speaking, acts, and suffering, Cardinal Mindszenty gives us some idea of the kind of courage needed to stand up to the Red menace at close quarters.

"Now we need men," he used to say repeatedly. Yes; you will concede, we need the kind of men and women who are not afraid to be big, to be heroic if need be, and to be stout-hearted, freely giving of self, grappling and beating down unspoken inner fears, finding new strength in prayer; heroic, indeed, is what it means to be saintly. Now in truth we need men.

American voices you have heard trying to confuse you. Was His Eminence not anti-Semitic? Anti-Semitic indeed, the man who had been more than once jailed by the Jew-hating Nazis for speaking out in Jewish defense, for organizing teams for their risky rescue from fiendish torture and sure death. You need read only the Jewish-produced Grey Book to sense the extent of his help. And what was His Eminence's gold medal for if not to honor him for this very fact? Why did the real anti-Semites sneer at him: "What about Your Reverence's Jewish doctor?"

You have perhaps heard him called a reactionary; but did you know, my beloved, that for 30 years Cardinal Mindszenty, as curate, parish priest and bishop, had been demanding reform: "Poverty must not be tolerated," he proclaimed. "Why is your rectory not heated?" Father Mindszenty was asked when he was pastor in Zala. "Until I know that every poor man has fuel," he admitted, "the parish priest will have no heat."

You may have heard him called uncompromising before the Reds. Yet have not you yourselves learned by now that there is no such thing as compromise with Communists on basic principles? You may have heard him carped at for being too outspoken, or heard it whispered maybe that His Eminence should not have stirred things up, that it was a bad time for public utterance, that his public relations were poor, that the whole affair Mindszenty was a "sectarian" matter. Yet what is a Christian bishop for if not to defend his flock, souls entrusted to his shepherding, from all tyranny and atheism masquerading under the forms of law?

As for sectarianism, you will not need to be reminded, dearly beloved, that whole congregations of Protestants, their pastors and ministers included, used to turn out publicly to do him honor when His Eminence went on his confirmation tours. Lutherans and Calvinists loved him, respected him, worked with him, joined him in his fight and theirs against Marxist monopoly-education, looked upon the Cardinal as their leader for true freedom and real religion. This is the man, my beloved, labeled the traitor Cardinal and an enemy of the people by the slaves of Moscow.

Having campaigned against His Eminence for months on end and tried to buy him with bribes, using too their well-rigged charges while shutting the Cardinal's voice off from all public reply, daring even to poison his very own people and bludgeoning them by foul means to sign statements against him, statements for which they had no stomach, heart, or conviction—the conditions under which the State collects signatures and arranges polls, he observed, are only too well known—these time-servers of atheism tortured his own typist to turn spy on His Eminence, his errand-boy, too, his own doorman, the postmaster at Esztergom, his own legal counselor, the manager of his Budapest office, in time even his own private secretary, since for these poor victims it meant submission or ignoble death.

Thus you see the Red Spider weave its stealthy steel threads around the Red Hat of the Cardinal of Esztergom. Thus you may observe how Red spokesmen whose strategy aims at confusion in the English-speaking world then as now furthered the vile

campaign against His Eminence. This even happened, beloved brethren, over one of America's largest radio chains. Indeed, ridiculous as it may sound in your ears, one eminent daily journal printed despatches from the Budapest trial itself written by its non-Hungarian-speaking fellow-traveler reporter finding fault with Cardinal Mindszenty's Hungarian pronunciation and even his Hungarian diction.

This should not surprise you, my beloved. After all, do you not recall Red master Lenin's own words: "All religious ideas * * * are an unspeakable abomination!" Mindszenty held out for religion, justice, freedom. So Communist sympathizers everywhere were following the Stalin line; dupes are rarely made without crafty cleverness.

Though again this may be hard to believe, my brethren, sympathizers and dupes are still doing so, subtley, sometimes at public expense. Why is it that broadcasts pouring from the West into this very same Red Hungary with its imprisoned Cardinal as of this hour give small comfort and no hope to the 70 percent Catholics locked there, none whatever to religious-minded Jews and Protestants?

Why is it that America is said to be paying with your dollars for the propaganda line that the United States does not oppose communism—only aggression? What hope can there be in this for God-fearing Hungarians? Is that the way to see in His Eminence's suffering what it really was and is? Is the symbol meaningless? Is the sign unread? Is atheism to your liking? Is Communist tyranny your friend? No, indeed, my beloved, you are not and will not be confused and deceived.

"Now we need men at home," the cardinal used to say. This, my beloved, ruled his thoughts. Surely no one of you can miss the fact that His Eminence knew whereof he spoke. Manfully, clearly, he championed true, lasting reform, not that so-called land reform that robbed owners of land, dividing it so that no one farmer, regardless of his skill, would have a big enough patch of ground on which he could possibly make a living; Mindszenty knew then that it was only step No. 1 to collectivization, farm socialism.

Repeatedly he spoke out for freedom. "For a small minority to impose its will on a huge majority," he warned in 1948, "is not democracy, but its very opposite." Not once but many times, dearly beloved, you can hear his voice crying out against poverty, calling for social justice.

And his acts, as you are well aware, matched his words. During the Nazi days of brutal occupation his name was a major target of their twisted smear propaganda. So much so, you do well to recall, beloved, that at the end of the terrible World War II the then Bishop Mindszenty was rewarded with a golden medal for his part in the resistance to Nazi tyranny. Yet when the time came for the Red masters to turn on His Eminence, the men who arrested him, jailed, tried, and convicted him were all former Nazis themselves, one-time members of the Hitler-run, green-shirted party of the Arrow Cross.

His very sufferings—why detail these for you, my beloved? You know them: Nazi-jailed, publicly campaigned against by the Reds, the secrets of 60 Andrassy Street (now renamed 60 Stalin Street), headquarters of the secret police make known to us by an escaped police officer who fled, unable to stand the sight any longer, expert forgers employed—these also escaped in time—the mental and moral suffering, the false friends, the slanders set down in the aptly named Communist Yellow Book. Can you wonder that United States Minister to Hungary Selden Chapin cried out, "He was a great man."

Yet until that time, dearly beloved brethren, many of you may not have realized what justice means behind the iron curtain. Now you know; now you fully understand that for the Communists, whether they are Hungarian, Russian, or American, "jurisprudence," in the words of a Hungarian commissar of such justice, "is one of the weapons of the class fight * * * make it a sharper weapon than ever"; to which another Marxian legist added this for your enlightenment: "The court is the instrument of politics" (Vishinsky).

But Mindszenty stood for religion, justice, freedom; His Eminence was a sign of another world, a word of man's dignity and brotherly love, dear brethren, a world hateful to and hated by the Stalinists, but beloved and cherished by you. The sign indeed was contradicted; but the sign stands firm even amid suffering. Confusion vanishes.

Symbol as the cardinal is of the fight between God and the powers of anti-God, His Eminence, like a deep-toned bell, tolls as a warning to you and to me, an alarm as well as a spur and source of encouragement. You may have read a few days ago in a Baltimore labor paper of known integrity words pointing up that admonition for us locally.

"Often in the past," recalls its editor, "we have warned against the growth of communism in Maryland. Once again, we sound a solemn warning to industry and to labor in the Baltimore area. It is time to realize that in every large or extra large plant in Baltimore there exists a red thread of communism, which broadens out here and there to ribbon width, and finally * * * reaches the proportions of whole cloth."

"Why does the Red line widen and grow?" queries this writer. "Where is the leadership to restrain and contain, or to destroy it? * * * This infiltration goes on day and night." Is it true, dearly beloved, as this informed Marylander suggests, that it is "because the people lie supinely on their backs and snore through a Red revolution brewing in our midst?" If you will not heed the sign that is Cardinal Mindszenty, maybe you will realize that this labor thinker understands the very facts about you here and now.

Such alarm bells, whether from overseas or in our own city, should indeed be a spur and encouragement to you, my brethren. "Now we need men at home!" urged the Cardinal. His Eminence has set us that example. The cunning but sham legality of his hideous trial and barbarous sentence you have of course seen operate in other cases before and since. "The twisting of words and facts," protests our Holy Father Pius XII, "has become a classical weapon of deceit."

Was not our Saviour Himself unjustly accused of stirring up the people? Were there not legal pretexts aplenty used against St. Peter and St. John the apostle? In spite of his being a Roman citizen, coveted ancient privilege, you will note that St. Paul the apostle likewise fell victim to legal sophistry. So did Mindszenty.

Yet you will discern in the self-drawn, reluctant picture of the apostle of the Gentiles, Paul, the lifelike portrait of his Eminence today in Red hands. "Wherein any man is bold, I also am bold * * * in many more labors, in prisons more frequently, in lashes above measure, often exposed to death * * * Five times I received forty lashes less one. Three times I was scourged, once I was stoned; * * * in journeyings often * * * in perils from robbers, in perils from my own nation, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, * * * in perils from false brethren; in labor and hardships, in many sleepless nights, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those outer things, there is my daily pressing anxiety, the care of all the churches!"

Hunger and thirst, perils from my own nation, in the city, from false brethren, many sleepless nights * * * Cardinal Mindszenty and 60 Andrassy (Stalin) Street. Will you not draw out the parallel for yourselves, my brethren?

For Cardinal Mindszenty's struggle goes on day by day. At latest report, November past, the red haters of God still would leave His Eminence little peace in his hospital-prison, my beloved. As of a few weeks ago he was reported in a much weakened physical condition; specialists advised that his health had been so much undermined by his so-called "treatment" that he should not be kept in prison.

To which you hear the Red Hungarian dictator in reply: "Everything must be done that he should not pass out in prison!"—fearful was the Red even to mention the Cardinal's name, my brethren. To the nerve specialists called in for consultation, the Red tyrant gave his threatening orders: "I will hold you responsible for his being freed in a condition in which not even the cleverest medical men can restore his health or his mental powers. If the priest (he meant the Cardinal) pretends to be out of his mind, drive him out of it, but do it for good." So the heartless war is waged, my beloved * * * "in many sleepless nights." Yet the Apostle Paul lived long before distorted science knew how to rob a man of his mind and his reason; Mindszenty knows that power all too keenly.

Still His Eminence's face may well haunt you, beloved, as you saw it 2 years ago in newspapers and magazines, whites of eyes showing abnormally, lines deep that were not there at all a few days before, upright in the courtroom withal as though he were sitting on his archiepiscopal throne at Esztergom. Can you fail to view that countenance as the modern "Ecce homo," "Behold the Man?" "A most serious outrage," asserts Pope Pius XII, "that inflicts a deep wound * * * on every upholder of the dignity and liberty of man."

So it is with reverence and admiration that you recall today, dearly beloved, the second anniversary of the Cardinal's life-sentence to prison. "I pray for a world of truth and love," His Eminence wrote shortly before his arrest. "I pray for those who, in the words of our Lord, 'know not what they do.' I forgive them from the bottom of my heart." This in his last pastoral letter. (November 18, 1948.)

Grateful indeed you may well be for the Cardinal's battle in behalf of loving religion, real justice, human freedom, against the powers of hating atheism, tyrannical force, wordy mouthings of "democracy" that really spell out the streamlined slave state.

Who among you will not be moved to pity at the sight of his plight? Yet proud, too. For he endures as the flaming symbol of all you hold dear: right thinking, brave speaking, courageous acting, suffering unspeakable silently borne without bitterness, merciful Christ-like forgiveness. His Eminence abides indeed as a warning as well as a stirring impulse to each of us to heed his insistent words: "Now we need men at home."

As if to explain this to us he had once made his mind clear beyond all doubt: "Rome can find another bishop if I die, but * * * believers are born through martyrdom."

Kneeling as we do today before this venerable altar, sacred historic nucleus radiating Catholic life through the United States of America, we will this morning want to pray for Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, and at the same time mindful of our Saviour's will to pray for our enemies, doing good to those hating us, praying for them who persecute and calumniate us, we will want to pray for His Eminence's persecutors too. We pray that the Cardinal's strength of spirit may never falter, that his torturers may turn to the Spirit of God; that his mind may weather the devilish devices of the evil one, that their minds may come home to God; that his heart may spark off that courage which you and I both need as example in this modern world filled in our day with the same searing battle that he faced almost alone, that theirs may find love and higher courage instead of hate in Christ's Cross.

Your Eminence as a free man was the only clear voice in your country bold enough to speak up for the 600,000 slave laborers dragged from your homeland into the cruel depths of Soviet Russia. Today in gratitude we speak to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in your behalf. We beg Our Lady to intercede for you.

Pray for us, too. Our Golgotha may almost be upon us. "Now we too need men at home."

J. W. Hanley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

[From the Natchitoches (La.) Times of Nov. 17, 1950]

J. W. HANLEY ON VISIT HERE

Joseph W. Hanley, of Chopin and Washington, D. C., Doorkeeper in the Senate, is visiting his relatives in the South. He timed his visit so as to be in the parish in time to cast his vote in Tuesday's election.

He is visiting relatives in Chopin, Boyce, Lena, Alexandria, and Natchitoches and stopped for a visit in Shreveport en route.

Hanley attended the National American Legion Convention in Los Angeles last month and also visited places of interest in the Pacific and Western States. This completed a visit to every State in the Union.

[From the Beaumont Enterprise of November 17, 1950]

DOORKEEPER OF SENATE CHAMBER IS VISITING RELATIVES IN AREA

Joseph W. Hanley, a doorkeeper in the United States Senate Chamber, was in Beaumont yesterday, visiting a number of relatives in the Beaumont area. A resident of Chopin, La., he recently returned from the west coast where he attended the National American Legion Convention. He will return to his job in Washington by November 17 when Congress reconvenes.

He is visiting relatives in Nederland, including his mother, Mrs. Harriett Hanley, and brothers, Floyd, Sherman, Willie V., W. L. and Carvel. A sister, Mrs. Exie Mae Beebe, lives in Orange.

Other Texas relatives include a sister, Mrs. Effie Pittman at Shiro, and a brother, Arthur, and sister, Mrs. Leona Parker, at Hondo.

Tax-Free Incomes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Tax Till It Hurts—Whom?" published in a recent issue of the United States News and World Report.

I also ask that immediately following the article there be printed three charts in which a comparison is given of the taxes paid by the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Members of Congress, as compared with those paid by average American citizens.

There being no objection, the article and charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX TILL IT HURTS, WHOM?—TAX-FREE INCOME HELPS PRESIDENT, CONGRESS

Truman's tax until it hurts plan hurts him less than most. Being President has become quite a job from that standpoint.

Critics point to $50,000 expense account, tax free, on top of a $100,000 salary, a house, a plane, yacht, servants, etc.

After taxes, he has $105,000. Others must make $300,000 to do as well. As taxes go up, they'll need to make even more.

President Harry S. Truman wants Congress to tax the people until it hurts. He is asking for 16 to 20 billion dollars more even if it means a drastic squeeze on the taxpayers.

Mr. Truman, however, is among those to be hurt least in such a squeeze. Thus, his demand for a crackdown on taxpayers is starting to be a bit embarrassing. The reason is this: The President who asks the tax increases, the Vice President who helps put them through the Senate, the Speaker who guides them through the House, and Members of Congress who vote the increases, do not share the burden equally with the common people.

All of these public servants enjoy big, tax-free expense accounts that they granted to themselves. Congress passed the bills, and Mr. Truman signed them and made them law. The tax exemption applies to one-third of the pay of the President. It covers one-fourth of the pay of the Vice President and Speaker, and one-sixth of the pay of Congressmen.

The Presidential expense account is $50,000 a year. It is paid to Mr. Truman as income. The President does not have to account for what he does with the money, and the whole $50,000 is tax exempt. Congress voted the tax-free fund for the President 2 years ago, and raised his salary from $75,000 to $100,000 a year. In addition to the expense account and salary, totaling $150,000, Mr. Truman has many advantages. He pays no rent. He has the use of a yacht, an airplane, and a fleet of limousines.

The Vice President and Speaker each draw a salary of $30,000 and are given $10,000 a year tax-free free expense accounts. Members of Congress get $12,500 in salary plus $2,500 for expenses.

Like Mr. Truman, most Congressmen have residences both in Washington and back home, and extra entertainment costs. As they see it, that is part of the justification for their expense accounts.

How these officials benefit from a tax-exempt expense allowance is shown in the accompanying charts. Mr. Truman's income tax this year will be nearly $34,000 less than that of a private citizen who makes as much but has no such tax-free expense account. The President will have about $105,000 left after taxes. An ordinary person would have to make $300,000 a year to have that much left over for spending or saving.

The President, therefore, has a tax advantage over other taxpayers that is substantial even at the present level of taxation. A tax increase, moreover, will make that advantage still larger. It also will point up the fact that Members of Congress are going about the business of imposing higher taxes while enjoying tax exemptions they provided for themselves.

Pressure for a change is rising in Congress as a result. There is talk of removing the tax-free privilege for these officials, thus placing them on an equal footing with other taxpayers. Bills actually have been introduced to do away with the special tax exemption for Congressmen. Some Members even now are refusing to use their tax-free allowances. Others use only a part.

But there still are Congressmen, a good many of them, who are ready to make a fight to retain special tax privileges for themselves as well as for the President, Vice President, and Speaker. One Member of Congress is proposing to double Congressmen's expense allowances from $2,500 to $5,000.

Your Congressman probably will tell you, privately, if not publicly, that he is underpaid, not overpaid. Furthermore, he will insist that his $2,500 expense allowance actually isn't big enough to cover expenses that are essential.

For example, he usually must maintain two homes, not one. He keeps a residence in Washington where he spends most of his time. Back home, even though he may not spend much time there, he must keep another residence.

He has to do a lot of entertaining. That's expected of him. And he has no expense account other than his $2,500 allowance to cover the cost of the lunches and dinners he buys for visitors from his district. Nor does he have any expense account to cover his campaign costs. A Member of the House has to run for reelection every 2 years. A Senator has to run every 6 years. In figuring their income taxes, they can't deduct campaign costs as business expense.

The tax advantage of a Member of Congress over an ordinary citizen with the same income amounts to about $600 a year. Most Congressmen believe that, as a practical matter, they are not as well off as, for example, a business executive drawing $15,000 a year. Congressmen, in fact, are not doing as well as they were a year or two ago. Living costs are up sharply. But they have not had a raise in pay since January 1947.

The Vice President and Speaker, too, face rising living costs, and they have not had a pay raise for 2 years. But, by comparison with Members of Congress, they are well off. They get $40,000 a year, including $10,000 tax-free.

Vice President BARKLEY, as the chart shows, can pay taxes on his $40,000 pay, and still have $32,894 left. A private citizen with $40,000 of income, and no tax-free allowance, realizes only about $28,500 after taxes. The Vice President and Speaker are furnished high-priced sedans for their own use, and the Government pays their chauffeurs.

A tax increase won't hit them as hard as it will hit the ordinary citizen, because one-fourth of their incomes is free of tax. But

they are placed in the embarrassing situation of having to steer that tax increase through Congress.

The President is in a class all by himself. He has what amounts to the best-paying job in the United States. His $100,000 salary and his $50,000 tax-free expense allowance are only the beginning of what is provided for him and his family by the Government.

His job, of course, has its disadvantages. There is very little real privacy. The hours are long and irregular. The problems and the pressures are immense. There are some heavy expenses that an ordinary citizen does not have to bear. But the ordinary citizen, even one whose pay gets up into seven figures, does not have the privileges and luxuries that are provided for the President.

He lives in a mansion. At the moment, the White House is being repaired at a cost of more than $5,000,000. So Mr. Truman and his family stay a short distance away in Blair House, normally reserved for visiting dignitaries from other lands.

His rent is free. The Government pays for heat, gas, electricity. It provides all the furnishings and trimmings. It supplies yardmen, housemen, maids, butlers, cooks, engineers, and guards.

Recreation and entertainment are his for the asking. Movies are brought into his home. Stars of the entertainment world are eager to appear at command performances. There is a fancy swimming pool in the White House where he takes a dip two or three times a week.

He can travel by special airplane, battleship, cruiser, special train, or on his yacht *Williamsbury*. A $40,000 fund, separate from his expense account, finances travel on official business.

These perquisites have been added gradually over the years. But, on a cash basis, Mr. Truman is far better off than any former President. It was just 2 years ago that his salary was raised from $75,000 to $100,000 a year. At the same time, he got his $50,000 tax-free allowance for expenses. In 1948, he had $48,275 left out of his salary after paying his taxes. In 1951, despite the recent tax increase, he will have $105,000 left out of his salary and allowance.

But that's the way Congress wanted it. Many pointed out, when the question of his pay came up 2 years ago, that executives in industry often had generous expense accounts. The Presidency was regarded as a top job that should be paid accordingly. Congress set about to give him independence and position.

The catch, however, is that now he wants to raise taxes all around. His tax-free allowances, and those of other officials, are becoming an issue when everybody else is being asked to pay taxes until it hurts.

TAX ADVANTAGE FOR PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Out of President Truman's annual pay of $150,000 he will have left to spend after taxes, $105,276. Out of private citizen's annual income of $150,000 he will have left to spend after taxes, $71,552.

Here's why. President Truman draws annual pay of $150,000. That includes a tax-free allowance of $50,000. So he pays income taxes on only $100,000. His tax in 1951 will be $44,724. Out of $150,000, he will have left $105,276.

The private citizen with an income of $150,000 gets no tax-free allowance. So he must pay taxes on $150,000. His tax on that amount in 1951 will be $78,468. Out of $150,000, he will have left $71,532.

SAVINGS FOR VICE PRESIDENT BARKLEY

Out of Vice President BARKLEY's annual pay of $40,000 he will have left to spend after taxes, $32,604. Out of private citizen's annual income of $40,000 he will have left to spend after taxes, $28,500.

Here's why. Vice President BARKLEY draws annual pay of $40,000. That includes a tax-free allowance of $10,000. So he pays income taxes on only $30,000. His tax in 1951 will be $7,316. Out of $40,000, he will have left $32,684.

The private citizen with an income of $40,000 gets no tax-free allowance. So he must pay taxes on $40,000. His tax on that amount in 1951 will be $11,500. Out of $40,000, he will have left $28,500.

AND FOR CONGRESSMEN TOO

Out of a Congressman's annual pay of $15,000 he will have left to spend after taxes $12,787. Out of private citizen's annual income of $15,000 he will have left to spend after taxes $12,190.

Here's why. A Congressman draws annual pay of $15,000. That includes a tax-free allowance of $2,500. So he pays income taxes on only $12,500. His tax in 1951 will be $2,213. Out of $15,000, he will have left $12,787.

The private citizen with an income of $15,000 gets no tax-free allowance. So he must pay taxes on $15,000. His tax on that amount in 1951 will be $2,810. Out of $15,000, he will have left $12,190.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the question is not whether the President and Members of Congress are overpaid; it is more a question of principle. At a time when taxes are taking such a large percentage of every individual's income, and at a time when the President is telling the American people that they must expect to be taxed until it hurts, I believe the first action of the President and the Members of Congress, who are receiving the special consideration referred to in the article, should be to repeal our own tax exemptions. In America we have no room for any privileged class, and it was with this thought in mind that on January 11, 1951, I introduced Senate bill 357, the purpose of which is to repeal these unfair exemptions.

Danger Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of national stress and uncertainty, in these days when America has undertaken, as a result of world conditions, to assume world leadership, it is well that all Americans take inventory of themselves and their country. To this end I am submitting for the perusal of my colleagues in the Congress and for Americans everywhere a sound and thought provoking sermon delivered recently by an old friend, a minister of the Gospel, the Reverend John W. Moore, pastor of the Methodist Church, at Hattiesburg, Miss. This splendid statement is as follows:

DANGER AHEAD

(By Rev. John W. Moore)

"But the children of Israel committed a trespass."—Joshua vii: 1.

Some years ago, within the memory of most of us, a great ship of the air was completing a prosperous trans-Atlantic voyage. The Zeppelin *Hindenburg* was crowded with travellers, many of whom were returning home from business or pleasure in Europe. Perhaps some of them had been a little dubious about this new mode of travel. Maybe some of them had been fearful during every hour of the voyage. But now the great ship was over solid ground once more. Behind, and all but forgotten, were the long leagues of watery wastes that for so many hours they had looked down upon. Already the lines had been connected to the mooring mast. Already the greatest airship on earth was settling down toward its place of rest and security. Greetings were already being waved through the portholes of the cabin to friends and relatives below. Already they were turning one to another and saying jubilantly, "We made it." And then there was a sullen roar followed by a searing flame that ran the length of the ship in a moment. The Zeppelin had exploded. Shrieks of agony from the dying took the places of smiles of welcome from the living. What a thing of horror. The ship and many of its crew and passengers were no more.

Such a voyage, with such an ending, is a parallel to so many of life's ventures. How often, for instance, is the denouement of the wedding festival, with all its promise of lasting bliss, unravelled in the court of law and in the broken home. Or how often do men start business careers amid most propitious circumstances, only to see their ventures crash into bankruptcy and loss. Or a fond mother and a proud father may look in rapture upon the tiny face of their first-born son, seeing him perfectly formed and robust. They may say (and their neighbors and friends may agree), "He will make a mark for himself in the world. He will be a great man." Twenty years later that babe, now grown into manhood, may stand before the bar of justice and hear the State announce that he is not fit to live and so must be done to death by the law of the land.

What makes our world like that? The answer is not far to seek. I had a neighbor once who was found guilty of the crime of murder. I followed the procession when he was led into court to receive sentence of death. As we passed under the arching entrance to the court building, there was a pause as every eye was lifted to an inscription chiseled into the facade of the courthouse, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." In those words of the Inspired Book is the answer to our question. How many times, by how many civilizations, by how many dozens of nations, and by how many millions of individuals has that old principle of sowing and reaping been proven true in practical test? And yet how slowly men and nations learn that truth. Each new civilization, each nation, rising to the zenith of its power and greatness; each person born into the world seems impelled to put it to the test in some sort of wickedness. Sowing to the wind, generation after generation needs must reap the whirlwind in bitterness of soul.

Our text finds a new nation, just trying its new found strength, reaping soon its earliest planting of bad seed in the soil of its promised land, amid the scenes of its destined greatness. Joshua had led Israel into Canaan, gaining military victories over their enemies as they went. In the enthusiasm generated by those victories, they had gone out against the small city of Ai. They had said, "We have nothing to worry about, for we are well able to overcome this insignificant people." A few hours later they were running pell-mell for dear life from those men of Ai. When they had time to be, they were dumfounded. They had a question.

You would suppose, perhaps, that they asked, "What's the matter with us?" But no; their question was, "What's the matter with God?" All our lives we have asked, or heard asked, this question in one form or another. During the Second World War, I heard a man put it in the positive form. He said, "We can't be defeated. God has too much at stake in America to let us go down." (I wondered how God got along before 1776.) It seems to me that God has always managed to get along without a champion nation, or armies, or navies, or atom bombs. For God's stake in the universe is not an individual, nor a nation, nor a civilization. It is rather truth and righteousness, and He is not afraid He'll lose it.

Israel was punished for Achan's sin. Why? God also punished Achan in a fearful manner. But after all, what was so wrong with Achan's act? He stole some of the spoils of war and hid it away for private use. What difference does it make what becomes of the spoils of war? I think I know something of the philosophy behind Achan's sin. I've seen it demonstrated so often among people I know. It's the philosophy behind a black-market tax that a great state levies with one hand on a commodity which it bans with the other hand. It's the rationalization that prompts organizations to promote bingo games for charity, in spite of the fact that bingo has been ruled illegal by the Supreme Court. It is the effort to purify the means by the end. It is to say, "Oh, well, its going to happen anyway, so let's capitalize on it for good." So Achan rationalized his conduct just like a modern man might do. After the battle there was a heap of booty piled in a public place. It was intended for the common good and was a part of the public treasury. Achan saw an opportunity to enrich himself from this common fund. A goodly Babylonish garment, 200 shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold would better his financial condition considerably without impoverishing the nation perceptibly. So he took it.

There are two ways to examine the morality of an act to determine whether it be right or wrong. The first is to judge it on its merits in the light of God's law. Ask the question, "Is it right?" and answer it honestly. If, from lack of strength one finds himself hedging on that method, then let him employ the second, which is to ask and honestly answer the question, "What would be the result if this thing were generally practiced?" An embezzler may justify his dishonesty on the grounds that, whatever God's law is, his defalcation is, after all, no grievous injury to anyone in particular, since he has robbed a corporation with hundreds of stockholders. But let him realize that, should a large percent of those entrusted with other people's money prove dishonest, the whole system of trusts and faith in the business world would collapse and then the matter takes on a different aspect. Similarly, a husband or a wife may lightly break the marriage vows on the assumption that somehow he or she is exempt from the moral laws that govern others. But when it is realized that if such practice should become common the homes of the land would disappear in a whirlpool of disaster, carrying with them our culture and our greatness, that transgression becomes a matter of terrible guilt. Thus it is that individual sins become national sins, and thus, for the transgressions of its citizens, one by one, a whole nation is penalized.

Sometimes, when a nation suffers for the sins of its citizens, it repents of its sins and calls on the name of God. And sometimes that is a good thing to do, but not always. For repentance without reform does not put the Nation in position to claim the protection of Almighty Providence. After Israel's defeat at Ai, Joshua fell on his face in prayer and God didn't like it. Joshua was not in position to pray and God said to him, "Get up off your face and clean up the immoral mess that is developing among the people. Then you can pray to me."

After America's set-back in Korea there arose in this Nation a great cry for prayer and a return to God. It wells up on every hand today from military men and high Government officials as well as from the leaders of the church. The bishops of Methodism have issued a strong appeal to our denomination to appoint special days and hours for simultaneous prayers on the part of our membership. But, in the light of our text, I raise the question whether we are in position to pray effectively.

Our Nation is in mortal danger, and the fact is recognized on every hand. But it seems to me that we are not in agreement among ourselves as to the enemy that threatens us most. In some circles it seems to be the consensus that our major enemy is communism. That is a fallacy. Communism will never destroy America. Not long ago we were traveling down one of our main highways when it became necessary to stop and let a flock of buzzards fly out of the road. On the shoulder of the highway was the carcass of a sheep and these repulsive birds were feeding on the carrion. Our little boy raised the question, "How did the birds kill the sheep?" Well, they didn't. They don't. In fact they can't. It isn't in their nature to kill. Their program is to be first on the scene after the killing takes place. Communism is a political vulture. It never destroyed a nation and never will. It just takes over when a nation is in its death throes. If America dies, it will die as every other great nation has died, at its own hands. Our mortal enemy is not something outside of us. It is selfishness and greed in high places and in low.

Joshua's men said they were defeated before the walls of Ai, but they were mistaken. Their defeat took place before the leveled walls of Jericho, when in the flush and enthusiasm of victory, Achan sinned. Similarly, our series of set-backs in Korea have stemmed from an attitude that developed among us during the Second World War. It is an attitude that, left unchecked, may eventually do us to death as a Nation. For, unless we mend our ways, there seems to be for us no justification for living. Our sin is the sin of Achan; the sin of selfish greed. Already in the cities and towns that are adjacent to Army camps, that greed evidences itself in the conversations and attitudes of the citizens who are ready to capitalize on the Nation's struggle for life and turn it into personal profit without rendering any substantial service in return. On the larger scale, among some of the country's largest business corporations, the situation is appalling. Perhaps as many as 20 veterans of the North African campaign of the Second World War told me the story of the amazing exhibition of that greed then. The Allied soldiers were being mauled by Rommel's men because of allied shortages of war material and supplies. Shipping was hard to find in sufficient quantity, our leaders told us. But time after time the great ships would pull into the north African docks and unload—not munitions of war—but vast quantities of beer and other merchandise that had no relation to the dire emergency of the hour. If this actually happened, then somebody was being enriched at the cost of the Nation's life blood. But since that time I have been told that it was not true, but was only the propaganda of the prohibitionists in this country. The other day I read an article in the January 1 edition of one of the country's largest magazines; a magazine that evidently derives vast revenue from beer and liquor advertising, and therefore is not open to the suspicion of being loaned to dry propaganda. This article expresses amazement that, despite our industrial greatness, our men, fighting a losing battle in Korea, were without many of the fundamental tools of war. It cites a British observer's comment on the "why" of that shortage. The Briton said he saw tanks held up for hours while beer and refrigerator trucks rolled toward the front. Here we have a straw in the wind. It's a big straw and the wind is strong. I do not insist that supplying beer to our soldiers will destroy the Nation, though I am quite certain it is a trend in that direction. But it seems to me that any unbiased person must admit that the spirit behind that sort of thing is destructive. A nation that will consent for its citizens to sell their sons for financial gain is a dying nation, ripe for the vultures of communism or any other "ism" that happens along. Our ears still ring with the cries of our teen-aged boys on the frozen hills of Korea for military supplies. We had sent them there to fight and die while we remained in solid comfort at home. Then when they began to freeze in subzero temperatures; when they lost arms and legs from frost; when their agonized cries for relief found us sitting snugly before our blazing hearths, we sent them beer. One of old asked a rhetorical question, "Which of you, if his son asks bread, will give him a stone?" It was a thing unheard of until our day and until our Nation outgrew its sense of moral responsibility. How many of our young men died while tanks were sidetracked to let the beer trucks roll?

During the Second World War the United States banned large-scale public gatherings in order to conserve transportation for the war effort. Our church, along with all the others, called off its large conventions. Other important groups did the same. By some sort of manipulation, the race tracks of the country got themselves exempted from this order. One of the country's foremost writers, delving into this queer situation, came up with the statement that in that year the tracks were responsible for the using up of 400,000,000 miles of transportation. That means that approximately 20,000,000 gallons of gasoline were thus consumed and that the equivalent of 20,000 automobile tires were worn out. At the same time all sorts of congratulatory messages were barred from the telegraph wires of the Nation. But the tracks maintained uninterrupted 24-hour service on its leased wires, carrying the daily-racing-form report.

These are additional straws in the same strong wind. They indicate a certain basic selfishness that seems to motivate the rank and file of our citizens. For some it shows itself in active participation in the business of strangling the Nation for profit. For the rest it is shown in stolid indifference to what goes on, so long as we are let alone in our complacency. They are symptoms of a terrible disease—the disease of sin. It is a disease that, left unchecked, will inevitably end in death for the Nation as it does for the individual. Unless America mends her morals, God will not hear her prayer for peace and safety. Having occupied for so long the role of the light of the world, and now hiding her light under a bushel of gross selfishness, her light bids fair to become darkness. Having been for so many of the world's people the salt of the earth and now being in rapid process of losing her salinity, she may indeed become, "From henceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot of men."

I have been asked to pray for the Nation. Here is my prayer. "Cleanse Thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins. Let them not have dominion over me. Then shall I be upright and I shall be innocent from the great transgression."

Fallacies of World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Frank Chodorov, editor of Analysis, in December 1950, wrote an inspired article for his paper entitled "One Worldism." Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

ONE WORLDISM

Five years ago the organization of the United Nations was ushered into the world as the guarantor of peace. It has failed. Despite that obvious fact, there are many whose faith in some sort of a superstate as an instrument of peace is unshaken, and who lay the failure of the UN to the limitations put upon it by the autonomy of its members. That is to say, they believe in peace through authoritarianism; the more authoritarian the more peace.

History cannot give this faith the slightest support. The glory that was Rome did not prevent its parts from coming into conflict with one another nor from rising up against the central authority. Even our American coalition of commonwealths came near breaking up in war, and uprisings have all but disintegrated the British Empire. Centralization of power has never been a guarantor of peace. On the contrary, every such centralization has been accomplished by war and its career has been one long preoccupation with war.

The best that can be said of any coalition of states is that it can keep smoldering fires from breaking out only so long as one of its members can exercise control over the others. It can maintain an armed truce. The UN has not done even that, simply because no one state has shown sufficient strength to take control. The two most powerful members have been in contention since its beginning and are now poised for a test of arms to determine the issue. Nothing is more certain than that the rivalry of these two powers will shortly reach the breaking point, that the UN shall collapse or shall be succeeded by another coalition in which one or the other will be on top.

The UN—it is moonshine to think otherwise—consists of two hostile camps, one held together by the American dollar, the other by fear of the Soviet Army. Neither law, morality, nor ideology is a cementing influence. If the American dollar is withdrawn the West will break up, its members entering into new alinements dictated by expediency; if the Soviet power shows weakness, Titoism will splinter the Red empire.

In short, it is evident now—even as it was to any one with some familiarity with the history of alliances—that the high moral purpose written into the charter of the UN charter is but a fairy tale. World peace is not to be achieved through this monstrosity. Like the League of Nations to which it succeeded, or the Holy Roman Empire, or any of the political coalitions in the history of the world, the UN is incapable of giving the world peace simply because it rests on the unsound assumption that peace is a function of politics. The fact is that peace and politics are antithetical.

When we look into the nature and substance of peace, and make comparison with the business of politics, we see how silly is this faith in the superstate. It is as irrational as the religions of totemism, animism, or fetishism. It is another magic-religion in which the hope of man for a better life rests on the mystic powers of an inscrutable authority, which must be propitiated into seeing things as man sees them. Just as primitive man sought the answers to all his questions in the totem pole, so does modern man look to political power to solve the problems of life. In both cases we have the same flight from self-reliance, the same escape from individual responsibility, the same mother-complex. That is the only way one can explain this blind faith in the efficacy of political power. The superstate idea is the most advanced form of this religion. The psychological identity of primitivism and statism is only obscured by the ritualism of charters, constitutions, and protocol.

SOCIETY IS PEOPLE

Peace is the business of society. Society is a cooperative effort, springing spontaneously from man's urge to improve on his circumstances. It is voluntary, completely free of force. It comes because man has learned that the task of life is easier of accomplishment through the exchange of goods, services, and ideas. The greater the volume and the fluidity of such exchanges the richer and fuller the life of every member of society. That is the law of association; it is also the law of peace.

It is in the market place that man's peaceful ways are expressed. Here the individual voluntarily gives up possession of what he has in abundance to gain possession of what he lacks. It is in the market place that society flourishes, because it is in the market place that the individual flourishes. Not only does he find here the satisfactions for which he craves, but he also learns of the desires of his fellowman so that he might the better serve him. More than that, he learns of and swaps ideas, hopes, and dreams, and comes away with values of greater worth to him than even those congealed in material things.

Society has no geographical limits; it is as big as its market place, its area of exchanges. The Malayan and the American are automatically enrolled in the same society by the exchange of rubber for a jukebox, and even the difficulties of language are overcome when a New Yorker confronts a Chinese menu. South American music became the idiom of the North American dance floor because automobiles are swapped for coffee and bananas. Society is the organization of people who do business with one another.

The law of association—the supreme law of society—is self-operating; it needs no enforcement agency. Its motor force is in the nature of man. His insatiable appetite for material, cultural, and spiritual desires drives him to join up. The compulsion is so strong that he makes an automobile out of an oxcart, a telephone system out of a drum, so as to overcome the handicaps of time and space; contact is of the essence in the market place technique. Society grows because the seed of it is in the human being; it is made of man, but not by men.

The only condition necessary for the growth of society into one worldism is the absence of force in the market place; which is another way of saying that politics is a hindrance to, and not an aid of, peace. Any intervention is the sphere of voluntary exchanges stunts the growth of society and tends to its disorganization. It is significant that in war, which is the ultimate of politics, every strategic move is aimed at the disorganization of the enemy's means of production and exchange—the disruption of his market place. Likewise, when the State intervenes in the business of society, which is production and exchange, a condition of war exists, even though open conflict is prevented by the superior physical force the State is able to employ. Politics in the market place is like a bull in the China shop.

POLITICS IS FRICTION

The essential characteristic of the State is force; it originates in force and exists by it. The rationale of the State is that conflict is inherent in the nature of man and he must be coerced into behaving, for his own good. That is a debatable doctrine, but even if we accept it the fact remains that the coercion must be exercised by men who are, by definition, as bad as those upon whom the coercion is exercised. The State is men. To cover up that disturbing fact, the doctrine of the superpersonal State is invented; it is more than human, it exists distinct from the people who staff it. That fiction is given plausibility by clothing it with constitutions, laws and litanies, like "my country right or wrong." A religion of authoritarianism is built up around an idol.

But, ritual does not give divinity to a golden calf. The hard fact remains that the priesthood of the State are just men, and the coercion they employ reflects their human capacities and frailties. They cannot get away from those limitations. Whatever badness is in them will show up in their use of force. They are not made good by the power to impose their will on other men.

Getting down to the facts of experience, political power has never been used for the general good, as advertised, but has always been used to further the interests of those in power or those who can support them in this purpose. To do so it must intervene in the market place. The advantages that political power confers upon its priesthood and their cohorts consists of what it skims from the abundance created by society. Since it cannot make a single good, it lives and thrives by what it takes. What it takes deprives producers of the fruits of their labors, impoverishes them, and this causes a feeling of hurt. Intervention in the market place can do nothing else, then, than to create friction. Friction is incipient war.

Now, if the business of the state is to cause friction within any given segment of society, any one country, by what logic can it be shown that a world-state will prevent friction? If a small state is an evil, as the one-worlders insist, why should a big state be a good? Can an institution that is essentially antisocial be made prosocial, by enlargement? No matter how high the totem pole it is not God.

Reason and fact are at great disadvantage in confronting blind faith, and those who worship at the shrine of authoritarianism will not be shaken by argument. Yet, one cannot help asking how the superstate will employ its army; the worshipers admit that an army is necessary to its proper functioning. The army will certainly be used to suppress something, to stop some people from doing something that to them seems good. For instance, there are many people in the world who practice polygamy, some who practice polyandry and a few who go in for monogamy. Will the omniscient priesthood of the superstate use its army to enforce a uniform conjugal practice? In that case, of course, friction will result.

Or, if it is decided that the world has too much oil—the over-production theory—will the army be sent to Texas or to Iran to shut down the excess wells? When such frictional situations are brought up, the devotees of authoritarianism answer that everything will be resolved by the democratic process—a process that has never stopped war.

ONE WORLD—ONE MARKET PLACE

One worldism is not an impossible ideal; but, it is not attainable through the medium of political power. On the contrary, the organization of the world into a single society—which is what the one-worlders really want—can be acomplished only if people can rid themselves of the fetish of authoritarianism. If men could come to a belief in themselves, if they could lose faith in the golden calf of politics, if they could once reach the maturity of manhood, the law of association would do the rest. It is not necessary to plan or build a world society; it is only necessary to remove the obstructions to its growth, all of which are political and all of which stem from faith in authoritarianism.

Our own country furnishes an illustration. In the beginning, before Americans had been completely converted to this political paganism, it was stipulated that their market place shall be as large as the country; the erection of trade barriers between the component commonwealths was prohibited. As the frontiers of the country were extended the market place grew apace, and, in time, goods, men, and ideas moved without hindrance from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Mexico to Canada. Therefore, an American society grew up. It was not planned; it grew. Several times the little separate political establishments set up blocks to trade at their respective borders, causing friction, but on the whole their efforts have been frustrated by the spirit of free trade. (It might be well to mention, in passing, that the prime cause of the Civil War was protectionism, which is a dogma of authoritarianism.)

Let us look at a contrary example. Europe, which, outside of Russia, compares in size with the United States, is cross-checked with tariff barriers, and Europe has been a battlefield for centuries. Political particularism has prevented the flowering of an European society. It is impossible for such a thing to get going in an area darkened by passports and customs regulations. Time and again the doctors of political science have prescribed some sort of political union for the ills of Europe, on the assumption that such a union will be followed by a customs union. Quite the contrary; the borders between countries lose all meaning if the peoples can do business with one another; which is another way of saying, if the states get out of the way of society. No political union can set up a society in Europe; that can only come from uninhibited higgling and haggling in a common market place.

If their sense were not dulled by their idolatry, the One Worlders could draw a sound conclusion from these two examples; namely, that the only way to a world society is through free trade. This does not mean that free trade alone would guarantee world peace, for there are other political institutions that make for friction, but, it would go a long way. After all, if the customer is always right, how could he be an enemy?

A Letter to Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address entitled "A Letter to Mr. Truman," delivered by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, at the Temple, Cleveland, Ohio, on December 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER TO MR. TRUMAN

(By Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver)

Were I inclined to write a letter to President Truman at this time, when letter writing seems to have become a rather explosive avocation, I would dwell on two matters: First, the manner in which his choleric letter writing and emotional outbursts of recent months are affecting his own status and that of the American people in the world at a time when, to use his own words, we are the leaders of the free world, and the eyes of the world are upon us; and secondly, about the implications of the national emergency which he has proclaimed, not so much as far as the American people are concerned, but as far as he himself and his administration are concerned. Every citizen is called upon to put aside his personal interests for the good of our country. What does this spell out for the President himself and for those in whose hands are the lives and fortunes of 150,000,000 of American citizens?

The first matter, that of the letter writing, is the lesser in importance by far, except as it has revealed an overcharged and uncontrolled spirit which has greatly troubled the American people. Long ago Samuel Johnson wrote: "In a man's letters his soul lies naked." The soul exposed in Mr. Truman's letters of recent date gives very little evidence of that wisdom and calmness which he solicited of the American people in his address the other evening. This has caused many Americans to wonder apprehensively whether major decisions of the Chief Executive in far more serious realms of national and international affairs are similarly determined by temper, pique, and resentment, and are likewise made in a headlong and impetuous fashion.

Everyone realizes, I am sure, the terrible strains and burdens of the office of the President of the United States, especially in these dreadful times. No one envies Mr. Truman the heavy and high overwhelming responsibilities which are his. The American people is inclined to overlook an occasional outburst of irritability on the part of a greatly harassed public official. However, when this irritability appears to be by way of becoming chronic and expresses itself in language which is not permissible even to a private citizen, there is proper cause for disquiet and criticism. The President of the United States, for as long as he holds that exalted office—and it is the most exalted and illustrious office in the world—is never a private citizen. He never can dissociate himself from his office. Whatever he says or writes or does has to a greater or lesser degree public significance and repercussions. What a music critic writes about Margaret, good or bad, is of little importance, of little importance, indeed, but what the President of the United States writes to a music critic, or to anyone else, and the manner of his writing, can bring a sense of shame and dismay to the entire Nation and make the office of the President of the United States the laughing stock of the world.

There is much sound counsel to be found in our Bible to which I should like to draw the attention of the President. The Bible counsels men not to give way to gusts of anger, temper, and passion. If these admonitions are applicable to ordinary citizens, how much more so are they to men who occupy high position, whose every word is freighted with consequence. Thus, we read in the Bible: "It is the discretion of a man to be slow to anger and it is his glory to pass over a grievous wrong."

One who was himself a ruler of men, Koheleth, writes in his book: "Be not hasty to get angry, for anger rests in the bosom of fools." The wise Hillel, likewise a leader of men, frequently cautioned his fellow men: "Guard your temper." And the rabbis declared: "The speech of the wise is always a clean and decent speech."

Were I inclined to write a letter to Mr. Truman, I would in all good will and earnestness bring these matters to his attention and suggest that he do not write letters when he is angry, and that all of his letters, like all of his speeches, should be checked by a second party before they are mailed, and, above all, not to make public statements "off the cuff." His latest ad lib about the use of the atomic bomb fell upon the world almost with the destructive effect of an atomic bomb and sent Minister Schumann hurrying to London and Prime Minister Attlee flying to Washington.

Our President owes it to himself and to our country in these desperate times to avoid anything that might cause unnecessary irritation and resentment among our people, or that might lower the dignity of the high office which he sought and to which the citizens of the United States elected him. What has happened has not been good for the morale of our people and cannot serve as an inspiring example for the emulation of our youth.

I pass on to the second and more serious matter about which I should like to write to President Truman. In his address to the country the other evening, he summoned the American people to unity and self-sacrifice because of the grave danger in which our country finds itself. "Those of us who work in the Government," he stated, "will do our best, but the outcome depends, as it has always depended, on the spirit and energy of our people."

In my humble judgment there has been very little wrong with the spirit and energy of the American people. They did not fail, either in unity or in the spirit of sacrifice, either in the First World War or in the Second World War. Whatever was asked of them they performed, competently and patriotically. They gave their sons to the war, and their daughters—as many as the Government demanded. On the battlefields our fighting men gave an excellent account of themselves, and withdrew from no sacrifice in life or blood. Our shops, our mines, our mills were adequately manned. Whatever taxes our Government imposed upon our people they paid. Whatever restrictions and rationings were imposed upon them were complied with. There never was and there is not now any reason to doubt the loyalty, the patriotism and the readiness to sacrifice on the part of the American people in defense of their country or their freedom. I doubt whether the proclamation of a state of national emergency was really required to make the American people aware of how serious the present situation is.

The American people is not illiterate. They read their newspapers, they listen to their radio, they know what is going on in Korea; they know what is going on in the United Nations. Their sons are even at this moment fighting and some of them dying in Korea.

But they, the American people, do not make our foreign policy. They did not send our armies unprepared into Korea. They were not consulted as to whether we should go into Korea. According to our Constitution, Congress, and Congress alone, has the power to declare war and make peace. The Congress of the United States was not consulted about sending our troops into Korea. President Truman alone decided this grave issue by the simple device of calling this intervention not a war, but a police action. This police action has already cost our people 40,000 casualties.

Our allies likewise were not consulted. In his speech last Friday evening the President said that we must work with a sense of real partnership and common purpose with the other free nations who need our help as we need theirs. These partners were ignored when President Truman ordered our troops into Korea. The question is, Why?

The United Nations, too, were not consulted. It is the prime responsibility of the United Nations, not of the United States, to resist aggression in the world. It was only after President Truman launched our military effort in Korea that the United States asked for the approval of the United Nations. This is not the procedure outlined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Why did not our Government wait for clear directives from the United Nations in the matter of Korea? Why did not our Government ascertain before we moved in who else was going along and to what extent and with how many troops? Why did we not learn of the widespread reluctance of the other free nations of the world to become involved in Korea, as was later evidenced by the rather slim and purely token participation on the part of only a few of these nations? Why did we not learn about this widespread reluctance before we committed ourselves to what has proved to be one of the most costly and disastrous enterprises in all the military history of the United States? Why?

The strong suspicion entertained by many Americans that the Korean move was inspired by domestic political considerations connected with an approaching fall election has not been satisfactorily resolved. The administration had for some time, prior to last June, been attacked and badgered, especially by the Republican opposition, with charges of Communist sympathies, with responsibility for the victory of the Communists in China and the defeat of Chiang-Kai-shek, and with widespread infiltration of Communists in the State Department and other Government departments. For weeks on end, before the Tydings committee of the Senate, wild charges were made by irresponsible political gentry and by publicity seekers of the type of Senator McCarthy. The administration found itself on the defensive, with an important congressional election approaching. The invasion of South Korea by the North Koreans last June offered a tempting opportunity to demonstrate to the country that the administration was all-out anti-Communist, and that it was ready to strike at communism wherever it raised its ugly head. It must have been assumed that the undertaking would be in the nature of a small-scale police action, that it would be brief and not too costly, and that the North Koreans would take to their heels as soon as they saw the American soldiers coming. President Truman also dispatched the Seventh Fleet to patrol the Strait of Formosa to see to it that the Chinese Communists did not take over Formosa, thereby intervening not alone in Korea, where a clear case of aggression could be established against the North Koreans, but also in the Chinese civil war, where the victorious Chinese regime had already been recognized by Great Britain, India, and other countries. Along with the intervention in China, we also promised to send aid to the French in Indochina where they were fighting to preserve French imperial interests in that country. The administration reversed its former line and permitted itself to be swayed by domestic political considerations and to be intimidated by the rantings of ex Communists, ex isolationists, pro-Fascists, and cranks of all kinds, and maneuvered itself and the American people into the disastrous Korean adventure.

Was it the American people that failed in Korea? Why was our military intelligence so faulty? Why did it underestimate so catastrophically the fighting numbers and the fighting quality of the North Korean Armies, to the point where we were almost driven into the sea at Pusan? And why did the same thing happen a second time, and more disastrously, as our soldiers were advancing so confidently toward the Manchurian border, having been assured of an easy victory and the prospect of returning home by Christmas? Was our intelligence aware of the size of the Chinese Armies on the Manchurian border waiting to strike at us? If aware, why were our men, who were so vastly outnumbered, ordered to move on to the Manchurian border? If unaware, why are the military commanders who are responsible for this shocking blunder continued in their posts to this day?

Did our State Department know that China would enter the war? If it did, what preparations did it make to meet it? Why was the American people lulled into a false sense of security by inspired spokesmen who in so many words assured them that China would not fight? If our State Department did not know whether China would enter the war, why did it take the dangerous gamble to move our forces beyond the thirty-eighth parallel? Why did it choose to ignore the clear declaration of the Chinese Foreign Minister and of Nehru of India, who warned the American people that if we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, China would come into the war? Why did we move beyond the thirty-eighth parallel? Why are we asking for a cease fire now when the Chinese and North Korean armies are advancing across the thirty-eighth parallel? Why did we not ask for it when we had reached the thirty-eighth parallel? Why did we reject the proposal of a neutral zone between Korea and Manchuria, which was favored by our allies?

These mistakes, these blunders, these failures, military and political, are not to be charged to the American people, although the American people, of course, will in the final analysis, pay the entire cost. These are the responsibilities and failure of the Government and of the administration and of those outside the Government and in the opposition party who provoked the Government to hasty action, and of those in Government who succumbed to the provocation, who fondly believed that an easy-going victory against the Communists in Korea would be a strong political weapon in their hands against the opposition in an approaching election.

The American people is now being asked to give many more billions of dollars to our Military Establishment, to build up the military strength of our country. The House of Representatives has already voted an additional $17,800,000,000 emergency defense bill. This will bring our total defense budget for the year to almost $42,000,000,000. I suppose that conditions being what they are, with the President of the United States warning us that our homes, our Nation, all the things we believe in are in great danger, the approval of such military expenditures is a foregone conclusion, and no patriotic American would wish to stand in the way. But the American people has a right to ask why we received so little in terms of fighting effectiveness for the many billions of dollars which they gave to the Military Establishment during the past few years. The American people has never been niggardly with its Armed Forces. What became of the $50,000,000,000 which was given to the Armed Forces during the past 4 years? Why were we so unprepared in June 1950?

Before the Second World War, in 1939, we spent on our Armed Forces a billion four hundred million dollars. In the last 3 years—peace years, mind you—we spent on the average of $13,000,000,000 annually. Yet we were unprepared.

The President said the other evening that on June 25 of this year we had less than 1,500,000 men and women in our Army, Navy, and Air Force. Thirteen billion dollars is a powerful lot of money to spend on such a small fighting force. In 1941, when our Army and Navy numbered a million and three-quarters men, we spent $7,000,000,000. In 1950 we were spending twice that amount on a smaller Army and Navy and Air Force. Is the unpreparedness of our Armed Forces so glaringly demonstrated in the Korean affair due to the failure of the American people to provide adequately for them, or is it the failure of the men at the top to get a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar paid by the American taxpayer? Have those who work in the Government really done their best, as the President promises they will do in the future?

I cannot escape the feeling that these glaring, tragic failures have been at the top—lack of consistency, courage, and statesmanship on the part of our political leaders, and blunders, waste, and poor management on the part of our military commanders and administrators. Theirs is the major responsibility for the plight in which the American people finds itself today.

There is always the tendency on the part of our political and military leaders, when their policies or their actions result in failure, to shift responsibility from their own shoulders to those of the American people. Somehow it is always the American people who are responsible for all that goes wrong.

It is proper to alert the American people today to the grave dangers in which they find themselves, as the President has done, but more is needed to meet the dire emergency—much more. In the first place, there must be self-examination at the top level. A sense of omniscience is not conductive to sound government, nor is impatience and irritability with suggestions and criticism, and narrow partisanship and a desire to make political capital out of grave international situations.

There is in my judgment need for a reexamination of our entire foreign policy which has been going from bad to worse ever since President Truman, on his own responsibility announced the so-called Truman doctrine and pledged our country to resist communism all over the world, a commitment on which we are simply not able to make good and one which our allies are unwilling to back up. A reexamination of our entire foreign policy is called for. It is no loss of face for a government which has pursued a policy which has been found wanting or inadequate or dangerous to reconsider and reexamine and adopt a new policy. It is far better to change to a sounder policy than to be unchanging in catastrophic wrong-headedness. Finally, there is need for a reorganization of our Military Establishment with an eye to greater economy and efficiency.

Without leadership a people perishes. It is to leadership that we must look for our salvation, a leadership which will match words with action and which will treat the American people as mature people who know the score.

In his address the other evening the President announced four things which the American people must do and will do in this crisis. I am in perfect agreement with all these four things. First, he said, we will continue to uphold and, if necessary, to defend with arms, the principles of the United Nations, the principles of freedom and justice. Fine. But please, let the United Nations decide when the principles of freedom and justice are endangered, and what should be done about it. That is its business. Let the deliberations and decisions and actions be collective—not unilateral. Let us not act first and then get the approval of the United Nations for our actions. The United Nations has assumed the responsibility of keeping law and order in the world. Please, let us not have a private Truman doctrine of our own. Let us not do our own private policing. Let us not jump into Formosa or Indochina or Korea or elsewhere—and there are a hundred potential danger spots in the world—until the United Nations directs us, along with all other nations, to act. We must avoid not only aggression, which we are not likely to indulge in, but aggressiveness as well. Let us strengthen the United Nations. Let us channel whatever help we can give to the world through the United Nations. Let us strengthen this international organization, which is the sole hope of a stable world to come.

Secondly, the President said he would continue to work with the other nations to strengthen our combined defenses. Excellent. But let us be practical about it. Let us make sure how far the other nations are prepared to go along and how much they are prepared to pay out of their own resources to strengthen their own defenses. Of course, they will permit us to help finance their military establishments, but they may not be willing to use them every time we think they should. Let us not drain our own resources too far to equip other nations militarily. Let us think first and foremost and always of our own defenses. Again, in our eagerness to organize the world against the Soviet Union and line up the free nations of the world against Communistic dictatorship, let us not undermine our moral position in the world by allying ourselves with Francos and Fascists and Titos and Nazis in Europe and reactionaries in Asia. It makes the Voice of America sound hollow in the ears of the world. In the long run that will undo everything that we are trying to do.

The President urged us further to build up our Army, Navy, and Air Force and to make more weapons for ourselves and our allies. By all means, let us build up to full strength, but let us not bankrupt ourselves by trying to arm half the world against the other half. Our resources are not limitless. Our Government is already $257,000,000,000 in debt. It is the hope of the Soviet Union that we will destroy ourselves through bankruptcy and sink our military strength into the great Serbonian bog of Asia.

The President finally urged that we expand our economy and keep it on an even keel. Nothing is more important than that. We must guard against inflation through greater production, higher taxes, and through price and wage control. In this connection, an American has the right to ask why the President of the United States did not use up till now the powers which were clearly his to control prices and wages, and why he permitted our country to move into the dangerous inflation spiral in which we already find ourselves.

These are some of the things about which I should like to write to Mr. Truman. I should also like to draw his attention to some words which he himself uttered the other evening and suggest that in those words lies the right direction of statesmanship in these dire days. He said, "There is no conflict between the legitimate interests of the free world and those of the Soviet Union that cannot be settled by peaceful means, and we will continue to take every honorable step we can to avoid general war." This is quite different from the dogmatism, the rantings, and the war-mongering of so many others which are so frequently heard these days.

Stalin, too, has declared more than once that the Communist world and the capitalist world could live side by side in one world. Truman does not trust Stalin. Stalin does not trust Truman. Hence the impasse. But it is clear that only in the direction of courageous and continuous exploration of every avenue for reaching understandings if only piecemeal, only in the direction of negotiation, earnestly sought and welcomed, lies the hope of the world. Negotiation is not appeasement. Let not the American people be persuaded into closing their minds at the sound of the word "appeasement." It is today a tabu device to paralyze thought and wise diplomatic action. There should be urgent and continuous exploration of every opportunity for coming to an understanding with the Soviet, a nation which we cannot defeat in war any more than it can defeat us.

Our defeat in Korea is not a fatal defeat. Bataan and Dunkerque did not determine the outcome of the Second World War. We are a strong and powerful Nation. We can become stronger and even more powerful. We are faced with most grave and menacing problems, and while we should do all that is practical and necessary to build up our military strength, we should bear in mind always that the basic solution lies not on the battlefield. It will have to be found at the conference table.

Our appeal to our national leadership in Washington, which we make in all good will, for we are all involved in one common destiny, is to be courageous and unafraid, not to be swayed by partisan political consideration and not to allow itself to be stampeded by warmongers, fanatics and cranks, and by those who would push us into war for reasons which have nothing to do with love of country. There are those in our country who do not want an understanding with Russia. There are those even in high Government posts who are ardently advocating a preventive war with Russia. There are those who will try to sabotage any possibility of agreement. These are our real enemies. When our President will give the American people the kind of leadership they need and crave for, the American people will back him up 100 percent. The American people have always rallied to the defense of their country whenever it found itself challenged and endangered.

Senate Bill 349

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter under date of January 29, 1951, from the Honorable Douglas McKay, Governor of Oregon, advising me that at a meeting of the Natural Resources Advisory Committee of the State held on January 24, 1951, the provisions of this bill were discussed. This committee is deeply concerned over the provisions of title 2, section 215, paragraph C of the bill which would seem to authorize the bypassing of State, municipal, and other local laws and believes that for that reason the bill should be modified to obviate this undesirable feature. The following is a copy of the letter:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Salem, January 29, 1951.

Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: At the meeting of my natural resources advisory committee on January 24, 1951, certain sections of Senate bill 349, which related to the construction and operation of community facilities and community services for defense housing projects, were discussed. The committee, which consists of the executive heads of State departments concerned with the development and conservation of natural resources, was particularly concerned with the provisions of title 2, section 205, in which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized, without regard to any Federal, State, or municipal laws, ordinances, rules, or regulations, to do all things which he determines necessary or desirable in the public interests for and in the planning, acquisition, construction, and maintenance of housing or community facilities.

"Community facilities," as defined in title 2, section 215, paragraph C, include waterworks, sewers, sewage, garbage and refuse disposal facilities, police and fire protection facilities, public sanitary facilities works for treatment and purification of water, schools, hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, streets and roads, and day-care centers.

The committee, by unanimous vote, objected to the provisions granted to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in regard to public water supplies, public water supply systems, sewers, sewage treatment works, public sanitary facilities, and water treatment or purification. The State of Oregon has been endeavoring for a number of years to remedy sanitary conditions in our streams and for public places. It has been conscious of the necessity for the conservation of its natural resources and for the protection of public health and, as stated above, planned programs for the improvement of water supplies and abatement of stream pollution are now under way, and for the Government to step in and ignore these things will not only disrupt the State's program but we will lose much valuable education on that subject that we now have.

The committee feels that it is very much against the public policy for the Federal Government to disregard State or municipal laws. Also, the committee feels that if public housing is constructed along this line it might be some time before we will be able to make a clearance and thus we will continue to have a disregard of sanitary authorities.

It is the belief of the committee that public policy, as expressed by paragraph 8 of section 2, is sound. It reads as follows:

"Any department or agency performing functions hereunder shall, in carrying out such functions, consult with the appropriate State and local agencies having responsibilities in connection with the planning, provision, construction, or operation of community facilities or services, so that, insofar as practicable, community facilities assisted or provided pursuant to this act may be integrated with State and local programs for such facilities and services."

It is my earnest request that everything possible be done to change this act before it becomes a law.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Governor.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the January 31, 1951, issue of the Southwest Citizen published at Lake Charles, La.:

WHY ROCK THE SHIP OF STATE?

For a number of years now, the New Deal's Fair Employment Practices Commission has

been a hot political potato. The greatest opposition to it has come from the South and passage of the bill has been effectively prevented in Congress.

The ostensible purpose of the FEPC is to protect minorities in competition for jobs and to assure them a square deal. What the bill actually does, however, is to give bureaucrats virtual control of the hiring and firing in private industry.

For instance, if the member of a minority group—and there are hundreds of these groups for they consist not only of persons of certain races but also those of various political and religious complexions—applies for a job as a bookkeeper and is not hired, he may, if he thinks he did not get the job because of his minority status, take his case to the bureaucrats who could force the employer to give specific reasons why the complainant didn't get the job. And if these reasons are not satisfactory, the employer can be forced to hire the man he rejected if, in the opinion of the Government, he is qualified to hold the job.

Our own feeling is that the proprietor of a business is entitled to hire or fire his workers as he sees fit and that it is not the Government's business what his reason is. If a businessman doesn't want to employ a Negro, an Indian, a Republican, or a member of any other minority group, he should not be forced to do it or even to be required to give his reasons therefor.

The South has borne the brunt of the fight against the FEPC and has thus been saddled with the public opprobrium generated by the professional tub-thumpers who get paid in money or in votes for their noise. Yet there is no real southerner who bears any ill will toward the Negro or who will not do more than his share to educate him, to give him work for which he is qualified, to help him get started in his own business. And we note on every side that the Negroes who are making the greatest progress economically are those who are getting the help of the southern white. Precious few of them are helped by the righteous orators who would exploit their minority status for political profit.

We believe it can be said truthfully that, on the whole, the white and colored elements of our southern population get along together very well. Our Negroes have always participated enthusiastically in every local civic drive and program to improve our community. The white population has voluntarily instituted, and is largely paying for, a program for better educational and sanitation facilities for our Negro friends. The end effect will be that colored men and women will continually improve their qualifications for better jobs. The white people know this and encourage it. And this effort will be continued.

The passage of an FEPC bill thus is an extremely controversial matter and tempers will boil if such an attempt would be made now. It would seem unwise to push such proposed legislation through Congress when our entire energies should be voted to the far more serious problems of organizing our national defenses and guiding the ship of state through the shoals of foreign threats. It would seem prudent to avoid intense wrangling over what are essentially peacetime side issues. It should be the logical purpose of everyone from President Truman down, to do all possible to promote a national unity of purpose.

Yet it is now reported that the President, who has failed to get an FEPC through Congress, will create it by executive fiat. Under the cloak of the war emergency, he is preparing to order FEPC into effect as a wartime necessity solely by means of a White House order. This may or may not be politically astute but the effect will be damaging to the Nation's effort for it would breed grave sentiments of distrust in his leadership.

We hope that the President will reconsider the matter or that those advisers around him will succeed in persuading him that now is no time to rock the ship of state.

An Irresponsible Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Irresponsible Budget," written by Henry Hazlitt, and published in Newsweek for January 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN IRRESPONSIBLE BUDGET

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Senator BYRD was using the language of restraint when he declared that President Truman's budget of $71,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year was "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility." Mr. Truman no longer seems to attach any meaning to figures, or even to pledges. He has repeatedly promised "rigid economy in nondefense activities." And he solemnly continues his lip-service to "strict economy" in the very budget in which, as Senator BYRD points out, proposed nondefense spending is increased "to the highest level in the history of the Nation."

Mr. Truman threw in practically the whole Fair Deal spending program—compulsory health insurance, bigger unemployment benefits, Federal subsidies to education, including nursery schools, more public power projects, including the St. Lawrence seaway, more Government housing, more handouts to foreign countries for "economic recovery," and on top of all this, the Brannan farm plan, the year-to-year cost of which is indeterminable.

It may be doubted whether Mr. Truman seriously intended this as a budget or meant it only as a campaign document—so that, in 1952, he can tell the pressure groups that he asked for everything, and only a niggardly Congress denied it.

The response of Congress to this budget was much milder than it should have been. Senator BYRD's estimate that it could be sliced by $7,000,000,000 was very moderate. Representative TABER's contention that it could be cut by $4,000,000,000 was even more so. I hazard the guess that with proper Federal policies and proper administration of spending, the whole $16,000,000,000 difference between the proposed $71,000,000,000 of spending and the $55,000,000,000 of prospective tax yields could be cut, making it possible to balance the budget without increasing taxes any further. And the result could be both more production and better defense.

Mr. Truman still talks of Government expenditures as if they came out of some fourth dimension and bought more things than were bought before. All they do is to change the direction of spending. What the Government pays out to Paul it must take from Peter. What it spends on Government project X it must take away from unborn or unexpanded private projects Y and Z. For every speech Mr. Truman makes on how many "new needs" he is meeting by his $71,000,000,000 of expenditures, millions of mute inglorious taxpayers could make a speech on how many old and new needs they will be unable to meet because these billions will be taken away from them.

It is not enough for Government to prove (though it seldom attempts even this) that every dollar it spends meets some vague "need" or other; it must show that every dollar it spends meets a greater need than it would have met if the man who earned it had been allowed to spend it on his own family or for his own projects.

Nor should we allow the magic word "defense" to save a proposed expenditure from serious scrutiny. Once Congress permits the administration to set up a sacred and untouchable category of expenditures, it will find the administration shoving every proposed expenditure possible under that category. Today "defense" covers a multitude of fiscal sins.

If there is any fiscal responsibility in Congress itself, it will return Mr. Truman's 1952 budget to him without approval and request him to submit a responsible, balanced budget with a certain specified number of billions sliced off the expenditure side. It will bind itself, in return, not to increase by its own appropriations either the total or any individual item of this revised budget. But it will not bind itself not to make any further reductions in individual items when the individual appropriation bills come before it. And its separate committees—including the Armed Services and Military Affairs Committees—will increase their technical and research staffs and make a far less perfunctory scrutiny of expenditure requests than they have in the past.

Senator Lodge's Exposé of Soviet Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Too Clever for Vishinsky," published in the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of November 21, 1950. The editorial deals with one of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO CLEVER FOR VISHINSKY

HENRY CABOT LODGE, United States Senator and delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, veteran soldier, too, who fought for the defense of Russia against the Nazis, in his statement last Sunday exposed Soviet planning, laid bare to the world the doctrine that Andrei Vishinsky, Russian Foreign Minister, is uproariously setting forth in orations.

Senator LODGE pointed to the declaration of the "great Lenin," as the Communists call him, that "a just war is not an aggressive war but a liberating war which is designed to defend people from foreign attack and from attempts to enslave it, or the liberation of people from capitalistic slavery"—a declaration that Vishinsky had incorporated in one of his deliverances with approval, with endorsement.

Senator LODGE stripped naked, he pilloried, Vishinsky as committed to belief that a war to demolish the capitalistic or free enterprise system in the United States would be a "just war," not a "war of aggression." This Communist scheming is not new to the Americans but Mr. LODGE pinned down Vishinsky with his own words.

Were the Russians to begin a war to free the Americans from capitalism it would sink the Russian people deeper in poverty even though the Kremlin were victorious. It would reduce the Americans and their allies to pauperism. Defense preparations are now making the Americans poorer.

In such a war, were it won by Communist nations, only the chieftains, the moguls, the masters, the overseers, would profit.

From the Russian point of view all able-bodied Americans drawing wages, whether bus drivers, weavers, doctors, preachers, or presidents of factories, are wicked capitalists, oppressors of the people. To Comrade Vishinsky the 75-cent-an-hour American is a capitalistic felon, an enslaver of the masses—and Comrade Vishinsky, Comrade Malik, Comrade Stalin, and the other whip handlers, scourgers in Moscow, are enjoying the life of princes of the blood. A czar by any other name can live as well.

Senator LODGE is too clever for a Vishinsky. One cannot hide from him.

Spies and Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, favorable editorial comment continues to press for early action on a bill to permit the FBI and other investigative agencies to intercept communications in order to apprehend spies, traitors, saboteurs, and disloyal elements in our country.

The people are justifiably aroused over the reversal of the conviction of Judith Coplon, a former Federal employee holding a highly responsible position. Unless Congress acts promptly, we may see the release of many other against whom the evidence of criminal acts is overwhelming, but who can evade punishment on technicalities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials, endorsing a measure I have introduced, from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, the Champaign-Urbana (Ill.) Courier, and the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union. The editorials follow:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of January 13, 1951]

SPIES AND LAWS

Congress has passed, at the Justice Department's request, a bill authorizing FBI agents to make arrests without warrants in cases involving espionage, sabotage and other felonies.

Another bill, introduced by Congressman K. B. KEATING of New York, would legalize FBI wiretapping to obtain evidence against suspected spies and saboteurs.

Both measures result from the New York Federal Appeals Court decision which voided Judith Coplon's conviction for stealing secret Government information and giving it to a Russian agent. The court held that, although her guilt was clear, Miss Coplon had been deprived of the constitutional right to due process of law because:

1. FBI agents, who arrested her without a warrant, failed to prove as present law requires that this was necessary to prevent her escape.

2. The Government failed to prove that FBI wiretaps led to none of the evidence used in obtaining her conviction.

Present Federal law makes it a crime to intercept and divulge communications. Yet the FBI does intercept—does tap wire—in its work of protecting the country from spies, saboteurs and other public enemies.

It first must get permission from the Attorney General, who acts by authority of an executive order issued by President Roosevelt in 1940. But if information the FBI obtains by wiretapping is divulged by its use as evidence in court, that can give a guilty spy basis for a successful appeal from conviction.

That is a ridiculous situation.

If FBI wiretapping was essential to national security in 1940, it is more essential now. It should be legalized. Information obtained by this method should be made admissible as evidence. And safeguards against its abuse, and for the rights of innocent persons, should be provided.

The Keating bill proposes that the FBI be required to obtain wiretap permits from Federal courts, upon showing of good reason to believe that information thus obtained is necessary to proper investigations. This would seem a much better safeguard than the present requirement for permits from the FBI's boss, the Attorney General.

[From the Champaign-Urbana (Ill.) Courier of December 24, 1950]

REVIEW WIRE-TAP BAN

Heightened concern over the national security may lead, it now appears, to a review of the use of wire taps as a means of gathering evidence against spies, traitors, and saboteurs. Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, made the first step when he introduced a bill to permit Federal Bureau of Investigation agents to obtain Federal court orders for wire tapping, if national security appears involved.

Some modification of the doctrine which bans the use of wire tap evidence clearly is needed. Representative KEATING calls the rule absurd and it certainly proved so recently when Judith Coplon's conviction for plotting to spy on this country for Russia was overruled on grounds that part of the evidence against her was gained by wiretapping.

The proposed change now becomes a matter of practical necessity. As the law stands, it permits spies to conduct their nefarious profession over American telephones. Government agents may suspect the tenor of the conversation, but are not authorized to listen in.

Permission to tap wires should be doled out sparingly, surely, for the private rights of the citizen must be guarded. The author of the bill, however, has provided against a possible danger of too free a use of the privilege when he asks that FBI men and military intelligence agents secure court permission before using the tapping system.

Fact is, the average citizen conducts business over the telephone of less importance than is ordinarily believed. If his conversation was really important, he would protest more vigorously than he does the party-line systems in use in all rural areas and in many city systems.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union]

KEATING BILL SHOULD PASS

A teapot tempest is still raging on the question of allowing the FBI to tap telephone conversations of suspected foreign agents.

With thousands of American boys already lying in Korean graves, we think it's high time to start helping instead of hindering the FBI. But many well-meaning persons still raise the bloody shirt of "martyred" civil liberties at such a suggestion.

Obviously, no sane person wants to start scrapping civil liberties wholesale. From Bunker Hill to Wonju our soldiers have fought to preserve a system of government whose core is the protection of the rights of the individual.

There are inconsistencies in the objections raised to FBI wire tapping. For example, it's permissible for an FBI man to eavesdrop on a conversation in a restaurant, but he can't eavesdrop on a telephone conversation.

Police of many States can use wiretap evidence on minor crimes, but the FBI can't use it in efforts to guard our Government against enemy espionage.

Representative KEATING has introduced a bill to remedy the situation. By making permission of a Federal judge necessary for such wiretapping, the bill attempts to protect the public against unwarranted invasion of its rights.

This long overdue measure should be passed quickly.

Fighting Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement entitled "Fighting Inflation," published by the Life Insurance Association of America. The statement is dated January 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHTING INFLATION

Since the autumn of 1939 we have been experiencing a price inflation which has brought about a decline of 43 percent in the purchasing power of the dollar, with the largest part of this decline taking place since the end of World War II. This steady depreciation in the purchasing power of our money has inflicted hardship and privation on many whose incomes are fixed or relatively constant, and it has seriously reduced the real value of accumulated savings. The inflation which we have already experienced is bad enough, but with the outbreak of war in Korea we are suffering an acceleration in the upward movement of prices.

The basic cause of this development is that the demand for goods and services by the American people and Government, supported by a record-breaking volume of money outstanding, is running far ahead of the available supply at existing price levels. With the very high employment of labor and other resources which exists in our economy today, there is little opportunity for a rapid increase in national output to meet the expanding requirements of our military program. To an important degree, therefore, it is necessary to divert current output from civilian markets to the military program.

Under these circumstances, in order to prevent serious inflation we civilians must compensate for the increasing demand of the Government by restricting our demand to the supply of goods and services which can be made available at present price levels.

The 83,000,000 life-insurance policyholders have a vital stake in urging upon the Government that a stiff program be employed to fight inflation. This arises from the fact that an erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar cuts into the value of savings which policyholders have accumulated through life insurance. As a matter of fact, of course, inflation exerts an exceedingly adverse effect upon most savers, but it must not be assumed that inflation will affect only accumulated savings. The history of past inflations demonstrates clearly that when prices rise at a rapid rate they generally outstrip increases in wages and salaries and other forms of current income.

Moreover, experience also teaches us the lesson that every inflationary boom has ultimately led to a collapse. An economic collapse would be disastrous in that it would play into the hands of the Communist world and would involve in itself a serious threat to our freedom. It is noteworthy that Nikolai Lenin, the prophet of modern communism, held that debauching the currency is the best way to destroy a country.

Alarmed at the rise in prices which got under way with the outbreak of war in Korea, Congress acted promptly in passing the Defense Production Act and in enacting an increase in personal income taxes. In addition, the Federal Reserve Board and the various Government housing agencies have acted quickly to tighten consumer and real estate credit. The measures taken so far are commendable, but they must be broadened and strengthened if we are to win the battle against inflation.

We believe that inflation can be stopped and held in check if steps along the lines outlined below are taken in time by the Federal Government. For the present, at least, inflationary pressures can be halted through the use of indirect controls without the need to resort to direct controls such as general price and wage ceilings and rationing. Indirect controls, if stern enough, have the great advantage of getting at the heart of the inflationary process which lies in the excessive effective demand for goods and services. They also have the advantage of not interfering with the freedom of choice of individuals. On the other hand, direct controls deal merely with the symptoms of inflation without getting at the basic causes, and for this reason should be employed only as a last resort. Even then, to be effective they must be accompanied by powerful indirect controls.

THE MEASURES WHICH SHOULD BE TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT

The basic reason for the inflation we have been experiencing is that our money supply has expanded faster than the supply of goods and services, so that the key to an effective fight against rising prices is a well-rounded program by Government directed toward reducing the active money supply in the hands of the public.

The volume of bank deposits and currency held by the public has risen from $63,300,000,000 at the end of 1939 to $173,000,000,000 at the end of October 1950 with a sharp increase of $5,900,000,000 occurring from the end of March through October of this year. Furthermore, in recent months money has been turning over at a much faster rate. The measures adopted by Government, therefore, should restrict not only the current income of the public but also the accumulated money supply. These measures should include the following:

Increased Federal taxation: The military-preparedness program in its present dimensions and all other Government expenditures should be carried on a pay-as-you-go basis. The taxes chosen to raise additional revenue should be geared to cut directly into the mass purchasing power which has given rise to inflationary forces.

A broad extension of excise taxes, or the imposition of a general spending tax, should be given careful consideration. This form of taxation is a direct deterrent to spending and an encouragement to saving both because of the tax itself and because of the psychology of it. The tax should not be applicable to necessities such as food and clothing at the minimum level.

A further rise in personal income taxes, when required, should be levied across the board on a straight percentage increase. A sharply graduated income tax will fall short in yielding revenue and will weaken the incentive which is needed for harder and more efficient work to increase production. It should not be forgotten that over a period of time expanding production is probably the most effective way to combat inflation.

When it becomes necessary to place a heavier tax burden upon corporations, this should be done by increasing the present corporate income tax. An excess-profits tax should not be employed because it is distinctly inflationary in that it leads to unnecessary corporate expenditures and discourages efficiency and increased productivity.

Reduced Government expenditures: As all individuals and business concerns will be called upon to cut their expenditures drastically, clearly it follows that all nonmilitary expenditures by the Federal, State, and local governments likewise should be cut to the bone. This requires, particularly at the Federal level, a searching reexamination of the peacetime functions of Government and the elimination or pruning of many activities. With the additional demands of our military program the burden of Government expenditures will be crushing without continuing to carry many items which were put into the Federal budget in the postwar period. Furthermore, although our military program must be sufficiently large to play our proper role in the preservation of freedom throughout the world, at the same time rigorous care should be exerted to insure that military expenditures are made efficiently and with a minimum of waste.

Tightened monetary and credit controls: A pay-as-you-go tax program is the cornerstone in the fight against inflation, but it is not enough to do the job. Its restrictive effects could be defeated by an expansion of credit and a resultant increase in the money supply, as well as by the spending of liquid assets which are now held in very large volume by the American people.

The action which has already been taken by the Government to curb real-estate and consumer credit is highly commendable because much of the current inflationary boom lies in the housing and durable-consumer-goods fields. While we do not like to see housing, automobiles, or any other such goods denied to anyone, it is to the best interest of all of us that the Government restrictions have been put into effect. It is imperative that the real-estate and consumer credit controls be watched carefully in order to insure that they have the desired restrictive effect, but it is not enough to rely solely on selective credit controls.

The Federal Reserve Board should have freedom to employ its general credit-control powers in order to exert its maximum influence in the fight against inflation. Steps which have already been taken by the Federal Reserve Board to raise the rediscount rate, and its efforts through open-market operations to tighten commercial bank credit and thus to bring about a rise in short-term interest rates, have been in the right direction. The same is true of the Treasury's recent decision to raise the rate on 5-year notes. The guiding principle here should be that the Federal Reserve must be permitted to restrict bank credit even though as a result interest rates must rise. Neither the Government nor the American people can afford a policy of easy money and low interest rates in a period of strong inflation.

Anti-inflationary public-debt management: Through public-debt management the Treasury can and has influenced the money supply. Much of the Federal debt issued during the war and postwar period is lodged in the commercial banks or the Federal Reserve banks with the resultant effect of a greatly expanded money supply. During the next several years the Treasury will be faced with heavy refunding of maturing debt, and its policy in managing this debt should be directed toward getting a substantial part of the debt out of the banking system into the hands of savers.

The constructive effect of this policy would be to reduce the money supply in the hands of the general public. Any new issues of Government debt should be placed outside the banking system. In order to accomplish these goals, it will be necessary for the Treasury to make its securities more attractive to all types of investors, which means essentially a higher rate on Government securities.

Strong wage-price policy: The Government, through concerted efforts by its various branches and by means of appeal to public opinion, should strive to prevent further developments of the wage-price spiral. This means not only the avoidance of wage and salary increases designed to keep up with the cost of living—it also means the avoidance by business of unwarranted price increases. The various measures of indirect control urged in this statement will fail unless at the same time the Government, with the cooperation of labor and management, succeeds in holding down the wage-price spiral. By the same token, if the controls urged herein are used fully, much of the cause for the wage-price spiral will be removed.

COOPERATION BY INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESS

The measures outlined above can go far toward fighting further price inflation, but in the last analysis their success will depend upon a thorough understanding by individuals and business of the forces which give rise to inflation along with the measures needed to combat it. With this understanding the American public and business can be counted upon to cooperate with a determined program by Government along the lines set forth here to fight inflation.

The main elements of action by individuals and business concerns in the fight against inflation are clear. Both groups should keep their spending for nonessentials at an absolute minimum and should bend every effort to increase their current savings. Existing savings of individuals in the form of war bonds, bank deposits, and in other liquid forms should continue to be held out of the spending stream. Business concerns, as well as individuals, must refrain from hoarding goods. Scrupulous care should be exerted by both groups to conform with rules and regulations promulgated by the Government to control such things as real estate and consumer credit.

Finally, labor and management should cooperate in stopping a further rise in the wage-price spiral. Real sacrifice by all of us is needed to wage a successful fight against inflation. The objective is so compelling that we must make that sacrifice, and it will be made only if effective controls compel it to be made.

SUMMARY

Since the autumn of 1939 we have experienced a decline of 43 percent in the purchasing power of the dollar, and with the outbreak of the Korean War we are now suffering an acceleration in the upward movement of prices. The basic cause of this development is that the demand for goods and services by the American people and Government, supported by a record-breaking money supply, is running far ahead of the available supply of goods and services at present price levels. Eighty-three million life insurance policyholders, in the interest of protecting the value of their insurance, have a vital stake in urging upon the Government that a stiff program be employed to fight inflation. The main elements of this program, which must be directed toward reducing the money supply in the hands of the public, are as follows:

1. Federal taxation should be geared to carry the military preparedness program, at least in its present dimensions, and all other Government expenditures on a pay-as-you-go basis. Taxes should be directed toward limiting civilian spending to the available supply of goods and services at existing price levels.

2. All nonmilitary expenditures by the Federal, State, and local governments should be cut to the bone and every effort should be made to insure that military expenditures are made efficiently and with a minimum of waste.

3. Selective credit controls such as those to control real estate and consumer credit should be employed as fully as necessary to restrict credit in certain boom areas, and the Federal Reserve authorities must have freedom to use their general credit control powers to curtail the money supply even though as a result interest rates must rise. Neither the Government nor the American people can afford a policy of easy money and low interest rates in a period of strong inflation.

4. In refunding the public debt, Treasury policy should be directed toward getting a substantial part of the debt out of the banking system into the hands of savers, thus reducing the money supply held by the general public. New issues should be made attractive enough to be placed outside the banking system.

5. The Government and business should pursue vigorously a policy of discouraging further rounds in the wage-price spiral.

These steps can be employed effectively by Government to halt inflation, but only if individuals and business concerns cooperate fully by cutting their spending to the bone and by increasing their savings, as well as by conforming in letter and spirit to the regulations issued by Government. It will require real economic sacrifice to combat the forces of Communist aggression successfully without incurring further inflation, but the American public, given sound leadership by Government, can be counted upon to make that sacrifice.

The Single Supply Catalog: An Essential Conservation Measure in Mobilization Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recent editorial comments indicate the impression prevails that nothing is being done toward the preparation of the single supply catalog for the Federal Government which was recommended by the Hoover Commission as an essential conservation measure. Accordingly, I inquired into the present status of this work. It is indeed gratifying to report the results of my inquiry to the Congress.

The supply catalog is now 45 percent complete, by the end of September 1951 it should be 75 to 80 percent complete, and the scheduled date of completion of the entire work is July 1, 1952. Already published in one form or other, and available for use of Government and industry, are 870,203 items.

The preparation of the catalog has necessarily included a vast program of simplification. For example, 1,000,000 gages of various types have been reduced to 186,000, of which 80,000 have been cataloged or published.

In addition to several hundred persons working on the stock catalog in Washington, there are more than 4,000 throughout the country. This staff, under the direction of the Munitions Board, is vigorously pushing to meet the scheduled dates of completion.

In view of the pending world crisis, conservation of our resources assumes a greatly increase significance in connection with mobilization. A most illuminating address on this broad subject, delivered on November 29, 1950, at the annual dinner and honors night of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in New York by Dr. Howard Coonley, Chief Conservation Planning Specialist of the National Security Resources Board, was published in the January 1951 issue of Mechanical Engineering.

Dr. Coonley's paper admirably summarizes the general conservation practices as developed in World War II, especially with respect to the supply catalog, and should remove much of the confusion in the public mind as to the scope of these activities.

To make Dr. Coonley's timely contribution more readily available to the Congress, the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the Nation at large, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the indicated address which follows:

THE ROLE OF CONSERVATION IN MOBILIZATION PLANNING

(By Howard Coonley)

Conservation is not an American characteristic. Our people have ingenuity, adaptability, and driving power, but we are not by nature accustomed to make much out of little, to see how far we can stretch the cloth which is within easy reach. In short, we lack a spirit of thrift. It should not require a war or even a threat of war to make us aware of the necessity to save.

When I sat down to consider how I could impress upon this audience tonight their responsibility for the conservation that is essential if our country and our way of life are to survive, I realized that it would be wise to turn to our benefactor Noah Webster to define the word I am using as my text. The result of my investigation was not completely satisfying. Noah says: Conservation is, first, a process of conserving or preserving; second, official care or supervision as of a river or forest; third, keeping as of bees or domestic animals; and, fourth, making of conserves or preserves.

The conservation that I have in mind goes far deeper than these definitions. In our present crisis it is the ingredient that will expand the output of our mills and our machinery that urgently important additional amount which is needed to take care of civilian as well as military requirements, and thereby safeguard our Republic and assure the survival of the democratic nations of the world, whether our destiny be the terrors of another war or the blessings of long years of peace.

I am undertaking tonight to tell you briefly what your Government's present program is in the field of conservation and what is proposed for the future.

SIX ASPECTS OF CONSERVATION

The National Security Resources Board, to which I am giving a substantial portion of my time as chief conservation planning specialist, is not an operating agency such as was the War Production Board. Its responsibilities and its authorities are limited to the area of mobilization planning, to the coordination of Government activities, and to the inauguration and stimulation of such activities where necessary.

Conservation as practiced in World War II and as it must be considered in mobilization planning may be divided into six broad categories.

First on the list I should place standardization. Perhaps I should combine with standardization, specifications, for in Washington the two have quite different meanings. There, specifications are thought of as schedules set up for immediate production and procurement; standards are rules and regulations designed for longer-term use. They have the framework of permanency. Simplification is an important corollary of standardization. In these areas of standardization, specifications, and simplification, our ASME is deeply interested and plays a vital role.

My second category might be stated as measures to determine and safeguard supplies of critical materials. This is a subject that should have our complete backing whether or not an emergency is threatened.

Third on my list is the development of substitutes wherever necessary and possible. This should be the natural habit of prudent industrialists.

In fourth position I place a program of salvage and savings at the source.

Fifth is a cataloging of supplies under a system of standard identification to avoid duplication and waste.

And last but not least I place international cooperation in conservation measures. And I say last but not least deliberately, for it is my firm conviction that lasting world peace must be built upon an interchange of goods, services, and techniques on a basis of mutual benefit and friendly understanding.

In a brief statement of this kind I can only touch the high spots of my subject. Yet you should know and I hope you will approve and support the measures that are being taken.

USE BEING MADE OF RETIRED EXECUTIVES

The handful of specialists (I feel I can properly call them experts) that are responsible for the National Security Resources Board's conservation activities have been—with one exception—recruited from that great group of recently retired executives who are still charged with the necessary physical energy, and who have the priceless attributes of experience and knowledge to make them outstandingly valuable to our conservation planning efforts. I am letting no opportunity go by to recommend to other Government agencies that they turn to the rich field of the recently retired for the assistance they need in their expanding activities. I am further tempted to pause in my thesis long enough to say that it would be well, as it may be necessary, for our leaders of business to reappraise their theories of the mandatory retirement age for members of their organizations. One of the outstanding industrial economists attached to a great and successful corporation tells me that a recent survey indicates the useful years of life of our men and women workers are

rapidly increasing due, undoubtedly, to greater understanding of proper foods and broader knowledge of preventive medicine. He predicts that within the next generation the period of efficient service will have increased by 15 years over our earlier estimate. I believe it is in a large part due to the wisdom and maturity of our little band of "minute men" that we have been so universally welcomed by all Government agencies.

FUNCTION OF THE CONSERVATION SPECIALISTS

But to return to the work being done by our small group of specialists; our main duty is to keep open the channels of contact with all Government agencies to learn what each is doing in the area of conservation; to assist wherever possible; to offer suggestions where they are sought or needed; to develop methods of coordination and stimulation.

One of the first groups with which I became associated after I came to Washington in March of this year was the Interdepartmental Standards Council. In December 1949, this Council was set up to coordinate and direct the standardizing activities of all Government agencies and to prevent duplication and discrepancy. Sixteen Federal agencies, both military and civil, are represented on this Council, of which S. J. Kaidanovsky of the General Services Administration is chairman.

The conservation planning specialists of the National Security Resources Board who have wide industrial experience and many contacts both within and outside of the Federal agencies are very active in the deliberations of the Interdepartmental Standards Council. They have been able to offer guidance on problems of international as well as national scope and to suggest important opportunities for developing standards which justify the attention of the Council. One of their chief concerns is closer cooperation between Government and industry. There is far too little known by one group about the accomplishments of the other in the field of conservation, of which standardization is a tool. A group of liaison engineers such as the conservation specialists can perform a very valuable function in bringing Government and industry closer together for the accomplishment of common objectives.

The most active participation in the Interdepartmental Standards Council on the part of the military comes from the Standards Agency of the Munitions Board of which Col. A. E. Michelsen is chief. This agency is another miniature group whose functions are similar to those of the American Standards Association in that they develop no standards but provide the machinery through which the three divisions of the Department of Defense determine what standards are to be developed, select the members of the committees that do the actual work, and pass judgment on the standards when they are completed.

At the present time the Standards Agency of the Munitions Board is reviewing several of their standards for drawings and drafting-room practices and is planning on an expansion of these standards. In this program, we of the National Security Resources Board are giving them every encouragement. For we can conceive of no conservation measure that would prove of greater value to the mobilization effort than a unified set of industrial-military standards in this important area. Had there been available in World War II such a group of standards, millions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of skilled man-hours would have been saved. As sponsor for ASA Committee Z14, ASME has an outstandingly important position in this area. It is my deep hope that some way will be found for Committee Z14 and the Munitions Board Standards Agency to work together on this project, so that the standards may be truly representative of the best industrial as well as military thinking.

DEVELOPMENT OF A SUPPLY CATALOG

I will not attempt to speak further tonight on the need of a monthly list of critical materials, classified as to their current criticality or on the programs of substitutes for critical materials, on both of which our group is working. It is a matter which I am pursuing vigorously. But I do want to refer to the developments that are under way of a supply catalog, to which I referred as the fifth on my list of categories.

Confusion, delay, and unnecessary work were experienced during World War II because of the lack of a common language to describe the Government's supply needs. You all know the now famous story of a combat vessel turning 500 miles off its course to replace a broken bearing only to find that several bearings of the same dimensions were on board but stocked under different item numbers. At one time, 11 naval agencies and 3 Army agencies attempted to solve this exasperating problem by each developing its own system. Immediately after the war the Secretary of the Navy submitted this problem to the member bodies of the American Standards Association. As a result a standard method of testing bearings has been agreed upon. Another standard on dimensions and tolerances is about to be issued, and a numbering system is approaching completion. The antifriction-bearing incident is one of countless though less striking examples of the difficulties that have arisen because of the lack of a supply catalog.

The need for uniform Federal cataloging has long been recognized. Supply systems of Federal agencies have traditionally contained thousands of apparently different items when in reality many of them were thought to be different only because of the lack of uniform item names, descriptions, and stock numbers. As early as World War I, experience showed that the lack of a common language to identify the same item, or similar items, used by different branches of our Armed Forces, caused duplication and waste.

A Federal Standard Stock Catalog was published in a single series of volumes from 1930 to 1935. These volumes, together with the supplements that followed, contained only 350,000 items. Five million items are included in the supply lists of today. Use of this first catalog was limited to a few Government agencies that found it practicable to adopt a uniform system. By the beginning of World War II, most Federal agencies had developed separate cataloging systems thought to be best suited to their individual use.

Technological advances made during World War II flooded the various Federal supply systems with so many new items that the work of cataloging fell far behind that of procurement. As a result, identical articles were listed by separate branches of the same service under different numbers and descriptions and frequently under varying names. Out of the avalanche of demand for an adequate Federal supply catalog, facilities and appropriations for its development were ultimately provided.

The Federal catalog program is at present the joint responsibility of the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency, which represents Military Establishments, and the Federal Supply Service, which represents civilian agencies. Authority for coordination of the program has been delegated to the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency by the General Services Administration. The cooperative efforts of these agencies are expected to reduce the 3,500,000 supply items estimated to be in our military supply systems and the 1,500,000 supply items estimated to be in the supply systems of the Federal civilian agencies to approximately 3,000,000. In other words, the first goal in the cataloging program is to eliminate approximately 2,000,000 duplicate items.

IMPORTANCE OF THE CATALOG

It is obvious that the intelligent use of a uniform catalog will preclude the purchase of thousands of unnecessary items, but that is only the start of the conservation of materials that can be realized. A decrease in the number of items purchased by the Federal Government means less demand on our industrial capacity and less stress on overworked transportation facilities. It means savings in storage space, with a consequent decrease in warehouse construction and less demand for scarce building materials. It means fewer people required to handle Federal supplies. It means tremendous savings in taxpayers' dollars. And since a uniform catalog system is designed to facilitate delivery of the right item in the right place, at the right time, it will save precious lives in time of war.

Under the impetus of the war in Korea, the then Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson called for greatly accelerated effort in cataloging items of military supply. In a memorandum addressed to the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, in September, he asked that within a year cataloging be completed in certain selected categories, that contribute most significantly to national defense under conditions of either total mobilization or partial mobilization. It is estimated that from 75 to 80 percent of the items in military supply fall within these categories.

In this work the conservation specialists of the National Security Resources Board have played an important part. Largely through our efforts technical and trade-association executives are being called upon for assistance and advice, with the result that the catalog when completed will reflect to a large degree industrial practices. When you who are active in the industries that are still to be covered are requested to participate in this important undertaking, I trust you will recognize the obligation and the opportunity, and give freely of your time and experience.

THE FIELD OF COORDINATION

Perhaps the most important activity that will be undertaken by the National Security Resources Board in the field of conservation will be the re-creation of a Conservation Coordinating Committee which proved so helpful in World War II. In September 1942, Donald Nelson asked the Undersecretaries of the Army and Navy and the chairman of the Maritime Commission to appoint representatives to meet with the director of the then Conservation Bureau of the War Production Board to discuss ways and means of cooperating in an all-out drive for conservation. Later this small group was expanded to include Lend-Lease, Treasury Procure, the Aircraft Coordinating Committee, and the Board of Economic Warfare, and was given the name of the Conservation Coordinating Committee. The deliberations of this committee which resulted in broad unified programs of conservation were carried out with great success and with complete understanding and cooperation. Several weeks ago, Chairman Symington agreed that a similar committee should be set up under the chairmanship of the NSRB to include representation of all three divisions of the Department of Defense, the Munitions Board, the National Production Authority, and other Government departments and agenices that have a major concern with materials, facilities, manpower, and production. I have been spending my time for these several weeks visiting the heads of these departments and agencies so that the purposes and programs of the Conservation Coordinating Committee should be understood and the appropriate representatives selected when the invitations from Mr. Symington are received. Nineteen departments and agencies will be represented. I am happy to say that the plan has met with enthusiastic approval.

In this somewhat disjointed outline I hope I have given you a preview of a united effort to make the most we can out of the materials, facilities, and manpower that are available to our Nation. The results should be fully as helpful in peace as in war.

A Young German Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the New York Times of January 31, 1951:

A YOUNG GERMAN SPEAKS UP

An 18-year-old German youth has become a hero of his people. Brought before a Communist tribunal in East Germany for distributing anti-Communist posters and injuring a policeman trying to arrest him, this young man, Josef Flade, told the court, "I love my liberty more than my life." When sentenced to the guillotine he calmly assured his judges that "thousands will avenge my death."

This act of courage has stirred all Germany as it has not been stirred since the heroic stand of Western Berlin during the Russian blockade. A wave of anger and protest not only in Germany but elsewhere in the world has now compelled the Communist regime to commute the sentence to 15 years' imprisonment. This means, of course, that Flade is likely to be shipped to Siberia to die a slower death. But his trial and conviction have made a mockery of Communist freedom and justice, and have brought home a warning which, more than the anonymous fate of millions, will, by its individual impact, make the Germans wary of Communist traps. What is more, the incident shows that even in East Germany the Russians still feel the necessity of yielding, at least on the public record, to the impact of popular opinion when it is aroused sufficiently.

Stop That Leak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, entitled "Stop That Leak," which appeared in the January 1951 issue of the DAR magazine.

Mr. Warren's outstanding career as a public servant in the House of Representatives and as Comptroller General is known to each and every one of us. I recommend his article for reading by every Member of Congress and by every American.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 2½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP THAT LEAK—TEAMWORK IN WASHINGTON MAKES THE TAXPAYER'S DOLLAR GO FURTHER

(By Lindsay C. Warren)

The Korean conflict has rudely awakened America from any dream of life-as-usual in the immediate future. A strong national defense has never been more urgently needed. The long arm of military necessity already has reached into thousands of homes. It will reach into every home, and touch each of us in some way. It will take an even larger share of our time and our effort and our money than it has before.

Americans never have shirked their assigned tasks in any fight. They stand ready to take up their belts to back up the firing line. They do not stint where their way of life is at stake. But they have always insisted that the time and the effort and the money they give freely be well used, particularly where it can mean the lives of fighting men.

In these critical days, we should take a good look at what has gone before. Now is the time to profit from past experience—not later. The hard lesson of past mistakes must be turned to our own advantage. We must search out and eliminate waste, and find new and better ways of doing whatever needs to be done. Every weapon must be brought to bear.

One of the most powerful weapons we command is our great national wealth. It is unmatched in world history. But, great as it is, it is by no means inexhaustible. Properly harnessed, it immeasurably strengthens the sinews of war. Wasted or misdirected, it can cost terrible hardship and even thousands of lives. It must be conserved, and carefully applied.

These are the watchwords of our leaders today. The whole Government is enlisted in the cause. The Congress worked day and night to enact wise legislation to provide the wherewithal to meet the emergency situation. The President has asked extraordinary powers to lead us in the crisis. Sweeping powers already have been given him to reorganize the executive branch, to consolidate functions and cut off those which are unnecessary, and to replace outmoded methods with modern ones. Vigorous action already has been taken, but much remains to be done. It is being done under forced draft, to be ready for whatever the future brings.

Mr. and Mrs. Citizen Taxpayer, and all the little Taxpayers, have a very special interest in all this. Already barely able to lift groaning heads under the assault of record peacetime spending, they face even heavier going. They look to their Government to see that it is not in vain.

As Comptroller General of the United States and the agent of the Congress, that is my vital concern. The General Accounting Office which I head is the Congress' own agency to check on the financial dealings of the Government. It is the great bulwark erected by the Congress against illegal and improper spending. Its task, and mine, is to see to it that the public moneys are utilized effectively, as directed by the Congress which controls the purse strings.

It has been said, also, that the Comptroller General is the personal Washington representative of every taxpayer. That is an apt expression of my feeling of responsibility. The fight against waste of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars is never ending. I intend to stay in the thick of it. Hardly less than the actual firing line, it is one for our children and our children's children. They will be called upon to pay for any weakening on our part now. That is why readers of this article have a very real and personal place in the fight.

Now, let's take a look at some of the things that have been and are being done with the public moneys. One bogeyman should be dispatched at the start. It is the popular misconception that fiscal matters are at best a dry subject, to be avoided at all cost. It is, unfortunately, a mental block to full understanding of how our money is used. At the risk of oversimplification, much of it can be easily dispelled.

The General Accounting Office—GAO in the Government vernacular—is one of the three central fiscal agencies of the Government. It is a part of the legislative branch. The other two are the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget. They are in the executive branch. These three central fiscal agencies together do for the United States just about the same job every housewife does for her home.

The money to run the Government is kept in the Treasury. It can be paid out of the Treasury only as Congress directs, by appropriations. It is spent, or disbursed, by disbursing officers.

The Bureau of the Budget prepares and presents the plan for use of the money to carry on the business of the Government. The plan, approved and financed by the Congress, is executed under direction of the President.

The General Accounting Office checks up for the Congress on receipts and expenditures. It watches where the money goes, to see that it is spent legally. More than $40,000,000,000 being paid out annually, involving 2,000,000 Government officers and employees, is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office.

Obviously, no household budget would be worth while without definite knowledge of what household income and expenses are. The operation would soon collapse. That is equally true of Government finances. Yet, during my 16 years as a Member of Congress before accepting the office of Comptroller General in 1940, I was forcibly struck by the lack of such essential information. No one could tell exactly how much was coming in from where, or how much was being spent for what.

Finding the answer to this perplexing problem was one of my first concerns as Comptroller General. The vast expenditures of World War II emphasized the need for prompt and vigorous action. With untold future demands facing us, solution of the problem is of paramount importance to every American.

The trouble was readily diagnosed. It was deep-seated in the hybrid structure of Federal accounting and financial reporting. That structure had been built, layer on layer and tier on tier, without any coordinated plan or supervision. No single agency or office had authority to enforce any corrective measures. It had just "growed like Topsy."

With the trouble isolated, the next and biggest step was to bring order out of chaos in the accounting and financial reporting. Simply stated, this means that those who receive and spend the money must be shown how to set down in their books of account clear and accurate records of how much money comes from what sources, and how much of it is spent for what purposes. Then

their transactions can be verified by an independent audit. They can be held responsible for any illegality. The audit is made by the General Accounting Office, which, being in the legislative branch, is entirely free of any dominance or influence from the executive branch where the bulk of the spending is done. Also, with proper accounting the public business can be more effectively planned and carried on, and the President, the Congress, and the taxpayers can be reliably informed of the state of the country's finances.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget came forward to join me in a concerted attack on this great task. Together we set up and nearly 3 years ago put into actual operation a joint program to improve and modernize accounting and financial reporting throughout the Government. All of the agencies were invited to participate as partners in the program, and have responded enthusiastically.

A special staff of highly skilled technicians was set up in the General Accounting Office to spearhead the program. They are working right in the agencies, in cooperation with their people. They are furnishing advice and all possible assistance to modernize and streamline accounts there and tie them in with others and with over-all Government accounting.

Tremendous progress already has been made under this joint accounting program. Each day brings substantial savings to the taxpayers and the promise of even greater ones in the future. The program is widely regarded as one of the most significant contributions in many years to economy and efficiency in government.

Although the joint accounting program already has yielded valuable returns, the work done has pointed up, also, weaknesses in the laws on the subject. New legislation has been badly needed to achieve maximum results. As the designated agency of the Congress on these matters, and one of the three central fiscal agencies, the General Accounting Office proposed such legislation in this session of Congress. The Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget, as the other two central fiscal agencies, participated in the drafting and strongly supported the measure.

The Congress enacted a new Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. It provides additional means to bring about the complete revamping and modernization of Federal budgeting, accounting, and financial reporting. It is particularly timely as a new and potent weapon to strengthen our hands against the waste of public funds.

Some idea of the benefits which will come from the improvement and modernization of accounting and financial controls throughout the Government can be gained from what has been accomplished, in a smaller field, with Government corporations. World War I spawned a number of them, and many others were created in the ensuing years. They operated at public expense, but were not subject to financial control by the Congress. Some stayed in existence long after their work was completed. For example, one of them set up to requisition material for 1917-18 airplanes, still was being liquidated 30 years later.

In 1948 there were 101 of these corporations in what I told Congress was "an unsegregated, sprawling crop of Government functions and functionaries." Often their charters were wide enough to drive a team of horses through. Some of the largest of questionable expenditures had been made by corporations. What was needed was to bring them under financial control of the Congress.

Congress passed the Government Corporation Control Act in 1945. It made the corporations subject to a commercial-type audit by the General Accounting Office and provisions of law relating to the Federal budget. Annual reports of audits are sent to the Congress. They have helped reduce the number of corporations by more than one-third, and to persuade them to pay millions upon millions in dividends into the Treasury.

It is not to be thought that the General Accounting Office itself has been overlooked in the program for greater economy and efficiency. It is not an office of professional do-gooders holding itself sacrosanct from panaceas prescribed for others. Quite to the contrary, it is the first place we look to see if new and better ways of doing our own job can't be worked out and passed on for the benefit of other agencies.

This inward turning of our scrutiny has wrought amazing changes. A Rip Van Winkle, waking today, would not recognize the General Accounting Office of old. Hidebound, antiquated procedures have been junked, and modern practices are replacing them. It is a continuing process, directed always toward greater efficiency and economy in our own operations so that we may help others achieve the same goals.

Each day the Office strives to do more and more of its growing duties, with less and less expense to the taxpayers. War-swollen payrolls stood at nearly 15,000 early in 1946. That figure now has been reduced by about one-half. Yet, at the same time far greater and more effective services are being rendered to the Congress, to other Government agencies, and to the taxpayers. By setting our sights higher, we are using our ammunition in more telling ways.

The best evidence of the accomplished results of this streamlining is the ever-increasing number of requests and calls for reports, advice, and assistance of the General Accounting Office. In 1 year, more reports are sent to Congress than in all of the years together before I came to the Office. Close cooperation and a helpful approach with the agencies in the executive branch have brought a similar response from that source.

Several other laws recently passed are scarcely less important, from the standpoint of potential economies and increased efficiency, than the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act mentioned previously. These, too, are parts fitting into the over-all pattern of coordinating and sensibly placing various Government functions which greatly affect the Public Treasury.

One of the new laws is the Post Office Financial Control Act. Under an old law, the accounting for the Post Office Department has been done in the General Accounting Office. One of the basic principles of the joint accounting program is that the agencies are responsible for the keeping of their own accounts. Consistent with that principle, this new law provides for the Department to keep its own accounts on a businesslike basis, subject to audit verification by the General Accounting Office.

Another one of these new laws is the Federal Records Management Act. It imposes on the Administrator of General Services the responsibility of leadership in an assault on the mountainous stacks and tomes of Federal records that threaten to engulf us.

The very size and volume of the piles of records, papers, documents, letters, reports, and the like is likely to completely defeat any value they may have had when made. Some idea of the magnitude of the problem and of the task undertaken may be gleaned from testimony given before a congressional committee by an expert. He showed that if just one page were added to each veteran's file in the Veterans' Administration, the total thickness of the files would be increased by one and a quarter miles. And that is the only one of hundreds of agencies.

This law will provide the means to scale and reduce the veritable mountain of Government records. Its aims are threefold. First, what is called the birth rate of records will be controlled. Only useful and necessary ones will be created, and those will be in proper form. Second, records now in being but not serving any useful purpose will be eliminated. Third, more effective use will be made of those in existence or created hereafter which actually are necessary.

The approach to the records management problem in this act has been likened to that which is working so well under the joint accounting program. Although primary authority to guide and coordinate the program is vested in the Administrator of General Services, all of the agencies also have been assigned their own special responsibilities and will participate as full partners. The General Accounting Office has given and will continue to give its full cooperation to get this program under way and make it a complete success.

So much for some of the work being done to realize on past experience in handling public funds. All of these activities are calculated to lighten the load on the taxpayers. They will pay handsome dividends in the form of real economies of operation and reduced waste, red tape, and duplication and overlapping of functions.

A great many other lessons, learned the hard way, should be kept fresh in our minds. They are the waste, extravagance, weaknesses, and ineptitude which plagued us in two world wars. If continued or repeated, they can seriously impede our defense efforts, and might end in defeat. With such practices rampant, the risks are multiplied. They must be rooted up and stamped out at all costs.

The great majority of World War II expenditures were for perfectly reasonable and proper purposes. But some were poorly conceived and executed; some were wasteful or wildly extravagant; some were so utterly ridiculous as to indicate a reckless disinterest in the national welfare; and some were actually criminal.

The scandalous waste was so shocking that even in the press of wartime business my sense of duty forced me to report to Congress how certain officers and employees were dishing out and giving away the property and money of the United States with reckless abandon. Contracting officers were obligating the Government for payment of hundreds of billions of dollars. Many of them, of course, were capable and efficient. However, some were highly inept and inefficient. Some showed unmistakable disposition or habit to ignore the taxpayers' rights. And some were downright thieves and crooks!

Our auditors found these officers allowing payments under cost-plus contracts for such extraordinary items as vitamin pills, juke boxes, and a $225 set of false teeth. These were not isolated instances; only the locale and things involved varied.

One aircraft manufacturer used some parts to make planes, charging the Government $10,000,000 for them under a cost-plus contract. The money was paid out, and everyone was happy—particularly the contractor. That is, until the General Accounting Office auditors came along and discovered that the parts actually had been bought and paid for by the Government from a different contractor. Every cent was collected back.

Another manufacturer charged the Government more than $1,000,000 as costs incurred under a cost-plus war contract. We found that he had been reimbursed for the identical costs long before, under previous contracts. This money was promptly recovered.

Three files are in my office, pulled at random from many records of war contract overpayments. In the first case a single bill was overpaid by $135,500. In the second the same thing happened, to the tune of $222,000. In the third a bill for $20,000 was paid twice. The General Accounting Office got back every cent in these and thousands of other like cases.

Small wonder that I strongly disapproved of the cost-plus type of contract and the way it was handled. Everyone was taken care of but the Government and the taxpayer. It was enough to make the blood boil. I told the Congress from my seat it looked as though everybody and his brother were out to get the Government during the lush war years.

These few examples are not intended to imply that we condone or countenance picayune obstruction. I see no economy in spending $100 to audit a $25 item. Nor should the purpose and the objectives of necessary audit controls be distorted so as to hamper an all-out war effort. General Accounting Office activities during World War II were geared to the war effort. I think it can be said with full justification that they in no way hindered that effort, but, in fact, were a real contribution.

For instance, every cent spent on the Manhattan Project was carefully audited. Highest commendations were given by the military on the way it was done. The auditors didn't ask, and didn't care to know, what was being produced. That project and many others of highest military priority involved billions upon billions of expenditures passing the watchful scrutiny of our auditors. Every conceivable type of payment and every kind of purchase and cost flowed by in an endless stream. Not once was the trust violated.

While on the subject of collection of illegal and erroneous payments, the General Accounting Office is one Government agency which pays its own way. It has caused the recovery and replacement in the Treasury of more than $700,000,000 just in the 10 years since I became Comptroller General. That is more than two and one-half times the cost of running the Office for the same period. But even this stupendous amount recovered in cash is relatively small beside the untold sums saved because the very existence of the Office prevents many more excesses. The sure knowledge that this independent congressional agency will examine into financial dealings is one of the most powerful of all deterrents to improper ones.

One of the most unfortunate schemes ever contrived to short change the taxpayer was the method adopted to settle terminated war contracts. Long before the end of hostilities some people urged that broad concessions must be granted to aid in reconversion to peacetime production. Cries of impending chaos if war contractors were not assured of all they might ask for terminated contracts led to legislation on the subject that was full of holes. Those who propagated it, viewing the profligacy of wartime contracting, seemed to think we had best "let the tail go with the hide."

I appeared before every congressional committee having jurisdiction and warned that an independent audit of these proposed billion-dollar termination settlements was essential to prevent tremendous losses. But the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 left such an audit completely out of the scheme of things. It directed that terminated contracts be settled by the very contracting officers who, as a class, had clearly demonstrated their incapacity for such an important assignment. Worse, it made the settlements final and conclusive.

The act wrote the General Accounting Office out of the picture, to all intents and purposes. The Office could not even look for or question or collect back excessive payments. It could step in only where there was fraud, and then only after the settlement was consummated. The limitations imposed made it virtually impossible to prove it even where it was reasonably certain that settlements were induced by fraud.

All that I warned of came about when terminated war contracts were settled under this act. Practically forbidden by law to rectify any of the damage, nevertheless the General Accounting Office found out enough to show by overwhelming evidence that the finality provision in the law was a whopping big mistake that was costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. The percentage of excessive payments and fraud reached an unprecedented high in the experience of the Office.

Contract termination settlements for World War II are about wound up. It is hoped that there will never be a recurrence of the costly results of this piece of hasty legislation. Such a law never again should be put on the statute books.

There was one unexpected, though perhaps small, bonus from the experience with World War II contracts. It was the actual knowledge gained of the unbelievably low moral standards of some officers and employees entrusted with the conduct of official business in a great emergency.

During the war I informed Congress of the dangerous habit of many officers and employees who accepted, or even themselves sought and solicited, wining and dining and expensive entertainment and all kinds of favors from war contractors. Such familiarity gives rise to a feeling of obligation, at the very least, and has a strong tendency to improperly influence those officers in the performance of their official duties for the Government. Heads of agencies issued directives strongly condemning it. But it persisted among the small fringe which is always ready to turn even national peril to personal profit.

Instance after instance has been found of former Government officers going to work for the very firms whose contracts they had handled while with the Government. The dealings in these cases are, of course, closely scrutinized, but obviously if any illegal or improper motive is present the guilty one generally has been clever enough and had ample opportunity to cover his tracks.

Existing statutes on the subject have had a salutary effect. Unfortunately, they are not broad enough to cover the present situation, and there has been a recent tendency to weaken them, particularly in wartime when they are most needed. Of course, no one would urge a law to penalize perfectly legal and ethical steps of Government employees to obtain private employment, or of private industry to obtain qualified employees. What should be guarded against are set-ups of the kind which are contrived at the expense of or risk of loss to the taxpayers.

After careful consideration of all phases of this matter, upon the special request of a United States Senator, I recently submitted suggestions for legislation designed to strengthen the law in this respect, while at the same time not in any way hampering normal and legal business activities.

These are a few of the more important things I have learned in over a quarter of a century in Washington. They are facts, pure and simple. They are not offered or intended to imply any undue criticism, or any pride of accomplishment. They will have served their purpose, and more, if from them we have gained the knowledge to save each of our taxpayers just a few dollars on his or her yearly tax bill.

Price Fixing Is An Economic Narcotic—The Record Proves It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a letter that appeared recently in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald.

In six paragraphs the writer has summed up the high lights of price-fixing attempts over 4,000 years of history.

As he indicates, price fixing has never worked. As a hot war economic narcotic, it may have merit. Under current conditions, it is at best a pious humbug; at worst, a cunning betrayal of trusting and patriotic citizens.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

CONTROLS

The history of controls is a record of 4,000 years of enslavement. Hammurabi (2285-2242 B. C.) had wage controls for boatmen, reapers, threshers, shepherds, laborers, artisans, bricklayers, tillers, stone cutters, milkmen, and carpenters. He regulated builders' fees and warehousing, and rentals of cows in milk, calves, oxen, wagons, freight and passenger boats. He brought nothing but poverty, destitution, and high taxes to the land between the two rivers.

The Hittite code (1350 B. C.) attempted to establish wage and price control but they had to be abolished. Henry III and George II tampered with the prices of grain and bread until an indignant Parliament kicked the royal edicts out the window. Edward II tried to control the production of seafood with the result that all fish disappeared from the markets of the British Isles.

France tried to put under iron control 30 necessities of life through the Committee of Public Safety. This law had under national compulsion "all who help handle, transport, and retail products of prime necessity." The people resisted these compulsions. Finally the battle became so violent that a counter-revolution took place, and on July 23, 1794, Robespierre, Saint-Just and Couthon were beheaded as enemies of the people.

The Roman Emperor Diocletian tried the same game. His words read like Truman talks. Diocletian's system was based on the highest motives of making the whole nation participate "in the blessings of that peace for which we have laboriously striven." It was necessary for the rulers like watchful parents of the whole human race to help the people from above. Finally on May 1, 305 A. D., the Romans gave Diocletian a swift kick in the pants. The previous partial controls of Tiberius, Commodus, and Alexander Severus also ended in failure.

A little perusal of American history shows we tried controls as far back as the Revolutionary War. On April 8, 1778, the Continental Congress record states: "It hath been found by experience that limitation on the prices of commodities is not only ineffective for the purpose proposed, but likewise productive of very evil consequences to the great detriment of the public service and grievous oppression of individuals."

There must be some other answer besides regimentation.

RUSSELL KEMPSHALL,
Richmond, Va.

An Outstanding Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include three short articles from the annual progress edition of the Spokane Spokesman Review.

This year's progress edition is truly journalistic and printing art. All of the stories are short and very comprehensive. Each page is richly illustrated in full color.

The three articles included are short subjects with which, by their nature, Members of Congress are familiar and should prove interesting.

WORLD'S MOST USEFUL RIVER

Key to the economic development of the Pacific Northwest, including its inland empire, is Columbia River.

This stream and its tributaries drain 259,000 square miles, of which 220,000 square miles are within the United States. The other portion constitutes the southeastern corner of British Columbia.

That part of the Columbia Basin east of the Cascade Mountains comprises about 240,000 square miles, depending on the exact spot between Bonneville Dam and The Dalles where the line is drawn.

Waters of this basin were used to turn gristmill and sawmill wheels more than a century ago. Hydroelectric development came in the late 1880's, first on Spokane River.

Spokane, less than 15 years old at the time, was one of the first really electrified cities in the United States, and the first in the West

Waters were used for irrigation early in the last half of the nineteenth century, the Walla Walla Valley being the cradle of this development.

Mormon settlers from Utah also introduced irrigation into the Salmon River country.

Steamboats plied the rivers and many of the lakes long before railroads penetrated this part of the country.

First surveys of the Army engineers, looking toward development of the Columbia's main stream as far up as the international boundary, had navigation as the primary consideration, power as a secondary objective, and irrigation only as an incidental issue.

But in the last 35 years a program for comprehensive development of the basin has been shaping up, finally coming into official recognition as a joint project of the several States, the Army engineers, and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

It embraces power, irrigation, navigation, flood control, and fisheries.

Several ideas have been advanced as to how this over-all objective may best be accomplished. They include an improved voluntary association of interests such as now exists, an interstate and international compact under congressional sponsorship, a Federal authority or administration, and a superdistrict similar to the hundreds of districts that have already reclaimed 3,700,000 acres between the Cascades and the Rockies.

The number of separate projects grows from year to year as new possibilities are recognized, so that any estimate of the potential irrigated acreage or the possible power development is subject to change with every scientific advance.

A few years ago, for instance, the ultimate goal was 8,500,000 irrigated acres, and 30,000,000 kilowatts of electrical energy.

But both figures may be revised upward by a few simple devices such as sprinklers for irrigation (see page 24, part 4), and arrangements by which water already used for irrigation may be dropped through numerous small plants to produce still more juice.

These possibilities involve another controversial question—to what extent revenues of power may be used to subsidize reclamation projects in which the farmers could hardly charge enough for their products to make the irrigation installations profitable by themselves.

That also brings in a question as to uniform power rates.

More than 130 big and little dams now pour juice into a power pool that extends from central Utah to the British Columbia coast.

The Federal and municipal systems, public utilities and private industrial plants already joined into that Northwest power grid aid each other by displacements of electrical energy rather than by transmission over long distances.

The installations, including several steam plants, extend far beyond the Columbia Basin itself—into the Missouri Basin in Montana, into the Salt Lake Basin in Utah, and to the swift-flowing short rivers of the Washington and British Columbia coasts.

Power hook-ups with California hydroelectric systems are considered probable within the next 5 years.

Even before that, the independent systems on Kootenay River in British Columbia are likely to be added to the grid.

Existing power plants in the Northwest grid develop a total of 5,300,000 kilowatts, of which more than 3,000,000 kilowatts are within the basin.

Plants now under construction or authorized—including a few that have hard sledding because of objections by fisheries or other interests—will add about 3,750,000 kilowatts.

That includes a Washington Water Power Co. proposal at Cabinet Gorge, on Clark fork of the Columbia (Pend Oreille River), just below the Idaho-Montana State line.

Idaho Power Co. and Montana Power Co. are also building new plants in their respective areas, mostly on the upper Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, and on the upper Missouri.

ONE DOZEN INTERNATIONAL RIVERS

Twelve rivers cross the international boundary between the Rockies and the Cascades—three of them more than once. Farthest west is the Similkameen, which rises in Washington, flows north across the line and returns after receiving the waters of the American-sourced Pasayten and Ashnola. The Okanogan, which rises more than 100 miles north of the border, receives the Similkameen at Oroville, Wash. Kettle River, rising at Mount Monashee, 80 miles above the border, crosses the line thrice—at Ferry, Danville, and Laurier. The main Columbia crosses the line between Waneta, B. C., and Boundary, Wash., just below the mouth of the Pend Oreille, which has crossed into Canada some 1 mile east. Kootenay rises in Canada, enters the States at Gateway, Mont., and leaves at Porthill, Idaho. Two of its tributaries, the Yak and Moyie, rise in the Dominion and enter the States. Another, Wigwam River, rises in the States and flows into Canada. Finally, Flathead River rises in the Canadian Rockies and enters the United States, and as it is the principal branch of the Pend Oreille, it might be said to cross the border twice. Creeks and minor forks would make the list even longer.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY BILLION BOARD FEET GROWING

Thirteen billion board feet of Idaho white pine extend from the eastern suburbs of Spokane, across Idaho into Montana and southward about to Kooskia, Idaho.

Washington has about a billion feet, Montana half as much again. The rest is in Idaho. It is the greatest stand of white pine on earth.

Yet this is only about 8 percent of the standing timber of the inland empire, estimated by forest and lumber company experts as 180,000,000,000 board feet of potential houses, bridge timbers, pole lines, furniture, apple boxes, packing cases, ships and toothpicks—not to mention paper such as that on which these words are printed.

Taking the region as a whole, new timber is being grown as fast as ripe timber is cut. Literally, these forests are eternal. Trees are cut, but the forests under intelligent logging practices and the expanding sustained yield program will reseed themselves and last forever.

"Boxing the compass" from the gorge where the Columbia breaks through the Cascades, you find the Ponderosa pine dividing the landscape with the Douglas fir. The latter is predominantly a coast tree, but grows also on the east side of the Cascades, up through the Okanogan and across the Canadian line.

Larch becomes an important factor in Okanogan County. Ponderosa continues eastward almost to the Idaho line, mixed in with cedar, hemlock, and the true firs. Typical operation is Columbia Lumber Co. at Kettle Falls, Wash., which cuts 80 percent Ponderosa, 20 percent larch and fir.

Yakima county has better than 9,000,000,000 feet of standing softwood, Okanogan about the same.

In Montana, Flathead and Lincoln in the northwest corner have better than 20,000,000,000 feet together.

Idaho's leading timber counties are Clearwater and Idaho, with about 25,000,000,000 board feet between them.

Swinging west into Oregon, you find about 30,000,000,000 board feet in the Blue Mountains, where Ponderosa pine predominates, and some of the area's largest mills are situated.

The California Tie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial by Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Pacific Northwest Public Power Association, together with a letter to Mr. Ford Northrop from the Secretary of the Interior, and Mr. Northrop's reply:

[From the Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin]

WHAT WILL BE THE PRICE?

The Bureau of Reclamation's proposed California intertie appears to have appreciable economic, engineering and national defense merit. However, the Bureau uses these reasons merely as camouflage to hide the real purpose of exacting a large toll gate profit which will subsidize the Central Valley project at the Northwest power user's expense.

The Bureau now sells Shasta power to Pacific Gas & Electric at 5.2 mills average and that company is a fairly willing customer in order to insure that no other customer steps in.

The 138-mile, 230,000-volt Klamath Falls-Shasta intertie would cost $6,000,000 on which operating expense, interest, amortization, and line losses might run 8 percent or $480,000 per year. If the line carries 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours southward each year, the Bureau's cost would be only 0.8 mills per kilowatt-hour or at most 1.0 mill. Since California rivers are low or dry in summer when irrigation pumping peaks demand the most power, the Bureau would be able to sell all Northwest summer dump as firm power and obtain at least 5.2 mills, and by taking off 1.00 mill for its costs, the Bureau could pay Bonneville Power Administration 4.2 mills for each kilowatt-hour at the California boundary. In light of these facts the Bureau's offer to pay the Northwest only 1.55 mills is ridiculous and outrageous.

But, that is not all. Last year the Bureau's powerful lobby killed the authorization of Hells Canyon dam as a Corps of Engineers project. And furthermore the Bureau intends to kill the authorization of Hells Canyon dam unless a huge subsidy is provided from power for the Mountain Home irrigation project. The Bureau's plan is to have the Northwest absorb the artificially high priced Hells Canyon power by increasing the $17.50 (the Bureau never did like this low rate) wholesale rate. Then the Northwest is expected to transmit Hells Canyon power 400 miles, absorb line losses and downprice the power at the California boundary to 1.55 mills thereby enabling the Bureau to clean up a net profit of 26.5 percent annually on the $6,000,000 intertie in addition to a similar profit at the dam. No private power company has ever made such outrageous toll gate charge proposals.

The Pacific Northwest needs the revenue from the California intertie or from an equivalent summer industrial load in order to keep wholesale BPA rates from jumping at least 20 percent in 1954.

But the Northwest should insist on at least 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour at the California boundary for another reason, namely, as a partial safeguard against developing in the Bureau or in the Interior Department (in which the Bureau is the dominating force) any notion of squatter's rights on Northwest power. It is still our power and the Bureau can take it or leave it at the price desired by Northwest people.

This whole situation, particularly as it illustrates the Bureau's domination over the Interior Department, suggests the need for asking Congress to amend the Bonneville Act to make the Bonneville Power Administration a business-type, power wholesaling corporation independent of the Interior Department.

We also think the Army should build Hells Canyon Dam.

MY DEAR MR. NORTHROP: I have recommended to the President that the Federal budget for fiscal year 1952 include a request for authority and funds for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of a 230,000-volt electric transmission line, which will connect the Bureau's Shasta project in California with the Columbia River Power System.

I call this matter to your attention pursuant to my conversations with you in Everett, Wash., on March 29, 1950. You will recall on that occasion we discussed the matter of this interconnection in some detail. At that time I told you that it was not my intention to seek authority for this intertie in the immediate future, and that I would communicate to you promptly any change of policy in this regard.

During the past few months international developments have made it necessary to reconsider this matter in the light of our rapidly developing defense requirements. Accordingly, the Defense Power Administration, which has been established within the Interior Department, has made a careful study of the Oregon-California interconnection, and has certified it as essential to the defense power program. The President is recommending authorization by the Congress as a defense measure.

The Oregon-California interconnection will provide relief to the serious power shortage that exists, and will continue for some time to exist, in the Pacific Northwest. This area will have important defense industries dependent, to the extent of approximately 300,000 kilowatts, upon interruptible power. In order to advance the production of aluminum, magnesium, and other metals and chemicals, including additional aluminum plant capacity scheduled for the region, the interruptible power supplies should be made firm as rapidly as possible, and additional firm power supplies should be provided. The Oregon-California interconnection will make substantial contributions to these objectives.

Specifically, the Northwest power pool will gain 200,000,000 to 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours for a 6 months' low-water period through the flow of steam energy from California, to be delivered over the Oregon-California interconnection. On a 12 months' basis, the kilowatt capacity to the Northwest will be increased on the order of 100,000 kilowatts. There will be gains of similar magnitude in the California area through the displacement of oil-fired steam generation by unusable excess hydro from the Columbia River system. There will be a still further gain in revenues accruing to the Federal Government from the sale of energy which otherwise would be unsold.

These are benefits which cannot be overlooked from a defense standpoint. Without them possible curtailment of power deliveries in the Pacific Northwest could be much more drastic than otherwise would be necessary.

As you know, I have been fully conscious of the concern which some interests in the Northwest have felt relative to the policy implications arising from the construction of this line. However, I believe pending defense power-load developments in the region should provide a basis for considerable reassurance.

I shall be pleased to have any comments or suggestions you may have to offer on this matter.

Sincerely,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

PRESIDENT NORTHROP DRAFTS NWPPA REPLY ON INTERTIE

MY DEAR SECRETARY CHAPMAN: I very much appreciate your January 4 letter, in which you indicate that the Defense Power Administration and the President have made a determination that a 230,000-volt intertie between the Columbia River Power System and the Shasta project is essential to the national defense.

On this subject I have noted (1) the Federal Power Commission report dated February 1950; (2) the address of Mr. William Dittmer, of the Bonneville Power Administration at the Eugene meeting of the BPA Advisory Council on April 29, 1948; (3) the address of Mr. Ben Creim, then Regional Power Manager, United States Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, at the Port Angeles convention of the Northwest Public Power Association on August 12, 1948; and (4) the address of Mr. Holland H. Houston, engineer for the Public Service Commission of the State of Washington, at that same convention and as later published in the November 1948 issue of Electrical West.

On the basis of this information there would appear to be an appreciable hydrological and electrical load diversity between the central California power system and the Northwest power pool. However, it is also appreciated that the load centers of the two power systems are separated by great distances, and that these diversities, appreciable as they appear today, will be considerably less in the future as there is a leveling off of the differences between power resources and loads within each power system.

Four factors appear to be in operation to reduce the present diversities: (1) As the central California system becomes more dependent on steam generation, the hazard of a dry year will diminish; (2) it is apparent the winter peak and energy loads in central California are rapidly overtaking the traditional summer peak caused by irrigation pumping; (3) as the Pacific Northwest adds upstream reservoir storage, the seriousness of a low-water year will lessen; and (4) the growth of Northwest irrigation loads and interruptible industrial loads will reduce summer surplus energy. I am not in the best position to fully evaluate the effects of these factors in reducing the diversities between the two regions on the economic feasibility of an intertie or on what might be the proper period for amortizing the cost of the new facilities.

In thinking how best to define the relationships which would be involved in interregional power transfers, I would like to submit the following principle as a premise: Just as there have developed in each river basin certain riparian rights and a right to the consumptive use of water, and just as such use of water within each region has become recognized as being the best use in the national interest, so also the rights of each region to prior use of its power must be regarded as the proper index of how such power can best be used in the national interest. Thus, the regional and national interests are identical.

In order to provide reasonable protection to the Pacific Northwest in regard to its greatest resource, namely, low-cost power, I trust that those who draft the necessary enabling legislation will give consideration to the following:

1. That this line shall not be authorized without prior establishment of at least the governing principles and policies which will apply to power transactions and financial accounting for benefits and obligations.

2. That no power shall be exported from either region if that power can be used within the region in which it was generated, and in any case that no prime power be exported.

3. That power scheduling shall be on a day to day basis only, and that any contracts entered into which may depend on imported power shall provide that the prower is interruptible.

4. That exported Northwest power shall be priced at the California boundary on the basis of the market value at the point of consumption in California less allowance for line losses and carrying charges on the facilities in California. Under present power marketing conditions, Northwest power shall be considered worth not less than two and one-half (2.5) mills per kilowatt-hour at the California boundary.

In stating the position of the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Ben Creim, in his August 12, 1948, Port Angeles address, gave as one of the purposes of the Oregon-California intertie "an improvement in the basic feasibility of the very necessary Central Valley Project (the repayment schedule for which was predicated on oil at a dollar a barrel)."

I would like to state as a matter of record that the Northwest Public Power Association, through resolution of its Board of Trustees, does not subscribe to the use of power revenues for subsidizing irrigation. Rather

our view, like that of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, is that the full benefits from the power resources of a region shall accrue to the power users of that region.

The Federal Power Commission report on the intertie states: "Under normal conditions, the transfer of firm power from California to the Pacific Northwest would not be economic, owing to the relative high cost of hydro power with its steam support in California. It was concluded, therefore, that only secondary or steam-replacement power should be considered in this study." From this statement it would appear that instead of delivering steam generated energy from California to the Northwest as you propose it would be more advantageous to build a steam plan near the Northwest load center, which could be assumed to be the lower Columbia River area. Thus there would be saved the higher costs due to transmission capital outlay and large energy losses, and the use of critical materials required in the construction of transmission facilities. A steam plant near a load center is a valuable factor in furnishing continuity of service as well as eliminating much of the cost of transmission. It is my belief that a steam plant can be built in approximately the same length of time that is required to construct an industrial plant which would be engaged in the production of materials and equipment needed for war purposes.

Before making final plans for construction of the intertie, which would use scarce materials and manpower, there should be full explanation of how delivery of energy and payment for the same will be handled. The Bureau of Reclamation has no steam generation plants, therefore it must be assumed that the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. will furnish energy to a California power pool. The company must first state that it can and will supply energy, and second that the price will be equal or less than the cost of steam energy at the Northwest load center.

I understand that the Shasta Dam reservoir has never been full. This would indicate the Bureau does not have any, or at least very little, hydro which it could spare.

In considering the possibility of sending 200,000,000 to 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours over a 6-month low-water period to the Northwest from California, I am reminded, for comparison, that our small electric system of Eugene sold in 1950 to its general retail customers the total of 208,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Mr. Holland H. Houston points out in his address, that, at the historical rate of increase in use of power the optimistic hydro potential of the Northwest will be exhausted by the year 1972. When it is considered that two decades is a short time in the life of the Northwest, and that it takes from 4 to 6 years' time to build a major hydro plant, it is not to be wondered that the people of the Northwest are concerned about their most important resource. Long before the year 1972, consideration must be given to preparing for dry years through the building of steam plants. Should not now be the time to build a steam plant in a Northwest load center?

If the full benefit of the intertie could be assured to the power users of the respective regions on a fair and understanding basis, there would undoubtedly be greater support for the advantages which this interconnection might give, and there would be less opposition because of fears in the minds of Northwest people that some of their most valuable resource, low-cost power, would be lost to the region.

I thank you for the opportunity of commenting on your proposals and explanations.

Respectfully yours,

F. Ross Norrance,
President, Northwest Public Power Association.

JANUARY 19, 1951.

There Should Be One Basic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Carroll County Independent, published in Center Ossipee, N. H., Friday, February 2, 1951, entitled "There Should Be One Basic Policy":

THERE SHOULD BE ONE BASIC POLICY

There is more argument and uncertainty about the present draft laws and status of men subject or not subject to draft than perhaps any one phase of our current rearmament program.

Students in high schools and colleges do not know whether to wait to be called, or to volunteer now and pick the branch of the service they want. Brilliant students headed for medical, dental or scientific schools do not know if they can secure deferment. Educators say that 18-year-olds should or should not be drafted. Farmers want exemption for their sons and manufacturers want exemptions for certain skilled men.

Before there is any talk about exemptions there should be one basic policy, that a man on becoming 18 years of age, or graduating from high school or academy, whichever comes last, owes 18, 21 months, or 2 years service to his nation. No man should be allowed to spend more than 5 years in high school or academy, to complete the work, the reason being obvious.

With the basic principle accepted, then it will be time enough to talk about exemptions. It might be well to exempt the top 5 percent, or top 10 percent of men of high mental capacity who are going to medical, dental, and scientific schools. The Nation can allow no gap in the classes of men coming from these schools. They are absolutely necessary for national defense. Obviously such men would be subject to a 2-year draft as soon as they receive their diplomas and be assigned to such duties where they will make their talents most valuable.

We cannot hope to meet the Russians or the Chinese on a man to man basis. There are just too many of them. Even if our men could meet and defeat them when outnumbered 3 to 1, they would still win, for they can feed riflemen into the lines indefinitely.

To hold the Russians and the Chinese by power politics, or by actual combat, we must overmatch them with technical ability. That is, our superior machines and fewer men must hold their ordinary machine and greater number of men.

One swift way to national suicide is to take young men who promise to be outstanding physicists, mathematicians, chemists, and electricians and put them into the ranks.

Some may see that this is class legislation. It is not. Brains just do not care where they are born, or in what class of society or in what race. Handsome is as handsome does. It is impossible to take a student and say to him, you are going to be a specialist in electronics. The man has to be born with certain mathematical ability and a natural liking for figures and formulas.

But before anything else is done, the Nation should accept a basic draft policy. In every war we have been handicapped by drafting and attempting to train men by hurry-up methods.

There is no substitute for slow thorough steady training, done in an unhurried manner.

If we had had such a policy of universal military training, begun in 1912 and carried through to date, it is almost certain the First and Second World Wars would never have been fought. Now it is quite possible that we are headed straight for the third world war, all because of lack of such a policy, carried through on a long time, permanent basis.

Veterans' Administration Hospital at Deshon, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Deshon Hospital Takes it on the Chin," published in the Butler Eagle of February 2.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DESHON HOSPITAL TAKES IT ON THE CHIN

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, in filing a protest with General Gray, VA Administrator, against closing the medical and surgical portions of Butler's Deshon Hospital, takes the position that this hospital facility is needed now more than ever.

He has asked for a complete report, inquiring how the action can be justified.

Senator MARTIN recalled that when the State sought to acquire the hospital, the Veterans' Administration resisted at every step.

Deshon, under present orders, is to be reduced from an 855-bed hospital to 500-bed capacity for tuberculosis patients only.

Butler's Deshon Hospital is the only hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration for the treatment of tuberculosis in the three States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

Within 90 days, more than 200 patients must be transferred to Aspinwall and Erie, with a 50-percent reduction in the hospital staff.

It is difficult to understand the reason for the unexpected ruling.

Why was it necessary to launch construction of two huge VA hospitals in Pittsburgh to cost many millions of dollars when Deshon could easily have been enlarged?

Could this be politics?

Everywhere, you are told, veteran hospitals are crowded to capacity, but it turns out that 100 beds are vacant at Butler and 200 beds are unused at Aspinwall.

We understand Butler's Deshon never was filled to capacity since it was taken over by the Veterans' Administration a number of years ago.

"It seems absurd to be spending millions of dollars for additional bed capacity when the Butler hospital is available," Senator MARTIN said.

What Senator MARTIN said makes sense to us.

Ever since Butler's institution was built at a cost of several millions, it has been kicked around, first by the State, then by the Army, and finally by the Veterans' Administration.

Jesus, Prince of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the sermon of Rev. James W. Fifield, Jr., minister of the First Congregational Church, of Los Angeles, which he delivered on December 3, 1950:

JESUS, PRINCE OF PEACE

This sermon has been rankling within me for a long time. Last Friday a widow whose 19-year-old son has presumably been killed in Korea, telephoned me expressing shock, sadness, and also bitterness. When she said, "There is nothing much that I can do but bear my sorrow, for no one will listen to anything I can say," I resolved to be her spokesman. I think her bitterness is justified. Our casualties in Korea already are the third largest of any war in our history.

The day in which Jesus walked the earth as the Prince of Peace was not unlike our own. He indicated people must live together in order to live at all. Palestine had actually been fertilized by its best blood. The Assyrians and Babylonians had recurrently come from the north, the Egyptians from the south, and finally the Romans had made their conquest of Palestine. For generations there had been armistice after armistice but no peace.

Americans have been stunned by the developments within our country and the world during these past years. A friend of mine said two wrestlers banged their heads together so hard that they fell down senseless. The first one to come to and get up, jumped on the other, and won the bout. Our people, like those wrestlers, have been stunned. We hope that they will wake up before our mortal enemy pounces upon them.

We have not wanted to believe that there was betrayal in high places for we have always kept a halo around certain offices in our country. Even when we disliked things that were happening and were suspicious of things we saw, we were unwilling to "throw mud" because of patriotic devotion.

Here's a letter from a man who has just gone back into the Army after 3 years of civilian life. He comments that it is an "unrecognizable Army." He says that they have nothing to fight a war with and no will to fight one anyway. In my contacts with personnel at Army installations, I have heard young lads inquire, "What are we going to fight for?" They feel it is unfair to send them out to fight without adequate preparation to win another victory when the splendid victory so heroically won in World War II has been literally thrown away. Their question, "What would we fight for?" is not easy to answer. If there were clear and righteous issues and honorable, competent leadership, all would be ready to make whatever sacrifices were required and eagerly.

There is deepening anxiety everywhere and especially among more thoughtful people. War budgets are expanding. Matériel and personnel are being drafted. New appropriations are being rushed. The use of atom bombs is being considered. The crisis comes nearer each passing day and our Nation, having been unprincipled in its policies, must now reap as it sowed, according to the teachings of Jesus and the laws of God.

We encouraged Russia's dream of world-domination. At Yalta and other conferences, our leaders betrayed us, sold us out, insisted that Stalin take even more than he had dared request, incredulous as that seems. We do not yet know the extent of our commitments because our State Department has resorted to secret diplomacy. We implemented Russia's visions with money and matériel, as well as by the betrayal of our allies in her behalf. Our betrayal of China and of European nations now behind the Iron Curtain is one of the blackest pages in American history. In South America, Europe, and the Orient, we have tried to purchase power, friendship, and good will with money, ignoring the Christian precept that spiritual values cannot be bought with money. Tasting power, we have made commitments which we cannot possibly keep. "The chickens are just beginning to come home to roost." Korea is only the first of our pledges calling for redemption. Other commitments made by our officials represent betrayals of a rank and desperate sort.

We have used the United Nations as a screen, just as England and France used the old League of Nations. The League was conceived by idealists with the finest of motives but, alas, it was doomed through misuse. No doubt, the originators of the United Nations included many noble idealists. But Alger Hiss and others, who are at least suspect, implemented the vision in ways which caused the United Nations to hamstring the free world. It is not right for those guilty of treason or suspect to be out on bail when our boys are being killed in Korea.

Some of you still believe in the United Nations. I respect the sincerity of your belief but do not share it. Use your own judgment concerning the United Nations. We dare not be unrealistic or impractically idealistic in such matters when our boys are dying in Korea.

There are only two real powers in the world today—the United States and Russia. The other allies do not really count in determination of major issues. The United Nations is what America wills it to be. It is certainly true that the United Nations would not move contrary to America's will, because America's withdrawal would mean its total collapse. In practical effect it is the United States and Russia that are fighting in Korea.

While we have been engaged in this international debacle the moral and spiritual altitude in our Nation has dropped to a new low, in part because of the example of the Federal Government. The mass corruption of the population is the fault of pressure groups, unscrupulous politicians, and boss rule. Many in this congregation today stoop to things they would not have done a year or two years ago. Business ethics, social ethics, personal ethics are often gutter level, as reflected by comic sheets, gangster movies, radio programs, magazine articles, etc. It is probable that American morals are at the lowest level in our Nation's history, including the carpetbagger era at the close of the Civil War.

Many of the things which I am saying you have been thinking but have not said, because, stunned, like the wrestlers, you hoped they were not true or because you did not wish to offend. Perhaps you trusted our leaders because you or your relatives are on Government payrolls or receiving subsidies. Many have become unspeakably beholden to our Government.

This situation is so serious that there is no easy solution. However, the situation is not hopeless, and with courageous action and God's help, our Nation and our civilization can yet be redeemed. The pattern for redemption and for effective, practical action is as follows:

(1) First, repentance for past sins and errors. The starting point to forgiveness and redemption is repentance. There is no other starting point. This is no time for arrogance in high places or low. We need to admit the folly of our ways, and to repudiate leaders who have betrayed us and our Allies, whether knowingly or in ignorance. We cannot have too much sentiment about leaders in Washington when our youth are being killed in Korea.

(2) We must clean out our own fifth column. In Government this means that every person, either guilty or even suspect, should be summarily and immediately eliminated. This includes those who profess a so-called socialism which is veiled communism. But we must, also, eliminate those guilty and suspect of communism in our trade unions, our schools, our colleges, our newspapers, our magazines, our business organizations and even our church officiaries. We must ready ourselves for a finish fight—the stake being survival.

(3) We must aid every responsible nation that fights communism regardless of whether there is any other point of agreement in culture or religion or politics. We need every ally on which we can count in this great moral struggle.

(4) We must find ways and means to enlist anti-Communists behind the iron curtain and make them effective as rebels, arming them and directing them. This may be one of the most important steps which can be taken.

(5) We must break relations with Russia. We should never have recognized her present regime. We must, also, break relations with her satellites and drive out all Russian agents and agents of all satellite nations from our country. We must stop shipping matériel to Russia or to any satellite nation or to any other nation which will not give solemn assurance that it will not reach Russia or a satellite of Russia.

(6) We must eliminate Russia from the United Nations. If that cannot be done, then the United States must withdraw from the United Nations, and promptly. We must stop the daily insults and intrigues which emerge from hostile, plotting, scheming, dangerous delegates and hangers-on at the United Nations.

(7) We must require all our allies to take the same steps, terminating their associations with those whom we plainly label as our enemies. The resources of the United States cannot continue to support enemies or even neutrals. They must be used only for ourselves or for our allies in this great conflict.

It is not easy to speak thus of the United Nations. Sufficient to say that if those who set up this organization conspired to make it a handicap for world peace, they have succeeded too well.

Our so-called bypartisan foreign policy has been no foreign policy at all. Stalin is the foulest dictator and anti-Christ of all recorded history. He has been responsible for the murder of more than 15,000,000 persons. It is asserted on presumably responsible authority, that the Communists, who are now mopping up in China, are murdering ten thousand a day, so that Mao Tse tung, although second to Stalin as a murderer, is daily increasing his score. Until recently our Government's official position was that the Communists in China were not Communists at all; that they had no relationship to the Kremlin in Russia, and that they were only agrarian reformers. During the last 18 months, the policy of our State Department has been to let the dust settle, and it has settled all over us. It is the Chinese Communists, directed by Moscow, that are killing American soldiers in Korea.

If, as Gen. Omar Bradley states, all our Armed Forces are presently engaged in Korea where we are suffering serious reverses, then it is fair to say that the victory of World War II, achieved by the devotion of our fighting men, has been utterly thrown away. The billions spent for armament, etc., have been wasted and our huge debt has bought only destruction of American honor and ideals plus concentration of power in

unworthy bureaus and persons. This is betrayal. Critical and extreme as the words sound, it is fair to say that this Nation which, under God, had a special place of privilege and responsibility in the sun, has sold its glorious birthright for a mess of pottage and the pottage smells.

This crisis has been as much, or more, our making as Russia's. Indeed, Russia could not have done what she has to develop it without our active cooperation and even our leaders' prodding. There have not only been international blunders, but immoral sins against God which call for penitence and contrition. We must entreat God to forgive us for failing to meet our great responsibilities and opportunities as a Nation and must remember that we, individually, constitute our Nation. All the blame for its mistakes cannot be put on its leaders. The process of redemption, therefore, must start in us with positive and affirmative action. Each of us must vow to do and think and say only that which is wholly true and honorable without any compromise or any exception. We need to listen again to the voice of conscience illuminated by the teachings of Jesus concerning the laws of God. The time for wishful thinking is past. There must be an end to all shades of gray. Things must be black and white—not right or left but right or wrong.

We must respiritualize our family life and our home relationships. After that we must realine our relationships with individuals and organizations, revitalizing our devotion to the good and severing all other relations. What I am proposing is a herculean task, but it might save civilization. Nothing less will. Unless courageous, moral, and spiritual action of a sort which will secure the help of God is taken, we shall drift on and on along the road to Communist world domination in which life will become mere existence, in which God will be banished, or damned, and in which dark ages will again be the lot of humanity. By next May a billion two hundred million souls, more than half the people of this planet, will probably be within the orbit of Communist control. This need not be. We should not be defeatist. We cannot give up the future of our children and grandchildren to such a despicable outlook. God forbid—no, not God forbid. We must not put the responsibility for this upon God. Rather, let us, with God's help forbid and prevent this terrible tragedy.

It is time for the American people who, like the wrestlers have been stunned beyond expression, who have felt the very things they were seeing couldn't be true, who have been betrayed; to wake up, get right with God, and, realistically, face the situation. However well we have been doing, it has not been well enough for the forces of good and of God are losing ground daily in the world. Each of you must do better and at once. I shall endeavor to do better, too. This sermon is an earnest effort to help sound the alarm. I hope you will quote it widely, but accurately.

"If this be treason, then make the most of it." Let us pray.

Address of President Truman at Dedication of Chapel of the Four Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Truman at the dedication of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains, reprinted from the New York Times of February 4, 1951:

This chapel commemorates something more than an act of bravery or courage. It commemorates a great act of faith in God.

The four chaplains in whose memory this shrine was built were not required to give their lives as they did. They gave their lives without being asked. When their ship was sinking, they handed out all the life preservers that were available and then took off their own and gave them away in order that four other men might be saved.

Those four chaplains actually carried out the moral code which we are all supposed to live by. They obeyed the Divine Commandment that men should love one another. They really lived up to the moral standard that declares:

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

CONQUERED DEATH BY FAITH

They were not afraid of death because they knew that the word of God is stronger than death. Their belief, their faith, in His word enabled them to conquer death.

This is an old faith in our country. It is shared by all our churches and all our denominations. These four men represented the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jewish beliefs. Each of these beliefs teaches that obedience to God and love for one's fellow man are the greatest and strongest things in the world.

We must never forget that this country was founded by men who came to these shores to worship God as they pleased. Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, all came here for this great purpose.

They did not come here to do as they pleased, but to worship God as they pleased, and that is an important distinction.

The unity of our country comes from this fact. The unity of our country is a unity under God. It is a unity in freedom, for the service of God is the perfect freedom.

If we remember our faith in God, if we live by it as our forefathers did, we need have no fear for the future.

Today many people have become fearful. If we reaffirm our common faith we can overcome these fears.

This does not mean that we can always be sure what the future will bring. We cannot always know what the outcome of events will be. As President Lincoln once said:

"The Almighty has His own purposes."

But we need not be afraid of the outcome if we go on trying to do the right thing as God gives us to see the right.

That is what we are trying to do in the world today. We are trying to establish world peace, so that all men can live together in brotherhood and in freedom. And to do that, we are working with other nations to create the rule of law in the world.

What does this rule of law mean? Let me give you an example. In the early days of our western frontier, law and order were not yet established. Disputes were settled in favor of the man who was quickest on the draw. Outlaws terrorized whole communities.

Men who wanted to see law and order prevail had to combine against the outlaws. They had to arm themselves. At times they had to fight. After they had put down lawless violence, the courts took over and justice was established. And then it was possible for all citizens to get on with the important work of building up their own communities, paving the streets and building new schools, and giving all people a chance at the right kind of life.

This is just what we are trying to do today in the international field. If we can put a stop to international aggression, order can be established and the people of the world can go ahead full speed with the constructive tasks of peace.

We are not trying to do this job by ourselves. We could not do it by ourselves if we tried. We are acting as one member of a whole community of nations dedicated to the concept of the rule of law in the world. As in all other communities, the members of this community of nations have many different ideas and interests and do not all speak with one voice. Some are cautious and some are impatient.

We cannot always have our own way in this community. But we have a tremendous responsibility to lead and not to hang back.

Fate has made this country a leader in the world. We shirked our responsibility in the 1920's. We cannot shirk it now. We must assume that responsibility now, and it will take everything we have—all the brains and all the resources that we can mobilize.

Leadership carries with it heavy responsibilities. Good leaders do not threaten to quit if things go wrong. They expect cooperation, of course, and they expect everyone to do his share, but they do not stop to measure sacrifices with a teaspoon while the fight is on.

We cannot lead the forces of freedom from behind.

The job we face is a hard one. Perhaps it will be harder in the few years immediately ahead than it will be in the years thereafter. If we can get over the present crisis successfully—if we can restrain aggression before it bursts out into another world war, then things will be easier in the future. And I think we can do this. We can't be sure, of course, but there is good reason to hope for success.

In recent months, the United Nations has been faced by a serious challenge. But it is meeting that challenge courageously, and it is still man's best hope of establishing the rule of law in the world.

NOTES EISENHOWER REPORT

General Eisenhower has brought home the report that the people of Europe, in spite of their difficulties and their many problems, want to preserve their freedom. He has told us of the effort they are making. They are working very hard, and if we all work together, we can be successful.

When things look hard, there are always a lot of people who want to quit. We had people like that in the Revolutionary War, and we have had them in every war and every crisis of our history. Thomas Paine called them the summer soldiers and sunshine patriots. If we had listened to them, we would never have been a free and independent nation. We would never have had a strong and prosperous country. We would not be strong enough now to stand up against Communist aggression and tyranny.

The sacrifices that are being made today by the men and women of this country are not being made in vain. Our men are in Korea because we are trying to prevent a world-wide war. The men who have died in Korea have died to save us from the terrible slaughter and destruction which another world war would surely bring.

Their sacrifices are being made in the spirit of the four chaplains to whose memory this chapel is dedicated. They are being made in defense of the great religious faiths which make this chapel a place of worship. These sacrifices are being made for the greatest things in this life, and for the things beyond this life.

I have faith that the great principles for which our men are fighting will prevail.

Rayburn's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Raleigh News and Observer:

RAYBURN'S RECORD

SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, has just passed the tenure record for a Speaker of the House of Representatives of 8 years plus, set a century ago by Henry Clay, of Kentucky.

There is more to the Rayburn record than mere length of tenure. As Speaker he has a dual responsibility, to serve as the impartial presiding officer for the whole House and, at the same time, furnish effective leadership for his own party in a body where controversies sometimes become bitter.

These two functions are difficult to combine without neglecting one at the expense of the other. SAM RAYBURN has never failed to measure up to both responsibilities. The House may have had better presiding officers and the Democratic Party may have had a better leader, although no names come to mind readily in either category. But the House has never had a Speaker more highly regarded by both his own party and the opposing party, and it will be a long time, if ever, before it does.

The country hopes that Mr. Speaker RAYBURN will remain in his present post for a long time to come.

Education in Literature, Art, and Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill today to authorize the Commissioner of Education to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities.

One of the purposes of general education should be understood in terms of performance, of behavior, not in terms of mastering particular bodies of knowledge. It is the task of general education to provide the kinds of learning and experience that will enable the student to attain certain basic outcomes, among them the following: To understand and enjoy literature, art, music, and other cultural activities as expressions of personal and social experience, and to participate to some extent in some form of creative activity.

It can scarcely be necessary to urge the importance of literature in the program of general education. Man's consuming interest is in man, and in this interest literature can serve. By means of great novels, poems, plays, and essays one can participate vicariously in many events that one's own life does not encompass, and so can gain as in no other way imaginative insight into the emotions, drives, and aspirations of one's fellow men.

Literature sets forth both the heights and the depths that man can reach. It is an avenue of communication with the great minds and the great souls of yesterday and of today. It can do as much as any other single form of experience to broaden and deepen the perceptions and sympathies of the individual.

This consequence does not, however, follow from the study of details of literary history, literary biography, literary techniques, or any other of the accompaniments to literature that make up specialization in the subject. The contribution of literature to insight and emotional maturity will come from one's own reading of the world's literary treasures, and from reflection upon them.

The world's literary treasures are not those of the West alone. They include the great intellectual statements of men everywhere and in all ages. There is probably no better way of promoting the intellectual and spiritual unity of mankind than through free trade in enduring literary expressions.

And in the graphic and plastic arts, too, man has recorded much of his thought and feeling about life through color, form, and sound. A signal defect in much of American education, and in American culture, is its failure to recognize that music, painting, sculpture, the dance, the drama, and others of the arts are authentic statements of experience.

One of the tasks of American democracy is to heighten and diffuse esthetic sensibility and good taste, to make our people sensitive to beauty in all its varied forms; in the commodities and services of everyday life, in private and public buildings, in community and regional planning.

The study of the arts in general education should not be directed toward the development of creative artists of exceptional gifts, though it may in some instances lead to this. It should aim at appreciation of the arts as forms of human expression, at awakening or intensifying the student's sensitivity to beauty and his desire to create beauty in his everyday surroundings, at developing bases for discrimination and interpretation, at inducing sympathy with arts and artists and active concern for their welfare. Support of the arts can no longer be left to the patronage of wealth; active encouragement of artistic expression in its various forms must become the responsibility of all citizens.

Before completing his general education, the student should acquire a measure of skill in at least one of the arts or crafts, in some form of musical expression or in dramatics. Participation in creative activity, even at a low level of proficiency, is one of the best means to understanding and appreciation of artistic expression.

Why Have Scientists Been a Weak Link Against Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, aside from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself, the function of full and free public discussion has been served by none of the American press so well as by the oldest of our business periodicals, the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, established in 1839. Dr. Melchior Palyi, an ably conservative contributor to the columns of that paper, has recently voiced a fear, shared by the conservative element in Congress, that the diplomacy of the Kremlin may be leading us into "history's greatest trap" in Europe.

That which seems to be most blinding in this danger, has been our own conceit over the discovery of a source of energy which does not utilize but rather explains the solar radiation that warms the surface of the earth. We have been at once paralyzed with fear and puffed with pride by the demagoguery of the scientists who devised and steered the Atomic Energy Act to passage (in the Senate without even a record vote), a state of affairs hardly conducive to sound public judgment at a time when well considered action is imperative and we must act, but not over-act.

"Our real problem," says some invited comment in the columns of the Chronicle, "is how to stop the war of attrition by other than military containment on the long Russian periphery where it will cost us so much more than it does the Soviet that it is we, not they, who could not sustain a long war, but would be caught in domestic disorder. Only then could a bombing coup de grace become good Soviet tactics. It is in this context that we cannot afford to sit tight. How can we change the context so that the Voice of America will spread itself at no expense at all just because it is the patent truth and not a meaningless jumble of 'facts' supposed to offset Soviet lies?"

If we are to avoid biting off more than we can chew, it would be well to listen to the relatively few scientists who see, as does the scientist-author of the recent best seller, "Science is a Sacred Cow," by Dr. Anthony Standen, the distinct limitations upon the attainments of science. To bring this matter of the illusions of science before the Congress, I have obtained permission to quote further from Alden Potter's caustic but pertinent comment in the Chronicle, as follows:

The danger of entrapment lies, indeed, in the element of truth, not in communism (or socialism), but in the hope to which the Kremlin can cling, of industrial disorder due to conditions of monetary instability, that is inflation. The Soviet system has by no means found a way to eliminate inflation, even in peace. It has, on the contrary, tried to meet its effects by much the same sort

of measures here threatened, summed up by President Truman as the "police state." By such means it has eliminated one of the greatest dangers in modern war, namely, lawlessness in labor strife, by eliminating strikes as measures of collective "bargaining." With this advantage—for war—their problem is to so manage as to compel us to face that danger before their similar inflationary situation can be made to collapse into anarchy by our tactics. Both systems are highly susceptible; but it is not enough that the pot should call the kettle black in either case. The winner will be that side which remodels the system to take it out of the scoty category of inflationary methods of finance. Before that can be accomplished it becomes necessary to rule out socialistic remedies, that is, the elimination of private property or "monopoly." This will have to be approached, not "experimentally"—history proves nothing; there is always the idea that the cure for socialistic failure is more socialism—but with the certainty of logic and reason.

The fact that revolution in economic theory is imperative has been so tersely stated in Price Control by F. R. J. Jervis that it deserves a quote: "It is painfully obvious that in economic matters the democracy is at present not merely uneducated, but miseducated; not merely, like the African bushman, unable to count above five, but dogmatically convinced that five is the sum of two and two." The fact is that neither laissez faire nor a socialist state has presented any evidence of being effective in dealing with this cultural lag in modern industrial society. By finding an actual solution for it, through submitting it to careful, open-minded study devoid of traditional predilections—the writer has attempted to promote such study in "When and How Do Figures Lie?" in the Chronicle for July 5, 1945—the justification for the Kremlin's cynical hopes and our own defeatism on this score would be swept aside and the whole morale of the intelligentsia who are primarily responsible for the utopian fallacies of socialism, could thus be shifted overnight to the side of capitalism—but not, indeed, to side with any such anarchistic laissez faire as is presented by the Marxian ideal of a fully "withered" state, or the similar Keynesian utopia of a decline in interest to zero when paradise arrives to facilitate savings ad libitum and so assure an adequate "capitalistic"—but in a profit- and interest-free "capitalism"—investment solution for all problems in life by removing poverty and inflated prices all at one fell swoop of unlimited supply to satisfy all demand.

This naive, money-free theory of price level is what the Soviet has attempted to validate; but it has failed so often and so largely that one may well suspect that the Politburo looks with cynical glee upon the American delusion that the way to global law and order is by such Point Four plenty and "perfect" competition as robs price of any meaning and retires a monetary-profit system of competitive trading to the limbo of a primitive past when everyone was a "chiseler" and science, "the endless frontier," was being frustrated by the profit motive from fulfilling its self-appointed mission as a sacred cow that could never be milked dry (and so permit inflation).

It is, indeed, their bitter-end resistance to any and all suggestions that Utopia is impossible, even to their sacred cow, that has made our scientists, seeking abundant Manhattan Projects as a way to abundance (at least for them and their Science Foundation) into convinced Socialists or even self-styled Communists. This latest pressure-group lobby offers, indeed, an abundance of everything except common sense and moral stamina. This was well demonstrated by Lord Stamp's retort to their "optimistic" view that only "The Frustration of Science" (a book by well-known British "liberal" scientists) by "monopoly capitalism" prevents the paradise they have prepared. But his advice went in one ear and out the other, leaving free play for an insufferable conceit and an ego so inflated in the atomic technician that he ignores plain proof that population can outstrip anything that technology can produce. * * * Gerald Wendt, editor of "Science Illustrated," has illustrated this utopian materialism (which with Bishop Oxnam puts the material cart before the moral horse by saying that law and order depend upon better living standards, or "belly before brain in brotherhood") by this fatuous assertion in a "Harper's" article: "In that mastery (of atomic energy) is lodged the one great hope for a decent standard of living everywhere."

Contrast this fools' paradise with the restraint expressed by the "Rockefeller Foundation Review" for 1948 (p. 26): "Inherent in our systematic efforts to promote the welfare of mankind there may be an assumption that by taking thought we may add a cubit to our stature. * * * Some such hope is implicit, if not explicit, in Socialist doctine, but it is implied also in the dominant attitudes of American society. 'Planning' and 'control' are the common coins of American politics, American business, American education, and American science, despite the concurrent emphasis upon liberty, individualism, and democracy. The bombastic phrase, 'control of nature,' is a byword of the literature of the day. Do we mean that because we have learned to navigate the tides we shall also control them? * * * Where do we think we shall stop—with the control of the speed of rotation of the earth, of its revolution about the sun? Shall we also learn to control the chain reaction in the sun whence comes all our life and power? Pride goeth before a fall. All our efforts will promote only disaster if they are not done in the humility appropriate to our ignorance, never forgetting that we have not made the earth or the heavens above it."

The trouble is that organized science has developed no policy to see these differences through to a conclusion and then pursue that conclusion on into others even though these may tread on the toes of their sacred cow. It seems fair to charge that as a pressure group science abandoned its reverence for the truth and joined the demagogues when it produced the Bush report and lately the Gordon Gray report, to the President, presenting itself as an "endless frontier" capable of utopian service to mankind, even into the globaloney of Point Four, all of which is implicit in the bureaucratic paternalism of the UNO with its might-makes-right implications. That this would be no step toward world peace was foreseen clearly by the "Chronicle" on July 7, 1945, when it said editorially: "Neither agreements reached at San Francisco nor mechanisms there devised will have much bearing on the course of world affairs or in the maintenance of world peace."

It has proved worse than that; what we have taken into our gates is a Trojan horse in war. A scientific utopia and freedom from want was its outer framework—its false pretense. It was science that set the stage for all this—for the naively generous appeasements at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and the disbandment of our armies and substitution of ECA. It is science that owes, not us alone, but humanity (including especially that segment in Korea), not merely its apologies, but a reversal of Modern Materialism (see "Philosophy for the Future," Macmillan, 1949, the American counterpart of Britain's "Frustration of Science") so as to point out the truth that the "cultural lag" is a moral, not a material, lag in general welfare.

It is not enough that the communistic personnel which organized UNESCO under Julian Huxley (specifically in the case of Dr. Joseph Needham, original head of the science section) is now out of control. The utopian materialism—communistic paternalism—implicit in the bureaucracy of the UNO, must be fully recanted. Then, and then only, need we no longer fear that the Kremlin can wage a successful cold war by boring from within and taking advantage of the naive scientism which sells itself down the river before it betrays democracy for no reason but its welfare-state "ideals" that are grounded in falsehood and hypocrisy. The world is finding socialism to be a flop. Only our own scientific utopians are preserving it as the nidus of subversive revolutions to be appeased and as something to fight about while glorifying the same utopians for their patriotic (and profitable) provision of the weapons of mass destruction.

The betrayal of truth penetrates beyond our own national welfare and prevents the moral and intellectual atmosphere necessary to worldwide understanding and peace through law and order, that is, through what ultimately must be a world government and not a nationalistic federation like the UNO to adjust imperialist disputes, each by negotiations having no law but only the compromises of power politics to govern the outcome. In the final analysis, of ideology rather than of power, it is not in any isolated nationalism that we can sit tight or stand pat. A common denominator that does not rest on power politics, but on truth, is essential in the conduct of the uncompromising diplomacy of peace.

India and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "India and the United States," by Dean Carl B. Spaeth, of Stanford Law School, before the Los Angeles Bar Association, November 30, 1950, as published in the Los Angeles Daily Journal, December 2, 1950:

This is a report on a conference in which I participated in India during the month of October.

The Lucknow conference was held under the auspices of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The conference was concerned with nationalism in the Far East and, in particular, with the international consequences of that nationalism.

The countries represented included almost all of the independent nations of the Far East as well as Great Britain, Canada, France, and the United States. My colleagues around the table during the 2 weeks were Indians, Pakistani, Indonesians, and Japanese, as well as representatives from Ceylon, a spokesman for the Bao Dai regime of Indochina, and representatives of Australia and New Zealand. With the exception of the representative of Bao Dai, who spoke only French at the conference, and some of the Japanese delegation, all the participants had an excellent command of English. Neither the Soviet Union nor Communist China was represented.

The principal delegations were composed of representatives of business, and the professions, former government officials, and scholars who have devoted most of their lives to the study of far eastern affairs. No votes were taken and no resolutions were adopted. The Institute of Pacific Relations is privately supported by the great educational foundations, by individuals, and by business concerns. As an organization the institute takes no policy position on the problems with which its members are concerned. Free of protocol and the limitations that often compel reserve by government spokesmen, there was a full and healthy exchange of views.

Ray Lyman Wilbur was the first president of the institute (began in 1925). It was Dr. Wilbur's view that, in unofficial conferences of representatives from all the Pacific countries, there would be a frank facing up to the truth disagreeable though it may be.

I hope that my report of my recent experience will give you an idea of the way in which some of the people of the Far East look at you and at me, at America, today—disagreeable though it may be.

My remarks are directed in large measure to relations between India and the United States because the discussions in which I participated were concerned with these relations.

Moreover, following the conference, the dean of the law school at Lucknow, aware that during the meetings I had seen only the relatively comfortable surroundings of a westernized hotel, a leading Indian university, and one of India's more fortunate urban communities, insisted that I join him on a visit to some of the villages that, in his phrase, "Are India." This we did in the vicinity of Benares, the shrine city on the Ganges.

I have seen poverty and disease the worst of it in parts of central and South Africa, but the worst in those areas was relatively well-being compared with the existence of the peasants, the physically ill villagers and the millions of the great cities of India. We went into tiny mud huts completely without sanitation facilities, where three or four families live huddled in the most sickening conditions. We went, as well, into the fields where the oxen, the wooden plow, a primitive system of irrigation, and workers at a wage of 4 cents plus 1 pound of grain per day, farm as their people have done for hundreds of years. After my trip to the villages had been followed by days in the worst of Benares and Calcutta, much of what had been said by Indian colleagues during the 2 weeks at Lucknow became meaningful.

In my limited time today, I shall discuss Indian-American relations by stating first the essence of the Indian position as my colleagues and I understood it at Lucknow, proceeding from there to an analysis of that position and finally to the recommendations I would make, if I were called upon to suggest the lines of a policy for the United States today.

One statement must precede my summary of Indian position. There is no doubt as to the depth of the distrust and suspicion of the western intention, the western purpose in the Far East. Today this means suspicion and doubt concerning the purpose and objective of the United States. Moreover—and this I would have you remember even though you forget everything else that I say—the important fact is not that the Indians and their neighbors may be wrong about us. The important fact for us is that they hold these views. We will miscalculate seriously if, because we believe they are wrong, we ignore their doubts and the strength of their convictions concerning us.

For the next few minutes, in the role of a spokesman for the Far East, I would like to speak to you Americans in the manner in which some of my Indian friends spoke to us during the Conference. This will be an effort to give you the essentials of the Indian challenge—the Indian question—to us.

"In both official and private statements by your western leaders there is frequent recognition of the movement for independence and of the spirit of revolution that have swept the Far East. But we of the west question seriously whether in the calculations and judgments of your western peoples and governments this recognition is given substantial practical effect. We feel that your judgments and your attitudes toward us are not significantly affected by the knowledge which you claim to have concerning our struggle for independence.

"This may be due to your failure to appreciate the scope and the depth of our revolution against the west. This revolution has been more than a struggle for political independence, whether in China, in its fight against western intervention by special treaties and concessions, or in Indonesia, or in India, in Pakistan, or Indochina. It has been a revolution against foreign political control. But it has been more than that. It is, as well, a social and economic revolution by people with a deep sense of their poverty and misery. Moreover, as one of your own scholars has expressed it, our struggle has been a 'racial revolt, a revolt of the east against the west, a determination that the destinies of Asia shall be decided by Asians, that the new nations of the east will be ends in themselves, not means to western ends.' It is this determination that affects our judgment and reaction to every deed, every proposal, of the west. We fear and will resist every action which, in using us to promote western ends, operates to restore the power and domination from which we have so recently been liberated.

"If you understand this, you will also begin to understand our determination not to be used as means or tools for the west in its struggle against the Soviet Union. We suspect that your interest in us springs not from a desire to help us and our people, but from your need to gain allies in your struggle against your enemy. It is in this context that we judge your apparently permanent occupation of Japan, your string of bases along the Asiatic periphery, your opposition to the Chinese Revolution, your defense of Formosa, your support for the French and Bao Dai. These actions are part of the struggle of the west against the Soviet Union; they are not actions that have been undertaken out of regard for the Asian view of the best interests of Asia.

"You, of course, claim that you are defending us against a common enemy, but this overlooks that Western Europe, with which you are now allied, has long been the enemy, and that each step which you claim to take in our defense now appears also to be one more step toward the restoration of western control, this time under the leadership of the most powerful Nation in the world.

"To declare that we refuse to be pawns in the western plan is not to say that we are about to cast our lot with the Soviet Union. In India, Pakistan and elsewhere we have moved vigorously against Communist leaders who, there is little doubt, have received and acted upon directives from Moscow. As Asia becomes more important in the Soviet Union's world strategy, that nation may be tempted increasingly to interfere in our affairs. But as the Communists or any other group in India or elsewhere in the east subordinate national independence or the economic welfare of their own country to the interest of the Soviet Union their prestige and power among us will be weakened.

"The net effect of our resistance to outside domination from any source whatever, whether from the west or from the Soviet Union is the neutrality which you deplore.

"To say that we are neutral does not mean that we will not meet our commitments under the United Nations Charter to join in putting down aggression. It does mean that we distinguish between collective action by the United Nations under the charter and the day-in-and-day-out struggles of the cold war.

"We are not prepared to join in the cold war. Moreover, because we believe you underestimate the determination of Asiatic peoples to resist threats to their independence, we may, in the councils of the United Nations, urge a greater measure of restraint than will be acceptable to you. It was this that induced our reservations with regard to the decision of the United Nations to press on to the Manchurian border. The Korean peninsula has served as the classical corridor both for the extension of Russian and Chinese power into the Sea of Japan, and for the extension of Japanese power into Manchuria and China. The advance of the forces of MacArthur toward the Manchurian frontier, coming at a time when Japanese power is being revived under the American occupation, would, we of India believed, not only arouse China's fears but also increase her reliance on Soviet Russia. Our reservations may have been wrong. We considered that your calculations should include a careful weighing of such a consequence.

"With regard to communism as a form of government—distinguishing now between the imperialism of Moscow and communism as a method of dealing with social and economic problems—there are also important reasons why our attitude differs from yours. We would prefer a system of government which not only achieves a decent standard of living but does so by democratic means. The danger is that the exercise of this preference, this choice, may not be open to us. We fear that countries as poor as ours may not be able to afford what seem to be the high economic costs of western democratic methods.

"Certain it is that in our part of the world no doctrine can hold its own with communism unless it also gives first place to the needs of ordinary people. The Communist emphasis on economic security has a strong appeal to those who live close to the bread or the rice line. People in the rice line have less concern with political and spiritual values than do those who have economic security. Our sick, underfed, and illiterate people, and we their leaders, believe that the Soviet internal program and the experiment which is now under way in China may hold at least a part of the answer for countries as poor as ours.

"We are told that we have been misled by a myth of Soviet accomplishment in the past 30 years. If this is the case, we must point out that the information which brought the myth into being came largely from English and American writers during the years between the wars, and to an even greater extent from Anglo-American propaganda which, during World War II, unqualifiedly praised and described the accomplishments of their great ally, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"Of one thing we are certain. Our miserable lot today is not the product of communism. We can hardly be blamed, therefore, if we take more than a passing interest in a system which appears to have done so much in so short a time for great numbers of a backward people.

"We are aware that the west, and particularly the United States, is possessed of financial and engineering know-how, of equipment and capital, which could be of the greatest assistance to countries such as ours. But on numerous occasions since the end of World War II both your President and your Secretaries of State have declared that the major initiative in developing the backward areas of the world must be taken by private capital. The difficulty here is not only that your business people demand privileges and guaranties which we venture to believe they no longer enjoy in their own country but

they require what they call a climate for investment which would compel us to abandon programs to which our governments are firmly committed. As to government aid rather than private aid from the west, although there has been much publicity concerning the bold new point 4 program, the action of the American Congress does not encourage us to believe that there will be a follow through that will make it a truly bold program. Moreover, we have been made to understand, by the Marshall plan example in Europe, that any direct assistance from the United States would be conditioned upon our abandonment of neutrality.

"We assure you that in the resulting impasse we realize that there may be danger to both of our interests."

Much more could be said to spell out the details of the Indian position. I have given you its essentials. In giving a composite picture, I have necessarily left out statements of members of the Indian and other delegations who departed from the position of the majority. At one extreme, was the member of the Pakistan delegation who declared that he could best demonstrate the extent of Asian distrust of the west, by reporting his own conviction, and that of many of his people, that the United States would never have dropped the atomic bomb on a white people. At the other extreme, one very able Indian representative took issue throughout the conference with the views of his colleagues. He was outspoken in his criticism of the failure to appreciate the real character of the Soviet threat he deplored acceptance of what he described as the myth of Communist accomplishment, and he favored unqualified adherence to the position which western leadership has taken in the United Nations. But his was almost the only dissenting eastern voice to the position as I have stated it.

Of course, the eastern position not only induced rather sharp responses from spokesmen for the west, but made all of us feel, after about a week of patient submission that the time had come to tell our side of the story. It was at the beginning of the second week that one American delegate stated his own reaction in terms of a frustrating dilemma. He pointed out "that western aid is condemned as imperialism, lack of aid as isolationism; keeping troops in Asia as expansionism, keeping troops out of Asia as inviting aggression, political neutrality as helping reactionaries, support of progressive forces as intervention. We are damned if we do and damned if we don't."

It is not my intention to argue the rights and wrongs of the positions taken by India, Pakistan, and other eastern representatives.

I share the view expressed by one of our leading papers that in today's world the neutral course of India leads to bottomless difficulties and inconsistencies. But I also feel that our impatience with the neutrals of today may be a good illustration of the American habit of looking only forward and regarding both the recent and distant past as dead weight. As I have thought about the neutral position of India, I have recalled that it was only a little more than 10 years ago that we were the great leaders of a neutral bloc, neutral as we ultimately came to acknowledge between the forces of Nazi evil, the forces that had overrun Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and France, and the forces of western democracy. Our neutrality had taken the form of a series of neutrality acts by which we legislated ourselves into the rigid position from which we were finally driven only by the attack on Pearl Harbor. Our neutrality had been dictated, at least in part, by the conviction that we could gain nothing by joining with either side. Our neutrality and isolationism went back over many years to a reluctance, among a powerful segment of the American people, to join in an alliance with any part of Europe, and in particular with the British Empire.

It is important in negotiating with countries like India that we not forget that a very short period of time has passed since the day when our motivations were comparable to those which induce their neutrality today. We must recall that India and Pakistan achieved independence in 1947 after a long struggle. It should not be surprising that in 1949–50 they are reluctant to join an alliance which includes nations from which eastern independence has been so recently won.

In urging a look-back to our recent and distant past with a view to more tolerant understanding, I do not propose that we abandon efforts to demonstrate that the neutral east may be misguided. I do this so that as we advance our own cause, we show a real appreciation of the considerations which influence the judgments of other peoples.

And as we take full account of the background of India's neutrality we should also give serious study to what many consider the real danger in India, both to India and to our interest in the Far East.

India has set a course for herself as a democracy in the western tradition. Her constitution is essentially democratic. The judiciary is independent. The army is subordinate to civil power. The press is protected by constitutional guaranties. During the coming year 170,000,000 citizens will go to the polls in one of Asia's first general and free elections. India is setting out on the road to democracy. The important question is:

"How far will she be able to travel on that road?"

She will probably be able to travel on that road only if she is able to respond to the growing demand of her people for food, clothing, and shelter.

Poverty is not new in Asia. What is new is that the people have learned to attribute their condition to the injustice or inadequacy of their rulers.

The view is shared by many who know India well that she stands a long, long way from an effective beginning on the comprehensive program required to meet the needs and growing demands of her people. There is a steady increase in population, approximately 1.4 percent or more than 4,000,000 per year; from 319,000,000 in 1941 to 342,000,000 at the end of 1946. The already low standard of living has been going down since 1942 and in some areas, for much longer than that. To meet the resulting need for increased agricultural and industrial production, the government is doing its best—some irrigation, some hydroelectric projects, but its best is not good enough. Consequently millions of people who had been led to believe that independence would bring the millennium, who believed that poverty would disappear after British rule ended, may become disillusioned. The independence movement, although of a dynamic revolutionary character, was essentially negative. That movement did not require and did not develop leaders to cope with the type of problem that has come after independence. Consequently, while there has been much talk in India of agrarian reform, industrial and commercial development, while speeches are made and some laws, such as that for the division of the large estates, have been put on the books, action has been, and promises to be, slow in coming. There is too much stress upon the defects and evils of the old, too little by way of concrete design for the new. As unrest grows, a preventive detention act is being used not only to lock up the Communists, but also Socialists and other troublemakers. There is concern that the one party system, the system of the powerful Congress Party, may feel increasingly compelled to limit basic freedoms of speech and press.

Failure to improve living conditions over a period of time would not necessarily mean communism in India. It might mean a move to the extreme right. The chaos that could conceivably precede or accompany a move either to the right or to the left would aid only the Soviet Union, not India, not the west.

What can the United States do to meet this and closely related problems in the Far East?

1. Almost every hour brings additional proof that the first and major task of the Nation today is military preparedness. Every hour brings additional evidence that our commitments for the maintenance of peace, our undertakings on the political level, are beyond our power to act. We are overextended. We must bring our forces up to our commitments. We must be prepared to meet force with force whenever and wherever there is a violation of the United Nations Charter. This is the first front. If the battle on this front is lost, everything is lost.

2. Calmly and with cold calculation we should reassess our strength and our weaknesses in the Far East. Such a calculation would give greater weight than we have given heretofore to the eastern attitudes about which I have been speaking today. Such a calculation would also consider how many of our Western Allies in the United Nations would join us in the kind of military operation on the Asiatic mainland which for a long time now has been the logical ultimate of the views expressed by flag-waving and speech-making Senators as they travel about the Far East.

3. I have said that overwhelming strength and military preparedness is imperative, but in the kind of struggle in which we are engaged, victory on the first front, military victory, does not necessarily mean ultimate victory. Whether we like it or not, we must continue to fight the battle on the second front, the battle on the front which has been so well fought under the Marshall plan in Europe. I refer to the front that my Indian colleague had in mind when he said that "in our part of the world no doctrine can hold its own with communism unless it also gives first place to the needs of ordinary people." This is what I mean by the second front in Asia. Greater wisdom than I shall ever possess is necessary to understand the motives and anticipate the strategy of the men in the Kremlin. Of one thing, however, I am reasonably certain. This is, that high on the list of their objectives is the determination to induce—to lead—to compel the United States and its allies not only to neglect, but to abandon the second front.

It is a second front—a standard of living—problem which is attaining serious proportions in countries like India. And because of the present neutral position of such countries our task is infinitely more difficult than it has been in Western Europe. It is more difficult because of Indian reluctance to abandon neutrality as a condition of aid. It is more difficult because, at a time when the demands on our resources seem overwhelming, our Congress and our people understandably draw back from proposals for aid to those who refuse to join our side. Can the impasse, the dilemma, be resolved?

This leads to my fourth point.

4. India and her neighbors have recently met in London under the auspices of the British Commonwealth of Nations and have agreed upon a program of economic development. Funds in the amount of over $5,000,000,000 are to be committed to the program.

The expressed objective is to resist the spread of communism in the Far East. A news dispatch from London yesterday stated that it was the hope of the Commonwealth nations that the United States would cooperate by tying in its efforts under point 4. Here then is an opportunity for United States collaboration on a multilateral basis which would avoid the delicate political problems presented by India's neutrality. We should seize this opportunity.

Nelson Rockefeller has been appointed Chairman of a United States Committee on the point 4 program. Rockefeller has had 15 years of experience on this kind of job in Latin America. During 10 of those years he was operating on development programs as head of his own private corporation. During five of those years he was at the same job in a Government capacity. He knows how to deal with foreign governments and with foreign business interests. He has learned that programs in aid of the economies of other countries must be safeguarded not only to prevent waste but also to insure that the development is in aid of those who need it most. Above all, in connection with the Standard Oil interests in Venezuela, with his own development company in Brazil and the Caribbean and with the Government, he has learned the importance of comprehensive programs to train the workers of underdeveloped countries to use the agricultural and industrial tools without which the standard of living cannot be raised.

As my point four then, I would urge that Rockefeller and his associates meet at the earliest possible time with representatives of India and the other Commonwealth countries of Asia so that there may soon be presented to the Congress a statement of what America should do on condition that these countries continue to help themselves.

5. And last on my list for today, I would tell the Indians and others of the east who are in the same neutral position that we know that the objectives of their neutrality—peace and security—are the same as the objectives which we pursue through collective action under the United Nations Charter. We should tell them further that we hope they will come to see, as we have so recently come to see that the establishment of a powerful collective force through and as a part of the United Nations is the more effective way to achieve their objectives and ours; peace and security. It may be that developments like those in Tibet and in North Korea will do to and for the Indian position what it took Greece, the Berlin blockade, and the fall of Czechoslovakia to do to and for the American attitude toward the Soviet Union. In a word, I would not pressure India to be on our side every time there is a vote in the United Nations. I venture the view that the mistakes of both the Soviet Union and Communist China will do more for our cause in India in this particular than any amount of pressure from us.

Whether you agree with any of my recommendations is not important. I shall have failed rather badly, however, if I have not given you some idea of the way in which Indians from many walks of life—wealthy business men, journalists, doctors, lawyers—look at the west, look at you and me today. I referred at the beginning of my remarks to Dr. Wilbur's association over the years with the work of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

In a commencement address in 1927, Dr. Wilbur had occasion to describe the purpose of the conferences of the Institute. One of his sentences sharply states the reason why I shall always consider my experience at Lucknow a great one. It is an effective statement of my major purpose in speaking here today.

"To see yourself as others see you, to view your own country through the questioning eyes of foreign neighbors, is a chastening and wholesome experience and one that millions must undergo if we are to deal successfully across the great ocean."

Bring the Boys Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert results of a poll conducted by the Detroit Free Press, Detroit, Mich.:

"BRING THE BOYS HOME"—PUBLIC OPINION VOTERS TURN THUMBS DOWN ON KOREAN WAR; SEEK STIFF CONTROLS; ASK FOR SLASH IN SPENDING

An additional week of voting did not change results in the Free Press survey of public opinion. Seven in 10 still favor withdrawal from Korea as quickly as possible.

Those who returned public opinion ballots largely continued other trends indicated in the first week.

There had been predictions that an additional week of balloting would upset results presented last week. It was argued that those who viewed unfavorably the published results would flood the mail with contrary views.

There was a flood of mail last week in the closing hours of the mail survey. But, as noted, it did not change results.

Most decisive vote was on price and wage controls—85 in 100 wanted stiff ones—and on the proposal to have foreign nations supply the bulk of UN forces. Again, 85 percent favorable. Almost as decisive was the vote in favor of cutting nondefense spending: 80 in 100 favorable.

Readers also indicated they are against dropping the A-bomb now, although they want it kept as a United States weapon. They oppose, 2 to 1, sending American troops to Europe; oppose by narrower margins drafting 18-year-olds and sending substantial aid to foreign countries.

Many of the one-quarter who favor admitting China to the United Nations explained their vote: They believe in facing facts and, as they see it, the Reds are the present rulers of China.

The plan to defend outlying bases but keep our armies at home, largely as proposed by ex-President Herbert Hoover, won favorable votes from about two-thirds of those who returned ballots.

One happening that seemed unusual to tabulators was the number who voted on only a few issues.

For example, in one case, 43 votes were cast. But of these nine did not choose to register an opinion on whether or not to stay in Korea.

For this reason the votes shown in the result table do not add up. To get a total of 4,000 votes on any one question, it was necessary to count well over 4,000 ballots.

The idea for the public opinion survey was suggested to the Free Press by Edward W. Sowers, editor of the Daily News in Rolla, Mo., after he used a similar ballot in Rolla to find out "what the public thinks."

Korea GI's are so busy they even receive their citations in fox holes. "Get the troops out of there" is the advice of the majority who voted in the public opinion survey. Exact results are shown in the table below:

Final ballot figures

Percentage		The question	Actual vote	
Yes	No		Yes	No
75	25	Should we withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible?	3,063	1,046
26	74	Should we stay until we can give Korea a government chosen by its people?	984	2,844
21	79	Should we drop the A-bomb now and take chances on reprisal?	822	3,107
22	78	Should we reject use of the A-bomb as a weapon of war?	888	3,065
38	62	Should we continue to send substantial aid to foreign countries?	1,443	2,402
44	56	Should we draft 18-year-olds?	1,746	2,256
33	67	Should we send American troops to Europe?	1,286	2,606
80	20	Should nondefense spending be cut drastically?	3,296	765
27	73	Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations?	1,062	2,915
85	15	Should we expect foreign nations to supply the bulk of UN armed forces?	3,296	600
66	34	Should we simply defend our outlying bases with air and sea power and keep our armies at home?	2,589	1,335
85	15	Should we have stiff price and wage controls?	3,406	601

Two Russian Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Two Russian Fronts," by Hugh Baillie, president, United Press Association, delivered before the annual conference of the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, Inc., at Chicago, Ill., on January 22, 1951:

Ladies and gentlemen of the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, having traveled from Korea to Europe and back to Washington, I am prepared to give you my reporter's observations of what I saw on those trips. I won't make any predictions or indulge in any editorial comment. What I am going to tell you is what was told me by other people. By the people who are running the show.

First, let me sketch lightly over where I went and who and what I saw. In Korea I saw General MacArthur. And I will say right at the outset that few military commanders in history ever did so much with so little, as General MacArthur has accomplished in Korea. How little won't be known until it's all over.

General MacArthur risked his reputation in this Korean War at the command of the United Nations. He told me that he was very much surprised when he was called to the telecom at 4 o'clock in the morning and saw there a directive for him to get in and fight in Korea.

We all remember the enthusiasm and the cheers which greeted the United Nations intervention in Korea. The enthusiasm of the United Nations evaporated under adversity. And now, some of our most powerful friends

are looking for the exits. And now that MacArthur has suffered reverses, most of which are attributable to not having enough troops, the popular thing is to second-guess him.

The thing for us to do in Korea is to get in or get out. You can't fight a half-war. You can't pull your punches. Yet that is exactly what we are doing in Asia. We are pulling our punches. We are pulling our punches because the United Nations is getting shaky on the issue, and because those back here who are running the show feel that we cannot risk a two-front war at this time. We now have about 2,500,000 men under arms. The last time we fought a two-front war, we had 12,364,000 men under arms. And corresponding munitions, ships, and supplies of all sorts.

But as to the question of whether there is going to be a war, why, the war's on now. The question is how fast it will spread. The cost of liberty is going up and up, as we all can see. Like everything else. The price is rising. But, we ain't seen nothing yet. This war is young.

Well, as I said, General MacArthur told me that he was surprised at being ordered into Korea. If there was anybody more surprised than General MacArthur, it was the Russians themselves. They did not expect the United States to show up. They had heard official pronouncements to the effect that we had written off Korea. When the Americans appeared on the field of battle, and in the air, and on the sea, I am sure the Russians felt they had been mousetrapped. They had been hoaxed.

People have asked me why the Chinese did not get into the war earlier, and come down into Korea and keep us from advancing so far. The answer to that is that the Chinese were not ready to enter the war earlier. It had never been supposed by the Russians they would need the Chinese in this particular campaign. They thought the North Koreans could handle it alone. It took several months for the Chinese army to move up into Manchuria and along the border and get ready to intervene.

By that time, under clearance from the United Nations, MacArthur had advanced so far that the Chinese obviously decided to lay back and let him come all the way up to the frontier. The Asiatic style of warfare, so I was told in Korea, is predicated on the annihilation of the enemy. The deeper we advanced the easier the Chinese thought it would be to annihilate us later. That's what they have been trying to do ever since last November.

General MacArthur achieved a military miracle in Korea by holding a line around the old Pusan perimeter. He was fabulously outnumbered at all times. When I was over there the artillery ammunition was rationed, 20 rounds to a gun per day. Then through the maneuver of the Inchon landing, and the constant air attacks which had weakened the Korean Communists to such an extent that they were ready to collapse, the tide was turned and the enemy army was virtually destroyed. When I accompanied MacArthur to Seoul, at the time he turned the government over to Syngman Rhee, the president of South Korea, MacArthur thought the war was over, and said so. During the ceremony MacArthur led in the Lord's Prayer, and thanked God for the victory. I was there in the assembly hall of the Korean capital building, and remember the broken glass that came tumbling down around our ears at intervals from the shattered dome, as MacArthur spoke and prayed. The Korean Red armies have ceased to exist as formidable antagonists, as was demonstrated by the rapidity with which we advanced into North Korea. But the Chinese were lying in wait.

They gave us plenty of advance warning. They issued statements, and made broadcasts, announcing that they would not tolerate the approach of the United Nations forces to their frontiers. Nobody believed them. Nobody believed the Chinese then, any more than we believe the Russians now, when they say they will not stand idly by and see us organize a Western European army, particularly with a backbone of German troops.

The Russians are making those threats at frequent intervals. They are discounted in this country. It is common knowledge that the Moscow correspondents are able to file through censorship only that news which the Russians want to get out. It is noticeable that during the last several days and weeks, our correspondent in Moscow, the United Press correspondent, has been able to file many stories, carrying the news that the Russians will not stand for the organization of the army, which has been undertaken by General Eisenhower. This is coming out because the Russians want it to get out. It is the first move, or one of the first moves, in their campaign to frustrate the organization of Eisenhower's army. They may be expected to try many other things.

First, they will try to scare the Germans out of joining General Eisenhower's army. They will also start an agitation in this country against arming the Nazis. They may be expected to create an incident, like the Berlin blockade, which will take our minds off the business of building this North Atlantic treaty army. Of course, the Russians don't want war, so to speak, if they can get what they want without war. Or at least, without getting into the war themselves, personally. They prefer wars like the one in Korea. As on distinguished British statesman said to me, "The Russians are very generous with other people's lives."

Those who are on the ground and running the show in Germany believe that if the Russians get the idea that the Western European army is actually going to come into being, and emerge from the blueprint stage (and they aren't convinced yet that it will), they will do something drastic. Meanwhile they won't. They are not afraid of a blueprint army.

But I was told in Germany that if they decide to move, they will endeavor to create inside Germany, Korea No. 2. And this is the way they would go about it. The Russians have, in the eastern zone of Germany, an army which is called the alert police. I have heard its figures given as high as 100,000 men. This is a fully equipped army, with tanks and airplanes, read to roll. Now the East Germans are endeavoring to start negotiations with West German Chancellor Adenauer, looking toward a unification of Germany. It so happens that I was actually talking to Adenauer at his office located in a villa at Bonn, on the Rhine last month when the original note from President Grotewohl of East Germany was handed to him. I remember that Adenauer turned to me and said, "We certainly live in interesting times."

When the time comes that the Russians want to create this Korea No. 2 the formula is simple. The East Germans announce that Adenauer has been wasting their time. They would say that he, and he alone, was standing in the way of a unified fatherland. If they follow the classic formula, they will denounce him as a tool of Wall Street and the American cannibals, and they will call on all loyal Germans who want a unified fatherland, and who do not want to be "sold" into Eisenhower's army, to rise and put Adenauer out. And to help it along they will send their alert police army to take a hand in the proceedings. As soon as the German alert police army emerges from the Russian zone it will be met by the American forces in Germany. Two divisions. And maybe by the British also. Two more divisions. The ordinary German civilians will have a terrible time making up their minds what they want to do. If they join the German insurrection, they risk their necks, and if they don't, they risk their necks, because the East Germans will say to them that they will take care of them later. Meanwhile the German army from the Russian zone will be fighting the American army and possibly the British and maybe some French, with the Russians standing on the sidelines just like the Chinese stood on the sidelines for a while in Asia. And there you would have your Korea No. 2, according to what I heard in Germany. Americans fighting Germans who tell the world that all they want to do is to unify their country.

Now, you are going to be hearing more and more about this chap Konrad Adenauer, the Chancellor of West Germany, from now on. He is 75 years old, lean, jaunty, and seemingly tireless. He can take on the High Commissioners of the United States, Great Britain, and France and negotiate with them for hours at a stretch. After keeping them in session for 8 hours or so, they will emerge from the meeting looking all beaten up. Adenauer will come out looking fresh as a daisy. He thrives on negotiating and bargaining. If he were in this country, he would probably be a labor negotiator.

Adenauer is striving to drive a tough bargain with the victorious Allies. He wants the occupation statute converted into a treaty and he wants the High Commissioners to become ambassadors. He has no intention of paying Hitler's debts, nor has he any intention of continuing to pay the costs of the occupation. He wants the German scientists to be let loose to conduct their research for the benefit of Germany instead of for its conquerors. He wants Germany to have the right to build its own merchant marine and air fleet (no doubt with American money, like everybody else). And instead of furnishing combat teams to Eisenhower's army, to be commanded by Frenchmen, Americans, or British, Adenauer wants the Germans to have their own army with their own general staff. All this would have seemed fantastic only a few short months ago. It isn't fantastic any more. If the present trend continues, and the Russians don't succeed in frustrating the plan, in about 2 years you will see Germany back in business.

And since we are about to negotiate a peace treaty with Japan, to be followed by the organization of a Japanese army to lend a hand in the Far East, the chances are that two of our principal allies in the future will be the two countries that we brought to total defeat in the last war, Germany and Japan. That is, if Russia sits still and lets all this happen.

Adenauer makes no secret of his appreciation of the fact that he has been handed a tremendous break by the Russians. He intends to take full advantage of it. Adenauer is sure that if we keep fighting in Korea we will be playing the Russians' game. He told me the Russians desire to have us bled white in Korea so they could occupy Europe without a fight. As he put it when I interviewed him for the United Press the Russians would win the game without losing a man.

Adenauer told me there would be lasting peace only when the United States was able to confront Russia with a military force which the Soviets would consider dangerous. He said that to build such a force the United States needs Germany. And that America will get the whole-hearted cooperation of Germans only when they no longer feel they are a second-class power under occupation. That's the basis of his argument.

Adenauer in his desire to have us discontinue the war in Asia is in entire agreement with the other European statesmen with whom I talked last month. What they want, of course, is for us to liquidate the war in Korea and bring our Army over to Europe.

You have heard the question asked, if the Russians actually are going to move, why right now—this January. They'll never find Europe any flatter, or less able to resist, than right now this January. Well it could be, of course, they are waiting for the snow to thaw and the ground to harden so as to carry their armor.

Churchill believes it's the atom bomb. This, in his opinion, is the great deterrent to the Russians. They know we have more atom bombs than they have, and a better delivery system.

Other British authorities told me the Russians first would have to grab the Persian oil fields before they could enter into a full-scale war. The first move in such a war, therefore, would be Russian occupation of the rich Azerbaijan oil fields in Persia. However, it must be remembered that Russia is less dependent on oil than the west. Their armies don't use so much armor as we do. They take the form of another Asiatic horde, like the Chinese. One of the amazing features of the Korean War has been how the Chinese managed to do it, without air power and without extensive transport. The fact that they use human beings instead of trucks, very largely, gives them a big advantage. You can shoot up the roads and destroy the convoys, but it's harder to interrupt the supplies when they're all brought down on the heads or backs of people. As a matter of fact, in Korea we have a highly modernized European-style army fighting in a primitive country. The enemy knows how to use his legs. He hasn't been riding in automobiles since infancy. He can walk up a mountain like a fly going up the side of a house, and can keep on doing it day and night. He doesn't need a big plant behind his lines. And when he's wounded nobody worries about carrying him back, they just throw him into the ditch. There are always more where he came from.

The American soldier is a precision instrument, trained, a technician, with background and education. He is not expendable. Put him against a Chinese coolie of whom there are unlimited quantities, and give each of them an automatic weapon, and it's a standoff. Much the same situation would prevail in a war with Russia.

Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain is very anxious to have us out of Korea. He regards any war in Asia as a bottomless pit for the white race. And this attitude is heartily echoed by Bevin, the Foreign Secretary.

In France, I found the same thing. Premier Pleven believes that we can be bled to death in Asia. Foreign Minister Schuman thinks the same thing. But Schuman doesn't believe that Stalin is going to strike a military blow in the immediate future. He feels that Stalin has become old and prudent, and that he would be too wise to risk everything in an open war when he can continue to attain his objectives by subversion. In this respect Schuman agrees with Attlee who also foresees an intensification of Russia's underground methods in seeking its objectives, without war. And two of Russia's prime objectives, of course, are Italy and France where the Communists are a large and powerful political party.

General Eisenhower has probably been handed the toughest assignment of all at this particular time. But I think he expects to succeed, or he wouldn't have undertaken it. To Europeans, of course, the appointment of General Eisenhower meant just one thing. That is, the Yanks are coming. They don't think Washington would ever let Ike down. If he comes back and says we can discourage the Russians, and encourage Europe in really rearming and joining up, but that he needs a certain number of American divisions as a starter, he'll get them. That's what they believe.

Ladies and gentlemen, the position today is that we have called Russia like Britain called Germany in 1939. You may recall the British told the Germans there would be war if they entered Poland. I remember being in London at that time and I asked the British what they could do to defend Poland from the Germans. The reply was they could do nothing; however Poland would be the chip that Germany would knock off Britain's shoulder and start the war.

Like the British, we have drawn a line. We drew a line against the Russians in Korea. We have drawn a line against the Russians in Europe. I have been on both fronts. On the Korean front where we are at grips with the Communists, and on the European front where we are preparing to come to grips with them if they advance.

The war has already started. The question is whether it will spread, and how fast. Russia is still calling the tune.

Never was there such a time when there was so much dissension in high places, so many contrary opinions of what ought to be done, or how to go about doing it.

I have been on a long trip and seen a lot of people—people who presumably know the answers—people who are in command—people who bear the responsibility. Yet I think I can say, without joking, that this is a case where the more you see and hear, the less you know.

The less you know for sure, anyway.

Twice before in our generation the lights of freedom have burned low all over the world. Twice before they have been rekindled by the United States. The question before us now is, whether we will have to rekindle them this third time?

Draft for "Sick" Railmen an Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of February 4, 1951, written by Austen Lake:

DRAFT FOR "SICK" RAILMEN AN IDEA

(By Austen Lake)

I am just old Joe Blunt, American, and pretty confused in the head by what I read in the newspapers. So here we are, the sovereign United States people, exhorted to stand unitedly behind President Truman in what is called a national emergency. But how can we stand behind him when he faces in so many directions on the same basic problems like wage-and-price controls? Because, no sooner do we stand behind him on one decision, then he pivots around and we are not behind him any more.

Also we are invited to show our loyalty by following our congressional leaders. And so we should. But how can we form a common procession when the leaders traipse off in separate parades and individual counter-marches. Because, no sooner do we fall in line, than we find ourselves trailing a lot of men going nowhere in different ways.

Like I say I am just old Joe Blunt, American and father of four little Blunts, and I would like to do my democratic share. But, if President Truman and Congress don't know where they are heading on almost everything, how can the great commonality of Americans, like me, render realistic service.

JOE WILL DO HIS DUTY

Here last week the Nation gets a price-and-wage freeze as of January 25. So I say to old lady Blunt, "Well, costs are pretty stiff, but now we can try to budget the pay check." But next I read where Congress has changed its mind, and we have a price-and-wage thaw. So there goes my pay budget all to hell again.

That ain't what bothers me most. Here, today, comes a letter to my boy, Joe Blunt, Jr., which reads "Greetings from the President," and says for him to report for Army induction and physical examination next Thursday without fail. So young Joe says, "I guess that's it, Dad," and I say, "Yes, son, that's your duty as a good American boy." I got a daddy's unhappy feeling, of course, because young Joe is just 19 and fresh out of high school and don't know anything about what causes wars.

Still, when Uncle Sam stretches out his long arm and tells my kid, or your kid too, "Come on and no ifs, ands, or buts," we got to be good citizens. We haven't any choice like.

Then I see in the papers that the railroad switchmen are out on strike and paralyzing some 33 roads which are hauling essential war materials of our troops in Korea, where my nephew, Bill Blunt, is fighting with the marines. Only this ain't a regular, legal strike, because last December 14, the United States Department invoked a court injunction which made rail strikes unlawful.

So the paper says how the railroad switchmen are pretending to get sick all at once while their union bosses said "Tuk-tak. It's some kind of epidemic over which we have no control." Now that, of course, is pure malarky which even a simple guy like old Joe Blunt can recognize, let alone a real smart man like President Truman. Then I think, "It seems strange that a Government which has the power to draft young boys, to fix prices, and freeze wages, to grab strategic materials and otherwise control the freedoms of individual action and the economic life of the Nation, can be so helpless to stop and punish wildcat strikers.

WHAT IF JOE GOT SICK?

So I say to old lady Blunt, "What would happen if young Joe decided to get sick and stay sick for the duration of the hostility in Korea and elsewhere?" And old lady Blunt gives me a queer look and says, "That would be rebellion against the Government, and young Joe would go to jail." Which, as I know, is the right answer.

But then I say, "Here the Justice Department has a court order, dated back to December 14, against railroad strikes. Yet the switchmen are defying Federal law and striking anyway, even when the Army is placed in control of the railroads. Isn't that rebellion, too, and shouldn't somebody go to jail?"

So, if the President and Congress don't stand firmly behind their own laws, how can old Joe Blunt or the American people be expected to stand behind the President and Congress? That is, unless the people somehow grow two faces and learn to stand facing opposite directions at the same time.

Then old lady Blunt, who is pretty cute in some matters said, "Well who would you

arrest—the entire brotherhood of railroad switchmen, numbering some 35,000?"

"No. But the Army is asking for 80,000 soldiers for immediate service and it seems kinda sensible to draft the 35,000 switchmen. It might not be a bad idea if Mr. Truman would mail them all a letter starting, 'Greetings from the President of the United States,' like he did today with young Joe. Then he could say, 'Now you are inducted into the Army and my first direct order, as your Commander in Chief, is to get back on the job switching trains, and no ifs, ands, or buts.'"

Old lady Blunt wrinkles up her nose and sniffs, "But that ain't the democratic way and, if nothing else, President Truman is a Democrat first. Not only that but the whole Truman administration is owned, body and soul, by the labor vote, or thinks it is. And Mr. Truman is never a man willfully to kick votes in the face."

SOME OF LIFE'S PUZZLES

The only conclusion I can manage from all this is that it constitutes "Government by drift" and Mr. Truman and Congress, as the captain and crew of our ship, are allowing the winds, cross currents and tides to carry the Nation willy-nilly, by guess and by accident. At which point old lady Blunt says, "Have you got a couple of dollars? I want to buy some pork chops to feed young Joe a good, last meal before he joins the Army." So I fish around and all I can find is $1.50, which I hand over, warning, "That is all we got till next Wednesday payday."

Old lady Blunt sighs and says, "Well I hoped to buy pork chops, but I guess we will have to eat cabbage soup again and maybe some eggs." So I turn to the part of the paper which says how the Government is still paying millions for farm subsidies and stock piling more mountains of eggs, butter and cereals to rot in order to keep prices at top levels. Which puzzles me some more on how the Government can boost prices up and freeze 'em down at the same time.

I will close by wondering which way Mr. Truman and Congress are facing today, so I can face that way too, and thus stand unitedly behind them.

United States Policy Must Be Based on Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, we have, in the City of Los Angeles, a comparatively new metropolitan newspaper which recently demonstrated the kind of journalistic leadership which we all greatly admire. The paper conducted a poll to ascertain the sentiment of its readers relative to our foreign policy. When the results of the poll showed the thinking of a majority of those writing in to be isolationist and contrary to what the editor deemed best for the safety of the United States, he promptly took an editorial position contrary to the majority expression of those answering the poll, and set forth his reasons for believing them to be in error. I think Mr. Virgil Pinkley, the editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Mirror, deserves to be commended, both for his forthrightness and the high quality of his editorial analysis of our situation. The editorial merits widespread dissemination, and I am therefore including it in our RECORD as follows:

UNITED STATES POLICY MUST BE BASED ON FACTS

Final results in the Mirror poll on the United Nations-European aid question show that the thinking of a majority of those who participated is ruggedly isolationist.

We respect and understand that viewpoint. But we disagree with it.

We have a certain sympathy with those who are annoyed and repelled by recent international developments. However, now more than ever, we should not let emotion outrun reason. This is a time for mature, reasoned decisions of long-range character. Analysis dictates the conclusion that isolationism is wrong for the United States at this point in history.

To us the fallacy of the isolationist position is clear. The world has shrunk so much in the past 10 years that the United States could not stand safely alone, even if it wished. That statement becomes truer and truer every time a faster plane and a stronger A-bomb are produced. Since we cannot stand alone we must learn to stand together against tyranny.

Standing alone looks deceptively simple. Just build our big wall and hide behind it, they say. Standing together is much harder, because it involves blending our American viewpoint with those of other nations. And though their basic aims may be the same, their ways of reaching the goal are bound to differ. That generates an appearance of confusion and uncertainty which makes it easy for the faint-hearted to say, "Aw, let's toss the whole United Nations out of the window."

Here are some answers to some of the most frequent isolationist charges:

1. Western Europe is not doing its part in the common defense.

Answer. The United States in 1950 had 14 men in uniform per 1,000 population. Britain and France each had 16 men in the armed services per 1,000 population.

2. Air and sea power can beat Russia in Europe; a land army isn't necessary.

Answer. That's what many thought about Korea, too. Our sad experience there, and that of World War II, are conclusive evidence that air attacks will not stop ground forces. The man with the rifle wins wars.

3. If the United States sends troops to Europe, Russia will start a war.

Answer. Russia respects only strength. She is far more likely to attack a weak foe than a strong one. She will never be offended into a war.

4. Western Europe isn't so vital; what if we do lose it to the Reds?

Answer. Take steel, for example, since it is a basic material of war power. In 1950, the United States produced 96,500,000 tons of steel. Russia and her satellites produced 34,900,000 tons. A far larger percentage of Soviet steel than American goes into military production. Western Europe produced 57,000,000 tons. If we desert Western Europe we have handed the Russians equality in steel output.

Most of the uranium for our atom bombs comes from the Belgian Congo. The air bases we need in event of war with Russia are controlled by our Western European allies. The airfields in Britain, French North Africa, Greece, Turkey, and Italy are the key to power strokes against Russia. If we are denied these bases we lose our No. 1 advantage over Russia.

On the strength of these facts alone, we urge those who would have us pull back inside a shell to reexamine their views.

The United States is the leader of the free world. The harsh facts of economic reality makes us so. What leader ever won a fight by putting his head in the sand?

Duty to Country—Or to Purse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune on Sunday, February 4, 1951, entitled "Duty to Country—Or to Purse?"

The action of the striking railroad workers has aroused the indignation of the people of the country and properly so.

As I have stated in previous insertions in the RECORD of other editorials on the same subject during the past few days, the time has come to not only halt the present strike but to strengthen the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley law so that the President will have adequate power to deal with Nation-wide strikes that affect the national health, welfare, or security.

The editorial follows:

DUTY TO COUNTRY—OR TO PURSE?

The current "sick call" by switchmen members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is the latest, most flagrant, and vicious abuse of the power the organized labor monopoly has created.

In a sickeningly transparent ruse to force the American public and its Government to comply with what otherwise might be legitimate needs, the switchmen are costing the United States incalculable damage.

The news reports tell of walkouts in at least 44 major cities and the consequent tangle of rail traffic. In Chicago, shipments of food and medical supplies bound for Americans fighting in Korea are halted. Backed-up shipments have forced layoffs in industries manufacturing our defense needs, halting production which we may never regain.

The strike, and such it is no matter how much the sanctimonious aura of sick leave is spread, is technically against the United States Government. The Army assumed control of all major railroads last year in a Federal move to avert just such dangerous walkouts as we now face.

Now this newspaper has opposed the encroachment of Federal Government into the lives of citizens as much or more than the next one. We feel and always will feel that an individual is entitled to make his living and bargain for a better one without being seduced or coerced by Government in any case.

But the fact remains that Government intervenes in these cases only when the national security and the welfare of all citizens is threatened by the arbitrary and dictatorial attitude of the comparative few. And it is a proven fact that our particular administration, conscious of labor's political power as it is, will intercede only when the need is dire and after the great mass of the American people have brought their opinion to bear. That has been established in the coal strikes and rail walkouts of the past few years.

Therefore the railroaders on strike today are deliberately flouting the order of a Government acting in the interest of all its people. They are sacrificing in no small degree the welfare and security of all Americans.

This strike is even more indefensible since the switchmen actually claim they are discriminated against by their own union. Their grievance is against their own leaders, not the GI in the snows of Korea. But it is the GI who suffers. Their claim for a reduction in their workweek may very well be legitimate. But the GI cannot discard his responsibility to his Nation by walking out on 7-day-a-week combat duty just because he thinks his gripe is legitimate.

Continued refusal by organized labor to recognize and shoulder its responsibilities may prove labor's downfall yet. Failure by union leadership to put duty to country before duty to purse can't be tolerated much longer.

Two New York Newspapers Whooping It Up for Internationalism and Urging That We Spend Ourselves Into Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, never in the entire history of our country have the American people been more keenly aware of the fact that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

There is a growing realization that the danger of war and the atom bomb are being deliberately overemphasized to blind us to the fact that we are being rushed headlong into a situation worse than war—total economic collapse. That would mean revolution and unbridled anarchy throughout the entire world—a throwback to the dark ages.

If we would defeat our enemies and save our country, we must see clearly who our enemies are. The struggle that goes on in the world today is not between communism and capitalism, but the age-old struggle between the forces of absolutism and the forces of freedom. Communism is merely one of the instruments used by the absolutists to set up the power state, and to achieve their objectives the absolutists have entered into an unholy alliance with the Communists, Fascists, fellow travelers, phony liberals and one-worlders. The tools with which they work and the vehicles on which they are riding to power are supplied by a debauched, manipulated, irredeemable paper currency which is so manipulated that we are financing communism in Europe while our sons are dying to stop communism in Asia. Prices are high because they have made our dollars cheap.

We must recognize that there is a national and international conspiracy to drain away our wealth, to gain control of our industry and commerce, replace our system of government with the power state, lower our standard of living to the world level, and reduce the United States to the status of a province in a world government in which we will be outnumbered and outvoted 15 to 1.

The leading absolutists of today are the one-worlders of Wall Street and the London counting houses. They are the real architects of our foreign policy. They want the American taxpayers to pay the interest on their foreign bonds; that explains our European policy. In Asia, they want to gain control of such strategic materials as raw rubber, tin, manganese, and tungsten, which are so essential in our economy, and thereby dominate our industry and commerce. Chiang Kai-shek and Nationalist China was in their way; they caused him to be eliminated, and as a consequence our boys are dying in Korea.

These international conspirators, through the press and radio which they seek to control, are softening us up for the kill; beating the war drums to justify the regimentation of the American people, the drafting of our sons, the rearmament of Western Europe, and spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

While giving lip service to small business they are pursuing a course that is destroying small business and forcing all business into monopolies which will be easier to take over when der tag comes.

The appended article from the Washington Times-Herald of February 6, 1951, tells you how two big New York newspapers are whooping it up for internationalism. These are not isolated examples; the internationalists are buying outright or gaining control of newspapers in all sections of America. They have their columnists and commentators—slick, tricky individuals who wave the flag with one hand while chiseling away the foundation of this Republic with the other—bleeding hearts who drool for the forgotten man while advocating policies which will place him in perpetual chains, and sell America down the river.

These international racketeers must be stopped—and stopped now. Show me an internationalist, and I will show you a potential traitor to the United States. The hour is late. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The article from the Washington Times-Herald follows:

TWO NEW YORK NEWSPAPERS WHOOPING UP INTERNATIONALISM—TIMES AND HERALD TRIBUNE AGAIN BACK UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN EUROPE'S TROUBLES

(By William Fulton)

NEW YORK, February 5.—For the third time in less than two score years, the eastern internationalist press is whooping it up for greater involvement in Europe's chronic troubles, wholesale drafting of youth, giving President Truman a blank check for shipping troops overseas, and building vast armaments.

The only new note is virtual subservience to the United Nations.

Constant embroilment in Europe's wars is salable here because of the large foreign-born population along the eastern seaboard—people not yet assimilated to the American way of life and still militant about issues in the old country.

VIOLENTLY PRO-BRITISH

Bellwethers for the internationalist line are the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. Both papers engaged in a saber-rattling campaign prior to Pearl Harbor. The Times in particular came under fire on the grounds it was violently pro-British and anti-German before this country's entry into World War I in 1917.

Generally speaking, the foreign inclinations of the two papers reflect the prevailing thought among the bankers and the Wall Street financial district. The publications have denied any connection, but the parallel is striking.

On the financial front in recent years this parallel has revealed itself in the newspapers' espousal of the Marshall plan. Billions have been poured into European "recovery" and many millions have found their way back into big banks here and corporations doing business abroad. Thousands of dollars have filtered back to the newspapers and magazines which support the Marshall plan.

According to the most recent figures, the Herald Tribune has received subsidies for its Paris edition amounting to $60,000 from the Economic Cooperation Administration. The Times did not participate in the first subsidy plan although the Herald Tribune did so.

AGREE WITH ALDRICH

On the political front, the Times and Herald Tribune see eye to eye with Winthrop Aldrich, board chairman of the Chase National Bank and undercover financier for Governor Dewey's me-too political campaigns. Aldrich was slated for appointment as Treasury Secretary or Ambassador to Britain had Dewey been elected President in 1948.

Currently the two newspapers are ballyhooing General Eisenhower and the North Atlantic Pact. While the two papers are separately owned, their editorial pages and play of the news are of "tweedledum and tweedledee" sameness.

Julius Ochs Adler, vice president and general manager of the Times, a member of the Citizens Committee on the Present Danger, is making public speeches these days in favor of the universal military service bill.

The pinko trend on the Herald Tribune is generally laid on the doorstep of Joseph Barnes, formerly foreign editor on the paper. Barnes was a Harvard buddy of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, millionaire supporter of Communist-front causes.

Barnes later threw in his lot with Bartley Crum in the ill-fated publication of the New York Star, an outgrowth of the failure of PM, the Marshall Field journalistic flop in this city. The Star twinkled only briefly.

BENNETT BORN IN SCOTLAND

Before the Herald Tribune fell upon these evil days, it was regarded as the organ of the British Foreign Office, the United States State Department, the Episcopal Church, and Wall Street.

James Gordon Bennett and his son, and Horace Greeley and Charles A. Dana built the newspapers that finally merged into the Herald Tribune. The elder Bennett, born in Scotland, established the Herald in 1835. His son obtained social position in England before he could get it in New York, where he was born in 1841.

The younger Bennett was horsewhipped by his fiancée's brother after his engagement was broken off in 1877 and thereafter he lived abroad. He became more European than American. The Herald became a British mouthpiece and was violently prowar in 1914.

While the Bennetts were establishing the Herald, Horace Greeley founded the Tribune

in 1841. Greeley, a newspaper genius, was succeeded by Whitelaw Reid, who married Elizabeth Mills, an heiress.

WAS UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR

Subsequently Reid became the American Ambassador to Britain and his paper went completely British, taking its editorial direction from Whitehall. The Herald was taken over in 1924 from Frank A. Munsey, who had acquired it in 1918, and the consolidated sheet became the present Herald Tribune. Ogden Reid, Whitelaw Reid's son, became the publisher.

The family acquired in-laws in the British nobility when Jean Reid, Ogden's sister, became Lady Ward by marrying John Hubert Ward, equerry-in-ordinary to the King and brother of the Earl of Dudley.

Ogden Reid had married Helen Rogers, a secretary in the American Embassy in London. When he died several years ago, she became president of the company, and a son, Whitelaw, took over as editor. Mrs. Reid is an energetic, international do-gooder whose one-time Republican principles have been diluted and distorted by the globalists.

The Times was a limping newspaper property toward the end of the century when Adolph S. Ochs, one-time printer's devil who had made a success of the Chattanooga Times came to New York City to make his mark. He took over the management of the Times in 1896 and made a great success of it. Ochs admired the Times of London and modeled his enterprise after it.

One of the reasons why the Times has been criticized for its foreign inclinations is that through the years a number of foreign nationals have been employed, particularly in the news service abroad.

EDITOR BORN IN ENGLAND

A case in point is Frederick T. Birchall, one-time acting managing editor, who was born in Warrington, England, in 1871. He came to the New York Times in 1905. During World War I he took a leave of absence to work for the British Government.

After Carl van Anda retired in 1926, Birchall was named acting managing editor and served in that capacity until 1932. The "acting" was never removed from his title because Birchall always remained a British subject. He went abroad in 1932 to take charge of the European news service and finally retired early in the war. He is now living in Nova Scotia.

Upon his death in 1935, Ochs left his controlling stock interest for the benefit of his grandchildren, the offspring of his daughter, Iphigene, and her husband, Arthur Hays Sulzberger. It was entrusted to three trustees, providing for a life interest for Mrs. Ochs and Mrs. Sulzberger.

The three trustees are Mr. and Mrs. Sulzberger and Adler Sulzberger is the publisher and real boss of the Times.

The Rail Strike and a 1948 Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave first obtained, I am introducing in the RECORD, with my own remarks, an editorial which appeared in the Atlanta Journal of February 2, 1951, entitled "The Rail Strike and a 1948 Manifesto."

It is every day becoming more apparent that the railroad labor law, as well as the Taft-Hartley Act, is too weak in its provisions for dealing with nationwide strikes that threaten the public health, welfare, and security.

I am in hearty accord with the Atlanta Journal editorial which follows and agree that the time has come, not only for action to halt the present railroad strike masquerading under the pretense of illness, called by some a hit and run strike, but also time for the Congress to take action to strengthen both the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley law so the President will have adequate power to protect the country from irresponsible labor union leaders and those who blindly and to their own hurt follow their lead.

The editorial follows:

THE RAIL STRIKE AND A 1948 MANIFESTO

Five years ago the engineers' and trainmen's brotherhoods rejected a Presidential fact-finding board's recommendation for a 16-cent wage increase, and also President Truman's subsequent proposal of 18½ cents. The unions struck the railroads, the President seized them in the name of the Nation. The President threatened to draft the strikers, public sentiment condemned the strike, and it was called off after 2 days. The two brotherhoods then accepted the President's wage proposal, although Whitney of the trainmen threatened to destroy Harry S. Truman.

Three years ago the engineers, firemen, and switchmen rejected a fact-finding board's award of a 15½-cent raise and called a Nation-wide strike. The President went through the formality of seizing the railroads, the Department of Justice got an injunction, and there was no strike. The Army went through the motions of running the roads for 2 months until management and the unions agreed on the 15½-cent wage increase, plus some rules changes.

Last year, some of the brotherhoods adopted a new tactic. They called it the hit-and-run strike. The President again made the gesture of taking over the railroads. The Nation still holds them in theoretical captivity to preserve the health and security of our 150,000,000 people, and court injunctions forbid any strike.

So there is no strike. Instead, a mysterious illness has hit a lot of switchmen in various strategic rail centers. In consequence we are suffering a paralysis of transportation.

That is, the men report that they are sick. Union leaders profess to be trying to persuade them to return to work.

The claim of illness is, of course, untrue.

It is a flouting of the Government of the United States and the law of the land.

It is a repudiation of the agreement signed at the White House on December 21, 1950, by the president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, by the president of the Order of Railway Conductors, by the president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, and by the grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

The union movement in this country won public support because it was predicated on the character and the responsibility of its leadership and its membership. They were forthright men who kept their contracts and whose word was good.

No greater disservice could be done the union movement than the insolent dishonesty which characterizes this present rebellion against the majesty of the Nation and its courts.

It is union irresponsibility at its worst.

On May 25, 1948, a manifesto was issued by the Railway Labor Executives' Association. This manifesto said it was speaking for an overwhelming majority of the Nation's rail workers.

It demanded that, as a matter of permanent policy, the Federal Government take over the ownership and operation of the country's railways.

The relationship between the actions of the rail unions in 1946, 1948, 1950–51, and the manifesto of 1948 should be brought into the open. It is a matter of national concern, one of the greater perils of the none-too-remote future.

How "Right" Settled a Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the entire country is becoming more and more alarmed over the serious impact of the current strike involving the railroads of this country. The issues involved appear to be serious and complex. It is to be hoped that all parties involved are attempting to settle this controversy, that is bringing so much hardship to the American people and the alarming slowdown to our defense program, on the basis of not who is right, but what is right.

Mr. Speaker, within recent days the National Assembly on Moral Rearmament was held here in Washington at the Shoreham Hotel. In attendance at these conferences were many Senators and Representatives, as well as delegates from many sections of the world. Many of us were greatly impressed with the impact for good that this conference brought, not only in the fight against communism, the conflict between management and labor, but the need for us individuals to analyze our own actions on the basis of certain absolute moral standards, involving honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following statement made by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, in the other body on the occasion of the appearance on Capitol Hill of many of the visiting delegates to this National Assembly.

I invite the attention of the Senate to a group of distinguished visitors who are seated in the gallery today. Among them are military, political, industrial, and labor leaders from the danger areas of Europe and Asia. They bring evidence of an ideological force for democracy that is seeking to bring an answer to communism in those areas.

Along with our military and economic strategy, America more than ever needs to develop ideological strength if we are to win what is primarily a struggle for the minds of men and women. We as a people must live and proclaim the inspired experience of our democracy based on moral standards in which alone can freedom survive and flourish.

These men and women of all races and all creeds, and of widely varying views on life, come together in one common purpose.

They are making a distinct contribution to the cause to which I refer. They merit our attention and support.

Mr. Speaker, several Members of the other body expressed similar statements as did our own esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], who had this to say about the need of showing the world how to settle problems on the basis of what is right rather than who is right:

It has been encouraging at a time when we are compelled to appropriate billions of dollars and mobilize millions of men to meet the threat of world communism, that evidence should be presented in our midst of a world force which is answering communism in men's minds and hearts. Through the capture of key leadership in critical areas it has actually turned the tide of communism in some of the most vital danger spots in Europe and Asia.

I would like only to point out, as one example of the effectiveness of moral rearmament in producing national unity in this time of crisis, that the presidents of two of America's major airlines brought their top management personnel and the leaders of the pilots' associations in both companies and announced that serious strikes had been averted on both sides because of the influence in their companies in recent weeks of the program of moral rearmament.

It would be an interesting speculation to visualize how many millions—perhaps even billions—might be saved this Government in its present mobilization effort if such a spirit of honesty, teamwork, and unselfish cooperation and patriotism were to be multiplied throughout the length and breadth of this land.

Mr. Speaker, referring again to the serious railroad strike now costing not only American lives but millions of dollars, I think it most appropriate to include as a part of my remarks what the idealogy of moral rearmament accomplished in settling impending strikes involving the United Air Lines and the National Airlines as carried in the January 24 issue of the Pathfinder:

HOW "RIGHT" SETTLED A STRIKE

United Air Lines President William A. Patterson thought hardboiled Larry Shapiro was kidding. Three months ago Shapiro suggested that deep-seated company-union differences could be settled "on the basis of absolute honesty, purity, love, and unselfishness."

Speaking for the United Air Lines Pilots Association, he soon convinced Patterson he was dead serious. Contract talks—deadlocked for 18 months over 119 points of disagreement—were resumed. All but three of the differences have since been cleared up, and a strike which would have cost his company an estimated $12,000,000 has been averted. Patterson last week told 500 delegates to a National Assembly on Moral Rearmament in Washington. The quick settlement, Patterson said, came about by applying MRA principles to the dispute.

Sharing the platform with his boss, pilot Shapiro said he had been "an expert in damning management"—until he attended the 5-day Labor Conference of Moral Rearmament last September at Michigan's picturesque Mackinac Island. There, he said, he found in MRA principles a solution "so simple that even today I am amazed."

MIRACLE MEDICINE

Later in the week delegates were told of another airline strike—this time at National Airlines—sidestepped by negotiation based on the ideology and spirit of MRA. "Henceforth," said W. T. Babbitt, vice president of the Airline Pilots Association, "I shall refer to MRA as a wonder drug that makes real human beings out of people."

MRA's healing power was startlingly visible at the Washington assembly. Labor and management weren't the only ones to bury the hatchet publicly. Delegates from France trooped to the microphone to apologize to German delegates for "gloating" when Allied bombers rained death on Germany during World War II. The Germans, in turn, humbly assumed public blame for their country's three invasions of France. All speakers testified that their change of heart resulted from a pilgrimage to the European center for moral rearmament at Caux, Switzerland. There, during the last 5 summers, 30,000 persons from 104 countries and territories have gathered for training, indoctrination, and devotion.

FOUNDER

As he listened quietly last week to these protestations of brotherhood and good will, bright-eyed Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman (pronounced bookman), 72, wore the look of a man pleased but not at all surprised. He and his untold millions of followers (there are no membership lists) think that all problems can be solved by the application of the absolute standards of honesty, purity, unselfishness and love under God's daily guidance.

Criticized at one time as an upper-class Salvation Army, MRA today draws its members from all walks of life. Nonsectarian and nonpartisan, it is supported by voluntary contributions, has no denominational creed. Meeting places range from London dockers' houses to the huge Hollywood Bowl.

The doctrine is spread in round-table discussions, summer training schools in the United States and Switzerland, personal evangelism, radio broadcasts, extensive publications, and presentations of well-staged, forceful dramatic productions.

The Moral Re-Armament movement (also known as the First Century Fellowship, the Oxford Group, or simply Buchmanism) was born in 1921 as Frank Buchman strolled through the quiet college yards at Oxford, England, reflecting on the question, How can one man change the world?

DIRECT ORDER

Suddenly, he says, God gave him the answer, which he hurriedly jotted down:

"First one man changed, then two, then four, then eight. A million changed. A whole nation changed."

The Pennsylvania-born Buchman has since devoted his own life to changing the lives of others. Best statement of MRA's aims, ideology, and methods is in a book of his speeches, called Remaking the World (Robert M. McBride, New York: $3). A bachelor and a former Lutheran minister, Buchman summarizes MRA's precepts this way: "Be honest with yourself and with your family and with your neighbor. Be pure and genuine in what you do. You'll find that you're happy, that the people around you will become happy and friendly. Soon this feeling will spread to whole cities and then to nations and to the world. If you'd like to change the world, first try changing yourself."

Mr. Speaker, is it not reasonable to contend that if these great airlines and their employees can come together on the basis of what is right instead of who is right, then the same can be said of the problem involved in this great calamity involving the railroads of this country and the employees thereof? Somebody must make the first move as was the case with Larry Shapiro.

The Late Rear Adm. F. D. Berrien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a write-up from the New Haven (Conn.) Register giving notice of the last services for Admiral F. D. Berrien, an outstanding naval hero, a most distinguished constituent, a remarkable athlete, brilliant coach, a great American, gentleman, and leader:

LAST SERVICES FOR ADMIRAL BERRIEN—WAR HERO AND EX-COACH OF NAVY FOOTBALL DIES AFTER SHOVELING SNOW HERE

Funeral services were held Friday morning, February 2, in Center Church, New Haven, Conn., for Rear Adm. Frank Dunn Berrien, retired, 73, United States Navy hero and coach of one of the most successful of Annapolis football teams. He died suddenly in his home at 367 Prospect Street while resting after shoveling snow from his sidewalks.

During a 35-year active career, Admiral Berrien served all over the world and participated in several campaigns as well as two World Wars. Coach of the Naval Academy football squads from 1908 through 1910, the goal line of his last team was never crossed.

CAPTURED SUBMARINE

Nation-wide fame came to the naval officer during World War I when he commanded the destroyer *Nicholson*, which, in November, 1917, captured the German submarine U-58 and its crew. The *Nicholson* later rescued the freighter *Julia Luckenbach* from shelling by another German sub.

Surviving are his wife, the former Mary Elizabeth Whittelsey of New Haven; a son, Frank W. Berrien of Miami, Fla.; and a daughter, Mrs. Harry Lugg, of Rockville. Funeral services were held in Center Church at 10 a. m. with the Rev. David N. Beach, pastor, officiating. Interment was in the United States Naval Academy Cemetery, Annapolis.

A resident of New Haven since his retirement in 1935, Berrein was called back to service—he was the only member of his graduating class to return to active sea duty—during World War II and served as troop convoy commander between San Francisco and Australia.

Berrien, then a captain, commanded the United States Submarine Base at Groton from 1921 to 1923 and established the Naval ROTC at Yale University in 1926. He was commander of the unit here for 2 years.

Admiral Berrien was born in Galesburg, Ill., August 17, 1877, son of Leonard Budd and Harriet Mat Smith Berrien. His father was a manufacturer of agricultural machinery. Graduating in 1900 at the United States Naval Academy, he was commissioned as an ensign in 1902. At Annapolis he was an outstanding athlete. He played four years on the varsity baseball team, three years on the football team, and was a record-breaking hurdler, on the track squad of 1900. He rose to the rank of captain in 1918, and was commissioned rear admiral and retired June 30, 1935.

While a midshipman at the Naval Academy he saw service in the West Indies during the Spanish-American War. From 1900-1904 he was on Asiatic duty, participating in the Philippine and China Relief campaigns, and

between 1904 and 1908 served with the Atlantic fleet on the battleships *Kentucky*, *Missouri*, *Minnesota*, and *Connecticut*. In 1908 he returned to the Naval Academy as head football coach.

From 1910 to 1913 he commanded the destroyer *Trippe* of the Atlantic Fleet, participating in naval operations in the campaign against Mexico in 1913. From 1913 to 1915 he was in command of the naval magazine at Hingham, Mass., and then for 11 months was on duty at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I., where he graduated in 1917.

CHIEF OF PATROL STAFF

When the United States entered World War I he served as chief of staff to the commander of the United States Patrol Squadron based at Hampton Roads, Va. In 1917 he was ordered to duty on the staff of Admiral William S. Simms in London. From July 1917 to June 1918 he commanded the destroyers *Nicholson* and *Wilkes*, and destroyer division No. 9 at Queenstown, Ireland.

While in command of two destroyers operating in a convoy protecting merchant ships out of Queenstown, Berrien—aboard the *Nicholson*—captured officers and crew of the first German submarine taken by United States forces in World War I.

When he returned to the United States in June 1918, Berrien was put in command of the hospital ship *Comfort*, in convoy from New York to Brest, France. After the armistice he was United States naval port officer at Bordeaux. Later he served as chief of staff to the commander of the destroyer squadron of the Pacific Fleet under Rear Adm. Henry A. Wiley.

After duty at the New London submarine base Berrien commanded all United States destroyers in European waters from 1923 to 1925 and then graduated from an Army War College in 1926.

KEPT TACOMA LIGHTED

He commanded the aircraft carrier *Lexington* following his service at Yale. In 1930 the "*Lex*" furnished electric power to the city of Tacoma, Wash., for a month. The feat was widely publicized and became a Navy legend. Captain Berrien pulled the carrier, then the largest Navy vessel in the world, up to a dock in Tacoma and while using only one-quarter of the electric power of the ship was able to keep Tacoma lighted.

Other assignments were as officer in charge of the hydrographic office in Boston and captain of the navy yard at Washington, D. C.

Admiral Berrien was a member of many organizations, including the Military Order of the Dragon, Order of the Carabao, Military Order of the World War, American Legion. Also the Faculty Club at Yale and the Graduates Club, New Haven.

He was awarded many service medals of the world wars, including the United States Distinguished Service Medal. Great Britain made him an honorary member of the Order of St. Michael and St. George and Greece made him a commander of the Order of St. Savior.

Church Endorses Food Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended resolution of the Broadway Tabernacle Church, of the Congregational denomination, points up the widespread support among religious groups for extending food aid to the Republic of India to avert impending famine there:

Resolution on wheat for India

Recognizing the tremendous need of India's people for food, intensified in recent months by a series of national disasters, and aware of large stores of food grain held by the Government of the United States of America: Be it

Resolved, That the members of Broadway Tabernacle Church, Congregational, 211 West Fifty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., assembled at a stated corporate meeting of the church on Wednesday evening, January 24, 1951, declare themselves in favor of the Government of the United States making available to the Government of India 2,000,000 tons of wheat upon mutually agreeable terms, and urge that everything possible be done to complete this transaction speedily.

JOSEPH E. CHOATE,
Clerk.

ALBERT J. PENNER,
Minister.

Congressman Doyle Explains How H. R. 2383 Would Stop Use of Power To Arbitrarily Destroy Legitimate Business—Remarks in Regard to Case of Ewing Versus Mytinger and Casselberry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I filed a bill which was given the number of H. R. 2383, the text of which follows:

H. R. 2383

A bill to amend section 304, subsections (a) and (b), of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 304 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 331), is amended by striking the balance of the sentence following the words "dangerous to health" and changing the comma after "health" to a period.

And it is further amended by striking all that portion of the last sentence of such subsection following the words "between the parties" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or, if no such stipulation be filed within a reasonable time, the court, on motion for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, may transfer the case for trial to any other district or division thereof."

That subsection (b) of section 304 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 331), is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following sentence:

"Cases brought hereunder shall be entitled to preference on the trial calendar."

And it is further amended by striking from the third to the last sentence all words following "such court", and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"On motion, for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, may transfer the consolidated proceedings for trial to any other district or division thereof."

In connection with the bill, I wish to further add that on August 17, 1950, in the Eighty-first Congress, I filed H. R. 9466; which bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill was not acted upon by this committee and, therefore, never had a chance to come to the floor of Congress for debate and decision. H. R. 9466, and H. R. 2383, which I introduced on February 5, 1951, are identical bills.

At the time I filed H. R. 9466 in the Eighty-first Congress, I inserted remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 17, on page A5924, and related that I became interested in the situation therein described because of the location in the Eighteenth Congressional District, which I represent, of the important business of Nutrilite Products, Inc., the continuance of which business was placed in immediate jeopardy by reason of the manner and method applied to make effective section 304, subsections (a) and (b), of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Since that date, the matter has been litigated through the United States Supreme Court and finally determined as the case of Ewing against Mytinger and Casselberry, the defendant being the prosperous, important business located as aforesaid.

The issues concerned are of such importance and of such Nation-wide interest that I asked the assistance of the worthy legal counsel of my constituents, Mytinger and Casselberry, in the preparation of these remarks. The purpose in so doing was to have enunciated as fully as practical the issues involved and the practical situation which has developed as a result of the interpretation by the United States Supreme Court. Also it will give the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which H. R. 2383 has been referred, the earliest possible opportunity to have the basic arguments in support of this bill to its attention.

So my effort in connection with the bill last session and the bill this session is to be constructively cooperative to the end that the greatest good and the greatest number shall be served.

I will make further remarks about this subject tomorrow and I now respectively call you attention to the following:

The bill (H. R. 2383) I have just introduced is intended to correct a situation growing out of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Ewing against Mytinger and Casselberry, Inc., decided by a divided court on May 29, 1950, with rehearing denied on October 2, 1950. That Court has held that the Congress intended to confer such unbridled and such unstoppable power upon the Federal Security Agency as to irreparably injure—yes, even to destroy private businesses. And the Court goes so far as to hold that even though Mr. Ewing is acting arbitrarily, capriciously, and oppressively, the Congress intended to take from Federal district courts their traditional equity powers of protection to stop such action, even where the evidence establishes to the satisfaction of the trial court that Mr. Ewing is 100 percent wrong. As I will develop later, the Supreme Court blames this unprecedented grant of

power upon the Congress. I do not believe Congress intended to give such power to Mr. Ewing; and if Congress in using broad language did inadvertently grant the power; I propose that we immediately take it away. Under our system of government no man should have power.

My interest in this important matter goes back more than 2 years. Evidence was then presented to me showing that a valued and long-established business located in the Eighteenth District of California, which I represent, was in a life-and-death struggle with the Food and Drug Administration. Mr. Ewing had ordered multiple seizures of the vitamin and mineral product sold by this company throughout the Nation on the ground that certain parts of the company's advertising literature was misleading, although he and his subordinates conceded—as they must—that the product is harmless and in fact beneficial. Eleven seizures had been made, all carefully spaced and planned geographically so as to cause the maximum injury to my constitutent's reputation by the publicity attendant thereupon.

The seizures were made as follows: Belleville, N. J., Seattle, Wash., St. Petersburg, Fla., Chicago, Ill., two seizures; Clarkfield, Minn.; Spokane, Wash.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Hastings, Nebr.; and New York, N. Y. And these seizures were made with the purpose of destroying my constituent's business before a trial on the merits of Mr. Ewing's claims about the literature could be had. I pause here to say that the last two statements are not mine but are taken from the unanimous findings of a special three-judge court, which findings I will quote later herein.

Naturally no company could thus be universally attacked and disgraced all over the Nation by lawsuits and the attendant publicity by Government officials and hope to continue to exist. Judge David A. Pine of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, when appealed to for an injunction, said he would grant one unless Mr. Ewing agreed to make no more seizures. He said this decision was made "because I feel there has not been a strict and literal compliance with the statute and that there should be when such a drastic and harsh provision of the law permits the acts contemplated."

Mr. Ewing's counsel agreed Mr. Ewing would make no more seizures pending Mr. Ewing's compliance with the law. I then wrote to Mr. Ewing on January 27, 1949, as follows:

I trust that all of the persons passing upon the problem before it comes to your desk for your own personal finding and signature will make very sure that the finding they ask you to sign is true in fact, and that the finding they ask you to make is consistent with existing law and facts in the premises.

Furthermore, I respectfully request that, inasmuch as my constituents emphatically maintain to me that, under the Food and Drug Act, their product, "Nutrilite," is not misbranded by their printed matter. And inasmuch as the reported determination of the Department to consecutively libel the interstate shipments of this product could and would normally bust or break the corporation producing the same before the matter could get to a final court decision—it would appear reasonable, would it not, Mr. Ewing, that there be no finding by you which would result in forcing the producing company to insolvency until there had been a reasonable hearing opportunity given the producing corporation to the end that there be opportunity to make a showing before yourself as to their contention that this Nutrilite product is not misbranded.

Mr. Ewing did not grant the hearing I requested and his deputy made findings against my constituents without according them a hearing. Again the matter was brought before Judge Pine, who characterized the actions of the deputy on behalf of Mr. Ewing as unfair, drastic, and harsh, but the judge was forced reluctantly to conclude as he did at the first hearing:

Shocking as it may seem to you and me, Congress has certainly given him the right to do just this without a hearing.

My bill, which I now offer, strikes from the law the provision which shocked Judge Pine and which he labeled harsh, drastic, and unfair, for I do not believe Congress intended the interpretation given to that provision by Judge Pine and then later by the Supreme Court in the decision cited above.

And Judge Pine is not the only person in a highly responsible position who was shocked by the actions of Mr. Ewing and his subordinates against my constituents. My people then were allowed by Judge Pine to amend the complaint against Mr. Ewing and claim this harsh provision of law is unconstitutional, and a special three-judge court was set up to hear the case. Judge T. Alan Goldsborough, who served with distinction for so many years in this House, Judge Bennett Champ Clark, a very able former Member of the United States Senate, and Judge Edward A. Tamm were the members of this special court. After a long-drawn-out trial these three distinguished and able judges unanimously held that Mr. Ewing and his subordinates had acted "capriciously, arbitrarily, unreasonably, oppressively, and unlawfully" and should be and were enjoined from carrying out their unlawful scheme to destroy my constituent's business.

The court findings soundly castigated the public officials. The three judges in their findings said in part:

5. Nutrilite contains no substance or material or combination of substances or materials harmful or deleterious in any manner to human users thereof when taken in suggested dosage. No claim has been made by any Federal, State, or other governmental agency that Nutrilite is adulterated or harmful in any manner to the health of human users thereof, insofar as the record before the court shows.

6. The label of the package in which Nutrilite was and is sold complies with all requirements of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

7. The objection of the defendants to the sale of Nutrilite, which is the basis of this action, is the use by plaintiff of any advertising pamphlet entitled "How to Get Well and Stay Well." Nutrilite is sold directly to users thereof and this pamphlet is used in making about 40 percent of the initial sales of Nutrilite.

8. The product now sold as Nutrilite was first marketed about 1933; defendants' records show they received information about it in 1939 and had correspondence about it in 1940; plaintiff has been its exclusive national distributor since 1945; defendants received their first copies of the then current edition of the pamphlet How To Get Well and Stay Well, on December 5, 1946, together with names and addresses of certain of plaintiff's distributors outside of California.

* * * * *

32. (a) On December 30, 1948, the instant injunction action was filed. At this time it was the intention and plan of the defendants to file many more libel seizure actions and seize nutrilite throughout the Nation. The food and drug inspectors knew of this general policy.

* * * * *

(c) Defendants made no effort to secure an early trial in the libel cases and in order to effect seizures more quickly mimeographed copies of the booklets, How To Get Well and Stay Well were prepared for transmission to United States attorneys.

* * * * *

34. On January 24, 1949, Judge David A. Pine of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia found that the actions of the defendants in rendering said decisions were unfair, drastic, shocking, and harsh, and held that the decisions of defendants Crawford, Larrick, and Dunbar, described supra, were unlawful because the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency did not have the authority to delegate this power to make such decisions to said defendants.

* * * * *

39. The seizure actions caused plaintiff a sales loss of some $100,000 per month from the time of the first seizure until the instant action was filed, and the defendants were restrained from making further seizures. The seizures had the effect of frightening plaintiff's agents and distributors, so that they worked less, and some resigned, with the net result of loss of morale among agents and distributors, loss in sales volume, and loss of personnel. Unfavorable opinions and injurious information with respect to the labeling of plaintiff's product reached many private individuals and organizations. Publicity about the seizure cases initiated by defendants appeared in newspapers and magazines in a way which did injuriously damage plaintiff and this led to loss of customers. Plaintiff was compelled to hire counsel in the 10 libel cases and put up bonds and costs in each case. The value of the Nutrilite seized by defendants in the 10 libel actions is $6,822.17, and the product so seized will be unsalable if returned to plaintiff. The nature of plaintiff's business makes good will of the public one of its most valuable assets and the acts of the defendants in the embargoes and seizure actions in widely separated parts of the United States has caused the plaintiff's injury and damage. Defendants admit injury to plaintiff and that there has been a serious impact on plaintiff's rights by their actions, and that there is no provision of law requiring or permitting defendants to reimburse plaintiff for the damages herein found or for the injury or for destruction of its business and good will by the actions of the defendants, in the event of a determination of said libel actions in favor of plaintiff. The injury and damage to plaintiff which has occurred and which is threatened by defendants is therefore substantial and irreparable.

40. The defendants have never advised plaintiff of the particulars of plaintiff's literature considered to be objectionable by defendants. The defendants have not provided an opportunity to plaintiff whereby such literature could be corrected, revised, and amended in a manner which would conform to the views of and be acceptable to the defendants.

41. That plaintiff would have been subjected to many additional seizures of its

product throughout the United States in addition to the existing 11 seizures of its product if not enjoined from so doing is admitted by defendants. It was a general policy and plan of the defendants to make with all possible speed many seizures of plaintiff's product. Such additional seizures, and the product could be seized by defendants in the hands of more than 5,000 of plaintiff's distributors, would have the effect of destroying plaintiff's business prior to any possible adjudication of the disputed issues on plaintiff's labeling in any of the libel actions already filed or threatened.

42. There was and is no emergency involving injury or damage of any kind to the public or to any purchaser, consumer, or user of Nutrilite or in connection with Nutrilite and plaintiff's use of the three pamphlets which constitute defendants' sole objection to Nutrilite's sale. Defendants have not at any time indicated or contended that there is an emergency or situation of compelling public necessity with respect to the labeling of plaintiff's product and no such emergency or situation did, in fact, exist at or prior to any of the actions of defendants described herein.

43. The evidence herein on the actions, conduct, and course of action of defendants before and after the decisions of Crawford, Larrick, Dunbar, and Kingsley described above reveal, as do their decisions and actions in making said decisions, that the defendants in making said decisions acted capriciously, arbitrarily, unreasonably, oppressively, and unlawfully.

The three-judge court also held that the language my bill strikes from the law is so unreasonable as to be unconstitutional when used as Mr. Ewing was using it here against a harmless and beneficial product to destroy a business before trial of the merits of Mr. Ewing's charges.

Mr. Ewing appealed to the Supreme Court, and that Court held, as I stated above, that the injunction must be set aside, that Congress intended to confer this unbridled power upon Mr. Ewing and even if he exercises it in an arbitrary, capricious, and oppressive manner, Federal district courts have had their injunction jurisdiction removed by Congress so they are helpless to prevent the resulting irreparable injury. The Supreme Court in a nonunanimous opinion by Mr. Justice Douglas thus reversed the three-judge court's decision. Mr. Justice Jackson, one of the dissenting Justices, said:

The Court does not deal at all with what appears to be the ultimate issue decided by the court below.

The trial court of three judges wrote no opinion but made 43 detailed findings of fact which would require 20 of these printed pages to reproduce and which summarize a 1,500-page record of a long trial. Those findings are made largely on undisputed evidence and on evidence from Government sources. This Court does not criticize or reverse any of them.

The substance of these is to find that the Government instituted a multiplicity of court actions, with seizures in widely separated parts of the country, with a purpose to harass appellee and its dealers and intending that these actions and the attendant publicity would injure appellee's business before any of the issues in such cases could be tried. This, the court held, was justified by no emergency, the product being, at worst, harmless and having been marketed for years with knowledge of the Department.

Assuming as I do that the act on its face is not constitutionally defective, the question remains whether it has been so misused by refusal of administrative hearing, together with such irreparable injury in anticipation of judicial hearing, as to deny appellee due process of law or to amount to an abuse of process of the courts.

The Government has sought and received from this court protection against a multiplicity of suits under circumstances where injury was less apparent than in this (*Landis v. North American Co.* (299 U. S. 248)). The holding of the court below and the contention of the appellee here that the Government is not entitled to so apply the statute as to bring multiple actions designed to destroy a business before it can be heard in its own defense is not frivolous, to say the least.

I am constrained to withhold assent to a decision that passes in silence what I think presents a serious issue.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion stated that the findings of the three judges were justified by the evidence and the three-judge court should have been held to have jurisdiction to grant the relief given.

I introduced this bill last August, and it was H. R. 9466 of the Eighty-first Congress. Due to the international situation, and the short time that Congress was in session after the bill was introduced, hearings on my bill were not possible before that session ended. In reintroducing this bill today, I am ever mindful that today our Government is being held up to the international spotlight as one where democracy under law rather than dictatorial powers exist. I am in favor of carving out of our law every provision which allows bureaucratic abuse, without hearing, to destroy a lawful and honest business. I think it is our duty as Members of Congress to seek out such provisions—and some may slip by us inadvertently or as here be held to exist by court decision regardless of what Congress intended—and carve those provisions out of our law. That is my proposal in my bill. I hope you will all support it to the end that in the future when your constituents come in contact with Mr. Ewing you will not find the courts helpless to stop this arbitrary, capricious, and oppressive action.

Address of Frank A. Hecht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address of Frank A. Hecht, president of the Navy League of the United States, on December 7, 1950.

I believe this speech merits general reading. It follows:

Nine years ago today we went to war to resist aggression. Then we did not hesitate. There was no thought of appeasement. The odds were against us. But we were not intimidated. We buckled down, tightened our belts, and fought on to victory.

Today we are again at war. Whether we like it or not, whether we choose to admit it or not, we are at war with Communist China. They have attacked our forces. They are killing our men. What more is needed for one nation to make war on another? The Chinese Communists have killed many more Americans in Korea than the Japs killed at Pearl Harbor. And yet there are those timid souls who would pull the covers over their head and pretend that nothing has happened, that we were still engaged only in a police action. They will not recognize the fact that we and our allies in Korea have been the victims of an attack just as we were 9 years ago.

Once again we find ourselves assembled in annual meeting for the purpose of reviewing the record of the past year and planning for the coming year.

The past year has been a busy one for your officers. It has been one of transcendent importance, both for our country and the world. Decisions have been made and steps taken which will influence the course of free government in the world for good or for evil in our lifetime and in the times of our descendants.

Immediately following our annual meeting of last year at St. Paul, we found ourselves at variance with those in the Department of Defense who advocated a program of economy, which involved reducing our Armed Forces. We made this stand known in our publications, in our contacts with the Members of Congress, especially those who serve on the Armed Forces committees of the House and Senate, in speeches by our officers and directors, through press releases, and in other media. The reason for this stand was that we believed then, as we do now, that disarmament, whether it be complete or partial, not only renders us physically incapable of dealing with an international emergency but also it actually encourages aggression because of the fact that an aggressor nation will attack when it realizes our military weakness. We said then that Communist Russia was an aggressor nation. We say it now. It will be just as true in the future as it is today. We must always be ready to deal with Communist aggression wherever it breaks out.

We differed with the policy of the State Department with regard to Communist China. We did not believe that, through default and inaction on our part, we should allow a government which was friendly to be replaced by one which, of its very nature, we knew to be hostile.

We differed with and criticized the action of the former Secretary of Defense in canceling construction of the flush-deck carrier. We protested the threatened attrition of Marine Corps ground-support aviation and the reduction of the Marine Corps itself to a parade-outfit status. We publicly went on record, after a vote of our board of directors, as favoring the bill which would make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

We have continued our publications, and have encouraged increased activity on the part of local councils. During the year your directors went on record as favoring the resumption of the celebration of Navy Day under completely civilian auspices. Accordingly, on Navy Day, your president laid a wreath on the tomb of Theodore Roosevelt, the father of the modern American fleet, at Oyster Bay, Long Island. The birthday of this great American had been selected as Navy Day. Celebrations were held in various other parts of the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. Because of the limited time between the determination to resume the celebration of this day and the occurrence of the day, preparations and programs were, of necessity, curtailed. It is hoped that every local council will plan, initiate and carry out an appropriate celebration honoring the Navy and the men and women of the Navy on next October 27. It

is my sincere belief that it is much more becoming for a civilian organization to pay tribute, to laud, and to honor the Navy and the men and women of the Navy, than it is for the armed services themselves to indulge in eulogies of self-adulation, as was done when Armed Forces Day was celebrated under the auspices of the services themselves.

During the past year your president has traveled from coast to coast, visiting with local councils. The interest expressed by the various members in their local communities was encouraging. As much cannot be said for the organization of all local councils. Because of the inactivity of local officers in many instances the local council has not held meetings regularly and has, to a large extent, become merely a paper organization. It is hoped that State presidents will see to it that local councils hold elections. Members of the local councils are urged to elect as their officers men who have a genuine and sincere interest in our work, who are willing to devote time and effort to it and, as a result, can achieve an active local council. It is unfortunate that the local enthusiasm, interest, and desire to participate in behalf of a sound defense program is not better coordinated within the local councils. This situation must be corrected. We rely on you to see to it that it is done.

After every war there is always a wave of disinterest in the Armed Forces which sweeps the country. The period following the end of hostilities in World War II was no exception. People assumed the attitude that the size and composition of our Armed Forces was a matter for the experts, and was no proper concern of a busy professional man or industrialist. More time and interest was manifested in golf scores or the pennant races than was ever given to the questions of national defense. People, who knew what the current tax reductions were that they were entitled to, knew and cared nothing about the size of the budget for the Navy and the other armed services. How short-sighted they were. Because the Nation got, and perhaps wanted, economy, we are faced with a worse situation which will necessitate vast expenditures for our armed services in the years to come. This situation will undoubtedly bring about controls, shortages, inconveniences, and other things which will deeply affect the daily life of every one of us. Defense is everybody's business—always. That is true whether we are fighting in Korea or whether we are fighting in Europe or elsewhere. It is true even if we are not fighting anywhere. It will be true as long as aggressive communism remains a strong force in the world. We invite you and all who think along similar lines to join us in the Navy League to see that we do have an adequate defense, to urge a sound foreign policy and to keep a vigorous eye on our domestic economy. This can be done better through an organization than it can by individuals working separately. To that end we invite your cooperation.

Tonight as we sit here, American men are fighting and dying in Korea. We and the other of our peoples of the world are in retreat there before the forces of Communist aggression. It is one of the great crises of our national history. The situation calls for bold and courageous action. Temporizing and half-hearted measures will not suffice.

Korea has proved once again that there is no easy way to victory. It has disproved the claims of those apostles of push-button warfare, who say that warfare as we have waged it in the past is obsolete and that we can rely upon the atomic bomb as our principal means of defense. In the light of Korea, our defense policies must be re-examined. It has proved anew that we need balanced forces—strong ground troops, a strong fleet and tactical air power as well as a strategic bombing potential. In Korea we suffer from an inferiority in manpower. We need more ground troops. Those are available on Formosa. There the Chinese Nationalist Government, the duly constituted government of China, which we have and still do recognize as such, has available 600,000 troops. These have been offered for use in Korea. We refused to utilize them for fear of provoking attack by Communist China. Regardless of the intricacies of international diplomacy, the fact is that we are now at war with Communist China. If there were ever any reason for not utilizing these Chinese Nationalist troops, that reason has now disappeared. Accordingly, I respectfully propose that the following steps be undertaken immediately:

1. That we reaffirm our recognition of the Nationalist Government as the legal government of China and declare that the Communist government is controlled by a non-Chinese government, that it illegally seized power by force, with the assistance of a foreign government.

2. That, if the Nationalist Government is willing, we invite them to send a large army to fight with UN troops resisting Communist forces in Korea.

3. That we reaffirm our determination to defend Formosa from invasion and implement this by strengthening the Seventh Fleet.

4. That we announce that we will veto in the Security Council of the United Nations any proposal to hand Formosa over to the Communist forces.

5. That the authorization be immediately given to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to have our forces bomb logistic supply bases in Communist China, as well as enemy forces in the vicinity of the Korean fighting front.

6. That we request of Congress increased defense appropriations and increased manpower for the Armed Forces.

It would be unwise and unprofitable for us to undertake an all-out conquest of the mainland of Asia. Because of our inferiority in manpower and the vastness of the terrain, such undertaking would probably be doomed to failure. However, we can control the eastward spread of Communist forces from the mainland of Asia, if we hold the line which is now anchored on Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines. Although we are inferior in land forces, we have a definite superiority in seapower. If our island defense line is to be breached, it must be done through a landing operation. Such an operation can be successfully resisted, if we have a strong enough fleet. We know that the Russians possess a well-trained, well-equipped, and efficient submarine force, which is in excess of 270 submarines. The Communists, by utilizing this force, can inflict losses on our fleet. Therefore, it behooves us immediately to increase our Far East fleet, and to increase our training for and our potential to cope with enemy submarines.

If our island chain, which I mentioned, were breached in any part, the chain will be materially weakened. It is unthinkable that we would allow any diplomatic maneuver to allow the Communist forces to take over Formosa. Remember that Chiang Kai-shek was our faithful ally. In the early part of World War II when we were unable to send a single bullet or a single gun to the Nationalist forces, President Roosevelt repeatedly wrote Chiang, urging him to continue to fight against Japanese aggression. This he did. He kept faith. Unfortunately, as much cannot be said for us. Do you think in view of what has happened that Chiang can consider us a trustworthy and desirable ally?

Recently in the United Nations we have seen the extraordinary spectacle of the representatives of Communist aggression, the ambassadors of a government whose troops are now killing Americans in Korea, coming to appear before the United Nations to accuse us of aggression in Formosa. While they accuse us of aggression, they will not answer any questions about Chinese Communist aggression in Korea. We have wholeheartedly supported the objectives of the United Nations and will continue to do so. However, unless the United Nations is to go the way of the League of Nations, it must face up to the aggressors and take a positive stand in support of the United Nations forces in Korea.

Regardless of the outcome of the Korean situation, communism will still remain an aggressive force. It will be a continuing threat to us and to all free nations. Communism cannot reach its objectives while there are democratic, capitalistic, or free governments anywhere in the world. Never before in the history of the world has one nation subjugated so much territory and so many people as has Communist imperialism. The price of our survival will be our willingness to make sacrifices and our development and retention of the power to resist Communist aggression.

We are a maritime nation. Our entire economy is dependent upon imports. Without imports our industry will be greatly curtailed. Our economy would be disrupted and our war potential vastly diminished. In the last war we saw what happens when we cannot get a vital import such as rubber. The reason we could not get rubber was that the enemy was able to take over the island area where it was produced and that we did not retain control over the sea lanes. The same is true of manganese and many other products. We do not have enough oil resources in our country to supply ourselves and our allies in the event of an all-out shooting war. This means we must import oil from the Near East, South America, and from other points around the world. To make sure that this oil gets here, we must retain control of the sea lanes. The way to do that is with a strong fleet.

Believe me when I say that people in the service in the Navy count on us to say things which they cannot say. We are perfectly free to express ourselves, to criticize and to present our views to Congress. Those on active duty are not. This is one of the most important roles of the Navy League.

With due modesty and without any sense of boasting, I think that we can be justly proud of our activities of the past year and the correctness of the stand which we have taken on matters pertaining to the national defense. The year ahead offers tremendous opportunities and presents commensurate challenges. Whether or not we can and will live up to what is expected of us depends, in large measure, upon you, our members. Will you help by taking an active part in your local organization, by increasing our membership, by becoming familiar with the questions and the answers presented by the world situation? We honestly believe that within the Navy League you and your friends can achieve these objectives. Mistakes of the past and mistakes of the future, if they are permitted, are paid for in American blood. They can be prevented if the facts are known, the issues are discussed, and if sound decisions with regard to national defense are reached. Now more than ever before it is apparent the Nation needs a strong Navy. The Navy needs the Navy League. The Navy League needs you.

God grant us today the courage, the intelligence, and the resolution which we had 9 years ago. God grant that once again we shall be victorious over the forces of aggression and then enemies of liberty. God be with us now as then. God be with us always.

Unions in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the contention that the Taft-Hartley Act has made it practically impossible for labor to exercise its right to organize is sustained by recent reports on the progress, or lack of progress, in legitimate labor organizing in the South. Here is one report, published in the Commonweal of February 2:

UNIONS IN THE SOUTH

(By John C. Cort)

In 1947 there were about 1,250,000 workers employed in textile mills, mostly strung along the eastern seaboard, of whom a little over half worked in the South. The major subdivision of the textile industry is cotton spinning and weaving. In 1925 about 80 percent of this industry was in New England and 20 percent in the South. Today the figures are exactly reversed, with 80 percent in the South and 20 percent in New England.

Many New England mills have closed up and moved bodily to the South to escape the unions and their high wage rates. Others have folded up in the face of southern competition. For more reasons than one, therefore, the Textile Workers have been forced to concentrate on the job of organizing the southern mills. They have spent several million dollars on the job and have conducted about 60 strikes in the last 5 years. And still only 15 percent, or less than 100,000 of these workers, are now represented by either the CIO or A. F. of L.

Consider some of the difficulties. In 1948 there were about 770 mills located in small southern villages which were owned in toto by the mill owners. If the workers went on strike the mill owner would simply evict them from their homes, pointing self-righteously to his lease, which specifies that the occupant must work in the local mill. If the union fought this outrage in court, there was usually a local judge who could see only that each tenant "refused to work for the plaintiff, quit his job, and walked off." No mention of a strike at all. Case dismissed. (See case of Plymouth Manufacturing Co. strike, McColl, S. C., 1949.)

Often the mill was owned by a large textile corporation which also owned anywhere from 10 to 44 (Burlington Mills) other factories. It could well afford to close one mill for a year or even forever. Many of these corporations are owned by northerners, including such big outfits as Goodyear, Firestone, U. S. Rubber, who do not hesitate to inflame every conceivable southern prejudice in order to lick the union and fatten their own money bags.

Last March the CIO set out to organize the Orr Mill in Anderson, S. C. A columnist in the local paper bristled with bigoted indignation, saying, "Yet from the so-called 'melting pots' of the northern cities, where people of strange races and imbued with alien ideologies are blended together to produce all manner of men, including numerous arrogant mongrels, come emissaries of misinformation and hate to tell textile workers in this section of America what they should think, believe, and do."

To this point I have summarized less than half of the textile workers' case against the South. The second half tells what happens when and if the CIO should overcome all these obstacles and still win a collective-bargaining election. Then the agony really starts. Here is a case which is only somewhat more painful than the average. It involves the Tower Hosiery Mills, a subsidiary of Burlington Mills, the giant that owns 45 mills and is the second largest employer of textile labor in the South. Note the timetable: 1943—union wins election, but does not feel strong enough to strike and no agreement results; 1944—union loses election; 1945—union wins election; 1946—again unable to negotiate a decent agreement, union files charge of failure to bargain in good faith; 1947 (14 months later)—National Labor Relations Board gets around to holding a hearing; 1948 (1 year later)—trial examiner makes report; 1949 (11 months later—NLRB agrees with union and orders Tower Hosiery to bargain in good faith; 1950 (13 months later)—United States court of appeals rejects company's appeal and sustains the NLRB. The textile workers' attorney concludes sadly: "Of course, no contract has been consummated. Indeed, there is now no local union at this plant."

One is reminded of the old saw, "The operation was successful, but the patient died." The National Labor Relations Act, even as amended by Taft-Hartley, is supposed to protect labor's right to organize and bargain in good faith. In the South this protection is a mockery, and, indeed, not only in the South. In the North as well. In my own local union we have just passed through negotiations in which two employers openly and unashamedly committed unfair-labor practices. But knowing that any appeal to the NLRB would take several years to process, we could do nothing but take it.

The southern industrialists no longer need the goon squad in white sheets, the tar and feathers, the free ride out of town on a fence rail that were so popular a few years back. They use them too, occasionally, even now, but today the better class of people doesn't soil its fingers with such vulgarity. Today they hire a high-priced lawyer and strangle the union to death with legal red tape and delay, to which homicide the Taft-Hartley Act lends itself with glad abandon.

They say that "justice delayed is justice denied." The textile workers filed 165 charges of unfair-labor practices against southern mills with the NLRB between August 22, 1947, and February 28, 1950. From the time the charges were filed these were the average periods of time before they could get action from the Labor Board and the courts; about 12 months before the NLRB issued a complaint; about 1 year and 4 months before the NLRB held a hearing before a trial examiner; about 1 year and 6 months before the examiner made his report; 2 years and 3 months before the Board handed down an order; 3 years and 8 months before the courts forced compliance in those few cases that the union was able and willing to push this far.

Total Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, an article by Max Eastman entitled "Total Blunder," in the February 1951 issue of Catholic Digest, warrants careful reading and thoughtful consideration. Although I do not necessarily make all of the thoughts in this article my thoughts also, I agree entirely with the main thesis that "America is without leadership in the most subtle and complex and implacable danger she ever confronted."

The article follows:

TOTAL BLUNDER

(By Max Eastman)

Everybody agrees that the present plight of the United States is bad, but nobody names the true cause. "Dialoyalty in the State Department," "Stalin doublecrossed us," "Roosevelt died," "Truman is small town," "Acheson is stubborn," "The Republicans were ignored," "We can't support the whole world." None of these guesses fully explains what is the matter. The real, simple, and sole cause of our plight is ignorance.

We are up against a complex, mystical, pseudo-scientific religion, a well-armed crusade called Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism. It differs from everything else in history, most of all from everything American. It has created a crisis that may well be the supreme crisis in the life of mankind. And yet, up to the present moment, no one in executive authority in this country has taken the trouble to study its dogmas, decrees, plans, and strategies, and find out what it is and how it works.

On February 11, 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt said to a bunch of Communist-minded young men and maidens on the White House lawn, "The Soviet Union, as everyone knows who has the courage to face fact, is a dictatorship as absolute as any dictatorship in the world." That was bold, true, and supremely important.

The Soviet Union, after Hitler attacked it, continued to be a dictatorship, as absolute as any dictatorship in the world. But Roosevelt lost the courage, more exactly, the intellectual clarity, to face the fact. He began to deceive himself, and deceive those about him. He became soft-headed; so did they. He became fuzzy-minded; so did they. He didn't know much about Stalin or Lenin, and nothing at all about Marxism, and instead of reading up on it, or calling in somebody who did know, he cultivated his ignorance. So did they. Aided by the war fever, he reached the point where he could habitually speak of the Soviet Union as a democracy, a liberty-loving, peace-loving nation. He could say of Stalin, who had then fully shown himself to be one of the bloodiest tyrants in history, "I got along fine with Marshal Stalin. I believe he is truly representative of the heart and soul of Russia. I do not think any insoluble differences will arise among Russia, Great Britain, and the United States. We came to the conferences with faith in each other, and now we have supplemented faith with definite knowledge." But it was definite knowledge of what was not true, the most fatal of all forms of ignorance.

Cultivated ignorance, not knowing because you don't want to know, extended into every department of our Government, and every phase of our political and military strategy in relation to Russia. Our statesmen didn't know and didn't want to know what Russia's foreign policy was, what Russia's internal regime was, what Stalin meant by democracy, what the great purge of 1936 to 1938 was about, why and by what means the fabulous confessions were extorted.

They didn't know or want to know that the Chinese Communists were hand-and-glove with Stalin in his plan to seize Manchuria, and then all China, and then all Asia, and then the world. They were taken in by the transparent hoax that the Chinese Communists were middle-of-the-road agrarian liberals, independent of Moscow. For 5 years our whole Far Eastern policy was based on that Moscow-manufactured hoax.

And when the hoax was exploded, did they change their policy? Not for a second. They got out an enormous White Paper, 1,054 pages, trying to justify their policy. The makers of our foreign policy were more concerned to defend their own past than the future of our country.

However, I am not discussing the Democratic administration here. I am not campaigning for the Republicans. They have been just as ignorant. They joined the Democrats in what has been mistakenly called a bipartisan foreign policy. It was a nonpartisan no foreign policy, a harmony of ignorance, a clasping of hands on the fact that none of them had the slightest idea what to do.

I do not know how much Winston Churchill will be able to say in apology for his part in handing half the world to a tyrant; how far he was hoodwinked by Stalin, how far outvoted by the Stalin-Roosevelt combination. He has not yet told us about that. But he joined heartily in the conspiracy of self-deception.

He contributed to Roosevelt's cultivated ignorance of Soviet policy. His guilt is greater, too, for in him ignorance requires more cultivation. He does not decide on things by hunch, as Roosevelt did. In Great Contemporaries, published in 1937, he wrote two paragraphs containing the entire body of knowledge for the lack of which the delegates at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam threw away their opportunity to rebuild the world.

He wrote, "Communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the Communist faith as the doctrine itself. Pacific propaganda may be made the mask of hatreds never before manifested among men. No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists. Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin. Then when the time is ripe every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition and contrary opinion must be extinguished by death. The absolute rule of a self-chosen priesthood according to the dogmas it has learned by rote is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigation, progressively and forever.

"To be forewarned should be to be forearmed."

How shall we reconcile this penetrating wisdom, a warning to the free world against every mistake its leaders have made in the last 5 years, with the giant part Churchill played in making those mistakes? How shall we reconcile it with his saying to the House of Commons in November 1944: "I believe with deep conviction that the warrior statesman at the head of Russia will lead the Russian peoples, all the peoples of Russia, into the sunlight of a broader and happier age for all, and with him in this task will march the British Commonwealth of Nations and the mighty United States of America." He said this of a government which keeps in slavery 14,000,000 of its people.

Churchill has frankly stated that he gave up all other considerations in his determination to beat Hitler. He exclaimed in a broadcast June 22, 1941: "I will unsay no word that I have spoken about communism. But all this fades away before the spectacle which is now unfolding. We have but one aim and one single, irrevocable purpose. We are resolved to destroy Hitler and every vestige of the Nazi regime."

And more intimately he confided to his secretary: "I have only one purpose, the destruction of Hitler, and my life is much simplified thereby." His praise of Harry Hopkins, though little short of adulation, could rise no higher than this: "There he sat, slim, frail, ill, but absolutely glowing with refined comprehension of the cause. It was to be the defeat, ruin, and slaughter of Hitler to the exclusion of all other purposes, loyalties, or aims. In the history of the United States few brighter flames have burned."

It is unquestionable, indeed, whether such an abdication of intelligence in high places is to be found in the previous history of the United States, or such praise of it in England. Whatever may become of the British Empire, these words mark the end of the classic tradition of British diplomacy.

Churchill did unsay every word he had spoken about communism. He unknew every item of his knowledge about it. He achieved, by a somewhat strenuous exercise of will, the ignorance that our American leaders were naturally endowed with. But the result was the same—a second world-conquering tyrant is at our gates because a war against the first one was fought blindly.

Truman has wisely undertaken to get the truth about America into the minds of the Russians, but there remains the heavy task of getting the truth about Russia into the mind of Truman. Before a man can learn something, he has to know that he is ignorant of it. Even this preliminary knowledge is denied to those transfixed by the Churchill-Roosevelt tradition.

Truman got a merited horse laugh last year when he said, "I know Joe Stalin; he's a good fellow, but he's helpless in the hands of the Politburo." Yet that was only what his predecessors thought when Stalin failed to live up to his promises at Yalta. It was a notion that Stalin himself had been careful to plant in their minds in advance. Stalin has demonstrated by 5 solid years of treachery his unaltered belief that no faith need be, indeed, may be kept with non-Communists. That is the very simple truth which those must see who aspire to lead us from here on.

President Truman recently said to Arthur Krock, "The real trouble with the Russians is that they are suffering from a complex of fear and inferiority where we are concerned." If he really means that, America is without leadership in the most subtle and complex and implacable danger she ever confronted.

The real trouble with the Communists is that they believe that we are a degenerating society, and that they are the society of the future. They believe that in the long run they are bound to win. They are in a mood of belligerent superiority. They control one-third of the people and nearly half the earth, and threaten our national life as it has never been threatened before.

To the Truman-Marshall-Acheson school of diplomacy, last-ditch defenders of the policy of not knowing because you don't want to know, the attack in Korea must remain an impenetrable mystery. All they can learn from the sacrifice of American lives in that battle was summed up by Dean Acheson in the brilliant thought (not quoted verbatim): Because of the unprovoked attack in Korea, we must be all the more careful not to do or say anything that might provoke the Chinese Communists. The Chinese Communists are "provoked" by one thing and one only—an exposed point in our defenses, another chance to win a battle for the totalitarian world-Communist crusade of which they are a part.

Ignorance in the Executive, ignorance in the makers of our foreign policy is more dangerous than treason.

Address of John F. Nave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following speech made by John F. Nave, national commander of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at a dinner given in his honor on January 28, 1951, in Syracuse, N. Y.:

I find it extremely difficult tonight to speak at length; or on any particular subject.

It occurs rarely in a man's life that he is singled out to be honored by an affair of this nature.

With deep humility and great pride I accept the benevolence, good will, and confidence that this occasion inspires.

As National Commander, I realize the faith, trust, and vote of confidence placed in me by my fellow veterans and organizational members throughout our beloved country.

It has been stated that over 9,000,000 honorably discharged American War Veterans in the United States today have eligibility requirements for my present position.

It has been further stated that only 16 of them have attained this coveted position.

This great honor bestowed upon me by my fellow veterans is indeed something to be greatly proud of and forever remembered and cherished.

My great hope and ambition is to keep faith with the great office to which I have been elected for the fiscal year 1950-51; and to pass onto my successor accomplishments not in existence at the time of my assumption of office. This, I know, shall be.

Since, tonight, you honor the National Commander, it is only fair to reveal a few highlights of the national organization he has been entrusted to command.

My organization is nonprofit and nonpolitical.

It does not promote the candidacy of any person to public office. Its income does not go to any private individual or concern. The national, State, and local officers serve without salary or compensation. Charity and benevolence is the basis of our veterans' cause, which we so honorably and faithfully serve.

It is composed entirely of persons who were honorably discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States for service rendered in time of war.

It is a patriotic American veterans' organization.

It is against all Communist, Fascist, totalitarian, subversive, and un-American groups and organizations.

It is faithful and loyal to the Constitution and Government of the United States; and against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.

Moreover, it reaffirms the privilege of all veterans' organizations to serve and aid veterans, their wives, widows, and dependent children and parents, regardless of their position or station in life.

In addition, it fosters and advances the true principles of democracy, freedom, and loyal Americanism.

Lastly, incorporated as a war veterans' nonprofit, nonpolitical membership corporation in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, California, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Rhode Island, it is

also specifically recognized by name as such under 23 different State laws, as well as sponsoring 67 bills in Congress during the last 4 years, in its individual name.

This, in brief, is a short synopsis of the national organization which I am entrusted to command for the ensuing year.

To paraphrase the words of the military, I am proud of my command and the assignments it entails. Its foundation consists of the cornerstone of democracy and freedom. One could not find a better cause to serve.

As I stated in my opening remarks, I find it extremely difficult to speak at length or on any particular subject this evening. I believe the reason is perhaps quite obvious.

Your presence here tonight on this gala occasion in my behalf is both touching and overwhelming. To be so honored is not only rare in a man's life, but also greatly inspiring.

This day is a memorable and joyful one for me. May the Lord be as gracious and kind to all of you present here tonight who made it possible.

If the Small Miners of America Could Have Produced During the Last 5 Years, We Would Not Face Our Present Shortage of Critical and Strategic Minerals and Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the production of the small mines of this country is necessary if we are to have an adequate supply of the critical and strategic minerals and metals. For 5 years following World War II some of us from the far West urged a program which would continue the production of this large segment of the American mining industry. Our efforts were unsuccessful and today our Nation faces a desperate shortage of these materials. Why that happened is discussed in a speech I made at the annual convention of the American Mining Congress at Salt Lake City on August 25, 1950, which I include as part of the RECORD, as follows:

The problems of the small mine operator is a large subject. My association with those problems has been in the legislative field, and my discussion of them will be limited to the legislative problems of the small miner in which I have some first-hand knowledge.

The legislative problems of the small mine operator originate in the field. If he didn't have trouble in his operations in the field, he never would have been back in Washington having legislative problems. All I know about that is that the small miner—and some not so small—have been telling me that they are going broke—that they have had to close up their mines—that the present price will not support their operations—and that something has to be done about it.

Presumably, the small miner has exhausted his remedies in the field—whatever could be done in improving his operations by his own resources has been done. No one comes to Washington for help—least of all the little fellow unfamiliar with the labyrinthian ways of Washington—unless it is the last resort. So he has come, and the crescendo of his complaints has risen as the reports of more and more mine closures have piled up. Surely he has been in a sorry plight, and he wonders why something hasn't been done about it.

Let me tell you why.

The small miner in his effort to get help has been faced by an unusual and formidable coalition. He has been opposed in his own Government by the Interior Department. He has been opposed in his own Government by the State Department. He has been opposed in his own industry by some of the big operators. And he has been opposed in Congress by interests themselves getting fat on Government protection and subsidy.

I will be specific.

The Interior Department has vigorously opposed any legislation modeled on the World War II premium price plan. It has supported, but reluctantly, a very limited program for additional development and exploration and the salvaging of those minerals and metals which would be lost in presently closed or closing mines unless immediately taken out of the ground.

The record is clear.

In the Eightieth Congress the President on the recommendation of the Interior Department vetoed the Allen bill to continue temporarily a modified version of the premium price plan. Consistently thereafter, the Interior Department opposed a bill for a similar purpose authored by Congressman Russell, of Nevada. In this Congress—the Eighty-first—the Interior Department has turned thumbs down on a bill by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, and me, to aid the small miner which was introduced after exhausting conferences with the Interior Department and after we had gotten what we believed was their agreement. The bill was killed in the Rules Committee with their help.

Subsequently, on two different occasions, Senator O'MAHONEY and I worked up further compromises—bills that gave the Interior Department unlimited power to pick and choose between operators—which they demanded—the so-called selective contract system for incentive payments for the production of critical and strategic minerals and metals. These measures were twice defeated on the floor of the House—after taking them around the Rules Committee on a special rule. Those bills have had the approval of the Interior Department but not what I would call their enthusiastic support.

As this war emergency came upon us a new measure was locked up in the Rules Committee along with the others. This was a measure providing for limited help in exploration and development and in addition the salvaging of mineral and metal resources which would be forever lost to the Nation unless removed from the ground now—the deep mines in Michigan, which are closed and watering up, as an example. This measure had what I would call the half-hearted support of our Government agencies. Finally, reluctantly—beaten into it by the necessity of war—the leaders in Washington started to talk about the importance of minerals and metals—the deplorable condition of the stockpile—which had been called to their attention all along—and the expenditure of two or three billion dollars on essential materials.

Now what has brought this attitude about; what has been the reasoning which has supported this reluctance to aid the small mine operator?

Let me answer that question.

There are people in our Government who believe that our mineral resources have been grievously depleted by war; that the mineral resources of this Nation have been used up to an astonishing degree; that our minerals and metals have been scattered over the four corners of the earth, in almost every land and at the bottom of almost every sea in the extravagant expenditure of war. That this being true, we should conserve our resources by keeping them in the ground, and should use so far as possible, and stockpile so far as possible, the resources of other nations. That that was not only the wise, but the cunning thing to do, and was the policy of true conservation. And that certainly it is sheer folly to use any more of our resources than we had to—much less pay premium or incentive prices to bring them out of the ground and burn them up in industrial use.

Now our answer was as ancient as the lore of western mining—and as hard to understand without experience. It was the ancient proverb of mining—that ore begets ore. That the only way to develop and conserve our mineral resources is by mining them. And, our legislation provided that the mineral wealth produced as a direct result of incentives from the Government should go into indestructible stockpiles which would grow in value, and not be lost or used until needed—and that by this method we would not only bring to the surface in usable form our mineral wealth, but also—in effect—stockpile the manpower and transportation to make the resource available in event of war. Additionally, we would thereby maintain and keep the finest stockpile our Nation could hope to have—a healthy, going domestic mining industry producing and ready to produce more in a national emergency safely beyond the reach of the snorkel submarine.

But our arguments were unavailing, and policy was made in high places.

Linked in this dangerous and specious reasoning with the so-called conservationists has been the State Department. It fitted their necessities exactly.

The State Department needed to maintain the dollar balances of foreign nations. For that to be done, foreign nations must sell us something for which dollars could be paid. The thinking of the conservationists dovetailed neatly. Minerals and metals should be bought abroad. The domestic market should be supplied with foreign minerals and metals. Millions should be spent through ECA in developing foreign mineral and metal production for sale to the United States. And, the scattered and politically impotent domestic small miner was a perfect victim, whose murdered squeals would hardly be heard from the far west on the spot-lit Washington stage.

Moreover, even the political hazards were further minimized. The conservationists in the government departments and the dollar-balance policy in the State Department found an unexpected ally in some of the big mining operators.

And they—the big mining operators—had some ideas that make sense to them. Here they are:

They did not want the Government to get its meddling hand into their industry. Their observation proved that Federal regulation followed the Federal dollar. It made no difference that they were not required to participate unless they wanted to—or that their nonsubsidized mines would not have to compete in the free market with the subsidized small mines whose production would be required to go into the stockpile. It was the dread foot of Government through the peacetime door of their industry. And they wanted none of it. Further, a little mine nursed on a Government subsidy might grow to a big rough competitor who no longer needed a subsidy—or any odds from them in the free market. Others with foreign investments, presently or in prospect, could see no merit in reducing or endangering the home market. From any side it looked like a horned devil to them—and their emissaries trod the high-ceilinged halls of the Capitol, button-holed Congressmen and whispered the mining industry is against it.

It is a fine tribute to the Congressmen from mining States—Republicans and Democrats alike—that in the face of these circumstances a bill ever got to the floor at all. There is no partisanship among the supporters of mining in Congress. They fought hard and well—on both sides of the aisle. Especially I want to pay tribute to the Representatives from this State, Colorado, Montana, Idaho, Arizona, and New Mexico, all of whom, regardless of party, have done everything in their power to repair the desperate situation of the domestic miner.

But there were not enough of us. The Senate, where mining is relatively stronger because each mining State—no matter how small—has as many Senators as New York, twice passed mining bills. In the House, where the thinly populated mining areas are submerged in representation from the great metropolitan areas, we did not do so well. The Congressmen from the East and South voted us down. Some didn't like subsidies for the mining industry—Congressmen from New York who shout their heads off for low cost public housing—we got 2 votes out of New York's 45. Congressmen from the South who will fight to the last breath for parity for cotton, tobacco, and peanuts—we did not get a single vote in Georgia. Congressmen from the Midwest—the land of wheat and corn—who not only want parity but cheap Government financed storage for their grain—and will vote Democratic if they don't get it from a Republican Congress. We got 6 votes out of Ohio's 23. And some just weren't interested—and "I have to cast one economy vote this session, don't I?"

In summary, then, the problem of the small mine operator is to convince the Interior Department that "ore begets ore"—that mining and developing our mineral resources is conservation; to convince the State Department that American dollars paid for foreign minerals and metals has a Siamese twin—a dangerous and costly dependence upon ocean-borne supplies from foreign lands constituting a serious threat to our national security and our long-range peace time needs; to convince some of the big operators that the national interest is above any private interest; and to convince the eastern and southern Congressmen that the security of their farms, factories, and homes requires a self-sufficiency of those things without which our industrial machine will collapse.

It is a big order. And I am sure the American small mine operator takes no satisfaction from the fact that the Korean crisis has made the hard realities plain: that our domestic mining industry has slowly gone out of existence; that the stockpile is deplorably short and unable to sustain any kind of a war effort; that we are tragically lacking in some of the very essentials of a war effort.

The damage can be repaired, but it will be costly, and in our present emergency we will suffer from our failure to have a well-balanced and long-range domestic mining policy. Government agencies will be given more power than contemplated in any of the measures I have referred to—and it may be a long time before we can limit that authority. Steps will be taken to maintain and increase the domestic production of critical and strategic minerals and metals by providing the assistance required to assure production from small and marginal mines and the undeveloped mineral deposits of the United States. In our haste we will again gouge our resources—as we did in the last war—rather than following orderly development and production. Manpower will be short and costs will be high. But what the Nation, Congress, Government officials—and I believe the industry—have finally been convinced must be done, will be done. The officials of our Government will be urged to counsel with all phases of the mining and related industries and to avoid if possible some of the pitfalls in our past experience. Out of all this I hope will come a balanced long-range domestic mining program based on the principle that it is sound for our economy and necessary for our security to have and to maintain at all times a healthy going domestic mining industry. I have confidence in the leadership in the mining industry represented here at this great convention, and know of your willingness, your anxiety, to do your part.

Cecil Dickson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cecil Dickson has resigned as coordinator of information for the House of Representatives to assume new duties with the Motion Picture Association of America.

We shall miss him very much. Mr. Dickson had character, ability, and integrity. He served this body well, and we sincerely hope for him great success in his new work.

OFFICE OF COORDINATOR
OF INFORMATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 1, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Serving under you as Coordinator of Information for the United States House of Representatives for the past 2 years has been a supreme privilege and honor, but now I must resign to assume new duties with the Motion Picture Association of America, which we have discussed.

The intimate association with you, the second most important official in our Government, and the confidence and trust you reposed in me constitute the highest tribute one could receive in 30 years of close personal friendship. I shall cherish the memory for all time.

It has been a challenging and interesting pleasure to work for you and the other Members of our great Congress. I am deeply grateful to you for the opportunity to serve, and I was so happy to be with you when you established a record for both accomplishments and tenure as Speaker of the greatest legislative body on earth.

May the coming years bring to you more honor, greater happiness, and genuine contentment which you so richly deserve.

With deep personal affection and high regard, I am,

Gratefully yours,

CECIL DICKSON.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1951.

Mr. CECIL DICKSON,
Pleasant Hill, Paconian Springs, Va.

DEAR CECIL: I have received your letter of February 1, 1951, stating that you must resign as Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives to assume your new duties with the Motion Picture Association of America. Let me say that I accept your resignation with deepest regret, but I cannot stand in the way of your progress or bettering yourself and your family.

When I first met you, you were a correspondent with the Denison Herald at Denison, Tex., which is in the district I represent. Since that time I have watched your career with a friendly interest. You made good and reached a high place in the newspaper fraternity. No one could have made a greater or more satisfying Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives than you have. Your work has been thorough and intelligent to the highest degree. Throughout the years I have appreciated your friendship and your loyalty to me personally. You are not only loyal to men, you are loyal to principles. It has been a high privilege to have enjoyed the friendship of and worked with, throughout the years, a man of your steadfast honesty, your high degree of loyalty, and your marked ability.

You carry with you into your new field my unalloyed friendship and best wishes.

Affectionately yours,

SAM RAYBURN.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense held in Washington, D. C., January 25 to 27, 1951.

This resolution asks that the reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 be not extended and that in its place there be established the principle of flexible import fees.

Mr. Speaker, the Women's Patriotic Conference represented 40 organizations and more than 2,000,000 American women.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT OF 1934, AS EXTENDED, ADOPTED BY THE TWENTY-FIFTH WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 25-27, 1951

Whereas a healthy national economy is necessary to a strong national defense; and

Whereas good wages and full employment form the foundation of a healthy economy; and

Whereas the free trade importation of products of countries where workers are paid much less than workers producing comparable goods in the United States can only result in increasing unemployment here and a weakening of our economy and our potential for national defense; and

Whereas the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program has removed protection from our workers and investors against the unfair competition of the low-paid workers of other countries, thereby threatening jobs of workers in industries important to our national defense; and

Whereas as a result of the reduction of tariffs and import fees incident to the passage of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as extended, grave injury already has been inflicted upon various industries in this

country, important to our national defense program; and

Whereas imports into our country should be controlled by the imposition of import fees which would reflect the difference in our workers' wage standard and standard of living to those standards in other countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge upon Congress that the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as extended which expires in June of this year, be not extended further and that in its place there be established the principle of flexible import fees, to be decided upon by the Congress in keeping with the Constitution of the United States.

FORTY PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING MORE THAN 2,000,000 WOMEN

American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.; American Gold Star Sisters, Inc.; American Gold Star Wives, Inc.; American Legion Auxiliary; American War Dads Auxiliary; American War Mothers; American Women's Legion of World Wars; Auxiliary to Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War; Blue Star Mothers of America; Catholic War Veterans of the U. S. A. Ladies Auxiliary; Dames of the Loyal Legion of the U. S. A.; Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War (1861–65), Inc.; Daughters of the United States Army; Ladies Auxiliary of the Military Order of the Purple Heart; Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; Marine Corps League Auxiliary; National Amvets Auxiliary; National Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States; National Patriotic Council; National Society for Constitutional Security; National Society Daughters of the Revolution; National Society Daughters of the Union (1861–1865), Inc.; National Society of New England Women; National Society Patriotic Women of America, Inc.; National Society of Service Star Legion, Inc.; National Society Women Descendants of the Anc. and Hon. Art. Co.; National Women's Relief Corps Auxiliary; National Yeomen F; Navy Club U. S. A. Auxiliary; Navy Mothers Club of America; New York City Colony, New England Women Society Sponsors of United States Navy; the Wheel of Progress; United States Army Mothers; Women of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States; Women's National Defense Committee of Philadelphia; Reserve Officers Association Ladies Clubs of the United States; the National Gold Star Mothers, Inc.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the ninth of a series of short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

MAIMONIDES: GREAT JEWISH LAW SCHOLAR AND PHILOSOPHER (1135–1204 A. D.)

Maimonides (1135–1204 A. D.) was born in Spain and migrated to Egypt, where he became the greatest Jewish scholar of medieval times, writing works on law, logic, astronomy, medicine, and philosophy.

His principal philosophical work, The Guide for the Perplexed, sought to harmonize Jewish teachings with philosophy, especially that of Aristotle. At the same time The Guide recognized that reason is limited and needs to be supplemented by revelation. The work influenced not only Maimonides' Jewish successors but also Arabian and Christian—among the latter St. Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus.

In the Mishna Torah he gave a classified collection of Jewish oral law, which became a reference book for rabbis and judges.

His plaque was sculptured by Brenda Putnam, of New York City.

Unsnapping the Bear Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, other than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], there is no man in the present House so well equipped to speak upon the situation in Korea as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMENSKI]. Only a few weeks ago he was in Korea while the present action was being joined. He has first-hand knowledge of the psychology of the people in Korea and China. Today he is in this House clothed in the modesty of a new Member of this body. He is a pleasing and convincing speaker and above all he stands for something, as was so well evidenced by the way in which he beat the Hague machine last November in absentia.

This House stands well in need of information from a man so well informed. He should be encouraged to give it without further delay. I believe his observations while in Korea will be most helpful to all of us in Congress.

I include in the RECORD herewith an article written expressly for International News Service this month and which was published on January 19 in the Jersey Observer:

REPRESENTATIVE SIEMENSKI OFFERS WAR PLAN—JERSEY CITY CONGRESSMAN CALLS "RED HORDE" OF CHINA A MYTH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A Member of Congress who only a few weeks ago was serving in Korea, herewith presents a five-point program for unsnapping the bear trap clamped on UN forces by the Chinese. An Army major and press chief for the Tenth Corps, Representative ALFRED D. SIEMENSKI was evacuated direct from the Hungnam beachhead to take his post in Congress, to which he was elected from New Jersey's Thirteenth District while serving in Korea. He fought in the Italian campaign in the last war and later served with the American Military Government in Austria under Gen. Mark Clark.)

(By Representative ALFRED D. SIEMENSKI, Democrat, of New Jersey)

WASHINGTON, January 19.—The alleged "Red horde" of China, capable of sweeping western democracy out of all Asia, is a myth.

China today is a mass of poverty-stricken people seething beneath the feet of a minority Red bloc.

Only the officer corps, for instance, in the Red army are Communists.

We can save China and the rest of the Orient for the free world by the political, economic, and psychological defeat and sterilization of that minority—and without committing American troops to any land campaign in China.

"WE MUST HOLD IN KOREA"

But we must hold in Korea. That is basic, because Korea, with its Yalu River power dams and its southern "rice bowl" is the key to domination of Manchuria and the frustration of Russian aims of conquest.

To unsnap the bear trap that the Chinese Reds have clamped on United Nation troops in Korea and to save the west from a catastrope in the Far East, I propose that:

1. We prevail on Chiang Kai-shek to become military adviser to General MacArthur and move Chiang's government-in-exile to Tokyo, leaving his troops under military, not political, command.

2. The Nationalists declare themselves "volunteers" at the disposal of the United Nations.

3. We employ Nationalist troops in Korea to kidnap the entire Chinese Red Army of Mao Tse-Tung. The Reds would desert to us by the tens of thousands, if given a decent chance.

4. We promote a triple entente comprising Free China, the Republic of Korea and Japan. The establishment of Chiang's exile government in Tokyo would facilitate this step.

GET DOWN TO ORIENTAL NEEDS

5. We quit wasting our time talking to the Orientals about vague intangibles and get down to their needs. Wars are fought for the right of a people to live as a nation—to give those people the opportunity of getting what they need to live. They need food, medical care, and housing.

Once they understand that we are fighting to see that they obtain those things, they will be convinced we have the right idea, without all the frills.

If this program is put into effect, any large scale landing on the Chinese mainland will not be necessary. But we should encourage raids and guerrilla warfare to keep Peiping off balance until the remainder of the program achieves success.

Perhaps I can wrap up what I'm trying to say here in one little incident that I witnessed:

One of our Chinese Red captives, after being fed and given warm accommodations, announced that he was ready now to fight for the United States.

He was a veteran of 60 campaigns and had been impressed first into the Nationalist army, then into the Red army.

He was told, "No, your fighting days are over. Why do you wish to fight for the United States?"

He replied, "Because I have gotten better food and care from you than I ever had before. If I can't fight, then I'll work for it."

Multiply him by the multitudes of China and the Orient and you see what I'm driving at.

But we should never try to appease the real Communists. They are vicious, cruel, and ruthless.

We Want What's Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to insert a timely editorial from the Detroit Free Press of January 27, 1951, by Frank B. Woodford, on the controversy now before the Civil Aeronautics Board between Nationwide Airlines and Wisconsin Central. As the article well points out, the issue at stake is whether the two great peninsulas of Michigan will at long last be united by adequate transportation or whether the Upper Peninsula will still be considered as the lost colony of the State of Michigan.

The editorial follows:

WE WANT WHAT'S OURS

(By Frank B. Woodford)

There's a battle going on between Michigan and Wisconsin and Illinois before the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and Michigan had better win it.

The fight is over whether the Upper Peninsula of this State will be served by an airline operating from points in the Lower Peninsula, or whether air service will be furnished by a line running between Chicago, Milwaukee, and Upper Peninsula points.

So far, with the skirmishing just started, it looks like our neighbor States to the west have the edge in this fight.

They probably will be able to bring enough political pressure to bear in Washington to emerge the winner, with half of the State of Michigan as the prize, unless Lower Peninsula folks bestir themselves and take an active interest in the contest.

The stakes are high.

They consist of an area about as big as the entire State of Connecticut, with a fairly heavy population, and a lot of cash business. Most of the latter is, by existing circumstances, now drained off into Milwaukee and Chicago.

Detroit and other cities in the lower part of the State get very little of this business. Undoubtedly they could use it. Certainly they are more entitled to it than either Wisconsin or Illinois.

Unfortunately for a great many years that part of the Upper Peninsula west of the straits always has been closer, economically, to Chicago than it has to Detroit or other Michigan localities.

Included in this "lost" area are such important towns as Marquette, Escanaba, Houghton, Iron Mountain, Ironwood, Stambaugh, and many others.

In these places the citizens have Michigan license plates on their automobiles; they pay a sales tax and other taxes to the State of Michigan; they send a few representatives and a senator or two to Lansing to help make the laws.

But beyond that, they are generally as remote from that part of Michigan which is "down under" as if they lived in Iowa or Minnesota.

The bulk of the things they buy comes either from Milwaukee or Chicago. They read the newspapers from those places, while it is almost impossible to obtain a Detroit paper up there. They listen to Chicago stations on their radios, and when they "go to town," as the saying has it, it's to Chicago that they buy their tickets.

They even root for the Cubs instead of the Tigers, and that's about the last straw.

This all came about because of the inadequacy of transportation between Detroit and that part of the State. It's almost as far by automobile from Detroit to Marquette as it is from Detroit to New York.

If you go by train from Detroit to Escanaba or Iron Mountain, you first have to go to Chicago. It's a trip requiring 2 days or a day and a night.

But by air from Detroit it's only 2½ or 3 hours to those Upper Peninsula points, and an airline now covers the distance on regular schedule in that time. Moreover, the air fare is about half the first-class train fare.

It's a small line, Nationwide Airlines, which runs out of Detroit for the north. Its competitor is Wisconsin Central Airlines.

"There isn't enough traffic to support both," says the CAA, and the hearings now being held are to determine which line will be certified to serve Upper Peninsula points exclusively.

If Wisconsin Central gets it—and it has powerful backing—business will continue to filter through Milwaukee and Chicago. If Nationwide is allowed to operate directly between Detroit, Lansing, Grand Rapids, and the Upper Peninsula, the latter will again become part of the State of Michigan, in fact as well as politically.

Certainly the results are important enough to the people of all of the State so that they ought to get busy writing to their Congressmen and to the CAA, demanding that the Upper Peninsula be returned to the fold.

We want our lost colony back again.

Attention, Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the criticisms that I have heard from the other side of the aisle, and which may be valid, I think it is appropriate that the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 5, 1951, be included in the RECORD:

ATTENTION, TAFT

A political check up on top defense officials shows them to be overwhelmingly Republican, 12 to 5. This is the way they line up:

Republicans:

Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization.

Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator.

William H. Harrison, Defense Production Administrator.

Manly Fleischmann, National Production Administrator.

Cyrus Ching, Chairman, Wage Stabilization Board.

James Knudson, Defense Transportation Administrator.

Bruce Brown, Petroleum Administrator for Defense.

Charles W. Connor, Solid Fuels Administrator.

James Boyd, Defense Minerals Administrator.

Robert Goodwin, Director of Defense Manpower.

John Small, Chairman, Munitions Board.

Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman, Federal Reserve Board, which is in charge of credit restrictions.

Here are the Democrats:

Michael DiSalle, Price Stabilization Director.

Clifford B. McManus, Defense Power Administrator.

W. E. Barber, Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Raymond Foley, Housing Administrator.

Millard Caldwell, Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

Let's Roll Back Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following radio address by Scott Bishop, program director for radio station WIOD, Miami, Fla. Mr. Scott Bishop gave this talk on the editor's report program on January 26, and repeated it on January 28.

I want to talk to you today about the price of food.

On February 1—next Thursday—the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics will begin a survey of Miami families of moderate income to determine how much they spent on food, clothing, rent, recreation, taxes, and other items during 1950.

Well, all this is very nice, very nice, indeed. But I think these families of moderate income know full well how much they spent last year for rent and food and for taxes. I don't think it will take a survey to tell these people about the present high cost of living. These people the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics is going to interview don't have to be surveyed to learn where their money is going.

That's why I want to talk to you today about the price of food.

And I want to ask you some questions, too. For instance, one question I want to ask is this:

"Why has the cost of food risen 247 percent right here in Miami since 1940?"

Why has food gone up almost two and one-half times over the cost of 10 years ago?

Why does it take $8.47 to buy the same amount of food today—that one dollar would have bought in 1940?

Take any grocery bill right here in Miami. If you spend $20 a week for groceries today, you would only have had to spend $8 a week in 1940. Eight dollars a week then—$20 a week now.

Has the average income increased 247 percent since 1940? Is the average worker now earning 2½ times as much as he did in 1940? Statistics prove he is not.

But statistics also show that the average employer has made every honest attempt to keep pace with the breakneck speed taken by rising prices. The average employer has been utterly unable to increase the wages of his employees 247 percent. Even now, our courts are overflowing with bankruptcy pleas from the smaller businessmen who have been completely crushed by the ever-rising tide; by the ever-demanding drain on their budgets and on their financial resources. Even now, businesses which once operated at a fair profit to the benefit of employer and employee alike—are now operating at a deficit, writing in their account books with red ink in the optimistic hope that the American economy will soon again find a more stable path to follow.

And, in the meantime, what? Let's look at the facts. Let's look at the record. Let's let the figures speak for themselves.

For instance, let's go back not 10 years but let's go back 5 years—to January 1946.

We had just ended a 4-year war with Germany and with Japan. During 1942, 1943, 1944, and most of 1945 our war-production output was at the most gigantic peak ever known to the human race. Food in those years was available, but food was not overplentiful. You could walk into any grocery

store in Miami and find the soap shelves empty. The sugar shelves empty. The gelatine-dessert shelves empty. The table sirup, black pepper, tapioca pudding, canned cherries, canned pineapple, preserves, and jelly shelves empty. The Kleenex and paper towel shelves empty. The coffee shelves empty. Shortening shelves empty. The gum and candy shelves empty. The meat counters sparsely filled, and with not-so-choice cuts at that.

Then came 1946. The war was over.

Foods which had been scarce for more than 3 years began to come back on the market. Shelves began to be stocked again. Sugar was available, shortening was becoming more plentiful, coffee was on the way back. So were the many, many items which had been scarce for so long.

But let's keep the facts still in mind. The American people had either done without—or had managed to struggle along for 3 or 4 years with very sparse supplies of all those scarce items which were missing so long from the grocers' shelves.

And when these scarcities did come back, what happened to the prices?

Let's examine the record again. Let's look at the facts again. Let's let the prices speak for themselves.

After all those years of rationing and of doing without, the American people, having, in most part, reaped a considerable harvest of good American dollars, were ready to go back to the good old days when meat and coffee, shortening and sugar were all plentiful. They had the money and they were willing to pay.

Prices remained higher than before the war—yes; that's true. But equally true is the fact that prices did not skyrocket.

The facts being what they were, prices had every logical reason under the sun to skyrocket. But they didn't. Today, you can step inside any store in the land and what do you see? Shelves heaped high with everything imaginable in the line of foodstuffs.

Bars of soap by the thousands, packages of soaps by the hundreds, tins of shortening by the dozens, pounds of coffee by the score. All you want—buy it and take it away. No limit. Help yourself. Load up your grocery basket and carry it out.

If you can pay the price. If you don't care what it costs you. If you can afford it.

Mrs. Homemaker bought liberally and in plentiful quantities back in 1946—only 5 years ago.

But let's see what her grocery dollar did for her 5 years ago. Let's compare what her grocery dollar did for her 5 years ago with what it will do for her today. Here are the facts. This is the record.

The comparison stands in black and white in the grocery ads of 1946 and in the grocery ads of 1951. For example:

Coffee: Coffee was 41 cents a pound in 1946. Today, coffee is selling at 90 cents a pound and still going higher. Coffee is 49 cents a pound more right now than it was in 1946. And yet a recent news story on the radio and in the newspapers reported that the crop for 1951 appears more promising than that of 1950.

Why, then, is coffee 220 percent higher now than it was at the close of World War II? Does it cost the grocer, the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer 220 percent more right along the line to get that coffee onto our tables? I doubt it. I very much doubt it.

Then let's consider shortening, put up in 3-pound tins. Vegetable shortening of this nature was 64 cents in 1946 for the 3-pound container. Today, that very same product is 91 cents for 3 pounds and still going higher.

What has caused vegetable shortening to increase in price more than 140 percent in 5 years? And just consider the small item of ground black pepper. Back in January of 1946, ground black pepper sold at 10 cents for the 1½-ounce size. Believe it or not, that same size tin of pepper now costs the Miami housewife 37 cents—27 cents more.

But what is there about the growing, processing, wholesaling, and retailing of ground black pepper that has caused it to go up in price 370 percent in 5 years?

Then consider today's meat prices. Plain, ordinary round steak. Up from 42 cents a pound in 1946 to $1.15 a pound today. That's an increase of 73 cents a pound in 5 years. That's an increase of 274 percent.

And hamburger. Hamburger was 29 cents in 1946. It is 60 cents today. Forty cents more a pound for hamburger.

Pork chops were 37 cents. Today, they're 89 cents a pound. That's 52 cents more a pound.

And look at these prices:

Chuck roast, 27 cents a pound in 1946; 73 cents today; 46 cents higher.

Pork roast, 35 cents a pound in 1946; 89 cents today; 54 cents higher.

Veal cutlets, 47 cents a pound in 1946; $1.39 today; 92 cents higher.

Cold cuts, 29 cents a pound in 1946; 79 cents today; 50 cents higher.

Beef liver, 40 cents a pound in 1946; 89 cents today; 49 cents higher.

Margarine, 21 cents a pound in 1946; 37 cents today; 16 cents higher.

Powdered soap, 23 cents a package in 1946; 31 cents today; 8 cents higher.

Paper towels, 10 cents a roll in 1946; 23 cents today; 13 cents higher.

Hand soap, 3 bars, 20 cents, in 1946; 3 bars, 39 cents today; 19 cents higher.

Salt, 2 boxes 9 cents in 1946; 2 boxes 16 cents today; 7 cents higher.

Crackers, 1-pound box, 18 cents in 1946; 1-pound box 25 cents today; 7 cents higher.

Sugar, 5 pounds 29 cents in 1946; 5 pounds 45 cents today; 16 cents higher.

Canned milk, 3 cans 25 cents in 1946; 3 cans 39 cents today; 14 cents higher.

Flour, 5 pounds 29 cents in 1946; 5 pounds 45 cents today; 16 cents higher.

Catsup, 14 cents in 1946; 39 cents today; 25 cents higher.

Baby food, 3 jars 19 cents in 1946; 3 jars 29 cents today; 10 cents higher.

And this could go on and on and on, this seemingly never-ending list of items which are so incredibly higher in cost now as compared to war's end in January of 1946. And why?

I don't know why, I am unable to determine. I can guess, and I don't think I'd be far from wrong. Someone is cleaning up, someone is turning the homemaker's pennies and dollars into fortunes.

But who? And how long will it continue?

I am not concerned here with price controls. I am not debating the usefulness or the uselessness of price controls. As an American citizen, I am not in favor of Government telling any man what he can or what he cannot ask for the goods he sells. But I am in favor of investigating any condition existing in America today which gouges the American housewife—the American mother. More and more, the high cost of food becomes a situation which should and must be investigated. Any rollback on prices existing at any time in the month of January this year is completely useless—except for the fact that such a rollback does act toward keeping already exorbitant prices from becoming even more outlandish. Reports are that an official investigation of high food prices soon is to get underway. All of us sincerely hope that this investigation will turn up facts—not double talk. That it will be carried out in a sincere, honest manner—not merely as an empty political gesture.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this broadcast, WIOD received 587 letters and 65 telephone calls, all of them complimentary to the station, and all of them very much concerned about the alarmingly high cost of food.

I thought you might be interested in this indication of the feeling of the people in south Florida in regard to the high cost of food.

Special Class Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which is most enlightening and interesting from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., January 28, 1951:

SPECIAL TRAINING CLASSES BENEFIT EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN HERE—GREATER LAWRENCE SPECIAL CLASS TEACHERS USE LATEST SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE OF MENTAL RETARDATION TO HELP YOUNGSTERS INCREASE UNDERSTANDING; TRAINING OF PARENTS IS EQUALLY IMPORTANT

(By Bill Collins, Jr.)

The trouble is so few people have the courage to voice the hurtful truth, and the truth is so important at a time like this.

The little girl with the golden hair laughed when her mother kissed her cheek, and sent her off to school. Her long and shiny ringlets danced as she skipped out of the yard, a green-blue pencil box held proudly in her hand. There was a prideful joy alight within the watching woman's eyes as she saw the happy gleam of laughter. This, she said within her heart, is all that was really needed—new friends, new interests. I hope it is, she prayed.

The child said nothing within her heart. Her eyes were eager for the adventures of a new, untouched day. A running dog stopped to wag its tail, and she smiled and touched its head. A pretty pasteboard lady waved from a drugstore window, and the child felt warm inside. She had no fears, nor trepidations. She had already forgotten yesterday.

Yesterday did not return until she sat down at her desk, there in the first-grade classroom. There was the cruel, unthinking giggling of children sitting near her. Then yesterday came back in all its chaos and confusion. Her heart raced and hammered against her tiny ribs, and she dug her knuckles into her eyes so no one would see the tears.

Yesterday had been the first day, her first day of school. How wonderfully it started. The teacher was a kindly, friendly lady. The blackboards were trimmed with marching, cut-out animals, and the desks were freshly cleaned. First they sang out loud, and then the teacher passed out crayons.

That was the beginning. She couldn't remember which color each one was. She couldn't understand what the teacher wanted. As the day progressed, she found more and more confusion in things that seemed to be so easy for the others. She couldn't remember the teacher's name. She couldn't count to five. She couldn't name any of the letters on the cards the teacher held. Then the laughter came, with the innocent cruelty of children.

Before the day was done, she was sitting stiffly, silent at her desk, her hands so tightly clenched, her knuckles were bloodless blobs of bones. When the teacher tried to talk, she refused to answer.

Still, no one saw the truth.

It was not until almost 3 years later—three terrible, heartbroken years of humiliation, torture, stubborn silences, and intermittent fits of fury—that someone had the courage to voice the truth, to win the child another chance, to say, with forthright frankness, "this child is mentally retarded."

There is no machinery more complex than the workings of the human mind. "Ostrich-ism" has, for many years, even ages, made mental flaws a source of unearned shame. But now we are emerging from the dark ages of ignorance on such matters. People, today, are beginning to recognize the facts—and, more important, to do something about them. The undeserved stigma is being smashed by truth.

Mental retardation is nothing to be whispered about, nor hidden, nor ashamed of. It could happen to anyone, in any family, as easily as polio could strike, or cancer. And it is as free of shame as these. It must be fought, not skeletoned in a closet.

Almost one person in a hundred is, or will be, mentally retarded. Conservative estimates place the number of mentally retarded persons in these United States at 3,000,000 men, women, and children. With the right kind of training some 75 percent of them become partially, or wholly, self-supporting. These are facts.

Few people realize that there are millions of people in this country whose intelligence quota is 70 or lower. Even the best individuals in this group can never hold a job, except, perhaps, doing unskilled manual labor under close direction. They are facing one of the world's greatest problems—and they cannot face it alone.

Left to fend for himself, a mentally retarded youngster can become either an introvert—being an utterly impassive, vegetable-like being—or an extrovert, being overaggressive, restless, and excitable. With help, he might learn to be neither. Without help, he might easily become a delinquent.

Today the world is realizing.

The world is realizing, to quote a national magazine, "That a mentally retarded child * * * (can belong) * * * to any family, and is not a proof of some fault in the parents." Such realization—and it has been a long while in coming—has opened a new way to happiness for such unfortunate youngsters. It has made the parents of such children understand that such youngsters can be trained to live out their lives with much more happiness than was expected, and that they should not be a source of shame, to be "hidden away in an attic."

Science is now studying mental retardation. While some of its causes are still obscure, much has been learned. The cells of the brain are delicate. Damage to them is usually irreparable. Science says such damage might be caused by many things: Certain types of anesthetics, perhaps at childbirth; German measles, experienced by a mother-to-be; certain infections in early childhood, such as sleeping sickness; severe nutritional deficiency on the part of a mother-to-be; and various other factors. Heredity is the cause of only a small minority of cases.

Science has not only worked at finding causes; it is working at ways of remedy. There is a chemical substance which can improve the IQ perhaps as much as 15 to 20 points. This is a special form of glutamic acid, which may be administered only by experts. This treatment is given only to children who are seriously retarded. Aside from the chemical means of combatting this unfortunate circumstance, science is working out methods, main cog of which is training. Most important—the experts have found—is training, both of parents and children.

Perhaps one of the most fruitful efforts aimed at training parents of such children was the moving story noted authoress Pearl S. Buck wrote about her own mentally retarded daughter. Its publication in the May 1950 issue of Ladies' Home Journal must have been a blessing to thousands of parents whose children suffer the same misfortune. It also did much to open the eyes of others.

Even more important is the training of the children themselves. Today schools all over the world are working on the mental retardation problem, aided by the information gleaned in clinics which are studying the problem relentlessly. There are special classes for this work in Greater Lawrence: five in Lawrence, two in Andover, and one each in Methuen and North Andover.

Teachers in these classes realize the importance of the work they are doing. To my mind, they are a valiant group—handful size—waging a determined war for an American birthright; the pursuit of happiness.

I visited one of these special classrooms the other day, after the children had left for the afternoon. Three teachers and I sat at small desks which were arranged in a circle. They were the desks used by the children. As we talked, I tried to visualize the youngsters, sitting there in that circle, seeking a way to fuller understanding, fighting an uphill battle to knowledge, and I realized how much they deserve praise. Theirs is not the simple task of school work; theirs is the task of joining their fellow men.

The Present Policy of the Defense Minerals Administration Will Not Produce the Essential and Critical Minerals and Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the effort of our Government to develop an adequate stockpile of critical and strategic minerals and metals is in hopeless confusion, and it will continue to be as long as the present policy is followed. In Denver, Colo., on February 3, 1951, at the annual meeting of the Colorado Mining Association, I discussed our present situation with regard to minerals and metals, the reasons for it, and what can and should be done about it. Under leave to extend, I include my remarks at this time in the RECORD:

Well, here we are again. It reminds me of an old film—a little flickery and dark in places, but thoroughly real. America had been the arsenal of democracy for 3 years, and the voracious appetite of great war machines for raw materials had already been demonstrated. And yet, when we entered the First World War—the one to make the world safe for democracy—on April 6, 1917, we had no stockpile, and our industries were facing dangerously low supplies of many essential materials.

In the light of our subsequent experience it may be worth while to remind you what followed. Three months after the declaration of war with Germany on July 9, 1917, President Wilson issued a proclamation prohibiting the exports of coal, food grains, meats, steel, and other products. The effect of this order was to control by license the entire foreign commerce of the United States. Less than 3 weeks later, the President created the War Industries Board.

Upon this Board fell the responsibility of mobilizing America's industrial forces and converting them from peace and construction to war and destruction. As described by its Chairman and now our elder statesman, Bernard M. Baruch, "The War Industries Board is a method of control devised by the President to equalize the strain placed upon American industrial structure by the war." No one used the terms "essential, critical, and strategic materials," but steel, copper, aluminum, lead, nickel, mercury, antimony, and platinum were as essential to victory during the struggles of World War I as they are today.

In the concluding report of the War Industries Board, credit is given to the miners for having played their part and contributed to the successful prosecution of the war in a way second to no other industry. But prices fixed by the Government had worked hardships on many copper operators, and the signing of the armistice left them with large stocks on hand and with no large orders booked.

It would unnecessarily take your time for me to tell you about the last war. You all know about it. But there are certain parallels which I wish to draw. For 3 years at least prior to World War II we were again the arsenal of democracy. We again entered the war without any stockpile of essential materials. Instead of the War Industries Board we set up the WPB. Again, the mining industry played a part in winning the war second to no other industry. And again the mining industry was left flat on its back by its Federal Government.

Now let's bring it up to date. For the past 3 years and more we have again been the arsenal of democracy—under the Marshall plan and under the arms-aid program to Greece, Turkey, and Europe. We now have the Defense Production Administration—instead of the old War Industries Board and the WPB. We again have no stockpile of the essential materials adequate for our needs—we are perilously low on some items. And again the mining industry is being called upon to make a contribution to the defense effort second to no other industry.

These parallels—this repetition of history—reflects on our national intelligence. Three strikes in this country means "out"—and we are at bat facing what may be the last pitch. For the mining industry this parallel of history has a special significance which I will come to later.

In the light of this desperate situation, what has the Government done to promote the production of these critical and strategic minerals and metals? It has set up a bureaucratic obstacle course remarkable even for Washington, where they are experts in that sort of thing.

If you are a miner out in the field and want a production contract with the Government, here is what you have to do:

1. An application must be filed on National Security Resources Board 146, with additional data as required by the Defense Minerals Administration, or by letter with the form to be filed later. This form is a 12-page document which asks you questions which cannot be answered except by the highest military authorities in this country, and if they are asked, they will indignantly inform you that the answer to the question is classified material. As an illustration, the form requires you to state how granting the application will contribute to national defense, and what evidence exists as to future shortages of the materials. The form ends up with a promissory note which you are required to sign agreeing to reimburse the Government upon demand for any expenses incurred in connection with or arising out of this application or any loan made pursuant thereto.

2. Your application should be sent to the Defense Minerals Administration, who is Mr.

James Boyd, Director of the Bureau of Mines, Department of Interior, Washington 25, D. C.

3. All applications and correspondence clears through the Office of the Executive Secretary of the DMA (Defense Minerals Administration), where a certificate is attached and routing is determined. Thereupon it may take various courses.

4. If the application involves exploration and development on new properties, it is neatly stacked up pending policy determinations at the high level. Policy has not been determined.

5. If the application requires an over-the-market contract, it is neatly stacked up and held in abeyance pending policy determinations not yet made as to whether shortages are sufficiently acute in the particular field (except manganese and perhaps one or two rare items) to warrant an over-the-market contract. These policy determinations have not as yet been made.

6. Applications for financial aid for plant expansion by producers which are not marginal are channeled to the Supply Division of the Defense Minerals Administration.

7. In channeling the application to the appropriate commodity committee, it goes to the industry chairman, who has associated with him a Bureau of Mines member and a USGS member.

8. This committee either rejects the application or approves it for mine examination.

9. If approved for mine examination, the application is routed to the appropriate regional office.

10. It is then routed from the appropriate regional office to the appropriate field office.

11. It is then routed to the office of the field team, consisting of representatives of the USGS and the Bureau of Mines.

12. Then the mine examination occurs by the USGS and the Bureau of Mines field team, including physical examination, the preparation of necessary maps and field reports.

13. When the report is finally complete from the field team, it is routed back precisely over the same obstacle course to the field office, to the regional office, and to the industry chairman. In each of these it is carefully examined and finally, if it passes muster, the next step is taken by the industry chairman.

14. The industry chairman sends the application, plus the field report, plus all the appropriate comments, on the way to the Operating Committee of the Defense Minerals Administration, which perhaps rejects it, or returns it for more information, or holds it for changes in policy. But if none of those occur, then it is sent on the next step.

The industry chairman of the Operating Committee of the Defense Minerals Administration has a committee consisting of a Bureau of Mines member and a USGS member.

15. The application then goes to the Production Division of the Defense Minerals Administration, where it is properly routed into the next step.

16. The next step is the drafting of contracts based upon all of the information and all of the comments now attached to the original application. Thereafter it proceeds on again and goes—

17. to the Defense Production Administration for approval, which first sends it on another detour and by-path which is—

18. to the RFC to determine whether the loan can be made under its regular terms and pursuant to the usual policies of the RFC. If so, the loan is made there; if not, then—

19. a certification is prepared approving the application and the amount of moneys required to be secured from defense funds. Preliminary to this, however, it must be noted that the miner must not be able to obtain funds from private sources or government sources, including the RFC and Federal Reserve, to be eligible for a defense loan. All of these facts must be certified to. If they are all certified correctly, then the application is sent back to the RFC authorizing disbursement from the defense funds to the RFC as the disbursing agent.

20. The RFC then selects a trust bank for deposit and withdrawal on approved vouchers.

21. Finally, the miner is entitled to go to the trustee bank if he has survived all of these difficulties, and on the presentation of approved vouchers receives his money to proceed with plant expansion or increased production.

A mere recitation of these steps will indicate to you that this is one of the most intricate processes ever devised in the bureaucratic brain.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 was passed on September 8, 1950. What has been done since then to facilitate production of minerals and metals? The answer is precisely nothing.

The last check with the Defense Minerals Administration, and that was some days ago, showed that there are 507 applications pending. There have been no loans approved to date. And bear in mind that there has been no policy decision whatever as to the handling of exploration and development loans. And no policy decision as to over-the-market contracts. I am informed that the great majority of applications now pending before the Defense Minerals Administration are for exploration and development, but policy has not even been decided upon at the higher level.

There has been no contracts issued for production at the market price. In regard to these contracts, the DMA policy on December 5, 1950, was that "the applicant for the certification of a purchase contract * * * will be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Defense Minerals Administration that ore reserves * * * are available and adequate to secure the requested contract, and the applicant will be required to satisfy the DMA that it can meet a firm delivery schedule." Further, as to loans, "projects to be approved by the DMA must, in its judgment, show definite promise of yielding material * * * in amounts that will significantly improve the minerals supply position for national defense."

How many miners can meet those requirements?

The present program for the production of minerals and metals is a complete and hopeless failure. I do not mean by that statement that many of the men responsible for this program are not doing the best they can, or the best that can be done. Jim Boyd has called in some able men from the field. But they have an impossible task, the present set-up will not and cannot be made to work.

It may be wondered why this should occur in the light of the experience of the last war, when the mining industry made magnificent contributions in the production of the essentials of our war effort. Why, if we did it during the last war, can't we do it now? The answer arises from a strange set of circumstances.

The record is replete with statements by the officials in charge of the program for the production of minerals and metals during the last war that it was a success. There is an official report to that effect in the files of our committee. The representatives of the Interior Department connected with that program so testified before our committee. In 1946 the Stockpiling Act was passed, which had as its objective making this country safe from a repetition of the shortages of the last war. To implement that law after the war was over, and to save the rapidly collapsing domestic mining industry, we tried to get a continuation of the premium-price program, or some modification of it, on at least a minimum basis. The Allen bill for that purpose was vetoed by the President. The Russell bill in the Eightieth Congress could not be passed because of the opposition of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines.

In the Eighty-first Congress Senator MURRAY and I introduced a bill for a modified premium-price plan. In a speech last fall at Salt Lake City, I outlined in detail how the Interior Department, the State Department, and the big mining interests got together to defeat that legislation—and the reasons for their strange alliance. I'm not going into that in detail here. But it should be explained that the Interior Department was willing to support a program calling for what they called "selective contracts" for the production of minerals and metals for the stockpile.

That approach was embodied in S. 2165, which passed the Senate and was finally turned down in the House because of lukewarm support from the Government. But after all that argument and effort going over a period of 5 years, the Department of the Interior had gotten itself committed to the philosophy of selective contracts—which simply means that the Government could make contracts with anyone it wanted, under any terms it wanted, for any amounts it wanted. We told them then that such a system was administratively impossible. That it wouldn't work. That it would leave the little fellow and the medium sized miner, who didn't have the organization to come to Washington and negotiate a contract, out in the cold. Further, that it would be completely bogged down in red tape, and confusion.

When the Defense Production Act of 1950 was passed last fall with its broad delegations of power—and it became apparent to everyone that the stockpiling program was a complete failure and that the production of these critical and strategic minerals and metals had to be encouraged—the Government, and especially the Bureau of Mines and the Interior Department, were completely committed to the selective contracting system—rather than the methods successfully used during the last war. You are now getting an object lesson—and they are too—in how that kind of a system works—or rather, fails to work.

The career officials who orginated the minerals program are like the old Bourbons of France, of whom Talleyrand once said "they never learn anything, and they never forget anything." It is only a question of how bull-headed they are, how long it will take for them to swallow their pride, and go back to the simple and tested methods we used for getting mineral production during the last war.

The Government held a meeting the other day with the tungsten producers. They were told that the national requirements are five times what the domestic industry can probably produce. But what kind of a contract will it give these producers? It offered a contract with a termination clause and subject to renegotiation at the end. The producers were assured that the Government would be fair if a 5-year contract was terminated in 2 years, leaving the producer stuck with a large capital investment and the Government could be depended on to do the right thing under the renegotiation clause.

But what does the record say? It says do not rely on these assurances, and do not trust the Government to keep its word. The memories of the last time are all too fresh.

It will be recalled that the Government at the beginning of the last war, and for many months after it commenced, urged the mining industry as its patriotic duty to go out and produce minerals and metals. The miners were assured that they would

not be left holding the sack; that Uncle Sam would be fair; and on these assurances in close cooperation with the various Federal agencies many mining operators went into the field to develop mining properties. They were given certificates from the War Manpower Commission entitling them to keep essential labor. They were given priorities by the War Production Board for essential materials and machinery to carry out their development program. Some of them had firm contracts, but others were told when they asked for a firm contract that there wasn't time to write out contracts, but to go ahead and get the production and get it in to the Government. They did precisely that.

And then the Government, finding its situation a little less desperate, refused to accept delivery of the production of many of these mining operators and they found themselves stuck with huge capital investments on which they had no chance whatever of recouping their principal, much less a fair profit. When they had contracts, those contracts were terminated. They were excluded from any sort of contract settlement. The Government washed its hands of them completely and told them that they were speculators and that they would have to take their losses. I introduced a bill in the Eighty-first Congress to compensate them only for their losses in capital investment—nothing whatever for the interest on their money or any profit on their operation.

This bill, H. R. 834, passed both Houses of Congress by large majorities, but was vetoed by the President of the United States. No amount of discussion of the matter, either with the agencies responsible for this unjust treatment, or the White House itself, brought any change in the Government's position. Finally, one mining company, the McArthur Mining Co., which happened to have funds enough to hire lawyers, brought suit in a Federal district court in Missouri. The Federal district court sustained in every particular the allegations of the mining company and held the Government not only liable for the return of the capital investment, but also for the profits lost in the mining operation, which altogether amounted to nearly $300,000. But even after a Federal district judge had declared that the Government had unfairly treated the mining industry and should keep the promises which it had made, and on which large mining operations had been undertaken, the Government still was unwilling to reimburse the injured miners for their capital losses, and no claim was made at any time for the lost profits or the interest on the ventured capital.

And today the Government is mauling the McArthur Mining Co. around in the circuit court of appeals and preventing them from recovering the amount of money already awarded in the Federal district court. The Government lawyers, paid by the year, will finally in all probability wear out the mining company—and at least the others are discouraged from undertaking the same procedure.

In the light of all of these facts, is it to be supposed that the mining people of this country, and especially the small miner, will again risk his capital on the glib assurance of some official in Washington that the Government will see that he is taken care of and that he has nothing whatever to fear from Uncle Sam? I am in hopes that such will not again be the case. The mining people of this country are willing to do their patriotic duty. They are willing to step forward in any national emergency, but they are not willing to be played for suckers three times in a row. There is a reciprocal responsibility on the part of Government officials to exercise some patriotism toward the miners themselves, some fairness in the way these Government programs are administered, and to give some kind of responsible assurance to the mining operators that they will not be left busted and forsaken as they have been before.

What, then, should the American miner say to the Government officials in Washington who are handling the mining production? They should tell the Defense Production Administration to abandon their whole ridiculous program and that they propose to have no part of it until it contains, first, a simple procedure which permits a practical participation in it, and, secondly, contains firm assurance that the mining operators who do participate will not be sacrificed to the eloquent speeches about patriotism and the callous indifference of the same public officials when this emergency is over.

Specifically, the miners should recommend as to production contracts that the Government: (1) publish the list of the needed materials; (2) publish the specifications of the needed materials; (3) publish the price it is willing to pay for the needed materials; (4) establish convenient places at which it will receive and pay for the needed materials meeting the specifications; and (5) that the Government agree in a simple form of application that any producer delivering to a depot will have acceptance of his product guaranteed at the market price for a period of not less than 2 years from the date of the first delivery, and that the longer-term contracts either at or above the market price can be arranged by negotiation.

Two years should be the absolute minimum. On some items, such as tungsten and quicksilver, the Government can very properly and safely guarantee to accept all production at market prices for the next 5 years.

As to over-the-market production, the miner should recommend that the premium-price program be put back into operation immediately and the application form made as simple as it was at the end of the premium-price program during the last war. The maximum price at which premiums will be paid and the specifications under which the material will be received should be established with the understanding that contracts for 2 years or longer periods of time may be negotiated with a guaranteed floor and a published ceiling.

As to contracts for exploration and development, the miner should recommend: That the current procedure should be completely junked; that the Government give public notice that it will advance a percentage of the exploration money requested by a mining operator ranging from 90 to 100 percent on small loans to a maximum of 50 percent on large loans—to those companies and individuals who can show the need for such money for exploration and development. Those loans will automatically police themselves without all the field inspections, 12-page applications, bankers' statements, etc., now completely swamping the Minerals Production Agency in Washington. A miner will not put up $5 of his own money to lose $5 of the Government's money. Moreover, he will rarely put up $1 of his own money, plus his time and effort, to lose $9 of the Government's money if the total amount is not very large. This is the program set forth in the bill, H. R. 975, pending in the last Congress and sponsored by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House. It was a good bill a year ago. What is wrong with it now? If it was good then, it is good now, and even more necessary.

These three simple steps will give the assured market which is essential to confidence in the mining industry. In doing so, they will expose the Government to no improper or unwise financial commitment. Government red tape will be reduced to a minimum. On sales at market price there will be no contracts to be negotiated, no mines to be examined. The Government should buy a miner's production whether it is a truckload or a wheelbarrow full. The Government does not pay except on delivery. The same thing is true on overmarket production except that the Government has to determine how much of the marginal production it wishes brought out and offer over-the-market premiums accordingly. The premium contracts will require some supervision but less than 50 people ran the whole premium-price program in the last war. DMA has more than that now, and I am informed that 200 additional field engineers will be needed. They just aren't available. An exploration and development program on a liberal matching basis will be as pointed out—largely self-policing.

With these three steps backed by firm contracts, domestic mining will have the assured market, the price levels, and the available financing to go to work, and a minimum burden will be put on our already overburdened Federal agencies.

Without them, I do not believe that the mining industry can or should proceed. And in closing I refer again to the history of this problem. Three times we have been the arsenal of the democracies of the world. Three times we have been caught with not only inadequate but dangerously low stocks of these essential materials. Three times we have set up Government agencies to build and gird the industrial strength of the Nation for war. Three times the mining industry has been called up to make a contribution to the successful prosecution of the defense of the Nation second to no other industry. Twice the mining industry has met that challenge and it will do so the third time. But it should not be three times the miners are left bankrupt by an ungrateful Government.

Now is the time for the mining industry to speak up—and I hope you will do so.

Congressman Clyde Doyle Cites Census Figures Proving Los Angeles County's Industrial Manufacturing 10-Year-Period Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, during my two previous terms of service in this legislative body as Representative from the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California I have frequently called to the attention of you, Mr. Speaker and my other colleagues, as well as other officers in the executive and administrative branches of Government, the fact that increasingly and rapidly the just deserts and needs of the west coast of our Nation, with particular attention to the prominent growth of southern California, with a spotlight on Los Angeles County, must be given due heed and consideration in all matters relating to national expenditures, branches of national offices of administrative government, transportation and freight rates, flood control, and so forth.

The Eighteenth Congressional District is entirely within the borders of

Los Angeles County, and its largest city is Long Beach, the home of the battleship fleet and the Long Beach Navy Shipyard, which accomplished such noteworthy records of production and manpower results during the last war.

The facts and figures which I herewith give you are ultimately related to the very geographical area in which all of the manufacturing and industrial plants and establishments included in the figures are an integral part. It is well known and observed that the hundreds of important manufacturing and industrial plants in the great Eighteenth District in Los Angeles County make it one of the most important of the manufacturing and industrial areas in the whole Nation. The most detailed breakdown would prove this conclusively, for in the Eighteenth District of California is not only located the important city of Long Beach, but also the important communities of Compton, South Gate, Bellflower, Lynwood, Downey, Norwalk, Artesia, Signal Hill, Paramount, Dominguez, and Hollydale, and intervening important communities with slightly less population.

There is, in fact, now being rapidly concluded and sold to purchasers, all in one subdivision, 17,500 separate roofs and homes. Thus such increases logically bring great manufacturing and industrial plants. Thus our great Nation must bind its industrial and manufacturing plants and people together with the bonds of common interest and unity, and all move forward together as one great American people.

The following are the figures, which are self-explanatory:

SECTION I

POPULATION

A. The population of the 14 southern California counties totals 6,985,204. This amount is greater than the total population of any one of 41 States.

B. On a comparative basis 57.5 percent of the total population of California (58 counties) is found in the 14 southern California counties.

C. Southern California has 42 percent of the total population of the three Pacific Coast States (Washington, Oregon, and California).

D. The Los Angeles metropolitan area, according to the 1950 census, is the third largest in population in the Nation; it ranks only behind New York and Chicago.

E. The city of Los Angeles ranks fourth in population among American cities, behind New York, Chicago and Philadelphia, according to the 1950 census of population.

SECTION II

INDUSTRY

The importance of southern California as a center of industrial production is dramatically portrayed by the Los Angeles figures from the latest census of manufactures (1947).

A. These figures show that on a Nationwide comparative basis the Los Angeles metropolitan area ranks third in total number of manufacturing establishments and fifth in dollar measurement of products.

B. During the period 1939–47 the Los Angeles area led the nine leading American industrial areas with a 79-percent increase in number of plants and a 200-percent increase in value added to product by manufacturing.

C. Southern California has a total of 11,130 factories; this is 46 percent of all the factories on the Pacific coast (24,128).

D. Southern California employs 400,000 industrial workers. This is 44 percent of all the factory employees on the Pacific coast (913,789).

E. In the factor value added by manufacturing southern California accounts for 41 percent of the output of the entire Pacific coast.

Manufacturing statistics—Standard metropolitan areas

[Census of manufactures, 1947—U. S. Department of Commerce]

[Money figures in thousands]

Area	1947		1939	
	Number of plants	Value added by manufacture	Number of plants	Value added by manufacture
New York	49,287	$9,319.7	34,102	$3,152.7
Chicago	12,779	5,624.9	9,931	1,940.1
Los Angeles	9,736	2,055.5	5,725	520.9
Philadelphia	7,296	2,085.6	6,082	1,040.6
Boston	5,407	1,381.2	4,679	511.7
Detroit	4,788	2,910.0	2,934	1,089.6
San Francisco-Oakland	3,698	1,048.5	2,463	365.9
Cleveland	3,239	1,546.1	2,627	506.9
St. Louis	2,958	1,292.3	2,549	461.8

RELATIVE POSITION

1947

By number of plants	By value added by manufacturing
1. New York	New York.
2. Chicago	Chicago.
3. Los Angeles	Detroit.
4. Philadelphia	Philadelphia.
5. Boston	Los Angeles.
6. Detroit	Cleveland.
7. San Francisco-Oakland	Boston.
8. Cleveland	St. Louis.
9. St. Louis	San Francisco-Oakland.

1939

1. New York	New York.
2. Chicago	Chicago.
3. Philadelphia	Detroit.
4. Los Angeles	Philadelphia.
5. Boston	Los Angeles.
6. San Francisco-Oakland	Boston.
7. Detroit	Cleveland.
8. Cleveland	St. Louis.
9. St. Louis	San Francisco-Oakland.

Percentage change 1939–1947

	In number of plants	In value added by manufacturing
New York	42	195
Chicago	24	190
Los Angeles	70	300
Philadelphia	21	170
Boston	16	170
Detroit	68	165
San Francisco-Oakland	5	185
Cleveland	24	210
St. Louis	16	180

F. There is a popular opinion that aircraft production and motion pictures make up the bulk of the industrial activity of the Los Angeles industrial area. While we do lead the Nation in these industries, the Census Bureau reports on the high degree of diversification of this area by showing that the Los Angeles area ranks third or better among major American industrial areas in the following industries:

First place in national ranking: Aircraft and aircraft parts, motion pictures, pumps and compressors, refrigeration equipment, heating and plumbing equipment, canned sea food; total, 5.

Second place in national ranking: Women's and misses' outerwear, automobile assembly, pressed and blown glass, rubber tires and tubes, wood millwork, oil field machinery and tools, jewelry and silverware, concrete and plaster products, storage batteries; total, 9.

Third place in national ranking: Petroleum refining, construction and mining machinery, nonferrous foundries, household furniture, fabricated textiles, pottery and related products, tractors and farm machinery, conveyor equipment, newspaper publishing, miscellaneous wood products, women's and misses' underwear; total, 11.

The Los Angeles industrial area ranks third or better nationally in 26 industries as measured by dollar value of output.

SECTION III

WHOLESALE TRADE

Los Angeles is the wholesale distribution center for the far western part of the United States.

A. The Census Bureau has announced that the figures of the latest census of wholesale trade in the United States (1948) indicate that total wholesale transactions in the Los Angeles area for that year were $5,686,479,000 as compared to $4,979,961,000 for the San Francisco-Oakland area. In other words, the dollar volume of wholesale trade exceeded that of San Francisco-Oakland by 14 percent.

B. The State of Washington, according to the same source, did a total volume of wholesale business in the same year of $2,658,504,000. The Los Angeles area exceeded this figure by 113 percent.

C. The State of Oregon did a total volume of wholesale business that year of $1,908,141,000. The Los Angeles area exceeded this figure by 198 percent.

SECTION IV

RETAIL DISTRIBUTION

The Los Angeles metropolitan area is the third largest retail market in the United States, according to the latest retail census (1948) of the Census Bureau.

A. The figure representing total retail sales for the Los Angeles area is $4,887,000,000; this represents an increase of 241 percent over 1939. Los Angeles dominates as California's leading retail center.

B. The total volume of retail trade of the State of Washington in the census year was $2,221,306,000; the Los Angeles area exceeded this by 120 percent.

C. The total for Oregon in the same year was $1,597,300,000; the Los Angeles area exceeded this figure by 143 percent.

Los Angeles is the first ranking retail market of the western United States.

SECTION V

ECONOMIC FACTORS

A. Two hundred and seventy nationally known industrial concerns have located their Pacific-coast factories in Los Angeles County since 1930; over 75 percent of the companies locating plants on the Pacific coast have selected southern California.

B. Sixty-eight nationally known companies doing business throughout the United States maintain their national headquarters in Los Angeles.

C. If the present rates of population growth continue in both areas, Los Angeles will be larger than Chicago within the next decade.

D. The population total of the city of Los Angeles is greater than the combined population total of Seattle, Wash.; Tacoma, Wash.; Portland, Oreg.; and San Francisco, Calif.

E. Los Angeles County has maintained the greatest rate of industrial growth of any county of the Pacific coast during the postwar years as measured by capital investment in new facilities.

1946	$155,793,492
1947	124,811,500
1948	72,181,500
1949	93,415,500
1950	98,397,250

Germ Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD excerpts from a broadcast of the nationally known radio commentator of the American Broadcasting Co., Mr. Paul Harvey, of Chicago, on the evening of January 14, 1951. Paul Harvey is one of America's most brilliant and patriotic radio commentators. I want to personally thank and commend the Burton-Dixie Corp., manufacturers of Slumberon mattresses and kindred products, for sponsoring Paul Harvey on a Nationwide hook-up, and particularly for providing a Washington outlet for his reports every Sunday evening at 10:15, eastern standard time.

Mr. Harvey's broadcast of January 14, 1951, pertains to one of the most important factors in any future war, namely, biological or germ warfare. I can personally attest to the soundness of his presentation of this subject, due to the fact that, as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Eightieth Congress, I was privileged to sit on the subcommittee that heard testimony in executive session in regard to this particular phase of war. While the United States has been emphasizing the need for and spending billions of dollars on atomic warfare and a defense against it, Soviet Russia has placed its emphasis on biological or germ warfare. In my opinion, our Department of Defense should give more attention to the problems of germ warfare than they have, especially in view of the fact that Communist saboteurs in our country could poison the entire water supply of every major city in America in less than 24 hours. The importance of this question has been brought out in a very vivid manner in Mr. Harvey's broadcast and I trust every Member of Congress will take time to read it carefully and thoughtfully.

I am aware that ever since gun powder some men have claimed that we'd progressed past the point where anyone would dare launch war.

But tonight it's true.

On this January night of 1951, the great nations of the earth have developed such weapons that we've reached the end of the line.

The only possible way any nation today could win a war would be to revert to the world's first weapon—a tainted apple. And in what minutes remain tonight I think there's time to prove it.

At the Nuremberg trials of Nazi war criminals a certain document was admitted to evidence. A high command report to Hitler stating that the only way the Nazis could take over the United States would be to spread disease among humans, plants, and animals. The document recommended research along those lines. A subsequent report in the permanent files of those trials stated that the Nazis had experimented with spreading hoof and mouth disease among meat animals in Czechoslovakia. And with such complete effectiveness that there would be no need for further research along this line. Meaning the animal population of any nation could quickly and easily be destroyed.

By now you know I'm talking about germ warfare. Washington is still talking about A-bombs. Retired Admiral Ellis Zacharias, with a lifetime record of being right, says our A-bomb is now a fourth-rate weapon in the United States arsenal.

More: On September 26, 1947, a scarcely noticed memorandum was placed before the United Nations by the American Association of Scientific Workers. It read in part, "Germ warfare has now been developed into a major weapon for mass destruction. Contrasted to atomic warfare, it is cheap and simple. It could be used to destroy men, animals, or plants selectively, or merely to make them useless only temporarily."

If the Japanese had not surrendered after we'd used the A-bomb, we were prepared to distribute a synthetic hormone—airborne—which would have destroyed the Japanese rice crop. Diabolical, because it would have permitted the rice to grow normally, yet yield nothing.

Psittacosis and tularemia are classified as "weapons useful for debilitating a population rather than destroying it."

On the other hand, on April 16, 1948, Northwestern University announced that its chemists had isolated a substance of such toxicity that one-quarter pound dropped in the water supply of a city of 100,000 would kill every inhabitant. And I'm revealing to you only the small fraction of our germ weapons which are not classified.

Our atomic scientists got one exciting hour in the limelight in World War II when they could demonstrate their wares. Our germ scientists had labored just as hard, and even more effectively, but were denied their demonstration.

Understand, germ warfare is not chemical warfare. Germ warfare is the use of living organisms or their products to attack either human life or the food or drink which supports human life.

Give you an idea: At Hiroshima, in addition to the A-bomb, we could have poisoned the water supply, destroyed the rice crop, infected the surviving animals with rinderpest, and started an epidemic of both bubonic and pneumonic plagues.

Now you see why I say Russia is not going to start anything which we could finish that way.

But wait a minute.

I did not say we have outlived war. There is still one way Russia could do it. By weakening us from within without warning. World War II proved there's no profit in conquering rubble. Russia would like to capture our industry intact. And there is one way she can. To fly over Pittsburgh and scatter disease-bearing germs would be too obvious. That would start war. And we're better at that scientific kind of warfare than she is.

But Russia, with a trained army already behind our lines inside this country, has the perfect machine for launching germ warfare by slow degrees in a manner that would never be detected until too late. They are ready to commit sabotage.

In an unprecedented action, there was a meeting of the highest officers of seven railroads in Chicago this past week at which they were told by Civil Defense officials that there are now 5,000 trained saboteurs in Illinois ready to strike at our railroads in the event of war. But what nobody seems either to know or to notice or to dare to talk about—is the fact that enemy experiments in germ sabotage may already be under way.

You will recall the recent outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico. In the November issue of Nation's Business, official publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, William Bradford Huie cites that incident as one of several unsolved mysteries. No one has traced the beginning of this strange and sudden 1946 epidemic. But it took an American army of 1,130 scientists 3 years to whip it. And not counting the money, it cost the lives of 523,000 cattle and 471,000 hogs. Just recently, near Mexico City, the deadly O virus was discovered for the first time on the North American Continent. A disease so easy to spread you can carry it on the sole of your shoe. Somebody's experiments? I don't know. But when 1,100 persons in Mercersburg, Pa., a city of only 2,500, when roughly every other person in town, went to bed violently ill just last month from some airborne something nobody has yet explained. I think it's time now to give ourselves the benefit of any doubt. Russia wouldn't have to destroy England to subdue her if one out of every three Englishmen, including soldiers and doctors and nurses, went to bed with the flu, as has happened within the past 2 weeks in Liverpool. One hundred and twenty-six great towns in England and Wales have been stricken. In the past 1 week 458 persons in those towns died from it. Tonight 250,000 are ill with it. Slow sabotage? Testing for something bigger? Checking on the efficiency of subversive agents? Probably not. Flu epidemics are not uncommon. But I am trying to show not what is happening, but what could happen.

Dr. Andrew Ivy, world renowned medical scientist, vice president of the University of Illinois, tells me it is entirely possible purposely and maliciously to spread influenza virus. Presumably by air or food or both.

In Mein Kampf, Hitler said, "A shrewd victor will always take what he wants by degrees."

At any event, I have here shown the only one way in which any nation now could conquer the United States. It would have to be by sneaking up on us. And they can. Just as long as we allow their agents to run loose behind our lines, yet shackle our own FBI by prohibiting them from making any arrests until after the overt act. If a toxin planted in a city's water supply takes 9 hours to work, then the FBI is going to be just a little too late. Our best devices for detecting airborne organisms require a culturing-out process which takes weeks.

If I were suddenly to announce that your United States had been invaded by an enemy army of half a million men, you'd close ranks then and come out fighting. All right. The hour is tonight. Fifty thousand Reds, and half a million who'll do their bidding, by the FBI's own estimates, already are inside our country, potentially armed. An advance echelon of 22,000 already has established itself in the key jobs in vital industry.

Technologically we have reached the point where no nation would dare wage offensive war against us, unless or until they first paralyze our trigger fingers. If we can prevent sabotage from within—do you see what it means? Americans, we have reached the long-sought saturation, the point of no more war. Now to erase that "if."

I respectfully recommend that you write your lawmaker in Washington now. Just a post card will do. Or send him a copy of this broadcast, if you like. Tell him we want no more stalling and no more double-talk about the so-called rights of this subversive Communist minority in our midst. That it's time for somebody to start looking out for the "rights" of the decent, God-fearing, loyal majority of the American people for a change. That if courts rule self-defense unconstitutional, then let's seriously investigate those courts. Let's dare to find out who in Washington is protecting the Communists in Michigan, and Indiana, and New York, and California, and Pennsylvania. And if these termites continue to crawl through legal loopholes in our Constitution, then let's turn that same weapon against them. I've found a loophole too, Earl,

Browder. The weakest and the strongest word in our Constitution is the word "welfare." Presidents have virtually led us to socialism in the interest of the public welfare. All right, then. Now, in protecting the public welfare, let's imprison and expel this illegal, disloyal, treasonous army from our shores. Write to your Congressman. If you don't get action there, write to your President. If you don't get it there, pray: "For each big job, demanding a big man, Almighty God, send us a leader. A man with his feet planted firmly in American tradition. A tall man, with his head above the fog of selfish interests. Not a common man. Send us, this time, an 'uncommon man,' a statesman. We don't deserve him, but send him anyway. And hurry please. The hour is late. The candle of freedom burns low."

Army Nurse Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, February 4, 1951:

A JOB WELL DONE FOR 50 YEARS

Through three wars and the intervening years of peace members of the Army Nurse Corps have distinguished themselves in their selfless care of servicemen. This month the nurses mark "50 years on a mission of mercy," as they celebrate their golden anniversary.

Indispensable members of the medical team, some 300 Army nurses are in Korea today supporting our troops in the combat zone. The Surgeon General of the Army reports that their work has been magnificent, that without their fearless assistance the high rate of recovery of combat casualties would be impossible. The chief surgeon of the Far East command, where many of our combat wounded are being cared for, also pays tribute to our gallant nurses: "The members of the Army Nurse Corps have all distinguished themselves by their devotion to duty, their utter disregard of working hours, and their willingness to do anything that needs to be done at any time. They have displayed courage, stamina, and determination. They have completed every task with which they have been confronted in a superior manner."

This record of service without regard for personal comfort or safety distinguished the Army Nurse Corps in two other wars. In World War I, some 10,400 Army nurses endured the uncertainties of combat nursing in England, France, Italy, Belgium, and in Siberia. Many were decorated—3 with the Distinguished Service Cross, 24 with the Distinguished Service Medal, 26 with the Croix de Guerre, 69 with the British Royal Cross, and 2 with the British Military Medal. In World War II, the Army Nurse Corps achieved its peak strength of 57,000—and sent almost half its number overseas. From Iceland to the jungles of the Southwest Pacific, and on the beachheads from North Africa to Normandy, they served close behind troops. They suffered bombings and strafings—died of wounds on the Anzio beachhead, were Japanese prisoners after the fall of Corregidor. One nurse out of every 40 who served was decorated; they received the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Soldier's Medal, the Air Medal, the Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart.

Army nursing began as far back as Revolutionary times when General Washington asked Congress for a matron to supervise the nurses, bedding, etc., and for nurses to attend the sick and obey the matron's orders. Women volunteered to nurse the sick and wounded during the Civil War, but it was not until the outbreak of the Spanish-American War in 1898 that Congress again authorized the employment of nurses under contract to the Army. The success of their pioneer venture convinced all skeptics of the value of women nurses to military medicine. In February 1901 Congress authorized the establishment of a Nurse Corps as a definite component of the Army. Pay in those days was $40 a month and nurses held no military rank. Today it is $213.75 for a second lieutenant and Army nurses, like all other officers, receive all allowances and benefits of commissioned status.

Army nurses held only relative rank until World War II, at which time they were granted temporary commissions. The struggle to achieve rank and the accompanying benefits of officer status went hand in hand with the struggle of the nursing profession itself to improve the pay of nurses and the living and working conditions. Military recognition of the professional worth of nurses gave impetus to the efforts of nursing leaders world-wide in their program to raise standards.

The final, and perhaps most significant, step in the evolution of the Nurse Corps came with passage of the Army-Navy Nurses Act in April 1947. This law created an Army Nurse Corps section in the Officers Reserve Corps and authorized a Regular Army component for nurses through which, for the first time in history, women became eligible for permanent commissions in the Regular Army. The present chief of the corps is Col. Mary G. Phillips.

Now, with the celebration of their golden anniversary, the Army nurse assumes a major and vital role in the care of our fighting men. The men who defend American security must be assured that doctors and nurses stand ready with professional skill, when needed. At this time the Nurse Corps estimates as its minimum need for the first 6 months of 1951, 3,000 graduate professional nurses. They are asking for 500 qualified nurses to volunteer each month to meet the needs of the military expansion.

The oldest of all the women's military services, and because of its long tradition of service to military sick and wounded, one of the most loved, the Army salutes its Nurse Corps on its "50 years of a mission of mercy."

Free-and-Easy Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, again there is offered an innocent-looking bill to extend for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1951, the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements which, in fact, represent no reciprocity but its use by the President in reducing tariffs have been helpful to foreign countries at the expense of American workers. This new extension of authority of the President does nothing to prevent damage to the American worker. Out in my district in Chio, many industries are becoming affected by existing agreements and those proposed to be entered into. The hand glass industry at Tiffin, Ohio, has been affected by these imports, especially those from Czechoslovakia. These agreements were consummated even after it was overrun by Russian communism. Such plants are not only throughout Ohio and in West Virginia but in other States affecting thousands of workers. There is the cutlery industry making shears, scissors, and surgical instruments, that has been greatly affected by such imports, and one of the principal places of the industry is at Fremont, Ohio. Then there is the paperboard and strawboard industry affected by such imports and these are situated in many places throughout the country and at Sandusky, Ohio, and there is the parts industry, with reference to bicycles and motorcycles. During the war when companies in the United States were permitted practically no manufacture of bicycles, yet they were able to make them in England and sent into the United States. And now, due to the reduction of import duties, it is felt by suppliers in northwestern Ohio.

There is the refractory products industry used in the manufacture of steel centered in the limestone region of Sandusky and Seneca Counties where the imports again affect not only hundreds in the immediate area but places throughout the United States who are a part of the same industry. Probably other industries throughout northwestern Ohio are directly affected and many others indirectly affected throughout the State. But these are the particular ones in the Thirteenth Ohio District which are affected by the free-and-easy method of bringing in cheaply made foreign goods which not only cuts at the industry but strikes at the American workmen by eventually destroying his job like those in the New England watch industry. It would be most interesting to have a complete survey of the State of Ohio, where the free-and-easy importation of cheaply made foreign products will cut down and take away the employment of thousands directly as well as tens of thousands indirectly throughout the State of Ohio brought about by the free-and-easy favored foreign trade agreements entered into and proposed by the United States which can not only damage and destroy the industry, but the very workmen whose families depend on the continuance of these American industries.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to stop this damage to American workers and industries in northwestern Ohio. I have introduced legislation that the President should immediately take such action that would be necessary to modify, rescind and cancel and stop such damaging trade agreements now made and in the process of being made on the importation of foreign hand-made glassware and products, foreign-made paperboard, foreign-made shears, scissors, surgical and manicure implements, foreign motorcycles, bicycles and parts, and foreign magnesia refractory products all so that American workers will be protected in their jobs, protected in their standard of living, and assured the continuance of these American industries.

It's Happening on Your Own Front Lawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert T. Fallon:

IT'S HAPPENING ON YOUR OWN FRONT LAWN

(The writer of this article, reprinted from the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, by special arrangement, is presently in Walter Reed Hospital, recovering from five bullet wounds suffered in action in Korea. His mother, Mrs. John Fallon, lives at 1832 Jefferson Place NW. He attended Wilson High School and Sullivan Preparatory School here before moving on to West Point.)

(By Robert T. Fallon, first lieutenant, Seventeenth Infantry combat team)

I want to tell you something about a war.

I want you to imagine for a moment that it is a very cold, wet, wintry evening at about 10 o'clock. You have been sitting very comfortably by your fireside reading the evening paper. It's been a pleasant day, dismal outside, but warm and restful by the fire. You decide to step out on the porch for a breath of air before turning in. I'm sure you've done it often. But on this particular evening, a strange sight greets you.

There's a great hole right in the middle of your front lawn, and the dirt has been thrown up all around it, outlined sharply against the white, even snow. Squatting in the hole is a hunched figure.

Let me tell you something about him.

He's been in this area now for about three weeks, living in a dozen holes just like this one on your front lawn. The most apparent thing about him is that he is cold, and that's because out on your lawn it's about 20 degrees colder than where you're standing. Every now and then he'll grab his shovel and dig a little deeper in the hole just to keep warm. That's the only way he has, because he'll be seen if he builds a fire, and he may bring mortar fire into your living room.

He's been cold for a long time—and wet. He can't feel his feet, and he's getting worried because he's afraid they might be frostbitten. It's going to be a long night, and it's going to get colder.

He's very dirty. The grease from a hundred "C" rations is frozen to his parka and gloves, coating the two weeks' beard which covers his face. Soot from the small fires he dares to make during the day is all over his pants and boots.

But he's dirty all the way through. He hasn't changed his underclothes in over a month and he doesn't intend to for some time to come. It's too cold to go down that far. You can smell him, and it's bad.

He's pretty hungry, too. They didn't get his rations up to him until after dark, and he couldn't build a fire to thaw them out. He'll have to wait until morning. A cup of hot coffee would sure taste good. He looks old with that beard and sort of hunched over posture. But he's only about 19, though not like any 19-year-old you've ever seen.

You may wonder what he's thinking about as he sits there during those long solitary hours. Well, it's not much. Just how cold it is, and again how nice that coffee would be. Maybe every now and then he thinks of home, but that's a long ways off, and the cold, his feet, and his hunger are much more immediate. You'd be surprised how those three things can fill your mind.

You notice that he's cut a hole through your hedge, and his rifle is sitting on the pile of dirt pointing in readiness through the opening. That's another thing he's thinking: When are they coming again? He gets a little scared out there all alone. He'd like to go over and talk to his buddy in a similar hole about two houses up, but it's not a good idea to go crawling around at night. He wishes they weren't so far apart, but it seems they always have a big sector to cover with never enough men to cover it. It doesn't help being so far apart.

What would you like to do with this man? Ask him in to your fireside, get him a cup of coffee? Would you like to loan him your razor and let him take a hot shower? Give him a bed to sleep in instead of the dirt and cold of his foxhole? Sure you would. You wouldn't think twice about it. But I'm afraid you can't. There's someone on that hill over there who wants to get into your front door, and the man was told by his platoon leader that he's supposed to take care of your house and the one next door. So he can't come in, and you find that you can't reach him. He's very far away.

But you come out in the morning and he's still there, huddled over his little fire, thawing out his hands and his rations, trying to get the feeling back into his feet. By this time the hole is pretty deep from all the digging and he's cut down a little more of your hedge. He's there again when you come home from work. While you are greeted by a comfortable fire in a living room, the soldier is getting ready for another cold night.

I have told you about this soldier, and placed him on your front lawn, because I want you to realize that every desolate hill that soldier defends in that far-off land is in reality your front door. There are people who want to get in to do you harm, and it's his job to keep them away. He's going to do his job and he's not going to ask you to do it for him. If he has to sit on your front lawn in the cold, that's just the way things go. He's not going to begrudge you the comforts of your fireside or your dinner table, but he'll be mighty bitter if he finds out that you're not doing your part of the job.

What is "your job?" Well, it's not really important what I happen to think "your job" may be. But I think it is important that you find out soon what it is and start doing it, for whatever it is, it's a vital part of a country's struggle for existence. Perhaps it would be more clear to you what your job is if you returned home tonight to find that hunched, shivering figure sitting in a hole on your lawn.

Penny-Wise—Pound-Foolish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Monday, February 5, 1951:

WHY CLOSE VA OFFICE?

Since, by the looks of things, there will be many more veterans before there are less, it seems hardly practical at this time to close the Veterans' Administration regional office in this city. As a matter of fact, it's rather difficult to understand why curtailment of the important service the VA renders to veterans and their families should be contemplated at a time when the world situation points up the debt of gratitude we owe veterans. It stands to reason that cessation of this service locally will impose some considerable hardship on Greater Lawrence citizens who have occasion to consult the VA about problems relating to their rights and privileges as veterans.

If it is the intention of the Government to serve the interests of economy in the matter, it's our feeling that the interests of economy would be better served by leaving the situation undisturbed. Maintenance of the local VA office certainly involves no such great sum of money that its expenditure reflects painfully upon the tax rate. Nor does it add a fraction of an inch to our mountainous national debt. Zeal for economy is laudable, but it misses the mark when it attacks so basic a function as the Veterans' Administration. Men who have served their country to the best of their ability—and may soon be called upon to do it again—have a right to expect that their country will serve them to the best of its ability.

Academy of Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee and presented arguments in behalf of my bill, H. R. 235, which proposes to authorize the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service to provide specialized training and specialized education for young men and women who desire to make lifetime careers of serving in the State Department of the United States.

It is my conviction that such an academy will result in a substantial improvement in the personnel of the State Department. By obtaining improved personnel in the State Department, our chances of having better diplomacy will be improved and the chance of our becoming involved in future wars thereby decreased.

The cost of maintaining and operating such an academy I estimate at about $3,000,000 a year. Since the State Department now spends billions of dollars annually the cost of maintaining such a school would be only a fraction of 1 percent on the amount of money now being expended by the State Department each year. Better qualified men of sounder judgment in the State Department easily might result in a saving many times greater than the cost of operating and maintaining an Academy of Foreign Service.

I hope that further hearings will be granted by the committee and that all those in favor or opposed to the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service, including witnesses from the State Department, will be heard. It is my belief that the obtaining of improved State Department personnel is of paramount importance. I am confident that out of

adequate hearings on this subject great progress can and will be made toward improving State Department personnel.

The better the personnel in our State Department and other foreign service agencies the more likely we are to have amicable relations with other countries and the less likely we will be to become involved in wars.

My statement to the Foreign Affairs Committee follows:

Mr. Chairman, I thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for providing me this opportunity to explain to you and discuss with you my bill H. R. 235.

The bill H. R. 235 proposes to authorize the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service for the specialized training and specialized education of young men and young women who desire lifetime careers in the foreign service of this country, especially those of the State Department.

At the present time we have the Army's West Point, Navy's Annapolis, and a Coast Guard Academy to provide specially trained and educated young men as officer personnel for the armed services. It is the mission of these young officers to win our wars when and if we become involved in them.

It is the responsibility of the State Department and other foreign services, through the use of wise diplomatic and carefully planned foreign policies, to keep our Nation out of wars, honorably. The intricate and varied problems that now daily arise in our Nation's foreign service agencies demand that we have in the foreign services the best specialists it is possible to obtain. The personnel of the State Department, in my opinion, can be improved greatly by the specialized abilities that can be developed in an academy devoted exclusively to the training and education of future diplomats.

Several months ago, I was one of about 40 Congressmen present at a meeting where a former member of the Communist Party of the United States was the speaker. This man said he had been a sincere member of the Communist Party. He apparently had been an effective member for he was taken to Moscow and for several years was specially trained in a Russian Government college to become an officer in the coming Red revolution which the Soviets are planning in their efforts to sovietize the world.

This reformed Communist told us that there are three colleges in Moscow maintained by the Russian Government for the training of young men and women, who, it is expected, will go forth and endeavor to sell communism to the people of all nations.

It occurred to me that if Russia can afford to support three national colleges devoted to training young people to spearhead and serve the cause of communism in the world, that the United States ought to have an Academy of Foreign Service to sell Americanism to the world. Selling the American way of life, through wise diplomatic policies and effective propaganda, in my opinion, is one of the primary missions and functions of the State Department. Such salesmanship, involving as it does a thorough understanding of peoples of all nationalities, is a most complex business and demands, in my opinion, the high order of specialized training that only a specialized college can provide.

After I had listened for several hours to this reformed Communist tell of the specialized colleges in Russia, it occurred to me that if Russia could afford to maintain three of these specialized colleges in Moscow, that America, in an effort to preserve its own peace and security, ought to have one of these colleges.

I wrote to the Reference Service of the Library of Congress to ascertain if any bills proposing to establish a college of foreign service had been introduced in previous Congresses. Director Ernest Griffith of the Library Reference Service replied that 12 such bills had been introduced in the previous four Congresses—one in the Seventy-eighth Congress, five in the Seventy-ninth Congress, four in the Eightieth Congress, and two in the Eighty-first Congress. He sent me a copy of each of these 12 bills. After studying these 12 bills, I drafted the bill, H. R. 235, which I introduced on the opening day, January 3, of the present Congress.

WHAT H. R. 235 DOES

The bill H. R. 235 proposes to authorize the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service for the specialized training and specialized education of young men and women who desire to make a lifetime career out of work in the State Department and foreign services of the Nation.

The number of students who would be enrolled in the Academy of Foreign Service, as proposed in this bill, shall be "not less than one student for each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Commissioner" (that is, not less than 534 students to begin with).

Appointment of students to the Academy would be, as far as practicable, by the same methods as apply to appointments to the present Naval and Military Academies.

Candidates for admission to the Foreign Service Academy would have to be between the ages of 20 and 25 and to have had at least 2 years of college training. They would have to undergo such tests as to mental aptitude and unquestioned loyalty as the Board of Trustees of the Academy might prescribe.

Before admission to the Academy each student would be required to submit a statement in writing to the President of the Academy, stating that he or she will serve in the foreign services of the Government of the United States where assigned for a definite period of years.

The students in the Foreign Service Academy, it is proposed by H. R. 235, shall receive the same pay and allowances as cadets at West Point or midshipmen at Annapolis.

GOVERNMENT OF THE ACADEMY

The management of the Academy of Foreign Service, as proposed in H. R. 235, would be vested in a Board of five trustees to consist of the Secretary of State, two Members of the Senate, and two Members of the House, appointed respectively by the Vice President and the Speaker. The House and Senate Members would serve terms of two years each and not more than one of the Senate Members or the House Members could be of the same political party. This would assure, as far as possible, nonpartisan administration of the Academy.

The faculty of the Academy would consist of a President, at a salary not to exceed $20,000, to be selected by the trustees and such other professors, associate professors, and instructors as the trustees might deem necessary.

The bill provides that Foreign Service Academy students may be assigned to the Army's West Point and Navy's Annapolis for instruction or military observation, a provision which I regard as salutary, since military science often is related to the problems of the State Department and an able diplomat should have some understanding of military problems.

In addition to being assigned to the State Department, graduates of the Academy of Foreign Service may be assigned, under the provisions of H. R. 235, to the Department of Commerce for service in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Department of Agriculture in the Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations; and to the Department of the Treasury for service in connection with international finance and currency, tariffs, debt adjustment, and related activities.

STATE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

The State Department on January 1 of this year had a total of 25,360 employees on its payrolls, of which 7,621 were departmental, 16,056 in Foreign Service, and 1,703 in international activities.

There are in addition to those in the State Department those who are engaged in the foreign services of the Commerce, Agriculture, and Treasury Departments. While I have no figures on the number of these, I would guess that their total probably is about 5,000. Thus, we have presumably about 30,000 Government employees in the State Department and in the other foreign-service agencies.

Assuming there is a 5 percent turn-over in these agencies, which I know you will agree is very low, this would create a demand for 1,500 replacements a year, of which possibly as many as 300 or 400 a year could be filled by graduates of the Academy of Foreign Service. I think the need for about 300 or more persons of the skills and training of Foreign Service Academy graduates exists. This figure is only a guess, but, based on the low rate of turn-over I have suggested, the 300 figure, if in error, is probably too low rather than too high.

WHAT WILL IT COST

Due to the present national debt of $257,000,000,000 and the unbalanced state of the budget, it is a certainty that someone will ask how much will it cost to operate such an Academy.

I obtained from the Library of Congress Reference Service a report on the maintenance and operating costs of the Naval and Military Academies over each of the past 11 years. I include the report as to cost of the two existing Academies herewith:

Operating costs of the U. S. Naval Academy and U. S. Military Academy, 1940 to 1951, inclusive

	U. S. Naval Academy	U. S. Military Academy
1940	$2,155,421.37	$3,243,201.45
1941	2,331,893.27	3,328,122.82
1942	2,830,978.79	3,553,915.49
1943	3,046,655.65	6,190,459.97
1944	3,[illegible]70,991.61	6,729,467.39
1945	4,039,563.63	6,367,194.38
1946	3,391,272.53	7,259,268.43
1947	5,362,574.17	7,084,472.68
1948	4,908,690.77	7,325,139.25
1949	5,604,182.10	7,780,286.00
1950	[1] 5,600,000.00	[1] 8,130,000.00
1951	[1] 5,666,000.00	[1] 5,706,414.00

[1] Estimate.

Budget of the U. S. Government, 1951. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950, pp. A65, 738, 740 (1950-51).

U. S. Treasury Department. Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the U. S. Government, 1940-49.

This report shows, as you will note, that during the current year the estimated cost of operating the United States Naval Academy is $5,666,000 and of the United States Military Academy is $5,706,000.

Inasmuch as the proposed Academy of Foreign Service will have a much smaller enrollment, at least to begin with and probably always, the cost of operating and maintaining an Academy of Foreign Service will be very substantially less than that of either of the two Armed Forces academies.

Present enrollment at West Point is 2,448 and at Annapolis 3,663, each school having an enrollment of about five to six times the contemplated enrollment in the proposed Academy of Foreign Service.

Among organizations interested in establishing an Academy of Foreign Service is the American Legion. I have had a letter from Miles D. Kennedy, director of the American Legion, in which he says in part:

"For your information I would advise that the American Legion is very much interested in creating a United States Academy of Foreign Service.

"Enclosed please find a copy of H. R. 8171, introduced by Representative SMITH of Wisconsin, April 24, 1950, at our request."

The Smith bill was one of the bills studied by me prior to the drafting and introduction of my bill, H. R. 235. The Smith bill does not go into the same detail as H. R. 235, but has the same purpose.

Two main arguments have been advanced heretofore by the State Department in opposition to the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service. One of these is the alleged great cost of such an academy and the other is based on the claim that there are established colleges already providing the same training as the proposed Academy of Foreign Service would offer.

Neither of these State Department arguments are convincing. The claim that the Academy of Foreign Service will cost too much is not a sound argument since its total cost, based on the low cost of operating West Point and Annapolis, would indicate that the total cost of maintaining and operating this Foreign Service Academy probably would be less than $3,000,000 a year. If the proposed Foreign Service Academy would contribute anything toward improving the competency of State Department personnel, this investment of $3,000,000 a year, aimed at preserving the peace of the Nation, would be very much worth while.

The State Department today is one of the Government's greatest spending agencies, its expenditures running into many millions of dollars annually. The more competent State Department personnel which an Academy of Foreign Service would tend to produce should result, in my opinion, in savings many times the cost of the proposed Foreign Service Academy.

It is true, as the State Department has contended in past years, that there are other colleges in the Nation that are teaching the same subjects that presumably will be taught in any Foreign Service Academy that is established.

These colleges, however, are not devoted exclusively and entirely to curriculums devoted to making outstanding experts in foreign service. The training of men and women for the foreign service is not their main and exclusive purpose. It is merely a sideline with them.

If this argument that we already have colleges that teach subjects of value to the education of future diplomats is sound, the same argument might with equal force be used against maintaining the Army's West Point and Navy's Annapolis, since there are many schools which provide a certain amount of military training to their students.

It seems to me that the creation of an Academy of Foreign Service, devoted solely and exclusively to the training and education of future diplomats, will provide an atmosphere where the student, surrounded by like students studying similar subjects, will live foreign-service problems every waking hour of his college days. The result, I feel, will be the development of an esprit de corps that will be most conducive to building a more effective State Department and foreign-service personnel.

The better State Department personnel we have the better will be our chances of selling the American way of life to the world and preserving the peace of the Nation.

Service Needed—Expenditure Justifiable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Quincy, Mass., Thursday, February 1, 1951:

FALSE ECONOMY

The Veterans' Administration in Washington has ordered the closing of 317 offices having only one contact representative and a clerk.

The reason: Lack of funds.

Perhaps nationally, a fairly sizeable sum would be saved at the expense of veterans of all ages—the younger men of the Korean War and World War II, the middle-aged of World War I, and the elderly of the Spanish-American War.

It would also be at the expense of the widows of heroes of all wars.

Closing of the Quincy office, one of the 317, on April 1, will bring hardships, particularly to the aged Spanish War veterans and to the widows whose small children prevent them from easily going into the Boston office for settlement of claims or for help in whatever problems that confront them.

Locally, how much will the VA save a year by closing the office to thousands of South Shore veterans—the office that handles, with no red tape, 1,000 inquiries a month plus 500 telephone calls, 100 pieces of correspondence, and 300 forms and applications?

It will save $720 a year rent. It will save another nominal sum paid for telephone service to Boston and south shore towns. This $60 a month rent includes heat and light, too, for the two rooms in the Chamber of Commerce Building.

It will not save anything on salaries because the contact representative and the clerk are to be assigned elsewhere.

It will not save enough to offset the invaluable services offered to the men who have done so much for their country.

One particular service given by Herbert F. Carroll, contact representative at the Quincy office for nearly 5 years, is personal calls at the homes of the seriously disabled, the infirm, and the widows tied down by youngsters.

All that these people now have to do is call the Quincy VA office. Mr. Carroll can probably make a home call that very day or the following day at the latest.

When the office closes April 1, these same people will either have to go in personally to the Boston office, wait several hours before it is their turn to see one of the 35 contact representatives or telephone in and wait possibly 3 or 4 months before a home call can be made.

That certainly is a lot of time wasted. Once in a while it could happen that a veteran, desperately ill and in need of his monthly disability check, found it was all fouled up somewhere along the line. Under the new set-up after April 1, a long wait could conceivably mean that this veteran would die before his affairs could be straightened out.

If the Federal Government wants to show it intends to keep expenses down, it would be well to look with an economical eye at some other branches of service that are burdening the taxpayers.

It should not cast its economical eye at a service that offers so much to the men who did so much.

The Veterans' Administration itself cannot do anything to reopen the offices ordered closed for lack of funds.

It will be up to the veterans themselves, their families and their organizations.

Pressure from them in the form of protest letters to their Congressmen might do a lot of good.

We Must Preserve World's Greatest Pine Forest—Time Is Running Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of all the Members of the House to an important letter which I should like to include in our RECORD. A large group of outstanding Californians have joined together in the California War Memorial Park Association, under the leadership of Mr. John B. Elliott, of Los Angeles, to prevent imminent destruction of the world's finest stand of pine trees and to preserve the beautiful primeval forest, located in Tuolumne County, Calif., as a memorial to the valiant men who gave their lives in World War II. These magnificent pine trees have a majesty and strength which is a fitting symbol of the valor displayed by American boys who laid down their lives to preserve this Nation, for in the forest, too, there is a constant battle for survival, and these giant pines, hundreds of years old, have withstood the ravages of time and the perils of the forest. To see them towering silently in the sunlight is an inspiring sight that stirs the depths of the soul, and brings one to ponder the mysteries of life and the wonders of Nature. It is simply inconceivable that we should allow these trees to be destroyed, and yet they are in imminent danger. I hope every Member can find time to read the letter to which I referred a moment ago, which was written by Mr. Willard G. Van Name, known and respected throughout the world as an authority on living invertebrates.

The letter follows:

CALIFORNIA'S PINES—CREATION OF STATE PARK ASKED TO PRESERVE GIANT TREES

(The writer of the following letter is associate curator emeritus of living invertebrates at the American Museum of Natural History.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is probably pretty well known that most of the surviving groves of the famous giant sequoias, or big trees, of California are now safely preserved in National or State parks and no longer in danger of destruction. There is, however, one very large and fine grove that is still in private ownership. This is the South Calaveras Grove, situated in Tuolumne County, a little more than 60 miles from Sacramento, only a short distance from the North Calaveras grove, which has been a State park for many years.

There has long been a plan to have the State purchase the south grove also and enlarge the park to include both groves in its limits. This has never been carried out,

perhaps partly on account of the expense but more probably because the deep rocky gorge of the Stanislaus River separates the two groves, so that only the north grove is generally visited by tourists. The much finer south grove has up to the present been accessible only by poor roads and circuitous routes.

Though the two Calaveras groves were the first discovered of all the California big trees, and were famous in the early gold-mining days of a century ago, the most remarkable feature of the Calaveras area is still unknown to most people. It is not, as is pretended, the south sequoia grove but a small tract of forest lying near it on the north along Beaver Creek. Most visitors to the sequoias do not get much of a view of it.

UNIQUE STAND

This small area, hardly more than half a square mile in extent, bears the most remarkable stand of pine trees in the world—sugar pines—California's most beautiful forest trees, some of them 200 to 230 feet tall, with trunks over 8 feet in diameter; also some immense Ponderosa pines slightly less in height, but of immense size—trees little inferior to the average sequoia in size and magnificence, such as can be seen nowhere else in the world at the present time.

They are the last of their kind; probably eight centuries, if not a thousand years, would be required to reproduce them if destroyed, and they are much more important to save than the neighboring sequoias, many groves of which are under safe protection already.

Now, are the people of California (and for that matter of the whole country also, for this is a national, not a local matter) going to let the wool be pulled over their eyes and spend their money buying the sequoias which nobody wants to cut, as they make inferior lumber, and do nothing to secure this remarkable stand of pines for the park? That is what the lumber interests and their political allies hope. These wonderful pine stands must be bought now, along with the sequoias. Now or never. The lumber interests are trying to get the State to buy only the sequoias now, and "leave acquiring the pine stands until later on"; that is, to wait until the pines have been cut and there are none left to save.

This deceitful course would put an end to the last hope of having in the Calaveras region the most magnificent State park in the country. It is said that the difficulty is not financial, that the cost can be provided without the aid of any Federal appropriation, a most important matter in such times as these.

OPPOSITION TO PROJECT

Besides the desire of the owners to cut rather than to sell these trees the opposition comes chiefly from very short-sighted local commercial interests and the political influence they control, who prefer the immediate though short-lived increase of business. There is little Federal land involved, and no excuse for Forest Service opposition.

But not all hope of saving this remarkable forest area is gone, though immediate action will be needed. The project is in the hands of a well-organized association with a large membership of prominent and influential Californians, the California War Memorial Park Association of Los Angeles, whose name sufficiently explains its purpose to make this park a memorial to the Californians who lost their lives in the last war. The project has the expressed support of Governor Warren and of a majority of California's congressional delegation, and it is hoped that it may be put through in spite of opposition.

WILLARD G. VAN NAME.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 22, 1951.

Let the President Set the Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from three of my constituents, which very tersely expresses the thoughts and ideas that are contained in letters which I receive in every mail from the people of my congressional district, on the subjects referred to in their letter.

The letter in full follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *February 1, 1951.*

Representative GEORGE SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In our opinion it is high time to call a halt to the wild schemes of the administration, therefore for the record we protest the following:

Taxes: The tax free $50,000 a year the President had himself voted. He is demanding exorbitant taxes for only part of the people. Everyone should share the burden. Cooperatives included. Taxes too high for middle incomes.

Food, money: We protest sending food and lending money to India, England, Yugoslavia, or any other country that votes with Russia and her satellites against the American people. We have been too soft with Socialist governments.

Politics as usual: We are sick and tired of the schemes of the administration and its politics as usual. Surely there are enough men of integrity in Congress to save the United States from enemies within and without.

Yours truly,

MRS. BEN HEFFNER,
MRS. H. H. OLIVER,
MRS. WALTER OLIVER.

The President has asked the people to tighten their belts and deny themselves during the emergency. The people say they are willing to do this, but they think the President should set the example for the rest of the Nation. Above all, they think and say that there should be equality in the matter of taxation, and in this connection, they object vehemently to the President's receiving $50,000 a year tax exempt, or any other sum that may be tax exempt, while they have to pay on their full incomes.

They also object strenuously to the exemption from taxation in whole or in part, of the cooperatives and others, while the individually owned, tax-paying competitors have to pay on the conduct of like businesses and on like profits. They say that all should be put upon the same basis and the President and the cooperatives should not be exempted or favored above private citizens. They say that the great middle class is now, as always, bearing the brunt and the burden of high taxes.

The people are becoming thoroughly dissatisfied with the administration's handout program, and I dare say nearly all the people are disgusted with the way the administration has handled foreign aid, especially to the Russian satellite countries. We cannot agree that part of the taxpayers' money should be spent to subsidize and help maintain the governments of certain countries, while they are trading with the enemy, and perhaps letting them have some of our own commodities that were given to the nations which we are helping under our foreign-aid handouts.

The people are not altogether blind to what the administration is doing or not doing with reference to the influences of communism within our own borders and from without, and they are thoroughly disgusted with the way the situation has been and is now being handled.

Let the President set the example. Let the bureaucrats fall in line first. Why does not the President and his family of bureaucrats try tightening their belts before they ask the people to do so? That is what the people want. That is what should be done, for the case of those on the Federal payroll, living off the taxpayers are supposed to be hired people, the servants of the people, and they certainly should set the example for the rest of the people. If they will do this, our good citizens will follow much more willingly.

Friends Cannot Be Bought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Saturday, February 3, 1951:

MR. SMITH GOES TO TOWN

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of the First Wisconsin District, made a speech in the House on foreign policy Monday. As Mr. SMITH's counsel was sensible, it goes without saying that his recommendations are not representative of the official line of the State Department.

Mr. SMITH said that, without the expenditure of a dollar or a man, the United States could win the friendship of 200,000,000 million people in the Mediterranean Basin by supporting opposition to British and French colonialism. He said that this would retrieve a great bloc of people now tempted by communism, and that it would serve American security by safeguarding 60 percent of the world's oil reserves, plus rich deposits of phosphate, magnesium, and potash. There is ample corroboration of the thesis that these repressed peoples may embrace communism simply because they are frustrated at every turn in their search for real independence. The Egyptian Government has openly stated that a continuation of Britain's refusal to withdraw her garrison and to recognize Egyptian claims in the Sudan could throw the country into the Communist camp. British troops, said Representative SMITH, are also in Iraq and

Transjordan, and French military forces are holding down 30,000,000 people in Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco.

Indeed, even as he spoke, a Committee for the Freedom of North Africa was lodging a complaint with President Truman that France, by moving fresh troops up from Dakar, was reinforcing its police-state regime in Morocco, where wholesale arrests are taking place. The protest, sent while the President was in conference with Premier Pleven of France, charged that the United States was serving the interests of communism by supporting French colonialism in North Africa and Indochina.

This, as Representative SMITH makes clear, is a self-defeating game for the State Department to play. If other confirmation of that obvious fact were required, it has been supplied by Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, commander of the Marine Corps Department of the Pacific, who said, "Colonialism is through in Asia and in other parts of the world as well." General Erskine said that independent Thailand, which has showed much spunk in opposing the Soviet Union, is the only country in southeast Asia where a white man can venture out on the street without escort and not risk being knocked on the head.

Colonial countries do not love communism more; they like colonialism less. They will turn, however, to the people who seem willing to help them achieve their aspirations for liberty, and if the helpful are Russians, that is too bad for the west. As a Middle Westerner, with the unhampered outlook of this section of the country, Representative SMITH has no difficulty seeing these realities clearly. Why cannot the State Department see them, too? Is it because the Department really is not averse to throwing subject peoples into the arms of Stalin?

Resolution To Embody a Divine Acknowledgment in the Federal Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have risen to present a resolution that would embody a divine acknowledgment in the Federal Constitution.

In these days when we are calling upon the Almighty for guidance and victory and peace, it behooves us to give to Him the honor which is His due.

Our colonial forefathers did not hesitate to incorporate their recognition of God and His blessings into their public documents. The Mayflower Compact, the Great Law of Pennsylvania, the Compact of Rhode Island, and many other early civil documents including the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation, recognized "the power that has made and preserved us a nation." Today, 43 out of the 48 State constitutions contain their divine acknowledgments.

But our Federal Constitution, declared by Gladstone to be "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," is lacking in this respect. It fails to acknowledge the author of our Nation's liberties.

For Centuries Men Dreamed of Organizing a World To Keep the Peace—Only One Government, a Dictatorship, Now Stands in the Way of Achieving That End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 28, Dr. John R. Steelman and the National Broadcasting Co. brought to the American people—by way of television—the twenty-fourth Battle Report, Washington. I would have you believe, sir, that, while terse, brief, candid, and all-illuminating, this report of current happenings is one of the most complete expositions and statements on today's events ever brought to my notice.

On the occasion of this telecast, Dr. Steelman introduced a most distinguished group of Government officials. He first introduced the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Dean Rusk, who subsequently did exactly what Dr. Steelman said that he would do—bring us up to date on the situation in that troubled part of the world.

In his talk, Dean Rusk frankly and candidly posed, and gave forthright and true answer to the problem as to why we are now in Korea and why we are staying in Korea.

We are in Korea—

Said Mr. Rusk—

because we are trying to prevent a worldwide global war, and the frightful destruction of life which such war would produce. The thousands that have died in Korea have sacrificed their lives in a struggle to prevent the millions of deaths which a world-wide war would surely bring.

Let us not be discouraged too soon—

He said—

At the end of World War II the human race almost succeeded in doing what men have dreamed about for centuries—that is, in organizing the world to keep the peace. Only one government now stands in the way. That government is a dictatorship, which has behind it considerable power, but the peace-loving world itself is strong, and we cannot afford to give up our goal just when we have come so close.

Day before yesterday—

Bob McCormick, NBC commentator, declared—

Soviet-designed planes used by the enemy appeared for the first time to attack below the thirty-eighth parallel. But well has our Air Force reason to be confident. Russian MIG-15's in actual battle have proved no match for United States Air Force F-86 Sabers, capable of 700 miles per hour. Our Fourth Fighter Interceptor Group has already been credited definitely or probably with bringing down 17 Russian jets with no loss to ourselves. For an up-to-the-minute report on how our jets are doing in Korea—

Mr. McCormick continued—

we turn now to an officer just returned from there—rated as command pilot, combat observer, aircraft observer, and technical observer, from Air Force headquarters—here is Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of the Members of both Houses of Congress know Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White personally. They know him as an intrepid commander, a splendid gentleman, and a distinguished officer. Until quite recently he served as director of legislation and liaison, and in that capacity won the respect and the esteem not alone of all members of the Armed Services Committees in both Houses of Congress but of all with whom he came in contact.

General White, a flying officer, deputy commander of the Thirteenth Air Force, and later commander of the Seventh Air Force in the South Pacific, is no stranger to the situation in Korea. It was because of his knowledge of battle tactics that he was selected by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff as principal military adviser to Dr. Robert L. Stearnes, president of the University of Colorado, who recently, together with the general, conducted an evaluation and study of operations at the Korean battle front itself.

What General White reported, Sunday last, of their work in Korea and the use of the jet aircraft by the Russians, as well as our own Air Force, merits the reading not alone of every Member of this Congress but of all persons who have any personal responsibility or interest in the problem.

The report made by the Honorable John C. Green, Director of the United States Office of Technical Services, like General White's statement, touched on a most important subject, and one about which I knew but very little. His every word fired my imagination and made me more than ever appreciate the many facets attending the current problems facing the Federal Government in trying to maintain a war, and do so with a minimum of interference on the American manner and method of life.

At the conclusion of Mr. Green's splendid narration, Robert McCormick, NBC commentator, brought us still to a newer scene:

It was a training camp in Texas. The cast of characters—enlistees who responded to the hurry-up call for 150,000 Air Force Reserves and National Guard men. The result—the camp was swamped. A whole new tent city is born of the necessity to handle the 21,000 recruits. In the first 2 weeks of this month alone, the camp cleared 40,000 volunteers. For an informal report on the status of the Nation's Organized Reserves and National Guard—plus a revealing statement of the employment problems many of their members are now meeting—we turn to the special assistant to the Chief of Staff of the Army for civilian component affairs, Maj. Gen. Lawrence C. Jaynes.

At the conclusion of General Jaynes' talk, there was certainly nothing that remained to be reported to the American people with respect to our National Guard or Organized Reserve Corps or individual reservists.

With our Eighth Army spearheading back into Seoul, with the supreme commander of the Atlantic Pact nations returning from his tour of Western Europe

with his already-stated confidence in the strength of the democracies, the Special Assistant to the President, W. Averell Harriman, discussed, at some length and with great effect, the problem of bringing to our support the national forces in terms of manpower of all the nations that make up the North Atlantic Pact nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is in that manner that we come to the end of the twenty-fourth battle report, Washington, and, again, I state that John Steelman and the National Broadcasting Co., together with all who contributed to the wonderful success of this program, are to be congratulated upon the splendid presentation made last Sunday over NBC television.

Because of the importance of this program, under unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the twenty-fourth Battle Report, Washington:

Mr. McCORMICK. As Gen. Matthew Ridgway, commander of our troops in Korea, pays a surprise visit to the front and reports the situation getting better all the time, NBC television once again turns its cameras of the Nation's Capital to reflect the fight for freedom, not only in Korea but at home and throughout the world.

Washington, now going into action on the economic front, as in Korea our planes match this action with action of their own, strafing support of our UN forces as they launch the greatest drive since our withdrawal from Seoul.

Today Battle Report scans, through its cameras and guests "the ramparts we watch" from Europe to the Far East, and pauses, too, for a report on our reservists and industrial security. But, first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Again during the past week another proposal to bring about peace in Korea was made through the United Nations. In commenting upon it, the President said: "Let me stress again that the American resolution contains—as all our proposals have contained—a method for bringing about a cease-fire and opening the way for peaceful settlement of outstanding issues."

Freemen all over the world are awaiting the reply from Communist China. They realize that the United Nations' police action in Korea is necessary to prevent aggression and to save millions from slavery. But they want peace. Let us hope the Chinese leaders will recognize they are mere puppets and have sold their people into slavery. Let us hope they will see the light and join in the work of building a peaceful, prosperous world.

This afternoon we will hear from a distinguished group of Government officials. The Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Dean Rusk, will bring us up to date on the situation in that troubled part of the world. Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, of the headquarters of the Air Force, has just returned from Korea, where he saw what our new jet planes are accomplishing. Mr. John Green, of the Department of Commerce, will tell us how the technical and scientific information of our great industries is being guarded. Maj. Gen. Lawrence C. Jaynes has a message of special interest to all reservists and National Guard men. And Mr. W. Averell Harriman, Special Assistant to the President, who has been working very closely with General Eisenhower, is here to tell us of the progress we are making in Europe.

All these men are working in different spheres—but all are working to create a world of peace—and a world where men are their own masters and not the slaves of a tyrant.

Mr. McCORMICK. American GI's in Korea, literally "digging in" for the battles that loom ahead. And from this frozen, snow-covered battlefield comes words that spark their actions. Words from General MacArthur on his eighth flying visit: "No one is going to drive us into the sea." Words, too, from the third division's commanding general: "If they order us, we will go back and take Seoul. We can stop anything the Communists can throw at us." Despite the determination of our troops, here at home—in many corners—one hears the oft-repeated question: "What are we doing in Korea, anyway, and why are we hanging on?" For the answer, we invite your attention now to one who helps direct our Asian policy, the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Dean Rusk.

Hon. DEAN RUSK. Today, I wish to say a word to those who ask why we stay in Korea. It is a serious question—because men's lives are at stake—and it deserves a serious answer.

We are in Korea because we are trying to prevent a world war and the frightful destruction of life which such a war would produce. The thousands who have died in Korea have sacrificed their lives in a struggle to prevent the millions of deaths which world war would surely bring. The issue in Korea is aggression. We can face it, or we can run away from it. If we face it, we have a chance to organize the determination of the world against aggression, to show the aggressor that his crime will not be accepted and that his crime will not pay. If we succeed, the aggressor may hold his hand. If we run away from it, the aggressor will learn that there is a great profit in crime, that he will not be resisted, and that his victims are weak and can be destroyed at will. These are not theories but hard facts. We Americans have already had one unforgettable lesson about what happens when unbridled ambition goes unchecked. We have seen the world go down the trail from Manchuria to Ethiopia to Munich to Poland and, finally, to Pearl Harbor. We must not tread this path again.

Let us not be discouraged too soon. At the end of World War II, the human race almost succeeded in doing what men have dreamed about for centuries; i. e., in organizing a world to keep the peace. Only one government stands in the way. That government is a dictatorship which has behind it considerable power. But the peace-loving world itself is strong and we cannot afford to give up our goal just when we have come so close.

We are in Korea because we cannot afford to leave Red China and its neighbors under the impression that the forces of Peiping are irresistible and that Red China's neighbors must now come to terms with communism at the cost of their freedom. The vaunted power of Red China is being unmasked in Korea. Chinese soldiers do not relish the punishment they are getting from our guns and planes. They are learning that their masters have tricked them into a war of foreign aggression. They are learning that their masters have put them into battle without provision for minimum care in case of wounds or sickness or frostbite. In other words, Red China is learning a great deal about the cost of aggression.

We are in Korea because we cannot abandon 20,000,000 Koreans to communism. We and they have fought side by side against aggression for several months, sometimes in defeat and sometimes in victory. Throughout the campaign the Korean forces have fought with spirit and courage and the Korean people have demonstrated their determination to be free. We cannot now abandon our comrades to the fate which would be theirs if the Communists took over.

Further, we cannot abandon Korea if by doing so we should leave our friends in the Philippines and in Japan under the impression that we do not take our commitments seriously and that we might lack courage in the face of adversity.

Our gallant force in Korea is fully able to take care of itself. We should not act like a defeated nation when, in fact, we have not been defeated and when, in fact, there is an excellent chance that we can deny the aggressor the object of his aggression.

The willingness and ability of the entire free world to increase its strength and to join its forces to insure their mutual defense depends, to a considerable extent, upon the attitude of the United States. Our strength is increasing rapidly as is that of our friends. Our ability to meet the worldwide threat which we now confront is improving steadily. If we can show that we have both the will and the ability to defend ourselves, the main attack may be averted. Our attitude in this situation may easily determine the course of history, which cannot say of us that we chose the road to disaster because we were unwilling to fight for peace.

Mr. McCORMICK. In the skies over Korea, news comes that American jets like these are meeting increasing challenge from the enemy. Day before yesterday, Soviet-designed planes used by the enemy appeared for the first time to attack below the thirty-eighth parallel. But well has our Air Force reason to be confident. Russian MIG-15's in actual battle have proved no match for North American F-86 Sabres, capable of 700 miles per hour. Our Fourth Fighter Interceptor Group has already been credited "definitely or probably" with bringing down 17 Russian jets with no loss to ourselves. For an up-to-the-minute report on how our jets are doing in Korea, we turn now to an officer just returned from there, rated as command pilot, combat observer, aircraft observer, and technical observer, from Air Force Headquarters, here is Maj. Gen. Thomas White.

Maj. Gen. THOMAS D. WHITE. During the past week, there has been a marked increase in Communist air activity in Korea. More and more, enemy jet aircraft of modern design have come over from their sanctuary bases in Manchuria to challenge our control of the air over North Korea. So far, they have not penetrated very far south, but their penetrations are getting deeper and deeper, and the quantity of aircraft committed is growing larger.

There are three very significant facts about these air battles now going on.

Of course, the first and most important fact is that we are winning them. Our pilots report, however, that these enemy jets are very good, high-performance airplanes, and that enemy jet pilots are well trained. The lesson here is that we must spare no effort to continue improving our jet fighters.

The second significant fact about these air battles is that many people are being reminded of something they have been prone to forget up to now—and that is, the first and over-riding responsibility of the air commander is to destroy the enemy air forces and protect our Ground Forces against attack by enemy aircraft. During the early days of the war in Korea, the North Korean air force was small and inferior, but if it had been allowed to operate unrestricted it could have given our Ground Forces plenty of trouble. However, it was quickly disposed of, and to this very day practically no United Nations soldier in Korea has ever seen any but United Nations airplanes overhead. This very absence of effective enemy air opposition has caused many people to become preoccupied with the other missions of the Tactical Air Force, particularly with the close support mission. These air battles

you are now reading about underscore the threat which General Partridge, commander of the Fifth Air Force in Korea, has always had to be prepared to meet—this in addition to his difficult job of isolating the battlefield and closely supporting our Ground Forces.

The third significant fact about this commitment of the Communists jet air force is the likelihood that the Communists are trying to find some way to lessen the effect of our air attacks on enemy ground forces. General Stratemeyer's Far West Air Forces are continuing to hammer the enemy on the ground, day and night, every day, as they have since the first day the Air Force was committed to combat in Korea. This sustained air attack has taken a heavy toll of the enemy, and doubtless this is one of the main reasons why the Communists are now committing their jet aircraft.

In summary, General Stratemeyer now has a real air battle on his hands, as well as the job of other tactical support to our Ground Forces. It is gratifying to see that his airmen are handling the air battle with the same high degree of effectiveness that they have been performing the interdiction, close support reconnaissance, transport, and evacuation missions that are also included in full scale tactical air support.

Mr. McCORMICK. Loaded aboard ship for the fighting front go implements of war to combat the threats to peace. Behind this scene and feeding it with an ever-increasing supply so essential to ultimate victory. The rails hum with new war cargoes daily. And behind the trains, in turn, vast stockpiles of further supplies that sit in yards awaiting their moment to stream out to wherever freemen will take up arms in democracy's defense. But it is to a story behind all of this, America, that we next invite your attention. Namely, the delicate business of keeping our industrial processes and techniques secure from enemy knowledge and use. Concerned with this vital task, is the Department of Commerce official upon whom we next focus our cameras. He is Director of the United States Office of Technical Services, John C. Green.

Mr. JOHN C. GREEN. In the last week I found that an eminent scientific society was sending critical information directly to Moscow. When I asked a representative of the society about it, he replied that they had been doing this for many years, it was a routine procedure to which no particular thought was given. Also, a manufacturer of precision equipment who is selling most of his product to the Armed Forces was prepared to send detailed technical literature to one of the Communist embassies. He felt that there might be danger in selling them the actual equipment but he could see no particular objection in making the technical details available to personnel in this country. These situations indicate a serious lack of awareness of the security importance of science and technology.

Basically every American wants to take all reasonable measures to preserve our security and avoid giving aid to the enemy. However, the free world to which we are accustomed, the full exchange of ideas and scientific information has become a national habit. We are accustomed to describing in detail our latest scientific and technological achievements for world audiences. Unfortunately, these are troubled times and we must develop a national awareness that these scientific and technical discoveries are a precious possession which should not be made generally available without careful consideration. At the same time, we must remember that the exchange of new facts can operate to our benefit. For example, in such important and diversified fields as penicillin, jet propulsion, radar, and even atomic energy much basic significant data was transferred here from friendly scientists abroad. In view of this situation, we must be careful not to design procedures which cut us off from important foreign discoveries available through reciprocal exchange of information but it should be truly reciprocal and not a one-way street.

Once technical data is published and generally circulated in this country, it is virtually impossible to keep it out of the hands of others who are actively seeking it. The best that can then be done is a delaying action. Therefore, the more intelligent approach is to use good sense before the release. This means that the American people who produce valuable segments of information should ask themselves a very simple question—will the general release of this information be of substantial benefit to our people and our friends or will it operate for the benefit of hostile nations? If this question is honestly asked and then the company or person acts according to common sense, good judgment and patriotism, a tremendous step will have been taken.

There will be times when these decisions will be difficult to make because of complex or conflicting factors involved. Recognizing this, your Government, through the Department of Commerce, is ready to offer direct and prompt advice as to whether or not the release of scientific information or technical data might compromise national security. This is not censorship, but a public service. Fundamentally, the decision must remain with the individual, the author or the company.

Every intelligent American knows that scientific superiority will be the decisive factor in future wars. He should equally realize that it is his patriotic duty to take reasonable measures which will safeguard our scientific secrets. Failure to do so is unconscious sabotage of our fighting forces.

Mr. McCORMICK. The scene: A training camp in Texas. The cast of characters—enlistees who responded to the hurry-up call for 150,000 Air Force Reserves and National Guard men. The result—the camp swamped. A whole new tent city is born of the necessity to handle the 21,000 recruits. In the first 2 weeks of this month alone, the camp cleared 40,000 volunteers. For an informed report on the status of the Nation's Organized Reserves and National Guards—plus a revealing statement of the employment problems many of their members are now meeting—we turn to the special assistant to the Chief of Staff of the Army for Civilian Component Affairs, Maj. Gen. Lawrence C. Jaynes.

Maj. Gen. L. C. JAYNES. As a direct result of the present national emergency it has been necessary to call upon our civilian components, those units and individuals who have a vital mission in the defense of our country. Their mission is to be trained and ready to serve in the event of a national emergency. This includes furnishing units effectively organized and trained in time of peace for rapid mobilization, expansion, and deployment. It also includes furnishing additional trained personnel for necessary expansion of the Army of the United States and providing a reservoir of civilians with military experience available for assignment. The National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps provide the civilian components to meet this mission.

The primary consideration has been the ordering into active military service certain National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps units; the screening of individual reservists for active duty, standards of training, grade and rank, promotion and assignment, all demanding the concentrated effort of our top military planners. In the sudden shift from peacetime to emergency footing, hardships were bound to occur. Rapid strides have been taken by the Army to correct resulting inequities and to insure the fair and impartial treatment of all guardsmen and reservists who are subject to being ordered into the active military service.

Mr. McCORMICK. Let's look at one of our most moving mobilization problems. Let's look at it from the standpoint of the aggrieved—reservists and National Guard men, subject to military duty at any time; their story: They offer their services to their country, ready to go in any emergency.

Their thanks, many of them complain, is to go jobless. Excellent qualification, perhaps, but that ever-present danger of being called into service—employers don't like the idea of losing a man just when he's been nicely broken in on a tough job. So, it's a chorus of "No's"—endless trudging, trudging, trudging, looking for a job.

So say many of the men involved. In a time of manpower shortages, no work for them, and only because they tried to do their duty.

If it's true, something must be done—but then the question of what can be done. These men need—deserve—jobs; the country needs every man.

And steps are being taken to straighten it out.

General JAYNES. In connection with the mobilization problems, I have mentioned, I am very happy to say that most employers throughout the country are cooperating fully and patriotically with their employees who hold Reserve status. Such employees have pledged themselves to set aside the comforts and advantages of civilian pursuits whenever their country needs them in uniform. Certainly, they deserve at least equal consideration with their non-Reserve fellow employees. Most employers, as I have said, recognize this and resist any temptation to hesitate to employ or advance individuals who are reservists. We still get reports of some reservists, however, who had had difficulty in getting jobs, or in getting ahead on their present job, simply because their future status is somewhat uncertain. I hope we will hear less and less of such reports, and that all employers will accept the inconvenience of occasionally losing a key man as a small part of their contribution to our national effort. There is no such thing as "this man's Army"—it is your Army, whether civilian or reservist, whether employer or employee. When a man unselfishly contributes his spare time to prepare to serve that Army when he is needed, take pride in him, help him, don't penalize him.

Our Reserve forces are a vital part of our country's defense. These men and women have agreed to give up their civilian pursuits to serve their country when they are needed. They deserve the respect and admiration of every one of us.

Mr. McCORMICK. As Eighth Army spearheads probed north within 10 miles of Seoul, the riddle "Where's the Chinese Army?" seemed finally to find an answer. Maybe below Seoul, where reports indicate ominous heavy troop activity, and stiffening Communist resistance makes many feel we are about to collide with the main Chinese forces. Cautiously, our troops continue to feel out the enemy along the new 90-mile front. Meanwhile, the Atlantic Pact Nation's Supreme Commander, Ike Eisenhower—shown here in Paris where Communists staged a riot for him—returned from Western Europe confident of the strength of the democracies. For an experienced evaluation of the defense role of France and our other European Allies visited by General Eisenhower, we bring you now the Special Assistant to the President, W. Averell Harriman.

Hon. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN. During the coming week, the arrival of two men in Washington will focus attention on the strengthening of the North Atlantic community for our mutual security.

The Prime Minister of France, Rene Pleven, will arrive tomorrow morning—followed 2 days later by our great general—Dwight Eisenhower.

The French Prime Minister is coming to discuss with the President the problems our two countries face together in Europe and the Far East.

I first met Rene Pleven in London in 1941, when he was one of the stalwart group of French leaders of the French resistance to Nazi tyranny. Today he is again a stalwart leader of France in resisting the new threat. He represents the spirit of the French people, which has made possible the reconstruction of France from the chaos left in the wake of war.

The French people, as well as the other people of Western Europe, have made good use of our help under the Marshall plan. Principally, through their own hard work, they have regained their economic vitality—in fact, in industry, production is now running well ahead of the prewar highs. As a result of the cooperative effort of the Marshall plan, the peoples of Europe are now in a position to undertake the new and arduous task of reestablishing their combined military strength. A start has been made.

Before Korea, our European partners were spending on their military forces about the same percentage of their national income as we were at that time, and since Korea, they are expanding substantially their military budgets.

But we can't judge military effort merely by a comparison of budgetary figures. In France, for instance, it is traditional for their young men to serve their country for nominal pay—in fact, less than what we would consider cigarette money. Then, too, they have been fighting a costly war for the past several years against Communist aggression in Indochina.

It is planned that our European allies will develop forces in terms of manpower greater than ours. They have the men. Their combined population, if we include Western Germany, is much larger than ours. But we must recognize, in facing the problem together, that their total output of industry and agriculture is less than half of ours. And on a per capita basis, they have only about one-third of the goods available that we have for both civilian and military needs. Thus they have not the capacity to arm the larger forces adequately for modern warfare. Because of our far greater productivity, we have undertaken to supply a considerable part of the required equipment and some other imports to make possible increased munitions production.

Later this week, General Eisenhower will report on what he has seen during his trip through Europe. Better than anyone, he can tell us the job that we and our European allies must do to build the forces in Europe needed for our mutual security. With the inspiration of his leadership, we can all move forward with confidence that this job can be done to convert our collective potential strength—vastly greater than the Soviet's—into a combined military force to deter aggression and to protect our security and our freedoms.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another "teledocumentary," this, then against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your twenty-fourth battle report, Washington.

United States Aid Can Win 200,000,000 Friends for Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on February 3, 1951:

HOW TO WIN 200,000,000 FRIENDS AT NO COST

General Eisenhower took to the air waves last night to give the taxpayers an imitation in shorter form of the persuasion he attempted upon Congress the day before.

So far as we have been able to learn up to this writing, nobody was thunderstruck.

There may have been citizens who thought it possible he would say of his European jaunt: "I went. I saw. You wouldn't want any."

WHY THE BIG IF?

But of course not. Even a child knows that Mr. Truman made very sure of the general before leading him up to be commander in chief of the international defense forces.

The general has now performed accordingly. He comes back with the novel suggestion that there is no doubt about the all-seeing, all-knowing wisdom of the Truman program in foreign affairs. And then he proceeds to talk against people daring to have doubts.

If the taxpayers and Congress are locked up, then why all the jawing? When the customer is sold, you just hand him the pen. Certainly you don't tell him that he has no doubts and that if he does they are beneath him.

It is, indeed, worth reflection that the general himself, in spite of his frontal positiveness, has dragged in plenty of hems and haws on the side.

Last night's speech was notable for the use of the big "if." In one single sentence of 80 words, the general found it necessary to protect himself 6 times with "if."

A clue to this necessity shows itself when one reads his detailed text. In rummaging around for evidence to support his claim of France's will to resist, he mentions the war in Indochina. When the British are his example, he cites Malaya.

In view of the fact that Britain's government is a Socialist bartender for communism and the Communists are the largest single section of seat holders in the French Chamber of Deputies, it may be argued that the general had no choice. He had to look half way around the world away from them for a likely story.

But to the world itself he could hardly have offered a more unhappy evidence of that ignorance, to call it by the best possible name, which inflames against America so many people who would gladly be our friends and allies if we would let them.

It would profit the general, at least we hope he is capable of it, to read an address to the House of Representatives on Monday last by Representative LAWRENCE W. SMITH, of the First Wisconsin District.

Mr. SMITH made it plain and clear how the United States can gain the support of 200,000,000 people living around the edges of the Mediterranean Sea in important regions as much threatened by Communist aggression as any in the world.

A REAL PROGRAM

Furthermore, he showed how this can be done without spending a dollar of taxpayers' money, and for that matter it can even be done in honor.

He proposes that the United States throw its sympathies with these exploited people against, not for, British and French colonialism. And, why not?

General Eisenhower, in his speech to Congress, made much of the danger that would follow Communist seizure of various places where raw materials lie that we might want to buy.

Well, in the Near East and north Africa there are enormous deposits of material wealth, of which 60 percent of the world's proved oil supply is just one.

The people who live there are not fooled. They know why the British and French denounce communism in the colonies and swallow it at home. And so it is no wonder these suppressed and exploited victims of colonialism grow more and more interested in what Russia has to say to them.

Communism is an enemy they have yet to know, but colonialism they can hate with certain knowledge born of bitter experience.

The American people, whether General Eisenhower will or no, have something to think about in the observation by Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, commander of the Marine Corps Department of the Pacific, that "colonialism is through in Asia and in other parts of the world as well."

We can think about the fact that a committee for the freedom of north Africa complained to President Truman of French police action in Morocco even as French Premier Pleven and Mr. Truman were discussing "anti-Communist measures."

We can think about the fact that in Asia, it is independent, self-governing Thailand that stands up to the Soviets. General Erskine says Thailand is the only place in southeast Asia where a white man can walk the street without fear of being knocked on the head.

No wonder General Eisenhower's sales talk suffered from hems and haws. He should have listened to Representative SMITH, instead of expecting a nation to listen to him.

Internal Security Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the President recently announced the appointment of a Commission of Internal Security to examine this vital problem in these days of national emergency. Many of us have been concerned over the failure of the present administration to take adequate measures to guard the Nation's internal security during recent years. As a result of this past failure, many Communists and Communist sympathizers were allowed by the President to assume positions of influence and responsibility in our Government. Alger Hiss, who was defended by the President, is a classic example of the weakness in the Nation's internal security during recent years.

It is my hope that the new Internal Security Commission will properly exercise its functions to prevent the mistakes of the Truman administration on questions of internal security from being repeated in these critical times. In any event, it is my hope that the Congress will constantly be on the alert to see that our Nation is protected in the future from any possibility of Communists or Communist sympathizers obtaining employment in our Federal Government. I am including as part of my remarks an editorial published in the San Marino Tribune in my district on February 1, 1951. Mr. H. H. McCormack, the publisher of the San Marino Tribune, has pointed out the problem now before us in his editorial, and I recommend it to all the Members of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER COMMISSION TO BYPASS COMMIE-FIGHTING CONGRESS?

Verily, this is the day, as well as the heyday of bureaus, boards, and commissions, bringing to mind once again Lincoln's distrust of commissions. Said he: "I have done with commissions. I think they are contrivances to cheat the Government."

President Truman, far from having done with commissions, has just set up a nine-member Commission of Internal Security, headed by Admiral Nimitz, retired, to consider in all its aspects the question of how this Nation can best deal with the problem of protecting its internal security, at the same time maintaining the freedoms of its citizens.

The commission will examine existing legislation against treason, espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities. It will look into the doings and methods of State and local governments, of public groups, of private groups of all kinds and citizens in their daily work and in their homes, aimed at protection against such subversive activities. It will consider the harm that comes from the wrong kind of action as well as the good that comes from the right kind of action. It will investigate operation of Federal employee loyalty and security programs.

While it appears to be the President's purpose, from reports now at hand, that the commission shall direct its attention toward subversive activities, the language of its authority, to consider in all its aspects national security and freedoms of citizens, seems sufficiently comprehensive for delving into whatever may have bearing thereupon.

Regardless, however, of the intended scope of the commission's assignment, the larger fact is that no such inquisitional body is called for, inasmuch as the Congress is not only clothed with both duty and authority to act in the premises, but has already exercised its authority with telling effect, through disclosures of the Un-American Activities Committee, brought about mainly by the acumen and persistence of Congressman, now Senator, RICHARD NIXON, of California, whereby Alger Hiss, as a conspicuous example, was pried loose from his niche in the State Department and forced into the light of day for beholding of all the people; and this, in face of Mr. Truman's aspersion of red herring cast at the committee.

Furthermore, the Congress last fall enacted the so-called Communist control bill, designed to frustrate Communist and subversive activities. Far from having Mr. Truman's support in passing the measure, the Congress was compelled to override a Presidential veto—which it did, decisively.

The operation of the new commission will be not only a useless duplication of endeavor but also a manifest and wholly unwarranted trespass upon congressional prerogative.

Mr. Truman's commission will have complete access to FBI and other Government files, notwithstanding that the President has steadfastly refused like access to congressional committees, maintaining his stand by assertion of precedents.

The action now required of the President is that he bend every effort toward rooting out from Government departments every vestige of subversion of every kind and degree; and that he do so without further stalling or awaiting findings of a supernumerary and entirely needless commission.

There is something appallingly inconsistent in the administration's attitude of toleration toward communism and subversion on the home front, the while America's sons by thousands are compelled to go and meet Communist "aggression" in mortal combat on the other side of the world, with casualties thus far of more than 46,000 of whom not less than 7,500 are no longer concerned with what a commission decides about communism—they are dead—with naught by way of halting communism to show for their sacrifices.

Communism could be handled, ousted, from the home front by an aggressive administration minded so to do, without casualties. If the administration at Washington doesn't share that conclusion, make no mistake about it, American mothers and fathers do.

Is Truman Playing Into Stalin's Hands?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, March 18, 1947, contains a speech by the Honorable HOWARD H. BUFFETT, Congressman of Nebraska, entitled "Is Truman Playing Into Stalin's Hands?"

Mr. Speaker, Congressman BUFFETT apparently gave much thought to the preparation of this speech and collected an abundance of material and factual information set out in the premises of his address, from which he drew certain conclusions and made certain deductions.

Remember that this address was delivered by Congressman BUFFETT on March 18, 1947, now approximately 4 years ago. It was delivered 3 years before the hostilities in Korea began. It was delivered before a number of other things happened, which have transpired during the past 4 years.

Congressman BUFFETT, I am sure, makes no claims of being a prophet nor the son of a prophet. Nevertheless, Congressman BUFFETT's address on this subject on that occasion was truly prophetic, and the Congressman undoubtedly spoke better than he knew at the time. Many things that he suggested might happen, could happen or would happen, actually have transpired, during the past 4 years since the Congressman's address was delivered.

On account of the well-reasoned argument presented in the address and because of the fact that Congressman BUFFETT clearly foresaw what he considered the inevitable results and termination of some of the activities of the Truman national administration in foreign affairs, I think it only fitting and proper that Congressman BUFFETT's address on March 18, 1947, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, be reprinted for the benefit of those who would appreciate knowing how accurate his judgment was and how cogent his reasoning has been demonstrated to have been.

The following is the address of Congressman BUFFETT:

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman demands large-scale American intervention in the political, economic, and military affairs of the Balkans. He tells us other lands must have similar intervention.

This proposal prompts me to repeat a comment by Lord Welby, once treasury head for England. Shortly before World War I started the British Empire toward liquidation, Lord Welby declared:

"We are in the hands of an organization of crooks. They are politicians, generals, manufacturers of armaments, and journalists. All of them are anxious for unlimited expenditure, and go on inventing scares to terrify the public and to terrify Ministers of the Crown."

Probably Mr. Truman's demand does not reflect the kind of scare Lord Welby reported. And so, it may have another origin. Could that origin be that American intervention in Greece has been craftily connived for by the Kremlin, and that Mr. Truman has swallowed the bait?

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one fact clear. I am not happy talking about foreign affairs. I would prefer to leave that field to others.

But as an American, I am ashamed and appalled by the recent record of failure in foreign affairs. So I cannot remain silent while new and more ghastly blunders are concocted.

A TRAGIC RECORD OF FAILURE

Truly no one could possibly have handled our foreign affairs much worse than the present administration. It is tragic to have to confess that American blood and treasure was used to deliver into communistic tyranny the lands of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary, Manchukuo, and large parts of Germany, Austria, Finland, China, Korea, and Japan. But it is true.

Even yet it is hard to believe that 400,000 American boys died for the Atlantic Charter and that instead their sacrifice was used to expand communism over two continents.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to assess the enormity of this failure. A man from Mars reviewing it would come to one or the other of two conclusions—either our Government has been in the control of Communists, or it has been in the hands of terribly stupid people completely fooled by the Communists.

As the first conclusion would indicate unlimited treachery and treason, it must be ruled out. Left with the second alternative—that the administration has been terribly stupid and misled—we must consider the present Truman demands in the light of that record.

Lacking only the former head man and some minor characters, the present administration, including its Republican collaborators, is the same assortment of officials that have steered America to the brink of chaos. Surely then we must examine their schemes now with the utmost skepticism.

DOES THE LEOPARD CHANGE ITS SPOTS?

Mr. Speaker, for 14 years the New Deal Party brazenly carried water for communism in America and throughout the world. Now we are asked to believe that overnight it has changed into the world-wide champion of anticommunism.

While welcoming administration professions of anticommunism, Congress and the people should remember that the Good Book says, "By their fruits ye shall know them." A management which has committed 14 years of blunders for communism is hardly qualified, because of an almost overnight reformation, to be given a blank check for a crusade against communism.

Mr. Speaker, suppose this intervention proposal fits right into Stalin's plans? If American intervention in the Balkans is what the Communists want, we had better learn that fact now.

Most all Americans are agreed now on the dangers of communism. Some of us have been concerned about communism for a long time. Our warnings and our efforts, such as my amendment to prevent postwar lend-lease from going to Russia and others, were ignored.

But now is not a time for recriminations. It is a time to carefully appraise our position and chart our course. The decision involves unlimited consequences. Our intentions do not matter. The consequences follow automatically.

To get a clear understanding of our present situation, we must go back a long way. When our leaders precipitated us into World War I, they thereby committed us to the one lasting consequence of that war. What was that consequence? The establishment of communism in full control of a powerful government—Russia.

NEW DEAL SPARKS COMMUNIST EXPANSION

Following this initial victory, we did not hear much about communism between 1921 and 1933. But when the New Deal took over in 1933, it was not long until Roosevelt gave communism a tremendous boost by official recognition.

This recognition enabled communism to begin to expand its activities, both in Europe and America. At that time the Communists were secretly promoting World War II. Finally Stalin's deal with Hitler precipitated the conflict.

When Hitler attacked Russia in 1941, Roosevelt immediately pledged the Communists unlimited materials from America, with no questions asked and no pledges made in return. Billions of our resources went to Russia. But Russia's hostility toward us never lessened. Many of our officials knew of this continuing hostility, but kept that fact from our people.

Many strange things happened. America's then No. 1 Communist, Earl Browder, was in the Federal penitentiary for violating our statutes. The New Deal pardoned him. All through the war the New Deal high command, both civilian and military, catered to Russia's every whim and every demand. War materials reportedly went to Russia ahead of the necessities of our own troops.

But she returned less in reverse lend-lease than we received from the Fiji Islands.

The Communists saw that the longer the war lasted the greater would be their victory. Accordingly, they cunningly insisted on the barbaric demand for unconditional surrender to prolong enemy resistance.

REAL WAR TRIUMPH WAS STALIN'S

When hostilities ceased, we had the momentary elation of a great military victory. But the real triumph was Stalin's—achieved with the aid of 400,000 Americans who died believing they were fighting for the Atlantic Charter.

Even after VJ-day our foreign policy remained perfectly attuned to the wishes of the Kremlin. Using human distress in Europe as the bait, Communists promoted UNRRA, with Uncle Sam paying the bill.

Whatever the intentions were, UNRRA added to Stalin's conquests. Congress had been specifically warned that UNRRA would enable Stalin to extend his mastery over Europe. But the New Deal Congress, aided by the failure of the Republican leadership to explode this scheme, voted almost $3,000,000,000 of the savings of the American people for this arsenal of communism.

Our postwar policy in Germany also carried out the desires of the Kremlin. The Morgenthau plan, and the official hate-the-German doctrine were Moscow-approved and enabled the Communists to woo the German people. The New Deal Party carried out Moscow's order.

NOVEMBER ELECTION FORCES CHANGE IN STRATEGY

Then last November a titanic ballot-box uprising took place in America. The American people demonstrated overwhelming opposition to a foreign and domestic policy which, knowingly or unwittingly, was following the Communist Party line.

So the conspirators in the Kremlin had to revise their strategy for world conquest. Let us visualize the reaction of the top Communists to our election. Stalin knew that direct hand-outs from America were over. He also knew that America was entirely too strong to challenge militarily; so what should he do in his unswerving objective of world domination?

Surely Stalin would determine that he must reverse his tactics here to continue his conquests. Perhaps his mind would recall the famous prediction of Huey Long, who declared that if fascism ever comes to America, it will come in the name of antifascism.

What better tactic could Stalin now develop than to promote communism in America in the name of anticommunism. This tactic, of course, would require the continual creation of communistic scares outside America.

Likewise, if he were to exhibit traditional Russian cunning, an historical Russian tactic would suggest itself to him. He would recall how Czar Alexander I sucked Napoleon into advancing to Moscow, and how that overextended position so depleted Napoleon's strength that later he toppled easily at Waterloo.

Then Stalin might smile as he recalled Hitler's 1,500-mile supply line to Stalingrad. He would remember how the devouring logistics of that far-flung position decimated Hitler's military machine. So, Stalin would be determined that he must keep America overextended and off balance.

AMERICA "OUT ON LIMB"

That would be the political strategy, just as it always has been a favored Russian tactic. He would needle us and play hit-and-run infiltration wherever America could be sucked in, especially remembering, of course, our continued willingness to aid the outposts of the British Empire.

This strategy would have another especial value to Mr. Stalin. With American attention on an external campaign against communism, his army of stooges in the New Deal could quietly be enrobed in a concealing mantle of anticommunism.

So, besides involving the American people in bankrupting commitments abroad, a communistic drive would divert suspicion and attention from Stalin's agents in the New Deal.

This scheme would make use of the tactics long used by subway pickpockets. Do you remember that trick? It was for one thief to concentrate the victim's attention by frontal shoving and jostling, while the thievery was carried out by the accomplice in the rear. He picked the pocket while the victim's attention was on the disturber in front of him. It is a simple trick, but Mr. Stalin has apparently been dealing with simple minds in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Communists have started this strategy, and that Mr. Truman and his advisers have been taken in. He proposes to send large amounts of military aid to Greece and Turkey. Most certainly we will apparently stabilize the situation there for awhile. Probably the Communists will fold their tents like the Arabs and silently steal away.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman intimating that the Communists are going to quit?

Mr. BUFFETT. Oh, no; just wait until the next paragraph.

UNCLE SAM, INTERNATIONAL FIREMAN

Then after we have spread ourselves in Greece and Turkey, and our leaders are patting themselves on the back for their successful firm stand, a new alarm will come in. Communistic outbreaks will be reported serious in another area. We will rush to that alarm. A $1,000,000,000 call will come from Korea. There will be renewed demands from China.

All over the world we would soon be answering alarms like an international fireman, maintaining garrisons, and pouring out our resources. Our position would become more overextended than Hitler's was at the height of his conquests—if it is not already.

In the meantime, what will have happened at home? Economy plans will have generally gone up in smoke. The futility of then attempting to stop the reckless spenders, aided by the sly inside agents of the Kremlin, would quickly become apparent to all. In the pattern developed through the war years of deficit spending, this administration combination would dress up every spending scheme as vital in their anti-Communist program.

Attempts at economy would again be smeared as reactionary efforts to save dollars at the cost of the lives of American boys. Patriots who try to bring about economy would be branded as Stalin lovers.

The misery of the people, from continued militarism and inflation, would soon become unbearable. As their anguished protests became vocal, the shackles of regimentation and coercion, so lately thrown off, could be refastened in the name of stopping communism at home.

Of course, all this spending over the world will both make certain and hasten a financial collapse in America—an economic Pearl Harbor. That is the ultimate goal of the current Red needling.

INFLATION—COMMUNISM'S SECRET WEAPON

Stalin knows, as Lenin taught him, that the surest way to overturn an existing social order is to debauch the currency. When the President mentioned inflation in Greece, he unconsciously touched on the very condition which Stalin is counting on to give the Communists victory in America.

And so, Mr. Speaker, if America is now sucked into a state of undeclared war in Greece and other places, we would seem to be paving the way for world triumph of communism. In World Wars I and II our noble objectives vanished when military victory was won. So it will be again if we take the road to war.

We will again learn too late the truth of William Graham Sumner's words:

"When a war is begun, it will run its course and bring its consequences. What the intention was makes no difference."

PARTIAL LIST OF CONSEQUENCES

But, Mr. Speaker, we should consider now what some of the ultimate consequences would be. Here are a few of the probable results:

First. Truth-telling would generally disappear in radio, press, and movie. The totalitarian tactics of smear, censorship, and lying propaganda would overwhelm those who resist. Those Americans who correctly anticipated the communistic victory in World War II were politically crucified and silenced in most cases. The same terrorism will happen again if we are now maneuvered into thinly veiled armed conflict with Russia.

Second. Military conscription would soon be demanded to fill the ranks of garrisons for Palestine and the Near East oil fields.

Third. Laboring people would be in danger of a labor draft like President Truman wanted last May. As inflation mounted, class struggle, which the Communists have never yet been able to create in America, might rapidly develop. Every hidden force of inflation would be adding to the distress of the people—as far-flung military and economic operations exhausted our economy.

Fourth. OPA regimentation and coercion would be reimposed under the old forms or in some new sugar-coated version.

Fifth. GI benefits of World War II, when added to these new foreign hand-outs, would soon be an almost impossible financial load for the budget. Postponement by a moratorium, or serious dilution by inflation, could follow.

Sixth. Outstanding war bonds would probably be largely frozen in the hands of their owners.

Seventh. Within a few years our currency would become so diluted by inflation that it would have only a fraction of its 1939 purchasing power.

Eighth. Then the condition having been created here that Mr. Truman described in Greece of "savings wiped out by inflation," the people, beaten and bankrupt, would be ripe for a Communist dictatorship.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is presenting a problem which we ought to consider very carefully. The gentleman spoke of the likelihood of a communistic dictatorship developing. Does the gentleman agree with me that the dictator might not be an American?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes; that is entirely possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Along the line of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] was saying, we have not had an American foreign policy which originated here for 10 or 12 years.

Mr. BUFFETT. My remarks take recognition of that possibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As I got it, he, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] was suggesting that this dictator might come from abroad. My understanding is that our foreign policy has been coming from abroad through the British Empire for something like 10 years. If I am wrong, I would like to have the gentleman from Ohio correct me.

Mr. BUFFETT. As these consequences began to unfold, all effective political opposition would end. In fact, passage of this scheme, when added to the humbug presidential campaigns of 1940 and 1944, might indicate that one-party Government has already been largely accomplished.

The smear terrorism long used by the New Deal would be directed against every patriot who resisted successive moves in this so-called anti-Communist drive.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Members of this House to think long and earnestly before they vote us into a probable Stalin trap, either the immediate one in Greece or later ones which may be skillfully concocted to get us out on a limb everywhere.

PROBABLY POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY HAS TEMPTED ADMINISTRATION

I am afraid the Truman high command has been tempted by the domestic political attractions abounding in this scheme. It seems to enable them at one stroke to apparently cast off their long-ingrained Communist taint and simultaneously shift the blame for 14 years of inflation.

This scheme would lay the inflation headache right in the laps of the Republicans. Truman could then say that the end of OPA, not the foreign hand-outs, brought skyrocketing price levels. The Republicans could not point out that excessive foreign-handouts caused the inflation, because they would be recorded in favor of that policy. So the Balkan deal seems made to order to revive the New Deal domestically and likewise made to order for Stalin internationally.

Even if it were desirable, America is not strong enough to police the world by military force. If that attempt is made, the blessings of liberty will be replaced by coercion and tyranny at home.

Our Christian ideals cannot be exported to other lands by dollars and guns. Persuasion and example are the methods taught by the carpenter of Nazareth, and if we believe in Christianity we should try to advance our ideals by His methods.

IMPERIALISM ABROAD AND FREEDOM AT HOME WILL NOT WORK

We cannot practice might and force abroad and retain freedom at home. We cannot talk world cooperation and practice power politics. If we try to face both ways at once, we will repeat the sad lesson of the crusades. Ernest Barker summed up that tragedy in these words:

"The crusades may be written down as a failure. They ended not in the occupation of the east by the Christian west, but in the conquest of the west by the Mohammedan east."

Mr. Speaker, is the Truman administration truly trying to stop communism? Then its task begins at home. I suggest the same three-point program that I have long advocated, for a starter:

First. Clean out the Communists and the fellow travelers in our own Government.

Second. Stop giving foreign nations free economic support. End the administration policies that have used America as an arsenal for communism. Encourage genuine relief under nonpolitical auspices.

Third. Stop imitating communism. Communism arose out of the ashes of an economy destroyed by currency inflation and was welcomed by a people saddled with tyrannical bureaucracy. To stop communism we must balance the budget, reduce the debt, and cut taxes.

Mr. Speaker, long ago the admonition was offered, "Physician, heal thyself." If the Truman administration is now finally interested in stopping the spread of communism, it will take to heart that specific advice from the founder of the only effective antidote for communism, the Christian religion.

Congressman Doyle Further Explains How H. R. 2383 Would Stop Use of Power To Arbitrarily Destroy Legitimate Business—Remarks in Regard to Case of Ewing Versus Mytinger and Casselberry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday in the Appendix of the RECORD beginning at page A610 I had printed the copy of the bill H. R. 2383 designed to amend section 304, subsections (a) and (b), of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Following the text of the bill I made certain remarks and explanations about the purpose of the bill and also related that in the preparation of said remarks I had asked and received the cooperation of the legal counsel for Nutrilite Products manufactured by the important firm of Mytinger and Casselberry, whose home office is in my important home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.

With the following additional remarks, I trust that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which H. R. 2383 has been referred; the Department of government concerned; and all persons interested will thus be more promptly informed as to the purport of the bill and the conditions which brought it to the fore.

I respectfully call your attention to the following which concludes the explanation of H. R. 2383:

While not directly related to the multiple seizures outlined above, the action of the administration in an injunction proceeding brought against these same constituents of mine under section 302 of the act shows another facet in Mr. Ewing and his Food and Drug Administration's arbitrary scheme to irreparably injure and which would destroy my constituent's business. While the three-judge district court case was pending, the Food and Drug Administration instituted their own injunction proceeding in Los Angeles, raising the same claim of misleading literature (which the three judges found to be 100 percent wrong) asking an order prohibiting shipment of the product in interstate commerce. This was not pursued, however, until after the Supreme Court had reversed the three-judge court. After that, the complaint was amended in the Los Angeles action by a prayer that the court require my constituents to refund all purchase moneys received from the sale of this valuable and beneficial vitamin and mineral product. The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act contains no provision which even by the fondest stretch of the imagination would justify such a prayer. To insure maximum publicity, Mr. Ewing's Food and Drug Administration in its press statements and an assistant legal attorney for them mentioned fantastic amounts of millions of dollars as possible refunds. You can well imagine how damaging this has been and on charges which the three-judge court held to be absolutely false.

To those who know the provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act this latest publicity attack on my constituents is not only unlawful in origin but is obviously maliciously inspired. For example, the Drug Trade News, a periodical which usually applauds, as in many cases it should, the action of the Food and Drug Administration, stated in an editorial on November 27, 1950:

The court proceedings recently started by the Food and Drug Administration to compel a manufacturer to refund to the customer the price paid for a misbranded food and drug product, must be looked upon as a revolutionary development in the enforcement of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Such action would seem completely beyond the power of the act, and hence outside the lawful authority of the administrative agency. It can be pointed out, however, that if the manufacturer knew in advance that he would be required to refund the purchase price in the event his product was later found to be misbranded, a more meticulous observance of the act would be the direct result, provided he were willing to operate under such hazardous conditions.

But, however meritorious such a requirement may or may not be, its very character is such that it should rest upon congressional action and not on mere administrative interpretation. Certainly no such drastic proposal should be engrafted upon the act, either by the FDA ruling or by judicial sanction.

Congress is the lawmaking body, although many administrative agencies in Washington seem oblivious to this fact. There has been altogether too much extension of Federal law through administrative usurpation coupled with the hunch that the courts can be counted on to go along.

Not only is the Food and Drug Administration to be condemned for its arbitrary and capricious action which has caused incalculable damage to my constituents, but the agency should be taken to task for squandering public funds in such a fashion. This litigation, which has been going on for 2 years, and over what has been held by three judges to be the most innocuous of advertising, has not only cost the Government countless thousands of dollars but has expended thousands of hours of labor and fruitless effort on the part of Government attorneys and other personnel. This is all the more appalling when it is considered, as is obvious to anyone conversant with the facts of the situation, that the Food and Drug Administration could, if it had desired to be fair-minded, have sat down at a conference with my constituents and ironed out any real differences of opinion over the advertising which Mr. Ewing and his Food and Drug Administration seek to condemn.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS AND THE MULTIPLE SEIZURE POWER

My proposed amendments to section 304 (a) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act are designed primarily to prevent the reoccurrence of the unparalleled and unprecedented absence of protection against the abuses just outlined. Insofar as the power to make multiple seizures is concerned, my amendments would have the effect of only taking away from the administration the power to institute multiple seizures for the same alleged misbranding when a product is harmless and, first, the Administrator determines without hearing that the labeling is fraudulent; or, second, when the Administrator determines without hearing that the labeling is misleading in a material respect. The Administrator, of course, would still have the power to institute a single seizure where he determines ex parte that labeling is misleading or fraudulent, and in that case the court would then determine whether his charges are true. If the charges are proved he could then and only then make multiple seizures all over the Nation.

My amendments would not affect, change, or alter the power to institute multiple seizures when, first, it is alleged that a product is harmful or adulterated; second, when the misbranding has been the basis of a prior judgment in favor of the United States in a criminal, injunction, or libel for condemnation proceeding; or, third, when the Administrator determines from facts found without hearing that the article is dangerous to health. As a practical matter there would seem to be complete justification for multiple seizures in the three categories just mentioned. Although the power of the Administrator to institute multiple libel proceedings when it is alleged a product is dangerous to health or is adulterated might be subject to arbitrary and capricious enforcement, the very nature of the charge involved would seem to warrant the assumption of that risk by individuals whose products come within the purview of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. My bill thus removes none of the essential protection of the public. All it does is insure that the carte blanche authority to destroy honest, harmless, and beneficial businesses on whims and caprice is ended once and for all.

REMOVAL AND CONSOLIDATION

Section 304 (a) of the act now provides that where a libel proceeding may be removed for trial to any district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties or, in the case of failure to stipulate, the claimant of the articles seized may apply to the court to have the trial removed to a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business. These removal provisions relate to cases where there has been only one seizure action. Substantially similar provisions are contained in subsection (b) of section 304 which provides that the multiple libels may be consolidated for trial in, first, any district selected by the claimant where one of the multiple libel proceedings is pending; second, a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties; or, third, a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business.

The relief ostensibly accorded the claimant by removal and consolidation of multiple libel proceedings is in many instances only partial relief and in others completely illusory. In each jurisdiction in which a libel action has been brought the claimant must file his claims, answers, and bonds unless he is willing to permit the various actions to go by default. Even if consolidation is effected, substantial burdens are placed on the claimant in attempting to try the consolidated proceeding in a jurisdiction far removed from his home district where his witnesses, records, and other materials are located. Of course, if the seizure has been effected in a claimant's home district other seizures predicated upon the same claim could be removed and consolidated in a claimant's home district for trial. Experience has shown, however, that seizures ordinarily are not effected in the claimant's home district, but rather in jurisdictions far removed. In practice, the statutory right to have multiple libel proceedings consolidated in one of the jurisdictions where a libel has been instituted is meaningless for often the closest jurisdiction in which a libel proceeding has been instituted is hundreds or thousands of miles removed from the claimant's principal place of business.

While it would appear that under the statutory provisions of section 304 that the parties to a libel proceeding could stipulate to removal to and consolidation for trial in the claimant's home district, the Food and Drug Administration has a declared policy never to agree to stipulate to removal to or consolidation in such a district. This policy apparently is applied under all circumstances regardless of the hardship in particular cases.

As has been noted previously, both subsections (a) and (b) do authorize a court to transfer a single proceeding or consolidate multiple procedings for trial in a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principle place of business. There are no appellate court decisions interpreting this provision, but the few district courts which have had occasion to pass upon it have held that a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business excludes the claimant's home district. Such a ruling does not work an apparent hardship where the claimant's home district is in the East where district courts are reasonably close together. Far different circumstances prevail in the West where district courts are frequently hundreds of miles apart.

If a claimant's principal place of business were in Los Angeles, for example, and a number of seizures were made in the East, what district would be one of reasonable proximity to the southern district court of California which holds court in Los Angeles? The closest adjoining districts are the northern district of California, located in San Francisco, and the district of Arizona in Phoenix. Each of these two cities is nearly 450 miles from Los Angeles. It is easy to conceive of circumstances where it would be difficult and expensive to properly try a lawsuit 450 miles removed from one's place of business. To take another example, suppose the claimant's principal place of business is in the district of Hawaii and seizures are made in various parts of the continental United States. It would appear that the claimant's only hope would be to have the multiple libels filed in the United States proper, consolidated for trial in either the northern or the southern districts of California, which are some 2,000 miles away from Hawaii.

The proposed amendments to section 304 (a) and (b) therefore seek to make adequate provision whereby a court in which a libel action has been filed may upon proper application consolidate multiple libel proceedings for trial to any district or division thereof. A similar provision is proposed to apply to a single libel proceeding brought under section 304 (a) of the act. It should be noted that under the proposed amendments, transfer of a single libel proceeding or consolidation of multiple libel proceedings to any other district or division is not mandatory, but is discretionary with the court for the convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice.

The Food and Drug Administration objects strenuously to the proposed amendments which would authorize transfer for trial to the home district of the claimant. It is asserted that such a procedure would prejudice the Government's case and create false issues where local juries may be intimately bound up with an industry that is on trial. They overemphasize the probability of such a situation arising and overlook the fact that under the proposed bill removal for trial to the home district of the claimant is not automatic but rests solely in the discretion of the court which may order such removal "in the interest of justice," upon motion by the claimant. In the event that the agency feels that in a particular case possible prejudice might arise by transfer to the home district of the claimant, then he could contest any removal motion on the ground that removal would not be in the "interest of justice." The proposed bill would not only relieve some claimants from the onerous burden of trying lawsuits far removed from its home district where the interest of justice requires that the case be tried in some other jurisdiction.

CONCLUSION

Experience in the administration and the administrative interpretation of legislation often indicate provisions which require change, revision, and repeal. This is particularly so when it is revealed that the "cold" words of a statute are interpreted by both the administrative agency and the judiciary as bestowing an unlimited and an uncontrollable grant of power which was never in fact contemplated by the Congress and where the administration has pursued a completely arbitrary course of conduct in applying legislation. Fortunately, statutory defects in legislation and administrative abuses of powers granted are soon discovered and the Congress in such instances harnessed the administrators to insure that our Government continues as a government of laws rather that a government according to the whims and caprice of dictatorial men.

Such is the situation in regard to the present so-called multiple seizure provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. As shocking as have been the abuses under these provisions, the courts have denied relief from the arbitrary administrative action on the ground that Congress by certain broad language in the statute, intended to withhold power from the judiciary in such cases. While believing the Federal courts have the inherent power to stop arbitrary administrative action, particularly where such action affects valuable property rights, there is no choice but to accept the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States blaming the Congress for lack of this power to stop this abuse. The administrative abuses of the Food and Drug Administration and the absence of an adequate remedy, compels the Congress to reexamine the so-called multiple seizure provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and furnish a remedy to our people against such abuses. The oppressive and destructive powers must be taken away, I believe. My bill does take these away and ends forever this existing unbridled power to inflict irreparable injury by arbitrary, capricious, and oppressive action. Ours must be a government regulated by the enactment of crystal clear laws in every instance possible and the administration thereof should not cause undeemed arbitrary action so far as the intent of Congress is concerned.

The Battle of Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, you hear a lot about the battle of ideas. One aspect of this is the battle of words. Under the Roosevelt administration there were introduced many terms and initials which became shorthand for agencies, programs, ideas, and categories. These standardized ideas were repeated and repeated through mass media until the public accepted the connotations that the administration wanted them to have. The term "reactionary" was applied to anyone who was not a New Dealer. The concept of conservatism was debunked. Anyone was either a liberal or a reactionary. And the term "liberal," which in Webster's dictionary is defined as "befitting a man of free birth; not restricted; not bound by orthodox tenets or established forms in political or religious philosophy; independent in opinion; not conservative"; was applied to those advocating centralization of power and control in the Federal Government. The New Deal calls its dreamers idealists. That is a misnomer. They are not idealists, but sentimentalists.

It is not only in domestic affairs that these term-makers work. They looked back at Henry Cabot Lodge's opposition to the League of Nations and dubbed him an isolationist. Lodge thought that collective security impotent to stop aggression—see Walter Lippmann's column of January 15, 1951, in the Washington Post. But there has never been a Cabot or a Lodge of Boston with isolationist outlook and he was not isolationist, just doubtful of collective security. Nevertheless, that label of isolationist has stuck. Now that term is again being used to brand anyone who questions the present foreign policy. Rather than answer the honest criticism of its foreign policy by the opposition the administration yells "Isolationist" just as if it meant "Stop, thief."

The apologists for the agrarian reformers—that is, the Chinese Communists—try to defame anyone who champions economic, military, and moral sanctions against the Chinese Communist regime by calling them members of the China lobby. This name implies that these individuals are part of a concerted action and are receiving personal financial benefits for criticizing the Communists. Many of these critics of Chinese Communists have had extensive personal experience in China and are speaking out against what they recognize as a great evil. Yet, they are dubbed lobbyist by the administration, whereas the greatest lobby in this country is the Government lobby which subtly floods the mails and papers with its version of every question.

Now the administration always refers to Russia and her satellite nations. That gives the impression of the great mother star with her little attendant stars revolving around her in reflected glory. Instead they should call Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and others, what they are—slave nations, captured by an imperialistic totalitarianism. This is one instance where the administration has been outsmarted at its own game.

Insults to My Family Must Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I can fight off below-the-belt attacks I receive from the Commies back home, but it is difficult for members of my family to bear the insults these rats heaped on them in last Sunday's press headline.

My wife and other family members have just as much right to work for me as does any other American citizen.

They are employees in my congressional office, and they will remain in those positions as long as they do satisfactory work and as long as they wish to work and they do work.

They will continue to be paid within the legal limit, just as they have been, on a strictly legal basis.

I am getting sick of the unwarranted attacks and inferences hurled at me and mine every 3 or 4 months by Pravda-minded headline writers whenever the payroll subject comes up.

As long as I serve in Congress, I will hire whom I alone want to work for me.

I run the show in your Congressman's office. If I did not run the show, these Reds would soon overwhelm me, and I would not be serving the people of my district but a handful of chimps.

These insults and smears hamper direct American representation in this district. While Commie headline writers care little for this fact, they should at least direct their abuse in other directions just once in a while.

Rest assured that no stooge of the enemy camp will ever be able to penetrate to a place on my payroll. I suppose that is what they are sore about, not being able to join my office staff, and then to wreck it, thus destroying the painstaking, thorough, quick, and efficient service which Americans of our section have become accustomed to.

There are six hard-working people on my congressional payroll. They are qualified to be there because they have

taken an oath to defend our Constitution and that they are not members of the Communist Party.

That is more than the chimps can say who were responsible for insulting my wife and family.

A Few Tax Tips to Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Fred Othman can make even tragic things sound almost funny. His needling of the administration in this particular instance is a masterpiece:

A FEW TAX TIPS TO TRUMAN

(By Fred Othman)

I'll be a good deal happier about paying my share of the $4,000,000,000 extra income taxes President Truman wants if this Government goes a little easy on buying sterling-silver finger bowls with gadroon borders for dainty-eating admirals.

Fancy dinner service for the big brass is a small matter maybe, but if I'm to make sacrifices, I'll be pleased if the Government makes a few small ones, too.

The sea-going finger bowls I learned about accidentally awhile back when a batch of them came up for sale as wartime surplus. They are just the beginning of economies among the Federals that I'll be thinking about on March 15.

I'll be delighted to learn that the Bureau of Standards never again will spend $1,000 per acre to beautify its front lawns; plain grass ought to be good enough during the emergency. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation can quit financing snake farms if it wants to maintain my high regard; it also can be a little more careful about investing my money in the juke-box business.

I trust the Federal Trade Commission will spend no more of its valuable time tossing encyclopedias into the air to see whether they bounce or break when they hit the floor. The Agriculture Department can quit publishing treatises on how to crack nuts without cracking your knuckles. This is a good thing to know, I will admit, but in times like these I believe nut crackers can be educated by cruel experience.

Uncle Samuel also would make me happier if he cut down a little on the black limousines for bigwigs and the four-engine flying machines for generals.

Then there is the matter of the President's $50,000-a-year expense account, which is tax free and for which he need make no accounting to the Internal Revenue Bureau. Congressmen have similar expense accounts, but for only $2,500 each.

There has been considerable criticism about these on the theory that if anybody else tried to get away with such a swindle sheet, he'd probably go to jail.

My own feeling is that the President and the lawgivers ought to be paid enough so that they could remit to the tax collector, like the rest of us. Their defenders insist that their expenses are so heavy, largely for entertaining visiting firemen (which is nondeductible), that they deserve to be treated different from other citizens.

There can be no defense of Federal clerks with little or nothing to do. This is a hard one to prove, but a friend of mine from a farm college some months ago had to visit the Agriculture Department. He was amazed. He said he never had seen so many feet on so many desks; he suggested that I take a stroll through the endless corridors and see for myself. I did and wrote a piece about it.

This resulted in considerable bitterness—my mail for awhile was too hot even for asbestos gloves—and the next time I called at the Agriculture Department the doors to all the offices were closed. The feet no longer were on view.

You see how it is, bureaucrats. I'll be thinking about you, every one, when I write that check for the tax collectors. You can help to make it hurt a little less.

India's Grain Request Delicate Problem for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I am quoting an article by James Daniel, columnist, discussing India's grain request, as follows:

INDIA'S GRAIN REQUEST

(By James Daniel)

Congress seems to be in a show-me mood on India's request for a gift of $180,000,000 worth of United States wheat to avert a threatened famine in that country.

If Congress, after a thorough study of the facts, is convinced that—

1. India's food shortage is real;
2. Is the result of natural causes; and
3. Cannot be met by increased importations of grain paid for in cash or by barter—

Then the gift of wheat is likely to be voted.

On the other hand, if Congress concludes that—

1. India's food shortage has been aggravated by the Indian Government's own ill-advised policies, or
2. Could be offset by using other cash or credit resources available to India—

Then India's request probably will be rejected.

The search for facts was begun yesterday when a bipartisan group of Senators and Representatives called at the White House. They wanted to do something about the uproar created when the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee recently sidetracked a suggestion to help India, apparently because of disapproval of India's appeasement of Red China.

In a letter requesting the conference, the Congressmen told President Truman they were united in believing that it would be in the interest of the United States to help prevent a catastrophe in India—"within the reasonable limits of our capacities."

Moreover, they said they all believed that the desire to help the Indian people did not in any way lessen our opposition to India's foreign policy. Nor, they said, did their opposition to India's attitude on China lessen the desire to help the Indian people.

But beyond this, the White House conference showed some uncertainties as to the facts in the Indian matter.

Among questions asked were these:

1. Is it true, as reported, that India has been buying overseas grain at a higher cost than Pakistan, a surplus food area, has been offering it to India? The Pakistanis have so charged. The Indians reply that Pakistan has been unable to meet her grain commitments to other countries.

2. Is it true, as reported, that India has increased her cotton and jute acreage, which Pakistan formerly produced for the whole subcontinent, in order to carry out a boycott of Pakistan products? The Pakistanis have charged that actual food acreage has been diverted; the Indians admit their cotton and jute acreage has been subtantially increased.

3. Why won't India trade the United States raw materials such as manganese in return for grain? More than a year ago, when the Indian request was first made, the State Department suggested such a swap. But the Indians were not interested. They are now our principal source of manganese, the vital steel ingredient. And we are their principal customer. But they want cash for everything they sell to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I think the question of a barter of wheat for manganese would be to the mutual advantage of both the United States and India. India needs wheat, we need manganese. So why not? The United States has already assisted India to the extent of $200,000,000, and as one who has opposed many of our altruistic programs, I think it is preposterous to consider giving India, or for that matter other countries, $200,000,000 more gratitiously, be it wheat or money.

The resources of the United States are limited, and by our past largesse we have already weakened our strength, and in view of our defense preparedness program, I do not see how our economy can bear any further dissipation of our resources.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a discussion of the request of India for 2,000,000 tons of food grains by Mr. Creston B. Mullins, columnist, where Mr. Mullins states:

INDIA'S FOOD SHORTAGE CREATES DELICATE PROBLEM FOR AMERICA—FAR-REACHING POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS ARE INVOLVED IN REQUEST FOR GRAIN

(By Creston B. Mullins)

Congress soon may receive one of the most controversial proposals for foreign aid it has ever been called on to consider, when legislation is introduced to provide 2,000,000 tons of food grains to India.

The matter already is heavily overlaid with powerful political considerations which may delay, if not defeat, action on Capitol Hill. Prime Minister Nehru's leadership of the fight against branding Red China the aggressor in Korea will be remembered.

On the other hand, assisting the prospective legislation on its way through both Houses of Congress will be recognition of India's extremely powerful position among the Asian peoples and the necessity to avoid doing anything which resembles retaliation or deprivation of needy Indians of the food they will have to obtain abroad if famine is to be averted.

In response to India's formal request for 2,000,000 tons of grain, American Government agencies are now engaged in an intensive study of all phases of such a relief measure. The factors being inquired into are manifold and extremely complicated. What exactly is India's food situation? Is there real or only potential danger of starvation? Does 2,000,000 tons represent the actual need? Can India reasonably be expected to pay for such a quantity of grain—the value of which will run between $150,000,000 and $200,000,000—even if long-term credits are provided? Or would it be better to make an outright grant-in-aid and avoid the ill-feeling and recriminations which accompany pressure to collect a bill that may be defaulted?

UNCERTAINTIES AND FACTS

Furthermore, can the American Government readily spare such a quantity of grain? If so, what problems of transportation are involved? With our pressure on Europe to do more for its own rearmament, what demand will be made on America to make up loss of food production through diversion of manpower into war industries?

Congress will want to be satisfied both on the wisdom of rallying to India's assistance after what Americans regard as her strange behavior at the United Nations, and on the international political aspects of leaving susceptible to Russian intervention a sore spot in Asia.

Congress will want to be satisfied not only on the extent of the natural calamities which the Indian government claims are responsible for the plight of its people, but also on the character and extent of any man-made factors which have contributed to the food shortage.

There will be close scrutiny, too, of India's economic conflict with Pakistan and whether American food aid at this time would weight the scales against India's relatively small Moslem neighbor—population 80 million—which won partition from India in 1947.

In the maze of uncertainties which beset the whole problem, certain facts are clear. There is no question that there has been a series of natural calamities which have cut into India's own food production. There is no question about the existence of a food shortage, although no famine yet. There is no question that India has had to import vastly more food this year than it usually imports.

Outside these few certainties, however, the field is open and the path of the searcher for facts is beset with booby-traps of all kinds.

PARTITION BOOSTED DEFICIT

In support of its request for American food the Indian government presents a case substantially as follows:

The people of India—now totaling 350,000,000 and increasing at the rate of 4,000,000 annually—consume each year approximately 46,000,000 tons of food grains—wheat, rice, millet, corn, barley, and "gram," which is something like split peas. Indian diets vary widely, but the great basic staple food for everyone is grain.

India produces large quantities of each of the grains it needs, but the annual output of forty-three or forty-four million tons, in good crop years, is two or three million tons short of requirements.

Even before partition in 1947 India imported food. But before Pakistan was created out of the Moslem areas the country was more nearly self-sufficient. Agricultural areas which now comprise Pakistan were then part of India's food-producing machinery.

After partition, which assigned to Pakistan important wheat- and rice-growing areas, India's deficit in grain increased to about 2,000,000 tons a year and it was forced to lean more heavily on foreign—including Pakistan—sources of food. However, immediately after partition India set forth on a program to wipe out the food deficit by the end of 1951. As recently as 2 years ago progress had been so good that success was believed in sight.

A widespread program of intensified agricultural production was set in motion. This included reclamation of waste land, irrigation projects to put those lands into production, accelerated production of fertilizers, seed improvement, and hybridization of grains. Official figures for the 1949–50 crop year show an increase of 6,000,000 acres over the previous year in land devoted to food production, and an increase of 1,000,000 acres in that devoted to jute and cotton.

When Britain devalued the pound September 18, 1949, India, like many other countries, followed suit. Pakistan, however, being in an excellent financial condition in spite of its infancy as a nation, did not devalue its rupee. Consequently, prices of Pakistan's exports in terms of the Indian rupee rose between 30 and 40 percent. India immediately ceased buying Pakistan's food grains, jute and cotton. This loss of the Indian market, however, did not force Pakistan to devalue, and the Karachi Government has disposed of its agricultural surpluses in other foreign markets.

ELEMENTS CUT HARVEST

India obtained food imports elsewhere, too. The latter part of 1950 saw the occurrence of certain natural disorders which cut deeply into Indian food production and roughly tripled the amount of food which must be obtained from foreign sources this year.

A great earthquake occurred in Assam, in Northwest India. It was weeks before full reports of the disaster reached the outside world. Indian government officials now report that the quake caused extensive destruction of croplands. Later in the year local floods in many areas conspired with larger-than-usual swarms of locusts and partial failure of the monsoon in southern India to reduce grain crops even further.

The result was that when the winter harvest was in, India found itself seriously short of food. In addition, the natural disorders which hit the winter harvest also will reduce the smaller spring harvest, mainly wheat, which begins in May.

The net result was calculated by India's food ministry. On the basis of actual and anticipated loss, India will be short 6,000,000—not 2,000,000—tons of grain this year, with no relief in sight until next winter's harvest comes in.

India has a complex system of food rationing for its town and city population. For Indians it is a 12-month-a-year ration, for others it lasts only 4 months of the year. The provincial governments operate the ration system on policies set and supplies provided by the central government in New Delhi.

Of India's 350 million people, roughly one-third—110 millions who live in the cities and towns—are on full or partial ration. This was 12 ounces of food grains a day, substantially below the 16 ounces a day considered standard for Indians. Two weeks ago the daily ration was slashed to 9 ounces. Most Indians do not live entirely on this ration, but supplement it according to their means and dietary habits.

Further reduction of the ration for town and city dwellers is regarded as impossible by Indian officials. The rationing machinery, operating with present supplies, is not suited for expansion to take on the burden of millions of new beneficiaries, i.e., the marginal groups from the food-growing districts which have been worst hit by the natural calamities.

CRITICAL MONTHS AHEAD

The prospect for Indian officials is grim. The months of greatest emergency will be August, September, and October, when present food stocks run low and the new harvest is not yet in. It is in this period that the Indians fear a repetition of the great Bengal famine of 1943, which is reported to have taken—directly and indirectly—more than 3,500,000 lives.

India has attempted to deal with this year's 6,000,000-ton deficit in food grains with the means at hand for purchase abroad. It has contracted in world markets for the delivery during the rest of this crop year of 4,000,000 tons. It has not been able, however, to finance, with its strained foreign exchange resources, the purchase of the remaining 2,000,000 tons which, it contends, would save the lives of many who may die of starvation.

Indian estimates are that as many as 7,000,000 lives may be jeopardized by the growing shortage of food. Present calculated shortages, caused by natural phenomena, may be aggravated if growing uncertainties over the future cause producers to hold back on deliveries out of present stocks.

Not all of India's contentions with regard to existing conditions—and their causes—go unchallenged. The charge has frequently been made recently—even by those who concede the seriousness of potential famine conditions—that not all of India's troubles are the work of Mother Nature and that India's own policies have reduced to a considerable extent the availability of food from foreign sources.

Although the Government of Pakistan has not intervened officially against an American grant-in-aid of food grains to India, Pakistan officials are outspoken in their criticism of the pending Indian appeal and the prospects that the request will be granted.

Pakistan claims an interest in the situation because of the loss of its traditional markets for its jute, cotton, wheat, and rice in India. Although it has succeeded in selling its surpluses in other world markets, it feels the dislocation seriously and considers that the Indian government has gone out of its way to destroy its natural market.

Pakistan's complaint is based on the failure of India to purchase 600,000 tons of wheat which was surplus from its 1950 crop and which, the Pakistanis contend, was offered to the New Delhi government at prices well below the world market.

Although the price may have been substantially higher than before devaluation, the Pakistanis say, it was still lower than the price India finally paid for Australian and Argentine grain. This is adduced as evidence of Indian ill-will toward Pakistan and of a determination to throttle Pakistan's economy even if it costs India money.

Pakistan asserts that it now has a surplus of 350,000 tons of rice which India could purchase to help meet its food deficit, and it anticipates a surplus of 150,000 tons out of the coming wheat crop this May and June.

Another Pakistan argument is that India, striving desperately to make itself independent of Pakistan's jute and cotton, has diverted to these crops portions of reclaimed lands which could have been used for food production.

PAKISTAN'S ANGLE

The sum and substance of the Pakistan contention is that if India is threatened with famine it is due, in part at least, to India's own economic war which it has waged against Pakistan since partition, and that any American grant of food to India would put this country's resources behind India's campaign to throttle Pakistan economically.

Pakistan's interest is that of any merchant who hates to see a paying customer go on relief when he could still pay for his food. It is not clear yet, in the minds of American Government agencies, whether India could be reasonably expected to pay for food she may get from this country. Her financial situation is still under study.

The Indians have expressed a preference to pay. Two hundred million dollars, however, is a heavy drain on a country with India's resources in foreign exchange, and she could repay such a sum only over a period of years. Long-term credits in payment of food which is to be immediately consumed is not a good business proposition.

That is why the present trend of American official thinking is toward a grant-in-aid rather than a sale on extended payments.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the foregoing statement by Mr. Mullins brings out facts and important information on the question under discussion, and I will follow this statement by reading another letter from Mr. J. J. Singh, president, India League of America, of

New York, published in the Washington Star of this date and which gives a viewpoint and other pertinent facts in connection with the request from India to this country for 2,000,000 tons of wheat.

Mr. Singh states:

WHY INDIA MUST HAVE GRAIN FROM US

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Zulfequar Ali, in his letter which appeared in your paper of February 1, says that India's request to the United States for 2,000,000 tons of wheat should be looked upon from a humanitarian point of view because "human beings, wherever they may be, must be saved from starvation and famine."

He adds, however, that in connection with India's request for food grains from the United States, the "food position of India's neighboring areas should be studied. Burma has been a large exporter of rice. Pakistan is another area surplus in food."

It is true that, before World War II, Burma used to export large quantities of rice and India was one of her best customers. However, with the conquest of Burma by the Japanese, all import of food grains into India from Burma during the last war was stopped. And, unfortunately, ever since the end of the war, Burma has been afflicted with internal crisis. This conflict has greatly diminished the rice-exporting capacity of Burma.

However, the Indian Government has been able to make arrangements with the Burmese Government for importation of 50,000 tons of rice. That is all that Burma could spare. But India faces a shortage of 6,000,000 tons. So it can be easily seen that India cannot get enough food from Burma for her needs.

With regard to surplus food in Pakistan, Mr. Ali perhaps does not know that west Punjab, which usually has surplus wheat and for a long time has been considered the breadbasket of northern India, unfortunately suffered a tremendous loss of food, particularly wheat, because of unprecedented flood conditions in the summer of 1950. Pakistan just does not have any food whatsoever for export purposes.

Pakistan had contracted to supply 300,000 tons of wheat to Japan and a lesser quantity to West Germany, which contract she is now unable to fulfill. On October 18, 1950, the Pakistan Government issued a communiqué which clearly stated that there is no surplus food available for export in Pakistan.

Mr. Ali, who presumably comes from Pakistan, says that "while India claims paucity of funds to feed its population, it is spending millions upon millions of dollars on the purchase of arms and explosives, not against any external aggressor, but with only Pakistan in mind."

In 1950 India spent approximately $2,750,000 in the United States on military stores. And these military stores did not contain any arms and explosives, but consisted of spare parts for American vehicles, including trucks, Red Cross units, etc., that India bought from the United States war-surplus stocks. Compare this figure with $41,400,000 that India spent on food grains in the United States in the last 4 months of 1950, and further compare it to the $120,000,000 India is planning to spend for buying food grains in the United States in the first 3 months of 1951.

It is true that India spends almost 50 percent of her national budget on defense purposes. (Pakistan spends about 65 percent.) Under normal world conditions criticism for such heavy expenditures on defense would be legitimate. But with the world situation as it is today, and with India's borders exposed as they have never been before in her history, India can ill afford to reduce her defense expenditures. I suggest that even if there were no friction whatsoever between Pakistan and India, the new danger to her borders will force India to spend the same amount which she is spending today, and perhaps more.

The actual food situation in India is most critical. The Government of India has been forced to cut its basic ration from 12 ounces to 9 ounces—900 calories a day for an adult. If this situation is not alleviated, it will undoubtedly result in death by starvation for thousands, and great suffering for millions more.

Reports from India indicate that American observers in India and Indian friends of the United States are convinced that a generous response from the United States to the appeal of India would be the most effective demonstration that the United States could make to the Asian peoples of its altruistic intentions.

I would like to add that nationals of India living in the United States, like myself, to whom this has become a second motherland, and thousands of American friends of India in this country, most sincerely hope that this opportunity will not be lost to create stronger bonds of friendship and understanding between the people of India and the people of the United States.

J. J. SINGH,
President, India League of America.
NEW YORK.

Mr. Speaker, I have placed this discussion before the House, as I believe that it will be of interest to the Members, in view of this matter being probably submitted for consideration in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are humanitarian and generous, and we have demonstrated this fact time and again; however, as much as this country is willing to help others, under present circumstances, and in the present situation, and in view of the billions that our Government has given away to other countries all over the world, I do not see how we can be expected to continue to give away the resources of our country any further. As General Eisenhower well said a few days ago, "The United States cannot carry the rest of the world on its shoulders."

Salute to a Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Salute to a Hero, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of January 28, 1951:

SALUTE TO A HERO

Last fall, in Soviet-occupied East Germany, Hermann Joseph Flade was arrested for distributing leaflets urging people to vote against the Communists. Placed on "trial" as an "enemy of the state," he upset all the expectations of the Red "court." He refused to grovel before it. He refused to be cowed into saying that he had done wrong. He refused to go through the rigmarole of reviling himself and glorifying his persecutors over the broadcasting system that had been set up to carry his words to the public.

Instead, reminded by the "court" that he might be sentenced to death for the "crime" of advocating votes against the Reds, Hermann Joseph Flade—18 years old, just out of his boyhood—declared in a clear, strong voice, "I love my freedom more than my life." Whereupon, greatly embarrassed by the fact that his words got on the air before the loud speakers could be silenced, his "judges" condemned him to be beheaded. That was about 2 weeks ago. In the meantime, his story has been spread throughout the whole of Germany, and demonstrations have been staged both to honor his bravery and to protest against the decision to execute him. And up to now, as if inhibited by the popular reaction, the puppet Communist authorities have deferred the act of decapitation.

The probability is, of course, that Hermann Joseph Flade will be put to death in a little while. Be that as it may, however, he has already achieved, in his own way and despite his brief span of life, a kind of immortality. A German Patrick Henry, he has earned the right to a high and permanent place of honor, not merely in the history of his own country but in the larger history of mankind's age-old struggle for liberty. Let us salute him. Let free men everywhere be inspired by his shining example to stand firm, without ever wavering, against the vile system that seeks to devour all who dare to be Flades.

IV–F Athletes and the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present a telegram from Hon. Don Ewing, associate editor of the Shreveport Times, and an editorial taken from the Shreveport Times of Sunday, February 4, 1951. Both of these documents are self-explanatory.

The telegram is as follows:

SHREVEPORT, LA., *February 6, 1951.*
Representative OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Regarding Tittle editorial, he has informed Times that football league announcement that he is now IV–F was in error and that he is III–A, being married and having a child. He was IV–F in War II from chronic bronchial asthma, but during part of time at L. S. U. was not eligible for draft because he had not reached the age. We brought this out in editorial Sunday. I have put story on Associated Press, stating content of second editorial, and will forward you copy of editorial. It might be that you would want to insert second editorial or withdraw first editorial from final permanent publication in RECORD. Tittle case still offers good example of points at issue, but editorial does put him in unjust light, due to original misinformation from professional football league announcements which had listed him as IV–F now.

DON EWING.

The editorial is as follows:

IV–F ATHLETES AND THE DRAFT

Defense Department insistence that 18-year-olds must be drafted to meet manpower needs has more or less automatically centered public attention on professional and

amateur athletes who are classified as IV–F because of inability to meet Armed Forces physical standards, although perhaps able to buck a football line, hit a home run, or serve repeated aces in tennis.

Most of these men obviously could serve their country well in behind-the-lines posts even if unable, through chronic affliction of some kind, to meet the standards for combat service. But until very recently the Armed Forces have made no physical differentiation between physical fitness for combat duty and physical fitness for noncombat duty. That fact is partly responsible for whatever need now may exist to go outside of present manpower draft pools.

Unfortunately, this situation—which is purely one of laws made by Congress and administrative regulations made by the Armed Forces—has caused IV–F's to be placed, in the minds of some, in the unsually undeserved light of trying to avoid military service when the fact is that they have nothing to say about it. There is no reflection on any IV–F through being a IV–F. No IV–F classified himself. Draft boards did that, and they acted under laws and regulations not of their making, either.

The case of Y. A. Tittle, former LSU star quarterback and professional football player since 1948, illustrates some of the points involved. Acting on broadcast announcements from professional football sources that Tittle had been taken by the San Francisco Forty-niners when his former team, the Baltimore Colts, disbanded, and that he was considered a desirable acquisition because of being classified IV–F, the Times recently used him as typical of athletes who cannot get into military service though able to earn a living in physical-contact vocations. As a public figure in the professional athletic world, and a past public figure in the LSU football world, he was subject to public discussion, and it was specifically pointed out that the reason he could not get into service was because he was one of the victims of laws and regulations which were not of his making and which he could not surmount.

Actually, the Tittle case turned out to be an unjustified example, as that athlete himself now has pointed out to the Times in a frank discussion of the matter. Tittle was only 17 years old when he first played at LSU in World War II. Most of his LSU football service was either when he was ineligible for draft by age or would not have been called because of the end of the war—entirely aside from physical exemption. Actually, Tittle was not given a draft classification until February 1945, when he was put in IV–F by a Dallas, Tex., board which certainly had no reason to want to help LSU athletically, and the end of the war then was only a few months away. (He is a Texan.) Tittle has been a victim of chronic asthma since he was 3 years old—he now is 25—and has to take "shots" before each gridiron game; sometimes during a game he has to be signaled to be taken out for another "shot."

Actually, the professional football publicity announcements that Tittle is IV–F in the present draft are incorrect for he now is III–A—married and with a child. There seems little question that Tittle is one of the many now exempted who would do most anything to get into service, but probably never will get there. The Times, of course, regrets that misinformation from seemingly official sources caused it to place him in the forefront in an undeserved manner in an issue of great public interest.

All of his detail is essential in fairness to Tittle, but it does not alter the fact that the Armed Forces philosophy that everyone in uniform must be physically fit, figuratively, to march 40 miles and tear a tiger apart at the end of the march is both wrong and unfair. There are nearly a million young men now classified as IV–F. Unquestionably a great portion of them are physically fit to take behind-the-lines uniformed posts and, as has been stated in these columns before, would like to be in uniform and out of IV–F. Putting them in service would release a comparable number of men, now in uniform, for combat duty. And, it probably would enhance rather than depreciate over-all efficiency in the Armed Forces, for many of the IV–F's may have especial qualifications which the Armed Forces need in noncombat posts.

Actually, the entire matter of IV–F athletes is minor. They form a very tiny part of the nearly million men now listed IV–F.

The whole point is that a IV–F system that, by Federal law or Armed Forces regulations, bars men capable of normally earning a living in normal civilian occupations from similar uniformed occupations is unfair to the IV–F's, to other young men of the day, and even to the military itself. It is wrong all the way through.

The Defense Department now states that it will reclassify many IV–F's through altering physical standards to permit them to serve in posts they are capable of filling. Brig. Gen. Raymond Huff has announced that in Louisiana there will be a reexamination and reclassification for men rejected for educational reasons—with acceptance of those with 9 years of school regardless of their grades on aptitude tests. All of this is on the good side—for everyone concerned. In the meantime the IV–F problem needs more study and perhaps more action—but with realization from all that it's the Washington authorities and not the IV–F's who are to blame for whatever ills exists.

Idea of War Without Profit Uninspiring to Our Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, because of the penetrating insight, careful analysis, and vivid interpretation, I include in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of January 28, 1951:

IDEA OF WAR WITHOUT PROFIT UNINSPIRING TO OUR ALLIES—ANALYST HOLDS MERCENARY ANGLE MAY BE REASON FOR DEFENSE APATHY IN EUROPE

(By Constantine Brown)

In World Wars I and II America was looked on by the nations which fought the aggression of the Central Powers and the Axis as the savior of western democracy.

At the time these wars started we had not committed ourselves to any action or assistance. Statesmen of the allied countries rushed to Washington to beg us to intervene. They pointed out that by our inactivity we would permit these forces of destruction to rule the world.

We eventually joined the Allies, in both wars, on condition that they make no territorial or other kind of profit from the blood which American boys would shed on foreign battlefields.

Now, when world war III is under way in Korea, we who have committed ourselves to defend the remnants of western civilization have to beg, cajole, and plead with our allies to prepare themselves to meet the new threat. The response, to say the least, is hesitating and weak.

The reason for this attitude is not alone the war weariness of most of our western allies and their discouragement after two heavy bloodlettings between 1914 and 1945. The real reason seems to be the failure of political leaders and the people themselves in Western Europe to see profit for themselves in another conflagration. And when they weigh the alternatives—rule for a generation or two by native Communists under Moscow's control, or physical resistance to a Russian onslaught with its inevitable losses in human life and property—they seem inclined toward the former.

This was made very clear to this reporter during a 4-month trip through Western Europe in the late fall of 1948. Politicians, men in the liberal professions, factory workers, farmers, and shopkeepers joined in similar expressions. In Germany the slogan heard incessantly was "Ohne uns" (without us). In France and the Benelux countries the refrain was that the next conflict will be between America and Russia. Western Europe could gain nothing but utter destruction by becoming involved in the struggle between the two giants.

PHILOSOPHY OPPOSES OURS

From many letters and other communications received since there seems to be even less enthusiasm for any "military adventure" among the peoples of continental Europe than there was a year ago. The Allied governments undoubtedly told General Eisenhower that they could mobilize some forces—about 40 divisions—within the next 2 or 3 years, provided American ground-aid air forces are sent in sufficient numbers to create a protective wall against an immediate Russian onslaught on Western Europe.

Whether these Prime Ministers and Defense Ministers, whose terms of office depend entirely on the temper of the man in the street, have been able to assure General Eisenhower that they express the temper of the public is another question. General Eisenhower will tell his story to the executive and legislative branches of our Government when he returns to Washington.

The philosophy of the Europeans regarding war is opposed to our own. For centuries the peoples of the world have waged wars for profit. Victory meant territorial expansion, indemnity money, and loot for the soldiers. Wars were considered like duels—gentlemen's affairs. Soldiers fought, but the civilian population, by and large, suffered relatively little. Since 1914, however, war has shed this gentlemanly aspect. Weapons of destruction have become more damaging to everybody, and civilian populations have suffered in many cases as much as soldiers.

SOVIET GOT THE SPOILS

By our participation in the European wars we introduced a new element. We attempted to remove the element of national profit. We were not particularly successful after World War I.

As a gesture toward the American people and their idealistic President, Woodrow Wilson, the Allies did not demand that the defeated Central Powers pay a war indemnity. This was camouflaged, however, under the more palatable name of "reparations." There were no direct annexations of enemy territory. These were called "mandates over backward areas."

The Allies, who disbelieved our lack of desire for territorial expansion, offered us the German possessions in the Pacific, the Marianas, Marshall, and Caroline Islands. We proudly turned them down, and they were turned over to the Japanese. In World War II the blood of 100,000 Americans was shed to remove the Japanese from these islands, which they had turned into fortresses.

But the British, the French, the newly created Polish Republic, and others who fought the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires got their pound of flesh. By and large, World War I was remunerative to the victors—except for America, which footed the bill.

World War II was more bitter and destructive than the first. At the end there was

only one actual victor—Russia. Britain and the Netherlands lost many of their colonies, which became free and independent nations. France inevitably became a second-rate power.

We occupied Japan—a financially costly proposition—but Russia obtained vast territories. She arbitrarily took over Eastern Germany, which is of little consequence in itself. But we gave her the green light to bring under the Kremlin's yoke entire nations—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria in Europe and the entire territory extending from the Urals to the Pacific Ocean in Asia. No nation in history has ever gained as much territory—containing hundreds of millions of people and untold natural resources—as Russia gained after World War II.

Our gain has been involuntarily, but succinctly, expressed by Gen. Mark Clark when, after the occupation of Naples, he was asked by a skeptical Italian what we expected to get out of this war. He replied: "All we hope to gain is a spot to bury our dead." And, indeed, that is all we obtained at the end of World War II—burial places for hundreds of thousands of Americans killed in the crusade to destroy despotism.

Unfortunately, we did not realize—all of us—that we had helped create a far worse and unhuman kind of oriental despotism, which now threatens our national existence.

NO PROFITS IN SIGHT

No wonder that there is a layer of idealism among the American people which cannot be matched by our friends across the Atlantic. With their background it is little wonder that the Europeans, especially the members of the Atlantic Pact, have been slow in responding to our frantic appeal to rearm against the threat from the Moscow dictators. There is nothing in this new war for them which even vaguely can be described as profit.

When the United Nations decreed last June that the North Korean aggression must be repelled, the American people did not hesitate to approve the order given by President Truman for our forces to move into Korea. The fact that 90 percent of the western forces in the UN police action were American did not bother the people of this country. Nor did they complain over the 50,000 casualties which we have suffered in a faraway land in which our only interest is the United Nations' interest.

Our people know that this heavy toll—to which must be added an expenditure of $14,000,000,000 up to December 1—will yield no profit except the knowledge that we are ready to stand against an aggressor regardless of cost.

Our Government and our country are willing to make far greater sacrifices to prepare Europe to resist aggression and maintain its liberties.

There is only one proviso in this picture. That is that the peoples of Europe themselves must share our willingness to make the utmost sacrifices so that future generations may remain free.

A Letter to Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the reading of my colleagues an editorial in the February 4, 1951, issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, which takes the form of an open letter to General Eisenhower.

Neither in his appearance before a joint meeting of Members of Congress nor in his subsequent public appearances did Eisenhower make the slightest effort to provide answers to the searching and pertinent questions set forth in this editorial.

When Eisenhower appeared before the Members of the House and Senate, he said this:

I do not believe * * * that the United States can pick up the world on its economic, financial, and material shoulders and carry it.

Yet, a few moments later he seemed to imply that Marshall-plan aid—on which we have already spent nearly $40,000,000,000—should be continued, and he left no doubt that he would urge the giving of vast quantities of military equipment to Western European nations.

A few hours later, before a congressional committee, he urged the sending of additional American divisions to Europe, the transportation and maintenance of which, to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, would fall upon the shoulders of American taxpayers.

I have said, and I restate it here, that General Eisenhower gave Members of Congress and the American people, hungry for facts, a treatment in the form of glib generalities. The following questions can and should be answered now:

OPEN LETTER TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

DEAR GENERAL: The American people have confidence in your integrity, your judgment, and your sincere desire to protect the security of this country. Upon your return to the United States from an inspection trip abroad you declared (1) that the defense of Western Europe is essential to the defense of America, and (2) that there exists a firm will to resist Communist aggression among these Western European nations.

Therefore, you advocate sending American divisions to Europe to stiffen this will to resist and shipment of American equipment to arm the troops to be trained there.

Perhaps we should be willing to take policy decisions on faith and accept the sacrifices and hazards involved if our leaders declare these things necessary and wise. Certainly you have more authoritative information than we citizens can acquire and you are trained by education and experience to assess a military situation.

Yet the tragic and largely futile entanglement in Korea proves that military and political leaders do make serious blunders and that public doubts about the wisdom of a policy seriously weaken the Government in carrying it out. We therefore believe that the American people are entitled to the answers to certain questions which inevitably arise in connection with the sending of American troops in considerable numbers to Europe. Some of these questions are:

1. Key unions of Italy, France, and certain other countries are controlled by Communists. Is there any effective way to counter the national paralysis that would inevitably result in case Russia attacked?

2. Western Europe is one of the most advanced industrial areas in the world with a total capacity exceeding that of Russia and her satellites. How does it happen that such an area cannot provide its own arms for defense? Is it because the governments and peoples involved are unwilling to make the necessary sacrifices?

3. Britain and other European countries have plainly indicated that they want to recognize and do business with the Communist government in China. Are we compelled to furnish arms and troops for the defense of Europe while the countries involved will not even support us diplomatically in guarding essential American security in the Pacific?

4. Since Western Europe possesses such an immense military potential in comparison to the danger that confronts it, why cannot these countries at least build defenses capable of withstanding the first shock of a Russian attack? From the physical standpoint they are fully capable of doing that. What about morale?

Frankly, we do not believe that you or anyone else has answered such questions as these satisfactorily. We think they ought to be answered before any large troop commitments are made. It is notoriously bad military strategy to tie defense to that of countries which are not resolutely determined to defend themselves to the death.

Your prestige plus the political power of the administration will be sufficient to carry through the policy which you outline. But there would be much more solid public support if more detailed answers were given to the questions asked above. The public is willing to be convinced. But we do not believe it has yet received the conclusive evidence of European determination to resist that is needed to eliminate lingering and disquieting doubts about the wisdom of the administration's policy.

For Four Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from a recent issue of Aerie, concerning the Four Chaplains.

This is so important that President Truman appeared personally and gave his blessings upon them:

FOR FOUR CHAPLAINS

On the corner of Broad and Berks Streets, in the city of Philadelphia, workmen are completing a unique chapel. There on the campus of Temple University is to stand a Nation's shrine to the dream of human brotherhood.

You, as an Eagle, will have a part and place in that unique chapel of interfaith understanding. For your Aerie and the other lodges in Eagledom have the chance to join in an Eagle contribution that will erect and pay for the main chapel entrance, above which is to burn the eternal light of brotherhood and good will.

This Chapel of the Four Chaplains honors the four clergymen of three faiths, who, when the *Dorchester* was torpedoed in the North Atlantic, gave their life belts to the enlisted men and "arms linked as they steadied themselves in prayer" went down with the ship. For their heroic sacrifice, these men of the faiths were posthumously awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. The Chapel of the Four Chaplains, which the Eagles are privileged to participate in erecting, honors these four men who died to show all how man should live.

With its symbolical depicting of the three great faiths of our people—Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Hebrew—this living memorial exemplifies the need for solidarity among those who believe in the spiritual dignity of

mankind and the right of individuals to live in freedom and self-respect. Located in the City of Brotherly Love, it will be a shrine for a whole nation. Just as the Eagles chose a living memorial—the Eagles Memorial Foundation—to honor the members who fought and died in the wars of our Nation, and more recently took the lead in seeking a continuing tribute to the Secret Service men who die or risk death protecting our country and its public personalities, so the Eagles join in a living shrine to the memory of the four gallant chaplains who went down with the *Dorchester*.

When your aerie decides what it will give to the building of the universal entrance and erection of the eternal light at the chapel of the four chaplains, you will have to balance what you can afford to donate against what you'd like to do for so worthy a cause. Philadelphia aerie led off the parade with a gift of $1,000. Since the goal of the campaign is $25,000, far more modest donations from other aeries will take the drive over the top. But whether you give $10 or $100 or $1,000, your contribution will will be an appreciated one, for your aerie will become a partner in a most worth-while undertaking. You will join the poet, Joseph Auslander, in perpetuating the epic story of which he wrote:

"Four men of God put out to sea;
(Washington, Poling, Fox, and Goode)
Their God was one, though their faiths were three;
And the men who worshiped their God were free
Where the cross and the star together stood.
Four men of God went down to sea,
(Washington, Poling, Fox, and Goode)
Bound by a passion for liberty
And a burning faith that keeps men free
In the bond of human brotherhood."

Address of Very Reverend Edward G. Jacklin, S. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Very Reverend Edward G. Jacklin, S. J., President, at the alumni dinner opening the centenary year of St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, 1851–1951:

May it please your excellencies, Right Reverend Monsignori, Reverend Fathers, honored guests, Sons of St. Joseph's, Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, tonight as we celebrate the opening of the centenary of St. Joseph's College I should like to express in the name of the college our deep appreciation and thanks to the guests who honor us with their distinguished presence this evening and to the alumni to whose generosity and devotion we owe this memorial hall. I should also like to express my warm gratitude to the very active president of the alumni association, Mr. Joseph P. Tully; to Mr. Joseph Trainer and his committees, and last but not least to the lovely and indefatigable ladies of the Bellarmine Guild, all of whom have worked so hard and so ably in staging this memorable opening of our centenary year. I should also like to express my deep personal appreciation to three past distinguished Presidents of St. Joseph's College, Father Tallon, Father Love, and Father Long for their kindness in being with us this evening. No doubt they will share my sentiments when I say the quickest and most bewildering way to become a prominent citizen overnight, through no fault of one's own, is to be named the president of a college.

I am grateful too to detect in the audience this evening a number of faces of friends and classmates of mine, some of whom I have not had the pleasure of seeing in 27 years. As I note upon their faces the ravages of time and the surplus profits tax, an incident in the life of Ethel Barrymore comes to mind. After one of her brilliant and exciting performances, the great actress was relaxing in her dressing room, when she was told a party of people wished to see her. When she declined to entertain them, the messenger informed her they were old friends, in fact, classmates. "Classmates," boomed Ethel, "in that case, wheel them in."

On the other hand, time is relative. A few weeks after returning to the city last summer, the new dean of the college who preserves the illusion of youth extremely well, Father Sullivan, and myself were induced by the blandishments of Father Brown to run the gauntlet at a reception and tea party given by the ladies of the Bellarmine Guild. A bit shell-shocked and shaken by the exotic aroma of tea, I noticed a stately dowager of somewhat formidable mien fixing her eye on the new administration and surveying them with the cold precision of a social scientist. "Hmmm," she murmured in a slightly thunderous undertone, "they look like a couple of refugees from the Whiz Kids." If we manage to do one-half as well as they, we shall be quite content.

The fact that St. Joseph's College opened its doors 100 years ago may seem a bit antediluvian; but in fact its origin may be traced back further still. In 1639, just 5 years after the Catholic colonists of Cecil and Leonard Calvert stepped ashore near St. Mary's on the lower Potomac, Father Ferdinand Poulton, an English Jesuit, writes back home of his plan to open a school. In 1640, at Calverton Manor and again 37 years later at Newtown Manor, schools were founded only to be suppressed in each case by the dominant Puritan party that seized control of the colony and repealed the Toleration Act of the Calverts.

A few years later, in 1685, while Governor Dongan was in power, another English Jesuit, Father Thomas Harvey, opened the New York Latin School. This too quickly met the fate of its predecessors. However, in 1746, with the assistance of some Philadelphia Catholics, the Maryland Jesuits started a school at Bohemia Manor a few miles south of the present border in the no man's land then in dispute between Pennsylvania and Maryland. Among its first students were Charles Carroll of Carrollton who would later put his name to the Declaration of Independence, and John Carroll who would become a Jesuit in 1753, accompany the congressional committee to Canada in 1776, found Georgetown University, and be consecrated the first bishop and archbishop of Baltimore.

The story comes closer to home, however, when in 1722, a gentleman in knee breeches and buckled shoes, a broad brimmed Quaker hat and a snuff colored coat, began visiting Philadelphia. A Jesuit, Joseph Greaton by name, he established permanent residence in 1729, as the first Catholic pastor of the city. Within earshot of the hammers erecting the State House which would later become famous as Independence Hall, he built a two-storied brick residence and a small chapel which to all appearances was a kitchen with a chimney atop of it instead of a cross. In 1734, certain gentlemen, undoubtedly left-wing liberals of the day, viewing the twelfth and thirteenth law of King William with marked favor and the presence of the Popish chapel with a dim eye, objected to its existence. In reply Father Greaton presented his classic defense:

"We are and of right ought to be, free and independent of any civil law restricting or debarring our right to religious liberty. We claim the right from William Penn."

The upshot of the dispute was that Penn's principle of religious liberty for all, Catholics not excepted, continued in practice till time and usage completely confirmed it. Thus religious independence was established in the little church below Fourth and Walnut 40 years before civil liberty was proclaimed at Fifth and Chestnut Streets and Penn's principle of religious freedom embodied in the Constitution. To William Penn and his enlightened view on religious freedom and to the Friends of Philadelphia, who more than once persuaded angry mobs not to demolish Old St. Joseph's, we owe the original building that housed the first classes of the college. And to Father Greaton, we owe the earliest foundations of the college still to be.

That the hope of establishing a college still engrossed the minds of the Jesuits at Old St. Joseph's is clear from a letter to Bishop Carroll in 1785, in which Father Robert Molyneux announced the purchase of a property adjoining the old chapel for the sum of £900. He wrote somewhat quaintly:

"Besides these advantages and that of a spot for building a house for ourselves, there is room for building a college, should it ever be necessary, without incommoding the premises."

However, despite the commodiousness of the premises, some 50 by 80 feet, and despite the nearby location of the Blue Anchor Tavern and other patent advantages of Philadelphia, then the Nation's Capital, Bishop Carroll in 1789 founded the first Jesuit college at Georgetown and opened it to students of every religious profession. Among the reasons advanced in the first prospectus for choosing the location were: "The salubrity of the air, convenience of communication, and cheapness of living." In reviewing Bishop Carroll's action with all charity, a judicious historian might insert two comments at this point in the record: first, Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus (even Homer sometimes nods), and, secondly, this was obviously before the days of accurate thermometers and the Fair Deal.

Despite this blow, the hope of erecting a college in the city reared once again its bloody but unbowed head. Father Anthony Kohlmann writes on November 7, 1808:

"There is the finest prospect for establishing a college in Philadelphia. A certain J. W. Wellers, who by his unremitting exertions has carried on very important works for the good of religion has promised to build a college in 1 year, provided the society furnish him some masters."

I regret to note that the masters were not forthcoming; and I regret even more that we have lost contact with the heirs and assigns of Mr. Wellers. In 1844, Father Dubuisson reports:

"We are trying to build a college in Philadelphia. The one we have is rather a preparatory school than a college. A better building and more teachers are needed; and neither is forthcoming. We have great hopes for Philadelphia, but their fulfillment depends upon the means at our disposal."

Finally under the prodding of Father Brocard, Fr. Felix Barbelin, S. J., the little red-headed priest who was the curé d'ars of early Philadelphia, enlarged the colonial residence of Father Greaton and built the college on a lot fronting on Willings Alley. A modest beginning in all truth but so was the mustard seed.

On September 15, 1851, the school year was inaugurated with a Solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost. Ninety-seven boys, little knowing what was in store for them, happily chanted the te deum and were enrolled. Their school day ran from 8 to 5, with a modest lunch period of 2½ hours in the middle

of the day, a social amenity which our intense modern civilization has overlooked. It seems that loud talking and noise in Willings Alley, playing in the neighborhood and expressions savoring of low breeding were frowned upon. That they were men in those good old days is clear from the fact that the hours of study at home were from 6 to 8 in the evening and—an appalling item—from 6 to 7 in the morning. In addition to the courses in religion and ethical philosophy, the curriculum offered a commercial department and a classical department with side courses in French, German, music, and drawing.

Straightway, there was born the Philomelian Society, which is ominously described as "composed of those students who are remarkable for possession of a fine voice or who are learning to play on musical instruments." The organization counted 21 charter members, who made their first public appearance a few weeks later. By a strange coincidence, the neighborhood began to lose its charm as a residential district at this time and the general exodus of the better families began.

No doubt it would be not only proper but timely for me to remark here and now that I do not intend to give a blow-by-blow description of the next 100 years round by round.

However, suffice it to say that on January 14, 1856, the college was transferred to a new school building and a new debt at Juniper and Filbert Streets on the site where the present Bulletin Building now stands. At this time, the Reverend James A. Ward, S. J., a brilliant classicist, was president. Not having the assistance of a secretary, he devised an ingenious method of reducing his correspondence to a minimum by composing his letters in Latin verse. A few months after taking office, he created a motto which, because of its classical brevity and concentrated wisdom, all subsequent presidents of modest liberal arts colleges have made their own: "Nisi Deus memor sit nostri, omnis res nostra fracta est"; "without a miracle, we shall be bankrupt."

Perhaps bank tellers of the day had difficulty with Ciceronian latinity. Perhaps the fathers wished to return to guard the fabulous hoard of gold buried under old Saint Joseph's. Perhaps with customary Jesuit shrewdness, they foresaw that real estate at Juniper and Filbert had no future. At any rate the college returned to its old location in the summer of 1860, and languished through the difficult years of the Civil War and its aftermath.

Father Barbelin, once again at the helm of the college, finally realized a long-cherished desire to obtain a suitable property for a college when on November 20, 1866, he purchased the property at Seventeenth and Stiles Streets, described as being in the highest section of the city amid sparsely settled suburbs.

Father Villiger took up the task of rebuilding with energy and clarity of vision, though he entered upon it, as he himself said, without money or prospects, with a debt of $30,000, and nothing to rely on except the merciful providence of God. Step by step, however, the plan originally conceived by Father Villiger was executed in his own administration and in those of his successors, till the quadrangle of buildings was complete.

In 1886, the college received a bequest of $72,000 from the estate of Francis Anthony Drexel, a gift of princely proportions at the time for a struggling college. In 1899, Father Clark erected a new building, fronting on Stiles Street and extending back along Seventeenth Street; it was reserved for the college and the first step taken toward separating the college and preparatory department. In the same year, advanced courses in literature, science, and philosophy leading to a master's degree were undertaken. The golden jubilee exercises were held in November 1901, a feature of which was the presentation of Plautus' Duo Captivi in the original Latin.

In 1912, in the pioneer days of the science, a wireless receiving and sending station was installed, the first college station of its kind perhaps in the Nation. In February 1915, under the sponsorship of the alumni sodality, evening classes were inaugurated with 954 students pursuing 22 course offerings.

With entry into World War I, on April 4, 1917, the college pledged itself to the service of the Nation. So many of its students and alumni enlisted for the first Officers' Reserve training program at Fort Niagara that one of the daily papers truthfully reported: "In proportion to its size, St. Joseph's College has furnished more men for the camp than any other college or institution in the State." During the war, the institution was utilized by the War Department for military training of the Students' Army Training Corps. From the ranks of the college came 122 officers, 331 noncommissioned officers and enlisted men, 14 of whom yielded up their lives in service. In 1919, regular courses were resumed; and for the first time, distinct faculties for both the college and high-school divisions were appointed.

With the appointment of the Very Reverend Albert G. Brown, S. J., to the presidency of the college on October 1, 1921, the college entered upon a period of vigorous expansion. One of its distinguished sons, Bishop Gercke, of Tucson, Ariz., on November 18, 1923, laid the cornerstone for the new wing on Thompson Street that finally completed the group of buildings Father Villiger had originally envisoned. During the spring months of 1922, with the gracious approval and blessing of His Eminence, Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, plans for a universal appeal for funds to build a greater St. Joseph's College were formulated. The project was enthusiastically endorsed by a general meeting of the alumni, August 16, 1922. It was presented to the people of the archdiocese by His Eminence in a laudatory letter, concluding:

"I earnestly recommend this campaign to our reverend clergy and devoted laity. I ask their cooperation in this great work and I pray God to make it a success."

The drive was overwhelmingly successful, $1,147,857 being subscribed. In 1923, 20 acres of the present site were purchased for $280,000, and in October 1927 classes were opened in the new building.

That St. Joseph's College rears itself today in Gothic strength and beauty on its lofty site is due to the courage and vision of Father Albert G. Brown, S. J., and of Father Matthew G. Fortier, S. J., his able and tireless cooperator in all his plans, to the generosity of the clergy and laity of Philadelphia, to the active enthusiasm of its alumni and friends, particularly to the members of the Original Foundation Committee, some of whom are our guests this evening, and above all, to the gracious endorsement of all its plans and the hearty encouragement of its supporters by His Eminence Dennis Cardinal Dougherty.

From that day onward the progress of the college was steadily maintained under the able direction of Father Talion, Father Higgins, Father Love, and Father Long. Finnesey field and the college stadium were completed; the Lonergan School of Mechanics was erected. The faculty residence and grounds, the Barry House, the Keenan House, three student halls, Greaton, Quirk, and Simpson, were all added to the steadily growing college. In October 1935 the St. Joseph's College School of Social Sciences was opened to combat communism. In January 1944 the St. Joseph's College Institute of Industrial Relations began, offering tuition-free courses in labor-management, its problems, and solutions.

In 1946 my immediate predecessor, Father Long, inaugurated the drive for the Alumni Memorial Field House, which was to commemorate the men of St. Joseph's College who gave their lives in both World Wars. As always, the response of the alumni was immediate and generous, and over $200,000 was raised. On November 11, 1949, the Alumni Memorial Field House and the Edward J. Flanigan Auditorium were dedicated.

In the barest outline such is the history of the college. Skipping over it lightly, but not irreverently, I trust I have recited in the main only external facts, "Things done that caught the eye and have the price," in Browning's phrase. But the real story could have been told far more tellingly and far more truly by many in the audience tonight who played key roles in the unfolding of its history. For the real drama of its birth and growth, its true significance and lasting value, lies hidden in the hearts of the men who as teachers, Jesuit and lay, down the decades created its traditions and brought wisdom and inspiration to its halls and who as students drank deep of living water at its intellectual and religious well springs.

Four basic elements, the religious, the socio-political, the scientific, and esthetic, are the dominant constituents of every culture. These are the stable roots from which the intellectual and spiritual life of a people springs, takes its shape and grows. Like genes and chromosomes that fix the physical characteristics of a race, these four cultural factors perpetuate the intellectual and spiritual properties of a people. To transmit these properties from generation to generation is the essential task of education. For unlike genes and chromosomes, they are not a native endowment, but must be slowly and often laboriously acquired. Just as it is necessary for a boy who hopes to become a sculptor to learn how his father handled a chisel and hammer before him, so it is imperative for a man who desires to become cultured to study the ways of his cultured forebears. Once mastery over the rudiments has been won, then, if he be graced with genius, he can devise new processes, create fresh forms, and contribute his bit to progress.

Such in fact has been the story of the cultural growth of Christendom and of western man. Into the making of its distinctive culture, four basic elements have entered in the course of centuries. First came the heritage of divinely revealed truth in the Judaeo-Christian tradition which freed western man from the bonds of pagan fatalism and revealed to him his human dignity and supernatural destiny. Next when Europe rose from the ruins of barbarism, the Roman law and its ancient socio-political institutions were resurrected and baptised in the Holy Roman Empire. Later in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the scientific thought of Greece and Rome was assimilated and transformed into Christian scholasticism. Finally with the rediscovery of Hellenic beauty during the Renaissance, western man refashioned the aesthetic forms of his literature and art. The distinct contribution of the Ratio Studiorum; the Jesuit code of liberal education that was 50 years in the making and has been tried and tested for four centuries, was to integrate the aesthetic element of beauty of speech and artistic form of expression with the religious, political, and scientific elements of culture and thus to provide perfect and viable expression for the wisdom of the west.

To the transmission of this intellectual heritage of Christian culture, St. Joseph's College has made its modest contribution for the past 100 years. For a century, in good days and ill, it has been the champion of a liberal humanistic and Christian tradition which, it believes, is fundamentally the soundest and wisest ever conceived by man. Today the widespread trend toward general education indicates the correctness of its belief, and the record of its sons in medicine, law, business, scientific research, and education, government, and the church, confirms its judgment. In its educational endeavor and in its contribution to the community, the Church, and the country, St. Joseph's College boasts a tradition of which we are rightly proud.

Tonight as we cross over the threshold into a new century of growth and achievement, God grant us through the merits of His Divine Son the wisdom and strength to perpetuate and enrich it.

Sees Inertia Endangering Financial Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Frank Kent, one of the ablest, grandest persons I have ever known, a newspaperman who has written for many, many years, has expressed his opinion, and so has Bruce Barton, a former Member of this House who has made a grand success in his own right, and I extend their two articles which speak for themselves:

SEES INERTIA ENDANGERING FINANCIAL STRUCTURE—WRITER SAYS WASTE OF MONEY IS NATIONAL PERIL

(By Frank R. Kent)

What kind of people are we, anyhow? Are we largely a Nation of nitwits who supinely permit the perils that threaten us abroad to be needlessly enhanced by the idiocy and cowardice of our rulers at home? We smugly listen to the political and journalistic demagogues spout that old stuff about the fundamental intelligence of the great American people but, actually, are we not a conglomeration of fools without the gumption to avoid falling into the same pits out of which, at great cost, we have twice had to dig ourselves?

A strong case for an affirmative answer to the last two questions can be made. For example, look at the fiscal facts as they now exist. Regardless of party, all men of wisdom and experience agree that unchecked debts and deficits ultimately lead to financial disaster. Yet for nearly 20 years we have steadily piled up the one and deepened the other until at the beginning of the present fiscal year both had reached undreamed-of heights and depths. Then, last summer we were catapulted into Korea and the realization driven home that in Russia we had a powerful, potential enemy whose aggressions threaten our very existence.

The urgency of arming ourselves led to Presidential pronouncements and congressional action. The country was responsive. All it wanted was leadership. It was pointed out that we must not repeat the mistakes of the last two wars: That delay in the regulation of wages, profits and prices in World War II had cost us $100,000,000,000 and prolonged the conflict by 6 months; that the only way to control inflation is to control it at the start. Everybody agreed about this. Nevertheless, nothing was done and for months there was a continuous spiral of wage and price raises until the cost of living attained heights never before approached and inflation reached vast and menacing proportions.

The reason for this costly and dangerous delay is perfectly clear. Chiefly, it was the savage opposition of the labor unions to any controls until after they had gotten their fourth wave of wage increases through. This the administration, closely linked with them politically, permitted. This will always remain an indefensible attitude which has greatly damaged the national interests. As a result, inflation has been greatly advanced and the cost of all materials greatly increased. The freezing of wages and prices now ordered by Eric Johnston, Director of Economic Stabilization, comes after long months of terribly expensive inaction. This is not Mr. Johnston's fault. The fault is Mr. Truman's.

Here is the administration asking appropriations totaling many billions of dollars and urging Congress to levy an additional $16,000,000,000 in taxes. Conservative estimates fix the deficit for the next fiscal year at the unbelievable figure of $25,000,000,000. When you combine these astronomical figures with an astronomical debt of $275,000,000,000, one does not have to be a mathematical genius to grasp the fact that they involve grave fiscal peril; that they preclude all possibility of a pay-as-we-go policy or a balanced budget; that they mean Federal finances have become almost unmanageable; that we really are threatened with a governmental financial collapse that would cripple our defense effort, create a condition of chaos. If that happens—and it can happen—Russia could win the war without the loss of a soldier.

In such a situation it is impossible to conceive of an excuse for spending a needless dollar on nondefense activities. If there is any other way than rigid economy to keep the Federal financial structure from crumbling, no one has suggested it. The President himself has often spoken of the necessity for "rigid economy." Yet he has taken no real step toward that goal. Time and again it has been pointed out that Congress cannot make the essential reductions by itself. Any real reduction can only be achieved under Presidential leadership. That leadership Mr. Truman distinctly has not provided.

Not only has Mr. Truman exhibited no desire to lead but in his recent message to Congress, by advocating various nonessential and highly costly projects to which he committed himself in 1948, he made it clear he has no intention of supplying that kind of leadership. In light of these facts the inertia of the American people is shocking.

MANPOWER OR AIR POWER?

(By Bruce Barton)

As my friend Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky points out in his book, Air Power: Key to Survival, professional soldiers tend always to fight each new war with the strategy and weapons of the last.

The United States and its Allies won World War II by invasion forces, landed under the protection of naval guns. So now, in the air age, our generals and admirals want more Navy and more millions of men to wade ashore and fight on land.

The three departments of the military are jockeying for position, each demanding most men and most money. The result, says Major de Seversky, is the same as if three engineers were debating how to get our Armed Forces across a wide river.

The first says, "I will build a ferry." The second, "I will build a bridge." The third, "I will dig a tunnel." If we don't look out, our economy will be bankrupt, and the enemy will have won the war before any one of these projects is finished.

When I was in Congress we cheerfully voted every dollar for national defense that the Army and Navy asked. All of us assumed that the country was well protected, especially in the air. Hadn't the Wrights invented the airplane? Weren't our factories the biggest and most efficient in the world?

It came to us with a terrible shock when we learned—first from Colonel Lindbergh—that we had only a few hundred planes, mostly obsolete, while Germany had thousands.

Congress and all of us were shocked again when the war started in Korea. Billions and billions had been given to the Armed Forces in the preceding 5 years. What had they bought in the way of arms, ammunition, and implements of war? Seemingly almost nothing.

Generals and admirals are brave men who have sworn to give their lives, if need be, for their country. They are entitled to our respect and gratitude. But before we give them universal military training, let them tell us whether they plan to win the next war with manpower or with air power.

Ike and the Con Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of February 7, 1951:

IKE AND THE CON MEN

Gen. Eisenhower has told the American people that they must send some divisions of foot soldiers to Europe but, he is careful to add, America will never be called upon to contribute more than a small fraction of the total ground force.

BEFORE THE WAR

Once upon a time Winston Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." We gave him the tools but we finished the job, as Gen. Eisenhower should know better than any other man alive, for three quarters of the soldiers he commanded on the western front were Americans.

Before that the American people were told by their own Government that if they repealed the neutrality act we would avoid involvement in the war. The neutrality act was repealed and before long we were in the war. Likewise, the American people were told that if they adopted conscription and mobilized the National Guard we could stay out of war. Both measures were taken and we got into the war. Lend-lease was just another of the devices which would surely keep us out of war.

Then, after the shooting stopped, came the British loan. Our people were solemnly promised that the loan would put Britain on her feet and assure the stability of Europe, but before the last of the $3,750,000,000 had been squandered it was apparent that Britain was in no better shape than before. Then it was the turn for aid to Greece and Turkey.

AND AFTER

Mr. Acheson assured Senator HICKENLOOPER that the aid to Greece was not to be regarded as a precedent for loans to other European countries. Mr. Clayton said all other countries' requests for money would be handled by the International Bank and Export-Import Bank, thus avoiding any additional burden on the American taxpayers. Mr. Clayton said the Western European countries were

making great strides toward economic recovery. The implication was that the loans to Greece and Turkey would complete the job of European rehabilitation.

But it was only 3 months later, in January 1948 that Secretary Marshall proposed the $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan, or ERP. In selling this project to Congress and the country, General Marshall said that his scheme would spare the United States the necessity of becoming "an armed camp, regulated and controlled."

The Marshall plan billions were voted, but just 3 years later Congress was debating whether to draft all the boys at 18 or wait until they were 18 years and 6 months old; price control and wage control had been instituted; the demands of the military had absolute priority in all factories and nobody could think of any detail of "an armed camp, regulated and controlled" that had been overlooked by General Marshall, now Secretary of Defense.

Another witness on behalf of the Marshall plan was Secretary of the Army Royall. He told Congress what would happen if the Marshall plan were not adopted. He said Army and Air Force appropriations would have to be increased by $9,500,000,000.

What's more, he said, the draft would have to be instituted. The Marshall plan was adopted but so, too, was the draft; and the military appropriations rose, not by the two and one-half billions which the Marshall plan was supposed to spare us, but by twenty-five billions, which is to say 10 times as much.

Still another witness was Secretary of Defense Forrestal, who said he did not want to leave with the committee "the impression that we were hoping to spend this money to create a great concert of military force. That is, I think, illusory. You cannot depend upon that to provide us with security."

Perish the thought of a military alliance against communism, said this spokesman of the administration, but 6 months later the Vandenberg resolution, foreshadowing the North Atlantic alliance, had been rammed through the Senate and the following year came the treaty itself.

THE UNITED STATES PAYS ALL BILLS

General Bradley, testifying in behalf of the treaty, said it did not imply any expenditure but a few weeks later the appropriation was declared to be a necessity. Mr. Acheson, in reply to Senator HICKENLOOPER's now famous question, said there was absolutely no expectation that American foot soldiers would be sent to Europe as a consequence on the pact, and now General Eisenhower says American foot soldiers are the heart of the matter.

Anyone who wishes to go into the record in greater detail should read a couple of articles by Mr. William L. Neumann which were published in American Perspective, from which we have drawn some of the quotations given here.

The moral, of course, is obvious. There is no slightest reason to believe General Eisenhower when he now says that the American contribution will be relatively small. The only conclusion that anyone can draw from the unbroken record of bad faith and false promises by the principal spokesmen for this administration is that they are a pack of confidence men, wholly undeserving of belief. The token army they now talk about is the prelude to the huge army of Americans they intend to send into the colossal war they expect to fight.

The only remedy lies in the adoption of the Wherry resolution which says that no American foot soldiers may be sent to Europe without specific authorization from Congress.

Address of James B. Carey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following partial text of a speech by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of CIO and president of International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, at the Ohio State Industrial Union Council, CIO, Columbus, Ohio, January 6, 1951:

The world of 1951 is a world of uncertainty, of fear, of horrible danger, of treachery, of bravery. It is a year in which no one knows what the next months will bring, whether it be hope or gloom, or despair, or confidence, or life or death. Right now we have no way of knowing how far Russia's greed for power over men's minds and bodies will carry it. We have no way of knowing whether December 31, 1951, will see Soviet locusts eating up most of Asia and all of Europe—two-thirds of the world's population—or whether by some means, military or moral, Moscow will have lost or withdrawn its grand strategy.

The world will have to decide this year. There is no more time for equivocation; there is very little time, for let's-make-another-appeal, no more time for anything but action. If we can prove to Russia that real peace pays, maybe Russia will learn the facts of life the hard way. If that succeeds quickly, we can really build a world bulwark of peace that no one could break.

As I appear here today, I want to talk about the dangers that are ours, and what I think is the road to take to prevent a crushing defeat for the free world we love. I want to focus your attention on what are the roles and responsibilities for government, for business, for labor in this struggle. I want to talk about you and me, about yours and mine.

It seems clear that we are all in this struggle together. If we lose to communism, capitalism is done for, free enterprise will vanish, there will be no free farmers, small business will become part of the Soviet machine, and instead of free labor there will be the kind of slave labor we now see in Eastern Europe and in China. There will be no difference between Democrats and Republicans in the Communist concentration camps, and the same bullets of the firing squads will kill Hoover and Acheson.

But America is coming to the parting of the ways on the question of how our freedom is to be preserved. There are two roads pointed out to us, and we will have to choose between them.

But they are completely opposite roads. By one road we can defeat Communist aggression, maintain and expand the free world and realize the blessings of not only liberty but also a higher standard of living for ourselves and hundreds of millions of others.

By the second road, we will at best maintain in America an armed camp that will steadily degenerate into a semi-Fascist state, that will resemble more and more the dictatorship that we are trying to defeat.

What are these two roads open to us?

First, there is the road proposed by the McCormick-Hearst-McCarthy Taft-Hoover Dixiecrat axis. This group proposes in effect that we abandon our democratic friends throughout the world as being "unreliable"; that we hold onto the only "reliable" fighters against Communist such as Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, the Emperor of Indochina, and others of that like and that we pull back to our shores and go into our storm cellars.

By whatever name this is called, whether it is TAFT's "reexamination" or Hoover's isolationism, the theory is the same. This group feels that it is hopeless to try to defend democratic Britain and France, social democratic Norway or Switzerland, or Italy. We can only fight when America itself is invaded. Otherwise let the rest of the world go hang.

Now this theory is not new. The same people who advance it now in fighting Communism advanced it in 1940 when the issue was fighting Nazi-Fascism. You remember the America First group, whose political leaders were the same people, the Tafts, McCormick, Hearst, Hoover and whose big business backers supplied millions of dollars for propaganda. When Britain was fighting alone for democracy these "brave men" of the America First group wanted to abandon her and abandon Europe. They had no stomach to fight for democracy. It was too expensive. Here is what your own Senator TAFT said in 1940 after France had been overrun and Britain was staggering under the blitz.

"I do not know what the Germans may do, and no one knows what they may do until they are freed from the present war and have an opportunity to show. When they do, we can adopt the same methods. We can take the same steps that may be necessary to meet the particular kind of German blitzkrieg, if there is such a blitzkrieg, at the time we find out what it is."

In plain English this outstanding statesmean meant—"Let the Nazis win the war and then if they attack us, we'll figure out what to do."

Isn't that exactly what TAFT is saying today in the fight against communism?

At that same time, in 1940 and 1941 when Roosevelt was trying to get this Nation to rearm, the big industrialists said we did not need to have more steel, more copper, more aluminum. They wanted business as usual, and profits as usual. It was organized labor that went out and demanded that this Nation mobilize to meet the Nazi challenge.

The policy of these reactionaries, the ones who always cry "free enterprise" and "democracy" was one of defeatism when it came to a showdown. They had no confidence in democracy or freedom. They were willing to throw in the sponge.

Today, they are pursuing the same policies. While the McCarthys, Tafts, Hoovers, McCormicks, Hearsts, beat their breasts in denouncing Communism in the State Department or on the radio and demand purges, when it comes to really fighting communism they want to throw in the sponge, retire to our storm cellars here.

Isolationism and communism are allies today just as isolationism and fascism were allies just 10 years ago, in 1940 and 1941. To a few naive souls it may still sound extreme to link Senator Taft, Herbert Hoover, and Colonel McCormick—supposedly relentless foes of communism—with the Kremlin's scheme for world conquest.

Nevertheless, wittingly or unwittingly, the Tafts and the Hoovers are as much in partnership with Joseph Stalin today as they were with Hitler and Mussolini a decade ago.

How? To begin with, not even an expert today can tell the difference between the Chicago Tribune's editorial policy and the editorial policy of the Communist Daily Worker. Since the invasion of the Republic of South Korea last June both papers have screamed incessantly for the withdrawal of

American troops from Korea. Both papers have demanded that American troops be pulled out of Asia and out of Europe. Both papers have declared, in effect, that both continents should be turned over to the tender mercies of Russian totalitarianism. Both papers constantly attacked and undermined every major decision and action undertaken by the United Nations.

There are other ways in which the Taft-Hoover-McCormick axis serves the Kremlin. These American isolationists today demand exactly what they demanded in 1940 and 1941—that this country retire behind its two oceans, that it turn itself into a kind of "Gibraltar," completely surrounded by a hostile world.

Stalin himself couldn't ask for more. He couldn't ask for a more gratifying surrender than for the United States to abandon the democratic nations of Europe and desert the nations of Asia where democracy is beginning to move forward for the first time. We would be handing over to Stalin's slave-labor machine countless millions of men and women and giving him, by default, the priceless natural resources of two continents to strengthen his war-making ability.

Is it any wonder that even the Nation's outstanding Republican newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune, can't even call this madness "isolationism." The Herald Tribune flatly terms it "retreatism."

I tell you as earnestly as I can: there is no place in this world today—this world of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb—where we can hide from totalitarianism. Neither the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans nor the North Pole are barriers.

We can no longer mince words or insist on the niceties of etiquette when our Nation's future is at stake, when democracy everywhere is in desperate danger. We have got to see and state it openly that those men who advocate our giving up our allies in this life-and-death struggle are virtual traitors. Isolationism today is communism's fifth column. Isolationism is as much our enemy as the communism it serves. Our own safety as a nation and the establishment of democracy and peace throughout the world depend on repudiation of everything that the Tafts, the Hoovers, and the McCormicks stand for. We must, for our own salvation and for the world's salvation, wipe out the poisonous illusion that we can survive without friends or that there can be peace in a world one-fifth free and four-fifths enslaved.

What would happen in America as a result of successful isolationism?

I think we already see the signs of it—I think we can see that the isolationism of this axis of defeatism is tied to a reactionary policy at home. Here is what they will aim for:

1. They will try to convert America into an armed camp for an indefinite period while the Communists nibble away at the Western Hemisphere—at Canada, South America, the West Indies.

2. They will use this situation they have created to panic the American people into giving them political power in 1952.

3. Once in power, they will use the Subversive Controls Act and similar acts to stamp out anyone or any group who disagree with them. Free labor, free farm groups, free citizens' groups will be placed under iron control. The jails will fill up with political prisoners.

4. The greater the Communist menace became from the outside, the tighter the controls would be placed on Americans until finally we would resemble the same dictatorship we are trying to fight.

This is no wild dream. This is a grim, ghastly possibility. This is what would have happened if the Tafts had won the 1940 elections and had controlled the Government then. Only then I think they would have made their peace with the Nazis.

I say this is a possible road. You may say that some of those who want to take us down that road don't believe in dictatorship. That may be true. But if we all end up in a Communist concentration camp or before a firing squad, will it make any difference to us whether TAFT or MCCARTHY was only an ignorant fool and not a scheming Fascist?

What is the second possible road that we can take in this decisive year of 1951? That road is the road of fellowship with the democratic world, realizing that we are all in a state of siege, and it's a matter of all for one and one for all. As freemen we all survive or perish together.

This means that we recognize that Europe, having gone through two devastating wars, is mortally afraid of a third, so instead of being impatient and dictatorial, we work with the free people of Europe in real comradeship and understanding. We let the people of Europe and of free Asia know that we will not only share military defense with them but also the possibilities of decent living standards. We make clear that this is not a fight between the philosophy of communism and capitalism, but between democracy and dictatorship.

We let them know that to the extent of our ability we will join with them to prevent a Communist aggression and will not desert them.

We let them know that America does not want to dictate but to be at one with them in partnership and comradeship.

This means that in America we will not only keep our freedoms but expand them. We will sacrifice in proportion to ability to do it. We will expand our industrial capacity because we have confidence that now and after this emergency there will be an unlimited market for the comforts and decencies of life.

We will make America a show place of democratic and civil rights because we are not afraid of the loyalty of Americans to freedom.

In this struggle that lies ahead, it will not be the McCarthys, the Hoovers, the Tafts, the McCormicks, who will be in the front lines in fighting communism. No, as always, it will be organized labor. For we have been fighting communism all over the world for 30 years, and it is the ICFTU that today is the first line of defense for democracy. It is strange and ironic, that the press is willing to play up these Tafts and McCarthys, yet it is labor who stands on the firing lines day after day, repelling the Communist onslaught.

It is an ironic and perhaps tragic thing that despite TAFT's 10 years of complete blindness, first before the Nazi menace and now before the Communist menace, the press of this State of Ohio went all out for him. In its blind antagonism to liberalism and labor, the press of this State was willing to court disaster to the Nation by having men like TAFT in our national leadership.

It is a strange and ironic thing that these big business corporations who yell about communism in Washington refuse to join the struggle against Communists unless they are guaranteed their enormous profits. The newspapers the other day said that United States Steel is building a $400,000,000 steel plant to expand production. But United States Steel only agreed to do that after the Government guaranteed that it could write off the cost of the plant in 5 years. That means that the Government will pay United States Steel $300,000,000 of the cost in terms of taxes that it will save. The company will actually pay only one-fourth of the cost and it will completely own the plant. The same thing is true with regard to Alcoa in aluminum, with the monopolistic copper companies. You read last week and the congressional report on the way our defense is being held up by the refusal of the monopolistic International Nickel Co. to expand nickel production.

It is a strange and ironic thing that these big business corporations like General Electric, Westinghouse, and International Harvester cannot only continue to do business with Communist unions but even try to pit Communist and anti-Communist unions against each other. Yet these corporations beat their breasts about the danger to free enterprise and the American way of life.

And when I go to the Munitions Board to propose that defense contracts not be granted to plants where there are Communist unions, these great patriotic American corporations and the patriotic American press remain silent.

What is the difference between having the GE plant in Schenectady, whose union is run by Communists, than having the same plant located in Stalingrad where Communists are also in control?

We in labor have a tremendous job to do in this year 1951. We have got to make clear to the American people the two roads that they can travel and the dangers to them if they travel the road of isolationism and reaction. We must educate them on the real way to fight communism, with arms, with ideas, with economic aid. We must show that it is fatal to appease dictatorship in Europe and Asia—since the more concessions we feed to it, the stronger it gets and the weaker we get.

We have got to show likewise that it is fatal to feed reaction with concessions here, because the more we feed it the stronger it becomes and the weaker the forces of liberalism and freedom become.

We have got to demonstrate to all concerned, that the fight against communism by this Government cannot succeed if it is simply led by men from big business. There must be, in places of equality with them, leaders of American labor, directing the strategy, the policies, the operations of this vast operation freedom.

Already much damage has been done to our cause abroad by not having men from labor in the top policy and operating parts of our defense drive.

We have got to realize that the fight for civil liberties, the rights of labor, decent living standards, equality of sacrifice at home is a necessary part of the fight against dictatorship and aggression abroad. We can only remain free in the world by being free at home. All free American labor, through the united labor committee, has presented its program to President Truman. On that program we can go to the American people, and to the people of the world.

We have got to show the American people, despite the lies told about labor in the last election, that we have no interests that are separate and apart from the welfare of our country and its people. We have got to show by our actions and our educational work that, as in the whole history of our country, it has been organized labor that has led the way in this struggle for a better democracy. And today we are prepared again. We want to unite with all men and women of good will no matter whether they be Republicans or Democrats, business men or farmers, lawyers or doctors.

Blind or Brazen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the great newspapers in our country is the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. I will frankly state that it is more Republican than

Democratic, but regardless of our political beliefs or religious feelings I want to insert this article which will appeal to all sane thinking Americans:

BLIND OR BRAZEN?

The President has revealed to Congressmen his plan for a $16,500,000,000 tax boost, the heaviest demand ever made in the history of the United States. He calls this program essential for defense. Actually it embraces not only defense needs but his whole fat galaxy of social nostrums and Fair Deal whimsies.

No intelligent American fails to recognize that great sums must be spent for rearmament. If Soviet imperialism is to be checked short of war, it seems possible to accomplish only by matching might. We ought to foot the bill for our mobilization on a pay-as-we-go basis, or as nearly so as possible.

But Mr. Truman's budget and tax proposals pay scarcely any attention to slashing nondefense expenditures. His few gestures toward economy are thin lip service. He fools no one and probably doesn't intend to.

Senator BYRD, the capital's most outstanding champion of sound fiscal policy, has written the White House urging a cut in nondefense costs of more than $7,000,000,000. He analyzed the budget and showed specific categories where the cuts could be made. If his advice were followed, less than $10,000,000,000 more in tax levies would be necessary to put defense on a cash basis.

The President's comment was that Senator BYRD doesn't know very much about the Federal budget.

The Senator has been studying budgets, taxation and spending habits of the Federal Government for decades. He is probably the best informed man on the subject since Carter Glass. Yet he is blandly ignored and disparaged by the White House.

Mr. BYRD's recommendations are not politically partisan; he is a Democrat. They are not impractical. He would increase budget allotments for price-wage control, labor training, allocation agencies and revenue collection. But he demands a slash in such purely domestic schedules as farm supports, aid to education, public housing save for defense workers, the vast public works, highways and airport bounties. He wants to call a sharp halt to such Truman panaceas as the Brannan plan, lush Federal supports for the Commodity Credit Corporation, for socialized medicine, and aid to education.

The gigantic defense production program is going to give jobs to anyone who can do a day's work. We soon will face a labor shortage. This means social security spending can easily be curtailed. It should be.

Certainly the Nation faces bigger taxes. But they should be held to a minimum of necessity. The President has no such attitude of mind. He has larded his budget with every scheme and program dreamed up since he has been in the White House. Now these conceits are called defense projects. This is cloaking politics under a defense mantle. The guise should fool no one.

The President's demands will force people of the Nation to shoulder the greatest tax burden in our history. He insists on sacrifice for everybody—but the Government.

This refusal to accept the grim requirement for shearing economy in nondefense spending ought to meet with militant revolt of Congress. There would be no politics in a hard-boiled cut of lavish domestic expenditure. It is a simple, portentous matter of economics. Defense costs may continue at mountainous figures for 2, 3, 5, or 10 years. Unless Government carves out waste and experiment and nonessential drains, the Nation can be smashed in the Kremlin's war of economic attrition.

The President's failure to recognize the danger and retrench indicates either blindness or a brazen disregard of fiscal sanity.

What If Korea Were Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of February 5, 1951:

WHAT IF KOREA WERE GERMANY?—LONDON ECONOMIST POKES FUN AT BRITISH POLICY BY SPECULATING ON REACTION TO ATTACK IN WEST

(By David Lawrence)

Many people here have had a good laugh over an article in the London Economist twitting the British Government on its recent tactics in the UN in connection with the Korean situation. It is in the form of an imaginary dispatch dated about a year hence—January 22, 1952—from a British correspondent at Lake Success. It reads as follows:

"Since the withdrawal of the United Nations forces from Bonn, opinion in the Assembly has been veering in favor of the American view that it is necessary to abandon Germany altogether in order to restore peace in Europe. The British delegate, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, has, indeed, continued to press for the condemnation of Russia as an aggressor, arguing that the whole purpose of the United Nations would be stultified if the Assembly refused to stigmatize the Russian invasion of West Germany as an aggression.

"The American delegate, Mr. Warren Austin, however, is urging caution. He maintains that hasty action would not be in the interest of peace and that time is needed to study the latest Russian counterproposals, which should be given the most careful consideration.

"The proposal of the United Nations Political Committee for a cease-fire in Germany, to be followed by a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, was rejected by Russia, who insisted that Russian basic terms for a settlement must be accepted before the victorious Russian volunteers could be advised to desist from their offensive.

"The Russian demand is that all foreign troops must be withdrawn from Germany and that the internal affairs of Germany must be settled by the Germans themselves; as all German politicians who have not either escaped across the Rhine or joined the Communists have now been shot, Moscow is confident that Herr Ulbright will be able to handle the situation with difficulty. The Russians are willing to accept the proposal for a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers on condition that representatives of Italy, Iraq, and Mongolia are added to it and that the conference is held in Leningrad.

"The British Army having suffered 50,000 casualties in the fighting in Germany, British public opinion is in a somewhat excitable mood and the Government is being sharply criticized by the opposition for the ineffectiveness of its European policy. The Prime Minister has pointed out that the RAF cannot be used for bombing beyond the boundary of the British zone without a decision of the United Nations, but he has promised to do all he can to get the United Nations to declare Russia an aggressor, even though it is generally recognized that no sanctions are likely to be imposed.

"Opinion in well-informed circles in Washington, however, is that America must be wary of being drawn into an extension of hostilities; it is felt that the British are liable to be headstrong in their reactions to events in Europe and that their old imperial traditions are making them unduly bellicose. The State Department has not yet abandoned its hope of detaching Russia from China, and deprecates any policy which might have the effect of driving Stalin into the arms of Mao.

"Senator Bebop has made an important speech at Cincinnati, in which he warned the American people against allowing American troops to be tied up in Europe when there was such a serious danger of a Russo-Chinese attack on Alaska, Japan, and the Philippines. He said it was very unfortunate that nobody seemed to be able to exercise any control over General Eisenhower, who had evidently underestimated the prospects of Russian intervention when he pursued the East German invaders back across the zonal boundary. Everything should be done to restore peace as quickly as possible, so that there should be no damage to the old friendship between the Russian and American peoples. The Russians, he declared, were a proud people who would not long be subservient to the mandarins of the forbidden city.

"A deep impression has also been made by an address delivered to the Foreign Policy Association by Mr. John K. Poffenheimer of Adriatic Exports, Inc., who told his audience that he had been doing excellent business in trade from Trieste behind the iron curtain and that, if only America would do nothing to interfere with Russian expansion, there was no reason why this trade should not go on for a few years longer. He said that communism in Europe could not be stopped by force, and the sooner Britain realized this, the better.

"The Indian Prime Minister has also given a press conference in Mexico opposing the idea of declaring Russia an aggressor. The Russians, he said, had suffered great humiliations in the period before Peter the Great, and naturally it would take them a long time to get over it; they were very sensitive to criticism and, if they were to be branded as aggressors simply because they had committed an act of aggression, it might spoil the chances of peaceful negotiation. The Indian delegation in the Assembly has been taking a similar line with the support of the bloc of Asian and Arab countries.

"The latest news from Germany is that the Russians have crossed the Rhine on a broad front and that an armored spearhead has penetrated into Aachen. The Political Committee of the Assembly has today voted for an adjournment to consider Mr. Vishinsky's clarification of the Russian terms for a cease fire. Sir Gladwyn Jebb strongly opposed the adjournment, declaring that the new Russian statement was a transparent attempt to divide the free world and delay the exercise of the Pacific functions of the United Nations. Mr. Warren Austin, however, urged that delegates must have time to consult their governments about the 'new situation' and said that in the opinion of his Government the United Nations 'should not at this stage take a new and important decision.'"

The Chickens Are Coming Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the great "do-good" attitude of the New Deal in attempting to do everything for the rest of the world at the expense of the United States is now bearing fruit in the form of vinegar. We are now beginning to pay the price.

Let's take the case of manganese. Several years ago representatives of the Bureau of Mines and other experts in this country appeared before the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee in executive session and told us that manganese was a strategic material of which there was a great shortage in this country. We were told that while we had an unlimited supply of low-grade manganese, and that it would produce steel with only 70 percent of the efficiency of the steel today, that processes could be developed and methods of manufacture devised to utilize this low-grade manganese and still produce top-grade steel. This, of course, would mean that we would either have to place a tariff on manganese to help our manganese industry during this period, or else subsidize the cost outright.

Of course, the "do-gooders" could not think of putting on a tariff and the President vetoed all the bills we had pertaining to a subsidy, and the administration, at the direction of the President, blocked in the various committees any attempts to subsidize mining interests.

Now, let us see where we are getting manganese. We were getting approximately one-third from Russia and anyone with any common sense could see that Russia, knowing our position, would sell it to us at such a low price that we could not possibly develop our own manganese and compete with her price. Then, when we get into the tough spot in which we are today, Russia cuts off the supply.

Our other source of supply is India and, of course, we all know India's weakness. She wants our 2,000,000 tons of wheat but will do nothing for us. The third source of supply is Africa.

Just see how dumb we have been.

Foolishly I have supported this legislation in the past, but now I am going to start thinking about my own country first, whether the administration does or not. I intend to vote for all the amendments and then vote against the bill.

Where Credit Is Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, last week announced that the United States Treasury has closed all American ports to the further importation of canned crab from Russia. Secretary Snyder based this action on the ground that Russian crab is caught or processed in whole or in part by slave or forced labor. When any product is so produced the Secretary may prohibit further imports of it into the United States.

Behind the Secretary's action of closing our ports to Russian canned crab lies the work of one Congressman, RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington. Our colleague, Mr. MACK, insistently and persistently for the past year has been carrying on a fighting campaign against the importation of this Russian crab meat.

Of Mr. MACK's efforts to stop these crab imports the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, one of the largest papers in the Pacific Northwest, recently said editorially:

WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

The entire American crabmeat industry will benefit from the recent Treasury Department order forbidding imports of Russian crab meat into the United States on the ground that it is produced by use of forced convict and indentured labor.

Let it be remembered for the record that two men from this State are entitled to all the credit for this.

They are Mr. Ray Webb, of Westport, spokesman for the crab fishermen of Washington, and Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK.

Mr. Webb called the Post-Intelligencer's attention more than a year ago to the unfair competition to which Washington crab fishermen and packers were being subjected by Russian imports, dumped at prices which Americans could not afford to meet.

As soon as Congressman MACK learned of the matter through the Post-Intelligencer he took it up on the floor of the House.

Congressman MACK's fight undoubtedly was responsible for the Treasury Department's action—as prior to that time protests from the American crab-meat industry had apparently fallen on deaf ears.

But, Mr. MACK has not been satisfied with just stopping Russian crab meat imports. He says the importation of Russian canned crab is just a symbol of the far more extensive and dangerous practice of American citizens trading with the enemy.

In a recent speech Mr. MACK pointed out that in the first 10 months of 1950 that Britain, France, and Belgium sold Russia and her allies more than $200,000,000 of such war goods as iron, steel, copper, lead, zinc, rubber, ball bearings, automobile trucks, barbed wire, and such similar products.

Mr. MACK said we ought to demand that our so-called allies stop this kind of trading with the enemy. We cannot, however, very effectively, Mr. MACK rightly says, demand that our allies stop trading with the enemy until we, the United States, ourselves stop trading with the enemy.

Mr. MACK in his recent speech pointed out that the United States, in the first 10 months of 1950, bought more than $36,000,000 in goods from Russia and sold her less than $600,000 in goods during that same period.

"In other words," Mr. MACK said, "we have been supplying Russia about $3,000,000 of American money monthly which Russia has employed to buy war goods in other countries. If we want other countries to quit selling war supplies to Russia and her satellites," Mr. MACK correctly argues, "we, the United States, must stop supplying Russia with the money to pay for the war goods she is buying from our allies."

Concerning Mr. MACK's activities in behalf of the United States trading with the enemy, the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., recently said editorially:

WE NEVER LEARN

Representative MACK of Washington makes a point when he says that the United States should quit trading with the enemy before asking other nations to do so. He told his colleagues that in the first 10 months of 1950 we imported $36,344,000 in goods from Russia, while in the same period we sold her only $562,596 worth. By this process, as Representative MACK observes, we are supplying the Russians some 3,000,000 United States dollars per month—dollars which Russia spends to buy war goods from our so-called good friends, Britain, France, and Belgium.

Russia has many things we need, but she also has some things we don't need, such as furs which compete with our own fur growers' products, with disastrous effects in many cases. We also have goods that the Russians need but they choose to get them elsewhere—mostly from the satellites.

Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, lately exposed the fact that Americans up to quite recently were shipping oil and steel tires to Red China and large quantities of steel, aluminum, and copper to Russia. We never seem to learn.

Prevent Rail Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, three of my sisters married railroad men—conductors and brakemen. I happen to have a brother who is chief personnel officer of that same railroad, so I get all arguments, pro and con.

Regardless of what we think, I include, without endorsing everything, the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 7, 1951:

PREVENT RAIL STRIKES

This country must find a way to prevent railroad strikes.

In peacetime or wartime such strikes are intolerable. Railway labor unions fight out its controversies with railway managements without hurting millions of innocent bystanders and gravely endangering the whole Nation.

Most of the yardmen who took part in the "sick strikes" have gone back to work in response to Defense Mobilizer Wilson's appeal to their patriotism.

The damage they have done cannot soon be repaired. The public anger they have aroused is inspiring demands for law to draft strikers into the Army, or to compel arbitration, or to authorize other drastic measures.

Their controversy with the railroads is still unsettled.

Senator MORSE, of Oregon, urges President Truman to settle it by using his war powers and calling on unions and management to accept the decision of an arbitrator appointed by the President.

That might insure temporary peace on the railroads. It might produce an approximation of justice. But it is not a good plan, because it calls for more personal intervention by the President, whose the need is for less.

For 15 years this country did have a way to prevent railroad strikes.

That way was provided by the Railway Labor Act of 1926, a law sponsored by the railroad unions.

Strikes were not forbidden. There was no compulsory arbitration. The law created good machinery for conciliation and mediation, which helped to settle a large majority of controversies. Those not thus settled were submitted to able fact-finding boards, appointed by the President. The recommendations of such boards were not binding. There was no power to enforce them except the power of public opinion.

Both sides often complained about the board's recommendations. But both sides customarily accepted them. Labor, management and the public were spared the economic loss and punishment of strikes.

The Railway Labor Act still is on the books but most of its effectiveness is gone, destroyed since 1941 when President Roosevelt first intervened to help strike-threatening unions get more than his own appointees to a fact-finding board had recommended.

Time after time since then, railroad unions have rejected conciliation, mediation and fact-finding recommendations, and carried their cases to the White House, seeking and too often getting Presidential intervention.

The ruin of a good law by bad administration and political interference, started under Mr. Roosevelt, has continued under Mr. Truman.

The fine machinery erected by the Railroad Labor Act has all but broken down. It has become almost impossible to persuade enough able, fair, experienced men to help operate that machinery.

Yet the principles of the Railway Labor Act are still sound.

What the country needs is not stern new laws to forbid strikes or to punish strikers, but a return to those sound principles.

The way that prevented railroad strikes for 15 years can prevent them again—not to the complete satisfaction of either labor or management but with happier results for all concerned than the last 10 years have produced.

Root politics and incompetence out of the operation of this law. Put ability and integrity back in. Encourage and help the railroad unions and their members to recover the keen sense of public responsibility they once displayed in such great measure. Help them to regain public confidence and gain public determination that, because they must not strike, they must be fairly treated.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, in the simple far-off days of 1934, the American people, tired of the arguments and squabbling in open congressional debate on the fixing of tariffs. They decided to turn tariff-making over to the President. They imagined he and his aids would sit down in an atmosphere of pure contemplation and study proposed tariffs with an eye single to the public good.

Since then Congress and the public has not known what was happening under executive control of tariff-making. Strangely enough it turned up in the State Departments. Its one-man government is shrouded in mystery.

Our colleagues are now telling us the full story of how our American industries have been injured by one-man State Department tariff agreements. As the complaints grew our guides and mentors in the State Department said that a few industries might suffer but it was all for the general good. They promised that their program would bring about one economic world of peace-loving nations, all trading freely with each other. So the traditional American concept that an individual American has rights even against the Government or the world of nations was scrapped for State Department concepts of the general good.

Today we see that the State Department's one economic world has failed as dismally as their one political world. We see the collapse of their peace program in the Asian debacle, but we must recognize the similar collapse of their world economic Utopia. Never in all history have so many restrictions been put on foreign trade as we have seen since the State Department took over management of foreign trade from Congress. By quotas, bilateral agreements, State monopolies, import licensing, and tinkering with the value of the currency, other nations have been closing their gates while we were opening ours wide to all comers. There was no such thing as reciprocal trade. It was all one way against us.

At home we found that the innocent-appearing plan for freeing world trade had somehow changed into a purely socialistic scheme for government control of all foreign transactions. The sinister result of this high-sounding word "reciprocal" now appears. The Soviet Union has been one of the principal one-sided beneficiaries. We got nothing in return. When the U. S. S. R. sold to us cheap furs and crab meat produced with slave labor over our lowered tariff walls, what did she take from us in exchange? She bought machine tools, chemicals, oil, and other products for her war industries to make the equipment now being used against our men in Korea. Or she took gold for her fifth column operating within our midst. Besides, she threw out of work our laborers in fur and fishing.

Now as the criticisms mount, the proponents of this program say the plan is good, but it has been badly administered. They will fix it directly. It is time we stopped being fooled. A bad law, which gives arbitrary power to one man, is not ever well administered. The reciprocal trade-agreements program is badly administered because it is in the nature of one-man government to be badly administered. Such government is carried on in the interests of the one man in power, and the advisers, toadies, and secret rivals who surround him. It becomes ridiculous, too. It appears that he let 10,000 carloads—or 10,000,000 bushels—of potatoes in from Canada free from tariffs. At the same time the Government burned 10,000 carloads of Maine surplus potatoes and charged it all to the taxpayers.

That is why congresses and parliaments were invented in the first place, to make one-man rule of special favors and corruption impossible. Americans once knew exactly what kind of government they would get if they let one man or a few men with absolute power fix taxes and tariffs and do as they pleased about matters vital to the Nation. They fought a revolutionary war about it.

Let us, before it is too late, correct the same evil. Let us say: We will no longer tolerate one-man tariff making. He shall not determine what industries are to live or die, what workers must learn a new trade or leave home. Under the law as amended he still has power to decide which sections of our country will have a windfall and which will be threatened with decay. Thus he determines the fate of industries vital to our national defense.

Tariffs are laws. They are not the business of the President or his advisers. They are the business of Congress, the representatives of the people.

When Congress voted the first reciprocal trade agreements bill it surrendered that vital principle. Congress gave the Executive its legislative power.

Let us do less talking about the mistakes of the Executive. Let us face our own mistakes. Logrolling is bad, but it is out in the open, and every interest is represented. Executive logrolling is hidden in dark places, and no interest is represented unless it can pay for favors with thousands of votes. The intrigues that go on in the depths of one-man government do far more damage to the Nation than the worst evils in Congress where the citizens can see them and correct them.

Let us for once boldly announce that we have faith in lawmaking by the Congress. Let us decide now that we are done with lawmaking by one-man government. He promised us peace through reciprocal trade. He brought us war and lost our trade. Let us decide we do not want Executive control of our tariff or taxes or wars.

The American Congress is about ready to make the laws, and tell the Executive to obey them.

Mr. Truman's Vicious Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

This is as true today as it was when Jefferson uttered his words, and, of course, we all know that Jefferson founded the Democratic Party and that Franklin Roosevelt dumbfounded it, but I am happy to include the following article which recently appeared in the Washington Times-Herald:

MR. TRUMAN'S VICIOUS TAX PROGRAM

Congress should wholly disregard Mr. Truman's tax proposals.

They are vicious in that they will put a premium on loafing and waste at a time when the country is supposed to need greater output; and they are silly because they will raise far more money than the Government really needs.

TRIMMED TO WHOSE BONE?

Mr. Truman says he must have all this additional money, most of it to come from higher income taxes, because he can't cut expenses below the seventy-one and one-half billion set forth in his budget. He was vehement about that when some Republican Congressmen asked him whether he didn't think some economies were possible. He said they weren't. He said the budget was trimmed to the bone.

Of course it isn't, either on the civilian or on the military side.

So far as civilian spending goes, Mr. Truman hasn't recommended even a cut in his own vastly excessive personal expense accounts that he gets tax free. He hasn't called for a suspension of all reclamation schemes and money-wasting river and harbor improvements.

He hasn't called for an end to all farm subsidies. He hasn't taken politics out of the post office. He hasn't insisted that the Veterans' Administration cease giving service to gold bricks, but instead has allowed the arch enemy of the gold bricks, Dr. Magnuson, to be fired.

Mr. Truman won't cut the routine expenditures of Government back to the already fantastically extravagant level established by Mr. Roosevelt.

BILLIONS IN FAT

If Mr. Truman needs his vicious tax bill to balance the budget as it stands, he needs much less money than he is asking to balance a reasonable budget.

Senator BYRD, a Democrat, says he has found seven billions of fat in Mr. Truman's budget. Senator DOUGLAS, among others, is equally confident that great economies are possible on the civil side.

These are Democrats, one of them a confirmed New Dealer, and if they know that Mr. Truman is the most extravagant President by far that this country has ever known, surely the Republicans in Congress should have no trouble in proving the case and making it stick with the help of conservative southern Members.

The military budget is an even worse offender against the prosperity and welfare of the people. The President pretends that the Nation must have 3,500,000 men in service and he is quite obviously getting ready to raise the ante to 4,000,000 or more as soon as the 3,500,000 are under arms.

No one has shown the need for any such numbers and nobody ever can if Congress will demand an accounting of just what all these men are to do.

This country and its possessions can be fully protected against invasion with no more Navy than we now have, with some growth in our Air Force, and with no more troops than the Army now has. There is no need for the draft. There is no need for the enormous expenditures planned for equipment.

If Congress will adopt the Wherry resolution or something like it, and then restrict our contribution to Europe under the North Atlantic treaty to naval and air support and even some deliveries of munitions, the whole case for these tax increases blows up.

If, in addition, Mr. Truman will exert himself to find a way to end the war in Korea that never should have been begun, which has already cost us more than 7,000 lives, and from which nothing is to be gained, taxes actually can be reduced.

Of course, if this country is to support an enormously swollen and ever-swelling bureaucracy, if it is to subsidize everybody who wants a handout at home and abroad, if it is to engage in futile wars and seek other and bigger and more futile ones to fight, then no conceivable amount of taxation can balance the budget.

IT WILL SOAK EVERYBODY

Let there be no mistake about it. Mr. Truman's tax plan, if adopted, will ruin the country. It will grind the poor as well as the rich. It will take so large a part of everyone's earnings that there will be little incentive to work harder and therefore produce more.

And let there be no mistake, either, about the only approach to the problem that will succeed in defeating the Truman program. The only way to lick it is to slash the appropriations, civil and military, until they are brought within the capacity of the people to pay them.

That means an end to New Deal squandering and, more particularly, a revision of New Deal foreign policy. Everything else is economic and political quackery.

Your Public Relations in the National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended the following statement of Edward L. Bernays, well-known authority on public relations of New York City, which appeared as a public advertisement and which I believe to be of sufficient general interest to be included in the Appendix:

YOUR PUBLIC RELATIONS IN THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

(By Edward L. Bernays)

For some time now forward-looking Americans have recognized that private interest must coincide with public interest. This is particularly true in the present national emergency.

But some of us have not yet awakened to this truth. And unless everyone of us does, there may be no private interest left to worry about.

Our national strength is founded on a unified, powerful morale.

This morale is built by our common belief in our national goals and united action to achieve them.

The national emergency demands that all of us on all fronts work together for the general good.

Complete cooperation on the home front is as vital to national survival as it is on the military front.

For the sake of his own private interest, the individual must willingly sacrifice convenience, comfort, and profit for the common good, endure hardships and suffering.

For unless we maintain our continuity as a free, independent nation, we shall have nothing as individuals.

Every American is responsible for our morale. Our national morale is the sum of our individual morales. This means that all of us, men and women, old and young, corporation executives and employees, must be willing to serve wherever and whenever we are needed. Any man who acts at the country's expense helps the enemy. If he injures his country's strength, he destroys everything he values for himself.

Acting at America's expense includes profiteering, chiseling, black and gray marketeering, or doing anything which places personal profit above the public interest.

It also includes slander, hate, rumormongering, and scapegoating at the expense of public officials or private citizens.

Our national welfare in this emergency requires that individuals, groups, and corporations give the most painstaking attention to their public relationships.

They must ensure, in their own interest and in the public interest, that every action and utterance *raises* morale and does not lower or destroy it.

They must make certain that their policies, words, and acts are dictated not by narrow immediate expediency but by the broader interest of self and country.

If ever there was a time when such public relationships were indispensable, that time is now.

The Sixth Anniversary of Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, February 7 should be a day of national memory. This is the anniversary of Yalta, a conference which should live in history as a day of mourning.

On this day, 6 years ago, the people of Poland, whose heroic and tragic battle was the first resistance to Nazi aggression, were sold into the despotism of communism. To those who say that the people of central Europe have willingly accepted the domination of Soviet Russia, I give you the example of Poland.

The people of Poland were not consulted at Yalta. They were not asked to vote. They were not considered as human beings. On the contrary—they were traded as a commodity over a counter, turned over to the Kremlin as part of a bargaining deal.

By our Government's participation in this agreement, we forfeited our claim to moral leadership throughout the world. Lest we forget, Alger Hiss was at Yalta. By all accounts, he played a large role in its deliberations. Lest we forget, too, the agreements reached at Yalta have never been submitted to the Senate of the United States for ratification or examination. Our State Department does not regard them as treaties, but they are treaties in every other sense. They have bound us hand and foot in Poland. They have made it impossible for us to protest against the seizure of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

Thanks to these commitments, our Government has done what the armies of Stalin could never have done. We have literally pushed millions of our friends behind the iron curtain, never to emerge in our lifetime.

Let Americans who are confused by the march of events remember this day. February 7 is the anniversary of Yalta, another day that should live in infamy in the annals of history.

Address of Hon. John Sparkman, Senator From Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN, Senator from Alabama, at the annual Democratic dinner in New York:

Mr. Chairman, Senator LEHMAN, ladies, and gentlemen, Democrats all, I am glad to join you tonight in this victory dinner paying honor to a great American. I may add that he is almost an Alabamian. His roots are in Alabama. Had his parents waited just a little longer about moving to New York from Alabama he would have been born there along with his older brothers and sisters.

This occasion is indeed an appropriate one. We in Congress have not known Senator LEHMAN as long as you have, but he has already made a profound impression upon us. We all admire his integrity and honesty. Particularly do we like his characteristics of tolerance and open-mindedness. Never in any debate in which he was engaged, nor in any statement made by him, have I heard him in any way impugn the motives of his adversary or fail to respect fully the thoughts of others.

These are invaluable qualities. They are qualities which we all must cultivate and practice if we are to meet successfully the crisis that confronts us today.

We recognize that the problems produced by this crisis are so numerous and possible solutions so clouded by uncertain or unknown factors that there are bound to be honest differences of opinion on the best way to get the results we want.

In this land of ours, which has become the citadel of freedom and democracy for the entire world, it is necessary that the policy we pursue be submitted to free and open discussion and adopted by a meeting of minds. Our leaders do not, as does the Kremlin, submit only one choice and liquidate those who do not vote for it.

Of course, in the policy that we follow there is delay in determining just what our actions shall be. Free and open discussion, however, is a necessary process if there is to be an understanding by the American people of the realities of the situation, and if they are to be aware of the critical issues with which our leaders must deal. There must be such understanding and awareness if in the long run our relations with other countries are to receive the support of the American people.

Our leaders in the executive branch of the Government know this. The policies suggested by them have been reviewed before the Congress and laid before the people with reasonable regularity. This has been done in the hope that the proposed policies would be met with reason, modified with reason, and adopted with unity.

Unfortunately, in these times some who have means of reaching sizable audiences yield to the easy temptation to give forth utterances of impassioned but confusing nature. Too often do they dwell on the past, too frequently do they seek to find official scapegoats for conditions which they themselves helped to create. They, and all of us, should realize that to assume public responsibility in these days is to accept the heavy burden of dealing with inevitable problems, fears, and failures; and from these, to chart the course to ultimate success. This requires penetration, tolerance, and, above all, honesty.

In spite of the unnecessarily created confusion, it does seem to me that out of the great debate which has been raging during the past several weeks there is emerging a national unity. We have found many points of agreement.

Thus the great debate is now entering into a conclusive and constructive phase.

Even though valuable time has been lost, debate has been necessary to air our differences of opinion, to bring to our people a keener understanding of the great dangers which we face, and to enable us to work out a course which an overwhelming majority of us can follow. Isolationism and defeatism, twin sister of the disgruntled and the despairing, have again been thwarted in their fight to determine the Nation's policies.

Whatever discussions we have in the future, may they not be partisan, scrimonious, or selfish in aim. May our sole purpose be to bring about the unity so vital to our survival.

As Senator LEHMAN so aptly said in this same city when he addressed the Democratic National Committee at its dinner here last December, "If we are firm enough and wise enough we will avoid catastrophe. But a household divided against itself can be neither firm nor wise nor strong. We have the right to expect unity in the free world. But beyond this, we have the right to expect, nay, to insist, upon unity in the world affairs at home. If ever there was a time to merge our differences in a common cause, that time is now. United in determination as well as in action, or cause, and the cause of freedom in the world will prevail."

The same processes which enable people in a democracy like ours to reach a common goal on the national level are not only inevitable but desirable in world forums. It is necessary that we be just as patient and tolerant in dealing with peoples of other free countries as we are with one another if we are to reach understandings mutually helpful to us and to them.

We must recognize that many barriers such as language, background, and so forth, while surmountable, make our problem of reaching a common ground more difficult. Yet in the long run, it is absolutely essential that nations of the world, and especially the free nations, understand and respect one another's rights if there is ever to be a peaceful world in which the dignity of man has value.

We can never compromise our principles, and that is why we had to insist in the United Nations that the Communists of China be labeled the aggressor in Korea. This to the American people was a moral issue, and to have evaded or refused action would have caused a far greater lack of support for the United Nations than any military set-back in Korea.

The United Nations went into Korea in the first place because it was the moral thing to do.

The United Nations can suffer military defeats and survive; it cannot sacrifice principles and survive. It is indeed encouraging that an overwhelming number of United Nations members voted last week to uphold the moral principles necessary to keep that organization alive and virile.

What was and is the best course to follow regarding Korea is not the first nor will it be the last instance in which free member nations disagree.

In deciding our stand on problems that arise we must make every fair effort to reconcile our differences, if any, with other free nations. They expect leadership from us, not dictation.

They say, and with much truth, that agreeing with one another is a two-way street. They say, and again with much truth, that while they need us, we also need them.

No one can deny that on the whole we have been considerate of other nations' attitudes. No one can deny that there have been occasions in which we justifiably criticized the attitude of our allies. Such are some of the aspects of the Korean crisis. Yet some of us have been deeply concerned by the vigor with which some Americans insist that the United Nations accept completely and without any variation the views of the United States.

There can be complete subservience only by nations that are satellites. Few Americans, if any, want for us in the United Nations this Russian-like situation. Rather we want other nations' confidence. We want them to know that we have no imperialistic designs on them and that we are only interested in maintaining our freedom and helping other like-minded nations to do likewise. We want them to make their share of whatever sacrifices are necessary to crown our joint efforts with success, but we want to work with them in determining what these efforts shall be.

These, it seems to me, are elemental prerequisites if liberty-loving nations are to stand together to maintain liberty.

We know that the appeasement of communism does not pay. Certainly we should leave nothing undone to encourage other nations to resist communism. Most of them, however, are much closer to Communist armies and are in more immediate danger than are we. Their greater reluctance to make a move that might bring Communist retaliation can therefore be understood. Part of our job is to build a joint security, and to persuade these nations that further appeasement is even more dangerous than resisting pressure now.

Surely, we should be foolish to give up the United Nations in despair any time a crisis is upon us. What kind of a country would we have today if the Thirteen Colonies had taken a similar attitude under the Articles of Confederation? History records many crises, any one of which could have been fatal, through which this Nation has passed.

Instead of permitting these many threatening situations and differences to destroy us, wisdom prevailed and we emerged from each crisis stronger than ever. We may do the same in the United Nations. The possible good is worth the try.

Many forget that the United Nations is a very young organization. It has no great body for tradition on which it can stand. Before it has discovered its own two feet, unbelievably heavy burdens have been placed upon it. It is surprising when one reviews the many accomplishments of the United Nations. That within itself would take a long time to relate.

Some critics seem to expect from a 5-year-old organization the strength, the endurance, the character, and the abilities of a fully mature institution.

Others make the mistake of looking on the United Nations only from the standpoint of military security. It is true that this is and should be a major function of the United Nations. I wish we all could realize, however, the important part which member nations want the United Nations to play in building economic security. In fact, I dare say that a large majority of the 60 members would rank this No. 1 on their list of the most effective things the United Nations could do to check communism.

It is tragic that Russia and those who follow her make it necessary for other nations to use for defense purposes resources

which could go toward building a better economic life. Economic security is a goal, however, which must not be lost sight of even though temporarily dimmed by the necessity of military preparation. It is one which Russia intentionally strives to block because in the long run it is an effective bar to Communist expansion.

The importance of the United Nations working toward economic security can be appreciated when one realizes that one-half of the world's people have an average annual income of less than $100 a piece.

Two-thirds of the world's people live in poverty and suffer from hunger and disease. They are determined to make a change. The question so vital to our world is in what direction will they go.

This is a problem to which the United Nations has not yet been able to give proper attention. To condemn that organization, however, because some of its functions are not operating with perfection at the present time is as naive and dangerous as it would have been to condemn the Constitution of the United States because it failed to prevent the War Between the States, or because its eighteenth amendment was impossible to enforce. In an imperfect world, we have to learn to live with imperfections which we cannot immediately remedy.

I am not arguing that we should not try to remedy the imperfection in collective security today. I simply suggest that we should endeavor to analyze clearly and honestly the weaknesses in the United Nations, and then make every effort to eliminate them. If we do this and still fail, we can at least hold our heads high and honestly say that the resultant destruction was not of our making.

While it may never be that we can solve all our international problems through the United Nations, does anyone believe our problems would grow less outside that organization? Of course, Russia poses many problems inside the UN. Would we have less problems with Russia if either or both nations were on the outside? As I have indicated, the United Nations has solved several vexing problems, potentially dangerous to world peace.

Were we to abandon our goal of collective security through the United Nations, we would endanger more than moral and economic power. We would in the process jeopardize what limited security we might obtain through alliances with a chosen few. We would jeopardize the regional defense arrangements such as the North Atlantic Pact and the defense agreement with Latin America already made under the United Nations.

We would bring upon ourselves the multiple dangers of a half-hearted isolationism.

Just as we have learned the high costs of appeasement, so should we have learned the high cost of isolation. It did not prevent World Wars I and II; it would not prevent world war III. It would, however, virtually assure that the Communist world be able to take over the rich resources of Western Europe. It would also virtually assure that world war III would come as soon as the Communists had consolidated their ill-gotten gains. It would bring about the almost certain destruction of our form of government and our way of life.

The fact has been greatly publicized that in Western Europe alone lies one-third of the world's industrial potential. Should Western Europe fall into Communist hands, the Communist rulers would be able to challenge us on almost even terms. Their coal resources would be doubled. Their steel output would be tripled. Furthermore, their manpower would exceed ours overwhelmingly. How safe could the United States be in that situation?

It is possible, of course, that with superior air and sea power we could retaliate against the conquerors of Europe and destroy a large part of the industrial might they had gained. If we were to rest our defense and our security on such a plan, we would invoke the hatred of every human being now living in Western Europe.

General Eisenhower, in his recent report, makes clear that Western Europe will resist aggression if they can be sure of our help. Recent actions of England, France, and other West European countries, actions that compare favorably with our own efforts, should remove doubt that the countries value their freedoms and will fight, if need be, to retain them.

As General Eisenhower says, "We must give Europe assistance, not only because there is no acceptable alternative but because if we were left standing alone, isolated in a world of communism, our system would wither away."

No; there is neither wisdom nor justice nor safety in allowing American support of the free world to deteriorate, and I cannot believe that those who have proposed such a policy have its establishment as their goal.

The time draws near when we must compose our differences at home and enunciate a policy that will have the undivided support of the American people and the respect and allegiance of the free world.

I think the circumstances in which we find ourselves, and the experiences which we have already had, point clearly to the course which is in our best interest.

That course is a reaffirmation and a strengthening of the bonds that exist between the United States and other nations in the free world. It is a policy of mutual defense, of collective security to the greatest degree possible. It is a policy of economic, political, and military participation in the defense of Europe. It is a policy of unwavering faith in the United Nations, and persistent and patient efforts to bring its security functions to maturity.

It is not pleasant for our people to contemplate such a long, hard program. It is a program that brings few cheers. But I have seen the American people respond to crises before, and I know that once again our people will endure hardship courageously to remove another obstacle to world progress. It is the only program I know that will at the same time work to deter aggression and prepare us to defeat it.

Over the centuries man has dreamed of peace. Cooperative efforts by peace-minded nations to build peace is nothing new. It was tried as far back as the Greek city states and has been tried many times since. The failure of such efforts does not diminish the truth of the fact that only through international cooperation can there be built a world of freedom and justice.

As long as we remain people free to dream we must continue to work for this kind of world. We must do so because to the degree that freedom and justice do not exist elsewhere, freedom and justice are threatened in our own country.

We must do so because it is the righteous and moral thing to do. We must do so because it is our only hope for eventual world peace and for the preservation of the dignity of mankind.

We must never let the hope for peace die. This, I know, is also the prayer and hope of the man whom we honor tonight. His whole life has been and is dedicated to humanitarianism, to freedom and justice for our people and for all people.

I need not relate the many honors that have been him. Few Americans have held so many positions of trust and confidence. Yet he has told me that of all his high honors and all his achievements the deepest satisfaction he has enjoyed came to him as Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

This was one of the most difficult tasks he ever undertook. His helping to relieve thousands and millions of hunger and suffering, however, more than compensated for the pain and trouble caused him. His outstanding work with UNRRA is certainly one job by which he wishes to be remembered.

The people of New York have done well by themselves and by the Nation in returning him to Washington for a full 6-year term in the United States Senate.

Investigate the Freeing of Nazi War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that other Members of this House must have been as shocked as I was when they learned that our American authorities had reprieved 21 Germans sentenced to death for alleged war crimes, and pardoned or commuted sentences of 68 others.

In my opinion, these reprieves, granted to persons who committed the worst crimes against humanity in all history, have struck a death blow at the very foundation of our American system of justice and have brought down upon us the derision and contempt of the world.

How dare our American authorities release these war criminals in the face of our Nation's promise that they would be punished to the limit for their horrible and unbelievable crimes? How dare they turn loose upon civilization that loyal Hitler ally, Alfred Krupp, the munitions king, who helped plan the conquest of the world? Six of Krupp's business directors are again free to help his new rise to power. Four former Nazi generals, thanks to us, are once again free to plot against democracy and to advance the cause of nazism. Others were forgiven for their monstrous massacre of American prisoners at Malmedy, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge. Surely, the parents and relatives of those massacred must be aghast at our unpardonable action, and embittered by this disregard of the sacrifices made in the name of freedom.

Krupp has stated that he intends to take over the active management of his vast iron, steel, and coal empire of the Ruhr. He will again control the tremendous properties restored to him by the recent order of United States High Commissioner, John J. McCloy. This is a stern reminder that in all these years since the shooting war stopped, we have failed in one of our chief aims—the breaking up of the great German cartels. Our objective was to prevent forever, their gaining control of the German Government again. Those cartels built

up the German war machine and restricted our own defense production. The reprieve of Krupp restores to power German Nazi industrialists, and his strategy, wealth, and control will unquestionably aid the cause of nazism.

We know that so far, our program to break up cartels has failed, and that former Nazi industrial leaders have slipped back into places of power in Germany. Now we have freed one of the greatest plotters against democracy of all time, who reaped millions of dollars of profits as a result of the wars he inspired, and whose industrial controls made them possible. It is reported that upon being questioned, Krupp said that he had not thought out philosophically the ramifications of his conduct. In other words, there is no feeling of guilt or shame on his part. His release from prison is another threat to our own liberty, for we cannot expect loyalty from such a man—rather we must fear him. His hunger for profits out of war, death, and destruction, far outweighs any other considerations.

On February 1, 1950, I wrote Commissioner McCloy, urging that he carry out immediately the execution of the death sentences imposed by the Nuremberg courts on top Nazi war criminals, and whose cases were being reviewed. I received a reply giving weak excuses for the delay. I thereupon investigated, and found out that on March 9, 1950, official notification was sent by the State Department to Commissioner McCloy, informing him that he as High Commissioner, had complete and absolute authority to execute the death sentences. I again communicated with McCloy, insisting that it was his duty to obey the mandate given him, forthwith. I emphasized the fact that the criminals had had every opportunity to protect their legal rights; that they had failed to prove their innocence in the Nuremberg court; that their appeals had failed; and that after years of delay, the death-dealing Nazi criminals stood guilty as ever—but were still alive.

The campaign of forgiveness, of disgraceful reversal of our former judgments was under way then, as evidenced by the unconscionable disregard by our officials of the clear duties imposed upon them.

Who can forget the gruesome reports which reached us concerning the atrocities committed by Frau Ilse Koch—the mistress of Buchenwald. Reports of her sadistic killings of the tortured inmates of the concentration camp still fill us with revulsion and horror. Her ghoulish practices shocked the entire world. Who forgave her? Our own Gen. Lucius D. Clay, when American military governor in Germany, commuted her life sentence to 4 years when he decided that the charges against her were not satisfactorily proved. In answer to that stupid decision one might ask—Can a lampshade testify?

It remained for a German court, after a new trial had been ordered, to impose upon Ilse Koch the maximum sentence possible—imprisonment for life. Our fiasco in lessening her punishment added to our list of monumental failures in dealing with Nazi war criminals.

I consider the mass reprieves a boon to all those who would destroy freedom and democracy—particularly to the Communists who can point a finger of scorn at us and label our about-face as bribery.

I cannot countenance or condone this action by our American authorities in Germany. I am certain that countless other Americans, as well as myself, demand an explanation. So do many Germans who opposed nazism and who want no resurgence of it. What faith are they to place in us in the future? How can we expect democracy to flourish in Germany in the face of such actions on our part? We want to know what motives underlie the mass reprieve order. Any good which was anticipated by such reprieves is wholly destroyed by the resulting general distrust of American motives, and the assured rise to power of former Nazi war lords, whose dream of world conquest is now renewed.

I have introduced a resolution calling for a complete and immediate investigation of the United States military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it, and a report as to why the mass clemency order was issued. My resolution requires an answer to the questions raised, and I shall do my utmost to get immediate action on it. I urge the Members of this House to give it their support.

I have also reintroduced my resolution calling for a complete investigation of the American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it, with reference to the extent to which they have permitted or encouraged the reestablishment of cartels, the resumption of power by former Nazis and the resurgence of fascism and antisemitism.

I first introduced the latter measure on January 4, 1950. It is apparent now that such an investigation is imperative and should have been ordered long ago. Had we been alert to the danger, had we anticipated and prevented the coddling of the Nazi leaders and criminals, we would not now be confronted with such an unwise and unjustifiable decision as that recently made by Commissioner McCloy.

Let us act now on this important question, before further irreparable damage is done.

Patuxent Produces Navy Test Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Patuxent Base Skips Glamor in Training Navy Test Pilots," which appeared in the Baltimore Sun, January 14, 1951. It describes the activities of the naval air test center, a function of the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics, of which Rear Adm. A. M. Pride is Chief. The article follows:

PATUXENT BASE SKIPS GLAMOR IN TRAINING NAVY TEST PILOTS

(By Lt. Comdr. R. J. Boylan, U. S. Naval Reserve)

There's a school that isn't a school down along the Patuxent River.

It has a two-story building, an air-conditioned classroom with desks and blackboards, a faculty with college degrees, and hundreds of young men clamoring to get in.

But Rear Adm. Malcolm F. Schoeffel, the headman in the area, loathes many of the connotations that the word "school" implies. So it's known as TPT for test-pilot training at the naval air test center, a rolling 6,800-acre tract in southeast Maryland, where the third Lord Baltimore used to live.

The admiral believes that TPT is certainly a place of higher learning, and he is well aware of its grueling curriculum, but he just feels that calling it a school might tend to obscure its purpose and give the place a false impression of being an institution rather than a living organism.

WAS STARTED IN 1948

TPT was started in 1948 with a high ambition: To produce the best test pilots in the world. There is quite a gap in the world of military aviation between the aeronautical engineers who design airplanes and the pilots who fly them. The industry's test pilots help to bridge that gap. The Navy hopes that by training some test pilots of its own there will be a greater accord between the drawing board and the plane in flight.

Above all, the Navy and TPT do not want to turn out anything approaching the Hollywood comic strip or television version of test pilot—a glamour boy who risks his neck in screaming dives and comes up with a boyish grin and only a vague idea of what happened and why.

TPT takes only the cream of the applications—about 37 out of 375. It starts with the fact that the applicants are experienced Navy pilots. And in a difficult 6 months that combines academic classroom work in the mornings and flying along planned, practical and problem-filled lines in the afternoon, it attempts to produce a combination pilot-engineer who can write an intelligent, clear, concise report on his test experiences with piston and jet aircraft.

HIGH ENTRANCE STANDARDS

Pilots come to TPT from the fleet and from other air activities. They must have the recommendations of their commanding officer who fills out a form giving the applicant's experience in aircraft, a summary of his high-school and college courses but also adding an opinion of the applicant's energy and determination in performance of flying duties, his judgment, patience, and conscientiousness, and his intelligence and ability to analyze problems.

After examining the papers from the 375 applicants TPT can pick the makings of a really outstanding class for its 6-month course.

Although still young and currently instructing only its fifth class, TPT has ambitions to extend its length from 6 to 8 months and to keep its graduates employed on test projects at the Naval Air Test Center for 2 years after graduation. It also has ambitions along other lines.

One ambition, to be realized this spring, will be to invite nine manufacturers each to send a test pilot to the school to learn Navy methods of testing aircraft. Except for salary the Navy plans to bear all the expenses of the test pilots while they go through the 6-month course. Manufacturers are Grumman, Martin, Curtiss-Wright, McDonnell, Chance Vought, Consolidated, North American, Douglas, and Lockheed.

BEGUN ON A SHOESTRING

The course will enable the manufacturers' test pilots to have broad experience in flying a wide variety of planes. The Navy also hopes it will give them increased status at their plants. Some company test pilots do not have enough status to convince engineers that certain fight qualities must be corrected.

TPT was started on a shoestring, with an appropriation of only $19,000. That meant that the founders had to borrow desks and beg equipment, but TPT proved its value with the first class of graduates. And although it's a school that isn't a school, its students behave very much like students everywhere. They have their names engraved on a metal plaque which hangs in the ready room adjoining the single classroom and at graduation they have diplomas and a dinner dance at the officers' club.

Graduation is a happy time because it means the end of a long period of working hard from early morning until late at night. Students attend classes in algebra, trigonometry, slide rule, physics, thermodynamics, structures, engines, aernodynamics, stability, armament, and other subjects from 8:15 a. m. until 11:45 a. m. with 10-minute breaks for coffee in the ready room.

AFTERNOONS OF FLYING

The afternoons of flying in one of TPT's stable of planes are carefully planned to complement what the pilot has learned mornings. Before lunch (for which he has a generous half hour, whether he needs it or not) he works out a problem with mathematics and slide rule. In the afternoon he takes up a 500-mile-per-hour-plus Banshee jet fighter and works it out in the upper air.

After 3 weeks of check-out flights in the planes, which range from a Catalina flying boat to late jets, a student advances to performance flights for 12 weeks and then "handling qualities" flights for the last 6 or 7 weeks. The first class of 20 flew 2,500 hours during their 5½ months at TPT. This included 900 hours of familiarization and 850 hours of instrument flying.

After a day like that the TPT student has little or no time for an evening of relaxation at the officers' club. One reason is that he probably either has some night flying or some late hours with the slide rule. Another is that it is a solid 7 miles from the bachelor officers' quarters to the club.

REASONS FOR PRIDE

TPT, despite its short history, has reason to be proud of its present and its past. Its small faculty is headed by Daniel Dommasch, who has an unusual combination of academic and practical background. After receiving a degree as master of aeronautical engineering from New York University, he became a structural analyst with Fairchild and later Brewster aircraft companies. Then he was a project engineer with the CAA for 4 years, a project engineer and engineering coordinator at Bell Aircraft in Buffalo, and assistant professor of Iowa State College in aeronautical engineering.

Another member is Walter Hesse, who has a master of science degree in mechanical engineering and who now is working on his Ph. D. His thesis is based on the development of a thrust meter and a means of testing thrust meters.

TPT also has been instrumental in landing at Patuxent an engineering extension course of the University of Maryland on the graduate level. This enables civilians and other personnel at the station to get a master's degree by night study. TPT's faculty helps out in presenting the university courses.

But the best test of any place of higher learning is its graduates. And there TPT can pridefully point to Capt. Marcel Guoin, coordinator of tests; Capt. R. E. Dixon, of flight test; Capt. W. J. Widhelm, of tactical test; Commander Turner F. Caldwell, Jr., assistant director of flight test, who was one of the test pilots for the Douglas Skystreak D558-1, which surpassed Mach 1 in its early flights; and many successful Navy test pilots.

Let's Hope the 1951 Method Employed in Negotiating Contract Will Set Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal which expresses eloquently the sentiments of many people with regard to the contract recently negotiated between the United Mine Workers and the coal operators:

LET'S HOPE THE 1951 METHOD EMPLOYED IN NEGOTIATING CONTRACT WILL SET PATTERN

For more than 30 years President Lewis has been pleading with the bituminous coal operators to set up a small official committee, representing their many separate organizations, with whom the UMWA could deal in promoting efficiency and peaceful settlement of wage matters.

The bituminous wage agreement signed January 18 represents the nearest approach to a peaceful, intelligent method of wage negotiations in the history of the industry.

The new organization of bituminous coal operators, headed by Harry Moses, is in a large measure responsible for the quiet negotiations that prevailed.

Of course, Mr. Moses consulted with his membership—which is largely composed of captive-mine operators, but also includes the largest commercial operators in the Nation.

The Southern Coal Producers Association was freely consulted after negotiations between the northerners and the UMWA had weighed the situation and had reached a measurable understanding and agreement.

The press and radio, as well as publicity bureaus, were equally surprised when the first news leak of progress being made toward the new agreement came 24 hours before its signing.

Signing of the new agreement without fanfare or Government interference—promoting legal action in one form or another—and without a division among operators as between the North and the South, is an achievement of such magnitude that the industry as a whole can feel justly proud.

It's a stand-out of collective bargaining that proves once again that the less the Government interferes in wage matters, and the more business organizations refrain from trumped-up misrepresentations in publicity attacks, the better off will be the lot of employers, employees, and the Nation.

Of course, the agreement was a sad blow to the year-round anti-Lewis, anti-UMWA writers, cartoonists, and commentators. As one wag put it:

"The peaceful settlement in coal means there'll be no spring training for many in these vocations."

Both coal operators and coal miners have learned a lot during the last decade about coal wage matters and working conditions being tried in the press and on the radio. A great deal of harm has resulted from the widespread misstatements about every phase of coal production and consumption during these wildcat publicity campaigns.

The war in Korea and the armament program gave impetus to the orderly procedure of negotiating both the bituminous and anthracite agreements.

The Nation is now reassured of an ample coal supply.

Coal miners will not be easily lured to other jobs.

The business of coal-mining communities will go ahead as best it can under whatever restrictions of price fixing and controls the Government imposes.

Coal miners and their families will bury the thought that they will be singled out for inequitable treatment as regards wages and rationing as was the case on numerous occasions during World War II.

President Lewis rightfully termed the agreement a "bread and butter contract" for, certainly, the increase in food prices fully justifies the 20-cents-an-hour, 10-percent increase agreed upon.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the southern coal operators—which group was ostensibly organized during the war period to deflate the UMWA at the war's end—also joined Mr. Moses in praising the settlement.

To the surprise of nearly everyone, John Battle, executive vice president of the National Coal Association, for the first time that we can recall, complimented both the industry and the UMWA.

The coal industry can well rejoice in the hope that the wage negotiations of January 1951, will set a pattern which will govern the industry's wage negotiations in the future.

The time lost, the money spent, and the streaming of representatives of Government agencies and politicians into coal disputes can and should be avoided.

The United States has the most productive coal mines in the world.

American coal miners are the most efficient.

American coal is the best prepared in the world.

Under common-sense procedure the American coal industry can continue to grow and prosper under a sound labor-management relationship policy.

Anthracite operators, following the custom of letting the bituminous operators negotiate in advance, quickly signed an agreement carrying the same wage increases.

In recent years the anthracite industry has greatly reduced negotiating periods. This has largely resulted from the reduction of negotiating committees to a minimum number and holding down on publicity releases dealing with the conference differences.

This, in turn, has resulted in vastly improved labor relations in the region. The old game of around-the-year open-season attacks on the anthracite miners and the UMWA has given way to joint action between management and miners for more efficient production and bigger markets.

In anthracite, as in bituminous, President Lewis has through the years preached the doctrine that cooperation between the producers and the UMWA could achieve a remarkable result for the coal industry as a whole.

Maybe some day the anti-union crowd, as well as some prominent present-day labor leaders who have reached the heights due to President Lewis' efforts, will appreciate his contribution in setting the pace for the betterment of American workers.

Letter of James Shea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my attention one of the most beautiful letters that I have ever read. The letter was written by a Canadian father to the Adjutant General of the United States Army just after he had been notified of the death in action of his son in Korea.

His beloved son, born in Newark, N. J., enlisted in the United States Army in Buffalo, N. Y., in April of 1950, and gave his life in the month of December of that year.

The beauty and thought expressed in his letter and the great faith and hope in the cause for which his son fought were so unselfishly revealed that I wrote and asked the father for permission to place his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it may be read by all. Granted that permission, the letter follows:

ST. CATHARINES, ONTARIO,
December 14, 1950.

The ADJUTANT GENERAL,
United States Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some months ago it was my privilege to stand in the reconstructed House of Burgesses in Williamsburg, and a few days later to visit the home of Thomas Jefferson at Monticello. It was on a cool summer morning that Mrs. Shea and I stood in the old capitol, and as we stood there time rolled back for me. As I sat on one of the benches of the house I visualized that maybe from where I was sitting Patrick Henry had made his famous treason speech. That the men gathered around him were solemn faced in the decision to resist tyranny and oppression.

At about the same time, as we stood there in reverence, my son, James, was in the perimeter of the beachhead in Korea. No less a patriot than Washington, Jefferson, and Henry, because he, along with many other poor lads, was fighting the cause of liberty.

And now your letter of December 11 comes to me, that somewhere in that distant land he has found his final resting place. Well, let it be, and if need be, there are six other lives from the father of him, and the mother of him, to the youngest of his brothers, who will willingly give what he and countless others before him have given, and what countless others will give in the preservation of human rights and dignity.

God bless him, and you, and the rest of our leaders, who so nobly endeavor in the right. May my flag and your flag fly in the furthermost corners of the earth for where these flags fly shall we always find liberty and justice, and government of the people.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES SHEA.

Who Says Statistics Are Dry?—Just Look At These

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from Labor, a national weekly newspaper, dated February 3, 1951:

WHO SAYS STATISTICS ARE DRY?—JUST LOOK AT THEM—NEW "NO-RUBBER YARDSTICK" PROVES AVERAGE AMERICAN TWICE AS WELL OFF AS IN HOOVER 1933

From now on, there's a complete and devastating answer to the shouts that high taxes and the welfare state are ruining this country. The answer is provided by a brand new kind of statistical report, issued by the conservative Department of Commerce.

Daily papers brushed off this report and distorted its significance. They tried to give the public the impression that, somehow, the new statistics puncture exaggerated claims about the economic progress made by America in the years of the New Deal and Fair Deal.

What does the report actually show? First, let's see what the Commerce Department says about it, and why it is important.

"Gross national product," the Department explains, "is a comprehensive measure of the Nation's output of goods and services."

In other words, gross national product is a figure which shows how much the American people produced in a year, and, therefore, how much they can consume and enjoy in a year. It's the best yardstick of the American standard of living.

Up to now, the Department points out, gross national product has been measured in current dollars. The value of a dollar increased during the depression, and since then the value of a dollar has decreased. So up to now, statisticians measured gross national product by what might be called a rubber yardstick.

But now, by long and scientific study, the Department's statisticians have taken all the "rubber" out of the yardstick. In the new report, the first of its kind, they measure gross national product in constant dollars—having the same value each and every year.

Thus, for all the years from 1929 through 1950, they have a real measure of gross national product—a measure making possible accurate comparison of any year's production with that of any other year.

Let's compare the gross national product in 1950, the latest year, with that of 1933, the year when Hoover stepped out of the White House and Roosevelt stepped in.

The propagandists who shout that high taxes and the welfare state are ruining the country want the people to forget that 1933 was a year of the Hoover hunger, when millions of Americans were tramping the streets in desperate search of jobs. They picture 1933 as a glorious time of low taxes and free enterprise.

Well, measured by the new "no-rubber" yardstick, the gross national product in 1933 was $61,500,000,000. That's what the American people then produced, and had to consume and enjoy.

In 1950, after 17 years of the New Deal and Fair Deal, the new "no-rubber" yardstick shows the gross national product was $153,000,000,000, a 149 percent increase over 1933.

In other words, in 1950 the American people produced, consumed, and enjoyed almost exactly two and one-half times as much goods and services as they did in 1933—the good old days of low taxes, no welfare state, and the Hoover hunger.

Let's be absolutely fair about it. In 1933, the population of this country was about 125,000,000, and in 1950 it was 150,000,000. So gross national product would have had to increase somewhat just to keep pace with population.

After making full allowance for that fact, however, this is clear:

In 1950, the average American produced, consumed, and enjoyed exactly twice as much goods and services as he did in 1933. Obviously, he was twice as well off after 17 years of the New Deal and Fair Deal.

In view of that fundamental fact—proven by the new "no-rubber" yardstick—the talk about high taxes and the welfare state ruining the country is just plain nonsense.

Wayne County District Commissioners' Annual Report, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, we have in my home county, Wayne County, Iowa, an unusually effective and efficient board of commissioners for the soil-conservation district. The annual report of this organization sets forth a surprisingly good record of accomplishments during 1950. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the report of this organization that other Members of Congress and others interested may note what has been accomplished by the soil-conservation program in one typical agricultural county in Iowa:

WAYNE COUNTY DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS' ANNUAL REPORT, 1950

INTRODUCTION

The year 1950 is past history and we, the commissioners, are proud to relate what has been accomplished in the Wayne County Soil Conservation District. True, we recognize our shortcomings for there are many more things that could have been accomplished.

We have no happenings to report more spectacular than what has been the usual trend in the past years. However, we feel that there is a movement toward a definite goal—that of accepting conscientiously a good, sound conservation program. We feel that the all-important development is this gradual, steady movement that is apparent each year—that we have forged ahead just a little further.

A LOOK AT THE WEATHER

The growing season of 1950 was one of the coolest on record, but despite this fact the crops have been only a little less than outstanding. Excess rainfall during the month of June caused damaging soil losses. Farmers in general felt the need for more rigid erosion control practices than what

were in operation at the time these rainstorms occurred.

During the latter part of the summer and continuing through fall exceptionally dry weather prevailed. This prompted the building of a number of farm ponds to ease the water shortage brought about by these dry periods. We have noticed, also, that the trend is toward the building of larger and deeper ponds.

This dry period has made it possible to do some conservation work that would be impossible during the average season. An example of this is the construction of surface drains and diversions in ordinarily wet areas. However, terrace construction was almost halted during early fall because of the hardness of the soil caused by the dry weather.

OUR DRIVE FOR LEGUMES

Because of their importance deep-rooted legumes are getting more attention in our district. Since Wayne County soils in general are made up of fine particles and are run together, the need for aeration has been realized. Without the deep roots of the legumes the soil cannot be aerated; and without proper aeration another essential for superior crops will be sorely missed—that of water percolation.

The increase in legume seedings has brought more hay into the district and has made better pasture, but utilization of this roughage has presented a problem. The need for more livestock is recognized, but most farmers are reluctant to pay the high prices for this livestock or are financially unable to meet this situation.

While we are on the subject of legumes, let us say that successful corn yields can be traced to fields that have grown legumes. Lime and fertilizer programs are also in close coordination with legume seedings. Farmers are realizing that it is not how many acres are in corn that count, but in how many bushels there are in the crib. The raising of proper legumes is the road to this goal and our district is on this road.

THE ANNUAL WAYNE COUNTY FIELD DAY

The top activity of the year was the Wayne County soil conservation field day, which was held on the Lyle Duncan farm 3½ miles north of Lineville. Attendance was limited due to rain which started in the morning when the plowing contest was in full swing, but even so an estimated 3,000 people attended the yearly demonstration. Some of the accomplishments of the day included the construction of a mile of terraces, filling a silo with a field cutter, plowing of 10 acres on the contour, establishing of one-half mile of multa flora rose fence, construction of a diversion dike, blading in several gullies, insulating the house and installing a water system.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Other events of the year consisted of obtaining several thousands of multa flora rose seeds for some 50 or more farmers, assisting in the planting of the seed in establishing permanent fence, helping farmers fill out applications for fish from the State conservation commission and attending various meetings held in the county. Also many groups worked together on terrace construction and other soil conservation practices on individual farms.

TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL ASSISTANCE

The following states the accomplishments of the State-employed technicians' aid and the clerical assistance in the Wayne County district. The figures given cover only the work completed for the first 9 months of each of the years 1949 and 1950. This gives a comparison during the same part of the 2 years—before we had State aid and after State aid was in operation.

A year ago as of October 1, 1949, we had 34 farm plans prepared, signed and approved by the Commissioners. The accomplishment this year as of October 1, 1950, was 44 plans. Therefore, 10 additional plans were signed the first 9 months of 1950 as compared to the first 9 months of 1949, or a 29-percent increase.

Contour lines were laid out on 1,417 acres last year as compared to 2,183 acres this year, an increase of 766 acres or 47 percent. Last year 3 miles of terraces constructed compared with 4½ miles this year gives an increase of 1½ miles or 50 percent. Diversions constructed increased from 2 miles to 4 miles—a 2-mile increase or 43 percent. Waterways increased from .75 mile constructed in 1949 to 3.9 miles, an increase of 3.1 miles or 420 percent.

Farm ponds constructed to date show no increase over last year. Fence row management and planting for wildlife increased from 300 feet to 1,100 feet, an 800-foot increase or 266 percent.

The clerical help resulted in better relations with and more service to the public in addition to resulting in more accomplishment in the district. Being able to keep the office open part of the time resulted in 650 additional office visitors and over 300 additional telephone calls received.

In addition to this applications for plans increased from 46 to 53, an increase of 7 or 15 percent. Furthermore, it is estimated that we got about 150 more requests for layout assistance and information than if we had not had someone in the office.

Other incidental accomplishments are the coloring of approximately 65 soil maps, all of the new agreements as typewritten and assembled, periodic reports made up and the assemblying and distribution of newsletters.

YEARLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Listed below are accomplishments of the district for the calendar year 1950: Contouring, 3,490 acres; pasture improvement, 1,963 acres; farm ponds, 29; terraces, 8.6 miles; diversions, 6.7 miles; farm drainage, 185 acres; open drains, 3.5 miles; waterways, 12.2 miles.

A PUBLICITY PROGRAM

Through State aid the local district has purchased 35 millimeter Kodachrome color film, with which many pictures have been taken and made up into slides for projection purposes. With these slides we hope to show graphically the achievements and progress of our district from year to year.

The slides have been made available to many local organizations for lectures, entertainment, and various other purposes. At present the county superintendent of schools, W. A. Tock, has a set of conservation slides which he shows to rural schools and parents' and teachers' meetings in rural areas. The slides, all taken within our district, have also been shown before GI classes, high-school and grade-school groups, 4-H and Farm Bureau groups.

Another device for trying to bring soil conservation to the public eye was the proclamation of Iowa Soil Conservation Week by Governor Beardsley from June 12 through June 18. During this period tours of four outstanding farms in the county (Lloyd Greenlee, Harvey Holder, "Pete" Carpenter, and Rex Devore) were arranged by the Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and Farmers Home Administration. These tours were arranged to show the public the advantages of the different phases of soil conservation.

An interesting demonstration was held July 15 at the Wayne County Experimental Farm north of Seymour. The farm was laid off into test plots, planted, and cared for by Iowa State College representatives. On the selected date (July 15) these test plots were explained to and discussed with those who attended the demonstration; and the beneficial results obtained from these experiments will be adopted and publicized as a part of our soil conservation in future years.

EXTENSION SERVICE ACTIVITIES

One of the biggest problems confronting, and recognized by, most Wayne County farm families in the area of agricultural production is the low productivity of soils. One of the twofold objectives of farm families is to prevent further soil depletion caused by soil erosion and heavy cropping and to increase family income by building up and maintaining a more productive soil.

The educational program of the soils district cooperating with the extension service lies in helping farm families recognize the need for the various solutions to their problems in the area of soil conservation and in understanding all the various practices necessary to having a productive soil. Solving problems of soil conservation is done by people. The soils district through educational and technical service helps people help themselves.

The educational program on soil conservation pointed toward several things in 1950 and again in 1951.

1. Use greatly increased amounts of commercial fertilizers where economic increases in crop yields can be obtained.

2. Use fertilizers according to recommendations based on soil tests.

3. Greater use of supplementary erosion control practices, such as contouring, waterways, terrace outlets, terraces, diversions, etc.

4. Use of the most efficient and productive crop rotation adapted to soil resources.

5. Increase family income and decrease labor requirements in a soil-conservation program, through better utilization of forage crops by livestock and seed production.

6. Growing of higher yielding and better adapted forage crop varieties.

7. Increase of crop yields per acre by controlling crop insects, diseases, and noxious weeds.

8. To increase volume output on the farms by bringing unproductive pastures into a good rotation or by reestablishing in better pasture forages.

9. To increase capital input into many Wayne County farms for soil conservation purposes and to improve forage crop utilization through an efficient livestock program.

This educational program was carried out in various ways, including: Soil test interpretation, soil sampling, and fertilizer meetings; meetings and tours at the Seymour-Shelby soil area experimental farm; newspaper publicity of activities, results and approved practices, helps with soil conservation tours, field days, etc.; furnishing educational material and suggestions on soil conservation for special soil conservation programs for groups such as 4-H Clubs, Farm Bureau townships, rural women's organizations, PTA, etc.; educational information on soil conservation to vocational agriculture departments, on-the-farm-training instructors; work with county livestock men and livestock organizations on soil conservation.

ARLO NOBLE,
Chairman,
WALTER BECKMAN,
MAURICE GOODE,
JAMES H. GOODE,
Secretary,
Wayne County Soil Conservation District Governing Body.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, archbishop of Boston:

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(By Rev. Richard J. Cushing)

It is almost a dozen years since the invasion of Poland by the Nazis. Two weeks after that barbarous invasion, the world will recall with shame the no less brutal, even cowardly, attack made from behind on the Polish Army by Soviet Russia. Under this double attack, and this double treacherous contact of the Nazis and the Communists, came the surrender of heroic Poland. With this surrender, came the division of martyred Poland, between the two most ruthless, totalitarian dictatorships of our generation.

Henceforth, bitter memories were bequeathed to Polish people throughout the world. But bitter memories are not so disturbing as our memories of shame, and the Polish people need suffer from none of these. The peace came to Poland; but the shame lies elsewhere.

No American, no citizen of any of the Allied Nations can possibly think without shame, yes, without burning shame, of what Allied diplomats and political leaders did to Poland in 1945, and 1946, and 1947. Suffice it to say, that diplomats themselves, our own diplomats, have told a dreadful story of the Allied default of our commitments, our most solemn commitments to the Polish people. The United States Ambassador to Poland was so appalled by the treatment of the victor nations that he resigned his post in protest—an almost unique action in American diplomacy—and published in a book which bears the dramatic title, "I Saw Poland Betrayed." It is a shocking book; a book which future generations of Americans will read, I repeat, with shame. It is a story of murder, and fraud, and of double dealing, and brutality, and duplicity, rarely excelled in the history of these crimes.

In the hope that by our prayers, we may cancel some part of the national and international shame which other eyes must forever associate with the modern history of Poland, I am broadcasting this message.

The future freedom of the Polish people will surely come. We know that, because we know that there is a God; and we know that He will not be mocked forever. We know it because we know something of the spirit of the Poland, and we know that it will not be forever trampled underfoot. We know that Poland will one day be free, if only she can survive the present enslavement; and we know that she will survive it because we know her will to survive it. Poland will only lose her identity; Poland will only be lost if she becomes a Communist nation. It is true that the state or the political regime in Poland has become or has been violently taken over by the Communists. But there is a very sharp distinction, a distinction greater than that between the body and the soul between a nation and its political state. The state may be the expression of the will of the people, or it may be imposed upon them by violence from without. A nation is the people themselves.

The Polish nation will not be Communists because of the character of the Polish people themselves. First of all, the Polish people are Catholic Christians. They are among the most convinced and conscientious of Catholics. They are Catholics in the most complete sense. They are thoroughly Roman in their loyalty, and thoroughly devoted to Jesus and Mary in their piety. We know not what defects in the faith of a people make them susceptible to the scourge of communism, or materialism in any other of its forms. But this I do know; a people who give top place in their spiritual life to Jesus Christ, top place among their earthly loyalties to their unity with His vicar, and top place in their devotion to Mary, the mother of God: Such a people do not become infected with materialism, or adherence to aetheistic communism. Such a people are the Poles. And again, the Polish people are protected against becoming Communists because they well know the menace to their faith, and freedom of those who seek to impose upon them Red Fascist totalitarianism.

Someone has said that experience is the school of mankind, and that men will learn in no other school. If that is true, the Polish people have abundant experience, long and terrifying, of what must be expected if they permit within their gates, those who are presently bringing such pressure upon them to become Communists and partisans.

Today, the Polish are trying, under the watchful guidance of Almighty God, to maintain the same Catholic faith under Stalin, that they maintained for centuries under the grinding heels of the czars of Russia.

I hazard the statement that the Polish people are 96 percent Catholic, and 98 percent anti-Russian. Please God, this latter quality will be purged of all hatred, all antagonism, anything which might result in unchristian wrath or destructive war. Please God, the anti-Russian sentiments of the Polish people will only serve to keep them on their guard against the unchristian and inhuman philosophies by which the rulers of the Russian people have enslaved the Russians themselves, and seek now to enslave the people of Poland. People who are anti-Russian in this legitimate sense, will not become aetheistic Communists. Such as people are the Poles. Finally, the Polish people are 99 percent passionately Polish. They love their native land. They know how communism would change its fair face. They love their national customs, and they know how communism would destroy these. They love their traditions, patriotic and Christian; and they know how inconsistent with these is Red aetheism. They love their homes, and their families, and their churches, and their schools. They are resolved that the tyrants of the east shall not defile these.

Patriotism and religion are twin virtues. The passionate love of the Poles for their nation has a religious quality. Their love for their faith includes a patriotic aspect. All this is as it should be. A people thus patriotic and religious will not turn traitors and prove infidel. The Polish nation, I tell you, no matter what is happening, will not become Communists. God Almighty knows it will not be easy, whatever their national spirit and valor, for the Polish nation to persevere against the brutal force which has already broken so many and such great nations. It will take far more than national heroism, far more than human strength, to survive in the face of the mass materialism which strikes down and perverts mighty people so brazenly, so brutally, so systematically, as does atheistic communism. The people of Poland need strength from on high.

They need God's grace in measure overflowing. They need our prayers. I plead for this spiritual aid for Poland. Those prayers we promise the Polish people today. They must not cease until God Himself speaks to silence the enemies of faith. Until God Himself strikes to stop the enemies of His people. Let us pray in season and out of season for Poland, for faith, for freedom, and peace. We must also pray for the political leaders of the world, for those who are oppressing Poland, that their hearts may be softened; for those who profess to be friends of Poland, that their heads may be cleared.

To our prayers, we must add our practical efforts. We must be vigilant against treason in high places; and against unworthy acceptance of treason among the people. We must somehow control our representatives rather than allow them to control our fates; so that it will not be possible again for them to betray a whole people against knowledge.

To our prayers, we must add our practical efforts. We must be vigilant against treason in high places; and against unworthy acceptance of treason among people. We must somehow control our representatives rather than allow them to control our fates; so that it will not be possible again for them to betray a whole people against our knowledge and our moral judgment, as they did betray Poland.

We must in all things imitate the peaceful virtues of Christ, the Prince of Peace: His forbearance, His patience, His spirit of forgiveness, His will for peace, His desire to bring together all men in concord and unity. But we must not be unmindful of His righteous wrath against those who defiled His temple, and His people; and seek to impose upon them insupportable burdens acting in their name to do those things unworthy of men, and hateful to God.

So I ask you to pray for Poland. I ask you to pray for ourselves. Pray that Poland may keep the faith, and that we may grow in it. That we may not lose our freedom, and that Poland may regain hers. That Poland may be made holy, and that we may be cleansed for our sympathy. That we may be restored from our shame, and that Poland may be made strong, and pure, and pleasing to God. That we may enjoy together with Poland, with all the nations whose Lord is God, the blessings of peace and piety, and Christian joy. Amen.

Military Supply Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following exchange of correspondence between myself and the Defense Production Administration:

JANUARY 25, 1951.

Maj. Gen. WILLIAM H. HARRISON,
Administrator, Defense Production Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HARRISON: Permit me to tell you how pleased I am that you were selected to head the production and materials control activities of the Government during these critical days. Experience such as yours is of incalculable value in preparing the Nation to defend itself against aggression. As vice president for operations of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., president of the International Telephone & Telegraph Co., Director of Production of the War Production Board, Assistant to the Chief of Production of the Army Service Forces and Chief of the Army Signal Corps Production and Distribution Division, you have gained an insight into both civilian and military operations. Therefore, you can properly evaluate the relative needs and requirements of both the civilian and the military.

For a number of years I have been making a study of military-supply operations for the purpose of assisting the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, in seeing that our fighting men were the best trained and equipped soldiers in the world. We have found that military supplies cannot be procured and distributed with any degree of certainty unless a common language is used for all military-supply installations. Therefore, in 1949 I introduced a bill, H. R. 321, that would establish a single catalog system to be developed by the armed services but which could be used by all the Federal agencies. Action on this bill was postponed to give the Defense Department an opportunity to take steps without legislation toward the development and installation of a single catalog system.

At the same time the Congress approved Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, that included a provision for the establishment of a single catalog system. Unfortunately, this law did not define clearly what was meant by a single catalog system.

Advantage has been taken of the lack of definition of Public Law 152 and of the postponement of action on H. R. 321 to further delay the establishment and installation of a single catalog system for the Armed Forces. Recent reports issued jointly by the Munitions Board and the General Services Administration, although filled with high sounding phrases, make it clear that nothing has been accomplished and that their program does not even contemplate the use of a single catalog or the elimination of all existing catalogs with their duplicating names and numbers.

This should not be news to you. One of your outstanding contributions during your Army career was the development and installation of the single catalog system for the Signal Corps, replacing 13 existing catalog systems. This system was so efficient and so useful to supply operations that it was voluntarily adopted for communications items by the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and by the armed forces of other allied nations. With this as a tool, you were able to make the Signal Corps procurement and distribution operations the finest in the services.

In developing and installing a single catalog system, even though for communications items only, you have been able to accomplish something that has been attempted for almost 50 years without success.

You recognized what was later confirmed in great detail by the Hoover Commission that supply management is impossible without a single catalog system. You no doubt recognize that your present mission cannot be accomplished without it. It is impossible to control the allocation of critical materials or pass upon the necessity for new facilities where items are procured, stored, and issued under hundreds of duplicating names and numbers.

Without a common identification system and a common supply language it is difficult and many times impossible to coordinate supply activities; interchange of items between services is impossible; the difficulties of supplying arms and equipment to our allies are magnified; civil defense supply problems are multiplied; and the waste of materials, manpower, facilities, transportation costs, and storage space mounts to astronomical figures.

Therefore it would seem that the responsibility for seeing that a single catalog system is developed and used by the Armed Forces and the civilian agencies should be delegated to you by the Congress and by the President. At the same time the Congress should accept the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and enact legislation that would clearly define what is meant by the development and establishment of a single catalog system for the Federal Government. As the armed services, for obvious reasons, should be the agent of the Federal Government in carrying out this project, I have reentered H. R. 321 as H. R. 1033.

Your comments on these proposals would be appreciated. If I can be of assistance to you in any way please do not hesitate to call upon me. We realize that you are carrying a heavy burden.

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1951.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: As General Harrison will be away from the city for several days, I am acknowledging your letter to him of January 25 concerning the desirability of developing a single catalog system which would be used for procurement not only by the Armed Services, but also other Federal agencies. Your letter will, of course, be placed before General Harrison upon his return.

During the last war, I served as General Harrison's executive officer handling Signal Corps procurement and distribution operations. The cataloging system initiated by us during that period was, as you indicated in your letter, most helpful in carrying out our job. On the procurement side, it pointed up duplications of the same item having been procured under different nomenclature and description which, of course, would, if repeated, often lead to excessive purchases.

Where one can provide a common identification, there is no doubt that procurement work as well as the distribution end, would be materially assisted.

As the result of our procurement and distribution work in the Signal Corps, I can assure you that strong arguments may be made for placing responsibility of developing a single catalog system with the agencies doing the actual purchasing and distributing. The people doing the above work receive the direct benefits, and it is their understanding and acceptance of this which will bring forth an accurate and usable system.

Sincerely,

H. G. WILDE,
Assistant to the Administrator.

Passage on India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Tuesday, February 6, and which bears the title "Passage on India."

The editorial analyzes a subject which heretofore, from a publicity standpoint, has received little more than passive attention. Recently the attitude manifested by Nehru and his followers has demonstrated that considerable merit may be attributed to the facts as detailed in the editorial. Aside from the spotlights which Nehru occupies in this picture, the editorial contains much valuable factual information, the benefit of which cannot be overstressed at this time.

Undoubtedly, the American people will welcome an impartial exposé of Nehru's temporary rule in India and his adamant position recently taken by his representatives sitting at the United Nations table.

The editorial follows:

PASSAGE ON INDIA

Nehru and company, who temporarily rule India, have been having fun lately kicking Uncle Sam in the ribs at the meetings of the United Nations.

IMPOLITE BLACKMAIL FROM A RICH BEGGAR

At the same time, millions of people who live in India have been suffering what Nehru and company guardedly admit to be a technical inability to eat, due to no food.

Naturally, therefore, Messrs. Truman and Acheson are very much interested in a proposition to send Nehru and company some 2,000,000 tons of the United States taxpayers' wheat. Nehru and company may then distribute it to the taxpayers of India and perhaps thereby be saved from being kicked in the ribs, themselves, by the folks down at the Indian grassroots, if any.

There is some objection to this procedure, of course, but when all is said and done you may be sure the wheat will be on its way. Our masters in power always follow the form book, sooner or later.

So, since another huge chunk of our property looks outward bound, it may be of some interest to have a few facts on this further beggar at our gates.

India is a word that points vaguely at a wedge of land in Asia bounded on the north by the world's most rugged and fearsome mountain chain, and on the other two sides by an ocean open to the world.

In size, this wedge of land works out to about half as big as the United States. In natural resources and the means for wealth, it is tremendous. Properly run, India could give the United States of America plenty to think about as a rival in industry, agriculture or war.

For instance, its tremendous river system could be harnessed to electric power dams to give India potency second only to the United States of America and far more than Russia's.

India has one of the world's great reserves of coal and high-grade iron ore. It is a treasure house of other minerals and metals, ranging from gold, silver and copper through tungsten, bauxite, mica, chromite and magnesite. All these are commonly used throughout American industry to make your kitchen equipment and your automobile shiny, long-wearing and smooth-working—but now off to Truman's wars.

There are tremendous forests in India, too, and a herd of some 200,000,000 head of cattle, one-third of all the cows in the world. And above all, India has one of the world's richest farm belts.

The climate goes through many shifts. In the extreme north it is temperate and pleasant most of the year, with big winter sports in the celebrated Vale of Kashmir.

The wind is a big thing in India. In winter it is dry and keeps pulling the cover off the central land plain, to make deserts. In summer it sweeps in from the ocean and floods the coastal regions with rain as high as 60 inches a season. But in the United

States of America there are regions as hot and desert as any of India, and winds that rip and tear. Our climate is as harsh as any in the world, but here we've licked it for day-in-day-out purposes.

Taken all in all, India has no cause to complain against nature. It has the stuff for a great power.

Now, as to people, they number nearly 360,000,000 and average out to about 248 persons to the square mile. About 87 percent live in the country and 13 percent in the city. They range from almost prehistoric primitive tribesmen to a highly cultivated few. The great mass in between are underfed, fast-breeding, quick-dying, ignorant hand farmers.

WHY ARE WE DIFFERENT?

We have here a population running somewhere near 150,000,000, about 45 per square mile. We divide about 57 percent in the city, 43 percent on the farm.

Nowhere do we have any poverty to compare with India's. The great mass of the American people is the best educated, best fed, most skilled, healthiest, and longest lived of all the human race, in spite of the drains put upon us by reckless government in the past 50 years.

Why has India, with all her wealth, sunk so far?

Some blame the conflict of Hindu religion with Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Jainism, and the vast number of offshoots from these which develop such fantastic consequences as the caste systems, the refusal of Hindus to eat meat of cows, and Mohammedans even to so much as touch a piece of pigskin.

But the United States of America also has many religions at work in its national life, utterly unrestrained by law. Yet none has gone overboard against common sense.

Taken all in all, we would say the root cause of India's maladjustment is that the power of government there is traditionally from beyond the border.

Alexander the Great was her first well-known conqueror, back in 326 B. C. After him there came a Golden Age, significantly under the rule of native kings of the famous Gupta dynasty. Then the Mogul empire crashed in from the outside again, and there followed a turn-down that has never really been corrected. The British in the eighteenth century started picking up the leavings any others had missed.

Now this above-mentioned wedge of Asia has a supposed independent status, but actually not. It is split into two nations—Pakistan for the Mohammedans and India for the Hindus. The minorities get killed.

Pakistan has a long way to go, and India is governed by a gang of doctrinaire Socialists who can't wait to get into some kind of world order or other that submerges their own life to foreign domination.

The United States of America, which now for the first time in its history takes orders from beyond its own borders, by way of the United Nations, can look at India and think about what comes from that kind of thing.

Soviet Union's Plan for World Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following study is taken from an address delivered by the Very Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., regent of Georgetown's famed School of Foreign Service before an assembly of the National Guard of Massachusetts on Saturday, January 20, 1951. The address is entitled "Soviet Strategy and Soviet Tactics":

I invite your attention to the success of Soviet strategy and tactics in the broad field of world geography. It will be remembered that Nazi Germany made its own the celebrated theory of the British geographer, Sir Halford Mackinder respecting the influence of geographical environment on history. As early as 1904, and again in 1919, and finally in 1944, he warned the Western World that the pivot of history lay in that vast inner land mass of Eurasia to which he gave the picturesque title of the heartland. Describing it as roughly coinciding with what is now Soviet territory, he declared, with extraordinary foresight, that if this natural fortress, inaccessible, as it is, to sea power, should ever be properly garrisoned militarily and developed economically by a virile people, it could become the center of an empire capable of ruling the world. Mackinder's brilliant hypothesis ended with the warning: "Who rules East Europe commands the heartland; who rules heartland commands the world island; who rules the world island commands the world."

This thoughtful condensation of much human history and accurate observation of the influence of geography on history was conceived and formulated, to be sure, in an age when air power had not yet become a major component of military potential. Hence, the theory has been modified, but not entirely canceled out by the coming of the age of air power. Soviet Russia, consciously or unconsciously, is supplying the deficiency in terms of military aviation.

I believe the unknown geopoliticians behind the iron curtain have adapted Mackinder's formula to the new circumstances of the air age. They have probably changed and shifted some elements and emphasized others, so that their consolidation of land power in Central and Eastern Europe now leaves them free to accelerate control of marginal lands on the rim of the world island. It may well be that they are saying: "who controls the rimlands of Europe and Asia can protect the heartland of the world revolution." The growth of Soviet sea power, especially of submarines, is not without meaning in such a program.

Take a map of the world and follow with your finger the creeping progress of the Soviet Empire since the disappearance of the Nazi and the Japanese Empires. Through Petsamo on the north, acquired from Finland by force, she now has a new outlet to the Atlantic. Drop a line from that point, through central Europe, to Albania, her satellite on the Adriatic, noting as you pass Yugoslavia, which would be repossessed when Stalin finally decides to deal with Tito. At the terminus of this fringe of her power she has access to the Adriatic, and hence to the Mediterranean. Her march toward Greece was countered by the Truman doctrine and her hopes for Communist triumph there have been frustrated with American assistance. Had her plans succeeded in the Hellenic world, she would have been enabled to anchor her power firmly in the western end of the Mediterranean, then turn to a corresponding eastern anchor in Spain, which always remains a factor in her planning. But her hopes for gaining control of Spain, which go back even before 1935, have been frustrated thus far by the tough hidalgos. Should she ever succeed in fomenting civil war in the Iberian Peninsula, with the emergence of a satellite Communist state such as the Marxist pattern always assumes will follow a domestic revolution, Gibraltar would be the next target. Istanbul and the Dardanelles have always bulked large in the expansionist program of Russian imperialism, and this craving for that traditional objective, inherited from the czars, has not been neglected by the new autocrats. Unreasonable concessions have been demanded from Turkey in recent years but denied with equal determination, and the refusal backed up by American economic aid. But the demand will surely be renewed at a propitious moment.

SEA CONTACT SOUGHT

Meanwhile, the atmosphere of pressure will serve to maintain that psychological tension and expensive defense program along Dardanelles which Moscow utilizes so consistently in its war of nerves. The measure of validity in Russia's historical claims for free exit through the Dardanelles is not slight. More than one European statesman has gone so far in the past as to concede publicly that Russia should have Constantinople. Both England and France so declared in 1916, but that age-old controversy between Moscow and Constantinople was limited in its application to the ancient capital of the Byzantine emperors. It now carries a wholly different significance, in view of the Communist program of world revolution and the hope to overthrow all non-Communist governments such as Turkey. This new messianic universalism is, as we have already noted, what Soviet Russia has added to her inherited czarist tradition. This urge to the sea and the constant process of opening up new territories and colonization of them was noted by the greatest of Russian historians, V. O. Kluchevsky, as the principal fundamental factor in Russian history. "All other factors," he writes in volume I of his celebrated History of Russia, "have been more or less inseparably connected therewith. * * * Debarred from settlement by the geographical features of their country, the eastern Slavs (in their historical evolution) were forced for centuries to maintain a nomad life, as well as to engage in ceaseless warfare with their neighbors. It was this particular conjunction of circumstances which caused the history of Russia to become the history of a country forever undergoing colonization—a movement continued up to, and given fresh impetus by, the emancipation of the serfs, and remaining in progress to the present day."

FORCES OF WORLD REVOLUTION

An entirely new factor, possessing the dynamic energy which Lenin imparted to it by dialectical materialism has now been superimposed on Kluchevsky's summation of Russian national history. The evangel of world revolution and the specific instruments to achieve it, whether in the form of the Third International or the Cominform are commonly ignored by those who seek to justify Soviet conduct. They keep referring to certain old grievances, such as her landlocked isolation, her legitimate striving to acquire warm-water ports, the ignoring of her existence at Versailles, the refusal to accord diplomatic recognition during so many years, and her exclusion from the powers which met at Munich, although the latter should now be cause for gratitude and not a stigma.

Soviet Russia was predestined to bellicosity from the very moment Lenin turned the successful domestic revolution of 1917 into an organized Marxist revolution on a world scale. And each decade as it passes will add to her manpower. Her population trend and fertility rate indicate an increase which should bring her population to something over 250,000,000 by the year 1970, whereas the rest of all Europe combined will probably not exceed 400,000,000. And if we consider the population of newly acquired territories, the Soviet total should reach 270,000,000. This is not to include non-Russian satellite countries of Europe, Manchuria, Mongolia, and China, in all of which fertility is high.

Since population is one of the important components of military power, these new acquisitions will progressively encourage the Politburo to more frequent use of its favorite weapon—aggression by proxy.

CONTROL OF RIMLANDS

Return now to the northern perimeter of Eurasia and continue along Soviet Russia's Arctic coasts with a geopolitical eye. She is dominant there, and has no contestant in those icy solitudes. She already claims approximately 50 percent of all offshore territory lying within the Arctic Circle, including such potential landing fields as Novaya Zemlya, Wrangel Island, Franz Josef Land, and the new Siberian group. Rounding the eastern shoulder of Siberia as it projects into the Bering Strait you will note that she possesses not only Kamchata, Sakhalin, the Kurile and Komandorskie Islands, exercises control over North Korea and still controls the important harbors of Port Arthur and Dairen, both of them strategic ports of China. The encirclement of East Asia, by control of its rimlands, is nearly complete.

These developments underscore a cardinal point in the program of world revolution; Communist strategists have always maintained that the way China goes furnishes the key to all problems on the international front. The general headquarters for the forthcoming struggle for Asia is believed to be located in Thailand, where Soviet personnel in Bangkok is reported to be enormously in excess of any legitimate diplomatic need. From the Pacific, then, to the iron curtain on the west, she will be in a position to mount an outer ring of offensive and defensive installations around her heartland, particularly in marginal regions adapted to land-based air power.

If her efforts to secure a base in Tripolitania, the western half of Libya, had not been refused in the United Nations, she would have gained a coveted foothold in the Mediterranean basin. That great inland sea, if ever dominated by Soviet influence, would prove of inestimable strategic value in sealing the outer rim of protective areas, providing at the same time a sea route to western Europe and the Atlantic world. That is why Tito's rebellion particularly enrages the Moscow geopoliticians.

LOOK TOWARD INDIA

The invasion of Tibet in early November 1950 by Communist troops from China reveals two constant factors in Soviet strategy. The geographical position of that hitherto inaccessible region makes it a strategic, though difficult, passageway for a military advance on India, provided suitable airfields can be located somewhere among its towering mountains. Reports are already current that locations for the first potential air bases have been surveyed by Russian agents on a flat plain in western Tibet between Lake Rakas and Lake Manasarowar. This would bring Soviet striking power dangerously near the heart of India. New Delhi, the capital, lies approximately 300 miles to the southwest, an easy two-way run for Soviet bombers through negotiable passes of the Himalayas.

To meet the requirements of political strategy, the planners of the aggression invoked their usual pretext. They welcomed the existence of a rival Dalai Lama—another claimant to the position of ruler and high priest—who was living in exile in China. By supporting the claims of a second living Buddha of mercy against the actual incumbent, the Communist politburo of China staged another "liberation." They activated the familiar pattern of a civil war to be instigated by Communists and utilized by the Soviet Union for hidden intervention. The device is an old one and was employed in Greece, China, and Korea. It was tried in Finland, where a Communist regime was first installed under Kusenin as prelude to the invasion of 1939. The erection of a puppet state usually follows and the iron curtain falls. Then, to preclude assistance from outside powers, the Communist legalists invoke international law as forbidding foreign intervention in a purely civil war.

This concept was introduced into the Soviet argument against the United Nations resolution to come to assistance of South Korea. It makes both the United Nations and the United States of America not only iniquitous warmongers, but actual aggressors by unilateral, legal definition. Since, according to Mr. Vishinsky and all Communist jurists, the Soviet concept of law is the only valid interpretation of legality in any situation, the invasion of Tibet, like that of South Korea, became an act of moral heroism and dialectical purity.

There may well be other considerations arising from the historical development of Tibetan autonomy. China, to be sure, has never officially acknowledged the separation of that remote province from her sovereignty, although for a long time Tibet has acted independently. The significant fact for humanity is the steady advance of the Communist World Revolution into another area of Asia and the establishment of new outposts in what has been called the roof of the world.

EYES ON WEST

This geographical pattern would seem to extend itself to other significant spots much nearer the Western World, where forward bases would be indispensable for logistical preparation of the eventuality prophesied so unequivocally by Mr. Stalin: "* * * a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable." Two other Soviet maneuvers acquire special geopolitical meaning when related to this persuasion of inevitability, and when integrated with the concrete position already taken by Soviet strategists and diplomats.

In December of 1946, Ecuador was requested to grant fishing rights to the Soviet Union in the waters adjacent to the Galapagos Islands, a highly strategic area off the west coast of South America approximately 1,000 miles from the Panama Canal. The distance could easily be covered in 4 hours by hostile war planes launched from the deck of a properly camouflaged fishing bark. One bomb would be enough to cripple the locks and sever one of the vital defense lines of the two Americas. Then, in January 1947 Norway was presented with a Soviet demand for bases on Spitsbergen, the ice-covered group of Arctic Islands, 3,500 miles from New York, Chicago, and the industrial heart of the United States. Modern bombers, with a 5,000 mile one-way cruising range from Spitsbergen, could reach not only industrial centers represented by Detroit and Pittsburgh, but penetrate deep into continental America. Should the Communist Empire ever advance as far as the English Channel on one side of the world and eventually dominate the full coastline of China and its pendants on the other, the position of the United States would indeed be perilous. North America would become in effect a huge island flanked east and west by a great power which hates us.

UNITED STATES ULTIMATE TARGET

The Russian Revolution, now at the very zenith of its accomplishments, is on the march from Berlin to Korea. Eight nations have had their freedom burned to ashes already. The United States will be the ultimate target with the richest booty in the world piled on the scales of the balance. The final confrontation has come and the first American blood has been shed. The two central figures whose emergence Stalin predicted sit facing each other across conference tables which stretch from the Kremlin to the English Channel, from Brussels and Berlin and Paris to New York and Washington. The unprecedented character and stark realism of the conflict became evident when the President of the United States could bluntly declare last year that he could no longer put faith or credence in any promise made by Soviet Russia.

In normal times such a statement from the head of a government would have meant instant rupture of diplomatic relations and a probable full mobilization for war on both sides. But we are not engaged in conventional diplomacy under accepted standards of international decency such as prevailed at Vienna in 1815, after the Napoleonic wars. We are embarked on a kind of cosmic poker game for the highest stakes in history. Some there are who believe one of the players has been prologuing a colossal bluff which began at Yalta and Tehran and which succeeded notably against the leading player on the opposite side, who was then in failing health. The Government of the United States finally decided to call for a show-down on the Korean crisis—and was supported by the United Nations. Had both done so earlier, the odds in favor of true peace in Europe and Asia would have been far more favorable and Soviet Russia would not have had the gains that began with the desertion of Poland by her former allies. On the issue, when the cards eventually fall, may well depend the quality and quantity of human freedom for generations to come.

WHAT ALTERNATIVE?

The record is clear and the designs of Soviet Russia were never unclear. Her gamble in Korea was logical perfidy. Edmund Burke in 1772 warned Europe that the partition of Poland by Prussia, Austria, and Russia would not be the end of the feasting. It was, he pointed out, only a breakfast for the great armed powers; but where would they dine? He knew that neither history nor appetite for power ever stops short.

The true question before the American people and before their Representatives in Congress is not so much the cost in dollars, though heavy, but the alternative possibilities. There is need of complete thinking at this point, not spurts of enthusiasm, of volatile sentiment, or unfounded fears, or programs for the partial containment of Soviet aggression. The cost of a needed commodity or of an essential service is not truly stated by the price tag but by the foreseeable consequences if it is not bought.

A fire extinguisher for a modest home or a sprinkler system for an industrial establishment may seem expensive in terms of the present income of the respective buyers; it can be immeasurably more expensive, possibly fatal, not to have them on hand and in working condition when a fire breaks out. If the grim record of the past 5 years of Soviet-American relations has achieved anything, it has clarified the cold war down to a basic consideration. The debate is not whether we can afford to do the necessary things for the defense of Christian civilization, but can we afford not to do them.

Big Hugh, the Father of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a book entitled "Big Hugh, the Father of Soil Conservation," written by Wellington Brink

with a preface by Louis Bromfield. I have not had an opportunity to read the book. I shall do so right away. I do want to say a word concerning Dr. Hugh Bennett, the subject of this book. Dr. Bennett is well known throughout the Nation. Many of us have had the great privilege to have known Dr. Bennett a long time personally. I met Dr. Bennett soon after I came to Congress 14 years ago and I have been with him on many occasions since that time. I have had an opportunity to observe his work and I think I know something of how he is regarded in the Nation. I consider Dr. Bennett not only the foremost man in soil conservation in the Nation, but I think he ranks among the very top men in the Nation in ability and achievement. As a man, he is a lovable character. He is a pioneer in his field. I am confident that the work which he has accomplished and the plans which he has launched to conserve the soils will forever remain the basic principles for our thinking and action in this most important field of endeavor in our Nation. The good which Dr. Bennett has done cannot be estimated. He has gone far toward turning this Nation around from a wasteful course to one of conservation of our land and natural resources. The United States is fortunate to have had a man of the energy, the foresight, and the practical common sense possessed by this outstanding public servant. The Nation owes to him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that tens of thousands of people all over the Nation will be able to read this book concerning Dr. Bennett. The preface to the book, by Louis Bromfield, is so well written and gives such an accurate picture of Dr. Bennett that I think it would be well to include this in my remarks. I so request. The above-mentioned follows:

PREFACE

A good many years ago while in the midst of the wasted cotton lands of Georgia I met a big hearty man named Hugh Bennett. I knew what his job was. At that time and today I think the biggest problems of this country and the world are food and the conservation of natural resources and real wealth. I had seen nation after nation in every part of the world reduced to poverty and virtual starvation by the very process which had been taking place in the United States since the first soil was dug up by the white man. Here, tramping about on the barren, eroded red soil of a Georgia cotton field, was the man who was doing something about the disaster.

The important thing was that he was getting the job done and getting it done largely through the force, vigor, and intelligence of his own personality. Within 5 minutes I knew that I was in the presence of a great man and a man to whom this Nation and the whole world owed a very great debt. Like all great men, he was simple and direct, with no time for shiftiness or pomposity. The farmer liked him, the average citizen liked him, the scientists recognized in him that most needed of all forces—the one which translates research and knowledge into action and achieves results.

In the many years which have intervened since that first meeting Hugh Bennett became one of my best friends. We have talked from the same platform many times and have traveled hundreds, perhaps thousands, of miles across country over back roads, past fields where in summer you could look through the sides of a house and see the wasting gullies on the other side. I know him as well as I know any man alive and there is no man whom I respect and admire so much. I think this is because he has the old American virtues of integrity, simplicity, directness, and honor—virtues which are not too plentiful in these times or are, at least, obscured by the age in which we live.

In those same years I have traveled on an average fifty to sixty thousand miles a year mostly helping to fight the battle which Hugh Bennett started and organized for conservation of our natural resources and for a better agriculture which could stand on its own feet and contribute to the wealth and welfare and health of the Nation rather than simply devour its economy. And in all that traveling I have seen something miraculous happening. I have seen, perhaps for the first time in history, a whole Nation turning to right a wrong, to check an evil, before it was forced to do so by utter disaster. I doubt that this could have been accomplished without the leadership and wisdom of Hugh Bennett. Certainly without him the progress would have been infinitely slower.

It has not been an easy fight. There were and still are many enemies and many fools and many small men whose jealousies loomed larger than their interest in the Nation's welfare. Because we spend two to three billions a year in attempting to aid and educate the farmer, it is assumed by the average citizen that we have, and had, in this country a sound agriculture. Few errors of public thinking could be greater. In the past, particularly in the single-crop corn, cotton, and tobacco areas, we had one of the worst agricultures ever practiced by man and much of our agriculture is still upon that level. Except for the isolated "good" farmer, we practiced in the past a system of tillage which could certainly not be dignified by the word "agriculture" and could, indeed, scarcely have been called "farming." This fact has cost the Nation billions of dollars in real wealth and the individual citizens billions in high prices and in taxes, and industry billions in purchasing power.

Conditions fortunately have begun to change and every year there are more good farmers, and more bad farmers are economically liquidated regardless of subsidies, parity guaranties, and Government support buying. Eventually out of grim economic necessity the level of our agriculture will be raised and we shall have lower costs for consumers and higher profits for the farmer arising out of high and efficient production and the arresting of destruction by erosion and flood.

The progress already made is astonishing to any veteran in conservation and much of the progress can be credited to Hugh Bennett, who dramatized the situation, formulated the pattern of its cure, and then pressed forward to translate theory into action.

Every year there are more contoured and terraced farms; every year there are more grass and legumes planted; every year more sensible and effective crop rotations come into operation; and every acre properly treated can be measured in benefits to every citizen of the United States.

The battle has not been an easy one and in the field of erosion and floods Hugh Bennett has been in the bruised and bloody vanguard, fighting to get knowledge to the farmer—fighting, sometimes desperately, for appropriations from Congressmen who were willing to vote hundreds of millions in log-rolling, pork-barrel operations but grew penny-wise when it came to spending money for the benefit of the whole country instead of some single small area.

The word "bureaucrat" has come to be a term of opprobrium in the last generation and less. It is the story of a good word gone wrong, and perhaps we need another word to designate those good servants of the Government who work devotedly at low salaries for the welfare of all of us. Such men, in so vast and disorganized a Government as our own, are still in the minority. They deserve a fine and noble word to designate them—to distinguish them from the parasites and the meddlers. Perhaps "public servant" is the expression needed. There are many of them in the fields of research and action, of constructive public undertaking, who do not depend upon politics to provide them with jobs, but upon their own character and abilities and the contribution they can make to the good of all of us in terms of intelligence, integrity, and human dignity.

Such a man is Hugh Bennett, who deserves the greatest honor from the American people as one of the greatest benefactors since the beginning of their history.

LOUIS BROMFIELD.

Lustron Housing Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT SUTTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, a few evenings ago I sat in front of a television and observed and listened to what I considered one of the strongest and most conscientious appeals for unity and cooperation among the citizens of America that I have ever heard. I refer to the very strong and able speech delivered by the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, who at the present time probably possesses more administrative power than any man in the United States, with the exception of the President. As we all know, he is the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. I respect Charlie Wilson and, having recently discussed matters with him on different occasions, I know that he is a man of sincerity and with devout respect for this Nation. His loyalty is unquestioned. He beams his love for America, the country that has been so good to him during the years that he has achieved such a remarkable financial success. I was intensely interested with what Administrator Wilson had to say with reference to the reaction that our railroad strike would have among our enemies.

I agree with every word that Charlie Wilson had to say, and sincerely hope and believe that his almost prayerful pleading will be heeded by the railroad men and that soon our transportation will be again up to par.

However, I could not help but wonder what caused such discontentment, disgruntlement, and unhappiness among the working classes of the American people. I refer to those of us in the lower-income bracket, and with prices so high as they are nowadays, that bracket embraces a very large percentage of our American citizens.

We in the Congress realize that taxes must be asseed in order to build up our defenses and, frankly, it is apparent that we in the lower income brackets are going to bear the brunt of the burden. So, hence, it should be easily understood why there is so much resentment and so much

bitter criticism of certain of our administrators in the Government who would absolutely destroy and throw away one of the finest manufacturing establishments that has ever been produced with taxpayers' money. I refer to the Lustron Housing Corp., near Columbus, Ohio. Such actions are what cause discontentment among those of us who have not been blessed financially to the extent that we can own a $50,000 home and live in luxuries and on the fat of the land.

The very same pleadings and the very same arguments that were so ably spoken by Director Wilson on last evening, apply in the case of the closing of the Lustron plant, only on a smaller scale. Thousands of workmen lost their jobs when the plant was closed, and many thousands of would-be home owners were denied the luxuries that only Lustron houses provide, in that particular price range.

Regardless of whether certain administrators' wishes are carried out or not, regardless of how much they detest reversing their former opinions, and regardless of how determined certain plutocrats may be, to have their way, or shylocks may be in their lust for gold, the wishes of the masses and taxpaying American public must be observed if this democracy is to continue to survive.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that, in my opinion, there are administrative officers in this Government who have absolutely no feeling or respect for a very large majority of the working people of this Nation. They are selfish to the core, and unless those in authority rid this Nation of that type of administrator, we will be paying through the nose when Gabriel blows his horn.

The history of the Lustron Corp. reads like a novel. At the close of World War II, the Navy made available to Lustron their present quarters, which are a part of the old Curtiss-Wright bomber factory. The site on which the Lustron plant is situated covers 210 acres of land. The Lustron plant embraces approximately 23 acres. I am advised that the North American Aviation Co. has been leased the remaining portion of the manufacturing establishment for the purpose of constructing airplanes.

Now it develops that the North American Aviation Co., is in need of space for modification and assembly centers. I have been untiring in my efforts to find out just how much additional space that the North American Aviation Co. needs for assembly and modification and have been given figures all the way from 200,000 to 1,000,000 square feet. There are more than 150 idle acres adjacent and contiguous to the North American plant and for the life of me I have not been able to ascertain why that any man who has attained sufficient success in life to be an administrator in the world's greatest Government and be in charge of the expenditure of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, would recommend the destruction of $55,000,000 worth of property in order to utilize a million feet of warehouse space.

Now here are the facts: The citizens and taxpayers of America loaned the Lustron Housing Corp. $37,500,000, $36,500,000 of which is unpaid and all outstanding obligation due the United States Government. The Lustron plant is now equipped with $15,500,000 worth of the most modern prefabricated housing machinery known to the engineers of America. In order to junk the $15,500,000 worth of machinery and remodel the building to suit the North American Aviation Co. for airplane assembly and modification uses, the Government must further expend some $2,500,000 to $3,000,000. Thus, the $36,500,000 loan to Lustron, plus the $15,500,000, the value of the equipment, plus $3,000,000 for remodeling of the building, equals a total of $55,000,000 initial losses that the Government incurs if we are to use the Lustron plant for airplane-assembly purposes.

Mr. Speaker, what manner of a brainstorm could any administrator be having when he would make a recommendation that would cost the American taxpayers $55,000,000, when he could just as easily expend not more than $6,000,000 at a maximum and get the type of assembly plant, according to specific specifications, and save the Lustron Corp. for the purposes for which it was originally constructed, namely, the building of houses that we so direly need?

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why that after weeks of investigation I am so definitely certain that the Lustron Corp. should be in full operation.

The method of construction and design used by the Lustron Corp. makes it possible to construct many types and sizes of buildings needed in our defense program. I refer to barracks, warehouses, hospitals, and field quarters, all of which are fireproof, acid resistant, rust proof, portable, clean, and healthful structures which require no paint and which may be cleaned by washing with soap and water, just like we scrub our ice boxes. They contain no refuge for vermin, insects, bedbugs, or disease germs. They are practically hermetically sealed, and thus are ideal for storing perishable items, explosives and ammunition or other materials that must be protected from fire or weather conditions as well as rodents and any other destructive element.

This is not speculation, as close to 3,000 homes were built and sold during the productive lifetime of the Lustron plant. For the past several weeks, I have been amazed at the testimonials received from the owners and occupants of Lustron houses. Everyone, without a single exception, with whom I have discussed this house have spoken in glowing terms.

Our best example of the value of this product for defense purposes is the fact that at the present time there are 60-odd houses in use at our marine base at Quantico, Va. In my remarks before this House on January 12, 1951, I inserted a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which appears on page 194, from Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps, and who is at the present time in charge of our gallant marines who have always and are now giving such a wonderful account of themselves in the fighting over in Korea. The general was lavish in his praise of the Lustron house. It is true that General Shepherd is detained in Korea, on a very important mission, and cannot appear and speak in person, but in his absence, I am happy to refer anyone who is interested in Lustron housing to Commander Davis, who is now the Public Works Officer at the said marine reservation at Quantico, Va. Commander Davis is proud of the Lustron house at Quantico and speaks in no uncertain terms of their value and regards them as probably the most satisfactory houses that we have on the base.

It is a known fact that it is a policy of this Government to spare no reasonable expenditure in research. I understand that the research that was made in connection with the machinery that has been installed in the Lustron plant was complete in every detail and that one of the finest engineers that this country has produced employed some of the best engineering minds in the Nation to work out a complete and satisfactory blueprint of what is now a reality. It is nothing short of stupidity or collusion on the part of administrators or competitors that would even dare to recommend that the Nation be denied the benefit of the information obtained in the expenditure of millions of dollars in this research.

Another thing in which we should be very definitely interested is the conservation of our natural resources. Lustron fits into this picture so far as coal, wood, and oil are concerned, because of the type of construction of the Lustron house. I am advised that considerable savings has been proved in heating these houses. When we take into consideration that oil, coal, and gas are in great demand, we must not overlook the fact that we can perfect material savings of these materials by utilizing the Lustron house.

One of the crucial problems facing this Government today is the question of manpower. The military is parading daily from the Pentagon to the congressional committees screaming their heads off for the Congress to give them permission to draft our 18-year-olds.

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, this is a serious matter. I know something of the hardships that are suffered by our fighting men and, in my opinion, a battle front is no place for our 18-year-olds.

Of course, it is necessary to use a large portion of our military manpower behind the lines, many of our men are utilized by the Engineering Corps in construction work. When we are so badly in need of housing, naturally it requires a large corps of men for this particular work. By reactivating the Lustron Corp. and permitting them to furnish their capacity of houses for our defense program, we can save four out of every five men for house construction purposes that we are using today. That is, after the house is delivered to the site or on the field where it is to be erected. Just think, 80 percent of manpower savings, men who are classed in the IV-F, can erect houses and

thus permit those of us who are in physical condition to do the fighting, but yet, apparently certain administrators in this democratic Government of ours care little for the hardships and the sorrows that they are forcing the mothers of this Nation to bear.

Another angle to be considered, and the one which is probably the most important to the future of this Nation, is the question of health. I understand that the Mayo brothers, who we all recognize as some of the world's finest physicians, have recommended on more than one occasion to sufferers of the dreaded disease known as asthma, that they live in a Lustron house. Insofar as I am concerned, if we have a product that can be manufactured at the proven reasonable figure of the Lustron house that will cure or relieve the sufferers of asthma, our expenditures for research are not in vain, and the cost was cheap at any price.

Furthermore, housing is one of the fields in which America has not progressed as fast as in numerous other undertakings. By that I mean that we now have many of our conventional houses constructed along the specific lines of our homes of 500 years ago. They are vulnerable to termites; they must be constantly repaired; they have joints, nicks, corners, and crevices; they harbor filth, vermin, cockroaches, water bugs, bedbugs, and insects of various kinds—all of which are carriers of disease and affect the very health and happiness of our people.

I recall that not so long ago some of the outstanding magazines of our country carried numerous pictures of living conditions in Spain and in various other foreign countries. The pictures were of the slum areas, showing the destruction caused by vermin, rats, and the filthy conditions under which some human beings were forced to live. Why, Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any reason why it is necessary that the photographers journey to foreign lands to procure pictures of such filth-infested slum areas when it has been to my extreme sorrow to walk not more than half a mile from the dome of this Capitol and observe Americans living under conditions just as bad, if not worse, than those described in France, England, and Spain, or any other country on the face of the globe; and yet we are offering to destroy the only plant that the engineers of this country have ever developed, after the expenditure of millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds, that is capable of constructing 100 prefabricated houses each day that are just about as sanitary as can be designed. They require no paint; they have no nicks and corners in which vermin can live; they are acid-resistant, will not absorb moisture, and, according to actual tests, are warmer in the wintertime and cooler in the summer, and can be procured at a savings in the United States of some $6,000 per unit over conventional houses, and from $14,000 up in savings outside of the continental United States.

Another thing in which we should be vitally interested when we consider purchasing a house is its resistance to fire. Hardly a day passes that we do not notice in the press such horrible happenings as persons, mostly the aged and infirm or little children, being burned to death when their homes are destroyed by fire. I have seen all kinds of bloodcurdling deaths, but for the life of me I cannot conceive of any more horrible way to die than to be burned to death. I am advised that the underwriters gave the Lustron house as low insurance rates as has ever been given on any structure in this country—the same rate as that given to completely concrete and steel houses. I know that we cannot overlook such improvements in the safety field.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many reasons why the Lustron plant should be in full production, operating three shifts, that there was bound to be skulduggery, inside maneuvering, competitive jealousy, and persons seeking hand-outs before a plant like Lustron could be ordered closed by sensible men.

The members of our legal profession tell me that it is not unusual that circumstantial evidence is much stronger than real evidence. Therefore, I would like to review a little of the evidence that has been uncovered concerning the Lustron loan and its subsequent closing or attempted foreclosure.

Whether or not the loan should have been originally made is no longer pertinent. The picture is just this. The loan was made. The money has been expended, the plant is completely equipped, ready for production; in fact, production of some 3,000 houses was accomplished and 8,000 orders were on hand at the time the plant was closed; in fact, the fires in the furnace are still lighted. Now that is the picture.

While Lustron was in operation, this financial genius, who has been identified to us as Merl Young, appeared on the scene. At the request of RFC officials Merl was placed upon the Lustron payroll at $12,000 a year. Later, at the request of an official of the RFC to the president of the Lustron Corp., his salary was raised to $18,000 a year, provided the increase was approved by the RFC Board in writing. That approval was given. It later developed that at the same time this financial wizard was drawing $10,000 a year from a firm headed by one Rex Jacobs.

A few months before Lustron was closed, Merl Young and others notified the officials of the Lustron Corp. that they were sending an engineer to inspect the Lustron plant. It turns out that the engineer was none other than one of Merl Young's employers and one of his old cronies, Rex Jacobs, with whom Merl often fraternized, and lolled in the Florida sunshine while visiting with Jacobs in his mansion down in the sunshine State of Florida.

According to the press, Merl Young originally was a messenger in the Government service, making $1,080 a year. At one time Merl resided at Greenbelt, Md., and, by the way, he had a brother who likewise resided at Greenbelt. His name is Herchel. Now I understand from reliable sources that all of a sudden, Merl came into the money. Then Herchel moved to swanky East Braddock Lane, Chevy Chase, Md., in a fine home which he reputedly purchased and later he opened an office in the Statler Hotel and claimed to be an industrial consultant. I understand further that Merl had another brother named Gene, who was induced to Washington from Dallas, Tex., and was likewise in some way connected with Rex Jacobs for some 7 months. Now I understand that Gene is holding one of the top jobs in the Government. According to Merl's own statement, his income many months ago was $60,000 a year.

This morning a person came to see me and asked that I endeavor to get the Government to investigate what he had understood to be a loan or a prospective loan to some furrier, and that according to his advice, that Mrs. Merl Young, who by the way is one of the confidential secretaries in the White House, was wearing a beautiful white mink or ermine coat, that he understood was a part of Merl's fee for interceding with the RFC.

Mr. Speaker, we know for a fact that many of these charges are true, and it goes without saying, that where there is smoke there is bound to be fire. Now after I appeared before this house on the 12th day of January, and made certain accusations, that have already been completely confirmed by the report that was recently submitted by the subcommittee investigating the RFC, I had a call from a White House confidant who came by to see me to ascertain whether or not I would confer personally with Merl Young. I told him that I would be happy to talk with anyone regarding any matter that could be helpful in my duties as a Representative in the Congress. Thereupon, Merl Young came to see me the next day. I had a very lengthy conference with Mr. Young, and he denied that he was ever on Rex Jacob's payroll. A few days thereafter, another former RFC employee appeared on the scene. I refer to the Honorable James Windham, who I understand is at the present time the secretary and treasurer of the F. L. Jacobs Manufacturing Co. of which Rex Jacobs is the president.

In my conversation with Mr. Windham, I learned that he was a former employee of the RFC, in fact being the Administrative Assistant to the Director of the Corporation at the time that Rex Jacobs procured a $3,000,000 loan from the RFC. Shortly after the loan was made, Mr. Windham joined the Jacobs firm and certainly he should know who was on their payrolls. I asked him—Mr. Windham—if Merl Young was ever on their rolls. His answer was "Yes." Then I heard that Mr. Windham had been visiting the Lustron plant.

Mr. Jacobs visited the Lustron plant and he had barely entered the office when a long-distance telephone call was received by the president of the Lustron Corp. from Washington inquiring if Mr. Jacobs had arrived. The president of the Lustron Corp. was prompted to talk to Jacobs freely and to show the said Jacobs through the Lustron plant. When his inspection tour was over Mr. Jacobs suggested that, although he was perfecting a sale for his washing-machine business, that he had made arrangements for the purchaser thereof to furnish the washing machines that were to be installed in Lustron houses and that Merl Young would receive $15 apiece for each machine installed. Thus, if Lustron had been permitted to operate around the clock, they would have produced a minimum of 100 houses a day, which would have produced an additional income of $375,000 annually for the financier Merl Young. Not bad, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the Congress. I am reminded of the story of from "rags to riches." What a clique. Young, Young, Windham, Jacobs, administrators in the Government of the highest influence, Hunt, Robert Hagarty, et al.

In the renegotiation section of the Department of Justice Jacobs is a familiar name. At the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Jacobs is a most familiar name. Some of the courts of this Nation are thoroughly cognizant of the name of Jacobs. The F. L. Jacobs Co., of whom Rex Jacobs is the president, according to reliable information, was forced by the Department of Justice to renegotiate with the Government and repay many millions of dollars in excess profits growing out of contracts given to the said Jacobs Co. to produce necessities and munitions of war during World War II. I believe that I am right in saying that the case was so strong that when the Department of Justice appealed to the courts that Jacobs refused to contest their claims and voluntarily paid some $15,000,000 in excess profits.

If this is not the exact figure, it is in the neighborhood of right, because my informer is none other than James Windham, the former administrative assistant of the Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but at the present time the secretary and treasurer of the F. L. Jacobs Co.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of this Congress, if the administrators of this Government who are in charge of letting contracts under our present defense program are not required to stay on the alert in dealing with such concerns as the F. L. Jacobs Co., history is bound to repeat itself.

Oh, yes: now I am reminded of the proposal that Lustron stock be vested in a substantial part in the hands of Merl Young, Robert Hagarty, and Ed Hunt. Hagarty was later found to be a business associate of Merl Young and his brother Herchel, and Hunt was identified as an associate of Rex Jacobs. They proposed that enough stock be sold to these men to offset the 86,000 shares owned by the Lustron president at 1 percent per share or $860 for an equal number of shares. This proposition was turned down and Rex Jacobs was flatly refused in his suggestion that the Lustron Corp. use his washing machines in order that Merl Young could collect an additional $375,000 yearly.

Unfavorable publicity concerning the Lustron Corp. began to trickle out of the RFC. It was not long thereafter until they were set for the kill. Then the attempted foreclosure.

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, these are the simple facts of the case, and I am perfectly willing for the taxpaying public of America to be the jury and I will be contented with their verdict. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the many reasons that have heretofore been set out, why America needs Lustron, I want to call your attention to what 1 year's savings will buy in the way of munitions for war; 250 medium tanks; 250 jet-fighter planes; 10 aircraft carriers of the *Midway* class; 20 bombers; 10 modern subs; and 25 anti-aircraft guns.

Scarcity of steel is now a legitimate reason for refusing to reactivate this plant. Recently Administrator William Henry Harrison, head of the Defense Production Administration, and I had an extended conversation with regard to the subject of steel. At the time, he advised me that lumber was more of a problem than steel, and that we had more of a shortage of timber than of steel. The general stated further that so far as the material was concerned, that he could make out our case. So I assume that the general is the last word upon the production of the respective commodities, and fully aware of what is available. To say the least, it is like I stated before this House yesterday, the Lustron Corp. would use 80,000 tons less steel each year than we are now utilizing in the manufacture of beer cans. Lustron has become a matter of grave concern to the people of this Nation and I sincerely hope that the Members of Congress will rise up in their wrath, and defy any administrative officer of this Government to salvage and destroy the efforts of thousands of technical engineers and deny our defense agencies and citizens the benefit of this house.

Mr. Speaker, I have refrained from calling too many names, as it is not my nature to be jealous of or to harm anyone. Honesty and fair play is all that I demand, but I hope that by my refusal to accurately describe many persons who are as deep in the muck as the ones who have been named are in the mire will not be taken adversely. I trust that it will not be necessary for me to complete this "financeer" family tree through affinity, "consinquinity," or "goldinity" and specifically name and trace the maneuvers of the other members of this "almighty dollar fraternity."

If the American people are denied the progress that they have so dearly paid for in developing the Lustron house, during the weeks to come I assure you that the entire country will learn and realize that up until now the half has never been told.

February Anniversaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, February, our month of heroes, is again upon us. During the next few days our people will celebrate, each in his own way, the red-letter dates upon the calendar which mark again the anniversaries of the birth of two of our greatest national heroes: George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Here were two men who were ever willing servants of liberty; ever the guardians of national honor. The days in which they lived, served, and died were fraught with tragedy, but with the held of divine guidance they were able to not only rise above the turmoil of their times but above the horizon of history as well.

But there are other and darker anniversaries this month. There are February dates which are inscribed in our contemporary history in blood and are tragic in no less degree than were those through which Washington and Lincoln, each in his turn, bore the burden of sorrow. These, too, are dates which freemen should keep in their minds and hearts as we seek again to stem the onrush of tyranny and the oppression of tyrants. Many peoples, once proud and free, today stagger and groan under the merciless shackles of a servitude no less real to them because it is remote from us. These are the speechless and these are the human beings from whose shoulders has been stripped ruthlessly the mantle of human dignity. These are the slaves and the blood brothers of the millions who have gone to paradise graves under the lash of brutal masters whose lust for power drives them to their own eventual destruction. But for this moment the power mad wield the whip of absolute authority without thought of God, man, or constitutional governments. Judgment day is a long distance along the road of eternity, and to be hopeless, as many are, is to suffer a cancer of the soul. Little wonder, then, that men, women, and children of a dozen nations see no hope in the morning light and no promise in the sunset.

But we who are free can and should reaffirm that the prisoners of brute force are not without friends and not without a real and sincere pledge of succor in this hour of desperate need, for without hope the human soul is already half enslaved. We Americans are slow to anger and loath to violence, but once aroused we become a power and a fury in the defense of human liberty and the precepts of common international decency. We do not feel that because a brigand escapes with his loot, that he is forever free of judgment, nor that the murderer goes scot free because he escapes the dragnet in the first few hours after his crime. Neither do we believe that the welding of manacles on weaker hands means eternal slavery.

There is no desert so arid that tortured liberty cannot quench its thirst. There is no heaven so high and no ocean so deep that the soul of liberty can be deprived of its breath. The spirit of human liberty is far beyond the reach of a lash or the scalpel in the hand of the most able surgeon. It leaves the mortal frame when life itself departs, but until that instant it is the most elusive element in the entire spectrum of human emotions.

Thirty-three years ago today the Lithuanian nation came into being. February 16 is a date that will mock those Lithuanians who today are in bondage. February 6 is an infamous date on the calendars of the liberty-loving Polish people, for it was on that date that the vulture of Yalta cast its shadow over Warsaw. Our concern and our shame must be the part that this Nation played in the tragedy of Poland. That the Yalta agreement was never ratified by the representatives of the American people in no way diminishes the ravages and the terror which followed the implementation of our national policy at that time. Thus it is that we have a moral responsibility to insure that freedom shall again flower wherever a Pole places his foot. We have an even greater responsibility to ourselves and to those who follow us in our cherished tradition of American liberty.

If the millions of citizens of this great Nation could speak to the enslaved today they would say: "Be of good cheer and let hope be the star upon which your eyes rest. Keep liberty and the love of liberty the silent password on your lips and in your hearts. The free world is not the decadent creature depicted by your captors, but in its every manifestation it is a virile and living thing. We cannot in this moment commune together, but in spirit we stand beside you. As we increase our strength to meet the great test that appears with every passing day to be the more inevitable, we look to you as allies and as friends. Freedom will come again to the Poles, to the Lithuanians, to the Estonians, and to all of the others who place their faith in a divine being and an ordered world."

Mr. Speaker, there has been introduced into the Congress legislation to empower the Department of Defense to utilize the willing hands of those abroad who want to strike a blow for their own ideals and their national traditions. The bill would permit enlistments in the United States Army of aliens who are qualified to bear arms; bear arms not in the defense of this country or of an ally, but in support of their own principles. Hundreds of thousands of aliens have good reason to hate Communists and communism. The more intelligent, the more sincere, the more enlightened the service of these men to their own democratic institutions and governments, the more violent the punishment meted out to them and to their loved ones on the fall of those governments. Individually, they represent haunted shadows, drifting through the free world, stateless and embittered, or worse yet, hounded slaves behind the iron curtain. United, these men could and would represent a force designed to exact just retribution from the common enemy of free men. Their services should be utilized and quickly. To those who say that we have never employed mercenary troops, I would answer only that the spirit of liberty and the desire for freedom, which burns alike in the soul of every human creature, has no knowledge and no need of mercenary troops. We seek allies in the great struggle ahead. We have at hand, anxious and willing to strike a blow in their own behalf, uncounted thousands of recruits who ask only the opportunity to fight back with something more lethal than a hand sickle or a hoe. Are we to give them their chance in the common cause?

I hope so, Mr. Speaker.

Prominent Internationalists Who Have the Same Objective as Joe Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on pages A607 and A608 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I showed how a powerful segment of the press and radio are diligently engaged in selling America down the river.

Today I am listing 33 prominent internationalists calling themselves the Committee on Present Danger, and the Crisis Committee, who are whooping it up to draft 18-year-olds, send an army and unlimited military supplies to Europe, and thereby hasten the day so fervently hoped for by Joe Stalin when we will have spent ourselves into bankruptcy.

This is the same gang who sold us the Marshall Plan on the promise that it would stop communism and furnish a market for our surplus production. Since then communism has spread over one-third of the globe and we now realize the Marshall plan was just a slick trick to force the American taxpayers to pay interest on foreign bonds held by international banker-racketeers of Wall Street and the London counting houses; and to tax free enterprise in the United States to build up socialistic-communistic regimes in Europe and Asia which are committed to the destruction of free enterprise everywhere.

What this committee of 33 advocates will accomplish from within could never be accomplished by any enemies from without.

Communist Russia is the greatest economic hoax in all history. The Balkans are seething with revolt, and Russia would fall apart from her own internal weaknesses if our enemies within and without would stop financing her.

It is time to think and talk and act American; and designate internationalists for what they are—potential traitors to the United States.

The real facts of the present situation are that the internationalists—deliberately, and the New Deal-Fair Deal—stupidly, have made such a mess of our economy that they must depend on war and the rumors of war to keep it going.

Unless the American people demand a return to sound monetary and fiscal policies in Government, they should stop complaining about high prices, high taxes, and the imminent danger that their sons be sent to fight more foreign wars; for in the last analysis, the American people have only themselves to blame for the kind of government they get.

The following article is from the Washington Times-Herald of February 8, 1951:

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS SOUGHT FOR LOBBYING BY INTERNATIONALISTS

A drive to raise an initial $100,000 to lobby for sending troops to Europe and for the drafting of 18-year-olds was launched last night by a group of citizens supporting interventionism of the Truman administration.

Telegrams were sent to business men throughout the Nation asking them to listen to a radio speech on the world crisis by James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, and then make contributions to the $100,000 lobby goal. Conant, at the age of 24, served as a lieutenant in the Sanitary Corps in World War I.

HEADQUARTERS HERE

The drive is being pushed by the Committee on the Present Danger, which has headquarters in Washington. The committee has 33 members, all prominent internationalists. Nineteen of the thirty-three members of this committee are also members of a crisis committee, which is pleading for unity behind Truman foreign policy.

Many of the 33 committee members served on the committee for the Marshall plan, which spent almost $150,000 lobbying the multi-billion dollar Marshall plan through Congress as the sure means of promoting peace. Many of the members of the Marshall plan committee profited handsomely from the spending under the Marshall aid program. They will also profit from spending under the defense program.

MEMBERS LISTED

The 33 members of the committee, by States, are:

Alabama, William D. Arant, lawyer; California, Dr. Robert G. Sproul, president of the University of California; Colorado, Dr. Robert L. Strearns, president, University of Colorado; District of Columbia, Dr. Vannevar Bush, president, Carnegie Institution of Washington, and John Lord O'Brian, formerly general counsel for War Production Board.

Illinois, Laird Bell, chairman, board of trustees, University of Chicago; Truman K. Gibson, Jr., lawyer and member of President's Commission on Universal Military Training, 1947; and Theodore W. Schultz, professor of economics, University of Chicago.

Kansas, Dr. William C. Menninger of the Menninger Foundation; Louisiana, Monte M. Lemann, lawyer; Maryland, William L. Marbury, lawyer.

Massachusetts, Dr. James Phinney Baxter III, president, Williams College; Dr. James B. Conant, president, Harvard University; Gen. Robert Cutler, president, Old Colony Trust Co.; and R. Ammi Cutter, lawyer.

Minnesota, Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc.; Missouri, Dr. Frederick A. Middlebush, president, University of Missouri; New Jersey, Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president, Princeton University.

ADLER ON COMMITTEE

New York, Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, general manager, New York Times; Frank Altschul, chairman of committee on international policy, National Planning Association; Lewis H. Brown, chairman of the board, Johns-Manville Corp.; Dr. Charles Dollard, president, Carnegie Corporation of New York; Gen. William J. Donovan, former Director of Office of Strategic Services; Edward S. Greenbaum, lawyer; Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War; Stanley Resor, chairman of the board, J. Walter Thompson Co.; Robert E. Sherwood, author and playwright; and Tracy S. Voorhees, former Under Secretary of the Army.

Pennsylvania, Howard C. Petersen, president, Fidelity Philadelphia Trust Co.; Rhode Island, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president, Brown University; Texas, Will L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State; Virginia, Miss Meta Glass, former president, Sweet Briar College; Washington, Dr. Raymond B. Allen, president, University of Washington.

URGES SUPPORT FOR IKE

In his radio speech, Conant said there is "a good chance" a third global war may be avoided if the free world becomes strong and united behind the Eisenhower mission. He urged troops for Europe and drafting 18-year-olds.

He expressed belief the catastrophe of world war III may be avoided "if Europe is made defensible and without delay."

Lives at Stake in the Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "Lives, Not Profits, At Stake." The article is by Constantine Brown, and deals with the current railroad strike. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, inasmuch as it is a very impressive one.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of February 6, 1951]

LIVES, NOT PROFITS, AT STAKE—RAIL STRIKE SORRY SPECTACLE TO FREE NATIONS; GIVES ENEMY PROPAGANDA AMMUNITION

(By Constantine Brown)

House-cleaning during a storm is difficult. But when the dirt under the rugs menaces the health of the family, the big broom must be used and the windows opened.

We are presenting a sorry spectacle today to the free nations of the world, whom we are supposed to lead in their struggle for survival against Communist imperialism. We are supposed to show a determination, through unity at home, to weather the Kremlin-raised hurricane. And what is the picture our allies and friends get from the United States?

Railroad men are on strike at a time when more than 100,000 American soldiers are fighting for their life in Korea.

The soldiers in Korea receive in the neighborhood of $100 a month. It is true that they also get board and lodging—the board represented by K rations and the lodging a foxhole in subzero weather. When they work only 18 hours a day they consider themselves lucky. Death and injury are the GIs' professional risks, and they get no workmen's compensation.

The strike is an inherent right of all workers. But a strike which affects men whose chances of survival depend largely on the arms and ammunition they receive from America, 7,000 miles away, is a crime, for it hits directly at those who are fighting for the preservation of American freedoms, which includes the right to strike.

The switchmen's strike not only has slowed the sending of military equipment to Korea, but it is also interfering with the production of desperately needed war materials. Strikes by railroad men, longshoremen, steel workers, and miners no longer interfere with profits, but menace the lives of the sons of the strikers themselves.

We pointed with scorn last year at the political strikes provoked by the Communists in Western Europe. We criticized them because they were jeopardizing the countries' chances of preparing themselves against the Russian threat. They now see the same thing happening in this country, when we are waging a full-fledged war against overwhelming odds. The strike is not caused by political subversion. It is merely the result of economic dissatisfaction of a group of men who, however just their demands may be, do not have to place the lives of American boys in jeopardy.

In the past we have adopted a holier-than-thou attitude toward the lack of financial integrity among some of the governments with which we are associated. The wrath of the administration and of many radio and newspaper commentators was directed against the venality of the Chiang Kai-shek regime. We wanted no part of it, because Chiang's relatives and many members of the Kuomintang had dipped their hands into public funds.

What do we see today at home? "Five percenters" offer their services to contractors and are able to obtain favors through their connections with high Government officials. Only last week the Fulbright committee made public an unsavory story of how persons high in the Government—including the White House—were able to influence loans made by the tax-supported Reconstruction Finance Corp.

How many similar instances exist today is not known. But there is an uneasy feeling in congressional quarters that the Fulbright committee has lifted only a corner of the rug under which much of Washington's daily dirt has been swept.

It is true that the country is still rich enough and the country, by and large, healthy enough that such peccadillos will not damage its fiber. But these disclosures give our enemies their best propaganda ammunition, and one which the Voice of America cannot offset.

Our Tragedy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in the January 31, 1951, edition of the Kansas City Times there appeared an editorial entitled "Our Tragedy in China."

This editorial points out two fundamental truths which stand out in bold relief despite all the controversy that might develop over the position of individuals who have the courage to tell the American people what has been happening in China during the past several years.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR TRAGEDY IN CHINA

At the Republican Party's Kansas Day celebration in Topeka Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, again developed his charge that a "crimson clique" in the State Department deliberately fostered the recent victory of communism on the Chinese mainland and so must be held directly accountable for the present fighting in Korea with its tragic cost in American lives.

The controversy which has raged over who specifically in the State Department was responsible for the formulation of our policy toward China, say between 1943 and 1949, and what their motives may have been—a controversy initially provoked by the extreme partisanship with which the Senator phrased his original indictment—should not be allowed to obscure two fundamental truths.

One is that our relations with China were grossly mishandled throughout the period in question. The other is that a whole series of evil consequences, of which the most conspicuous at the moment is the Korean conflict, has now resulted from our protracted blundering.

The basic facts are hardly open to dispute. Indeed, most of the factual material can readily be obtained from any careful reading of the State Department's own publication, entitled "United States Relations with China," which was released as long ago as August 1949. The weakness of this lengthy report to the American people lies in its failure to draw obvious conclusion, or, rather, in its tendency to draw false conclusions from the record by implication.

The Department asked us to believe, essentially, that the outlook in China (from the point of view of our interests) was hopeless from the start, that nothing we could have done would have halted the emergence of a Communist dictatorship on the mainland and that we made no mistakes, either of omission or commission, in dealing with the Chinese situation during and immediately after the Second World War.

Even before MCCARTHY launched his bitter attacks on the State Department, it was being pointed out by responsible observers on every hand that this reading of the record was not in the least persuasive and that—on the most charitable estimate those in charge of our Chinese policy had shown themselves confused and inept.

Whether the situation in China was actually hopeless and whether the seizure of control of the country by the Communists could have been prevented, of course, will never be known. What seems perfectly clear is that the State Department's approach to the situation was hopeless and that our policy was not calculated to prevent that seizure.

We tried first to force a coalition between the Chinese Nationalists and Chinese Communists. And when those efforts broke down—as they were bound to break down—we then threw up our hands and did nothing. The outcome was inevitable. Instead of trying in any effective way to compel Chiang Kai-shek to clean his governmental and military house, by taking power away from a reactionary clique and giving it to the progressive and enlightened Chinese among his associates, we confronted the generalissimo with an impossible demand that he join forces with the Soviet-dominated Communist leaders.

The net result was that the Nationalist Government steadily lost the confidence of the Chinese people, its armies steadily became more inefficient, and Mao Tse-tung and his associates rode to power while we pronounced a futile curse "on both your houses" and watched helplessly the emergence of Red China as a springboard for Communist aggression in Asia.

Modern American diplomacy probably never made a greater error or one more terrible in its consequences. That is why, for all the extravagance of some of his statements (those at Topeka appeared more restrained than usual), the Wisconsin Senator can never be ignored or dismissed entirely from the foreign policy debate. Quite apart from the question of personal loyalty which he has injected, the State DEPARTMENT is simply too vulnerable to criticism on its past course in China.

The Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a broadcast by Raymond Swing over Station WOL on January 15, 1951, in regard to the point 4 program.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to put in a word for point 4. Point 4 has become a term of world-wide meaning ever since President Truman, in a Presidential message, proposed that the United States make a policy of aiding underdeveloped areas with its unique technical assistance. In a foreign policy that has been otherwise heavily weighted with more immediate kinds of self-interest the point 4 program has beamed forth like a candle as the most effective expression of American ideology. However, Congress hasn't cared much for it. It takes a wide first-hand knowledge of the world, a vivid sense of the many hundreds of millions of people living in abject poverty and familiarity with the ways by which their living standards can be raised by modern technical methods you see what a power a point 4 program can be. It would be strong in the ideological fight with communism. It would be still stronger in assuring the United States the warm friendship of the great bulk of the world's population, as living standards come to be lifted. But, as I said, Congress hasn't eyes and ears attuned to these more-distant realities and has never been generous with point 4.

Last year it appropriated less than half the cost of a single cruiser to the entire point 4 program, $34,000,000. However, this small activity has given American foreign policy a slight sparkle and luster. I venture to say that the United States gets more positive prestige from this $34,000,000 than any other single outlay of similar size in the budget. It had been hoped to raise the sum of more than $100,000,000 this year—certainly a bagatelle in relation to the $71,000,000,000 of the budget. But instead of this amount, it now appears that the point 4 program is to be turned into a straight-cut device to get raw materials for defense purposes. Plans are being laid for this along with the reorganization of ECA. It is hoped to divest the State Department of all operational agencies and put the aid program throughout the world under ECA. Point 4, then, is to be something like the Board of Economic Warfare, with an eye on special possibilities where raw materials can be developed by timely financing and technical guidance. Now no one can object to the development of raw materials needed for defense. No one can object to ECA having charge of all technical assistance everywhere. But objection can be raised to the transformation of point 4 into a Board of Economic Warfare or anything like it. It deserves to be retained and expanded for its original objective, and instead of trying to sell Congress something that sounds more selfishly nationalistic, an effort should be made to interest Congress in point 4 as being one of the finest and least expensive expressions of Americanism in our foreign policy. It's not a foreign program out of which individual Americans can hope to get rich. It's not a program of capital expansion. It's not a Twentieth Century brand of enlightened imperialism. It is devoted simply to bringing to the neglected parts of the world and their neglected peoples the technical aid that can help them increase their own efforts on their own behalf. It's designed to expand their agriculture, develop their power, and get them started on the spiral of increased production. It's not done in the expectation of recruiting soldiers to stand on—stand against—the Soviet bloc or of combating immediate communism infiltration. It simply makes a start on helping the vast majority of people in the world to improve their economic status. Obviously, the United States will share any expansion of the wealth of the world, but the share would not be in dividends on stocks and bonds; it would be in a closer and richer brotherhood and to drop this chapter from American foreign policy would be to lose the one many would like to consider most characteristically American.

Problems Confronting the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a very unusual letter which I have received from Dr. Ericson, a medical doctor at LeSueur, Minn. Forty years ago he was an immigrant to the United States from Sweden. His letter is so unusual and so impressive that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESUEUR, MINN., *January 13, 1951.*

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THYE: The reason for this letter is that the country is in a mess and may be in a worse one unless something can be done. What I write may do no more good than grandmother's onion poultice of long ago.

We need to get ready and also stay ready for many years. We need to conserve manpower. We need to find if our people will adjust themselves to go without many things, work harder for less and produce more with less manpower, and yet pay more taxes; all to the purpose of staying solvent. To do this we need to live democracy, not glibly talk about it. We must reinstate responsibility to the country in all citizens, not continue to make the country responsible for the people. Self-government imposes obligations on everyone—something that is often forgotten. To be free does not mean to have license to do what one wishes at all times—there must be regard for others.

Our foreign policy as of today should be: Keep ourselves free and strong without imposing our will on others; help those who are willing to help themselves and us to keep free, not by words but by deeds; improve the functioning of the UN (set up military force) so that it can do its work—assure peace.

If there is a will to do this, it can be done without national insolvency or ourselves becoming a dictatorship. We must keep a sense of proportion. We are only 7 to 100 in world population. We should conduct our affairs so that the rest of the people will choose our way of doing things. Then they will help us protect ourselves in common. We cannot garrison the world. We have neither the will nor the manpower.

Some 40 years ago I felt Sweden partly on account of forced military training, adopted by that country as a protection. Today, I am convinced that we should ask every young man to accept this obligation in this country as our safest way to avoid destruction, financially or militarily. A large standing army will prove so wasteful over the years as to endanger solvency, as well as tend to divide us. Universal training will give all available strength at all time, as in periods of stress it can be augmented by a fair process of draft of those who have served.

It should be possible to keep the cost of this training within reasonable limits, and also set up safeguards as to its use. The physical fitness could be started in the schools, and is an asset in peace as well. After high school the defense services could give the required training for a balanced defense, with refresher courses for a few years to remind them to keep fit. When the world situation improved the military training could be curtailed, but the fitness program would still be valuable. There would be about a 6 months' gap in the flow of students to the colleges, depending on length of the first training period. If the program is to continue for many years, as it seems now, it must be impartial, all contribute and share the dangers and burdens equally, or there will never be unity and wholehearted effort. The draft and exemptions are subject to too many errors or outright fraud. The problems of the colleges must be secondary, if we really are in danger and the whole thing is not a political expedient. Of primary importance is a system that is impartial, supplies the men when needed with the best training and in best condition, with the least dislocation of the national economy.

Therefore, the best time is after school, so that college or life work can be started after the initial period, and the refresher courses come during vacations. This would stagger work for both the schools and the services, so that less installations would be needed. In this way there would be the least interruption in getting higher training, except in times of stress, and that would be true no matter what system were used.

Above all, we must face the fact that we cannot displace communism by war. Proper individual and national conduct of affairs, coupled with faith and devotion, are more important. Then we can spread ideas that will win for us where bullets do only harm. In the meantime, we should keep strong so that no bully can overtake us or our friends.

Now, what should we do?

1. Adopt some form of UMT until the UN is ready, using a draft in addition if need be. I have served on the local board and am doubtful as to the selective part. The UMT is impartial. The services will have to get used to taking and using substandard men. That is the safest way to give us unity and enough men for all services. The older must get into their life work to keep the economy going. There is no sense in having protection if there is nothing to protect.

2. Let anti-Communist Chinese do what they can, with our supplies and technical help—no massed manpower. Our part to keep the Pacific open.

3. Assist Europe when those nations have shown determination to help themselves and do their share in actual accomplishments. If the people there are apathetic, we risk more than it is worth for them or us.

4. Conclude peace with Germany, Japan, and Austria, ignoring Russia if necessary.

5. Get Japan back in production to help stabilize Asia.

6. Keep Red China out of the UN, and drop Russia if need be to get things done. Russia has not acted in good faith and Red China is not behaving any better. Given time, the Russian people will overthrow the present rulers. With intelligent help, they can do it earlier. If we adopt a policy of live and let live, even if our living standards should drop for a time, the people there will know we are not only talking. There are enough DP's in Europe to let some of our ideas through the curtain. Giving something for nothing is not helping as much as helping people to help themselves. That should be our real foreign policy.

7. When it comes to setting up of national policy for the present emergency, we should be careful so as not to start another war in the future. There is much in the world history to hint that quotas, supports, and other means to protect certain groups or peoples may lead to such states and pressures that war results. These supports lead to higher prices—less people can enjoy the items protected—with envy and hate easily engendered by political opportunists. Our policy should be to encourage competitive cooperation so that prices can come down, with better living for more people. That is the only way to a possible permanent peace. By a competitive cooperation I mean competition among groups to improve production by cooperation among groups to improve the means of production—i. e., exchange processes and patents. There is no better way to give the world population what it needs until human relations are better. In this respect the agricultural program here must be watched.

A rather long letter, but there are so many angles.

Yours very truly,

SWAN ERICSON, M. D.

Civilian Defense Activity in Manchester, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an account of a recent civilian defense activity in the State of New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the account was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following is a report of what can be done by a civic-minded business organization in civilian defense planning and preparation.

Recently the residents of Manchester, N. H., witnessed a demonstration by a mobile disaster emergency relief unit which had just been established by the N. G. Gurnsey Distributing Co., of Manchester.

Modeling their equipment after that of the P. Ballantine & Sons large mobile disaster relief units, the Gurnsey Co. showed how the trucks of any private company could be equipped at no sacrifice of usual service to deal with an emergency.

Blankets, stretchers, tools, first-aid kits, flares, portable lights, ropes and ladders provided by the Gurnsey Co. converted their delivery trucks for services as evacuation vehicles, ambulances and first aid stations. The drivers are all Red Cross-trained in first aid.

Rear Adm. Miles R. Browning, (USN, Ret.), State Coordinator of Civilian Defense, was among the many officials and industrial leaders of New Hampshire who witnessed the demonstration. Already other firms in other cities in New Hampshire are adopting similar plans and are preparing their own trucks as units of the New Hampshire civilian defense.

Mr. Carl Badenhausen, president of P. Ballantine & Sons, first conceived the idea of civilian disaster units last May. They have been at the call of the New Jersey authorities twice already, in the South Amboy explosion and during the recent hurricane. These units are now enrolled in the civilian defense structures of New Jersey and New York. They also exist in Washington and in Boston. Several similar units are planned in other cities in the near future.

Recognition of the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include two resolutions adopted by the twenty-fifth Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held at the Statler Hotel here in Washington from January 25 to 27 last. The many Members of the House and Senate who have introduced measures to accomplish the ends set forth in the following resolutions, welcome the support of the great organization, whose spendid work in the field of national defense has done much to spur production and to rekindle the spirit of patriotism and devotion to country.

As one of the sponsors of the proposed Marine Corps legislation, may I assure the resolutions committee and the members of the Patriotic Conference on National Defense that we shall continue in our efforts to obtain early hearings on the subject matters of the resolutions, and that we welcome their assistance in carrying the message back to their respective organizations.

The resolutions read as follows:

RECOGNITION OF THE MARINE CORPS

Whereas the Marine Corps has demonstrated its efficiency, loyalty, and capability in the defense of our country since 1775; and

Whereas the Marine Corps is a part of the United States Navy, trained in naval as well as other military strategy and tactics, having as their specialty amphibious landings in warfare; and

Whereas the Marine Corps has no representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, except directly through the Chief of Naval Operations; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this body that such representation is essential to the proper planning of any offensive or defensive action proposed or considered by our Armed Forces; and

Whereas the Commandant of the Marine Corps, by virtue of his position and training, is the logical and proper person to so represent his branch of the service and its specialty, the amphibious phase of warfare: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-Fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense do hereby endorse and heartily support all bills and/or resolutions introduced in the Congress of the United States to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

STRENGTHENING OF MARINE CORPS

Whereas the Marine Corps has been, and is, an efficient fighting force of the United States and the first combat group to be called on for service outside the limits of the continental United States in time of hostility or other emergency requiring force and arms; and

Whereas the recent peacetime history of the Marine Corps is replete with attempts to diminish the number of its personnel beyond a point requisite for the safety and welfare of our country; and

Whereas a permanent personnel strength within the Marine Corps of 400,000 persons is considered essential to the safety and security of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense endorse and bind itself to support those Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives who have introduced bills and/or resolutions in either House of Congress to fix the personnel strength of the Marine Corps at 400,000 persons; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of National Defense, and all Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

Possible Big Four Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following regular Tuesday broadcast, The Christian Science Monitor Views the News, over the American Broadcasting Co. network, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor:

THE DOOR IS STILL OPEN—DOWN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Soviet Russia has answered the last Allied note concerning a possible meeting of the Big Four. Its note left open the door to a meeting, but there are still major points to iron out.

The big new fact is that Moscow is willing to discuss matters other than the arming of

Germany, as the Allies had demanded, although it insists that the German question must come first on the list.

Perhaps this attitude is partly a result of softening American policy on the arming of Western Germany. It was apparent from General Eisenhower's statements last week that the United States is not proceeding heedlessly with the preparation of German units in the European Army. Russian warnings against such action have been taken seriously. Moreover, German disinclination to participate—except, perhaps—on extortionate terms, was an element in slowing up Washington's pressure for arming the Germans.

This easing of the situation on German armament is very encouraging. That situation was one of the most difficult and dangerous elements in the world picture. But the United States, under General Eisenhower's apparent influence, seems now to have put Germany last on the list. This was only realistic, since we are far from being ready with enough war material to supply the western Allies in the immediate future.

Our threat to arm the Germans—a threat which the Germans themselves greeted with a mixture of alarm and bargaining zeal—was an obvious response to the Russians' act in arming the East Germans. We are therefore perhaps in a bargaining position ourselves, if and when the Big Four meeting is ever held.

The crucial question is whether, if the western powers drop their plans for arming Western Germany, the Russians will reduce or disband their already well-armed German police army in the east.

At any rate, Russian policy has now moved somewhat closer to Allied policy concerning the possible Big Four meeting. The door is still open, and it is up to state-craft to see if something substantial can pass through the portals. Nobody has much optimism about the results of such a meeting, but all rational men are glad that meetings can still take place, and that all contacts have not been broken off.

One reason for the present Russian willingness to meet is revealed in the results of a public opinion poll in West Germany made public in Frankfurt at the meeting of American diplomats. The Germans were asked which would be better for them: to join the West politically and militarily, or to try and unify Germany and remain neutral. While 44 percent favored linking with the West, 41 percent chose unity and neutrality. This shows plainly that if Russia at a Big Four meeting proposes unity and neutrality, which it is almost certain to do, it would have strong support even in West Germany.

It is emphasized on the other hand that an overwhelming majority of the Germans oppose communism. They oppose being drawn into a trap with the East German Communist state. But they manifestly fear that rearmament will make them the first victims of a possible war. Their viewpoint is thoroughly understandable.

The fifth and last of the atomic explosions has shaken Las Vegas. The Atomic Energy Commission says it has concluded its experiments for the present and is completely satisfied with the results. This blast was sighted by television from Los Angeles, and in Boise, Idaho, 300 miles away.

It is evident that these explosions are diplomatic and political as well as atomic and experimental. And the chain reaction they set up in Moscow may be even more vivid than the view from Las Vegas. They are blunt warning at a time when the physical strength of the West in other areas has yet to be mobilized.

In Korea, however, the strength of the UN forces continues to manifest itself. There are many signs that the Communist resistance has become much stiffer, and a major counteroffensive may be launched soon. But General Ridgway's troops are sure of themselves; they are extorting a tremendous toll of the Communists; and they seem quite able to maintain their positions and to make small gains. How long this sort of thing can continue remains to be seen. We are grinding the pick of the Chinese armies to pieces at little manpower cost to the UN forces.

There would seem to be every reason why Peiping would be willing to negotiate. And yet it is not. Presumably the Russians are supporting China in every way to continue this involvement of American troops. But it is obviously a bad business for the Chinese, and—in its way—for the United Nations. Yet the UN can take satisfaction in its struggle to resist and punish aggression, and to uphold the goal of collective security.

Questions and Answers in Which the Public Is Intensely Interested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a reprint of a radio broadcast over radio station WBT, Charlotte, N. C., which was made the early part of this week.

As these questions are being propounded to Representatives throughout our great Nation, I am taking the liberty of inserting these questions and answers in the Appendix of the RECORD:

1. What do you think of General Eisenhower's report to Congress?

Answer. I was very much impressed by General Eisenhower's report to the Congress realizing that he had to be very guarded in the remarks to us. It would have been decidedly unwise for him to make any disclosures that would show Russia any vital part of the program which the United Nations plans for the settlement of the crisis with Korea. The information he furnished us could not be used in any strong or lengthy argument by the Members of Congress, but it was such as to impress this most distinguished body of the stupendous task that he had undertaken and the very practical and serious way that he had gone about a solution of preparing the United Nations countries for any emergencies.

2. How do you feel about drafting 18-year-olds?

Answer. The question of drafting 18-year-olds has probably produced more difference of opinion by people who are absolutely concerned over the welfare of this Nation than any other question before the United States at the present time. It is very plain that if young men at this early age are drafted they should not be sent into combat service until they have been in training for at least 1 year. This is in strict conflict with the Government's plan as announced by General Marshall and may be considered impractical, but these are my views at the present. There is another complexity to the situation in that it would be a serious handicap to the boy's education who would reach 18 in the middle of his graduating year and be drafted at that time, preventing his continuing his course for 6 months longer until he could complete his course. This might result in many boys not completing their education at all. It may be that General Eisenhower is right when he says that it does not make a great amount of difference if the boys are drafted at 18 or 19, providing they are not drafted at a later age.

3. How do you feel about taxes?

Answer. I feel that our taxes should not be increased any more than is necessary to adequately arm our three branches of the service so that we may resist any dangerous aggression on the part of Russia. And cut as much, as is possible, expenditures for nonmilitary purposes. Having spent so much in preparation, we should try to cut all we can in unnecessary civilian expenses.

4. Do you feel we can effect some economy in nondefense spending?

Answer. I do feel that some economy can be effected in nondefense spending which was indicated by a provision in the last appropriation bill providing for a $6,000,000,000 cut in civilian expenses.

5. How do you feel about prices and wage controls? Can they be effected?

Answer. I feel that price and wage controls will be effected, but that they need adjustment at the present time which can only be effected through trial and experience. If properly carried out, the program should have a strong effect on stabilizing our economy and controlling inflation as much as possible.

6. Regarding the international situation, how do you feel about withdrawing our troops from the Far East in order to strengthen Europe?

Answer. I would not be opposed to withdrawing our troops from the Far East if the effect was to strengthen the military set-up of our country and to bring us nearer to a permanent peace. But just how and on what terms our troops are to be withdrawn deserves careful consideration by our chiefs of staff and should be done in such a way as to maintain the prestige and honor of the United States of America.

7. Do you feel an international army in Europe under General Eisenhower would be a real deterrent to the Reds should they decide to attack in force through Western Europe?

Answer. I do feel that an international army in Europe under General Eisenhower would be a real deterrent to the Reds should they decide to attack in force through Western Europe.

8. Do you feel we are doing enough financially and diplomatically in Europe to counteract Communist propaganda?

Answer. I would say without trying to analyze just what is being done to counteract Communist propaganda in Europe that too much could not be done in this direction and until communism is beaten down in this strategic area, a permanent peace cannot be attained.

9. What should our future strategy be in Europe?

Answer. Our future strategy in Europe should be left to the decision of our chiefs of staff in the United States in collaboration with military leaders of all the countries represented in the United Nations.

10. Should we continue to fight in the United Nations for sanction against Red China?

Answer. I am satisfied that we should continue to fight in the United Nations for sanctions against Red China as I am satisfied that they are plainly the aggressors in the Korean conflict and have no reason whatsoever in inflicting themselves into the armed conflict between the United Nations on one hand and the North Koreans on the other.

11. How do you feel about the atomic bomb and should we use it?

Answer. The knowledge of the atomic bomb is of great defense power to the United States and the other countries of the United Nations and is probably the main reason that the Russians have not been more aggressive

and threatening to the Americans than already. Although her conduct has been quite disrespectful and intimidating and at times threatening, I do not believe that the atomic bomb should be used as an offensive weapon under present circumstances as the use of same might immediately precipitate a war.

12. How do you feel about Russia and the atomic bomb? Do you believe Russia can match us in atomic research?

Answer. I do not believe that Russia can match America in atomic reserve and that she is getting more and more behind America than ahead of her. I consider this the principal reason that Russia has not already attempted to humiliate us in a positive way or opened war on the United States and the Nations that are friendly to us.

13. Do you believe that Russia has the atomic bomb?

Answer. Frankly, I do not believe that Russia has the atomic bomb in the sense that America has. I have good reason to feel that she has not had the time nor means to perfect the atomic research in any manner comparable with that of the United States. In other words, it is my belief that they lack both the knowledge and the funds with which to produce an atomic bomb in the least comparable to the atomic bomb now being produced by the chemists and workmen in America.

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by Mr. Carroll Binder, United States representative, in the Committee on Freedom of Information, on the Preamble of the Freedom of Information Convention submitted by the U. S. S. R., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment on the remarks of the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union concerning the preamble of this convention. Those of us who had been following this subject for the past 3 years see in this text the same old Soviet arguments, and indeed we could have anticipated almost all of them. I do not think it is necessary to present any detailed analyses of the real significance of the text he has proposed, but it may be of some usefulness to examine its relationship to the actions of the Soviet Union during the past 3 years.

Now the Soviet preamble begins on the premise—the false premise—that freedom of the press can only be secured if the press is free from pressure and dictation exercised by private publishing monopolies, trusts and syndicates. This is not the place nor the time to engage in an argument over the merits of the private enterprise press system. In another forum I would be delighted to engage in such a discussion with the delegate of the Soviet Union. But I do want to point out that the proposition he now puts before us ignores the greatest monopoly of all, the monopolistic, all-powerful Soviet information system. It ignores the elementary fact that there can be no semblance of a free press if a government, through a ruling party or otherwise, completely controls all press and information activities. In the Soviet Union these activities are conducted under the pressure and dictation exercised by the Soviet Government. It is therefore obvious that there is no freedom of the press in the Soviet Union. This fact is worth repeating now only if there are those who still find it possible to maintain that freedom of the press means complete and rigorous censorship by the state, that freedom of speech means freedom only to praise an absolute dictatorship, that freedom to receive information means freedom to be indoctrinated, without choice, in the dogmas of a single ruling party and to have access to no other sources of information.

But there is another aspect of this Soviet line that is somewhat more subtle. It is the thesis that there are principal tasks in the dissemination of information. Now this concept that the press must carry out certain "tasks" has had a certain allure for the unwary. From the premise that organs of information are a powerful means of influencing public opinion, they have been tempted to conclude that these organs should carry out certain tasks, that is, that they have a certain set of prescribed functions in the interest of society.

At this point one might logically inquire: Who is to assign these tasks? Who is to be the taskmaster to see that the tasks are carried out? In practice this can only be done, and in fact is only being done, by governments which have assumed the power to control the press. In essence then, the tasks which are assigned to the press are those which further the policies and objectives of those governments. Of course there are some who would contend that the press can assign itself such tasks. But in practice this would require, at least, control by a political party; and again we would not have a free press as we know it.

Mr. Chairman, the press does have one great responsibility. It is the responsibility to seek the truth and to report its findings as comprehensively and objectively as possible. The press succeeds in promoting desirable social, economic and political ends only to the extent that it succeeds in providing the general public with available facts and opinions and thus enables them to reach their own decisions. But it is not the function of the press to become an advocate or dispenser of party lines or governmental policies. It is not the function of the press to indoctrinate the reading public.

Now, I would like to turn to the tasks which are set forth in the Soviet preamble. The dissemination of truth and objective information is of course a favorite objective of the Soviet Union. In the context of this preamble and of the political line which the representative of the Soviet Union has laid down this really means the dissemination of such information as the government considers truthful and objective. This can be the truth or half-truths or complete falsehoods. If it is in the interest of the policy and grand strategy of a government to assert that the Republic of Korea attacked the North Korean regime, then the press of that government disseminates this as a fact, even in the face of conclusive evidence, accepted by the rest of the world, that precisely the opposite is true.

Another favorite task of the Soviet Union, of course, is the development of friendly relations among states based upon respect for the principles of the independence and sovereign equality of nations and the achievement of the lofty purposes of the United Nations. And once again the government assigning these tasks decides what nations are worthy of being treated as independent and sovereign equals and what the lofty purposes of the United Nations should be. I hardly think it necessary to cite any examples of the way in which the Soviet Union has carried out this great task. There is hardly a nation represented around this table that has not been the object of the Soviet Union's tender solicitude as expressed in this task of the Soviet press.

Another great task of the press as set forth in this Soviet preamble is to promote the application of measures against propaganda and the inciters of a new war and the countering of any propaganda of aggression capable of creating a threat to the peace or a breach of the peace. Now, the Soviet Union has labored long and hard to promote this notion. When this issue is presented in the United Nations, the effect always has been to pose the question, are you against war? It presumes the answer, yes, whereupon the reply is, "then you must support action curtailing propaganda which threatens to disturb the peace." The question is precisely the same as that posed by the familiar joke, used frequently in America and perhaps in other countries: "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?"

I am sure we need waste no time puzzling over the answer to the Soviet question. The root of the issue lies in the fact that this Soviet task poses the problem of who is going to decide what constitutes propaganda for war and aggression. Once again the Government is the taskmaster, and to enforce its decisions it would resort to censorship and suppression of news whenever it was in its interest to do so. Once again the Soviet formula for liberty becomes a prison for free minds.

But I think the time has come to take a good, hard look at this proposition from another angle. Obviously, we can assume that all peoples are against war and against propaganda for aggression. But what has been the real objective of the government which has labored so hard to promote this proposition? I suggest that an interesting answer to this would be provided if one were to plot on a chart the dates when these propositions were being urged in the United Nations and elsewhere, together with the dates when certain violent events were taking place, or about to take place—events in which these same governments were, shall we say, not exactly disinterested.

Note, for example, the timing of the first raising of this issue in the UN in the General Assembly of 1947 in relation to the sinister assault on the independence of Greece. Note the timing of the repeat performances on antiwarmongering resolutions in the UN in relation to the Berlin blockade, and several other points of international tension during the past 2 years. Note the timing of the false and treacherous Stockholm appeal in relation to recent events in Korea. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to push this exercise too far, but I do suggest that these coincidences are rather interesting.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, how long shall we go on being the dupes in this treacherous game? Once more we are asked, Are you against war and the spreading of war propaganda? This may still be a legitimate question, but are we the ones who are called upon to answer it or is an answer forthcoming from the questioner? Mr. Chairman, this game has many aspects and ramifications. The Stockholm appeal, now somewhat more presentably disguised, has become the common-front device of the 1950s. It is a stealthy new device for entrapping the weary, the confused, and the alarmed people who have a real horror of war and serving their innocent collaboration. It is the new tactic of infiltration and intrigue. In Eastern Europe, a succession of laws have recently been promulgated for punishing the propagation of war or incitement to war. The puppet regime of East Germany has already demonstrated how this law is to be used as a device to blackmail the weak and

the unwary in West Germany into collaboration with the party line.

Mr. Chairman, these tactics may continue to be successful, they may snare those who dare not voice their suspicion and fears, they may snare those who are not in possession of the facts. But, I repeat, is it still incumbent on us to play along with this game? We cannot plead ignorance of the facts. We need not give any further testimony of our desire for peace and genuine cooperation for the ends which the UN was established to serve. It is not we, but they who must now give some concrete evidence of these same intentions.

That is why I do not consider it necessary to give any further consideration to propositions of this nature. The United Nations has already gone on record. It is now time for those who have promoted these propositions to go on record.

Individualized War Against Red Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Eventful Present: Individualized War Against Red Leaders," by Arnold Perreton, of Concord, N. H., as it appeared in the Manchester Union Leader of January 27, 1951. I believe the article may be of interest to Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EVENTFUL PRESENT—INDIVIDUALIZED WAR AGAINST RED LEADERS

(The article below was written expressly for the Union Leader by Arnold Perreton, of Concord. Mr. Perreton is well known as an architect and planning consultant.)

The United Nations is faced today with the critical problem of how to prevent the precipitation of World War II between the Soviet Union and the free nations. So far the Korean crisis has precipitated confusion among all leaders and people. Confusion reigns in the midst of impending great danger.

It is now a well known fact that the rulers of the Soviet Union are determined to destroy the free nations and to win domination over all people in the whole world. Unless we can defend it in time we face the possibility of the eventual fall of Japan and Europe. With ample war plants in Europe, Japan and its own hidden areas in Russia, along with immense military supplies, abundant resources and manpower, the Soviet Union will be able to concentrate on us from almost all directions. We pride ourselves on our vastly superior war production capacity to defend ourselves. But we must also face the very likely possibility of extensive sabotage and subversive activities in our poorly defended midst. Mighty France of World War II fell in 40 days and we may also have a similar fate.

Realizing this, a frenzied rush of delayed war production is on the way. Confiscatory tax measures and conscription of all manpower are ours to face. Alarmed at our scope of war preparation, it will also spur the Soviets to even greater effort of preparation; and a race of war preparation of a magnitude inconceivable by man may result. Our preparation of war, possible efforts at counter revolution and mass defense against aggression will also present the Soviets with the golden opportunity to use it as excellent hate propaganda to consolidate her people and strength. A war between two giants, leading to ultimate exhaustion and stalemate is a definite possibility. Continued chaos, loss of individual security and freedom over the whole world is ours to face.

If mass preparation and war will lead to chaos, what tactics can we use to make a quick end to war? How are the Soviets vulnerable?

The Soviet Union has a totalitarian Communist structure in which the rulers, members of a minority Communist Party, dominate and hold the majority of people in complete subjection to the state. The strength of the rulers is perpetuated by maintaining a state of fear and consequent obedience by all people. The weakness of the rulers rests on their own fear of revolt by the people. The strength and weakness of the Soviet Union is therefore based on fear. How can we capitalize on this fear? What precedent do we have for dealing with fears provoking totalitarian rulers?

A few short years ago World War II was fought. On termination of the war, after many thousands were killed and billions were spent, an international tribunal was created to try the heads of a nation for starting a war and for committing outrages in violation of international law. Two new principles were established by the convictions, namely: (1) That starting and waging aggressive war was declared to be a crime for which individuals were responsible, and (2) that violation of the laws of war such as extermination of civilians and the enslavement, deportation, and torture of prisoners were crimes for which individuals were responsible even when done under orders of a superior.

Here then is our clue, our basic tactic for combating and counterattacking the evils of totalitarian communism. For, haven't we sufficient evidence already of extensive violation by the rulers and leaders of the Soviet Union? Why must we now engage in another exhaustive mass war before we can apprehend these few rulers and leaders? Instead of conducting a mass war against the Soviet nation, why not conduct an individualized war against only the rulers of the Soviet Union and the leaders of the Communist Party; and invoke the support and revolt of the subjected Soviet people?

To instrument an individualized war against the rulers and leaders of the Soviet Union, the United Nations must be authorized to—

1. Suspend the representative members of the Soviet Union to the United Nations on the grounds of suspicion of having violated the principles of international law and having misused and discredited the United Nations by their conduct at its sessions.

2. Appoint an international tribunal to collect evidence of violation and prepare a case against the individual violators, and to summon them to stand trial.

3. Declare a state of war against all individual violators and members of the Communist Party in case the summons to stand trial are ignored and war activity is continued. No war shall be declared on the Soviet Union as a nation or any of its satellite nations.

4. Organize an international espionage—police force to effect the capture or elimination of each individual violator and leader of the Communist Party. Furthermore, all sessions of communistic controlled government, and communistic meeting and public rallies shall be reported and subjected to bombing of required scope.

5. Organize a propaganda force to invoke the aid of all non-Communist Party members in Soviet Union to assist in the capture and elimination of individual violators; and to invoke the subjected people to revolt from the Communist-controlled government.

The free nations must be authorized to—

1. Seize and imprison every known member of the Communist Party within the boundaries of its nation on the first evidence of any sabotage or incident of disorder.

2. Maintain a civilian defense force to defend all power installations, water-supply areas, and war-defense plants from any attempts at sabotage; and to provide the necessary help and protection in case of disorder, attack, and bombing.

3. Maintain a military force of Army, Navy, and Air to participate in only the defense of any and all areas of aggression by the Soviet Union. Penetration within the boundaries of the Soviet Union for the purpose of bombing military supply bases, war production plants, transportation facilities, and oil fields is to be construed here as a defense measure.

As indicated by these principles, the offensive war by the United Nations will be conducted entirely against individual violators and not against the nation of people as a whole; and the defensive war by the free nations will be conducted only as a means of defense against sabotage and military aggression by the Soviet Union. It is construed here that with the gradual elimination of the key violators and the adverse psychological effect on the remaining rulers and leaders of the Communist Party, the brain and heart of the Communist organization will be greatly endangered and a collapse of the Communist octopus will be inevitable. The winning of the war, consequently, can be accomplished in a comparatively quick, easy, and economical way.

Instead of the necessity of waging war, however, the effective threat of the individualized war may now be used as a potential factor to negotiate peace. By the enthusiastic manner in which all the people support this measure, they have now the opportunity to indicate that the prospect for the success of totalitarian communism in the advanced free nations is slight.

Also, the rulers of the Soviet Union may be prevailed upon to perform a great good by fostering amongst their backward people the inevitable democratic growth and gradually decrease their totalitarian control, and thereby enjoy the pleasure of seeing their creation serve a profound social need and, at the same time, live to an enjoyable and justifiable old age. On the contrary, if the rulers and leaders are despotic inclined and mad men bent on the domination of the whole world, they can be eliminated by means of the individualized war as quickly as necessary.

Whether for war or for peace, the instrument of individualized war presents to the United Nations the definite military policy to end the war and achieve and maintain everlasting peace. Since a mass war would inevitably lead to complete world chaos, the United Nations and all free nations must, therefore, be charged to supplement their preparation of mass-war tactics to include also the tactics of individualized war. With the danger of delay because of the confusion in the ranks of all leaders, it is the responsibility of the people to express their desire. Consequently, if the principles of individualized war as outlined here makes sense and appeals to their better judgment, each and every individual is enjoined to notify their Congressman, the President, and the delegate to the United Nations to adopt the principles of individualized war to make a quick end to war.

Draft Convention on Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, is one of the outstanding foreign affairs experts in America. Minnesota is proud of his accomplishments, and particularly proud of the fact that he was a representative of the United States Government on the drafting of a Convention on Freedom of Information in the United Nations.

It is a pleasure for me to ask unanimous consent that a statement by Mr. Binder on January 17, delivered in the Special Committee of the General Assembly on the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, During the 3 years of United Nations debates on freedom of information, my Government has had many opportunities to set forth its concept of this freedom and to suggest how it might be extended and safeguarded throughout the world. The record will show that the United States has been foremost among the governments urging the United Nations to promote and protect this freedom everywhere.

I shall confine myself now to matters which are directly relevant to the draft convention on freedom of information. I believe it is essential that our respective attitudes be made clear as possible at the outset in order that we may know from the beginning where we are heading. This is especially important because the long debate which has already taken place in this document has, I believe, confused rather than clarified the real issue.

To dispel this confusion we must lay bare the basic need for freedom of information in the world today. The setting in which we meet is one in which freedom itself is under attack. It is not a new attack. Freedom has been under constant, unremitting attack by totalitarian regimes—Nazi, Fascist, and now Communist—during much of the twentieth century. Use is made of every weapon—political intrigue, propaganda, and even military force.

In this setting each one of us must ask ourselves these basic questions: Will our actions here add strength to the force of freedom? Are we likely to advance and protect the principle of freedom of information?

Or will our efforts evolve into a document which in effect will utilize the prestige of the United Nations to legitimize certain restrictive governmental practices which do not now enjoy international respectability? I suggest that the answer to these questions should be the only determining factor in our work.

Each of us must seek to answer them in the light of his own understanding of this freedom. I should, therefore, like to summarize the principles which my Government strongly believes should underlie any convention in this field. I shall attempt to do so with all the candor which the subject warrants and I shall begin by asking: What is this freedom we are discussing?

Freedom of information is the basic communications system of a democratic society, and without it that society and that way of life cannot thrive. In my country, and in many other countries, it is the means by which common, every-day citizens seek and receive information about their work and about new methods of work; about their living conditions, good or bad, and the reasons for them; about their local officials, their state government, and their National Government. It is the process by which they reach their decisions and make them felt upon those who govern, so that their country is ruled according to the wishes of the people. Therefore, when information is inadequate, when it is incorrect, when it is false, the decisions of our society are warped and misshapen and the common good suffers.

But freedom is not only essential to a balanced political life. It is the source of intellectual, cultural, and scientific strength and independence. The individual must be free to express his aesthetic feelings according to his own motivations and to explore every avenue of thought. Whether he is an architect or artist, an engineer or writer, a stonemason or a teacher, his country develops and flourishes in its own richness only insofar as he is enabled to develop his own talents to the limit of his capacity and in his own way.

Freedom of information is the right of every person to have access to all available facts, ideas, and opinions regardless of source, and not only to the information approved by his government or any party. It is his right to test the official pronouncements of his government against the opinions of his fellow citizens, and those held by other peoples; his right to advocate his beliefs through organs of his choice. It is his right to state his frank opinion of his public officials, and those of other governments as well. It is his right to communicate freely with his fellow citizens, and with those of other nations.

We believe that the exercise of this freedom is the inalienable right of every person. We believe that this freedom belongs to that relatively small but vital area of the democratic process which must remain, as far as possible, immune from governmental interference. This is the absolute test of democratic government. To the extent that the exercise of this freedom is not free, no other liberty is secure.

Freedom of information, like all forms of freedom, is subject to abuse and must, therefore, be subject to certain restraints. But such limitations must never go so far as to impair the basic freedoms. A doctor never prescribes the abolition of food to cure a stomach ache, even though the food may be the direct cause of the discomfort. The doctor knows from long study and experience that there are certain specific remedies that will alleviate the local suffering without impairing the patient's basic health.

Following this simple analogy, we believe that such limitations as must be imposed on freedom of information must evolve out of long and democratic experience in the use of this freedom. They must be such as to safeguard the maximum of freedom for each person. They must not be experimental in character, like regulations to control traffic in our streets, nor must they be applied to every transient irritant. They must always be subject to public criticism and to review by impartial judicial authority. And finally, we believe that such limitations as are necessary must, whenever possible, operate after the fact, as a means of penalizing proven and serious abuses, and not as a prior gag on freedom of speech. That is our understanding of this freedom and its proper use.

Now to some this concept may appear to be impractical. It will appear so if this freedom is confused with less fundamental liberties. It will seem so to some governments which, for various reasons, do not consider their people capable of reaching sound conclusions in the light of all available facts, or to governments which feel that they cannot wait for the public to make up its mind. And, of course, this concept is extreme and completely impractical for totalitarian systems, since it is the strongest weapon against dictatorship. But this is the only concept which my Government believes capable of promoting freedom of information, and therefore the only concept we can support.

Now the debate which has taken place in the United Nations on this subject has shown that there are, broadly speaking, three other main points of view with respect to this convention. There is, first of all, the totalitarian view as exemplified by the Soviet Union, which does not believe in freedom of information. This view maintains that freedom of information is to be guaranteed only to the extent that it furthers the doctrines and objectives of communism as practiced in the U. S. S. R. This is essentially the meaning of the guaranty set forth in the Soviet constitution. In practice the governments which support this view have created a vast information control apparatus for the indoctrination of their peoples in the dogmas and dictates of the ruling party and for insulating them against all contrary facts and opinions.

These governments are engaged in a terrifying experiment to condition the minds of hundreds of millions of persons in an attempt to make them respond automatically to the commands of their rulers. In their hands information has been transformed from a means of enlightenment and understanding into a political weapon taking any form or shape required by the situation. It has become a knife to assassinate reputations, a drug to dull the senses, or a poison to instill suspicion and fear.

Of course, when they have sought support for their view in the United Nations, they have been careful to present it in the most disarming disguise. They have maintained that to promote friendly international relations it is first necessary to define what information is and then to suppress the dissemination of anything which does not conform to the definition. The suppression is, of course, to be accomplished by censorship and the definition is to be interpreted only by the government. With a few exceptions the United Nations has seen the danger in these proposals and I trust we shall not fail to do so now.

Another view apparently assumes that the real danger to freedom of information today is that it is abused by certain foreign correspondents and newspapers. Those who share this view seem to look upon this convention as a means of putting certain restraints on the work of journalists. They are willing to include in the convention some general language about freedom of information, but their primary concern seems to be to include certain specific curbs on journalists.

This is, I believe, a short-sighted and dangerous point of view. This convention was never, as I understand it, intended to deal primarily or even directly with the work of journalists. I have understood its intent to be the promotion and protection of everyone's right to freedom of information. To distort it into a punitive measure directed at journalists would certainly be a mockery of everything the United Nations has attempted

to do in this field. We must realize that undesirable checks placed on journalists would apply equally to artists and teachers, to lawyers and politicians—and in the last analysis to people like ourselves drawn from every walk of life. Even if the grievances against some journalists and newspapers are assumed to be real, this is certainly too high a price to pay to settle a few scores.

And finally there is what I have heard described as the middle view. This is the view which accepts the fundamental principles of genuine freedom of information, but it is preoccupied with ways and means of insuring that the freedom will be exercised responsibly and that abuses will be punished. It is dedicated to insuring responsibility by law and apparently it is not especially concerned that those who will administer the law may also determine the real content and meaning of the freedom.

Now the real danger posed by this view is its stress on the need and desirability of arriving at some sort of compromise among the other dominant points of view. Those who hold this view seek to harmonize the maximum of liberty with the highest degree of discipline, and while they shun the totalitarian conception of freedom, they do not rule out the possibility of arriving at some sort of working agreement with at least some aspects of it.

This is, in our opinion, the greatest danger facing this committee. Compromise is an essential part of the democratic process. The people of the United States have learned to regard it as the key to the successful functioning of their Government. My Government has on many occasions also demonstrated its willingness to apply it to its international relations. But we must make a careful distinction between compromises relating to the way in which fundamental principles are to be executed and compromises of the principles themselves.

We are convinced that the fundamental principles of freedom of information cannot be the subject of compromise. We must, therefore, ask those who urge compromises what they propose to achieve by them. It is obvious to all by now that the totalitarian states will not, and indeed they cannot, agree to any compromise as regards their basic doctrines. Clearly then, the likely result of a compromise in this area would be to weaken and dilute the democratic concept of freedom by pulling it down toward a lower common denominator. To seek compromises merely for the sake of reaching some sort of agreement, even among the nontotalitarian points of view, would hardly promote freedom. It is much more likely to restrict it.

There are those who sincerely feel that we must reach some agreement or the prestige of the United Nations will suffer. But it will suffer for more if we agree on measures which entail repressive limitations on free speech and the free press. I would summarize the position of the United States on this matter by saying that we are anxious to participate in any effort to reach agreement on measures to further the cause of freedom of information. But we are strongly opposed to any compromise which is likely to endanger that freedom, regardless of its motivation.

I have felt it necessary to review frankly the background of this convention in order to make absolutely clear the frame of mind in which my Government approaches the task before this committee. I must state with equal frankness that we do not believe that the cause of freedom of information will be furthered by an attempt to complete this convention now. The debates which have already taken place on this matter suggest that the convention, which was intended to advance this freedom, is more likely to restrict it. This is not a hasty conclusion, nor am I attempting to prejudge our work. It is a conclusion based on 3 years of discussion and negotiation, not only in formal committee meetings but in many informal talks and in exchanges of views with a majority of the foreign offices of the members of the United Nations. Unless many governments have now changed their minds and will no longer press some of the proposals advanced in the past, it is difficult to see how we can hope to arrive at any agreement, let alone a constructive agreement worthy of the United Nations.

My Government is convinced that it would be far preferable to acknowledge that we have reached a temporary impasse and to await the development of the draft International Covenant on Human Rights. The draft covenant now contains provisions in article 14 which, in our opinion, embody the maximum constructive agreement now attainable on this difficult subject. Moreover, we cannot see that this proposed covention would add anything of concrete and positive value to the guarantee now set forth in the draft covenant. But we do see clearly the prospect of adding undesirable limitations and restrictions.

That is why I would urge this committee to recommend that this convention be held in abeyance until we have taken definite action on the Covenant on Human Rights. Only then will we be in a position to determine to what extent it might be possible to advance still more the cause of this freedom. And only then would we really know what it might be desirable to add to the guarantee contained in the covenant. This is not only more logical; it is also more realistic and practical. To proceed now with the completion of a more specific convention would in our opinion, only add to the difficulties in the way of a successful covenant.

We do not consider it necessary to attempt once more, and in a small group of the United Nations, to reconcile views which have not been reconciled over a period of 3 years in the United Nations as a whole. If the committee should decide nevertheless to make still another attempt, we must stand on the principles I have outlined.

Mr. Chairman, we are a small group discussing a subject which has already been debated at great length. As we sit here, momentous decisions are being considered by the United Nations and we are apt to feel that our work has no great significance. But our work is of the greatest significance and, what is more, it is related to the discussions which are under way elsewhere in this organization.

We live in a world which, in terms of communications, has been reduced to the size of what was once a small principality. The remarkable advances which have been made in the facilities for mass communications have created an instrument whose potentialities for good or evil have never before been available. It is being utilized by a few governments as means of forceful persuasion and as a cloak for policies and actions which their peoples would never willingly accept if given a free and informed choice. Now, more than ever before, it is vitally important to see to it that all facts and opinion receive the widest dissemination in order that people everywhere may have a chance to seek the truth and to make up their own minds.

We have a free choice. We can either face up to this great challenge and avoid any action which might hamper still more the spread of facts and ideas, or we can seek escape into the realm of purely verbal agreements which may only serve to strengthen the hand of those whose actions are responsible for the grave threat to world peace. I trust this committee will keep its eyes on the real issue and not permit itself to add to the confusion and indecision which endanger the free world at this moment.

This Way to Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Way to Suicide," which appeared in the January 22 edition of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WAY TO SUICIDE

"If we build our strength—and we are building it—the Soviet rulers may face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world. That is what we hope will happen, and that is what we are trying to bring about. That is the only realistic road to peace."

The foregoing words should be read and reread by every American. They were spoken last week by President Truman in his sixth message on the state of the Union.

On their face they are attractive and reasonable words. They reflect a hope of peace and a dread of war which endure in millions of human hearts.

These words of the President occur in a message which, but for them, would deserve to be applauded as a fine and forceful speech.

It may very well be argued that the President's words are a useful concession to the universal desire for peace, a necessary recognition of the European and Asiatic state of mind.

But these words of the President cannot be dismissed in so easy a fashion. They cannot be dismissed on any ground.

The President has shown too many times that he believes in the capacity of the Soviet rulers to face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world.

Mr. Truman's principal adviser on world affairs, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, has shown too many times that he believes in what he has chosen to call the possibility of coexistence, a cooperative peace, a cooperative relationship with the rulers of Soviet communism.

On the record the passage quoted here from the President's message must be taken for what it unquestionably is—a considered restatement, made in all good faith and with full conviction, of the major conception and major purpose underlying American policy.

THE FATAL FALLACY

Taken for what they are, these words of the President are mistaken and dangerous.

Taken for what they are, these words demand the attention and the talents of all the participants in the great debate over United States policy, a debate which has explored almost every aspect of the subject except the corrosive and fatal fallacy which the President preserved and restated.

The nature of the fallacy is clear. The fallacy is that those whom Mr. Truman calls the Soviet rulers are capable of arriving, by their own decision, at a state of peace with the non-Communist world. There is no prospect whatever that they are capable of doing so. Not so long as they are the Soviet rulers. Not so long as the system which drives them to their conquests, feeds their purposes and gives them their power is in being. Not so long as the vast complex of doctrine, nations, governments, parties and

men called Soviet communism is intact, undefeated and undestroyed. Not until its power—its inherent compulsion—to harass, assault, and engulf the non-Communist world is effectively eliminated can there be any chance of peace in the world.

The defeat and abolition of Soviet Communist purpose and power are not enough; the forces of anticommunism must always have other and more positive objectives. But, to repeat, there can be no peace worth the name and no secure progress toward a better life and a better society everywhere so long as Soviet communism retains its power to obstruct all progress and to assault all non-Communist societies.

THE FALSE CONCEPT

Make no mistake: the President does not assume and require the defeat and dismemberment of the Soviet system. The official author of this fatal fallacy, Mr. Acheson, has recently said in so many words that to subvert the Soviet Union—that is, to bring about the downfall of Soviet communism—is neither required for peace nor a proper purpose of American policy. When Mr. Truman speaks of enforcing peace through strength, he must, on the record of what he and his Secretary of State have said, be supposed to mean peace with the present rulers of the present Soviet system.

Many Americans do not need to be told that this concept is false. With their minds, in their hearts and in their bones they know that it is false.

Many others would like to believe in the possibility that Mr. Truman says he believes in. Many Americans do believe in it still. But their number lessens. Events visible to all, and the actual behavior of the Soviet rulers, make any belief in the possibility of peace with the present rulers of the present Soviet system more unreal with every day that passes.

There is something nightmarish in the spectacle of a President of the United States who at this late and awful hour refuses to perceive that the concept which he restated last week is false. There is something nightmarish, too, in the continued presence at the President's right hand of a Secretary of State who has so long cultivated this pernicious fallacy. It is terrifying, it is wrong, that this proud priest of coexistence with Soviet communism, Dean Acheson, should still be in a position to shape the President's most vital conceptions and statements of American policy.

Here, Life once more submits, is a real and present danger to this Republic.

So long as the nature, the purposes, and the capacities of our enemy are misunderstood and underestimated at the very pinnacle of American policy, what hope is there that our policy will make sufficient sense? What hope is there that American power will be fully and effectively mobilized? What hope is there that, once mobilized, it will be used to maximum effect and with adequate awareness of the tasks before it? What price the great debate over policy when the declared objective of our policy is founded upon so glaring a fallacy?

This fallacy is a source of weakness—a cancer—which only the President can eradicate.

He can eradicate it. He can at long last drive from his councils all who have sold and fed him on the pap of coexistence with Soviet communism.

He can drive from his own mind, and drop from his utterances, the paralyzing illusion that the rulers of Soviet communism as it now exists can be persuaded to peace or forced to peace.

He can perceive that the situations of strength on which he relies can be effective only if they are used to bring about the dismemberment of the Soviet Communist system as it now exists and to remove from the world the threat of Soviet power at it is now exercised.

He can perceive that peaceful, stable coexistence with Soviet communism is utterly impossible. To hold that it is possible, as the President holds when he talks of forcing or persuading "the Soviet rulers" to "lay aside their plans," is to perpetrate a pietistic fraud.

THE PRODIGIOUS EVIL

If coexistence with the present Soviet Communist system is impossible, is total war inevitable?

Maybe so. Maybe not. Given the pressures resulting from a full recognition on our part of what must be accomplished and a full determination to accomplish it, the Soviet empire may start to change within and to crumble. No man can say just how the pure wickedness of Soviet communism will ultimately be banished from the earth, as some day it will be banished. But what no man has a right to say is that we can live peaceably and happily with this prodigious evil.

Meanwhile what must be said is that the Soviet empire, far from retreating, will continue to expand unless it is opposed with all our strength and all our mind and all our will. That includes the steady, calm, and constant acceptance of the risk of all-out war.

The President said last week that his chosen road—the road to a contrived peace with the present rulers of the present Communist system—is "the only realistic road to peace."

It is not a realistic road to peace.
It is not a realistic road to anything.
It is the road our enemy wants us to take.
It is the road to our defeat.
It is the way to suicide.

Proposed Assistance to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "India's Need," from the Washington Post of last Tuesday.

The view of one newspaperman on the problem of India's famine is summed up in a New York Times dispatch from New Delhi by Robert Trumbull, which I also ask to have printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 6, 1951]

INDIA'S NEED

Considerable misapprehension has arisen over the position of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on relief of hunger in India. Senator CONNALLY has done well to point out that nothing has been sidetracked for the reason that no legislation has been presented to the committee. It would be unfortunate for the Indians or anyone else to conclude that the Senate is cool to the proposal to send 2,000,000 tons of grain to India.

What happened is that Assistant Secretary of State George McGhee went to the Senate last Friday to consult with a subcommittee headed by Senator GILLETTE and including Senators WILEY, FULBRIGHT, and TOBEY. Mr. McGhee told the Senators the facts of India's famine and added that the requisite amount of American grain and ships for transporting it are available, though some ships would have to be withdrawn from the reserve fleet. If the situation in India is as serious as it appears to be, the State Department had no course but to acquaint Congress with it now. This sort of consultation in advance of legislation is exactly what the Senate has clamored for.

Apart from the very real influence of drought and earthquakes, India has worsened her situation, as we recently pointed out, by continuing to divert food cropland to jute production. She refused to buy grain from Pakistan when grain was available, and it is by no means clear whether she has made full use of her sterling balances in London to obtain dollars to buy food. Her trade war with Pakistan, as a correspondent notes elsewhere on this page, has continued unabated. The statement of the Indian Minister of Agriculture this month relative to attempt to attain self-sufficiency in cotton and jute at the expense of food production seems to us a shocking piece of shortsightedness.

Regardless of mistakes in policy, however, the fact is that famine impends. No large amounts of food are available from India's neighbors, and if a catastrophe is to be prevented, aid will have to be forthcoming from the United States. Congress should ask some hard questions about the man-made factors in India's plight. But the food ought to be granted, and quickly. It would be a grave mistake for Congress in any way to connect the question of aid with Prime Minister Nehru's attitude toward Korea. However unrealistic that attitude may be in our eyes, hunger and politics do not mix, and any attempt to associate them would do this country incalculable harm in Asia.

[From the New York Times]

INDIA SEES FAMINE WITHOUT UNITED STATES GRAIN—COUNTRY LACKS RESERVE, FOOD MINISTER SAYS, EMPHASIZING DESPERATE SITUATION

(By Robert Trumbull)

NEW DELHI, INDIA, January 28.—India's central food reserve, which normally would be about 1,000,000 tons, are now down to zero, and, unless 2,000,000 tons of grain can be obtained from the United States on concessional terms, famine is virtually certain before the next crop is harvested in October, K. M. Munshi, Minister of Food and Agriculture, said today.

With newspapers lying before him headlining cold congressional reaction to India's request to Washington for help, the frail Food Minister's tone was despairing. He declined to discuss the political aspects of India's relations with the United States, which now turn on the Chinese situation, but dwelt on the cold figures that make India's desperate food position plain.

Elsewhere, however, indications are that if Congress rejects India's plea, friends of the United States in the Government—of whom Mr. Munshi is known to be one—will suffer a great loss of influence in the wave of anti-American feeling that is likely to arise among Indian legislators, whose constituents are hungry. And this is India's election year.

[India's request for 2,000,000 tons of wheat has been referred to Congress by the State Department. The matter has been held in committee, and the outlook for action by Congress appears unfavorable.]

ANTI-UNITED STATES PROPAGANDISTS BUSY

The question in India is not one of buying India's goodwill with food or of India's threatening the United States with ill will if grain is not forthcoming. What will happen, it is believed, will be the natural reaction of anyone who asks a prosperous friend for help in a desperate position and is rebuffed.

In recent days, as reports have been published here of the stand-offish attitude in Congress because of Prime Minister Jawaharial Nehru's urging of negotiations with Communist China on Korea and other Far Eastern problems, anti-United States propagandists, both Indian and foreign, have been exceptionally busy.

Their first tactic was to point to published Washington reaction against a food loan or grant as proof that United States aid to needy peoples is merely a political bribe. False propaganda also has been made that the Soviet Union has offered large quantities of grain to India with no strings attached.

SOVIET AID REPORTS DENIED

This latter allegation is said by Government officials to be completely untrue. Russia has never been an important source of food for India. Indian officials know of no surplus in the Soviet Union, and no Russian offer has been made. However, there has been much informal and unofficial talk of prospective Soviet aid which responsible persons in the Indian Government are inclined to put down as propaganda, since there have been no formal approaches.

India, in her present situation, would accept grain from the Soviet Union or anyone else willing to make it available. That is official policy. Communist China's offer of 50,000 tons—a negligible amount—on a barter was accepted, and 30,000 tons are being purchased from Bao Dai's Vietnam, a Government that India does not recognize.

The food position, as outlined by Mr. Munshi in the interview today showed that the country was living, as he expressed it, "from ship to mouth."

Only 2 states out of 22—Punjab and Pepsu (Patiala and the East Punjab States Union)—are now rated as surplus areas because of crop failures elsewhere due to natural causes. They are expected to produce about 300,000 tons beyond their own needs by April and May. This amount, which is infinitesimal in a country that annually consumes 50,000,000 tons, will have to be spread over all the shortage areas.

SOME WITHOUT FOOD FOR DAYS

When a food ship is delayed a few days, which is a common occurrence, it means that some rationed area is without food for that period, unless reserves are in the immediate area for quick distribution. Such situations are handled by "pipeline" stocks constantly shuttled about the vast country from warehouses and railroad cars. India's pipeline contains 700,000 tons.

This amount is rock bottom. Normally, there would be another million tons or so available to the Central Government to take care of contingencies that continually arise and to provide a cushion. "Today," said Mr. Munshi, "no such reserve exists."

This year India, at a high price in foreign exchange, has contracted for 3,700,000 tons of grain from abroad, to arrive at the rate of about 300,000 tons monthly. Granted that these imports arrive on time, this will in no way alleviate the tightness of the present situation. "For instance," Mr. Munshi said "290,000 tons are scheduled to arrive in February and already 280,000 tons have been allocated to the deficit state for that month."

Mr. Munshi indicated that the 2,000,000 tons asked from the United States were urgently necessary to maintain the vital pipeline and keep the country's head above water. "Without it," he said, "a collapse in any one area would mean a national calamity."

He denied an assertion made in Washington that India had refused to buy 600,000 tons of grain offered by Pakistan.

Remit, Please!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Remit, Please!" which appeared recently in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMIT, PLEASE!

Corp. Earl Booth, of the Fifth Cavalry Division, has written to a collection agency in his home town of Louisville, Ky., enclosing a bundle of Korean currency as down payment on a $23.50 grocery bill.

The corporal wrote:

"I haven't been paid since July, so don't have much American currency at present.

"I am most grateful to you for informing me of the fact you are sending the cops after me. I will be very happy to see them because, you see, I am a policeman myself, presently engaged in a police action for a force called the United Nations.

"My police squad is located in central Korea, and I am sure you have heard of our chief, MacArthur.

"If you had sent the cops after me last August or September I would have been easy to locate in a hospital."

The collection agency gave the letter to the press, but didn't forget its business integrity. It sent Corporal Booth a receipt for the exchange amount represented by the depreciated Korean currency—American cash totaling 26 cents.

Somewhere hidden in this little yarn is a moral, or maybe a couple of them, having to do with thousands of doughboys who are giving everything, and with some civilians who are taking everything.

Welcome of Israeli Ambassador Abba Eban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 3, Hon. Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, Governor of the State of Maryland, welcomed the Israeli Ambassador to the United States on his visit to Maryland. Since I believe that the Governor's remarks are of interest to the entire Nation, as well as to the State of Maryland, I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. THEODORE R. MCKELDIN

It is no merely routine duty of office to welcome the truly distinguished Israeli Ambassador to the United States, but I take it as one of the most congenial privileges that has fallen to my lot as Chief Executive of the State of Maryland.

Even if Mr. Eban's great reputation as scholar, orator, and statesman had not been heralded before him, we should nevertheless wish to greet with the greatest interest and friendliness the representative of the new State of Israel.

The land of Israel is the focal point of religious interest of everyone in the vast assemblage, be he Jew or Christian. We have been nurtured from infancy upon the stories of the Bible; and the ground which constitutes the modern State of Israel is hallowed by the footsteps of the ancient prophets and seers and singers of Israel, and of our own Lord and His apostles. The very mention of the land of Israel, therefore, stirs us with emotion as does no other place on earth outside our own, native country.

I am one of those Christians who believed completely and literally God's promise to restore Israel to its ancient home. We rejoice that it happened in our generation. We are filled with admiration for the valor and sacrifice of the small population of Israel which successfully withstood the attack of its more numerous enemies in the very hour of its birth. In the past two years we have been thrilled again and again by the magnitude of the successes they have achieved in the face of odds that would have spelled discouragement and failure for a less resolute people. We are proud that the United States, through the United Nations, had a part in establishing this new sister nation, thus fulfilling the Holy Bible's sacred promise, and allowing a people whose spirit and ideals are so much like our own to join the world's family of great democracies.

When all this is symbolized for us in the person of Abba Eban, universally recognized, despite his youth, as a man of the highest intellectual powers, an accomplished scholar, an orator of renown and a statesman of the very first rank, I am double pleased to welcome him most heartily to Maryland; and with you, my friends, I anticipate with pleasure, the message he brings us.

The Rise in Coffee Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Who Made the Money on Coffee?" published in Cosmopolitan magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO MADE THE MONEY ON COFFEE?—WHAT IS BEHIND THE PHENOMENAL RISE IN COFFEE PRICES?—THE REAL ANSWER WILL ASTOUND AND ANGER YOU

(By Leslie Gould)

When it comes mother's turn to glance at the family newspaper, she generally doesn't have much time or even the inclination to look at the stories buried in the back section on the financial pages. That's a pity because, if she'd been reading those pages two summers ago, she might have got some warning that once again the bite was about to be put on her purse. Maybe she couldn't have done anything about it, but she would now know why she is paying over 75 percent more for coffee, and why father's noontime cup of java has gone from 5 cents to 10 or 15 cents.

Those stories she missed—which, incidentally, didn't contain a word of truth—paved the way for some brazen market manipulations by a small band of speculators. These manipulations have cost her 40 cents on each pound of coffee she buys. While the price of her coffee rose, she kept denouncing the corner grocer as a bandit because he was handiest, but she was pointing her finger at the wrong man. The corner grocer was taking a bite, but his was just a measly nibble compared to what others were grabbing from her.

Within 10 weeks, behind-the-scene speculators in coffee—here and in South America—became richer by millions, and their unconscionable, artificial rigging of the market added six to seven hundred million dollars a year to America's annual coffee bill, or, roughly, around $25 a year for each coffee-drinking family.

This increase can be added to the cost of our State Department's good-neighbor policy. The State Department felt that exposing the South American speculators might have endangered the good-neighbor policy. Therefore, it actively worked to cover up the foreigners' manipulations on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange. The State Department even went so far as to force a powerful senatorial investigating committee to tone down its report and soften its criticism of the boodlers.

The sly operation in the speculative coffee market had all the earmarks of the sort of stock manipulations common in the early twenties, before the stock market crash. Stories from South America appeared in United States newspapers alleging that coffee crops would be small because of storms and drought, and that Americans and Europeans were drinking more coffee than ever. All such stories were false.

A financial-page story said that drought in Brazil had reduced that country's crop severely; the truth was that Brazil had sufficient rain, and that the crop was about normal. "Floods in Guatemala," said another story, "damaged the crop there, and there was hurricane damage in Haiti"; the truth was that the production of coffee in Guatemala was within five percent of normal, and that Haiti's crop was normal that year.

Those were the stories the American housewife missed. The story that the consumption of coffee in America was rising was just as false. Actually, Americans drank no more and perhaps even slightly less coffee in 1949 than they had consumed the previous year. Although coffee consumption went down twenty-four percent just before the outbreak of the Korean war, the Pan-American Coffee Bureau issued a "survey" purporting to prove that there had been a great rise in coffee drinking!

All this, of course, was to justify the increase in the price of coffee.

Coffee is one of the few commodities under the control of interests outside the United States. The National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia is a $100,000,000 combine that buys and sells all the coffee produced in that country, and even operates the mills there. Its directors, acting through the headman, Manuel Mejia who is known, for good reason, as "Mr. Coffee"—can hold coffee off the market or release it for sale according to the condition of the market. Brazil controls the amount of coffee that can go out of its country.

The real trading in the coffee market, however, takes place on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange. Half the purchase contracts are held by foreign interests, and 30 percent of that half is controlled by one Brazilian broker. In the early spring of 1949, the price of coffee on the exchange was 21 cents a pound. By September, in line with general inflation, the price had gone up to 28 cents a pound. There was no shortage of coffee, despite the planted stories, but in September the price went up another 3 cents, and then, in October, it went "through the roof," to use a speculator's term. The price reached 46 cents that month, and 52 cents the following month.

These rigged increases, to which the roasters, wholesalers, and retailers added increases all along the line, raised the price housewives paid for a leading chain-store brand from 42 cents to 59 cents between September and December 1949. The retail price of a nationally advertised brand jumped, during the same period, from 53 cents to 80 cents. The rise continued unabated in 1950. By last October, the chain-store coffee sold at 79 cents a pound, and in September, housewives were paying 90 cents for a nationally advertised brand.

Although the Central and South American coffee growers didn't get any of the loot mulcted from the United States housewife in 1949 (most of it went to the speculators), in 1950 a bag of coffee brought the growers twice as much. In Brazil a deficit of $43,000,000 was changed by 1950 into a surplus of more than $250,000,000. In addition to Brazil's all-time high in dollar earnings, that country has also obtained loans of $136,000,000 from the American Export-Import Bank and the World Bank. Colombia, too, thanks to the generosity of the American housewife, has increased its gold and foreign exchange from $68,000,000 to $130,000,000.

All this prosperity, naturally, makes the South Americans very fond of us.

The manipulations that raised the price of coffee and kept it so high as to make it a major item on the budget of the American housewife were easy for the South American speculators because the United States anti-trust and antimonopoly laws do not apply to them. And the State Department—which forced the Senate's Gillette committee, investigating the sudden and uncalled-for rise in coffe prices, to take the teeth out of its report—did not help the housewife.

The action of the State Department, which had the effect of concealing the identity of the speculators responsible for the price rise, has led to rumors that there may be some Washington politicians who are splitting some of the millions snatched from the American housewife's purse. It has happened before; several years ago investigation revealed that a member of the White House staff, a State Department official, and at least one Senator were in on the ride when the price of grains shot up.

Nobody likes a good neighbor better than the American housewife, but six or seven hundred million dollars a year added to her household budget seems to be too high a price for keeping her neighbor's love and affection.

Threat of Russian Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "You Can't Play Games With Gangsters," published in the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader on January 30, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU CAN'T PLAY GAMES WITH GANGSTERS

The absurdity and unreality of the United Nations trying to operate in a world facing the threat of Russian aggression with Soviet Russia sitting as one of its major members is beginning to filter into many minds.

This situation has been stated in a realistic way by George V. Denny, whose brilliant work as moderator of America's Town Meeting of the Air has contributed so much to a public understanding of the grave problems facing us as a Nation today. Mr. Denny has shown rare ability in balancing opposing views on the various issues presented by Town Meeting, so as to enable the American people to reach intelligent conclusions.

Referring to Russia's place on the United Nations, Mr. Denny recently asked this pertinent question:

"When will we learn that we endanger our lives, our fortunes, and our honor when we try to play games with gangsters?"

Then he answered his own question by declaring that it would have been as sensible to give Al Capone a place on the Chicago city council at a time when he controlled much of that city's life, as it is to give Moscow's rulers a place in the UN. After which he added this pithy statement:

"The time has come for us to organize a real United Nations consisting of those who have demonstrated their desire and ability to live and work under law to stop our common enemy before he destroys us one by one."

The real issue facing the UN today is whether Soviet Russia shall be allowed to use that organization to promote its plan of world domination. That is what Soviet Russia has been doing since the UN was established. By the use of its veto power, it has blocked all effective UN action against Soviet aggression, except for the few months that it stayed home and sulked over the UN refusal to seat Red China. During that interim the non-Soviet members sought to remove the obstacle of the Russian veto by empowering the UN Assembly to take action if the Security Council was paralyzed. But today Russia is using this change in UN procedure to create division in that organization by playing on the fears of timider and more credulous members and thereby restraining them from taking action against open aggression. Thus once again the purpose of the UN is defeated and the organization is made a tool of Soviet aggression.

The outcome therefore is perfectly plain. Either Soviet Russia should be kicked out of the UN and the organization remodeled to include only those who have the desire and ability to withstand aggression, or the UN should fold up and cease its make-believe. These are the two alternatives as Mr. Denny sees them. And Denny is absolutely right.

Lost Prestige in Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the letter I have here submitted for publication in the RECORD was published a few days ago in the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier.

The writer, the Reverend J. E. Pritchard, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, is performing a most vital service in calling attention to what is probably America's greatest need in this hour—that of real friends throughout the world.

The record shows that we do not have these friends, and why? Because, through international bribery, we have attempted to buy friends—because we have aided and abetted certain of our so-called European allies in their continued exploitation of millions of people in their colonial domains—and because our own Government has failed to stop the diabolical operations of our own internationalists-for-a-profit.

Here is the letter:

LOST PRESTIGE IN ORIENT

CEDAR FALLS, IOWA.

To the EDITOR:

The magazine, United States News and World Report, one of our top publications, under date of February 2, page 7, made this statement, "War in Asia is showing United States to have few real friends in a hard world."

To me, that is one of the most depressing lines I have read in these last few years. For, an individual with scarcely a friend is in a sad condition. It is true also for a nation.

When I was young, my country was loved all around the world. People came to America by the millions and we were busy welcoming them and helping them to obtain the blessings of democracy. The poor and the oppressed from the ends of the earth looked to us for freedom.

Not only that, we sent missionaries to faraway lands to establish schools, hospitals, and churches. We staffed these institutions with capable leaders who carried good will to benighted lands.

Thirty years ago our missionary bishop to China, Bishop Wilson Seeley Lewis spoke to the Methodist conference at Sioux City. He said, "China loves us. I can go anywhere in China without fear." He pulled a tiny American flag from his pocket. "This is all the bodyguard I need even among bandits." Then he said, "Remember, all of China loves us."

Now what has happened to change this? What has happened that our country has come to the place where it has few real friends in a hard world.

Two late books will shed considerable light on the question, Half of One World, by Hailey, and The Situation in Asia, by Owen Lattimore. Lattimore says that at the close of World War II all of the Far East respected us. We had knocked the Japs off their necks and they felt that we would support them in their efforts to establish their own governments. We failed them.

Our leaders supported Chiang and tried to keep him afloat. His corrupt regime finally failed. We gave our support to our European allies and tried to keep the rump and of decadent colonial empires alive. And lastly, our own country has become another white nation battling on the soil of Asia.

It is pathetic for a man who has reached the pinnacle of high esteem to fall to the gutter of disrespect. It is a tragedy for a Nation to take the wrong road and tumble until it has few real friends in a hard world.

Our leaders are trying to solve this problem by calling people to prayer. What answer will a righteous God give to a Nation that prays for peace and prepares and engages in obliteration?

There is a road to peace. When this Nation gets its cheeks wet with the hot tears of repentance and gets right with God, when it quits its wicked ways, then it will again be respected and loved and can live in peace.

REV. J. E. PRITCHARD.

Television Channels for Educational Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram addressed by the Medical Society of the County of Queens, N. Y., to Commissioner Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, on the subject of assuring a certain number of television channels for educational purposes on the television band. The question raised and now being considered by the Federal Communications Commission is one which I believe merits consideration and study by Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Queens County Medical Society petitions the Federal Communications Commission to do all in its power to assure an adequate number of channels for educational purposes in the television band. The advantages to public health in keeping physicians abreast of the active modern advances in medicine makes the assignment of some television bands for this purpose an important public-health measure.

Is There a Military Supply Conspiracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following thought-provoking article by Col. P. Joseph Smith which appeared recently in the Reserve Officer magazine.

I commend it to my colleagues, particularly those who served in World Wars I and II:

IS THERE A MILITARY SUPPLY CONSPIRACY?

(By Col. P. Joseph Smith)

Since World War I, every effort to develop and install a unified supply catalog system for the services has met with failure. Now, Reservists want to know why their wartime knowledge and hard-won victories over supply problems are being casually cast aside.

A multitude of Reservists insist there is a conspiracy to prevent the President, the Secretary of Defense, the service secretaries, and the Congress from improving the efficiency and reducing the tax burden of the Armed Forces. And further, they contend that this resistance is being carried on ruthlessly and in complete disregard of the safety of the men at the fighting front and of the national security.

As proof of their contention, these experienced Reservists point to their own trials during the war and to the events in the military forces since the war.

Supply confusion was prevalent throughout the Armed Forces during the early stages of the war. Reserve officers, when first they came in contact with the situation, assumed that this was caused by the sudden expansion of military operations (wondering at the same time why plans, techniques, and methods were not available for this certain contingency) and went to work to overcome the mountainous obstacles that were clogging the movement of supplies and equipment.

Miles of red tape were cut, Colonel Blimp inhibitions were cast aside, ingenious new devices and methods were developed, duplications of staffs and facilities were eliminated, and by the end of the war the vast machinery of supplying our theaters scattered over the world as well as our allies had been streamlined and was being operated with improved efficiency.

The reservists found that the key to any supply improvement was a single catalog of supply items that provided a single designation and a standard reference symbol for all items. They found that such a system to include all the items used by all the services could be developed and installed within 2 years' time. This was tested out on supply functions that included almost all the allied armed services and was greater in magnitude than all the postwar supply functions of the Department of Defense.

The results were so spectacular that steps were immediately started toward the development of a single-catalog system to include all the Armed Forces. However, with the end of the war, the Reserves were released or transferred and the services lapsed into their old lethargy.

The reservists waited for the services to follow through with the programs and improvements that had been initiated during the war. Instead they learned through the Hoover reports that conditions in the Armed Forces had reverted to those prevailing in the Armed Forces when the war started; and it dawned on them that the supply confusion that they found and were on the way to overcoming, may not have been an accident of the war, but a result of a specific plan.

HOOVER REPORT EXPOSÉ

Their suspicions were confirmed by the Hoover Commission's reports that attributed the inefficiency and waste to "great and stubborn resistance of supply officials" and "to the realization by the technical services and the bureaus that a standard commodity catalog, when made mandatory in use, will require adjustments and changes in their time-honored methods of purchasing, storing, and distribution, and will provide the means for eliminating duplication of staffs and facilities."

The Reservus learned also from the Hoover reports that the discovery of the dependence of supply efficiency upon a single-catalog language was not unique to them or to this war—it had been known to supply personnel since before the First World War. Every effort of supply personnel to develop and install this tool of supply management had met with failure throughout two World Wars.

So the reservists set out to discover what the means were by which every attempt to install a single-catalog system had been defeated. One of them, Lt. Col. Vernon J. Nelson, of Idaho, wrote a letter to the President that appeared in the July 6, 1950, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He advised the President that he, along with former Presidents, had had the "wool pulled over their eyes" by the simple device of being told that "there was a program under way and great progress was being made."

By this deliberate distortion of the facts, every effort of the supply personnel since before the First World War to establish a single catalog system had been defeated. The same sort of statements have been issued for years.

LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS

By now these Reserve officers are up in arms. In 1949, Lt. Col. Glenn Rathbun, an infantry officer who had lost his sight in the Rhine battles, arranged for his Congressman, JACK Z. ANDERSON, of California, to propose a bill, H. R. 321, to establish a single catalog system for the Armed Forces. The hearings held before the House Armed Services Commitee brought out that there was a great need for the single catalog system, confirming the Hoover Commission findings, and that the solution was comparatively easy. It was disclosed that a system had been devised by the Office of the Secretary of Defense early in 1948, based upon the wartime experiences, that could have been completed and installed by last spring and by now all the duplicating, costly systems would have been eliminated.

The Reserves want to know why their wartime knowledge and experience is being disregarded and their hard-won victories over these supply problems are being thrown away, instead of preparing the Nation to meet a new and growing menace.

They want to know why the same old methods and systems that had caused them so much trouble have been brought back.

And above all they want action. They have written letters to the President, to the Secretary of Defense, and to their Congressman requesting that a full-scale investigation be made, pointing out that for 40 years there has been a plethora of committees, voluminous committee reports, directives, consultants, and fine speeches, all designed as stage scenery for the "fine program under way, great progress being made"—but no catalog.

REPORTS MEANINGLESS

Experienced Reserve officers say flatly that the present methods never have produced a functioning stock number system and never can. Also they point out that the attempt to give the impression of great progress by issuing glowing reports on numbers of cards processed is meaningless: that cards have been issued for years without any perceptible effect on the development of a catalog system.

The present reports of the Defense Department specifically omit any reference to the date when the system will be installed, promising only that by 1952 there will be several million cards available. With curious frankness it is specifically stated there will not result a single catalog.

So the veterans of the American Legion in the national convention at Los Angeles unanimously adopted a blistering indictment of the supply cataloging system as presently operated and sent a resolution to the Secretary of Defense that action be taken immediately to develop and install a sound working system in accordance with the experiences of the last war.

It was significant that shortly before the resignation of Secretary of Defense Johnson, a letter was sent him from Colonel Rathbun pointing out that the Secretary had been forced into a false economy program by his advisers; that had he helped to have passed Mr. ANDERSON's catalog bill, he could have had more savings fall into his lap naturally than all the programs that had aroused so much antagonism and bitterness and brought down upon his head a national avalanche of criticism.

The Secretary of Defense, who had foolishly rejected a method for establishing a single catalog system, has passed from the Washington stage. It is perhaps more than a coincidence that during the same week of his passing, William H. Harrison, who had wielded a single catalog system so effectively during the war quietly moved into the national picture as Administrator of the National Production Administration.

A single catalog system when developed and made mandatory will act automatically as a surgeon's knife to expose the duplication of services and facilities and the enormous waste in supply operations; it will have the same effect on bloated bureaucratic empires as a sharp pin on an inflated balloon; and it would be the most powerful instrument toward unification of the services. Therefore, it is inevitable that the decisive battle between the bureaucrats and the reservists for the reforms in supply operations proposed by the Hoover Commission and so earnestly desired by the entire Nation will be fought over a single cataloging system—the key to our national security and sound economy.

Norway Is Ready To Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Norway Is Ready To Fight," published in the United States News and World Report. This article is a direct report from Oslo, and is an encouraging and enthusiastic report from the tiny, rugged nation of Norway, which has fought and continues to fight against tyranny and aggression. I commend the article to the attention of all Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWAY IS READY TO FIGHT

(There's no talk of appeasement in Norway. Once-occupied Norway is ready to fight to the last man if Russia moves. Defenses are being rushed. So is mobilization. Everything is being done to get a small but willing army in fighting trim. Here is a first-hand report from Norway by Robert Kleiman, regional editor of United States News and World Report in central Europe.)

OSLO.—Norwegians, strengthened by American aid, are showing a will to fight that promises the United States a better-than-even chance of holding a vital Scandinavian base against Russia. Norway's military planners do not expect a Russian assault now, but the country is grimly getting ready, just in case.

With Finland practically disarmed and Sweden neutral, Norway becomes the main northern outpost barring Russia's growing sea power from access to the Atlantic. Norway cannot defend itself unaided. But, with Norwegian cooperation now being offered enthusiastically, the United States hopes to—

Make it impossible for Russia to capture Norway by a sneak attack.

Hold vital Norwegian bases if Russia mounts a major assault.

In either case, Norwegians alone will take the full brunt of an initial attack. Atlantic Pact plans call for no non-Norwegian forces to be based in this country in peacetime. By 1952, the Allies expect to have a strategic reserve of ground troops in Britain earmarked for Norway's defense. But, until then, the United States is dependent on Norwegian ground forces and British-American sea and air power to hold this key strategic area.

At stake in Norway is an elongated country that for 1,100 miles lies athwart the shortest great-circle aerial route to New York from bomber and rocket bases in Russia.

In Allied hands, Norway's southern coast guards the exit from the Baltic, home of Russia's main submarine fleet. The Russians have more than 120 submarines in the Baltic, more than half of them modern, ocean-going craft, plus 5 cruisers and 20 destroyers.

Norway's North Cape dominates Russia's Arctic passage to the open sea. Fearful that the Baltic might be closed by allied blockade, Russia has built a costly Stalin Canal that can take warships, up to light-cruiser size, from Leningrad through Lake Ladoga to the White Sea.

In Russian hands, Norway would provide Stalin with the most dangerous series of natural submarine bases anywhere on the above line of Western Europe. German built submarine bases at Trondheim and Bergen are still intact and can service a fleet of 40 U-boats. Too, the west coast is ice-free the year around and is indented by deep fiords.

Russia's Arctic ports are icy many months of the year. That is why allied strategists believe Norway will be one of Stalin's chief objectives if war comes.

Defending Norway, at this stage, depends heavily on the willingness of the Norwegians to fight. American officials find that the answer to that is clear. There is less talk of appeasement and neutrality here than in any other capital in the Atlantic Pact.

Partial mobilization already has been started. Since the Chinese attacked in Korea, the whole country has been put on a 24-hour alert.

Draftees scheduled to be released at the end of the year are being held over in service. Organized reserves are being called up as a first step to doubling military manpower this year. Mobilization plans are being rehearsed that can put almost half the trained men under arms in 8 hours or less.

Orders already have been issued to the 200,000 troops, reserves and national guardsmen to mobilize automatically and resist invasion, even if the Government is paralyzed by a sneak attack. These unprecedented orders say:

"Continue to resist despite orders to the contrary purporting to come from the King or Government. * * *

"Resist even if alone and the situation seems * * * hopeless. Disregard any threat of reprisals such as bombing of towns."

The Norwegians are preparing for extended guerrilla warfare, if that becomes necessary. A six months' supply of grain and other essentials has been stockpiled. Caches of food and arms are tucked away in mountain hideouts.

Air-raid shelters are under construction and alerts are being practiced in all the cities. Special police are being recruited to counter fifth columnists. The country is preparing to follow a scorched-earth policy. Universal military service, already in effect for all youths of 20, is backstopped by the recruiting of men 26 to 40 for a national guard.

All defense plans have been speeded up. Military goals originally set for 1954 have been moved ahead to 1952.

Armed strength of Norway, in manpower, doesn't amount to much when compared with the United States, despite the current build-up. About 35,000 men are under arms now. Target for the end of 1951 is 60,000 men—the equivalent, in terms of population, to a 3,000,000-man army in the United States.

The navy is small, with a backbone of seven former British destroyers. The United States is furnishing numbers of torpedo boats and considering the transfer of several destroyers to Norway.

The air force is small, but it is staffed by high-caliber personnel, many of whom fought with the RAF in World War II. The force is equipped with about 100 combat planes—40 of them British jet fighters. Two squadrons of pilots now are being trained in Texas on American jets.

Coastal and port defenses, vastly superior to those of 1940, are being strengthened by the addition of American antiaircraft batteries. The Norwegians have 80 modern coastal forts that were installed by the Germans during World War II occupation. Many of the big guns are like new.

Financing defense means major sacrifices for Norwegians, who have lived even more austerely than the British since the end of the war. Their taxes will have to go up, imports will be cut, and other belt-tightening measures applied.

Norway lives by importing food and manufactured goods, paying for them with the earnings of its large merchant fleet and exports of paper and pulp, fish, whale oil, and ores. A fifth of the country's physical assets, including half the merchant fleet, was destroyed in the war.

The country had just begun to turn the recovery corner in 1950, when new defense burdens came along. Rationing of some foods was dropped only last spring. There were prospects that the country would be able to support itself by 1952. Now, all this is out the window.

Living standards are frozen at the 1950 austerity level, and cuts are likely for later this year. The textile ration is so low it takes 18 months' ration to buy a man's suit. Women get three pairs of stockings a year. It is doubtful that a return to general food rationing can be avoided.

Defense planning is based largely on the assumption that if Russia moves she will strike at Norway with a massive land-sea-air attack. Russia could draw forces from 90 divisions for such an attack.

Chances of holding Norway, or essential bases there, against a major Soviet assault in 1951 are slim. But Norwegian defenses, already strong enough to counter a sneak attack of the Hitler variety, will give the Atlantic Treaty nations a fighting chance to deny Norwegian bases to Russia if war comes in 1952.

Military planners believe that, by 1952, chances will be fair and, by 1953, very good for holding at least a coastal foothold in Norway against a massive Russian attack. This gives the allies at least 15 months to prepare for a 1952 attack, since fighting weather doesn't come to Norway until April.

An American officer sums up the outlook in these words:

"Norway is the kind of area we are best suited to defend, because the invaders will have to come by air and sea and would be unable to mass overwhelming ground forces against us. The Norwegians are doing their share to hold a base vital to the defense of the United States. The question is whether we can supply the arms, the sea and air power that will be needed to counter a Russian attack."

Light in Darkness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a front-page editorial entitled, "Light in Darkness," which appeared recently in the Washington Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGHT IN DARKNESS

In this time of almost numb despair—of grief over the seeming failure of our hopes for a lasting peace and a working formula for the world, one gnawing responsibility is the anxiety of our young men in the colleges, who are unable to find assurance that they are doing the wise thing in continuing their studies, hoping to find later the proper place in some branch of the service.

In a letter to the parents of boys in such a tumult of indecision, the president of a southern university concludes: "While we wait for exactness of knowledge, we are telling our boys what I think would be the counsel of everybody responsibly placed from General Marshall to our faculty advisers: Wait until you know what is required of you. The country must be saved, of course, but it is the promise of boys like you that makes the country worth saving.

"If you are to be interrupted you will be immensely grateful and I know this fact as a verity, for every lap of progress you made before the interruption, there will be that much less to do when you come back older and hurried.

"Use now for coolest reasoning that excellent mind you have. After all, you are not children to be thrown into panic like a frightened herd of sheep. You are a picked group, tested and approved by all of life's standards up to the present moment. Live in terms of your best hope and your finest aspirations, and don't throw those things away in a desperate gesture of acceptance of what seems the inevitable.

"Do today's work today with full faith that tomorrow is in the hands of a loving God."

A 44-Hour Workweek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Wrong Medicine," from the January 27, 1951, edition of the Concord Daily Monitor, published at Concord, N. H.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WRONG MEDICINE

A member of the Federal Reserve Board has had the courage to tell Congress that the workweek, before payment of overtime, should be raised from the present 40 hours to 44.

The average workweek has crept up about 2 hours in length the past year, under the production demands induced by war and inflation fears. But it still is only 41.6 hours a week.

The payment of time and a half for overtime remains a definite deterrent to further production in a Nation in which there is no serious unemployment.

When originally enacted, at the bottom of depression, the law limiting the normal workweek to 40 hours was devised to spread employment, to make it necessary for more workers to be required to do a given job. If it was effective in doing that, and it was, then it follows that it is today an impediment to increasing production in a period during which there will develop serious manpower shortages.

The suggested 44-hour workweek at normal pay per hour is a compromise. The more natural workweek would be 48 hours, or six 8-hour days. Beyond that it is probably true that efficiency of workers declines and little is gained in actual boosting of total production. Longer hours than 48 a week, if worked occasionally, might further boost production.

The suggestion to lengthen the workweek is not being advanced to reduce wages paid. It is suggested to remove a psychological hindrance to the more efficient use of American manpower. Wages can be adjusted in a variety of ways so that no injustice is done anyone. Increased production, in itself, is the surest way to depress and keep prices under control, and if that can be done and inflation ended, then wages automatically are increased, for they will buy more.

Boosting the normal workweek under the wage-hour law would tend to establish a new maximum workweek, and in some kinds of employment the workweek would naturally continue at shorter hours. The 8-hour day, 6 days a week, fits into three-shift operation in any industry in which machinery is part of the production process. It is the only way that maximum production can be obtained from machinery, and if machine production can be kept efficient less machinery is needed at a time when the material and manpower to build it is needed for other purposes.

The changing of the wage-hour law would accomplish far more than will the freezing of wages.

There are other Federal laws, invoked in depression, which should also be repealed to permit the national economy to meet current conditions in such a way as to forestall further inflation. Some inflationary devices when millions are unemployed are one thing but in times like the present their continuation as national policy is an invitation to disaster. The various subsidies are among these other laws.

Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article, which appeared in the Washington Star of January 28, 1951.

While not subscribing to everything said in this article, I think it is essential that all Americans should know some of the things that it states.

Personally, I am very happy that Spain has finally been recognized and that the United States and Spain are to exchange ambassadors.

The Honorable Jose Felix de Lequerica, the Spanish Ambassador to this country, is a very fine man, well educated, with a broad knowledge not only of Spain and America but of the whole world. His comprehensive outlook and good intentions will do much, I think, to dispel some of the fog that has surrounded our relations and will contribute much to full cooperation between his country and ours in establishing a just and lasting peace.

MADRID.—Spain's strategic geographical position—between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean and sheltered behind the Pyrenees Mountain barrier—is her prime military asset.

Franco has said and repeated that he has a million men to fight communism when his motherland's borders are endangered.

The nation also has important mineral resources, such as mercury and wolfram, of which the western war machine is in short supply.

These important trumps are offset, however, by a rickety transportation network and creaking economic system which desperately needs dollars, raw materials, and electricity, and is largely deficient in agriculture.

TROOPS POORLY ARMED

Spain's troops are sketchily armed and almost completely ignorant of modern tactics and weapons. They are tough and courageous and make fine soldiers when properly trained, however, Franco has made no public statement that he would be willing to send them into battle before Spain's frontiers were attacked. Whether he would permit any part of them to be integrated into General Eisenhower's European defense forces in exchange for American arms and financial aid remains to be seen. (The new Spanish Ambassador to the United States has indicated that Spain would join in Europe's defenses.)

The nation presently has approximately 350,000 men comprising half of the 1948 and all of the 1949 classes under colors. The class of 1950 has been called for next month with the remainder of the 1948 troops freed a few months later if the international situation warrants.

These soldiers are plentifully supplied with small arms, although a majority are of the 1921 model. Artillery all dates from the Spanish civil war, although a prototype of a 105-millimeter cannon has been made and now is being tested. The tanks are a mixture of German, Italian, and Russian models used in the civil war.

Spain's navy is composed of 6 cruisers, the most modern of which is the 10,000-ton *Canarias*, which was completed in 1936. It also has a number of destroyers, gunboats, and minelayers.

The air force has about 300 planes, less than a hundred of which are in a condition to fly. Jets have never even been seen in this country.

From the military viewpoint Spain's worst drawback is a poor railroad and road system. Both would have to be completely overhauled before a modern army could move over them.

Last month the government announced a 5-year program to renovate trunk highways. It hopes for American dollar loans to make over the railroad system.

INDUSTRY LAGS

The nation's industry has been all but at a standstill the past 3 years, because the longest drought known here nearly emptied the reservoirs and exhausted the electricity reserves. Because of a lack of dollars industry has faced a continuous shortage of raw materials.

The country never has had enough grain to feed its population or livestock. It is also deficient in meat and sugar. A helping hand would be necessary to put all those difficulties right before the country could become a positive asset in western defense. But Spain's geographical position alone makes her important to Allied grand strategy:

Bombers and fighters based on the Iberian Peninsula would control the western Mediterranean up to Italy and the Atlantic from Britain to Dakar and as far west as the Azores.

Her closeness to Africa, just across the Straits of Gibraltar, would considerably simplify the supply problem.

Natural obstacles have less military value in these days of air-transported troops, but with peaks rising well over 10,000 feet in the Pyrenees Mountains, Spain enjoys a rugged bulwark on her northern frontier. If Spain were prepared in advance to receive it, an Allied army could hold out a long time behind this bulwark.

The Allies are anxious to bring Portugal into the defense setup. To do so, however, they must almost certainly include Spain.

The Portuguese themselves are insisting that Spain be brought into the Atlantic Pact. They argue that unless the Spaniards stop any Red assault at the Pyrenees, Portuguese defense efforts would be futile.

Use of Portugal's great port of Lisbon in any future war almost certainly would hinge on Spanish cooperation. If Lisbon were used as a supply unloading point, there would be no way to move war materials up to Europe except across Spain.

Address of Robert E. Smylie, Idaho's Brilliant Attorney General, at Ground-Breaking Ceremony for Albeni Falls Dam in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we are building an empire in the Pacific Northwest by harnessing the mighty Columbia River and its tributaries to carry our ships, irrigate and reclaim our arid lands, and develop almost unlimited quantities of hydroelectric energy, at the lowest possible cost.

From a resources standpoint, the Columbia is the mightiest stream on the North American Continent with a power potential of 40 percent of the hydroelectric energy that can ever be generated in the entire United States. So stupendous is this natural resource that only by comparison can the mind comprehend it. The power potential of the Columbia River and its tributaries is nine times as great as the potential of the St. Lawrence waterway in both Canada and the United States, and 18 times as great as the share the United States will receive.

At a ground-breaking ceremony signifying the start of construction on Albeni Falls Dam in Idaho, one unit in this great river development system, the following address was made by Idaho's brilliant attorney general, Robert E. Smylie:

[From the Priest River (Idaho) Times of February 1, 1951]

Fellow Idahoans, this morning marks the ending of a long and arduous road for the people of the great inland empire—for all the people of the Pacific Northwest. And it marks a commencement. In 1937—13 years ago—the first recorded step leading to this morning's ceremony occurred when Senate Committee on Commerce directed Chief of Army Engineers to make a study of the feasibility of constructing a multipurpose dam at Albeini Falls. Since that date there has been frustration, contention and much delay. But as the plunger drives home to shoot the first dirt on the project this morning, the construction of Albeni Falls Dam is finally underway.

Here in this north country—land of timber, mines and mountains—this is a meaningful morning. This is a significant hour for all of the Columbia Basin. It is a meaningful morning for all of Idaho, north, south, and central. It marks the beginning of big construction on the upstream power sites in the Columbia River system. It brings the promise of power which will ultimately balance Idaho's economy between agriculture and industry, and finally free the upland States of the Columbia Basin from the colonial status of the past—a status induced by geography, by transportation differentials between the upland States and tidewater, and by the resultant character of our economy.

For those reasons alone it is entirely fitting that I bring you greetings this morning from our Governor, Len Jordan—and through him, from the government of the State of Idaho. Further, it is entirely fitting that I extend the congratulations of your government to all who had a hand in bringing about the commencement of construction which begins here today.

It is unnecessary to relate once more that Albeni Falls Dam will figure strongly in the history of this area for many decades to come. It will be immediately important to the effort we are waging to stem the tide of aggression. The dam and the power plant when constructed will deliver a bloc of power that will make significant contributions to development of the industrial muscle that we need to man the ramparts of the free world against the dark forces of tyranny.

The part that Albeni Falls will play in the defense of our freedom need not claim our entire attention this morning. With expedited construction schedules we can count on power to turn the wheels of Northwest industry being "on the line" at an early date.

I would prefer, although it seems like dreaming, to consider for awhile the impact of this significant hour on the peacetime economy of our State and region. I prefer to do this because Idaho is an upland State in the Columbia River Basin. In common with the other upper-basin States, we have problems which must not be overlooked if total development of the basin is to become an accomplished fact.

Albeni Falls is one step toward complete utilization of the hydroelectric potential on the Columbia-Snake River system. There are other developments which should not, and will not, lag far behind. There is Palisades Dam on the Idaho-Wyoming border, the Scriver Creek development in the Boise area, and there is Libby Dam in Montana. All of these will generate power. And they will also provide additional upstream storage for the generators on the main stem of Columbia River.

As these generators are built, and come into use, they will commence multipurpose utilization of a resource in which the peoples of the upper-basin States have a very real equitable interest. That resource is water.

Those of you who know the arid reaches of the Snake River plain know the importance of water in southern Idaho. Water has strung a chain of verdant irrigated valleys along the great curve of Snake River from its source in Wyoming's mountains to where it turns north to meet the Columbia.

Those of you who know central Idaho will understand that water there means the dream of river-borne transportation to tidewater. It means that the produce of one of the world's finest stands of timber can be processed in the forest.

I could go on at considerable length to elucidate the meaning of water to the people of the upper basin. But realistically, on the morning of this new departure, we should solemnly assess our real interests; how they may be protected and served, and how Idaho may lift herself by proper use of this resource out of the unbalanced economy of the past, and, with the other States of the Northwest, face a bright new industrial future.

It is not dreaming to say Idaho's glorious history is only a beginning. With inexpensive power and fuel, we can overcome the transportation differential that has always held us captive to the tidewater States.

There is no dark guilt involved in this old captivity of our economy. Geography blessed Idaho with timber and mountains. But geography also pushed us up against the rim of the continent, far distant from our markets, and from the centers of industrial commerce. These rugged overland distances made it impossible to attract processing industry unless and until we could offer the compensating advantage of inexpensive power and fuel. With the development of the upper-basin generators, that power will be generated within our own boundaries. It is Idaho's task to see that at least some of that power is used to develop Idaho.

Plainly stated, Idaho and the rest of the upper Columbia Basin territory—and I include all of the Inland Empire—must insist that an equitable share of the actual power produced at the upper-basin power sites be allocated for use in the upper-basin States. In no other way can we make certain that Idaho's industrial development will keep in step with the tidewater areas of the Northwest.

This is no dog-in-the-manger attitude. The dams that generate the power will also firm up the storage for the downstream generators at power sites on the lower river system. All that this statement implies is that we want final freedom from our geographic disadvantage through application in this State of a resource that the same geography gives to this State in great measure. If an equitable share of the power that is developed here can be used here, and if the navigation system on the two rivers is operated to carry water-borne freight to and from Idaho, we can approach industrial and economic equality with the coastal areas of the basin. We can participate fully in the dispersal of existing manufacturing industry. We can attract and create new industry by bringing power and raw materials together. Then there will be an end to our heavy dependence on extractive industry. Then we can become an economy healthily in balance between agriculture, forestry, mining, and industry.

The development of the Northwest will go forward. No one disputes that proposition. No one contends that it should be otherwise. We are agreed almost completely on where the power sites should be located. Only the method by which we shall control, divide, and distribute this common resource, and how we shall live with it, remain to be decided. Idaho must make certain that when that decision is finally made we are assured of a unified, comprehensive, and basin-wide development which will serve all of the people all over the basin equally. Somewhere between the opposing positions of complete Federal control of the resource and local control of the resource we will find an answer. I, for one, will never willingly abdicate our opportunity to compel usage of these Idaho resources for Idaho's benefit. But common ground will and must be found between the battle lines now drawn up by the antagonists of this question to which a sensible man may in honor repair. For this common ground, all who are determined that the Pacific Northwest shall forge ahead, must search.

ROBERT E. SMYLIE,
Attorney General of Idaho.

The Mobilization Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.:

MR. WILSON'S CLARION CALL

That was a mighty powerful speech which Defense Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson delivered last night in a Nationwide broadcast from the White House. Its effect on the striking railroad switchmen was almost instantaneous. The strike ended in the New York area this morning and appeared nearing its close in several other cities.

Mr. Wilson's appeal had the twin virtues of brevity and forcefulness. He didn't scold, he didn't harangue; he simply laid the situation the line in plain, but simple, potent language. His long experience in dealing with men as top executive of the General Electric Co. stood him in good stead last night as he fashioned his dramatic request that the men go back to work to end paralysis of the Nation at a time when it is in the greatest danger of its history.

The mobilization chief, well remembered by many Greater Lynn residents because of his appearance here last October to open the community fund drive, told the strikers that their actions now can hurt the Nation more every day than all the Communist armies in Korea put together. He said that tanks, ammunition, guns, clothing, and equipment destined for fighting American boys in Korea were being halted by the wildcat strike.

Unexpectedly moderate in tone—and therefore, that much more effective—the speech pointed out that the switchmen are entitled to fair wages and good working conditions, and have every right to use legitimate means to obtain them. "But a strike against the whole Nation, depriving millions of men, women, and children here at home of food is not a legitimate means in time of great peril," he said.

There is abundant evidence today that the Wilson speech hit home. Certainly, it left a profound impression on his fellow countrymen in all parts of the Nation. And, incidentally, while we're casting about for Presidential timber for 1952, it might be well to consider this outstanding American who has made so many notable contributions to his country's service, not the least of which was his magnificent effort of last night.

It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the American people should read the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 6, 1951:

IT CAN BE DONE

The bad news from the tax front hit the streets yesterday. To raise a fast $10,000,000,000 for rearmament, Treasury Secretary Snyder proposed—

Twenty percent tax on new autos—up from 7 percent.

Twenty-five percent on refrigerators, radios, television sets—up from 10.

Ten cents per pack tax on cigarettes—up from 7.

Double the present 1½ cents a gallon tax on gasoline.

Twelve dollars a gallon tax on whisky, up from $9, and $12 a barrel on beer—up from $8.

And other whopping increases all along the line, including income and corporation tax rates.

Well, we've got to dig it up somewhere, if we pay as we go in the defense effort—which is the wise thing to do. But the worrisome fact is that there's a lot of fat in that $71,600,000,000 budget President Truman has set up.

The taxpayers could be a lot more cheerful above paying through the nose if they could only be sure their dollars were going for what they intended.

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, a strong administration supporter, says the Truman budget can be trimmed by at least $2,500,000,000; and he puts the finger on a number of welfare-State items.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, another administration supporter, set no specific figure, but he's for cutting to the bone nonessential spending.

Senator O'CONOR, Democrat, of Maryland, says $5,300,000,000 can be lopped off and Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, has offered a formula for knocking out $9,100,000,000. The United States Chamber of Commerce calls for a $7,000,000,000 cut.

Strike an average of these responsible, detailed estimates and you get $6,000,000,000. That's approximately what President Truman proposes to ask Congress for still later. It won't be necessary if Congress saves us the $6,000,000,000.

It can be done—if Congress resolutely eliminates or slices huge chunks from a lot of the nonessential items which Mr. Truman has palmed into the budget, as even his own backers now acknowledge.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the tenth and eleventh short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

GREGORY IX: HELPED COMPLETE CANON LAW

Gregory IX was pope from 1227 to 1241, a nobleman of Anagni and probably a nephew of Innocent III. Gregory and Frederick II, emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, were constantly in conflict.

He systematized the Inquisition and entrusted it to the Dominicans. Legal historians remember him for ordering the condensation of the decretals (papal decisions and decrees) into a single collection. The volume is considered an important step toward codifying canon law.

Gregory was known for his strong character and learning. He died on August 22, 1241, while Frederick II was advancing against him.

The Gregory plaque was done by Thomas Hudson Jones, of Washington.

INNOCENT III: ANOTHER ROMAN STUDENT OF CANON AND CIVIL LAW (1161–1216 A. D.)

Innocent III (1161–1216 A. D.) was elected Pope at the age of 37. Educated at the University of Paris, he became a profound student of civil and canon law. The outstanding characteristic of his reign was the assertion of world power and making supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal authority a working reality.

Innocent III had an active interest in law. He constantly presided over the court, instituted ecclesiastical reforms and centralized his administration at Rome.

His accomplishments during a dark period in history were much the same as those of Gregory IX—preservation of the remnants of Roman law.

Innocent's greatest triumph was his victory over King John of England. The quarrel arose over a dispute on the election to a vacant See of Canterbury. For years the Pope virtually ruled England through his legates.

His plaque was done by Joseph Kiselewski of New York City.

Untold Facts in the Korean Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House. I respect my obligation as a member of that committee. I strive to keep myself informed so that I may in turn inform my colleagues in this House of developments that affect the conduct of this Government's foreign affairs.

Here is a copy of a monthly magazine, the New American Mercury, published in New York. In this issue of this magazine, its editor, William Bradford Huie, reports on a treaty signed in Moscow in February of 1950—a treaty signed a year ago—between Soviet Russia and Communist China. Mr. Huie charges that this treaty set the stage for the Communist aggression in Korea. This American Mercury article says that the Chinese Reds "planned and manipulated" the Korean War from its beginning.

In this article which is titled "Untold Facts in the Korean Disaster," Mr. Huie enumerates six points in that treaty he says was signed by our enemies a year ago in Moscow. And he enumerates, from the letter "A" through the letter "H," the terms of the treaty concerning the Chinese Communist armed forces.

I will not repeat here the amazing terms of this treaty, since I intend to ask permission to incorporate in the RECORD the entire article as it appears in the New American Mercury. I recommend that the Members of this House study it carefully. I agree with Mr. Huie, and I quote:

Here is an amazing situation—a situation which should be of concern to every American. The signing of these agreements was one of the most significant events of our time. It meant, in effect, that a 5,000,000-man Chinese army had been assimilated into the Russian Army. Russia had accomplished what American diplomacy in the interest of mankind, should have prevented.

But were the American people warned of this pact? Were the terms of this pact published so that we could prepare accordingly? The tragic fact is this: There is reason to believe that the United States Government itself did not know the terms of the agreements, much less understand their significance.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I try to keep informed. I expect my Government to keep me and all other citizens inside and outside of Congress informed of such important events. But until this article reached my desk, I was as much in the dark as any other American about this treaty—signed a year ago—which has brought death to our soldiers, sailors, and Marines in Korea.

I ask why it is that a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House must get information—a year after the fact—about such actions that so vitally affect this Nation's welfare from a magazine instead of from the State Department. I commend Mr. Huie for the service rendered this country by informing us of this dastardly compact between our enemies.

But I ask, Why did not our Government discover the terms of this treaty? And if it did know of this treaty, why did it not inform the Congress and the people? And why did it not act to prevent the aggression which is taking American lives in Korea?

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article from the New American Mercury:

UNTOLD FACTS IN THE KOREAN DISASTER

(By William Bradford Huie)

(NOTE.—In the preparation of this article the author had the assistance of Ralph Wallace, who made a special trip to Formosa and Tokyo; of Freda Utley, author of numerous books on the Orient; and of intelligence officers of the British, American, and Chinese Nationalist Governments.)

When some future Gibbon considers the present period in American history, he probably will record that in the year 1950 the quality of leadership in this Nation reached a melancholy low. It was another of those tragic eras, he will write, when a vigorous, aspiring people found themselves defeated and despondent because they had neglected to seek out wise men to lead them.

Why, our Gibbon will ask, did the American people—a people who had known Washington and Hamilton and Madison and Lincoln, a commonsense people capable of giving substance to the Western ideal, a people who had survived Valley Forge and challenged the Rocky Mountains in covered wagons, a people whose cause Tom Paine had said was the cause of mankind—why did such a people allow mediocre men to exercise power when the demand so obviously was for greatness?

The story of how we wasted the warm young blood of Tarawa and Iwo Jima, and allowed the Asian masses to be armed against us—this is a story which American parents must understand so that, if we have the chance, we can recount it to our children. It's a bitter story, for first it's the story of a few Americans who were traitors; men whose minds and bodies were actually in the employ of the enemy. It's a dispiriting story because it's the story of men who were heroic, of men who were honest and sincere and patriotic, of men who wanted to do good, but who lacked vision, who lost sight of the realities, who did the bidding of traitors, and who, therefore, brought this Nation and the cause of mankind to disaster. It isn't traitors who do the most mischief to free men; it's the dupes of traitors. Finally, it's a warning story, a story of a people who knew more than their leaders but who had delegated too much, who had allowed their leaders to operate in secrecy, who had neglected to impose those checks and balances which the fathers of our liberties warned us to maintain.

The Mercury, in subsequent issues, will document this story so that no reasoning man can misunderstand it. Here, we erect the skeleton on which to work, and we detail events which led to the military disaster in Korea.

THE FIRST ERROR

Every American schoolboy should be required to repeat: "The key to power in the Orient is Manchuria." Only Manchuria contains the minerals necessary to modern industrial and military power. Japan fought Russia for Manchurian concessions in 1904. Japan invaded and took Manchuria in 1931. It was power from Manchuria that enabled the Japanese to thrust southward in 1937 and then challenge the United States in 1941. We fought Japan, essentially, for Manchuria; it was Manchuria that the blood of Tarawa and Iwo Jima should have purchased for the cause of mankind.

Roosevelt went to Yalta in February, 1945, to persuade the Russians to enter the war against Japan. The Russians had no intention of staying out of the war; they were just waiting until we had created the vacuum so that they could march in. And what they did the Russians want? Concessions in Manchuria. But it was our men who had died for Manchuria. How could we bargain away Manchuria without breaking faith with our own dead?

Among the President's advisers at Yalta was Alger Hiss; and Hiss was there because a large group of men in our State Department wanted Russia to have Manchuria.

Also among the President's advisers were General Marshall and General MacArthur. (General MacArthur did not accompany the President to Yalta; but his advice was sought and given on concessions to Russia.) And here is a saddening fact: Both General Marshall and General MacArthur were willing to make concessions in Manchuria to "induce" Russia to enter the war. The generals were victims of the world's poorest intelligence service. By 1945 Japan was on her knees, trying to make peace, yet General Marshall and General MacArthur both believed that Japan was still so strong that we should give away the prize for which we had

fought. So it's a fact that General Marshall and General MacArthur urged Roosevelt to make the same concessions to Russia which Hiss and the State Department traitors and fools were urging him to make.

Those who doubt that MacArthur could make such an error will have their evidence when the papers of James Forrestal are published. For here is another fact: Forrestal, alone among the major figures in our Government, opposed making any concession to get Russia into the war against Japan.

To know that Forrestal took this position—he was also supported by George F. Kennan in the State Department and by Admiral William D. Leahy—is important to us now; it reassures us that our Nation has not ceased to produce great men of vision; we have ceased placing them in positions of power.

THE FATAL ERROR

The error at Yalta, while serious, was not beyond correction in 1946. The Russians had their concessions in Manchuria—railroads and ports; they had looted its industries; but the Chinese Nationalist Government was struggling to exercise control and Russia was pledged to respect this control. There were no Chinese Communists in Manchuria; the Japs had kept them out.

It was then that Truman and Marshall, under the influence of the State Department knaves and fools, made the fatal error. Instead of sending Marshall to China with instructions to aid Chiang Kai-shek in the destruction of the Chinese Communists, Truman sent Marshall with instructions to compel Chiang Kai-shek to embrace the Communists.

THE EVENTS OF 1950

In February 1950 a treaty and a series of agreements were signed by the Russian and Chinese Communist governments. Our Government should have learned the terms of the pact. From its actions, apparently, it did not; our intelligence is so incompetent. Here, published for the first time, are the more important terms:

1. Russia was to send 45,100 Soviet personnel to China, of which 12,000 were to be assigned to the army, 8,000 to the air force, 3,000 to the navy, 5,000 to the political sphere, 12,000 to industrial development; and 5,000 to cultural and educational fields. Each company in the Chinese Army was to have at least one Russian political adviser, with the number of advisers being multiplied in the higher echelons.

2. All mineral, oil, forestry and food resources of China were to be developed by joint commissions of Russians and Chinese.

3. To ensure the solidarity of the ruling position of the laboring classes China and Russia would cooperate fully in the field of economics and culture. (Portraits of Lenin and Stalin now hang in every Chinese barracks and mess hall; all troops sing the Internationale; all Chinese teachers must take a course in Soviet culture and aspirations; and Chinese school books are being altered to tell the Russian story.)

4. There was to be complete cooperation between all persons of both countries connected with security. Under this term the Russians immediately installed in the Chinese Army the Russian system of compartmentation of secrets; and this system defies the best intelligence agents.

5. To help solve the economic difficulties of the Chinese Russia agreed to employ Chinese jobless laborers. This is the vicious term which enables the Chinese Reds to send to Russia all the political undesirables—and it enables Russia to recruit slave laborers from the inexhaustible Chinese pool. Already, under this term, more than 500,000 Chinese have been sent to Russia. When the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh Chinese armies rebelled in South China last year, the armies were broken up and the men sent to Siberian labor camps.

6. To meet Soviet emergency needs on the European front in a future war, the People's Government of China agreed to send laborers and expeditionary forces to serve under the Soviet high command.

On matters particularly concerning the Chinese armed forces here were the terms of the Moscow and Harbin agreements:

(a) The Chinese army was to consist of 5,700,000 men.

(b) Russia was to be in control of training the Chinese army.

(c) Russia was to control aviation, navy, radar, communications and meteorology.

(d) Russia was to begin the immediate training and equipping of 50 Chinese divisions.

(e) Russia was to transfer to China: 600 war planes and all the Japanese naval craft awarded to Russia at the end of World War II. Russia was also to send several regiments of antiaircraft troops to protect the Chinese airfields.

(f) Russia and China agreed to the intensive development of an International Army Corps with soldiers of all Asiatic nations serving in the ranks.

(g) Russia was given 12 air bases in China, from Hami to Shanghai. Russia was also given naval bases at Port Arthur, Dairen, Yongkow, Ching-Hwang-Lao, Hu-Lu-Tao, Taku, Chefoo, Tsingtao and Lien-Yung-Kang.

(h) China and Russia agreed to operate in all future military operations under a joint Sino-Soviet staff.

After the signing of this pact there was the usual all-night banquet in the Kremlin. Stalin's principal toast to the Chinese was this: "To your victory in all Asia." And Mao replied: "To world victory of communism in 1952."

Now here is an amazing situation—a situation which should be of concern to every American. The signing of these agreements was one of the most significant events of our time. It meant, in effect, that a 5,000,000-man Chinese army had been assimilated into the Russian army. Russia had accomplished what American diplomacy, in the interest of mankind, should have prevented.

But were the American people warned of this pact? Were the terms of the pact published so that we could prepare accordingly? The tragic fact is this: There is reason to believe that the United States Government itself did not know the terms of the agreements, much less understand their significance.

Most Americans, no doubt, assume that our Government, being reasonably intelligent, maintains agents in China to gather information on the activities of the Chinese Government. Here is the truth: In the first six months of 1950 our Government did not have a single agent in Peiping or in all of China.

The Chinese Nationalists, being enemies of the Chinese Communists, do maintain an excellent espionage network in China. So most Americans, no doubt, assume that our Government maintains expert liaison with Chinese Nationalist intelligence. Here is the truth: For a period of 9 months before June 15, 1950, not a single American intelligence officer had visited the headquarters of Chinese Nationalist intelligence on Formosa.

Why? Because our State Department was clearing the ground for the recognition of the Chinese Communist government; and there was a a State Department directive against our intelligence officers going to Formosa.

And here is one more point. Most Americans have been led to believe that our Central Intelligence Agency is of some importance. If that were so, in 1950, surely it would have been employing expert Chinese agents. The truth is this: During 1950 what few Chinese were employed by the CIA were first screened by John Davies, of the State Department, and Mr. Davies has written: "The destiny of China belongs to the Communists."

Since, however, our Government does formally recognize the Chinese Nationalist Government as the legal Government of China, there is a Chinese Embassy in Washington, and Chinese intelligence is submitted both to the Pentagon and to the State Department. The evaluation of the intelligence is left to Americans.

But here is the situation regarding the Chinese Nationalists in Washington. The head of our Defense Department is General Marshall. The Chinese Nationalists distrust General Marshall; they blame him for their defeat in China.

At the State Department, Acheson, Jessup, John Davies, Hiss—they have all believed that "the destiny of China lies with the Communists."[1] The State Department issued the directive against American intelligence officers consulting on Formosa with Chinese Nationalist intelligence. So how welcome are the reports of Chinese Nationalist intelligence at our State Department?

In May 1950—3 months after the signing of the Sino-Soviet pacts, and many months after the Russians had begun retraining and reequipping the Chinese Red armies—our press and our State Department were telling Americans that "Mao is developing into another Tito"; that "Red China's interests must conflict with those of Russia"; that "Russia cannot influence China's destiny."

Here is a sequence of facts which should demonstrate to any reasonable American the appalling inadequacy of our leadership.

1. The Sino-Soviet agreements were signed in February and March 1950. Our Government either didn't know the terms, or it didn't act accordingly.

2. In April 1950, the Chinese Red army of General Lin Piao captured the iron-rich island of Hainan, which is off the southernmost coast of China.

3. In May 1950, Lin Piao's troops began transferring from the far south of China to the far north—to Manchuria. Chinese Nationalist intelligence transmitted this information to the Pentagon and to the State Department. The intelligence transmittal also contained this information about Lin Piao: he is the youngest and ablest of the Chinese Red field commanders. His field army of about 1,500,000 men was the first to be reequipped and retrained under the Sino-Soviet pact. Lin Piao is the protégé of Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, and is regarded by the Russians as completely trustworthy.

The jurisdiction of Lin Piao's field army is southern China; it had just concluded the occupation of Hainan. Now why, in May 1950, would Lin Piao's army start moving all the way across China to Manchuria?

Chinese Nationalist intelligence reported to the Pentagon in May 1950 that Lin Piao's movement to Manchuria could indicate only one thing: an imminent attack on South Korea.

4. Meanwhile, our Government had decided on a policy for South Korea: We had withdrawn our arms; if it were attacked, we would not defend it. No American military man believed that we could successfully defend South Korea.

5. On June 25, 1950, there was an invasion of South Korea, and at 6 p. m. on this date it was the policy of the United States not to intervene. No military man believed that we should intervene. But between 6 and 8 p. m., the President, in conference with Dean Acheson and General Marshall, decided on a policy of intervention.

6. The divisions which led the North Korean attack on the South Koreans were divisions which had been a part of Lin Piao's army. The Korean War, from the beginning, was a war between the United States and South Korea, on the one side, and Russia and Red China on the other. North Korean troops were employed during the period when no other troops seemed necessary.

7. During July and August of 1950 Chinese Nationalist intelligence informed the Pentagon and the State Department that more Chinese Red divisions were pouring into Manchuria. And what else could this possibly mean except that these troops were to be employed, if necessary, in Korea?

8. To this last question our Government came up with the most amazing answer of all. Every American should memorize this fact:

The American people were told by their Government that movement of Lin Piao's troops into Manchuria was a hopeful sign. It was hopeful because it indicated that China was stiffening her resistance to Russia.

9. Late in October 1950, just before the elections, the President flew to Wake Island to confer with General MacArthur. The President took along as his adviser, Dr. Philip Jessup. Dr. Jessup subscribes to the view that the future of China lies with the Communists; his advice has helped bring this country to disaster. And at Wake it was decided by MacArthur, Jessup, and Truman that our troops could push to the Manchuria border in safety because, obviously, the Chinese Communists would not intervene.

10. Early in November 1950, intelligence was transmitted to our Government to this effect: the troops opposing the United Nations Armies in North Korea are not North Koreans; they are troops of the International Army Corps of Russia and China. The whole invasion of South Korea was planned by the Sino-Soviet staff; Red China has been in the war from the beginning, and will commit whatever troops are necessary to drive the Americans from Korea.

11. On November 24, 1950, General MacArthur visited the front lines in Korea and launched his home-for-Christmas invasion. He said that he was now opposed by only "scattered remnants" of a defeated enemy.

12. On November 26, 1950, disaster was in the making, and MacArthur announced that "more than a million" Red Chinese troops were already in Korea.

Now the questions which every American citizen has the right to ask are these: If MacArthur knows the Orient, why did he completely misunderstand the character of the Korean War? Why was he so confident that the Chinese Reds would not enter a war which they had planned and manipulated from the beginning? If, when he launched his home-for-Christmas offensive, he knew that he was confronted by a million Red troops in Korea, why did he spread out his army in an insane offensive? And if he didn't know that "Chinese hordes" of a million men were immediately in front of him, why didn't he? Has our intelligence sunk to so low a state that even in the field, and with complete command of the air, we can't locate a million men in front of our armies?

In the Korean debacle the President, Acheson, Marshall, and MacArthur have given this Nation the sorriest military leadership in its history.

[1] State Department white paper on China, p. 573.

New England Wholesale Meat Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following telegram:

BOSTON, MASS., *February 7, 1951.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The New England Wholesale Meat Dealers Association has today sent the following telegram to Eric Johnston, Administrator, Economic Stabilization Agency, and Michael V. DiSalle, Director of Price Stabilization, in Washington, D. C.:

"An acute shortage of meat for consumers in the New England area threatens. We urge every effort be made to insure the necessary flow of meat to this area through the normal channels of distribution at once. Pending the formulation of over-all dollar-and-cents ceiling prices, it is imperative that dealers be permitted to purchase meat at prevailing offering prices and to resell said meat with a normal operating markup. The present price squeeze is most harmful to both meat dealers and the general consumer public in this area.

"Our organization is mindful of the magnitude and complexity of the problem confronting the Director of Price Stabilization, and desires to cooperate in every way. We stand ready to send our representatives to confer with you immediately and to assist in this emergency. We ask for your prompt response to this communication, and hope for favorable action and speedy relief."

We respectfully request your immediate assistance in this emergency, and urge that you take whatever action you deem appropriate to apprise the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency and the Director of Price Stabilization of the pressing need for immediate relief in the New England area.

NEW ENGLAND WHOLESALE MEAT DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
HAROLD WIRETT,
General Counsel.

Leaders of Organized Labor Should Think Twice Before Supporting Socialist Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, although their efforts have been remarkably unsuccessful, labor leaders in the United States, long have tried to deliver the union vote, for local, State, and National candidates, whose records have marked them as Socialists, in fact if not in name.

They did their best to help return the Truman administration to power in 1948. Possibly at that time, and under the circumstances then existing, they did help in small degree. At any rate, they made the welkin ring with claims that they reelected Harry S. Truman. It seems that he believes it, too.

But now we stand at the threshold of world war III. Things are far different from the cushy days of 2 years ago. Now it is clear to all of us, that the Truman administration's policies have brought this Nation face to face with a dreadful emergency; a peril more deadly than any since the infant days of the Republic.

The American people, organized labor included, now understand that they must forget the good old days. They know that now they must give us their easy way of living. They know they must buckle down to hard work and sacrifice. Work and sacrifice, while their sons fight, and many of them die, in God only knows what war theaters, in what parts of the world.

And in this last and greatest of national emergencies, the Truman administration falters. It vacillates from day to day, from hour to hour. It falls prey to the doubts and uncertainties, the fears which are common to leaders, who fall short of leadership; who are leaders only in name.

In the desperation begotten of total unwillingness to admit and correct its own mistakes, as might be expected, the Truman administration turns to the brand of British-type socialism, which it vainly imagines American labor supports.

The Truman administration seeks to discipline the American people for war by means of more socialistic regimentation instead of less. Evidently the administration distrusts the American people and feels it dare not leave them free to discipline themselves at all.

Possibly in this the administration suffers a misgiving that the American people are finally aware of its blundering incompetence; that most Americans harbor an even greater distrust of Truman administration leadership.

But, however that may be, in its uncertainty and confusion the administration seeks on the one hand to socialize the economy and regiment the people while on the other it makes gestures of appeasement to the supporters of free enterprise and individual liberty.

In trying to be all things to all men; in trying to please everyone, the Truman administration pleases nobody. And of all those who now are displeased, the labor leaders howl the loudest. They are learning something they never knew before about socialism and socialistic techniques.

The lesson they are just beginning to learn here is explicit in some things that are happening in labor-socialist Great Britain. The lesson is all the more easy to learn from what is happening in England because over there the process of nationalization is far advanced. It is a lesson which American labor supporters of socialism should study with close attention.

Now the story of what is happening in Britain is somewhat hard to follow. So I hope my listeners will bend a careful ear.

I shall begin by saying that sometimes a chance remark is more revealing of a situation, even one of national or worldwide importance, than is long discussion by those best qualified to formulate and express opinions.

This happened recently when an obscure Laborite member rose in the British Parliament to talk on a minor matter affecting his constituency.

The Member of Parliament said in effect: The trouble is that we have largely socialized our national economy, without socializing our trade unions.

Afterward he was quoted as admitting that he said more than he intended. He had meant only that British labor unions, while dominating the Labor-Socialist government, have retained merely a sectional, rather than a national outlook.

But his remark apparently made a deep impression. Political observers in England now point to the fact British labor has lost its smartest leaders to the Government, where they are forced to think on the national level.

It is said that British labor, having lost these men, has failed to maintain a level of intelligent thinking to comport with its dominant position politically.

Many important political writers in Britain now appear to think that trade unionism presently will be subordinated in government, to the fast growing influence of labor-socialist intellectuals.

These intellectuals comprise a lily-fingered clique outside the labor unions. Their interest in the labor movement and in socialism is purely ideological, and perhaps more opportunistic than idealistic. Certainly they have no practical interest in the advancement of trade unionism itself. Sir Stafford Cripps was leader of this group until his health failed.

Now, the comments of British political observers are based upon two glaringly obvious facts, with respect to the factions in the badly split Labor-Socialist Party.

One fact is that British trade-unions are strongly opposed to further nationalization. They call it a pause, to consolidate gains; but there is reason to think it something far different.

The other fact is that Labor-Socialist intellectuals are fighting to rush nationalization through to completion. This is to be expected of men, who are not interested in people, but solely in an ideology.

It is said that Prime Minister Attlee's willingness to compromise with the intellectuals, is all that holds the party together, against the assaults of Winston Churchill and his Conservatives.

And now the lesson for American labor leaders begins to emerge.

In Great Britain they have gone far toward socializing the entire economy; while neglecting, or refusing, to socialize the labor unions. To do this, would be to make the unions a part of the Government; or at least, to put them completely under Government control.

This is what was done in Soviet Russia. The realists of the Kremlin understood that when organized labor assumes control of the government, or even when it overtly tries to do so, it ceases to be organized labor. It becomes a political party.

Labor unions, as such, properly can be appurtenant only to a free-enterprise economy. Under a completely socialized economy, the government is the only employer. The government is dedicated, theoretically at least, to full employment, and highest possible living standards for everybody without exception. Under such conditions, labor unions have no valid reason for existence.

Yet in Great Britain the labor unions continue their traditional fight for higher wages and easier working conditions, at the expense of other segments of the population. At the same time, they dominate the Government, which is committed to provide these things for everyone.

Organized labor in the British Isles would appear to be in the position of a man up against a judo expert, bound to be seriously hurt, if not destroyed, by its own strength.

Quite possibly the critics of the thinking now being done by the British trade-union leaders, as leaders of a faction within the Government, are completely wrong. Possibly those leaders are smarter than their critics think.

Perhaps they understand the real reason for the rising power of the Labor-Socialist intellectuals, who would rush socialism in Britain to its logical conclusion.

Could it be that they are beginning to realize that complete socialization means complete destruction of trade unionism in the British Isles? Is that why trade-union leaders now seek to halt the progress of socialization?

In view of these things, the enthusiasm of American labor leaders for socialism in this country might not be so great if they stopped to think. They might slow up, too, in their efforts to transform American organized labor into a Labor-Socialist political party.

It was unfortunate for British labor, as a political party, that its government had so far committed itself to nationalization of the iron and steel industries that it could not draw back.

Now let me draw a conclusion from all this. The wise old Samuel Gompers always held that organized labor, when it enters politics, carries with it the seeds of its own destruction.

No wiser decision ever was made by the rank and file of American organized labor than the decision which took them to the polls last November, as Americans first, and labor unionists afterward. As individuals, their wisdom was far greater than that of their leaders.

It was thinking along these lines, in part, which compelled me long ago to oppose any and all legislative measures toward socializing the American economy, and to look with disfavor on labor unions in politics.

The Sell-Out of Principles at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, February 7, 1945, will go down in the annals of American history as the day on which America sold her ideals for a mess of international politics. Until that day, 6 years ago, honor and a high regard for morality and justice had characterized our international dealings. We had not always been successful in our diplomacy, but we had acted with firm regard for moral principles.

At Yalta, however—let us face the facts—this democracy, which is dedicated to the ideals of human justice and equality, agreed to the partition of Poland and thereby sold millions of Polish patriots into lifelong slavery. The very people in that country who had been our most loyal and self-sacrificing allies were the ones who were most injured and endangered by this shameful negotiation at Yalta.

The time is past for futile and partisan recriminations. The results are a national disgrace, and the time is long overdue for national recognition of that fact. Repudiation of the persons involved is not enough. We should immediately proclaim that the Yalta agreement no longer forms any part of our present foreign policy, and pray that the international situation will improve sufficiently so that the glorious nation of Poland will be freed from its present terrible fate to which we contributed so materially.

Thinking Is Tremendous Moral Force in World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, we all hear a lot about the importance of little things. We hear that minor events often sway the fates of nations. The missing horseshoe nail is the classical illustration of this belief.

Nevertheless the fact remains that, almost invariably, great events grow out of great ideas. And sad to say, this is true whether those ideas be good or evil.

At any rate, behind all the happenings which determine the long-term trends of world affairs—behind the things men live by and for—always there is the thinking of individual men.

Sometimes that thinking is done in the press of public life, in the course of debate over the policies which shall guide the life of a nation.

Sometimes it is done in the quiet of a college professor's study, or in the attic room of a man who lives in the world of ideas, with small thought of material things.

Such thinking has been known to take place even in the fields, as a plowman followed his plow; or, indeed, in such a spot as the forlorn office of a country lawyer in a raw frontier town.

But always this thinking, which serves as the seed of great events, is thinking of such originality and force, either for good or evil, that men take it into their hearts and nourish it, each after his own secret desire.

I believe that you will agree with me that such thinking is a tremendous moral force in the world. It is so because it appeals to the deepest instincts of the human heart.

Now it sometimes happens, as any student of history knows, that two or more of these forces find expression and wield their dynamic power upon mankind all at the same time.

In fact it is manifestly true that the world, as we know it, is the outward appearance of a sort of unstable compromise, in the unceasing conflict between differing ideologies—some of them good, some of them bad.

This conflict of ideas, and the unstable compromise, we see all about us today. The world we live in is a world wherein only the most temporary stability is achieved, in anything, anywhere.

The world-wide ideological conflict we have today has been fought economically and politically for a number of years. We have called it the cold war. Now it is being fought in part by force of arms. God grant that the present little war does not become a third global war.

This ideological conflict, of course, is between totalitarianism and communism on the one side, and free enterprise and individualism on the other.

On the one hand, the individual counts for nothing, and exists only for the welfare of the state. On the other, the individual is of first importance, and the state exists only for his welfare.

Now all of these considerations, and particularly that of the tremendous ideological forces set free in the world by the thinking of individual men, lead up to an observation I wish to make. And here it is.

In January 1848, almost exactly 102 years ago, when Karl Marx and Frederick Engels issued their infamous Manifesto, outlining and advocating the philosophy of socialism and communism, Abraham Lincoln was just beginning his term as a Member of the House of Representatives in Washington.

In the same month, of the same year, two great ideological forces came into being; forces which have battled for possession of the minds and hearts of all men, until this very day.

Lincoln, the rail-splitter, and Lincoln, the young lawyer, in the frontier town of Springfield, must have thought some at least of the great thoughts, which he first expressed before the Congress of the United States.

As the farm boy, who read the Bible in the light of the rude fireplace in his father's log cabin, and as the young lawyer, who found it hard to make both ends meet, Lincoln must have been inspired to some degree with the concepts of moral grandeur, which made him great.

In those days of his boyhood and young manhood, Lincoln must have laid the groundwork of that compassionate philosophy, that ideology of human understanding, which guided him as President of the United States, when the institution of human slavery threatened the existence of the Federal Union.

Marx and Engels, as we know, stood for the enslavement of all men, at the hands of a few proletarian leaders, whom they thought would come into power through class conflict. They did not believe in the equality of all men.

Both were far removed from the ordinary lives of mankind. They knew little of the joys and sorrows, the triumphs and defeats, of the average man. They knew little of human affairs, and apparently, even less of moral and ethical considerations. To them, Christianity was a mockery. They were inhuman, because they dealt solely in theories.

But Lincoln was a man of the people. He understood them completely. He knew their joys and sorrows, their triumphs and defeats. And his deep religious faith colored all his thinking with gentle compassion, with a profound belief in the essential goodness of mankind. Lincoln had, above all, the common touch.

Yet Lincoln was not a materialist. He believed passionately in the spiritual concept of human life. He believed, perhaps more than anything else, that men, as spiritual beings, are born as brothers, equal in all things, and entitled to those essential liberties, without which human dignity cannot exist.

Lincoln's predecessors in the White House, great as some of them were, witnessed the institution of human slavery in this land, dedicated in the beginning to the proposition of human liberty. And they did not overtly condemn it.

So it remained for Lincoln to become the first great exponent of this proposition, that all men are created free. He became, and still remains in the hearts of all mankind, the world's truest and greatest symbol of freedom for every individual, regardless of race, color, creed, or economic condition.

But Lincoln believed that individual liberty is possible, only when accompanied by individual responsibility. And so it followed that he believed in, and supported by all that he said and did, the system of free enterprise, which has made this the happiest and strongest Nation on the globe.

Lincoln made all Americans free. He preserved the Federal Union. He taught the homely virtues of patience, humor, friendliness, and common honesty. And it was subsequent to the Civil War that the United States began its climb to unparalleled prosperity and world leadership.

Who can say, then, that it was not Lincoln's influence, in large measure, which made it possible for us to reach our present happy estate?

But as I said in the beginning, now it has happened that throughout more than half the world's land area, and among more than a third of the world's population, the evil teachings of Marx and Engels have gained the ascendancy.

Socialism and communism are on the march in the unhappy lands abroad. Indirect attempts are being made to impose the monstrous philosophy of totalitarian socialism on the American people.

Can it be that much of the trouble in the world today has come about because we, the Nation to which all the world has looked as the bulwark of human liberty, have become cynical?

Have we departed from the teachings of the Great Emancipator?

If we have, it is time that we turned back. If we do not, then all the world may descend into the ultimate darkness of slavery, under Marxian communism.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Omar B. Ketchum, National Legislative Director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

The Eighty-second Congress is in session and the Eighty-first Congress is now history. Insofar as veterans' legislation is concerned the Eighty-first could well be tagged the "Eighty-worst." The Eightieth Congress, roundly denounced in 1948 as the "worst Congress in history," was a giant of accomplishment compared to the Eighty-first.

By OMAR B. KETCHUM,
VFW National Legislative Director.

How To Get the World on Our Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Laffan Morse is president of Unicorn Press, one of America's largest book-publishing houses, and editor in chief of the New Funk & Wagnalls Encyclopedia, America's newest encyclopedia, completed less than a year ago, and already recognized as one of the world's finest encyclopedias. He was always a close student and opponent of the Marxist theory and practice. As editor in chief of the encyclopedia he headed a large

staff for gathering facts from the far corners of the earth. An immense amount of data flowed through his office daily.

Before the great task of compiling and editing the 36 volumes of the encyclopedia was over, he had come to two frightening conclusions—that we were losing and would inevitably lose the cold war, and that for the same or similar reasons we might very well lose the hot war. He saw the Communists waging a new kind of war on the world—what he called ultra-modern war, in which the processes of the old-fashioned kind of war are reversed, the destruction of a people's will to resist being attacked and destroyed before the shooting begins. In this new type of war resistance forces, guerrilla armies, are created before the regular armies are thrown into battle, and frequently accomplish the overthrow of a nation without the use of regular troops at all.

This, we recognize, as the method of conquest of the Soviet Union. The important point he saw is that such warfare is carried on not by a governmental agency, which is powerless to do so unless it is actually at war with the nation under attack, but by a private, supra-governmental agency, the private organization of people called the Communist Party.

He, therefore, proposed over a year and a half ago the formation of a Democratic International, organized as the Comintern was organized, backed with substantial funds to begin its activities, and led by the best military and political brains the free nations can provide. It would constitute a sort of private army, similar in structure to the Communist Party, of skilled and trained men of all nations, whose aim would be to preserve democracy in the countries in danger of invasion by the iron curtain countries and to create revolution within the iron curtain itself.

Leading public opinion is today swinging toward a political solution of our difficulties, because the dangers of total military warfare to the free world itself are becoming daily more apparent. This daring plan Mr. Morse contends furnishes the outline of the instrumentality which could create and supply the revolutionary forces within the iron curtain and crush communism without the need of resort to world war III.

An article describing this plan appeared in the August 2, 1949, issue of Look magazine. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article and strongly urge that it be read by my colleagues:

HOW TO GET THE WORLD ON OUR SIDE—WE'VE GOT TO ORGANIZE OUR FRIENDS IN OTHER LANDS TO FIGHT THE COMMUNISTS WITH THEIR OWN WEAPONS

(By Joseph Laffan Morse, editor in chief, New Funk & Wagnalls Encyclopedia)

We Americans bitterly hate war. We hate it so much we cannot bear to face the fact that it is coming. Military experts agree the Soviet armies could today march almost unopposed through Europe and Asia. The only thing that stops them is our possession of the atomic bomb.

We face this hard choice: Strike now in a preventive war or wait and hope—until Russia has a stockpile of atomic bombs. Both alternatives are bad. We do not wish to bring death to millions of innocent people; nor to gamble that we ourselves will suffer the indescribable horror of atom bombing.

What can we common people do? Is there no way out? I say there is a way, but it will take huge determination and ingenuity, courage, and sacrifice. The pattern of what we need to do already exists. It is the pattern followed by the men in the Kremlin as they have won their victories in Europe and Asia. We can use their own weapons to destroy them.

We need to create a democratic international, similar to the Communist International, but for democratic purposes. The avowed aim of the Comintern was Communist revolution in all countries. The purpose of the democratic international should be democratic counterrevolution in all Communist countries, and the destruction of communism throughout the world.

The Democratic International should be a movement of democratic peoples, not their governments, in exactly the same way that the Comintern was an international movement of Communists and not of Soviet Russia.

As a first step, democratic leaders from all nations should assemble to plan for world-wide action. This great meeting, making public our goals, would parallel the historic Moscow meeting in 1919 of the Third Communist International.

Next, we should organize a secret invasion army—an international army of a million specialists. These must be spies, secret agents and organizers, saboteurs, propagandists, and agitators. Each must be carefully trained for his job in schools like the notorious Lenin school in Moscow and Gen. William Donovan's school for the Office of Strategic Services in World War II.

The secret army of the Democratic International should be directed by a general staff of the best brains on earth. It should be backed by almost unlimited funds. It should be recruited among the nationals of every country we need to invade—Russians, Poles, Bulgars, Czechs, Frenchmen, and many more—including even Americans.

Hundreds of thousands of such men everywhere are eagerly waiting to enlist. Literally millions of likely recruits are in Western Europe today—men who have risked death to escape from Soviet Russia and iron-curtain countries.

With our secret army, I propose that we invade every non-Communist nation, exactly as the Communists have invaded each such nation, but for democratic purposes, and to wipe out the sworn and trained Communist forces plotting to destroy them.

INVADE WITH TRUTH

More important, I propose the invasion of the Soviet satellite nations and of Soviet Russia itself.

It must be made clear that our secret army will not attempt to murder Communists nor to conquer Soviet Russia by force of arms. That is not the way of the kind of warfare I propose.

Instead, we should invade the iron-curtain countries armed only with the democratic truth. The weapons of the Democratic International should be words, ideas, information, not guns. Our invasion should be like the one accomplished by our OSS in World War II, under the noses of the German Army and the Gestapo, but on a much larger scale.

We should invade stealthily with the prospective leaders, organizers, and recruiters of underground armies. We should provide centers to which freedom-loving men may rally, to be trained and led in the ways of revolution against tyranny, protected from seizure and sudden death. We should invade with printing presses, books, pamphlets, radio transmitters. We should bring expert knowledge for forging identity papers and travel passes. We should set up underground newspapers and radio stations, secret meeting places, and escape routes.

We need to furnish the leadership, funds, and materials that underground armies require to grow. We need to build the revolutionary forces now existing within the iron curtain to the point at which the oppressed millions can overthrow their hated masters.

Do you think this plan for a democratic international is a wild and impossible scheme? You may at first, but only because democratic peoples have never conceived of waging ideological war on an all-out basis.

This much is certain. The scheme will work. It has made possible the victories of the Kremlin in nation after nation. It has been used first by the Comintern, and now the Cominform, with crushing effect, for over 30 years. Used by our enemies, it will soon drive us into a corner where we can fight our way out only by guns and bombs.

It will work better and faster for us than it ever did for the Communists, and here is why:

1. Consider the iron curtain. By erecting that invisible wall, the Soviet rulers have themselves told us they cannot withstand such an invasion. The measures they have taken to keep the curtain leak-proof are so fantastically extreme as to indicate more than a mere uneasiness; they reveal an abysmal fear—fear that their people will learn the truth about life outside the iron curtain. The democratic international will rip the iron curtain, expose their lives, give their people the means to unseat their oppressors.

KEEP RESISTANCE FORCES ALIVE

2. Consider the power of our ideological weapons. Even today, after the Soviet masters have killed and jailed millions of people, revolutionary forces still exist; not merely in the satellite countries, but in the heart of Russia itself. Every few weeks, we read of new purges, designed to wipe out every last vestige of resistance; but resistance lives on, fed by man's undying hope of freedom. And our propaganda weapons will feed this resistance until it sweeps all before it.

3. Consider our manpower and resources. Soviet Russia's biggest mistake in World War II was to send her armies past her borders, for hundreds of thousands, seeing the free world for the first time, never came back. But we can send out a countless army, backed by tremendous resources, sure that after seeing what is within the iron curtain, our men will return stronger democrats than before.

Further, the Comintern started with comparatively small groups in other nations. Today within the iron curtain, there are not merely a large number of armed partisan groups, fighting the Reds from hideaways, and large underground resistance groups; but there are literally millions of our friends, living in hope that we have not finally deserted them. They wait only word from us that the battle can begin.

4. Consider why we have been losing the ideological war thus far. One reason is that we have left it to our Government to act, and its power to carry on such warfare is severely limited. An official attempt to create revolution in another country would provoke a shooting war before we are ready for it. That is why our Voice of America radio broadcast, our biggest ideological weapon, is hamstrung in any attempt to attack the Soviet Government directly.

WE ARE ON THE DEFENSIVE

But there is a bigger reason. It is because we are constantly on the defensive, and so suffer defeat after defeat. Communist ideological strength is that it is anti; we are pro. We are for the government of Italy; hungry and discontented Italians are easily moved to be against. And in a world emptied of wealth by two world wars, the Communist secret armies thus find millions of followers:

But what happens at the point the Reds have gained control, as, for example, in Czechoslovakia? There, the Communists are the pro forces, defending the Communist Government. And we should become anti. We should move over to the offensive, using the powerful propaganda weapons they have laid down. But have we? You know we have not. Instead, we have ceased activity within conquered Czechoslovakia, abandoning to Communist slavery millions of one-time friends and potential allies.

That is the basic situation the Democratic International will quickly cure. Our Government is helpless when facing a Communist seizure of power. Its only choice is whether to recognize or not to recognize the new Communist Government; but no more than that, short of war. Only we, the people, have the power to go over to the offensive, to wage all-out propaganda warfare; to upset the Communist governments by fomenting revolution.

IT WILL COST US CASUALTIES

We must think of the cost of such invasion and propaganda warfare.

Our invading army will not escape without casualties. Many brave men will be caught and killed. Soviet officials and secret police will be on the alert. But each such death will make new recruits; violence nurtures resistance when men have the organization and weapons for resistance. Purges in Communist countries will trap the innocent with the guilty, enemy with friend, serving again to divide our enemies and provide us new recruits.

Finally and inevitably, the work of the Democratic International will gather power and speed. The grip of the Soviet dictators on their people will loosen. Then we shall unleash the people against them. And democratic leaders, already chosen in the counsels of the underground, will be ready to form new governments.

An ugly picture? Think of Hiroshima. The cost in lives? Measure it against those lost in a shooting war. The cost in dollars? Measure it against even this year's bill for armaments. The alternatives we have are unimaginably more costly.

I do not wish to minimize the difficulty of what is ahead. The structure of democratic governments doesn't lend itself readily to the establishment of a democratic international; whereas the dictatorship in Soviet Russia is peculiarly adaptable to such revolutionary activity. Let us consider that point:

The Communist Party is above and superior to Communist governments. Stalin's great power arises from the fact that he is boss of the Politburo, the governing body of the Communist Party. Hence, he is dictator not only of Soviet Russia but of all Communist governments and all Communists everywhere. So, when the Communists conquer a country, he can say it is not conquest by Soviet Russia but by the Communist Party—that Soviet Russia is not an aggressor.

Such a dictator can order the establishment of a Communist international which openly declares it will work to overthrow other nations. He can finance it secretly out of public funds, place high Soviet officials at the helm, and have it go into action overnight.

F. D. R. PROTESTED TO SOVIETS

That is exactly what Lenin did. Then, when other nations protested, the Soviet Government blandly replied that it had no connection with the Comintern and no power over its activities. President Roosevelt protested as late as 1935, after granting recognition to the Soviet Union, that Russia had broken its promise not to permit within its borders any organization "which has as its aim the overthrow * * * of the United States." Stalin rejected the protest and we withdrew it.

We have no such easy way of creating a democratic international. We have no dictator or international Democratic Party—similar to the world-wide Communist Party—to organize, finance, and operate the democratic international. We cannot even ask our Government to step in and help us. We must act on our own. But surely we shall have the inventiveness, the skill and ingenuity, the courage and determination to overcome our own handicaps—to preserve our lives, and our way of living.

When we create our democratic international, what can the Soviets do about it? Retaliation will do them no good; for at last they will be on the defensive. Actually, they will merely bluster and threaten, and our Government will coldly brush them off.

REDS WILL DENOUNCE PLAN

Next, they will use every means they can to keep Democrats everywhere from supporting the movement. Picket lines will appear; petitions will reach the President and Congress; fellow travelers will denounce the democratic international on the radio, in books and periodicals, and from platforms and street corners. Proponents of the plan will be smeared. Strikes will threaten contributing industries. Violence, bloodshed, riots if possible—and every weapon, legal or illegal, they have within reach—will be turned upon us in a panicky intensification of their propaganda warfare.

But that will be all. And it will be mostly just talk. But in talk lies our greatest danger; talk that can stall the democratic international under the weight of words; talk of peace—that we can make peace with conspirators intent on destroying us, and so need not go on the offensive. Talk to keep us so hopelessly confused that we will keep arguing until the time even for winning a shooting war will have passed.

Through it all, we must keep on remembering—that there can be no permanent peace except between peoples who control their governments; no peace at all until the dictators shall have been wiped from the face of the earth.

Walter Geist a Defender of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States should be made aware that we have lost a great and typical American. On January 29, last, Walter Geist, president of Allis-Chalmers Co. of Milwaukee, passed away.

During the critical days of the last war when our enemies began to know the power of American industry, it was the power of men like Geist and the workers under his direction that they were feeling. In the present emergency, Walter Geist was preparing again to bring to bear the great productive power of his organization in defense of his country. The strain of this may well have contributed to his death.

We Americans are too prone to forget the importance of the factor of American industrial power that obtained victory in the last two wars and is today giving Soviet Russia pause against her present inclination to attack us in all-out war.

If the Kremlin could get rid of the Walter Geists of America, it could effectively disarm us and expose our population to the overwhelming mass of manpower under the control of Soviet Russia.

Walter Geist not only turned his plant over to the defense of his country during war, but when peace was in prospect, devoted himself to great civic enterprises and to scientific efforts in the relief of human suffering.

An example of his concern for the welfare of his fellowmen was his direction of his firm's assistance in the development of the mechanical kidney; it has already saved the lives of many patients in danger of death because of kidney diseases. Another was the production of the high power betatron in the treatment of cancer; and more recently the research efforts of his firm to assist the scientists of Marquette University in the development of a substitute for blood plasma from okra, an extremely important advance in medicine.

As a leader of free enterprise, Walter Geist demonstrated how a great American industrial plant can produce the turbines to power our fighting ships at sea in the defense of our country against attack from a foreign enemy, or can help to produce the mechanism to combat the attack against disease and illness in a mission of mercy.

Milwaukee, Wis., and the Nation will miss Walter Geist, and I know the Congress will want to extend its sympathy to his widow and children, to his employees and to his associates in his company.

Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the privilege of submitting herewith for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from my good friend, Raymond D. Moon, Bay County veterans' service officer, Panama City, Fla. This well-written letter speaks eloquently for the masses of the people. I hear from many persons daily about the necessity for a more adequate price-control structure. Notwithstanding the

date of January 11 on this letter, I know that Mr. Moon and the majority of others feel that much more must be done; in fact many persons have stated to me that they consider that the present price freeze is a rank insult to the public for it freezes profiteering and penalizes people who have honestly tried to hold down prices. I believe it is now generally agreed that should prices be rolled all the way back to the beginning of the Korean War some people would be penalized but the present freeze of inflation hurts everyone.

BAY COUNTY VETERANS SERVICE OFFICE,
Panama City, Fla., January 11, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. SIKES,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: In my daily work here in the office, I have the privilege of meeting people from all walks of life. The rich and poor, strong and weak, afflicted and disabled, all pass through the office sooner or later; that is, if they are veterans or dependents of deceased veterans.

In handling the work I am able to sense the pulse of public opinion and feel the needs of the different categories of the human element. It is interesting to note these things when one is a public servant, and it affords me a great deal of pleasure to be able to sense other persons' trials and troubles and to be able to share their burden.

What I am coming to is this: the rising, spiraling cost of living is hurting to the bone. The families in the low-income brackets are not able to have the essential bare necessities at the present time. To make it worse, prices are still leaping higher and higher.

In speaking of these conditions, prices here in Panama City have taken a terrible beating since the new Congress has convened, and the talk has spread about freezing prices. Within the last 2 weeks mark-ups on staple groceries have been from 5 percent to as much as 40 percent. Milk (dairy), bread, haircuts, and laundry and dry cleaning have skyrocketed from 4 percent to 33⅓ percent. These are actual facts, and it seems to be only the beginning, as there are no signs of prices reaching a static stage.

For the sake of our economy and also national security I feel that it is time for positive action to be taken to control prices. Talk only has a tendency to spur prices higher and make things worse. If positive action is not taken soon, we may have serious internal problems which will be difficult to cope with.

Thanking you for your consideration in this matter and with best regards, I am

Yours truly,

RAYMOND D. MOON.

Wanted: A Military Policy for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, Human Events on February 17, 1951, carried a very remarkable article written by Edna Lonigan entitled "Wanted: A Military Policy for Survival." I am particularly struck by the suggestion that the Voice of America be taken out of the State Department and turned over to the military which did such a good job of psychological warfare in Japan during the last war. It suggests that we are in a new kind of modern warfare and that we ought not to be bound down by the classical pattern.

WANTED: A MILITARY POLICY FOR SURVIVAL

(By Edna Lonigan)

Gradually the debate on foreign policy, opened by Hoover and pressed by TAFT, is working round to the primary issue—military policy. Neither foreign policy nor domestic policy can be set until we have a military policy. But first we must face the political question: Who is to make our military policy?

Because of the power of words, we assume the State Department makes foreign policy and Defense works out military strategy. This assumption is a hold-over from the days when we had a constitutional Executive, when Government agencies possessed clear-cut functions resting on statutory powers and duties, and respected the appropriate limitations.

We do not live under that form of government any more. We live under a pyramidal type of Executive, in which all money is paid to the President under loose general grants of power, and real policy making is determined amid a continual struggle within "the palace." In that struggle the State Department coterie now rules supreme. Professional military men or old-fashioned executive officers are no match for them.

The sound American doctrine that the political should take precedence over the military wherever possible has been perverted by State into a new and dangerous doctrine—that the political planners should make the decisions on which our survival as a nation rests. State, arrogating to itself sole responsibility for the strategy by which we are to counter Soviet aggression, has left to the military only technical military questions such as training or weapons—and the rescue of our men after they are committed.

The dividing line between political and military judgment does not run—as it should—between State and Defense, but between State and the top Defense officials on one side and the muzzled professional fighting men on the other. TAFT was profoundly right when he said he did not trust the plans of our top military men, but exempted the generals and admirals in the field from this criticism. He put his finger on the most important issue in our struggle for survival as a nation.

II

Arms and armies are not defense. A nation can spend billions, keep millions of men under arms, build atom-bomb plants and Maginot Lines; but if it follows bad strategical concepts, it will be defeated. Witness France in 1940. In fact, a certain elephantiasis in the Armed Forces, a rush for more men and spending, spells military sickness, not health.

Congressman WALTER JUDD tried, without success, to get to the root of the matter. When representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to testify for foreign aid, JUDD put the questions: Are you giving us what in your judgment is the best military plan for our defense? Or are you giving us merely the best military means to implement the plan the State Department has already decided upon? The Defense officials only hedged.

A nation cannot rely for its survival exclusively on political means. The military cannot start thinking on D-day. Only when Defense officials can plan their strategy wholly apart from our political hopes can they be ready to serve us if those hopes fail. Far from being subordinate to political policy, defense is the last line that protects us against all miscalculations in foreign policy.

The State Department's grand strategy rests ostensibly on the out-worn nineteenth-century doctrine that communism is a popular uprising, due to poverty among the masses. Therefore, they argued, the Soviet Union could be outgeneraled by our spending money to raise the standard of living in neighboring countries. But Communist revolution in the twentieth century arises out of a military coup d'état, by a small band of conspirators directed by a foreign power.

The State Department—to put the best possible face on it—trusted for our survival to the thinking of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, while the Soviet strategy was by Clausewitz out of Genghis Khan.

The idea of opposing Communist strength by welfare work might have been debatable if it had been coupled with a strong defense program, as at first proposed. Congressmen JUDD, JACKSON of California, and others fought hard for such a military hedge. But the State Department took the position that spending was defense, that no military strategy was required in Europe or Asia. According to Paul Hoffman's testimony at ECA hearings, the administration promised that military rearmament would not be allowed to interfere with ECA.

We still have no military strategy to outwit Soviet military planners. In a global war, as in Korea, our Armed Forces will have to fight on Stalin's terms—in the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with only the shaky timbers of UN for diplomatic support.

III

How is it possible that our Defense officials have fallen into such a trap? The reason is the total change in the character of our foreign-policy-making agencies in the last 10 years. The dignified and comparatively effective State Department of 1939 has disappeared. All during the New Deal, Hull kept his Department rigorously within the constitutional framework of a limited, nonaggressive executive agency, spending money only as directed by statutory law. But by 1940 Hopkins, Wallace, and Morgenthau were moving over into making political and military strategy for World War II. They set up emergency agencies, like FEA, modeled on AAA and WPA. After VJ-day the personnel of these agencies was incorporated into State. Grew and other "old hands" were let out.

It is worth noting that this change from our historic methods of foreign-policy making coincided closely with the growth of Communist influence on our foreign and military policy.

Truman's State Department is a combative, aggressive agency like AAA and WPA. It builds its own political following and propaganda arm, by skillful use of large funds, as AAA and WPA built theirs. It is ruthless in its empire-building at the expense of other Federal departments. Its budget has mushroomed, its staff has been multiplied many times, at the expense of qualified, experienced career men. Control of free funds gives it the necessary means for politicking and propaganda against its rivals in the administration. It has carried on unremitting attack against everyone in the administration or outside who has dared to oppose its plans.

State hypnotized the military who stayed too long in Washington by the argument that the political planners should do their thinking for them. Even General Bradley was won over. It sent to "Siberia" the nonpolitical fighting men who tried to warn the country of its danger. Finally, intoxicated with success, the State Department cabal pushed even to the top places in our Defense Establishment men and women who would go along with its policies.

In theory, of course, the President makes these decisions, but as the executive establishment grows larger and larger, it becomes increasingly true, as Moses pointed out, that most of the decisions are made by the secondary ruling class, those officials who best understand the art of manipulating power. Today there is no question but that the State Department combine (including its satellite agencies like ECA) is the strongest influence in the palace guard. Acheson has taken the place in Truman's entourage occupied by Harry Hopkins in Roosevelt's day.

IV

How long can Congress trust our survival as a nation to the military planning of this global colossus? The cure is simple, if Congress has the will to take hold. It must divorce the State Department from all economic and spending programs, which are the sources of its power to compel other agencies in the administration to do its will. Only thus can our defense planning be divorced from State's ideological windmills.

Congress can then call in our best admirals and generals, and tell them to make a strategy for our security divorced from all political and ideological thinking. If they cannot do it, we can find men who will. Let us find the real fighting men who can decide, with no hedging and no politics, what is the line which can be held in Asia, in Europe, in Africa? Whom can we trust militarily as allies? What is the precise military significance of UN? Let us have done with talk of what we can do in 1952. What of today?

When they have cleaned house in Defense, Congress can turn ECA over to the Defense Department. All of ECA which is not defense can be liquidated. The rest can be managed without that colossal waste of time and manpower which Washington calls interdepartmental cooperation. The Armed Forces did a brilliant job of economic reconstruction in Korea through GARIOA (Government and Relief in Occupied Areas) because they were not concerned with undermining Syngman Rhee. They did equally well in Europe. In the little time that is left, Defense must fit ECA to a single purpose—our survival.

Straight loans can be turned over to the International Bank or Export-Import Bank. The Voice of America can be dismantled, and replaced by a program of psychological warfare, like that suggested by Gen. Bonner Fellers, wholly under control of the Armed Forces.

Without its spending funds, State will have no power to punish Members of Congress, members of the press or others who criticize its policies. Congress can then dismantle the empire which the Hopkins-Wallace-Frankfurter groups have built up behind the facade of the dignified old State Department, without fear of attack from mass organizations or the mocking-bird columnists who are part of State's propaganda machine.

When the present State Department has been stripped down to the Foreign Service and a desk for the Secretary, it will be possible for the President to induce a man of courage and intelligence to take over as Secretary of State, and rebuild an American foreign policy with a single aim—the survival of our country.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, this week Republicans throughout America pay homage to the founder of their party and the greatest symbol of liberty who ever lived, Abraham Lincoln. Regardless of party, all Americans honor the day of his birth. His life, his works, and his teachings carry a lesson for all of us that can be studied with profit today.

The reverence with which many of us regard Lincoln has been brought home to me here in Washington as I take visitors from time to time to see the Lincoln Memorial. Those of you who have seen it know how serene yet strong is the expression on the excellent likeness of Lincoln, sitting in his chair in the main hall of the memorial. On either side is inscribed quotations from his Gettysburg Address and the second inaugural. Most people are profoundly moved.

Lincoln's principles are the basic American ideals of honesty, integrity, hard work, plain living, good government, and freedom. His career as a pioneer boy, the rail splitter, country storekeeper, small-town lawyer, legislator, and President is the classic example of the opportunity our system of government affords every citizen—the opportunity to develop to the fullest extent his individual capabilities for the benefit not only of himself but of the entire community. That is the very basis of the American ideal—that freedom of each man to better himself through his own initiative and with the resources God gave him results in progress for everyone. It is impossible to define liberty or freedom—to do so limits them and they are limitless concepts—but there is no better way to describe it than this.

FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM

Lincoln is known as the Great Emancipator, but his interest in freedom extended far beyond the problem of the American slaves. His every action was pointed toward the preservation and extension of the freedoms guaranteed in our Constitution, freedoms which he truly believed were the inalienable birthright of every man. Many of his words are applicable to problems we face today, as when he said:

> The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can do individually as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere.

There is the perfect answer to the do-gooders, the Government economic planners, who are today endeavoring to extend the power of the Federal Government over the lives of individuals under the guise of social reform, with the excuse of emergency.

At another time, Lincoln said:

> We hold the true republican position. In leaving the people's business in their hands, we cannot be wrong.

And again:

> If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions.

FAITH IN THE PEOPLE

Lincoln's abiding faith in the American people and in our system included a true understanding of the division of power, the checks and balances of the Republic, which were written into the Constitution. How much more smoothly would our Government operate, and how much more wisely, if the present occupant of the White House had Lincoln's clear understanding of his duties and Lincoln's faith in the people, as shown in these remarks:

> In a certain sense, and to a certain extent the President is the representative of the people. He is elected by the people, as well as the Congress is, but can he, in the nature of things, know the wants of the people as well as 300 other men, coming from all the various localities of the Nation? If so, where is the propriety of having a Congress?
>
> By the Constitution, the Executive may recommend measures which he thinks proper, and he may veto those he thinks improper, and it is supposed that he may add to these certain indirect influences to affect the action of Congress. My political education strongly inclines me against a very free use of any of these means by the Executive to control the legislation of the country. As a rule, I think it better that Congress should originate as well as perfect its measures without external bias.

An excerpt from a letter Lincoln wrote in 1848 is especially applicable to current debate in the United States. To W. H. Herndon, he wrote:

> The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

A LESSON FOR TODAY

One could continue at great length reciting the deeds and words of this great American. This much, it seems to me, is certain: if we are going to win through the present period of crisis, to settle peacefully if possible but otherwise if necessary the international difficulties of the present day, if we are to straighten out our fiscal affairs, and if we are to leave for future generations the heritage of freedom which was ours, we must turn our hearts and minds once more to the true Americanism exemplified by Abraham Lincoln. As he stated it:

> What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoast, our Army and Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors.

Here in Washington we had our celebration of Lincoln's Birthday this week, a "kick-off" dinner for others throughout the Nation. Nearly 12,000 people thronged the Ulline Arena here for the program and box supper. At least a dozen Lincoln Day dinners are scheduled in Montana, and hundreds of others throughout the Nation. All true Americans, Republicans or Democrats, can

subscribe to Lincoln's philosophy. All of us can profit from refreshing our memories with his teachings.

I am proud to be a Member of the House of Representatives in which Lincoln was for several years an able and aggressive leader.

Draft of Farm Labor Threatens Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within a single decade, and the third time within a generation, America is again at war. This time we are less prepared, and confusion in executive agencies is greater than ever before.

Most of us viewed with deep misgiving administration weakness and delay with respect to economic controls, designed to halt inflation.

We have seen, with a feeling akin to despair, the final act of desperation, when temporary and unplanned wage and price freezes were imposed, after it became apparent that inflation was out of hand, after scores of billions had been added to war costs, and prices had far outrun average incomes.

That feeling was enhanced by submission of a Federal budget for 1952, proposing Federal expenditures on partisan-politically-inspired projects, which would waste the substance of the people, while contributing nothing to the security of the Nation.

The fact that these socialistic spending proposals, impudently were presented in the guise of measures to support the war effort, added still further to the general disquiet.

Industry is the source of our greatest strength from both economic and military standpoints. Yet industry was told to convert at once for large-scale war production, in the absence of definite plans and blueprints, on which alone production can be based.

At the same time the productiveness of industy, the incentives for efficient and economical production, were restricted by a mistaken tax policy, by a corporate tax law, politically conceived, and born of a desire to win votes, even though winning of a war might be jeopardised thereby. Congress did improve this situation, to some extent, by providing for war contract renegotiations.

But in every executive department of Government, confusion has persisted. Where planning was done, always it was piecemeal. No over-all plans for anything have appeared.

In the matter of military manpower, we have heard endless arguments as to which age groups should be drafted. For awhile we were told that the fate of the Nation hung on the necessity of drafting 18-year-olds. Then the argument swung away to the desirability of calling up older men, husbands, and 4-F's.

Throughout all this talk no consideration apparently was given, and none is being given today, to the really important questions with respect to military manpower. Perhaps the most important of all these is the question of food production.

It has been said that an army travels on its stomach. It can be said with equal truth that the American people, as a whole, will not be able to outproduce the Communist world and win the war that is now in its early stages, if they are asked to do so on empty stomachs.

Yet the present draft policy, which seems to be accepted without debate, is to draft all farm labor, except in extreme hardship or dependency cases.

Farm labor nowadays, as we all know, consists almost exclusively of farm owners—older men, who bore the brunt of farm production in World War II, and often in World War I—and their sons.

Scores of thousands of those sons are of draft age; but under the present policy, there will be no deferment for them, it would seem, unless they alone, in each instance, are responsible for operation of the farm.

Now Michigan is not only a great industrial State; it is a great farm State, as well. So in order to high light the situation with respect to food production and the drafting of farm labor, I shall give you some figures on conditions at home.

These figures comprise statistics gathered by the Michigan State College department of agricultural economics. As statistics, they deal with human beings percentagewise.

In 1945, the last year for which figures are available, the average Michigan farm employed about one and one-half persons; 1.55, to be exact.

On this 155 percent of a person the farm operator himself constituted 97 percent; unpaid family help, 48 percent; and hired help, 10 percent.

It is estimated that today less than 6.5 percent of the labor on Michigan farms is provided by regular hired help. Farmers just cannot compete with industry's more attractive wage scales.

About the only farmers' sons who remain on the farm nowadays are those who have studied scientific farming and who plan to make farm operation a career.

Small, 80-acre family farms, worked by one man, who labored from dawn until dark, furnished a large portion of the State's food supply during World War II. But those farms are not so common today as they were in 1940.

Mechanization has caused the small farms to be gobbled up into larger ones, so that machinery can be used more efficiently. Today the average Michigan farm consists of something over 105 acres.

In 1940, a total of 153,517 Michigan farms employed 261,331 men. In 1945, a total of 150,386 Michigan farms employed only 232,518. In 1940, the average Michigan farm had 1.7 employees; in 1945, it had 1.55 employees; and the downward trend has continued ever since.

From these figures it should be clear to everyone what a terrific, and possibly disastrous, effect on the farm labor supply, and hence on food production, the drafting of these young career farmers is bound to have.

But this is not all of the story. There is another factor of at least equal importance. This pertains to the age status of present farm owners and operators; the men who must take up the slack when their sons are drafted.

In 1945, slightly more than 16 percent of Michigan farm operators were 65 years old and older; 2 percent were between 55 and 64 years of age; and 47 percent were between 35 and 54. The average age in that year was 49.8. And since that time, of course, those who still survive are 5 years older.

When the young men are drafted, the load will fall back on these old-timers—men who worked day and night during World War II—men who now, on the average, are past the years when they could do two men's work, even in an emergency.

And this time, Michigan will not have more than 12,000 prisoners of war to ease the farm labor burden, as it had during World War II. Not if the debacle in Korea is any criterion of the future.

Because these conditions prevail, not only in Michigan, but in general throughout the country, it is pertinent to ask: Where does the farmer go from here?

Under the present farm labor draft policy, the pinch is expected in about 6 months. What will the farmers of Michigan do then? What will all American farmers do?

The answer to these questions is obvious. Farmers will cut down food production. They will have no choice, unless it be to change over to forms of farming which require less help. And this would result in an unbalanced food supply. Dairy herds, for example, would be abandoned for beef cattle, which take less time and return more profit.

Possibly Marlin R. Bigelow, manager of the Kalamazoo Milk Producers Cooperative, stated the situation best when he was quoted recently in the newspapers as saying that lack of farm labor probably will cut milk production in the cooperative's area as much as 30 percent in the next 6 to 12 months.

In the last few weeks, he said, two large dairy herds in the area have been sold off; and another one faces the same prospect when the only son in the family is taken by the Army.

Now the action of Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey, in granting 30-day deferments to 30,000 college graduates a few days ago, may be all right, although on first thought it appears discriminatory against less fortunate boys. The idea, however, is to give them a chance for further deferments, in the cases of those who succeed in landing war-essential jobs.

The proposal to give President Truman powers to release 75,000 college students from military service, after their basic training, so they may continue their studies, may be all right, too. The idea is to maintain our system of higher education, and to keep the Nation

well supplied with technically trained younger men.

As I say, these things may be all right; but I am suspicious of them, if for no other reason than that they would be used as a means of vote-getting political favoritism. We have had too much of that kind of thing in the past.

But in the light of the administration attitude betrayed by these actions and proposals, there is one observation I must make.

Whereas the boys now in college, or who will graduate within the next few months, are potentially valuable to the country outside the Armed Services, the young men on the farms are now, at this moment, valuable in the nonmilitary service of food production.

Whereas the college boys and college graduates may obtain war essential jobs, the young men on the farms now, at this moment, have war essential jobs. Many thousands of them are in war essential food production jobs, from which they cannot be spared.

This Congress should make every effort to correct this latest and most dangerous blunder, of the confused Truman bureaucrats.

Let's Get Out of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am including a statement which I made before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on Tuesday, February 6, in support of my resolution to have the United States withdraw from the so-called United Nations.

The matter referred to follows:

Mr. RICHARDS (presiding). Mr. RANKIN, we will be glad to hear you on your resolution, House Joint Resolution 125.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. RANKIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I did not come here with any speech cut and dried, or any argument written out. I was notified that I would be heard for a few moments on my resolution to withdraw our country from the so-called United Nations, that Tower of Babel, that totem pole, which has been set up in our midst, and which is now laboring diligently, if not successfully, to destroy the Government of the United States, and to subordinate our people to the domination of foreign elements, many of whom do not have sense enough to run their own governments.

In my opinion, I speak the sentiments of a vast majority of the American people, as you will all find when you get back home. I would like to read the election results of a man running under the United Nations flag against a man with the United States flag, or even with a Confederate flag.

That so-called United Nations is Communist-controlled. It is a hotbed of communism and is literally swarming our country with Communist spies. To show you how far it is going in that direction, I want to call attention to some things it is doing to the United States of America.

I presume no man in Congress has fought communism harder than I have. I have taken all the punishment, all the lying attacks, all the abuse, that the Communists, their stooges, fellow travelers, and sympathizers could heap upon a man, and that at a time when we did not know whether Mr. Austin, of Vermont, was going east or coming west when he was in the Senate. I never heard a word from him about the danger of communism when I was leading the fight against communism, and exposing the activities of Communists in this country from William Z. Foster up and down.

The Senate of the United States had no right to commit the Government of the American people to the domination of foreign powers. If this country is saved, it seems to me that it will be by the Congress of the United States, and that means largely the House of Representatives.

Let me show you some things that have been done by this outfit. And we have not a representative up there, let me say to you gentlemen and ladies, we have not a representative from America up there that I ever heard of protesting when we were going through the tirades of the Communists, trying to enforce their policies upon the United States, some of which are now being imposed by this so-called United Nations.

In the first place, they assume to tell us when and where to go to war. Now, if you think that is popular, you go home and talk to the mothers and fathers and the wives or widows of those men who are dying in Korea. Congress has not declared war; its Members were not consulted. In fact, it was called a "police action." The United Nations declared it for the United States to fight. There is no telling where that outfit will want to send us to war next. We have already lost more men, killed and wounded, in this Korean "police action," as President Truman called it, than we did in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War, all combined.

I see now that certain interests want us to go to war in Iran to serve their selfish ends. I hope Congress will not sit idly by and let that happen.

You know we had the old League of Nations. One of the wisest things the Senate ever did was to refuse to enter the League of Nations, with its article 10.

I want to show you what it did. A certain big oil magnate gave the League a building in which to hold their meetings. Somebody said when he did so that he saturated the international mind with Standard Oil. A few years later those oil interests that owned the oil reserves down there attempted to find an outlet for Bolivia to get to the Pacific Ocean. You remember there were two small areas on the west coast of South America called Tacna and Arica, and they endeavored to take them for Bolivia, in order to give them pipeline outlets to the Pacific Ocean. But Chile, to which they belonged, would not give them up.

Then they turned and tried to drive down through Paraguay. They took the Bolivian Army and started to drive down through Paraguay to force an outlet to the Atlantic. To my surprise, and to the surprise of everyone else, Paraguay had developed one of the greatest generals in the world, a man named Estigarribia. He took his army and drove them out of Paraguay and back on to Bolivian soil. What did the League of Nations do? It branded Paraguay as the "aggressor."

Senator Lowe, of Louisiana, took the floor and exposed that fraud so plainly and indisputably that the heads of the governments of South America called a meeting and stopped that war.

Now this United Nations has plunged us into another war, or "police action," worse than that was. And let me show you what it is attempting to do to you. Have you read where they had outlawed the alien land laws of the various States? Did you know that in many States of this Union it is unlawful for an alien to own land? California is one of them, Louisiana is one. I have been trying for years to get Mississippi to adopt the same law. The United Nations has outlawed the alien land laws in those States that have them.

What right have they to meddle in the internal affairs of the United States, or the internal affairs of an individual State?

Now they come along with their genocide law or "convention." If you commit physical or mental injury to a minority group, or a member of a minority group, then you are subject to be tried. Where? Why, before an international court, even in a foreign country.

In other words, it has taken precedence over all the courts of our land.

Now, if you call some fellow a dirty scoundrel, or a darned fool, you might be brought up and tried for genocide. You have injured that fellow mentally, evidently, because no man like those ignoramuses terms when they are applied to him. You will have committed genocide, if he is of a different race or religion, or ethnic origin, whatever that may be. You are subject to be tried by an international court. Do you think the American people would approve of that, if they knew what was going on? Not on your life. That outfit is out to destroy the United States Government, and they have a gang of professors running around over this country advocating the abolition of the United States.

There is a professor in the University of Chicago who says in all his public speeches, "We must get rid of the United States."

Are we going to sit here and let them destroy the Government of the United States and subordinate us to the domination of foreign powers?

This genocide law was probably written by Malik, the Russian delegate. He has more influence up there than Mr. Austin has. About all Mr. Austin does, it seems, is to get in the movies and on the radio.

But behind the scene, the enemies of the United States wrote this genocide program. They would interfere in Alabama, Kansas, North Carolina, Mississippi, Arkansas, New York, California, and every other State in this Union.

This is the beginning of the battle. We are going to get out of this thing and get back to the Government of the United States, or our country is going down. We might as well understand that now.

You take this war. Congress was not called on to vote on it, and probably would not be called on in case of war in Iran. I heard that argument awhile ago about the land-ownership proposition. Did you see where the Shah of Iran called his leaders in the other day and said he was going to sell his land to the little fellows who work it, and advised them to do this same thing? He said it would be cheaper than having a revolution. You know the big oil interests want us to go into Iran. You mark what I tell you, that is the next place. There are some oil interests down there, and the UN seems to follow the pipelines. Iraq is another one; our boys may be fighting a "police action" there before long.

Alger Hiss and his gang drew up the United Nations Charter at San Francisco. If any of you have any doubt about Alger Hiss' relations with Russia get the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities and read them.

Hiss and his crowd drew it up, and it subordinates the United States to the domination of foreign influences. They can come in and wipe out our immigration

laws, and that is the next drive, don't forget that, and flood this country with the riffraff of every other nation on earth.

I am telling you, this is the most dangerous thing that has ever been done to the American people.

We went through a war between the States, but we were all fighting for the same form of government. As I said on the floor of the House the other day, when you see a question arise that affects the safety of this Nation, the men who fly to its defense are the sons and grandsons and collateral relatives of the old Federal and Confederate soldiers who fought the War Between the States.

But here you have an alien element that is trying to destroy the sovereignty of the United States, as well as that of North Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Kansas, Ohio, New Jersey, Virginia, New York, and every other State in the Union.

Not only are they trying to destroy the sovereignty of the States, their rights to control their internal affairs; but they are trying to destroy the Government of the United States itself. You might as well get ready for it, the battle is now on. The sooner we withdraw from that monstrosity the better off we are going to be.

When General Patton was persecuted because he had shown himself to be the greatest general we had produced since the War Between the States, when that communistic influence was persecuting General Patton, I took his part on the floor of the House. After we got him back in action, and he had taken his Third Army and fought his way up to Berlin, he was ordered to move south and turn the victory over to Communist Russia.

We have just been through the most useless war in history. Our boys won the fight, but Russia got the proceeds of the victory. Our boys won the victory in the field, on the sea, and in the air, and then the same crowd of wild-eyed internationalists that now seem to have control turned the victory over to Russia, the worst enemy civilization ever knew.

General Pattim came to see me, and said he wanted to thank me for defending him as he expressed it, "When I was on the battle front and could not defend myself."

I said, "Why General, you do not owe me anything compared to what we owed you." I told him he was the greatest general this country has produced since the War Between the States.

He said, "I want to ask you one question: What do you think of this United Nations?" I said, "General, don't you forget that Towers of Babel have been collapsing in confusion by the tongues ever since the days of Genesis. This will not be an exception."

He said, "I want to remember that if I don't remember another thing you have said."

I see somebody in yesterday's RECORD referred to the United Nations as a "totem pole" that some of the benighted people of the world worship and expect to get directions from.

We don't expect to get any blessings from it. We have already heard its voice, and our boys are dying in Korea as a result.

The quicker we get out of it, the longer America is going to survive. If we let them dominate this country, that freedom, that independence, that liberty, even that government, even those State governments our forebears built will disappear.

Mr. RICHARDS (presiding). You have 1 minute.

Mr. RANKIN. If there are any questions I shall be glad to answer them.

I did not want to come in here and take your time this morning without answering any questions you desire to ask.

Mr. RICHARDS (presiding). We wanted you to come.

Mr. RANKIN. This battle is going on. We are in more danger at home today than we have ever been before. Do not forget that the Reds have their agents permeating this Government. They are in key positions. I will call the names of some of them on the floor of the House. They are out to undermine and destroy everything for which our people have fought for the last 200 years.

God being my helper, I will never quit this fight until we get rid of that so-called United Nations, that supergovernment that, as I said, is swarming this country with spies and trying to undermine and destroy this Government, as well as every State government, and to subordinate our people to the domination of foreign elements who have proved incapable of governing themselves.

God save America!

The resolution referred to follows:

"House Joint Resolution 125

"Joint resolution terminating United States participation in the activities of the United Nations

"*Resolved, etc.*, That (1) membership of the United States in the United Nations shall be held and considered to be terminated, (2) no person may represent the United States on or in any of the organs, agencies, or activities of the United Nations, and (3) no funds appropriated by any law of the United States may be used to share in the expenses of, or otherwise to support, the United Nations or any of its organs, agencies, or activities.

"SEC. 2. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed: (1) The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (Public Law 264, 79th Cong.), and (2) all other laws or parts thereof to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect on the day after the date of its enactment."

Slaves of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, disregarding the lessons of history which teach us that war is destructive and ruinous, General Marshall and Anna Rosenberg, willing tools of those financially powerful and politically ambitious interests which got us into World War I and World War II, now would rob the cradle and cheat the grave by forcing every physically and mentally fit American young man, as he reaches the age of 18, to become subject to, and the slave of, a military machine for some 7 years.

The foregoing are harsh words, but they are justified by the present program of Mr. Truman, his British-loving, Communist-serving State Department, the internationalists, and one-worlders.

Without in any way questioning the sincerity or the loyalty of those who are back of the present program of aid to all the world, of involving us in an all-out war in Asia and in Europe, it may truthfully be said that, if Stalin seeks the destruction of our Republic, he could devise no better program than that formulated with the assistance of Alger Hiss, followed by Acheson and Mr. Truman—a policy of spending us into brankruptcy, stripping us of our natural resources, and, finally, conscripting our youth. That program, through attrition and exhaustion, will make this Nation as helpless as though it had been overrun by victorious armies.

We know that every military leader who has conscripted all able civilians into the armed services has, when confronted in battle by freemen, in the end been defeated.

The administration just a few days ago, through General Marshall, who insisted that he did not know where he was when the Japs descended on Pearl Harbor, and Anna Rosenberg, born in Hungary and now attempting to foist the Old World military despotism upon this country, announced its program for the future of young Americans.

Marshall and Rosenberg demand that the Congress conscript all young men, as they reach the age of 18, for 27 months' service with the Armed Forces. They further propose, following that service—and do not forget, once inducted for 27 months, the Congress might lengthen that service for another indefinite period, as it has in the past—to keep the young men in the service for an additional 5 years.

Their proposal is that, after the 27 months' service, these young men are to be assigned to fully organized drilling units, subject to combat duty when called by their Government. After the active combat service has expired, these young men would be subject to the orders of those at the head of the war machine. They might be ordered to drill part or all of the time. They might be required to attend the colleges and universities, study the courses designated by the military.

Think of it—7 years and 3 months taken out of the life of every young man physically and mentally fit—devoted to the service, not of his country, but to the service of any one of the 12 Atlantic Pact nations.

Is this a nation of free people? Are we to have a military dictator? Are our citizens compelled, as are the Russians, as were those under Hitler, Mussolini, to serve in the armed services at the will of some military man?

This administration now proposes to send 40 divisions—80,000 men—to Europe, to be followed shortly by an army of 200,000. Unless all signs fail, if the one-worlders and the Trumanites are permitted to have their way, this war—the end of which no one can see—may call for twelve, as did the last war—or perhaps fifteen—million men in Europe.

Is this war being staged so that Truman, the New Dealers, the one-worlders, the internationalists, can control our people for the next and succeeding generations? If that is not the purpose, will someone tell us the real purpose?

Do not answer that the purpose is to contain communism. That just does not go down, for the present and the preceding administrations have harbored and encouraged Communists right here in Washington and in China.

Do not answer that it is to carry the four freedoms throughout the world,

for the recent railroad strike, the current proposed tax bill and price-control with its regimentation, conscription for wars on foreign soil, teach us that we are losing our freedom here at home.

And do not suggest that all war will be ended by fighting another one.

The need of this country is for a Congress and a President who will think of the Republic, its people, its future; make us strong here at home.

Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the 1951 revised constitution and bylaws of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc. This organization is a patriotic American war veterans' organization, nonprofit and nonpolitical. It has advocated a policy against all Communist, Fascist, subversive, totalitarian, and un-American groups and philosophies. It has been recognized under the laws of various State legislatures; namely, New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, and is incorporated under eight different States; namely, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, California, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Rhode Island. It has established local organizations from one end of the country to the other and has been most active in aiding and assisting veterans not only of Italian-American extraction but all veterans of all wars, their families and dependents. I for one am proud of the accomplishments of the Italian-American World War veterans, and I notice that year after year their numbers continue to increase due to the outstanding contribution that they are making in local and national affairs.

NATIONAL DEPARTMENT,
ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR
VETERANS OF UNITED STATES, INC,
Syracuse, N. Y., January 1, 1951.

Subject: National constitution and bylaws.
To: National, State, and local posts, departments, officers, and members.

SHORT TITLE

NATIONAL CONSTITUTION

Article I. Name.
Article II. Purpose.
Article III. Membership.
Article IV. General powers.
Article V. Assets of existing organizations.
Article VI. Nonpolitical.
Article VII. Not to engage in business.
Article VIII. State agents.
Article IX. Badges, emblems, and insignia.
Article X. Auxiliaries.
Article XI. Amendments.

NATIONAL BYLAWS

Article I. Organization.
Article II. Chapters.
Article III. Suspension and revocation of charters.
Article IV. Local posts.
Article V. State Departments.
Article VI. National convention.
Article VII. National executive committee.
Article VIII. National officers.
Article IX. Finances.
Article X. Life membership.
Article XI. Discipline of posts and post members.
Article XII. Field days.
Article XIII. Politics.
Article XIV. Amendments.

NATIONAL CONSTITUTION

PREAMBLE

For God and Nation, and for our Commonwealth, the former members of the Armed Forces of the United States, having aided in maintaining the honor, integrity, and supremacy of our country, holding in remembrance the sacrifices in common made and drawn together by strong bonds of respect and mutual suffering, solemnly and firmly associate ourselves together in creating the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., the principles and purposes of which shall be allegiance to the United States of America and fidelity to its constitution and laws. To hold aloft the torch of true patriotism; to strive for a better understanding between nations, that peace and good will may prevail; to cherish and preserve the memories of our military and naval associations; and to aid and assist veterans, their widows, and orphans.

Article I. Name

The name of this organization shall be Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

Article II. Purpose

The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(a) To aid and assist veterans and their families;

(b) To assist public and private agencies and institutions endeavoring to promote the public welfare;

(c) To foster, encourage, and promote social, civic, historical, athletic, patriotic, musical, and scientific activities and affairs;

(d) To uphold and maintain the honor and integrity of the United States and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies;

(e) To uphold and maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States and fidelity to the Constitution;

(f) To promote patriotism, advance the civic welfare, encourage benevolence, stimulate charity, champion the cause of education, and inspire friendship;

(g) To stimulate a feeling of mutual devotion, helpfulness, and comradeship among all veterans and their dependents, widows, and orphans; and

(h) To encourage and develop in all people a spirit of good will, fellowship, and understanding, as a guard against future wars and chaos.

Article III. Membership

SECTION 1. Any person who believes in the principles enunciated in the preamble to this constitution, and who is an American citizen, who was regularly enlisted, inducted, or commissioned, and who was accepted for, or was on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Air Force of the United States, in any war, campaign, or expedition recognized by the Congress, shall be eligible for membership in the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.: *Provided, however*, That no person the service of whom with the Armed Forces has terminated shall be eligible for membership unless such termination was honorable discharge or honorable separation: *And provided further*, That said service as a regularly enlisted, drafted, or inducted, or commissioned was accepted for and assigned during the period between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, or between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, all dates inclusive; and during any period in furtherance of any legal mandate of the United Nations. (This includes veterans of Korean War.)

SEC. 2. No person may be a member at any one time of more than one post.

SEC. 3. No person shall be entitled to membership who, being in such service during either of said period, refused on conscientious, political, or other grounds to subject himself to military discipline or unqualified service.

SEC. 4. No person who has been expelled by a post, shall be admitted to membership in another post, without the consent of the expelling post, except that where such consent has been asked for and denied by such post, he may then appeal to the department executive committee of the expelling post for permission to be admitted to membership in another post, and shall be ineligible for membership until such permission is granted.

SEC. 5. Any person who has been of service to this organization and has cooperated with it to help to further its high ideals, either through sacrifice or the rendition of material assistance, whether he be of Italian birth or extraction or not, may be elected to honorary membership, it being understood, however, that such membership shall give such person no voice in the affairs of the organization and such person shall not be liable for nor have to pay any dues. The honorary membership not to exceed one member per year in each post, State Department, and national department. All applications for honorary membership shall be forwarded by the sponsoring post, State department, or national department to the national executive committee for final approval.

SEC. 6. There shall be no form or class of membership except as specified in the constitution.

SEC. 7. No person shall be permitted to hold more than one membership in this organization.

SEC. 8. No member upon resigning his membership from any post shall be privileged to receive a remittance of any membership dues theretofore paid.

SEC. 9. No member may solicit funds or offer for sale any form or kind of merchandise as a veteran in the name of the organization except with approval of the post of the particular town in which he is operating.

SEC. 10. Transfers: A member of one post may secure a transfer of his membership to another post with the approval of the receiving post, whereupon the national organization shall notify all posts concerned.

SEC. 11. There shall be no transfer of dues, credit or voting strength to members of posts where members transfer from one post to another until the first of the next fiscal year.

Article IV. General powers

The corporation shall have perpetual succession and power—

(a) To sue and be sued;

(b) To receive, hold, lease, own, use, improve, and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary for its corporate purposes;

(c) To accept gifts, legacies, and devises which will further its corporate purposes;

(d) To adopt and alter a corporate seal;

(e) To adopt and alter a constitution and bylaws and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State;

(f) To establish and maintain offices for the conduct of its business;

(g) To establish, regulate, and discontinue subordinate State or Territorial organizations and local chapters or posts;

(h) To promote the formation of ladies' auxiliaries to local chapter or post organizations existing within the jurisdiction of

the corporation, composed of mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and nieces of veterans who are members of, or are eligible for membership in, the corporation, or mothers, widows, wives, sisters, daughters, and nieces of deceased veterans who, if living, would be eligible for membership in the corporation;

(i) To publish a magazine or other publication;

(j) To adopt emblems and badges;

(k) To charge and collect membership dues; and

(l) To do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry into effect the objects and purposes of the corporations.

Article V. Assets of existing organization

The corporation may acquire any or all of the assets of the existing organization known as Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all its liabilities.

Article VI. Nonpolitical

The corporation shall be nonpolitical and, as an organization shall not promote the candidacy of any person seeking public office.

Article VII. Not to engage in business

The corporation shall have no power to issue capital stock or engage in business for pecuniary profit or gain.

Article VIII. State agents

As a condition precedent in the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., shall file in the office of the Secretary of State of each State the name and post-office address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom legal process or demands against the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., may be served.

Article IX. Badges, emblems, and insignia

Exclusive right to name, corporate seal, emblems, and insignia. The corporation and its State and Territorial organizations and local chapters or posts shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and to use in carrying out its purposes the name of Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., and the sole and exclusive right to the use of its corporate seal, emblems, and badges as adopted by said corporation.

Article X. Auxiliaries

SECTION 1. This organization recognizes a ladies' auxiliary, a national order of wreckers, Sons of Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., and Junior Daughters and Sisters of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., as auxiliary units of this organization.

SEC. 2. The auxiliary shall be governed in each department of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the national executive committee and thereafter approved by such Department of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc.

SEC. 3. Eligibility: This organization recognizes an auxiliary organization to be composed of mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and nieces (who are at least 16 years of age) of veterans eligible for membership in this organization, and any woman eligible to membership in this organization; and, in addition, mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and nieces who are at least 16 years of age of persons who were eligible and were killed in military or naval service of the United States in either World War I or World War II or were eligible for membership and have since died.

Article XI. Amendments

This constitution may be amended at any national convention by a vote of two-thirds of the total accredited delegates assembled, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been read to the convention at least one calendar day before they are voted thereon.

NATIONAL BYLAWS

Article I. Organization

SECTION 1. The governing body of this organization shall be the national convention, the national executive committee, the State departments, the posts, and such territorial organizations as may be approved.

SEC. 2. Each such body shall keep records of its proceedings which shall be open for inspection to any recognized officer of the organization duly appointed by the national commander.

Article II. Charters

SECTION 1. This organization may grant charters to State departments and local posts.

SEC. 2. Any ten persons eligible for membership in this organization, who desire to form a post, shall make application for a charter to the commander of the department of the State in which they reside, and if there be no State department, then to the national, using the regular form prescribed by the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. When there is already one post in a city, a charter may be granted for an additional post only upon the basis of an application for charter signed by at least 25 eligibles, except in cities of 100,000 population or less it is hereby provided that a charter may be granted on an application signed by not less than 25 eligibles.

SEC. 4. No new post shall bear the name of a living person, nor shall an existing post change its name to that of a living person. No post shall adopt the name already adopted by any other post in good standing, nor shall an existing post change its name to that already adopted by any other post in good standing. No post shall be named for a person who is not a veteran of either World War I or World War II.

SEC. 5. When a charter has been issued and signed by the national commander, it shall not thereafter be changed or amended except in the case of change of name, change of location and/or the dropping of names therefrom of ineligibles, and/or consolidation of posts as prescribed by the bylaws.

SEC. 6. All applications for post charters shall be accompanied by the current per capita tax for each signer of the application together with the officers' bond premium.

SEC. 7. The approval of the post charters shall be signified by countersignatures of the commander and the adjutant of the State departments to which the post is affiliated.

Article III. Suspension and revocation of charters

SECTION 1. Charters of local posts may be revoked or suspended by State executive committee with the approval of the national executive committee, or by the national executive committee where there is no State department; and shall be revoked by the national executive committee when a post has had less than 10 paid members for a period of 18 months.

SEC. 2. The national executive committee may, for cause, revoke the charter of any State department. The term "for cause," as used herein, shall refer only to matters specifically required or prohibited by the constitution and bylaws of the national or State department, or posts.

SEC. 3. All charters revoked by the State department shall stand suspended pending action of the national executive committee.

SEC. 4. When the charter of any post has been revoked all members of that post shall become members at large.

SEC. 5. Upon revocation of a State department or local post all property, money, and effects of the State department or local post shall revert to the national organization to be held in trust for a period of 18 months; in the event the State department or post charter is not reissued within a period of 18 months the said property shall become the absolute property of the national department.

SEC. 6. In addition to any other grounds therefore, a member may be suspended and tried and the charter of a post or State department may be suspended and revoked, should such member, post, or department resort to a civil court action against a post, department, or the national organization, or the officers thereof, as such, before exhausting all remedies available within the organization.

SEC. 7. While under suspension, no meetings shall be held in the name of the post or organization except for the sole purpose of the discussion of cause, effect, or removal of penalty. No funds of the post shall be expended or obligation incurred, except for the purpose of reinstatement from suspension during and while the order or suspension is in force and effect.

SEC. 8. Any post failing to meet the obligations imposed upon it by the constitution and bylaws, or ceasing to function for 6 months as an Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., post, or voluntarily ceasing to function as a post, or merging with one or more other posts, or refusing to pay the department and national per capita dues, or under such other conditions as might make such action necessary, shall upon order of the department executive committee, surrender its charter for cancellation. Upon failure to surrender such charter, immediate steps may be taken for its revocation, suspension, or cancellation.

Article IV. Local posts

SECTION 1. Each local post may adopt its own constitution, bylaws and regulations and levy its own membership fees, provided that such constitution, bylaws and regulations, do not conflict with those of this organization, or with those of the State department with which the post is affiliated.

SEC. 2. Each local post shall elect a commander, a senior vice commander, vice commander and quartermaster, and may elect or appoint such other officers as may be necessary to operate the post.

SEC. 3. Each local post shall keep complete and accurate records of minutes of meetings and financial records of all monies received, expended, and remitted; all money must be deposited in the name of the said post; and shall have an accounting made of the same once each quarter, a report of which shall be submitted to the State and national organization.

SEC. 4. Provision shall be made by each State department and local post for the expenditure of funds by it only on the basis of checks or vouchers signed by at least two officers thereof.

SEC. 5. Seniority: The department commander shall assign the numbers issued to posts under his jurisdiction and such numbers shall be issued according to the date of the charter under which they are acting, provided that in the case of new posts, the number shall be assigned as of rate of muster. When a post charter is canceled, the post number shall be held vacant for 1 year, but at the expiration of 1 year may be reissued to a new post authorized within that department. Numbers shall be issued only to posts for which charters have been authorized by the national commander.

SEC. 6. Revival of charter: A defunct post may be revived with its original name and number, provided these have not been reassigned. If such revival is desired, an application shall be submitted as provided for in the formation of a new post and a charter issued as though the post were a new post.

SEC. 7. Meetings, stated: The stated meetings of each post shall be held at least monthly.

SEC. 8. Meetings, special: The post commander may call a special meeting whenever, in his opinion, the same may be necessary for the welfare of the post. The post commander shall call a special meeting upon request, in writing, signed by seven members in good standing. The post adjutant shall notify all members in writing of the time and place of any special meeting and of the business to be transacted, such notice to be delivered to each member at least 48 hours in advance of the time set for the meeting. No business shall be transacted at any special meeting except that for which the meeting was called.

SEC. 9. Quorum: The post bylaws may specify the minimum number of members required to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business in no case to be less than six members in good standing.

SEC. 10. Change of name: Any post may change its name by a two-thirds vote of the members present at a regular or special meeting called for the purpose, of which meeting and proposed action at last 30 days' notice in writing has been given to all its members, and provided that such change shall be approved by the department executive committee and the national commander.

When permission for change of name has been granted by the national commander such post shall be issued a new charter at the expense of the post.

SEC. 11. Installation of officers: Post officers shall be installed into their respective offices at a regular or special meeting during the period of September 1 and November 1, and such installation may be conducted publicly at an open meeting to be held for that purpose.

The installation shall be conducted by the department commander or by a member in his stead who holds or held a rank at least as high as that of post commander.

Article V. State departments

SECTION 1. Formation: Whenever two or more posts have been organized in any State or Territory or foreign possession or country, a department may be organized in said State, Territory, or foreign possession, or country.

SEC. 2. Authorized body: The State departments shall be the authorized governing bodies of the posts and territorial organizations operating within the boundary lines in their respective States, and shall be composed of representatives of said posts and territorial organizations.

SEC. 3. Legislative powers: The legislative powers granted to a State department shall be vested in the State convention and shall be composed of the department officers and the accredited delegates representing the several posts and territorial organizations of the department.

SEC. 4. Administrative powers: The administrative affairs of the State department shall be vested in a department executive committee to be composed of representatives of the several posts or territorial organizations of the department, the department commander, the department senior vice commander, and such other department officers as the department constitution may provide.

SEC. 5. Officers: The State department shall elect a commander, a senior vice commander, a quartermaster, and shall elect or appoint such other department officers as may be provided by its constitution and bylaws.

SEC. 6. Constitution: Each State department shall adopt its own constitution, bylaws, and regulations and provide its own membership fees, provided that the provisions of such constitution, bylaws, and regulations do not conflict with those of the national organization.

SEC. 7. Organization: Each State department may establish such territorial organizations within its own State as it may deem necessary.

SEC. 8. Eligibility to office: Any person holding membership in this organization, whose current per capita tax has been duly received by the State and national organization, shall be eligible to any office in that department: *Provided*, That no member shall hold two elective department offices at the time or any post shall have more than two members elected to a department office. No person who being a paid employee of any other veterans' organization shall be eligible to hold an elective or appointive office in this organization or any unit thereof.

SEC. 9. Election of officers: The commander, senior vice commander, junior vice commander, quartermaster, judge advocate, officer of the day, and such other officers as may be prescribed by the department constitution and bylaws shall be elected by ballot or roll call at the annual meeting of the department convention in each year. A majority of all votes cast shall be necessary for a declaration of election.

SEC. 10. Term of office: Officers thus elected shall be installed before the adjournment of the convention at which they are elected and immediately enter upon their duties, and shall hold office until their successors are duly installed. A department officer appointed and installed in office shall continue to hold office during the pleasure of the appointive power unless otherwise provided. A department officer, elected or appointed, shall retain such office only while he remains a member in good standing in a post in the department of which he is an officer.

SEC. 11. Bylaws: A department convention may adopt bylaws for the government of the department, not conflicting with the constitution, bylaws, or orders of the national organization, and may provide for the alteration or amendment thereof.

SEC. 12. Revocation of charters: The national convention at its annual muster or the national commander, with the consent of the national executive committee, may at any time revoke the charter of a department which for three-fourths of a year has failed to forward its reports, dues, or moneys properly payable to the national headquarters.

SEC. 13. Suspension of charter: The national commander may suspend the charter of a department for a period of 60 days for violation of the laws or usages of the organization or refusal to comply with lawful orders of the national convention or national executive committee, and if no appeal is taken within the period of 60 days, the charter of the department may be canceled: *Provided*, *however*, That before the charter is canceled, the department commander in question shall be duly notified of the charges against it and upon request shall have a suitable opportunity to appear before the national executive committee to show cause, if it may have any, why its charter should not be canceled.

SEC. 14. Arrearage: Any department in arrears for returns, reports, per capita tax payments or other financial obligations, shall be deprived of all representation at the national convention until the same are paid to the proper authority.

Article VI. National convention

SECTION 1. Supreme body: The legislative power of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., shall be in annual national convention to be held within the last week of August ending the first Monday in September at a place to be determined by a majority vote of the voting delegates in attendance at each preceding convention: *Provided*, *however*, That if any convention fails to designate time and place of the succeeding convention, the national executive committee shall do so, nothing convention date.

SEC. 2. Delegates: At each national convention, each State department shall be entitled to two delegates and two alternates. One delegate shall be the department commander in office at the time of the national convention, and the other shall be his immediate predecessor in office.

Each post shall be entitled to three delegates and three alternates for its charter. One delegate of which will be the post commander or next officer and for whom per capita tax has been paid to the national department and for whom the State capita tax has been remitted by the department quartermaster prior to the opening of the said national convention: *Provided*, *however*, That any such nonpolitical shall not be extended to designated delegates of any post which is indebted to the national organization in the sum of more than $50; to the State department in the sum of more than $50.

All duly elected national officers by virtue of their office shall be delegates to the national convention. In addition to all post delegates, all elected national officers, past national commanders, and two national executive committeemen from each State, and all appointed national officers, in accordance with article VIII, section 2, are entitled to vote at the annual national convention: *Provided*, *however*, They have qualified with respect to the payment of national and State per capita tax and the convention fee.

SEC. 3. Voting: Each delegate shall be entitled to one vote. There shall be no form of unit rule or voting by proxy.

SEC. 4. Convention rules: The rules of the national convention shall be prescribed by the national executive committee, subject to amendment and approval by the national convention. All matters of parliamentary procedure not otherwise specifically covered by such rules or by these bylaws shall be governed by Demaree's Manual of Parliamentary Procedure. Copies of convention rules shall be prepared and distributed by the adjutant to the delegates upon their adoption.

SEC. 5. Credentials: The form of the convention credentials shall be designated by the national executive committee. The national commander shall appoint a credentials committee composed of one member from each State, and shall, in accordance with the provisions of these bylaws and the convention rules determine the eligibility of all persons seated and voting in the national convention, and shall officially notify the convention and the delegates as to the number of votes each delegation shall be entitled.

Article VII. National executive committee

SECTION 1. Administrative power and composition: Between national conventions, the administrative power shall be vested in the national executive committee which shall be composed of the national commander, national senior vice commander, five junior vice commanders, national quartermaster, judge advocate, national chaplain in office, national rehabilitation officer, two national executive committeemen from each department, and retiring national commander. National commander shall be presiding officer.

SEC. 2. Term of executive committeemen: The term of each national executive committeeman and alternate shall be 1 year.

SEC. 3. Meetings: The national executive committee shall hold its stated meetings as follows: One within 24 hours preceding the convention of and one within 24 hours following adjournment of the national convention.

SEC. 4. Special meetings: Whenever any seven members of the national executive committee deem it necessary they may request in writing, that a special meeting of the executive committee be held, and upon receipt of such request the national commander shall call a special meeting setting forth the time, place, and reasons for such.

During the period of the convention whenever the national commander deems it necessary, he may call a special meeting of the executive committee.

SEC. 5. Communications: The regular business of the organization requiring the consideration of the national executive committee between stated meetings shall be transacted through the office of the national commander by means of correspondence or referendum (mail or telegraph ballots).

SEC. 6. Quorum: A quorum shall exist in the national executive committee when seven members are present and seated.

SEC. 7. Powers: All legislative, administrative and executive matters not otherwise specifically covered by the provisions of the constitution, bylaws and regulations of this organization, or by any enactment of the national convention shall be determined by the national executive committee.

Article VIII. National officers

SECTION 1. Election of officers: The national convention shall elect a national commander, senior vice commander, five junior vice commanders, judge advocate, chaplain, quartermaster, rehabilitation officer, officer of the day, and two members at large for the national executive committee from each State. No person shall succeed himself as national commander.

SEC. 2. Vice commanders: No more than one vice commander shall be chosen from any State, and no more than one national executive committeeman shall be chosen from any one post.

SEC. 3. Appointed officers: By and with the consent of the national executive committee the national commander shall appoint a national adjutant, national legislative chairman, national sergeant-at-arms, national historian, Americanization officer, chief of staff, chief inspector, service officer, two aides-de-camp, and one deputy chief of staff from each State.

SEC. 4. Eligibility to office: All active members in good standing shall be eligible to any office: *Provided*, That no member shall hold two elective national offices at the same time or an elective national office and an appointed elective office.

SEC. 5. Past national commanders: All past national commanders, while in good standing in their respective posts, shall be members for life of the national executive committee, and shall also be life delegates to all national conventions of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., with vote, to be exercised by them with their respective departments.

SEC. 6. Presiding officer: The national commander shall be the presiding officer of the national convention and of the national executive committee meetings. He shall appoint such committees as may be provided for by these bylaws, and such committees as may be authorized by the convention or by the executive committee.

Duties of Officers

SEC. 7. National commander: The national commander shall be the executive head of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., with full power to enforce the provisions of the national constitution, national bylaws, and the will of the national convention. He shall be the chairman of the national convention and the national executive committee; sign all vouchers properly drawn on the quartermaster; make all appointments as prescribed by these bylaws, and may remove these officers at his pleasure. He shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 8. Vice commanders: In case of the removal of the national commander from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the duties of his office, the same shall devolve upon the senior vice commander; and in the case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the commander and senior vice commander, the duties shall devolve upon the office of the vice commander first elected.

SEC. 9. Adjutant: The national adjutant shall keep correct records of the proceedings of the national convention and executive committee; he shall conduct its correspondence and issue the necessary orders under the direction of the national commander. He shall keep proper files of all correspondence and copies of the applications for membership in the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc. He shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office. The national adjutant shall by and with the consent of the national commander appoint such employees as may be deemed necessary to conduct the business affairs of his office, and shall by and with the consent of the national executive committee determine the salaries of such employees.

SEC. 10. Quartermaster: The quartermaster shall take charge of the funds, securities, vouchers, and all other property of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc. He shall keep a true record and account of all moneys due and receivable from all sources. He shall pay all warrants drawn on the treasury when properly countersigned by the national commander. He shall retain one copy of such vouchers for his own files and shall submit one copy to the national adjutant.

He shall turn all bills over to the national commander for approval. No bills shall be paid by him until approved by the national commander or by the national executive committee. He shall keep a true record of all liabilities of the national department.

He shall purchase all supplies or other property necessary to conduct the business of the national department. When necessary to purchase such supplies, he shall fill out a requisition form, provided by the national executive committee and submit same to the national commander for approval; and no supplies or property shall be purchased until said requisition is approved by the national commander or the national executive committee.

The quartermaster shall have charge of all supplies and furnish same to all State departments and all posts. He shall be treasurer of all committees of the national executive committee. He shall keep a systematic account between the national department and State departments and posts, debiting and crediting per capita tax, each item of supplies separate, so as to render a strict account of the cost of all revenue from all receipts and supplies.

He shall issue to each State department and to each post and each national department officer, at the last of every quarter through the magazine or in pamphlet form as directed by the national executive committee, his report showing receipts and disbursements. Said report shall be mailed not later than the 10th day of the following month, and shall show the total receipts from each State department, each post, or other sources for the quarter.

The quartermaster shall maintain a complete roll of our membership. He shall render an annual report in writing at the national convention. He shall compile a complete inventory of all property and report the same to the annual convention. The national quartermaster shall be bonded for $10,000 and the same shall be paid by the national department. The bond shall be kept by the national finance committee.

SEC. 11. Judge advocate: The national judge advocate shall be the legal adviser of this organization. He shall, upon the request of the national commander and the national executive committee or the national convention, render his opinion upon all existing and proposed amendments to the constitution and bylaws of this organization, or any unit thereof, upon all questions of parliamentary procedure and upon all questions arising out of the national organization, interpost, and interdepartment disputes.

Upon receiving the opinion of the judge advocate upon any such questions, the national commander shall render a decision which shall be subject to appeal to the national executive committee and to the national convention, provided that notice of intention of appeal is given within 30 days after the decision of the national commander is made known.

In all such cases the decision of the national convention shall be final. He shall perform such duties as are incident to his office.

SEC. 12. Historian: The national historian shall be the publicity officer of the national department and shall be required to furnish publicity matters to the newspapers and only with the approval of the national commander.

SEC. 13. Patriotic and Americanization officer: The national patriotic and Americanization officer shall perform such duties as his office may require or the national commander may direct.

SEC. 14. Chaplain: The national chaplain shall perform such duties in connection with his office as the commander or the national convention may require.

SEC. 15. Officer of the day and sergeant at arms: The duties of the officer of the day and sergeant at arms shall be as prescribed and pertaining to his office.

SEC. 16. Chief of staff: The chief of staff shall have full charge under the national commander of the work of organizing new posts.

SEC. 17. Chief inspector: The chief inspector shall perform such duties as are required of him and incident to his office.

SEC. 18. Legislative chairman: The national legislative chairman, subject to the instructions of the national commander, national executive committee, or the national convention, shall direct and supervise all Federal legislative activities of this organization.

No Federal legislation shall be sponsored or endorsed by him, or by any national officer, or any member or officer of any subordinate unit, unless it has been approved by a national convention or by the national executive committee.

The national legislative chairman shall by and with the consent of the national commander appoint such employees as he may deem necessary to the conduct of the affairs of his office, and shall by and with the consent of the national executive committee determine the salaries of said employees.

SEC. 19. Rehabilitation officer: The rehabilitation officer shall concern himself with the rehabilitation program and hospital work of veterans confined in hospitals, and such other duties as are incidental to his office. The national rehabilitation officer shall by and with the consent of the national executive committee determine the salaries of the national rehabilitation officers and other employees of his department.

All national rehabilitation officers in the several national districts and States shall render a detailed monthly report of the work done by them to the national rehabilitation officer, and he shall, in turn, within 10 days from receipt of said report, transmit a consolidated report to the national department.

Article IX. Finances

SECTION 1. Finances: The revenue of this organization shall be derived from the per capita tax, contributions, and such other sources as may be approved by the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. Per capita tax: The amount of the national per capita tax shall be 75 cents for the fiscal year 1940-41, and thereafter shall be determined by the national convention and shall remain in effect until changed by the subsequent national convention.

SEC. 3. The national and State per capita tax shall be collected from the member by each post and transmitted directly to the national organization together with the national and State record and subscription.

SEC. 4. Annual dues shall be payable October 1 of each year.

SEC. 5. All revenues and expenditures of this organization shall be under the direct supervision of a national executive committee.

SEC. 6. Budget: The national department shall operate under a budget which shall be set up by the national executive committee within 30 days after the national convention.

SEC. 7. Not more than 90 percent of the estimated income for the official year shall be budgeted. The remainder shall be set aside as a restricted reserve which shall not be expended except upon unanimous approval of the executive committee and two-thirds of the members present and voting.

SEC. 8. Depository: The national executive committee shall designate the national depository or depositories for all revenue of this organization, which shall be located in the same city as national quartermaster.

SEC. 9. Deposits: All funds received in the name of this organization by any officer or committee thereof shall be deposited forthwith in such depositories as may be designated by the national executive committee, where such funds shall be and remain the property of this organization until such time as they are properly expended or remitted in accordance with the regulations of the national executive committee; provided, however, that in case of any extraordinary fund-raising enterprise entered into the committee in charge of such activities may, with the approval of the national executive committee, receive and expend from those receipts such amounts as may be necessary in the transaction of the particular business in which the committee is engaged. All such committees shall make a complete account of all receipts and expenditures which shall be submitted to the national executive committee for audit and approval.

SEC. 10. Bonds: All persons having custody of the funds of this organization shall give adequate surety bond of not less than $1,000 with the governing body under which they are functioning. Such bond shall be obtained by the national organization and the sum of $5 shall be charged against the posts or State departments whose officers are thus bonded. Each post shall have at least one bonded officer. Each State department shall have at least one bonded officer.

SEC. 11. Notification: Upon designating the officer to be so bonded each unit of the organization shall send notice giving name and address of such officer to the national organization, together with the required sum of $5 as prescribed.

SEC. 12. Salaries: The salaries of the national commander, the national adjutant, national legislative chairman, national rehabilitation officer, and all other national officers not otherwise specifically provided for in these bylaws shall be determined by the national executive committee with the approval of the national executive committee. It being further provided, however, that no one shall receive a salary greater than that paid the national commander.

Article X. Life membership

SECTION 1. Eligibility: Any person eligible to membership may become a life member. Those eligible, who were born before January 7, 1902, or who served in World War I, may become life members upon the payment of $50 to the life-membership fund through national headquarters. Those eligible who were born on or after January 1, 1902, may become life members upon payment of $100 to the life-membership fund through national headquarters.

SEC. 2. Benefits: A life member shall have all the benefits and privileges of post, State, and National membership as long as he may live, without the further payment of any tax, fee, dues, or assessments whatsoever, subject, however, to the provisions of article X of the national bylaws.

Life membership may be secured on a monthly installment plan and under the following conditions: (a) If the total life-membership costs to be paid in monthly installments, the buyer shall have two fiscal years after making the first payment in which to complete payments; (b) if monthly installment payments extend beyond such time, such installments shall be used, first, to pay current membership dues (as hereinafter provided) for each fiscal year during the term of installment payments, and the balance applied to the cost of life membership. Life membership when paid in monthly payments will cost $50 or $100, plus $5 for each full fiscal year immediately following the date of payment of the first installment.

Money paid for life membership in full or in installments shall not be refunded under any circumstances to any member, his heirs, or estate. During the life of a fully paid life member, the life-membership fund shall pay current post dues not to exceed $2, and current State department dues not to exceed 50 cents in which the member is affiliated, and his current national dues.

SEC. 4. Special fund: All life-membership funds received by national headquarters shall be deposited in a life-membership account, the funds to be withdrawn only as required to pay annual National, State, and post dues during the life of each life member, or for investment purposes.

SEC. 5. Life-membership card: A fully paid up life membership entitles the member to a life-membership certificate without cost, plus a lasting life card to carry in pass case or wallet.

Article XI. Discipline of posts and post members

SECTION 1. Post sole judge of membership: Each post of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., shall be the judge of its own membership, subject to the restrictions of the constitution and bylaws.

SEC. 2. Charges: Charges may be preferred against any member or officer of this organization when put in writing, signed by five members in good standing. Such charges shall be filed with the governing body, who shall prescribe the mode, time, and place of trial for the accused, the penalties which may be imposed, and serve notice upon all parties concerned at least 10 days prior to date of hearing by registered mail.

Members may be expelled or suspended from the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., only upon a proper showing of a cause.

Charges shall be based upon disloyalty, neglect of duty, dishonesty, and conduct unbecoming a member of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., and no member in good standing shall lose his membership until given a fair trial by the post or department in such manner and form as the department bylaws and department executive committee shall prescribe.

SEC. 3. Appeal: Any member who has been suspended or expelled has the right to appeal to his department executive committee, or to the department convention, according to the provisions in the bylaws of such department, and he may appeal to the next superior governing bodies in the order of their rank.

SEC. 4. Charge: Every charge must give the name and mailing address of each member thereto accused and of the accusers, and shall set forth the charges with sufficient particularity so that the accused may adequately prepare a defense thereto.

SEC. 5. Trial: At the written request of the accused or accusers, when charges are properly filed with a State executive committee or the national executive committee, or when charges have been filed with the latter and referred by it to a State executive committee, the national commander shall appoint a trial board of not less than 5 or more than 30 members from the membership of the State executive committee, or of not less than 5 or more than 7 members of the national executive committee, as the case may be, who shall try the charges in lieu of a trial before a full committee, and whose decision shall be final, subject only to the right of appeal. No member of such board or any trial or appeal body shall be an accuser or an accused.

SEC. 6. Suspension from office: Any member or officer of this organization or any unit thereof, upon receiving notice that he is summoned for trial, by and with the approval of the national commander shall be suspended from membership and from every appointive and elective office held by him until thereafter acquitted of the charges preferred or until the charges are dismissed. Such charges shall be tried within 30 days after filing with a post, or within 60 days after filing with any higher governing body, or after any higher governing body assumes jurisdiction thereof.

SEC. 7. Manner of appeal: Either the accused or not less than a majority of the accusers may take an appeal from a finding of guilt or innocence or from any order made to the next superior governing body, in the order of their rank, by a written notice of appeal filed with the adjutant of such body within 30 days after mailing of notice of such finding or order. Such notice of appeal shall also be mailed to the accused or all accusers, as the case may be, and shall set forth all reasons and arguments upon which the appellant relies. All such notices shall be sent by registered mail. No appeal shall be effective if notice is not given at the time and in the manner provided in this paragraph.

SEC. 8. Retrial of charges: The governing body to which an appeal is taken shall not retry the case on its merits, but shall limit its determination as to whether the charges were substantial, and whether the accused had a fair trial. It may affirm, modify, or set aside any order made pursuant hereof, or affirm, modify, or set aside any penalty imposed, after trial, or order a retrial before the body to which the appeal is taken.

If dissatisfied with the decision of an appeal to the next higher governing body, either the accused or a majority of the accusers may appeal to the next higher governing body, if any. The decision made by the national convention, which is the highest governing body, as to an appeal to it, shall be final.

If an appeal is taken to a national convention, the national commander may appoint a committee to hear and consider the same and report its recommendations to the convention for ratification or other action. Notice of appeal to a national convention must be served on the national adjutant within 30 days after notice is mailed as to the action or decision which is the subject of appeal, but no such appeal shall be taken or entertained until the appellant has exhausted all other remedies or hereinbefore provided in these bylaws.

SEC. 9. Penalties: The following penalties may be imposed upon a finding of guilt: Reprimand, suspension for a term of not more than 1 year, or expulsion. In addition, a recommendation may be made to the national executive committee that the guilty member or officer be blacklisted; but only the national executive committee may order or approve the penalty of blacklisting, subject to an appeal to the next national convention to be held.

SEC. 10. What constitutes sufficient cause: The refusal of any member, post officer, auxiliary, State department, or other subordinate unit to fully accept, recognize, and abide by any order or finding made pursuant to these articles, after the same has become

final, shall be sufficient cause for the suspension of the charter of any such unit, and for the revocation of such charter or charters, and for the discipline of each member or officer found guilty thereof.

After a finding of guilt becomes final, the penalties imposed shall be self-executing: *Provided, however,* That the penalty of blacklisting shall not be effective until approved by the national executive committee or by the next national convention upon timely appeal to it; and if such penalty is approved, no inadvertant acceptance of the membership of the accused shall be effective for any purpose nor may he ever again become a member of this organization or of any subordinate unit or auxiliary thereof, until his application is approved by a national convention, upon the recommendation of the national executive committee.

Article XII. Field daisy

The field daisy shall be the official standard flower of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., and its auxiliaries; and that the poem known as The Field Daisy be adopted to symbolize the memories of our departed comrades. The official Field Daisy Day shall be the first Saturday of the month of June.

"THE FIELD DAISY

"Because you nod and smile in
Sun-drenched fields;
Because you are the eye of day
And known to all who live in these our States;
Because, by just the shadow that you cast,
You keep the sun away from small dew-drops;
Because you're pure with stainless spotless petals;
Because you have a heart of crimson warm;
To us, you symbolize the simplicity, devotion, and tenderness of
The common things of life.

"We take you as our flower; we look upon you with tears of pleasure;
You are not denied the poorest of us, and yet you are sought by the richest.
You speak with gentle whispers, to the failing heart;
Can you see us? Do you know our thoughts?
As we place a floral tribute in our homes, are your eyes a-twinkle to make us gay?

"Field Daisy, lovely simple flower, you are ours,
No longer are you born to whither and die unnoticed; we mothers of fighting men have taken a sturdy, upright, friendly, hardy flower as our emblem.
To watch you grow, to see you smile, will help me meet my God,
Because He devised your pattern and your color and your life.

"Field Daisy you are ours, in meadows and in fields. Each friendly
Flower will remind us of one mother's son, one splendid lad,
One friendly smiling boy, who wants his home, his friends,
His peaceful life, his laughter, and
His Mother."

Our daisy is red bud, white petals, blue label.

Article XIII. Politics

SECTION 1. This organization shall be nonpolitical and nonsectarian, and the name of this organization or a name of any unit thereof shall not be used in representing the desires or wishes of its membership in any political, sectarian, or labor dispute, except as hereafter provided.

SEC. 2. Nothing in the above provisions shall prohibit this organization or any unit thereof from participating in political issues which have a direct bearing upon the welfare of World War I, World War II, and Korean campaign veterans.

Article XIV. Amendments

SECTION 1. These bylaws may be amended at any national convention by a vote of two-thirds of the total accredited delegates assembled: *Provided,* That the proposed amendment shall have been read to the national convention at least one calendar day before they are voted thereon.

SEC. 2. All matters of procedure not otherwise provided for in these bylaws or in rules of national convention shall be governed by Demeter's Manual of Parliamentary Procedure.

SEC. 3. A motion of interpretation shall be improper unless the matter sought to be interpreted is clearly ambiguous or uncertain of meaning.

SEC. 4. The national commander, on recommendation of a post or State department, may issue a certificate of merit for outstanding service to the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc.

Compiled and revised by John F. Nave, sixteenth national commander, 1950–51.

The 10 Major Gripes of Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, most of us who have followed the work of the Reserves know that there has been constant and increasing dissatisfaction with the way the military services have treated their reserves during the present emergency. I think we can sum it up with the statement that the Reserve programs as such have virtually been killed by the present policies. It will almost be impossible to enlist an adequate number of Reserves when the present emergency has ended. The United States News and World Report, one of the most informative and best written of the news magazines, has listed the 10 major gripes of Reserves.

They are well stated, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include them in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 10 MAJOR GRIPES OF RESERVISTS

WHY CONGRESS WANTS TO CHANGE THE SYSTEM

1. Advance notice of recall is too short—often a few days.

2. Authorities "lose" deferment pleas, or ignore them until a man is in the service. Then it's too late.

3. Promises—about length of service and a point system for release, for example—are abandoned almost as soon as announced.

4. Men who acquired new skills or professions after War II are recalled to unskilled military jobs they left 5 years ago and forgot.

5. Reservists often are turned down for active duty after they have torn up their lives in order to report on time.

6. Personnel records are out of date, thoroughly snarled up.

7. Men who want to be called cannot get called while others are taken against their will. Commands refuse to let their reservists volunteer for duty elsewhere—they hoard "availables."

8. The Army discriminates against reservists in promotions: 80 percent of Army officers on duty are reservists; they get 20 per cent of the promotions to grades above captain.

9. Unorganized reservists who never got drill pay are being taken before organized reservists who train every week.

10. Veterans with many years' service are returning to hazardous duty while nonveterans stay at home.

Protective Underground Office Space for Government Employees Proposed in District of Columbia To Reduce Dispersal Appropriations and Provide Emergency Bomb Shelters for District Without Extra Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, as a matter of interest, the testimony of Mr. Morris Kanfer before the House Committee on Public Works on his proposal to build and lease to the Government an underground bombproof office building.

The advantage of the proposal to me, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, is that this would appear to be one means of providing adequate bomb shelters for a substantial number of people without cost to the District of Columbia.

Since Mr. Kanfer's own description, as given to the committee, is clear and concise, I leave it to his words, except to add that he has assured me that national and local civil-defense officials have expressed strong approbation of the idea.

STATEMENT BY MORRIS KANFER, WOODWARD BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C., AT HEARING ON DISPERSAL BILL, H. R. 1728, HELD BY THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, FEBRUARY 5, 1951, HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE, CHAIRMAN

The revised dispersal plan reducing the sites from 8 to 6 resulted in a reduction of $45,000,000 in the appropriation requested. It is entirely possible that a further substantial reduction in the appropriation requested can be achieved without jeopardizing the program for securing the continuity of important Government functions in the event of an attack.

Testimony before the Senate subcommittee hearing on January 30, 1951, indicated that of the 40,000 persons to be dispersed, 25,000 are related to the defense departments and the remaining 15,000 are personnel of departments other than defense. It is respectfully submitted that these 15,000 civilian personnel can be dispersed to suitable underground office space to be constructed in the outlying areas within the District.

The dispersal bill under consideration by this committee fails to take into consideration the feasibility of housing Government personnel in protective underground office buildings in the outlying sections of the District, removed from the White House approximately 4 to 5 miles. The General Services Administration has been offered such an office building to be constructed large enough to house 4,000 Government personnel, at a site on Connecticut Avenue at Albemarle Street NW., where a natural ravine runs through the property, making it ideally suitable for the construction of such a building. The building would be constructed in accordance with the recommendations of the Civil Defense Administration for protective quarters to secure the occupants in the event of a bombing attack and such facilities would thus be available to the citizens of the District as emergency bomb shelters without requiring the District to expend millions of dollars to provide separate shelters under the civil defense program.

Some confusion as to policy concerning the construction of an underground office building in the District of Columbia has been evidenced in my discussions with various Government officials. I am advised that the National Security Resources Board has approved the principle of dispersal, decentralization, and underground protective space—all three, as the proper means of obtaining greater security for Government personnel and thus permitting the continuity of Government functions in event of an attack. Obviously, the greater number of Government employees are to remain in Washington and these would be safer in an underground office building than in apartment houses on Massachusetts Avenue.

On December 10, 1950, Mr. Jess Larson, testifying before this subcommittee, stated that the underground citadels used by the British Government to carry on its functions were designed to withstand the impact of 200-pound bombs but before the war was over they had to adjust them to meet the impact of 2,000-pound bombs. Mr. Larson further stated that the reason we were not considering similar underground citadels for Washington was because it was believed that the Washington terrain was unsuited for constructing such citadels, and also because it would be too costly to provide such protective facilities for the 40,000 people to be dispersed.

This committee's attention is called to the fact that the Washington terrain does permit the construction of protective underground facilities in some areas away from the downtown section of Washington. For example, the altitude of the Connecticut Avenue and Albemarle Street site is approximately 260 to 300 feet above sea level. That site is particularly suitable for the construction of such underground facilities without great difficulty and without any exorbitant expense. It is estimated by the contractors who are planning the construction of the underground building on this site that it would cost little more to build an office building underground than it would cost to build it above ground where the site does not require much excavation.

It is suggested this committee consider the feasibility of modifying the dispersal program by moving out of the District 25,000 personnel offices instead of 40,000 and leaving the remaining 15,000 civilian personnel offices dispersed in underground office facilities scattered throughout the District of Columbia, removed from the White House a distance of 4 to 5 miles.

In order to finance the construction of an underground office building, however, it is necessary to obtain from General Services Administration a 10-year lease for such facilities, whereas its present statutory authority to lease property within the District of Columbia is limited to 1 year. It is therefore suggested that the dispersal bill, H. R. 1728, under consideration by this committee be amended to authorize and direct the Administrator to enter into long-term leases for the use of emergency underground facilities.

The utilization of such underground facilities by the Federal Government as office space in lieu of such space it now occupies in rented apartment houses in the District would not only provide greater protection for Government personnel, but would release these apartment houses for housing use, the sole purpose for which they were designed and built. Such underground facilities would thus become available in case of need as bomb shelters for District residents. The District would otherwise be required to incur substantial expense in constructing separate bomb shelters under the civil defense program, or do without such shelters.

The principal objective of the dispersal plan is to provide better protection for Government personnel, thereby assuring the continuity of important Government functions in the event of attack. The primary function of the Civil Defense Administration is to provide bomb shelter protection for civilians in the event of attack. Both objectives are so similar that it seems logical to combine, whenever and wherever possible, the methods of providing for the safety of Government personnel as well as of civilians, within the framework of the same structures, thus saving many millions of dollars by avoiding the duplication of such structures.

It is estimated that the rental cost to the Federal Government for such protective underground office space would be no greater than it now pays as rent for office space in apartment houses on Massachusetts Avenue. The successful completion of such a project in the District might well set a pattern for utilizing similar underground space in other cities for Government offices and for civilian bomb shelters in the event of an emergency.

The following amendment to H. R. 1728 is respectfully submitted for this committee's consideration:

"SEC. 1-a. The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to contract for and acquire, on long-term leases not to exceed 10-year terms, emergency underground facilities within the District of Columbia and surrounding area suitable for office space and other uses, to be assigned to Government departments and agencies, provided plans for such underground facilities are either prepared or approved by General Services Administration or any other governmental agency having similar jurisdiction over such space and providing also such plans are approved in advance of construction by the Civil Defense Administration, or appropriate State, district, or regional director thereof, with respect to that portion of building to be used as general bomb shelters in event of emergency."

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress a most interesting address regarding the difficulties which we have encountered in our attempts to secure an adequate supply of physicians, dentists, and nurses to meet the now critical needs of our country. This address was delivered by Mr. William A. Calvin, acting director of social insurance activities for the American Federation of Labor. I am sure that all of the Members of the Senate were very well acquainted with the ability and intelligence constantly displayed by Mr. Nelson Cruikshank, who held that position until recently. Mr. Cruikshank is now in France lending his best efforts to the fight against the spread of communism in Europe. Those Members of Congress who may not be acquainted with Mr. Cruikshank's successor will find in this address convincing evidence that Mr. Calvin will show that same intelligent and purposeful drive which characterized Mr. Cruikshank, together with a fiery command of language which is all his own.

I commend Mr. Calvin's address to the Senate and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Social insurance, or social security, has measured up to the full stature envisioned by the authors and sponsors of the original act. It has been evaluated by the naked rule of honesty and has proven to be a veritable bulwark buttressing the fortress of democracy against the paralyzing grasp of communism or other alien political philosophies.

Old-age survivors insurance removes the specter of fear of insecurity, if not abject impoverishment, and total dependency on some form of charity from the consciousness of the American people. However, there are still some serious gaps in the structure of our national health protective defense lines that must be sealed effectively as an inescapable obligation to our citizens of every station, and regardless of race, sex, or creed.

The administration-proposed plan for national health insurance which was enthusiastically supported by the American Federation of Labor, was defeated by American Medical Association-influenced Members of this National Congress who were gullible enough to accept the most malicious, vindictive, misleading propaganda ever conceived in the distorted minds of professional lobbyists as a valid reason for denying to all of the American people the benefits of adequate medical attention when needed, at a cost within their financial reach.

My remarks should not be construed as a blanket indictment of the great humanitarian American medical profession, as that would be entirely erroneous. Doctors, dentists, medical scientists, nurses, technicians, etc., are by the large conscientious, sincere, hardworking people devoted to the commendable work of helping their fellow men. They are, however, the victims of as vicious a propaganda cesspool as has ever tarnished the Stars and Stripes.

In order to substantiate the foregoing statements, and others to follow, it is advisable to examine the record of reaction and obstructionism to which the American Medical Association through its massive lobby has been committted.

We are confronted with a problem in the United States that seems scarcely within the boundaries of reason or logic. Here we have admittedly some of the outstanding doctors and finest hospitals in the world; yet, thousands of our citizens are sick and in need of medical attention at this moment, which is denied them because they cannot afford it. The dollar bill presents an insurmountable barrier between the doctor and the patient.

The national health-insurance plan would eliminate the financial iron curtain, making medical service available to the people who would have paid in advance for such service through a payroll deduction which would not exceed $1.40 per week or $72 per year. This would also insure the doctors of prompt payment for all of their services.

National health insurance has been branded as socialized medicine by the American Medical Association lobby. This is deliberate misrepresentation. Socialized medicine would place all medical practitioners on the payroll of the Government.

It would mean Government ownership and operation of all hospitals. It would mean regimentation of the medical profession.

The American Federation of Labor is uncompromisingly opposed to the socialization of medicine, and enactment of the national health insurance bill would be one of the most effective methods of combating any tendency to restrict the free selection of doctors by patients or the acceptance of patients by doctors. It would assuredly improve relationships between the doctor and patient.

The proposed national health insurance bill included among its various subsections provisions for Federal financial assistance to medical education designed to bolster the present weak, insecure framework of our source of medical professional supply by making possible the development of an increasing number of doctors annually and by expanding training facilities.

Due to the recognized urgency of maintaining a balanced ratio of doctors and other medical professionals with our constantly increasing population plus the mandatory demands for more doctors, dentists, and nurses for the Armed Forces, a separate bill was drawn dealing exclusively with Federal aid to medical education, which was overwhelmingly endorsed by the deans of our medical colleges, and after extensive revisions to meet every American Medical Association objection, was approved by the American Medical Association. This bill passed in the United States Senate without a single dissenting vote.

After passage by the Senate, the trickery of the professional lobbyists who represent the American Medical Association enters the picture, and to remove any possible allegation of bias I am going to quote herewith excerpts from an article carried in Collier's magazine, December 16, 1950, over the signature of Albert Q. Maisel:

"When the measure was reported on the floor of the Senate in August 1949, a routine objection was raised to its immediate passage by unanimous consent. At this juncture, both Senators PEPPER and TAFT, long bitter opponents on most other questions concerning the public health, stood up and urged their colleagues to support the measure. Two weeks later, when the bill again appeared on the calendar, it passed unanimously.

"FEARED TACTICS OF LOBBYISTS

"The worried deans and directors of the medical, dental, and nursing schools breathed a sigh of relief. For, they figured, if the American Medical Association were opposed to the bill its powerful Washington lobby would have shown its hand in the Senate, would have blocked this measure (as it had blocked many others) in committee or, at a very minimum, would have forced a debate and a counting of noses on the Senate floor.

"For the AMA lobby is powerful indeed. It operates through two channels. Officially the AMA is represented by Dr. Joseph S. Lawrence, director of its Washington office. But the real power behind the scenes is the California publicity firm of Whitaker & Baxter which, for the last 2 years, has been directing the American Medical Association's well-heeled national education campaign—aimed at preventing passage of the administration's compulsory health insurance program. Lawrence, Whitaker, and Baxter are registered with Congress as lobbyists.

"Many of the medical school deans, unversed in the intricacies of politics, felt so certain that the aid to medical education bill would easily pass the House that they authorized the enrollment of larger classes than their schools had handled at any time since the war. The number of freshmen admitted to medical schools jumped, in 1950, by 5.3 percent over the preceding year.

"AMENDED TO MEET OBJECTIONS

"In the House, the Blemiller bill, a duplicate of the Senate measure, again received bipartisan support. Representative HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania, former Republican National Committee Chairman and longtime opponent of socialized medicine, joined with Democratic Congressman ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin, in sponsoring amendments to the original House bill to make it meet the AMA objections brought forth in the Lowell Reed conferences. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce promptly reported favorably on the altered bill.

"By then, late in the session, it was necessary for the House Rules Committee to speed action on the measure if the whole House was to vote on it without delay. This procedure promised to be routine.

"But suddenly the applecart was upset.

"A small group of insurgent members of nurses' organizations in Georgia and North Carolina, and the owner of a private hospital in the latter State, got the impression that the measure would somehow set up the American Nursing Association as an accrediting body for all nursing schools—and thus force the closing down, for lack of accreditation, of some of the less qualified schools in the Southern States.

"On behalf of this group, Representative ROBERT L. (MULEY) DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, protested to the Rules Committee. The sponsors of the bill offered to amend the measure to overcome this objection. That satisfied DOUGHTON, and he withdrew his protest.

"But the Blemiller bill had, by then, been labeled 'controversial.' The Rules Committee, fearful of setting a precedent that would throw a host of other controversial measures onto the House floor in the last 2 weeks of the session, withheld its approval. The bill was held up till Congress could meet again, in 1950.

"Even after Congress adjourned, the American Medical Association's opposition had not crystallized. Early in December 1949, the house of delegates of the AMA met in Washington and approved a report of its council on medical education and hospitals which declared that, 'While the council is not entirely satisfied with the bill, it does incorporate several modifications suggested by the council's representatives and it is a distinct improvement over any other bill for Federal aid to medical education that has been introduced.'

"The report added, 'The council is aware that Federal aid to medical education creates definite hazards to the continued freedom and independence of the medical schools. With few exceptions, however, the medical schools and their parent universities have expressed the opinion that, unless additional aid is provided, medical education in this country cannot achieve its full development. The legislation which has been passed by the Senate contains safeguards that should protect the medical schools from unwarranted interference in their affairs by the Federal Government.'

"SUDDEN CHANGE OF SENTIMENT

"Less than 2 months later the AMA completely changed its tune. At a conference of its national education campaign, Louis H. Bauer, M. D., chairman of the board of trustees, stated the AMA's position on pending legislation. The aid to medical education measure was added to the long list of bills which the AMA opposed.

"But the outbreak of the Korean war did two things. It changed plans for adjournment, and it served to highlight the urgency of drastic action to get medical education into high gear. When the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, our armed services had 5,844 physicians on their rolls. They needed about 1,550 more.

"The Army, whose need was the most desperate, sent out a call to 3,000 Reserve lieutenants and captains in the Medical Corps, requesting their return to service. Only 200 replied, and of these only 15 volunteered.

"By mid-August it became apparent that voluntary enlistments of physicians and nurses would never begin to meet the service's needs, even for a limited mobilization. The Defense Department found itself compelled to run to Congress for the hurried passage of a doctors' draft bill. First on the list were 7,500 young doctors and dentists who had received their medical education at Government expense while deferred from active military service during World War II. But the draft bill was not limited to these men alone. It authorized the President to order a general registration and induction of physicians up to the age of 55 and of dentists through the age of 45.

"To meet the needs of a 3,000,000-man force, the armed services will have to drain from civilian life substantially more than 5,000 physicians and proportionately large numbers of dentists, nurses, and technicians. * * *

"Facing up to this crisis, Representative Blemiller led a strenuous campaign in Congress all through last July and August to get aid-to-medical-education measure reported out to the House. Day after day he read into the RECORD endorsements of the bill's passage by Dean George W. Bakeman, of the Medical College of Virginia; by Dean Murray Kinsman, of the University of Louisville; by Dr. A. C. Ivy, vice president of the University of Illinois; Dean Willard C. Rappleye, of Columbia University; Chancelor Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago; and many others.

"HOW MEDICAL SCHOOLS VOTED

"Dean Joseph C. Hinsey, of Cornell University, chairman of the executive council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, wrote that a poll of its membership showed 47 schools favoring the bill and only 16 opposed. He disavowed the action of the AMA as 'taken independently of our association * * * and without a poll of our membership.'

"The deans of all the schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health in Massachusetts, including Harvard, Tufts, and Boston University, declared, 'We are convinced that the present desperate plight of our professional schools, not only in Massachusetts, but throughout the United States, has already interfered with the quality of professional education and is preventing the development of adequate medical and health personnel for the country.

"'We make this statement,' they add, 'in full awareness of the position recently taken by the American Medical Association. We vigorously oppose that position.'"

The article which was accorded special attention and comment by the editor of Collier's concludes with the following ominous paragraph:

"But one thing is certain. Unless immediate steps are taken to solve our chronic and growing shortage of medical, dental, nursing, and public health personnel, your health—and that of your family, your neighbors, and your sons in the services—will be jeopardized for years to come."

Since the convening of the present session of Congress, a new aid-to-medical-education bill has been introduced which will undoubtedly have strong bipartisan support. It should be enacted into law with the universal approval of a grateful people.

The fate of this commendable legislative document will, to a very material degree, depend upon the attitude of the American Medical Association, and unless a transformation comparable to changing of the leopard spots takes place this bill will be opposed by the AMA on the fallacious unsupported allegation that it is a camouflaged scheme to bring the medical profession under rigid Government control—socialized medicine.

Fortunately, under our form of government, a sufficiently aroused public consciousness can counteract the influence of any selfish group, no matter how heavily financed that group may be, and have no doubt that the AMA lobbyists have access to almost unlimited funds as evidenced by the advertising campaign costing $1,100,000 just prior to the November 1950 elections. This money was spent for the combined purpose of defeating candidates who were in favor of health protective legislation, and electing candidates who were committed to the campaign of obstructionism of the American Medical Association.

It is high time that we dust off that deathless document of liberty, the Magna Carta, and reread with intensified interest the dynamic words, "to no one shall we sell, deny, or delay the right to justice." The Magna Carta is the cornerstone of freedom; it is as significant today as it was over 700 years ago.

Back-seat driving in an automobile is not only disconcerting; at times it is dangerous. But when in the face of a national emergency we find our legislative vehicle swaying precariously because of the iniquitous influence of political back-seat drivers such as the AMA lobby, it is potentially disastrous.

Every Member of the National Congress should be advised by their constituents that the deficit in the number of professional medical personnel must be corrected, and that Federal aid to medical education presents an avenue of approach which will, if utilized effectively and intelligently, meet this menacing challenge to our Nation.

The Present Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Present Danger," by Mr. James B. Conant, for the Committee on the Present Danger. The address was delivered on February 7 over a national radio network. It is a clear, simple, forceful expression of the need for building up our armed strength, and the responsibilities of our youth with relation thereto.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESENT DANGER

(Address by James B. Conant for the Committee on the Present Danger)

(This address to the Nation was delivered Wednesday, February 7, 1951, over the National Broadcasting Co. network by President James B. Conant, of Harvard University, speaking for the Committee on the Present Danger, of which he is a member.)

Fellow citizens, the United States is in danger. Few would be inclined to question this simple statement. The danger is clearly of a military nature. On this much we can all agree. The Congress of the United States has, with almost no dissenting voices, authorized a vast program of rearmament and mobilization.

But as to the exact nature of the danger which confronts us there is far from being complete agreement among the citizens of this Republic. Nor are we by any means of one mind as to how we should mobilize the young men of the Nation. Indeed some few question even the need for an army of the size announced.

Now, if we are going to ask the youth of the country to serve 2 years in the Armed Forces—as I believe we must—if the Government is going to ask this sacrifice of them, each one of us who supports this program must be prepared to answer one simple question—why?

Why must we look forward to a period of austerity, of partial mobilization, of more weapons for war, fewer tools for peace?

The answer to these questions seems to me to be summed up in General Eisenhower's recent statement that we must build a secure wall for peace.

The free world has entered a new period—a highly disturbing and dangerous period. Let me recall to you the signals which announced the arrival of this new stage in our history in which prompt and bold measures are required for our survival.

The first clear sign was a year ago last September, when President Truman announced that the Soviet Union had exploded an atomic bomb. This marked the end of our monopoly of a weapon on which the security of the free world in no small measure depended.

The grim atomic age had dawned far sooner than all of us had hoped. It was evident that before long two major powers would have atomic bombs in sufficient quantity to constitute a military threat to one another. Whether such time was 3 or 5 years off might be a matter of opinion, but it was hardly to be questioned that the balance of power between the free world and the Soviet Union was about to be upset. This first clear danger signal could be read by all of us some 15 months ago.

The second signal flashed last June. Up till then the spread of Soviet communism had been by subversion and internal revolution as in the case of Czechoslovakia, not by military aggression. The aggression of the North Koreans established a new pattern. It could hardly be argued any longer that the dwellers in the Kremlin never intended to use military means to gain their objective, that their sole concern was with a battle of propaganda, of intrigue and sabotage.

The third signal was the action of Communist China and the justification of this action in the United Nations by the official representatives of the Soviet Union.

In short, within less than 18 months the free world has been confronted with two highly unpleasant facts. First, the Soviet military power is beginning to mount in terms of the most modern type of warfare, the United States monopoly of the atomic bomb has ended; second, the Soviet allies, at least, have shown a readiness and willingness to gain their ends by force of arms.

Place these facts against the background of the postwar military situation on the European continent and you can see the outlines of the present danger—a danger to the entire free world, a clear danger to the United States. The background is quite as important as the signals. Indeed the latter are so obvious as to warrant little comment, but the situation on the Continent is far harder to understand.

Let me give you my analysis if I may. For on the appraisal of this situation by each and every one of us as Americans, the course of history in the twentieth century may well depend.

Let me start with a question. Why has the Soviet Union not extended its power to the English Channel since the close of World War II? A few may argue that the failure is evidence of a lack of interest on the part of the Soviet Union—that the rulers in the Kremlin have no desire to spread their doctrine. In the light of recent history any such assumption appears not only improbable but highly dangerous. Others may think the failure reflects the inability of the Communist Party in France, Italy, and the Low Countries to pull off another revolution of the Czechoslovakian type. Certainly no such revolutions have occurred, and we Americans can take satisfaction in the fact that aid through the Marshall plan has been of prime importance. But surely the one deterrent to direct military aggression has been and is today, the overwhelming destructive power of the United States strategic air force armed with the atomic bomb.

Let me spell out this last point. If Russia tomorrow should move its troops toward the Atlantic Ocean, European territory would be conquered, but the Russian industrial centers would be destroyed from the air. This would be a bad swap from any point of view. It seems clear that we could strike a devastating series of blows against the Soviet's vital centers. Or so I read the newspapers, and so I believe the Russian rulers read their own sources of intelligence. As long as the United States strategic air force is in this commanding position, the danger of Russian troops marching to the channel is relatively slight.

But as the years go by, the deterrent power of strategic bombing will meet an ever-mounting counterthreat—a threat to the industrial centers of Great Britain and the United States, to the continental cities themselves. Any doubt about our being engaged in an arms race has certainly disappeared. The Russians are building up their offensive strength and doubtless likewise their own defenses against strategic bombing. The time may well come when these defensive measures are far more effective than at present. Under their totalitarian system they have been able to direct so much of their industrial strength as they desired into the manufacture of military equipment; they have been able to concentrate on building radar networks, jet planes, and antiaircraft weapons.

Now an arms race today is a highly technical affair. Both sides have equipment on the production line, new developments being tested, blueprints of designs not yet off the drawing boards. No one can say with certainty when one side or the other has the predominance; for few, military men will challenge the statement that the battle alone is the pay-off. But what determines the course of history is the estimate of men in control of national destinies as to the chances of success in a future war. Therefore the danger of a third global war, I am convinced, turns on the fact that a few years hence the handful of men who rule Russia may decide that the power of our strategic Air Force has been largely canceled out. If at that time Europe is defenseless on the ground, the Russian hordes will begin to move. Strengthening the defense of Europe in terms not of a deterrent threat against Russian cities but in terms of armies to stop an advance—this seems to me the top item on the agenda of the free nations of the world. Only then can we achieve a true global stalemate.

We need not only trained manpower but, as Dr. Vannevar Bush says, the most modern weapons for our men to use. We shall have them, perhaps including tactical atomic weapons. There will be a tactical air force. We shall not meet hordes with hordes. We can and must maintain superiority in the quality of weapons for perhaps a generation. Our Defense Establishment must be geared up to do the best possible job in research and the development of new instruments of war.

But at this point some listener may object. He or she may say it is impossible to defend Europe against the vast manpower of Russia and its satellites. This clearly is a question which only military men are capable of answering with authority. General Eisenhower, whose professional competence no one can challenge, has just returned from an inspection of the situation. If he believed Europe to be indefensible he would, as he said, "recommend that we abandon the North Atlantic Treaty alliance and—by ourselves—attempt however futilely, to build a separate fortress against aggression." He made no such recommendation. Quite the contrary. Such a recommendation, he said, was for him impossible. He reports, "In every capital, there is growing a desire to cooperate in this mutual security effort." The governments are taking measures to build up their defense establishments.

"On every side," General Eisenhower said, "I saw heartening evidence of a regeneration in Europe's spirit. Its morale, its will to fight, will grow with every accretion to physical strength. * * *

"The preservation of free America," General Eisenhower said, "requires our participation in the defense of Western Europe."

"While the transfer to Europe of American military units is essential," General Eisenhower continued, "our major and special contribution should be in the field of munitions and equipment."

"The arrival in Europe of new American land and air units, though modest in protective influence by themselves, will certainly produce added confidence and accelerate the production of military force throughout the member nations."

"Success," he held, "is attainable. Given unity in spirit and action, the job can be done."

That is General Eisenhower's conviction after a first-hand appraisal of the situation.

What must we do here at home?

What is required of the United States, if we are to play our part in the defense of the free world—in building this wall of security of which General Eisenhower has spoken? Clearly, the rapid production of arms and military equipment—and on this we are well embarked. But we must also be in a position to furnish men as well as arms.

To quote General Eisenhower once again: "We have to devise a scheme that we can support if necessary over the next 20 years, 30 years, whatever may be the time necessary, as long as the threat, the announced threat of aggression remains in the world."

In other words, General Eisenhower says that we in the United States must be prepared to stand by in a partially mobilized state for a long period of years. To this end we must have a system of universal military service.

Let me talk for a moment about universal military service and training. As you know, Congress now has before it a universal military service bill. The Committee on the Present Danger is supporting this bill. This measure needs to be understood by the American public, for there is much confusion as to what is in fact involved.

In any discussion of universal military service, it is important to separate certain issues which can all too easily become entangled. In the first place, we are not talking about the type of legislation which would be needed to mobilize the manpower of the country on a total basis if we became engaged in a global war. That is another subject. What would be required in such an eventuality would be a national service act such as was proposed in the closing days of World War II but never became law. I am not discussing this evening mobilization for an all-out war. I am discussing, rather, partial mobilization for a long-drawn-out period of international stress and strain. I am discussing the method of maintaining over many years three and a half to four million men in our Armed Forces.

What the situation requires is a universal military service act which will call into the Armed Forces all able-bodied young men when they graduate from high school or reach 18 years of age, whichever is later. This is a vital point in the argument; this is the essence of the bill which must not be destroyed by amendment. Those of us who support the bill believe that the interruption of a young man's education should be before college, not during college, and for those who go direct from high school to a job, before starting in an occupation.

After they have completed the 27 months of military service, these young men will be ready to enter college or go to work. The problems which bedevled us in World War II in regard to deferring special types of students or essential men in industry will be eliminated if military service is performed between the ages of 18 and 20. To my mind, it is quite clear that a man's military service had best be done before he enters the productive life of the country or before he begins his collegiate or professional education.

On this point we have the testimony of Dr. William C. Menninger, who was chief psychiatrist of the Army in World War II.

"From the point of view of the mental health of our young men," Dr. Menninger said, "a program of universal military service and training is far more practical than our present system of selective service. The present system engenders hostility in the man who is selected because he must carry an unfair share of the burden. Because it is selective, it tends to stimulate men to seek deferment on whatever grounds they may be able to plead."

"With our present system," he continues, "a man of draft eligible age lives in uncertainty from mail to mail. The result is great unrest in our youth of this age, not only in colleges but in industry and business."

Dr. Menninger concludes that—

"A system which begins at a definite age, which distributes equally the responsibility and privileges among all youth, and which runs for a definite length of service, is far superior, from the mental health point of view, to our present indefinite and discriminatory system under the selective service law."

That is the testimony of the psychiatrist, Dr. William Menninger.

Now, there is one obvious difficulty in a scheme of universal service between 18 and 20. How is one to provide from each age group the required number of officers and specialists? I have become persuaded, contrary to my first opinion, that in order to accomplish the training of officers and specialists a small fraction of each age group should be selected after basic training by a civilian board and sent to the colleges for specialized education. This feed-back proposal, which first came before public attention as a result of recommendations of the Association of American Universities, is incorporated in the bill now before the Congress. The inclusion of this feed-back meets the objections that many educators first raised to a universal military service program.

Some scientists have been disturbed lest the passage of this bill strike a serious blow at the national defense by interfering with the continuous flow of trained men. I venture to think they are mistaken and I call as an expert witness Dr. Vannevar Bush, who headed all our scientific work during the last war.

Dr. Bush appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee to urge the passage of this universal military service and training bill, and this is what he said:

"We should call all young men at 18 without exception, adjusting standards to defer only those who cannot be used somewhere in the widely varied efforts of the Military Establishment. Once the system is in full operation, the process of choice of men to receive advanced training to become officers or to develop new weapons, to maintain our public health, or to perform other professional duties should be on a secure basis of fair competition. There will be adjustments needed in a transition period, for it would be absurd to denude our laboratories just when we need them most, and it would be short-sighted to deny to industry the engineers it must have to build new weapons in adequate quantities in the next year or two.

"But when the system is in full operation," Dr. Bush went on, "every youth on reaching 18 should expect to go into the service of his country, with his subsequent advancement and the nature of his assignments during the entire age period until he emerges from the Reserves and goes his own way determined by competitive tests and the judgment of fair men."

I heartily agree with Dr. Bush. And it is hardly likely we shall be foolish enough to draft out of the colleges today students who are well on their way toward the completion of their specialized training.

Let me emphasize the distinction between universal service and selective service, for this point is often misunderstood. The bill before Congress is a real universal military service bill and not merely an extension of the Selective Service Act to include 18-year-olds. The power given the President to call up men by age groups and the establishment of a large reserve are the distinguishing features. When the call goes out for an age group the draft boards will make no deferments in this group on grounds of occupation or dependencies. When the program becomes fully operative the services could count on at least 700,000 to 750,000 men from each age group, and another 100,000 for limited service by lowering the present physical and mental standards for induction.

In addition to providing a force in being the continual flow into the Armed Forces of those who reach 18 and their release after about 2 years will provide over the years a pool of trained manpower—a large body of men in reserve status. I believe this to be imperative. The danger of all-out war is so serious that all our young men must have military training for their own protection as well as for the protection of their country.

The present selective service law expires in June. Clearly before that date Congress must act on the bill that is now before it. But one may hope that the matter may be settled in the coming weeks. Delay will not reassure the free peoples of the Continent; it will not contribute to the morale of our young men. Quite the contrary. Until it is settled how we are to recruit our armies there will be a feeling of uncertainty and confusion in many families throughout the land. I suppose all of us who are urging the rapid rearmament of the United States would agree that there is nothing we like about the whole business. Universal military service is a bitter pill to swallow, and I for one have come most reluctantly to support such a program. But the desperate need to build up our military strength cannot be denied. One of the chief reasons for the existence of the committee under whose auspices I speak tonight is the belief that we must take immediate steps to meet the national danger. We urge all our citizens to impress upon the Congress and the administration the imperative need for prompt and adequate action. We have no time to lose.

Many of us remember with what shock we read of the fall of France in 1940 and with what fear we awaited the outcome of the battle of Britain. Our military men, we know now, were full of apprehension as to what would be the consequences to the United States of the loss of the British Isles. The margin of victory then was narrow enough, we all recall. But with the weapons of the 1950's an enemy in control of the channel ports would be far more dangerous, perhaps impossible to stop.

In short, while the defense of Europe is essential for the survival of Europe, it is just as essential for the survival of a free United States. Again on this point General Eisenhower speaks with authority:

"Western Europe," he reminds us, "has the greatest pool of skilled labor in the world and a vast industrial capacity second only to that of the United States. Now if we take that whole complex with its potential for military exploitation and transfer it from our side to another side, the military balance of power has shifted so drastically that our safety would be gravely imperiled."

Note carefully General Eisenhower's use of the words "gravely imperiled," which he repeated to emphasize the seriousness, to his mind, of the possibility of the loss of Europe. Europe lost—just sketch the outline of such a world and fill in the details yourself, all the terrible details. Imagine as in a nightmare the Soviet Union in control directly or through puppets of all of Europe, the Middle East, and the North of Africa—Great Britain neutralized, this hemisphere alone. Think in terms of military strategy, think in terms of raw materials, think in terms of western civilization. However you look at it the picture is too terrifying for contemplation.

What is the alternative? A third global war? Not to my mind. It may be forced upon us any day—that one must admit. Conceivably the masters of the Soviet Union have already decided to start world war III and given the necessary orders. If so, a global war is indeed inevitable. But otherwise peace or war hang precariously in the balance of the future. I believe there is still a chance, a good chance, of avoiding world war III—a war which can lead only to wholesale destruction with no clear victory possible for either side. I believe there is a good chance of avoiding this catastrophe, but only if Europe is made defensible and without delay. For today we are dealing with an inherently unstable situation. To be sure the free world has the ability to punish an aggressor who moves his troops by destroying his cities from the air. But matching possible retaliation against possible invasion provides no true opposition of military strengths; it provides no basis for successful negotiation. Not that we should cease discussing with the Soviet Union the settlement of disputed points in Europe. We must continue to explore every road to peace. But we cannot approach the heart of the present tensions, the technological arms race, we cannot even consider steps toward disarmament until the free peoples of Europe can be defended and feel secure.

I venture to conclude on a note that I trust will not seem unduly optimistic. If the United States will show leadership, be both calm and strong, prove that freedom can endure even long years of partial mobilization, then there is hope for the second half of the twentieth century. I see a radically altered international situation a decade or more hence, a free world secure on its own frontiers, a Soviet Union with vastly diminished ambitions and pretensions, yet itself secure against invasion. Under such conditions, the United Nations might well function as those who founded it first dreamed. Under such conditions, steps toward disarmament would no longer be regarded as utopian; the terror of modern weapons might slowly vanish from the skies.

But while the present danger lasts the peoples of the free world must be armed and ready. As General Eisenhower has so well said, we must meet the fearful unity of totalitarian force with a higher unity—the unity of freemen that will not be defeated.

Julius Ochs Adler, Raymond B. Allen, Frank Altschul, William Douglas Arant, James Henry Barker III, Laird Bell, Lewis H. Brown, Harry A. Bullis, Vannevar Bush, Will L. Clayton, James B. Conant, Robert Cutler, R. Ammi Cutter, Harold W. Dodds, Charles Dollard, William J. Donovan, Truman K. Gibson, Jr., Meta Glass, Edward S. Greenbaum, Monte M. Lemann, William L. Marbury, William C. Menninger, Frederick A. Middlebush, John Lord O'Brian, Robert P. Patterson, Howard C. Petersen, Stanley Resor, Theodore W. Schultz, Robert E. Sherwood, Robert G. Sproul, Robert L. Stearns, Tracy S. Voorhees, Henry M. Wriston, Committee on the Present Danger.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Sound Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 324, the purpose of which is to change our fiat currency, which is causing most of our troubles in the domestic field, to a sound currency with a metallic base. I shall not enlarge upon this subject at the present time, except to say that I still agree, as I always have, with Hon. William McKinley's definition of sound money. The essence of his sound money philosophy I quote in his own words:

The money of the United States, and every kind or form of it, whether paper, silver, or gold, must be as good as the best in the world. It must not only be current at its full face value at home, but it must be counted at par in any and every commercial center of the globe. The dollar paid to the farmer, the wage earner, and the pensioner must continue forever in equal purchasing and debt-paying power to the dollar paid to any government creditor.

To those who believe in sound money, and I know of no person connected with the New Deal who does, the article published by Mr. Herbert Bratter in the Sunday edition of the Washington Evening Star should give cause for serious reflection on this subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting Mr. Bratter's article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

UNITED STATES IS BARGAIN COUNTER OF THE WORLD GOLD MARKET—OTHER NATIONS BUY IT LOW HERE, SELL HIGH; BLACK MARKET MOCKS MONETARY FUND RULES

(By Herbert Bratter)

In Washington today a dollar is one-thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold. But no one cares about the price of gold in these days of inflation; gold, the only commodity that has remained fixed in price since 1934. No one cares, because you can't get gold legally to hoard.

The Treasury may care, though. The Treasury deals in gold with foreign governments and central banks. Gold is used as the measure of the relative values of the world's different currencies. The Treasury pays $35 an ounce for all gold offered to it; and charges foreign governments and the jewelry trade $35 an ounce when it sells gold.

Many people about the world do not think the dollar still worth one-thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold. In places abroad where the laws are not so rigid, or not so rigidly enforced as here, individuals trade in gold at prices well above the legal limit. This trade goes on with the use of local currencies. Frenchmen, for instance, buy and sell gold quite freely in Paris every day, using francs as money.

American dollars are also used in some of this gold trade abroad. And not all this trade is between private parties exclusively. Governments and central banks participate in it, sometimes through the subterfuge of selling "industrial" gold to "industry"; and sometimes just plain gold coins to any buyer at hand. This governmental activity keeps the world's black markets supplied with the yellow metal. And since black markets involve both gold and currencies, the rules to which the members of the International Monetary Fund are solemnly committed are daily being mocked.

TYPE OF GOLD BREEDS

What riles, or should rile, the United States Treasury is that governments which are free to turn in dollars here and get gold for them at $35 an ounce are busy selling gold for dollars and other currencies at premium prices. This means that they are using Uncle Sam's gold policy as a good thing. Recently, it is reliably reported the Bank of France was reproved for engaging in this type of gold digging. It is not a new practice with the Bank of France. It seems to be just a case where London got irked about it. Why Washington should wait for London to prod it, if it did wait, is not quite clear.

Other countries have been selling gold at high prices while simultaneously buying the metal from the United States at the fixed price of $35. Mexico, for instance. South Africa's battle with Secretary of the Treasury Snyder in the International Monetary Fund has long been a matter of record. South Africa seems to have won out. It has been busy since 1949 selling all the gold the traffic will bear at premium prices.

Now Canada is under pressure from its gold miners to go and do likewise. And Canada has always been held forth as a model of good international behavior, even though, along with many other countries, it has found a way to subsidize its gold miners and still be a member of the fund in good standing. For the miners, a subsidy is the same as a higher price.

As the residual buyer of the world's gold for these many years, the United States is the keystone which holds the structure of the international gold bullion standard together. If we stepped out, the arch would tumble. Since the dollar we use at home is completely of the paper variety and now daily losing some of its value in trade, the American gold standard has degenerated into a form of global charity from which the U. S. S. R., along with the rest of the world, is free to benefit. Temporarily, thanks to Korea, we are in such a hurry to buy materials abroad the while we are also developing and reconstructing the world with gifts and loans, that we have had to send gold away to balance the books.

Only a few days ago, for instance, one of the big London banks in an advertisement in the New York Times revealed how one country's loss can be another country's gain. While we are exporting gold for the above reasons, Britain's gold stock is rising. Said the chairman of Lloyds Bank, Ltd., to his shareholders:

"The elimination of the sterling area's current dollar deficit meant that during

1950 we were able to place the whole of our Marshall aid receipts to reserve."

In other words, the Marshall plan is now being used to give gold away.

BRITAIN'S STOCK RISES

The British, of course, like others, argue that a country needs a comfortable gold reserve against the time when the trouble with Russia has been settled and dollars again become scarce. At such time gold may again be expected to flow toward the United States "magnet."

Among the anomalies of American gold policy let us now turn to a recent announcement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the so-called World Bank, devised at Bretton Woods in 1944 along with the International Monetary Fund.

In January the World Bank announced in Washington conclusion of arrangements long under study to lend South Africa $50,000,000 for electric power and transport purposes. Simultaneously, South Africa obtained an additional $10,000,000 from eight American commercial banks, in effect, as part of the above-mentioned arrangement. The bank announced that the money will be used in part to finance the large expected industrial demands of the new Orange Free State gold fields. There, in what until recently was open country, rich deposits of gold have been discovered and huge mines and whole cities will be created to extract the precious yellow metal from the bowels of the earth.

A bank spokesman reports that South Africa, already the largest gold producer in the world, with the full development of the Orange Free State fields, hopes to increase its annual gold output by as much as 50 percent. In other words, with the aid of the World Bank's dollars, South Africa expects to dig out of the earth the gold with which to repay the loan. And if the trend in recent years proves to have been only interrupted by the conflict which began in Korea last June, one way or another the new South African gold will find its way into the vaults of Fort Knox.

NEED OUR OWN EQUIPMENT

What will South Africa buy with the dollars which it is now being lent and which, the bank has announced, may be supplemented by further lending in the future? The shopping list includes such items as turbo-generators, boilers and accessories, electrical apparatus including switch gear, transformers, power and control cable, cable for station lighting and grounding, pumps without which no deep mine can continue operations, piping and structural materials. During World War II South Africa was insistent in its requests for priorities for American mining equipment to keep the Rand gold mines working. Today, when we are turning our economy topsy-turvey for the defense of the Western World, it seems odd to be setting aside large productive resources for such equipment as is enumerated above, equipment which consumes not only valuable manpower but strategic and critical materials. However justifiable it might appear in normal times to finance the output of more gold, these are not normal times. If the United States Government lends its support to such ventures today, what can it answer tomorrow, when our own gold mining industry and that of other friendly countries ask for similar equipment?

The Orange Free State gold fields, it is said, may yield uranium as well as gold. South African gold ores, like the oil shales of Sweden and the marine prosphate deposits of the United States, are potential sources of that element as a byproduct. But the World Bank does not contend that its purpose in lending to South Africa is uranium production.

From one standpoint, it might be said that the World Bank is lending to South Africa to replenish that country's gold and dollar reserves. The bank states that without its loans South Africa could secure the desired equipment only at the expense of its foreign exchange reserves and maintenance of foreign exchange reserves at a satisfactory level is particularly important to South Africa. That is, South Africa would rather not use its own money.

FOREIGN-EXCHANGE ANGLE

But there is a more interesting foreign-exchange angle to the loan. Twenty percent of the loan proceeds will be spent in the dollar area, while the rest will be spent almost entirely in the United Kingdom, in sterling. Yet the bank is lending the $50,000,000 to South Africa in dollars. In explanation, the bank states that the type of equipment South Africa wants is in short supply here and at best could not be delivered within a reasonable time, whereas Europe and particularly Britain can supply what is needed. And to buy in Britain one requires pounds sterling.

The World Bank holds some two hundred and thirty million of uncommitted pounds sterling; that is, British currency paid in as part of Britain's subscription to the bank's capital. When the Bretton Woods Bank was launched, it was in part on the basis of the argument that all the member countries would contribute local currencies—plus a small gold payment—and that when a borrower needed one of those local currencies the bank would draw on its supply thereof.

TREASURY CONCERNED

But in this instance, as in others, it does not work out like that in practice. Bank spokesmen explain that the British do not consent to the bank lending pounds sterling to South Africa. Were the bank to do so, the South Africans would spend the sterling in Britain. British equipment would be shipped to South Africa and Britain would have nothing to show for the transaction. It would be what the British term as an "unrequited export." So the bank is going to have to take dollars and go out into the exchange markets and buy pounds sterling therewith, to the extent of about $40,000,000 the while its £230,000,000 remains untouched for lack of permission to use it.

When the deal is carried out, $40,000,000 of British equipment will be exported from that country to South Africa and $40,000,000 more will have been added to Britain's gold and dollar reserves. These dollars will be supplied by American investors in the World Bank's bonds.

Under a British-South Africa agreement, South Africa is paying regularly in gold for £50,000,000 of its purchases of goods in Britain.

The loan which the World Bank has made to South Africa necessarily had the approval of the National Advisory Council, whose Chairman is the Secretary of the Treasury. The Treasury has been not a little concerned in recent years over the tendency of other countries to operate in the gold market at premium prices. At the last two annual meetings of the World Fund, Secretary Snyder has resisted the forceful demands of South Africans for a higher price of gold. Latterly, South Africa's Government has encouraged the sale of South African gold on world free markets at prices which are illegal under the rules of the World Monetary Fund. Now, in effect, South Africa is being rewarded through the World Bank for its flouting of that other American-supported monetary institution, the World Fund.

In recent years we have had committees to formulate American policy on foreign aid, raw materials, and the like. Perhaps we should have a committee of able students to tell us in simple words what America's gold policy is or should be.

Roll Back the Prices and Tax Excess Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every one of us is being deluged with protests over the order freezing prices and wages, because the order failed to make the price controls retroactive for a reasonable period.

I am inserting at this point two typical complaints, received by me, which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. The first is a resolution of the City Council of Hamtramck, a progressive and dynamic community in my congressional district, of which I pride myself to be a citizen. The resolution is dated January 30, 1951, and reads, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY COUNCILMAN ROOKS

Resolved, That the common council does hereby protest the freezing of prices of commodities at the highest price level reached in the period of December 19 to January 25, and does hereby request that immediate steps be taken to roll back prices to at least December 1, 1950, to provide relief for workers whose wages did not increase in proportion to run-away prices; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of said resolution be forwarded to President Truman, the Price Director, Congressman T. M. Machrowicz, and Senators Homer Ferguson and Arthur Vandenberg.

Supported by Councilman Dulapa.

Carried by the following vote: Yeas: Councilmen Dulapa, Kozak, Wojtylo, Rooks, and Bielski. Nays: None. Absent: None.

The second is a letter which I received from one of the board of auditors of Wayne County, Mich., which expresses the sentiments of many of our citizens:

BOARD OF WAYNE COUNTY AUDITORS,
Detroit, Mich., February 7, 1951.

Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ,
Michigan Congressman, First District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACHROWICZ: Because of innumerable vigorous complaints on the part of my constituents regarding the inadequacy of price control, I am forced to address this communication to you in order that you may be advised of the widespread and deep-seated dissatisfaction on the part of our loyal Democratic supporters.

It is the feeling of these people that the proposed price-control formula is totally inadequate. Furthermore, it is my personal belief which is shared by many that if effective price controls were to be established, that the prices should be rolled back to approximately June 1, 1950, prior to the start of hostilities. It is also the opinion of my constituents, which is wholeheartedly supported by myself, that the formula as presented could hardly be termed even an idle gesture insofar as its effectiveness and equity is concerned, and it is my considered judgment that only by making price controls retroactive to a normal period, preferably June 1950, would any effective lasting benefits be realized by the public.

It is generally conceded by the wage earners and taxpayers in my community that the wages have not kept pace with the recent rapid advance in prices, etc., and unless some

adequate remedy is applied, I cannot see how the taxpaying public could make any further contribution in taxes, etc., to Government.

The inequity of the ill-conceived and ill-advised proposed price control without regard to wages, plus the proposed increase in income tax and other taxes has acted as a two-edged sword to sever and alienate the strongest and stanchest of our Democratic supporters.

Because of the seriousness of this situation, I am calling it to your personal attention in the hope that you may take an active part in correcting this very unsatisfactory situation.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR A. SUMERACKI,
Wayne County Auditor.

It cannot be denied that the general public in all parts of the country is greatly disappointed and dismayed that the price-freeze order failed to take cognizance of unwarranted and unjust price increases which became prevalent for several months before the price-freeze and particularly after the announcement that a price-freeze was imminent.

Prices were frozen at the highest levels and failed to give the public any real relief from inflation. The order gives little hope for relief for some time in the future. It rewards those who took advantage of advance notices to raise their prices and punishes those who patriotically held the line.

The times and the situation call for direct and courageous action, not for half-way steps. On February 8, 1951, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] introduced H. R. 2515, a bill to roll prices back to June 25, 1950, and to impose a 100-percent tax on excess profits above the normal peacetime profit of the year 1949. I wish to commend the gentleman and express the sincere hope that this bill will soon be reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means and adopted by this Congress.

It is the best way that I can think of to prove to the people of this country that we are honest, sincere, and courageous in our determination to stop the vicious inflationary spiral and put our domestic economy on a sound and fair basis.

What About Conditions in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter I have written to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, together with an enclosure of said letter. I also wish to enclose portions of a letter received from a father who has a son in Korea. These documents are as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1951.

Gen. CLIFTON B. CATES,
Commandant,
The United States Marine Corps,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL CATES: An individual in whom I have great confidence and who is a friend and supporter of the marines has written me concerning the situation in Korea. Following is a portion of that letter:

"Another marine, who was at Chosin Reservoir and participated in the march to the Hungnam beachhead, reported to his mother that not only were many of his outfit without parkas but that the few who had them were relieved of them. He said that when he observed the servicing of the equipment for cold weather and deducted that he also should be prepared for duty where it was cold. Therefore, he decided he should find something to wear in place of the summer uniform provided him. Consequently, he proceeded to 'borrow' warm wool clothing from Army store aboard ship and went into the cold of Korea in these while others were clad in summer uniforms. This or another boy reported that they found men who failed to answer roll call frozen in their beds on the ground."

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which my informant sent to me, and which was received from a Nebraska marine.

I should like to have a report on these matters. Thanking you, I am,

Very truly yours,

CARL T. CURTIS.

POHANG, KOREA, *January 21, 1951.*

How are you all this cold Sunday afternoon? I am pretty good except it is very cold. It got down to about zero last night with a high wind.

Writing on this paper may seem to you as a joke, but it is not. We are that hard up for anything here. Fact is, we stole the toilet paper that I am writing on. We are out of paper, we are eating on very slim rations, because the Army rations them out to us. They figure we can eat and live on a little bit of nothing.

The PX is open, but all they have is shaving gear. You cannot eat or write on shaving cream. It is no fun to go to bed, or go to work, on only a half full stomach.

We look forward to a package from home because we know it will most likely be something to eat. We try to steal us some extra chow whenever we can, so we will have something in the tent to eat between meals.

Another thing, these are not as necessary as food, but we can hardly get a cigarette to smoke. The PX does not seem to have them. We are supposed to get a ration of beer but we do not get it most of the time. One night they even cut us down to half a can apiece. These things are not the necessities of life but it certainly helps the morale of the troops over here.

We moved up here onto a plateau not far from the beach. The mud was 6 inches deep up here. We sloshed around in the mud setting up our tents, then the commanding officer put out an order that there would be no straw bought off of the "gooks" and put on the ground.

The officers have cots, and some of us guys have cots, but a lot of the outfit are sleeping on the ground. Three of my squad do not have cots yet. We will most likely have to steal some someplace for them.

I am not writing this for sympathy for us. We are in hopes you can get something into the paper to do us some good.

A DISGUSTED MARINE.

FEBRUARY 7, 1951.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I have not bothered you with a letter for a couple of weeks. But this past week I received a letter from my dear boy in Korea that made me sick at heart and I decided to write to you again and ask you if you Congressmen can't do something to help our boys in Korea.

If you can't bring them out of that hopeless conflict then at least let them have the liberty to fight the enemy with everything available to gain the victory. Their hands are tied by the insane policy of the Government in refusing them permission to bomb Manchuria and China. I think that a few atom bombs on the cities of China would bring them to terms as it did with the Japanese.

My son, Dale, who has been through all the severe fighting ever since the first marines landed in Korea in August including that terrible battle from Chosin Reservoir to Hungnam has never written a single complaint till his last letter. In the letter we received from him last week he writes, "The Chinese are not the only ones who are cold, hungry, and weary of this war. We are cold, hungry, and weary of the war, too. We hope some kind of reasonable peace can be made with the Chinese and that we can come home." He says that he does not mind the combat but that the cold weather is the worst thing, that if it were summer it would not be so bad.

Fight To Win or Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, whatever else has happened as a result of Korea, the American people are finally awake and thinking. This time we have got to think through our great foreign problem. Here is a good example of American thought, an editorial from the New York World-Telegram as follows:

FIGHT TO WIN OR QUIT

General MacArthur says that the American Army fighting in Korea as the agent of the United Nations awaits political decisions from "the chancelleries of the world" on the problem confronting it.

That problem is the intervention of Red China, dating from last October.

"Considering that the entire military might of Communist China is available against this relatively small command (the UN forces)," General MacArthur warns, "only by maneuver may it avoid hazards inherent in the great odds which it now faces."

That is a clear challenge to the gentlemen representing the United Nations at Lake Success, to make up their minds what they intend to do. And it must be answered.

The American resolution branding the Reds as aggressors, which has been presented to the UN, makes no provision for sanctions against Red China and carefully avoids anything that might be interpreted as authorizing Gen. MacArthur to strike directly at Peiping's homeland and supply bases. It is from China itself, and the bases there, that the Red forces fighting our troops are being supplied. But our troops have become the forgotten men in this war.

The Defense Department is trying to muzzle Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, who raised this same issue upon his recent return from Korea.

"We have been fighting distinctly under wraps since the Communists came into the war," General O'Donnell says. "I never thought I'd see the day when we would have to sit back with our hands tied * * * If we're going to fight, let's not hit 'em light, for heaven's sake. It's time people know that this is an all-out war."

TROOPS HAVE BEEN LET DOWN

That is mild to what the boys in the frozen foxholes are saying.

They have been let down. They know it. They want to come home.

They are tired of being shot at like sitting ducks while the United Nations exchanges notes with the outlaw Chinese government at Peiping.

The State Department seems determined to make General MacArthur the goat in this situation, just as it made former Defense Secretary Johnson the goat for the original debacle in Korea.

But it can't get away with that. The record is too clear.

The fault is not in Korea, but in Washington, in London, and at Lake Success.

The weakness of American political leadership was demonstrated when it was unable to persuade any of the great powers to join us in sponsoring the mild condemnation resolution presented to the UN.

Britain, Canada, and the other fair-weather friends will vote for this resolution on the show-down. But they'll do it with great reluctance. And they are not prepared to support any reprisal measures against the Chinese Reds. Yet this resolution would do nothing more than officially recognize a condition which has been fact for 3 months while ducking the question of what is to be done about it. So the resolution itself is an act of appeasement.

GENERALS GAGGED—ON CARPET

General MacArthur has been gagged and General O'Donnell has been called on the carpet, doubtless to be warned to make no more statements on the outrageous way the policy makers have bungled this whole affair. But the truth will out, despite gags and censorship. The record made at Lake Success is there for all to read.

Our Army in Korea has plenty of fight left in it, according to General Collins, the Army Chief of Staff.

But why should that Army fight when the cause it is supporting has been disowned by the organization it is representing? No effort is being made to reinforce it. Why should more men die on a mission that seems to have been abandoned?

The UN must answer these questions, or it will be faithless to the world which has placed its trust in it and faithless to the men who have died fighting in its name.

Economic sanctions should be voted against Red China. Its ports should be blockaded. The bases from which it is supplying its outlaw forces should be bombed. Aid should be extended to the guerrilla forces fighting the Reds on the China mainland. The Chinese Nationalists should be encouraged to return to China proper so that the ROCs will be forced to fight on two fronts. That is the way to carry on this war if there is any desire to win it.

It cannot be won by the present half-hearted measures.

If the UN doesn't intend to fight to win, then our troops should be pulled out and the whole enterprise abandoned.

If the UN will not face up to this issue, then our own Government must. We should fight to win or quit.

Marquette Alumnae's Accomplishments for Their Alma Mater Shows Free Enterprise at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the alumnae of Marquette University have done a marvelous job for the coed students at Marquette. In 1938, they started with $10 000 of borrowed money to provide housing for these girls. Now, only 12 short years later they are engaged in constructing a new $1,000,000 residence hall.

All this has been done through the energies and efforts of the Marquette alumnae. It shows what can be accomplished by an energetic and determined group of women. This shows free enterprise at its best. Free enterprise is not merely the right of a person to engage in a commercial business for profit. Rather, it encompasses all forms of action whereby an individual or a group of individuals band together to promote a program for the general good of society.

To detail more fully the job which these women have done, I include herewith an article from the Milwaukee Journal of January 28, 1951:

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S PROJECT OF BETTER LIVING FOR COEDS WORKS OUT WELL

(By Dorothy Witte)

Look at the abundance of bobbed heads and curly bangs, shoulder-length hairdos and sleekly waved heads when Marquette classes break on the avenue and you would think women had always been part of the Marquette scene. But there was a time, not too long ago, as many Milwaukeeans remember, when they were not.

Coeducation began slowly at Marquette University. In 1906 there was a training school for nurses, but it was not considered exactly a part of the University. In 1908 the first woman was graduated from the law school. In 1910 there were one or two women in the colleges of music and journalism. And in 1913 a scattered few women were graduated in dentistry and liberal arts and medicine.

Slim beginnings, to be sure, but the women of Marquette have been making up for it ever since. In those days, of course, there were no gathering places for the women students, and no housing for out-of-towners, most of whom stayed in private homes.

Now it is a different story, and the story has been written by the women of the university with the benevolent smile of the school fathers. Thirteen years ago the Jesuit priests who managed the university loaned a newly formed women's alumnae group $10,000. Since then the highly ambitious, loosely knit group has accomplished amazing things:

BUILDINGS BOUGHT, REBUILT

1. They have purchased and rehabilitated buildings to the amount of $205,092.

2. They have furnished and equipped and maintained these buildings to the amount of $32,603.

3. In addition, they have given $500 to Lisette Lodge, $500 to the university's library fund, $2,000 to the university building fund drive, and $3,000 to the union drive.

This is high finance, no doubt about it. How was it accomplished? Well, they borrowed $10,000, raised $10,000, paid off the loan, and borrowed some more. Borrowing the first $10,000 was the hardest, they say. Here's how it happened.

In the fall of 1937 there seemed to be a growing housing need at Marquette. It was this need which prompted the gathering together of 15 women, the alumnae from every department and college in which women were enrolled. Nucleus of the present Association of Marquette University Women, the women sent invitations to all Marquette women graduates. Five hundred came to the tea at Drexel Lodge, and among them was Hildegarde, who came and played the Drexel piano.

It was in February 1938 that the board issued another call to the women alumnae to come to a luncheon. Nearly 500 came, paid dues of $1, and took on the project of housing for out-of-town women students. (At that time there were 237 women at the university; now there are 1,800 enrolled.)

FIRST DORMITORY IN 1938

By June 1938 they had found the building suitable for the first dormitory, an apartment building at 1135 West Kilbourn Avenue. They borrowed $10,000 from the Jesuit Fathers, paid the apartment owners $4,000 for the first year's rent, and agreed to remodel the building. The owner was George Meyer, Sr., now deceased, who was later to be benefactor of the group. He said they had a free hand and could do anything they wished.

They had $6,000 to accomplish the renovation and furnish the dormitory. The architect father of one of the members, Constance Brielmaier (Mrs. Leo Donovan, now of Oakland, Calif.), donated his services. Housing committee members visited furniture factories, compared prices and bought carefully.

One committee made 98 pairs of draperies, for example. They came to the dormitory, named Alumnae House, cut the fabric lengths, and took them to their homes to sew. They cleaned, painted, waxed, and varnished, preferring to do all the work themselves in order to keep total costs under the $6,000 figure. Their husbands helped move in furniture, and the first women's dormitory was ready in September, 1938, to admit 80 students. Miss Wenonah Els, 4112 North Ardmore, a member of the first board, took a leave of absence from her teaching duties to become the first house mother.

In the same way the alumnae group has bought, remodeled, refurnished and maintains Rigge Hall, 739 North Eighteenth Street; Nicholas Hall, 731 North Thirteenth Street; Merritt Hall, 1717 West Wisconsin Avenue. By early 1949, all borrowed funds were paid back, and the group decided to renovate a coach house behind Lizette Lodge, 3200 West Highland Boulevard, as a recreation center for all university students. By May 1, 1950, at a cost of $15,000, the remodeling was complete. Hilltop House is a headquarters for mixers, parties, and informal get-togethers, and there are clubrooms on the second floor, and toboggans in the loft. There are also a piano, radio, record player, pingpong table, and a rented television set.

CLEANING AND PARTIES

How were these things accomplished? Many committees worked on many events, large and small, to raise funds. Almost every year there was a card party and style show, for example, which brought in $1,000 to $1,500. A bazaar, at which 12 alumnae chapters of university clubs and sororities had booths, brought in a like amount, and a series of lectures accounted for a similar sum.

A new project of recent years is the Marquette University engagement book and calendar, which is sold to women alumnae members and their friends at $1 a copy. One year a journal photographer, John Alhauser, 2839 South Lenox Street, gave his services without cost and made the photographs for the book. Profits from the calendar book, an idea suggested by Miss Els, increase every year. Last year, 3,000 copies were sold. This year 5,000 were ordered and requests are still coming in.

"When we borrowed the first $10,000," recalls Mrs. Eugene Wozny, 1642 South Layton Boulevard, president of the association, "we worked hard to pay it back, and as soon as we were solvent, we would borrow more, and that's the way it went." When additional houses were purchased for dormitories, the women would do the needed cleaning themselves. They washed windows and walls and floors, and never hired a workman for a task they could do themselves.

Describing the annual bazaar, a typical fund-raising operation, Mrs. Thomas Callen, 3856 North Thirty-eighth Street, president of the association last year, told of the extensive planning required.

"The chairmen, Kay Iding and Mary Ellen Schwalbach, sent out 4,000 circulars to women graduates 2 months before the bazaar, and the committees were working right up to the day of the event itself," she said.

Big coverall aprons were the best sellers, she reported, and "we had loads of them." The booth with knitted goods also did a large business, and articles which remained after the sale were saved and brought out again to sell at Christmas parties. Toy boxes, she added, went well as late as Valentine's Day.

Similar planning and care went into arrangements for the annual card party and style show. Four tickets were sent to every person on the alumnae list. If members were not able to come they were asked to pick up their table prize and play at home.

RESIDENCE HALL UNDER WAY

"We had no idea so many people would come," said Mrs. Callen. "There was an overflow crowd and we had to make announcements over the public address system, saying 'please don't go home, we're setting up more tables.'"

Five hundred members came, many with their husbands. The style show was a great drawing card, since it presented an opportunity for wives to broach the subject of spring wardrobes to their husbands.

By the end of summer, 1949, remarks Mrs. F. L. McElligott, Thiensville, Wis., dean of women and faculty adviser to the alumnae group, the women were well established. They were, in fact, in a position to borrow more money, and so they did.

Along about this time the Marquette alumni association wanted to reclaim the women's group, which was not altogether anxious to be reclaimed. However, a merger was effected and the two organizations are now associated. The women's group continues to hold its own meetings, manage its own program and raise its own money.

Now the association of Marquette University women is going ahead on a new project, the biggest of all. They are planning to build a new million-dollar H-shaped residence hall. Plans are drawn, contracts are signed, and digging has actually begun on the building, which will extend from Eighteenth Street to Nineteenth Street. Dr. Mary Neville Bielefeld, 2809 North Fifty-sixth Street, who served on the first association board and later as a president, is chairman of the new building project.

One board member remarked, "The new building is going to be out of this world. We are trying to have everything built in, so we've been spending hours with contractors."

So quiet and unobtrusive has the alumnae committee work been that most of the 351 girls who now live in Alumnae House, Merritt Hall, Rigge Hall, and Nicolas Hall, do not know that half the fun of their college lives, the dorm sessions, is directly attributable to the work of Marquette women of an earlier day.

Dead Animals on the Public Highways—Menace to Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I appealed to the various State and Federal authorities to clean the dead animals off of the public highways in order to prevent the spread of those infectious diseases carried by the decaying remains of those various animals. At that time, I published a report issued by Mr. S. W. Jackson, of Franklin, Pa., district engineer for district No. 1 of the highway department of that State.

I have just received another report from Mr. Jackson showing the number of dead animals of various kinds removed from the highways in the various counties of that district during each of the last 10 years.

If every highway official were as diligent as Mr. Jackson has been in removing dead birds and animals from the highways as soon as they are found, I feel sure that it would contribute greatly to the health of the Nation.

It is regretted that Mr. Jackson is now retiring from his position of district engineer, after 42 years of continuous service. I certainly hope his successor will follow his splendid example, and that every other highway official in America will do the same thing.

The report of Mr. Jackson referred to follows:

RECORD OF DEAD ANIMALS AND BIRDS KILLED BY MOTOR VEHICLES DURING THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FROM 1941 TO 1950, INCLUSIVE

This slaughter was confined to the 4,096 miles of State highways contained in district No. 1 located in northwestern Pennsylvania and includes the counties of Erie, Warren, Crawford, Forest, Mercer, Venango, and Lawrence. The number of animals and birds removed, is not an estimate, but an actual count, made by the department of caretakers who remove the bodies and report through the department maintenance superintendents to the district engineer's office in Franklin, where the annual report is compiled. The figures recorded below do not include Lawrence County for the years 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944 which were not available. These figures do not make any allowance for escaped cripples or for bodies removed by carrion eaters, or by sources outside the department of highways.

WILD BIRDS AND ANIMALS

Species	County total for the year 1950							District total for the years										10-year grand total
	Erie	Warren	Crawford	Forest	Mercer	Venango	Lawrence	1950	1949	1948	1947	1946	1945	1944	1943	1942	1941	
Rabbits	1,543	1,127	3,026	548	2,577	1,249	1,297	11,367	11,727	8,734	5,428	6,668	6,894	6,528	7,155	9,125	8,738	82,784
Woodchucks	84	214	105	144	110	78	85	820	849	610	510	548	623	439	386	413	464	5,863
Squirrels	15	53	22	15	121	17	39	302	367	127	167	259	230	175	170	159	174	2,230
Skunks	155	203	148	95	213	67	137	1,018	1,592	1,305	510	891	925	1,065	1,417	1,797	1,768	11,994
Raccoon	19	42	42	19	90	20	47	279	232	100	31	60	37	36	48	28	27	870
Deer	7	75	6	30	16	9	5	157	142	105	61	46	29	37	21	23	31	644
Bear															2			2
Opossum	675	601	1,089	291	1,046	513	400	4,705	4,408	2,356	986	880	692	1,085	977	695	296	17,028
Weasel	10	2	8	1	2	6	3	37	33	34	10	12	26	20	23	18	19	232
Muskrat	11	7	28		44	5	6	101	105	87	54	60	71	73	141	59	49	820
Mink	1	1	1		2			5	4		2			1	2	2	1	17
Fox	1	4	1		3	2	3	14	12	12	1	6	3	1	8	4	2	64
Porcupine		55		74		12		141	141	135	56	60	41	36	46	17	16	688
Grouse		40	1	50	8	18	1	118	84	41	34	34	25	22	23	30	35	454
Quail			1			2	2	5	11	1	3	6	6	3	6	23	29	68
Ringneck pheasant	75	9	137	2	219	13	131	586	438	314	126	145	168	102	120	157	202	2,978
Woodcock		4	1		1	4	1	11	20	31	4	6	28	35	13	30	5	173
Beaver			1					1		4				1				6
Total	2,596	2,437	4,697	1,275	4,462	2,015	2,252	19,657	20,061	14,006	7,709	9,587	9,657	9,680	10,694	12,575	11,824	126,469

DOMESTIC FOWL AND ANIMALS

Species	County total for the year 1950							District total for the years										10-year grand total
	Erie	Warren	Crawford	Forest	Mercer	Venango	Lawrence	1950	1949	1948	1947	1946	1945	1944	1943	1942	1941	
Chickens	41	15	105	2	75	25	31	294	271	394	261	366	239	345	357	443	348	3,542
Ducks		1	4		7			12	8	14	5	17	15	21	9	10	10	123
Geese					1			1	1	6	2		11	3				24
Turkeys				3	1		2	6	1	1		3				3	6	20
Guinea fowl		1			3			4	2	5	1	6	15	15		2		52
Cats	430	177	381	40	431	206	230	1,874	2,101	1,823	1,040	1,171	1,006	724	844	1,011	1,178	12,772
Dogs	243	79	154	8	245	90	227	1,065	1,078	864	641	668	394	419	510	504	544	6,104
Horses	1		1		2			4	2	2			1	1		2	5	17
Sheep										1			3	3	2	1	1	10
Cows									1	1	3	5	2	6		4	5	28
Pigs	2		1		3			6	3	1	4	9	7			2	3	35
Mules										1						1		2
Goats										2		2						4
Total	717	273	586	53	768	320	519	3,256	3,500	3,106	1,960	2,235	2,017	1,536	1,747	1,982	2,111	23,035

Hon. Herbert Hoover's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three editorials on Mr. Hoover's speech of February 9. The first is from the Washington Post of Saturday, February 10; the second from the Star of Sunday, February 11; and the third from this morning's Post. They are as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 10, 1951]

MR. HOOVER'S REALITIES

There can be little doubt that Mr. Hoover's speech of December 20 helped to bestir the European nations to do more to help themselves. But, while recognizing this, we find his reasoning, a rehash of which was heard last night, as faulty as ever. He continues to misinterpret the North Atlantic alliance. He says that the pact merely provides that the nations shall aid each other in case of attack. But that is only one of the provisions—the ultimate one. The object and the essence of the pact is the clause enjoining the signatories to develop their collective capacity to resist attack. Here was a vow to replace a nationalistic system of defense with a collective system. Does Mr. Hoover think for one moment that there would have been one European signatory if all that Europe could expect was liberation by an American air armada? Before liberation could come, every one of the signatories would have been strung up as soon as the enemy appeared.

It is quite clear, as Mr. Hoover says, that there is no hope of matching the Russian hordes division for division. But no military strategy envisages any such posture. What is planned is the mobilization of enough of a collective force to hold up a Russian advance until such time as our bombers could enfeeble the attackers by demolishing communications and supply lines and bases of supply. We need air, in other words, for use not inside Western Europe but beyond it. Upon no other assumption is there a possibility of galvanizing a will to fight in Western Europe. It has hitherto been the task of American diplomacy to validate such an assumption in the eyes of the people of Europe. The progress to that end has lately been heartening. But there would be an immediate retrogression if the Hoover policy were adopted. The Europeans, seeing the basic assumption undermined, would sink back into an apathy produced by an awareness of their helplessness. There would be, indeed, that lack of cohesion and unity in the free nations which the former President takes for granted on the basis, forsooth, of the interallied arguments in the United Nations.

Adoption of the Hoover policy would ease the Stalinist task to such an extent that this country would find itself facing across an ocean (which Mr. Hoover still calls a "moat") a Russified Western Europe. From Jefferson on no American statesman has been willing to accept such a prospect. Two world wars have been fought to prevent the Old Continent from falling under the sway of an aggressive power. Now the treatment is going to be different. The prevention of an attack has taken the place of resistance to attack as the guiding principle of American foreign policy. As Mr. Hoover says, "America is the major deterrent to the Kremlin's ambitions of world conquest," but it is a deterrent only as it puts itself in a position which will both command the aid of allies and the safeguarding of their bases and resources from conquest.

It is strange that Mr. Hoover fails to see the need of collective prevention based upon a unified command. He has long been aware of the grand design of Stalinist aggression. He would fight if Stalin seized the other rim of the Atlantic Ocean. The bold policy he eschews in the Atlantic he supports in the Pacific where there is less of a threat to the American interest and where the price is infinitely less precious to Moscow. The aim is that he would insure the very isolation which he fears will be forced upon this country by the failure of the other free nations to defend themselves. The logic of the world situation, surely, is to do what is humanly possible to prevent such a failure—to show Europe as well as Moscow that we mean business, and not by sounding a half-hearted and defeatist warning bell, either.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of February 11, 1951]

MR. HOOVER MISSES THE MARK

In his latest foreign policy talk Herbert Hoover retreats a bit from the position he took last December 20. In the earlier address he said he would not send another man or another dollar to Europe until the Europeans had created enough combat divisions to "erect a sure dam against the Red flood." Mr. Hoover did not repeat that condition Friday night. Instead, he seemed willing to have this country proceed with the extension of aid in the form of arms. But he remains opposed to the idea of sending any more American troops, in substantial numbers, at least, to Europe.

One of Mr. Hoover's troubles is that he tends to fight make-believe battles. Thus in his talk Friday night he said: "There is a stark reality upon which our foreign policies must be based. With any seeable land forces from non-Communist nations, even including the United States, a land offensive against the Communists could bring no military victory, no political conclusion." That may be true. But it is not a "stark reality" if Mr. Hoover is talking about our policy of aiding in the revival of Western Europe's military strength. That program has as its dual aim the creation of enough strength in the West to discourage a Russian attack, and, failing that, enough strength to keep the Russians from overrunning all of Europe. The program does not even remotely contemplate a land offensive against the Communists, and no responsible advocate of the program has ever made any such suggestion. So Mr. Hoover, on this score, is talking not about a stark reality but about an imaginary and unrealistic proposition.

The same thing is true when he says that Communist armies can no more get to Washington than any Allied armies can get to Moscow, and that no responsible military man denies these two conclusions. The answer to this, of course, is that no responsible military man, nor any other responsible person for that matter, has ever suggested that the force we hope to create in Western Europe is capable of getting to Moscow. No such thought is in anyone's mind. The whole purpose is to prevent the Russians from invading Western Europe, not to invade Moscow, and when Mr. Hoover suggests the contrary he is simply setting up a straw man and then knocking him down.

Beyond this, there is a tone of despair and defeatism about Mr. Hoover's speech which should not go unchallenged. He wants to concentrate on the air and sea arms of our defense. "The unbearable strain on our economic system," he said, "will come from trying to do five things at the same time. That is, to maintain armies in the Pacific; to build up an air force; a naval force; to furnish munitions to nations who are determined to defend themselves, and to send land armies to Europe. Our economy cannot carry this load for long."

But Mr. Hoover has said things like this, or very much like this, before.

In his speech Friday night he pointed out that the Kremlin has under arms and in reserve probably 300 divisions, with 30,000 tanks and 20,000 airplanes. And he recalled that in World War II, when Russia had no satellites, the Germans failed to overcome her with 240 well-equipped divisions. But at a comparable juncture in history—on November 19, 1941, just about 3 weeks before Pearl Harbor—he made another talk. Then he was opposing American intervention in the war against Hitler. He doubted that we could break the military stalemate in Europe, and he pointed out that "we can now observe that Russia could not overcome the German Army, even with her 10,000,000 men, 20,000 tanks, 20,000 planes, fighting on her own soil behind her own fortifications with her transportation wholly overland and on inside lines." It was an argument with an impressive and authoritative ring. But that German Army was chewed up and destroyed.

Mr. Hoover, in that same address, did not believe we could send an army to Europe and defeat the Germans. He thought our freedoms would be lost and our economy ruined. We would need 5,000,000 to 8,000,000 American boys in addition to the British, he said. It would take more than 5 years to build the necessary shipping. And no military expert believes we could land such an army in Europe even if we got it overseas. In Mr. Hoover's judgment, it couldn't be done. But we did it.

These old errors are not dredged up to embarrass the former President. All of us have made mistakes. The point is that, on the record, Mr. Hoover's crystal ball is filled with cracks and cloudy spots. He tends to think and counsel in terms of what we cannot do. We need to adopt a different approach. First, we must understand clearly what it is that we intend to do. Our intention is not to attack Moscow with land armies, but to assist in defending Europe as an essential part of our own defense. And second, we should make up our minds that, to this end, we are going to do what we can do; that we are not going to let the fears and the doubts and the hesitations cause us to lose the battle by default.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 12, 1951]

QUESTION TO MR. HOOVER

Former President Hoover should be called as a witness when the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees begin their joint hearings on the troops-for-Europe issue on Thursday if only for the clarification of one point. In his speech on Friday night Mr. Hoover seemed to imply that the United States could remain unscathed by supplying arms and munitions to Europe and preparing to overwhelm Soviet Russia by air and sea power if that country should attack Western Europe. But what of the American troops already in Germany? While Mr. Hoover noted that the two American divisions in Germany would become a part of the proposed North Atlantic Pact army, he seemed completely to forget them in outlining his strategy.

Although these two divisions would not add substantial strength to the forces that General Eisenhower is trying to assemble for the defense of Western Europe, they would be enough to involve the United States in any "land war in Europe" that is likely to break out in the foreseeable future. Is it conceivable that this country would be content to bomb and blockade Russia while two divisions of American boys were being wiped out by superior forces in central Europe? In the early days of World War II General MacArthur's troops in the Philippines were left to their fate because there was no possibility of reinforcing them. But the situation would be entirely different in Europe. With command of the sea and easy access to European ports, this country would never leave two divisions to be slaughtered, captured or backed into the Atlantic without sending them reinforcements.

Since we should be in the land fighting from the beginning, therefore, would it not be far better to join with our allies in building up a defensive force as rapidly as possible? The "stark reality" of the situation is that, so long as the United States has an army of occupation in Germany, it is in effect an European power. Would Mr. Hoover have all the American soldiers in Germany brought back home immediately? Or does he regard them as being expendable?

Food Situation in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the India News Bulletin entitled "Food Situation in India," which contains information which should be helpful to our consideration of the proposed sale or gift by our country of a fairly large supply of grain to alleviate suffering among these people, and to evidence our sincere interest in aiding underprivileged peoples of the world, within our means. The article follows:

[From the India News Bulletin of February 9, 1951]

FOOD SITUATION IN INDIA—AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

One of the first things the Government of free India did was to set an early target for achieving self-sufficiency in food. This objective has been unfortunately retarded by a succession of natural calamities.

To understand the food situation in India it is necessary to have an idea of the main crops and of the time they are harvested. Speaking generally, the "rabi" crops, namely, wheat, barley, and gram, are harvested during the months of March, April, and May. The "kharif" crops—maize, jowar, and bajra (millets)—are harvested from August to December. Rice is on a different footing. There are three crops, the main crop being the winter crop, which is harvested from November to January. The summer crop is negligible, but the autumn crop, from September to November, represents a considerable portion of the crop in the States of Bengal, Assam, Bihar, Orissa, and the Gangetic Valley, which covers Uttar Pradesh. In Madras there are three crops, the first being harvested from September to January, the second from January to March and the third from April to June.

The current food shortage is due to the failure or anticipated failure of these three main crops. Droughts occurring in the north and central areas since the fourth week of September have caused considerable damage to the "kharif" and "rabi" crops. The rice crop in Bihar has been damaged, and the standing "rabi" crop is not satisfactory. In central India rice and millet crops have been affected to a great extent in unirrigated areas, and the young "rabi" plants in many cases have withered away. In the Gangetic Valley the rice crop has been considerably damaged. The germination of "rabi" crops in unirrigated areas in this state is unsatisfactory.

On the other hand, heavy rains and cyclone during the third week of November 1950 caused considerable damage to winter rice in parts of West Bengal and Assam. The seriousness of the damage in Assam was aggravated by severe earthquakes. Added to these, locust attacks and crop diseases have been reported from many areas. These calamities are primarily responsible for a reduction in the available supplies of food grains from local production to as low as 38,000,000 tons in the calendar year 1951.

TOTAL NEED

Even before partition of the country, India was a net importer of food grains. Imports were mainly rice from Burma, Thailand, and Indochina. The net amount of food grains available for consumption before partition averaged about 38,500,000 tons a year. Average annual production locally was about 39,000,000 tons, and average annual net imports were about 1,500,000 tons. These figures do not include available supplies for some of the Indian states ruled formerly by Indian princes, as statistics are not available for those states. However, it may be estimated roughly that the supplies from these areas averaged annually about 6,000,000 tons. Thus the average available supplies for consumption for the whole of India before partition was about 46,000,000 tons annually.

If the Republic of India were to maintain the level of consumption that prevailed before the partition of the country, available supplies should be over 46,000,000 tons. Estimated available supplies of food grains through local production for the calendar years 1948, 1949 and 1950, were 43,700,000, 42,800,000, and 43,300,000 tons, respectively. Imports of food grains during the same period were 2,800,000, 3,700,000, and 2,200,000 tons, respectively. Average annual consumption since 1948, taking into consideration changes in government stocks, may be estimated at 46,000,000 tons. The nature of this consumption is characterized by rationing of food grains in cities and small towns. If rationing is to be discontinued the net available supplies for the present population of India should be over 46,000,000 tons annually.

The year 1951 is a critical year for India as the hopes of an estimated increase in production during the 1950–51 season have been upset owing to natural calamities. Estimated production for 1951 is only 38,000,000 tons. Government stocks are at a record low level. The Government of India has been compelled in this situation to reduce the ration of food grains from 12 ounces to 9 ounces per day per adult. The number of people who will come under this scheme of rationing is expected to be 125,000,000 in 1951.

The Government of India, about the middle of 1950, expected to import about 4,000,000 tons in 1951 not only to increase the ration but also to build up reserves. However, when the prospect of available supplies of food in 1951 deteriorated considerably, the Government estimated that about 10,000,000 tons of grain would be necessary to enable it to meet its ration obligations in 1951. Out of this quantity, about 3,500,000 tons is expected to be procured locally and about 6,500,000 tons will have to be imported. Unless this quantity arrives in India during the year 1951, more than 50 percent of which should be available before June, the Government will not be able to prevent widespread famine in the country.

FOOD VERSUS MONEY CROPS

A misunderstanding exists in some quarters that the Government of India has reduced acreage under food crops in order to grow more cotton and jute. The facts are:

Food acreage was increased from 139,500,000 acres in 1948–49 to 196,500,000 acres in 1949–50. The area under commercial crops, including jute and cotton, during the same period rose from 41,500,000 to 43,000,000 acres. Thus, while the food acreage in 1 year increased by 6,000,000 acres, area under money crops by 1,500,000 acres only. The increase was made possible by the government's land reclamation projects. It may be pointed out here that the total cultivable wasteland in the country is 60,000,000 acres. Official plans aim at reclaiming 43,000,000 acres.

The increase in jute and cotton acreage is negligible compared to the total acreage under food grains. The total cotton acreage (i. e., 11,400,000) is only 5 percent of the total food acreage (i. e., 195,507,000). The total area under jute (i. e., 1,138,000) is only 0.5 percent. If only the increase is considered, the figures are: cotton 0.3 percent and jute 0.25 percent of the total food acreage. Besides all cultivatable land is not suitable for food production. The determining factors are the level of the land, accessibility of water, etc. Therefore, it does not follow that merely because a certain acreage has been put under jute or cotton, that much land is denied to food grains.

It may also be pointed out that jute is one of India's most important industries which earns nearly 45 percent of her dollar exchange. India can hardly afford to starve it. When India and Pakistan were one country, there was no difficulty; though most of the raw material came from what is now Pakistan and the mills were in India. What India is doing now is merely to insure a reasonable supply of raw material for the industry.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY TARGET

The Government's policy continues to be the attainment of self-sufficiency in food grains by March 31, 1952. Land improvement schemes and reclamation projects are progressing satisfactorily. Irrigation schemes, main plank of the "grow more food campaign," are being put into operation. If there is no grave calamity in 1951, such as widespread failure of crops, it is expected that large imports of food grains will be discontinued by the target date. Any import of food grains after that date will be to build up a central reserve which will serve as a buffer stock.

Roger Baldwin Accuses Us of Confusion—Reveals Himself Neck Deep in Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the Boston Herald under date of February 2, 1951:

THIS IS HOW I SEE IT—ROGER BALDWIN ACCUSES US OF CONFUSION—REVEALS HIMSELF NECK DEEP IN CONFUSION

(By W. E. Mullins)

Roger Baldwin, a somewhat vocal advocate of civil liberties, has written some letters to the Mail Bag chiding me for some comment

here on his activities on behalf of the oppressed and downtrodden. During the past few years he has been on a semi-government mission in Germany and Japan alerting our enemies to their civil rights.

The gist of the comment here was an expression of bewilderment at the processes of a government that could do no better than send a draft dodger and a notorious Communist and Soviet sympathizer to teach our enemies the ideals and the priceless benefits of all phases of freedom.

With Baldwin's right to object to what was written here I have no objection. His views are welcome. Nevertheless, buried in his first letter was an insinuation that I was confused. This assertion merits some examination in an effort to ascertain which of us really is confused.

Baldwin's letter contained a denial that he ever was a draft dodger. He said he had been sent to jail for being a conscientious objector. In his college year book he wrote: "When I was called in the draft, I refused to submit, was prosecuted at New York, and sent to prison for a year."

Let us ignore the circumstance that the patriotic young man who was drafted to fill the call to which Baldwin turned a deaf ear may have lost his life in the war. I ask for an analysis of the difference between draft evasion and conscientious objection. In the final analysis it's all the same. The Army needed a recruit. The citizen called refused to answer.

I merely made the point that this administration must have been able to select a better representative of Americanism than a citizen who was sent to prison for refusing to hasten to its aid in its hour of need.

CLASS POSITION CITED

In another statement Baldwin once declared: "But I also became a pacifist, opposed to violence in all forms." He stated: "As a pacifist, I opposed the war." Now, that would seem to establish this particular bleeding heart as a genuine pacifist, so peaceful that he went to prison before he'd shoulder a rifle.

I dug up an article he once wrote for Soviet Russia Today, a magazine in the interest of—guess who? He wrote:

"Those of us who champion civil liberties in the United States and who at the same time support the proletarian dictatorship of the Soviet Union are charged with inconsistency and insincerity. 'How can you consistently support the right of free agitation in capitalist countries when you defend a dictatorship that tolerates no agitation against its rule?' we are asked. * * *

"Everybody takes a class position, consciously or unconsciously. * * * All my associates in the struggle for civil liberties take a class position, though many don't know it. * * *

"I, too, take a class position. It is anticapitalist and prorevolutionary. I believe in nonviolent methods of struggle as most effective in the long run for building up successful working class power. Where they cannot be followed * * * only violent tactics remain. I champion civil liberty as the best of the nonviolent means of building the power on which workers' rule must be based. If I aid the reactionaries to get free speech now and then, if I go outside the class struggle to fight against censorship, it is only because those liberties help to create a more hospitable atmosphere for working class liberties. The class struggle is the central conflict of the world; all others are incidental."

NOW WHO'S CONFUSED?

"When the power of the working class is once achieved as it has been only in the Soviet Union, I am for maintaining it by any means whatsoever. Dictatorship is the obvious means in a world of enemies, at home and abroad."

Now, here is one of the more notorious champions of civil liberties who went to prison because, he said, as a pacifist he was opposed to all violence. In his magazine article he admitted that he would pursue nonviolent methods but where these are not successful only violent tactics remain. Later on he conceded that when the working class had grasped power, "I am for maintaining it by any means whatsoever."

Look what has charged me with being confused.

In another part of his protest he pointed out that his defense of the Communist leaders who were convicted of trying to overthrow the Government was not his personal view but the view of the Civil Liberties Union, of which he is national chairman.

This finger pointer is entirely unconcerned about Baldwin's fantastic philosophies which seem to change with the weather. The facts are that he refused to bear arms for his country when it was in distress and that he is, on the record, a notorious Soviet sympathizer.

I thought 1 month ago and I think today that it was preposterous to give him even the slightest measure of status as an agent of this Government because I do not believe him to be capable of giving true expression to our genuine ideals. It is entirely characteristic of this administration that he should be so dignified. He is one of the best exhibits of Communist sympathizer in Government.

St. Lawrence Seaway Is a Peril to Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we who reside in Pennsylvania regard the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as the greatest threat faced by the industrial life of our Commonwealth.

On February 11, 1951, John Cummings, in his column in the Philadelphia Inquirer, spells out this threat to Pennsylvania in the following article:

REAL SEAWAY EMERGENCY IS PERIL TO PENNSYLVANIA

(By John M. Cummings)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—Advocates of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project have seized on the national emergency as an argument calculated to induce Congress to approve a scheme that has either been sidetracked or defeated outright every time it has been brought up on Capitol Hill.

The most sanguine supporters of the project concede it would take at least 4 years to complete it and then, because of weather conditions in that part of the country, it would be frozen to uselessness 5 months of the year. For this the taxpayers would be called on to provide countless millions at a time of loud and persistent clamor to limit major construction to projects directly concerned with defense.

The two United States Senators from Pennsylvania, ED MARTIN and JIM DUFF, are unalterably opposed to the seaway. Like other statesmen associated with the opposition, they see, among other things, the likelihood that the seaway would have a blighting influence on such major eastern ports as New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

In the South there is opposition because of the detrimental effect it would have on New Orleans, Houston, Galveston, Mobile, and other Gulf ports.

Nevertheless, the advocates of the seaway are more optimistic than at any time since the project was first launched more than 50 years ago. The Power Authority of the State of New York is for it because the seaway has been linked with power development. In a recent report to the New York Legislature the authority stated that if the project is once more defeated it is prepared to proceed with power development in the St. Lawrence in conjunction with the Canadian Government.

There is no serious objection to the power development. It's the seaway that stands at the center of the controversy. Congress is being told that with the Mesabi Range in Minnesota rapidly reaching the point of exhaustion, iron ore from Labrador is the one hope of the steel industry in the Middle West. To get this ore to the mills the seaway offers low-cost transportation, so the argument runs.

In other days supporters of the seaway were content to picture the prospect of seagoing vessels proceeding inland to Chicago and other cities along the lakes. This, of course, was a frank threat to the ports along the Atlantic seaboard and naturally the reaction was swift and strong.

Now, however, you find the seaway men on a different tack. It must be built because we are in an emergency period. President Truman long has been listed among the supporters of the project. It is not surprising, therefore, to find General Marshall and Secretary of State Acheson tossing their influence in the direction of the gigantic boondoggling program.

Senator MARTIN recalled today that while he was governor of Pennsylvania he fought the proposal every time it was advanced. On one occasion he sent his secretary of commerce down here to record the feeling of his administration at a public hearing. "I was against this thing right along and I am against it now," said the Senator. "It can have no beneficial effect on the emergency we are facing. Not only that, it could prove a death blow to the railroads which must have freight to carry if they are to exist. And to my mind the continued existence of the railroads is vastly more important than a seaway that would be useless 5 months out of every 12."

Senator JIM DUFF was equally emphatic in his opposition. "I'll have no part of it," said Big Red. "It promises nothing of lasting good to the country."

A consistent opponent of the plan is Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This committee handled seaway legislation in the past because it is necessary to work out the scheme on a treaty basis with Canada.

Pennsylvania's stake in this thing is enormous. It is important enough to engage the attention of Governor Fine and Mayor Samuel—and the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia as well as the Pittsburgh chamber.

Qualified observers in Washington report the emergency argument is making headway. If the opposition doesn't express itself soon and forcefully we might wake up one of these fine mornings to discover the job had been accomplished.

Buffalo, N. Y., long an opponent of the seaway, is weakening. It was fearful its huge grain business would be lost to the city. Now the city is told it will soon need new sources of iron ore and it had better shift positions.

There is an emergency in this situation, all right. It applies to Pennsylvania perhaps more than to any other State. It might be of interest to the Fine administration and the chambers of commerce to know it's later than they think.

Lincoln and the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article appearing in the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1951:

HIS CHERISHED WORK LIES PATTERED—LINCOLN EMPLOYED A RAZED PRESS

(By J. R. Wiggins)

The appearance of this thoughtful book is well-timed. Its Civil War examples of newspaper behavior in a time of unparalleled crisis are instructive to newspapermen again struggling with the difficult problems of a national emergency. Its story of military and civil government reactions to newspaper policies is equally valuable reading for officials who have to deal with a free press in wartime.

The instruction in both cases consists often of examples of what to avoid.

The Civil War President, for the most part, exhibited an amazing patience and restraint in dealing with a dissident press that was shockingly irresponsible in its criticism as well as with newspapers of all political faiths that seemed to have no security consciousness whatever.

Military commanders, on the other hand, proceeded against editors in a manner that was often summary and arbitrary, although the provocation was sometimes very great.

Would we, in the midst of armed rebellion, with military operations in the heart of the country, preserve as well the freedom of the press, countenance as patiently the most violent criticism, endure as calmly real hardships resulting from the luxury of individual freedom? For all the bad spots in the Civil War record that Harper relates, it is a sobering question.

Mr. Harper's great contribution is not in divulging the new and novel facts about Lincoln's relationship with the press. Although he has unearthed some things new to this reviewer, it is the orderly arrangement of information hitherto available only in a dispersed form that makes this book valuable.

Lincoln's relationships with newspaper editors were very close, as this study makes clear. He understood the press. He knew how to use it. He did not hesitate to put his own writing into the press. He tried to influence others. He had a realistic and practical notion of newspaper propaganda.

The list of newspapermen Lincoln appointed to Federal office is a very long one. It reflects Lincoln's wide acquaintanceship among newspapermen and it reveals the active political role of most editors of the day. Greeley, of course, is the outstanding example of the politician-editor. Another is Henry J. Raymond, editor of the New York Times, who was chairman of the platform committee in the convention that gave Lincoln his second nomination.

The Civil War government made some bad mistakes in its press relations, however. W. H. Russell of the London Times was denied an Army pass and virtually driven from the country for a fair and objective story of Bull Run that was too accurate for administration comfort.

Dennis A. Mahony, editor of the Herald at Dubuque, Iowa, was seized by a Federal marshal, in the dead of night, and whisked away to prison in Washington, without charge.

C. C. Fulton, editor of the Baltimore American, only newspaper friend of the administration in Baltimore, was jailed in Fort McHenry for a schedule he sent the Associated Press, heralding the postponing campaign as a great success just when it was bogging down.

General Burnside seized the Chicago Times because it favored slavery and released it only on President Lincoln's order.

Editor Wharton, proadministration owner of the Parkersburg Gazette, criticized the condition of the troops of Gen. David Hunter, in an editorial. He was jailed, his newspaper was seized and offending copies burned, his office was ransacked and all its records destroyed at Hunter's direction.

A forged AP dispatch caused President Lincoln to order the arrest of the editors of the New York Journal of Commerce and the World and the suppression of the papers. These actions were reconsidered when the culprit was found.

The military, in hundreds of cases, proceeded summarily against newspapers. No distinction was made, in many instances, between expression of opinion and reports of the news. Giving comfort to the enemy, in many cases, consisted of giving him the comfort of agreeing with him.

The situation was bad enough so that former President Franklin Pierce was moved to say, "Even here in the loyal States, the mailed hand of military usurpation strikes down the liberties of the people, and its foot tramples on a desecrated Constitution."

On the other hand, Samuel Medary continued his attacks on the Government throughout the war, up until his death, relatively unmolested. Newspaper attacks on Lincoln reached incredible violence just before his renomination. Not only the Copperhead press but newspapers hitherto friendly to Lincoln assailed him in the most savage terms.

Censorship of news dispatches filed in Washington was one of the most controversial press issues of the Civil War period. It began in April, 1861, and was badly handled, directly by the Treasury, the War Department, State Department, and then War Department again. Finally it resulted in Congressional inquiry.

The House Judiciary Committee, on March 20, 1862, resolved that "the Government shall not interfere with the free transmission of intelligence by telegraph, when the same will not aid the enemy in his military or naval operations, or give him information concerning such operations on the part of the Government."

The House agreed and gave its support to the principle of unobstructed military news in wartime, notwithstanding the fact that hostile troops were not far away across the Potomac.

Harper tells the story of the press and the Gettysburg Address most interestingly. He cites the Chicago Times' "disparaging utterances," editorial and others. He also points out, however, that the address was widely published (because of its very brevity), and that it was recognized at the time by the Springfield Republican, the Ohio State Journal and others as a great document.

THE NEW YORK HERALD of Sunday, April 16, 1865, after Lincoln's assassination, made the inevitable charge: "It is as clear as day that the real origin of this miserable act is to be found in the fiendish and malignant spirit developed and fostered by the rebel press, North and South. That press has, in the most devilish manner, urged men to the commission of this very deed."

This certainly was not the sober judgment of the country. It indicates, however, the violence and malevolence of the newspaper criticisms that Lincoln endured. That he submitted to it rather than impair rights he highly prized and well understood is not the least of his claims to greatness and to the gratitude of subsequent generations of Americans.

No press could be more irresponsible or partisan than some of the Civil War sheets. No threat to the Nation could be more immediate and direct. Somehow or other, a free press and a free country both survived. It was a feat of statesmanship pregnant with interest in a day when it seems equally difficult to defend freedom without abandoning it.

A Retired General of the Marine Corps Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest fallacy which confuses the people today in the matter of national defense is simply this—when our chief military leaders in the Armed Forces speak before Congress and to the press, they are not expressing their own independent judgment. They speak for a policy as laid down by their Commander in Chief. Consequently, we have seen it in the past that the Eisenhowers and the Marshalls are selected to make public statements because of their so-called high prestige and popularity with the people.

I am sure that the people expect and demand that on the battle fronts some one man or general must make the final decision. But in the field of diplomacy or foreign affairs, I am sure our top military leaders should not be made to make public statements in these fields. We are still a republic and the Constitution very wisely put the approval of treaties in the hands of the Senate and the power to declare war in the Congress.

The people are demanding an answer to just what is to be our policy in the matter of national defense. They full well know we have had no established policy in foreign affairs except to try to buy with tax dollars a false economy and well-being.

A righ-ranking officer flew to Europe to evaluate their will to fight. We are informed Luxemburg has a battalion. From France, this general flew to Italy but he did not stop in Spain, the only country in Europe which has fought communism. Did he bypass Spain on orders, because there are in Spain 400,000 troops that would fight.

The Marine Corps has always been the elite of our combat forces. Their motto, Semper Fidelis, has always been carried out and it is still the bright star in our fighting forces in Korea, even though some men in high places say they are simply a "police force."

Let us take a look at what Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, USMC, retired, has to say. General del Valle served more than 30 years in the Marine Corps and is a graduate of the Naval Academy. He has also served as naval attache at many foreign embassies in Europe.

You will find his open letter to the President most interesting and thought-provoking. The letter follows:

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA,
December 18, 1950.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because we ordinary citizens in a free Republic have the duty of expressing our opinions to those who are elected to serve us in government, I have the honor to communicate to you the following comments upon your public emergency speech of December 15, 1950.

First, there can be little disagreement with the declaration that our homes, our nation, and all the things we believe in are in danger, and that this danger was created by the rulers of the Soviet Union. This establishes a frank and clear distinction between these rulers and the oppressed Russian people, as well as the Chinese people, and the other enslaved peoples of Central Europe which the masters of the Kremlin rule with but ill-disguised illusions of sovereignty. The very fact of this belated acknowledgement by the head of our free Republic will, of itself, bring a breath of hope to those suffering millions under the Kremlin's heel who are our true allies. There has been a notable reluctance to drive this natural wedge on the part of yourself and of your Department of State in sharp contrast to the course of action we once pursued in countries overcome by Hitler. It is to be hoped that henceforth, having made public recognition of this distinction and of its implications, you will pursue the logical policy of aiding and abetting the guerrilla forces and other underground movements which the desperate slaves of the Soviets everywhere maintain, which heretofore have been completely ignored.

It was scarcely to be expected that the chief executive would so far take the ordinary citizens into his confidence as to admit to them that the policies pursued by himself and by his Department of State, and by his predecessor in office are largely responsible for the present unfavorable juxtaposition of forces, moral, political, and military which constitute the danger of which he speaks, to our homes, our Nation, and all the things we believe in. The secret agreements at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam; the admission of the Kremlin in Tokyo to a victory they had not won in a war they had themselves helped to incite; the leftist policy in China, which rejected the Nationalist forces of Chiang Kai-shek in favor of the agrarian reformers who are now slaying our sons in Korea; the soft policy toward our own communistic traitors at home; the lackadaisical security with regard to our atomic secrets; all these things, Mr. President, can be laid at the door of the White House advisers. It had been a great and noble thing, and of great promise to the Nation if you had seen fit to sketch into the picture this background of all our woes as now painted.

Secondly, Mr. President, I find myself involved in an incomprehensible muddle when examining the steps whereby you propose to meet this, our very dangerous situation.

1. To uphold, with arms, the principles of the United Nations, when that body includes Soviet Russia and most of its satellites, and very likely will shortly contain the Chinese Communists who are the immediate cause of our discomfiture, leaves one in very grievous doubt that your policy has changed at all. The United Nations, like its predecessor, the League of Nations, has served chiefly as a means of confusing our national patriotism and watering it with communistic internationalism, while draining away the real wealth of this country in grants of aid to tottering Socialist governments upon whose assistance we certainly cannot count in this our dark hour, and who even now pretend that everything is our fault, in Korea and in the whole world. Meanwhile they demand ever greater assistance, first economic recovery and now military supplies and equipment, while refusing to allow the arming of the one nation which could really defend Europe, Germany, and rejecting the only hope of a beachhead in Europe, Spain.

The time has come to speak plainly, Mr. President. We should no longer form part of an internationalist body whose influence has been the very reverse of peaceful. It has failed in its purpose of keeping the peace, not once, but a dozen times. It failed to save the satellites which the Kremlin has absorbed; it failed to prevent the torture of Mindszenty; or to effect the release of Robert Vogeler. It failed to prevent the assaults on Greece directed by the Kremlin. It does not serve notably as a shield in the coming advances against the Near East and Asia, nor does it permit Turkey to disarm and go about its lawful occasions. It did not prevent the political Zionists from seizing Arab territories in Palestine, leaving a million Arabs homeless; and it did not prevent the rape of Korea with its aftermath, nor indeed the absorption of China by the Politbureau. It has not kept the Kremlin from preventing peace in Europe. It now serves only to make us weak and indecisive because of our involvements in it. When we should be strong in the knowledge that right makes might, we are listening to an ally's plea to recognize the power of Mao over the suffering Chinese masses because might makes right in the bright new lexicon of socialism.

2. We shall continue to work with other free nations to strengthen our combined defenses, you say, is your second point. This is a vague and disquieting pronouncement, as the only interpretation we can put on it is that you intend to continue your costly policy of minding everyone else's business before our own. The fact that the next point was third instead of second gives color to this interpretation.

3. We shall build up our own forces and weapons and those of our allies. An afterthought of the provision to work with other free nations is to arm ourselves, and then only concurrently with arming these allies. I submit that we had better mind our own business first, and then that of these so-called allies. These allies against whose entanglements George Washington warned us, and who have manufactured weapons for centuries and used them in their eternal quarrels are perfectly capable of arming themselves—if they really mean to fight. The internal situation within most of them and their reaction to the proposals for rearmament of Germany and Spain give ample reason to doubt that these people do have any intention to fight. With us there is no choice, we have got to fight. Let us, then, arm ourselves.

If any arming of allies is going to be done then the first arms should go to Chiang Kai-shek, who has an army of over half a million trained men, and the anti-Communist guerrillas in China, who number over a million. The arms should go to them, and to Spain, which sits behind the Pyrenees with another army of nearly a half million, and which can put another equal number into the field on short notice; and to West Germany, with whose divisions our success in Europe would be assured; and to General Anders, whose influence with Polish groups could be decisive; and to the millions in the Ukraine, to whom a few dropped or smuggled weapons, mere token that they are not forgotten, would mean the birth of a new hope, and a thorn in the side of the police state which now rules them. All this would be merely a belated attempt to undo the harm done by your policies and those of your predecessor. The chief thing is to change the line of action which has been pursued from that of an unstable indecisive internationalist misalliance into a dynamic, American, forceful one.

4. In the fourth place, you plan to expand our economy and keep it on an even keel. This is an altogether laudable and acceptable objective, since the war effort will, as it always has, depend upon the national economic strength. This strength has been dissipated by grants and gifts to all and sundry, both by your own and your predecessor's governments, and viciously attacked from within by the leftists, who abhor capitalism. Both your own and your predecessor's governments further weakened our economy by a malicious and deliberate grant of excessive power to irresponsible labor leaders. The right of free Americans to work when and where they like has been seriously curtailed, and the right of free Americans to hire whom they please, when and how they please, has been beset by Socialist measures such as FEPC, which you saw fit to press upon us, even at the eleventh hour; and similar socialistic adventures calculated to destroy capital, which is the heart blood of the economy which you now say you want to strengthen. The very methods of taxation in vogue are designed for the destruction of capital, as Karl Marx himself foretold in advocating the income tax. John Marshall once said: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." In the use of this power your Government and that of your predecessor have tended indeed to destroy, not to strengthen capital and the economy which depends upon it. Let us turn away from this evil and destructive policy and we shall indeed strengthen economy.

That the policy is not to change is implied in the immediate establishment of controls within the state of emergency, and the intention to increase the already almost unbearable taxes, but not to control or reduce the expensive Socialist experiments, supports, grants, etc., and the excessive governmental interference with the life and commerce of the citizens; nor to cease the outpouring of our wealth abroad. Is the emergency then, merely to become a cover for the continuation and extension of the socialization of this Republic, which will then become as impotent and as ripe for communism as are the Socialist governments of Europe, and as are all Socialist governments everywhere? The man who labors will have no choice of wage, after controls, nor the citizen any freedom of choice whose buying and selling of goods is the real barometer of prices. Omniscient Government employees, filled with their power and importance, are to hold at bay the play of the free and natural forces of supply and demand. The demand for labor raises the price of that commodity just as all the others, in relation to the available supply. The modern King Canute will now order the tides to recede. Thus the economy is to be kept on an even keel and headed for the rocks of socialism.

You have the opportunity, Mr. President, of saving the American Republic and the entire Christian world from disaster and even destruction. If the men who surround you and counsel you have proved to be wrong thus far, and are indeed responsible for the sameful position we now occupy, can you not grant us, as a token of your good intentions, at least a change in your advisory personnel?

The men of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam; the men who guided our Far East affairs into the present debacle; the men who would sacrifice the American Republic to international socialism—are not these men still at your elbow?

The time has run out, Mr. President, and we are at war. Your actions will decide whether we live or perish, and the time is now.

Most respectfully,

P. A. DEL VALLE,
Lieutenant General, United States Marine Corps (Retired).

Rural Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to read an article in the Florence Times, of Florence, Ala., which described how the Farm Housing Act of 1949 increased the food-production possibilities of one of my constituents. It was because my studies on the need for better farm housing showed that there were hundreds of thousands of families such as the Benny Comers described in this article that I first began working for the passage of this act. It was because we knew that such an act could bring the same great improvement in the life and efficiency of many such farm families that men like Senator SPARKMAN and Senator HILL joined me in sponsoring this act.

I would like for all of you to read the story of the Benny Comer family as it was printed in the Times, because to each of you who joined with me in supporting this legislation, it should provide visible proof that the things we do here in Congress are good things:

RURAL HOUSING PROGRAM IS BRIGHTENING FAMILY'S LIFE

(By Bill Cade)

Christmas will be a whole lot brighter in at least one home in Lauderdale County this year, because there are new windows in which to hang wreaths, a new hardwood floor on which to set the traditional Christmas tree, a new and modern kitchen in which to prepare the traditional cakes and cookies and even a new chimney—in fact the whole house is new.

To some, it might seem a little facetious to intone so much enthusiasm into a description of a new home, but this particular home could not be considered ordinary.

But let's start at the beginning, and as this particular story in the Farmers Home Administration series, tell about a family which has already moved into its Government-financed home.

Back in 1947, three short years ago, W. H. "Benny" Comer, his wife, two sons, and daughter, moved onto a 40-acre farm in the Rogersville community, which Mr. Comer had purchased for $6,500.

On this farm the Comers found a smoke-used weather-beaten frame house out of which to make a home. They were anxious to start nourishing the earth to reap its harvests so they moved right into the existing building.

By January of 1950, "Benny" had his original loan on the farm about half paid. He and his wife had worked hard to feed, clothe, and educate their children and save enough money to decrease their indebtedness from $4,500 to $2,500 in that length of time.

They had heard about the relatively new aid to farmers through the Farmers Home Administration. Upon investigation and after talking with authorities on the subject, the Comers discovered that they were eligible for a loan to build a new house.

So on January 16, 1950, application for a $5,000 loan was filed. After due processing, including Government appraisal, the loan was granted in June, 1950.

The house was built under the scrutiny of a construction engineer who supervised the job from its foundation to completion.

After 3 months of anxious waiting the Comers moved into their new home with all the modern conveniences—literally, a few years from their original home, but figuratively, miles away in terms of improved standard of living.

And the repayment of the loan is not working any hardships for this family. The loan runs for a period of 33 years, with 4 percent interest on the unpaid balance. This figures to annual payments of $275.30, including both interest and principal, or $23.95 per month.

Still, the Comers are not satisfied. They yet have a lot of ambition and are anxious to improve their standard of living more and more. So the next target for improvement is their farming land. Mr. Comer plans to develop his farm in order to reap the full benefits from it. And he is considering another type loan which the Government makes especially for those interested in farm improvement.

At present, "Benny" is only a part-time farmer, deriving some of his income from working in a store. In addition to his 35 acres of row crops, he has five acres of pasture on which he raises dairy cattle and produces grade B milk, another source of income.

It is the purpose of the Government, in making its Farmers Home Administration loans, to provide farmers and their families standard housing with modern equipment and design on long-term payments which they can repay without jeopardizing their standard of living.

The "Benny" Comers at Rogersville are one of the several families who think the FHA loans are wonderful. In Mrs. Comer's words concerning their loan—"It's the finest thing that has ever happened. I don't know when we would have been able to build if it had not been for the FHA loan."

With the original house still in plain view from their modern home, the Comers have only to look backward to count their blessings.

Yes, Christmas will be a whole lot brighter for the Comers, and the future does not look so dim itself.

Mr. Speaker, the Times article, of course, described only what happened with one of the many families which have been helped by this legislation. In the 13 months since the first loan under this act was made, there have been a total of 6,982 families like the Comers. These 6,982 families received a total of $30,000,000 in credit. About 2,000 of these families have already completed their construction, like the Comers, and are now living in their new homes. Over 4,000 others are now building, repairing, or remodeling their homes or other farm buildings, and will soon be happy in their own new surroundings. About 500 others have received their loans so recently that they have progressed no farther than the selection of plans or the ordering of materials. Soon, however, they too will have new homes.

But the story does not stop there. We have authorized the loaning of many millions in addition during the next 2 years, and the steady flow of applicants in the Farmers Home Administration offices tell us that this additional loan fund will still be necessary if we want the farmers in our home districts to enjoy healthy, sanitary, efficient-working surroundings. Latest figures from the Farmers Home Administration indicate that they have received over 30,000 applications, so they have actually made loans to less than 20 percent of the families who have asked for this type of assistance.

But that is the national picture. I am far more familiar with what is happening in my own eighth congressional district, where I have some 23,000 farms among my constituency. In this area we have already helped 77 families have better buildings on their farms, and 30 of these are already living in their new quarters. Of the 77, 66 have been for new dwellings, 4 have made major repairs to existing dwellings, and 12 have added necessary buildings other than dwellings. Some of these latter 12 also had repairs or new construction on their homes.

The average loan made to a farmer in the eighth district was only $5,470, somewhat lower than we had anticipated in view of the fact that almost 95 percent of the money went for entirely new construction.

Despite the very evident need for materials and labor to be diverted to war construction, it is equally important that we have the food which this Nation needs to build a strong defense. Our farmers will produce more efficiently if their buildings help maintain the family's health or make their work easier. As we draft more and more men into the military services, we must depend on the womenfolk on our farms to help produce the cotton, wool, meat, grains, and vegetables we need. An efficient kitchen where the farm wife can do her housework quickly and effectively will let her have more time to work in the crops. A new barn on the farm may make it possible for the farmer to add a few more dairy cows or a few more hogs to give us more milk or meat.

How much is it costing the Government to provide this more healthful, more sanitary, more efficient construction, and to make it possible to increase food production for the war effort by providing farmers with the credit they need for new buildings? That average of $5,470 per dwelling is not a cost figure, because this money is loaned the farmers, and most or perhaps all of it will be repaid, plus interest. The program is too young, yet, to have anything too definite as to repayment records; but we have seen enough figures to date to see a definite trend established. In the eighth district, the 77 borrowers—or rather those of them who have scheduled repayments due as yet—have already repaid 103 percent of the matured principal, plus interest. For the whole State of Alabama the record is even better, with 127 percent of matured indebtedness paid. In nearby Georgia the Hubert Herndon family, who received their housing loan just a year ago and were allowed 33 years in which to complete repayments on it, have already repaid their loan in full.

How much is this program worth to America?

I sincerely believe that a farm family will work harder, make more money, and fight to maintain a farm home if—should adversity strike—that farm home is a comfortable and attractive one. If the place is dilapidated and run down, or if it lacks the modern conveniences which

make living worth while in America, the family is more likely to have an "Oh, what is the use?" attitude. They have less reason to desire to farm efficiently, participate in community affairs, or to share their homes with friends.

I also believe the rural church and the rural schools will benefit by this new housing program. Indirectly, perhaps, but the church or the school is no better than the component individuals who make up its congregation or assembly. The child will take more interest in its studies and do a better job of preparing its homework where there is a good lighting system in the home. There will be less chance to pass disease from one scholar to another if the sources of some of these diseases are wiped out by home improvements. There will be a better comradeship among the pupils if the child feels he can bring his companions home to also enjoy the modern conveniences. And the church, depending as it does upon contributions from persons who attend, will find that with the prosperity of a new home or more efficient farming buildings, the farmer can come to church more regularly and contribute more to its upkeep.

In the 4-year program set up by the Housing Act of 1949, a total of $275,000,000 was authorized for rural-housing loans, and this would make it possible for an estimated 140,000 farm families to have more adequate housing than in the past. With half the Nation's farm population in the South, and with the housing problems more acute in the South than elsewhere in the Nation, it is estimated that somewhere near 75,000 southern farm families will have better housing under this program within the next 4 years. A thousand or more of these probably will be in north Alabama.

Cautious Optimism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, nearly every thoughtful person who is unbiased in the matter now feels that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should be built. Our national defense would be greatly strengthened and if it is put on a self-liquidating basis it would eventually through the years pay for itself many times over. Mr. Charles E. Wilson's statement on the matter is heartening. The following is an editorial from the Watertown Daily Times, of Watertown, N. Y., whose editors have given thoughtful study over the years to this whole matter:

CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM

This newspaper's attitude concerning the chances of the St. Lawrence seaway proposal in the new Congress can best be described as one of cautious optimism. We do not believe that last fall's election greatly altered the line-up of proponents and opponents. On the other hand, we discern two factors that tend to improve the outlook for the legislation. The question is: Will these factors carry sufficient weight to convert a sufficient number of opponents?

No. 1 of these two factors is the evidence that President Truman really intends to make the seaway bill a piece of "must" legislation. Up to this year, like his predecessors, he was satisfied to recommend the project in his annual state of the Union messages and there let the matter rest. In 1951 he has not only appealed again to Congress to pass the bill, but he indicates that he proposes to go all out in its behalf. The dispatch Monday that Mr. Truman is considering a meeting with the opposition in an effort to break down resistance to the project is a case in point.

The other factor is, of course, the defense angle. There is no doubt that the St. Lawrence project can make a vast contribution to this program. No one can deny that we will need tremendous new sources of power, and there are few who will not concede that the proposed St. Lawrence canals will open up an avenue to new sources of iron ore. And, as we have noted before, if electric power and iron ore are not needed in mobilizing for defense, we would like to know what is.

We regard the change of attitude of Charles E. Wilson, the mobilization chief, as of great significance. As recently as December, this former president of General Electric was saying that there was no great urgency for constructing the seaway. Now, 2 months after taking the defense job, he is all for starting construction immediately.

No one can convince us that a tough-minded, practical man like Charles Wilson changed his views for some light or transient cause. No one can tell us he was motivated by politics. He wants the seaway started now because, and only because, he thinks it will contribute to the work he has been assigned to accomplish—namely, the building up of the Nation's defenses.

Let those who have opposed the seaway on political or sectional grounds follow Mr. Wilson's example.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *February 6, 1951.*

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,

Thirty-seventh Congressional District.

DEAR ED: I have just mailed a very important letter to Gov. Thomas Dewey in regard to the possible reapportionment of our district.

I have conveyed to him that if such a deal is to be made now is the time to bring it to the people of our district. In doing so it would enable you to put forth your platform and also to get acquainted with the people of the county or counties.

Jack Gordon, myself, and my dad attended a Townsend meeting on the first of February and Mr. Gordon spoke of the wonderful trip to Washington and so forth. Personally I would like to see you in office for 100 years and I sincerely believe that when next election comes around you will win again.

It is true that the Republican Party is not in power now but I think if we fight long and hard enough we are sure to come out victorious and then perhaps things will be done right.

I need not go into anything lengthy to tell you. I am a stanch supporter of your platform and have always been.

In closing I hope this finds you and your family in the best of health. I beg to remain.

Very respectfully yours,

ROBERT E. STEWART, Jr.

P. S.—My dad sends his kindest regards and personal success to you in the future.

Anniversary of the Battle of Trenton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Trentonian, of Trenton, N. J., entitled "Anniversary of the Battle of Trenton." On February 21, a joint celebration will be held in honor of this historical event and the occasion of Mayor Connolly's birthday. Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin and I will be on hand representing the Federal Government. The editorial follows:

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF TRENTON

(By Dr. R. R. Robinson)

No city in the world can surpass in importance the significance of the history of Trenton. It was perhaps only a coincidence that the beginnings of the modern age for mankind occurred here. After a long series of disheartening battles and retreats, Gen. George Washington led his army across the Delaware and won the first victory of his career, the Battle of Trenton, 175 years ago. Seven days later he destroyed five times as many British troops in the second Battle of Trenton.

FIRST SUCCESSFUL TRY AT FREEDOM

It must be remembered that the Revolutionary War was the first successful attempt in the history of the world to establish freedom for all its people. As a direct result of the events which happened in Trenton, we have been able to establish a democracy which recognizes and attempts to provide that all men must have as a God-given right an equal freedom of opportunity.

One of the coincidences in the history of Trenton is that our country's first President was elected here, when the Continental Congress elected Col. Richard Henry Lee to be its leader. Colonel Lee made the original motion in Congress for declaring the States of America independent.

Before the Colonies declared themselves independent of Great Britain, the Provincial Congress of New Jersey, with Samuel Tucker, of Trenton, as its president, declared itself an isolated colony independent of any royal sovereign. We were a separate little group of people proudly declaring that the greatest empire in the world could no longer claim ownership of our little colony of New Jersey.

Thirteen years later, General Washington returned to Trenton on his way to his inauguration in New York. He was received in a celebration which has been preserved in a gigantic oil painting, The White-Robed Choir, by Thomas P. Rossiter.

SEEK TO PRESERVE TRADITIONS

Mayor Doval J. Connolly and the citizens' committee want to preserve and revive the traditions in which we can take such pride. When the Alice Bartlett Hunt Foundation presented to Trenton this long-lost oil painting, it was thought to be a marvelous opportunity to assemble the citizens and celebrate the occasion, on the eve of Washington's Birthday. The fact that Trenton's own Josiah Bartlett, an ancestor of the donor of the painting, was an original signer of the Declaration of Independence, makes the ceremony even more significant.

To make this occasion a memorable one in the history of our community, Maurice J. Tobin, United States Secretary of Labor, has volunteered to represent our Nation's capital at the presentation of the painting to the community. It is certainly fitting that the guest of honor should be the Cabinet representative of labor, indicating the progress the average man has made since the old days of subjugation of citizens and the enslaving of large minorities of our population. In our democracy all people have a voice, and we are grateful to Mr. Tobin for personifying that spirit and our progress.

The fact that Trenton was for some time the capital of the United States is apparently a fact that we have made little of in our history. President Adams moved his Cabinet to Trenton and conducted the Nation's business from the Phoenix Hotel on the corner of Hanover and Warren Streets. Of course, it was only by accident that Trenton was not selected as the permanent site of the capital of our country. Ironically enough, it was only the opposition of General Washington that prevented Trenton from being selected.

MAGNANIMOUS CEREMONIES PLANNED

Mayor Connolly's citizens committee desires to join with all the people in making the evening of February 21 a memorable occasion. It would be highly desirable to have Mr. Tobin repeat the Marquis de Lafayette's remark about Trenton: "I have never seen the States so handsomely represented." Lafayette visited Trenton on three different occasions to meet Joseph Bonaparte.

The ceremony which has been arranged will begin with a dinner at the Stacy-Trent. As part of the entertainment the original ode written by Gov. Richard Howell for Washington's visit will be sung. The white-robed choir which greeted General Washington will be reproduced, singing the songs which Washington and Lafayette both remarked have made such impressions as will never be effaced.

As in the past, the money raised by activities sponsored by the mayor's citizens committee will be used for juvenile welfare. It is planned to present Mayor Connolly with a check which shall be used solely for the purpose of sending 300 children to camp this summer.

The agencies which work with our young people will be asked to select children of all groups. Without any embarrassing publicity for them, the children will be sent away quietly to enjoy camping life under much different circumstances than those under which General Washington and his men camped at Valley Forge.

Lespedeza Was Good News From Korea Back in 1922

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the January issue of the Missouri Farmer, entitled "Lespedeza Was Good News From Korea Back in 1922":

LESPEDEZA WAS GOOD NEWS FROM KOREA BACK IN 1922

From a thimbleful of seed planted at the Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station in 1922 by Dr. W. C. Etheridge, a hundred million dollar crop revenue has resulted for Missouri from Korean lespedeza. Dramatic instances have happened before, but none more so for Missouri agriculture than the story of the expansion in acreage of lespedeza on farms over the State.

In 1921, a specimen of this wonderful weed seed was obtained in Korea by a party who sent it to the United States Department of Agriculture Bureau of Plant Industry. This sample of strange seed was first sown at the United States Department of Agricultural Experiment Station at Arlington, Va. It grew and reproduced seed abundantly, which is the prime essential of any forage crop. But still little was known of this squatty legume, which was considered as a weed in Korea.

When this fabulous thimbleful of seed was planted in the spring by Dr. Etheridge it made lush growth during the summer months of 1922. Of course, this caused a quickened interest by all concerned, but experimentation was only in the process of beginning. The matured vines were pulled up in late October, and the precious seed was threshed in a miniature threshing machine. About a pint or so of the seed was recovered, and this was saved with growing hope.

PLANTED IN 1923

In the spring of 1923 all of this seed was planted. It was noted on last year's acreage extensive volunteer growth of this annual plant was present, thus proving the ability of "natural reseeding." Then there was discovered an enormous number of bacteria nodules on the last year's root systems. Ordinarily, seed of other legumes must be inoculated, but here was a legume that quickly associated itself with nitrogen-fixing bacteria. This was called natural inoculation, and another spoke was added to the rapidly turning wheel of Korean lespedeza.

A sharp May frost in 1924 was fatal to the clovers and it damaged the lespedeza stand, but it came back to grow on with vigor through the hot summer months. Here was a pasture crop that would stand late spring frosts and withstand the hot dry months which ordinarily checked the growth of all other pasture crops. In 1924 a mixture of lespedeza with oats was sown to see if the two crops had an affinity. The oats were harvested for their grain and the lespedeza was cut for hay. Experiments proved that the protein content was practically the same as alfalfa and that stock liked this little legume and there was very little stemmy waste to the hay.

A SIMPLE EXPERIMENT

In 1925 a quarter of an acre was sown to lespedeza and two thin yearling heifers were borrowed from the animal husbandry department. It was not known at this time if in its growing state that the plant might be poisonous to animals. The plot was fenced off, pipes were laid to furnish water, and the two heifers were weighed in. Tremendous gains were achieved, proving that as summer pasturage lespedeza surpassed all other crops grown in Missouri.

Five-pound lots of seed were sent in 1927 to some 60 farmers throughout the State. Questionnaires were provided with the sample lots, so that a fairly representative account could be made of the practicability of this legume in various sections of the State. It is needless to say that the reports were more than satisfying. From that date until now, lespedeza has spread like a tidal wave all over Missouri. Now it is being grown on 10,000,000 acres of farm land, either double-cropped or in single stands. This is twice the acreage of all corn grown, and twice the combined acreage of all wheat, oats, rye, and barley being grown in the State. Estimating at a very conservative rate of $10 return profit from each acre of lespedeza grown, it can be ascertained that a hundred million dollar business has resulted from this chance planting in 1922.

HERE'S WHAT IT'LL DO

To briefly sum up the attributes of lespedeza: It will grow on medium to poor soil, but will respond to fertile soil and soil treatments as well as any other crop; will provide excellent grazing during the summer months of July, August, September, and the first half of October, when no other pasturage will grow and produce equal feed value. It will reseed itself naturally, and will fit in nicely with crop rotation methods advocated in any balanced farming program. There are many other assets of lespedeza which are of equal importance, but which must be adapted to the individual farmer's needs.

The first bad drought in recent years was in 1952. At this time, approximately five or six thousand acres of lespedeza was in stands in Missouri. This drought proved the real worth of lespedeza on a large scale as a dry-weather plant. Then, there were the droughts of 1954 and 1955, but by this time lespedeza had become an institution rather than an experimentation.

SEEDS INDUSTRY

Since 1946 there has been a downward trend in acres established to lespedeza. A peak acreage of 10,722,449 acres was reached in 1946 and the 1949 acreage was 10,130,455. This shift in land utilization has come about through the increased popularity of other legumes such as ladino, birdsfoot trefoil, hairy vetch and increased acreage of land seeded to alfalfa and red clover.

But, with the ever-increasing menace of soil erosion, lespedeza will become a more vital asset to Missouri hill farmers. There is easily room for 10,000,000 more acres of this legume in the State. Land which now is practically wasteland due to erosion and poor crop management, could well be seeded to lespedeza as the first step in rehabilitating the land. It alone cannot restore the soil fertility which has been mined and leached from the soil, but should be used as a link between other crops and soil treatment.

The Treasury-Federal Reserve Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a thoughtful discussion by Mr. Aubrey G. Lanston, president of Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., of the Treasury-Federal Reserve Board dispute over the management of the public debt.

I have previously expressed the belief, as well as the hope, which I now repeat, that an area of agreement can be reached. In that connection I wish to point out the fact that a higher interest

rate on long-term securities is not the only method by which the Federal Reserve Board can protect its open market committee. In exercising its control over national banks the Federal Reserve Board has the power to distinguish between risk loans and normally sound loans. It also has the power to ask Congress to increase its power over reserve requirements and as a temporary war emergency measure extend that power to all banks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TREASURY-FEDERAL RESERVE DISPUTE

I would like to talk to you this morning about the differing convictions of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, because these involve questions of policy that are of great importance to our economy and, therefore, to you as bankers. Public opinion is being brought to bear on the impasse that exists, and it is being marshalled through statements that oversimplify the point at issue. It would be unfortunate, as we see it, if too many people accepted the thought that, if the Federal Reserve were freed of its compulsion to buy Treasury securities at fixed prices, the Federal could necessarily exercise a deflationary influence. Nor should we accept the generality that preys upon our love for tradition, namely, that the Federal Reserve was created as a supreme court of finance and that it would be a sacrilege if it were interfered with in any way.

Let me tell you at the outset where we stand on these matters. We believe it is most desirable that the Federal become more free than it has been in the past decade to follow a restrictive credit policy at times when this is needed. We agree with those who say that Treasury domination of Federal Reserve credit policy is dangerous. We do not go along, however, with the sophomoric contention that the Federal Reserve should be omnipotent or that it should be free to assume an attitude that might be described as "the Treasury be damned." There is much appeal in the thought advanced by Mr. Russell Leffingwell that the Treasury and the Federal Reserve be equal partners. On such a plane each can act to restrain the other or to goad the other as the case may be.

The question of domination or partnership is important largely as a matter of who holds the final say. The real problem involves many technical phases of debt and credit management and the need for a continuing understanding of investor psychology. Perhaps the outstanding problem in the technical field is whether 2½ percent Treasury bonds need be supported forever at par or better. We have long been of the firm belief that par support should not be a permanent practice. At the same time we are equally firm in our belief that we cannot depart from such a practice overnight, particularly in an atmosphere of contention between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. We also believe that if the two partners in money and debt management are so far apart in their convictions that agreement can be reached only by literally hitting one of the two of them over the head, the public cannot be blamed if it loses confidence in both, and in the dollar, and in Treasury securities.

We are inclined to place a great deal of weight on the importance of the state of mind of the investor and on the degree in which this must be considered in the management of both debt and credit.

The open-market operation is the principal instrument with which the Federal may affect the amount, availability, and cost of money. We know quite well how readily the Federal can expand the amount and can increase the availability of credit by the purchase of securities in the market.

We believe that some misconception exists as to the ability of the Federal to contract credit by the sale of Treasury securities. Success in this regard depends upon the Treasury's cash position. If the Treasury is operating with a substantial cash surplus, the Federal can contract reserve credit by selling securities in the market or by redeeming obligations as they mature.

If the Treasury does not have a cash surplus, attempts by the Federal to sell in the market cannot contract credit against the will of the market and may only expand the amount of credit in use.

At the present time the Treasury faces a deficit, and the prospect of the Treasury attaining a surplus seems remote. Therefore, in future open-market operations the Federal will be unable to contract credit to any appreciable extent by sales of Treasury securities on balance.

Perhaps this is why we are confronted with the demand that the Federal Reserve be restored to the independence conceived for it 37 years ago. Such independence would permit of an attempt to reduce the inflation problem by denying credit to the market, with the obvious result that a sharp upward trend in interest rates would follow. In the meanwhile the Federal Reserve creates, on occasion, a situation where there is no market for Treasury securities.

This brings us to the second phase of open-market operation, namely, the techniques employed by the Federal that would produce a trend toward higher interest rates. One can be certain that if the Federal were free to precipitate, directly or indirectly, a sharp upward trend in interest rates and if it were determined to use this mechanism to the necessary extent, it could stop the present inflation spiral. But once this had been accomplished, or during the process, another series of chain reactions would be started, such that the resultant inflation potential would cause our present problem to be dwarfted by comparison.

The February National City Bank letter offered a comment that was of great interest to us in this connection. It was directed primarily to the defense effort, but it applies equally to those phases of credit and debt management that have precipitated the Federal-Treasury dispute. The National City Bank noted that during most of the time since Korea, people have been uncertain as to the extent of the requirements of defense and what was expected of them. The bank went on to say that little authentic information had been available on the size of the defense program, and it admitted that, although such uncertainties may have been unavoidable, the lack of a firm basis for calculations left the way open for uninformed opinions, speculation, and extreme statements both public and private. The comment closed with the following quotation, "Undoubtedly there has been inflation by publicity, which has fostered a contagious state of alarm and scare buying."

We believe that the drawn-out public discussion over the clash between a fixed interest rate and credit control, a discussion in which Federal Reserve officials have taken a long lead, has contributed importantly to the expansion of bank credit.

How much weight should be given by the Federal to the impact of its credit policies on holders of Treasury securities such as businesses and individuals? For an idea we might turn to an estimate of the so-called inflationary gap that was recently made by a noted Federal Reserve economist. He said that the gap during the next year could be as much as $20,000,000,000 and will stem from a contraction of $10,000,000,000 in the goods available for civilian purchase and an increase of a like amount in consumer and business income. He cautions that the estimate is premised on (1) no further price or wage increases, (2) no substantial credit expansion, (3) no further tax increases, and (4) a consideration of particular potency to our discussion; namely, no large use of available liquid assets. He then points out that individuals and businesses hold $176,000,000,000 of bank deposits and currency and $90,000,000,000 of Treasury securities, a large part of which are redeemable on demand or have short maturities. The total is $266,000,000,000. The question, therefore, is whether attempts by the Federal to reduce the size of the inflation gap will suggest that some portion of the $90,000,000,000 of these Treasury securities be sold or whether such investors thereby will be encouraged to increase their holdings.

The Federal Reserve, as a special guardian of the purchasing power of the dollar, also must keep in mind that some $100,000,000,000 of Treasury securities rest in the portfolios of commercial banks, savings banks, insurance companies, and the like, and that such investors hold additional billions of other marketable securities, the value of which would be affected, along with their Treasury securities, should a sharply increasing trend in interest rates occur.

Managers of these portfolios, such as yourselves, are concerned with the decreasing purchasing power of the dollar, but you also take into consideration in the management of your portfolio the dollar prices that your security investments command in the market. Many of the decisions that you make with respect to the purchase, sale, or retention of these securities are based upon changes in market values. Collectively these decisions of yours, influenced as they must be by the Federal Reserve's policies, will bear importantly on whether individuals and businesses prefer to acquire additional securities or are inspired to bring their liquid assets into play in a manner that will heighten our inflation.

Thus the Federal Reserve is quite correct in saying that it must protect the purchasing power of the dollar, but the Treasury is also on sound ground when it says that investor confidence in Treasury securities should not be impaired by unexpected sharp fluctuations in the dollar prices of its securities. These two statements are the crux of the dispute.

Now let us digress for a moment in order to examine the weight that should be given to the Board's contention that it has a responsibility for credit that it is not able to discharge. There is nothing new about this. The Federal Reserve was charged just as fully in this connection 9 years ago as it is today. Yet 9 years ago, as a consequence of the war emergency, the Federal Reserve agreed to underwrite a pattern of rates for Treasury wartime financing. The Federal Reserve had no option because the Treasury faced an unprecedented deficit, the money had to be raised, and there was nothing else to do.

Since the Treasury again faces a deficit, is there any better way to resolve matters than to bring about an agreement between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve in the technical area of interest rates and support techniques?

Nine years ago when the Federal accepted the responsibility of protecting the prices of Treasury securities, the Secretary of the Treasury would have accepted a support price that was fractionally below par. When I say this I am not making an assumption. The choice of par, as a precise figure, was made by the Federal, and with the passage of time most Treasury security investors have come to believe that whenever "the cards were down," neither the Treasury nor the Federal would elect to drop the support price of the 2½ percent bonds below that figure.

Indeed, you will recall that by the time we had to face up to the inflationary problems of 1947 and 1948 a leading official of the Federal proclaimed that failure to support Treasury 2½ percent bonds at par would lead to a catastrophic condition. We repeat that we firmly believe that we need to get away from par support, and we believe that a program should have been and could have been worked out long before this. A period of national emergency and of bitter dispute between the Treasury and the Federal, however, is not a propitious moment to engage in drastic changes or to withdraw support.

Furthermore, if the reasons for supporting outstanding Treasury bonds were compelling in 1948, how do we justify ignoring similar reasons today?

The Federal has lived with its conscience for 9 years. Why must it suddenly choose a war emergency and a period when the Treasury faces a deficit of unknown size to suggest that it be free to act independently?

Indeed the differences between the type of inflation that we face today and that with which we were confronted in 1947 and 1948 should leave the Federal Reserve with less rather than more reason to have precipitated these questions. During 1947 and 1948 the inflationary problem arose primarily from activity in the private economy, at a time when the Treasury had a substantial cash surplus. The present inflation has been enlarged by the prospect of controls, of shortages, and of an undefined but large defense program.

Some portion of the plant and equipment expansion necessary to the defense program is yet to be met. The money needed from outside sources must come largely from either the insurance companies or the commercial banks. At the present time great emphasis is being placed on the expansion of bank credit. Few seem to realize that under existing conditions loans granted by banks are less inflationary than the extension of an equal amount of credit by insurance companies.

Now, the Treasury security and other bond markets have remained relatively calm throughout this drawn-out Federal Reserve-Treasury dispute and its accompanying publicity. This calm is the result of a general confidence that the Treasury long-term rate of 2½ percent will stand, and so will per support for outstanding long-term bonds. In other words the rank and file of investors do not believe that the Federal will be or will feel free, in the final analysis, to unstabilize the Treasury security market by decreasing the support prices or by withdrawing support.

My first question, therefore, is as follows: If against the contentious background of recent months, the Federal reduced its support price for Victory 2½'s to 100 and, at the same time, became a more-than-usually reluctant buyer of short-term Treasury securities, would investors continue to be calm or would their confidence be somewhat shaken?

Second, would a drop in the support price of 2½ percent bonds to 100 or an increasing denial of a market to some holders of Treasury securities produce an increased volume of precautionary sales?

Third, if the Federal Reserve were to drop the support price to 99½ or 99, how confident would institutional investors be that such support prices would hold?

If the Federal breaks par in support of Treasury bonds, will this be deemed, by investors, to be evidence that it has adopted a program of retreat to successively lower prices depending upon the volume of bonds offered to it?

If, to make its credit less readily available, the Federal decided to let the market decline to whatever point was necessary to dry up selling, how far would prices have to decline? Does anyone know? Can we afford to act on optimistic guesses?

Now let's go to the other side of these things. Let us assume that, to reduce the availability of credit, the Federal Reserve drops its support prices sufficiently low that it ultimately dries up any substantial selling. How many institutional investors would become buyers of Treasury securities?

We are asked to believe that more Treasury securities can be placed if the interest rate offered on them is made more attractive. When bond prices decline interest rates become more attractive, but I have never seen a bond market that was undergoing a major decline that could be characterized as a confident one. If the bond market is caused to decline sharply while institutional investors are net sellers on balance, where are the additional buyers of these bonds going to come from?

We believe that the important consideration is not whether interest rates become more attractive or whether a higher level of rates is brought about. It is the trend of rates that is important. As bankers, you may agree that there is a tendency to feel more "loaned-up" when the outlook is for higher rates of interest than is the case if the outlook is for lower ones. The same thing is true with respect to bond buyers. A given rate is unattractive if the trend of the market is down, but the same rate can appear attractive if the price trend is stable or rising.

Please do not misunderstand. We are not an advocate of low interest rates. We would have much preferred a Treasury decision calling for a long-term 2¾-percent bond or a long-term 2½-percent bond at a discount to yield 2.70 percent or 2.75 percent. Both of these would have been possible without disturbing the stability of outstanding bonds if the Treasury and the Federal had evidenced an ability to resolve their differences.

We have been told that market conditions have clearly shown that the Treasury has insisted upon interest rates that are too low. In justification, our attention is called to the natural forces of supply and demand as they appear in the market and to the amount of Treasury securities that the Federal has been forced to acquire. The market for Treasury securities during the past year has been made almost entirely by the Federal Reserve, and the market has looked, most of the time, the way the Federal open-market operations caused it to look.

Let me illustrate this by comparing two financings a year apart. First, we will go back to November 1949. When the Treasury and the Federal Reserve were discussing the terms to be set on the approaching refunding of that period the market "looked" as though a 1⅛ percent rate were no longer suitable. The Treasury, nevertheless, decided to continue with a 1⅛-percent 1-year rate. It also offered a 1⅜-percent note with a 4¼-year term. This note quickly reached a premium of eleven thirty-seconds above 100. Why? Because investors took the financing decision of the Treasury as an indication that the Federal had lost the fight to advance the pattern toward higher yields. Both offerings were an outstanding success.

During the months following the Federal showed by its handling of the open market that it had not given up the fight. Even when the Treasury in the spring of last year acceded to somewhat higher interest rates for shorter-term securities, the Federal appeared to be dissatisfied. At least, that is the impression gained by close observers, an impression that was more than fully justified by the open break that occurred in August of last year.

Let us now consider the latest refunding in which the offering consisted of a single issue of 5-year 1¾-percent notes. The terms set by the Secretary of the Treasury were those recommended by the Federal Reserve, ones that were later characterized by the Federal as appropriate and attractive. Most market observers, and we believe the Treasury as well, were skeptical of the appropriateness and the attractiveness of a 5-year obligation for corporations who were large holders of the maturing securities. But there are grounds for believing that the Federal assured the Treasury that this refunding would be a success.

What is the record? Only about 52 percent of the public holdings of the maturing securities were exchanged for the new issue and held throughout the exchange period. The remaining 48 percent of the public holdings were sold to the Federal or redeemed for cash. This hardly could be construed as a successful exchange from the point of view of the sound objectives of debt management.

About 15 percent of the public holdings were redeemed for cash. This compares with a 21 percent cash redemption last September and October and with the more normal cash redemptions of 5 percent or less. The drain on the Treasury's balance resulting from these two refundings was $3,500,000,000.

The differences between the successful refunding of November 1949 and the unsuccessful exchange offering made in November 1950 are twofold. In the first place, it is a testimony to the deterioration in investor confidence that has been brought about by the public wrangling over differences. Second, it suggests that the Treasury is a better judge of the type of securities that investors will buy than is the Federal.

This brings to mind something that has occurred to us with increasing frequency over recent months. We have wondered whether the Governors of the Board and the other members of the Open Market Committee could possibly be too far removed from an intimate contact with the Treasury security market, that is, from the changing states of mind, the preferences, and the reactions of those whose activities create the supply and demand with which the Federal open-market operation must contend. These are details of great importance when it becomes necessary to refine the terms of Treasury offerings. We also have wondered whether an adequate exchange of technical information takes place between the Treasury and the Federal. We have wondered about these things, because if such situations were to exist they would explain why some of the misunderstandings arise.

But let us get back to more tangible things. The apparent calmness of institutional investors will be put to a full test when the Treasury begins to refund almost $40,000,000,000 of maturing or callable securities. The bulk of these refunding covers a span hardly longer than 4 months and begins this June.

Were the Treasury to experience the same percentage of cash redemptions that it suffered in the last refunding, it would have to pay out about $6,000,000,000. No wonder the Secretary of the Treasury believes a stable and confident Treasury security market is a prerequisite to financial mobilization.

If, therefore, the Federal Reserve were to endeavor to make credit unavailable by reducing support or by withdrawing it, what would be the attitude of holders of the maturing and callable Treasury securities?

Many have substantial forward commitments in mortgages and the like. A larger number would be offered good loans at rates substantially higher than those now prevailing. Some of those loans will be necessary to the defense program.

Would investors accept the refunding offerings to be made by the Treasury?

Or would they deem it prudent to redeem their securities in order to meet their commitments or to make loans?

If, in the final analysis, the Treasury met with no greater success in these financings than in those just past, would potential buyers of long-term Treasury bonds gain or lose in confidence?

And, wholly aside from the Treasury's cash position, if it must meet large-scale cash redemptions, from whom will it obtain funds? From the Federal Reserve banks? Or from the commercial banks?

In either event it would appear that banks as a whole might be forced to cope with some more or less unworkable plan such as a secondary reserve requirement, a ceiling reserve plan, higher cash reserves, or they may be told to accept Treasury certificates of deposit bearing interest at some rate, such as one-fourth percent. Yet none of these devices will insure an improvement in the credit condition over what it can be if debt management is permitted to work in our favor instead of against us.

This is not a question of interest costs. Surely many would prefer higher rates, but the determining element in the equation is the maintenance of investor confidence. This requires a stable and confident Treasury security market and confidence among Treasury-security investors that they will not be subjected to some abrupt manipulation of the market, by either the Federal Reserve or the Treasury.

It seems to us important that the attitude of the institutional investor toward the market for Treasury securities may determine the confidence that business corporations and individuals have in these same securities. To parlay the reduction in the value of the dollar by decreasing the dollar price of Treasury securities abruptly may be the worst way to deal with inflation.

In summation we suggest that the differences between the Federal and the Treasury involve questions of policy that are most important to the economy and to you. It is dangerous to accept oversimplifications, either of principle or of the technical aspects of the points at issue. Federal Reserve open-market operations designed to reduce the availability of credit cannot do so on a quantitative basis except as the Treasury is armed with a substantial cash surplus. The Treasury will soon be operating at a deficit. A substantial cash surplus is hardly a possibility. To reduce the support rendered to Treasury securities, against the present contentious background, or without warning, would be most dangerous. The withdrawal of support would be intolerable. Yet, we need to plan for its ultimate elimination. Of greater importance than an increase in interest rates, is the trend of rates. But, this is no time to attempt to control credit by starting a trend to higher rates. To do so would multiply not reduce the inflation potential. Neither the Federal nor the Treasury should be omnipotent or dominant. Each should consider itself to be an equal partner charged with responsibilities of equal weight.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article appearing in the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1951:

UMT CAN BUILD IKE'S WALL FOR PEACE

(By James B. Conant)

(Following is a digest of a radio address delivered last Wednesday night under auspices of the Committee on the Present Danger.)

The United States is in danger. Few would be inclined to question this simple statement. The danger is clearly of a military nature. On this much we can all agree.

But as to the exact nature of the danger which confronts us, there is far from being complete agreement among the citizens of this Republic. Nor are we by any means of one mind as to how we should mobilize the young men of the Nation. Indeed, some few question even the need for an army of the size announced.

Now, if we are going to ask the youth of the country to serve two years in the Armed Forces—as I believe we must—each one of us who supports this program must be prepared to answer one question—why?

Why must we look forward to a period of austerity, of partial mobilization, of more weapons for war, fewer tools for peace?

The answer to these questions seem to me to be summed up in General Eisenhower's recent statement that we must "build a secure wall for peace."

Within less than 18 months, the free world has been confronted with two highly unpleasant facts. First, the Soviet military power is beginning to mount in terms of the most modern type of warfare—the United States monopoly of the atomic bomb has ended; second, the Soviet allies, at least, have shown a readiness to gain their ends by force of arms.

Place these facts against the background of the postwar military situation on the European Continent and you can see the outlines of the present danger.

If Russia tomorrow should move its troops toward the Atlantic Ocean, European territory would be conquered but the Russian industrial centers would be destroyed from the air. As long as the United States strategic Air Force is in this commanding position, the danger of Russian troops marching to the channel is relatively slight.

But as the years go by, the deterrent power of strategic bombing will meet an ever-mounting counterthreat—a threat to the industrial centers of Britain and the United States, to the continental cities themselves. The Russians are building up their offensive strength and doubtless likewise their own defenses against strategic bombing.

Therefore the danger of a third global war, I am convinced, turns on the fact that a few years hence the handful of men who rule Russia may decide that the power of our strategic Air Force has been largely canceled out. If at that time Europe is defenseless on the ground, the Russian hordes will begin to move.

Strengthening the defense of Europe in terms not of a deterrent threat against Russian cities but in terms of armies to stop an advance—this seems to me the top item on the agenda of the free nations of the world. Only then can we achieve a true global stalemate.

What is required of the United States, if we are to play our part in building this wall of security? Clearly, the rapid production of arms and military equipment—and on this we are well embarked. But we must also be in a position to furnish men.

General Eisenhower says that we must be prepared to stand by in a partially mobilized state for a long period of years. To this end, we must have a system of universal military service.

Congress has before it a universal military service bill. This measure needs to be understood by the American public, for there is much confusion as to what is in fact involved.

In the first place, we are not talking about the type of legislation which would be needed to mobilize the manpower of the country on a total basis if we became engaged in a global war. That is another subject. I am discussing, rather, partial mobilization for a long, drawn-out period of international stress and strain. I am discussing the method of maintaining over many years three and a half to four million men in our Armed Forces.

What the situation requires is a universal military service act which will call into the Armed Forces all able-bodied young men when they graduate from high school or reach 18, whichever is later. This is a vital point in the argument; this is the essence of the bill which must not be destroyed by amendment.

Those of us who support the bill believe that the interruption of a young man's education should be before college, not during college, and, for those who go direct from high school to a job, before starting in an occupation. After they have completed the 27 months of military service, these young men will be ready to enter college or go to work. The problems which bedeviled us in World War II in regard to deferring special types of students or essential men in industry will be eliminated if military service is performed between the ages of 18 and 20.

To my mind, it is quite clear that a man's military service had best be done before he enters the productive life of the country or before he begins his collegiate or professional education.

On this point, we have the testimony of Dr. William C. Menninger, who was chief psychiatrist of the Army in World War II.

"From the point of view of the mental health of our young men," Dr. Menninger said, "a program of universal military service and training is far more practical than our present system of selective service. The present system engenders hostility in the man who is selected because he must carry an unfair share of the burden. Because it is selective, it tends to stimulate men to seek deferment on whatever grounds they may be able to plead.

"With our present system a man of draft-eligible age lives in uncertainty from mail to mail. The result is great unrest in our youth of this age, not only in colleges but in industry and business.

"A system which begins at a definite age, which distributes equally the responsibility and privileges among all youth, and which runs for a definite length of service, is far superior, from any mental health point of view, to our present indefinite and discriminatory system under the selective service law."

There is one obvious difficulty in a scheme of universal service between 18 and 20. How is one to provide from each age group the required number of officers and specialists? I have become persuaded, contrary to my first opinion, that in order to accomplish the training of officers and specialists, a small fraction of each age group should be selected after basic training by a civilian board and sent to the colleges for specialized education. This feedback proposal is in the bill now before Congress. It meets the objections that many educators first raised to a universal military service program.

Some scientists have been disturbed lest the passage of this bill strike a serious blow at the national defense by interfering with the continuous flow of trained men. I venture to think they are mistaken, and call as an expert witness Dr. Vannevar Bush, who headed all our scientific work during the last war.

Dr. Bush appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee to urge the passage of this universal military service and training bill, and this is what he said:

"We shall call all young men at 18 without exception, adjusting standards to defer only those who cannot be used somewhere in the widely varied efforts of the Military Establishment. Once the system is in full operation, the process of choice of men to receive advanced training to become officers or to develop new weapons, to maintain our public health, or to perform other professional duties should be on a secure basis of fair competition.

"There will be adjustments needed in a transition period, for it would be absurd to denude our laboratories just when we need them most, and it would be short-sighted to deny to industry the engineers it must have to build new weapons in adequate quantities in the next year or two.

"But when the system is in full operation, every youth on reaching 18 should expect to get into the service of his country, with his subsequent advancement and the nature of his assignments during the entire age period until he emerges from the Reserves and goes his own way determined by competitive tests and the judgment of fair men."

Let me emphasize the distinction between universal service and selective service, for this point is often misunderstood. The bill before Congress is a real universal military service bill and not merely an extension of the Selective Service Act to include 18-year-olds. The power given the President to call up men by age groups and the establishment of a large Reserve are the distinguishing features.

When the call goes out for an age group, the draft boards will make no deferments in this group on grounds of occupation or dependencies. When the program becomes fully operative, the services could count on at least 700,000 to 750,000 men from each age group, and another 100,000 for limited service by lowering the present physical and mental standards for induction.

In addition to providing a force in being, the continual flow into the Armed Forces of those who reach 18 and their release after about 2 years will provide over the years a pool of trained manpower—a large body of men in Reserve status. I believe this to be imperative. The danger of an all-out war is so serious that all our young men must have military training for their own protection as well as for the protection of their country.

The present selective-service law expires in June. Clearly, before that date Congress must act on the bill that is now before it. But one may hope that the matter may be settled in the coming weeks. Until it is settled how we are to recruit our armies, there will be a feeling of uncertainty and confusion in many families throughout the land.

I suppose all of us who are urging the rapid rearmament of the United States would agree that there is nothing we like about the whole business. Universal military service is a bitter pill to swallow, and I for one have come most reluctantly to support such a program. But the desperate need to build up our military strength cannot be denied.

Many of us remember with what shock we read of the fall of France in 1940 and with what fear we awaited the outcome of the battle of Britain. Our military men, we now know, were full of apprehension as to what would be the consequences to the United States of the loss of the British Isles. The margin of victory then was narrow enough, we all recall. But with the weapons of the 1950's, an enemy in control of the Channel ports would be far more dangerous, perhaps impossible to stop.

In short, while the defense of Europe is essential for the survival of Europe, it is just as essential for the survival of a free United States.

Europe lost—just sketch the outline of such a world and fill in the details yourself. Imagine the Soviet Union in control directly or through puppets of all Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa; Britain neutralized, this hemisphere alone. Think in terms of military strategy, think in terms of raw materials, think in terms of western civilization.

What is the alternative? A third global war? Not to my mind. It may be forced upon us any day—that one must admit. But I believe there is still a chance, a good chance, of avoiding world war III—a war which can lead only to wholesale destruction with no clear victory possible for either side. I believe there is a good chance of avoiding this catastrophe, but only if Europe is made defensible, and without delay.

Need Arms First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article appearing in the Kansas City Star of Wednesday, February 7, written in Paris by its foreign correspondent, Mr. Marcel Wallenstein.

Mr. Wallenstein is not a casual visitor to Europe, but has lived there for the past 15 years. During that time he has visited the various countries and has had an opportunity to become personally acquainted with their problems and their thinking.

I urge the Members of the Senate to read this splendid statement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED ARMS FIRST—WITH PROPER AID AND LEADERSHIP FRANCE AND BRITAIN WOULD FIGHT THE RUSSIANS—TURN IN REICH FEELING—DESPITE WARRIOR TRADITION, GERMANS HAVE STRONG DESIRE TO AVOID ANY CONFLICT

(By Marcel Wallenstein)

PARIS, February 7.—A stream of letters has been received from readers asking: Will Europe fight if necessary?

One writer wants to know if we can depend on the British and French if we find ourselves up against it?

Perhaps the most interesting letter is from a man in northwest Kansas who says, "The Germans have always proved to be the best fighters in Europe. There are millions of them we could arm to help us if we have to fight Joe Stalin. Wouldn't we be better off if we shipped guns and tanks to Germany and forgot about the others?"

GIVES HIS ANSWER

The answers as this reported sees them:

Europe will fight if forced to do so—and if properly armed and properly led by European governments. By "Europe" is meant chiefly Britain and France. The British record of the last war should be too well known to need explanation here.

The French defeat in that war in less than 6 weeks was caused partly by bad leadership in the government and in the field and the lack of weapons. A badly armed French army—without air cover—lost more men killed in the battles of May and June 1940, than the American expeditionary force under Pershing in the Kaiser's war.

These two countries seem to appreciate the danger of remaining unarmed while an enormous Russian military machine sits in Europe. They are taking steps to the limit of their powers to correct their weakness. The report of General Eisenhower should show a willingness to cooperate in Britain and France.

TURN BY GERMANY

And now as to Germany. Here is the surprise. As the man from Kansas writes, the Germans have been the warriors of Europe. But it is no longer so. The Germans of the present have no stomach for war. They don't want it at any price. Perhaps never in German history have the people been so pacifistic as they are now.

This is true of the industrialists who backing of previous war machines has been partly responsible for earlier wars, and true of the mass of people who formerly gave blind obedience to their rulers. The right and the middle of the German political framework look with distaste on rearmament. The most prevalent remark in Western Germany at the moment is "not for me" when one speaks of another war.

FEAR THE RUSSIANS

The people fear and hate the Russians, after the taste of Russian occupation. The Communist faith finds little sympathy from the average German workman. But he is not ready to take up a gun again in defense of Western Europe. He looks around him at his battered cities and knows they would be the first to come under attack.

The German iron masters are making money faster than at any time since the defeat of their country. The Allies of the west need their steel and buy it. The Russians also want it, and the German employers seem to have the idea that they can profitably do business with both sides if permitted to do so.

A German on a business mission to Paris recently said:

"You need us. The world needs us. We have something to sell. The Russians want to buy it, as well as you. The Russians wouldn't kill us. They would let us work."

SEES CONTINUED JOBS

This man actually believed men of his class would be permitted to continue at the heads of their industries if the Russians occupied the Ruhr. "Listen," he said, "the Allies swore we should never again be militarized. They made war a crime. They tore down our war plants. Now they are saying, "We want you back in another army—for another war." Then he took his fat cigar out of his mouth and said, "Count me out. Every German I know is saying the same thing."

There is of course an element of blackmail in this. The Bonn Government and the recovering Western Germany heavy industry leaders know how hard pressed the Western Allies are for manpower to meet the Russian threat. They, not unnaturally, wish to drive as hard a bargain as possible with former enemies before organizing a new German defense force to be enrolled with western armies.

WORK THEIR ADVANTAGE

Having been given an advantage by the political situation, the Germans are working it to the limit. The lawmakers of Bonn hesitate and stall on disarmament questions. Eisenhower was received with less animosity than was expected—even with certain reserved hospitality.

If there are people who have no wish to rearm or fight in any predictable future time they live in Western Germany. The same probably is true in that part of Germany which wears the Russian yoke.

Only the presence of German units in an international force can bring that force within measurable distance of an organization that could defend Europe against Russian aggression. Every observer agrees—and few Germans deny it—that German morale at present is unequal to playing its proper part in the defense of the west.

Mr. Truman Decided in Favor of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Mr. Truman Decided in Favor of Inflation," published in the Minneapolis Star of February 7, 1951. The editorial contains a number of questions which are answered by Mr. Arthur Upgren, economic consultant of the Star. It is a very thought-provoking editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN DECIDED IN FAVOR OF INFLATION

For months the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have violently disagreed about Federal money policy. Secretary John W. Snyder wants to support par prices for Government bonds. The Reserve Board wants to let the open market make the price of Government bonds.

When the disagreement broke out in a public argument, President Truman intervened and decided in favor of the Treasury Department. To throw some needed light on that decision, the Star got its economic consultant, Arthur Upgren, to answer the following questions:

Question. How important was the decision made by President Truman after the White House meeting last Thursday?

Answer. The decision was more important than any other in giving the United States another dose of inflation.

Question. Who will be hurt by that inflation as it comes?

Answer. The Treasury of the United States for a large amount, and the American people will be hurt by a still larger amount.

Question. Will the housewife find it more difficult to buy food for her family?

Answer. Yes; because more money will compete with her at the butcher's counter.

Question. Are you willing to guess how much more a $20 basket of groceries will cost Mrs. Consumer a year from now under these policies?

Answer. If she goes to the legitimate markets, $2 more; if she goes to the black markets, something more than that and an awful lot of trouble.

Question. What is inflation?

Answer. Rising prices.

Question. Then we are already having inflation?

Answer. Yes; we have had a considerable amount of it already—cost of living is up 8 percent since last March; wholesale prices are up 17 percent; the price of farm land is up 5 percent; city real estate is up 5 to 10 percent; farm products are up 24 percent; 28 important raw materials are up 48 percent. That is a part of the inflation we have already had.

Question. What causes inflation?

Answer. Too much money, especially when that money is in the hands of people who already think prices are going higher.

Question. I take it you believe the decision at the White House last Thursday will mean still more money?

Answer. Yes; it can mean much more. That's what the idea of making this war production period another 2½ percent war means.

Question. Just how will 2½ percent bonds make more spending money?

Answer. In two ways. First, the Federal Reserve will buy anybody's bonds at par. Because there are $257,000,000,000 of bonds, a lot of cash money can be let loose that way. Second, which will be still more dangerous in the years ahead, the Government can borrow money so easily at 2½ percent that borrowing may truly become our way of life.

Question. Isn't it true that when the Federal Government sells bonds, that usually increases the capacity of banks to loan money to people in a position to borrow it?

Answer. That is especially true when the Federal Reserve takes bonds from all comers at par. Doing that gives the bank all the reserves they need to lend money.

Question. How many dollars worth of loans can be made for each dollar of bond face value?

Answer. More than $5.

Question. Secretary Snyder's argument that the Government should continue to borrow money cheap was based on a plea that every ½ percent increase in the interest rate means Uncle Sam has to pay a billion and a half more in interest for the national debt. Is that correct?

Answer. Yes. It does mean a tiny fraction more is paid in interest on the debt.

Question. But if a cheap money policy is followed, doesn't the cost of the defense program go up because of higher prices?

Answer. It goes up fast. I think of an example—Congress appropriated enough money early last summer to buy a thousand jet airplanes. But because of inflation the money bought only 770 jet planes. On $40,000,000,000 spent for defense, inflation now is costing the Government $6,000,000,000.

Question. You think President Truman made exactly the wrong decision last Thursday?

Answer. I think he did because a rise in prices of 10 percent can cost the American people $20,000,000,000 a year via inflation for the $1,500,000,000 the Treasury is trying to save.

Question. Do you think such a bad decision can remain final?

Answer. I feel sure the Treasury will have to reverse its policy. England did under a similar set of conditions.

Question. Then you think Governor Marriner Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board was right about stopping the Treasury's easy money policy and that Snyder is wrong?

Answer. Yes, entirely, because this time we start a war effort with tight, full employment and rising prices. Easy money will feed the fire of inflation. In 1941 we had 12,000,000 unemployed, and factory output was low. It is not that way this time. We can't produce a great deal more so the easy money will boost the prices of what we are producing.

Meeting the Problems Involved in the World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on January 6, 1951, Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, delivered a very important address before a meeting of the Ohio State Industrial Union Council at Columbus, Ohio.

In this address Mr. Carey presents a thorough analysis of the dangerous problems threatening our country. He points out that this fight against Communist imperialism is not merely a militaristic struggle. If we are to win in this contest, we must be able to show that capitalistic democracy can provide a way of life superior to Communist dictatorship. As he points out, we have to realize "that the fight for civil liberties, the rights of labor, decent living standards, and equality of sacrifice at home are a necessary part of the fight against Communist dictatorship and aggression abroad."

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Carey's address printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The world of 1951 is a world of uncertainty, of fear, of horrible danger, of treachery, of bravery. It is a year in which no one knows what the next months will bring, whether it be hope or gloom, or despair, or confidence, or life or death. Right now, we have no way of knowing how far Russia's greed for power over men's minds and bodies will carry it. We have no way of knowing whether December 31, 1951, will see Soviet locusts eating up most of Asia and all of Europe—two-thirds of the world's population—or whether by some means, military or moral, Moscow will have lost or withdrawn its grand strategy.

The world will have to decide this year. There is no more time for equivocation; there is very little time for let's-make-another-appeal, no more time for anything but action. If we can prove to Russia that real peace pays, maybe Russia will learn the facts of life the hard way. If that succeeds quickly, we can really build a world bulwark of peace that no one could break.

As I appear here today, I want to talk about the dangers that are ours, and what I think is the road to take to prevent a crushing defeat for the free world we love. I want to focus your attention on what are the roles and responsibilities for government, for business, for labor in this struggle. I want to talk about you and me, about yours and mine.

It seems clear that we are all in this struggle together. If we lose to communism, capitalism is done for, free enterprise will vanish, there will be no free farmers, small business will become part of the Soviet machine, and instead of free labor there will be the kind of slave labor we now see in Eastern Europe and in China. There will be no difference between Democrats and Republicans in the Communist concentration camps, and the same bullets of the firing squads will kill Hoover and Acheson.

But America is coming to the parting of the ways on the question of how our freedom is to be preserved. There are two roads pointed out to us, and we will have to choose between them.

But they are completely opposite roads. By one road we can defeat Communist aggression, maintain and expand the free world and realize the blessings of not only liberty but also a higher standard of living for ourselves and hundreds of millions of others.

By the second road, we will at best maintain in America an armed camp that will steadily degenerate into a semi-Fascist state, that will resemble more and more the dictatorship that we are trying to defeat.

What are these two roads open to us?

First, there is the road proposed by the McCormick - Hearst - McCarthy-Taft-Hoover Dixiecrat axis. This group proposes in effect

that we abandon our democratic friends throughout the world as being "unreliable"; that we hold onto the only "reliable" fighters against communism such as Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, the Emperor of Indochina, and others of that like and that we pull back to our shores and go into our storm cellars.

By whatever name this is called, whether it is Taft's reexamination or Hoover's isolationism, the theory is the same. This group feels that it is hopeless to try to defend democratic Britain and France, social democratic Norway or Switzerland, or Italy. We can only fight when America itself is invaded. Otherwise let the rest of the world go hang.

Now this theory is not new. The same people who advance it now in fighting communism advanced it in 1940 when the issue was fighting Nazi-fascism. You remember the America First group, whose political leaders were the same people, the Tafts, McCormick, Hearst, Hoover, and whose big-business backers supplied millions of dollars for propaganda. When Britain was fighting alone for democracy these brave men of the America First group wanted to abandon her and abandon Europe. They had no stomach to fight for democracy. It was too expensive. Here is what your own Senator TAFT said in 1940 after France had been overrun and Britain was staggering under the blitz:

"I do not know what the Germans may do, and no one knows what they may do until they are freed from the present war and have an opportunity to show. When they do, we can adopt the same methods. We can take the same steps that may be necessary to meet the particular kind of German blitzkrieg, if there is such a blitzkrieg, at the time we find out what it is."

In plain English this outstanding statement meant "Let the Nazis win the war and then if they attack us, we'll figure out what to do."

Isn't that exactly what TAFT is saying today in the fight against communism?

At that same time, in 1940 and 1941 when Roosevelt was trying to get this Nation to rearm, the big industrialists said we did not need to have more steel, more copper, more aluminum. They wanted business as usual, and profits as usual. It was organized labor that went out and demanded that this Nation mobilize to meet the Nazi challenge.

The policy of these reactionaries, the ones who always cry "free enterprise," and "democracy," was one of defeatism when it came to a showdown. They had no confidence in democracy or freedom. They were willing to throw in the sponge.

Today, they are pursuing the same policies. While the McCarthys, Tafts, Hoovers, McCormicks, Hearsts beat their breasts in denouncing communism in the State Department or on the radio and demand purges, when it comes to really fighting communism they want to throw in the sponge, retire to our storm cellers here.

Isolationism and communism are allies today just as isolationism and fascism were allies just 10 years ago, in 1940 and 1941. To a few naive souls it may still sound extreme to link Senator Taft, Herbert Hoover, and Colonel McCormick—supposedly relentless foes of communism—with the Kremlin's scheme for world conquest.

Nevertheless, wittingly or unwittingly, the Tafts and the Hoovers are as much in partnership with Joseph Stalin today as they were with Hitler and Mussolini a decade ago.

How? To begin with, not even an expert today can tell the difference between the Chicago Tribune's editorial policy and the editorial policy of the Communist Daily worker. Since the invasion of the Republic of South Korea last June both papers have screamed incessantly for the withdrawal of American troops from Korea. Both papers have demanded that American troops be pulled out of Asia and out of Europe. Both papers have declared, in effect, that both continents should be turned over to the tender mercies of Russian totalitarianism. Both papers have constantly attacked and undermined every major decision and action undertaken by the United Nations.

There are other ways in which the Taft-Hoover-McCormick axis serves the Kremlin. These American isolationists today demand exactly what they demanded in 1940 and 1941—that this country retire behind its two oceans, that it turn itself into a kind of Gibraltar completely surrounded by a hostile world.

Stalin himself couldn't ask for more. He couldn't ask for a more gratifying surrender than for the United States to abandon the democratic nations of Europe and desert the nations of Asia where democracy is beginning to move forward for the first time. We would be handing over to Stalin's slave-labor machine countless millions of men and women and giving him, by default, the priceless natural resources of two continents to strengthen his war-making ability.

Is it any wonder that even the Nation's outstanding Republican newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune, can't even call this madness "isolationism." The Herald Tribune flatly terms it "retreatism."

I tell you as earnestly as I can: There is no place in this world today—this world of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb—where we can hide from totalitarianism. Neither the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans nor the North Pole are barriers.

We can no longer mince words or insist on the niceties of etiquette when our Nation's future is at stake, when democracy everywhere is in desperate danger. We have got to see and state it openly that those men who advocate our giving up our allies in this life-and-death struggle are virtual traitors. Isolationism today is communism's fifth column. Isolationism is as much our enemy as the communism it serves. Our own safety as a nation and the establishment of democracy and peace throughout the world depend on repudiation of everything that the Tafts, the Hoovers, and the McCormicks stand for. We must, for our own salvation and for the world's salvation, wipe out the poisonous illusion that we can survive without friends or that there can be peace in a world one-fifth free and four-fifths enslaved.

What would happen in America as a result of successful isolationism?

I think we already see the signs of it—I think we can see that the isolationism of this axis of defeatism is tied to a reactionary policy at home. Here is what they will aim for:

1. They will try to convert America into an armed camp for an indefinite period while the Communists nibble away at the Western Hemisphere—at Canada, South America, the West Indies.

2. They will use this situation they have created to panic the American people into giving them political power in 1952.

3. Once in power, they will use the Subversive Controls Act and similar acts to stamp out anyone or any group who disagree with them. Free labor, free farm groups, free citizens groups will be placed under iron control. The jails will fill up with political prisoners.

4. The greater the Communist menace becomes from the outside, the tighter the controls would be placed on Americans, until finally we would resemble the same dictatorship we are trying to fight.

This is no wild dream. This is a grim, ghastly possibility. This is what would have happened if the Tafts had won the 1940 elections and had controlled the Government then. Only then I think they would have had made their peace with the Nazis.

I say this is a possible road. You may say that some of those who want to take us down that road don't believe in dictatorship. That may be true. But if we all end up in a Communist concentration camp or before a firing squad will it make any difference to us whether TAFT or MCCARTHY was only an ignorant fool and not a scheming Fascist?

What is the second possible road that we can take in this decisive year of 1951? That road is the road of fellowship with the democratic world, realizing that we are all in a state of siege, and it's a matter of all for one and one for all. As free men we all survive or perish together.

This means that we recognize that Europe, having gone through two devastating wars, is mortally afraid of a third, so instead of being impatient and dictatorial, we work with the free people of Europe in real comradeship and understanding. We let the people of Europe and of free Asia know that we will not only share military defense with them but also the possibilities of decent living standards. We made clear that this is not a fight between the philosophy of communism and capitalism, but between democracy and dictatorship.

We let them know that to the extent of our ability we will join with them to prevent a Communist aggression and will not desert them.

We let them know that America does not want to dictate but to be at one with them in partnership and comradeship.

This means that in America, we will not only keep our freedoms but expand them. We will sacrifice in proportion to ability to do it. We will expand our industrial capacity because we have confidence that now and after this emergency there will be an unlimited market for the comforts and decencies of life.

We will make America a showplace of democratic and civil rights because we are not afraid of the loyalty of Americans to freedom.

In this struggle that lies ahead, it will not be the McCarthys, the Hoovers, the Tafts, the McCormicks, who will be in the front lines in fighting communism. No, as always, it will be organized labor. For we have been fighting communism all over the world for 30 years, and it is the ICFTU that today is the first line of defense for democracy. It is strange and ironic, that the press is willing to play up these Tafts and McCarthys, yet it is labor who stands on the firing lines day after day, repelling the Communist onslaught.

It is an ironic and perhaps tragic thing that despite TAFT's 10 years of complete blindness, first before the Nazi menace and now before the Communist menace, the press of this State of Ohio went all out for him. In its blind antagonism to liberalism and labor, the press of this State was willing to court disaster to the Nation by having men like TAFT in our national leadership.

It is a strange and ironic thing that these big business corporations who yell about communism in Washington, refuse to join the struggle against Communists unless they are guaranteed their enormous profits. The newspapers the other day said that U. S. Steel is building a $400,000,000 steel plant to expand production. But U. S. Steel only agreed to do that after the Government guaranteed that it could write off the cost of the plant in 5 years. That means that the Government will pay U. S. Steel $300,000,000 of the cost in terms of taxes that it will save. The company will actually pay only one-fourth of the cost and it will completely own the plant. The same thing is true with regard to Alcoa in aluminum, with the monopolistic copper companies. You read last week end the congressional report on the way our defense is being held up by the refusal of the monopolistic International Nickel Co. to expand nickel production.

It is a strange and ironic thing that these big business corporations like General Electric, Westinghouse, and International Harvester can not only continue to do business with Communist unions but even try to pit Communist and anti-Communist unions

against each other. Yet these corporations beat their breasts about the danger to free enterprise and the American way of life.

And when I go to the Maritime Board to propose that defense contracts not be granted to plants where there are Communist unions, these good patriotic American corporations and the patriotic American press remain silent.

What is the difference between having the GE plant in Schenectady where union is run by Communists, than having the same plant located in Stalingrad where Communists are also in control.

We in labor have a tremendous job to do in this year 1951. We have got to make clear to the American people the two roads that they can travel and the dangers to them if they travel the road of totalitarian and reaction. We must educate them on the real way to fight communism, with arms, with ideas, with economic aid. We must show that it is fatal to appease dictatorship in Europe and Asia—since the more concessions we feed to it, the stronger it gets and the weaker we get.

We have got to show likewise that it is fatal to feed reaction with concessions here, because the more we feed it the stronger it becomes and the weaker the forces of liberalism and freedom become.

We have got to demonstrate to all concerned, that the fight against communism by this Government cannot succeed if it is simply led by men from big businesses. There must be, in places of equality with them, leaders of American labor, directing this strategy, the politics, the operations of this vast "Operation Freedom." Already much damage has been done to our cause abroad by not having men from labor in the top policy and operating parts of our defense drive.

We have got to realize that the fight for civil liberties, the rights of labor, decent living standards, equality of sacrifice at home is a necessary part of the fight against dictatorship and aggression abroad. We can only remain free in the world by being free at home. All free American labor, through the united labor committee, has presented its program to President Truman. On that program we can go to the American people, and to the people of the world.

We have got to show the American people, despite the lies told about labor in the last election, that we have no interests that are separate and apart from the welfare of our country and its people. We have got to show by our actions and our educational work that, as in the whole history of our country, it has been organized labor that has led the way in this struggle for a better democracy. And today, we are prepared again. We want to unite with all men and women of good will no matter whether they be Republicans or Democrats, businessmen or farmers, lawyers or doctors.

Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. J. S. Jones, secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, with which he sends me a statement issued by the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association on the subject of price controls. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE CONTROLS

Livestock producers, having intimate knowledge of the livestock and marketing business and with their experience under World War II price controls fresh in their minds, strongly emphasize their belief that price ceilings and rationing on livestock and meats will not do what is expected of these measures; instead they urge the use of indirect economic controls, which take purchasing power out of the hands of all consumers, as a practical and effective means of maintaining equitable distribution of meat and livestock products during this present, and perhaps extended, emergency.

Price ceilings on livestock and meat tend to reduce production at a time when more production is badly needed. Such measures cause waste of both meat and essential by-products; they are costly to administer; the resulting black markets would not only bypass established market channels, but would also create serious health hazards.

Livestock producers believe that the meat price situation is not as critical as it has been made to appear. With livestock numbers and feed supplies at high levels, we can reasonably expect to increase meat output by 12 percent in the next 2 years by from 25 to 30 percent within the next 3 to 5 years.

For these reasons livestock producers would rather see indirect economic controls—which are inevitable and are developing, such as higher taxes, higher interest rates, restricted credit, and similar measures—used to combat inflation. They believe that price controls on meat and livestock are both unworkable and unenforceable; and that if inflationary pressures are controlled through indirect measures which strike at the causes of inflation, the increased production which can be reasonably achieved under present circumstances will result in reasonable prices for meat and livestock and will best serve the Nation's interests in the long run.

Political Basis Behind Antitrust Prosecutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times of Wednesday, January 24, 1951, entitled "Jackson Grows Candid," together with an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 26, 1951, entitled "Candor."

The article and editorial quote Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson as having told the New York State Bar Association that for some years antitrust cases had been picked by this administration on a political basis. I think this statement is one of the most damaging admissions of a prominent Government official, and confirms the low level to which the administration has sunk during recent years.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 24, 1951]

JACKSON GROWS CANDID—SAYS POLITICAL BASIS IS BEHIND ANTITRUST PROSECUTIONS

Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson told the anti-trust section of the New York State Bar Association last night that anti-trust cases had been picked for prosecution on a political basis. The meeting was held at the Harvard Club, and Justice Jackson was the guest of honor.

Referring to his own experience in the Department of Justice before being appointed to the Supreme Court, he said with a laugh, in which the audience joined:

"After all, they had to be picked on some basis. We might as well be candid about it."

Justice Jackson said he believed the Government must depend more on administrative processes than on criminal conspiracy prosecutions in dealing with anti-trust problems.

Justice Jackson said he had favored the anti-trust laws because he believed they tended to prevent the socialization of industry. He added that he did not believe in too great concentration of power, either in industry, Government, or unions.

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 26, 1951]

CANDOR

The other evening Supreme Court Justice Jackson told the New York Bar Association that for some years anti-trust cases had been picked for prosecution on a political basis.

"After all," Mr. Jackson remarked, "they had to be picked on some basis. We might as well be candid about it."

Well, we admire his candor. Mr. Jackson, who was formerly Attorney General and before that long connected with the Justice Department, confirmed what a good many people had long suspected but were reluctant to believe.

Most people would prefer to believe that the Government's policemen brought their charges on some other basis—reasonable grounds for thinking there really was a violation of the law, for instance, or, if they had to choose between several possible cases for immediate prosecution, giving priority on the basis of the evidence, public interest or something similar.

So, though we admire the candor, we cannot join the laugh with which the Justice made his remark about the political basis and in which his audience joined the other evening.

We do not find it amusing.

Presentation of the George S. Bartlett Award for 1950 to Robert Hugh Baldock, State Highway Engineer of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Oregon residents were greatly pleased to learn of the presentation of the George S. Bartlett Award for 1950 to Robert Hugh Baldock, State highway engineer for Oregon.

Mr. Baldock has been our State engineer for many years and has taken an active part in highway problems throughout the Nation and as a result has reached the pinnacle of success in the promotion of highway legislation and the effecting and carrying out of a program for integrated highway development not only in our own State but Nation-wide. This award to Mr. Baldock was highly deserved and as representative of the Third District of Oregon I want to add my word of personal appreciation for the honor thus bestowed upon my fellow citizen.

I include as part of these remarks an article by Hal H. Hale, executive secretary of the American Association of State Highway Officials, together with Mr. Baldock's brief response:

PRESENTATION OF THE GEORGE S. BARTLETT AWARD FOR 1950 TO ROBERT HUGH BALDOCK, STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER OF OREGON

(By Hal H. Hale)

For an unknown period of time before the recording of the history of mankind in written form, peoples, nations, and institutions followed the practice of publicly recognizing outstanding achievement and accomplishment by an individual with some special award or token. The earliest indication of this practice was in the so-called pagan era prior to the dawn of Christian civilization. In that period of worship of pagan gods the priests and various orders of the temples dispensed amulets or small tokens used in the rituals of worship of the day.

The practice was continued and further expanded following the advent of the Christian era. Many types of medals were, and still are, utilized in various forms of religious worship throughout the world, many of which bear some likeness of Christ or of the saints.

As might be anticipated, kings, potentates, and emperors were quick to seize upon the custom of using medals for purposes other than religious, and frequently substituted their own likenesses for the religious symbols of the church, a practice not unknown to us in this generation. Adoption of the practice by the military was also an early and natural development, and it is in this field that the widest use has perhaps occurred. The American Congressional Medal of Honor is typical of the custom of recognizing outstanding bravery in wartime with an award of great honor. The British have been noted for their use of the custom for a century and a half. Hardly any important event in British history is without recognition in the form of a medal or commemorative token of some kind.

In the field of technical awards, early records indicate that students were presented with an emblematic scroll upon their completion of some prescribed course of study, thus the custom of the high school or college diploma so widely used today. It would appear that the University of Naples was the first institution of higher learning to bring the presentation of a scroll and the conferring of a degree into general practice as an award of graduation.

Following this commendable custom there was created in 1931 what is known as the George S. Bartlett Award, to be conferred annually upon some individual who has made an outstanding contribution to highway progress. This is the most important such honor or recognition in America and the world.

In accordance with procedures established at the time the award was created, Robert Hugh Baldock, State highway engineer of Oregon, has been selected as the recipient of the George S. Bartlett Award for 1950. Mr. Baldock, or Sam as he is addressed by most of us, does not come before this group unknown and as a stranger. Few among us are better known and none more highly respected, nor is this the first high honor bestowed upon him. Mr. Baldock joined the Oregon Highway Department in 1915, shortly after being graduated from the University of Colorado. After having worked his way through the curricula of jobs afforded by such a department, he became chief engineer of the department in 1932, which position he still holds. Early in his highway experience he became an active participant in the affairs of the American Association of State Highway Officials. In 1947 he received the highest honor that the association can bestow, namely, the presidency of the American Association. He has been a thorough student and author, as well as engineer and administrator, through all these years. In 1946 the University of Oregon, in due recognition of his ability, conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of science.

It is of more than passing significance that in our search in the Library of Congress for historical material for this important occasion, there was found a volume under the heading of "Merit" titled "A System of Merit Ratings for Engineers," by Robert Hugh Baldock. To me this means more than finding that he is also listed in Who's Who in America.

Chesterfield, in his writings, left us this quotation: "Real merit of any kind cannot long be concealed; it will be discovered, and nothing can depreciate it but a man exhibiting it himself. It may not always be rewarded as it ought, but it will always be known."

Sam, I knew George Bartlett. Not so intimately as many present here knew him, but well enough to know that wherever he may be today, on the other side of the river of life, if he is privileged to glance back into this troubled world, that, as I am honored to place this plaque in your hands, he will smile, flip his halo with his finger, make a motion of straightening whatever he may be wearing for his bow tie, and say, "Fine; that's just the way I wanted it to be."

I could find no more fitting quotation for this occasion than that of Lord Halifax: "True merit, like a river, the deeper it is the less noise it makes." Congratulations.

RESPONSE BY R. H. BALDOCK

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the American Association of State Highway Officials, I am humbly grateful and feel deeply honored to be the recipient of this award.

Labor Unions Help Win Freedom Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Labor Unions Help in Freedom Fight," written by Mr. Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News, and published in that newspaper, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

LABOR UNIONS HELP WIN FREEDOM FIGHT

In the spring of 1947 I returned from several months' study in Central Europe with a trunk full of documents and observations proving that Red Russia expected to use organized labor as its main force in bringing all of Europe under Communist domination.

Some day, I hope, the inside story of how the Kremlin organized that great drive will be written. Then, and not before, will the American public learn that the decisive battle of the cold war in Europe was won for our side by organized labor—and not entirely by the Marshall plan and the architects who put the Atlantic Pact together.

It must not be forgotten that Russia had all of the advantage in the early days of the fight for control of organized labor in Europe. Workers were hungry, confused and in a general state of desperation. Industrial plants had been destroyed, workers' homes were gone, transportation was at a standstill, the currency systems had broken down, and there were no standards of employment.

Communism lost that fight, and every well-balanced American can take a deal of pride in the recent report by Harry Martin, president of the American Newspaper Guild and labor information director of ECA, on the part organized labor played in the Korean crisis.

Among other things, he told a Commonwealth Club of California audience:

"In Europe it was from the free trade unions that the earliest and strongest support for the United Nations action on Korea came. While other segments of European society debated, the unions rushed to our side.

"Only one day later the Norwegian labor movement issued a pamphlet totaling 500,000 copies called "War in Korea." Because of the swift action of the Norwegian labor movement, the Norwegian people were quickly informed on what had happened in Korea, a far-off country of which they knew little, but whose danger was also their own.

"Delegates of the Durham Mine Workers Association, representing 100,000 mine workers, adopted a resolution cabled to Stalin, calling on him to halt the invasion.

"International Mine Workers Federation delegates, representing unions in Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Holland, and France also spoke out boldly following the Korean aggression at their meeting in Stockholm, almost on the borders of Russia.

"Danish Communists attempted to interfere with the unloading of arms-aid. But it was a phony strike, a political strike, a treasonable strike. Leaders of the Danish unions promised it would not take place. The shipments were unloaded.

"When Western Europe joined with the United States in the Atlantic Pact and the flow of arms began to move to our pact allies, the Cocos—as they are sometimes called in France—grew desperate. They called for a mass movement of European workers in protest against rearmament. Violence broke out along the water fronts all over Europe.

"But the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions exposed the program for what it was, a vicious campaign of treason carefully calculated to destroy Europe's chance to resist aggression. The great federations of transport workers, of dock workers and of seamen took the cue and struck back.

"Today, with a few notable exceptions, the much-needed weapons of defense are being unloaded in major ports of every European democracy.

"Just last month Austrian Communists, at first obviously encouraged by the Russians, had made plans for a coup to begin with a

general strike and to culminate in open revolt and the seizure of the government. There was much dissatisfaction among workers of all political persuasions with the new wage-price policy. So a general strike was called and the Reds mobilized for action.

"But the Austrian Federation of Trade Unions had been the major force responsible for keeping the total Communist vote down to barely 5 percent of the ballots cast. Its leaders now called conferences of the shop stewards in every factory in Austria—even in the Russian-occupied zone—on the day before the strike.

"Down the line went the word: the general strike is a phony, a trick to overthrow our government, and it must not succeed. The story of the next 4 or 5 days is essentially that of courageous and unarmed union members fighting with their bare fists, and with the sweat of their brows in the factories, against the well-trained and well-armed action squads of the Communists.

"There are two countries in free Europe where the Communist trade unions still hold a substantial edge over their unshackled opponents: France and Italy. Much has to be done before the Communist influence in these countries is wiped out. The workers there must have decent standards of living and a fair share of the fruits of recovery.

"In the countries where the unions are strong and free, the European recovery program is enjoying a genuine success; while in the countries where the unions are weak or are in the hands of the Communists, the recovery program has encountered its most discouraging problems.

"It is my firm conviction that these problems will be solved as free labor grows strong enough in France and Italy to make its voice heard and its influence felt."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from all over our Nation a continued avalanche of well-justified messages on behalf of the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. My own State of Wisconsin in particular has confirmed anew its historic position urging the Congress to complete this vital project.

New hearings on the seaway will be commenced on Tuesday, February 20, before the House Public Works Committee. These hearings, I trust, can be conducted with dispatch. I hope that they will not involve needless detailed repetition of the same old facts which have been presented a dozen times—pro and con—before other committees of the Congress and other authoritative groups. There are literally warehouses full of all of the duplicating and overlapping reports, hearings, documents, and so forth, which have been made on the seaway thus far. And while I appreciate the desire of my colleagues on both the Senate and House side to get whatever new information might be available, it is a fact that practically everything has already been said on both sides of this proposition. The case for the seaway is, I believe, complete and definitive.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain items on this vital issue:

(a) The text of a radio address which I delivered last Saturday by transcription on Station WGN.

(b) The text of an editorial from the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press endorsing the seaway.

(c) The text of a resolution from the Milwaukee Common Council along this same line.

I also ask that along the more general line of the position of the upper Midwest in the Nation's defense effort, there be printed an editorial from the Minneapolis Star.

There being no objection, the address, editorials, and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USING AMERICA'S RESOURCES

(Address by Senator WILEY over Station WGN, Chicago, Ill., on Congress Speaks program, Saturday, February 10, 1951, 1:45 p. m.)

It is a pleasure to speak to you this afternoon on a subject which I believe is important to every American, namely the adequate using of all of our basic resources.

I am grateful indeed to this great station for the opportunity to submit these thoughts to you. May I say, friends, that it will be a pleasure to receive your reactions to my remarks this afternoon.

You and I are well aware that our country is in the midst of a grave crisis. Every newspaper edition, every radio news broadcast tells us the grim story. Now, in this crisis, if we were sure that we were really using every resource that our country possesses, we would be less concerned. Unfortunately, however, we find that our country is somewhat like a man who is fighting for his life, but with one arm resting at his side.

I say to you, my friends, that America is not using her great resources as she should, and I should like to prove that point to you.

A FEW REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF SEAWAY

To us of the Midwest, there is one great resource which in particular has not been fully tapped. I refer to the 2,400-mile inland ship artery which can be ours through completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Now, my friends, I need not repeat to you all of the vast number of reasons why this St. Lawrence project should be approved by the present Congress. Let me mention, however, that the seaway will not cost the taxpayers a dime. It will pay for itself through ship tolls and electricity payments. It will, in fact, enable the cities and farms of the Midwest to have direct contact with the deep ocean ports of the world. It will help bring in vitally important Labrador iron ore which is so essential for midwestern industry and for American weapons. It will assure inexpensive transportation for farm products. It will give us a protected life line, free of the submarine threat which destroyed literally hundreds of ships off the Atlantic and Gulf coasts during World War II. Those are but a few of the reasons.

Unless we utilize the seaway we will find ourselves in the role of a second-class nation, depending on foreign imports of iron ore—imports from South America. We will be a second-class nation which won't be able to adequately defend itself.

RUSSIA HOPES SEAWAY WILL BE DEFEATED

There is nothing that Joe Stalin would like better than to see the St. Lawrence seaway bill this year defeated once again. Joe Stalin would laugh up his sleeve. He would probably say to himself: "Why, those foolish Americans. Here in Communist Russia we are building canals, dams, hydroelectric projects. We are utilizing our Russian resources to the fullest. But over there those foolish Americans have a tremendous source for electric power—2,200,000 horsepower—to meet their shortage of electricity. But they are wasting that hydroelectric power. They could have a tremendous shipping channel to supplement their overburdened transportation facilities. But do they use it? No; they allow a few selfish, obstinate lobbyists to sabotage the whole project." That is what Joe Stalin would say to himself. Do you want that to happen?

ARGUMENTS HASHED AND REHASHED

Now, my friends, this seaway has been debated for a quarter of a century. It has been studied, investigated, reviewed, analyzed. There are whole warehouses full of reports on it. All of the facts are known. All of the arguments have been hashed and rehashed. Let's quit talking about it. Let Congress do something about it.

Support of the seaway exists in every phase of American society. Every American President, regardless of his party, has supported it—Herbert Hoover, Harry Truman—Democrats and Republicans. In Wisconsin, my own State, every single Governor, every single legislature, has supported it.

Who opposes the seaway? Just a handful of blind, selfish interests. They may not realize it, but their action amounts to encouraging national suicide. Their action means that in effect America is fighting a defense effort with one arm hanging helplessly at its side. What a travesty, what ridiculous folly.

PORTS, RAILROADS OPPOSE SEAWAY

But what do we see in the opposition? A few ports and railroads fear that the seaway will provide them competition. But their fears are ridiculous, because there is more than enough transportation for the existing ports and railroads, plus tremendous new arteries.

America's railroads are already choked with traffic. They cannot possibly handle the increased tonnage that will be necessary during this national emergency. But still these certain railroads continue to spearhead the opposition to the seaway, just as they led the opposition to the Panama Canal 50 years ago.

Now, you, my friends, know that in this year of 1951 anyone who objected to the Panama Canal would be regarded as a candidate for a booby hatch. Why? Because that Canal has more than proven itself from a commercial standpoint, from a national defense standpoint, and from every other approach. And yet the same moth-eaten arguments which were originally raised against the Panama Canal back in the early 1900's, those same phony arguments are being raised once again today against the St. Lawrence seaway. Fifty years from now anybody who criticized the seaway would probably also be regarded as a candidate for a booby hatch. Why? Because this project is so sound, so fundamentally just, so absolutely necessary that it takes a blind man not to see its advantages. But we are told that "there are none so blind as those who will not see." Certain folks have put the blinders on their own eyes, but I say to them, that it is time to take those blinders off.

WE WILL NEED SEAWAY 6 YEARS FROM NOW

I say, let the Congress show that it has vision and judgment by approving the St. Lawrence seaway bill during the present

session. Let there be no further stalling, no further dilly-dallying, no further long, repetitious reports and expensive hearings. There is no reason for delay. Every minute is precious.

The seaway, we know, will take more than half a dozen years to construct. But remember, my friends, that we are in this emergency with Russia not just for 1951, but for perhaps as long as 10 or 20 years to come. If the seaway had been approved 6 years ago we would be using it today. The time for action is now.

AMERICA SHOULD DECENTRALIZE

Now, my friends, I said at the start that we were not adequately utilizing our resources. Let us turn now to a second major field to prove that point.

I say we should better utilize the resources of the small communities of this land. I say that the time is overdue for the Government to decentralize its agencies and spread them out among the smaller communities of this land. It is ridiculous to continue to center a quarter of a million Federal workers in one bomb target, namely, Washington, D. C.

THREE TYPES OF ACTION NECESSARY

Folks, in this field of decentralization, we need basically three types of action:

(a) Decentralization of government.
(b) Decentralization of population.
(c) Decentralization of industry.

Of these three phases, it is obviously most difficult to decentralize huge factories and millions of people. But we can fairly readily disperse key Government agencies. Now, I don't consider it real decentralization of you merely disperse an agency from Washington, D. C., to some other huge, crowded city. That merely amounts to moving the agency from one target center to another. On the contrary, decentralization must mean moving out to the "grass roots" of our country. By doing so, we will pump economic life blood into many of these small communities.

But what do we find?

PHONY DISPERSAL PLANS

At present, there are limited plans for so-called Federal decentralization or dispersal. But the plans are largely phony. Your Government is contemplating spending $150,000,000 to disperse agencies within a 20-mile or so radius of Washington, D. C.

Let me repeat that point, my friends. At present, certain Government planners want the Congress to appropriate around $150,000,000 of your tax money to set up agencies in temporary buildings within 20 miles of Washington. Now, that my friends, is perfectly fantastic. In the first place, a high-speed bomber flying at 400 miles an hour can aim a bomb at Washington, and it is lucky to hit a target 10 to 20 miles away.

In other words, what these so-called Government planners are doing is saying that we trust that if Russian bombers aim their bombs at the Capitol or the White House, they will really hit those specific targets instead of having those bombs fall wide of their target.

You and I know that if America puts sufficient interceptor planes, radar sets, guided missiles around Washington, that will partly prevent attacking bombers from hitting the targets right on the nose. This will mean that many bombs will fall wide of the target, and where will they fall? Right on the agencies which have presumably been dispersed and decentralized 20 miles away.

So, my friends, merely spreading agencies 20 or 25 miles away from Washington will not satisfy the present need. I say that essential Government agencies should be spread out in the grass roots of the 48 States. Moreover, I don't want to see agencies coming into already overcongested cities. I want them placed, insofar as possible, in smaller communities.

Now, obviously to do so, it will take a considerable amount of money and planning. But this can and must be done. We know that in Russia they went literally back to the hills and built whole cities. They took their production plants and spread them over vast areas. But what has Washington done? It has simply put its head in the sand and failed to recognize the basic facts of history.

WHAT REAL DECENTRALIZATION MEANS

I say that units in Federal departments should be placed in those areas where the actual functions exist, for example, the United States Department of Agriculture divisions should be decentralized to the dairy areas, the cotton sections, the wheat sections of this vast Nation of ours.

The Department of the Interior units should be located primarily in the areas adjacent to their subject matters, and so forth.

WHAT ABOUT CONGRESS, COURTS, AND PRESIDENT?

Now, here is another fact, friends. The present decentralization planning of the Federal Government takes no account whatsoever of the fact that the White House, the United States Supreme Court, and the United States Congress could be completely put out of commission by a single atomic bomb. Well, I have been urging for years that our Government planners get down to earth and make some sensible plans for relocating the White House, the Supreme Court, and the Congress, as well as the central units of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Atomic Energy Commission in different areas of this country. In this way, we will be utilizing the resources of these various areas and we will be making sure that we don't put all of our eggs in one basket, namely, Washington, D. C.

CONCLUSION

These then, are the two suggestions I submit to you this afternoon. First a suggestion for the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and second, a suggestion for genuine decentralization.

If we apply these suggestions, we will be better utilizing the great resources of the American people. We will be utilizing both hands, so to speak, instead of merely allowing one hand to dangle at our side.

I want to thank you for listening to me this afternoon. I hope that when you write to your Congressman and Senator, you will give him your reactions to these specific proposals.

Thanks again, too, to Station WGN for its courtesy, and thanks to you my listeners.

This is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY signing off from Washington.

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press]

OPEN THE SEAWAY

Senator WILEY has asked support of the St. Lawrence seaway project as a means of making North America "an atomic-age arsenal of democracy."

He said Tuesday that it would be an absolute sin to further delay construction of the seaway. The Senator made this comment in connection with the plans of a group of Senators to introduce a new seaway bill this week. Similar legislation already has been introduced in the House.

Senator WILEY notes that our industries eventually will need new sources of raw materials. The St. Lawrence offers a practical route for bringing these materials—particularly, iron ore from Labrador—to the mills in the Great Lakes region. As the situation now stands, we are wasting a precious resource by failing to open this water route to large vessels. The natural waterway is there for us to use, but we cannot gain full benefit until the necessary improvements are made. At the same time we are denying ourselves the benefit of a great source of power that would help meet the steadily increasing demands from our industries.

The arguments against the seaway are phony, Senator WILEY contends. He says the issue boils down to a "fight between certain selfish railroad and port interests on the one hand and the people of the United States on the other." He hopes the American people will succeed and persevere.

Members of the House Public Works Committee will hold hearings during February on the proposed legislation. Advocates of the seaway should be prepared to fight vigorously for their cause and to answer all the various excuses that undoubtedly will be brought forth in an effort to forestall the project. It will be said that the project is too big and too costly to undertake at this time, but we agree with Senator WILEY that the real objections will be based on selfishness. In spite of their steady growth, there always are some interests that are fearful they will be put out of business.

RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE (WIS.) COMMON COUNCIL

Whereas on May 23, 1947, this honorable body adopted a resolution urging the Congress of these United States to pass legislation for construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; and

Whereas the present Congress is again considering the aforesaid project; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project would provide vast quantities of low cost hydro-electric power, would extend the benefits of direct ocean transportation to the City of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin and the entire Great Lakes area; would permit Milwaukee industries to import raw materials at low cost and, by utilizing direct ocean service, to expand greatly their foreign trade and to reach new foreign markets, and in general would enhance the economic prosperity and well-being of the Great Lakes area and the entire Nation; and

Whereas World War II demonstrated the absolute necessity of the St. Lawrence Seaway for the national defense and the military security of this Nation by providing a safe and landlocked basin for national defense industries, for storage of strategic materials and for construction of naval and merchant vessels; and

Whereas the agricultural and industrial resources of the Great Lakes area could have been effectively employed had the St. Lawrence Seaway project been completed and available for use at the outbreak of said World War II; and

Whereas the aforesaid is also true if this Nation of ours becomes involved in any future armed conflicts; therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That its members urge all Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin to lend their best efforts to assure the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway at as early a date as possible to permit expanded foreign trade and to insure the national defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this honorable body reaffirm the unalterable belief of the city of Milwaukee and its citizens in the merits of this great project which holds vast potentialities for the future welfare and prosperity of the city of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin and the Nation at large; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Representatives CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI and CHARLES J. KERSTEN, and the other representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star of January 22, 1951]

THE UPPER MIDWEST IN THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

The defense program now getting under way presents the upper Midwest with some very serious, special problems. What is going to happen to the region in terms of industry and population, and what can the region legitimately do to maintain or strengthen its relative position in the Nation?

Before attempting to answer this question, the Star would like to make its own position clear. We do not intend to seek special favors for the upper Midwest. The region will insist, we are sure, on pulling its share of the national load, whatever that may be.

But we do purpose to do everything we can do to see that the upper Midwest gets its just deserts, and that it is not injured by avoidable blunders or official ignorance about the region's true capacities.

CLUES IN PAST 10 YEARS

There are some clues in the experience of the past 10 years to what kind of problem the upper Midwest faces for the next 10. We know from the 1950 census that a defense program sucks manpower out of the region. Minnesota, for instance, suffered a population loss of 170,000—the difference between the number of people we'd have had because of natural increase, and the number we actually have. The population loss of the upper Midwest region on this basis was close to half a million.

From 1940 to 1950 the region showed a net gain in industry, but it lost ground relatively to the rest of the country.

The same things—relative loss of population and industry—almost certainly will happen to the upper Midwest in the next 10 years under the impact of the kind of defense program that is being planned. They seem unavoidable because of the manpower shortages in the making.

Take aircraft production as an illustration. The present plan is to create plant capacity to produce 50,000 aircraft a year, but to hold production in such plants to one shift a day until events call for full production. The same pattern is to be followed for tanks, electronic gadgets, and other "hardware."

It is not to be realistically expected that a great deal of this plant capacity will be located in the upper Midwest. It will be located close to industrial centers where cutbacks in civilian production release the workers needed for one-shift-a-day operation.

Even in the initial stages this program will suck manpower out of the upper Midwest. If and when a signal is given for three-shift operation of new plants the suction will become irresistible for manpower not occupied with essential military work.

SOME THINGS TO BE DONE

In the face of this prospect there are some things the upper Midwest can demand in its own and in the national interest.

1. It can demand that no existing plant capacity here that could be used for military production be duplicated elsewhere unless such duplication is unavoidable.

2. It can demand that reasonable heed be given to unemployment problems that will be created here as locations for new plant capacity are determined.

The upper Midwest should press these demands in every possible way—through the influence of its business, industrial, and labor leaders; through its Members of Congress of both parties; through its civic and commercial organizations.

LOGICAL WAY TO START

There is, fortunately, a logical way to start pressing such demands. It is to insist now, with all the vigor the upper Midwest can muster, that Federal procurement agencies learn what our region has to offer in plant capacity and skilled manpower.

The region should ask that teams of competent procurement people come to the upper Midwest without delay and spend a month learning what we can do and who can do it. We have plenty of competent and experienced industrialists to plan the details of such a survey, and there's not the slightest doubt they'll put out the welcome mat.

If such a survey can be arranged—and it's reasonable to believe it can—the question of establishing branch procurement offices at some convenient central point in the upper Midwest should be discussed with the visiting survey teams. The teams should come prepared to dicuss such branch offices, and to make definite recommendations about their establishment.

The Star's editors do not pretend to know what the outcome of such a survey, and of frank discussion of the establishment of branch procurement offices, may be. But we strongly believe the survey must be made and the question of branch offices must be discussed.

If these things are done, and done before the defense program begins to dislocate the economy, the upper Midwest will have real confidence it is getting its just desserts. If that confidence exists the region can be depended upon to make its sacrifices without much complaining.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the twelfth and subsequent short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

SIMON DE MONTFORT: THE CELEBRATED ENGLISH STATESMAN (CIRCA A. D. 1200–1265)

Simon de Montfort (circa 1200–1265), Earl of Leicester, spent a good part of his active life leading the revolt against Henry III of England. At the famous Mad Parliament of Oxford, he was opposition leader.

De Montfort became almost a dictator of England after his victory on the battlefield at Lewes in May 1264.

He stands out as an important figure in legislative history because the Great Parliament he summoned was revolutionary in that it contained not only knights from each shire to represent the rural nobility, but also representatives from the towns and boroughs.

He left a heritage of championing the cause of the nobility and the people against the king. For years after his death, De Montfort was considered a martyr by the Commons.

His plaque was done by Gaetano Cecere, of Fredericksburg, Va.

LOUIS IX: AUTHOR OF THE MISE OF AMIENS (A. D. 1214–70)

Louis IX (1214–70), King of France, stands in history as the ideal king of the middle ages. He became renowned for his ability as a compromiser, an arbiter who often was called upon to settle disputes between warring factions of his nobility and in succession disputes in neighboring countries.

Louis is said to have given charity to more than 100 beggars daily, but protected the royal decor by bringing them in the back door. He went on two crusades, and was canonized in 1297.

In his relatively uneventful reign, Louis IX simplified administration, improved the distribution of taxes, abolished the so-called judicial duel, and sought to introduce uniform Roman law.

ALPHONSO X: FAMOUS SPANISH KING OF THE MIDDLE AGES (A. D. 1221–84)

Alphonso X, the "Wise" (1221–1284), was King of Leon and Castile and is remembered as author of the code "Las Siete Partidas," which is the basis of Spanish jurisprudence. Historians set him down as perhaps the most interesting, though not the most capable, of the Spanish kings of the Middle Ages.

Alphonso was called the father of Castilian prose. Besides "Las Siete Partidas," several other important works were written under his editorship. They included the so-called Alphonsine Tables in astronomy, an illustrated book on games and a famous collection of medieval poetry and music.

Alphonso displayed legislative capacity and a desire to provide his kingdom with a code of law and a firm judicial system.

His plaque was done by Gaetano Cecere, a Fredericksburg, Va., sculptor.

EDWARD I OF ENGLAND: FOUNDER OF THE PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND (A. D. 1239–1307)

Edward I (A. D. 1239–1307), as king of England, had such an important hand in the development of the law and the parliamentary constitution he was called the English Justinian.

He did, however, fail in his chief ambition—the conquest of Scotland—but succeeded in humiliating his northern neighbor by removing the coronation Stone of Scone to Westminster.

The general effect of Edward's work was to eliminate feudalism from public life. In 1295 he called a representative parliament of the three estates, which subsequently was called the Model Parliament, because it first illustrated the type to be perpetuated in subsequent parliaments.

"What touches all," said Edward's writ of summons, "should be approved of (by) all and it is also clear that common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common."

The parliamentary constitution of England was established as result of Edward's action.

The Edward plaque was done by Laura Gardin Fraser, of Westport, Conn.

Ambassador Monnet B. Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during my service on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I had occasion to study the unique and intricate relationship between the United States and the Republic of Panama. During a visit to the Canal Zone I observed the very excellent work being done by our Ambassador, Monnet B. Davis. It seemed to me that he had an exceptional grasp of the situation and that he was performing an outstanding service to his Nation.

Evidently he was appreciated by the people of our neighboring Republic. When Ambassador Davis left his post in Panama a very fine editorial appeared in the Star and Herald commenting on his service. I take pleasure in placing this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AMBASSADOR DAVIS LEAVES

Today we see a good friend of the Republic of Panama leaving our shores for other fields of endeavor to carry out new diplomatic missions for his country.

Ambassador Monnet B. Davis and Mrs. Davis are leaving for the United States today en route to Israel where Ambassador Davis will head his country's diplomatic missions. We feel sure that Mr. Davis will harvest the same success in his activities there that attended his mission here.

While not neglecting the high interests of his country in his dealings with the Republic of Panama, Ambassador Davis was able to so conduct his mission here that the people of Panama could feel they were getting a fair deal. There were no high-handed gestures or impossible demands, instead there was always helpfulness and an obvious effort to understand our problems and viewpoints as he moved to carry out the purposes of his mission.

And so Ambassador Davis won the respect and the friendship of the people who saw in him a sincere worker in the field of inter-American amity and cooperation, a worker filled with good will towards Panama.

It is unfortunate indeed that the requirements of the service should cause these constant changes in personnel. We no sooner get well acquainted with one envoy when he is shifted to some other post, and we must start all over again getting acquainted with his successor. In these days of continuing problems, it is hard to see men go who have threshed out issues with us and reached a thorough understanding of problems and their background. And Ambassador Davis is one of those men in whom we have developed confidence.

The gathering at the penthouse atop the embassy office building yesterday was proof of the departing envoy's popularity both among his fellow citizens and among citizens of Panama. The general comment was—"It is a pity that he must leave us." The Star and Herald joins wholeheartedly in this expression of regret at the departure of this wholesome couple who have endeared themselves to so many. But we do wish for them in their future activities the same measure of success that featured their stay in our midst.

Address of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN at a dinner in his honor sponsored by the Democratic State Committee in New York City on February 6, 1951:

My party and the people of my State and and Nation have long honored me beyond my dreams and desserts. I have tried my best to requite these honors with faithful service. This gathering tonight is additional evidence of your friendship and your confidence for which I thank you all from the bottom of my heart.

I am very proud that Senator SPARKMAN, colleague and friend, has honored us all by taking part in this occasion. Senator SPARKMAN has become one of our main bulwarks and supports for a dynamic foreign policy. It has been my privilege, on many occasions, confidently to follow his leadership. One of the rich satisfactions of being in the Senate is the association with rare minds and high characters such as his.

As far as I am concerned, personal gratification in holding high public office is far exceeded in these days of crisis by a sense of personal responsibility. Concern for the security of our country and the world is constant and unrelenting. The days are filled with questions, and many nights are filled with prayerful reflection.

But we in Washington share our anxieties with the whole Nation. And we draw fresh strength from the sure knowledge that our people have always risen to every need and every crisis. America will not fail the world now.

A few days ago, former Secretary Hull, who helped guide America through the perils of World War II, described the present situation as one of "chaos and unspeakable danger." Never was a phrase more fitting.

We are threatened with world chaos. We are confronted with unspeakable danger.

But we have not invoked this chaos, nor have we provoked these dangers. The men in the Kremlin have done that. We cannot wish the dangers away by hiding behind our ocean, by running away, or by retreating into isolationism. That is the fools' paradise, the course of irresponsibility and sure disaster.

In the face of these dangers, we must not retreat, but advance; we must not withdraw, but press ever onward. Ours is the dynamic faith and the dynamic way of life. If we believe in it and in ourselves, as I know we do, we must not give way to fear or panic.

What are the evil forces which have seized the world in their grip and have struck so many of us with dismay? They are the forces of an unlimited tyranny which seeks to justify itself by extending a ruthless power over the entire world. Shall we abandon ourselves to these forces?

Yet we cannot meet these forces with force alone. This tyranny parades under the false banner of universal hungers—hunger for equality, for national and individual dignity, for economic security, and social justice. Nowhere are these aspirations more totally denied than within Soviet Russia. But a diabolic and ingenious propaganda has kept this fact from large sections of mankind. This fact is least known among those peoples who feel these hungers most keenly—among the depressed and exploited peoples who for too long have been denied the benefits of modern technology and civilization, and who for too long have been oppressed by selfish economic and political forces.

It is our responsibility today to convince these peoples that the ways of freedom promise economic and political salvation far more surely than the ways of repression and slavery. We must show our desires to bring about for all men a higher standard of living and individual security in a world at peace; we must show that freedom is not only compatible with these goals, but essential to their achievement.

This approach must particularly characterize our policy in those areas where our motives are most misunderstood—our motives are misunderstood in many areas today, sometimes even by our friends. This must be the main weight of our policy in Asia, just as military aid must be the main weight of our policy in Western Europe.

Nor, in our concentration on the dangers from abroad, can we afford to forget or overlook the problem of policy at home. To arouse and maintain the confidence of the free peoples of the world we must not only teach free democracy abroad, but practice it here at home. We must intensify our efforts to eliminate these defects in our own democracy so that we may, with current example, prove that progress can be better achieved by evolution than by revolution.

The measure of social justice enjoyed by the American people is the measure by which we will be judged in the world. Equality and freedom and economic advancement are the great triumvirate which can command the hosts of mankind today.

We recognize, of course, that, as President Truman pointed out, some desirable social programs must temporarily be deferred in this country, because of the compelling demand in money and manpower of our defense effort. But we must not cease to proclaim our determination to fight for these programs as soon as the crushing burden of armament can safely be reduced.

In the last analysis, our national strength is in the health and welfare of our citizens. These are the chief resources of America. Factories and machines are but passing assemblies of metal and mortar. Our real power is in the skills, the vigor, the morale, the strength of heart, and the freedoms of the American people.

We must have—we will have—national unity in our purposes and objectives. We may, for the sake of unity and under the pressure of necessity, defer decisions on some of our domestic issues. But we must not sacrifice our ultimate purpose to serve temporary ends. The effort to achieve our immediate goals must not be used as an excuse to abandon our ideals or our program for a better life for all people.

We must proceed with clear mind and steady purpose. Our faith must be constant and strong. Our will must be unflinching. We must cherish one another, not only in this land of ours, but in all the free world. We must move as great tides, not with fearful and frantic impulse, but with sure and confident pace, gathering strength and power as we go, in numbers and in our depth of purpose, until at last we reach the goal of peace, world security, and justice under law.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1951.

Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOLLIVER: It will be deeply appreciated if you will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your earliest convenience the following excerpts from my article in the February issue of the National VFW Magazine:

"The failure of the Eighty-first Congress to face its responsibility to the Nation's

veterans can be placed squarely on the doorstep of the United States Senate. * * *

"The House of Representatives, stimulated by an aggressive and sympathetic Committee on Veterans Affairs, did a most commendable job in approving veteran legislation but their efforts were largely nullified by an indifferent Senate. * * *

"The two Senate committees to which important veteran legislation is referred are always too busy on other legislation which they consider of primary importance to give the necessary attention to bills affecting veterans and their dependents. There are many able Senators on both committees but they just don't want to be bothered with veteran problems, especially when they receive a little encouragement to let it alone. It is a defenseless and tragic situation that should be corrected by the Eighty-second Congress. * * *

"The solution to this problem would be the creation of a standing Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs comparable to the efficient, hard working House Committee on Veterans' Affairs which functions under the leadership of chairman JOHN E. RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi) and ranking minority member, Mrs. ESTHER P. ROGERS (Republican, Massachusetts). * * *

"The comparative speed with which the Senate can act when it wants to, and when the Chief Executive wants it to, was demonstrated in the passage of Public Law 394, Eighty-first Congress. On December 4, 1950, the President recommended to the Congress that the program of vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans, which was in effect during and after World War II, be extended to Korean veterans. The Senate passed the bill on December 15, the House passed it on December 18, and the President signed it on December 28. * * *

Thanking you in advance for this courtesy, I remain

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

Mississippi Gets Its Balance and Climbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Bicknell Eubanks, from the Christian Science Monitor:

MISSISSIPPI GETS ITS BALANCE AND CLIMBS—BAWI PLAN STARTS BOOM

(Southern success story—II)

(By Bicknell Eubanks)

JACKSON, MISS.—"We're on our way. They can't call us the No. 1 economic problem any more."

These words, uttered by Mississippi's aggressive Secretary of State, Heber Ladner, typify the South of today, for the South is on its way toward industrial leadership, its leaders feel.

"Just take a look around," Mr. Ladner told me when I visited him in his office in Mississippi's beautiful capitol. This was my first trip to Jackson since 1936, and I was anxious to get first-hand the story of the State's climb from the economic morass it had wallowed in for decades.

I had come back to my native State of Mississippi to see if all the stories of progress were true. I remembered a State which was self-satisfied with its genteel poverty. In those days of the 1920's and 1930's when I first became aware of what was going on around me, a farmer did well to get a couple of hundred dollars a year. He lived on credit at the stores. The stores existed on bank loans. And the banks could do no more than hope that next year's cotton crop would turn out all right.

ECONOMY REBALANCED

"That's all gone now," Mr. Ladner told me. "Of course, we still are primarily agricultural, but our drive toward a balanced economy is showing up in a big way."

So I took his advice to "take a look around." I drove from one end of the State to the other. In almost every town of more than 1,500 population, I could see evidence of Mississippi's BAWI program to "Balance agriculture with industry."

This evidence ranges from small factories—such as a window-frame plant in Winona, Miss.—to multimillion-dollar projects like the International Paper Co.'s rayon pulp mill at Natchez, Miss.

To the visitor from the East, this growth presents an interesting feature—the absence of the dirty, congested, industrial sections of the older manufacturing centers on the Atlantic seaboard. In nearly every case, the new industries in Mississippi—as well as in the South in general—are away from built-up areas, so that land costs less, taxes are less high, and there is hardly any problem of waste disposal.

The International Paper Co.'s new plant at Natchez is one of the most dramatic developments in southern progress. It is located in a town which previously had been known only for its annual "pilgrimages" to its beautiful antebellum homes. Now Natchez is taking its place in the vanguard of the South's march toward economic self-sufficiency. It is rapidly becoming the most industrialized section in Mississippi. In addition to the rayon mill, Johns-Manville and Armstrong Tire & Rubber Co. have each built a $3,000,000 plant.

The rayon project is perhaps the biggest in the State. It is to cost a total of $20,000,000, with the first section, costing approximately $5,000,000, already in operation. It is Mississippi's largest wood-using industry. The capacity of this modern plant will be 100,000 tons a year, increasing the present estimated North American production of rayon 13 percent.

The three big factories at Natchez are being developed by private capital. But Mississippi is not depending alone on corporations using their own funds to build in the Magnolia State. It has developed its BAWI program, under which communities or counties can float bond issues to be used in attracting new industry. While I was in Jackson, the State announced that the one-hundredth certificate of public convenience and necessity under the BAWI Act had been issued—to the city of Clarksdale. William E. Barksdale, director of the State Agricultural and Industrial Board, was quite pleased.

FORTY-TWO PLANTS OPENED

"It shows the progress we are making," he said. This former newspaperman said that during the past 6 years, 42 BAWI plants have been opened in the State, employing 12,410 persons and providing $27,368,000 annually in payrolls.

BAWI and other new factories range from $50,000 projects to gigantic ones costing up to $20,000,000. Some of them include: Shannon, garments, $55,000; Brandon, cement, $'',000,000; Purvis, women's slips, $190,000; Brookhaven, sweetpotato dehydrating, $30,000; Canton, milk processing, $60,000; Yazoo City, ammonia, $5,000,000; Hattiesburg, insecticides, $1,500,000; Crystal Springs, transformers, $100,000.

The effect of these and scores of other plants on Mississippi's economy cannot be overestimated. For more than 125 years, Mr. Ladner point out, the State had depended on a one-crop economy based on soil-depleting cotton. In the early history of the State, when the soil was rich and prices were good, money poured in. Then came the Civil War, the reconstruction era, and a decline in cotton prices. These factors, along with the draining of the growing power from the soil, pushed the State to the bottom of the heap.

STATISTICS SHOUT

Mr. Ladner had some powerful statistics to point up the economic gains in Mississippi. He cited them to back up his belief that these gains are mostly permanent.

"In 1932," he said, "the State tax was only $136,000. In 1949 it was more than $13,500,000. In 1932, the State collected less than $1,500,000 from the sales tax. This same levy brought in more than $25,000,000 in 1949."

He pointed out that Mississippi is the ninth ranking oil and gas producer in the United States, with a 1949 production of almost 38,000,000 barrels of crude oil and almost 109,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas. This provides a severance tax to the State of more than $500,000 a month.

As I talked with Mr. Ladner, I recalled the dark days of 1932, the last year of Theodore G. Bilbo's second term as governor. The State was almost bankrupt. Its bonds could find no market. Farms were being lost through foreclosure. Banks were going under. Teachers in many counties went unpaid. Outside sources of capital had dried up.

Since then, beginning with the sales tax started by Gov. Mike Sennett Conner in 1933, the State has literally pulled itself up by its bootstraps. Communities are booming, the State's bonds are selling well over par, schools are thriving, and out-of-State capital is pouring in.

The Korean People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, within the past several days, two great American newspapers on opposite coasts, the Los Angeles Daily News and the New York Times, have called attention to a phase of the Korean War that merits more interest by far than we have given to it—the pitiful plight of the uprooted millions of Korean citizens who are struggling for survival between and behind the battle lines and midst the cross-fire of opposing armies. Mr. Manchester Boddy, the eminent publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News, a great humanitarian scholar and writer, commented editorially on February 5, as follows:

PLIGHT OF KOREAN PEOPLE OVERLOOKED

(By Manchester Boddy)

The long and intensive experience newsgathering services have had in reporting world affairs is being put to excellent use in supplying war news from Asia, but there is one important factor in the Korean situation, of profound interest to American newspaper readers, that I think is being overlooked.

I refer to the condition of the Korean people.

Some time ago Jim G. Lucas, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, wrote: "Returning United States pilots report streams of refugees heading north and others moving south. Apparently the Chinese Reds have cleared out the villages to make room for troops. Every village on 'the other side' is fair game. Most of them are troop concentrations, so we bomb and burn them."

One UP report quoted Gen. Robert B. McClure, of the Second Division, as ordering his men in the Wonju area to "kill everything that moves" to prevent the infiltration of Red soldiers who take advantage of our men, treacherously killing them, even in the back areas.

Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, after his first thorough inspection of the battle area, described what he saw as "perhaps the greatest tragedy to which Asia has ever been subjected in the course of its history. * * * Everything else is dwarfed by the pathos of this tragedy. * * * Our American people haven't the faintest conception of it."

That last sentence emphasizes the point I have in mind.

The American people should have a very thorough conception of just what is happening to the 30,000,000 Koreans whose homeland is the battleground in a new kind of war that may spread through Asia and to the continent of Europe.

What does the average Korean know about the United States? In his own words—why does he think our soldiers are in Korea? Does he know what the United Nations flag means? Who does he blame for the war? What does he think the war is all about? What does he hope for—dream about—work for?

We hear it said that life is cheap in Asia; that the average Korean does not look upon death as we do. How about that?

After all, it is his country that is being reduced to rubble; his home that is being destroyed; his cities, ports, factories, and railroads that are being demolished. Just what does he think about all this? Or does he think?

Does the average Korean fear the American as he does the Red soldier? Does he think that some day he will have a voice in shaping the affairs of his homeland? Or have long years of suppression under Japanese rule—and fear of Chinese aggression before that—burned out his hopes and ambitions?

Spokesmen for the Korean people are a dime a dozen. Some are good and some aren't. But all are suspected of doing the thinking and talking for the Koreans for purposes of creating favorable or unfavorable propaganda. Our readers would like to hear the average Korean speak for himself, answer the questions I have suggested and many more that on-the-spot reporters can ask. We would like to see the answers just as the Koreans give them.

Until early last summer Korea was little more than a name on the map to the vast majority of Americans; today it is a household word—and any bright youngster in grade school can make it into an outline map of sorts. But we have only a vague, shadowy notion about the Korean people.

If our civilization must engage in bloody warfare, we can at least realize that our fighting involves human beings and not geography alone.

One of these days a shocked America will want to rehabilitate what are left of the Korean people; to balance the horrors of destruction with an enlightened era of construction. We should get better acquainted with the Korean people.

On February 11, the New York Times Magazine carried an illustrated factual account of the unspeakable hardships suffered by the masses of Koreans who have been driven from their homes into the barren fields, crowded trails and roads, frantically seeking survival in subzero temperatures. This article was written by Gertrude Samuels who also took the pictures which appeared with her article. Like the editorial above, the article is worthy of our attention and I am having it printed in our RECORD:

KOREA'S REFUGEES—MISERY ON THE MARCH—NOT EVEN WORLD WAR II IN EUROPE PRODUCED SO PATHETIC A FLOW OF UPROOTED CIVILIANS

(By Gertrude Samuels)

PUSAN, KOREA.—Just behind and in front of the shifting lines where bitter military battles are being fought on this mountainous peninsula, and out of earshot of the battle of semantics at Lake Success, are the Korean people, swept up in the tides of war. Their fate makes a strange and terrible story—of refugee women and children and the old, hungry, sick, uprooted, torn from families, begging for survival. Not even in the Europe of World War II has there been so much collective human misery.

Everywhere one turns in the towns or villages, where frozen rice paddies are terraced into the mountains, are the pleading faces of hungry children, many dressed only in rice sacks, holding before them tin plates; or the mute, bewildered faces of mothers with young babies carried papoose fashion, trudging south to presumed safety.

The cruel condition of the babies and orphans is heartrending. I saw 200 of these youngsters without parents, who had been gathered off the streets of Pusan by the United Nations Civil Assistance Command (C. A. C.), dusted with DDT, vaccinated and given some cast-off clothing, as they were placed in the hold of a small cargo boat for transfer to one of the inhabited islands off the south coast of Korea.

One boy carried his crutches. Another, without legs, sat in a box. Their tired and pinched faces lit up momentarily as I focused the camera on them. Like kids anywhere, they shouted their own expression of amusement and approval, Ichi ban: (No. 1!)

In Taejon, within an area of about four square blocks, conditions were incredible, even for an oriental country. Perhaps 8,000 to 10,000 people were gathered on the bare earth and rubble, the women cooking the national dish of kimchi, a stew of cabbage, garlic, and red peppers, over open fires; old men striving to raise huts of rice straw mats; dirty and shivering children running, weeping, staring; and over the whole a wintry despair.

To understand the plight of the refugees, one has to picture a tiny, heavily populated country the size of England, the majority of the people farmers who eked out a living on the soil. Poverty they are used to, but not starvation. The total population is around 28,400,000 of whom some 20,000,000 lived below the fateful thirty-eighth parallel. Today there are an estimated 1,912,500 refugees who have been pouring from both above and below the parallel to the "safety" zones.

About 545,000 have found their way to 84 camps in the south. These are the lucky ones. But the great majority of the refugees, some 1,367,500, are literally on their own.

There are three main groups trying to meet the responsibilities created by the exodus. They are the Korean Government, itself a refugee here from Seoul; the United Nations Civil Assistance Command, under the unified command; and the seven-nation United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK). The immediate concerns are for food and shelter. They may be partly answered by present plans to transfer some 300,000 refugees to the islands of Kotedo and Chejubo by LST's and cargo boats.

The operations of CAC and UNCURK are largely advisory and supervisory. Although their members feel the plight of the refugees acutely, they are handicapped by limited functions and lack of means. As one observer said: "The refugees can't eat advisers."

The mathematics of the situation makes this point sharper. For some months, United Nations relief goods coming into the Goverment's Office of Supply have ranged from skim powdered milk to charcoal and sleeping bags. But of 1,000,000 blankets promised by the United Nations, Government figures disclose that only 78,000 have been received; of 1,000 tents promised, fifty have arrived. (Incidentally all 7,000 CARE packages subscribed by individual Americans are marked "arrived.")

But where agencies concerned with the refugees have been able to provide help, the results have been dramatic.

I witnessed a mass feeding of children under 13 years of age here in the Korean Women's Association building (there are three other similar centers in this crowded city), where the pinched and helpless look leaves children's faces at the sight of food. They queue up like tired, little old men and women, their eyes glued on the vat of hot rice soup, and as each receives half a bowlful and a spoon, he starts to eat before looking for a place to sit down. Then each one tries to get in line again.

I visited a tent camp on the outskirts of Pusan which can accommodate 7,000 refugees—in wooden sheds, huts of bamboo frames put up by the Government, 30 tents furnished by CAC. Here women and children are processed through a dusting station, sprayed with DDT and vaccinated against smallpox and typhus by a staff of Korean doctors and nurses.

There is obviously no simple answer for all this misery. There is a bitterness and a sense of helplessness on the part of the professional corps—international as well as American—that so few supplies are flowing in. The people of this country look to sympathetic Americans for help before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, these two great newspapers have performed a public service in supplying a reference that must not be neglected in the formulation of our plans relative to Korea. I recall all too vividly the indescribable condition of thousands of Filipinos huddling together in fear, cramped on a small stretch of beach near Dulag, Leyte Island, shortly after we landed there. They were without food, shelter, sanitation or safety but they displayed a spiritually inspired courage in their quiet resignation. They had faith that their liberation would be accomplished. This gave them courage.

How much worse must conditions be in Korea, where cold, destruction, shifting battle lines, and lack of advance planning for civilian relief, is aggravating the inevitable miseries that flow too relentlessly from the ravages of war. Even the outcome of the awful quandary in which they find themselves is still uncertain. As we come to a fuller understanding of the facts, the American people will respond as one to the needs of the harassed children of little Korea, where the cynical Kremlin puppets chose to arrogantly throw down the gauntlet to the free world.

Abraham Lincoln's Voice Still Clearly Heard for the Democratic Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this one hundred and forty-second birthday of Abraham Lincoln you and I sit as Members of the same great legislative body of which he was a Member from the State of Illinois from March 4, 1847, to March 4, 1849. He was elected as a Whig, and while here in Washington, lived at Mrs. Spriggs' boarding house here on the Hill where the Library of Congress now is.

Some of the other distinguished Representatives in the House at that time were Amos Abbott and John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts; Alexander H. Stephens and Robert Toombs, of Georgia; Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee. The Senators from Illinois were Sidney Breese, of Carlyle, and Stephen A. Douglas, of Quincy.

Lincoln was appointed to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee and also to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

History records that the principal issues of those days were the War with Mexico, the extension of slavery, and the Wilmot Proviso, westward migration, discovery of gold in California, and relations with the Indians.

At the annual memorial service for this citizen of the ages, in the very next seat to me on my right was a Boy Scout in the uniform of the One Hundred and Second Troop of Washington, D. C. We sat in the front row. My distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN H. MURDOCK, of Arizona, was presiding as chairman.

As I looked a few feet beyond this Boy Scout, there on the floor of the theater, in painted outline, were the footsteps of the assassin whose terrible deed almost caused a complete change and diametrically opposite course in the history of our beloved Nation. But thank God that then, as now, the American people rose in unity and strength and with common purpose to defeat fear and to come to common accord because of their recognition of the high purpose for which our America was given birth.

If my recollection does not do me disservice, it is a fact that on April 26, 1949, I also extended my remarks in observation of the anniversary of the untimely assassination of Abraham Lincoln; and then again on February 9, 1950, I, likewise, made remarks in observation of the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln during the Eighty-first Congress.

Naturally, because I sit in the United States House of Representatives where he once also worked and served God and humanity, I was interested to find the text of the following preamble and resolutions sponsored by Lincoln when he was a Member. This text is furnished me by the Library of Congress:

THE LINCOLN SPOT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Lincoln moved the following preamble and resolutions, which were read and laid over under the rule:

"Whereas the President of the United States, in his message of May 11, 1846, has declared that "the Mexican Government not only refused to receive him (the envoy of the United States) or listen to his propositions, but, after a long-continued series of menaces, have at last invaded our territory and shed the blood of our fellow-citizens on our own soil";

And again, in his message of December 8, 1846, that "we had ample cause of war against Mexico long before the breaking out of hostilities; but even then we forebore to take redress into our own hands until Mexico herself became the aggressor, by invading our soil in hostile array and shedding the blood of our citizens";

And yet again, in his message of December 7, 1847, that the "Mexican Government refused even to hear the terms of adjustment which he (our minister of peace) was authorized to propose, and finally, under wholly unjustifiable pretexts, involved the two countries in war by invading the territory of the State of Texas, striking the first blow, and shedding the blood of our citizens on our own soil";

And whereas this House is desirous to obtain a full knowledge of all the facts which go to establish whether the particular spot on which the blood of our citizens was so shed was or was not at that time our own soil: Therefore

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to inform this House—

First. Whether the spot on which the blood of our citizens was shed, as in his messages declared, was or was not within the territory of Spain, at least after the treaty of 1819, until the Mexican revolution.

Second. Whether that spot is or is not within the territory which was wrested from Spain by the revolutionary Government of Mexico.

Third. Whether that spot is or is not within a settlement of people, which settlement has existed ever since long before the Texas revolution, and until its inhabitants fled before the approach of the United States Army.

Fourth. Whether that settlement is or is not isolated from any and all other settlements by the Gulf and the Rio Grande, on the south and west, and by wide uninhabited regions on the north and east.

Fifth. Whether the people of that settlement, or a majority of them, or any of them, have ever submitted themselves to the government or laws of Texas or of the United States, by consent or by compulsion, either by accepting office, or voting at elections, or paying tax, or serving on juries, or having process served upon them, or in any other way.

Sixth. Whether the people of that settlement did or did not flee from the approach of the United States Army, leaving unprotected their homes and their growing crops, before the blood was shed, as in the messages stated; and whether the first blood, so shed, was or was not shed within the enclosure of one of the people who had thus fled from it.

Seventh. Whether our citizens, whose blood was shed, as in his message declared, were or were not, at that time, armed officers and soldiers, sent into that settlement by the military order of the President, through the Secretary of War.

Eighth. Whether the military force of the United States was or was not so sent into that settlement after General Taylor had more than once intimated to the War Department that, in his opinion, no such movement was necessary to the defense or protection of Texas.

(Source: THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, December 22, 1847, p. 64.)

The great Lincoln author, Carl Sandburg, says of him:

To understand the humor of this merry, serious, sad man, one must remember his sympathy and understanding for men and his deep faith in God. He moved without the slightest jar from telling a funny story to a decision on some serious problem of government or to a declaration of his faith in the providence of Almighty God.

And historian Sandburg also writes that Lincoln was paid a visit by members of the Baltimore Presbyterian Synod, and that, when they voiced their confidence in him as President, Lincoln made to them an avowal of religious faith, as follows:

I have often wished that I was a more devout man than I am. Nevertheless, amid the greatest difficulties of my administration, when I could see no other resort, I would place my whole reliance in God, knowing that all would go well, and that he would decide for the right.

Am I in error when I say to you, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, that this Nation under God will only have a new birth when it follows the precept of President Lincoln in his statement to the Presbyterians as quoted by author Sandburg in his pages devoted to Lincoln's Laughter—and His Religion.

Each time I enter the magnificent, yet solemn, Lincoln Memorial here in Washington and view the following language engraved in marble over the great statue of our martyred President, I am inspired:

In this temple as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever.

Also, I remember that in this very place my own son, in his young boyhood, upon his first visit to this hallowed shrine, in his youthful vigor and inborn and inherited admiration and love for the life of Lincoln, sought to climb up the base of the marble seat where Lincoln sits and touch the right toe of his marble boot. I then remarked to his mother and my wife that I would to God that I might deserve to touch the toe of the boot of this man who so clearly lived and died for the sake of his conscious belief. Little did I then realize that some day I would also be a Member of the United States Congress.

One of the quotations which is most favorite to me and perhaps is particularly appropriate just now is as follows:

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations.

Another quotation by him was in a speech delivered at Peoria, Ill., October 16, 1854, as follows:

Stand with anyone that stands right. Stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

Again, on this return to Washington from Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., to take my seat as a reelected Member of this Congress, we deliberately drove hundreds of miles out of our way in order to again have the inspiration of visiting the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park about 3 miles south of Hodgenville, Ky., to the situs of the 110 acres of land, about 100 acres of which belonged to Thomas Lincoln, the father of Abraham. This park area was acquired by the United States Government in 1916 and thereat is now housed and preserved the Abraham Lincoln birthplace cabin. The Memorial Building, which protects the original cabin itself, is magnificently situated and is constructed of pink granite from Connecticut and of marble from Tennessee.

As entered this significant Memorial Building of the old Lincoln family farm just a few minutes after it was unlocked by the National Park guard and hours before any other visitors arrived, my eyes again read the following upon the inside rear wall of the beautiful marble Memorial Building:

He was the North, the South, the East, the West, the thrall, the master, all of us in one; there was no section that he had held the best; his love shown as impartial as the sun; and so revenge appealed to him in vain, he smiled at it, as at a thing forlorn, and gently put it from him, rose and stood a moment's space in pain.

Remembering the prairies and the corn and the glad voices of the field and wood. (Maurice Thompson.)

The color of the ground was in him—the red earth; the smell and smack of elemental things: the rectitude and patience of the cliff; and good will of the rain that loves all leaves; the friendly welcome of the wayside well; the courage of the bird that dares the sea; the gladness of the wind that shakes the corn; the mercy of the snow that hides all scars; the secrecy of streams that make their way beneath the mountain to the rifted rock; the undelaying justice of the light that gives as freely to the shrinking flower as to the great oak flaring to the wind, to the grave's low hill as to the Matterhorn that shoulders out the sky. (Edwin Markham.)

This very day, as I look about me in this House of Representatives, I note that there is marked absence of much of the distinguished leadership on the minority side, the Republican side of the aisle. And it is good it is so, in my judgment. For, with deliberation and purpose, the House again takes note of the fact that many distinguished Members of this legislative body are in other portions of our great Nation, yesterday and today, speaking of his high purpose and principle and reminding the American people that it is such high purpose and lives based on principles which are the only ones that, in fact, endure.

Again today I have been asked by a couple of my colleagues here why I, a Democrat, always speak a few words at least in observation of the birth and the life and the death of Abraham Lincoln. Just a few minutes ago, in fact, I replied, in answer to such question to me directed, that, amongst other reasons, it was because I felt that his memory must always be perpetuated as a voice being a true symbol of democracy and an enduring voice for a world at peace.

I should like to have lived here at Washington when he did. I think that his greatness must have been so visible that even the youth of his day recognized it. In fact, my own father told me of the several times when he drove a phaeton in which Mrs. Lincoln on occasion rode, and of the two or three times when he personally saw the President. My dad was then about 15 years of age, and it was during the Civil War.

I always feel that my words about Abraham Lincoln's life and its inspiring and strengthening influence upon me and my ideals and ambitions ever since I was a little boy are entirely inadequate and woefully lacking in making it clear to anyone else just how much the life of Lincoln has meant to me. But, nevertheless, I continue to increasingly realize that I am affected by what he actually was. So it is that I humbly speak with you and share the opinion that his position of enduring eminence among the great was such that he achieved it and possessed it without ever having anyone in his personal presence feel small. And each time I go to Gettysburg, the site of his world-famous speech of November 19, 1863, I am again very happy that as a young lad I came to feel that I must live to personally possess that attitude and spirit which Lincoln himself must have possessed and which he revealed in the words which begin: "Four score and seven years ago." And, because so few persons have ever known who else was on the platform with Abraham Lincoln on that historic day, I relate that my best information is that they were: Mrs. Wise; Secretary of State William H. Seward; Col. Gordon Lofland; Hon. Horatio Seymour; Secretary of War Edward M. Stanton; Postmaster General Montgomery Blair; Hon. Edward Everett; Hon. Oliver P. Morton, Governor of Indiana; Col. John Hay, Secretary to the President; the Misses Gilbert; Hon. Andrew G. Curtin, Governor of Pennsylvania; Col. John W. Forney.

And, now, with the world as it is, this Gettysburg Address again comes to us so intimately, I again repeat its text:

Four score and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here has thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. Speaker, because of what he was as a man and as an American citizen, and as a Member of Congress, and as a President of the United States; and because of what he did as such; and because I feel his voice still speaks to us as legislators in this House of Representatives in the United States Congress where he also was a Member—for these reasons amongst others, I could not do less than again thus simply and yet vigorously speak out to the end that you and I shall profit most and serve our country most if we also increasingly seek to have the spirit of Abraham Lincoln and live for the high principles and on the high plane which he patterned after to the very point of his untimely death at the hands of the assassin.

Lincoln and Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following delivered by me on February 11, 1951, at the monument of General Kosciusko in Washington, D. C.:

Tomorrow, the 12th of February, is a memorable day for liberty- and freedom-loving people everywhere. The hand of God must, in some way, have appeared in the selection of February 12, as the birthday of two great defenders and fighters for freedom and equality for all peoples.

The story of Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, who with his heart's blood wrote forever an unforgettable memorial to the sense of justice, is well known to all of us.

Few of us realize, however, how closely the life and ideals of Thaddeus Kosciusko parallel those of Abraham Lincoln.

Inspired by a fervent love of freedom and liberty, this great Pole's imagination was stirred by the announcement of the American Revolution. He borrowed money and came to America to offer his services to this Nation. His brilliant service in the American Army soon caught the attention of George Washington, who later placed him in charge of the building of the West Point fortifications, where a monument was erected by the American youth as a grateful tribute to his heroism and leadership.

Upon returning to Poland after the American Revolution there soon flamed under Kosciusko's leadership all through Poland once again the cause of freedom and liberty against a Russian tyrant. In the spring of 1792 he led a tiny but inspired army in its heroic resistance against the Russians.

Upon the termination of the insurrection he returned to the United States. Of this country he said: "I consider America my second country and feel very happy on returning to her."

Some insight into Kosciusko, the man, can be had from the oath which he took upon assuming leadership in the Polish insurrection.

"I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, swear to the Polish nation, in the presence of God, that I will never employ the power which has been entrusted to me against any citizen, but I will exert it only to defend the integrity of my country, to recover the nation's independence, and so strengthen the general liberty of our country. So help me God."

That oath he never violated. According to the testimony of his contemporaries, he taught soldiers and peasants that they are his brothers, his countrymen, that they have a common country for which they were fighting together; he aroused in them love, unbounded enthusiasm, and strength which overcame difficulties; he trained them by his example. He was democratic throughout, without ceremony visiting palaces and huts. Recognizing all men as his brothers, he discerned only two kinds among them, good and bad ones. He was not a terrorist. He was a pupil of Washington and similar to him by his nature. He was not very eloquent, but his deeds spoke well for him.

He reminded his people of "their incontestable right of defending themselves against tyranny and oppression." He told them: "No Pole can honestly look for personal good, except in common good; none can think of saving honors and estates, except in saving the country." He pledged the nation "to spare no sacrifices whatever, but to use all the means which sacred love of freedom can inspire in the breast of man; all that despair can suggest for its defense."

His profound love of freedom and keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering remained with him unto death. And he displayed his deep sympathy for the American Negro slave when he dictated his parting testament to the new world shortly before his death. This was indeed a remarkable document and read as follows:

"I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this."

The funds arising from the sale of his lands were used to found the Colored School at Newark, N. J., one of the first educational institutions for Negroes in America.

Such was the life of a great citizen of Poland and the world, Thaddeus Kosciusko. What a great travesty on justice that the Polish Nation which gave America and the world one of the greatest exponents of freedom and the dignity of man, today suffers under the yoke of the very same Russian tyrant against whom Kosciusko led the Polish Nation in revolt.

There is no nation on earth with ideology so similar to that of our American Nation. There is no nation on earth which by its sacrifices earned liberty and freedom more than the Polish Nation. Our own Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we also celebrate tomorrow, said: "No nation can endure half slave and half free." Were he alive today he certainly would have said, "The world cannot endure half slave and half free."

In these momentous and trying days, when the fate of the world and of our entire civilization is at stake, let us remember the example of those two great patriots whose memory we celebrate tomorrow.

Let us not forget the oppressed Polish nation. In seeking peace for the world, let us not lose sight of the fact that no just and permanent peace can endure in the world without doing justice and returning liberty and freedom to our great ally, the Polish Nation.

How Nebraskans Feel About Present Management of National Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter received from a group of my constituents.

Inasmuch as this letter reflects the sentiments of my mail generally, it occurs to me that it will be helpful if the thinking of these good substantial people is made available for other Members.

While this letter has only a handful of signatures, the men who signed it are successful citizens of mature judgment, and I am confident their views reflect a cross section of the thinking of the Second Nebraska Congressional District:

JANUARY 17, 1951.

Hon. HOWARD BUFFETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUFFETT: We respectfully request that you call to the attention of this Congress the following facts, which we believe are most detrimental to the United States:

That every Congress since 1932 has shirked its duties in upholding the laws of the Constitution of this country. Both Republican and Democratic members of Congress have been either too lazy to do any sound thinking or planning for the good of this country, or for political reasons have given more and more powers to the President and the executive branch of this country.

We have heard propaganda how Mussolini was going to conquer the world, then Hitler, and now Stalin, but we are afraid that before the people in this country are aware of it, we will have a dictatorship here. We cannot take care of half the world and ourselves also.

If we are going to cure all the ills of the world, and spend all of our resources, and kill all of our men doing it, we will be the losers all along the line. Let us have the biggest and best Air Force, Navy, and Army in the world but let's keep them here to protect our country first, last, and always.

We believe the President and all others involved in getting us into this Korean war should be impeached and removed from office.

We must quit printing and spending money at the rate our President and bureaucrats want us too.

Respectfully submitted.

Ernest J. Jager, Harry A. Hoover, Paul Johnson, Vam Ampting, J. F. Vutsen, Ray Matson, Lee Wofford, F. Merion Mooberry, D. Fay Hosman, Violet S. Anderson, Theodore F. Donelson, C. A. Holsten, C. Susman, H. V. Johnson, Omaha, Nebr.

Postal Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the address of Mr. William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, at Cass Technical High School Auditorium, Detroit, Mich., on January 6. The text of this speech is from the January 1951 edition of the Postal Alliance, publication of the National Alliance of Postal Employees:

The year just ended witnessed troublesome times in your postal service. Moreover, it is unfortunate that the end is not in sight, and will not be unless and until you and your neighbor and a whole host of other public-spirited citizens band together and make known your protests in high places; that is, the Congress of the United States.

I have been actively identified with the postal service for more than a quarter of a century. Nearly 20 years of that time were spent as a working letter carrier; for the past 10 years I have represented letter carriers as president of their organization, the National Association of Letter Carriers. As their spokesman, I talk for approximately 100,000 letter carriers located throughout the length and breadth of our country.

During all the time I have been associated with the postal service, I have never before witnessed so much confusion, contradiction, bunk, and bluster as will now be found in the topmost echelon of the Post Office Department. The concept of service to the American public has been lost, even destroyed. Laws, rules, codes, and regulations that governed the conduct of the postal service and its relations with the public and employees have gone overboard.

Some of the things that are going on in the Post Office today will never lead to a savings in your tax dollar. A correct description of this administrative caprice would be "false economy."

Ben Franklin is popularly regarded as the founder of our postal system. Actually, a mail service was in operation in this Nation during its earliest days. It is historically correct, however, to credit Ben Franklin's administration as Postmaster General as the one where the idea of progress in the postal service started. Today, approximately 190 years after his time, we are faced with a halt in the progress of the service. Indeed, on some fronts, retrogression has already set in. It's time to get back on the road of progress.

All of you are familiar with the curtailment of postal functions that has been plaguing the Nation for the past 9 months. Your mail has been delayed for days in reaching you; letters and packages you deposited in the mails have been subjected to the same unreasonable delay in reaching your correspondents. Small business, as well as industrial giants, have been forced to stand by helplessly while the good will and patronage of their customers melted away after vainly waiting for a shipment that was put in postal channels for delivery.

One irate businessman has properly described the new order as "snail mail." A well-known columnist has called for a Deliver-a-Letter-Week campaign to replace Letter Writing Week. Another mail user finally decided why special delivery mail costs more money than ordinary postage—it's to pay for the extra delay in delivery.

Now all of the cutbacks and eliminations that have taken place in the postal service during the past year have been foisted on taxpayers under the pious guise of economy. In the light of what has transpired in the last several weeks, this so-called economy turns out to be the biggest flim-flam ever put over on the long-suffering taxpayers of this country.

The Postmaster General has been running up and down the country shouting, "Postal deficit!" The press statements coming from the Post Office Department, no doubt, intended to explain the poor mail service you are getting, would have you believe we are only a hop, skip and jump from postal bankruptcy. Well, if we are—and I don't think we are—then I must say that the Postmaster General's cure is novel, to say the least.

First of all, his administration approved and encouraged legislation in the Congress of the United States that would increase postage rates in some instances as much as 200 percent. Stymied in that, the alternate cure was the wholesale firing of thousands of war veterans who were originally employed as a temporary stopgap for an undermanned permanent postal personnel. This cruel reduction in force was accompanied by a curtailment of mail deliveries, elimination of directory service for misaddressed mail, establishment of inconvenient hours of service in post offices and branches—in short, a slow, uncertain postal system in place of the swift, sure mail service you have a right to expect from your Government.

Now, going back to the Postmaster General's abortive attempt to raise postage rates all out of reason, I want to say that letter carriers take the stand that it is administrative caprice to expect people to pay higher prices for poorer service. Certainly, we do not expect a free mail service. No sensible person expects everything in life to be free. We do believe and we have long advocated a reasonable and fair postage rate but the term reasonable and fair does not mean to us that mail users should be gouged by exorbitant rates, while at the same time millions of dollars are shoveled out to corporations engaged to haul the mails. Reasonableness and fairness works two ways. Justice and equity is not a one-way street.

Permit me to give you one recent example of the Postmaster General's concept of postal economy; that is, at your expense and to the profit of the railroads.

The day after the recent national elections—November 8—when the press wires were loaded with election news, little attention was given to a big piece of news that affects every one of us whether we ever send or receive a letter or a parcel, or ever ride a train.

Announced at that time was a compromise agreement between the Postmaster General and the railroads that the Government would give to the railroads $312,000,000 in retroactive pay for carrying the mails—retroactive for 3 years. That's additional money you are going to pay which you never knew until now that you even owed. How would you like to be able to collect from those you work for on such basis? Isn't that nice work when you can get it?

In other words, the very same Postmaster General who tells you he cannot afford to give you good mail service, in the same breath wants you to believe that his Department can afford to spend six or seven times as much on retroactive mail haul pay to the railroads as he says it would cost to give you efficient postal service.

This deal was approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission on December 4, just a few short weeks before Christmas. In releasing the report, the ICC said the $312,000,000 of your tax money was "back pay for carrying the mails." Santa Claus certainly came early and often with his bag filled to overflowing for the railroads.

At the time the postal authorities appeared before the ICC last November their testimony revealed that the railroads were to get this so-called back pay, but that in the future they were not to be paid for hauling empty mail cars across the country. I might say at this point that, at various times in the past, competent witnesses from the Post Office Department have testified before congressional committees that the Department uses only about 80 percent of the train space for which it pays with your money.

The Railway Mail Pay Act was established in 1916. Like most public laws of the land, the sponsors of the legislation and the men who caused its enactment were sincere and honest in their hopes for the legislation and the high purposes it was to attain. As happens in many of the laws put on our statute books, certain abuses developed and were allowed to grow. This happened under the law governing the mail pay system. Enormous millions of dollars have been given the railroads for hauling empty mail cars up and down and across the country. Your taxes pay the railroads an estimated $60,000,000 each year for empty "dead-head" mail cars.

Persons outside the railroad industry and the Post Office Department are not expected to know all the ramifications involved in the payment for mail haul. Let me give you an example of how the system worked for years to your disadvantage.

More mail goes west than goes east when you pass the Mississippi River. This condition creates empty mail hauling space coming east. Now no one is to blame for the fact that the mail volume headed west is greater than that coming east. In fact, it is not a blamable condition at all; but what I am finding fault with is that the Government, which is to say the Post Office Department in this case, paid the railroads the same rate for dragging these empty cars back to get new pay loads.

Profoundly, from time to time, it was recommended by the present Postmaster General that these return trips be abolished. The latest pronouncement to that effect was at the time of the public hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission last November. Well, let's see what the record shows at this date.

Although the hand-out was first agreed upon by the Postmaster General and the railroads before their ICC hearings, and it was agreed that the Post Office Department pay for no more empty mail cars in the future * * * the ICC announcement of approval of the deal merely authorized the paying of $312,000,000 and said nothing whatever about stopping payment of the same rate for empty railroad cars as for loaded mail cars. After attention was called to this gross omission, the ICC amended its previous decision.

Of course, there is always the chance that payment for return trips may be abolished; yes; abolished by the simple method of paying more for traveling in one direction, perhaps twice as much. Such a sum to be added to the $288,736,615 paid to the roads in 1949, for example, would bring the total payment to nearly a half billion dollars yearly, or an increase of about 300 percent since 1947.

It is interesting to note that one of the Commissioners of the ICC dissented. Said Commissioner Lee: "The Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 does not confer jurisdiction upon us to approve compromise agreement with respect to the total amounts which shall be paid by the Postmaster General to the railroads for past and future services. * * * In my opinion, we are without power to prescribe the lump-sum payment of $312,000,000 conditionally agreed upon by the railroads and the Postmaster General."

Another interesting point in this latest false economy stunt in the curtailed postal service era is the statement attributed to the president of a large midcontinental railroad. Last September—which is to say before the compromise agreement or adjudication was entered into—this national leader issued a statement that he was expecting into the road's receipts some $[illegible] in retroactive pay for mail hauling.

It is little wonder that this day that $312,000,000 hand-out was made by the Post Office Department, rail stocks hit their highest peak in 20 years.

This $312,000,000 is just the beginning. It covers only the period from February 1948 through December 1950. New hearings are now underway to fix a reasonable mail haul rate for the period beginning January 1, 1951.

This $312,000,000 hand-out is by no means considered a subsidy to aid in the development of a surface transportation system such as done for air transportation.

The word "subsidy" has been bandied about quite loosely in connection with payments by the Post Office Department to carriers engaged in the haul of mail. Actually, there is only one outright subsidy in effect at this time. It is paid to carriers about or engaged in the transportation of mail by air. There are, however, numerous factors influencing the Post Office budget.

Section 406 of the Civil Aeronautics Act directs the Civil Aeronautics Board to fix rates for the transportation of mail by air, such rates not only to include carriage of mail, but for the sound development and maintenance of an adequate air transportation system. This latter injunction says plainly is a subsidy, even though carriers in the postal financial reports as a subsidy without distinction from other income subsidies.

There is no requirement under present law to show how much of a particular payment to an air carrier is for service and how much is a subsidy. It is indeed interesting to note that no other public-utility legislation merges subsidy and rates into one figure. Prior to 1938, steamship lines were subsidized through the mechanism of mail payments, but this system was replaced by the direct operating and construction subsidies provided by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Neither I nor the organization I represent is attacking the financial aid to airlines. But we do hope to see a change in methods of procedures whereby actual service charges will be shown in one figure and subsidies reflected in a separate amount. There is much merit in this separation of subsidy from airmail pay.

By the same token, we would like to see a thorough investigation initiated with respect to the method of determining payments for railroads. If you are interested in stopping future multi-million-dollar hand-outs, about which I have been talking, I suggest that you make known your views to Congress.

Included in this latest $312,000,000 was in more than six or seven times enough to restore good mail service, but your mail service will not be restored unless you take the time to tell those in authority that you are now asking and demanding remedial action.

And like every other citizen of our beloved Republic, the letter carrier has his personal problems. Specifically, he is having a most difficult time trying to stretch his salary to meet current high prices. That proposition, question, I readily admit, confronts a great many other people.

The question of a wage adjustment and more important, the need for one, is out of the letter carriers' channels. The simple truth of the matter is that he is no longer able to cope with rising prices. Unless something is done to bolster his purchasing power, the inside will go by default and, with its meager savings, his home, his family and his potential to serve primary and vitally in the many and grave problems of our time.

It may be that many of you are not familiar with the rather unique procedure that is involved in the adjustment of wages for Federal employees. It is almost entirely different from the accepted method in private industry. For instance, in one of your automobile plants here in the motor city, management and labor sit down at a conference table and iron out their differences in a wage dispute. Management can cease production and labor can withdraw its manpower, if either so decide. Not so in negotiations between the Federal Government and its employees. It is preposterous to think of the Federal Government or its employees quitting its functions at any time. But the important part, from the viewpoint of the employees, is that they do not have the same economic weapon other workers have—that is, the right to strike and bargain for improvements in their welfare, hours of work, and wages. And I hasten to add, Federal employees are not asking, nor do they want the right to strike against their Government. But they do insist on a quid pro quo arrangement.

Then, again, we find another difference in the manner of carrying out wage negotiations between the Federal Government and its employees as opposed to private industry and its employees. Let us again cite as an example one of your automobile plants and the union representing the men in the shops. When they sit down to negotiate, each side will be represented by two, three, or at the most five men. If the problem develops into a prolonged situation, an outside, disinterested member of the Federal Conciliation Board sits in on the discussions. So there you have 10 or 15 people to bring into agreement. Compare that with the problem of the Federal worker. He has to convince 96 Senators, 435 Members of the House of Representatives, and finally the President of the United States.

Uncontrolled inflation will surely undermine our defense effort, destroy our American way of life, and raise taxes to ruinous levels. Perhaps the answer is controls. But they are unpopular in the minds of many people.

As spokesman for approximately 100,000 letter carriers, I want to go on record for controls—but only after certain conditions are met and only if controls are accompanied by certain other stipulations. Time does not permit a lengthy discussion of all the "ifs" and "ands" and the "whys" and "wherefores" of the complex question of controls.

I have told you that letter carriers find themselves in an economic strait-jacket because of their low wages and the rising cost of living. Briefly, permit me to give you a word picture of the situation in which the average letter carrier finds himself.

The average carrier earns $3,200 per year—those are his gross earnings. The average letter carrier is a married man; he has two children. Like yourself, the average letter carrier is confronted with an approximate 75 percent rise in living costs, using the period 1935–39 as the average. Now in 1939 the top wage for letter carrier was $2,100. The average salary level was slightly less. Therefore, it follows that, if his salary had kept pace with prices during the years from 1939 to 1950, he should have received money increases amounting to $1,575. That would means his average salary today should be $3,675. But it isn't, as I mentioned a moment ago, the average wage for a letter carrier today is $3,200. In other words, there is glaring deficit of $475 in his gross pay alone.

In 1939, a letter carrier, earning $2,100 a year, paid no income tax on himself, his wife, and two children. He did, however, pay $73.50 into the civil service retirement fund. That left him a net take-home pay of slightly more than $2,000—and the purchasing power of the dollar in 1939 was 100 cents per dollar.

Today, our average letter carrier is attempting to support his wife and two children on an average gross pay of $3,200—less about $195 contributed to the retirement fund; less approximately another $115 in withholding taxes; less an additional $150 required for uniforms—and I might say that the letter carrier is practically the only Federal employee required to wear a distinctive uniform on duty who has to pay for it himself. Well, when you add up all the deductions you find that our average letter carrier takes home approximately $2,750. Like everyone else, our average carrier has to contend with a purchasable dollar that has shrunken to 57 cents. It all adds up to a pretty dismal picture. The sum total of it all also dramatically points up the need for an immediate upward wage adjustment of postal salaries.

We have presented our case to the new Congress, which convened last Wednesday, January 3. I am happy to say that our appeal has met with an appreciative response in its phases. Several members of the House of Representatives have sponsored bills designed to increase postal wages up to 17 percent. As I explained to you, the successful prosecution of legislation that will benefit Federal employees is a long, tedious, and sometimes discouraging process. Merely introducing salary increase legislation is not enough; it is only the first step; your letter carrier will need lots of help along the way and it is on that note that I will close this discussion.

When your letter carrier approaches you and asks for your help in securing a much-needed boost in salary, I do hope you will lend a helping hand. We are convinced that our request for fair treatment with respect to wages is reasonable and I hope that I have been able to transmit some of our own conviction to you. I also trust that you will write to your Senators and your Congressman and tell them you want to see your letter carrier and other postal employees treated equitably in the matter of a living wage.

Remember Back in 1939 When You Could Shop and Get Change From $1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I assume it is natural for the average Member of this body to feel that his people are most patriotic. History will justify my contention that those living in our favored area of the South are indeed patriotic. Statistics show that we have more volunteers for the service than other sections. Ours is a proud but humble people. In view of such a high degress of patriotism, my folks seldom complain. In our all-out effort to increase necessary defense matters, they are anxious to bear their proportionate share. Most of the industrial people in my district are employed in the textile mills. The wages there are reasonable but not high. By living frugal lives, it is possible to make both ends meet under normal conditions. It is difficult to realize how most of our folks are living nowadays in view of the constant increase in the cost of the necessities of life. As one who has constantly and openly advocated general controls, I am of course disappointed in the slowness in the application of controls. To be sure, the word "control" itself is unpleasant. We are reconciled to the fact that many of our privileges and liberties must be temporarily foregone in order to meet present emergencies. Unless run-away prices are controlled, I fear the consequences. Attached hereto is an excerpt from the current issue of the United States News and World Report which points out very graphically what is happening. Let us put first things first and adjust these grave differences.

REMEMBER BACK IN 1939 WHEN YOU COULD SHOP AND GET CHANGE FROM $1

It looks like the same dollar. But it goes twice as fast as it did in 1939.

Take grocery bills: Food that cost $9 then costs $21 now. Take clothes: The price of a 1939 wardrobe buys one coat now.

It's the same all down the line, with a few exceptions.

The 1951 dollar, compared with 1939, is half gone before you get it.

If you want to see what has happened to the dollar, just look back to the "good old days" of 1939—12 years ago.

In those days a housewife could walk into a grocery store with a dollar and come out with a pound of coffee, a pound of hamburger, a dozen eggs, a quart of milk, a loaf of bread, and a pound of shortening—plus a few pennies in change.

Today she can get the coffee and bread for her dollar. The other items will take another $1.80.

The average individual, watching his pay check go, may find the talk about a 50-cent dollar, or a 50-cent dollar, a little on the theoretical side. He may need, instead, to look at actual prices and costs. When he does, he finds that a dollar goes about twice as fast today as it did in 1939. In other words, it goes only about half as far as it did in the year when World War II began in Europe.

Meals provide an example. A typical family of four was likely to eat up about $9 worth of food in an ordinary week of 1939. Today, if the family has not improved its diet, it finds the food bill taking about $21 out of the weekly pay check.

One reason is that the dollar that bought 3½ pounds of good round steak in 1939 will not buy even 1 pound of the same quality steak in 1951.

A quick backward glance is a help in understanding what has happened to the family's clothing dollar, too. For $60, back in 1939, a man could buy his wife a heavy wool coat with fur trim, and still have enough cash left to buy himself a wool suit, a pair of shoes, a hat, a dozen pairs of socks, a half-dozen shirts, five undershirts, and five pairs of shorts.

Today, if the man plans to buy the same medium-quality goods, he will be wise to get the items for himself first. If he gets the coat for his wife first he won't have enough left out of $60 to buy his shoes alone. The clothing for him will cost a total of about $102.50—if he manages to find such things as medium-quality shirts. And the medium-grade coat for his wife will take $55.

In that same 12 years, a rayon dress has gone up from $2.50 to $9.50, while the $1 cotton house dress has gone to $3.25, and a rayon slip that could be had for 85 cents has gone to $2.60. For a young boy's suit, $7 was ample in 1939. Today $16 is barely enough. A pair of girl's shoes, of better than average quality, has jumped from $2.65 to $6.

Problems of furnishing a home and acquiring a car in 1939, too, seem simple by today's standards. Gasoline for the car has gone up only from about 18.5 cents a gallon to 26 or 27 cents a gallon in most places. But the car itself could be bought new for as little as $776 then. Today the same make—considerably improved—costs $1,720.

The bedroom suite that was marked $65 back in 1939 now carries a $165 tag. The "medium price" for an electric range in those prewar days was $160. Today $320 is "medium."

The housewife who wants to replace the $65 sewing machine she bought back in 1939 will need $170. If she wants to replace that $65 wool rug with one of similar quality she must be prepared to pay nearly $170.

Some things needed to keep the ordinary family going have changed relatively little in price.

Nylon hose, telephone service, cigarettes, a radio are examples. And electricity still costs most families less than it did back in 1939.

But the family that wonders what has happened to the value of its dollar since 1939 needs only to remember the days when a nickel bought a bar of good toilet soap or a ride on the streetcar, and a half dollar was a high price to pay for a haircut. That was a year in which only the town banker required a house big enough and fancy enough to cost $10,000.

What has happened to the dollar since 1939, in short, is the same thing that has happened to the 5-cent candy bar. About half of it is gone.

Prices then and now

Round steak, pound:	
1939	$0.29
Now	1.05
Man's suit:	
1939	25.00
Now	56.00
Auto:	
1939	776.00
Now	1,720.00
Coffee, pound:	
1939	.21
Now	.85
Wool rug:	
1939	65.00
Now	160.00

I Doubt if There Be a Single Worker's Home Anywhere in This Country Where the Cost of Foods and Other Necessities Is Not a Matter of Daily Family Concern and Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again I invite the attention of the House to another Battle Report, Washington, wherein Dr. John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s television station and cables, telecasted his weekly report to the people of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, the entire country is, each day, becoming more and more concerned with the terrific impact of inflation upon the Nation's price economy. I doubt if there be a single worker's home, anywhere in the country, where the cost of foodstuffs and other necessities is not the matter of daily discussion and concern.

The situation with respect to wage and prices on the home front is secondary only to national concern as to the well-being of our fighting forces in Korea.

It is because of these facts that the talks made by the various speakers on Battle Report, Washington proved of such tremendous interest to me. On Sunday last, in his personal statement to the Nation, Dr. Steelman said, in part:

On the domestic front, price and wage controls have been foremost in the news. All of us know that inflation is like a cancer gnawing at the vitals of our prosperity. It is threatening the future of all of us—and all of us must unite to fight it or sacrifice our economic security.

Two men in the vanguard of this fight are with us today. One is Mr. Michael V. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization; and the other, Mr. Cyrus Ching, Director of the Wage Stabilization Board. They, together with the Honorable William V. Bailey, mayor of Battle Creek, Mich., will talk to you with respect to the matter pertaining to their administration and enforcement.

You will also hear from a young officer, Lt. Robert Fallon, wounded in the drive on the Manchurian border, and who is now undergoing treatment at the Army Medical Center here in Washington. He will tell us of some of the vicissitudes of infantry fighting at temperatures 30° lower than those suffered by Washington's troops at Valley Forge.

Additionally thereto, we shall hear from Donald R. Heath, whom you will remember as the last Minister to Bulgaria, now stationed in Indochina, and who represents us in all three of the nations which constitute that unhappy land. He has come to us today with eyewitness report of the situation. Mr. Heath will tell of the courage and fortitude of those far-away and little-known people, and of how they, in struggling for freedom, are fighting desperately to hold back those who would enslave us.

Altogether this teledocumentary was one of the most complete, understandable expositions as to how inflation can destroy government—and of the steps that have already been taken by the President and the Congress to control, if not avoid, it—which I have ever read.

No one can read that breath-taking, factual statement made by Lt. Robert Fallon—off-the-cuff and from right out of his heart, without knowing of the never-ending hell which is being suffered by the boys in Korea.

In answering the question—who is this infantry soldier—Lieutenant Fallon, of the Seventeenth Infantry Regiment makes answer:

He is a man who, but a short time ago, was sitting in a comfortable living room, even as you. Now, he is awaiting with dread the bitter, endless winter night when to sleep means often not to awaken. He is the next-door neighbor who took, with such relish, the extra piece of roast beef when you had him over for dinner last summer. Now, he is vainly hacking away at a can of beef stew which has frozen solid. He is the laundryman who used to deliver your bundle of spotless linen each week. Now, he is wearing a shirt he hasn't changed in 6 weeks.

This man, whom you know so well, has become a part of the finest young of fighting men in the world—the American infantry. He is you, your soldier—there, because you asked him to go.

Mr. Donald Heath, our last Minister to iron-curtained Bulgaria, and, now, our Minister to the Associated States of Indochina, made a statement with respect to the conditions in that far-off land, which, I know, is of deepest interest to every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of these facts that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the twenty-fifth Battle Report, Washington, as produced by Ted Ayers of the National Broadcasting Co., under the patronage of the assistant to the President, Dr. Steelman, and commented upon by Robert McCormick, one of NBC's aces and most popular commentators.

The telecast was, as follows:

Mr. McCORMICK. Back to snow-covered Washington comes General Eisenhower—returning with an optimistic report on his tour to build up a wall of security around the free nations. And, once again, upon the world capital of that security, NBC television turns its cameras.

Washington, concerned this week end with the Nation-wide rail strike disrupting the movement of supplies to our forces in Korea.

Korea, where our standing jet pilots—very much on the job—help blast the way for our troops latest advance to within 8 miles from the Han River.

Today, Battle Report's cameras and guests combine to inform you on the infantry soldier in Korea, the price and wage freeze here at home, and the critical situation in Indochina. But first, the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Mr. STEELMAN. All over the world today men of good will are striving tirelessly in a gigantic task. They realize that mad-dog despots are plotting to deprive them of freedom which is their God-given heritage. They know that the despots control huge armies, poised and ready for instant attack. Yet, they do not want war. They want peace—the right to live their own lives and to do their own thinking. Hence, the task they face is twofold. They must protect their freedom—without engaging in a terrible war.

Last week the Premier of France, Mr. René Pleven, visited Washington to confer with the President and Government officials. The communiqué issued at the close of the conference leaves no doubt that two great nations are united in their opposition to the would-be aggressors. General Eisenhower returned to the capital last Wednesday. He, too, brought encouraging news. Throughout his travels in Europe he saw with his own eyes and heard with his own ears how Europeans cherish the freedoms they have fought so long to win. Those who would betray them are losing ground constantly.

On the domestic front, price and wage controls have been foremost in the news. All of us know that inflation is like a cancer gnawing at the vitals of our prosperity. It is threatening the future of all of us—and all of us must unite to fight it or sacrifice our economic security.

Two men in the vanguard of this fight are with us today. One is Mr. Michael V. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, and the other, Mr. Cyrus Ching, Director of the Wage Stabilization Board. They will talk to you with respect to the matter subject to their administration and enforcement.

You will also hear from a young officer, Lt. Robert Fallon, wounded in the drive on the

Manchurian border and who is now undergoing treatment at the Army Medical Center here in Washington.

He will tell us of some of the vicissitudes of infantry fighting at temperatures 30° lower than those that were suffered by Washington's troops at Valley Forge. Additionally thereto, we shall hear from Donald R. Heath, whom you will remember as the last Minister to Bulgaria, now stationed in Indochina and who represents us in all three of the nations which constitute that unhappy land. He has come to us today with eyewitness report of the situation. He will tell of the courage and fortitude of those little-known people—and of how they are struggling for freedom and fighting desperately to hold back those who would enslave us.

All over the world, men of good will are united. We cannot and will not fail in our struggle to win justice, freedom and prosperity for men everywhere.

Mr. McCORMICK. As the big guns we need to back up our desire for peace swing along our production lines, the Nation moves into action on the economic front. For clothes like these, and a thousand and one other articles. F-day came at 6 p. m. last Friday—for it was then that a big freeze was announced clamping a lid on prices and wages. Climbing prices on such items as cars and groceries were halted as stabilization officials prepared to consider the next step beyond this stopgap measure. Object: to combat inflation and put a firm footing under our economy. A foundation we must have if we are successfully to meet communism's challenge to our security. Throughout the Nation, crowds of wage earners were affected by the action taken jointly by the office of Price Stabilization and the Wage Stabilization Board. To housewives from coast to coast, any relief from the soaring prices they've been complaining about is good news, though many still have a lot of questions they'd like answered. One such housewife is here with us today, America.

Now, we'd like you to meet Mrs. Charles Schwartzel, of Louisville, Ky., Mrs. Schwartzel, you came up to Battle Report for a reason.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. As a homemaker, and a mother of two children, I believe I'm like a great many other women in the country when I say I'm a little confused. I'd like to get some answers to a few questions. Straight simple answers on this price and wage business.

Mr. McCORMICK. You may fire when ready, Mrs. Schwartzel. And here to supply the answers are Mr. Michael V. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, and Mr. Cyrus Ching, Director of the Wage Stabilization Board.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. Mr. DiSalle, why were prices frozen? I'd like to know and without any gobbledygook.

Mr. DiSALLE. Mrs. Schwartzel, as a mother and the person in your household who does most of the buying, you know that up until January 25, 1951, when the price freeze went into effect, the cost of living was at an all-time high and promised to go even higher. In other words, we were undergoing inflation, the deadly spiral that can knock the pins out from under even this powerful country. Some prices, since the start of the Korean fighting, had gone up 50 percent. I won't go into specific rises in textiles, metals, or industrial items. You know what I'm talking about because most everything you wanted to buy had a higher price tag. This inflation affects not only you and me but our defense program, too. Our Government set up a budget for defense buying. Those items, because of inflation, now cost more than was figured. We'll have to make that money up and a lot of it is going to come from you and me in the form of taxes. Why, did you know that every 2-percent increase in prices sends the cost of the defense program up a billion dollars a year? Now let's get down to some of the reasons for the inflation. In order to get our Armed Forces ready for any eventuality certain materials must be siphoned from the civilian market to put muscles in our Armed Forces. Even before any real shortages showed up, however, prices began to jump, due to a combination of things. There was and is more money than ever before in the hands of the consumer and so he began buying—scare buying—anticipating possible shortages. Then the profiteer jumped into the picture and again up went prices. And remember this: Real shortages haven't yet put in an appearance. It will be months until the effect of the expanded security program is felt. Plants are in the conversion stage; it takes time to retool and mobilize on a big scale. There's plenty of everything. There are no shortages today. Then, again, price rises brought about wage rises all along the line of production and distribution, and resulted in further price hikes. Looking ahead, more people than ever before in the history of this country will have jobs. Many families will have more than one breadwinner and more money to spend. There will be less to buy and more buyers for every item. This, too, would give prices another shove. Something had to be done and done quickly. Voluntary controls didn't work at all, and so we issued the price and wage freeze of January 25.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. I suppose, Mr. Ching, that with a ceiling on prices there had to be one on wages too.

Mr. CHING. Naturally, we're trying to achieve a balance between prices and wages. Let me say right here, that the price and wage freeze will not eliminate inflation, not by a long shot. But it will help keep the inflation we're experiencing from going completely wild. We haven't frozen wages permanently. This action gives us the time to study the situation in detail and to decide where and when certain wages should be raised. We want to be fair. You realize, I'm sure, that there's a balance to aim for on prices and wages in order to stabilize our whole economy. Please give us the time to do this thing correctly. You may be a little hot under the collar right now, but, believe me, we hope to iron things out to everyone's satisfaction.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. Mr. Ching, my husband's earnings are pretty well fixed. It's become quite difficult for us to meet all our obligations. He hasn't had a raise for a year and now it seems he'll be stuck where he is.

Mr. CHING. I know just what you're up against. Men with fixed salaries, and they constitute the majority of our workingmen, are in a quandary right now. They're afraid, as your husband is, that their current income is as high as it will go. As I said a few moments ago, this order is strictly a stop-gap affair to give us time to adjust wages fairly. If we had taken the many weeks and perhaps months it would have involved to undertake a detailed study, wages and prices would have gone further out of line, to everyone's sorrow. Please assure your husband, Mrs. Schwartzel, that if his earnings are unfairly balanced as against the prices you're paying, he'll have his opportunity for an increase if our study shows it is called for. We are not bogeymen, determined to impose an iron law. We want everyone to get a fair deal and we're doing our best to see that policy through.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. Mr. DiSalle, ceilings on prices do not cover everything, and you haven't really rolled back prices at all. You're just pegged them at their highest point. Are they going to stay there?

Mr. DiSALLE. We're looking the price structure over right now and I can assure you that a number of prices will be rolled back. This freeze order was merely a point of beginning, to help prevent prices generally from going any higher. We realize that unnecessary scare buying or hoarding by consumers, and some apparent profiteering now being investigated, have spiraled many prices beyond a legitimate profit margin, and we intend to do something about that kind of thing. You've got to understand that price control in itself does not cure inflation. It is only one of three methods. Through tax and credit regulations your Government will hold down buying power when there aren't enough goods to go around. The Government is also doing everything it can to keep materials moving to the production lines. That should bring us higher production. Add price and wage controls and you have the triple attack we're making on inflation in order to achieve the stabilization you want. We think we've put a stop to the unholy spiral where higher prices gave way to higher wages, which in turn sent costs skyrocketing, and so on and on up the road to disaster. Now the price freeze does not prevent some prices from still rising. The reason? There are some agricultural products that we can't control simply because we have not been given the power to do so yet. The law doesn't permit them to come under price controls at this time. The order also specifically exempted fresh fruits, vegetables, fish, and seafood from controls. There are obvious reasons for that step. These products are highly seasonable, and are directly affected by weather and the means of transporting them to consumers, and they are highly perishable. Price controls for these items may become necessary; and if they do, they'll be worked out specially for them. And there are other exemptions I'd like to point out. Take certain oil-bearing seeds which we have to bring in from abroad. The seeds are used directly in the defense mobilization program. We were advised by the Department of Agriculture that price controls on there oil-bearing seeds would, in effect, cut down the amount of the product we could import. Then there's wool. This country imports most of its wool, and wool is a strategic item in defense production. Placing controls on wool imports would harm our defense planning. So you see, we didn't rush off in all directions at once in setting up the rules. But right now, more than anything else, what my office, and Mr. Ching's, desires most is the backing of every citizen to make the plan work out for the benefit of us all.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. Help out? Exactly how can everyone help? What can I do?

Mr. DiSALLE. We've got to build our military strength and build it fast. But, at the same time we must keep our economy strong. Inflation can destroy both our objectives if we let it go rampant. As we see it, here are some of the things we must do to prevent inflation from sabotaging our efforts.

Mr. CHING. First. Production must go up to supply our armed forces with what they need, and to provide for the civilian market. As we go along we'll have to reduce civilian production. Every one of us, at every level, management and labor, should make a very searching investigation of any increases in wages which bring about higher prices without sending production higher.

Mr. DiSALLE. Second. Higher taxes are coming. Pay higher taxes without grumbling because higher taxes help hold down prices now.

Mr. CHING. Third. Accept credit curbs gracefully, with the knowledge that credit restrictions help our supply of defense materials and help keep prices down by reducing competition for all supplies.

Mr. DiSALLE. Fourth. Let's determine to save more money. Laying that money aside means we won't buy everything we see and that money is made available for investments so that production can be increased.

Fifth. Buy only what we need, when we need it. Remember that scare buying operates against ourselves, that bidding for items that may be short will shoot prices skyward. These aren't easy things to do, but I think we can and will do them. Our Nation has met other crises before and we've always risen to the job.

Mr. McCORMICK. Attacking inflation, suppressing it through wage and price freezes, certainly calls for real, unselfish cooperation, on every level. If this is going to work, every one of us must sincerely want it to work. Mr. Ching, Mr. DiSalle, you're looking for help, so I'd like you to meet Mayor William F. Bailey, of Battle Creek, Mich. Mayor Bailey has an idea percolating on how his city can pitch in.

Mayor BAILEY. Mr. DiSalle, it strikes me that until you have complete machinery in every city, town and hamlet to enforce the price and wage ceilings, you're going to need help. It's an enormous job, what with people clamoring for specific rulings and reports of violations and so forth. Well, I've thought it over and here's an idea I'd like to propose. I'm thinking of setting up a mayor's voluntary committee to work with the regional and district offices of price stabilization. They'll really work and on a purely voluntary basis. There's going to be a constant job of informing our people on the wisdom of the freeze and to iron out the kinks as they show up. Now the way I see this committee, it will be composed of representatives from many types of working and selling people. Someone from management, labor, civic organizations, retail establishments, women's clubs and so on. You just let them know what you want done and how to go about it, and I'm sure they'll volunteer their help. Well, that's the idea in brief. Now, do you think we could be useful?

Mr. DiSALLE. Mayor Bailey, in the everyday English this Schwartzel asked for—you sure can be helpful. The idea is sound and we certainly can use your volunteer emergency committee. I'm not about to say we need all the help we can get. Your committee, working with the folks in the home town, and knowing as many of them personally, should inspire the confidence and the backing we need so badly. Put in, I think, your idea in the good to keep just for yourself. What would you say if we borrowed it and applied it on a Nation-wide scale?

Mayor BAILEY. Go right ahead and take it. If it does some good I'll be mighty proud.

Mr. DiSALLE. Then it's a deal. And as soon as we get off the air, I'm going to send word to thousands of mayors in the United States requesting the formation of the kind of committee you've been talking about. It's the type of voluntary cooperation which will go a long way toward building a greater understanding of our common problem.

Now, in winding this up, let me suggest that we think back only a few short years ago. We've lived through price and wage controls before. They are nothing completely new or revolutionary. Last time, I don't think anyone was hurt by them, and I don't think anyone will suffer now. Nobody loves controls. I certainly don't. But in our present situation they are absolutely necessary for the common good. And controls are part of the big plan to make us strong in the military side. A well-armed America will throw a shadow of strength that should cause any would-be aggressor to think twice before acting. You've heard the truth and so you know. And, in a democracy knowing is strength.

Mr. McCORMICK. In Korea, an ocean removed from the economic battle on the home front, steadily mounting enemy resistance continues to greet our advancing troops. Despite this, our Eighth Army has ripped new holes in the Red defenses below Seoul, proving itself far from the beaten yelping dog the Chinese radio is calling it. In reporting our new successes in Korea, we might we pause to mark the foot soldier for special citation—the infantry man who was carrying the determination of this Nation through rain, sleet, and snow. Lieutenant Fallon, from whom we hear next, led such men in the Seventeenth Infantry Regiment. Trained at West Point, wounded in the drive on the Manchurian border while directing mortar fire on the enemy, he is now undergoing treatment at the Army Medical Center here in Washington. For some moving words—his own words—on the men he led, listen to those from First Lt. Robert Fallon.

Lieutenant FALLON. This is the infantry soldier's war. And never in this country's history has any war required him to be so skillful. He has had to master the use of a dozen different weapons. He has had to learn the stealth of the Indian in night combat and patrols and the hardiness of the Eskimo in staying alive in subzero weather. Again, never has a military campaign required him to be so tough. These are the things that the American people are asking him to do: We have asked him to fight in a land thousands of miles from his home; we have asked him to risk his life daily, and the only reason he has is that we have told him that it is necessary. There is none of the compulsion of the Civil War when men were defending their homelands; none of the national dedication of the World Wars when the entire world was enflamed. No, his reason for fighting today is that the American people have asked him to fight. That is good enough for him.

We are asking this infantry soldier to endure temperatures 30 degrees colder than those known to the gallant men who followed George Washington to Valley Forge. We have asked him to undergo two tiring and difficult withdrawals, one in the chilling, merciless heat of summer, the other in the misery and cold of a Manchurian winter, both against odds at times more staggering than those faced by the valiant defenders of Bataan. We have asked him twice to turn and stand against these odds. The infantryman dug his hole and manned his weapons and held. He held when ships and planes and tanks very often could not help him—on the frozen hillsides of Korea. He did this lonely job well at a time when it seemed that it could not be done.

And who is this infantry soldier. He is a man who but a short time ago was sitting in a comfortable living room even as you. Now he is awaiting with dread the bitter, sudden winter night when to sleep means often not to awaken. He is the next-door neighbor who took with such relish the extra piece of roast beef when you had him over for dinner last summer. Now he is painfully hacking away at a can of beef stew which has frozen solid. He is the laundryman who used to deliver your bundle of spotless linen each week. Now he is wearing a shirt he hasn't changed in 6 weeks.

This man whom you know so well has become a part of the finest group of fighting men in the world—the American Infantry. He is you, your soldier, there because you asked him to go.

Mr. McCORMICK. Scene: Indochina, another border-in-the-balance in the Far East. Here French troops and the Vietnamese National Army, assisted by American military aid and equipment, struggle against the rebel Communist forces of Ho-Chi Minh. The question on everyone's mind—will the Chinese Reds join this fight too? It was to go into this critical matter, among others, that President Truman and French Premier Rene Pleven last week closed themselves in conference. And brought all the way from Indochina to lend his first-hand information to assist them, was the man we meet next. That you may hear his report firsthand, we present now our last Minister to Iron-curtain Bulgaria—up to the time we suspended diplomatic relations—who now serves as our Minister to the Associated States of Indochina, Donald R. Heath.

Mr. HEATH. French and Indochinese troops, helped by American arms aid, are holding the pass against the spread of communism to Southeast Asia. American arms aid is not, as the Communist propaganda spreads, being used to bolster up a French colonial regime in Indochina. The French colonial regime ended with the signature of the so-called Pau accords on December 16. On January 1, all Indochinese Government services were turned over to the Indochinese States. A relatively large number of French Government technical experts are being held temporarily, at the request of the Indochinese, in certain posts until Indochinese can be trained to take their place. In the case of many positions that will be a matter of only a few months. Meanwhile, French instructors and American arms are being devoted to building up a Vietnamese national army. It will take a good many months, however, to make Vietnamese troops equal in numbers and training to the rebel troops, who are trained and equipped by the Chinese Communists. The Vietnamese have asked for the continued assistance of the French forces until the Vietnamese army is ready to assume responsibility for the defense of Indochina.

I have been asked many times in the past week about the position of the Communist threat to Indochina and its significance to the free world. The menace is in no sense the result of Indochinese and the Communist operation in Indochina with minor variations is the same experienced by other areas under Communist attack throughout the world. The Communists seek to gain control by disguising themselves as nationalists. They attempt to prevent the development of an independent nationalist government. They go to all imaginable extremes to prevent reconstruction of the country now devastated and the alleviating of human suffering in areas not under army domination. Their tactics are those of murder, kidnap, arson, threats, and intimidation. The Communists know that the development of healthy, independent states and the development of the human and material resources of Indochina would make their subversion and domination impossible.

The hope which I saw for the future of Indochina lies in these brave people of whom there are many who have fought for freedom, freedom, and human betterment despite the threats of retaliation from the Communist-directed machinery and assassins who exist in every area. The Communist attempts at intimidation, leaders from the village level to the highest positions in government, in striving forward to make these rules will tend to give meaning to their sacrifices.

The Chinese Communists have thrust into Korea and Tibet. There is other pressing on Indochina's borders. The free nations of the world are banding together. The people of southeast Asia are not willing to be slaves of Communist imperialism. They do not want to become the sixth bowl to fall after seizure of a Communist-directed Chinese war machine throughout the rest of Asia. By collective action the free world can be instrumental in assisting the people of Indochina now in the Communist orbit.

Mr. McCORMICK. Now, shift the lens and cameras upon the battle again. It seems fitting today, for another "anniversary." Then, against the background of bloodshed in Korea, in Robert Taft's home, a prayer is offered on your twenty-first birthday Support, Washington.

Nation Is Warned To Guard Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as we mobilize the resources of our country to meet the threat of a Communist aggression, we cannot afford to neglect the school system which we have built up over the years. During World War II our school system was too much neglected, and we are feeling the effects of this neglect today.

It would be the height of folly to restrict our present school program during this period when we need to utilize every possible resource. The training of our manpower to meet our military and civilian needs is not something that can be accomplished after an individual becomes of military age. The training for a proper role as a citizen is the full-time function of our school system. We cannot afford to neglect any portion of it. Our school system should be our chief resource in providing better citizens, better soldiers, and a strong civilian morale to resist the subversive efforts of communism. It will be a great tragedy if we permit the present mobilization to bring about a wholesale shift of our best teachers from their present jobs to temporary defense work. We will suffer another major set-back if we halt the construction of new school buildings.

We cannot afford to postpone essential school construction any longer. The proper education of our children is just as vital to our defense as any part of our military training program.

Those communities which are attempting to solve their problem of school facilities are being penalized today by mounting costs. These costs will become higher daily unless would-be bidders on construction have some assurance of being able to secure the necessary materials. Taxpayers will be called upon to meet these additional local costs unless we can head them off. The penalties of inflation are heavy enough without this added burden being forced upon us.

School trustees throughout the country are today faced with the virtually impossible problem of meeting the cost of construction within limits set up by available revenue and bond issues. Mounting costs and scarce supplies make it impossible to secure firm bids for the construction of badly needed educational buildings.

The one important step in the solution of this problem could be the establishment of priorities on building materials for school construction. I have requested the National Production Authority to establish these priorities and have also asked Dr. Earl McGrath, head of the Office of Education, to make the same request. I urge all of my colleagues interested in the country's school construction program to support this effort.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following article from the New York Times which further substantiates the need for guarding our schools during this crisis:

NATION IS WARNED TO GUARD SCHOOLS—IT WOULD BE CRIMINAL, WHILE PREPARING FOR WAR, TO NEGLECT THEM, DR. RUSSELL SAYS—PUBLIC'S ROLE STRESSED—IF A COMMUNITY KNOWS WHAT IT WANTS IN EDUCATION, IT CAN GET IT; TUITION PLAN IS TOLD

(By Benjamin Fine)

While preparing for total war it would be criminal for this Nation to neglect its schools, Dr. William F. Russell, president of Teachers College, Columbia University, warned yesterday.

Addressing 300 educators attending the eleventh annual Tuition Plan forum at Sherry's, Dr. Russell called for greater support of the country's schools. It would be dangerous at this time, he declared, to cut down on the schools, to fail to construct new buildings, or to permit teachers to leave their jobs.

It is the public's responsibility so to support and guide the schools as not only to realize the American dream, but also to protect our land from foreign enemies, he declared.

GRAVENESS OF TIMES STRESSED

"At this particular time," Dr. Russell said, "an especially grave responsibility falls upon us all. For we are going into a period, if not of war, at least of a long period of time apparently, in which we must be prepared to go to war at a moment's notice. And we must prepare for a war to be fought, not as in olden times, by a few hired mercenaries and hired soldiers, but for a total war, to be fought by all that we have and are.

"We must make the best of our total stock of raw materials, of our machines and factories, and equally we must make the best use of our human resources. That means that every item of ability, energy, and zeal in our population must be used to its maximum. The square peg in the round hole, in ordinary times thought to be unfortunate, in time of preparation for total war becomes a scandal and a waste. Just that much potential power is lost."

Five thousand citizens' groups concerned with the public schools, representing 500,000 individuals, are now actively engaged throughout the country in working for better schools, another speaker, Roy E. Larsen, president of Time, told the educators. He called this movement toward citizen support one of the most heartening developments in recent school history.

Mr. Larsen, who is chairman of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, said the primary responsibility for formal education belonged to all the citizens of this Nation. Our publicly supported and locally controlled schools were cited as examples of democracy in action. He added that the basic purpose of his commission was to encourage the formation of more independent local groups and to help those now working in every way possible.

"The citizen organization which represents all factions in the community, which works objectively without personal prejudice, which cooperates with administrators, teachers and the school board, will be able to carry out the citizens' primary responsibility," Mr. Larsen said. "They will be able to determine what kind of school system they want, and to go about getting that kind of school system to serve the needs of all children as individuals and the community as a whole."

Long Beach (Calif.) Newspaper Writes Constructive Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Long Beach Press-Telegram for February 4, 1951. It appears to me it is so crystal clear in its analysis and constructive suggestions and ideas that I am pleased to have the opportunity to share it with you:

RED LINE IS SHREWD, BUT DOESN'T FOOL PEOPLE WHO ASK QUESTIONS

Yesterday a reader called to report that he had received some printed material which sounded as if it might have come from a subversive source.

"But how can you be sure?" he asked.

The answer is—you can't make a sweeping definition of what constitutes a subversive influence. Such definitions catch too many innocent people who are merely exercising their privileges under the Bill of Rights.

But you can assume a questioning attitude which should help you determine whether a writer or speaker is trying to improve America or tear it down.

There is no doubt the propagandists for communism are busy across the land—in Long Beach as well as elsewhere. They use every device and medium: letters, public platform, microphone, pamphlets. Paradoxically they camouflage their propaganda with a false cloak of "patriotism."

They speak of "peace." Naturally, it is a term attractive at this time to so many. But the usual give-away is that their "peace" proposals are almost identical with those of the enemy and, of course, opposite to those of the United States. They represent communism as a peaceful ideology, hoping you will forget that its militaristic actions reveal it as an imperialistic doctrine of force and intrigue.

They attack the American press, for it is a great symbol of the American freedom. They tell you the press is muzzled and kept. But nothing can be done about this, they say, because the press is an example of private enterprise. They insinuate that it would be better if there were no private enterprise.

An ironical proof that this attack on the press has no foundation was demonstrated recently at a Long Beach meeting by a left-wing speaker from another city. He read example after example of news stories "which the 'free' press said nothing about." But the joker was his items of proof were clippings of those news stories from that same "muzzled" American press which he was criticizing. When this contradiction is pointed out, anyone can see how ridiculous was the speaker's argument. But many persons fail to probe beneath surface remarks, and therefore the propagandists get away with such things.

The Communists and fellow travelers exploit human sympathies to the full. They pretend they are being persecuted for trying to uphold the Bill of Rights. "Me against the world," they wail. Watch out for the men who proclaim themselves as martyrs.

While most of these vermilionized "patriots" are too subtle to declare baldly that everything Russia does is good and everything the United States does is bad, that, nevertheless, is the burden of their message.

Certainly, this country is not without its wrongs, and everybody has a right and duty of criticism. But there's a difference between criticism which seeks to improve our democratic system and criticism which attempts to replace our democratic system with communism.

Not that this latter criticism should be stifled—but it certainly ought to be recognized by everybody for what it is. The best way we can fight communism in America is by identifying its proponents, keeping them out in the open, and occasionally tossing verbal harpoons into their red tinges.

Here are some questions a citizen might ask himself when attempting to judge the convictions and affiliations of a speaker or a writer:

1. Is he offering a positive program of his own—or is he merely falling in step with the enemy?

2. Does he continually harp about "capitalistic" institutions which can't be punished for their "evil doings" because the system of Government protects them?

3. Does he appeal to your emotions, instead of to your intelligence? That is, does he try to exploit your feelings of sympathy, resentment, etc., instead of trying to get you to reason out a situation?

4. Does he use concrete terms, or is his pitch full of glittering generalities such as "social mindedness" and "decadent democracy?"

5. Does he never say anything good about the United States? Does he talk about American imperialism.

These five questions, of course, can't tell you the complete story. But they are a guide. If you ask them, you'll be well on the way to the necessary thinking which must be done in connection with the menace of Communist propaganda. The Red line is shrewd, but not too shrewd for people who ask questions.

Air Force Jet Fighters Spread an Air Umbrella Over All Vital Areas and Industries of Middle West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are continuing to vote every dollar and all else that is being asked to secure the defense of these United States, but I shall always continue to contend that we should not stop at a dollar's worth of defense value for every tax dollar collected and paid out of the Federal Treasury, but achieve the defense with a minimum of manpower and lives of our people.

The question which presents itself to the House now is whether those who are in charge of our Nation's defense plan to secure this country by the use of air power or by the unlimited use of manpower. One of the most heartening things which I have come upon in months, with respect to the situation of our Nation's security, is an article written by Mr. Max K. Gilstrap, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 29.

The article is entitled "Jet Fighters Spread Umbrella Over Midwest Plants."

Mr. Speaker, I know the great majority of my colleagues in this House share in my belief that the American people are not afraid of a practically nonexistent Russian surface navy. Neither are they afraid of amphibious attack being made against the cities of our east and west coasts—nor of Russian tanks rumbling either across the Alleghenies or the Rockies in endeavor to invade the great Mississippi Valley Corn Belt, and the great industrial empire that lies behind those mountains.

The thing our people fear above all else is the power and might of a Russian air force which could spread death and destruction out of Russian-built bombers flying over the great metropolitan areas, towns, and villages of these United States.

It was, indeed, heartening to read this article by Max Gilstrap, in which he pointed out how much the United States Air Force is on its toes in guarding our cities, towns, and the great industrial plants of the Nation.

In a mere matter of 30 seconds—

Mr. Gilstrap discloses—

the men on the Selfridge Air Force Base in Michigan grab their helmets, parachutes, and "Mae West" life jackets, and race to their Sabre jets, where they find a crew chief waiting to button them in. With no engine to warm up, the ship roars off the runway in a scant 6 minutes—and, rocketing, the pilot climbs to 40,000 feet to take a heading or degree direction given in his phone earbrim.

Mr. Speaker, accompanying the article is a fragment of a map of the North Central States, showing the principal metropolitan and industrial areas covered by different air bases.

What Max Gilstrap writes of the work of the Air Force in defending the area adjacent to Selfridge Field in Michigan is true with respect to Air Force defense activities on every base in these United States.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder, then, that this nationally known correspondent in charge of the Monitor's Chicago office states that—

An anxious America can find a bright spot in the all-too-slow national effort toward preparedness in the zest and bustle which is taking place on Air Force bases throughout the land.

It is altogether unfortunate that Louis Johnson, when Secretary of Defense, ignored the mandate given him by the Eightieth Congress and failed to strengthen the Air Force with the $850,000,000 voted by the Congress. This would have enabled us now to have an air-force-in-being of the strength recommended not alone by our own Congressional Aviation Policy Committee, but by that eminent board of business leaders headed by the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, now Secretary of the Department of the Air Force—and, as outlined in the Finletter report, anchored on every hand.

As Max Gilstrap states:

Needed air strength to secure national safety will not be achieved in a matter of months. It may take a year, according to top officials in Washington, to attain a strong air arm. But the United States has the happy knack, in a crisis, of moving faster than it thinks it can.

The hopeful note observed in this important part of the home Air Force defense mission is the general feeling that it speedily preparation has America's greatest opportunity to prevent rather than to meet the threat of general war.

Mr. Speaker, this timely article by Max Gilstrap of the Christian Science Monitor is so heartening to every conscientious American citizen that I am asking unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert the same in the Record of our proceedings.

The article is as follows:

JET FIGHTERS SPREAD UMBRELLA OVER MIDWEST PLANTS

(By Max K. Gilstrap)

SELFRIDGE AIR FORCE BASE, MICH.—Getting zero. Looming through the dense fog, birdlike F-86 Sabre jet fighters with swept-back wings sit on the wet runway, poised and ready.

It was a reassuring glimpse of a fast-growing arm of the Nation's air defense. It said better than words that the country has begun furnishing a protective air umbrella over its vital industries spread across the Middle West.

Jet fighter protection is part of a vast, complicated national air defense program being rushed to protect America, especially in the emergency. It is a vital link in the nationwide network including aircraft warning stations, radar listening posts, and an intricate communications system being woven across the country.

COME NOTHING CHANCE

Col. James R. Cross, Jr., commander of the Sixty-third Fighter-Interceptor Wing, component of the Eastern Air Force Defense, explained that his jet fighters serve as a powerful fist in the United States air arm. They help protect such industrial centers as Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago.

Several times a day these operational jets streak off into the skies above Lake St. Clair and cut over mid-America to patrol the skies for unidentified aircraft.

Under the Sixty-third Fighter-Interceptor Wing command, the Sixty-first Fighter Squadron here joins the Sixty-third at Oscoda, Mich., north of Saginaw Bay, and the Sixty-second at Chicago in protecting areas within a 500-mile radius of their respective bases.

Assisted by the unblinking, cloud-piercing eyes of ground radar stations, they search for unidentified aircraft over the vital South Ontario, mill centers, and manufacturing factories. Orders require them to force down any plane which refuses to give its identification.

This goes back in the Civil Aeronautics Administration requirement that all planes file flight plans of any intended crossing of the American-Canadian border. A penalty for noncompliance with the CAA rule makes the pilot liable to a year in prison or $10,000 fine.

Heartening signs of America's determination to build its air strength quickly are visible despite the heavy odor that surrounds this home of the Tenth Air Force headquarters.

"It's busting out at the seams," a flight lieutenant remarked. He waved at the swarms of aircraft crowding the field. Of a vast reserve training program of 115,000 air reservists spread over 10 North Central States.

In the squadron operations room we found the Sabre jet pilots. At first glance they appeared overly nonchalant, swapping in their flying togs, playing ping-pong and reading magazines. But their manner was brisk and an air of expectancy hung over this room as they kept their ears cocked toward the phone.

Action calls come frequently for these men on 24-hour alert duty.

Other fliers, off duty, are available for action within an hour's notice.

Capt. William T. Whisner, of Shreveport, La., and Lt. Curtis L. Utterback, of Brackettville, Tex., natty in blue Air Force uniforms, described what happens when they are alerted.

Over the phone comes an order, "Scramble red flight." Or it may say, "Scramble white or blue flight," the colors indicating the number of the flight. In a dash, the men grab their helmets, parachutes, and Mae West life jackets from the wall and are out of the door in 30 seconds. Racing to their Saber jets, they find a crew chief waiting to "button them in."

In the cockpit the pilot fastens his shoulder harness and safety belt, plugs in his head set for radio, connects his oxygen mask. No engine warm-up is necessary. Off he roars, a scant 6 minutes having elapsed since the moment he was alerted.

USUALLY FLY IN PAIRS

Rocketlike, the pilot climbs to 40,000 feet and takes a "heading" or degree direction given in the phone order. Then he listens for radio instructions. Ordinarily he is given the location of an unidentified aircraft to identify and he zooms off, usually with another plane to find it. Six 50-caliber machine guns are loaded and ready to fire.

Orders for opening fire would have to come from headquarters. But Captain Whisner remarked, "I wouldn't be likely to wait very long for orders if a plane opened fire or if I saw it's bomb bays begin to open."

Jet pilots are justly proud of their Sabres whose exploits and superior speed against the fastest Russian-built planes have been heard from in Korea. They hold the world's speed record of 670.981 miles per hour for operational jets. One attained an unofficial record of 710 miles per hour flying from Dayton, Ohio, to Washington in 33 minutes and 3 seconds.

HEARTENING SITUATION

An anxious America can find a bright spot in the all-too-slow national efforts toward preparedness in the west and bustle at this air base.

Watching the flood of reservists, draftees, and enlistees arriving; hearing that 16 bases are scheduled for reactivation across the country, and seeing the flyers in action is to share some of their confidence that America will be able to prepare in time to prevent general war.

Needed air strength to assure national safety will not be achieved in a matter of months. It may take a year, according to top officials in Washington, to attain a strong air arm. But the United States has the happy knack in a crisis of moving faster than it thinks it can.

The hopeful note observed in this integral part of the broad Air Force defense mosaic is the general feeling that in speedy preparation lies America's greatest opportunity to prevent, rather than to meet, the threat of general war.

Compulsory Bond Subscription Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine has asked that his proposed compulsory subscription plan in relation to personal taxes be inserted into the RECORD. The plan is as follows:

A certain percentage of your wages, over and above the present tax, is levied at the same rate as that contemplated now in increased taxes. In return for this levy, which is withheld, as at present, you receive non-interest-bearing bonds as follows:

Twenty percent of new levy in 5-year maturity bonds.

Thirty percent of new levy in 7-year maturity bonds.

Fifty percent of new levy in 10-year maturity bonds.

Now, say Joe Doakes draws a wartime wage of $450 and his new levy is set at $80, he would then receive $16 in 5-year bonds, $24 in 7-year bonds, and $40 in 10-year bonds.

Now, these bonds are nonnegotiable, noninterest bearing, and nontransferable—except, of course, in case of death—and cannot be cashed in before maturity. The net and obvious end product of this compulsory subscription plan is that—

First. The war will be financed.

Second. There will not be excessive taxes to be repealed after the war—and who ever heard of a tax being repealed?

Third. The compulsory savings thus achieved will provide a long-term economic cushion.

Fourth. The morale of the taxpaying public will be kept at a higher level knowing that—in a reasonable number of years—they will get their money back.

Fifth. This part of the public debt will not be subject to the corroding effect of interest.

Sixth. This plan will not have any of the confiscatory elements present in all taxes.

Seventh. The knowledge that these bonds will have to be redeemed at maturity may possibly prod the people in our Government to arouse themselves out of their usual lethargy and so conduct public affairs that we may, in time, achieve a sound national fiscal policy. It may even make it necessary for the Treasury Department to collect income taxes from the higher bracket racketeers. Who knows?

The only argument that could, and probably will be raised is that this plan is far too simple. It offers none of the delectable vistas of overwhelming red tape.

Yea-and-Nay Votes on Appropriation Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER B. McMULLEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1951, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, my friend and colleague, Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS, introduced House Resolution 119. The purpose of this bill is to require the Members of Congress to vote yea or nay, and further that their vote shall be recorded, on any and all appropriations.

This bill has received wide publicity and in my opinion the people of the Nation feel that it should be passed. I have received a number of communications from my constituents urging the passage of this bill and I feel that the time has come when Members of Congress should be willing to stand up and be counted on how they vote to appropriate and spend the taxpayers' money. We of the Florida delegation intend to work for the passage of this bill.

I am including herewith the following editorial on the subject from the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times of February 6, 1951, entitled "It's Our Taxes, Boys—Remember?":

IT'S OUR TAXES, BOYS—REMEMBER?

Just a year ago Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Fort Lauderdale, introduced a resolution in the House which would have required a roll-call vote on every appropriation bill.

In applauding Mr. ROGERS' move then, we editorially observed that "All too often the Congressmen would prefer not to have their constituents know where they stand."

We pointed out that this is one of the main reasons the two Houses have resisted installation of electric vote-recording devices such as many State legislatures use. This coyness was one of the principal reasons for the establishment of Congressional Quarterly, the Washington news service, which polls the Members of Congress on votes where no record is kept.

Sure enough, Representative ROGERS' proposal disappeared into the limbo. Consequently billions of dollars were appropriated without record votes—in fact about two-thirds of all the tax-spending bills were so passed.

So now Mr. ROGERS is trying it again. He's going to introduce the same sort of resolution and see if the Eighty-second Congress is any more responsible than its predecessor.

All the sound reasons for this step last year are doubly valid this year. First, the appropriations to be voted this year are enormously increased. Second, the House Appropriations Committee has already pulled some hanky-panky by abandoning the one-package budget and going back to the old piecemeal system of appropriations for each department.

The one-package plan failed to produce the volume of savings its enthusiastic backers thought it would. But it did cut down in the log-rolling produced by the other system and, imperfect as it was, it gave a more comprehensive picture of the total expenditures.

With Congress due to spend about $70,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' hard-earned cash, and putting on the bite for far heavier taxes, certainly John Q is entitled to know how his Representative or Senator is spending his—John Q's—money.

We hope the whole Florida delegation in House and Senate gets behind the Rogers' resolution. We can't think of any better way to get the State favorable publicity than by upholding this fundamental right of the people.

Exemption of Certain Farm Boys From Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, we have repeatedly sent appeals to Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, for the exemption of certain farm boys, and while he has replied that production

will not in any way be interfered with, the facts are that the draft is seriously affecting production. What Mr. Hershey says and what he does do not agree at all.

Appeals have been made to local boards, and the State board, but there seems to be no one interested in keeping up farm production. It just has not yet occurred to these officials and to Mr. Hershey in particular that the production of food is of the least importance. If we are to follow our policy of settling every disturbance on the globe's surface, we may expect a long contest, and if that is true, food will be the most important fact in our whole armed system. To bring this situation definitely to the attention of the Congress and the people, I quote a letter I just received from a farmer of Williams County, N. Dak., that speaks for itself:

Congressman USHER L. BURDICK,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing you in regard to our son ———, who has just been called down and passed his physical examination for the Army.

I'd like to paint this picture to you and see if you can in some way help us get a deferment for our son.

Four years ago we left our farm on account of poor health. As you know, I've been so bad with rheumatism that it's left my back so I can hardly do any hard work or ride tractors. And my wife, too, has been fighting lung trouble, so doctor's orders were to leave the farm. So we established our home in town, leaving the farm to our son. He has been doing all our heavy farm work all his life and he is now 23 years old. He has established his home there, running the farm of approximately 1,600 acres under cultivation, of which 480 acres he owns. He also has a herd of 18 registered cattle and 20 other Black Angus. We have and own ample pasture land for a larger herd if help could be gotten. He has a full line of farm machinery consisting of three tractors, self-propelled combines and all other necessary farm equipment. Now all this equipment he still owes some money on, and where can we find one that can take over?

Now, we've appealed to our local draft board with an answer of rent it out or sell. Then we appealed to our State board, but it seems like nothing is being done for our farm boys.

So I'm appealing to you, wondering if in some way you could help us or tell us what to do.

Thanking you in advance for anything you do for us.

Respectfully.

Voting Records Should Be Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States:

VOTING RECORDS SHOULD BE PUBLIC

The most valued gage by which the folks at home can judge how well their elected representatives are serving in Congress is a record of their vote on any and all legislation.

Whether the lawmaker votes "aye" or "nay" is a specific indication of his stand on any issue. It is a much truer and more easily recognizable guide of his stewardship in office than what he says. Look at a lawmaker's voting record and you can tell whether he is doing right by his constituents.

Although the voting record is a simple method of determining a Congressman's worth, it is not easily accessible to the ordinary citizen. Perhaps Congress has wanted it that way—to make it easy for the Members of the House and Senate to talk one way and vote another, without the boys at the fork of the creek being any the wiser.

Under present arrangements, the Legislative Reference Service will not give to persons or organizations who request it, the voting record of any Member of Congress—unless permission from that Member is first obtained.

If nothing else, this lack of cooperation looks bad. It gives rise to the idea that the lawmakers would rather the public did not know too much about the individual record of the Members.

Congressman BOGGS of Louisiana is now attempting to remove the protective cloak which substantially protects the voting records. He has introduced a bill to change the regulations. It is the second time he has made the proposal. He tried last year to put over a similar bill, but nothing came of it.

What he proposes now is that the Legislative Reference Service shall be required "upon application by the editor of any newspaper or other publication published in the United States, or any group of 10 or more citizens of the United States, to compile and make available, without charge, to such applicant the voting record in Congress of any Member thereof for any period specified in such application."

In other words, an editor or any group of 10 people could get the voting record of any Congressman for any period simply by requesting it. Permission of the House or Senate Member would not be required.

That is as it should be. Primarily, this would be a service to the public, because most larger newspapers have such facilities as wire service and special representatives to obtain any desired voting records.

Mr. BOGGS' bill should be enacted.

Protecting America's Bald Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I introduced H. R. 5507 for the protection of the bald eagle, and the bill was given favorable consideration by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and was passed by the House on July 10, 1950. However, it was not acted on by the Senate and I reintroduced the measure at this session and it was assigned the number H. R. 1879.

This measure has the support of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the American Museum of Natural History, the National Audubon Society, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Emergency Conservation Commission, the National Wildlife Institute, the National Park Association and Wilderness Society, and the American Nature Association. An editorial recently appeared in the Portland Oregonian urging the passage of this legislation. I am including the editorial as a part of these remarks, as follows:

PROTECTING AMERICA'S EMBLEM

If the national symbol of the United States is to survive, Congress should enact a bill just introduced by Representative HOMER ANGELL of Oregon. The measure seeks to extend to Alaska a law making it a crime to kill or capture a bald eagle. The Member from Portland succeeded in getting an identical bill through the House of Representatives in the previous session of Congress, but it died in the Senate.

Everywhere under our flag except in Alaska the bald eagle is protected. In Alaska, however, it is mercilessly hunted. Presentation of an eagle's talons brings a $2 bounty from the Territorial treasury. Pressure from commercial fishermen is responsible for this situation. They believe that the eagle makes heavy inroads on the salmon runs.

Ironically, in spite of the bounty, the Museum of Natural History points out that "it is only in Alaska that the bald eagle still exists in numbers sufficient to give hope for its permanent preservation." In other places, civilization has encroached on the crags and feeding grounds necessary to the continued existence of the great bird which is a synonym for Uncle Sam.

Many naturalists contend that overfishing by commercial interests in Alaska exceeds enormously any toll taken by bald eagles. The suspicion seems well founded that trappers and canneries are blaming on the hardy bird a fault which may be attributed to human beings. Passage of Congressman ANGELL's bill will make possible a final effort to preserve in its natural state the national bird of our country.

Raw Cotton Price Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article by Mr. Gerald Dearing published Saturday, February 10, in the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

COTTON COMMENT—BUREAUCRACY GAINS FOR ERRS BY WEARING OUT OPPOSITION THROUGH DELAYS, EVASIONS, REPORTS OF CONFUSIONS, AND CREATING OF DENSITY AMONG THOSE COMPLAINING

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

Cotton men, looking apprehensively toward Washington, there at the mounting red ink in their ledgers as expenses go on and business is at a standstill, are wondering when price ceilings will be lifted.

They are being given the full treatment of delay and evasion of Washington bureaucracy and any faltering on their part at this time can be disastrous.

Due to the heavy pressures which they have built up since price ceilings were made effective 2 weeks ago last night, they have been well on the way to winning their arguments. They can win if they persist. Washington, the unity, and doubt at this time can defeat them, or force them into compromises that are obnoxious.

It has long been the practice of bureaucracy to stall for time—because time works in their favor. They know that no matter how loud and strong the complaints against their actions are at first, that they grow

weaker and weaker as time progresses. They rely on the suggestion of compromise proposals on their part to get the protestants divided among themselves. They manage to raise doubts in the minds of the opposition, to create distrust between one segment and then another. The opposition gradually dies down.

Then they have their own way.

This must not happen to the cotton industry and the fight for the removal of price ceilings.

The battle is for more than the immediate opening of the futures market. It is for the life of the cotton trade. It is for survival of a major segment of the free-enterprise system.

Victory for the advocates of price ceilings on raw cotton can and probably will be the repetition of the history of the raw-cotton industry in England. It will close the exchanges, make the normal traders unable to function, just as they now are unable to trade, and result in the intrusion of Government into the cotton trade, which bureaucracy then would take over.

This would mean that Government would determine the price to be paid for cotton and the price for which it would be sold. The producer would have only one buyer—the mills could find but one seller. As the supply rose and fell the Government would order the farmer to plant according to the need—not voluntarily but as a matter of law.

Government-controlled economies are economies of artificial shortages. The evidence is in the price control and slaughtering order on meat, which has just been issued.

There has been no complaint that there is a shortage of meat, only that prices have advanced too far. So price ceilings are being clamped down. But, in addition to the ceilings, comes notice that packers will be assigned butchering quotas beginning April 1. Instead of being able to buy all the cattle and hogs offered by the farmers and butcher them to fill the demand of the public, the packers will be limited. This will create a shortage, artificial, of course, but a shortage nonetheless. Shortages lead to black markets, which create greater shortages. Then comes rationing for the public—less meat, smaller supplies. And the bureaucrat is in command again.

The cotton trade needs unity and persistence in their fight. There should be no talk of compromise, no slackening of effort.

This is not cotton's final battle against bureaucracy—unless it is lost. If this battle is lost, there can be no more cotton trade. If it is won, there is hope of victory in the next fight, which is inevitable as long as the Government-in-business termites are allowed to bore their way through the Government bureaus in Washington.

Criticism Should Be Constructive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the following excellent editorial by Mr. Manchester Boddy, the able editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News, which deals with the subject of criticism and recommends standards which, if adhered to, would do much to preserve American democracy:

CRITICISM SHOULD BE KEYED TO UNITY

(By Manchester Boddy)

Being an optimist by nature, and having seen my optimism justified through experience, I have always been more than a little impatient with critics who deliberately refuse to point out the good along with the bad and thus prepare the reader for a plus or minus balance honestly arrived at; with critics who can do no constructive work.

Once I wrote something like this to a writer who was unfairly (I thought) criticizing a public official who was making a valiant effort to solve tough public problems. The critic replied on the back of a penny postcard with these words from Horace:

"I'll play a whetstone's part, which makes iron sharp, though unable itself to cut."

Quite a lot of people must think their mission in life is to be a whetstone, judging from the volume of criticism one reads and hears. Perhaps there is more now than in former years, although my editorial scrapbooks do not prove it.

In the field of national affairs, my collections of unbalanced criticism begin with "the mistakes of Woodrow Wilson", which, among other things, caused an uncontrolled war boom that ended in the sudden and disastrous bust of 1921.

I have a clear recollection of the year, but, like many others I was so "busted" at the time that the so-called economic crash made no impression; it just reduced some of the war profiteers to the status of the average veteran.

But now as I review all of the economic, military, and political mistakes charged against Woodrow Wilson, I wonder how the Nation managed to survive, much less win a war. If I had known about the mistakes at the time, I probably would have stayed home and grumbled (perhaps yelled) instead of going off with a gun to the western front, bubbling with enthusiasm for the good, old United States of America, most perfect of all nations on earth.

My second collection is devoted to "the corruption of the Warren Harding administration," and "Calvin Coolidge's long sleep."

Each, of course, is a post mortem. The experts, with the detachment of autopsy surgeons, put the dead administrations under microscopes and discovered the "seeds of destruction" that could have been sterilized if Messrs. Harding and Coolidge had done what they oughter—but didn't. As I read the reports I wonder how we ever survived.

The most interesting collection is concerned with proving that Herbert Hoover was the chief architect of the great depression. Reading it makes me think of a building that collapsed because the builder just didn't know how to provide bracing, proper foundations, and allowances for sway and strain. The mistakes were so easily discovered after the collapse.

The most voluminous collection, naturally, is devoted to the tragic mistakes of F. D. R. It seems that no part of the United States or the world at large escaped the dire consequences of his ideas and actions, all of which could have been avoided—if.

Our latest collection grows fatter with each passing day: "The mistakes of Harry Truman." This is only a temporary file, concerned primarily with grumblings and scarepieces put out for propaganda purposes. The autopsy surgeons will not render the final verdicts until the administration has taken its place in history.

Intelligent, constructive criticism by competent critics is the essential vitamin that keeps our body politic alive and healthy. Without it our democracy would go the way of totalitarian governments and be destroyed. It is better to tolerate a lot of harmful criticism than to do away with all criticism.

Nevertheless, the rapid development of radio as a means of mass communication has brought with it an overburden of critics whose main stock-in-trade is a glib tongue, a pleasing voice, and the notion that a large audience is in itself complete justification for whatever is said.

The test of the value of too many critical dissertations on the state of the Union has become: "Does it attract a large audience? If so, it must be good. My sponsor pays for the audience, not for the soundness of my views."

The same, of course, can be said of critics who express themselves through the printed word, although time has developed a responsibility in this field that has not yet found its counterpart in the showmanship of many political critics who use the radio as their means of expression.

If we are to develop the degree of unity in the United States that alone can carry us through the perils of our time, we must be as careful with criticism as we are with all other potentially dangerous weapons.

Unpleased Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

UNPLEASED STATESMAN

Senator TAFT's latest attack on administration policy strengthens the suspicion in many minds that the Ohio statesman wouldn't like any Trumanite proposition even if it were good.

When he limited his attack to domestic issues, Mr. TAFT could be sure of a hand from Democrats as well as Republicans. That was shown by his landslide victory in the Ohio senatorial contest last year after a campaign pitched almost totally on national questions. Since that triumph, however, the Senator has taken a running jump into the dispute over foreign policy and the overseas defense program. His attack from the Senate floor last Thursday indicated his purpose to wage an all-out fight against the defense plans formulated by the armed service chieftains—possibly because they have the support of the administration.

The Senator's repetition of his earlier charge that Mr. Truman is assuming military authority he does not have in asserting his power to order American troops overseas without congressional consent. Perhaps he will force that issue to a vote in the Senate—unless a private canvass of the membership convinces him the test would go against him. That political quarrel will take care of itself in due course. But Mr. TAFT started an attack from another angle that will arouse Nation-wide interest.

In a roundhouse swing at General Eisenhower, the Ohio oracle questioned that world-famous officer's judgment and conclusions in the military field and intimated that he had been less than frank with the American people. General Eisenhower, according to the Senate's military expert, is exaggerating the danger of an unsuccessful war in Europe. His report on the European situation was hazy, the Senator complains. And finally he demands that Congress write its own order arbitrarily

defining and limiting the movement of American troops abroad from this time forth.

Senator TAFT's military judgments and prescience were tested by Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, and as we remember it he flunked all down the line. His pre-Pearl Harbor talks and votes revealed him as misinformed with respect to the international situation and perhaps the world's worst guesser on what was in store for the United States. Americans of all parties and of none welcomed the Senator's smashing victory in Ohio. But do any of them feel that his triumph at the polls on strictly domestic issues qualifies him to master mind the Nation's foreign and defense policies after the Pearl Harbor show-off and show-up of his judgment in that field? Maybe, after all, General Eisenhower knows more about the military situation and prospect than even Senator TAFT himself thinks Senator TAFT knows.

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following address made by me at the wreath-laying ceremony held at the Kosciusko Monument, Lafayette Park, Washington, D. C., Sunday, February 11, 1951:

We are observing today the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko, Poland's great patriot and American Revolutionary War general and aide to Washington.

We pay tribute today to a great crusader of freedom who devoted his life not only to the restoration of freedom in his own country but to the restoration of American independence as well. Thaddeus Kosciusko lives in the hearts of the Polish people today as a symbol of their dearest national hopes and aspirations and for the American people he represents a magnificent fulfillment of the moral obligation that every person on the face of the earth has toward freedom-loving people everywhere. After fighting a desperate battle against despotism in his own land, Kosciusko came to the aid of America in her hour of need. He stood by the cradle of American independence and helped to lay the foundation for a government in the New World dedicated to the principles of liberty and justice.

In life, actions, and words of this great man we find much that is pertinent today, and in paying tribute to him, let us not forget that his beloved country, Poland, has again been deprived, as in Kosciusko's time, of its freedom.

Poland today is under the ruthless domination of Soviet Russia, a power more terroristic in its methods than the Czar of Kosciusko's time. There is no freedom in Poland today. A puppet regime, completely subservient to the Kremlin, holds this unhappy land in a vicious vise of Communist tyranny and dictatorship. No amount of oppression can quench the burning love of freedom in Polish hearts, but Poland does need friends in its desperate fight for liberty today, as America did in Kosciusko's time. The United States, as the leading nation of the world, has a grave responsibility and a great mission to perform before God and man, that is, to lead the world back to the path of justice and freedom. There will be no free and independent Poland until the world of freemen will marshal all the moral and material forces at its disposal and bringing them to bear upon the evil force which has enslaved Poland. Poland must rise again and take its rightful place among the free nations of the world—that a strong, freedom-loving people will not die and we, here in America, can and must help to speed the coming of the day when Poland shall be truly free again. Helping to restore the proper independence of Poland is part of the battle for preserving American independence as well.

On this day, therefore, let us pledge ourselves to support every effort which would make the spirit of Kosciusko, the spirit of freedom and justice, live again in Poland as it is alive in America. May the memory of the great sacrifices this great son of Poland made for the cause of human liberty, strengthen the determination in our hearts to further the principles for which he stood, freedom and equality for all people.

What Is the Aim of the United Nations in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it never does any good to say "I told you so," but on this Korean matter I cannot refrain from stating that I announced in a news release that if the UN forces stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel there was better than a good chance of peace.

Rhee, president of South Korea stated that he would pay no attention to any orders from anyone to stop at the thirty-eighth parallel. One of the Senators had this to say, "the Republic of Korea will never be satisfied with having its country divided at the thirty-eighth parallel, because this means economic and political suicide.". This same Senator protested the British request that the forces stop at the thirty-eighth parallel. The South Koreans did not stop at the thirty-eighth parallel but went on 5 miles farther into North Korea and the result many anticipated happened. The Chinese came roaring down from the north and not only drove the South Koreans out but drove into the UN lines 19 miles farther, and the plunge has not yet stopped. With a chance to bring about peace, this opportunity was shattered again by the headstrong Rhee and many more unthinking persons in responsible positions.

By this action we are playing the game Stalin wants—to meet his allied forces in ground battles in a place selected by him as a battleground. It is becoming more evident every moment that Herbert Hoover is thinking straight when he says that on the ground we cannot overcome the hordes of China and Russia.

There are some important facts to ascertain now. Did the UN order a stop of forces when they reached the thirty-eighth parallel? If they did who violated that order?

Our first purpose and the only purpose announced was to drive the invaders out. Now through the statements made by the Senator from California and others, our plan is to unite all of the Korean peninsula under one government and undo what this Government agreed to when the thirty-eighth parallel was set up.

Mr. Rhee should be told to stay in line and fight with the United Nations or shift for himself. The UN should state the case of what we are doing in Korea in no uncertain terms and any nation that disregards the purpose should do its own fighting and not call on the United States for the establishments of new government anywhere. Our only purpose has been to stop aggression, but if we have launched a campaign to change boundaries and set up new governments, the people of the United States ought to know it.

Food for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter addressed by me to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean G. Acheson, dated February 2, 1951:

FEBRUARY 2, 1951.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The people of India are facing a period of mass hunger and starvation, and their government has applied for 2,000,000 tons of grain from the United States to be paid over a long period of time. Our Government has agreed to ship 4,000,000 tons to be paid in dollars on the barrel head. We are the only country in the world which has resources to supply this food and thus avert a terrible catastrophe. Our bins are filled with grain, ready for shipment.

It is our bounden duty to help. It is a serious fact, indeed, that our Governments are in disagreement over the China-Korean problem, but it would be most unfortunate to put such differences in the way of relief from suffering. This is no bargaining issue, but an issue of immense almightiness: millions of Indians may starve and we can save them from this fate. I realize that it may be necessary to take cargo ships out of mothballs to transport this grain. So be it. But can we turn our backs upon the hungry, when we have it in our power to give?

On making a careful inquiry into all the ramifications of this subject, I feel that the present food shortage in India is due to a series of unavoidable natural disasters; that the 2,000,000 tons of grain the Indian Government has asked for is a conservative figure and is designed only to sustain life on a minimum basis; that India's dollar resources available for food purchases have already been virtually exhausted; that India maintains an effective rationing and procurement system which will enable the Indian Government to make maximum use of imported food grains.

India has been struggling hard to meet her food shortage. She seeks to increase her food production. She has under construction a number of multipurpose projects on the lines of TVA to provide irrigation and electric power, and to control floods. New projects, on completion, will bring 42,000,000 kilowatts of electric power. Her official plan was to achieve self-sufficiency in food supplies by 1951, but a series of natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods, locust plagues and droughts so seriously hampered the program that she is unable to feed her teeming population.

There is a time-honored story which comes readily to mind: A beggar accosted two men and asked for alms. One man helped the beggar, but the other disdainfully refused. The latter soon feels the touch of the angel of death on his shoulder and guiltily rushes to give alms to the beggar he spurned. But the angel of death stops him and says: It is too late. One never repairs the holes in the ship after it has set out to sea.

It may be too late to help India, if we tarry much longer. I strongly urge that our Government address itself to this problem in the humanitarian terms it deserves, so that 2,000,000 tons of grain will be made available.

Mahatma Gandhi, India's great philosopher and mentor has wisely said, "My patriotism is not an exclusive thing. It is all-embracing and I should reject that patriotism which sought to mount upon the distress or the exploitation of other nationalities. The conception of my patriotism is nothing if it is not always, in every case, without exception, consistent with the broadest good of humanity at large." It is interesting to note that we are soon to erect a monument in the memory of Gandhi here in Washington.

Refusal or further delay to ship this grain would belie this tribute to India's great savant.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

City of Long Beach, Calif., Opposes Senate Joint Resolution 20 and House Joint Resolution 131 and Petitions Congress To Disapprove Each of Said Resolutions—Congressman Doyle Cites City Council Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this morning I received from the City Council of the City of Long Beach, under the seal of the city clerk thereof, Resolution C-12838, which accompanies these remarks on the subject.

I am sure you recall that in the Seventy-ninth Congress, again in the Eighty-first Congress, and now in this Eighty-second Congress, I filed what is commonly termed as the State quitclaim tidelands bill. Each of the bills I filed in each of these three sessions of Congress have represented the theory adopted by my native State of California and by my home city of Long Beach in this important matter. The bill I filed in this Eighty-second Congress is H. R. 58, and it was filed on January 3, 1951. It is the same text as emanated from the Judiciary Committee in the Eighty-first Congress with approval.

Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania, has again filed the same bill, and I am again in support of the Walters bill, which is before the Judiciary Committee. Also several other members of the California delegation have filed the same text as the Doyle bill and the Walter bill, and I believe they, too, are in support of the Walter bill.

While it is true that in the United States of America against State of California the Supreme Court enunciated the theory that the United States has paramount rights, there has not yet been determined, under that decision, the lines and boundaries of the base inland water areas, and so forth, involved in this history-making decision.

The important city of Long Beach did, many years ago by virtue of the city charter approved by the State legislature, extend its corporation limits out into the Pacific Ocean 3 miles from the beach shore of the ocean, this 3 miles being approximately to the point of the line upon which the Federal breakwater was constructed in front of our city so that comparatively few acres of water which are within the corporation limits of Long Beach extend upon the Federal breakwater line.

Senate Joint Resolution 20 by Senator O'MAHONEY would, I believe, allow others there in the city of Long Beach, to wit: the State of California or the Federal Government, to lease or drill for oil within the corporate limits of the city of Long Beach. In fact, about 4 miles of the municipal bathing and recreation beach could be, and logically might well be, absolutely destroyed for the purpose of recreation, if this should occur. A lessee of Senate Joint Resolution 20 could, I believe, not only drill up against the shore line of the city of Long Beach, but it could place storage tanks and other drilling equipment and paraphernalia on the bathing beach itself, all within the corporate limits of the city of Long Beach.

All these tidelands titles were granted by the State of California to the city of Long Beach by grants beginning in 1911 and ending in 1935. At the time of the first grant, there was no thought of there being oil or petroleum deposits within the confines of the said grant of the State to the city.

As House Joint Resolution 131 does not at all report what appears to be the best interest of the State of California and the city of Long Beach, I ask that my opposition be also registered thereto. If there is to be what is commonly termed "interim legislation" then this interim legislation must be amended so as to permanently protect the meritorious interest and welfare of the State charter in the city of Long Beach. If the interim legislation is to be enacted into law, then the important city of Long Beach of approximately 300,000 people, must be eliminated from legislation which, in fact, is interim and should be placed on permanent basis as far as that important city is concerned.

I am informed that hearings on the O'Mahoney interim resolution begin about February 19, 1951. I am also informed that no date has been set for the hearings on the Walter bill and its companion bill before the House Judiciary Committee.

The resolution of the City Council of the City of Long Beach follows:

Resolution C-12838

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Long Beach, Calif., opposing Senate Joint Resolution 20 and House Joint Resolution 131, and petitioning the Congress of the United States to disapprove each of said proposed resolutions and reject favorable action thereon

Whereas under certain acts of the Legislature of the State of California (California Statutes 1911, p. 1304; California Statutes 1925, p. 235; and California Statutes 1935, p. 793), the State of California granted to the city of Long Beach all of its right, title, and interest held by it by virtue of its sovereignty in and to all the tidelands and submerged lands, whether filled or unfilled, situated below the mean high-tide line of the Pacific Ocean within the corporate limits of said city; said corporate limits of said city extend into San Pedro Bay, bordering the Pacific Ocean 3 miles from mean high-tide line; said tidelands and submerged lands consist of 13,027 acres, of which approximately 1,000 acres have been reclaimed and filled by said city, upon which port and harbor facilities, park and recreational improvements have been constructed, at a cost to said city in excess of $35,000,000; said lands and navigable waters constitute 8.11 miles of water frontage of said city on San Pedro Bay, all of which historically and by prior court decision lie within San Pedro Bay, an inland water area of the State of California; said tidelands and submerged lands and San Pedro Bay are shown upon the aerial photograph taken on December 26, 1947, attached hereto; and

Whereas on July 26, 1947, a stipulation was entered into by Tom C. Clark, as Attorney General of the United States, and the attorney general of the State of California, in the case of *United States of America* v. *State of California*, No. 12, Original, wherein it was stipulated that the United States of America does not claim in said litigation "that part of San Pedro Bay landward of a line drawn from Point Fermin in a northeasterly direction through a point 300 feet due south of the southeasterly extension of the Navy mole and breakwater to the line of ordinary low tide in the city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.," said area constituting inland waters of San Pedro Bay, and that said description of San Pedro Bay is "without prejudice to the right of California to claim" that the line separating said bay from the "3-mile marginal belt" lies farther seaward than the line therein described and that said bay includes a larger water area than therein described; and

Whereas there is attached hereto a map entitled, "California Coast Line—Point Fermin to Newport Beach," prepared by R. R. Shoemaker, chief engineer of the Long Beach harbor department, upon which is portrayed said proposed Government line fixing the seaward limit of the inland waters of San Pedro Bay substantially as described in the aforesaid stipulation, said line being located immediately adjacent to and seaward of reclaimed lands and harbor facilities of the city of Long Beach; said map portrays the boundaries of the city of Long Beach extending 3 miles into San Pedro Bay and said 13,027 acres of tidelands and submerged lands conveyed to the city by the State as aforesaid; only 3,028 acres of said 13,027 acres lie landward of said Government proposed line, 1,016 acres of which have been reclaimed and filled and 2,012 acres of which constitute navigable water areas; 9,999 acres of said tidelands and submerged lands conveyed to the city as aforesaid are located outside of and seaward of said Government proposed bay line, 9,847 acres of which constitute navigable water area and 152 acres of which consist of public-beach area, filled and improved by the city of Long Beach for public recreational uses; said public beach area extends 3.9 miles seaward of the line of ordinary low tide outside said Government proposed bay line along the bay and ocean front of said city; and

Whereas the city of Long Beach, by and through its board of harbor commissioners, has projected and planned future port and harbor development at an estimated cost of $85,000,105, seaward of said Government proposed bay line, also indicated upon said map; and

Whereas section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 20 and of House Joint Resolution 131 (82d Cong., 1st sess.) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the State of California respecting the issuance of new mineral leases covering said 9,999 acres of tidelands and submerged lands conveyed to the city by the State as aforesaid, outside of said Government proposed bay line, portrayed upon said map in white, light blue and yellow, all within the corporate limits of said city; said authority includes the granting of mineral leases upon the 152 acres of filled public beach lands extending 3.9 miles along the water front of said city, portrayed upon said map in yellow, all notwithstanding that the State of California has heretofore conveyed all of said lands to the city of Long Beach as hereinbefore mentioned; said 9,999 acres of land are the subject of controversy between the United States and the State of California in proceedings now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States as to whether or not the same constitute submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters; and

Whereas section 4 of said Senate Joint Resolution 20 and of said House Joint Resolution 131 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant oil and gas leases to qualified persons offering the highest bonuses plus the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent on said 9,999 acres of tidelands and submerged lands referred to in the preceding paragraph, and pursuant to which contract said 3.9 miles of public beach consisting of 152 acres into an offshore, including oil-well derricks, tanks, and production equipment, notwithstanding that said 9,999 acres of submerged and reclaimed submerged lands have been granted to the city by the State of California and all but a small portion of which lie landward of the Federal breakwater and within the area controlled by said State and city as a part of San Pedro Bay and inland waters of said State and in controversy as to whether or not the same are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, in proceedings now pending before the United States Supreme Court, as hereinbefore stated; and

Whereas the granting of the authority to the Secretary of the Interior by the provisions of said resolutions as hereinbefore stated may result in the serious impairment of the rights and equities of the city of Long Beach in the ownership and control of said lands, and inestimable damage to said city;

Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Long Beach resolves as follows:

SECTION 1. The city of Long Beach does hereby record its opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 20 and House Joint Resolution 131, and petitions the Congress of the United States to disapprove each of said proposed resolutions and reject favorable action thereon.

SEC. 2. That the city attorney be and he is hereby authorized and requested to present to the members of Congress and the appropriate committees thereof all matters pertinent to the foregoing and transmit a copy of this resolution to the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate and to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and to the other Members of the Congress.

SEC. 3. The city clerk shall certify to the passage of this resolution by the City Council of the City of Long Beach, and shall cause the same to be posted in three conspicuous places in the city of Long Beach, and it shall thereupon take effect.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the City Council of the City of Long Beach, at its meeting of February 6, 1951.

[SEAL] C. O. SCHAMMEL,
City Clerk.

Mr. Speaker, the map and photograph referred to in the foregoing have been retained by me, but I will be pleased to have any of you, my colleagues, who are interested to indicate it to me for I will have them with me on the floor of the House for several days, and I will be glad to show them to you.

Speed Up Construction of the Natchez Trace To Provide Necessary Ingress and Egress To and From Our Atomic Bomb Plants

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate transportation to and from our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and also the one at Paducah, Ky., it is absolutely necessary that we speed up the construction of the Natchez Trace with all possible haste.

This great highway, which was authorized in 1934, extends from Nashville, Tenn., to Natchez, Miss., along the route traveled by Andrew Jackson on his march to New Orleans in 1814.

Practically all of the right-of-way has been secured, and a large portion of it has been graded and is now ready for surfacing.

There will not be a single surface crossing on it between Nashville and Natchez, a distance of more than 400 miles. All of the highways and railroads will either cross this road by overhead structures or underpasses. Therefore, in case of necessity, it could be used for a speedway to transport the necessary materials to and from our atomic-bomb plants with all possible haste.

These two great atomic bomb plants are vitally important to our national defense, and may mean our salvation in case of an attack.

This highway will go right between them and will connect with each of them by a splendid highway that is already constructed.

The National Park Service informs me that "If funds and rights-of-way were made available, this Service and the Bureau of Public Roads could place under construction during the 12 months thereafter approximately $10,000,000 worth of construction."

We cannot afford to neglect our defenses at home while sending our boys all over the world to fight foreign wars.

If this country is ever attacked by a foreign foe, the chances are that it will be an air attack, and that our main defense will be the Air Force and the atomic bomb; and the completion of this great highway will be just as necessary to our defense as it was in 1814 when it was thrown open by this Indian and Andrew Jackson was permitted to march his heroic army over it to New Orleans, and win one of the greatest victories in the history of the Nation.

This highway should be finished as quickly as possible. We cannot afford to wait until our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb.

It would then be too late.

Korea and Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by our colleague, Hon. Frances Bolton, of Ohio, to the League of Republican Women of the District of Columbia on February 13, 1951:

One question bears every American: "What are we going to do about the ground danger from the Kremlin?" This question dominates our thoughts and even intrudes itself into our dreams. The urgency of the problem cost the life of an author a publication as Ben Ferencz. To solve that problem, all of us in Congress would seek to make some contribution. Each of us perhaps nowadays the assist hope that he, and he alone, can offer the true solution to the riddle propounded by the Kremlin's ugly life.

On the threshold of my remarks, I should like to say that there are two diffuse attitudes of mind which can get us into great difficulty. Unless we can escape both these attitudes, we cannot hope to be any sound thinking about the problem.

One is the pushing, confusing attitude which refuses to see any real danger and resists on a life-or-death basis the thought of any sacrifice of comfort or convenience. This loosely optimistic thinking was very prevalent even in the highest places down to the moment of the North Korean attack last June. It found expression in statements from the White House that we were hurtling from war than we had been at any time since 1945. It found expression in numerous speeches by the then Secretary of Defense to the effect that if Russia attacked at 4 a. m. we would be ready by 5. These statements now rank with Neville Chamberlain's immortal utterance in the fall of 1938 about "peace in our time."

We can thank the North Korean and Chinese masters in the Kremlin for doing much to put an end to this kind of wishful thinking. I believe that the President is now awakened. I am certain that the Congress is awakened. The great majority of thoughtful people in the country are profoundly awakened.

The second dangerous attitude of mind lies at the other end of the emotional spectrum. It is the defeatist attitude. If the

easygoing attitude is infrared, the defeatist attitude is ultrapurple. It views the power of the Soviets as invincible. It considers that the people of Europe and Asia have all succumbed to the blandishments of the Kremlin and cannot be won by any appeal from the west. It regards communism as a wave of the future. It believes that the people of Europe are incapable of united action in their own behalf, and that, therefore, nothing remains for this country but to withdraw into its hemispheric dignity, where we shall have either what Winston Churchill has called a peace of mutual terror or else a war of intercontinental bombing, in which the great American cities will all be destroyed and we shall be lucky if we can bag even one or two great cities in the U. S. S. R.

I think it may be worth while to note and recognize various types of defeatism, so that we can be on guard against them.

There is, of course, the deliberate and subversive defeatist, who desires the success of our enemy, and contributes to it by spreading the philosophy of despair. These people may not be very numerous. Still I think the antecedents and environments of the defeatists are always worthy of examination, because they may enable us to detect and so to counteract subtly destructive influences in our society.

Apart from the subversive defeatist, we find the thoughtless defeatist who is so dismayed by the numerical superiority of the Soviet population and the satellite, or better, subjugated populations that he can think of nothing else. He does not seriously attempt to carry his thinking beyond the first road block. Or to use another metaphor he will paddle his canoe down a stream of thought until he comes to a difficult portage. There he gives up and takes to the woods.

But perhaps the most dangerous type of defeatist and certainly the most interesting psychologically is the man whom I would call the "defeatist in detail." This man will not tell you directly that our position is hopeless, and that there is no help in us. Not at all. His technique is a sophisticated one, and proceeds something like this. He will write a series of articles. The first one demonstrates conclusively that there is no salvation through course A. The next will show by very cogent reasoning that there is no salvation through course B. The third article discloses the utter hopelessness of achieving success through course C. The fourth article demonstrates that course D is attended by such hazards that we should not even consider it. This process goes on as long as the ingenuity of the writer and the patience of the public will permit. When all the articles have been added up, all that the reader knows is that there is an aggregate of things which we cannot do, and nothing has been indicated that we can do. There is a fine collection of negatives but no affirmative.

At least, so far as Asia is concerned, it seems to me that several prominent writers are defeatists in detail, because, although they never directly say that Asia must be given to the Soviets, they fail to point out any method by which it can be prevented. The man who says flatly "there is no answer" to such and such a problem, is less insidious than the man who examines a dozen possible answers and rejects them all without directing attention to the fact that he offers no solution.

Now let us leave the abstract and turn our attention to the actual course of events.

When the North Korean aggression began at the end of last June, public sentiment, in my opinion, fully supported the policy of resistance which was adopted by the UN upon, if not entirely as a result, of the urging of the Truman administration. In all the first months of our difficult enterprise, there was much and quite legitimate dissatisfaction with the unpreparedness of our forces and the grave mistakes which had led up to the outbreak of hostilities. After the Inchon landings in mid-September, complete victory appeared to be within our grasp and there was a feeling that our policy of resistance was about to pay off. When in late October or November the Chinese Communists first appeared on the scene in large numbers, not only were our brightened hopes blighted, but there was a panicky feeling that all was hopelessly lost. And this notwithstanding the fact that the possibility of Chinese intervention was apparent from the first. The cry was raised: "Get the boys out of Korea; we never should have gone in," etc.

I will not presume to predict the course of future events in Korea, nor will I pose as a military expert to say what may and what may not be possible from a military point of view in that country. However, I think that even now it may be said that there was too much pessimism when the Chinese Communists appeared, and that our troops, even when outnumbered, can make the course of the Chinese Communists anything but easy. There is evidence that the cost of the enterprise already far exceeds Soviet expectations.

Military defeat is a bitter medicine, but sometimes a necessary medicine. There were plenty of reverses to American arms in the early days of World War II. When we left the Philippines, General MacArthur's slogan was "I shall return." If we do have to leave Korea, as I hope we shall not, let it not be in any spirit of finality, but with the conviction that we have lost a battle without losing our cause. This was the spirit in which the British returned from Dunkerque.

Let no one feel that the men who have shed their blood or given their lives on Korean battlefields have made a needless or a worthless sacrifice. In my opinion, they have served their country as nobly as any men who have ever fought for it. Nothing can make their sacrifice vain but falseness, and feebleness on the part of those who direct our national destiny.

It is my firm belief that the best security of Europe is to keep the Soviets engaged, involved, and anxious in Asia. It seems to me we have not yet done a tithe of what we could do and I believe must do to frustrate communism in Asia. The most hopeful feature of our whole situation in Europe, Asia, and everywhere else in the world is that the people who have had a taste of communism all loathe it heartily. This loathing may be ineffectual when the iron curtain is tightly drawn, but when we can get even a toehold under the iron curtain, anti-Communist forces are released and can become effective. However, we cannot work too fast, because under the methods of the police state, resistance is ruthlessly suppressed, people of property, of education, and of potential leadership, are liquidated by millions and the task of resistance becomes steadily more difficult.

From the information which comes to me and which I believe reliable, I am certain that very important successes can be achieved through guerrilla activities on the mainland of China. If Chiang Kai-shek's armies can be permitted—not to say encouraged—to fight on the mainland of China, and given such assistance in material as is necessary, I feel fairly certain that they can create at least enough of a diversion to keep China in turmoil for many years. If even the southwest provinces of China could be conquered from the Communists, it might very effectively seal off Indochina, Burma, Malaya, to say nothing of Indonesia, from further Communist advances. The belated action of the UN in designating Red China an aggressor, seems to me a diplomatic victory. If this success could be followed up by economic sanctions against Red China, the Mao regime might be further weakened. I realize that economic sanctions may not be easy to work out but certainly an attempt should be made.

I am aware of the British view that hostility of the West to the Mao regime will simply throw him more firmly into the arms of Moscow. In my judgment, it is the merest wishful thinking to suppose that Mao is not already securely in the arms of Moscow, and that anything will dislodge him. He will never become a Tito. If he did, he would still be an unsatisfactory personality from the American standpoint. If Mao tried to recede from the Kremlin, he would almost certainly be liquidated and replaced by a faithful servant of the Kremlin. Probably Tito himself will be when the time comes. In fact, it seems to me not unlikely that sometime this spring Tito will fall out a window or die of a quite unsuspected heart ailment. We have got to learn, however, that we can work through stooges, as well as the Russians. We are in a game in which no holds are barred; this is simply not a Marquis of Queensberry world.

Our accomplishment in Korea even to date has probably been to upset the Russian timetable. It has certainly been the cause of our accelerating our own timetable, an acceleration which may yet prove to be our salvation. We may be able to upset the Russian timetable for some years—long enough for the West to arm. In the third volume of Winston Churchill's book on World War II he describes the campaign in Greece in the spring of 1941. At the time this campaign seemed a hopeless and humiliating failure. The British were driven out of Greece and even out of Crete. They suffered devastating naval losses. But we have since learned that this campaign upset the timing of Hitler's attack on Russia and very probably prevented the fall of Moscow. If such be the case, it may not even be too much to say that the British campaign in Greece saved the war. In another sense the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor which certainly brought this country into World War II, may have been a decisive contribution to the final destruction of Hitler and Tojo. The point to emphasize is that we cannot appraise events by examining them as isolated phenomena. We must see them in the long chain of causation.

People best qualified to judge believe that the next Soviet move will be against Jugoslavia. It will presumably be made by Soviet stooges in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and possibly other countries. I should expect no more direct Soviet participation than in Korea. Some well-informed people expect this attack to be made when the Balkan spring brings good weather. But I repeat my belief that continued resistance in Korea might well save Jugoslavia.

The Jugoslav Army will certainly resist, but Jugoslavia is at best a sadly divided country with the Serbs, the strongest group numerically, very unpopular with the Croatians and other racial and religious groups. How we may best assist in Jugoslavia is a matter which I hope is receiving the most careful study by our military authorities. It may well be impossible for us to put ground troops in Jugoslavia. On the other hand it will probably be impossible for the invaders of Jugoslavia to occupy the whole country. The Nazi occupation was one merely of railway lines, ports, and cities. There can be, should be, and probably will be continued and continuing guerrilla activity against any invaders of Jugoslavia. In this way it would be possible at least to keep the country in turmoil if not to expel all invaders.

We ought now, in my opinion, to serve notice on the Kremlin and its agents what acts on their part will be deemed acts of aggression. We can afford to leave Stalin uncertain about many things but we should leave no doubt in his mind about our view of certain acts on his part. For this purpose I have introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 which seeks to designate as aggression any armed attack on any nation by the U. S. S. R., Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Russian occupied Germany, Albania, or Communist China.

I lack the time and the expert knowledge to discuss other probable specific acts of aggression, against such countries as Greece, Turkey, Iran, and so on. Obviously our present capacity to aid resistance varies from place to place on the Communist periphery. Let me say, however, that I think it wholly impractical for Congress to pass on actual troop movements. Military measures must nearly always be taken swiftly and secretly. In the nature of things the legislative process cannot produce results swiftly or secretly. No one is more jealous than I of the legislative prerogative of Congress but military strategy is not its role, even when military strategy has, as it often does, political implications.

All these resistance movements we can aid, equip, and inspire, without great expense and without serious prejudice, it seems to me, to our great armament program. If we can keep up resistance in Jugoslavia we shall almost certainly be able to delay the Soviet attack on the Middle East.

I realize that this all adds up to a very difficult war of nerves but it seems to me that a continuous series of local attacks and local resistance can forestall a general war. Then, if we are adroit enough, it might be possible to aid rebellion in the U. S. S. R., the potentiality of which is known to exist. We ought, I think, to attest daily our love for the Russian people enslaved by their wicked rulers. If we go in for any nonsense about unconditional surrender we shall solidify where there is now fluidity, and unite where there is now disunion. Only by great adroitness can we offset the enormous Soviet advantage in manpower.

More than any other philosophy communism carries with it the seeds of its own destruction. We must see to it that communism destroys itself, not us.

Address of Hon. O. C. Fisher, of Texas, Before Combined Service Clubs of Uvalde, Tex., on January 22, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered to a joint meeting of the Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions Clubs of Uvalde, Tex., on January 22, 1951:

I am most grateful for this privilege, which I very highly esteem, of coming to Uvalde today and speaking to this large audience of Uvalde County citizens assembled here on this occasion. The generous introduction by my good friend, Jack Richardson—with whom I attended high school up at Junction a good many years ago—is likewise appreciated.

Now while the Congress is marking time, legislatively speaking, while committees are conducting hearings on bills, it's easier to get away for a few days than it is later in the session when weekly agendas are crowded with important measures.

It's a good thing for Members of Congress to get home as often as possible, talk and counsel with the people and draw upon the composite wisdom of those whom they represent. That is an essential part of the workings of a democracy under our representative system. Personally, I get a measure of inspiration just from seeing the parade of Stetson hats on the street corners and in the lobbies and in the market places. Somehow they typify the independence and sturdiness of the West, and I am inspired by listening to the clump, clump, clump of boot heels on the sidewalks. Uvalde is a typical cross section of the great Southwest where men believe in the fundamentals of Americanism and know that two and two still make four.

THE GOVERNMENT'S BUDGET

It was suggested that I talk to you today about some of the problems with which we are faced during these times—times which are probably more dangerous and perilous than any in our history. Actually I doubt that I can add much to your stock of information, though I welcome the honor and privilege of discussing some of the issues of the day in which you and I are interested and which now engage so much of our time and energies.

Only a few days ago the President sent his annual budget message to the Congress. It calls for an unprecedented peacetime expenditure of $71,000,000,000. A major portion of this will go for national defense, a program with which I am sure we are all in complete sympathy. Last year the Congress appropriated and authorized commitments of upwards of $50,000,000,000 for the stepped-up preparedness program. It takes a lot of money to train, equip, and maintain a modern American army, for example. It costs about $10,000 to recruit, train, equip, supply, and maintain one American soldier. That includes the armament and equipment for a fighting army. One B-36 requires more than a tank car of gasoline and 10,000 pounds of lubricating oil on a trip to Europe. A modern tank consumes a gallon of gasoline for each 2 miles it travels. This, of course, means more taxes, more sacrifices, more inconveniences on the part of all the people. It is of utmost importance that we balance the budget as nearly as possible. A balanced Federal budget is perhaps the strongest single deterrent to inflation. But I was disappointed in a number of the items recommended by the President in his budget message. For example, he recommended funds to finance such dubious programs as the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, nationalized housing, FEPC, and several others that are both nonessential and undesirable. It seems to me that if we are to have a strong America we must maintain a sound economy. That means we must cut nonessential expenditures to the bone and make an honest effort to pay our way during this emergency.

OUR INTEREST IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Now, let's consider the global situation for a moment and see where and how our interests and our security may be imperiled. There's some talk going around these days by those who say: "Let's get out of Korea, Asia, Europe, build our own defenses, and not spend taxpayer's money, the lives of our young men, and our Nation's resources involving ourselves in other people's affairs." If that is a valid argument, then it should be followed. If it is not valid, its weakness and its danger should be exposed. Certainly if it is valid it would greatly simplify the solution of most of our problems.

In order to intelligently answer the question thus raised, we must take stock of ourselves and the relationship of our economy, our strength, and our security to the rest of the free world. Let's first look at southeast Asia. Why are we interested in that vast area? Most of the countries of southeastern Asia are now under considerable Communist pressure. They face dire trouble, just as South Korea did. Most of the experts seem to be agreed that had it not been for the unexpected resistance encountered by the Communists in South Korea, Red Chinese armies would long ago have marched into Indochina. It was marked for conquest last fall, but the timetable was upset in Korea. If Indochina should fall, then Malaya, Burma, Thailand, and Indonesia would likely be devoured, and Ceylon and possibly India would be in line for a like fate.

But, so what? What difference does that make to us so far as our own independence and our own security are concerned? After all, we live 8,000 or 9,000 miles away from Indochina and the rest of southeast Asia. Well, as a matter of fact it makes a lot of difference, and here are a few of the reasons:

TIN—OUR MAIN SOURCE FOR MANUFACTURE

Did you ever stop to realize that the "rice bowl" of the world is in Thailand and Burma? India has been importing up to 750,000 tons of rice per year from these two countries to help feed her teeming millions who at best have but a subsistence existence. If Thailand and Burma are occupied by Mao Tse-tung and his Kremlin-directed Red armies, that source of food for India would be promptly diverted to meet a pressing need for more food for the Asian armies. Thus, disease, civil strife, poverty, and industrial unrest in India would undoubtedly result in some extent, and the Indians would surely pay through the nose for all imports thereafter obtained from southeast Asia. A most fertile field for Communist activity would then be opened.

But, again, how does that directly affect us? According to Government statistics that have been released, we imported 350,000 tons of manganese from India last year. Steel cannot be manufactured without a minimum of manganese. In the past we got most of our manganese from Russia, but most of that has been cut off and now we must look primarily to India for our supply. Here at home we produce very little at present. It is a highly critical and strategic material that we have always had to import from faraway places. Without manganese we naturally would become a weaker nation, industrially. Our entire economy is geared to a vast steel production. So, it is to our interest that our Indian market be kept open and that it not be jeopardized by or fall into the hands of the Communists.

Another highly critical material of which we produce very little at present is tungsten. In the past we have looked to China for much of our supply, and Indochina is now an important source.

MORE OF OUR TIN AND RUBBER COMES FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA

Among other strategic materials which we must obtain from southeast Asia are tin and rubber. We import more than half of our tin from that area alone. Our tin consumption runs around 60,000 tons a year, and Bolivia—our next source of supply—produces a little more than 20,000 tons annually. We produce none in the United States.

Of even more importance to us is raw rubber. Did you realize that we import 95 percent of our natural rubber from Malaya, Indonesia, Indochina, Ceylon, and Thailand? These countries produced more than a million and a half tons in 1948, and we imported 760,000 tons of it—85 percent of all we brought in. Indeed, those countries produce 90 percent of the world's supply.

To be sure, we have made great strides in developing synthetic rubber. But while synthetic rubber is good enough for your automobile tires, bomber and heavy-duty tires must have a sizable content of natural rubber. Otherwise they will not stand up. Since we have but a limited stockpile, we must continue to look to southeast Asia for

this vital material if we are to maintain the strength of a great air force and keep the big trucks and mobile units moving.

It must be kept in mind, of course, that if we lose these sources of strategic materials we naturally become a little weaker as a result and the Communists, who would take over and exploit these same materials, would likewise become a little stronger. Along with the added raw materials, the Reds would at the same time become slaveholders over multiplied millions of additional people.

OUR INTEREST IN WESTERN EUROPE

Now, let's take a look at Western Europe. Why should we interest ourselves so much in that part of the world? Already we have spent billions over there, helping revive the war-devastated economies of Western Europe. Our help undoubtedly saved Greece from being behind the iron curtain today. And the same is probably true of Turkey and other countries as well. But why should we continue to spend taxpayers' hard-earned money to help re-arm those people? Why should we risk the spilling of American blood there? Suppose Soviet Russia should choose to occupy Western Europe, how would that affect our own security?

Actually, as I see it, it's not so much a matter of what we would lose—though that would be of enormous proportions—as it would be what the enemy would gain. Let's talk about steel for a moment. We produce, roughly, 100,000,000 tons of steel per year. Russia and all her satellites produce only a third of that amount. Western Europe (not counting Britain) has an annual steel capacity of 40,000,000 tons, and Britain produces about 18,000,000. So as it now stands, the United States and the other free countries produce 160,000,000 tons of steel a year compared with about 34,000,000 tons put out behind the iron curtain. But if Western Europe is taken by Russia, the Red's steel output would be immediately more than doubled. If Britain should also go down, then the steel potential under Communist domination would be about equal to our own. It must be kept in mind that Russia diverts a much higher percentage of her steel to military purposes than we do.

IF WESTERN EUROPE FALLS, WE MAY LOSE OUR SOURCE OF URANIUM FOR A-BOMBS

Moreover, we import many strategic raw materials from Europe and Africa. Indeed, from the Belgium Congo we get most of our highly critical uranium from which atom bombs are made. If Western Europe is occupied by the Russian hordes, they will then have submarine bases up and down the Atlantic coast, and to say the least our source of supply of uranium from Africa would be curtailed or possibly be cut off entirely. Our loss might be Russia's gain.

IF WESTERN EUROPE FALLS, STALIN MIGHT GET MIDDLE EAST OIL

Furthermore, the loss of Western Europe would probably mean the loss of the Near East, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East. Right now Stalin is suffering from a serious lack of steel production and of oil. It is estimated that Russia and the satellites produce no more than 320,000,000 barrels of oil per year. That represents only about 6 percent of the world's reserves. The Middle East has 42 percent of those reserves. By combining the two, Stalin would control one-half of the world's oil reserves. So our loss and the loss to our allies could conceivably become gains for our enemy.

I have been indulging in assumptions. It goes without saying that should the Kremlin provoke another global war, any military successes she might achieve would be at great expense and heavy loss. But since it is generally conceded that as of this time Western Europe is vulnerable and most of it could be occupied by the superior forces of Russia, we may very well appraise the possible effects upon our own security if a formidable defense for Western Europe is not provided before the Reds should decide to strike.

Along with these strategic and material advantages which would accrue to the benefit of the Communists, if they choose to occupy most of Western Europe and plunge the world into another world war, Stalin would at the same time gain control and domination over some 260,000,000 people, with their combined industrial and scientific capacity and know-how. He seems to have the capacity for making use of people even though they are in chains.

CONTROL OF UNITED STATES IS PRIMARY OBJECTIVE OF SOVIET RUSSIA

Now, as I see it, all these considerations achieve their real importance only when we recognize the fact that the control of the United States of America is undoubtedly the ultimate objective of Soviet Russia. In fact, since the time of Lenin, the Communists have openly affirmed that world domination is their final objective. They make no bones about it. Lenin said—and Stalin has reiterated—that communism and capitalism cannot live in peace side by side in this world, and they have sworn by violence and otherwise to destroy their opposition. Who is holding them up and preventing the realization of that plan today? It is, of course, the United States. Other free countries, weakened by war, could provide only feeble resistance without joint efforts and in conjunction with America. In a real sense, then, we constitute the only really formidable road block in the way.

SOVIETS CONCENTRATE THEIR PROPAGANDA AGAINST US—THEIR NO. 1 OBJECTIVE

This past fall I traveled in Europe, from the Baltic to the Caspian Sea—along the periphery of the iron curtain from Norway to Persia. Everywhere I found that a major part of all Russian propaganda, beamed over radios and in the Communist press, was directed at the United States. Every kind of fantastic lies—distorted half-truths—that could be conceived of were being manufactured and used against that "capitalistic, Wall Street-dominated, warmongering country called the United States."

Since we are beyond doubt the No. 1 stumbling block in the way of the Soviet determination to dominate the world, it is important that we keep in mind the enemy's strength and methods. We are told that the Russians now have 4,500,000 men under arms, with a trained reserve of some 14,000,000 who can be called up at 60 days' notice. They have more than 20,000 operational airplanes, including modern jets, and they have some 30,000 tanks. Moreover, since 1945 they have added 7,500,000 square miles of new territory and more than 500,000,000 people under their control. This Soviet expansion has wiped out Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and has reduced to servitude six nations that were independent before 1939.

The tentacles of the Soviet octopus now cover one half of Europe. All this has been accomplished without the loss of a single Russian soldier.

WE MUST LOOK TO FUTURE—PAST ERRORS WON'T HELP NOW

Now, recognizing our danger and our interests as they exist around the world, what can we do about it? We certainly cannot extricate ourselves from this peril by spending our time condemning the mistakes of the past, of which there have been many. If we wanted to take the time it would be easy to go back to Yalta and wonder why Russia was permitted to enter the Japanese war at its very end and yet, though scarcely firing a shot, being permitted to occupy Manchuria—the most hightly industrialized area in the whole of Asia. We can disagree with Secretary of State Atcheson's ill-considered action in announcing more than a year ago that our outer defenses in the Pacific did not include Formosa and South Korea. That amounted to an invitation to the Reds to move in. Yes, how tragic was the mistakes of concessions made in the occupation of Germany, isolating Berlin 120 miles inside the iron curtain. The same could be said of Vienna in Austria. Diplomatic blunders in the handling of the Chinese problem and elsewhere could be multiplied and explored at length.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

But we must be realistic and look to the future. What can we do?

1. We can step up our rearmament program, actually build, man and equip a hundred air groups, a strong army, and a powerful navy.

2. We can follow the leadership of General Eisenhower in cooperating with other free nations and build a really formidable international army in Western Europe. We, of course, cannot police the world alone. We can lose the war of exhaustion, as indeed Stalin is hoping we will. There is just so much we can do and remain sound and solvent. Western Europe can be successfully defended only if the European countries put their shoulders to the wheel, including providing a major portion of the needed manpower and by making full use of their industrial capacity. It will be recalled that in both of the last wars these Atlantic Pact nations were able to put in the field in 90 days 140 equipped and trained divisions, aside from naval and air forces. We are in a position to contribute much to the success of this collective security movement in the way of guns and military equipment, as indeed we already have done and shall continue to do if the Europeans show their willingness and determination to rearm in strength.

3. We can encourage, as our Government and that of Great Britain have already done, the rearming of some of the Germans in the western zone. Such troops can be integrated with the Atlantic Pact army and steps can be taken against any possible resurgence of Prussian militarism. This, of course, can only be done if the Germans themselves put their hearts into it and show an honest willingness to assist in the defense of the non-Communist countries of Europe, including their own. This program has the support of General Eisenhower, of the American Legion, and of Winston Churchill. The latter told Parliament only a month ago that Western Europe cannot be successfully defended without drawing upon the military strength of Germany.

4. We can likewise encourage, under proper supervision, the rearming of Japan on a scale that would protect that country from Communist aggression and also help to stabilize the balance of power in the Orient. General MacArthur has advocated it.

5. We can help and encourage France in Spain and Tito in Yugoslavia. Both of them advocate philosophies and engage in conduct contrary to our beliefs. But both of them are announced enemies of Russian communism and Russian imperialism. Both have large armies, and their soldiers have proven to be good fighters. I do not see why we should be too particular who our friends are so long as they are on our side and are enemies of Russian aggression. After all, we had Joe Stalin himself as one of our allies during the recent war. Survival itself may be involved and we can't be too particular about who is helping carry the water to put the fire out. We must, it seems to me, draw upon all available sources of manpower and resources in our cooperative and mutual effort to stem the tide of world communism and stay the hand of Russian thrusts at freedom and independence. Communism itself, with its world-dominating ambitions, must be destroyed or reduced to impotence if we are to ever again have peace on this earth. Otherwise these forces wil be a continuous menace to freemen.

6. We can, as we are doing, refuse to ship goods and commodities to our enemy, Red China. Likewise, our Government some time ago put an embargo on shipment of strategic materials to Soviet Russia—our real enemy in Korea. An economic blockade of China by our Navy would be fully justified in view of the unprovoked war the Red Chinese have been making upon American boys in Korea. The Korean conflict, it must be kept in mind, is but one incident in the world-conquering strategy of Soviet Russia. The failure of Britain to fully go along with this trade-restriction program as applied to those now making war on us and on free peoples everywhere has been most disappointing.

7. Moreover, we can encourage Chiang Kai-shek and provide him with planes, guns, tanks, and military equipment. He has a half-million trained troops under his command in Formosa—a veritable unsinkable carrier, as General MacArthur has described it. With the help of hundreds of thousands of anti-Communist guerrillas now in China, the Chinese Nationalists operating from Formosa are in a position to seriously damage and harass the Red communcation lines and factories in China and Manchuria.

OUR STRENGTH AND ADVANTAGES

I have talked of the advantages enjoyed by Soviet Russia, and I have described her military strength. Before I conclude perhaps we should refer to some of our own advantages of which there are many. During World War I and World War II, the United States was the arsenal of democracy. Militarily, our industrial capacity has been our greatest asset, not discounting the brilliance and sacrifices of the millions of Americans who have distinguished themselves in battle. But men cannot fight without equipment to fight with.

During the last war we outproduced all the rest of the world combined and furnished most of the arms for our beleaguered and war-lashed allies. That great industrial capacity has been made possible by the use of our own raw materials coupled with the importations of many strategic materials. From this we were able to build a hundred thousand airplanes a year, quantities of tanks, bombs, trucks, and other military equipment. Those materials, put to use by American ingenuity and free labor under our free-enterprise system, have made of us an industrial giant. We can, therefore, say that industrially we are far superior to Soviet Russia, whose potential compared to our own is quite backward.

2. We have the atom bomb in considerable quantity, whereas the Russians have it in but limited supply at this time.

3. We have 10 times as much oil as does Stalin.

4. We have three times as much steel capacity.

5. We have some 200 B-36's and a like number of B-50's—all of which are capable of reaching every industrial city in Russia, and we have naval bombers that can do the same from carriers.

6. We have them outclassed in our great communication systems, including telephones, telegraph, railroads, highways, commercial airways and all other modern methods.

7. We have the psychological advantage of the declining favor of communism in free countries.

8. We have the benefit of the moral support of world opinion, and we are alined on the side of Christianity and enlightened civilization. History may record that these factors in the final analysis are decisive.

9. And, finally, we have the invincible faith and determination of the American people who through prayer and united effort can undertake to provide the leadership and rally the forces of right, decency, and justice all around the world, where free people can be reached, against the hideous hand of godless communism, slavery, and oppression.

The Need To Equalize Comparative Pay Levels in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that face us in Congress is the growing differential in pay scale between classified and nonclassified civil-service workers. Because I know that Members of Congress are anxious to do the fair thing and because many of them do not have the facts available, I wish to point out some of the inequities that now exist in the Federal pay scale.

The wage adjustment of January 1, 1951, granted to the nonclassified blue-collar workers of the San Diego area employed by the Navy has caused a marked wage differential between this group and the classified, or white-collar workers, who have to meet the same increase in living costs.

The tabulation which follows is based on the official pay schedules effective November 19, 1949, and those in effect as of January 8, 1951. This widespread differential in favor of the nonclassified group has been a progressive increase with each wage adjustment granted since 1949. In watching its effect on the caliber of employee initially recruited over the past 10 years, it is clearly indicated that there has been a gradual decline in the desire of young people to make a career of Government clerical and administrative work as compared with the blue-collar worker of today and of the previous 20 years of observation.

Without corrective action, this condition will become even more apparent in the higher grade levels in future years. Even with prompt recognition of these facts and with action taken to effect correction to induce the best personnel to enter Government work, it will take some years to bring about the required change for the better.

I, therefore, recommend that the Federal pay raise legislation now before Congress be amended to more adequately equalize the comparative pay levels between the various graded and ungraded workers and supervisory groups to the standards of 1949.

Comparative pay table, classified and nonclassified civil-service employees, naval activities, San Diego area

	Pay rates Nov. 19, 1949		Pay rates, Jan. 8, 1951		Increase	Percentage	Percent required to equalize classified with nonclassified
	Minimum	Third increment	Minimum	Third increment			
GS-2	$1,440.00		$2,430.00		$1,000.00	70.17	40.96
Laborer	.60		1.20		.96	100.00	
GS-2	1,265.00		2,630.00		1,365.00		
Laborer		1,580.00		3,630.00	1,050.00	67.3	21.5
		.72		1.20	.64	88.6	
GS-4		1,497.00		2,520.00	1,023.00		
Helper	1,000.00		2,675.00		1,675.00	88.7	37.4
GS-4	.64		1.20		.75	117.1	
Helper	1,331.00		2,801.00		1,470.00		
GS-4		1,008.00		3,095.00	1,115.00	58.0	46.7
Helper		.75		1.42	.73	94.7	
GS-6		1,589.00		3,140.00	1,551.00		
Machinist	2,300.00		3,430.00		1,130.00	50.0	32.67
GS-6	.90		1.81		.42	82.57	
Machinist	2,628.00		3,764.00		1,136.00		
GS-6		2,800.00		3,700.00	1,200.00	46.0	29.5
Machinist		1.11		1.97	.86	77.5	
GS-8		2,305.00		4,097.00	1,792.00		
Quartermaster machinist	2,900.00		4,200.00		1,300.00	44.8	20.4
GS-8	1.55		2.56		1.01	65.2	
Quartermaster machinist	3,224.00		4,324.00		1,100.00		
GS-8		3,500.00		4,450.00	1,350.00	43.5	26.1
Quartermaster machinist		1.55		2.90	1.11	71.6	
		3,224.00		5,082.00	2,008.00		
F-5	4,000.00		6,400.00		1,800.00	38.1	32.1
GS-12	10.20		24.00		13.80	122.2	
Foreman	2,906.00		6,245.00		3,437.00		
F-5		5,900.00		6,900.00	1,000.00	26.0	45.4
GS-12		14.40		26.66	12.16	84.4	
Foreman		3,744.00		6,905.00	3,161.00		

An Army With Control of the Air Is Almost Indestructible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks on Wednesday last, I pointed out to the House the wonderful work being done by the assistant to the President in the Sunday afternoon telecast, Battle Report, Washington. This is the television program on which Dr. Steelman, each week, arranges to have top-flight Government officials make reports on current happenings of factual import to all our people.

Among those whom Dr. Steelman introduced to the television audience that afternoon was Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, of the United States Air Force.

In commenting upon Air Force activities in Korea, Mr. Robert McCormick,

National Broadcasting Co.'s ace commentator on that program, spoke, in part, as follows:

Soviet-designed planes used by the enemy appeared for the first time to attack below the thirty-sighth parallel. But well has our Air Force reason to be confident. Russian MIG-15's, in actual battle, have proved no match for United States Air Force F-86 Sabres, capable of 700 miles per hour. Our Fourth Fighter Interceptor Group has already been credited definitely or probably with bringing down 17 Russian jets with no loss to ourselves. For an up-to-the-minute report on how our jets are doing in Korea, we turn now to an officer just returned from there, rated as command pilot, combat observer, aircraft observer, and technical observer, from Air Force headquarters, Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of the Members of both Houses of Congress know Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White personally. They know him as an intrepid commander, a splendid gentleman, and a distinguished officer. Until quite recently he served as Director of the Directorate of Legislation and Liaison, USAF, and in that capacity won the respect and the esteem not alone of all members of the Armed Services Committees in both Houses of Congress, but of all with whom he came in contact.

General White, a flying officer, deputy commander of the Thirteenth Air Force, and later commander of the Seventh Air Force in the South Pacific, is no stranger to the situation in Korea. It was because of his knowledge of battle tactics that he was selected by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff as principal military adviser to Dr. Robert L. Stearnes, president of the University of Colorado, who, recently, together with the general, conducted an evaluation and study of operations at the Korean battlefront itself.

Mr. Speaker, one of my business acquaintances in New York City who read the extension of my remarks in the RECORD of February 7, sent me a clipping of a news article written by Gill Robb Wilson, World War I pilot, nationally recognized top-flight authority on military aviation, and now aeronautics editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, we in this House have heard much pro and con about the use of modern jet planes in the tactical support of ground troops in Korea. My friend pointed out how completely the statement made by Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, in his talk on the "Battle Report—Washington" program, was corroborated by Gill Robb Wilson in his splendid article entitled "Air Power Decisive in Halting Chinese." Mr. Wilson declared: "The total adds up to the thesis that an army with controlling authority is almost indestructible." Further along in his article he pointed out that interrogation of enemy prisoners in Korea was a little surprising. "The consensus of prisoner testimony," he said, "is that aircraft machine-gun fire, napalm, and fragmentation bombs are the things most feared by the Chinese, and they are feared in that order."

It is because of the splendid achievements of our Air Forces and the wonderful support which they have afforded to all ground troops in Korea that I am including herein, and as part of my remarks, the short talk by Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, as well as the article written by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson.

The talk by Major General White was as follows:

During the past week, there has been a marked increase in Communist air activity in Korea. More and more enemy jet aircraft of modern design have come over from their sanctuary bases in Manchuria to challenge our control of the air over North Korea. So far, they have not penetrated very far south, but their penetrations are getting deeper and deeper, and the quantity of aircraft committed is growing larger.

There are three very significant facts about these air battles now going on.

Of course, the first and most important fact is that we are winning them. Our pilots report, however, that these enemy jets are very good, high-performance airplanes, and that enemy jet pilots are well trained. The lesson here is that we must spare no effort to continue improving our jet fighters.

The second significant fact about these air battles is that many people are being reminded of something they have been prone to forget up to now, and that is, the first and overriding responsibility of the air commander is to destroy the enemy air forces and protect our ground forces against attack by enemy aircraft. During the early days of the war in Korea, the North Korean air force was small and inferior, but if it had been allowed to operate unrestricted, it could have given our ground forces plenty of trouble. However, it was quickly disposed of, and to this very day practically no United Nations soldier in Korea has ever seen any but United Nations airplanes overhead. This very absence of effective enemy air opposition has caused many people to become preoccupied with the other missions of the tactical Air Force, particularly with the close support mission. These air battles you are now reading about underscore the threat which General Partridge, commander of the Fifth Air Force in Korea, has always had to be prepared to meet—this in addition to his difficult job of isolating the battlefield and closely supporting our ground forces.

The third significant fact about this commitment of the Communists jet air force is the likelihood that the Communists are trying to find some way to lessen the effect of our air attacks on enemy ground forces. General Stratemeyer's far west air forces are continuing to hammer the enemy on the ground, day and night, every day, as they have since the first day the Air Force was committed to combat in Korea. This sustained air attack has taken a heavy toll of the enemy, and doubtless this is one of the main reasons why the Communists are now committing their jet aircraft.

In summary, General Stratemeyer now has a real air battle on his hands, as well as the job of other tactical support to our ground forces. It is gratifying to see that his airmen are handling the air battle with the same high degree of effectiveness that they have been performing the interdiction, close-support reconnaissance, transport and evacuation missions that are also included in full-scale tactical air support.

The article written by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson was as follows:

THE AIR WORLD

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

AIR POWER DECISIVE IN HALTING CHINESE

While the Chinese armies were sweeping over the vastly outnumbered United Nations forces and both the Tenth Corps and the Eighth Army appeared in jeopardy of capture or annihilation, the writer made the statement that an army with control of the air is almost indestructible.

In the face of the situation at the time, the statement appeared to be contrary to the evidence. However, subsequent development in Korea supported the writer's thesis.

Communist advances by night were stalemated when C-47 transports, each loaded with 150 illuminating flares, patrolled the Communist supply lines and enabled B-26 tactical bombers to strafe convoys and troops on the roads. This was the first time in aviation combat history that such an operation had been attempted but it proved extremely effective and brought the advancing Red armies under round-the-clock air attack.

Where United Nations troops were outflanked and surrounded time after time, C-119 combat transports parachuted ammunition and food to the beleaguered forces, which were thus enabled to maintain themselves against overwhelming numbers.

As a result of the air attacks, the veteran combat-tested Chinese divisions, despite their fanatical disregard for losses, were gradually brought to a stalemate and the offensive again was gained by our ground forces.

Air Force estimates of casualties inflicted on the Communists during the Korean campaign total almost 100,000, half of which occurred from November 21 to the end of the year and practically all of which were against front-line troops.

There has been much conjecture as to why Chinese armies ceased to follow the retiring United Nations armies. Some theorists attributed it to political reasons. Others called the Red retirement a trap. And now it is being asked if it could be possible that United States air power was decisive in stopping the Red Chinese armies.

It seems well to let the facts speak for themselves. What army in history was able to advance with its supply lines constantly shredded and its first-line troops suffering casualties of such proportion?

Air power alone did not stop the overwhelming Chinese armies, but air power imposed a large proportion of casualties on those created by heroic army and navy forces, winter weather and disease, and it supported the resistance capabilities of the surface forces. The total adds up to the thesis that "an army with control of the air is almost indestructible."

Interrogation of enemy prisoners in Korea is a little surprising. The consensus of prisoner testimony is that aircraft machine-gun fire, napalm and fragmentation bombs are feared in that order.

While it is true that a fighter plane carries 1,600 rounds of .50-caliber ammunition firing from six guns, it is news that casualties by machine-gun strafing exceed those of the terrible fire bombs and fragmentation projectiles. Naturally machine-gun fire can be aimed more accurately but the napalm and fragmentation bombs, covering a wider area, were generally supposed to inflict greater damage.

No theater of air operation ever has witnessed more ingenuity in the employment of tactical force than Korea. However, it must never be forgotten that air power in Korea, even at its best, has fought a war with one hand tied behind its back.

The genius of military air power is its ability to smash sources of supply and manufacture, rather than merely to aid ground forces. When Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, commander of the Far East Bomber Command, returned from Korea, he made clear in his statement that Korea was a frustrating field for air power because, for political reasons, it could only be utilized in an auxiliary capacity.

The Strength of the Democratic Party

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Representative EMANUEL CELLER at the New York State Democratic dinner honoring Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN which was held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on Tuesday evening, February 6:

I consider it one of the greatest privileges ever accorded me to be given this opportunity to say sincerely and directly what I feel about my friend and my colleague, HERBERT LEHMAN. I know I do not speak for myself alone; I know I express the affection and esteem in which Senator LEHMAN is held by all my colleagues in the House, who grace this dais.

The central core of the Senator from New York is integrity. On that his friends and even his political opponents agree. It is the rarest quality of man. It is this quality, so easily recognized and so eagerly applauded, which has carried the Senator from post to post of highest distinction. Let me point out here that in 1928 when Herbert was elected to the post of Lieutenant Governor in the State of New York, he received a plurality of 14,000 votes. Two years later he was reelected with a plurality of 565,000 votes. From 1932 to 1942 he served as Governor of the Empire State, and the peoples of the State with its millions of population bestowed upon him the respect, admiration, and affection that cannot be rivaled by any man now in public life in the State of New York.

In marked tribute to their former Governor, to the Director of UNRRA, to his humanitarianism, to the strength of his mind and heart, the people of the State of New York sent him to the Senate despite the fact that fortune had smiled upon the opposition party in other election contests.

HERBERT LEHMAN is a vote-getter, the politicos say. Certainly. But why? Not by reason of a shallow glamor. Not by reason of high-powered public-relation counsels. Not by reason of political bargaining, but by reason of his integrity. The country and the State and the party owe much to Senator LEHMAN, and we acknowledge our debt proudly.

Thinking about Senator LEHMAN, I found myself thinking about the Democratic Party as a whole. I determined then to speak out about some of the aspects, some of the behavior patterns, which seem to be developing within the party itself. I reviewed the last election returns and I came to the following conclusions: (1) We have not taken sufficient pride in both the tradition and the work of the Democratic Party; (2) the strength of the Democratic Party lies in its proclamation of principles—the Democratic platform of 1948—and in their fulfillment; (3) the election returns of 1950 have been misinterpreted as a loss in Democratic strength.

Let me quote from the Democratic Party platform of 1948: "Ours is the party which rebuilt a shattered economy, rescued our banking system, revived our agriculture, reinvigorated our industry, gave labor strength and security, and led the American people to the broadest prosperity in our history."

We have been the party in power since 1933, with a 2-year interval of congressional Republican domination. We remained in office and were returned to office on the strength of our fulfillment of the belief (and I quote again from the Democratic platform of 1948) "that democracy—when dedicated to the service of all and not to a privileged few—proves its superiority over all other forms of government" and further "to provide leadership in the world toward a realization of the 'four freedoms.'"

These are the principles to which Senator LEHMAN adhered until his name has become synonmous with these principles. The election of Senator LEHMAN to the Senate proves conclusively where the strength of the Democratic Party lies, both in the integrity of its principles and the integrity of the men who adhere to them.

Senator LEHMAN never forgot that upon our adherence to the New Deal of President Roosevelt and the Fair Deal of President Truman depends the allegiance of the people to the Democratic Party, then we are denying the ultimate source of our strength. If we do not adhere to the principles originally enunciated and summed up in the word "liberalism," we are erasing that vivid line of distinction between two political parties and making it a matter of indifference to the voter of which party occupies which seat.

The issues are clearly drawn—prosperity for the many as against privileges for the few; competitive free enterprise as against monopoly; social and political equity of opportunity as against social irresponsibility; civil liberties as against individual repression. The Democratic Party has a proud record—a record which again and again and again was placed before the public and approved. When the people tried republicanism for 2 years, they quickly repudiated the change and turned once more to the Democratic Party. With enthusiasm, vision, imagination, the courage to experiment, the Democratic Party stirred the peoples' pulses and gave them an interest in government which had lain dormant in the earlier years of Republican control.

I maintain, moreover, that the 1950 election returns was not an indication that the Democratic Party with its principles of liberalisms has been repudiated by the people. As Mr. Bean puts it, 1950, the Democratic uptrend continues. There has been no repudiation of New Deal's and Fair Deal's social and economic policies. In all midterm elections, a normal loss of 25 to 30 seats of the party in power is expected. In 1950 the Democrats actually lost 28 seats in the House.

I repeat, this was no more than was to be expected. Let it be noted, in fact, that while the party in power lost a net of 71 seats in 1948, 45 in 1942, and 55 in 1946, in 1950 it lost only 28. In the midterm elections of 1938, 1942, and 1946, the number of Democratic seats went down from 332 in 1932 to 188 in 1946.

It still holds true that the larger the vote, the more Democratic votes are cast. While there was a turn-out of approximately 41,000,000, a larger turn-out than in previous mid-term elections, the fact still remains that in view of population increases, there was still a definite lack in the number of votes cast.

Again, let me note that between 1944 and 1948 the number of Democrats increased from 242 to 262 and that between 1946 and 1950 it increased from 188 to 234. Here are two 4-year spans, evidencing the upward trend of the Democratic Party continues.

In the Senate careful analysis proves the same thing. Normally in an off-year election, the party out of power picks up four or five seats. The Senate in the 1950 election gained five. Here again we find that the number of Democrats staying home in industrial areas played a large part and that the turnout in the midyear election continues with the national apathy which we must strive to overcome.

Last night the Republicans had a box supper shindig in Washington. There was much hysterical screeching against us, carping, nagging criticisms without the slightest shred of responsibility. These past masters of fiddle-faddle have a 20/20 vision in their hindsight. They are the usual Monday morning quarterbacks. They were madder than the hind feathers of a hen in a high wind. Well, let's keep 'em mad—by sticking to our principles, and we'll box them in again, with Truman in 1952, as we did 'n 1948.

The source of the strength of the Democratic Party, I cannot emphasize sufficiently, lies in its clear-cut and well-defined adoption of the principles of the New and Fair Deals. We must not lower the distinction between our party and the opposition party. We have an identity as a party which the people have embraced. More than that, that identity has gained the country many friends abroad. More than the money we have been able to give or even the food we have sent, this identity as a liberal party of a party whose concern with the people as a whole has been demonstrated by legislation and executive action, has more than any one factor enabled the people of other countries to withstand Communist lies about the United States. This identity is as valuable to us, and I'm speaking of practical politics now, as is the trademark, or a copyright, or a patent granted to a commercial enterprise.

Our tribute tonight to Senator LEHMAN bespeaks plainly our recognition of his strength not only as a personality but as a leader in the Democratic Party. He has set an example to all of us, and we the New York Democratic delegation in the House humbly acknowledge our debt to him.

Speech of Mr. Homer D. Crotty, President, State Bar of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the supporters of a socialistic government in this country are now threatening to carry their totalitarian practices into the legal profession. Many members of the bench and bar throughout America are very much concerned over the attempt to bring about socialized law in this country. The socialization of the legal profession would destroy the very background of our American independence and individual freedom.

I am including in my remarks a recent address before the annual meeting of the Bar Association of San Francisco last month by Mr. Homer D. Crotty, of San Marino, Calif., an outstanding lawyer and president of the State bar of California. In his address Mr. Crotty discusses the threat to the legal profession and to our American way of life. I recommend his remarks to all of the Members of the Congress.

The address follows:

I would like to analyze a few of the tendencies which affect the lives as well as the practices of the lawyer today and which, if

unchecked, may prove disastrous to the profession.

So that we may have a proper perspective, let me make a few comparisons. It was just 50 years ago this month when Queen Victoria died. The age of Victoria has been looked at from various points of view. Some feel it to be a bit comical; others a hopelessly reactionary period; and still others look back at it as the age in which a few people enjoyed a very good life with its attendant maintenance—a high standard which will never be seen again. There was then an air of stability which seems totally lacking in this age of security seekers. It is difficult now to understand why Gladstone, a few years before Victoria died, remarked that he had predicted over a revolution. That great liberal, it is admitted, would be utterly bewildered today. The Victorian age represented an ordered society in which most people thoroughly believed. Everywhere there was an increasing prosperity—a confidence in the age and in the future. No feeling of danger in the acceptance of new ideas disturbed anyone. The idea of progress was accepted without question. There was, moreover, profound belief in the value of our western civilization; in its free democratic institutions, its humanitarianism, and its obedience to law. There was no doubt that all was right with the world, and if a few flaws were pointed out by the critics, these were merely squeaks in the machinery which could be oiled and eliminated.

What has happened to this confidence in an ordered society? Today we have seen the most unbelievable progress in the sciences, both pure and applied. The advances in medicine alone would have been considered by the Victorians as fantastic. The rapidity of communication and travel are bewildering. The advances in the weapons of war have been appalling.

But, now, we talk more about the collapse of civilization than of its continued upward progress. We await with increasing anxiety the advent of chaos. In the interim between Victoria's age and ours have occurred the two most destructive wars in history and their concomitant ills. There have been the most outrageous atrocities inflicted upon human beings since the Middle Ages and before. Tremendous masses of people have been murdered or have been uprooted from their ancestral homes for no better reason than the whim of a despot or from motives of revenge. Propaganda has developed to the ultimate in mendacity. Our conception of an ordered society has fallen down.

In the international field we see all nations preparing for another war (if they are not already engaged), more totalitarian in its nature than anything heretofore imagined. There is no confidence here and unrest in the world. The quest for security has never been greater, and in relation to many things will be overlooked. Sometimes I wonder whether in this quest for security, and in the willingness to make sacrifices to get it, we should not recall that the Ultimate winding in the most vociferous guardian of his liberty dozes.

What I would like to pursue are some of the ideas which were held by an intelligent minority in the Victorian era and which today are so pertinent and so strong. The effect of these ideas upon the legal profession has been profound. These ideas, I submit, have had more than a little to do with the foundation of an ordered society. Regardless of whether we like it or not we are at war, these ideas have crashed their controlling influences. As we go into this coming difficult era, known as the garrison state, let us hope their progress can be arrested.

I will discuss them in the following order:

First. To insure justice for all, the legal profession should be supported and directed by the State.

Second. Private property in land should be abolished.

Third. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax should be imposed.

Fourth. Inheritance should be abolished.

The second, third and fourth of these are taken verbatim from the Communist Manifesto of 1848, and the first from the general philosophy of the Socialists. Moreover, the influence of these four ideas has been worldwide.

The protagonists for these ideas were originally the Socialists. In Europe, before the Hitler regime, they were adopted by the Social Democrats, and later by the Nazis. In England they are the principles of the Labor Party, and in America of the Socialist Party, and I think it will be seen as I go on that a considerable number of Democrats as well as Republicans adhere to some of their offshoots.

First of all, let us examine the first idea—to insure justice for all, the legal profession should be supported and directed by the State. At the outset, all will agree that every person, whether or not he is able to afford a fee, is entitled to the services of a lawyer. The board of governors of the State bar has gone on record to this effect and at its November 1950 meeting has declared that all lawyers should support legal aid and lawyer reference service with time or money or both. The need of the public must be supplied by our profession and not by the state. For the bar to fail its obligations to all, is simply suicidal. If the bar will aid only those who can pay a fee, it must expect the inevitable socialization of the profession, with state support and state direction. We have in theory the view that all the public, wealthy or indigent, is entitled to legal service. In practice it develops that with too few exceptions, only those who can pay are to be served. This attitude recalls the deep irony of Anatole France who said, "The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to beg in the streets, to sleep under bridges, and to steal bread."

Because of what has happened to the profession in other lands, there is a far greater awareness of the dangers to the bar in this country than formerly. We have witnessed the liquidation of the organized bar in many countries. Behind the iron curtain, associations of lawyers have disappeared from one end of the area to the other. In serving a client the lawyer in these lands must first consider whether the interest of the state is involved. If it is, the state's need, not his client's is served. Those countries have, additionally, that travesty of justice known as the People's Courts. In Great Britain, along with its other nationalization programs, has come the first step in nationalizing its bar. This one is particularly seductive, and likely to appeal to our state planners here. The English plan is administered through the law society and the government is the paymaster, in those cases where the fee cannot be found from other sources. There was an overwhelming rush of English lawyers to climb on the gravy train, for, at least, fees were to be guaranteed and paid by the state. How much independence can be expected from a bar which has so willingly accepted the kiss of death? When the mere moderate administrators are replaced in England by the more socially-minded, you may be sure the bar will go along with greater and more crushing restrictions, or be made to.

One may say that such could never happen in the United States. My answer is that it could. There are powerful advocates of this very course for us. One can expect that at many legislative sessions this year, throughout the Nation, there will be attempts to institute this socialized law.

The answer of our profession should be immediate and total resistance. But more positively, we should advance vigorously the legal aid and lawyer reference plans which are being sponsored by the State bar. San Francisco has had both for a number of years. By a judicious amount of advertising their usefulness could be expanded considerably. Our State bar is actively engaged in sponsoring this work throughout the State. We have before us the example of New Jersey, where last year these services were instituted in every county of that state.

At least, let our answer to this program of socialism be firm and positive. We should not be swept into the fixed tide a lot of unresisting corks, to be gathered into an eddy and disposed of at the will of the State. This program of ours must go on, regardless of whether there is a war or whether we live in a garrison state.

The second idea—private property in land should be abolished—at first blush seems to be a very remote prospect in this country, but is it really remote? Let us see how that idea has spread. In those countries in which the views of the Second International predominate, the course is gradual and insidious nationalization. The great industries of transportation and communication are the favorite first targets, then come coal, steel, gas, electricity, banking, and then all means of production and distribution, and finally the retail outlets and the land itself. Where the Bolsheviks gained control, the take-over was drastic and catastrophic. All real property and most forms of personal property were seized by the State, without compensation. The frightful suffering caused by the economic upheaval which followed was considered merely an incident to the liquidation process. Latterly the Soviets permit ownership of personal property and a few forms of real-estate holdings. When it comes to the socialization of property, you can take your choice—the slow and creeping methods of the Socialist International, or the violence of the Red International.

Perhaps we might hear that this widespread seizure never would happen in England, but to answer this, listen to the plans of the Labor Party. In 1948, to mark the centenary of the first publication of the Communist manifesto in 1848, the Labor Party of Great Britain issued a special edition in English of that important cornerstone of both internationals. Among other things cited to show the achievement of certain aims of the manifesto, the Labor Party, in a foreword to the manifesto, stated:

"Abolition of private property in land has long been a demand of the labor movement. A heavy progressive income tax is being enforced by the present Labor Government as a means of achieving social justice. We have gone far towards the abolition of the right of inheritance by our heavy death duties." (Communist Manifesto Socialist Landmark, p. 7, London [1948].)

Not even a notable deficit is a deterrent to nationalization. Witness the British coal industry. Only a few years ago England exported coal. It is true that not all mines then made a profit. But what do we see today—the entire industry operated at a loss and the country importing coal. The end is not yet. We seem to be strangely influenced by our English models. So I suggest that the further drift to socialization be fought at every step. If it is to continue, the legal profession can expect to become employees of the state. Where the state owns the industry, who but government-employed lawyers advise that industry? When there is but one buyer or one seller of a commodity for the entire nation, as in Soviet Russia, it is submitted that the field of commercial practice will be limited.

There may be some comfort to be found in the change of position in some few respects in the Soviet Union with regard to limited ownership of private property. Evidently the Kremlin discovered that with all incentive gone, an equality of misery did not work and that some incentive must be provided. Thus we have the Stakhanovites, who get exceptional rewards for exceptional work. On the other hand, there is Siberia awaiting the sluggard or the disobedient. Capitalism

still provides the incentives, although these are being whittled unmercifully by the income tax. But we do not have any convenient Siberia to which to send the recalcitrants.

The third idea which was absorbed by the democracies from the Communist manifesto with the greatest fervor is the imposition of a heavy, progressive or graduated income tax. The theory behind this point of the manifesto was that through this means social justice would be achieved. Using simple English, this means the elimination of the wealthy and middle class through this brutally effective device. You will note the reference above to the program of the Labor Party in Great Britain, that the heavy, progressive income tax there is being enforced by the labor government as a means of achieving social justice. When our Federal income tax was first adopted in 1913, the maximum rate was 7 percent on the net income. Today the rate in the topmost bracket has gone to 91 percent. In England, with certain refinements—the rate has gone to the point where a total net income, after taxes, is limited to approximately $24,000 in our money. Through the use of a special tax in 1948 it was possible for the government to take more than 100 percent of certain incomes. In this range the rates ran up to 125 percent of the income, and involved naturally the use of certain capital to pay the income tax. In the case of a trust for Lady Mountbatten, an act of Parliament was necessary to permit the trustees to use part of their trust corpus to pay the income tax for that year.

No political party, except perhaps the Communists, has been so frank as has the Labor Government in England to denominate the progressive income tax as a means of eliminating the wealthy and well-to-do, but it can no longer be doubted that these trends are firmly on the march in this country. It can be confidently prophesied, unless the people take a stand, that the same maximum income limitation will be enforced here as in England. Bare-faced confiscation of income would be resented violently, but the achievement of the same purpose by a progressive income tax is deemed eminently respectable and politically desirable. For example, it was calculated under wartime rates that for a person to leave an estate of $100,000, representing 20 years' accumulations, he would have to have annual net earnings, without counting any living expenses, of $32,000 a year. To leave an estate of $1,000,000 representing income accumulations over the same 20-year period, he would have to have a net income of $1,075,000 per annum, and spend nothing that is not deductible. The result of this progressive income tax has made it almost impossible for lawyers any longer to leave much of an estate, except possibly through the medium of life insurance. The same thing is true of their clients, who will face the same difficulty of accumulation through income. Capital gains appear to be the only way out. Corporate earnings have not been treated so ruthlessly, on the theory that the goose which lays the golden egg should not be crippled. Here again I feel that a very important incentive in American life is being eliminated by following this doctrine of the Communist manifesto, and a firm stand should be taken against further increases in income taxes.

It is true that great sacrifices are demanded and should be cheerfully given for our country at war, but it is submitted that the burden of these sacrifices should not rest unduly on either the wealthy or the middle classes. A retail sales tax would produce far more income than the income tax. Canada has a retail sales tax of 8 percent. Mr. Peter Drucker has suggested a consumption tax of 20 percent. It has been stated recently that if all incomes in excess of $100,000 were taxed 100 percent, the amount raised would be not more than $900,000,000. On the other hand, if all incomes of over $25,000 were taxed 100 percent, the tax would raise approximately $5,500,000,000—perhaps only a down payment on our war program. If Congress really wants to control inflation it can be done by taxation but not solely by taxation on incomes. The elimination of incentives because of the tax rate should have important adverse effects on American life.

The fourth idea, that inheritance should be abolished, was put into effect in Soviet Russia soon after the Bolsheviks seized power. Elsewhere in the world, it has taken the more socially acceptable form of inheritance taxes. Let us examine this point in detail. Were it to be advocated that in the United States or in California that all inheritance of property should be abolished, the outcry against such a doctrine would be earsplitting. Yet when a procedure to accomplish essentially the same purpose is dressed up in the form of inheritance taxation there is almost universal acceptance of the principle and practically no sound of protest. Perhaps it seems pleasant that this route of expropriation is reserved for the wealthy. There are, after all, only a few who are wealthy.

The tax is introduced at a nominal rate. In 1916 the top Federal rate was 10 percent. Time after time the rates have been advanced, and now the effect is felt not only by the wealthy but by the middle classes as well. Today the top bracket has 77 percent carved from it (exclusive of credits). Nearly everyone expects the advances to continue.

The amount of taxes raised by the estate and inheritance taxes is not large. Indeed, the whole amount produced by the Federal estate tax, it has been estimated, is about the same as the amount disbursed for the potato growers subsidy (172 Commercial and Financial Chronicle, No. 4968, Mayo Adams Shattuck, pp. 1, 34 ff.). In California, in 1948, the total death and gift tax collections were slightly over $20,000,000, altogether clear that the purpose of inheritance, estate, and gift taxes is principally social reform, and only incidentally, revenue raising. Our people have decided apparently to eliminate the man of wealth. There are still quite a few wealthy dinosaurs above ground, whose demise the tax gatherers eagerly await.

There is for all practical purposes no retreat in this march, for the people appear convinced of its righteousness. But the question remains, not whether substantial estates are to be all but confiscated, but whether the social reformers, regardless of party, are to extend their activities to eliminate the middle class. Should not the line be held at not greater than the rates provided in the present laws? If not, then please ask yourselves, how far will our law makers go? Will they carry out the mandate of the Communist manifesto, that inheritance shall be abolished by the more acceptable but equally effective method of taxation? If it is abolished, may we not assume that probate of estates will be a truly ministerial function, to be handled solely by the tax bureaus?

It is interesting to note that the realists in the Kremlin have retreated. They followed literally the Communist Manifesto and abolished all inheritances in 1918. But this law was abrogated 4 years later by a new law which permitted inheritances up to 10,000 rubles for each estate. Three years later, the 10,000 ruble limit was removed and now no limit is imposed.

The Russian inheritance tax formerly ran up to 90 percent. In 1943, the tax was abolished and now only a filing fee is charged, running to a maximum of 10 percent on the largest estates. (Social Meaning of Legal Concepts—1. Inheritance of Property and the Power of Testamentary Disposition, pp. 3, 4.) What the values of individual estates are now in the Soviet Union, I do not know. In 1943 the London Economist reported several 1,000,000 ruble contributions to the Russian war relief from farmers. So we must assume there are a number of substantial holdings.

The four ideas which I have mentioned above, are particular instances where the creeping paralysis of the Socialist International is affecting our society in general and our legal profession in particular.

I sincerely believe that the American people are thoroughly aroused over the dangers from the Third International, and that a violent overthrow of our Government is inconceivable. But why are they so complacent about the aims of the Second International, the aims of which accomplish the purpose of the Red International, not by revolution, but by the insidious routes of nationalization and taxation? Is confiscation unrecognizable when it happens gradually? May I ask what room there will be for lawyers if the nationalization process is complete, if the Government becomes the only buyer or the sole seller, if incomes and estates are reduced to the vanishing point, except a position as a Government employee?

Perhaps the fulfillment of these ideas may seem remote at this time. If so, please compare the situation in England, in the United States, and in California, between 1930 and 1940. Then make a comparison with 1930, and each preceding decade back to 1900, and you will be startled by the progress.

I submit that the burden of supporting our war program should be distributed equitably and not used as a means of accelerating social reform. Other effective revenue-producing means can be devised.

It is hoped that the lawyers will protest vigorously the persistent advance both on State and national levels to hold off further encroachments of the ideas of the Socialist International. We should object strenuously to a philosophy that will reduce us to an equality of misery.

If we take no steps to hold the line, you may be sure that the profession will be swirled about like leaves in a storm, and with about the same fate.

In conclusion, may I urge upon you an increasing interest and activity in public affairs. Nothing is more important in our daily lives. We should give these matters the same attention we give to the interest of our clients. If we do not, we may be sure progress in these four ideas will be progressively overwhelming. If we retire to our corners in dudgeon, we can only expect a more rapid progress in their fulfillment. Let the lawmaker know your views. That, at least, will be a start in holding the line. We cannot afford to be apathetic.

Postal Employees' Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Detroit News:

THEY EARN MORE PAY

The postal service is everybody's business, and any proposal likely to improve that service should have the support of all.

Postal employees are notoriously underpaid in the light of today's wage standards. Many are reported to be leaving the service to take better-paying jobs in Detroit alone. 550 have quit since last July.

Because of the poor pay—the workers say they must put in 11 years to get the top of

$3,670 annually—the service is attracting inferior replacements. This means poorer service.

Post office workers' pay is fixed by law, and an increase is possible only through legislation. Several bills for an increase have been introduced in Congress, but no action has been taken on them.

To get action postal workers have decided to stage a post-card campaign in which you will be asked to write to your Congressman and urge him to support pay-increase legislation. This cause strikes us as being a worthy one, deserving of the cooperation of all.

Address of Hon. James M. Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Hon. James M. Mead, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, at the annual Notions Sales Conference, Statler Hotel, New York City, February 6, 1951:

The Federal Trade Commission and the vast retail business of the country, of which you are representatives, have much in common. We are both concerned with the practices and methods which adversely affect the business of selling and distributing merchandise to the buying public. We are both interested in maintaining the free functioning of industry and trade on a sound and constructive basis. In that manner the public as well as business itself is shielded from the harmful effects of unfair competitive methods and monopolistic controls. The present emergency emphasizes the importance of this common objective for good business.

In the commercial and industrial aspects of the present world struggle the contest is essentially between a system of free competitive enterprise, on the one hand, and a regimented totalitarianism on the other. The preservation of our liberties, the survival of our democratic way of life, depend in no little measure upon our ability to operate our economic system in such a way as to outstrip all others in production and distribution of materials and products for defense and for civilian requirements.

To accomplish this we must harness to the task our productive capacity to its fullest potential. We must see to it that private business, which serves us all, is not pushed, or allowed to drift, into the clutches of private monopoly. Trade must be carried on under principles of scrupulous practices. Methods which injure competition by deceiving or exploiting the consumer or undermining the confidence of the people in the integrity of business must be prevented.

These tasks call for greater vigilance on the part of the law-enforcement agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission.

President Truman has been mindful of the need for special alertness in these matters. In a directive of September 28, 1950, the President referred to the fact that during the last war the long standing tendency toward economic concentration was accelerated. He explained that mobilization, in the absence of protective measures, may again expose our economy to this threat and thereby imperil the very system we are seeking to protect.

He further pointed out the fact that in various provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, Congress likewise indicated its concern over this danger to free competitive enterprise. The President instructed the defense agencies to consult with the Attorney General and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission for the purpose of determining and eliminating, without impairment of the defense effort, "factors which may tend to suppress competition unduly, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power."

Restraints of trade and other monopolistic conditions stemming from industrial combinations, and the use of deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition, are problems with which the Federal Trade Commission must deal. Because their harmful effects upon our economy are more deeply felt in times of emergency than in normal competitive periods, the Commission's task is more urgent than in normal times. It is not erased by the fact that we are mobilizing for defense. In periods of emergency some rights and privileges of peacetime must be temporarily abridged or restricted in the interests of national survival. However, that need not, and should not, entail the surrender or crippling of our competitive free enterprise system.

Last week I directed the Commission's staff to be on the watch for "opportunists in the business world," who may seek to exploit consumers and the Government during the national defense emergency. Based upon our experience of World Wars I and II, it is anticipated that unfair acts, practices, and methods in connection with obtaining defense contracts will be employed more extensively as the letting of such contracts expands. Experience has demonstrated that when the Government begins to take an increasing proportion of the output of industrial concerns, efforts are often shifted by some to securing a preferred position on Government work. By others a preferred position is sought with respect to scarce materials or products needed in the civilian economy. Then there are some who plan for a preferred position in respect to business operations after the emergency is over, in short, some special unwarranted advantage to the detriment of one's competitors.

During the last war, small and independent business found it necessary to organize, to seek the assistance of the Federal Trade Commission and committees of Congress in order to remain in business. The Commission was called upon to expend considerable time and effort on cases involving collusive bidding and fraudulent efforts to deprive the Government of a fair price on its defense purchases.

The impact of the present mobilization effort is already being felt in our economy. It is placing a strain upon our free enterprise system and increasing the threat of private monopolistic controls and unfair trade methods. If the accelerated growth of the concentration of economic power experienced in World Wars I and II is to be prevented in the present emergency, and small and independent business afforded opportunity to survive and offer real competition, intensive vigilance is required.

DECEPTIVE PRACTICES

When considering matters of importance to the protection of the competitive enterprise system under which our country has produced the highest standard of living in the world, we must not overlook the need for guarding against the types of acts or methods in selling merchandise which collectively fall under the heading "deceptive practices."

In times of war or, as in the present emergency, in all-out preparedness for adequate national defense, the functions of the Commission in this field likewise occupy a position of much importance. When there are shortages in essential materials, and substitutes must be used, the necessity for truth in advertising becomes greater than when such materials are in full supply. Particularly is this true of such things as food, clothing, household furnishings, and medicinal preparations.

As more and more physicians are called into the military service, self-medication inevitably increases. The civilian then must rely to an increasing extent upon the Federal Trade Commission to check promptly false and deceptive claims made for dangerous drugs, ineffective remedies, or fake nostrums. The citizen who must to a large extent treat himself is entitled to all the protection and safeguards that this Commission can throw around the advertisements of foods, drugs, and medical devices. Not only is this true with respect to the preservation of the public health, it is also true with respect to protection of the consumer's pocketbook. In times when taxes must be sufficiently high to support the military burden, it is important that the public should receive real value for its money. Purchase of ineffective remedies is not only a waste of the public's money, but it is also a hazard to health. The use of and the reliance upon such remedies postpone or prevent recourse to proper treatment.

It is also highly important to give such protection as can be given promptly to the public in its purchase of other necessary household supplies and requirements. Experience in World War II showed that as soon as some materials become scarce, the opportunist of light conscience will use substitutes, or materials of inferior value, and materials which may even be harmful. Use of substitutes may not in itself be objectionable, but we must prevent false advertising of such substitutes and stop the use of false claims which will be detrimental to the purchasing public and unfair to the honest competitor.

High wool prices, shortages of raw wool, and conditions arising from emergency controls will undoubtedly increase the use of shoddy and wool substitutes in the manufacture of consumer fabrics. Changes in fiber content, stresses which arise from shortages and attendant conditions, together with pressure to maintain accustomed price ranges in apparel merchandise, make it more urgent than ever that there be thorough enforcement of our Wool Products Labeling Act. I am happy to note that informative labeling generally has in recent years become an integral part of the merchandising practices of progressive manufacturers and merchants. Scrupulous manufacturers and merchants must be protected against dishonest competitors who would pass off their products as wool, when in reality they contained substitute fibers, or those who would falsely label their fabrics as new wool when they were made of shoddy, or who might otherwise conceal the true fiber content.

Proper wool labeling must be enforced as a necessary medium of protecting the civilian population. During the emergency period there will be many changes in quality and standards. Active enforcement is highly important to bring an adequate measure of protection to our fiber-producing industries; to our manufacturers and merchants against the evils of deception, confusion, and unfair competition.

Our field investigation staff is located in strategic industrial centers to expose false or unfair sales practices—practices in the form of advertisements, labels, and other forms. Our continuing surveys of radio and periodical advertising, as well as our unfair competition and antimonopoly work form part of the Government's effort to protect the public in the mobilization effort and to maintain our private-enterprise system.

Constant vigilance is required not only by the Government but also on the part of business itself. Government alone cannot do the job adequately. Much depends on the active and moral support of the vast group of scrupulous and patriotic men and women in business who constantly keep their sights on that which is honest and fair in industry and trade. With business and Government working together in unity under the inspiring motive of doing what is best for our country, we can be assured of the ultimate triumph of our ideals of freedom and justice for all.

The Righteous Sword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMOND CHATHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church, and Chaplain of the United States Senate:

THE RIGHTEOUS SWORD

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, U. S. Senate)

There is nothing inherently good or bad about a sword. The quality of sharpened steel may depend on whether it is in the hands of a surgeon or a bandit. Earth's greatest Teacher admonished, "Put up your sword; for he that takes it shall perish by it." That sword was drawn in anger and vengeance. It was a bad sword. But Jesus also said, "I am not come to bring peace, but a sword." That sword unsheathed against evil was a good sword. All depends upon the purpose for which the blade is to be used.

In ancient days, the walls of ruined Jerusalem were rebuilt by toiler-soldiers with trowels in one hand and swords in the other. And as late as last summer, gardeners were seen with hoes in one hand and cans of poison spray in the other for the pests which attacked their growing plants.

Without swords, coerced men are compelled to cry peace when there is no peace and to surrender the most heavenly things to the most hellish forces. There is a sword bathed in heaven. If swords are in the hands only of those who cannot be trusted with them, then the only peace possible between the lion and the lamb, which, it is prophesied, shall some day lie down together, is for the lamb to lie down inside the lion. There are present-day appeasers of evil who would label that arrangement peace. But a peace dictated by unethical force is the peace of slaves.

When a prime minister took an umbrella to Munich and no righteous sword, a glorious little democracy in the midst of Europe was thrown to the wolves in appeasement, a perfidy committed for peace in our time. A show of weakness will never bring in any day of peace.

A nation must be strong to make its work for peace effective. A peace gained by constant retreat because of the threatening blackmail of superior force is not peace, but war. It will be a day of mourning for all the free world if ever our Nation, whose potential force is the greatest, refuses to back to the hilt its belief in universal brotherhood with its terrible swift sword against aggressors ready to pounce on new victims. There always is enough bad in the world to shatter any dream of an ethical peace, unless that ill will has a restraining fear of the power of organized good will. Whenever a nation with a completely unethical purpose to conquer the world reaches the stage of aggressive hostility a part of its technique always is to develop disarmament propaganda in the nation against whose life it is plotting. To weaken the national striking power is to vote to make it inevitable that the democracies shall be forced to do the bidding of moral perverts who have been allowed to fashion a preponderance of swords.

Of course, force never is the last word. At best, it but clears the way for the constructive agencies of friendship, good will, and cooperation to do their healing work, so that at last swords can be turned into plowshares. But when you face men who have put the state on the throne, instead of God, you cannot conquer them by kindly example or a friendly smile. No gentle charms can stay the fangs of the cobra when it is ready to strike. That callous devilry is to be allowed at will to trample righteousness into the mire whenever it is powerful enough, while the forces of good stand impotently by, is a tragic travesty of justice and judgment.

In England, before World War II, a group of influential clergymen, ignoring Germany's rearmament, led a movement utterly to renounce the sword of defense.

Declaring they were willing to risk all on meeting Hitler's threat with understanding and good will, they secured hundreds of thousands of signed pledges of a virtual refusal to take up arms. That futile policy, sincerely followed, helped to bomb the churches of which these preachers were the ministers and to fill the land with lamentations for the mangled and the dead. That crusade was a definite factor in Britain's unpreparedness when the foe struck. Time tragically proved it was no hour to exchange a clean sword for an olive branch.

In America, a man stood up in a free pulpit to preach. He quoted detached sentences from the Christ whose hand held the lash when His Father's House was made a den of thieves, and whose eyes were often as a flame of fire. The preacher declared that evil, no matter how diabolical, was never to be resisted with any physical weapons. Rhetorically, he asked, "What has a sword ever accomplished worth while?" In a pew was a worshiper in whose heart was an aching void and in whose home was a Purple Heart, speaking of the valor of a young crusader who marched forth with a righteous sword and came not back. At the church door, following the service, that worshiper said to the clergyman: "I can tell you one thing that the righteous sword has done." "What?" asked the minister. Replied the listener with deep feeling, "The sword in the hand of those who have resisted militant evil has given you the right to stand here today and to proclaim your convictions without fear of being liquidated." The one who had publicly said that rampant evil was never to be resisted by force paused for a moment and then acknowledged, "I am afraid I cannot refute that."

There is no refutation in God's world and man's for the flash of the righteous sword.

A Prayer for the President and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a prayer which I received from Sister Mary Samuel, of St. Clara Convent, Sinsinawa, Wis. This very kind lady informed me that this beautiful prayer is being recited every day by 1,500 professed sisters, residents in different parts of the United States. Sister Samuel stated in her letter to me, "I wish it could be framed and put on the two walls of Congress," and I most heartily agree with that sentiment.

A PRAYER FOR THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of these United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides, by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion, by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy, and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of the Congress and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

Food for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, resolution, and editorial:

COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF BUFFALO AND ERIE COUNTY,
Buffalo, N. Y., February 6, 1951.

The Honorable EDMUND P. RADWAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The annual meeting of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, assembled in session February 2, 1951, unanimously endorsed the resolution of the general board of the National Council of Churches supporting the provision for making available 2,000,000 tons of food grain to relieve the acute food shortage in India.

I write, therefore, to express the hope that the proper legislation will be drafted, introduced, and passed. There are those inclined to punish Nehru for his position on Korea by letting the people of India starve. The Christian conscience rejects this attitude as morally intolerable. Further, starving people are ripe for the spread of communism.

Very truly yours,

HARLAN M. FROST,
Executive Secretary.

FOOD FOR INDIA

Whereas the Government of the United States has been officially requested by the Government of India to make available 2,000,000 tons of food grain to relieve the acute food shortage in that country; and

Whereas such action on the part of our Government would be justified not only on humanitarian grounds but also for reason that it would strengthen bonds of friendship between the American and Indian peoples; be it

Resolved, That the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of

America recommend that the Congress and the executive branch of the Government of the United States take such steps as may be required to assist in meeting the present urgent needs of the Indian people for emergency food aid and that this food be made available on such terms as may be mutually acceptable to the two Governments.

Adopted by the General Board of the National Council of Churches, January 17, 1951.

No Time for Grudge Politics

Unless the Congress of the United States appropriates the price of 2,000,000 tons of grain for famished India, millions of humans may starve to death. It isn't in the American tradition to stand idly by so long as we have the wherewithal to avert such a catastrophe. We have it, and to spare.

Prime Minister Pandit Nehru allined himself with Soviet Russia in voting against the United States resolution in the United Nations identifying Red China as an aggressor in Korea, an attitude which soured Congress on India. But this is no time for a punitive gesture. Our grain elevators are bulging with what it takes to prevent a famine in India and common humanity demands that we spare some of it to save lives. Besides, think of the psychological effect such a gift would have in Asia—India stubbornly refuses to support us in the UN, but we send food to the starving millions anyway.

The administration delayed asking Congress to come to India's assistance largely because UN Delegate Warren Austin did not want to be wide open to Communist charges of blackmail if India retreated from appeasement and voted with the United States in condemning Communist China. In addition, a suspicious Nehru might have become convinced we were trying to buy his vote. If the grant was made before the vote, Congress might have considered it rank ingratitude if he didn't support the resolution of censure.

At the White House Friday, President Truman appealed to ranking Members of both parties for speedy congressional action to approve the gift. Some of the Congressmen demurred at dipping into our feed grain reserves in a time of crisis. Others want to hold public hearings. However, the President received some unexpected support when Senator Robert A. Taft declared himself in favor of the Indian-aid program.

Prime Minister Nehru has not asked for the grain as a handout. He pocketed his pride when he asked for it in the first place and salved it by proposing that India pay for it on a long-term credit basis. The Congress will cancel out the gesture of good will if it demands payment for the grain. Piling more debt on the burdened shoulders of the Indian people will spoil the effect. That is the common-sense attitude of Herbert Hoover, who was called to the White House this week to advise on the problem. "Let it be free. The United States has never in its history failed to be helpful to a famine-stricken people." That's the way it should be.

Evacuation of Boston by the British, March 17, 1776

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the approaching one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the fortification of Dorchester Heights by Gen. George Washington in 1776 calls attention to one of the most significant military actions of the American Revolution.

The now populous region known as South Boston constituted then the area known as Dorchester, Dorchester Neck, Dorchester Heights, and Dorchester Point. It forms a peninsula projecting eastward toward the Atlantic. Dorchester had been founded as early as 1630, and its scanty inhabitants had made very considerable contributions to the development of the colony. Its historians are particularly proud of the fact that here was established, in 1630, what is almost certainly the first free school supported by public taxation on this continent. It is believed also that a decision taken in 1633 to have the men of the colony meet every Monday "to settle and set down such orders as may tend to the general good" was the beginning of the "town meeting" system of local government, which became characteristic of New England and has had lasting effect on the development of democratic government in America. Dorchester citizens were active in the early measures of resistance to British tyranny, out of which emerged in time the War of Independence.

The Battle of Bunker Hill—which should be called the Battle of Breed's Hill, where it was really fought—took place on June 17, 1775. Tactically it was a defeat for the Colonials, for the British remained in possession of the area. Their losses were staggering, however, and left them greatly weakened as well as bewildered. On the American side there were almost the effects of a victory, so far as morale was concerned. Colonial militia had stood up successfully against British Regulars. The ground lost—a neck of land containing Bunker Hill and Breed's Hill—was not very important. The gathering American forces were able to surround the whole larger area. For the ensuing 9 months the British were more and more tightly contained in Boston itself. Their forces were strong and they had command of the sea approaches, but displayed singular inactivity. In part this was due to their distance from England; it took messages 5 or 6 weeks to cross the ocean from the home government.

Be this as it may, in the period following Bunker Hill the British were fairly tightly confined in Boston itself. There is evidence that they did not intend to stay there indefinitely, and planned to make some other central position such as New York or Philadelphia the base of their effort to subjugate the Colonies. They were in no hurry, however, to leave Boston, and when they did so it was not as they had planned but a very hasty evacuation under duress.

The Americans began building up their forces. Washington was appointed to the supreme command; he accepted June 15. Before him was a great task, to take the shifting Colonial volunteers and militia, little more than a motley aggregation of untrained men, and turn them into an army. He had all sorts of difficulty with discipline and enlistments and discord and supplies. In the last-named category the primary problem was gunpowder. There was never enough of it, then or throughout the war, and the quality was poor. The patriot James Warren wrote in July:

> The armies continue to look at each other and fortify themselves. No action or prospect of one. It is a barren time.

But—

Adds a historian—

> not barren for Washington. He needed this breathing space for the organizing of his Army and the training of his men, for studying his enemy and learning as well to know his friends. This was his first experience in command of New Englanders, and if at times he admired the Yankee temperament, at others it disappointed him. Weak as compared with his well-fortified enemy, at present Washington could not strike a blow. He began now to study that lesson of waiting and of preparation which he put to such good use in the years of the long war. (French, p. 310.)

There were some small operations. Washington made two raids on Charlestown, held by the British. Later Howe made his own attempt on Dorchester, caused by information that Americans were gathering fascines and gabions, preparing to fortify the place. In the early morning of February 14, 1776, he sent detachments from Boston and Castle William—in Boston Harbor—to the empty peninsula. They found no military materials, but burned some vacant houses and returned with captured sentinels. Content with this evidence that the Americans were doing nothing, Howe relaxed his attention.

The battle for powder described above had begun to be successful and Washington succeeded in building up a fairly substantial reserve; but there was also the battle for cannon. The only storehouses where any large cannons were available to the Colonials were at Ticonderoga and Crown Point. Winter made possible the portage of these great weights by sledge. Washington sent Col. Henry Knox after them. Knox reached Ticonderoga on December 5. He got 43 cannons and 16 mortars. Three of the latter were of 13-inch caliber, each weighing over a ton. Knox got these pieces to Lake George by sledge, took them on boats and scows to the end of the lake, then by road again to Albany, crossing the Hudson four times on the way. The boats sank several times. At Albany one of the largest cannons fell through the ice at a ferry. After a difficult time, this "drowned" cannon was recovered, and nicknamed "The Albany." From Claverack on the Hudson the pieces were sledged over the Berkshire hills, where the snow was now dependable. Thence to Springfield and then to Framingham, by the 25th of January, 1776.

Washington was at last ready to take up the long-cherished idea of fortifying Dorchester Heights. The difficulty now was the weather. If the work was to escape British interference it must be done in a single night, but experience of similar operations attempted when the ground was frozen indicated that it might take weeks. The dilemma was solved by a decision to build the breastworks of fascines, which were bundles of sticks held in place by wooden frames called chandeliers; these were prepared in large quantities.

The local militia were called in for the night of March 4, a date chosen as the anniversary of the massacre, when Massachusetts men might be expected to be at their fighting best. Teamsters with their carts and horses, entrenching tools, quantities of marsh hay, were all quietly assembled. On the third a blind was thrown up along the causeway between Roxbury and Dorchester. Two hundred and fifty axmen were set to fell the trees for the abattis. In addition to these and the large number who were to set the fascines and chandeliers in position, there were 750 men posted on the lower hills near the water, with sentries between, who would cover the workers. Barrels were prepared, filled with earth, to roll down from the higher hills if there was an attack. Another preparation was the misdirection of the enemy's attention by cannonading Boston from the land side for two nights. Not much damage was done to Boston, but the great brass mortar named the Nancy and three more exploded and split. The British replied with a noisy fire of their own.

The night of the fourth proved perfect for the enterprise. It was mild, with a bright moon on the hills, but near the water level a haze which cut off Dorchester from sight, both from the town and from the ships. The wind was of such a direction as to carry sounds away from the town, the ships, and Castle William.

The march began about 7 p. m. Certain low hills were immediately manned as cover for an attack by the enemy, which Washington expected.

Following the covering party came the working party, 1,200 men under Thomas, and after them 360 ox teams. The hay, in great bundles, was laid as a screen along the short neck, where the carts were to go back and forth. All went in silence; orders had been given in advance, and each detachment knew its business. On the two hills selected for fortification, the two summits of which towered above the anchorage of the British Fleet, the chandeliers were laid out on the plans already marked, the fascines were put in place; and with pick and shovel men fell to work on the frosty earth to make a ditch and raise and thicken the breastworks. The axmen were felling the orchards and making the abattis; and men were filling the gabions and the barrels for rolling down on the enemy. The carts, having been emptied, returned for more chandeliers and fascines; some of them before morning made three or four trips. The work was pushed with such tremendous energy that by 10 o'clock they had two forts, one on each hill, strong enough to be capable of defense against small arms and grapeshot. (French, p. 659.)

By 3 o'clock in the morning 3,000 fresh men came on, in part as relief and in part to man the works. There arrived also five companies of riflemen. By dawn, with the cannons brought up, the digging and heaving and ramming and firming completed, the work was done.

The British may have had intimation that something was going on during the night. If so they did nothing about it. By morning the work was discovered, and the British began shelling the fortifications, but found their shots falling short.

Their position was now untenable. The admiral is reported to have notified Lord Howe that his ships could not remain in their anchorage. The plunging fire from the forts commanded not only the anchorage, but Castle William, and the ship channels and the town itself. The new fort was so high and so far away that the British guns could not be elevated sufficiently to reach them. There was only one possible recourse for Howe, an attempt to drive the Yankees from the new position by the use of troops.

It would have been a spectacular battle, along the lines of Bunker Hill, but with much greater advantages on the Colonial side. Howe sent Brigadier General Jones with 2,200 men to undertake the task. Seven regiments were sent to the castle by boat intended to embark from thence in flatboats. An assault was to be made on the Dorchester Peninsula at a point nearest the island where the castle stood. The attack was to be made on the first fort while that fort itself shielded the attackers from the second fort. Main dependence was to be on the bayonet. Meanwhile other troops were prepared to attack Roxbury. Washington had made careful plans for receiving the attack.

Why did this assault on the new fortifications never come off? All that day, the 5th of March, it was expected, in vain, by the Americans. It seems the British were waiting for the coming of nightfall, and a favorable tide. But that night there arose what one writer describes as "a Hurrycane, or terrible sudden storm." Some of the transports were driven ashore, and boats could not live in the surf on Dorchester Beach. The tempest prevented the battle.

Such was the official British explanation. Historians, however have evidence to indicate that the real reason for calling off the battle was a realization that an attempt to force the new American position would be not only bloody but futile. A council of war decided that the attack must be abandoned and Boston evacuated. By the second day, the necessity for such an action was more obvious. The American parapets had risen higher and thicker, and more cannons had been mounted. The situation was hopeless for the British. To the dismay of the loyalists in Boston, preparations for evacuation began on the 6th.

The British had plenty of shipping, but all was haste and confusion. Many valuable stores were abandoned. Some 2,000 loyalists went along, most of them perhaps with the complete loss of their possessions and property. Stories were told of fine mahogany furniture found floating in the docks or driven on distant beaches. There was some plundering by British soldiers—against Howe's orders, however.

It is probable that Washington could have attacked at this time and destroyed the British Army. There were reasons against this. The town would have been destroyed, and probably many noncombatant Americans killed. He himself was running out of powder again, as a result of the bombarding. To "hold his hand," says the historian French, "was both human and wise." There were some negotiations, which fell through, but seem to have resulted in a kind of gentleman's agreement that if Howe would leave the town intact, Washington would not interfere with the evacuation. Washington was watchful for some last enemy attack, while the British ships were held up by bad weather, but no attempt was made.

Washington expected the British move to be toward New York and immediately began dispatching forces thither. To the surprise of all, however, by a decision, the reasons for which are not even now clear, Howe sailed for Halifax.

The fortification of Dorchester and the consequent forced evacuation of Boston by the British constitute the first signal victory of American forces in the Revolution. It was long ere there was another. So far as Washington's personal command was concerned, the only one that could be compared with it was the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown at the end of the war.

For Massachusetts this was the end of an era. When the fleet sailed away Boston at last stood free from its long struggle with Britain, and was not again the focus of action. For the Colonies as a whole, new hope existed. What seemed the long stalemate in New England was over, but had ended with an American triumph. There was new spirit in the Colonies now, which did much to sustain them in the hard years which were to follow. For Washington himself, his influence was consolidated, his skill acknowledged, and his own talents developed. Says the historian French:

> At Boston were shown Washington's great characteristics: His power to wait, to confront a stronger enemy without yielding, to bear without disheartenment weakness and disaffection in his own army, to build up strength by whatever means he could, and at the right moment to strike suddenly and effectually.

Sources: Allen French, the First Year of the American Revolution, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934; William Dana Orcutt, Good Old Dorchester, Cambridge, 1893; Benson J. Lossing, the Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution, New York, 1850; Tercentenary Committee, Dorchester Old and New, Chapple Publishing Co., Dorchester, Mass., 1930; Sydney George Fisher, the Struggle for American Independence, 1908, volume 1.

Federal Job Holders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there is much being said about nonessential expenditures in Government during these crucial times. We are all concerned about our budget, expenditures, high and increased taxes.

There is much talk about economy on those matters not related to our national defense and future security. The people of the country are not only interested in talk and agitation but action. I believe by far the majority Members of this Congress feel the same way. We are continually faced with the difficulty of requests for increased expenditures and the alarming trend of increased

Federal payrolls, much of which is under the guise of national defense.

Our people are willing to make all necessary sacrifices for our own protection and security to prevent aggression and to try to bring about peace and peaceful relationship among nations. We do not believe it is necessary to accede to the request of huge outlays and continuous large increases of Federal employees for many of these programs that have little or no relationship to the national defense.

An editorial on this important subject in the Washington Post today points to this problem in a most effective manner. The Appropriations Committees are meeting now, holding hearings for the next fiscal year. I desire to call to the attention of not only the members of that committee but every Member of Congress this appropriate discussion in the editorial and therefore under unanimous consent, I include it in this extension of remarks:

PERSONAL JOB HOLDING

The congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures headed by Senator BYRD reports that since the outbreak of the Korean war, new civilian workers have been added to the Federal payroll at an average rate of about a thousand per day. By June payrolls will be above the World War II peak figure and will still be rising. California leads the District in the number of civilian Federal employees, with New York and Pennsylvania not far behind in second and third place, respectively. New York City alone harbors 114,000 civilians working for Uncle Sam; Chicago has 52,000; Philadelphia, 47,000, and St. Louis, 23,000.

To arrest this alarming trend, which not only increases the cost of running the Government, but aggravates industrial labor shortages, the Byrd committee has recommended that the National Security Resources Board be authorized to control proposed increases in civilian employment by Government agencies, and that the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate require an NSRB survey of personnel requirements to be made before approving appropriations for increased employment in any Federal agency.

The defense program has added to the work burdens of some Government agencies, and, of course, the new defense agencies are compelled to build up their staffs. However, many old-line departments and agencies are undoubtedly overstuffed. It is the will to save money through more economical use of manpower that is conspicuously lacking in such cases. Under pressure from an outside agency, such as the NSRB, they could make substantial cuts in expenditures, reduce the drain on our manpower reserves and lighten the burdens borne by taxpayers.

The Debate Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am placing in the RECORD a very timely statement by the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann.

I believe the Members of the House and readers of the RECORD will be interested in Mr. Lippmann's analysis. It follows:

THE DEBATE GOES ON

(By Walter Lippmann)

It costs much sweat, and even a few tears, to work out who agrees and who differs with whom in the great debate. Subject to correction later when the hearings, which are to start this week, have produced their results, it is fair to say, I think, that there are no irreconcilable differences in the views of Taft, Dulles, and Eisenhower. The more one studies their remarks, the more it appears that their differences are matters of emphasis rather than of substance.

In the meantime I have found it helpful to realize that the whole business is difficult to follow because there are two debates going on simultaneously, each dealing with a great subject. The first has to do with the rights and powers of the President. The second has to do with the strategical question of how—not whether—Western Europe is to be made secure against invasion.

The extraordinary thing about this debate is that, thus far, the two men who ought to be leading it,—the President and his Secretary of State—have refrained from giving the country an informative and reasoned description and explanation of the project. No one contradicted Senator TAFT last Thursday when he said in the Senate that Congress had been unable to obtain definite knowledge about whether or not we had made a commitment at Brussels, or about the size of the American Army that the administration was proposing to send to Europe, or about the status of General Eisenhower himself in relation to the other Atlantic governments.

But if all that is unclear and indefinite, Congress does have before it a clear and definite proposal to conscript 18-year-old men for 27 months. The contrast between the heavy concrete sacrifices which Congress has to vote and the generalities and abstractions in which the President and his Secretary of State communicate their purposes is striking. The issue of the President's powers has arisen, and will surely not easily be brushed aside in this Congress, because the administration has in effect taken the position that Congress must provide the men and the treasure, but that the President then has full power to decide where to deploy them.

This is not a tenable position. If the President were a wiser man than he is, he never would have dreamed of questioning the right of the Congress to participate in the unprecedented project of placing an American standing army in Europe and of merging it in an international army. He would not only have sought the advice of Congress but he would have insisted from the outset that Congress share his responsibility.

Because the President failed to do that, he laid himself open to and invited the kind of attack which Senator TAFT delivered at the Lincoln Day dinner in Chicago. It is that Harry S. Truman is too impulsive and not careful enough in his judgments to bear alone the responsibilities of life and death.

On Sunday, Governor Dewey came out strongly for the President's position. "I do not believe," he said, "that the deployment of our troops is a matter for congressional action. I believe the deployment is a matter for the experts and on that I will trust General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and the Chiefs of Staff rather than anyone else." I wonder whether this is Governor Dewey's considered view.

Can Governor Dewey argue seriously that the project of an American standing Army in Europe, involving perhaps three-quarters of a million men, can be called a mere deployment like sending troops to Hawaii, Alaska, or even by putting ground crews at some air strips in Great Britain. Does not the proposal to place a permanent American garrison on the European Continent call for a political decision of the greatest magnitude? Is this not in the substance, even if it is not in the form, a treaty? One need not contend that the decision should be presented as a treaty in order to believe that the administration ought to handle it with the same kind of respect and deference for Congress which it would show if it needed to obtain ratification of a treaty.

Governor Dewey, moreover, seems to feel that these decisions will not be made by Mr. Truman but that they will be made by the "experts" and "on that I will trust General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and the Chiefs of Staff, rather than anyone else." I myself do not think it is fair to the generals to expect them to take over the very highest responsibility of the Government. And we would certainly have fallen into an ignoble state of affairs if the elected Government were in these great matters to evade its responsibilities and to seek refuge and protection behind the general.

As a matter of fact, if Governor Dewey will recall the events of the past year, he will find little in the record to warrant his confidence that the military "experts" will decide military questions and that the civilian "experts" will decide political questions. One of the striking characteristics of the Truman administration has been the confusion which weakness and haphazardness have brought into the relations between the civilian and the military authorities. Many things that we now regret, many things we may perhaps live to regret, arise from that confusion.

Address of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1951, Northwestern University, which is located in Evanston, Ill., celebrated its one hundredth anniversary. Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, the distinguished Governor of the State of Illinois, delivered the principal address at the convocation ceremonies, an address which is truly thought-provoking at this time when the great debate is going on.

Not only has Governor Stevenson made an enviable reputation and record in his high post in the State of Illinois as one of the Nation's most capable State executives, but his background and experience qualify him extraordinarily to speak on foreign affairs. In 1943 he was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to head the mission in Italy which was established as a part of the newly created Foreign Economic Administration. His report on his mission contained recommendations for a plan of economic aid for the European nations which may very well have been the foundation for the Marshall plan.

In 1945 Governor Stevenson became a special assistant to Secretary of State James Byrnes. His ability in this position won him much acclaim, including

editorial approval of the New York Times.

When the United Nations Conference was organized in San Francisco, Governor Stevenson was press spokesman for the United States delegation. Successive appointments as minister and representative to the Preparatory Commission for the United Nations qualified him for his later role as senior adviser to the American delegation. Throughout 1946 and 1947, as an alternate delegate, he was appointed to various important committees of the United Nations.

Governor Stevenson's address follows:

Some 5 years ago this university, for reasons best known to its trustees, conferred an honorary degree on me. Having thus honored me I suppose the least the Governor of Illinois could do in appreciation was to decline President Miller's and Mr. Burgess' invitation to speak at this hundredth anniversary convocation. Instead, I accepted, after the manner of insensitive and egotistical politicians. I apologize.

Because there are others who can speak with authority about the founding of Northwestern University, I am, with, I am sure, your enthusiastic approval, going to resist the temptation to tell you of the faith and convictions of the founders who stood here 100 years ago and dreamed of a university of the highest order of excellence. All that we see about us testifies that they founded well and that their successors have wrought well upon those foundations. In the 100 years the dream by the lake here in Dr. Evans' town has become one of the world's large and honored communities of scholars.

Early Illinois was notoriously inhospitable to higher education and I recall the remark of a lusty legislator who said in opposition to a bill to charter the first three Illinois schools that he was "born in a briar thicket, rocked in a hog trough, and never had his genius cramped by the pestilential air of a college."

Northwestern, too, was born upon a scene on which the light of higher education shone but fitfully. But in our time one never sees a considered catalog of the assets of Illinois that does not always proudly list its universities at the top.

I once heard it said that Massachusetts Institute of Technology "humanized the scientist" while Harvard "simonized the humanist." Just what Northwestern does I don't know; perhaps both. But at all events its contributions to the sciences and the humanities and also to the wholesome goodness and gaiety we associate with American student life have brought to this campus imperishable distinction and affection.

Thanks to Northwestern, its neighbor, the University of Chicago, the great State university, and many distinguished lesser institutions, Illinois, and particularly this section of the State, is now one of the treasure houses, one of the major repositories, of the Western World's culture.

It is proper, therefore, that we pause to note the one hundredth birthday of this proud university; that we pause a moment in our feverish defense preparations to recall what we are defending. Certainly one of the things we are defending is the future security and health of privately supported universities such as Northwestern. In turn we confidently expect them to defend for generations to come the spirit of free inquiry and fearless scholarship which is a basic condition of free men. For that protection and for the contribution of the universities to "a large resolute breed of men" which Walt Whitman called the only bar against tyranny, we will have to trust to the future; we will have to trust that the guardians here and elsewhere of the riches of our learning will never forget what the treasure they guard is, what it is composed of. We will have to trust that the guardians of western thought will never permit its vitality and beauty to be smothered by strong, arrogant men who burn books and bend thought to their liking, nor obscured by timid men trembling in the darkness of anxiety.

The continuity of our heritage of scholarship, both bold and free, which is the peculiar and priceless possession of the university, must, then, be entrusted to the future. But what of the present which has such a bearing on the health and strength and continuity of the custodians of our culture?

Are the universities to be stripped of students in order to defend our cultural heritage? The young of college age are the seed corn of a society and a nation. To survive must we eat our seed corn? And if we do, can we survive? We must and we will, I think, find at least a partial answer to that disturbing question. And we will find it in calm deliberation, not in frantic fright.

Then, like you, after some experience, I have made the disturbing observation that absence of thought in war seems to be mandatory. And, of course, total abstinence from thought is very agreeable for most of us, and a uniformly popular condition among adolescents. But is it necessary in mobilization, in half war, if you please? Perhaps we have something to think about here as we enter the new and unexplored era of the garrison state.

Again, I must ask with a shudder if it will be largely women who enjoy the benefits of more advanced education in the new era? Is the ancient tradition of masculine primacy in jeopardy? Heaven forbid. And I should think a little reflection on this appalling possibility by the male leaders in all countries could do more to insure peace than a balance of power in the world. It is high time, it seems to me, that we males begin to think of survival in terms of gender as well as nationality and ideology.

There is another problem of which you are all soberly mindful. How are the privately endowed universities to survive financially; how can inflexible income meet flexible costs—costs that flex in only one direction? What will be the further ravages of inflation, of ever higher income taxes and sharply diminished student population and student fees? How will President Miller balance his budget? Actually I really don't feel very sorry for him because he can always tell the trustees to raise more money. But if I can't balance the budget of Illinois you'll tell me to find another job.

But there must be survival for the privately endowed institutions. By virtue of their very independence, they are indispensable to the kind of survival we are all talking about. We have long since accepted as right and just publicly supported primary and secondary education for all. But is that the destiny of higher education too? I hope not. It will be an ominous day indeed when all higher education is government subsidized. Yet simple economics point that way and already most of the great private universities must rely more and more on Government subventions, whether it be GI tuition or scentific research projects.

And in this connection we could well afford to examine critically the relative growth of the tax dollar and the private dollar contributed to higher education.

There are masses of statistics, but let me just refer to the immediate situation in our Illinois. As taxpayers you support six State universities and colleges. For this 2-year period the legislature appropriated $128,000,000 for them. In all of them tuition is but a fraction of the fees charged by private institutions. Three separate boards of trustees, elected or appointed, now divide control over these institutions. There is little coordination. Confusion and rivalry complicate just and wise decisions on appropriations and other legislation.

With the hope of improving this situation, I asked the United States Office of Education to survey the situation in Illinois. This week I published its interesting and informative study which does not attempt to say what plan of coordination Illinois should adopt, but offers several alternative plans to improve the present disorderly system.

With what emphasis I can command, I say that a public service so expensive and competing with privately supported colleges should be considered as a single program and coordinated on a State-wide basis. The budget requests of the several institutions should be equitably appraised on the basis of relative needs. There should be some competent over-all determination of the curriculum, the degrees offered, and the research programs at each institution. There should be a continuing evaluation of the operations at each, and a continuing study of the State's needs for tax-supported higher education.

If these controls are not exercised how can we assure the taxpayer his money's worth out of this costly service? And how can the legislature or the executive deal fairly, prudently and intelligently with such intricate problems at the six institutions.

I believe the time has come and gone when Illinois should attack disorder and disintegration in a major and expensive State service boldly and decisively, and with a considerate view to the plight of those private institutions of which the State is so proud.

Northwestern was born here in a quiet village on Lake Michigan by a burgeoning city a hundred years ago. That, too, was a time of revolution abroad and of transition here. In 1851 Illinois was filling up with immigrants from the South and East. A steel plow to cut the tough prairie sod had been invented. The reaper had come to our prairies. On plank roads, Illinois was rising out of the mud. A railroad was pushing westward. Europe was in political and economic ferment. The Irish and the Germans were coming in search of something better and more hopeful for the average man. With not 30,000 souls, Chicago was struggling out of the swamps. Illinois was passing from the log-cabin-frontier era and shouldering its way into the new industrial day that was breaking upon the Union.

A hundred years have passed, a hundred years which have seen the culmination of a great historic expansive movement of peoples from Europe to the west, and the conquest, development, and integration into the world community of the two great American continents, severed by revolutions but tied by cultural inheritance to their Western European roots.

At the same time, there came another great expansion—from west to east. The Slavic peoples and culture pushed through the Ural Mountains, across the vastness of Siberia to the Pacific, and on across the Bering Sea to Alaska and our own west coast. The Russian tide collided with the Japanese, just emerging from the hermits' hut, with vaulting ambitions, too. There it stopped—for a time—but the land mass over which the Russian expansion surged has for the most part remained firmly in Russian hands, while the European overseas expansion created a new and independent center of power here on our continent.

Twice in 25 years our new center of power, stretching from the tropics to the Arctic and facing both the Pacific and the Atlantic, has been compelled to intervene to redress the balance of power in the world. And now with Britain and France enfeebled by these wars, with the German and Japanese power crushed, the United States and Russia, which have risen from the mists of these short hundred years, even as this university, stand

face to face, with the other nations polarized around them, drawn by the gravitational pulls of proximity, coercion, self-interest, and kinship.

Believing as we do in a community of free nations and free peoples acting peacefully and responsibly through governments freely chosen, we conclude at last that we cannot live in comfortable security with a great imperial power which has seen the barriers to its expansion collapse and is on the move again, taking here, probing there, and pressing relentlessly against the uncommitted, disorganized millions. Capitalizing the ancient racial xenophobia and the mechanic zeal to mitosdize the world of the Russian people, the leaders of the new Russia, armed with force and the old weapon of frustrated revolution, use the seductive new weapon of communism to soften their victims. But whatever the trappings, the methods, the weapons, the objective is destructive—imperialism. I often think it would be both more accurate and more effective if we talked less of communism with all its appeal for ignorant, miserable peoples and more of imperialism which threatens the freedom and independence of everyone and has no appeal. Communism can be a fighting faith, but imperialism is subDe slavery.

So, as Northwestern University enters its second century, America, rich, peaceful, and undisciplined, finds itself face to face across both the seas with an inscrutable, ruthless conqueror, strong, cunning, and armed with an egalitarian idea that has great appeal for the miserable masses of humanity. No longer is there anyone to protect us. No longer can we sow when and where we are certain to reap. There is no safe investment, no certain harvest any longer. We cannot even measure the price of saving ourselves. Indeed, we seem to be in some doubt as to whether we should save ourselves at all; whether we are worth the cost.

The quiet past in which this great university grew to manhood is no more. Our bright land is troubled and sorely tried. Things are badly out of balance when we spend $239,000,000 for one aircraft carrier, four times the endowment of this university. Its future is in doubt. Our future is in doubt. Some say fight now. Some say appeasement is the wave of the future. Some say abandon Asia. Some say abandon Europe. And worst of all, everybody says something—including me.

In our time peace has become as abnormal as war used to be because this is the revolution. And revolution is extremely irritating, vexatious, and bewildering to a prosperous, peaceful, contented people that wants nothing except to be left alone.

How have we reacted to this condition of perpetual danger? It seems to me that for 5 years we have suffered from the confusion and distraction of alternate moments of illusion and despair. Hoping always for a cheap and painless escape from the realities of a distasteful destiny, aided and abetted by politicians who will say anything to be popular and by editors either myopic or worse, public opinion has moved in violent pendular swings between optimism and pessimism, between the mountains of complacency and the marshes of despair.

In fatness hate to be shut of war, worry, and expense, we obliterate our power and leave it to the United Nations to keep a peace that never existed. When things go right we gush paeans of praise for the United Nations; when they go wrong we damn it and even propose to forsake the good because it is not the perfect. In fear we overestimate the foe; imperil our liberties, exaggerate the foe's cunning and strength; even demand a shut-down as though the certainty of doom were preferable to the uncertainty. At the perpetual danger invites the complacency of status and we underestimate the peril by overconfidence in our virtue and power, as though that were enough in a moral contest. But the self hypnosis of loud and repeated talk about our righteousness and freedom will rally no allies nor blow the Kremlin walls down.

And now as things get tough and we find we can't buy, threaten, or preach our way to peace, we are menaced by amateur strategists. Even the isolationists have reappeared, flexing their muscles, or rather their tongues, and proclaiming "Let the whole world go. We should worry. We can defend ourselves with a strong Navy and Air Force." Haven't they heard about Pearl Harbor or the atom bomb? Was the last war all in vain? Haven't they heard that we are not self-sufficient? Won't a garrison state become a police state? And do they forget that nothing succeeds like success? If they do, conquerors don't. I suppose any moment even America First may emerge full blown again, except that I hope this time it is more properly entitled "America Last"—last on the Kremlin's list.

The reemergence of the straight isolationist doctrine—the same people saying the same things we heard before the whirlwind a decade ago—is to me the great regurgitation. They remind me of Charles Lamb's remark, "I cannot make present things present to me."

But fortunately the great debate about foreign policy, which was mostly a debate about military strategy and not foreign policy, appears to be about over. And, none too soon, it appears that we have about made up our mind to stop fighting each other, gather all the like-minded allies we can find, and settle down seriously to the very serious business of getting stronger than the brigands that are preying on the world.

Perhaps an occasional national debate like this one is a healthy thing. It clears the air, releases tensions, focuses torpid attention on great issues, and melts divisionist controversy into a mold of common conviction.

Maybe we have about reached a common conviction that peace through power is our salvation. Maybe we have decided that only by once again redressing the balance of power in the world and confronting Russia with a preponderance of force can we thwart an imperialism more sinister than the world has ever seen.

But we should profit from an experience like this, because it won't be the last time we get rattled; it won't be the last time we doubt our beliefs and believe our doubts.

I suppose, for example, we will have to assume that the isolationist argument will have at least nine lives, for the very human reason that it pleases the average man because it spares him any immediate inconvenience or sacrifice, and it flatters his sense of power to feel that America can live alone and like it.

And have we learned that while the whole Nation may debate the broad policy of whether to defend or not to defend, whether to defend alone or with allies, the details of the where, when, and how we will defend are sometimes questions of military, political, and diplomatic strategy which cannot be settled safely or wisely by public debate? Nor can they be wisely settled by men who behave, to borrow a line from King Lear, "as if they were God's spies," but who are neither military strategists nor geopoliticians.

Have we learned that what 150,000,000 Americans know about our plans the enemy knows too? Have we learned that hunting scapegoats is not a foreign policy?

Have we learned that our mission is the prevention, not just the survival of a major war? Have we discovered that there are no Gibraltars, no fortresses, impregnable to death or bless anymore?

While the debate talks incessantly in terms of our national crisis and our national survival, it is not just our crisis, it is the crisis of the whole free world. Have we learned that making domestic political capital out of world crisis is not the way to win friends and influence people? Do we realize that the Russians have already gained a portion of their objectives by using our indecision and moral confusion to weaken our leadership in the free world? The Russians know the value of even reluctant allies in this final struggle for power. Do we? Or are we going to risk the slow strangulation that comes from whittling away the friendly world?

If we have not learned that having the most to lose we have the most to save, then I say, let us pray.

But if we have, if the immensity of the responsibility and the stakes has dawned upon us, then the great debate has been a great blessing and we are on the way to thwart this latest greatest threat to all this university symbolizes.

Why should we be poor in spirit? The task is great, the price is high, but the price is better than life. With Europe and its great industrial concentration and forward bases shored up and steadfast, with access to the tin and rubber of south Asia, middle eastern oil, African manganese and uranium, the scales are still weighted to the west, and the waves of the future are still free. Aggression must be called aggression in the United Nations. But in insisting on no equivocation about the legal and moral position, we dare not forget that the allegiance of India, uncommitted to east or west, is the ultimate objective of both east and west in the Orient. And we dare not fall into the trap, the outlette, Russia has prepared us in China. War there will drain our resources and at the same time make China completely dependent militarily on Russia. With every Russian jet at least six Russians go along. A weakened China means a stronger Russia pressing from behind against Hong Kong, Indochina, south Asia, and finally India. Hounded by people of small vision and great emotion it will not be easy to stand the pressure to help solve Russia's problems with China. And with us mired in the morass of the China mainland the Soviet could turn next summer to some unfinished business with Tito in Jugoslavia.

Pray heaven we can remember amid the discord and chagrin of defeat that military force alone cannot win the day for us in Asia. Our moral authority there is low because we are white and Asia is colored. Desperately poor, struggling to shake off the shackles of white colonialism, Asia is just now passing through the era of revolution, independence, and self-determination that swept the western world long ago. It will take great patience, great insight, great restraint for us who see the whole world in our own image and likeness to win confidence and faith in the great uncommitted areas of Asia. It can't be done with the white man's sword. But it can be done; they can be convinced that Communist imperialism is not liberation but a more deadly enemy of normal aspirations for freedom and social justice than colonialism.

Are we, I wonder, moving as a nation from our Greek period to our Roman period; from a period in which the validity of our ideas was the important consideration to one in which their effectiveness is crucial? Good intentions and reliance on the rightness of our cause will avail us little against an enemy that cares nothing about validity and is concerned only with effectiveness. The Greeks were right, but they died.

A danger greater, it seems to me, than Germany or Japan in the last war, or Communist imperialism now is moral fatigue, disintegration, half loyalty, timid faith—the "weakening of the central convictions to which Western man hitherto has pledged allegiance."

When freedom didn't exist it too was a fighting faith that men would die for. But now that it is old, it looks a little pale and

gentle and lacks the appeal to the militant, irrational sentiments once mobilized by conquering religions and now by imperial communism.

But communism resolves no anxieties. It multiplies them. It organizes terror. It is without spiritual content or comfort. It provides no basic security. In the long run it cannot cure the disease of this anxious age. But its short-term methods are grimly effective. We can't sit still and wait for the fever to run its course. Without combative faith in our spiritual heritage, we won't long hold out against the subtleties of selfishness and fear. If western civilization is to save its body, it must save its soul too. It must awake again the emotionalism, the confidence, the defiant faith of a resolute breed of men to whom liberty and justice mean something positive every day—not just when war has reduced us to the stark issue of self-preservation.

It's easy to care mightily then; it's hard now. It's easier to fight for principles than to live up to them. But now is the time that a passionate belief counts if we are to avoid another war, and if we are to avoid the greater menace of cowardly surrender to our own doubts and fears.

Don't the universities have a large, indeed the leading, role to play in articulating the purpose and the combative faith of a great people in this era of convulsive transition and this hour of discord and doubt? Don't they know best what we stand to lose?

We have proclaimed our military weakness, our vacillation, our hesitation, our fear. Enough of that. The test of a nation is defeat. The time has come to proclaim our faith in all its might and majesty. History will go on and "The Forfeiture of Freedom" would be a sorry title to this chapter; rather the historian must write that in arousing America to redefine and defend its ideals the ugliest despotism dug its grave in the twentieth century.

It was in 1776 that Tom Paine wrote: "The heart that feels not now is dead; the blood of his children will curse his cowardice, who shrinks back at a time when little might have saved the whole."

An Asian Replies to Asians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, recently the United Nations took the historic action of declaring Communist China an aggressor. Many years from today historians will be writing about it and the debate that preceded the decision will be studied and analyzed. One of the most significant phases of that debate was the detailed analysis of the negotiations with the Peiping regime as made by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of Philippines (who served with distinction in this body), in which it is clearly shown that the Chinese Communists spurned all the peace-making attempts of the United Nations.

In his analysis, General Romulo makes a measured reply to India, Egypt, and the other members of the Asian Arab bloc, all of which took a stand against that of the United States on the question. Because it will help enlighten the American people on a matter that is vital to our freedom and national security, I include in the RECORD General Romulo's statement, as follows:

VERBATIM RECORD OF IMPROMPTU INTERVENTION OF PHILIPPINE FOREIGN SECRETARY CARLOS P. ROMULO DURING DEBATE ON CEASE-FIRE IN KOREA BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS POLITICAL AND SECURITY COMMITTEE JANUARY 22, 1951

General ROMULO. Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

The adjournment of the debate has been moved by the delegate of Egypt to give our Governments time to consider the new communication from Peiping which has been read by Sir Benegal Rau. There is, however, a question of procedure that must first be settled.

The message read by Sir Benegal was received by the Ambassador of India in Peiping, ostensibly in answer to a request for elucidation by the Government of India.

I believe that it would be an essential first requirement for a proper consideration of the message from Peiping to have the text of the note sent by the Ambassador of India requesting clarification of certain points in Peiping's message of January 17.

It would then be necessary to make sure that the subsequent clarification from Peiping is clearly intended for the use and information of the first committee, and that therefore the Indian delegation be requested to convey the desire of the committee that this clarification be addressed directly to this body.

(After the interventions of Turkey, Greece, Ecuador, Honduras, and Chile, General Romulo again asked for the floor.)

General ROMULO. Mr. Chairman, I asked a few minutes ago for certain clarifications of procedure in order that the adjournment of debate suggested by the delegation of India and moved by the delegate of Egypt may be put to useful purpose. Let me restate the two suggestions I made: First, I requested that the full text of the notes exchanged by the governments of India and the Peoples Republic of China be given to the committee in order that we can understand the full scope and meaning of the new message from Peiping. Specifically, what questions about the cease-fire, its timing, and its relationship to the negotiations on other issues, did the Government of India ask?

Secondly, some means must be found of conveying to the Peiping government the need of communicating any new proposals directly and formally to the United Nations, in order that our governments may deal with them in an appropriate manner.

The third point, which I now wish to add to my previous observations, is this: If this latest message to the Government of India is merely a clarification or elucidation, then we must assume that the original message from Peiping of January 17 remains unchanged, and that this subsequent explanation does not alter the previous position adopted by Peiping. If this is so, then the statement that "a cease-fire for a limited time-period can be agreed upon in the first meeting of the seven-nation conference and put into effect so that the negotiations may proceed further. This apparently hopeful statement must be interpreted in the light of the Peiping message of January 17 which stated: "It must be pointed out, however, that the principle of a cease fire first and negotiations afterward * * * could never lead to genuine peace. Therefore, the Central Peoples Government of the Peoples Republic of China cannot agree to this principle." In other words, Mr. Chairman, this last message cannot alter the earlier point of the Peiping regime.

Is it possible to interpret this latest message not as elucidation but, in a sense, as a substitute proposal?

Mr. Chairman, we want to be enlightened. I therefore yield the floor to the delegate of India.

(The delegate of India intervened.)

General ROMULO. Mr. Chairman, with much regret I must say that the answer of the delegate of India was neither an answer nor was it enlightening.

In my previous statement on January 18, I made an analysis of the reply of the Peiping government to find out if there was any basis for believing that it embodies any "counterproposals" worthy of the name. I pointed out that the proposals contained in Peiping's cablegram of January 17 indicated no willingness whatsoever to make a new approach to the problem or to consider new terms for a peaceful settlement thereof.

An effort has since been made to present the reply of Peiping as embodying a set of so-called "counterproposals." This is an opinion that must be examined with the greatest care. One feels that it arises from the attempt to consider the first committee's five principles which were communicated to Peiping on January 13 and Peiping's reply thereto of January 17, in isolation from all that has gone before, as if this exchange of messages was the beginning rather than the culmination of the prolonged negotiations to bring about cessation of hostilities in Korea.

But Peiping's reply is the third communication we have received in answer to the third approach we have made to that government. On December 16 the Committee of Three sent a message to Peiping stating, among other things, that "the purpose of the cease-fire in Korea will be to prevent the conflict from spreading to other areas, to put an end to the fighting in Korea, and to provide an opportunity for considering what further steps should be taken for a peaceful settlement of existing issues, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations." The message then expressed the desire of the Committee of Three to meet with representatives of the Peiping regime with the least possible delay.

Five days later, on December 21, the Peiping government replied to the effect that it could not instruct its representatives to remain in Lake Success for negotiations with the "illegal three-man committee" which had been set up by what it described as an "illegal and null and void" resolution of the General Assembly.

On December 19, the group of three sent a further message to Peiping spelling out in some detail the plans of the cease-fire group in relation to the proposal of the 12 Asian Governments to appoint a committee which would meet as soon as possible to make recommendations for the peaceful settlement of existing issues in the Far East. It was intended by this message to reassure Peiping that once a cease-fire arrangement had been achieved, the negotiations visualized in the second resolution should be proceeded with at once, and that the Government of the People's Republic of China would be included in the negotiating committee referred to in the latter resolution.

It should be noted that in this second message, the group of three already made a considerable advance from the vague generalizations about a cease-fire which were contained in its message of December 16. Indeed, the cease-fire group, even without an explicit authorization by the first committee, went so far as to give the assurance that negotiations for the peaceful settlement of existing issues in the Far East would immediately follow the cease-fire and that the Peiping regime would be included in the negotiating committee. No one can deny that the group of three, by its second message of December 19, leaned over backwards to make a gesture of conciliation to the Peiping government.

Four days later, on December 23, the Peiping Government expressed doubt that the negotiating body to discuss existing issues in the Far East would ever be set up, and set forth its position as follows:

First, that the idea of cease fire first and negotiations afterward was totally unacceptable;

Second, that the only basis for negotiating a peaceful settlement of the Korean problem is the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and the settlement of Korea's domestic affairs by the Korean people themselves;

Third, that the United States forces must be withdrawn from China; and

Fourth, that the People's Republic of China must be seated in the United Nations.

On January 13, the first committee approved the five principles and transmitted them to Peiping. Again, it must be noted that the first committee went out of its way to meet the objections and to resolve the doubts of the Peiping government. In establishing the sequence of cease fire before negotiations, the first committee made two notable advances toward conciliation; first, by declaring that the cease-fire arrangement would contain adequate safeguards for ensuring that it will not be used as a screen for mounting a new offensive, and secondly, by explicitly stating that the negotiating body would attempt to settle peacefully all existing issues in the Far East, including those of Formosa and the representation of China in the United Nations.

In contrast to the eager desire shown by the first committee to approximate the position of the Peiping government, to set its doubts and misgivings at rest, and to give a formal pledge that the two questions in which it is most deeply interested would be considered by the negotiating body as soon as agreement has been reached on a cease fire, the Peiping government has shown no inclination whatever to move from its previously established position. Its reply of January 17, except for the addition of two details, repeats almost word for word its demands of December 23.

In the light of this review of the whole course of our negotiations with the Peiping regime, we are constrained to reject the notion which regards the last message from Peiping as embodying any sort of counterproposals. The picture that emerges from this analysis is that of the United Nations making three separate gestures of conciliation, taking three long steps to reduce the distance that divides the parties, while the Peiping government continues to stand firm and unmoving on its original demands and its price for peace.

The Philippine Government is not insensitive to the argument that peace is so important that we must continue our search for it by exerting further efforts to reach an understanding with the Peiping government. The countries of Asia are understandably concerned that this quest be pursued, and none among them more deeply than my own. But the question that must now be resolved is whether we have a better chance of preserving peace if the United Nations continues to bend the knee to the aggressor than if it undertook finally to stand firmly on the principles that gave it birth. We believe that history rather than wishful thinking should be our guide in this dilemma, and history teaches us that the surrender of principle and the appeasement of the aggressor have never led to peace but only to further and larger aggressions.

But other events of recent history have been invoked to support the thesis of further appeasement. Mention has been made of the United Nations effort to settle the problem of Indonesia. It is true that the United Nations persevered in its effort to settle that dispute. But the Republic of Indonesia, with the support of the Government of India, the Philippines, and others, never at any time abandoned the principle that a breach of the peace and an act of aggression, within the terms of the Charter, had been committed there. A position of moral principle was taken without vacillation by the 15 countries of Asia and Africa that attended the Conference on Indonesia in January 1949 in New Delhi, which was held on the invitation of the Government of India. The conference included the following countries: Afghanistan, Australia, Burma, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Yemen. On January 22, exactly 2 years ago today, the Conference adopted a resolution, later transmitted to the Security Council, which declared, among other things, that the Conference was "of the opinion that the Dutch military action launched on the 18th of December 1948 constitutes a flagrant breach of the Charter of the United Nations and defiance of the efforts of the Security Council and its Good Offices Committee to bring about a peaceful settlement," and that it was firmly convinced that the Security Council was properly seised of the Indonesian question "as a breach of the peace and an act of aggression, under article 39 of the United Nations Charter." The resolution further recommended that if the parties to the dispute did not comply with the recommendations of the Security Council, the Security Council "shall take effective action under the wide powers conferred upon it by the Charter to enforce said recommendations." This was an obvious reference to economic sanctions, which the Governments of India, the Philippines, and others had already adopted in some degree even without the authorization of the Council.

This was 2 years ago, and the dispute was between two states, not between one state and the United Nations. If I cite this admirable instance of the solidarity of the Asian and Arab States in a matter of principle which was of direct concern to them, it is because I feel that the reference that has been made to the Indonesian question argues not in favor of vacillation and surrender of principle but rather the contrary. It argues in favor of a stanch affirmation of the principles of the Charter and resolute opposition to aggression by whomever it may be committed. I daresay that it is greatly owing to the unshakable moral position then taken by Asian and Arab states that the Republic of Indonesia now sits with us around this table.

In New Delhi we also spoke of further measures that might be taken, without asking ourselves whether those measures would have any practical effect in halting the military action against the Republic of Indonesia. Today, on the other hand, we are being asked what further action we intend to take following the adoption of the draft resolution presented by the United States. We are being detained by the argument that to brand the Peiping regime as an aggressor may serve no useful purpose. We didn't ask ourselves such questions 2 years ago. I think the feeling among the states gathered in New Delhi was that fidelity to principle and reliance upon the moral power of the United Nations were things of great value in themselves, apart from the question of whether or not, in a particular case, their reaffirmation would serve a useful purpose.

In accordance with the views I have repeatedly expressed and in the light of the historic precedent I have just cited, my government gives its wholehearted support to the resolution submitted by the United States.

You Can Change the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following book condensation from the Reader's Digest of April 1949:

YOU CAN CHANGE THE WORLD

(A condensation from the book by James Keller, founder, in 1945, of the Christophers)

"Better to light one candle than to curse the darkness"—so goes an old Chinese proverb.

In a small California town a young Negro, studying to be a teacher, took a part-time job at a filling station to help support himself and his wife until he got his degree. But some customers objected; they wanted to buy gasoline only from white men. The owner was about to fire the boy when a woman neighbor asked:

"How many customers will you lose if you stand by this fellow?"

"About 18; maybe 20."

"If I get you 20 new customers, you will keep him on?"

"You bet I will."

Not only did this aroused woman bring 20 new customers but 5 more for good measure. She was a Christopher—one of a growing band of men and women united in the purpose to help change the world into a better place.

What is a Christopher? He is one who believes in individual responsibility for the common good of all and sets himself a specific job to do; an average man or woman ready to work and make personal sacrifices. It is literally astounding to learn the results that are being achieved single-handed by little people of faith and zeal.

Although under Catholic auspices, the movement embraces all faiths among its followers. The movement has no chapters, no committees, no meetings; there are no membership lists and no dues. From a central office in New York occasional bulletins are mailed out to more than 100,000 interested persons; that is the sole unifying contact. Each believes that alone and unaided he has a post of his own in the war between good and evil, and he must believe in the power of himself, as an individual, to change the world.

How single-handed efforts multiply into power was symbolized at a patriotic meeting of 100,000 citizens jammed into the Los Angeles Coliseum one starless night. Suddenly the chairman startled the throng:

"Don't be afraid now. All the lights are going out."

In complete darkness he struck a match.

"All who can see this little light say 'Yes.'"

A deafening roar came from the audience.

"So shines a good deed in a naughty world. But suppose now every one of us here strikes a light."

Faster than it takes to tell, nearly 100,000 pinpricks of flame flooded the arena with light—the result of 100,000 individuals, each doing his own part. That is how the Christopher movement works.

No matter who you are, or what you are, or where you may be, you can do something to change the world for the better. You, as an individual, are important. You count.

Remember the gigantic letter-writing campaign which helped to smash the radical forces in the Italian elections recently. Literally millions of letters went out from people of Italian descent in the United States encouraging relatives in the old country to vote against totalitarianism. One of the men who fostered that dazzling campaign was a barber in Southampton, Long Island.

Irritated by Old World criticisms and lies about our American ways, he was also exasperated that people who resented such attacks did nothing to countcract them.

He decided to do something about it personally.

First he wrote to relatives in St. Catherine, Sicily, describing his happy life here. Next he wrote his wife's relatives. Then he persuaded his son, a doctor, and his daughter, a dietitian, to write. Meanwhile he appealed to newspaper editors and even to President Truman to help enlist the Nation. All agreed it was a good idea but too unwieldy. Various organizations wished him well, but that was all.

But the barber, enraptured with his cause, refused to quit. He kept on asking for help. Slowly the idea burned with its own fire. Businessmen, young GI brides from overseas, housewives, veterans' groups, civic societies, and religious leaders joined in. A steady trickle of letters to Italy swelled to a torrent; the Democratic victory heartened all Europe.

One man helped start this, because he lifted himself out of his own narrow, selfish sphere and into the larger world with all its breath-taking potentialities.

Not spectacularly, but in countless ways, tens of thousands of Christophers are busy and never before in history were such efforts needed so desperately. For today the world is ill of the disease of the soul called materialism. If the trend toward paganism continues, it is only a matter of time before our Nation will collapse from within. That is what happened in Germany.

Millions of decent Americans have long forgotten the basic truth that every human being gets his fundamental rights from God—not from the State. That, in fact, the chief purpose of the State—as the founding fathers repeatedly affirmed in the Declaration of Independence—is to protect those God-given rights.

To believe that these rights are safe today is to embrace illusion.

The stockbroker who, forsaking Wall Street, lowered his entire family's living standards to take a Government job and fight for good principles is a Christopher. So is the Baptist lawyer down in Texas who spends all his leisure time making speeches on the brotherhood of man. And so is a girl epileptic, bed-bound in a small California hospital, who started writing a column that would concentrate on the good in life around us, instead of just the opposite. A little newspaper printed her words; ten letters poured in—and, believe it or not, this girl is now almost completely recovered from epilepsy. Her doctors understand why; she got out of herself and out of her own narrow world, gave herself a purpose in life and so did away with mental and emotional frustration.

It is estimated that subversives who are trying to undermine the United States compose less than 1 percent of the people of our country. Christophers believe that 1 percent of the normal, decent citizens of America can be found ready and willing to work just as hard to restore divine truth and human integrity to American life.

The story of one American wife shows the inestimable power of a woman, working behind the scenes in her own home. Her husband told her the Reds were taking over his union. "Keep out of that," she advised him. "It'll only mean trouble."

But a Christopher explained how getting decent people to stay away from union meetings was just what the Reds wanted. From then on, she urged her husband to attend every meeting, she induced him to urge others, finally she egged him on to run for president of the union. In substance, that is the history of how a large union was taken away from an organized leftist minority. One woman with a Christopher purpose was all that was needed to start the fire.

In the home, in all our personal relationships, we must practice love and we must pass on the message of the good life. As you grow in love for others, you will find your own power increasing. You will learn how to disagree without being disagreeable. You will become more approachable. You will better understand why all people want to be truly loved and not just tolerated. You will emphasize more and more the good side of even the worst people. You will develop an inner warmth, an abiding sense of humor; naturally you will make mistakes, but you will always be able to laugh at yourself. Your never-say-die spirit will give courage to everyone you meet.

Life itself will take on a new and exhilarating meaning, because you will be fulfilling the purpose for which you were created: To love God above all things and your neighbor as yourself.

"We hate Christianity and Christians," proclaimed Anatole Lunscharsky, Soviet Commissar of Education. "Even the best of them must be considered our worst enemies. They preach love of one's neighbor and mercy, which is contrary to our principles. What we want is hate. * * * Only then will we conquer the universe." (Quoted in Izvestia.)

The one thing that terrifies the godless the world over is the fear that some day all those who believe in Christ will wake up—and start acting their beliefs.

Once that happens, most of the great problems which plague mankind will disappear overnight.

War—Russian Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Knerr, United States Air Force, retired, the author of this article, has had a long and brilliant military career, which began in 1908 when he graduated from the United States Naval Academy. In 1912 he transferred to the Army seeking an aviator's rating and received flight training in 1917 as an officer of the Signal Corps. Later, when the Air Corps was established, he, of course, was transferred to the Air Corps.

After a brief retirement because of physical disability, he was returned to duty in 1942 and served as Commanding General of the Air Technical Service Command in Europe, and was Deputy Commanding General for Administration United States Strategic Air Forces in Europe throughout the war. In 1948 he was appointed Inspector General of the United States Air Force.

Just prior to General Knerr's appointment as Inspector General, United States Air Force, he served as alternate to Gen. H. H. ("Hap") Arnold, in the latter's capacity as Adviser to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, of which I had the honor to be Vice Chairman. His keen and penetrating understanding of the military problems of our country, not to mention its international political problems, was of immense value to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Hugh Knerr, as stated, graduated from the Naval Academy, served in the Army, and became Inspector General of the Air Force. His long and varied military career, covering 42 years of our country's most recent history, entitled him to speak with the authority he exhibits in his article which follows:

WAR—RUSSIAN STYLE

(By Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Knerr, USAF, retired)

We are losing a war without firing a shot. We are losing it because we do not seem to understand that the character of international conflict has completely changed since the close of World War II.

Psychological warfare is now the most potent weapon in the arsenal of the totalitarians. Although Hitler gave us a first-class course in how this weapon can be used, we have chosen to ignore it. That we should not choose to use it is understandable. That we do not recognize it in the hands of Russia is inexcusable.

Military arms are essential to this kind of warfare, not necessarily for use but to brandish under the noses of statesmen and politicians fearful of their own position or the safety of their country. That these arms may be inferior or lacking in substance does not appear to be important so long as they are there in great numbers.

Russia has retained a huge army primarily for psychological purposes and the control of her own and subjugated peoples. Reliable estimates indicate she can muster a ground force of 3,750,000 men. The Atlantic Pact nations will do well to raise 2,000,000. So what?

Would it not be perfectly stupid to enter a tiger's cage relying upon your teeth and fingernails simply because the tiger has only teeth and claws? Yet that appears to be exactly the attitude we and other nations are assuming.

We have become so hypnotized by the colossal manpower available to the Russians and their Asiatic cousins we think we must match them man for man and weapon for weapon in a conflict of their own choosing: A psychological victory for Russia of the first magnitude.

In a contest between ground forces western civilization is certain to take a licking again. It is impossible for us to stoop to the immorality inherent in total disregard for human life and dignity. Eastern materialism is no more inhibited in this regard than the tiger.

On the other hand, we are just as certain to control the situation if we but follow the example of experts in tiger handling and take a chair, pistol, and whip into the cage with us.

As with the tiger, the mere attitude of a willingness to fight with weapons he does not understand and that will hurt him when he steps out of line would be most effective in countering the Russian confidence in, and our fear of, superior ground forces. Fear of this obviously superior force and all the unknown forces that may be back of the iron curtain is the secret of Russian psychological success.

RUSSIAN TACTICS EXPOSE WEAKNESS

Fear of the unknown is a universal weakness of mankind. The oriental has played upon it for thousands of years. Cunning, indirection, cynicism are favored as naturally as the occidental prefers an immediate, direct settlement of differences.

The oriental employs his approach as a form of mental and psychological torture to wear down his opponent to the point where, in exasperation, he gives up or makes a mistake that may be seized upon to advantage. In this process the bait of apparent success is occasionally thrown out to the occidental who, in his desire to believe in the integrity of his fellow man, grabs it as proof that his opponent has been misunderstood. In spite of the rude awakening that inevitably follows, the same thing happens over and over again. Think back 10 years, or read tomorrow's newspaper.

This process of leading from weakness is as simple and effective as at cards. The same necessity exists for concealing what you do not have. The iron curtain is as necessary to Russia as the vest and sleeves are to the card sharp.

It is my conviction that we find ourselves in these unhappy circumstances as a consequence of honest people trying to beat an international sharper at his own game instead of letting him have it in good old western style when he is caught cheating.

It is strange how this myth of an all-powerful Russia has grown up in the mind of the average American, who normally is not too gullible. How is it? This business of Russia overrunning Europe in 3 weeks and then putting it to work producing weapons for our defeat is a neat bit of psychological propaganda not entirely of Russian origin. That sort of stupidity is the product of considerable intelligence.

Certainly Russia can get to the Channel in 90 days. Napoleon made the Volga in less time than that. Russia is not going to make the same mistake in reverse, knowing full well that her real objective lies 3,000 miles beyond.

To win Russia knows she must devise means for cancelling the ability of the Atlantic bloc to produce five times more steel, three times more coal, seven times more electric power, and 10 times more oil than she can. The key to the riddle facing Russia is the United States.

Why expose her front to war and her back to millions of desperate saboteurs among her own and subjugated populations?

Why not drive wedges in the western wall and allow the frost of suspicion to work for her?

Why not create a rift between England and France over the industrial resources of the Ruhr?

Why not founder the United States and England on the shoals of socialism?

Why not frighten us into dissipating our power among nations too cynical or decadent to fight for an ideal?

Just stop and think over what Russia and her agents have already accomplished along these lines.

Could a war have netted Russia as much in so short a space of time?

VISIBLY STRONG, WE CRINGE IN FEAR

Russia knows that if she cannot knock the United States out quickly she is doomed to eventual defeat. Confronted by the industrial might of this country, twice proven within a generation, Russia senses the folly of attempting to match her shortages in food, rubber, oil, transport, and skilled workers against our obvious plenty, for of such is war compounded.

Her home-made propaganda scours in the knowledge that a hundred of her cities are marked for destruction if she overstepe the bounds of our credulity and restraint. Burned by the lash of a few recent contacts with our air and naval power, she draws her curtain tighter and roars—in frustration. That we misinterpret the roar is not to our credit.

Now, what of our side of the story? Over the past century we have established a moral force in the world so far beyond any Russian concept as to be incomprehensible to her.

We have created an industrial capacity that is at once the envy and despair of Russia.

We have produced an army that had little difficulty in destroying the evil forces of nazism and fascism—then disbanded it.

We have built a Navy capable of controlling the seven seas—then moth balled it.

We have brought into being the incontestable thesis that air power is peace power—but have not supported it.

We have extended the hand of friendship to fallen enemies and bankrupt creditors without expectation of advantage.

A prodigal, lusty giant in the family of nations, it's time we snapped out of it. Time that we assumed sober leadership of mankind and stopped cringing at the taunt of imperialism.

Let us boldly proclaim that we are an imperialistic power intent upon establishing peace and justice throughout the world, Russian-style democracy notwithstanding. Let us make it clear there is a limit to fruitless debate, a limit to the money and material we will give away, a limit to the manpower we will drain from industry.

And let us inform the United Nations that we will lead in this crusade of 1951 but make it clear there can be no neutrals in this conflict with evil. Each must be for us or against us. Each must contribute a like proportionate share of national resource.

Let us lay down in no uncertain terms our intention to make maximum use of our industrial power, our air power, and our naval power. But by the same token we will not have our Army used as a pawn in an international chess game with the champion.

And finally, let us make it crystal clear we are through with the role of a genie in a bottle to be called forth or hustled back again at the whim of a beggar.

All of these we can do. The Congress of the United States has the power and authority to do them. The voter and the taxpayer have the final responsibility to see that they are done. This responsibility must be accepted sooner or later. Why wait?

Southern California Demands Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from the decisions of some of the heads of administrative agencies establishing regional headquarters for the southwest section of the United States at San Francisco that a special study of the map of the southwest section of the United States and a perusal of the latest comparative census figures for Los Angeles and San Francisco would be in order for these gentlemen.

The establishment of regional offices in San Francisco has created an unnecessary hardship for hundreds of residents of southern California who must journey north wasting many valuable days annually seeking the Government assistance and cooperation that should be available to them in southern California.

Recent census figures show that the population of the city of Los Angeles is now 1,957,692, while the population of San Francisco is only 760,381. Los Angeles also has 46 percent of all the factories on the Pacific coast with 44 percent of all the factory employees on the coast.

Certainly the people of southern California and the Southwest section of the United States are entitled to the facilities and services of a regional office of major administrative agencies in the southern part of California. The logical location for such offices is in the Los Angeles area.

The following is an editorial on this subject which appeared in a recent edition of the Los Angeles Daily News which clearly states the facts and the needs of the citizens of Los Angeles and southern California:

FACTS ABOUT LOS ANGELES FOR WASHINGTON BUGEMS

What some of our civilian brass in Washington, including possibly the President himself, seems to need is a lesson in geography.

This lesson should be equipped with adequate illustrations, diagrams, graphs, and a report on the latest census figures. These esteemed public servants do not seem to know, for example, that Los Angeles is a large city in southern California, 347 airline miles away from San Francisco, of which many of them think we are a suburb.

Pending assembly of the necessary maps and other exhibits for our higher echelon officials, here are certain outstanding facts for their immediate information and edification. The latest census figures, prepared by one of their own departments, shows the population of Los Angeles to be 1,957,692. The population of San Francisco is 760,381. These figures apply only to the city limits in both cases.

The metropolitan area of Los Angeles is the third largest in America, being exceeded only by New York and Chicago. This city also is the logical and strategic metropolis of the southwest and central to that area, to northwestern Mexico and to the broad Pacific.

Now, why is it that this geography lesson needs to be brought home to the men of the White House and sundry capital agencies? Why is it that it is deemed such a vital lesson by the southern California delegation to Congress that it has organized to march on the White House as a body to impress upon the officials there the facts to which we have adverted?

It is because Washington bureaucracy continues to make San Francisco regional headquarters for all Federal agencies and is in process of making it regional headquarters for more. The latest case in point is the establishment in San Francisco of regional headquarters of the Economic Stabilization agency which will have jurisdiction over California, Arizona and Nevada.

Some time ago the regional office of the Department of Commerce was established here. Later it was reduced to a district office and the regional office was moved to San Francisco. Edwin Bates, manager for the district of the Department of Commerce, says that his functions have not been reduced in actual status and that he will be able to render the same service as formerly to the businessmen of this area. This is fortunate and not the case with many other agencies.

Chamber of commerce officials, including Oscar Trippett, president, and Harold Wright, general manager, who went to Washington to protest against the continued treatment of Los Angeles as a hick town or a suburb, say that hundreds of residents of this city are forced to go to San Francisco, hat and briefcase in hand, and waste many valuable days annually in seeking what they need from the Government when they should be able to get it here. They point out, very appropriately, that Los Angeles has not only more than twice San Francisco's population, but 46 percent of all the factories on the Pacific coast, with 44 percent of all the factory employees on the coast.

How is this absurd attitude in Washington accounted for? It is due largely to habits of mind. Since the Mother Lode and Barbary Coast days the east has thought of San Francisco as the big city on the Pacific coast. To this day people for miles in every direction say they are going "to the city" when they go to San Francisco. San Francisco is a delightful place and we gladly concede it. But Washington should be reminded that something has happened since Jack London made the place famous and Nob Hill was the center of the social universe.

Population and the stream of economic life in the West have moved south and southwest, and people have moved with it. Let's put it in terms which Washington understands best: In the 1948 presidential election California's voters cast 1,913,134 for President Truman. Out of that total Los Angeles County contributed 812,690, and San Francisco contributed 167,726. Let's put it another way: The State has 5,244,837 registered voters. Of these, 2,198,878 live in Los Angeles County and 429,806 live in San Francisco. See what we mean?

—L. E. C.

Labor Fights for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a very fine analysis of the role of free labor in the present struggle against communism and specifically in the current international situation is presented in an article by George P. Delaney, the international representative of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Delaney's article entitled "Labor Battles Reds Round the World" was published in the Washington Post, January 28, 1951. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

LABOR BATTLES REDS ROUND THE WORLD

(By George P. Delaney, international representative, American Federation of Labor)

One of the most important contributions of American labor to the preservation of freedom and the extension of the democratic way of life is its consistent fight against the spread of Communist ideology throughout the world.

While from all directions there is much effective opposition to Communist ideology, no group has done so much to supply aggressive resistance as free trade-union members and their representatives in the nations of the free world.

Everywhere the proponents of communism are attempting to persuade the working people that the Marxian ideology is the panacea for all ills, though the millions of slave laborers in Russia are a living contradiction of such false propaganda.

According to Communist theory, the working people are the segment of the population in each country that will spearhead a successful revolution. To stage a successful internal revolution, a hard core of Communists must capture the labor movement of a nation. It should be borne in mind that there is no greater achievement for a Communist than to convert or capture an important labor leader.

Theoretically, upon exposure to the pseudo truths of Stalinism, the worker will react by taking his place in the ranks of the Communists. In the free nations the opposite reaction has occurred, and the union members of the free nations, except in a few scattered instances, have forcefully opposed the party line.

Totalitarianism in any form breeds and grows strong in poverty and disease, in social reaction, and economic injustice. Workers who live in a free country, who enjoy a decent standard of life, who can join free unions, and who can bargain collectively will always reject communism.

In recent years when a small-scale struggle was on in the labor movement of the United States between revolutionary communism and a trade-unionism that would function within a democratic society, communism lost decisively. In Western Europe, when workers have been given a choice they have always chosen a democratic society over a Communist state. The elected representatives of free trade-unions have been the first victims of any form of totalitarian dictatorship. This was true in Italy and Germany in the twenties and thirties; in Argentina, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary in the forties.

In the total diplomacy of today labor's role in world affairs is of paramount importance. People to people, worker to worker communication of the message of vigorous dedication to the principles of democracy can be a decisive factor in the struggle between the free world and the slave world. Such an exchange of views is being effected through many organizations and channels.

Among these are the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the International Labor Organization, the A. F. of L. Free Trade Union Committee, the Inter-American Confederation of Workers, which is working to prevent the spread of Communist ideology particularly in Central and South American nations, and the International Secretariats.

The Free Trade Union Committee has been active in Europe and Asia, rendering material aid to the restoration of a free trade-union movement in those areas. The committee also assist free trade-union movements in exile and trade-unionists in distress.

Economic Cooperation Administration labor advisers in the Marshall plan countries and labor attachés in many United States embassies have made significant contributions. The Office of International Labor Affairs of the Labor Department is doing an excellent job. The A. F. of L., the CIO, and the independent unions maintain standing committees on international relations and have worked with great success in disseminating the concepts of freedom to foreign workers in both the free world and the slave world. In the United Nations, in the Economic and Social Council, and the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, free labor has been very active and articulate.

In November 1949 the trade-union centers of the free world sent delegates to London to establish the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. The machinations of labor representatives from the iron curtain countries in the World Federation of Trade Unions had revealed that they were government puppets and not free trade-union representatives. Every twist and turn of the party line was followed rigorously. Consequently, the bone fide trade unions withdrew from the WFTU and formed a common front against the slave world, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Thus, for the first time, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations joined forces in an international labor confederation.

The ICFTU has made a highly auspicious beginning. Its publications go to the far corners of the earth. An ICFTU delegation toured Asia, conferring with labor leaders on techniques of organization and foreign policy. The ICFTU is represented at the United Nations and maintains a branch office in New York. From its headquarters at Brussels are issued policy statements on foreign affairs formulated by affiliates of the ICFTU. On January 4, 1951, a conference of representative Western Hemisphere unions was held at Mexico City under the auspices of the ICFTU.

The International Labor Organization is an inter-governmental body composed of 63 member nations. Each country is represented at the annual ILO conferences by two delegates from government and one delegate each from the most representative voluntary organizations of workers and employers.

Today one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, the ILO was for many years an autonomous part of the League of Nations. This agency seeks to raise the working conditions of workers in all nations through the adoption of labor standards adopted by the conferences, and ratified by the member countries.

The ILO does important research work on international aspects of unemployment, industrial safety, minimum wages, social security, etc. It also sends teams of experts into the field to assist nations in formulating labor legislation, to assist groups of nations in such programs as planning for emigration, and it is now playing an important part in the United Nations technical assistance program.

In the industrialized states of the free world, the standard of living is relatively high. Free trade unions have organized a large proportion of the labor force. Collective bargaining is at a fairly mature stage. Moscow propaganda falls on deaf ears among such workers.

In the underdeveloped nations of the world, the problem is much more engaging and does not lend itself easily to generalizations. Some nations are trying to throw off forms of colonialism, while other peoples are attempting to form unions as instrumentalities for social and economic reform. Communists have frequently capitalized on such conditions and have taken over the leadership of the forces of revolution.

If communism is not to be allowed to spread to the underdeveloped nations, the standard of life of their people must be elevated substantially. Anyone who believes that we can remain an oasis of plenty in a world of hungry people and still brute and maintain the friendship of these people, is blind to the facts.

The action of the economic survey mission to the Philippines in requiring certain internal reforms, including a minimum wage law, as a prerequisite to economic aid, pleasure a pattern that should be developed. No amount of economic aid is going to win the friendship of the working people of the free world if only the upper classes benefit.

In many underdeveloped nations, free trade unions are prohibited. Union leaders are persecuted, imprisoned, and slain. If workers are given an opportunity to secure jobs at a fair wage, under decent working conditions, to join a free union and to bargain collectively for wages and conditions of employment, they will not become communists.

In considering the whole situation, the above statement should be recognized as a truism. The idea of democracy is much more compelling than the idea of Communism, if each presupposes a decent standard of living.

Letter From Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, our people have been inspired by the leadership and ability of so many of our young men who are now carrying the fight to the Communist enemy in Korea. I am including at this point a letter from one of these young men, Maj. Volney F. Morin, of Los Angeles, because this letter indicates the high ideals and the fine courageous type of American manhood safeguarding our Nation during these critical days. This letter was addressed to the dean of students at the University of Michigan.

Before being recalled to active duty with the Four Hundred and Fifty-second Bombardment Wing (L) of the United States Air Force in Japan a few months ago, Major Morin was practicing law in Los Angeles and serving his community in many worth-while civic activities. He is an outstanding young man, and in his letter he helps to answer the question, "Why are we fighting in Korea?" I urge all of the Members of the Congress to read his letter:

HEADQUARTERS, FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND BOMBARDMENT WING (L),
APO 75, UNIT 1, CARE OF POSTMASTER,
San Francisco, Calif., January 15, 1951.

ERICH A. WALTER,
Dean of Students, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

DEAR DEAN WALTER: Thank you for your good letter of January 4.

You admonished me to preach a bit longer. While I am not an authority on international relations, I am obliged to admit there is a viewpoint of detached austerity associated with an APO number on the other side of the world. At an APO you are removed from the day to day argument, discussion, and passion of events in the United States. But—to preach a bit:

As a lawyer, it seems to me a person's ability to walk a dark alley alone is dependent upon the law and order of the society in which he lives. A bully lurking in the dark alley takes note of that law and order.

If you lived in a lawless society, you would have to take certain steps in order to walk that dark alley without fear of the bully—

First, you would have to be strong enough to beat him up.

Second, you would have to convince him that you could do it.

Third, you would have to let him know what act of his would cause you to fight.

It seems to me, the United States is now walking the dark alley of international trouble. At least one bully (and possibly more) lurks in that dark alley. The United States must take the same steps to protect itself that you would take. In short, it must be strong; others must know it is strong; it must announce what it will fight for (specifically: It cannot disclaim interest in Korea and then be surprised if the bully moves in). Moreover, it would seem prudent for the United States to gather whatever allies it can find to help it on it's travels. In walking an alley of peril the United States would be better off with an old ally (e. g. Chiang)—than without.

When I was in school in Ann Arbor (1937–41) it was fashionable to chew on the intellectual bone of socialism. Looking back on those days, we never cracked the bone to the marrow. But then, neither did anyone else. Stuart Chase had written glowingly in his Economy of Abundance of the benefits of a planned economy. As an aside, it is interesting to note he would have planned for a lessened food production in 1951 because experts had predicted a population decline by this time. In 1932 in the preface to his On the Meaning of Life, Will Durant lamented his loss of belief in the Socialist Utopia because, as he put it, of the avarice of men. No wonder we failed to reach the marrow of the planned economy. It wasn't avarice; it was a tougher problem.

It wasn't until 1945 that an English Socialist, Barbara Wooten, in her book, Freedom Under Planning, gave a somewhat accurate definition of a planned economy. She said it was: "A conscious and deliberate choice of economic priorities by some public authority." This was a forward step. For Marx and Engels never said how they would run the Socialist utopia. Moreover, they would not allow the disciples to discuss the question. They were right. Kill the enemy before you discuss the division of spoils.

Perhaps it is not surprising that it was almost 100 years from publication of the Communist manifesto in 1848 until Miss Wooten came close to defining a planned economy.

But it seems to me Miss Wooten still did not reach the issue. Simply stated, the marrow is: "How did you do it?" For example: How does a nation determine it will produce steel? Is it done by comparison with a capitalist economy? If not, how does it know it should produce steel rather than molybdenum or tungsten?

Assuming a determination to make steel; then how much? Clearly, it is not sufficient to have one Englishman making steel; nor is it feasible to have every Englishman making steel. As Mason said to Dixon: "We've got to draw the line someplace." The question is: Where? An English Socialist told me just before my departure from the United States that the determination of how much steel to make was based upon the capital goods requirements. But this only removes by a step the final question of how much.

Assuming ability to determine how much steel to make, the planner of the economy must then determine what to do with it. Does he make automobiles? If so, what kind. Does he make locomotives? Washing machines? Refrigerators? Or what?

In short, the planner of the economy is obliged to make goods for maximum human happiness. But he has no way of finding out what goods he should make. Human taste varies.

To my knowledge, all nations (and it is not too late to remember the word "Nazi" meant National Socialist Workers Party) that have tried the planned economy have stumbled on these questions. The only answer seems to be: A war machine. The military knows what it wants. The military answers the question of: What to produce? How much? What to make? What is left over is piecemealed to the civilians. If they don't like it, they can be shot or imprisoned in the name of patriotism.

Had we chewed harder on our intellectual bones when we were collegians we might have seen it was inevitable that socialism leads to war machines; and the war machine has never been built that has not been used. The conclusion is inescapable—we must fight to survive in the dark alleys of the world. A planned economy creates a bully.

I am glad to be able to relate to you that in a limited way America is ready to fight.

In June of 1948 the United States Air Force organized five tactical air support wings. One of these was located in southern California. This was the Four Hundred and Fifty-second Bombardment Wing (L), commanded by Brig. Gen. Luther W. Sweetzer, Jr. With a maximum of 10 days' notice (and in many cases individuals reported on the same day they received their notices) the Four Hundred and Fifty-second was ordered to active duty in the middle of the Mojave Desert. Approximately 3,000 civilians gathered in that desert. They lacked the seventy-five-thousand-odd pieces of equipment they were soon to acquire; they lacked clothing; inoculations; dog tags; identification cards; and all the fiddle-faddle that is required for American combat troops. It is interesting to recall that on that first morning there were only nine cooks. Most of the barracks were nailed shut. Beds were stacked in neat piles. General Sweetzer had only a desk and chair; and could not offer his staff a place to confer.

Suffice to say that within 60 days the Four Hundred Fifty-second Bombardment Wing had 92 percent of its seventy-five-thousand-odd pieces of equipment. Every man had a full issue of clothing, including three khaki uniforms, one blue uniform, one OD uniform, together with heavy shoes, overcoat, gloves, and all of his field equipment which in turn included two blankets and a sleeping bag. A movement order was received. The wing then moved by bus, plane, truck, train, and ship a distance of 7,000 miles without loss of a single piece of equipment or injury to a man. Seventy-seven days after the Four Hundred Fifty-second was called to active duty it hit the enemy for the first time.

At this writing the Four Hundred Fifty-second has flown over 7,000 combat hours. It has hit the enemy with over 1,400 sorties. It has bombed, machine-gunned, rocketed, and napalmed the enemy with observed satisfaction.

Perhaps, in a small measure, the Four Hundred Fifty-second (led by an officer corps which is 97 percent Reserve and manned by enlisted personnel who are 70 percent reservists) is indicative of the potential of the United States.

This potential is further exemplified by the continued support the Four Hundred Fifty-second receives. For each combat mission of 40 planes there is required a freight train of 24 10-ton railroad cars. The cars supply only gasoline and ordnance. Further, daily trainloads of food, equipment, supplies and clothing are required.

It is interesting to note the combat record has been achieved in spite of a confused and conflicting policy at home. Individually, the men of the Four Hundred Fifty-second are not enthused about fighting and dying on the Asiatic mainland. They receive daily letters inquiring why they came and what they are doing. Due probably to home-front pressure, those having four dependents have been permitted to go home (without replacement). No more airmen will be called who do not volunteer for duty. In short, the men of the Four Hundred Fifty-second are fighting what is to them an all-out war (for no matter how small the theater of shooting—it's all-out) with confusion, doubt, and uncertainty at home.

If the Nation must continue to walk the dark alleys of the world, let's hope we shall be able to produce an unlimited number of these reserve wings.

With warm personal regards to you and yours, I am,

Cordially,

VOLNEY F. MORIN,
Major, USAF, Judge Advocate.

Approved for publication:

D. J. BRACKENBURY,
First lieutenant, USAF, P. I. O. Officer.

Air Power Was Decisive in Halting Chinese—Gill Robb Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I noted in the Appendix to the RECORD of Wednesday last that the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, ranking Republican member of the House Armed Services Committee and, incidentally, one of the most realistic and best-informed authorities on military tactics ever to sit in Congress, quoted a recent article entitled "Man Power or Air Power." The article, written by our mutual good friend and former colleague, Bruce Barton, stated, in part:

Generals and admirals are brave men who have sworn to give their lives, if need be, for their country. They are entitled to our respect and gratitude. But before we give them universal military training, let them tell us whether they plan to win the next war with man power or with air power.

Mr. Speaker, every unbiased military authority in the world recognizes the proven fact that American air power is truly American peace power. I personally for years have contended that in any future contest in an all-out global war victory will perch on the standards of that nation which enjoys and is able to maintain supremacy in the air.

Few men in the world speak on both civil as well as military aeronautics with greater authority and clarity and with less service prejudice than Gill Robb Wilson, nationally known and accredited aviation editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

In an article published last week headed "Air power was decisive in halting the Chinese" this intrepid World War I fighter pilot declared:

No theater of air operation ever has witnessed more ingenuity in the employment of tactical force than Korea. However, it must never be forgotten that air power in Korea, even at its best, has fought a war with one hand tied behind its back.

The genius of military air power lies in its ability to smash sources of supply and manufacture rather than merely to aid ground forces.

Mr. Speaker, that type of warfare—known as strategic—is but one of the established roles and missions of the United States Air Force. Noting the fact that our Air Force was not permitted, under rules established by the United Nations, to cross the Korean boundary, either to make observation of Russian strength or strategic attack, Mr. Wilson went on to say:

When Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, commander of the Far East bomber command, returned from Korea he made clear in his statement that Korea was a frustrating field for air power because for political reasons it could only be utilized in an auxiliary capacity.

Mr. Speaker, in these days, while we in Congress are weighing the necessity of drafting our 18-year-old boys, trying to understand the lessons that have been taught by the bloody struggle now going on in Korea, and evaluating the terrific impact of a $71,000,000,000 budget upon our national economy, to insure our peace and security, it behooves every Member of this body to read Gill Robb Wilson's article entitled "Air Power Was Decisive in Halting the Chinese."

For that reason I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD report of the splendid achievement of our Air Force in the Korean War.

The article is as follows:

AIR POWER DECISIVE IN HALTING CHINESE

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

While the Chinese armies were sweeping over the vastly outnumbered United Nations forces and both the Tenth Corps and the Eighth Army appeared in jeopardy of capture or annihilation, the writer made the statement that an army with control of the air is almost indestructible.

In the face of the situation at the time, the statement appeared to be contrary to the evidence. However, subsequent development in Korea supported the writer's thesis.

Communist advances by night were stalemated when C-47 transports, each loaded with 150 illuminating flares, patrolled the Communist supply lines and enabled B-26 tactical bombers to strafe convoys and troops on the roads. This was the first time in aviation combat history that such an operation had been attempted but it proved extremely effective and brought the advancing Red armies under round-the-clock air attack.

Where United Nations troops were outflanked and surrounded time after time, C-119 combat transports parachuted ammunition and food to the beleaguered forces, which were thus enabled to maintain themselves against overwhelming numbers.

As a result of the air attacks, the veteran combat-tested Chinese divisions, despite their fanatical disregard for losses, were gradually brought to a stalemate and the offensive again was gained by our Ground Forces.

Air Force estimates of casualties inflicted on the Communists during the Korean campaign total almost 100,000, half of which occurred from November 21 to the end of the year and practically all of which were against front-line troops.

There has been much conjecture as to why Chinese armies ceased to follow the retiring United Nations armies. Some theorists attributed it to political reasons. Others called the Red retirement a trap. And now it is being asked if it could be possible that United States air power was decisive in stopping the Red Chinese armies.

It seems well to let the facts speak for themselves. What army in history was able to advance with its supply lines constantly shredded and its first-line troops suffering casualties of such proportions?

Air power alone did not stop the overwhelming Chinese armies, but air power imposed a large proportion of casualties on those created by heroic Army and Navy forces, winter weather and disease, and it supported the resistance capabilities of the surface forces. The total adds up to the thesis that an army with control of the air is almost indestructible.

Interrogation of enemy prisoners in Korea is a little surprising. The consensus of prisoner testimony is that aircraft machine-gun fire, napalm, and fragmentation bombs are feared in that order.

While it is true that a fighter plane carries 1,600 rounds of .50-caliber ammunition firing from six guns, it is news that casualties by machine-gun strafing exceed those of the terrible fire bombs and fragmentation projectiles. Naturally machine-gun fire can be aimed more accurately but the napalm and fragmentation bombs, covering a wider area, were generally supposed to inflict greater damage.

No theater of air operation ever has witnessed more ingenuity in the employment of tactical force than Korea. However, it must never be forgotten that air power in Korea, even at its best, has fought a war with one hand tied behind its back.

The genius of military air power is its ability to smash sources of supply and manufacture, rather than merely to aid ground forces. When Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, commander of the Far East Bomber Command, returned from Korea, he made clear in his statement that Korea was a frustrating field for air power because, for political reasons, it could only be utilized in an auxiliary capacity.

A Pledge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 11, 1951. Comment is unnecessary. Each of us should take the pledge.

A PLEDGE TO AMERICA

(By Russell Davenport)

A few years ago, in a poem called My Country, I wrote these lines: "America is not a land of ease, not a land of rest."

Today these words are being tested. Our country faces the threat of war. We feel the challenge to help her get ready for whatever happens. In the final count America's strength will be the sum total of us all.

If we love our country now, there are ways to prove it. We cannot all do big things, but everybody can do small, specific things. Judging by what our elected leaders have told us this far, here is a pledge that we can make today—to ourselves and to our country:

I will—

Recognize the need for higher taxes and willingly pay them.

Keep only a reasonable supply of the necessities of life. I will not hoard.

Be willing to work longer hours.

Make no undue profit out of the preparation for war. But I will also keep my business or farm prosperous and strong because my country may need its services.

Obey price and wage controls without asking for special favors.

Hold living costs to a minimum by giving up luxuries, and practice at home a pay-as-you-go policy. I will advocate the same policy for my community.

Urge my community to set up an adequate civil-defense program and do my full share in it.

Remember that the way to get things done in a democracy is through a positive attitude, not criticism that is purely destructive or despair that can lead to panic. I will strive through positive thoughts, sympathetic understanding, and courageous decisions to build a better and stronger America.

The needs of America are moving us onward together. And what each one of us does today, by deed or word, will help decide the destiny of our country.

Why Not Pull Out of Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, sincere, conscientious, patriotic citizens throughout the United States, believing that our own interests and those of the world could best be served by our participation in a world organization, have become disillusioned by the events of the months since the beginning of the present Korean conflict.

The present thinking of a majority of our people is expressed in the following editorial from the Three Rivers Commercial of February 9, 1951, published by Mr. William H. Shumaker, at Three Rivers, Mich.:

WHY NOT PULL OUT OF KOREA?

Now for the fourth time UN (mostly American) forces are locked in desperate battle near the latitude of Seoul. The ground was lost in June when the North Korean invasion swept southward. It was won back as we fought northward. It was lost as the Chinese Reds pushed southward. It now appears almost won again as we climb northward into what sometimes seems to be a military vacuum.

The Korean campaign begins to take on the horrible aspect of perpetual motion. We have a nightmarish, uncanny sense of having been through it all already as our forces advance and retire (censorship forbids the word "retreat") through cycle after cycle.

But the cycles aren't precisely identical. New men die in each advance and rebuff. New equipment is expended, new blood is shed, new cripples are created. The cost in blood and treasure mounts—and mounts—and mounts.

It is difficult to see what we can gain in Korea. It is difficult not to believe that Korea is a diabolical snare set for us—successfully—by the Kremlin.

The Russian boycott of the UN was simultaneous with the invasion of South Korea. The UN police action directive was not blocked by any Soviet veto, as the USSR did not vote. A step of this nature by the UN must, under the UN charter, article 27, have concurring votes from every permanent member of the Security Council, which includes Russia, but the Russians when they returned made no effort to revoke the intervention resolution.

Russia has not and need not lose one man in Korea. Chinese pawns do the dying for them. The Chinese reservoir is bottomless. We could continue to slaughter till the crack of doom, and the Chinese birth rate would replenish with more millions.

Yet the drain on America is sickening. Chinese superiority in numbers can keep us in Korea, never quite winning, never quite losing, wasting our strength ad infinitum, weakening our entire defense structure.

The nature of the Korean fighting lures us to overemphasize on land fighting in our defense preparations, whereas, as TAFT, Hoover, and others have reiterated, air and sea power are our surest weapons.

If allowed to win in Korea, we would hold a peninsula considered by military experts to be indefensible. Our overextended position would make us vulnerable to another disastrous experience whenever it best suited the Kremlin to push the button.

So why not get out of Korea? Why let Russia call the tune? Why not choose our own ground, if fight we must? It is argued that to leave would cause us loss of face in Asia. But if Red-informed Asians would see our departure as imperialism defeated, they must see the present war as imperialism embattled, and would see our victory as imperialism triumphant. Is any of these three worse than another?

No, the lost face should we abandon Korea would be in Washington, among those blunderers responsible for our Asian fiasco. Is the saving of face for a few politicians worth the terrible price we are paying in not pulling out of Korea as fast as possible?

What could possibly suit the Politburo better than to have the Truman-Acheson war in Korea continue undetermined for months or years even if in the end the United States should win the war?

Are We Deserting Our Boys in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, what is the situation in Korea? What are the true conditions under which our troops are fighting? Rumors are contradictory and the reports from our fighting men are not rosy. The complaints about inadequate clothing and lack of equipment which come from the GI in battle are brushed aside by denials from the Pentagon.

But while American men are dying in Korea and the United Nations debating society affords no help to them, it is time we learned the truth.

The following letter from a constituent of mine includes the words written by an American soldier in Korea to his mother:

FEBRUARY 6, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDONOUGH: I have a nephew in Korea. His outfit has been in some of the worst fighting of the war. His company won a citation last November. A few days ago his mother received a letter from him, which read in part:

"There are only a few members of my company left. Unless we get more equipment to fight with, or are pulled out of here soon, we will all be dead. We haven't a chance."

Over the radio, day after day, we hear that the morale of our troops is high and that everything is rosy over there. Then, from the boys themselves, we get the real story of the true situation. While wishy-washy little men squabble at the UN, our boys are left to die on foreign battlefields, with the bitter knowledge in their hearts that we have let them down.

Won't you please do whatever you can to see that needed equipment reaches these boys on time and in sufficient quantities to enable them to defend themselves? If this cannot be done, they should be brought home. In Heaven's name let's do something.

I know you will do all you can.

Respectfully,

MRS. MYRTLE SHAY.

The lack of equipment this boy writes about is vital to him. It is his life or death. If the administration which sent him and thousands of others from their homes to do battle in Korea, without the consent of Congress, is not supplying them with the necessary equipment to defend themselves, an investigation is in order and is, in fact, overdue. It is the duty of Congress to get the facts.

Address of Ex-President Herbert Hoover; Saving America for Americans

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misinformation concerning, so much distortion of, and so many false attacks made on the great speech delivered by ex-President Herbert Hoover on last Friday night that I am taking the privilege of inserting that splendid address in the RECORD.

I am well acquainted with ex-President Hoover. I knew him during his services as Secretary of Commerce and as President of the United States. While I have not always agreed with him on those fundamental issues that divide the two great parties in this country, I can safely say that I never found any reason for questioning his integrity or his patriotism.

He puts the welfare of his country first.

He is now approaching the sunset of life, and his warning to the American people has that same ring of sincerity as when expressed by Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural address, or by George Washington in his farewell message to the American people.

In 1941, Mr. Hoover delivered a great speech in which he warned us of the dangers of a world war. I inserted that address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I want to quote a short portion of it at this point. He said:

Finally we must not forget the price we shall have to pay if we join in this war.

It means the sacrifice of our most precious lives and the hopes of millions of mothers and wives. It means the sacrifice also of our own liberty to a dictatorship of our own, inevitable in total war.

If we go into war, we must pass through postwar bankruptcy. The savings of the people will be lost. The endowments of our universities, colleges, hospitals will be destroyed. * * * When we go to the peace table hate will again, as before, sit at that table endeavoring to destroy the hope of any real peace among men. Liberty will not recover on this continent for a generation.

How prophetic those words were.

We have now gone through World War II. What have we got out of it? Death, taxes, a pension roll, and hatred. Our boys won the fight in the field, on the ocean, and in the air, but the victory was turned over to the greatest enemy civilization has ever known.

As I said, ex-President Hoover's speech on last Friday night was a solemn warning to the American people and to the American Congress. If we continue to follow the program advocated by the wild-eyed internationalists, who are always demanding that we go to war in some foreign country, it will do just what Lenin gloatingly predicted in 1920. It will drag this country down to physical and financial exhaustion.

We had better change our course now, before it is too late, and follow the program laid down by Thomas Jefferson, George Washington and other great statesmen of the past, and now reemphasized by ex-President Hoover in his address of last Friday night which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point.

The speech referred to follows:

Fellow Americans, I have been urged by many thousands of you to again discuss with you our foreign policies.

A responsibility rests upon me to speak out from 50 years of personal experience with most of the peoples of the free world and with Russia and China. I have been entrusted during 35 years with high responsibilities by my countrymen.

I should like to address you through the rose-colored spectacles of idealism and the need of free nations to defend freemen.

But I would be doing my country a disservice if I did not take into account the realities in this endangered world.

There is nothing sacrosanct about foreign policies as witness the tombstones which have been erected over many of them in the last 10 years. They bear the inscriptions "Undeclared war," "The alliance with Stalin, Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam," "Dismantling of German peacetime industry," "The promoting of Mao Tse-tung."

Many men, including myself, have demanded the revision of these policies at each wrong turning.

The rightness of our many proposals has been proved by time. I shall recall only two of them for your test.

Seventeen years ago, as President, I refused recognition of the Soviet Government. I knew from ample experience, and their own documents, that this bloody conspiracy against mankind would flood our country through this open door with fifth columns and spies; that they would sabotage our national life and Government. Every American knows they have done just that.

About 10 years ago on June 20, 1941, in a great crisis I urged the revision of our policies to meet the greatest danger that had come to the American people.

Mr. Roosevelt had proposed a tacit alliance of the United States with Stalin and his Communist Russia. Britain was then safe because of the diversion of Hitler's armies to an attack on Russia. A few sentences from that address were:

"Now we find ourselves promising aid to Stalin and his militant Communist conspiracy against the whole democratic ideals of the world. * * *

"It makes the whole argument of our joining the war to bring the four freedoms to mankind a gargantuan jest. * * *

"If we go further and join the war and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in the world."

I said these two dictators—Stalin and Hitler—were locked in deadly combat, that statesmanship required the United States to stand aside in watchful waiting, armed to the teeth; that the day would come when these nations "will be sufficiently exhausted to listen to the military, economic and moral powers of the United States and at that moment and that moment only can the United States promote a just and lasting peace."

Remember this was in June 1941, almost 10 years ago. Need I remind you that the grip of communism in this decade has spread slavery from 200,000,000 to 800,000,000 people? And we have no peace.

I could recall a dozen more instances, some within the past 12 months.

OUR PROBLEMS NOW

In order to reach any conclusions as to the wise course for America to pursue in the critical issues which confront us we must again and again appraise the constantly-shifting forces moving in the world.

The problems which we face are of far larger dimensions than the current discussion on sending contingents of American boys to Europe. Their appraisal must also include:

1. Land war strengths.
2. The defense of the American people and the Western Hemisphere.
3. Our economic capacity over a long period.
4. The United Nations.
5. Our policies in the Far East.
6. The North Atlantic military alliance.

Policies in these six categories cannot be separated from each other—they are all interlocked.

We must appraise the somber facts around these points before we can map a national direction. We must not shrink from clear-minded appraisal of our strengths, our weaknesses and the attainment of the purposes to which the Congress has committed us.

LAND WAR STRENGTHS

We may again appraise as best we can the present military strength for land war in the world.

I am fully aware of the shortcomings of the term "divisions" as a measuring device for comparative military strength, but it is the nearest to a common descriptive unit that we have.

The Kremlin-directed horde has under arms and in reserves probably 300 combat divisions, with 30,000 tanks. I am now told they have over 20,000 mostly tactical planes and they have with their satellites 50,000,000 men available for cannon fodder.

In World War II, when Russia was without the satellites, the Germans failed with 240 well equipped divisions to overcome her. With her allies of general manpower, general space, general winter and general scorched earth, she had stopped the Germans even before lend-lease had reached her.

The nations of Europe in the Atlantic Pact have at the present moment less than 20 equipped and trained combat divisions available for European action.

There is here a stark reality upon which our foreign policies must be based. With any sceable land forces from non-Communist nations, even including the United States, a land offensive against the Communists could bring no military victory, no political conclusion. But that does not mean that there are no other methods of stopping the Kremlin's ambitions.

THE DEFENSE OF OUR BEHALFAR OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

The second stark realism upon which our foreign policies must be based is the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Its defense is not only in our interests but in the interests of free men everywhere.

Much criticism is offered, even to a discussion of this question. An atmosphere of hurry, rush, anxiety is being developed, the effect of which is to make it difficult, if not impossible, for the American people to judge their own situation.

I may say at once that with proper economic action this hemisphere can be made self-contained in critical raw materials. From a long professional career and from years as Secretary of Commerce dealing with such questions, I might qualify in this field.

Further, unless we so dissipate our strength as to become a beaten and crushed people, we will be able to keep sea lanes open.

Moreover, this hemisphere can be defended from Communist armies come what will. It is still surrounded with a great moat. To transport such invading armies either 3,000 miles across the Atlantic or 6,000 miles across the Pacific would require transport ships and naval protection which the Russians do not possess and could not build or seize, no matter what further countries they occupy. If we have a proper naval and air strength, we could sink them in midocean. With somewhat more attention paid to our defenses, this would apply to invasion via the Bering Straits. Hitler could not even cross the English Channel. Atomic bombs do not transport troops over the ocean. Communist armies can no more get to Washington than any Allied armies can get to Moscow.

No responsible military man denies these two conclusions.

The American people should not be frightened into rash action by fear that we cannot survive. I am not advocating isolationism. But if other nations should fall, we may be isolated by circumstances and against our will.

We might go into a period hard to endure, but this Nation can stick it out.

OUR AMERICAN ECONOMIC CAPACITY

The third stark realism upon which our policies must be built is our economic capacity. The bleak outlook of the world may well last more than a decade—possibly two of them.

The new budget calls for Federal spending of over $71,000,000,000. This $71,000,000,000 alone, plus State and local expenditures, is about 27 percent of our national income.

That is beyond the long endurance of any Nation and fatal to the preservation of a system of free men.

The President has asked for a large increase of taxes. We will need also to increase State and local government taxes.

This burden is going to fall on people with smaller incomes. The proof of this is easy.

If all personal incomes above the level of a United States Senator were confiscated it would yield only about $3,000,000,000 of additional revenues. But confiscation would stop most people earning the $3,000,000,000. We must also remember the excise and corporation taxes in most part are automatically passed on to the consumer or these milch cows would die.

Grim austerity must enter the doors of every American home.

Even before these burdens are actually imposed there are stark signs of economic strain. The purchasing power of the dollar has fallen 20 percent in 6 months. The stock boom indicates that many people are seeking flight from inflation. Our already gigantic Government debts permit little expansion without inflation of credit. Two wars prove economic controls cannot wholly stop inflation. The surest road away from inflation is to accept the President's wise proposal to pay as you go.

But we simply cannot carry this expenditure or such tax load for long.

The economic destruction of the United States is one of the means by which Stalin hopes to overcome us.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The fourth focal point of our thinking must be the United Nations.

Our stark reality here is the lack of cohesion and unity in the free nations. Even some of our European allies are anxious to appease the Chinese branch of the Kremlin on policies of the United Nations.

Despite this, we must not forget that the aspiration of mankind for over a century has been to find peace by collective action against aggressors. The United Nations was built on this same central idea as the concert of Europe and the League of Nations. Halting and faulty as it may be, we cannot abandon this idea and this hope.

But it must be clear that the UN for the present will not be a substantial protection from Communist aggression.

OUR POLICIES IN THE FAR EAST

Our men are holding heroically to the mission assigned us by the United Nations in Korea. We are suffering great losses. General Marshall says we must send 15,000 men a month. We cannot yet see the end. But were we to drive all the enemy out of Korea, how much of our armies must remain there to protect it?

Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines are vital links in our national security. This must not be minimized by nations anxious to direct our energies to Europe. We will need retain much military strength in the Pacific to protect those areas.

Certainly there is little stark reality in talking about American ground divisions in Europe in view of our involvement in Asia.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

The sixth consideration in our decisions revolves around the North Atlantic Pact and the proposals to start another American expeditionary land army to Europe.

Current statistics stretch this pact far beyond its text. The pact provides that the nations shall aid each other in case of attack. There has been no attack.

Moreover, at the time of ratification of that alliance the administration, through the Secretary of State and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, gave positive assurances that under the pact no expeditions of American ground troops would be sent to Europe. That certainly meant no forces to Europe prior to attack. Our participation, prior to an attack, was to be limited to munitions. The pact being the will of the American people through the Congress, and in the faith of the text and those assurances, I supported the alliance.

But last fall it became evident that the administration was contemplating sending ground troops to Europe. It was also evident that after years of gigantic American subsidies, the European Atlantic Pact nations had done nothing of consequence toward their own defense. Former Prime Minister Churchill had repeatedly and forthrightly stated this fact—the last occasion being only a few weeks ago.

I made two addresses in protest. Judging by the scolding of the European press, I may have helped to start them thinking.

Then General Eisenhower was appointed to organize their military strength. And the General has become the potent symbol of the policy of at once sending American ground troops to Europe.

The American people are indebted to General Eisenhower for many great services. He has magnificient fitness both for the command and the stimulation of spirit and action among the Allies in Europe.

But his appointment does not commit the American people as to policy.

The stark reality in Western Continental Europe are their large Communist parties and the disunities which gnaw at their vitals. Their prejudices prevent taking Spain into the alliance with 20 divisions and the most defensible area in Europe. For some reason Turkey and Greece are excluded from the alliance.

Equally vital is the fact that there is little hope of adequate land defense of Europe without West German participatation. Two months ago detailed plans and great progress were announced. Now it is decided that West German military participation is out or can wait.

From press reports based on information from European officials and from General Eisenhower's statements, it would appear that his army, including the 2 American divisions now in Germany, will start with 9 or 10 divisions; by the end of 2 years, including American divisions, it would seem to be 35 or 40 divisions.

The stark reality is that such an army is small compared to the strength of the enemy. America is at present the major deterrent to the Kremlin's ambitions of world conquest. There is nothing that Stalin would like more than to get the United States into his clutches by fighting us on the ground in Europe. There lies his overwhelming strength.

Disaster could thus come to the American Hemisphere with no salvation to Europe.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE NEED ANSWERS TO SOME QUESTIONS

The American people should have more information before they risk trying a third expedition of ground troops to Europe.

Any defense line in Europe must be over 400 miles long. Will our responsible leaders make a public statement that the forces so far proposed can defend this line against odds of 3 or 4 to 1? We have tried this in Korea.

Will our responsible leaders tell us whether they contemplate the proposed American contingent as only an installment? Does not this contribution and our huge increase in the Army budget imply many more American divisions? Do the American people know all the facts?

ALTERNATIVE POLICIES

Despite all these stark realities and these problems, I have believed there is a way to at least an uneasy peace for the world.

In my address of 6 weeks ago I stated that we should not land men or send money to Europe until large European forces were in sight. I was well aware of the obligation assumed by Congress to give aid in case of attack. It was my view that we should hold to that provision of the pact, and I urged "arming our Air and Navy to the teeth."

I suggest that air power and the Navy is the alternative to sending American land divisions to Europe. With our gigantic productive capacity and within our economic strength we can build and sustain overwhelming air and sea forces held on our home ground ready in case of attack.

Stalin well knows we could carry on that kind of war for his destruction for indefinite years.

The air threat has been during 4 years the most powerful deterrent to any attack on Western Europe. It is far more powerful than pouring American divisions into the reach of this Asiatic horde. I am suggesting no attack. I am suggesting the very protection for Western Europe and our own defense which the Senate contemplated when it ratified the Atlantic Pact.

There are other reasons for such a policy—both military and economic.

Manifestly if attack on Europe came the free world would be inferior in ground forces. Such a ground war would at best be a war of defense. In the air we would have the offensive. An Air Force has range, speed, flexibility, and striking power which can come nearer gaining a decision than allied ground armies. Especially is this true, for in an air war the Communist horde would be without a large part of its ground allies—General Manpower, General Space, General Winter, and General Scorched Earth.

The whole Korean tragedy is developing proof that the way to punish aggressors is from the air and sea, and not by land armies. It would be infinitely less costly in dead and disaster.

The unbearable strain on our economic system will come from trying to do five things at the same time. That is, to maintain armies in the Pacific; to build up an Air Force; a naval force; to furnish munitions to nations who are determined to defend themselves and to send land armies to Europe. Our economy cannot carry this load for long.

I can give you an indication of the lesser economic strain to attain the same or more power by air than ground forces. To train, equip, place in Europe, and maintain for 1 year, 10 of the usual combinations of American divisions would cost about $4,500,000,000. This same sum would, for example, purchase and man 390 B-36 long-range bombers compared to 60 of them at present. If neither went into battle, the annual cost of the 10 divisions would be about $3,000,000,000 and that of such a segment of the Air Force less than $1,000,000,000.

POINTS OF REVISION OF OUR FOREIGN POLICIES

I can most clearly state the points of foreign policies in which many of us believe at this time by summarizing a program. No program can be perfect—none without risk. For the present I suggest:

1. We should devote our overwhelming productive power to air and naval strength and supply of munitions.

2. If the Europeans are attacked, we should be prepared and use such overwhelming air and naval power to the limit and keep it up until they have had enough. The Kremlin knows that we are committed by the Congress to do so. I believe that reserve, if large enough, is Europe's real protection.

3. We should supply munitions to nations doing their utmost to defend themselves.

4. From the stark realistic, economic, political, and military reasons which I have given you, my personal conviction is that we should not create land armies for expeditions into the quicksands of either Europe or China. I do not want to even start on the road to another Korea.

5. There are those who think we should send more divisions to Europe for their encouragement even before there is an attack. To them, I urge watchful waiting until much more military strength has been developed by Europe itself and there is more evidence they have resolved their disunities.

6. We must reduce our national expenditures to a level we can carry over a long term of years, and at the same time avoid economic disaster which can destroy freedom in America.

Senator BYRD estimates that $8,600,000,000 of proposed nondefense expenditures in the budget could be reduced or postponed. We should spend all we can afford on air, navy, and munitions rather than large armies.

7. We can and must defend Formosa, the Philippines, and Japan. We can do it by naval and air forces.

As to Korea, we should demand of the United Nations that they call for a stop of supplies to Communist China by the non-Communist nations.

Since Red China is making war on our American armies, we should free Chiang Kai-shek to do what he wishes in China and furnish him munitions.

8. I proposed 3 years ago that we should give full independence to Japan and Western Germany under representative governments. During 100 years these nations were the great dams against these Russian-controlled hordes. In the last war we may have been engaged in a great crusade for freedom of mankind, but we certainly destroyed these two dams. The sooner they are given their independence the sooner, for their own security, they will resume their ancient role.

9. Recently I proposed that if the nations of Europe failed we should, as a prudent Nation, have in mind a second line of air and naval defense based upon the foreign shores of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, both North and South, and I may add the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean.

10. Congress should recover its constitutional authority over starting wars. It could certainly do so through its power over the purse.

IN CONCLUSION

I have proposed no retreat, no withdrawal. I have proposed no repudiation of treaties or obligations. Rather I have proposed that the pledges to the Congress and the American people be kept. I have proposed that we stop, look, and listen before we start on a road of land war that risks the loss of all civilization.

I propose no good to Stalin. His greatest hope is to get us into a land war.

Before we go off the deep end of steps toward another land war in Europe, let us remember that we fought two such wars hoping to bring peace and we have no peace. We should be prepared to make heavy sacrifices to help. But we should do it with common sense, within our strength, with the long view of history in mind.

The essence of the program I have proposed is to effectively restrain our enemies from attack upon our allies or themselves. It is the best chance of peace—even if it is an uneasy peace.

If we pursue the lines of our own genius and resources, we can meet this—the greatest menace of a century.

And being in the right the Almighty is on our side.

Charles Gilmer, Sulligent, Lamar County, Is Named Alabama Future Farmer of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Charles Gilmer, 17-year-old farm boy of Lamar County, has been chosen as Alabama's future farmer of the year. Thus he brings distinction to himself and reflects honor upon his fellow farm boys of the great Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

Young Gilmer's record is so outstanding that I desire to include as a part of my remarks a news story about it, written by Thomas F. Hill, and carried in the Sunday, February 11, 1951, edition of the Birmingham News. The article follows:

CHARLES GILMER IS NAMED FUTURE FARMER OF YEAR

(By Thomas F. Hill)

SULLIGENT, ALA., February 10.—Charles Gilmer, who this year has been honored as Alabama's Future Farmer of the Year, has found the secret of turning base materials into gold.

But his Midas touch has nothing to do with black magic. The secret is simple. It is hard work. It is steady work. And it is a genuine love for that work.

This year, the 17-year-old member of the Sulligent FFA chapter has been selected from 12,000 active FFA members as having the most outstanding farming and FFA program during the past year.

This came as a surprise only to Charles. All his friends and associates knew the recognition just had to come.

NO STRANGER

The smiling youngster is no stranger to livestock circles, and for the past 4 years the slogan among young beef showmen in Lamar County has been "Beat Gilmer."

And for the past 4 years, the slogan has been to no avail. In 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950. Young Gilmer showed the county champion at the fat stock shows. And each year he was awarded money for a steer by the Birmingham News-WGSN.

The "Beat Gilmer" slogan is working again this year, but again it may not work. S. S. Gibbs, Gilmer's vocational teacher, says it looks like Gilmer's fourth News calf might win again this year.

LOVE OF WORK

Gilmer's love of work was clearly shown one afternoon recently when Mr. Gibbs decided to drive out for a visit. It was Saturday, and Gilmer's parents and sister were in town, as were most of the youngsters of the county. When Gibbs drove by he saw Charles in the field driving a tractor-drawn plow.

Through several years of hard work and good management Charles has built his farming program up to an asset value of $34,112.50. His investments have been primarily in land, farm equipment, livestock, and pasture improvement.

In announcing its choice of Charles Gilmer, the Alabama FFA executive committee issued the following statement:

"To select Alabama's 'Future Farmer of the Year' is no easy task for the reason that many members of the Future Farmers of America have done and are doing outstanding jobs. Charles has, in the past 4 years, done an outstanding job in assuming a great responsibility in the operation and management of his farm home. He has accomplished much in his vocational agriculture and FFA work. The committee truly believes that Charles exemplifies the important part FFA members today are playing in Alabama's agricultural world."

HIS RECORD

Charles has a very outstanding record in leadership and other FFA activities during the past 4 years.

His first year FFA activities were as follows:

Assistant finance director of FFA chapter; assistant FFA store operator; represented chapter in calf scramble in Birmingham; won county fat-stock show; member of FFA string band; elected secretary of chapter for following year.

FFA activities for 1948–49: Elected vice president of county FFA; delegate to State convention at Auburn; awarded State farmer degree; member of chapter judging team; won county fat-stock show; won seventh place in class in Birmingham show; gave response for FFA at Birmingham News barbecue; entered second-place sow in county hog show; member of FFA quartet; operated FFA store with over $300 profit; member of chapter nursery committee; set 700 shrubs; 100-bushel club entry; elected chapter treasurer for next year.

1949–50: Main speaker on banquet program, nursery-committee chairman, setting 850 shrubs; member of FFA quartet, 100-bushel club entry, supervised FFA store, chairman arrangement committee of father-son banquet, won county fat stock show, placed third in Birmingham show with prime steer, member of beef-judging team, gave response for FFA at Birmingham News barbecue, showed grand champion dairy cow in county show and second place beef bull.

1950–51: Showed grand champion dairy cow, first- and second-place beef steers and second-place beef bull at county achievement-day festival; member of beef-judging team, member of FFA quartet, entered home-improvement contest, No. 1 member to be called upon by his chapter.

MORE PRAISE

His FFA Adviser, Mr. Gibbs, praised Charles' work highly. "Charles is a splendid worker," Mr. Gibbs said. "He can always be depended upon for a jam-up job as leader or chairman of any committee. He has a good personality and is liked by everyone. He is neat in appearance and wears nice clothes.

"Farming—with chief interest in livestock—is first and foremost with him. Pleasure and social life comes second. He is a most outstanding young man and has a very bright future ahead of him."

Charles developed an interest in livestock early in his high-school course. His herd now consists of two registered Jerseys, four registered Hereford cows, three grade cows, two steers for the spring fat stock show, two Hereford heifers, a registered bull which he plans to use as his beef-herd bull, a registered OIC sow, and a litter of pigs.

Working in partnership with his parents and sister, Claire Joan, Charles strives to improve the farm home each day. He also does tractor farming for neighbors in his spare time.

MORE FARMING

Being in the sawmill business, Charles' father, Stanton Gilmer, turned the farming over to Charles 3 years ago. Each year Charles has averaged 150 acres in cotton, corn, and hay. As a junior III student, he started his pasture program, sowing 5 acres of dallas, lespedeza sericea, and fescue.

Each year he has increased his pasture acreage, and this year he seeded 33 additional acres. Rapidly he has turned rolling, eroded hillsides into valuable green acres to furnish grazing for his livestock. He has his own crusher, with which he grinds and mixes his home-grown feeds. The 1½-acre farm pond is stocked and well fertilized.

Probably his proudest moment came last spring when his best calf graded Prime in the Birmingham stock show. It was placed third in the middleweight Hereford division, but the Federal grader put the Prime stamp on it after sticking Choice labels to the first- and second-place winners. Charles' steer also sold higher than the other two winners.

THREE PRIZES

Recently at the county Achievement Day festival in Vernon, Charles' dairy cow was declared grand champion; his two fat stock-show entries copped both first and second prizes.

As a result of his successes and capabilities, Charles was a natural selection in 1949 and again in 1950 to give the response at the Birmingham News barbecue, held in Birmingham, at which checks for News calves were awarded stock-show winners who participated at the Birmingham stock show.

Charles told his Alabama State fairgrounds audience of his interest in livestock farming and how the stock shows and FFA had inspired him to work with untiring interests toward a challenging goal.

He is a versatile high-school senior. He also is song leader for Sunday school and church services at his church and teaches the young people's Sunday school class. He is president of the Beta Club and plays trombone in the high-school band.

GRADUATES

Charles graduates from high school this spring. He plans to attend Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, next year. He will study animal husbandry.

His 4 years' FFA work have netted him over $1,000 in prizes alone. He could cover a wall of his room with blue ribbons he has won at shows.

His farm home shows the results of his vision and desire to attain the ultimate in convenience and beauty.

He did an excellent remodeling job on his home early this year, with electric lights and running water in his house and barn, bathroom, laundry unit, a freezer chest, radio, and electric fans.

THE KITCHEN

Labor has been cut to a minimum in Mrs. Gilmer's all-electric kitchen. It consists of a hot-water heater, stove, refrigerator and kitchen sink with attractive built-in cabinets.

Cement walks have been built around the house, and shrubbery from his FFA nursery makes the Gilmer home the equal of any to be found anywhere in appearance and neatness.

Charles' healthful living habits and love for hard work have kept him in excellent physical condition. This has led fellow students at the high school to "high pressure" him to adding an extra activity to his accomplishments—football.

Gilmer always turned them away and finally made it final by summarizing his attitude toward life and the farm.

"I've watched these players train," he said. "I'll stick to farming. I just can't see myself working that hard without any money coming in."

Need for Limited Wire Tapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal. The editorial follows:

NEED FOR LIMITED WIRE TAPPING

Among the unpleasant tasks that beset the new Congress is the apparent necessity of legalizing, within limits, and without further delay, a most unsavory procedure.

Nobody with moral sense claims that wire tapping is a nice thing to do, but catching and prosecuting criminals is not a nice business. Governor Dewey has experienced the dilemma; he has had to denounce wire tapping by the wrong people, although he freely used it himself when he was a whirlwind young prosecutor.

The Federal Communications Act of 1934 contains a blanket ban on intercepting any communication and divulging the information to any person unless authorized by the sender. Hence, even when enforcement officers resort to wire tapping, the evidence gained by it is not admissible. This has seriously embarrassed the prosecution of traitors.

The Judith Coplon spy case dramatized this fact. The appeal court was obliged to hold the evidence illegal and order a new trial, while conceding that her guilt was plain. But the court, headed by one of our great jurists, went on with what lawyers call obiter dictum. It suggested to Congress that legalization of limited official wire tapping would obviate such paradoxes in future cases of the kind.

Despite the ban, the FBI continued to tap wires when necessary. It acted under orders of the Attorney General and, during World War II, with the approval of President Roosevelt. The FBI has cited in its defense the "set a crook to catch a crook" theory and the tenuous legal argument that the offense is not in intercepting alone but in also divulging.

The FBI also has cited the paramount demands of national security.

So Congress would be merely recognizing and legitimatizing a method that the FBI already feels compelled to use and is using. Beyond that, however, it would specifically require the admission into court of evidence obtained by wire tapping or by following up wire-tap clews. That is where the FBI has been stymied.

The bill is H. R. 479, by KENNETH B. KEATING (Republican, New York). It would let only the FBI and military intelligence tap wires and use wire-tap evidence, and then only in cases of suspected treason, spying, sabotage, and others involving disloyalty to the United States. It would allow the tapping only if a Federal judge approved it in each instance, and only under rules of the Attorney General.

These would seem to be adequate safeguards and restrictions against abuse. As KEATING told Congress, the inhibition under which the Government now labors to protect itself against treason "is certainly carrying the right of privacy to an absurd and ridiculous length.

"No nation can survive which does not meet problems threatening its very existence with more realism than this."

If Lincoln Were Alive Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this week we are paying tribute to the memory of one of the greatest Americans and one of the greatest human beings of all times—Abraham Lincoln. What would Lincoln do if he were alive today and had to cope with the problems with which we are confronted? What would the Great Emancipator think or say about our present-day events if he were among the living?

A most interesting speculation on this subject is contained in a column by Walter Winchell, the noted columnist, which appeared several days ago. It is entitled "Abraham Lincoln in the Twentieth Century." I urge all Members of Congress to read this brief column.

[From the Washington Post of February 9, 1951]

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

ABRAHAM LINCOLN IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Wisdom is as enduring as time itself. Recurring storms sweep across history's horizon—but the sagacity of great men has the constancy of the sun and is as illuminating. The immortality achieved by prophets and sages does not stem solely from their past accomplishments. The sources of their everlasting glory are words and deeds that light up the future. The homage paid Lincoln has been inspired by the nobility of his tenets. He embodied mankind's brightest aspirations—and he fought with deep courage to make them a reality. The political and moral issues Lincoln faced differ in detail with current conflicts, but the principles involved have not changed. The Lincolnian concepts of the nineteenth century are applicable to twentieth century problems.

He was blessed with the moral strength that is so desperately needed in Washington today. Lincoln was one of the rare politicians who combined practical ability with moral ideals transcending political expediency. He could have compromised on the slavery issue and allowed the festering spiritual infection to afflict the Nation. But he refused to appease indecency. No man had a deeper devotion to peace. Yet he took drastic action when he discovered the conflict could not be reconciled amicably. Sometimes a leg must be amputated to save a life. Lincoln said this Nation could not exist half slave and half free, and that inexorable logic obviously applies to the world of 1951.

Men of little faith and less courage are always with us. They measure each challenge by the extent of their fears. They would surrender to the foes of peace in the name of peace. Lincoln knew amity could not be purchased by blackmail. When his opponents threatened that his election would lead to the destruction of the Union, he shot back: "You say you will destroy the Union and the great crime will be upon me? That reminds me of a thief who holds a pistol to your head and mutters: 'Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you—and then you will be the murdered.'"

One of the most disgraceful current episodes is the attempt of Communists here to use Lincoln's name for their own nefarious purposes. Just as a gangster disguises himself with an alias, so the Communists are using Lincoln's name for camouflage. Only the demented mentality essential to Communist fanaticism could believe democratic Lincoln would be an ally of despotic Stalin. You might as well expect an angel to shake the hand of the Devil.

Since atheism is a salient feature of communism, it is well to remember Lincoln's classic observation: "I never behold the stars that I do not feel that I am looking at the face of God. I can see how it might be possible for a man to look upon the earth and be an atheist, but I cannot conceive how he could look up into the heavens and say there is no God."

On the question of dealing with subversives, Lincoln made his position crystal-clear during the early days of the war. He did not believe freedom extended to treachery or that liberty included the right to destroy it. He boldly declared: "Under cover of liberty of speech and press the Copperheads hoped to keep on foot amongst us a most efficient corps of spies, informers, suppliers, and aiders and abettors of their cause in a thousand ways. Must I shoot a simple-minded soldier boy who deserts, while I must not touch a hair of the wily agitator who induces him to desert? I think that in such a case, to silence the agitator and save the boy is not only constitutional, but withal a great mercy."

Lincoln also speaks in the debate now raging about whether a President can assume war powers during national emergencies without the consent of Congress. As many Chief Executives did before him—and after him—he dispensed with constitutional niceties when the survival of the Nation was at stake.

Lincoln assumed war powers directly after the guns of Gen. Pierre Beauregard fired upon Fort Sumter. It was 3 months later that Congress declared a state of war existed.

Front pages disclose political differences are rocking the Nation. But similar struggles were more savage during Lincoln's era. Although he attained the Presidency with a decisive majority in the electoral college, he had a minority of the popular vote. The Nation was split wide open on every major issue. As a result, the most shameful vituperation was leveled at President Lincoln by the press and politicians. Yet his faith in the people never wavered. His reaction to the political turmoil illustrated Lincoln's genius for stating the truth with humorous simplicity: "The people will decide. If they turn their backs to the fire and get scorched in the rear—they'll find they have to sit on a blister."

The words he delivered before a regiment in 1864 would be just as propitious if addressed to our troops in Korea: "I happen, temporarily, to occupy the White House. I am a living witness that any one of your children may look to come here as my father's child has. It is in order that each of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance for your industry, enterprise and intelligence; that you may all have equal privileges in the race of life, with all its desirable human aspirations. It is for this that the struggle should be maintained, that we may not lose our birthrights. This Nation is worth fighting for to secure such an inestimable jewel."

Arizona's Water Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that California receive her proper share of the Colorado River water in order to provide this vital necessity of life to many millions of people in a State rapidly increasing in population. The population of California has doubled during the past 10 years and it is expected to double again in the next decade.

Despite these facts, certain Arizona land speculators are endeavoring to divert a great portion of the Colorado River to enrich themselves at a time when the Nation's efforts must be directed for national defense. These land speculators are sponsoring the central Arizona project and legislation has been introduced in the Congress to carry out their schemes. This project would not only cut off a vital supply of water to the people of California, but it would also add an additional and nonessential burden upon our Nation's taxpayers at this hour of national emergency.

I am including in my remarks an editorial from the Pasadena Star-News of February 4, 1951, which calls attention to the position taken in this matter by the land speculators of Arizona:

CALIFORNIA MUST RENEW EFFORTS TO THWART ARIZONA'S RIVER WATER PLAN

Californians with a clear eye to the future welfare of this State must gird themselves for another stiff fight in the Congress of the United States against an Arizona water grab at the Colorado River.

That Arizona-backed bill authorizing the Federal Government to construct the central Arizona water and irrigation project at a cost of $700,000,000 has been favorably reported by the Interior Committee of the Senate. This reporting out of the bill makes a very live measure indeed for Senate consideration. The bill was approved in Senate committee last year, but California opposition succeeded in blocking it in the Public Lands Committee of the House.

Action by the Senate committe indicates that the California delegation in both Houses of Congress must renew their efforts to stop the bill. California Senators and Representatives will need all the help they can get from groups, like the Colorado River Association in this State, and individual Californians. Since the California delegation will exert all its own energy the best way for other Californians to help is to engender friendliness for the California position with Representatives and citizens of other States. Many California citizens have connections in other States where the case for California can be fairly presented.

Arizonians like to picture California as a huge hog that wants more than its share of Colorado River water and is seeking to rob Arizona of water. This is Arizona, bias, and flagrant misrepresentation, and far from the truth. The truth is that California seeks only to protect rights to its share of the water as inherent in the Colorado River treaties. Yet in all fairness to Arizona and all the basin States California does not ask to be the arbiter of what its own rights are; on the contrary, it proposes that a resolution by Congress ask the United States Supreme Court to interpret the river treaties and expresses complete willingness to abide by the high Court's opinion. This reasonable proposal has been determinedly opposed by Arizona.

California believes that the central Arizona project would infringe upon the rights of Nevada and California to waters of the lower Colorado, and, furthermore, that the project would exact a cost from all taxpayers out of all proportion to the benefits to Arizona lands.

That is the proposition, with Arizona still ignoring the Supreme Court suggestion, clamoring for the central Arizona project and shouting charges that California is trying to rob Arizona of water. Arizona has reversed the true status of the controversy.

When Relief Is a Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune in the RECORD because it contains some information that must command the attention of Congress, and the sooner the better. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 1403, which would deal with part of the problem of growing abuses to the aid to dependent children program. This bill is now before the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand several other Members also have similar bills pending.

It should now be obvious to everyone that the Federal Security Agency has no intention or desire or authority, whichever you choose to accept, to cope with this growing menace to a fine program. And since the original fault lies with Congress, I think the only solution that can ever be obtained will have to be provided by Congress.

We hear many Members these days talking about cutting unnecessary Federal expenditures. Here is one way a substantial sum can be saved for the Federal Treasury, and at the same time a great contribution will have been made to make this a more moral and decent America. I suggest that all Members who sincerely want economy to give my bill and this problem more than a second glance.

The newspaper editorial follows:

WHEN RELIEF IS A RACKET

The Tribune has begun a series of articles on the type of people who get dependent children's aid in Oklahoma. Our reporter went directly where the relief checks are going—to the homes. He talked to the parents, particularly to the mothers. What he found in many cases is disgusting.

Many of the children who qualify for these checks are illegitimate. Many of the women who are supposed to be helped by this money to give their children a decent upbringing are promiscuous slatterns whose "boy friends" wander in and out at all hours. The welfare checks encourage this conceiving and bearing of illegitimate children. If the children are starved sufficiently the parents can even make a little profit out of them.

This isn't what Oklahomans had in mind at all when they voted to participate in the children's aid program. We wanted to reduce the number of unhappy children, not increase it. But our good intentions have gone sour.

The chief reason why they have gone sour is the secrecy that surrounds these payments. The taxpayers are not permitted to know who gets their money. The theory is that the feelings of the recipients should not be hurt by letting it be known that they are living in part on public charity. It is also an engraved invitation to grafters.

As long as these records are hidden, as long as the citizen who is tapped for taxes cannot learn whether his next door neighbor has his hand in his pocket or not these evils are going to grow. Politically-appointed case workers show that in many instances they cannot or will not rehabilitate people who demand and receive relief. Yet without rehabilitation this money is wasted.

Paying women to add to our population of miserable, illegitimate children is worse than bad sociology. It is bad Christianity. It is bad charity. It doesn't eliminate want. It compounds it. For it raises new generations of twisted, subnormal people, bred in the foulest environment, who are candidates for our swelling ranks of unemployables, criminals, and insane.

The people Oklahoma never intended to make laziness profitable or promiscuous living attractive. Yet what have we done? Read these case histories by our Investigator X.

The hard-working citizen, who labors to support his own family in these inflation-ridden and tax-loaded years, cannot long continue to share his paycheck with large groups of people who have no intentions of taking care of themselves. The time is coming when we are going to have to stop cultivating weeds and thistles in our fields.

The cure is squarely up to the Federal Congress and State and county officials.

First of all, we must make public welfare records public. As long as they are hidden dishonest men and women will succeed in taking money from the people without fear of detection, and dishonest politicians will build political machines by putting undeserving people on relief.

Secondly, the State should force the fathers of illegitimate children to support them, or these men should be thrown in jail for bastardy. The idea of these fellows loafing and looking at their television sets while the postman pads up to the door with a public baby-bonus is senseless and inhumane.

Thirdly, women who have had illegitimate children should not be permitted to draw checks on these children. If they can support these youngsters well and good, but these mothers have no right to ask the State to hand over money for them to spend as they see fit. Oklahomans supplied dependent children's relief checks to keep families together on the assumption that these would be families in which children could be properly reared.

The chronic unwed baby-breeder is an enemy of the people. She's not a mother; she's a racketeer. Her children should be taken from her and put in orphanages. That's expensive, but not nearly as expensive as the present situation in which she can actually qualify for a free living if she bears enough of these children. It's time we quit treating such people with sentimentality. It's time we charged a few of them with State vagrancy.

Fourthly, we've got to make it dangerous for fathers to abandon their legitimate children. This has been ridiculously easy in most counties. There have been few prosecutions of the men who walked off, and the burden of caring for their families has been quietly—and, of course, secretly—shifted to the taxpayers. Child abandonment costs the people much more than the

average burglary. County attorneys and judges should put it in the same class.

Oklahoma has the second highest per capita public welfare burden in the Nation. It's not because we have the second highest percentage of people in need. It is because sloppy administration, poor case work, and laziness among our county attorneys have all combined to make relief chiseling easy and profitable.

There will be a lot more money available for helping children of decent families that have suffered unavoidable hardship if we wipe the racketeers off our rolls.

When are we going to start?

Edwin Arthur Hall, Prognosticator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years I have been right many more times than wrong in predicting certain political events.

I believe I am right today when I state that the next congressional district of which Broome will be a part will consist of Broome, Chenango, Delaware, Otsego, and Tioga Counties.

Do not ask me how I found out. There is a never-failing source which always supplies me with the most valuable information.

The incident which gives most credence to such a set-up was the recent appearance in Binghamton of "Big Jim" MacDuff, wealthy country banker, and ruler of Otsego County's Republican machine.

"Big Jim" was pictured in the annual Lincoln Day huddle at the Arlington with some of the group we always see at those feasts.

To my knowledge, this is MacDuff's first fraternal get-together with the Binghamton boys since Otsego County left the district 9 years ago.

There is one sure thing. I have a host of friends up in that county and I have never failed to keep in touch with them. I have already received a nice lot of assurances from former supporters in that bailiwick that they will take their coats off and go to work for me just as soon as they know for sure that Otsego is coming back into the Broome fold.

Otsego is a wonderful county and I hope I get it back.

The Item Veto in Appropriation Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Decatur (Ill.) Herald:

UNWANTED WEAPON

A New York Republican Congressman has offered a bill and a constitutional amendment which would provide a weapon against pork-barrel projects in the House and Senate.

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING's proposals would allow the President to veto specific items in the annual omnibus appropriations bills. As matters stand now, the whole bill must either be vetoed or approved.

The rivers and harbors and flood-control sections of the appropriations measures traditionally contain a great many pork-barrel projects. Representative KEATING believes that allowing a specific-item veto would enable the President to get rid of a lot of nondefense, nonessential spending.

The New Yorker's idea is a good one, but its future looks doubtful. Neither the House nor the Senate has shown any inclination to interfere with this political spending. Even amid cries of economy in Government there is constant logrolling for these pet projects. Economy is always for somebody else. And any President is going to think twice about making his party members mad.

As long as politics remains the ruling force of Government, there will be useless and wasteful political spending.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 16, is being observed in the United States by Lithuanians who have never abandoned the national dream of freedom under a democratic independent government for Lithuania.

It has been 12 long years since the lights went out in the Baltic States. I do not defend those Lithuanian quislings who had placed their own economic welfare above that of the nation in secretly allying themselves to the Nazi conquerors; nor to those other quislings who had entered into equally secret and traitorous allegiance to Soviet Russia.

The fact remains that the overwhelming majority of the people of Lithuania and of the other Baltic Republics were, like the Czechoslovakians, dedicated to the same democratic ideals and form of government which has endured in these United States for almost two centuries.

Lithuania was one of those sturdy, free countries of Europe which was demonstrating the capacity of small nations to lift themselves by their own bootstraps without resort to the desperation of communism or fascism. Many of them now lie prostrate, captives of Russian imperialism. Our sympathy goes out, not only to those who are still in the homeland but to those who in the United States keep alive the patriotic ideals of freedom and the democratic way of life.

I am happy to salute the American people of Lithuanian birth or descent and to join with them in observance of February 16 as the Lithuanian day of independence.

Where America Stands Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] delivered a very statesmanlike address at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Raleigh, N. C., on February 10. I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is the first speech of a major character which he has made outside the Senate since he became majority leader, and it is well worth perusing.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE AMERICA STANDS TODAY

(By Hon. ERNEST W. MCFARLAND)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Democrats. Your kind words of welcome and the friendly enthusiasm of this fine audience emphasizes the honor you have paid me in inviting my participation in your Jefferson-Jackson Day gathering. Your cordiality and friendship is warmly reciprocated.

I know that the spirit expressed by you is also an inspiration to the members of your great congressional delegation. Senator CLYDE HOEY is no ordinary public servant. He is an adornment to the Senate of the United States, not merely an able legislator but a distinguished Senator and so acknowledged by his peers. Senator WILLIS SMITH is a recent addition to our body but his ability and public record are well known and already he has won the admiration of his colleagues.

I am proud that I can count these men as my personal friends, just as I am proud that I have the friendship of your 12 distinguished Congressmen. All of them—Messrs. COOLEY, BONNER, KERR, BARDEN, CHATHAM, DURHAM, CARLYLE, DEANE, HAMILTON JONES, WOODROW JONES, my good friend MONROE REDDEN, of Hendersonville, and that great patriarch of the House, BOB DOUGHTON, have the high regard of their colleagues.

We meet here tonight in a noble tradition. Andrew Jackson—the man who breathed life into our great Democratic Party, the man who put into practice the principle of a people's government, was a guest 121 years ago at the first dinner honoring the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. It is altogether fitting and appropriate that we who attempt to follow in the paths of these two men honor them. Both fought for human rights, for justice, for equality and freedom of mankind. Jefferson and Jackson were traduced in their time just as Wilson and Roosevelt were in theirs. Jackson was called an illiterate, a liar, an atheist, a dictator, and worse.

Today the epithets continue, varying only to suit the times. All of us have seen personal friends reviled because they held steadfastly to ideals which we ourselves cherish. Always those who fight entrenched greed and oppression, whether at home or abroad, are ridiculed, castigated, and maligned. But we can take comfort from the fact that domestically and internationally our party has never deviated from the basic principle of establishing here a better land for all the people

and encouraging that policy throughout the world.

Those who differ with us in political faith like to pass these affairs off as mere political dinners. They are more than that—they are the warp and woof of our governmental history; at these dinners policies are expounded and affirmations made which help set our course in national and international affairs. Today, as in the past, we not only draw inspiration from what our forebears did, but we can and must affirm that the principles which guided them, guide us.

Is there a continuity of purpose and action by our Government? Of course, there is.

Are we following any different policy today than Jefferson and Jackson followed? Of course not.

The fundamental policy is as simple and clear today as it ever was. We believe in the right of man to be free; to choose his own form of government, his religion, and his way of life. We demand it for ourselves and we favor it for mankind everywhere, free of aggression and subversion.

Our tactics may change from generation to generation, from year to year, even from day to day, but our basic strategy—never. We have shed blood and spent our substance to achieve and maintain freedom here and to help bring it about elsewhere in the world on the very simple premise that wherever the bell of tyranny tolls it also tolls for us.

Let us analyze briefly the current situation and see if we are deviating from our basic American policy.

Where does America stand in the world today?

We are told over and over again—by some statesmen who have been wrong in all their prophecies of doom for the last 20 years—that we are in terrible shape.

These sad souls who weep for us on the radio and turn gloomy faces to our television screens tell us that we have very few friends anywhere on earth.

Some of the experts who hailed our action in Korea last summer now are ready to write off our struggle against Communist aggression there as a total failure. These summer soldiers are not willing to fight in January as they were in June.

Other self-appointed statesmen of the air waves and the press are urging us to wash our hands of the United Nations. These petulant pundits want us to pull away and sulk behind our oceans, if the other members of the UN will not do exactly what we say at the exact moment when we call for action.

Now let us take up these points one by one—let us see whether the gloom peddlers and the defeatists are right or wrong.

Are we really in terrible shape—or is it possible that certain people are trying to make us think so for their own special interests?

The truth is that our country has never been stronger in its entire history than it is today—and it is growing stronger hourly.

The truth is that we have many millions of firm friends around the globe.

The truth is that an overwhelming majority of the United Nations have joined with us in every step we have taken to stop aggression and to restore peace with honor in the world.

Look at the power and prosperity of America at this very moment, and do not permit the weepers and the wailers to confuse or dismay you.

All Americans who want to work now have good jobs at good wages. Farmers are receiving the highest incomes in history. Businessmen are making the largest profits they have ever enjoyed.

Everywhere you go in America today, you see new homes and new automobiles—the solid signs of prosperity. You see factories operating at full capacity. You see great mills turning out record quantities of steel. You see oil wells producing tremendous streams of fuel. You see long lines of freight cars and trucks moving across the land, carrying the products of American farms and American industry.

The banners of smoke flying from our factory chimneys are signals of our strength of determination to uphold the rule of justice. The sound of jet engines in the sky is a warning to all aggressors that the mightiest air force on earth serves the cause of liberty. Our ships upon the seven seas remind mankind that the most powerful navy in history moves upon the oceans for America and the free world.

This great Nation is throbbing with energy, bursting with strength, and filled with industrious and intelligent people who have never accepted the idea that America could ever fail in any task.

So I say to you that the captious critics, the defeatists, the fearful men who urge us to abandon our leadership of the free world do not represent America today.

We did not seek the position of power we now hold. We did not force our way into the forefront of the free nations. Because of our strength and high ideals, the eyes of freedom-loving nations have turned to us for leadership.

If we have been misled and misruled as these critics cry, let the defeatists explain how America has gone from triumph to triumph.

Where is the confusion they shout about? Is there confusion in the minds of the President and the bipartisan leaders of Congress who created the Marshall plan? Can a program which aided 270,000,000 people in Western Europe to throw off the poisons of communism be called a product of confusion?

Was the Berlin airlift, which raised the morale of Western Germany and frustrated the Communists, an example of confusion?

Was it confusion to sponsor the North Atlantic Pact which bound 12 free nations together against aggressors?

Was our aid to the Greeks which enabled them to throw out the Communists an evidence of confusion?

Are the encouragement and assistance we are giving nations everywhere to resist Soviet imperialism examples of confusion?

When we stop to think, my friends, we know that all these important steps of the last few years were entirely consistent.

Every one of these bold and resolute actions checked and confounded the evil forces of communism. Every one of these decisive actions heartened and strengthened the forces of our side—the forces of decency and respect for law, the forces of humanitarian civilization and human honor.

After the Second World War, we Americans resolved that we would not fall back into the folly of isolationism which had led us to the disaster of Pearl Harbor.

In the Senate we ratified the United Nations Charter in June of 1945 by a vote of 89 to 2. That vote was a tremendous revelation of how many Americans looked to the United Nations as a great instrument of hope—a noble institution which might enable us to free ourselves and our children from the senseless scourge of war.

Our faith in the UN was fully justified last June when the Security Council acted swiftly to condemn the aggression of the North Koreans. We all remember the strong surge of approval which went through America and all over the world when the President heeded the call of the Security Council to meet the brutal challenge of the Communists.

As free Americans, we have never bowed to aggressors. Acting as our Commander in Chief, our great President, Harry Truman, met the issue last June as Jackson and Jefferson would have met it—without flinching, without fear.

Let us remember that we went into Korea to stop the forces of aggression before those forces engulfed the whole world in a total war.

Let us remember that Communist aggression is no academic issue; it is a live, dangerous, spitting serpent. Always it moves forward; always we must be on the alert to keep it from threatening the life of America.

Is there any question—is there any doubt in any American's mind that sometime, some place, sooner or later the United Nations would have to call a halt to this gobbling up of the world, this suppression of free people? Haven't we learned the folly of appeasement? Have we forgotten Hitler and Munich so soon?

It is the masters in the Kremlin who choose the time and the place for attack.

Had we been fully prepared in Korea, the assault would have come in Iran, Iraq, Indochina, Western Germany, or some other place. Some may say we should have waited, allowed Korea to be overrun, and chosen a different time and place to meet the Soviet challenge. But none can deny that the challenge eventually had to be met. Let us remember that appeasement has never bought peace.

By acting as we did in Korea, we brought the monster of Communist aggression into the open. We proved to the free world that we would spill our blood and spend our treasure to halt Soviet aggression before it devoured more nations, before it brought the horror of war to the shores of America.

The firm determination and the fighting spirit we have shown in Korea may have disrupted the plans of the Kremlin for world conquest. That was our purpose.

I feel deeply the cost in lives in Korea. Certainly, all of us want that cruel carnage to end as soon as possible. We believe that every American life is very precious. But we have learned in the blood and sorrow of two great wars that we cannot have peace unless we are willing to fight for it.

The courage of our men and our UN allies there may have spared millions of Americans, millions of free men in other countries, from death or mutilation in a global conflict. Let us remember that a single atom bomb dropped here in Raleigh would snuff out the lives of several times our casualties in Korea.

It is true that we have borne the brunt of the battle. France and Britain and our other allies have not contributed as many troops as we hoped they would. But they have lived under the grim necessity of building up their forces in Europe to prevent the onslaught of Soviet armies there.

We must always remember how much our allies endured in World War II. We must remember that they were bombed by enemy planes week after week, year after year. We must remember that many thousands of Englishmen saw their homes go up in flames. We must remember that Belgium and Holland were overrun by ruthless armies, and France was crushed by military occupation for four long years.

The horrors of war, devastation of homes, imprisonment, concentration camps, separation of loved ones—these destroy the will to resist, the urge to fight. They breed despair and a sense of futility. If we think of these things we will not be impatient with our friends in Europe. We will understand why they are not able to rearmed up strong forces as rapidly as we desire. It will take time for them to restore themselves materially, and spiritually. But they are making great progress.

General Eisenhower has just returned from Europe. He conferred with responsible leaders; he asked questions; he saw facts at first hand. He dealt with men who were his companions in arms a few short years ago.

He knows them and they know him. What does General Eisenhower tell us?

Our friends in Europe will fight—they will resist the tide of Communist aggression. Their spirit has been revived by our example; by our own determination to rearm and checkmate the Kremlin at every turn. They believe in us, and Eisenhower assures us that we can believe in them. In fact, they are now not nearly so concerned about our troops as they are about arms—the munitions of war.

They know, as we know, that the test, if it comes, will come in Europe. They face up boldly to the fact that their homes and their lands may again be the first battleground.

Whom are we going to follow—General Eisenhower or the men who one day advocate that we isolate ourselves in this hemisphere and forget the rest of the world and the next day admit that perhaps it would be better to give Europe limited aid? Are we going to follow Eisenhower or the men who argue with each other about mathematical formulae on troops?

Who knows the military situation and the facts in Europe better—the great soldier who served as supreme commander in Europe or the timid men suddenly become military strategists? Whom are you willing to believe?

I prefer to believe General Eisenhower when he says quietly and plainly that we can count on the support of millions of freedom-loving people in Europe. I prefer to follow Eisenhower when he insists that he can, with our aid, build up a European fighting force which can deter Russia. I prefer to take Eisenhower's valuation that the governments in Europe are alive to the threat from the Kremlin and will fight to the death against it.

We cannot fail to build a better future for ourselves and all mankind—if we stand by the simple, straightforward ideals we have supported throughout our history.

We have maintained one fundamental principle in the east and in the west, in the Pacific regions and in the Atlantic areas, in North America and in South America—in the whole wide world.

Our basic principle has been the principle of devotion to the rights of man—the right of nations to be free and independent, the right of small nations to live without fear of big nations, the right of men to choose their own forms of government without threats of subversion or aggression.

This great principle can never be destroyed, as long as there are men who are willing to offer their lives to cherish and protect it. There will never be a shortage of such men in America. While the spirit of honor and brotherhood lives in our hearts and the hearts of free men everywhere, our cause must inevitably be victorious.

We have met every test in the past; we will do so in the future.

We are now well launched upon the tremendous task of arming ourselves and our allies to prevent the spread of war. We are not resigned to the idea that the terrible tragedy of a world conflagration is inevitable.

We are girding ourselves to make a mighty effort for the maintenance of peace with honor in the world.

In this noble cause, we are on the side of the angels. The world wants peace. The world wants hope. The world is ready to respond to cheerful, courageous leadership. And we can give it, if we rise now to the heights of heroism reached by our gallant fighters in Korea.

We can win the battle for peace—if we work and pray for the good of suffering humanity while we prepare to defend the ramparts of freedom.

Let us go forward together, united as Americans, united as free men under the banner of the United Nations. Let us guide ourselves calmly and confidently, with the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson and the fearless heritage of Andrew Jackson.

Then we will have no reason for fear. Then we will never be touched again by the cold fingers of despair. With the help of God, we will carry the flag of freedom to our coming victory.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Montgomery County Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, February 12, it was my pleasure to address the Montgomery County Republicans at the Manor Club on the subject of the meaning in our times of Abraham Lincoln's birthday. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN'S MEANING IN THE ATOMIC AGE

I am delighted to be back once again before your splendid Republican organization. It is a particular privilege to be among those who did such a tremendous job in the November 1950 election.

The resounding victory of the Republican cause in your great State of Maryland was a tremendous tonic to the entire country. It showed in particular that folks who work in our Nation's Capital and who are close in every other way to Washington itself clearly recognize the fact that there are grave deficiencies in the present administration. The fact that you are near to the scene has in no way blinded your eyes to the errors of the Fair Deal.

The celebration of Lincoln's birthday is more, of course, than just an occasion for our get-together as Republicans. You and I know that Abraham Lincoln was bigger than any political party. He was a Republican, but basically he was an American—a great and humble American.

FOUR MEANINGS OF LINCOLN'S LIFE

To us of our time there are many meanings of Lincoln's birthday, and I, for one, should like to spell out four such meanings to you today:

1. The political meaning.
2. The international meaning.
3. The national meaning.
4. The great spiritual meaning of Abraham Lincoln.

GOP IS PERFECT CHOICE FOR 1952

Now, first, my friends, we, as Republicans, know that Abraham Lincoln serves as a tremendous inspiration to our entire party. Just as the Republican Party came upon the American scene at exactly the right moment in our history, so, in November 1952, the Republican Party will once more emerge as exactly the right choice for the American people—a people tired of administration "bungling, burdens, and baloney."

DEMOCRATS IN POWER FOR TOO LONG

You and I know that the excessively long period which the present Democratic administration has held in office presents a grave danger to the future liberties of our country. I, for one, do not believe that any party is so wise, its leadership so sound, that it can be trusted with power virtually unbroken for 20 years. On the contrary, we have seen the danger of such long durations of power in the long succession of shocking scandals—the scandal of Democratic tie-ups with organized crime in Illinois and elsewhere, the scandal of Democratic meddling in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the scandal of administration tie-ups with the "five percenters," the scandal of Communists and other suspects in Government—the Hisses, the Coplons, the Remingtons, the Bentleys. We have seen on the basis of all of these scandals that the Democratic Party has outlived its usefulness as a majority party, if indeed it ever had such usefulness.

THE RIGHT IDEA AT THE RIGHT TIME

Abraham Lincoln came to the fore in the year 1860 as President of the United States. He and the newly born Republican Party had the answer to the great need of the hour, the need for preservation of the Union.

We recall the words of Victor Hugo "that there is nothing more powerful in the world than an idea whose time has come." Abraham Lincoln had the right idea, and there was no human power on earth that could triumph over his indomitable will to preserve this Union.

I should like to quote now and a bit later on from some of Lincoln's own words. In 1864 he said:

"This Government must be preserved in spite of the acts of any man or set of men. It is worthy of your every effort. * * * I have admonished you not to be turned from the stern purpose of defending our beloved country and its free institutions by any arguments urged by ambitious and designing men, but stand fast to the Union and the old flag."

THE RED MENACE FROM WITHIN

It was Abraham Lincoln who warned the American people of the danger from within. The Democratic Party has virtually ignored that danger. It has coddled a whole generation of traitorous individuals whose loyalty was not to our country, but rather to a vicious foreign ideology—an ideology that claims there is no God, that claims man is a materialist brute, that there must be a perpetual conflict between classes and nations until communism triumphs.

Now, friends, to summarize this point, the political meaning of Abraham Lincoln in our time is that we of the Republican Party are charged with a great mission to bring about Republican victory in 1952.

We should not presume that the accumulated blunders of the Democratic administration will automatically bring it down. On the contrary, we know that the Democratic Party, feeding on patronage (particularly on the basis of tens of thousands of defense jobs in Government and industry), we know that this Democratic Party is in many respects tremendously strong. It will take an invincible determination on our part to wrest control from it.

FRIENDSHIP TO ALL PEOPLES

Now, my friends, there is a second meaning of Abraham Lincoln in our time, and I refer to his meaning on the international scene. The man who spoke on March 4, 1865, in his

second inaugural address, said: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right," that man was not simply a citizen of America, rather he was a citizen of the world.

What finer attitude could you and I have toward all peoples than to hold no malice toward them, to seek justice for them; yes, justice even for those who were our bitter enemies during World War II.

Moreover, we hold no malice even for the enslaved people of Soviet Russia and the satellite states under it. We know that if these humble peoples were given their freedom, they would eradicate the tyrannous group of men in the Kremlin, which has set them on a course of international aggression.

AMERICA MUST LEAD THE WEST

We know, however, that we must not be weak or timid in facing the leaders of the Kremlin. If we are to preserve that "government of the people, by the people and for the people" of which Abraham Lincoln spoke, we must in our international policy recognize our responsibilities to ourselves and to the world. Whether we like it or not, we are the leaders of western civilization—the economic, military, political, and spiritual leaders. We have inherited the legacy of other great countries whose prestige had previously dominated the globe. Each of our three great branches of Government must accordingly play its part, each neither exceeding its powers nor failing to exercise them.

As Lincoln said in his second annual message to Congress on December 1, 1862: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history."

I repeat, my friends, we of this generation cannot escape the responsibility of our times. We cannot stick our heads in the sand like ostriches, we cannot tell the world to go "hang"—(it is we who will go "hang" with it). We know that we are living in a contracted world in which man's ingenuity and inventiveness have practically annihilated space and time. We are every nation's neighbor. We are indeed our brothers' keeper.

But to be adequate, there must be no more secret agreements, no more blundering Yaltas, Tehrans, Potsdams, no more sellouts of the right of free peoples.

LIMITING GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Abraham Lincoln had a message for the world, but also he had a message for our own country insofar as our future national policy should be concerned. We come, therefore, to the third great meaning of Lincoln's life, the national meaning.

During this present era of crisis, we know that Government is unfortunately going to have to play an increasing role in the lives of all of our citizens. The controls which we are already experiencing are but the token of even more comprehensive controls which may come in the future, controls over strategic materials, over prices, over wages, and so forth.

We do not, however, want to allow these temporary controls to be used by the Administration as a cloak so as to cover up socialistic designs which would regiment our entire economy. The American people are willing to submit to a temporary system of Federal dictation, but they are not going to lose their great and lasting zeal for liberty.

SOCIALISTIC ITEMS MUST BE ELIMINATED FROM BUDGET

We know that in President Truman's $71,600,000,000 budget, there were a vast number of socialistic items that have absolutely no business being there. I refer, for example, to his proposal for socialized medicine, for socialized farming, and so forth. Those items in his budget must be completely eliminated.

What then, is the standard that we should pursue in evaluating proposals for new action by our Government?

I think that there is no better standard than that which Lincoln himself recommended almost a hundred years ago. On July 1, 1854, he stated:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Would that Mr. Truman and his associates around him might remember that phrase:

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

DANGER OF LEANING ON GOVERNMENT

We know that if the people get into the habit of relying upon government, eventually they would not be in a position to do anything for themselves and government would have to do everything. Listen to the words of another great American President:

"Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. * * * When all government in little as in great things shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will become venal and oppressive."

The man who spoke these words was President Thomas Jefferson, a man with whom the Democratic Party nominally claims great friendship. But surely those words of Jefferson indicate what we feel to be a profound Republican view. In fact, Lincoln in his second inaugural address on March 4, 1865, said: "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society."

SEEKING DIVINE GUIDANCE

Now, my friends, we have reviewed three of the great meanings of Abraham Lincoln's life. I refer to the political meaning, to us as Republicans, the international meaning, and the national meaning.

The fourth great meaning comes to each of us, to you and to me, as children of God. And I refer, of course, to the spiritual meaning of Lincoln's life. We all know that he freely told us that "when I have no other place to go, I go to my knees in prayer."

We know that Lincoln utilized divine power to master the problems around him. He did not have a college education. He was self-educated in the school of hard knocks. There was probably not a single member of his Cabinet who did not have more education than he did. And yet those Cabinet Members could not hold a candle to his great spirit which rose above the problems which his Cabinet members could not master.

Lincoln, you see, had three great techniques which he fully utilized: (1) The power of prayer, to which I have referred; (2) a wonderful sense of humor; his ability to tell a wholesome yarn that would release taut nerves and tense minds; (3) a deep and abiding love of the Republic to which he gave his all.

In your life and mine, whether we are private citizens or public officers, we, too, can utilize these three great approaches.

CONCLUSION

We have viewed, then, the four meanings of Abraham Lincoln's life. As the years go on, the shadow of his greatness lengthens and we see even more that his words, his thoughts, and his actions were worthy of the ages. He wrote himself large into the conscience of all mankind and into the history of western civilization. May we be as worthy of the challenges of 1951 as he was of those of 1861.

Thank you.

Lincoln Day Address by Governor Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club on the evening of last Monday, February 12, 1951, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF DEWEY'S ADDRESS AT LINCOLN DAY DINNER IN THE WALDORF

As we join tonight to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln, we are facing an issue that may decide the very existence of our country. As in Lincoln's day, it again involves the age-old issue of freedom or slavery. This time we are deciding whether we will all be slaves or whether we shall all be free.

Some progress has been made in the 2 months since I called in this room for a swift build-up of the Armed Forces of our country, for immediate all-out production for defense against aggression abroad and for a real fight against inflation at home.

At least, 8 months after Korea, our Government has actually begun to get orders out to industry for some of the weapons we needed before Korea. We finally have in that job the leadership of a really able man—and, I might add, a good Republican—Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson.

But the fight against inflation is still a sham battle, accompanied by much sound and fury, strong regulations and weak administration, a slow freeze and a quick thaw. It appears that our wage and price controls are being run by Annie Oakley. The Washington regulators toss up an order, shoot it full of holes, and then give somebody a free ride. Meanwhile the Treasury is, in effect, pumping Government bonds into the Federal Reserve at low interest rates, creating the most powerful engine of inflation this country has ever seen.

Having looked over some of the people running wage and price controls, I came to the conclusion that they are there, not for the purpose of fighting inflation, but to provide jobs for undeserving Democrats at the expense of the people.

Meanwhile, as every American bends his back to bear the new load of taxes, the President's budget includes every political spending device anybody has been able to think of to catch votes and wreck our defense program. It even includes that moth-eaten socialized medicine scheme that would wreck the health of our people, and the Brannan plan, which the farmers themselves don't want.

GET DOWN TO BUSINESS

If the national administration really wants to defend America, I suggest it quit politics as usual and get down to business.

Our country is the core of opposition to the spread of Russian barbarism and Communist slavery throughout the world. We are now engaged in a great debate over that mass of human slavery, even as in Lincoln's time, and as before it splits the members of the two great political parties.

The debate has hammered out agreement on many points and the issue has narrowed down to the simple question: How shall we meet the challenge and with what kind of force?

On one side is the group which contends that America's welfare and the defeat of communism requires that we inspire and strengthen our allies with arms and troops to preserve their freedom. This group holds that without united action by the free nations, acting within the United Nations, we ourselves are in great peril. These Americans believe we should make every sacrifice to mobilize swiftly to repel any new invasion of the free world in Europe, Asia, or Africa.

The other side, which also includes members of both political parties, says we cannot afford to undertake this great obligation. They say we would be spreading ourselves too thin. They say Europe is unwilling to defend itself, that it is riddled with socialism, weak economically, threatened with internal revolution by Communists, and does not even pay its debts. They say the free areas of Asia are too disorganized to avoid collapse whatever happens.

These Americans conclude that we should send only a few, if any, additional troops to Europe or Asia, and that we should concentrate on making the Western Hemisphere invincible; that we should keep our money and our boys at home, building our own strength. They say the Western Hemisphere is self-sufficient and unconquerable and we should not dissipate our treasure and risk the blood of our youth for lost causes all over the earth.

CITES LATIN AMERICA

This is a most appealing argument. I wish with all my heart and soul that I could believe in it. I have two sons who are going to be involved and I would gladly give my life to avoid sending them to far-away lands to risk being wounded or killed. But in all honesty I am compelled totally to reject the idea that America can live alone.

I say to you: We could not survive in a Communist world. First of all, how long do you think we would have South America with us? With all Europe in Russia's hands, to whom would South America sell all the essential exports she now sends to Europe? Many of South America's exports are farm products that we do not need and cannot absorb. Without a market for her exports, how long could we, in this country, make up the difference to keep South America on our side?

Clearly, we would very soon be isolated, here in North America. We would be the loneliest people on earth. What would we do, an island of freedom in a Communist world, outnumbered 14 to 1, with oceans which would no longer be our protecting moat but a broad highway to our front door?

We produce less than half our wool, only a portion of our sugar and none of our coffee and tea. We can survive without these things.

But with what would we defend ourselves? We are short 50 basic metals. We might get along without tungsten or chromium or even without natural rubber or tin, though it would be tough.

But some things are life and death. To make steel you need manganese—and where does our manganese come from? From overseas. For years Russia provided 50 percent of all our manganese. Today the largest sources are in Africa; the next largest is—where do you think? In India—halfway around the world.

Steel makes automobiles, trucks, tractors, plows, new buildings, new highways, new bridges, and machine tools. We might get along, perhaps, without all these—but only at a stone-age level of existence.

Meanwhile, what happens to Fortress America? Where do we get the steel to make guns and planes and tanks, or atom bombs? Without these, Fortress America is lost.

It is perfectly clear that Russia does not wish to challenge the United States in all-out war until she catches up with us on the atom bomb. The bomb had kept this shaky peace, and it has kept it because we had bases in Great Britain, Africa, and the Mediterranean from which to deliver the bomb.

But how do we make the atom bomb? With uranium—and our principal source of uranium is again in Africa, in the Belgian Congo. Suppose the Russians took Europe, including Belgium. Who gets the Belgian Congo and its uranium? The Russians. I suspect we would overnight find ourselves fighting a land war in Africa for the defense of the crucial uranium for the atom bomb. And we would be fighting that war thousands of miles from home, with no allies, against a triumphant enemy.

OPERATION SUICIDE

I do not need to labor the point. We cannot protect ourselves by withdrawing from the rest of the world.

Operation withdrawal is Operation Suicide.

The simple fact is that the front line of defense of our very existence—the only line of defense we have—is overseas, thousands of miles away, where lie the raw materials without which our country could not survive.

Now suppose a miracle occurred overnight and we suddenly discovered all these essential materials right here in the United States. Then how long would we survive, isolated and surrounded, with only 54 miles separating Soviet Russia from Alaska?

Last December I called for 100 divisions, or about 1,800,000 ground troops. That works out at about 35 combat divisions plus behind-the-lines organization. Isolated and alone, we would need not 35 but 100 combat divisions to have a ghost of a chance of defending our shores from Alaska to southern California to the Gulf of Mexico and from Florida to Maine, and this in addition to the enormous Navy and Air Force it would take to patrol the Pacific Canal—if we still had it—and then on down to Cape Horn. And still, with all the colossal industrial capacity of Russia, Japan, Germany, and the rest of Western Europe, the Russians could take their own sweet time and bomb us out.

No, ladies and gentlemen; I would rather see my country do its share as a part of a great free world than to see us isolated, suffocated and exterminated.

I do not want to see my country shrinking timidly from its obvious destiny and waiting for destruction. I want to see my country act with courage and honesty. I want it to stand up for the right and live in freedom.

Let me confess immediately that I do not relish entrusting the fate of freedom to the shifting whims and demonstrated incompetencies of the present national administration. I did my best to throw them out a couple of years ago. And I'm sure somebody else will succeed in that effort next year. But the inexorable march of human history does not wait for nations to settle their internal differences.

The day of decision is upon us. The issue should be decided upon the real facts which have been much ignored. For example, those who argue that we ought not to defend Western Europe forget that we have already decided that question. Twice in this country we have chosen to go to war because our freedom was imperiled by the armed conquests of a dictator in Europe.

Those who argue that we should not send an American Army to Europe forget that we already have an American Army in Europe—112,000 American troops who are performing their duties in the occupation of Germany. We have American troops in Austria, in Britain, Trieste, North Africa, and the Mediterranean. Those American boys would be at war the instant the Red Czar moved into Europe. They are our own flesh and blood, and who denies that America would send them everything we had in the air, on the sea and on the land? I say we should reinforce them now while Europe can still rearm and prevent a war.

SAYS UNITED STATES WILL WIN

Once and for all let's stop this business of waiting for wars and crises and then frantically improvising, going through the agonies each time of too little and too late. However much we would like to dream of doing things the easy way, we have absolutely no choice if we wish to stay free and keep our freedom without a war.

Freedom was never bought in a bargain basement. Freedom was never saved by timidity, selfishness, half-way measures, or appeasement. America is not going to close her eyes to the cause of freedom in this world. We are going to stand by our commitments; we are going to shore up the cause of freedom. We are going to win.

The face of the world has changed much in the last 3 months and other nations are beginning to know *we* will win, too.

In Europe the frozen spirit of despair has given way to a new spirit of defiance. The people see that America has again taken firm hold of freedom's sword and will not put it down while tyranny is on the march.

The peoples of Europe and their governments have been rallied to their own defense by the inspiring leadership of General Eisenhower. Everywhere he has gone his presence has dismayed the Communists and fired the courage of freemen.

Yugoslavia, once a Russian satellite, has become the greatest thorn in Stalin's side. Titoism threatens to spread behind the iron curtain. The former Red Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia is reported to have escaped and Stalin has had to send a marshal of the Red army to hold down the Czech people. Just last week key leaders of Italian communism deserted the Russian cause.

The British have won successes in their fight against Communist guerrillas in Malaya and there is new hope of French victory over communism in Indochina.

RECALLS ATOMIC TESTS

One of the greatest triumphs of recent months has been the abandonment by our own Government of the frightful follies of its appeasement of the Reds in China. For four long years I demanded and pleaded that we should back up the recognized Government of China. It took a war by Red China to wake up our administration but at last they are acting as though they are seeing the light and will start backing up the forces for a free China.

Another thrill of hope went around the world this last week as a result of those atomic tests in Nevada. Every one of those explosions said to freemen everywhere: "Take courage. America is arming. Be strong; you can remain free."

Each of the explosions said in thundering words to those 14 men darkly conspiring in the Kremlin: "Beware. Stop your plans of bloody conquest. America is strong and she means to be stronger. She has hundreds of bombs where those came from."

No, my friends, this is no time for us to follow the counsel of despair. It is a time to be strong. It is a time for boldness. This is a time for greatness.

We tried the other course. We tried isolationism twice and each time we were drawn into a bloody conflict, still unarmed and unprepared. We fought two wars for freedom in Europe and we won no peace.

This time let us win the peace without a war.

This time let us make sure that no dictator thinks he can pick off one nation after another and then swallow the world.

It is time—long since time—that we drew the line.

Let us decide as a nation that we can win this peace through strength. We must also let the rest of the world know what we will do and what we don't do. There is grave doubt that Stalin would ever have launched the attack in Korea if he had known America would respond. In fact the Government of the United States had officially taken the position that we would not defend Korea. We created a vacuum and dictators move into vacuums.

Let us not repeat that blunder.

We officially announced we would not help Chiang Kai-shek. Again we ourselves created the vacuum. Again Red satellites moved in and won domination over 450,000,000 Chinese who are right this minute killing American boys.

Let us stop handing armies and nations over to the Russians. The only way to stop it is to draw the line.

All the world knows what nations we will defend for sure and as a result no attack has been made on a single one of them.

Now let us go to the rest of the way. We should say where we stand as to the rest of the world. Let there be no more blundering into little wars or big wars. The United States with her allies should make clear their common purpose.

Greece and Turkey should be brought into the North Atlantic Treaty immediately. Then we should settle other questions.

Will we move into war if the Red czar invades Iran? If not, will we let him take all of Iran's oil and then take Iraq and Israel and then perhaps march down into Saudi-Arabia? Will we allow that crucial oil supply to fall into Russia's hands? Or would we bomb it out? Nobody knows. It is a vacuum and dictators move into vacuums.

There is strong reason to believe Russia intends to move on Yugoslavia this year. If she does so through satellites what will happen? Nobody knows. If Bulgaria and Rumania invade Yugoslavia will atom bombs fall on Sofia and Bucharest? Nobody knows.

If Yugoslavia should fall, how long then would Greece remain free. With Greece and the Dardanelles gone, the eastern Mediterranean would become a Red sea and our bombing bases there for the defense of America would be gone.

WANTS TO WARN WORLD

Let's make up our minds and then let's tell the world the answers, so nobody will ever have an excuse to drag us into an accidental war. And let's make sure of our friends—all of them.

The Turks have 25 divisions. The heroic conduct of their troops in Korea reminds us that the Moslem world contains great force and great courage. More than 200,000,000 Mohammedans have a devout religious fervor and they have no affinity for godless communism. Their world spreads from Egypt all the way to India and into China. In the last vote in the United Nations on the China issue a number of Moslem nations abstained from voting. It is time we brought the full power of Islam more securely to our side.

Spain has 22 divisions and Yugoslavia 30. I want them on our side. Brave little Greece which has already won one war in the last 5 years is stoutly prepared to do her share again. Greece can produce and is willing to produce 10 divisions right now. And yet there are some in this country who haggle over whether we should produce 35.

The memory of Lincoln reminds us that there have been dark days throughout all our history. When we lost battles in the War Between the States, the Copperheads demanded that Lincoln abandon his effort to preserve the Union and compromise. Fortunately for us and for the world Lincoln was no weakling, no appeaser. In the darkest hour he stood more steadfast than ever. Let us remember our great history. Let us not start running for cover every time things go badly in Korea or some place else.

Above all, we must have faith in ourselves. Prepared, we can out-produce, out-think, and out-fight the hordes of communism every day in the week. Free American industry can keep ahead of slave Russians forever and the Kremlin should never forget it.

SAYS ALL SEEK FREEDOM

We have the winning cause because every man on earth wants to be free. The world is discovering that communism is slavery. Let's help them discover it faster.

Every dictator is a craven, selfish bully, exploiting millions of others just to keep his job. Dictatorship is a rotten thing and there are millions of people who would rise in revolt even with the odds 100 to 1 against them if they thought they had a chance. Let's give them a chance. Let's give them arms and money and hope.

Once again the cause of freedom is rising in the world. We struck bottom in the last few months but nothing on earth can stop us now—that is, nothing except our own follies.

If we will resolve our doubts in favor of courage and action, I can see the day coming when Stalin will have too much trouble at home to think about tackling somebody else.

I can see the day coming when Europe will be united and her scattered forces will be welded into an unconquerable power which Russia will never dare attack.

I can see the day coming when a new emancipation proclamation will free the Soviet slaves in Czechoslovakia and Poland and Hungary and Bulgaria and Romania and China, even in Russia itself, and when that day comes the Kremlin will no longer be a safe place for dictators.

If we in America choose to live in Lincoln's tradition, we will keep our freedom because we have earned it. We will inspire others to do likewise. I have no doubt as to the outcome. America will always chose the path of freedom. We will make that choice because brave men and women, fearing God, can make no other. Ours is an abiding faith in the cause of human freedom. We know it is God's cause.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Although in this proud and freedom-loving land independence is only a cherished legend today, the respect and admiration which its brief career as a sovereign nation engendered among its friends in the rest of the free world have continued and grown stronger during this period of domination.

Before 1918, its history had been a bleak, but inspiring record of a 900-year fight against the oppressive and dictatorial rule of the Russian czars. When the opportune moment presented itself during World War I, Lithuania courageously proclaimed its independence which was then acknowledged by all the world.

During the all-too-brief lifespan of free Lithuania, its citizens prospered and lived happily as members of a modern, progressive society. The Government functioned smoothly in the new nation. Trade flourished, agrarian reforms were instituted, and the future seemed assured.

Now, there can only be a blind, desperate hope that the future will not be as horrible as the present, that the iron curtain cannot last forever. The enormity of Russian crimes against the small country of 3,200,000 people can be approximated by the fact that the estimates of persons murdered, starved, and tortured to death, or deported to a lingering death in Arctic work camps range from half a million to one million. Genocide is being ruthlessly practiced as a matter of national Russian policy, since the rulers know that the fierce desire for freedom will persist as long as there is breath in a native Lithuanian's body.

We can only be amazed and humbled at the accounts of the astonishing courage and personal integrity of these people. Here, in our warm clothes and comfortable homes, we can only ask ourselves if we would be a fraction as brave if confronted with the horrible prospect of the fate that faces a guerrilla captured by the Russians. Yet the resistance movement survives and with it the hope and spirit of these brave, pitiable people.

We as a Nation cannot escape the judgment of history that we must share the responsibility for their fate by our blindness and gullibility during the period of World War II, when we allowed the Russians to regain control over the fate of the Baltic Nations. The time must come when Lithuania and her sister nations along the North Sea will be free to enjoy a well-earned independence day once more. Let us hope and pray that that time will not be too long in arriving, that it will not be too late for the heroes of the present resistance.

An Anniversary Message to the Lithuanian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in these days of tenuous peace—when a United Nations force is repelling aggression in Asia—the fate of the free world hangs in the balance.

The combined efforts of all freedom-loving people are required to combat the insidious flow of Communist expansion. Whether it be by infiltration or by violence, the end result remains the same.

The course of Communist domination is evident in Lithuania today. A people noted through history for their love of liberty have been crushed by a godless dictatorship. All is not lost, however, as the flame of freedom still burns brightly in the hearts of Lithuanians everywhere. Those who have come to America and have contributed so greatly to our way of life still fight on and offer encouragement to those under Communist domination.

Freedom will and must once again come to the crushed nations of the world; the task is great, but the example of the Lithuanians is a beacon for all to follow in attaining our goal.

The celebration of Lithuania's thirty-third anniversary of independence on February 16 is a mark of the will to survive as a free people.

Lithuanian Independence Day, February 16, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, another year of enslavement has passed for the struggling peoples of Lithuania—under the domination of the ruthless leadership of the Kremlin. February 16 marks the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence by this brave little land, peopled by 3,000,000 souls, hundreds of thousands of whom have been deported in abject slavery to the frozen wastes of Russia. How many of them are still alive no one knows.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared its independence after 160 years of Russian rule. The liberty for which generation after generation had yearned and longed for, had fought and died for, had become a reality at last. There was great rejoicing throughout the land. The nightmare of serfdom had vanished. Hopes for the future were bright indeed. Its independence had been recognized, not only by all the free nations of the world, but by the Russian Government itself. This was 4 months prior to the fall of the czarist regime in Russia.

This freedom and liberty was to be all too short-lived however, for in 1940 the present rulers of Russia, in violation of a solemn treaty with the Lithuanian people again overran its countryside, imposing a tyranny more frightful than that of the czars. The world is well aware of the torture, persecution, imprisonment, and liquidation of the clergy, both Protestant and Catholic; the shocking fate of Cardinal Mindszenty; the treacherous effort to stamp out all religion. These actions are repulsive to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. All liberties enjoyed in the brief span of years from 1918 to 1940 were obliterated. Again terror and subjugation ruled the land.

On February 16 Americans of Lithuanian extraction, together with their fellow men throughout the world will gather together, heavy of heart and saddened by the thoughts of the plight of their homeland, to recall the more pleasant moments of the joy and exultation of their relatives, friends, and neighbors in the homeland on that day 33 years ago when liberty and freedom was theirs. They will offer anew their prayers and hopes for the speedy return of the new day of liberation which must and will come to oppressed peoples of all lands, including theirs.

All history has proven that the spirit of a brave people cannot die; that it cannot be crushed by ruthless dictators, by slavery, by despotism. The flame of liberty, ingrained in the hearts and souls of people by the God of love and justice is eternal in humankind; it is the eternal, unquenchable light. It burns today in the souls of all the inhabitants of this brave little land. It may be dimmed; it may seem to have been obliterated by those who never believed in light, but it will flare anew ere long, brighter and more enduring than ever.

I join with all Lithuanian-Americans on this occasion in the fervent hope and prayer that the day of the new liberation will soon, again, bring joy and happiness to the hearts of Lithuanians wherever they may be, and that the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will become a reality to them.

Hon. Will M. Whittington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am privileged to include the resolution passed unanimously by the American Association of State Highway Officials at their thirty-sixth annual meeting, held in Miami, Fla., on December 7 last, which gives high praise to the valued services of the Honorable Will M. Whittington, chairman of the Committee on Public Works in the House.

Many tributes have been paid to our distinguished colleague who voluntarily leaves service in the House of Representatives at the conclusion of this session of the Congress. From all over the land high tribute has been paid him, and while all of us know his fine character, his strict application to duty, his loyalty to country, his enormous capacity for work, and his fine leadership, I am glad to include in these remarks this fine expression from those who know how well he handled all of the affairs of the committee, and in this instance, particularly, the wise and efficient handling of highway legislation.

The resolution follows:

Resolution 7

Resolution in appreciation of the services of the Honorable Will M. Whittington

Whereas the Honorable Will M. Whittington, Representative from Mississippi in the Congress of the United States, is retiring this year after 26 years of outstanding service in the House of Representatives, and nearly as many years of service on the Committee on Roads and as chairman of the Public Works Committee since 1948; and

Whereas in his championship of the cause of an adequate highway system, Representative Whittington made an outstanding contribution to good roads throughout the Nation; and

Whereas Mr. Whittington has at all times given wise counsel and advice and has cooperated to the greatest extent in furthering the objectives of the American Association of State Highway Officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association in convention assembled in Miami, Fla., on December 4–7, 1950, conveys to Mr. Whittington its sincere appreciation and best wishes.

Address of Chief Justice Benjamin C. Hilliard, of the Supreme Court of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address by the Honorable Benjamin C. Hilliard, member of the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado and twice chief justice thereof, and an honored member of this body serving from March 4, 1915, to March 4, 1919, and to include the introduction made by Mr. Roy G. Munroe, president of the Colorado Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, which is as follows:

For many years it has been the great privilege of the Colorado Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to have a prominent part in the annual celebration of the adoption of the Bill of Rights. It is, of course, a natural thing that the Sons of the American Revolution should be active in this celebration. Our great ancestors, of whose deeds we are so justly proud, were those men who by their bravery and their sacrifices made America a Nation. From their number came the men who met in Philadelphia and drafted the Constitution of the United States. And from their number came the leadership of the group who saw to it that the Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution almost immediately after its adoption.

This year it is our purpose, through the use of the radio and through the use of transcriptions, to bring to as many of Colorado's adults and school children as may be reached by these methods, a reminder of the great heritage we have and of the great part the Bill of Rights plays in our heritage.

We have asked one of our own members, a distinguished citizen of Colorado, and one of the Nation's outstanding jurists, to speak to us on the Bill of Rights. He brings to his discussion a lifetime of service to the people of Colorado and the United States, an intimate and almost exhaustive knowledge of the subject, and a gift of phrase which, I am sure, you will find most enjoyable.

I take great pleasure in presenting to you, to speak to us on the Bill of Rights, Mr. Chief Justice Benjamin C. Hilliard, of the Supreme Court of Colorado.

Chief Justice HILLIARD. It is, of course, a great privilege to be allowed to speak on this subject in behalf of the Sons of the American Revolution. As do all of our members, I have pride in knowing that my ancestors were among those immortals who, against almost insuperable difficulties, wrested freedom from the then most powerful nation on this earth. A bare handful of men, scattered thinly along the fringes of the Atlantic, ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed, fought and vanquished the best that Europe could send against them. Through their prowess, their perserverance, and their faith, they established that the principles which had been laid down in the Declaration of Independence were worth all that it had cost to sustain them.

As Mr. Munroe has very well said, it was from our revolutionary ancestors that we obtained the freedom, the privileges, and the blessings which are our portion. From their ranks came the men who wrote the documents which proclaimed and have preserved those freedoms, privileges, and blessings. From their minds, steeped in knowledge of the evils that must be guarded against if men are to be free, came the great American charters: The Declaration of Independence, the Northwest Ordinance, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights. And of these, the greatest is the Bill of Rights.

As we all know, when the final draft of the Constitution of the United States had been signed, on September 17, 1787, by George Washington, and the representatives of all the former colonies, save Rhode Island, it was definitely understood that safeguarding amendments were immediately to be proposed. Indeed, had it not been for the pledge that these amendments would be proposed and adopted, the Constitution would never have been ratified. The reason for this is not far to seek. It was born out of the knowledge of the leaders in the colonies that unless certain things should be forbidden the new government, it would, no matter how high might be the ideals of its sponsors, fall into the evil courses which the Revolution had been fought to avoid.

It will be remembered that the Declaration of Independence had proclaimed that certain rights are inalienable. Recall the words, the most eloquent ever penned by man: "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It was widely feared throughout all the colonies that unless the new Government, set up by the Constitution should be limited in its powers, that in time it would assume, and would be held to have, the power to trespass upon the rights which the Declaration of Independence had said should be inalienable. This fear came out of the lesson of history, that governments, unless they are circumscribed, will encroach upon and deny the rights which free men ought to have.

Hence, we find in a few short months after the Constitution was adopted the addition to it of the first ten amendments, which have come to be called, and rightly so, the Bill of Rights. Let us examine them in such detail as time will allow. Let us look at the evils they were designed to avoid. And let us look at the quaintness of their language.

An established church supported by taxation levied upon those who did not subscribe to its doctrines, was a crying evil. The first amendment forbade an established church but at the same time extended to every man the right to worship as he saw fit. Remembering the suppression of newspapers, the imprisonment of men for their opinions, the refusal of the English overlords to permit the people to assemble or to petition for redress of their grievances, the first amendment forbade the Government to abridge the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech, the right peacefully to assemble, and the right of petition. So accustomed are we to these privileges that we have forgotten where these rights come from. We should remind ourselves and, as we look about the world, consider how little of these freedoms are vouchsafed to other nations.

The right of the people to bear arms as a way of putting in the people's hands the means of resisting oppression is guaranteed by the second amendment. Quaint to our ears and strange to our present customs is the interdiction laid down in the third amendment, against the quartering of soldiers in a citizen's house. But in its time the quartering of soldiers on the citizenry was as great an evil as could be imagined. The third amendment made it an impossibility in the United States.

In many places in this world today and in the times before the American Revolution, no man was safe in his house, his effects, or his papers. In the dead of night, the dread knock on the door, and the king's officers marched in without warrant, arrested the innocent, searched his premises, destroyed his effects, and carried off his papers and his property. Since the adoption of the fourth amendment no American has had to fear those things. And, as was said of the Englishman after American example had taught the English Government what freedom means, "The wind may enter an Englishman's poor cottage, and the rain may come in, but the king cannot."

Again we are forced to remind ourselves that what we consider our natural rights are really rights hard won from oppressive governments and oppressive men. How often do we recall that before the American Revolution men were held for crimes without information or indictment; that men were tried again and again for the same offense until a conviction could be had; that men could be compelled to be witnesses against themselves; that men's property could be taken from them for governmental use without compensation; and that men could be tried for acts which were made criminal by laws passed after the acts had been committed. The fifth amendment put an end to such abuses. Is it not fitting that we should at least annually, reexamine the source of our blessings?

In times not far gone, as history goes, a man accused of crime was not entitled to a jury; he could be taken hundreds of miles from his home and friends for trial; he was not entitled to be informed of the charges made against him, nor was he permitted to have counsel; and he could not have process to compel the attendance of witnesses in his behalf. Those monstrous abuses were abolished for all time for Americans by the sixth amendment.

The right of trial by jury in civil matters is the privilege which the seventh amendment gives to Americans. How important that right is. And how little do we remember whence came that right.

It is not long ago either when men could be imprisoned without the right of bail, tried unfairly and unjustly, fined excessively, and punished in cruel and unusual ways. Under the eighth amendment such things cannot—and do not—happen in the United States of America.

And finally the Bill of Rights contains the ninth and tenth amendments. Some writers have endeavored to say that the Bill of Rights is composed of only the first eight amendments. In a narrow sense, in the sense that the first eight deal with the rights of individuals, something may be said for that view. In the larger, and more accurate sense, however, the last two amendments are as important as the others and do confer and preserve rights which otherwise would not be ours.

Says the ninth amendment, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." That is a rule of construction. It was intended to—and it does—discourage the usurpation of rights which the people reserved to themselves. And, finally, the tenth amendment provides that powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited by the Constitution to the States, are reserved to the States or the people. Again, a rule of construction, so that the general Government may not usurp that which belongs to the States or the people.

The great blessing which has come to the American people is not the fact that our rights and privileges are set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It is the fact that we have the courage and the tenacity to uphold those privileges. A constitution means nothing, a bill of rights means nothing, if the people do not demand and receive the rights which those documents provide.

There is no doubt that in the United States the people do demand and do receive their rights. That they do, if, considering my office, properly I may say, I think is due in great measure to the American courts. The courts of this country have been steadfast in preserving the sanctity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Many attempts have been made to thwart, to override, to evade the Constitution, but the courts have turned these efforts aside. That these attempts always arise in cases of great emergency makes the refusal of the courts to permit them a further tribute to the American judiciary. It can be summed up very fairly by a quotation from a decision of the Colorado Supreme Court handed down during the dark days of the great depression of the 1930's. The court said:

"* * * We must declare without hesitation that which our function demands. We pronounce as the most certain of law that there has never been, and can never be, an emergency confronting the State that will warrant the servants of the Constitution waiving so much as a word of its provisions. Armed men may destroy the Government. Military rule, or the rule of the mob, may replace the orderly processes that have been our fortune since sovereignty was granted us by the United States. But no species of reasoning, no ingenuity of construction, no degree of emergency can persuade us that the Constitution is without potency or dissuade us from performing our duty as its sworn officers."

So long as there are American courts and American judges, the liberties, the lives, and the happiness of the American people will be sustained, for the Bill of Rights will be safe and will be enforced.

Conservation Paying Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the critical emergency which faces the United States and all of the free world, awakens us to the need for conservation. It applies to industrial production, manpower, money, energy, and natural resources.

Even before the present emergency we were hearing stern warnings that we were using up the Nation's productive soil and that unless we practiced sound conservation measures the time was not too far distant when the Nation would be forced to turn elsewhere for part of its food supply. In our own Ninth District of Texas we have seen the initiation of sound soil-conservation practices.

A recent report from one of the districts inspired an editorial in the Rosenberg Herald, a grass-roots weekly published in Fort Bend County. Because it points out how well the soil-conservation program works, I take pleasure in inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information and enlightenment of every Member of Congress:

CONSERVATION PAYING OFF

The old adage that "the proof of the pudding is in the eating" is proving to be very true in the case of the Coastal Plains Soil Conservation District. Organized in the early part of 1941, the 1950 report, just released, reveals very clearly that soil-conservation work in Fort Bend County is paying off. Those responsible for the work of the district state that they feel that they are making and will continue to make steady progress toward the ultimate goal of improving the land and the productivity of the soil.

They have the proof, such as the 30-bushel-per-acre increase in corn production by Louis Rand after applying phosphate and planting legumes; the 199-percent increase in cotton production in 5 years after completing conservation plans on the J. E. Junker farm; the increased beef and dairy production reported by the ones who have taken their conservation work seriously; the $300,000 increase in income to the cooperators of the district; and many other things outlined in their lengthy report.

Soil conservation and all the various practices connected with it are paying off in Fort Bend County, and we predict that in future years Fort Bend will be a more prosperous county and have a more stable economy as the result of the splendid work that has been done.

Speaker Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, great honor to a man is never so deeply felt, nor so long remembered, as when it is bestowed upon him by the people of his own State.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who now has presided over this Congress longer than any other man, won at an early age the love and respect of the people of Texas. Now the whole Nation honors him.

SAM RAYBURN cherishes his home folks in Texas.

What Texas thinks of SAM RAYBURN is contained in a magnificent document for all to see. This document is House Concurrent Resolution 22, adopted by the Texas House of Representatives on February 5, 1951, and concurred in by the Texas Senate on February 6, 1951. The document referred to voices the feeling of the great State of Texas for its distinguished son.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD a copy of that resolution of the Texas Legislature:

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Whereas Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Bonham, broke an historic American record of 100 years' standing established by Henry Clay when he sat for the three thousand and fifty-seventh day as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and

Whereas he is admired and respected in the Congress by Democrats and Republicans alike for his patience, fairness, forthrightness, and ability as the presiding officer of the United States House of Representatives; and

Whereas he is one of the greatest statesmen of modern times, using wisely and effectively the powers and prerogatives of the high and honorable office he holds; and

Whereas he is not simply the holder of the Speakership tenure record, but is a warm-hearted, gracious gentleman, second in line of Presidential succession; and

Whereas Hon. SAM RAYBURN served as a member of the house of representatives of the State of Texas with honor and distinction in the thirtieth, thirty-first, and thirty-second legislatures and was elevated to the coveted speakership by his colleagues in the thirty-second legislature, 1911; and

Whereas Texans everywhere are justly proud of SAM RAYBURN and his unparalleled record of unselfish and devoted public service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Texas (the senate concurring), That the legislature join with the citizens of Texas and all true Americans in congratulating SAM RAYBURN on the occasion of his three thousand and fifty-seventh day as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America and in commending his great devotion and service to the principles of Americanism; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
ROBERT E. SCHTERPITH,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 22 was adopted by the House on February 5, 1951.

[SEAL] CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 22 was adopted by the Senate on February 6, 1951.

LOYCE M. BELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

A Hard Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Alabama Courier on February 1, 1951. Mr. Steele McGrew, editor of this progressive and outstanding weekly newspaper, has written this splendid and pertinent editorial, and I wish to bring it to the attention of the Members:

A HARD DECISION

No parent wants the blood of an 18-year-old son shed on a far-flung battlefield. No person wants boys' lives snuffed out in war, whatever the age of the boy, unless that person is bestial.

The world's majority of people want peace, but peace they do not have, nor does it seem likely that peace is likely to come in the immediate future. Authorities say, therefore, that it becomes necessary to build an army of such strength that the 18-year-olds, their younger and older brothers, their parents and neighbors, may be safe from the enemy.

Lack of preparation now may lead to defeat later, should full war come to us. And, a defeated nation not only counts the terrific loss of life of those in battle, but also the infants, women, and old in the overrun land, as well as the principles for which it fought.

Also, when a country is faced with defeat, it drafts into service manpower that goes much below the 18-year-olds, as a last, desperate stand. This would be intolerable, but possible.

It is not an emotional battle we must fight with ourselves as much as one that concerns our depth of thinking for the safety of everyone. If we shudder at the fate of drafting 18-year-olds, would we not rather, through contemplating deeply the over-all conditions, have such an armed force in this country that the fate might not be possible due to our power?

If it is necessary, in order to insure our success, perhaps these boys should be drafted so that they may be well trained and able to hold their own, more safely and surely, and ready to meet an emergency.

None of us like to see them drafted, but it might be the wiser course in the final outcome.

Lincoln—Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an excerpt from the column, Taylor Made, published in the Grafton News, of Grafton, W. Va. This very popular feature is written by Mr. Charles W. T. Lockard, publisher of the Grafton News, and one of the finest weekly newspapermen in West Virginia, follows:

The current observance of the birthday of the now admittedly great Abraham Lincoln causes us to reflect and call the attention of our Republican friends on the similarities of Lincoln and President Truman. Both are men of the people; both were of humble birth; both received meager education; both failed in private business; both were or are the object of bitter ridicule; both were or are unpopular with the majority of the press of their day; both are said to be men of strong will; both are known champions of human liberty and freedom, regardless of race, color, or religion; both suffered antagonists within and without their parties; both had assassin's shots directed at them by fanatics (Lincoln was a shot victim, but Truman's would-be assassin was a poor

shot); Lincoln fought a dogged and determined battle to bring peace and freedom to all the people of this Nation and engaged in a war to accomplish this end; President Truman is now fighting a dogged and determined battle to bring peace and freedom to all the peoples of the world through the United Nations and is sending our fighting men to war to accomplish this aim; the fiscal policies of both were or are under attack; the administrations of both men are or were accused of committing great blunders. But today, Lincoln, who was hated in his day, was honored some generations later now has a great national shrine in his honor on the banks of the Potomac. Truman, fighting the same battle as Lincoln fought—but on a larger scale—is today getting the same treatment from his people as Lincoln did some 80-odd years ago. Many of us will live to see Truman honored as Lincoln now is. So think it over boys. Lincoln, a berated man in his time, is a great man in the eyes of posterity. Truman, too, is an equally great man and history will prove it. Just you wait and see.

Founding the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune and president of the Washington Times-Herald, Inc., delivered last night on the Chicago Theater of the Air over WEAM and the Mutual Broadcasting System:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 11, 1951]

FOUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

(By Col. Robert R. McCormick)

How our country was formed is certainly the most interesting and important story in the world. It is also the most important because it shows the unique conditions which made this particular United States possible.

The beginning of the movement was, of course, the departures from England—not only the original settlements of the individual colonies but the later migrations. The English settlements were predominantly made under charters of the Stuart kings. There were also Dutch and Swedish settlements, and French in Maine and South Carolina, abutting on Spanish colonies. The charters varied from the fantastic feudal ones of the Carolinas to the near republics of Connecticut and Rhode Island.

The first settlement, of course, was Virginia, which started out as an adventure in quest of gold and the subjugation of the natives. To this came a number of Englishmen ranking as gentlemen. In the absence of a nobility, they developed into a self-conscious aristocracy wearing, at the time of the Revolution, silk clothes and lace cuffs. The great political philosopher, Mason, preacher of equality, would have the sheriff summon the common people to listen to him. The self-made aristocrats of Virginia were the first to resent airs of superiority from England.

The New Englanders were tradesmen, people of the middle class. They gladly elected Bradford, the only gentleman among them, governor. Development of a merchant marine gave to them a hierarchial structure and a sense of discipline not shared by the New England farmers.

New York had English and Dutch aristocracies, composed of the recipients of large land grants; the former, grateful for their given wealth, became Tories and their descendants are still Tories.

Maryland was founded as a refuge for Catholics, and Pennsylvania as a home for Quakers and all other dissenters. A special character was imparted to western Pennsylvania and western Virginia by Scotch-Irish descending from the clan system rather than the feudal system of England. In Pennsylvania they quarreled with the Quakers over representation in the legislature. In Virginia they practiced their religion in defiance of the law of the Colony.

As we know, there were 13 colonies planted by England. A fourteenth, Nova Scotia, was planted by Scotland. It is not so generally known that they were inhabited by 14 nationalities: English, Scotch, Scotch-Irish, Irish, Welsh, Dutch, Swedish, Jews, Palatines, Swiss, French, Spanish, Russians, and Portuguese. Governor Oglethorpe brought with him to Georgia a guard of German mercenaries. They readily became assimilated.

Among all of these people, the only ones well disposed toward the mother country were some members of the Church of England. The others were all indifferent, cold, or hostile. There was considerable migration from the West Indies and between the Colonies. Puritans from New England imparted to the Church of England in Virginia a puritanism nonexistent at home.

Though there was little love of England, the different races, religions, and Colonies were slow to combine. The New England Colonies formed the New England Confederation to fight the Dutch and French, and later to fight the Indians, but it did not last.

Plans of colonial union were presented by Penn in 1696, Franklin in 1754, and Galloway in 1774 on the verge of the Revolution, but none of them was adopted, although Galloway's received only one vote less than a majority in the Continental Congress.

At different times, every Colony except Georgia was in revolt, beginning with Bacon's rebellion in Virginia in 1676. New England and New York rebelled against Governor Andros. Puritans in New Jersey revolted against the proprietors. The Scotch-Irish in Pennsylvania made an unofficial war on the Indians. There were the revolts against the Calverts in Maryland and, just before the Revolution, the Regulators of North Carolina fought a losing battle against the governor.

The Colonies were held to England in their fear of France and Spain, and England used them in her plans for further conquest. Only the northern Colonies from Massachusetts to Virginia fought the French. Only the southern Colonies fought the Spaniards, and South Carolina built a navy and fought the pirates.

In the absence of a nobility owning almost all property, the Colonies had a tendency to follow Pennsylvania in mitigating the harsh British criminal laws and laws against debtors.

After the defeat of France and Spain in 1763, neither Colonies nor mother country had the same need of each other. The King and Parliament took an increasingly overbearing attitude while the Colonies became more and more independent. Governor Dunmore, in his colonial victory over the Indians at Point Pleasant, had opened the way across the Appalachian Mountains. Settlements were made in the West and land speculation became common.

At the same time that the Parliament began to interfere more and more with colonial trade and taxes, the king proclaimed that the land west of the height of land was part of Quebec and not to be settled by the English-speaking colonials, while a revival of Church of England domination threatened to force conformity upon the Lutherans, Catholics, and the Calvinists of different degree of Calvinism who were thus driven together.

The first serious infringement upon colonial rights was the tax on molasses. This was passed before the defeat of France and was not enforced partly because of the need of conciliating the Colonies during the French war. It was followed by the stamp tax, including a tax on newspapers. This led to the first step toward union, the stamp-tax congress, participated in by nine Colonies, and prevented the appointed officials from operating.

After its repeal, the Townsend acts were passed, claiming the right and power of Parliament to tax the Colonies. The decisive act was the tax on tea. The killing of various citizens in a collision between the soldiers and a mob, called the Boston Massacre, added fuel to the flames. Later came the destruction of the British warship *Gaspee* in Rhode Island and the Boston Tea Party.

The association was created by the first Continental Congress, attended by 12 Colonies and a representative of one Georgia county, to prevent intercourse with England and to prevent the purchase of tea in the Colonies.

Nonintercourse at this time, as again before the War of 1812, was much more harmful to British than to American interests, in that it acted as a protective tariff under which American industries were started.

Washington's militia saved the British regulars after Braddock's defeat. Colonial troops prevented Montcalm from pursuing the regulars after his victory at Ticonderoga. Washington took Fort Duquesne after Major Grant was beaten by the French and Indians Jon Bradstreet made the decisive capture of Fort Frontenac, while, as we have seen before, Sir William Johnson took Fort Niagara and was decisive in the capture of Montreal.

The war against Spain was carried on entirely by Colonials, although some of the time under the leadership of Governor Oglethorpe.

In spite of these facts, upon which the British Government had acted during the crisis, after the victory was won the British conceived a wholesale contempt and hatred for colonial soldiers. Even the defeated Major Grant said in Parliament: "That they were not soldiers, and never could be made so, being naturally pusillanimous and incapable of discipline; that a very slight force would be more than sufficient for their complete reduction."

The capture of Burgoyne and Cornwallis and all of the British guard regiments at Yorktown failed to change this attitude. The naval victories of 1812 and Jackson's defeat of Wellington's peninsular veterans at New Orleans are ignored. After the Civil War, Lord Wolesley said one Regular Army corps could have ended the war in a few months. Our winning of World War I and World War II has not changed it. Derogatory remarks have been heard within the last few weeks.

After Lexington and Concord, there was a wave of independence sentiment which forced the British governors to take refuge in warships or become prisoners.

The siege of Boston compelled the appointment of a commander in chief by the Second Continental Congress, which, however, was only arrived at after much hesitation. The actual conduct of war, necessitating foreign loans and foreign alliances, again made independence necessary and occasioned our first great document, the Declaration of Independence. Conduct of the war under the Continental Congress led to the next step—the Confederation—which, as I have said before, was not the weak instrument it has been called but one under which the country

might have been ruled if Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton had been in that Government. The Confederation passed the ordinance for the Northwest Territory, providing for the admission of more States into the Federation and these to be free States. Moreover, it called the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution was followed by the Bill of Rights, thus making our free and independent Republic.

Even then it took a great Civil War to free the slaves.

This is the long, hard history of our Government not paralleled by any other in the world. No other country wants to copy it. On the contrary, all countries want to draw us into a world government, modeled on their own evil institutions, and American Tories are plotting to that end in this country.

A Way Must Be Worked Out To Teach More Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Journal of Monday, February 12, 1951:

A WAY MUST BE WORKED OUT TO TEACH MORE DOCTORS

Financial necessity has forced the University of Louisville medical school to increase its tuition fees to $300 a year for Kentucky students, and $1,200 a year for students from out of State. From any aspect, this is disturbing news. Raising tuition rates may save the school from financial collapse, but it will not serve the purpose for which medical schools are established. It will not increase enrollment or help to ease Kentucky's doctor shortage. It will give the son of wealthy parents an unfair advantage over the boy of ambition and ability. Indeed, it will make it practically impossible for the son of the average Kentucky family to become a doctor.

This situation is not, of course, confined to Kentucky. The same thing is happening to medical schools all over the country. And unless medicine is to become the private province of the privileged few, something must be done soon to help the medical schools meet higher operating costs and still enlarge their enrollments.

For the second time within the past 2 years a bill has been introduced in the Senate to establish a Federal-aid program to train more doctors, dentists, and nurses. The men who framed the bill have wisely avoided any mention of health insurance or any of the other controversial measures which the medical profession has repeatedly condemned as leading to socialized medicine. Instead, the bill seeks merely to help existing medical schools remedy the national shortage of medical personnel. It would grant $10,000,000 a year to medical schools for expansion of training facilities and $41,000,000 a year for scholarships and financial aid to schools.

Like its predecessor, this measure was inspired by experiences during World War II, when it became painfully obvious that we did not have enough doctors, dentists, and nurses to protect the health both of the civilian population and an expanded military force. And chances for the bill's passage are undoubtedly improved by the difficulty the Armed Forces are having now in recruiting enough medical personnel.

This shortage is nothing new. In 1948 an official of the American Medical Association testified before a Senate subcommittee that we would need an additional 38,000 doctors by 1960 to supply civilian needs. Many medical authorities have contended this figure was too low. At any rate, we have not increased our output of doctors. On the contrary, enrollment has been cut back in many medical schools because of inflated operating costs. As a result, the Federal Security Administration has estimated that by 1960 we will have a shortage of at least 27,000 doctors, 23,000 dentists, and 163,000 nurses. If 20 percent of medical personnel is required for military service, the shortage will be commensurately worse.

It is doubtful that the limited Federal aid bill proposed can correct this deficiency. Two years ago the chairman of the American Medical Association's Council on Education testified that American medical schools needed an additional $15,000,000 annually to operate at the 1948 rate of production, and that they were desperately in need of $200,000,000 for enlargements. Since then, of course, these needs have grown with the increased costs of building and operation. But this is a situation accumulated over 50 years, and cannot be remedied overnight. The bill proposed will make a positive and vigorous start.

It will be interesting to see how the AMA reacts to the challenge. Doctors, of course, will benefit from the bill as much as will the American people. But you may recall that the AMA lobby managed to defeat a similar bill in 1949 on the excuse that, while the bill itself was innocuous it might lead to greater Government participation in the medical scene.

Since then our shortage of doctors has led the American people to wonder whether Government participation, to the extent of enlarging medical schools, is not essential. Such conservative voices as those of Senators TAFT and DONNELL have spoken for the Federal aid program. Herbert Hoover has warned that "our medical educational system is woefully inadequate for the conduct of national defense * * * and is doubly inadequate for the needs of our people generally." Deans of both public and private medical schools have endorsed the program almost unanimously, and even the AMA has recognized the need for action by voting $500,000 for a medical school fund. Its conduct concerning this latest bill will be revealing.

The Military Manpower Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this week, after more than 5 weeks of intensive study and hearings, the Senate Armed Services Committee ordered reported by unanimous vote, 13 to 0, a bill to provide the Nation with a realistic program for raising and maintaining the military manpower strength required for the national defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the leading papers of the Nation regarding the manpower hearings and bills.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 11, 1951]

FOR THE NATION'S SAFETY

A Senate subcommittee has rounded out a month's hearings on the proposal to set up a program of universal military service and training. The group's findings now give substantial support to the plan as submitted by Defense Secretary Marshall. Some minor modifications have been recommended, and there may be further changes before the plan takes form in legislation, but thus far it has remained relatively intact. It calls for the induction of young men at 18 years for a period of training and service of about 2 years. After that they will pass into an available reserve. A small group, with special qualifications, will receive advanced technical training and be available for specialized services.

The Senate group has opened its doors to a wide range of opinion and judgment. The hearings have not been hasty, and there has been no evidence of predisposition or bias. Secretary Marshall and his assistant, Mrs. Rosenberg, have been questioned closely and at length on various aspects and implications of the program. There has been an obvious and highly commendable attitude of taking this very serious problem seriously. If the ultimate finding and the action based on it bring this plan into operation, we believe that the cause of the Nation's safety will have been well and thoughtfully served.

It should be borne in mind that this is not in itself an emergency program, although the circumstances that have brought it to this stage may be critical. It is not the purpose of this plan suddenly to raise a huge army to meet an instant need. That emergent character belongs rather to such operations as the Selective Service Act, whose purpose has been to deliver a required volume of manpower at a given moment. The universal service plan, in contrast, proposes to assure a steady flow of available manpower over a considerable period of time. It stems from the realization that we face a long-range as well as an immediate threat and must plan accordingly.

Two fears have been expressed in regard to this planning. The first is the feeling that the 18-year age level may be too low. The second is that a program of universal service may in some way undermine the democratic character of our state and our society. In our view, both of these fears are sufficiently groundless to be outweighed by the necessity for action.

The 18-year level is not an innovation. It is the age at which young men have been made liable for military service in each of the world wars. If our young men at that age were able to be soldiers in the time of combat they are able to become soldiers now in the time of peril. Their older brothers who were inducted at 18 have the right to expect that this group of young Americans can be called upon for service as readily as were its predecessors.

The 18-year level is a logical dividing place in our society and in our educational pattern. It marks the point at which an interruption can be made with the least likelihood of permanent dislocation. Our colleges and universities are prepared to make required adaptations to this program, and our society as a whole can likewise meet this required change in the normal course of civilian life.

We believe, moreover, that our democratic society can well meet any threat to its survival posed by a system of universal military training. There is no tendency to glorify a military caste or clique. There is no desire to perpetuate a system of training for one moment longer than it is imperative. The threat to our survival is from without rather than from within and we must be strong to meet that threat. We may hope that the strength thus created may help to avoid the necessity for using that strength in battle. We know that we cannot hope for peace if we are weak. We may be able to keep the peace if we are sufficiently strong.

Finally, the essential idea of truly universal service is more democratic than a program of selection to raise an emergency army. Universal training and service can spread the physical burden of defense on the broadest possible base. It can do that, also, if the idea now being applied to the Armed Forces is applied, in spirit, to the whole of the body politic. The duty of defense is universal, just as the privileges that accrue from the liberties defended are universal. The plan for the armed services should be a symbol, in one field, of a state of mind and spirit that applies to all fields and to every citizen, of whatever age.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 15, 1951]

THE TIMES DEMAND IT

In both an immediate and long-term sense, the military manpower bill just approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee is so well tailored to these dangerously uncertain and explosive times that Congress as a whole should feel impelled to adopt it, or something very much like it, by an overwhelming vote.

Formally entitled "The Universal Military Training and Service Act," the bill is the end-result of more than a month of intensive and painstaking effort by the committee's preparedness subcommittee headed by Senator JOHNSON of Texas. Although its authors do not claim perfection for it, its critics will be hard put to show how any of its essentials can be cut away without leaving the security of the Nation on a woefully weak foundation.

For the bill, as explained in an admirably lucid and convincing statement by Senator JOHNSON, provides for two things that are absolutely indispensable to the safety of the United States in the kind of world we have now and the kind of world we are likely to have for years to come. The first is the manpower that is needed immediately to cope with the present crisis. And the second is the reservoir of trained strength that we must build up if we are to be adequately prepared to avert grave perils in the future.

Accordingly, to meet the immediate need for a minimum of 3,500,000 men in the Armed Forces by next June, the bill would lower the present induction age and authorize Selective Service to take 18-year-olds, but with this important proviso: That they would be called after, and only after, the manpower supply in the older groups had been exhausted. The first to go would be all the unmarried and physically fit, aged 19 through 25. Next in line would be all the 19-through-25 single youths with physical defects not serious enough to disqualify them from limited duty. Finally, before any 18-year-olds were drafted, all married individuals in the eligible bracket would be called, except fathers and veterans.

As for the long-range security objective, the bill would provide as follows: (1) Upon completing his tour of active duty (36 months, including 2 months of leave), each man trained for service would move into the Reserve for 6 years—an arrangement insuring the retention of soldierly skills and creating what Senator JOHNSON has called a predictable, dependable, constant, ever-ready force of militarily seasoned manpower serving as a base for strategic planning against future dangers. And (2) when the need for rapid mobilization ceases (in which case authority would exist to end the draft and shorten the 36-month service period), there would be established a program of universal training to guarantee the continued maintenance of adequate Reserves—a system which we should have long since put into operation.

Everything considered, the major provisions of this bill—under which most of the men affected would serve in the Army, because the Navy and Air Force are built on long-term enlistees—seem definitely to be quite as sound and as fair as they are essential. As far as the current situation is concerned, who can doubt that prompt affirmative action on just such legislation is sorely needed? After all, in Senator JOHNSON's words, we have suffered about 50,000 casualties in Korea, we have only one ready division available for the defense of our country, and we are engaged in an inescapable struggle for survival—a struggle whose end is not in sight. And so—whether we like it or not—we must build up our military manpower, and we must do it as quickly as we can.

Of course, there is always the possibility that world tensions will suddenly ease and that the size of our Armed Forces in being will be out of proportion to our security needs. At the moment, however, no possibility could seem more remote than that, and what we must keep in mind, in any event, is that the sooner we develop military strength of the sort envisioned in the proposed bill, the better chance there will be to avert new Koreas and the catastrophe of a global war.

Clearly, this is no time for half measures. As Senator JOHNSON has said, "It is better for a prudent nation to have and not need, than to need and not have. Too often, the strength of American arms has been paper strength. Our greatest peril has been our own lack of preparation for hours of peril." Let us profit therefore from our past mistakes and do all that the present hour requires.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 14, 1951]

SOLID CORNERSTONE

The military manpower bill which, among other things, lowers the draft age to 18, is now before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In a notably clear statement on reporting the bill, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, which heard more than 100 witnesses, summarized:

"The choice is before us: We must have the men. Shall we call again upon our generation of veterans or shall we ask of the 18-year-olds the service which, in all moments of peril, our men have traditionally provided at age 18?

"Will you face the veteran father, his wife and family, and tell him he must again enter service because you are unwilling to require service of the unmarried 18-year-olds? That is the choice.

"I believe this is a good bill, an enduring bill, a wholly fair piece of legislation which can be a solid cornerstone to a half century of American strength."

The weight of evidence and testimony, in this newspaper's opinion, strongly supports these conclusions. The bill for universal military service and training, beginning at 18, should be passed.

[From the Chicago News of January 10, 1951]

FUTURE LEADERS

Congress will be called to referee a contest for the 18-year-old boys, and decide whether they shall go into colleges, into the armed services, into industry, or into some form of military training exempted from immediate combat.

It is a knotty problem and there will be no unanimity on the solution. But one thing we could learn from Russia is that an abundant supply of new engineers and technicians of all kinds should be a primary consideration. The Soviets are training 100,000 a year, several times the output of our own technical schools.

In time of war, the claim of the Armed Forces to the 18-year-olds is soundly based. At that age they have the resilience, the adaptability, the quick reflexes that—with proper training—make the ideal soldier.

A proposal for a year of compulsory military training for 18-year-olds is already before Congress. The bill calls for 4 months of active training and 8 months of academic courses. Thereafter, if need arose, the trainees would be expected to volunteer, or be drafted.

Any program of universal training runs up against the problem of finding instructors and housing. With the Armed Forces in the process of expanding to a total of 3,500,000 men and women, neither camps nor instructors enough to do the job properly will be available.

Representative VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has criticized the present practice of deferring college students. He contends that this amounts to an exemption for the sole reason that a youth can afford to continue his schooling.

A proposal which answers many of these objections is for a revival of something like the Students Army Training Corps of World War I. If the million youths turning 18 each year were given college aptitude tests, the top fifth, say, could be given deferments to enter college—with scholarships when necessary—for technical or professional training.

Those who failed to make the grade would take their places with the noncollege group, subject to military service or to such deferment as essential industry might dictate. Graduates would be subject either to military call, or to civilian service where needed.

None of these proposals is free from objections, and some injustice is doubtless inherent in all. Nevertheless, consideration of our long-range manpower problems makes it essential to come to grips with the problem. Any system will probably give some breaks to the more talented. But that is the way of the world, and those who get the advantages may be expected to return the favor by their services to society in the future.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of January 12, 1951]

EVERYBODY'S OBLIGATION

Everyone who is aware of America's tradition as a nonmilitary Nation will contemplate with regret the proposal for compulsory military service for every physically fit American boy of 18.

Nevertheless no one can doubt what Defense Secretary Marshall told the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee when he outlined the proposal: "The tensions that unsettle the world may persist through the lifetime of many of us."

That argues strongly for a permanent program. Along with it must go arrangements for everyone to bear his share of the job of making the Nation strong. There are military desk jobs that the physically unfit can do.

Looking back at the lessons taught by World War I, President Harding said in his inaugural address that:

"There is something inherently wrong, something out of accord with the ideals of representative democracy when one portion of our citizenship turns its activity to private gain amid defensive war, while another is fighting, sacrificing, or dying for national preservation."

Before the Senate subcommittee, Assistant Defense Secretary Anna Rosenberg asserted that the proposal "embodies the concept of universal participation and equal obligation."

Congress, when it writes a universal military service law, must steadfastly uphold that concept.

[From the Des Moines Register of January 12, 1951]

GENERAL MARSHALL'S DRAFT PLAN

There is no doubt that if we must maintain a high level of military preparedness in the years immediately ahead the fairest distribution of this burden upon our population can be achieved by the automatic draft of young men at a specified age.

General Marshall, Secretary of Defense, thinks the proper age is 18, and his Assistant Secretary for Manpower is therefore introducing in Congress a universal training and service program toward this end. Under it the draftees would be liable, at present, for 2¼ years of service. Those physically unfit for military duty would not necessarily be exempted, but assigned to service jobs compatible with their physical condition.

And because the Defense Department would be taking over young men at the age when normally many would be entering college, the plan is to send up to 50,000 of those on active duty into universities and colleges for special training. Eligible men already in higher education would be deferred in some cases or embraced in an expanded ROTC program, and the Federal Government would undertake to provide more scholarships for talented young men than in the past.

It is perfectly obvious that this kind of program would spread access to college education over a much wider cross-section of the American population in the long run. It would make the availability of higher education hinge more nearly on merit and less on economic circumstances. And this is a thing that some of our leading educators, including President Conant, of Harvard, have been driving at for a long time.

There are going to be a lot of us who dislike the prospect of universal military training, even for this extended emergency period. But if we are agreed that we must have the trained manpower, then the real problem is to get it in the way which will be most just to the whole population.

Under the Marshall proposal, the President would be authorized to reduce the service period to 6 months as soon as circumstances permit. Naturally, we will all hope, for every reason, that such a state of the world develops—the sooner the better.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of January 15, 1951]

TO SURVIVE IN FREEDOM WE'LL NEED UMS

If the United States is to survive in freedom its young men will have to devote some of the best years of their young manhood to its defense. This will be true whether the Communists limit their attacks to a series of local wars or plunge the whole world into a war to the death.

The American people cannot hope to preserve their free institutions in the critical years ahead unless at least several million men at all times are ready to go into action at a moment's notice and at least several million more constantly will be fit for active service on very short notice.

Those responsible for national defense feel they must have at least 3,463,000 men in active service by June 30. Marked deterioration in our relations with the Soviet power would require considerably larger Armed Forces. That size military establishment cannot be wholly manned by professionals. It cannot be staffed by volunteers. The only sound and equitable system of raising sufficient men for the Armed Forces in such a situation is compulsory universal military service.

The Tribune did not favor the sort of universal military training which was proposed before the crisis took such a grave turn. The training proposed under such schemes would not have produced soldiers fit for combat. The system would have been wasteful of the time of the youth being thus trained. It would have wasted the time of the men required to give such half-baked training. It would have wasted taxpayers' money without giving the Nation a dependable supply of well-trained troops available for service wherever needed.

The plan for universal military service drafted by Defense Secretary Marshall and Assistant Defense Secretary Rosenberg, which is now being considered by the Senate Armed Services Committee, is quite another matter. It is presented in quite a different world climate.

Without undertaking to say at this time whether the plan is correct in every particular we do not hesitate to endorse its broad concepts and recommend its speedy adoption in substantially its present form.

We are open to conviction as to whether our young men should become liable for military service at 18, as the committee proposes, or 18½, as many Members of Congress seem to favor; whether the period of active service should be 27 months, as the plan now proposes, or could safely be fixed at 24 months.

We are open to conviction as to whether the plan sufficiently provides for a continuing supply of men trained to serve the Nation as physicians, scientists, engineers, technicians, and in other skills which can be acquired only through prolonged training.

Such phases are subject to revision in the light of expert advice and experience.

What the citizen needs most to bear in mind is that the plan is a well-considered effort to provide the Nation with the soldiers it needs in a manner fairest to all and least likely to dislocate the lives of individuals or society in general.

It is hard for most American youths to leave home to serve in the Armed Forces at any age. It is hard for their parents, girl friends, schools, or employers to see them go away at any time. But it is imperative henceforth that millions of them go and go regularly. The age being considered is the one at which the going should cause least hardship and the Armed Forces can be provided with the sort of men they most need.

The plan is designed to avoid an aristocracy of either education or wealth. It envisages sound defense now and in the future at a price the Nation can afford to pay by providing a beginning rate of pay of $30 a month. Most of the nations of the world have had such systems (with much lower compensation) for many generations. Neutral countries such as Switzerland and Sweden require such service of their youth. The world's foremost democracy can ask no less of its youth in time of peril.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 12, 1951]

NO CHEAP SOLUTION

This country at last seems on the point of adopting a sound and sensible draft policy. The proposal set forth in Washington by Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall for a draft of 450,000 18-year-olds not only offers an effective means of meeting our present military requirements, it also provides a solid basis for a continuing system of service which outside pressures may force this country to retain for many years to come.

The prospect of sending all our young men into the armed services is essentially so repugnant to American hopes and ideals that we have deferred confronting it until the last possible moment. Homes which 10 years ago sent their children into uniform—for the last time, they hoped—are once again called upon to undergo pain and sacrifice. Secretary Marshall himself summarized the situation succinctly when he said: "I do not present it as a cheap solution, but there is no cheap or easy solution to our present security problems." Once we accept this hard fact, there is nothing left to do but see to it that the draft system is adequate, equitable, and honest.

The new Marshall plan meets all these requirements. It largely follows the recommendations set forth by the Committee on the Present Danger, headed by President James B. Conant, of Harvard University. Service is to be universal. Provision is made for deferment of those research workers and scientists currently working on vital projects. Interference with education is held to the minimum commensurate with establishment of an army well fortified in man power and brain power. This means that students now in college will be able to complete their academic year; that up to 50,000 men in service can be sent to college for special training; that 75,000 men a year can be deferred for scientific studies after first undergoing a 4-month basic military training course. Even these arrangements will make things difficult for many educational institutions, particularly the smaller colleges, but this simply is one more adjustment that will have to be added to a steadily growing list which all Americans are being called upon to make.

Speedy enactment of the Marshall proposals into law will constitute a key victory in our struggle for survival. Like all victories, it demands a heavy price, but there is no alternative to paying it.

Addresses at Reception of the Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1951, the Democratic National Committee gave a reception at the Shoreham Hotel to the Democratic Members of Congress.

The guests of honor were President Harry S. Truman, Vice President Alben W. Barkley, and our own genial and highly respected Speaker, Sam Rayburn. Our national chairman, William M. Boyle, Jr., presided.

I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD their remarks on that occasion. I commend them to the attention of all:

Chairman BOYLE. First on behalf of the Democratic National Committee and for myself personally I wish to express our deepest appreciation for your attendance here tonight. We are here tonight as Democrats to honor and to show by our presence here that we revere and back with our minds and our full strength, and our loyalty, three great Americans, three of the greatest Americans of our times, three of the greatest Americans of all times—the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House.

This great gathering tonight of the leadership of the Democratic Party, of the Members of the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, members of the Cabinet, heads of the Government departments, shows to the world and to the United States a determined effort on the part of the Democratic Party to band together, to bring to America the security that she needs now in this time of stress. Today we are Americans before we belong to any political party. For the Government to function we must have a strong, vigorous party behind the Administration in power to make it effective.

You by your presence here tonight indicate that backing that is so necessary for the

President to be able to function in the executive department properly and also to back up the leadership that you have under Vice President BARKLEY, ERNEST MCFARLAND, and LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate, Speaker RAYBURN, JOHN MCCORMACK, PERCY PRIEST in the House of Representatives.

In 1913 two great Americans came to Washington to represent two great States. One of those men went on to become the Vice President of the United States. Ladies and gentlemen, Vice President of the United States BARKLEY:

Vice President BARKLEY. Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, and fellow statemen, Bill Boyle was supposed to present the Speaker at this time and give me an opportunity to answer him. Now he's twisted it around so that SAM can take my measure. And I want to say to you, SAM, in advance that I'm going to be awfully easy on you.

Now I'm going to say just a word more or less seriously. I deeply appreciate the compliment paid to SAM RAYBURN and me by the chairman when he said that in 1913 two great statesmen arrived in Washington—one of them from Texas and the other one from Kentucky. That was our opinion of ourselves when we arrived, and neither of us has had any occasion to change our viewpoint since.

Well, it's been a great pleasure for me to parallel SAM RAYBURN here for the last 38 years. I dare say that no two men in the history of Congress ever had such parallel careers and SAM and I have had. We came in at the same time, were sworn in on the same day, were assigned to the same committee—Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—and it being a major committee we could only have that one place. I outranked him because my name began with B and his with R, and then when I got off of the committee and went to the Senate, that made him ranking member. I got out of his way. He quit tramping on my heels—I thought for good. Well, he became chairman when the Democrats came into control of the committee. He became the majority leader of the House and I became majority leader of the Senate, and we worked together—when we were Members of the House together in the Wilson administration—so that SAM and I arrived at the same time, went on the same committee, cooperated closely during our membership in the House, which was 14 years in my case and has been 38 years in his. During my period in the Senate we were majority leaders of the two respective bodies at the same time under a Democratic administration, fighting for the same things. And now he is the Speaker of the House of Representatives and on the 30th of January will have been Speaker longer than any other man in the history of the country. And I am the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States. I dare say that no two men who ever came to Congress in the history of the country have parallel records of that sort. I'm very happy and very proud of my association with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, not only as Speaker but as just plain old SAM RAYBURN as he was when he came here from Texas in 1913. I'm not only proud of our association legislatively but proud of our friendship, our intimacy during all those years. We have pretty much thought alike and worked alike and acted alike in our approach to and our efforts to solve the tremendous problems that have faced this country since the 4th of March 1913.

Now, when he and I came here, I dare say that neither of us could have foreseen that this country would have faced and would be facing today the great problems that confront our people and confront the world. We used to debate questions of domestic policy 50 years ago. I remember as a schoolboy in a debating society debating the question over and over again, "Resolved that the signs of the times point to the downfall of the Republic." Politicians used to come to the courthouse in the town where I lived back in that time and discuss the downfall of this Republic because of the maldistribution of wealth and because of the growing riches of some people and the growing poverty of others and so on. Well, since those days we have progressed in every sense of the word, in wealth and in population, and in power, in production, in the enjoyment of the things that make life worth while.

And notwithstanding the assertions sometimes made by the critics that we are losing or have lost our liberties, or some of them, I'd say that in view of the complexity of our lives, the interdependence of all of our people upon all of the rest—the interdependence of every community on every other community and every State on every other State and every group on every other group, we are enjoying more liberty today in the real sense of the world than we enjoyed 50 years ago.

When we talked 50 years ago in our schools and colleges about signs of the times indicating the downfall of the Republic, which was the subject for debate, we were talking about internal conditions. We were not talking about any danger that threatened us from without. There wasn't any. But now, we are subject to a danger but it is not a domestic danger. It's a danger that threatens us from without. It's one that in those days we didn't imagine could ever exist and it's one that SAM RAYBURN and I did not by any stretch of the imagination foresee, when 38 years ago we entered the House of Representatives as young, green, awkward Members from our States.

But we are threatened, my friends, by a greater danger than any that was ever concocted by any debating society on our domestic issues, or any accumulation of wealth in our country. We're threatened now by a danger that is more sinister, more powerful, and more determined—a danger that in order that we may avert it will require the sacifice, the determination, the toil, and the unity of our people.

As the President said in his message the other day, he didn't ask for unanimity—you can't ask 150,000,000 people to think the same thing about everything—but they may think different things about different questions that arise in this country. But there is only one thing they can think in regard to the danger that faces this country now, from without, and it faces it on both sides of the ocean.

And that is the determination of our people and of all the free peoples of the world, under our leadership, that these liberties which we have enjoyed and our forefathers won for us and handed down to us, and which we desire to hand down to our children and their children for a thousand years, these liberties cannot afford to be allowed to go down in this great world-wide contest. I have been in the countries where these liberties have been destroyed. I have within 2 years been in all the iron-curtain countries, except Yugoslavia and Russia. I saw what had happened and what is now happening in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Bulgaria, in Hungary, in Rumania.

I saw all these liberties—freedom of religion, freedom to educate your children, freedom to own your home, freedom to choose your own occupation, freedom to speak, freedom to have a free press, freedom to worship, freedom to do anything—destroyed—not by the will of the people but by their inability to prevent a strong power from without from overwhelming their country and destroying their liberties. That's the fight that the world is up against.

And it is therefore necessary that we give to the world, not merely a semblance, but the reality of unity here among the people of the United States. The unity of purpose among all the free nations and all the peoples who want to be free and are not free but who would relish the opportunity in my judgment to help make the fight for freedom.

We have been given the leadership of the world, not by any connivance of ours, not by any desire to exercise power, but in the very nature of things, we have been given the scepter of leadership. And that carries with it responsibility. And that carries with it not only a group responsibility among Members of the Congress of the United States but it carries with it individual responsibilities among the Members of the Congress of the United States and all public officers and all people who believe these things ought to be preserved.

Therefore, as we meet in this Eighty-second Congress, facing these dangers, and these grim times, recognizing that if we are not united behind our leader whom the people chose in a free election in 1948, if by any circumstances we are divided among ourselves, we will infinitely damage our own cause, and our own prestige in the world.

We will have difficulties—we'll have sad days probably before the thing is over, in the long run. But we must stand together and we must stand behind our authorized spokesman, the President of the United States, and those whom he has chosen or will choose to help him work out these terrific problems that face our country and face the world. I didn't intend to say all that when I got up here but I just had it in me and I wanted to do it. You see as Vice President, I don't get much chance any more to make a speech. I'm happy to be here, to be able to see so many Members of the House and the Senate and to be in this trio so beautifully complimented a while ago by Bill Boyle.

Chairman BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Vice President. I think the Speaker used some strong minded mental telepathy on me so he would speak last, after the Vice President tonight. So, ladies and gentlemen, I have the honor to present to you the Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN.

Speaker RAYBURN. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Boyle, my fellow countrymen, and Democrats. I don't know whether Bill Boyle intended to be exceedingly kind to me this evening or not, but he was. Two years ago I was called on first, and I started out with the year 1913 and talked about BARKLEY slightly, or slightingly, and he told how I was tramping on his heels and he finally had to get out of the way. And I had a lot of fun out of him, I thought, and then he came on, and did he do a job on me. It was gruesomely funny—funny to him—but I want to say this in all seriousness, our association for 38 years has been fine. He has been as kind to me as anyone could be and frankly, there has never been any jealousy between Barkley and me. I chose to tread one path and he chose to tread another. I think he's pretty well satisfied at this turn in the road that he's reached. And by his getting out of my way several years ago I achieved the ambition of my life, and that was to be the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

And on the 30th of this month I will have achieved another distinction, and that is to have served longer as Speaker of the House of Representatives than any other man in the history of this Republic. That's enough.

I am one man in public life who's satisfied, who has achieved every ambition of his youth. And so I am glad. But I want to say this about the Vice President of the United States. In my opinion, he is the greatest public speaker in America today. And he is one of the great good men that this country has produced.

And, Mr. President, it's mighty fine for you to come here and associate with us this evening. We know that you're glad to come, because you're one man that station and position does not change. No man that station or position changes is big enough for the position that he changes to. And so I'm glad to be here, Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Boyle, and with you, and meet and greet my associates in the House of Representatives, and I think, Mr. President, that most of the Senators that I greet

here this evening graduated from our school over in the House of Representatives.

I'm glad to be an American tonight, as I've been glad to be every day of my life. I'm glad to be a Democrat tonight, as I've been glad to be one every day of my life. You know, we've been accused of a lot of things, and as the Vice President so well said, there have been moaners and groaners from Jefferson to now; that at every step in progress some people sat back and said, "You're destroying the liberties of the people."

I don't know of a single so-called liberty in all of my lifetime that I have given up that hasn't benefited me.

I own some cotton acres down in Texas. I know if they let me plant all the acres that I want to plant in cotton and all of my neighbors in that State and in the other States that produce cotton, we'd have so much cotton that we'd return to Hoover days and 4½-cent cotton. I'd rather plant a third as much cotton and get three times as much for that third of cotton than I used to get for 100 percent of cotton. I'm better off.

And they want to tell us that we've spent the country into bankruptcy. When we came into power in 1933 the national income of the United States was the paltry sum of $39,000,000,000. Fourteen million people were unemployed.

If the breadwinner in the family had a wife and one child—that made 42,000,000 Americans that had no buying power. And farmers—33,000,000 of us—who were selling the price of our product so far below the cost of production that our buying power had been reduced to the very vanishing point, 75,000,000 Americans that had no buying power or practically none.

We started out on a program of putting people to work, giving them a buying power, and before the war our income had been raised from thirty-nine billions a year to nearly ninety billions. Then the war came on and our income went up and up and up. And the moaners and the groaners said there'd never been a war that we didn't have a depression after. Our national income would go down and down and down. It would have unless there had been some statesmanship employed, unless there had been some vision and some planning.

But 1946 wasn't a war year. And our national income mounted to $176,000,000,000. Nineteen forty-seven wasn't a war year and our national income went to more than $200,000,000,000. Nineteen forty-eight was not a war year, but it was in the aftermath of the war and our income went to above $220,000,000,000. In 1950 I understand our income will run somewhere from $250,000,000,000 to $280,000,000,000. That's how this socialistic, this communistic, Democratic Party has spent the United States into bankruptcy.

Instead of 14,000,000 unemployed, more than 62,500,000 people are employed at good wages, at decent hours, and under decent working conditions. This is the way we have destroyed the liberties of the people. This is the way we've spent the country into bankruptcy. Our liberties have been destroyed? Do you know how free every man, woman, and child in America is? In this land of democracy everybody can say what they want to say, write what they want to write, speak what they want to speak as long as in the doing of that we do not take away from the other fellow the same rights, the same prerogatives, and the same privileges to exercise the same rights. That's how free we are. That's how our democracy has been destroyed. That's how we've been spent into bankruptcy.

We live in the most dangerous time—as I said to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the other day—that in my opinion any man or woman or child living in the United States of America today—has ever known. The time has come when we must speak and act together in the face of these dangers if we are to retain this matchless and marvelous liberty, and these great freedoms that we enjoy today.

Under the President's leadership America has been challenged. We must under his leadership lead this world, if it's to be a fit place for any people to live in decency.

And so I care not and I've said this to audiences from one end of the country to the other, I care not whether people love or hate Harry Truman. He is our President in these terrible times and he will be until January 20, 1953, at least.

He is our leader or we have none. He is the leader of the democracies of the world or the democracies of the world have no leader. What are we going to do about it? Are we with carping criticism going to try to tear down that leadership; Democrats, Republicans or what not, let me warn you, again we must speak and we must act together or the civilization that our fathers knew, that we know, may vanish from the face of the earth.

So let's join under the leadership that we have, that is grand. I know Harry Truman as not many of you do. For 10 of the 11 years he was in the Senate of the United States he and I were warm personal friends. When he moved into the Vice Presidency, as head of the Senate, while I was Speaker and the titular head of the other body, we were friends. I know his great heart; I know that every impulse of his being is to serve his day and generation well.

And if we, in our positions, charged with responsibility, will stand with him, then we will one day look forward to the sunshine of a better day, of peace in the world that every good man and every good woman in the United States and throughout the world is praying for tonight. Then we may do our job in our day and generation as our fathers did 163 years ago when they brought forth in Philadelphia from May until September that great charter known as the Constitution of the United States—representative democracy where the people spoke, where they chose their President each 4 years; their representatives in the Senate each 6 years, and their Representatives in the House each 2 years, a responsive Government.

Nobody's been smart enough yet to change that fundamental. Our fundamentals are the same as they were in 1787 and thank God I believe we have men and women in America today to preserve those fundamentals, and pass them on to the generations that are to come after us.

Mr. President, I greet you as our leader. I'm proud to follow you. Your announcement in the House of Representatives the other day was one of the greatest that it has ever been my privilege to listen to. You chartered our course and I am pleased to follow.

Chairman BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And now, ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

President TRUMAN. Thank you very much. I would like to know what chance a countryman from Missouri has after "that" and "that" (pointing to Vice President BARKLEY and Speaker SAM RAYBURN).

I heard the Vice President say that he and SAM considered themselves statesmen when they came into the Congress in 1913. I have an old definition for a statesman, a very old one: A statesman is a dead politician.

I have no desire yet to be in that class. I don't want to see my friend the Vice President or my friend the Speaker in that class, either. But they are living statesmen. They have done a job for their country that is unequaled in its history. As President of the United States, I am one of the luckiest of the Presidents to have a Vice President and a Speaker such as Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. RAYBURN. There have been Vice Presidents and Vice Presidents, and there have been Speakers and Speakers, but I don't think there has ever been a team as close togther and as anxious to do the country the best job possible as is now presiding over the Senate and presiding over the House of Representatives.

I have just received an engraving of a picture presented to Henry Clay in 1821, and they were presenting that picture to Henry Clay on account of the fact that he had succeeded in having a resolution passed in the House of Representatives, authorizing the then President of the United States to recognize the provinces of South America, when in his judgment they had become independent republics. Just a short time before that, Mr. Clay had been responsible for the Missouri Compromise which made Missouri a State along with Maine on a compromise basis—Maine got in first, Missouri almost never did. But in 1850 Mr. Clay agreed to another compromise, which in the middle fifties he changed into the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and brought on the War Between the States.

In going over these various things, and the people who have occupied these positions, you will remember that Andrew Jackson had about as much trouble as any President that was ever in office. He had a Vice President from South Carolina, and his name was Calhoun. And when Jackson was on his deathbed, someone asked him what were the two things he had left undone that he wished he had done while he was President; and he said one was that he should have hanged John C. Calhoun and shot Henry Clay. Well now, there is no such parallel here.

But you know, the Presidents of the United States who have apparently had the most trouble, and who have been most viciously attacked in the public prints, are those whom we class as the great Presidents. There never was any man as bitterly attacked as George Washington. You should go down to the Library of Congress some time and get out the papers from New York and New Orleans, and other places around all over the country, and read the things that were said about George Washington. They were terrific and terrible. The same thing was said about Jefferson. Of course, nobody has been as bitterly attacked as old Jackson was, and he didn't care—and neither do I.

And, one of the most misrepresented Presidents in the public prints was Abraham Lincoln. We went to Gettysburg one time, and made about a four-paragraph speech. And there was a gentleman there who spoke for 2 hours, and I'll bet there is hardly a man here who can name who that gentleman was who was the main speaker at the celebration.

On that day, when Lincoln made that famous speech, old Horace Greeley, and Dana and Medill in Chicago, said Lincoln had disgraced the country by the terrible speech he made on that day. There isn't a man here who has not at one time or another memorized that Gettysburg Address. I'll bet you can't say a word of what the other gentleman said, and I'll bet you can't name him—Edward Everett.

Well, another man who was viciously mistreated while he was President was Grover Cleveland. You should read some of the things they said about Grover while he was President of the United States.

And they hounded Wilson to his grave.

But those men made the impression on the country that has made the country great. I don't think I can make any such impression, but I want to say to you that I have the responsibility which belongs to the President of the United States. I am exercising that responsibility to the best of my ability, and I expect to do the very best I can for the United States of America, and for the world. That's all I can do.

In order to accomplish the purpose which I think Almighty God intended this country to carry out, we must, as the Government of the United States—and you are just as much a part of it as I am, and you are elected for that purpose—we must work together, not only for the welfare of the United States itself, but for the welfare of the whole world.

Since Mr. RAYBURN and Mr. BARKLEY have deemed it wise to go back into history, I am going back a little further than they did and draw analogies to the situation we face now.

All of you remember what happened to Xerxes when he attempted to pulverize the Greek republics. You all remember what a terrible time the Roman republic had when Hannibal was winning victories for 21 years in Italy. I don't know whether you remember it, but if it had not been for Charles Martel there would have been no Christian Europe. He prevented the downfall of Christian Europe at Tours. Then along about 500 years after that, there was a certain Mongol—and we are troubled with Mongols right now—who got as far west as Vienna; but he was stopped at Vienna and never got any further. The Christian world survived.

We are faced now with those people who believe in the individual, and who believe in a moral code based on the Sermon on the Mount—which is the best exposition of what a man ought to be that has ever been enunciated; and on the other side we are faced with those people who do not believe in a moral code, who only make commitments to break them. They are—I can't say they are immoral, because that has a definite meaning in our language—but they are unmoral. They believe in the material things and not the spiritual.

Now this country, and the free countries of Europe and Asia, must band together to make an effort to put morals above materials. That's all I am striving for.

I want peace in the world. But I don't want peace at any price. I want peace with freedom and justice.

I don't think there is a citizen in this country of ours who does not believe that, if he has been raised right—had the right sort of mother, and most of us have.

I hope—I sincerely hope—that this great organization, the Congress of the United States, will remember that honor and justice are greater for the welfare of your children and mine—and I hope my grandchildren—than fat and ease.

Resistance to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on January 28 the New York Times published a letter to its editor, written by Josiah E. DuBois, Jr., Esq., under the caption "To resist communism."

Mr. DuBois, a prominent member of the New Jersey bar, was raised in my own community, so I know something of his talents and his ability.

Because he treats in this letter with a vital subject upon which he is well qualified to speak, as the letter itself will indicate, I hope that the Members of the Senate will make appropriate use of his able counsel and advice. To this end I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO RESIST COMMUNISM—POLICY MEETING ASPIRATIONS AND NEEDS OF PEOPLES URGED

(The writer of the following letter, formerly general counsel to the War Refugee Board and chief prosecutor of the I. G. Farben trials, was counsel to Ambassador Edwin W. Pauley, whom he accompanied on reparations missions to Germany and the Far East)

CAMDEN, N. J., *January 25, 1951.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

During the last 5 years we have lost one-half of Europe and a large part of Asia. Why?

It is the judgment of this writer that the reason lies in large measure in our own failures and not in the affirmative successes of the other side.

The failures of our statesmen in the diplomatic skirmishes of the last year are merely symbolic of more fundamental failures in our foreign policy during the last 5 years. The pattern of our actions in both Asia and Europe during this period demonstrates a complete unawareness on the part of our leaders of what has been actually occurring in these parts of the world during the last generation; and a concomitant failure to understand the wishes, hopes, and dreams of the over 1,000,000,000 people living in those parts of the world.

STRANGLED ECONOMIES

Before the end of World War II the peoples of China, Korea, and the Philippines had suffered for years under the Japanese New Order for Asia. The Japanese industrial cartels commonly known as the Zaibatsu had obtained a stranglehold over the economies of China and Korea and the Japanese had for a long time drained the life-blood of the economies of these countries.

All of our talk and our declarations at the end of World War II were to the effect that we would proceed to wipe out the domination of Asia by the Japanese and would rehabilitate and strengthen China, Korea, and other Asiatic countries.

In December 1945, I worked in Japan on a program which was submitted to President Truman whereby the great excessive industrial capacity built up in Japan for war purposes and for conquest would be distributed as quickly as possible to other countries in the Far East, particularly China, Korea, and the Philippines. This program, combined with other programs, was designed to rebuild the economic strength of China, Korea, and the other far eastern countries as quickly as possible. It was the purpose of these programs to wipe out the domination of these countries by Japan, particularly the economic domination of China and Korea by the Japanese industrialists.

The program submitted to President Truman by Ambassador Edwin Pauley specifically warned that unless China was strengthened economically and strengthened quickly China might well fall to the Communists. The President and our State Department issued declarations of policy in line with these recommended programs, specifically emphasizing this country's desire to strengthen China, Korea and other areas of Asia.

DEPARTURE FROM PROGRAM

Instead of following this program designed to rebuild China, Korea and the Far East generally as quickly as possible, our Government concentrated on keeping and rebuilding Japan as the industrial heart of the Far East. We permitted the Japanese cartelists to continue to maintain a stranglehold on certain key industries in the Far East vital to the well-being of China and South Korea. In China we formally backed Chiang Kai-shek. In South Korea, Syngman Rhee and a few large land owners and cotton millers, former collaborators with the Japanese and their New Order, became the leaders of the Korean people with our blessing. In Indo-china we gave aid to the French-backed Bao Dai. Should we be surprised that we have lost large parts of Asia?

In Europe a similar pattern of talk and declarations of policy was the order of the day in 1945. As a member of the American delegation to the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, I saw this Government formally endorse a program designed to insure that Germany would no longer be the dominant power in Europe. The program agreed upon at Potsdam was designed to insure the announced purpose of this Government to give priority to the rebuilding of Germany's victims over the rebuilding of Germany itself. In the words of our leaders in 1945, "Last time we rebuilt Germany. This time any rebuilding that is done will be applied to Germany's victims."

AGREEMENT ON GERMANY

Actually there was no real meeting of minds at Potsdam, and the agreement which was eventually signed was worth no more than the paper it was written on. No sooner was the ink dry on the Potsdam agreement than both sides, the east and the west, began playing the old game of power politics and began bidding for the favor of Germany, paying only such attention to the actual provisions of the Potsdam agreement as seemed in their own best interests at the time. This policy of bidding for the favor of Germany reached its initial climax in 1946.

Our policy in Germany has justifiably increased the fear of the average European to the point where he feels insecure. This feeling of insecurity has played into the hands of the Russians and their stooges since April 1945. I was in Czechoslovakia twice during 1947—before the Russians took over. The Czech people to whom I talked were gravely disturbed about our policy in Germany. They emphasized the feeling of insecurity which it gave to the Czechs and how this fact played into the hands of the Communists. I have been in France several times since the war and can vouch for the fact that, if I am any judge at all, the average Frenchman has the same feeling.

I do not condone in any way the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia. It was nothing short of criminal aggression. However, I do believe that the will of the Czech people to resist such criminal aggression was greatly lessened, and the ability of the Russians to conquer Czechoslovakia from the inside was greatly strengthened, by the fact that our policy in Germany had caused such a feeling of insecurity among the Czech people.

Even in the case of Poland it is not at all clear to me that the Poles embrace Russia with open arms. In fact, the reverse is probably true. But our policy in Germany, as I see it, leaves them no choice.

The gigantic struggle being waged today for the hearts and souls of men will be won by deeds, not by words. The Voice of America must sound rather weak to the peoples of Asia and Europe who are forced by the actions of America to face the possibility of reliving the dark area before the end of World War II or choosing communism. The will of these peoples to resist communism is seriously weakened by our actions in facing them with such a black choice as the only alternative. We cannot afford to turn the clock back to the period preceding the end of World War II. The world cannot survive its repetition.

JOSIAH E. DUBOIS, Jr.

Growing of Guayule in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement I recently made to the press regarding the growing of guayule in the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The first step has been taken in what might well make possible the growing of natural rubber within the United States.

The Department of Agriculture has agreed to undertake a project for growing guayule, a desert shrub successfully grown in the Southwest, and from which natural rubber may be obtained.

Additionally, the program contemplates expanding the production of guayule seed in California, where the shrub flowers and seeds rapidly.

More than 90 percent of the world's supply of natural rubber is now grown in the Far East. This dangerous position of our source of supply has been a paramount concern of the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee since it was formed. If the eastern nations crumble and communism chokes off our supply of natural rubber, the industrial might of this Nation would have its muscles slashed.

In its published reports the preparedness subcommittee has called attention to the perilous shortages. The committee's first report called for reactivation of the synthetic rubber program, and since that time plants have been reactivated which will add about 400 thousand long tons to our present supply of synthetic rubber. The committee in that initial report also urged an immediate study of the possibilites of growing rubber in the United States.

The necessary durability of the rubber needed for many products can be assured only by an adequate blending of the natural and synthetic products. We need all the natural rubber we can get.

This program which the Department of Agriculture has undertaken bears promise of getting that supply. Not tomorrow, since only 1,600 acres in the Winter Garden area of Texas will be devoted to the first seedlings. But today's problems would not be with us had we been sufficiently farsighted yesterday. We are looking to the future—we are looking at the long range picture when it is not beyond reason that all of the eastern sources of supply could be cut off.

The 1,600 acres for the nursery seedling program will at first require irrigation to provide seedlings, transplanting on dry land areas which will be selected west and south of San Antonio, Tex. Transplanting could begin this fall and if the world situation requires it, funds may be requested to put about 50,000 acres of dry land into cultivation.

The Department of Agriculture proposes to contract with private individuals, using existing farm equipment to the greatest extent possible. Small acreages will be used in order to experiment with diversified growing conditions and to give regional farmers experience in guayule cultivation. Areas selected for seedling nurseries are in the Texas counties of Zavala, Maverick, Dimmit, and Pecos and possibly in Reeves County.

The Texas seedling program will be under the direction of the Production and Marketing Administration, with the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture supplying needed services.

Control Order Disrupts Marketing of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, when the Director of Price Stabilization drafted general ceiling price regulations, it had the effect of closing every cotton exchange in the Nation. Cotton mills, cotton merchants, and others, who have at all times used the exchange to hedge with their sales or their purchases, are powerless to remove or place a hedge, a necessity in their regular business operations. The exchanges have long been performing such hedging operations.

All cotton interests are united in their efforts to modify this order, which freezes the price of cotton at all levels except that of the producer. The producer is interested in having the order rescinded, since it has the effect of depressing the price of cotton at a time when production costs are mounting. Labor costs are expected to be higher during 1951. Farm machinery prices have increased appreciably in the past few months, as well as the price of fertilizers and insecticides. It all adds up to a much shorter production of vitally needed cotton for the year 1951.

The Government has asked the farmer to increase his acreage from approximately twenty million acres to twenty-eight or thirty million acres in order to produce a 16,000,000-bale crop. Unless a modification of this ruling is made before the planting season, a much smaller acreage than is proposed will be planted this year.

I do not recall any action or lack of action on the part of the Federal Government that has created such widespread unrest among the people of the midsouth area as this general price control order has. Hundreds of telegrams have poured into the offices of the Senators and Representatives, urging the reopening of the cotton exchanges and a modification of the order.

It would be much simpler and more plausible to place ceilings on cotton goods rather than to attempt to control the price of raw cotton, as there are hundreds of various grades and staples of cotton which would make it very difficult to successfully operate a program of this kind. During World War II it was a simple matter to place ceilings on manufactured cotton goods. The experience gained in applying ceilings on the finished product could readily be utilized at this time. Only a few employees would be required to do this job.

It would be disastrous if regulations of the Office of Price Stabilization should result in the direct cause of the Nation's losing the increased production of cotton which is so badly needed this year. To get the large production this year is the only answer to the whole problem. Abundant production of any commodity is anti-inflationary and sets to work the time-honored law of supply and demand.

The cotton farmer wants to know at an early date what action will be taken in connection with this dilemma, as he is now engaged in preparations for the crop year 1951. It is necessary that he have absolute assurances from his Government that he will not only have adequate farm labor for cultivating and harvesting his crop, but also the necessary machinery, fertilizer, insecticide, and most of all a good price.

Justice Department: Prosecutor and Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the Barrons on February 12 entitled "Whither Justice?" It points out the predicament of the Justice Department in trying to be on all sides of all questions. It is nothing short of a fantastic position. The article follows:

WHITHER JUSTICE?—THE DEPARTMENT'S PREDICAMENT POINTS AN ISSUE

About 2 years ago the Department of Justice filed a civil antitrust suit seeking the dissolution of the Big Four meat packers—Armour, Swift, Cudahy, and Wilson. The suit charged these firms with suppressing competition in the sale of meat and meat products by controlling the supply, by adopting uniform cost formulas, and by quoting identical prices.

Last week the same Department of Justice took upon itself the legal enforcement of price control. One of the first orders of the Office of Price Stabilization Justice will have to enforce concerns meat. The order establishes quotas limiting meat processors to slaughtering the same percentage of the total kill as they did in 1950. The idea is to combat black markets in meat by "keeping profiteering newcomers out of the business."

Put more bluntly the Department of Justice will now try to enforce on the meat industry the very practices which it claimed the big four were illegally using back in 1948. Instead of trying to expand competition in this field by letting new slaughterers into the business, the Department will try to limit competition by keeping them out and maintaining the status quo.

THE DOG CATCHER

This is a strange about-face for the Justice Department to have to make. If it were confined to the case of meat, one might let it go without comment. But the case of meat is only indicative of a larger reversal. The fact is that the Justice Department, for 60 years the guardian of the spirit of the Sherman Act, will now play dog-catcher for Messrs. DiSalle and Johnston. And in the process one cannot doubt that a great American tradition as well as a great institution find themselves in jeopardy.

The situation is the more ominous, as well as the more ironic, because it appears that Justice sought out its new role. In the last war the enforcement of price control was handled by the OPA—a good precedent since it at least emphasized that price control would be temporary. The Defense Act of 1950 is somewhat ambiguous on the question of enforcement. It states in one section that all litigation arising out of the Act shall be handled by the Attorney General. But another section states that agencies created under the Act cannot delegate authority to other agencies and departments.

Had Attorney General McGrath been anxious to keep his Department out of the whole price control imbroglio, he might well have urged the administration to go back to Congress for clarification on what the Defense Act meant, or at least let the matter be settled in the courts. But Mr. McGrath, like Mr. DiSalle himself, is a man in a hurry. He was apparently delighted when the President ruled Justice should take on the job of enforcement, and if now he burns his fingers in trying to hold down the vibrating price lid, he will have only himself to thank.

PITY ANTITRUST

Meanwhile, our sympathy goes out in particular to Mr. McGrath's lieutenant, Mr. H. Graham Morrison, head of the department's antitrust division, who only a few weeks ago in a speech before the New York Bar Association, evidenced considerable enthusiasm for his job. It was Mr. Morrison's contention then that, while the war effort might present his division with some special problems, it would still have plenty to do. Antitrust, according to Mr. Morrison, would press to see that small business got its due share of war orders. It would work for the dispersion of industry not only in the name of defense, but to foster competition. Above all, it would not, except in rare cases, give up any of its pending suits.

Said the enthusiastic Mr. Morrison: "Many of the cases now pending and many of those which will be filed will substantially aid our war effort. For example, cases involving price-fixing, limitation of production, withholding from the market, unauthorized market, and customer allocation."

We wonder how Mr. Morrison feels about those brave words today. For, as the case of meat indicates, the Department of Justice as agency for the price stabilizers must now be on the side of both price-fixing and market allocation. The Department may talk about warring on monopoly and restraint of trade, but this war has little meaning where prices are frozen. The essence of free enterprise is the free market, where prices are allowed to fluctuate up or down and where capital, materials and manpower, respond to such fluctuation. Against this, Mr. DiSalle and Mr. Johnston are committed for the duration. And if the Justice Department takes on not only the enforcement of price ceilings, but also some future controlled materials plan, its dilemma will be the more pronounced.

That dilemma, of course, goes beyond the Department of Justice. While the Department was foolhardy in plunging into the price-control mess, the mess itself derives from trying to wrap up the economy in a straitjacket of direct controls. If this sacrifice of enterprise were really necessary in the cause of rearming America, this publication would be the first to argue it should be made. Given the world situation, as Mr. Hoover himself pointed out last week, the United States must rearm, and we shall not save the enterprise system by abandoning that attempt and retreating into a new form of isolationism.

TIME FOR CHANGE

But does the present rearmament effort really need the battery of direct controls which Washington is imposing? On that point we remain unconvinced. Surely, as long as the administration fails to cut down on nonessential spending, and continues recklessly to inflate credit, the case for direct controls remains highly dubious and the case for a decent monetary and fiscal policy gains ground. If the fix in which the Justice Department now finds itself dramatizes the need for a reversal of Washington's domestic policies, it may still yield a certain amount of good. For it may hasten the day when the United States really attempts to maintain its flexible and dynamic economy while at the same time playing out its role as a world power.

True Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a thoughtful and encouraging letter recently circulated by the HQZ Co. in San Jose, Calif.

If more industries would adopt the attitude followed by this particular organization, this country would be a better place in which to live.

I commend this communication to the attention of my colleagues:

WHY THERE WILL BE NO PRICE INCREASE IN HQZ PRODUCTS

HQZ Co., *San Jose, Calif.*

Our costs are climbing too—just like yours and everyone else's. We could justify a retail price increase very easily before any accountant—and without a price increase we're going to have to watch every penny.

However, there will be no change in HQZ products, HQZ packages, or HQZ prices. First, we think any further move toward inflation is un-American. Second, we know the consumer is extremely sensitive to and resentful of climbing prices. Third, even if the consumer were to accept the price increase, the tax collector would relieve us of a good share of it anyway, so we have decided to hold the line, counting on hard work and added volume to provide the necessary revenues. We think that is the American way, and if this sounds like flag waving, perhaps you will agree, there is considerable room for idealism in America today.

This policy of voluntary price restraint gives HQZ products a very favorable position in your competitive consumer picture. Self-merchandising stores report a strong consumer response, with accelerated purchases of HQZ hair oil and HQZ castile shampoo. It looks like a buying trend is on the way which will make continuation of our price policy possible through added volume. When a merchant gets a chance to ride a healthy trend, if he is wise, he does all he can to encourage it and take full advantage of its benefits. In the present case, this is particularly gratifying because it is in a good cause for our country in general, and for your customers and neighbors in particular.

Won't you do what you legitimately can in the way of display and suggestive selling to promote HQZ sales so we can continue to hold the present price line?

Cordially yours,

HQZ DISTRIBUTORS, INC.,

R. W. COSWELL, *President.*

Forum of Public Opinion at Sunray, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Thursday evening, January 18, 202 citizens of the small town of Sunray, Tex., met together for the purpose of obtaining a cross-section of public opinion on national and international problems.

I have commended the Sunray citizens for their patriotism and public spiritedness in conducting this meeting, and in order that the conclusions reached may be available to all Members of Congress, I request permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. W. E. Simpson, chairman of the meeting, and report as to the consensus of local opinion there on a number of vital issues.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF SUNRAY,

Sunray, Tex., January 23, 1951.

HON. LYNDON JOHNSON,

United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: We sincerely hope that you find time to read the enclosure personally. Too, we should so much appreciate an acknowledgment of receipt, if possible.

Thursday evening, January 18, 1951, a group of 202 voting citizens of this community met for the purpose of obtaining a cross section of public opinion upon some of the current problems facing our country today, and forwarding the findings to some of our more influential representatives in Washington. Upon the enclosures we list the group reactions which were taken without any attempt at swaying anyone's opinion.

Trusting that this communication will be received in the same spirit in which it is offered, viz; honest patriotism and love for America and anxiety for the welfare of our great country.

Very truly yours,

W. E. SIMPSON,

Chairman.

Tabulations by: Messrs. John Worst, Horace Tompkins, and Paul Hamby.

GROUP OPINIONS POLLED AT SUNRAY, TEX., MASS MEETING HELD THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1951, FOR DISTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC OFFICIALS IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Question. Shall we withdraw from Korea?

Answer. No; unanimously.

Question. Should full-scale-war support be furnished there?

Answer. Use only as much of our resources as is necessary.

Question. Despite Atlantic Pact Treaty, should the United States of America furnish the major portion of defense aid to indifferent or lukewarm European nations?

Answer. No; help only those disposed to help themselves.

Question. As appears presently, do you favor the United States of America being made subservient to and its military policies being dictated by the UNO?

Answer. Positively no. Kick the Communist nations out and get down to business.

Question. Should President Truman or any other individual have the authority to commit troops and supplies to any foreign country without the sanction of the American Congress?

Answer. Absolutely not. We prefer congressional action upon all phases of national defense.

Question. Would changing men in key positions, such as Cabinet members, Supreme Court Justices, military and economic advisors, etc., weaken or strengthen our defense effort?

Answer. Definitely strengthen it. How could it be weakened?

Question. Do you favor full mobilization of all needed industry as well as manpower at this time?

Answer. Mobilize anything and everything needed to protect the United States of America.

Question. With full mobilization in effect, would some system of controls upon commodity prices, wages, and finances be necessary?

Answer. Majority of 170 believed that controls would be necessary while the minority believed controls should be effected only when needs arise.

Question. Should power to control and regulate our defense efforts be retained to Congress or delegated to individuals or small groups?

Answer. Too much power by individuals is extremely dangerous. Let Congress control all phases of American defense.

Question. Presently which branch or branches of our Armed Forces should be expanded most rapidly?

Answer. The armed services are a team, but apparently greatest need appears to be naval and Air Corps expansion.

Question. Do you believe wages and prices should be frozen during a full-scale war?

Answer. Unqualified yes.

Question. In case of all-out war, do you favor the Government letting cost-plus contracts, with their accompanying waste, or limiting war-contract profits to a maximum rate of not to exceed 10 percent?

Answer. No nation can long survive the waste of cost-plus deals.

Question. What should be done with admitted or proved Communists in the United States?

Answer. Either executed or removed from any contact with Americans.

Question. Do you think that our laws should be changed, if present laws do not cover the cases, so that known Communists could be refused job privileges, right to peaceful assembly, freedom to spread their doctrines, or appeal bonds upon conviction of subversive activities and other free rights?

Answer. Yes; treat them exactly as we would any other traitors.

Question. Should we use the atomic bomb in Korea, now?

Answer. No; save it for Russia or any nation who attacks America.

Question. Should our Air Force be allowed to attack military targets in Communist China?

Answer. Definitely, if Communist planes continue attacking our forces in Korea.

Question. Do you consider our watch-wait-prepare defense program sufficient to cope with our present crisis, or should we go into a highly accelerated program of preparedness?

Answer. Not adequate; get ready and fast.

Question. Measures passed to increase taxes to meet the emergency should or should not be repealed after the emergency ceases to exist.

Answer. End immediately upon ending of the emergency.

Question. Do you think that saboteurs should be tried and punished as traitors, even to assessing the death penalty in case sabotage causes someone's death?

Answer. Unqualified yes.

Question. Despite various reports, do you believe Russia has an atomic bomb equivalent to or possibly superior to ours?

Answer. No; they might possibly have an inferior one, and could eventually develop an effective one.

Question. Do you favor drafting 18-year-olds for training and after 6 months' or 9 months' training put them into combat?

Answer. For training, yes. For combat service, no.

Two Schools of Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, there are presently two schools of thought in the United States on the very vital and important subject relating to our over-all foreign policy. Ex-President Hoover and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT seem to speak for that group which is opposed to an all-out program of supplying foreign countries with unlimited troops which necessarily would require extensive drafting of American boys, and which armies are to be equipped and sustained at the expense of the American taxpayer. Both gentlemen subscribe to a policy of providing the United States with a substantial ground force; of materially adding to the strength of our Navy; and that we have at our disposal an air armada second to none in the world.

In this respect, their views are diametrically opposed to the foreign policy now being exploited by the Truman administration; conceding that the President's policy advocates strengthening our own military forces, nevertheless it advocates aggressive warfare in China and Korea, and that of sending large troop segments to Europe and Asia as a deterrent to Soviet aggression and attack. In the furtherance of this policy, the Truman administration has the support of such officials as Governor Dewey and General Eisenhower. Both of these gentlemen have expressed definite disapproval of the Hoover-Taft policy. Therefore, an all-out program of aid to foreign nations calls for drafting American boys from 18 years up, to be molded into a large armed force in order to provide Europe with an army of occupation ready and fully equipped to instantly meet Soviet aggression and attacks by Russia on her home territory if, and when, that should come to pass.

The Hoover-Taft policy is definitely confined to making America an impregnable fortress, and opposed to frittering away our American substance in manpower and material by participating and meddling in the many quarrels that now prevail in European and Asiatic sectors.

The latter group, for which Dewey and Eisenhower seem to speak, is espousing a program that is in full accord with the present policy promulgated by Secretary of State Acheson, and obviously by and with the consent of the President of the United States. These men are the mouthpieces for the internationalists, and represent the global aggressive policy.

In the not-too-distant future the people of the United States will have an opportunity to decide which policy is ultimately to prevail. The editorial published in the Chicago Herald-American on February 11, 1950, entitled "An American Policy," follows:

AN AMERICAN POLICY

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Once again Mr. Herbert Hoover has indicated the dangers confronting the Republic in our undertakings abroad, and has charted a sane course for survival and security.

The title of the former President's latest radio address expressed a fundamental fact. "We should revise our foreign policy."

From this basic premise, Mr. Hoover analyzed the misjudgments that placed us in an unsupportable position, the ruinous error of pursuing further a mistaken direction, and the line of action that is now necessary to avert military defeat and economic catastrophe.

The primary blunder, Mr. Hoover noted, was the New Deal's recognition of Soviet Russia—a boon to bolshevism which four preceding administrations had wisely withheld.

Out of this fatuous relationship came our wartime alliance with Stalin, involving enormous bounties in money and munitions, and our secret surrenders of principle at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam—a purblind set of procedures which "won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in the world."

Consequently, occidental civilization is now threatened by the specter of world conquest and world communism.

And we, as the only remaining strong non-Communist power, are seeking to repel the menace by measures that are insufficient and extremely hazardous.

We are already fighting a United Nations war in Korea, in which victory would be useless to us and which may engulf us in an Asian war.

The administration is preparing—by unconstitutional methods—to send American land troops across the Atlantic to defend reluctant nations in Europe from the hordes of the Orient.

This is a foolhardy venture for which we have not the population, hence the manpower.

To attempt to sustain such an effort would probably cost us millions of casualties and exhaust our material and financial resources.

The Hoover program, to call it such, would rectify that which is wrong and conserve, as well as mobilize, the invincible forces at our disposal.

First, we should abandon the pretense of friendly relations with Russia while the Soviets wage proxy war upon us.

Second, we should make the Western Hemisphere our base, immune from invasion—with Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines as outposts in the Pacific, and with the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean available to us in the East.

As Mr. Hoover said: "This hemisphere can be made self-contained in critical raw materials."

Third, if we are to arm the North Atlantic alliance, it should include Spain and the bastion of the Pyrenees, as well as Greece and Turkey.

Fourth, our main reliance should be upon naval power to keep the sea lanes open, and air power for pulverizing attack and continental protection.

Great expenditures would be required; yet not so great as to be beyond our means.

And assurance can be made doubly sure by eliminating socialistic squandering from the Federal budget.

In Mr. Hoover's words, our revised policies must "avoid economic disaster which can destroy freedom in America."

Rogers Renews Move for Record Vote on Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress I introduced House Resolution 450 which would require a yea-and-nay vote on all appropriation bills passed by the House of Representatives. I received favorable editorial comments, as well as radio comments, from all parts of the Nation endorsing this resolution and the principle that it sought to establish, but the resolution was never reported out by the Rules Committee for consideraiton by the House.

I, therefore, have introduced this same resolution and it is now known as House Resolution 119. I am again receiving enthusiastic endorsements from newspapers and radio commentators.

My colleague, Hon. CHESTER B. MCMULLEN, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD on February 13, an editorial from the St. Petersburg Times carrying its endorsement to this resolution. I include herewith a splendid article written by John Pennekamp, who is associate editor of the Miami Herald and writes a column entitled "Behind the Front Page," which is read widely throughout the State of Florida, as well as other parts of the Nation. John Pennekamp is not only well known for his fine articles and editorials but for his civic leadership, and for the contribution he has made in the establishment of the Everglades National Park. The above-mentioned follows:

BEHIND THE FRONT PAGE—ROGERS RENEWS MOVE FOR RECORD VOTE ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

(By John Pennekamp)

Congress will spend something like $70,000,000,000 during this session. Would you like to know how each Senator and Representative votes on each appropriation?

Chances are you won't, unless a bill which DWIGHT L. ROGERS, Fort Lauderdale, United States Representative from the Sixth Florida District, fares better than it has in the past.

ROGERS wants to compel a recorded vote in the House on every measure that spends money.

He has made a compilation of the spending by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress—the current session is the first of the Eighty-second Congress—which shows:

It spent a total of $51,714,916,058, and there was a recorded vote in both Houses on only $16,420,620,879 of the total.

Thus two-thirds of the money was appropriated without the citizen being able to determine how his Senator or Representative voted.

Of the $51,000,000,000, approximately $30,000,000,000 was spent without a recorded vote in either House. Of the remainder, approximately $6,000,000,000 was spent with a recorded vote in only one House.

Here is a list of the appropriations which were made with no record vote:

Funds to UN for Palestine refugees, $16,000,000; independent offices, $7,600,000,000; Labor-Federal Security, $2,300,000; Agriculture, $715,000,000; Treasury-Post Office, $3,000,000,000; State-Justice-Commerce, $667,000,000; Independent offices, $7,600,000,000; Interior, $584,000,000; supplemental, $75,000,000; and military, $13,000,000,000.

The House also shied away from a recorded vote on $5,600,000,000 for foreign aid, while the Senate left no record of how its Members voted on $100,000,000 for advanced planning for public works and $664,000,000 for Army civil functions.

That public sentiment has been overwhelmingly for the Rogers proposal has long since been established. In a survey which he made in Florida, ROGERS learned that it was favored at a ratio of 2,727 to 39.

Nationally the suggestion won general editorial approval, and was widely acclaimed by commentators.

But he could not get it out of the Rules Committee.

Whether it will have better going in this session will depend on what degree of attention is paid to public opinion. In periods of national crisis, it frequently is regarded as safe to ignore public opinion because the pressure of the times make for forgetfulness at election.

Congress has acted to eliminate one of its evils of its financing operations. Instead of an omnibus appropriations bill, it has gone back to separate appropriations.

This eliminates the dependency which some appropriations frequently relied upon from others in the same bill, and also enables the Congressmen to separate various items and vote for them individually.

That move, ROGERS thinks, also has improved the chances for his bill.

"I think," he says, "that it is important that this resolution be adopted so that the taxpayers can know how their representatives vote to spend their money. With Congress due to appropriate or spend $70,000,000,000 of the taxpayer's hard-earned cash, and putting on the bite for far heavier taxes, certainly John Q. is entitled to know how his Representative, or Senator, is spending John Q.'s money."

The Will To Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks, an editorial that appears in the current issue of the United States News and World Report which is a reprint of an editorial that appeared on December 6, 1940. As usual, Mr. David Lawrence rings the bell. The time has come for us to give serious consideration to the thoughts he has expressed for we all know that if another war comes it may be the end of civilization as we know it. The above-mentioned follows:

THE WILL TO PEACE

(By David Lawrence)

(The excerpts which follow appeared a little more than 10 years ago—in our issue of December 6, 1940. The first year of World War II had passed, and the American people were discussing the possibility of being drawn directly into the conflict. The thoughts expressed then seem somehow applicable to our present-day situation and hence are reproduced this week.)

The urge is to meet force with force. Our own Nation waits patiently with a feeling of resignation—when shall our turn come? Every day seems to bring us nearer to the edge of the precipice. Entanglement appears assured despite our best effort to keep out of the war.

Whether our lot be peace or war, nations, like individuals, must discover for themselves again a basic relationship to the spiritual force that can move heaven and earth. It is this power of the Almighty which men from time immemorial have been slow to recognize except in times of adversity.

Such an era of desperation is here. The world leans heavily on thin reeds of tradition and wonders what it is that keeps the plague and the holocaust unabated as all around us reason and logic, unselfishness and justice, are pulverized by the bombs that blast the bodies, not solely of combatants, but of innocent men, women, and children.

When shall we turn the tide of this brutishness? How shall we penetrate the armor of the stolid dictatorships which hold millions within their frightful discipline?

For this the Pope urges prayer. We must pray, his holiness says, until the Lord shall hear our supplication. We must find within ourselves, moreover, that new approach to Him which will someday bring understanding to a bewildered world.

But, you will ask, where amidst these abstractions do we find concrete guidance?

There is always the risk that one's own exhortation will be clothed with self-righteousness. We as a Nation have done nothing wrong, we think. We have offended nobody else in the world, we say. Surely, we are not guilty of any international transgression, we argue.

But the penetrating examination which is so essential to any appraisal of self compels the admission that America and her citizenry have sinned by their prolonged indifference to the problems of a world which now entangle us despite our selfish desire to avoid their burdens.

When all around us men and women, young and old, begin to see that prayer is futile unless those who pray are ready to make each day the sacrifices that entail service to others, then perhaps the present generation of which we are a part will qualify for the blessings of peace which now are denied us.

The world has become too much rooted in the theme of mere possession, of acquisition, of quest for power, of the vanity of place, of compensation only through the coin of materialism. The compensations of the spirit and of genuine brotherhood do not yet gratify and this may be one reason why prayers die on our lips, silenced in fear and misgiving, because we have not ventured to do the work on earth that God would have us do.

The ego that guides us in our day-to-day bickerings slowly saps the strength of a nation, for the whole cannot be stronger than the sum of its parts. Creature comfort begets an idolatry that makes us inadvertent to the woes of suffering humanity in other lands. We want our lives, our property, our fortunes, and our sacred honor—and we are willing to let the rest of the world shift for itself. Can it be that a higher force now challenges this principle of national policy,

this selfish tenet of individual behavior, and even as we pray asks us to prove that we really would pay the price that peace demands?

Peace is a hostile concept today because we are afraid of what it may mean to us. We are afraid of the pride that must bury as we admit our shortcomings. We are afraid of the property loss we must undergo as we concede that world trade and a world equilibrium require financial and material contributions as generous in the days of peace as they were extravagant in times of war.

But peace is inevitable. Our trust in the ultimate consummation of a peace with justice is not misplaced. Its realization is merely postponed till the human instinct for brotherhood emerges again. It can come only as nations, one by one, find in their revitalized individuals an understanding of the obligations of prayer.

For when we learn to pray, not for our comforts and our material wants but for the lives of others even in far distant lands, and when we, too, begin to find each day in our own lives the way to serve unselfishly the people all around us, then perhaps will the power of prayer well up to heaven, bringing us a peace whose rewards we have truly earned and whose blessings we have really deserved.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received from the Lithuanian American Information Center:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N. Y., February 3, 1951.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.,
United States Representative
From Michigan, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LESINSKI: February 16, will mark the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Lithuanian Americans, as well as Lithuanians everywhere this side of the iron curtain, will observe the day with fitting ceremonies while Lithuanians in the homeland, completely shut off behind the iron curtain, will silently and secretly join in the observing an independence which has been temporarily put aside.

In the brief span between the two World Wars, Lithuania established her right to take her place in the family of free nations.

The cause of freedom was precious to her. Despite economic hardships, Lithuania showed remarkable vitality, great ability in self-government and economic development.

Today, as a nation, Lithuania is being exterminated. She is a victim of a consistently perpetrated genocide. The Soviet occupation has cost over 500,000 lives, victims of torture, planned starvation, political executions, and exile to death camps.

Lithuania, together with other nations behind the iron curtain is waging a great struggle against world Communist expansion. Their fight for their freedom is not only for their own liberation, but it is a fight for the freedom of the world.

Lithuania's underground is still waging a heroic fight against a mighty, vastly superior, ruthless force.

Lithuanian Americans have a stake in the survival of this ancient race. Almost every Lithuanian American family still has relatives in the old country, with whom all contact has been broken during the Soviet occupation.

The Lithuanian American Information Center, as spokesman for the Lithuanian American Council, which represents nearly 1,000,000 Lithuanian Americans, would like to call this anniversary to the attention of their good American friends who have helped in the past to appeal to the conscience of the world.

Please accept, sir, our expression of deep esteem.

Sincerely yours,
THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER.

The Barriers to Impeachment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial that follows, and which was published in the Chicago Daily Tribune on February 13, 1951, is in line with the expressions contained in many letters that come to my desk practically every day. It must be evident to all of us that the people of America are disturbed about our foreign policy. They are disturbed and concerned with the large casualty list in Korea. They are sick and tired of hearing congressional debate and procrastination over who has the power to send American troops to participate in secondary and police wars. We need a clarification of this very much muddled question.

Once a law is passed by Congress which clearly forbids the method presently resorted to by President Truman—that is to say, a law that specifically provides that no American troops can be commandeered by the President to participate in hostilities akin to those now taking place in the far eastern sector—then the American people will have a more definite policy upon which to proceed in the event there is a violation or defiance of such a congressional mandate.

I can conceive of no better way to determine whether the President of the United States has laid himself open to impeachment than that of his continuation to stand in open defiance of a congressional act, a constitutional provision, or all treaties made in pursuance thereof. The editorial to follow lays special emphasis on the fact that a bill of impeachment should not be confused with a trial for a crime:

ARTICLES FOR A BILL OF IMPEACHMENT

Even many who concede President Truman's unfitness for his office question whether he can be removed by impeachment. Some argue that votes for impeachment cannot be obtained. This is a question of practicability, not principle, and it may be solved as the disastrous effects of the Truman policies are made apparent. Others, however, assert that Mr. Truman, whatever his failings, has done nothing for which he could be impeached.

This is a false defense, arising from the confusion of impeachment with a trial for crime. Crime may be the basis of impeachment, as in the cases of bribed judges, but impeachment, under the plain language of the Constitution, is not a process for punishment of crime. It is a legislative procedure for removing unfit officials, involving no other penalty than removal and future disqualification of the office holder.

The grounds for impeachment are thus as broad as human failings. One judge, early in the Republic, was impeached simply because he was crazy, and there was no other method of removing him from the bench. When the time comes for the impeachment of Truman, the articles of the bill will fall into two classes, each backed by overwhelming evidence. One is Truman's violations of the Constitution, which he is sworn to uphold and defend; the other is his repeated sponsorship and protection of grafters and influence peddlers in his official family, including the White House circle.

More than 7,000 young Americans have been killed already in Truman's unconstitutional war in Korea. The post-ratification of his act by the United Nations cannot save him, because he failed to observe the law that requires congressional assent for furnishing troops to UN. In his assertion that he will send troops to Europe without the permission of Congress the President has served notice of intention to violate the Constitution again.

Truman's institution of Pendergast spoils politics in the White House has brought the Presidency to its lowest position in history. His military aid, Major General Vaughan, accepted bribes, one of which was passed on to Mrs. Truman. Vaughan's friend, Maragon, now in prison, peddled influence from the White House with Vaughan's assistance.

The recent report of Senators FULBRIGHT, DOUGLAS, and CAPEHART on venality within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation again reached into the White House. An old family friend of the Trumans, after a meteoric rise in the bureaucracy, was shown to have steered bad loans through the RFC and then left public office to be paid off by the recipients. Another White House employee was found to have used his official position for the promotion of other political deals with RFC funds. Truman, instead of cleaning house, launched an angry attack on the Senators who had pointed out the crooks he sponsors.

Truman is crooked as well as incompetent. That is sufficient ground for the impeachment of any official.

Letter to Hon. Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to ex-President Hoover by a constituent of mine, Mr. Harry Meola:

MEOLA & MEOLA,
Middletown, N. Y., February 13, 1951.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
New York City.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: Your 10 points are to the physical well-being of the Republic what the 10 Commandments of Moses are to the soul.

So long as you and other loyal citizens do not compromise with the internationalist who would waste our heritage and abolish the United States for a world state, the day will soon pass when he may call a good American, isolationist, and then go to dinner.

There is no compromise with an Alger Hiss or an internationalist who would give his country the kiss of death—at Yalta or in Congress. Rather Benedict Arnold had not failed in his attempt to keep us in the folds of the Union Jack. Rather the Union had broken like humpty-dumpty at Gettysburg. Rather death at the end of a foreign bayonet within our own wall of iron than sacrifice one more American boy to the Red Moloch in Europe.

Sincerely,

HARRY A. MEOLA.

What Is To Become of the Family-Type Farm in the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, as the farm population in the Central West moved to cities and villages in the days of the Dust Bowl and effort was made by Congress to equip the people with means by which they might again establish homes on the land. Land loans, production loans were put in operation, and the rebuilding of farm homes seemed to be getting well under way.

But before we were quite out of the depression following World War I the Second World War began. We went at production again with full force. Boys were drafted from the farms and in such great numbers that production of crops seemed doomed. But another factor appeared for the first time. Tractor power on the farm had made marvelous strides in perfection. A gas tractor could do the work of 12 horses and 3 men—and every other farm device to save manpower came forward almost overnight. Production went ahead, but in the wake of this unheard-of production the farm population began to go down again. Some small-farm owners were unable to purchase this high-powered machinery, and if they did, they did not have land enough to farm an economical unit for the full utilization of tractor power. The large farms could operate all right and at the same time take on several small farms to give their tractor power full operation. Production went up again, and the smaller farms were abandoned and many of the buildings moved to the towns and villages. One time in North Dakota the highways were lined with buildings being moved to the larger centers of the country. Farm homes disappeared and small villages seemed like ghost towns compared to their former status. County-seat cities increased in population; business increased at these points, while the small-business places in the county either carried on a day-by-day trade or went out of business entirely.

Now we are threatened with another war, if we are not indeed already in it.

Restrictions have again been put on strategic materials. Farm machinery will not last forever and much of it needs replacement now. Two farmers apply for machines—one a small family-type farm with, say, 320 acres, and the other farmer operates 10,000 acres. Each needs a new tractor. Which one will get a tractor? The argument that those in authority use is that, after all, production is what is needed in wartime—and lots of it. The man farming 10,000 acres can produce more than a small farmer, therefore he receives a preference in obtaining machinery. Again, let us take the drafting of farm boys. One father has a son who operates his farm and without which this small farm cannot operate. He asks to have his son deferred. The 10,000-acre farmer has two sons who alone operate this very large farm unit. He asks to have his sons deferred. The Selective Service Administration is concerned with production—and lots of it. They argue that the large farm will produce so much more than a small farm that the result is as follows: The small farmer's son is drafted and the two sons of the large operator are deferred.

There seems to be no conception on the part of the managers of this Government that a farm home is necessary. They are not interested, in the least, in preserving the farm home. What they are concerned with is production, and production they will have if they put out of business every family-type farm in the United States.

These small farms will have to quit as the fathers, in many cases, are too "stove up" physically to operate their farms. In answer to this, the Army says, "Well, we will send you farm laborers to take the place of your boy." They do, and what does the farmer get? In the last war, Negroes from Alabama were sent out to run tractors; store clerks and soda-fountain jerks came out to run the combines. And how they ran them. There were not enough repairs between Ohio and Minneapolis to replace the parts smashed by these tractor experts sent out by the all-knowing Army. The tractor business is not learned overnight, and the very reason the Army is so red hot to get farm boys is because they know machinery, and practically every one of them is a mechanic. The Army must have these men and hand us a bunch of nondescripts, who know nothing about mechanics or anything else. They are so inferior that the Army will not take them for combat training.

Unless we can arrive at a place in our civilization where we can have peace for at least a few years, it is obvious that the old family-type farm, which has been the bulwark of our progress and development, will disappear and we can turn back to Goldsmith's Deserted Village and repeat with him:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade—
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

Need for Students To Influence Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Students for Democratic Action of New York State, a fine, anti-Communist group of liberal-minded young men and women, publishes a Newsletter whose March edition contains a very constructive outline of the principles and programs of this organization. It is an idealistic and at the same time a sound and practical set of principles. I am encouraged to see the young people of America thinking in these terms; it will be well for our country if more of them do so.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this article written by Mr. Richard A. Givens in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE FOR MARCH 1951 ISSUE OF NEW YORK STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION NEWSLETTER

(By Dick A. Givens, Students for Democratic Action national board member)

The dangerous international emergency makes it more vital than ever for students to participate in public affairs. The purpose of Students for Democratic Action (SDA) is to give students an opportunity to influence public affairs and to learn at first hand how politics works. SDA's stand in the current crisis, as decided and agreed on by SDA members, may be summarized as follows:

1. We favor full political freedom for all people everywhere, and hence—

(a) We strongly oppose all forms of totalitarianism, whether Communist or Fascist, and

(b) We favor full civil liberties and academic freedom for all, including those with whom we disagree.

2. We believe equal opportunity for all is not only desirable in itself, but also will help strengthen democracy against any form of totalitarianism. Therefore—

(a) We oppose all discrimination, including segregation, based on race, creed, color, or origin, and

(b) We favor public action wherever needed to assure equality of opportunity in social and economic life.

3. We recognize that in the atomic age, all nations are interdependent. As a result, we believe that in the present international emergency—

(a) No nation can stand alone, and we can survive only by full cooperation with other free peoples,

(b) Aggression anywhere must be resisted as strongly as conditions will permit, but

(c) Primary emphasis must be placed on defense of areas most vital to the survival of the free world—especially Western Europe.

4. We believe that by working together, liberal (and hence non-Communist) students can and must do something about such issues as foreign policy discrimination and extension of civil liberties. Hence SDA activities include—

(a) Support of liberal candidates in election campaigns,

(b) Work on campus to promote extensions of academic freedom and nondiscrimination (for example, at Columbia, SDA secured student body adoption of a plan to end bias clauses in the rules of student organizations, including fraternities),

(c) Educational meetings (on such issues as Franco Spain, atomic energy policy, and academic freedom), and

(d) Political work between elections (through publicity and direct representations to government).

SDA is proud of its achievements in promoting academic freedom and nondiscrimination, in educational projects, in election campaigns, and in political work between elections. But the continuing crisis calls for even greater efforts.

Democracy will be strong or weak depending on the vigor or apathy of its citizens. The democratic way of life cannot be strengthened by leaving things to the other fellow. And the necessary drafting of many students to help stop aggression means those remaining must be even more effective than before. Surely every enlightened citizen owes it to himself and his future as well as to his country to participate in the political life of his country.

For a New Middle East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Christian Century for January 24, 1951, entitled "United States Should Reexamine Near Eastern Policy":

UNITED STATES SHOULD REEXAMINE NEAR EASTERN POLICY

The role of the Arab nations in the current world crisis serves to confirm our repeated warning that American policy toward the Near Eastern countries has been poorly conceived. As leaders in the bloc of Arab-Asian nations who are striving to break the impasse in Korea, the Arab countries assume a new importance. Unhappily, our relations with them over the past 5 years are hardly calculated to impress them with either the honesty of our avowals or the objectivity of our interest in Korea—or any other area of the world. In view of the present precarious balance of power in the UN, it is distinctly our loss that these countries no longer possess their traditional faith in and friendship for the United States. If the present conflict should balloon into a world war, the disastrous effect of our shortsighted Near Eastern policy would become even more apparent. These are not days when nations can disregard human rights and put their trust in Singapores and Gibraltars. The friendship and active support of whole areas and peoples are now as much a factor in the conflict with communism as they have always been in keeping the world at peace. American Near Eastern policy has lost for us the respect and friendship of 40,000,000 oriental Arabs and of many million more among their kinsmen and coreligionists in North Africa and southern Asia. Certainly it is time that our policy makers took a more realistic view of the facts in the situation. It is not enough that we help provide the meager rations that keep body and soul together for some million Arab displaced persons. Despite any repercussions it may have on the partisan political scene in America, we should hasten to reexamine our Near Eastern policy. Concessions should be made to defensible Arab grievances. That is to say, we should take steps to help implement all UN decisions regarding Palestine. Beyond that central consideration, we should proceed to do what we can do—and we can do a great deal—to lift the level of economic life for the peoples of the Near and Middle East.

The Defense Construction Program in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I recently made to the press regarding the defense construction program in Alaska.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, chairman, Preparedness Subcommittee, Senate Armed Services Committee, today announced that Senator LESTER HUNT, chairman of the Alaskan task force of the Preparedness Subcommittee, had informed him that the lagging program of defense construction in Alaska has received an urgently needed shot in the arm. Members of the task force in addition to Senator HUNT were Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and WAYNE MORSE.

Senator JOHNSON further stated as follows:

"As a result of recent labor-management conferences held at Anchorage, Alaska, it now appears that the Defense Establishment and other Government agencies engaged in vital construction in Alaska can be assured of 12 months of construction uninterrupted by labor disputes.

"During the past construction year a series of crippling strikes struck at the heart of defense construction in Alaska. Due to the gravity of the situation, the Alaskan task force of the Preparedness Subcommittee demanded that an interdepartmental labor-management conference be called in an attempt to stave off further work stoppages during construction season. As a result of this suggestion by the Alaskan task force, an interdepartmental committee was established by the Secretary of the Interior. The purpose of this committee was to acquaint both labor and management with the urgency of the situation. Dr. Frank Graham, special consultant for the Department of the Interior, was chairman of the meeting.

"After the first day's session, representatives of both labor and management requested that the conference recess in order that they could enter into direct negotiations. When the conference was concluded, January 26, 1951, contracts had been signed by all the unions and contractors to cover the next construction season. Each of these contracts contains a no-strike, no-lock-out clause. The committee has been informed that at least one and probably two of the major craft unions would now be on strike if this conference had not been arranged.

"In view of the fact that this conference was attended by all of the construction crafts within the Territory of Alaska and by most of the international construction trade unions, I feel that the results achieved set an example for our national preparedness effort.

"The spirit of cooperation shown by both labor and management in this conference was very stimulating and gratifying to us.

"It is my belief that this conference, called at the insistence of the Alaskan task force, has made an important and significant contribution to our defense effort."

Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Loveland Reporter-Herald, whose editor is H. E. Holden, gives us some interesting sidelights on what our people back home are thinking. I commend this editorial to you for careful reading and consideration:

THIS FELLOW, ACHESON

No more glaring instances of Presidential bullheadedness and brash determination to have his own way regardless of the impact upon the country has ever been seen in America than President Truman's insistence upon keeping Dean Acheson as Secretary of State.

At a time when the United States is giving its very lifeblood to halt the spread of dangerous ideologies, we place our foreign policy in the hands of a man whose entire career reeks with procommunism. And our own President insists that it be this way.

Who is this Acheson? What has his record been? Who are his friends and coworkers?

Acheson is the man who in 1946 as Under Secretary of State, engineered the United States loan of $90,000,000 to the Communist puppet government of Poland. Acheson's own law firm helped press the request in the State Department.

Acheson was legal counsel to the Soviet Union before he entered United States Government service. (This by admission of Senator Millard Tydings, of Maryland, his political mentor and close friend.)

Acheson is the man who, appearing before a Communist-front organization with Paul Robeson in Madison Square Garden in November 1945 said: "There is no specific reason to suppose (that) the vital interests of the American and Russian people" will ever be opposed.

Acheson is the same man who appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on June 19, 1946, and asked for lend-lease funds for China, a part of which would be used for the purpose of arming the Chinese Communists.

Acheson is the man who said: "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss." He also was counsel for Lauchlin Currie, another pro-Communist who ordered dumped into the Indian Ocean 120,000 tons of supplies destined for Chiang Kai-shek.

Acheson is one of those who has consistently sat upon the evidence in the notorious Amerasia case and is still keeping the facts from public scrutiny.

Acheson and his pals are the men who could have spared us the Korean war and our disgraceful humiliation in the Orient.

And who are his friends? Well, there were Alger and Don Hiss. There is Philip S. Jessup, Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent, John Stewart Service, John J. Muccio, Justice Felix Frankfurter, and a host of others with similar records and similar ideas. Do you think any of them would be welcome in the American Legion or the VFW?

Yet this is the man on whom we are forced to rely to keep us at peace with the world or to guide our conversations with other nations in times of war. How can we expect to stop Russia with a pro-Communist doing our talking?

Perhaps it is as some of our GI's in Korea asked Congressman HUGH D. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, when he visited the battlefields:

"How about this guy Acheson, is he on our side?"

Fathoms and Feet, Acres and Tons: An Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the implementation of the Atlantic Pact and the military-aid program—MAP—we realize that one of the most serious complications, although little thought of by the man on the street, is the fact that measurements, weights, gages, and so forth, the calibers of rifles and guns, the power ratings of engines and electrical equipment, even the scales by which maps are made, vary not only between countries, but even as between the different departments of the military services in one country, such as our own. French cartridges will not fit British rifles or machine guns and neither will American cartridges. British-made nuts and bolts generally are different from those made in other countries, including our own. The French kilogram and liter in no way correspond to the English pound and quart; even English quarts are different between dry and wet measure. The examples could be multiplied many fold, but the sum total is a terrific problem in supplying arms and equipment, spare parts, ammunition, food, clothing, airplane engines and instruments, and spare parts, and so forth. It means multiplication of confusion. It means a tremendous problem in the organization into a single effective striking force of military forces of different countries each of which must have its own separate supply train because its weights and measures, and so forth, its gages and power ratings are different from those of other countries involved in the same combined armed force.

This constitutes a serious problem of General Eisenhower and his staff. One of their first requirements must be standardization of as many of these items as possible. Therefore, I deem it appropriate at this time to present the following article which sets forth clearly and succinctly the genesis of the principal systems of weights and measures now employed in the industrial world, for the better understanding of all concerned. If one were to speculate, one might very well prognosticate that the proper and efficient implementation of the Atlantic Pact and MAP will require the member countries to adopt a common system of weights and measures of all kinds.

FATHOMS AND FEET, ACRES AND TONS: AN APPRAISAL

(By Keith Gordon Irwin)

(Professor emeritus in the Division of Science and Arts of Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College, Professor Irwin presents here some of the results of many years of library investigation, particularly in European books for the years 1300 to 1700. Eventually these results will be given a much fuller treatment in a book manuscript, which will deal also with the evolution of weighing devices and will include forms of early thermometers, barometers, and clocks.)

Who has not heard—and, hearing, perhaps believed—that our foot rule's length was set for all time by the boot length of an early English king? And that the size of the nose of another early monarch played, somehow, a part in setting the dimensions of our yardstick? And who has not read—and, reading, perhaps believed—that an acre's length was the furrow-long strip that a certain mythical yoke of oxen was able to plow between restings? And that the acre itself was the land that these oxen could turn over with the plow in a day's time? And who has not been told—and, listening, perhaps believed—that the entire system of weights and measures in common use in this country is but a hodgepodge of diverse units, in a plan that is without logic and with little merit?

It has long been recognized that historical facts may not square with the origins suggested in legendary tales. In the case of the common measures, there is convincing evidence that arrogant and whimsical kings and robust oxen were not the prime actors that the stories have implied. Nor is there truth behind the allegation that the common units were illogical in their nature or in their interrelationships. Must is one to be condemned as a believer of fairy tales if he is inclined toward disturbing thoughts as to whether these age-old measures are either adequate or desirable for a modern world, and whether a proper and wholly defensible procedure might not be to discard the old system and start anew on a more modern one? Such thoughts need not be considered either irrelevant or inconsequential. Their consideration justifies the presentation of our common system against a background of history.

THE COMMON MEASURES OF LENGTH AND FARM AREAS AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF HISTORY

Our present system of measures for distances on land and sea is a direct heritage from the half-forgotten measures brought to England by the Anglo-Saxons of 15 centuries ago. The plan they used was so remarkable for its simplicity and high practicality that we might be pardoned for seeking to credit it to Saxon genius. But the plan itself antedated by at least half a thousand years the Saxon landing on British soil, for Greek literature left an ample record of its use along the shores and waterways of southeastern Europe even in early classical times.

The basic unit of this old plan was the arm stretch, or the distance spanned by the outstretched arms. The Greeks called this the orgula. In Europe it became the toise of the French, the faedm of the Danes, the fathom of the Saxons. Races of people differ in stature. So the actual length of this basic unit varied somewhat from one racial group to another. The classical metrologists report that the Greek arm stretch in Solon's time was equal to 72.90 of our inches. In medieval Europe its length in the Rhineland was equal to 79.86 inches. With the long-armed Saxons it reached 79.20 inches. But throughout Europe the same decimal plan was used for the smaller and larger units. The nature of the completely decimalized arrangement was worked out by the scholars first of all for the classical plan, for which Greek literature gave abundant clues. Under the name of the Greek Itinerary System, this plan may be found listed among the measures of antiquity. The entirely comparable old English plan as developed by England's eminent metrologist, the late W. M. F. Petrie, was worked out from such source material as old maps, old itineraries, old laws, and the measurements of ancient buildings. In words of today, the Saxon arrangement becomes:

Ten finger widths equal one doublehand.

Ten doublehands equal one Saxofathom.

Ten Saxofathoms equal one chain.

Ten chains equal one furlong (for land measures) or one cablelength (for offshore measures).

One thousand Saxofathoms equal one "thousand" (the old English sea-and-land mile).

Farm lands were laid out in a similar simple way:

A block of land 100 Saxofathoms wide by 100 Saxofathoms long equals 10 acres.

As this land would be plowed lengthwise, a strip of land 10 Saxofathoms wide by 100 Saxofathoms long equals 1 acre.

The Saxofathom, as a unit of length, has long since disappeared, being outlawed six centuries ago in favor of a shorter fathom. Yet that ghostly arm stretch is still the basic measure for the farm lands of an English-speaking world. A modern contrivance for measuring small acreages has, perhaps unwittingly, restored for the moment the old Saxon measures and the simplicity of the old plan. Because it has done so, the contrivance is worth describing. Made of light material and triangular in form, it has a waist-high handle for the apex of the triangle and a strip of wood for the base. At either end of the strip, and jutting down a few inches, is a rounded peg. From center to center the pegs are 79.20 inches apart. This number is important, for it is the exact length of the old Saxofathom. The main measure is divided, on the baseboard, into 10 equal parts, and each of these, again, into 10 equal parts. These divisions correspond to the double-hand and finger-width units of the old plan. When in use the device is given a whirling, end-for-end motion as the operator walks down the boundary of the field he is measuring. For a square 10-acre field the count should be 100 Saxofathoms for width and the same for length, and the report is that even an inexperienced operator will not miss these results by more than an inch or so. For fractional acreages or plots of ground not dimensioned in any exact Saxofathom manner, the scale upon the base of the device is called into play, any part of the main unit being represented as a decimal fraction. For fields laid out with square corners the acreage is found in all cases by multiplying together the length and width, as measured in Saxofathoms, and dividing the result by 1,000. The plan is that of the Saxons. The use of the decimal point, if one is needed, is the only part of the plan that is modern.

Had the men of that long-ago time in England not been such tall men, with such a great reach of arm and long stride, a second development in English measures would certainly have followed a different course and a simpler one. In the year 1066 Saxon England was conquered by the Normans from across the English Channel. In the following centuries Norman castles took the place of the simple fortified homes of the Saxon thanes, and abbeys and Gothic cathedrals were reared on the sites of earlier

church structures. Skilled workers were needed for this construction—workers in carved wood and fashioned stone, forged metal and shaped glass, embossed leather and embroidered tapestry. Such craftsmen, brought to England from the Continent, were, in general, shorter in stature than the fair-haired, blue-eyed Saxons. As the Saxofathom was too long a distance for their outstretched arms to span, their measures, of necessity, were based upon shorter lengths. At first the units adopted by one craft may have had no close agreement with those of other crafts. And there must have been trouble between the various craft groups, between the hewers of wood and shapers of stone who knew only Saxon measures. A compromise plan was imperative if confusion was to be avoided.

About the year 1250 such a compromise plan was developed; by 1350 it was in virtually universal use in all but the most rural districts of England. This plan set up a new fathom exactly ten-elevenths as long as the old Saxofathom. This new unit was divided in half to get the cloth maker's yard, and into six parts for the craftsman's foot.

The new fathom met with no special objection from those who held the lands of England. The acre, of course, was no longer to be referred to as 10 fathoms by 100 fathoms in size, for the fathom itself had changed. It was now 11 new fathoms by 110 new fathoms. The plan had lost part of its decimal simplicity, but the boundaries of the acre were intact. And the rod—a common measuring stick of 2½ Saxofathoms—was not changed in length, though new notches were to be cut on it to mark off its length into sixteen ½ feet. The furlong was also intact. But for some reason the old mile of 10 furlongs was discarded. For it there was substituted a statute mile of 8-furlong length. This meant for the square mile of farm land a drop from 1,000 acres to 640 acres.

Of the subordinate units of the old plan, a few had to be forced out of existence to prevent confusion. Thus the old yard was legally abolished to make way for the new one, which was ten-elevenths as long. The finger width also gave way to the inch. For the hand—as a twentieth of the Saxofathom—there was a different fate. By a mere 1-percent increase in size it was to fit into the new plan as a 4-inch measure. Thus only a few changes were made in bringing the craftsman units into accord with those of old England, and none of these affected land areas or invaded property rights. Yet the full consummation of the shift of measures, small as it was, stretched almost across two centuries.

In 1624 an attempt was made to restore the simplicity of the Saxon plan for farm measurement. Edmund Gunter, a practical English mathematician, proposed in that year an arrangement of measures that bypassed the old Saxofathom and reintroduced the old double hand under the name of link. If we include the finger width as the smallest unit, we may write the Gunter plan as: 10 finger widths equal 1 link, 100 links equal 1 chain, 10 chains equal 1 furlong, 10 square chains equal 1 acre, 1 square furlong equals 10 acres.

On the practical side, Gunter devised for the surveyor a skillfully constructed chain with 100 equal links. With the aid of such a chain the surveyor could measure farm areas rapidly and accurately and report the result in simple, decimalized units. George Washington, as a young man, used Gunter's equipment and plan, as did all American surveyors from Washington's time almost to our own.

The Gunter measures did not gain common acceptance among farm people, for the plan neglected that versatile measuring unit of the farm, the rod. To the surveyor an acre would be 10 square chains of land; to the farm user it would be a block of land 4 rods wide by 40 rods long, or its equivalent. To that extent, the Gunter attempt to restore the decimal simplicity of the old measures fell short of accomplishment.

In Saxon days there had been no difference between the length-measure plan as used for distances on land and for distances out from the shore, except that the furlong of the landsman was the cable length of the seaman. The sea and land plans were to diverge, however, when the new fathom was adopted. The men of the sea were to retain the old system in its entirety, cutting all units to ten-elevenths their former size, in keeping with the change in the fathom. This meant that the sea mile of 1,000 new fathoms was, after this, considerably longer than the 8-furlong statute mile used for land measurement.

Some centuries later, a small but highly important change was made in the sea mile's length. By that time the ocean navigators had discovered that the length of a minute of arc on a great circle of the earth was slightly more than 1,000 fathoms. By increasing the sea mile to 1013.4 fathoms, the two would be brought into coincidence. In time this change was adopted officially, the new length becoming the nautical mile of the seaman, or the geographical mile of the cartographer.

As the result of these several stages of development, each entirely logical in itself, the English system of length and surface measures came to be not a single plan but a composite of three interwoven designs. The old English part had given the English-speaking nations their farmland unit of the acre and the statute mile. The craftsman part had contributed the yard, the foot, and the inch. The distance-at-sea part had furnished the nautical mile. And the units so developed may not readily be changed. The farms of the British nations and the United States would seem to have imposed an unbreakable rigidity upon the size of the acre. The foot that received its length when there were few crafts has, today, embroidered around it the workday measures of a thousand occupations. The size of the nautical mile is fixed by the very earth itself.

THE METRIC MEASURES AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF HISTORY

We shall now need to turn our attention to a modern plan that was devised to eliminate the more pronounced disadvantages inherent in such older systems as that of England.

In the decade that followed the American Revolution the use of decimal fractions took on practical importance. In the money system devised for our newly established country these fractions when used with decimalized money units made a combination that was startling in simplicity and usefulness. To carry this same idea to the whole field of measurement became the dream of scientists and others the world over.

Only a French Revolution could have brought such scientific dreams so swiftly to fruition, for that period was one of those rare times in history when old standards were swept away, without a word of protest, to make room for new ones carried on a wave of high idealism. There was no compromising, no counting of costs. Many of the plans pressed so urgently by the savants and accepted so enthusiastically by the revolutionary assembly were not, however, to become a permanent part of the structure of French measurement. The 10-day week ran too counter to human requirements to gain more than a transitory existence. The decimalized plan for the hours of the day and the new form in which the year's calendar was cast met a like fate. And so did the plan for measuring the earth in a new kind of degree—though the failure here was related to the international scope of the plan and the puny effect that the decisions of a revolutionary assembly of France would have in dictating the measures of a world. The plan itself proposed that the old method of dividing a quadrant of the earth into 90 degrees, with each degree marked off into 60 minutes of arc, be changed to give each quadrant 100 new-sized degrees and each of these, 100 new-sized minutes of arc. Although this novel plan soon passed into oblivion, it was to leave a permanent imprint on another part of the over-all plan, as we shall see.

The plan developed for the handling of measures and weights, unlike most of the others, was to outlast the French Revolution. It was intended to be ideal both for land and for sea, and its final form was a modernized version of the English nautical mile plan and that of the old Saxon-Teutonic sea-and-land system dovetailed to give a single composite. For all its attempt at high practicality, this French, or metric, plan was to fail at a point where success seemed most certain. And a chance factor was to prove of outstanding importance in its acceptance.

In the sea part of the plan, there is a close basic relationship between the metric measures and those of England. The nautical mile, as has been pointed out, matches the length of a minute of arc on a great circle of the earth. The metric mile was devised along the same line of reasoning. It was to match the length of a hundredth of a hundredth of the earth's quadrant, following the idea of the new-sized degree and new-sized minute of arc, whose existence in a sort of blueprint state we have already mentioned. Just as a thousandth of the nautical mile was (very nearly) a fathom, so a thousandth of the metric mile was to be (exactly) the length of the new French basic measure to be known as the meter.

This metric mile (later christened the kilometer) was, by nature of its relation to the size of the earth's quadrant, 540/1000 as long as the English nautical mile. That it failed as a useful sea measure may not be charged to any gross error in the measurement of that part of the earth that this unit was to represent. It came, instead, from the evanescent nature of the new-sized degree upon which its length had depended. Today in metric countries the same nautical mile is in use in the rest of the world, this length of a minute of arc on a great circle appearing, quite awkwardly, as 1,852 meters.

The newly devised measures were, however, successful as land units. This was not through design. It was due to a chance relationship, to the fact that the meter was half as long as the old north-Europe fathom. This ancient arm-stretch unit, which, among the Saxons, was the basis for all measurements on land and waterways, had its counterpart in the measures used by the Teutonic tribes that invaded the continental Roman provinces with the collapse of the Western Roman Empire. It was in terms of these fathoms that the captured Roman lands were laid out anew. There was, it is true, a little variation from tribe to tribe in the length of this almost universal measure. The Saxofathom was a little longer than most of the others. Its length, as mentioned previously, was that of 79.20 present-day inches. For the districts along the Rhine the corresponding length was 79.08; for some parts of France it was 78.24; and for Spain, 78.98. Strike an average of the last three, and you have 78.77. Double the length of the meter, and you have 78.74. The similarity is startling. It seems much too close to be the result of chance. But upon that accidental relationship was to rest much of the acceptance of the metric system as a land measure for continental Europe.

The importance of that relationship may, perhaps, best be shown by placing the metric plan of length beside the well-decimalized Saxon system. Had the meter been exactly half as long as the Saxofathom it would necessarily follow that every Saxon unit of length from the finger width to the old English mile would be matched, unit for unit, by a metric measure of half its size. Extended to farm land, a block of ground that measured 100 Saxofathoms by 100 Saxofathoms would be 200 meters by 200 meters. In Saxon terms that much land would be 10 acres, in metric 4 hectares. Even the English statute mile, though not a part of the original Saxon plan, would fit into the simple scheme of relationships. Its length of 8 furlongs, or 800 Saxofathoms, would be equal to 1,600 meters.

In the average American relation of Saxon and metric measures that we have pointed out will arouse no particular interest. Propose to him that we could secure international uniformity in the matter of land areas by cutting down our 10-acre fields to 4-hectare size and our miles to 1,600-meter lengths, and he may but shrug his shoulders. He wants to know how much would have to be pared off. Tell him that it would amount to but 2.23 feet for each dimension of the 10-acre block and about 30 feet for the mile, and he may reply that 30 feet is almost as wide as a country road. You argue that this small change would make our measurements agree with those of continental Europe and the Americas to the south of us, and he responds, "If they really want unity that much, let them up the meter a bit to match what we have to offer." He does not consider himself a reactionist or a blockader of progress. His answer represents, to him, simply common sense.

THE BACKGROUND FOR THE COMMON AND METRIC UNITS OF WEIGHT

Up to this point we have followed only the story of the development of measures of length and surface. We should speak somewhat briefly of other units as well.

It has often been implied that the plan used by the founders of the metric system in arriving at weights units was unique. On the contrary, all comprehensive systems of measurement and weight from the time of Solon in ancient Athens down to the present appear to have used it. It would be more logical to stress the point that in the metric plan the relation of small weights to each other or to large weights was in every case a decimal one.

How the gram-weight of the metric system was to represent the weight of a cubic centimeter of pure water at a temperature of 4 degrees Centigrade is doubtless familiar to everyone who has studied the physical sciences. How the English craftsman obtained the weight of the pound is seldom told. This weight unit came into general use in England in the relatively brief period between the years 1300 and 1333. As may be judged from internal evidence and from a knowledge of similar methods used elsewhere in Europe, the English plan was to set the weight of a cubic foot of water equal to 1,000 ounces, that of 16 cubic feet of water equal to 1,000 pounds. The metric plan was to parallel the other, but with a more complete decimalization, when it set the weight of a cubic decimeter of water equal to 1,000 grams, and the weight of a cubic meter of water equal to 1,000 kilograms.

It is always far easier to prepare accurate replicas of a standard weight than to develop the standard itself from volume measurements, a fact that has been recognized since Solon's time. The original standard establishing the legal size of the pound was placed in the English exchequer in the time of Edward III. A new standard, conforming to the original one, was prepared in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Although neither of these is in existence now, close replicas of Elizabeth's pound constitute the standards of today in England and the United States. Whatever may have been the case in the earlier standards, those of today are too heavy by half a drop of water per ounce, if the cubic foot of water used in checking the weights is measured under the same refinement of conditions specified for metric weights. The error, which amounts to 8 parts in 6,962, or eleven one-hundredths of 1 percent, may have been introduced in connection with Elizabeth's standard. It appears reasonably certain that her advisory committee suggested that the weight of the pound should, for commercial convenience, be made equal to 7,000 troy grains. For pure water at a temperature of 4° C., the correct value is exactly 6,960 grains.

The similarity in basic plan between the cubic foot of water and the ounce, on the one hand, and the cubic decimeter (or liter) and the gram, on the other, explains certain relationships between English and metric measures that have been noted by technical and scientific workers. Thus, the weight of a liter of a gas as given in grams matches in number value that of a cubic foot of the gas as recorded in ounces. Also, the specific gravity of a solid or liquid has a numerical value that is the same as the weight of the solid or liquid in grams per cubic decimeter, or the weight in ounces per cubic foot, if these weights are divided by 1,000. For example, the specific gravity of mercury is 13.6; a cubic decimeter of it weighs 13,600 grams; a cubic foot will weigh 13,600 ounces. Or the weight of moisture present in a sample of air will be expressed by the same number whether given in grams per cubic meter or in ounces per thousand cubic feet. Or a solution of a certain strength may be made either by adding the required number of grams of the material to make up a liter of solution or by using the same number of ounces in making up a cubic foot of solution. Such similarities can be almost endlessly extended, but always, it should be noted, the results will match only to three figures, for there is an inherent error in the English plan of 8 parts in a total of 7,000.

OUR WINE MEASURES

The pint and gallon that we use for liquid measures are not, by their nature, comparable either to the cubic foot or to such metric measures as the liter. They represent wine measures set up under legislation for the wine-handling trade. The tun, a large unit not mentioned in a direct way in the early English laws, was the quantity of wine that in a vat measuring 4 feet by 4 feet on the inside would fill it to a depth of 25 inches. This much wine was considered to weigh 2,000 pounds. Since wine has an average specific gravity very close to 0.99 for wine-cellar temperatures, the results were always close to the 2,000-pound estimate. The basic small unit of this wine plan was the pint, a measure that was 1/2000 of a tun and so would hold a pound of wine.

In later times many commodities other than wine were, at one time or another, measured out in pints—that is, in capacity vessels of an assortment of sizes each designed to hold a pound of a certain kind of commodity. The Queen Anne bushel, which has been in use with us since colonial times, is an example of a 64-pint measure set up for grain.

During the nineteenth century the British Empire, plagued with a multiplicity of such pints, swept away the wine measures, the Queen Anne bushel, and a variety of other capacity devices, replacing them by a single system in which the imperial gallon, a new unit, was to have the volume of 10 pounds of water and the new bushel was to be 8 imperial gallons in size. The plan stopped short, however, of being adequate from a modern point of view. It failed to make the pint the volume of a pound of water, with the pint divided decimally into smaller units. These two points were important.

Our pint and gallon are not adapted to general work with liquids to the extent that the British imperial gallon and the metric liter are. It should be noted, however, that our pint is basically defined in terms of water, for it was to be a vessel holding one pound of a liquid whose weight (as indicated by the specific gravity) would be 99/100 that of water. It would follow then that 8 pints (12 gallons) of water would weigh exactly 100 pounds, and a sixteenth as much, or 6 pints of water, would weigh exactly 100 ounces. These values are completely correct for temperatures close to 39 degrees Fahrenheit, or wine-cellar conditions. Even the Queen Anne bushel is not so bizarre in its capacity as the legal content of 2150.42 cubic inches would imply. It is exactly 33/40 of a cubic foot in size; so 40 bushels of grain will just fill a bin whose inside measurements are 7 feet by 8 feet by 1 foot.

The tun of wine as a liquid capacity measure seems always to have been matched in the early days of the wine measures by the idea of a tun weight of 2,000 pounds, which is what such a quantity of wine would weigh. Given a more modern spelling and now applied to commodities in general, this weight unit is our 2,000-pound ton. And tonnage, or the number of tuns of wine that a boat might carry, is now tonnage and represents any load or cargo measured in tons.

Another tun-weight idea was in use, from the beginning, among seamen. It was a gross weight taking in the weight of the tun of wine and the container for the wine. Whether the liquid was handled in barrels or casks, 12 pounds of container weight was estimated as being required for each 100 pounds of wine, or 240 pounds for each 2,000 pounds of wine. This gross ton of 2,240 pounds soon became fixed for all commodities carried by ships. Its continued use has long resulted in a moderate amount of confusion.

TROY AND APOTHECARY WEIGHTS

Not long before the development of the English weight plan, the thriving Italian cities of Venice, Florence, Genoa, and Milan had set up an integrated plan of a similar nature to fit their commercial needs. And the same had been true of the group of federated cities along the Rhine, the North Sea, and the Baltic known as the Hanseatic League. For all three—England, the Italian communes, and the Hanse cities—the weight units were derived from the weight of a cubic foot of water. England, as we have noted, divided the weight of their cubic foot into 1,000 ounces. The Hanseatic League split the weight of its somewhat larger cubic foot into 1,000 ounen. The Italian cities with a still larger basic cubic foot divided it into 1,333⅓ ounts. The result was an English ounce of 437.5 grains, a Hanse ounen of 490.0 grains, and an Italian ounts of 524.2 grains.

The Oxford Historical Dictionary suggests that the abbreviation oz., as used for the common ounce, is, in reality, that of the Italian ounts. The difference between 437.5 and 524.2 grains was evidently so slight that the two weights must have been considered commercially equivalent for ordinary weighing.

The Hanse ounen, nearly 10 percent heavier than the other two, was known in England as the troy ounce. This weight unit dominated the commercial dealings of Western Europe during the ascendency of the Hanseatic League, for the weighing of silver and gold, as well as for drugs and luxury items which, coming from the East, were distributed by the merchants of the Rhineland cities. By the close of the reign of Elizabeth of England the prime importance of the Rhineland ounen and its companion weights of the drug trade was diminishing. Bitter religious wars had alienated old trade routes. The products of India, China, and the Spice Islands were reaching Europe by cargo ships that ran directly to the cities that faced out on the Atlantic. There were new sources for silver and gold and new weight systems for their handling.

By the end of the nineteenth century the troy and apothecary weights which in an earlier day had been raised by the Hansa cities to a position of international importance had vanished in all countries but our own. The metric countries had built their pharmacopoeia around metric units. The British had abolished all the old weight units of these two systems except the troy ounce, using it only in the minting of coins. Even in the United States there has been a gradual shift away from the old apothecary weights to metric ones in the filling of prescriptions and the compounding of medicines and to common weights in wholesale drug handling. It is not improbable that another decade may see the end of the scruple and the drachm. Perhaps the "fine ounce" may be gone as well. They have all outlived their usefulness.

MODERNIZING CHANGES OF THE PAST THREE-QUARTERS OF A CENTURY

This brings the story of the development of the English and metric units down to the year 1870. The English system was by that time half a thousand years old; the metric system had not yet spanned a century. But neither had as yet reached a condition of immobility. Thus, in the decade following 1870 we find the metric system being improved for scientific purposes through the concerted efforts of an international group of scientists. New definitions were set for the meter, kilogram, and liter, and smaller units were added to the original plan. It was in this period that the meter changed its status from a French measure to an international one.

From that same period of time modernizing changes began to be applied to the common units, most of the modifications being along the line of decimal-fraction handling of the foot, inch, and pound. Thus the new engineer's chain, supplanting Gunter's chain for surveying and land measurement, was 100 feet long, with the foot divided decimally. Before the turn of the century the micrometer, a device that could be used to measure the parts of a machine to the hundredth or even thousandth of an inch, had been added to the mechanic's list of indispensable tools.

The shift to decimal dimensioning has been largest in the metal trades. In this connection we have the report of S. B. Elrod, of Purdue University, at the 1948 meeting of the American Society for Engineering Education:

"Fractional dimensions are giving way to decimal dimensions. The two place decimal system inaugurated by the late Carl E. Johansson, in the Ford Motor Co. plants, has gained ground rapidly and is used by most of the automotive industry and over 80 percent of the aircraft industry. The system has the advantages of the metric system without requiring a reeducational and retooling program. Surveys conducted periodically show the shift to decimal dimensions continues steadily."

With us another movement has also been under way that is directly related to the idea of modernization. By the turn of the century, or shortly after, many devices had been perfected that could measure or weigh in an automatic and highly accurate manner, the results being reported to decimal-fraction parts of the unit used. There were odometers to measure the length of trips, chronometers to read time intervals, and vending machines to report on gasoline supplied and its cost. All were practical, all were illustrative of the ease with which decimally divided units can be handled in measurement and in calculation.

But something more than decimal dimensioning and mechanical devices is needed to give a real modernization to the common plan. As in the metric system, well-named large and small units are needed within the framework of the decimalized main measures of length and weight. Strangely enough, the know-how needed to design a machine that automatically measures liquids to thousandths of a pint, determines to the nearest pound the weight of a load of coal, or carries out the thousand and one things demanded of weighing and measuring devices does not include the know-how for the production of a modernized plan built about the common units. Nor have the engineering schools or industry itself presented a program that might effect such a plan, though each has made some contribution to the emerging pattern of modernization. Considering the present status of our capacity measures and the difference in such measures as used in this country from those of other English-speaking countries, it may be considered surprising that the more thoughtful representatives of engineering and industry have given but nominal approval to the proposed substitution of the pound-pint, or volume of a pound of water, for all other pints. By replacing our present wine pint and grain pint with such a pound-pint, and fitting it into the framework of the imperial gallon and British bushel, we could achieve a capacity plan having both logic and practicality. With such a plan we may envision a day when the kilopint and millipint of the English-speaking world would become the useful measures that the kiloliter and milliliter are for the metric countries.

THE POSSIBILITY OF WORLD UNITY IN THE MATTER OF MEASURES AND WEIGHTS

Even a well-modernized treatment of the common units cannot be expected to result in a plan that would equal that of the metric system. As a younger system, the metric units had a greater over-all simplicity of relationships. The weight standards were more accurately constructed. Each main unit was the center of a decimalized arrangement of both large and small secondary units, for which a simple and consistent naming plan had been developed. These things made it the best that the human mind could conceive and the human hand construct.

In 1866, by act of Congress, the use of metric units was legally sanctioned in this country. This meant that a duality of measures would, after that date, be permitted. And it was freely predicted that the meter, liter, hectare, and kilogram would soon supplant, in a comparative way, the foot, pint, acre, and pound of the older system. This prediction was based upon two premises: the appeal that an international system of measures and weights might be expected to have for the liberal-minded thinkers of America, and the practical advantages of the metric system itself.

The results were highly disappointing. America was definitely not international-minded. And the practical advantages were considered nebulous by a people whose life activities had been geared to the common units. Thus the farm population could see no advantage in the use of the hectare and kilometer over the acre and the mile that would justify the effort involved in making the change. Within the home a somewhat similar condition existed. Such craftsman units as the yard and foot had been built about the height, the arm-stretch, and the stride of men. And the American home, reflecting the life of the people who lived there, had used these units for the sizes of rugs, the heights of ceilings, and the dimensions of furniture and other equipment. It was quite understandable, then, that the housewife would discover no advantage in substituting the unfamiliar and awkwardly long meter for the homely, useful units about which her home and its life had been developed. Likewise in the shop the American worker discovered no advantage in the centimeter over the inch, as a small unit of length, that would justify the redesigning of the machinery in the shop to give whole-number dimensions in centimeters or millimeters for such things as bolts, steel thickness, gears, and shafting.

None of the population groups that we have mentioned—the farm people, the housewives, and the workers in the shops—had considered the metric system as a whole. Each group condemned the new system as impractical because it failed to offer advantages in some limited field. There is a reverse side to the picture. Gains have been made for metric units in such special areas as the scientific laboratory, where the handling of small lengths, volumes, and weights is almost universally done in such units. Even operational plants that handle raw materials by the ton or gallon may have a laboratory equipped only with metrically calibrated apparatus. In the field of machinery manufacture, the producer of scientific equipment normally makes products fitting whole-number metric dimensions. Those producing general equipment intended for metric countries may follow the same policy. But for the vast majority of the factories which, in this country, are producing tools and machine products for the American public only common-unit dimensioning will be used. To do otherwise would lose a hundred customers for one that might be gained. And the same general idea extends to all the major fields of human endeavor in the United States.

For many of us it is with reluctance that we acknowledge that our dream of world uniformity in weights and measures is, after all, but a dream. To be sure, England, centuries ago, shifted from the agrarian measures of the Saxons to the industrial measures of the craftsmen, and did it without devastating effects. But the units of the old plan and the new were fully commensurate, no property lines were affected, and the industrial workers were convinced of the need for the change. Any attempt to install the metric system in present-day American, supplanting the common units in a legal way, would be favored by none of the factors that supported the change to craftsman units. We may, of course, point out that France made such a shift and emerged successfully. But our present situation does not parallel that of France toward the close of the eighteenth century. Previous to the adoption of the metric plan that country was without any unified, national system. Several length standards were in use, each supreme in its own area. The weight units, though quite uniform throughout France, needed drastic redesigning. They represented the thousand-year-old coinage weights of Charlemagne, for which some worn coins of old Byzantium had been the model. For this peculiar combination of measurement ills the introduction of metric values could have the desirable effect of a compromise plan, not far out of line with old measures, yet capable of sweeping away all the old outmoded or conflicting standards. A somewhat similar set of conditions was present at the time of the establishment of the German Empire in 1871. The somewhat variant measure and weight standards of the numerous kingdoms, principalities, and duchies that were combined in empire formation were brushed aside, the meter and kilogram, as compromise units, taking their place.

For the system of common units found in this country and other English-speaking nations there is present no mixture of rival measures that would call for eradication, no desperate need of a compromise proposal whose forceful adoption could bring order to a chaotic situation. No parallel to a France or a Germany exists.

In an indirect way the adoption of the metric system by continental Europe was to improve the situation for those countries which, like our own, use the foot, the acre, and the pound. By eliminating the older measures of that continent that went by the name of "foot," and "acre," and "pound," the widespread metric adoption left the world with but one foot and one meter, one acre and one hectare, one pound and one kilogram.

Thus we conclude our report on the origin and development of the English and metric systems. With such a background we should be able to make some rather reliable predictions as to the future.

The history of the past would seem to justify with certainty the following aspect of the future. These two systems—English and metric—that today dominate so completely the industrial world will continue, side by side, as the giants of the world of tomorrow. Neither has been able to absorb the other—a situation that will not change in any foreseeable future.

On a second point there would seem to be equal certainty. The common system is still in the process of change, with the future offering ample opportunity for further modernization.

Russia Speeds Up Construction of Waterway Connecting the Don and the Volga While Our Government Delays Construction of a Similar Project—The Missing Link in Our National Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to fully evaluate the grave dangers that lie before us. But there is one thing we do know, and that is if the continental United States is ever attacked by a foreign power our main weapons of defense will be the airplane and the atomic bomb, with such naval and radar facilities as our Government is willing to provide.

The missing link in our defense program, as well as the missing link in our inland waterway transportation system, is that short connection between the Tennessee and the Tombigbee Rivers that would provide what would amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the Great Lakes, the Ohio, the Tennessee, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Illinois Rivers, and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

RUSSIA SPEEDS UP CONSTRUCTION OF A SIMILAR PROJECT

The Army engineers say that the only other project on earth that compares with it, when it comes to transferring the traffic from one major watershed to another, with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances, is the one connecting the Don and the Volga Rivers in Russia, the construction of which Stalin is now speeding up with all possible haste.

The engineers' report shows that this Tennessee-Tombigbee project will cut the water distance between the Gulf at Mobile and our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, by more than 880 miles, and cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf to where this project enters the Tennessee River, by more than 75 percent, or from $39,060 to $8,880 on a barge load of 14,000 tons; a saving of $30,380—on its fuel bill alone.

Their report also shows that it will cut the water distance from Mobile to our new atomic-bomb plant at Paducah, Kentucky, by more than 350 miles, and cut the cost of transportation by more than 60 percent, or from $2.40 a ton down to 89 cents a ton; and that a barge load of 14,000 tons going from Mobile to Paducah would have its cost of transportation cut from $34,980 down to $12,480, or a savings of $22,120, on its fuel bill alone.

Now let us take the States that border on the Great Lakes, the Ohio River, the Missouri, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, and the Tennessee, such as Illinois, Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and Tennessee—States in which our great steel plants, aluminum plants, and other large manufacturing establishments, necessary to our national defense, are located.

Everybody knows that our iron-ore deposit in the Mesabi Range is now being depleted. There are only two other sources from which that ore can be obtained—Labrador and Venezuela. The use of the iron ore from Labrador in this area is out of the question until the St. Lawrence project is constructed; and the use of the iron ore from Venezuela in this area is out of the question until this short missing link in the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway is completed.

The Aluminum Company of America, whose plants are distributed throughout this area, is getting 95 percent of its bauxite from South America today. This inland waterway would greatly facilitate the importation of that raw material which is so necessary to our national defense.

The enemies of the St. Lawrence project continue to harp on the fact that it would be frozen up something like 5 or 6 months in the year.

This Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway will not be frozen at all, but will be open for traffic the year round.

It has already been authorized by law, and more than half of it has been completed, or will be when the Demopolis Dam, which is now under construction, is finished; and the planning of the rest of the project has already been done. What we need now is an ample appropriation to speed up the construction of this vital missing link with all possible haste.

It will give us a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Tennessee River, and then a downstream route along the Tennessee 215 miles to Paducah, Kentucky, and then 47 miles down the Ohio to Cairo, Illinois—making a downstream route from the point where this project connects with the Tennessee River on the Mississippi State line to Cairo, Illinois, of 262 miles.

There are 47 locks and dams on the Ohio River between Cairo and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; 8 on the Allegheny; and 13 on the Monongahela, which provides what amounts to a slack-water route along the entire length of those streams. Therefore, this project will provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf at Mobile, to Pittsburgh, and to all points along the rivers mentioned, by which the raw materials so necessary to our national defense, as well as to the industries in that area, may be imported, and, at the same time, save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

The barges that go down the Ohio, the Illinois, the Missouri, and the Mississippi to the Gulf, carrying the finished products produced in that area, could bring back the iron ore, bauxite, oil, salt, sulfur, lumber, cotton, unfinished, and other raw materials necessary to their operations.

The average tow bargeload is 14,000 tons. Every load of that size going from the Gulf at Mobile to Cairo, Illinois, would save $20,160 on its fuel bill alone. That would be the saving on every bargeload of that size going to any point on the upper Mississippi up to Minneapolis and St. Paul, or to any point on the Illinois or the Missouri Rivers, or to any place along the Great Lakes.

Going to Paducah, Kentucky, or to any point between Paducah and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, or to any point on the Allegheny or the Monongahela, it would save $22,120 on its fuel bill alone. Going to Oak Ridge, or to any other point on the upper Tennessee, it would save $30,380 on its fuel bill alone.

Unless some cheap method of transporting these raw materials into that area, such as this inland waterway, is provided, many of those great industries are going to have to move.

I am appealing to the Members of Congress from those States to join us in our efforts to secure the necessary appropriations to speed up this construction with all possible haste.

At this point I am inserting a table that was worked out by the Army engineers showing the cost per ton of

barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee.

Remember these are the savings on the fuel bill alone.

The table referred to follows:

Showing cost per ton of barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee on its fuel bill alone

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per ton of 14,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per ton of 14,000 tons	Average savings per ton of 14,000 tons
New Orleans, La	Cairo	$28,280	$18,480	$9,800
	Paducah	29,400	17,640	11,760
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	33,880	13,860	20,020
Mobile, Ala	Cairo	33,460	13,300	20,160
	Paducah	34,580	12,460	22,120
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	39,060	8,680	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala	Cairo	41,440	13,300	28,140
	Paducah	42,560	12,460	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	47,040	8,680	38,360
Demopolis, Ala	Cairo	37,520	9,380	28,140
	Paducah	38,640	8,540	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	43,120	4,760	38,360
Columbus, Miss	Cairo	39,620	7,140	32,480
	Paducah	40,740	6,300	34,440
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,220	2,380	42,840
Aberdeen, Miss	Cairo	40,320	6,440	33,880
	Paducah	41,440	5,600	35,840
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,920	1,820	44,100
Amory, Miss	Cairo	40,740	6,160	34,580
	Paducah	41,860	5,320	36,540
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,340	1,540	44,800
Fulton, Miss	Cairo	41,020	5,740	35,280
	Paducah	42,140	4,900	37,240
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,620	1,120	45,500

Remember that this is the only possible way to construct what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the Ohio, the Illinois, the Tennessee, the Missouri, and the upper Mississippi Rivers.

It is 1,768 miles from Cairo down the Mississippi to New Orleans, then along the intercoastal waterway to Mobile, then up this slack-water route along the Tombigbee to the Tennessee, and then downstream on the Tennessee and the Ohio to the point of beginning.

Of that 1,768 miles, 1,131 miles of it is downstream, and the rest of it is in slack water.

There is not another project like it on earth, or one that can be constructed to compare with it, unless it is the connection between the Don and the Volga, in Russia, which Stalin is now speeding up.

We cannot afford to wait.

Christianity and the World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the December 28, 1950, issue of the National News-Letter is devoted to a message by his grace, the archbishop of York, on the present world crisis. This most eminent churchman has set forth in a scholarly manner the difficulties which beset the civilized world. I believe that the message is deserving of widespread readership and include it as an extension of my remarks at this point.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE WORLD CRISIS

(A message from His Grace the Archbishop of York)

BISHOPTHORPE, YORK, *December 25, 1950.*

DEAR READER: Commander King-Hall has asked me to write the Christmas news letter, and suggested I should take as my subject Christianity and the World Crisis. I feel greatly honored that he should ask me to do this. I shall attempt to state concisely and plainly a Christian view of the crisis and the way in which it should be met.

THE UNIQUENESS OF THE CRISIS

It is a truism to say that we are living in an age of crisis. The self-confidence and security of the Victorians has gone, and we no longer look upon progress as certain. The crisis through which the world is now passing has two characteristics which distinguish it from all previous experiences. It is different in intensity, for it is shaking the foundations on which our civilization is built: the beliefs, the standards, and the ideals which for generations have been taken for granted are now threatened with destruction. It is different also in its extent: it is not limited to any one nation, or even to one continent. Modern inventions have linked up the world as never before: ideas are flashed within a few seconds of time from one end of the earth to the other. Restlessness, change, revolutionary movements are everywhere to be found.

Hope for the future is uncertain, for there is dread that man by using the destructive weapons he has invented may commit race suicide. The old age in which our forefathers and most of those who read this letter were brought up, is rapidly vanishing, and the new age has not yet come to the birth. The early church looked forward with hope to the passing away of the world and all that it held, but modern man dreads the ruin which will come upon civilization if atomic weapons are used in another war.

CAUSES OF THE CRISIS

There are three fundamental causes which have led to the world crisis.

1. First, the emergency of an unrestrained nationalism. Nationalism is far more than the patriotism which is selfless love of the fatherland; it is the passionate assertion "my country, right or wrong." The totalitarian state is the organ through which a nation both expresses and attempts to realize its most arrogant ideals. The state gradually makes unrestricted claims over all its subjects, and treats them as if they existed for the good of the state and not the state for their good. The interests and power of the state are set above all moral standards. Nations as well as its own subjects must yield to the will of the totalitarian state. The spirit of Deutschland Über Alles is not a disease limited to Germany alone; wherever it is found it shows the intolerance which disregards the rights of all other nations. Its supreme law is the welfare and glory of the nation; nothing must stand in the way of this; conduct is good or bad insofar as it furthers or hinders national power.

POVERTY AND HUNGER

2. Nationalism is intensified by poverty and hunger. Often its aggressiveness is due to the necessity of finding room and food for an overlarge population. In older histories the economic factors in the rise and fall of nations were usually ignored. Karl Marx went to the other extreme and treated economics as the cause of all historic movements. It is now generally accepted that Marx made a valuable contribution to the scientific writing of history by the emphasis he laid on the economic background of social and political changes. But he was wrong in regarding the economic motive as the sole explanation of human action. Man is far more than an economic animal. Thomas Carlyle once said that if a shoeblack were given the whole world he would still be dissatisfied, "for he has needs over and above his stomach." With this reservation, we may find in economics one of the main causes of world unrest. In many parts of Eastern Europe hunger and want have led to revolution. In the Far East famine is epidemic and hunger is normal; at brief intervals in India and China millions die of hunger, and even in favorable years a very narrow margin separates the peoples of the east from starvation. Where there is want there exists a fertile field for revolutionary propaganda.

In the past the people of these countries accepted their lot as inevitable; now through the cinema and through contact with the western armies they have discovered that their misery is not the universal fate of mankind, and they are told by the agitator that within their reach there is a new and better world if they only have the courage to rise against their masters and to break away from ancient traditions and customs. This teaching has an inflammatory effect on hungry people who already have felt some faint stirrings of revolutionary nationalism.

GODLESS RELIGION

3. Nationalism and hunger would not, however, by themselves account for the crisis of our age. The dynamic cause is to be found in a religion which denies God and proclaims a gospel of equality and plenty. The evangelists of Christianity were not more fervent than the apostles of communism. On a gigantic scale with all the modern methods of propaganda through the wireless, the cinema and the press, they conduct a relentless attack on western civilization, and attempt to replace it by a new social and political order. The headquarters of communism are in Moscow, but in every land it has its agents pledged to advance its cause regardless of truth and patriotism. The fifth columnist gives the whole of his allegiance to "the cause" and disregards all the ordinary ties of honor and loyalty. He is ready to betray his country, to spy out its secrets, to sabotage its industries,

to stir up strife between employers and employed, to foment suspicion between trade-union leaders and their followers, to incite his fellow workmen to useless strikes, and to obstruct the peaceful settlement of industrial disputes. Behind all the local movements of communism there stands the armed might of Russia with its great armies, its 25,000 tanks, its huge air forces, built up within the screen of peace propaganda, of which the Stockholm petition and the Warsaw Peace Congress were the latest manifestations.

When the guns ceased from firing there was expectation that the world would enter into a period of peace. These hopes have been cruelly disappointed. A new kind of war, the cold war, is being waged on a wide frontier. Already in Korea the cold war has become a shooting war, and the intervention of Communist China in the dispute has suddenly brought dangers of immeasurable gravity. The extensive frontiers of the Soviet Union enable it to stir up trouble at far distant points. It prompts the satellite states to action and meanwhile keeps its own armies intact. The western democracies are thus compelled to disperse and dissipate their forces in different parts of the world in the attempt to halt the advance of communism.

A false step may be taken by one of the powers, and suddenly the whole world will find itself on the brink of a catastrophic war in which the atomic bomb and every other destructive weapon would be used in the struggle.

CHRISTIANITY AND PEACE

Christianity is a religion of peace and condemns war as one of the greatest of evils. The recent Lambeth Conference reaffirmed a resolution passed by its predecessor in 1930 "that war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." It insisted also on "the duty of governments to work for the general reduction and control of armaments of every kind, and for their final elimination, except those which may be necessary for international peace protection." But the conference also recognized that in an imperfect world "there are occasions when both nations and individuals are compelled to resort to war as the lesser of two evils."

It is here that the conference and the great body of Christians differ from pacifists who regard peace not only as the greatest of blessings but also as the greatest good. Most Christians, hating war and seeking peace, hold that injustice is a greater moral evil than war and that justice is a greater virtue than peace. The Christian realizes that under present conditions unilateral disarmament is more likely to lead to war than to peace, for an aggressive state would be tempted to attack a nation with great possessions which had deprived itself of all possibility of effective defense. Peace petitions and congresses may weaken the resolution to resist injustice and serve as a convenient screen behind which the aggressor state can complete its arrangements to attack. The Christian must always urge the duty of reconciliation, but at the same time he recognizes that the state may call upon him to resist by force injustice and tyranny. It is easy for the pacifist to denounce all war, but most Christians have the harder duty of deciding when war is more tolerable than some intolerable injustice.

THE WITNESS OF THE CHURCHES

It is not sufficient therefore for the Christian churches to praise peace and to denounce war. They must attempt to remove the causes which are most likely to lead to it. The divisions of Christendom are a grievous scandal, but they must not be exaggerated, for there is remarkable unanimity among the different communions on the causes of war and the measures required to remove them. There is greater cooperation today between the Christian churches than at any previous time since the separation of the churches of the west and the east. The drawing together of so many churches is, as Archbishop Temple said, "the great new fact of our time." The Reformed churches meet and confer together in the World Council of Churches, and, though the Roman Catholic Church is unwilling to take part in these conferences, various papal encyclicals have shown how close is the agreement of the Roman Catholic Church with the other churches in its attitude to the world crisis. There are three great lines of agreement in the Christian approach to the crisis.

THE LIMITATION OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

First, the churches are united in their conviction that above the changing laws of nations there is the absolute, unchanging law of God binding on all races, nations, and individuals. All through western Christendom there was at one time the conception of a universal law. True, it was often broken or ignored, but, nevertheless, men judged themselves, and still more their neighbors, by their observance or rejection of this law. The Christian conception of universal law comes from belief in the sovereignty of God who reigns in righteousness on high above all nations and individuals. This is opposed to the theory that a nation can make for itself its standards of right and wrong. When a state does this it tramples underfoot the claims of weaker nations and destroys as scraps of paper the treaties it had made with them. The Pope, in an encyclical of October 1939, was expressing the mind of Christendom when he condemned the totalitarian states, for "they seek to dispense the civil authority from observing any of those higher laws which have their origin in God. The divine authority and the influence of its laws thus set aside, it necessarily follows that the civil power attributes to itself that absolute autonomy which belongs to the Creator alone."

The practical corollary of the recognition of the sovereignty of God is that there must be some limitation of the national sovereignty. As long as each state claims complete sovereignty in its relationship to other nations there is little hope of abolishing war as a means of settling disputes. International laws and covenants are the recognition that there must be some limitation to that complete sovereignty in the exercise of which a nation disregards the rights of its weaker neighbors. The old League of Nations and the United Nations organization were given a somewhat vague and shadowy supernational authority, but its exercise depended upon the support of the nations of which they are composed. The opposition of a powerful state or the exercise of the veto can cripple effective action by UNO. It is always difficult for a nation to accept any limitation to its sovereignty. Even the attempt to set up an international authority to control the making and use of atomic weapons failed through the refusal of Russia to allow the infringement of her sovereign rights to the extent of permitting effective inspection within her borders. But while Christians can hold different views as to the methods most suitable for limiting national sovereignty, they are united in accepting the principle that all nations are under the sovereignty of God, and therefore must not live for themselves alone. The Christian ideal of world order is a fellowship of nations under the rule of God, each making in freedom its distinctive contribution to the good of mankind. The United Nations has proved disappointing in many ways, but it is worthy of support as the only existing organization for the exercise of international control.

THE BACKWARD PEOPLES

The Christian churches are also united in demanding a fairer distribution of the world's goods, so that the poorer nations may be given opportunities for a higher standard of living than at present they possess. In the past the more powerful nations have often subjected backward peoples to shameless exploitation. They have sometimes given them good order and peace, but in exchange they have taken advantage of their want and ignorance to extract from them cheap labor. Little has been done to help the teeming populations of the east to overcome their poverty by teaching them improved methods of agriculture. Primitive cultivation produces far smaller crops than is the case in those countries where scientific methods are used.

Recently Mr. Malcolm Macdonald stated in a broadcast that in Great Britain 60 people depend on a thousand acres of cultivated land as against 900 in Asia; the yield of wheat per acre in India averages 650 pounds as against 1,600 pounds in the United States; in India there are 18,000 tractors compared with 2,400,000 in the United States, with a farming area only one-sixth greater. The Columbo Conference has recently made recommendations which, if carried out, would lead to the supply of the necessary capital, but this depends on the readiness both of the richer states and of private investors to grant the required money or to lend it on reasonable terms. The taxpayer will have to make sacrifices to save the backward peoples from starvation; he may even have to accept for a time a lower standard of living. Greater prosperity in the Far East and elsewhere would reduce the danger of revolution; but the Christian motive for supporting this policy is that of compassion for the children of the One Father who are suffering destitution and squalor. The last Lambeth Conference urged "the statesmen of the world, together with their peoples, to do their utmost to frame a world policy for the fuller development, and a juster distribution, of the world's economic resources to meet the needs of men and women of all races."

COMMUNISM

The churches are also agreed that they must resist the materialistic conspiracy which is now threatening the peace of the world. This will not be defeated only by physical force or by economic changes. It is a new religion bringing hope to millions. Its faith, therefore, must be outfought by a stronger faith, and the devotion its creed inspires must be met by a stronger devotion to a nobler creed. Ideas can be suppressed for a time by force; they can only be decisively defeated by ideas which are true and not merely attractive.

The predominant form of communism, Marxian, is opposed to Christianity on three matters of vital importance: it is materialistic, denying God and the spiritual; it degrades man into a mere instrument of the state; and it assumes that in this world there can be created a perfect order of changless justice. Against this the Christian asserts his belief in a personal God who is the supreme reality; that every individual is of value, with rights belonging to him as a man; and that man's disobedience to God prevents him from making a perfect order within history. Marxian communism everywhere sees in the Christian Church an enemy which it must persecute so as either to destroy or to intimidate it. On the other hand it is important that Christianity should never be treated merely as a convenient bulwark against communism. Christianity is

too great to be a means to any end; it must be accepted because it is true, and not because it is expedient.

SPIRITUAL CRISIS

The roots of the world crisis are not so much economic, political, and social, as spiritual. Man has lost his belief in a living God, and with this he has lost the meaning and purpose of life. He is driven here and there without any clear and satisfactory goal in view. He is restless and disillusioned, sometimes wildly optimistic that the latest scientific discovery or political theory will inaugurate an earthly paradise, but at other times fearful lest some catastrophe may destroy the civilization he has built up and that death will extinguish forever his own individuality. He is intimidated by the size of the universe and his apparent insignificance amidst the vastness of the infinite spaces. Loss of belief in God has left him perplexed and helpless in the midst of forces which he has helped to unleash, but which he now finds he is unable to control.

Christianity offers to men the key of the riddle of life; it teaches that God created men to do His will; that He reveals in Christ His love for them, and what He intends them both to be and to do; that He calls them to love Him, and to live in peace and good will with their fellow men of all races and lands; that He promises them the help which the world cannot give, and a life which mortal death cannot destroy.

This faith has been largely abandoned; millions now never take the trouble even to consider if it might be true. But the failure of scientific materialism to give lasting happiness and peace should make men ask themselves again whether they have not been precipitate in abandoning the religion of their forefathers, and whether they should not seek the old ways of truth, mercy, and righteousness, and, still more, whether they should not follow One whom millions before them have found to be the way, the truth, and the life. A spiritual remedy, the return to the living God, will alone solve the crisis in the affairs of the world and in the lives of individuals.

It is difficult in these days of great anxiety to speak of a happy Christmas. Yet I venture to wish you all a happy Christmas, with the prayer and hope that the statesmen and peoples of the world may be given such wisdom and forbearance that this stricken world may soon see the cessation of strife and the first signs of the dawn of peace.

Yours sincerely,

CYRIL EBOR.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the Independence Day of Lithuania. In commemorating this day it is proper and fitting to pause, at least briefly, at Lithuania's present-day plight, and to see where it fits or could fit into the framework of world problems.

Lithuania is forcibly occupied and illegally ruled by the Soviet Union. The independent state of Lithuania is being converted into a Soviet colony. Lithuania's economic, cultural, and political system, based on that of the free world, has been destroyed by the Soviets. Human rights and fundamental freedoms have been nullified and abolished. The people have been deprived of their property rights and their livelihood; they are being terrorized, persecuted, arrested, and deported to prisons and slave-labor camps in Siberia and the northern wastelands of Russia.

The criminal acts of the occupant of Lithuania constitute an international case of aggression and genocide. The unprovoked and forcible occupation of a sovereign and independent state and the persecution and annihilation of its innocent people, in accordance with international law, is a grave criminal offense. It follows, then, that the Soviet Union has committed an offense not only against Lithuania and the Lithuanian nation, but also against the entire civilized world.

The Soviet violations were perpetrated in the following manner:

First. By their conspiratorial agreements—of August 23 and September 28, 1939—with the Nazis to divide Lithuania, Poland, and other states between Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany.

Second. By the seizure and plundering of the Lithuanian state.

Third. By the terrorization, deportation, and annihilation of the people of Lithuania.

Lithuania was one of the first victims of the Soviet expansion to the west and must be placed alongside other states in any plan guaranteeing the integrity and sovereignty of the states of Europe. Without securing the existence of Lithuania it is impossible to secure and maintain the existence and sovereignty of other small European states.

In solving the problem of the self-government of European states the decision should be based in a manner such as was stated by Talleyrand, the French delegate to the Vienna Congress in 1815, to wit: Russia must withdraw from Europe or the Western Powers must drive her back to her own borders. In settling the problem of liberating the states of Europe not only should the principles of international law be kept in mind, but also the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Declaration, by which all of the signatory nations, not excepting the Soviet Union, renounced all claims to foreign territory and expressed themselves in favor of liberating all of the enslaved countries. The New York Times recently proposed that the Western Powers come out "with a broad program of their own—a program which will not only expose the Soviet maneuvers but also carry new inspiration for all freemen and help to mobilize the moral forces of the world in the same way that the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter did in other days of stress. There is no better way of doing this than to revive the principles of both these charters, and to apply them to all nations, including those now held in bondage to the Soviets." This proposal deserves commendation and support.

Lithuania still is occupied and enslaved by foreign armed forces, just as she was during World War II. Lithuania and her people do not belong to Russia and must be distinguished from the Russians racially, culturally, and philosophically. Russia belongs to the east, Lithuania belongs to the west.

The Lithuanians have an ancient and glorious past, and they have every right to national independence, which was wrested from them by Soviet force. They are fighting and will continue to fight without let-up for their independence. Their struggle is not only for their own rights and freedom, but for the freedom of the democratic world. The enemy of the Lithuanians is also the enemy of the entire democratic world. The Lithuanians are in the front lines of the conflict, and the help of the democracies, from both near and far, is absolutely necessary for Lithuania.

The Lithuanians solicit and beg all freedom-loving people to support their crusade against the horror which destroys nations, against the enemy of freedom and mankind, against dictatorship, against despotic Red imperialism.

Thirty-third Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in a memorandum to the United Nations, on Lithuanian resistance sent from the underground toward the end of 1948, we read:

> There is a little country in this weary world where since 1941, day and night, year in and year out, machine guns and automatic rifles roar, hand grenades explode, and fierce flames pierce the skies. * * * This is called Lietuva—Lithuania. Her people are fighting Attila, Tamerlane, and Genghis Khan reincarnated in communism. They are but one of a group of peoples still fighting for the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" which had been proclaimed by the western allies, which had been accepted by Russia, and violated at Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and San Francisco.

These freedoms have, indeed, been violated by Lithuania's protector and leader to socialism, the Soviet Union. Today, only a small number of the former population is still in Lithuania. Thousands of these brave people have been killed or sent to Siberia. Their crime? They believed with all their hearts in the right of peoples to order their own national existence. They refused to bow their heads to the Russian conquerors.

A few survivors of Soviet camps met, some months ago, in Jerusalem. Faithful to their country's old Catholic tradition, they placed a plaque in the Lithuanian language, on the altar of the third station of the cross. It read:

> 1940–50: Lord! save Lithuania. Jerusalem, January 22, 1950.

Many thousands of Lithuanians now live in America where they have found the freedom and the human decency that is presently denied to their mother country. But they do not forget Lithuania and their less fortunate brothers who suffer under Moscow's rule. They will never forget them and they will always be ready to fight the enemies of the democratic people of the world. On this day, February 16, which marks the anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is fitting that we pay tribute to those people who continue to resist with whatever means they have at hand the crushing domination of Soviet imperialism.

Why Not a National Holiday To Honor F. D. R.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Machinist, a publication of the International Association of Machinists, an A. F. of L. union, published an editorial in its issue of January 25 urging a national holiday to honor the late President Roosevelt.

I ask consent that this excellent editorial, setting forth a proposal to which I heartily subscribe, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT A NATIONAL HOLIDAY TO HONOR F. D. R.?

(Next Tuesday, January 30, would have been Franklin Roosevelt's sixty-ninth birthday. For the fourth year, we are reprinting our editorial, originally published on January 29, 1948, urging a national holiday to honor FDR. One State, Kentucky, has adopted this idea and made Roosevelt's birthday a State-wide holiday. The proposal is now being considered in several other States.)

Today Franklin Roosevelt occupies a place in our history beside George Washington and Abraham Lincoln as a leader who came to the American people in a time of great crisis and led them through.

We observe the birthday of Washington in every State and that of Lincoln in 31 States. Roosevelt's birthday, January 30, should be added to those two.

Most of us are not too young to remember the stark fear that faced this Nation in 1933. The United States was in the throes of a crisis unprecedented in time of peace. Most of all we needed something to restore our confidence. Franklin Roosevelt did that and more. He pulled us out of the crisis by main force. As one historian has written, the 99-day session of the Seventy-third Congress that began on March 9, 1933, witnessed the most daring Presidential leadership in American history.

He followed in the middle thirties with a program of social legislation—social security, labor relations, home loans, bank-deposit insurance, rural electrification, minimum wages—to name a few of the great New Deal laws. Roosevelt gave the common people of America the chance for security and self-respect.

During the second half of his administration, when we were plunged into the worst war in our history, Roosevelt led us to victory.

The forgotten men whom Roosevelt fought for can lead the way in making his birthday a national day of remembrance. National holidays can only be suggested by Congress. They must be officially proclaimed by State governors and local mayors. Any group of citizens has the right to petition a governor or mayor to proclaim a holiday.

Observance of Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays came slowly. Three months after Washington's death in 1799, Congress adopted a resolution urging a public noting of February 22. A few cities followed the suggestion in succeeding years, but it was not until the one hundredth anniversary of Washington's birthday in 1832 that the entire country made the day a holiday.

Almost the same held true in Lincoln's case. In 1866, a year after his assassination, Congress adopted a resolution urging observance of Lincoln's birthday. The idea grew, but again it was not until 1909, the one hundredth anniversary of the Great Emancipator's birth that the observance became a national custom.

For 10 years we have been observing Roosevelt's birthday as national infantile paralysis day. But his birthday must be remembered for more than the great personal handicap which he overcame. Working men and women will gladly honor him on his birthday, as one of the greatest friends they ever had. For more than that we must remember him. Roosevelt was one of America's beloved leaders. His ideals deserve to be remembered by every American this year and every year.

A Democratic Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject A Democratic Foreign Policy, delivered by Mr. Michael Straight, editor of the New Republic, at Pittsburgh, Pa., at the annual Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make 2¾ pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All across America tonight, we in ADA are meeting to honor a great leader that we followed and loved.

He could not stand unaided, but he lifted this Nation to its feet.

He could not walk alone, but he led this Nation in the long march toward social justice and lasting peace.

Roosevelt was our field commander—in the greatest army ever formed in modern times—the army of the New Deal. Some, like the liberals, were scouts in that army, ranging ahead of the lines. Some, like the trade-unions, brought up the heavy battalions. A few, like our main speaker, were officers. Most of us were privates. All of us served under a gay and daring leader. His method in politics was to fire a star shell to outline the ranks of the enemy, alert the people with a battle order, and close to grapple, with all the Nation taking sides. The days of his Presidency were dramatic and exciting days. Those of us who marched with him loved what we fought for and fought for what we loved.

Six years ago we lost Roosevelt. And every one of us who remembers that day can bring back a sense of tears at the world's loss, and our own loss. Each day that we move without him, the magnitude of that loss grows. In his bold and militant spirit Roosevelt would have advanced the cause of freedom in all countries by a world New Deal. For all our efforts, we have retreated from his spirit and the magnitude of our difficulties is the measure of our retreat.

If we come tonight to honor Roosevelt, then we cannot ignore or conceal those difficulties. We must turn and face them as he would have done.

Roosevelt faced in fascism the challenge of the great lie. It sought world power through world war. It appealed to two chosen races that were a fraction of mankind.

We face in communism the challenge of corrupted truth. It seeks world power through world revolution. It appeals to all peoples to whom poverty and exploitation make unendurable the conditions of today.

We are a stronger Nation than the Nation Roosevelt led. But we face a far greater task. It is a harder task because we are divided. In Roosevelt's day the liberal movement, save for a few months between Munich and Dunkirque, knew where it was going. Today the liberal movement, which alone can save America, is in danger of being scattered to the winds.

Facing that danger, let us agree first on the nature of the challenge that confronts us.

The Soviet regime is a ruthless regime, committed to innate antagonism against the free world. It has failed to provide a better life for its peoples. So it must rule them by terror and justify the terror by driving fear and hatred of the outside world into every enslaved Russian mind.

The Soviet regime is a corrupt regime with little to offer free peoples. It seeks to crush the heritage of Europe, the faith of Latin America, the nationalist ambition of Asia to be independent and free. It is a weak system that gains by our greater weakness; it seizes leadership where we forfeit leadership; it enslaves people where we abandon people; it stands for progress where we deny progress; it wins by default.

The Soviet regime is an opportunist regime. It places a high value on world power. It places a still higher value on preserving its own power. It is patient and cautious. It fears and respects the might of industrial America. It avoids unnecessary risks. It launches aggression where aggression is unopposed. It incites revolution where revolutionary conditions prevail. Where strength and stability preclude aggression and revolution it retreats and waits.

The Soviet regime is a realistic regime. It recognizes that the free nations still hold two-thirds of the world's peoples, and three-quarters of the world's resources. It knows that as long as free people stand together aggression cannot pay. Its single, unswerving ambition is to break up the unity of free peoples, in order to overrun them one by one.

Too many Americans have given up all hope of world peace. But if this analysis is

right, there is no need yet to give up hope. For as long as the free peoples are strong and stand together peace is possible. Only when they are weak, and divided, is the world threatened by war.

In attacking the unity of free peoples the Soviet leaders are unprincipled and astute. They combine peace campaigns and campaigns of aggression. They play on labor's fear of capital and capital's fear of labor. They exploit the guilty conscience of the liberals, even while they plot sabotage and assassination. They force a wedge through every crack and crevice in the free world.

In Europe the Russians use the threat of force to terrorize all peoples. Eighty Soviet divisions stand on the borders of Europe. Twenty Polish divisions are being raised under a Soviet general to sweep through Germany. Ten Czech divisions are being raised to move into Austria and Bavaria. Six hundred thousand soldiers in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Albania are being trained, equipped, and indoctrinated to attack Tito, the insolent dwarf who defied Stalin's will.

To bring that force closer, the East German puppet parliament enacts the death penalty for West German resistance leaders and openly marks them down for execution when the Soviet armies roll.

The impact of this force and terror strikes in every European heart.

The West German Communist Party has been heavily subsidized by German industrialists as an insurance policy against the future. In France and Italy the Communist Parties conduct door-to-door canvasses, collecting contributions from washerwomen and elevator operators, and presenting them in return with receipts marked: "Present this for protection purposes when the Red army arrives."

In Yugoslavia the pressure is even more intense. Day by day the pattern of infiltration, subversion, and provocation by border incidents that preceded the attack on South Korea is being worked up against Tito.

Today, and for the foreseeable future, no land force stands between the Red armies and the British channel. Day by day the Russians warn that efforts to defend Europe may set those armies rolling. And yet the peoples of Europe are accepting the challenge, and taking the risks of defense. They are taking the risk on the assurance that they have the whole-hearted support of the one nation that can match Soviet power—the United States.

In Asia, Russia is working in the same way to divide Asia and the West and to break the resistance of Asia to aggression.

In colonial days, no force existed in Asia that would resist aggression. The oppressors were too weak, the oppressed lacked the will to resist. The leaders threw their weight against the Allies in the war, and collaborated with the Japanese. The Indian jurist who sat on the war crimes tribunal refused to join its finding that Japan was an aggressor on the ground that Japanese aggression was provoked by the imperialism of the West.

Fortunately for us, the rise of Soviet aggression has coincided with the rise of one force in Asia that is strong enough to resist it—Asian nationalism. For nationalism must clash with imperialism, and in Asia, as in Europe, communism is the cloak for Russian imperialism. So when the Communist fifth column in Asia was hurled against the Nationalist movement by Moscow it failed—it failed that is except in China, where Chiang Kai-shek forfeited the leadership of Chinese nationalism and it passed by default to Mao Tse-tung.

Today Russia is weak in non-Communist Asia. But democracy is also weak. No democracy in history has ever been created overnight. Yet the democratic nations of Asia are all less than 5 years old. No democracy has ever functioned under conditions of 90 percent illiteracy and the continuous threat of starvation. But those are the conditions under which the democracies of Asia are trying to function today. They are almost overwhelmed by inflation and falling living standards. They are working desperately against the timetable forced on them by Communist China without regard for human costs. They know that they cannot survive free in war and already war is raging in Korea. Yet they are committeed to democracy and to the United Nations, and against aggression, again in the belief that the one free nation which can help them will provide inspired leadership for progress and peace.

That is the challenge to great leadership that America faces in Europe and Asia. It is a challenge that Roosevelt would have gladly welcomed and one which in his spirit we can meet today.

Are we meeting that challenge in Roosevelt's spirit?

In Korea our soldiers are fighting with great courage so that we can be courageous. At home, we are moving to mobilize our own strength. But in providing inspired leadership to the world we are faltering at a critical hour.

We are not living under the shadow of the Soviet armies. We are not overwhelmed by poverty and famine. Yet we are becoming obsessed by fear. We are losing the quality that has made America and held it together—confidence in ourselves.

One group that incites fear and loss of confidence in America is the isolationists. They want us to dishonor our pledges to Europe. They want us to crawl back into a cave and wait for doom to overtake us. They propose that we surrender Western Europe to Russia and yet hold Britain, 20 miles away. They suggest that we triple the economic resources available to Stalin and then sit back and wait for him to collapse of his inner weaknesses. Their proposals have been condemned on economic grounds and military grounds and strategic grounds. And in God's name isn't it about time that it was condemned on moral and spiritual grounds? It seems to me perfectly clear that if we willingly surrendered a thousand million people to Soviet enslavement we would at the same time surrender our own moral and spiritual will to survive. No people who committed so enormous a crime could be left with the conviction that their society held out anything worth fighting for. We would sink into a morass of apathy and cynicism, and the last free nation would be lost without a shot being fired.

Americans know that. And they will reject the Hoover doctrine when it is placed before them honestly and openly. It will not be. Instead, men with praise of freedom and fine anti-Communist phrases on their lips will move this year to enforce the Hoover doctrine in a concealed dishonest form. They will attempt to withhold from our allies the vital lifeblood in manpower and military and economic aid that President Truman has asked for and that alone can save thousands of our lives later on.

I stated that a new Korea is in the making in Yugoslavia. I want to repeat now, that just as the refusal of Congress in 1950 to aid South Korea brought on the Communist attack against South Korea, so any evidence in 1951, that the Congress is abandoning Europe by withholding aid, will bring on a Communist attack against Yugoslavia and will lead to world war. But that is precisely what the Republican-controlled Congress may do, unless we act now.

One threat to American leadership comes from the isolationists. A second threat comes from the provocationists. The first group seek to isolate America. The second group makes it easy for Stalin to isolate us.

We went very far last year toward provoking Russia, and breaking up the new-formed partnership of free peoples, when we pressed for the immediate rearmament of Germany without any safeguards in the form of an economic or a military or a political federation of Europe. Our allies almost broke with us, because they knew that a remilitarized sovereign Western Germany is capable of provoking a third world war in order to reunite Germany, and to make Germany predominant after a war in which Russia and America have drained their life blood.

In the same reckless spirit we are going very far right now to provoke China, and to break up our partnership when we continue to intervene on the losing side in China's civil war. Once again our allies are ready to break with us, because they know that we are playing Russia's game. For not once but many times Chiang Kai-shek has declared that he would welcome a third world war as the one means by which he can march back to Chungking behind a phalanx of American planes, American guns, and American boys.

The Congress and the administration have piled error on top of error in our Asian policy. First, the administration surrendered the control of Asian policy to the generals. Then the generals passed it along to the China lobby. People talk of appeasing Communist China—the same people who spent the thirties fighting Roosevelt and appeasing Hitler. I am not concerned with appeasing China; I am very much concerned with continued appeasement of Knowland, McCarthy, Fulton Lewis, and Henry Luce.

Those men have succeeded in squandering America's moral standing in Asia. They have obscured completely the nature of our struggle against Soviet imperialism.

We want to arouse Asia against Soviet imperialism.

At the same time we assert our imperial control over an integral part of China in Formosa.

We want to stir Asia up against Stalin's use of puppet regimes.

At the same time we deliver our incomparable power to our puppet, Chiang Kai-shek, who could not survive a month on Formosa, let alone in China without our aid.

We want to mobilize Asia against Russia's efforts to ride roughshod over the interest of small countries in the United Nations.

At the same time we threaten that unless the UN falls in line when we crack the whip we will quit the UN and abandon our allies.

The Chinese Communists are engaged in selling their nation out to Stalin. And one day the people of China will punish them for that crime. That day is postponed because, when we oppose the legitimate nationalist aspirations of China to control its own territory, and to join the community of nations in the UN, we consolidate 400,000,000 nationalist Chinese behind their Communist oppressors. Still worse, we turn all the nationalist sentiment of Asia against us. That is what is happening now and it spells disunity, disaster, and war.

That is no reckless charge on my part. Last week Life magazine wrote:

"Life sees no choice but to acknowledge the existence of war with Red China and to set about its defeat in full awareness that this course will probably involve war with the Soviet Union as well."

Senator TAFT added that he favored cutting down our commitments in Europe in order to help Chiang Kai-shek inside the mainland of China.

"If this brings war between the United States and the Chinese Communists," he said, "it is nothing different from what we now have. In fact, it would be a much less dangerous war to us, much less fatal to our men, and much less expensive in material."

I suggest to you that that line amounts to strategic insanity and moral suicide.

The Chinese are doing their best to settle without a general war in Korea. There is only one nation that can gain from a war between America and China, and that is Soviet Russia. Senator TAFT and the comfortable men in Rockefeller Center may see no difference between today's limited conflict in Korea and unlimited atomic war. But the peoples of the world who have suffered bombardment and occupation and famine know very well what the difference is. And if they believe that America has grown so callous and indifferent to human life as to seek unlimited war, then they will desert us, and we will be left entirely alone.

Certainly we are disillusioned with the failure of other nations to back us. Certainly we will find it hard to function with nations that challenge our decisions and dispute our will. Let's remember that patience as well as strength is the price of union among the free peoples today. Roosevelt foresaw that in his last message on the state of the Union.

"In our disillusionment after the last war we preferred international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see and think exactly as we did. We gave up the hope of gradually achieving a better peace because we had not the courage to fulfill our responsibilities in an admittedly imperfect world.

"We must not let that happen again or we shall follow the same tragic road again—the road to a third world war."

A nation enters a war for one purpose—victory. In unlimited war against China there can be no victory. Our partnership with the free nations would break up. All Asia would oppose us. The United Nations would be against us. We would waste our lifeblood for nothing. Yet that is the drift of American policy, now that our policy is out of control. Certainly we must hold in Korea. But the one purpose of holding in a war we cannot win is to negotiate an honorable settlement. The liberals in America, who have rushed to the aid of Chiang Kai-shek and sanctioned the use of the atom bomb against China have done the liberal movement a grave disservice. We must regain our sanity and retrace our steps before it is too late.

None of us today dares to say what Roosevelt would do if he were with us.

We do know that he would tell us not to lose faith in peace, or give up trying for peace.

It is for us to ask how; I suggest that the answer may lie along these lines.

First, we must make war unprofitable for the aggressor.

That means sustaining General Eisenhower in his critical task of preventing aggression against Europe. It means sustaining Eisenhower with American soldiers.

It means sustaining Eisenhower with military aid to help our allies rearm.

It means sustaining him with economic aid so that our allies can turn their resources to rearmament.

It means supporting political federation in Europe without which Eisenhower is a military tyrant if he takes the actions he must take to defend Europe.

Making war unprofitable means raising a large armed force in the United States, and a just armed force. There is still Jim Crow in our Army, and no Jim Crow army is going to save world democracy.

Second, we must help others share the burden of resisting aggression. We have learned in Korea that we lack the resources to police the world alone. The answer is not to give the world over to Stalin, but to help other free peoples carry their share.

Only the Europeans can defend Europe. Only the Asians can hold Asia. Our task is to help them defend themselves, and us, in a common fight. They will carry their share of the common load only if we permit them to share in the determination of our common policies. That means that we must stop blustering and threatening in the United Nations. We must listen to what Asia is saying and what Europe is saying. We must recognize their ambitions and their deep-seated fears, and we must share our resources with them. We must remember that in Britain a family eats meat once a week, and that in India a man sent to jail gains weight on 18 cents worth of food a day. We must realize that the price of partnership is to treat others with the respect and understanding that partners deserve. We must act and think as part of the UN team.

Third, we must cut down the potential of communism.

We must remember that aggression and revolution strike where poverty and exploitation leave the free nations economically and socially weakened.

We must remember that the military victories of communism are prepared by our economic and social defeats.

Our people today are embittered by our losses in the Korean War. And they are fearful of the costs of rearmament.

It is for us to make it clear that as long as we attempt to prop up corrupt regimes against a tide of progress, no amount of arms and aid from America, for all our wealth, can provide stability.

It is for us to make it clear also that progress is the alternative to communism and that the more we can cut down the potential base of communism in human misery, the less we will have to spend in fighting communism where it takes hold.

Aid is sterile unless it is accompanied by reform. Reform, at least in Asia, is impossible through democratic procedures without aid. Both go together and, within limits, a policy of supporting reform can reduce the amount of aid necessary to halt communism.

Aid means military aid, and economic aid.

No Congressman will be caught voting against military appropriations. But very few will support President Truman's request for $4,000,000,000 in economic aid this year.

That is because we have failed to demonstrate that economic aid to our allies is as vital to our own security as military weapons.

In Asia today, living standards are falling, the situation is getting out of hand. At such a moment time is of the essence. Roughly, this is true:

The sooner we give aid, the more we can stress economic as against military aid and the less we will have to give.

The longer we delay aid, the more we will have to stress military assistance, including manpower, and the more we will have to give in order to retrieve a situation that is drifting out of control.

Aid, as I said, is part of the story. The rest is reform. We cannot easily explain democracy to Asian peoples unable to read or write. But if we can make it clear to the great majority of Asians that democracy means that the farmer owns his land, then democracy will take roots. This year the Government of the United States should declare that land reform is official United States policy, calling for land reform in feudal economies, supporting land reform in nations like India, where representative governments lack the means to carry their own sound programs out. That step alone can save untold resources and lives in our long struggle against Communist revolution that poses as reform.

Fourth, we must keep our own democracy moving forward.

That means strengthening the economic and social and spiritual foundations of our society that endures because it is stable and just and free.

The struggle we are waging is a long enduring struggle. If its duration were this year and next year only we could afford waste and luxury, and time misspent in snipping pennies from the luncheons given to school kids, and the social-security benefits paid to our old people. But this struggle is a long one, and if it means years in which the military budget is a hundred billion dollars or more we must confront the real problems—first of raising production in order to maintain living standards, secondly in preventing the continued erosion of our standards of education and welfare.

We must raise productivity, and we must share what we have. Roosevelt was disgusted with the inadequacy of the excess-profits tax he was given in the last war. How would he feel about today's tax which allows our corporations 60 percent more in excess profits than they earned in the profit-rich years of the last war?

A just society means a society that justly shares its burdens. It means also a society in which all participate. Today our Government is being turned over to the direction of one group—the manufacturers. We need their skills. But we need also the skills of labor. American labor is bitter today at the lack of realization of its problems in our representative Government. And unless labor feels that its voice is raised in the councils of government, its voice will be raised instead on the picket lines of costly strikes. We cannot afford that kind of disunity at home.

A free society means a society that gains strength and wisdom through tolerance and compassion. Freedom after all is not a relic of a bygone age, to be laid on the shelf as a sentimental keepsake. Freedom is the means by which a democratic society cleanses itself of forces of corruption and greed and selfishness and incompetence that threaten all human societies. Those forces exist in every society and unless they are exposed they multiply. They are exposed when society itself protests the right of its citizens to protest. When that right is withdrawn, far too often today, the efficient functioning of a free society is immediately impaired. After all we are no greater in resources and manpower than our enemies. Freedom is our one unique weapon. If we forsake it to play the Russians at their own game of suppression we are lost. They play that game so much better than the worst of our intolerant men.

Last, we must stand for great ideas.

We cannot pretend that the burden of rearmament is easy to bear. We cannot deny that the outlook for generations is dark. For every one of us, the prospect of war is fearful. For our allies, living on the margins of misery, and under the shadow of the Soviet armies, facing again the horrors of bombardment and occupation, the future seems far worse.

Yet we have no alternative but to face our common future, and affirm our common destiny.

Behind the iron curtain, enslaved peoples face the same future. They go on working for their masters because they have no choice. The peril and the glory of freedom is that it offers free peoples a choice. We can be sure that they will make the right choice, whatever the cost, only if survival holds out to them the vision of a world of happiness and opportunity and lasting peace for their children or their grandchildren if not for themselves. Only the vision of a better world at the end of this struggle will give embattled peoples the strength to shoulder today's burden and to struggle forward.

Roosevelt knew that when he founded the United Nations during the darkest hours of Bataan. Churchill knew it and the knowledge summed up his greatness. "Those who serve supreme causes," Churchill said, "do not consider what they can get, but what they can give."

If we see communism simply as a threat, then we may be overwhelmed by communism in one form or another.

If we see communism as a challenge, then we can overcome that challenge, and in overcoming it we can make this time of

sweat and agony a time of advance toward a new time of peace.

The answer lies not in our governments or our leaders or our allies. It lies in every one of us. It is a challenge to every one of us. We can meet the challenge by working harder, by giving more, by taking less, by holding to our faith, and by joining together, in continuous, organized, disciplined action, in militant liberal groups like Americans for Democratic Action, knowing that only this extra effort as citizens can make all our other efforts worth while.

We all know that at heart. That is why we have met together tonight. We have met, not to mourn Roosevelt, but to draw from his life of service and his spirit of dedication, a new inspiration for ourselves: As Justice Holmes once said:

"At the grave of a hero we end, not in sorrow at the inevitable loss, but with a kind of fierce joy; and with the contagion of his courage we go back to the fight."

Thirty-third Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

The United States can well be proud of the fact that it was one of the sponsors of the re-creation of a free and independent Lithuania after the conclusion of World War I in 1918.

In the 20 years that followed, the people of Lithuania, through a progressive, liberal, and democratic government, and through its achievements in the field of education, social justice, and industry, have well established their right to a place in the family of free nations.

Unfortunately, Lithuania, just as Poland and other countries beyond the iron curtain, became the victim of Nazi aggression in 1939.

And just as in the case of Poland, after the Nazi invaders were defeated, Lithuania was trampled under the equally cruel and ruthless foot of the Communist Soviet invader. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanian victims have been brutally murdered or lost in concentration camps.

But the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people lives on. They continue to fight for their freedom and the freedom of the world.

I think it is entirely fitting and proper that we pause on this day to consider the plight of these Lithuanian people and of the freedom-loving people beyond the iron curtain.

In our search for a formula to establish world peace we cannot fail to resolve to include restoration of full independence and liberty to them as an essential and indispensable condition, without which there can be no hope for a just and permanent peace.

Aged and Disabled Retired Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to the President by John H. Hoeppel, founder of National Defense magazine, making an impassioned plea for more consideration for aged and disabled retired enlisted men. Inflation has taken a heavy toll from all in this country including veterans who are on fixed compensation. This is the source of most of the trouble about which this letter complains. It is addressed to the President, but it should have been addressed to Congress as well, and that is my reason, Mr. President, for asking permission to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1951.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMANDER IN CHIEF: In the interests of fair dealing to the aged and disabled retired enlisted men of the armed services who are today victims of discrimination and the increasing lower standard of living due to increased prices and higher taxes, we respectfully appeal to you to consider the following statement of facts—and if you feel as we do that they merit your consideration, will you please forward this letter to the Secretary of Defense recommending to that Office that the discriminations and injustices here complained of be corrected through legislation?

We have every confidence in the Congress of the United States to deal fairly and squarely with the aged and disabled retired enlisted men of the armed services if you as Commander in Chief and the National Defense Department will make the proper recommendations to the committees of the Senate and House on the Armed Services.

First and foremost, we ask your kind attention to the desperate plight of thousands of aged and disabled retired enlisted men in the lower pay categories who today are not receiving sufficient to live because of the depreciated dollar which buys ever and ever less.

We repeat, there are thousands of aged and disabled retired enlisted men, all of them veterans of an American war, who received $89.25 per month retired pay in in 1922 and who today receive only $96.25 per month retired pay. In other words, in the last 28 years these men have received only $7 per month increase in retired pay. If you will compare the cost of living in 1922 and the increase in taxes of at least 1,000 percent since that period, you can readily see that the income of these men is down to the vanishing point and that they are not far removed, especially if they have dependents, from the standpoint of charity.

Five different times industrial workers have received an increase in pay since World War II. So much so that many of them are today receiving 100 to 200 percent more pay than they received in 1940. Our industrial workers and civil-service workers have received substantial increases as here shown above that of thousands of retired enlisted men of long service.

An economist, writing in today's press, directing our attention to the vanishment in purchasing power of the dollar, stated with a presentation of concise figures that unless an individual today received 270 percent more pay than he did in 1935 that then such individual was a victim of our own shrinking economic policy. We are not qualified perhaps to compare this economist's analysis but we do know that with the exception of one group of retired enlisted men, all of them today are immeasurably in more desperate straits with the small increase which they receive than they ever were when compared with the retired pay they received in the yesterdays.

Illustrative of this, we mention that an enlisted man of the first grade received $133.87 per month in 1922. Today, his taxes have increased approximately 1,000 percent and with living costs up 200 or 300 percent, the same man today receives $220.50 per month. In other words, his living standards have been immeasurably and pathetically reduced. The foregoing comparison was made in respect to the first grade where their pay is highest. The comparison with men in the lower grades would show that virtually all of them have suffered an inordinate lowering of living standards so much so that ere long some of them will become—if not now—objects of charity.

At the moment Congress is deliberating on paying $50 per month combat pay in addition to foreign-duty pay for all enlisted men who are in the combat area in Korea. We offer no objection; rather, we heartily approve this proposal. However, those of us who served in combat in two to five wars and who were never considered for combat pay and who since our retirement have continued to be discriminated against because of apathy and indifference on the part of the department heads, we are not asking for retroactive combat pay but we do ask for a square deal so that our retired pay may be in keeping (measured in purchasing power) with the dollar which we received when we were retired after 30 years of creditable and honorable service. All industrial workers and public employees have recently received cost-of-living bonuses, and even Congress itself, not ignoring yourself, received substantial increases in pay, much of it income tax exempt, while those of us who served our Nation in combat abroad are thus far ignored for a cost-of-living bonus and we are even denied a square deal in the computation of our longevity pay which we gained fighting our Nation's battles abroad. We especially appeal to you to recommend to the Department of Defense that all retired enlisted men receive at least a cost-of-living increase of $20 per month. The coal miners recently received approximately $30 per month which was about the nth increase they have received since 1940. We have no criticism to make of this, but we do feel that those of us who faced bullets and who won Uncle Sam's battles in the yesterdays are entitled to be relieved from poverty today, due to the rapidly diminishing purchasing power of the dollar, and the addition of proportionate tax which is levied on a man whose income is only $600 per annum.

We further urge you as Commander in Chief to remove the abject discrimination practiced against individuals who are penalized under the provisions of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, because they had the ability and efficiency to be promoted during World War I. All such individuals who were promoted to commissioned rank have been denied longevity pay for their double time while at the same time men with whom they served in the yesterdays receive longevity pay for their double time in all instances where they didn't have the ability or experience to be promoted to commissioned rank. We ask, Is it fair to penalize men who gained double time side by side to give one longevity pay for double time and to deny it to another because he was promoted to command men during the war?

The discriminations under which the retired enlisted men of the Army have suffered, unfortunately, are extensive and we are reluctant to take your time to call your attention to them, but we will conclude this appeal to you with a further statement and a request, to wit: Do you think it is fair and honest that an enlisted man of the Navy who never served in war and with only 16 years' experience, that such enlisted man should be treated free in a Navy hospital while at the same time an Army enlisted man with 30 years' service who served in combat in two or more wars should be forced to pay for hospitalization in an Army hospital even though the disabilities for which he requires service are of combat origin? This abject, inhuman, and unfair discrimination along with the others described above are a matter of official record.

Will you kindly, as Commander in Chief, deal as fairly and squarely with those of us retired as you are seeking to deal with those now serving in Korea today? We believe that you will do this and it is with this degree of confidence that we conclude our appeal, thanking you for your consideration to this and wishing you well in your service to our Nation for a better America.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL DEFENSE MAGAZINE,
By JOHN H. HOEPPEL, *Founder.*

Chiang Kai-shek Should Be Permitted To Open a Second Front in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Kings County Republican Committee at Brooklyn, N. Y., on Monday evening, February 12, 1951:

It is a privilege to join tonight in this tribute to the great and noble spirit of Abraham Lincoln. It is an especial privilege to do so here in Brooklyn, a community of good will, good people, good homes, good churches—and the Dodgers. In this great Borough of Brooklyn lies a great cross section of families and homes that in themselves are a monument to the freedom and individual dignity for which Lincoln fought and died.

In Lincoln breathed the hopes and prayers of ordinary people like ourselves in all parts of the world. His uncompromising opposition to human slavery gave birth to a new political party which has served this Nation well through generations of constant development and progress.

Today, after 90 years of political service, the Republican Party still is the only party of freedom in these United States. It is still the only party which steadfastly has refused to accept the alien doctrines of socialism and communism, either in part or in whole.

Across this land of ours, the American people, weary of the trend toward a total state, have come to realize more and more that the lone champion of the basic freedoms that have made America great is the Republican Party. And they are going to translate that belief into action and elect a Republican Congress and a Republican President in 1952?

And why shouldn't they? Is there a person within the range of my voice who does not realize deep inside him that something is fundamentally wrong with the Democratic leadership in Washington? Is there anybody within the range of my voice who does not fervently hope that out of the election in 1952 will come an administration possessing the basic characteristics that made Abraham Lincoln great—intelligence of purpose, unflinching devotion to ideals, and, above all else, the courage to carry out what the brain and heart and soul dictate?

It is the great tragedy of our day that in a period of crisis we have an administration in Washington which is so bankrupt in leadership that its first measurement of every undertaking is whether it will help perpetuate those in power. Votes have become the yardstick of their policies.

This is not the true spirit nor the wisdom of our fine American heritage. And I am proud to stand here and tell you tonight that there are patriotic Democrats in and out of Congress, in and out of government, who tell me with the deepest sincerity that the only way to save America, the only way to achieve the leadership we so desperately need, is by a landslide Republican victory next year.

We welcome Democrats and independents everywhere to this crusade. Our task far transcends party lines.

The great issue before the world today—an issue so vital that it affects every man, woman, and child on earth—is: Which will triumph, the forces of Marxism as embodied in communism and socialism, or the free principles of liberty and individual dignity of man which our civilization has evolved out of 3,000 years of experience?

Shall it be the godless materialism of Marx, or the idealism instilled in us by the religious teachings of all faiths?

Shall it be the police state that triumphs, or shall political systems that recognize the essential dignity of man emerge victorious?

Shall we become the victims of secret police, or shall we walk the earth as free men fearing no one but God?

Shall our homes and our churches be liquidated, or shall the morality of the family and the basic religious teachings survive, mightier than ever?

These are the questions. To meet them we must not only possess the finest qualities of spirit and the maximum of wisdom, but we must be able to translate those qualifications into practical action.

Let us apply ourselves tonight to examining the situation we are now in. Here briefly is what we see:

Since the end of World War II, due principally to the use of armed might and the tactics of infiltration, and due also to the incredible policies which the United States and other free nations have followed, the Soviet Union has managed to expand its domination from 170,000,000 people to 800,000,000 people. In other words, almost without firing a shot, Communist Russia in five so-called peacetime years has increased its domination fivefold over human beings and now physically controls half of Europe and half of Asia and threatens the other halves on both continents. That is fact No. 1.

The free countries, on the other hand, devoid of the guile and immorality which the Communists practice, have failed to produce the political weapons necessary to match the unprincipled tactics of the Soviet Union. True, ECA has been devised as a weapon, and it has had some success, but it has not been enough by any means. Our counterpropaganda, a political weapon so effectively used by the Soviet Union, has been long on quantity and pitifully short on quality. Our programs of technical assistance and capital loans have operated in dubious fashion and have not proved too effective. In short, we have permitted ourselves to be completely outmaneuvered in the employment of political weapons. That is fact No. 2.

Finally, while Russia has spent the last 5 years increasing its armed might, the free countries, and particularly the United States, have been busily engaged in reducing their military strength. In our own country, the record must show that the Republican Eightieth Congress passed laws directing the President of the United States to build the Air Force up to 70 groups, to strengthen the Marine Corps, and to broaden naval aviation by the construction of a super aircraft carrier. But unfortunately, the administration had other plans. These plans called for the armed services to be reduced, and by the President's own directive countermanding the action of the Republican Eightieth Congress, the Air Force was held to 48 groups, the Marine Corps was virtually consigned to oblivion, and construction of the super aircraft carrier, on which $4,000,000 already had been spent, was ordered halted by the White House in 1949.

The Republican Eightieth Congress, by passage of the Vandenberg resolution, laid the groundwork for the military assistance program, and the Eightieth Congress also voted funds over administration protests to send arms to the anti-Communist Chinese Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The military assistance program was commenced, but unfortunately the military aid that the administration permitted to reach the anti-Communist Chinese Government of the generalissimo was far short of what was needed—in fact, it was pitifully small. But that is not all. Because we had fuzzy-minded, pinko officials in our security setup, the Soviet Union was able to steal the secrets of the atomic and the hydrogen bombs. To sum up, Russia and its satellites have spent the last 5 years in an enormous armament program while the United States and the other free nations were disarming. That is fact No. 3.

No one regrets the Korean conflict more than the American people. But despite its terrific cost, Korea has finally awakened the world and certainly the United States to the fact that the Communist conspiracy is essentially a conspiracy employing deception and armed might. So, we are rearming—rearming at greatly increased cost to the United States and the free nations everywhere. The Air Force is at last being built to 70 groups, and construction of a superaircraft carrier has finally been started all over again. The Army is being expanded. The Marine Corps is coming back into its own. The Navy is being taken out of the mothballs.

I ask you—could it be that the Republican Eightieth Congress was right after all?

We long ago learned that no Nation can suddenly launch a huge rearmament program without throwing its entire economy badly out of joint. Because that is a fact, the administration found it necessary to seek, and Congress to vote, the imposition of wartime economic controls. So, once more America is plagued by arbitrary controls administered by political favorites and White House errand boys. Once more we are burdened with bureaucratic red tape, high prices, and shortages.

I think I can be pardoned for what I am about to say. Had the directives and policies of the Republican Eightieth Congress been followed instead of sabotaged, the Korean conflict might never have happened, wartime controls and sky-high taxes might

not be with us, and the world crisis which now exists might have been averted.

Now, let us examine what we are doing today from a practical standpoint.

We appear to have solidified our position along the Han River in the vicinity of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. That theater occupies approximately 200,000 of our troops, with Japan as a base of operations.

On Formosa to the south, the recognized Government of the Republic of China, headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, still holds out, together with its anti-Communist army of 600,000 troops. Despite the fact that the only Government of China that we officially recognize is the generalissimo's government, the administration in Washington refuses to back the generalissimo and his fighting forces. In fact, President Truman in his official announcement on Korea on June 27, 1950, declared that we were sending the Seventh Fleet to Formosa to prevent any more air and sea operations by the generalissimo's forces against the Chinese Reds, thus inactivating the 600,000 troops on the island.

On the Chinese mainland, anti-Communist guerrilla bands continue to make raids on the Chinese Reds. Approximately 1,500,000 anit-Communist Chinese guerrillas are engaged in these sorties.

In French Indochina, a so-called volunteer Communist army, composed substantially of Chinese Reds, engages a French force. The French have approximately 150,000 fighting men operating in that area.

In the balance of Asia, the operations of the Chinese Reds are a constant threat to the security of Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Pakistan, and India.

In Europe the forces of the Soviet Union and its puppet states are comparatively quiescent. However, military men are generally in agreement that the Soviet Union, with its 200 Red army divisions, could roll all the way to the English Channel on the west and to the Pyrenees on the south unless a miraculous rearmament program were undertaken by the free nations of Europe. At the present time, the free nations of the world combined could not muster more than 60 divisions to stop a Soviet advance in continental Europe.

Two nations in Europe are on the outside looking in. Yugoslavia, a former satellite, has broken with the Soviet Union, and Tito casts an occasional friendly glance at the western powers. Spain, the guardian of the Pyrenees and one of the strongest military powers in Europe today, remains isolated from the free nations, anti-Communist though the Franco regime is.

That briefly is the practical situation. Just where do we go from here?

Apparently it is the aim of the administration in Washington, as it has been for the past 5 years, to put our eggs in the European basket. We are told that American troops should be put on the continent of Europe. We are at this moment sending more and more military supplies to the members of the North Atlantic community. We are sending food to Tito. We are in consultation with the governments of Western Europe and their military leaders.

Everyone knows that we must have an effective aid program for Europe. Everyone knows that we must not, if we can possibly prevent it, allow the resources and productive capacity of the free European nations to fall into Communist control. It is essential to have a program that meets this problem.

But I protest with every resource at my command the formulation of any over-all strategy which virtually ignores the focal point of our trouble today—Asia. And I might add that Republicans in countless numbers, myself included, have been protesting such a policy, such a strategy, for years. Our protests date all the way back to 1943 when the first secret decisions were reached by the administration in Washington to give its blessings to the Chinese Communists as a political force in the Orient, as opposed to our great ally, the established government of the Republic of China.

How many Americans recall that on December 15, 1945, President Truman publicly announced to the world that unless the Republic of China admitted Chinese Reds to its government, American aid would be cut off? How many Americans recall that the aid was cut off and that General Marshall was sent to China to make sure that the troops of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek stopped their attacks on the Chinese Reds? How many Americans recall the protests against this policy made by such outstanding experts as General Wedemeyer, Patrick J. Hurley, and William C. Bullitt? How many people recall that General MacArthur declared that our failure to help the Republic of China may be "the single greatest blunder in the history of the United States"?

Stop and think.

We abandoned the anti-Communist forces of Asia once, and the Reds took over China. Are we going to make that same mistake twice?

America has suffered 50,000 casualties in Korea. Mr. Truman says we are going to stay in Korea.

Are we going to leave 200,000 American boys stranded in Korea? Or does some master planner think the pressure can be taken off them by deploying other hundreds of thousands of American boys to the scene in Europe?

If we really want to take the pressure off our forces in Korea, and if we want to diminish the threat of a Soviet sweep across Europe, why, may I ask, do we not employ the 600,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on Formosa?

There is no question whatsoever about the desire and the eagerness of the generalissimo and his troops to join in battle against the Chinese Reds. When the Korean conflict broke out, the generalissimo, within a week, offered to transport immediately 33,000 troops from Formosa to Korea. We turned him down cold.

Why?

Our State Department claimed that we did not want to antagonize the Chinese Reds and bring them into the conflict.

Well, the generalissimo's troops are still on Formosa, but our boys have been fighting the Chinese Reds since last November.

The State Department's reasoning is no longer valid today, if it was ever valid.

What could be sounder logic, both strategically and militarily, than to allow the anti-Communist forces of the generalissimo on Formosa to participate in the war against the Chinese Reds? Why not let them open a second front in Asia?

Let us consider the possibilities:

First, there is good reason to believe that the Chinese Reds could not support a two-front war. They have neither the railroads nor the highways nor the transportation to supply a force fighting in Korea and another on the Chinese mainland, where presumably the troops of the generalissimo would infiltrate if we gave them the necessary material aid.

Second, there is excellent reason to believe that if the generalissimo's 600,000 fighting men reached the mainland of China tomorrow, they would double the size of their army within six to eight weeks by the addition of anti-Communist guerrilla forces already fighting the Reds in South China.

Third, the opening up of a second front on the Chinese mainland by the forces of the established government of China, operating from Formosa, would not only take the pressure off our forces in Korea, but would reduce the pressure on the French in Indochina and the Communist threat to Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Pakistan, India, and Europe.

Fourth, according to responsible military opinion—yes, right in our own Pentagon—the establishment of a second front on China's mainland by the armies of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is not only feasible and practical with aid from us, but it would be the cheapest operation that we could promote in the terms of dollars and manpower.

The forces of the Generalissimo are mostly battle tested, and they are as well trained as the Chinese Reds. Their needs to make a second-front operation successful fall mainly in the categories of ammunition, transportation, planes, tanks, and food. The Generalissimo has planes and tanks, but he would need more. The Generalissimo has a navy, but it needs replacement parts and servicing.

Whether the second front would be opened up by an invasion of the mainland or whether it would be built up by a series of commando raids and night landings would depend on the number and strength of the Chinese Red forces in that area. For such purposes the Generalissimo already has assembled miscellaneous craft, but his operations would be much more successful if the United States provided amphibious craft, landing barges, and PT boats.

In addition, it would be desirable to have American experts to help train the Generalissimo's officers and men. Shipments of food—a critical item in Asia—would be a prime necessity.

What kind of logic is it that lets our soldiers die in Korea when, by shipping the proper supplies to the Generalissimo, a second front could be opened in China without a single GI being forced to place a foot on the soil of the Chinese mainland?

Certainly, if the Soviet Union can employ its puppet states to fight its wars even against their will, then the United States can call on its friends who are not only willing but begging for the opportunity.

Certainly we want a united and militarily strong Europe. Certainly we are willing to provide equipment and possibly some of the manpower necessary to achieve that goal.

But let us not place all our eggs in the European basket. Let us remember that we have friends in Asia and that we are fighting a war in Asia at this very moment.

If it is right for American boys to fight Chinese Reds in Korea, what can be wrong with American help to the anti-Communist Chinese fighting the Reds on their own soil?

What are we in Korea for, to win or to lose?

If we are in Korea to win, then we should do everything possible to bring that victory about. If we are not in Korea to win, then this administration should be indicted for the murder of thousands of American boys.

Some persons may ask: If a second front in Asia can be opened at very small cost to ourselves and without employing American troops, why haven't our generals done it?

The answer is that we do have military people who favor the employment of the anti-Communist forces of the Republic of China. There is good reason to believe that General MacArthur favors such an operation. There is good reason to believe that there are people in the Pentagon who favor such an operation.

Why hasn't a second front been opened? The reason is that the State Department is preventing it, the same State Department crowd that cut off aid to the Government of China back in 1946, thus allowing China to fall into Communist hands. Can anyone expect the State Department to admit 5 years too late that it was wrong? Can anyone expect the State Department to accept the blame for the fact that American boys are now being killed by Chinese Reds?

No; the State Department, as now constituted, is never going to permit a single soldier from Formosa to participate. Why? Because it would mean that the State Department would finally have to admit that we should have supported Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek all along.

If we want to develop a true global strategy that will wipe out the Communist threat of world domination, if we want a strategy that will save Europe and save Asia at the same time, if we want a strategy that will help save American lives not only in Korea, but wherever the next so-called police action may occur, then I say to you that we must clean out the State Department from top to bottom, starting with Dean Acheson.

The master planners in the Kremlin have had their eye on Asia for a quarter of a century. All anyone has to do is to read the writings of Lenin, Stalin, or the Daily Worker. William Z. Foster, the head of the Communist Party in the United States, wrote in the Daily Worker on December 2, 1945, "the war in China is the key of all problems on the international front."

Hitler in Mein Kampf stated emphatically that Asia was the key to the world situation. Tojo knew that Asia was the key to the world situation. Military strategists of many governments have declared the same thing time and time again.

Almost everybody knows it except our State Department.

Time is running out in Asia. How long do you think 1,500,000 anti-Communist guerrillas can hold out against superior forces? How long will it be before the bottoms rust out of Chiang Kai-shek's small navy? How long will it be before his guns, tanks, and planes are completely outmoded? How long will it be before the Chinese Reds have perfected their defenses to such an extent as to make a second front impossible?

No; time is not on our side. If we permit the State Department's bankrupt policies to prevail, time will have run out completely, while more thousands of American boys die on foreign soil.

The people of Greece will never forget that the shipment of 50 of our Navy's Helldiver bombers was their salvation back in 1946. Those 50 planes, together with only three American military men to train Greek fliers, and a mere handful of mechanics to teach the Greeks to service the planes, turned the tide against the Communist forces in Greece.

Certainly, if we could afford to gamble in Greece and achieve such wonderful results, we can afford to take a chance on Formosa.

A little can go a long way if it is effectively applied. Successful policies are not measured in billions of dollars, millions of foot soldiers, and thousands of planes. The true measure is how effectively those dollars, those men, and those planes are employed. Nor is the measure of good government its multitude of controls and edicts, or the scarcities and hardships it imposes, or the lavishness of its spending and the harshness of its taxes.

Don't you think it is about time Washington learned that?

Yes, in this crisis, we need leadership and sound policies as we have never needed them before. As Americans, everyone of us must act in the full meaning of good citizenship. We must look to the year of 1952 for deliverance. It is up to every American to help obtain this leadership by promoting widespread discussion of the issues and the most careful selection of political candidates in both parties. Each of us can help; each of us should participate to the utmost.

As we near the end of this day of tribute to Abraham Lincoln, let us borrow from his wisdom, his simple principles and his frugality. Let us remember that it was the clear, high-principled thinking of Lincoln that saved this Union, and let us realize that without clarity of thought, without actions based on fundamental principles, without the moral values that he embraced, we cannot save the world we live in.

We have more than an opportunity. We have a duty. God grant us the wisdom and the strength to perform it.

Truman Did Not Exceed His Power in Sending Armed Forces to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in Congress and in the press about the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. On January 12 I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A113 a statement of my own in which I reviewed briefly my own views on the constitutional and military powers of the President.

One of the outstanding editors of my district, Wallace E. Sherlock, of Fairfield, Iowa, wrote an excellent editorial January 17 expressing his views of the President's powers, just prior to receiving the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing my remarks.

I am including Mr. Sherlock's editorial and editor's note which appeared in the Fairfield Daily Ledger of Wednesday, January 24:

TRUMAN DID NOT EXCEED HIS POWER IN SENDING ARMED FORCES TO KOREA

There is much interest being aroused whether the President has the lawful right to send our troops into foreign countries without an act of the Congress. As we count the pros and cons, it appears to us that the cons are in the majority. However, we are convinced the pros have the better of the argument.

The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army, and, unless the Congress enacts laws to the contrary, the President has the right to do about as he pleases with the Army.

As we read constitutional history, the Congress is superior to the President, but the latter can act in emergencies that relate to foreign affairs, especially military affairs, when the Congress fails to act or is not in session so it can act quickly. Of course, the President is supposed to follow precedents.

In defense of the proposition that the Congress is superior to the President, we need only to cite, as our first reason, the fact that the drafters of the Constitution provided for the legislative department of our Government first in that document. At that time, the Representatives were to be elected by the people and the Senators were to be chosen by the State legislatures.

The people were to be the sovereign power under the Constitution. Certain powers were given the House of Representatives that were not even given the Senate, because, as provided then, the Members of the House of Representatives were the only national officials who were elected by a direct vote of the people. An example is the provision that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

That the Congress was to be considered superior to the President is proven by such statements in the Constitution. It was to have the power, by a two-thirds vote, to pass an act over the President's veto; it has power to coin money and regulate the value thereof; to establish post offices and post roads; to declare war, and make rules concerning captures on land and sea; to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, and other powers.

The expressed powers of the President are limited. The two important powers are the right to veto laws enacted by the Congress and the power vested in him as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. The Constitution does not go into detail as to the extent of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

The Constitution does give the Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide for and maintain a Navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces. If the Congress fails to make these rules, then the President in emergencies has the right as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to use the Army and Navy without waiting for Congress. So far as we can gather from reading constitutional and military histories, the Congress never has set up these rules—either general or specific.

The late President and late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court William Howard Taft is on record as saying: "The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. Under this (provision of the Constitution) he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation.

"Of course, this incidentally which this power furnishes, gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly in effect.

"Under the Constitution, only Congress has the power to declare war, but with the Army and the Navy, the President can take action such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no option but to declare it or recognize its existence."

Mr. Taft went on to point out cases in which the President used the Army and Navy in foreign countries without waiting for the consent of the Congress. He cited the acts of Polk in ordering the Army into the disputed territory between the Nueces and Rio Grande Rivers which brought on the Mexican War.

There are numerous cases in United States history when the Presidents sent the Army and/or Navy into foreign areas without the consent of the Congress. Some of the countries invaded requested the presence of our armies—others did not.

There was the Nicaraguan case under Taft's administration. We landed a part of our Army in Vera Cruz in Mexico to bring the Huerta administration to its senses. President Wilson sent our Army into Mexico just before World War I.

Then there was the landing of our Army in China during the Boxer Rebellion under the McKinley administration. We could cite a number of other cases where similar acts have been committed by Presidents of the United States.

We are not writing these lines to outlaw President Truman for his invasion of Korea or his proposal to send a large force into Western Europe without asking the Congress for a declaration of war. But we are saying that he has had plenty of precedent.

But we are reviewing that part of our American history to suggest to the Congress the importance of setting up some general rules to control under such circumstances.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The above editorial was written January 17, but we have not had the space for it till today. Since writing it, we have received daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS No. 7, volume 97, and we find on page A113 an extension of remarks of our very Congressman THOMAS E. MARTIN on this same subject.

Mr. MARTIN takes much the same stand we have taken above. He says among other

statements: "President Truman had the authority and power under section 2 of article II of our Constitution to order American troops into Korea.

"The President's obligation and liability for national security as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces necessarily leaves to him the matter of determining how far he must go within his powers to fulfill that obligation unless so limited by Congress."

Mr. MARTIN goes on to say: "Unless Congress places restrictions and limitations on the use to be made of the Armed Forces of the United States before additional troops are sent to Europe, the President as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces undoubtedly has the power to send additional Armed Forces to Europe even though he intends them to operate there as a part of a great international army.

"The power of Congress extends to all legislation essential to the prosecution of a war with vigor and success, except such as interferes with the command of the forces and the conduct of the campaigns."

We may add to Mr. MARTIN's statements that if Congress fails to act then "the sky is the limit" for the President.

Vice President Barkley Receives 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following account of the presentation of the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award to Vice President BARKLEY by the National Committee for Labor Israel:

On Wednesday, February 7, 1951, at 11 a.m., leaders of the National Committee for Labor Israel met in the office of the Vice President at the Senate Office Building, to present to Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award. The committee headed by its general chairman, Joseph Schlossberg, included Isaac Hamlin, general secretary, Harry Greenberg and Joseph Breslaw, vice presidents of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union (A. F. of L.), and Charles M. Segal, a director of the National Committee for Labor Israel.

In a tribute to the Vice President, Mr. Schlossberg said:

"Mr. Vice President, as chairman of the National Committee for Labor Israel, it is a pleasure to present to you the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award in recognition of your selfless and devoted aid to the State of Israel and the Histadrut, the General Federation of Jewish Workers.

"Your efforts on behalf of the new state of Israel have done much to create the proper climate for the understanding of all people of the struggle of Israel for the preservation not only of its own life and future, but of the democratic principles which we as Americans hold so dear.

"The present international unrest underscores only too dramatically the urgent need of preserving democratic institutions in the world today. We consider Israel a vital flank in our fight against totalitarian aggression, and in view of this, we deem it of the utmost importance that Americans continue to give wholehearted support to the Jewish state and to its democratic instruments.

"Mr. Vice President, you have labored hard to support the cause of Israel and the Histadrut, which has laid the very foundation for the Jewish State. You have brought the message of Israel and freedom and democracy to the people of America, and in so doing you have made a great contribution to the very life of Israel.

"In presenting you with the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award we wish you health and many more years to continue your indispensable efforts on behalf of the United States and freedom and democracy everywhere."

The Vice President replied:

"Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of gratitude that I accept from you the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award. I could not claim that anything I have done merits this distinction from you and from your committee. Nevertheless, I deeply appreciate the generous spirit which has constrained you and your organization to bestow this award upon me. I thank you and them for the distinct honor which you do me today.

"Whatever I have done in behalf of the freedom of Israel and the Jewish people who have found and are finding it a haven for applied democracy, I have done because I believe profoundly in democracy and in the ideals of free government for all people. The creation of the new State of Israel seems almost a miracle of our period. It came earlier than most people expected. I am happy that our Government, through the President, was the first to recognize it, and that our Government sponsored its admission to the United Nations.

"I am especially proud to be the recipient of this award because of its meaning in connection with labor Israel. All my life I have labored and sympathized with those who labor. All my life I have sought to advance the welfare of those who labor, and to recognize their worth in any democratic system of free enterprise and equality of opportunity.

"The recognition of this service by the State of Israel and by the friends of Israel is a fitting companion to their recognition of the individual rights of man and the dignity which men may attain under free institutions.

"It is needless for me to say that I wish for your organization, the Histadrut, the greatest possible success in its worthy efforts. I wish for the State of Israel permanent and increasing stability, and I wish for all the people who may find rescue and refuge under its institutions not only life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but that they may overtake happiness and clutch it to their bosoms as a part of their way of life.

"Again, let me thank you for this great honor which you have done me."

The UNESCO Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO—is a UN agency devoted to the promotion of better understanding among the peoples of the earth through education and the interchange of ideas. Appended hereto is the foreword to the publication the UNESCO story and the preamble to the constitution of UNESCO, which outline the fields of work in which this international organization is engaging:

FOREWORD

The story of UNESCO is one of a great crusade for international understanding, based on the belief that cooperation and good will among the peoples of the world can be a deciding force in the search for a lasting peace.

UNESCO's high ideals and principles are expressed in the preamble to its constitution. To make their achievement a reality instead of a dream, however, its member nations must fashion a practical program on which the peoples of the world can work together. That is UNESCO's primary challenge today.

Each member nation faces another responsibility: providing information on UNESCO's program and objectives to its own citizens and making plain how communities, organizations, and individuals can contribute to them.

The UNESCO story embraces such long-range ambitions as teaching the illiterate half of the world to read and write—other far-reaching projects to raise standards of living which only the resources of governments can carry out—combating ignorance and prejudice throughout the world, freeing the minds of men.

It is a story of cooperation being fostered among nations and among great organizations, national and international, and of the contributions of leaders in education, science, and culture. But it also is the story of the things ordinary citizens of a fortunate land can do to help those in other lands to share in the progress of civilization, of what a community in any country can do toward playing its part in world affairs.

The UNESCO story in the United States, if told in terms of UNESCO objectives, is that of the great civic, religious, and student organizations which have sent medical missions and educational aid to war-devastated countries, and of scores of foundations and universities which have helped rebuild institutions and equip laboratories.

It is that of educators and scientists and writers seeking ways to better understanding, and of thousands of American teachers and youths who have gone abroad as ambassadors of good will. It is the story of courses on UNESCO and its objectives in scores of colleges and schools and of movements to end intolerance in our own cities and towns. It is a story to which hundreds of communities and groups are adding chapters day by day—of a little western town which staged an international festival in which half of its citizens participated and which drew 2,000 people from the surrounding countryside; of a grand piano sent to the Athens Symphony by music clubs; of an American children's art exhibit in a Japanese school; of thousands of groups in our own country trying to understand the problems and ways of the peoples of other lands.

UNESCO makes no claim to credit for all these activities. Most of them started in the United States through organizations which believed in the UNESCO idea before UNESCO got fairly under way. The UNESCO contribution has been to expand them and give them a firmer foundation for the future—and to point up new objectives. It is the achievements of these organizations, and the deep desire of individual citizens to take part in efforts seeking world cooperation and peace, that underlie the strength of the UNESCO program in this country today.

PREAMBLE OF THE CONSTITUTION OF UNESCO

The governments of the states parties to this Constitution on behalf of their peoples declare—

That, since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed;

That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war;

That the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races;

That the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern;

That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

Enlistment of 18-Year-Old Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress, official publication of the International Reform Federation, before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on January 31, 1951, which was published in the February 1951 issue of Progress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE ENLIST 18-YEAR-OLDS?

(Statement by the editor, Clinton N. Howard, before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, January 31, 1951, in opposition to the enlistment of 18-year-old boys)

Mr. Chairman, I am a "peace-I-fist," but when might challenges right I am a pacifist as were my fathers before me who belonged to the plain people of Pennsylvania. On one occasion when a boy of 10 I dined with my father in a public house where an old-fashioned dinner bell was rung in and around the house to call the help, hands, and guests who came tumbling in like hungry hounds.

TURNING OTHER CHEEK

My father was a rural reverend and sat at the table with his broad-brimmed hat on. A rude fellow of the baser sort rebuked his table manners, asking him whether he wore a crock when he cut his hair. He also inquired why he did not remove his hat when he "et." My father explained that he never uncovered except in the presence of his superior. The diner rejoined offensively. Father replied, "Friend, my name is Howard. What is thy name?" He replied, "My name is Bell." Said my peace-I-fist father, "Friend Bell, if thee does not hold thy tongue, I'll knock the clapper out of thy bell." The warrior subsided. Having turned the other cheek, my father argued that the Lord left him to his own valor and discretion.

THE RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE

We are at war. It does not matter why, when, or where, we are at war. There are only two alternatives. We will either win or lose, and I favor our winning, either by honorable arbitration or by armed conflict. While war is always to be deplored, defeat is better than suffering wrong, humiliation, and defeat. War is not always wrong. We read in the Divine Revelation, "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon: and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not. And the great dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world, was cast out and his angels were cast out with him." Where did he go? The Bible says, "He was cast out into the earth." Our Lord confirmed it, saying, "Behold, I saw Satan as lightning fall from heaven." And he has been waging war on the earth ever since.

MILITANT MOSES

If it was right to fight in heaven against an aggressor who rejected and defied Jehovah, it might be right to fight to stop communism when it resorts to force and uses an innocent infant nation as a shield. The Lord led the armies of Israel out of Egypt to the coast of the Red Sea, divided the waters and Israel crossed over on dry land. Moses and the children of Israel sang, "The Lord is Man of War; the Lord is His name. I will sing unto the Lord for He hath triumphed gloriously; the Lord is my strength and song and He is become my salvation. Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea." It was a song of victory, of right over might.

For 40 years he trained them to fight and to conquer the more powerful nations that inhabited Palestine. It was an army of invasion and God commanded them, saying, "Thou shalt utterly overthrow and destroy them, throw down their images, overthrow their altars and root out their groves." They marched victoriously, crossing the Jordan, leveling the walls of Jericho and establishing the capital of Israel at Jerusalem where David the King, sang in triumph, "Blessed be God my strength who teacheth my hands to war and my fingers to fight."

THE ARMY OF THE LORD

God was their commander in chief and named the conditions on which victory would be won. He did not send schoolboys to be slaughtered, but men to fight and He fixed the age of their enlistment.

Again and again He commanded Moses and his successor Joshua, saying, "Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel after their families, with the number of their names, every male by their polls; from 20 years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel." And when they ran short of young men above 20, that were fit to fight, the Lord said unto Moses, "Number the sons of Israel after their families and after the house of their fathers, from 30 years old and upward even unto 50 years old, every one that entereth into the service."

GOD SAID "EVERY MALE"

Mark the significant fact that the families, the young women, the mothers and the youth and the children were commanded to remain in the cities, only the males above 20 were to be drafted. That was the military age of service fixed by the Almighty. Not the windfalls but the handpicked, 20 years old and upward that were fit to fight. Not 18-year-old adolescents without sufficient military training, as we did in Korea, ill-clothed, ill-trained, ill-armed, soft-spoken youth, from our high schools, but 20 years old and upward was the law of the Lord.

SOBER SOLDIERS

And of still more importance than the matter of years, it was to be a sober army, a total-abstaining army, a water-drinking army. In his last address, when Moses turned over the military leadership to Joshua, we read, "And Moses called unto all Israel and said unto them: 'And I have led you 40 years in the wilderness; your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot. Ye have not eaten bread (but manna), neither have ye drunk wine or strong drink: that ye might know that I am the Lord your God'." When they were parched with thirst and cried out against Moses for bringing them into that desert place, saying, "What shall we drink?" God did not send them canned beer as a present from the brewers of Egypt, but water out of the smitten rock, and we are told in the divine revelation that the rock followed them, supplying potable water in a desert land. God gave them manna to eat and H_2O to drink. Total abstinence and Divine dependence brought deliverance.

THE WATER CURE

There [Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, generals of the Army, and commander in chief of the American military forces in the White House, there is your cue: give our armies the water cure; enlist only those that are fit for military service, 20 years old and upward, and give them H_2O to drink instead of hooch and our enemies will lick the dust.

THREE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND FOOTMEN

It is not a question of numbers but of fitness. When God called Gideon to fight the Midianites he told him that his army was too large, and he reduced it by 22,000, and reduced it again until only 300 fighting men "who lapped water as they ran" remained, and the Midianites, "who filled the valley like grasshoppers for multitude; and their camels without number," fled in terror. God said, "By the 300 that lapped water will I deliver the Midianites unto they hand. * * * For the kingdom is the Lord's: and he is the governor among the nations. * * * The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms. * * * Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance." May that nation be the United States of America in peace and war.

An Interesting Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, those of us in positions of legislative responsibility cannot, of course, base our final judgments simply on the results of opinion polls. They are not necessarily scientific or a true reflection of the will of our constituents. Furthermore, there are times in our experience when we will reach the conclusion that the best interests of our country require us to follow a course which is not popular. Right rather than expediency must be our guide.

Nevertheless, it is helpful to know how various segments of our people are thinking. The policies pursued by our country, if they are to be completely successful, must be backed by the overwhelming sentiment of our citizens. It is a wholesome thing, therefore, for Members of Congress to be furnished

with the results of opinion sampling throughout the Nation.

A group of young people from the Fortieth Congressional District and adjoining territory in and around Rochester, N. Y., who have formed the Citizens Opinion Committee, have sent me a letter indicating an interesting project which they have just undertaken. With it they have transmitted the results of the first sampling of public opinion which they took.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this letter and accompanying summary of replies to specific questions dealing with United States foreign policy. The formulators of the questions and all those who participated in this venture are to be commended for their public-spirited interest in initiating this important undertaking.

The letter and summary follow:

THE CITIZENS' OPINION COMMITTEE,
Rochester, N. Y., January 18, 1951.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of our Representatives in Congress, you have undoubtedly wished many times that you might be better informed about the thinking of your constituents.

Nine of us in the Rochester area have volunteered our services to form a Citizens' Opinion Committee. Our ages range from 23 to 31, with most members in their late twenties.

The purposes of our committee are—

1. To present problems of governmental policy to citizens of voting age in this area, in such a way as to stimulate their thinking about these problems.

2. To determine the opinions of people on these policies.

3. To supply you and your other immediate Representatives and Senators with tabulations of our findings.

In carrying on this project, we are trying to present the policies without personal or political bias and without influencing the decisions of the survey participants. While we recognize this as probably an imperfect instrument by some standards, we believe it a worth-while one. It presents opinions from many people who have often felt the need, but have seldom found the opportunity, to write their Congressmen.

A copy of our survey statements, a tabulation by percents with graphs, and a list of the participants are enclosed. In the future we hope to have other surveys on governmental, foreign and domestic policies.

Briefly, here are some of the pertinent facts about our survey:

1. Twenty-one statements are included in the survey, dealing with general and Asiatic phases of the United States' foreign policy.

2. Two hundred survey sheets were distributed by members of the committee through personal contact with friends, business associates, and, in some cases, through them to their friends and associates. The survey covered persons of all ages and without regard for political affiliations.

3. The survey was conducted between January 8 and 13.

4. The final tabulation included 115 returns. In addition to this, 16 were returned too late to be counted.

5. Persons taking part in the survey include chiefly, executive, supervisory, and office personnel in Rochester industries; teachers in the public schools; staff personnel from the University of Rochester; and housewives. The following groups are represented in relatively fewer numbers: Skilled workers, farmers, merchants, engineers, State Teacher College faculty at Brockport, and retired persons. Approximately one-half of the returns are from college graduates.

Virtually everyone participating in the survey reported that our project had stimulated their thinking. In fact, many reported that it had provoked extensive discussions within family groups and with friends and associates. A few felt that they were not sufficiently informed to express opinions on Government foreign policy. For many, however, our undertaking has resulted in reconsideration of former opinions and formulation of new ones.

We shall be greatly interested in your reactions to this project and will welcome any comments you may care to make on its value to you or in any areas which might be similarly treated in the future.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD E. PULTZ.

Citizens' Opinion Committee: A. William Ashley, foreman, Delco appliance division, GMC; Myra Howes, secretary, Taylor Instrument Co.; Richard E. Pultz, methods investigator Eastman Kodak Co.; William H. Vandenbergh, attorney, Lumberman's Mutual Insurance Co.; Betty Cavanaugh, secretary, University of Rochester; William B. Nestle, campus school coordinator, State teachers college, Brockport; Jane Vandenbergh, housewife, 276 Ingomar Drive; Herman Walz, law student, Albany Law College; Jane Wilkins, assistant librarian, University of Rochester.

GENERAL FOREIGN POLICY

1. Dean Acheson should be relieved from his office as Secretary of State: Agree, 65 percent; disagree, 30 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

2. The United States should use the veto, if necessary, to prevent the seating of Communist China in the United Nations: Agree, 78 percent; disagree, 20 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

3. Under no circumstances should the atom bomb be used: Agree, 7 percent; disagree, 89 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

4. The United States should not use the atom bomb unless a state of open war exists between Russia and the United States: Agree, 58 percent; disagree, 32 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

5. The United States should immediately use the atom bomb on Russia: Agree, 2 percent; disagree, 96 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

6. Although we must continue to send aid to Europe, we should concentrate our greatest efforts in arming Asia: Agree, 8 percent; disagree, 87 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

7. The United States should give equal effort to the defense of Europe and Asia: Agree, 37 percent; disagree, 53 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

8. While we continue to send aid to Asia, we should concentrate our efforts in the defense of Europe: Agree, 46 percent; disagree, 43 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

9. Our defense effort should be devoted entirely to the Western Hemisphere: Agree, 16 percent; disagree, 76 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

10. The United States should not send armaments to other parts of the world beyond those required under our present commitments until the defenses of the United States against direct attack have been greatly improved: Agree, 78 percent; disagree, 18 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

11. The present crisis warrants embarking immediately on a wartime economy: Agree, 78 percent; disagree, 16 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN ASIA

KOREA

1. All United Nations forces and equipment should be evacuated from Korea as rapidly as consistent with the safety of these forces: Agree, 53 percent; disagree, 41 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

2. United Nations forces should remain in Korea to carry on a delaying action if possible, without greatly increased reinforcement: Agree, 30 percent; disagree, 61 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

3. United Nations should continue to make a stand in Korea at all costs: Agree 15 percent; disagree, 79 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

CHINA

1. The United States and other non-Communist countries should supply the Chinese Nationalist forces with the materials necessary for an invasion of the Chinese mainland: Agree, 68 percent; disagree, 27 percent; no opinion 5 percent.

2. The United States and other non-Communist countries should give sea and air force support to the Chinese Nationalists in any invasion of the Chinese mainland: Agree 46 percent; disagree 47 percent; no opinion 7 percent.

3. The United States and non-Communist nations should enforce an effective military blockade of the Chinese coast: Agree 70 percent; disagree, 21 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

4. The United States, in conjunction with other non-Communist countries, should discontinue all direct or indirect trade with Red China: Agree 93 percent; disagree, 4 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

5. The United States should establish a vast counter-Communist propaganda program throughout Asia: Agree, 90 percent; disagree, 7 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

6. The United States should supply military equipment to the French in Indochina: Agree, 51 percent; disagree, 35 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.

7. The United States should seek the use of United Nations troops in Indochina: agree, 32 percent; disagree, 51 percent; no opinion, 17 percent.

PACIFIC—GENERAL

1. Further use of United States forces in Asia should be governed by United Nations policy only: agree, 48 percent; disagree, 40 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

2. The United States should encourage the Japanese to rearm for the purpose of defending their homeland: agree, 85 percent; disagree, 10 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

3. The United States should establish a strong Pacific defense line, which would include the Aleutians, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, and Australia: agree, 98 percent; disagree, 2 percent; no opinion, zero.

Congressman Hall's Invalid Mother Is Attacked by Frank Gannett's Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, beaten back, snarling, and frustrated over EDWIN ARTHUR HALL's never-failing defiance of its gangster journalism, Frank Gannett's Binghamton Press has just revealed a despicable attack on the Congressman's invalid mother.

Throwing all discretion to the winds, the unbridled fury of this wolf pack shows its true colors best in featuring a yellow poison-pen letter writer, a Press stooge, from which it quotes:

One of the first things HALL did was to appoint his father as his secretary and his mother as clerk: His mother stayed quietly at home and never did any Government work whatsoever. This went on for several years until exposed by the Washington Post.

My dearly loved and late lamented father worked day and night in my Washington office, usually putting in a 12- to 16-hour day.

But he was never safe from the smears the Gannett newspaper hurled at him and at me during all the time he worked in my office.

So great was the hatred which the editor held for my distinguished father, that his picture was withheld from Press columns at the time of his death, and the large funeral which he received was glossed over with scarcely a mention.

My mother was employed by me at the time she was on my payroll, taking important messages for my Binghamton office and addressing letters.

She has as much right to be on my payroll as any other American. She earned every penny she received and has taken a world of abuse from this Commie clique because she is loyal to your Congressman and her own son.

Whenever my mother desires to work for me again and is sufficiently well, I will put her back on my payroll, regardless of press smears.

It is well to point out that in 1946 my mother suffered a serious heart attack after a similar press tirade. Gannett's hounds are bent upon exterminating all of us to satiate their hateful desires.

Hitler's storm troopers used to go about rubbing out free representatives and their wives as in the case of Herr and Mrs. Von Sleicher in the early days of nazism.

Behind the iron curtain they liquidate whole families immediate to a person who dares speak his mind.

But I do not find anywhere in recent annals, at least, a case as degrading as the press feature of this wanton attack upon the character of my mother, helpless to defend herself, ill from prolonged sickness, and victimized by the storm-trooper slander of our local Gannett smear tabloid.

Mobilizing Our Farm Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on January 30, 1951, the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, delivered a notable address on the subject of mobilizing our farm power, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Cleveland, Ohio. The subject is of such general interest that I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Brannan's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOBILIZING OUR FARM POWER

(By Charles F. Brannan)

Just about the first thing that comes to a person's mind at these meetings of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is the old saw: "Nothing succeeds like success."

Roughly 15 years ago only about 11 percent of the Nation's farms had central station electric service. At that time, how many of us would have dared to predict that today—only a decade and a half later—87 percent of our farms would have central-station service?

But that's the record.

Since 1935 the figures on farm electrification have been almost exactly turned around. Then, only about 1 farm out of 10 had power from a central station—now only about 1 farm out of 10 does not have power from a central station.

The initial successes of the rural electric co-ops have been steadily expanded into greater and more glowing achievements.

Your success is also an unanswerable rejoinder to those who argue that free enterprise is handicapped in these days by Government interference. Your co-ops are living examples of free enterprise. They are living proofs that free enterprise cannot only survive but that it can, and will, thrive in an atmosphere of intelligent governmental assistance.

So I want to tell you again, as I have in the past, that it is a real pleasure to meet with this great group of representatives of business-managed, tax-paying organizations. I want to tell you that you have every right to be proud of your business management—of the fact that 99 percent of the loans are being paid back on schedule or ahead of schedule—and especially of the fact that you are successfully operating power systems in many areas that the utility industry refused to electrify because it didn't think it would pay out.

As for the taxes you pay—well, I'm sure it would be news to you folks to find out that you didn't have to pay real-estates taxes, personal-property taxes on equipment, occupational-license taxes, social-security taxes, various excise taxes, sales and use taxes. Of course, you pay these taxes—all of them—just like any other business.

I never have believed that very many people are fooled by this phony tax-equality line—and I don't believe it today.

Once again, then, congratulations on the fine job you are doing. The tremendous success which you have achieved in helping to bring electric power to the great majority of our farms is one of the reasons why agriculture can face the future with real confidence in its ability to meet the food and fiber needs of the Nation.

I want to talk with you today along three principal lines. First, I want to review briefly the situation we face as a nation. Second, I'd like to discuss agriculture's part in today's challenge—what the Nation expects of its farms—how well farmers are equipped to meet the Nation's requirements—and what is being done to help equip them better. Finally, I want to talk with you specifically about the part electric power and the rural electric co-ops can play in the present emergency.

We are living in one of the most critical periods in all human history. We have got to realize that we are now facing probably the most serious threat to civilization of the past 20 centuries.

There is no longer time to put things off until tomorrow or to depend on somebody else doing our job for us.

We hope for peace—we want peace, earnestly and prayerfully. We have proved again and again that we are willing to go much more than halfway to achieve peace.

But who could be so blind as not to recognize that we must be prepared for anything?

Military preparedness is, of course, the most immediate essential. But military preparedness, in these times, has come to mean something much broader than ever before. It means more than planes, ships, tanks, and guns operated by trained manpower. Military preparedness involves industrial and agricultural preparedness.

Agriculture's job is to produce the food and fiber we need for the strength and vitality of our Armed Forces, for the health and productivity of our civilian population, for ample reserves, and for shipments to those other nations to which it is advisable to give aid.

Our material answer to the alleged superior manpower resources of the Soviet Union and its satellites is an economic answer—superior production. Man for man, there is a wide difference between the productivity of American producers on the farm, and those of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

In Asia today it takes four persons on the land to support themselves and one person off the land. In the United States the situation is just about reversed—less than one-fifth of our population is on farms, and they provide food and fiber for themselves and the other four-fifths of our population.

Not only does our agriculture provide food to keep the efficiency and vitality of our military forces and industrial producers at high level; it also provides raw materials without which American industry would be crippled.

We are fortunate, indeed, that our agriculture today is in a strong position to meet all foreseeable demands.

Let me list some of the outstanding facts in this regard.

Our farms are much more productive than they were 20, or even 10, years ago. Total food production is running about 40 percent above the years just before World War II. Our field-crop production in 1950 was bigger than in any year before 1948.

Agriculture as a whole is in a relatively good financial position. Farmers have plowed back a lot of their earnings into up-to-date machinery and equipment. Using the national programs available to them, they have built up reserves of soil fertility. We have developed programs and storage facilities to carry over reserves of corn, wheat, cotton, and other crops.

In the period of little more than a year, beginning in June 1949, 700,000,000 bushels of grain-storage facilities were added to our national capacity under the emergency storage program. This has been a big aid to our over-all defense position.

There are more than twice as many tractors on American farms now as there were in 1941, before Pearl Harbor. There are twice as many trucks on farms, nearly three times as many combines, and more than three times as many milking machines and mechanical corn pickers.

We have made fine progress in the use of various new plant varieties and hybrid seeds, insecticides, and fertilizer, and in better breeding and feeding of livestock.

The result of all these advances is that farm output per man-hour has risen about 50 percent above the 1935–39 average.

Our agriculture, in short, is far better able to face the problems and demands of the

present and future than it has ever been in any previous national crisis.

The Nation is depending on our agriculture to maintain this general high level of output this year and to step up production of the commodities that are in greatest demand. We particularly need more pork, beef, corn, cotton, and wool. But we know from past experience that when the Nation is fully employed and when incomes are high, most farm products are faced with big demand.

Our annual pig crops have been climbing for several years. In 1946 the crop amounted to 83,000,000 head. Last year the crop was over 100,000,000 head. We look for this year's spring crop to run about 6 percent ahead of last spring.

The number of cattle and calves on farms has also been on the upgrade every year since the end of 1947. We expect this trend to continue also.

We need a big cotton crop this year—we hope for 16,000,000 bales.

One of the big questions farmers are asking all over the country is this one: Are we going to have the manpower, supplies, and equipment to turn out the production that's needed?

Farmers know that they use a lot more motor fuel today than they did in 1941. Actually, they use twice as much. They need twice as many rubber tires for cars, trucks, and tractors.

Farmers know that they're using a lot more electric power than ever before. REA consumers used 25 percent more power last year than they had used the year before. Farmers in general, according to industry estimates, used eight times as much electricity last year as they did before World War II. Of course, most of this is due to the greater number of farms now hooked up to power lines. Nevertheless, the average consumption of electric power per electrified farm is now estimated by industry to be two and one-fourth times as much as in the prewar period.

The Department has set up a number of offices and facilities to aid farmers in getting essential equipment, manpower, and materials. In addition, we expect that the facilities of all the Department's bureaus and agencies will be used to help meet the objectives of agricultural preparedness. This means that we will not only help farmers get essential production tools and supplies, but that we are going to encourage them in every way we can to make the best possible use of what is available.

The important job in agriculture is going to need the whole-souled cooperation of organizations outside, as well as within, the Department.

We are depending heavily upon your contribution to national defense.

You folks are the leaders of rural electrification in your own communities and in your own States. You know the importance of electricity in wartime production. Many of you have been through this kind of emergency before and I am happy that you will therefore be better able to guide your co-ops through these troubled times.

Today more than 2,500,000 farm families are depending on you to supply an essential utility service in an adequate and dependable manner.

This job of providing adequate service is really a double job. You need to make sure first that you have plenty of power to deliver and, second, that your systems are maintained to deliver it.

The defense production program will seriously strain the Nation's entire power supply. It will be increasingly difficult to get power for your needs. I urge you to plan ahead as far as possible to provide power not only to meet wartime demands but also to take care of the normal increase in power consumption on farms.

It is vital also that you keep your systems in constant repair, so as to prevent trouble before it has a chance to develop into a major problem. This will call for expansion of, and added concentration on, your preventive maintenance program. If you have not already done so, I urge you to mobilize your forces for system maintenance.

In many cases you will need to increase the capacity of your systems to make sure that they will be able to carry the loads that defense farm production will put on them. Farmers are depending on you. They need all the assurance you can give them that power will be delivered on an uninterrupted basis.

But merely providing dependable power is not enough. If rural electrification is to be of maximum service to the defense program, your farmer members will need help in harnessing their electricity for top efficiency.

They will need guidance in substituting electricity for manpower.

On a great many farms, electric power can be more fully applied to heavy time-consuming farm chores.

Some of the most striking evidences of the labor-saving advantages of electricity may be found on dairy farms. It takes a lot of time to milk 10 cows twice a day by hand. An electric milker can do the job in about half the time, with only one-half kilowatt-hour of electricity.

Electricity can save time and labor in separating cream, pumping and heating water, hoisting hay, and grinding feed. It is important in processing and preserving foods. A farmer with a milk cooler can cool 10 gallons of milk with about 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. Rapid cooling keeps the bacteria count low and maintains the quality of the milk.

I urge you to step up your programs of member education, and to work in close collaboration with other organizations and agencies to make sure that every farmer knows how to use electricity in his production job. Many farmers need advice on the care of their appliances and equipment. These tools may have to last a long time.

Fortunately, you and your farmer members can do a lot to make the most of materials now on hand. The homemade pig brooder is a good example. By using baby-pig brooders, farmers can cut down the number of pig losses and produce an extra 30 percent or more of pork at weaning time. Looking at it another way, this means a saving of about 250 pounds of feed per litter.

It doesn't take expensive or hard-to-get equipment to make a brooder. A 150-watt bulb, some scraps of metal for a reflector, some pieces of lumber, and a little know-how are all you need.

I'm sure there are many other ways in which farm people can make equally effective use of electric power without heavy cash outlays.

Research is going ahead in the Department and elsewhere on new uses for electricity. I have no doubt that this emergency will give added impetus to this research. We all know that use of artificial light is an accepted practice in poultry enterprises. Light has also been employed to speed up plant growth, and it has been demonstrated that vegetable yields can be stepped up by its use. New types of plants have been developed by treating seed with X-rays. Black light has been used to eliminate defective seed. By the use of the germicidal lamp, it may be possible eventually to save a good deal of food that otherwise would be spoiled by mold.

In making these comments, I do not mean to evaluate any of the research that is now going on. I merely want to point out that in time of such national emergency as this, research takes on new importance. I am sure that you will do your part in making available to the American farmer as many new uses for electricity as possible in the months and years ahead.

Besides all of these responsibilities that I have mentioned, you have a responsibility to the half million or more farmers who still are without electric power. You will want to push line extensions as fast as possible to make power available to these farmers.

Though this is not an easy job, it is by no means an impossible one. The speed with which you have built power lines—more than a million miles of rural distribution lines in 15 years—indicates what American ingenuity and drive can do. These million miles of co-op poles and lines stand as a tribute to the initiative, determination, and perseverance of rural people. I know that you will continue your efforts to make the advantages of electric power even more widespread.

By taking full part in your own community civil defense programs, your co-ops can render still another service to the Nation. You can do this by working with the USDA agencies in your counties, by providing channels of communication to farm people for information on the defense program and its requirements, and by assisting your local civic groups in helping rural industries, especially decentralized war plants, to locate in your areas.

Born of a community need and nurtured by democratic ideals, rural electric cooperatives will surely shoulder all these responsibilities in the defense effort.

It is paradoxical that while the Nation has made great progress in rural electrification, the farmer's position with regard to telephones is worse today than it was 25 years ago. Even in normal times the rural telephone is much more than a luxury or a pleasant convenience. In the event of shortages of tires, gasoline, automobiles, and other equipment, adequate rural telephone service takes on increased importance. According to a recent survey in a Midwestern State, two-thirds of a farmer's phone calls are business calls. The telephone program may well play a vital role in enabling the farmer to be a better, more efficient producer.

From what I have already said, it should be obvious that the Department of Agriculture recognizes the importance of the electrified farm and of the rural electric co-ops to the farm production program for national defense.

I firmly believe that it would be a great error if the Nation allowed its potential for food and fiber production to be curtailed because of inadequate power supplies.

In his recent state of the Union message to the Congress, the President emphasized the necessity for us as a Nation to increase our capacity for production and to keep our economy strong for the long pull ahead. He pointed out that only by increasing our output can we carry the burden of preparedness for an indefinite time.

It was heartening to me—as I am sure it was to you—that he urged the Congress to give priority consideration to certain urgent activities, and that power development was among them.

We have all seen the close relationship existing between the REA program and the development of power by public agencies. One does not need to be a public power booster to recognize that the areas of our country where farmers have the cheapest power, and where they use the largest quantities of it, are generally those which have major Federal power projects. On the other hand, it is equally obvious that the area of highest wholesale rates is in the Northeast, where there is no Federal power development—now. Growing support of the St. Lawrence development project may yet change that picture.

Every addition to our power capacity, wherever it is made, increases our national wealth. Every addition to our power capacity, wherever it is made, increases our

ability to turn raw materials into armaments, clothing, and processed food for defense.

This country has undeveloped resources along rivers in the Northeast, the Northwest, the Southeast, the Southwest, and along the Missouri, that potentially are capable of doubling our national power generating capacity. It is in the national interest that these water power resources be developed as rapidly as possible.

As our Nation moves ahead, rural electric co-ops must hold fast to their principles. They must cherish the rights which you and other leaders before you have won—the right to generate your own power when there are no adequate sources available; the right to transmit your own power, and above all the right to buy from the Government, power developed by the Government, for all the people.

Well, I think that covers briefly the three principal topics that I wanted to talk over with you.

Before I close, however, I'd like to add just a few words about the general situation so far as agriculture and farm people are concerned. I have indicated that our agriculture is in a far sounder position to meet whatever demands may be made upon it than it has been in previous periods of national emergency.

I am convinced that this Nation as a whole is well able to take care of itself in any situation that may develop.

It would be foolish to underestimate the strength that might be arrayed against us in the event of an all-out struggle. But it would, I think, be equally foolish to underestimate the strength of the American Nation and of the American idea of freedom and justice.

In these times, let us give our wholehearted support to our own national mobilization program. Let us unite with a determination to do whatever needs to be done. Let us be resolute that this Nation shall remain free.

Rail Unions Are Called Unfair in Their Attack on Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of hysteria when the slogan appears to be "smear those in public office," it is, indeed, refreshing to be able to feast one's eyes upon comment that is laudatory of one in public office.

I am pleased to call your attention to an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 14, 1951, about a distinguished public servant, John Steelman, assistant to the President. He is only one of many who goes about his work quietly, unobtrusively, and with only the one thought in mind, and that is how he can best serve his country.

The item I refer to follows:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON—RAIL UNIONS ARE CALLED UNFAIR IN THEIR ATTACK ON STEELMAN

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 13.—The railroads and the labor unions are getting closer toward a peace treaty. But there are some mysterious circumstances being revealed which show why the task of mediation at the White House has been made doubly difficult.

A controversy has developed over the part played by John R. Steelman, special assistant to the President. For several days now efforts have been made from labor sources to discredit Mr. Steelman's role, and this has been done partly by the dissemination of a report that he had set himself up as a sort of czar or 3-year arbitrator.

This report is wholly untrue but the reason for spreading it would appear to be to try to weaken Mr. Steelman's influence at the President's side.

Actually, John Steelman is one of the ace mediators in the country. For 7 years he was the head of the United States Conciliation Service and was involved in the handling of more than 10,000 strikes or threatened strikes and more than 80,000 labor disputes of all types. Mr. Steelman is not assigned exclusively to labor matters at the White House, but assists in general administrative tasks and gets into labor problems only when they are sufficiently acute to require the attention of the President himself.

FACTS IN CASE LISTED

In the face of the long and efficient record of Mr. Steelman as a mediator, it came as a surprise to find the unions charging that he had set himself up as a 3-year arbitrator. The facts with reference to Mr. Steelman's part in the recent negotiations are these:

1. Mr. Steelman was not assigned to the railroad dispute by the White House but became involved in it at the special request of the four union presidents. He agreed to call meetings but with the understanding that the Railway Mediation Board would participate in the discussions.

2. When, on December 21, a memorandum agreement was signed in full by the four presidents of the railroad unions as well as by the representatives of the railroads, the documents set forth the understanding of both parties. It was not in legal language but it recited unequivocally the basic points of agreement in the form of a summary.

3. It was fully understood by both sides that the points in this memorandum would be put into legal language later. There was a provision which said that if the parties could not agree on the details before writing the actual agreement itself, John Steelman was to make the final decision.

4. This service to be rendered by Mr. Steelman was to end as soon as the agreement was drawn up in legal language and hence his part was to be temporary—probably for a few days.

5. There was an understanding at the time that a blank space was to be left on one of the points dealing with the price for coupling or uncoupling hose but, once the final agreement on this rule was reached, Mr. Steelman was no longer to arbitrate anything.

6. An understanding was reached also that after July 1, 1952, the parties would go to Mr. Steelman again in connection with wage stabilization but only to set in motion machinery whereby the President of the United States would appoint a referee to determine whether further wage increases were justified under Government policy.

ATTACK CALLED A REPRISAL

The foregoing sets forth the actual connection of Mr. Steelman with the entire affair, and yet for some odd reason there has been an effort to make it appear that somehow the President's assistant was setting himself up for some special job of a permanent nature out of which presumably he was to derive a benefit.

This type of unfair attack could only have been started as a reprisal against Mr. Steelman because he stood his ground—and so did the President—in insisting that the original memorandum of points signed on December 21 was binding and that the four union presidents who signed it should in good faith have recommended it to their organizations for ratification instead of backing down on it.

Mr. Steelman has been the center of controversy before when he settled the coal miners' dispute in 1941, as a special arbitrator appointed by the late President Roosevelt, but he was attacked then as too friendly to the unions. Plainly the lot of a mediator is a hard, hard lot, but John Steelman's record for fairness isn't going to be tarnished by insidious propaganda from rail unions which played "sick" and recently caused hundreds of millions of dollars in losses to the American people.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for several years the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Broadcasters, and the Radio-Television Manufacturers Association have been sponsoring the national voice of democracy contest among the secondary schools throughout the country. This is one of the best of the many excellent projects which contribute so greatly to the strengthening of our Republic. Through calling the attention of the younger people to the basic tenets upon which this Nation is founded, they are doing an exceptional job in encouraging this type of thought and in its dissemination among the citizens at large.

The residents of the Twelfth Congressional District of Missouri, including myself, are greatly honored that one of the winners of the fourth annual contest resides in that district. Robert Burnett of St. Mary's High School, who lives at 4209 Hartford Street, St. Louis, Mo., was one of the four final winners in this Nation-wide contest. The other three winners are Marcia Anne Harmon, 16, of Del Rosa, Calif.; Norita Newbrough, 16, of Baton Rouge, La., and Richard Romulo, 17, of Washington, D. C. I am very desirous of calling to your attention the high quality of the radio broadcast which brought to Robert Burnett this coveted award.

I also want to commend the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Broadcasters, and the Radio-Television Manufacturers Association for their fine public service in establishing this annual contest. Each of the four winners receive a $500 college scholarship and a trip to Washington, D. C. These young people are now in Washington, D. C. visiting the

various shrines of democracy and the living government which these shrines inspire.

I am happy to put into the RECORD a copy of Robert Burnett's winning radio script. It is regretted only that the full value of this broadcast cannot be retained when it is put into the printed word.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Do you know who I am? I am the voice of democracy.

Listen! Listen, American! Listen, citizen John Doe, to the most startling words in all history, for they are the beginning of my life's story.

"We, the people." Have you got that straight? Not, mind you, we the royal elect; or we, the sovereign king; but we, the people. Listen, citizen Doe, those words place my very life in your hands. I'm your personal responsibility. Do you hear that? Your personal responsibility.

Now what I've got to say here won't be very flowery, just straight American talk.

You know, there's a lot of people around today trying to tell you I'm no good; trying to tell you that democracy's got some weak spots. Well now, some of that's true. I've made my mistakes. Sometimes I've forgotten just what my job is, and made a slip here and there. But those mistakes are never too big, and never too many. I always manage to catch myself in time. That's because my blessings outnumber my weak spots a thousand to one. That's why I speak for democracy.

Now these blessings I talked about don't just happen. What I mean is this; you can't have rights unless you take the duties with them. And that's what a democracy is—a mixture of both—rights and duties. Rights and duties, John Doe. So John, the next time you say, "I've got my rights," then save a little breath to add, "but I've got my duties too."

You want to know something—something big? Well listen. Just what do I do for you, John Doe? What does democracy give you? Let's take a good look.

Anybody ever come to your house early in the morning and take you away because you had a different idea than the President? Any American cop ever invade your home without a warrant? I don't think so. And as long as I'm around, you'll never experience that fear.

And here's something even bigger, John Doe. You can walk into the church you want to. You're free to speak and write what you think. You can choose the kind of government you want.

Mighty good, John, mighty good.

Here's something else I mean to you—something fresh and clean. I'm that little farm of yours up in Vermont, with no big barbed wire fences around it. I'm that ranch and pasture land in California—big, free, windswept. No heavy iron curtain out there, John. Just a lot of land with a lot of freedom. And that's the way you want it to stay, isn't it? A lot of good things, and they're here. They're here because democracy is at work. Think it over John. You like it, don't you?

And, John Doe, if I ever die, it won't be a natural death. Because you'll have to kill me. You, yourself—John Doe. You'll have to kill me with negligence, with laziness, with indifference. Oh, don't vote. Don't run for office. Don't serve on juries. Don't support good men. Then I'll die. But you'll have to do it to me, Citizen Doe.

So John, don't start to use me next year—or next week; start to use me today. Yes, John Doe, start to use me today, for tomorrow may be too late.

Don't you ever forget it, Citizen Doe, democracy is your personal responsibility.

A House Divided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Evening Star of Washington, D. C. It strikes me as being an important and sensible point of view to reflect upon as we strive to unite our efforts in the common defense:

A HOUSE DIVIDED

Some Senators think General Marshall's announcement that our present policy contemplates the sending of only four additional American divisions to Europe will have a sobering influence on the great debate. It will be a good thing if the opinion of these gentlemen is correct. For this country, in a critical hour, is a house divided aga nst itself, and, as the Bible reminds us, such a house cannot stand.

The current scene is chaotic. Republican Senators have just returned from a swing around the Lincoln-day circuit, in the course of which they registered various degrees of dissent from our foreign policies. In the House of Representatives 118 of the 199 Republican Members signed a so-called declaration of policy which, with other things, calls upon this Nation to refuse further aid of any kind to Western Europe unless persuaded that Western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden. Just what that means the Republican Members do not say and may not know. But Representative WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, says there are those on the Democratic side of the House aisle who are not without sympathy for the Republican view, and Representative DORN, of South Carolina, reports that if his mail is an accurate barometer the people have lost confidence in the top executives of the country.

Against the background of this battle among ourselves, the so-called fight against communism goes on. General Eisenhower returns to Europe to try to persuade the Western Europeans that the United States is not going to let them down. Secretary Acheson—brave man—reminds the Communist countries that the President has warned that any aggression might well strain to the breaking point the fabric of world peace. Threatened Yugoslavia is visited by an assistant Secretary of State. Are the Yugoslavs expected to believe that an America which cannot make up its mind what to do about Western Europe can be counted upon for help in event of a Communist attack? Secretary Pinletter of the Air Force has been in Turkey, a most valuable potential ally in event of war. It would be interesting to know what assurance he felt able to give the Turks, and how the Turks felt about any that may have been given.

The great tragedy in all this is that we may well be booting away the last hope of a free world. Unless General Eisenhower is a starry-eyed dreamer, and not even the rashest critic of the policy he advocates has called him that, there is an excellent chance that the free world can be saved from both Communist domination and war. All that is needed is understanding of the problem and the danger, plus a willingness to take reasonable preparatory measures. That will never be done, however, unless the United States takes the lead. We must encourage weaker nations by our example, but we will never do that by wrangling among ourselves, by eying allies with excessive suspicion, by anesthetizing ourselves with the notion that, after all, it won't matter too much if we let Europe go by the boards.

There are those who say that our foreign policy has been a costly failure. That simply is not true. Our policy has not achieved all that might have been hoped for. But it has achieved a great deal. Those areas of the world that are really vital to our economic well-being and our physical security remain threatened, but they also remain outside the Communist camp. If we had done nothing they surely would have been lost to us. Because of what we have done, there still is a chance—a good chance—that they can remain safely this side of the iron curtain. Let those who are so prone to reckless accusation, who say that our policy has failed and should be abandoned, consider the alternatives for a moment. Do they really believe that this proposed additional effort should not be made, that it would be better to chuck the whole business and resign ourselves to the prospect of withdrawing into an isolated armed camp in this hemisphere and trying to stay alive there from now until doomsday?

There can be only one rational answer: We must make reasonable effort to go forward with the work that we are engaged upon. And so the Star hopes that the Senators are right; that the four-division announcement will have a sobering effect; that we will stop tearing ourselves apart; that the Senate's indorsement of the principle of this program will be forthcoming, and that, before it is too late, we will be able to demonstrate to the rest of the world, both friendly and unfriendly, that we have made up our mind as to what we intend to do, and that we are determined to act on the basis of that decision.

Address of Gov. John S. Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia and her fine people are fortunate indeed in having as chief executive a man of ability, integrity, and foresight. The Honorable John S. Battle is truly a Christian gentleman of the old school and we in Virginia are proud to call him our Governor.

It is with pride that I include with my remarks the speech of the Honorable John S. Battle, Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, which he made at the dedication exercises of the McLean Peace House on April 16, 1950, at old Appomattox Courthouse:

These ceremonies here today, in the truest sense of the word, commemorate not the close of an internal war but the real beginning of a firmly united nation which was envisioned by our first President. In his Farewell Address to the people of the United States, he said: "The name of America, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations."

The restoration of the Appomattox buildings, including this beautiful McLean House, does not represent a monument to the South or to the North; nor does it perpetuate any thought of victory or defeat. It simply gives

recognition to the fact that here honest, courageous, and patriotic men laid the ground-work for the rebirth of a strong America, dedicated to the principles of free government and free institutions upon which our country has risen to its present position of world leadership as the champion of individual freedom and representative democracy.

Suffice it to say of that April 9, 1865, that every man who trod this soil could reverently repeat the words of General Lee: "You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed."

Certainly devotion to duty and loyalty to principle are as essential today as ever before. In an era of world-wide conflict of ideologies, it is imperative that those who espouse democratic principles allow no extraneous matters to interfere with the fundamental goal of maintaining the type of government and the kind of institutions which make possible the enjoyment of the greatest good by the largest possible number.

The defense of our homeland and the democratic way of life we have maintained since the establishment of American Government has called for the expenditure of our finest resources in other wars since 1865. The closely knit union which grew from those troubled years reduced that cost in life and blood to an extent no man can accurately judge; but it is certain that without a strong, freedom-loving America, whose people always are ready and willing to resist the forces of oppression and tyranny, the life we have known in America through the centuries today would be no more.

I can think of no higher tribute to those valiant men who fought for what they believed in the War Between the States than to envision as their indestructible monument these great victories for democracy in two world wars.

The Commonwealth of Virginia is proud of this restored setting at Appomattox, which ultimately will take on the appearance of the original village. The National Government, through the National Park Service, has rendered a distinct public service in advancing the project to its present stage and I am sure the people of the entire country who have the opportunity of visiting it will draw inspiration of a value far out of proportion to the financial cost involved.

I am delighted that the Commonwealth can have a part in refurnishing the McLean House and can thereby assume a joint responsibility of reteaching the lessons of history which were written here. It is indeed a privilege and a high honor to accept, on behalf of the Commonwealth of Virginia, this addition to the public shrines of America.

Administration of Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the following letter received from a veteran in my district. Judging from the mail received in our office, there is still considerable confusion in connection with the Selective Service System. It seems ridiculous that we should invest money in training men for the Navy and then draf them against their wishes into the Army. I trust other Members of Congress will speak out against the inequities that are so apparent. In my opinion, the manner in which our boys are being called into service is doing more to disrupt the morale of the American people than any single thing our Government is doing today. The letter follows:

AKRON, OHIO, *February 13, 1951.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Congressman, Fourteenth District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I am writing you in a very much confused veteran. I realize you are busy but the matter I wish to discuss with you is of great concern to me.

I enlisted in the United States Navy September 5, 1945. Honorably discharged July 12, 1946, with the rate of seaman first class. My serial number is 792-55-67.

In order to keep my standing with the Navy I joined the Naval Reserve August 17, 1948, and was active for some time until my work necessitated me to go inactive.

On February 1, 1949, I received from the draft board (113) a notice classifying me as 1-D. My selective service number is 33-113-27-568. On February 6, 1951, I received a second notice that reclassified me into 1-A.

Upon receiving the latter notification, I was informed that inasmuch as I did not have a full year of service, I was not considered a veteran and was subject to the draft. I have received approximately 2 years of college and other rights under the GI bill due to the fact I had served over 90 days.

I have been under the impression that the Navy would call me back into service, but when I received the notice of a 1-C classification, it confused me. If it is necessary for me to go back into service, I would prefer going back into the Navy. With the training that I have had and my status as a reserve member I think it only right that I should try to protect this interest.

Hoping that you will be able to rectify this situation in which I find myself.

I remain,

LOWELL F. BOWMAN.

Frances Elizabeth Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered in Statuary Hall on last Friday at the memorial services for Frances E. Willard, former national president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, we are meeting today to honor the memory of a great woman—Frances Elizabeth Willard. She ranks among the very top of the great personages who have made America the great country that it is today, and a perusal of her life is an inspiration not only to the youth of this country, but to those of us in the legislative Halls of Congress who are constantly striving for those higher things in life which build up character.

Frances Elizabeth Willard was born in Churchville, N. Y., September 28, 1839. She died on February 17, 1898. It had always been her request that when the end came her friends should regard her passing not as death but as birth into the heavenly life. And so the organization which she did so much to build and establish, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, celebrates her "heavenly birthday" each year on February 17. Because of a request by the Architect of the Capitol, this ceremony is being held on the 16th instead of on a Saturday when few employees would be on duty.

Miss Willard was primarily an educator. She was the first woman to be elected the president of a college, the Evanston College for Ladies, a new venture in higher education for women. The experiment was not a success financially and in 1873 it was merged with Northwestern University, Miss Willard becoming dean of women and professor of aesthetics in the faculty of liberal arts.

She held the then radical belief in the feasibility of student self-government and on account of a disagreement over this with the president and trustees of the university, she resigned in 1874.

She had been interested in the woman's temperance crusade and went East to study the temperance movement, particularly in Maine. While in Cambridge, Mass., she received on the same day two offers. One was the position of lady principal of a fashionable New York finishing school at the then princely salary of $2,400 a year. The other was an urgent plea from Mrs. Louise S. Rounds, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Illinois to accept the presidency of the Chicago union without remuneration. Miss Willard declined the first and accepted the second invitation, and for some months went without lunch because she had no money to buy food and walked for lack of carfare. Finally she was persuaded to make known to the women her financial situation, and a small but living salary was raised for her.

When the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union was organized at Cleveland, Ohio, in November 1874, she was offered the presidency but declined, and was elected national corresponding secretary. She was elected national president in 1879.

Miss Willard was outstandingly an organizer. In 1881 she started a tour of the Southern States with her secretary, Miss Gordon, and eventually built up the WCTU to the then unheard of strength of 200,000 members.

In 1883 after a tour of San Francisco's opium dens, she conceived the idea of a world's WCTU and put it into practice the following year when the national WCTU sent Mary Clement Leavitt, of Boston, around the world carrying the polyglot petition signed in practically every known language, petitioning the world's governments for the abolition of the traffics in alcohol and opium and the protection of women and children. One fruit of this effort was the enactment of the Hague and Geneva Opium Conventions and the establishment under the League of Nations of the Permanent Central Opium Control Board. This has now been taken over by United Nations and its Commission on Narcotics. The world's WCTU promoting the sisterhood of women all over the world in the effort to defend their homes and give childhood full opportunity has been one of the great factors in making possible the understanding between the nations of the world on which our hope for a future of freedom for humanity must rest.

Because it was necessary to obtain legislation to unmuzzle the teachers before the facts about alcohol and narcotics could be taught in the public schools, the women, whose concern for the problem of the alcoholic had led them into the temperance crusade, were led to venture further into

the path of legislation. This again was another highly radical measure. Miss Willard, because of her immense personal prestige and the respect she commanded, became one of the most effective pleaders in her own day and generation for the ballot for women.

When she passed away in the Empire Hotel in New York City, Mary Lowe Dickinson said: "We know no other woman whose homegoing would have left so many other women feeling as if the sun had gone." And her funeral train resembled the funeral procession of the martyred President Abraham Lincoln.

Last of all, the great State of Illinois chose her to represent them here—the only woman in our Nation's hall of fame.

Frances E. Willard, educator, organizer, leader of women, and above all, servant of God.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, at the Lincoln Day Dinner in Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Lincoln Day dinner at Kansas City, Mo., on February 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, first of all I bring you a "hands across the continent" greeting from the people of California to those of Missouri and also express the sincere regret of Gov. Earl Warren that because of illness he was unable to be with you tonight.

In a free nation the citizens must have the facts in order to make sound decisions. This administration and its predecessor have not been frank with the American people nor with their elected Representatives in Congress.

The time has come when the doings of the Executive Department must no longer be hidden from both the Congress and the Nation. There is, of course, a legitimate field of security to protect information about secret weapons or battle plans. Security must not be used to cover up mistakes, past or present.

Before commitments of far-reaching consequences are made the people of the United States are entitled to know the prospective cost in manpower and in dollars. They are also entitled to know the impact such policies will have on their economic and political life.

I am convinced that if the American people are treated as adults they will respond as such. But no person in the executive branch, be he the President or an official in one of the executive departments has the right to assume that he has constitutional or psychic powers which permits him to give the country one piece of the jigsaw puzzle at a time when he alone or in association with a handful of others knows what the entire picture will be when the pieces have been painstakingly put together.

In this country, as yet, the people run the Government rather than the Government running the people. But we have trod the path of big government about as far as a free people dare go without taking stock of the situation and determining what our future course of action should be.

Our budgets have grown to such astronomical figures that it is hard for our citizens to grasp the full significance of the amounts being spent and proposed.

As a boy I grew up part of the time in Washington, where my father represented the sixth district of California in the House of Representatives for the 12-year period 1903 to 1915. In 1910 the total appropriations for all functions of Government, including the military, reached $1,044,433,622.64. It was front-page news all over the country. We had become a "billion-dollar Government." For next fiscal year the President has proposed a $71,500,000,000 budget.

Our foreign policy has a direct relationship to our military policy. Our Armed Forces under the proposed budget for the next fiscal year will take over $41,500,000,000 out of a $71,500,000,000 total.

The total gold production of the entire world from the time of the voyage of Columbus to America down to the present has been $42,600,000,000. By next year, if not this, we will be spending almost double that amount annually.

The total value of all farm production in the United States for 1950 was an estimated $30,400,000,000. The budget already submitted by the President for next fiscal year will spend more than double that amount for the Federal Government alone. State and local costs of government are in addition.

After years of savings, the American people have accumulated in their savings banks, building and loan associations, and the Postal Savings System $59,600,000,000. This entire amount would only pay the cost of the Federal Government for 10 months at the President's budget proposed rate of spending.

In the 158 years from George Washington through 10 years of the administration of Franklin Roosevelt 32 Presidents spent approximately $250,000,000,000. During the 6 years Harry Truman has been President, together with his budget proposals for the next fiscal year, his administration will have spent over $275,000,000,000.

During 16 of the last 18 years that the Democrats have held the White House, the country has operated with a deficit. The exception was the 2 years of the Republican control of the Eightieth Congress. Can this Nation afford such fiscal policies and maintain a solvent Government or economy?

No business, large or small, could afford such management without leading to bankruptcy, nor can a government. History is replete with the sad tale of nations that have traveled this primrose path.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two is the year for the American people to get rid of both red ink and red herrings.

Every American citizen having a sense of responsibility fully recognizes the fact that the free way of life is being challenged by international communism. He knows that the victory for international communism would be more costly in human liberty, in looting, and in reparations than even these vast astronomical figures we have discussed.

I believe that our people are prepared to carry the heavy burdens of necessary defense expenditures and for the essential functioning of the Government. They have a right to expect, however, that all unnecessary fat will be cut out of the budget and that a full dollar's worth of value is received for every dolar spent in the military as well as the civilian establishment.

Of the estimated $16,500,000,000 deficit at least $6,500,000,000 should be made up by the curtailing of nonessential expenditures and not to exceed $10,000,000,000 by new taxation. The President expects the country to practice austerity. He and the executive departments should go and do likewise.

The power to tax is the power to destroy and we must guard our political and economic system from destruction by bad fiscal policies as well as from the aggression of hostile foreign enemies.

This week we are celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. One of the primary faults of the Democratic administration has been that they lost sight of Lincoln's view that "What is morally wrong cannot be politically right."

At Yalta without the knowledge or consent of the American Congress or the American people the executive branch of the Government bartered away the rights of the Republic of China in Manchuria. This was done without the knowledge or consent of the Republic of China, our long-time friend and wartime ally. By this act of expediency we made certain Soviet domination of Manchuria, made inevitable Communist domination of the mainland of China, and paved the way for Communist aggression in Korea.

In 1947 Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer was sent to the Far East to make a report on conditions in that area of the world. His very able report on China was suppressed for 2 years though it was many times requested by responsible committees and Members of the Congress.

His report on Korea made at the same time has been suppressed to this very day though there have been official requests made for it by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. It is my personal belief and I state it on my responsibility as a Senator that had the information contained in this report been made available prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Korea the Congress would have insisted that steps be taken to strengthen the defenses in Korea against the strong possibilities of aggression which were anticipated in the document.

There are many other examples that can be cited of pertinent information withheld from the Congress when if such information had been available tragic errors in executive judgment might have been prevented or steps taken in time to alleviate damage already done.

The President's judgment has not been demonstrated as being so sound that he should be entrusted with blank check powers over sending unlimited armed forces anywhere in the world for an unlimited period of time prior to approval being given by Congress.

Legislation dealing with economic controls should have a definite termination date and in addition should give Congress the power to terminate it by veto-proof congressional resolution.

In Korea since June 25 of last year we became engaged in support of international law and order against aggression. We are now furnishing 90 percent of the armed forces and suffering 90 percent of the casualties.

We have already suffered more casualties in this struggle against aggressive communism than we did in the Revolutionary War (12,200); War of 1812 (7,000); Mexican War (17,000); and the Spanish-American War (10,000) or a total for those four wars of 46,000. The latest Korean casualty list released by the Department of Defense gives a total of 48,085.

This Government and this Nation should not be satisfied with the part played by the United Nations as a whole and the part played by many individual members of that organization. Our casualties alone are considerably greater than the total number of armed forces all the other United Nations combined have in Korea.

The Republic of China alone (and the offer has not been accepted to date) was willing to send within 5 days of the invasion 33,000 of the best troops from Formosa to help stem the tide of aggression in Korea. This is a greater number than all the other United Nations members, excepting the United States, have placed in Korea to date.

At least if they are not going to help us by carrying a fair share of the burden of supplying armed forces we should make it plain that we expect them to stop giving moral and material aid to Red China. If they are not willing and ready to cut off trade we should do so forthwith by a blockade of the China coast. Our Government has been weak and timid in dealing with our fellow members of the United Nations in this regard. Either they want a collective security system or they don't. This is the time to find out.

On January 11 in a speech on the Senate floor I stated that I would support the strengthening of the defenses of Western Europe against Communist aggression even in advance of our obligation to come to the aid of our North Atlantic Pact Allies in the event of aggression.

It was my belief then that some formula should be worked out that would make certain that our European allies were putting up their full share of the manpower for the common defense.

Without a declaration of a state of war by Congress or the bringing into effect of our treaty obligations by an act of aggression by the Soviet Union or its satellites or approval of such action by Congress I do not believe the President has blank-check powers, to place American troops in Europe without limit as to number or as to time.

The Congress has a constitutional obligation it cannot and should not abdicate to this or any other President be he Democrat or Republican. Many of our troubles today stem from the willingness of Congress to rubber stamp the acts of the President. It is long past time for Congress to reassert itself as a coequal branch of the Federal Government under the Constitution. Already there is far too great a concentration of power in the hands of the executive branch of the Government. The time to stop is now and the Congress can do it if it has the will.

Within the last 18 months two catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development (as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949) and the establishment of a Soviet-recognised Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off chain reactions that have not yet run their full course.

These events separately are sufficient to cause everyone who believes we should have a free world of freemen to examine his own conduct to determine if he is making his greatest contribution toward freedom. The combined events make it mandatory that we do it.

Our economic system is tied with Siamese-twin attachments to our constitutional form of government. If one is destroyed they both perish. There is no need for either catastrophe to happen if we get off the perpetual defensive and take the offensive.

There are too many people who have had our hospitality or advantages joining forces with Moscow and her satellites in spreading their views on "What's wrong with America?"

Those who believe in our system should start a crusade to tell "What is right with America?"

We, of course, will not close our eyes to the liability side of the ledger, but as citizens with our feet on the ground and common sense gained from experience and observation we know that America's assets in freedom of religion, speech, and press, and in agricultural, educational, fiscal, industrial, and governmental categories to mention but a few, greatly exceed our liabilities.

Seventy-eight million life-insurance policyholders own policies with a face value of an estimated $228,000,000,000. For contrast, our Federal public debt is now over $256,000,000,000.

Individuals who still believe that thrift is a virtue also own directly or through institutions for their account some $56,700,000,000 in savings institutions and $2,900,000,000 in the Postal Savings System. A substantial part of the $35,000,000,000 of time deposits in commercial banks is theirs. They also have a stake in annuities and pension funds amounting to an estimated $5,000,000,000 and a direct stake in the Social Security System (Federal, State, and local) of $29,000,000,000.

We have more stockholders than any other nation in the world. According to the 1950 census estimates we have 24,000,000 home owners.

To permit this solvent, going concern of ours to be liquidated by the strong-armed action of international communism or to consent to the voluntary bankruptcy proceedings of state socialism are both unthinkable and unnecessary. We need an alert and determined citizenry if the battle is not to be lost by default.

We must not let complacency destroy the spirit that has developed a great world power out of a small colony in less than 175 years. We must not build or depend upon military or economic Maginot lines.

This Nation has never been wedded to the status quo or ruled by the dead hand of the past. Our economic as well as our political system broke away from Old World patterns.

Short-sighted European-style capitalism built the gallows for its own execution by allowing and encouraging monopolies, cartels, low wages, and great aggregations of capital narrowly held.

The lifeblood of our system to the contrary is competition, productivity, good wages, and widespread ownership of our economic structure.

We must continue to demonstrate to the world that here in America we have political and economic freedom. Here our people, since the founding of the Republic, have looked forward to leaving to their children a better land than they themselves found.

The challenge we face is to meet the economic, social, and political needs of the twentieth century while we maintain free institutions under a constitutional Government.

Certainly security alone is not the whole answer. The most secure man is the one who has his clothing, food, medical care, and housing guaranteed for life—as an inmate of a state prison.

The sustained stability and progress of our American system of capitalistic free enterprise requires high real wages, sustained buying power for abundant markets, and maximum production at low unit costs. American agriculture, labor, and industry must not be undermined by the dumping of goods produced by low-paid labor abroad while outside markets are closed to our products.

In meeting the growing challenge of socialism and communism the dynamic American system must continue to demonstrate that labor, management, and investors all have a vital interest in maintaining our way of life.

High productivity and widespread distribution of that which our Nation can produce is more sound than the doctrine of scarcity brought about by stoppages of production or by governmental action.

In the growth of our economy there have developed powerful groups in business and in labor. Not all of them have recognized that with power must go responsibility. No man or group of men in the ranks of labor or business have the right to strangle the economic life of 150,000,000 Americans and by so doing endanger the entire free world.

The Government of the United States established economic traffic laws many years ago to protect our businessmen and consumers against unregulated monopolies. These were the antitrust statutes.

More recently, first through the Labor Relations Act of 1935 and later through the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Government has sought to establish a national labor policy that would be fair and equitable, not alone to labor and management, but to the general public as well.

While some well thought-out amendments are in order, they should be weighed in the light of their effect upon the entire population, and not just one part.

Our entire national economy must not be at the mercy of one man or small group who can give an order that will cause a creeping paralysis to close down our mines, factories, and transportation systems and work a hardship on countless people. This is far too much power for any responsible man to want and any irresponsible man to have.

There are some in Government who apparently believe that if an individual spends his own money it is inflationary, whereas if the Government takes it from him and spends it such is not the case. This is economic nonsense and squirrel-cage thinking. Government spending has been and is a major inflationary factor.

I make no claim that we can "unscramble the eggs" of Government finance, but I do maintain that we should no longer ignore the warning lights that have led to disaster when ignored elsewhere in the world.

We are faced with the necessity of greatly increasing our defense expenditures. This makes all the more essential the cutting out of not essential fat from the President's budget.

The American position should be billions for the defense of freedom from aggressive communism, but not a penny for boondoggling or socialistic programs.

The problems facing us on the home front cannot be solved by Government alone. They cannot be solved by labor, management, or the farmer alone.

Here in America, as Lincoln put it, we have "this last best hope of earth." Each of us has an individual and collective responsibility for its preservation. We are interdependent one on the other. An American economic collapse would bring despair everywhere except in Soviet Russia.

There have never been so many people in the entire history of the world who have had as large a stake, as much to gain, or as much to lose as the people of the United States of America.

Nor does history record a people who have been as unselfish in their possession of their power, their resources, and their good will.

In this century, which is not yet half over, they have sacrificed blood and treasure in two World Wars and in the current operations in Korea to prevent the destruction of free institutions on the continent of Europe. Few dispute the fact that all of Western Europe and perhaps even Britain would today be behind the Communist iron curtain if it had not been for the firm stand taken by this Republic and a considerable contribution of our resources to prevent the complete economic collapse of those war-torn nations.

Communism thrives on chaos. A rehabilitated Europe was the only chance for survival had by free institutions in that area of the world. While communism has been at least temporarily stopped in Western Europe, it has made great gains in the Far East. At the end of the war communism ruled less than 200,000,000 people. Today 800,000,000 are within the iron curtain. By what standards do you measure success in foreign policy?

Four factors relating to the ability of the Western World to defend itself against Communist aggression are: (1) Industrial capacity; (2) population; (3) raw materials; (4) territory.

Except for the first, international communism now has the edge on all the others.

Fifty years of friendly interest on the part of our people and our Government in a free and independent China and the overwhelming contribution made by our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Pacific during World War II, gave us the power, the prestige, and the opportunity for constructive action no western nation had ever before possessed. We could have pioneered in exporting the ideals that inspired men who loved freedom everywhere following our own break-away from colonial status.

All this opportunity has been frittered away by a small group of willful men who held positions in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and who had the backing of their superiors. They were aided by others in and out of Government who by design or ignorance helped to advance the cause of the Communists in China.

In Europe where the record of Soviet aims was clearly outlined in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, we finally stood up to communism in Greece, Turkey, Iran, Berlin, and Western Germany.

Knowing that communism thrives on economic and political chaos we gave economic aid through the ECA. With the North Atlantic Pact and the arms implementation legislation, we have given moral and material support for the protection of Western Europe and the Middle East from overt aggression. In that area we have given hope and support to those advancing the cause of a free world of freemen.

Munich certainly should have taught us that appeasement of aggression, then as now, is but surrender on the installment plan. Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain 10 years ago, may have sincerely thought that he was gaining peace in our time by consenting to the destruction of a free and independent Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany. We know now that paying such international blackmail only increased later demands that made World War II inevitable.

The men in the Kremlin are as power hungry as the Nazis and their system is as destructive of human liberty as was Hitlerism with which they were bedfellows while Poland was being dismembered in 1939. They have, however, learned some new techniques.

In terms of ultimate destructive impact upon our free institutions, what difference does it make whether an American citizen, such as Gold betrays his country, or whether our country is betrayed by an alien such as Dr. Fuchs? What difference does it make whether the betrayal is done for pay or for love of the Soviet system? What difference does it make whether it is done by a card-carrying Communist member or by a pervert who, being in a key position, has been blackmailed to deliver State secrets? What difference does it make whether the secrets are stolen by a burglar from an office at night or whether they are carried out in daytime by a naive employee with a gold badge and a tarnished sense of responsibility? The end result is the same, and those who set the policies and were careless or tolerant or ignorant, cannot escape their responsibility at the bar of American public opinion.

Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. It is no less destructive in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, or Bulgaria. The pattern may differ slightly.

In Poland the opposition leader, Mikolajczk, was forced to flee; in Bulgaria Petkov was hanged; in Rumania the king was given a 2-hour ultimatum to change the government regardless of the constitution; in Czechoslovakia Masaryk's life was forfeited when it became apparent that coalition with communism would not work.

A chinese official put it clearly by saying to me recently: "There can be no real coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger."

In Europe during the postwar period we have had a foreign policy in which the Republicans and the Democrats have contributed to the initiation and formulation of doctrines that are understandable.

In the Far East, during the same period, there has been no such bipartisan foreign policy. The Republicans in Congress were not consulted in the moves leading up to the bankrupt China policy which now stands revealed in all its sorry detail.

The administration, and it alone, has the full responsibility for the debacle which has taken place on the continent of Asia and which day by day and hour by hour is endangering the future peace of the world and the security of this country.

Yes; we have waited for the dust to settle, and the American people can now see the wreckage of the position once held by this great Nation in the Far East.

Alger Hiss at Yalta and the Amerasia Red network in Washington all contributed to losing in the Pacific that which our fighting men had won. It has been lost to the Soviet Union which participated in the Pacific war for 6 days.

In China, up to this very hour, the State Department has been more interested in saving face than in saving freedom.

The representatives of our Department of State persistently tried to get the Government of the Republic of China to form a coalition with the Communists. When they refused, we placed an embargo against the shipment of any arms or ammunition to the legal government of the country while during those same months the Soviet Army of occupation, in Manchuria as the result of the Yalta agreement, was turning over to the Communist forces large amounts of captured Japanese war stocks.

That the National Government of China made mistakes, has had Benedict Arnolds and men who betrayed their trust, needed no undersecring from us in the way and at the time it was done. Our own history also has examples of men who have betrayed their trust from Cabinet members down to ward bosses.

We have also been plagued with racketeers, highwaymen, and 5 percenters at various times.

The basic objective the United States should have kept constantly in mind was to preserve a free, independent, united, non-Communist China. In the postwar illness of that Nation, we prescribed that the strychnine of communism be taken. The State Department having contributed greatly to the Chinese disaster still proclaims that we must investigate some more. State Department China policies have been directed toward a postmortem rather than a consultation.

Had China been a former enemy, like Japan and Germany, we would have, since VJ-day, been giving large amounts of supervised material help and sending many of our ablest military and civilian leaders to stabilize her currency, feed her people, and protect her from Communist aggression.

Both of these former enemy nations have received more aid from us since VJ-day than has our wartime ally and long-time friend, the Republic of China.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, there are some in this country, in Great Britain, and in India who believe that by appeasing the Communists they may change their way of life. This is naive and such a viewpoint is dangerous to the peace of the world and the security of this country.

The question is asked: Can anything be done at this late date? I believe that it can. While desperate, the situation is not more desperate than it was at the time of Valley Forge or at Dunkerque.

First, of course, we need an understandable foreign policy in the Far East. As a basis for such a foreign policy, I suggest the following:

1. That we make clear that we have no intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China and that we will give vigorous leadership to the free nations in the United Nations in opposing the seating of the Communist representatives.

It is inconceivable that the free nations of the world will yield to Soviet blackmail by seating the Communist regime of China in the United Nations. Such an abject surrender to the Soviet Union will be destructive of the ultimate objectives of the United Nations. Any such a surrender to Communist pressure will properly be acclaimed throughout the world as a Communist triumph and will have a tremendous psychological effect throughout the entire Far East.

Our Secretary of State at the time he announced that our own vote would be against removing the representatives of the Republic of China and seating the representatives of the Communist regime in their place also announced that we would not urge any other nation to vote for or against the proposition and that we would ourselves not use a veto. By these latter two announcements he largely destroyed the effectiveness of our own vote on the matter.

2. We should give supervised aid to the legal Government of China now on the island of Formosa in the same way we have given it to the legal Governments of Greece and Korea both of which have also been targets of aggressive communism.

There is a larger population on Formosa than in Greece or Australia. There are more anti-Communist troops than in all the other non-Communist areas of Asia combined.

The forces of the Republic of China, if given arms and ammunition, are in a position to attack the flanks and rear of the Communist forces fighting against the United Nations in Korea. They are willing and able to help and if we take off the neutralization restrictions they can make commando type raids on the long coast line of China and can supply the more than a million non-Communist guerrillas operating in south and central China.

A mission headed by a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer could supervise the requests for aid, advise with the Chinese Government relative to the training of troops in the use of equipment, and make certain from a logistical point of view that the supplies were received at the points where they were needed.

3. We should forthwith move in the United Nations for economic, political and military sanctions against the Chinese Communist aggressors in Korea.

(a) Economic sanctions would include the cutting off of trade by all nations with Communist China.

(b) Political sanctions would include the withdrawal of recognition of the Communist Chinese regime by United Nations members who have extended diplomatic recognition.

(c) Military sanctions would include a naval blockade of the China coast and the striking by the United Nations air forces of military targets north of the Yalu River from which arsenals, supply depots, and concentration points are coming the supplies and reinforcements attempting to destroy the United Nations forces in Korea.

Neither the United States or the United Nations should use ground troops on the mainland of Asia outside of Korea. We should support with supplies, non-Communists of Asia who desire to fight for their freedom from Communist domination. There are still millions who are ready and able to do so if they get some moral support and equipment.

Yes; America has come of age. We can no more return to a policy of isolation than an adult can return to childhood. We must assume our responsibilities as a great world power without whose active support there can be no adequate international system of law and order.

We need a dynamic American foreign policy. Liberty is still a greater force than slavery. Our own fight for freedom electrified the world.

Let us rekindle the torch. We must assume a moral leadership that we lost at Yalta. Let us make it clear to freedom-loving Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Koreans, and Chinese that their desire for liberty is understandable to us.

Let us make clear to the Soviet Union and her satellites that we and they are on a diplomatic quid pro quo basis. The United States Government should serve notice that we will no longer tolerate our Ambassador and diplomatic officials being restricted to Moscow and occasional outside trips while theirs are free to roam from Pennsylvania to California, and from Maine to Texas.

We should make it clear that we will no longer permit five times the number of visas to be issued for Soviet citizens to visit this country as are issued to our citizens to visit Russia.

It should be made clear to all the Soviet satellites that they will treat our diplomatic representatives and our citizens with respect and international law, or we will break off diplomatic relations and tell their people why it is being done.

Of course, we should seek a just and lasting settlement of the cold war, but not by another Munich or another Yalta.

Any settlement to be worth while must include freedom from the tyranny under which millions of people suffer, in part at least, as a result of our past mistakes.

No nation or its leader had the moral right to barter the lives of millions of men, women, and children into the godless hands of international communism. The Soviet Union has long since violated various part of their wartime agreements with the West. To Polish and Chinese patriots a public denouncement of the Yalta executive agreement would clear the atmosphere and give them renewed hope and courage.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I recently visited the Nevada testing grounds and was there for the final explosion. I returned to Washington greatly encouraged by the splendid teamwork of our scientists and our armed services. This is no time to take a defeatist attitude vis-à-vis the Soviet world. It is no time for faint hearts to sell America short.

It was Lincoln who said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history * * * the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, even we, here have the power and bear the responsibility * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

If we use the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, there is no domestic problem we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need fear.

Address Delivered by Hon. Watkins M. Abbitt, of Virginia, at a Meeting of the Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me at a meeting of the Hub Federation of the Future Farmers of America, at Appomattox, Va., Friday, January 26, 1951:

At no time in the history of our Nation has so much depended upon the young men and women on the farms. Today you in your teens and early twenties stand as a bulwark against the evil forces that would enslave your country.

You are in demand on the farm and in the Armed Forces. Many of you Future Farmers in the lower age groups are skilled through the training in your organization and your love of the land to the point that you become key men in farm production. This is particularly true where you have played a big part in the family-operated farm. On such farms you become a vital part in our Nation's agricultural production. The big part you play is indicated by the fact that farm operators and unpaid members of their families make up three-fourths of all farm workers.

With this in mind I understand that an assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture stated before the Preparedness Committee of the Senate that the availability of deferment authority is of particular importance so that some key workers may be retained on farms until qualified replacements are found or until persons who have completed their service are available. Of course, this means that agriculture and military service are definitely tied together as they always have been. The Minutemen at Concord and the soldiers at Valley Forge alternated between the farm and the battlefield in order that the freedom of their farms and families might be maintained.

So both the usefulness of youth on the battlefield and on the farms is brought into focus.

It is recognized, however, in making deferment that even though a farm-reared boy in the 18- or 19-year-age group may already possess substantial farm skill, the men in the higher age groups who might be liable for military service if the younger ones are not taken possess even greater farm skills. Under any circumstance on the farm or in the armed services, the Future Farmers of America stand solidly in the front line of forces fighting for our Nation's survival.

If the part played by the Future Farmers of America in our Nation's agriculture has always been a fundamentally important one, it now takes on far greater stature. Increased production of food and fiber is the foundation upon which the military and diplomatic forces of our country is built.

Although increased production is the watchword, that does not mean that we have alarming shortages or even mild shortages. It simply means that demand for farm products will continue to advance and that we must be prepared. Foodstuffs shipped to Yugoslavia and India recently represent food in diplomacy.

By aiding these hungry countries, we are able to point out to them the attitudes of free peoples toward their neighbors and the ability of democratic countries to produce more than they need. Although adequate supplies are now on hand, larger stocks to meet the anticipated increased demand will make a defense against inflation and lighten controls needed over food commodities.

In order to assure this abundance, acreage allotments have been removed for cotton. To be on the safe side, the Nation needs at least 16,000,000 bales from the next cotton crop.

Allotments for wheat and corn have been called off and larger plantings of both crops are being urged.

However, there need be, as I said, no alarm that we have present any severe shortage of food. In fact, we have quite large supplies of grains and other storable commodities on hand. For example, at the beginning of the corn marketing season (October 1), stocks stood at a new record high—850,000,000 bushels.

But the speeded-up demand is already making rapid inroads upon this all-time high stock. The increased demand for meat and other livestock will drain further from these large supplies as the months go on. So it is expected that our reserve carry-over of corn next October may be cut down by about 500,000,000 bushels.

The wheat situation is equally strong. The carry-over at the end of this current marketing season is expected to exceed 430,000,000 bushels, which would be about the same as at the beginning of the season. The withdrawal of wheat allotments gives the grower a chance to put in more spring wheat and at the same time have the advantage of price supports.

So it is that to these large piles of food laid away must be added still greater yields. You might ask why it takes more meat and protein foods to feed the military. Is not the military made up of the same men and women that were eating their daily quota of food in civilian life? Surely that is true. But the men and women in service, because of their strenuous and continuing expenditure of physical and mental energy, need more food. Then too, food stockpiles must be built up in every area where an enemy may possibly attack. Although only a few of them may actually ever be used as food.

And then there is another drain upon our food supplies that comes with an emergency. More people are employed at higher wages and harder work. They too have an appetite for heavier diets and the job creates an appetite which comes with higher wages—money enough to pay for the best of food.

Of equal interest to the production of food in the emergency is the price of food. The price the consumer pays and the price the farmer receives are both of dramatic concern to all. Here's where price control now being extensively discussed will come in. Factory workers look at it this way. They say they won't sit by for a freeze on wages while food prices go up. At the same time, the farmer cannot sell his crops unless he receives for them a price that is on a parity with the income of labor. (Parity stated quickly and simply is a figure arrived at through complex processes which establish the point at which the farm products prices are on a level with other prices.)

Now if we take this through easy I think we can work out just what the farm price situation is now and give real meaning to our price-control legislation.

Let us start back in 1949 and the first part of 1950 when farm prices had fallen so drastically as to bring most of the commodity prices out of line with the cost of things the farmer had to buy—all these costs as we recall being on a distinct upgrade.

To correct this situation, we in Congress inserted a provision in the national defense law—the one that empowers the President to put on price controls—that would permit farm prices to come back in line with parity before any price ceilings could be put upon them. To say it another way, the Defense

Production Act earnestly tries to give the farmer this protection by providing generally that no ceiling on agricultural commodities be imposed at levels below the higher of the two standards: (1) Parity or (2) the higher prices during the 30-day period in May and June prior to the outbreak of the Korean conflict.

The very strong position that agriculture finds itself in today so far as large stocks of grains and other storable commodities and so far as price is concerned, did not come about by chance or luck or just happen to happen.

The capacity of our farms to make the fabulous record of production that they achieved through the past 11 seasons came about through the intelligent planning and the hard work of the farmers working in team with broad-gage Government programs that helped them to increase production and to maintain an income that put them on a sound financial footing for continued big yields.

You and your fathers and your families all did your part in making each new year from the beginning of the last war to today a better year. Today the yields of American farmers are 40 percent greater than they were in the 1935-39 average.

All that you and other Future Farmers throughout the country have learned about soil conservation and all the projects of the various sorts from water holes on the limitless cattle ranges of the West to terracing on the steep slopes of Appomattox County farmland has made secure great areas of our Nation's soil. It has held the soil against wind and water. Grassland farming, better pastures, and legumes have encouraged the earth, adding humus and guarding it against erosion.

Each job that you did on your farm because a part of a vast improvement of our greatest natural resource—the land. Working with you was the Department of Agriculture. Through agricultural production programs it aided by paying in part the cost of soil-conserving practices and so assisted farmers who in most instances could not have carried on the project without help.

Let me take time just to quote a few figures. I think they are amazing enough to be worth while and give you a rough idea of how all of us working together have made a real and an astounding contribution to our national wealth and given assurance of a food supply for our citizens in war or peace.

Nearly 3,900,000 farmers are cooperating in the Agricultural conservation program. Since 1936 these cooperating farmers have seeded 51,000,000 acres of soil-conserving pasture. They have built a million dams, used 250,000,000 tons of lime. They applied 24,-000,000 tons of superphosphate. Two hundred and fifty-five million acres of green manure crops were established and turned under to the continued enrichment of those millions of acres of hard pressed soil. Just a few more. One hundred and thirty million acres were contoured. And last but not least 220,000 acres of trees were planted.

In Virginia alone 47 percent of the farms, totaling almost 10,500,000 acres, took part in the ACP programs. Over 70 percent of the farmers received some assistance with the average gross assistance amounting to $67.36.

With such Paul Bunyan-like achievements going on across the Nation, the vast production that bulwarked our troops and war workers throughout the last war and enabled them to win is explained. So great was the ability of our farmers and the strength of our soil even after the drains in energy and demands made upon the soil, we were able to follow through by feeding the war-wrecked and soil-depleted nations of the democratic world until they could be back on their feet.

The cost of this gigantic operation in soil mining considered in the light of a basic defense move was indeed a bargain. Defense usually comes high with airplane carriers proposed at a cost of $300,000,000. Airplanes in experimental stages at $100,000,000 apiece are not out of the ordinary for the new supersonic models. The cost of the ACP program last year, in which nearly 3,000,000 farmers took part and 681,000,000 acres were benefited, came to $285,000,000.

Going alone hand in hand with the encouragement of better farming methods was the price-support program which gave the farmer reasonable assurance of an income adequate to keep his farming operations going.

The need for an economic protection to the farmer if we were to have a sound national economy and to keep our farms operating as going concerns was pointed up in the early thirties. Then with no economic protection we saw 32-cent wheat, 19-cent corn, 10-cent eggs, and 18-cent butter. Along with the wreckage of the price structure went the foreclosures. Millions of acres of land lay idle and naked to erosion. Farmers could not afford to put in the crops.

It was our good fortune that no marauding dictators saw fit at that time to take a crack at us. It would have been very bad for us had they.

This economic stability which has accrued to the farmer and has benefited the Nation as a whole by pouring untold billions of dollars into the national wealth and into trade, was bought very cheaply.

Before we consider the cost let's get price-control operations in focus by seeing what they have done for tobacco growers in Virginia.

As you may know, Brunswick and Mecklenburg Counties, along with Halifax and Pittsylvania, stand out as counties where tobacco is the most important product. Of course, in the counties of southside Virginia especially, tobacco represents a far greater portion of farm income than for the State as a whole.

And that means something because the proportion of Virginia income from tobacco is on the increase. Twenty-one years ago the value of all the tobacco produced in all the Commonwealth represented only one-fourth of our total income from farm crops. That is on an average from 1925 until 1929. That is a little before most of you Future Farmers were around here.

But from the period 1945 to 1949, which all of you remember well, tobacco represented one-third of the total income of the Commonwealth. And in this census Halifax, Pittsylvania, Mecklenburg and Brunswick Counties stand out. Four-fifths of their total cash income was from tobacco.

The farmers of this great Commonwealth have worked together and with their Government in the tobacco programs that have assured a fair return for labor expended. They are to be congratulated for having accepted their responsibilities in the promotion and operation of those programs. For when the farmer receives a good price for his tobacco, his neighbor shares in his prosperity. Good prices to the tobacco grower help to assure jobs and good income to all of the people in our Commonwealth.

In the 17 years of the operation of price supports, the total cost has been $736,500,-000 or an average of $43,000,000 a year over the 17-year period. For most of this time only wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice—all storable commodities—constituted the basic crops protected by price supports. It was not until the recent war that an attempt was made to support perishables. The $43,000,000 average loss a year is attributable mostly to losses on potatoes, eggs, dried milk, butter, and cheese. In fact $593,000,000 of the loss was accounted for by these perishables letting the loss on the storable commodities at $132,500,000 or an average of $7,800,000 per year.

So far so good. You Future Farmers have had projects that have been fun to do and that have paid off in better crops, better livestock and given you the fun of trying for an honest goal.

Now how are these projects to be turned to the defense of our Nation?

Here are a few things that must be done—done right away. First, we have got to take care of our farm machinery and equipment. We have got to work with the soldiers at the front and those who are going to the front. Equipment and repairs for farm machinery will not have first priorities. The materials that go to make up tractors, plows, discs, and steel silos will first go into weapons of defense, planes, trucks, and all that are needed to keep the enemy from our shores. Of course, this means that there will be less farm machinery to be brought first hand from now on.

So it's up to the future farmers of America and the present farmers of America, if America is to have a future and farmers are to farm as we know it in America, to cooperate in order to maintain the mechanical efficiency of American farms.

Many of you future farmers took part during the last war in projects which helped keep crumbling farm equipment in order. If you didn't take part in it, you heard about it from elder brothers, your fathers, and your teachers. They told you what the set-up was.

When we came into the last war we had even less farm machinery than we have today, and more of it was in bad repair. This was due to the fact that we had not recovered from the depression, and farmers had not yet obtained income enough to get all the machinery which they needed.

The comparative machinery situation lines up like this:

	1941	1950
Automobiles	4,300,000	5,800,000
Tractors	1,700,000	3,800,000
Trucks	1,100,000	2,300,000
Milking machines	210,000	710,000
Combines	225,000	650,000
Mechanical corn pickers	120,000	410,000

So here's what we can do with what we have. First, make a project of looking over your farm equipment in the light of future events. Look it over carefully. You will know what it needs and what it is going to need in the way of repairs. So the best thing to do is to order the repairs needed and the repairs that it looks like you are going to need. After you have got these lined up, order them at once. It will help your country and your farm and save you a lot of trouble later.

I am saying this despite the fact that your farm might be better equipped than it ever was mechanically. I would still look around for parts that are wearing out or that look like they are going to give out.

Out of 100,000,000 tons of steel normally used by farm implement manufacturers, 20,-000,000 go into repair parts. Rationing indicates that 75,000,000 tons will go into new farm machinery and that by the same ratio 15,000,000 tons will go into repair parts. An effort is being made to adjust this relationship so that a larger percent of the material available will be used for parts.

Here's another way to make your farm a profit to yourself and to your country. Use fertilizer and lime. Get your order in for your lime and fertilizer now. Take the fertilizer now and store it on your farm until you are ready to use it. By doing so you can keep the factories and the mixers working steadily and save storage and transportation that can be used to further other defense efforts.

Your Future Farmers have had many projects in the efficient use of labor. The care of equipment, the ordering of new parts and the use of fertilizer in accordance with the anticipated demand for them is naturally labor

saving. If you have a machinery part that is faltering and you have already ordered and have on hand its replacement, much labor has been saved. It is a long trip to town and it may be a long time that you sit idle on the tractor while your implement dealer sends to the county distributor for the part and the county distributor sends to the factory for the part. All of that is labor saving. And there are others—

And last, but not least, we have the soil. In days when we do not know how long it will take to win the conflict that now faces us, we must be sure of one thing—and that is the efficiency of our soil.

As we talked before about how the production increased year by year through the last war and all through the world famine because we had care for our soil. Today there is a greater obligation on the part of the farmer and the Government to see that the agricultural conservation programs step out and fight the enemies on the home front—careless farming and its allies wind and water erosion—and protect us from the devasting raids upon our land that this pair make.

In other words, it is up to us to see that pasture improvement, cover crops, terracing, and all the other soil saving methods are practiced with even greater intensity in these times than in ordinary times.

It is up to all of us to help ourselves and each other in order that each of us may work our own farms, choose our own girls, and rear our own children in accordance with our own beliefs, and do our part to see that as many others as possible in this world have the same opportunities—opportunities of freedom.

Postwar Assistance to France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on February 14 it was my good fortune to be host at a small luncheon in honor of the Honorable Charles Delbruck, president of the Lutheran Churches of France. Unfortunately, many Members of the House and Senate were out of the city at the time, but we invited as many Lutherans as we could find, and most of them were present.

Mr. Delbruck is a lay Lutheran, and operates a textile manufacturing business. All of us present had a very profitable luncheon hour. Economic, political, and religious questions were discussed. Notes were not kept of the questions and answers, but I do have our distinguished visitor's eloquent opening statement, and I ask unanimous consent to insert the statement in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dear brothers in Christ, I wish to express in the name of the Lutheran churches of France, the gratitude which is overflowing our hearts and that I cannot keep to myself any longer.

Let me tell you that following the last war we met your representatives in Europe to have the Lutheran World Federation and we have experienced a wonderful and most precious feeling of Christian love coming from over the ocean and surrounding us.

We are thoroughly thankful to you for the wonderful help you gave us and are still giving us; for the promptitude of your action and its efficiency coming as it did when our country was liberated of the occupant. It came at a time when everything was so difficult for us, when the tremendous task of reconstruction as well as moral and spiritual regeneration faced us, when we had to rebuild our churches, our parsonages, our parish houses and our homes, our schools, our factories, our roads and bridges, our railroads, and telephone and telegraphic systems; when such a work seemed far from possible, and when there was no food and no clothes for our children.

And just at that time, when we were not far from despair, answering our prayers to God to give us help, came the news that our brothers in faith from over the ocean had made a tremendous effort to help us, bringing to us a new hope and possibilities to stand again and little by little to resume life again.

We heard and rejoiced to hear that funds had been gathered, that this effort was to last, but, above all, we had the feeling that we were not alone before this heavy task awaiting us, that brothers in faith were praying with us and for the success of this task; that we were children of the big Lutheran world-wide church, that our brothers and sisters in faith stood by us and shoulder to shoulder with us. And this was the answer to our prayers to God when we felt so distressed and helpless.

And this is why I wish to say to you, quite simply today, but, from the deepest of our hearts, "We thank you for all that you have given to us your brothers in Jesus Christ. Thank you for the brotherly and Christian way and for the spirit in which you have come to our help."

The Republican Party and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a speech entitled "The Republican Party and the Future," delivered by Malcolm Williamson, of Waynesville, N. C., at the Lincoln Day box supper, Uline Arena, Washington, D. C., on Monday, February 5, 1951.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE FUTURE

On the eve of the celebration of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, whose name has become almost synonymous with the Republican Party, it is fitting that we consider the Republican Party and the future.

From the days when Lincoln, the dark horse candidate of the Republican Party, was elected President with only 1,865,000 popular votes, until now, 13 of the 17 Presidents of the United States have been members of the Republican Party. In the 90 years since 1860 our country has made such great strides that today we can truthfully say we are the most powerful and influential Nation on earth. The American way of life has become the envy of all peoples who long for the material and spiritual blessings which through the years of Republican guidance came to this land of freedom and opportunity. I need not remind you that the freedom and prosperity of our country, in large measure has been due to the Republican belief in free enterprise and despite the Democratic belief in creating prosperity through endless Government subsidies. The only way to increase a standard of living is to produce more. Fortunately, the Republican Party realizes this. Our party's history is adorned with the names of great national leaders like Lincoln, and McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt who demonstrated that America could not only become strong internally, but could become, in a short 40 years, the hope of freemen everywhere. The Republican Party has contributed much to America in the past. It can and it will contribute even more in the future.

The Republican Party has had days of adversity as well as days of prosperity. Though it is true that from 1932 until now our party has suffered a set-back in the national elections, this eclipse has never been total. These losses show that in many areas the party has suffered from disunity. In recent years many Republicans have meekly followed the leaders of "me-toolism." This me-too philosophy is the most dangerous enemy of the Republican Party today. Its futility is obvious. By the defeat of the Republican ticket in 1948, the people have shown that if they must have the Democratic program, they will elect Democrats to carry it out. This has been an expensive lesson, but I believe that we have learned it. As evidence of the abandonment of "me-toolism," in every 1950 Senatorial race where the Republican fought for Republican principles, he was elected. If the Republican Party is ever to regain power, we must say and do what we believe. Republican policy must not be merely a few vague principles. It must be manifested in the everyday decisions of the United States Government, as it was in the extremely constructive Eightieth Congress.

On the surface the future looks dark for America. The inevitable retribution for past mistakes is about to overtake us. The administration leaders realize that their past is catching up with them. They seem so worried about their political careers, however, that they can see no way out. Their only proposal is to arm to the teeth even if it bankrupts the Nation, which is exactly what Russia wants. Fortunately, we have Republicans in Washington with the ability to chart other courses for the ship of state. Largely through Republican efforts we are at long last telling our allies that they must either stand with us all the time, regardless of petty differences, or they must stand by themselves. Through Republican efforts the administration is being forced to consider allowing Chiang Kai-shek's troops to fight their enemies instead of making American boys bear all the sacrifices. Through Republican efforts America is about to construct its first real foreign policy since Franklin Roosevelt recognized the Soviet Union. Though it is true that the present predicament of the United States cannot be blamed on the Republican Party, we can be blamed if we do not fulfill our duty to work endlessly for a workable, peaceful solution to our tragic plight.

The Republican Party also has a great responsibility to the future of America in the field of domestic policy. The greatest blessing a government can bestow upon its people is to give them a sound currency. Through inflation the Socialist schemers have almost realized their dream of making old people dependent on the Government by destroying the value of their savings. Inflation can never be checked by minor controls around the edges. It can only be stopped at its source—reckless Government spending. Republicans have always realized the danger of an unbalanced budget and are at last achieving a measure of success against deficit

financing. Calvin Coolidge might have offered as a remedy to governmental extravagance, the simple statement, "I do not choose to spend." Republicans in Congress must balance the budget, reduce the national debt, eliminate unnecessary and undesirable Government agencies, and give the American people government at a cost they can afford to pay. If Republicans will take the lead in achieving these goals, I have no doubt that the Republican Party will receive its just reward.

To regain control of the National Government, the Republican Party must become strong in the South. This is a difficult task, but it is not a hopeless one. I believe that the average southerner is in sympathy with the Republican principles, but does not realize it. They call themselves southern Democrats, but everyone knows a southern Democrat is a Republican too stubborn to admit it. With a little education, work, organization, and perseverance the Republican Party can win the South.

The greatest need of the United States today is leadership. The Democratic Party has been unable to provide it. The Republican Party can. It offers an alternative to war. It offers economical government, labor-management stability, increased prosperity, a logical solution to inflation, and it offers hope to America. Surely the American people will eagerly accept the party with these policies and in 1952 we shall elect a Republican President.

Proposed Dispersal of Federal Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial from the Sun, published in Arlington, Va., with respect to the proposed plan for the dispersal of Federal agencies into Virginia and Maryland.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VIEW ON DISPERSAL

We hope Congress takes a long and searching look at the current proposals for dispersal of Federal agencies into the Virginia and Maryland countryside. This week indications were that the ideas of the Federal planners were arousing a lot of questions on Capitol Hill.

Last week Senator BYRD told an Arlington audience he was reserving opinion on the dispersal plan. He pointed out that an enormous initial cost would by no means be the end of the expense involved, and more important, he pointed out that dispersal, as it is understood now, would still leave in Washington the really vital personnel and units of Government.

Additionally, we think it is high time something was said about the moral aspect of a flight from Washington. There is an element of what some might call cowardice in the prospect. At a time when, above all else, the United States should display complete firmness and faith in itself, it offers the rest of the world the picture of administrative bureaus running away from the Nation's capital.

If we admit, as under dispersal we would admit, that we can't defend our own capital city against a potential foe which must traverse thousands of air miles to reach it, then it seems to this newspaper we present a sorry sight for all to behold.

What can Washington expect the great manufacturing cities of its own country to think—Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, New York, and all the others? No one speaks of dispersing their factories or their teeming populations of producing workmen. Let dispersal of Washington bureaus become a fact, and it isn't hard to imagine the scorn and derision—to say nothing of the bitterness—with which the Capital would be regarded throughout the Nation.

No layman knows today what the authoritative judgment may be on the probability of a sneak attack on this country. Commonsense prudence would dictate that certain archives be removed and that preparations be made for a speedy shift from Washington of the heart of the military establishment, of the President's office, and of Congress, at the moment when a potential condition became critical. But that sort of preparation is a vastly different matter from the shifting now of thirty to fifty thousand administrative personnel a few miles outside the city.

As they think it over thoroughly, Members of Congress may find that the dispersal plan as it has so far been drafted will, if carried through, leave them open to some very embarrassing questions at home. And the Nation will, we think, find its prestige seriously undercut in every other capital.

The threat which Russian communism poses becomes greater, and bolder in action, exactly in proportion to the degree the rest of the world exhibits apprehension and uncertainty. Under present conditions, removal of a considerable segment of the machinery of Government from Washington would amount to a tacit admission of fear and doubt, which the Kremlin would find most cheering.

Benjamin Stolberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article and a statement relating to Benjamin Stolberg, who died recently. The article, written by George Sokolsky, was published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 29, 1951, and the statement was published in the January 31, 1951, issue of Human Events. Benjamin Stolberg was one of the outstanding figures in this country in the battle against communism. I believe the article and the statement pay to Mr. Stolberg a well-deserved tribute.

There being no objection, the article and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of January 26, 1951]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

I suppose when a man passes 50, he begins to go to funerals. For years, I never went to one. During the past week, I went to two and could have gone to a third were I in San Francisco, where my friend, Edgar Rickard, died after living a long and good life. Friends pass on and leave a void that is not filled too soon and sometimes never.

The death of Ben Stolberg is a greater loss to this country than is readily realizable. Ben might have been regarded as the theoretician, the guide and philosopher of anti-Marxism in America.

Long before many who today are shocked by the almost inhuman brutality of the Communists realized the dangers of an unmoral way of life, Ben Stolberg recognized the evil and the peril to mankind. He inspired a band of fighters.

Ben was a Jew from Germany who came to this country early enough to go to Harvard and the University of Chicago. Although not native in English, he developed a literary style that was pungent, sharp, and precise.

His use of words mirrored his mind, for he cut through dross and shams with the deftness of a surgeon and found the heart of the problem where it stood out uncovered, for better or for worse.

His integrity was so crystal clear that he suffered for being in advance of the times.

But in recent years, he talked more than he wrote. Many of us found in his mind a storehouse of precisely cataloged data and experience, and his wisdom a guide to the target.

We took his wares, hardly realizing that he could have used them to his own advantages. And he gave to whoever asked, without regard to himself. He lived a cause, and his cause was anticommunism. To put it more constructively, he had discovered the soul of America and made it his faith.

It is interesting—and surely of more than passing significance—that this immigrant should have loved America so uncompromisingly. This was no second home. This was no place of refuge. This was all to him.

Perhaps it may sound exaggerated to those who take everything for granted that they find here, but Ben Stolberg literally loved the United States, its traditions, its institutions, it soul. His only son, David, fights in Korea.

Perhaps the full sadness of this apparently jolly man's life was a consciousness that he might have done it all differently. For his convictions and beliefs and faith matured in his fifties as he could not have foreseen in his twenties and thirties. Once perhaps cynical, he had found faith.

He had become a conservative in the truest sense of the word; that is, a conservator, one who constructively seeks to preserve, to guard the richness of tradition, making progress within the disciplines of historic truth.

Had he lived longer, this mature view of life would have given his work a new and powerful direction. This I can tell you: Many articles written by many writers, many speeches spoken by great public figures found their inspiration in the conversation and in the notes which Ben Stolberg bestowed so lavishly.

And yet he had nothing of worldly goods, nor did he even live comfortably. I am certain that in recent years he was not disturbed by the income tax.

Boycotted and blacklisted by Communist and fellow-traveler magazine and publishing house editors, he regarded that, too, as part of the fight against Stalin. In fact, while he was dying, in his last hour, he smilingly said: "Yes, I did kill Joe Stalin."

And so our friends go and we weep for them and move on to our work. And then each of us goes, too, and a new generation takes over. Always the satisfaction must be that nothing really dies.

We plant our little seeds and the trees which we never live to see grow. We hurl ideas into the air and they do take root.

Stolberg lived long enough to see the day when most Americans are sure that communism is not just a political party, but an

evil out of the Apocalypse. He heard the hooves of the four horsemen long, long ago. We can all hear them now, for they are upon us.

[From Human Events of January 31, 1951]

BENJAMIN STOLBERG

The sudden death of Benjamin Stolberg last week is indeed a severe loss. A list of his books appearing in the obituary notices in the papers bears testimony to his erudition and knowledge of politics, especially in the labor field. Recent pieces in the American Mercury—one on TAFT, another on Lattimore—showed his talents undimmed. But it is not so much the loss of his pen, brilliant as it was. Ben was a Bohemian—somewhat like that artist in Balzac's Cousin Bette; many of his masterpieces were talked, not written. It was in that very role that his influence—the influence of the cenacle—was exerted. As George Sokolsky well pointed out the other day in his column, Ben's great background knowledge, the pyrotechnics of his conversation, and the shrewd alertness of his mind proved of inestimable inspiration not only to other writers and thinkers, but also to many figures in the arena of politics.

His death came with special cruelty, for the word had gone around that Ben was making a come-back. It may be recalled that he had been so bold, in the thirties, as to expose the Communist ramifications in the American labor movement. To use a journalist's expression, the story was "broken too soon." It was not too soon for the good of the country, but at that time the Communist infiltration and influence had risen to a new high; and "liberals," in and out of editorial offices, found the Stolberg frankness too strong a medicine. Within 10 years, of course, Phil Murray and his aides were sweating profusely in an effort to purge the Reds whom Stolberg had uncovered a decade before.

As a result of this cowardice, Ben was blacklisted and his hitherto familiar byline disappeared from national magazines. His is but one case of the general boycott imposed on writers of independence. There were others: John T. Flynn, William Henry Chamberlin, Eugene Lyons—to mention a few. They were punished for being "right too soon." But the events of the past year began to have effect; a few editorial doors closed to Ben were beginning to open. When we saw him a fortnight ago he was filled with plans for articles, books, a column, etc. Then suddenly it was all over.

Telegram From Senator Lehman to Lithuanian American Information Center on Thirty-third Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Friday, February 16, was the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. On the occasion of that day I was very pleased to address to the Lithuanian American Information Center a telegram greeting Americans of Lithuanian descent on the observance of this historic occasion.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my telegram in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1951.

Miss MARY KIZIS,
Executive Secretary, Lithuanian American Information Center, New York, N. Y.:

Following is message marking anniversary of Lithuanian independence:

"This thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania is for all a day when we must rededicate ourselves to the liberation of a people who after a century of Russian domination, and brief years of independence are again under the heavy yoke of foreign tyranny. It is the prayer of all of us that the spirit and courage of the people of Lithuania will remain steadfast and unchanged during these darks days of oppression. To those Americans with friends and relatives in their native country, I can offer only the continuing hope that they may again be reunited through the reestablishment of a free and independent Lithuania. All who are devoted to freedom, liberty, and justice are resolved to hasten that day of the deliverance of Lithuania into the family of free nations."

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator.

Soil for Peace or War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota is extremely fortunate to have as one of its leading farm editors Mr. Alfred D. Stedman, farm editor, St. Paul Dispatch-Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn. Mr. Stedman has had years of experience in agricultural matters, having served with honor and distinction as an official of the Department of Agriculture. His intimate knowledge of the agricultural economy of the Midwest is revealed by his penetrating and constructive articles concerning agricultural legislation and programs.

On February 8 last, Mr. Stedman addressed the Minnesota Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors. His comments pertaining to the value of soil conservation in our defense program are worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Stedman's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL FOR PEACE OR WAR

The roots of the United States-Russian contest for world leadership go deep into the soil. The dead dynasties of the past lie buried under eroded earth. The modern maritime empires have failed or faded. But surviving are two landed nations. The contest of ideologies is between these landed giants. The United States has one of the world's great rich-land areas. Russia has the other. Today their contest moves toward some grand climax, or we hope anticlimax, that is still hidden and holding the world in suspense.

The rivals' strength comes from their resources of the earth—their metals, coal, oil, waters, timber and also vital food to feed their working, planning and fighting forces. Thus the soil producing the food has a key place in the preparedness program that aims above all to maintain peace by making war prohibitively dangerous to Russia or, if that aim should fail, to win World War III.

We have some land advantages, but so has Russia. We have the freedoms of our farms and homes that are not a dictator's but here can be our own in fee simple. We have superior food producing power conveyed by machines and know-how. Russia, however, has untapped soil resources east and west of the Urals that she is busily exploiting. In the Danube Basin, Poland, and East Germany, she has a grip on the bread lands of other countries. But we of the United States are compelled to stand or fall on the soil we've got.

So we are hit by the most urgent of all farm questions. What will our Nation do to safeguard its soil?

In the emergency, the United States is getting set to put great new strains on its remaining soil fertility. The official call is out to grow more, more and still more food.

This continuing burden is to fall on a shrinking soil reserve. More than 280 million acres already have been ruined or nearly so by erosion. Half a million more go down the drain each year. Scientists say the curve of our productive soil resources still slants sharply downward. The line of worn-out cash-cropped soils is moving westward across our state and Nation. Cropping alone is removing soil nutrients from Minnesota lands six to nine times faster than their replacement by fertilizers. All this is weakening the food foundation of our Nation and others depending heavily on us for food. And the too-precarious margin of food safety is exposed to imponderable dangers of drouth, of grain rust or livestock epidemics, either accidental or unloosed in biological war.

And now your soil conservation district work feels a deep and patriotic urge to get ahead faster. The goal is a technically sound soil conservation plan for every farm. But you have never had enough technicians to draw those plans and right now you urgently need more appropriations to supply them. In the Nation, the task of getting such farm plans in operation isn't yet one-fifth done. In Minnesota, it has reached only 1 farm in 15. At last year's rate, getting the whole job done nationally would take until 1967. At a stepped-up rate being proposed by Chief H. H. Bennett, it would take until 1971. For this essential, farm-by-farm conservation program, that would represent great progress.

But the United States now faces emergency as well as long-time soil needs. The need to hasten with gully control, contouring, terracing, and tree planting remains, and is more pressing. But besides that there are additional needs for easing the special, intensified drains of emergency farming. Rapid speed-up in adoption of crop rotation systems is urgent. More acres need to be returned to legumes and grasses. More acid soils ought to be limed. More humus and plant nutrients should be going back into the land. So the emergency side of the soil job will need close attention by you and the consolidated Federal agency that is soon to get the conservation job. We must come to grips with the question of how to win over many more of a very substantial minority of farmers to conservation farming. This is especially true when farm labor shortages fan the urge to farm in simple, familiar ways.

Conservation farming appeals powerfully to established, careful farmers, with pride in good work, in good soil, in service to the Nation, and a very warm spark of religion in their souls. It offers them bigger and surer long-time returns. From grass in rotation, they can get more feed units per acre and return more nutrients to the soil, with great savings in labor. Over the years, they can average more corn or oats or flax on fewer acres. Their built-up soil reserves are a fine investment for self, for posterity, and for country.

Why, then, do so many go right on straight cash-cropping, uphill and down, just mining the soil in the same old way? With some, the case for conservation has simply failed of any convincing presentations. Some find it hard to change long, ingrained habits of farming. Some want to take one more big gamble at selling off soil fertility while these prices hold. Maybe a few are emotionally "ag'in" it.

But many are up against very real troubles. Some of these have farm mortgages so heavy as virtually to compel the mining of their soil. Some renters have annual leases giving small assurance of return of long-time investments in building the land. Some just haven't the money to pay the first costs of conservation.

How can more of this large number be won to conservation farming in the emergency and after? A much better information job by all organs of information, including the press, can and should be done. Also, we can look into the chances for reforms in the lease laws. Further, we could ask the banking fraternity to help work out reforms in those conventional farm loan practices that are now virtually forcing vicious mining of the soil.

Also, we can continue to use inducements to offset first costs and get conservation practices started. That's not buying or bribing. Rather it is a familiar way to launch a selling job. Business far and wide uses inducements every day to get sales campaigns rolling. To increase defense plant capacity, Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson officially stresses the offer to business of inducements in the form of Government loans, tax assurances, and guaranties.

The Government has been offering conservation incentives in forms of technical aid, payments, or shares in the costs of fertilizers, lime, and seedling trees. If practical businessmen consider that a big scale offer to business of incentives is necessary to increase defense plant capacity, the moderate use may also be found wise for safeguarding soil-producing capacity. If not, then a great hunt will be needed at once for other effective means of greatly expanding the scope of soil conservation in the emergency.

America can, in that emergency, go on neglecting the soil foundation of her food supply. In that way seems to lie the greatest risk. Or America can do her best to safeguard her soil. In that way seems to lie the best chance of strengthening the preparedness program's bid for peace, and hence of serving the greatest safety for the Nation.

Liberation of Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of February 12, 1951, by Dr. V. S. Krajcovic, chairman of the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR LIBERATION OF SLOVAKIA,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1951.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As chairman of the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia, I like to express my deep appreciation for this opportunity to demonstrate the necessity for this solemn protest against the violation of religious freedom and the crimes against humanity perpetrated by the Red regime in Czechoslovakia, which on January 15, 1951, sentenced Bishop Michael Buzalka, of Bratislava, and Bishop Eugen Gojdic, of Presov, to life imprisonment, while the dean of Slovak hierarchy, Bishop Jan Vojtassak, of Spiska Kapitula, received 24 years of imprisonment.

These three Slovak bishops have been tried and imprisoned because they too—like Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinats—dared to oppose a totalitarian dictatorship for its ruthless suppression of religious freedom.

These three latest victims of religious persecution were tried at Bratislava, wartime capital of Slovakia, for high treason, military espionage, and other crimes. All three were arrested several months before the trial opened and were subjected to a conditioning treatment. Their arrest came after they criticized the Red regime's pseudo-Catholic seminary which opened last fall at Bratislava. Earlier these gallant prelates had scored Communist authorities for liquidation of Catholic convents and monasteries which the defendants were said to have opposed. The bishops were blamed for everything done by the Nazis and politicians during World War II. They were charged with having consecrated illegal bishops in their own dioceses on orders from the Vatican.

The Prague Red radio announced that all three defendants had confessed their crimes. But to the listeners to the excerpts of the trial broadcast there was every indication that the bishops were speaking completely out of character as they mechanically recited their confessions at the prompting of the Czech prosecutor, Karol Bedrna. One other proof of the conditioning of the three Slovak prelates is the fact that these confessions were replete with Communist ideology which was totally at variance with the usual manner of speaking of the bishops.

Bishop Buzalka, of Bratislava admitted at this travesty of justice and mock trial, that he maintained a negative attitude toward the people's uprising in 1944; that he was spreading antipeople propaganda at confirmation ceremonies, missions, and retreats; that he sent calumniating reports on church conditions under the Red regime. He expressed his scorn of false Vatican radio reports, admitted alleged illegal contacts and espionage reports. At one point in the mock trial, the Red stage managers had overplayed their hands. Prompted by two identical questions, Bishop Buzalka twice picked up and painfully recited the same paragraph. When the Red prosecutors realized that their tactic had misfired, they tried to drown out Bishop Buzalka's speech with a volley of new questions.

The 73-year-old dean of Slovak hierarchy, Bishop Vojtassak of Spiska Kapitula, hardly stood on his feet, but proudly uttered into the face of his Communist persecutors the belief that Slovakia will be free and that again the religious freedom and the high principles of humanity will prevail. He was charged of having received from American Slovak Catholics $10,000, but arranging to have the funds remitted to exiled Slovak leaders; for having announced excommunication decree against Communists; for withholding dispensation for Sunday work ordered by the Communists; and for mimeographing of illegal pastorals and distributing subversive leaflets.

Bishop Eugen Gojdic, of Presov, the only living Greek Catholic bishop behind the iron curtain, was charged with writing inciting pastoral letters and illegal leaflets; with sending espionage reports to the Vatican, and with helping the underground forces in Slovakia.

Thus, on January 15, 1951, Bishop Buzalka and Bishop Gojdic received the life sentence, while Bishop Vojtassak received 24 years of imprisonment from the hands of Communist perpetrators of crimes against humanity and crimes against religious freedom.

The shameless comedy of this mock trial buried the three great Slovak bishops in prison and thus the three most powerful bastions of the Slovak national resistance against communism have been annihilated.

Since then a month passed, and although the imprisonment of these three Slovak religious leaders was a case of flagrant violation of basic human rights and a case of violation of religious freedom, the democratic world was left apathetic to what goes on in Slovakia and behind the iron curtain.

Urged by such representants of American Slovaks like Rev. Emery Gottschall and Mr. John T. Kmetz, the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia laid its protest with the President of the United States, with the Secretary of State, and with the General Secretary of the United Nations, with the request to investigate these crimes and to protest officially by the Czechoslovak Government.

The three Slovak bishops became martyrs only because they committed the crime to worship their Master in their own way, and the crime to preach in their own way the essence of the four freedoms to their Slovak people. But the still free world did not protest, and the United Nations Commission for Human Rights did not even raise its voice for the defense of these democratic and religious leaders of a resisting Slovakia, which even now struggles for its survival.

In this world of apathy and darkness there was, however, one light which came from oppressed Slovakia itself. In the same time when the brave bishops received their sentence the Slovak anti-Communist resistance opened fire against the tyrants in order to convince the world that the hope for freedom is still alive in Slovakia, and that the Slovaks deserve the recognition of their national aspirations for freedom.

In conclusion, I urge you, dear Senator, in the name of all Slovaks who resist communism, to ask the President and the Congress of the United States of America to make an official protest to the Czechoslovak Government against the unjust imprisonment of the Slovak bishops and the persecution of religion and other crimes against humanity which are daily perpetrated in Slovakia, and to bring the case of Slovakia to the attention of the United Nations.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. V. S. KRAJCOVIC.

Edison's Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address entitled "Edison's Vision," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the Rotary Club of Paterson, N. J., on February 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDISON'S VISION

(By George E. Stringfellow)

Nothing is more impressive to our eyes and to our imagination than the rising sun, increasing the light from the faintest beginnings to the full splendor of a brilliant morning.

This planet was a dreadful place before the sun had done its work. Monsters infested the earth. The air was saturated with poison gases. No creature now living could possibly have breathed before the sun purified the air.

The sun has been working for a long time to improve things. We now have a planet upon which we can live and upon which we have made at least a start toward looking at the best side of nature.

King Solomon was said to be wise. But, when the thunder roared and the lightning flashed, his conscience troubled him. The king would turn away from his many wives and his own doubtful associates. Solomon would run to the bed and put his head under an embroidered pillow where he would lay shivering. Even Sheba could do nothing for him. The thought that lightning could be tamed and put to work never entered Solomon's mind.

I speak today of the man who made lightning our servant. I refer, of course, to Thomas Alva Edison, who was born in Milan, Ohio, 104 years ago next Sunday. You know much about his successes. Let me tell you something about his failures, for it is mainly from their failures and what they did in the face of their misfortunes that we learn most about the great men of history that will help us.

Edison lived to be 84. His formal education was limited to 3 months in the public schools. His teacher sent him home as a moron to be cared for by the State.

Edison insisted that he could not have succeeded without the lessons of his misfortunes and failures. In fact, he emphasized that even the misfortune of deafness, from which he never recovered, was a great asset.

When Edison was 12 years old he was working as a newsboy on a train between Port Huron and Detroit. One of the way stations on this run was Smiths Creek. It was there the happening occurred which made Edison deaf. Now we shall see what were the facts.

There are many vivid and contrary versions of the origin of Edison's affliction, but what actually happened may be told in his own words: "My train was standing by the platform at Smiths Creek station," said Edison, "and I was trying to climb into the freight car with both arms full of newspapers when the conductor lifted me by my ears. I felt something snap inside my head. My deafness started from that time and has continuously progressed," concluded the genius.

Here is a boy, 12 years old, seized by a man and lifted by his ears, to be made deaf to the end of his days. A word of complaint? Never throughout his long life. Bitterness toward the man—for this was the act of a man, not an act of nature—a feeling of self-pity, frustration, rancor, "Why did this have to happen to me?" Well, hardly. Look at the consequences.

Edison spoke of his deafness much as Helen Keller speaks of her blindness. "My deafness has not been a handicap but a help to me," said Edison. "From the very start, after the earache pain ceased, deafness probably drove me to reading."

He was, in his energy, courage, compassion, and sincerity, even thankful for the necessity of adapting his experiments to his affliction. He attributed at least two important developments to that necessity—the telephone as civilization knows it today and the phonograph.

"In experimenting on the telephone," Edison explained, "I had to improve the transmitter so I could hear it. This made the telephone commercially practical, as Bell's magneto telephone receiver was too weak to be used as a transmitter commercially.

"It was the same with the phonograph. The great defect of that instrument was the rendering of the overtones in the music and the hissing consonants in speech. I worked over a year, 20 hours a day, Sundays and all, to get the word 'specie' perfectly recorded. When this was done I knew that everything else could be recorded."

This greatest inventor of all time was never discouraged by his small knowledge of anything. It wasn't so much what he knew that helped him but what he tried to know. He was a true genius. When he was pressed for a definition of a genius he coined the famous adage: "Genius is 1-percent inspiration and 99-percent perspiration."

Edison knew that freedom and progress for an individual or a nation—or even a genius—does not mean "I do not have to work." He knew the future belongs to those who prepare for it. And he knew that the commonest form of opportunity is harder work and better work.

Edison knew that the heavy ball of progress needs a great deal of pushing. Said Edison, "I recall that after we had conducted thousands of experiments on a certain project without solving the problem, one of my associates expressed discouragement and disgust over having failed 'to find out anything.' But we had learned something. We had learned for a certainty that we couldn't do it that way, and that we would have to try some other way."

With a full measure of friendliness and good will Edison expressed gratitude to those who saw him through. He credited the American free-opportunity system as an essential factor in what he was able to do for all mankind.

In America's low-cost products, created by enterprises without which these products would not exist except for the rich and powerful, Edison saw an asset, like the assets flowing from the sun. "We live in a cooperative commonwealth," he said.

He often pointed to October 28, 1878. This was the date on which thirteen enterprising men who had resources and believed in Edison delivered to the New York County clerk's office the papers for incorporation of an undertaking to support and develop his work. Edison was one of the incorporators. They called it the Edison Electric Light Co. To the public it sounded as strange as if you or I were today to form the Atomic Household Products Co. This group risked $300,000 in an enterprise that had as its only asset the 31-year-old brain of Edison.

But this brain, alive and humming with effort and imagination, was searching for a filament that would glow brilliantly in a glass bulb when electricity passed through the filament. This was a problem of discovery which was buried in the mysteries of electric incandescence. In 361 days, with the support of his business associates, Edison produced a light which later illuminated the world.

Actually, the lamp itself was only a fraction of what Edison needed to accomplish if the light was to be useful on streets, in homes, in workplaces, and if the thousands of future tasks of electricity were to be born—in short, if men and women were to have an electrical age, electricity must be produced and distributed so effectively, so inexpensively, and so safely that people could afford to use it.

While the glowing lamp was the symbol of Edison's success, he had to develop, and his associates had to finance, an entire generating and distributing system including the invention and construction of giant dynamos, conduits, power lines, wires, insulators, sockets, meters, fuses—everything.

Of Edison's 1,097 patents, 300 dealt with the generation and distribution of power. The glow in that little lamp took up the task of light where the sun left off.

While Edison overcame the scientific difficulties in the delivery of power and the defeat of darkness, he pointed out that it was cooperation, vitality and risk-taking willingness of American business enterprise that sustained him and brought his results within reach of all. It was this enterprise, and the American opportunity for free enterprise, that left him free to develop his wonderful talents of invention and development. It ran the risk and supplied the vast capital needed to translate his inventions into tools for human advancement. In short, American enterprise made the inventions widely useful to average people, and at a low cost to all. And this is the essence of human progress. This is the system which our intellectual morons would take apart, tamper with and destroy in the name of liberalism. Oh, liberalism, what sins are committed in thy name against humanity.

But Edison's risks were not over. I spoke of failure a few minutes ago. This is what I meant.

About 1890, 11 years after the first success of his electric light, Edison set out to devise a system of mining and milling low-grade iron ore that would be economically sound. He was convinced that the country's known deposits of iron ore were disappearing. In short, he was now going beyond and even deeper than the wires in the bulb, the power stations, dynamos. He was going to the problem of the supply of iron ore itself.

His supporters stayed with him. Through his tremendous effort and what was for them an enormous expenditure of $3,000,000 Edison invented and put into operation a revolutionary method of reclaiming iron ore through ore refinement. It was called the magnetic ore separator.

But the undertaking did not work out. After 6 years, unforeseen developments left Edison and his backers with a terrible failure on their hands. New and immensely rich iron-ore deposits were discovered by other men of imagination, working in other progressive undertakings. Edison's refining methods just could not compete.

Looking back on this period, Edison said, "For a good many years I worried about my payroll; didn't know how I was always going to meet it. My trouble had been that I always had too much ambition and tried to do things that were financially too big for me. If I had not had so much ambition and had not tried to do so many things, I probably would have been much happier, but less useful."

Here is a good example of what is meant by the profit and loss system in our country, a term which should always be used in referring to the way enterprises live instead of merely saving the profit system. For losses, you know, occur even more frequently than profits in business life.

While the immediate outlook for civilization is not encouraging, yet this old world and our relatively new country have withstood many storms of adversity. In substantiation of that statement, may I quote briefly from an editorial from Harper's Weekly:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. • • • Not in the lifetime of men who will read this editorial has there been such a grave

and deep apprehension. Never has the future seemed so incalculable as the present. * * * The political pot seethes and hubbubs with uncertainty. Russia hangs like a dark and silent cloud over the horizon of Europe. * * * All resources and energies of the British Empire are sorely tried."

That editorial was written 95 years ago. Therefore, do not become too despondent about the immediate future.

Edison's last message to the American people was, "Be courageous. * * * History repeats itself again and again. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

Edison lived a good life and when the game was over he turned and met the Great Referee smiling, unafraid, for he won without boasting and he lost without whimpering. He was a man of great courage. He was imbued with the spirit of our founding fathers. He was the essence of intellectual integrity.

Human progress is endless and continuous as the rising of the sun. Much has happened to this planet since the monsters disappeared. But more good things have happened to us than to men and women any place in the world. Look around your town, your home, your living room, your work place, your parks and streets, your stores. The greatest opportunities lie ahead.

The great days of America are by no means done. We have only touched the border of our achievement. If you and I did not believe this, we would not believe in America. Because that faith in America is America.

Unlimited possibilities are ahead through the new Edison being born today; the men and women of imagination and character who are each in their own way helping today and will help even more tomorrow to make America an even greater wonderland of the world.

The Mighty Men of Rushmore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a poem dedicated to the Mount Rushmore Memorial.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Legion magazine of February 1951]

SPEAK! FATHERS OF OUR LAND

(By Daniel D. Coons)

Speak! great men on granite throne,
Your deeds shall ever stand
On history's scroll as America's soul,
Speak! fathers of our land.
You began our house with lasting stone,
Have we been building well
This house supreme—your zealous dream,
What does your vigil tell?

What see you now, brave Washington,
As on you gaze through storm and sun
At your democracy?
Think you that we have nourished well
Your hard-won freedom? Can you foretell
If time may see
Some act dispel
Our liberty?

Wise Jefferson, proclaimed your pen
Our independence; say you amen
In silent retrospection?
Grant you full sanction for our deeds,
Laws, diplomacy, political creeds?
Wise Jefferson,
What further needs
Must still be won?

Great martyr Lincoln, your guiding hand
Our Union saved in war-torn land.
Will world-wide unity
Yet gain United Nations goal,
To make mankind's afearing soul
Forever free
From tyrants' toll
And slavery?

Bold Theodore Roosevelt, your dauntless force
Gave to world trade the Isthmus course
Toward the setting sun.
What lies ahead for free estate?
Will despots' greed yet devastate
What trade has done?
Can UN re-create
What barter won?

Watch on, great men; through endless years
Watch on from boundless sky,
Your granite throne is freedom's dome
Your deeds shall never die.
God grant your land of joy and tears
Shall never cease to be,
The star of hope to all who grope
For priceless liberty.

Manpower for the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last Thursday I inserted in the RECORD several editorials from leading American newspapers concerning the manpower question. I ask consent now to have printed in the Appendix editorials on the same subject from the New York News, the New York Post, the New York Times, the New York World Telegram-Sun, and Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York News of January 14, 1951]

WHAT KIND OF DRAFT?

One of the most urgent chores of the Eighty-second Congress is that of deciding which of many plans for easing America's young men into military service would be best for our national security—and fairest for all the youths involved.

Unfortunately, there's no longer any doubt that some sort of compulsory service is necessary. Officially, these are peace times, with some loud police action overtones. But we'd hate to try to convince any GI now in Korea that he isn't tangled in a genuine 18-carat war. And if you don't believe that Joe Stalin would pump us on a minute's notice, any time he thinks he has a jackal's chance of getting away with it, take a look at the latest maps of Europe and Asia.

The bitter fact: If we want to survive as the United States of America we've got to gather up and train enough young manpower to warn off any and all Red Napoleons or to rock them back on their heels when and if they do take an all-out swing at us.

So how has America handled this problem before?

As historians know, we war-loathing and free-wheeling Americans have never taken overkindly to any draft system. In our Revolutionary War plenty of patriots volunteered, but other rugged souls resisted all pressure to make them join up with the Continental Armies except at their convenience. Some took to hissing American officers or even got completely sore and signed up with the Redcoats.

In our Civil War all hell broke loose in many parts of the country. In New York City's own draft riots, July 13–16, 1863, some 1,000 men were killed. Most common protest against the Civil War draft was that any citizen with a few hundred spare dollars, and able to find a substitute, could hire said proxy to do his share of the fighting.

DRAFT DODGERS AND IV-F'S

In World Wars I and II draft reactions were still not entirely satisfactory. The smile-when-you-say-that word of 1917–18 was "draft dodger." In the last war the commonly used term of scorn was "IV-F"—though the too often forgotten fact was that most IV-F's weren't draft dodgers at all, but completely patriotic guys who had flunked a physical or mental examination. Nobody became a IV-F by applying for the title.

As we see it, the universal military service and training plan presented to Congress the other day by Defense Secretary George Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna M. Rosenberg should do away with many previous conscription headaches.

In essence, their proposal is to assign some sort of defense spot to every possible American male as he reaches the age of 18. At present 1,050,000 attain that age annually.

Of these, about 700,000 should be found physically and mentally fit for full combat service. Another 100,000 could be used in non-combat-service jobs.

Still another 20,000 could probably be brought up to snuff by means of a physical rehabilitation program. Of the remaining 230,000, about 150,000 could not qualify for military induction, but might be found capable of doing some useful work in connection with the defense effort.

Only 70,000 or 80,000, according to Defense Department estimates, would be incapable of any type of assignment because of "extreme physical, mental, or moral handicaps."

TRAINING AND JOBS

One big benefit of such fine-combing of our youth power, of course, will be to ease the discontent and irritation which accompanied our last war's 34-percent rejection rate. Under the new plan, all but completely disqualified youngsters will be doing their share, with or without a rifle.

As for pay and length of service, the recruits would get $30 a month for 4 months. Thereafter, for the duration of their draft hitch of 27 months, they would get a private's pay of $75 for 4 months, then $85 as privates first class.

To avoid cutting off the Nation's upcoming supply of young doctors, scientists, and highly trained specialists, the first 3 years of UMST make provision for the deferment of 75,000 promising students. But even these would get their 4 months' basic training first and then would "owe" the military 23 months' service.

Further details of UMST will have to be debated and decided in Congress, when and if. Right now, though, Uncle Sam needs as many of those 1,050,000 young men annually as he can get, and we have yet to see a draft plan that looks fairer or more effective than this one.

[From the New York Post of January 12, 1951]

THE 18'S

These days many issues become intensely personal and we intrude almost timidly into what must seem like intimate family discussions. Who can pass righteous judgment on the Defense Department's proposal to draft 18-year-olds—except the kids and their parents? What soothing words are there to comfort a mother whose son faces induction? We don't own the words and we shall not try to borrow them. We know only that in Russia's slave empire conscription of all human beings is routine; no editorialist dares question it, and a mother airs her sorrow only at grave personal risk.

That is the short-run strength of the commissars. In their domain no single life is deemed worthy of lamentation; the anguish of parents is a publicly proscribed symptom of bourgeois weakness. In our way of life the projected draft of 18-year-olds is a kind of national tragedy, signifying the failure of so many hopes. Its advocates are as mournful as its opponents. We have no inside dope to refute General Marshall's plea for induction of the 18 group and we are sure it gave him no pleasure to propose it. If large-scale induction of the 18's will help to persuade the Kremlin that aggression won't pay off, the action may some day justify rejoicing. But there is no visible impulse now to let the brass bands play and to pretend that the 18's are lucky fellows. For that sanity, at least, let us all be thankful.

[From the New York Times of January 12, 1951]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE TRAINING

The question of universal military service and training has now been put before the country in a form that demands a speedy response from the Congress and the American people. Without prejudicing the necessary arguments and discussions on the details, it is our opinion that the time has come when a failure to enact a universal military service law would endanger the security and even the democratic survival of our country.

We are being forced in a number of fields to make some of the most crucial and comprehensive decisions in the history of the United States. This is one of them, and we must all face it with clear vision. It is not a simple emergency measure that we can handle with a feeling of "Let's get the agony over with." This is a proposal to change our national structure in a more or less permanent way. General Marshall mentioned 10 years; in reality the political situation in the world, with the vast forces of totalitarianism and democracy lined up in strength, does not allow the hope that we could abandon a powerful defensive structure in our generation. We must strike a high level of defense and keep it—what General Marshall called a durable layer of military protection that would survive the alternate moods of public alarm or complacency.

The democracies have always been reluctant to adopt UMST, although the equality of obligation that it assumes is of the essence of democracy. The French were the first to realize that fact, appropriately enough during their great revolutionary period, in 1798. Universal military service has always met opposition from the pacifistic point of view, and, in the case of a few, from religious scruples. Great Britain, for instance, struggled against it for years. Clement Attlee, as head of the Parliamentary Labor Party, led the opposition to it in the House of Commons on April 27, 1939. Yet, as Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, head of His Majesty's Government since 1945, continued wartime conscription. Reduced to 12 months under left-wing pressure, the term was raised first to 18 months and then, last October, to 2 years. France, too, in this postwar period cut its UMST term to 1 year, but last October raised it to 18 months. The 27-month maximum that is proposed for our service would be a little longer than that of any of the other democracies. But why not? We are urging other countries to step up military defense, and we should set an example.

No one will claim that a perfect, immutable plan is now being offered. The present program results from the best judgment of the administration, the Secretary of Defense, and the civilian and military heads of all our Armed Forces. It has features that are certainly admirable. Eighteen years is the right age to call up youth. The proposals would use up all but a small and permanently unqualified group, and there are careful plans to sustain our educational structure and keep up an uninterrupted flow of scientists, technicians, and professional men.

The economics of the program seems to be well worked out. General Marshall vouches for the fact that the new plan is best adapted "to give us protection at a cost in men and money that is within the capacity of our economy to bear." Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, indeed, claims that UMST will actually save the country money, since the alternative would be to call up married men and pay dependency allowances.

Possibly there are some risks in the program, but we live in a period when risks are unavoidable. The greatest risk of all lies in weaknesses and inaction. Despite divisions of opinion on what to do with our Armed Forces, the country is united in its determination to rearm and build up our defense. Former President Hoover and President Truman, Senator Taft and Secretary Acheson, Republican and Democrat, are all agreed on the basic necessity for armed defensive strength. UMST, in General Marshall's words, "is at once the most effective, the most economical, and the most democratic way to safeguard our Nation." We should put it into effect as soon as possible.

[From the New York World Telegram-Sun of January 12, 1951]

THE SOONER, THE BETTER

Defense Secretary Marshall and his manpower assistant, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, made two impressive points when they presented the broad outline of a universal military service and training program before a congressional committee this week.

They made clear that universal military service and training is at once the least costly and the most effective means of attaining immediate partial mobilization and at the same time assuring a vitally necessary pool of trained men for the next decade.

Economically, there is this consideration: If we don't draft the 18-year-olds we shall have to tap the young married men, with and without dependents, who are now exempt. There are now 630,000 of these in the 19–26 age group potentially available for induction. If they were called up it would cost the Government $679,000,000 a year including their pay and dependency allowances.

If, instead, an equivalent number of 18-year-old were taken—as proposed under universal military service and training—since they are almost uniformly without dependents, the cost for a year at the proposed pay rate would be $466,000,000. Thus the annual payroll savings alone would be $513,000,000—not counting the loss to industries and farms and to the purchasing power of families that would be involved in calling up married men.

But something much more important than money is involved.

From his experience in World War II, General Marshall said that men of 18, 19, and 20 unquestionably made the best soldiers. They have stamina and recuperative power far beyond that of the older groups.

By starting the training of our young men at 18—instead of 19 as at present—we not only immediately solve the problem of reaching the 3,200,000-man Army goal by next July. We also start an ever-expanding flow of well-trained men into the Reserve components.

It is this important Reserve pool, now lacking, from which an army in being could be doubled or tripled almost overnight. It is the cushion, or durable layer of military protection that would survive the alternate moods of grave public alarm and complacency over the next decade. It could mean the difference between national survival or total defeat.

At the same time these youths whose combat training started at 18 will have greatly enhanced their own chances of survival if they are required to go into battle.

The urgency of the situation is beyond question. This newspaper believes, along with General Marshall and other advocates of universal military service and training, that the sooner it is put into effect the greater will be our national security and the stronger our voice for lasting world peace.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of January 17, 1951]

TIME TO GET TO WORK ON REAL NATIONAL SERVICE LAW

Defense Department decision to ask Congressional authority to extend enlistments due to expire in the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 for one year sharply points up the persistent delays in the military manpower program.

The fairness of such extensions is decidedly in question. But the necessity for them may be unavoidable. This proposal, and others such as the plan to accept 21-month volunteers for the Army demonstrate the ineffectiveness of the present draft system.

It is plain that the goal of 3,462,205 in the defense forces by June 30 cannot be reached under the present setup, and perhaps not even if the new Universal—National—Military Training Act gets through Congress.

The Defense Department draft of that law has not yet been sent to Congress. But prospects are not too good that if the draft is submitted within a day or two as now promised it will be dealt with expeditiously. Futher, there are indications that its effectiveness may be impaired by restrictions on the use of 18-year-olds and other changes.

One thing is sure: More speed on the part of the Defense Department and Congress is needed. In addition Congress itself should make certain that the law shall not have embedded in it crippling amendments, such as the present Selective Service Act contains.

The importance of this problem is given new emphasis by clear indications that fresh troops will have to be forwarded soon to relieve the harried and battle-weary men who have been taking a pounding in Korea for months, and to replace heavy losses.

It is already late to act. No more valuable time should be lost in enacting a national training measure that will work.

Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Edison's Shining Example," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the other entitled "Thomas A. Edison, Man of Vision," published in the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News of February 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 9, 1951]

EDISON'S SHINING EXAMPLE

George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., speaking in Paterson, N. J., has taken notice of the fact that in these times there is more moral significance in Edison's failures, hard work, and handicaps than in his successes.

Since Edison was born 104 years ago in Milan, Ohio, widespread changes have come about in American life. Some of them—electric lights, radio, television—were brought about directly or indirectly by Edison himself.

But if there is one thing clear about Edison it is that he didn't achieve his successes by observing a 40-hour week. He was able at the age of 31 to throw himself into the task of creating not only an incandescent bulb but an entire city generating and distribution system only because he had been conditioned from childhood to take 24-hour days as a matter of course for weeks on end.

The principal secret of Edison's method was to try all the wrong ways of doing a thing in order eventually to find the right one.

That called for patience and a unique ability to face repeated failures with courage and renewed optimism. Above all, it called for the will to work on against heavy odds. That is an attitude hard to find these days. Perhaps the majority of our research scientists do still have it. And there are others. It is upon them that America will have to depend for survival and the continuance of the basic ideals which have made it great.

[From the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News of February 9, 1951]

THOMAS A. EDISON, MAN OF VISION

Members of the Paterson Rotary Club were fortunate yesterday in having as their speaker a man who was intimately associated with Thomas A. Edison through the later years of the great inventor's life. Their speaker was George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and one of New Jersey's leading citizens, and his subject was "Edison's Vision."

Mr. Stringfellow spoke eloquently not so much of Thomas A. Edison's successes as of his failures for it is from man's failures and from his misfortunes that much of progress comes. In working to perfect the phonograph, for instance, Edison had difficulty eliminating hissing consonants. Mr. Stringfellow recounts that Edison worked 20 hours a day, every day, for more than a year to get the word "specie" perfectly recorded. There were countless failures in this experimentation. But each failure was a step toward success. Each failure ruled out a faulty step. Success came eventually.

Edison had real and permanent failures, too. He devised a magnetic ore separator to utilize low grade iron ores. It cost him and his backers $3,000,000. Then rich iron ore deposits were discovered. There was no need for the magnetic separator. A technical success, it was a financial failure. But there may still come a day when our Nation, faced with an iron shortage, might practically use the Edison principle.

Mr. Stringfellow says that losses are more frequent than profits in business life, but as we learn from the rise above the losses, as Edison did, we triumph. And he adds eloquently, "Unlimited possibilities are ahead through the new Edisons being born today; the men and women of imagination and character who are each in their own way helping today and will help even more tomorrow to make America an even greater wonderland of the world."

Regional Shifts Will Offer Opportunities to Haverhill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excellent article entitled "Regional Shifts Will Offer Opportunities to Haverhill," written by Eugene L. Belisle, and published in the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of February 7, 1951. The article deals with the opportunities for the development of the natural resources in New England and in the Northeast, and places particular emphasis on the need for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway without delay.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO HAVERHILL—REGIONAL SHIFTS WILL OFFER OPPORTUNITIES TO HAVERHILL

(By Eugene L. Belisle)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Gazette presents herewith another installment of Eugene L. Belisle's report to the Haverhill Industrial Commission on his studies preliminary to recommending a program to help the community meet its needs and opportunities for growth.)

Physics, chemistry, and electricity applied to natural resources have given entirely new meanings to old or previously unusable materials and substances.

The twentieth century has witnessed the rise of a whole group of industries requiring vast amounts of electricity for processing (such as abrasives, aluminum, sponge iron, heavy welding, heavy plating, etc.) with electric supply and costs a paramount factor. Industries requiring the largest and cheapest electricity supplies have in this century sought locations as near to major water power localities as posible, insofar as reachable by low-cost (preferably water) transportation. Hence aluminum production in the Columbia Basin, the St. Lawrence Rapids, and the Saguenay River with bauxite moving all the way from South America to the latter point—1,000 miles past the New England coastline.

Harnessing or failing to harness new sources of energy available to a region has been of great significance to its industrial development during the last quarter century. Nor is by-passing of the task of harnessing available natural sources of energy in river and possibly tidal waters on the ground that atomic energy will in time render this unnecessary any answer for a region to make. Each major development of natural resources sets up a new center for development of related satellite industries and these in turn for secondary manufactures. Atomic energy installations will further focalize new industrial development and population and market growth in its peripheral areas.

New England has long neglected its admittedly limited but still substantial undeveloped hydroelectric potentials within its borders (principally in Maine) and its still larger potential resources of this type in the St. Lawrence and northern tidal waters (which admittedly require pilot plant development at high unit costs before the full potentials can be harnessed with resulting low unit costs). There is now a clear tendency to continue this neglect on the ground that atomic energy development will render the hydro potentials unnecessary. On the basis of a century of experience first with coal, then with oil, natural gas, and hydroelectric energy, this is wish-thinking.

Industries utilizing large amounts of high heat are a second major type of twentieth century industry (glass, ceramics, heater-reduction products, etc.); natural gas, oil, and coal are sources (except where electricity is required or can be used). Regions more distant from these carbon deposits, such as New England, must pay transportation on them which adds to cost of manufacture as compared with the originating region. But any new transportation development (such as the natural-gas pipeline) opens up new opportunities to develop such industries in the previously isolated market location.

Application of physics, chemistry, and electricity to either both exhaustible (mineral deposits) and renewable (soil products) resources has developed a whole range of new substances, products, and industries. For example: Nylon from coal; plastics from many substances, including peanuts, soybeans, and cellulose (wood, cornstalks, etc.), and many other products; sugar, alcohol, yeast, and many other products from sulphite liquors previously dumped into rivers by pulp and paper plants (the Northwest pioneered in this; New England still fails to follow suit); magnesium from brine, oyster shells and electricity (Michigan, not sea-girt New England pioneered in this); dairy products stabilizer from sea moss (Japan, Maryland, and various other areas beat New England to this). Karl T. Compton, former president of MIT, pointed out vigorously in 1939 that New England lost the rayon industry because of its failure to be awake to the magnitude and significance of the revolution in physics and chemistry underlying development of synthetic products.

This revolution has given new meaning and possibility to every old substance and resource under the surface of the earth, or growing or capable of being grown from the soil of the earth in forest or farm, and in the waters of the sea, and even in the atmosphere (nitrogen fixation via electricity). Yet, today, after 30 years of relative or absolute economic loss, including clear loss of opportunities in rayon, aluminum, abrasive, and some other industries, New England is not yet systematically reexamining its entire natural resources in the light of this revolution. Meanwhile, systematic, energetic, well-financed researches of this type are going on in numerous other regions of the United States whose natural growth potentials are such as to demand less effort of this kind on their part.

Unless we look searchingly at basic facts about our natural geography and natural resources in the light of such past, current, and anticipated future developments, appraising frankly both the assets and the liabilities thereby revealed, we will continue to build on the obscuring of liabilities and the neglect of assets, as we have been doing for at least 30 years. A series of fundamental studies in these respects was begun in the twenties by a few outstanding and foresighted New England minds in industry, business, and various branches of research. These beginnings have been neglected and lost—sometimes purposely. Despite continued thought and study by a few individuals and small research agencies, the region lags behind other regions in its awareness, action, and applications.

Meanwhile the myth lives on of maintaining industrial advance solely on the basis of the presumed perpetual superiority of those assets most susceptible to migration—management, capital, and labor—simply because we once held the historical initiative in these respects (as a consequence of natural resource locational factors). This myth is New England's Achilles heel. Our leadership in research, in managerial and labor skills, in financing, and in the whole field of secondary manufactures (metals and machinery as well as nondurable products) is being, and will be even more seriously challenged by the rise of industries in the newer, younger regions. The only way to undergird these secondary durable and nondurable industries and to build a logical pattern of diversification is by the development of such new prime industries as the region is capable in the new light of its natural resources viewed through the eyes of modern physics and chemistry. We need indigenous industry of new types as a fundamental basis of our future development.

The developments going forward in eastern Canada, offer great new opportunities in these respects. But we will find it necessary to about-face on some of our most cherished blindness of the last quarter century if we are to see or use these natural opportunities.

The running out of the best ore grades and cheapest extractions of the Mesabi Range together with the discovery and prospective development (financing already well advanced) of vast iron ore deposits in Labrador point to the establishment of a new, major steel and heavy industry area in the North Atlantic Continent; it would lie in the St. Lawrence Basin below Montreal—unless joint United States and Canadian military and national security agencies decree otherwise. What will their thinking be? If war is to be the yardstick of the future, a strong case can be made for diverting these ores much farther inland. Nothing could more dramatically indicate the profound degree to which natural trends will be diverted by the assumption that war is the world's destiny.

Strict economic logic points to a vast industrial complex at a point along the navigable upper reaches of the St. Lawrence to embrace (1) ore by rail or river from Labrador and thence toward; (2) coal by rail, lake, and river from the Middle West or from Nova Scotia; (3) near the vast hydro developments and potentials of the St. Lawrence and its tributaries; (4) to which water-borne bauxite is already flowing for processing into aluminum; (5) with the Great Lakes and Ontario Basin tributary lands of farm and more distant forests. Canadian thinking with respect to its peacetime future has been understandably taken with this logical development for many years. And the development has been taking form; but with the major phase yet to come.

But the above is not all. Such a development would throw open the previously locked-up mineral resources of the upper eastern Adirondacks and Champlain Valley (including large reserves of titanium ore) and those of northern Vermont (including turpentine rock) and New England in general, which flanks the St. Lawrence. Involved in this development is the St. Lawrence deep waterway and power project. The seaway will eventually be built anyway by Canada perhaps on an all-Canadian route, if the United States does not ratify the agreement of 1932 with Canada to build it as a joint project. The power developments will be built respectively by Canada and New York State if not as a joint international project, as long planned.

For more than 20 years New England has been the chief center of national political opposition to the combined joint international projects for seaway and power development, originally prepared by Herbert Hoover. Yet the most competent and farsighted business and industrial leaders and engineers in New England favored this project after long and careful study during the 1920's. And all that has been accomplished by the opposition that has developed since that time—through arguments revealing a woeful lack of knowledge of natural geography and transportation and power economics—is to delay the project.

This delay has cost New England millions in inability to develop industries requiring large volumes of low-cost power, or based upon the new low-cost deep-water route between the New England coastline and the Great Lakes. When it is built—and it will be built within the next 2 decades—New England will get (1) some of the low-cost power, but less than if we had not opposed and thereby made it almost inevitable for New York to obtain more than its natural share of the power available to the United States; (2) some new industrial and trade opportunities, but less than if we had not delayed it and thereby given Canada the initiative to seize many of these opportunities for the St. Lawrence Valley.

Our opposition to this development has been "of a piece" with our general unintelligence regarding natural geography, natural resources, and transportation economics during much of this century—and which has been reflected in the withering and death of water-borne traffic in New England, in unnecessarily drastic collapse and losses in textiles and shoes, 1922–32, and in many other losses, either of industries or of industrial opportunities. Yet beginning with the first settlement until the end of the nineteenth century, a healthy respect for and relatively advanced knowledge of these very factors were omnipresent in New England's history.

One of the proofs of whether we have yet learned or are ready to learn anything will be when the St. Lawrence question next arises. Meanwhile, we might study and ponder the full significance to New England of the great potential development in the St. Lawrence Valley, of which Saguenay and St. Lawrence power; Labrador iron ore; sponge-process iron; seaborne bauxite; Niagara abrasives; the eastward plant movements of Republic Steel; Hanna Steel, National Lead; Nova Scotia coal; Adirondack titanium; Vermont minerals; surplus Maine potatoes; northern New England forests; Ontario farmlands; the St. Lawrence seaway; Passamaquoddy and Fundy tidal power; the natural gas pipeline; and ocean minerals and organic substances, are all among the present or potential components. Even the resources of Greenland are a part of this picture.

Does this square with the often-presented picture that New England has no important natural resources? That we must content ourselves with being ever more the marginal and dwindling manufacturers of low-wage, low-value-added-by-manufacture products of shoes, textiles, pulp and paper, apparel, novelties? Or, conversely, that our superior skill alone will save us by giving us the lion's share of new high-skill manufactures?

Yet the whole prospect of possibilities for more substantial undergirding of the livelihood and life of 9,000,000 people in this old and increasingly rundown region is bound up with the question: Does the future lie in war or peace? And if in war, what happens to this opportunity of our northern flank and with what consequences to our opportunities for averting this region's decline?

As we come to now to a closer view of the prospects of the specific region with whose destiny Haverhill's is mostly closely bound up, it will be clear that New England's chances of coping with its internal complex of developing conditions adverse to economic and industrial development and population maintenance will be materially and perhaps fatally reduced unless this great prime industry expansion to the northward can be assumed. For it alone among the regional shifts within the North American Continent offers natural opportunities clearly outweighing natural potential losses at least for two or three decades.

The development of eastern Canada would not bring many automatic benefits to New England; indeed, it would be a potential point to which New England industries and population might migrate, as some have already done. But this is not a natural trend except in a few cases.

The predicted developments in all other regions will work somewhat more to the disadvantage of New England during the next 20 years than to its advantage, even if New England puts itself into the best of shape.

But to put itself into the best of shape is precisely the problem. For the shape it is in has already been indicated in the discussion of "What Has Happened to the Land"—which can now no longer be escaped as a problem requiring vast capital investment in dollars and in labor before there will be either yield or safety. It has been indicated in the discussion of "What Has Happened to the People"—which will require a vast investment of capital, in both dollars and work, in order to preserve this ultimate resource. Finally, it will require a vast investment in both dollars and labor to reconstruct the environments for living—the cities, the road towns, the industrial and rural slums, the urban factory, commercial and civic centers and districts, the transportation and traffic arteries, the protective belts of restored open lands, enclosing neighborhoods, communities, secondary metropolitan areas, and primary metropolitan areas in order that each may begin to take form as a reflection of a design of developing social and physical order, arresting the present drift toward physical and social topsy-turviness and unmanageability.

These three interrelated investments and tasks represent a challenge of such magnitude that we cannot find a successful precedent in experience. They can be planned and undertaken only through a great searching through earlier and current related experience, and devising new designs and methods. Failure to perceive the overall dimensions of the task and to provide for living growth through the enlargement, not merely revision, of our perception of designs necessary for livelihood and living in our new technological era is resulting in the disorderly disintegration of our cities. The need is for an intelligently conceived decentralization, which is the only other alternative, and the only constructive one.

In order to do this we must simultaneously check the process of disintegration, and plan and develop the needed decentralization. We already have to grapple with the fact of declining old cities and new, haphazardly mushrooming intercity areas; this combination creates massive, mounting public costs and countless addition direct costs to industries and people: In the old city centers, we see direct economic wastes—such as those experienced in transportation, materials handling, distribution, time wastes, vehicle fuel wastes, trade volumes at lower levels than the market potentials, excessive public and private land-taking costs for widening, excessive operating costs in many aspects of public service and maintenance directly resulting from physical and land-use patterns, in the new road towns and intercity areas, the jumble is even worse with even heavier capital outlays and service costs in relation to revenues, than the old weakened city centers.

Mississippian Finds Herbert Hoover a Man of Frustrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article headed "Mississippian Finds Herbert Hoover a Man of Frustrations." The article is written by Mr. David L. Cohn, who is one of the most powerful writers of our times. The article was published in the Delta Democrat-Times, of Greenville, Miss., whose editor is Mr. Hodding Carter, on January 28, 1951. I think the article is well worth the attention of the Senate.

I have an estimate of cost of printing of the article, which will occupy 2¼ pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of $184.50. Nevertheless, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSISSIPPIAN FINDS HERBERT HOOVER A MAN OF FRUSTRATIONS—HIS ISOLATIONISM IS BETRAYAL ON BIG SCALE

(By David L. Cohn)

When a Mississippian wants to describe a confused, frustrated man, he says of him that he is "acting like a blind dog in a meathouse." A current example is Mr. Herbert Hoover, whom the press describes as "our only living ex-President." This seems to me redundant as well as wasteful of high cost newsprint because the dead, filled with a mellow wisdom, preserve a becoming silence, while the people may be relied upon not to confuse Hoover, Herbert Clark, with Hoover, J. Edgar.

Mr. Hoover, the Iowa wrong-way Moses, who 25 years ago led the Republican Party into the poison-ivy patch from which it has never emerged, last month made a major speech on our foreign relations. It is also—especially as the pronouncement of a man whose massive dullness seems indicative of stolid virtue—devious, callous, pitiless, immoral; its only light the cold glint of glacier ice.

I find it a department store of the mind where one may shop under one roof for nearly anything. Your money returned—but not your life—if the goods should prove unsatisfactory. Military merchandise, sir? Step this way. Gift-wrapped, the defense of the United States looks good. But I'm afraid of it.

As most of us, I buy brand names on the assumption that the name on a product of a long-established manufacturer is a guaranty of its worth. Therefore I don't want the Hoover product because he has no competency in this field. His one venture into the military occurred during the depression when he chased a ragged mob of squatter unemployed from Washington's outskirts. This scarcely qualifies him even to lead men to defeat.

As a conservative and a conservator, I admire him extravagantly. Against great pressure he managed to hand over the depression intact to his successor who, ungrateful and wastrel, undid all the good work he had done by breaking up the depression and so acquired the affections of an unpredictable people, many of them filled with an unreasonable desire to eat. But militarily, I'd as soon trust Gen. Lew Wallace as General Hoover. He marched a regiment up and down for 24 hours almost within sight of the battle of Shiloh without finding it. (He was later rewarded with an ambassadorship to Turkey, and returned the compliment by writing Ben Hur.)

CAR IN EVERY POT

Over here is a package of Mr. Hoover's economics. But again, I'm afraid of it. Gazing backward into the mirage of that distant day when he sat ponderously upon the Constitution to prevent its violation by rude men, I can see the car in every pot, the chickens in every garage, and sad-faced men selling apples at every street corner. Mr. Hoover, by his actions and inactions when he filled the White House with the lightnings of inertia, has become our one classical economist. Classical in the sense that the country has long known what to avoid by not doing what he then did, and doing what he did not do.

Item: During the depression when wheat sold at 30 cents a bushel, this great economist doubling as President of the United States told farmers at Des Moines that their salvation lay in a higher tariff. Since wheat then sold for 30 cents, while the tariff on it was 40 cents a bushel, foreign wheat could have come in only if shippers lost a dime on every bushel and paid the freight besides.

Economics is not, I grant you, an exact science. Mr. Hoover, however, made it almost a science of inexactitude. Hence, without too much difficulty, I can restrain my enthusiasm for his offerings in this field.

NO GRAZING RIGHTS

In his lighter moments he sometimes appears as a tea-room mystic gazing into the dark future. Once he predicted that unless the country were run by sound men, grass would grow in Detroit's streets. The unsound men prevailed, but Detroit has sold no downtown grazing rights. He now reminds us, with equally flashing insight, that we may go broke. May I respectfully remind him that we face the imminent prospect of going blind?

If we should go broke and preserve our freedom, is this a high price as against the possible alternative of national death, degradation, slavery? The material wealth of the country lies in its farms, mines, ranches, factories, forests; in the skills, energies, inventiveness, and will of our people. These would remain if all our savings were lost. I have not observed that the amorous propensities of boar hogs are affected by Treasury statements.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

Spiritually this was a great country long before it became a big country. We shall sink into decline whenever we aspire to greater bigness instead of bigger greatness. Greatness was breathed into it at its birth by great men, and we profoundly moved the eighteenth century European world before we had scarcely moved a wheel. Then this tiny infant Nation, at a time when absolutism prevailed nearly everywhere and few men had rights, proclaimed the stupendous doctrine of the rights of man. Americans spoke more of a standard of life than a standard of living. Sometimes they expressed their mood in the phrase, "high thinking and plain living."

Materially, this country's bigness lies in its productive capacities. Its greatness resides in its incomparable unity in diversity; its Bill of Rights; its conscience; its sense of fair play. These are the glories of the Nation. They proceed, not from savings, but from the spirit, and, treasured up for a life beyond life, it may be assumed that they will survive the corruptions of inflation.

THE SURVIVAL

Some of us have gone broke before and survived. In April 1865 men of the Army of Northern Virginia rode home on the mules and horses that General Grant had magnanimously let them retain. They returned to their ruined farms, houses burned, stock destroyed, ditches caved in, slaves flown, fields grown up in weeds. But by June 1865 they had a cotton crop planted. The next year they produced a larger crop, and they eventually rose with help from nobody. Let no one drench the wines of the American spirit with the dirty crankcase oil of defeatism. Men must soar before they can walk.

If we should lose our savings we could begin over again and rise to bigness. But if we should lose those things that are the glories of the Nation, we could not arise again to greatness.

In his speech he assures us that he does not advocate isolationism, but something new called retreatism. This merely leaves one's head, not one's body, exposed to the enemy. Rejecting all actual or potential allies except the British Commonwealth—if it would cooperate—Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, we would thereby save ourselves. God, bringing up the rear in Mr. Hoover's wake as a celestial salvation army, would, it is presumed, save the rest.

Even the minority whom Mr. Hoover would graciously save shudder at his method: a thrown rope that falls just short of the drowning men. Western Europeans, noting us recklessly playing with destiny and toying with dishonor, fervently wish that one of their boys—Christopher Columbus—had stayed at home. They know that we can destroy them through our recklessness. They are less certain that we can save them through our wisdom as they observe our divided counsels, a polite euphemism for the cell fission of idiocy.

Nor are Europeans altogether touched to fire as they watch Senate debate upon the life-or-death crisis of our times descend to ward-heeler level; recrimination rushing in as reason, shrieking for her life, rushes out. Similarly, their confidence in our intelligence is not overstimulated as they see our compass pointing in all directions at once while we look for the villain who done us wrong. The plug-ugly is, variously, President Roosevelt, Mrs. Roosevelt, the whole Roosevelt family by affinity or consanguinity, Harry Hopkins, Harry Truman, Mr. Acheson, whose especial opprobrium it is that he cannot bear the sight of a split infinitive, the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, and all Europeans, wretched foreigners that they are.

TIED TO OUR APRON

Fearful, therefore, not of our intentions but of our dispensations, Western Europeans would like to get shet of us as much as Mr. Hoover would like to get shet of them. But they are tied to our apron strings. Consequently they sweat it out while we indulge in our favorite sport of being garrulous but inarticulate or alternately play possum or partisan. The New York Times reports that—

"To observers who attended the recent sixth conference of foreign ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty powers one fact seems to stand out: the universal—almost desperate—hope of Europeans is that the United States will close its ranks, stifle its domestic quarreling, and assume need to confront Soviet expansionism."

Lincoln said that a house divided against itself could not stand. How could he know that we should one day live in ideational trailers; here today and gone tomorrow? The Times continues—

"Republican attacks on the administration—especially personal condemnation of Secretary Acheson—have alarmed and depressed Europeans. They see in them signs of American wavering and the possibility of a return to isolationism—making far easier the Soviet policy of terrorizing its weak opponents into paralysis."

Mr. Hoover would send no soldiers to Western Europe. He is doubtful of its will and good will. We could not send enough soldiers, even if we would, to protect it. Europeans must do the greater part of the job. Hence their request for American soldiers is not evidence of a desire to hide behind us. It is, on the contrary, nothing less than an invitation to at least short-run disaster. For by so doing Europeans are inviting us to make their homes our battleground in the event of war. But perhaps it is better to fight along the Missouri than the Marne.

AVOIDED COMMUNISM

As for the alleged decadence of Western Europe, implied by Mr. Hoover, it has, I suggest, done what we asked of it at the inception of the Marshall plan: avoid communism through economic health as the condition precedent to continued democracy and defense. It has not gone Communist. It has succeeded so brilliantly in doing what it set out to do that in 1950, for the first time in a generation—not merely since the end of the last war—it appeared that its economy might work.

This is not enough for Mr. Hoover. He bleats about the sacrifices we made in bringing about this miracle. Aside from the fact that we did not help the Marshall plan countries merely as a selfless philanthropy but helped them to save themselves as part of the plan to save ourselves, we made no sacrifice at all. The Marshall plan is the greatest bargain we ever bought since the Louisiana Purchase.

For a few billions we retained as potential allies 270,000,000 people. Nearly double our population, they are one-third more numerous than the Russians. Our intellectual, spiritual, and technical equals, they run the world's largest workshops outside our own. There are among them thousands of the earth's foremost scientists and technicians. (Radar, guided missiles, jet propulsion, the A-bomb: all these are essentially European in origin.) They are largely democrats from whom we derived the basic principles of our Government, and they are one with us in religious faith, traditions, aspirations.

Where should we now be if Italy and France had gone Communist 3 years ago? What victory have we scored over Soviet Russia except our great victory in Western Europe? Sacrifice nothing. Using crassness as a measure, let us spell out our bargain. It has cost us about $14 per capita per annum to save these great people to our side for the duration of the Marshall plan. During the same period we spent $85 per capita for booze and $200,000,000 annually for potato chips to create more thirst for more beer. Then we paid farmers $500,000,000 to produce the potatoes for part of the chips, throwing the remainder in a kind of keep-the-change mood to the hogs. Off-stage in this moment of sacrifice, the Eightieth Congress reduced taxes by $5,000,000, and only yesterday some of our great minds were addressing themselves to the sovereign question whether we should continue the tax on mink coats.

BLIND LEADING WEAK

Mr. Hoover is petulant because Western Europe did not rearm and recover at the same time. We might have rearmed but did not. Europe did not rearm because it could not. We could have had guns and butter. Europe's bleak alternative was between guns and bread. This presents not a choice but a compulsion. Had we armed, Europe would feel more secure. But unarmed ourselves, we are insecure in the presence of an unarmed Europe. This is the end result of the triumph of hope over experience; of the blind misdirecting the weak.

In his speech, Mr. Hoover wears at different times the uniform of the military, the gown of the academician (school of economics), and the garb of the preacher. In the latter capacity he upbraids Europeans for their alleged lack of spirituality. This holier-than-thou touch, this repulsive self-righteousness, seems scarcely equable with Christian humility. Lifting his eyes piously to Heaven, he says: "America cannot create their (Europeans') spiritual forces." Rome, abandon St. Peter's. Go out into the wilderness and there, like St. Anthony of Padua, seek that God whom you have so shamelessly abandoned. Chartres, draw a veil of rayon over your glorious stained-glass windows molded in the light of the Lord's grace in the great age of faith. You have sinned in Mr. Hoover's face and are unworthy.

Lacking the awful eye of God that peers into the inmost eyes of men, I cannot plumb the depths of European spirituality or chart its shallows. Europeans, however, might retort that our spirituality personified in Mr. Harding and the Ohio courthouse gang caused the United States to withdraw from the world not long ago in the name of "normalcy"—that is, to betray America's greatness in the name of shabbiness; and now it sees our spirituality, personified in Mr. Hoover, offering it a brimming draught of hemlock in a cup of thorns cunningly wrought.

BANKERS TO WORLD

Europe is poor. This, in the eyes of the rich, is original sin. But in 1914 Britons walked the alien earth lordly and secure. They held the gorgeous East in fee. Their King-Emperor's writ ran over half the earth. Everywhere it was the highest praise of a man's solvency and integrity to say that he was "as good as the Bank of England." They were bankers to the world while we were borrowers. They were a creditor nation but we were a debtor nation in 1914. They fetched and carried for the world on all the seas, and they also insured the ships and cargoes. The while, from Waterloo in 1815 to the outbreak of the war in 1914, we grew in security for a hundred dynamic years behind the shield of the British Navy as it policed the earth.

Let us recall—even if a dose of humility kills us—the days of the Battle of Britain. Then jitters swept this potentially mighty, but actually weak, nation. Then 130,000,000 Americans found security in the person of a handful of RAF fliers—many of them with the down of youth on their cheeks. Winning that battle, they gave us a chance for survival.

FRENCH AS EXAMPLE

In 1914 the French were the world's richest people per capita. Five francs then bought $1. Now it takes 400 francs to buy $1. Such were the fearful bloodlettings they suffered in the First World War, one-fourth of the men who went out in 1939 were orphans of that war. They could add that the Germans, during the last war, took into Germany as slaves 2,500,000 of their young men. (This, on the scale of our population, is equivalent to 7,500,000 men.) They kept them for nearly 5 years. Many died. Many went home diseased and broken. Then, by way of footnote tinging the whited page with more blood, they could write that they now monthly lose more officers in Indochina than their military schools can produce annually.

It cannot be pleasant—despite Mr. Hoover—for a once rich, powerful, and still proud people such as these, to rattle the tin cup on Capitol Hill. It cannot be pleasant, either, to hear themselves denounced as material and spiritual beggars. It might be salutary for Mr. Hoover to remember that pride not only goes before a downfall, but it also accelerates it.

The west now facing extermination, Mr. Hoover suggests isolationism; futility thrice compounded. What if it is the suicide of reason on the grave of frustration? What does it matter if it is panic parading as policy; delusion masked as doctrine; inertia become paralysis; magic ascendant over mind? It is something even if it is dishonor preceding eventual death. More sadly perhaps, it is the last remaining item in our bag of tricks that we have hitherto tried and found wanting as we sought to evade the inexorable responsibilities of our power.

WRONG FOR LIFETIME

The proposal is lent a certain weight because it comes from an elder statesman. (Agar jelly, injected into an ox tongue, also lends it weight if no nourishment.) For, in our theology—arthritis become art—when a man has achieved the feat of being consistently wrong for a lifetime and remains wrong longer than others by outliving them, he is elevated through common consent into the sacrosanct status of elder statesman. One might say of some of these cornland Ciceros what Bentley said of George the Third:

"George the Third
Ought never to have occurred.
One can only wonder
At so grotesque a blunder."

Resorting to magic, we proclaimed neutrality at the start of the First World War; the moral equivalent of proclaiming immunity to smallpox. It failed. The next time, some of our medicine men got up as elder statesmen, suggested cash and carry as an addendum to neutrality. Two monkey bones are a more powerful ju-ju than one. We were delighted with the cracker-barrel Machiavellianism of cash and carry even if it was so transparent a hoax that it could not have deceived even an adult. (A child-loving people, we do not attempt to deceive them. We merely betray them.) But it also failed. So we wearily fought a war again. We won it again. And we threw away the victory again; threw it away with our customary levity as though the cosmic were the comic.

DISASTER PRODUCTION

It is clear that international political error, in our hands, is an interchangeable part permitting the mass production of disaster. Thus, having made all the other mistakes possible, it is now proposed to return to the most ancient error of all—isolationism—happy in having before us the models that did not work in 1807, 1914, 1939. For old mistakes are cozier than new ones; the reason perhaps why so many men and women remarry their divorced mates.

Isolationism is a form of what psychologists call retreat to the womb; the yearning of an insecure adult to return to the place of prenatal security. It is the marsupial approach to international relations. Gather all Americans in the pouch of mama opossum (a native American animal) and no harm can come to them. But psychologists must be astonished to find what they identify as a malady in individuals being erected into a doctrine of fancied security for a nation.

Nor is this all. Isolationism is indicative of a dangerous—and perhaps ultimately fatal—flaw in our national character. It reveals that in our inmost heart we do not want to live up to the responsibilities of our power. We do not want to police the world. We do not want to keep our young men stationed in distant outposts. We do not see why we should be disturbed in the enjoyment of our abundant goods. We merely want to be let alone. (So did the Natchez and Tchopitoulas Indians. Dead at our hands they live on in the names of dingy New Orleans streets.) We want, in short, to evade destiny; to short circuit it; or, that failing, to exercise it by the voodoo of isolationism.

SEALING OUR DOOM

Materially, it would seal our doom. For, attempting to penetrate the clouds of Mr. Hoover's deviousness, he seems to be saying

that we ought to abandon Berlin, all European, and Middle East strategic bases for bombers, and the Belgian Congo whence we derive uranium ore for A-bombs. We would abandon nearly the whole world to Soviet Russia carrying on only with Britain if it should cooperate. He does not tell us how Britain could cooperate if its sea approaches reeked with Soviet submarines and Soviet guided missiles were launched upon her in fiery showers from Calais 20 miles distant. Proposing to give most of the world's population and its resources to Russia, Pravda paid Mr. Hoover a unique honor. It printed his speech in its entirety; majestic proof of Mr. Stalin's approval of his views.

Spiritually, Mr. Hoover's isolationism would spell our degradation preceding our death. It is betrayal on a world scale; the brutal renunciation of our treaties with, and our promises to, Western Europe and the United Nations. He indicates with callous cavalierness that if Russia should take Europe, it would one day rise again. This is frozen nonsense. If anyone doubts that a culture can be destroyed, let her go to Mexico. There the Spaniards quickly did to death the ancient Aztec culture. The Russians, taking Europe, would shoot every moral and intellectual leader so that each conquered land became a headless, amorphous mass of people. They would transfer large parts of the native populations to Siberia to die as slave laborers, replacing them with Cossacks, Kalmucks, Tadjiks. There would be no road back.

Yet Mr. Hoover, calmly contemplating the crucifixion of Europe, does not offer any of its people asylum here. They must die for their sins where they are.

(O America, compassionate mother, you who have offered asylum to the heavy-hearted, the sore-oppressed, the lost and homeless of this earth; you who have taken its hurt and weary children to your bosom and made them whole again; you who have been faith and hope and charity to all the world for so long as you have lived—is this your son speaking?)

Somehow I do not think that Mr. Hoover's isolationism would make us happy even if we should achieve it and walk for a little while directionless men on the cold crust of a cold dungheap. Imprisoned within our own fortress, hearts dead, consciences tortured, slowly choked by the contracting forces of the enemy, he could leave us alone to die of shame. Or, weakened, he could assail us with the force of the world at his back and destroy us. This might be our final triumph. For then we should have an all-American tableau as we died in the streets of our towns and perished on our doorsteps, every man wept over by his own mother and buried by his own father, until their turn came to mount the pyre, the sun sinking blood red on the final day of America and its all-American policy.

The Russians might then place an electric sign on the dome of the Nation's Capitol blinking this legend into the eyeless night:

"The only truly self-contained communities in the world are the cemeteries."

The Coal Industry in America and in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What a Difference," discussing the coal industry in the United States and in Britain, published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of February 14, 1951. The article deals with the mining of coal in the United States compared to the mining of coal in Great Britain under a socialistic plan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT A DIFFERENCE

Do you want to see the difference between socialized enterprise and free enterprise? Take a look at the coal industry here and in Britain.

In the last 5 years more than 220 large coal mines, each with a daily capacity of over 500 tons, have been opened or placed in development in this country. In addition, about 800 smaller mines have been opened, plus many new surface or strip operations. These new facilities alone have a productive capacity of 280,000,000 tons of coal a year—more than half of the expected production total of 1950. It all represents new growth, new risks, new ventures.

Now for Britain. In 1949 the total deep-mine production of British coal was 28,000,000 tons less than in 1939. Absenteeism, under government ownership, reached a peak and was largely responsible for the drop in production. England's mines were far inferior to ours even under private management. Under nationalization, which was supposed to produce Utopia in a hurry, the inferiority has become still more marked.

What it all amounts to is that free enterprise has scored another triumph in the United States. There has been a quiet revolution in our coal mining in recent years, characterized by a great and dramatic expansion of mechanization and research. This could have been accomplished only as it was accomplished—by the cumulative efforts of progressive, private management working for the greater good of all and striving to earn a profit at the same time. Here's one more case where the facts speak for themselves.

Selective Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Selective Controls," published in the Washington Post of February 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE CONTROLS

The action of the Federal Reserve Board in tightening credit curbs on most new commercial construction was preceded by two regulations imposing similar curbs on residential building credit. Consumer credit has also been restricted by means of selective controls specifying minimum down payments and maximum maturities for installment sales of specified goods. These selective real-estate and consumer-credit controls relieve the upward pressure on prices of labor and materials. At the same time they release scarce materials for defense production. They are, therefore, not only a very effective means of restricting loan expansion, they reenforce the efforts of other agencies to control prices and regulate production by cutting down the output of nonessential goods and stimulating expansion of defense industries.

Selective controls are, in fact, a much more effective means of restricting loan expansion than nonselective control—that is to say, control which curbs loan expansion by raising the cost of credit, or increasing interest charges on borrowed money. There is a good deal of truth in Secretary Snyder's contention that limited increases in interest rates have little deterrent effect on private borrowing, especially when business is booming. At any rate, the powerlessness of the Federal Reserve System to prevent an expansion of loans through nonselective overall credit control, so long as it is committed to support of the bond market, does not preclude effective use of selective controls reducing the volume of loans by limiting the amounts that may be advanced to private borrowers for specified purposes. These types of control can always be tightened or relaxed in response to changing conditions. They can also be extended to good advantage to cover other forms of lending. The blanket kind of control, on the contrary, makes it impossible to discriminate between credit advances that are in the public interest and those that are undesirable. Thus the Reserve Board's new regulation does not apply to certain classes of construction, such as schools, hospitals, churches, and public utilities.

If the Reserve Board were given broad authority to apply selective controls at its discretion, it could cooperate with the Treasury in stabilizing the bond market without increasing the upward pressure on prices that would be intensified by continued excessive expansion of bank loans.

Public-Private Power Truce Spells New Era for State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Public-Private Power Truce Spells New Era for State," published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of February 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC-PRIVATE POWER TRUCE SPELLS NEW ERA FOR STATE—LONG-TIME ENEMIES NOW ARE BUDDIES

(By Roger V. Devlin)

On a wall in an office of the Southwestern Power Administration is a huge map of the Southwest. A large area in the center of the map—embracing all of Oklahoma, a large section of Texas, most of southern Missouri and a big portion of western and northern Arkansas—is shaded in blue.

That blue is the color of an electric spark.

It defines the area which, says Douglas G. Wright, SPA Administrator, is being served by the Nation's only partnership of public and private power.

It is an area where industry can be offered, because of that partnership, lower power rates than anywhere else in the country with the exception of the Pacific Northwest and the Tennessee Valley—and probably just as low as TVA.

"It solves a major problem," said Gov. Johnston Murray, after conferring with Wright. "I have every reason to believe we are in better shape than ever to draw new industry to our State."

That map, centering on Oklahoma, is cross-hatched with marks representing major electric lines. All are linked to each other.

It also is studded thickly with bright metal pins whose color identifies major power consumers on or near those lines—municipalities, Rural Electrification Administration units, key industries.

Until recently those power lines were divided into three sections. One was the system of the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma. A second was the Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. Both are private utilities.

The third system, consisting principally of a trunk line from north-central Arkansas into east-central Oklahoma, then bending south to reach the Denison Dam on the Red River, was that of the Southwestern Power Administration.

For years the two private systems have fought a no-holds-barred battle against the SPA.

But the battle now is ended. They have become partners in a program which, they have discovered will be mutually advantageous and will help materially in developing the State.

The Federal Power Commission put its final stamp of approval on the partnership agreement a few days ago. It earlier had been approved by the two companies and the Secretary of the Interior, who is top boss of the SPA.

Two basic factors make the agreement possible and workable: SPA gets its power from hydroelectric projects built and building; PSC and O. G. & E. get theirs from steam-generating plants.

But hydroelectric dams must contend with weather factors which provide them with plenty of water energy during flood periods and only small amounts during droughts.

They could operate at top speeds during the one period and close down entirely during the other, but that would be inefficient. They attempt to balance it out by generating at much less than capacity over the full year, or by operating at near capacity for short periods each day, then cutting back for the remainder of the day.

On the other hand, customers of Public Service and Oklahoma Gas & Electric don't require an even flow of power all day long. They turn on their lights in the mornings, again in the evenings, but use little or no electricity during the night and at midday.

But in order to meet the power demands during those peak periods, private utilities must install considerably greater generating capacity than they need during the rest of the day.

Both the steam and the hydro systems thus had a grave weakness, economically, when operating independently and fighting each other.

The partnership eliminated those weaknesses with the stroke of a pen. It tied the two systems together.

The steam plant can operate at a steady, efficient level 24 hours per day. When the peaks hit, hydroelectric generators go to work and handle the extra load. In exchange, the hydro system can draw on the steam plant's steady supply of energy during low-water periods.

A second major advantage also enters the picture. Scattered through the area are many small REA units and communities whose power consumption is so small or so scattered that a private power company cannot supply them except at a loss.

On the other hand, those customers are defined as "preferred" by the Government agency and they can buy hydroelectric power at wholesale rates.

In order to serve them, though, the SPA would have to build a whole network of transmission lines, which in many cases might duplicate private lines already in place.

The private-public power partnership also has solved that problem. Southwestern Power, for instance, has a preferred customer in western Oklahoma but no lines anywhere near it. So it sells a block of power to Oklahoma Gas & Electric at a junction point of their two lines. At the other end of an OG&E line, near the customer, SPA buys back that block of power for delivery to the REA.

The private utility is recompensed for what virtually amounts to use of its transmission line. The REA gets a low Government-power rate. Everyone is happy.

Obviously, the partnership—it is called an interchange agreement—is much more complicated and detailed than those illustrations.

But the important thing is that for the first time in history public and private power have gotten together for their mutual benefit, instead of fighting, and that their cooperation will be of tremendous benefit for Oklahoma and the Southwest.

"The power potentialities of this area, under this agreement, are terrific," says Wright. "We can handle any foreseeable industry.

"As far as power is concerned, this can become the most favorable area in the country."

And Governor Murray agrees: "This is the kind of spirit we must have to attract new industries."

The Legislator's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials entitled "The Legislator's Dilemma," published in the Arkansas Recorder on February 2, 1951. They were written by Mr. John Wells, who is a well-known journalist from my State, and one of the most penetrating writers on public affairs of whom I know.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGISLATOR'S DILEMMA

(Probably nothing is so flattering to an editor as a request to republish something. A member of the general assembly bestowed that sort of flattery on the recorder by asking us to carry again the editorials under the above title that appeared in the issues of August 18 and 25.

(Any similarity to current situations or political incumbents is strictly coincidental—it could happen in any administration.)

Before scolding the general assembly in general, or any member in particular, imagine yourself in the legislature.

You are the representative of Just-Any County.

You know that your people want Highway 00 blacktopped.

Furthermore, John Smones' oldest son is holding down a $250 per month job in the revenue department; and your own Uncle Jim is a longtime employee of the State comptroller's office.

Besides that, Mrs. Mary Splinther, a widow, whom everybody in the county admires for having laundered her children through college, wants you to get her daughter onto the education department staff.

Moreover, the publisher of the principal newspaper in your county is a member of one of the major commissions by appointment of the governor.

With all those factors in mind, what are you going to do when the administration shoves a bill at you that is in the interest of a few promoters rather than for the public's benefit? You know full well that it's bad legislation, and that, in time, if enacted, it will add millions to the sum which must be extracted from taxpayers.

What are you going to do?

You can attend the meeting of the committee to which the bill is referred, and attempt privately to talk the measure to death; but when you try that, you find the committee already pledged. Each member has been called to the governor's office, and "counseled" with. They, too, have patronage and road obligations.

So the committee rubber stamps the bill "Recommended do pass."

By that time, the word has seeped back to the governor's office that you are opposed to the legislation. You are invited to the governor's office but for the time being you dodge that interview.

That night you get a telephone call from John Smones, whose boy is in the revenue department. Mr. Smones can deliver his township, with 400 votes, 4 or 5 to 1; in fact he gave you that margin in the primary; you can't afford to be ungrateful.

Patiently and earnestly, you state the case against the bill. You point out to him that it is adding $100 in potential tax load for each member of his family, with nothing in return. That gets no rise out of him—then you catch on; why should he be concerned about $400 more tax load, while his son is being paid $3,000 a year plus expenses and has a State-owned car to drive?

Discouraged, you promise to review the proposal thoroughly, and, yes, you'll go to see the governor tomorrow. That is really what Mr. Smones is calling about, he confides. The governor was puzzled and a little miffed that his request for you to visit him had not been complied with.

Next morning Mrs. Splinther's daughter is waiting in the house chamber for you. She has been put on notice that her application for a position in the education department is going to be pigeonholed if you persist in bucking the administration's pet bill. You ask her to sit down, and then expound in detail the harm that the measure will do to every citizen, including her.

She listens, but she's thinking only about that job she wants. She doesn't know anything about the legislation, and she isn't interested; but she is interested in that job, and she knows it is in jeopardy—because of you. Her family and friends do not think it very considerate of you to let your personal views on a bill that the Governor wants interfere with Miss Splinther's ambition to advance in the educational field.

In desperation you write the newspaper publisher at home, pointing out the obvious faults in the proposed act. You suggest that an editorial setting the public straight would be a genuine service to his journal's readers.

Before you can mail the letter a page summons you to the telephone. It's a call from Mr. Publisher. He cannot understand your attitude. What are you trying to do? Deprive your county of improvements and your people of recognition from the administration?

You respond quickly that you had just written him about that very piece of legislation. Through the telephone, you sense his impatience, as he lectures you on the futility of tilting windmills. He declares emphatically that the bill is going to be passed anyway, so why knock him off the commission and prevent other fellow citizens from receiving honors and benefits that the administration can bestow?

You agree to try to find a basis for going along on the bill—and, yes, you will talk with the governor. Wearily you trudge back to your desk, tear up the letter to the publisher, and head downstairs to see the Governor. Shall you state your objections, or just listen?

You listen. The Governor, having publicly and privately plugged for the measure, is in no position to consider objections to it. His prestige is at stake, and he is counting on his friends to stand by him.

You muster up the courage to withhold a commitment, but—with the feeling that your publisher friend, Mrs. Splinther and daughter, Mr. Simones and son, and Uncle Jim are breathing down your neck—you repeat the promise to give the proposal further and sympathetic study.

As you walk out of the governor's private office into the reception room, you run smack into Uncle Jim—now who had tipped him off to be at that spot?—and he looks you squarely in the eye, and cautions you to be practical. He remind you that plenty of men would like to have his job, which he owes to the Governor. Oh, yes, he's been down there through two administrations, but today his obligation is to the incumbent and it would embarrass him if his nephew loomed up as a troublemaker in the house.

You figure that, here at least you can vent your irritation, and you cut Uncle Jim short with a flat statement, which you would like to believe, that you were elected to do what is best for the greatest number, and that's what you intend to do.

Your dander roused, you decide to solicit reinforcements. You've always regarded Representative Jamestone of an adjoining county as an especially able lawmaker, and he's been in the house for four terms. He surely must be aware of the bad features of this bill. You take a seat next to his, and proceed to interrogate him. Yes, he's read the bill; he knows that it's not what the State needs; but he is not going to sacrifice his county's interests.

Besides, he reminds you, the newspapers have endorsed the bill, and are going to give any legislator opposing it a rough time. You see that nothing is to be gained by arguing with him, so you retire to your desk. Awaiting you there is the senator from your district. He asks what's the idea of jeopardizing Mr. Publisher's reappointment to the commission, and cutting your neighbors out of that long-needed blacktop job from the county seat to the county line. The senator has talked with enough members to know that the administration has the votes to pass the bill—why mess us all up by creating ill will in high places?

With that, he abandons you to your meditations. Just then, a messenger drops 30 to 40 telegrams on your desk—they are demands from influential citizens back home that you vote for the bill that's bothering you. Not one of them could possibly have read it; but they are telling you how to vote.

* * * * *

The clerk is reading the bill. The speaker sends a page for you, and when you reach the speaker's stand, he leans over to say that he's going to be terribly disappointed unless you give this an "aye."

In your seat again—the drone of the reading clerk's voice is just background noise for your conflicting thoughts. Not even one constituent has suggested you should vote against the bill. Of course not, for the only constituents who know anything about it are those who have been flattered with contacts from administration sources.

That can be your defense later on—that the only recommendations from home were that you support the bill. Then you think of your duty to that son of yours. Some day he is going to have to share the tax burden. At least you hope he does, for you would not like to see him leave Arkansas to live in some other state. This is where he belongs. Well, are you going to load more taxes onto his generation, and perhaps drive him from the State's borders?

You can't kick this one around any more. They are ready for a roll call. The moment of decision is at hand.

How are you voting?

More than once in the 60-day session, the lawmaker will have to make a decision which he would like to avoid.

Where lies his duty?

From all sides, he is besieged by demands from constituents with a financial stake in keeping the administration's good will, and from powerful individuals who may make or break him in the next campaign.

The average citizen not on the public payroll and not drawing money from the State does not make demands on his representative. He is not even aware of proposed legislation which may cost him dearly, either in direct levies or indirectly in the division of tax revenues from proper purposes to wasteful promotions.

If the legislator decides to vote contrary to the demands of those applying pressures, he is not likely to receive the plaudits of the taxpayers whose cause he has defended in the face of threats and promises.

No, his compensation must come from within—from the knowledge that his oath of office has not been merely the prating of a political parrot.

1. Consider the possible choices and the consequences.

The bill before the House is not in the public interest, but the only constituents who have been heard from want it passed—for only-to-obvious reasons. No one else who helped elect our man has expressed the faintest interest.

A public official does have an obligation to those who assisted him with their votes, support, and contributions. No one will condemn him too much for standing by those who stood by him—so he decides to vote "aye."

Its over now. The bill has been passed. The administration is satisfied. Uncle Jim rests easy once more in his job on the comptroller's staff; Mr. John Smones' son figures that his job with its $250 per month salary, expense account, and State-owned car is safe for the time being; the road from the county seat to the county line will be black-topped; Mrs. Mary Splinther's daughter has assurance that she will be selected for the education-department position for which her application is pending; the newspaper-publisher constituent is assured of reappointment to the commission on which he has been serving.

The lawmaker seeks consolation in the fact—and it is a fact—that his vote has gotten a road for his county and patronage and honors for constituents. After all, should he let his personal convictions penalize his home folks, the people who elected him?

He will explain all that to his son a decade hence when the young man is wondering what part his dad had in the general assembly when legislative enactments laid the foundation for ruinous debt without compensatory benefits in public improvements. Will the explanation suffice? Or will son shake the dust of Arkansas off his shoes and depart to the asphalt and concrete of other States whose politicians had not progressed to the point of corraling votes at whatever the price, in roads, jobs, contracts, and benefits from public funds?

What if there are no such States left? Then son might as well stay in Arkansas. Is that something to hope for, or not?

2. The legislator, heeding his conscience, backed by his best judgment, votes "No."

The newspaper back home lashes him for having obstructed the administration's program; but the publisher is told that, despite his fine editorial sentiments, he must reconcile himself to giving up his Commission appointment—all on account of his Representative's stubbornness.

Uncle Jim gets his dismissal notice from the comptroller. He'll have to look for a job. Horrible thought, isn't it?

And old John Smones is going to have to support his son in the style to which he has grown accustomed on the Revenue Department payroll, with his nice salary, expense account, and State car; or else the Smones boy will have to try self-reliance for a change.

Poor Mrs. Splinther. She wanted so much for her daughter to get that specialists' assignment in the education department. Now the young lady will have to apply for a teaching job somewhere.

All of them are off their Representative for life. He will get no more votes from them.

His conscience is clear, but what's it worth to the people of his county, who know that his vote cost them the blacktop on the road from the county seat to the county line?

ANOTHER DECISION TO MAKE

Another set of alternatives is before him. He can take it lying down, and abandon hope of any satisfaction from political activity now or in the future; or he can go at it the hard way, and acquaint the people of his county with just what was involved in the bill he voted against.

He chooses the latter course. The first week-end at home provides an opportunity for a conference with friends whose only concern with State government is that it be properly conducted. He finds them inclined to regret that he voted as he did, against a bill which the administration wanted so badly it felt impelled to show its displeasure by disciplining the whole county and several of its residents.

The situation calls for careful, thorough preparation. He reads portions of the bill to the group, points out its promotional aspects, puts his finger on the sections and phrases that provide an outlet for public money to reach the bank accounts of promoters.

He convinces his listeners that he voted right; and they agree to work up a larger meeting for the next week end, so that others may be similarly informed. For this gathering the county is combed for leaders in all lines of endeavor. They, too, are won over to the lawmaker's view of the legislation.

An explanation and endorsement of his position is prepared by the group, and taken by a committee to the newspaper which had denounced his vote. They ask the publisher to carry a story about the endorsement. If he refuses, they buy advertising space for it.

Invitations to address various civic clubs come to the representative, and he has the chance for which he had wished in vain a few weeks before—to explain in detail why he could not in good conscience go with the administration on the bill under discussion.

His senator, by now, is busy explaining why he was for the bill.

And nearby counties have begun to take notice; their representatives who helped pass the bill are on the defensive. The administration by now wants it understood that it was the legislature's doing—the governor merely signed it after it had been overwhelmingly passed.

Democracy works if right-thinking politicians work. The lawmaker looks ahead to the next campaign with optimism and enthusiasm—his faith in the integrity and intelligence of the people, once they are informed of the truth, stronger than ever.

He concludes, with reason, that when people go wrong in an election, it can usually be put down to lack of information or mistaken impressions. In such instances, the blame belongs at the door of the press and the politicians who may have tried, but somehow missed, pointing out the right road.

When that no longer is true, elections will be a waste of time and money, and democracy will have died.

Doctor Shortages Ahead—Dr. Rusk Urges Larger Classes With Speeded Courses

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the New York Times:

DOCTOR SHORTAGES AHEAD—DR. RUSK URGES LARGER CLASSES WITH SPEEDED COURSES

(By George Eckel)

Unless medical education is expanded and accelerated at once the Nation faces a deficit of 22,000 physicians by 1954, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman of the national advisory committees on mobilization, said here today. The deficit would be undiminished by 1960 in the absence of measures to counteract it, he added.

Even if both recommended measures were begun at once the deficit in 1954 would be 14,500 physicians, but by 1960 it would be reduced to 2,000, he asserted.

Any such deficits, he declared, meant "a serious threat to the health and welfare of our people."

He called on the medical profession and the medical schools to undertake the added workload necessary to cope with the situation.

Dr. Rusk, who is associate editor of the New York Times, addressed the forty-seventh annual Congress on Medical Education and Licensure, sponsored by the American Medical Association, the Advisory Board for Medical Specialists, and the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States.

TWO STUDIES SUMMARIZED

His presentation summarized the conclusions reached by two committees which he heads, the Health Resources Advisory Committee to the National Security Resources Board and the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists and Allied Specialists to the Selective Service System.

Dr. Rusk held, that unless the profession was to fail to meet the mobilization challenge, enrollments in medical schools must be increased by 15 percent and accelerated courses of studies must be instituted to turn out an extra class every 3 years.

Some 178,000 physicians were in active practice today, he stated, and by 1954 there would be a need for 210,600. The expected supply under present conditions would be about 188,600, he added.

The estimate, proceeded, was predicated on Armed Forces of 5,000,000 men by 1954 and continuing at that level through 1960. If the ceiling through 1960 was not raised above the 3,500,000 man in uniform contemplated by the end of this year the deficit could be reduced by 2,000 to 20,000, he said.

Dr. Rusk declared that the studies by two committees made these assumptions:

1. The emergency state of part or complete mobilization would continue for 10 years.

2. The 1949 ratio of physicians to population in the civilian population was accepted as adequate and was used as a base line.

3. The ratio of physicians to servicemen and women in the Armed Forces would have settled by 1954 to 2.7 per 1,000, a rate substantially below the World War II rate and below the present rate.

4. The estimate of physicians required for civilian defense must assume the possibility of catastrophe, not only physical but epidemic.

A 15-percent increase in enrollments of medical schools, which now graduate 6,000 physicians a year, would not produce any increase in graduates until June of 1955, or of graduates who have finished a 1-year internship until June, 1956, at the earliest, Dr. Rusk stated.

GAIN BY MEASURE ESTIMATED

By 1960 this measure alone, he added, would reduce the prospective deficit of 22,000 by only 5,000. The increase per class in World War II was 12½ percent, he noted.

Acceleration of medical training, by running four 9-month school years together and completing them within 36 months, would yield 6,000 additional physicians every 3 years, he said.

By 1954 this would reduce the deficit in active physicians from 22,000 to 14,500 and by 1960 to 10,000, he estimated.

After stating that, based on the Armed Forces reaching and keeping a level of 5,000,000, the two measures together would cut the deficit in 1954 to 14,500 and in 1960 to 2,000. He said that if the Armed Forces did not exceed 3,500,000 the two measures together would erase the deficit by 1960.

Physician requirements by category in 1954, if the Armed Forces had 5,000,000 men, were analyzed as follows by Dr. Rusk: 183,600 for the civilian population, 3,300 for civilian defense, 1,800 for industry and rehabilitation, 2,800 for public health, 500 for medical schools and 18,500 for the Armed Forces.

Dr. Rusk defended the measures he recommended, despite the known defects of acceleration, as the only solutions to a situation in which nothing is possible to avoid or even reduce this deficit before 1954.

"These plans are flexible, and no permanent oversupply is imposed," he declared. "Any part of the program could be adjusted if the situation eased enough to permit it.

"No account is taken of the increased aging of our population, or of the rehabilitation of the wounded veterans coming back from combat."

He noted that "we recognize the difficulties of an accelerated program."

"We should, however," he went on, "be able to profit by our experience in the last war. The depletion of teachers can be prevented, internships could be extended rather than curtailed, in as much as internes already are performing medical services."

Dr. Rusk stated that the present authorized physician ratio in the armed services was 5 per 1,000 men, calling for 17,500 this year in that category alone, but plans called for a tapering off to 3.7 per 1,000 men, as the requirements are less after the formative shakedown phase of mobilization.

A panel discussion on problems arising from mobilization following Dr. Rusk's presentation showed varying opinions on his recommendations.

Dr. Stockton Kimball, dean of the University of Buffalo medical school and chairman of the joint committee on medical education in time of national emergency, reported that three-fourths of the medical schools in the association of American Medical Colleges did not favor the principle of acceleration.

"Practically each of the errors in medical education during the last war we are now asked to repeat," he stated.

Dr. Kimball also produced estimates that for an expansion of 1,000 in enrollments by 1954, approximately the 15 percent recommended by Dr. Rusk, medical schools would require an additional $6,200,000 for operating expenses, an additional $67,000,000 for new school construction and an additional $32,000,000 for hospital construction.

On the question of financial aid to schools, Dr. Rusk said that the health resources advisory committee would, if necessary, back any reasonable program to provide adequate funds with adequate safeguards.

Dr. Victor Johnson, director of the Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, Rochester, Minn., raised a question on Dr. Rusk's figures for civilian requirement of physicians.

If the 22,000-physician deficit developed, he said, it would be almost entirely at the expense of the civilian population. On the basis of Dr. Rusk's figures, he added, this would reduce the civilian physician ratio only from 1 in 850, the 1949 level, to 1 in 950, whereas during World War II the ratio was 1 to 1,350, admittedly too small. Would so slight a reduction make so much difference? he asked, in effect.

Dr Rusk replied that we needed the physician ratios we had in 1949, that in World War II we were lucky in having nothing that even looked like a major epidemic, and that the obstetrical case load was very low because of the absence of 16,000,000 men.

He remarked that many physicians were heavily overworked in the last war.

Col. Richard H. Rimes, chief medical officer of the Selective Service System, declared that a draft of physicians might not be necessary because military requirements might be met through the efforts of the profession.

Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two very fine articles from the Christian Science Monitor on the subject of Alaska.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA'S NATIVES STRIVE WITH OLD AND NEW WAYS

(By Louis R. Huber)

JUNEAU, ALASKA.—About one-third of Alaska's present 128,000 population is made up of people who have always lived there—the natives.

They are now in various degrees of adaptation to the white man's way of living with which, inevitably, they will have to contend.

In Metlakatla, southernmost settlement in Alaska, 600 Tsimshian Indians live in what undoubtedly is the most prosperous town—white or native—in the entire Northland.

In the Brooks Range near the Arctic Ocean an undetermined number of Nakanna continue living happily in their traditional ways—their only concession to modernity being the use of guns rather than spears and bows and arrows, for hunting.

Each of these groups, the Metlakatla Tsimshians and the Brooks Range Nakanna, enjoys a stable economy. But the Tsimshians

have come full circle around to the white man's life and have made a success of it. The Brooks Range Eskimos are still living as their ancestors have for centuries.

In between these two poles of native life are thousands of other Alaska natives trying in varying degrees to turn to white men's ways. A few are succeeding, but many are worse off than before. The latter are those who are thrown without safeguard into contact with white folk.

The use of liquor undoubtedly contributes mightily to the frustration of many Alaska natives. This writer talked with Wayne Waldrip, United States deputy marshal at Dillinghom (southwestern Alaska), about the native liquor problem.

Mr. Waldrip is in the thick of it: Eskimos, Koniags, and mixed Alaska natives in his jurisdiction come to Bristol Bay each summer to work for the salmon canneries there. Each native earns what is, for him, a sizable amount of money during the short red-salmon season.

"But all too often the first thing he does is to turn to liquor when the fishing season is over. He may not spend much of his money for liquor—but somebody is sure to see to it that he is relieved of all he earned before he sobers up. He then goes home broke," said Mr. Waldrip.

He favors the enactment of a law which would prohibit the sale of liquor to natives, with stiff penalties for its violation. Not all Alaskans familiar with the native problem agree with this as a remedy, however.

This writer also talked with Judge Joseph W. Kehoe in Nome. Judge Kehoe has had long experience in Alaska; he is situated in the center of the largest group of natives in the Northland—the Eskimos—who, in his region, outnumber the whites.

"While I have no cure for the liquor problem," said Judge Kehoe, "I am not unfamiliar with the failure of the attempt to ban intoxicants during the many years the eighteenth amendment was in effect. The State of Washington once tried denying Indians liquor, and so did Alaska. Neither effort was entirely effective."

Judge Kehoe added that practically all the Eskimo people in the northern part of Alaska are themselves well aware of the menace of liquor. Annually they petition that no liquor-sale licenses be granted in or near their villages, and their petitions are granted.

"Any part of life is as good to the Eskimos as another—and they like it all. They have no sense whatever of urgency or schedule. Midnight is as good as noon—a feeling they may have got from the long summer days and the unending winter nights," a Nome resident said.

Where leadership has been provided, as at Metlakatla, the natives have come through with flying colors. But where no leadership is given and the natives have to fumble their own way, the results are usually disastrous.

It is significant that the Metlakatlans' advance into civilization was due to the work of a religious leader.

William Duncan, a lay missionary of the Church of England, was the man who led the Tsimshean Indians of Metlakatla in their rise from savagery. But before he ever thought of becoming a missionary, Mr. Duncan was a successful Yorkshire leather salesman.

And after he arrived in the midst of the Tsimshians (at Fort Simpson, British Columbia, where they then lived), Mr. Duncan spent a whole year learning the Tsimshean language before he attempted to interest the Indians in becoming Christians.

His program was a rigid one, but the Indians, already aware of the degradation coming to them through their untutored association with white men at Fort Simpson, followed Mr. Duncan almost without question.

The penetration with which this great leader perceived his task and the effective[illegible] which he carried it out stand yet as a monument of missionary achievement.

In any discussion of Alaska natives the question of reservations naturally comes up, because reservations have been proposed time and time again in recent years—and a few, indeed, have been established in Alaska.

But the trouble with reservations, according to Alaskans who have lived longest with and studied hardest the native problem up north, is that reservations build a wall between aboriginal and civilized living. The reservation principle tells the native to take his spears and fishhooks and go on living as his ancestors did—often on land that the world needs in one way or another.

The northland natives themselves, mainly in southeastern Alaska, have taken a hand in their own affairs by forming the Alaska Native Brotherhood and the Alaska Native Sisterhood. Both are organizations actively seeking to forward the cause of natives.

And progress has been made. At Hydaburg, Kake, and Klawock the natives have developed an economic self-sufficiency approaching that of Metlakatla, and largely through their own efforts.

ONCE PROUD ALEUTS FACE THREAT OF EXTINCTION—LEADERS NEEDED, HELP ESSENTIAL

SEATTLE.—A thousand once-proud Aleuts, who numbered 16,000 in their island-chain homes 200 years ago, are well on their way to extinction.

This is the alarming forecast of natural scientists who have visited that region during the past several years.

"It is a familiar picture to anthropologists: that of a formerly vigorous and numerous people, physically and culturally well adapted to a rigorous environment," said Prof. William S. Laughlin, of the University of Oregon.

SITUATION SERIOUS

"The Aleuts themselves are aware of this condition," he added.

The Aleut village of Nikolski on Unimak Island, which his excavations have shown to be around 4,000 years old, was cited as an example of how the Aleuts are disappearing.

At the turn of the century Nikolski had approximately 125 inhabitants. In 1938 it had 85, and today it has only 59 inhabitants. Migration away from the village has been negligible, said Professor Laughlin.

Does this mean that extinction is inevitable for the Aleuts? Not at all, he says. The trend can be reversed and the Aleuts, whose intelligence he praises, can once again flourish. He blames bureaucratic indifference and mismanagement.

"It is one of the saddest ironies of history that these people should succumb now to American paternalistic neglect," said Professor Laughlin.

AGENCY AIDS NATIVES

The Aleuts, like nearly all Alaska natives, are ministered to by the Alaska Native Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, United States Department of the Interior.

This Agency, with headquarters in Juneau, the Territorial capital, is one of the largest—if not the largest—in Alaska. With a total of more than 800 employees, it has teachers, doctors, nurses, and institutions throughout the entire northland.

"The objectives of the Alaska Native Service are to discharge the moral and legal obligations of the United States Government to the native people of Alaska—particularly to bring to them health, education, and an economic base which will permit the native people to become an integral part of the social, economic, and political life of Alaska," says Hugh J. Wade, recently appointed area director of the ANS.

Professor Laughlin, whose views coincide with those of other natural scientists familiar with Alaska native problems, focuses his attention on the Aleuts and charges that the objectives of the ANS are not being reached.

RESULTS OF SURVEY

A seven-man research party from the Peabody Museum of Harvard University made a study in 1948 of the Aleut villages of Atka and Nikolski, he said, finding the average individual diet to have a value of approximately 800 to 1,400 calories a day. (About 3,000 calories are needed daily per individual for healthful living.)

The Aleuts are thus starving, says Professor Laughlin, because they have no economic base—no regular employment—and the ANS has done nothing to provide such.

"The only income the Aleuts have is what they may get from fur trapping; they catch fish and seals and, with other food supplied them, that is their entire diet," says Professor Laughlin. "They are starved physically and deeply frustrated mentally; it is no wonder if they take to drinking with economic oblivion staring them daily in the face."

He contrasted the Aleutian-chain life with that of the Aleuts on the Pribilof Islands. Under the Fish and Wildlife Service there, the Aleuts have regular annual employment at the seal rookeries and are healthier, have higher morale, and are on the increase.

Mr. Wade answered by saying that his agency could do more in providing an economic base in the island chain if Congress would provide funds—much was spent in building up the Pribiloff sealeries, a natural industry, he explained.

MODERN HOMES

The Aleuts live in houses built for them by the Government to replace homes they lost when war swept over their islands. The houses are of modern construction—but the occupants have no jobs.

The only regular contact the ANS has with these people is through the husband-and-wife teacher team in each village. Either the husband or the wife is the teacher; the other spouse then is classed as "special assistant."

Although officially prescribed duties may not include other offices than teaching, the husband-wife team through force of circumstances becomes, also, personal adviser, doctor, nurse, janitor, handyman, and moral and economic leader for the village.

Professor Laughlin's criticism falls heavily on the inadequacy with which, he charges, the husband-wife team fails in the latter categories. Even the teaching function, he says, is imperfectly carried out inasmuch as only English is taught.

"In order to help these people," insists Professor Laughlin, "the white leaders who come to them must speak their language and speak it well."

It is significant that the second in command in his research parties for the past several years has been Dr. Gordon H. Marsh, a linguist of Columbia University. He is an accomplished scholar in the field of Aleutian folklore and the Aleutian dialects.

Mr. Wade says that the ANS instructs its teachers to respect and encourage the use of native foods—and, indeed, this writer has seen circulars and pamphlets sent out by the ANS for that purpose—but Professor Laughlin declares his experience has shown that the teachers scorn both native foods and native traditions, many of which are wholesome.

Reforms in RFC End Some Abuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reforms in RFC End Some Abuses," written by Jack Steele, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFORMS IN RFC END SOME ABUSES SENATORS ASSAILED—NEW AGENCY HEAD DESCRIBES CHANGES—HARBER TOOK OVER WHEN INQUIRY WAS ENDING, ACTED BEFORE ITS REPORT

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—A series of important reforms in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been put into effect quietly in recent months, it was disclosed today by W. Elmer Harber, who became Chairman of the lending agency 6 months ago.

The reforms abolish some of the RFC practices which were sharply criticized by the Senate Banking Subcommittee at its public and private hearings last year. They were instituted before the subcommittee issued its blistering report on favoritism and influence in the RFC 2 weeks ago.

The new regulations, among other things, bar RFC employees from taking high-paying jobs with borrowers whose loans they help arrange, require that at least three of the agency's five Directors approve all loans of more than $1,000,000 and seek to bar the RFC's doors to influence peddlers.

HARBER TELLS OF REFORMS

Mr. Harber, a homespun country banker from Shawnee, Okla., came to the RFC after the subcommittee's inquiry was virtually completed and was not named in its critical report. He outlined the RFC's own reform program in an interview.

He said the program is aimed primarily at setting up good business procedures in the RFC, although he conceded that it would alter practices which brought on some of the subcommittee's sharpest criticism.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the subcommittee, also has proposed that most of the same reforms be written into law through legislation he has introduced to abolish the five-man RFC Board and reshape its lending policies.

PROMISES FURTHER STEPS

Mr. Harber spoke with deep feeling as he outlined the steps already taken by the RFC and promised that others will follow to put its lending operations on a "business basis" and ban any "influence peddling" in connection with its loans.

He made no attempt to defend or apologize for some past actions of the RFC. Neither did he mention his fellow directors, three of whom were singled out for criticism by the subcommittee.

He said, however, that the changes already made had been authorized unanimously by the board.

In apparent anticipation of the reopening of the subcommittee hearings slated for Wednesday, he also said he was ready to fight any move to abolish the RFC or to fix any blame on the great majority of the agency's employees.

The reforms he listed include the following:

1. A rule barring any concern receiving RFC loans of more than $100,000 from hiring within 2 years any RFC employee who had a voice in RFC lending operations. Borrowers must sign such agreements under penalty of cancellation of their loans.

(This move will prevent repetition of many cases cited by the subcommittee in which RFC employees helped arrange loans and then turned up with high-paying jobs with the borrowing firm. One such case was that of John J. Hagerty, who helped arrange the $4,000,000 loan to the Waltham Watch Co. as manager of the Boston agency. He gave up his $10,000-a-year RFC job to become president of Waltham at $30,000 a year. When Waltham closed despite the loan, Mr. Hagerty went back to RFC as an assistant to the directors. Another was that of E. Meri Young, named by the subcommittee as a $60,000-a-year expediter of RFC loans. He left an examiner's post to take jobs simultaneously with two borrowers, the Lustron Corp. and F. L. Jacobs Co. Still another was that of Allen Freese, who went from assistant controller of the RFC at $10,750 to a $22,500 job with the Texmass Petroleum Corp., for which the RFC had approved a $10,100,000 loan.)

VOTE BY THREE DIRECTORS

2. A rule requiring that at least three directors vote affirmatively to authorize any RFC loan of $1,000,000 or over.

(The subcommittee assailed the RFC for approving the controversial $10,100,000 Texmass loan by vote of only two directors. One voted against it, one refrained from vote and one was absent. This loan marked the RFC's first venture into the highly speculative oil business. Jesse Jones, who guided the RFC for many years as Federal Loan Administrator, refused even to consider loans to oil companies.)

3. A regulation requiring all lawyers and expediters representing prospective borrowers to register with the RFC.

(The subcommittee charged that such agents, many of them former RFC employees, appeared to have easy access to RFC officials and were reported to be promising to arrange RFC loans for a fee.)

4. A companion rule requiring that such agents have letters of authorization from their clients before being permitted to discuss pending cases with RFC officials.

(The subcommittee did not mention this matter, but Mr. Harber noted that it would prevent influence peddlers from gaining inside information on RFC affairs unless authorized by prospective borrowers to represent them. "We are trying to tell people they don't need lawyers or influence peddlers to represent them before RFC," he said. "If they go ahead and hire the wrong kind of agent, RFC is not to blame.")

ECONOMY PROGRAM

5. A thorough economy program aimed to streamline RFC operations and save more than $5,000,000 a year. Mr. Harber said the aim was "to make both ends meet"—although the RFC has always claimed its operations were profitable. The agency is dropping 978 employees in its Washington and field offices to save $4,375,000 a year. It has raised its interest rate on new loans from 4 to 5 percent to bring in $1,000,000 a year. It has also instituted application fees and now charges interest to borrowers who do not use the full amount of a loan within 4 months after it is approved.

(The subcommittee at its hearings last year charged that the RFC was actually operating at a loss although the agency claimed a sizable profit. The subcommittee's argument was based on the fact that the RFC itself pays no interest on surplus funds it has built up or on some funds provided by the Treasury. Theodore Herz, the subcommittee's accountant, contended that the RFC lost about $6,500,000 on its lending operations in 1949 when it claimed a profit of $6,226,000.)

6. A change in regulations to permit field agencies to make final decisions on all loans of less than $100,000 without submitting them to the board of directors.

(The subcommittee found fault with the previous practice under which field agencies could grant such small loans, but had to submit to the board for final review all such applications they wanted to object to. Subcommittee members accused the directors of overriding the field agencies too frequently to grant small loans which had no public interest.)

Mr. Harber said the RFC directors were also considering another move to foreclose against all borrowers as soon as their loans become delinquent. In the past, the directors have often extended the loans of borrowers who fell behind in their payments.

The RFC Chairman indicated that these reforms were already producing results.

One of the first lawyers to be ordered to register was Archibald Palmer, New Yorker and one-time attorney for Judith Coplon.

What Price Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address entitled "What Price Gold," delivered by Mr. Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash., before the Colorado Mining Association at Denver, Colo., on February 2, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE GOLD

(By Frank Lilly)

The names of "the six honest serving men" who, Rudyard Kipling says, "taught me all I knew," were "Where and What and When and Why and How and Who."

I propose on this occasion to let these "six honest serving men," individually and as a group, teach us what we should know about gold with particular reference to what the price should be.

This is not designed as an argument in behalf of the gold producer or of any monetary policy except as the facts, "hewed to the line," speak for themselves.

TWO DAYS AND SEVENTEEN YEARS AGO

It was 2 days and 17 years ago today that President Roosevelt issued the proclamation which fixed the United States Treasury price of gold at $35 an ounce. In this single sentence we have the Who, When, What, Where, and How—everything but the Why.

The Why runs back to August 1914 when, at the outset of the First World War, Great Britain went off gold as a war measure. To her everlasting credit, Great Britain made an honest effort, in 1925, to restore the gold standard which she had maintained for nearly 100 years, but, because she made the mistake of pricing her gold too low at $20.67 an ounce, she was again forced to go off gold in September 1931—not, be it noted, because she wanted to do so but because she did not have enough gold to back her currency.

GOLD PRICE ALWAYS RISES

No inconvertible paper currency can, in the very nature of things, be as good as gold, hence the value or price of gold always rises in terms of such devalued currency. So the price of gold in Great Britain rose from 85 shillings 12 pence, the equivalent of $20.67 an ounce, to 92 shillings 6 pence in the last quarter of 1931, to 118 shillings in 1932 and in November of 1933 to a high of 142 shillings 2 pence, or the equivalent of $34.91 an ounce.

The United States, in the meantime, had remained steadfastly on the gold standard, and, both before and after his election, President Roosevelt had insisted that he had no intention of "tampering with the currency"; which I firmly believe he meant. However,

circumstances alter cases and wise men change their minds.

Since Great Britain, in going off gold, gave gold a higher measure of value in that country than it had in the United States, our exports to Great Britain declined and our imports increased, with the result that we lost gold in settlement of trade balances to the extent of $446,219,397 in 1932 and another $173,445,507 up to April 1933, when an embargo was placed on gold exports.

THIRTY-FIVE DOLLARS A "LUCKY" FIGURE

Meanwhile, in the confusion and hysteria of the time, Congress passed, in a single day and without any debate, a law nationalizing gold and making it a crime for a private citizen to own or trade in gold. In May 1933 the United States entered the world gold market through the RFC and brought back, on a rising scale, some of the gold that we had lost at $20.67 an ounce. Finally, the price was arbitrarily set at $35 because that figure was considered a "lucky" number and not because any investigation had been made to determine whether or not the figure of $35 was a true and proper price. Prima facie evidence that $35 an ounce was not an adequate price is furnished by the fact that the President and his advisors in the Treasury Department have never subsequently made any attempt to restore the gold standard. As a matter of fact, neither the President nor any Treasury official has ever made an attempt either to provide for currency convertibility into gold at any other price or to determine what the United States price of gold should now be, although this country is strictly "isolationist" in adhering to a $35 price.

NICE BUSINESS FOR FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

In this connection, it is of interest to note that the gold, which by law must be turned into the United States Treasury, is not paid for directly by the Treasury. The procedure is for the Treasury to issue gold certificates, which are turned over to the Federal Reserve System, and receive in return Federal Reserve note currency that is then used by the Treasury to pay for the gold. Incidentally, the Federal Reserve banks, which are privately owned banks, operating under what amounts to a Government franchise, could, under the law, issue additional currency against gold to an amount equal to three times $35 an ounce, or a total of $140 of currency on each ounce. Nice business if the gold producer could get it.

It is only fair to point out that the Federal Reserve has not so far taken full advantage of this inflationary privilege, but they do not need to do so when, under their monopoly over our currency, they are realizing enormous profits in their use of what should really be the people's gold—your money by inalienable right. This is how it is being done, but the why lies in the fact that the public does not realize what has been done and is being done.

THE WHY OF HIGH PRICES

When gold convertibility was taken out of the monetary system, the brake which would have prevented, or at least slowed down, inflation was removed. The why of today's high price is uncontrolled, debt-based, printing-press currency that has in the last 17 years reduced the purchasing power of an ounce of gold to approximately one-third of $35.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that $35 may have been a fair and proper price for gold in 1934, it does not necessarily follow that it is a proper fit for 1951 any more than the sizes of hat, shoes and clothes that junior wore at that time would be proper for the young collegiate of today. Incidentally, try to get your wife to wear today the styles of 1934—just try it.

Junior has grown up, styles have changed and the world of today is as far removed from the world of a decade ago as the iron age was from the stone age. This is now a world of approximately 2,500,000,000 people—more than there have ever been before, despite the losses of World War II. This is the atomic age, combined with speed, unprecedented production and a high scale of living, all of which call for a reexamination and revaluation of former standards.

FOREIGN CURRENCY DEVALUATIONS

The monetary systems of every other country in the world have undergone tremendous changes. Some of them: China, Greece and Hungary, for example, have been forced into complete repudiation of their paper currencies. Italy has devalued its currency to a figure equivalent to $1,145 an ounce for gold and France, to $486.50. Russia devalued its currency 10 to 1 as of January 1, 1948, and revalued in gold on March 2, 1950. Great Britain devalued the pound sterling to the equivalent of $2.80 in September of 1949 and her example was followed by 40 other countries, chiefly in the sterling bloc.

So what? says the average United States citizen. Just this: These devaluations, because they have given gold a higher measure of value abroad, are the "why" this country has lost a total of over two and one-quarter billions of its gold since Great Britain's devaluation in September 1949. Few realize that this is equivalent to more than one-third of all the gold produced in this country during the last 150 years; or that the total loss during the last 6 months is nearly three times as much as this country lost from 1931 to 1933, the 2 years preceding the raising of the price of gold to $35. As a matter of fact, the average weekly loss during the past 6 months has been as much as is now produced in the United States in an entire year.

ONLY ABOUT 10-PERCENT GOLD BACKING OF TOTAL UNITED STATES MONEY SUPPLY

It is true that, despite these losses, we still have nearly 60 percent of the world's monetary gold. This does not, however, necessarily mean that we have enough in relation to our monetary needs. Actually, we have a gold backing equivalent to only a little over 10 percent of our total supply of money, including bank deposits, but not including many billions of Government bonds and other obligations that could be converted into currency. Incidentally, our total supply of gold on the basis of $35 an ounce would pay only about one-third of the annual budget now before Congress.

We must not forget that world trade operates exclusively on gold in the settlement of trade balances. We hear much about the preeminence of the dollar but the cold fact is that over a billion of the world's population now operates within the sterling bloc and nearly a billion in the Russian gold ruble bloc, both of which give gold a much higher measure of value in their economies than the $35 an ounce price we use in paying foreign trade balances.

UNITED STATES PAYS IN CHEAPLY VALUED GOLD

The United States is currently paying extraordinarily high prices for the world's commodities and paying for them in cheaply valued gold. A year ago an ounce of gold would, for example, have bought nearly 60 pounds of tin; today it will buy only a little over 15 pounds. Just why we should cut off our nose and spite our face by stubbornly refusing to utilize the purchasing power of gold demonstrated by other countries cannot be answered by any of Kipling's "honest serving men."

A part of the confusion over the price of gold lies in the fact that there are actually several prices for it; namely, (1) an exchange price, (2) a commodity price, and (3) a monetary price, which is the measure of value given gold in a nation's monetary system. The price in the United States is the same for all three. In Great Britain, however, the exchange price, which is officially controlled and essentially a fiction, is maintained at approximately $35. The commodity price paid by processors, jewelers, dentists, etc., is equivalent to about $60 an ounce. The monetary value, on the basis of legal parity, is $102.17 an ounce, according to figures furnished me by the United States Mint. In other words, Great Britain's two devaluations, the first in September 1931 and the second in September 1949, have given gold the same measure of value in that country has if the price of gold had been raised to $102.17 an ounce.

You have no doubt read several newspaper reports about people who have risked the loss of large sums of gold in their efforts to smuggle gold out of this country so as to dispose of it at a large profit in Great Britain, India, and other foreign countries. These facts speak for themselves as to the true price of gold abroad.

NO PROOF $70 WOULD BE PROPER PRICE

In the course of my study of the question of What Price Gold, I have asked a large number of well-informed men for an expression of opinion as to what the price should be. The great majority have replied "$70 an ounce"; but in no case has anyone attempted to justify that figure by relating it to such factors as purchasing power in commodities and/or wages, foreign devaluations, and world or United States monetary requirements.

It is interesting, and probably significant, to note that if the price of gold were related to the present purchasing power and wages the price here would be approximately the same as the figure of $102.17, which is the London equivalent, on a legal parity basis, of the United States price; for commodity prices and wages have, on the average, trebled over that of the period of 1934–38. Accordingly, to justify, on a comparative basis, a price of $70 an ounce for gold, both commodity prices and wages would have to be rolled back to 1939–44 averages.

GOLD PRICE MUST BE INCREASED OR ELSE

One thing, therefore, seems crystal clear: Either commodity prices and wages must be rolled back or the price of gold must be increased—unless, of course, we continue on down the path of inflation via a debt-based paper currency to bankruptcy and repudiation. I believe all thinking men must agree on this conclusion.

TIMES CALL FOR QUICK DETERMINATION

A free market for gold would probably be the best way to determine what the price of gold should be, but we seem to have waited too long for that and must, accordingly, resort to some plan that will permit quicker action. Under the circumstances, the suggestion of the American Mining Congress that the price be determined by a Monetary Commission, should, I believe, be carried out without further delay. As a matter of fact, why wouldn't it be proper for the Colorado Mining Association to act and itself appoint such a commission instead of merely suggesting?

HOW A PROPER PRICE COULD BE DETERMINED

It would, it seems to me, be possible to arrive at a reasonable conclusion on a proper price for gold by way of the following steps:

1. Determine just what this country's overhead is or, in other words, the amount required to meet our fixed charges and living requirements.

2. Determine how much production is needed to provide the income and profits necessary to meet those fixed charges.

3. Determine how much money is required to attain and maintain that necessary production, because such production would not be possible without an adequate amount of money.

4. Having decided how much money is necessary, proceed to make our money sound by backing it with a minimum 40 percent of gold and restoring the gold standard with convertibility of currency to gold.

Then, finally, if we do not now have enough gold to provide a 40-percent backing on the basis of $35 an ounce, or $70 an ounce, raise the price of gold to whatever figure is needed to give the necessary gold coverage to make our money sound.

THERE IS GOOD IN GOLD

Failure to use the atom bomb in the present world emergency can be justified on the grounds that its tremendous power to destroy is a two-edged sword. The power in gold, however, is constructive, and failure to use the larger measure of value inherent in it to attain and maintain the healthy economy that is a prerequisite to a peaceful world is not only inexcusable but comes close to being wicked. There is good in gold. Let's make the greatest possible use of it.

Why Not Try Christianity—Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an article entitled "Why Not Try Christianity—Now?" written by Dr. Clarence Poe, who is president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, one of the leading agricultural papers of the United States and which has an immense circulation. This article is followed by A Working Program For Peace, which supplements his discussion applying the principles of Christianity to our present world situation. I think this whole article is well worth perusing, and I trust that the suggestions which he makes will receive consideration in connection with the settlement of our international problems.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT TRY CHRISTIANITY—NOW?

(By Clarence Poe, president and editor, the Progressive Farmer)

A few weeks ago I was talking with one of the ablest women I have ever known. A woman of great practical judgment, she has inherited and is active in directing large business interests. She also has a deep and sound interest in all movements for the development of her State, our underprivileged classes, and the South as a whole. Somehow the talk turned to religion, and she used one unforgettable expression:

"Every time I have tried to do anything that Jesus tells us to do," she said very simply, "I have found that it works."

Very often since then, as wars and rumors of war have all but drowned out the Christian message of "peace on earth, good will to men," I have thought of this woman's matter-of-fact tribute to the everyday practicability of Christianity.

"When we try to do what Christ tells us to do—it works." And if it works in our personal relations, why should it not work in international relations? If putting Christianity into practice among individuals brings returns in peace and good will, why should not putting Christianity into practice among nations do so? In other words, why not try Christianity as a way out of the present un-Christian threat of world war III and world destruction?

This does not mean that we should stop or lessen our present efforts to arm America with weapons of war so long as we are threatened with weapons of war. But it does certainly mean that we should try Christianity—and keep on trying Christianity—as a means of preventing such a war.

We in America profess to be a Christian nation. So do the people of Britain and all Europe. The President of the United States often praises the Sermon on the Mount. So do our Senators and Congressmen and our diplomats. Why, then, should they not get down on their knees along with all our common people and pray in all sincerity, "By God's help we will try to learn—and then to use—Christ's way of dealing with the gigantic devastation and destruction that now threatens our human race."

Suppose we should with all our hearts try to find Christ's way, what conclusions would we reach? Every reader must answer that question for himself. I can report only what my own sincere efforts lead me to conclude for myself.

1. First of all, most of all, I believe we should have to act in a spirit of Love. God is love, we are told, and love is certainly the keynote of all Christ's teaching. The King of England gave the world its noblest Christmas 1950 message when he declared:

"If our world is to survive in any sense that makes survival worth while, it must learn to love, not to hate; to create, not to destroy."

Every move of our diplomacy, every effort to strengthen our armaments, would have to be tested by the yardstick, is this in harmony with the spirit of love—a spirit of love not only for our own Nation, but for all nations; not only for our own people, but for all peoples?" Because war always kills the innocent many along with the guilty few, how can any Christian nation justify it so long as there remains any Christian way to avoid it? Should we not say with General Marshall, "Wherever there is a conference table, the United States should be the first one at it and the last one to leave it"?

2. If we have Christ's spirit, must we not also say, "Always the only justifiable use of force is to repel the use of force"? We must arm to prevent other nations from using arms against us and we must use arms if arms attack us, but we must not be rushed into any unnecessary or so-called preventive war by any foolish talk that war is inevitable and that we should start it whenever we believe we can win it by slaughtering millions of poor, plain men and women in other lands who no more wish to kill us than we to kill them.

3. If we have the spirit of Christ, we Americans must also learn a new sympathy for suffering in other lands. Why should the average American farmer boast of his prosperity when he thinks 100 acres of God's earth too little for his family while millions in Asia have less than 2 acres per family? Why should American businessmen take the credit for a prosperity that is so largely due to the fact that the rich resources of our country are divided only among 150,000,000 people instead of one thousand million as they would be in Asia? Instead of boasting of our superiority to other peoples, should we not rather humbly pray in the language of the Psalmist—

"Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy Name give glory."

4. Furthermore, if we have the spirit of Christ, should we not be ready to spend out of our abundance, not merely for war and guns but to help the poverty-stricken millions abroad who live half-starved, die pitifully young, and go through life almost without hope, all because they lack the privileges God has given us? A truly great "Christian Alternative to World Destruction" is found in Senator BRIEN MCMAHON's proposal first made last spring, namely—

(1) That all nations reduce armament and spend two-thirds of their then war budgets for a world program of reconstruction, irrigation, education, health, industrial progress, and human welfare.

(2) That if other nations agree to do this, the United States would itself give ten billion for this purpose.

No other program our President or Congress or our people or our Christian churches can support would likely do so much to check the world-wide trend toward communism and war and instead set the governments of all nations upon a new era of hope and progress and peace. Ten billions so spent might save world peace, while 50,000,000,000 to wage war or prepare for world war III may (or may not) end only in world war IV or world suicide.

A WORKING PROGRAM FOR PEACE

We have just presented the general principles that we believe should be followed if we try to apply the principles of Christ to present world conditions. Next—

1. As for specific policies, we believe first of all that the United Nations is indeed the hope of the world, the only alternative for the recurred war system of settling international disputes, and that we must use it as the one great agency for promoting world peace. It can be made effective now by transferring any question from the Security Council, where Russia has a veto, to General Assembly, where there is no veto, and giving UN greater military power.

2. The next great need is to turn the energies and purposes of all nations from war and destruction to a great program of peace and progress by adopting some such plan as Senator MCMAHON's for world peace and reconstruction.

3. We must also make easier the efforts for peace by remembering that Christ never called sincere peacemakers "appeasers." Rather, He called them "the children of God." Also, our foreign policy should be truly nonpartisan and our President and generals must quit making decisions without fully consulting the peoples of Asia and Western Europe who would be the first to be overrun in case of war.

4. There are three fatal mistakes Russia wants us to make: (1) To get hopelessly bogged down by a war with China, (2) to lose the support of other UN nations by insisting on our own way about everything, and (3) to spend ourselves into bankruptcy by trying to get peace by guns without also using UN and the principles of Christianity to prevent war. We must not make any of these mistakes.

5. Peace in Korea might possibly be brought about by using almost exactly such principles and policies as Dr. Frank Graham used to bring about peace in Indonesia and the principles Dr. Ralph Bunche used in Palestine.

6. Finally, we should have faith that if we can only delay war, we may also prevent war from happening at all. We should remember that the plain people of all nations want peace, that Russian leaders and policies could possibly change, and that tyranny nearly always breeds rebellion—and eventually successful rebellion. We may also well remember that the stages of the Russian Revolution have been not unlike those of the French Revolution: (1) Confiscation of land by the peasants, (2) chopping off the heads of opposition leaders, and (3) repudiation of religion. Yet France soon greatly changed. So may Russia and China. History seems to say to us in America, "If you will not only keep strong but also support such a Christian program for world unity, peace, and progress, as Senator MCMAHON proposes, you may not only delay world war III but possibly prevent it from happening at all."

Fight or Get Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fight or Get Out," appearing in the Morning World-Herald, of Omaha, Nebr., on February 13.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHT OR GET OUT

Monday morning headlines related that the UN forces were back in Seoul.

But by Monday afternoon the Reds (Chinese and North Korean) had launched another thunderbolt, had smashed through the South Korean lines, and the UN divisions were tumbling backward all along the front.

So here we go again, up and down the peninsula. First one side grabs the ball and runs to the 5-yard line. Then a spectacular goal-line stand, and the other tide takes the ball and runs back up the field.

In football this see-saw business can be very exciting. But in Korea men are being killed. Thousands of them in every offensive. And so far as can be observed from the side lines, nothing is being accomplished—nothing, at any rate, which is worth the cost in American lives.

The people and their Congress have been very patient. They have accepted the view that their leaders—military and diplomatic—knew what they were doing and that their plans would bear fruit in due season.

But the further the campaign proceeds, the more difficult it becomes to maintain that sublime confidence.

Two articles of American policy in Korea simply do not wash.

The first is the determination of the State Department to keep Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek out of the war. Chiang has an army variously estimated at from 300,000 to 600,000 men on Formosa. Some of them are experienced and well-equipped troops, eager to fight. Others need only American arms to make them formidable fighting units. But all of them are kept immobile on Formosa because the State Department does not wish to sully its lily-white fingers by joining hands with Chiang.

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican leader of the House, discussed this issue yesterday in his Lincoln Day address in Brooklyn, and asked the question which must have occurred to millions of bewildered Americans:

"What kind of logic is it that lets our soldiers die in Korea when, by shipping the proper supplies to the Generalissimo, a second front could be opened in China without a single GI being forced to place a foot on the soil of the Chinese mainland?"

The second incomprehensible article of this country's Korean policy is the continued coddling of the Chinese Communists.

After weeks of nervous debate, the United Nations finally was persuaded to pass a resolution which timidly avowed that the Reds had committed an act of aggression. But there the matter lies. There has been no retaliation. Neither in trade nor in military ways has China been made to suffer. Even nations which voted for the aggressor resolution are still doing business with the enemy, and apparently the State Department is so weak, so lacking in good American qualities, that it does not even dare to protest.

If American soldiers are to be kept on Korea, they should be backed to the limit by their Government. They should have all the support, military and diplomatic, that their countrymen can give them.

If Washington is not ready to give them that kind of support, it should recall them from Korea at once.

In other words, America should fight or get out.

The young men on Korea should be supported, or they should be evacuated.

American blood should not be poured out in a seemingly endless series of inconclusive campaigns up and down the Korean Peninsula.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rushing for Seaway Bandwagon," published in the Detroit News of February 4, 1951; an editorial entitled "Senator DOUGLAS Scores Again," published in the Springfield (Ill.) State Register of February 6, 1951; an editorial entitled "Bringing the Ocean Closer to South Dakota," published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader of February 6, 1951; and an editorial entitled "The Seaway Again," published in the Cincinnati Inquirer of February 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News of February 4, 1951]

RUSHING FOR SEAWAY BANDWAGON

Like a glacier suddenly enlivened by the big thaw, the inch-by-inch progress of the 40-year-old St. LAWRENCE seaway project has quickened to a pace daily more like that of an avalanche.

Rumblings of this movement begin to be heard throughout the land. Widening cracks are seen in the opposition so long solidly effective.

The time clearly has come for Michigan Congressmen and citizens to put their backs into boosting the movement's gathering headway. Now, if ever, opportunity is frantically beckoning. This 40-year-old dream of a deep-draft channel connecting the Great Lakes with tidewater and the oceans at last shows signs of coming true.

Stalin, it can be said, may be bringing to pass what both Hitler and the Kaiser failed to accomplish.

After each world war the fact was noted and attested by highest authority that neglect to build the dams and locks to flood out the St. Lawrence Rapids had prolonged the fighting. Lack of the seaway had denied to national defense the use of Great Lakes shipyards. It had multiplied difficulties of transporting war materials abroad and critical raw materials inland.

Lacking the seaway, the Nation had denied itself the ability to bring to bear on the enemy its maximum potential efficiency. It was much as though we had deliberately handicapped ourselves by partially blocking New York Harbor.

However, after each war, it was said this was the last. Hopeful of peace everlasting, those jealous of the seaway's promise of opening a great new trade route quickly resumed efforts to stop it at any cost.

This time history may not have to repeat itself. This time, at last, we may see to the development of our greatest remaining natural resource, before war comes.

The change is due as much as anything to Stalin's known possession of the most formidable submarine fleet of all time.

Along with that, it has been noted that Lake Superior iron deposits, depleted by two World Wars, cannot stand another one. If not, via the seaway from the newly discovered Labrador-Quebec deposits, the needed ore must be brought from overseas. It is either the seaway or exposure of the chief essential of our national defense to the hazards of undersea attack.

It has taken facts like these to inspire the Ohio State Chamber of Commerce to reconsider its traditional opposition to the project.

It was the facts, and patriotism, that induced Chairman BUCKLEY of the House Public Works Committee to announce after the recent White House conference, his conversion to the seaway. He comes from New York City and, like others in that hotbed of jealous opposition, heretofore has fought the project.

These are the signs, now accumulating, of what may achieve the irresistible power of an avalanche. But it still needs pushing, as those of us well know who recall how readily self-interest distorted and dismissed the facts of 1918 and 1945.

Now is the time for this Great Lakes region to throw off the habit of defeat and demand the project on which its own industrial future, no less than the safety of the Nation, depends.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State Register of February 6, 1951]

SENATOR DOUGLAS SCORES AGAIN

Newsmen and radio commentators are kept busy by the tremendous constructive activities of United States Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois. He has been talked and written about in connection with a variety of responsibilities, including Secretary of State and President of the United States.

The press story suggesting that Senator DOUGLAS is one of a number being considered as successor to former Senator "Happy" Chandler as high commissioner of baseball, while complimentary, is not to be taken too seriously. The Senator cannot be spared from the battle front of statesmanship.

One of the most recent public declarations of Senator DOUGLAS was as cosponsor of the bill for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

On this subject Senator DOUGLAS makes a specific six-point presentation of conclusions which command favorable public consideration and official action.

The Illinois Senator analyzes this project from the viewpoints of navigation, war supplies, national defense and that transcendent fundamental—to supply low-cost power to defense industries. Expansion in the northeast States will be seriously limited without this new source of power, as he points out.

Senator DOUGLAS has dared to strike a blow for liberty on a highly controversial issue which always arises when low-cost power is advocated. The expression is anathema to what has long been called the power trust.

It was the courage and initiative of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in advocating low-cost power and conservation of hydroelectric resources in New York State when he was Governor which placed him in line for the Presidency of the United States.

There may be a parallel in the Douglas case, but Senator DOUGLAS is placing the welfare of the people and the safety of the Nation, as well as the peace of the world, above all considerations which relate to his own personal and political welfare.

In Senator DOUGLAS today the State and Nation are recognizing masterful leadership which is finding favor with unprejudiced authorities on the fundamentals of government throughout America.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader of February 6, 1951]

BRINGING THE OCEAN CLOSER TO SOUTH DAKOTA

From a reader who knows much about transportation comes the suggestion that the Argus-Leader give full endorsement to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway.

"You can help South Dakota a lot by supporting it," he writes.

Support of this project by the Argus-Leader would represent no change in thought on the part of this newspaper because we supported it some years ago when it was actively in limelight.

The reason for endorsement, of course, was the manner in which it would affect South Dakota beneficially in respect to transportation.

The St. Lawrence waterway project would make it possible for ocean vessels to reach the Great Lakes. This would mean that Duluth, Minn., actually would be an ocean port. Thus in effect the ocean would be that much closer to South Dakota, including the cheap water rates that prevail. Such a development would be helpful to the commerce of this State generally as well as to other inland States in the area of the Great Lakes.

The project is in the foreground again because President Truman has suggested prompt action in respect to it.

As a result, discussion of the project is again widespread.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, for example, refers to it as "costly hoax." But its special concern is well exemplified by one statement in its editorial, as follows:

"By diverting ocean traffic, including iron ore, to the Great Lakes, the seaway would cause untold losses to eastern United States ports, including Philadelphia."

But what would be Philadelphia's loss in this respect would be the gain of Duluth, South Dakota, and many other inland areas.

The Argus-Leader cannot agree, however, with President Truman's contention that immediate construction is in order as a defense measure. Years would be required to complete the project and its development would interfere with other more necessary and vital undertakings. And the cost would be at least $1,500,000,000.

So, let's forget about it for the present. But let's keep it in mind as a desirable project for the future.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 6, 1951]

THE SEAWAY AGAIN

The recurrent issue of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project comes to the fore again at a moment when its possible uses for national defense purposes are more engaging than ever before.

Powerful political and economic issues are involved in the project—as previously—but it seems to us that now if ever is the time to examine the proposal strictly on its material merits and in terms of its actual usefulness in continental defense.

Inland steel producers, including such imposing figures as W. W. Seebald, president of the Armco Steel Corp., have argued that unless the navigation phase of the St. Lawrence seaway is completed, the steel industry of the central United States will be starved for lack of quality ores, since the Mesabi Range bordering on Lake Superior is nearing depletion. If the seaway is completed, it would give the ore fleet of the Great Lakes access to the new and immense deposits in Labrador, via the St. Lawrence River, which at present will not accommodate deep-draft vessels at its mouth. This surely is a matter in which expert opinion is available, and therefore a decision could be made on the basis of practical need.

There are other, and for the moment possibly more important questions, of course. One is how long it would take to accomplish the project and how much of a diversion of manpower and materials it would require from the more pressing tasks of national defense. If it would not seriously conflict with the immediate needs of national defense and could be carried to completion within a relatively short space of years, it certainly recommends itself. On the other hand, if it cannot be finished inside of a decade or a decade and a half, and meanwhile would be in serious conflict with more urgent defense tasks, it certainly does not recommend itself.

All of these are questions which can be answered factually, and should be answered factually.

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on January 19, 1951, the Washington Daily News contained two excellent articles and the Washington Star an editorial on the wonderful work being done by the Preparedness Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I ask that the articles and editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 19, 1951]

PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE CHARGES AIR FORCE HOARDS MEN

The Senate Preparedness Committee today accused the Air Force of Hoarding the best of the Nation's available manpower.

"This must stop," the committee said in a report charging overcrowding at the Lackland (Tex.) Air Force Base.

It blamed the overcrowding on Air Force greed for the elite of the Nation's manhood. The committee, headed by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas) said the Air Force made a deliberate effort in December and January "to enlist beyond its capacity too great a share of the good material available."

The result, it said, was that 68,731 men and women were crowded into a base which can accommodate only 27,500 and men who might have made "invaluable" Army officers are now Air Force privates.

"STOP STOCKPILING"

"This is an illustration of the wrong kind of stockpiling," the committee said. "We don't have enough men for one service to build itself up as a mentally and physically elite corps. This must stop."

Accordingly, it demanded that all services hereafter draw their men from a single draft pool.

The Senate investigators said they found that conditions at Lockland were substandard, but concluded that "no undue hardship to enlisted personnel resulted from the housing, clothing, food, or medical care offered at the base."

They scuttled rumors of a pneumonia epidemic killing off men at the base, saying that only two deaths had occurred there in 18 months—one from an accident, one from cancer.

The investigators found that, because of congestion, 5,653 men were living in tents with dirt floors and thousands still were wearing civilian clothes. But they had abundant and good food and medical care, they said. There was "no evidence of oppressive discipline" and morale was high, but there were some "cry babies," the committee said.

CAPTAIN ROTH CRITICIZED

The committee castigated Capt. Myron Roth, base public information officer, for claiming without substantiating evidence that subversives had spawned the rumors about conditions at Lackland. It said Captain Roth's explanation was a "direct affront and served to discredit the Lackland command."

The report absolved the base command of any wrong doing, saying full guilt falls on Air Force headquarters here for a grab-the-best enlistment policy which is irresponsible and merits censure.

It said the policy was an inexcusable breach of the unification law and "was deliberately contrived to deprive the other services of manpower." The committee said this is reprehensible.

"The Air Force's apparent unconcern for the other services is not merely a rebuff to the spirit of unification, it is also an attitude detrimental to the best interests of the Nation," the committee said.

Despite appeals by base officers to headquarters to slow up enlistments, the committee said, it was not until January 16 that enlistments finally were suspended. By that time, it said, the base was hopelessly overcrowded and there was a complete breakdown in basic training.

"The Air Force," it concluded, "hoarded far more manpower than it was prepared to utilize. The committee is inclined to believe the Air Force knew what it was doing and, from all indications, did it for a calculated purpose."

COMMON POOL

It said if there ever was "a persuasive argument for compelling all the services to draw their manpower from a common pool through selective service, this performance by the Air Force is it."

Declaring that "we don't want any more Lackland situation arising," the committee said it is investigating indoctrination stations and camps for all three services. It said inquiries are under way at Fort Dix, N. J.; Camp Chaffee, Ark.; Fort Knox, Ky.; Camp Breckenridge, Ky.; Fort Jackson, S. C.; Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; Fort Riley, Kans.; Camp Roberts, Calif.; and Fort Ord, Calif., all Army installations.

Also being investigated are the Navy's Newport (R. I.) Indoctrination center, Great Lakes (Ill.) Training Station, and San Diego (Calif.) Naval Station, and the Air Force's Sampson (N. Y.) Air Force Base, and Sheppard (Tex.) Air Force Base, and the Marine Corps Parris Island (S. C.) Base, and San Diego Marine Recruiting Barracks.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 19, 1951]

HOW LACKLAND INVESTIGATION BEGAN

(By Marshall McNeil)

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Preparedness

Committee, told in an exclusive interview today the inside story of how his group investigated the Air Force's greedy and irresponsible handling of enlisted men at Lackland Air Force Base near San Antonio.

The technique used in this case is SOP—standard operating procedure—for the committee.

"I got the first complaint from a New England Senator," Senator JOHNSON said. "Then I got a couple of letters myself. I read them to Air Force officials in a closed session of our committee, asking them to check on the situation by telephone. They didn't do that. So we moved in."

FOUR PROBERS

First, Senator JOHNSON sent four investigators to Lackland, with orders to present their credentials to the commander. They did. The commander invited them to lunch. They declined.

"Instead, they dressed in Air Force uniforms and lived among the boys, in their crowded, uncomfortable, inadequate quarters, mostly tents," the Senator went on.

By letter and word of mouth there had been many wild rumors out of Lackland: stories about such overcrowding and substandard conditions as led to suicides, many deaths from pneumonia, poor food, and inadequate medical care. Sons had complained to their mothers, mothers their Senators. Senators raised cain with Air Force headquarters. Nothing much happened. There was an effort to brush off the whole thing as subversive rumors from some nebulous fifth column.

SLEPT ON COTS

"The four investigators slept on cots, sometimes without mattresses," Senator JOHNSON said. "Oh, sure, it was better than a frozen foxhole in Korea, but nevertheless darned uncomfortable—and inefficient, too, if you're trying to indoctrinate a young man with the idea that he is a vital cog in our Armed Forces."

Each night an investigator would telephone Washington and dictate a report to a stenographer in the Johnson office here.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 19, 1951]

WRONG WAY TO MOBILIZE

Strong language was used by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's Preparedness Subcommittee in reporting on overcrowding at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas, but the group's findings justify strong language. Although rumors of deplorable health and morale conditions proved to be unfounded, the subcommittee was shocked by the chaos created at the base by what the investigators described as the Air Force's "greed for the best of the Nation's available manpower."

The "inexcusable waste of manpower caused by the selfishness of the Air Force"—as the subcommittee put it—resulted in the jamming of 68,731 men at one time into a training camp with a rated emergency capacity of only 27,500. The inevitable happened. Thousands of recruits had to be housed in hastily erected tents, hundreds of them without floors, stoves, or lights. During part of last month many of the men slept on canvas cots without mattresses and with insufficient covering. Bathing and shaving facilities were overtaxed. Serious clothing shortages developed. (It was during this period that rumors were circulated that the hardships had caused numerous deaths from pneumonia or from suicide. Actually there had been no deaths from either cause.)

More serious than the discomforts of the men was the complete collapse of the training program for which the men were sent to Lackland. It became utterly impossible to give the recruits the preliminary training which is so important to soldiers or flyers. Undisclosed numbers of Air Force recruits were sent on to advanced bases under the handicap of little or no indoctrination. The subcommittee exonerated the Lackland command of blame for the mess, after it was shown that Washington had ignored repeated protests from the base. "What this adds up to is, bluntly," said the report, "that the Air Force made a deliberate effort to enlist beyond its capacity too great a share of the good material available." It was unfair hoarding of manpower by one service at a time when the Army was seeking good material, too. This destructive form of interservice competition is the reverse of the teamwork which unification was supposed to bring. The Defense Department should take whatever steps are necessary to prevent a recurrence of the mistakes of Lackland—including the mistake of trying to cover up the facts in misleading press releases.

The FBI Agent Who Cannot Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "The FBI Agent Who Cannot Quit," by Carol Hughes, which appeared in the February issue of Coronet:

THE FBI AGENT WHO CANNOT QUIT

(by Carol Hughes)

One day back in 1901, President Theodore Roosevelt was taking his daily horseback ride through Washington's Rock Creek Park. On duty in the park was Joseph F. Amos, a Negro mounted policeman whom the President knew.

On this day, Amos summoned his nerve and approached the Chief Executive. "Mr. President," he said hopefully, "I have a young son, but he's beyond my control. I know Jim's an all-right boy, Mr. President, and I wondered if you knew of a job he could get."

Roosevelt smiled. "Amos," he said, "you just send that boy around to me—I'll control him."

Like a startled deer, young Jim Amos popped from the bushes where he had been hiding to have his first close look at his future boss. If the most kindly fairy had waved her magic wand over his head that day, she could hardly have granted him a more fortunate future. For that was the beginning of a career that was to make him an almost intimate member of a President's household, and one of the most distinguished Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

For almost 11 years, James E. Amos was closer to "Teddy" Roosevelt than almost any man who entered the White House. He was a "nursemaid" to the Roosevelt children, a second butler at all state dinners, and finally was a bodyguard, major domo, friend, and idolator of the President. He was alone in the room with the ex-President's head cradled in his arms when the great man died.

As a trusted member of Roosevelt's staff, Amos came in contact with Washington's top statesmen, politicians, ambassadors, citizens. From this coveted position, he went on to one of the Nation's highest posts of trust and honor. Jim has been Special Agent Amos of the FBI for almost 30 years.

In his years with the FBI, Jim has played many roles, encountered many dangers, engaged in many secret cases. He has risked his life often; known much high adventure; and is today one of the firearms experts in the FBI.

There isn't a gun in existence that Jim Amos can't take apart blindfolded and put back together again. When Federal legislation finally permitted FBI men to carry guns, Jim assisted in training the men, and in setting up safety rules for the firing range. The final test of Amos' ability lies in the fact that J. Edgar Hoover has three times petitioned the President of the United States to retain Amos in the service, after he had passed the mandatory retirement age.

The bright young Negro boy who appeared in the President's office on that July day back in 1901 could hardly foresee what the future held for him. After serving first as nursemaid to the six lively and adventurous Roosevelt children, Jim moved up the White House ladder to the great dining room. Here, where State secrets were discussed, Jim quickly learned to keep his ears open and his mouth shut. So well did he do both jobs that he was soon Roosevelt's almost constant companion. Today he says: "Mr. Roosevelt was not only my employer, he was also my dear friend to whom I could always go with my most personal troubles. I loved him deeply and served him, I hope, faithfully."

When the President retired to his home at Oyster Bay, he insisted that Amos leave his service and go on to more profitable enterprises. But Jim always remained subject to call, and when finally Roosevelt knew that his time was short, he sent for his faithful friend.

No one else could quite handle the sick old Rough Rider. From then on, Jim never left the room at night. On the final night, Amos heard Roosevelt breathing irregularly. He went to the bed and held the ex-President's head in his arms until he breathed his last.

Jim entered the FBI in 1921, working at Washington headquarters. His main duties were encoding and decoding confidential messages and handling important mail. These duties gave him an enviable view of the entire operation of the fledgling bureau, and when he graduated to field work Jim was ready.

In hundreds of cases over the years, Amos has proven invaluable in tracking down his man. J. Edgar Hoover says: "He has sources and contacts enjoyed by few other agents in the service."

In the case of Ralph Richards, a bandit as well known for his escapes as for his armed robberies, Jim took up the trail when it seemed hopeless and finally located his quarry in Mount Vernon, N. Y. Richards was arrested, and Jim went on to other affairs.

Soon thereafter the call went out for Amos again, Richard had escaped. Week after week Jim investigated every clue, followed every lead. Finally he found Richards in a mid-Manhattan rooming house, and called for another agent to aid him in making the arrest.

As they entered the room it was the quick thinking, along with the agile body of Amos that saved both agents' lives. Amos, in the lead, saw the fugitive's hand dart under his pillow. Jim leaped from the door to the bed to land on his prisoner. Under the pillow was a .45 automatic.

On another occasion Amos found it necessary to arrest his prisoner without the aid of a second agent. As Jim moved in on the vicious hoodlum he handed over the warrant and stood there unarmed, waiting for the man to read it. "You don't think I'm going with you?" said the thug contemptuously.

Amos looked at him calmly. "What does that warrant say?"

The hoodlum said, "To bring me or my body."

Without changing expression Amos said, "Make up your mind."

The hoodlum went.

Today Amos' fabulous knowledge of criminals has made him a favorite of law-enforcement officers from coast to coast. For years he served as liaison between the New York field division of the FBI and the New York City Police Department. And although Jim as special agent has performed many services for the Negro people, there has never been any tendency on the part of the Bureau to make this a specialized duty. Today Jim looks back and chuckles over two of his favorite big cases—involving so-called Negro saviors.

One was the spectacular Garvey, who called himself the "provisional president of Africa"—leader of the colored races of the world. Jim was almost a rookie when he was assigned, in 1923, to get evidence to convict the swindler who had raised millions of dollars to transport his people back to their home land. Garvey was selling stock in the Black Star Line, a corporation having for its purpose "the acquisition of steamships to transport to Africa members of the Negro race who would build the promised land."

Amos knew that Garvey's fraud appealed to many honest Negroes, so plodding ly he set out to become friendly with some of Garvey's followers, and to collect evidence of how money was collected and spent. Amos sent his man to 5 years in Atlanta Penitentiary, and thought his case was finished. But when word drifted back that Garvey yearned to start all over again, Amos got deportation papers for the swindler. When Garvey left prison, he was shuttled to the British West Indies—and Amos went on to nab his successor in Harlem.

This time it was "Father Abraham," who was passing himself off as the reincarnated Lord and speaking a gibberish that he told his disciples was the ancient Hebrew tongue. "Father Abraham" had established temples for his followers in which they could live free if they signed over all their worldly goods.

Jim kept him under surveillance while digging back into his past. He discovered that Abraham was a native of Georgia, where he had worked as a waiter. When Abraham began to transport young girls to his temples in New Jersey, he was arrested on white-slavery charges.

Although eligible for retirement as far back as 1941, Amos did not quit because of a special request from Hoover that he be allowed to remain on duty. A pleasant-faced keen-eyed man with graying hair, Amos at 70 does not appear to be more than 50 years old.

In all Jim's years of service, there have been a few times when heart ruled his head, but never to the detriment of the Bureau. One of the occasions involved one of the biggest cases he ever worked on. He was sent to the Midwest to join some 20 picked fellow agents in an investigation of a white-slave ring.

Amos soon unearthed a woman who went by the picturesque name of "Stack of Dollars," and persuaded her to act as undercover agent. With her help, Amos was able to turn over information which aided the FBI in netting 87 suspects who were later convicted on charges of protecting white slavers and dope peddlers.

During another white slave investigation in the East, Amos met a madame who freely answered all questions, until he began to inquire about her background. Finally, as Jim persisted, she broke down. She said she was willing to testify, that she knew she would have to go to jail, but would he grant her one favor. A 16-year-old daughter who knew nothing of her mother's life was coming home that night from boarding school and the mother would be in jail. She pleaded with Jim to meet her daughter at the train and take her home.

Jim was a very busy man that day. He helped transport the prisoners to the United States attorney's office in Trenton, N. J., filed his reports, and finished his day. Then Jim took a train for Philadelphia to meet an unsuspecting girl. He escorted her home and followed the mother's instructions to the letter. And to this day the girl knows nothing of her mother's past.

In presenting Special Agent Amos with a 25-year-service award, Mr. Hoover said: "The unselfish and willing contribution of hard work and personal sacrifices which you have made in the Bureau's behalf have earned for you a distinct share in whatever accomplishments it can claim. I should like you to accept this key as an expression of my gratitude and appreciation for your splendid services, and with a wish that, through our continued association, I shall be able to make a similar award to you on your thirtieth anniversary."

Jim Amos, who has lost none of the spirit of enthusiasm he has always shown in his work, is quite sure he will get his thirtieth-anniversary key. For as J. Edgar Hoover says: "He wears with distinction and honor of 'fidelity, bravery, integrity.'"

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the sixteenth and subsequent short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

SULEIMAN: SULTAN OF TURKEY AND REFORMER OF CIVIL AND MILITARY LAW (A. D. 1494–1566)

Suleiman (1494–1566) was known in Turkey as the lawgiver. His claims as a legislator rest mainly on his organization of the Ulema, or clerical (religious) class, in its hierarchical order. The judges belonged to this class, while all executive and administrative power remained in the hands of the military.

He inaugurated a new system for feudal tenures and improved the lot of his Christian subjects.

Suleiman also is remembered for his encouragement of learning and the arts. He wrote verses and it is from his time that historians note the rise of the influence of the harem and Turkish political development.

His plaque was done by Joseph Kiselewski, a New York City sculptor.

GROTIUS: DUTCH STATESMAN AND AUTHOR OF THE FIRST TREATISE ON INTERNATIONAL LAW (A. D. 1583–1645)

Grotius (1583–1645) was an extraordinary man. He wrote Latin verse at the age of 9, was ready for the university at 12 and at 15 edited an exhaustive work on Martianus Capella.

The Dutch jurist wrote important books on theology, history, and classical subjects, but gained his most lasting fame from writing the "De Jure Belli et Pacis"—considered the first definitive text on international law.

The work is a study of the principles of positive "natural" law. It recognizes that prior to any political organization, there still exists law, based on reason and the nature of man as a social being.

The Grotius plaque was done by Paul Jennewein, of New York City.

COLBERT: REFORMER OF THE FRENCH LEGAL SYSTEM (A. D. 1619–83)

Colbert (1619–1683) was the chief power in the administration of Louis XIV. His influence was felt in several fields of government. He overhauled the financial administration of France, including tax levying and collecting. He instituted rigid controls over production in both industry and agriculture.

His most lasting achievement was the establishment of the French marine. Not a champion of personal liberty, Colbert ordered judges to sentence as many men as possible to the oar to supply oarsmen for his galleys.

He reformed certain aspects of the judiciary by reducing the length and expense of trials and codifying ordinances.

The Colbert plaque was sculptured by Laura Gardin Fraser of Westport, Conn.

POTHIER: ANOTHER FRENCH JURIST (A. D. 1699–1772)

Pothier, Robert Joseph (1699–1772) was a French judge and professor of law. He studied law for the purpose of qualifying for the magistracy and was appointed judge of the presidial court of Orleans in 1720.

His "Pandectae Justininae in Novum Ordinem Digestae" is considered a classic in the study of Roman law. He wrote many monographs on French law, much of which was incorporated almost textually in the French Code Civil.

The Pothier plaque was done by Joseph Kiselewski, of New York City.

Two Ways To Do a Job: The Easy Way and the Washington Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leslie Gould, financial editor, in the New York Journal-American on the proposed ceilings on motor gasoline octane numbers:

HIGH OCTANE GAS CUT-BACK: TRUMAN WAY OR EASY WAY?

(By Leslie Gould)

There are two ways to do a job. The easy way and the Washington way.

A case in point is the Washington move to reduce civilian consumption of tetraethyl lead—the stuff that gives more power and zip to gasoline. If there is too little tetraethyl lead in your gasoline your car motor will ping or knock.

Instead of ordering a flat, across-the-board percentage cut in the amount of tetraethyl lead each company can have, Washington is dreaming up a ceiling on the octane rating of gasoline.

Under this proposal, premium gasoline must not have an octane rating in excess

of 90, intermediate grades, 86, and regular, 84.

This would require policing and checking, and in the end it might not save any lead. For motorists with cars requiring higher octane gas would move up from the regular grade to the intermediate or to the premium. Even those who can get by with a lower quality gas could make the shift to the better grade.

Such an order also would put a ceiling on individual company competition—for there would be no point in seeking improvements in gas quality. The ceilings are there, and a company could not exceed them.

The sound and easy way to handle it would be to cut everyone back 12½ to 15 percent in their use of tetraethyl lead, and how they use what lead they receive would be their business.

Each company would be on its own in research, and competition to improve the product would continue. There would be an incentive to find new and better ways for improving gas quality.

Another thing which an octane rating ceiling ignores is the effect of altitude on motor performance. Each thousand feet of elevation is equivalent to two octane numbers. A car at sea level using 90-octane premium gas would need at 2,000 feet altitude only 89-octane gas for the same performance.

A national ceiling on octane rating would mean nothing, and if there were a rush to premium grade, the next step would be rationing. That is what the Washington boys want anyway—full regimentation of the country.

To date, price control is a joke—but not funny, "ha, ha," as far as the average housewife is concerned. This kind of restriction as proposed for the oil industry would be about the same thing.

Civilian use of tetraethyl lead is about 370,000,000 pounds annually. Military aviation use currently is around 50,000,000 pounds. The stockpiling boys, who have been awful slow in accmulating almost everything, want 24,000,000 pounds set aside in the next 6 months. This would mean a cut-back of 12½ percent.

Will it be done the Truman way or the easy way?

Utilization of Western Land and Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult decisions to make during a time of threatened or real international disturbances is just how far we should go in continuing our programs to build those facilities which make for the development of our domestic economy. It is difficult because the intelligent citizens of America know that it is absolutely necessary to dispose of a common enemy. However, at the same time intelligent citizens of our Nation also appreciate the fact that if, in the disposing of a common enemy, there is a possibility of jeopardizing those values which make us desire the disposition of such common enemy we may not long continue to have the desire which causes us to be virile in the first place.

One of the problems confronting the people of the reclamation States—that is, the 17 Western States of the Nation—at this time, is the extent to which they should go to press their wishes in regard to continued construction of authorized projects, new authorizations, and new construction.

Recently, Judge Clifford H. Stone, one of the outstanding authorities on reclamation and irrigation, made a statement before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In my opinion, the logic of it demands the reading and study of Members of Congress. Accordingly, I am having it placed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that Members of Congress, especially those from the East, will understand the position of their fellow citizens of the West concerning the continuing development of this great storehouse of our Nation's natural resources.

STATEMENT BY CLIFFORD H. STONE, OF DENVER, COLO., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 14, 1951

It is a great honor and privilege to appear once again before this committee of the House of Representatives. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is concerned with prospects for continued prosecution of the country's program for the development, conservation, and utilization of western water and land resources. I, too, am concerned with the self-same matter.

I venture to address you today—not in my capacity as director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, nor in my capacity as vice chairman of the Upper Colorado River Commission, nor even in my capacity as first vice president of the National Reclamation Association. I speak to you rather as a citizen of the West, as one who has been living close to western water problems for more years than it may be wise to remember and, finally, as one who has been urged by his friends to make this statement today.

I do not propose to speak to you today of any particular interest that I may have in the authorization and in appropriations for one or another great reclamation project. For this is an occasion when we may not devote ourselves to the interests of one or another State or group of States. The answers to the question which is before this committee and before the country today transcend the interests of any one State, or group of States. They affect the interests of all 17 Western States. It is no exaggeration to say that they may well affect directly the economic welfare, strength, and survival of the Nation. They affect the interests of our Territories and insular possessions as well. Indeed, they go further than that. They affect the entire world.

The question I pose to you members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and, through you, to the Congress of the United States of America is this: What about the Federal reclamation program in this and in the years to come?

Now, I am well aware that one possible answer to such a question can consist simply in an expressive shrug of the shoulders, signifying hopelessness, accompanied by a reference to perilous world conditions, to the need for immense expenditures, both at home and abroad, and to the slight prospect, in the light of these conditions and of this need, for the authorization of new projects and for adequate appropriations for projects authorized or under construction. I have, however, too great a respect for this committee and for our great legislative branch of the Federal Government, to expect that I shall ever hear in these halls the counsel of despair that would be inherent in such an answer. The people of this Nation look to this committee and to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate for something better than that. I have referred to the Nation as a whole; for, remember, this cannot properly be viewed as a sectional program.

No doubt, every member of this committee has a better grasp of world conditions than I have. Yet I doubt that any one of you can say whether we shall be at war on a large scale tomorrow, or the next day, or 10, or 20 years hence. We may well continue in our present state of feverish preparation for years to come. Does this mean that the Federal reclamation program is to be virtually abandoned for such a period—whatever it may be? The blow to our economic system that would result from such a shut-down might well be beyond the endurance of the 17 Western States. It might well be reflected, too, in adverse economic effects on the country as a whole. Furthermore, quite aside from the economic disaster that would follow such a shut-down, there are other reasons why I think this country cannot afford an affirmative reply to that question.

It is authoritatively reported that the population of our country, during the period 1920–50, has increased by more than 40 percent. And the trend is even higher. But what about the rest of the world? Well—the same thing seems to be happening elsewhere. In many other parts of the world, according to an article published by the Population Reference Bureau, here in Washington, populations will more than double within the next 25 to 50 years.

It becomes clear, then, that the time is not far ahead when we shall be hard put to it to fulfill our domestic needs for the products of agriculture. It is clear, too, that the time lies not too far ahead—if, indeed, it is not already here—when we may need to ship food and fiber abroad in ever increasing quantities. We can strengthen the democratic governments abroad by shipments of food and fiber, as well as by the shipment of guns. Yet, we cannot maintain adequate food supplies for our own increasing population, at endurable prices, much less make needed shipments abroad, unless we continue to build our agricultural economic strength at home by continuing the programs of land and water resource development.

I have not said these things because I believe that we should seek to do the impossible. I realize full well that budgetary conditions may become such, from time to time, as to indicate the need for some retrenchment of domestic expenditures, including expenditures for reclamation, until most urgent defense requirements are met. The 17 Western States can and will do their patriotic bit to bear that part of the bitter fruit of man's apparent lack of capacity to wage peace as well as war. But—remember this—we cannot afford, by reductions in appropriations for projects authorized or under construction to throttle the reclamation program. That program must be kept going. And the conclusion is inescapable that you must also build a shelf of authorized projects, both large and small, that can be undertaken during periods of reduced stress. You should have these projects ready to go. Reclamation projects are not investigated, planned, and built over night. Their engineering takes a lot of time. The investigations that must precede them take a lot of time. This work should be done now. Projects should be authorized now. In other words, we should plan now for peace and, to the fullest practicable extent, we should build now for peace as we prepare for war.

There is much emphasis today on the power features of reclamation projects. This

is not improper. Nor is it unnatural. We must have power in large quantities for the processing of mineral resources which are acutely needed in the production of industrial and defense materials. Hydroelectric power has been a part of the reclamation picture in the 17 Western States since 1906. It plays a part, not only in its own right but as a companion to the agricultural phases of the reclamation program. We would have it continue so. And, in order to assure that it will so continue, we would urge that even in those cases where the need for power is deemed more acute than the need for increased agricultural production, the whole project of which power is a feature will nevertheless be authorized, even though construction of irrigation facilities be deferred, thus assuring the necessary protection of agricultural rights in water and suitable financial assistance in the return of irrigation costs.

What about the Federal reclamation program in this and in the years to come? The answer to that question is in your hands. I hope that you will agree with me: First, that the Nation cannot afford to throttle that program today; second, that the Nation cannot afford unduly to curtail that program; third, that the Nation cannot afford not to have a shelf of authorized projects ready for construction; and, fourth, that needed power production shall be obtained from features that derive their validity from the fact that they are parts of authorized reclamation projects. The country looks to your vision and to your courage. Even during this tragic period when we must put our minds and hearts to the task of preparing for defense, so we should also keep our minds and hearts on present domestic needs and on building for posterity.

Let us not be guilty at home of having provided too little too late.

A Problem for Generals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, of the Gary Post-Tribune, sets out some practical thoughts regarding the size or number of our military forces to be sent to Europe:

A PROBLEM FOR GENERALS

The most responsible lawmakers of both political parties agree it is wholly fitting and desirable that Congress express its views on the big question of sending a sizable force of American soldiers to Europe.

In the Senate hearings now getting under way, that program will be thoroughly examined. And no doubt the Senate's final attitude will be given concrete character through action on a formal resolution of some sort.

If, as is likely, the decision is to approve dispatching more men to Europe, then it is fair also that Congress ask for definite assurances from the Atlantic Pact nations that their own contributions of manpower are proportionate to ours. Again, there appears to be no dispute among responsible men on the need for these assurances.

But it is quite something else for the Senate or the whole Congress or any other group of laymen to say exactly what that proportion should wisely be; or to place a rigid, arbitrary limit on the size of any force we shall send.

The basic military strategy affecting the defense both of the United States and the Atlantic community must be entrusted to our military leaders. They—and no others—are competent to judge how many men, how many planes, how many tanks, how many ships we need for the defensive tasks we have assumed.

It is a military—not a political—decision to state that only a certain number of troops, let's say 100,000, should be sent to Europe. That might be a perfectly satisfactory total. But it's for the generals to say, not our Senators.

The men in the Senate who today are contending it is their business are declaring in effect that our military men are unfit for their jobs. They are seeking to superimpose their judgments on those of the best military minds in this country.

Now if our military leaders are really as incompetent as this suggests, then we in America are in a very uncomfortable fix. We are in a position where we might have to fight a general war from the floor of the Senate and House. Anyone who has ever watched the day-to-day operations of our lawmakers must shrink from this prospect. However justifiable their tactics may be in legislative matters, they are totally out of place in the conduct of a military campaign.

Fortunately, though, the outlook is probably not that dark. In spite of the pronouncements of a growing force of Capitol Hill generals, there is a good chance that our military leaders really do know their business.

When the test comes, the American people almost certainly will rest their confidence in the generals to decide military issues. For they understand that we are beyond hope of saying if the men who must guide our military destinies are not equipped for their responsibilities, we would have no other place to turn.

The Soil Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have made it a practice to acquaint myself with the work of the Federal agencies in my district during every recess of Congress. The first-hand information thus obtained is invaluable. The experience so absorbed on the ground is educational. Moreover, thereby I am enabled to make up my mind on how the programs we devise in Congress are carried out and whether the funds we provide are well spent.

The Third Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States, is predominantly agricultural. I was born and reared on a farm and in addition to the practice of law, I am proud of the fact that for many years I have owned and operated my own farm. It is but natural, therefore, that I should pay close attention to our farm program.

A few weeks ago, I described an on-the-farm visit with a group charged with the administration of certain phases of the program. Today I want to talk about a tour I made with the local heads of the soil conservation program.

Almost 2,000 years ago we were admonished by infallible authority that as we sow, so shall we reap. This homely lesson reflects the experience of the ages. It cannot be violated with impunity. Nature will not stand for us to keep on taking everything out of the ground without putting something back into it. China did this for centuries until today Mother Earth there refuses to produce. She has been milked dry; she is exhausted. Stripped of once fertile topsoil, huge areas in China today are almost completely barren. The seeds produce only poverty, hunger, and pestilence—yes, and the fruits thereof, communism.

That simple is the lesson; that important is its observance. On this background was conceived the soil-conservation program, which was designed to encourage proper soil conservation practices throughout the United States. In the mountainous regions the problem addresses itself to combatting soil erosion. In the flat regions of my district we are mostly concerned with drainage, fertilization, pasturage, and similar problems peculiar to more or less level land areas.

The questions are, is the program worth while? Is its administration in competent hands? Is the money well spent? The best way to judge is to observe the results in specific cases.

The particular area I visited is within the jurisdiction of the Grand Coteau Ridge Soil Conservation District, in charge of or guided by Mr. A. C. Morris and Mr. De Louis Soileau. This particular unit has 311 farms receiving assistance and expert advice. The following are typical examples of actual performance, as explained by Mr. Morris.

D. B. Osenne beef cattle ranch was the first place visited. Mr. Osenne is one of the largest and most progressive cattlemen in southwest Louisiana. This place is located on the lowlands along the Atchafalaya River Spillway. Six years ago this land was covered with noncommercial underbrush and timber and providing little or no grazing for livestock. With the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service technicians, this 2,082-acre ranch has been changed from unprofitable land to highly productive pasture land. The first step necessary was to establish a few of the main drainage canals. From year to year Mr. Osenne cleared from 200 to 250 acres, completing the drainage in this acreage as clearing was accomplished and preparing the seed bed and seeding to clovers and grasses. This procedure has been followed from year to year, and at present Mr. Osenne has established about 1,530 acres of excellent pasture land. Mr. Osenne raises Brahma cattle and has been carrying from 1,000 to 1,500 cattle on his pasture, which has been highly profitable. A lower portion of this ranch consists of approximately 800 acres which have been subject to backwater from the Atchafalaya River when the river is high. This area is being salvaged by constructing a levee around the area with a series of drainage canals inside the levee, with a floodgate at the lowest point, which will permit drainage and prevent backwater from flooding the land.

The second farm observed was the 85-acre Keystone farm belonging to Mr. L. Charles Willis. When Mr. Willis came in possession of this farm about 2 years ago, it was in a very low state of production, having been grown in sugarcane for probably half a century without applying proper soil conservation and soil building practices. Little was known of such practices at that time. Mr. Willis applied to the Grand Coteau Ridge Soil Conservation District for assistance in planning and applying proper soil conservation and soil building practices to produce pasture for raising beef cattle. A conservation survey was made, classifying the soil. A soil analysis was made to determine the plant food needs. With Mr. Willis a plan was prepared, setting forth the best known practices needed to be applied to obtain early and satisfactory results. These practices consisted of establishing proper drainage, applying needed fertilizer and lime, proper preparation of seed bed and seeding to a mixture of clovers and grasses. Sufficient pasture forage was produced the first year to graze one cow per acre for a period of 8 or 9 months and leave the pasture in good growing condition.

The third area observed was a pasture on the Expadie Laperouse farm near St. Martinville, La. Mr. Laperouse has been a successful farmer all of his life. This was an old pasture area which was converted from native grass without treatment to improve pasture, including land preparation, fertilization, and seeding to lespedeza and grasses. This work was relatively new but was furnishing splendid grazing.

The next farm we visited was that of Regis LaGrange. LaGrange is an outstanding planter and businessman in my parish. It is a 1,158-acre farm located in the lowland of the Atchafalaya River. Five or six years ago, as in the case of Mr. Ozenne, this farm was growing undesirable and noncommercial underbrush and timber. On the request of Mr. LaGrange, Soil Conservation Service technicians worked out a conservation plan for this farm. Drainage being one of the primary needs, a few of the main drains were established first. Mr. LaGrange cleared from 100 to 150 acres of this land each year. Following the clearing, a complete drainage system was established, and the land prepared and planted to farm crops. During the next 3 years 758 acres of this 1,158-acre farm were cleared, properly drained and put into cultivation of highland crops. This land has produced as much as two bales of cotton per acre and equally as productive in other crops grown, namely, sugarcane, sweetpotatoes, and corn. Thus, land that was unprofitable 3 years ago today is highly productive and occupying services of 14 families.

We then visited the Willis brothers' 1,000-acre farm. A large portion of this farm has been in operation for a number of years. Another portion of it extends into the lowland area of Bayou Portage. On request, a conservation plan was worked out with Mr. Charley Willis for this farm. One of the primary needs of a portion of this farm was proper drainage. A complete drainage plan was prepared and the principal portion established. This has resulted in increasing production on a large acreage which formerly was low in production because of lack of proper drainage. Other areas which because of soil type and lack of suitability for cultivation were prepared and seeded to clovers and pasture grasses. This is one of the best examples of diversified farming we have locally. There is a balance between cultivated crops, pasture land, and livestock. The principal cultivated crops consist of sugarcane, cotton, sweet potatoes, corn, and beans. The pasture land is divided into three areas, a portion on which beef cattle are raised and on another portion hogs. An additional acreage is cleared. This will be converted to improved pasture.

One of the local farmers, Mr. Robert Champagne of Patin community, made the tour with us. He, with a group of his neighbors, has obtained assistance through the Soil Conservation Service. He explained that this group of neighbors has cooperated in establishing a drainage system which improves their land to the extent that the production in many cases has been doubled. Other lands that were not in cultivation at all can now be converted into productive cultivated land. He expressed the appreciation and support of the community for this type of work and stated that no other work could assist farmers in a greater way in their community.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Soil Conservation Service could not be a success without local cooperation. In fact, the spark plug of the whole farm program in my parish is Mr. Stanley Angelle, our experienced county agent. We are fortunate also in having a police jury composed of outstanding farmers and businessmen. Mr. Paul (Dell) Angelle, Jr., has been president of our police jury for over 20 years and under his capable leadership the program could not be anything but a success in St. Martin Parish.

Mr. Speaker, what I have said about my own parish is true throughout the third district of Louisiana. For instance, I have just received the annual report of the Iberia-Vermilion Soil Conservation District. The members and officers of the Board of this district are as follows: Nedier J. Le Blanc, Delcambre, La., chairman; Paul Barras, Loreauville, La., vice chairman; J. F. Noel, Abbeville, La., secretary-treasurer; Joseph Zaunbrecher, Gueydan, La., member; J. Malcolm Duhe, Jeanerette, La., member.

The annual report is an outstanding record of accomplishment. I am glad to say that Mr. Nedier J. LeBlanc, the chairman, has extended me an invitation to visit the work in his district, and I look forward with pleasure to observe the planning and application of soil and water conservation practices from farm-to-farm in the Iberia-Vermilion Soil Conservation District.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the part I took in providing funds for the operation of the soil conservation program, because from actual observation I can testify to my colleagues of its success in my district.

Marketing Agreement on Raisin Grapes Seems To Favor Processors Rather Than Grape Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it now appears that the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and administered by the United States Department of Agriculture is falling far short of accomplishing the fine objectives of its declared policy with respect to the Federal marketing agreement and order governing raisins grown in California. It appears that the division of the United States Department of Agriculture having executive authority over the marketing agreement and order to take care of the surplus crop of 1949 was administered in a negligent, incompetent, and unsatisfactory manner greatly to the detriment and loss of the raisin growers. To explain the matter more fully I submit a copy of a letter from Mr. Guard C. Darrah, attorney for the Biola Packing Co., Raisin Growers Association, and Raisin Growers Protective Association, a group of interested raisin producers. This letter was sent to Mr. S. R. Smith, of the Department of Agriculture, under whose supervision this agreement and order was administered.

I hope this letter will be read by all members of the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate, as it presents the views of one group of grape growers who believe they have a real grievance.

The letter follows:

STOCKTON, CALIF., *November 14, 1950.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Fruit and Vegetable Branch,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention: Mr. S. R. Smith.)

DEAR SIR: Your wire, addressed to me, dated November 9, 1950, apparently arrived in the evening of that day and was not delivered to my office until November 10, 1950, too late for me to catch a plane or any available train so that I could be in Fresno at 2 o'clock p. m., Pacific standard time, November 10, 1950, at the meeting you scheduled.

I am not convinced that it would have been of any avail to me to be there and present the views of myself and my clients. The program was inaugurated to take care of a very unfortunate market situation that existed in 1949. The spirit and purpose of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 is certainly laudable as well as justifiable. Almost any business can go broke in this country, but if farmers are not kept in business, we will starve and nobody will be in business.

Our group feels that so much money should be spent as is necessary to bring to a conclusion the program launched with such high hopes to take care of the surplus crop of 1949, although they feel that as administered, it developed an intolerable situation; in this, that although in its concept, it contemplated control of the program by growers, actually quite a number of the so-called growers on the advisory board and administrative committee were actually far more interested in packing houses or wineries. Consequently, the Raisin Administrative

Committee, which has administered the program seems in the eyes of many growers to have acted not in the growers' interest, but in the interest of the packers.

At the open hearing conducted in Fresno in May, I believe it was, of this year, it developed that wineries were paying $45 to $50 a ton for early deliveries of Thompson seedless green to start their winery operations with. The San Joaquin Valley produces sweet wine, which is fortified wine. In order to fortify the wine, alcohol taken from an equivalent amount of must, or crushed grapes, is added to the new crush to fortify it. This price of $45 to $50 a ton was higher than prevailed at the close of the 1949 glut season, but was justified by the current forecast of a short crop for 1950. For the purpose of a winery, raisins, which contain four times as much sugar per pound as grapes, would have served the purpose of producing fortified brandy just as well. This fact was brought out at the hearing. This justified a price for raisins of from $180 to $200 per ton. I am assuming that you understand that all of the alcohol produced by grapes or raisins comes from the sugar content; therefore, it is sugar alone that the winery is after when it wants material with which to produce fortifying brandy (alcohol). Notwithstanding this obvious demand, the Raisin Administrative Committee recommended a price of either $142.50 or $143 per ton for raisins. These raisins were not made available to the public, but were divided up, like cutting a melon, by the packers on a predetermined proportion with the proviso that should any packer fail to grab his allotment of the raisins of the poor farmers, who are being sold down the river, such packers should be reallocated to the packers who were so eager to get their hands on these raisins. At the time this price was arrived at, raisins were already selling in excess of that amount. The packers who bought them, took no chance whatsoever since they were like money in the bank in light of the strong demand. Actually, these raisins were sold in great part by the packers for $350 a ton in competition with the 1950 crop.

The current price, until the recent withdrawal from the market by the packers, has been $275 a ton to the grower and $350 a ton to the trade. The reserve pool was used throughout this program to prevent the price of raisins from approaching parity. Every time the market tended to rise, more of the reserve pool was released and the rise was checked by supplying the packers with all the raisins they needed at the moment.

It is the belief of a number of the growers that at the present time, the recession in demand is caused by the availability of large quantities of the 1949 crop. My clients would like to have a list of all of the buyers of the $620,743.87 worth of surplus raisins sold for livestock consumption. They believe that these same raisins are now entering the market in competition with their current crop.

When it was revealed that I was to write this letter to you, one of the growers just wrote and suggested that the following five statements would be in order:

1. This Marketing Agreement and Order contains a dishonest principle and is a disgrace to the United States Department of Agriculture.

2. It has been maladministered, and there is little prospect that its future administration will be improved.

3. The administration of this Marketing Agreement and Order has brought about a lower average price for raisins rather than correct such price level toward 90 percent of parity or 100 percent of parity, which is the declared policy of Congress in enacting the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

4. The administrators of the Marketing Agreement and Order have spent an unreasonable and fabulous amount of money in administering it, and have lost the raisin producers millions of dollars.

5. A continuation of this Marketing Agreement and Order in its present form and under present personnel which govern it would be a tremendous detriment to the interests of the raisin farmers.

In explanation of this rather blunt language, let me say that what the writer means when he says the order contains a dishonest principle, is that he feels it is dishonorable for any person to purport to act on behalf of growers, as the members of the Raisin Administrative Committee are doing, and then sell to themselves as packers, the growers raisins, and to a certain extent, he is right.

No packers, processor, or consumers should have any part in determining the price they are to be able to buy raisins for from a reserve or surplus pool. To permit such a thing violates the basic morals involved in the law of principal and agent.

At the present time there are many sources from which our statistics date necessary for the proper operation of any of our agricultural enterprises. It is our understanding that this and the expansion of public relations and grower informational phase of the program are the justification for raising by assessment the $97,500. The expression "expansion of the public relations and grower informational phase of the program" is hazy, nebulous, and cloudy. It is purposely vague to enshroud the real purpose of carrying on the program which in the opinion of myself and my clients is to keep entrenched those who control the raisin industry for their own benefit, to wit, the raisin packers.

If it had been the desire of the Raisin Administrative Committee to permit growers to know what they are doing, it would have invited them freely to attend their meeting, whether they allowed them a voice or not. If you had intended for them, or even a small segment of them, to have at the most a weak and quavering voice in the matter, you would not have given me less than one day's notice to break standing appointments and attend a meeting 120 miles from here.

We ask that the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture disapprove this proposed budget.

Yours very truly,
BIOLA PACKING CO.
RAISIN GROWERS ASSOCIATION.
RAISIN GROWERS PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

Poem by Enlistee in the Air Force at Lackland, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by a young enlistee in the Air Force at Lackland Field, Tex., which I think is rather interesting, in view of the investigation of conditions at Lackland, recently consummated.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Down in the Texas Sattland
Lackland is the spot.
Down with the snakes and lizards
In the land that God forgot.

Down with the snakes and lizards
Where the airman gets his due.
Down in the middle of nowhere
A thousand miles from you.

No one knows we are living,
No one gives a damn;
Back home we are forgotten,
We belong to Uncle Sam.

Four years! Oh, how can we stand it!
We slave for our hard earned pay
To protect the people with millions
For two and a half a day.

Some day when life in this world is over
And we will go to a place known well,
St. Peter will say, "Those are the boys from Lackland;
They have served their time in Hell."

Universal Military Service: The Promise Is Security, the Record Is Disaster—Ambitious Leaders Always Involve Nation in War To Perpetuate Their Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress has before it a demand for a peacetime universal military service law. In 1948, Congress surrendered part of the American people's basic liberty by passing a temporary peacetime conscription bill.

But those who think military strength will result from compulsory military service are not satisfied. Using the current crisis as a backdrop, they propose permanent universal military service, taking each youth at 18.

Such a law would constitute a decisive repudiation of the unalienable rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, guaranteed in the Declaration of Independence.

Such a law would be a surrender to and imitation of Soviet Russia's system of slavery, for article 132 of the Soviet Constitution says: "Universal military service is law."

Significant as these facts are, I do not wish to dwell on them now.

Instead I propose to discuss peacetime universal military service on the ground chosen by its proponents—the claim that this scheme will bring national security and peace.

The necessity of adequate preparedness for national safety is not debatable. On this goal we all agree.

The issue here is: Will universal military service give us the security its sponsors claim? Will peacetime conscription prevent us from being attacked or assure us of victory in case of attack?

Fortunately, this proposal can be evaluated by facts instead of theory and

argument. Ample historical data can guide us to sound conclusions, if we will heed it.

FRANCE WAS FIRST VICTIM

The first modern major country in which universal military service became a national policy was France, where it was initiated in 1792. After a few exciting years of foreign conquest by Napoleon, France suffered overwhelming defeat at Waterloo.

Conscription was dropped, but was revived in 1848 by Napoleon III. It existed in France before World War I and World War II.

Never did it prevent France from being attacked.

Never did it provide France with the defense necessary for safety. In both World Wars the nations without universal military service saved France.

France, burdened by military service, has become one of the weak, second-rate powers of the world.

In Germany, conscription was started in 1814 as a defensive measure. What happened? Germany's tragic adventure in militarism began. Universal military service brought the same harvest. First military expansion, then foreign wars, then defeat and disaster.

What is the record in Japan? Japan adopted universal military service in 1873. Again came the telltale sequence of militarism, fomented war abroad, then defeat and disaster.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE FAILED IN ITALY AND RUSSIA

The fourth victim of conscription was Italy. The people of Italy have always been unusually peace loving, but when Italy adopted universal military service, it took the fatal step toward disaster. First costly militarism, then foreign war, then defeat and disaster.

The foregoing summarizes the result in every major nation permanently subjected to universal military training, excepting Russia. There the revolution in 1917 prevents a full comparison. However, the record is clear. Compulsory military training under the czar never kept Russia from being attacked, nor saved it from defeat.

In Communist Russia, universal training did not deter Hitler's attack in 1941. Moreover, Russia was close to catastrophe when saved by supplies from the nonconscription lands, England and the United States.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE IS A SELF-STARTER OF WAR

Was the disaster in these conscript nations brought about because the people were militaristic? Or was it because compulsory military service carried in it the seeds of calamity? A study of the workings of this scheme is revealing.

Each nation adopts compulsory training for national defense. In doing so, they authorize an enlarged military organization to train the mass of conscripts. From this point on the germs of disaster automatically do their deadly work.

The first action of the universal military training organization is to respond to nature's first law—self-preservation. This brings about expansion or, in military terminology, empire building. Here the military are not unlike other governmental bureaus or private business.

They know no organization stands still. They know that more pay, more generals, and more position security for themselves depends on their ability to get their spending classed as essential—imperative.

WAR ALARMS ARE CREATED OUT OF THIN AIR

So those in charge of universal military service, like any businessman or bureaucrat, begin to dig in and solidify their position. How is that done? An enemy must be located. Then their public-relations department begins to excite the fears of the people.

Vividly realistic propaganda about the military preparations of other nations is concocted. The capture of secret war plans and maps may be reported, when the truth is that the secret data is pure forgery. No lie becomes too big if it serves the purpose.

In Japan the military authorities indoctrinated conscripts with the imaginary danger of attack by the United States, and justified it in these words:

> To make a good soldier, there must always be an immediate enemy. He must be led to believe that this enemy may strike today. He must be convinced that the enemy is prepared to annihilate our country at the first opportunity.

Then activities of the military broaden. Every idea of the military becomes national defense. Military costs spiral.

At first the load is endured by the people without protest. But before very long the people begin to question the discouraging burden of armament and universal military service.

What happens?

OPPOSITION SILENCED BY WAR

The political and military are confronted by an overloaded citizenry demanding economy in Government. Here the military chiefs, unlike ordinary bureaucracy, have an ace to play.

They can stymie retrenchment and evade the loss of power and rank involved in reduced establishments. Their ace is to arrange an incident, and create a state of conflict.

Arranging an incident usually presents difficulties. But thus far no major nation whose politicians and generals needed a war has found that problem insurmountable.

Let us take a recent case or two. In 1931, Japan, like other powers, was suffering from the global depression. The people were demanding relief from the heavy burden of military expenditures. How did the military respond? They staged an incident in Manchuria. That ended the debate.

The economizers in the Japanese Diet were silenced. Public opposition became unpatriotic.

A recent incident in our own history, if we could get the truth about it, may provide sobering evidence of the attitude of politicians and generals toward war after defense preparations reach the war level tempo.

On November 25, 1941, President Roosevelt met with his War Cabinet. Of that meeting, Secretary of War Stimson wrote in his diary:

> The problem was how we should maneuver them (Japan) into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves. It was a difficult proposition.

Twelve days later America was at war with Japan.

WAR MAKERS SLYLY PIN FIRST SHOT ON PROPOSED ENEMY

Historians of military tactics emphasize the psychological importance of arranging to convince a people that the other side fired the first shot. The incidents that have sparked recent wars generally indicate mastery of this emotional problem.

Has every war provoked by the nations using conscription—France, Germany, Italy, Japan—since Napoleon's conquest has been generated in similar fashion?

Despite the cunning efforts of war-creators to hide their tracks, the telltale pattern is usually discovered sooner or later. The record is so parallel, in nations of diverse national characteristics, that this conclusion seems inescapable:

Wherever the rulers of a major nation have established universal military service, the people have been marched into militarism under the cloak of national defense. Foreign war, defeat, and disaster have always followed.

PROMOTERS FLATTER US

Against this record elsewhere, the advocates of universal military training in America insist that we are different. The promoters of universal military training claim that America will not follow the road of militarism, conquest, disaster, that has resulted elsewhere.

They claim that the United States is not militarily ambitious; that we have no imperialistic schemes; and that the rest of the world does not need to fear us.

They know such statements appeal to the people, because the people are peace-loving. But the people of other lands are also peace-loving.

Certainly, that is true of the Italian people, who are perhaps more peace-loving than almost any other. The fatal flaw in this argument is that the people do not start wars—nor are they able in a nation with conscription to prevent their rulers from involving them in war.

No, Mr. Speaker, compulsory military training will not bring military security for America. Militarily, the sure way to national safety is an alert and incorruptible intelligence service, a superior air force, plus a modern army and navy, equipped with ever-improving technical and scientific weapons.

Beyond these, an invigorated ROTC, CMTC, and National Guard in the several States can furnish specialized training for reserve forces. Of course, no amount of military preparedness will save us if our leaders abandon reasonable foreign policies.

WHY PUT AMERICA ON HISTORICAL ROAD TO NATIONAL SUICIDE?

Mr. Speaker, the advocates of universal military service build their case around what they call its practical military value. The record of compulsory military training in major nations completely discredits this claim.

Universal military training brought defeat and disaster to France, Germany, Italy, and Japan. In none of these nations were the civilian components then able to maintain the necessary supremacy over the military. What is so different about America that the same consequences will not follow here?

What sound reason can anyone give to support the claim that the fatal germs contained in peacetime conscription elsewhere will not develop here? Where is the evidence to support such a conclusion—a conclusion contrary to the unanimous verdict of history for over 150 years?

Are our political rulers and military chiefs so different from similar humans elsewhere that they can be expected to perform directly contrary to human behavior for 150 years?

Where is the evidence?

I challenge the advocates of Universal Military Service to explain away the record of history on their principal arguments, namely:

First. That universal military training will prevent war.

Second. That it will assure victory in case of war.

Why are these assertions not substantiated in at least one major nation using compulsory training during the last 150 years?

The American people, who must sacrifice their sons and pay the bills, are entitled to full and forthright answers.

Mr. Speaker, universal military service does not prevent war.

It does not bring victory.

Instead, it has always brought defeat and disaster.

Congress should reject it for once and for all.

Freedom has been the high road to national security for America. Why give up the freedom principle by which America grew to greatness—and take in its place the European military regimentation that has unfailingly produced war, misery, and national decline?

The Last Stand of the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The Last Stand of the GOP," delivered by one of the outstanding newspaper editors of America, Mr. Palmer Hoyt, of the Denver Post. The speech was delivered at a Lincoln Day banquet in Portland, Oreg., on February 12, 1951. I commend it to the reading of my Republican colleagues.

Mr. BENTON. I hope when the Senator's Republican colleagues are reading the editorial on the last stand of the GOP they will not overlook the speech, also inserted in the RECORD, by Mr. Erwin D. Canham, who certainly is one of the most distinguished journalists of the country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST STAND OF THE GOP

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, 7 years ago, on February 12, 1944, I had the privilege of addressing a similar banquet in Portland. My opening remarks were: "Mr. Chairman, Mr. and Mrs. Willkie, Governor and Mrs. Snell." Also at that meeting were Robert S. Farrell, Jr., and Marshall Cornet. These great citizens have been sorely missed at the national and State level.

Tonight, it is a privilege to address interested and active Republicans such as you here attending this Lincoln Day banquet. You are the hope of the country and of the world. I believe and have often said that the two things which could quickest destroy our civilization are a shooting war with Russia and a collapse of the two party system in these United States. I am not here to defend the Republicans, for they stand indicted by their own failures, and will be defended by their own constructive victories.

I am here to suggest that the Republican Party should not be misled by its apparent successes in 1950. Any reasonable analysis will reveal that the vote was more a protest vote against the administration's vacillating policies at home and abroad rather than a constructive vote for constructive Republican policies.

As a matter of fact, there has been far too much blind defense of Republicans by Republicans because they were Republicans. This point of view was well illustrated in a little story I heard the other day. It is the story of a young farmer who assaulted a tramp with a stick of cordwood and wound up in jail. His lawyer finally came to see him and asked, "Jim, how did you come to hit this fellow? You know, you almost killed him. He is in the hospital now and may not live. Whatever made you do it?"

"Well, Mr. Smith," said Jim, "you see it was like this. This feller came by the farm the other night, and I invited him in for dinner. Right away he started criticizing the furniture. Well, I let that pass because our furniture ain't any great shakes at best. Then he teed off on the food. Well, I let that pass, too. At lot of times my wife's cooking leaves a little something to be desired. Then my wife came in out of the kitchen, and he jumped on her. He said, 'Say, you ain't nothin' but an old bag, are you?' Well, I didn't do nothing about that 'cause as a matter of fact, when she gets that wrapper on, she don't exactly look like Cleopatra, anyway. But then, by jiminies, he started in on the Republican Party. That was too much for me; so I let him have it."

This is an important occasion, and one that we cannot afford to celebrate lightly. This day marks the one hundred and forty-second anniversary of the birth of a very great American, perhaps the greatest American who ever lived, Abraham Lincoln.

On this day, when we reflect on the profound crisis in which we find ourselves, it is comforting and helpful to remember Abraham Lincoln. For his greatness was not only the greatness of his era and his place, but also the greatness of all time. After his assassination on April 14, 1865, Edward M. Stanton, the Secretary of War, spoke a perfect requiem when he said, "Now he belongs to the ages."

In fact, Mr. Stanton spoke more truly than he knew. Mr. Lincoln belongs to the ages, to this particular age, to this time of crisis, and to us here tonight. His immortal words at Gettysburg: "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us * * * that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

That, if you please, ladies and gentlemen, connotes the crisis that is being faced today. For if this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people should perish, then man will slide clear to the bottom of the black pit from which he emerged a million years ago.

The issues were not greatly different in Mr. Lincoln's time. Then he faced the problem of saving the Union, but now we face the problem of saving the Union and of saving the world.

Despite our tendency to think increasingly that the struggle for the world is a military one, there are many more issues involved.

That Mr. Lincoln clearly recognized the issues of his time was often made apparent, but never more clearly than in his 1857 speech in Springfield. He had just received the Republican nomination for the senatorial seat from Illinois. Mr. Lincoln said, and I quote, "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."

All we need to do is to substitute the word "world" for the word "government" to have, in these remarks of Lincoln's, a perfect description of the situation our country and the other nations of the free world find ourselves in today.

To paraphrase Lincoln, this world of ours cannot endure half slave and half free. Some day it will cease to be divided. Some day it must become all one thing or all the other. And whether the final victory will perch on the banners of freedom or the dark standard of twentieth-century slavery will depend, to an enormous extent, on us, on what we do, on our understanding, our will, our visceral fortitude.

Each year the Nation in general and the Republican Party in particular on this date, turn their thoughts backward to study our heroic past and the life and works of the great emancipator. It is fitting and proper that we should do this, particularly at this time when the Republican Party faces its most severe crisis, if not dissolution.

One of the dangers that faces the free world today is the fact that there are many appeasers in the world, in the Nation, and in our party. It is interesting to note that Abraham Lincoln was not an appeaser. Even though Lincoln made it clear that he did not propose and would not favor overthrowing the system of slavery in the South by force, neither was he willing to have peace through appeasement, as were others, including Stephen A. Douglas.

Nor if Abraham Lincoln were alive today would he stempt to appease either imperial communism or the atomic bomb.

Our land today is full of appeasers, but if Abraham Lincoln were alive, you can rest assured that he would not be one of them.

When, despite Lincoln's efforts and the efforts of others, war did come, Lincoln did not turn away from the bloody task that faced the Nation. There were those who said, with Horace Greeley, "Let the erring sisters go.". Lincoln was not one of them. He would not let the Union be split apart. A severed Nation, Lincoln realized, would mean the end of the United States as the world had known it. It would also mean the end of the American system of freedom, the end of that American experiment in democracy which has served, and today more than ever, can

serve as a beacon of hope for the hundreds of millions struggling to be free. That was the pith and meaning of the immortal Gettysburg address and its resounding peroration: "that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

As an American, Lincoln's imperishable greatness rests on the fact that he saved the Union. As a world figure, whose significance for all nations and all peoples has steadily grown, Lincoln's greatness arises out of his role as a secular prophet of democracy.

"What constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence?" he asked in one of his speeches. "It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, the guns of our war steamers, or the strength of our gallant Army. These are not our reliance against a resumption of tyranny in our land. All of them may be turned against our liberties without making us stronger or weaker for the struggle.

"Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere."

No truer words were ever spoken. In Korea today we are engaged in a bitter and bloody struggle against desperate odds. We are in that struggle for no selfish purposes. We do not desire any nation's territory. Long ago we turned our backs upon imperialism, a system of domination alien to our beliefs and our institutions. We are in Korea, when you get right down to it, because our defense lies, as Lincoln put it, in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere.

The fact is, and it has taken two costly wars to bring it home to us, we are safe only if the area of freedom expands in the world; our danger grows whenever the area of freedom shrinks. That was true when Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese militarists were on the rampage. It is no less true now that the heirs of Genghis Khan, Ivan the Terrible, Peter I, and Nikolai Lenin have made world domination through world enslavement their openly declared goal.

There were many timid, frightened men in Lincoln's day. That cowering breed is still with us. In the face of the Soviet menace, they would have us scurry to cover, hide behind our two oceans while totalitarian darkness covers the face of the earth beyond this hemisphere's borders.

They deny they are isolationists; that is a label nobody likes to have pinned on him these days. But whatever you may call them, the palpable fact is that what they are asking us to do is to ignore realities.

These realities are tough, unpleasant, and also inescapable. We can ignore them only to our own terrible hurt.

There are always those who shout loudly, when a battle is going badly, that it should never have been undertaken at all. They are saying that about our action in Korea.

Few were opposed to our moving in to help put down the aggressors when that move was first made. Many now insist that it was a mistake. But I say there was never a more glorious page in our national history than the page we wrote last June when we lifted high the banner of collective security and proved that, in this country, at least, there was the determination to prove to the aggressors that aggression does not pay.

For collective security to work, it must be collective, however. We have not stood alone in Korea. But no amount of explanation can change the fact that 90 percent of the United Nations forces which have given battle to the North Korean and Chinese Communist aggressors in Korea were American forces, and that among the nations which have clamored most loudly for the appeasement of Red China, were the very nations—such as the Arab nations and India—which did not contribute a single, solitary soldier to the common effort to enforce a system of world law and order.

This state of affairs is disturbing. But we cannot afford to let disappointment and chagrin over the failure of the United Nations to do what the principles and purposes should have compelled them to do—divert us from our high purposes. Let us never forget that in fighting for the freedom of the world, we are fighting for our own freedom and security as well.

Because of the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and other streamlined death-dealing devices, the issue today is even more clearly drawn than it was in Mr. Lincoln's time—today it is the issue of survival. If the crisis is unclear to anyone, it is merely because his vision is blurred by the myopic curtain of prejudice or partisan politics. The issue is as sharply drawn as the two words—slavery and freedom. We are in grave trouble, and only the supreme combination of courage and brains can get us out of it.

For many years, those who would save the world were considered do-gooders, but today if we are to survive, we must save the world, or else lose our freedom.

We have, unfortunately, passed from the halcyon days of Tom Marshall, when all the country needed was a good 5-cent cigar. There is a much more serious connotation in a new expression of the country's need. What our country needs today is a national policy. To whom can the country look for leadership today? From whom does the public expect leadership? Not from the administration, for it vacillates. Not from the Republicans, for they fail to agree.

There are those who point out that ROBERT ALPHONSO TAFT of Ohio is Mr. Republican, and he is the one to follow. But there are millions in this country who remember that Mr. TAFT only recently opined that he saw little reason to think that Russia might ever attack us. They also recall that Mr. TAFT took a very dim view of the chances of war with Germany and Japan in his speeches of 1940 and 1941.

Who, then, speaks for the Republicans?

Mr. Hoover, our only living ex-President? He frightened millions of Americans with his new concept of isolationism, in which Festung Europa became Fortress America. To me, as one American, it brought forth a nightmarish picture of two giants standing on adjacent islands, hurling A and H bombs at each other with vigorous abandon.

Is Mr. Dewey the spokesman? Today even Mr. Dewey's most stalwart admirers will admit that he has become a juvenile William Jennings Bryan.

Should the people listen to John Foster Dulles? No, too many think he speaks for the administration.

To Harold Stassen? Millions think that his recent predictions of peace were unfounded and millions more believe that his belief in the mails as a way to Stalin's ear is unwarranted.

The country and the Republican Party needs a Lincoln. But in lieu of a Lincoln, they could do with a policy. And there are many new voices to trumpet that policy through the land, voices like that of the Honorable JAMES DUFF, the Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, and the Honorable WAYNE MORSE. And perhaps even one day, Dwight D. Eisenhower will decide he is a Republican and lend his effective voice to spreading the word.

What should a Republican policy cover? It seems to me that as a minimum:

1. It should admit the basic issue of our time is survival.
2. It should seek a permanent bipartisan foreign policy to cover that same survival.
3. It should aggressively understand that the maintenance of our economic position is second only to survival.
4. It should insist on drastic and immediate curtailment of non-war expenditures.
5. It should subscribe completely to the fact that production and more production is the answer to both the Russians and economic disaster.
6. It should recognize the sound principle of economic and military aid to threatened democracies and to allies.
7. It should insist on including Greece, Turkey and Spain in our arms aid pact.
8. It should recognize that unification of the armed services is still unproductive of proper economy and that the administration should reveal the necessary degree of military preparedness and its nature, because adventures into obsolescence are expensive and dangerous.
9. It should recognize as a party our full obligation to the United Nations.
10. It should recognize the existence of atomic bombs and other top-drawer weapons, and insist that aggressors be advised that they will be used against them.
11. It should recognize the necessity for the equalization of the tax load, both as to individuals and as to corporations, organized evasions by cooperatives, churches and educational organizations and the hoodlum empire of racetrack wires and slot machines, has cost this country billions of dollars.
12. It should stand for fair employment and equal opportunity for all, but should castigate the Democratic Party for its hypocrisy in attempting to pass unenforceable FEPC laws.
13. It should attempt to strengthen the weak portions of the Taft-Hartley Act and make it more acceptable to labor, looking forward to further cementing the identical interests of capital and labor.
14. Republicans should recognize that we have today in America a welfare state and the people like it very well.
15. It should renounce McCarthyism recognizing that only in totalitarian countries can the charge ever become more important than the proof, the law, the acquittal, or the trial.
16. It should recognize that today the Democratic Party is the party of special privilege: witness the activities of the 5-percenters and the current RFC scandals.
17. The Republican Party should recognize propaganda as a weapon of war and accept immediately the need for a much more enlarged and vigorous Voice of America. America, a Nation of salesmen, is still behind Russia in convincing the peoples of the earth.
18. Finally, the Republican Party should recognize the potential power of spiritual force and the need for spiritual unity among free men so that this world under God may have a new birth of freedom and shall not perish from the universe.

Finally, there are some facts of history that we, as Republicans, should remember tonight as we celebrate the birth of the man who more than anyone else created the Republican Party. We should remember, for example, that the GOP rose like Phoenix from the ashes of the Whig Party and that the Whig Party vanished in a cacophony of dissident voices. The Whig Party elected a President in 1848, Gen. Zachary Taylor, but by 1858 neither the House nor the Senate had a single Member bearing the Whig label. It is also interesting to note two other things in this connection: One, that the immediate rock on which the Whigs wrecked themselves was that of foreign policy—they opposed the annexation of Texas; and two, the Whig Party was a party of appeasement and compromise.

And so may we Republicans here tonight and those millions like us in this country highly resolve that this party shall be of the people, for the people, and by the people, and that neither this party nor this Nation shall ever perish.

Appeasement Can Never Satisfy Tyrant's Appetite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Florence (Ala.) Times, February 9, 1951. Mr. Louis Eckl, editor of this outstanding daily, has written an excellent and timely article which I want to call to the attention of every Member:

APPEASEMENT CAN NEVER SATISFY TYRANT'S APPETITE

Those who remember well how futile appeasement proved to be in staving off World War II find it hard to understand the eagerness of today's appeasers.

Both in Europe and Asia there are sincere men who honestly believe that the way to meet Communist aggression is to make concessions to it. The idea, of course, is that if you give the Reds what they say they want, then they'll stop bothering the world, and we can all have a secure peace.

The supreme fallacy in this view is that Communists, like any other tyrannical group bent on general conquest, never stop wanting things. Their appetites can't be satisfied until they have swallowed the globe.

When Hitler got what he supposedly wanted at Munich—the German Sudetenland region of Czechoslovakia—he genially announced to the world that he had no further territorial ambitions. A few months later his armies marched into Prague, and soon he was knocking at Poland's door. Had he gained Poland without a fight, there would have been some new demand by the Nazis upon the free world.

The technique of piecemeal, bloodless conquests was carefully refined by Hitler. He tried not to ask for too much at a time. Perhaps only the precipitate haste of his time schedule alarmed the democracies to the point where they determined to support resistance to further aggression in 1939.

Hitler conceived his scheme of bloodless invasion with a cynical calculation. It was his belief that if an aggressor did not demand too much at once, concession to his demand might seem reasonable and just.

But as each succeeding demand was granted—for the same reason—there would, he felt, be less and less point in holding out against the aggressor. The appeaser, having yielded so much, could not see the sense of turning about and resisting fresh demands. He would ask himself: Why stand here, at phase 3, when we did not stand in phase 2?

The men in the Kremlin have studied Hitler's methods well; they practice them better than he did. People who believe these men would be satisfied by a single series of concessions don't understand the workings of the totalitarian mind.

Any lull gained by concessions to Stalin or Mao would be only temporary—until they considered the moment right to seek new advances. Blackmailers are not by nature a charitable breed; they do not take pity on their victims and let them be.

One can sympathize with the war weariness and fear which dictate an appeasing mood in some places. But there can be no sympathy for appeasement that is based on ignorance of history. And in the end, if the free world is to save itself, that mood must everywhere give way to a resolve not to be hoodwinked again by the tyrants who now confront us.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr Speaker, the need for a program of universal military training has long been recognized. I have for many years advocated enactment of a practical and workable plan of universal military training. I have been glad to see that in the State of Georgia and in the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent, the need for this training is recognized by women as well as men. On February 1, 1951, the executive board of the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs endorsed universal military training, and on February 6, 1951, the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta also endorsed it.

Under leave previously obtained, I insert herewith the resolutions adopted by these two organizations:

RESOLUTION

Whereas it is the duty of all citizens to engage in training for civilian defense; and

Whereas Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, has introduced a bill known as H. R. 1752 calling for universal military training: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs in session February 1951, embrace H. R. 1752; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from Georgia, Mr. Earl Cocke, American Legion, and that copies be given to the press.

This the 1st day of February 1951.

GARTHA B. PETERSON,
Chairman, Legislation.

CERTIFICATE

The above resolution was adopted on the 1st day of February 1951.

MRS. WRAY SMITH,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States House Resolution 1752, which provides for universal military training, which bill was introduced by Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas it is believed that such a measure is necessary in order to preserve the fundamentals of freedom and protection for the citizens of the United States: Be it, therefore,

Resolved by the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, That we endorse and urge the passage of the bill providing for universal military training; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta and that a copy thereof be forwarded to Hon. CARL VINSON as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and to each Member of the House of Representatives and the two Senators from the State of Georgia, and to the Atlanta Journal and the Atlanta Constitution.

This 6th day of February 1951.

THE WOMEN'S CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF ATLANTA,
By AMBER W. ANDERSON, *President.*

Attest:

LAURENCE L. THOMPSON,
Secretary.

Lies, Damned Lies, and Inflation Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a thoughtful and intelligent article by Edna Lonigan upholding the position of the Federal Reserve Board and pointing out the error and subterfuge of the Treasury's position in the present controversy:

[From Human Events, Washington, D. C., of February 14, 1951]

LIES, DAMNED LIES, AND INFLATION CONTROLS

(By Edna Lonigan)

Freedom is hard, uncompromising, even cruel. It demands the facing of the facts of life with real courage and the meeting of problems without recourse to the dream life of fancy. That kind of escapism is reserved for the managerial elite, to whom truth is what they wish it to be or what pleases their passion for power. Clear words, with precise meanings, hard money that can be counted and chartered accounting, are the necessary conditions of a free society; all three are abandoned, as unwarranted handicaps, by those who would fashion society to their personal ambition.

An instance of this conflict between reality and fantasy is the current controversy between the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury over inflation controls. The issue is clear: Shall the FRB continue to support the value of Government paper by buying in what the public will not absorb; or shall the true value of this paper be ascertained by permitting it to find its own level in the open market?

The FRB is in favor of the second course, which is realistic, while the Treasury, anxious to hide the fact that the market value of its bonds is below their advertised value, urges the continuance of the present support scheme. The FRB contends that the support price is decidedly inflationary (for reasons which will be explained), while the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, insists that the inflationary effects of support can be overcome by police controls. In line with political reasoning and considerations, Mr. Snyder ignores the impossibility (demonstrated in every country in which controls have been tried) of eliminating black-market operations.

II

Why does Mr. Snyder hang on to the fiction of supported bonds? Because he knows, and the FRB has informed him of the fact,

that to throw Government bonds on the open market would necessitate—if their price is to be maintained—a higher interest rate. The Government would have to compete with other securities offered, securities which not only yield a higher return but promise an appreciation in market value; the face value of the bonds stays put. The so-called stability of Government bond prices is maintained because the Government does not have to meet the lie detector test of the free market. It does not have to pay a price that fits the growing risk.

However, if the Government raises its interest rate the bubble of a low cost of financing its borrowings will be burst. Not only will the true cost of servicing the national debt be exposed, but the theory that interest rates can be arbitrarily fixed by Government economists will get its come-uppance. The managerial elite cannot afford to face the facts of life.

On the other hand, if the FRB is compelled to continue the policy of buying all the bonds the public will not buy, it can do so only by increasing the volume of credit money—which is, in actual practice, even more inflationary than the printing of bogus money. The FRB has no pool of money with which to buy bonds. For every bond that falls into the hands of the Federal Reserve System, a credit is issued, either to the Government or to the bank which sent it in for discount. That credit becomes purchasing power. That purchasing power shows itself in the market place; the more purchasing power the higher the price of milk, machines, and monkeyshines. Not all the controls ever thought up by the managerial elite can prevent it. Credit money or printing-press money, the cost of living must go up.

The issue between Mr. Snyder and the FRB comes down to this: Shall the cost of Government be hidden behind a low interest rate, while the cost of living rises, or shall the housewife be protected by curtailment of the power of the Government to increase indefinitely issuance of credit money? To put it another way, shall the true cost to society of Government wastage be exposed to view?

III

Inflation during war is inevitable. It results from the depletion of the Nation's annual output. A war is not fought with money, it is fought with wheat, lumber, steel—with things that, were they to come to market, would hold prices down. The economic effect of war is the same as that of a drought, or of a conflagration consuming so many factories, department stores, and warehouses in each town in the country.

The workers who produce what is destroyed in war cannot be paid in goods, simply because the consumers' goods have not been produced. In time of war, or the preparation for it, everybody's standard of living goes down. It must. Inflation controls can do nothing about it. There is simply not enough to go around.

The problem of a war economy is to get people to work harder and to live on less. A war economy is obviously and necessarily the opposite of a free economy; but, during previous wars, when the ideal of a free society still hung high in American life, the problem mentioned above was met in an honest and straightforward way: Wages, in terms of money, were increased even as the purchasing power of money decreased, but there was the expectation that the money would harden as soon as the crisis was over. This expectation was based on the fact that the vast technological development necessitated by war production would be turned to the production of consumable goods after the war, and the abundance of such goods would lower prices. (For, during wartime despite the vast destruction of wealth, there is one great economic gain: War brings a revolutionary upturn in the arts of industrial organization and technology.) Thus, the worker would at last be paid in real wages.

A corollary of what might be termed the "free war economy" is that with the cessation of hostilities the expenses of government are reduced. That is, the Government ceases to siphon goods off the market, except for necessary expenses and a good portion of the taxes go toward the liquidation of the national debt. The burden of servicing this debt is correspondingly reduced.

This process of returning to a normal and factual way of living characterized our economy after World War I. Bond prices fell, but money rose in value, so that even those who lost some of their savings profited by the greater purchasing power of the dollars they earned or the dollars they received for their bonds.

IV

The present conflict between the Treasury and the FRB is really the issue of whether the honest method of conducting a war economy shall prevail or the dishonest one that stems from socialism. If the Treasury prevails, the country will be pushed that much faster into the slave-pattern for which it has been preparing these past 20 years. If Congress supports the Federal Reserve Board, the descent can be reversed.

To repeat, inflation cannot be entirely prevented during war. There is a shortage of goods, and nothing can be done about that, war being what it is. But, inflation is not caused by a shortage of goods only; a concomitant cause is the increase in the amount of money or purchasing power. War does not necessarily bring on either a larger fund of greenbacks or credit dollars; the first must be printed and the larger must be authorized, and only the administration can do either. That's exactly what the administration is doing now.

The influx of credit dollars, or any other kind of dollars, pushes prices up faster than the war shortages alone could do. This causes unrest among the housewives, and, to assuage their sense of hurt, the Government throws the blame on the housewives themselves. The housewives are bidding too much for meat and lipsticks. They must not do that. Nor must the butchers and lipstick-makers accept what the housewives offer. Both are unpatriotic, and a law must be passed to prevent such reprehensible behavior.

So, there are fixed prices, priorities, allocations, compulsion and, of course, enforcement agencies. Also, black markets. None of which would be necessary if the Government stopped creating money out of nothing—if it stopped supporting its bonds. True, prices, would go up because of the war-created shortages but they would not go up as rapidly, nor reach the same heights. More important, the freedom of which we are so proud, and for which we are constantly fighting, would be preserved.

V

That is what the FRB, consciously or not, is fighting for. It may be that, as bankers, they are more conscious of the threat to their own existence involved in this support scheme. Regardless of such motives, the banks are inadvertently fighting the battle of freedom. For, it so happens that whatever impels any segment of society to oppose the encroachment of government on its freedom of action, in so doing it serves society as a whole. Nobody can be free at the expense of another. Society is so integrated that restrictions placed upon any part of it impinge on the freedom of its contiguous parts; contrariwise, the freer the banks the more can they help their customers to act as free men.

At bottom, then, the struggle of the FRB and the Treasury involves questions of social and political importance that far transcend the technical issue. It is the constant struggle between society and the state.

The theory of representative government is that the interests of society are entrusted to its agents, whose business it is to see that these interests are protected from the power of the state. In pursuance of that theory, Congress should see to it that the issue brought up by the Federal Reserve Board shall be decided in its favor. Put the bonds on the open market where they will find their true value, and if the citizens pass them up, increase the interest rates. Let's not have more counterfeit money—and more counterfeit freedom.

No Plunge in the Dark as Suggested by Secretary Snyder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in the morning Washington Post of February 16, 1951, entitled "No 'Quickie'," states perfectly the case for an over-all picture of the tax situation rather than a leap in the dark as proposed by the President.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting this editorial as a part of my remarks:

No "QUICKIE"

We heartily approve the decision of the Ways and Means Committee to hold hearings on proposals to raise additional revenue instead of rubber-stamping the administration's tax program. For, as we pointed out in a recent editorial, without advance knowledge of the total amount of revenue to be raised, it is practically impossible for legislators to decide whether proposed tax increases will insure a fair distribution of the total contemplated tax burden.

The administration is proceeding on the assumption that $16,500,000,000 of additional revenue will be required to balance the budget in the next fiscal year. In the first place, the amount of money required to balance the cash budget, which measures the inflationary impact of deficit financing, is less than $13,000,000,000. That raises a question as to the total amount of taxes required as a curb on inflation. Second, the Ways and Means Committee wants to find out what is being done by the appropriations committees of Congress to pare budgeted spending recommendations before writing a tax bill. Otherwise there is no way of determining how much additional revenue will be needed to close the gap between receipts and expenditures. Third, the committee should investigate alternative means of raising revenue before acting on Administration recommendations. Fourth, the committee ought to have an opportunity to discuss Secretary Snyder's recommendations for raising such additional revenues as may be required to balance the budget. The Treasury's two-package tax approach is, in our opinion, an impediment to formulation of a well-balanced program aiming at a definite goal.

Nor is the need for so-called quickie tax legislation as pressing as administration spokesmen assert, since Government receipts are currently higher than expenditures. To be sure, new taxes should be voted as promptly as possible to offset the inflation-producing increase in purchasing power that will be felt when Government spending begins to outstrip Government income. But, as Mr. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee says, a tax program such as that proposed can't be put through "before breakfast."

Speech at Commemoration of Thirty-third Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me February 18, 1951, at Webster Hall, New York City:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, representatives of the Baltic States, members of the clergy, and my fellow citizens and friends, I am very happy to join with you in the commemoration of the thirty-third anniversary of that eventful day, of that milestone in the long and honorable historical record of the Lithuanian people—the declaration of independence promulgated by the Council of Lithuania at Vilnius on the 16th day of February 1918.

It would be futile on my part to discourse on the historical achievements of the Lithuanian race; on their service to the peoples of Western and Central Europe in holding the nomadic invasions from the East; on their centuries-old struggle with the Teutonic knights which saved Muscovy and Russia from the Drang Nach Osten; on their traditions of tolerance and freedom; on the valiant struggle of every generation of Lithuanians since 1795 for the reconstitution of their country's independence; on the inspiring martyrdom of Lithuanian Catholics in defense of their faith; on their unprecedented fight for the freedom of the press when, for 40 long years, Lithuanian men, women, and children had to smuggle in across the German frontier their prayer books and grammars and hide them from the Russian police. You know these things—I can only express my admiration for the excellent qualities and character of the people from which you sprang.

However, I wish to speak to you about the principles and aspirations which animate you and are common to Lithuanians, to Americans, and to mankind, about our joint defense of our Christian heritage, of our human dignity and freedom, of our ways of life, which are menaced by the evil men who presently control from the Kremlin of Moscow the destinies of hundreds of millions of human beings, and who hold the decision for war or peace.

My friends, until a few years ago the plaints of the Lithuanian people and of their good neighbors, the Latvians and Estonians, were frankly disbelieved by the rank and file citizens of this our great free country, and by statesmen of the world.

In a country where individual value and freedom of man are rated so high, it sounded almost unbelievable that in the present so-called enlightened age, the twentieth century of the Christian era, there are human beings who would exert every ounce of their strength, of their mental powers, who would subvert every modern invention toward enslaving the rest of the world, toward subjecting the former freemen to a police regime where the wife and child should spy on the husband and father, the brother upon his brother or sister, where every fifth person in civilian calling and every tenth person in the armed forces should be an agent-informer for the huge network of secret police serving the selfish interests of a single legitimate party which brooks no criticism of its evil deeds.

Who could have believed that there is a group of men, backed by vast armed forces and a network of spies, who would carefully select for extermination the very best elements of the peoples and countries which their Red army invaded?

Who could have believed that lands would be seized by foreign invaders, that freemen farmers would be converted into serfs of the State, that children would be claimed by the State as constituting the property of a single political party which claims supremacy over the people and the government?

Who could have believed that thousands of trucks, some of them lend-lease by the United States during the late war, would descend on peaceful farms and city homes in the dead of the night, rouse the inhabitants, separate the family heads from their wives and children, and would transport them all, regardless of their age and their innocence, for slave labor in the Arctic mines and forests thousands of miles away from their homes, for a slow death by starvation, cold, untended disease, and overwork?

Who could have believed that anywhere from fifteen to twenty or more million people of various races should be settled in such extermination camps, and that an average of one and a half million people should be dying annually in such slave camps?

Today, thanks in a large measure to fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent or extraction, to the self-effacing and untiring efforts of your coalition Lithuanian American Council and your information center, and to the living witnesses—some of whom are present in this very hall—the hundreds of thousands of former displaced persons—the American people know and believe, and the rest of the free world knows that this is true.

America is now girding in earnest for the defense of this country, of this continent, of the rest of the world. Once again we live on an emergency status, on borrowed time, and everyone realizes that the present emergency is greater than any that this country has ever faced.

We are paying huge taxes, and are prepared to pay more, for the support of our means of defense. We are compelled to increase our Armed Forces, our armaments, our facilities for telling the rest of the world the truth about our country and our intentions. Our men are fighting and dying in bleak and cold Korea, fighting in a war we did not start and in which we realize that the barbarian hordes attacking our boys are not our real enemies—that they are driven into slaughter by the evil masterminds who control the Communist-enslaved part of the world from the Kremlin. Once again our citizens have to give their blood for the Red Cross, to face the draft, to revive civil defense and the USO, to give relief to the homeless and the orphans and the hungry whom we can reach with our generous aid.

Just a few days ago we observed Lincoln's birthday. This year, more understanding than ever in the past, we pondered over the wise and significant words of Abraham Lincoln that the world cannot exist half free and half slave. We realize better than ever before that peace—and freedom—are indivisible. That a disturbance of peace in Korea or Greece, that enslavement of the Chinese or Lithuanians threaten our own security and peace and our own freedom.

This truth is brought to our consciousness ever more clearly when we learn that last Friday, on the 16th of February, the Lithuanian independence day, the Voice of America simultaneously began Lithuanian language radio broadcasts and increased broadcasts in Chinese dialects. China and Lithuania—both meet here in the United States, both need our exertions in behalf of spreading the truth about the events in the world. Both are enslaved by the same conspirators of the Kremlin. China, the nation with the oldest history, and Lithuania, the country speaking the oldest Indo-European language, both are objects of our attention in this one world of indivisible peace, of indivisible freedom. China and Lithuania, in both these far-removed countries a merciless underground struggle against the Soviet enslaver is active; drafted mongols are guarding the iron curtain separating Lithuania from the west; drafted Lithuanians are stationed at the far eastern outposts of the vast Eurasian Empire controlled by Russia.

Do we need a clearer reminder that freedom is indivisible? That the enslaved populations are our natural allies in our fight for freedom?

Ladies and gentlemen, in 1659, Alexander Carolus Curtius, a Lithuanian nobleman, arrived here in New York City, then called Nieuw Amsterdam by the Dutch settlers, to teach classics to the adolescent children of the colonists. He stayed here 2 years and is commonly titled "The Father of American High Schools," the first schoolmaster of New York. He came here to the American shores to help preserve the western Christian heritage of the settlers. Today the Lithuanians in their own homeland need our help in preserving their western Christian heritage, their birthright as freemen.

The Lithuanian contribution to the development of America continued practically unbroken since 1659. There were Lithuanians who had fought in the American Revolution to help our ancestors to secure their independence. Other Lithuanians had come here in the wake of the Napoleonic wars, and after the suppression of the Lithuanian insurrections of 1831 and 1863–64. The steady flow of Lithuanian immigration increased since 1864, particularly since the Russian ban on all Lithuanian printing and the institution of a 20-year military service for Russia.

Here the Lithuanians established an excellent name for themselves, as good citizens and men. You have 124 Roman Catholic parishes in this country. You maintain several academies and colleges, about 9 high schools, and 70 grammar schools. You publish about 50 newspapers and magazines in this country, in either Lithuanian or English, and thus you help maintain excellent standards of citizenship, of Americanism, of well-informed community influencing political consciousness of our masses. Everyone knows that you are not anti-Russian. You are antitotalitarians, anti-Communists, pro-Americans, pro-freemen.

Since 1940, since the invasion and enslavement of Lithuania by Russia in a conspiracy with Hitler's Germany, you have formed a nation-wide coalition Lithuanian-American Council, with the sole objective of burying for the duration your partisan differences in order to help the people of Lithuania to regain their freedom and independence. In your activities you never limited your scope to Lithuania alone. Rather, you spoke up for the Latvians and Estonians, for Poles with whom Lithuania had some differences, and for other enslaved nations. Is there a greater proof needed to show your Americanism, your devotion to the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy, which made this country great?

I am proud to note that, regardless of our deviations and errors in other fields, the Government of the United States has firmly held and continues to adhere to the principles enunciated on July 23, 1940, by the Department of State. I will read that statement:

"During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

"From the day when the people of these republics first gained their independence and democratic form of government the people of the United States watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

My friends, this most excellent statement of the American policy still stands—every word of it.

The Lithuanian flag still flies in Washington. The Lithuanian Legation and consulates enjoy complete recognition and freedom of action. Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian ships are still plying the seas under the protection of our courts. Lithuanian passports are still internationally recognized travel papers, even though the country itself is occupied and oppressed by a most brutal enemy. Lithuanian language radio broadcasts are now going daily on the air across the Atlantic Ocean to bring a message of encouragement to Lithuanian freemen. The Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation has a sympathetic audience whenever it addresses memoranda to the United States. Tribute to the spirit of the Lithuanian people is paid in our congressional speeches.

Thanks to the indomitable spirit and love of freedom, Lithuania is still unconquered. While no public observations of the Lithuanian Independence Day are permitted and the national anthem is banned, and while tens of thousands of Russian armed troops and police are prowling all across the country—we may rest assured that, as in the past years, there were Lithuanian Independence Day observances in the forests still controlled by Lithuanian freedom fighters. Hundreds of thousands of people visited the few remaining open churches to thank the Almighty for the benefits enjoyed by Lithuania in the past and to pray for relief from the present enslavement. Other masses of people prayed in silence while at work in factories and state-controlled farms. The Russians failed to enslave the minds of the Lithuanians. They cannot control the thoughts of self-respecting Lithuanians who recall that they were born freemen endowed with certain God-given rights which no man and no government has the right to take away.

We know, and we shall let the Lithuanian people know that we are aware that Lithuania is a victim of genocide—and you are one audience to which I do not have to explain what this new term means. I am informed that, in addition to mass deportations and ravages of the past few years, the new Stalin 5-year plan calls for 100,000 Lithuanian workers to work on the Volga and Turkmenian Canals in 1951. Special committees were installed with every secretariat of the Communist Party in every country late last fall, and lists of prospective victims were drawn. The arrests started January 1, 1951. Twenty thousand people are being transported to Russia this month alone—and the Soviet radio and press are already praising these "volunteers"—but we must inform the Russians that, sooner or later, they will pay the penalty for their crimes, that genocide convention was negotiated for just such purpose, and that we mean business—in Korea or elsewhere.

Our first concern today should be to overcome the pacifism which has stagnated our former allies and some of our new ones. Pacifism has left a vacuum of power in these countries, making it easier for communism to move in. By revitalizing a brave people like the Lithuanians and all other freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, we can eventually defeat communism without war.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I am very happy to be here with you tonight and to be of any help to you at Washington. I am proud of your aspirations, and I am as one with you. May I reassure you, and through you the people of Lithuania, that justice and liberty shall win, that Lithuania shall be liberated and free again, and may the Almighty hasten that day.

Accept the Dare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeton (N. J.) News tells us that we must accept the President's dare to cut his $71,000,000,000 cash budget which actually amounts to nearly $95,000,000,000 when authorizations are added. For one, I am willing to accept the dare and cut the President's budget. I sincerely hope that a majority of the House is feeling the same way. The editorial to which I have referred follows:

MUST ACCEPT THE DARE

In a somewhat flamboyant manner, President Truman has dared Congress to cut his $71,000,000,000 budget. The President asserted that it was a good budget and he dared Congress to reduce it. He also asserted that 2 years ago Congress complained about the size of the budget, but before that body was through with the appropriations it had added $2,000,000,000 to the total. The President made a good point here. We do not recall how much Congress did add to some of the appropriations but we do know that it did add some.

But now the President has put the issue squarely up to Congress and that body cannot, must not, refuse to accept the dare. To do so would be an abject surrender on the part of that body to a browbeating threat on the part of the Executive, the surrender by the House of Representatives of its constitutional right to be the originator of all revenue bills and the creation of a one-man maker and director of our national finances.

There cannot be the slightest question to this issue. It is as clear as the noonday sun, and making the assertion as he did and the way he did, Mr. Truman intended it to be a direct challenge to Congress as to who should be controller of our finances, the direct representation of the people invested with power under the Constitution or Harry S. Truman, elected to carry out the will of the people as promulgated through Congress.

This is the issue which confronts the Nation.

The next move is on the part of Congress.

Mr. Truman says his budget is a good one.

Congressmen and Senators who will be called on to consider it, say that it is a bad one.

Senator BYRD, an expert in such matters, says $9,100,000,000 can be cut from the budget without impairing the efficiency of government. Other Senators of both political parties do not hesitate to say billions can be cut off.

Over in the House, where all revenue bills must originate, members of both parties declare the budget is a bad one and must be cut.

With the best financial minds in both Houses of the Congress thus agreed, it is impossible for Congress to fail to meet the dare of the President and cut his budget without mercy or else, by failure to do so, stultify itself in the eyes of the people.

Why even the general public knows the budget is a bad one, because it knows that under the guise of defense measures, the President is attempting to foist on the public the Brannan farm plan, which Congress has consigned to the garbage pail, the socialized medicine, educational, housing bills, the St. Lawrence waterway, civil rights, and other measures which Congress has refused to enact even in peace days. The appropriations for every one of these measures should be cut out completely and the President told flatly not one cent for any of them, and that appropriations for the civil branches of the Government are going to be cut to the bone, and above those figures he will have to find the money elsewhere, and if he wants to take the fight to the people he is welcome to do so.

The honor and power of Congress is at stake.

Let us see how well that honor and power will be upheld.

W. E. M.

Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1951, marks the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Americans of Lithuanian descent will observe this day with fitting and appropriate ceremonies. Yes; all over the world where Lithuanians live will there be retold the story of Lithuanian independence which, for the time being, has been temporarily put aside.

We here in the Congress should convey as best we can to the people of Lithuania a message of hope and friendship—a message of our hope that in the near future they will attain again their desire for a free government and become a member of the family of independent nations.

Today Lithuania as a nation is being exterminated. The Soviet occupation has cost over 500,000 lives—victims of torture, starvation, political executions, and exile to death camps.

On this day of anniversary it will be heartening to the people of Lithuania to know they have the lasting friendship of our people in America.

The Scandal of the Scandals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is deplorable that high officials of this administration have condoned "government by influence" and "government by favoritism." It is more deplorable that they are so brazen and defiant in the face of justifiable criticism. This cynical attitude represents a real danger to our form of government.

I insert hereafter a relevant editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis.:

THE SCANDAL OF SCANDALS

One of the most scandalous things about the Truman administration scandals is the small amount of public indignation they arouse.

The quantity of them alone in their consistent quality of filth, corruption, and crookedness has sort of inured the electorate to shock and horror.

And therein, by countenancing if not encouraging their continuance. Mr. Truman has visited upon this and probably coming generations a deep and lasting sin.

Twenty years ago, one of the smallest of the comparatively most innocuous pieces of mischief pulled off in Washington under Harry Truman would have been enough to have blasted him and all his troop out of power.

There was a public conscience then. And the public expected conscience in high places.

But not any more.

The public has become too used to watching such things as influence being peddled from the very steps of the White House to the highest bidder, in cash or political advantage.

It has watched the callous stealing of elections, heard gangsters blithely admit their working arrangement with powerful politicians, seen old cronies mismanaging, cheapening, and poisoning Federal administration, lost count of traitors who have gained points of vantage from which they could betray the Nation to its enemies.

Yet through all of this the President has done nothing in the name of reformation, everything in his power to prevent it.

Thus today, a Senate committee controlled by his own party investigates the powerful Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC), finds its loan policies dictated by a web of influence reaching into the White House itself.

And Mr. Truman calls their findings asinine, and demands reappointment of all five of the RFC's accused board members.

Sadly, Democratic Senator PAUL DOUGLAS remarks that "influence is an illness of mediocre administration."

But this illness springs not from a mediocre but from a downright bad administration.

Still, few of the public which suffers because of it seem to care.

Like the people of Barcelona and London during the war, they have become so used to and weary with bombers overhead and fire screaming down upon them, that they don't even look up any more, they don't even pay attention to the air-raid sirens.

And that is the big curse of this whole business.

Americans have come to expect this stuff of their Government, and to figure nothing can be done about it. And when cynicism and hopelessness rule the mind of the land, decency and democracy—and thus liberty—have gone.

Smooth Sailing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent editorial written by Charles Francis Coe that appeared in the Palm Beach Post-Times of February 11, 1951. In his own rugged manner Mr. Coe calls attention to what the American people are thinking about, and asks the question many are asking, "If we have to make greater sacrifices for the war effort, why doesn't the President himself set an example for us all and give up some of his luxuries paid for by the taxpayer?" It is a simple question and the answer is equally simple. As long ago as August 3, 1950, I urged the President to practice the personal economy he was begging the American taxpayer to exercise, but my pleas were ignored and recently the Congress was dared to reduce his budget with many proposals which have nothing to do with the defense effort. Such leadership during these anxious times is alarming.

Charles Francis Coe, or "Socker" Coe as he is affectionately known by his many friends, has lived an active life and knows it from many angles. In his earlier days he was a heavyweight boxing champion of the United States Navy; later he became a successful automobile dealer in Massachusetts, and wrote articles for the Saturday Evening Post. He was so successful in this work that he went into semiretirement, and built a home in Florida. After the financial crash in 1929 he again took up his writing, studied law, passed his bar examinations in Florida, and became general counsel to the Motion Picture Producers & Distributors Association. When Will Hays died, "Socker" resigned and eventually became the chief editorialist of the string of about 25 Florida newspapers owned by John Perry.

"Socker" Coe is a man respected by his friends and one who hates hypocrisy in any form. His intense patriotism is needed in times like these, and acts as a stimulus to all who love their country.

SMOOTH SAILING

President Truman insists that we must all make greater sacrifices to the war mobilization. We agree with him. We hold it to be a moral certainty that the sacrifices will be imposed.

The Bureaus in Washington undoubtedly will grow in number rather than decrease. That villainous and mountainous Government payroll will embrace another horde of confused but ravenous grovellers in the public trough. The taxpayers will provide the trough and the slush therein. So we can be fairly certain of making the sacrifices the President so touchingly advances as pleasurable duties.

What about his own smooth sailing? A yacht for weekends, which might be put to more practical usages in a war. A mighty airplane which costs fabulous sums to run and ride in, might drop a load of bombs on troops just fixing to slay our fighting kids, were it not awaiting the Presidential whim. That fifty thousand a year salary raise tax exempt, might furnish a cup of coffee or a few cigarettes for the lads in the battlefields or hospitals.

It would appear that President Truman, sensing with consummate skill the fact that we cannot share the yacht, the airplane and the tax exempt salary, takes the position that, if we cannot share those, he will not share our sacrifices. That would match the reasoning of his screwy economic planning. That is the type logic we have learned to expect from him.

So he has smooth sailing. If the wake he churns in passing us common folks, causes undue turbulence about the rowboat which is our measure of participation, then we just pull a little harder on the oars to get to smoother water. If we break or lose an oar, that is our hard luck. There will be no destroyers, operated at colossal expense on our money, to stand guard over us. We are on our own.

If, by chance, we manage to earn a dollar or two more than we used to earn, we will pay the clickety-clack bracket through income tax, with none of that "exemption" relish, so delectable to the Presidential palate. Those who believe that this is a land where abides equal opportunity to all men, will wonder a bit about where the equality comes. These will sense the splendid wisdom which dictated that we must support but one President.

If we had two, with the appetite for special privilege so manifest in Mr. Truman, the country would go broke in a week. Whether or not the President knows it, there is widespread resentment against this churlish effrontery which scorns the fitness of things wheresoever that fitness is apt to limit the wanton spending and personal prerogatives of the White House gang. It were well for him, for his public prestige and for his party, that he take a little more accurate measure of the cumulative feeling in these matters.

Faith in the leadership of this country is at the lowest ebb in history. The hinterlands, which are the backbone of the Republic, feel deep apprehension. The sentiment is almost solid that Truman and Acheson are without knowledge of what cooks. The public ear is aching with double talk. The public heart is wearied with fear. The public conscience is outraged at the prodigal spending.

The public spirit wants defense, not bureaucracy. It wants strength, not wanton self-indulgence of the few. It seeks integrity, not insolvency of motive, of method and of mentality. It appraises the basics by weighing these greedy demonstrations. The resultant appraisals are shocking.

It sees a President weaseling around the lowering of exemptions for married taxpayers, while holding in his hand $50,000 a year with no tax to be paid. It recalls that this obnoxious conniving took place in the most flagrant political atmosphere, so that the President could sign the legislation into law before he undertook his new term, merely because, had he been serving at the time the law was passed, he could not have received the increase.

In this perilous and perilous hour of our national history, such shenanigans are barefaced assault upon the faith of our people. They breed deep discontent and abysmal

suspicion, through flaunting political skulduggery brazenly before the world. They destroy confidence not alone here but abroad. They reflect a cynical impiety in the top leadership of this God-loving people.

They do violence to every tradition and precept which have builded our national dignity and prestige. They fester in sacred places, fostered by the practices of Tammany and Pendergast. They expose the most venal and avaricious intent to fatten at public expense, while posing as faithful servants of our Nation. They are just as wrong as things can be wrong.

They cry out for rectification, that once again our people may look with pride upon our Capital, its public institutions, and public officials. They explain by inference, Mr. President, why Acheson remains at your side, why his loyalty to Him does not impress you as disloyalty to our country. Kick in with some of these sacrifices yourself, sir. Then we will understand.

CHARLES FRANCIS COE.

Food for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stop Haggling Over Food for India," published in the Christian Century for February 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP HAGGLING OVER FOOD FOR INDIA

Shall the United States Senate be permitted to use starvation as an instrument of foreign policy? That question is raising its ugly head in the languid discussions which have now started in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on whether we shall make available to India the 2,000,000 tons of grain that country needs to avert famine. Nehru, it is said in the cloakrooms, is showing too much independence in the east-west conflict. Let's drag our feet a little on this food question and force him to come around. That attitude is utterly wrong. It shows contempt for the humanitarian tradition of the American people. It reveals a callousness to suffering which is shocking in its cruelty. Do the Senators want to present this Nation to the world as a monster which cannot be placated unless it has its way? That is what they are doing. No wonder we are losing the battle for the minds of men. Instead of gaining an ally, this course offers the surest method of alienating not only the second most populous nation on earth, not only the rest of Asia, but all people everywhere who have a spark of compassion left in their souls. It refuses to credit the Indian Prime Minister's peace efforts as the sincere attempts they are to avert the global catastrophe of war. It assumes instead that our position is the only one that can possibly be right. Nehru is risking everything on an effort to avert war, not only because he believes this to be his duty to mankind but also because he sees that war between the great powers could easily reduce India to a brawling chaos in which all ordered government would collapse. Who would benefit from that? If Senator CONNALLY and his colleagues cannot be statesmen, if they cannot rise to the demands of ordinary humanity, if they cannot be restrained from alienating our last friend on earth, the American people ought to demand that they quit misrepresenting us to the world. They will understand if they are told they must stop haggling over food for India.

Every Second Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the December 1950 issue of the American Federationist, the official monthly publication of the American Federation of Labor, carried a stirring article entitled "Every Second Counts," which so well epitomizes the nature of the crisis we are facing, and the action we must take to meet and beat that crisis, that I ask that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It should be noted that this article was prepared and printed prior to the reverses in Korea which were needed to awaken many to the seriousness of our situation. Labor, in general, had anticipated the need for all-out action, and was prepared to offer its support before it was called upon. In the midst of the smokescreens now being thrown up by many groups, decrying labor's willingness to take its full share of the burden in this emergency, I feel that the real courage and conviction of responsible labor groups and leaders in rising to meet and anticipate the country's demands merits fullest praise and recognition.

EVERY SECOND COUNTS—WE MUST REBUILD OUR STRENGTH VERY QUICKLY

The gravest challenge in history now confronts the American people. Communist Russia, armed to the teeth, is moving against the non-Communist world. The goal, as always since the Communist gang seized power by violence in Russia 33 years ago, is conquest and domination of all the nations and all the peoples of the earth. The No. 1 target is the United States, champion of the free way of life which shows up totalitarian communism for the tremendous fraud that it is.

At the moment Communist Russia is acting through her junior partner in crime against humanity, Communist China. Stalin has other puppets ready to kill, burn, and enslave whenever he decides to twitch the strings. Many countries are in great peril. Stalin has huge Soviet armies at his command, a tremendous air force, the atom bomb. His own essential industry, unlike ours, is widely dispersed and hidden. He has his covetous eyes on Western Europe, on the oil fields of the Middle East, on India, and Latin America. Of all the countries that he plans to conquer, the one he most wants to crush is our own great and free United States.

Where will the Communists move next? When will they strike next? Will they roll against Western Europe first? Will they bomb us? It is anyone's guess. Only Stalin and his fellow-gangsters in the Kremlin know the answers. But so long as the Communists' military strength is enormous and that of the free world tragically puny, the likelihood of further Communist aggression and the danger of the defeat and enslavement of all democratic nations continue very great.

The time has arrived for very plain talk. If we want to survive, there is no time whatsoever to be lost. Just as quickly as possible, with every loyal American rendering the maximum service where he is most needed, with all secondary objectives gracefully granting priority to the most important task in our history, we must build up our armed strength. Just as quickly as possible, we must establish equality in military potency with our ruthless enemy and then surge far ahead of him.

So long as we remain relatively weak and unprepared, the Red Fascists will be tempted to move again and again, to gobble up more defenseless countries or even to dump atom bombs on our large and exposed industrial cities. So long as we remain relatively weak, no realistic American or citizen of any other non-Communist country can justifiably feel secure.

Once we have rebuilt our strength, the situation will be entirely different. Then Communist Russia will know that the day of easy victories is over. The Communists may decide to commit new aggressions anyway, but if they do, the free world will then be in a position to repel the aggressors and make them rue their murderous deeds. More likely, the existence of overpowering American strength, ready to destroy the Communists if they make but one foul move, will suffice to persuade the Reds to behave. Stalin and his henchmen are slave masters, murderers, and bullies. Words never deter a bully. But he is always profoundly impressed by strength capable of smashing him.

Without question, the imperative task facing the United States and the American people is the rebuilding of our military strength. Every American must cooperate wholeheartedly. There will be many dull jobs, many unpleasant jobs, many dangerous jobs. All of these jobs will have to be done. Not only our precious liberty, not only our lofty principles and ideals, but our very lives—yes; our very lives—depend upon every American citizen now rolling up his sleeves and getting into the fight with all his ability, with all his strength.

We probably have far less time to get ready to defend ourselves than we did in 1940. There's not a minute to be wasted. Let's get going.

Famine Relief for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

FAMINE RELIEF FOR INDIA

The Commission on Evangelical Action of the National Association of Evangelicals, having received the eye-witness report of its secretary, Dr. Clyde W. Taylor, who just returned from a tour of the famine area of India, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas this commission has carefully studied the crisis that has arisen in India because of the devastating drought and has concluded that it is our Christian duty to share our food supplies with starving men and women in India; and

"Whereas the sending of such material does not imply that we necessarily approve of India's political alliances and attitudes: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we memorialize the Congress to give favorable and careful consideration to the request of India for allocation of wheat and other foodstuffs, and that we urge the Christians of America to share with those who are dying for want of food; and

"That we urge Congress to safeguard the interests of the United States and the people of India, first, by making it mandatory to the India Government that the people of India shall be fully informed that such foodstuffs are the gift of the people of the United States sharing with the needy of India the necessities of life; and second, that this foodstuff must be distributed to the people of India at actual cost, avoiding all irregular profits of merchants, millers, and all others;

"That such safeguards are urgent because in many lands our relief has been used to propagandize and spread the influence of some political party, religious hierarchy, or totalitarian regime, with neither appreciation nor public acknowledgment of America's sacrifice; and, furthermore, such American food has found its way either into illegal markets or has been sold through merchants who profiteered at the expense of starving humanity. These abuses must be avoided."

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 12, 1951.*

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the House has acted to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and has included amendments which are of doubtful merit. During the years ahead it seems clear that more and more of our surplus will move into export channels and trade encouragement may not be necessary. But the following editorial, published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, does point out serious dangers and it is worthy of the attention of every Member:

NOW WE CAN RELAX

It seems odd that Congress should be worrying about foreign competition with our infant industries right now, but that's the fact. At least the House has been worried. Yesterday it amended the reciprocal trade agreements extension act by restoring the "peril point" provisions.

Under this amendment, a President must give Congress a chance to disapprove any tariff concessions under the act which in the opinion of the Tariff Commission would put an American industry under peril from competition of foreign goods. The provision was put into the law in the Eightieth Congress, was taken out by the Eighty-first, and now apparently is to be put back in.

No one wants to see young and struggling American industries, like United States Steel, General Motors, and du Pont, put in peril of their lives by the unfair competition from the big industrial bullies of Europe. If they and others are in peril, let them be protected by all means from the machinations of bureaucrats who want to increase our foreign trade.

But this does seem a strange time to be worrying on that score. We are entering on a new period of war production throughout the western industrial world. It is destined to be a period of indefinite duration and its chief characteristic will be a shortage of goods and raw materials. We shall be needing and wanting everything we can lay our hands on. In fact, the United States right now is bidding energetically for all the raw materials in sight, and if there is going to be any surplus manufactures lying around, doubtless we shall be wanting those too, but there won't be.

At the end of this period, whether it be with war or not in between, the situation that existed at the close of the last war will be repeated. The problem will not be to keep foreign goods out of the country, but how to get paid by foreign countries for the goods which will be available only in America.

However, if Congress does not have enough to worry about without adding the danger of foreign competition to the list, this furore about protecting home markets is as good a way to take it out as any. Of course, in the world situation that is going to exist for the foreseeable future, such measures are going to be as nearly completely meaningless and pointless as anything that could be struck off by the mind of man. But it gives a feeling of righteousness and of a duty performed, and that is perhaps enough.

Bewildered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "Bewildered," appearing in the Mount Holly (N. J.) Citizen. This column is written by our former colleague, Hon. Frank Mathews, Jr., who will be well remembered for his pungent observation on national affairs while he was a Member of the House:

BEWILDERED

(By Frank Mathews, Jr.)

A friend of mine said to me, "Why are we Americans so callous? Our boys are dying by the thousands in Korea. We read the headlines, shrug our shoulders and go about our business as usual."

People who have recently been in Europe tell us that Americans are hysterical while the Europeans who are nearest to and most in danger from Russia and communism are very little flustered about it but quite concerned about our hysteria.

These two views do not seem to jibe.

Perhaps we are neither callous nor hysterical. Perhaps we are just bewildered. Now finally awake to the terrible and insidious threat of communism, we are organizing ourselves on a totalitarian basis to fight a total war against it. Some of those who were previously the loudest shouters against communism because it was totalitarian and the wordiest proponents of our way of life, to combat it are now the most hysterical advocates of totalitarianism to fight it.

Anyhow, we are preparing as never before for a war greater than ever before. Against whom? Against Russia, of course.

To us who want completely adequate defense against whatever may threaten us, at least two things are confusing. First, how is Russia, which so recently was wholly inadequate to defend itself against a Germany fighting other large and strong nations at the same time, without $2,000,000,000 of lend-lease from us and a vast American military second front in Europe, now so strong; and secondly, is there no way to avoid totalitarianism than by becoming totalitarian?

This week let's take a look at the first of these problems.

How did Russia, in about 5 years, become so strong that we believe she can lick the whole world unless we and every other nation of that world sacrifice everything we have to stop her? Either we are grossly exaggerating the power of Russia or we are largely responsible for that power—or perhaps something of both.

My great overt national sin occurred in 1940, when I expressed the belief that nazism and fascism, bad as they were, were local diseases, but that communism was a virulent epidemic so contagious and deadly it could engulf the entire world, and advocated that we not give our all to enthrone communism merely to force nazism and fascism to abdicate.

I continued in this sin while I was a Member of the House of Representatives by voting against the $3,750,000,000 loan to Great Britain and opposing the Marshall plan as such. Both were sold by the administration to our people as sure-fire measures to stop communism, while at the same time that administration appeased and gave aid, succor and comfort to Russia, coddled communism within its own ranks and sent the author of the Marshall plan to China to return with a report that the Chinese Communists were not really Communists of the Russian type at all, but were just nice, harmless agrarian liberals, or something like that.

We now know that Great Britain and other nations who received our aid and goods are either reshipping or selling vital materials to Russia and Communist China and opposing our efforts in the United Nations to have both these outfits branded as what they really are. We seem to feel that we are honest, generous, sinless folk who have been fully betrayed, sold out, and double crossed by the nations we supposed were our friends and whom we so nobly aided in their time of need.

Next week I would like to give you a somewhat different slant on this situation.

Condemnation of Governmental Socialistic Endeavors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution condemning governmental socialistic endeavors, recently adopted by an outstanding group of Maine young men known as the State of Maine Junior Chamber of Commerce at the monthly meeting of that group held at Augusta, Maine, January 18, 1951:

CONDEMNATION OF GOVERNMENTAL SOCIALISTIC ENDEAVORS

Whereas the United States has the highest standards of living of any country in the

world, as a result of our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas socialization, wherever tried, becomes a cancerous growth which prostitutes its people at the feet of its Government and crucifies their freedom on the cross of political fortune, from which living death, no nation can be resurrected, and

Whereas powerful political figures encourage a program of a welfare state designated to buy tenure in office with an eternal mortgage upon our precious heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State of Maine Junior Chamber of Commerce in body duly convened at its January Board Meeting in Augusta, Maine, on this the 18th day of January, A. D. 1951, does hereby condemn governmental socialistic endeavors in violation thereof; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen of this State as an appeal paramount to party allegiance to give this Nation under God a new birth of freedom for individual endeavor.

ECA Plants 300,000,000 Seedlings a Year in Korea Prior to the Russian-Red China Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to note that the contribution to the defense of Korea against Communist aggression consisted of planting 300,000,000 seedlings a year by the ECA.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Frank P. Litschert giving some of the history of the bungling, fumbling jobs so characteristic of the New Deal:

(By Frank P. Litschert)

Congress is alert to grave shortcomings in the Truman-Acheson policy in Korea after our occupation forces were withdrawn in July 1949—just 1 year before the Communist aggression.

Reviewing the State Department's Korean policy for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 7, 1950, Secretary Acheson declared that "conditions of stability and public order have continued to improve, and the threat of Communist overthrow appears, at least temporarily, to have been contained."

How temporary was this happy situation may be judged by the fact that the Communist aggression broke on June 25, just about 16 weeks after Secretary Acheson's official estimate of his great success in containment.

So certain was the State Department of this success that it gave no military assistance to Korea after the withdrawal of our occupation forces.

House Report No. 2495 from the Foreign Affairs Committee, July 11, 1950, recalls two different congressional appropriations for military aid to Korea. These were $27,640,000 under Public Law 329 of the Eighty-first Congress, signed by President Truman on October 6, 1949, and $30,000,000 under Public Law 430, signed on October 28, 1949.

But on July 11, 1950 (3 weeks after the Communist aggression), the Foreign Affairs Committee reported: "No deliveries of any consequence have been made as yet * * * The reasons for lack of deliveries are these, etc."

This dismal report of inactivity, in the face of the gathering Communist mobilization in North Korea, was the basis of the statement a few days later by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan:

"Last October Congress voted millions for military aid to South Korea. When the Reds attacked 8 months later, exactly $200 forth of signal corps wire was all that had been delivered."

Of the $150,000,000 in nonmilitary aid to Korea voted in February 1950, not 1 cent had been delivered when the aggression broke on June 25.

Commenting on this sad record, President Syngman Rhee of the South Korean Republic declared publicly:

"I asked for antitank guns. I did not get antitank guns. I asked for antiaircraft guns. I got none. I asked for ammunition for what few rifles we had. I got no ammunition. When the dreaded blow fell, we were able to oppose the strong North Korean air force with only 10 trainer planes—the best we could afford."

What kind of aid were we giving to Korea before the aggression? The answer was given by Edgar A. J. Johnson, Director of the Korean Division of ECA, on March 7, 1950, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (hearings, p. 372): "There is a vigorous program of reforestation going on, and at the present time there are being planted about 300,000,000 seedlings a year."

Does this fit in with the statement of Prof. Owen Lattimore, State Department consultant on Asia, on July 17, 1949? Said Lattimore: "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not let it look as though we pushed it. Hence the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000."

This, in broad outline, is the story of the Truman-Acheson policy in Korea, which, to date, has cost 50,000 American casualties.

Not until the State Department is housecleaned from top to bottom may the American people hope for deliverance from such incompetence and treachery.

Temporary Reorganization Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Temporary Reorganization Powers," published in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPORARY REORGANIZATION POWERS

The Senate has made a reasonable compromise in agreeing to give the President modified reorganization powers during the present emergency. Although the White House had asked for unrestricted authority to shift agencies or to consolidate them while the current defense crisis continues, the Senate insisted on retaining the right to veto any proposal within 18 days of submission. This was a marked concession, in view of the requirement of the 1949 Reorganization Act that Congress be given 60 days in which to disapprove any Presidential plan for executive reform.

Mr. Truman wanted Congress to reactivate a section of the War Powers Act of 1941 which gave the President blanket reorganization powers in time of national emergency. It was under that section that the late President Roosevelt created the War Manpower Commission, the War Labor Board, and numerous other temporary agencies—without specific legislative action.

The Korean situation today is not such as to cause critics of blanket Executive powers to change their minds as to the need for some congressional check on Presidential plans. Nor was there any fight by administration stalwarts in the Senate for acceptance of the President's original proposal. The principal debate was over the period which should be allowed for congressional action. The suggestions ranged from 12 to 30 days, with 18 finally approved. This would allow sufficient time for committee study and report. If neither the Senate nor the House should veto a proposed reorganization by a majority of the full membership, the plan would become operative. The 18-day limit would apply only to temporary reorganizations related to national defense, however. The 1949 law for permanent reorganization of the Government would not be weakened in any way. It should not be, for Congress still has a lot of work to do in the field of reform covered by the Hoover Commission.

Radios Render Great Public Service; KROX Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in these times, when it seems to be popular to criticize and to find fault, we very often overlook the great good accomplished by Americans and American industry.

I would like to single out just one industry today for a word of commendation. I refer to the radio stations of our Nation.

In this day of confusion, when many lands are subject to the iron rule of a dictatorship, we should note the contrast between the operation of American radio stations and those in some other nations. There are countries in the world, especially those behind the iron curtain, where radio is used constantly to divide and subjugate the people, to thwart the freedom of mankind, and to instill hatred and greed into the hearts of the citizens.

Compare this use of radio with the operation of the radio stations in America. We are all familiar with the public service programs of the American radio industry, the free time made available for the purpose of education and the sharing of knowledge, the programs dedicated to humanitarian causes, the unselfish devotion to the ideals of freedom of thought and expression, and the constant effort to make life better for all our people as well as the people of all the world.

The radio industry of America stands unchallenged in its service to the ideals which are America's heritage and the industry asks nothing in return, being content to operate freely in a land where freedom is the paramount tradition.

While I am proud to pay this tribute to the radio industry of America as a whole, I would like to single out, as an example of the public-service record of the industry, a radio station in my own district. I refer to radio station KROX at Crookston, Minn.

Carrying on in the great tradition of the radio industry, Station KROX exemplifies the spirit of community cooperation and service of all radio stations in our Nation. Last year the area around Crookston suffered one of the most disastrous floods in history. It is not possible to determine the number of lives that were saved and the property damage that was avoided because of the part Station KROX and other radio stations in that area played in flood operations. It is sufficient to say the station and others were a strong beacon of mercy and refuge in that disaster.

A recent service performed by the Crookston station is best described in a story from the wires of the United Press:

Crookston authorities have captured a suspected hit and run driver after a public campaign for his arrest was launched by radio station KROX.

KROX posted a $100 reward for the suspect's arrest and invited the public to add to the reward fund. The station also broadcast a series of programs which urged the citizens of the Crookston area to contact the local police with any information they might have regarding the accident. It was through a tip offered to the sheriff by a listener of the station that led to the arrest.

I am proud of these services KROX is giving to its community. I am more proud to know that hundreds of radio stations, all over America, are equally vigilant and equally public spirited.

We need have no fear for the future of our democratic way of life as long as we have free and unafraid avenues of information. Our free way of life is safer and more secure because of the services of America's radio stations, television stations, newspapers, magazines, and other publications.

Exploration for Petroleum in the Gulf of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, development and exploration for petroleum in the Gulf of Mexico, which a little over 3½ years ago occupied the time of large number of crews, has now fallen off to such an extent, according to the testimony of Walter S. Hallanan, chairman of the Offshore Lessees Committee, that there are now only four geophysical crews in operation off the coast of Texas and only five drilling rigs operating in the entire Gulf of Mexico.

This statement was made today before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of Senate Joint Resolution 20, introduced by the junior Senator from New Mexico and myself, to provide for the continuation of operations under leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hallanan's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF WALTER S. HALLANAN, PRESIDENT OF PLYMOUTH OIL CO., BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

My name is Walter S. Hallanan. I am president of Plymouth Oil Co., an independent producer and refiner, which owns a substantial interest in approximately 120,000 acres of oil and gas leases acquired through competitive bidding from the State of Texas in 1947 on submerged lands in the Gulf of Mexico. I am appearing before you as chairman of the Offshore Lessees Committee, which consists of representatives of most of the holders of leases on submerged lands off the coasts of Texas, Louisiana, and California.

The committee will recall that at the hearings held in October 1949 on the subject of submerged lands, the offshore lessees presented detailed and comprehensive testimony in order to give you as complete and accurate picture of our offshore operations as was possible. We showed you a motion picture of our operations. Mr. E. F. Bullard, president of the Standard Oil and Gas Co., described the geology of and the geophysical work accomplished on the submerged lands in the Gulf of Mexico. Mr. H. H. Kaveler, assistant to the vice president in charge of production of Phillips Petroleum Co., testified with respect to drilling operations and production practices. Mr. Hines H. Baker, president of Humble Oil and Refining Co., discussed the equities of the holders of leases acquired from the respective States. Mr. Ernie E. Pyles, vice president of Jergins Oil Co., presented the facts concerning offshore operations in California.

At the hearings held before this committee last August on Senate Joint Resolution 195, Mr. Clayton Orn, counsel for the Ohio Oil Co.; Mr. W. W. Clary, counsel for Signal Oil & Gas Co.; and myself appeared in behalf of the offshore lessees to supplement the testimony previously given you. It is my understanding that the records of both those hearings during the Eighty-first Congress have been formally adopted as a part of the record of this hearing. It is the purpose of my testimony today to bring up to date the record, with respect to offshore operations for oil and gas.

I am advised that current production from State leases on submerged lands off California (exclusive of production from the city of Long Beach) averages about 50,000 barrels per day. These leases cover 10,600 acres of submerged land. This oil is being produced from about 400 wells, the wellheads of which are located on the uplands, but the wells are drilled at an angle and bottomed out under the water. Operations off California are continuing under a series of stipulations which have been entered into annually by the State and the United States pending the determination of the location of the seaward line of California's inland waters—that is the line where the rights of the State end and the paramount powers of the United States begin under the Supreme Court's opinion in the case.

Of the total of 2,925,000 acres leased since 1945 by 30 operators from the States of Texas and Louisiana through competitive bidding, there remain outstanding leases covering 1,550,000 acres, or about 50 percent of the area originally leased. Leases covering about 400,000 acres have been surrendered within the past 6 months.

As of February 14 of this year, 235 wells had been drilled on these leases, resulting in 91 oil wells, 28 gas condensate wells, 4 dry gas wells, and 112 dry holes. These wells are located at distances from shore varying from 1 to 27 miles. The total oil produced up to the present time is estimated to be about 9,500,000 barrels. Present production, practically all of which is off Louisiana, amounts to about 20,000 barrels per day. Offshore operators have expended in excess of $250,000,000 in the search for oil in the Gulf of Mexico. The gross revenue from the oil produced has amounted to about $90,000,000.

I would like to call to your attention these facts which illustrate the extent to which activities in the Gulf have declined. Three and one-half years ago 48 geophysical crews were in operation. At present there are only four in operation, all off the coast of Texas. Eighteen months ago 26 drilling rigs were in operation. Six months ago the number had dropped to 14. At present 5 rigs are drilling off Louisiana and none off Texas. Unless some relief is granted, when these five wells are completed, drilling in the Gulf will be at a complete standstill.

On last December 11 the Supreme Court of the United States entered its decrees in the Texas and Louisiana cases. In these decrees the lessees were enjoined from carrying on any activities on these submerged lands except under authorization first obtained from the United States. On the same day the Secretary of the Interior issued a notice which, in effect, authorized those then conducting operations to continue them for a period of 60 days. A subsequent notice has extended the period for an additional 30 days, or until March 11. In other words, drilling of the five wells now being drilled and production from existing wells can be continued, but no new wells can be commenced. The Secretary stated in his notice:

"The relationship between the known domestic supplies of petroleum and the present and potential national needs, military and civilian, for petroleum is such that undue interruption of the present operations in the Gulf of Mexico would involve the risk of injury to our national security and economy. Moreover, the producing wells and the elaborate facilities used in drilling for and producing oil and gas in the submerged coastal lands are subjected to unusual risks of loss, injury, and deterioration through action by the elements, which can only be avoided or minimized by continuous and vigilant operation and maintenance. Such loss, injury, and deterioration, if permitted to occur, would be an economic waste in an operation of benefit to the national security and economy and productive of income to the Federal Government."

Gentlemen of the committee, we cannot overemphasize the great importance of adequate petroleum supplies in these critical times. Petroleum is the lifeblood of the machines of production and mobilization—whether on the farm or in the factory. It is the propelling power of practically all forms of transportation—whether on land, on sea, or in the air. It is the motive power for all our military forces—whether the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force. History shows that our superiority in oil was a vital and decisive weapon in winning the past two World Wars. Our enemies' inferiority in oil hastened their ultimate defeat. Lord Curzon said of World War I, "The allied cause floated to victory on a wave of oil." Fleet Admiral Nimitz said that World War II was won with "bullets, beans, and oil." No one knows how

what our petroleum requirements would be in the event of another world conflict. We all agree that they will be staggering—even beyond the requirements of previous wars.

Let us look for a moment at our present petroleum picture. Today our domestic production of crude oil is approaching 6,000,000 barrels a day, and our Nation's partial mobilization plan is just beginning. This production is 1,100,000 barrels a day in excess of the peak production in World War II.

Today we are importing both crude oil and refined products in sizable quantities. According to the latest published report of the Bureau of Mines, which is for the month of November, we imported an average of 465,000 barrels of crude oil a day, 100,000 barrels a day coming from the Middle East and 365,000 barrels a day coming from Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela. We also imported from the Caribbean area about 450,000 barrels per day of refined products, mostly residual fuel oil. Total imports of crude oil and refined products are currently in excess of 1,000,000 barrels daily.

The impact of a world conflict on these foreign sources of supply is unpredictable. Many believe that the Middle East supply would be lost. In that event, we would not only be deprived of that oil we now utilize here at home, but we would also face the responsibility of furnishing from our own supplies the necessary petroleum requirements of our allies overseas, who are now receiving supplies from the Middle East. Production in the Middle East for November averaged 1,900,000 barrels daily.

Many are also concerned about the possibility of a substantial reduction in supplies from South American sources which might result from sabotage in those countries where the oil fields are located or from extensive submarine warfare along the shipping lanes.

With respect to the relationship of petroleum to our national defense, this committee will be interested in a request made by the Department of the Interior on January 29 of the National Petroleum Council, of which I am chairman. The Department informed the council that preliminary studies by the Petroleum Administration for Defense indicated that in the event of war there would be a sharp increase in the demand for petroleum requirements which would require large quantities of capital and materials, and the Department stated that the magnitude of the quantities was not known. However, the Department, which is specifically charged with the responsibility of seeing that adequate petroleum supplies are obtained to meet our civilian and military demands, requested the council to make a study of the capital and materials needed in order to increase the availability of petroleum products in the Western Hemisphere by 1,000,000 barrels per day. That study is already under way. This assignment, which I consider to be one of the most important that the National Petroleum Council has been called upon to undertake, is certainly indicative of the staggering demands we may have to meet.

If the necessity arises, how can we be prepared to replace the petroleum imports which we might lose, to supply our allies who might be cut off from their present sources of supplies, and, at the same time, to satisfy the tremendous increases in military and essential civilian requirements at home which would result from another world conflict?

For one thing, we must intensify our exploratory activities. We must intensify our drilling activities, both exploratory and development, in an attempt to discover new oil fields as well as to develop fully and rapidly the existing fields. We must build up a reserve productive capacity which will be available immediately to meet the demands of any emergency. As the late Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, said: "I do wish to emphasize that undeveloped oil fields provide no power for machines of either war or peace."

When we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, we were in a position to increase our production immediately and within maximum efficient rates by more than 800,000 barrels a day. At present, according to the best informed opinion, our reserve productive capacity is only about 450,000 barrels per day. It is imperative that this cushion of safety so vital to our existence be very substantially increased with the utmost speed.

Of great importance to our Nation's energy supplies are the very large natural gas reserves that have been discovered off the coast of Louisiana. Natural gas is an essential fuel for many of our basic industries. Plans have been made and contracts entered into requiring the development of these gas fields, and the laying of marine pipelines to transport the gas to shore, where it will enter gas transportation lines for distribution throughout the eastern half of the United States, thereby adding substantially to the supplies we need to satisfy the ever-increasing fuel demands of our mobilization program.

These submerged lands which are the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 20 offer one of the largest potential producing areas in the continental United States yet to be extensively tested. Much of the time-consuming work of exploring any new area is already behind us. We have spent years on research and gained years of experience in the solution of the physical problems of operating on the submerged lands. We have designed, built, and assembled large quantities of equipment peculiarly adapted to the search for oil in the open sea. We estimate that about $100,000,000 has been spent on such equipment. We have employed and trained many men in this highly specialized, costly, and technical work. We have already located many prospects by means of geophysical surveys and have purchased leases on them. Some of these have been tested resulting in discoveries. Others have been failures. Many of them remain untested by the drill.

Unfortunately, however, we are in a position where we are powerless to move. We have been enjoined by the Supreme Court. The Secretary of the Interior cannot give us relief. As he stated in his report dated January 29 to the chairman of this committee concerning this joint resolution, "guidance from the Congress is needed for the program of expanded development referred to above."

If we are permitted to resume our work, I firmly believe we will substantially increase our producing capacity. I have talked with many offshore operators and I can assure this committee that if the necessary permission is granted, the extent of offshore operations will soon surpass the peak of all previous activities.

It is difficult to estimate how much additional production and reserves will be developed by these efforts. I understand it is the belief of some operators that the daily production from fields already discovered in the Gulf could be more than doubled in 6 to 8 months. I also know it is the opinion of some operators that, depending on the magnitude of new discoveries, it may be possible to increase production in the Gulf by two to three hundred thousand barrels daily within the next 2 to 3 years.

But in any event, to fail to permit the utilization of our experience, our special equipment, our trained personnel, and our geological and geophysical knowledge in an effort to discover and make available, for immediate use during the critical years ahead, this strategic material so essential to our Nation's very existence, would unnecessarily jeopardize our national security. It could even be disastrous.

The offshore lessees believe that the provisions relating to operations on the submerged lands contained in Senate Joint Resolution 20 will enable us to move forward and resume our earnest endeavors to discover and develop vitally needed petroleum reserves. The resumption of these operations will provide additional insurance for this Nation's security, which we just cannot afford to deny to the people of this country.

Gentlemen, we must not risk having too little, too late.

Farm Prices Not in Line With Farm Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, too often, in these days of high prices and high costs, we hear complaints that the farmer is getting too much. I would like to point out that the prices of things which the farmer must buy have risen many times more than have the prices of the things he sells.

Even in figuring parity the farmer is not brought into a true position regarding his costs and selling price of his products.

I would like to put into the RECORD a letter I received from a farmer in my district in Minnesota. Mr. Axel Burman, of Trail, Minn., points out some facts which prove the farmer is not over-paid, rather his position is not even equitable with the rest of the Nation because his costs have gone up so much faster than his income. Mr. Burman's letter follows:

TRAIL, MINN., *January 22, 1951.*

Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After sealing my other letter I come to wander back to 1915, when I started farming, before the First War I. A 7-foot binder was $125. An International 7-foot is now $650, same size, same make. A disk harrow—14 disk—was $40; in 1951, $180—1915, $40. Help was 25 cents per hour in 1915. Help now is $1 per hour, 1951, board and room included now as well as then in 1915. A bushel of wheat was $1 in 1915. A bushel of wheat is $2 now in 1951. No wonder the industry wants war.

At that time we raised our own horses, which was our power. We raised our own oats and hay, which was our fuel. Now we buy a tractor at somewhere around $2,000. This tractor eats about 30 gallons regular gasoline per day, or about $6 per day. It's all making a much expensive way of farming.

Still we are required to make both ends meet with double the price of wheat, whereas the industry not only asks but gets five times as much for their product, and most times, if not always, is producing poorer grades of merchandise, something a farmer cannot get by with.

Our wheat has to weigh up or you get No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, and down goes the price. This holds good on anything we raise or buy. Equally, horses now are worthless. Manpower is too high. Machinery must take the place, but not at a gain for the farmer. No; at a loss. The farmer struggles along, overworking himself, and many a time his wife putting in 14 to 18 hours per day, where industry only works 40 hours per week.

Hoping you will do something about it,

Sincerely,

AXEL BURMAN.

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, few indeed are the men who have been equally famous in the military annals of America and of their own European homeland. Perhaps they could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Kosciusko is one of them.

In these days when the dark clouds of despotism threaten to veil the bright sun of freedom and leave the world in the old darkness, it is a happy task to recall the career of the first foreign patriot to come to the aid of America in 1776. Kosciusko did not have to come. This was not his country. But he loved liberty. He greatly desired it for his own Poland, but the time had not come. When will it come?

But across the sea was America fighting to be free. Perhaps he could help. And if he lived he could use his experience in freeing Poland, too. Thoroughly trained in the art of war and especially in military engineering, his services were invaluable to the American cause throughout the Revolution. For he came early and stayed late—as long as there was necessary work for him to do. As we review the record we wonder what our brave but untrained patriots would have done without his educated skill. America was unprepared for the engineering required by a full-scale war. Kosciusko had trained for years in the best schools of Europe. And as we read the story of this achievements we are impressed with the superiority of his plans. When his counsel was followed success came so far as success was dependent on engineering. When his suggestions were disregarded, the results were likely to be disastrous, as at Ticonderoga where he wanted to fortify Sugar Loaf Hill, but his superiors decided that it was unnecessary; and the British came and fortified the hill, forcing the Americans out of Ticonderoga. Among his accomplishments we may count a good portion of the success at Saratoga, which led to French intervention and victory; and the development of the fortifications at West Point where he spent 2 years rearing works which to this day bear indisputable testimony to his skill. From August 1780 until the last shot was fired Kosciusko aided the highly mobile southern campaign, planning transportation and at times fighting as a cavalry officer. His brilliant work elicited the highest praise from General Greene. Belatedly Congress made him a brigadier general.

Returning to Poland Kosciusko fought the Russians in 1792 and again in 1794, and might have saved his nation if all his countrymen had been like him. In the latter year he was defeated and captured while gallantly fighting against overwhelming odds.

Hope for a season, bade the world farewell,
And freedom shriek'd, as Kosciusko fell.

The Russians imprisoned him for 2 years. When released he made his way to America expecting to make this country his final home. Congress voted him money and lands, a part of which went to found one of the first schools for Negroes in the United States.

When Kosciusko heard that there was new hope of freeing Poland from the domination of other powers, he returned to France in 1796 and spent the rest of his life until his death in 1817 in efforts as earnest as they were futile to restore his native land to her once proud status among the nations.

He is enshrined forever in the hearts of all lovers of liberty. He does not need our few words of appreciation and praise. But we need now as never before to remember often and well the example he has left us of a broad love for human freedom, reaching out beyond the narrow borders of State and country to any people struggling against despotic tyranny.

His dust in Poland rests—
His urned heart a shrine!
Poland! He is thy son!
Columbia! Also thine!

Causes of Our Present Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration is trying to hide behind every possible screen rather than face the true reason for our present inflation. Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an excerpt from an editorial which appears in the February 12, 1951, issue of the Freeman:

The domestic economic policy administered from Washington has now touched heights of absurdity beyond the reach of any satirist. The administration is permitting, encouraging, and ordering inflation at a mounting rate. At the end of 1939 the volume of money (as measured by demand deposits and currency outside of banks) totaled $36,000,000,000. In May of 1950 it totaled $109,000,000,000. At the end of December it reached $117,000,000,000. Here is the inflation. Here is the increase in monetary purchasing power bidding for goods. Here is the cause of the constant fall in the value of the dollar.

Yet the Secretary of the Treasury has chosen this moment to announce that the interest rate on long-term Government bonds will be kept down to 2½ percent. This inevitably means further inflation. For the Federal Reserve Banks will be forced to support the bonds at levels to yield that rate. In buying such bonds, they pay for them by creating still more money and bank deposits.

Then the administration turns around and pretends to protect the citizens from its own inflation by throwing blanket price and wage ceilings over the entire economy—with the usual political loopholes for the pressure groups. This order is so absurd that even the administrators who framed it won't defend it. An official of the Office of Price Stabilization immediately announced that it was working to cure the absurdities and inequities in yesterday's freeze. We may confidently predict that it will cure some absurdities and inequities only by creating new ones.

The truth is that price control is a completely spurious remedy for inflation. Its political function is to divert attention from the real cause, which is the Government's own fiscal and monetary policies, and to put the blame on the wicked businessmen.

Congress and a Knowledge of How It Serves Is the Crux of Real Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by Miss Virginia Eileen Miller, executive secretary of the Committee for Congress, to request publication of the article by Henry Stoner, former Washington newspaperman, which points out that the very crux of real Americanism is Congress. It is a pleasure for me to comply with this request because the Committee for Congress is trying to make available to schools, colleges, and adult study groups material which is now available about the work of the Congress of the United States and its Members.

(By Henry Stoner)

The very crux of the real Americanism is Congress. It is the last great institution of free government in the world. Too many people do not know much about it. Even doctors of philosophy in political science, for instance, have never read a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our Voice of America is missing a great bet in not plugging Congress more, Congress as an institution, Congress as individual men and women.

Congress is the one national institution which binds America together as a nation, as America, as the United States of America.

Congress is the only institution which truly differentiates America from Russia, or any other totalitarianism, in the final analysis.

Congress is the one element which makes America truly American. All governments, whether totalitarian or democratic or constitutional, etc., have executive branches, and all wise people know that all executive branches are finally controlled, whether totalitarian or democratic.

Only the legislative branch—and Russia and all other dictatorships have no legislative, truly free legislative branch—in the final analysis represents all the people for whatever they want, and I say not disdainfully, for as far as earthly affairs go, the voice of the people is the voice of right.

The legislative branch must consider, must reconsider, must be completely alert to what is called public opinion.

The executive branch of government is the power branch. The judicial branch is the legal branch. Common sense, where common sense is of a beneficent, ameliorative nature, is in full bloom in the people's, the legislative, the congressional branch. Five hundred and thirty-one men and women, 96 in the Senate and 435 in the House, are less apt to go wrong in expressing the wishes of the people, than 10 citizens, the President and 9 Justices of the Supreme Court.

The real America is, after all is said and done, the Congress. If America lives, Congress lives; if Congress lives, America lives.

This is my affirmative conception of my native land, the United States of America.

The one thing that the Hisses and the Remingtons and all the bright young men who went sour on about America, was that they failed to understand, to depend upon the legislative processes to achieve ends. America is means, not ends. The "Commies" say that life is the end, not the means.

America knows that honest ends presume honest means, and that the two are inseparable. You must first start with honest means, and always strive to be civilized and Christian, and it is only a matter of time until your ends are right, are righteous. And the discussion of means is with the legislative, the Congress.

That is my philosophy. I believe it to be correct. I have studied thoroughly to discern the right.

When I say that America is at her gravest hour I do not mean to be neurotic or hasty. This is the real hour of reexamination.

The older we get the more we crave the good old days. That phrase, that concept, viz, "the good old days," implies the days of peace, the days when we had understanding, the days when problems seemed to have ready answers. Yes, the days when a basic, honest, simple philosophy was held.

And like all beginners, we look back to our national parents, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Ordinance of 1787. These constitute the American manifesto (sic), these are the same to Christian America that the Kremlin would like to make the cynical, devilish Marxian manifesto to Russia and the world the Russian tyrants seeks to dominate. Russian communism is an atheistic philosophy that denies the right of the free individual a voice in his own national destiny. That is why I believe that the voice of the people, as expressed through our Congress, holds the solution of our national and international problems today.

And I believe with Wilson that ours is primarily a congressional Government. Hence to promote, as the Committee for Congress is trying to promote, a better understanding of the Congress of the United States and the responsibilities and duties and accomplishments of our Representatives and Senators in Congress, is a sacred occupation. I, as an ordinary American, therefore congratulate the Committee for Congress in this undertaking. Ever yours for the Congress of the United States of America.

The Committee for Congress, 1060 National Press Building, RE-6399, Washington, D. C., is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, educational project using Your Congress Magazine, press, radio, television, motion pictures, and other education and informational media to create a better understanding of our legislative processes. All loyal citizens are invited to utilize its facilities or to assist in its work.

Postal Employees Need a Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no doubt that the postal employees definitely need a raise in pay. As a group they have been discriminated against. At present the pay schedule for postal clerks ranges from $2,670 to $3,770 a year, divided into 11 pay grades, with a $100-per-year differential between each pay grade.

The only increase which postal clerks and letter carriers can receive above these pay grades are merit-grade increases. The merit-grade increase is $100 per year after 13 years of service, a second $100 increase after 18 years, and a third $100 increase after 28 years of service.

I have received hundreds of letters from postal employees in Milwaukee telling of their need for an increase in pay. These letters speak more eloquently than anything I can say.

I include herewith excerpts from some of these letters:

I make $2,970 a year on which I'm supposed to support my wife and child. Could you live on that amount of money?

I am going on my fifth year at the post office, yet a man working next to me who started to work at the same time I did or later, but who comes under another law gets $1,000 a year more than I.

We were much better off in 1939 when we were getting $2,100. Our rent at that time was $37 and now it's $82.

We allot no money for recreation inasmuch as our budget cannot stand it.

I have been in the postal service for going on 13 years. Never before have we had such difficulty making both ends meet. My wife has been forced to seek employment, leaving our two children home alone at night.

I had to acquire a part-time job to augment my postal salary.

It is very difficult for us to make our take-home pay meet the simplest necessities of life.

In my case, I'm married and have one child. I'm trying to pay off my home. My pay grade is $2,970.

I'm getting tired of working 12 to 14 hours a day to earn a living for my wife and three boys. To top this we live in a two-car garage.

My wife is working, but now that she is, we don't get to see each other very often. I see her about 15 minutes every morning.

I cannot make ends meet at this rate of pay. My take-home pay is $129.32 twice a month.

We have had to drop the hospital insurance we carried to ease the strain on our food budget.

With the overtime taken away from regular postal employees, can you blame any of our boys, some with 10 years service, leaving the postal service and looking for outside employment?

Only one thing has remained stationary and that is my wages.

I am compelled to take a part-time job to live decently.

I make $2,970 and it sure is tough to make ends meet.

I find I must buy very carefully, and then only the most essential things to make my pay check reach.

Whenever an unforseen emergency arises such as illness in the family, I am forced to borrow.

We are in dire need.

Living from one pay day to the next is no joy.

I have had one new suit in the last 5 years.

Expenses like insurance, medical, and so on, we must skimp on in order not to fall into debt.

We have no weapon such as strikes and walk-outs.

My family has been retrenching for the past 2 years, to the point where we are learning to fight.

Cigarettes is our only luxury. There is no entertainment. We have been to the show once in the past 2 years.

It's rough getting along on $2,870.

Even a movie for relaxation is an event.

I am tired of working 12 and 13 hours a day to give my family a decent place to live.

I am just barely hanging on to my insurance and Blue Cross.

My wife does part-time work whenever possible.

I just borrowed $1,500 to pay clothing and fuel bills.

My wife has been forced to obtain full-time employment in order to make ends meet.

The raise you Senators voted yourselves, $2,500 per year, practically represents my yearly salary.

Get rid of several hundred women in our Milwaukee office and give a man a chance to support his family in a good American way is accustomed to * * *

I can barely eke out an existence.

I am the mother of four children—in order to give them the necessities, I have worked part time, over a period of years.

The morale at the post office has hit an all-time low and the work being turned out is just as low.

We have had to cash savings bonds that were intended for future security, in order to meet our current bills.

I have not been fortunate enough, as yet, to find outside work to fit in with present tour of duty.

We have no children. Why? And leave them to run around like little unfed and underclothed bums.

I will have to seek additional work to make ends meet.

I have been in service for 2 years and have had to have a part-time job most of the time to make ends meet.

I would like a car, a home of my own, but that is out of the question.

I am making $2,870; after all living deductions, I have a total of $88 for foolishness such as clothes, car, and recreation.

It seems illogical to me that Congress will authorize billions of dollars to be spent under the Marshall plan and then leave their own employees in such a desperate financial strait.

After deductions, what is left for me? Zero.

In the past, I have had to take out three different loans to make ends meet.

I have to live with my in-laws to make ends meet.

I have been in the postal service for 14 years and our salary has never been up to par.

Postal service is steadily losing its attractiveness.

We clerks are way behind the eight ball since prices have started to zoom.

It is utterly impossible to meet today's needs and stay out of the red.

We are still getting along on our regular salaries as of before this high price fluctuation.

We simply cannot make ends meet.

Please help me to attain a fair standard of living.

Our salaries have not kept pace with those paid by private employers.

I am asking for enough of a wage raise to allow me to clothe, feed and provide adequate insurance protection for my family.

We are 2 years behind other labor in salary adjustments.

Our plight is deplorable.

If some misfortune strikes us, we are forced into debt or deeper into debt.

All I make is $3,070 a year and I pay out a year about $1,314.94.

My salary of $2,870 per annum is just a means of existing, not living.

I am a newly married man and I have my wife working as I cannot make things go on my salary.

We are taking an awful lot of punishment now for the future.

I realize the importance of economy in Government, but it should not be taken out of the workers' hide.

I am fortunate enough to be single yet. I could not even think of getting married and supporting a wife with wages of this kind.

The Government is sending billions of dollars overseas to help other countries and closes their eyes to their own employees.

This is not a shining example of our President's declaration of prosperity here in the United States.

The fixed income is one sad affair.

I am resigned to the absence of beer in the ice box.

My wife is employed. Before she went to work, we sold our savings bonds and borrowed money on life-insurance policies.

Congress, too often, waits, sidetracks, stalls, and what have you, to pass bills for the postal workers.

I am a clerk in the $3,870 grade and received my last longevity increase of $100 per year on October 1, 1950. Coupled with the fact that new taxes were imposed also on October 1, 1950, I wound up with the earth-shaking pay increase of 1 cent.

Who can be blamed but those in charge—namely, the President, Congress, and the Cabinet head, who seems to think that we, as his charges, should be satisfied with just anything.

We have an empty house. How can we ever buy furniture for it?

I buy a bond out of my pay check, but have to cash them in every time we buy something for the home.

I have worked as a letter carrier for 8 years and my take-home pay is $65.

This hand-to-mouth existence is disgusting, especially with the Democrats sending so much money overseas.

My wife and I have very little social enjoyment. We don't own a home or furniture.

Before I started to work part time, we had to borrow from a loan company between pay days so we had food in the house.

A married man with a family is unable to save anything or even put away a dollar for a rainy day.

Congress Ignored Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 16, 1951:

CONGRESS IGNORED AGAIN

Defense Secretary Marshall's announcement that the United States plans to send 100,000 more troops to Europe undoubtedly will take a lot of steam out of debate over America's participation in the integrated army of defense to be raised by the Atlantic Pact nations.

The extent to which the United States would provide Ground Forces for the European army under the supreme allied command of General Eisenhower has been one of the most controversial issues of the debate. The Defense Secretary's clarifying statement is expected to soften opposition to the troops-for-Europe plan, inasmuch as the announced strength this Nation will furnish is much less than previously had been indicated.

But the announcement still fails to remove one highly controversial question involved not only in the Atlantic Pact program, but in other critical matters of foreign policy. That is the right of Congress to express the will of its membership and to have a voice in the formulation of policies and commitments vitally affecting the welfare and security of the American people.

Consistently has the President refused to take Congress into his confidence or to consult with leaders other than those of his own political clique in the framing of policy during the grave international crisis. Nor has he seen fit to apprise the public at large of the true facts of the situation when such a revelation unquestionably would have brought greater unity and more concerted action on the part of the people.

The Marshall announcement is indicative that once again Congress has been ignored in the formulation of European policy. The number of troops to be dispatched to that continent apparently already has been decided upon and only under pressure has the figure been made available to Congress.

Repeatedly in the past few months has the President appealed for national unity, both on the part of Congress and the public. While making the appeal with one hand, however, he has seen fit to pursue with the other his stubborn, lone, and domineering role in the international game.

Never in the history of this Nation has the need for unified action been greater. But it cannot be achieved through mere lip service on the part of the President. He must demonstrate that the executive branch of the Government is ready to give the same cooperation to Congress that he demands of that body.

The value of having the Nation solidly behind the dispatch of additional American troops to Europe is great, and every reasonable effort should be made to obtain it.

Regardless of the President's authority to commit troops to combat in foreign areas without congressional consent, unity will be achieved far more readily and far more quickly if matters of such vital importance are submitted to the Congress, whose Members are the duly elected representatives of the people.

Induction of Conscientious Objectors Into the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Irven J. Blum Post, No. 1609, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of York, Nebr.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas during any period of national emergency it is the duty of all citizens called upon to serve their country in the Armed Forces; and

Whereas due to religious training and beliefs, certain persons object to serving in the Armed Forces during such time of national emergency; and

Whereas such persons could be of extreme value to the Armed Forces in other than combat units within those forces; and

Whereas it is felt that such persons should not be shown preference over those others who also hold life dear to themselves, but who are willing to forfeit their lives for the protection of our Nation: Be it therefore

Resolved, That Irven J. Blum Post, No. 1609, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of York, Nebr., in regular session, recommend to the national VFW, through channels, that a request be made to the Congress of the United States that the Selective Service Act of 1948 be revised to eliminate this situation; and be it further

Resolved, That such persons, known as conscientious objectors, be inducted into the Armed Forces with the understanding that they shall not bear actual arms, but that they shall be required to perform such other duties as may be needed and required.

L. HAROLD HAMLIN,
Commander, Department of Nebraska.
Adopted February 15, 1951.

Contributions of Massachusetts to the Development and Growth of the City of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by George T. Hines, representing Hon. Paul A. Dever, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on Sunday, February 11, 1951, on the occasion of the twenty-eighth annual Massachusetts State Sunday at Valley Forge, and conducted under the auspices of the Massachusetts State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

The address follows:

Anyone who has studied Washington, its origin, the long period of its growth, and its present-day maturity, must be struck with the fact that in a physical sense it was the work of many persons who brought it to fruition, persons who were called to the Capital City, brought their knowledge and their skills, made their contributions, and in most cases departed.

Each receding tide, however, left behind it some who remained, either to continue their labors, to direct the work of those arriving, or to finish projects of long duration.

The contributions of Massachusetts to the city and its governmental and private structures, the memorials and decorations by those who either were native or adopted citizens of the State are in the aggregate, outstanding, and predominant.

Massachusetts' men probably contributed more to the physical aspects of Washington, than those from any other State, particularly during the years of great development and growth.

This was the period when the artistic history of Massachusetts was virtually the history of art in the United States, for many of the outstanding painters and sculptors were either born in Massachusetts, educated there, or made their homes there.

Legislators and governmental executives from Massachusetts who made decisions in these matters were well advanced in their thinking, chiefly concerned with the future and permanence, and by their decisions they have built into Washington some of the permanence that is Massachusetts.

The Washington of today was only a dream in the mind of the obscure French architect and military engineer, Pierre Charles L'Enfant, when he developed the plan for the Federal City under the supervision of President Washington, who selected the site, and the Congress of 1790, which authorized it.

Up to and through the Civil War, L'Enfant's plan was either forgotten or considered too large. In 1860, the city had not a street light. Pigs roamed the principal streets, the wastes of Washington were disposed in open sewers and there were no pavements except a few patches.

While the physical aspects of the sprawling metropolis gave glaring evidence of its uncompleteness, even this early period indicated it would be a big city some day. Some of the greatest minds America has produced were offering their contributions to make the Nation great and its center of government achieve the position it occupies today, the most outstanding capital city in the world.

The year 1870 marked the beginning of a new and effective physical development of Washington. The streets were paved, gas lamps installed and a central sewer system begun. Soon Washington had more paved streets than any city in the country.

The second great drastic change in the city's appearance was inaugurated by the Treasury Department under President Coolidge of Massachusetts whose administration started the huge Federal Triangle development and the reconstruction of the Mall program under the general plan of Frederick Law Olmsted of Brookline, Mass.

What is not so generally known and appreciated, however, is the great influence Massachusetts architects, planners, and landscape engineers had on the present aspects of the city, not to include the Massachusetts sculptors and painters who enhanced and ornamented the buildings, public squares, and left behind them probably greater contributions of art than those from any other state.

The work of developing Washington is never complete, and tomorrow may witness the influence of other persons who have either been born or received their education in Massachusetts, and who will continue the contributions that Massachusetts proudly makes to the capital city of all capital cities—Washington.

With the exception of Pierre Charles L'Enfant, no one has had so profound an influence on the development of Washington, or contributed more to the beautification of its physical lay-out and its parks as two Massachusett's men, Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., and his son, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr.

Recognized as the foremost landscape architects in the country, they spent most of their lives in Brookline, Mass., where the company bearing their name still has its headquarters.

Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr. (1822-1903), planned the grounds immediately surrounding the Capitol and designed the terraces, which add so immeasurably to the dignity of the Capitol Building when viewed from the west. He also planned the landscaping of the Boston parks as well as the park systems of many other cities in the country.

Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., designed the present Mall and Union Square, and had a part in the developing of the Federal Triangle, containing most of the modern Government office buildings. The Mall, Union Square, and the Government buildings make up the area that lies between the Capitol and the Washington Monument.

The Jefferson Memorial landscape was designed by the Olmsteds. Olmsted made a special report on the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, which is now under way, and designed the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial, which is to be erected on an island in the Potomac River. He also developed a plan for reconstructing the Washington Monument grounds, which is about to be started.

He was consulted in the development of the portion of the Capitol Grounds between the Capitol and the Union Station. At the present time, an effort is under way to have an Olmsted Park in Washington named after both father and son. While Mr. Olmsted, Jr., has maintained his interest in the planning and physical improvement of the city since his retirement in 1932, his place on the National Capital Park and Planning Commission was taken at that time by one of his associates in Boston, Henry V. Hubbard of Milton, Mass., professor of city planning at Harvard University, who died in 1947.

Mr. Hubbard carried through to completion a number of the plans developed by Mr. Olmsted, as well as contributing many of his own ideas, particularly in the recent development of the Jefferson Memorial and the lagoon, famous for the display of cherry blossoms every Easter season.

Mr. Hubbard was succeeded in the membership of the National Capitol Park and Planning Commission by Dean William Worcester, head of the School of Architecture and planning at MIT.

The position of Director of Planning of the National Capitol Park and Planning Commission has, with the exception of a few years at its inception, been always held by Massachusetts men.

Massachusetts may well take pride in the contributions of its citizens in the building of the Capitol, its contents, and surroundings. Charles Bulfinch, native of Boston, the first American-born architect, is one of the three men credited with developing the design of the Capitol.

Bulfinch, recognized as one of the greatest architects this country has produced, designed the present State House in Boston, the old Connecticut State House at Hartford, and the Maine State Capitol in Augusta. Many public and private buildings in New England, a number of the old residences in Boston, and many of the spires and edifices of New England churches are built from the designs of Bulfinch.

With the completion of the original structure, Bulfinch remained as Architect of the Capitol. It was he who determined that the front of the building was to be the eastern approach. It was he who laid out the original landscape design of the grounds, the western steps and fence that faces what is now the downtown section of the city.

Probably the most conspicuous statue in the Capital Grounds is on the west plaza. It is the seated figure of Chief Justice John Marshall and is the work of William W. Story, of Salem, son of Associate Justice Joseph Story, of the United States Supreme Court.

The bronze doors of the Capitol were cast in Chicopee, Mass. All through the Capitol Building, many statues and paintings are on display, some of them depicting Massachusetts events. A number of the statues and busts represent well-known Massachusetts men.

Of those most significant, however, a majority of the paintings and busts in the Capitol are the work of Massachusetts artists.

The erection and the expansion of the Library of Congress is a monument to Dr. Herbert Putnam, who in 1899 was called from the position of librarian of the Boston Public Library to accept the post of Librarian of the Congressional Library. Dr. Putnam is still living in Washington.

Much of the exterior and interior statues, murals, frescoes, and mosaics are the work of Massachusetts sculptors and painters.

Among the private collections in the Library are those loaned or contributed by Massachusetts men and women.

You may remember that President John Adams, of Massachusetts, was the first to occupy the White House. Many of the paintings in the White House are by George Peter Healy, born in Boston in 1813.

A few days ago I had the pleasure of inspecting the unfinished White House from cellar to roof. As you know, the old White House is now merely a shell, inside of which a modern building is being built. It is not generally known that several hundred people work in or are connected with the White House and apart from the danger of collapse of the old building was the fact that facilities were completely inadequate. So the new building, instead of being one-story deep, is now three stories deep and will extend well out underneath the White House lawn on the Pennsylvania Avenue side.

The old sandstone foundations to the front doors of the White House are being retained. On the underside of these stones can still be seen the black marks from the burning of the White House by the British in the War of 1812.

Incidentally, you can obtain pieces of wood, stone, bricks, and old hand-made nails from the old White House by writing to the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, Fort Meyer, Va. These souvenirs are given freely, but there is a charge made for shipping and transportation.

The story of the Washington Monument is most romantic; and while this monument to Washington had been first proposed in 1783, it was not until 1848 before the Monument was started, with a grant of land from Congress.

It took 37 years to complete the Monument; and curiously enough, Speaker of the House Robert C. Winthrop, of Boston, not alone officiated at the laying of the cornerstone in 1848, but he lived to dedicate it in 1885.

Part of the marble in the Monument was from Massachusetts, but the entire solid inside wall is of Massachusetts granite.

The Smithsonian Institution, the National Art Gallery, and the Corcoran Art Gallery have many paintings and works of art by Massachusetts men, most of whom are familiar to you; such men as, Whistler, Copley, Sargent, Homer, and Gilbert Stuart, whose painting of General Washington is probably the most distinguished portrait we have of the Father of our Country.

You may remember that this was the painting that Dolly Madison rescued when the British arrived to burn the White House. Cutting it from its frame, she fled across the street to the so-called Blair House, where the President now has his temporary home, and she watched the burning of the White House and her precious possessions from a window, with the painting still clutched tightly under her arm.

May I point out that the Blair House was built in 1810 and its first occupant was Dr. Joseph Lovell, of Boston, when he was Surgeon General of the Army. It was later the home of George Bancroft, of Massachusetts, Secretary of the Navy, who is credited with establishing the present Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Several of the great churches in Washington have interesting Massachusetts connections. The Episcopal Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul has practically, from its origin, been erected under the direction of distinguished Boston architects. This is also true of the great Catholic National Shrine on the grounds of Catholic University.

The All Souls Unitarian Church was designed by Boston men, and it was here that Dr. Edward Everett Hale, of Boston, author of "The Man Without a Country," began his ministerial career.

Significant to this day, is the fact that the original Lincoln Statue in Lincoln Square, Washington, showing the Great Emancipator freeing the slaves, is the work of Thomas Ball, of Charlestown, Mass. The present magnificent Lincoln Memorial was designed by Henry Bacon, descendant of an old Dedham, Mass., family and the statue itself is the work of Daniel Chester French, who while born in New Hampshire, spent practically his whole life in Massachusetts. May I at this point interject a little personal story, and it is, I believe, told for the first time here.

During the last war when Washington was almost completely blacked-out, I had occasion to take a walk down to the Lincoln Memorial, a huge, shadowy mass in the darkness. The only light in the vicinity was a faint, blue light, shining on the statue of Lincoln.

My son and I started up the stairs but were stopped by a chain stretched across and a guard who informed us that the monument was not open to the public after 5 p. m.

We stopped and chatted with the guard and he told us this very interesting story: The only people that were allowed up to the statue at night were distinguished leaders who came there alone—to think out their vexatious problems and crystallize their momentous decisions—in front of the statute of the Great Emancipator.

They would approach alone in the darkness, be recognized faintly in the very dim light, and after asking permission would proceed up the long stairs.

After they disappeared up the steps in the darkness, their footsteps—back and forth—in front of the statue—made the only sound that rose above the murmur of the great city. They would usually remain a half-hour or more, and their returning footsteps would bring the guard again to attention. With a friendly salute, they would disappear on their way back to their offices.

It is entirely believable to me that these men, oppressed with the weight of their decisions, found restoration and peace at the feet of the statue of the Great Emancipator—the great peace and restoration of spirit that we all find in other temples—dedicated to Christ.

When men such as these, living today in their public lives, can find clarity and decision and renewed strength before the statue of Lincoln, we can be sure that the lessons he taught us of tolerance, honesty, patience under overwhelming and bitter attack, fearlessness to do right as he saw it, still dominate the decisions and lives of our leaders, we can be convinced that the destiny of America still is in good hands.

The statue of Lincoln significantly faces the monument to his great predecessor, Washington, looking directly toward the Capitol. These three great structures dominate the Washington skyline, a constant reminder of the struggles our forefathers went through to establish and maintain our country, our liberties, and our national character. They are bound to be great inspiration and a guide to our national leaders as they decide on the future of our country today.

The wisdom of Washington and the humanity of Lincoln still guides our destinies.

Facts on Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in all the current debate about prices and the ever increasing cost of living, a determined effort is being made to paint the farmer as the chief villian. Those who point the finger of guilt at the American farmers as responsible for increased living costs just don't have the facts.

It is only fair to listen to the facts on both sides of the controversy. I am sure, when the American people have all the information about food costs, they will readily admit that prices paid to the farmer are not the chief factor in the high cost of living.

Facts on food prices are ably presented in the following article from the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press which was written by one of the country's ablest farm authorities, Alfred D. Stedman.

FACTS ON FOOD PRICES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

In the hubbub over rising food prices, millions of fingers are now being pointed in accusation. A concert of voices names the alleged offender. The Washington storekeeper, selling dollar-a-dozen eggs to Sen. Thye put the bee on the popular culprit—the farmer, he said, and Government-supported egg prices. The baker, talking about higher bread prices, emphasized wheat and other ingredient costs.

The housewife, buying apples at 10 cents a pound; the soft drink consumer laying costs to sugar prices; even the cocktail hound soaking up highballs at 50 cents a drink while orating against milk prices at 18 cents a quart—all of these lately have seemed agreed as to where the blame belongs. That is on the farmer, on the huge Government stores of food bought in supporting farm prices, and on the allegedly fantastic Government losses on farm purchases and farm subsidies.

But reasonable people will no doubt be interested in knowing the relevant facts, not on just one side, but on both sides of that story.

As to eggs, it is true that farm prices did advance rather sharply (36 percent) above the unusually low price a year earlier. The price has been steadily moderating from the peak.

But as a farmer and producer of eggs on his farm near Northfield, Senator Thye talking to the Washington seller had the facts first about farm prices of eggs. Those prices on Thye's farm had been nowhere near $1 a dozen, but about 42 cents. The Government wasn't supporting them, but stopped that on December 31. So in blaming $1-a-dozen eggs on Government-supported farm prices, the Washington storekeeper was 100 percent wrong.

As to bread, not over one-fifth of what the consumer pays for his loaf goes to the wheat farmer. On December 15 wheat prices were up just 6 percent from their level a year earlier. That rise wouldn't account for a rise of one-fifth of a cent for a loaf of bread. All the farm ingredients put together, including lard as well as wheat, do not account for one-third of the consumer bread price. Almost two-thirds of the consumer price goes to the baker and retailer.

Recently one of THYE's colleagues, Senator MAYBANK, of South Carolina, made this statement: "In June 1948 the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel; the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread, 13.8 cents. But in October 1950 the price of wheat had dropped to $1.91 a bushel, whereas the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread had risen to 14.7 cents." Certainly the labor costs of baking, slicing, wrapping, and offering other services now demanded by consumers have been going up. But centering the blame for rising bread prices on the wheat farmer isn't in accord with the facts.

As to apples, the western farmer last autumn got 90 cents per 50-pound box, field run, delivered at the packing platform. That was 1.8 cents a pound to cover all his costs of growing, spraying, irrigating, picking, and hauling. The charges added by washing, sorting, wrapping, crating, storing, transporting, wholesaling, and retailing are what push the consumer price up to 8, 10, or 11 cents a pound.

As to sugar, the cost was actually lower in late December than it was on October 31, 1947, when sugar controls were removed. And the sugar price is so tiny an item, anyway, in the cost of a soft drink that it would be hard to find the effect of a 1-cent-a-pound sugar increase on a bottled drink.

The authentic facts about farm prices are available to all. They had, on December 15, risen 23 percent from the bottom a year earlier. Beef cattle and lamb prices were respectively 41 and 38 percent above their official parity or equality with general price levels. But milk, butterfat, grains, turkeys, and chickens were substantially below and potatoes, apples, sweetpotatoes, and citrus fruits far below parity.

The recovery of farm prices accompanies a national jump to $206,000,000,000 in disposable personal income, after taxes. Have farmers shared unfairly in that income rise? They have not. Net farm income for 1950 was actually below that of 1949 and much below the 1947–48 peak.

A higher disposable national income normally raises food prices because people spend a rather uniform share of such income for food. The $1.00 per day wage increase just won by John L. Lewis, for instance, will enable his coal miners to help in bidding food prices up. But is that, or the fact that greater coal costs of transporting or processing food will push in the same direction, the farmer's fault?

One hour's average labor will buy more food in this Nation than in others and many times more than in any regimented economy in the world. As Senator THYE told the Farm Bureau, the farmer's share of each dollar spent by the consumer for food was only 53 percent in 1946, and has slumped to 48 percent today.

Folks with a real liking for facts on both sides may be shocked also to learn of the gross inaccuracy of much of the recent so-called news of farm-price supports. Last Monday afternoon a Washington dispatch from a usually accurate news agency was widely published which said that "there was a net loss on price supports last year of $1,600,000,000."

People have been stirred up by vivid descriptions of such vast losses, of mountainous food purchases, of waste, and of farm demands for subsidies. And farmers have been told by newspapers and newspapermen to throw overboard their price-support programs or put them in a stand-by status for the duration.

An excellently informed and truthful agricultural correspondent, Fred Bailey, of Washington, recently reported that "the campaign to make the farmer the goat on rising food prices is now well under way in the big city press" supported by some city Congressmen who want to roll prices all the way back to the farmer.

Here are facts: The $1,600,000,000 referred to in last Monday's story as net loss, wasn't loss at all, but was the total amount loaned. The net realized loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the year ending last June was $249,230,000. The net realized loss in the current fiscal year through November was $100,281,000.

Said John W. Haw, agricultural development director of the Northern Pacific, to the Farm Bureau convention: "In its report to Congress on June 30, 1950, the Corporation showed a cumulative net realized loss in 17 years of $636,040,401. The Corporation has turned over its capital many times in this period; yet the net loss has been less than 5 cents on each dollar invested." He said the job has been substantially accomplished with economy to the taxpayer.

The recent big losses and big waste have been on potatoes and eggs. Both of those purchase programs were forced by Congress over repeated protests of the executive branch and many farmers. And from both of them the Government now has withdrawn. As to subsidies, the farmers producing the perishables that the Government sought to subsidize are up in arms against them. As to the storable products, the Government's holdings of these are now widely acknowledged as being a vital protection of the Nation's safety in the war emergency and a check on inflation. More stockpiling of this kind is considered absolutely essential, as a munition of war and as a safeguard against runaway prices.

So there are facts bearing on both sides of the farm-price story.

Father Raphael C. McCarthy, S. J., President of Regis College, Denver, Colo., Gives the Marquette University Graduates of Milwaukee a Patriot's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the welter of the great debate now confusing the minds of the American people, I want to present to the Members of Congress, by way of contrast, a most forceful and clear expression of the nature of today's crisis.

If American college students can be nurtured by the powerful ideas expressed in Father McCarthy's speech and gain inspiration from them, we need have no fear for the future of our country. His words will grip every patriot heart.

I wish to include in my remarks the speech of the Reverend Raphael C. McCarthy, S. J., president of Regis College, Denver, Colo., given in the Marquette University High School Auditorium, in Milwaukee, Wis., on February 6 last at the midyear commencement exercises for the graduates of Marquette University, as follows:

My dear graduates, you are finishing your course and leaving Marquette at a critical and challenging time. You are going out into an anxious, bewildered world where even those who are supposed to be our leaders seem uncertain about present policies and future actions. We are living in what is probably the most momentous period in history. Old values are being questioned and new experiments are being tried. The nature of future civilization may be determined in our time.

It is enormously deplorable that within the short period of 33 years we have fought in two World Wars and are engaged in an undeclared war now. Your generation, like other graduating classes before you, are compelled to interrupt the careers for which you have been preparing in order to defend your country. That is justly regrettable, but it is a necessary evil. It is an evil for war is disastrous to victor and vanquished alike. It is necessary because it is imperative that we build up the strength of our resistance for we are confronted with the problem of survival. We stand for peace. We have fought for it. We have paid an apalling price in wealth and in American lives to win it and still we do not enjoy it, but we are not willing to buy peace by forfeiting our freedom.

The struggle in which we are engaged is not primarily between forms of government, between demrocracies and dictatorships, between communism and facism, although many are deluded into thinking that it is. The issues at stake are far more fundamental. The conflict is between two philosophies of life and by a philosophy of life is meant a practical rule of living—a norm that tells a man what he is here for, what the world expects of him, what his responsibilities are.

There are two great forces today that are bidding for the adherence of men and of nations. They are diametrically opposed. They are incompatible with one another. They are religion and godlessness. They are paganism and Christianity. The most articulate, aggressive, and ruthless exponent of the new paganism is communism. It has already enslaved 800,000,000 people. One-third of all the inhabitants of the earth drag out their lives behind iron curtains. Its professed goal is to bring all nations under its domination and it regards the United States as its chief foe for, while our ideals and our resources endure, it can never reach its goal completely.

Communism is a far more imminent danger to us than many people imagine, or are willing to admit. Indifference to it constitutes our greatest weakness. According to Lenin, communism prefers to achieve its aims by revolutions and by violence. But when these agencies are not timely, as is the case in the United States at present, Communists resort to less brutal methods. They fall back upon deception and cunning; on sabotage; on infiltration into Government positions; on control of labor unions and the promotion of strikes; on worming their way into the channels that mold public opinion—the press for instance, the radio, and the movies. They try to plant their members in police systems and in the Armed Forces. That program has been actively and intelligently pursued among us for several years and not without success. The object of the program always is to foment discord, to arouse suspicions and class hatreds, so that the field is prepared for revolution when conditions favor it.

If we are to correct an evil we must first know what the evil is. The wisest and safest way to face an opponent is to try to know the truth about him; to be realistic as to his strength, his weakness, the time and place and method of his attack. It is less disastrous to overrate a foe than it is to undervalue him. For, to underrate his power or his determination is a suicidal strategy that invites destruction.

The great perplexity, the indecision, that obtains with respect to communism and that hampers our efforts to combat it is, in large part, due to ignorance of its true nature. That it is a malignant force is a simple fact that should be recognized by any open minded person who has studied the movement at all. But the theory and the practices of communism are far from simple. It is a complex system made up of several very destructive elements. Unless it is understood as such it cannot be fought successfully, for the most brilliant remedies may fail to cure a disease that is incorrectly diagnosed. By many of our people communism is regarded only and principally as a political movement that is subversive of our way of life. And that is true. The Communist philosophy of government is that the state is supreme. The individual exists for the state, his worth is estimated by the contribution he makes to the common good. He is a cog in the machine and when he fails to mesh he should be discarded. Such rights and privileges he has he owes to the state and it may take them away as it sees fit, whether those rights are ownership, liberty, or life.

In such an organization the state is the only employer, the people work at the wages and under the conditions that the state imposes. There is no place for unions and bargaining and strikes. There is no such thing as liberty of the press or of speech or of teaching. A man acts and talks and even thinks as the state wants him to. If he behaves otherwise he loses his job and he and his family starve. He may join the uncounted multitudes whom Russia has sent to concentration camps or tortured to death.

Communism has another objective and it is the one that is attractive to many people. It proposes a subtle economic theory that is supposed to correct existing social inequalities. In theory it argues for a classless society in which wealth will be equally divided. Russia still preaches this theory but it has long since failed to practice it.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not a collection of classless states. The aristocracy of the czars was indeed effectively destroyed but it has been succeeded by another aristocracy, of commissars and party favorites. Experience taught Russia that a consistent, equal distribution of wealth is impossible, and when it is attempted it strangles progress, for why should the intelligent, the ambitious, and the industrious exert themselves when they receive no greater reward for their extra efforts than do the shiftless, the lazy, and the incompetent?

The basic idea of communism, and the one which we must unalterably oppose, is its materialistic philosophy of life. All its other theories and practices are logical conclusions from that conception. Communism is anti-God. It scoffs at His existence and in consequence it denies man's spiritual origin and destiny, since these truths are meaningless if there is no God. It is tireless in trying to rob people of faith. It is fanatically anti-religious. In its creed man is but a glorified brute who has no more rights than other animals. He may be put to work as his decides, cooped up in deadly camps or slaughtered when the state deems such practices profitable to it.

This, in very brief outline, is the force that menaces the peace of the world. It is organized, it is unhampered by scruples, it is backed by an almost apostolic zeal and by a willingness to undergo heroic sacrifices in the achievement of its objectives. If it were satisfied to function only in the countries that have fallen victims to it we might feel that it is no concern of ours. But it ambitions the conquest of the earth and, according to its repeated declarations, the United States is the main obstacle to its progress and we must oppose it if we are to continue as a nation. For it is destructive of the very things which we believe make life worth living. It strangles liberty; it insults human dignity; it strives to banish God from His universe. It cannot live side by side with a Christian civilization and, therefore, from the very nature of the case it is our mortal enemy. For, although Europe and America today are not completely Christian, they still live by Christian traditions—the fundamental ideas of human freedom; the fatherhood of God; the common brotherhood of man; the intrinsic worth of the human person; the rejection of the principle that might makes right or that the state can determine what is moral or immoral—all these are Christian ideals. They are the foundations on which this country of ours was built, through the observance of which it has become great. If they were to go down what we have known and loved as the American way of life must perish.

In our struggle with communism we are faced by three possibilities—surrender, appeasement, or resistance.

Surrender means the loss of freedom, of hope, of faith, of love. It means a debasing slavery.

There can be no appeasement of Communists. For how can you compromise with those who recognize only one virtue and that is physical force, who know only one vice and that is weakness, whether it takes the form of mercy or charity or any kindly sentiment. Men with this philosophy of life regard concessions as marks of fear and of weakness. To them they are only invitations to make more stark demands. Chamberlain learned that when he tried to buy off the Nazis.

What bargaining can be done with people who pride themselves on following Lenin's command that truth and honesty and justice are to be used when these work to the advantage of communism and when they seem to hamper its purposes they are to be displaced by treachery, deceit, and lying. For such people peace treaties and agreements and signed promises are less than scraps of paper.

There remains for us, then, the only alternative of resistance. We have earnestly desired peace. We have striven for it against gangsterism and we have been denied it. Still we do not stand for peace at any price. We should stand for righteousness at any cost. A Christian cannot be neutral between right and wrong. We may hope, and we should pray, that we shall not be called upon to engage in another world war. But we must recognize its possibility and prepare for it. It is true indeed that ideas cannot be changed by mere physical force nor can we hide in security behind a stockpile of atomic bombs. The best that force can do is to insure a minimum of external observance. But we face a foe who respects only power and we may avoid a war by causing him to fear our strength and if, which God forbid, we are attacked, we shall be prepared to protect ourselves from the fate of nations who were weak or trustful and who now know communism for what it is.

This preparation involves sacrifice. Those sacrifices are not so great as Communists endure in pursuing their plan of world conquest, yet they will be sufficiently trying; some of them may be grievous. For the majority they will take the form of privations of various kinds. Shortages, priorities, heavy taxes, perhaps rationing. For others, and many of you may be among them, the demand will be one of service. But we must pay the price for anything in life that is worth while. If it could be had for the asking, it would be of but little value and esteemed but very lightly. We must protect the greatest natural blessings that men can know; we must defend for ourselves and for those who come after us the liberties which we received from our ancestors. They wrenched the torch of freedom from the hands of unwilling oppressors and they kept it burning when it cost them hardships.

We are not unique in the fact that we are called upon to forego comforts and endure inconveniences in the defense of what we cherish. Men of every generation have faced that harsh demand. They have been facing it in other countries for many years. We have proved ourselves at other times. We shall not fail now. There is a disagreeable job ahead of us but if we keep faith, it will be done and perhaps sooner than we think.

War is brutal always and preparation for it is exacting. But it has a few compensations. It reveals lovely human traits which otherwise might lie unexpected. Virtues which in prosperous times are allowed to tarnish are taken down and dusted and brightened—loyalty, devotion, courage, unselfishness become potent, active forces in the lives of people.

Our present crisis will make great demands on our patriotism. I know that we shall not only be reconciled to them but shall meet those demands generously and cheerfully. We shall not feel abused or frustrated because we are called upon to fight for our self-preservation. Rather may our attitude be that of the boy in the last war whom a chaplain visited in a hospital. The priest expressed his sympathy because the boy had lost his leg and the soldier said, and he smiled as he said it: "Sir, I did not lose it. I gave it."

We could wish that we should never see another war, or the threat of it, but we must face harsh facts. For us the problem is one of survival. Our cause is a just one. Supporting it in whatever way we may be called to do we can be sure of God's help. The crusaders of old fought to deliver the holy places from the infidel. Our responsibility, and our privilege, is to safeguard our Christian culture, to enable ourselves and others to keep faith in God.

Joyce Kilmer who gave his life for his country in World War I, in a poem called The Peacemaker, wrote some words that are pertinent to us:

"What matters death, if Freedom be not dead?
Who fights for freedom goes with joyful tread
And has for Captain Him whose thorn-crowned head
Smiles from the Cross upon a conquered world."

May that Captain bring peace to the world and may He keep you in His hand.

Academy of Diplomatic Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 131.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas diplomacy is the vital keynote in affairs of the world today as always; and

Whereas it is of utmost importance that the United States of America have in its diplomatic service, men trained in the arts and ways of diplomacy, to better represent our Nation in world affairs; and

Whereas our Nation is too often at a loss when dealing with the diplomatic representatives of other nations because of their

training in this line, they being more in the class known as career diplomats; and

Whereas if our Nation could be served by men especially screened and trained in diplomacy, we would be represented on a far more equitable basis with other nations; and

Whereas the diplomatic bungling of the past and present is largely due to the lack of proper or sufficient knowledge of the ways of other nations and its peoples; and

Whereas past history has proven the fact that all of our military victories have been for naught because of diplomatic inefficiency, ignorance, and treachery; and

Whereas proper schooling and training over a period of time, would enable our Government to pick men of the highest caliber for the diplomatic service: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post. No. 131, in regular session January 10, 1951, recommend, through channels, that the national organization take the necessary steps to bring before the Congress of the United States, a request for the immediate formation and operation of an Academy of Diplomatic Science; and be it further

Resolved, That students be recommended for such an academy by the Congressmen of the various States, but that such a recommended student must pass certain entrance requirements as may be deemed necessary relative to scholastic and loyalty background; and be it further

Resolved, That lack of such schooling shall not hinder those having proper and sufficient practical training or experience, through years of service in the diplomatic services, and found capable, from being advanced to high positions in such service.

L. HAROLD HAMLIN,
Commander.

Adopted February 15, 1951.

Gold From Sand Piles at McNary Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, an interesting project in recovery of gold is going on at McNary Dam which is now under construction in the Columbia River, between the States of Oregon and Washington. I include as a part of these remarks an article by Herbert Jonas entitled "He Gets Gold From Sand Piles," from the Saturday Evening Post, which is a story about this gold-recovery project at McNary Dam:

GOODY STUDIES "PAY DIRT" FROM HIS PATENTED SLUICE BOX—HE GETS GOLD FROM SAND PILES

(By Herbert Jonas)

There's money to be made taking gold from low-grade river sand—if you know how.

A. H. Goody, a Tacoma mining engineer, has the knack. During the construction of the McNary Dam in Washington State, Goody worked stockpiles of sand profitably, although the pay dirt in them ran as little as half a cent a ton.

As the Government moves ahead with its Columbia River development program Goody stands to hitch-hike a fortune from the sands of the great stream and its tributaries. For each Federal dam yet to be built is in better mining territory than McNary, and upstream sands assay as high as 10 cents a ton.

Actually Goody prospers where other miners might not eke out a bare living. He succeeds for two reasons: He has a patented process for recovering "flour" gold, and he has a contract whereby sand dredged from the river for dam construction is sluiced through his gold trap on its way to stockpiles.

Flour gold is so powdery fine that it can't be stopped by the ordinary sluice boxes used in mining. A few prospectors have caught it by lining their miner's pans with mercury and then placing the mercury amalgam in a hollowed-out potato and baking it in an oven. The heat evaporates the mercury and leaves the gold. The process yields small quantities of flour gold, but also exposes the miners to mercury poisoning.

Goody's system uses no mercury. He has rigged up a special sluice box only 13 feet long, in which a series of centrifugal actions sucks heavy sand and fine gold from a stream fed into it by a sand-and-gravel machine. The box operates unattended.

Once a day Goody trucks a load of the gold-bearing concentrate, which assays over $500 a ton, to his home in Tacoma. There he turns a thin stream of water into a strainer-like gold trap, shovels in the concentrate and washes it until only gold dust remains.

The yellow residue isn't pure gold by Government standards because it contains a slight alloy. This fortunate imperfection allows Goody to sell the gold as he sees fit. If it met bullion requirements, he would be required under the law to sell it to the United States treasury at $35 a troy ounce.

As it is, a dollar's worth of the powdery metal makes a pendant design on a tie clasp which brings the resourceful Goody $7.50. And a nickel's worth in a plastic card labeled "Souvenir Flour Gold Recovered by Goody" nets a ready 25 cents from tourists who visit McNary Dam.

The Industrial West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Current Issue," published in the Columbia Basin (Wash.) News of January 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT ISSUE

Although Horace Greeley has long ceased to wield his potent pen, his immortal advice to the youth of his day, "Go west, young man," still bids the adventurous toward the Pacific, and strikes terror into the sooty hearts of eastern manufacturing interests.

Evidence of their fear of the lusty industrial infant that is the West is an article in the Contractors and Engineers Monthly, a trade publication of the heavy-equipment industry, centered in the East.

The article discredits western hydroelectric power development and reclamation projects, terming them luxuries. Specifically attacked was Ice Harbor Dam. This attitude is understandable coming from eastern interests.

What is not acceptable is the deliberate sabotage by California's Representative NORRIS POULSON, and an Astoria newspaper which reprinted the easterner's article.

POULSON, showing typical California jealousy of the Pacific Northwest, read the condemning article out of the Astoria paper into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Ice Harbor project has been brutally punted from one end of the political gridiron to another. Fearful, lest the need for power to operate more aluminum mills or other industries should cause rapid development of the West, eastern interests, and the coast fisheries groups have consistently blocked the dam when allocation of funds seemed imminent.

The Astoria paper's attitude is to oppose anything which might pose difficulty for commercial fishing. Dwindling fish runs in the Columbia have been blamed on various power dams, when in actuality overexploitation by commercial fishermen has been responsible for destruction of brood stock before the fish ever had a chance to run to headwater spawning grounds. Fish and game departments have been unwitting tools in aiding the commercial fishermen, by predicting the end of sport fishing, without biological proof that the dams are responsible. Commercial fishing laws have been notably lax, enforcement has been spasdomic, and violations are seldom persistently prosecuted.

Hydroelectric power and irrigation will go hand in hand in building the Columbia Basin. As one of the potentially rich productive areas of the Nation, the basin is battling sectional, regional, and national opposition, prompted by vested interests, long the foe and deterrent to progress.

Demonstration that western power can produce tremendous amounts of vital war materials is provided by the aluminum mill near Spokane, which supplied tons of material during World War II. What such development means to an area economically is apparent from tax statements of the Spokane area. In addition to hiring more than 30,000 men, the aluminum mills paid more taxes to the Spokane area coffers than did all the railroads in that area, noted as a rail center.

It is easy to see why eastern interests do not want more competitive developments out of the West. What Californians and selfish commercial interests on the coast do not realize is that they are helping to destroy themselves by contributing to disunity in western State's congressional representation.

Congress would be justified in showing reluctance to vote projects needed for development of the West, when western States bicker among themselves over their desirability.

Industrial power is one of the West's key drawing cards. Industries here can be free of the carboniferous pollution of coal smoke. There is room for unlimited expansion of plants, and living conditions free from the squalor of overcrowded eastern industrial cities.

"Go West, young industry" might well be the slogan for the modern day. As the need for more production increases, the tremendous power potential of the West will be realized. The luxury projects, objected to by commercial fishermen (whose business itself represents only a fraction of the industry created by adequate power supplies) and eastern industrialists, will be the backbone of electrochemical processing and other related power consuming productive activities.

Ice Harbor represents an economical, practical link in the West's power hookup. The history of the West has been a fighting saga. Our Washington congressional representatives are carrying on the westerner's traditional refusal to let ungrounded opposition interfere with expansion.

We are now engaged in a battle for our right to grow and expand our productive capacities. Cheap electric power is a necessity. Ice Harbor Dam would produce such power.

The power of the West lies in its electrical potential.

Gen. Carlos Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials dealing with the activities in the United Nations of my friend, Gen. Carlos Romulo, Foreign Minister of the Philippines. One is from the New York Times of February 2, the other from the New York World-Telegram of February 3. I do not disparage the Times editorial when I say I prefer the heading used by the World-Telegram, "Romulo, the Scrapper."

Mr. President, it was my privilege, as chairman of the United States delegation at the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, in Geneva, Switzerland, in the spring of 1948, to support General Romulo's candidacy for election as president of that Conference. There I saw at first-hand his skill and courage in the conduct of the Conference. He is not only a great orator; he is one of the most able diplomats on the international scene. Again and again he has proved his faith in freedom and his willingness to fight for it. He is, of course, known to many Members of the Congress, and I am sure they will join me in congratulating him on these editorials, which record another brave fight well fought.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 2, 1951]

AGGRESSION ON THE RECORD

The General Assembly of the United Nations has now acted to put the aggression of the Chinese Communists in Korea formally on the record. This seems to us to have been the only possible course if the United Nations valued its survival. There have been strong misgivings in some quarters and equally strong resolution in others. The contrast is brought out, typically, in the comments of the Indian and Philippine delegates in the Assembly. For India, Sir Benegal Rau stated:

"We should like to have it on the record that when the world was marching—that is, in our view—toward disaster, we, most of the Asian Powers, did all we could to halt the march. * * * I only hope the members will ponder carefully what the position will be if the (Asian-Arab) draft resolution is defeated: no early cease-fire; every problem in the Far East unsolved; the atmosphere for successful negotiation vitiated; the tensions in the Far East perpetuated."

A reply to that statement was made by General Romulo for the Philippines, when he said, in support of the United States resolution:

"We cannot allow to pass unanswered the invidious claim of any delegation that it alone, together with those that shared its views, was dedicated to the cause of peace, while others that did not share those views were, by implication, committed to the disastrous course of war. * * * We shall vote in favor of this resolution, as we did in committee, because we are convinced more than ever that of the two paths that were shown to us, this is the surer way to peace."

Hats off to General Romulo. And, while quoting him, it's pertinent to add these wise words he said the other night when he was awarded a degree at Boston University.

"The true power of America does not rest on the dollar and the atom bomb.

"The strength of America still rests on the conviction held by the free peoples of the world that America stands for justice, for freedom, for equality, for progress, for all the great humane values of our civilization.

"If this faith in America is lost, the dollar cannot redeem it and the atom bomb cannot restore it."

[From the New York World-Telegram of February 3, 1951]

ROMULO, THE SCRAPPER

In the months-old fight to keep the Chinese Red outlaws in proper perspective before the United Nations, Gen. Carlos Romulo has been one of the most consistent and valiant warriors against appeasement.

As chief UN delegate and Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, a free and independent country, he has always stood ready to take on all comers who insist that they and they alone, are the spokesmen for the Asiatic people.

Last December when Red China's vituperative Wu snarled his accusations against the United States before a timorous UN, it was General Romulo who made the most telling counterattack. Point by point he answered Wu's charges that American capitalism was trying to dominate Asia. And for a capper he devastated Wu's pretenses that the Chinese Red was speaking for the people of the Orient.

After Wu went home, Sir Benegal Rau of India took the lead in the appeasement bloc. He, too, assumed to be the voice of Asia. But fortunately, General Romulo was always there to challenge that.

When the UN voted to negotiate with the Chinese Reds on Korea, it was General Romulo who delivered the most stinging indictment of the sell-out—at a time when the United States delegation went along with the appeasement crowd.

Last Thursday the UN finally approved a watered-down resolution naming the Chinese Reds as aggressors—over the pious protest of India's delegate who said:

"We should like to have it on the record that when the world was marching—that is, in our view—toward disaster, we, most of the Asian powers, did all we could to halt the march."

Once more, General Romulo leaped to the challenge.

"We, cannot," he said, "allow to pass unanswered the invidious claim of any delegation that it alone, together with those that shared its views, was dedicated to the cause of peace, while others that did not share those views were, by implication, committed to the disastrous course of war. * * * We shall vote in favor of this resolution, as we did in committee, because we are convinced more than ever that, of the two paths that were shown to us, this is the surer way to peace."

Hats off to General Romulo. And, while quoting him, it's pertinent to add these wise words he said the other night when he was awarded a degree at Boston University.

"The true power of America does not rest on the dollar and the atom bomb.

"The strength of America still rests on the conviction held by the free peoples of the world that America stands for justice, for freedom, for equality, for progress, for all the great humane values of our civilization.

"If this faith in America is lost, the dollar cannot redeem it and the atom bomb cannot restore it."

Funeral Sermon for the Late John B. Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the funeral sermon for the late John B. Sullivan, a former Member of this body, delivered by the Reverend James P. Johnston at the Immaculate Conception Church in St. Louis, Mo., on February 2, 1951:

SERMON

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.

Down in the lowlands of Kentucky, my friends, not too far from the thriving city of Louisville, banded together move a group of silent men. Some of them are ex-war veterans—soldiers tired of blood and carnage—seeking peace in the solitude of the Divine Prince of Peace. Living under the law of labor and prayer, they are called Christian Fathers or Trappist Monks. The world, though, may call them fools. They seldom speak only to say, when they do, "memento mori" (remember to die). Fools? Yes, but the wisest of fools. Fools for Christ's sake. He was a fool for their's—to the heights of holy Calvary.

Fools—but what's so foolish about the thought of death? Has, or will, anyone escape the eternal decree of the all-just God? Summed up in a few words, "It is appointed unto man—once to die." Once—no trying it over; no repeating; no second act. Figuratively, we are all actors on the great stage of life. We play our part, big or little; we take our bow; the curtain rings down and that's it. For it is appointed unto man, once to die.

Once to die and so important is our dying right that next Wednesday, Ash Wednesday, the grand old mother, the Catholic Church, will hold up an arresting finger and signal us to the altar rail and as she places the blessed ashes—the symbol of death—upon our forehead she will sign us with the sign of the cross. The sign of death, which is also the sign of eternal life. She will whisper the age-old admonition, "Remember man, thou art but dust and to dust thou shalt return." In a word, "Remember death."

Remember death. Ah, but the outside world, busy like Martha of old, has no time to think of death. Not today. Wait until I'm old. Wait until I've lost my outlook on life. So every sermon on death is for the fellow across the aisle, the old gant down the street, the aching woman, bedded down in the hospital ward. So today, big business finds the builder wanting to pierce the

heavens with another monument of stone, the banker is thrilled that the market is gaining in leaps and bounds and down in the land of flowers, the vacation lovers are tossing away their money like tomorrow brings the atomic bomb. The cry is "Business—more business."

Speaking of business—two score and a few years ago, Congressman John Sullivan (God rest him) knelt at his devoted Irish mother's knee but he soon pushed on to that day of days when he made his first holy communion. Then I say, he learned, lived and kept the greatest business God ever gave to man to keep—that was the business of saving his God-given immortal soul. In a word, why were you born? Created? Back comes the answer from your little catechism. It contains a college of truth. Invaluable platinum. Listen to it, "You were born (so was I) to know, to love, to serve God in this life that we might be happy with Him in the life to come." Thanks be to God, John Sullivan, to his dying day never forgot that lesson. Following after his King of Kings who pleaded, "My child, give me thy heart; follow me; I am the way, the only way; truth, the real truth; the life that spells eternal life."

It has been my privilege to know John for over 30 years. I watched him climb the political ladder of success, rung by rung. Honors didn't taint him, success didn't spoil him. He was a friend of the little man as well as the big. Charity saw him helping the less fortunate but first, last and always, he was a Catholic gentleman. Politics can be a dangerous game if the game isn't played square. The temptations are many and the fall is quick and easy but I say, "Gentleman John B. Sullivan" he was just that. Above reproach, steeled to the wishes of baser folk because, I repeat, he was a Catholic gentleman. It is regrettable that John died so young but though he did, his was a full life because he gave it the best he had day by day. A champion of the people, a real democratic son, following always the principle of the great party he represented. To know him was to love him. A credit to his faith, the Catholic Church, through whose doors he walked to adore his God and now his judge. Interested in the Cardinal Glennon Hospital, he forwarded me his check because he loved the memory of his friend and cardinal, the late Archbishop Glennon.

This morning, it was my privilege to offer up the adorable sacrifice of the spotless Lamb of God for your friend and mine, John Sullivan. God be good to him. Together, we offered this gift of gifts and at the memento of the dead we prayed, eternal rest—everlasting light. Then came the last gospel of this Mass that must ever lead us back over the corridors of time to that first and greatest of all Masses, celebrated by the great High Priest, Jesus Christ, on the altar of the cross. At the sad but holy hour of 3, we catch the consumatum est—it is finished. The story of divine infinite love is completely told, for greater love than this, no man hath, who lay down his life for his friends. John Sullivan, too, gave his all helping here and helping there, trying to throw the oil of his every effort on the turbulent ocean of these critical times. Oh, Good Fridays will come and go but don't take down the cross. Plant it deep in the fleshy soil of your human heart. It has the only answer to that eternal why of why these things must be. Sickness, sadness, disappointments, heartaches, and, then, death.

To Mrs. Sullivan, John's right arm, his devoted wife, secretary, and his all, we extend to you our every sympathy. Though it is hard, you must take your chalice of suffering and kneel with the Christ of Gethsemane and pray His prayers, "Father, not my will, but Thine be done." To the brother and sister and other relatives, we lavish our every condolence.

May I ask of you, who loved John in life, please don't forget him in death. It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins. So, let us take the roses of our rosaries, the violets of our prayerful aspirations, the lilies of our holy communions, the forget-me-nots of our many Masses, shape and fashion them into one large bouquet and place them at the feet of the Mother of God. She will give them to her Divine Son all for your friend and mine, John.

Since we are going to bid him good-by, it must be a prayerful good-by. A man of God and a champion of his country, this God blessed America. He served them both and served them well. God rest his soul.

National Officer of Military Order of Purple Heart Expresses Views on United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, no group of American citizens is more entitled to have their say and be heard on American foreign policy than our veterans who have received the Military Order of the Purple Heart. These men have fought for our Nation on the battlefield and have sacrificed their blood for the defense of the United States and for the preservation of the American way of life.

In a recent edition of the Los Angeles Examiner there appeared the following editorial written by Adolph N. Sutro, national public relations director of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, which also appeared in the California Purple Hearter, an official publication of the order. In this editorial Mr. Sutro has made a concise analysis of our foreign policy, and has pointed out the weakness that exists in this policy which permits other members of the United Nations to withhold an adequate share of men and materials to support our forces fighting in Korea, and has left us to bear the brunt of the battle. The Purple Heart veterans of America are concerned for the future of our Nation, and the recommendations on foreign policy by Mr. Sutro, as their spokesman, demands the attention of Congress.

ANTE UP OR ELSE

(By Adolph N. Sutro)

History will show Uncle Joe Stalin to have been the most unscrupulous, shrewd, and crafty ruler of the twentieth century. Without firing a single shot, he has conquered many lands.

In Korea, he set a trap for his arch enemy, Uncle Sam, who has done more than all other nations combined to halt the spread of his communistic doctrines.

After World War II, it was agreed that Russian troops should occupy that part of Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel, and our troops could occupy that part of Korea south of that parallel, pending both nations withdrawing their troops from Korea at the same time.

Joe Stalin laid a shrewd plan to trap Uncle Sam and make him keep large numbers of his troops pinned down over there, perhaps for years, without using any Russian troops. After a series of verbal clashes with Uncle Sam about Korea, Joe Stalin withdrew his Russian troops from Korea.

Before he did so, however, he armed the North Koreans, and not long thereafter, he ordered them to drive the foreign American troops out of South Korea.

In the meantime, the United Nations had been put into operation which on its face value appeared to be a good thing for all nations, and has proven to benefit everyone at the expense of Uncle Sam.

America and most parts of Western Europe are populated by freedom-loving occidentals, while on the other hand, Uncle Joe cracks his whip over lands populated for the most part by a Mongol people of oriental extraction, who are his slaves, as are practically all peoples behind the iron curtain.

Uncle Sam and Uncle Joe are both working to gain their objectives in the United Nations; Uncle Sam's objectives being to help other nations better themselves, while Uncle Joe uses the United Nations, to try to gain control of other nations or else try to make them destroy each other.

In the meantime, Uncle Joe is training many thousands of Communists to operate as termites within the borders of all freedom-loving countries with the destruction of our own democracy his ultimate goal.

Unfortunately, the United Nations has used Uncle Sam to pull its chestnuts out of the fire, by making us use our own manpower and material to fight the Korean and Chinese Reds. Each of the United Nations should have shared in this campaign on a population pro-rata basis, but, to date, none of them have.

If any one of the United Nations had lacked the finances or the ability to produce armament, then it should have increased its contribution of manpower to the United Nations armed forces in lieu of material, which also has not been done to date.

Mounting American casualties and miscalculation of the enemy's forces and armament in Korea are making our people demand that Uncle Sam insist on this immediate change of policy.

Should other United Nations fail to rectify at once this gross inequity for their own protection, then it is imperative that we withdraw from the United Nations and call our troops home for our own protection.

Joe Stalin has been crafty not to send his Russian troops into Korea, but he does send those of his puppets to take punches at us from time to time.

In the future, it may be weeks or months between such punches, between which he will have his puppets make unacceptable peace offers. Uncle Joe just stays home and "rattles his sabre," while planning where next to tie down more of our troops in some distant part of the world.

This can go on until the children of our fighting men grow up and their hair turns gray with age.

Our only hope to upset Uncle Joe Stalin's well-laid plans is to insist that the nations of Europe wake up and band themselves together as a United States of Europe for their own protection.

Then let us demand that our next Secretary of State be a man like John Quincy Adams, one of America's greatest statesmen who, as Secretary of State in 1823, wrote the Monroe Doctrine.

Let us then heed the words of President Washington against becoming involved in entangling alliances with Europe. Let us go back to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, build up the armed forces of the nations of the Western Hemisphere against

aggression from Europe and Asia, and get out of both.

We, of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, which is composed entirely of American combat-wounded war veterans, pray that Uncle Sam will protect our country against all the crafty and well-laid communistic plans of Joe Stalin to bankrupt, conquer, and enslave all our people.

Hoover Writes of Boyhood in Oregon Quaker District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Oregonian of Sunday, February 11, 1951, is an interesting news item of our only living ex-President, Herbert Hoover, in connection with his memoirs which are being presented in Collier's magazine. The item is about that portion of Mr. Hoover's life which was spent in my State of Oregon and pursuant to leave granted, I am including it as part of these remarks, as follows:

HOOVER WRITES OF BOYHOOD IN OREGON QUAKER DISTRICT

The only living ex-President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, tells of several years of his youth spent in Oregon in the current issue of Colliers' magazine.

Hoover, writing his personal memoirs in serial, tells of his move to Oregon at the age of 10 to live with an aunt and uncle at Newberg, a Quaker settlement in the Willamette Valley.

He arrived in 1884 to find his Aunt Laura Minthorn and her three daughters making the pear butter supply for the winter in a wash boiler over a fire in the yard. Young Hoover had never eaten pears before and after 2 days of an almost exclusively pear diet he did not eat pears again for years.

CHORES CHECK EXPLORATION

"I was at once put to school and the chores," Hoover writes. "These included feeding the doctor's team of ponies twice a day, hitching them up periodically, milking the cow and splitting the wood."

All this routine, Hoover stated, plus abundant religious occasions, somewhat interrupted the constant call to explore the Oregon forests and streams. That, he said, was accomplished in time.

The ex-President tells of a summer job at weeding onions in the great bottom lands north of Newberg for 50 cents a day and board.

Hoover writes of the family's move to Salem where Dr. Minthorn started a Quaker land-settlement business. He became office boy and attempted repair and sale of used sewing machines on the side. When a business college opened in Salem, he enrolled for the night session. The teacher knew much of mathematics and carried Hoover through algebra, geometry, and higher mathematics.

ENGINEERING TEST TAKEN

An engineer from the East drifted into the office and interested young Hoover in the study of engineering. After a year of mulling it over, young Hoover seemed decided upon an engineering career.

About this time a notice appeared of a public examination for entrance to the new free university founded by Senator Leland Stanford.

The future President took the examination in Portland but did not do too well. However, he was encouraged to go to the university, engage a tutor, and take the examination again. He did and thus enrolled at Stanford, leaving Oregon never to return as a resident.

Letter From a Constituent and Reply Thereto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission already granted, I submit herewith for the Appendix a letter from a friend and my answer thereto:

CENTRAL VALLEY EMPIRE ASSOCIATION,
Fresno, Calif., February 13, 1951.

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: It is good to read in the February 7 edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your remarks on the attacks which have been made on you by virtue of your wife working in your office.

I just want you to know that my wife works in my office and she does a swell job. As a matter of fact she does twice as much work as she gets paid for.

There is certainly nothing in American history which would indicate that a wife should not, if it is possible for her to do so, work along with her husband in his business.

I hope that you keep her right on there in spite of all the attacks.

With my kindest regards, I remain,
Sincerely,

CENTRAL VALLEY EMPIRE ASSOCIATION,
JOHN ARTHUR REYNOLDS,
General Manager, Secretary.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1951.

Mr. JOHN ARTHUR REYNOLDS,
General Manager, Central Valley Empire Association, Fresno, Calif.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: I am indeed appreciative of your helpful letter, defending my practice of employing my wife as secretary.

Naturally, it is difficult for you to understand why a few who consider themselves the elite in our community have nothing better to do than to try to stir up trouble over what you and any other rational person would consider logical and natural.

You cannot understand because you have never known anybody like the "squares" such as happen to occupy several of the so-called positions of responsibility in our fair city.

Suffice it to say there isn't any other place in the country where these characters could make a living. There just isn't anybody like them in the United States. They are tolerated only for the well-known reason they happen to have a lot of "dough" and have made everybody afraid of them.

Since they are financially well off and lazy, they do not have to work and wouldn't anyway. The alternative, of course, is to spend their useless hours trying to vent their spleen on the Congressman from our district who happens to be me.

They've been doing it for years, and as this particular matter is only a current gripe, they'll be on my neck about something else in another week or two, doubtless to rub it in by asking a favor.

Pardon this lengthy note, but in view of your never having seen anything so odd I thought these "punks" ought to be described in detail.

I wish to make it perfectly clear, however, that the thousands of patriotic Americans at home who back me up term after term in Congress compensate one a hundred times for the small handful of troublemakers and make me mindful of and thankful for the highest honor a man can possibly attain, that of representing in Congress as truly an American district as our own Thirty-seventh. New York.

With best wishes, I am
Most sincerely,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Wages of American Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a compilation which I call to the attention of Senators interested in the problem of the wages of American seamen. The statement shows the basic monthly pay of American seamen on all types of ships. The conclusion reached is that American seamen are today the highest paid in the world. This information is from the Merchant Marine Bulletin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SEAMEN NOW HIGHEST PAID IN WORLD

Basic wages for American able seamen, the best paid in the world, have increased 201.1 percent since 1941, according to the American Merchant Marine Institute.

The prewar monthly basic income of an AB was $82.50, reaching $145 at the war's end. Since October 1945 there have been eight successive wage increases and these have upped the monthly rate to $248.41, a new high. Overtime earnings average 30 percent over basic wage. In addition seamen enjoy a pension and welfare plan along with food and lodging furnished by the steamship companies. The monthly basic wage rate for a typical United States-flag Liberty type ship follows:

Rating	Basic monthly pay
Master	$759.63
First officer	469.42
Second officer	411.69
Third officer	372.66
Chief engineer	606.95
First assistant engineer	459.42
Second assistant engineer	411.69
Third assistant engineer	376.66
Radio operator	362.13
Bosuswain	215.35
Able seaman (6 per ship)	248.41
Deck utility	200.99
Ordinary seaman (3 per ship)	213.79
Deck engineer	253.01
Oiler (3 per ship)	248.41
Fireman watertender (3 per ship)	248.41
Wiper (2 per ship)	245.26
Chief steward	307.70
Chief cook	282.01
Second cook and baker	267.64
Messman (3 per ship)	213.79
Utility (2 per ship)	213.79

Sixth Anniversary of the Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago today, without the knowledge or the wish of the American people, the United States was committed to the dangerous and unscrupulous Yalta agreement. For 6 years this notorious agreement has remained a blot upon the record of American diplomacy. In the opinion of many, it represents an appeasement greater than that of Munich itself. Yalta, which should have marked the end of totalitarian expansion, marked instead the real beginning of the spread of Communist domination over one-third of the world.

At Yalta was laid much of the foundation for the postwar world, a foundation so undermined in the making that it is little wonder that the peace built upon it is badly crumbling today. When the conference ended it was pronounced a "good start on the road to a world of peace." Looking backward it is evident that only the Soviet schemers were given a "good start." Let us consider some of the agreements into which we were drawn at the Crimea 6 years ago.

In February 1945, while the world lay in a shambles, the vision of a lasting peace shone before the eyes of everyone. People everywhere staked their hope on an international organization which would be strong enough to make that vision a reality. However, engineered by a man since convicted of a terrible crime, the Yalta agreement forged shackles for that organization even before its formation. The veto, which the Russians have since used 47 times to defeat action in the UN Security Council, which all the rest of the world favored, was agreed to at Yalta. Further, the principle of equal representation for all nations in the General Assembly was compromised by allowing the Soviet Union to have three representatives when all the other nations of the world had only one.

The most cynical action of the Yalta conference, however, was the betrayal of Poland. Poland, the home of liberty and freedom, the first country to resist the Nazi blitzkrieg and the Soviet hordes, was sold out to Soviet Russia. A democratic Polish government in exile had maintained itself throughout its country's occupation, and several hundred thousand Poles fought with the greatest bravery and sacrifice as part of the Allied armies during World War II. But the Yalta agreement allowed, indeed forced, the entrance of Communists into the postwar government. Once entrenched in a coalition, as everyone now knows, it is only a matter of time, and usually a short time, before the Communists, with backing from Moscow, have come to control the key positions, force out the democratic elements, and seize control. This was the case in Poland, so that although the vast majority of Poles were freedom-loving, they were enslaved by a few Communists—Communists whose wedge was forged at Yalta.

The second treacherous betrayal of Poland at Yalta was the concession of half of Poland's territory to Russia. The Polish people are, and will long remain, embittered because the Western Powers let Poland down on this count. The 14 points, the Atlantic Charter, and other statements of ideals to which the United States has pledged itself, specifically denounce territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. Yet at Yalta the United States participated in a breach of the principle of self-determination almost without parallel in our history.

The Polish people had no voice in the assignment of their territory to Soviet Russia. At Yalta the great powers, unmindful of the desires of the Polish people, took as the basis for a boundary settlement a line which put almost half the Polish nation within Russian boundaries. Because of this action millions of Poles have lost faith in us. As more appeasement was revealed bit by bit for 2 years after the conference, it became apparent that secret diplomacy reached its acme—or should we say its nadir—at Yalta.

Actually, the people of the United States, through their elected Representatives, never have given their approval to this agreement which in fact extended the Soviet empire to the heart of Europe. It is difficult to believe that the United States would be a party to an infamous agreement which allowed states liberated from fascism to be enslaved by communism and which turned Axis satellite states into Soviet satellites instead. What made the leader of the United States commit a deed so out of character with the fairness and idealism that have always distinguished this Nation in its international relations? Perhaps the explanation lies partly in the influence of a Presidential adviser—Alger Hiss. Both before and during the Yalta conference, Hiss had a power difficult to overestimate since the President had to depend on advisers to an unprecedented degree. Reports of the various discussions of the Crimean meetings show that he was one adviser almost always on hand.

This Yalta agreement, once understood by the American people, naturally has been denounced by the American press. On the ground that no nation has the authority to dispose of the rights and the territory of another nation without its own participation and consent, the Yalta agreement should be declared invalid. It should be declared invalid because it was never ratified by the United States Senate. It should be declared invalid because, in spite of the many advantages Stalin gained from Yalta, he has not fulfilled the few commitments which he did make.

This agreement can still be denounced. Until it is, the millions of people in Poland who were sold into slavery at Yalta can never have faith in our good intentions, no matter how loudly we may proclaim them. For 6 years we have contended with the handicap which has resulted from our ill-considered concessions at Yalta. For 6 years we have let the innocent victims suffer. For 6 years we have watched the Soviet system infiltrate, conquer and absorb more and more of the world's population. On this anniversay of shameful Yalta, let us inaugurate a serious effort to rid ourselves of the shackles of this agreement so that we may once again walk with honor among its victims.

Disposition of Surplus American Wheat—Recommendations of the Oregon Wheat Growers League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Don McKinnis, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, enclosing recommendations passed at the twenty-third annual meeting of the league, December 7, 8, and 9, 1950, regarding the disposition of American surplus wheat. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the recommendations be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., December 29, 1950.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I call your attention to the enclosed recommendations which were passed at the twenty-third annual meeting of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, December 7, 8, 9, 1950.

To save your time, I have chosen these resolutions from the five standing committee reports. They are the recommendations which should most properly be brought to your attention.

The executive committee of the wheat league will appreciate your consideration of these recommendations. Any advice or suggestions you care to make will be welcome.

Sincerely yours,

DON MCKINNIS,
President.

P. S.—Please note the new address of the Oregon Wheat Growers League. Any communications addressed to Mr. McKinnis will be promptly brought to his attention.

RECOMMENDATIONS PASSED AT THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE

THE CERTIFICATE BILL

We recommend that the Oregon Wheat Growers League continue to support the certificate bill and urge the passage of this bill in Congress. This plan would be self-supporting. It would allow United States wheat now in surplus to compete in export markets with foreign wheat and flour; it would make it easier for those nations short of food to buy it here; it would allow wheat not needed for human food to be used for livestock feed; it would encourage the development of industrial uses of wheat, and would relieve our critical storage situation.

FOREIGN POLICY

During the past year a number of developments have reduced sales of our wheat and flour abroad. Canadian and Australian millers are selling flour in the Orient and Latin America at prices United States millers are unable to meet. Licensing regulations in Hong Kong, Singapore, and elsewhere exclude United States flour and give a monopoly in those markets to Canadian and Australian mills. These are part of the British Empire to which the United States gives billions of dollars through ECA. Flour purchased with United States funds for Korea is being milled in Japan from wheat produced in other countries.

The net effect of these and other developments is that all available wheat is bought from other exporting countries and the United States supplies only that portion of the world wheat market that cannot be supplied from other sources.

Bakers in the Orient and Latin America are becoming used to brands of flour from other countries. These have previously been established markets for Pacific Northwest flour. Such markets, once lost, will be exceedingly difficult to regain.

It is highly important to wheat producers that our mills be kept running and that we hold and expand markets for our wheat and flour in other countries.

We recommend, therefore, that the Wheat League do everything within its power to get our Government to take a more realistic, businesslike attitude toward promoting sales of United States wheat and flour abroad.

Specifically, we recommend—

1. The use of the certificate plan, or export subsidies that will enable our surplus wheat and flour to compete freely on the entire world market, outside of, as well as within, the international wheat agreement.

2. Insistence that our wheat and flour be given an even break in licensing regulations of importing nations which we are helping to finance.

3. Requiring that, where the United States Government puts up the money, our flour and wheat be given the preference over flour and wheat from other countries.

RESEARCH ON GRAINS

The United States Department of Agriculture has maintained a plant breeder at the Pendleton Branch Experiment Station for years. This position was discontinued during the summer of 1950. Plant breeding, varietal, insects, and plant disease research is needed at this station if the progress of our wheat breeding and research is to remain on the high level as in the past.

We therefore recommend that proper steps be taken by the Oregon Wheat Growers League to have funds earmarked for filling and maintaining this position at once.

We further recommend that copies of this resolution be sent to Cereal Division, Bureau of Plant Industry, Beltsville, Md., and to the dean of agriculture, Oregon State College.

CARRYING CHARGES ON LOAN WHEAT

In view of the fact that it is the intent of the law that the loan rate should be based on parity as of the beginning of the marketing year, the Oregon Wheat Growers League is of the opinion that the Commodity Credit Corporation should assume the carrying charges which accrue prior to the maturity date of the loan on warehouse-stored wheat, the same as they have in the past, and should continue to make a storage allowance on farm-stored wheat.

GROWER'S OPTION ON SURRENDER DATE OF CCC LOAN WHEAT

We recommend that the Oregon Wheat Growers League request the Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, to put in effect a program which would allow the wheat grower the option of delivering his wheat under loan 90 days before the maturity date of the loan or any time during this 90-day period. This action would facilitate the movement of wheat out of storage before a new marketing year and enable Commodity Credit to obtain wheat, if needed, before the loans are due, April 30.

COLUMBIA RIVER DEVELOPMENT

We are desperately short of electrical power, both for development of our area and for national defense. Navigation on this river is of great importance to our area. Speedier development of one of our greatest natural resources is essential; at the present rate it will be 8 years before there will be enough power to meet even present demands. We, therefore, recommend the Oregon Wheat Growers League use all of its influence to speed up the development of the Columbia River and its tributaries.

WHEAT VARIETY IMPROVEMENT AND SMUT CONTROL

With wheat smut becoming a more serious problem each year and with dwarf smut fast becoming a threat to all Oregon wheat producers, everything possible must be done to keep these losses at a minimum.

Elmar and Brevor, two newly released varieties, are among the few varieties that are more resistant to dwarf smut. It is understood that these varieties are not wholly resistant to dwarf smut and that there is a constant threat of new smuts developing. This threat can be at least partially controlled through proper seed treatment of all wheat seeded. Ceresan "M" by slurry treatment offers the best method of good seed treatment.

Elmar and Brevor, being the newest varieties released, and with no others in prospect of being released immediately, we recommend that farmers produce these as fast as seed becomes available. These two varieties are adapted to specific areas of rainfall and soil conditions and farmers should acquaint themselves with these requirements before large acreages are seeded.

BLACK STEM RUST FUNGUS

The common barberry is the alternate host for the black stem rust fungus, and the breeding place for new races of the fungus. Also it has been demonstrated that new races arising on the common barberry are frequently capable of infecting hitherto rust-resistant wheat varieties. Race 15–B, an extremely virulent new race of black stem rust, has been found and identified in the Pacific Northwest. Eight races not known to exist elsewhere in the world, and 11 races not known to occur in the Mississippi Valley, have been found in the Pacific Northwest. There being no commercial variety or advanced experimental variety of wheat in the United States or Canada that possesses resistance to race 15–B and other new races; and as the prevention of the spread of black stem rust is not only a regional problem but also a national problem, it is recommended by the Oregon Wheat Growers' League that the league request an immediate ground survey of the distribution of the common barberry in the wheat producing and adjacent areas of the State of Oregon by the Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station and the State department of agriculture; and that following the survey, the eradication of this disease-propagating plant be carried out by the proper agencies.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Soil erosion continues to be a major problem in our wheat-producing areas. The importance of adequate soil conservation has long been recognized by our farmers. Continued emphasis should be made in getting everyone conservation minded.

We recommend that the Pendleton Branch Experiment Station erosion research project, and that Merrill Oveson, superintendent, be commended on the fine work on conservation tillage practice research carried on there.

We further recommend that steps be taken to provide adequate funds for continued research at the Pendleton station on this major problem. We believe that further research is needed before farmers can be fully confident of the place that such implements as the rotary subsoiler, chisels, subsurface tillers and others have on their farms.

EQUALIZING LOAN VALUES ON BARGE WHEAT—COLUMBIA RIVER TERMINALS

Historically, our Pacific Northwest wheat depends on export market. Normally, large amounts of our crop move to Columbia River port elevators for storage and subsequent loading onto ships. These Columbia River port elevators presently have a total receiving and storage capacity of approximately 15,000,000 bushels.[1] During the past 5 years, 1945 through 1949, over 135,000,000 bushels[2] have been exported from these Columbia River terminals, or an average of about 27,000,000 per year. During this same 5-year period the movement of barge wheat down the Columbia River to these terminal elevators has averaged about 2,600,000 bushels per year, with an average of 575,000 bushels of this amount during the harvest months of July, August and September. Thus barge delivery wheat to the Columbia River terminals is not large in relation to total capacity of the terminals, and amounts to about 9 percent of annual exports from these terminals. However, the movement of wheat by barge is a major factor in the storage, handling and marketing of the grower's crop, especially during the harvest season.

Presently, the Commodity Credit Corporation loan rates provide an 8 cents per bushel discount on wheat delivered to Columbia River terminals by barge. This discount unfairly penalizes that volume of grower wheat which is moved by barge. Especially is this true of the volume during the harvest period when, often due to boxcar shortages, barge movement is the only method of shipping which can keep many of our country facilities and river subterminals open. This 8-cent discount is so great that, as a practical measure, the growers do not take loans on barge wheat. The grain is either sold or consigned. These growers are penalized for a movement of grain which benefits every grower in the Pacific Northwest.

Establishment of the same terminal loan value on rail and barge wheat should be considered in the light of this special area problem. Equalization between rail and barge rates would correct the inequities and would have the following advantages:

1. Barge wheat would not cost the Government any more money than rail because large quantities are exported in excess of barge deliveries. Rail transit is not needed at the export location.

2. Encourage and facilitate movement of surplus grain at harvest time to terminal elevators, thereby relieving country facilities, and providing adequate export stocks in immediate export loading position.

3. Relieve boxcar shortages. Wheat shipped by barge from river counties means more boxcars for areas away from the river. Barge companies now have equipment sufficient to move 900,000 bushels[3] of wheat per month. This volume is equal to about 500 boxcar loadings per month.

---

[1] Figures developed from trade survey of terminal storage capacities.

[2] Figures obtained from records of Portland Grain Exchange, Portland, Oreg.

[3] Figures obtained directly from Inland Navigation Co. and Tidewater Shaver Barge Lines and compiled by Pendleton Grain Growers, Inc.

4. Eliminate basic cause underlying the forced sale or consignment of barge wheat, and thus make the support price equal for qualified growers.

5. Provide conditions favorable to the maximum and most efficient use of all transportation, handling and storing methods during emergency and scarcity periods.

Therefore, it is recommended—

1. That the Oregon Wheat Growers League go on record in favor of equal loan rates on barge and rail wheat delivered at Columbia River terminals.

2. That immediate action be taken to contact PMA and CCC in regard to getting favorable action well in advance of the 1951 crop.

AGRICULTURAL MANPOWER

The present world situation is becoming more acute from day to day. Realizing that agriculture will suffer labor shortages, we recommend that the executive committee of the Oregon Wheat Growers League take immediate steps to have a State manpower board set up with county boards to review labor needs of the counties for the reclassification of farm labor by selective service.

With the very possible acute labor shortages we further recommend that the enlistees within a county be counted in favor of the county draft quota. We ask that the executive committee take immediate action and contact proper authorities.

CONSERVATION RESEARCH

That effective research in the field of soil conservation should be continued and expanded in order to carry on an efficient soil-conservation program.

CONSERVATION PRACTICES NECESSARY FOR LOANS OR CERTIFICATES

That where allotments are established, or certificates are issued, a certain percentage of the acres of each farm be utilized by a recognized soil-building practice before eligibility for loans or conservation payments or certificates is established. And be it further resolved that each farmer shall be eligible for price support on all of his crops before being eligible for loans or price supports on any one of his crops.

ADJUSTMENT OF WHEAT LOAN RATES IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

That wheat growers as well as other interests be given a hearing before any action is taken toward adjusting wheat loan rates in the Pacific Northwest. Further, that the Oregon Wheat League make a thorough study prior to the hearing of the loan rate structure to determine whether the possible increase in movement of wheat out of the Pacific Northwest would justify a change in the loan rate structure.

Thirty-Third Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War I many submerged and suppressed national groups regained their independence. The Lithuanian people, one of the three Baltic nationalities who for more than a century had suffered Russian rule, declared their independence on February 16, 1918. That day was and still remains a day of commemoration.

The Lithuanians have a distinct place in the turbulent history of northern Europe. They are the most numerous of the three Baltic nationalities—about 3,000,000—and they have always been sturdy defenders of liberty. Although they have borne the heavy yoke of the Russian Government for more than a century, they have managed always to keep their love of liberty and their patriotism alive. Their sturdy and unyielding spirit, fortified by their firm belief in Christian principles, has served them well. They have clung to Christianity with the same tenacity as they have to their unhappy homeland.

Both in the attainment of their Lithuanian independence and in its sustenance during more than two decades, I am happy to say, the United States has made important contributions, officially and unofficially. The Lithuanians received great encouragement from the Fourteen Points declaration of our former President Wilson. It was a source of inspiration to them to know that their struggle for liberty and independence had the support of our wartime President and our people. Nor was the moral and material aid given to Lithuania by the people of this country, especially by the worthy citizens of Lithuanian descent, of less significance.

This latter group, totaling more than 500,000, have served their adopted country well. As law-abiding, hard-working, and loyal citizens in wartime and in peacetime, they have contributed their full share in the making of this country and in the shaping of American civilization. It is the independence day of the brethren of these people who, today, in northeastern Europe suffer under the most oppressive of tyrannies, that is being celebrated on this 16th day of February.

In 1918 when the Lithuanians earned their freedom they and the friends of freedom all over the world thought that the servitude and misery of foreign rule had come to an end. This brave people who had struggled against Teutonic knights in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, against foreign overlords through the next four centuries and finally, against the regime of the Russian Czars for more than a hundred years, had at last broken the chains of their involuntary servitude. A new day had dawned for them, and a new, promising life began for them as a nation. During the twenty-odd years of her independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania made tremendous advances and became a model democracy in northeastern Europe.

Today this unhappy country, and its people, once more finds itself in chains and sealed off from friendly contacts with the Western World. In 1940 the Soviet Union descended upon the little country and swallowed it; a year later it was overrun by the Germans, and the Soviets were expelled. In 1944 the dreaded Russians returned, to complete their absorption of this unhappy people. Last year it was reported that some 600,000 Lithuanians had been deported to slave-labor camps in Asiatic regions of the Soviet Union. According to the New York Times of February 16, 1950, these people were being killed, were starving to death, and were undergoing deportation at the rate of 2,000 to 3,000 each month. Against this terrible campaign of attrition the Lithuanian underground patriots are still active, still striving to gain their independence. It is to the credit of this country that our Government still accords diplomatic recognition to the Government of Lithuania—a clear indication that we believe that on some February 16 to come, the Lithuanian people once again will celebrate their day of independence in full freedom and in peace.

Fundamentals of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of February 15 entitled "Fundamentals of Inflation." This editorial deals with the current research into public policy of the famed business group, the Committee for Economic Development, on the first board of trustees of which I had the honor of serving as the vice chairman.

Since its founding 9 years ago the CED has taken leadership in the clarification of our fiscal policy. Now, as this editorial indicates, it is concerning itself also with monetary policy, a subject of such vital significance that many distinguished economists think our ineptitude in this area largely accounts for our failure to control the rise in prices of the past 7 or 8 months. Much of the recent testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has dealt with this and kindred subjects touched on in the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDAMENTALS OF INFLATION

We think the country as a whole will echo the demand of the Committee for Economic Development that it is high time the administration established a clear and consistent anti-inflation program.

The Committee for Economic Development points out that while so-called direct price-wage controls have their place in a major defense effort, they do not deal with the causes of inflation, and unless those causes are removed such controls can do more harm than good. This, of course, is sound common sense. Direct controls, in this respect, are like a loan granted to a State on condition that it undertake certain constructive financial reforms needed to insure its solvency. Unless it moves immediately to put those reforms into effect the whole benefit of the loan may be negated, leaving the borrower worse off than before. And in the hands of an administration that is uncertain in its convictions and inclined, all else being equal, to pursue the course of least political resistance, controls partake of the nature of such a stop-gap loan in another respect. They serve to create temporarily an impression of economic stability, and thus are a temptation to the administration to relax its fight on inflation by those techniques which deal with its real causes.

There is nothing complicated about dealing with price inflation, given the will to deal with it courageously, no matter what group is hurt politically. But we may just as well abandon any hope that we can defeat it so long as we continue to protect the vested interest of the wage-earner in the 40-hour week and escalator wage clauses; so long as we permit the farm bloc in Congress to tell us that we must make an exception to the over-all commodity price freeze of the products in which it is particularly interested; and so long as we place the protection of an artificial parity for Government securities higher in our scale of values than the protection of the dollar.

Fundamentally, price inflation is the result of an unbalance between the volume of goods and services available, on the one hand, and the volume of purchasing power, on the other hand. The only way it can be overcome, therefore, is by increasing the supply of goods and services, or by reducing the supply of purchasing power, or both. There has been a good deal of lip service in Washington recently to the idea of solving the problem by increasing production. The Committee for Economic Development points out that while increased production may be a long-term solution, it won't immediately stabilize the economy.

We would go further than this. We think that the talk about defeating inflation by increased production is largely irrelevant so long as the defense effort continues. The reason it is virtually impossible to attack inflation from the supply side, once a war or a major rearmament program has gotten under way, is that you are dealing with an economy that is operating at total capacity, or close to it. Even if we could double production tomorrow the inflation gap represented by rearmament production would still remain. For while such production creates purchasing power just as effectively as the production of civilian goods, not a dollar of that newly created purchasing power is offset, inflationwise, by increased civilian consumption.

The sooner we put increased production out of our minds, therefore, as a practicable solution of the inflation problem and concentrate on the demand side the sooner we can hope to see some tangible results. And when we start to concentrate on demand or purchasing power we should be on guard lest we be misled by the oversimplificationists. The expansion of bank credit, for example, is not the sum total of increased purchasing power. Broadly speaking, three different kinds of purchasing power enter into the problem of price inflation. They are: Purchasing power that is created currently, such as wages; purchasing power previously accumulated (savings); and what may be called future purchasing power, which would be purchasing power created by the banks to be used now and repaid later.

This is the basic situation that has to be met in formulating and carrying out an anti-inflation program. That being so, the general thesis of the Committee for Economic Development is completely logical. It calls for drastic steps to cut Government spending; sharp and prompt tax increases, designed to restrain consumer spending as well as to increase revenues; a national program to encourage saving, and, finally, the adoption of a policy under which the Federal Reserve would be freed from its responsibility to peg the Government securities market, so that it could devote itself to the task for which it was created, the task of stabilizing the money market and protecting the purchasing power of the dollar.

Fight Winning War in Korea or Get Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from my home State of Michigan where I found the majority of the people demanding a clarified policy in Korea. The situation in Michigan is well stated in an editorial by John S. Knight, one of our foremost American publishers, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, Sunday, February 18.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

FIGHT WINNING WAR IN KOREA OR GET OUT

According to Fred Sparks, recently returned Chicago Daily News foreign-service correspondent, the "kids" in Korea are living with one foot in a fox hole and the other planted on Main Street, U. S. A.

Putting it another way, they sense that the big decision as to whether we stay in Korea or pull out has not yet been made.

In the absence of any clearly defined policy by the military brass, the political big shots, or the United Nations, our troops in Korea just don't have that "let's get it over and go home" spirit which was such a strong morale factor in World War II.

Nor do they clearly understand why they are in Korea; why they can't bomb enemy supply arsenals in Manchuria; why they alternately advance and retreat; or what our real objectives are.

They know only from the limited information which comes to them from the Stars and Stripes or an occasional broadcast that a great debate over foreign policy is raging in Washington.

They read, too, that the United Nations has branded Red China as an aggressor. "Why then," they ask with the candor characteristic of youth, "can't we bomb the daylights out of the Chinese Reds where it really hurts?"

When they get no satisfying reply, should these "kids" be blamed for thinking that maybe it's just a politicians' war, and the hell with it.

In fact, that's what a good many people are thinking right here at home.

MAC ARTHUR'S PREDICAMENT

General MacArthur is the victim of much undeserved criticism from Drew Pearson and other "typewriter warriors" for our reverses in Korea.

Conceding that "Mac" has pulled a few boners, the facts are that MacArthur has had to fight a war with one arm tied behind his back.

He has repeatedly said that the "restrictions" placed upon him are "unparalleled in military history." In his most recent statement, MacArthur hinted at his predicament by saying that "the future of Korea continues to be dependent upon international considerations and decisions not yet known here."

In other words, even the Commander in Chief of all forces in Asia is without adequate instructions from his superiors and knows not where he stands.

Can you blame MacArthur for describing Manchuria as a privileged sanctuary and complaining that he is unable to see clearly the outcome of the war under present limitations?

WHY WE HAVE NO POLICY

In the early days of the Korean conflict a decision was taken against bombing Manchurian supply centers for fear of bringing the Chinese Reds into the war.

At the time it was reached, this conclusion seemed justified. Now that the Chinese Reds are killing our boys, it seems fantastic that we sheathe our most effective weapon.

The diplomats at Lake Success passed a watered-down resolution terming Red China an aggressor nation, but they literally wring their hands over the suggestion that sanctions be employed.

Ernie Hill, our correspondent at the UN, says: "Delegates frankly state that under present circumstances they will never vote to press the war across the Chinese border."

Peter Lisagor, member of our Washington staff, reports United States diplomatic officials feel that the original resolution to pacify and restore security to Korea applies well enough. There is no great urgency to change it.

No great urgency, my eye. We should either fight a winning war in Korea, or get out.

What sense is there in committing thousands of our best young men to the "meat grinding" process—MacArthur's term for the Korean fighting—to satisfy the United Nations diplomatic front?

The "meat grinding" type of war could last for years without decisive results.

Another reason why we have no firm policy in Korea is that the British shudder at the thought of antagonizing Red China and losing their important commercial foothold in Hong Kong.

Fred Sparks told a Chicago audience that the British are even permitting a trickle of strategic supplies, including crude rubber, to reach the Chinese Communists.

This is the age-old diplomatic practice of two nations professing friendship while their sons are killing one another on the battlefield.

In World War II when Dictator Franco was firmly allied with Hitler and Mussolini, Great Britain allowed this same trickle of strategic materials to reach the enemy they were presumed to be fighting.

This procedure was justified by the British on the ground that it kept Spain as a neutral nation.

As David Lawrence said recently, "The belief grows that the Korean situation has become more and more of a political problem, as pressure is exerted against Prime Minister Attlee from the left wingers inside the Labor Party. The affinity of the left wing Laborites with Communist objectives in the Far East has manifested itself in a demand that the Peiping regime be recognized by the United Nations and in the campaign to prevent the Red Chinese from being branded as aggressors."

What manner of allies are these?

BRING MAC ARTHUR HOME

Since we have had an Eisenhower report on Europe, how about a MacArthur report on Korea?

What greater service could General MacArthur perform for his country than to tell Congress and the people the plain, unvarnished facts about Korea?

His critics hint darkly that Mac wants to undertake an all-out war against the Chinese Reds. The accusation is false, but let MacArthur answer the question.

Let him outline his problems, amplify his remarks about diplomatic restrictions and tell us what he would do, and when, if he were in a position of final authority.

It isn't only the kids in Korea who are confused. It's all of us.

The suspicion grows that the United States is being inextricably caught in the web of old world diplomacy. This is a pattern of diplomacy which settles nothing permanently, nor makes more than a gesture toward reaching final and lasting agreement.

The American heritage is different. We knew what we were fighting for at Valley Forge, New Orleans, Missionary Ridge, and Manila Bay.

We thought we knew what we were fighting for at Belleau Wood, St. Mihiel, Bastogne, and Okinawa.

Are we as sure today about Seoul, Inchon, and Wonju?

Or our 50,000 casualties in Korea?

Are we satisfied to accept the view that the United States of America must send the flower of its youth to fight communism on every front, or will we insist that our objectives must be clearly defined so we will know the reason for and the price of our sacrifice?

While the thought of war is repugnant to all of us, no good American shrinks from the conflict if he knows why we're fighting and what we are attempting to achieve.

The situation in Korea is beclouded by the inconclusive vaporings of timid men at Lake Success and the foggy bottom pontification of those sitting in the seats of the departed mighty at Washington.

Walter Lippmann hints that we have long since put aside the political objectives declared in the UN resolution of October 7 to establish by arms "a unified independent and democratic government in Korea."

What, then, are our objectives? A military partition of Korea which would again divide that country into two spheres of influence?

What is the truth?

A personal report by MacArthur would either confirm or dispel our doubts. It is a story that no other man could tell.

After 8 months of diplomatic double talk about Korea, and for the sake of our sons in combat, it's time to find out, or get out.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Substitute for Blood-Plasma Discovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add further to the remarks I made recently with regard to the discovery of okra as a substitute for blood plasma by Marquette University.

I include herewith an article that appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel of January 28, 1951:

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY PLASMA SUBSTITUTE OUTPUT CENTERED HERE

The manufacture and distribution of the okra substitute for human plasma will be centered here in Milwaukee.

They will be supervised by Marquette University Medical School, where the new discovery was developed.

Patents for control of the manufacturing process have been applied for by three of the men concerned in the research. Dr. Hiram Benjamin, staff member of the medical school and chief of the research team, has applied for the basic patent.

Subsidiary patents, which concern the purification process by which the okra product is reduced to a powder, have been applied for by Dr. Harry Ihrig, Ph. D., vice president in charge of research at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., and Darwin Kaestner, plant and production manager of Lakeside Laboratories here.

The three men have agreed to turn their patents over to the medical school. They are giving up the patent rights on the principle that control of a product of such potential importance to humanity should not be vested in individuals but in a nonprofit medical institution.

Lakeside Laboratories, at 1707 East North Avenue, will be licensed to manufacture the plasma replacement, according to Dr. John S. Hirschboeck, dean of the medical school.

CAN BE SUBLET

Lakeside will be able to sublet manufacturing contracts to other laboratories if the demand for the new product exceeds Lakeside's capacity, but all such agreements will be subject to the approval of the medical school.

In this way, Dr. Hirschboeck explained, Marquette will be in direct control of the standards governing the manufacture and distribution of the plasma substitute.

Marquette's royalties from sale of the product will be used to promote and expand the university's medical research program, Dr. Hirschboeck said.

EXCELLENT TEAMWORK

One phase of the research which led to the okra plasma replacement is a fine example of teamwork between science and industry. This was the task of working out a method by which large quantities of the okra extract could be reduced to a powder without sacrificing any of its useful elements.

The Globe Steel Tubes Co. started this problem on the way to solution by loaning the medical school Dr. Ihrig, then director of laboratories for the company. Globe Steel also provided the use of laboratory facilities which were not available at Marquette.

Dr. Ihrig's services as research consultant were continued by the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. after he had gone to that firm as vice president in charge of research. Further steps in the purification process were worked out in the Allis-Chalmers laboratories.

Members of the Lakeside Laboratories staff who cooperated in the development of the plasma replacement included Kaestner; Dr. Harvey L. Dalell, scientific director; Harris L. Friedman, director of laboratories; and Joseph M. Jacques, chemist.

The Social Security Act Should Be Amended To Permit Recipients of Earned Benefits To Earn $100 Monthly Without Loss of Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the Eighty-first Congress I had a bill pending before the House Ways and Means Committee to amend the Social Security Act to permit recipients of earned benefits to earn up to $50 monthly without loss of benefits. At that time the ceiling on such earnings was $14.99 monthly, and a retired person drawing earned social-security benefits did not dare to accept any employment that would pay over $14.99 monthly or face the loss of his monthly benefit check.

When the House Ways and Means Committee perfected the amendments to the Social Security Act, the proposal contained in my bill that the ceiling on wages earned be increased to $50 monthly was adopted. It has since become law and is in effect at the present time.

No doubt many of you have found, as I have, that with the cost of living continually on the increase there is ample justification for increasing the ceiling on earnings to $100 monthly and still preserve eligibility for earned profits under the Social Security Act. For that reason I have introduced a bill this date to amend the Social Security Act by allowing a person entitled to earned benefits to earn an income of $100 monthly and not suffer the loss of social-security benefits he is receiving.

After all, the recipient of earned benefits contributed his share of payroll taxes along with his employer while he was working in covered employment. Since he purchased the benefits he receives by his contributions from wages earned, he is not receiving any handout from the Federal Government when he cashes his monthly social-security check.

These retired persons represent a large group of good American citizens who through toil and taxes have helped build this great Nation. There is no good reason why they should be denied the right in their retirement years to increase their income by accepting employment that does not pay them over $100 monthly and still be able to retain their status as recipients of earned social-security benefits that they and their employers purchased through payroll deductions.

The increase of the present ceiling on earnings of from $50 to $100 monthly provided in my bill will prove a morale builder to many retired persons who are able and eager to accept employment because they find it impossible to meet the high cost of living on their fixed income from present social-security benefits. These deserving citizens buy their groceries and other necessities of life in the same stores that are patronized by their neighbors who are gainfully employed. Therefore, it requires no stretch of the imagination to realize the desperate plight facing these fine American citizens, and with that thought in mind, I sincerely hope that my proposal to increase the present ceiling on income from $50 to $100 will receive the immediate and enthusiastic approval of Congress without any further delay.

Radio Address of Miss Marcia Anne Harmon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Miss Marcia Anne Harmon, of St. Bernardine High School, Del Rosa, Calif.:

(By Marcia Anne Harmon, age 16, St. Bernardine High School, Del Rosa, Calif.)

When I pondered on the title of this year's contest, I asked myself, "Who really should speak for Democracy?"

In my mind's eye I saw the battlefields of Korea and the boys who are fighting and dying over there for the ideals of democracy. And I thought—yes, these could probably speak, but then, no. These soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen of ours, fight and die, but they remain strangely silent concerning those sacred principles so dear to them. They act; they do; but they do not boast, nor speak.

Who or what, then, would represent democracy's case? Across my mind floated two symbols of democracy.

One was that of a tall, graceful, alluring statue, standing, holding aloft the torch of freedom at the entrance of New York Harbor. Lady Liberty expresses all that democracy means. Her famed sculptor would have her say to all: "Welcome to my home, a shrine of freedom, O you oppressed of other lands. Here is your chance to use and share your talents in your own way for the good of all. Here, you can carve out your fame, embellish your name, lay the foundations of your home and family, and participate in the cultural, economic and political betterment of your equals and on the same footing with them. My torch, burning brightly, symbolizes light for your paths, truth for your minds, and a promise of freedom for your God-given rights."

While I was still considering Lady Liberty's words, her picture faded out, introducing another symbol of democracy—the ballot box. I wondered what this symbol would say and then realized this would be its proclamation: "I am your voice of democracy. In your desire to procure democracy, to protect it, and to dedicate yourselves to the ideals of freedom, I act as a depository for your conscientiously considered attempts to maintain honorable men in official positions. You choose me to secure for you the treasure of good laws, through legislation, initiative, and referendum. You are a person, thinking and doing; I am your voice in proclaiming the good for all.

"True, you are," I thought, but then I realized the ballot box was saying to me: "You are a person; I am only your voice." And I suddenly realized it is the voice of youth, the youth of our times, who must bespeak democracy's worth. And this is what youth would say. This is what I would say:

"I speak for democracy, because I want the freedom that democracy is. I want the right to such education as I am capable of receiving; the right to choose and pursue a career, to travel where I wish, to live as simply or as luxuriously as my income or taste indicate. I want the right to individuality, and accepting the good and discarding the evil, I want the right to expect that my life will have been of some value in the Creator's great plan. I want to worship God in my own faith. I do not want to be the henchman or stooge of some power-mad monster, and know only what he chooses to allow me to know, and do only what fits his purpose. Neither do I want to be the tool of greed, envy, or hate. I want to be true to myself and a vital part of my own democratic Government—a Government of which I, as much as any one person, am responsible. I want to accept that responsibility with intelligence and gratitude, and share in the work, the costs, and the benefits of democracy."

Many great minds have blended their wisdom to build this democracy of ours. Many brave deeds and many noble lives have been required to keep it alive. To extend it on to others in other centuries will call for even deeper wisdom and greater bravery than ever before, but with God's help, the youth of America for whom I speak will learn to live wisely and bravely in order to keep democracy shining.

Yes, I speak for democracy.

Speech of Ricardo Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a speech made by Ricardo Romulo, a student at St. John's College High School, Washington, D. C., a son of General Romulo, a former honored Representative of this House from the Philippines.

Mr. Romulo was one of the four winners of the 1950–51 Voice of Democracy contest. This outstanding feat deserves the attention and respect of every Member of Congress.

I am certain everyone in the House will enjoy reading this excellent speech, which won for Mr. Romulo a $500 college scholarship and a trip to Washington, D. C.

(By Ricardo Romulo, age 17, St. John's College High School, Washington, D. C.)

I speak for democracy.

Because I hail from the Philippines where my forefathers, generations ago, did not know it, and now thanks to America, my country is democracy's outpost in Asia.

Because I know what democracy has meant to my country where before its advent there was no freedom; but now freedom has given us progress, better standards of living, unity, happiness, and contentment.

Because whence I came my people were benighted and enslaved until democracy came.

I speak for democracy—

And I speak the language of courage, because at this critical juncture in history, when there are evil forces that would destroy it, only the strength that comes from the united will of a people can overwhelm those that would subvert it.

I also speak the language of faith because in the history of mankind never has there been a beacon light that has offered such guidance and inspiration to millions of people everywhere as democracy has done and shall ever do.

Here in America, democracy is the living mortar of the American people's unity. It belongs to all of us, even to those who are its guests, because democracy has many interpretations within the pattern of our daily lives.

In America, we accept freedom of religion as a divine right under the proposition that all men are created equal before God. Today, throughout the 48 States, stand some 250,000 churches, representing almost every known creed, denomination, and faith. For democracy means a faith for every seeker. And in this land wherever and however religious services are held, democracy means the right of every man to seek out God in his own way.

Democracy means more than casting a vote and abiding by the will of the majority. America's system of government demands of every citizen a deep sense of personal responsibility and vigilance. For democracy works like a wheel, with government at its hub. Between the Congress, which guards the people's liberties and the people it leads, there must be constant interaction along the spokes of public opinion.

Democracy has made America a land of opportunity—where energy, enthusiasm, and an economy of free enterprise have converted its natural wealth into the highest standard of living on earth. This year Americans at work will earn more than $200,000,000,000. But behind this enormous national pay check lies a vital meaning of democracy—the right of every man to choose his own trade. And whatever his trade or profession, here every worker has the chance of becoming the boss. For free enterprise is the economic dividend of democracy.

In action, democracy can never be selective. It is a give-and-take position, by which the God-given right of any one man to speak his mind must be the right of all without prejudice or restriction.

To work, democracy must come from the people. It means inquiring into the workings and problems of government at all levels. It means thinking through critically—yet with common sense.

This, then, is democracy. To each of us it conveys a different personal meaning. But to all it means freedom, opportunity, and happiness.

Thus I have spoken for democracy because I want to live a useful full life as a good citizen and because I want to die a free man.

How Do Gasoline Prices Do It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent article from Texaco Star on gasoline prices:

HOW DO GASOLINE PRICES DO IT?

(By Don Herold)

I'm glad I didn't try to hedge against general inflation by buying a billion dollars' worth of gasoline in 1925.

It sells for less these days than it did in 1925.

I could have made money by buying up almost any other commodity in 1925 and salting it away and selling it at today's prices—from collar buttons to canned tomatoes. But not gasoline.

Leaving off taxes, the average price of a gallon of so-called regular gasoline in 1925 was 21.93 cents. On July 1, 1950, it was 20.17 cents.

In this same span of time, general living costs went up 37.5 percent, food up 68 percent, apparel up 51 percent, house furnishings up 53 percent.

Apparently, the oil business is a whole lot more competitive than some people think, or gasoline would be 30 or 40 cents a gallon (exclusive of taxes) today—if it had followed the general skyrocketing trend.

While nearly all commodity prices have soomed heavenward, gasoline prices have stayed low because of technological improvements in production, lower unit costs made possible through increased volume, and efficiencies put into effect at every stage of handling oil.

This story is even better, too, than the naked arithmetic reveals.

Gasoline of today has more git-up-and-go in it than gasoline of 1925. On the basis of car performance, two gallons of present-day gasoline do the work of three gallons of 1925 gasoline. In other words, your gasoline dollar today is worth 50 percent more than it was in 1925.

Spurred by the rival forces of free competition, the thousands of companies that make up the oil industry have constantly improved their gasolines. Increasing the quality of its products is a competitive habit of the oil industry. Thousands of companies spending millions of dollars on research and thousands of millions of dollars on new equipment in the competitive effort to win business has produced the usual byproduct of American industry: better products for Mr. and Mrs. Public.

Now, you may think everybody knows all this. But public-opinion surveys show that the motoring public at large thinks that gasoline is a whole lot more expensive than it used to be.

Part of the public's confusion is due to the fact that gasoline has been loaded harder and harder with taxes.

Today, Federal and State taxes on gasoline average 6.70 cents a gallon—nearly a third of the average retail price of regular gasoline, ex-tax. The oil industry isn't to blame for this—in fact, doesn't love it at all.

The oil companies act as tax collectors for Federal, State, and local governments. In 1949 the oil companies collected nearly $2,000,000,000 in gasoline taxes for Uncle Sam and for the States.

Furthermore, although gasoline prices have remained reasonable, the oil industry has had to meet greatly increased wage and material costs all along the line.

So, I think anybody who is in any way connected with the oil business has reason to crow. A stockholder or an employee of an oil company should have fun—should make a regular habit of—telling what his industry has done about this matter of retail prices.

The public in general is misinformed on this matter of gasoline prices. I, for one, enjoy helping to set 'em straight.

Building of Strategic Bombers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ANDERSON-TULLY CO.,
Memphis, Tenn., February 16, 1951.

The Honorable W. J. B. DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DORN: This morning's Memphis Commercial Appeal carried a news item under date of February 15, 1951, that you had urged the building of 5,000 B-36 and B-50 strategic bombers.

I want to take this opportunity of congratulating you and assuring you that at least this writer is in complete agreement with you.

The cost of training, equipping, and transporting one division of American troops to Western Europe would be about $450,000,000. Ten divisions, which is the lowest figure I have heard for General Eisenhower's European army, would run around $4,500,000,000. In World War II, the United States Navy's Task Force 58, consisting of 16 aircraft carriers, 8 battleships, 17 cruisers, 75 destroyers, and an array of other vessels, of which it lost 10 percent in 3 days of action, and with a personnel of nearly 100,000 succeeded in dropping on Japan only 513 tons of bombs and represented an investment of over $4,500,000,000.

Five thousand strategic bombers of the B-36 and B-50 class, or even larger and more powerful bombers, at an average cost of $3,000,000 each, would represent an investment of some $15,000,000,000, with comparatively small personnel, operating, and maintenance costs.

Long-range, strategic bomber task forces carrying atomic weapons, rockets, guided missiles, and electronic devices for navigation, target sighting, and radar jamming are our most effective method of carrying war to Soviet Russia—and cost-wise, the only method our economy can support without serious and dangerous strain.

We cannot hope to win against Russian mass by using mass. Nor can we hope to win against Russia by naval power, as Russia has no navy to defeat. Our surest hope lies in American technology, American technique, and American industrial production, the finest expression of which is the long-range, strategic bomber, manned by a crew of alert, well-trained, well-disciplined, and quick-thinking American men. Any military planning which does not utilize such airpower as the spearhead of our strategy is fallacious and will do much to defeat us militarily and economically. Furthermore, Russia cannot build such great armadas of long-range, strategic bombers because she is forced to concentrate on tactical aviation to support her land armies.

Those of us who have been adherents of the same viewpoint you hold wish you success in this serious hour.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM R. KENT,
Vice President and Treasurer.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter to the editor that appeared in the Washington Post Monday, February 19, endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway. The writer of this letter, Mr. John Edelman, of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO. He probably, as well as anyone, represents labor in the northeastern part of the country and his letter shows that he has studied the St. Lawrence seaway and realizes the great benefit that it would be to our country at large as well as to the laboring men of the Northeastern States. I hope that every Member of the House will read the following letter:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

In your issue of February 5, there was a letter from Mr. Carroll B. Huntress, chairman of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, taking exception to your editorial of January 29 supporting the St. Lawrence seaway. Mr. Huntress' principal point is to belittle those segments of the steel industry which are supporting the project in order to bring Labrador-Quebec ore to the middlewestern steel mills.

The whole CIO supports the St. Lawrence seaway project authorized by successive resolutions of its convention, and has been supporting it for a longer period than the steel companies. The National Grange similarly has been an active supporter of this project. The same is true of the Army, the Navy, and other defense agencies of the Government. It is obviously nonsense to imply that all of these supporting forces are mere stooges of a few steel companies.

The 6,000,000 members of the CIO are for St. Lawrence on the broad grounds of public policy. My union has some very slight measure of self-interest in this project; it is essential that manufacturing industries in New England find sources of cheaper electric power.

The industrialists who have recently switched to the St. Lawrence project have done so simply because they now recognize certain physical and economic facts that have been recognized for a long time by the quite widely varying interests which have been for the project. Until very recently this country was self-sufficient in the matter of iron-ore supply; it is now clear that we may have to import more than 40 percent of our national requirements from abroad. Our ore imports may have to rise from 7,000,000 tons in 1950 to as high as 65,000,000 tons in 1960.

As we see it, the crux of the problem is this: Which is the cheapest and safest way of bringing ore to the centers of steel production? The eastern railroads want to insure themselves the revenue involved in shipping the ore from the Atlantic to the Middle West mills. It just happens that it is more expensive to bring this ore by Atlantic sea lanes. In addition, ships hauling ore from South America are peculiarly vulnerable to submarine attack.

JOHN W. EDELMAN,
Washington Representative,
Textile Workers' Union of America, CIO.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Is a Spendthrift Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Salt Lake City Deseret News, in an editorial in the January 5, 1951, issue, said:

This is no time to spend money out of fear of a bogeyman myth.

The editor was referring to the St. Lawrence seaway project that has been before Congress since time immemorial.

Every Member of Congress should read the editorial which follows:

THIS IS NO TIME TO SPEND MONEY OUT OF FEAR OF A BOGEYMAN MYTH

One of the spendthrift measures certain to be lobby-pressured hard on the Eighty-second Congress will be a St. Lawrence River lakes-to-the-sea deep waterway bill.

Already its propagandists are ranging the land armed with what they argue are two inescapable demands of patriotism.

One is that the Canadian-United States power scheme associated with the deep waterway aspect of the project is a defense necessity required to supply electricity needed by New York State and New England armament industries. This is questionable.

The other is that if the St. Lawrence is made deep water for its length it will open the Great Lakes ports to oceangoing vessels so that our mid-States steel industry can get Labrador iron ore which we'll need, because the Lake Superior ores are running out.

With scarce more than a glance at the tangled problems associated with the socialized production of electric power by Government works, which the St. Lawrence project would aggravate, let's look at that notion about our vanishing iron ore supply.

This myth was born about 10 years ago. We were told that the high grade deposits of the Lake Superior region were going to run out not only pretty soon but quickly; specifically the Mesabi Range, largest of the sources, was on the verge of exhaustion and that the steel industry from Chicago east would have to contrive a new pattern, perhaps before World War II was done.

In May 1942 the Mesabi alarm was rung loudest by E. W. Davis, the director of the Minnesota Mines Experiment Station, in a report to the War Production Board.

"At war production rates," Mr. Davis said, "the known reserves of the Lake Superior district will be exhausted in 1950, but without Government financing a shortage of ore may be expected several years previous to complete exhaustion."

Government money was not provided; the Lake Superior ores are not exhausted; and what happened in 1950 was that Lake Superior ore production had so maintained that close to $50,000,000 is now in process of being spent for nine new carriers of the largest size to freight ore down the century-old Great Lakes route.

What went wrong with the forecast of ore exhaustion which the St. Lawrence waterway drumbeaters are still using as a talking point, was what goes wrong with practically every estimate of the life of a mineral deposit. It never (at least rarely) turns out quite as expected.

Not many years before the tale of iron-ore exhaustion was hatched, we were hearing the same sort of scare forecasts about the exhausting of United States petroleum reserves. When the wailing was loudest the biggest fields in the country's history were discovered and the industry was pretty nearly drowned in new oil.

The Government financing that Mr. Davis wanted for Minnesota ore would have been for developing methods of using the low-grade sources of iron called taconite. Huge quantities of such ore, with 20 to 30 percent iron content, are available in the Lake Superior country, if it can be worked up without too much expense.

But the ore still coming down the Great Lakes is 50 percent iron or better; 82,000,000 tons of the stuff in 1948; 78,200,000 tons last year. The biggest year was 92,000,000 tons in 1942. Annual deliveries vary because ice makes the Great Lakes shipping season undependable. Last year it was short, which is one reason for the nine new ore freighters. A St. Lawrence seaway could not lengthen the ice-free season.

What has turned out to be true about iron ore, as in the case of petroleum, is that as more is needed more is found.

As for the taconite, progress is being made in the separation of the ore from the rock; close followers of the processing think the main problem will be solved in 5 years or so.

The iron-ore and steel companies which have contracted for the nine big new ore boats, at any rate, believe they are making no great speculation on the life of the iron trade on the Great Lakes. Labrador supplies can await proven need.

Or they can be delivered by coastal routes, just as Venezuelan ore will be brought to the United States Steel Corp.'s newly authorized plant on the Delaware, at Morrisville, Pa. In case of a "hot" war with Russia, if the Soviets have as good a submarine fleet as we are told they have, these oceangoing ore carriers would be vulnerable just as bauxite carriers were to German submarines during the last big war.

But the lower reaches of the St. Lawrence could be equally vulnerable to submarines, and the whole deep-water stretch an open invitation to bombers; a better target, because closer to Russian bases than the Panama Canal.

The St. Lawrence project has waited safely a good many years. A decent regard for realism indicates that it can still safely wait. This is no fit time to divert millions of dollars and thousands of men and machines and massive quantities of steel and copper and concrete and suchlike strategic materials in short supply, to a controversial construction project.

The Hardin Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the Hardin project in south-central Montana and its central feature, Yellowtail Dam, are of great importance in the Missouri Basin development program. Over the years I have endeavored to advance this vital irrigation and hydroelectric power project, but have been unable to do so because some members of the Appropriations Committee have been reluctant to grant funds for the construction until they were assured that proper arrangements had been made with the Crow Indians, on whose land the dam will be constructed, for any loss that might accrue to them.

Two years ago I began an effort to reach a just and fair settlement with the Indians. As a first step, I secured, through the Public Lands Committee, an estimate from the Federal Power Commission as to the effect of the project upon the Crow Indians. At the same time the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Reclamation conducted independent studies to determine what compensation should be made to the Crow Indians for the use of the reservoir and dam site. I am glad to report that these efforts have materialized into a concrete offer to the Crow Indians. The Indians are now considering whether they will accept the offer. I hope that we are near a fair and just agreement with the Crow Tribe which will settle this problem, and that with this news, the Appropriations Committee will see fit at an early date to recommend that construction begin.

I include an article from the Hardin Tribune-Herald of February 8, 1951, concerning the offer to the Crow Indians:

CROWS ARE OFFERED $1,500,000 FOR YELLOWTAIL SITE

The Crow Indians were asked this week to consider an offer of $1,500,000 to pay them for their land and their interest in the proposed Yellowtail Dam project on the Big Horn River, 35 miles southwest of Hardin.

The offer was transmitted to them by Paul L. Fickinger, Billings area director of the Indian Service, on instruction from the Secretary of the Interior.

The dam would be built in the Big Horn Canyon, which the Indian Service ranks as the third largest in North America, and would back up water for a total distance of about 71 miles from a point 42 miles north of the Montana-Wyoming line. The plan for the project was enacted by Congress on December 22, 1944, but actual construction has been indefinitely postponed for lack of funds.

The offer conveyed by Fickinger in a letter to Robert Yellowtail, chairman of the Crow tribal council, concerns an application of the Federal Bureau of Reclamation for rights-of-way on Indian lands for the proposed reservoir, camp site, and recreational area, and for the right to build and operate the dam on tribal lands. The application was made to the Secretary of the Interior.

Unlike the situation which developed 2 years ago when members of three small tribes in North Dakota faced the prospect of having to give up their homes to make way for the Fort Berthold Reservoir, no dispossession of Crows would be involved in the Yellowtail project. According to Fickinger's letter, a total of 6,846¾ acres would be required, but it would be for the most part uninhabited land in the wild, craggy depths of Big Horn and its tributary canyons.

In his letter to Yellowtail, Fickinger related that A. L. Alin, Omaha consulting engineer, had been engaged to make a study of the Crow's interests in the project and had arrived at a valuation of $28,952 for the land, $7,904 for timber on it and $1,374,000 for relinquishment of rights in the dam site, making a total of $1,401,856.

"This amount," Fickinger wrote, "was determined by amortizing the annual net power return from the hydroelectric development capitalized on the basis of 100 years life and interest at 2½ percent with half of the sum thereby determined for credit to the tribe as owners of the site and half for credit to the investor for his contribution."

Fickinger said that the Bureau of Reclamation at the same time had made an independent study and arrived at a figure of $1,410,800 as a fair reimbursement for the Crows.

"After completion of these two independent studies," he wrote, "the two bureaus entered into discussions which resulted in an agreement that in order further to protect the interests of the tribe and at the same time simplify negotiations, a rounded sum of $1,500,000 would be a fair offer to the members of the Crow Tribe for the Indian lands and interests in the dam and reservoir sites. This recommendation was approved by the Secretary of the Interior for presentation to the Crow people."

Fickinger asked Yellowtail to present the secretary's offer of $1,500,000 to the Crows for consideration and to make reply through the tribal council to the Billings area office of the Indian service. He said he was sending mimeographed copies of the appraisal

report for distribution among the Indians and he offered the services of his staff for consultation with the tribal council on the matter.

Double-Talk Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from St. Marys Press, St. Marys, Pa., for February 17, 1951:

DOUBLE-TALK STALIN

When double talk to its most polished degree breaks into public print, Premier Joseph Stalin can be seen the author.

He broke a 2-year silence Friday to sum up what he thinks of the world situation today and a finer job of Soviet propaganda was never unleashed by a Red disciple.

Mr. Stalin in Pravda, his official mouthpiece, calls United States a warmongering nation, and says American forces are bound to lose out in Korea, and why.

Mr. Stalin has the answer to that and here it is neatly rolled up in a capsule: "American soldiers fought gallantly against Germans and Japanese in the last war, but they do not have their hearts in the Korean War, hence the reverses."

Mr. Stalin says we are headed for certain defeat unless we pull all our troops off the Korean Peninsula and agree to a peace conference on the soil of Communist China. Can you beat that for gall?

Mr. Stalin is not only beating the drums for his own cause, but is also carrying the torch for the Chinese Reds, whom he would like to have pictured before the world as victims of Yankee aggression.

That is the worst distortion of truth that could be uttered by any human being, but the world has become accustomed to nothing but deception from Stalin, the greatest mass killer of all time.

The Soviet premier said further "war is not inevitable at this time." Those, indeed, are kind words coming from the man who has the power of life and death over millions of people behind the iron curtain.

There would be no talk of war today or in the future if Stalin would have lived up to terms of the Atlantic Charter to which he attached his signature in August 1941.

That document, drawn up at the instance of Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt said all nations on conclusion of hostilities if this country should become involved, would permit self-determination by the people themselves in various lands.

This was supposed to apply specifically to Poland and the Baltic States, but Mr. Stalin conveniently forgot his written pledges once victory perched on his banners and by sheer conquest placed the iron heel of despotism on millions of innocent people, who today have no idea of what freedom means to man.

Mr. Roosevelt, let it be pointed out, gave him a couple of assists (A) by later repudiation of the Atlantic Charter as a mere scrap of paper and (B) turning over to Stalin all the rich resources of Manchuria after they had been promised Gen. Chiang Kai-shek as his proper spoils of war.

Without this country's aid, assisted no little by the espionage system that was given tacit birth by recognition of Russia in 1933 by such men as Dr. Klaus Fuchs and Harry Gold, Stalin would still be the master of a small area of land peopled by less than 100,000,000 people.

Stalin claims this country is trying to make the United Nations an instrument of war, just about the silliest thing he could have said. Residents of this country have stood amazed at the actions of United Nations delegates walking the tightrope in efforts to avoid mentioning Red China as an aggressor power.

And none of them outside bold-spoken Warren Austin, chief United States delegate has had the courage to blame Soviet Russia for what has taken place in Korea.

Of course, the Russian people whose press and radio are subservient to the state, don't know the truth of the situation. They hear or read only what is approved by the Kremlin.

They should be told the truth, that Americans are as anxious to live in a peaceful world as the average Russian family, but with Stalin at the helm they will never learn that fact.

Mr. Hoover's Second Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

MR. HOOVER'S SECOND LOOK

Some weeks ago our only living ex-President told the world in a radio broadcast what he thought this country should do in the current world crisis. Specializing in its military problems and policy, he advised cancellation of any plan to send troops to Europe to strengthen the defense of the free nations against Communist attack—unless and until they grow strong enough to defend themselves. In effect, as most Americans understood his message, he advocated what used to be known as the isolationist policy—concentration upon defense of the Western Hemisphere while leaving Western Europe to defend itself or go under the Communist yoke.

This bit of master minding drew some applause from isolationist circles but left the main body of American opinion unconvinced that Mr. Hoover has acquired omniscience with advancing years. So he made a second try last Friday night. The military phases of the problem still fascinate him and he puts most of his new emphasis on an argument that the United States must not create land armies to send on expeditions to Europe or Asia. Admitting our obligation to aid the Atlantic Pact nations in case they are attacked, he contends in effect that our obligation can be fulfilled after the attack is launched, by harassing the aggressors with air and naval bombardments until they have had enough.

The harassment would be unpleasant, no doubt, but the aggressor probably could bear it with some degree of cheerfulness while he overran Western Europe and seized its industries for the build up of his own weapons and facilities for further conquest and more effective harassment of Mr. Hoover's own "Gibraltar," these United States.

Even as revised, Mr. Hoover's textbook on national defense causes us to doubt a little the only living ex-President's infallibility as a military strategist. If it is his ambition to play second violin in Senator TAFT's orchestra, we think his performance qualifies him for that post. But we cannot believe that Mr. Hoover's military program as he outlines it would serve our imminent national needs or lead toward secure freedom for the peoples who crave it—or benefit anybody save Stalin, who should welcome its tacit invitation to invade and occupy Western Europe while we stuck to the watchful waiting role for which Mr. Hoover casts us.

Colonel Lindsay Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore placed in the RECORD some guest editorials by Col. C. H. Lindsay, vice president and general manager of the Tremont Lumber Co., Winnfield, La., dealing with the question of communism. Colonel Lindsay is an outstanding industrialist and has given considerable thought to the question. I wish to include in the RECORD another guest editorial by Colonel Lindsay. It is as follows:

A PRICE FOR COMMUNISM
(By C. H. Lindsay)

We spent billions of dollars from our Treasury along with priceless blood and suffering by all to save Russia from the Germans and billions more in money and sacrifices to save China from the Japs; now, Russia and China, former friends, are foes—all from the basis of communism.

Big hearted United States of America has given foreign nations by gift, grant, and otherwise, billions of dollars during World War II; we have given this to buy good will and purchase peace. Take inventory and see what we have facing us. You can clearly see a dark future which will always add up if we support any plan that will take our free enterprise.

Just as the stars shine out as soon as it is dark so will communism. For that reason, we must not let it become any darker by supporting any move or scheme that surely leads to present-day chaotic conditions by upholding or assisting any group that will hinder our freedom.

A man must stand erect, not be kept erect by others. A man in the right, with God on his side, is in the majority though he be alone. We as a Nation must stand for a free world, even though we stand alone.

If our dollars and sacrifices had been spent fortifying ourselves and building our own strength, there would not be an ingrate Communist who would dare to thumb his nose at us. We must not buy communism at a high price and lose our democratic freedom.

Water Conservation Official Issues Statement Relating to Proposed Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget for fiscal year 1952 in-

cludes $8,000,000 which is proposed as a supplemental appropriation, subject to project authorization, to initiate construction of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon.

It is the fear of the people of my State that this project might be authorized without reference or benefit to irrigation requirements of the Snake River Basin or to the interests of the State of Idaho. Such must not be the case.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a statement by H. W. Morrison, president of the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., published in the Idaho Daily Statesman, February 15, 1951, setting forth some of the controversial items on this proposed project:

WATER CONSERVATION OFFICIAL ISSUES STATEMENT RELATING TO PROPOSED HELLS CANYON DAM

H. W. Morrison, president of the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., Wednesday issued this statement on the Hells Canyon Dam issue:

"The developing controversy growing out of the proposed construction of Hells Canyon Dam should, in my opinion, be clarified. This can be accomplished only if our people are afforded an opportunity to review all factors and interests which are involved in the proposed project, and the efforts which have been made to harmonize such interests.

"As you know, our organization, Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., is broadly representative of all groups interested in the development of Idaho's water resources. Our primary objective has been the creation of reliable sources of supplemental water for lands already under irrigation. Over the past 10 years, we have advocated and furthered the construction of Anderson Dam, Cascade Dam, and Lucky Peak Dam. These structures are providing the long-range solutions to our agriculturists' problems of crop failures in short water years and flood hazards in high-run-off years. We have also assisted the Snake River water development committee in obtaining congressional approval of the construction of Palisades Dam, as the answer to a similar problem confronting agriculturists in eastern Idaho.

"The second principal objective of our southwestern Idaho organization is development of the arid Mountain Home lands lying east of Boise through fuller utilization of Idaho's ample water resources. The Mountain Home project would reclaim approximately 250,000 acres of some of the finest soil in Idaho and would create agricultural development, employment, and income opportunities and taxable values almost equal to those of the entire Boise Valley as we now know it.

"At one time, when its cost was estimated at approximately $100,000,000, authorization of the Mountain Home project was considered imminent since repayable costs to be collected from farmers plus revenues to be derived from the electric power features of the project, were in total sufficient to enable the project to stand on its own feet, financially, and thus to render it feasible under the terms of the reclamation act. World War II not only prevented authorization of the Mountain Home and all other new reclamation projects, but its lingering economic effects increased the estimated cost of the Mountain Home project to in excess of $200,000,000.

"The United States Bureau of Reclamation, particularly the regional office located here in Boise under the former direction of R. J. Newell and now headed by H. T. Nelson, has always been sympathetic and cooperative in our efforts to bring about reclamation of the arid Mountain Home project lands. However, we have been told repeatedly that under the terms of the present reclamation act there could be no opportunity for bringing about this development unless its greatly increased cost could be met with the assistance of revenues from electric power, larger than the amount which would be available from power developed by the project's own features. The only alternative would be a direct appropriation by the Congress of the amount by which the project failed to qualify under the reclamation act's financial feasibility requirement; but this alternative method is wholly impractical since the Congress and the Nation could not afford to establish such a precedent.

"Early last December, I was advised by Mr. Nelson that his office had been directed to prepare immediately a draft of legislation proposed to be submitted to the Eighty-second Congress for authorization of the construction of Hells Canyon Dam. It was our understanding that the proposed legislation contemplated the construction of Hells Canyon Dam as a power and flood control project exclusively, to meet the desires and urgent needs of the States of Oregon and Washington. To the officers of our southwestern Idaho organization, it appeared grossly inequitable that Idaho's water resouces should be utilized on so vast a scale without guaranteeing to Idaho a fair measure of the benefits resulting from such utilization. We therefore entered promptly into conferences with members of our organization's executive committee and board of directors, Governor Robins, the commissioner of reclamation of the State of Idaho, and with representatives of the Idaho State reclamation association, Snake River water development committee, Mountain Home Improvement Association, officials of Idaho Power Co., and representatives of reclamation interests in the Twin Falls and Idaho Falls areas.

"As a result of these conferences, we prepared what we believe is a sound and reasonable statement of the Idaho position, meaning that if the Hells Canyon project is to be built Idaho is entitled to receive consideration in the manner and to the extent outlined in our statement. This statement was submitted to Mr. Nelson, as the director of the Bureau of Reclamation in this region, and discussed thoroughly. Mr. Nelson in turn recommended that we make known our position to (a) the Commissioner of Reclamation and his assistants in Washington, D. C.; (b) the Secretary of the Interior and his staff; and (c) the Director of the Budget and representatives from the White House. Accordingly, as president of the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., I headed a delegation which included Governor Robins and representatives of Idaho Power Co., Snake River Water Development Committee, and Mountain Home Improvement Association, as well as other individuals of recognized standing in reclamation activities in the Idaho Falls and Twin Falls areas. E. W. Rising, our organization's representative in Washington, D. C., joined this delegation upon its arrival there.

"We were received courteously by all of the Washington officials and were accorded the opportunity of presenting completely our requests. As a result of our visit to Washington, the Boise office of the Bureau of Reclamation was allowed more time in which to prepare the draft of the proposed legislation, and it was directed by the Secretary of the Interior that in the framing of the proposed legislation consideration be given to our thinking as expressed at the conference in Washington.

"For the past month, at the request of Mr. Nelson, the Bureau's regional director, conferences have continued locally for the purpose of agreeing upon language in the bill which would protect Idaho's rights. These conferences have been attended by Governor Jordan and other State officials, as well as by representatives of reclamation and water resource development groups. Publicity concerning these meetings had been deferred pending general agreement among the conferees and finalization of the proposed legislative draft and its submission to the Secretary of the Interior at Washington, D. C. This has just been accomplished within the past few days; and while we here have no way of knowing whether or not this draft will meet the approval of the Washington officials, we feel that the interests of Idaho will be quite well protected if the provisions we have requested are retained in the legislation proposed to be enacted to authorize the project. The requested protective provisions are, briefly:

"1. Full and complete reservation of Idaho's right to present and future upstream consumptive uses of water for all domestic and irrigation purposes.

"2. A definite statement in the bill's preamble to the effect that the purposes of the legislation include the reclamation of arid lands of the Snake River Basin, as well as the production of electric power at Hells Canyon Dam.

"3. An allocation of benefits from the sale of Hell's Canyon power in amounts sufficient, together with revenues from the proposed Scriver Creek power development, to make financially feasible development of the Mountain Home project.

"4. The protection of rights of the Idaho Power Co., owner of the Oxbow site which would be inundated by construction of Hells Canyon Dam, through an allocation to the company of a block of firm Hell's Canyon power equivalent to that which could be produced by the Oxbow development.

"5. An allocation to the State of Idaho of a substantial block of Hells Canyon power in lieu of taxable values which would be lost through the inundation of other low-head dam sites upstream from the Hell's Canyon site, it being understood that the State of Idaho would have the right to contract for the sale of this power and to receive substantial kilowatt-tax revenues annually therefrom.

"It should be definitely understood that we have neither promoted the construction of the proposed Hells Canyon project, nor endeavored to oppose it. We believe that we are scarcely in position to deny the States of Oregon and Washington their proportional benefits from this natural power resource if the Congress decides to authorize the dam's construction. We do feel, however, that since Idaho's most important water resource is involved, Idaho's interest in the utilization of this resource is paramount. Therefore, Idaho's rights should be protected, and we have accordingly made every effort to accomplish this objective fairly and with proper consideration of the rights of other States. Should the legislation as finally proposed by the Secretary of the Interior fail to embody the protective provisions which we have recommended, then our southwestern Idaho organization, like other public-minded groups, would feel obliged to reexamine our present position in this matter.

"We recognize, as do all others, that it is questionable whether this is the proper time to undertake the expenditure of large sums of money such as would be required to build this project. This is a decision, in our opinion, for the Congress to make. We are agreeing that, with the exception of the Scriver Creek unit, no funds will be requested to inaugurate construction of the Mountain Home project until the national emergency is declared at an end by the President, or, alternatively, until a period of 6 years has elapsed. The Scriver Creek unit is a power producer and may properly be undertaken for the purpose of developing power for the defense effort under proper safeguards for the State of Idaho. The Scriver Creek unit can be constructed in about 3 years and

would produce approximately 150,000 kilowatts of power, the sale of which would assist in financing the development of irrigation features of the Mountain Home project."

Is This Our Nation's Twilight?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune on February 10, 1951:

A LESSON FOR THE SENATE

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight? Congressman HARRISON, of Virginia, wants to know. Every thinking citizen is pondering this question. Our unthinking citizen, like the ostrich of legend, is content to see nothing and listen to less. If we are in the twilight of our country, it is because of the failure of the parasitic citizen to do his duty. The greatest peril that confronts us is not our foreign enemies, nor the pinks and commies here at home, but the unconcerned don't-give-a-whoop citizen who takes no interest in our fate. That citizen's indifference has elected indifference to high offices of public trust.

If we are to be saved from our stupidity and complacent indifference, it will be because of the uncompromising devotion to our country of such Senators as JOE MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin; NIXON, of California; and those who stand with them. We are encumbered with Democrats who, to protect the seditions their party has sponsored, are more anxious to save their party than their country.

In the process of recognizing the time-honored practice of seniority in committee, Senator MCCARTHY was recently assigned to the subcommittee which determines State Department appropriations.

There is no one in the Senate who knows as much as does MCCARTHY about the active seditious agencies of treachery and treason. As no other Member of Congress, he has brought out into the open the revelation that our State Department has been, and still is, honeycombed with subversive workers. And MCCARTHY has done this work against the obstructions of sneering, ridiculing Members of the United States Senate; politicians who are afraid of our politically active foes.

While other Senators rested, indifferent to our dangers, MCCARTHY found work to do, and went to work. He worked. Early and late, MCCARTHY worked. Long hours of work. Long days of work. Weeks, months of self-sacrificing work, and this work taxed his own purse heavily. It has taken all he had and all that his unknown volunteer could hand him to do this work, work which other Senators should have shared, but work which others shamefully shirked. It is because of our shirking Senators that the gentleman from Virginia asked the other day: "Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight?"

Timid Senators who are afraid of the political power of our traitors have been slow to rally to the support of JOE MCCARTHY. They failed him when he needed them.

Future historians are going to write the name of JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, high among the heroes of this twilight hour of our country's years.

The Democratic Party, which has permitted the termites of treason to creep into our Government, has made a political record that will never be told in song and story. If America survives we will build no monuments to those who brought us to this twilight hour.

Pretty much alone, JOE MCCARTHY brought the people to see the red herrings. He has revealed the rats as well as those who have been infected by the rats.

Under MCCARTHY's investigations a lot of rats have been fired but still the administration holds on tenaciously to those that are left. But the more effective MCCARTHY's now generally supported work becomes, the less likely is our danger that this may be our country's twilight hour.

Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, the other day said, "MCCARTHY has done more to establish confidence in the hearts of Americans than any other man in recent years." Yet a Member of the Senate, a chap from Connecticut, one WILLIAM BENTON, so stoutly denounced MCCARTHY on the Senate floor the other day that he was ordered to sit down because he had violated the traditions of Senatorial decency. After twice being ordered to take his seat for such offense, his Democratic colleagues voted him on his feet again, a shocking picture of pale patriotism.

This fellow BENTON got mad because MCCARTHY had excused from committee service the Republican lady whom the stanch Americans in Maine sent to the Senate. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH is reported to have suffered embarrassment and chagrin (poor thing), at being let out of a committee of importance to our country's defense. She was removed by MCCARTHY. She had ridiculed, smeared, and belittled his service to our country, which was beyond the lady's power to match. But because she could not match it, she would better have cheered it than smeared it. She deserved no place on any committee whose work is related to our national security. She is not among those who defend us against the twilight of our existence as a free people. Let the lady blush.

The second reason, and a better one, MCCARTHY dropped the lady from Maine because he needed her place for an American defender. In her place, MCCARTHY put the new Senator from California, RICHARD M. NIXON. Such a Senator was needed right there.

While the lady from Maine was belittling MCCARTHY, NIXON knit together the conclusive clues that landed HISS where his own perfidy properly placed him.

Historians record trifling incidents that have affected the course of nations. Perhaps the whimper of the lady from Maine, with its resultant volcanic eruption from the Senator from Connecticut, will have done us an incalculable national service in this twilight hour.

Things were getting pretty dark. The black clouds of treachery and treason were gathering. A futile attitude has been growing among the people. Bribes are now being parceled out in Washington in the form of war contracts, weapon factories, and munition plants, to induce a lot of the seething and recalcitrant party boys to behave. But neither the Democratic Bentons, nor the Republican Smiths, can longer hide the hideous fact that the people have lost all confidence in Dean Acheson and the whole State Department of his making.

If this be, as feared, our Nation's twilight hour, we are in this growing confusion and darkness because of the capricious irresponsibility of citizens we have elected to lead us.

MARGARET SMITH of Maine has a lot to learn from the Senator from Wisconsin. Shades of Thomas B. Reed and James G. Blaine, Maine deserves a Senator who can match MCCARTHY in the service of our country.

Neither the sensitive lady from Maine, nor the volcanic Senator from Connecticut can deny that the termites of treason have eaten deep into the foundations of our freedoms.

BENTON would do well to go back to his Yale and again look into the bronze face of Nathan Hale.

JOE MCCARTHY has been a lone soldier. His devotion and his purpose are so right no traducers can destroy them. They have grown little who have tried to belittle him.

In our own country's twilight hour, so filled with our own made fears, the Senator from Wisconsin has shown the people in every State what a United States Senator should be. If the Senate Chamber in our country's Capitol were filled with McCarthys all of Europe would respect us, and Russia would fear us. The Senator who today is not impatient to defend us against our foes is an encumbrance on the country. When our Senators do their full duty, we will be freed from fear.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert three editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway project, which appeared in three Michigan newspapers recently:

[From the Escanaba (Mich.) Press of February 6, 1951]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT IS VITAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

The arguments in support of the St. Lawrence seaway are so overwhelming that many of the political leaders who have long opposed the seaway project are now supporting it. The converts include Senator TAFT, Ohio Republican; Chairman BUCKLEY, of the House Public Works Committee; Economic Stabilizer Wilson; and many more. Steel company officials, once alined with the seaway opponents, are now supporting the project because of the development of the rich ore fields in Labrador.

The cost of the navigation-power project has been the subject of much of the controversy, with seaway opponents greatly distorting the financial picture. The project will cost $800,000,000, but only half of the cost will be borne by the American Government. The other half will be paid by Canada.

About half of the American cost of the project would be the power phase of the seaway development and this is self-liquidating—beyond question. That leaves $200,000,000 that could be assessable against taxpayers if the navigation tolls failed to meet construction costs, as opponents claim.

This is about the cost of a single battleship at today's prices. But the navigation and power phases of the St. Lawrence seaway would strengthen our national defense resources to a far greater degree than a battleship or even a couple battleships.

In fact, unless the St. Lawrence project is developed, we will be greatly handicapped if war develops on a broad scale. Our high-grade iron ore reserves are being rapidly depleted, and we will have to rely heavily upon the Labrador ore fields to keep our great steel industries operating at capacity

production. There simply are not enough railroad ore cars to move this vital raw material to our steel mills. Even if the railroads could do it, the cost would be so great that it would mean at least a $10 per ton boost in the price of steel.

The power phase of the project is at least of equal importance. The great industries of the East are facing a serious power shortage, and they need the electrical energy that can be tapped from the St. Lawrence River. Canada's needs are equally great. Unless the United States acts soon to develop the St. Lawrence project, Canada probably will proceed to do it alone—and we will have to pay tolls to Canada forever.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of February 3, 1951]

THE SEAWAY FOR DEFENSE

The St. Lawrence seaway proposal definitely will be hashed over in Congress again this year. The inclusion of it in President Truman's list of defense projects makes that certain. But informed Washington opinion gives the project little chance for approval. The argument being used against it now is that the country has neither the money nor materials to spend on it in this critical period. Yet, for lack of the St. Lawrence development the defense effort may be seriously handicapped.

Two new aluminum plants are being built in the Northwest instead of New England, which is a more ideal location for them. The reason New England isn't getting the plants is that it doesn't have sufficient electric power and the Northwest does. A serious shortage of electric power exists all through New England and New York. This shortage is the chief reason why New York's Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has tried desperately to get the Federal Government to approve a joint New York-Ontario power development on the St. Lawrence.

Canada is confronted with a similar shortage. The St. Lawrence has the best undeveloped hydroelectric power resources in North America. Canada says that if the United States hangs back any longer it will undertake the seaway-power project on its own. Canada also is thinking about the great iron-ore deposits in the Labrador region and of how to get the ore to the great steel-manufacturing centers. Nothing would prove more vital to the United States defense in a prolonged conflict than a dependable source of iron. The Mesabi deposits in the Lake Superior region have a limit; another source on the North American Continent is essential to this country's defense.

The ore is in Labrador. The problem is getting it to Pittsburgh, Youngstown, and other steel cities. A railroad to bring it to the St. Lawrence is to be completed within the next 5 years. But without the proposed seaway, only the smaller vessels will be able to transport it from that point to Great Lakes ports. This would be both costly and inadequate.

For the last 10 years the United States has been talking as though it actually intended to do something about the seaway. It is about time that it made up its mind. Congress should stop playing dog-in-the-manger. Either it should approve the project this year or tell Canada to go ahead with it on its own. Further, if the Federal Government doesn't intend to develop the St. Lawrence's power possibilities, it should authorize New York to go ahead with its plans in cooperation with Ontario. If Congress had acted favorably 10 years ago the United States would be in a much more secure position than it is today. This country may have dire need of the seaway and the river's power before another decade elapses. Maybe Canada and New York can save the United States from the results of its shortsightedness if given the chance.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of February 8, 1951]

SEAWAY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Prospects for favorable action in Congress on the St. Lawrence seaway projects are considered brighter at this session than at any in the several decades it has been a perennial subject of futile debate.

The Middle West is joining in a concerted move to get it going. Detroit is vitally interested. So is our next-door neighbor, Muskegon. So are other cities in the Great Lakes region, including Grand Rapids.

President Truman says that the project now has "a new and special urgency."

That, of course, is the keynote of the present campaign.

If the seaway is to be built now, it must be justified almost entirely on its potential contribution to the national defense. The long-range benefits to the industrial Great Lakes region fall into second place, although they are no less important than they have been or will be at any other time.

The economic value of turning Detroit and Bay City and Saginaw, our own Lake Michigan ports, Chicago and all the other harbors into ocean ports is obvious.

Defense, however, has priority now.

Only this week Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilization Director, notified the State of New York that little or no structural steel will be available for the New York thoroughway.

Very little steel can be allocated for new highway work other than access roads to new defense projects. New building construction, after defense projects, schools, and hospitals, will be practically nil.

The St. Lawrence seaway undeniably would make our country more secure. It would serve the heart of the steel industry on which almost all industry depends, particularly war industry.

Lake Superior iron ore deposits have been seriously depleted by two world wars. They must in the near future be supplemented by ore from the newly discovered Labrador-Quebec deposits, which require a seaway for transportation, or by ore from overseas which, in wartime, is subject to the hazards of submarine attacks. Already, big steel plants are being built on the Atlantic seaboard—but their supply of ore might readily be cut off by the most formidable submarine fleet of all time, Stalin's.

There is the added defense possibility of loading tanks and trucks and other impedimenta of war on ships at Detroit for transportation overseas.

This country is far from self-sufficient. We still must get vital minerals such as manganese and chrome from Asia and Africa and the Middle East. Congress must determine whether we can afford the additional hazards of trying to import our ore from across the oceans or even along the sea route from Labrador through submarine-infested waters. Congress must determine whether the cost of the seaway is offset by the expense of moving steel plants away from the Great Lakes region or of bringing ore to them by rail.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which will consider the matter, recently was reported 8 to 4 in favor of it, with Senator SMITH of New Jersey, undecided, and one Senate observer who has followed seaway legislation for years has estimated that 56 Senators are for it or open to reason with 31 against it and 9 doubtful.

Politics and special interests still are factors in the discussion, but the decision now must be made almost solely on the basis of national security.

United States Zone of Germany—Occupation Costs and Who Pays Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended article from the Information Bulletin issued by the Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany for January 1951, is valuable in giving Members a picture of the financial conditions under which our occupation is proceeding and the very fair arrangements which are made to cover our occupation costs as far as the German government is concerned:

OCCUPATION COSTS—SUMMARY OF BASIC PERTINENT FACTS

With threatening forces close to her frontiers and no army of her own, Germany has been assured Allied protection against attack. The Allied governments "will treat any attack against the Federal Republic or Berlin from any quarter as an attack upon themselves," says the recent New York communiqué of the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Germany's outlay for occupation costs, paying but partial support for Allied armies stationed here, has to be considered therefore as the cost of national defense.

The cost of such defense is not, as critics maintain, prohibitive. For Germans it totals about 25 percent of the Federal and State budgets. In contrast, defense costs for the allied powers take a far larger bite: In the United States it totals 42 percent of the Federal budget, in the United Kingdom, 25 percent, and in France, 35 percent.

But defense is certainly not the only advantage Germany is receiving. Occupation costs pay for thousands of jobs; they pay for services provided by Federal agencies; they pay for investments in the revival of the German economy—investments which eventually will belong to Germans exclusively.

In addition, America, through their Government or through spending out of their own pockets, are pouring vast sums of money into the German economy—an amount which far exceeds the total bill for occupation costs.

Why should Americans, pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into building up Germany's economy, use occupation costs as a method of tearing it down? The lack of logic in this false philosophy can be clearly illustrated by an analysis of the financing of occupation requirements.

From May 8, 1945 (VE-day) to March 31, 1951 (end of current fiscal year), the United States will have extended a total of DM. 16,669,850,000 ($3,969,000,000)[1] in aid to Germany. Of that sum:

Government and Relief in Occupied Areas (GARIOA) contributed DM. 8,349,600,000 ($1,988,000,000);

ECA contributed DM. 5,040,000,000 ($1,200,000,000);

The voluntary relief agencies of the United States contributed DM. 571,200,000 ($136,000,000);

Private gifts to the German people contributed DM. 1,470,000,000 ($350,000,000);

[1] All monetary figures in this article are given in Deutschemarks (DM.) for which conversion into United States dollars is at the official rate of one Deutschemark to 23.8 cents.

STEG (a German public corporation given United States Army surplus goods to sell) contributed DM. 840,000,000 ($200,000,000); United States share of International Refugee Organization (IRO) contribution was DM. 399,000,000 ($95,000,000) in United States funds.

The total of this aid—DM. 16,669,800,000, or $3,969,000,000—far exceeds the cost to Germany of the United States zone occupation, which in the same period comes to DM. 11,244,600,000 ($2,677,214,600).

Not only has Germany received vastly more United States aid than she has paid, but the United States Government itself has spent far more money than the Federal Republic to maintain the occupation. So far, the United States cost amounts to DM. 17,388,000,000—a staggering $4,140,000,000.

This figure includes the salaries of United States occupation personnel, which are paid by the United States Government and not from occupation costs as popularly assumed. United States-supplied money not only pays these American salaries, but supports periodicals like Die Neue Zeitung and Heute, radio stations like Berlin's RIAS, visiting experts, German Youth Activities' centers, and similar institutions, and the offices of United States resident officers (with the exception of rental and electricity costs).

The figure does not include, however, the many millions spent by the United States State Department on the exchange program. That is an additional item of United States expenditure. Not only do the German exchangees—scientists, farmers, students, trade unionists, specialists of all kinds—gain subjective knowledge and understanding but valuable practical experience which can efficiently be applied in reconstructing the homeland.

But even to compare American and German costs is a specious argument, for Germany does not by any means forfeit the use of the money she pays out for the occupation. Every penny of these costs remains inside Germany and is channeled right back into the German economy.

The total occupation cost budget to the republic is DM. 5,462,860,300 ($1,300,160,751) for the fiscal year which will end in March. From this approximately DM. 1,747,405,000 ($415,882,390) is going into the pockets of some 471,500 Germans who are employed by the three Allied Powers. DM. 388,120,700 ($92,172,726) represents utilities and rents being paid to Germans whose facilities are being used by allied personnel. DM. 489,089,000 ($116,403,182) is going directly to the federally-operated postal and railroad systems. DM. 964,190,000 ($229,477,220) represents capital expenditures in the three zones—the majority of which are new buildings which will later become German property. These four items alone amount to DM. 3,588,804,700 ($854,135,518), all of which is channeling back into the Germany economy.

Moreover, DM. 188,000,000 ($44,744,000) of the occupation costs is being used to support displaced persons and DM. 71,000,000 ($16,898,000) to pay restitution, burdens resulting from the war which in any case Germany would have to bear.

In the American zone the major part of the occupation-costs budget—36 percent—is used to pay 140,000 German employees. Added to these are 59,000 Germans employed by American authorities and establishments whose wages and salaries are not paid from occupation costs. That means that close to 200,000 persons—unskilled workers as well as university graduates—in the American zone alone earn their living with the Allied Powers. If they were discharged the majority of them would, judging from the federal unemployment problem, have to be supported from public funds—and that would mean an added drain on the taxpayer's wallet.

Newspapers which tell in vibrating headlines of nine German employees for every two Americans seem to ignore this West German unemployment burden which at the beginning of 1951 stood at almost 1,690,000 persons. But even so, since Germans on the occupation-costs payroll in the United States zone total 140,000, and there are more than that number of American personnel in the zone, there is actually less than one German employee for each American. Moreover, these employees are not the handmaidens of occupation personnel; the great majority are office workers and technicians.

Typical of the difficulties which would arise if German employees of the Allied Powers were released is the city of Heidelberg. That city's Tageblatt (daily newspaper) recently published a report stating that in Heidelberg 8,000 Germans are working for Americans. The paper estimates an average monthly income of DM. 250 ($59.50) for these workers, or approximately DM. 24,000,000 ($5,712,000) each year. This purchasing power is substantial, and if it suddenly disappeared would cause serious dislocations in city industry and trade. Moreover, it would throw 8,000 persons on a labor market which couldn't support them. Tageblatt uses these arguments to show the city administration what difficulties would be forthcoming if occupation employees were discharged.

"Such savings in occupation costs, to be welcomed in the interest of the federal republic and the taxpayer, would result in a heavy burden for Heidelberg. It is only reasonable to ask that funds which are saved by personnel reductions be transferred to Heidelberg for financing new jobs to counteract the increase in unemployed. The funds which the state is prepared to contribute in recognition of the emergency already existing in the town is an entirely different matter. They would be no help in solving the problem which is apparent in the discussion of occupation costs."

Heidelberg is no isolated case. The problem illustrated here exists in all communities where large troop contingents are stationed or HICOG agencies are established. Often these localities are spas or districts with very little industry where other employment would be scarce.

United States policy in selection of employees has likewise ameliorated what might have become an overwhelming social problem. Americans have employed those Germans nobody wanted to employ, for example, the war veterans who left school to go into the army. Depending not so much on written references as on the good will of applicants, Americans have likewise given jobs to thousands of refugees. Many a prisoner of war returning from Russia is thankful for jobs offered by the occupation powers. And no less thankful are students in university cities when Americans give them side-line jobs as baby sitters, language teachers, visitors' guides, and youth-camp leaders.

Here are more financial benefits which have accrued to Germany as a direct result of the occupation for which Germans partially pay:

The Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany is financing from its own funds a series of housing projects (for example, the DM. 3,000,000 ($714,000) project of 500 apartments in Frankfurt) which will one day be turned over to the German economy.

Large sums of foreign-exchange credits are accumulated in West Germany when United States occupation personnel shop and travel; their total spending amounts to at least $50,000,000 (DM. 210,000,000) a year.

The establishment of recreation centers for occupation personnel has guaranteed visitors and a steady income to many spas and health resorts which otherwise might have stood empty.

So far as the United States is concerned, there is one more trenchant argument for those who would chafe at paying the cost of occupation. This revolves around the annual cost to the United States of its debt directly attributable to the war. The occupation grew out of the war and the debt did, too. Germany ended the war with practically no debt. The United States debt was increased by $220,000,000,000 (equal to DM. 924,370,000,000 at current conversion rate) during the war years. The annual interest charge on this war-contracted debt is slightly less than $5,000,000,000, or somewhere near DM. 21,000,000,000. This is an annual charge for interest only and does not provide for any repayment. It is a figure which should be kept in mind when viewing the United States occupation's cost to Germany: this year, just DM. 2,404,000,000.

In making such comparisons, American policy-makers are well aware that the United States capacity to pay is far greater than Germany's. Studies are now under way to determine what Germany's reasonable capacity for expenditures—defense expenditures—is.

With these considerations in mind, it can be legitimately pointed out that the most recent United States appropriation for defense is $42,000,000,000. This represents about 14 percent of the gross national product of the United States. Under Hitler's Reich, 19 percent of Germany's gross national product went into rearmament. Germany today pays for the total of Allied occupation costs about 5.5 percent.

While attributes of national health, resources and other economic factors determine how much of a country's gross national product can be siphoned off for defense purposes, nonetheless percentages of gross national product are the fairest comparison of capacity to pay.

This enormous disparity between the German and United States percentages of gross national products used for defense purposes should convince even the most skeptical that Germany is not being asked to pay anywhere near the limit of its capacity.

For a National Day of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 16, 1951, issue of the Cotton Trade Journal, Memphis, Tenn.:

FOR A NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

The fate of mankind, perhaps for the next century, depends on events immediately ahead.

The free world is looking to the United States for leadership in this critical period. The future of civilization depends largely on the thoughts, the words, and the works of America and Americans today and tomorrow.

For many years we have worshipped at false altars, seeking material pleasures, amassing material wealth, boasting of material power. Now our national energies are directed toward building a preponderance of such power for defense against the menace of aggressive communism.

Let us ponder this thought:

As long as we rely solely on material might we are placing ourselves on the same level with the godless forces of the Kremlin, whose philosophy sneers at religion as the opiate of the people.

Now, if ever, is the time to get down to bedrock, to face fundamentals.

Now, if ever, is the time to rise to a higher concept of life and its significance.

As a nation and individually, our greatest need today is actively to seek divine guidance in our daily affairs; to recognize that the kingdom is the Lord's; and He is the governor among the nations.

Nothing is more important than that we lay all other duties and tasks aside and turn humbly, in audible prayer and silent meditation, to the one Creator and Giver of all good, seeking His direction, asking that His will be done.

We therefore respectfully urge the President of the United States to set aside by official proclamation a National Day of Prayer.

That to emphasize its significance this be a week day rather than a Sunday, and that it be declared a legal holiday, on which all workday activities cease, with the exception of vital maintenance and health services; that all theaters, clubs, and other places of entertainment close on that day.

On this day let Americans of all faiths and creeds, as a people united in God, gather in their houses of worship and in family prayer circles and neighborhood prayer meetings to seek earnestly that guidance which alone can bring unfailing strength and security, and the blessings of peace.

The spiritual power engendered in mass observance of a National Day of Prayer would, by comparison, render insignificant the material strength created by a day's industrial production.

The tremendous spectacle of the world's mightiest Nation humbly turning to God as the source of all true power would inspire our allies and friends throughout the world, multiplying their faith and endowing them, as well as us, with a new, indomitable, and enduring strength.

Let us remember that this Nation was founded on faith in God.

The framers of the Declaration of Independence, in concluding their epochal document, emphasized their reliance on the protection of divine providence.

As our forefathers turned to God in the critical hours of the birth of this Nation, so let us now turn to Him in this, the most fateful period of its history.

Jotham Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared recently in the Washington Times-Herald by George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

We were discussing plays and the question naturally arose as to what plays could youngsters of 10 and 14 be taken. Not being converted speakeasy sophisticates, we were weary of discovering that the playwright suffered the tortures of the damned seeking for a curtain line and finally came up with the novelty of a foul word, spoken by an apparently innocent ingenue.

That always gets a laugh.

Also we wanted the children to feel that because they went to the theater, they were not being influenced to believe that sex is all there is to American life; that life has some finer aspects, some very decent moments, a moral side, if you please.

So we went to see Jotham Valley, a play put on with all the skill of professional showmanship by a group who call themselves Moral Rearmament.

This is a musical, with songs occasionally comparable to Oklahoma and with a story that is so real that it does happen in every home. A very good time was had by all.

The essence of Jotham Valley is the melodrama of two quarreling brothers, whose hatred brings misery to all their neighbors, particularly when one brother deprives the valley of water, because he, legally but not morally, controls the water rights.

Here is a struggle that is universal, for legal rights do not suffice in a world that requires constructive living.

Law passed by legislators is often not only inadequate but, being the product of man, unsound. We have to live by the laws of man, but natural law, the law of God, transcends the laws of man.

So, in the end, in this play, the key of truth opens the hardened heart of the brother and he permits the water to gush forth, so that the cattle drink of God's bounty, and life is good. Also the brothers make up.

This plot is as simple as Romeo and Juliet, which is the simplest and most usual of stories, being nothing more than that boy loves girl, but the parents say no.

Most really important plots are simple, just as great symphonies are written around little tunes. (To wit, those notes in Beethoven's Fifth, which Winston Churchill turned into a V for victory.)

Simplicity, of itself, may not only be truth but interesting and even exciting. What is more simple than a single tree, growing out of a rock along a granite seashore, standing proudly in a gale.

All the smudge that a modernist can hurl at canvas cannot equal the majesty of that one object against a barren sky. And yet, as the poet said, only God can make a tree.

So in Jotham Valley, it is the simplicity of plot, in a musical and engaging setting, which opens the mind to the truth that man can and does change his nature through the humility of faith.

It is not surprising that this play has encountered the opposition of Communists and the homosexuals in the theater, the former because they do not want men to think that the nature of man can be elevated by his own will, and the homosexuals because they excuse their indecencies on the ground that they cannot help themselves.

They say they are not evil but just that way because they are just that way.

Jotham Valley is as good a play for adults, but it is important that children and youth should see it. With grace and ease, it projects the idea that life can be made worth living once the human wants to live a worthwhile life.

This idea is not novel, but it needs to be constantly reiterated. Men live by hate because they like to hate. When they cease to like to hate, they will cease to hate. The causes for hatred are often so trivial, so unimportant as to be ridiculous when analyzed.

I know of groups of men who hate each other with violence. Knowing both sides, I also know that the hatreds are the product not of conviction but of suspicion and habit.

Reconciliation is difficult because who is the first to say, "I have been wrong and a fool," when both have been wrong and both are fools?

So goes the world and in the end comes war and death. If children and young people could see Jotham Valley, maybe they, too, might find the key to better living.

George Scott Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on the Judiciary had the honor of accepting an oil painting of George Scott Graham presented to the committee by his daughter, Mrs. Marian McFadden, of Memphis, Tenn.

Present at the ceremonies before the Committee on the Judiciary were Mr. and Mrs. Guilford Jameson. Mr. Jameson, who made the formal presentation, had been clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary at the time of Mr. Graham's chairmanship. Also present were former Congressman and Mrs. Addison T. Smith. Mrs. Smith had served as secretary to Mr. Graham many years. Also present were Mrs. Charles Semmes and Miss Irene Lupuld, both old friends of the man we honored. Attending the ceremonies were some members of the Pennsylvania delegation, headed by Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, dean of the Republican Pennsylvania delegation. Mr. Harry Williams, who had served as messenger to the Committee on the Judiciary at the time of Mr. Graham's chairmanship, was also present, and spoke with great feeling of his years of service with him. Representatives LOUIS E. GRAHAM and FRANCIS E. WALTER, as well as the chairman, paid tribute to Mr. Graham, to his qualities of leadership and to his humanity. As dean of the Republican Pennsylvania delegation, Representative SIMPSON spoke of the inspiration the work of such men as former Representative Graham gave to him and to all Members of Congress.

I am happy to include in these remarks the statement made by Mr. Guilford Jameson in the formal presentation of Mr. Graham's portrait:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Judiciary Committee, George Scott Graham, of Philadelphia, Pa., was a member of this committee from the beginning of his service in Congress in 1913, and became its Chairman in the Sixty-eighth Congress. He held that office until his death on July 4, 1931. He brought to the office a rich and broad experience achieved at the bar. For 18 years he had served as District Attorney of Philadelphia County, and upon leaving that office resumed the practice of law in Philadelphia and New York City as the senior partner of eminent law firms in each of those cities.

This committee meets here today to accept an oil painting of him but neither the artist's brush, the pen or the spoken word will be adequate to portray him as he lives in the memory of those who knew him. He

was a man of fine stature and noble countenance. His carriage was that of a military leader and he possessed a rich and resonant voice, to enhance his persuasive powers of debate. While from his public activities one would be chiefly impressed by his strength, in private life graciousness and wit were his forte. I do not know of a higher tribute that I can pay to his memory than to say of him that no care or adversity, of which he knew many, was equal to the courage and gaiety of his spirit.

The records of this committee show how devoted he was to its work. Measures affecting the courts, Federal prisoners, labor relations, and veterans' affairs were sponsored by him and enacted into law. But it was as a defender of our constitutional form of government that he rose to the greatest heights.

Soon after he became chairman his political philosophy was challenged by the proposed child-labor amendment. One of our Government bureaus, enlarging upon its role as a fact-finding and information center for the Nation, had become a protagonist for a constitutional amendment to yield the power of the States over child labor to the Federal Government. Financed by Government appropriations, and with the prestige and power that goes with being a Federal agency, this bureau had succeeded in the previous election campaign, in stirring up the emotions of the people, particularly the women's organizations, into a political crusade for the adoption of the amendment. There was no question but that the committee and the Congress would vote for its submission. But George Graham saw in the proposal the dangers of further centralization of power and a threat to our dual form of government. With characteristic fidelity to principle in the face of overwhelming odds, he vigorously opposed its submission. His minority report, written nearly three decades ago, has proved so prophetic and contains such pointed observations on the needs of this hour that I quote from it here as a mark of his statesmanship. He said:

"The care of children both as to their labor and education is primarily conceded to be within the control of the parents, and the State should only invade the dominion of parental control to such an extent as will correct abuses. The love which the god of nature has planted in the breasts of fathers and mothers is a sufficient guaranty in the great majority of cases for the careful nurture, training, education, and development of children. We hope there never may come a time in the history of our country when either the State or the Federal entity will absorb into itself the entire care and control of childhood. The Russian Soviet presents a lamentable spectacle of the dangerous growth which might possibly be obtained in that direction. We, however, do not fear that this state of affairs can ever exist in our beloved America."

"It is not only the dynamic forces of nature that destroy the hills but the elemental changes through trituration which will wear them down, and if given time enough, finally destroy them. Our perfect system of checks and balances and duality of government are not more imperiled by destructive war than they are by the insidious efforts of idealists and earnest reformers in time of peace. * * *

"It is this unwise tendency to centralize all power in Washington to which we object.

"It is this tendency with its resulting creation of new bureaus, a new army of officeholders under the National Government, to which we object.

"It is to the creation of a bureaucracy with all its tyrannous proclivities and increase of expenses to which we object.

"It is to compelling citizens to seek redress of their grievances under a bureaucratic government and to travel thousands of miles to Washington in order to do so that we object."

"Our country has an area of 3,000,000 square miles and a population of 110,000,000 people. The sections of our country differ greatly in their industries and in their peoples. The conditions of life and of being are greatly diversified, and to rule and control this vast area and this vast population, ever increasing, from Washington as a central point, will mean practically the end of local self-government. The principle of local self-government to the greatest practical extent and applying to the widest possible range of subjects, administered by the smallest governmental unit reasonably adequate for the purpose, has been the cornerstone of our existence. The tendency to centralize represents the antipodal principle. The individual citizen is unable to follow, feels himself powerless to influence, what a Government far removed from his locality, operating through unknown and inaccessible bureaus and commissions, may be doing. Consultation with his fellow citizens is useless and for the most part impossible. The United States by creating a multitude of Government agencies, involving the country in vast expenses and these agencies being inaccessible to the average citizen, will result in the creation of a vast lobbying system at the capitol. It will deny to the citizen the primary principles of local self-government."

The political battle against this centralization still rages, and there are many of us who firmly believe that our country's true course lies in the direction he so forcefully presented on that historic occasion.

In 1930 the fallacy of attempting to regulate the personal habits of the people by the bludgeon of Federal law was becoming more and more apparent. Again, notwithstanding the fact that this committee and the Congress was composed of a membership predominantly dry, Mr. Graham boldly decided to hold a hearing on the results of 10 years of the eighteenth amendment. This was the first time since the adoption of the eighteenth amendment that those who advocated its repeal would have the privilege of opening and closing the hearings. These hearings lasted over a period of several weeks, and the information there presented and the national attention which it received laid the foundation which later brought about the repeal of the amendment. His philosophy of the limits of Government on man's freedom is set forth in his statement opening this hearing, from which I quote:

"No one wants the restoration of the old conditions or the saloon. We may well ask, 'Cannot control and regulation of the liquor traffic supply the place of prohibition?' What use of more laws, drastic and partaking of the spirit of vengeance rather than justice? Natural liberty of the individual has never been totally surrendered to society, but only so much as is needed to preserve the organized entity. Freedom of decision as to what one may drink, eat, or wear is as fundamental as freedom of belief in religion. Like in the delegation of powers to the Federal Government by the sovereign States—all not delegated were reserved—individual man has a large reservoir of powers. Only when one's choice by overt act breaks the peace or injures society can the individual decision be assailed, and then only to punish the overt acts. * * * Cannot some system be devised to control and not prohibit that will lessen the evils portrayed? The use of wine has been countenanced throughout the ages. Cana, of Galilee, is not exceptional. Had God wished automatons, He could have changed the nature of the grape or destroyed the human appetite. He wanted character. He wanted the man who met temptations and conquered."

I realize that what I have said here today is but a meager tribute to the man and his statesmanship. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing him will always cherish his memory. It is therefore with pride and renewed devotion that I have the privilege of presenting this portrait of him, a gracious gift to the committee from his daughter, Mrs. Marian McFadden, of Memphis, Tenn.

How Pleasant It Is for Brethren To Dwell Together in Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brotherhood Week is being celebrated throughout the country this week. The idea, which has originated with the American people, has also begun to spread to other countries and this year several European countries have instituted Brotherhood Week and are celebrating it jointly with us.

"Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." Thus sang the Hebrew psalmist in ancient Israel. The annual observance of Brotherhood Week has become a most constructive method of interfaith understanding. At a time when religion and our way of life are under attack by evil forces in the world, utmost cooperation among the great faiths is needed to spread religious tolerance and better understanding of our fellow men. In fact, in these days of moral crisis it has become a dire necessity.

I commend to your attention the following editorial from the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C., of February 18:

BROTHERHOOD, A PRACTICAL IDEAL

Threescore and three years have passed since William Morris, the great British artist-craftsman wrote: "Fellowship is Heaven, and lack of fellowship is Hell; fellowship is life, and lack of fellowship is death; and the deeds that ye do upon the earth, it is for fellowship's sake that ye do them." But the passing of time has served only to confirm the humane sentiment thus expressed. Events have sharpened the need for mutuality. We require each other as earlier generations did not. Our destiny is one, we are a unit in the fate we face. Either we will have fellowship and life or we will have fear and hatred and strife and death.

This is what Brotherhood Week, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, signifies. The 7 days of the calendar set aside for rededication to the principles and purposes of fellowship represent an opportunity which all individuals of good will should welcome—an opportunity consciously to take one's place with one's civilized neighbors as a fellow worker in the common endeavor to save and to improve civilization. A background of Judeo-Christian tradition dating back 50 centuries supports the objective sought. The challenge of the gravest menace to freedom ever seen in modern times gives it direction.

Every American has a duty in the circumstances. The prevailing emergency touches us all, puts upon each of us a heavier responsibility to think and speak and act in terms of fellowship. We must stand together, sharing resistance to evil so that the good values of our comomn social and cultural heritage may survive into the future. The ideal of Brotherhood Week is an intensely practical ideal, and it must be practiced as such.

What are the alternatives? Conscience answers that they are defeat, disaster, and the disappearance of our natural humanitarian way of life. No American deserving of the name will choose catastrophe rather than cooperation, destruction rather than constructive solidarity. Each of us remembers the words of an earlier prophet than generous William Morris, the ancient Hebrew psalmist who said: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." The observation has more meaning now than when it first was expressed ages ago.

The Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paragould (Ark.) Daily Press of Thursday, February 1, 1951:

THE TRADE AGREEMENTS

A perennial subject of vigorous argument has been presented to the new Congress. This is the question of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It seems only yesterday that Congress finished the last round of debate on this matter, but the act expires June 12 and hence there must be action by Congress before that date if the program is to be continued.

One trouble with the program is that its benefits have been less easily observed than the results which become the basis of objections. The attacks against it come chiefly if not entirely from supporters of the protective tariff principle. Since they see the purpose of tariffs as the protection of American industry from foreign competition, any lowering of tariffs appears bad. An agreement negotiated under the act always involves reduction of some American tariff, and this effect is immediately apparent. The entrance of the benefiting foreign goods also can often be observed.

The benefits are mostly on a broader, longer term basis. One immediate gain at home is that American consumers are able to buy certain imported goods at lower prices, and this is what the opponents object to. Another is that some American firms find an enlarged foreign market for their goods. Over the longer term, the trade agreements stimulate the general flow of foreign trade, which is an important element in the margin of profit for a great number of American industries and lines of business. This is important also to our general aim of promoting economic progress throughout the world, and specifically to the objective of maintaining an even balance of trade. If we believe in these goals, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is one means of achieving them.

Occupation Policy in the United States Zone of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1949 I was a member of a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee which undertook a European study mission which included a study of occupation policies in the United States occupation zone of Western Germany. As my part of the work of the study mission I concentrated on this phase of its activities.

The objective of our occupation policy being the democratization of the German people, the question of the extent to which there has been a return of Nazi or ultra-nationalist influences in key places in government, education, business and society was a critically important inquiry. This led directly to the question of the growth and utilization of the liberal forces in German life and the extent to which our occupation policies have fostered such growth and utilization. On this subject I am appending an exchange of correspondence from June 1950 to January 1951, with High Commissioner McCloy. It shows the scope of the efforts which have been made along this line and the development of the liberal forces to help attain the objectives of our occupation mission in Germany.

From this exchange of correspondence it is clear that much remains to be done both in Germany and by American organizations in this activity. Germany is rightly considered the fulcrum of Europe and a vital part of an adequate defense for the security of Western Europe against Communist aggression, but this security can be compromised seriously by creating an unreliable Germany, a possible future Soviet ally, as in 1939. General Eisenhower has made this clear for the people of the United States and all the free peoples in his refusal to accept unwilling German help in a federated European defense force.

The mission of our occupation policy in Germany, therefore, was never more important than it is today, for the security of Europe itself is seen to be tied directly to the democratization of the German people in the western zones, to the strength of free institutions there and to their understanding of and their will to fight for their liberties. The correspondence is as follows:

JUNE 12, 19[illegible]

Hon. JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany,
APO 757, New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMISSIONER MCCLOY: One point which I think troubles so many of us here is whether any inventory has been made of the liberal forces to which you refer. For example, in your appraisal of the situation you speak of the dearth of non-Nazi teachers. This is an illustration of what I have in mind. It prompts me to ask whether any inventory has ever been made of the "liberal forces" in the various fields of activity which will determine which way Germany will go. The value of such an inventory would be that at least the resources available could be assessed and scrutinized.

Another factor which has concerned me as we have gone along is whether or not the great number of American organizations in a position to influence their German counterparts have been employed effectively in our occupation efforts. They would range all the way from the Masonic order to the trade-unions, and I see no reasons why they should not include religious denominations, sports organizations, the theater, and the arts and a host of similar activities. You certainly are a person of enough top experience to know the accumulated enthusiasm in these quarters which exists in the United States for any new job. Undoubtedly this would all take some handling, but I am thoroughly convinced that when the imagination of the American people is stirred by action they have never shown themselves to be remiss in supplying the means. Your job is, I believe, even bigger than you think.

With best wishes, believe me

Sincerely,

J. K. JAVITS,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY,
Frankfurt, Germany, August 16, 1950.

Hon. J. K. JAVITS,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: In your letter of June 12, 1950, you ask whether an inventory of liberal forces in Germany has been made. No formal list of liberals has ever been drawn up by us, and I do not think a mere listing of names would mean very much. But in a sense, the reports of our field observers on developments in Germany, the results of public-opinion surveys, and the participation by Germans in the hundreds of democratization projects we are carrying on represent such an inventory.

We must keep in mind that there are thousands of men and women all over Western Germany who are honestly and sincerely devoting themselves to building up democratic forces and opposing the return of Nazi ideas and methods. I think the people of Berlin in their inspiring struggle against communism have also shown that there is a readiness to fight a new totalitarianism.

While names are not conclusive, here are a few of the more prominent people in Germany whom I count among the leading liberal spirits:

Dr. Theodor Heuss, president of the Bundesrepublic, is a man of progressive mind and persuasion. He is trying to strengthen the liberal forces of Germany without regard to party or creed; and his influence is considerable, both with the masses and with the leaders of public opinion.

In the Bundestag, though not in the majority, there are a number of liberals of influence and authority. For example, Helene Wessel, the leader of the Center Party; Carlo Schmidt, of the SPD; Dr. Herman Schaefer; Brentano, of CDU; and Dr. Gerhard Schroeder, of Dusseldorf. Parenthetically, I want to say that though a majority of the Bundestag members may not be progressive in the American sense, they are not narrowly and aggressively nationalistic as is proven by their support of Marshall aid, the Schuman plan, and the Council of Europe. Moreover, many of them, including Dr. Adenauer, were victims of Nazi concentration camps themselves and are strong anti-Nazis.

In the Laender governments, among the progressive men and women are: Brauer, of Hamburg, Kaisen, of Bremen, Frau Brankslepe, of the Westphalian CDU, Waldemar von Knoerringen, of Bavaria. And there are many progressive and forward-looking mayors: Reuter, of Berlin, Klett, of Stuttgart, Heimmerich, of Mannheim, for example.

In the intellectual and professional life of Germany might be mentioned: Edwin Redslob, of the Freie Universitaet in Berlin, Dolf Sternberger, of the German Voters Association, Dirks, of Frankfurt, the 80-year-old Alfred Weber, of Heidelberg and Paul Loebe, former president of the Reichstag. As for the newspapers and radio, I could list a large number of names, including Reger, of the "Tagesspiegel," Kogon, of "Frankfurter Hefte," the publishers of the "Frankfurter Rundschau" and the "Sueddeutsche Zeitung" of Munich.

Also there are developing a number of organizations with progressive goals: the Europa Bewegung, the Weber Vereinigung, the Civil Liberties Union, and so forth.

As I have said, the liberal forces in Germany are not the most powerful element in office today; but they are active in civic affairs, trade unions, churches, industry, and politics, conscious of their responsibilities and alert to the possibilities; and they have our support. In the coming year I hope we shall be able to make our all-out effort to extend this liberal circle. I hope it will be possible to focus public attention and rally public support to the forward-looking organizations, institutions, and individuals of Western Germany so that the people of Germany and of the world will join together in the good fight for a full and useful life for all.

American universities are already at work here. American trade unions are here, American civic and community organizations are cooperating. Through the Offices of Public and Political Affairs we are trying to expand such connections. Anything you can do in your private or public capacity in the United States to forward the idea of participation by private organizations will be most welcome.

In closing may I express my appreciation for the interest and understanding you have in our common problem. Your positive approach has been of great help to us here.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany.

DECEMBER 12, 1950.

Hon. JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany, APO 757, New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMISSIONER MCCLOY: Reference is made to your letter to me of August 16 which followed my question regarding an inventory of the liberal forces in Germany with whom our occupation authorities find it practicable to work. I have submitted this reply to associates in the United States who are most interested in the subject, and who have gone to a great deal of trouble to give their views and comments and to obtain information on your letter of August 16. All concerned realize the critical importance of being sure we are working with as many of the liberal and democratic forces of Germany as can be mustered. The purpose of this letter is to give you the comments I have received. It is in no sense a criticism but only is looking toward a widening and deepening of the relationships between us and the elements in Germany who will work toward the same objectives of general peace, human rights and security, and well-being toward which we are working.

One of the first comments made is that your list is largely devoid of young people and that reliance is mainly on elements prominent before the Third Reich but which have not been successful in saving Germany before.

One suggestion which has been made and which seems to be appealing is that, say, 24 members from a delegation of nongovernmental representatives of labor, the self-employed groups, and those engaged in the professions, in education, and public opinion forming be called to the State Department for a frank discussion in Washington as to the state of liberal and democratic ideals and actions in Germany and why their prestige has declined, or is declining, which is the view of this particular informant. I am sending a copy of this letter to Colonel Byroade of the State Department with a specific reference to this last suggestion for his consideration.

I would very much appreciate your views upon this letter.

Sincerely,

J. K. JAVITS,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY,
APO 757-A, New York, N. Y., January 16, 1951.

Hon. J. K. JAVITS,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAVITS: I have received your letter of December 12, 1950, commenting on my letter of August 16 which, unfortunately, appears to have slighted the civil liberties' groups, church leaders, women's organizations, labor unions, youth groups, schools and universities with which this office maintains most excellent working relations.

In connection with any comment on the absence of youthful liberal leaders in Germany today, I would like to point out that over half of our exchanges program is devoted to teenagers, college students, and trainees. During the past year, for example, of the 2,565 exchangees sent to the United States, 358 were rural teenagers, 122 were urban teenagers, 447 were college students, and 409 were trainees. More than 200 United States schools and universities participated in this program.

I also would like to call attention to our work with the following leaders of private German social agencies and institutions: Bert Evan, chairman of the Junge Union in Rhineland-Westphalia; Dr. Guenter Olzog, of the Hochschule fuer Politische Wissenschaften in Munich; Prof. W. Grewe, of the political science faculty, Freiburg; Dr. Dirk Oncken, Bund fuer Buergerrechte in Frankfurt; Dr. Herman Heimlich, oberbuergermeister of Hamburg; and Frau Myer-Kuhlenkampff, director of the Pestalozzi-Froebel Institute of Berlin, and chairman of the Leadership Training Subcommittee of Youth Work and Youth Welfare in Bonn.

Unfortunately, such men and women rarely can afford the time for a prolonged study-tour of the United States. However, there are in the United States, at the present time, other adult and student exchangees who might contribute to a discussion on the state of liberal ideals in Germany today, as you suggested in your letter. I am informed that the State Department is considering calling such a meeting, possibly early in February, to coincide with the visit of representative leaders of the Bundestag.

I have asked that a copy of our two-volume report on the "Exchanges Reorientation Program—Fiscal Year 1951" be forwarded to your office for the information of yourself and your associates. As you read, you will note the wide coverage given by this program to Germany's youth and educational problems.

Again, let me assure you of my appreciation for the interest and understanding which you have in our common problems.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany.

Statement to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on Proposed Bills and Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I submitted to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding five of my legislative proposals which have been referred to that committee for consideration:

STATEMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON PROPOSED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS, FEBRUARY 15, 1951

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for granting me the opportunity to present this statement in connection with several of my bills and resolutions which have been referred to your committee. Permit me to take a moment to compliment you for instituting this new and very logical procedure whereby the authors of the proposed legislation are afforded an opportunity to present their views and the benefit of their opinions on such bills to the committee. Your innovation is a commendable step forward in our democratic parliamentary system.

Five of my proposals have been referred to this committee: One bill (H. R. 1391), two House resolutions (H. Res. 65 and H. Res. 98), and two concurrent resolutions (H. Con. Res. 21 and H. Con. Res. 22).

H. R. 1391

H. R. 1391 seeks to amend section 113 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress by adding a proviso to withhold Marshall-plan aid from countries engaging in acts of aggression, as determined by proclamation of the President of the United States or by the United Nations. I have supported a similar amendment back in 1948 at the time the law was enacted. At that time Great Britain was the aggressor nation because of her misconduct in fomenting hostilities in the Middle East. Later, the Netherlands engaged in open warfare to destroy the Republic of Indonesia, disregarding for a time world opinion in the United Nations and public opinion in our own country.

It is my sincere conviction that neither Great Britain nor the Netherlands would have dared to encourage or engage in hostilities had they known beforehand that as a result of their actions they would stand to lose the economic assistance of the United States. The same holds true for other nations. I feel certain that if not for British intervention there may never have taken place an Arab-Israeli war, the whole Middle East would have long ago been pacified, and we would be far advanced today in safeguarding the security of that area and its strategic raw materials against communism. In a similar manner, we lost precious time in Indonesia where the ill-fated Dutch intervention has alienated large segments of the native population, so that today Indonesia constitutes one of our weak links in the Far East, at a time when we need the cooperation of all freedom-loving people.

We should try to prevent the repetition of such acts of aggression so that we may have the fullest opportunity to concentrate on the problem of problems—how to deal with the ruthless aggressors of Communist Russia and Communist China.

We can do so by the adoption of my amendment to withhold all financial or other aid from all those participating directly or indirectly in acts of aggression. It will be a friendly but stern warning and should serve to prevent many future international headaches for us. It will prove helpful in this crisis that confronts us now.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 65

House Resolution 65 calls on the President of the United States to appoint a bipartisan commission which is to undertake an investigation of the conduct and status of American policy in Germany. So much has happened during the past year concerning Germany and our attitude toward the people of that country that it would take me too far afield to go into a detailed account on this subject. I believe the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee are well aware of these developments and the events which prompted this change.

The committee will agree with me, I am sure, that we have failed in our major purposes—to democratize Germany, to break up the German cartels, to stamp out Nazi and other antidemocratic ideologies, to eliminate anti-Semitism, and other equally important goals for which we fought a bloody 4-year war against Hitler. Large sections of our population today are distrustful of Germany. They fear we may be building up a new Frankenstein that may someday come back to plague us. Others fear that, since there is little difference in the ideologies and methods of Nazi totalitarianism and Communist totalitarianism, we may someday again see an alliance between these antidemocratic elements aimed against the free nations of the world.

We must move cautiously in Germany and only with as complete knowledge as we can obtain about the true conditions there concerning all matters relating to American policy. It is for this reason that I urge you to approve this resolution.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 98

House Resolution 98 suggests the establishment of a Joint Committee on International Economic Development of 30 members, 10 to be drawn from the Senate and 20 from the House, which shall, in cooperation with the United Nations, inquire into the economic development of other countries, particularly in underdeveloped areas.

Specifically, the joint committee should investigate, make interim reports, and submit a final report to Congress by the end of the present Congress concerning the following: (1) The improvement of the standards of living and social services in those countries; (2) the development of agricultural and industrial projects capable of increasing productivity and the standard of living; (3) the improvement of educational opportunities, including technical and university training; (4) the integration of such projects with similar projects initiated by the United Nations.

Only by such a committee can we be kept fully apprised of how our point 4 is developing and how much further, if at all, we should proceed with it.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

House Concurrent Resolution 21 establishes as a fundamental objective of United States foreign policy our intent to support and strengthen the United Nations and to work for its development into a world federation which would be able to preserve peace through the enactment and enforcement of world law. Since similar resolutions urging a world federation have been introduced by several of my colleagues in the House and have been referred to your committee, I shall refrain at this time from presenting lengthy argumentation in its favor. In general, I aline myself with the views already expressed by those colleagues in support of the idea.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

Finally House Concurrent Resolution 22 requests the President of the United States to convene a Federal convention with delegates representing the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty and of the United States, in order to explore the application of the principles of a free Federal union within the framework of the United Nations. Such principles have attained notable success in this country, in Canada and in Switzerland, as well as other countries. By the adoption of these principles on the part of the North Atlantic Treaty countries, it may be further possible to safeguard and strengthen their free institutions, unite their defensive efforts, encourage fullest economic cooperation, and achieve other goals set by the democracies of the world.

I urge you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, to give my proposals your fullest attention and your early consideration.

Effective Disarmament Our Real Aim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the remarks made by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] at the Lyric Theater in Baltimore, Md., on February 18:

EFFECTIVE DISARMAMENT OUR REAL AIM

What is it that we are talking about here tonight? Perhaps it is an idiosyncracy of mine, but at least it has always been a strong conviction on my part that politicians as well as ordinary mortals should keep silent unless they, in their own minds, are pretty clear as to what they are talking about. Unfortunately, the phrases "world government" or "world federalist" have some very unhappy connotations and lead to much fuzziness in thinking. They inevitably arouse the specter of a world bureaucracy attempting to run the details of our everyday lives, or millions of Asiatics or Africans outvoting the United States in some parliamentary body and imposing upon us some sort of unwanted treatment. That is certainly not my concept of what we are talking about tonight.

My concept of our discussion is that we are talking about the creation within the United Nations of such limited machinery as can assure the peoples of the world really effective disarmament. That limited machinery, because it will require the binding assent of many nations, might well be termed "government." In a sense, the term is correct, but the field of its operation would encompass so small a part of the sphere of action which we usually associate with the word "government" that the phrase "enforceable treaty mechanism" might well be a clearer form of definition.

There is no need of my developing the blessing to mankind of genuine disarmament. Justice under law enforced with a minimum of police machinery was the goal which the Original Thirteen States in our federation made a reality for our Nation. True disarmament throughout the world is only a natural extension of the same principle. It is the concept which must remain basic and continuous in our thinking about foreign policy. It is not a utopian dream, even though many of us may find that the road blocks on the way to its achievement are much easier to visualize than the realization of the objective itself.

Foreign policy, as indeed all public policy, must have a strong underlying purpose in order that it may have a continuity of direction no matter how many bypasses have to be traveled from time to time. As of this moment it would appear as though we were traveling a number of endless bypasses. Few, if any of us, know where our present fighting in Korea is leading us. We know that when the fighting began against the North Korean Government, we were engaged in an effort to make collective security a reality for a small and helpless nation. At one time that objective appeared near to success, but as of this moment, the moral justification for the action seems lost in a welter of confusion between expediency and face saving.

Our present preparedness program and our efforts to encourage our colleagues of the North Atlantic Pact to increase their armed strength also appear to be the antithesis of the goal which we are talking about. Of course they are by-passes—by-passes necessitated by the primary need for ensuring survival, but by-passes which can and should bring us back to the goal we are discussing. If we let the goal slip from our minds—if we forget the determination to reach that goal because of our preoccupation with the necessities of the moment, then indeed we have no foreign policy worthy of the name.

On the other hand, if the disarmament of which I speak is really our fundamental purpose, then we should keep reiterating it constantly, not alone to reassure ourselves that there is a better world ahead, but to give purpose, direction, and inspiration to each step as we move along. It is not only we alone who must have convictions with respect to what lies at the end of the path we are traveling; it is also the hundreds of millions of peoples of Europe and Asia and Africa who at times doubt the profoundness of our convictions and have difficulty in distinguishing between those who talk peace and actually make aggressive war, and those who prepare for war but in reality are using that preparation only as a means to try to ensure peace.

If we could state our convictions in concise and understandable language, it would do much to dispell the listlessness and despair to which General Eisenhower recently referred on his return from Europe. It would do much to keep Communist Russia on the defensive, both morally and politically. It could turn our foreign policy from one which appears to be essentially defensive to one which could continuously boast of real offensive strength.

Where does the Congress of the United States enter into this concept? Not only we, but the whole world, know that the executive branch of the Government alone cannot establish a lasting foreign policy. There is no need of my recalling the disillusionment which followed the congressional rejection of the League of Nations.

There is, however, real point in recalling the fact that the United Nations was created after the Fulbright resolution had been adopted by the Congress, and the North Atlantic Pact was negotiated after the Vandenberg resolution had been adopted by the United States Senate. An expression of opinion by the Congress of the United States gives infinitely greater assurance of a continuity of policy than any improvised action which might be taken by the executive branch. Certainly the many shifts in our policy with respect to Korea and the Far East during the last 5 years cannot give the world too great a confidence in the stability of purely executive action.

During the last session of the Congress a resolution was introduced and supported by 115 Members of the House and by 22 Members of the Senate, which made a declaration of policy in substantial accord with the very matter which we are discussing. I doubt whether any resolution which has come before the Congress has had so many individual Congressmen and Senators eager to sponsor it at its inception. It never came to the floor of either branch for debate. A similar resolution is being introduced into the present session of the Congress. What course it may take I cannot predict. But I do know this: Members of Congress are extremely sensitive to the voice of the people at home. It will be passed when enough people insist upon it.

However, the time is short. There is real danger that we shall get bogged down in the bypasses and fail to return to the main road. The clear voice of thousands of people expressing their conviction can hold us to a steady course. I believe that those voices will be heard and will be heeded. I believe that given time and courage we can make of their convictions a reality.

Oil Shortage Seen Facing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following interesting article from the New York Times dated Sunday, February 18, 1951:

OIL SHORTAGE SEEN FACING INDUSTRY—EXPANSION PROGRAM, COSTING BILLIONS, INVOLVES AID FROM WASHINGTON—DEPLETION RATE A FACTOR—INDUSTRY SURE OF FINANCING PROVIDED TAX CHANGES DON'T MAKE BURDEN TOO HEAVY

(By J. H. Carmical)

Despite its huge expansion since World War II it is becoming increasingly clear that the oil industry is facing a gigantic task in supplying military and civilian demand in the present emergency. In an effort to meet these demands the industry has embarked on a program to increase its capacity by an additional 1,000,000 barrels daily. The chief difficulty in meeting that goal is expected to be in the crude oil branch. The first step is at the request of the Petroleum Administration for Defense. A committee has been appointed by the National Petroleum Council. This committee is headed by Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).

The program is expected to cost billions of dollars. In addition, there will be materials and labor. However, as to materials, particularly steel, industry expects to have the aid of authorities in Washington.

Despite the huge cost, the steel industry is confident that the necessary financing can be provided by itself or through private sources provided that the tax laws are not changed so that it will have to bear too heavy a burden. Already, it is maintained that the Treasury Department's tax recommendations to Congress would make the oil industry carry an undue portion of the total tax burden.

BILLION IN REVENUE

Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, last week estimated that, if these recommendations were enacted into law, the oil industry would be asked to account for $1,000,000,000 in revenue over and above the proposed increase in rates applicable to all other corporations and individuals.

In addition to increasing the Government levy on gasoline to 3 cents a gallon from 1½ cents, the Treasury would drastically reduce the 27½ percent tax exemption now permitted for depletion of producing wells. Although there is some opposition to increasing the gasoline levy, which would bring the Federal take to roughly 25 percent of the refinery selling price, the chief objection, particularly to those engaged in crude oil production, is to the proposed change in the depletion provision of the law.

Mr. Brown pointed out that during the 25 years in which the present depletion rate has been in effect the oil industry has explored for, found, and produced ever-increasing supplies of crude oil. He said that Congress established the present rate of depletion because it had to find a method and an amount "that would insure proper tax payments and at the same time not discourage capital investments in such risk industries."

TO ENCOURAGE RESEARCH

Originally, the depletion provision was placed in the tax law so as not to discourage the search for oil. If all the net profit resulting from the discovery of an oil well should be taxed, Congress felt that the incentive to search for oil would be lessened. For that reason, it was determined that 27½ percent of the gross income resulting from the production of oil and gas wells should be exempt from income-tax payments.

With each of the 48 States levying a sales tax on gasoline and also some municipalities collecting an additional tax, many persons feel that gasoline is already paying more than its share.

Although the price freeze placed on crude oil and petroleum products in December has not appreciably influenced production, the belief in the industry is that it should be reviewed from time to time in order to maintain a proper margin of profit. In recent months nearly every item entering into the cost of petroleum products has advanced and the chances are that there will be further increases.

General Price Ceiling Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Texas, by House Concurrent Resolution 27, has clearly and ably set forth the dangers and pitfalls of the general price ceiling order of January 26, 1951, imposing price ceilings on cotton. Cotton is second only to steel as a war material, and, in my opinion, should not have been included in its raw state under the price-freeze order. The very logical reasons upon which I base this statement have been briefly and ably set out in the House concurrent resolution referred to, and I, therefore, place it in the RECORD with the request that all Members read it so that they may better understand some of the problems that can be created by such an order:

House Concurrent Resolution 27

Whereas the Federal Government's general price ceiling order of January 26, 1951, imposed price freezes on most agricultural commodities, while exempting materials classed as necessary to the defense program; and

Whereas cotton, which is second only to steel as a critical war material, was included in this general price freeze; and

Whereas past experience has demonstrated that, for many reasons, a price ceiling on raw cotton is unworkable and unenforceable, some of these reasons being the following:

1. Sufficient cotton must be produced to supply the Armed Forces as well as take care of our domestic and foreign requirements. Price ceilings on raw cotton might well discourage cotton planters, who have been asked by the Government to produce a 16,000,000-bale crop.

2. Raw cotton prices have little to do with the cost of the finished article. Only through controls of the finished products could price control be effective.

3. A short supply of labor and increased wages, as well as increased costs of machinery, equipment, fertilizer and insecticides, will greatly increase the cost of producing the 1951 crop.

4. The very nature of cotton marketing, involving hundreds of grades, staples and growths, makes it impracticable to place or enforce any ceiling on the raw product.

5. The nature of the cotton market is such that it must function freely; otherwise, with every potential buyer having a guarantee that the price could not rise any higher, the whole system of spot and future marketing would be adversely affected.

Whereas, in World War II price ceilings were not placed on raw cotton but rather on the finished products made therefrom, which arrangement permitted the prices of raw cotton to find levels consistent with control of textile prices; and

Whereas this method worked satisfactorily then and should be applied in the present situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States and the officials charged with the formulation and execution of price stabilization policies are hereby respectfully urged to reestablish the proven method of controlling cotton prices in the present emergency and thereby make possible the orderly financing, production and marketing of the 1951 cotton crop.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
REUBEN E. SEUTERITT,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 27 was adopted by the house on February 13, 1951.

CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 27 was adopted by the senate on February 13, 1951.

LOYCE M. BELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Freedom's Open Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the women's auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars post in Ruleville, Miss., recently conducted an essay contest open to senior class members in the Ruleville High School. The winner of this essay contest was Miss Nell Eastland, of Doddsville, Miss.

Miss Eastland's essay is a fine expression of faith in the American system. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S OPEN DOOR

(By Nell Eastland)

"Freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, these are principles that have guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation." Thus Thomas Jefferson expressed the sentiments which were in the minds and hearts of the Pilgrims and Puritans when they left their ancestral homes and came to a wild and unsettled new continent. America to them was freedom's open door.

These sturdy souls, who had for so long been persecuted by King James I for refusing to conform to the worship of the Anglican Church, left England to seek in America a refuge where they could worship God according to their own beliefs. Here they laid the foundation for the democratic form of government. They never allowed themselves to be enslaved.

As the Colonies grew, England put more and more restrictions upon them—taxes on practically every article, restrictions and more restrictions. The colonists resisted, at first verbally, but then as the injustices continued their desire for independence became stronger, and they fought for their independence. Once again they had refused to be enslaved.

The burning desire in the hearts of the men who met in Philadelphia in 1787 to draw up the Constitution was to set up a democratic government, a government in which certain freedoms would be preserved for the coming generations. They drew up the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees these rights: Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of petition.

One of the most important and most desired of all freedoms is that of religions. Not all of the people in the world had this freedom then or have it now. In many countries the government still dictates to the church. Recently we have heard of the purging of ministers and high church officials by the dictatorial governments of the East European countries. These churchmen, by their words and deeds, had stood in the way of the complete domination of the people by the government.

America is one of the few countries of the world where any citizen can express verbally or in writing his private opinions even though they are contrary to the policies of the government. A democracy thrives on constructive criticism, but in dictatorial governments and their satellites a citizen does not dare express anything critical of the individuals in power. Such peoples are not free. Only in a free country can public opinion mold the policies of the government.

Fifty nations of the world have gladly banded together in the United Nations organization and pledged themselves to promote and protect the independence and liberty of all peoples and all countries. Almost every generation has been called to arms to defend their ideals of freedom. Sometimes men fight for their own liberty, often to insure the rights of others. As the freedom bells rang out around the globe on October 24 the armed forces of the United Nations organization continued their fight to protect the rights of one of the weaker nations. So by promoting friendly understanding and cooperation between nations and the use of force only as a last desperate resort we hope to keep open freedom's door.

The Lesson of a Motto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there are many institutions in our country which have made a distinct contribution to American life and have helped make the United States the great country that it is. One of these institutions is the famous Boys Home in Boys Town, Nebr., which was founded and led for many years by the late Father Flanagan, a Catholic priest and a distinguished American. Boys Home was established and flourishes to this day as a nonsectarian institution, offering a home, affection, belonging, and an education to homeless youths, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. On its board of directors sit prominent Americans of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths.

This institution continues to teach the American people a great and timely lesson through its motto, which is acquiring universal recognition. The well-known poet Joseph Auslander voices some very fine, soul-stirring thoughts concerning this motto which should touch the heart of every man, woman, and child in this country. His brief remarks were published in the magazine This Week, February 18, under a picture showing a GI in Korea carrying one of his wounded comrades. Both picture and words teach a beautiful message. The words follow:

A HAND TO HELP

(By Joseph Auslander)

"He ain't heavy, Father. He's my brother."
Motto of Father Flanagan's Boys' Town.

One of the first things that strikes you as you enter Father Flanagan's world-famous Boys Town, in Boys Town, Nebr., is the simple, inspiring plaque which has become a kind of symbol of the spirit and work of that wonderful experiment in affection and faith—the picture of a sturdy young lad carrying a crippled little boy in his arms. Beneath this is written: "He ain't heavy, Father. He's my brother."

Today, against the background of current news stories and news pictures like the one shown above, it is impossible to read these words without a catch at the throat and a thrill at the heart. What a lesson for all of us—individuals, families, communities, and nations—that utterance carries.

If only, in our daily lives, at home or at our business, or in our dealings with our neighbors, we could share the burden, reach out a hand to help, lift another's load onto our shoulders for a while.

If only, in their intercourse with each other, the countries of the world could apply this warm and generous human impulse to their councils and deliberations, the poisons of fear and envy and suspicion would surely evaporate in peace.

If only everyone everywhere in the world, of whatever race, creed, color, or conviction, could stand before his God and say, "He ain't heavy, Father. He's my brother."

If only——

Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., on February 14, 1951:

WHERE IS THE "BATORY"?

Do you remember the *Batory*, the Polish liner in which the Communist spy, Gebhart Eisler, escaped after his conviction here, landed in England, and was permitted to go free? Well, the *Batory* is again in Southampton, England, getting the overhaul and cleaning which the shipyard workers at Brooklyn, N. Y., refused to do on the ground that she is a Communist ship. She will now be fitted out by the English workers to continue her service to the common enemy.

Why, we wonder, does the British Government maintain such friendly relations with Russia, China, and the Red satellites? Why are British factories turning out great machine tools for Russia, the very things that Russia most desperately needs to build up her armament? Why are Russian engineers being entertained in British factories and being shown how to make such things so necessary to the making of war? Why, again, are British merchants doing a booming business with Red China through Hong Kong, reputedly the greatest boom in the history of that British outpost? Oil, rubber, and steel, the things the Red Chinese need most to carry on the war in Korea against British and American soldiers, are pouring into China to fatten English merchants.

When the question arises as to whether General MacArthur may order his forces to go north across the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea to run the Red army down, Mr. Attlee, the British Prime Minister, says "no." Is England to dominate our foreign policy even to the point of dictating to our Armed Forces, while we supply the main bulk of the forces engaged in putting down the Communists?

All these things are arousing deep resentment here in America and the friendly relations between Britain and America are being sadly frayed. The character of the present Labor Government in Britain is strikingly shown by the fact that they have now put up an out-and-out pacifist for a by-election to Parliament.

There is only one strong man in England in whom the American people have unbounded confidence. He is, of course, the former Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, who currently is vigorously battling to throw Mr. Attlee's Labor government out of office.

Years ago Mr. Churchill said that Labor was not fit to govern. He did not say that in a snobbish spirit. He simply meant that the British Labor Party was so essentially socialistic that it would bring about Britain's

downfall, and apparently his convictions are being borne out by Britain's present policy.

Britain and her satellites in the past year, even after the Korean fighting broke out, have time and again consistently voted against the United States in the UN. Britain hurriedly recognized Red China to preserve her trade with that country and to bribe the Chinese not to take over the British colony of Hong Kong. It is high time for Britain to make up her mind whether she is going to put the dollar first in her foreign policy, or whether she is earnestly and honestly going to join heartily with the free peoples of the world in the fight against communism.

At Cross-Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the following article by W. M. Jablonski, petroleum editor of the New York Journal of Commerce, deals with a subject of taxation which is now before the Congress. For this reason I believe the article will be of real information and interest to the Members.

The article follows:

President Truman's request for a reduction in the traditional tax depletion allowance for oil drilling reveals a startling lack of coordination in the administration's national defense objectives.

To be sure, Congress will be hard pressed to finance our huge mobilization program. All of us will have to carry the increased tax burden. No group or industry can ask for, or expect, special privileges.

But tampering with the depletion allowance for oil exploration and drilling is something else again. For a quarter of a century Congress repeatedly has upheld this 27½-percent allowance in recognition of the extraordinary hazards in oil drilling (82.3 percent of the exploratory wells drilled in the United States last year were dry) and of the need for encouraging risk capital to insure adequate national petroleum supplies. Only last year Congress again upheld this allowance as no tax loophole but as a necessary measure in the national interest.

To reduce the oil-drilling incentive now in order to help pay for the expanded military machine we are building—when additional oil capacity will be needed to oil that same military machine—would be working at cross-purposes.

This is the time to do everything possible to encourage—not discourage—domestic oil development.

The Government itself has recognized the need for offering special tax incentives (accelerated depreciation) to encourage expansion of vital defense plants. Yet at the same time the President would cut away a long-standing incentive for oil development.

The President's proposal is also hard to reconcile with the urgent request from another branch of the administration—the Interior Department—for the oil industry to study ways of expanding its productive capacity by 1,000,000 barrels per day for military needs in case of war.

A glance at current oil figures will show the weakness of the tax proposal. Our crude oil producing capacity has been estimated by the oil States at about 6,700,000 barrels daily. Industry sources put the figure closer to 6,400,000.

To meet current requirements alone, domestic oil production has been stepped up above 6,000,000 barrels daily in recent weeks, supplemented by crude imports of over 600,000 barrels per day (plus imports of 400,000 barrels daily of heavy fuel oil).

Our margin of petroleum self-sufficiency, without the benefit of imports, thus has dwindled to just about nothing, compared to the million-barrel-a-day domestic reserve that proved so vital in the last war.

This situation is too tight for comfort right now. When it comes to oiling the military machine we propose to build it is alarmingly small. Only through the most drastic civilian rationing or an uninterrupted flow of overseas imports on a vastly expanded scale could we meet the needs of all-out war.

To tamper with the long-standing oil drilling tax incentive at this point would be little short of national folly.

Illinois Central Railroad Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Central Railroad, one of the great institutions of the Mississippi Valley, is this year celebrating its centennial. I include an article from the Christian Science Monitor on the history of the Illinois Central:

TO CHANGE THE SUBJECT—CASEY JONES: RAILROAD'S COLORFUL ERA

(By Bicknell Eubanks)

This year marks the one hundredth year of operation for the Illinois Central—the "main line of mid-America." This 6,500-mile line, which numbered Abraham Lincoln among its legal staff, can boast that nearly every ton of freight which moves across the United States either passes over or crosses its lines at one or more points.

The railroad's current president, Wayne A. Johnston, recently told a dinner gathering in New York City that "a study of the railroad's history tells one a great deal about the development of America since 1850, when four-fifths of its area was in a primitive state and when there were fewer people in the United States than there are today in its four leading metropolitan centers.

"The history of the Illinois Central is the history of mid-America. When the railroad was organized there were only seven cities or towns on the 921-mile route from Chicago to New Orleans along what is now the main line of the railroad. Chicago then was little more than a trading post, with a population of less than 30,000."

The Illinois Central had a brilliant cast of supporters in the Congress—Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, and Jefferson Davis. Lincoln represented the Illinois Central from 1853 to 1860, when he was elected President. He received from the railroad the largest fee earned during his legal career—$5,000.

But all this history meant not nearly so much to me when I was growing up in Mississippi. My father was a conductor on the Aberdeen branch of the IC, and I used to hear some wonderful tales about what used to be the most colorful business in the United States—railroading.

Dad is now retired, but it doesn't take much to get him started on stories of some of those colorful figures of the early part of this century. Among his most famous acquaintances was a dashing engineer whose handling of the whistle put him in the class of a symphonic French horn player, and whose exploits are recorded—a bit erroneously—in the famous folk song Casey Jones. I used to hear Dad talk about Casey Jones, but I was quite big before I connected him with the song I heard in those days in less aesthetic company than now will admit to its existence.

Dad was a young telegrapher in Durant, Miss., around 1900, when he first met Casey. Dad found a $50 bill wadded up in a bunch of discarded train orders, and tossed into a corner of the station.

"That much money in those days scared me," he always said. "I saw that it was in some orders which Casey had thrown away, so I took it to the station agent, Mr. Neely. When Casey came back the next night on No. 2 (then the IC's fastest passenger train) he was mighty glad to get back the money. He wanted to reward me, but I couldn't let him do that. The next trip north, though, he climbed down from the cab with a big bundle under his arm. It was a dressed turkey. He gave it to me."

Dad says that all the stories about Casey's handling of a locomotive are very nearly correct. But Dad always waxes wroth when anyone suggests that Casey was a reckless engineer. Far from it. He was a skillful engineer who knew how to get the most out of a locomotive.

Dad recalls one time when No. 1, going south, had to pull into the hole to let No. 2, going north, by. In spite of the fact that No. 1, with Casey at the throttle, had to pull out of the sidetrack onto the main line, wait for the flagman to throw the switch, then get started again, Casey pulled into Canton, 20 miles south, as No. 2 pulled into Durant, about five miles north.

Dad always contends that it wasn't carelessness or disregard of orders that got Casey killed. In fact, paradoxically enough, Dad feels it was Casey's own brilliance as an engineer. He was good, and he knew it. When he pulled into Durant that night he had picked up about 1½ hours since leaving Memphis. He was sure he could go into Canton, his division point, on time.

Dad gave Casey his last orders, and, like most railroaders of that day will tell you, Casey wasn't going too fast; he already had made up his time when he started around that long curve near Vaughn, Miss. That is just about the most terrifying curve on any railroad. It seems to begin everywhere and wind up nowhere. But as Casey came around it, going slow, in fact, from his viewpoint, he saw that a couple of boxcars and the caboose of a freight train were sticking out.

Casey grabbed hold of the air brakes, yelled to his fireman, Sim Webb, to jump, and tried to stop the train. He almost made it. No one else was even hurt.

It wasn't long after that that a Negro roustabout in a Memphis roundhouse started humming a tune, then fitting words to it, that is now one of the most famous of all folk songs. It was never copyrighted by the IC.

Alex Stirewalt, Outstanding Arkansas Citizen, Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding man whose recent passing after a brief illness is mourned by a host of friends throughout eastern Arkansas. For many years he served as chairman of the Crittenden County Production and Marketing Administration Board and held various other offices with great distinction. He was a farmer, merchant, and patriotic citizen. He gave of his time and his talents most willingly. He was in the forefront of all movements which had for their purpose the betterment for his county, State, and Nation. He was a Christian gentleman in the truest sense. A real American. He was loyal to his friends.

The West Memphis (Ark.) Crittenden County Times carried an editorial on January 26, 1951, depicting the life, character, and services of this outstanding leader of men. The full text of the editorial is as follows:

ALEX STIREWALT

"That's one man whom I never heard anyone say a bad thing about."

"Whenever there was a job that required a lot of work to be done, they gave it to him, he took it and did it well."

"The flowers at his funeral depicted his nature—the red, the richness of his heart; the pastel, his softness; and the white, purity."

Such were a few of the tributes paid to Alex Stirewalt, esteemed by all who knew him and recognized by all as one of Crittenden County's most outstanding citizens.

As the minister said at his final rites, Mr. Alex would have suggested: "Don't say anything about me, just something for the family." That's the manner in which he lived, always retiring and never seeking credit for the many duties which he discharged so faithfully.

Mr. Alex had about all the free jobs there are to bestow upon an individual. Every time a secretary-treasurer was needed—without compensation—it was Mr. Alex who got elected. He not only did these assignments efficiently, but served as a leader for his community for every worth-while campaign that was launched.

His place as a leader in our county cannot be filled. His absence will be one felt more keenly with the passage of the days. Would that the world had more men who possessed his fine qualifications.

What We Are Fighting for in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times of February 9, 1951:

AN ANSWER

Back in June when the North Koreans crossed the fatal thirty-eighth parallel in open aggressive attack, the whole Nation and most of the free world applauded the quick and resolute action of President Truman, speaking for the people of the United States.

For the first time in a long while Republicans, Dixiecrats, Truman Democrats, and just plain Democrats found themselves thoroughly in accord and acting in unison. The spirit of a united Nation put new life into a battered and defeatist world.

But only for a short time. As disaster threatened on the heels of defeat, people everywhere, including the troops who were doing the fighting, began to ask what we were doing in Korea anyhow. The strong purpose of an aroused people frittered away into the dispirited lackadaisical of prime horse-body Robert A. Taft and the obscure but fantastically impractical "Gibraltar of the West" proposal of Elder Statesman Herbert Hoover, who should have known better.

Why are we there? What are we fighting for? Gen. Matthew Ridgway had an answer for his troops.

It is also a good answer to all the questioning people of this bewildered country:

"It is not a question of this or that Korean town. The real issues are whether the power of western civilization as God has permitted it to flower in our own beloved lands shall defy and defeat communism; whether the rule of men who shoot their prisoners, enslave their citizens and deride the dignity of man shall displace the rule of those to whom the individual and his rights are sacred. * * *

"The sacrifices we have made are not offered vicariously for others, but in our own direct defense. * * * The issue now joined is whether * * * the next flight of fear-driven people * * * shall be checked and defeated overseas or permitted step by step to close in on our own homeland. * * * Never have members of any military command had a finer opportunity to prove an honor to the profession of arms and a credit to those who bred us."

Salem's Position Unchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Robert Letts Jones in the Salem (Oreg.) Capitol-Journal concerning proposals before the CAB for a change of airline service at that city. I thoroughly agree with the position which Mr. Jones has taken. I trust that the Civil Aeronautics Board will give full consideration to the position expressed in this editorial as reflecting the views of the people of the community involved.

SALEM'S POSITION UNCHANGED

Off to Washington, D. C., this week goes the final argument of the city of Salem in the Civil Aeronautics Board case which would substitute West Coast Airlines, a feeder line, for United Air Lines service here. The case developed more than a year and one-half ago from a CAB show-cause order why West Coast shouldn't be substituted. It is hoped the case is nearing a decision.

Salem's position in this matter which would substitute a feeder-line service for the main-line service of United has not changed during the proceedings. Since the case affects the city, business, farmers, and industry in and around the city, and the well-being of McNary Field, Salem's position is plainly this:

United Air Lines service is essential to the position of Salem as capital of the State of Oregon. Furthermore, the city needs more, not a change or less, air-transport service. Growth of Salem from 30,908 in 1940 to 43,064 in 1950 indicates the expanding needs of the community.

Salem feels that main-line facilities of United are imperative considering geographical considerations for Oregon's capital which is presently served by main-line air transport, highway, and railroad facilities. In this connection, United Air Lines has pioneered commercial air travel for the city since United was granted permission by the CAB to serve the city in 1941. That was the time when Governor McKay was the city's representative before the CAB in Washington on the proposal.

The economy of the city and surrounding territory demands adequate main-line, speedy air-express, and air-freight service such as offered by United. Local business and industry have geared operations to an expanding through air-express and air-freight service. This is illustrated, for example, by the 84-percent increase in air-freight poundage outgoing from Salem for 1950 over 1949, and by the 90-percent increase of air freight off at Salem for 1950 over 1949.

Another argument is that airport development at McNary Field is dependent on United Air Lines service. Rental and landing fees paid by United are such as to become a vital part of the operating budget of the field. In fact, expansion of the airport and the new administration building on the field, occupied last July, are predicated on an expanding service by United for the city.

* * * * *

The stand-by status of the city's airport is not to be overlooked, either. McNary Field is the only adequate alternate field in this part of the State for air-transport traffic to the Portland airport. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has recognized this fact. The expensive instrument-landing system, along with the 24-hour weather and control-tower service, bears out that fact. Salem is forced to maintain an airport and administration building capable of handling Portland's air-transport service when the Portland field is closed in by weather.

The facts clearly indicate Salem's need for keeping and developing United Air Lines service here—as was realized when the threat to present air service for the city developed more than a year and one-half ago.

A Small United States Army for Europe—German Participation in Europe's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended analysis by the distinguished commentator, Walter Lippmann, from the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, February 19, 1951, puts in realistic terms the reasons for our action and gets away from the unrealism of assuming we are trying to match the U. S. S. R. man for man on the ground in Europe.

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A SMALL ARMY FOR EUROPE

In giving the figures—four ground divisions added to the two already in Europe—Secretary Marshall was only making somewhat more specific what General of the Army Eisenhower had already told Congress.

The figures are not sensational in the sense that they give away closely guarded

military secrets. There is no such thing as hiding the long business of mobilizing and training American divisions, putting them on ships, landing them in European ports, and moving them to their stations in Germany. The Russians are in a position to know exactly at all times what ground forces are in front of them in Europe and vice versa.

Even during an all-out war, when passing back and forth across the lines is difficult and dangerous, it is only occasionally that as much as a division is hidden successfully for any length of time. Hiding an American division of talkative and letter-writing GI's is like hiding an elephant with a siren attached to him on the stage of Constitution Hall.

In the literal and obvious sense no question of military security is involved. But in another and less obvious sense there are very important military and political implications, some of them which must be secret indeed, in the decision to plan at present for a small army unit of high efficiency.

Why, it will be asked by many here and abroad, should we believe that a small American Army of this kind is of great military importance? How, it might be said, can any army small enough not to frighten Mr. Hoover too much be strong enough to impress Stalin at all? For obvious reasons so small an army would not, as General Marshall put it, "appear to represent in pure fighting power a large contribution to the immediate defensive strength of Western Europe."

The key word, I believe, in General Marshall's remarks is the word "defensive." As a defensive force, in Mr. Hoover's sense of a "dam" against the Red Army, these six divisions, or even double that number, would be fantastically insufficient. These six divisions make sense only if we look at the part they are meant to play in the grand strategy—not of defense but of deterrence.

Then they make big sense and are in fact of great importance to the security of the Western World and in the prevention of a great war. The grand strategy of deterrence rests fundamentally, of course, upon making it the indubitable fact that the Soviet Union could not win a world war because its main adversary, the United States, could not be defeated and would grow even stronger as the war continued. This is, and always has been, the military fact which protects the west, which protects otherwise indefensible places, such as west Berlin, Vienna, Iran. This is the military fact which protects General of the Army MacArthur's bases and supply lines, having given him unchallenged freedom of the air and sea over and around Korea and Japan. This military fact is becoming, happily, more and more of a military fact from month to month.

Nevertheless, the west will not feel secure, nor will it be so secure as it is entitled to be, if Western Europe could be had without a fight. There is here a temptation which needs to be removed. For if Europe could be had without a fight, by surrender if the Red Army started to march, then Europe would be a hostage held in order to neutralize American power.

The presence of an American Army is a guaranty that Europe cannot be taken or surrendered without a fight. Thus it will serve to rally those Europeans who do not wish to surrender without a fight and it will serve to prevent the Russians from thinking that Europe can be had without a war. All will see that—if there is the kind of fight that very modern weapons produce—there will not be much of military value in Western Europe to surrender or to capture. In military parlance, the power to deter, which is paramount, will have been reinforced by the power to deny.

Within this strategic conception many things that are otherwise confusing become intelligible. It makes intelligible the fact that General Eisenhower expresses so much confidence in the success of his mission, which is to prevent war, though in fact he will command a small army. It also makes intelligible the fact that he is not counting on a German army.

The whole business would be less bewildering to the American people—and to the Germans—if it could be admitted frankly that it reflects a radical change in the strategic and political plans which, from August to November, the administration talked so much about. It was then that they taught Mr. Hoover and the Republicans and the general public to think that Western Europe could not be saved without a very large ground army to which we would have to make a very large contribution in order to induce the Germans to make a still larger contribution. The whole discussion of rearmament by Germans in Germany has rested on this notion.

That is why Dr. Adenauer, who has realized what General Eisenhower's report signifies, is making it publicly known how deeply distressed he is. His political position inside Germany is indeed weakened by our change, let us say, of emphasis about the indispensability and urgency of German rearmament. But Dr. Adenauer is more disturbed than he needs to be if what he fears is that we would or that we could make a deal with Russia at the expense of Germany's chance to be again an independent nation. We do not betray nations in that fashion. But that the role of Germany in the Atlantic community is not now what it appeared, quite falsely, in September is certainly true.

That is a good thing for Germany, as it is for all of us. For if the proceeds of peace depend primarily on our power to deter, and then on our power to deny, they can be improved still more by eliminating from our activities, as General Eisenhower so manifestly wishes to do, the element of provocation. Nothing would be so provocative as the formation of a big German-American army capable of striking offensively on the ground to the Vistula and beyond.

Strikes Against the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, the Atlantic City (N. J.) Tribune published an editorial entitled "United States Antistrike Law Needed."

The thoughts that are expressed in this editorial are worthy of the careful attention of the membership.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress I introduced H. R. 525 which sought to have the Labor Committee investigate equitable means to prevent the interruption of work in any industry or establishment the continuous operation of which is necessary to life and health.

My resolution particularly limited itself to operations now defined as public utilities and to hospitals, and the processing and transportation of essential foods and fuel.

My resolution further particularly provided for full attention to special compensation, pension rights, and other forms of security to workers in such industries, on the theory that if such workers were to give up their normal and inherent right to strike, they were entitled to special protection in their rights as workers.

While the right to strike in the normal course of employment should not be subject to the slightest question, there is, indeed, a grave question as to the right to strike in those limited areas where the national defense efforts may be brought to a standstill, or where the health and even the lives of American people are endangered.

Having for many years advocated action in this special field, I was much interested in the editorial which now follows in part:

UNITED STATES ANTI STRIKE LAW NEEDED

Th state of paralysis and confusion experienced by most of the Nation during the past few days when transportation workers have either called a strike or reported "sick," should be ample reason for the President to request Congress to enact a public utility antistrike law.

A similar bill has been in force in this State for a few years, and has been moderately successful in keeping utility workers on their jobs while wage disputes and other working conditions are troned out during arbitration.

Strikes by utility workers are not merely against an employer to gain their demands, but involve untold hardship inflicted upon the innocent public, and cause dangers to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the United States and the security of their Government.

We have stringent regulations governing the operations of utility companies that protect the public from being at the mercy of even the most monopolistic utilities, but we cannot at present do anything to control utility workers who can, at the drop of a union leader's hat, tie up the Nation's railroad system. Millions of dollars are lost by firms that cannot conduct their business during strikes, and unemployment is forced upon thousands of other workers due to plants having to shut down.

* * * * *

We are all being asked to face sacrifices in these critical times, and it would seem that the same sacrifices are incumbent upon union workers as are expected from civilians who are joining our Armed Forces.

A Federal public utility antistrike law should be broad enough to include unions and workers upon whom the public is dependent for health and welfare. This would include the mine workers, munition workers, food processors, transportation workers, and those upon whose productivity the Nation is dependent for food, power, communications, medical supplies, and armament.

Address by Hon. Willis Smith, of North Carolina, at the Annual Convention of the North Carolina Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful address delivered by my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMITH] from North Carolina at the annual convention of the North Carolina Farm Bureau in Asheville, N. C., on February 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the farm bureau organization in North Carolina, I do not come to speak to you today with any definite feeling that I can tell you anything that you do not already know, or that I can offer accurate solutions for the difficult problems that you have already considered. But I will talk about some paramount problems of our Government. And I may go away feeling that I have in turn acquired from you impressions and understanding of how you feel about some of these questions that so sorely perplex us.

IDENTIFIED WITH YOUR ORGANIZATION

While I have not been active in your particular organization, nevertheless it has been my privilege to be rather closely identified for many years with some of your subsidiaries where legal services were required. I found those associations most pleasant, and at times profitable. I have been interested in learning from time to time more about the basic and fundamental policies and practices of your group and its affiliated organizations.

OUR NATION IN PERIL—A RELENTLESS FOE

Today our Nation is in peril. We find ourselves confronted by what appears to be a relentless foe, determined not merely upon securing for itself a temporary or even a lasting advantage in its own system of thought and life, but rather intent upon bringing all the world under the domination of its ideas, its policies, and its power. America stands between that philosophy and that power and the rest of the free world.

What shall we do with this power, and how shall we meet the challenge to our type of civilization and to our mode of life—this civilization, and this mode of living that has meant so much to our forebears, to us, and we trust to our posterity?

METHODS OF MEETING THE CHALLENGE

We can meet the challenge with reckless abandon and hysterical emotion, attempting to change suddenly our way of life, as some would feel necessary. In that process we may sink ourselves into the morass of additional problems that would be sure to arise and confuse us.

Or, we can meet this challenge calmly and serenely, insofar as that is possible, and determine upon a course of action that will be participated in patriotically by all of our citizens, with a will, a determination, and an inspiration that can assure us of victory. That will be the way of calm and sound judgment, confidence in our institutions, and a collective determination that we will not in time of war abandon those instrumentalities and safeguards in our Government that have made us the greatest Nation on earth. Let us not abandon our own basic freedoms.

I do not believe that any one man or any one small group knows how to have us meet the challenge unerringly, at first blush. Rather I believe that the opportunity and the necessity is for every group to cooperate, submerge their independent ideas, and attempt to reach a common understanding that will provide the ambition and the inspiration to a successful endeavor by all our people.

AT WAR—NOT A POLICE ACTION

We are at war—and make no mistake about that. We are in a serious war, and not merely a police action. We are in this war not by the usual and constitutional congressional declaration of war as has been one of the cardinal provisions of our Constitution since the foundation of the Republic. Rather we are in war because we assumed certain obligations under the Charter of the United Nations—whether wisely or unwisely we cannot for certainty know.

Out of that obligation and in accordance with the determination and dictation of the executive branch of the Government, thousands of American boys have been sent 7,000 miles away from home. The contest is with a foe, not because of any activity of that foe against the territory of the United States, but rather in pursuit of a moral idea that may have been extended a little too far. We call the force United Nations, but that is hardly more than just a name.

The result of this today is that thousands of American boys have lost their lives and lie in unmarked graves on Korean soil; that thousands upon thousands of other boys have lost their arms, their legs, their eyes, and the use of other functions of their bodies. All of these things have been done, we know, without any idea of self-aggrandizement, but because we believe in the ideals of self-government and democratic action among all peoples, and some at least imagine that such a course was necessary. Whether our rulers acted wisely will have to be one of the verdicts of history. Whether we have benefited or injured Korea will be answered only in the years ahead. We have at least assumed a tremendous responsibility in the destruction of not only lives but of human habitations, such as they were, in the land of Korea, where so many Christian missionaries over so long a time had endeavored to keep precepts of the Christian religion.

WAR: BY WISDOM OR BY BLUNDER

I realize, as you do, that regardless of how we got into this war, whether by wise design or by colossal blundering, we are in it now. American prestige and freedom must be preserved. Some contend that only an endless conflict of fighting and killing can "save our face." We have slain thousands, and maybe slaying hundreds of thousands more may add to our glory. Few know precisely how and why we went into Korea so alone—and they are not saying much about it. There are millions of Americans who do not believe that we should ever have gone into Korea. There are other millions who believe that even today we should retire from the field. There are these conflicts in reasoning and in emotion which are permeating the minds of millions of Americans. Regardless of the dissimilarity of these views, they are all entitled to be presented and to be heard without suppression.

DISCUSSION WITHOUT SUPPRESSION

It is well indeed that there has been discussion. Out of this situation and the realization of the relentless foe that we face in the world at large, there has arisen the question of what we shall do with respect to Europe—that section of the earth's globe which has been called so frequently the cradle of civilization, and where the achievements of human beings have been so great—save only for their failure to erect a barrier against the possibility of war.

AID IN DEFENSE OF EUROPE

War has indeed devastated Europe from time to time since the earliest dawn of history, and war is again hovering over its life. Shall we join with the Europeans in all-out defense of what we are pleased to term our American way of life and the freedoms of mankind of which we talk so much? I think that the average American citizen will feel that having joined the United Nations with the hope that it could eliminate war from the human program of life, we should assist in some reasonable measures in carrying forward the objectives of that organization, as long as it appears that it can hope to accomplish anything. At times amidst the bickering at Lake Success that hope becomes faint, and yet there is still some chance for effective cooperation of the civilized nations through that agency. My hope is somewhat dim for any real accomplishment, but yet I am willing to see America do its part to preserve what little chance may be left in that organization. But I said:

AMERICA'S PART—JOINT ENTERPRISE

I do believe that if we are to furnish support and sustenance for the United Nations, and if we are to have American boys die 7,000 miles from home for an idea or ideal, we should likewise expect from the other participants in that organization, who believe in democracy as we do, equal sacrifices of men and material, to the end that our efforts may indeed constitute a joint enterprise. I do not believe that we should rush hastily into the sending of millions of American boys to Europe, and certainly not until we have made sure that the Europeans are willing to do something substantial for themselves and in their own defense.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF CONGRESS AND EXECUTIVE

I know that it is claimed that the Executive and not Congress has the power to send American armies anywhere on earth, but to that theory I do not subscribe. Section VIII of Article I of our Constitution gives to the Congress the duty of providing for the common defense, the declaration of war, the raising and support of armies, the providing and maintenance of a navy, and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." And then in the eighteenth paragraph of that section VIII of Article I, Congress is given the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." Congress is given this power in the Constitution because Congressmen are the direct representatives of the people, with elections frequently—that is to say, every 2 years.

Nowhere in the Constitution is the Executive given the power to abrogate the terms of the Constitution above set forth. It would seem, therefore, that there should be no effort by any person in the executive department to ride roughshod over the powers of the Congress, or to challenge or defy its authority, as provided in the Constitution. I hope that we may be able to reach a common understanding of what is a proper interpretation of these powers of government. Let us maintain our constitutional processes. They are our hope for the success of democracy.

YOUR ORGANIZATION'S RIGHTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

Your organization is interested in the preservation of rights under our Constitution. I know you believe in the principles of democracy, and I also know that you are opposed to dictatorship in any form, whether by one group in Government or by another. You and your policymakers look askance, as I do, at every unnecessary proposed innovation in our Government—at every restriction upon the rights of citizens—at every effort to impose unnecessary controls on the people.

Reforms we do wish, but not at the cost of democratic freedom. It was with this in mind that the founding fathers of our Government placed restrictions upon the representatives of the Government. They knew that in the history of the world nations had risen to heights of glory and then declined because governments had reached too far into the control of everyday lives of citizens. Such abuses have generally been by the executive branch of the Government. Let us therefore be on guard to protect those rights and liberties which we have treasured for so long.

CONTROLS ONLY WHERE CLEARLY NECESSARY

I appreciate fully that your organizations are opposed to all controls that are not absolutely necessary, in order to protect our national independence, and in that I can join you. I believe that one of the best expositions of this principle that I have seen anywhere is the address of Mr. Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the American Farm Bureau Federation, made at the annual meeting of the National Cotton Council in Biloxi, Miss., on January 22, 1951. Many of you have doubtless read it, but those who have not should do so for the fine understanding which it will most assuredly give of the dangerous subject of controls. Some of them we may have to have, but I believe Mr. Fleming's interpretation of the dangers thereof is indeed pertinent.

FARM BUREAU INDEPENDENCE—BRANNAN PLAN

Your organization has shown independence and courage, as witness its magnificent fight against the so-called Brannan plan, which apparently was conceived for the purpose and with the intent of seducing the unthinking voters of America. But the members of your organization were not deceived, and you saw it for what it was, a political expedient based upon unsound economic reasoning. I was glad to have a small part in the condemnation of that scheme which you so quickly recognized as an enslaving possibility for the American farmer. Let me commend you for the wisdom which your organization showed.

MEAT RATIONING AND MY HOGS

I do not have the time to talk to you about price controls and rationing as I would like to, but I must tell you about my own experience in the rationing of meat in the last war. I had a farmer client living about 25 miles from my city, who said that if I would buy two pigs and furnish the feed he would raise them for me so that my family and the members of my law firm and their families would not have to go to the open market and compete for available meat. I thought I was doing a patriotic thing, so I wrote him a check for the cost of the two pigs and for sufficient feed to carry those pigs to their maturity.

When the fall of the year rolled around, I spoke in great glee to some friends about my meat supply. And then one of them inquired, with a twinkle in his eye and a smile upon his face, as to whether or not the hogs had yet been killed, cured, and were in my possession. I replied in the negative, but said that process we expected to enter upon very shortly. Then to my surprise I was told that the law was against me; that I could not kill those pigs without permission from Government representatives, and that in order to keep the meat I would have to have sufficient red ration points, which of course I did not have.

Then, the fun began. I asked for permission to kill the pigs and was told that I could not do so in the absence of sufficient red points. I then asked if I could not kill them upon the basis that they were mine, that I had raised them and fed them. I was asked the question, how often had I seen them, and was told that if I hadn't visited them at least once every 2 weeks I had no authority to kill them and to take the meat. I replied that I had not been able to visit the pigs every 2 weeks because there was such a thing as gasoline rationing in effect, and I had not been able to get enough gasoline to visit my pigs regularly. The answer was again, "No," I could not do that which I thought I was entitled to do. I then asked what should I do with the hogs. Nobody in the rationing department could give me any advice. Then suddenly someone called to my attention that there was a law or a regulation that after a hog had reached the weight of 200 pounds no more feed could be purchased for him. There I was, with two hogs, reaching the weight of 200 pounds, and I unable to purchase further feed to keep them alive. I inquired at length as to what I should do, but until this good hour I have never received a satisfactory answer. And, then, one day nature settled the whole problem. Cholera got into a neighboring herd, was transmitted to the farm of my friend, and before very long he came to advise me that my two hogs were dead—dead of cholera, because I had not been able to give them a respectable death months before—dead, if you please, and four or five hundred pounds of meat lost to human beings with whom I would have shared that meat. So, you can understand that I have some misgivings about rationing and control systems.

CONFIDENCE IN YOUR ORGANIZATION

Let me assure you that it will be my desire to work with your organization to the end that we may produce for that great and substantial mass of our citizens, the farmers, the soundest economy that can be constructed. There is, of course, the possibility that we could not always agree upon everything, but, in reading the resolutions as adopted at your national convention, I see little with which I would differ. I hope, therefore, that I may be of some benefit in carrying out a sane, sound, and satisfactory program for the farmers of North Carolina, and of America as well.

The interests of every group will have to be considered, and I shall not fail to give heed to what I consider to be sound economic doctrine from whatever source it may come. We must maintain a high and profitable wage scale, in line with the purchasing power of the dollar, because only by the economic stability of the great mass of our citizens can the industries and the farmers of America hope to permanently profit. I know that you would not desire that the wage earners of America be subordinated to your interests, but rather that they be made successful and financially independent to the end that they in turn could create the great demand for the products of farm and forest.

DISLOYALTY IN GOVERNMENTAL DEPARTMENTS

One other matter about which you have seen much in the papers that I wish to mention—disloyalty in governmental departments. Apparently there has been some—how much we do not know. As a member of the new subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I hope that we may conduct an efficient, exhaustive, but withal a fair investigation. We wish to smear no one. We wish to protect no one. I saw firsthand in Czechoslovakia in 1947 Communists in government disguised as Christian Social Democrats, or some such high-sounding name. The No. 2 Communist there so disguised sat next to me at a luncheon given by President Benes. He was under suspicion then by Mr. Benes and the late Jan Masaryk and Lawrence Steinhardt. He proved to be what they suspected but what the people generally did not believe. He arose to take his Communist spot when the time arrived. If there are such in our midst, they should be exposed. They should not be coddled nor their activities condoned. The dangers from such in our State are not many, as generally we know one another, but nevertheless, we should be constantly on guard against encouraging or harboring any such enemies of our society.

May I thank you one and all for your attention.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Lincoln Day dinner address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] before the Middlesex Club in Boston, Mass., on February 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In any meeting of Republicans celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, it is supremely important to remember that Lincoln achieved greatness, and through him the Republican Party came to power by facing courageously and frankly the great social, political, and economic problems of that critical period.

Lincoln came from the common people. He always kept himself in sympathetic contact with the common people, with their hopes, with their aspirations, and with their problems. Lincoln was sensitive to public opinion. And he understood public opinion because he was sensitive to it. So long as the Republican Party has kept to the course charted by Lincoln, we have enjoyed the confidence and support of the people. Only when we have veered from the paths that led to our greatness have we lost public confidence and thereby the support of the people in the election of our candidates to the highest office within the gift of the people.

After a series of defeats such as we have suffered in the past four national elections for the Presidency, there are those who have been willing to spend their energies berating what happened, without giving effort either to formulate a new course of action or to prepare for future success.

At the outset, may I say that I feel it is a tremendous mistake to attempt to channel the thinking of all groups of the party within the confines of the thinking of certain segments in the party. In my Republicanism it is not heresy if what one believes does not happen to coincide with what prominent leaders of the party may believe on certain issues or problems; provided there is substantial agreement on final objectives.

Disagreement within the party should not be interpreted as a sign of party weakness. Strong disagreement on policy, actually reflecting sincere conviction rather than an endeavor to gain political advantage, is a mark of strength, not weakness. The fact is that disagreement within the party, based upon conviction, is one sure way that the party will grow strong enough again to gain control of the National Government. Conflict of opinion certainly develops strength just as surely as it discloses weaknesses necessary to be corrected. As in college athletics, a strong scrub team always makes a better varsity.

The important thing is for the party as a whole to possess the wisdom to make the right choice between the different ideas expressed by various leaders within the party. Certainly if the party leaders do not make these choices correctly the people certainly will, if given a free chance both on issues and on candidates.

Instead of becoming steamed up on possible candidates for the Presidency for 1952, instead of factional fights to secure and hold delegates to the national convention, instead of wasting energy on the petty distinctions of the band wagon, let us spend our energy and our initiative as a party in developing a clean line of party philosophy. Let us decide where we are going and how we expect to get there. Then, as in Lincoln's time, those who give character to a true philosophy and to a true course of action, and those who prove best able to furnish the strategy and tactics to make that course effective will furnish the vital natural leadership that neither propaganda nor political manipulation nor organized publicity will ever successfully produce.

The time has come for the Republican Party to make some important decisions. But in making those decisions, there are some mighty important distinctions to be observed. Unless we start with a clear knowledge of those distinctions, we will not get as far as we should and certainly not so far as we will go if we are willing to make them.

As a party we must be positive and affirmative; not merely negative and critical. When we are opposed we should be opposed because we have a definite constructive alternative policy of our own. We need to have both a clear understanding and a clear definition of our attitude with respect to foreign policy, both in Europe and in the Far East. We need a clean-cut policy on military preparations and all the important phases of those preparations. We need a definite and constructive policy on taxes, on domestic spending, on the use of atomic weapons, and a definite decision on party attitude with respect to how and when and under what circumstances American troops are to be used.

If this means that we have to have some rough scrapping within the party, let's have it now. The sooner it's over, the better. The country will be for it and the right thinking people will be for us if we are right in our decisions.

No endeavor to gain party advantage by appeal to emotions ought to be tolerated in reaching these decisions. These are decisions of such supreme importance that they ought to be decided on the merits without respect to any other consideration whatsoever except what is right and best in the circumstances. Let the great debate go on, but above all else let great decisions be arrived at, because what we need in this critical period is action, and our party must be a party of decision and action.

It is true that this is a time when it is necessary for those in responsible positions in government to use "no" as a frequent word in their vocabulary. The demands upon government are so great, and from such various sources, that unless responsible officials can get around to saying "no" when "no" is necessary, we will bankrupt government at every level. But while it is imperatively necessary to realize that there are a tremendous number of "no's" to be said, there are also certain essential places where it will be equally fatal if we don't say "yes" when "yes" is the proper answer to the problem.

We need to say a clear and unmistakable "no"—so unmistakable that everybody in this country knows what we mean—to every item in the Federal budget where the administration and the social planners have packed fat in that budget, when all we can afford right now is lean meat. We need to say this, and we must say it, no matter whether it affects a Democratic district or a Republican district. We must say "no" to the waste of money in any form.

And above all, we must remember that we can't do logrolling and back scratching as Republicans on favorite items of our own and expect to achieve what we will demand, namely a budget free of everything except the most vital necessities of this enormously critical period.

The men and women who built this country were not negative. They were positive and aggressive and bold. They were imaginative and hopeful. They went about their tasks with the determination to make them turn in the direction they wanted them to turn.

The Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock to found the Massachusetts Bay colony and to create a New England in America; those who went through the terrible hardships and deprivation to found Virginia; those who crossed the Alleghenies and won Fort Duquesne and the Ohio; those who settled the Carolinas and Georgia and spread southward through the Gulf States and westward through Tennessee and Kentucky; those who crossed the plains and followed the Oregon Trail to the Pacific; and the Santa Fe Trail to the Southwest; all these were men and women who took every necessary risk for the future. They did not balance nicely the chance they took in comparing those risks with the objective they sought; they strove with courage, with hope, with imagination, and also with sacrifice and thrifty living, to do what they were determined to do in order to secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity.

We in our day are of the same faiths and the same hopes as were they. To be leaders as they were we must exhibit the same affirmative qualities and the same boldness of action with respect to the objectives we now seek as they did in their day and generation in building this country. Above all else we must hold high the torch of hope and freedom at a time when it has gone out in so many other places in the world.

Someone said of Cromwell that hope shone in him like a pillar of fire when it had gone out in other men. And that same hope must shine like a pillar of fire in us at a time when the deep shadow of communism is falling more darkly over large portions of today's world.

These are days of great challenge—days that try men's souls as our fathers' souls were tried in the great days of the Revolution. This is a time when everything we believe in, everything that has made us what we are is challenged by the evil force of a new tide of barbarism in the world.

Surely if we are to successfully stand against this onslaught against our civilization, we must adhere to our ideals as a people. We must join with those in other lands of like ideals, of like laws, of like manners, of like ethics, and of like religious beliefs in a power in the universe greater than ourselves. We must realize in this day of challenge and change that if those of us with common ideals do not stick together, we will probably fail together.

I am confident as you are that we will be equal to the ordeal that confronts us. These are great days. They are days of trial and sacrifice. But they are days of opportunity and responsibility and of nobility of action that come to few generations of men.

Here in the renowned Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in the great city of Boston, in the critical days that led to the Revolution, Paul Revere had a conviction of the coming danger and by a midnight ride became the symbol of alertness and preparedness that preceded the conflict on the morrow when the embattled farmers at Concord fired the shot heard round the world.

We are in need of Paul Reveres today to arouse the people in the free world to their danger and to awaken them as he did in those glorious days in the past to the privilege of sacrifice for those things more wonderful than life itself.

In Pennsylvania last month before the end of my term as governor, a ceremony was arranged in which a replica of the Liberty Bell was to be presented to the people of Pennsylvania. Before attending the ceremony I imagined that it was to be a small reproduction, merely a miniature token of that bell that means so much to everyone who loves liberty. But when I attended the ceremonies I observed the great size of the bell; then I realized it was an identical size with the bell of the revolution. I learned that the original bell had been reproduced exactly in all its dimensions even to the size of the clapper; that a chemical analysis had been made of the metal in the original bell; that even the wood on which the reproduced bell hung was procured from the same oak forests in the mountains of Switzerland as the original bell. Thus the replica given our people conformed in every particular with the original bell except that the replica was not broken as the old bell was when it cracked more than 100 years ago while being tolled for the death of Chief Justice Marshall. A cracked bell loses tone and resonance and is a mere dead, hollow imitation. It no longer is live and full of vibration and of resonance and soul.

Thus those of us who heard the tolling of this complete replica of the Liberty Bell heard a sound that had not been heard ever before by any of us or those of our citizenry for many generations. We heard for the first time the true sound and tone and voice of the Liberty Bell of the Revolution.

That stirred in every one of us, as it will stir in the heart of every one of us who hears it, a new call to duty of authentic tone, the tone that requires the best of everything that we have and everything that we are.

It is only by the ringing out of that bell in all the States and by the appeal that it can make and by our response to that appeal that we of this day and generation are to be equal to the responsibilities of the cause that confronts us and to be worthy to be numbered with the great men and women of the Revolution, who in their day and generation responded to the call of that bell, as we in our day must do likewise if we are to transmit to those who come after us those blessings of liberty which our fathers who heard the original bell had transmitted to us and which makes America the best of all the places in the whole world.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] recently addressed a group in Portland, Maine, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Lincoln Club of Portland. What he said to that group, I think, merits the attention and consideration of every Member of this body. I, therefore, invite the attention of my colleagues to this excellent address and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sincerely grateful for the privilege of addressing this meeting of true Americans and loyal Republicans in the grand old State of Maine.

We are assembled to honor the memory of the greatest of all Republicans—a plain man of the people who rose from the depths of poverty and hardship to a commanding place among the world's immortals.

In celebrating the one hundred and forty-second birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln we recall the vast contribution of his faith, tolerance, good will, and courage to the preservation of the Union.

We pay tribute to his greatness as a foremost champion of freedom and human rights.

We praise him as a stanch exponent of the American way of life which we are now fighting to preserve.

And we remember with deep gratitude his service to the Nation as one of the founders of the Republican Party and as a stalwart advocate of Republican principles which guided our Nation during three generations of its greatest progress.

I am happy to be here tonight because of the bonds which join your State of Maine with my State of Pennsylvania in historic association.

I am proud that West Brownsville, in my home county of Washington, Pa., was the birthplace of your distinguished statesman, James G. Blaine.

It was in Washington County that the future Speaker of the House, United States Senator, Secretary of State, and Republican nominee for President spent his boyhood and received his education.

In Pennsylvania also we are proud of the valiant service of the men of Maine on the battlefield of Gettysburg. Enshrined in honored memory are the names of Gen. Joshua L. Chamberlain, a hero of Little Round Top, and Gen. Oliver Otis Howard, who held Cemetery Hill in the center of the Union line.

Another link between Maine and Pennsylvania was established a few years ago when we gained the services of your distinguished former Governor, Horace A. Hildreth, as president of Bucknell College. We hope to keep Governor Hildreth and to convert him into a real Pennsylvanian, but I'm afraid he retains strong and enduring ties with the State of Maine.

I welcome this opportunity to express my high regard and warm admiration for your distinguished United States Senators, OWEN BRUWSTER and Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH. They serve your State and the Nation with patriotism, courage, and outstanding ability.

Senator BRUWSTER is recognized as one of the outstanding leaders of the Senate. He is a great American and a great Republican. The substantial Republican gains in the Eighty-second Congress were, to a large extent, due to the hard work of Senator BRUWSTER as chairman of the senatorial campaign committee.

Mrs. SMITH'S sturdy independence, her tireless energy, and her high sense of public duty reflect her deep understanding of real Americanism.

In these days of critical and momentous decisions it is appropriate to consider American policies. It is fitting to hold such discussions in a Republican meeting.

In Lincoln's time the Nation was torn asunder by a great internal upheaval. The preservation of the Union was the sacred cause to which Lincoln dedicated all of his loyalty, his patriotism, and his passionate love of the United States.

He succeeded in saving the Republic because he rallied all the Union strength to his side by the power of his faith in the people.

Through the dark days of defeat, disappointment, and discouragement he held firmly to faith in himself, faith in the righteousness of the Union cause, and faith in God.

Today we face a crisis just as grave and just as challenging as in Lincoln's time. The basic issue confronting us is the preservation of freedom in the United States and in the world.

We face a well-organized, well-prepared, and well-disciplined enemy who knows no truth, no honor, no justice, and no God. His weapons are lies, deceit, treachery, and force.

Since the end of World War II the Communist dictators of Soviet Russia have gained control of one-third of the world. They have placed 700,000,000 people in Europe and Asia under the iron rule of terror and tyranny. They have prepared the plans and have stockpiled the weapons for world conquest and the enslavement of all free people who dare resist their fiendish purpose.

That, my fellow Americans, is the grim picture of a world in which the future civilization hangs in the balance. It is a world tottering on the brink of a third world war, more terrible, more destructive of human values, than any conflict in recorded history.

The time has come when the American people must know the plain truth. We the people are the American Government—not the President, not the State Department, not the Congress, not the courts—but we the people.

Our objectives, our foreign policy, and the commitments into which we have entered must be set forth in the language the people can understand.

Within the limits of security they have a right to know the obligations we have undertaken in secret agreements. We know that much of the trouble we face today is the result of secret agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

It is not my purpose tonight to review the terrible mistakes, the glaring blunders, and the confused bungling of the past. But it is pathetic to look back only 5 years and to realize that in that short period we have dissipated and squandered so much of the strength that made us the most powerful Nation of all time.

In five short years we bartered away the victory won at great cost in precious lives and treasure. We have crushed the hopes and aspirations of millions of freedom-loving people in many nations who looked to us for moral leadership and the betterment of the human race.

And when the Communist forces of aggression launched their brutal invasion of South Korea we were totally unprepared, even though nearly $50,000,000,000 had been appropriated to prepare for such an emergency.

In recent weeks I visited a number of camps where our boys of the Armed Forces are training for whatever duty may lie ahead. Everywhere I went I heard the same questions:

What is our defense plan?

What is our objective?

Why are we fighting in Korea?

Are we fighting the Koreans, the Chinese, or the Russians?

Why isn't General MacArthur allowed to bomb the Communist supply bases, communication lines, and reserve positions?

Why don't we let the hundreds of thousands of trained Chinese Nationalist soldiers fight the Chinese Reds?

Should America send ground forces to Europe?

The soldiers and the American people are demanding the answers to these questions.

It's high time for those who have been operating in secret to take the people into their confidence. And it's high time for Mr. Truman and his State Department to take the Congress of the United States into their confidence.

I can tell you that the Members of Congress have been just as much in the dark about the defense policies and the foreign policies of our country as the average citizen.

How can we arrive at the right decisions when the true facts are withheld and concealed? How can Congress have a real bipartisan policy under such conditions?

Abraham Lincoln trusted the people of the United States. One of his outstanding characteristics was his undeviating faith in the capacity of free men to govern themselves.

He realized that they might be led astray for a time by false hopes and deceptive promises. But he was firm in his belief that the good judgment of the American people and their love of freedom would lead them, in the end, to the right decisions.

Government that does not trust the people is not representative government.

Government that is not responsive to the people will degenerate into dictatorship.

The American people are aroused. They are fully aware of the dangers forced upon us by Communist aggression. They are prepared to make every sacrifice demanded for the defense of the American way of life. They are ready to fight to the death to preserve their rich heritage of liberty and independence.

All they ask is leadership. In this hour of peril they want leadership in which they can place their full trust and confidence.

They look in vain to Washington for leadership that will rise above deception, double-talk, and the shifty trickery of the machine politician.

With nearly 50,000 casualties in the frozen mountains of Korea, the cry is for leadership that will prevent further bloodshed and needless loss of life in new and worse political blunders.

We do not have that kind of leadership in the White House.

We do not have that kind of leadership in the State Department.

That, fellow Americans, is one of the reasons why our people are worried, confused, and perplexed.

In my opinion, there is another reason that strikes at the fundamentals of American moral strength. Eighteen years of New Deal and Fair Deal philosophy has misguided many of our citizens into believing that they must look to the bureaucrats at Washington to solve all their problems. They have been taught to believe that the great white father in Washington would assume all their responsibilities. The false promise of something for nothing has led so many to forget that initiative, industry, self-reliance, and thrift are the only sound foundation for individual progress and national security.

Today they are bewildered and dismayed. They have learned at great cost that those who offered the doubtful blessings of a planned and controlled economy lack the leadership so badly needed in these days of crisis.

Universal military training will help drive out this false philosophy.

Just a month ago President Truman, in his state of the Union message, raised the hopes of Congress and the American people when he said, and I quote:

"The Government must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

Yet a week later he submitted a budget for the 1952 fiscal year calling for the highest nondefense expenditures in our Nation's history.

Instead of cutting spending not related to national defense, he proposed nonmilitary expenditures estimated at over $30,000,000,000. That unbelievable sum represents an

increase of more than $6,000,000,000 over this year's figure.

In that amazing budget message President Truman made it clear that his administration has no intention whatsoever of practicing "rigid economy in its nondefense activities."

He left no doubt that if his recommendations are adopted nothing that the Fair Dealers normally demand will be curtailed or postponed.

My good Jeffersonian Democratic friend, the able and distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD, had this to say about Mr. Truman's budget, and I quote:

"In my experience of 18 years, considering the perils that confront our country, this message represents the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

With all the sincerity at my command I submit that this is no time for fiscal or any other kind of irresponsibility on the part of those at the head of our Government.

Even greater and more shocking disregard for the critical times in which we live was manifested when Mr. Truman loaded into his budget all the excess baggage of his socialistic proposals.

Rejected and discredited by one Congress after another, these fantastic spending programs are again pushed forward, not as part of a so-called social-welfare program, but in the guise of measures essential to national defense.

Included are the Brannan plan, to regiment agriculture at a cost of billions of dollars to the taxpayers, the vicious scheme to socialize the practice of medicine, the dangerous proposal to place education under Federal regulation, and other socialistic schemes.

Are these consistent with the President's pledge to practice rigid economy in nondefense activities of the Government?

Are they in line with the sacrifices which our citizens will have to make in their daily lives?

Are they justified in view of the tremendous burden of new taxation which must be imposed upon every man and woman?

The American people are ready and willing to accept the vast burden growing out of the defense program. But they must have unmistakable assurance that the additional taxes will not be squandered by continued wasteful extravagance.

First and foremost in the hearts and minds of the American people is the security of our Republic.

In my opinion we can be spared the tragedies of another world war.

There are certain steps we must take.

We must know the friends we can depend upon.

We must have a navy and an air force so strong that we will have absolute supremacy on the sea and in the air.

We must have the best-trained, best-equipped, and most mobile ground force so that it can be speedily sent to any part of the world. This does not mean a large and expensive professional army.

The manpower for defense must be made ready through universal military training. There must be no exemptions.

We must not send any man into combat service without at least 1 year of intensive training.

Before we send our soldiers to Europe or anywhere else we must have a carefully thought-out plan that the people can understand and will approve.

Three-fourths of the strength of an American army is morale. You cannot have that morale unless our people give wholehearted support to attaining our objectives.

In advocating universal military training I am guided by the principle laid down by Gen. George Washington, who said, "Every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal service to the defense of it."

The defense plan of Washington placed reliance upon the citizen soldier. Washington was right. The citizen soldier has won our battles. He has kept us a stable, powerful, and progressive nation because he believes in the American way of life.

Wars are not won by people who put politics first, or business first, or profits or special advantages first. Not for many years will we return to the easy peacetime ways.

Babies born today may reach selective-service age before the Communist drive to conquer the world is defeated.

We must keep in mind that military preparation is only one phase of our defense effort.

Stalin's greatest fear is not the number of divisions we have in the field. He will fear our potential military strength if we have universal military training. He would then know the number of well-trained Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserve divisions that we can throw into battle. He will know that the number will increase each year.

Stalin will also fear a financially strong America.

To achieve that end we must work for a balanced budget.

We must meet the costs of defense as far as humanly possible out of current revenues.

We must have a stable currency and maintain the purchasing power of the dollar by defeating inflation.

We must have sound fiscal policies, not only in the Federal Government but also at the State and local levels.

Stalin will also fear a powerful industrial America, producing an endless stream of planes, ships, tanks, arms and munitions.

Stalin will also fear a rearmed moral and spiritual America—an America that believes and practices the American way of life—tolerance, good will, and love of God.

In reflecting upon the greatness of Abraham Lincoln we are reminded of his deep religious convictions, his humility, and his sound common sense.

In an address at Springfield, Ill., he set forth a lesson in right living which gives new patriotic inspiration with every reading.

I quote from Lincoln's speech as follows:

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate, in the least particular, the laws of the country, and never to tolerate their violation by others. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap, let it be taught in the schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice."

We can strengthen our country if we all resolve to live by Lincoln's precepts.

We can strengthen our country if we turn again to God for guidance.

In the struggle that will determine the course of civilization we need the revitalizing spark of a great spiritual and moral awakening to rekindle the flame of righteousness and freedom in the dark days ahead.

We are committed to a task of unprecedented magnitude.

The greatest honor we can pay Lincoln is to plan to preserve the Nation he so nobly served and in the words of the great emancipator:

"With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

America's Opportunity for Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject America's Opportunity for Leadership, delivered by me before the American Business Association, at the Hotel Statler, in this city, on February 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY FOR LEADERSHIP

As we read history, we see that leadership has come to various nations through the centuries. It is our hour now, and the question is whether we will be adequate. This leadership that we are called to requires that we spearhead the defense of the great human freedoms. This Nation has physically been unharmed in the last two World Wars. She has sacrificed much of her wealth and her blood, but the dynamic free-enterprise system, her great political values, and the vitality of 151,000,000 people are all intact.

As there has been no formal treaty of peace with Germany and Japan and no declaration of the Congress, we are still at war with these nations. We are at war in Korea with Communist China, who is backed up by the Kremlin, and all over the world our armed forces from land, air, and sea, are poised for action, if Russia begins anything.

Leadership today calls for offensive peace. That offensive calls for the highest type of statesmanship and generalship to open the eyes of the Kremlin so that it will see the utter futility of pursuing its course in attempting to take over the earth. Leadership calls also for building adequate air, land, and sea forces to be ready for any emergency. It is impossible for us to crawl into our shell and think that by so doing we can serve our own best interests and provide the leadership that the world is hungering for. We dare not allow a vacuum to be created throughout the world for Russia to take over, and we dare no longer permit Joseph Stalin to carry on his policy of divide and conquer, which would divide us from our Atlantic Pact allies and permit him to gobble up these nations, one by one. In our offensive for peace and for adequate defense, there is no place for retreat.

THE GREAT DEBATE IN CONGRESS

You have read a lot about the great debate in Congress. Right now, we are holding hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee on the Wherry resolution.

Everyone agrees it is necessary to build a defense that is adequate. The simple issue is, Should the President, should the Congress, or should the two of them knock their heads together and try to agree on what percentage of our land forces should be available to send to Europe under the Atlantic Pact?

At present it appears that any peace offensive that has been launched has been ineffective. The Kremlin continues its international criminal activities. If another war should start, Europe would be the prize. The judgment of our military is that while we could knock out Russia's industrial potential, because she has stockpiled so much war material, unless she could be stopped in

Europe, she could take over Europe. Therefore, it appears that America should be prepared to send such further military contingents, air, sea, and land, to Europe as will accord with the recommendations made by our highest military chieftains. Of course, our land forces should go, when and if determined, only in an amount proportionate to Western Europe's own contribution.

We feel that under the circumstances that exist that Congress and the Executive should cooperate as partners, each fulfilling its responsibility—Congress in control of appropriations and the President spearheading the policy. Congress should not become a "rubber stamp" of the President; but neither should it attempt to take over constitutional executive functions. Our aid abroad has for its purpose to build up the morale and bring about the improvements of the military potential of our western allies.

ANOTHER TYPE OF LEADERSHIP

Some time ago I recommended that there be created a Board of Counter-Revolutionary Strategy along the lines of the work of the Office of Strategic Services during World War II. You and I know that in all the satellite countries, in the Ukraine and elsewhere, the serfs and the slaves under the iron hand of the Kremlin are not happy. We know that here is an opportunity to stir up the flames of revolt and dissension in Josef Stalin's own camp. Silver bullets—which means dollars—spent in this direction, by utilizing the right kind of propaganda and by penetrating behind the iron curtain, would get results and save a great deal of money and lives. We read in the paper that already some of Josef Stalin's front in Italy and elsewhere is cracking up. Let's add fuel to that situation. Let's exemplify that leadership that is so necessary so that a real shooting war will not result.

AMERICA SHOULD DECENTRALIZE

While we are putting on an offensive for peace and while we are getting ready for an emergency, let us remember that there is another step that should be taken. I have been arguing about this for years. The time is overdue for the Government to decentralize its agencies and spread them out among the small communities of this land. We need basically three types of action:

(a) Decentralization of Government.
(b) Decentralization of population.
(c) Decentralization of industry.

If you merely disperse an agency from Washington to some other huge, crowded city, that merely amounts to moving the agency from one target center to another. You know that there is at present in contemplation the idea of spending a hundred and fifty million dollars to disperse agencies within 20 miles or so of Washington, D. C. That, to me, is ridiculous. These agencies should be spread out to the "grass roots." A bomber might well miss the heart of the target and get the agency 20 miles away. The whole plan is indicative of an utter lack of what the world situation means.

ECONOMIC LEADERSHIP

We are called upon as leaders to demonstrate not only to the world but to ourselves that, economically speaking, we have the vision that will save the Republic. This calls for—

(a) Paying for our offensive for peace and our rearmament as we go. We have a national income approximating $250,000,000,000. If you are going to save the goose that lays the golden egg (I mean America's economic and political system), you've got to "tax until it hurts" but not "until it kills."

(b) We've got to get a system of procurement into the military (Army, Air, and Navy) that will return a dollar's worth of value for every taxpayer's dollar expended.

(c) We've got to get the criminals, Commies, the chiselers, and the grafters behind the bars.

(d) The best brains in America must be gotten into the positions of trust and execution.

A hundred and fifty-four million of us Americans have to be thinking a little differently than we have before. We've got to realize that this is our job. Like Lincoln, we will have to get on our knees and pray that we may be adequate to fulfill the job before us.

Lincoln, the Man of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for many years Vermont was represented in the House of Representatives by the Honorable Charles A. Plumley. Recently, at the Pavilion, in Montpelier, Vt., at a dinner given by the Women's Republican Club of Washington County, he delivered an address entitled "Lincoln, the Man of the People." I think this address is well worth printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have that done.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, on my way to the Capitol one morning last December, I stopped once more to look at that classic memorial, where sits the marble statue of Abraham Lincoln, the man who needs no monument, the recurring anniversary of whose birth we honor ourselves today by observing.

Rugged, honest, steadfast—his perseverance, his unwavering loyalty to the fundamentals of American government, his genuine respect for the Constitution, his grave concern for the destiny of the Republic that he saved, ended only with his untimely death.

Strong without symmetry, humorous without levity, religious without cant, tender, merciful, forgiving, a profound believer in divine love, an earnest worker for human brotherhood—Abraham Lincoln was perhaps the best contribution which America has made to history. His origin among humble laborers, his native judgment, better than the wisdom of the schools, his perfect integrity, his very ruggedness and angularities, made him a fit representative of the young Nation which loved and honored him.

So many people have so well said those things which all of us would be proud to put in words that little remains to be said or can be said which has not already been spoken. One poet has said:

"Some opulent force of genius, soul, and race,
Some deep life current from far centuries,
Flowed to his mind and lighted his sad eyes,
And gave his name, among great names, high place."

No monarch ever had greater power than he; none ever employed it so tenderly, so benevolently, so graciously. No power of pardon, except that of Providence, was ever exercised so mercifully, so benignly. No other human being dried so many tears, stopped so many heartaches, revived so many hopes.

In the words of Edwin Markham in his poem, Lincoln, the Man of the People:

"Up from the log cabin to the Capitol,
One fire was on his spirit, one resolve—
To send the keen axe to the root of wrong,
Clearing a free way for the feet of God.
The eyes of conscience testing every stroke,
To make his deed the measure of a man.
He built the rail-pile as he built the State,
Pouring his spendid strength through every blow;
The grip that swung the axe in Illinois
Was on the pen that set a people free."

Though Lincoln is dead, wet today and for all time, and to eternity, he stands upon the earth—

"As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm."

"With malice toward none; with charity for all, following the right as God (gave him) to see the right," there he stands, like the Christ of the Andes, at the top of man's world.

A redeemed and reunited Republic is his monument.

Today, as in his time, the United States of America faces a crisis—only greater because we have no right to lose what those who sacrificed and died for it made possible for us. A momentous peril portends, involving the destiny of civilization and destruction of all that we hold dear and that Lincoln saved for us, a catastrophe of such magnitude threatens such as the world has never experienced, growing out of the maddened strife across the sea.

Trapped between two hostile oceans, the flooding problems of the world have already submerged those problems of our own on the correct solution of which our own perpetuity depends and is predicated, and in high tide the destructive isms undertake to sweep on to destroy the peace, order, and security of the world.

We stand today, a solid wall so destined against the further encroachment and seeping in of these atheistic and medieval doctrines of the Old World, as the last haven for free men. As Jefferson wrote with respect to his day and time, so today:

"Sole depositaries of the remains of human liberty, our duty to ourselves, to posterity, and to mankind, calls on us by every motive which is sacred or honorable, to watch over the safety of our beloved country during the troubles which agitate and convulse the residue of the world."

It is an unsatisfactory and empty philosophy which suggests that the way to bring peace and order and security and abundance to the world is for us to undertake to settle the problems of the world, alone and first.

Was it not this man Lincoln, looking far ahead and beyond his day, who said, "At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer," said Abraham Lincoln, "if it ever reaches us it must spring up amongst us, it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide."

So far as the future is concerned, I wonder if there will be a future for my grandchildren, or if they will ever enjoy the privileges and opportunities which have been accorded me and you, if such a standard of living as we have enjoyed shall be maintained, or is it worth the price? So I wonder, and have wondered, and one night, believe it or not,

I wrote what I call a poem. I called it "I Wonder," and this is what I said:

"As once I wandered at eventide alone
In rain-drenched garden paths through flowers and weeds,
I wondered if any day and sun would ever follow to atone
For all the wind and dark had done; to which no heed in world at large
Is paid for by those who idly pass to waste both lives and time and money never earned,
Lightly burdened by thought or care of whence these came or what a burden some must bear
To save us from the catastrophic flair.
For reckless, wicked waste of things they claim do make men great.

"Still stand I wondering what will be their fate—
The fate of those who measure not nor calculate
The depth to which by ill-considered recklessness with lives of other people's sons, and dollars, not their own,
They have condemned those generations yet unborn
To travail such as other age has never known."

The unvarnished truth is that as we solve or fail to solve our own domestic, economic, social, and internal problems, so in the last analysis shall we and the western democracies stand or fall. We alone are responsible for our own welfare and the stability of our cherished form of government. Our own domestic problem should be our greatest concern. Yet, as Wordsworth said:

"We must be free or die, who speak the tongue
Which Shakespeare spoke;
The faith and morals hold which Milton held."

Let me tell you that in this crisis our responsibility is as great only, and just so great as is our opportunity. We must not sacrifice our democracy in an effort, emotionally superinduced, to help maintain a democratic ideology world wide. What we shall do must be the result of our calm, cool, courageous consideration of all the angles that the situation, forced upon us, now presents.

The question that confronts the American people today is: Which road, if we take it, will lead us away from rather than toward our possible destruction and involvement in the age-old controversies now seething and boiling anew

Which is the way out for America and the world? Quo vadis?

So we look again tonight to Lincoln, uncommon commoner, great emancipator, saviour of a Nation, and say reverently as does Hermann Hagerdorn in his poem, Lincoln:

"Be with us, Master! These unseeing eyes
Waken to light, our erring, groping hands
Unfetter for a world's great needs!
Till, like Creation's dawning, golden through the lands
Leaping, and up the unlit, unconquered skies
Surging with myriad steeds,
There shall arise
Out of the maze of clashing destinies
Out of the servitude of race and blood
One flag, one law, one hope, one brotherhood."

The question then that confronts us is what price are we willing to pay for liberty to save civilization? What is our responsibility? This question gave me great concern, and has always given me great concern, but particularly in the latter years of my service as your representative. It is one only to be answered by the people.

I am proud of the fact, and justly so, that I served in one Congress in the nine terms which I did serve when the Republicans were in a majority in the House of Representatives. That was the much maligned Eightieth Congress. The American people never made a greater mistake in their lives than they did when they returned to power those who are entirely responsible for the mess in which we find ourselves today. What did the Eightieth Congress do? I will tell you very briefly, viz:

It gave the people the promise of accomplishment incident to a change in administration. It afforded an opportunity for deliverance to those people corrupted by the gratuities of the New Deal and the Fair Deal and the Welfare State. It is too bad, but it is true, that a majority were content to continue in power an administration based upon the postulate that this was a good government in which to live so long as one could live off it.

That day has passed. We have scraped or will have scraped the bottom of the bucket. Only by terrific sacrifices, personal, such as our friends and neighbors in Europe have experienced, which God save us from, shall we ever be able to survive. I mean just that. Few folks realize the truth. They have too long lived on a Santa Claus no longer existent. The future which confronts them involves a fight for survival which will cost sweat and blood and tears in comparison with which that suffered and sustained by European neighbors is nothing but a drop in the bucket.

Why will people be so dumb as not to realize that today we face the executioner. Why do they not realize that we shall survive or go down into the limbo of lost nations if we do not appreciate the fact that this is our day of decision?

The Eightieth Congress and its record will go down in history as one of the greatest of achievement under most adverse circumstances ever accomplished in a most trying era. What did it do? Let me tell you very briefly. It was confronted by the disastrous results of 14 years of New Deal Democratic bad government. The country was threatened by economic disintegration of our free economy and a revolutionary change in our free government. The Eightieth Congress with understanding, courage, and foresight met the challenge to the preservation of the Republic and undertook to reverse the ruinous New Deal policies and establish solid foundations upon which our country could grow and go on forever. For the first time in 16 years it balanced the Federal budget.

It shaved $7,000,000,000 off the public debt.

It cut President Truman's padded budget more than $6,000,000,000.

Despite three Presidential vetoes, it reduced taxes $4,800,000,000, 71 percent of the tax relief therein found going to those with incomes under $5,000.

It improved labor-management relations by the passage, over the Presidential veto, of the Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Act, which provides for fair and just procedures for peaceful settlement of labor-management disputes.

It exposed the Communist infiltration in Government and labor unions, and in the Hollywood film industry. It caused the jailing of Communists for contempt of Congress. It undertook to ascertain wherein the Communist influence had spread to schools and colleges in our land.

It passed 188 bills meeting the needs of war veterans.

It expanded social security over Presidential veto.

It aided small business.

It extended reciprocal trade agreements with reasonable safeguards.

It passed hundreds of other measures benefiting every segment of our population, creating wholesome conditions for prosperity and happiness.

Responsibility for the bankrupt diplomacies of the Truman administration cannot be escaped by it, for an administration which harbors so many who see in the Russian way of doing things greater benefit than in our own could not be expected to follow a consistent and firm position in dealing with Communists at home or abroad. The major issue of today is the same as it was in 1945. It is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, deficit spending, as against American freedom for the individual, a pay-as-you-go economy, and the protection of the American way of life against Fascist or communistic trends. The Republican Party rejects the alien ideology which calls for an all-powerful central government. We have faith in our free people and believe that freemen in our Republic have accomplished more and will continue to accomplish more for the happiness and contentment of humanity than has been or can be accomplished by men in any other kind of system. The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress pledged themselves for economy as against the fact that President Truman holds the record for the biggest peacetime expenditure of all time. The Eightieth Congress cut the President's budgets to the tune of over $2,000,000,000 and more, to the extent that the total savings accomplished during the first session of the Eightieth Congress amounted to approximately $4,500,000,000. The Eightieth Congress went on record by example and by precedent to insist that taxes must be so imposed as to stimulate creative enterprise, not destroy it, and to afford the individual adequate purchasing power. Three times President Truman vetoed tax-reduction bills, but the third time this Congress passed it over his veto.

The Eightieth Congress was relentless in battling communism, fascism, and other alienisms. Senator NIXON, then a Republican Representative, compelled the exposing under protest, and caused the trial of Alger Hiss and others. Each time the Eightieth Congress revealed that there were disloyal persons on the Federal payroll and elsewhere, no determined efforts were made by those in top authority to purge those charged from the Government household or to locate subversive, un-American groups spotlighted by the House of Representatives committee without fear or without favor.

I should say to you that the founding fathers never intended that our foreign policy should be made by only one man. The people reserved that right for themselves, acting through their Representatives in the Congress and their President. I regret that New Deal Democrat Presidents, past and present, have stretched their constitutional rights to make agreement with foreign governments. Neither the Republican leadership in Congress nor the American people were consulted when the secret deals were made at Quebec, Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam; deals to remap much of the world; deals to freeze the future of our war enemies; deals that bypassed Congress and the American people.

The Truman administration record in foreign affairs is serious in reversals, vacillation, fumbling, and bungling which cannot be escaped, nor can it be tossed into the lap of the Republican Party, for we were not consulted. The Eightieth Congress delivered on its pledges to the people. Its progress was made despite obstruction every step of the way by an administration whose philosophy of government revolves around radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, Government extravagance,

stifling and destructive taxation, centralization of power and authority in Washington, coddling of Communists, and corrupt big-city politics.

The Eightieth Congress undertook to show the people the way out. This is a Government of, for, and by the people, although that very fact may spell the end of the democracy our founding fathers undertook to establish.

President Truman called the Eightieth Congress the worst, but even so, from his standpoint, in addition to what I have enumerated, this so-called worst Congress did something that the New Deal and Fair Deal never could do during their long years of mismanagement—it balanced the Federal budget. Furthermore, it created a surplus of some $8,000,000,000.

And while it was pursuing this worst possible course, it made substantial payments on the national debt, and it took 7,000,000 low-income Americans completely off the Federal tax rolls, saving them some $5,500,000,000 a year in taxes.

Do the voters everywhere know that despite President Truman's promise that there would be no nonessential spending in next year's budget, almost $10,000,000,000 has been earmarked for nonessential spending, including every socialistic plan ever dreamed up by the administration schemers—socialized agriculture, medicine, and industry?

Under the proposed $71,500,000,000 budget, only slightly more than $20,000,000,000 of expenditures has been justified through itemization. The remainder is only a blanket request for lump sums, and we don't know how these sums are to be employed, or for what purposes.

In other words, the President has sent to Congress an arbitrary figure for his new budget, but he does not justify more than a small portion of his request. This is one budget at which both Houses of Congress will take a long look and, I feel certain, trim out all the nonessentials, particularly as they apply to the socialistic program of the miscalled Fair Deal.

While the budget appears to be tops at $75,500,000,000, it actually is much higher. The budget requests permission to authorize, not appropriate, a total of $94,500,000,000, plus another $4,000,000,000. Does the administration think that the United States economy can take the punch to the jaw that an almost $100,000,000,000 budget would deliver? Do the people realize what an additional $16,500,000,000 tax burden this year will do to their standard of living? And do they know that while the administration is preaching austerity for the populace, it is practicing luxury for Government?

Do the people realize fully that the same administration and State Department crowd that fumbled us into the Korean war still is on the job and still fumbling?

We must recognize the evils of reckless spending and inflation; of weak, fumbling policies, and of the loss of traditional liberties through creeping socialism.

If I were to say what I think should be done, which nobody has asked me to say, I would say:

1. We shall have to stop regarding world politics as a game of chance. We must devise practical strategy—political, economic, psychological, and military—to meet the Soviet threat in the most effective way.

2. We must end the dangerous neglect of our home defenses by building up our strongest fighting weapons—sea and air power.

3. We must keep the United States financially and economically sound by a realistic arrangement of the national budget so that we do not spend ourselves into ruinous inflation; nor tax our system into national bankruptcy.

4. There must be an abrupt end to foreign policy by secret agreements and by Executive authority; the people are tired of the consequences of both.

5. See to it that the people are aroused to elect a Congress which may duplicate that of one of the greatest—the Eightieth.

In conclusion, upon this occasion and of this date, may I repeat the statement I have made before, in substance, to the effect that once I stood in admiration before the tomb of Shakespeare in the church at Stratford; another time I stood in awe before the tomb of the mighty Napoleon in the Invalides at Paris. Often I have stood in suspense before the tomb of the father of our country at Mount Vernon. Before I left Washington I went again to the tomb of Lincoln. I wanted a message from him to give to Vermonters. His spirit seemed to say:

"The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in. * * * To do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

"Go tell my Vermont friends," he continued to say, "and all my fellow Americans everywhere, in these days of stress and conflict everywhere, to be brave and have no fear. Tell them to stand by any man who stands right; stand by him while he is right and part from him when he goes wrong. Tell them that we here highly resolve * * * that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Annual Dinner of the Traffic Club of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Massachusetts has had the honor of having both distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania address our citizens recently. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] before the annual dinner of the Traffic Club of New England in the Statler Hotel, Boston, Mass., on February 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I know that those of you who have come from many points in the United States and Canada share with me the great pleasure of being here tonight.

The historic Commonwealth of Massachusetts has contributed so much to the preservation of the ideals of the patriots, heroes, and founders of American independence.

In the proud pageant of American history Massachusetts has a place of honor and glory. Here were enacted the opening scenes in the drama which electrified the struggling Colonies and inflamed the spark of freedom in the New World.

Here the first American blood was shed in resistance to tyranny and oppression. Here the embattled farmers defied the armed might of the world's most powerful empire. The inspiring story of Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill should be told wherever free men meet to champion the inalienable human rights we hold to be God's gift to all mankind.

The heroic past of Massachusetts lives on in its greatness of today and in its loyalty to everything that is American.

That loyalty and devotion to all that is best in American way of life is exemplified in the patriotic and unselfish service of your distinguished United States Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

It is a great honor to be associated with these outstanding sons of Massachusetts in the Senate of the United States. Both served with honor and distinction in time of war. Both serve their State and the Nation with the highest degree of constructive statesmanship in these days of troubled peace.

In the House of Representatives both great political parties have turned to Massachusetts for leadership, with your distinguished Congressman, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, as leader of the Democratic majority and the distinguished former Speaker of the House, JOE MARTIN, as the leader of the Republican minority.

If I may be permitted to say so at this nonpolitical meeting, we Republicans are confident that in the next Congress we will reverse the situation with respect to the minority and the majority.

It is an honor to be here tonight because the railroad men of America represent one of the strongest and most constructive forces for a powerful, progressive, and prosperous nation.

I am happy to pay tribute to the American railroads and to the men who run them. We are proud of their accomplishments under the American free-enterprise system in the face of the restraint that is placed upon them by taxation and regulation.

The advance of the railroads to their present greatness is an outstanding achievement of American initiative, enterprise, and courage. From the small wood-burning engine of the early days to the giant Diesel of today, their record is one of continuous progress and improvement. No other country in the world is served by such a vast network of railroads as we have here in the United States.

The American people owe a great deal to the American railroads—more than they know—and more than they appreciate. No country is any greater than its natural resources. No country is any greater than its transportation system. Transportation in America has meant, and still means, principally the railroads.

This country was developed by transportation, tied together by transportation, and preserved by transportation.

Railroads are not only essential for their peacetime function, but they are of extreme importance in our national defense.

They must never become Government owned or operated.

A little more than a century ago my State of Pennsylvania ventured into public ownership of transportation. A system of canals was constructed at a cost of more than $40,000,000, a stupendous sum in those days.

It was held out by the promoters of the system that the revenues would remove forever the necessity of levying State taxes.

But that hope quickly vanished in thin air. The venture of government in business was so badly managed and proved so unprofitable that it placed the State in danger of bankruptcy. The project was abandoned and the bonds which financed the system were not finally paid off until 1913.

There should be a lesson in Pennsylvania's experience for those who advocate the nationalization of power, transportation, and other basic industries.

In World War I, under Government administration, railroad operating costs more than doubled and the taxpayers footed the bill. You gentlemen who battled your way through those trying times know more about the disastrous results than I can tell you.

During World War II the American railroads, under the efficient control of private management, paid millions of dollars in Federal and State taxes and, in addition, continued the payment of dividends to the stockholders.

If it had not been for the performance of railroads—a performance no one thought possible—the great armada that went to the far reaches of both the Atlantic and Pacific to bring victory to the American Republic and our allies would never have been possible.

As railroad men you have many problems but I will leave the discussion of those questions to men better qualified to do so than I am.

I feel that this is an appropriate time to consider the dangers that face our country and the world today.

The paramount issue is the preservation of freedom in the United States and in the world. If we fail to solve that issue nothing else will matter because freedom is the most precious possession of the human race.

Today we face a well organized, well prepared, and well disciplined enemy who knows no truth, no honor, no justice, and no God. His weapons are lies, deceit, treachery, and force.

Since the end of World War II the Communist dictators of Soviet Russia, by armed aggression and diplomatic trickery, have gained control of one-third of the world. They have placed 700,000,000 people in Europe and Asia under the iron rule of terror and tyranny. They have prepared the plans and stockpiled the weapons for world conquest and the enslavement of all free people who value freedom of the individual and respect the dignity of man.

That, gentlemen, is the grim picture of a world in which the future of civilization hangs in the balance. It is a world tottering on the brink of a third world war which, if it comes, will be more terrible, more destructive of human values, than any conflict in recorded history.

It is not my purpose tonight to review the terrible mistakes, the glaring blunders, and the confused bungling of the past. I shall not attempt to fix the responsibility, but it is tragic to look back only 5 years and realize that in that short period we have dissipated and squandered so much of the strength that made us the most powerful Nation of all time.

In five short years we have bartered away the victory won at great cost in precious lives and treasure. We have crushed the hopes and aspirations of millions of freedom-loving people in many nations who looked to us for moral leadership and the betterment of the human race.

The question that is worrying the people of America is not how did we get here, but where are we going? They are asking, What are we going to do about it? How are we going to defend freedom against Communist aggression?

In recent weeks these questions have been discussed by American statesmen in what has become known as the great debate.

In my opinion, ex-President Herbert Hoover, Senator Taft, General Eisenhower, and the others who have expressed their views on foreign policy have rendered a great service to the American people. They have brought the issues out into the open where they should be. They have given the American people an opportunity to hear the situation analyzed from the military point of view, the economic point of view, and from the standpoint of our resources and our abilities. The people should know the facts because if we are to succeed we must have the patriotic support and backing of every real American.

There are some in high places who seem to be without a plan. They seem to meet each new development as it comes along without any well conceived notion of the direction they are taking. They are upset by fright and misguided by emotion. They fear political repudiation by the people for the cumulative errors of Yalta and Potsdam and the irresponsible course they have taken in recent years.

In this time of grave decision we should forget the errors of the past. It is a time for all of us to work together. It is a time for cool, hard-headed thinking and sound common sense.

I have always felt that the position of the United States in international relations would be greatly strengthened if we had a foreign policy which the people could understand and approve.

In February of 1949, before China had been taken over by Communist Russia, I said:

"We must call forcefully to the attention of the people the shameful outcome of a foreign policy which has placed millions of people in Europe and Asia under the tyranny of Soviet Russia. * * * We must point out so all may understand the fallacy of spending billions of dollars to prop up Western Europe while we leave the back door wide open for Communist domination over 450,000,000 helpless people in China."

I voted to approve the Charter of the United Nations in the hope that it would develop into an instrument for peace in the world.

I supported the North Atlantic Pact in which the free nations of Western Europe agreed to develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. They pledged each other that an attack against one shall be considered an attack against all.

Since the close of World War I, I have continuously advocated a defensive pact of the free nations of the world and preparedness to meet any emergency. On May 5, 1947, speaking to the American Legion in Indianapolis, I said:

"While war with Russia may not be imminent, we must be ready for any eventuality—strong, alert, and united at home. We have got to keep America a powerful enemy and a powerful friend abroad * * *. Until the nations of the world indicate their willingness to live in peace, let us go our way with an atomic bomb in one hand and the spirit of the Cross in the other * * *. Then every nation can choose which hand it prefers."

Continuing, I said:

"Our national defense must be based upon the ideals of our Republic. That means equal obligation as well as equal rights for every citizen. In the kind of world we live in today, in which things happen swiftly, equal obligation means to me universal military training. That is the only way to be ready on time when an emergency occurs * * *. I stand for a highly trained Regular Army, backed by a well-organized, well-trained civilian Reserve. We should have the best and strongest Navy and the best and strongest Air Force we can conceive * * *. Our fiscal policies must include a balanced budget, reduction of the debt and equitable distribution of the tax burden. Every expenditure of our Government, whether for use at home or abroad, must be carefully scrutinized * * *. If we collapse financially or if uncontrolled inflation results, America could easily drift into a dictatorship."

I believe that statement was sound then and I believe it is sound now.

Again in March of 1948 I warned in these words:

"Congress should provide a plan to train our young men in the fundamentals of protecting themselves under fire. Otherwise, they may have to learn under the hell fire of bombs, shot, and shell. We must, therefore, without delay take leadership in bringing the God-fearing, peace-loving nations of the world together in a defensive pact joining the Old World and the New for mutual protection against Communist domination and enslavement. We must tell the aggressors, clearly and forcefully, that if any one of these nations is molested all will fight to preserve its freedom. We must leave no room for doubt. That policy, if backed by powerful military strength, will avert war * * *. We must take decisive action before it is too late. Delay will prove costly to us and the world."

Tonight I want to outline what I think should be done to meet the present situation and how we should approach it.

Certainly no one wants to abandon Europe. We have given billions of dollars during and since World War II toward the preservation of the free nations of Europe.

Nearly all of us here in America are descendants of people from those countries.

Our civilization, our culture, and our religion are interwoven. They are dependent, in a large measure, upon us and we are dependent upon them in trade and commercial relations. It is, therefore, to our mutual advantage to work together and cooperate with each other. From a selfish point of view on our part, it is much better that we stand together against Communist aggression than to be placed in a position where we may have to face it alone.

It is equally clear, however, that if the nations of Europe are not ready and willing to assume their share of the responsibility, if they lack the spirit to sacrifice, to endure hardship, and fight for freedom, we can accomplish nothing but harm to ourselves if we continue to pour our substance into Europe.

I have the greatest respect for General Eisenhower, his love of country, his patriotism, his sincerity and his judgment. I am sure he does not want the Congress or the American people to accept his judgment blindly. I am confident he wants the Congress and the people of America to think carefully, to obtain all the information possible, and to arrive at a sound decision.

So the first question we must resolve, giving full consideration to General Eisenhower's report, is whether or not the free people of Europe are willing to face up to the facts and make the necessary sacrifices. If they are, then we must help them build the necessary defense.

The second decision we should make is that we must pay for the cost of building our defense out of current revenue. It must be on a pay-as-you-go basis. To do otherwise would lead to further inflation, which could destroy us through national bankruptcy.

The third question to be decided is this: How much can we tax American people each year without destroying our economy?

After we have determined this amount we then must go forward with a defense plan that is within our means—one that is practical and in the best interests of our country and the free nations of Europe.

Regardless of the conclusions we may reach, certain steps should be taken without delay.

We must have the best and strongest Air Force in the world so that we will have complete supremacy in the air.

We must build up the most powerful Navy so that we, together with Great Britain, will have complete command of the sea all over the world.

We must speed up and put into high gear all our industrial capacity for defense. We must produce ships, tanks, weapons, munitions, and equipment on a scale surpassing anything we have ever done before.

To achieve that tremendous production for ourselves and the friendly nations of Europe is the most important job we have right now. It will require a great force of manpower on the home front.

It is therefore clear to me that we cannot at the same time maintain a ground force of millions of men in the field over a long period of time. To do so would rob us and our allies of the critical defense material without which no army can fight.

Some have suggested that we should organize an army of 100 divisions as quickly as possible.

Let me explain why any attempt to maintain such a force indefinitely would spell out national bankruptcy in the boldest letters.

Each infantry division is made up of approximately 18,000 men. Behind that fighting force are the soldiers at the corps and Army level as well as the supply and other auxiliary troops. With these, each division comprises more than 60,000 men. One hundred divisions, therefore, means upward of 6,000,000 men.

The cost of maintaining a soldier in the Regular Army is approximately $5,000 per year. That covers the cost of shelter, food, clothing, and pay. It does not include the weapons and equipment he is trained to use. Translating these figures into an army of 100 divisions, it would represent approximately $30,000,000,000 a year for shelter, food, clothing, and pay. The other costs would just about double that staggering figure.

A ground force of 6,000,000 men would cut so deeply into our manpower that we would not be able to turn out the ships, the tanks, the planes, the bombs, and the other equipment so necessary for ourselves and our allies.

It is, therefore, clear to me that the other Atlantic Pact nations, with more than 200,000,000 people, must provide the ground forces for the initial defense of western Europe. They are in a better position to supply this manpower if we are to mobilize the productive capacity of America for the giant task of furnishing them with food, arms, and equipment.

While they are building up the ground troops of Europe we would be building our Navy and Air Force to be the air and sea arm of a well-rounded defense force operating from bases in the Atlantic or such other places as the military leaders might decide.

This question naturally arises: "Don't you intend to have an American ground force?"

The answer is "Yes," but we cannot maintain a huge ground force in Europe and in Asia and here in America except at a cost which would mean national bankruptcy.

And, in addition, it would be bad military strategy because we would be dividing our forces and would be spreading ourselves out too thin.

The ground forces of Asia must come from the islands of the Pacific, Japan and the Chinese nationalists. With our help they must supply the army for the initial defense of the Pacific. Our responsibility will be to provide the air and sea power both in the Atlantic and the Pacific. It must be remembered that the greater distance we take our soldiers away from America the longer the supply lines become. That means more men and more money are required behind the lines to maintain the soldier in the front line.

I am, therefore, opposed to sending American ground troops to the far corners of the earth at this time without knowing if and when they will be needed.

I would substitute another plan which in my opinion would provide a much more effective means of strengthening the United States and of helping our Allies.

I would maintain here at home a well trained regular Army of modest size, drawn from Selective Service under the present age limits. It would be equipped with the most modern and finest weapons. It would be the fastest and most powerful striking force, with the greatest fire power the world has ever known. It would be completely motorized on the ground and could be moved by air or sea to wherever it might be needed.

I would adopt universal military training for every boy in America, beginning at the age of 18 or upon graduation from high school, whichever occurs later. He would be given 1 year of intensive military training. From my own experience as a soldier covering half a century, I know that no young man should be sent into combat without a year of such training. It trains him to protect himself and teaches him that he has an obligation to his comrades and to the flag.

The well trained soldier has a better chance of coming home alive.

The soil of Europe and Asia is the final resting place of many American boys who would have returned had they been properly trained and if we had not been forced to throw them into battle before they were ready.

After a year of universal military training the boys would return home to pursue their education or to enter upon civilian jobs. They would then become members of the organized Reserve or the National Guard.

Under that system approximately 1,000,000 young men each year would be fitted into a definite military organization, trained and ready to be called to the colors in a matter of days.

I have tried to emphasize the fact that manpower is the thing that wins wars. Manpower provides the cutting front on the battlefield. It produces the food, the transportation, the weapons, the munitions, and the equipment.

It is most important, therefore, that we save manpower wherever possible. We must cut it down in Government. We must eliminate every possible nonessential function and every unnecessary job in the Government service. This should be done not only in the Federal Government but also at the State and local levels. Many men unable to pass selective-service requirements could be used in noncombat jobs to replace able-bodied men in uniform.

Government spending for nondefense purposes should be slashed to the bone. We must have sound fiscal policies that will preserve the solvency of the Nation. We must have a stable currency to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar and check the destructive force of inflation.

We must never forget that we can be destroyed from within.

It is not enough to build up our military strength alone.

We must have in America a great moral and spiritual rearmament. We must live in righteousness, obeying the laws of God and man.

If we do these things we can overcome the forces of evil and preserve peace in the world.

If we fail it will be because we have neglected our duty to our country and to posterity.

God helping us, we will not fail.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the speech I delivered in observance of Lithuanian Independence Day by the parishoners of St. Francis' Church, Lawrence, Mass., Sunday, February 18, 1951:

When Lithuania was robbed of her independence, that loss was felt by all Americans.

Because our own country was established on the belief that all men are created equal.

The progress of the human race toward emancipation has been long and difficult. Sometimes the freedom once gained has been lost to an aggressor. Whenever that happens, the one great hope of mankind is endangered. That is why we are fighting in Korea. That is why we sincerely grieve with the people of Lithuania.

In every age there have been tyrants, men who wanted to get complete control over the lives of the people by reducing them to slavery.

History is filled with stories of the devastation and the suffering inflicted by these evil men.

In the end they were always defeated because the people knew them to be conquerors and resisted them from the beginning.

The would-be dictators of the twentieth century are more cunning.

They come like the wolf in sheep's clothing, pretending to be gentle and kind so that they can get into the house. Once inside, they attack and overwhelm the victim before he knows what has happened.

That is the tragic fate of Lithuania and of every other free country that has been taken over by the trickery and force of Red Russian imperialism.

But that is not the whole story.

We, the people of the United States, of Great Britain, and France, and other nations allowed ourselves to become weak and indifferent. We stood by while these crimes took place without lifting a finger to help our brothers in humanity. Perhaps we kidded ourselves at the time into believing that the Communists were not as bad as they had been pictured.

Whatever the reasons, or lack of reasons, we know better now.

Because we are in danger.

We are rearming fast, because we now know the facts of life in dealing with communism.

Pretty words won't protect us.

And we can't survive all by ourselves.

We need friends and allies.

Like Lithuania and others, who cannot help us now because we did not help them in their time of peril.

I said at the opening of my remarks that when your homeland was seized by the Reds your loss was felt by all Americans.

I want to qualify that statement.

In August of 1944 when the Nazis were expelled, we thought that Lithuania and the other small Baltic countries were simply occupied by the Russian Communists. Just as we occupied a part of Germany and all of Japan.

But what a difference there was in the two methods.

We came to bring peace, to rebuild, and finally, to restore the countries we occupied to the full control of their own people.

But the Communists had other ideas.

They moved in for keeps, either by complete incorporation of these nations into the Soviet Union or through the device of puppet governments which fools nobody, not even the traitors who played the Soviet game. Tito, the Commuist dictator of Yugoslavia, held out against complete domination of his country by the Kremlin. Other quislings waited too long, and now they cannot escape from the trap of their own making.

The lesson in this is that anyone who thinks that he can be half-Communist or a Communist for the sake of his own individual country as he sees it will be either liquidated

or enslayed in the end by the tin gods who play the one-way game of tyranny from the control center at Moscow.

Even the leaders of Red China will learn this bitter lesson, if they haven't learned it already. We know that they are the prisoners of Stalin, even though they appear to be acting on their own. The question is, do the Chinese Reds know how they have been fooled by Stalin yet?

We, as Americans, cannot afford the luxury of being against communism 1 day a week, and then forgetting about it the other 6 days, because the Reds are plotting against us and working against us 7 days and 7 nights in every week.

Toward the close of 1945, immediately after the war's end, we began to break up our Army, Navy, and Air Force as if our defenders were our own worst enemies.

Everybody wanted to get back into the personal game of life again and to forget about everything else.

We wanted to retreat into the childhood days of this Nation, when two vast oceans did separate us from the rest of the world, and we could tend to our own business.

But Stalin knew better. He did not disband his power. He did not start to build new homes and automobiles and television sets for his people. He went right on building up his military power while we were tearing ours down.

Of course our possession of the A-bomb secret did make him think twice about expanding too far and too fast.

But he could shove a little here in one country, making it look like a civil war, or he could buy a few traitors in another country. Gradually he would be able to eliminate our friends one by one while we did nothing to help them, always creeping closer and closer to us—the main prize. And he knew that sooner or later he would get the A-bomb and thereby cancel out the one advantage that we had.

Meanwhile, he felt that the United States would retire to the deep freeze of isolationism, permitting him to build up for the final blow that would give him conquest of the world.

But we did wake up suddenly, although a little late, and now we are feverishly trying to make up for the lost time during which we permitted the Communists to extend their gains.

Why did we make this startling about-face?

It began with Lithuania.

We were a little disturbed by the few rumors we heard as to what was going on in that country under Russian occupation. But then we conveniently put this problem out of our minds on the excuse that it was none of our business anyway.

And besides, it was too far away.

In 1950, however, we decided that Korea, even though it was a greater distance away, needed UN troops to protect its independence. We have made a little progress in our thinking since 1944.

Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia were gobbled up by the Russian bear without even a real protest from us.

Then came Poland. Here the Reds tried to conceal their greed behind the flimflam of words. Sure, they promised democracy and free elections, and then proceeded to eat up that country after it had been flavored with "Russian dressing."

Czechoslovakia was next on the menu.

The way it was swallowed up really warned us that there was no limit to the appetite of communism.

When Moscow tried to bite off Turkey and then wash it down with Iranian oil, we got worried because the Reds were threatening to clean up everything in sight. We stopped the reach of the Russian bear in that direction, at least temporarily.

And we helped the people of France and Italy to feed themselves before the Reds fooled them into giving up the little they then had for themselves.

The Russian bear has a tapeworm that demands more the larger it grows. When the Communists took over China, we thought it would take a long, long time for them to digest that huge country.

But when it pounced on little Korea soon afterward that was the last straw.

The line had to be drawn somewhere, and the sooner the better.

Communism would never be satisfied until it ate the dessert, which was us.

It was then that our counter-move, called operation tapeworm, went to work to hold the Communist appetite in check. Whether we will ever be able to physic communism out of Russia remains to be seen, but at least we must tame the bear and make it give up what it has devoured.

To say this is one thing, to do it is another.

If we could read the unknown future we might find that our hopes will come true and see there the end of the Communist menace where it began—in Moscow—and as a result of a house-cleaning by the Russian people who were the first to be enslaved.

But it would be folly to rely upon that alone.

Strength to resist aggression anywhere is the first order of business, and the most important business in the world today, because it is the price of collective security.

A man who does not stand up for his friends, who fails to come to their aid when they are attacked, will wind up by having no friends when he needs them. And the same goes for any nation.

The trouble is that we have failed to look ahead in the field of foreign affairs, to do something before and not after the fact.

That is why we must share some part of the blame for the present misfortune of Lithuania.

If we had stated clearly and courageously, even before World War II was over, that we would never tolerate the taking over of any one nation by any other, Lithuania might have been saved.

But we didn't do it then.

And the result is that we must make up for this neglect the hard way now.

To rally the support that we must have from the God-fearing nations of this world and from the peoples who exist under the hammer and sickle, we must declare that we will work for the liberation of all nations that have been conquered by Red Russian imperialism. Nothing less will suffice if there is to be peace and freedom for all the peoples of this earth.

High on the list of the wrongs that must be righted is the restoration of independence to the brave people of Lithuania.

Peace Pilgrimage to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith my letter of February 12, 1951, to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and his reply of February 16, 1951:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1951.

Mr. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has recently been called to stories in the newspapers concerning a so-called Peace Pilgrimage to Washington, on March 1.

A number of my constituents would like to know the nature, objectives, and affiliations of the American Peace Crusade, which is the name of the group sponsoring the pilgrimage.

I would very much appreciate any information you can give me.

Very respectfully yours,

A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 16, 1951.

MY DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I have received your letter of February 12 concerning the American peace crusade, and its plans for a peace pilgrimage to Washington on March 1. From the membership of the group, and the general tenor of its pronouncements, it is obvious that this American peace crusade is merely a continuation or regrouping of the spurious partisans of peace movement, which as you know has been the most concentrated and far-flung propaganda effort of the international Communist movement in the postwar period.

The partisans of peace movement was organized by several Communist-controlled groups in Paris in 1949. The focal point of its original effort was a world-wide drive to collect 400,000,000 signatures to the so-called Stockholm appeal, an adroitly framed petition which superficially appeared merely to be an affirmation of the world-wide desire for peace and the universal desire for effective control of atomic energy. What the Stockholm appeal actually called for, however, was the adoption of the Soviet plan for the regulation of atomic energy, a plan which has been overwhelmingly rejected again and again by the majority of the United Nations.

The partisans of peace and its partner, the Cominform, announced that one goal of the movement was to collect 5,000,000 signatures in the United States. In spite of the most intensive campaign by Communist agents and those deceived by them, a final count of 2,000,000 signatures was officially claimed by the Cominform as having been collected in this country. I know it is as shocking to you as it is to me to think that even that small percentage of our citizens would sign their names to a petition which by its very nature had as its objective the weakening, if not the destruction, of the bonds which unite the free world. What the appeal in effect called for was the banning of any use of the atomic bomb, without any admission of the desirability of banning the tremendous armies and armament the U. S. S. R. and its satellites have maintained since 1945, not to speak of the illegal rearmament of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania beyond the limits imposed in the peace treaties.

In this latest manifestation of the partisans of peace, American peace crusade or peace pilgrimage, or whatever name it goes by at the time, the same people are calling for the same things, but this time they have added two more points.

The first is that the peace crusade calls for the UN forces to withdraw from Korea. The

Cominform has been calling for an immediate withdrawal from Korea, too. The Cominform wants us to withdraw from Korea because if we do withdraw, it will mean that we are not willing to resist aggression wherever it may break out. Voluntary withdrawal from Korea would be a clear indication to the forces of international communism that the United States, as the leader of the forces of the United Nations, was abdicating its responsibilities, abandoning its allies, and renouncing the moral force which has made this country what it is.

The second point these peace crusaders stress is that we should immediately seat Communist China in the United Nations. When you consider that by an overwhelming vote Communist China was recently condemned by the UN as an aggressor, a sudden seating of Communist China would in effect be an invitation to other aggressive-minded governments to flout the principles of the Charter, and would, indeed, offer a premium for the very sort of aggression we are combatting.

Of course, the peace crusaders call for atomic arms control. We know what they mean by this, too. They mean the highly propagandized Soviet plan for atomic arms control which the partisans of peace so zealously promoted while ignoring the United States proposal overwhelmingly supported by the United Nations with the exception of the Soviet bloc.

There is no doubt that this crusade for peace will try to use the standard weapons of the partisans of peace—divide and conquer, infiltrate, and confuse. I am sure you will agree with me that it is the duty of every American to reject and expose the false motives of this group.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. Wherry's Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. WHERRY's Courage," published in the Washington Times-Herald of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. WHERRY'S COURAGE

Once again, Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, showed himself on Monday to be as valiant a fighter for America as this generation has produced.

The Senate's Foreign Relations and Military Affairs Committees were meeting in joint session to take testimony on Mr. WHERRY's resolution declaring that the President may not send foot soldiers to garrison Europe without congressional approval. Many of the members of the committees are unfriendly to the Wherry proposal, and such of them as are in agreement with him had little to say. The burden fell upon him and he carried it manfully.

HE'S NOT A COWARD

The witnesses were the highest brass in the Pentagon. They had their orders and they had their story well prepared, but unlike his colleagues, Mr. WHERRY was not weak-kneed and he was not intimidated.

Mr. WHERRY elicited some information of great value. In response to a question, General Collins, the Army chief of staff, said that in the last war France contributed little to the Army on the western front because she had been overrun. This time, said General Collins, the French might be expected to provide from 90 to 100 divisions.

But if that is so, as Mr. WHERRY can now argue, what need is there for any American divisions in Europe? If France, to say nothing of the other allies, has all that potential strength and is being provided with the most modern of arms as a gift from America, how can anyone say that half a dozen American divisions are all that stand between Western Europe and catastrophe?

If the French wish not to be overrun by the Russians, the means to save themselves are in their own hands, and any troops that we send will merely encourage the French to depend upon us instead of themselves.

Senator WHERRY was contending for the principle of governmental responsibility to the people and their Congress. He was seeking to save the lives of American young men and to save the National Treasury from bankruptcy. He had the courage of a man who knew he was in the right. With the same moral armament, Washington stood firmly at Valley Forge.

I Decline to Accept the End of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following statement by Mr. William Faulkner, distinguished American author, upon the occasion of the award to him of the Nobel prize in literature. Mr. Faulkner's statement is in itself worthy of taking rank as one of the great challenges to humanity in this period when defeatism and despair are all too prevalent. The above-mentioned statement follows:

I DECLINE TO ACCEPT THE END OF MAN

(By William Faulkner)

I feel that this award was not made to me as a man, but to my work—a life's work in the agony and sweat of the human spirit, not for glory and least of all for profit, but to create out of the materials of the human spirit something which did not exist before. So this award is only mine in trust. It will not be difficult to find a dedication for the money part of it commensurate with the purpose and significance of its origin. But I would like to do the same with the acclaim, to, by using this moment as a pinnacle from which I might be listened to by the young men and women already dedicated to the same anguish and travail, among whom is already that one who will some day stand here where I am standing.

Our tragedy today is a general and universal physical fear so long sustained by now that we can even bear it. There are no longer problems of the spirit. There is only the question: When will I be blown up? Because of this, the young man or woman writing today has forgotten the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself which alone can make good writing, because only that is worth writing about, worth the agony and the sweat.

He must learn them again. He must teach himself that the basest of all things is to be afraid, and, teaching himself that, forget it forever, leaving no room in his workshop for anything but the old verities and truths of the heart, the old universal truths lacking which any story is ephemeral and doomed—love and honor and pity and pride and compassion and sacrifice. Until he does so, he labors under a curse. He writes not of love but of lust, of defeats in which nobody loses anything of value, of victories without hope, and, worst of all, without pity or compassion. His griefs grieve on no universal bones, leaving no scars. He writes not of the heart but of the glands.

Until he relearns these things, he will write as though he stood among and watched the end of man. I decline to accept the end of man. It is easy enough to say that man is immortal simply because he will endure; that when the last dingdong of doom has clanged and faded from the last worthless rock hanging tideless in the last red and dying evening, that even then there will still be one more sound; that of his puny, inexhaustible voice, still talking. I refuse to accept this. I believe that man will not merely endure; he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance. The poet's, the writer's, duty is to write about these things. It is his privilege to help man endure by lifting his heart, by reminding him of the courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity and sacrifice which have been the glory of his past. The poet's voice need not merely be the record of man, it can be one of the props, the pillars to help him endure and prevail.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on February 11, I heard a great address by a great and spiritual American, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, of the Washington Hebrew Congregation. The subject was Abraham Lincoln. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The devout souls who founded the Washington Hebrew Congregation first met for worship in the year 1852. The President of the United States whose signature later appeared on our charter from Congress was Franklin Pierce. Whenever I look at our charter in the library of our temple I am reminded of the kind of America we had in the fifties of the last century. Franklin Pierce, the youngest man to have become President, had been the nominee of the Democratic Party, a coalition of southern planters and conservative eastern businessmen, and on a platform of opposition to anti-slavery agitation had been swept into office by all but four of the States of the Union. In

his inaugural address Franklin Pierce rightly interpreted his election as a mandate from the people to bury the antislavery controversy and to permit human bondage to continue wherever it existed in our States.

Never had the old slave society seemed more assured of its future in our land as in the 1850's. Thomas Jefferson had wanted to erase it, for he had said, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep forever." It is true George Washington had repeated these words, "Not only do I pray for the rooting out of slavery on the score of human dignity but I can clearly foresee that nothing but the rooting out of slavery can perpetuate the existence of our Union by consolidating it into a common bond of principle." It is true many of the planting aristocracy had begun to realize that slavery was undesirable and in 1820 had gone so far as to accept the Missouri Compromise whereby the larger portion of the Louisiana Territory was dedicated to freedom. It is true the agitation in the North against slavery had become increasingly bitter: William Lloyd Garrison had started his magazine, the Liberator, in 1831 and for nearly a quarter of a century had thundered in the condemnation of slavery as crime and demanded the emancipation of the slaves; there were Wendel Phillips, the eloquent New England aristocrat; Whittier, the poet; James Russell Lowell, the author; and Emerson, the philosopher—all had labored to raise the moral issue of human bondage. In 1852 Harriet Beecher Stowe had dramatized the abolitionist creed in her play Uncle Tom's Cabin; but as someone said, "it deepened the horror of slavery but did not change a single vote." For in spite of all these, in 1852 the Democratic Party on a proslavery platform had carried every State except four in the entire Union.

Indeed, from 1820 on it seemed that slavery had become stronger than ever. The use of steam and steel in the new textile looms of the North had produced a great need for cotton; and the invention by Whitney of his cotton gin had increased the picking power of every slave even a thousandfold. To feed the hungry mills of England and New England there had been a transformation of the old gentle plantation life gradually veering toward freedom to a new feverish hunger for new land for cotton, where overseers could drive slave gangs across new areas in mad search for new profits. To justify their slave system a great corpus of learning—in the fields of history, and law, of economics, philosophy, and even religion had been gathered, where with profound sincerity and eloquence they won many to the acceptance of the rightness of slavery.

They were so convincing that in 1835 Garrison, the abolitionist, was dragged by a mob through the streets of Boston—a mob composed of some of the most respectable as well as the street urchins—and Garrison's life was only saved because the police put him in jail. The attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts addressed a mass meeting of some of the leading citizens in the sacred confines of Faneuil Hall, the cradle of liberty, where he praised the mobs that attacked and even killed some abolitionists and compared them to the patriot fathers of the Boston Tea Party. In the famous debates in the Senate in 1850 of Calhoun, Clay, and Webster, even Webster asked only for compromise acceptance of sectional slavery. In the few years that followed new concessions were made to it. In 1854 the Congress repealed the Missouri Compromise and threw open vast areas of the Louisiana Purchase to slavery, once closed to it for decades. In 1857 Chief Justice Taney in his Dred Scott decision had ruled the Missouri Compromise had been void from the beginning, that Congress had no power to forbid slavery anywhere. This was followed 2 years later by another decision of our highest courts upholding the fugitive-slave laws and their drastic enforcement. When the new Republican Party had run on a platform opposed only to extension of slavery but permitting it to thrive where it was, in spite of the decades of abolitionist agitation in our land, they were hopelessly outvoted. It seemed as if slavery was not only here permanently but was about to sweep westward and southward into a vast slave empire of the entire hemisphere. As Wendell Phillips, the lover of freedom, said, "The sky was never so black."

But in a few years, just a little more than one decade, so much of that past that seemed so ominously threatening or rigidly secure was trust aside. All this cannot be grasped without understanding Abraham Lincoln. He was born in a Kentucky log cabin, but he was swept westward to the frontiers of the Ohio. He was early aroused by the inhumanity of the slave trade, but as he said, "I bit my lips and kept quiet." He did even less, for when he ran for Congress he condemned the abolitionists as agitators endangering the cause of freedom, and even joined a group of southern Whigs to name a slaveholder as the candidate for the Presidency. It was only after he had retired from Congress that he began to sense the dangers of the ethics of slavery to the workingman's charter of freedom. As late as 1858 in his debates with Senator Douglas we find in his "house divided" speech these words: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved. I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all of one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South." Lincoln challenges the justice and the political honesty of the Dred Scott decision that extended slavery to the new West, but he does not object to it in the Old South. In fact, he had won the Republican nomination in 1860 precisely because he was a conservative in his views on southern slavery. At his inauguration Lincoln appealed for union, peace, and friendship. He spoke up against secession, but could anything be more conciliatory than this plea to the few Southern States that had seceded? He said:

"If the Almighty Ruler of nations, with His eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail by the judgment of the great tribunal of the American people. * * * My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it. We are not enemies but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break, our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot's grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature." These words were said in March of 1862 but by September of the next year Lincoln had issued the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves in great areas of the Old South. Why? Was Lincoln really an abolitionist who had pretended to be a conservative and had taken advantage of his position to destroy the old slavery? No. The evidence is all against it. The answer is that the same flood that moved Lincoln from a log cabin in Kentucky to the western frontier, a similar tide swept Lincoln forward by the tragic necessity of his duty to a beckoning new frontier of the American dream. We find it stated with abounding earnestness in the Gettysburg Address he delivered in November of the same year, in these noble words it is ever wise to repeat:

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

These noble words that speak of man's dedication as part of a divine compulsion is even clearer when Lincoln said in the following year:

"I claim not to have controlled events but I confess the events have controlled me. The Nation's condition is not what either party or any man devised or expected. God alone can claim it."

The Civil War was not only a tragedy that Lincoln tried his best to prevent but had come as the result of moral imperatives arousing out of great social forces he could not ignore.

The historians of our time point out that these States thought they had the power to win their extremist demands, which they deemed just. They thought that even though fewer in number their control of the flow of cotton and other raw materials would ruin the North and win the aid of England and France, whose upper classes were with them and whose mills needed them. They thought that nearly all the military skill and munition supplies were in the South—which for years had kept the Federal Government without military strength—and that through their control of New Orleans they could easily capture the Mississippi Valley, the granary of the North. They thought that because the North was not only unarmed but divided into so many different factions—with a President elected by a minority—and a crude citizenry of, to use this snob term, greasy mechanics with all kinds of conflicting opinions—though the North may be larger and richer—it could not or would not fight. The South thought it had the power to secede from the Union and to build a new

kind of Nation based on slavery and sweeping forward to a new kind of racial destiny. Thus the South which seemed so secure in the 1850's, refusing to take the steps toward conciliation and compromise—it fought on heroically until its last straggling armies were dispersed, all its homes were in ruins—and the old plantation aristocracy was left crushed and impoverished in a ruined land.

It had sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind. There is a power greater than man that brings retribution for our moral failures. Thus many of the people who in this very city of Washington were in the seats of the mighty in the 1850's were either ruined or killed in the 1860's, because of what they and others had done or failed to do to face the moral challenge of their time. How wasteful that Civil War was. It not only cost us more than 600,000 lives but if we had paid every master for every slave it would have cost less than the money we spent in the bloodshed. But it had to be, for so many men require suffering before they can understand the error of their ways; so many drift selfishly without thought of a nobler vista of tomorrow; so many are blighted by the ethical impotence of the countless numbers who felt the horror in Uncle Tom's Cabin but would not change even their vote from the old ways and certainly could not rise to the new moral disciplines for a new age.

The greatness of Abraham Lincoln was that he had the vision and the strength of character to see his duty and rise to it. Lincoln was not an Abolitionist even after he had won the election. Lincoln was not aware of the long-range effects of the impending changes of the new industrial America developing in the North; a remarkable political pattern never before achieved—that combined an empty land beckoning to the Old World's homeless, in a continental economy whose open frontier gave its new immigrant labor the bargaining power for its freedom and whose tariff walls helped its new industry to grow mightily without foreign competition. Lincoln was not aware of the inevitable military superiority of this combination of free men and machines in any battle with a preindustrial feudalism.

But, Lincoln was aware of the moral superiority of the American ideal of liberty and union and by the logic of his duty to that ideal and by the bitter reality of his fruitless efforts to keep the peace with feudalists who could not be satisfied with any concessions—feudalists who did not know how to merge their good with the higher good. Thus, Lincoln by his sad experience was gradually transformed from an appeasing compromiser into the harbinger of a new age. He began to see that in this young Republic of the west the oldest institution of human bondage was in a wrestle of death with the youngest and most hopeful vision of the new freedom. Here a new industrialism was developing without the shackles of a hereditary aristocracy and a military caste; borrowing the inventions and using the credits of the Old World but using them with the generous resourcefulness of freemen whose technological power would take giant strides to build America into a homeland of the world's oppressed. Lincoln felt that the future was on their side for they were on God's side—on the side of the free and the just. The great Lincoln grasped that moral truth of the impending struggle and had the courage to there take his stand: with the moral vision of one who felt that for him there was no alternative to one's sacred duty.

We can see this insight most clearly in one of the closing paragraphs of his second inaugural address: "Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsmen's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

Lincoln was true to the heart of the best of the democratic tradition not because he was of humble origin or of sincere devotion. Look at the autocracies of our own day that have cast their bleeding shadow over our world. Hitler was born in a village hut in Bohemia and Mussolini knew poverty in the blacksmith home of his father. In utter sincerity one arose from humble origin to outdo the atrocities of Attila and the other to don the toga of a modern Caesar. No; it is not because he became the country's leader out of humble origins and served it with wholehearted sincerity but it is because of the principles of life that he affirmed in his leadership that makes Lincoln a towering figure of the American tradition. Further it was not only the nature of his life but of his death that had made Lincoln into the great myth of the soul of America. Every generation must find inspiration in new saints to strengthen its own faith, and that is why men instinctively turn to revere those who have died in the path of duty; for it is in the heroism of the martyr that we come the closest to the pure flame of human aspiration and feel the rocklike strength of human integrity. Around that flame men have brought their loftiest hopes and into its rock they have carved the scriptures of their hearts.

When we think of the lovely closing words of his second inaugural speech, uttered only 1 month before his death, we can understand why the tomb of this sad backwoodsman has become the shrine of American patriotism. In these words he uttered the faith that all Americans, whatever be their creed, can share; a faith in the supreme value of a homely kindliness and neighborly charity; a faith that not only with malice toward none and with charity for all but "with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right"; a faith in the necessity of the courageous integrity of free souls dedicated to the discipline a free conscience dictates, knowing that charity without a firm conscience can become a sentimental mask that permits weakness in ourselves and injustice to others; a faith that only when goodness is combined with integrity can goodness achieve the heights of true righteousness; a faith that it is the duty of every one of us to bless this land with more than a spirit of tolerance and charity—that alone did not build the best of America nor can that alone build a better world after the defeat of Hitler—but we must also be true to the light which God reveals to us; to be firm; to know where we stand on the issues of our day that deny the liberty of the soul of any man, of any race or creed, and to make these standards live by the honest militance of our sincere convictions and by the strength of our own devotions; to be firm; to stand for something in the spirit that God grants to the courageous minds and hearts of free men. It is to have strength without hardness, to have courage without cruelty, to have convictions without being malicious, to make high decisions without being uncharitable, to do what is right and still to be kind—that is the message the name of Lincoln has come to mean to all Americans today.

In that sense the figure of Lincoln looms on the spiritual horizon of America, to use the words of Walt Whitman, as "a man to match the mountains and the sea" of this free land, uttering the scriptural wisdom of a prairie sage, the parables of a frontier saint, the ideals of an American prophet "grounded in a righteousness as immovable as one of the giant ranges of the Rocky Mountains," an eternal symbol of the lofty frontier of our American hope, and to his name, in the words of the poet, "men will come as to a shrine and temple of the good to be made sweet and strong of heart in Lincoln's brotherhood." Amen.

The Cure for Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on February 2, 1951, there appeared in the Haviland (Kans.) Journal an editorial entitled "Production Is the Only Cure."

In these days of continuing, run-away inflation, demands for higher taxes, and hesitancy on the part of those in authority and power in our Government to meet the issues head-on, it would be well to read and reread this editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRODUCTION IS THE ONLY CURE

The people of the United States have become reconciled to the necessity of the Nation embarking on the greatest defense program in what some like to call our peacetime history. It will be costly and because of it a still greater portion of our national income will be diverted to the Government. But one thing we do not seem to realize is that this cost must come from the pockets of us all. Instead, most of us have the idea that the other fellow should pay the bill. It's the other fellow's profits which should be limited and the other fellow's business which should be regulated. We are in favor of any tax and any regulation so long as it is placed on somebody else.

For many years, the tax laws were directed toward forcing the cost of government onto the shoulders of corporations and individuals with large incomes. A part of this was pure politics, because these corporations and individuals did not have many votes. As the cost of government increased, an attempt was made to cover the increase without touching the pocketbooks of the great mass of voters. That can no longer be done. Every worker is beginning to feel the cost of military preparation and the continuing high cost of government. Unless he learns the truth about taxes, he will suffer far more than he has to date.

All the cost of Government is not for military purposes by any means. As a matter of fact, the principal cause of the present inflation has been Government spending for nonessential purposes. Even in the face of a threat of an all-out war, President Truman insists that he will not drop his social and welfare schemes, socialized medicine, the enormously expensive St. Lawrence waterway, and other visionary experiments. Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, in an itemized statement, has shown that $10,500,000,000 could be taken out of the President's proposed budget without affecting the military budget. All such spending only aggravates inflation. It adds nothing whatever to production, puts more money in circulation, and thereby still further cheapens the dollar.

Any kind of control is only a stop-gap measure. It is not a cure. Production is the only thing that will stop inflation, along with a decrease in Government spending. Since 1932 the Government has had a deficit every year, except for the 2 years when that "do nothing, good for nothing Eightieth Congress" was in control. Most people agree that control of prices is needed, although the administration waited until everything was at its highest to put it on. No one, even those in Washington, knows what the present control will do or how it will be made to work. But no control will stop inflation until the Government stops holding up the prices of foodstuffs artificially; until it stops financing the inflationary housing boom; until it stops subsidizing an inflationary export boom. It must stop its bond-pegging policy and its low inflationary interest rates. If such steps are taken, and other unnecessary spending stopped, we will get the all-out production that only free markets and a free economy can provide.

Regardless of whom we may agree with or differ from, one thing should be kept in mind—the first responsibility of every American citizen is the perpetuation of individual liberty and our representative form of government. This primary objective must always remain ahead of personal comfort and security for civilians as well as the troops in the front lines.

F. J. C.

Dividends From UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dividends From UN," published in the Washington Times-Herald of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVIDENDS FROM UN

In the first 5 years of its life the United Nations has succeeded in spending almost $857,000,000. Of this the United States contributed $424,000,000—almost half of the total. By June 30, UN outlays will approach $1,000,000,000, and of this sum the United States will have contributed $543,000,000.

HALF-BAKED EXCURSIONS

Can any American explain what possible benefit the United States has received from a single dollar contributed to UN, let alone half a billion of them? We have been treated to a never-ending wrangle, to a wholly useless and costly war in Korea, to the threat of another world war with unimaginable destruction, to military and economic regimentation in preparation for war, and to some half-baked, wholly unrealistic, and dangerous excursions into social uplift on a global scale. The Declaration of Human Rights and Genocide Convention are typical of these.

The facts and figures on UN have been the subject of study by a Senate subcommittee under the direction of Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, and the report of this group leaves no doubt that UN has degenerated into a racket. The only people who profit directly from its operations are the new class of global bureaucrats who draw tax-free salaries. Trygve Lie, the Secretary-General, benefiting from 11 forms of allowance and 6 of benefits, draws $53,000 a year, free of tax. He may be worth $53,000 to himself, but to no one else.

The Senators speak of the vested interests that have been created in UN by international bureaucrats whose principal object is to keep every existing project going and to invent new ones constantly. Among these is a study of the effect of chewing coca leaves.

Others proposed or in existence are world clinics for alcoholics, the improvement of obstetrical practice in China so that the ranks of the Chinese Red armies may be kept up to quota, a world compact to end divorce mills, a study of the social problems of South American aborigines, the standardization of map symbols, legal procedure for the issuance of death certificates of persons missing in war, an Asiatic flood-control program, and an investigation of the scientific basis of Yogi.

WHO GETS THE DIVIDENDS?

There are almost 10,000 UN bureaucrats living largely off the American people. The old League of Nations was able to stagger to the grave with only a fraction of this horde of payrollers and at only a fraction of the cost. With each passing year UN grows more grandiose in its pretensions and more futile in its effect.

The common stockholders in the organization are supposed to be the citizens of the United States and of other governments. For them there are no dividends. The preferred stockholders are presidents, premiers, and dictators who regularly collect through the ability of UN to keep international tensions strung tight so that there are always wars and threats of wars with which to keep the people cowed and quiescent so that they will submit to the constantly increasing exactions of the state upon their incomes and their very lives.

When are the people of the world going to get onto this gigantic fraud?

Religion's Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Religion's Part," published in the Somerset (Pa.) Daily American of February 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELIGION'S PART

Because the United States has become strong and rich, there is a disposition in some quarters to slight, or ignore the part that has been played by religion in its development.

Indeed, throughout the Western Hemisphere the part of religion in the making of a great continent, has been fundamental.

Along with the Spanish explorers there came friars to spread the gospel among the Indians.

The French colonization projects in Canada failed until Henry IV sent missionaries to convert the Indians. The commercial endeavors of the first Frenchmen who came to America aroused the suspicions of the red men. They heard the gospel gladly.

But the Spanish had slight influence upon the people who comprise American citizenship and the French influence did not extend far into the United States.

Freedom of religion was not immediate in the colonies. Different colonies were settled by men of different faiths. The Church of England dominance in Georgia, the Carolinas and Virginia left no place for other faiths there. And the union of church and state in those colonies made it possible for the colonies to collect taxes for the church, for the parishes to employ no clergy and then at the end of each year to declare a dividend out of the revenue that had been provided by the state for the support of religion.

The New England colonists were insistent upon freedom for their own religious faiths, but none for those who dissented. Roger Williams fled to what we know as Rhode Island to escape the tortures of the Puritans.

Maryland, under the Roman Catholic Calverts, and Pennsylvania, under the Quaker Penn, were exceptions. These colonies set the pattern that was followed when the Constitution was adopted. New Jersey was perhaps the last State to throw off intolerance. Not until the adoption of the constitution of 1844 did Roman Catholics enjoy all the privileges of American citizens, there. Although they did have freedom to worship according to their consciences, there were privileges of importance denied them.

Because of the fundamental seriousness attached to religion, the French statesman de Tocqueville, after visiting the United States, in 1831, wrote his Democracy in America and states that in the United States religion is the chief concern of the people.

It is therefore quite appropriate that during the Lenten season respect should be paid to a subject that from the beginnings of this country has been foremost.

It is interesting to observe, further, that Somerset churches were more largely attended Sunday morning than they had been for months.

The civilization under which Americans live is known as the Western civilization and it is founded upon the doctrines of western Christianity.

Universal Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on February 13, 1951, there appeared in the Topeka State Journal an editorial entitled "Do We Want Universal Service?"

This editorial points to some fundamental positions once familiar to all of us. Since in the near future this body will be called upon to consider the question of universal military training it is well for us to have before us frank and clear points of view on this most important proposed change in our fundamental policy.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE WANT UNIVERSAL SERVICE?

Should the country adopt the universal military service plan which is before Congress? One citizen group called the Committee on the Present Danger, made up of assorted educational, scientific, and professional VIP's, believes emphatically that the country should. Let's look at this interesting movement.

The Committee on the Present Danger supports a bill which, as the committee says in its recent statement, would cause military service in this country to begin at the age of 18 or at the end of the high school year after reaching 18. The 27 months of service and training authorized in the bill—after deduction for customary terminal leave—in reality means about 25 months to total actual military service. As such it need represent for students a break of only two academic years."

"We support the bill," says the committee, "because it is a real universal military service bill and not merely an extension of the Selective Service Act to include 18-year-olds. The power given the President to call up men by age group is the distinguishing feature. When this call goes out, the draft boards will make no deferments for this age group on grounds of occupation or dependencies. When the program becomes fully operative, the services could count on at least 700,000 to 750,000 men from each age group under present physical standards, and another 100,000 for limited service by lowering present physical and mental standards for induction."

Then follows the old argument that over the years this would provide a pool of trained manpower, though not mentioning that in the event of later war the pool of trained manpower would have to be completely retrained to catch up on new weapons and ways of waging war, for nothing grows obsolete faster than an ultra-modern war.

The committee's integrity and great sincerity is immediately acknowledged, but we hope it will realize that even the judgments of its VIP's in all walks are fallible, and that there are two sides to this question of adopting a permanent military class or reservist training system. The other side has been hinted at by Pearl Buck, Nobel prize winner in literature, who wrote a letter to Look magazine (February 13 issue) "profoundly deploring" Dr. James Bryant Conant's earlier Look article, "A Stern Proposal for Survival." Harvard's President Conant, a chemist by calling, is a member of the afore-mentioned Committee for the Present Danger. Mrs. Buck wrote:

"Dr. Conant * * * proposes that all young men be put under military control. Their teachers are to be men trained in the inevitable narrowness of the military outlook, men experienced only in the ways of physical and mechanical force, and in a type of strategy oblivious to human psychology. For the two most educable years of young manhood our men must live in an environment of low standards of personal behavior and moral integrity. * * * What is the gain if we commit our national life to militarism? Dr. Conant does not know. He hopes at best for 'a global stalemate.' But he cannot promise it. * * * Many Americans will consider victory not worth while if, in order to avoid tyranny from abroad, we put ourselves under military control at home, for tyranny has always begun with military control. * * * The mistake of military men has always been that they see problems too simply and have only the one simple remedy of more militarism, * * * a program which has nowhere ever been finally successful in achieving even its own purposes."

It might be said further that this plan for systematic militarization would change something very fundamental about this country and what it has meant as a beacon to the world. Do you recall that millions of Europeans emigrated to this country—perhaps your own ancestors—to escape compulsory military service and Europe's round of wars, fed and readied by the class reservist system? Further, Europe has had this universal service and training for a long time, yet Europe is chronically diseased with war. Germany had it and lost. The system has done nothing whatever to further or insure peace, yet many of its American advocates promise such a benefit here. Again Europe has universal service now, but the debate is over Europe's ability or willingness to supply divisions of men to defend itself.

Shall we continue to say there are two sides to such a fundamental change and not rush into it? Congress probably will not. That doesn't mean that Selective Service couldn't use a complete overhauling to stop leaks and equalize standards. The Committee's point about lowering present physical and mental standards for induction should be applied as matters stand.

Senator Lodge and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the February 14 issue of the Boston Herald there appeared, under the caption "LODGE and labor," a letter to the editor, over the signature of James F. Hughes, past president of the Central Labor Union, A. F. of L., at Lawrence, Mass. Inasmuch as his communication pays a very just and fitting tribute to our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] I hope it will receive the serious consideration of every one of his colleagues in this body. To that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LODGE AND LABOR

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

The unofficial announcement that Governor Dever will seek Senator LODGE's seat, were it authentic, would place organized labor in Massachusetts and in the Nation, in a rather embarrassing position, provided labor adhered to its policy of electing its friends.

Fortunately, Senator LODGE and Governor Dever are friendly to labor, making it difficult, but mandatory for labor to support both when seeking reelection to their present respective positions.

The official organ, the League Reporter, of the American Federation of Labor lists LODGE in its columns as a liberal. Why?

1. Senator LODGE voted in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

2. Senator LODGE voted in favor of a minimum wage.

3. Senator LODGE voted in favor of liberalizing the social-security law.

4. Senator LODGE voted in favor of higher monthly compensation to pensioners under the old-age and survivors insurance law.

5. Senator LODGE voted in favor of extending the old-age and survivors insurance law so that farm help, domestic help, and numerous other groups of workers be included.

6. Senator LODGE favors the union shop with adequate safeguards.

7. Senator LODGE opposes the issuing of injunction in labor disputes without first hearing labor's side of the case.

8. Senator LODGE favors extending Federal financial aid to private and parochial schools.

9. Senator LODGE introduced a bill to have the President and Vice President of the United States elected by popular vote, the vote of the people.

10. Senator LODGE, in the years from 1947 to 1951 sponsored an all-out program of preparedness, a preparedness program which would be the dagger in the ribs of the Russian and Chinese Reds.

11. Because of his determination, clear-mindedness, and his patriotism President Truman appointed Senator LODGE as United States representative to the UN.

This brilliant, unblemished, and fearless record of Senator LODGE marks him as an outstanding public official, worthy of the support of labor and all fair-minded citizens, Democrats as well as Republicans, in the State of Massachusetts.

Those who may try to unseat the Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., would do well to consider his smashing victory over the late popular and beloved Senator, David I. Walsh.

JAMES F. HUGHES,
Past President, Central Labor Union, A. F. of L., Lawrence, Mass.

Food Price Amendment to the Defense Production Act Still Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is the lead editorial in the New York Times of February 17, 1951, entitled "Stabilization Without Tears":

STABILIZATION WITHOUT TEARS

The House Ways and Means Committee has rejected President Truman's request for immediate action on a $10,000,000,000 tax bill and let it be known that it is going to hold full hearings and listen to all proposals for dealing with the financing of the rearmament program.

The idea of getting an uncomplicated "quickie" tax bill passed first and following it up later with a second revenue bill has much to recommend it from the standpoint of keeping revenue receipts ahead of spending. However, we think the Ways and Means Committee has acted wisely in its decision to canvass the entire tax field before committing itself on the program outlined by the President. And we are the more convinced of this after reading news reports on the testimony given before the committee by Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Director, and his Price Administrator, Michael DiSalle.

The fact is that, whatever its previous intention might have been, the Ways and Means Committee might well have been moved to reconsider its whole approach to the revenue program simply on the basis of this testimony. Consider the situation for

a moment. Never before in history has a nation financed a major war entirely out of taxes. Now we are undertaking to do what is the equivalent of that. The American taxpayer is told that the Government expects him to provide the prodigious sum of $71,600,000,000 in taxes to finance the defense effort in 1951–52. And the Nation's chief stabilizer, appearing before the Ways and Means Committee in behalf of the program, warns that "failure to tax—and tax hard now—will be perilous to our country's strength and safety." It will not be possible, this spokesman for the administration tells us, "to hold the inflation line unless Congress votes a tax bill sufficiently high to pay for our defense program as we go." Yet this witness, the chief stabilizing authority of the administration * * * apparently supports the powerful farm bloc in giving a special position of favoritism to farm prices in the stabilization program. Asked whether legislation now being considered would involve any change in this section of the Defense Production Act, Mr. Johnston is quoted as replying: "I didn't say that. The farmer is certainly entitled to his parity." Does Mr. Johnston know that farm prices as a whole are already above parity in relation to November farm prices? And if he regards parity as a sacrosanct concept, does he believe it works both ways? Does he believe that farm commodities that are selling far above parity should be rolled back to that level?

Mr. DiSalle is quoted to the effect that "we ought to be able to do better than the OPA did in World War II, when it held the rise in the cost of living to 9.1 percent in the first year." One wonders how America's housewives must feel now. A day or two ago Secretary Brannan assured them that the special dispensation to subparity farm prices would mean an annual addition of only $4,000,000,000 to their food bill. Now they are consoled with the thought that their cost of living should be held to a rise of less than 9 percent over the next 12 months. By the figures of the OPS itself, that maximum comes to the fairly generous figure of $18,000,000,000.

It is time the administration realized that pay-as-you-go means something more than simply imposing back-breaking taxes on the American public. If, as Mr. Johnston says, it is impossible to stabilize the economy without high taxes, then it is little less than fantastic to propose a program of pay-as-you-go taxation while conducting the price-wage policy on the basis of giving a minimum of political offense to every group in the economy.

General Eisenhower's Earlier Appearance Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "General Eisenhower's Earlier Appearance Before Congress," published in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of February 3, 1951. The article discusses the demobilization of the Army at the end of World War II, and a statement made at that time by General Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S EARLIER APPEARANCE BEFORE CONGRESS

General Eisenhower's appearance before the Congress this week recalls that once before, on January 15, 1946, he also addressed the joint House and Senate membership. It is with some irony that one recalls that 5 years ago General Eisenhower, as Chief of Staff of the Army, was called upon to explain to the Legislature why the troops were not being demobilized faster. His opening sentence at that time is significant in light of developments since. He said: "I have come here this morning because a very human desire has clashed with the Army's manpower needs to do the job which has been assigned to us by the Government."

What was the situation then? General Eisenhower said: "Now just where does this leave us? On VE-day we had 8,300,000 troops. We have already discharged 5,000,000, and by July 1 we shall have discharged another 2,750,000 men who were in the Army the day Germany collapsed. This leaves but half a million or so of the VE-day men. Except for veteran volunteers, that is all that will be left of our own VE-day Army on July 1, 1946, less than 14 months after the last shot was fired in Europe. All the rest will be recruits. It is with this relatively untrained Army in the throes of reconversion that we must undertake the grave tasks still ahead. * * * My sole purpose, which I am certain you share, is that the Army that did so much to win the victory will be left fit to preserve it."

It is difficult to tell how much the rapid break-up of our World War II Army (which in those days included the Air Force) contributed to our present dilemma.

Rev. Martin Niemoeller's Opposition to Rearmament of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Niemoeller's Visit," published in the Washington Post of today. I suggest that any Senator who is interested in obtaining the German viewpoint regarding rearmament read the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIEMOELLER'S VISIT

When General Eisenhower administered the coup de grace to the arming of Germany as a primary object of American policy toward Atlantic defense, that aspect of the policy was already moribund, as a result of an opposition which arose in Germany itself. The opposition sprang from a one-man crusade conducted by that extraordinary Lutheran cleric, Martin Niemoeller. Pastor Niemoeller, who is a presiding bishop of United Protestantism in Germany, came to Washington for the day on Monday. He was on his way to other parts of the country on a tour arranged by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America. The State Department knew he was coming. Whether he was asked to call or whether he asked to be received—he visited the Department, but was received by several subordinates headed by the deputy of the official in charge of the German desk. Undoubtedly Pastor Niemoeller was put out, though the Department might have a good case for what seemed a slight, in view of the curious and unique position of Pastor Niemoeller as a leader in the opposition to the established government at Bonn.

Pastor Niemoeller has been in the habit of speaking his mind freely throughout his tempestuous life, and suffering for it. Since the war he seems to have expressed the thoughts of millions of his countrymen. Such a man, with his hold on so many people in Germany, cannot be ignored. He has to be understood, or Germany itself will not be understood. Even a minimal curiosity should have caused the policy makers to make some effort to get at first-hand his observations and conclusions and an appraisal of the man himself. Why did he raise his powerful voice against a proposal which would have recreated a German army? Whence his ability to make that voice whisper throughout Germany, East and West, and have it echo back as the conviction of millions of Germans? The answers go to the heart of things in the east-west struggle. Pastor Niemoeller believes that diplomatic resources are not yet exhausted, and that even if those resources are spurned in Moscow, the west must always keep its eye on the impact of its diplomacy upon public opinion. He fears that the Stalinists are increasing their lead in the battle for the public mind. On defense he believes that the proper approach is the development of a European army; indeed, he thinks that all measures of defense should be dovetailed in the building up of a united Europe.

The policy on the rearmament of Germany seems to have developed in a vacuum by persons who felt that the Germans themselves could be ignored. Niemoeller merely reminded the world that there are Germans in Germany, not militarily worthless puppets. The problem of talking to oppositionists is a thorny but by no means an insuperable problem. It has arisen before in respect of important personalities—Rene Pleven, when he was here as De Gaulle's representative; Yukio Ozaki, the perennial oppositionist in Japan; and Feng Yu-hsiang, the vice generalissimo to Chiang Kai-shek before the split in the Kuomintang. Policy in foreign affairs should rest upon knowledge of the forces at work in the countries in which we are operating, and some means should be found for knowing non-Communist oppositionists to Allied policy as well as Communist oppositionists to Stalinist policy.

Vanishing Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Vanishing Surpluses," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of recent date. In this connection I call the attention of my colleagues to the danger of having to depend upon a crisis of war to keep up our economy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VANISHING SURPLUSES

Impact of war and preparation for war on the Nation's economy is illustrated by the change in farm surpluses. A few months ago they were a mounting problem calling for a new approach.

New Government holdings of cheese, butter, cotton, and wool have almost disappeared and the surpluses of the major grains—corn and wheat—are so highly regarded they are being stockpiled against future emergency. The Government has already called upon the farmers to produce more of them. Potato control has been abandoned.

Wheat is needed against the possibility of feeding allies in a war, and there is a high priority on corn to keep meat supplies adequate. The changed prospect is reflected in prices, wheat quotations being at their high in several years despite a large surplus.

The Commodity Credit Corporation claims a loss of only $773,000,000 in its 17-year history. This, however, does not include administrative costs, interest, and storage charges, which exceed the sales losses. CCC has authority to use nearly $5,000,000,000, and currently has $2,888,000,000 invested in price supports. It would appear that a considerable saving could be effected in this field, holding the budget down and avoiding some of the proposed new taxes.

This general situation of challenging economic problems that can be solved only by war calls for searching analysis. Is the American economic system so decadent that it must be supported by emergency after emergency to keep it working at top speed and stave off collapse of the standard of living? And what happens when the Nation runs out of emergencies? Will it then be necessary to create another?

Proposed Amendments to Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several editorials regarding the proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act. These include editorials from the Washington News, the Washington Post, the Washington Star, and the Birmingham Post-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of January 15, 1951]

TOO MANY DEFERMENTS

Overhauling of the draft law, with a severe tightening of the present deferment policy, will be one of the most pressing problems before the new Congress.

The grim fact is that under the present set-up Selective Service is going to have a hard time furnishing enough men to provide an army of 3,500,000 by next July, President Truman's goal.

As in the case of so many other problems of the emergency, the whole question of manpower supply is still in the discussion stage, with no firm policy taking shape.

Selective Service is operating now under a 1-year extension, to next June 30, of a postwar draft law altogether too lenient and top-heavy with exemptions. Bypassed are the World War II veterans, all fathers, men with dependents, students, youths under 19, and men over 25, and those mentally or physically unfit for general service. Certain occupational deferments are also permitted, mostly agricultural.

At the current rate of demand, under these limitations, Selective Service will be running out of men before summer.

In that light, and in the face of the compelling need, we don't think much of the proposal advanced last month by one of Selective Service's own advisory groups. It would defer indefinitely "superior" university students so that they could continue their studies. Their superiority would be determined by giving them an aptitude test similar to that now given by the armed services and certifying them as "promising students."

The time is past for such unfair and unequal selectivity. The need now is for men, and in large numbers, regardless of how "promising" they may be as plotted by an "aptitude" test.

General Eisenhower, who is still adding to the luster of his name, as the preceding editorial points out, was not particularly "promising" as a student. He was in the lower half of his class at West Point. And it took General Patton 5 years to get through.

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of January 20, 1951]

DON'T WEAKEN UMST

The long-awaited bill for universal military service and training finally has been introduced in Congress.

In recent hearings before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, the main target of attack has been the starting age—the draft of 18-year-olds. This opposition undoubtedly reflects the sentiments voiced in letters that have been pouring in on Congressmen from parents who, understandably, dislike to see their youthful sons called into service.

Yet this newspaper believes the principal arguments against the draft of 18-year-olds have been categorically and satisfactorily answered by competent witnesses before the Senate committee. These facts seem to have been established:

There are barely enough men in the 19-to-26-age bracket to provide an army of 3,500,000 men, and not enough if that goal is raised or the present call-up rate is increased.

The alternatives are to take fathers, veterans, or 18-year-olds. And, as Draft Director Lewis Hershey pointed out: "The mortgage is on the 18-year-olds since they've got to serve at 19 anyway."

Young men drafted at 18 would, in most cases, return to civilian life between their twentieth and twenty-first birthdays—still young enough to get a college education. Those in high school would not be drafted until they had finished, or reached age 19, whichever came first. Youths in college before they became 18 could finish the school year. In addition, each year 75,000 promising students would have their active military service deferred to study a wide variety of courses for specialized training, though they would be obligated to complete their military service time after graduation. It seems to us there is an even better argument for placing military service first.

There has been some talk of 18½ as a compromise age. But this is offset by the Defense Department's pledge that no 18-year-old will be sent overseas without at least four, and possibly six, months of basic military training.

The 18-year-olds are not yet an important factor in the country's labor force. Their induction would not greatly disrupt industry's manpower.

The stamina, endurance, and recuperative powers of 18- and 19-year-olds unquestionably make them superior soldiers. By starting their training early they improve their own chances of survival if eventually they must be sent into combat.

And, important from a long-range view, UMST beginning at 18 will provide the country with an ever-expanding pool of trained reserves for the next 10 years. Yet the system is flexible enough to meet any world change for the better—the President can reduce or eliminate service requirements as the emergency eases.

This newspaper believes that Congress should enact UMST promptly without change or compromise on the 18-year-old age requirement.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 13, 1951]

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS

The harshest and most far-reaching sacrifice required in the interest of national security has now been set plainly before Congress. It entails something unprecedented and profoundly unwelcome in American life—the peacetime impressment into military service of all physically fit youths reaching the age of 18. This means not only hardship for the boys called into uniform and heartache for the families they must leave, but also a profound wrench to the traditions of a country which has always abhorred militarism and has never until now considered a large standing army in peacetime necessary to its safety. Only necessity could justify such a course. Unhappily, the necessity appears to be at hand.

Secretary of Defense Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg, who presented the plan for universal military service and training to the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee, made no attempt to gloss over its harshness. This break with the past is not likely to be of brief duration. The Secretary spoke of it as a 10-year burden. But there is no way to measure its duration just as there is no way to measure the duration of the world crisis compelling it. As General Marshall observed, "There is no cheap or easy solution to our present security problems."

We need to create speedily an armed force of 3,200,000 men and we need also to maintain a large corps of trained reserves. Patently the best way to accomplish both of these aims is to induct and train the youngest men fit for military service. They make the best fighters, their induction will entail the least dislocation of the national economy and the least disruption of family life, and they will be available longest for the defense of the Nation. The alternative, induction of older men now deferred, would impose even graver hardships.

The UMST program outlined by Defense Department officials appears to have taken into account intelligently the importance of continued education for some of the young men to be called to duty. It would permit students now in college to complete their academic year. It would provide for a return to college after basic training of perhaps 100,000 to 125,000 of the most apt students each year—so that the national need for skilled scientific workers and for educated men equipped to assume the responsibilities of future leadership would not be ignored.

Whether induction should be authorized to begin at 18 or, as Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has suggested, at 18½, and whether the

term of service should be for the full 27 months requested by the Defense authorities or limited to 2 years, are details which Congress will need to study carefully. What we do in the present crisis will be looked upon by the rest of the world as a demonstration of our resolution. It will be taken as a standard, no doubt, by those nations upon whom we are urging increased military preparedness. We cannot afford at this stage to falter or to equivocate in our own program.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 22, 1951]

COLLEGE PROGRAMS

American colleges have already been hit very hard by mobilization. The uncertainties of the draft situation have led great numbers of young men to leave their campuses or to forego higher education in order to enlist in the armed services. If universal service for 18-year-olds is made a national policy, it is estimated by the executive director of the Association of American Colleges that enrollment of male students will drop by as much as 80 percent. The needs of national defense are paramount, of course. And there does not seem to be any way short of a no-deferment program to raise an army of three and a half million. But the cost of such a program in terms of its impact on education ought to be reckoned realistically.

One effect of a sudden drop in student enrollment will perhaps be the destruction of a number of colleges—particularly those without large endowments and dependent for their operation on income derived from tuition fees. A number of institutions have already been obliged to reduce the size of their faculties. They may, if the pinch becomes severe enough, be obliged to close their doors altogether. This loss of educational facilities would entail a very severe cost to the Nation.

Universal military service would also mean a serious gap in the training of young men for future professional careers. Four or 5 years hence this might present the Nation with a disastrous shortage of doctors, engineers, research chemists, physicists and experts in other fields where knowledge cannot be acquired quickly. In a world where military strength is to a great extent dependent upon scientific supremacy, we can scarcely afford to be indifferent to the supply of skilled scientists. Nor can we recklessly forsake the training of young men for future national leadership. Provision for a student training program in the universal military service and training plan submitted to Congress by the Defense Department is a wise form of conservation. It will help substantially to stabilize the country's educational structure.

The colleges themselves, however, will be obliged to make important adjustments to the hard realities of the present situation. President James Bryant Conant, of Harvard University, recognized the need in his annual report to the board of overseers just released. Planning for the future, he declared, must be based on the assumption "that we shall be partially mobilized but not in a global war for many years." The situation today is not analogous to that which faced us after Pearl Harbor when education as usual was abruptly suspended and teachers as well as students enlisted for the duration.

The duration now is indefinite. After the transitional period of draft induction, college enrollment will probably return to normal or even in excess of it as young men are released to resume their studies. Speeded programs may be necessary for them, although Mr. Conant considers the 3-year college course, improvised after the last war, unsatisfactory; professional schools will have to make some modifications, too; and faculties will have to ration their contributions to Government service in order "to prevent a dissipation of their highly specialized manpower." Colleges are a national asset far too valuable to be lightly or needlessly sacrificed.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 21, 1951]

TEEN-AGERS IN BATTLE

One of the reasons most frequently given for opposition to the lowering of the draft age to 18 is the fear that youngsters might be sent into battle without adequate training. That is an understandable fear, but it needs analysis. Why were 18-year-olds pressed hurriedly into combat during World War II? Because a sudden desperate need for fighting men arose, and there was no time to train the teen-agers or to bring in reinforcements from elsewhere.

There can be no sure guaranty that such an emergency will not arise again. But there is a protection against unpreparedness. That is to make sure that every young man receives ample training as a matter of course. That means universal training and service starting at 18. It is a tragedy whenever men go into battle unprepared; whether they are 18, or 19, as is now legally possible, makes little difference. The aim of current legislation is to build military strength and a reservoir of trained men so that this will not happen. Eighteen-year-olds are needed to keep the Armed Forces at strength and to place the reservoir of trained men on a sustaining basis. No wishful thinking can blot out the fact that international tension is likely to be with us for a long time. The kindest thing that can be done for the 18-year-olds, who sooner or later would be involved anyhow, is to train them adequately to meet their responsibility.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of January 12, 1951]

COMBINING TRAINING AND SERVICE

Defense Secretary Marshall has presented to Congress a combined military service and training program that has the advantage of meeting both immediate and long-range manpower needs of national defense. It would supply the trained men required in the present emergency to build our military strength to 3,200,000 men. Yet the program would be flexible enough to provide universal training facilities after immediate goals of the armed services are attained. The plan, therefore, would end what Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON, of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee calls the dangerous luxury of sporadic, piecemeal manpower measures to which we have become addicted.

As outlined in general scope by General Marshall and Assistant Secretary Rosenberg, the plan calls for the induction of 18-year-olds for training and service in the Regular Establishment or assignment to Reserve components. Induction now begins at 19. All physically fit 18-year-olds would be given from 4 to 6 months' training before being sent on to one of the regular fighting branches. The policy would be not to send men under 19 overseas except in dire emergency. The training and service period would cover 27 months, after which they would become members of the Reserve for from 3 to 6 years, the Reserve term depending on whether membership was in an organized unit or an inactive class.

Once the emergency needs of the Regular services are satisfied, however, the induction machinery would become more a source of trained reservists than of regulars. The President would have authority not only to reduce service requirements but to eliminate them altogether if conditions warranted. Thus, the Defense Department's plan would be adaptable to the long-view program of building up a strong body of reservists in all branches. The theory is that the larger and stronger this stand-by citizens' reserve, the less need there will be for maintaining a huge standing army at great cost to the Nation.

Even this compromise between development of a garrison state and the inadequacies of past and present patchwork measures will be costly and inconvenient. It will mean readjustments in the home, in education, and in industry. If the program is made truly universal, it will, in effect, ration the services of all of the country's manpower, young and in the older brackets. But, as General Marshall told the Johnson subcommittee, this is a reasonable price which "a resolute people will be willing to pay for their liberties."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of January 10, 1951]

UMT STILL NECESSARY

Many persons share Senator TAFT's misgivings over the maintenance of a large standing Army in this country in time of so-called peace. He told the Senate he had heard talk of an American Army twice the size of that now planned and warned that such an increase in armed strength as a long-range program would put the Nation perpetually on a deficit basis. In addition, he said, "It would pose serious problems in the fields of military morale and industrial manpower."

There is an alternative, however, to what the Ohio Senator termed "a garrison state." Universal military training would provide a constant reservoir of trained manpower that would enable the country safely to reduce the size of its Regular Army. It is the lack of such a training program in the past that has complicated the task of raising the minimum Armed Forces required in the present emergency. And, still lacking such a program, there is no satisfactory source of trained manpower except selective service and the system of camp training now under way. Once the required strength is attained, induction of men for training and service in the standing Army is the only method which Congress has provided to keep our strength at the level deemed necessary for security.

General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other authorities have told Congress repeatedly that the only way to avoid the burdens of a large standing Army in time of peace—and yet remain potentially strong—is by creating a stand-by reserve of young men trained in the rudiments of warfare. Such a permanent reserve could be built up within a few years under a universal military-training program of the type advocated by defense officials on numerous occasions in the past. It has been said the UMT would not be feasible right now, because of a shortage of instructors and camp facilities. It is true that these facilities are being taxed beyond capacity by the selective-service remobilization program. There is no good reason, however, why the new Congress should not pass stand-by legislation of the type just introduced to authorize UMT whenever facilities for carrying out the plan become available. We would be far better prepared to meet aggression today had we started the training of our youth before the emergency developed.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald of January 13, 1951]

THE SOONER, THE BETTER

Defense Secretary Marshall and his manpower assistant, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, made

two impressive points when they presented the broad outline of a universal military service and training program before a congressional committee this week.

They made clear that UMST is at once the least costly and the most effective means of attaining immediate partial mobilization and at the same time assuring a vitally necessary pool of trained men for the next decade.

It is, as Mrs. Rosenberg summed up, the only device "for providing a sound defense now and in the future at a price we can afford to pay."

Economically, there is this consideration: If we don't draft the 18-year-olds we shall have to tap the young married men, with and without dependents, who are now exempt. There are now 630,000 of these in the 19–26 age group potentially available for induction. If they were called up it would cost the Government $979,000,000 a year including their pay and dependency allowances.

If, instead, an equivalent number of 18-year-olds were taken—as proposed under UMST—since they are almost uniformly without dependents, the cost for a year at the proposed pay rate would be $466,000,000. Thus the annual payroll savings alone would be $513,000,000—not counting the loss to industries and farms and to the purchasing power of families that would be involved in calling up married men.

But something much more important than money is involved.

From his experience in World War II, General Marshall said that men of 18, 19, and 20 unquestionably made the best soldiers. They have stamina and recuperative power far beyond that of the older groups.

By starting the training of our young men at 18—instead of 19 as at present—we not only immediately solve the problem of reaching the 3,200,000-man Army goal by next July, we also start an ever-expanding flow of well-trained men into the Reserve components.

It is this important reserve pool, now lacking, from which an army in being could be doubled or tripled almost overnight. It is the cushion, or "durable layer of military protection," that would survive the alternate moods of grave public alarm and complacency over the next decade. It could mean the difference between national survival or total defeat.

At the same time, these youths whose combat training started at 18 will have greatly enhanced their own chances of survival if they are required to go into battle.

The urgency of the situation is beyond question. The sooner UMST is put into effect the greater will be our national security and the stronger our voice for lasting world peace.

Congress Should Insist on a Share in Policy Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the January 27 issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

CONGRESS SHOULD INSIST ON A SHARE IN POLICY MAKING

The constitutional crisis through which we are supposed to have been passing is not so much a constitutional crisis as a crisis of confidence. Few people seriously believe that the President lacks legal power to send troops abroad for specific missions, although his right to involve the country in a major undeclared war is certainly questionable. What is definitely doubted by millions of Americans is the ability of President Truman, Secretary Acheson and our leaders generally to decide where to send anybody. The November elections constituted a repudiation of the administration which neither the people nor Congress is in a position to carry through to a logical conclusion. That is the source of the crisis which does involve differences in constitutional interpretation, but is actually brought about by doubts regarding our present leadership.

In these circumstances it is not only natural but necessary that Congress should more and more edge into the picture and insist on a larger share in planning and responsibility. Korea gives the leaders of Congress their opportunity and points out their duty. In addition to merely consulting with the State Department and saying "Yes," Congress will have to exert pressure. Specifically it might well insist upon an explanation of our persistent refusal to release the troops of Chiang Kai-shek for an attack from Formosa, and the strange ins and outs of our attitudes on the proposal for a cease fire in Korea. The State Department first consented to a proposal for a conference on Korea which excluded from the proposed discussions the Nationalist government of China, the regime which we recognize and which has a seat on the Security Council. Later the United States representative at Lake Success reversed our position and insisted that Chiang Kai-shek be represented at any conference about Asia.

The official explanation at the time was that we had no expectation that the Chinese Reds would consent to the cease-fire proposal, and that when it had been rejected we could proceed to tell them off as aggressors. But it is strange diplomacy which announces in advance that we are not acting in good faith, but only to prove a point that we have decided already. And suppose the Chinese Communists had accepted, and we had found ourselves in a conference stacked three to one against us; were we prepared to hand over Formosa and a UN membership to the Communists as the price of a foehold in an unprofitable Korea? Or what was the deal?

The State Department's attitude on the Formosa question has been explained by a commendable desire not to become further involved in an Asiatic war. It is also a survival of the left-wing nonsense to the effect that we must have no traffic with Nationalist China lest we alienate our friends in Asia. Now that our friends in Asia are revealed even to the most starry-eyed as our enemies in Asia, Congress might well ask why we can't aid the enemies of our enemies even if Mr. Acheson and his group aren't prepared to treat them as friends. Here again there has been a mighty change since the January slap by Mao Tse-tung. Formosa is apparently to be regarded as essential to American security, after all these years of State Department insistence that it wasn't.

There are indications that Congress is alive to this. Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada (Democrat), has introduced a resolution calling for aid to Chiang Kai-shek, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, one of the ablest on Mr. Truman's side of the floor, also urges support of Chiang, Franco, and Tito, not because they are Democrats, but because they are anti-Communists. Here it might be observed that the State Department's eagerness to help Tito, who prides himself of being a purer Communist than Stalin, is in curious contrast to its attitude toward Franco and Chiang. These are items in our foreign policy which Congress might well probe. There must be some reason behind attitudes so defiant of logic.

The Dilemma of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of the Philippines and Permanent Delegate to the United Nations, when the honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon him by Boston University on January 31, 1951.

General Romulo was cited by Boston University as one "whose life and achievements reflect glory and honor upon that island country" and as a "patriot who has held the freedom of native land dearer than life, and whose fervent patriotism now encompasses all mankind." The citation also said that General Romulo is a "soldier whose efficiency and loyalty have been proclaimed by promotion to the rank of brigadier general, a diplomat who knows that 'peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war,' and who is winning renown by the consecration of superb mental and personality powers to the establishment of peace on earth and good will among the nations of the earth."

His speech entitled "The Dilemma of the Free World" was favorably commented upon editorially by leading American newspapers, because it underscores the fact that the objectives of the free world of today are to keep alive the will to freedom and the will to resist those who would destroy freedom.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, if we go by the allotted span of human life, silver anniversaries are not a rare or unusual observance. The Biblical threescore and ten, if cherished with care and husbanded without haste, do permit a man the proud achievement of sticking to something—a useful profession or a beloved spouse—with fidelity and affection, and in the end receiving the plaudits of admiring friends and neighbors.

The achievement of Dr. Daniel L. Marsh is rare in this: That, having passed the Biblical span, he can point to 25 years of faithful service as a university president in the noblest profession there is—a profession to which he has been wedded as to a beloved spouse—and that, having reached this milestone, he has yet the vitality and the vision to go from hence toward a future of undiminished usefulness to his country and people. Anyone can have a silver anniversary of some kind, but the pleasures of a silver anniversary as one of the great educators of America are given to but a few. You, Dr. Marsh, are one of these fortunate few, and I am happy to have you come to join thousands of your friends and neighbors in paying you this just and affectionate tribute of admiration. Humbly, yet sincerely, I add my voice to the paean of praise that comes to you today from all those, in this land and in other lands, who have watched Boston University flourish into greatness under your patient and devoted leadership.

Manila is almost halfway around the world from Boston. But the world has become so small and history has moved so fast that while Boston, 200 years ago, was the farthest outpost of western civilization in the New World of America, Manila, today, is the farthest outpost of western civilization in the Old World of Asia. The expanse between Boston and Manila represents the area covered by the advancing wave of western culture. If that area is to be held and defended as an area of freedom, the common faith and ideals of these two cities, and of the lands for which they stand as symbols, must remain strong and enduring as hoops of steel. The outpost in Manila will be held if the people of Boston keep the faith.

This is not a modern Tale of Two Cities. It is an attempt to reduce to simple terms the dilemma of the free world. America, which has become the arsenal of the free world, must soon make a difficult choice. America must choose between a policy of withdrawing to its frontiers to safeguard its freedom and its way of life, and a policy of assisting free peoples everywhere to defend their freedom against the menace of a new and more terrible despotism. America must choose between defending its own freedom in Boston and San Francisco and defending that same freedom in Paris and London, in Sydney and Manila.

Whatever the decision, it will not be an easy one to make. But the difficulty should be the measure of our invention and imagination. This Nation was made great through courage and vision. These same qualities will be needed to defend and protect it. To follow the counsel of fear is to embark on the road to disaster.

Last night, at Lake Success, there took place an event of truly historic proportions. After 2 months of protracted debate and much searching of hearts and consciences the Political and Security Committee of the United Nations General Assembly decided by a substantial vote to pin the label of aggressor on the Government of Communist China.

The decision is not so simple as it sounds. What make it significant are the premise on which it stands and the united action that now must follow it. The free world has had the courage to identify the aggressor and stands ready to take additional measures to meet the aggression.

The United States should be proud of the leadership it assumed in the making of this historic decision. The emotional pressures that tended toward a rash and impulsive decision were greater than any nation in a similar situation has ever borne. But the patience and forbearance of the United States have been rewarded by the support of its friends and allies. Today the free world stands forth united and strong in the sight of the aggressor.

The Philippines is one of the two states of Asia (Thailand being the other) that rejected the repeated invitations to weakness and surrender. Though they frightened us with new threats by the aggressor and scared us with the danger of another world war, we stood firmly by the conviction that the surest way to whet the appetite of the aggressor and to bring on the tragedy of another war is to surrender to intimidation and blackmail.

I cannot say, standing here before you, that by this decision we in the United Nations have avoided the risk of war. But I do say that if this risk does exist we could not avoid it by bending the knee to the aggressor. What we have done is to give notice to the aggressor that the free world has made up its mind to resist his further aggressions or attempts at aggression, as we resisted them a few years back in Iran, Greece, and Berlin. This time, instead of half-hearted resistance or unilateral decisions to resist, we have proclaimed our unified purpose and determination to maintain the peace and security of the world.

My country made a difficult decision in breaking away from the group of 12 Asian and Arab states which favored further negotiations with the aggressor in Korea. This decision is symptomatic of what is going on in the mind of Asia. Back of the neutralism of Asia and its reluctance to join forces with the west are the fears and suspicions which centuries of unhappy contact with the Western Powers have bred. Almost alone in Asia, the Philippines was spared this experience and memory of colonial subjection and exploitation. The United States must feel proud that today, once again, as in the days of Bataan and Corregidor, the people of the Philippines have decided to stand beside the people of the United States in the great political crisis of the United Nations.

Nevertheless, the problem of keeping the free countries of Asia within the democratic camp remains urgent and pressing. If the Philippines remains an outpost and promontory of the free world in Asia, then it must be held not only for its own sake but also for the sake of advancing the cause of freedom and democracy in that part of the world. To this end the United States must do two things. It must insist that the American experiment in the Philippines become the measure of the present and future colonial policy of the Western Powers in Asia. And the United States must act in regard to the Philippines in a manner to reassure the other countries of Asia of its friendly and generous intentions.

The Philippines is the pilot plant of freedom and democracy in Asia, and what America does there in terms of friendly understanding and fair dealing will have a vastly more persuasive effect upon our neighbors than the broadcasts of the Voice of America and the squadrons of American bombers and battleships.

The true power of America does not rest on the dollar and the atom bomb. If these were the only source of American power, it would not last. The strength of America still rests on the conviction held by the free peoples of the world that America stands for justice, for freedom, for equality, for progress, for all the great humane values of our civilization. If this faith in America is lost, the dollar cannot redeem it and the atom bomb cannot restore it.

The decision that was taken last night at Lake Success reveals the true dimensions of the problem that America must face. America's responsibilities as the leader of the free world cannot be met by military strength alone. Those responsibilities can be met only if its relations with the free countries of the world are placed on a basis of mutual consideration and respect, and if its legitimate concern for the security of Europe and of European interests in Asia does not overshadow its equally legitimate concern for the freedom and progress of the Asian peoples.

Some bitterness will have been caused by the refusal of the majority of the Asian countries to support the antiaggression resolution of the General Assembly, but I trust that American statesmanship will overcome this natural disappointment and resolutely apply itself to the vital task of repairing the rifts that have appeared in the ranks of the free world. I dare, above all, to express the fervent hope that retaliatory measures shall not even be thought of, that the American policy of assisting the underdeveloped countries shall not suffer as a consequence, and that food or any other form of relief and assistance shall not be used as a weapon of political pressure or as an instrument of national policy. Tolerance, not resentment, becomes as of today the essential ingredient of the common faith and purpose of the free world.

The crisis that confronts us will bring with it the evil of narrow perspectives and short-term objectives. Though these may assume the appearance of necessity, they cannot take the place of wisdom. A basic ingredient of the wisdom which we now require is the capacity to fix our eyes on the long-term objectives of the free world. Those objectives are to keep alive the will to freedom and the will to resist those who would destroy freedom.

In this city of Paul Revere, it is a supererogation to stress the virtue of alertness to danger. We have been awakened to the peril of aggression and the risk of general war. The modern Paul Reveres of the press and the radio have done their job well, so well, in fact, that we seem to feel the need of a little serenity and reassurance. We need to order our thoughts, to ponder our course of action, to look beyond the horizon, to lift our eyes, as the Psalmist said, to the hills whence cometh our help.

We need, above all, to avoid the pitfall of despair and the rash actions which despair inspires. If American freedom was born at Bunker Hill, it is well to remember that Bunker Hill commemorates a military defeat. Even so was the freedom of the Philippines assured at Bataan, though Bataan brought only tragic disaster to our arms.

That we may lose the first encounters with the enemies of our freedom is not an occasion for despair. The principle of freedom will triumph in the end because we have refused to bargain with it, because from the first, as on Bunker Hill and in Bataan, we have resolved together to cherish it with courage and devotion till final victory is won.

(Dr. Marsh at this juncture conferred upon General Romulo the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa. It was the second time in its history that Boston University awarded an honorary degree at special exercises. Five years ago Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was similarly honored.)

Dr. Marsh, that this day should have been chosen to invest me with the honorary degree of doctor of laws is pleasure and satisfaction enough. It is like being served a rare and delicious fruit that is not in season. But to savor such a fruit in this company and on such an occasion is to compound the value of the gift. The personal honor that I feel I lay before you, Dr. Marsh, as a token of my high personal esteem and regard. But the honor that this award signifies for my country and my people I lay before this great Nation as a symbol of the mighty bonds of affection and gratitude that shall unite forever the people of America and the people of the Philippines.

Wage-Price Fiasco Another Symptom of Anarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Wage-Price Fiasco Another Symptom of Anarchy," by Ralph A. Lee, managing editor, which appeared in the Southwest-Times Record, of Fort Smith, Ark., in the issue for Sunday, February 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAGE-PRICE FIASCO ANOTHER SYMPTOM OF ANARCHY—GOVERNMENT APPEARS INCAPABLE NOW OF DEALING WITH FORCES IT SET IN MOTION

(By Ralph A. Loe)

In view of the wage-price fiasco and other disquieting symptoms of approaching anarchy, there is a real question whether Government as now constituted is capable of dealing with the disruptive forces that are developing.

Legislation by faction and by ballot pressure has grown so enormously that there is a question now whether Government creates circumstance or is the creature of circumstance. In the lackadaisical and belated attempt at wage-price control, Government obviously is a captive of some of the very circumstances it created.

Government is laying the basis for its eventual destruction when it deliberately prostitutes itself to the prejudices and the political innocence of its voters. Decadence is hastened when the electorate learns that by voting group interests it can obtain temporary benefits not available by voting individual convictions with only the general welfare in mind.

When a republic is subjected to this contamination, it gradually loses character and degenerates by degrees from one nameless form to another, ending usually in absolute dictatorship. The tragic story has been repeated time and again in history.

From all sides, there are warnings that inflation cynically set in motion 18 years ago is on the verge of getting completely out of hand. There is abundant evidence also that neither Congress nor the administration knows quite what to do about it.

The wage-price control effort has bogged down in a fruitless chicken-and-egg argument between labor and industry. Labor argues that wages have not caught up with prices, and for the unorganized majority this is true. It will be true a year from now, for it is the history of every inflation that wages never catch up with prices.

On the other hand, industry rightly insists that wages are the principal ingredient of prices, and that even a beginning of control is impossible until the wage factor is stabilized.

At this point the six members of the Wage Stabilization Board representing industry and the public voted approval of a formula limiting increases to 10 percent, and the three labor members resigned in protest. The 10-percent formula which produced the labor resignations was inflationary in itself, of course, and would have entailed an immediate increase in prices.

Without representation on the Board labor will feel itself under no obligation to abide by any of the Board's decisions. There will be strikes as usual, culminating as usual in further wage increases and further price increases.

No one wins or possesses even a worthwhile temporary advantage in this insane roundelay, but it will continue as long as people continue to think strictly in terms of group interests and without regard for the welfare of the country.

In the large sense, however, the temporary success of any wage-price scheme would have no important bearing on the basic forces which threaten disaster. Controls deal with the symptoms and not the origins of inflation. What is wrong fundamentally is the fact that the country for 18 years has been deceiving itself with printing-press money.

When an inflation has progressed as far as this one, a nation's economy can move only in one direction, and that direction is up. Public and private debt is accumulating to such an astronomical extent that it can be supported only in terms of dollars which are depreciating in value proportionately to the debt increase.

As a matter of practical economics, it would not be possible for this country to support its existing debt in terms of sound dollars of inflexible value. Any real attempt to stabilize the dollar at this point would tend to freeze the business expansion which has produced constantly increasing tax revenues and made municipal, State, and Federal debt management possible.

At the municipal and State levels a point of diminishing returns already is appearing and there are serious difficulties in the maintenance of governmental functions and in the provisions of debt service. As the inflation continues these subdivisions of government will bog down in fiscal chaos, and there will be pressure for the Federal Government to assume the responsibilities that the municipalities and States are unable to discharge.

With its own affairs in disorder, the Federal Government could not assume new responsibilities unless it disregarded completely the conflicting wills of the people and their pressure organizations.

Along that road lies rule by bullet and not by ballot.

The Atlantic Union Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial about the Atlantic Union resolution which appeared in the January 18, 1951, issue of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS ACTION ON ATLANTIC UNION MORE URGENT AS RED CRISIS GROWS

The Atlantic Union resolution, which we endorsed when it was introduced in Congress more than a year ago, has again been put forth by a large group of Senators and Representatives. The changed character of world affairs has given the sponsors of the resolution a feeling of urgency in their proposal, a feeling which seems completely justified.

Who can deny that the world is at the threshold—indeed, well into the area of danger—where the struggle is clearly between freemen and the enslaved puppets of tyranny? Whether the ultimate victory will be won through political prowess or by force of arms, the outcome will ring the death knell of one or the other—freedom or slavery.

On the one hand the Communist despots are firmly welded in the tight band of Russian domination. The threatened democracies, on the other hand, are still dangerously asunder and unable to act in concert, even for their own salvation.

It is this historic division which the Atlantic Union resolution aims to correct. The sponsors, Senators LEHMAN, GEORGE, AIKEN, NIXON, KEFAUVER, and 22 others, are practical, hard-headed men. A mere military alliance, such as that under which General Eisenhower must collect his force against aggression, does not seem strong or final enough to these men. It is too easily broken, too confusing and impermanent to guarantee success.

Even General Eisenhower himself emphasized this need in London early this week when he said "the only way the free world can defend itself is for the free world to stick together." Surely we are not so politically immature as to refuse to explore the best way of accomplishing this.

The present alliance must be given political and economic force. The loose, 12-headed Atlantic Council which advises Eisenhower must be forged into a civil power with adhesion and strength.

The question is this:

Which type of valor is the best course for the democracies: To drown separately, though gallantly, in the sweeping tide of Communist imperialism or to unite and stem the tide with the same principles of free federal union which launched into the world this great Federal Union we now call the United States?

Nonsegregation Policy Vindicated in Combat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, clear evidence that a policy of nonsegregation in the Army pays off to the country is found in the appended dispatch in the New York Times of February 9, 1951:

MIXING OF GI UNITS PAYS OFF IN KOREA—MANY COMMANDERS HAIL END OF NEGRO SEGREGATION AS AID IN RECENT VICTORIES

(By George Barrett)

WITH THE EIGHTH ARMY, EAST OF SUWON, KOREA, February 8.—United States Army infantry outfits that are discarding Negro segregation practices in Korea are discovering that removal of the color line among fighting troops is paying good dividends both in morale and in battle.

For some weeks now the Army has been assigning white replacements to Negro units and Negro replacements to white units. In most cases this occurred because local commanders had to get whatever replacements they could without delay to bring their units back to fighting strength. This development has been for many Regular Army commanders a clue to their recent victories.

OBJECTIVE IS CAPTURED

Some days ago in this sector a battalion of white and Negro officers and Negro enlisted men took a double-barreled objective. They scaled two 1,800-foot heights and routed the Chinese Communist defenders, killing at least 250 of the enemy, wounding two to three times as many, and capturing 31 prisoners, an unusually high number.

When the fighting ended the men were ordered back down off the hill for the night to prevent a possible Chinese ambush, but they delayed their withdrawal for several dangerous hours to scour the heights for their wounded.

A Negro civil-affairs officer who voluntarily left his rear echelon sinecure to go forward during the bitter fighting to lead a platoon that had been badly battered was killed in action.

The regimental commander is Col. Dennis M. Moore, of Clarksville, Tex., a veteran of the Corregidor fighting and a survivor of the Bataan death march. Colonel Moore said the Negro unit had as nasty an assignment as any United Nations outfit in Korea and had done a good job.

NO BAR TO FRIENDSHIPS

As the replacements intermingle more and more in the units, the officers are finding out that the new friendships are in nowise hampered by the soldiers' color. One lieutenant asked for volunteers and got the choice of one team of buddies—a Negro and a white soldier—or none. One regimental surgeon on another sector is a Negro lieutenant colonel and the other is white. To the Negro soldiers in the regiment both are respectfully known as Doc.

There are instances now of Negro officers having command of white troops and Negro officers outranking white officers, without any special friction in either case.

Probably typical of most white officers and soldiers is Lt. George M. Richardson, of Macon, Mo., who told this correspondent that when he was assigned to work with Negroes and whites together he told his superiors that as a deeply indoctrinated southerner he would try his best to go half way and even more. Actually, he added, he found he had never had a single case where he had to go more than half way. In most cases, he was not conscious of making any special effort at all.

He said that in combat in Korea the principle of mixed ranks had proved itself many times, but he predicted it would still be a long time before it would be accepted as a practice at home by the officers and men who were close in Korea.

Un-American Handwriting on the Walls of the House of Representatives

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to remove from the walls of the House of Representatives those ancient caricatures with which we are confronted, and to replace them with figures of distinguished Americans. Those alien figures are merely the handwriting of un-Americanism on our walls. There has been a concerted effort on the part of a lot of radicals in some of our educational institutions for 20 years, or more, to destroy American history and to discredit those great Americans who helped to establish and build this great Republic. Today we are told that two-thirds of the colleges in this country do not require any knowledge of American history.

I wonder why.

Now, let us take some of the individuals whose supposed likenesses have been placed on the walls of this House, at the suggestion of some of those radicals, and see how great Americans have been bypassed by this stupid procedure.

In the first place, that distorted figure of the American eagle overhead, which looks as if Stalin might have stamped on it, should be removed and replaced by that splendid figure of the American eagle which appears on the Government seal.

We could easily select from the list of great Americans who have served in this body, and whose names will ring down the centuries, regardless of the attempts now being made to undermine and destroy them, figures to fill every space occupied by these imitations of alleged ancient leadership.

We might place the figure of Christ up there beside that of Moses, to remind the world that this is still a Christian country. If Moses had lived during the time of Christ the chances are that he would have been the greatest Christian leader of all time.

Prior to the turn of the last century there were 18 Presidents of the United States who had served in this House or in the Continental Congress.

George Washington not only served in the Continental Congress but led our forces in the Revolutionary War, presided over the Constitutional Convention, and served 8 years as President of the United States. We have that glorious painting of Washington before us, delivering his Farewell Address to the American people. God grant that his majestic figure may forever be before the eyes of Members of this House. His Farewell Address was the greatest message of its kind ever issued. It warned us against the very dangers with which we are now threatened.

But if Washington were here today, he would be branded as an isolationist.

Thomas Jefferson served in the Continental Congress, as Governor of Virginia, Minister to France, Secretary of State, and Vice President, and then served as President of the United States for 8 years. The figure of Jefferson is already before us, so we need not worry about him. He followed the policy laid down by Washington in his Farewell Address and warned us in his first inaugural address that our foreign policy should be that of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

He would also be called an isolationist. We had better follow his sage advice, if we expect this Nation to endure.

He and George Mason are the only two Americans in that entire panorama. Let us keep them there.

We might remove that caricature of Hammurabi, who is said to have reigned in Babylon about 2,000 years before the Christian era, more than 1,000 years before Belshazzar's feast, and 600 years before King Tut began his centuries of peaceful slumber, and replace him with the likeness of glorious old Benjamin Franklin, one of the wisest men that ever lived. He served in the Continental Congress that declared our independence, and also in the Convention that wrote our Constitution—which has been described by one of the leading English statesmen of all time, as "the greatest document ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

You might replace that mythical figure of Lycurgus, a reputed Spartan lawmaker, who is said to have lived eight or nine hundred years before Christ, with the likeness of John Adams, who served in the Continental Congress, served as Vice President of the United States, and then served as President for 4 years.

Remember it was John Adams who seconded the motion for the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

James Madison served in the Continental Congress and in this House of Representatives, served as Secretary of State for 8 years, and then served 8 years as President of the United States. We might well substitute him for that figure of William Blackstone, said to have been placed there because of his commentary on the common law. As a matter of fact, Blackstone was a Member of Parliament just prior to the Revolution, and one of the greatest enemies the American Colonists ever had. He did not write the common law, but merely wrote a commentary on it. We might as well have used the figure of Greenleaf and credited him with having originated the Rules of Evidence because of his great work on that subject. I would suggest that the figure of Blackstone be removed and be replaced either by James Madison or by John Marshall, a former Member of this House, a brave soldier of the Revolution, and the greatest Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States this Nation has ever known.

We might remove that ghastly figure of Maimonides, who is said to have been a Jewish Rabbi in Egypt about 900 years ago. We could afford to replace him with Alexander Hamilton, one of the leading Members of the Continental Congress, a hero of the Battle of Yorktown, and a great Secretary of the Treasury under George Washington. He was largely responsible for the development of our monetary system.

Or we might replace him with James Monroe, one of the greatest Americans of all time, who was father of the Monroe Doctrine which has protected all American countries from invasion for more than 100 years. He was a Member of the Continental Congress, a Senator from Virginia, Minister to France, Governor of his native State, Minister to England, Secretary of State, and President of the United States for 8 years.

We could not find a better figure to fill that vacancy.

Why not remove that antiquated figure of Papinian up there, who is said to have been a great Roman lawyer more than 1,700 years ago, and replace him with old Patrick Henry, a Member of the Continental Congress, whose famous appeal for American independence stands today as the most powerful speech of its kind ever delivered in the same number of words in all the history of mankind.

Or, we might replace him with the figure of John Quincy Adams, a former President of the United States, and the only man who ever served in that capacity who later became a Member of this

House of Representatives, in which he served with honor and distinction up to the time of his death.

That figure of Napoleon Bonaparte up there by the side of that of Thomas Jefferson would probably make Jefferson turn over in his grave. Jefferson knew Napoleon personally, but did not admire him.

Why not replace him with the figure of Henry Lee, known as Gen. Light-Horse Harry Lee, one of the great heroes of the Revolution, as well as a great member of the Continental Congress, who led the fight in his own State for the adoption of the American Constitution, and who paid that great tribute to Washington in which he said he was "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

He was also the father of Robert E. Lee, who has long since been recognized as the "greatest commander of the English-speaking race."

Or, we might replace him with the figure of one of the greatest Presidents, as well as one of the greatest soldiers this Nation ever saw—Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, who served as a Member of this House, led our forces to victory in the War of 1812, and served as President of the United States for 8 years. Why leave him out and place the figure of Napoleon Bonaparte on the walls of this Chamber?

The American people would applaud such a change.

That ghastly figure of Solon, who is said to have been an Athenian statesman and lawgiver more than 600 years before Christ, might well be replaced by John Jay, a member of the Continental Congress from New York, Governor of New York, and the first Chief Justice of the United States, upon whose motion the Legislature of New York approved the Constitution of the United States on July 9, 1776.

Or, we might replace him with the figure of William Henry Harrison, a former Member of this House, who served as President of the United States, or that of his successor, John Tyler, who had also served as a Member of this body before he became Vice President, and who succeeded William Henry Harrison as President.

If you want the figure of a real Christian leader who was a real patriot and who served with distinction in this body, we might remove that figure up there of Innocent III, who is said to have lived about 800 years ago, and replace it with the figure of Frederick August Conrad Muhlenberg, a great Christian minister from Pennsylvania, a leading member in the Continental Congress, president of the State constitutional convention in 1777, and the first Speaker ever to preside over this House of Representatives under the Constitution of the United States. His people have been leaders in that State from the Revolution down. At least four of them have served in this body, the last one being his great, great grandson, Frederick A. Muhlenberg, who served in the Eightieth Congress.

Or, he might be replaced with the figure of James K. Polk, a former Speaker of this House, who later became President of the United States, or with that of William Jennings Bryan, one of the greatest Christian leaders of all time, who also served in this body, and whose famous lecture on the "Prince of Peace," will ring down the centuries as one of the outstanding Christian lectures of all time.

Jonathan Trumbull, of Connecticut, aide de camp to General Washington and Speaker of this House of Representatives in the Second Congress, might well replace that ancient figure of Gaius, a Roman lawyer or jurist, who lived 1800 years ago.

Or, his likeness might be replaced with that of Millard Fillmore, Franklin Pierce, or James Buchanan, all of whom served as Members of this House, and later served as President of the United States.

We might replace that figure of Gregory IX, who was Pope of Rome about a thousand years ago, with that of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, a member of the Continental Congress, signer of the Declaration of Independence, who later became a leading Member of the United States Senate from the State of Maryland.

Or, we might replace him with the figure of either Abraham Lincoln or Jefferson Davis, both of whom served in this body, and who fought together in the Blackhawk War. Lincoln later served as President of the United States, and Davis as President of the Confederacy. I can think of nothing that would more clearly indicate that we have a reunited country than to place the figures of those two great Americans on the walls of this House, in which they both served.

We might replace that figure of Justinian over there, a Roman emperor who lived more than 1400 years ago, and also that of Tribonian, one of his chief flunkies, with Rutherford B. Hayes, who served in this body, and who later became President of the United States. It was his order taking the Federal troops out of the South that did more to reunite the country than anything else that had taken place up to that time.

We might remove that deceptive figure of Simon de Montfort, a British earl, who lived more than a thousand years ago, and whose main claim to distinction is that of being on both sides of a great issue. We might replace him with James A. Garfield, a former Member of this House, who also became President of the United States, or William McKinley, one of the leaders in this body, who later became President and served until his assassination by a ruthless anarchist who seemed to be a pioneer in this communistic movement to destroy the Government of the United States.

We might remove that alleged likeness of Louis IX, who served as King of France about 900 years ago, and that of Alphonso X, who is said to have served as King of Spain about the same time, as well as that of Edward I, who once served as King of England and failed in his life's ambition to overrun and conquer Scotland. We might replace either one of these three figures with Henry Clay or James C. Calhoun, both great Americans who served in this body and later served in the United States Senate with honor and distinction. It might not be a bad idea to replace a couple of them with the figures of U. S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, the two great military leaders in that unfortunate conflict known as the War Between the States.

Then there is the figure of Suleiman, Sultan of Turkey about 500 years ago, and Grotius, a Dutch humorist, according to the description in the RECORD, and Colbert, a French politician, who lived more than 300 years ago and of whom the average American never heard, and Pothier, a French professor, who lived a hundred years before the American Revolution—they should all be removed and replaced by distinguished Americans who have served in this body, such as Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, one of the greatest orators of all time, Benjamin H. Hill, who also served in this body, as well as in the United States Senate, and whose tribute to Robert E. Lee is unsurpassed, and hardly equaled, in all literature. We might replace one of them with L. Q. C. Lamar, a great leader from my own State, who served in this body, as well as in the United States Senate, in the Cabinet, and on the Supreme Court of the United States.

That would still leave us an almost inexhaustible list of great Americans who have served in this body, including Alexander H. Stephens, who served as Vice President of the Confederacy during the War Between the States, John J. Engles, whose tribute to Benjamin H. Hill will go down the centuries, or James G. Blaine, whose tribute to Garfield is one of the greatest orations ever delivered on the life of a great American.

We could come on down, Mr. Speaker, and invade the State of Texas and take glorious old Sam Houston, who served in this body, served as Governor of his great State, led the forces of Texas in their war for independence, served as President of the Texas Republic, and as a Member of the United States Senate. Why not substitute the likeness of Sam Houston for that of some of these ancient figures with which we are now confronted—or that of David Crockett, who also served in this body, and who gave his life at the Alamo that Texas might be free.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and name almost an endless list of great Americans who have served in this and the other body, or who have served our people with credit, honor, and distinction, in private life, such as Thomas Alva Edison, the greatest inventive genius of all times, who illuminated this old earth and made it mock the starry splendor of the skies, or Walter Reed, who probably did more to improve the health of the world and to relieve human suffering than any other man who ever lived. It was he who showed the world how to get rid of yellow fever, one of the greatest plagues the world ever knew, and incidentally, how to prevent malaria, typhoid, and other similar diseases. He deserves a monument almost as high as that of Washington's.

I could name other great Presidents, as well as great Members of this body or of the United States Senate, great military leaders, great writers, great inventors, and great religious leaders, who are far more entitled to the distinction of having their figures placed upon these walls than are these ancient representatives of foreign lands, alien tongues, and anti-American sentiments with which the walls of this magnificent Chamber are now disgraced.

We should replace them all with the figures of great Americans.

A Reminiscence of Grover Hall by Carroll Kilpatrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we in Alabama are proud of having given to the Nation the late Grover C. Hall, editor of the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser. Grover Hall was a brilliant warrior for the freedom and dignity of the individual, a Pulitzer prize winner, and an editor acclaimed throughout the Nation. His one-time associate, Mr. Carroll Kilpatrick, of Alabama, a distinguished author, has done a portrait of Grover Hall for Nieman Reports, January 1951. I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTRAIT OF A NATIVE—A REMINISCENCE OF GROVER HALL

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

One hot summer day in Montgomery, Ala., nearly 15 years ago, a distinguished looking man in a handsome double-breasted suit, a cane on his arm, and a talisman rose in his buttonhole, walked spryly down the main street, attracting much attention. He tipped his hat to his friends, who looked a bit startled but warmly returned his greeting. Not until he sat down in his favorite restaurant did he realize why there had been so many lifted eyebrows. His carefully trimmed mustache was in order, but he had left his collar and tie behind, hanging on the old-fashioned hatrack in his office, under the portraits of Lee, Jackson, and Cleveland.

That was one of the few times that Grover Cleveland Hall, editor in chief of the Montgomery Advertiser, was not equal to the occasion.

Grover Hall was one of the South's greatest editors in a day when fighting, personal editors were largely a thing of the past in American history. He was a human being with a greater passion for life and people—and a greater passion for the basic human decencies—than anyone I have known. His religion was freedom—freedom of the human spirit—and he practiced his religion faithfully and fearlessly. For so doing he was honored with the love of thousands of people, and he won Nation-wide applause.

Hall was the product of our eroded soil. He lived all his life in a State once ruled by the Ku Klux Klan. He had only a meager education and he was untraveled. But he believed in the dignity of man, and he spent his life trying to lighten the burdens of his fellow men.

In his youth, Hall knew the deepest poverty. His later life was not without tragedy, for his wife was long an invalid. Yet this man, without inheritance except the great freedom to make his own life, was an example of the blessing that freedom can be and of how it can enrich our soil. To a whole generation who knew his tremendous buoyancy, his relish for life and his essential goodness, Hall was a symbol and a guide. In this present time of troubles, when we are confronted with another terrible challenge to our faith in our heritage of freedom, the thing that Hall was and the faith he maintained stand as proof of the genius of this free land.

Hall was born in 1868 on a farm in one of the poorest parts of Alabama. It was 9 miles from his home to the nearest railroad. His town had never known, he once said, a football player, a Roman Catholic, or a Harvard graduate.

When still a plowboy in Henry County, he was invited by his older brother, then editing a paper in Dothan called the Daily Siftings, to join the paper as a printer's devil. Not long thereafter the paper folded and Hall spent several years on several different nearby small town papers.

In 1910, he moved to the capital of his State to become associate editor of the Montgomery Advertiser, a vigorous, conservative newspaper with a strong political bent. His first editorial was in defense of the right of Alice Roosevelt to smoke cigarettes. From that day on he fought against prohibition and blue laws, against antisedition and antievolution laws and for the right of man to govern himself. He continued as associate editor until 1926, when he became chief editor of a paper that always gave the editor very great freedom of action.

When Hall moved into the editor's office at the age of 38, Alabama was dominated by the KKK. Senator J. Thomas Heflin, Gov. Bibb Graves, a large part of the legislature, much of the Baptist and Methodist clergy, and many of the small-town editors were pro-Klan. Hall attacked them all, savagely and by name. Physical floggings increased. Night riders could be seen almost every week performing their vicious missions against the weak and unprotected.

Hall's vigor and his anger were equal to the challenge, and he gave no quarter. He wrote powerful, vitriolic editorials, highly readable and effective. "What a callous and wretched demagog Heflin is," he wrote.

Finally, the inevitable threat on Hall's life was made one night in a telephone call as he worked late, as usual, in his office. Hall bought a pistol and carried it for 2 days. "Then I put it aside with scorn and shame," he told me later. "I'm no gunman, anyhow. I can't shoot." He was never threatened again. But the violence of the fight continued.

In January 1928, as if to throw further defiance at the Klan, Hall declared for the nomination for President on the Democratic ticket of Alfred E. Smith, a Catholic and a wet and a darling of the anti-Klan forces throughout the country.

Tom Heflin immediately went after Hall and the Advertiser. "When I said the Advertiser had come out for Al Smith," Heflin solemnly informed the United States Senate, "I said the whisky interests and the Roman Catholics had gone down there and put sugar in their coffee." Heflin later pledged more than 35 large audiences to boycott the Advertiser. But the paper's circulation increased steadily as the campaign developed, and Smith carried Alabama in November. His majority was assured by the vote he won in the middle- and south-Atlantic counties where the Advertiser was the Democratic bible.

Hall's unrelenting fight against Heflin and the Klan won him the Pulitzer prize for the best editorial writing in 1928. His campaign against gangism, flogging, and racial and religious intolerance had brought him national attention.

Two years later the victory was complete. Hall saw Heflin's strength as a towering Alabama politician broken at the polls, and the Advertiser's candidate for governor on an anti-Klan platform carried the State.

The new Governor unmasked the Klan, broke its grip on the jury boxes, and reformed the primary voting laws which had made many Klan victories possible. The Klan was a thing of the past in the State which once had been the home of the Confederacy.

A few years later, Hall, sentimental human being that he was, appealed to Alabama's Senators to help Heflin find a job. The two old enemies, who had little in common but their love of politics and good yarns, became reconciled.

But when Heflin later tried to make a political comeback, Hall dipped his pen in the old ink and helped block the former Senator's last attempt to gain public office. "Heflin is Heflin, a buffoon, and a hog-bladder," Hall wrote in summarizing his opposition to Tom.

"I know I'm a softie," Hall used to say after spending a few hours swapping stories with Heflin. "I have never really hated anyone—and I've known some of the loulest men ever born of woman. Stump speakers have called me variously 'liar,' 'buzzard,' 'kept,' 'atheist,' and 'Roman Catholic.' But most of them have been courteous and generous, and we usually became friends in the end."

The Klan in Alabama in the twenties was primarily anti-Catholic, directing only secondary attention to the Jew and the Negro. It was the effrontery of a majority attacking a tiny minority that aroused Hall's burning contempt.

Hall's anger was aroused again a few years later when the Nazis sought to make a scapegoat of the Jew. "In Nazi Germany," he said, "I should probably be accounted eligible for all the current benefits of citizenship. My line must have been purged soon after the panic in the Garden of Eden. I am Anglo-Saxon-Pict-Celt-Welsh, out of an interminable line of deep-water Baptists. My forebears on both sides 'Lindberghed' across the Atlantic, the biggest ocean then known to them, and some of them later became involved in the American Revolution."

Hall said he was either born tolerant or learned tolerance early. "At any rate," he wrote, "I came early in my days to like minorities and to distrust majorities with regard to all questions involving delicate human relationships and prejudice. I had Jewish neighbors along with Catholic and Protestant neighbors, but that was after—or maybe it was how—I came to know that Jews were people like other people, a part of the warp and woof of the same country that had nurtured my ancestors and me."

Despite his qualifications in forebears, Hall could not have survived a day in a country where one group ruled over another and where one man claimed superior wisdom. If he had not been shot for defying the regime, he would have died of suffocation. In a

letter to me that could apply just as well today to another monstrous totalitarianism, Hall outlined his basic philosophy:

"The Advertiser," he said, "has but one dogma—freedom of the human spirit. It believes in the right of each and every human being in the two hemispheres to think and say what he likes, and it will angrily attack anyone who questions that right.

"With reference to all other social and political questions, the Advertiser is purely pragmatic. It supports what it likes, rejects what it does not like. The Advertiser pleads always for the utmost freedom of the human mind, at last the only friend of man, the only known link with what we call God. It affirms that the man has not yet lived who has the right to say what another human being, however lowly, shall think and say. This is the Advertiser's primary passion."

When Hall offered me his old job as associate editor, he said I would never be asked to write anything I didn't want to write except the anniversary and "drive" editorials. "You would be expected to whoop for the YMCA, the Salvation Army, and the Community Chest once a year," he said. Hall thoroughly disliked the task of writing anniversary and "drive" editorials. He had done only one that had really pleased him—a Christmas editorial 14 words long, written one year when he was engaged in a particularly bitter fight with a couple of political bosses. Hall's editorial that Christmas morning said:

"With one or two well-chosen exceptions, we wish everyone a very merry Christmas."

Everyone got the point.

The anniversary that almost proved Hall's nemesis (and confirmed his opposition to anniversary editorials) was a Fourth of July—a Fourth that Hall never forgot. Just before the holiday he stuck his head into his assistant's office and said:

"We have a lot of Fourth of July fans. I think I'll write a piece in honor of the great day."

He did. He wrote a long, glowing editorial about the birth of the Federal Constitution. The next morning as he drank his coffee he looked over his handiwork.

"I read the editorial and nearly fainted," he confessed afterwards. "As soon as I saw it I realized that the Fourth is the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, not of the Constitution. I expected to be kidded outrageously from one end of the State to the other. But my original theory was confirmed—nobody takes note of an anniversary editorial."

The next day Hall wrote a nice editorial about the Declaration of Independence, but he did not stop to explain that the day to celebrate the birth of the Constitution is September 17, not July 4.

Hall's lighter side, which endeared him to thousands of people and won him an amazingly large audience, found its best vehicle in Clarabelle. One day as Hall sat at his typewriter in the old building that had been a hotel during the Civil War he was interrupted by a purring noise. A stray cat, dirty and hungry, had made its way to his office.

Hall fed the visitor, gave her a name, and began writing occasional short paragraphs about her activities. The reaction of his readers was spontaneous. "We have decided to name the office cat Clarabelle," he wrote, "but actually she does not deserve so swell and lovely a name. She has dirt all over her body. She is the most ungrateful bum among all the retainers of the Advertiser."

To satisfy the demands of his customers, Hall wrote more and more about the cat, of her views on Hitler and other disturbers of the peace. Before long his mail became so heavy with comments about his feline visitor—one reader sent him a cat encyclopedia—that he threatened to be rid of the animal.

But Clarabelle was an institution.

"The Advertiser is asked to write more about Clarabelle," he said one morning. "But what is it to say of such an unworthy, unreliable member of the staff? She comes by this office only to eat her beef and sip her cream and take a nap."

For 2 years, Hall reported on Clarabelle's love life, her offspring, which were numerous, her unruly disposition and her ability to absorb great quantities of coffee cream.

Whenever Hall made a speech, there were demands from the floor for the latest intelligence on Clarabelle. Hall spent hours trying to pet the sullen cat, all the while insisting that he did not like cats. Once, when he couldn't find her kittens after he had promised one to a neighbor's child, he wrote:

"Clarabelle never hides herself, being without reticence, but always hides her kittens. She is a chiseler, a cynic and a dead-beat. The Advertiser is on the point of breaking with her once and for all."

But as long as Clarabelle survived, she was fed and humored—and talked about wherever Advertiser readers lived.

Hall loved the cat, but his greatest love was the newspaper business. He thought that it was favored above all others. And he thought that newspapermen were a race apart. Every young writer had Hall's help and encouragement. "Read David and Solomon," he would say to them. "They were the best columnists of their time. They could do their stuff and bring down the curtain in a flash.

"Pour your souls into your work. Write no witticism that does not spring from conviction, or some principle of philosophy, but take liberties with style. Get fresh about pompous utterances of vast wigs. Speak softly of the sad—and quit when you are through. Spoof, sympathize, interpret—but quit writing when the sap stops flowing."

When the time came to speak softly, Hall could speak as Father Montgomery. When a local dignitary deserved honoring, Hall knew how to do it well. When a friend died, he was deeply shaken and his obituary editorials came from the heart. Here is the first paragraph of one on the death of a local clergyman:

"Dr. Charles A. Stakely came quietly into this strange world, remained for 78 years to study some of its mysteries, but never to be bowed down by any of them, and then at last breathed softly and made a characteristically quiet exit. He was a compassionate wondrously understanding man. He never said a harsh thing about those who were destined to live this unpredictable life. He counseled them and strengthened them, but he never condemned them beyond their grace to bear."

The Advertiser was founded in 1828 by a Jacksonian editor, who soon thereafter was run out of town by the Whigs. "The Advertiser remained from its birth until 1929 a hardy States-rights newspaper, always under vigorous editorship," Hall once told me in the mid-thirties. "But after the depression I compromised to conform to the unexpected needs of society, and today I do not know whether we are for States rights or human rights first. Lately I have endeavored to reconcile Bourbons to the facts of a changing life and a novel experience."

Hall was a poor economist, however able he may have been as a philosopher. He was bored by statistics. He was often swayed more by human appeals than by factual analyses. The New Deal often disturbed and perplexed him, but the personality and humanity of Roosevelt won him. Hall supported Roosevelt in three elections and unquestionably would have a fourth time had Hall lived.

Hall was proud of the staff he organized on the Advertiser, and he spent hours with the men who worked for him. "The Advertiser is the least bossed newspaper gang I ever saw," he said one day. "I don't like to have people around me who need bossing. I like gentlemen who love their work and will respond to suggestion and their native instincts."

The publisher of the Advertiser and Hall were on good terms, but Hall did not hide the fact that he looked askance at business-office publishers. Once he was invited to address the American Society of Newspaper Editors on the subject The Problem of the American Editor. A few days after he accepted the invitation to make the speech, he received a telegram explaining that he would have to keep it to 15 minutes. "I don't need that much time to expound the problems of the American editor," Hall replied. "The problem can be put in one sentence, to wit, how to get the publishers out of the second grade."

Grover Hall's heroes were the famous personal editors—Frank Cobb, Henry Watterson, William Allen White. He had their gift of an easy, readable style as well as a Mencken-esque invective when the occasion warranted. Hall did not feel a close kinship with the latter-day editors of some of the more serious and solemn dailies.

"They have native wisdom and acquired culture," he said. "They are bright and entertaining. But they lack passion."

And that is what Grover Hall never lacked.

Senator Frear: Delaware's Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Dover (Del.) Index relating to the activities of the distinguished junior Senator from the first State [Mr. FREAR].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN OF THE YEAR

Even though 1951 is only 7 weeks old, we've just about made up our minds that Delaware's man of the year is United States Senator J. ALLEN FREAR. In seven short weeks Senator FREAR—Delaware's freshman in Congress—has achieved an amazing record that is fast making him one of the most important men in congressional circles.

What makes Senator FREAR such an important figure in Washington today is his sincere conviction to do what is right for the people he represents, regardless of political dictates. It didn't take the Joe McCarthy headline technique to win recognition for Senator FREAR in this present session of Congress. It took the realization of political leaders of both parties to recognize that in times such as these the guidance of able, conscientious, and politically tolerant leaders is sorely needed. And Senator FREAR is one of those leaders.

During the last political campaign in Delaware we noticed that Senator FREAR had refrained active participation. Why? We do not know. We can only speculate. But if it was because the State political leaders didn't feel that his advice was necessary, they certainly must have had a rude awakening when the Democratic leaders of the

Eighty-second Congress offered him two prime political leadership posts on the floor of the United States Senate—and he turned them down to maintain that independence of action that has won him the respect of Delawareans from one end of the State to the other regardless of political affiliations.

Senator FREAR is a member of the most important and powerful committees of the Congress there are today. The fact that a Senator from Delaware—considered a "political nobody" because of his State's smallness in size and population—should achieve such important assignments is indeed indicative of the respect Washington has placed upon Senator FREAR.

Last Friday night Senator FREAR addressed the Nation from coast to coast on an important issue in the present economy of our country which is gearing itself for all-out defense production. He spoke of the importance of defense housing needs. But unlike most speakers from the congressional seats, he told the Nation about his own State and how its problems in a little boom town like Newark could be applied anywhere in the Nation. In that one broadcast, Senator FREAR became a one-man chamber of commerce.

We have a feeling that Senator FREAR will be called upon more and more to take before the people of the Nation the important problems that face our country. We feel that when Senator FREAR does present these problems, the listeners of the United States can be assured that they are not listening to a mouthpiece for an administration or political party, but to an able leader with the sincerest confidence in the problems he presents.

Indian Bureau Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the headline "CHAVEZ scores Myer's control," dealing with the Indian Service, and published in the Denver Post of February 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAVEZ SCORES MYER'S CONTROL

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., February 14.—Strong criticism of Indian Bureau Administration was voiced here Tuesday by United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ (Democrat), of New Mexico.

He indicated that a shake-up of Indian Bureau officials was in the wind and that he was dissatisfied with the work of Indian Commissioner Dillon S. Myer.

"There's been entirely too much attention to the interests of the Indian Bureau and not enough attention to the interest of the Indians," CHAVEZ said.

"When I return to Washington I intend to look into the matter thoroughly."

The senior New Mexico Senator said that the purpose of the Indian Bureau is to advise, not control, the lives of the Indians.

INDIANS PROTESTING

"If you needed a doctor or a lawyer or a dentist," CHAVEZ said, "you shouldn't have to go to the Government to find out which one you should employ. I understand that Commissioner Myer has now made it impossible for an Indian to consult an attorney of his choice without the consent of the Indian Service."

In the last few months both Navajo and Mescalero Indians have voiced strong protests of Federal management of their affairs. The Navajos have been particularly bitter since uranium has been found on their lands and little has been done by the Indian Bureau to aid them in obtaining mining equipment or attracting outside aid.

"I feel sure," CHAVEZ said, "that the entire New Mexico congressional delegation will be solidly behind any investigation to protect the Indians in all their rights, personal or property. And if there is any attempt being made to exploit his rights in minerals or other details, it is high time we looked into the situation."

CHAVEZ cited several cases where Indians capable of caring for their own affairs are being harassed by bureaucratic dictation. He said that the Indians need education, water rights, and medical care, and beyond that a nearly free hand in their own administration.

"We have Indian boys fighting in Korea," CHAVEZ said, "and we had them fighting all over the world in the last war. If they are good enough citizens to fight in our Army and Navy, then it's high time we realized that they are citizens in the full sense."

URGES LESS CONTROL

He advocated immediate limited self-government for most of the Indian tribes. He was more definite about the Navajos of New Mexico and Arizona.

"The Navajo can be made self-sufficient by protecting his property rights and training him to his duties as a full citizen," the Senator declared.

"But the biggest thing we can do for them," he added, "is to leave them alone."

Presidential Pettiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Presidential Pettiness," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1951. The editorial speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL PETTINESS

If it be true that the small things a man does are apt to reveal his true stature, there is not much comfort for anyone in the President's latest tilt with Senator BYRD.

As President of the United States, Mr. Truman occupies what is certainly one of the most important offices in the world. It is not an exaggeration to say that the decisions he makes can and probably will have the most profound effect on the future of our civilization. What is one to think, then, when the President stoops to a level of petty politics that would be unworthy of a county political boss?

After a 2-year feud with southern Democrats, Mr. Truman last week sent to the Senate a long list of postmasterships. Included were eight that had been recommended by Representative BURR HARRISON, of Virginia. But a ninth Harrison recommendation—that for Berryville—was held up.

Berryville, of course, is Senator BYRD's home town, and the withholding of that nomination was a slap at him. Actually, Senator BYRD did not make the selection. Ordinarily Representatives make the recommendations for postmasters, but as a matter of courtesy they defer to the wishes of a Senator where his home town is concerned. In this instance Senator BYRD made no recommendation of his own, merely concurring in Mr. HARRISON's preference. So the rebuff intended for the Senator falls somewhat wide of the mark.

An injury, however, has been done, although not to Senator BYRD. If Mr. Truman thinks he can undermine the Senator in Virginia by such small-minded tactics as this, he had better think again. But the postmaster in question, one H. B. Harris, will have to continue on an acting basis, which means that he cannot earn retirement credit despite the fact that his service has been wholly satisfactory. So Mr. Harris, because he serves in Senator BYRD's home town, will suffer to some extent.

The real victim, however, will be the office of the President of the United States. It is hard to think of anything more damaging to the prestige of the Presidency, or more likely to impair confidence in the stature of the man who holds the office, than such petty, picayunish politicking as th''

George Washington's Faith in Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, once again we celebrate the birthday of our first President, whose military genius won for us our independence, and whose wisdom and love for freedom safely guided our struggling new Nation through the crucial early years of its existence. He fought for liberty with the sword, and once having gained it for his people, he devoted his life to preserving it.

We have revered the memory of the father of our country for so many generations that it is difficult to realize that he was made to suffer heartache because of his zeal to preserve liberty for the people of his country.

Walter Winchell, outstanding columnist, gives us a most enlightening and touching account of the outrageous assaults directed against Washington while he was serving his country and the first President's reactions to the attacks. In his column, Washington Meets the Press, Mr. Winchell shows us the man Washington setting the example of preserving liberty, although at untold cost to himself in frustration and personal anguish. It is such an inspiring article that I urge all Members of Congress to read it:

[From the Washington Post of February 22, 1951]

WASHINGTON MEETS THE PRESS

(By Walter Winchell)

The military genius of our initial Chief Executive has been faithfully recorded and

rightfully acclaimed. The shimmer of the 48 stars reflects the gleam of his sword. However, his triumphs did not end at Yorktown. Some of Washington's most inspiring victories were attained on the bloodless battleground of political strife. In some ways the battles in this field inflicted deeper spiritual agony than the physical rigors at Valley Forge. A lie can cause more pain than bruised flesh—the flesh heals more quickly than the spirit. He was the victim of outrageous journalistic assaults. A portion of the criticism was honest—but most of the attacks were sheer vituperation. It is the measure of Washington's greatness that his devotion to liberty was not undermined by Americans who perverted it. Despite the savagery of editorial blasts, he not only struggled to keep freedom intact, but sought to strengthen it.

The virulence of the abuse directed at Washington has seldom been surpassed. The personal vilification also extended to his family. But he rejected the counsel of advisers who urged him to suppress the instigators of the venomous press campaign. Washington never condoned treason, sedition, or lawlessness. When Pennsylvania citizens defied an excise law and threatened insurrection, he used force to crush the rebellion. His restraint in dealing with press attackers stemmed from his faith in liberty and the knowledge that freedom is indivisible. He knew that suppressing opposition newspapers would shatter the keystone of the democratic structure.

He noted: "Freedom will survive a minority who do not use it wisely. It gives wisdom to the majority who love it deeply."

He retaliated against villifiers with a crackling display of wit. When one detractor ranted: "Washington is suffocating the truth," he calmly responded: "My enemies say I suffocate the truth. My friends know that I embrace it."

He had journalistic defenders as well as belittlers, of course. J. W. Fenno, a pro-Washington editor, once whipped the critics with this lashing: "They are the most base, false, servile, and venal publications that ever polluted the fountains of society—their editors the most ignorant, mercenary, and vulgar automatons that ever were moved by the continually rustling wires of sordid avarice." Whew.

The following is Editor D. C. Claypoole's description of his quaint interview with President Washington: "He received me kindly, and after paying my respects to him, desired me to take a seat near him; then, addressing himself to me, said that he had for some time past contemplated retiring from public life, and had at length concluded to do so at the end of the present term. He had some thoughts and reflections on the occasion, which he deemed proper to communicate to the people of the United States in the form of an address, and which he wished to appear in the Daily Advertiser—of which I was editor. He paused and I took the opportunity of thanking him for having preferred that paper as the channel of communication with the people, then I quietly withdrew."

Such was the formal dignity of eighteenth century interviews. The result of that interview was a historic scoop. But Editor Claypoole didn't rush into print in the frenzied manner of modern journalism. It took over a week for the big news to reach print—when the Gazette published Washington's Farewell Address.

When the scurrilous press campaign began his reaction was expressed in a letter to a friend: "But in what will this abuse terminate? For the result, as it respects itself, I care not; for I have a consolation within that no earthly effort can deprive me of, and that is that neither ambition nor interested motives have influenced my conduct. The arrows of malevolence, therefore, however barbed and well pointed, never can reach the most vulnerable part of me; though, whilst I am up as a mark, they will continually be aimed."

The foregoing analysis of his bitter battle with the press was correct. But the constant barrage of invective finally shattered his philosophic calm. A man of great dignity, Washington was unable to descend to the level of meeting mud with mud. The resulting frustration caused deep personal anguish. Shortly before he retired to Mount Vernon, he made his private heartache public by declaring: "I never dreamed that I should be accused of being the enemy of this Nation, that every act of my administration would be tortured, and the grossest and most insidious misrepresentation of them be made as could scarcely be applied to a Nero or a common pickpocket."

Amidst the storms of vilification Washington never lost sight of the essential need for a free press. He always endeavored to extend the beams of liberty's beacons. He knew the greatest wealth of a free nation was not in its farms and factories—but in the liberty of its people. That is our priceless legacy, and Washington sought to preserve the treasure—by helping newspapers enlighten the people. He urged Congress to repeal the transportation tax on newspapers by reminding the legislators: "No resource is so firm for the Government of the United States as the affection of the people, guided by an enlightened policy; and to this primary good nothing can conduce more than a faithful representation of public proceedings, diffused without restraint throughout the United States."

Washington's exalted position today makes it difficult for us to believe the widespread bitterness engendered by the torrent of abuse. His pictures were publicly defaced; he was denounced at mass meetings; and there was one assassination attempt. Not a dirty trick was missed by his attackers. A New York Gazette published forged letters in an effort to embarrass the President.

When the fraud was exposed Washington observed: "Falsehood can wound a man, but truth strikes the final blow."

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Brotherhood Week this year is particularly timely, because of the stress of the critical position in which this country finds itself. In such periods of tension and danger, it is especially vital that we face the crisis as a united people, as citizens of the Unites States first and foremost. We cannot afford to be weakened by prejudices and preconceived ideas. For this reason, Brotherhood Week takes on added meaning for all of us this year.

Being unified, however, does not mean being stereotyped or being reduced to a common denominator in which we would lose all our individuality. Rather, being unified means the recognition of the true and inimitable worth of individuality. Unity through tolerance and freedom from prejudice means recognition that religious faith and racial origins contribute to each person's make-up, his unique personality, but only contribute. They are not the only molding factors which cause a person to think and react as he does. A person is a complex combination of all his family background, religious and secular teachings, plus all his experiences since the date of his birth. Each human being is a completely irreplaceable and separate entity and an entity of priceless value.

Thus, the deepest meaning that Brotherhood Week can have for us—the greatest lesson it can teach—is that each person has the inalienable right to be judged as an individual, not prejudged because of his origin, religion, or racial background. Human and therefore fallible, all of us need to be reminded of the ideals on which this country was founded and which constitute our moral and spiritual heritage. "All men are created equal"—that is the meaning of Brotherhood Week.

Because we need reminding occasionally, I have introduced a resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September as Interfaith Day. This resolution—House Joint Resolution 22—sets forth the basic principle that the fomenting of antagonism between Americans on the basis of sectarian creed is contrary to American traditions and to the spirit of the guaranties of freedom of worship embodied in the Constitution, and since it should be the policy of Congress to encourage mutual understanding of all people of good will, that this September Sunday shall be observed as Interfaith Day.

America is the guardian and stronghold of freedom, equality, and tolerance in this troubled world. Anything that can be done to encourage and strengthen the practice of these prime virtues must not be neglected. If we are to succeed in the spiritual and moral battle for men's minds—if we are to succeed in selling this democracy, equality, and freedom abroad—we must maintain our domestic vitality and strength by the daily practice of these fundamental principles at home.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle:

TEST OF AN IDEAL

Many moving phrases will be penned this week to the ideal of Brotherhood Week, in which annually the National Conference of Christians and Jews tries to strengthen the family ties that unite all peoples, everywhere. The real test of an ideal is not the homage that is paid to it, but the concrete results that can be measured from it. By that test we believe all Americans this week may take renewed heart, for by all standards we are a more tolerant, united, and understanding people than were our ancestors in the days of slavery, religious rivalries, and the Ku Klux Klan.

Reminders of the old evils exist, too abundantly, yet all in all we are less concerned about our neighbor's religion today, more concerned about his character and worth, than were earlier generations. People of all faiths work together, serve side by side in humanitarian causes, form firm friendships. In divisions based on color and race we have farther to go, yet even there the new laws continually added to our statute books and the widening front of the battle against prejudice are heartening signs of progress.

Brotherhood in its highest conception is world-wide, and we Americans, who represent almost all the national blood lines of the world and who have made democracy work, are the people who ought to take the lead in showing the world what can be done. The world may take note from us that brotherhood does not mean giving up individuality, it does not mean agreement on everything, it does not mean planing everyone down to a common pattern. The germ of what brotherhood really does mean is in the United Nations. People can be united and at the same time have their national characteristics. They need not all be alike; they need only recognize their common humanity and the right of every nation to its own way of life.

A certain lawyer, thinking to trick Jesus, asked Him, "Who is my neighbor?" And Jesus proceeded to tell of the Samaritan who came upon a wounded man by the roadside, and without asking any questions picked him up, tended him, and got a room for him. Really, that's about all there is to brotherhood. It is trite but eternally true to remind ourselves that if it were put to practice everywhere, we would not today be scrambling on the brink of disaster.

A Spokesman for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate in the United Nations on the Korean cease-fire question, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of the Philippines and permanent delegate to the United Nations, led in the discussion to brand Communist China an aggressor. Long before this debate, however, on December 7, 1950, General Romulo replied to the accusations against the United States made by Chinese Communist Delegate Wu in a manner that won for him the admiration and the gratitude of the American people. His speech in reply to Wu was inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD in volume 96, part 18, pages 7892–7894.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two editorials, one by the Daily Mirror of December 9, 1950, and another by the New York Times of December 10, 1950, both of which I believe accurately express the sentiments of the people of the United States regarding General Romulo's courageous and forthright stand:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of December 9, 1950]

GOOD FRIEND CARLOS

That wonderful big guy, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, foreign secretary of the Philippines, gave it to the Russians in their teeth at the UN Thursday—an Asian speaking to Asians, exposing the Red liars' blackest lie. Hear:

"I say, sir, that you can make this false accusation against so-called American imperialism in Russian, but you cannot say it in Chinese.

"You cannot say it in Chinese unless you are speaking in translation from Russian. You cannot say it in Chinese because no Chinese who knows the history of his country and who is aware of the long historic friendship between the Chinese people and the American people can make this accusation without sounding as if he were faithfully parroting the stale phrases of Russian propaganda."

General Romulo then related the story of American imperialism in the Philippines:

"Instead of oppressing the people, they taught them to cherish freedom. Instead of ruling the country with an iron hand, they trained the people in the art of self-government. Instead of keeping the people in ignorance; the better to keep them docile, they built schools, libraries, colleges, and state university. Instead of destroying their national consciousness, they developed the people's pride in their own history and traditions. And as for profits, it is a matter of record that America never did make money in the Philippines. Even the American troops stationed there never lived off the land or the taxes of the people; they were paid out of the United States Treasury.

"In 1946 * * * the United States fulfilled its pledge to the letter and recognized the independence of the Philippines."

The Voice should get this statesman's speech to all Asia. One million copies of it should be dropped over the Communist Chinese army.

General Romulo is a true friend of ours—and of freedom's.

[From the New York Times of December 10, 1950]

TESTIMONY FROM ASIA

The western powers in general and the United States in particular are placed in a somewhat embarrassing position by the barrage of false Communist propaganda in respect to their imperialism and aggressive intentions. They have given assurances and these are ignored. They can protest against falsehood but they cannot justify themselves in detail without the appearance of self-righteousness.

Into this situation General Romulo stepped on Thursday with an eloquent and detailed answer to the Chinese Communist diatribe against the United States. He made it plain that he was speaking as an Asian for the benefit of other Asians. He recounted his first-hand acquaintance with American imperialism and its fruits in the Philippines. He contrasted American actions, both there and in China, with actions of the Soviet Union "in the same region and at the same point of time," he said, because he believed this was "the most effective way to refute the charges of so-called American imperialism in Asia."

It was this record that he presented to the Chinese Communist representative in these words:

"I say, sir, that you can make this false accusation against so-called American imperialism in Russian, but you cannot say it in Chinese. You cannot say it in Chinese unless you are speaking in translation from Russian. You cannot say it in Chinese because no Chinese who knows the history of his country and who is aware of the long historic friendship between the Chinese people and the American people can make this accusation without sounding as if he were faithfully parroting the stale phrases of Russian propaganda. This country, which has never been at war with China, which was the one great power that took no part in the spoliation of China, which has consistently championed the cause of the Chinese people against their traditional enemies—the Japanese and the Russians—which has generously given help to the Chinese people in adversity, this great country, with such a record, can face the representative of the Peiping regime and shame him into silence."

This is testimony from Asia and it is friendly and welcome at this point. If the Chinese Communists are not willing to accept the expressions of good faith of the West, the Chinese people, whom they misrepresent, may eventually hear the tones of other voices. This certainly is General Romulo's belief and it is for that reason that he speaks. It will serve the cause of freedom if more and more perceptive Asians will raise their voices to join him in his expression of faith and hope when he says:

"In the face of the historical facts and the facts of record we do not believe that the peoples of Asia and, in particular, the Chinese people will remain deceived for a long time regarding the motives and policies of the United States and the Soviet Union. We understand full well that today the Chinese people are not free, that access to these facts has been barred to them by the machinations of vicious and lying propaganda."

A Message to the People of Western Europe by Hon. H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last Wednesday, February 21, I recorded a message to the people of Western Europe, in which I discussed the efforts of the Atlantic community to strengthen itself against Russian Communist aggression and the importance of the so-called war of ideas. This is one of a series of messages by various individuals in American public life which the World Wide Broadcasting Corp. intends to broadcast by short wave to Europe.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF WESTERN EUROPE

This is United States Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH. I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate and in connection with my responsibilities on that committee I am, of course, very much concerned with all matters of American foreign policy. I am happy, therefore, to have this opportunity to speak for a few minutes to the people of Western Europe. My own ancestors, on both my father's side and my mother's side, came from Western Europe. I believe that blood flows in my veins from all the countries whose people may be listening to this broadcast.

For many years I have been deeply interested in foreign affairs, and beginning over 30 years ago at the time of World War I, I have been much concerned with the problem of war and peace and I have been devoting my thinking and efforts to trying to discover ways by which our international difficulties might be settled by the rule of law and justice and not by the rule of might.

As a participant in World War I and as a friend of many years' standing and a great admirer of President Woodrow Wilson, who was the author of the League of Nations, I felt from those days that there must be ways and means to preserve the peace that would prevent these ever-recurring struggles which have brought such suffering to the world. From my experience both in World War I and in World War II I have come to the conclusion that had it been known before both of those wars began that the United States could mobilize its resources and would be a part in the big struggle, the wars might actually have been prevented. Certainly the Kaiser of Germany would not have precipitated World War I if he could have foreseen that the power of the United States would be added to that of his enemies in Europe. I think the same could be said of Hitler in the case of World War II.

Because of my deep feeling on this matter I was determined after victory was won in 1945 that my efforts in the United States Senate, in which I was then a new member, would be directed in support of all efforts to organize the world to preserve the peace. I was a strong supporter of the steps leading up to the final ratification of the United Nations Charter. I was a strong supporter of the so-called Marshall plan, the European recovery program, which I felt was necessary if our former allies were to recover their economic stability and play their full part in the effort to build peace and freedom in the world.

It will be recalled that when Secretary of State Marshall first suggested the program for economic recovery in Europe he included all the European countries and that meant Russia and her satellites as well as those countries which ultimately took part in the Marshall plan. We were all deeply concerned when it became clear that Russia would not join in this collective effort and that she was using her control of her satellite countries to keep them from participating. We were perfectly well aware that Poland, Finland, and Czechoslovakia desired to join the Marshall plan countries and participate in the recovery program, and we were aware that it was only the power of Russia that prevented them from joining.

It soon became apparent that the policy of Russian communism was to sow seeds of discord and hatred among the non-Communist European countries with the intention of so disrupting the economies of these countries that in despair they would go over to the Communist ideology. Yet in spite of the efforts of Moscow the Marshall plan succeeded dramatically and served as a powerful bulwark against the spread of Russian communism in Europe. I am sure that my hearers will agree that the success of the Marshall plan in restoring economic stability had much to do with preventing the spread of communism in Europe, and especially in such countries as France and Italy, whose economic situations were so desperately serious.

With the success of the Marshall plan in its early days in Europe we were all hopeful that we were on the road to recovery in spite of Russian opposition, but we were soon disillusioned when we discovered Russia was using another weapon in her movement for world domination by attempting to cut off the Allied Powers in the free zones of Western Germany from all access to Berlin, and thus to absorb that free city in the Communist empire. From this experience we realized clearly that Russia was prepared to use force if necessary to attain her ends where economic disruption was successfully opposed. Here again we were able to outmaneuver the Russian Communist attempts by the miraculous Allied airlift which was developed immediately to take care of our friends in the free western part of the city of Berlin.

The Berlin airlift was victorious, but the attempt by Russia to take over Berlin by force was a warning of the danger that we were all in. We saw clearly that Western Germany and our Marshall-plan partners in Europe were in real danger of an aggression by Russia. The Russian military divisions in the west were being maintained in large numbers and satellite armies also were being built up, ready to strike at an appropriate time by military force if the methods of Communist subversive infiltration did not succeed in taking over these countries. This realization and the Berlin airlift experience brought about the deliberations that ultimately led to the setting up of the so-called North Atlantic Pact. This pact, which was a defensive treaty between the cooperating countries concerned, provided simply that an attack on one of these countries was to be looked upon as an attack on all and that the countries participating would join in building up a collective defense to meet any possible aggressions.

The 12 nations which joined in this North Atlantic Treaty thus announced to the world that aggression by force against any one of them would be resisted by all. Thus we established for the whole North Atlantic community the principle of preserving peace through collective security which had been frustrated in the United Nations by Russian obstruction. We confronted Stalin with the very kind of clear warning which had never been given to the Kaiser or to Hitler, as I mentioned a moment ago. I am convinced that by this action we greatly strengthened the prospects for peace.

While these defensive moves were being developed among the Western nations we were suddenly aware that in the Far East another danger loomed because of the swift conquest of China by Russia, through the usual methods of subversive infiltration followed by taking over by force. While we were concerned with our dangers in Western Europe, the same danger swept over Asia and poor defenseless China was the first to be the victim. This has led to the subsequent Korean problem and the doubts and uncertainty that surround the entire far-eastern area, including Japan, the Philippines, Formosa, and the other countries in southeast Asia, yearning to be free from superimposed controls such as the new Republic of Indonesia, Indochina, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and even India and Pakistan.

The threat of world conquest by Russian communism by force of arms is very real. I have tried to indicate in this broadcast the developments of these critical dangers, but before I conclude I wish to emphasize to those of you who are listening that although I consider military defense of vital importance, the really great battle that is going on in this world of ours is the battle for the minds of men and women. It is what is called an ideological struggle, the battle of ideas. Up to this time the very skillfully managed Russian propaganda has seemed to be winning this battle for the minds of men throughout the world. The Moscow radio has dramatized a picture of its own invention, which seems to portray to the world a struggle between two great powers—Russia with her communism on the one hand, the champion of the downtrodden and exploited people of the earth, against a great rich imperialistic, capitalistic America, aligned with capitalistic powers trying to control the destinies of all people.

We all know how false this picture of the world struggle is. We all know that the countries that have become great under the western tradition have become so because our forefathers yearned for those human freedoms which alone can make great civilizations possible. The story of America is a story of men and women of European origin who were willing to make any sacrifice in order that they might be free from the domination or control of any human power and that they might be free to worship the God in whom they believed and follow their faith in the divine guidance of all human destiny. America's growth, America's success spring from the same source as the greatness of modern Europe—faith in those fundamental principles of human freedom which our ancestors brought to the new world. With this truth, which is nothing less than freedom under Almighty God, we in America have gone back to the countries of our ancestors and have asked them to join with us in preserving the supreme values which all of us cherish in common.

The really great issue in the world today is not communism versus capitalism or imperialism, as Moscow would have us believe. It is the atheistic materialism of the totalitarian state versus the idea of freedom under God, the idea of self-governing peoples who believe that the state is made for man and man's emancipation and that man is not made merely to be subservient to the state. This is the great challenge to free men everywhere. This is a cause to which the people of the west European countries who are joined together in the North Atlantic Pact, can well dedicate their lives and their destinies.

Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, Before Conference of Grand Masters of Masons in North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very able address delivered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] before the Conference of the Grand Masters of Masons in North America at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on February 20, 1951. I commend a reading of the address to the Members of the Senate and to the people of the entire country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK BEFORE GRAND MASTERS OF MASONS

The answers to the problems that face us now as we strive for peace in the world and security in our country must, I believe, be based on six general principles which I offer as a suggested chart for America as we strive to set a true course. Upon these our thinking and our decisions must rest. Certainly there must be an end to indecision and the feeling of insecurity that comes with indecision.

1. We can never gain our security through a program that leads to isolationism.

2. We can never gain our security by a program that follows a path of appeasement.

3. We can only gain our security by supporting our agreements by our actions, at least until we know that the other parties to those agreements do not intend to do their share.

4. We must move ever forward on a policy of strength and confidence. Our actions cannot be dictated by fear. We have the strength, the resources, and the tradition, materially and spiritually, to take the initiative against all threats to our security.

5. We can never make this Nation secure by hesitation, faltering, backing-and-filling.

6. We must strive for unity of purpose and of action even as Lincoln did in the darkest of Civil War days. There is a tremendous difference, as he knew so well, between honest criticism and mere obstructionism. The former is vital in a democracy at all times. The latter cannot be tolerated when the safety of our country and the security of our citizens are at stake.

At the moment, there are two issues in the forefront of everyone's mind here in Washington: our policy in Asia and our policy in Europe. These two issues are now constantly before us in the United States Senate. Questions being thoroughly discussed regarding these issues are many. Should we get out of Korea? Should we aid Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist forces? Should we declare sanctions against the regime of Mao Tse-tung in the United Nations now that the United Nations has finally proclaimed that regime to be the aggressor? What are our responsibilities in the Far East?

What steps should we now take in Europe? What is the best way for us to protect the safety and security of our country against a possible Russian advance in Europe? Should we send ground troops to Europe? Should we merely support Europe in the air and on the sea? Should Congress approve before troops are sent to Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty?

These two great issues also raise many questions of domestic policy here in the United States. Congress is now asked to raise our Armed Forces to 3,500,000 men. The President has recommended huge appropriations, increases in taxes. It has become only too clear that controls of our civilian economy must be firmly administered if we are to arm and equip this large increase in our armed strength adequately, and at the same time provide military equipment to our allies of the North Atlantic Treaty. These are truly tough decisions. Making them is not easy. The results of these decisions certainly will entail sacrifices on the part of every citizen.

Today every thoughtful American citizen is worried. That can't be denied. Many are greatly disturbed and those who have lost their loved ones in Korea are heartbroken. But if we are to live up to our responsibilities as the leaders of the freedom-loving peoples of the world, we must build up that confidence that inspires faith in our ultimate success—that gives the feeling that our actions are based on the calm judgment of prudent men.

From the present safety of our own land, we have watched the troops of the United Nations in Korea defend themselves bravely as they were pushed back last summer to Pusan. Then we witnessed a brilliant advance through practically all of Korea. We have followed grimly in recent weeks alternating retreats and advances which still leave the issue much in doubt. The brave men assembled under the banner of the United Nations have proved they know how to fight the advancing hordes of Communists and will fight to the death if need be. They are daily demonstrating the superiority of our fire power and the speed and maneuverability of our airplanes.

But there is grave doubt in the minds of many of those boys and in the minds of many of our citizens as to why we are now fighting in Korea. When the North Koreans, stimulated by Chinese and Russian Communists, crossed the thirty-eighth parallel last June, they became aggressors under the terms of the United Nations Charter. If the United Nations is to be a lasting force for peace, the violators of its resolutions must be resisted. The Security Council of the United Nations immediately ordered the Korean aggression resisted. Our boys are there to fight aggression, to make the United Nations a force for peace in the world. They are fighting to preserve life as we know it here at home and to make the future more secure for us all. We must win that battle which they are waging so valiantly, even if it cannot be won in Korea. Certainly we cannot win it by appeasement. Most recently, the Chinese have been overwhelmingly branded by the United Nations as aggressors themselves. That is a true statement of fact—it is not a yielding to false propaganda.

Certainly it would seem to be much wiser, hard though it may be to do so, to leave Korea if our military leaders say that we cannot expect ultimately to win there, or if the fighting drags out to a stalemate, but be unfettered by any agreements favorable to the Communists—like the proposed cease-fire suggestion—as would undoubtedly end in the loss of Formosa and the ultimate recognition of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations. This would be 100 percent appeasement.

Meanwhile, elsewhere in Asia the forces of communism are weakening by intrigue what cannot be overcome by military violence. Tibet has been invaded. The infiltration of Iran reportedly is taking place. While the situation in Indochina is bad, the French have become more aggressive. Under the inspired leadership of General de Tassigny, they are recovering some of the gains of the Communists. But final success is still far in the distance.

On Formosa, Nationalist Chinese forces are in active training and are, we are told, prepared for vigorous fighting. Our Navy is under orders to prevent these forces from engaging in commando raids or amphibious attacks on the mainland. They are equally under orders to prevent Communist attack on Formosa. Formosa is one of those islands in the Far East that are considered part of our line of security with Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. The present Nationalist forces are prepared to defend it. They may be able to stimulate commando raids and amphibious attacks or assist guerrilla efforts on the Chinese mainland. We should certainly encourage these undertakings in every way we can.

Possibly our Navy should blockade the Chinese coast if the Communists insist in their efforts on Korea or in other parts of Asia. But there are many difficulties involved in such a blockade. Certainly we should not put troops in China at the present time, nor should our Air Force make bombing sorties on the mainland of China. But that does not mean that we have to prevent the Nationalist Chinese forces from making active efforts to the limits of their own strength. That does not mean that it may not be wise to provide them with arms and equipment. Certainly it does not mean that we should turn over Formosa to the Chinese Reds at any United Nations conference table or elsewhere.

In Berlin and throughout Western and Southern Europe, the free nations stand constantly on the alert against possible further aggression by Communists. They look to us for that strong moral support and that material assistance they feel certain we can give them.

Tremendously important decisions are now in the making as to the extent of and the manner in which we are to provide assistance to Europe. Under our Constitution the President is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. He has the responsibility of deciding whether to send forces outside of the continental United States in the interests of our security. Congress has the responsibility of appropriating at its discretion the funds with which our forces are maintained and supported.

Our Government has signed and the Senate has ratified the North Atlantic Treaty. Under its terms we have organized the military assistance pact. But, the North Atlantic Treaty does not provide specifically for sending men abroad except to repel aggression. Consequently, the question arises: Can the President send troops as well as equipment under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty without prior approval of Congress? When the North Atlantic Treaty was ratified, the administration definitely stated that under article 3 materials but not men were intended. Now the President has stated that he expects to send men also.

General Eisenhower has testified that he believed we should send men, although at the same time he stated that the bulk of the manpower must necessarily come from the countries of Europe. While the interpretation given to the Senate by the administration when the treaty was ratified clearly did not include men, the Senate can in its wisdom join with the President in broadening that interpretation or it can appropriate funds under its constitutional power to permit the President under his constitutional power as Commander in Chief to send troops to Europe. Personally, I believe that a wiser move would be to recognize a more liberal interpretation of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Secretary Acheson has testified that he believes the Executive and the Congress should move forward in accord.

With compelling sincerity General Eisenhower stressed the need of our setting an example of vigorous leadership, for only by such vigorous leadership can we hope to inspire our European friends to their maximum efforts. Only by our example can we expect their doubts to be resolved and their energies to be fully channeled into our common cause of a mutual defense of freedom. It gave me personally much confidence to have him state his conclusions regarding manpower and production from first-hand observations, for I have felt for many weeks that Europe is our first line of defense and that as such we must contribute not only leadership but materials, energy, and some men. General Marshall now states that the plans call for four more, or a total of six, divisions to be stationed in Europe.

We all know that the implementing of the North Atlantic Treaty has gone ahead far too slowly in Europe. But there can be no doubt that our friends in Europe need us and we need our friends in Europe. We have made commitments in the form of a treaty. We have implied commitments from a moral point of view. We cannot go back on these obligations, expressed or implied, no matter how difficult the days ahead appear to be. To do so might well lose us the respect of the other nations of the world forever.

If on the other hand it becomes clear that these nations do not intend to live up to their side of these mutual obligations, we cannot and must not attempt to help defend Europe. We must review our position in that light when we know those are the factors upon which our decisions must rest, but until we do, we must go ahead with inspired leadership and renewed efforts and sacrifices that come with those efforts if we are to expect those who have suffered so much in World War II to do the same.

If we are to win through to victory over these grave threats to our Nation's freedom, we must look clearly and with courage at the problems which we face—problems that arise here in the United States very largely because we are not prepared for an emergency. The price of that unpreparedness we must now pay regardless of cost. And to those who bear the administrative responsibility for that unpreparedness, we look with more critical eyes. A Universal Military Training

and Service Act is now made necessary by certain self-evident realities: (1) The United States is now a participant in a struggle for survival, the dimensions and duration of which cannot be accurately calculated; (2) we do not now have under arms sufficient manpower to sustain a respectable military posture nor to provide a defense adequate to the immediate peril; (3) so long as the fighting continues in Korea, and the outcome of the struggle with our enemy remains undecided, there exists an ever-present need for readiness to increase the strength of our armed services; (4) we must build up a force of trained reserves so that we will not be caught again by another Pearl Harbor.

Our present laws authorizing the mobilization of manpower are inflexible. Congress has removed the statutory ceilings on the size of our armed services. But more legislation is needed to provide the manpower to build our forces to the needed level of strength.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that our minimum defense requirements necessitate an armed force of approximately 3,500,000 men by June 1951. This determination is the result of their best military judgment. If we accept that judgment, then we must provide the minimum manpower which these responsible officers have determined to be our need.

Reduced to the simplest terms, the two most pressing needs for this legislation are (1) the security of the Nation requires the most prompt possible build-up of our Armed Forces, and (2) we must now decide upon an enduring system of training and manpower readiness to meet the demands of a danger which now has no foreseeable end.

The bill proposed by our Armed Services Committee makes the manpower available so that if a further emergency arises it will not be necessary for Congress to act hastily in broadening eligibility to increase the pool of strength available. We believe that for the best interests of national security, it is imperative that the piecemeal manpower mobilization approach be abandoned and this more flexible approach substituted.

Right now to get that build-up and to maintain it will take all the qualified men from the Selective Service pool, the married nonveterans, husbands, some now in the IV-F group, and some now deferred as students, and finally about 400,000 not yet in the selective-service pool. So Congress has not many alternatives if it agrees with Secretary Marshall and the Chiefs of Staff that a force of 3,500,000 men is needed.

Economically we must expect a drastic change in our manner of living if we are to provide our defenses with needed materials and manpower. The solid solution of this problem is to raise to new levels our production of essentials.

In the meantime, controls are inevitable. It seems to me entirely likely that if we impose and accept adequate controls on our civilian economy now, we may in a shorter space of time than we now believe possible find ways and means of returning thereafter to a more normal situation, perhaps even in 2 years. It is estimated that the demands for our military production for 1951 and 1952 will amount to probably 50 billions of dollars in each of these years. When we consider that our present national gross product amounts to about 275 billions of dollars and realize that this military burden represents an addition of almost 18 percent to that figure, the enormity of the problem before us is clear.

Needless to say, this means sacrifices and a lower standard of living until we build up these military defenses, having allowed them to get much too low. It is, however, equally clear, a burden that must be carried if we are to survive as a free nation. When the build-up has been accomplished and if no war has come, just think how much more productive facilities we will have than we now possess.

Congress can pass legislation, but the order to freeze prices and wages must be issued by the administration. Congress can pass laws regarding enforcement of such orders, but the Executive must set up the machinery to enforce them. That machinery is even now not yet adequately in being. It should be implemented at once with proper and adequate powers and with forthright action on the part of its administrators.

Let us never forget that no sacrifices made by any individual or group here on the home front can be comparable to those being made and perhaps to be made by our soldiers on Korea's frozen hills and plains. Economic justice can always be restored; it is different with the life of a man.

In recent weeks a number of patriotic and well-intentioned proposals have been made for our guidance in the days to come. We Members of Congress welcome friendly and open discussion of our policies overseas and at home, but that does not mean necessarily that we agree with them. I find myself unable to agree with any proposal which recommends a backyard defense of this country. If we subscribe merely to a theory of the defense of this continent, we will surely find ourselves trying to protect North and South America and a few islands offshore against the strength and resources of all the rest of the world.

Can we survive in the United States with Europe with all its people and their resources in Communist hands? Such a theory and such a situation are unthinkable. Nor can I agree that an increased armed strength may provoke the Communists to more aggression in the immediate future. If this view is right, then why do anything? Why don't we drop our hands to our sides and let the blows fall? If aggression is to be provoked, I want to see that aggression provoked by strength and not by weakness.

In two world wars we have sent our manhood and our treasure overseas. Thousands and thousands of American boys have died on the European battlefields. Shall we now abandon all that they fought for, side by side with our European allies? Shall we willingly yield the Ruhr and the Saar, with their tremendous industrial potential, to the Soviet Union? Shall we say to Great Britain and France and Denmark and Holland and Belgium and the other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty that we didn't mean what we said when we joined with them to try to contain communism?

Shall we abandon Rome to barbarian invasion? Shall we hand to the Reds—on what would amount to a uranium platter—the vast ore deposits of Africa? What are we going to do about the great oil resources of the Middle East? Most important of all, shall we leave completely in the lurch, by withdrawing behind our own continental defenses, those valiant peoples of Europe who have so long looked to us for strength and help? American leadership, if it is to be worthy of the name and the things for which America has always stood—freedom and fair play—must be moral always, as well as military, diplomatic, and economic. We cannot and we must not go back on our word. To do otherwise makes us indistinguishable from the enemy we face.

Our paramount object in our struggle today is to preserve peace in order that our Nation may go forward in security and permit the undertakings of free men to make us happier, healthier, and build up the standard of our way of life. This unity is an expression of an all-American effort. We must have that "enduring system of defense" that General Marshall has described. We must be fully prepared for further sacrifices on the part of every one of us.

We can never subscribe to a backyard defense of our country and our homes. We can never abandon to barbaric violence the free peoples and the free institutions of the free world. We must never go back upon our pledged word. Such an effort is one dictated by an enlightened self-protection on our part and that of our allies. The clear minds of the people of our country and their clear voices can make their impact felt all over the world if dedicated to that single end.

In this time of our trial, Abraham Lincoln's voice saying, "My paramount object in this struggle is to preserve the Union," has thrilling echoes for every American citizen, Republican or Democratic, for it means in this day and age the preservation of these United States as a free and independent country. By our determination, with God's help, it will be done.

Lincoln Day Dinner Address by Governor Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day dinner address delivered by Gov. John Lodge, of Connecticut, in Minneapolis, Minn., on February 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Youngdahl, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very real pleasure for me to come to your great city of Minneapolis and join with you on this significant occasion.

To us in the East, the words "Minneapolis" and "Minnesota" are freighted with meaning. The unsurpassed scenic beauty of your State, with its vast natural resources, your storied Mesabi Range, your useful and varied industries, your turbulent early history, and your sturdy and self-sufficient citizenry all go to make a legend upon which we dwell with pleasure and interest.

I may say also that we in New England have long been aware of Minneapolis as a cultural center. Your writers, like Sinclair Lewis and others, have deeply enriched American thought and literature. The fame of your great university and other institutions of higher learning is well known to us. We are familiar, too, with the renown of your symphony orchestra; and may I say that we are grateful to you for sending us an Ormandy and a Mitropolous to lead our own famous orchestras to new heights of accomplishment.

Hence, my own great enjoyment in being privileged to visit Minneapolis and to have the honor of addressing you here this evening.

We are gathered to observe the one hundred and forty-second anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Yet this occasion should not be merely one of commemoration but should be rather a time for our rededication to the timeless truths for which Lincoln worked, for which he suffered and for which he died. These truths have, I think, been well understood by many people in Minnesota. For you have, during the past few years, elected to the high office of Governor of your great State such outstanding public servants as Harold Stassen, now president of the University of Pennsylvania; EDWARD THYE, now United States Senator, and your present great humanitarian, Luther W. Youngdahl. These are all men of whom the State of Minnesota can be justly proud. They have shown that they truly understand the function of the Republican Party. During a time of rapid change and increasing international tension they have demonstrated a vigorous comprehension of the needs and aspirations of the people of our country.

I have read with deep interest and real profit the penetrating inaugural address of Governor Youngdahl to your legislature. He speaks from tested experience and with a warm and understanding heart. The people of Minnesota are fortunate to have a man of his calibre at the head of the State.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve during my 4 years in Congress with the Congressmen whom you have sent to represent you in Washington. In particular I have had the stimulating pleasure of serving as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Minnesota, WALTER H. JUDD. He is my good friend. When I decided to run for Governor of Connecticut one of the real regrets which I had was that I would no longer be in frequent and close contact with this splendid man. There can be no more rewarding experience in life than that of a fine friendship. During my time in Washington I developed for WALTER JUDD not only a high regard but a real affection. WALTER JUDD's standard of service is truly Lincolnian in its high-mindedness and in its simplicity. The usual words of praise seem to lose their meaning when applied to a man of such remarkable intellectual attainments and of such significant moral purpose. I recall reading some years back an article in Readers Digest entitled "Wanted: More Men Like Dr. JUDD." I underscore that exclamation with emphasis. For WALTER JUDD has brought to his service in Congress not only a love of humanity, not only a zest for work, not only unimpeachable honesty, not only a deep sense of honor but in addition a lively understanding of the problems which afflict mankind and a breadth of vision in the field of foreign affairs which have marked him as a leader. He is the first to deplore that recent events have proved him to be tragically right. It is a tribute to the people of his district that they have understood this exceptional citizen and have returned him to Washington, this last time by a wide majority. He richly deserves this expression of confidence. He is a shining light of truth and honor in a world which has a desperate need of both. WALTER JUDD is the kind of Republican who acts in the true spirit of Abraham Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of the United States, is very much alive. In a real sense he belongs to the ages, to our age. For in his 56 years of life he stamped an image of himself on the tapestry of history and made an enduring impression on the minds of men and women the world over. He was a pioneer. He pioneered in the remote reaches of uncharted thought; in the field of action, and in the lonely depths of the human soul. His memory has a very special meaning in this fateful year. It has a meaning particularly for us Republicans who, while we bear much responsibility, have not yet received from the people sufficient power to discharge it.

Lincoln felt humble before his grave responsibilities. We feel humble as we contemplate his towering figure. But it is not enough to talk about Abraham Lincoln—the Republican Party must act like Lincoln. We must translate into effective action the inarticulate aspirations of millions of Americans in order that we may meet the challenge of leadership which is presented to us.

Lincoln said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

I believe that our Republican platforms, both in Minnesota and in Connecticut, reflect an urgent understanding of this inspiring exhortation.

The words of Lincoln constitute a veritable bible for the guidance of our party.

We must think of freedom not as a right to be used, but as a privilege to be earned and passed on undiminished to those who come after us. We must be alert to defend and deserve that privilege. We must recognize that the concept of freedom is still the most modern, the most revolutionary idea which man has discovered as a basis for his spiritual, political, and economic life on this planet. We must so lead our individual lives as to vindicate the enormous sacrifices made in the cause of freedom by millions of people. We must fulfill our daily obligations to the system which we enjoy in order that when we have been gathered to our fathers we shall have made a lasting contribution to the cause of liberty—in order that we too shall have earned for our generation a grateful remembrance. We must give more than lip service to the memory of the great man whose birth we are gathered here to celebrate.

The Republican Party was born in 1856 in the midst of the turmoil and terrible disagreements which preceded the Civil War. In this year of crisis the Republican Party must inspire a fresh, vital, and vigorous approach to the problems which face our people in order that a ravaged and devastated world may have a new birth of freedom. In 1951 as in 1861 the issue is freedom or slavery.

Never before in the history of our party, never since this Nation was founded, has any group had such a magnificent opportunity for service and leadership as the Republican Party has today. If we Republicans fail to grasp that opportunity our failure will be as final as the opportunity is fleeting. If we fail America fails. If America fails then western civilization with all its culture and capacity for growth will be swallowed up in the maw of godless Soviet aggression.

Accordingly, we are faced with exciting opportunities for service to mankind which are equalled only by our responsibilities in this trembling hour of destiny. Lincoln's deep understanding of human affairs can and must serve as a beacon light to guide our troubled footsteps.

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

We shall find the truth in Lincoln.

"The legitimate object of government," said Lincoln, "is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, the government ought not to interfere."

How admirably this expresses the true function of government. How brilliantly it declares the right purpose of the Republican Party. That we are not faced with the choice of being horse-and-buggy die-hards on the one hand or advocates of the me-too philosophy on the other is illustrated by the modern-minded programs under way in Minnesota and Connecticut. For example, we Republicans in Connecticut declare: "Whenever social or economic problems can be solved only by public effort, we believe the power of government should be used in their full solution."

It is not enough to do as so many Democrats suggest—turn our social problems over to the Federal Government; nor should we turn our backs on these problems. There is a happy middle ground for industrious, resourceful, and creative action. Certainly these social ills demand attention. But the remedy, the method is all important. Our party is not anchored to a dead past but to the constructive and timeless philosophy of Lincoln. Ours is not to imitate and follow while others lead. Neither should we oppose the opposition when it is doing something right. It is not enough to criticize and condemn. We must, above all, conserve, construct, and create.

Lincoln recognized the dangers inherent in the high cost of government. He had a systematic interest in the problems which face the working people. He said: "To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor or as nearly as possible is a worthy object of any good government." We know how large a share of the worker's salary is absorbed in Federal, State, and municipal taxes. We know, too, that the function of government is to perform services for the people. But in order to retain the right to enjoy the fruits of their labor, it is imperative that the working people should not be weighted down with exhorbitant taxes.

Of course, we cannot pay for the defense of our country without levying higher taxes. But I deplore the fact that, in the President's $71,500,000,000 budget, the items for nonessential spending are larger than at any time in our history. These can and should be substantially reduced. We must hold in abeyance some of our cherished plans in order to create a world in which these plans can be fulfilled.

Lincoln understood that there is no natural antagonism between capital and labor. The interests of the people who work come ahead of the interests of capital and this, may I remind you, is traditional Republican policy. Lincoln said: "Capital is only the fruit of labor, could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves the much higher consideration." But he went on to say that it is right: "That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interests should, after awhile, accumulate property and after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace." Labor and capital are component parts of a cooperative effort.

Stressing the community of interest which binds the several segments of our society together, Lincoln said: "Let not him who is homeless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

This community of interest is founded on equality of opportunity. Listen again to Lincoln: "We feel, therefore, that all legal distinction between individuals of the same community founded in any such circumstances as color, origin, and the like, are hostile to the genius of our institutions, and incompatible with the true history of American liberty."

I have grown weary of the hypocritical incantations on the altar of civil rights in which the Democratic Party seasonally indulges. The Democrats find this a convenient issue to drag out during election years, to kick around for vote-getting purposes and then put back on the shelf to gather dust while they are in power. The Republican Party traditionally has stood for equality of opportunity. It stands for equality of opportunity today. Lincoln said: "Let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man, this race and that race and the other race, being inferior and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal."

Let us enlarge our concepts to the circle of our duties. Men who are good enough to

die for their country are good enough to receive equal treatment under our laws.

Lincoln believed in the dignity of the individual. He believed that the individual is the complex heart of society. He was an eloquent exponent of the whole concept of individual freedom. We must not allow the rigors of the present emergency to obscure the central truth that freedoms and responsibilities are inseparable.

Indeed the world-wide attack on freedom by the ruthless forces of Soviet imperialism underscore the validity, the urgency of this thesis.

Just as we must continue our efforts to assure equal freedom in our own land so after two world wars we must now be convinced that we in the United States cannot remain indifferent to a threat to freedom in other parts of the world. We know deep down in that region of the heart in which we dwell alone that a world contracted by science must be united by freedom if peace is to prevail.

On the subject of foreign affairs also we find that Lincoln had profound and challenging thoughts. He said: "In our dealings with other nations let us by all means give a little here and give a little there but never should we do all the giving. Rather in the case of a long and threatening emergency let us prepare for the worst and work for the best."

We are preparing for the worst in Minnesota and Connecticut. I know that in addition to safeguarding human life and property you in Minneapolis have the problem of protecting a large and important railway center and defending key industries against sabotage and enemy assault. In Connecticut we also are concerned with the safety of our citizens and with the security of factories vital to the defense effort.

In spite of the prolonged lack and guidance from Washington, civil-defense plans are now under way in most of our States. Interstate compacts are being signed. Although the Federal Government will provide financial assistance in certain aspects of civil defense the problem of protecting the homes, the lives, the industries of the people of Minnesota and Connecticut is primarily a State problem. I commend your distinguished Governor for all that he is undertaking in this field.

We must prepare for the worst in other ways also. Our economy cannot be effectively mobilized in a period of inflation. This means that the Treasury Department should stop forcing Government bonds at low-interest rates into the Federal Reserve System. It means that the President should make better use than he has yet made of his control powers so that the consumer with fixed wages and fixed income is not heavily penalized. We must create a spirit of national unity. This means discarding the discredited, threadbare plan for socialized medicine. It means taking labor legislation out of politics. It means really cutting nondefense spending to the bone. It means true bipartisan consultation in the field of foreign affairs. It means the mobilization of our manpower for our Armed Forces in sufficient strength to discharge our international commitments and to insure our national security in a dangerous world.

It has been the fashion in recent weeks to talk about the great debate that is going on regarding our foreign policy.

And yet if we examine this debate closely, we find that the area of agreement is much larger than the area of disagreement. We find for instance that despite the heartbreaking ebb and flow of battle in Korea there is no public clamor for the withdrawal of American troops. Yet we cannot long postpone a high policy decision regarding this anxious question. We find that there is substantial agreement as to the need for collective action in Europe in case of war. There is substantial agreement that we must have a vast rearmament program, that we must render military assistance to the Atlantic Pact nations and to the French in Indochina. It is not suggested that we should cut either our own military budget or the amounts provided under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. There is some disagreement regarding the part that Western Germany should play in the defense of Western Europe. There is also some disagreement regarding the number of troops which we should send to Europe. Certainly we should not have to bear the full load of combat alone. Certainly we should accept and encourage help from the anti-Communist forces in Formosa and in China, from Greece, from Yugoslavia, from former enemy nations, from Turkey and Spain, from all former neutral nations, and of course, from our allies in the Atlantic Pact. We should also make it possible for anti-Communists from countries now under Soviet domination to play their part in the struggle. We need all the friends we can get.

It is a tragic fact that our lamentable far-eastern policy has resulted not in stability but in a war which so far has cost us the frightening total of 60,000 casualties. Those who are responsible for that policy are fond of saying that the Republicans who attack their far-eastern policy are the same Republicans who are isolationists when it comes to Europe. While the word "isolation" has become a weasel word through much misuse and abuse, I can say that I know many Republicans in Congress, including by good friend WALTER JUDD, who have not found it necessary to forget Europe while looking at China. We favored Marshall-plan aid, aid to Greece and Turkey, the Atlantic Pact, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, and many other measures which have as their purpose the creation in Europe of a political climate propitious for the preservation of freedom. The inconsistency rests with those in high office who chose to label the Communist surge in China as simply an agrarian reform movement and who were opposed to Chiang Kai-shek because, said they, the anti-Communist forces had lost their will to fight. How much will to fight would there be in Europe, I ask you, if we were to withdraw our support? I favor aid to anti-Communist China. I favor aid to the anti-Communists in Europe. I believe that it is not only in our national self-interest, that it is not only in accordance with our commitments but that it is our moral obligation to help our friends in Europe to withstand the Red tide. For us to postpone our assistance until they have erected a sure dam against the Red flood is to postpone it until such aid is no longer necessary. Moreover we need the bases; we need the manganese and other raw materials which might well be denied to us if Western Europe were to succumb; we need their manpower. We need to encourage their will to fight just as we should have done in Asia.

Certainly the people of Western Europe can provide manpower and skills even though they cannot provide dollars or all the equipment and arms which they need. Certainly also they need to know that we will not wait until they have been conquered before we take action, that our policy is not one of liberating Europe but one of protecting Europe from conquest. They need the assurance that this whole affair is a copartnership. Because of our predominance and general national health we must provide the leadership.

I do not believe that the Congress is in a position to decide on the exact number of our troops which should be sent to Europe, although the decision to send them is a matter of the highest policy on which the Congress should be consulted.

I am content not to linger over past mistakes. I have no desire to rake over the old dead coals of Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, and the arrangements by which the city of Berlin became an island completely surrounded by Red territory. I am glad not to stress the lack of vision and the appalling series of blunders and betrayals which permitted the Soviet empire almost unimpeded to swallow up one-third of the world's total population. But I do think that our leaders in Washington should stop defending these indefensible acts, should stop trying to justify their incredible mistakes and should instead attempt to create unity by trying to correct these errors. This is a time for concerted and resolute action.

We must mobilize, yes, but we shall not win this struggle without generating in our own land the great motive moral forces which for so many decades have guided our people onward on their great adventure. We know that our material world will crush in splinters around us unless it has some lofty thoughts to hold it up. There is a need for unity, yes, but there is an even greater need for the spiritual fervor, the deep convictions without which we cannot emerge victorious. Peace is a product of strength; war is a derivative of weakness. Our salvation lies in a dynamic faith in freedom. It lies in our determination not to yield or to be overcome. It is inherent in our resolve to ignite throughout the free world the temper, the energy, and the zeal which alone can bring us peace.

This, I believe, is the challenge confronting us this evening as our thoughts turn toward the great founder of our party. Let us hearken anew to Lincoln's luminous words: "Theirs (our American ancestors') was the task—and nobly they performed it—to possess themselves, and through themselves us, of this goodly land, and to uprear upon its hills and its valleys a political edifice of liberty and equal rights; 'tis ours only to transmit these—the former unprofaned by the foot of an invader, the latter undecayed by the lapse of time and untorn by usurpation—to the latest generation that fate shall permit the world to know."

If we are to avoid the "twin gulfs of immorality and inefficiency," if we are to meet the challenge of leadership in this troubled world, if we are to maintain America as a bastion of liberty, if we are to bestow the blessings of freedom on those millions who are languishing in bondage, a revitalized, vibrant and enlarged Republican Party must take the helm and press stanchly forward to new frontiers of achievement. On this historic mission we shall be propelled by the mighty spirit of an enfranchised people and inspired by the simple greatness of Abraham Lincoln.

We, the Republican Party, have the will; we have the vigor; we have the talent to match with consummate leadership the towering challenge of our time. We await only the mandate of our fellow-citizens. And when that Nation-wide mandate comes, as come soon it must, let us be ready, full-girt and resolute, to pilot America, her people, and her beloved institutions, safely across today's darkling waters to the longed-for haven of a peaceful, prosperous, and confident tomorrow.

American Committee on United Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 13, at the Belvedere Hotel in Baltimore, Mr. Howard Bruce, formerly Deputy ECA Administrator, was host to a large gathering of civic leaders of the city of Baltimore. Mr. Bruce's guest of honor was the Honorable Paul-Henri Spaak, formerly Prime Minister of Belgium, and who is now President of the so-called European Council, which is undertaking the unification and integration of the European states.

Mr. Spaak, who was introduced by the Honorable Paul Hoffman, formerly ECA Administrator, spoke under the auspices of the American Committee on United Europe.

Mr. President, I consider the address of Mr. Spaak of such importance in the present crisis that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The Public Printer advises me that the address will cover about 3½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $287.

I call the special attention of my colleagues to the closing portion of this significant address which deals with the subject of rearmament of Europe, a matter of urgent interest to all of us at the present time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, a year ago I had the honor of being a guest of the University of Pennsylvania. Reading the speech I made then, I quote the few sentences that follow:

"In my eyes nothing is more important for the future of our civilization and for the peace of the world than a strong solidarity between the United States of America and Europe.

"Misunderstandings can arise between us; our relations could become less frank, less friendly. It must not happen. It would be a great misfortune.

"For Europe to understand and know the United States of America, for the United States of America to understand and know Europe is one of the greatest topics of our times."

As I read these lines again, two thoughts come to my mind: First, that I was more than right to emphasize that nothing was more important than a close understanding between the United States of America and Europe, and, second, that events travel swiftly.

I want to speak very frankly to you.

If you sometimes feel that I am wrong in my judgments or if I hurt your feelings, do not bear me any ill will, my intentions are good. What I want is both to enlighten you about certain problems and to enlighten myself by studying your reactions.

I shall therefore say at once, somewhat bluntly: for a year the relationship between the United States of America and democratic Europe has been spoiled. A deep gap of mutual incomprehension has widened between both continents. Nothing can be more dangerous. For me, it is the great problem at the beginning of this year. Were this ill will to increase, were we to prove unable to go back, we would face disaster.

It is the duty of the Europeans who love the United States of America, just as it is the duty of the Americans who love Europe to consider that problem and above all to speak frankly to each other, so as to have a thoroughly loyal explanation and make a great effort of comprehension.

If I had to summarize my opinion of the present situation, I would say that we are today, in Europe, in the position in which your isolationists found themselves in 1914 and 1939. They did not believe then that to fight against German aggression was to fight for the freedom of the United States.

We in turn have nowadays some difficulty in making the people in Europe understand that to fight in Korea is to fight for European independence and that we must not mistrust a forward America, in the front lines of battle, as we ourselves were twice.

As for you, it seems to me that your confidence in Europe's vitality has greatly diminished; that you doubt her possibilities and even her willingness to share in the struggle against communism; that you suspect her of wanting an Asiatic Munich; that you feel that the efforts you have made to help her both economically and militarily are not in proportion with the results that have been attained and, little by little, a little sad and perhaps a little scornful too, you are ready to withdraw within yourselves.

If the problem is thus well stated, I would now like to develop it and the first part of my demonstration ought to be called: Introduction and defense of Europe.

For you will no doubt agree with me: before judging Europe, you must know and understand her.

You must never forget that in the course of 25 years she has been through two terrible wars.

I do not like to burden you with figures and statistics but I wonder if it is generally understood by the people of your country how great a trial the two World Wars constituted for Western Europe.

Let us take the example of France.

Do you know, or do you still remember that during the First World War, France lost 1,400,000 killed, which represents a proportion of one killed for every 27 inhabitants. That to this million and a half dead, one must add 4,266,000 wounded, 537,000 prisoners and missing, or a total of 6,161,000 men stricken in their flesh, in their physical integrity for a population of 40,500,000. What a dreadful loss of her very blood. A loss from which the France of 1939 had not yet recovered, a loss which is at the root of her defeat.

The balance of the Second World War, in loss of lives, wounded, disabled is fortunately slightly less cruel, but this time material destructions have been tremendous.

The total amount of these losses for France alone is more than $21,000,000,000.

The losses of Great Britain are even more important. In the First World War their casualties were over 3,000,000; in the Second World War over 1,000,000. And for the second war the total amount of her material losses $29,000,000,000.

To understand what happened, one must add to these losses of the allies, those of Germany. More than 7,000,000 German casualties in 1914, more than 20,000,000 in 1940 and for the Second World War, the material losses are estimated at $48,000,000,000.

Before finishing with this picture of Europe, I owe it to myself to ask the Americans to think about one of the characteristics of the war in Western Europe: I want to speak of the occupation of certain countries by enemy armies.

Those who never knew occupation cannot measure the ordeal it represents for a country: her whole administrative structure disrupted, her unity both political and moral threatened by those who collaborated with the enemy; hatred which sets in and divides, and in her very flesh the wound that those condemned for disloyalty will constitute for years and years.

It is something of a miracle that countries like France and Belgium, who in a quarter of a century have known such a trial twice have nevertheless managed to rise again, to regain their unity, and to start living once more.

It is of this that you have to think, American friends, when you think about Europe.

But you are going to tell me: Haven't we felt these misfortunes, this tragedy? Didn't we come to Europe's help in war and in peace? Did we not send our sons in 1917 and 1942? Are they not numerous those who died on the heights of the Meuse, and on the beaches of Normandy? Did we not accept the heavy burden of lend-lease, of UNRRA, of Marshall aid? Have we not lent, given, invested in Europe since 1920 hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of which very little will be paid back to us? What was the use of all this? Are people even grateful to us for it? To this last question I immediately answer in the affirmative.

European people, everyone of those who think and reflect, everyone of those who have some education and some knowledge, are aware of what Europe owes to the United States of America and are deeply grateful to them.

Of course, there is criticism, but it is only superficial and does not reach the real depth of the matter. It does not go further than the criticism Europeans have for one another. As for the practical result of the United States policy of material aid to Europe you would be very much mistaken if you believed that it has been useless or even of very little use.

First of all, and this is essential, without this aid Europe would not have been able to solve the problem both economic and political presented by her reconstruction in 1945. Without this help it seems undisputable to me that Europe would have known years of dark poverty, a situation even harder than the one she had to bear during the war itself, and her entire population would have known a most inadequate standing of life with the triumph of communism as an almost inevitable consequence.

Thanks to Marshall aid, communism, still powerful in France and Italy, it is true, is nonexistent in Great Britain. In the Scandinavian countries, Western Germany, the Netherlands and in Belgium it suffered such set-backs during the last few years that it has practically ceased to be a political factor.

However, it would be a mistake to look at the results of that policy from the single viewpoint of resistance to communism.

The truth is that Western Europe has made the most of Marshall aid and notwithstanding what is sometimes said in America, her recovery has been swift and even spectacular.

Of course, Europe's situation immediately after the Second World War was frankly bad.

The statement of her balance of payments can best make things clear.

In 1947, Europe showed a deficit of $8,500,000,000. This deficit is estimated at $2,200,000,000 for 1950–51, which means a profit of $3,700,000,000 in 2 years. This is the result of increased production and productivity in every field.

While the general index of production for the countries receiving Marshall aid was 86 in 1947, it is 124 in 1950, say an increase of 50 percent and this general and favorable indication can be found in every sector, industrial as well as agricultural.

Therefore, not the slightest doubt must remain in the minds of the Americans: The policy of aid has had important results. Those have been recently characterized by the rather spectacular fact of Great Britain's statement that she can dispense with Marshall aid from now on, and Sweden followed her example.

This great success is due to those who generously and intelligently conceived the plan, to General Marshall first of all; but it is also due to those who executed it.

How can I let pass the occasion offered me this evening to say publicly how grateful I am to Mr. Paul Hoffman? He gave himself devotedly to the work of rebuilding Europe. His accomplishment was enormous. It would be greater still if some of those to whom he gave advice had better followed it.

Let us summarize the situation: Europe, horribly hit by the war, ruined, driven to a position that seemed hopeless in 1946, has

mightily risen again; she has carried very far the reconstruction of her damaged properties; she has, in many countries, considerably bettered the standard of life of the working classes, and she could see ahead a more favorable future if it were not for the uncertain political situation and the threats of war. Honestly, I must underline this progress:

But, if looking at the situation from another angle, people were to ask me: Are these results sufficient? Shouldn't they have been bigger still? Then, with the same frankness, I have to answer: Yes, they could have been better.

Here we are at the heart of what I do not fear to call the European tragedy:

In spite of her recovery, it is obvious to me that Europe is going through a serious crisis. She no longer has, and by far, the place that used to be hers in the world, in the course of past centuries. For 25 centuries of history, Mediterranean and Western Europe was the center of the world. Athens, Rome, Madrid, Paris, London have been, one after the other, the capital cities where political strength as well as economic power and spiritual radiance were concentrated. Today, all this is nothing more than a very brilliant memory. The center of the world has moved. It is now in Washington, but it is also in Moscow, that major decisions are taken, from which will determine in the end, for us Europeans, our fate, our very life.

It is in the United States of America that we find the United Nations. It is an American general who is going to lead the armed forces in Europe. It is the United States who recently gave $10,000,000,000 to Europe in less than 2 years. It is also an American writer who was awarded the Nobel prize for literature. It is on the possible conflict between Russian communism and American democracy that the future of the world depends. Europe plays but second fiddle. It is obvious that in her present state of affairs she is unable to solve properly the economic problems that confront her, crushed as she is between the all-powerful United States and the U. S. S. R. and the development of new countries. It is even more obvious that she is incapable of solving alone the problem of her defense against an invasion coming from the U. S. S. R.

It is with a dreadful anguish that the clear-sighted minds of Europe are obliged to acknowledge these facts. Having done so, there remains for them but the choice between two positions: Either let things go, react no longer, resign themselves, hoping only for a miracle, or, on the contrary, pull themselves together, rebel, and, having made the balance of Europe's forces and the critical survey of her position, decide to save herself by putting an end to her obsolete divisions by uniting her at the beginning and unifying her in the end.

What is magnificent and thrilling about this task is that it is practically possible. Fundamentally, the situation of Western Europe is far from being desperate. The point is to organize her on a new basis, to take better advantage of her wealth and to rationalize her efforts.

What gives the right to speak with such assurance? The mere examination of some statistical data.

We Europeans look toward the United States and admire their might, the prodigious development of their economy, the standard of living of their population; but if we count up our own resources, our own assets, we have no cause for jealousy; we must however confess that here, much more has been made of the possibilities than at home, in Europe.

Let us make a few comparisons. The United States covers an area of 3,027,000 square miles. Western Europe has an area of 1,000,551 square miles, but the comparison is nevertheless to the advantage of Europe, if to the purely European territories one adds those controlled in Africa by European powers.

There are 150,000,000 Americans; there are 290,000,000 Europeans in Western Europe.

On these bases, Europe produces 451,000,000 tons of coal and the United States of America 570,500,000 tons. Europe produces 55,000,000 tons of steel and the United States 100,000,000. Europe uses 198,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours yearly and the United States 385,000,000,000. Why? Essentially, because in the United States for 150,000,000 inhabitants, there is 1 border, 1 market, 1 economy, 1 currency, and because in Europe, for 290,000,000 inhabitants, there are 15 borders, 15 markets, 15 economies, and 15 currencies.

Let us have the courage and the audacity to do, today, in Europe, what the Americans had the audacity and the courage of doing in the second half of the eighteenth century, and our problems are solved. Western Europe can then hope to become as powerful as the United States of America and more powerful than the U. S. S. R. and her satellites, and most certainly the alliance of the United States and the new Europe will constitute a force sufficient to hold communism in check and to maintain peace. Here is the stake of the battle, here is the victory that we may win without waging war.

But it is evidently much easier to state the problem than to solve it. However, it is already a great deal to know that a solution exists.

Evidently, in the course of action one comes across every kind of difficulties, both intellectual and material.

National feelings are still extremely strong in Europe. We must not forget that the people of Europe have been waging war against one another with a terrible continuity. Between 1790 and 1945, that is to say during 150 years, there were 40 years of war. It is obvious that it left traces, bad memories, susceptibilities that are still alive.

There is in Europe the very serious drawback of the different languages. At first, it may seem but of little importance, but when one thinks more seriously about it, what an obstacle it constitutes to mutual understanding; try to realize what would be your life, here in the United States, if all over your territory people spoke 15 different languages. Well, this is the case of Europe.

But there is even worse. When in the eighteenth century the 13 States of America decided to unite, their national life had been relatively short, their economy was in the middle of evolution. At home, in Europe, it is a world that became conscious of itself more than 1,000 years ago that we have to change, and there are age-long private interests that have to be modified and sometimes upset. Protected by borders, customs duties, industries more or less artificial were created, giving work to thousands of workmen and being sometimes a source of wealth for an entire region. A new organization of Europe, more rational, mainly more rational, could very well cause the collapse of all this, necessitating a long and probably painful readaptation.

There is no doubt about it, and everybody must know it: To make Europe is first of all to accept some sacrifices. To make Europe is to bring into being the most difficult of all policies, one that demands the maximum of wisdom, one through which one has to accept to lose something at once, but with the certainty that the whole collectivity will get back its equilibrium later on, and at a much higher level.

I have the impression that here in the United States many people think that Europe is incapable of making such an effort. Many people somewhat deceived by their own historical knowledge wonder why they do not see once more in twentieth-century Europe make the American experience of the eighteenth century.

I have tried to show that to reason thus was to see things from a much too simple point of view, and without trying to deny what is similar between the two situations I feel that it would be a grievous mistake to consider them as identical. Nobody knows exactly how the new Europe will be made, but personally I am convinced that she will be made, and I can honestly say that, in spite of appearances, she is already in the making.

It is at this point of my statement that I must thank the members of the American Committee on United Europe, who have organized the series of lectures that I am going to give under their auspices. It is a most remarkable thing to see so many important and distinguished American citizens, and I shall not name any of them because I should have to name too many, understand the paramount importance of the idea of a new Europe, and to see them give so much time, show so much faith, and spend so much money for the defense of that idea. They are, here, the correspondents of the Members of the European movement of which Messrs. Churchill, de Gasperi, Schumann, and myself are the honorary presidents. When the new Europe has become a reality people will understand what was the share of the European movement in that great undertaking.

It is the European movement which in the spring of 1948 convened at The Hague a congress of historical importance. Of course, it was not the first time that men had assembled to discuss Europe's future, but it was the first time that one could see, seated on the benches reserved for the members of a congress, some of the most prominent European statesmen, such as Winston Churchill, of Britain, Paul Reynaud, of France, van Zeeland, of Belgium, whose sole presence meant that the unity of European countries was no longer a dream that was supposed to come true in a hundred years, but a problem of the day the solution of which was urgent.

The Congress of The Hague separated after voting a resolution asking for the creation of an extra-European organization entrusted with the study of the European problems and capable of submitting some solution to them.

The idea was accepted and taken up by the Governments of France and Belgium. A draft was proposed to the signatories to the Brussels pact and in the spring of 1949 the texts creating the Council of Europe were accepted by the government of 12 states.

After rather long and laborious talks, it was decided that the Council of Europe would be composed of two organizations; a Consultative Assembly to formulate recommendations and a Council of the Ministers to examine them.

The first session of the Council of Europe was held in Strasburg in August 1949. Some greeted it with enthusiasm. The others were skeptical and doubted that this new parliament could work. They did not believe it possible to get such different representatives to work together.

The First Assembly was not a triumphant success, but it gave honest results.

First of all the skeptics were wrong. An efficient method of parliamentary work was very soon discovered and the machinery started working without too many shocks. Then it appeared, and that was very comforting, that a certain number of the delegates quite often very prominent men in their own countries were willing and capable of studying certain problems from a truly European point of view.

In a way, this first session was characterized by the revolt of the Assembly against the Council of the Ministers whose powers are immense but whose tendencies are extremely moderate and, let us say it, overcautious.

To tell you the whole truth, the second session of the Assembly which was held in August 1950 started in a real atmosphere of crisis, the basic cause of which lies in Great Britain's attitude toward Europe.

Today, it appears clearly that Great Britain refuses to commit herself thoroughly in the constitution of a new Europe.

Of course, it would be unfair to condemn the British attitude without trying to understand it and it would be unwise to discard their reasons, without studying them carefully.

First of all, it is clear that the English do not want in any way, to run the risk of changing their relations with the Commonwealth, by engaging themselves too closely with the European countries. One can, one must understand it. But what the British seem to ignore is that, on that point, even the warmest supporters of an United Europe, agree with them. Nobody in Europe, nobody wise, in any case, would dream of confronting Great Britain with a choice between Europe and the Commonwealth, first of all because we know very well that, confronted with such a choice, Great Britain would choose the Commonwealth and that she would be right in doing so; but also because in Europe, we want to keep or create with the Commonwealth, the closest possible ties, and that in that respect British intervention is indispensable.

The British do not want either to create, by integrating into Europe, what is sometimes called a third force, the objectives of which would be to maintain a kind of neutrality between the United States and the U. S. S. R. On this point, too, the English are entirely right. According to me, an organized Europe would inevitably become a force and even a force with which one would have to count, but, in my mind, there is not the shadow of a doubt this force must choose its side, and that side can only be that of democracy and of the free countries.

Finally, more particularly, members of the British Labor Party are afraid that a united Europe would endanger their reforms, both economic and social. As a matter of fact, they refuse to take the chance of any sacrifice—the sacrifice about which I have already spoken. I think, in that respect, that their policy is a little short-sighted.

Nevertheless, this refusal of the British to commit themselves has confronted, in their turn, the continental Europeans with a difficult choice.

Must they try, forestalling Great Britain, to make a united Europe without her, or must they, on the contrary, feeling Great Britain's presence to be indispensable, walk side by side with her, give up doing things rapidly and be satisfied with slow—very slow—progress?

On this point in Europe, and particularly in Strasburg, the controversy remains acute, and I admit that I am, myself, hesitant.

On the one hand, I would like to create Europe and to create her quickly. On the other hand, I am fully aware that the Europe about whom we are speaking today is already a terribly mutilated Europe. Because of the Russians, the whole Eastern Europe and a great part of Central Europe are outside our influence. To deprive ourselves now of British experience is, of course, to make a caricature of our dream of a united Europe.

All these explanations, very incomplete, though already very long, aim at showing you the complexity of the European problem.

What reasons, besides faith, do we have that we will succeed?

First of all, the attitude of the French Government.

The year 1950 has shown that for the French Government the adhesion to the idea of a European solution was no longer a theoretical adhesion to some principles, but the elaboration of practical propositions.

At the beginning of the year Mr. Robert Schumann, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, proposed to create in Europe one single market for steel and coal. Politically, he was seeking a lasting solution to the old Franco-German rivalry and, economically, the success of his plan would constitute the first effective step in the way of European integration.

A few months later the French Government proposed the creation of a European army. I know that this idea was not received very well in the United States; that it was considered as a dilatory maneuver aiming at putting off the rearming of Germany. But for us, who have known three Franco-German wars in less than a century, the idea of seeing the tools, which permitted these conflicts, destroyed once and for all, is a great idea and you will certainly understand it. The prospect of seeing the forces of Europe assemble in a single army to fight against an eventual aggression from the U. S. S. R. is without a doubt a prospect that to us seems like salvation.

But it is not only the position taken by the French Government which makes me believe that the idea of a new Europe is definitely on the march, it is also the work of the Assembly in Strasburg and it is above all the evolution of the mentality of the masses in Europe.

In Strasburg, in spite of all the difficulties, things are beginning to take shape.

The Assembly has already become a European rostrum unique of its kind.

It is there, and there only, that the different European viewpoints can be confronted publicly and contradictorily. I do not exaggerate in saying that without the Assembly of Strasburg, there would have been neither the Schumann plan nor the proposal for a European army. It is at the Assembly of Strasburg that the atmosphere making such tentatives possible was created.

But there is more. Efforts directed at giving a more realistic and a more effective authority to the Council of Europe are beginning to succeed. A way has now been found and I trust that in the course of this year, the statute will be modified in a manner enabling the Council of Europe to solve efficaciously a certain number of problems.

But what is more important is that public opinion, in all classes, is beginning to stem. Last year, in Philadelphia, I had to confess honestly that the movement for a united Europe was, so far, the movement of the elite. Today, I have the right to say that it is beginning to be a movement of the masses.

Why this change in the course of 1 year? Of course because of the effects of propaganda, but no propaganda in the world would have succeeded if events had not forced Europeans to awaken.

In less than 6 months, the Korean war and the question of the rearming of Germany have shown the Europeans that in questions vitally important to them, questions from which depended their very existence, they had but little say.

This conviction has been the reason for Europeans to awaken and will be, in the months to come, the basis of a more audacious will, which will permit, I am convinced, important progress in the cause of European unity.

It seems to me impossible to end this explanation without saying something about the rearmament of Europe.

It is not at all my intention to take part in the great debate that you are holding and upon which all depends.

But a clear understanding of the facts in Europe and of the European reactions can only aid the American people and their leaders to resolve the formidable problem which has been put before them. And it is that which gives me, I believe, the right to speak frankly.

In truth, a formidable problem. Because on the answer to the question raised in this debate hangs the fate of the United States, and that is much, but at the same time, on the answer to this question hangs also the fate of Europe, the choice between peace and war, and the destiny of our common civilization.

Let me say at first, and I repeat it to you and underline it with force, that in Europe, all the responsible leaders are perfectly conscious of the absolute obligation in which they find themselves, each in his own country, to do their part in the construction of the European defense.

No one thinks that he can leave to others, least of all to the United States, the responsibility of defending Europe. This is the principle that the immense majority of Europeans accept: the greatest burden in the defense of Europe must fall to Europe. American aid constitutes only an addition, but an addition of inestimable value because it transforms a defense which would be insufficient into a defense that will be victorious.

Let me say to you next that it is totally unjust and totally wrong to say that until now Europe had done nothing to solve the problem of rearmament.

As I have tried to explain to you, our principal activity during the last 2 years has been to reconstruct our land. It is for our reconstruction that you placed at our disposition the Marshall funds. It was for our reconstruction that we used them.

Now, in the past few months, we have faced a new problem, a problem altogether different, that of our rearmament.

We began to tackle this problem with the Brussels Treaty, signed 1 year before the Atlantic Pact by Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg.

In the framework of this treaty, our military chiefs went to work. They asked the different governments to build by the end of 1952 an army which would comprise at least 40 divisions. All of the governments accepted this plan and all began their work.

In France, the draft was extended from 12 to 24 months. The budget for defense, which in 1950 was 420,000,000,000 French francs, is, in 1951, 724,000,000,000, an increase of 70 percent. France will put 10 divisions on the ground in 1951 and then more in 1952.

In Great Britain, the period of general service has been extended from 18 to 24 months. Great Britain has promised 10 regular divisions and 12 territorial national guard divisions by 1952. Defense expenditures are now 33 percent of Britain's total budget.

In Belgium, the government proposes to extend the draft from 12 to 24 months. Expenses for rearmament will be, in 1951, 2,400,000,000 Belgian francs, or 10 times that of 1949. And Belgium will place five divisions in the field in 1952. In Europe, we can provide most of the men for our defense, and we will.

We can produce, also, certain arms; but it is absolutely clear that these divisions, which are indispensable to us, can only be equipped for modern war with the help of weapons from the United States. For this help, we hope.

All of this was decided and under way before General Eisenhower was designated to command the European forces.

The nomination of General Eisenhower is the best news received in Europe for many long months. It has been taken as a definite manifestation of American solidarity; as proof that the people of the United States attach to the defense of Europe the greatest importance.

In my opinion, General Eisenhower will succeed in his mission. His authority in Europe is great. He inspires respect and confidence. He will succeed, but on one condition: it is that the political problems posed by the defense of Europe and the American-European alliance are promptly and clearly resolved. It is absolutely necessary that on two sides of the Atlantic, we decide to look upon the problems of our defense as one problem, as a single problem; no longer the defense of France, or Belgium, or England, or the United States, but the

common defense of all the democratic and free nations.

What is the great fear of Europe? That America might refuse to declare war if Europe is attacked by the Russians? No. The great fear is that the United States will decide that to defend Europe on the ground is impossible; that the United States will accept the idea that Europe must inevitably fall to the Russian conquerors in the first phase of war and eventually be delivered by the victorious Americans after 2 years, 3 years, 10 years of occupation.

But I ask you, "What would be left of Europe after years of Soviet occupation?"

What we hope in Europe is that the United States will reject this fatalistic conception and that, from the very beginning of a war, they will be with us with all their strengths and with the precise objective of preventing the conquest of Europe.

I have been asked several times about the fighting spirit of Europe. My answer is clear. For a people or an army to be possessed of a true fighting spirit it is absolutely necessary to give them the conviction that they have a chance—a serious chance—of victory. Those who believe in inevitable defeat do not win battles.

There is for Europe only one hypothesis on which the chance of victory is great: It is that aid from America is given from the very beginning and completely; that the United States will engage itself without limit.

I understand very well that you are confronted with a very serious problem. Believe me, the question is not of deciding whether you will or will not send to Europe one division for each 10 European divisions. That is not in my mind the right approach to the difficulty. The question you must decide clearly and courageously is whether the defense of the United States begins in Europe, whether "Yes" or "No."

If you answer "No," in my opinion you are wrong, but then be logical and don't send any troops to Europe, because I do not see the advantage of sending a few American soldiers to participate in the fall of Europe by being beaten along with the Europeans in battle against Russia.

But if you say "Yes," and there are a hundred good reasons for you to say "Yes," then let your military leaders speak. Let them say what is required for the common defense of the United States and Europe. Since they are also the military chiefs of Europe, they will at the same time be able to insure that Europe makes the effort necessary for your effort to be worth while.

The hour of courageous decision is upon us. I am sometimes concerned when I see in Europe and also in the United States certain men who reason as if all were easy for the Russians; as if they had not themselves great difficulties to overcome; as if they held all the trumps in their hands.

What a fatal mistake. I am convinced that they already have and will have in the case of war more problems to resolve than we. Their internal situation, the atomic bomb, the possible revolt of their satellites, the length of their communication lines, their insufficient reserves of strategic materials are only examples of their troubles.

We have also our trumps and, up to now, when we have played well, we have won. In Greece, in Iran, in Berlin, and, on balance, in Korea also.

Let us be courageous and confident and above all, let us defend the just cause—peace, collective security, and the freedom of the people, the principles of democracy—and we will win again.

Is it not now the time—now or never—to repeat the immortal sentence that you have placed in stone on one of the most beautiful of your monuments:

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Chemical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, modern wars more and more are changing into chemical-warfare wars. Since we must win whatever wars we enter, I am pleased that this is true, since these United States are not backward in the basic sciences utilized in chemical warfare. In this connection I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Chemical Men Hit United States Delay on Expansion," published February 19, 1951, in the Journal of Commerce.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEMICAL MEN HIT UNITED STATES DELAY ON EXPANSION—WAIT, SEE POLICY ON QUICK AMORTIZATION BLAMED AS PLAN LAGS

(By B. J. Slotky)

WASHINGTON, February 18.—The Government's cautious wait and see policy in granting certificates of necessity for quick amortization to some growth industries was blamed today by segments of the chemical industry for bogging down essential defense expansion.

At the same time, a number of industry officials here said the delay in granting certificates to some stepchild industries may mean policy makers are trying to decide how far they should go with a program of building Government-owned plants, like those of World War II.

BIG BACKLOG OF BIDS

One National Production Authority chemical expert admitted last week there is a considerable backlog of applications for certificates still to be acted upon, although a number have already been cleared. However, pending policy agreement, no information has been released by the Defense Production Administration on these applications.

Top Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson is known to be drafting a bill to get authority and funds to start a Federal defense building program. However, such a program, when it emerges, is expected to be far less extensive than in World War II and will probably stress expansion that industry is hesitant to undertake.

The problem of certification delay is said here to be particularly hard on growth industries such as chemicals and nonintegrated steel. In responding to earlier Government demands for all-out expansion, some spokesmen say these industries are using up their cash and credit and exhausting working capital to build new facilities.

FEAR INTERPRETATIONS

They say that unless prompt amortization is available some companies cannot replenish empty tills and obtain the working capital they need to operate plants already under construction.

Another bottleneck, they fear, is Government amortizing agency interpretation of the amortization provisions in the 1950 Revenue Act. These agencies maintain that less than full 20 percent a year amortization must be granted if a facility will be economically useful at the end of an arbitrary 5-year emergency period.

DPA is now the Government's top amortizing authority. The Revenue Act authorizes the administration to permit corporations to write off needed new facilities for tax purposes in 5 years rather than 25, as formerly.

SAY "GLAMOR" GETS NOD

Such a determination, spokesmen feel, means in practical terms that "glamorous" products like aluminum, steel, and benzene get the right-of-way while other basic products are subjected to lengthy scrutiny before being approved for expansion.

During the last war amortization was granted on a 100-percent basis when expansion was needed for defense, until near the end of the war when the percentage was dropped to 35 percent because of the tapering demand for war materials. At that time if only one-half of the plant was needed for defense, only one-half was amortized.

The present amortization procedures stipulate up to 100-percent amortization for emergency facilities but the Government now subjects applications to scrutiny on whether they have postwar usefulness. If so, the amortization percentage is lowered in order to prevent industry from getting something for nothing. Mobilizer Wilson has taken the position that no percentage granted should exceed 80 percent.

JOHNSON MOVE

In an effort to eliminate restrictive interpretations of the Revenue Act, Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON (Democrat, Colorado), late last year offered an amendment to the excess profits tax bill which would deprive the administration of power it has exercised to grant less than 100-percent amortization.

JOHNSON explained his amendment would make it possible to grant certificates for facilities that were to be used partly but simultaneously for defense and nondefense purposes.

NSRB and later DPA have apparently based their interpretation of the act on the phrasing which authorizes a rapid write-off for only such portion of the cost as the certifying authority says is attributable to defense purposes.

The amendment, which finds high favor with the chemical industry, was dropped in conference with the understanding it would be brought up in connection with the next revenue bill. However, enactment of a revenue measure does not now appear immediately forthcoming.

Chemical spokesmen point out although Secretary of Interior Oscar L. Chapman has said 300 certificates of necessity totaling $2,000,000,000 have been authorized by the Government, none of these, so far as they know, has been granted to the chemical industry.

Does GOP Foreign Policy Rest Somewhere Between Diverse Views of Taft and Dewey?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Does GOP Foreign Policy Rest Somewhere Between Diverse Views of TAFT, Dewey?", which appeared in the February 14 issue of the

Salt Lake Tribune, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES GOP FOREIGN POLICY REST SOMEWHERE BETWEEN DIVERSE VIEWS OF TAFT, DEWEY?

The wide divergence of Republican views on American foreign policy was dramatized by the Lincoln Day addresses of Senator TAFT, currently the most likely 1952 presidential candidate, and Governor Dewey, twice the GOP nominee and titular head of the party.

Speaking in Salt Lake City, "Mr. Republican" TAFT reiterated his belief that we must limit our military commitments, especially with regard to Europe's defense. Mr. Dewey, speaking in New York, called for a world-wide Monroe Doctrine, with all-out war the penalty if Russia steps over the global line.

Mr. TAFT goes a little beyond the Herbert Hoover proposal of "air power and the navy is the alternative to sending American land divisions to Europe," but he insists that the United States limit the scope of its European defense project and that Congress have the say-so on the number of troops to be sent abroad.

Mr. Dewey has gone beyond anything yet advocated by any administrative spokesman in calling for a registration of every American above 17, an Army of 100 divisions and a greatly enlarged Army, Navy, and Air Force. He rejects "any idea that America can live alone" and says "the only way to stop" Soviet aggression is "to draw the line."

Mr. TAFT would limit our land army contribution to Europe to five or six divisions, which would mean about a million men in the country's entire land Army. "The Army's plan provides 27 divisions. Surely we cannot send 15 of them to Europe, considering our requirements in the Far East, in America itself, in Alaska, backing up the sea and air control throughout the world."

The Ohio Senator warned that the current administration program, if carried through the years, would result in surrendering our liberties, making this country a "garrison state." That danger is very real, but can we really do a great deal about it? After all, the Kremlin is still calling the tune. We are resolved against a preventive war. Can we wait for an attack before going on a war footing?

If the Republican leadership hopes to supplant the administration foreign policy there will have to be considerable compromising between the various schools of thought within the party. In the Taft-Hoover camp are Utah's Senator WATKINS, Nebraska's Senator WHERRY (though much more isolationist), Senators BREWSTER, CAIN, CAPEHART, JENNER, KEM, MALONE, and others. Senators DIRKSEN and KNOWLAND are thumping so hard for aid to Chiang Kai-shek that they give the impression they would risk a full-scale war with the Communists in the Far East. Mr. BRIDGES would be tough to the point of breaking at once all diplomatic ties with Russia and her satellites.

In the internationalist school, with Dewey the most ardent spokesman, now are Senators LODGE, SALTONSTALL, IVES, TOBEY, AIKEN, MORSE, and VANDENBERG. Unfortunately, the latter is still too ill to take an active part. So far as Europe is concerned, this group is not far from the administration in foreign policy views.

Mr. TAFT is strongest on domestic problems and he effectively tied the international program with the home front economic situation in his address Monday night. He is correctly concerned about the load limit the United States economy will bear over a long period of time and favors limitations to expenditures to avoid disastrous inflation. He doubts that taxes can take more than 30 percent of the national income without damaging the economy.

"I believe about $65,000,000,000 a year on our present national income, or perhaps $75,000,000,000 with an increased income, is about the limit we can stand. As I see it, the administration program will cost at least $55,000,000,000 a year for the Armed Forces and $30,000,000,000 for other purposes. The program, I feel, must be reduced and can be reduced without endangering the safety of this country."

Mr. TAFT made a fine impression during his 2 days in Utah. He commands great respect. His tremendous energy, his sincerity, his encyclopedic mind and unique courage impressed those who met and heard him speak. As someone has aptly said, he speaks simply and candidly; he does not wrap himself in the American flag.

Perhaps with a little more wrestling with his conscience, and the hard realities of the world situation, Mr. TAFT will emerge truly as Mr. Republican in foreign affairs—which he is not now—as well as domestic affairs.

Proposed Amendments to Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, several editorials regarding the proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act.

These include editorials from the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Boston Herald, the Grand Rapids Press, the Syracuse Herald-Journal, the Rochester Times-Union, and the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 13, 1951]

WHY SHOULD THEY START DRAFTING 18-YEAR-OLDS?

A sort of plural ogre steps into the lives of most young men when they are drafted for military service. The ogre's name is "They." "They" draft the youth. "They" ship him off to camp. "They" give him a uniform that feels uncomfortable after civilian clothes. Indeed, the young victim may convince himself "They" have been planning all this for his especial torment for a long, long time. Fortunately, the youth grows out of his hostility to "They" and he becomes a soldier. Some mothers don't, and become the moms.

In the end, of course "They" are the Congress of the United States. And Congress is not drafting boys for the fun of it. Congress is responsive not only to the moms but to the demands of economy, and it is not going to legislate a slice out of young men's lives unless it must. Right now it must. And the people who are advising Congress—Secretary of Defense George Marshall and his assistant, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg—are proposing a wise course. There isn't any easy one.

What they want Congress to do is to make every 18-year-old boy subject to 27 months of military training and service, and to put him into a Reserve military organization for 3 to 6 years afterward. These are the reasons:

From now on, perhaps, the United States will have to keep a much stronger military muscle than it has ever had before except in the midst of major war. But Secretary Marshall doesn't want to build a tremendous peacetime army to fret its time away in training camps.

"How about the Reserves?" we can hear the draftees asking "Why did they stay in if it wasn't for a time like this? And how about the veterans of the last war, don't they already have the training and experience?"

Yes, they did stay in for such a time as this, and many of them already have been recalled to active duty. They not only have training and experience (though some of it may have worn rather rough at the elbows), they also have more years than they did before. Besides, most of them have formed places in the productive capacity of this country. And production is as much a part of armament and defense as an army is. The Defense Department—"They," if you like—doesn't want to tear up industrial production while it builds an army. That would be like setting up an enemy to defeat our own effort.

The Regular Army, however, is big enough to do a great job of training. It and the Reserve and National Guard units now on duty can serve as a sort of faculty (the Army calls it a cadre) to organize and train the young Army. President Truman is talking of 3,462,000 men in the Armed Forces by the end of June. That is little more than a fourth of the Armed Forces at World War II peak. After the first 2 years there will be a yearly turn-over as 20-year-olds return to civilian life. Yet in event of war the Nation will have on tap an Army of respectable proportions, vigorous youth, and better training and skills than it has been able to muster in the past.

"They" are not trying to persecute mom's boy. "They" are doing the best they know how to protect his country, his very world.

[From the Boston Herald of January 12, 1951]

THE 18-YEAR-OLDS

It could not have been a pleasant duty for Secretary of Defense Marshall to ask Congress this week for a call-up of 18-year-olds. No form of compulsory military service is pleasant and we have rarely before demanded the services of such young citizens except in time of actual war.

But we are now in a state of emergency verging upon war. And for the particular set of circumstances which we face the Secretary seems to have produced as painless a solution as we can hope to get.

The Secretary's program is essentially the same as the one advocated by President Conant of Harvard. Under it universal military service for 18- and 19-year-olds would at first supplement and later replace the present selective service. The immediate aim is to help raise the quick strength we need to meet our enemies in Korea and Europe. The long term is to provide a mechanism for maintaining reserve strength without the cost and waste of a huge standing army.

In the long period of semimobilization which lies ahead the great problem for America will be to set up a balance of economic and human strength which will not collapse of its own weight before it has to be used. We have great manpower reserves. It is estimated that the potential United States labor force will number more than 70,000,000 by 1953 and we can spare the 3,500,000 the President seeks for the Armed Forces—perhaps even a little more—without slowing our economy. But we cannot match Russia's manpower in arms without weakening ourselves fatally in other lines.

The universal military service program would call upon everybody as he came of age to perform military duty, but the maximum period of compulsory service (except in actual war) would be 27 months. Thus the effect would be merely to postpone the entry of most young men into productive civilian pursuits, including higher education, and it would eventually release many, if not all of the older age groups, now subject to draft, from the obligation of military service.

Such an arrangement, if it can be made to work, would certainly put a minimum pressure on the civilian economy. And, if it is assumed that some kind of compulsory service is inevitable, the 18- and 19-year call-up is probably the easiest on servicemen, in that it catches them for the most part before they are committed either to college or to a profession.

The chief objectors are apt to be the colleges and universities, which are already being depopulated under selective service pressure. But generous exceptions are provided in the new proposal to care for their need. During the transition period some 75,000 exemptions would be granted to students to "keep educational pipelines from drying up," and ROTC and other military education projects would be expanded to utilize higher educational facilities.

Secretary Marshall's program is not ideal, but we do not live in a world whose problems always permit of ideal solution. Congress should approve universal military service promptly unless a demonstrably more practical program is offered during the current hearings.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of January 11, 1951]

DRAFT 18-YEAR-OLDS

Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall's combination universal military service and training program makes sense for these times. What Marshall is proposing is a program that would be flexible enough to meet the Nation's needs in times of crisis while shoring up the national defense in less critical periods.

To accomplish this twin purpose, Marshall would draft all 18-year-olds for 27 months' service. If world tension eased, the program would be altered to provide for up to 6 months of training and reserve service.

What should appeal to the public in this is the fact that the Nation would be assured of a reservoir of trained men at a minimum cost. It would cost less than trying to maintain a huge Regular Army for an indefinite period, and it would cost the individual the minimum in time away from school or other preparations for the future. Moreover, by taking the 18-year-olds, the country would be guaranteed a trained force for many years to come.

The hesitation which Congress has shown in drafting 18-year-olds can't be defended on anything but sentimental grounds. Military leaders have testified that men in this age group make excellent soldiers—better ones than do men around the 30-mark. Moreover, the younger men have fewer responsibilities and have not yet become essential cogs in the Nation's industrial machine. They can be spared far more readily than can the older men. Yet much of the talk in Congress about meeting the Armed Forces' manpower needs has been along the line that the draft age limit should be raised. Marshall's plan is much sounder from every angle and ought to be adopted ahead of any program to draft older men.

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal of January 12, 1951]

CALLING UPON YOUTH

Secretary of Defense Marshall's plan for compulsory universal military service and training of 27 months for all men on reaching the age of 18 is a far-reaching measure. In the weeks to come it will be carefully studied and debated, not only in Congress but throughout America—that America which it is designed to protect and whose millions of young men will be affected.

Secretary Marshall stated clearly the objective. It is to solve the problem of providing adequate, trained military manpower with the least possible impairment of the Nation's productive processes over a long period of years. Even after enactment the plan will be subject to change as experience suggests improvements.

To the formulation of this plan the Secretary and Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of manpower and personnel problems, have devoted much thought. Solving the problem calls for such a detailed knowledge of conditions that the average person will feel unqualified to pass a final judgment on it. It will profoundly affect not only the young men concerned but our colleges also.

General Marshall speaks by the book when he pays tribute to the fighting ability of young men because of their energy and resilience. These qualities were amply proved in the recent war. If actual combat should be deferred a few years, a reservoir of trained youth would be still available while if older men were taken their usefulness would rapidly decline.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of January 13, 1951]

YOUTH KNOWS THE SCORE

"We should get 'em young and get 'em ready."

"If there isn't going to be a war it will be because our strengthened forces are too much for Russia."

"If it's for the common defense I think it's good."

"If we have to have a war I'd rather be trained and ready."

"I think the 18-year-olds should be drafted."

There you are, folks. These are quotes from 17- and 18-year-olds in Rochester high schools who were questioned about universal service beginning at 18.

These young men evidently understand the score better than many adults. Every young generation is said to be irresponsible, but two have proved to the contrary when the chips were down and here comes a third one. How many generations does it take to convince the skeptical?

[From the New York Times of January 19, 1951]

FOR UMST

In the letter sent to Congress by Secretary of Defense Marshall, in support of the new measure which would provide for a system of universal military service and training, there occurs this passage:

"What we need, and what this bill would provide, is the assurance that we would be able to build up our combat force with all possible speed * * * that we would be able to maintain whatever strength might be needed for as long as might be necessary to insure world peace * * * [and that] we could achieve these ends with the minimum cost in men and money, and with the least necessary dislocation of industry, agriculture, education, and family life."

The new bill for UMST conforms faithfully to these sound principles. Let us consider, briefly, what it would and would not do:

It would not saddle the country with the gigantic cost of maintaining a standing army large enough to meet emergency needs; it would provide instead an adequate body of trained reserves—trained, and kept in training.

It would not make the safety of the United States the special business of a fractional part of its young able-bodied population; this responsibility would be universal, automatic, democratic.

It would not disrupt the normal procedures of each young man's life more than is necessary to achieve this purpose; the age 18 is deliberately chosen as coming between the period of high school and college education.

It would not drain the colleges themselves of the young scientific brains whose specialized training is also a necessary factor in the Nation's safety; provision is made for a temporary suspension of active military service, with this end in view, though the obligation for a later, post-graduate period of service would properly remain.

It would not set up a riches-and-poverty system of security, under which the armed services were overwhelmed with personnel one year and starved the next; instead, the supply of needed men would be constant, steady and predictable.

It would not fasten upon the country an inflexible, hard-and-fast system of national defense, impervious to changes elsewhere in the world; instead, if the present emergency should abate, the President would have power to reduce or eliminate the service requirement for all inductees and all services.

These are some among other strong advantages of the new bill. They are strong reasons for hoping that action on it by Congress will be prompt and favorable.

South Dakota Melody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, currently there is considerable interest in State songs. Locally, a contest is being conducted to bring out a song for the District of Columbia.

It is not easy for a poem of a few stanzas to convey the beauty, strength, and varied interests of any of our great States. A very fine picture of South Dakota is given in Marie Christopherson's South Dakota Melody, which, by the permission of the author and the Senate, I place in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA MELODY

(By Marie Christopherson)

From the fertile green Sioux valley
To the hills that kiss the blue,
There's a land of rugged beauty
Flaming sunsets and spacious view,
Where the golden pheasant crows at dawn
And cattle graze the plain,
Where the wind sings a refrain
To the fields of waving grain,
And the people smile at you.

Like a mammoth organ rumbling
Is the music of the pines,
And the mountain streams keep tumbling
Into clear ringing bell-like chimes,
There is music in the starlit night
Filled with love and mystery,
And there's music in the day
As we swing along our way,
South Dakota melody.

Here the mighty old Missouri
Rolling onward to the sea,
Sing a saga of our progress
As we work out our destiny,
There is music in her many moods
And music from above—
As the honking wild geese fly
There is music from the sky,
South Dakota melody.

Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, Analyzes Our Responsibility and Competence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator TAFT Analyzes Our Responsibility and Competence," published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, of February 14.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR TAFT ANALYZES OUR RESPONSIBILITY AND COMPETENCE

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, one of the strong men of his political party and presently Mr. Republican in the United States Senate, spoke in Salt Lake City at the Lincoln Day dinner on Monday evening. The audience that filled the banquet room at the Newhouse Hotel represented only a fraction of his hearers, since his talk was broadcast over KSL.

Senator TAFT's long experience in the Senate qualifies him to look with a critical and discriminating eye on problems of national import that may seem pretty remote or complex to the ordinary citizen. But he brought, in his address, some of these problems very near to the heart of the average man, and reduced many of their complexities to two simple categories: First, What should we do? And second, What can we do?

Under the first heading, he indicated strongly the fundamental constitutional questions in which we are involved, as a consequence of the clouds of war that are hovering about our heads.

He dealt with principles, not with personalities. Without questioning the right of the President as Commander in Chief to issue any order for emergency military action, anywhere, when the lives or property of American citizens are critically endangered, he boldly challenged the right of any President to make commitments otherwise which would embroil this Nation in a war without the consent of Congress.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole right to declare war. This was the constitutional fact which Mr. TAFT stressed—the reason for his reiterated insistence that we should operate, in both domestic and foreign relations, strictly within our constitutional framework; the elaboration of his fear that past agreements of various sorts have mushroomed or snowballed to the point where we are facing emergencies created by commitments unconfirmed by Congress and the people—and that these commitments are getting out of hand.

On this second question—What can we do?—Senator TAFT marshaled an imposing array of physical and fiscal figures. We have only 6 percent of the world's population, and so we cannot, on a basis of simple arithmetic, hope to compete in raw manpower with Asia's teeming millions, who outnumber us nearly 2 to 1.

We do have some 75 percent of the world's skilled manufacturing production, and so can beat any nation or all other nations in the output of nonagricultural materials necessary, for either war or peace.

As a consequence, our part in preserving the peace of the world, Mr. TAFT pointed out, cannot be primarily that of furnishing soldiers, particularly to garrison Europe.

He did not urge that we furnish no troops at all for the Atlantic Pact defense army which General Eisenhower has been named to recruit and command.

Rather, he urged—in effect—that our contribution to those forces be no more than the cadre necessary to stiffen—and to make effective the Eisenhower-type staff methods and operational training—an army the great bulk of which the European nations should provide.

Specifically he estimated that such an American contribution of ground troops should not go beyond 10 percent of the total Atlantic Pact European garrison force, as opposed to the plus 85 percent of American contingent in the Army now fighting under General MacArthur's UN banner in Korea. This he did not go quite as far on the ground-troops-for-Europe issue as Herbert Hoover urges; but he did stand staunchly at Mr. Hoover's side on the point of building up our Air Force and Navy to the point where we can safely put the brakes on some of the increased-ground-forces proposals that we are hearing these days.

Then he talked about money—taxation limits, fiscal policy, and the like; and he talked very soundly indeed. His major points are recited in our news columns.

The rest of the address was—as was to be expected and could be only proper at a Lincoln Day dinner held by and for Republican Party stalwarts—frankly and earnestly political.

If Mr. TAFT is not an active and overt candidate for the presidency today his admirers hope that he is, or hope soon to make him so.

He did not disappoint them. Altogether he fulfilled his engagement with a first-rate job of work.

Rain Making: Twentieth Century Legal Phenomenon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the subject of rain making involves a great many new legal questions, not the least of which is the question of how much responsibility rainmakers have for floods and for unusual disturbances of the weather.

The Harvard Law School Record in two installments carried an article by Ralph E. Corey entitled "Rain Making; Twentieth Century Legal Phenomenon." It has occurred to me that the article should have a wider circulation than it may have received through the Law School Record. In order that it may be available to businessmen, farmers, cattlemen, and others who recently have become interested in rain making, I am asking permission to reprint it in full in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it may freely circulate to those who are particularly interested.

I have received from the Government Printing Office an estimate that the cost of printing this article will be $205.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harvard Law School Record of February 14, 1951]

RAIN MAKING, TWENTIETH CENTURY STYLE, INCIDENTS HEADACHE FOR LEGISLATORS, JURISTS, COURT SAYS AFTER NATIONAL SURVEY

Some wag has declared in not-too-original paraphrase: "Weather is just like women—we can't live with her, and we can't live without her."

Since the dawn of history, man has been obliged to live with weather—and accept it, because he could not control it. But like the element of fire a few thousand years before, control it he did in 1946. As a result of an outdoor dry-ice experiment by Vincent J. Schaefer, a General Electric Co. chemist, an 8-inch snowfall fell in upper New York and Vermont, although the local weather bureau had forecast fair and warmer weather.

It is a rare treat, indeed, to be present at the birth of a new science. But the process of artificial rain making and weather control is more than just another scientific experience. It is a legal phenomenon of the twentieth century.

Since that snowy December afternoon in New England, the science of weather control has made considerable advances. But on the heels of these advances important legal problems have arisen which still remain unsolved and unadjudicated by the law courts of this country.

WHAT IS RAIN MAKING?

Before exploring the legal issues raised by the birth of this new phenomenon, a brief explanation of the artificial rain-making process seems in order. Rainfall is mechanically produced by a human operator who passes dry ice (or silver iodide) particles through a supercooled cloud (moisture cloud containing droplets in a liquid water state). A high instability in temperature, air pressure, and humidity factors occurs just prior to precipitation. The sudden introduction of dry-ice particles creates nuclei of ice particles. A chain reaction and contraction is set up within the cloud body, and rain falls. Man-induced rain may be accomplished in several ways. Airplanes may fly above the cloud and "seed" dry-ice particles over and directly into the cloud. Rockets and ground generators can shoot up silver-iodide mist or dry-ice particles into the cloud. Then, by estimating wind velocities and directions of air currents, a situs of proposed rainfall can be calculated and forecast.

Controlled rainfall is only one of several benefits which can result from man's interference with weather. Weather control may be employed negatively, as well. Rain clouds can be made to drop their rain burden prematurely. Hurricanes and tornadoes may be detoured from their courses by altering the weather factors in their paths. Extensive droughts, floods, and consuming forest fires can possibly be averted. Weather can also be harnessed for military purposes, and made to serve in the fields of atomic, bacterial, and chemical warfare.

RESPONSIBLE CONTROL NEEDED

These public benefits may result only if weather is controlled by some responsible agency. The possibility of grave damage to private and public interests from irresponsible attempts to control weather is great. The haphazard unscientific efforts of amateur

rain makers may actually be upsetting the balance of nature. It is alleged that private experimenters tend to strew every rain cloud which hoves into sight with dry ice. These clouds may float hundreds of miles away from the semiarid zones which need rain. They may dump their moisture in places like the Red River Valley, N. Dak., which last spring had an incredible 5,000 percent of normal rainfall. It has also been noted that widespread modification of the weather pattern over much of the United States may have resulted from a systematic silver iodide seeding operation conducted during 1950 in New Mexico. Possible applications and benefits of artificial weather control should not be permitted to overshadow the ultimate objective: To render calculable the effects of any hypothetical human intervention, and to introduce responsible control, as distinguished from haphazard interference.

NO ADJUDICATED CASES

With the exception of one recent New York case, *Slutsky v. City of New York* (18 Law Week 2523 (May 11, 1950)), weather control or artificial rain-making problems have not yet been adjudicated by the American courts. In an attempt to discover possible adjudication in this new field, the author sent a questionnaire to the attorneys general of the 48 States. The questionnaire asked: (a) Do you know of any rain-making or weather-control litigation in your State? (b) Have any weather-control bills been introduced into your State legislature, or into Congress by your Representatives or Senators? (c) What is your opinion as to possible grounds for legal liability arising out of damage resulting from artificial rain making and weather control? Over 40 replies were received. The majority replied in the negative to the questions asked, and none admitted to any knowledge of State litigation or legislation in this field. Most officials queried declined to offer opinions on the subject of possible legal liability.

Among those who offered helpful comment was Mr. Harold R. Fatzer, attorney general of the State of Kansas: "About 1900 this State was beset with professional rain makers who had enormous machinery with a funnel extending into the sky.

"The people of Kansas generally rely upon prayer as to such matters, but there is little evidence that they have ever been heard, and if such a method was either successful or unsuccessful nobody knew where and how they could litigate any damage resulting from the success or failure."

SEVERAL QUESTIONS

Several questions develop out of an attempt to relate artificial rain making and weather control to legal liability. Some apparent issues are: (a) Is there an ownership in clouds? (b) What is the liability at common law, if any, for injuries caused by artificial rain making? (c) If human control is to be exercised over weather, who should exercise it—private persons, the State, or the Nation? (d) If weather is controlled by the Federal Government, what legislation and factors of liability should be created?

WHO OWNS THE CLOUDS?

Until recently, no one has ever asserted a property right in clouds. The common law has long recognized certain so-called natural rights, or essential natural advantages which are inherent in land and air space. Pure air, the right of support, benefits from flowing water, freedom from nuisance, and pollution have long been considered natural rights. They represent essential portions of the value of the land in its natural condition. Without them, there would be little security in the enjoyment of land by its owner.

An Albany Law Review writer suggests applying the well-known water-rights doctrines in an endeavor to determine possible property rights in clouds. Eli Goldston, inquiring into the legal aspects of artificial rain making for the first time in the Harvard Law School Record in early 1948, suggested that the legal concept of natural watercourse should be extended to cover the entire precipitation-evaporation cycle. He noted that in recent years courts have increasingly applied surface-water rules to percolating water problems. Goldston further suggested that the best of present watercourse law be used, rather than treat celestial water as some mineral ferae naturae.

However, established water-rights doctrines appear to be of doubtful applicability to the field of weather control. These doctrines apply to earth-bound waters, and their judicial interpretations vary considerably throughout the United States. Moisture-bearing clouds are transitory and free moving. They form and disintegrate at pleasure in the course of their travels. They are not earth-bound like lakes and streams, and follow no predetermined, defined course, or existence.

Several theories exist in the common law on which a court might base liability for alleged damages to property caused by artificial rain making and weather control. Three such theories are trespass, negligence, and nuisance.

TRESPASS

The authorities seem to be in general agreement that intended trespass to property is made actionable by existing tort law. Prosser on Torts notes that "trespass may consist of any entry of a person or thing upon land in the possession of the plaintiff, or in remaining upon it, or allowing a thing to remain upon it, where there is a duty of removal." The Restatement of Torts finds liability for trespass only in the case of intentional intrusion, negligence, or some extra-hazardous activity. Liability is imposed for ground damage, regardless of negligence or intent. A recent opinion of the attorney general of Minnesota holds that when drift from aerial spraying is carried over into neighboring fields, a trespass to real estate is committed. The decision effectively allows recovery of nominal damages by all owners of possessory interests whose land or effectively tenable airspace has been trespassed.

NEGLIGENCE

The Restatement of Torts also impresses a strict tort liability for negligence in conducting an activity without due notice or warning, if an unreasonable risk and harm is created to persons and property on the ground. Persons damaged may recover for all harms caused by the actor's negligence. One case closely related to the field of artificial precipitation dealt with steam coming from a vent in defendant's building. The steam condensed in a cold wind, and fell, forming a coat of ice on the pavement adjoining defendant's property. Defendant had notice that this was happening. Held, Defendant's conduct was the proximate cause of plaintiff's fall on the ice, and defendant was held liable for his negligence. *Diehl v. Fidelity Philadelphia Trust Co.* (159 Pa. Sup. Ct. 513, 49 A. 2d 190 (1946)). In a similar instance, defendant was held liable for his negligence in allowing steam to escape across a public highway, obscuring plaintiff's vision and causing him to collide with another car. In other cases, liability was established in aerial crop dusting, and several States have passed legislation controlling crop-dusting activities.

The common law remedy for nuisance is a temporary or permanent injunction ordering its immediate abatement, on penalty of contempt of court. Statutory liability for nuisance in the field of aviation has been inserted in the Civil Air Regulations. The regulations provide for the seizure of aircraft, recovery of a civil penalty, and the suspension or revocation of the pilot's certificate for violating the provision which states that "no person piloting an aircraft shall permit anything to be dropped from an aircraft in flight which might create any hazard to persons or property."

PROXIMATE CAUSE

One of the most difficult questions with which a court will have to deal in determining weather control liability on a strict tort basis will be the pricking question of proximate cause. Proof of what happened during a rain-making experiment requires a laborious, if not impossible, reconstruction of scientific events in an air column whose volume may range up to thousands of cubic miles. The air column may be inclined at various degrees from the earth's surface. It may be moving 20 miles an hour, or with the fearsome velocity of a hurricane. Tremendous distances are involved at which such natural effects take place. It is unlikely that a plaintiff who alleges harm from an isolated rain-making experiment will be able to prove factually to the satisfaction of a court or jury that the precise experiment itself proximately caused the rain which, in turn, caused his damage. Moreover, technical meteorological equipment and specially trained weather personnel are required to record and evaluate the causal effects of the rain-making experiment upon a rain cloud. Such facilities would usually not be available to either of the parties in litigation, nor to the court.

As scientific knowledge and control in the weather field increases, proof of causation should become easier. However, the difficult burden of proof now placed upon the plaintiff to establish proximate cause may keep most aggrieved parties out of court, or will tend to promote pretrial settlements.

Whether or not a strict tort liability develops out of the application of these tort doctrines would seem in part to depend upon the relative responsibility of the person or agency conducting the weather control experiment, and upon the relative importance of the purpose for which the experiment is conducted. The restatement of torts states that where the Government activity is reasonable, despite imminent risks, the rule of ultra-hazardous activity should not apply. The restatement also observes that the utility and social value of the activity will dispel most of the charges of public nuisance.

RAIN MAKER'S DEFENSE

A rain maker might assert that he is privileged to make rain—that liability should not follow normal rainfall injury or incidental inconvenience (damnum absque injuria). He might also maintain that he is privileged on the grounds of public necessity or emergency. He might argue that an absolute privilege should exist to artifically create rain in the public interest, in event of emergency. In *Slutsky v. City of New York*, the only reported artificial rain-making case in this country, Mr. Justice Pecora of the New York Supreme Court reaffirmed the ancient privilege of public necessity, and refused to grant an injunction against the city of New York to restrain its recent emergency rain-making efforts. Justice Pecora said:

"The court must balance the conflicting interests between a remote possibility of inconvenience to plaintiffs' resort and its guests with the problem of maintaining and supplying the inhabitants of the city of New York and surrounding areas, with a population of about 10,000,000 inhabitants, with an adequate supply of pure and wholesome water. The relief which plaintiffs ask is opposed to the general welfare and the public good; and the dangers which plaintiffs apprehend are purely speculative. This court will not protect a possible private injury at the expense of a positive public advantage."

[From the Harvard Law School Record of February 21, 1951]

RAIN MAKING CALLS FOR UNITED STATES CONTROL IS COREY'S CONCLUSION IN FINAL ARTICLE

One of many issues which a court might be called upon to settle in an artificial rain-making case is: What is the liability for intentionally or negligently diverting rain away from another's land, or for causing rain to fall upon another's land, without his consent? In most agricultural regions of this country, the presence or absence of rain can spell prosperity or disaster. Rain may not always be considered a benefit.

Once the court has solved this initial issue, a further question might arise: Does one have a legal right to normal rainfall, free from human intervention or control? This is a most difficult issue to solve, since private property rights in clouds have not yet been established. Furthermore, how is a court to determine whether or not a cloud would normally have dropped its rain, had not human control intervened?

If the second major question should be answered in the affirmative, still other issues might arise to test the judicial temper: Should defendant be liable irrespective of fault, or only if he was negligent? Should he be liable only for the results he intended, or for those which were unintended as well?

Another factor is also important. If rain makers and weather-control experts are stopped from carrying on their experimentations by restraining injunctions and tests of absolute tort liability, progress in this important field is likely to stop. Whether this will be salutary or not will depend upon the inherent value of weather control to the national community. There seems to be little doubt that experimentation should continue in this field. But some responsible, over-all control may be necessary.

ADJUDICATION OR LEGISLATION?

In September 1950 the office of the Attorney General of the State of California submitted to the State water resources board a progress report dealing with the legal responsibilities and liabilities involved in artificial rain making. The report also dealt with the power of the State to regulate and control such activities. In the opinion of the writers of this report, there seemed to be little difficulty in sustaining the broad power of the State to regulate artificial rain making, both for the purpose of preventing damage to property, and to conserve the water resources of the State. This opinion was based upon the reasonable exercise by the State of its police power in the general fields of public health, safety, and morals, and the preservation and promotion of the field of weather control.

If adjudication of weather-control issues is left to State and local courts, the answers promise to be slow in coming. Almost 5 years have passed since Schaefer's snow-making experiment took place. Yet only a single artificial rain-making case has been brought before a court for adjudication. Goldston observes that when lawmaking runs ahead of scientific development, as it did in the subterranean water cases, much harm may result from the application of unsound rules. He reasserts that the genius of the common law lies in its case-by-case development. Whether the science of weather control can afford to wait for deliberate case-by-case adjudication is the question. If weather control problems are left to the courts for solution, it is also doubtful that a uniform, Nation-wide solution will result. Divergent statutes and judicial interpretations, which can seriously inhibit progress in this field, may result within different jurisdictions.

It appears, then, that a possible answer lies in the realm of Federal legislation and adjudication. Legislation by the Federal Government would tend to foreclose possible controversies between the States regarding interstate liability for rain-making and weather-control damage. Federal legislation would bring into play the vast resources and specialized civil-service manpower of the Federal Government. Undoubtedly such legislation would also establish uniform licensing requirements and regulations defining and limiting liability for rain-making damage. Federal courts would exercise jurisdiction over litigation arising out of violations of the Federal weather-control statutes.

WEATHER CONTROL ACT OF 1951

An example of such suggested legislation is the Federal Weather Control Act of 1951 (S. 4236) submitted to the United States Senate on December 8, 1950, and sponsored by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico. This proposed legislation generally follows the outline of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. It effectively places weather modification and control activities exclusively under the control of the Federal Government. Senator ANDERSON observes that, from a scientific standpoint, it is just as important to deal with weather modification and control at an early stage in its development as it was necessary to deal with atomic energy in 1946. In his mind, the issue is relatively clear: It is a question of intelligent Federal regulation now, or continued, haphazard private interference with weather, with no central authority to channel the course of its development in the national interest.

The bill provides for four major programs: (1) A program of assisting and fostering private research and development; (2) a program of federally conducted research and development; (3) a program for Government control of experiments and operations; and (4) a program of administration. These four programs will be supervised and administered by the Weather Control Commission, assisted by a general advisory committee, Military Liaison Committee, and an Interdepartmental Advisory Board. The Commission is directed to exercise its powers in such a manner as to insure the continued conduct of research and development activities in the field of weather modification and control by private and public institutions or persons. It may also conduct its own research and experimentation.

ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITY

The act also provides for Government assumption of the liability of its contractors growing out of the performance of their weather-control contracts. The factors of liability are stated in section 10 of the act, which, among other things, provides that—

With the approval of the Commission, any contract with a Government agency relating to weather modification or control may provide that the Government will assume and will become solely responsible for either or both of the following, to the extent that they arise out of the performance of said contract, are not compensated by insurance or otherwise, and do not result from a willful violation on the part of the contractor of any regulation or order established by the Commission pursuant to section 8 (a) (2):

1. All liability on account of claims by third persons, including employees of the contractor, for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, whether due to the negligence of the contractor or otherwise; but any contract so providing shall also contain appropriate provisions for notice to the Government of any claims made against the contractor, with respect to any alleged liability for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property; and

2. Loss of or damage to property of the contractor arising as a result of a risk defined in the contract as unusual.

The act further provides that—

No cause of action with respect to any such claims may be maintained against the contractor, but such third person's sole cause of action and only remedy shall be by suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation with respect to such claims.

Another provision specifies that the United States may avail itself of any and all general or special defenses which might be pleaded by the contractor, were he to be a defendant in the suit.

There seems to be lacking in the act the designation of a liability factor which would aid adjudication in this hypothetical case. Suppose that Bingling, a circus owner, schedules a 3-day show stand in Ames City, located deep in the heart of the upper Rio Grande Valley, an irrigated, agricultural region of great economic value to the Nation. Government rain makers seed clouds in the region. A heavy, 3-day downpour results, and farmers in the Ames City area rejoice. However, Bingling angrily folds his tents after 3 days of "no show," steals away and sues the United States in the Court of Claims for damage to his economic interest. What is the liability, and what are the factors of liability?

What appears to be lacking in the bill is the presence of a factor of liability which is based upon an express authority to balance relative economic and social interests which might be damaged or benefited by Government weather-control activities. In the hypothetical case just stated, the farmers' collective need of rain would seem to overbalance the private right of the circus owner to three rainless performances. With an express statutory authority to balance the interests, the Court of Claims would be aided in deciding the case above cited.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

Congress should be able to find constitutional authority to support its legislation in this field. The authority granted to Congress by the Federal Constitution to legislate in matters involving interstate commerce furnishes the basic authority. Clouds are valuable and usable properties which move freely in interstate and international commerce. Weather control substantially affects the commerce between the several States. Current Federal regulation in analogous fields may be cited in the cases of migratory birds, radio waves, Federal regulation of airways and navigable waterways.

If irrigation, water-power, flood-control, and navigation projects are considered to be objects worthy of Federal subsidization, it seems evident that weather control, with its foreseeable saving of human lives and property, should also be supported by public funds and efforts. It has previously been pointed out that the Federal Government is logically more able than private individuals or local governments to bear the huge burden of scientific research, personnel expense, or extensive damage claims.

When the period of strict Federal regulation has run its course, and when a conclusive control of weather has been achieved, it might then be feasible to amend or curtail the Federal statute in such a way as to grant State governments concurrent powers over supervision, regulation, and licensing of weather-control activities. Federal funds could still be made available to the several States for experimentation and regulation, either on a pro rata or total basis.

Rain making, the legal phenomenon of the twentieth century, is rapidly losing its phenomenal characteristics. If such legislation as the proposed Weather Control Act of 1951 becomes law, most of the legal problems discussed will no longer exist. The ultimate extent to which weather control may be utilized in the public interest is still speculative.

"Shooting for the Moon"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, one bit of strategy habitually practiced by the administration is that of "shooting for the moon" in its requests and recommendations to the Congress.

This procedure makes it possible for the administration to settle for less than originally asked for, while actually gaining more than either the merits of the case or the public interest warrant.

Thus, an illusion is created that Congress has won a victory or that the administration has graciously made a concession, whereas, so far as the net results are concerned, neither has actually occurred, and the public is still the loser. Fathers sometimes encounter this same type of maneuver with small, and not so small, children. The youngster—who has heard about inflation, too—asks for a dollar. The father settles for half a dollar, whereas, in reality, the youngster actually needed a quarter. An indulgent father may tolerate the practice with the full realization of what is going on, and even be amused by it.

There is no excuse, however, for a similar laxity on the part of the Congress when what is involved is billions of dollars of tax moneys and, in many instances, the lives and careers of the Nation's youth.

In its current dealings with the Eighty-second Congress, the administration is indulging, more than ever, in this practice of "shooting for the moon."

For example, consider the $71,500,000,000 budget proposed for 1951–52, and its accompanying tax-increase proposal of $16,500,000,000. Incidentally, the true 1951–52 budget is actually $98,500,000,000 instead of $71,500,000,000, since the higher figure is the recommended new obligational authority for 1951–52.

Please bear in mind that this budget and appalling tax-boost proposal were submitted by the President despite his earlier statement, in his state of the Union message, that the Government "must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities," and that "many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed." This high-sounding profession is, of course, completely belied by the President's inclusion in the budget of his entire Fair Deal socialistic program, most of which has already been rejected by the American people.

This is "shooting for the moon" with a vengeance, and the President's dare to the Congress to cut the budget further sets the stage for a phony congressional victory unless the Congress is alert to the maneuver. Note this point: The largest estimate of a possible budget cut thus far reported—that mentioned by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia—is only $8,000,000,000, and even with this cut the proposed $71,500,000,000 budget would still total $63,500,000,000, compared with a $47,200,000,000 estimated budget for 1950–51 and $40,100,000,000 actually authorized for 1949–50.

Thus, the trap is adroitly set whereby even a victory for the Congress in the form of a budget cut would still be a defeat for the taxpayer. The one ray of hope in the picture is the mounting evidence that even old-line Democrats are fed up with these tactics.

It is not alone in matter of finance that the administration uses "shooting for the moon" tactics.

The same procedure is involved in the effort of the Defense Department to tie in universal military training with the present emergency draft program. One of my Republican colleagues on the Armed Services Committee aptly described the proposal as a shotgun marriage.

For that matter, the currently proposed compromise arrangement for drafting boys at 18½, with the dubious proviso that they may not be used in combat until they are 19—when everyone knows there will not be any careful sorting of trainees in case of urgent need—suggests that the administration was again "shooting for the moon" in its original 18-year-old proposal.

And there are good reasons for believing that the administration was planning a "shoot for the moon" maneuver on the matter of troops to Europe until aroused public sentiment and congressional pressure, sparked by former President Hoover and Senator TAFT, forced Secretary Marshall to come up with the "only four divisions now" announcement.

And, of course, they can try "shooting for the moon" later, so far as the troops-to-Europe proposition is concerned.

Conservation of Pheasants and Other Game in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the weekly newspaper, the Reporter and Farmer, of Webster, S. Dak., pertaining to the work done by the Soil Conservation Service in cooperating with various groups to provide cover for pheasants.

It is significant that the practices discussed in the article will also provide cover for other game and will result in a complete conservation program for farmers who follow other suggestions of the conservation group. In view of the appropriations which Congress makes under the Pittman-Robertson Act and other acts, I believe this article is worthy of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODY PLANTINGS FURNISH WINTER HABITAT FOR CHINESE PHEASANTS

(By Louis M. Moos.)

The decrease in the pheasant population in sections of South Dakota has created a growing interest in the establishment of food and cover as a wildlife-management practice. Pheasants require several different kinds of cover, namely, nesting cover, loafing cover, roosting cover, escape cover and cover that provides protection from wind and blowing snow during the winter. All are essential, but the most pressing need at present is winter cover to protect the birds from cold and blowing snow.

Many of the measures included in a complete conservation plan for a farm are beneficial to pheasants and other wildlife. Among these are the establishment of woody plantings, strip cropping, grass buffers, grass waterways, seeding permanent hay, conservation management of range and pastures.

Correctly designed windbreaks and other woody plantings are of the greatest value for winter cover. That is, providing consideration is given to the protection required by pheasants in the selection of the tree and shrub species, their arrangement and the location in the planting in order to make it of greatest value to wildlife.

Such a planting must be wide enough to prevent its being completely filled with snow. It must have shrub rows to prevent the winds from sweeping through the plantings; it must include some shrubs that provide food for pheasants; and it must be located near enough to the principal food supplies.

A minimum width of 300 feet is recommended when a tree planting is designed for wildlife use. In addition to the rows of trees, such a planting should have at least one row, preferably two rows, of shrubs on the windward side, and a row of conifers and a row of shrubs on the leeward side. This will give the birds protection from the cold winds as well as keep snow from being blown entirely through the planting.

A snow tray will improve the planting for wildlife. It is provided by planting two rows of shrubs at least 30 feet, but preferably somewhat farther, to the windward side of the main planting. Snow will accumulate in the area between the shrubs and the main planting, instead of in the trees themselves. The snow tray is a good place to plant grass for hay and seed production, since it receives additional moisture from the snow when it melts. The snow tray will also provide a good nesting area for pheasants and other game birds.

Of the shrubs, Russian olive is most important for providing winter food. It produces much fruit, which stays on the trees all winter and is available to the birds even when snow in the planting is deep. Chokecherry, sandcherry, wild plum, and honeysuckle provide summer food for pheasants and many other kinds of birds.

Woody plantings must be located near available food or they will not be used by pheasants. Cover areas without available food within a quarter of a mile are seldom, if ever, used by pheasants.

Such plantings provide loafing and roosting cover, as well as protection from winds and snow. When the snow gets deep in such a planting, the pheasants will often roost in the trees. And they like to loaf in the protection of woody cover before going to feed in the morning, during the middle of the day, and before going to roost at night.

All types of cover help in protecting pheasants from their enemies, but a good clump of woody plants is the best escape cover.

The South Dakota Game and Fish Department has initiated a cover-development program in cooperation with local soil-conservation districts. Most of the plantings are being established in those areas most critically in need of winter cover. The soil-conservation service helps to locate and plan the cover plantings when aiding farmers in developing complete soil- and water-conservation plans for their farms. These plantings are mostly windbreaks that also provide livestock protection, help to control erosion and slow down evaporation.

Roosting cover can be provided by leaving stands of grasses and other vegetation around potholes, odd areas, fence rows, and adjacent to woody plantings. Vegetation not over 40 inches in height provides the best roosting cover.

The elimination of fall burning and protection of areas around marshes and potholes from grazing greatly increases available roosting cover. Any necessary burning should be left until spring, so that winter protection will be provided.

Fence rows, roadsides, pothole vegetation, and small uncultivated or ungrazed areas provide the chief nesting cover for pheasants in intensively cultivated areas. Protection of these areas is necessary during the nesting season if the pheasant hatch is to be successful. Studies by the South Dakota Game and Fish Department in Brown County showed that all nests in alfalfa fields were destroyed and 32 percent of the hens on the nests were killed during mowing operations. In these areas it is doubly important that desirable cover be supplied around the alfalfa fields so that the birds will be attracted to the better nesting places instead of the alfalfa.

A cover-development program should be designed to disperse the birds, keep them in better condition, and bring more of them through to the spring breeding season. The practices which increase cover for pheasants will also improve conditions for other types of wildlife.

Washington's Birthday Speech by Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered yesterday in New York City to the Nonpartisan League of New York, in commemoration of the birthday of George Washington.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, the Nonpartisan League represents the rank and file of the American people. It represents those independents who do not blindly follow the leadership of either the Democratic or the Republican Parties; it represents those who believe that the President of the United States should be elected by the direct vote of the people themselves.

At the present time, as you know, the people do not select the President. A group of politicians meet and nominate a man on the Republican ticket and 2 weeks later or so another group of politicians meet and select another man on the Democratic ticket. Then these politicians of both faiths get together and say, "Well, we don't care which of the two the people select. He is our man anyhow."

For illustration, in 1940, from an international standpoint there was no difference between the foreign policy advocated by President Roosevelt, nominated on the Democratic ticket, and Wendell Willkie, nominated on the Republican ticket. About that time Senator Burton K. Wheeler spoke at Los Angeles, Calif., and 180,000 people turned out to hear him. He was speaking on a platform of keeping America out of World War II, and yet the people of this country were unable to vote for a candidate embodying the ideas of Mr. Wheeler and those who agreed with him because there were only two names on the ballot of the two major parties.

You will be glad to know that the constitutional amendment I introduced last year, which is similar to one that the late Senator George Norris advocated while he was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, received 32 votes—exactly one-third of the Senate. In addition to that, Senator LONG, of Louisiana, was paired for it. This was by far the most votes the resolution has ever received.

But until we do have it, and the States ratify the constitutional amendment, it will be impossible for the people to select their own President. In my opinion, this is one reason why over 45,000,000 people did not go and vote in the last election; they simply weren't interested because there wasn't enough difference between the Democratic and the Republican Parties on foreign policy.

We have a great Constitution. Some time ago the Daughters of the American Revolution got out a manual for citizenship for new citizens, and they listed benefits and prerogatives that the Constitution gives to the average citizen of this country, and they said:

"WHAT THE CONSTITUTION MEANS TO YOU

"It establishes for you a stable and responsible Government.

"It makes you a citizen of the United States if native-born.

"It gives you citizenship, if foreign-born, on complying with liberal naturalization laws.

"It allows you a voice in the Government through the officials whom you help to elect.

"It guarantees you life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"It defends your rights even against the Government itself.

"It makes you equal with all men before the law.

"It confirms your religious freedom and liberty of conscience.

"It accords you free lawful speech.

"It guarantees you together with all people the right of peaceable assembly.

"It permits you to petition the Government to right your wrongs.

"It guards your property rights.

"It prohibits the Government from taking your property without due process of law.

"It lets you hold any office in the gift of the Nation for which you are qualified.

"It enables you to become a citizen of any State.

"It prevents you from being held to answer to a complaint unless you have been lawfully accused.

"It insures your right of trial by jury of your fellow men.

"It grants you the right of habeas corpus, that is, the right to know why you are held a prisoner.

"It assures you a speedy trial.

"It permits your having counsel for defense.

"It prevents your being tried again if once acquitted.

"It permits you to have a trial in the State and district in which you may be charged with an offense against the laws.

"It lends you the power of government to compel witnesses to appear in your behalf.

"It relieves you from compulsion to testify against yourself.

"It forbids excessive bail.

"It forbids excessive fines or cruel punishment.

"It protects you from slavery in any form.

"It keeps any State from depriving you of your constitutional rights.

"It sanctions your bearing arms for the protection of your life and home.

"It secures your home from search except by lawful warrant.

"It guarantees you that the legal obligation of contracts shall not be impaired.

"It permits you to participate in amendment of the Constitution from time to time."

My friends, the Nonpartisan League advocates the strictest adherence to the Constitution but agrees with Abraham Lincoln that a peaceful resolution which changes the Constitution is desirable if it effects and brings into execution what the people at large really want. The Nonpartisan League has never elected a United States Senator from Lynn J. Frazier and E. F. Ladd down to the present time who has not advocated keeping out of war and I know that this large group here today is united solidly behind the principles espoused by the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota 37 years ago. It is a great organization, this National Nonpartisan League of ours, and when we have a national convention, I know that you men and women will be in there battling for America.

The Tax Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Mrs. Grace C. Solomon, of Salt Lake City, has written a very interesting and pungent verse on one phase of the tax situation.

It was written specifically for the States' Council of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and was read at their convention here in Washington. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S THE LIMIT

There's a speed limit on the highway
Time limit on a note
Credit limit on a bank
And passenger limit on a boat.

There's voltage limit on powerlines
All kinds of limits in our lives
There's an age limit in the Army
Even a limit on how many wives.

But there are limits worse than that
Each month, each day, each minute
It's the tax on real estate we own
And on that, the sky's the limit.

—*By Grace C. Solomon.*

The Obstructionists Are at It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, reprinting of a Wenatchee (Wash.) Daily World editorial entitled "The Obstructionists Are at It Again" seems called for by the indecision of the Securities and Exchange Commission as to its jurisdiction in the case of the sale of a public utility to public organizations in the State of Washington.

The Federal law seems very clear on the point. The Holding Company Act of 1935 in section 2 (c) states that "no provision in this title shall apply to, or be deemed to include a State, or any political subdivision of a State."

This Federal legislation became law 5 years after the State of Washington made it possible for local political subdivisions known as public utility districts to operate electric utilities.

Such public utility districts are now seeking to purchase the Washington Water Power Co. Assumption of jurisdiction by the SEC would delay consummation of the sale.

The editorial of the conservative Wenatchee newspaper, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD, is very definite as to the cost of delay.

THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS ARE AT IT AGAIN

(By Wilfred R. Woods)

The same groups who fought Grand Coulee Dam, fought Chief Joseph Dam, and have fought the development of our water resources are at it again.

What is it this time?

A lawsuit has been filed here to stop the acquisition of Washington Water Power Co. properties by the Chelan County Public Utility District.

The situation is this: The owner of the Washington Water Power Co. is anxious to sell out. This is the American Power & Light Co., an eastern holding company which controls the Washington Water Power stock. The people, through the public utility district law passed in 1935, want to buy.

Then who is behind this move to stymie the whole deal?

Could it be that the management of the Washington Water Power Co. itself is behind it?

Who else could it be, when the law firm pressing the case are Metzger, Blair, Gardner & Boldt, of Tacoma, who specialize in representing power companies.

Just read the record of what these attorneys have done. They have sought for years to block the people's efforts to get benefits from hydro resources.

The public utility districts had a chance to acquire and expand Rock Island Dam for the good of the region. These attorneys opposed the purchase—the famous Skagit County Public Utility District case—whereby Rock Island Dam could have been completed years ago.

They were the ones who brought suit in Thurston County to block the purchase of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. That case is now pending in the Supreme Court. And now this firm comes up with the same kind of a suit on the Washington Water Power Co.

This situation is unique. The owner of the Washington Water Power Co., the American Power & Light Co., wants to sell. The people want to buy.

Now a few high-salaried managers, legal firms, and other employees are trying to thwart the stockholders and the people.

We protest. This must not be. Our region has too much at stake in the orderly development of our water power to let this happen.

The Washington Water Power Co.'s propaganda activities have been exposed in an independent engineering report filed with the Public Service Commission in Olympia. Anyone can read for himself the report, made by the Stone & Webster Service Corp., which shows how money has been squandered.

This Washington Water Power Co. is asking for a rate increase now of $1,000,000 a year, asking for more money to spend on propaganda.

The company tells of its efficient management and that its private ownership should be continued. But private ownership in this case means monopoly—guaranteed profits and no competition.

What businessman could not operate this way—squandering present earnings, without any competition, and asking more money? Anyone could run a power company, or anything else, if he had a deal like the Washington Water Power Co.

This is not free enterprise and this is not private enterprise. It is not enterprise, period.

The record of the Chelan County Public Utility District is in sharp contrast to these Washington Water Co.'s activities. In less than 2½ years the public utility district has improved its system, raised wages, and put aside a reserve. Its books show an increase in equity of nearly $500,000 and without an increase in rates.

This suit follows a familiar technique. It is typical of Washington Water Power intrigue, the kind used for years to block Jim O'Sullivan and others who were working for Grand Coulee Dam.

The plaintiffs in the suit are being used to stop the people of the State of Washington from delivering power at the cheapest possible rates, from enabling the farmer, the businessman, and the manufacturer to expand real free enterprise.

These plaintiffs are being used by power-company attorneys to sue the power company so that the management can block both the public and the stockholders.

Remember, there are some high-salaried jobs at stake in continued operation of the Washington Water Power Co.—$20,000, $30,000, and $40,000 a year. Big fees and expenses—several hundred thousand dollars a year, were also reported by the Stone and Webster exposure of Washington Water Power Co. mismanagement.

Undoubtedly it's a new high in power lobby double-cross of stockholders and power users.

Now for a word about the principle under which a power company operates.

A private utility company is not in the category of a private business. A utility is a privately owned monopoly; it is not a business.

The word "enterprise" does not apply where there is monopoly—a protected monopoly, which operates under license and which is guaranteed a profit.

In this category is the power company, which goes under the guise of profit business. And now it asks a rate increase to make the power user help continue the propaganda work. Because of this propaganda, many people in our own region do not understand the issue.

The very license under which the private power company operates assures it a monopoly.

The Washington Water Power Co. pays a lot of employees—presidents and executives and lawyers and propaganda outfits. It pays them high fees to run a business which has no competition and is guaranteed a fixed income on its investment. These fellows are paid many times what they are worth, parading around as free enterprise. They get free rights to operate on the streets, on the highways, and everywhere they want to run lines.

It's time we awakened to the insiduousness of this monopoly with a guaranteed income which is spending large sums of the people's own money to keep the public hoodwinked.

When a private monopoly gets to a point where it abuses its privileges, it's time for the people to take over.

We think the distribution of low-cost Grand Coulee power should be owned by the people, just the same as the streets and bridges and irrigation canals.

It was a terrific battle for municipalities to get their own domestic water system; the owners pulled all kinds of tricks.

But surely none of them was ever such a farce as this, where the employees spend the owners' money—squander it—and then ask more money to fight both the owner and the people.

And don't forget Kinsey Robinson and his people fought our power developments, including Grand Coulee and Chief Joseph Dams. Our dams and power-transmission systems would never have been built if they had won. And now they are trying to prevent us from improving what we have.

This firm of attorneys—Metzger, Blair, Gardner & Boldt—highly paid power attorneys, has been hired in a suit which would hinder the people from benefiting from the dams and other resources which the people have built with their own money.

Now the Washington Water Power Co. asks a rate increase to pay the propaganda bills, and even while doing so is guaranteed against competition and against loss of revenue.

We protest. This is not right.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a letter from Mr. R. S. Logan, president of the Logan Co., of Louisville, Ky. The figures contained in his communication should make us all stop and think. The letter follows:

LOGAN CO., INC.,
Louisville, Ky., February 14, 1951.

Actual expenditures for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1950:

	1940	1950
Department of Commerce	$75,116,535	$863,082,852
Department of Interior	71,385,280	568,435,344
Department of Labor	18,576,698	257,043,997
Department of Justice	96,813,162	131,250,904
State Department	20,829,487	361,226,112
Independent offices	3,269,254,403	9,033,490,925

Hon. THRUSTON MORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR THRUSTON: Don't the above figures indicate that the Board of Directors of the biggest business on earth have fallen down on their job?

Sincerely,

R. S. LOGAN.

The North Dakota Winter Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "The Governor Was Right," published in the February 17 issue of the Dakota Farmer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNOR WAS RIGHT

North Dakota's WILLIAM LANGER, in all his experiences as businessman and statesman, has probably never made a more accurate analysis and prediction than when he officially opened the first North Dakota Winter Show in Valley City in 1938. Some people may remember Governor LANGER saying: "The show is something which belongs not only to Valley City and Barnes County but to North Dakota as a whole, and people throughout the State will become increasingly proud of this event."

Administrators of the show, exhibitors, and visitors set out that very first year to make Governor LANGER's prediction come true. People who visited the North Dakota Winter Show one or more times during the past 14 years have spread the word that here is an event which, for worthwhile contributions to agriculture, measures up to any in the United States. The winter show has featured all the time-proven ways in which an agricultural exposition can be of value to farmers and livestock men, and has also been responsible for the introduction and wide acceptance of a few new promotion methods.

One of the most valuable features of any such event is the visiting, and exchanging of information. Talk of new varieties of small grain, types of pastures, and feeding rations for livestock helps to scatter valuable farming hints. In 1938, for example, one of the outstanding wheat exhibitors passed along the information that he liked Reward because it had done better than other varieties in dry years, but cautioned his friends not to sow Reward on poor land. A well-known swine exhibitor gave out the information that he had good results with barley as a spring pasture for his hogs. Another swine grower explained that he liked a mixture of oats, barley, and rape for pasture because the rape made good pasture after the hogs had the oats and barley pretty well cleaned up. A booth sponsored by the agronomy department at North Dakota State College exhibited 13 kinds of wheat, and farmers could see for themselves the comparative rust damage suffered by the different wheats. Farmers learned that Thatcher, Ceres, Reward, and Hope were the best yielding wheats at that time. The Valley City show has always been a good place to catch up on the latest farming developments.

Machines still had competition from horses on North Dakota farms in 1938, and the exhibitor and breeder of a prize Percheron stallion was confident of the future. He predicted that there would always be a demand for good horses, and he looked for 1938 to be a good year for horse production in North Dakota. Sale spectators at the first show saw the top Hereford bull go for $175, and thought the sale a success when 28 bulls averaged $121. Senator Gerald P. Nye, speaking on the farmer and war, stunned hundreds of listeners with the assertion: "If we were to engage in another war to make the world safe for democracy, after the war was over there wouldn't be anything left that would resemble a democracy, not even in our own land."

The 1938 exposition got the winter show off to a flying start, and interest and participation has picked up every year since. Many people and attractions have contributed to the growth, but it is doubtful if any single part of the show has had such tremendous success as the futurity. Organized by A. J. Dexter, agricultural development agent of the Northern Pacific Railway, the futurity was a novel effort at promoting livestock improvement when it was presented for the first time in 1942. The practicability of Mr. Dexter's rules regarding entry in the first futurity was openly questioned by breeders. According to the rules, breeders had to pay a $10 entry fee on each calf on or before September 1, 1941, and the show calves had to be identified before January 1, 1942. Each breeder was limited to eight calves, and the event was strictly show, not a sale. Only 33 breeders thought enough of the futurity idea to enter 40 calves that first year.

Today, all doubts about the value of the futurity as a means of promoting livestock improvement are gone. Spectator interest in the futurity is higher than in any other type of livestock exhibit at the winter show. Breeders have accepted the idea because the event places emphasis on young purebred stock—future breeding stock. A first prize in the futurity is a real tribute to the exhibitor's ability to select young breeding stock, because show calves must be picked out months before show time. One of the most important accomplishments of the futurity is the encouragement it has given small breeders and beginners in the purebred business. Strict enforcement of the rules enables owners of small herds to step right into the show ring with breeders of long-standing reputations, and not be overwhelmed by sheer weight of numbers. The familiar sight of many livestock shows where a few large breeders take all the space, is eliminated in this event. Ample proof of the effectiveness of the futurity in increasing interest in purebred cattle is furnished by this year's entry list of 105 breeders.

JUNIOR FUTURITY

By 1947, the futurity had gained such wide approval that it was decided to organize a junior futurity. The purpose of the junior futurity is to start young farm people toward the establishment of new purebred herds. Approximately 84 4-H and FFA members secured heifer calves for the 1947 junior futurity. In order to be eligible, the youngsters had to have the heifers in their possession before November 15 of the preceding year, and all care and feeding was supposed to be done by the exhibitors. Organizers of the junior futurity recognized the fact that very few 4-H or FFA members would be able to obtain high quality stock of the type desired, so a system was worked out whereby established breeders could help out. These breeders were called cooperating breeders, and they have consistently furnished young beginners with top quality heifers at prices below the open selling price. Most cooperating breeders work out easy-pay and incentive arrangements with their young customers. To illustrate, a breeder may let a 4-H member have a calf for half down at the time of purchase and the balance due at the time of the show. Other breeders agree to reduce the price if the calf places well up in its class.

Young breeders have been further encouraged in establishing purebred herds by a provision which enables the best calves in each junior class to show in similar classes in the senior futurity without payment of entry fees. It gives beginners a feeling of real accomplishment to compete with breeders whom they have regarded with utmost respect for years. Every junior entrant in the 1949 show was thrilled and inspired when Marlene Henke, Oliver County, topped 102 adult breeders and won the highest possible honor in the futurity—grand champion heifer over all breeds. Marlene's spectacular victory undoubtedly has inspired many prospective young breeders to devote more careful attention to the selection, feeding, and fitting of livestock. In 1950, 101 4-H and FFA members entered purebred Hereford, Angus, or Shorthorn heifers. About half of these entrants purchased their calves from cooperating breeders.

Al Dexter has performed a great service as manager of the futurity, but his long record of continuous service to the winter show was interrupted recently when the Federal Government called him for an important overseas job. Mr. Dexter has taken a year's leave of absence from the Northern Pacific Railway to become food and agricultural officer in Ireland for the Economic Cooperation Administration. The job of futurity manager for this year's show has been taken over by M. H. McDonald, North Dakota Agricultural College livestock extension agent. Mr. McDonald has made many valuable contributions to North Dakota's livestock industry, and it is certain that the futurity will be a success under his management.

LIVESTOCK SALES

Livestock sales have always been a top attraction at the winter show, and the increased interest in the sales has coincided with the general development of the show. From the modest beginning in 1938 ($175 top), the show expanded, and by 1940 it was a 2-day event. A total of 105 head of livestock brought $9,700 that year, and the sale was topped by a Hereford bull at $245. Figures from the 1947 sale illustrate the increasing interest in the event, and speak for the quality of livestock offered. The top Hereford bull brought $2,000, and the average for Hereford bulls was $528.10. Average sale price for Shorthorn heifers was $372.14, and Angus heifers brought an average of $407.70. Hereford heifers brought an average of $496.20, and the top Duroc gilt sold for an even $500.

The North Dakota winter show program has been revised from year to year, always with the idea of promoting and improving the State's basic industry. Visitors to the 1951 show will see features that have proven their worth in past years, plus a few additions and improvements. People who have been disappointed in past years because there were no seats for them at the livestock sales and futurity shows will be glad to know that seating capacity at the arena has been doubled. Extensive commercial exhibits will inform visitors of the latest developments in machinery and appliances. A complete home-economics program has been arranged, and matinee and evening programs featuring professional entertainers have been scheduled for Tuesday through Friday.

HIGH LIGHTS OF 1951 SHOW

Here are a few high lights of this year's show, which will begin Monday, March 5, and run through Saturday, March 10:

Monday: A livestock judging contest for 4-H and FFA members, in which about 500 youth are expected to compete.

Tuesday: Junior futurity and crops judging for 4-H and FFA members, and the annual swine and sheep show.

Wednesday: Senior futurity show, and North Dakota futurity banquet in the evening.

Thursday: Crops day. Also, swine and Shorthorn sales.

Friday: Sheep and Angus sales.

Saturday: Hereford sale.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the twentieth through the twenty-third and last of a series of short sketches published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

BLACKSTONE: CELEBRATED ENGLISH JURIST (A. D. 1723–80)

Blackstone (1723–80) achieved lasting fame with his Commentaries on the Laws of England. The work has been regarded as the most thorough treatment of the whole of English law ever produced by one man. It has been used as the standard textbook in English law for generations.

In the United States, the Commentaries was, for many years, almost the only source of knowledge of English law.

Blackstone inaugurated teaching of English law at the British universities, which previously had confined themselves to Roman law.

His plaque was sculptured by Thomas Hudson Jones of this city.

GEORGE MASON: DRAFTED THE VIRGINIA DECLARATION OF RIGHTS (1725–92 A. D.)

George Mason (1725–92), called the "Pen of the Revolution in Virginia," and whose homestead, Gunston Hall, is a public show place 25 miles south of Washington, exercised great influence in local and Virginia politics.

As member of the Virginia convention, he drafted the Virginia Constitution and its famous declaration of rights which became the cornerstone of our Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution.

At Philadelphia Mason objected to portions of the Constitution which gave broad, indefinite powers to Congress and its failure to include a bill of rights. He refused to sign the Constitution, and with Patrick Henry, led the fight in Virginia against its ratification.

Failing this, he suggested amendments, substance of which later was embodied in the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—to the American Constitution.

Mason believed that local governments should be kept strong and central government weak.

His plaque was done by Gaetano Cecere, of Fredericksburg, Va.

NAPOLEON (1769–1821 A. D.)

Napoleon I (1769–1821), the spectacular military genius, also left a tremendous mark upon the geography, administration, and jurisprudence of France during his reign as Emperor.

He centralized the administration, established the Bank of France, inaugurated financial reforms, made peace with the church, and instituted legal reforms to pave the way for the Code Napoleon. That was the first code of French civil law.

The code, fusing the Germanic and Roman civil law, has been in force since it was promulgated.

The Spanish code and those of several South American states, Louisiana, and Quebec were largely based on Napoleon's work.

His plaque was done by C. Paul Jennewein, of New York City.

THOMAS JEFFERSON (A. D. 1743–1826)

Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826) gained his greatest fame as the author of the Declaration of Independence. Years later, as third President of the United States, it was one of the achievements of his administration to increase the Nation's territory by more than 800,000 square miles through the Louisiana Purchase.

Among the greatest of his other achievements was his authorship of the Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty and the effecting of various reforms in the laws of his native State.

He was also the father of the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, which in substance held that the Constitution established a compact of States and the Federal Government had no right to exercise powers not specifically delegated to it by the Constitution.

Jefferson, who made many contributions to American thinking, was also the founder of the University of Virginia, founder of the first professorship of law—at William and Mary—in the United States, and author of a Manual of Parliamentary Practice still used in both Houses of Congress.

Before serving as President, he was at various times a member of the Virginia Legislature and the Continental Congresses, Governor of Virginia, Minister to France, Secretary of State, and Vice President.

The Jefferson plaque was done by C. Paul Jennewein, of New York City.

Marquis Childs' Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 17, 1951:

MARQUIS CHILDS' EXPERIENCE

After having been barred as a speaker at the Miner Teachers' College, Washington, D. C., because his name listed in the unevaluated files of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Columnist Marquis Childs has been cleared. He and two other speakers who found themselves in the same difficulty have received renewed invitations from the school.

It was all but inevitable that Mr. Childs, a former Washington correspondent of the Post-Dispatch, should have emerged from this experience with flying colors. He is widely and well known, so the implied reflection on his character was quickly publicized and evoked the sharpest of protests.

We cannot help wondering, however, if a less advantageously placed citizen would have fared as well. Certainly, more than a few people, especially governmental employees, are reluctant these days to avail themselves fully of the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution. Discretion, they are compelled to remind themselves, is the better part of valor. When free citizens thus feel that they had better not avail themselves of their freedom, there is something unhealthy in the state.

We sincerely hope that Mr. Childs' experience will bear the good fruit of helping make Washington's atmosphere as sane as it ought to be for all law-abiding Americans.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty Census Shows Home Owners Exceed Renters First Time in United States History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the 1950 Census of Housing Report has proven again that the average American cherishes independence and the privilege of private ownership, and prefers to buy and own his home rather than rental of private-housing facilities or Government-owned projects.

The trend toward home ownership has swung upward in the United States, and according to the census report, in 1950 for the first time since such information was first collected by the census in 1890, home owners have exceeded renters.

Today in the United States there are a total of 23,383,000 home owners out of 45,875,000 dwelling units. Fifty-one percent of all the dwelling units in our Nation are now owner occupied, and the percentage of home owners has increased since the 1940 census by 54 percent.

This should serve notice on the world that free enterprise and private ownership will not be relinquished by the American people in favor of any form of socialism or collectivism. Communism will never find fertile ground in this Nation as long as the majority of our people enjoy the privileges of private ownership of home and property.

Communism and socialism destroy initiative and reduce the individual to a state of serfdom subject to the will of an all powerful state. Reports from countries which have adopted socialism invariably show that production in socialized industry falls far below the production standard set under private ownership. Even such reports as have come from Soviet Russia indicate that the maximum production of which the individual worker should be capable is not achieved.

But in the United States under our free enterprise system we have outproduced the world. During World War II with the least restrictions imposed on manpower of any allied nation, we outproduced them all.

The United States was founded on the principles of individual liberty. It has expanded and grown in strength and power under the free enterprise system. Its future will be secure so long as the rights of private ownership and free enterprise are safeguarded from any socialistic planners in government.

To safeguard these rights is the job of Congress, and one that requires constant vigilance on the part of every Member in the interest of our national security.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Sets Good Example for Others To Follow in Radio Use To Promote Rail Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been deeply interested in the promotion of greater safety on American railroads through the use of radio and other electronic devices, I rise in the House this afternoon to congratulate the Missouri Pacific Railroad for the leadership it has taken in the development and use of radio on both passenger and freight trains over its vast system.

The Missouri Pacific is setting a good example that all other American railroads should follow and I am certain that in time they will. But in the business of protecting the lives of passengers and workers every day is important. I believe all railroads should be putting in a major effort in this field now.

It is unfortunate that every railroad is not as far advanced in the use of radio as the Missouri Pacific. Because, traditionally, there are laggards in every field I have proposed in legislation I have offered in this Congress that the Interstate Commerce Commission be given a strong hand in promoting rail safety through the development and use of radio on our rail systems. It is pleasing to see a great railroad like the Missouri Pacific proceed on its own initiative.

Let me enumerate to the Members of the House the progress the Missouri Pacific has made in the use of radio for passenger trains:

Radio will be installed in the cab of every Diesel-powered train—passenger and freight—on the Missouri Pacific system. The engine crews of Diesel trains will be able to keep in direct communication with one another. In freight train service the cabooses will be similarly equipped so two-way communication can be carried on between the engine crew and the conductor. All Diesel locomotives delivered in the future will be radio equipped.

Missouri Pacific will have more train radio than any other railroad in the world when the installations are completed this summer. Here are the high lights:

Missouri Pacific now has in operation radio equipped: 61 Diesel freight locomotives, 80 cabooses.

By summer, Missouri Pacific lines will have 312 Diesel locomotives radio equipped—41 passenger locomotives, 271 freight locomotives, 290 cabooses.

More than 75 percent of all Missouri Pacific's passenger-train mileage, more than 80 percent of all main line passenger train mileage will be radio equipped.

Three thousand two hundred and forty-three miles—one-third of Missouri Pacific's total—will be entirely Dieselized and entirely radio equipped—passenger trains, through and local freight trains, most of the balance will be partially Dieselized and radio equipped.

In addition to the foregoing, Missouri Pacific's initial train-radio experiment with 15 steam locomotives and 15 cabooses in southern Arkansas and northern Louisiana continues in operation.

In the Nation—The President's Mood in These Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three articles by the distinguished newspaperman, Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times of February 20, 22, and 23, in which Mr. Krock in his inimitable and excellent style paints a word picture that is typically interesting and constructive. Interest in these articles was expressed to me by the distinguished County Clerk of Kings County, the Honorable Francis J. Sinnott, and upon his suggestion I have requested and obtained permission to insert them in the RECORD so that they might be read by all before whom they come:

[From the New York Times of February 20, 1951]

IN THE NATION—THE PRESIDENT'S MOOD IN THESE TIMES: I

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—In a world of trouble, uncertainty, and open peril, with the responsibility for resolving these conditions resting more heavily on the President than on any other Chief of State, Mr. Truman's visitors find him still free of any tendency toward defeatism and intensely concerned with a wide range of interests—historic, present, and future. Persons who called on the President recently in his library said today that they were astonished at this diversity of subjects and the amount of study Mr. Truman obviously had given to them all. For many reasons this should go on the public record.

The President, when these visitors appeared, had just finished reading for the third time Stalin's answers to the questions of Pravda and was forming an analysis of their meaning and motive independent of the appraisal of his expert advisers. He would read them again—maybe several times more—to make sure his analysis was sound.

But Mr. Truman turned from that labor to a delighted inspection of a new edition of one of his favorite biographers, Plutarch, and was checking his memory of a famous passage in the life of Cicero about honest government. The type font attracted him by its beauty; and because of the esthetic fact that, except for not making an "s" look like an "f," the publisher had reproduced the format of Mr. Truman's old set of Plutarch. This led the President to show admiringly his special copy of the Koran, a diplomatic gift, and to comment that it is harder to read than the Bible.

Before these visitors departed, as they recalled today, in the hour they spent in the library it developed that the President has also been reading with great pleasure Herbert Hoover's serial autobiography in Collier's and Bernard De Voto's blockbuster against the American Medical Association in the January issue of Harper's magazine. Nor had he missed—also in Collier's—Jonathan Daniels' explanation of Why Mr. Truman Writes Those Letters (a personal interpretation, his visitors felt sure he greatly enjoyed).

But it was not long before the President was talking to the visitors of what he called his one great goal—enduring world peace—and, with what is represented to this correspondent as amazing versatility, was discussing his now familiar humanitarian plans which he said must accompany the armed defense program of the West if world peace, when attained, is to be stable. It should be noted that at the time the news was casting these heavy shadows:

Labor had withdrawn from an economic front of the defense mobilization program in the United States and created a crisis for which the solution was far from clear. Inflation had become a mounting fact in the United States. Soviet war tensions were increasing on the borders of Yugoslavia. In nearly all respects the world and the Nation were flaming with perilous controversy. In the United States certain impulsive words and acts of the President had created among many the uneasy feeling that he was emotionally upset in a time when this might well become a national danger.

For these reasons the following description is significant of a conversation that also dealt with eminent issues:

"The President turned to that big globe of his and put the point of a paper knife on the map of the Middle East. There, said the President, is one square mile which contains more oil than there is in the whole State of Texas. There is one of the places where the full exercise of point 4, within the screen of adequate defense from aggression, can make one of its greatest contributions to the attainment of world peace. Nearby are peoples who need the fruits of modern industrial and agricultural development which the United States can produce for them.

"The President said that before point 4 became an administration measure he sent experts on agriculture and water power to this area. And there is a tableland in Ethiopia of 60,000 square miles (he pointed to it with the paper knife) where the greatest cattle industry in the world could be established. He spoke with accurate detail of waterfalls far exceeding Niagara in height and potential power development, saying that to materialize all this was far better and simpler than to shoot away the products of mankind."

A peaceful world so organized, said the President to these visitors, could support twice its present population, with good standards of living, and of the two great powers, the United States, not Soviet Russia, was in a position to organize it. The cost, he said, would be small, the spiritual, moral, and financial returns immense, and the capital for the purpose, which could be protected, is in this country. The financing of American railroad building was done largely by the city (financial district) of London when the bulk of caiptal was there. And the only reason these sound foreign investments were liquidated was because of the need of gold at home to fight a war.

As the President revolved the globe to Indonesia (good "natural mechanics" there)

and South America to continue his presentation, the visitors said, his examples multiplied; his mind seemed capable of remarkable concentration on any subject he selected, and he looked like a man of 50."

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1951]

IN THE NATION—THE PRESIDENT'S MOOD IN THESE TIMES: II

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 21.—The atmosphere of partisan, intra-partisan, and world conflict which surrounds the President in this period of history, and which lately he has made more sulfurous by certain words and actions, vanishes in his private presence. This is the testimony of persons who have talked with him at length recently on all kinds of subjects and discovered a calm man, as convinced of the correctness of his policies as he is aware of the criticisms and the arguments in their support.

In these off-guard conversations the President, according to an account given to this correspondent, provides no basis for fears which have been expressed that he is rattled, or otherwise emotionally upset, or uninformed on the vast problems confronting him.

His own account, of course, and in his own words, can be the only accurate summary of the turn of his mind. The following are merely the impressions he recently has left with the persons referred to:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

In the Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson, the President chose as his deputy in this field a man whom he regards as the best trained for this purpose. That the Secretary's political and congressional following may be small in the personal sense Mr. Truman regards as far less important than his equipment, and as a transient factor and one which has most of its source in petty politics.

Even if Mr. Acheson desired to be replaced, the field of competent replacement is very limited, though the President agrees that it contains two or three citizens whose names came into the conversations. But he remains enthusiastic about Mr. Acheson's services. And he is firm in the belief that the foreign policy of his administration has been sound, wisely flexed for the impact of unforeseen events and world changes, and is moving steadily toward the attainment of durable world peace.

Mr. Truman regards himself as the best-informed President in history, though he ruefully concedes that the confinement of office obliges him to see many things through the eyes of others. He would like to observe Western Europe, for instance, at first-hand, since he must make the momentous decisions with respect to it. But he has confidence in the competence of his sources to identify facts and appraise them, and among these are the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal departments and our diplomats abroad.

The President believes he has a good record of appointments to the Foreign Service and has given unusual recognition to career men. But he has an idea how to improve their equipment. This is to require chiefs of missions to spend 1 year periodically at home, but not only that. Governors of the States would be invited to borrow these officers as their advisers on State matters which impinge on foreign policy. A year, say, in Jefferson City after 3 years in Paris would bring foreign policy home to Missouri and refresh the diplomatic mind with the thinking of Americans on this subject.

NATIONAL SECURITY

There would have been no inflation, the Presidential opinion seemed to be, if Congress in the last 5 years had followed his recommendations on several economic and fiscal problems. Inflation can yet be checked and the damage ultimately repaired if popular groups accept equality of sacrifice and if Congress follows his current proposals—the "quickie" tax bill, the pay-as-you-go policy, and so forth. He respects the convictions of those who oppose the Treasury's low-interest policy, but he cannot accept their theory in the present circumstances.

Parts of the huge costs of defense mobilization is the result of the repeated refusal of Congress since 1946 to provide for universal training of American youth to make it ready for military service if and when. Now that world conditions require this training to be directly military, and on a vast scale, it imposes costs which could have been far less. And the toll of the wasted time cannot be estimated.

But, on the brighter side are our new weapons—miracles of scientific research and engineering. We are in a position to destroy any tanks which can be sent against us, and swift and sure killers of submarines are in sight against a time when they may be the immediate primary weapon. There are other military tools of security in aviation and elsewhere that obviously should not be discussed. But an aggressor will have to take the heaviest punishment in the history of war.

APPROPRIATIONS AND INCOME

When the President spoke of an early goal of $300,000,000,000 of national income he was derided. Now the immediate prospect is of $270,000,000,000, and in dollars with the purchasing power of 1939, not 1951. In 1945–46, the first fiscal year of his administration, Federal appropriations were $67,800,000,000, which he reduced to $36,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1947, and $31,200,000,000 in fiscal 1948. The cold war brought them up to $37,300,000,000, and $40,300,000,000, and now perhaps as much as $56,000,000,000 will be required for fiscal 1951. But this reflects the pressure of global events, not internal policy. Maybe the budget can be somewhat reduced in the 17-percent area outside military expenses. But Congress has the responsibility of showing safe methods of doing this instead of again loading a percentage cut requirement on the President.

[From the New York Times of February 23, 1951]

IN THE NATION—THE PRESIDENT'S MOOD IN THESE TIMES: III

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—In two previous accounts of the attitude the President reveals toward many subjects in current private conversations it was noted that he leaves on the persons who have talked with him an impression of firm, but patient and calm, resolution quite at variance with the one some of his recent letters and press conference statements have created. His visitors, it was reported, found not the slightest trace of an emotional upset or other imbalance.

When their conversations with the President were ended they departed with these further ideas of his attitude on certain controversial matters:

The RFC: The report of the Fulbright subcommittee, charging an improper response of the RFC directors to outside personal and political influence, merited his appraisal as "asinine."

BEFORE THE REPORT

Mr. Truman was not referring to the Senators' proposal to put the Corporation under a single administrator instead of a board. The proof of this is that his own recommendation this week to the same general effect was decided on and in process of being drafted before the subcommittee made its report. The President changed his mind about covering the RFC into the Department of Commerce, concluding that an advisory and loan review board would serve his purpose. But he had reached the major conclusions previously.

The subcommittee made insinuations about individuals that left the effect of discrediting charges and then piously declaimed that it was not making charges. Mr. Truman as a Senator produced many reports on Government methods but never did he employ such a method.

His renomination of the five RFC Directors, among them men who were directly criticized in the report, was attacked as an act of defiance and disregard of congressional finding. But that was the only way to enable these Directors to draw their salaries until the RFC is reorganized, which the critics should know if they didn't.

HANDLING A STRIKE

The switchmen's strike: Their leaders did run out on their agreement "like Russians," as the President described it. It was an accurate description. First, they had asked his assistant, Dr. Steelman, to aid in settling the controversy with management. Second, they had signed the agreement he had negotiated. And then they endeavored to escape the responsibility they assumed by their signatures and which was imposed by their official union authority.

The appeal to the "sick" strikers made by Charles E. Wilson came from the proper source—the Director of that defense mobilization which the strike was seriously impeding. Also, it was the proper first approach (the Army has not the experienced manpower to switch trains), just as the legal sanctions represented a second correct approach.

Before the President intervenes directly in a situation, by broadcast or otherwise, other Government means should be exhausted. The end of the strike demonstrated these had not yet been exhausted.

LETTERS AND THE PRESS

Those letters, etc.: This subject appears to have had the lightest kind of treatment in the conversations. But the President's visitors left with the opinion that Mr. Truman stoutly reserves the right to express himself indignantly and forcefully, when he thinks the situation warrants; and to become President does not require a waiver on normal human responses to traduction, misrepresentation, and so forth, of the individual who chances to occupy the White House. This was when his visitors noted that the President cast a smiling glance at Jonathan Daniel's article on this subject.

President and press: Mr. Truman's friends found him as convinced as ever that many newspapers in the country—they seem to recall that he mentioned a percentage—are out to prove a certain thing. This is that the man who had not wanted the Presidency, or the Vice Presidency which preceded it and who inherited it through circumstances over which he had no control, was not qualified to administer the office. From that time on, whenever the occasion made it possible to afford even the pretense of a footing for this attitude, these newspapers had sought to prove their theory.

PRESIDENTIAL POWERS

Apparently in the long session in the President's private library a number of other items came into the conversations. (But, in the three articles of which this is the concluding one, the account has been confined to the subjects which best delineate Mr. Truman's present mood and touch great problems of the day.) Among them the enduring controversy over Presidential powers was not forgotten, with historical citations to prove that Lincoln's and Jefferson's limited view of these powers, before they assumed them, were sharply expanded when they were confronted with the assigned responsibilities of the President for national security and the general welfare.

This composite portrait of the President's mood is only a news-shot; it was not posed. It does not answer, and was not intended to answer, his critics, who will continue to find flaws in his personal deportment, his comprehension of issues, his policies and his factional and partisan practices.

Our Comic-Opera Spy Set-Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times it has been shown that conflicts among our intelligence agencies result in confusion and danger to the Nation, there has yet been no effort expended on the part of the Federal Government to set up a separate, independent, and consolidated intelligence system. The article entitled "Our Comic-Opera Spy Set-Up" in the February 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine, highlights the effect of our present divided authority upon the security of America.

The article follows:

OUR COMIC-OPERA SPY SET-UP

(By Donald Robinson)

The Federal Bureau of Investigation moved fast the day it learned that a Soviet espionage ring in San Francisco had penetrated the atomic-bomb project. It was not its fault that the Red spies got away.

What happened was this:

From an undercover source the FBI received a report that two MVD men—Gregori Kheifitz and Gregori Kasperov—had made contact with an important scientist working on the A-bomb. The report stated that the trio was to meet that very evening at a seafood restaurant on Powell Street.

Instantly the FBI went into action, dispatching several of its best agents, with special listening and movie-making equipment, to cover the meeting.

The FBI men raced to the restaurant. There they found the scientist and the Russians huddled together in a wallside booth. And there they also found something else.

The one booth from which the FBI men could operate their equipment had already been reserved. It had been taken by two operatives of the Army Counterintelligence Corps. The CIC men were working on the same case and trying to listen in on the very same conversation.

As one Government official ruefully remarked later:

"There were more investigators in that restaurant than customers."

It took precious minutes before arrangements could be made for the CIC men to relinquish their booth to the FBI agents—and then it was too late. No complete record of that sinister meeting could be made.

Did the scientist supply the Russians with a list of the experts working on the A-bomb? He was heard to speak of Niels Bohr, E. O. Lawrence, and others.

Did he disclose the secrets of Oak Ridge? He spoke of the big Tennessee atomic plant.

Did he give the Russians secret A-bomb plans? He was seen to hand them a batch of papers.

To this day no one knows the answers to these questions. The scientist was quietly dropped from the atomic project but no steps could be taken against the Red spies. The evidence was incomplete and they escaped scot free.

Imbroglios like this one are typical of the jungle-like chaos in America's counter-espionage machinery, a chaos which has been hamstringing the Nation's safeguards against foreign spies.

No less than 25 separate Government agencies have been—and still are—involved in the fight against spies, and it can be authoritatively stated that many of them have been more active in battling one another than in combating espionage.

"Internal security deserves more careful and intelligent attention than it seems thus far to have received," the Hoover Commission bluntly declared, and it was right.

This writer has just completed a searching, months-long investigation into the espionage situation during which he talked with the leading specialists in the intelligence field, both inside and outside the Government.

On the basis of this probe, it can be categorically said that the United States Government's safeguards against foreign spies have been crucially weakened, over a long period, by inter-agency rivalries, overlapping jurisdictions, and a shocking lack of centralized direction.

That was the reason Gerhart Eisler, the notorious Comintern official, was able to flee the country after he had been sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment for passport fraud.

When Eisler was released on $23,500 bail pending appeal, the FBI assumed that Bureau of Immigration men were watching him. The Immigration Bureau figured the FBI was tailing him. Neither checked with the other and Eisler—the man described as Russia's most dangerous agent—found it simple to sneak aboard the out-bound Polish liner *Batory*.

It can now be revealed that this also was why the MVD was able to get Lt. Anatole Barsoff back to the Russia he'd quit in fear and terror. It was how the MVD almost managed to shanghai Barsoff's partner, Lt. Peter Pirigoff—who loves America—and drag him off to certain death.

After these two Red army fliers fled Russia in a stolen plane, they were brought to the United States, praised for their courage, feted, and cast adrift.

The State Department didn't keep an eye on them. Neither did the Bureau of Immigration. Nor the FBI.

No one in Washington even knew about it when the Russian Embassy sent MVD men to look up Barsoff in the Brooklyn, N. Y., shop where he was working as a $35-a-week dress presser. No one knew about it when they talked him into returning to the U. S. S. R.

Not even when Barsoff, acting under the orders of the MVD, laid a trap for Pirigoff did Washington wake up.

Barsoff asked Pirigoff to meet him for dinner. Pirigoff agreed. He was smart, though, and tipped off the Government.

The two pilots met at a Washington, D. C., restaurant named Aux Trois Mousquetaires.

"Come back with me to Russia," Barsoff pleaded.

"You're crazy," Pirigoff replied. "You'll be dead within a year."

"Not me," said Barsoff. "It's you who's going to swing in Red Square."

He gave a signal and a gang of men surrounded the table.

"You, Pirigoff," one of them said, "come with us."

Pirigoff looked around for help but no one came to his aid. He got up and started to fight anyway.

A gun butt smashed on his skull.

United States Government men arrived then and put the MVD agents to flight. They saved Pirigoff and took Barsoff into custody. But the tragedy of errors was not yet over.

The Air Force urged the State Department not to allow Barsoff to return to the Soviet Union. It pointed out that when the Russian first came here he had been told a great deal—too much—about American intelligence procedure and tactics. The Army also begged the State Department not to let him go. He'd been given information on the American underground in Germany. It would mean a complete reshuffling of the underground, the Army warned.

In spite of the Pentagon's strong plea, the State Department permitted Barsoff to go back to Russia.

The results of this civil war in counter-espionage have been catastrophic to the national defense.

Because of it, Soviet spies have been able to steal some of the most secret formulas in the manufacture of the atomic bomb and vital information on the new hydrogen bomb, too.

And that is only a little of what they have gotten here.

This writer has learned on unimpeachable authority that Soviet spies have also secured and transmitted to Russia vast stores of confidential data on American submarines and military planes. Recently the Kremlin decorated two of its agents for stealing the blueprints of a new United States Air Force bomber.

In the Department of Defense files today is a sworn statement by Lieut. Gen. Izydor Modelski, the former Polish Military Attaché in Washington, divulging that a spy network established here by his Government has obtained essential details—including maps and photographs—on key industrial plants all over America.

All this and more is due to the amazing lack of coordination among the Federal agencies responsible for protecting the Nation's secrets. There are countless examples of this.

One of the most glaring is the coast-to-coast inspection tour that the State Department arranged for a group of Russian technicians.

Overlooking the tensions between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R., the State Department authorized these Russian engineers to survey bridges, power plants, and utilities in all parts of the country. It even included certain defense plants.

Not one official of the State Department consulted the military authorities or the FBI as to the wisdom of such a tour. In fact, the first the military people heard about it was when the owner of a big chemical plant in Wisconsin burst in on the Pentagon, frantically waving a letter in his hand.

"I got this letter from the State Department and I took the next plane for Washington," he said.

The letter was signed by an Assistant Secretary of State and asked the Wisconsinite to allow the Russian group to inspect his chemical plant.

"Are these people crazy?" the Wisconsin man shouted. "Don't they know that my plant is busy on confidential work?"

"There's nothing we can do," he was told. "This is a State Department matter."

Although the Wisconsin manufacturer refused to let the Russian party in his plant, the Russians did get to see other big utilities and plants throughout the United States.

"Is it any wonder," a ranking Air Force general fumed to this writer, "that the Russian Government has been able to prepare a thick volume showing, in pictures, maps and words, every important dam, power plant, bridge, and railroad siding in America?

"It's a perfect manual for enemy bombers."

Without even consulting the FBI, the State Department issued a visa allowing Mme. Irene Joliot-Curie, the French scientist, to enter the United States. At the time Mme.

Joliot-Curie, the wife of an admitted Communist, was on the FBI list of subversive agents.

When Mme. Joliot-Curie landed at New York, on March 18, 1948, the Bureau of Immigration, which maintains its own subversive files, had her detained at Ellis Island. The State Department, however, made representations to the Justice Department, which ordered her admitted to the country.

Nor is this the only time that the bars have been let down to dangerous elements.

Not long ago it was revealed by the Central Intelligence Agency, the organization in charge of all American espionage operations overseas, that 61 men whom it had identified as Russian spies were in the United States under visas granted by the State Department.

According to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, there are three techniques for dealing with foreign spies. These are:

1. Arrest and try them for violation of the Espionage Act.

2. Provide for public exposure of their activities through congressional hearings, newspaper publicity, etc.

3. Follow them and get to know their sources, contacts, and means of communications so that you can make use of them for your own purposes.

Hoover believes that the third system is the most effective method for handling espionage. He feels, of course, that spies should eventually be arrested and prosecuted but he thinks that full use should be made of them first.

However, the utmost integration of all Government agencies concerned with counter-espionage is required, Hoover declares, if proper tabs are to be kept on enemy spies.

And the stark truth is, there has been no such integration.

Under the law, the FBI is supposed to have prime responsibility for counter-espionage in the United States. It is specifically charged with enforcement of the Espionage Act. Nevertheless, two dozen other Federal agencies also have extensive powers in the field.

The three armed services have exclusive jurisdiction over tracking down spies among their personnel and in the industrial plants supplying them. The State Department controls the issuance of visas to suspected espionage agents. It also has two other units with counter-espionage functions—its Intelligence Section and its Special Agents group. The Bureau of Immigration is supposed to prevent spies from entering the country illegally. The Coast Guard checks on spies in the merchant marine. So does the Maritime Commission. The security section of the Atomic Energy Commission has the job of safeguarding atomic plants from spies. The Secret Service does the same for the White House. The Intelligence Unit of the Treasury Department makes special inquiries along these lines for the President and other high Government officials. Then there is the Central Intelligence Agency. It handles all counter-espionage work overseas.

But these aren't all. There are at least 11 others in the internal security picture, ranging all the way from the Bureau of Customs to the National Security Resources Board.

The two principal organizations are the FBI and the Central Intelligence Agency, and of necessity there should be 100 percent cooperation between them. This is a life-and-death matter inasmuch as the FBI works solely inside the United States and its possessions, and must rely entirely on CIA to cover the overseas outlets of any foreign espionage ring known to be operating in America.

Here is what an expert says on this score. He is Allen Dulles, the star performer of the wartime Office of Strategic Services, whose agents penetrated Hitler's own cabinet.

"You cannot cut off counterespionage at the water's edge. You have to be able to coordinate information which you get here with the information you get overseas. You have to follow espionage agents as they are sent here by foreign powers, while they are here, and then as they return from here.

"You have to follow their lines of communication which cut across the water's edge, and over the water, and you have to keep an eye on the feeder agents which they have here and elsewhere.

"For this, you need the closest liaison between the FBI and the CIA."

In this connection, this writer was told that Great Britain, the world's most expert nation in espionage matters, insists on absolutely perfect liaison between MI-5, its intelligence service, and MI-6, its counter-espionage organization. MI-6 has agents assigned to MI-5 offices all over the world. Right now, in the British Embassy in Paris, there is an MI-6 agent working in the same office with the MI-5 operatives, screening all their findings for information on spies heading toward England.

In no foreign locality, however, is an FBI agent assigned to a CIA office today. It may be denied, but liaison between the two organizations has been at a low ebb.

Such a lack of liaison created endless difficulties during the war between the FBI and Gen. "Wild Bill" Donovan's cloak-and-dagger Office of Strategic Services, the predecessor of today's CIA.

On one occasion FBI agents had a Nazi spy ring here "taped" and were planting "fake" secrets in its New York City "mail-drop" for transmission to Berlin. No one notified the OSS though, a blunder that had shocking consequences.

OSS men abroad, who were continually seeking to foil Axis spies, unearthed the European outlets of this same Nazi espionage ring and went to work on it, too.

Slowly, tortuously, risking the Gestapo at every step, the OSS men traced the ring's operations and found that all of its mail from America was being posted to Berlin via Spain.

A group of OSS men made a special trip to Spain and succeeded in making contact with the ring's Madrid representatives.

"You're wasting your time working for the Germans," the OSS men said to him.

"They're going to lose the war."

"Señors, with me it is a question of pesos," this Spaniard declared.

That was what the OSS men were waiting for.

"Why don't you do business with us instead of the Germans," they said. "We'll pay well."

A deal was made and soon the OSS men were buying, at a huge price, the very fake secrets planted in New York by the FBI.

Many months went by and thousands upon thousands of dollars were wasted before this situation could be straightened out.

Even now there is a serious lack of liaison between the Armed Forces and the FBI.

Not long ago the Army received reports that a Soviet espionage ring had launched a campaign to collect data on a number of American war plants.

The ring, which had its headquarters in the Soviet zone of Germany, was using every means in its power to get information on munitions production in such towns as Wichita, Kans., Rockford, Ill., and San Antonio, Tex.

The Army did not even inform the FBI of this development.

Recently the Office of Naval Intelligence and A-2, the Air Force intelligence division, gave clearance to the Department of Commerce to sell several hundred nautical, aeronautical, and topographical maps, showing every key point in the United States, to a concern known as the Four Continent Book Corp. of New York.

Not one of these agencies checked with the FBI.

Had they done so, they would have learned that the Four Continent Book Corp. was registered as an official agent of the U. S. S. R.

The Armed Forces themselves have been racked by internal feuds. The Navy recently went so far as to snub an ultra-important conference on intelligence matters which the Army held in Paris.

The Air Force sent representatives. So did CIA. The State Department, which had not been invited, actually asked that one of its intelligence specialists be allowed to attend. Its request was granted. However, the Navy, which had been invited, declined to attend.

No explanation was given and, as one Department of the Army official remarked:

"All we can assume is that the Navy is not interested in the coordination of intelligence activities."

None of these instances, though, are as bad as the muddling that has keynoted the Government's efforts to safeguard the atomic bomb.

The case of the Soviet spy Adams is characteristic.

The FBI espionage squad ran across Adams' trail in connection with an investigation of an atomic scientist named Dr. Clarence F. Hiskey. Hiskey, a University of Chicago chemist, was suspected of supplying the Russians with confidential data on atomic bomb research.

In its probe, the FBI learned that Hiskey's contact was a mysterious Russian by the name of Arthur Alexandrovitch Adams.

Agents were put to investigating Adams. They searched his room at the Hotel Peter Cooper in New York. In it they found not only highly secret information on the Oak Ridge atomic-bomb plant but also vital—stolen—facts on the development of atomic energy by our allies.

Day and night, then, the FBI espionage squad followed Adams. It was on his tail the night he conferred with Hiskey's friend and coworker, Dr. John H. Chapin, in the Stevens Hotel in Chicago. It was on his tail the evening he met Pavel Mikhailov, the Soviet vice consul in New York, and drove with him to the Russian consulate. He was carrying a big black attaché case that evening. It was on his tail the day he tried to board a Soviet freighter in Portland, Oreg., and flee the country. FBI men kept him from departing.

But the FBI's efficiency was all in vain. When it finally decided that Adams' usefulness was over and that he should be jailed as an example to other Red spies, it was prevented by State Department interference from doing as it wished.

The State Department actually ordered the FBI not to serve the warrant it had obtained for Adams' arrest.

"It might annoy the Russian Government," the State Department said.

As a result, Adams—the Russian master spy—is back in Russia today, safe and sound.

(The same thing happened when the FBI moved to arrest—after making use of him for 8 years—a Russian spy named Andrei Scherchenko who had penetrated the Bell Aircraft Corp. plant in Buffalo.

(As FBI Special Agent "Buzz" Roberts told Loren G. Haas, a Bell engineer, "Mr. Byrnes, of the State Department, says we can't touch him.")

Such interagency muddling has been more the rule than the exception.

There was another vivid example of it last year when a bottle containing all-important U-235 disappeared from the Atomic Energy Commission's Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago.

Under the law, the security section of the AEC should have notified the FBI of the loss within minutes.

It didn't.

Not for 4 weeks did the AEC security section bother to tell the FBI of this baffling disappearance.

The most graphic instance of all was the case of Dr. Klaus Fuchs, the atomic physicist who is now serving 14 years in a British prison for espionage on behalf of the Russians.

For more than 2½ years Dr. Fuchs worked inside the American atomic-bomb project as a member of the British Atomic Energy Mission. There was no secret at Los Alamos that was not available to him. Yet he was known to be a former member of the Communist Party.

Throughout the period he was at Los Alamos, Fuchs was in almost daily touch with a Russian spy courier, feeding him the innermost secrets of the A-bomb. Yet no one detected him.

Why?

Army intelligence took the word of the British Government that Fuchs was "all right." It didn't even ask the FBI to make a check on him.

It is true, of course, that after Fuchs returned to England and was given a high post in the British atomic set-up, the FBI supplied the tip which led to his arrest. However, regardless of all stories to the contrary, the FBI never had any suspicion of him personally.

The real truth about the incident is this. Through an undercover man, the FBI discovered that someone in the British atomic-energy system was "leaking" large quantities of information to the MVD. It couldn't find out who the "leak" was, though.

It was MI-6, the British counterspy outfit, which actually tracked Fuchs down.

Although no word of it has hit the headlines, many of the top leaders of our Government have been deeply concerned over the situation in the counterespionage field.

The late Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal was very worried about it and urged the National Security Council to take drastic remedial measures. He called for the appointment of a single director of internal security with full power over all counter-espionage and other internal security matters.

The Council agreed that the situation required correction but it wouldn't go as far—or even one-tenth as far—as Forrestal recommended. The most it has consented to—to date—is a program for voluntary action.

Under the terms of this program, two interdepartmental committees have been established and charged, in the words of a Council directive, with "effecting more adequate and coordinated internal security" on a voluntary basis.

One of these committees, the Interdepartmental Intelligence Conference, consisting of FBI, Army, Navy, and Air Force representatives, is supposed to coordinate the investigation of espionage, sabotage, and subversion cases.

The other, the Interdepartmental Committee on Internal Security, comprising officials of the Justice, State, and Treasury Departments, plus the National Military Establishment, is supposed to evolve broad policies.

Neither of these committees has any genuine authority. There is still no one in over-all command, still no one with power to keep the various agencies from cutting one another's—and the country's—throat. The program is a step in the right direction, but with world conditions as they are, it is not enough.

Never has the United States been so menaced by spies and saboteurs.

In World War II the internal Nazi threat was a slight one, involving only a few thousand bundists. Today the United States has to cope with a fifth column of over 500,000 Communists and fellow travelers, working under the direct orders of Kremlin agents. (The American Slav Congress, for example, gets its disruptive policies directly from two officials of an iron-curtain country's Washington Embassy. So does that other Communist front, the United Committee of South Slavic Americans. Members of the American-Russian Institute, a third front, serve as the medium of exchange between the consulate of an iron-curtain country and the Communist Party of the United States.) The United States is infiltrated through and through with Russian agents. At last count, the Department of Justice had espionage investigations pending concerning 635 aliens alone.

At this moment more than 120 foreign-espionage rings are reported to be functioning, clandestinely, inside the United States, prying into our most precious secrets.

Recently, United States counterespionage agents got their hands on some ultraconfidential orders which the Kremlin sent to its spies here. In these orders, the Kremlin directed its agents to make every effort—at once—to obtain information on new-type atomic weapons, robot missiles, and, above all, developments in bacteriological warfare.

That is why every expert to whom this writer spoke said:

"America must strengthen its defenses against spies. Otherwise, it is inviting disaster."

Poll on Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter from the president of the student council of the University of Nebraska which carries a result of a poll recently taken:

STUDENT COUNCIL,
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebr., February 10, 1951.

Representative CARL T. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: The student council of the University of Nebraska recently conducted an opinion poll on universal military training. One thousand five hundred and sixty-seven students, both men and women, were selected at random during registration for the second semester and asked to complete our opinion questionnaire.

This project was undertaken as a result of action taken at the annual convention of the Big Seven Association of Student Government held in Norman, Okla., last December 8 and 9. All of the schools in the Big Seven are taking similar polls and the results for the entire conference will be released by the association chairman at the University of Colorado in the near future.

The poll is being taken for the purpose of informing the public and our Congressmen as to how students in this region feel about universal military training. Nearly all of our students are in the age group involved in selective service and any universal military training program that might be adopted. Many are not old enough to vote, but we believe that their feelings should be given serious consideration. Only about 20 percent of our current enrollment is made up of veterans; therefore any prejudice on the part of veterans has not influenced this poll to any great extent.

The results of this poll show that over three-fourths of the students polled are in favor of universal military training, and that most of those in favor want a training period of 12 to 21 months after completion of high school or upon reaching the age of 18. The final tabulation of this poll is given below. It is hoped that you will consider this carefully in voting on proposed universal military training and selective-service legislation.

	Men	Women	All
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
For universal military training	79	73	77
Against universal military training	21	27	23

Length of training period favored by those for universal military training

	Men	Women	All
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
3 months	3	5	3
6 months	5	16	8
12 months	46	9	30
21 months	45	13	57
No preference	1	2	1

Time of training period favored by those for universal military training

	Men	Women	All
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
After high school or at 18	63	74	78
Anytime between 17 and 20	16	23	17
No preference	1	1	5

Of the 1,567 students polled, 1,155 were men and 412 were women.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT RAUN,
President, Student Council.

The Truth About Our Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the February 17, 1951, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. This excellent appraisal by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg is of vital interest to every American who is concerned with the military strength of his Nation:

THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR AIR POWER

(By Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, U. S. Air Force, as told to Stanley Frank)

In this time of crisis, when world peace and the security of the United States are immeasurably more important than the prestige of the United States Air Force or any other military service, certain fundamentals need restatement. Air superiority alone cannot win a war. The loss of air superiority could lose it. Although all military authorities agree air superiority must be held where full-scale land or sea operations are launched against a major opponent, I do not believe the Air Force should be allocated illogical amounts of the men and money available to the Defense Establishment. I concede the airplane as a weapon

is a two-edged sword that can be turned, vitally and directly against every American.

The American people must realize it is impossible to amass or invent an absolute, impregnable defense against bombing attacks by a strong, determined enemy. The Soviet Union, for example, now has at least 450 planes that can strike our major population and industrial centers from bases in the U. S. S. R. Since we cannot afford to underestimate a potential enemy's capabilities, we must anticipate that the Soviets will build known improvements into their aircraft that will counterbalance in large measure the improvements we can make in our continental defense. The grim contingencies must be faced squarely along with the urgent necessity for supporting a civil-defense program that can save countless lives in the event, God forbid, of an atomic bombing.

Should war come, we can be expected to destroy no more than 30 percent of the planes making an attack in strength on the United States before their bombing missions are completed. And our preparations today are not yet beefed up to achieve even that figure. Even if we had many more interceptor planes and antiaircraft guns and a radar screen that blanketed all approaches to our boundaries, a predictable 70 percent of the enemy's planes would penetrate our defenses despite the extraordinary valor and skill of our pilots.

My estimate of a 30-percent loss inflicted on an enemy air attack is based on the assumption that the raid would be made by at least 100 heavy bombers. If an enemy attempted to sneak through one plane or five, it is entirely possible no American city would be damaged. But the bleak and blunt evidence of the last war proved conclusively that no bombing attack mounted in sufficient strength by the Americans, British, or Germans ever was turned back by the most strenuous defensive action. The offense always has had a crushing advantage in aerial warfare, and there is no prospect that the balance will change in the foreseeable future.

Americans will be shocked by the admission that we are so vulnerable from the air. They will want to know why the billions of dollars in taxes poured into the military cannot buy better protection. They have every right in the world to demand straightforward answers to their question—answers stripped of technical gobbledegook. But that incontestable right carries with it the obligation to attempt to undersand the problems confronting military planners and the assigned function of the Air Force in the over-all security of the Nation.

Efforts toward that understanding have been confused by the contradictory claims of friends of air power, who believe air power is everything, and traditionalists, those who belittle air power, who fail to recognize that control of the air is a decisive factor in winning wars. One school has oversold air power to the public as an easy substitute for the harsh realities of war. The other has misinterpreted the role and distorted the results of air power—the direct cause of the controversy involving the Air Force's close support of ground troops in Korea.

Much of the dissension can be clarified, I believe, by a sober analysis of air power and by projecting its potentialities and limitations into the future. A lot of romantic, wild-blue-yonder nonsense can be dispelled by the concise, down-to-earth truth about air power.

First of all, it should be pointed out that the role of the air in the defense program is not determined by the Air Force alone. Broad policy decisions are made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, an executive planning board on which I serve with Gen. Omar N. Bradley, the chairman, the Army's Gen. J. Lawton Collins, and the Navy's Adm. Forrest P. Sherman. Our conclusions on Joint Chiefs of Staff are influenced by the needs and unique contributions each branch of the Armed Forces can make to the most effective military set-up with the appropriations and manpower at our disposal. Based on those considerations, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have given the Air Force three jobs—strategic bombing, the air defense of the United States, and tactical support of surface forces.

Although those three jobs seem pegged to different objectives, it is impossible to separate them in practice because—and this is a principle ignored too often—air power is indivisible. We don't speak of a "strategic" or a "tactical" army or navy, yet those terms constantly are applied to the Air Force. I suppose the habit is rooted too deeply in common usage to do anything about it after all these years, but the terms are misleading. The functions of so-called strategic and tactical air overlap and supplement each other.

The overriding purpose of every plane, whether it is a bomber or a fighter, is to win the air battle on which final victory on land or sea is predicated. In carrying out that mission, all types of aircraft collaborate in destroying enemy planes that endanger both combatants and civilians. A big, intercontinental strategic bomber is designed to attack the enemy's industrial capacity for waging war. In the process it cripples the enemy's ability to hurt civilians at home and soldiers in fox holes by smashing the plants that sustain his air force. His heavy bombers are wrecked on assembly lines before they can challenge our defenses; every fighter plane that is mauled in the air or on the ground is one less that can be thrown against grounds troops in the battle area. Conversely, our tactical planes attack strategic targets, thereby relieving the pressure on the big bombers and the units assigned to continental defense.

The last war provided any number of striking examples of the interchangeable nature of air power. The greatest concentration of heavy bombers ever seen was assembled to give direct support to ground troops for the breakthrough at St. Lo on July 25, 1944. Fifteen hundred B-17's and B-24's teamed up with 1,500 lighter bombers and fighter planes to plaster a small area, approximately 9,000 by 2,000 yards, and helped catapult the Allies from Normandy to the Siegfried Line in 6 weeks. Similar sorties by the biggest planes we had in Europe were laid on to assist the ground at Caen and the Anzio beachhead. After Gen. Douglas MacArthur returned to the Philippines in October 1944, big bombers operated from Clark Field, near Manila, against Japanese troops less than 10 miles away. MacArthur, incidentally, once described the island-hopping campaign in the Pacific as a series of battles for airfields. Last August 40,000 North Koreans massed along the Naktong River threatened to shatter our precarious lines in the Waegwan area. The ground put in a hurry call for help and B-29's dropped 1,000 tons of bombs on the North Korean positions.

"I don't know if they killed even a single cow or horse," Maj. Gen. Hobart R. Gay, commander of the First Cavalry Division, said. "All I know is that we didn't get hit with that attack we were sweating out."

In the atomic age, more than ever before, a strong offense is the best defense. An attrition rate of 30 percent on their planes never would stop the Soviets from attacking us, and the United States Air Force is not fooling itself on that count. The awful destruction produced by one atomic bomb would compensate the Red aggressors a thousandfold for the loss of 30, or even 100, planes and crews. Every democratic leader in possession of the facts has recognized publicly the one deterrent to overt Communist aggression—the certainty that we can retaliate swiftly and bring more destruction to them than they can inflict on us.

General Bradley spelled out the proposition on November 17: "It is a bruising and shocking fact that when we Americans were committed in Korea, we were left without an adequate margin of military strength with which to face an enemy at any other specific point. Certainly we were left without the strength to meet a general attack. In the military sense, the free world was left without adequate reserves except for the atom bomb."

Our stockpile of A-bombs is not the sole deterrent to aggression. It is our ability to deliver the bomb anywhere in the world that has been forestalling international communism's avowed design for world domination. Our strategic air power, poised to rain the atomic bomb down the throat of an aggressor in the event it is used against us, has been the cork keeping communism from spilling over the democratic nations.

The muscle of our strategic air arm is the B-36, which has more speed, range, armament, and carries a heavier bomb load than any big plane in operation today, or any plane the Moscow regime can get into mass production in the next few years. The B-36 can fly faster than 400 miles an hour and has a combat radius of more than 4,000 miles. This means it can fly 4,000 miles to perform a bombing mission, then return with a safe margin of fuel to land at its home base.

The Soviet Union's best bomber, the TU-4, a copy of our B-29, has a top speed of some 325 miles an hour and a combat radius of about 2,000 miles. Combat radius is the key to the advantage we hold in the air. Every industrial and communication center in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is well within the combat radius of B-36's flying from North American bases. Our other heavy bombers, the B-29, B-47, and B-50, can perform similar missions from overseas bases or, with refueling techniques, from this continent. Many would be shot down if the air battle were joined—no responsible airman ever claimed any plane was indestructible—but the point is that every American plane that returned would fly and bomb again. The Soviets' TU-4 can just about reach America's nerve center on a one-way mission; it doesn't carry enough gas to fly home.

If planes carried only conventional demolition and fire bombs, Communist air power would pose no serious threat to us at home, but the atomic bomb has changed the picture drastically. I do not discount the possibility, therefore, that the Soviet high command might sacrifice aircraft in the hope of knocking out America's productive capacity with a few massive blows. We cannot ignore the possibility, either, that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics might attempt to refuel her heavy bombers from mother ships over the polar regions to give them round-trip range, a factor that has been given the closest attention in our defensive planning.

One thing we know for sure: The Soviet Union has been working intensively on a heavy bomber to match the B-36. She will unquestionably build it, but the B-36 does not represent the limit of our invention. An intercontinental jet bomber is almost ready for test flights; an atomic-powered plane is more feasible than most people imagine. Soviet developments with big planes will call for radically different measures, but right now I am speaking in practical terms of the immediate situation and the probabilities of the next 2 or 3 years.

Right now, frankly, the increasing power of our strategic bombers cancels out the numerical superiority of the Soviet air force. The Soviet Union has about 20,000 first-line planes in all components. A good part of that strength consists of fighters, a mounting proportion of which are modern jets. Their MIG-15 is, for speed, in the same with our fastest standard interceptor.

I don't go along with the widespread belief that the Communists don't know how to fly, design, or maintain aircraft. I was air adviser to Ambassador W. Averell Harriman in the U. S. S. R. for 4 months during the war and I saw enough to convince me that the Soviets would be formidable adversaries in the event of war. They also showed me the most stunning combat pilot I've ever seen—a magnificent woman, a 6-foot blond Amazon who had shot down a dozen German planes.

Individually, Communist pilots are about as good as Americans in normal weather. American pilots are superior to those of the Soviet Union in two areas. They have more training in night as well as all-weather flying.

I have compared American and Russian air power at some length to high light the importance of strategic bombing. Although it is essentially an offensive weapon, it actually is our first line of defense. The most effective method of knocking out the enemy's air power, and keeping it knocked out, is to destroy the means that keep it alive. If war should come, the United States Air Force would attack simultaneously two targets—the industries feeding the enemy's war economy and the enemy air force itself.

Now that you know the B-36 is a 4,000-mile extension of our home defenses, my estimate of a 30-percent loss inflicted on an enemy air fleet over the United States may not be so terrifying as it first appeared—but don't get me wrong. I still say we are not invulnerable to atomic bombing with its frightful loss of life and attendant property damage. I repeat that people must cooperate with civil-defense authorities to increase their chances for survival. The people also can save themselves from another threat to their own and the country's welfare.

There is a dangerous delusion that radar screens and complicated electronic devices will give us an airtight defense against bombing. We could tackle an engineering project that would make the Great Wall of China look like the sand trenches children dig at the seashore. We could build a steel fence 5 miles high around the 17,936-mile perimeter of the United States. We could place an unbroken line of radar screens on top of the fence, ring our cities with automatic antiaircraft guns, and perfect a foolproof warning system for distinguishing between friendly and hostile aircraft approaching our boundaries around the clock. We could put an umbrella of interceptor planes over the entire country—and we could not keep out a determined enemy attacking in strength.

Sure, our radar network needs strengthening. So does every other aspect of the Military Establishment. I do not recommend, however, sinking limitless funds into static defenses because: (1) The returns are not commensurate with the investment; (2) the remaining military effort would be reduced to impotency. I'm not thinking of money alone. The millions of highly trained men required to maintain an elaborate defensive system would impose an intolerable drain on our manpower pool. Total victory in modern war is the product of ground, sea, and air power. Nothing can be gained, everything will be lost, if one component is sacrificed to such a point that it is unable to contribute to the grand objective.

Winning the air war, for example, would avail us little if the United States and the nations subscribing to the North Atlantic Pact were not rearmed for a determined stand in Europe. The proposition is as obvious as it is simple: The Soviet Union, which has vast supply dumps scattered throughout its zone in Germany, could wind up with a greater war potential than strategic bombing can knock out in the heartland of the U. S. S. R. if they were not prevented from seizing the industries of the Western European countries. Ground forces must be strong enough to stop the enemy from capturing those sources of production. At the same time, the Navy must be strong enough the fight off the Soviet Union's large fleet of snorkel submarines and keep the supply life line to Europe open.

It is a physical impossibility to build an adequate army, navy, or air force if disproportionate manpower and matériel are diverted to continental defenses. Further, the diminishing returns quickly reached on what has been called aptly an electronic Maginot line make the staggering expenditure utterly impractical. I wish I could tell the people of the United States that they are immune to attack from the air, but I have one consolation. I promise Americans the best air defense any civilian population ever has had.

The Germans, for all their other failings, had an excellent warning system and defense in depth from the French coast to Poland. They had 2 years to test their preparations against the RAF before we got into the war. From 1942 on, most German aircraft production was devoted to fighter planes, although Germans used their bombers as fighter planes after D-day in Europe. The Luftwaffe mauled the Eighth Air Force savagely on many occasions, notably at Schweinfurt and Regensburg, but the average loss we suffered in daylight strategic strikes on Germany was less than 4 percent.

Take the magnificent performance of the RAF, which shot down 1,178 German planes in the battle of Britain during August and September of 1940. The back of the Luftwaffe was broken in that abortive attempt to knock England out of the war, yet as late as February 1944 it was able to mount tremendous raids on London. The Germans had no heavy bombers, and their concept of strategic airpower was incredibly inept. British authorities and our own Gens. Tooey Spaatz and Jimmy Doolittle agree that the Germans would have won the battle of Britain had they gone after RAF installations and key plants instead of trying to terrorize the civilian population. The British knew the Germans were coming across the short southern coast line, and they knew London—except for several severe raids on Liverpool—generally was the target. Yet the RAF throughout the war destroyed slightly less than 10 percent of the German planes that attacked England.

No air force ever will exceed the gallantry of the RAF, but with the help of their lessons, I am expecting our pilots to be three times more effective. I am committing them to that achievement despite the pertinent facts that the area they patrol is more than 30 times larger than the United Kingdom, that enemy planes will carry far greater armament and firepower than the Germans built into their machines and they must be prepared to fight at night and in all weather.

I expect to be picked up on one factor favoring the defense that I've omitted. It will be pointed out that intercontinental bombers will not be escorted by fighter planes and, as a consequence, should be liable to much greater losses. That is absolutely true—if reference is made to World War II, when German bombers lumbered along at 200 miles an hour at altitudes that rarely exceeded 12,000 feet. The decisive air battles of the future will be fought at night and in foul weather at speeds in excess of 400 miles an hour and altitudes of more than 30,000 feet.

Up around 40,000 feet, the wild blue yonder isn't blue, even on the sunniest day. It is a purplish, cloudless void that plays queer tricks on the human eye. Pilots report they have difficulty judging distance and depth perception because there is no background for comparing the relative positions of planes. Ground radar can vector in interceptor planes to the approximate positions of bombers, but the fighter pilot is largely on his own in finding the enemy.

Jets must be used for interception because they alone have the speed to overtake an attacker and, equally important, the ability to gain altitude quickly. With approaching bombers flying 100 miles in slightly more than 15 minutes, a conventional piston plane is useless for defense work. It takes three times as long to climb from the ground to 40,000 feet as a jet—and the last half of the climb is twice as long as the first for both types of planes. Once contact is made with the enemy, a jet must score a kill quickly, since it carries only enough ammunition for four or five passes. Added firepower can be built into a jet only at the cost of sacrificing its speed and maneuverability. Even 200 pounds of added equipment will seriously affect its advantages over a bomber. Anyway, regardless of its armament, a jet always will be outgunned by the interlocking firepower of a bomber formation.

Downing a plane flying 7 miles or more above the earth with antiaircraft fire is extremely difficult. Instruments can calculate the speed and direction of a plane instantly and precisely, and fire at the exact spot where it should be when the shell explodes in the air. But it takes a high-velocity shell more than 20 seconds to reach 40,000 feet and in that time a plane going only 350 miles an hour will travel 2 miles. Here's the kicker: If the pilot changes his course by only 2 degrees—up or down, right or left—the shell will miss him by 375 yards. At that distance, the plane will not even be rocked, much less damaged. During the last war, bomber pilots had to hold a steady course over the target area and literally plow through a curtain of flak. New radar bombsights can draw a bead on the target throughout the most violent evasive action. A pilot can zigzag all over the sky and his bomberdier still can pinpoint the objective. It all adds up to the conclusion that we still must rely principally on men going up in machines to meet the enemy in direct combat.

Under no circumstances will we be caught with our planes down. The most direct route for an attack by the Soviet Union is from the north over land radar stations. A quick glance at a globe map will show that the U. S. S. R. is directly opposite the United States on the other side of the earth and the shortest distance between the two countries is by way of the North Pole. While you're reading this, regardless of the time of day or night, pilots in critical areas are sitting in planes ready to respond instantly to an alert.

We need more interceptor planes, to be sure. More than that, perhaps, we'll need the help of divine providence to shoot down hostile planes with atomic bombs before they unload. Only a fraction of the planes making an attack in strength would carry atomic bombs. Even if the enemy had 100 bombs—which she hasn't now—she could not afford to throw all into one raid. The atomic bomb is the product of such tremendous industrial effort that it cannot be used indiscriminately. The planes carrying them probably would be in the middle of formations protected by interlocking firepower. They would be the most difficult to destroy, but with luck—and I hate to rely on that capricious element with so much at stake—we'd get some among the planes knocked down. We can be hurt, but I do not believe the wounds can be fatal to our will and capacity to fight back with terrible vengeance. American industry already is decentralized in more than 40 key cities. The American people, aware at last of the grave danger to their freedoms, are putting meat and muscle on the Military Establishment. We still have far to go, but the blinders have been stripped from our complacency.

It has been put in the record that Air Force support of ground operations in Korea was eminently satisfactory. United Nations troops were given more uninterrupted assistance by fighter planes than any army in history. The Far Eastern Air Force had flown on combat missions for 181 consecutive days on December 20, and the end was nowhere in sight. I claim that the Air Force's use of tactical air power, including jets previously untested in battle, was completely vindicated by the results achieved.

Before getting down to particulars, the public should know several pertinent facts:

1. General MacArthur, before the outbreak in Korea, asked the Far Eastern Air Force to make its primary role the defense of the Japanese islands against possible seaborne or airborne attack.

2. The Air Force and the Army last spring discussed the conduct of exercises in ground-air cooperation in Japan, but the requirements of occupation duties and the limitations of maneuver areas made the training plan impracticable.

3. The Air Force's appropriations made it impossible for us to support each Army division with more than one group—75 planes.

4. Tactical air support was not neglected. Air-control parties were working with South Korean troops in the field 2 days after the fighting erupted before soldiers or marines were committed to action.

Tactical air support was inadequate during the early days of the fighting in Korea. It was inadequate for the identical reason that there were not enough soldiers, marines, tanks, and guns to stop the Communists. America was not prepared to fight. Two and a half years ago I testified in open congressional hearings that the United States needed a 70-group Air Force for the minimum calculated risk it could afford to take. On June 25, 1950, the Air Force had 48 groups.

There was absolutely no disposition on my or any other high officer's part to treat close support casually before Korea. If training and experience are the yardsticks, I'm basically a tactical airman. After graduating from West Point in 1923, my first assignment was with an attack group at Kelly Field, where we flew orange crates that barely staggered off the ground when machine guns were put on the wings. The first 15 years of my career were devoted exclusively to flying, teaching, and studying tactical aircraft. The biggest job I had before my present one was command of the Ninth Air Force, which supported the First, Third, and Ninth United States Armies from Normandy to the Elbe. The ninth flew more combat sorties than all other American, allied, and enemy tactical forces combined. I don't profess to know all the answers, but I've had as much experience in ground-air work as any man alive.

People who don't appreciate the true value of air power think they are getting fine support when they see a plane blast a mortar, tank, or machine-gun nest directly in front of them. That's the most ineffective assistance the plane can give. The idea is to get the enemy's troops and weapons before they get into position to hurt our side.

The same bomb that knocks out 1 mortar on the battlefield can knock out a convoy of 10 mortars 50 miles behind the front. Five hundred miles farther back that same bomb can blow up a railroad engine or a bridge, preventing the arrival of 100 mortars in the battle area.

A plane patrolling the battlefield can hit only a limited number of widely scattered strong points that are, properly speaking, more suitable artillery targets. Artillery is much more accurate than a plane barreling along at a couple of hundred miles an hour. Field guns can zero in on a target until it is leveled, whereas a plane cannot keep up a steady stream of fire. A plane's punch is wrapped up in its speed and range, assets that are best exploited by turning it loose to hunt for targets of opportunity far beyond the reach of artillery—troop concentrations, convoys, ammunition dumps, supply trains, and motor pools.

The damage from the air to the North Koreans was not immediately apparent in the early stages of the war, of course. To have implied, as many did, that tactical air power failed was as ridiculous as saying the Navy's submarines were worthless in the Pacific simply because their depredations on Japan's wartime shipping could not be seen at first hand.

The airplane was never meant to be employed as an antipersonnel weapon in the battle zone. Its low efficiency when put to this use was demonstrated when the Chinese Communist hordes were thrown into Korea late in November. Hundreds of thousands of troops concentrated in even a relatively small area like North Korea still were dispersed so widely that intense aerial bombardment and strafing were unable to stop their advance. The events in Korea proved, once and for all, that tactical air power is a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, ground strength. This is especially true against the Chinese soldier, whose ability to live on a handful of rice and to carry unbelievable burdens simplifies logistical problems.

It is not my province or my intention to criticize the decision of the United Nations which prevented air strikes at the Manchurian troop and supply depots supporting the Chinese. Isolating the battlefield from reinforcements is the prime function of tactical air, and I am simply stating the military fact that air power was rendered practically inoperative when the UN, in an effort to avoid a diplomatic rupture with the Chinese Communists, halted offensive action at the Yalu River, the boundary between Manchuria and Korea. UN pilots scrupulously obeyed orders by cutting bridges across the Yalu only on the Korean side, but those measures were nullified when the Yalu froze solidly, forming a natural bridge for the Chinese to move up with enough food and light-arms ammunition on their backs to sustain them for weeks. Accustomed to traveling on foot over long stretches of rough terrain, the Chinese hardly were inconvenienced when they were forced to take back-country trails. Sheer mass more than compensated for the Chinese Reds' lack of mobility and heavy equipment. When they encountered an obstacle, they merely flowed around our positions and continued to press forward inexorably.

We lost a battle in Korea, but air power kept us from losing a war. The Chinese, denied the use of roads during the day by UN air patrols, could not follow our forces fast enough to turn an orderly withdrawal into a rout. Everything from blood plasma to portable bridges was dropped to isolated units, saving them from annihilation. And when an evacuation beachhead was established at Hungnam, command of the air prevented the Chinese from bringing up the heavy artillery that could have riddled our troops at close range while they were jammed into the staging area waiting to board ships.

Critics who disparaged the Air Force's performance earlier in Korea failed to understand or consider the difference between close support—attacks in their immediate battle sectors—and genuine tactical air power—attacks behind the lines to isolate the battlefield. I can't blame infantrymen who suffer the greatest personal hardships in war, for feeling bitter and losing perspective of the "big picture"—an expression that has driven every man in uniform wild.

It is significant that commanders whose responsibilities embraced a wider area had nothing but commendation for the Air Force. Maj. Gens. L. B. Keiser, William B. Kean, and Hobart R. Gay, of the Second, Twenty-fifth, and First Cavalry Divisions, respectively, said the Air had saved their units repeatedly. Lt. Gen. Walton Walker, of the Eighth Army, announced officially that the Air's claims of destroyed enemy matériel were too low—a switch that will bowl over World War II veterans. Col. John H. Michaelis, of the famous Twenty-seventh Regimental Combat Team, expressed the "deep appreciation of all members of this command" for the Air support given them. On November 15, General MacArthur's headquarters announced the Air Force had accounted for 75 percent of the 900 to 1,000 Communist tanks destroyed. Three months earlier General MacArthur wrote Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer: "The contribution of the far-eastern air forces in the Korean conflict has been magnificent. They have performed their mission beyond all expectations."

A controversy affecting the lives of soldiers cannot be settled by lining up votes as in a popularity contest. It is resolved by weighing the best methods for achieving desired results. All right. The job of tactical aviation is to help win the air war and to weaken the ability of the enemy's ground forces to impede and damage your people. In trying to create the impression that the Air Force did not do all it could to help the Army, opponents promoted the conventional propeller, piston plane as superior to the jet for close support. It was a sucker play with few parallels.

The piston planes used in Korea would have been slaughtered had they been opposed by jets. The Air Force's tactical arm is being converted to jet propulsion as rapidly as possible, on the assumption that it must be prepared to fight a major power for control of the air. That vital battle can be won only with jets—and the Soviet union has them in great numbers.

Trying to evaluate the lessons of air power in Korea in the utter absence of enemy opposition is a waste of time. The piston planes that hovered over the battlefield would have been forced to high-tail for home by one enemy jet. You can give pretty fair ground support with an observation plane or a helicopter if the pilot can tool around without interference.

I can see the inevitable question coming. Suppose we are committed to other Koreas, in Asia or Europe, where there is no enemy air? Isn't the slower, more reliable piston plane better for close support than the hot, erratic jet?

The answer to that one is a cinch. Jets are superior for every conceivable job demanded of a fighter plane, including flying at treetop level to silence one machine gun. It has been proved by every test in the book.

A jet pilot's view of the target is clearer because there is no propeller obstructing his view, and the plane's power plant is behind him, rather than in front as in a piston. A jet is a more stable gun platform because its cleaner configuration reduces vibration and torque. In competitions at Las Vegas, Nev., last March, jet pilots outscored piston pilots for accuracy in aerial gunnery, ground strafing, dive bombing, and skip bombing. The jets were not equipped to fire rockets, but actual combat in Korea since has demonstrated that a jet is a more accurate platform for launching such projectiles. The tremendous speed of a jet has given rise to the fallacy that it is too fast to hit a target on the nose. If necessary, a jet can be slowed down to within 10 miles an hour of the speed of a piston plane, but even at 500 miles per hour it is a more precise weapon than a piston plane doing 250 miles per hour.

You look for ruggedness in a fighter plane. The jet, previously untried in combat, confounded the experts with its toughness in Korea. As of November 9, the F-80 jet had flown 16,141 sorties against 12,168 sorties by the F-51 piston. Enemy ground fire brought down 21 F-80's and 50 F-51's. The jet is easier to maintain in the field because it is a less complicated machine. The jet is twice as fast and can respond, therefore, quicker to an emergency call from the ground. The piston plane's range is greater, but it must be remembered that the piston engine is in the final stage of development, whereas the jet is in its infancy. The first jets we had 5 years ago could fly only 300 miles. Today the F-84E standard fighter can travel more than 2,000 miles nonstop. Jet pilots require more training, but they'll live and fight longer. Summing up, the jet is an all-purpose plane that can do everything better than a piston, including close support. Above all, it has the first "must"—the ability to help win the air battle.

Air power alone does not guarantee America's security, but I believe it best exploits the Nation's greatest asset—our technological skill. For all our productive genius, we cannot roll bodies off assembly lines to match the massive manpower of Russia and her satellites. We will be outnumbered more hopelessly than ever during the next few years when, due to the low birth rate of the depression-ridden 1930's, fewer men will be reaching military age than a decade ago. But we can, as in the last war, produce more and better airplanes than the rest of the world combined, and we have a reservoir of kids with the mechanical facility for flying all the planes we build.

I am not alluding to a cheap or a safe war. Both terms are harsh contradictions. The cost of war staggers comprehension, although, as Henry Morgenthau, Jr., former Secretary of the Treasury, once said, "It is a billion times cheaper to win a war than to lose it." Victory in the air is a long, laborious struggle. It took the United States and England 4 years to gain air superiority over the Nazis, and that was just the opening wedge. Death strikes as ruthlessly in the air as on the land or sea. The United States Air Force lost 53,793 men in World War II more than any branch of the service except the Army.

Air power holds catastrophe—and the hope of peace. How long the fear of retaliation of strategic bombing will restrain the Russians from plunging the world into chaos is something only the masters of the Kremlin know. But every day statesmen confer is a reprieve for civilization, sustaining the prayer that all hope will not vanish in atomic dust.

Socialism in Governmental Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my own remarks, I include a letter from Mr. Louis J. Bosse, managing director of the Associated Industries of Kentucky. The letter speaks for itself. I bring it to the attention of all the members of the Appropriations Committee in the hope that by following the suggestions contained therein, we might insure the preservation of American institutions and, at the same time, save money:

ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF KENTUCKY,
Louisville, Ky., February 15, 1951.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORTON: We wish to call your attention to a shocking piece of evidence pointing to the trend toward socialism within governmental agencies.

We have a pamphlet entitled "Common Human Needs" issued by the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Board of the Federal Security Agency, which was prepared under the direction of Jane M. Hoey, with the subtitle "An Interpretation for the Staff in Public Assistance Agencies." In chapter 4, page 57, there appears this sentence:

"Social security and public assistance programs are a basis essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

Bearing in mind that the pamphlet was prepared, printed, and circulated at the expense of the American taxpayer, we wish to protest the activities of the Federal Security Agency which promulgates and publishes at the taxpayers expense, such false ideologies.

We wish to request that the Appropriations Committees of Congress eliminate the spending of taxpayers' money on booklets which not only disseminate such un-American philosophy to employees of Government, but to the citizens generally.

We enlist your aid to prevent further circulation of such material from Government sources, the purpose of which is to indoctrinate Americans with a philosophy even at this very moment causing world-wide strife.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS J. BOSSE,
Managing Director.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Representative SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., Sixteenth District of Pennsylvania, at the Lincoln Day dinner, February 12, 1951, at Fond du Lac, Wis.:

High up on the bank of the Potomac River, facing the Washington Monument and beyond that the dome of the Capitol, stands a building. Beautiful of line and form, surrounded by well-kept shrubbery, and majestic in every detail, there is a structure of real loveliness for all to see. Within that edifice sits the huge form of a man. He has the rugged face of a pioneer, of one acquainted with poverty and with toil. The face is lined with deep hollows, and over it play shadows of seeming depth. The craggy brow, the dropping eyelids, the tousled hair, and the melancholy gray eyes, all produce an effect not easily forgotten. Depth of character and emotion, steadfastness, kindliness and patience, all combine to give one the impression of a man in tune with the ages. Abraham Lincoln sits calmly thinking and brooding over the Washington scene.

I have watched him under a starry moonlit sky; I have seen him during a storm; and through the dreary atmosphere of a cloudy foggy night. Time and again I have whispered, "If you were alive today, what would you say to the average man on the street—to the plain citizen of this Republic? How would you react to our complex baffling problems? Speak Abraham Lincoln, and tell us what is in your heart and mind."

But there is no response; only that quiet, steady, sorrow-etched face gazes back at me. "No, you cannot be with us physically, but your spirit, and the principles you espoused so nobly are with us yet, and they will endure throughout all eternity."

We are meeting tonight to honor the memory of Lincoln. To recapture some of the ideals and beliefs which dominated every fiber of his being. To find out, if possible, what could have inspired that humble man with principles so great and character so rugged, and to feel a certain amount of partisan pride in his Republicanism.

It has been aptly said that little men fret themselves into obscurity, while a "great soul forgets himself into immortality." Elbert Hubbard wrote of Abraham Lincoln, "Lincoln sought to lose himself among the people. And to the people at length he gave his time, his talents, his love and his life. The memory of his gentleness, his patience, and his firm faith, is the priceless heritage of a united land."

But we are a badly divided Nation today. Even within the family circle there are grave differences of opinion at the present time. The great debate over foreign policies only emphasizes and brings out into the open the divisions which have been smouldering for a long while.

The thought of home had united them. Forgotten for the moment was the strife that had divided them. If only someone could say the words or do the deeds which would unify us. I am convinced that only by a rededication to high principles, and the development of a strong faith, can we hope to stir the hearts and emotions of the people. The vital need of the free peoples today is just that.

Like Lincoln, we are living in troubled times. The world of our day is large, complex and involved. Our problems are international in scope. They are not new, although on a more vast scale. Essentially, they deal with strife and bloodshed, with despair and misery, and with survival itself. We are witnessing the awakened revolutionary movements of backward suppressed races, of dictators on the march, and of sharp challenges to the human values of Christian beliefs. These are the critical years which are casting their shadows over a frightened globe.

At such a time the weak, the timid, and the excessively prudent, are attempting to avoid the hard realities. They naturally shrink from assuming risks, and, taking counsel of their fears they seek a safe harbor within which to ride out the storm.

There is no assurance of safety or security, no matter what our course may be. Those who seek security may end up losing both security and liberty. Life from its earliest days has been a struggle—a fight against inequalities, poverty, injustice, disease, war—but man has moved forward and made progress in spite of terrific odds.

The vital necessity and the big question mark today—will freemen everywhere become inflamed with a deep-abiding love of liberty; and then, in that spirit, work wholeheartedly to use every resource within their power to offset the destructive forces now on the march? Will, they, like Lincoln, have faith that right makes might, and in that faith to the end, do their duty as they understand it?

A great national debate is in full progress. The air waves and newspapers are filled with the diverse opinions of individuals. They agree on the identity of the major nation opposing us. There is a growing realization that our enemies will do their sly best to weaken and destroy us. And there is overwhelming accord that the United States must get prepared.

It is obvious that we cannot sit idly by and do nothing. It is also crystal clear that

unless America is militarily and economically strong and united, the major source of resistance to Russia and her satellites will not be effective. To waste or not use efficiently our great potentialities would be senseless and dangerous. Ignore the terms "isolationist," "internationalist," "reactionary," "radical," and "liberal." I get so bored with labels which actually reveal very little. We don't have to be extremists, nor should we be foolish and neglect the welfare of our families and our country.

We need stanch allies who will share, and I mean share, the strains and stresses of resistance to aggression. We cannot emulate Atlas and carry the whole world on our own shoulders, no matter how sturdy they may be.

Two principal ideas appeal to me with great force.

First. Deter aggression by having defense forces so strategically located they would be effective in depriving Soviet Russia of those factors which would help her to wage war. At the same time, try to keep those factors available to us and to our allies. I refer particularly to oil, rubber, manganese, tin, uranium, the areas of iron and steel production, and skilled workmen. Middle East oil, the Ruhr, and certain countries in Southeast Asia, become of vital importance when viewed in this light.

Second. Assist those allies who show a willingness to cooperate, and whose national interests and background assure their continued opposition to Soviet Russia. Included among our potential allies should be Spain and Nationalist China. In China, and behind the iron curtain, we should constantly enlist the help of anti-Communists. Guerrilla warfare and underground movements demonstrated their effectiveness during the last war. I believe encouragement of such actions when needed would bring amazing results again.

Nations have been destroyed from within before being conquered from without. Here at home we must be constantly on guard against the subversive forces which would undermine us. A serious error of the past has been our failure to understand the aims and ambitions of the small coterie of ruthless men in control of Russia, and to appraise the real meaning of communism, spelled with a capital "C." We were encouraged to believe here in America that communism was a forward-looking liberal social movement, led by great idealists with a high code of ethics. That Soviet Russia was eager to follow the road of progress and peace. How wrong the judgment of our leaders was.

Several years too late we have finally become aware of our terrible mistake. Now we must work with the fervor of a zealot to rid ourselves of the poisons of Communist infiltration in our political, social, and economic lives. The destiny of a great people is on the scales, and mankind breathlessly awaits the results.

War is a ghastly business, and its devastating results are costly beyond measure. But not all the casualties are physical. Moral values deteriorate, and freedom takes wings and flies away. In order to fight a war there is of necessity a concentration of power, and only by sacrifice and heroic effort can it be restored again to the people.

Now we are concentrating authority in anticipation of another world war. I think many of us recognize with uneasiness that our Federal Government, perhaps for years to come, will exercise a firm control over large areas of our daily lives.

After strife has ended will we have the vision and the courage to do what so few nations have been able to do? Will we be able to repel the selfish drive of ambitious groups and individuals who will try to retain in their control the powers surrendered by the people under the spur of war necessity?

If this Nation is to see again what is so often referred to as our American way of life, then the fires of freedom must be kept burning in the hearts and minds of a substantial segment of our people. That will require constant study and a deep understanding of the fundamental concepts of our system of government, culture, and economics.

A group like this could do such a job in this community, if you would only become interested enough to act. Organize study groups and learn the great truths which have guided mankind through the ages. Life has proven in unmistakable actions that small groups or even a single individual can literally accomplish the impossible. Less than 100 persons brought about the Renaissance and Reformation in Europe, and 10 men were mainly responsible for the establishment of the American Republic. A small band of men along the shores of Galilee substantially altered the course of human events. Ignore the weeping and the wailing of the defeatists who claim that trends cannot be reversed. American history proves that they are wrong.

In 1805 William Lloyd Garrison was born. As he grew to manhood he thought about the existence of human slavery in America, and then announced he would destroy it. People laughed at him, and sneered at him, and denounced him as a fool. Hadn't slavery existed for thousands of years? The great empires of Egypt, Greece, and Rome had been built on it. Some of the leading men in the United States had praised it. It was an established institution in America. How silly for one man to think he could do anything about it.

But that did not daunt Garrison. Day in and day out for weeks, and then years, he worked, he talked, he fought, and finally he began to make some progress. Fifty-eight years after he was born, human slavery was abolished in the United States.

Perhaps you are saying to yourself at this point, "I want to help, but what am I to do? How will I proceed from here?"

First. It is essential that you possess a historical background. Go all the way back to the beginning of civilization. Observe especially the problems of earlier years. You will realize that in spite of modern trimmings, the fundamental differences are not new. You will see that the main conflict has been between centralized authority and human freedom. The problem arose vary prominently during the times of the Greeks and the Romans. Four thousand years ago, Abraham was attempting to teach his people the need for personal responsibility, and Moses, after leading the Hebrew people out of captivity through the Red Sea, tried to tell them they were free and should govern themselves. He gave them the Ten Commandments, the most individualistic code of conduct known to mankind, but they were not happy when he continued to refuse to be their ruler. They were used to authority, and were fearful of the challenges of freedom and hence continued to seek someone who would rule over them.

Christ appeared on the earth, and He reenergized the ancient truths. He emphasized the need for individual action and personal responsibility. Still the people did not comprehend the full meaning of His teachings, and when He refused to be their king, they crucified him. Shortly thereafter, the centralization of authority in Rome reached its zenith during the reign of Diocletian, with the complete regimentation of the lives of the people. Then came the collapse of the Roman Empire.

The Dark Ages contributed virtually nothing to the cause of human freedom. For centuries there were relatively few opportunities for the free action of the peoples of this earth. And suddenly, the light of freedom burst forth with renewed vigor on the North American Continent with the establishment of the American Republic. You are familiar with that most amazing success story. But now, that form of government, like others which preceded it, is threatened from within and from without its borders.

Second. Learn the basic facts concerning our American type of government.

Our forefathers were essentially religious, and it was natural that the government they established would be effected by those ideas. They believed that each human being was created by God, and therefore, if a majority of such divinely created individuals, after full and free discussion, came to a decision, it must be close to God's will—majority rule. They also believed, that each such Divinely created person, was endowed with certain inalienable rights, that no one could justly take away from him. Thus, they tried to make effective the will of the majority, and at the same time protect individual and minority rights.

They established a government of laws, and not of men, with a written Constitution, and a Bill of Rights. They provided for government by representatives rather than by direct action. Three coordinate branches were set up, with provision for a system of checks and balances. The process for amending the Constitution was purposely made long and difficult. Every move was directed toward cushioning the effect of hasty actions by a temporary majority. Protection against too much centralized authority, by a balancing of power, was the dominant idea running all through the Constitution. I shall leave it to your own good judgment how much the present trend is away from that idea.

Third. Set a good example by maintaining an active interest in your local government.

How far should the Federal Government go in the exercise of its powers in relationship to the States and local communities? That same problem of balance between central power and local action arose a long time ago in Greece and Rome.

If we are to retain our American Republic, with its sound balance of power between local and Federal Government, we must continue to retain an active interest in local affairs.

We will fight and win our wars in vain, and lose out in the end, unless there are individuals and groups like this who will be ready to carry on in later years to preserve our way of life. The real battle of the future will be for the minds of people, here and abroad.

All this will not be easy, but that should not deter you. Life itself is not easy. Last Easter, as I watched the people joyously celebrating the glories of the Resurrection, I thought of Good Friday which preceded it—the cross. Before every triumph there is drudgery, there is hard work, and often there are severe disappointments; in other words, there is a cross.

While at college, I read a poem which I have never forgotten and I would like to share it with you.

"Across the fields of yesterday
He sometimes comes to me;
A little lad, just back from play
The lad I used to be,
And yet, he smiles so wistfully
Once he has crept within,
I wonder if he hoped to see
The man I might have been."

Oh, the Nation this might be. If groups like this throughout the length and breadth of America could be persuaded to throw off their lethargy and indifference and join enthusiastically with others in the noble cause of preserving the American Republic, what a difference it would make. The words of the man whose birthday we are celebrating reverberate through the year—"We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

The decision is yours.

Fortresses of the Spirit—Libraries and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post of February 22, 1951, entitled "Fortresses of the Spirit—Libraries and Defense" by Malvina Lindsay:

FORTRESSES OF THE SPIRIT

(By Malvina Lindsay)

LIBRARIES AND DEFENSE

Typical of today's material viewpoint on civil defense was a recent suggestion that libraries might function effectively as bomb shelters. Concern with civil defense seems to be directed almost wholly toward saving our hides rather than our minds. Yet a poised approach to action in time of atomic danger might at least prevent our hiding among stacks of books that would embalm us for future archaeologists.

The defense housing bill, now pending in both Houses of Congress, provides that in communities, new and old, in which defense workers congregate, educational, recreational, and other community facilities be provided. It is generally understood that library service would be included. Yet the vital role that the library can assume in defense activities, especially in the new, bleak, industrial communities where adults as well as children need mental fortresses, is not generally understood.

The library's practical value in helping disseminate defense information is admitted. So also is its value in helping workers get retraining for defense duties. But it has even greater value in the building of morale and informed citizenship so urgently needed in times of national crisis.

During the last war a young librarian held her first important job in a Minnesota town of about 20,000 population. Living there were many wives and children of absent servicemen. The women knew great anxiety. Many of them also faced the problem of getting along on very little.

The young librarian discovered their problems and organized her library facilities, including her displays, to meet their needs. She suggested books that would help them, both mentally and in their practical make-it-do activities. She guided older women and men in the study of new skills they needed in order to qualify for jobs. She interested the more anxious ones in hobbies. She made the library a cheerful, helpful refuge for both children and grown-ups. It was the most rewarding experience of her career.

If ever there was a time when libraries needed to be fostered, in old as well as new communities, it is now. For aside from their so-called practical services, there are two fields in which they can make greatly needed intangible contributions. One is in promoting mental stability, the other in improving citizenship.

The dangerous weeks, months, years ahead call for stockpiles of self-control, confidence, and courage quite as much as for bomb shelters and radar screens. They call for volunteers, not only to spot aircraft but to keep invigorated the spirit of free-thought inquiry, research, mental growth, which is primarily what we are arming to defend.

In those few communities in which homes are crowded, often uncomfortable, the library may be at first a physical refuge. But in time it will be more. It will be found to offer an escape to the mind and spirit more solid and satisfying than that found on the television screen or in commercial entertainment.

Arming of the mind is a part of civil defense. But this cannot be done merely by getting out posters saying, "Be calm," "Be self-confident," "Be mature." People have to be helped to arm their own minds, and the library can provide tools for this.

Another service the library may be able to render in some communities is that of bringing together people with like problems to study and talk about the things that are troubling them. At least it can provide the means for many to work their way out of their own confusions by contact through books with great minds of the past and of the present.

An increasingly urgent need of today that the library can help meet is the Nation's lack of informed citizenship. At a time when the most critical decisions in the country's history are being made, the people who must render judgment on these decisions, or even dictate them, are uninformed about and indifferent to public affairs to an alarming degree.

Lester Markel, editor of the New York Times magazine, recently cited studies to show that only 25 of every 100 voters were reasonably informed about public affairs, that as late as a month ago, a third of a sample of voters were unable to identify Secretary Acheson.

Another danger to intelligent government is off-the-cuff decision by voters who accept misinformation and popular generalizations. The man in the library at least has to use his own mind and judgment in seeking information, and the use of the library is likely to quicken his zest for personal inquiry. A more aggressive salesmanship of library wares is needed everywhere to compete with the thrills of television and theatrics of demagogs for dominance of men's minds.

Not Charity, but a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I enjoyed a visit from George Barr, a citizen of my great State, a fine American, and a great humanitarian. For 16 years George Barr has conducted in the city of Chicago a successful business employing almost entirely handicapped people. The amazing thing about the undertaking is the labor record. There has never been the least sign of labor difficulty, and absenteeism among the employees is practically nonexistent. The morale of the employees is high, because they love their work and have regained confidence in themselves.

Several years ago an officer of a certain union in Chicago decided to organize the employees of G. Barr & Co. The union organizer called on Mr. Barr and requested permission to discuss the matter with his employees or, as Mr. Barr prefers to call them, his coworkers. Permission was readily given. In about an hour the organizer returned to Mr. Barr's office and said that he had decided the plant did not need organizing and although he had talked at some length to three employees, they simply looked completely blank and disinterested and would not even discuss the matter with him. Mr. Barr later ascertained that the three employees to whom the organizer talked were deaf and dumb.

The following article entitled "Not Charity, but a Chance," that appeared in the Reader's Digest January 1940, tells the story of George Barr's humanitarian work with the physically handicapped better than I can, so I include it as a part of my remarks:

NOT CHARITY, BUT A CHANCE

(Condensed from the Progressive)

(By William F. McDermott)

Nine years ago George Barr, a young chemist working for a firm in St. Paul, lost a leg and then his job. Unable to land another position, he launched out for himself. Today his medical-supply company in Chicago grosses $5,000,000 annually, and employs 147 men and women—130 of whom have such serious physical handicaps that they once seemed doomed to lives of dependency and idleness. They are paid good wages, plus bonuses.

"It's amazing how many jobs can be satisfactorily filled by the crippled," he told me. "Correctly placed, a handicapped person will do more work than a normal person. A man who uses crutches develops strong arms and shoulders and can feed a heavy machine with greater ease than an ordinary man. A deaf mute can do better work requiring finger dexterity, while a blind person, used to reading Braille, can do better where sensitivity of touch is required."

When you visit G. Barr & Co., George warns you to check your pity at the door. "These people don't need it or want it," he explains proudly. And you soon understand that; the place is electric with cheerfulness.

At one assembly line are 25 blind men and women. Their fingers fly fast and sure, and as they work they gossip and wisecrack with each other. At another long table are 30 deaf mutes, their faces alight with expression when they "talk." And here are 15 men and women who have lost an arm or a leg; 10 victims of infantile paralysis; some who have lost an eye. They operate machines, work on assembly lines, weigh, measure, pack and ship products, and do office work, fully as well as and often better than the average nonhandicapped employee.

The plant reflects the buoyant personality of its 32-year-old president. George Barr was graduated with honors from the University of Wisconsin in 1933. Three months after he got his first job he lost his leg in an automobile accident. With an artificial leg, he learned to walk without a limp; today he goes about his job like a whirlwind.

Barr couldn't find work because of his handicap, yet he refused to be doomed to pencil peddling. He developed a new formula for a hair-wave set, made it at night, and sold it in daytime to beauty shops and drug stores.

A deaf mute, Mitchell Schikovitz, was given a job. As sales increased, George and Mitchell needed another helper. Mitchell knew a jobless deaf-mute girl, and she was hired to label bottles. She still works for the company—and is now Mitchell's wife.

At the end of 4 years the concern was manufacturing a number of drugs and cosmetics and had 18 employees, all deaf mutes. Then, one day, while George was operating the labeling machine he realized that a man needed only one leg to press the pedal. So he promptly hired a one-legged man, and from that time on he has hired handicapped persons.

At the Barr & Co. switchboard is an alert, smiling girl who apparently has no handicap. Then in the corner you notice a pair of

crutches. A legless man operates a tube-filling machine. A 35-year-old factory worker who lost his sight 3 years ago now earns more than when he could see. A 32-year-old woman, born blind, started to work 3 months ago; it's her first job and she's as happy as a child with a new toy.

When employees know of crippled people unable to find work, Barr says, "Bring 'em in," and he does his best to provide jobs.

Barr finds it easy to maintain high morale in his factory because handicapped workers secure confidence and gratification through being gainfully employed. Moreover, being among their own kind gives them a feeling of normalcy which is lacking when they are among fully active people. For that reason, Barr recommends to other industrialists that handicapped persons of like affliction be given the same type of work, and that they be grouped together.

The labor turnover is less than 1 percent. Absenteeism is only one half of 1 percent. Employees are on the job "on time, all the time." The plant's safety record is excellent, for the crippled have learned to be careful.

Much of the plant's present production is devoted to war medical supplies, but civilian business on its 35 items has doubled in the last 2 years.

"There are plenty of opportunities for peacetime industry to give every handicapped person a self-supporting job," Barr said. "They will earn their pay. Moreover, if the handicapped have to live in idleness they're a burden to relatives or to the State. Our little factory has taken 30 blind people off pensions, saving the State of Illinois more than $10,000 a year. Multiply that a few thousand times and you really have something."

When the company won the coveted Army-Navy E award, the ceremony was unique. The presentation was made by an Army private on crutches, who had lost his leg at Anzio. Two deaf mutes, a blind boy, and a girl who had lost an arm received the award on behalf of the company. The blind lad made the speech of acceptance, which was translated into sign language for the benefit of the deaf mutes.

Barr's employees believe that their experience points the way to self-support and happiness for thousands of maimed war veterans. They insist that, if industry will give the handicapped not charity but a chance, they'll prove their usefulness. It looks as if George Barr and his employees had already proved their case.

A Report to the American Library Association Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the seventy-fifth anniversary of the American Library Association. The president of the Council of the American Library Association is Mr. C. R. Graham, of Louisville, Ky. As director of the Louisville Free Public Library, Mr. Graham has made an outstanding record of achievement. To my knowledge, this is the only free public library which owns and operates its own radio station. This station is used for cultural and educational purposes and has been of great service to the people of the Louisville area. I take this opportunity to insert President Graham's report to the American Library Association Council which was unanimously accepted by that council. I recommend it to my colleagues as a clear-cut and positive statement of aims and purposes. In this day of defense mobilization, it is also well to remember spiritual and cultural mobilization.

A REPORT TO THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION COUNCIL

(By C. R. Graham, president)

(Accepted unanimously by council)

In its 75 crowded years the American Library Association has faced many crises—internally and in the areas of its service to the profession and the Nation. It has always responded with vigor and imagination and I feel sure it will continue to do so. We now face a new national emergency—or, more accurately, a continuation of the crisis which many of us have witnessed throughout our lives. Through long familiarity with this crisis we are more aware of its nature than ever before and better prepared for it. We also face the danger of underestimating it from sheer frustration and weariness. This we must not do. My single message to the American Library Association Council is a call to service—I count on you to respond, as always, energetically and wholeheartedly.

Only 10 years ago at an American Library Association midwinter meeting, one of my distinguished predecessors in office reported the official declaration of a national emergency, the appropriation of billions of dollars for defense and the inauguration of selective service. On that occasion the American Library Association dedicated itself to national and world-wide service and libraries everywhere responded with expanded and redirected activities. We now face many of the same problems, some of them more acute than ever because of the more explosive weapons—and ideas—which we have and which we face from our antagonists. Once again the first duties of every American library are to assist in the national defense and to help build a peaceful world.

The American Library Association has not been inactive as the emergency has developed. We have strengthened our Washington office and redirected many of our own activities toward the demands of the emergency. We have worked closely on defense projects with other agencies such as the American Council on Education, the National Conference on Mobilization of Education, the American Book Publishers Council, and with the United States Office of Education which has been designated by the National Security Resources Board as the focal Government agency on matters relating to education. We have strengthened our Committee on Intellectual Freedom which helps to guard the chief target of our enemies—the free American mind. Now we are calling on all libraries and friends of libraries to mobilize.

We face many problems: Centralization of population in the so-called "war-impacted areas"; decentralization of population in the case of imminent attack; shortage of materials even for matters as essential to our future world as education; danger to our research resources—the physical embodiment of our heritage; shortage of staff as manpower demands increase; attacks on our integrity and on the controversial materials in our collections—physical evidence of the very freedom for which we stand ready to fight; and we face a world not yet ready to support the constructive weapons of the mind as fully as it recognizes it must support the destructive weapons for our physical defense.

Nevertheless, we also have tremendous advantages and opportunities: The chance to strike at the very root of the crisis and supply information and understanding—for defense and for future peace alike; the knowledge of community needs and the confidence of our various kinds of communities; the necessary technical materials to aid vocational training, civilian defense, and the other tangible programs on which our country is now embarked; and a front-line role in the conflict of ideas. We have enduring and penetrating weapons and we stand ready to use them with energy stemming from the special knowledge which our training and experience give us.

I ask you, therefore, to adopt, as a pledge, the following resolution on libraries and the national emergency:

"The peace and security of the world being threatened by despotism and aggression, the librarians and friends of libraries of the United States, speaking through the American Library Association, pledge themselves—

"1. To strengthen and extend the services of their libraries to meet the needs of national defense and world security.

"2. To conserve their resources for the national welfare.

"3. To sacrifice, economize, and improvise wherever possible and necessary.

"4. To meet the increasing need for information, knowledge, and education on which the future world depends for peace and prosperity.

"5. To preserve the open market of ideas which libraries represent as a symbol and guarantee of freedom.

"6. To lift the morale of a mobilized world through provision of the greatest recorded thoughts of men of all the ages.

"7. To cooperate with all agencies seeking to establish a world of decency, security, and human dignity."

Let us realize anew the power which we librarians hold and its basic role in the present world conflict. Our weapons—free ideas, freely expressed—are the strongest weapons and, therefore, are not only the first but the ultimate target of our enemies. Let us cast off modesty, timidity, and fear and wield these weapons with full confidence in victory.

Oil Industry Is Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 8, 1951:

OIL INDUSTRY IS THREATENED

The misfits of the Truman administration are on the prowl again.

At a time when industry is going all out to provide the stepped-up production required for the rearmament program, one of the businesses most vital to the Nation's welfare and security must take time off to fight for its very existence against an asinine administration proposal.

The industry is oil. The proposal is that made to Congress by Treasury Secretary Snyder for substantially reducing the rate in the depletion allowance clause of the revenue act. This clause recognizes the tremendous risks involved in the search for new oil reserves, and permits a special tax adjustment to return to producers a portion of the capital invested in this continuing exploratory work.

The attack upon the depletion allowance, which also is permitted the gas and mineral industries, is not new. It is one of the pet objectives in the Truman administration's continued harassment of business, but a wise and intelligent Congress has stymied repeated efforts to eliminate or seriously curtail the allowance and thus prevent the welfare staters from strangling the petroleum industry.

Any substantial downward revision of the depletion allowance could wreck the independent oil-producing business in the United States. It would prevent producers from getting back capital invested which is necessary if they are to continue in business. It would reduce exploratory work and the finding of new oil reserves so essential to maintain the production necessary to meet security demands. It would make us, within a few years, dependent on foreign oil which might be cut off in case of war.

No other industry is as hazardous as that of producing oil. Last year, 62 percent of all wildcat, or exploratory wells drilled in the United States were dry. Only 15 percent found oil and 3 percent found gas. Even in areas where oil already has been found, drilling still is a big gamble. Of all such wells drilled in the Nation last year, more than 23 percent were dry.

As early as 1916, Congress realized the hazardous situation of the oil industry and the necessity, if exploratory work were to continue, of returning to producers, tax free, capital invested in finding and producing oil. Capital is not taxed. Only income is taxable.

In that year, the cost depletion method of returning capital to producers was enacted and it was supplanted in 1918 by a recovery depletion method. Both involved endless engineering and accounting work, however, so an exhaustive survey was instituted by the Government for the years from 1918 to 1925 to determine a fair and simple depletion law. That survey, which formed the basis for the present law enacted in 1926, showed that the annual average depletion of capital invested in finding oil and producing it was between 32 and 33 percent of the gross income of producers.

The present depletion law, which has stood the test of time and proved its necessity in expanding the Nation's oil reserves, permits the owner of an oil or gas well to deduct from taxes 27½ percent of the gross income of his property up to a limit of half the net income from that property. This figure actually is between 5 and 6 percent lower than the Government survey on which the law was based showed what the depletion allowance for the industry as a whole should be.

Running true to form, administration officials in calling for a reduction of the depletion allowance from 27½ to 15 percent, do not reveal the true facts, either through misinformation or in a deliberate attempt to falsify the issue. They merely contend that the allowance is deducted year after year, even after the full original investment has been recovered.

But they fail to point out that when oil or gas is produced from a property, there is a reduction in the capital represented by that oil or gas in place. Nor do they cite that each individual producing property, or lease, is considered separately in figuring the depletion allowance. Some producers may drill 20 wells before finding oil. Thus, their capital investment is far greater than the capital invested in that twenty-first well. While the depletion allowance for one producing property may, over a period of years, total more than the investment in that one property, it still falls far short in most instances of returning to the producer the capital he has invested in various properties in search of production. This was clearly shown by the Government's own survey which found this loss of capital amounted to between 32 and 33 percent.

It is generally recognized that the depletion allowance is the incentive that has kept the Nation's reserves abreast of the steadily growing demands for oil and oil products. Without it the search for new fields would be seriously curtailed. For oilmen simply cannot afford to gamble away their capital.

Oil is vital to the welfare of this Nation. Any attempt to stymie the industry, such as by curtailment of the depletion allowance, can be disastrous. Congress should turn a deaf ear to the socialistic schemers and leave undisturbed a proven plan that oiled the way to victory in World Wars I and II and will safeguard the future petroleum needs of the Nation.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an address that I delivered on January 20 at the Department of Interior observance of Brotherhood Week. The spirit of brotherhood should not be confined to 1 week of the year but should be practiced by everyone, day in and day out, for the 52 weeks of the year.

If the success of this meeting today is reflected by the sincerity of this audience and—in fact—of the full sponsorship of Brotherhood Week, then we can indeed look forward with confidence to the results of this program. In the first place, the very fact that we are convening in the Department of the Interior auditorium is in itself symbolic of the objective for which we plead, for who has been a more outstanding practitioner of our cause than Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman?

It is also most encouraging that members of this audience, and those elsewhere who are enthusiastically observing Brotherhood Week, have subordinated all other interests in order that you might demonstrate your determination to dissolve intolerance in this land and in other nations of the globe.

These extraordinary steps to promote and preserve human dignity should not be necessary, of course. It is not at all complimentary to the prevailing moral state that such steps are necessary. Tolerance is an element of charity, and—unfortunately—charity is the least practiced of all virtues. Whether the contemporary disdain for this virtue is more dominant than in the past is problematical, inasmuch as the history of civilization records a procession of individuals, groups, and even nations that—by their very intolerant behavior—brought strife and suffering to the world. But we do know that, within our own range of memory, there has been little progress in the right direction. Whether such a situation can long endure is doubtful, because I question whether civilization can survive under continued defiance of the laws of Divine Providence. Certainly this program in which we are participating today will go far toward improving these conditions, but we will all have to make the intent of this project a 52-week proposition, and we will all have to impress upon succeeding generations that there is no work on this earth more important than that of cultivating the love and forbearance of all men, regardless of their faith, color, race, or nationality.

The basis of all charity, and, therefore, of all tolerance, is religious teachings. We have been paying entirely too little attention to the Lord's commandment—love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God. We have departed so far from this precept that we have permitted intolerance to rage throughout the world.

One of the most notorious examples of individual, then group, then nationalistic development of intolerance, was in Nazi Germany. It was like the crime of arson where the fire was to spread far and wide and blacken the hearts of millions. It penetrated every phase of German society. I remember so well in the summer of 1936 when one of our own boys from western Pennsylvania was made the target of a most disgusting display of intolerance—discrimination in the sports arena. John Woodruff, a graduate of the University of Pittsburgh and one of the greatest middle-distance runners of all time, won the 800-meter race at the Berlin Olympic Games in a spectacular run that deserved the acclaim of every sports enthusiast in the world. But, like Jesse Owens, who won three events in those games, Johnny Woodruff was a colored boy, and the Nazi leaders attempted to belittle their triumphs. Naturally, the effort backfired, and Woodruff and Owens became international heroes; but the revolting exhibition on the part of the German warlords provided an unerring insight into events that were sure to follow in any nation where intolerance is a governing principle.

Now, 15 years later, we find ourselves faced with another common enemy and disciple of the evil of intolerance. Communism has no place for the rights and the dignity of the individual. It must carry out an insidious campaign against the virtue of charity and other teachings of God. It, therefore, behooves us to unify our own peoples to a greater extent than ever before because only through such unison—through the recognition and practice of true brotherhood—can we cope with that dangerous and venomous state of intolerance that has enveloped and made captive many millions of human beings to our east and to our west.

Our recognition of brotherhood week and our willingness to expand and encourage the virtue it represents will give us the strength and the courage to carry on against all oppressors. But we must, in keeping with divine precepts—and, in reality, for our own welfare—never relax in forwarding the principles of this program.

We are approaching the anniversary of the birth of the father of this country, George Washington, who laid down the sound precept: "Give bigotry no sanction."

Military Housing in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to bring to the attention of the Congress the first of a series of articles written by Mr. Andrew Tully, of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, now appearing in those papers. Mr. Tully is at this time in Alaska and his writings

are particularly timely; they coincide with and substantiate with reference to inadequate military housing the findings of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate in a report released by that committee late last week.

(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, February 21.—If official Washington can spare the time from its cocktail parties, it ought to be ashamed of the way the wives and children of American servicemen are living in this near-Arctic community.

For security reasons, exact numbers of people involved can't be used. But at least several hundred servicemen and their families—mostly enlisted men—are living in one-room shacks without plumbing. In many cases, families with three or four children are crowded into these hovels. And they pay rents from $65 to $100 a month plus an average of $50 a month for heat.

Come visit in the home of Staff Sgt. Eugene Grueschow in an outlying section of Anchorage known as Mountain View.

It's a pretty warm day, only 5 above zero, compared with temperatures of 20 below a month ago.

In an unpainted shack covered with tarpaper lives Sergeant Grueschow, his wife, and three children. The shack is one room, about 15 by 15. Mrs. Grueschow is sitting on the couch chatting with a neighbor. Against one wall there's a two-tiered Army-type bunk bed. Robert, age 3, is sleeping on the lower bunk. Katherine, 2, a towhead, has just waked up in the upper berth against another wall.

There's a bassinet in which Paul, 3 weeks old, cries fretfully. A curtain in the corner conceals the family's single closet. There is a counter with closets above the chest. There are also drawers, a cupboard, a chest, and a combination desk-table. Heat is furnished by an oil cooking range.

Being a staff sergeant, Gene Grueschow has been able to buy on terms a small, 4-cubic-foot electric refrigerator. There is no toilet. There is no wash basin. There is no sink for drinking water. The Grueschows have to walk up the street to a community pump used by thirty-odd other families. Water flows freely from the pump except when the pump freezes. Then Gene Grueschow has to go 3 miles for water.

To go to the toilet, the Grueschows have to walk 50 or 60 yards to a community utility room. This is poorly heated if at all. The shack has space on one side for men and on the other for women. There are also showers which often have hot water and tubs for doing the family laundry.

The Grueschows are lucky because they are buying their shack. They've made the down payment and now are paying only $60 a month on the mortgage. Of course, they still have to shell out $50 or so a month for heat. And, since they're buying, they're also charged $5 a month for electricity, $5 a month for ground rent until they buy the lot for the shack, and $5 a month for use of the utility room. Their outlay comes to only $75 a month instead of the $85 most tenants pay. That's not counting the money for heat.

Yes, the Grueschows are lucky. They're not like the family over on Lane Street, several blocks away, who don't even have a pump. The corporal who is head of this family of four—the kids are 2 and 3—doesn't want any trouble with anybody so he asked to stay anonymous. You might call him Daniel Boone considering the way he and his family live.

Anyway, all the water used by this family is carried by the corporal in big pickle jugs from Elmendorf Air Base, a couple of miles away. When he can hitch rides that's fine. When he can't—well, his legs are still young and strong.

Of course, the corporal and his family share their privy with only three other families and it rarely gets colder than 10 below or so in the little structure except around midnight.

Then there's the family of Corp. William H. Epperson—a wife and two children, aged 4 and 8. Like other families existing in these subhuman accommodations; they rented their shack furnished. But when they moved in they found no dishes except a few chipped cups and saucers and no pots and pans. There's one bed, a couple of chairs and a chest. Corporal Epperson bought a cot. Now the kids have a place to sleep.

Surprisingly, most of the tenants of Mountain View and similar spots around Anchorage are fairly cheerful. At least the family's together, they say, and that's something. Only sometimes the smell kind of gets you. You know how it is.

Phony Communist Peace Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1951, I called the attention of my colleagues in the House to the sudden blossoming out of phony peace organizations obviously founded for the purpose of disseminating Communist propaganda. The Communists are determined to take advantage of the concern of our people over the proposed drafting of young men for military service.

At that time I suggested that the great American press expose the phony peace groups and their activities, for the protection of patriotic citizens who might otherwise be misled into signing petitions circulated by the Communists. The press of my home city has already responded to the need for publicity concerning the Communist peace organizations and I should like my colleagues to have the opportunity to read four excellent articles, one a column by Dora H. Moore which appeared in the Los Angeles Sentinel February 15, 1951; a news story by Ernest Brashear which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News; a news report which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News a few days after Mr. Brashear's story; and an excerpt from the February 19 column of the famous Los Angeles Daily News columnist, Mr. Matt Weinstock. I hope newspapers in other cities will join with our Los Angeles papers in exposing the current Communist tactics. The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Sentinel of February 15, 1951]

THIS WAY, FOLKS

(By Dora H. Moore)

I would like to reemphasize and elaborate on a warning recently issued by Fourteenth District Congressman SAM YORTY who claims "sneaking Communist traitors are setting up fake peace councils to prey on parents of 18-year-olds who may be taken into military service under the proposed new draft."

He cited petitions being circulated by an organization called the Southern California Peace Council, the petitions are headed, "I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier" and are followed by what YORTY called the "usual Communist propaganda." YORTY said he has asked the FBI to look into the organization and hopes the Attorney General will place such phony peace councils on his list of subversive organizations.

During the past months the east-side community has been deluged with petitions of every description, some honest proposals, but unfortunately too many shady (particularly Red shaded) petitions are circulating in this area. I would like to warn citizens in this area against indiscriminately signing their names to these petitions until they have carefully evaluated them. Ask where they originate, who backs the organization, and be generally discreet in signing papers carried by complete strangers.

It's just this serious. If you sign a petition sponsored by a Communist-front or other subversive organization, you immediately leave yourself wide open for a continuous appeal for sympathy for the publicly undesirable cause. The first thing you know, Government agencies will be making an embarrassing investigation into your private affairs, not necessarily to be snooping, but furthering a continuous effort to sift out followers and supporters of subversive organizations. Besides, no one likes to be a sucker—a set-up for every sharp operator that comes along.

Exercising discretion in signing things does not end with avoiding questionable petitions, but even more diligence is required when you sign notes, agreements, leases, and all other legal documents.

Not too long ago a couple contacted me in regard to a legal technicality that had cost them the down payment on a home (it was over $1,000). Simply because of a lack of even elemental knowledge of the law they had lost their life savings, their chance for a home of their own, and their swindlers couldn't be legally touched.

When making a sale or purchase that involves contract agreement, before you sign your rights away, contact a competent lawyer. If you are financially unable to do this, for a negligible sum the Legal Aid Society, California Bar Association, the legal section of the Red Cross, and other public organizations offer competent aid. The Sentinel will be interested in helping expose unfair deals. Remember, your taxes also pay for the services of a public defender. Let him earn his salary.

However, the surest way to avoid entangling tie-ups is to guard your signature as you would your life. A bad error of judgment may be that costly.

[From the Los Angeles Daily News]

LEFTIES START PHONY PEACE CRUSADE HERE

(By Ernest Brashear)

As a reporter I've been booted out of some pretty strange places, but last night was the first time I ever got ousted from a peace conference.

Of course, this peace conference was different. It was left-wing style, calculated to please the friends of Joe Stalin.

They tried to make people think it was a labor-union affair.

They called it the labor conference for peace.

But not a single A. F. of L. or CIO leader was there. In fact, I didn't see any labor-union leaders.

What was supposed to be a labor-union function turned out to be, instead, the first local move in a new phony drive called the American peace crusade.

The meeting, at the Park View Manor, 2200 West Seventh Street, was chaired by Olive Thompson, a member of the United Electrical Workers kicked out of CIO for Communist-line activities.

She introduced Elsie Moujar, who may be reached by phone at the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union, another outfit dropped by CIO in last year's housecleaning.

Elsie told about the enthusiasm at a Chicago meeting where some of the plans were made for a march on Washington to tell the President and Congress they better give us peace or else.

She sounded quite warlike.

Then came a talk from Jackie Clack, who attended the Communist-inspired Warsaw peace meet and also collected 2,700 signatures on the Stockholm peace petition, a little document that is said to have come straight off the Kremlin's private printing presses.

Jackie told about how proud she'd been while visiting Russia to stand beside women soldiers of the Red Army and how dreadful it felt to come back here after feeling the freedom of the Soviet Union.

Then they got down to the business of presenting "awards of merit for outstanding service in the cause of world peace * * * to some 35 Los Angeles trade-unionists," as the announcement bulletin described it.

The awards were little silver pins. Jackie Clack got the first one.

About this time, the woman who had been standing looking over my shoulder and watching me take notes started to fidget. I missed the next name.

Then came somebody supposed to be from the CIO United Auto Workers.

He wasn't there.

Then came a girl—not a union member—who was supposed to have gotten 700 names on the Stockholm petition. She wasn't there either.

Next came Homer Safford, secretary-treasurer of the Labor Conference for Peace. He got his.

Elsie then asked Jackie to give the awards to those being honored for Stockholm petition signatures.

A guy named Morrison got his, and that's where I went out.

The woman who'd been fidgeting asked if she could see me outside. I went. We were followed by two young punks disguised as workingmen.

They wanted to see my credentials. I showed 'em. They said they thought maybe I was an FBI man. Maybe that was just to make me feel good, because then they said it was a closed meeting, and I couldn't go back in.

I told them Elsie had said I could attend (as she had over the phone), and I pointed out I was a union member (CIO American Newspaper Guild). The invitation had said trade unionists are invited.

No; they said, the people are getting nervous (about 100 were there) about your taking notes, so you are not welcome. They sounded warlike. Being of a peaceful turn of mind, I didn't argue further.

I left.

Here are some other things I found out about the group:

They share offices with the Southern California Peace Council, which was branded last Monday by Representative SAM YORTY as one of the phony Communist peace fronts aimed at keeping this country unprepared.

The address is 326 West Third Street, room 310.

Included among the names of those proposing this so-called American Peace Crusade are those of Harry Bridges, Hugh Bryson, Mrs. Charlotta Bass, of Los Angeles, Rev. Stephen Fritchman, of Los Angeles, and a string of others commonly found on left-wing material.

There are three big ideas involved in this peace crusade deal. One is what they call the big debate, a kind of Gallup poll where everybody is supposed to vote for war or peace. The ballots are then to be shown to Truman to prove we want peace—and who doesn't?

Then there's the crusade itself, scheduled for March 1, when 3,000 crusaders are supposed to invade Washington to demand peace.

Last, they've dreamed up a grievance form by which American union men are supposed to tell the President he's violating their union contract by raising taxes.

And, just in case you wan' to drop around, the boys and girls are going to have another little pink tea Saturday night at the Nikabob Cafe on Western Avenue.

Principal speaker will be Harry Bridges, boss of the longshoremen's union.

That was announced after I left the meeting last night, so don't let anybody know who told you. I won't.

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of February 16, 1951]

OUSTING OF REPORTER FROM LEFT-WING "PEACE" MEET HIT

Ousting of Daily News reporter Ernest Brashear from a left-wing "peace" meeting last Tuesday night was protested today by Ben Nathanson, administrative officer of the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild, CIO.

"This is no isolated incident," Nathanson said. "Every newspaperman knows that reporters were barred from covering the recent convention of the Communist Party held in New York, and the United Electrical Workers, an organization thrown out of the CIO because it was top-heavy with Communists, never allows newspaper photographers to cover its conventions."

Brashear was covering the meeting which was sponsored by an organization that had been denounced by both CIO and A. F. of L. leaders as Communist dominated.

When the reporter was observed taking notes for his story, he was asked to leave.

"It was an outright violation of one of our basic democratic principles—freedom of the press," Nathanson said. "Now these people are attempting to drop the iron curtain in Los Angeles. They won't get away with it."

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of February 19, 1951]

ON THE BEAM

Ernie Brashear, this paper's labor reporter, last week described how he was ejected from a so-called labor conference for peace meeting at a West Seventh Street hotel, when he was detected taking notes. He identified himself as a member of the American Newspaper Guild, but was asked to leave anyway. He was there long enough, however, to detect a left-wing tinge to the proceedings.

The irony is that 2 years ago, at a State Federation of Labor convention, the People's World reporter was barred and Ernie was named to a two-man delegation to appeal to the federation to admit the reporter, in the name of free speech. Through his efforts the People's World man was permitted to stay.

Problems of Mine Operation and Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1951, I submitted to the RECORD a copy of a letter which I sent to Mr. William Henry Harrison, Defense Production Administrator, in regard to our domestic mines. Today I am putting into the RECORD a copy of the answer to my letter which was written by Mr. E. T. Gibson, Deputy Administrator of the Defense Production Administration. I might add that I am both irked and indignant over his unsatisfactory reply. My reply to Mr. Gibson is also herewith submitted to the RECORD so that the Congress may be fully informed of the apparent lackadaisical attitude and the dilatory manner which the DPA has been following. It is my hope that the United States Congress will get behind me with remedial legislation which will put the minerals program on a simple and direct operating basis and once again assure the American public that it is the Congress which runs the Nation's business, and not the bureaucrats.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 14, 1951.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARING: Your letter of January 31 has been received, and I have reviewed carefully the various points you have brought up with reference to the problems of exploration and encouraging increased production from small and marginal mine operations.

Undoubtedly, you have read by this time the statement of Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman on the defense programs of his Department before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in executive session on February 12, 1951. A copy of Secretary Chapman's statement is enclosed.

This office has been in close touch with Dr. James Boyd, the Administrator of the Defense Minerals Administration. He has been deeply concerned with this specific problem and the fact that the Defense Minerals Administration has been unable thus far to tackle in detail the question of mine exploration in accordance with the instructions under section 303 of the Defense Production Act. You will recall that whereas aid for loans and purchase contracts has been specifically spelled out, the act did not do other than state "to assist in carrying out the objectives of this act, the President may make provisions * * * for the encouragement of the exploration, development, and mining of strategic minerals and metals." As you undoubtedly know, the interpretation of that particular phrase in the act has been subject to considerable debate and also to a determination based upon modification or changes in the tax laws. This latter has been done since the first of the year.

At the present moment, the Defense Minerals Administration is moving forward toward the establishment of procedures for handling the problem of minerals exploration. As indicated in Secretary Chapman's statement and in statements made by Dr. Boyd before this same committee, a plan will be in operation at an early date.

I think it is important to remember that although to the man in the field the processing of applications and the establishment of procedures appears to be infinitely slow, more damage can be done by hasty action than by delay under circumstances where a program is as diversified as the minerals program for the United States. It is important to remember that more than 70 commodities are involved on the essential list of minerals, although possibly only 20 or more would qualify under an exploration program. However, these 20 commodities are sufficiently complex problems of their own—undoubtedly you will understand that the problems of mica are quite different from those of zinc, and the problems of quicksilver bear no relationship directly to the problems of beryllium. It is obvious

that the establishment of a workable program, covering as diverse a number of mineral commodities as must be considered in this instance is a task of major proportions.

This question is equally complex with respect to procurement of strategic metals and minerals at above market prices. No over-market price determination can be made by the contracting agencies until requirements have been established and until there are indications as to the critical essentiality of the metals or minerals involved. Obviously such determinations are tied in with the requirements of our military forces.

Coupled to this, Dr. Boyd informs me that he has had the problem of attempting to expand facilities of existing operations with a very small staff available to assist in the operation. He is hoping to expand this staff in order to take care of the workload, but as you probably know, mining engineers are difficult to find and men skilled in this highly specialized field are already engaged in work for our minerals companies.

It is proposed, under the new exploration plan which is modeled somewhat after the exploration portion of S. 2105, that the objectives you have indicated as necessary in your letter will be achieved. I can assure you that this office is making every effort to facilitate this work, and it is my hope that within the next 60 days an exploration plan will be in full operation.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. GIBSON,
Deputy Administrator.

FEBRUARY 22, 1951.

Mr. E. T. GIBSON,
Deputy Administrator, Defense Production Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GIBSON: Your answer of February 14 to my letter addressed to Mr. Harrison is at hand.

I am under the impression that my letter was not given detailed study before the answer was drafted as it is in the large part unresponsive. I know of Mr. Chapman's statement, and of many other statements made during the past year by officials of the Interior Department. The bare, blunt truth is that in spite of the output of words, little or nothing has been done to increase the output of minerals.

The Chapman exploration plan, if followed as announced, mostly on a 50–50 basis will be a flop. If the small and marginal miners had that sort of money they would already be spending it digging, as an official of the Mining Association of Montana has written me.

The Defense Minerals Administration may be moving forward, as you say, but the progress is too microscopic for me readily to observe.

We did not do any damage by "hasty action" during World War II and we got out the ore. There were a lot of strategic and critical minerals to handle then, also. It seems as though the experience of the past has been completely rejected.

Dr. Boyd, I believe, with Defense Minerals Administration, Bureau of Mines, and USGS, already has a larger staff than was engaged in the Premium Price Plan, the Metals Reserve Company operations, and the RFC mine loan division, and it appears that in 6 months only half a dozen procurement contracts have been let, no loans made, and no exploration projects allowed. Please correct me if I am wrong. Congress has granted the authority and the money. The reasons for lack of policy and lack of results in the agency operations do not interest the Congress. The lack of results does.

It would seem that the only cure for the demands our constituents are making is remedial legislation to put the minerals program on a simple and direct basis.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman from Nevada.

Letter of House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church to the membership of the church, issued at the meeting of the House of Bishops in El Paso, Tex., on January 12, 1951.

The communication is entirely nonsectarian and contains so much sound philosophy that it should be read by every American family.

While it points up our own shortcomings as individuals and as a Nation, it holds a torch of hope and faith to all Christian people.

The letter follows:

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. (Galatians 5: 1.)

Brethren, the minds of many are filled today with dread and gloom, for the future seems to hold for them little of hope, certitude, or peace. Since the attitude with which men face the future is itself a great factor in determining the future, we want in this letter to hold before all people teachings and insights of the Christian faith which can enable us to stand firm and wise in a difficult day.

First, remember that the great periods of history to which we look with pride in church and Nation have been those when God-fearing men stood fast in the face of adversity. We are not proud of the prodigal and cheap years in our history, and we are ashamed of the comfortable and half-hearted eras of the church's life. We cherish in memory the men and women, who, with patience and wisdom, tolerance and courage, and an unfaltering adherence to principle, worked and fought to achieve our liberties, and by their resolution turned the direction of history.

Since we all share this heritage of patriots, martyrs, and prophets, what we should dread is not difficulty, but rather the continuation of so much that is cheap and irresponsible in our way of life. God in His Providence has called us, as He called our forefathers, to greatness; to play in our day for the sake of all mankind a leading role in the struggle for freedom. It will require of us the same dependence upon God and self-denial, wisdom and patience, tolerance and courage which others have shown before us. We are called to accept this role and to join hands with the mighty fellowship of free men across the ages. If we want a comfortable material future, no encouraging word can be spoken: if we want strength of soul in the company of brave and faithful men, we can make this a great age.

Secondly, remember that if the future is uncertain, that is no new thing. Washington, Lincoln, and Lee were not able to foresee in their time of testing what lay ahead. Their greatness consisted in their willingness to place the future in God's hands while they in obedience performed the immediate duties before them. Consider Washington's words, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair. The event is in the hands of God"; or Lincoln's words, "Write firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right"; or the words of the hymn, "Keep Thou my feet. I do not ask to see the distant scene; one step enough for me." These men placed themselves in the hands of God, fulfilled day by day, sometimes in darkness, their duties and responsibilities, and left the success or failure of their efforts to Providence.

The greatness of these men reveals an enervating gloom for what it is: faithlessness to God and our present responsibility. There is no man who cannot see his present duty, and to do it at this significant moment in history is a rare privilege given to us by God. Nothing can take the place in our life together of integrity and character, and we must remember in the fear of God that we are threatened not only by outward forces, but by any lack of responsibility from within. Every man who lives irresponsibly today, who seeks his own security or gain without counting the costs to others every politician who plays recklessly on the present crisis for partisan advantage or his own advancement; every injustice in our common life, every hypocrisy in our democratic profession, weakens us and makes us less able to fulfill the role laid upon us. Even though we cannot see the pattern of the future, we can see the duties that lie at hand and the value of hard and self-denying work in the present. We, too, in our day, by what we do, can help to shape the course of history.

In addition to the tasks directly before us in our daily lives God requires of us vital concern, in spite of all discouragements, for peace and a world order rising above the anarchy of nationalism; an outgoing compassion for any of God's children who are suffering and in need; imaginative efforts in the strengthening of our common defense; and personal and community service to the men and women in the armed services.

"Away with gloomy doubt and faithless fear!
No arm so weak but may do service here."

Finally, we urge upon all men fervent prayer and a deeper understanding of the riches and gifts of the Christian faith. Since ages of adversity reveal to men their deepest needs, it is becoming clear to an increasing number of people that no one can be inwardly secure unless he walk with God. In a day when other foundations are shaking He alone is our strong Fortress and Friend. It also is becoming clear to an increasing number as they are shaken from comfortable assumptions that faith in God is the great source of the freedoms and values which are now threatened. Never in its history has the church faced a greater task or opportunity.

The immediate and obvious enemy of western civilization is Russian communism, but the deepest enemy is the godless materialism which bred the illusions and cynicism of communism and weakens us now from within. Beneath much of our own life there are assumptions which must be fought by every member of the church, for they are part of the total enemy we face. With the Communists there are members of all nations who share false and evil convictions:

1. This life is all there is; therefore, let's make the most of it, forgetful of any higher law.

2. Man's economic activity is his most important activity.

3. The more material things we possess the happier we will be as a people.

Since there is an inner struggle for the soul of our world which crosses all frontiers, we must realize that no final victory can take place on the field of battle. Since ideas are not destroyed by guns, the only way to overcome a false view of life is by the militant preaching and living of a true view of life.

We write this not only with the hope that non-church people will read and be led to a concern with the inner life of America and the world, but chiefly to impress church people with the great significance of their responsibility. While the Communists sent their missionaries to the ends of the earth, there have been comfortable people who have said it made no difference what a man believed. The great freedom for which our ancestors fought has been for others a petty and negative thing: Freedom from great convictions and discipline, freedom from zeal and sacrifice.

We are entering a new age in which we are called by our sovereign Lord to write a great chapter in His church's militant history. We can become by His grace and power finer, deeper, and more obedient people. There is in our life with Christ in His church comfort and strength in this world and comforting assurance to those who love Him of a world to come. There is in the midst of an uncertain world the comfort of Christ's presence with us and the divine assurance that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His church. But we would remind all members of the church that there is no assurance whatever that the church will increase to be largely effective without the devotion, discipline, and zeal of its members. Only by apostolic missionary endeavor will Christianity again become the soul of this world. Our responsibility is to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and to bear with power our witness in a sick world to God's saving and healing truth.

Alaska Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a press release of the Alaska Development Board at Juneau, Alaska, which demonstrates clearly the use to which the Alaska Highway is being put by the citizens of the United States and Canada:

For the first time in history, more people traveled to Alaska by automobile in 1950 than by boat, the Alaska Development Board revealed today in releasing its annual compilation of highway traffic figures.

The number entering the northern Territory by highway last year was 22,507 while the number of visitors by sea was 17,430. In outbound passengers, however, those going on the four ship lines regularly serving Alaska slightly exceeded those by automobile, 16,971 to 16,623.

The great preponderance of northbound over southbound travelers is accounted for, the Alaska Development Board says, by visitors who like the Territory so well they settle down to stay. Alaska's population has increased 77.4 percent, more than any State, in the past 10 years.

Growing importance of the Alaska Highway as a travel artery between the United States and the Territory is illustrated clearly in the 1950 traffic figures.

During the year a total of 16,907 vehicles traveled northbound and southbound over the wartime-constructed highway. This represents an increase of 4,261 vehicles and 10,883 passengers over 1949, and 8,353 vehicles and 20,446 passengers over 1948 traffic. The total highway traffic entering Alaska in 1950 amounted to 9,733 vehicles, while 7,174 left the Territory via the highway.

With road improvements continually being made along the Canadian section by the Canadian Government and long stretches of the highway system within Alaska being hard-surfaced by the Alaska Road Commission, substantial increases are anticipated during 1951.

Economic difficulties encountered by Alaska Highway trucking operations were reflected by a large decrease in truck movements. In 1950 a total of 1,476 trucks moved over the road, compared with 4,098 in 1949, a decrease of 2,622. Present operators appear to have sufficient capacity to meet current requirements of the region.

A slight decrease also was noted in bus traffic, a total of 212 busses making the trip, just 22 less than the previous year. Low-cost, round-trip bus tours to Alaska now being featured should result in increased traffic during the coming year.

The popularity of the Alaska Highway as a tourist route is evidenced by the large increase in vacation travel over it. A total of 23,279 persons traveled over the highway during the 1950 tourist season, an increase of more than 13,000 over 1949. The peak month was July when 6,331 persons moved over the 1,523-mile road.

Traffic also was heavy during the winter months, a total of 8,968 persons moving over the highway during the months of January, February, March, November, and December. The highway is open throughout the year.

Detailed information pertaining to personal travel over the highway may be obtained by writing the Alaska Development Board, Box 50, Juneau, Alaska.

Justice for Our Friends in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, which is the same as H. R. 4540, introduced during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. This bill would provide benefits for the men and women who served in the armed forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II. It would give them educational benefits similar to those received by other members of the American Armed Forces. Those of us who served with the brave and loyal Filipino soldiers will all agree, I am sure, that they certainly deserve every benefit given to us. They fought as members of the American Armed Forces, and the fact that the Philippine Islands were later given their independence should in no way be used as an excuse for denying them equal benefits with the rest of us.

We have been rightfully proud of the relationship between the United States and the people of the Philippine Islands. All factors considered, that relationship has been praiseworthy and has cemented firm bands of friendship between the United States and the Philippine Republic. Aside from the decisive need for equal justice in dealing with the Filipino soldiers, if we must always assert a selfish reason for doing what is right in foreign affairs, it is obvious that our relationship with the Republic of the Philippines is of such inestimable value from a standpoint of our defense that we should most certainly make every effort to demonstrate our desire to reciprocate their friendship by giving to the citizens of the Philippines, who fought as members of the American Armed Forces, the same benefits we have given to other members of our Armed Forces.

Lack of Virile Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from a patriotic young man in my district who is convinced that the great trouble with our international situation today as it affects this country and the welfare of our people is a lack of virile leadership.

I am sure that the mail which I am receiving daily is typical of that which is being received by many of my colleagues in Congress. It shows an utter lack of confidence in the leadership of the national administration in this country. These letters, as in this instance, come in ever-increasing numbers from the young men and women who are beginning to assume the burdens and responsibilities of leadership and citizenship in local affairs. Their minds are active and they are alert to the possibilities that the future holds in store for them and succeeding generations, if only we could supply our Government with virile leadership.

While I do not pretend to endorse all that this young man said in his letter, and do not agree in all details in his line of reasoning and conclusions, on the whole, I submit that it is a good illustration of the active and constructive thinking of the younger generation. It shows they are not completely in the dark as to where the real trouble lies. They are demanding virile leadership in this development and execution of national and international policies.

For the benefit of my colleagues and those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I quote verbatim and in full the following letter, which is an intelligent recitation of one of the younger generation, typical of the thinking of so many of them:

Representative GEORGE SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Quite reasonably you may not remember, but during your previous session in Congress I visited your office several times while I was employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington. My home address then, as now, was Tulsa—but it's been a long jump from the FBI to pipelining.

My purpose in writing to you at this time is to attempt to set forth my views regarding some of the critical issues facing our country—issues which the Congress is being asked to resolve, but issues about which I

feel every American should forthrightly voice his opinions. These views are not necessarily those of my company or of any other person—they are the opinions of a young lawyer, a veteran and Reserve officer, of a former newspaperman and Government employee, of a conscientious civic worker and youth leader, a God-fearing Christian, and of a loyal American.

I think the most difficult problem facing our Government is for that Government to make up its mind on a course of action. It is the administration's completely negative policy that has most of us more worried than Russia's possession of the atomic bomb. They taught us in OCS at Fort Benning: Determine the situation, locate your objective, then decide on a course of action.

I am confident that the intelligence available to our leaders in Washington is sufficient for an adequate analysis of the situation. Surely it must be clear to all concerned that the U. S. S. R. intends to destroy the freedom that we all take so much for granted. Certainly the evidence is ample that the Korean conflict was spawned by the master minds in the Kremlin, whether the result is what they intended or not. Furthermore, the facts unmistakably reveal that the United Nations as presently constituted cannot effectively cope with the situation. The vote in favor of branding Communist China as an aggressor made front-page news one day, but the simple fact that most of the member nations are afraid to even invoke sanctions was hidden on page 17 the next day. While we may be able to rally the support of a few friendly nations, the burden is still on Uncle Sam to provide the leadership and furnish the means to stop Soviet imperialism.

Our Constitution and Bill of Rights set forth the very noble aspirations of the founders of this Republic. If these still be our objectives, why is it necessary to continue vacillating over a foreign policy? Cannot a clear-cut, intelligent pronouncement be made by the President of this policy, followed by forceful action to carry it out? Our country is willing and able to fulfill whatever task is necessary to free the world from the menace of Communist enslavement. But we are far from ready, our will to accomplish this tremendous task may soon be decimated by indecision, and our ability could easily disappear through lack of virile leadership. I confidently believe that the people of these United States will respond in an unprecedented fashion to any call for duty or sacrifice if only the Government will decide upon a firm and resolute program of action. Unfortunately it is later than we think—but I believe we should do something about it.

I believe the draft age should be lowered to 18 and raised to 32. All men in this bracket who did not serve at least 12 months in the last war should be called to active duty. All men who did see service should be required to join Reserve units that would be called to duty only after the nonveterans were in service. The minimum mental and physical requirements should be lowered. Even an incompetent is capable of some type of service, and certainly a man who can hold a civilian job can do something of value in the Army or Navy. The principal problem here would be to require that the Armed Forces exercise more discrimination in their use of manpower, with careful appraisal of a man's ability upon induction.

I believe that industry should be fully mobilized. The military undoubtedly know what is needed to give our forces a fighting chance against the Russians. Emphasis should be placed on developing a superior Air Force, protection against enemy submarines, and a streamlined Army trained to combat Russian tactics.

The inequities so apparent in the last war between wages received by defense workers, civilian employees, and members of the Armed Forces should be eliminated. Naturally, a man is entitled to some premium for giving up his job to work in a defense plant, but it shouldn't be an excessive wage that increases the tax load and disturbs the Nation's morale.

I believe that a tax program should be inaugurated that would put defense spending on a pay-as-you-go basis, but that strict economies be enforced throughout the Government and all nonessential spending be discontinued. Certainly this is no time to even consider further social-security measures, unnecessary public works, or the like. Furthermore, I don't believe it wise to impose such a heavy tax burden on industry that incentive is destroyed, production curtailed, and dollar volume decreased to a point that the tax take is actually depleted. At the same time, price, wage, and profit ceilings should be extended to effectively curb the inflation spiral. Our dollar economy cannot stand a much greater strain than it is now carrying without splitting asunder.

America is at the cross roads—which way are we going from here? It is time for decision, for only by an aggressive, forward-looking policy can we expect to gain the support of the free world and unite our own people behind the effort and sacrifices needed to overcome the threat of destruction.

I appreciate your indulgence in this lengthy letter and trust that the views expressed may be of some benefit as you help to shape the destiny of our country and the entire world. Yours is a tremendous responsibility, and the hopes and prayers of your constituents go with you and your colleagues.

With best wishes and kindest regards.

Expansion of Mineral Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the expansion of mineral production in the United States and to encourage exploration and development of additional ore bodies.

The reasons for my action are made plain by an exchange of correspondence with Mr. Harrison and Mr. Gibson of the Defense Production Administration, printed in the RECORD February 2 and February 26.

In my letter to Mr. Gibson I pointed out that there has been a great outpouring of words from the Interior Department, telling the mining industry what is to be done for them, but there has been no outpouring of minerals and metals stimulated by the Defense Minerals Administration program. So far, the results of the expenditure of a vast amount of time and effort by a combination of the staffs of DMA, Bureau of Mines, and USGS appears to have been net, nothing.

Since 1947 committees of the Congress, especially the then House Public Lands Committee, of which I am a member, has been trying to work out a plan and legislation satisfactory to the Government. A number of bills have been introduced, hearings held and reported, which were acceptable to the largest part of the mining industry. These bills would have put into operation systems of mining aid which were thoroughly tried out during World War II and found to be successful. Each time they were killed by the opposition of the agencies, which wanted their own way or nothing. You have heard during these years the words "automatic incentive payments" and "selective contract system."

Well, under the Defense Production Act, the agencies were able to put into operation the Selective Contract System which had been discredited during the first part of World War II after a brief trial. Prior to the passage of the Defense Production Act early last September, there had been ample time to make plans for such a system as the Government had been pushing legislation to that end and should have known what it was doing. The horrible fact is, however, that when the authority finally was granted, either there were no concrete plans or they got snarled up in the bureaucratic process.

At any rate, the thing does not work. As Congressman ENGLE pointed out in a speech he made on February 3 in Denver, Colo., the Government "has set up a bureaucratic obstacle course remarkable even for Washington, where there are experts in that sort of thing." The people in DMA who are dealing with the program admit freely that it is literally unworkable.

The basic trouble seems to be a diametrically opposed theory as to whom these programs are supposed to help, and whether or not the small miner is honest in his endeavors to help the Government as well as himself.

I take the position that exploration money is appropriated to increase the total ore reserves of the country, for the benefit of the whole country. I believe that mining work is done better, more cheaply and more efficiently by a mining company than by a Government bureau. The theory of the exploration portion of my bill, then, is that we should appoint the miner the agent of the Government to explore for ore on the ground he knows best, with his own expert staff. The overall gain will be for the benefit of our economy; especially during this emergency. If there is an incidental gain to the mining company, that will benefit the economy in the long run. The Government apparently takes the stand that the miner should be carefully watched; that he is out to take money with both hands for his own benefit and not for the benefit of the United States of America. I do not for a moment believe this, but in any case there is no doubt that my plan will result in more exploration, more economically, and with better results than any devised so far. Perhaps Secretary Chapman's matching funds and repayment device will cost less, but it is not the sort of a program to set every miner looking for ore and in these desperate times that is what we need.

Exploration grants were made freely under the 1946 premium price plan. By

that time a good many of the war mines had already closed but yet, 463 mines located in 20 States helped with the exploration program, according to Bureau of Mines figures. What agency could match that? With the expenditure of $6,000,000, 271,000,000 pounds of new metals was uncovered. What is wrong with that? The average exploration cost was 1.65 cents per pound of metal found. Cheap enough. Let us do it again.

There seems to be a curious feeling in the Government that although the small and marginal miner, being vocal, should be jollied along, his actual contribution to the war effort is negligible. Fred Searls, Jr., stated the position when he said that putting small mines into operation decreases the total production of metal by robbing the big mines of labor. For this, among other things, Searls is against an incentive-payment plan of the automatic type. This theory, first stated by Searls in the early nineteen forties was definitely proved to be completely fallacious. Surveys showed that small mines use a labor force that otherwise largely would be wasted as the men either cannot, or will not, work for large outfits. In order to meet Searl's objections, I have provided that if labor pirating can be proved, the Director may cancel the company's incentive payments. Further, the statistics of the premium price plan, widely published, show that mineral production was increased, and that under any system of price ceilings an incentive payment plan is imperative if we are not to deal only with a favored few.

We are getting no results from the present plan. The old one worked. Let us do it again.

I know already that the House Interior Committee will receive adverse reports on my bill. I can almost visualize the exact phrasing. How, however, the officials of the Defense Minerals Administration and the Interior Department will dare to appear in hearings and oppose my bill and at the same time attempt to defend the present disgraceful record is something quite beyond my imagination.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the mining industry will rally behind this bill. I hope all of my colleagues here who want to see the United States make its maximum contribution to the war emergency effort will do likewise.

Where Are We Traveling?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Welding Engineer for March 1951:

WHERE ARE WE TRAVELING?

The Constitution of the United States holds that certain inalienable rights of every human being are derived from God. These include the right to live, to hold property, and to freedom from unjust imprisonment.

According to the theory (and practice) of socialism and communism, the only rights that an individual has are those granted to him by the state. He is entitled to nothing except what the all-powerful state says he may have. And that usually isn't very much.

We are wondering which of these two conflicting philosophies is prevalent in high circles in Washington these days.

A trip to our Nation's Capital reveals many disheartening facts. One of the most discouraging is that our national leaders seem to be just as unsure of what lies ahead as the American public. The pilots guiding the American ship through these dangerous waters will answer the most simple questions regarding what to expect with a candid, "I don't know." Yet they do not hesitate to impose curbs and controls when they know neither where we are going nor what is required to take us there.

What we need in this country is more straight thinking. It might be a good idea if our present leadership would devote less time to the planning of reckless spending of money and men and more time to the study of history.

History can be like a road map—to point a way to travel through the confused maze of time. If the road map shows only a bottomless chasm ahead, we should turn back before it's too late.

By history we don't necessarily mean ancient history. The Greeks and the Romans are too far away for their problems to have much in common with ours. But let's go back to, say, 1917 and see what the tolerance displayed to a handful of Communists did to the Government of Russia. Or trace back the history of the proud British Empire for the past 15 years to find out what socialism aimed at and has achieved there.

Or go back less than 10 years, to the beginning of World War II. Haphazard thinking with regard to controls and curbs cost us thousands of man-hours of production. The new controls include the same old mistakes of the past.

Our metals are scarce so their use has been restricted. Aluminum, for example, is banned from the manufacture of 200 civilian items, beginning with airfoil tubing (for windmills) and continuing straight down the alphabetical line to wheelbarrows and whistles. Yet nowhere is there any suggestion of the possible savings of critical metals that might be effected by the use of welding.

Fabrication by welding, where it is applicable, would make it possible to spread the curtailed metals 10 percent further since welded fabrication usually requires only 90 percent as much material as other joining methods.

Also, the present single-band priority set-up fails to provide for maintenance and repair welding, an absolute necessity of our industrial life. What's going to happen when machines break down if there's no welded repair?

Something has to be done to awaken production authorities to the dangers of such a shortsighted policy. Somebody has to do an educational as well as a selling job, and that somebody is we of the welding industry.

Even though our leaders have failed to read the signposts of history, we must not let their lack of knowledge of the advantages of welding impair our national progress. We in the welding industry must take on the responsibilities of leadership. We must show production authorities the way to the greater conservation of vital metals that is made possible by the judicious use of welding. We must point out the codes and specifications that have been evolved to cover practically every welding need.

If it is necessary that we conserve metals, let's do it in the most effective way through economical fabrication. Nothing offers the advantages of welding for production, maintenance or repair applications wherever metal parts are joined.

T. B. JEFFERSON.

Boy Under the Dome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, of Tulsa, Okla., under date of February 17, 1951, written by one of the great editorial writers of the Southwest, entitled "Boy Under the Dome":

BOY UNDER THE DOME

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Every day there move through the corridors of our Capitol at Washington groups of visitors, sightseers, piloted by interpreters, who give a touring talk on the history of the Capitol. They tell the stories that are revealed in paintings, murals, decorations, and sculptural ornamentations. They do well what our schools and colleges do poorly, or not at all.

Our educators avoid introducing students to the greatest culture ever known. Most of our college teachers today know more about the lands of the dead languages and the lives that were lived under tyrants than they know about the freedoms that made America.

But the people are now just beginning to be concerned. As in our country's beginning we are paying the tax cost of political corruptions. Instead of appraising the American people, our colleges are now being appraised by the people. Those who trail behind the public guides in our National Capitol leave with at least a slight acquaintance with our country.

On a recent trip to Washington I found myself blocked in a corridor by a typical visitors' group of about a hundred. So I joined them. They were just finishing their tour. As they paid off their pilot, I found myself speculating on the kind of folks they were. They were the mill run of holiday travelers from Vermont, Indiana, or Alabama, tradespeople, school teachers, middle-aged people, young people, and old people. Just looking over their Capitol.

I was attracted to a boy who seemed loath to leave. I followed him. As he walked away he was apparently looking again at everything he had been shown. When he got under the great dome, he lifted his cap, looked up, and after a moment he turned to me and said:

"It's great, isn't it?"

"It is great," I agreed.

"What a dome," exclaimed the boy.

"It's a great dome," I answered, "because it's the great home of a great country."

"How do you mean?" he asked.

"Dome" is an ancient word, I told him. It means home. A place of shelter. We get our word "domicile" from it. This great dome, I told the boy, symbolized the home of our country. To match our country, it had to be impressively big, mighty, strong, Great home of a great country.

"Oh yes," said the boy. "That's nice to know. Ours is a great country, isn't it?"

The lad and I sat down to visit under the great dome. I was astonished at the lad. He knew our country like a geographer. He talked about the Arcostook forests, the Appalachians, and the Sierras. He talked of our harbors, New York, San Francisco, Puget Sound. He knew where the Piedmont country lay. He recited names of grandeur, like the Blue Ridge of Virginia, and the Alleghenies of Pennsylvania, the Adirondacks, and Catskills of New York, the White Mountains of New Hampshire, and the Green of Vermont. He knew the kind of crops that are grown in Missouri, in Michigan, in Montana, and in Mississippi.

"You've been around, haven't you?" I remarked. "You've seen a lot of the country." "No, sir," he answered, "I've never been anywhere. I live in Ohio. This is my first trip. My uncle is here on business and he brought me so I could see Washington."

"Then you've been going to a pretty good school," I prompted, "they taught you a lot about your country."

"No," said the boy, "I never learned anything much about America at school; my father taught me. My father is always telling me about the difference between this country and the countries that have kings."

For a lad of 14, he was a find. What a father. Our country could use a million such dads. The boy began to explain that it wasn't the largeness of our land, but the largeness of our liberties that made America good. Philosopher.

In that one sentence, that lad had recited all there is to learn in a thousand college courses in economics and sociology. One father who had seen and comprehended the plan and purpose of this constitutional Republic had done the teaching job which the schools neglect.

Among the triumphs of American genius, we have been ushered into the photographic age. If our schools were equal to the public trust imposed upon them, they would equip themselves to take our boys and girls through the Capitol corridors, as the official guides now do. The youth of the land would become acquainted with their country. They now just accept it and live in ignorance of it.

The Turks did not invent the cotton gin. The Italians did not find the chilled plow. The English never fashioned the mowing machine, the reaper, or the harvester. The telegraph and the telephone did not originate in Brussels. Such simple things as the match, vulcanized rubber, ether, the turret lathe, and rotary and web printing presses, sewing machines, the electric light, elevators, block signals, air brakes, lawn mowers, refrigerators, typewriters, phonographs, fountain pens, washing machines, and automobiles, the gadgets that lighten the labors of life, were all born here.

The human freedoms that were made secure by the Constitution of our country emancipated minds. Individual initiative and enterprise, instead of being confiscated and curbed, were encouraged under the American flag. That's a story to tell youth. One boy had a father who told it while the boy's school failed to tell it.

Something more than the lure of fertile fields, virgin forests, and exhaustless mines lured your forebears and mine to seek our shores. Romance. Nothing in human history like it. What a culture to comprehend. The largeness of liberty brought the productive power and progress out of the soil. No other plow or seeder can bring the harvest that freedom grew here.

We fellows who make newspapers frequently fail to give the emphasis of importance to an inconspicuous item that flashes over the wire. It happened so the other day. A dispatch from Prague reported that a 15-year-old lad, proclaiming his love for liberty, was arrested by the Communist police. Jerked to jail, he was quickly put on trial (trial so-called). The stupid cruel court found him guilty of treason—treason against tyranny. The court condemned the boy to death.

When the sentence was pronounced the boy shrieked, "I would rather have death than live without liberty." A Patrick Henry across the sea. That lad's challenge to the cruel and autocratic court—his defiance of the beast-serving military tools of Moscow—found its escape from the court chambers through the open doors; it spread over the country.

Just as Patrick Henry roused the early Virginians to take their stand for human freedom, this Czech lad inspired a revolution for righteousness that became so impelling that, to quell it, the court changed the death sentence to a term of years which subsequent history is sure to shorten.

The boy in Prague was willing to die for the liberties Washington won and bequeathed to the boy under the dome.

The Inflation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received from my constituent, Mr. Remsen Brinckerhoff, of Englewood, N. J.:

FEBRUARY 9, 1951.

Hon. HARRY L. TOWE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOWE: I am writing as one of your constituents regarding the manner in which the President and Secretary of the Treasury are stimulating inflation by blackjacking the Federal Reserve Board, a body created by Congress. This Board was established by Congress to curb inflation (and deflation when it exists) by taking measures to control the money supply. After all, what is inflation but an increase in the amount of money in relation to the goods and services it can buy. Simply the old principle of supply and demand.

It is not a rise in prices any more than a temperature of 102 is the grippe. Those are but the resulting symptoms of the basic disease. And to think that it can be cured by freezing prices is just about as likely to succeed as trying to cure pneumonia by packing the patient with ice to cool him off. The basic fallacy is the same—attacking the symptoms and not the cause.

But not satisfied with that, they are going one step further and making the patient even sicker by continuing to force more germs into him—or more dollars into circulation. At the same time they hog-tie the doctor (Federal Reserve Board) who wants to try to eliminate the overbalance of pneumonia virus that makes the patient sick. It is like fighting fire with gasoline.

I hope you see the vicious circle. In an economy already containing a number of inflationary forces, such as the large national debt and the war emergency, this administration policy of pouring more money into circulation to peg the price of low-interest (cheap money for the Government) bonds, creates a continuous additional inflationary force. The inevitable result for an increase of money supply occurs—prices rise. Then the President screams politically about war profiteers, puts ice packs (ceilings) on the patient in an alleged effort to cure the disease he has created, disregards the doctor's advice, and tells him to be a nice fellow and cooperate, and then asks us to dig down in our pockets in terms of increased taxes to pay for the rising costs he has by his and the Treasury's policy created. In the meantime his policies continue and the same spiral or vicious circle goes on. He must realize this subconsciously, because he is already anticipating a further tax rise to pay for it in June.

Let's see the Congress put the trained doctor (Federal Reserve Board), whom it created for this very purpose, back in his job in place of the medicine man who is usurping it, before the patient becomes permanently injured.

Yours respectfully,
REMSEN BRINCKERHOFF.

Lax Immigration-Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Daily News is currently running a series of articles by a staff writer, Mr. Ernest Brashear, which articles describe the deplorable lack of enforcement of our immigration laws supposedly controlling the immigration of Mexican nationals into the southwestern part of the United States. These articles call attention to the fact that the ease with which the American border is crossed has resulted in infiltration of Communists into the United States to an extent which cannot be accurately determined.

American citizens of Mexican descent are a colorful and constructive force in the United States and particularly in southern California. They are cooperating fully in the search for a solution to the problem caused by the illegal immigrants, called "wetbacks" because of their wading across the river separating the United States and Mexico. Any confusion of our American citizens of Mexican descent with the "wetbacks" would be a decided disservice to a large group of fine American citizens, many of whom reside in my district in Los Angeles and are counted among our most outstanding citizens and leaders.

The "wetbacks" can hardly be blamed for their desire to find employment in the United States. It is the lack of patriotic responsibility on the part of some Americans added to lax immigration law enforcement, which makes Communist infiltration possible by inviting border violations. Without connivance, open or covert, on the part of some American employers, there would be no encouragement of entry by "wetbacks," and no jobs for them after their entry. If there were no jobs, word would get around, and the scramble across our border would abate.

Anyone who has studied the problem knows that in addition to lack of Federal

law enforcement, there is a lack of adequate State laws controlling labor contractors who recruit and handle agricultural workers. There is evidence to indicate that these labor contractors, some of their foremen, and no doubt some of the agricultural employers, benefit from the fact that "wetbacks" cannot complain when they are exploited, treated like animals, and even required to kick back some of their pay. Some of the people who scream loudest about subversive activities are actually conniving to make Communist infiltration possible, by their refusal to cooperate with the Immigration Department in the curbing of illegal entry of workers whom they encourage by making no reasonable effort to determine their right to be in the United States before hiring them.

It is very obvious that our immigration laws must be revised where necessary and vigorously enforced, not only for the protection of our own workers, whose wages are driven down and whose living conditions are kept at a low level by the entrance of "wetbacks," but also for our protection against entrance of Communist agents. We must crack down not just on the poor "wetbacks," who are only seeking a livelihood, but on the labor contractors and employers, large and small, who harbor and conceal these people by giving them employment, thereby knowingly, wilfully, and deliberately violating Federal laws in order to achieve their own selfish purposes. These Americans are, in my opinion, more culpable than the "wetbacks."

There have been enough investigations of this problem. No more are needed. In concluding these remarks, I should like to include a part of the preliminary report of one group of investigators—the Governor's Committee To Survey the Agricultural Labor Resources of the San Joaquin Valley. The chairman of the committee is Mr. J. Earl Coke, and the executive director, Dr. Paul Prasow. In its preliminary report dated December 15, 1950, the section dealing with the "wetback" problem said: "It has been asserted that the presence of Mexican "wetbacks" in the California agricultural labor market displaces native workers and therefore aggravates unemployment. In this connection, an immigration and naturalization official, testifying at the Bakersfield hearing, indicated that there were 167,000 deportations to Mexico from July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950, from the southern part of California, and two western counties in Arizona. Mr. Del Guercio of the Immigration and Naturalization Service estimated that approximately 60 percent of deported Mexican "wetbacks" were employed in agriculture. The northern California district of the Immigration and Naturalization Service reported 10,000 Mexicans were deported in the same year.

While Mexico "wetbacks" have presented some problems to the San Joaquin Valley, the committee desires to express public recognition of the truly significant contributions of Mexican-Americans to the social and economic structure, and to the culture of the valley, State, and Nation. The Mexican-American has not only played a vital historical role in the agricultural development of the San Joaquin Valley but has also made invaluable contributions to the culture and development of the community in which he resides.

Under present law, there are penalties of a fine up to $2,000 and imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years for knowingly harboring or concealing an alien who has entered the country illegally. The law asserts that such action shall be deemed a misdemeanor. According to immigration and naturalization officials, practically no prosecutions are attempted under this Federal statute because of the ambiguity of the severe penalty and misdemeanor stipulations. In addition, because of the comparatively small staff of enforcement officers, the main phase of the Immigration and Naturalization Service work is concerned with the return of those aliens who have been either arrested or convicted for criminal violations in this country. There is a real need for expanding enforcement service and personnel. The lack of detention facilities, and ease with which the Mexican "wetbacks" can enter the country are added problems. At one point alone in the border, it was estimated that as many as 2,500 "wetbacks" were entering weekly.

Sealing the border seems essential to reducing the number of illegal entrants. However, some responsibility should be borne by individual employers in determining the legal status of their agricultural workers. It is recognized that there is difficulty in discerning the legal status of Spanish-speaking workers. Nevertheless, there are indications that some farmers, as well as labor contractors, are aware when the "wetback" is employed. Testimony from a labor contractor indicated that he preferred using "wetbacks," although no wage differentials were made.

It is the expressed public policy of major farm organizations, including the San Joaquin Agricultural Labor Bureau, Associated Farmers, Agricultural Committee of the California Chamber of Commerce, Farm Bureau Federation, and others, not to condone the practice of using "wetbacks."

Recommendations to adequately cope with this problem are admittedly difficult. A restatement of policy by California agriculture on the hiring and use of "wetbacks" would seem essential. More frequent reporting by farmers to Immigration Service personnel, when some doubt of nationality status exists, would be another aid to better enforcement.

It is reported that there are no Mexican Nationals presently employed in the valley, who were admitted under the Mexican-American Treaty. The Governor's Conference on Employment reported that not a single agricultural employer in the San Joaquin Valley requested certification for Mexican Nationals for 1950. However, recent international developments have stimulated greater economic and agricultural activity in the valley. Thus, many of those testifying observed that the problem of unemployment in the valley will very likely diminish and corresponding problems of recruiting an adequate agricultural labor supply will increase. Therefore, it has been suggested that the door be left open with respect to use of Mexican Nationals to meet abnormal labor shortages in the future.

Recommendation: To decrease the current flow of Mexican illegal entrants, it is suggested that the Governor, in concert with other western governors, request the Federal Government to increase their border patrol. A better integrated State and Federal program is desirable, since it is a problem of mutual concern.

A Visualized Program for Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech which I recently made before the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture:

A VISUALIZED PROGRAM FOR MARKETING

I appreciate the honor of speaking on this series of lectures on agricultural marketing. If I understand my assignment correctly, it is to discuss some of the history and background of title II of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 and to express an opinion as to the progress which has been made in carrying out the program contemplated under that title.

Many of you were in the Department when this legislation was considered in Congress. All of you, I am sure, are familiar with it in a general way and know something of its background. I believe, however, that the history and background of this legislation is so important in showing what Congress had in mind at the time the legislation was passed that I should review the matter quite extensively even at the risk of going over ground with which some of you at least are already quite familiar.

This legislation, and I am speaking now of title II, was the direct result of an intense interest in the marketing of agricultural products which developed during the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. It was not an effort to meeet an acute problem then in existence; rather it contemplated setting up a program which, while of a long time nature, might give some effective relief to conditions which were expected to develop during the period following the end of World War II. The discussions which took place in the Committee on Agriculture of the House and in the Congress during the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses clearly indicate that Members of Congress had a great appreciation of what had been accomplished for agriculture during many years of research in the field of production. The fact that American farmers were able almost overnight to increase agricultural production by more than 30 percent, in spite of shortages of labor, machinery, fertilizer, and transportation, made a great impression upon Members of Congress and with it came the realization that this spectacular development was due in large

part to many years of patient research in the laboratory and test plot.

There was a feeling that, while this increase in the ability of farmers to produce was a Godsend during the war, it might create serious problems following the war unless consumption during normal times was sufficient to absorb it. It was natural under those circumstances for many to reach the conclusion that, if we could approach the problems of marketing and distribution in the same way and with the same success we had met the problems of production, we would have the answer.

There was also a strong feeling in Congress and also among farmers that the only permanent and satisfactory solution of the problem of surpluses, particularly of the perishable commodities, lay in the development of a better system of marketing and distribution rather than through Government price-support programs.

The first definite step in the way of action on this subject came with the introduction in the Seventy-eighth Congress by the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the late Hampton P. Fulmer, of South Carolina, of House Resolution 38, which passed the House unanimously on May 27, 1943. That resolution authorized and directed the House Committee on Agriculture "to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer as it affects farmers, the various types of middlemen, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers." The following were named as specific subjects for investigation:

1. The effectiveness of the present system of marketing and the adequacy of marketing facilities with particular regard to the protection of farmers and consumers.

2. The effect of transactions on the commodity exchanges upon farmers and consumers.

3. The existence of any practices in connection with grading, storing, processing, transporting, distributing, or marketing of farm products which adversely affect farmers and consumers.

4. The part which transportation plays in the distribution of farm products and the possible existence of discrimination in transportation rates.

5. The feasibility of setting up a cooperative program of marketing and distribution through local, State, and National marketing agencies which would provide facilities for grading, distribution, storage, and other essential activities.

The committee was directed to make a report to the House after the conclusion of its investigation and make such recommendations as it felt proper with respect to legislation.

I think it might be pertinent to point out that Chairman Fulmer, the author of the resolution, was a South Carolina farmer who produced a wide variety of crops, including fresh fruits and vegetables for the commercial market. Through long experience he came to feel the frustration which every producer of perishable commodities must feel when he contemplates the risks which must be taken not only by the producer but by the handlers of perishable agricultural commodities under our present marketing system. He was indignant at the low price which producers received and the high price which people in consuming centers were compelled to pay. On many occasions I have heard him express his views on the subject in the course of which he compared the actual price he received for fresh vegetables at his farm in South Carolina with the price quoted in Washington wholesale and retail markets. I think it should be noted that the concern which was expressed by Mr. Fulmer was directed just as much to the high price which the consumer had to pay as it was to the low price which the farmer received.[2]

In the beginning Mr. Fulmer appointed a subcommittee consisting of Hon. John W. Flannagan, Jr., as chairman, Hon. Stephen Pace, and myself as the other members, to formulate plans and set up an organization to carry out the studies authorized under the resolution. Despite the great interest in the subject matter, this investigation was slow in getting under way. We were in the midst of a war. Members of Congress were exceedingly busy on problems arising out of the war. Qualified staff personnel members to conduct the investigation were hard to secure.

The subcommittee, however, worked out a program of study which was outlined in a speech made on the floor of the House by Mr. Flannagan on June 21, 1944.[3] This program contemplated a study of every phase of marketing activity, beginning with shipping-point organizations, facilities and practices and going right down through every phase of marketing activity until the product reached the consumer. However, for reasons already stated, the committee was not able to complete its study during the life of the Seventy-eighth Congress. So great was the interest in this subject that much disappointment was expressed by Members of Congress from both rural and urban districts because the committee was not able to complete this investigation.

Consequently, early in the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Mr. Flannagan, who had succeeded to the chairmanship of the Committee on Agriculture following the death of Mr. Fulmer, introduced House Resolution 54 to authorize the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to make an investigation of the existing system of marketing, transportation and distribution of farm products. Investigation called for by this resolution was of somewhat greater scope than that provided for in the Seventy-eighth Congress. In addition to the subject matter included in the Seventy-eighth Congress resolution, the new resolution called for a study of "the adequacy of present facilities, local, State and Federal, for (1) furnishing producers, distributors and consumers with market reports and marketing information; (2) the development of standards and grades; (3) the inspection and certification of the quality and condition of farm products; (4) the development, analysis and publication currently of information showing the cost of marketing farm products through the various channels of distribution; (5) the inspection of meat and meat products and the influence of such facilities on the marketing of livestock; (6) protecting producers, distributors and consumers from unfair trade practices in the marketing of farm products."

Reference is made to this expansion in the scope of the committee inquiry for the reason that it indicates the interest of the committee in the service and regulatory activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, together with the part which those activities played in the marketing of agricultural commodities. Significantly also the new resolution called for a study of the effect of price-support activities upon the marketing and distribution of farm products.

House Resolution 54 was reported by the Committee on Rules on February 20, 1945.[3] A number of Members of the House spoke in favor of the resolution when it came up for consideration on February 26, 1945, and the only definite opposition was on the part of one Member of Congress, who explained it by saying that he was against all investigating committees. In the discussion of this resolution it was remarked by several Members that agriculture had made tremendous progress in the field of production through research and education, but that nothing comparable had been done in the field of marketing.[4]

So widespread was the interest in this subject that activity was not confined to the investigation being conducted by the Committee on Agriculture. Because of this interest Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., had appointed a Republican Food Study Committee under the chairmanship of Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio. The purpose of this committee was to make a thorough study of all problems concerned with the production, marketing, and distribution of food, both from the standpoint of the producer and the consumer. This committee held hearings in various parts of the country and through its staff made comprehensive studies on the subject. As a result of these studies the Food Study Committee concluded that some action should be taken by Congress in the field of research on agricultural marketing and distribution, and that better use should be made of existing Government agencies dealing with food distribution, processing, and consumption. As a result of the conclusions reached by the committee a bill was prepared which was introduced in the House by myself on March 28, 1946, and given the number H. R. 5925. Because this bill is the direct ancestor of title II of the Research and Marketing Act and because it represented the thinking of a number of Members of Congress at the time, it might be pertinent to read to you now the title of the bill and its declaration of policy. The title reads as follows:

"To improve nutritional standards, reduce the cost of food distribution, provide a broader outlet for American farm products, and promote scientific development of food processing, distribution, and marketing, by establishing a National Food Research Institute."

The declaration of policy read as follows:

"The Congress hereby declares that full production of food and farm commodities and effective utilization of all that is produced is essential to the welfare of the Nation and the health and prosperity of its people. The Congress further declares that the application of scientific methods to the production of food and fiber having been highly successful during the past 84 years, a similar scientific approach to the problems of utilization of all agricultural products shall be the policy of the United States, so that we may learn how to make effective and profitable use of the food and fiber we now know how to produce in abundance. The Congress further declares that establishment and operation of a National Food Research Institute for the purpose of concentrating scientific research, skill, and methods on the problems of food and fiber utilization is essential to the welfare, health, and prosperity of the people of the United States. The policies to be followed in attaining these objectives shall be (1) improvement of the operation of the private marketing system to eliminate waste and inefficiency and thereby to reduce the relative cost to the consumer; (2) making available to the food production, processing, and distribution industry scientific laboratory and research facilities and personnel so that opportunity for scientific research and development shall be available on reasonable terms to all members of the industry; (3) improvement of dietary and nutritional standards through research, processing, and marketing improvements and education; (4) development of new and wider markets for American food and fiber products, both in the United States

[2] See p. 4986, vol. 89, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.
[3] P. 6388, vol. 90, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.
[4] H. Rept. 182, 79th Cong.
[4] Pp. 1449–1460, vol. 91, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

and other countries, with a view to making it possible for the full production of American farms to be disposed of usefully and profitably without resort to subsidies or artificial price-support programs."

In order to carry out the purposes of the legislation as set out in the declaration of policy, the bill provided for the transfer to the National Food Research Institute of "all functions, powers, duties, and authority of each and every agency, division in or under the executive branch of the Government which, in the opinion of the President, as expressed pursuant to subsection B hereof, is primarily concerned with food processing, marketing, distribution, or utilization, or which would, if continued, substantially duplicate any function by this act authorized to be performed by the Institute."

Thus it will be seen that it was the purpose of this legislation to bring together in one bureau all of the agencies, not only in the Department of Agriculture, but in every branch of the Government which dealt with the marketing, processing, distribution, or utilization of food products.

H. R. 5925 aroused a great deal of interest in Congress and out. It was submitted to officials in the Department of Agriculture and in other agencies for their consideration and suggestions. Farm organizations, officials of marketing groups, and many individuals engaged in the distribution, transportation, and processing of food were asked to give their advice and opinions. On the whole, the objectives and purposes of the legislation met with a very favorable response and the extent of the interest manifested was indicated by the many helpful suggestions which were made as to possible changes and improvements.

All of this occurred at about the same time the Committee on Agriculture was concluding its marketing studies under House Resolution 54. That committee, as a result of these studies, reached the conclusion that the subject matter was so important, so complex, and so much of a continuing situation that it was beyond the ability of any congressional committee to find the answer to all of the many problems involved in the course of a congressional session. Instead, it was felt that the only way that these problems could be adequately considered and solved would be through a program of extensive and continuous research comparable to the research which had heretofore been carried out so successfully in the field of agricultural production. This meant, in effect, that the committee agreed with the approach to the problem which was suggested by H. R. 5925. However, it was felt that further consideration should be given to the matter, and that H. R. 5925 should be revised with a view of incorporating the results of the studies of the special committee and some of the suggestions which had been made by marketing experts in the Department of Agriculture and by men with practical experience in the field of marketing and distributing farm and food products.

On June 6, 1946, H. R. 6692 was introduced in the House as a substitute for H. R. 5925. This bill covered very much the same field as the earlier measure but was a much improved bill, embodying many practical and helpful ideas which had been suggested by those who had studied H. R. 5925. H. R. 6692 provided for a new agency in the Department to be known as the Agricultural Marketing Administration. Like the earlier bill, it provided for bringing together all governmental agencies dealing with the processing, distribution, and marketing of food and in addition provided for the transfer to the new agency of all the service and regulatory activities of the Department of Agriculture. This might have been implicit in the earlier measure, but in H. R. 6692 it was specifically set out. Thus we find that, as a result of the thought and study and experience of a great many men in Congress and out who were interested in improving the marketing of agricultural products, there evolved the program contained in H. R. 6692.

About this time, there was introduced in the House by Chairman Flannagan H. R. 6548 to expand agricultural research as previously carried out under the Bankhead-Jones and prior acts. This measure incorporated some new features, such as the authority to contract with agencies outside of the Government for research work, and broadened the scope of research especially in the field of utilization, but fundamentally it was a continuation and expansion of the program of research which had been carried on by the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges for many years. Because each of these bills (H. R. 6548 and H. R. 6692) dealt with the subject of research, because there was intense interest in each of them, because most of those who were interested in one bill were also interested in the other and because the end of the session was approaching, it was decided by the committee to hold a joint hearing on the two bills.

Many of those who appeared before the committee expressed their approval of both bills. Among those appearing who were particularly interested in H. R. 6692 were the late Albert S. Goss, Master of the National Grange; John H. Davis, executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; C. W. Kitchen, executive vice president of the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, whose long experience in the field of marketing activities in the Department of Agriculture was well known to everyone; F. R. Wilcox, assistant general manager of the California Fruit Growers Exchange; Albert J. Garner, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Maine; H. K. Thatcher, director of the Division of Agriculture and Industry from the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission; L. M. Walker, Jr., commissioner of agriculture for the State of Virginia; Warren W. Oley, chief of the Bureau of Markets of the New Jersey Department of Agriculture; and W. Kerr Scott, then commissioner of agriculture of the State of North Carolina and now the Governor of that State; and others.

During the course of the hearings, the committee reached a decision to combine the two bills—H. R. 6548 becoming title I, and H. R. 6692 becoming title II. To these were added the third title covering the appointment of advisory committees. A committee print was drafted containing the three titles and the hearings were continued on this committee print. Both of the original bills had been submitted to the Department of Agriculture for a report with the result that the Department expressed its approval with some slight amendments of 6548 and expressed its approval of most of the objectives and purposes of 6692, but objected to those provisions which brought together all of the many and scattered agencies dealing with agricultural marketing into the Agricultural Marketing Administration. Mr. Norris Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture, appearing before the committee on behalf of the Department, urged that instead of setting up the new administration that the bill be amended so as to simply give the Secretary authority to carry out all of the provisions contained in the bill. The committee was very reluctant to make the change. As far as I know, and I think I do know, every member of the committee favored the provision setting up an Agricultural Marketing Administration and felt that this was the heart of title II. However, responding to the plea of the representatives of the Department that they did not want to be bound to the exact type of organization set up in the measure and because of the lateness of the session and the desire to enact the legislation before adjournment, the committee acceded to the Department's suggestions and deleted the provision specifically setting up the Agricultural Marketing Administration. However, in section 206 of the bill the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to transfer all of the agencies dealing with "research, service, or regulatory activities in connection with the marketing, transportation, storage, processing, distribution of, or service or regulatory activities in connection with the utilization of agricultural products into a single administrative agency."

In order that there might be no mistake as to the views of the committee on this point, the committee report deals specifically with the subject as follows:

"One of the principal aims of title II is to facilitate administration of, and to increase the effectiveness of, the marketing work of the Department of Agriculture, and to give it the emphasis and attention that it should receive by providing for the integration of all the marketing functions of the Department, including marketing research, service, and regulatory activities into a single agency, whose primary responsibility shall be to conduct and administer programs designed to improve the marketing and distribution of agricultural products.

"Testimony introduced at the hearings shows that such activities as the Department has developed to improve the private marketing system have been shifted about through a long series of departmental reorganizations, and at present the marketing research, service, and regulatory activities are spread among various bureaus, agencies, and branches, of the Department. Such agencies all have numerous other duties in addition to their marketing functions. The agency in the Department of Agriculture that has a major share of the responsibilities for administering marketing services and improving distribution is also charged with the responsibility of production goals, support price activities, activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, purchase and sale activities, and other action programs, all of which are very important and necessarily make strong demands upon the time and energies of the Administrator. In view of the great importance of the marketing and distribution problems to the welfare of agriculture and of the Nation, and of the fact that so little effective work has been done in this field in comparison with the magnitude of the problem, this committee has reached the conclusion that research in marketing and the closely related marketing services and regulatory activities of the Department of Agriculture should be handled by an integrated, administrative unit within the Department, responsible to the Secretary. Such a unit should be staffed with qualified marketing experts and should be permitted to utilize all its energies and resources for promoting, improving, and developing a sound marketing system without its administrative officers being burdened with other complicated problems and heavy responsibilities incident to other important functions of the Department of Agriculture, much as they are at present. This is the method which has been used to achieve notable success in the field of production research. This committee is of the opinion that under such an administrative organization great progress can rapidly be made in the field of marketing. Accordingly, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer and consolidate the marketing research, service, and regulatory activities."[5]

The combined bill which bore the number H. R. 6692 and was reported on July 8, 1946,

[5] H. Rept. 2458, 79th Cong.

came before the House on July 15, 1946. It passed the House as it later passed the Senate by unanimous vote. Many Members of the House expressed their approval of the legislation on that occasion as well as their gratification that the committee had brought out such a comprehensive research program. On the question of how the authority given the Secretary in title II should be handled, Chairman Flannagan said, "The marketing program will never be a success until the marketing research, services, and regulatory work of the Department of Agriculture is coordinated under one directing head. While I believe the Secretary should be given a free hand in bringing about the proper coordination and consolidation of the respective marketing research, service, and regulatory agencies, as provided for in section 206, I am strongly of the opinion that unless this is done, the marketing program will be a failure. It is the unanimous opinion of the House Committee on Agriculture that the Secretary should carry out the intent of Congress as expressed in section 206 at the earliest date possible."[6]

I can say without any hesitation whatever that Mr. Flannagan was speaking for the entire committee in making this statement, and I think I can say he was expressing the viewpoint of practically everyone who contributed in any way to the formulation of this legislation.

For reasons which will appear later, I have devoted what may seem to be an excessive amount of time and detail in going into the legislative and historical background of title II of the Research and Marketing Act. In doing so I have not depended upon my recollection of the matter but have reviewed and restudied the legislative proposals and hearings which led up to the enactment of both titles I and II, as well as title III of that act.

Let me now briefly summarize what was covered in titles I and II. Title I was an amendment of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act. It contained little that was new. Its principal purposes were (1) to provide for contract research, (2) bring agricultural research activities up-to-date, and (3) authorize more appropriations for the same.

Title II, on the other hand, was entirely new. Its over-all purpose was to improve the marketing and distribution of agricultural products. This was to be achieved in three principal ways: (1) to bring together into a single agency all administrative units in the Department of Agriculture dealing with the distribution of agricultural products, whether in the fields of research, service, or regulation, (2) to carry out marketing research on a scale where it ultimately would be comparable with production research, (3) to separate marketing activity programs from those dealing with price supports, production controls and government purchasing programs.

It was the feeling of those who sponsored and supported title II that throughout the years most of our agricultural efforts had been devoted to production and practically none to marketing. It was believed that as a result of this emphasis on production, that phase of agriculture had far outstripped the equally important function of marketing. It was further believed that, if all agricultural marketing activities could be combined in one agency, it would give marketing a tremendous impetus and enable it to match production.

It is not necessary for me to say that the results under the Research and Marketing Act have been disappointing. Let me hasten to say that in stating this I mean no criticism whatever of those who have been in charge of its administration. I have an extremely high regard for the work of Mr. E. A. Meyer, the first Administrator of the act, and I am sure that Dr. Cardon and his associates know that I feel they have done the best possible job under the circumstances. Nor do I think the Appropriations Committees of the Congress should be criticized for their failure to make the full amount of appropriations authorized by law.

It is my view that the partial failure of the act is due primarily to the fact that the intent of Congress with respect to the administration of title II has never been carried out. Following the enactment of the law and on more than one occasion, a number of Members of Congress as well as others interested in the program conferred with Secretary Anderson and urged him to make the organizational changes authorized by the act. However, we were never able to convince him that this should be done, possibly because he had recently completed a reorganization of the Department based on a different theory. I have never discussed the matter with Secretary Brannan and I do not know that anyone else has, but for reasons which he doubtless considers good and sufficient, he has followed the same policy as his predecessor in this matter. But while I am not criticizing those who oppose the program called for in title II, I want to reiterate my belief in its merit and practicability and urge its further consideration.

No doubt most of you are familiar with the study of the operations of the Research and Marketing Act made last year by a study group headed by Mr. D. Howard Doane. This study was initiated by the House Committee on Agriculture through a subcommittee headed by Hon. Stephen Pace. The Doane group was composed of able and experienced men and its studies were thorough and conscientious. It had the complete and hearty cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture and other departmental officials, particularly Dr. Lambert and his associates. The committee wisely covered the whole field of agricultural research and developed some very interesting and helpful information. For instance, it found that there are on the books now some sixty separate acts of Congress which authorize appropriations for agricultural research.[7] The committee's report makes some excellent recommendations with respect to agricultural research generally, but it seems to me it fell down rather badly in attempting to deal with title II, never really agreeing on anything in that connection, although some members of the committee sized up the situation correctly and urged that an effort be made to carry out the real objectives and purposes of that title.[8]

I have spoken of the helpfulness of Dr. Cardon in connection with the Doane Committee's activities. One of the most helpful and illuminating statements which came out of the investigation was that made by Dr. Cardon on May 26, pursuant to a request by Subcommittee Chairman Pace.[9] In this statement Dr. Cardon put his finger squarely on the principal source of the confusion surrounding the administration of the Research and Marketing Act. Dr. Cardon stated that this confusion stemmed from two concepts, one being that the Research and Marketing Act had to be administered as an integral whole, the other being that the Research and Marketing Act program should be regarded as of a different character than the research, education, and service work previously carried out by the Department. I agree with Dr. Cardon that these concepts existed, and in my opinion, both were erroneous. I think I can give you the reason for these erroneous concepts. They stem from the fact that title II was never carried out as Congress intended it should be. I have already pointed out that title I and title II were entirely different types of legislation springing from an entirely different background and that their consolidation into one act was simply a marriage of convenience for the purpose of expediting consideration and enactment. There is no reason on earth why title I should not have been considered then and now as an extension of existing law, which it was, and administered along with other legislation relating to the same subject. Nor is there any reason why appropriations authorized under title I should not have been considered in connection with appropriations for previously existing research activities. I think it would have been so considered had there been no title II. And had title II been carried out as intended by Congress and a new agency set up as contemplated, the two bills would have had to be administered separately. Thus all the difficulties which have arisen over the administration of both titles could have been averted had the intent of Congress been carried out at to title II.

I hope I have not given the impression that nothing has been accomplished in the field of marketing research during the past 4 years. There is plenty in the record to belie any such conclusion. Considering the funds which have been available, much has been done, but it is only a fraction of what had been hoped for. No doubt more could have been done with larger appropriations, but a look at the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee from 1947 and thereafter indicates that there is little likelihood of larger appropriations unless something substantially like the original program is carried out. In this the Appropriations Committees are probably wise.[10] Likewise, it seems to me that under existing conditions it will be hard to impress the Bureau of the Budget with the importance of increased appropriations for this work.

If the program whereby all marketing activities in the Department were to be brought together had been carried out, it would have given such an impetus to marketing that there would have been some hope that it could attain the status of production in the Department's activities. Because marketing research ties in so closely with service and regulatory activities, such an arrangement would have made a greatly expanded research program possible. It would have enabled all those in the Department who work with marketing to give their undivided attention and energy to such program. That, it seems to me, is impossible as long as marketing activities are widely scattered, and in many cases, closely tied in with action programs like price supports, production adjustments, and buying and selling operations.

It is still my hope that eventually the advantages to be secured from the reorganization authority contained in title II will be so persuasive that some Secretary of Agriculture will use it. Until that is done, I see little opportunity for carrying out any program which will give marketing the same importance as production as far as Government activities are concerned.

[6] P. 9030, vol. 92, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[7] Appendixes G1, G2, G3, pp. 94–98, Hearings on Federal Agricultural Research, House Committee on Agriculture, 2d sess., 81st Cong., serial ZZ.

[8] Ibid., exhibit 2, pp. 62–69.

[9] Ibid., p. 51, also Report of Activities Under Research and Marketing Act, 1950, Agricultural Research Administration, p. 3.

[10] See pt. 1, Hearings on Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1948, especially p. 53 and pp. 206–239; also, hearings in subsequent years on appropriations for Research and Marketing Act.

Penalty on Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a column by the distinguished writer, Mark Sullivan. As he suggests, the whole American tradition of saving is being penalized by the special interests and the inflation that is going on. Thrift and free enterprise built our country up and thrift is being discouraged and much of our free enterprise is being taken over by the Government. We simply have to stop the present trend if we are to remain strong and free.

PENALTY ON SAVING

(By Mark Sullivan)

INFLATION AND SPECIAL INTERESTS

After the three labor members of the Wage Stabilization Board had resigned in protest against a ceiling proposed to be put upon wages; after the United Labor Policy Committee had protested threateningly against policies of Defense Mobilization Wilson generally; and after four high labor leaders had called on President Truman to express their protest—after these events accompanying controversy, a brief statement was given out by the President's press secretary. It read:

"The President • • • assured them that the administration was trying to work out the problem in a manner equitable for everyone without special privilege for any group."

"Without special privilege for any group" is familiar as a phrase though less so as a fact. What glaringly calls for attention just now, however, is a group which not only has no special privilege but even lacks a simple and fundamental right. This group is the savers, there are tens of millions of them, who have put their savings into life insurance, United States savings bonds, savings banks, and similar institutions. Between Government's treatment of these and its treatment of two other groups—labor and farmers—the contrast is an indictment of Government itself.

To labor the Wage Stabilization Board promises a ceiling higher than the present wage level and labor truculently demands still more. To farmers the Defense Production Act gives protection and immunity, it forbids the price stabilization agency to put a ceiling on any farm crop that is now selling below the parity price which the Department of Agriculture fixes; in effect farmers are given assurance of higher prices.

The sum of the condition is: For labor and farmers, more; for the savers, sacrifice. The nature of the sacrifice has been made familiar by experience. The saver puts a dollar into savings but when he gets it back later, 10 years in the case of United States savings bonds, for example, it is no longer a dollar in purchasing power. The dollar that he saved 10 years ago was, in effect, some 4 pounds of bacon. The dollar he gets back the present year is in effect less than 2 pounds of bacon. And so, with negligible variations, as to practically all forms of food, clothing, and manufactured goods.

This is the concrete picture of what goes by several names—reduction in purchasing power of the dollar, rise in cost of living, inflation. It was to stop this that the control agencies, now much in the public eye, were set up. While they have put ceilings on the prices of many goods, they have as to others encountered contention and complexity and have postponed the dates for imposing ceilings. One agency head has said that two important kinds of goods, clothing and food, will continue to rise for several months. Nevertheless the purpose of the control agencies continues and so apparently does their determination. We had all better hope they succeed and help them to.

The interest of the country as a whole in having inflation checked is second only to their concern about war. If indeed it is second at all, for one of the means by which Russian communism hopes to overcome us is through economic collapse of the kind that would result from inflation if it becomes extreme. And in this supreme national interest, if the people as a whole are to be looked upon as groups, the one group that should be the last to be called upon for sacrifice is the savers. They, more than any other detachable group, have paid the price of inflation. Over a period of 10 years they have seen every dollar of their savings fall in purchasing power to what was formerly 60 cents. During the brief priod of 8 months past they have seen the fall grow in quantity and momentum.

Again, if the people are to be looked upon as groups, two that are fair to be looked to for sacrifice are labor and farmers. So far as it is possible to separate temporary beneficiaries of an early stage of inflation from victims of it, labor and farmers have been beneficiaries. Within the past 6 years there have been five rounds of wage raises in industry. Within the same period agriculture as an industry has had the highest national income in history, and some of the increase has been due to a Government policy, price support of farm crops.

For protecting the savers against further sacrifice thorugh continuation of inflation and of reduction in the purchasing power of the dollar, the Government has a special reason. The Government needs to make large borrowings from the savers through sale of bonds to them, and the savers will lend with more readiness and satisfaction if they know it is a Government policy to stabilize the purchasing power of their saved dollars.

The Late Dan Clingaman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wauseon (Ohio) Republican for February 22, 1951:

CITIZENS PAY FINAL TRIBUTE TO LAST OHIO CIVIL WAR VET DAN CLINGAMAN

The beloved citizen and patriot, "Uncle" Dan Clingaman, died at the home of his daughter and husband, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Fauver, on East Oak Street, at dawn Sunday morning, February 18, after an illness of 3 weeks, at the age of 104 years 4 months and 23 days. He was the last Civil War veteran and the last member of the Grand Army of the Republic in Ohio. The citizens throughout the State join those of Fulton County in paying honor and respect to this, the last member of the Boys in Blue who from 1861 to 1865 preserved the Union.

Ohio gave 310,000 of her sons to the Union Army and of these about 2,000 were from Fulton County. Of this gallant army that helped save the Union, "Uncle" Dan was the last survivor.

HONORED AT NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT

"Uncle" Dan Clingaman was a charter member and a past commander of Losure Post 38, Grand Army of the Republic. He was loved and respected by his comrades and at one of the national encampments of the Grand Army of the Republic, when he was the lone survivor of the Civil War veterans in Fulton County, he was made an honored guest, the cost of transportation of himself and an attendant was paid to the encampment, as well as their entertainment.

When Gov. Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio, visited the Fulton County Fair some 3 or 4 years ago, he stopped at the home to pay honor to "Uncle" Dan, and this always remained a treasured and pleasant memory to Mr. Clingaman.

For many years Mr. Clingaman occupied an honored place in the parades of veterans of all the wars in which this country has been engaged. He attended every Memorial Day service held May 30 when his health or the weather would permit. He attended the services held in Wauseon, on the last Memorial Day.

At the homecomings and other occasions where the welfare of the community and loyalty was a part of the program, Mr. Clingaman had an honored place.

Daniel A. Clingaman was born near Melmore, Seneca County, on September 25, 1846. Six years later, his parents, by covered wagon, moved to a tract of wild land in German Township, near Burlington. His father died that fall. Here he worked on the farm and helped to clear the farm for cultivation and attended school during the winters until April 1865, when he answered the call for volunteers in the Union Army. He enlisted as a private in General Sheridan's army. His outfit was Company D of the One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry. He saw hard service in the campaign of the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. He served until the war ended and received an honorable discharge.

LOCATES IN TEDROW

Upon being mustered out, he opened a blacksmith shop at Tedrow which he operated for 15 years. Selling the shop, he purchased the farm which he owned at the time of his death, 1½ miles north of Wauseon and where he lived for more than 70 years.

Mr. Clingaman was a very successful farmer and was an active member of the Fulton County Agricultural Society for many years, serving as one of the directors of the board that managed the fair until he declined to serve longer on account of advancing years. His value to the society was recognized and he was elected an honorary member for life.

He united with the First Christian Church of Wauseon in 1880 and was a faithful attendant at Sunday school and worship services. At his advanced age only the condition of his health or the weather kept him away.

Mr. Clingaman frequently spoke of his early years on the farm when the forests had to be cleared away and the land drained and the team work done with oxen in order to produce a crop. As a fatherless boy he knew what hard work on the farm was and the trials that the pioneers of Fulton County endured.

WIFE DIED IN 1923

He was united in marriage to Miss Louisa Minnich, who died in 1923. Since then his daughter and son-in-law gave him devoted

love, care, and attention to add to his pleasures in life.

He is survived by his daughter, Mrs. Carl Fauver, and grandchildren, David Clingaman, Defiance; Daniel Clingaman, Springfield; John Clingaman, Wauseon; Charlotte Clingaman, Piqua; Mrs. Lowell Geringer, Wauseon; Mrs. Alfred Reighard, Delta; and Stanley Fauver, near Wauseon.

The Robinson-Gibbs Post, American Legion, conducted the services in the Penrod funeral home, Tuesday afternoon at 2 o'clock. His pastor, Rev. Ralph Richardson, assisted by Rev. John Osborne, pastor of the Church of God, officiating. Burial was in the Wauseon Cemetery.

Flags were flown at half mast during the day and all places of business were closed during the funeral hour.

A floral piece from the Department of Ohio, W. R. C., from Medina was received by the Clingaman family as well as a long distance call of condolence from the Civil War Veterans Association of Dayton. There are four Civil War Veterans left in the United States.

Address Before Future Farmers of America Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Future Farmers of America Federation at Spartanburg, S. C., February 22, 1951:

It is a pleasure to be here in Spartanburg with you this evening. I consider it a great privilege to address this splendid group of young men and their fathers.

I like the enthusiastic spirit with which the Future Farmers of America work to develop leadership, cooperation, citizenship, improved agriculture, and patriotism. You represent democracy in its truest sense—a vital force of teamwork among individuals with deep-rooted ideals, working incessantly for the common objective of human betterment. I have always been a firm believer in the underlying principles upon which the Future Farmers of America Federation was founded and feel that it has grown to be one of our great youth organizations.

Agriculture and the Nation as a whole needs leadership and I am confident that this leadership will emerge from among our young people as a result of the training received in our schools and through such organizations as the Future Farmers of America.

You farm boys of today are the citizens who will be supplying the food and other agricultural products for our country in just a few years. Many of you young men will, beyond a doubt, help determine agricultural policies in the future. The United States of America will be stronger because of the training you are receiving in the Future Farmers of America.

In these grave times agricultural productivity is a great source of national strength. But the role of agriculture in the present struggle for freedom in the world goes far beyond the ability to produce in abundance. Farming is more than just another industry; it is a way of life which we here in the United States must strive to preserve. Agriculture always has made and is still making more than material contributions to our economy and our national strength. Through the years since the founding of this Nation, people who owned their farms and tilled their soil have contributed a strong moral influence upon our national life. Such farmers are still a strong bulwark of democracy and a real safeguard against the inroads of communism in our own country. But we shall say more about this later.

This evening I would like to say a few words to you about three of our basic agricultural problems, for all of which you Future Farmers of America will be called upon to help find a solution. The first of these problems is that of raising the level of farm income. We have heard much about how this should be accomplished.

We in America are the best-fed and best-clothed people in the world. This did not just happen. Back of our abundant production are millions of farm people who have learned how to produce and live as no other people have ever done. These farmers have not been content with science in the laboratory. They have taken the results of the laboratory and applied them to their farms and in their homes. This has meant progress, and in times of trial a lifesaver, not only for themselves but for the Nation and the rest of the world.

And still while so much progress has been made in agriculture I don't need to remind you that the income per farm worker in many sectors of our agricultural economy is far too low. The question of how to raise this level of farm income is still before us. How can it be solved? Many of us today, I believe, are convinced that it cannot be done by raising prices of agricultural commodities alone. Much has been accomplished by Government price programs to give farmers equitable prices for their products, but we still find the average income per farm worker far below the average wage per industrial worker. For example, in 1949 the average income per farm worker was $1,587, while the average wage per industrial worker was $2,900. How may we raise the income per worker on our farms? It appears to me that this can be done only by increasing the productivity per worker on our farms through more efficient farming methods, more scientific farming, and farm mechanization.

Farm mechanization, on the other hand, raises another problem. How large must a farm be to justify the use of machinery? The answer to this question is a difficult one and will depend to a great extent on the scale of our farming operations, the kind of crops grown, whether it is a dairy farm or a cattle ranch or a diversified farm. One thing is certain, however, farms must be large enough to make it possible to use mechanized equipment efficiently. Mechanization is extremely important at this particular time when so many young people are needed in the Armed Forces and in our factories to produce the materials required for national defense.

This brings me to the problem of the family farm and a farm ownership. Our present family-farm system didn't happen by accident, it has been made possible by our Government's land policies. These policies were motivated to a very great extent by the philosophy of our founding fathers and early leaders that the freehold principle was essential to a strong democracy. Operator ownership of the family farms in the United States has long been one of the chief goals of agricultural policy. Numerous farm laws have been enacted toward that objective. It is true that many farms are still operated by tenant farmers, but the opportunity is now and must be always kept open for farmers to become farm owners if they choose to do so.

Statistics indicate that there has been a rapid gain in operator-ownership during the past decade, but there are developments which tend to make it more difficult for young men to get started in farming. The high cost of land, buildings, machinery, and livestock tend to limit rather than encourage expansion of the family farming tradition. We should therefore constantly strive to preserve the family farm concept and to make it possible for those who wish to farm, and who will do all in their power to farm efficiently, to eventually own their farms. What our farm policies will be in the years to come will depend a great deal upon you young men, the Future Farmers of America.

Finally, I wish to call your attention to the importance of abundant agricultural production in this present world emergency. You all remember the fine job done by the farmers of the United States during World War II and thus far in the postwar period. We were able to increase production during the war to supply the needs of the United States and our allies. During the early postwar years we produced sufficient quantities of food and fiber to aid a number of countries faced with shortages of agricultural commodities as a result of the war. Now we are confronted with another emergency. In the near future there will probably be shortages of some important agricultural products such as cotton, wool, grains, meats, and dairy products. Again we must stand ready to produce sufficient quantities of these foods and fibers, not only for this country but for our allies who are fighting with us in this great struggle to maintain peace and freedom for all peace-loving people throughout the world.

And now, my friends, I wish to congratulate you for continuing your education and preparing for your future occupation. I also feel that your parents should be highly commended for making it possible for you to attend school to become better citizens, better leaders, and more efficient farmers.

General Bradley's Address at Freedom Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by General of the Army Omar N. Bradley at the presentation of the Freedoms Foundation awards:

Here at Valley Forge, at the bleak, winter retreat of a defeated American Army, we have gathered to warm our hands and our hearts to a greater task—a global struggle for freedom's eternal survival.

I am convinced that we will win this struggle. In this righteous crusade we shall succeed. And all those nations joined with us in spirit and in action will remain alive and free.

That winter at Valley Forge was a battle without gunfire, a struggle without glory. Because of their suffering and their defeats, the American troops almost abandoned the cause. But their leader, General Washington, never lost faith.

Now there is little chance that the march toward freedom will ever falter. Too many generations have been sustained by the miracle of individual liberty; too many men have lived in freedom to abandon it without a fight.

The survival of freedom depends on the collective industrial and political power of the nations who have joined in this crusade. In this torn world the backbone of freedom takes its strength from the power we have to defend it.

The United States, and the freedom-loving nations of the world, have a greater industrial potential than our combined enemies. In the long run this industrial production and skill will assure our military supremacy if we need it.

Among the free nations we are attaining an international political understanding. The North Atlantic Treaty, as a first step, is a stronger combination than the compulsory league of Soviet satellites. In our individual nations we are stronger because each of us is free. In every satellite nation, where communism rules through the tyranny of a power-hungry minority, there exists a fundamental political weakness.

Morally and fundamentally, the free world has the undeniable power of a better idea. In our way of life no worship is denied, no abandonment of religion is required, no elections are counterfeited, no automatic "yes" is demanded.

WE NEED HUMILITY

The sum total of our strength in these broad areas will assure ultimate victory over communism. And for the moment, we are the trusted leaders of this crusade. But in order to win we must provide the kind of leadership that freemen can respect and support.

In this great responsibility we Americans need humility.

Many of us are caught in the illusion that we—of all the people in this world—are self-sufficient. Because of the supreme confidence we have in our strength, in our faith, and in ourselves, it is difficult to admit the need of help.

However, the American people, for all their strength and abundant charity, need guidance, courage and inspiration. In our American pride at being the arsenal of democracy, we must remember that we are also regarded as the arsenal of hope. Great leadership in such a righteous cause requires that a nation be humble—before its God and its fellowmen.

As we seek to protect the freedom which we hold in trust, we must provide more than material things. We must provide more than guns for soldiers, more than food for starving people, more than thoughts for hungry minds. We must show them our faith to bolster theirs.

We should realize that our Nation is distinguished in this world by the great quality of freedom which sets us apart. There are civilizations, religions, and ways of life much older than ours, which mark other countries and other people for special regard. Many of our precepts, and some of our modes of life, have been drawn from this background.

But it is this devotion to freedom that marks the American way of life. So long as the American people sustain this devotion, and cherish and protect and continue to earn the liberty which we hold so dear, this Nation will deserve a great place in the history of humanity.

Nature's resources, and our genius for development of them, were placed in this bright area of the world to be shared unselfishly in times of need. I believe that the American people will be endowed with the genius for development and invention only so long as their energies are devoted to the greater good. Realistically, we must acknowledge that the greater good for the world requires continued contribution of energy, faith, and cooperation from all peoples who hope to share the American abundance.

Frequently the cry is heard, "How can we go on giving and sharing indefinitely; won't we spread it all too thin and dissipate our strength?" We hope that friendly nations will some day become self-sufficient and independent of our aid. For the present, our assistance is needed to hasten their recovery. For the American people to falter or hesitate is unthinkable, for we are provided with ample strength upon which to draw.

A TRUISM IS CITED

We have friends—stanch, courageous, and worthy people who respect our leadership and join us in support of freedom.

We are provided with the strength of diversity which no regimented people can equal. When we apply the initiative and imagination of enterprising men to a difficult problem, we can count on a solution.

Divine providence gives us another, and greater, strength which has never surrendered to any threat or peril. This is the spiritual strength of our religious freedom—every man looking to his God, with faith and with prayer, for the guidance and the courage that human minds alone never quite provide.

There is an old truism that if something too big is given to someone too small to carry, either the load must be lightened or the carrier must grow big enough, strong enough, for the burden. There is little chance, as I read the avowed intentions of communism, that the load will be lightened soon, or that we may be able to shift it entirely to other shoulders. Since we now bear the burden, there is only one solution—we and our friends must become strong enough to carry it lightly, and with great endurance, and for a long time.

Our own confidence is essential to our leadership. We must maintain the basic quality of a right estimate of ourselves and our abilities. I believe it is this kind of humility which is required of a leader-nation in these times of peril. I would not have us think less of ourselves than we should.

I believe that we can take some inspiration in our present trouble from the words of a famous American, Thomas Paine, who wrote of our earlier crisis just before Washington's toops wintered here at Valley Forge:

"I have as little superstition in me as any man living, but my secret opinion has ever been, and still is, that God Almighty will not give up a people to military destruction, or leave them unsupportedly to perish, who have so earnestly and so repeatedly sought to avoid the calamities of war, by every decent method which wisdom could invent. Neither have I so much of the infidel in me, as to suppose that He has relinquished the government of the world and given us up to the care of devils."

In this assemblage today at Valley Forge we have tried to capture some of the spirit and humility so necessary to the task of preserving freedom. These awards presented by the Freedoms Foundation mark significant contributions to this great cause for which free men crusade.

A New "Uncontrollable" State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in New York, United Nations owns a piece of land and a towering skyscraper in which some 4,000 to 4,500 people are working.

All but a few of these people are citizens of other countries, although some 91 Communists or near-Communists are employed there by the United States, which is, as you know, a member of United Nations.

All of these people, being in some way diplomatic representatives of other governments, are immune from the laws and penalties which apply to you and me. Most of their salaries are tax exempt. Should one of them get drunk or violate a traffic regulation, he can, and ordinarily does, claim diplomatic immunity.

I have never been able to understand the policy which sanctions the residence and activities of these people—many of whom mean our Government no good here in America.

That we pay—to use the old expression—"through the nose," is indicated by the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of February 21, 1951:

DIVIDENDS FROM UN

In the first 5 years of its life the United Nations has succeeded in spending almost $857,000,000. Of this, the United States contributed four hundred and twenty-four million, almost half of the total. By June 30 UN outlays will approach $1,000,000,000, and of this sum the United States will have contributed five hundred and forty-three million.

Can any American explain what possible benefit the United States has received from a single dollar contributed to UN, let alone half a billion of them? We have been treated to a never-ending wrangle, to a wholly useless and costly war in Korea to the threat of another world war with unimaginable destruction, to military and economic regimentation in preparation for war, and to some half baked, wholly unrealistic, and dangerous excursions into social uplift on a global scale. The declaration of human rights and genocide convention are typical of these.

The facts and figures on UN have been the subject of study by a Senate subcommittee under the direction of Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, and the report of this group leaves no doubt that UN has degenerated into a racket. The only people who profit directly from its operations are the new class of global bureaucrats who draw tax-free salaries. Trygve Lie, the Secretary General, benefiting from 11 forms of allowance and 6 of benefits, draws $53,000 a year, free of tax. He may be worth $53,000 to himself, but to no one else.

The Senators speak of the vested interests that have been created in UN by international bureaucrats whose principal object is to keep every existing project going and to invent new ones constantly. Among these is a study of the effect of chewing coca leaves. Others proposed or in existence are world clinics for alcoholics, the improvement of obstetrical practice in China so that the ranks of the Chinese Red armies may be kept up to quota, a world compact to end divorce mills, a study of the social problems of South American aborigines, the standardization of map symbols, legal procedure for the issuance of death certificates of persons missing in war, an Asiatic flood-control program, and an investigation of the scientific basis of yogi.

This only suggests the fertility of bureaucratic resourcefulness in making work and finding devices to spend money. There are hundreds more of such boondoggles in the files.

There are almost 10,000 UN bureaucrats living largely off the American people. The old League of Nations was able to stagger to the grave with only a fraction of this horde of payrollers and at only a fraction of the

cost. With each passing year UN grows more grandiose in its pretensions and more futile in its effect.

The common-stock holders in the organization are supposed to be the citizens of the United States and of other governments. For them there are no dividends. The preferred-stock holders are presidents, premiers, and dictators, who regularly collect through the ability of UN to keep international tensions strung tight, so that there are always wars and threats of wars with which to keep the people cowed and quiescent so that they will submit to the constantly increasing exactions of the state upon their incomes and their very lives.

When are the people of the world going to get onto this gigantic fraud?

Idaho Legislature Memorializes Congress Regarding the Sending of Troops to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the people of Idaho are so resentful of sending troops to Europe without the approval of the Congress that they have importuned the members of their State legislature to memorialize the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary and expedient to prevent the sending of American troops to foreign lands by the President without first obtaining the consent of the Congress in the absence of a declaration of war. The resolution follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 3 (as amended)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of these United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session duly and regularly assembled, most respectfully present the following petition, resolution and memorial, to wit:

"Whereas the present world situation insofar as it affects the peace and welfare of these United States of America is at one of its most critical and uncertain stages; and

"Whereas the President of these United States of America contemplates sending greater numbers of our ground troops to foreign countries in order to protect said countries against invasion by aggressor nations; and

"Whereas we, your memorialists, believe that ground troops of the United States should not be sent to any foreign country for such purpose by the President of these United States, without first having obtained the advice and consent of the Congress of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of these United States to take such action as may be necessary and expedient to prevent the sending of the ground troops of these United States of America to foreign countries by the President of these United States without first obtaining the advice and consent of the Congress of these United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of these United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Idaho."

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 15th day of February 1951.

EDGAR H. DEAL,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 8th day of February 1951.

W. L. MILLS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 3 originated in the senate during the thirty-first session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

BRITT NEDAY,
Assistant Secretary of the Senate.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Is an Economic Monstrosity and Would Prove To Be a Wasteful Expenditure of Money, Manpower, and Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for over 50 years the St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been paraded before Congress, and during that time its construction has been urged by its advocates for practically every reason under the sun.

During the period of 25 years this Nation found itself engaged in two World Wars, and during that time we heard the argument that the St. Lawrence project was necessary if victory were to be achieved. Fortunately for the American people and the welfare of the Nation, Congress did not listen to such a specious argument and we concentrated on utilizing our manpower, money, and materials for increasing our standards of production so essential in meeting the needs of our national defense.

Today we find ourselves involved in another world crisis, and as usual the age-old statement is again being bandied about that our security rests in no small degree on construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

In fact, not only have the proponents of this boondoggling project attired it in the garb of national defense, but they have given it the "new look," or in everyday language, "something new has been added," by stating that it is needed to transport ore for several Midwest steel companies who are developing ore deposits in the Labrador-Quebec area, and who claim the seaway is needed to solve their transportation problem. In other words, the American taxpayers are being asked to subsidize these steel companies by providing the St. Lawrence seaway for their own selfish interests.

The far-reaching potentialities of atomic energy as a source of power have been carefully avoided by advocates of the St. Lawrence project despite the fact that they know rapid progress is being made in the field of atomic energy, and that there is the possibility that before the St. Lawrence seaway can be completed in the 5 or 7 years time required for its construction we may find that the development of atomic energy has revolutionized the power industry and rendered such a project as obsolete, useless, and a sheer waste of billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money.

There are many manifold reasons why the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is an economic monstrosity and should not be foisted upon the American taxpayers who are already overburdened by taxes that take about 35 cents out of every dollar they earn.

The following speech was delivered by me on February 21, 1951, over the American Broadcasting Co. network and should be of interest to every American citizen because it sounds a warning of the evil effects that would befall this Nation, its commerce, and its industries if the St. Lawrence project should be constructed.

The address is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am opposed to the St. Lawrence project because I represent thousands of coal miners and railroaders in the great State of Pennsylvania whose jobs will be seriously menaced by the proposed international ditch. The people of Pennsylvania are not selfish; hence I am not going to spend the time allotted to me in describing the devastating effect that the St. Lawrence project will have on the State of Pennsylvania. Instead, it is my purpose to discuss the effect that the proposed St. Lawrence project will have on the economic life of the entire United States.

In the interest of clarity of thought, let us remember that the proposed St. Lawrence project is divided into two component parts—first, as a seaway which contemplates the establishment of a 27-foot channel from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to Duluth, Minn., a distance of 1,677 miles. While utilization of existing facilities will lessen the construction work in some of the area, the greatest and most costly portion of the work remains to be done. This will necessitate the construction of a series of channels, canals, and large dams.

The second part of the St. Lawrence project involves the construction of a large hydroelectric power dam estimated to produce for the American side, 570,000 kilowatt-hours of firm electric current. The cost of the dam will be paid for by the American taxpayers.

In this connection, when you consider the progress being made in the field of atomic energy and the billions of dollars being spent in developing its use in the generation of power, it is readily apparent that the 7 years required to complete the St. Lawrence seaway might well find that atomic energy has revolutionized the power industry and the billions spent on the St. Lawrence seaway power project would be a sheer waste of the American taxpayer's money.

When you view the project in two parts, namely, as a seaway and power project, the natural question arises, What is the total cost? Those in favor of such a project are ultra conservatives in arriving at a cost figure, while those opposed to the project are unable to accept the modest cost claims of the advocates of the St. Lawrence project. On the other hand, 10 years ago leading and reliable industrial engineers in Canada and

the United States placed the cost in excess of $1,000,000,000, some contending that $1,350,000,000 is a sensible and sane estimate.

That these industrial engineers are proceeding on a sound basis is very evident when we recall the estimates that were given for the construction of the Panama Canal. The original estimate of $160,000,000 was absurd when the final cost was revealed as $375,000,000. Then, too, the Suez Canal was estimated at $30,000,000, but when completed the total cost was $80,000,000.

It must also be borne in mind that production costs are now at a high point, and since we are again in a period of war emergency further increases are very likely.

Aside from the great cost of this proposed project, let us keep in mind that we are being asked to construct this project at a time when the American people are faced with the necessity of building an adequate national defense against the threat of world communism that has engulfed us in war in Korea—a war that many regard as the stepping-stone to world war III. Why should we be asked at this critical period in world history to divert our manpower, materials, and financial resources to a project that cannot possibly be completed before 1956 or 1958, and when completed the seaway portion will be frozen over 5 months of each year? We have fought two World Wars in a space of 25 years and we did not need the St. Lawrence seaway to achieve victory. In fact, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Mobilization said in a recent speech, "The development of the St. Lawrence would take a long time. There are much more pressing problems if we are to win the war of production."

In addition, only 15 percent of the population of the United States will benefit from the St. Lawrence project, with the remaining 85 percent of American citizens being called upon to pay their share of the cost of construction, estimated to exceed $1,000,000,000.

In estimating the cost of construction, there has been little said concerning the cost of defending the St. Lawrence project. Military experts, however, are of the opinion that it will require over $1,000,000,000 to erect the necessary defenses at strategic locations along the 1,677-mile front. In addition, the maintenance cost of these defense posts cannot be ignored. For the maintenance cost of the channel and locks alone, more than $20,000,000 will be expended annually for the seaway part of the project.

When we consider the cost of construction estimated to exceed $1,000,000,000 and add another $1,000,000,000 for the erection of defense posts requiring additional millions for maintenance costs, we can readily see that this proposed St. Lawrence project is destined to cost us billions of dollars. I am sure you will agree that this is a tidy sum of money to saddle on the already overburdened taxpayers of America, who are now paying the tax collector 35 cents out of every $1 they earn.

For a moment, let us dwell on the effect the St. Lawrence seaway will have on the American market and transportation facilities. Upon completion, the St. Lawrence project will open the Great Lakes to world shipping and within a few months you will have dirty, cheap, ill-manned foreign tramp steamers flying foreign flags dumping their cargoes at Great Lakes ports instead of on the Atlantic seaboard, as is being done at the present time. These foreign vessels do not meet the standards of American shipping—in wages, living or sanitary conditions. As a result, it costs $500 a day more to operate an American vessel as compared to the cost of operating a foreign tramp steamer. The average wage paid foreign seamen is about half of the amount paid our American seamen. In addition the foreign vessels or their crews pay no taxes. On the other hand, American shipping interests pay large taxes, only to see such revenue applied to building a project that is establishing ruinous competition and threatening to sabotage American shipping and the American market.

We have spent over $19,000,000,000 developing our merchant marine, in which we take great pride. Yet, because of the size of American-flag ships and the fact they are being built larger, only about 9 percent of our merchant ships could use the proposed seaway, while a greater number of larger foreign vessels than are now using the 14-foot waterway will be able to use the new seaway.

Industries in the Great Lakes area should realize that if this St. Lawrence seaway is completed their fields, mines, factories, and forests will be brought into direct competition with the slave type of labor that prevails in foreign countries.

These foreign tramp steamers in addition to disrupting the American market will deal a death blow to the transportation facilities of our Nation, and to the anthracite and bituminous coal industry.

At the present time American railroads employ more than a million American citizens, and long trains carry millions of tons of freight to and from seaboard ports. It is estimated that American railroads will suffer an annual loss in freight revenue from $100,000,000 to $250,000,000 should the St. Lawrence seaway become a reality. These foreign tramp steamers will deprive the railroads of this freight traffic and the devastating effect is more fully realized since every thousand tons of freight lost to the American railroads means the elimination of one freight train. When you remove freight trains you destroy the jobs of railroaders. Thus we have foreign seamen on these dirty tramp steamers benefiting at the expense of the American railroad employees.

Nor can we ignore the ill effects of the St. Lawrence project on the coal industry of the United States. We must not forget that these tramp steamers coming into the Great Lakes region with cargoes of foreign coal will create a greater import market for subsidized and tariff-preferred coal of Great Britain, Nova Scotia, and Russia. This foreign coal, produced by cheap labor and transported at distress rates, will displace American coal produced at American mines under American working conditions. This would be in addition to the competition of crude and fuel oil produced from foreign sources under the same conditions.

The power part of the St. Lawrence project will produce hydroelectric power which will displace both in Canada and the United States the use of American-mined coal. And let us keep in mind that while this hydroelectric power may appear cheap, it, too, is subsidized by the American taxpayer.

Taking the importation of foreign-mined coal, and crude and fuel oil, together with the coal displaced by the power part of the St. Lawrence project, you will have destroyed a 35,000,000-ton American coal market. For every million tons of coal displaced we must keep in mind 1,000,000 man-days are lost to good American citizens in the mining and transportation industries.

The St. Lawrence project is nothing new. For the past 50 years it has been talked of at different intervals, only to be shunted aside as impractical and unsound. Now that we are engaged again in a gigantic effort to build an adequate national defense, advocates of this economic monstrosity have garbed it in the armor of national defense and present it to the American people, hopeful that patriotic fervor will cause the Nation to accept it lock, stock, and barrel.

In addition, the St. Lawrence seaway has been given the "new look" in the sudden interest taken in it by several small Midwest steel companies who are developing ore deposits in the Labrador-Quebec area and who claim the seaway is needed to transport their ore to their respective plants. I submit that these midwestern steel companies should solve their problem of transportation themselves and not expect the American taxpayers to subsidize them by providing the St. Lawrence seaway for their own selfish interests.

Surely you good people in the State of Minnesota are not going to accept a project that will permit iron ore to be dumped on the American market at a cheaper price and in competition with the ore from the great Minnesota iron range; you good people in Michigan and Wisconsin are not content to see your great agricultural market destroyed by foreign competition and the wages of labor seriously menaced; you good people of the great Mississippi Valley should not be expected by your Government to see your great import and export market destroyed by foreign vessels plying our inland waters.

We who live in the industrial States and on the seaboard are not being fooled by parading an old political pet—the St. Lawrence seaway—in the garb of national defense. Nor are we fooled by the efforts of the great State of New York, through political affiliations, to secure a power project benefiting mostly a small section of the State of New York.

In joining us in defeating this political and economic monstrosity—the St. Lawrence project—you are enlisting in a cause that will repel an invasion of the rights of the American workingman and contribute to the general welfare of every American citizen. Yes, you will be giving voice to the sentiments that should be inscribed on every heart—let us preserve the home and the job of every American workingman.

A Real Peace Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, in its lead editorial of Tuesday, February 20, suggests a basis for a program which if the Soviet Union agreed could really give the world the "long peace." To this seven-point program I would add two additional points making nine points in all, as follows: (8) Agreement on the majority UN plan for inspection and control of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction; and (9) cooperation on broad-scale technical assistance and stimulation of requisite investment in undeveloped and underdeveloped areas to raise standards of living and materially improve conditions of health and education. The editorial follows:

AGENDA FOR THE BIG FOUR

Despite Premier Stalin's latest blast against the West, the United States, Britain, and France have proposed to Moscow a March 5 meeting of their deputies in Paris to work out a program for a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the four powers. The new western notes represent the sixth diplomatic exchange on the project of such a conference, launched by the Soviets last November. They reply particularly to the Soviet note of February 5, which appeared to accept the western demand for extending the discussions to all problems causing present world-wide tensions, but which did so in such a conditional form as to leave Moscow's final meaning obscure. However, rather than engage in further exchanges, the western powers have followed the French

suggestion of leaving the clarification of these obscurities to the deputies. Their latest communication is phrased in such a manner as to require only a Soviet "Yes" to get the preliminary meeting under way.

If a new four-power conference is to accomplish anything worth while it must show a willingness to get down to business on the actual issues now agitating the world. These issues hinge not so much on German rearmament, however much the Soviets may wish to keep that question in the foreground, as on the whole problem of Soviet imperialism, as manifested in various aggressive actions since the war, and on the urgent need for western self-defense. These actions are best summarized in the latest British note relating to the Soviet-British pact, and the points made in that note should form the basis for the agenda of any four-power conference to which the western democracies can agree.

These points, and the western position regarding them, are and should be:

1. The imbalance between the vast Soviet armies and the western defensive forces, present or proposed—an imbalance which can be cured only by establishing a balance of power which will reassure the world.

2. Soviet subjugation and rearmament of Eastern Europe in violation of all wartime agreements and the peace treaties—a threatening situation which can be corrected only by the restoration of national and individual liberties.

3. Cessation of Soviet attempts to conquer nations by subversion, infiltration, coups d'état, and "civil wars," as in Czechoslovakia, Greece, and Korea—a situation which calls for dissolution of the Cominform.

4. For Austria a treaty of independence—which entails the withdrawal from Eastern Europe of Soviet forces now supposed to be guarding Soviet communications to that country.

5. For Germany, unification—which involves the determination of borders now legally fixed as of December 31, 1937; the restoration of personal and political liberties in the Soviet zone, as decreed in the Potsdam agreement; restoration of German sovereignty and a peace treaty with an all-German Government, as provided in the Potsdam agreement; and finally, assurance of German security by the dissolution of the budding German Red army in the Soviet zone and the establishment of adequate German security forces within a European framework.

6. Cessation of Soviet sabotage of the United Nations and sincere participation in its work, including Soviet support for collective security and cessation of Soviet aid to aggressors.

7. Finally, lifting of the iron curtain.

Such a settlement is not likely to provoke enthusiasm in Moscow, but would be a settlement in keeping with all wartime agreements, beginning with the Atlantic Charter, and a settlement that would restore real peace. Until some such settlement is achieved the western powers must beware of dictators talking peace while preparing for war.

Increase in Cost of Living Brings Additional Worry for American Pensioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, no group of Americans is suffering more from the high cost of living than those who have to rely on pension checks. Sylvia Porter in her column in the February 6, 1951, issue of the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times tells the truth about the predicament of our elderly citizens in their battle with the high cost of living.

Miss Porter's article follows:

INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING BRINGS ADDITIONAL WORRY FOR AMERICAN PENSIONERS

(By Sylvia Porter)

In 1938, the cost of providing an elderly couple with a decent, healthy standard of living was $70 a month.

Today, that same budget—allowing few, if any, of the small luxuries of living—demands $115 and $120.

Most elderly folks, dependent on pensions and living in decidedly moderate circumstances, simply cannot obtain that extra $45 to $60.

Thus, somehow, some way, they now must struggle along with only three-fifths of the goods and services considered necessities by the most objective nutrition experts.

And if they are to live above the subsistence level—are to have a few things beyond their absolutely minimum physical needs—their monthly budget today runs to $150.

Again, most elderly couples, relying on pension checks and either too bewildered or too feeble to get outside jobs find this even more impossible of attainment.

Thus, to them, luxuries are just a dream. Subsistence is their way of life.

And the pensions that just a short while ago they thought would give them comfort in their older years are a cruel mockery.

This dramatic illustration of what inflation is doing to the millions of pensioners in our land was outlined to me this week by Laurence D. De Trude of the National Industrial Conference Board.

What is particularly painful about the figures is that they emphasize that this is happening to our older folks—to our fathers and our mothers who worked a lifetime, scrimped and saved in the expectation of enjoying independent, proud later years.

And what is particularly pertinent about this story now is that it shouts a deeply vital message and warning to those groups who insist on fighting for greater and greater financial security—and yet, who are ignoring what inflation is doing to that security.

Pensions and (pay checks) in terms of dollars mean little in periods of this sort.

The benefits make sense only when translated into terms of food, clothing, shelter—what the money will buy in the market place.

The food that cost $1 in January 1939 now costs $2.15.

The clothing that cost $1 then now costs $1.49.

The housing that cost $1 then now costs $1.16.

And on the same $1 comparison, house furnishings cost $1.63.

Fuel, gas, and electricity cost $1.33.

Sundries cost $1.59.

The cost of food and shelter alone is now as great as the total budget for an elderly couple before World War II—leaving nothing, just nothing, for all the rest.

And as De Trude added, "the farther down the scale of living you go, the more disastrous the inflationary effect has been. As funds diminish, an increasing percentage of income is spent on food.

"The cost of foods commonly consumed by elderly couples has increased much more than the average for all items over the past 10 years, cutting in half the purchasing power of those living on smaller incomes."

Instead of being laggards or indifferent followers in the battle to stabilize the dollar's buying power, all those with pension arrangements, with private retirement income policies, with special corporation retirement deals, should be far in the lead.

Otherwise their benefits won't mean much when they get around to collecting them.

There can be no financial security to all unless we stop this insane cost-of-living spiral. Just glance back at the few figures in this report if you still wonder why.

Cotton Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., on Wednesday, February 21, 1951:

COTTON COMMENT—COST OF COTTON IN MAN'S SHIRT INCREASED 10 CENTS FROM 1948 TO 1950, BUT THE COST OF THE SHIRT GAINED $1.16 IN SAME PERIOD—DISALLE HAS SOLUTION

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

If Price Stabilizer DiSalle means what he says in his price-control edicts—that wholesale, retail, and other price margins will be held to the same dollars and cents level and not allowed to fluctuate on a percentage basis—the price of raw cotton will have little, if any, effect on the selling price of the finished product.

If, however, he allows the spinner, the weaver, the finisher, the converter, the jobber, the wholesaler, and the retailer to maintain percentage markups—that may be another story.

It may surprise some people to learn that cotton goods have only a small place in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index. Cotton's place in the total is only 2.3 percent. So, if the price of cotton products advanced 100 percent, it would have only a minor effect on the over-all index.

Men's business shirts of the type which sold for $3.65 last December have a weight of only three-tenths percent in the over-all index, but there are other figures of more interest than that.

It takes three-quarters of a pound of raw cotton to make a shirt of this type. This allows for the waste in spinning, weaving, and in cutting the shirt. This information is supported by statistics from the War Production Board, the Civilian Production Administration, trade associations, and private manufacturers.

Believe it or not, the cost of raw cotton is only 8 percent of the retail price.

This cotton shirt, which required three-quarters of a pound of middling 1 1/16-inch white cotton in 1946 still requires the same amount of cotton. The price of such cotton on January 3, 1946, was 27.20 cents a pound and the price of the cotton in the shirt was 20 cents. The shirt retailed at $2.49, which made the cost of cotton in the shirt a mere 20 cents.

The same shirt in December 1950 sold for $3.65, which reflects a price of 39 cents a pound for raw cotton or slightly more than 29 cents for the cotton in the shirt.

While the cotton in the shirt has increased by less than 10 cents a pound, the retail price of the shirt has increased $1.16.

This $1.16 represents increased labor costs, the maintenance of percentage of cost markups from the spinner to the retailer.

It works this way. The cost of raw cotton increased 10 cents in the shirt, but the retailers' mark-up, assuming that it was 40 percent of the selling price, was 99 cents on the shirt that sold for $2.49, and $1.46 on the same shirt at $3.65. Other percentage mark-ups on the original cotton cost, plus mark-up on the labor and transportation costs, account for the boost of price from $2.49 to $3.65.

If Mr. DiSalle can eliminate this percentage mark-up, and hold the margins of the handlers of finished cottons to a flat figure per unit, he will have accomplished much more savings for the consumer than any ceilings that he could place on raw cotton.

Those who believe he can or will do it should be able to hold their discussion sessions in any convenient phone booth.

Here's One Way To Eliminate Government Nonessentials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks today and the introduction of a bill to reconstitute the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, I include an editorial from the Rochester Times-Union of February 13, 1951.

The editorial follows:

HERE'S ONE WAY TO ELIMINATE GOVERNMENT NONESSENTIALS

The Federal Government has long lists of specific commodities which it classifies as strategic and nonstrategic. It uses them to control exports.

It has lists of specific types of construction that are essential and nonessential. It uses these to allocate scarce commodities.

But there is no master list of functions of government itself which are essential to the defense effort and those which are nonessential.

The administration goes to great lengths, and quickly, to draw up such lists and use them when it is determined to regulate somebody else. But it consistently refuses to do a job of regulating itself.

Therefore it is time to call back the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government to do the other half of its original job.

When the Hoover Commission was set up in 1947 it was instructed not only to recommend means of making government more efficient and economical but also to make recommendations for eliminating unnecessary Govenrment functions, services, and activities.

Congress realized even then that only by turning off some of the taps could real economies be made. That necessity is even more obvious today with the Federal budget at $71,600,000,000.

But because the Commission membership was equally divided between Democrats and Republicans, the reelection of Mr. Truman in 1948 on a "gimme" platform tipped the scales in favor of overlooking this half of the Commission's instructions.

The Commission decided that if it got anywhere at all it would have to confine itself to trying to get done efficiently all the things that Government was attempting to do.

As a result, the Commission's reports make practically no recommendations for eliminating nonessential services.

Just this is a necessary preliminary now to holding the Federal budget within limits that can be borne. Whatever the reasons for being wary of this task in 1947 and 1948, they have vanished now.

Lopping off nonessential tax-eating activities is the joint responsibility of Congress and the President. But it never gets done. Having once embarked on an activity there is no test for its continued usefulness.

The Hoover Commission has a vast background of material it gathered in its original investigations. Its members know better than any other group of men where tax money goes.

We suggest that Congress call it back, renew the second half of its instructions in 1947 and give it, say 6 weeks, to make up a list of activities essential to defense and the Nation's financial integrity, and those that can be dispensed with.

Then dump the nonessential ones as quickly and finally as an NPA order dumps other nonessentials.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose a resolution which was passed and adopted at the regular promenade of La Societe Des 40 Hommes et Chevaux, Voiture No. 290, February 13, 1951. Voyageur militair, Clyde Trammell, was authorized to prepare this resolution and sign the same as a committee of one representing Voiture Locale, No. 290.

"Whereas our hearts are sorely troubled because of the present wars and rumors of wars and fears and expectancies in addition to the actual reports of casualties from our war effort; and

"Whereas the basic cause of such conflict and rumors of more conflicts is freedom and liberty against communism; and

"Whereas communism has a great appeal to the mind of man, whose life is filled with trouble and burdens almost unbearable, because it is a form of mental and religious ideology, twisting the fact that, from the earth we came and to dust we shall return, the state is therefore God; and

"Whereas such communistic weaklings are taught to sabotage our American way of life by creating dissension, disunity, even to the extent of overthrowing our form of government by force; and

"Whereas our Government bends backward under our constitutional rights and immunities in the handling of such traitors, otherwise known as Communists, to the end that it seems justice and freedom and liberty, under our Constitution, is preserved to those who should not be entitled to that protection; and

"Whereas the facts of Government and of life lead us to know that an agreement with communistic Russia, or China, or any other communistic government is not worthy of trust or confidence because honor and an oath and belief in God are unknown to them: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by Voiture No. 290 of the Honor Society of the American Legion, known as the 40 and 8, as follows:

"1. That this Government first protect its own form of liberty and preserve its own life before it so strenuously protects and preserves the life and liberty of convicted outlaws in America, it being earnestly suggested that it is better to deprive some dishonorable American citizens of such protection than to have them destroy this Government.

"2. That this Government do something about it now, to limit the activities of the known Communists, to prevent further sabotage and unpatriotic actions on their part, either through limitations of travel or limitations of immigration or sanctions, even to the extent of breaking off relations with communistic countries.

"3. That this country use such force as may be necessary to stop forever the war of liberty and freedom versus communism, even to the extent of scorching all Russian soil with the atom bomb, if such action be deemed necessary, in order to save the youth of our land, now dying on the field of battle, and may America be forever preserved as the 'land of the free and the home of the brave' against all enemies within and without our borders; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, and to our Senators and Congressmen, Washington, D. C.; and to the Governor of Florida, the attorney general, secretary of state, and president of the Senate and speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida; and the grand chef de Gare, Norman E. Hagen, 1117 Inwood Terrace, Jacksonville, Fla., urging such action and recommendations by them as they may deem advisable."

This resolution was passed and adopted at the regular promenade of La Societé Des 40 Hommes et Chevaux, Voiture No. 290, February 13, 1951. Voyageur militair, Clyde Trammell, was authorized to prepare this resolution and sign the same as a committee of one representing Voiture Locale, No. 290.

CLYDE TRAMMELL.

Federal Payrolls Soar and Waste Mounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a survey by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce reveals that 1,000 new civilian employees are being added to the Federal payroll each day. This rate of increase began June 30, 1950—after President Truman decided to send troops to Korea. The survey further shows that there are now 2,181,000 Federal payrollers and that an estimated 500,000 will be added by the end of the current fiscal year.

This wild hiring of Federal payrollers is adequate proof that the Hoover Commission should be revived, as provided for in a resolution which I introduced in the House today. Other convincing reasons why my resolution should be adopted are contained in an editorial which appeared in the Detroit Free Press Sunday, February 25. Permission has been granted me to extend that editorial, which follows:

FEDERAL PAYROLLS SOAR; WASTE MOUNTS

President Truman, in his manpower mobilization directive, urged all employers, both

private and in Government, to eliminate overmanning and overstaffing.

His argument runs that conservation of our human resources is of vital importance in any prolonged effort to keep the strength of the United States at a high level."

Without questioning the soundness of the President's advice, we rise to inquire why the Federal Government doesn't set the example for the rest of the country by putting its own house in order.

According to the research department of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, since last June 30 our Government at Washington has been adding new civilian employees at the rate of more than 1,000 per day.

The total number of such employees now exceeds 2,181,000, with the prospect that another 500,000 will be added by the end of the next fiscal year.

If we grant that expansion of the Military Establishment means additional civilian employees as well, is there any good reason why overstaffing and duplication of effort should not be eliminated in other agencies of Government?

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reported recently that executive agencies "could do a better job with fewer employees * * * improved labor-saving techniques have not been placed in general practice * * * some of the key budget officers confide they would welcome the opportunity to reduce budget requirements * * * instead they are obliged to bolster justifications for increased appropriation requests * * * this kind of frustration was observed in all of the agencies surveyed."

This sorry state of affairs is a sad commentary on the lack of efficiency in a Federal Government whose leaders tell us, the rest of the country, how to "conserve our human resources."

The committee found a shocking waste of man-hours in the personnel management functions of the departments and agencies under study. Although the Budget Bureau has fixed a standard or optimum ratio of 1 personnel employee to every 103 persons employed and the Hoover Commission suggested a ratio of 1 to every 130 workers, the committee discovered that:

The Federal Security Agency has 1 personnel employee for every 69 persons on its payroll; the Bureau of the Mint 1 for every 59; the Southwestern Power Administration 1 for every 28; the Bureau of Reclamation 1 for every 83, and the General Counsel's office in the Treasury Department 1 for every 44.

In Government purchasing, 40 percent of the 44,261 purchase orders issued in the Treasury Department were for less than $20 each. Yet the average cost of processing these orders was a sizable $7.06 per order.

In the Bureau of the Mint, the average cost was $13.96, and in the Coast Guard it was $23.94. The Office of Education spent $10,293, or 33 percent, in overhead for $31,148 worth of goods and supplies.

Purchase orders in the Department of the Interior averaged $9.95 each, including a 50-cent order for the August 1950 issue of Esquire, requested by the Director of the National Park Service.

The committee found that the average daily work load of the 425 purchasing employees of four agencies was only two orders a day. In the Interior Department, it was only 1.4 orders per worker a day.

According to the council of State Chambers of Commerce, in one agency, the Southwestern Power Administration, "purchase orders were found to be whizzing through at a rate of seven-tenths of one order per worker per day."

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has repeatedly directed attention to the overly generous vacation and sick leave privileges given Federal employees.

A study of 48,000 employees in four departments revealed an average off-duty record of seven workweeks per year.

In three old-line nonmilitary agencies, Treasury Department personnel soared from 56,143 in January 1940, to 89,298 in June 1950; Interior Department from 45,690 to 60,144, and in the Federal Security Agency, from 20,780 to 31,642.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs had 13,565 employees on its payroll last June 30, or an average of one bureaucrat to every 30 Indians in the United States.

In such a small agency as the Prices and Cost of Living Division of the Department of Labor, there are five branches subdivided into 10 sections. One of these, the Statistical Services Section, is in turn broken down into three units, six subunits and 17 supervisory units.

The Federal Supply Service of the General Services Administration is divided into 4 branches, 17 sections, 27 units, 24 subunits, 13 groups, and 1 inquiry office.

How this burgeoning bureaucracy comes into being is explained by the committee's survey:

"Generally, the over-all job of an agency is broken down into such minute segments that it is difficult to determine the precise division of responsibility assigned to each part. When this condition remains unchecked, duplication and overlapping increases. The positions take on a high degree of specialization. As the size of a division increases, the director will request a personnel officer, an administrative and office services officer to look after division files, mail, mimeographing, and sundry duties.

"If a division's responsibilities can be made to assume the appearance and stature of a program the division director will ultimately obtain his own budget and accounting assistants. In time, the division may be raised to bureau of service status. Then it will be divided into several subsidiary divisions and the same process will begin again. It is a vicious circle that breeds waste and inefficiency. It is a prime cause of overstaffing."

Who pays for this outrageous waste of public money?

No one but you, the weary taxpayer who is being constantly exhorted to conserve your resources, fight inflation and buy Government bonds.

An even more insidious development was reported last week by Paul Leach, chief of the Free Press Washington Bureau.

Leach says the American people are supporting 45,000 Federal employees who are engaged directly or indirectly, full or part time, in dispensing information, publicity, and propaganda.

The Hoover Commission called much of this activity thought control.

The facts show that many of these 45,000 are used to further administration ideas, stir up pressure groups to influence legislation, and condition the American mind to ready acceptance of the Truman program.

The State Department alone employs at home and abroad 5,029 persons in publicity work, at a total salary cost of $14,015,670.

ECA has a total working budget for salaries, radio, publication, movies, and still pictures of over $17,000,000.

But as Correspondent William Stoneman writes from Paris: "Here, in Europe, at least, there is no evidence that any of the barbed stories written on this subject ever has resulted in the firing of a single useless employee, the reduction of a single inflated budget, or the trimming of a single bloated allowance."

Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, said last Tuesday that plans are now in the making to swell the education and information staff of the Voice of America to 13,000 persons, an increase of 45 percent over the number now employed by that activity.

"The presently contemplated 13,000-man operating force will be larger than the combined full-time staffs of the Associated Press, the National Broadcasting Co., and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer," BENTON told the Senate.

Senator BENTON, who once directed the Voice as Assistant Secretary of State, now feels that his baby has grown too large to be part of the State Department and is urging the creation of a separate Government nursery for its care and development.

Summed up, the administration at Washington wants you and me to accept austerity thinking, lower living standards, and higher taxes without complaint.

But there are no indications that the President intends to give up his $50,000 tax-free allowance, or that the merry bureaucrats have any funny notions about cutting expenses.

Big government is riding high, wide, and handsome, but you're being taken for the ride.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Resolution of Disabled Veterans of Honolulu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, worthy of preservation is the communication and resolution by the Disabled American Veterans of the Oahu County Council of Honolulu, T. H. It is an indication that the veterans who gave most for their country are determined that the press shall remain free and uncontrolled:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, *February 12, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Because of your perfect House voting record, and hence, we feel that you must be a good friend of D. P., we want you to have a copy of our recently passed "Keep Drew Pearson on the air" resolution, enclosed herewith.

We are sending more than 60 of these resolutions to that many mainland dailies.

With kindest regards and every good wish,
Sincerely,

JOE CAPSIN.

(Committees on good government, publicity, and rehabilitation, DAV Oahu County Council, Honolulu.)

RESOLUTION BY DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, OAHU CHAPTER NO. 1, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Whereas Mr. Drew Pearson, well-known columnist and commentator, is believed by the members of this chapter to be a loyal American imbued with the most exemplary ideals of citizenship; and

Whereas a notorious attempt has recently been made to still his voice by a threatened boycott of the product of the present sponsor of his new commentary; and

Whereas this chapter is convinced that the courageous and factual reporting of Mr. Pearson during the last two decades has saved our taxpayers millions of dollars; and

Whereas with Drew Pearson off the air small farmers, small-business men, war veterans, rank-and-file laborers, and small professional people who are a part of his thirty million or more audience would be deprived of facts concerning what goes on in the

National Capitol and throughout the Nation; and

Whereas Mr. Pearson in his fearless reporting has always been in the forefront of the honorable members of his profession who have taken the lead in exposing Communists, Fascists, Ku Klux Klanners, and other subversives and vigilante groups; and

Whereas at this serious moment of crisis in our national affairs, this chapter believes in accordance with the guaranties of the first amendment that not only the voice but also the pen of Drew Pearson and of all our great journalists should be freely available to the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oahu Chapter No. 1, Territory of Hawaii, Disabled American Veterans, hereby records in unanimity its recommendation that Mr. Drew Pearson, in recognition of his forthright, courageous, objective, and factual reporting, not be taken off the air; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution requesting support of this endorsement be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, President of the United States: Alben W. Barkley, Vice President of the United States; Tom Connally, United States Senator; Joseph R. Farrington, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; national commander, DAV; Adam Hats, Bell Syndicate, and the Weintraub Advertising Agency.

Certified, a true copy of resolution adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Oahu Chapter No. 1, Territory of Hawaii, at a regular meeting of the chapter of administration held in Honolulu, Hawaii, January 13, 1951.

PHILIP P. MINN,
Commander, Oahu Chapter No. 1, Territory of Hawaii, Disabled American Veterans.

Hon. Basil O'Connor, of New York, Sees Key to Peace in Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the RECORD an article concerning some of the views expressed February 11, 1947, by a great American, Hon. Basil O'Connor:

O'CONNOR SEES KEY TO PEACE IN HEALTH

(By L. A. Chapin)

Basil O'Connor, of New York City, Chairman of the American Red Cross, former law partner of the late President Roosevelt, and one of the busiest men in the country has an idea which has been growing on him for more than a year.

He believes it may hold the key to world peace, the solution of all economic problems for the next 100 years and the problem of making all countries democratic and resistant to the forces of totalitarianism.

While in Denver Monday on a Red Cross trip, O'Connor took the time from a round of heavy duties to explain his idea. It is so simple that at first the listener doesn't catch its full significance and when he does, he begins to wonder why no one ever thought of it—at least in the same way—before.

"What is the thing the world needs most, or, to put it another way, of what does the world have the least?" O'Connor began by asking. He then supplied his own answer. "It is health," he said.

"By health, I don't mean perfect health but a degree of health. I mean health in a broad sense—proper food, proper clothing, proper housing, proper sanitation, and a degree of cleanliness."

KEY TO DICTATORSHIP

"Look at parts of our own country. Look at almost any other country in the world. You find a universal need for health. Less than 20 percent of all the peoples of the world have a degree of health.

"I believe you can judge the progress of civilization better by noting what progress has been made from filth to cleanliness than in any other war. The amount of filth in the world is terrible. It has been made worse by the war.

"Lack of health is illness—a condition of not being well.

"The importance of this world-wide condition of illness, from my point of view, is that you can't have a proper economy or democracy in a world which does not have health.

"People who are not well cannot resist dictatorship. They cannot do productive work. The relationship between lack of health on the one hand and poor economy and dictatorship on the other can be traced throughout history."

MARKETING OPPORTUNITY

"I'm not trying to make the world a place full of hypochondriacs," O'Connor went on. "But what does this lack of health mean?

"It means this: If any considerable part of the peoples of the world were to be given health, it would require all the clothing, all the buildings, all the shoes, all the refrigerators, all the pasteurizing equipment, all the plumbing, all the pipe, all of thousands of other products which all the industries of all countries could produce in the next 100 years.

"Consider almost any small country and try to calculate the amount of steel alone which would be required to provide proper plumbing and you will see what I mean.

"People who can't stand, don't need shoes. If a fraction of 1 percent of all such people in the world were put on their feet and given health, the market for shoes would exceed all productive capacity."

OPPORTUNITY OVERLOOKED

"If a degree of health were given a considerable proportion of the world population, what would happen? A person who is well and possesses even a degree of awareness—I mean awareness and not education—begins to want things and begins to do the work to get them.

"I can't understand why business and industry as well as governments haven't realized what it would do to the economy of the world if some health were furnished to people.

"Health is the biggest business in the world. Economists are always looking for new ways to stimulate trade and stave off econmic disaster. Here is the answer—health—right in their own front yard."

SAFE INVESTMENT

"Every investment in health would come back many times over as health served to increase the power of people to work and produce and buy. What good would it do to restore the physical facilities, merely the buildings and factories, of any war-torn country in the world if its people were left in a condition of illness?

"Instead of furnishing milk to a few children of such a country would it not be better for America to furnish the pasteurization and refrigeration which would bring about a genuine increase in health?

"When you get down to brass tacks, economic ills are due fundamentally to lack of health. There is nothing any family dreads more than the possible illness of the wage earner. Romantic stories of countries in which peasants sleep away many hours of their lives lying in the sun are not romantic at all. Those people aren't lazy—they just don't have the stamina to keep going."

WOULD AID PEACE

World peace, O'Connor believes, can come only through sane thinking.

"People who are sick do not think sanely," he said. "Without healthy bodies they cannot think straight."

O'Connor in the last year has discussed his idea with many people but he never talked of it for publication until he came to Denver.

"I have been considering getting a group of people together to see what they could do with the idea," O'Connor concluded. Maybe I'll find time one of these days. I am convinced it has unbelivable possibilities."

Poland's Freedom and Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker the Indiana Department of the Polish American Congress, Inc., will hold the second solemn commemoration of the atrocious Katyn Massacre in the city of South Bend, Ind., on May 6 of this year. All persons interested in the fight for a free and independent government for Poland, whether of Polish extraction or otherwise, should attend this commemorative assembly to protest this flagrant and unprecedented violation of international law.

The committee of commemorations and special activities of the Indiana Department of the Polish American Congress, Inc., hereby submits the following resolution which was adopted at Gary, Ind., on the 7th day of October, 1950:

We, American citizens gathered on this 7th day of October 1950 at the Gary Hotel to participate in this program of decorating Congressman of the First Indiana District, Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, and several Americans of Polish descent by the Polish Government-in-exile, of London, set forth the following declarations:

1. Referring to the resolution unanimously passed and adopted in Gary, Ind., on the 16th day of September 1949, we again earnestly call the attention of the American public, our President, Harry S. Truman, and our Government, to the shockingly inhuman crime of genocide perpetrated in 1940 on Polish prisoners of war in the Soviet Union; also to similar barbaric treatment to which our sons, heroically fighting in defense of democracy, are now being subjected by the Red hordes in Korea; and

We demand that the United States Government, through its Representative to the United Nations, Hon. Warren Austin, initiate and bring before that body the following proposals:

(a) Press for the formation of an international tribunal to investigate and pass judgment on war criminals who coldbloodedly and with complete disregard of international law, murdered 4,500 Polish prisoners of war. These victims were transported from the camp of Kozielsk and brutally killed in the forest of Katyn.

(b) Ascertain the whereabouts and locate the graves of the Polish prisoners of war, who, in the spring of 1940, were interned in Starobielsk (4,000 officers) and in Ostashkov (6,500 officers) in the Soviet Union territory;

(c) Bring to justice those war criminals, who are guilty of wanton killings of American prisoners of war on the Korean front, where our young and heroic sons, defenders of the ideals of democracy, are being savagely murdered by their Red captors in complete disregard of international law protecting war prisoners;

2. Declare null and void all agreements concluded with the Soviet Union at Tehran and Yalta, where, without the consent of the American and Polish peoples, Poland, and other sovereign nations now suffering behind the iron curtain, were recklessly sold into communistic slavery;

3. Demand that liberty, justice and territorial integrity be restored to 140,000,000 peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, now enslaved by Red Imperialism;

4. Demand that—

(a) The Soviet Union pulls back its armed, political, cultural and economic slavery to the frontiers of 1938;

(b) The Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms incorporated in it, be sincerely and effectively applied to all international dealings;

(c) In the name of international justice, of historical truths and of Christian ethics, Poland be restored to its sovereign status as a free, indivisible and independent state with its legal Government now functioning in exile.

Deeply cognizant of mortal dangers instigated by the Soviet Union bent on destroying our civilization, and our American way of life, we call upon our Government and our Nation to valiantly, ceaselessly, and steadfastly watch the ramparts of democracy and freedom, to spread the message of good will and faith beyond the iron curtain, and, through our acts, sacrifices, wisdom and noble concepts of freedom, justify the faith in America, professed by the hundreds of millions of people all over the world;

Let us strive unerringly to show the troubled humanity that our way of living, that our democracy, that our ideals of freedom are the embodiment of truly Christian precepts of the dignity of man who was created in God's own image and endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

JOHN ROSZKOWSKI,
Chairman.
BENJAMIN J. LESNIAK,
CHESTER WALASIEWICZ,
CAROLINE CZECH,
VICTORIA BASINSYA,
Committee of Resolutions.

Passed and unanimously approved by participants.

EUGENE H. SWARTZ,
Mayor of Gary, Ind., Chairman.
JOSEPH WIEWIORA,
Secretary.

A Republican Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the often-repeated statement that Republicans could criticize but never offered anything constructive never was true.

Rank and file members of the Republican Party criticizing the New Deal, the lack of a consistent foreign policy of the administration, almost invariably offered constructive criticism, many times proposed legislation, to remedy the error, correct the evil.

Last week 121 Republican Members of the House joined by 2 Democrats, outlined a foreign policy for their party.

Foreign policy—truly designed—as all policies should be, for the protection of the homeland, should receive the support of all. No doubt many Democrats are in accord with the policy outlined by our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], but for obvious reasons did not choose at this time to sign this manifesto.

All Members of Congress are receiving letters which indicate that the people are sick of Acheson, of unnecessary wars.

Editorial comment from the Chicago Tribune and the Washington Times-Herald—and similar comment comes from other papers—is as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of February 18, 1951]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY TAKES ITS STAND

It was surely no suprise to anyone that of the 18 Republicans from Illinois in the National House of Representatives, 14 signed the declaration circulated last week, expressing opposition to the Truman foreign and military policy in general and in detail.

Everybody knows or should know that the great majority of middle westerners are of that mind. Their Representatives in Congress were reflecting the sentiment of the voters. Of Wisconsin's 9 Republican Representatives, 7 signed the declaration. Of Michigan's 12, all but 2 signed. Nebraska delivered 3 out of 4; Kansas, 5 out of 6; Iowa, 5 out of 8; Minnesota, 3 out of 5; Ohio, 9 out of 14. Indiana was an exception, with only two out of nine signing, but this is explained, in part at least, by the absence of many of the others from Washington.

There was nothing astonishing about the showing of the Middle West, but it will be genuinely astonishing to those who think that the internationalist press in the East reflects opinion in that section to see what happened in New York, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut. In each of these States, exactly half of the Republican Members signed the declaration and surely many more would have done so but for fear of offending Governor Dewey and the noisy committees which are shouting "crisis" and "present danger."

Mr. Dewey has been campaigning for a draft big enough to produce 100 divisions. He has declared that Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson are correct in their assertion that the President has the power to send as large a part of the United States Army to Europe as he wishes to send, without asking for the approval of Congress.

Mr. Dewey is obviously not speaking for the majority of the Republicans in his State and his section because of the 22 New York Republicans who sit in the House, 11 signed the paper which called for congressional control of the size of our army in Europe. Of the 20 Pennsylvania Republicans, 10 signed. Of the four Connecticut Representatives, two signed. On this reckoning, he speaks for only half of the Republicans of the area, and, in truth, he speaks for less than half.

Every Member who signed the declaration is for it. Not every Member who did not sign is against it. Some are still thinking the matter over. Others, for one reason or another, have not yet been approached. At any rate, of the 199 Republican Members of the House of Representatives, 120 had signed by Saturday. That is a shade better than three-fifths of the whole Republican representation in the House and furnishes impressive evidence of Republican sentiment across the Nation.

Look at the Pacific coast. Of Washington's four Republican Representatives, three signed. Of Oregon's four, two signed. Of California's 13, 8 signed.

Look at the Mountain States. In Colorado, two out of two, and the same in Idaho. In Montana, one out of one, and the same in Wyoming. The Republicans of the Mountain States were unanimous.

Look at the border States. Of the two Republicans in Congress from Kentucky, one signed the declaration. Both Republicans from Tennessee signed. Of three in Maryland, two signed. Likewise, of three in Missouri, two signed.

Even in New England, generally regarded as almost unanimously interventionist, nearly half of the Republicans declared for the principles for which Hoover, Taft, and Wherry have been battling. Among the signers were only two out of eight in Massachusetts, but Maine showed two in three; New Hampshire, one in two; Connecticut, two in four; and Vermont, none for one. The total is 7 out of 18 in the region whose Republicans are supposed to be wholly committed to the bipartisan policy.

What the support given to this declaration shows, among other things, is that the Republican Party, nationally considered, is in favor of the Wherry resolution and its counterpart, the Coudert resolution in the House. It is on this issue that the Republicans should take their stand. They will lose few Republican votes by doing so. They will gain millions of Democratic votes.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 19, 1951]

THIS IS REPUBLICAN POLICY

Of the 199 Republican Members of the House of Representatives, 120 have already signed a declaration on foreign policy that looks good to us and no doubt will look just as good to Mr. Hoover, Mr. Taft, and Mr. Wherry. The declaration will not please the Dewey-Vandenberg wing of the party, but it suits all of us who have been denounced as isolationists just fine.

The most remarkable thing about this declaration is that it comes from the grass roots.

Representative MARTIN, the official leader of the Republican Party in the House, and his chief lieutenants didn't think it up and weren't among the original 118 who signed it. The prime mover was Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Racine, Wis., ably seconded by Representative O'HARA, of Minnesota, another middle westerner, and three easterners, Representatives ST. GEORGE, of New York, and TOWE and HAND, of New Jersey. Mr. Dewey's claim to leadership in his own section has been directly challenged.

DEWEY REPUDIATED

There is no longer any question of where the Republican Party stands on foreign policy. We now know that with no pressure from party bigwigs, no promises of anything for signing, no threats of retaliation for not signing, 60 percent of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives placed their signatures on a document committing themselves to opposition to the foreign policy that has been called bipartisan.

Every signature on the declaration is the signature of a Representative who was elected no longer ago than last November. Every one of the 120 has characterized the so-called bipartisan policy as in large part a costly failure. Every one of them has put himself on record in favor of a reexamination and a revision of it. And every one has declared for full participation of Congress in deciding whether American soldiers are to be sent to Europe to serve in General Eisenhower's European army and, if so, how many.

As everybody might have expected, the Republicans from the Middle West were overwhelmingly in favor of the declaration. Of the 18 Republicans from Illinois, 14 signed. Of Wisconsin's 9, 7 signed. Of Michigan's 12, all but 2 signed.

Indiana's Republicans, perhaps because of absence from Washington when signatures were solicited, made a miserable showing, with only 2 out of 9 enlisted, but Nebraska delivered 3 out of 4, Kansas 5 out of 6, Iowa 5 out of 8, Minnesota 3 in 5, and Ohio 9 out of 14.

As we said, there was nothing astonishing about that; but it is genuinely astonishing to find that half of the Republican delegation from Governor Dewey's New York—11 out of 22—voted in direct opposition to Governor Dewey's declared views on foreign policy.

Again in Pennsylvania, exactly half of the Republicans—10 out of 20—voted for the Hoover-Taft-Wherry line. So did half the delegation—2 out of 4—from Connecticut.

These are among the States in which Republicans were supposed to be strongly internationalist. Here is clear proof to the contrary.

HOW WE CAN SAVE TIME

A few Democrats also signed. Representative WILLIAMS of Mississippi, we do not doubt, spoke for many of his colleagues who are deeply troubled over the Acheson-Eisenhower policies when he said that there were men on his side of the aisle who were in full sympathy with the movement, even though they had not lent their names.

At any rate, we now know that the bipartisan Republicans are a minority in their own party in Congress. Republican leaders in Washington and in the national committee who do not accept this verdict have no place in the party and certainly no claim to leadership.

The American people are pro-American; they believe that the foreign policy of this country and its military policy must be directed primarily toward the safety and welfare of the American people, not foreign nations. They are eager to repudiate the false and dangerous doctrines of the Trumans, the Deweys, and the Eisenhowers. If the Republicans in Congress stand firm for their principles, they cannot be defeated in 1952. If they revert to "me, toolsm," they cannot win.

The declaration of principles is the most important document to have come out of Washington in a decade. Representative SMITH and his colleagues have earned the gratitude of their countrymen. This declaration can save the lives of a million American boys and tens of billions of the taxpayers' money.

Our Fantastic Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when Communist aggression threatened in Korea last spring, President Truman was given a defense plan drafted by the military leaders that compose our War College. The plan called for punishing the Communist aggressors without sending any ground troops into Korea. It called for blockading Korea with our Navy and the systematic destruction of the industry and transportation system of North Korea with our heavy bombers. The Communists were to be allowed to push into South Korea but their war supplies were to be cut off, thereby making them helpless to carry on an offensive campaign. Standing off in safety out of reach of the Communists we would be able to pound them to death. Thus we would have been in the smart position of being able to punish without being made to suffer; while the Communists would be in the helpless position of having to take punishment from a foe they could not get at.

When President Truman scrapped the War College plan, following the advice of Acheson and Marshall, and ordered MacArthur to send our boys into Korea, he made a terrible blunder. That blunder has cost us in wounded and dead some 50,000 American boys, and we still are no better off than when we went into Korea last June.

Mr. Speaker, are we now to repeat our Korean blunder in Europe? Why not establish a chain of bases in Spain and North Africa? Then if Russia invades Europe we could attack her industrial centers and her transportation system by air, using our atom bombs where they will do the most damage. We hold an advantage over Russia in the air; she has an advantage over us on land. Why not use our advantage in the air and save our manpower? Why not follow the advice of our military leaders instead of following the advice of such men as Acheson?

Under permission previously granted, I include part of an editorial taken from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Saturday, February 24, 1951:

REPUBLICAN LEADERS WHOSE FEET DRAG

Of the 199 Republican Members of the House of Representatives, 124 have now signed the declaration of principles circulated by Representative LAWRENCE SMITH of Wisconsin.

This declaration is in direct opposition not only to the Truman-Acheson line of foreign and military policy but, more particularly, to the Dewey-Vandenberg line in the Republican Party. The declaration contains, among other things, an unequivocal endorsement of the Hoover-Wherry-Taft contention that more American troops should not be sent to Europe without specific congressional approval.

Although more than three-fifths of the Republican Members of the House have signed the paper, none of the Republican leaders in the House has done so.

The time has come to call a House Republican conference on the issue raised by the declaration. More than three-fifths of the members of the conference have gone on record in favor of the principles announced, and still others are known to be of like mind. Obviously, then, this declaration is in every sense but the merely formal one the official party doctrine.

It should, therefore, command the allegiance of the party leaders. They should be battling for it every day and every hour.

We do not say yet that the party leadership must be displaced. We do say that unless the party leadership accepts the will of the party majority without reservation the leadership must be changed.

The sooner a party conference is called to settle this matter the better for the country and, needless to say, the better for the party. The present situation in which the leaders are dragging their feet is intolerable.

Resolution Adopted by the New Jersey Republican State Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following resolution adopted by the New Jersey Republican State Committee:

Whereas Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll has submitted to the New Jersey Legislature a budget for the 1951–52 fiscal year which, in its demand for Spartan economy at all levels of government, sets a pattern for the drastic curtailment of all but the most necessary expenditures; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress a budget proposal by the President of the United States for the same period which constitutes an invitation to fiscal disaster for our country and which, unlike our own State budget, utterly fails to recognize the needs of the times: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Republican State Committee does hereby commend the Governor of New Jersey for his practical and realistic approach to the budgetary problems of our State and at the same time condemns the budget proposal of the President of the United States for the following reasons:

1. While purporting to call for expenditures of $71,500,000,000, it actually asks authorization to spend nearly $100,000,000,000.

2. Of this vast amount, the President has seen fit to itemize expenditures totaling only slightly more than $20,000,000,000 and has in effect, asked Congress for a blank check for the remainder.

3. In complete disregard of congressional responsibility, he has refused to state how many billions of dollars will be spent for defense. This committee, while fully aware of the need for high expenditures for the defense of our Nation, nevertheless believes it to be the duty of the President to confide in our elected representatives to the extent that they can make an honest examination of all proposals for defense expenditures before they are called upon to vote vast new taxes on the American people.

4. The President has claimed savings of $5,000,000,000 below last year in nondefense items. Many of these savings are not real. For example, examination shows one of these savings to be the amount expended last year for the 1950 census (a nonrecurring item). He also claims as a saving, the more than $500,000,000 which the Congress forced the President to cut from the 1950–51 budget before its adoption. In other words, he is claiming savings below a nonexisting budget.

5. These are but two of 130 items submitted by the President in which he has claimed to have effected savings. Examination shows most of them to be based upon transfers which, in many cases, turn out to be increases and not savings.

6. Despite widespread demands for rigid economy in nondefense spending, the President, often under the guise of defense preparation, has continued to foist his Fair Deal, socialistic program on the American people. For example, he has asked:

(a) Three hundred million dollars to "equalize education opportunities" among the States (as a defense measure on the grounds that the Armed Forces do not have time to teach draftees how to read and write): plus $106,000,000 for Federal aid to education in certain areas.

(b) A $275,000,000 payroll tax to set up the machinery for socialized medicine.

(c) Direct payments to producers of perishable farm products in lieu of price supports (the Brannan plan).

(d) Seven new waterways projects costing $1,500,000,000 as follows: Hell's Canyon, The Dalles and Ice Harbor projects in the Columbia Basin; Old Hickory on the Cumberland; a steam plant for TVA; Gavins Point on the Missouri and $20,000,000 to start the St. Lawrence seaway.

7. Although the President states that his budget totals $7,500,000,000, he has, in fact, asked for contract authorizations and appropriations of $94,500,000,000, plus an additional $4,000,000,000 to pay old bills. Inasmuch as the books of the United States Government are carried on a cash basis, the President's budget should state that he seeks a total of $98,500,000,000—or $27,000,000,000 more than he has admitted; and be it further

Resolved, That the Republican State committee calls on the Republican Members of the Senate and House from New Jersey to continue their efforts to compel the Federal Government to give the American people an honest accounting of their money, and to examine carefully all proposed expenditures, both defense and otherwise, to the end that this Nation may be saved from the fiscal disaster which will surely follow if the Federal Government is permitted to engage in the confused and illogical practices exemplified by the President's budget proposal; and be it further

Resolved, That our representatives shall bring this resolution to the attention of the Congress in the hope that the Congress shall see fit to follow the pattern established by the Governor of New Jersey in setting an example for prudent management which present circumstances demand at all levels of government.

One Bale Cotton on 4 Acres—Cost Producer $81.84 To Sell It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have received from Mr. H. R. Spivey. Farmers are being called on to produce more cotton. I am wondering if Mr. Spivey would be in the attitude to increase his acreage in view of the following language which was in a letter written to me December 15, 1950, by Mr. C. J. McCormick, Under Secretary of Agriculture. I quote the language:

> Therefore, if all farmers in a county should double their cotton acreage in 1951 over 1950, the 1952 farm allotments may be changed considerably or none at all or somewhere between depending on how farmers in the particular county vary their cotton acreage in proportion to cropland.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

BULLARD, TEX., *February 6, 1951.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,

Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I produced 1 bale of cotton on about 4 acres in 1950 and had to pay $81.84 to sell it. Why? Because I didn't have and couldn't get a white selling card. This was a hard financial blow—a gross injustice—at the hands of the Production Marketing Administration. I realize that it wasn't the intention of anyone in that department to work a hardship of disaster proportions to a farmer anywhere. Still, because of red-tape regulations, I was compelled to suffer a serious financial loss.

I operate a very small farm on the cash-rent basis and grew 4 acres of cotton to help pay the rent. I planted without an allotment because I understood that you intended to help us get at least a minimum of 5 acres anyhow. But I guess the bigger growers got the extra allotments because I never could get a permit to plant a single seed. Still, after I learned all this, it was too late, as I had already planted 4 acres, and I let it go on through and make. I didn't think it right at all for any farm regulation to say to a man that he couldn't plant any cotton, and to a neighbor just across the fence to go ahead and plant a sizable crop.

Well, since the PMA classified this cotton crop of mine as non-tax-free, I had to pay the penalty. The injustice of it is what burns me up. I didn't overplant. Just trying to make a living on my few acres. Everyone around here said it was a dirty shame that such hardship could be worked on a man just because he grew and sold a bale of his own cotton without PMA's permit.

Mr. BECKWORTH, can you help me get this money refunded to me? I need it much worse than they do. I understand that hardship cases receive special consideration, and I would appreciate it greatly if you would do what you can to help me.

Thanking you, I am,

Sincerely,

H. R. SPIVEY.

Democracy's Sentinel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have followed the deliberations of the United Nations in Lake Success with much interest and concern. There have been times when I have been assailed by a feeling of frustration at the seemingly interminable debates and the exasperating lies and distortions dished out by the delegates of Soviet Russia and its four satellites. But there were times when I felt within me both elation and pride and when I envisioned a better world of order and law emerging out of today's suspicion and mistrust.

During the recent General Assembly debate on the question of Chinese Communist intervention in Korea, I noted with disappointment the stand taken by 12 Asian and Arab nations against the United States resolution branding Communist China an aggressor. But I was heartened by the firm attitude of the Philippines which was uncompromisingly in support of the American resolution; and the repeated interventions of Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, in the course of the debate, won for him and his people the admiration and gratitude of the United States.

The role played by General Romulo and the leadership he is displaying in Lake Success today are best described in the following news dispatch published generally and which I clipped from the issue of December 17, 1950, of the Oregon Journal and which herein appears. It was written by Pierre J. Huss, chief correspondent of the International News Service in Lake Success, and one of the veteran diplomatic correspondents of America:

PHILIPPINES' ROMULO WATCHDOG FOR UN AGAINST APPEASEMENT

(By Pierre J. Huss)

FLUSHING MEADOW, N. Y., December 16.—An antiappeasement watchdog stands on guard at the United Nations today against well-meaning but ill-guided diplomacy which might fall easy prey to the wiles of communism and make a deal with Red China.

Carlos P. Romulo, foreign minister of the Philippines, is a man of peace, but he wants none of the appeasement which leads to bending the knee to communism at any cost. Consequently, he rapped knuckles right and left this week—whether of India or Britain—and made them wince and think again.

The tough little general from Bataan, who earned his star in the hard school of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as his aide-de-camp on Bataan and elsewhere, became outraged and walked out on 12 little delegates from Asia and Arab lands whose knees were knocking together over the prospect of facing up to Communist China's defiance of United Nations in Korea.

Before doing that, Romulo read the "riot act" to the assembled group, emphasizing that nations whose soldiers are dying on the battlefields must stand by their dead and wounded, and not "sell them down the river." He said it was "ridiculous" for this group to act as if Communist China had complied with every line of the UN Charter instead of having defied it in exact marching step with the Communist expansionism of Moscow.

"Over my dead body they'll appease the Commies," the hard-jawed former president of the UN Assembly told newsmen later.

Romulo's dander rose high during closed-door meetings of a 13-member Asia-Arab bloc mobilized by Sir Benegal Rau of India to forestall an assembly demand that Peiping get her troops out of Korea.

Rau—possibly reflecting the lofty ideals of Prime Minister Pandit Nehru in New Delhi—is absolutely sure that the UN can do business with Communist China. Rau refuses to consider himself an appeaser and has maintained all along that force cannot settle the issue in Korea.

Last Monday he and Egyptian delegate Fawzi Bey produced a draft resolution which carefully wrapped up the "peace settlement" in Korea into a single package covering all the Far East. By implication, it foreshadowed the surrender to Communist China of Formosa and actually named Mao Tse-tung's government as the rightful representative for a seven-power peace conference to be held on all Asia.

Romulo came out with both fists flying and rocked the "Cliveden set" in the UN with verbal rights and lefts. (The Cliveden set was a pro-Nazi British group which engineered the fatal Munich appeasement pact of 1938 and enabled Hitler to get ready for the blitzkrieg of 1939.)

Romulo fairly yelled at them that their resolution stood in rancid rejection of the Security Council resolution of June 27, which condemned North Korea as an aggressor.

"Has Communist China done any less than North Korea in defying the UN and fighting us with crack divisions poured out of Manchuria? Isn't it ridiculous to stick our heads in the sand and treat the Peiping aggressor as an equal? Gentlemen, you may—but I won't."

The impact of his Sunday punch in effect knocked the appeasers off their feet. After a recess, in which a number of the somewhat

startled group thought it over in the diplomatic lounge—which has a large bar—Romulo came up with a separate cease-fire resolution empowering the President of the Assembly and two other representatives to sound out both MacArthur and the Chinese Communists on prospects for a cease fire.

This course, Romulo pointed out, gives the United Nations a chance to acquaint itself with the situation on the field of battle, and to adjust itself to political developments before taking any decisions. The abashed group quickly approved the Romulo plan and sheepishly turned to what was left of the second part of the original "package" resolution on the Far East.

Romulo thumped the table and again lashed out at them for trying to make fools of themselves and the UN. He refused to have any part of their appeasement conference and walked out, leaving behind him a dozen unhappy diplomats. They finally introduced their second part in the form of a separate resolution—but minus the outright appeasement provisions. In particular, they dropped any reference to China and so gave up the move which Romulo said was an attempt to get Mao into the UN by the back door.

Romulo is staying at the UN to the last moments of the Assembly, even if that means canceling his Christmas in Manila. He can be relied on to be a sharp watchdog ready to tear apart those who would sabotage genuine peace efforts in United Nations or sell out to appeasement.

President Truman's Speech to DeMolay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of President Truman's remarks at a breakfast meeting of Masonic leaders:

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S ADDRESS TO DEMOLAY

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Frank [Frank Land, head of the DeMolay], and distinguished guests from all over the country, and the Supreme Court and legislative branch of the Government, and the secretaries of the executive branch:

This seems to have been a rather fixed-up proposition, to inform the President what his Cabinet and the Court and the legislative branch think of him. I am glad to know it. It is very satisfactory. I appreciate it most highly, but what I had expected to discuss with you this morning is a continuation of what these able and distinguished gentlemen have brought to your attention.

We have an emergency. I declared an emergency back in the latter part of 1950, because it was really on us—and it is on us now. And it is difficult—very difficult—for people to realize, as things go along as usual, that the Government is faced with the most tremendous emergency that any government has ever been faced with in the history of the country, and I say that because I know the history of the country very well. I know that we are going through some of the same things that were gone through in 1860, and 1916, and 1941.

CITES PROFIT FROM EXPERIENCE

We have made every effort possible to avoid a great many of those mistakes. We have not been able to avoid them all, but we are profiting by experience, and I think that I am very, very fortunate in having experienced men in every key position who understand the situation and who are honestly working it out on the basis as it should be worked out.

It was necessary for me to appoint a production manager, an administrator for the Defense Production Authority. He has had his difficulties, because it is very difficult to get people to understand that now is not the time to get all the traffic will bear, now is not the time to "get," because the Government is in a position where it has to have certain materials to meet the thing that General Marshall is working on: To keep the peace.

That is all this is for. It is an effort to prevent a third world war. And we are gradually approaching a position in the world where that can be prevented, if we have the support and cooperation of all the segments of the population. And that means industry, labor, the farmer, and you gentlemen—and all the white-collar people who do the inside work to make these other things operate.

Now, it is necessary, I think, in this country, as well as around the world, to try to mobilize the moral forces of the world against the unmoral forces.

SAYS ALL MUST SACRIFICE

We need to mobilize the moral forces in this country of ours, to prevent selfishness of certain groups from an endeavor to take advantage of this situation.

Everybody, I don't care who he is, or what his condition or his position is—from the President of the United States to the laborer who digs in the trench—must make some sacrifice in order that the whole country may be mobilized to meet the serious situation with which we are faced.

Now, for 5 years I have been endeavoring to mobilize the moral forces of the world, those forces which believe in the Sermon on the Mount, those forces which believe in a God, those forces which believe in the welfare of the individual, who believe that the Government is formed for the welfare of the individual and not that the individual is formed to be a slave to the Government.

That is what we are faced with. That is what we are trying to implant in the world.

I am here to say to you that if we could have expended the tremendous sums of money which were necessary to meet Hitler and Mussolini in the development of the resources of this world there would have been no necessity for the slaughter of all the young men of that generation in Europe. Not at all.

It is a tremendous outlook that we have for the future of the world as a whole if we can develop the undeveloped parts of the world to meet the pressure of populations in countries like China and India and Central Europe.

It can be done. It is not impossible. But we have to understand that we are faced with an unmoral force which does not keep its agreements, which does not believe in the things for which this Government stands, and for which the other free governments in the world do stand.

Now, it is your duty—you come from every section of the United States—to see if you can't revive that moral force in our own population that causes a man to give some sacrifice for the welfare of the rest of the human race.

That is your business. You are taught that. That is a part of your creed. All I am asking you to do is to help the President of the United States to mobilize the moral forces in the world to meet the unmoral forces in the world.

ASKS COOPERATION OF ALL

It can be done, and we are doing it—with some handicaps, I will admit. We have our troubles. Mr. Wilson—Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson—has had his troubles, and he will have some more before we get through. But Mr. Wilson and the President of the United States will work those troubles out. This Government is going forward, not backward.

We are not in the midst of any political campaign at the present time. In all probability, we will be in the midst of one next year, and we will meet that situation as we have met it before.

But that is not the object now. The object now is to meet the emergency with which we are faced, and to meet it on a basis so that everybody will make his proper contribution, and nobody will come out with any special privilege.

Now, if you gentlemen will give me a lift on that this breakfast will have been worth while.

Thank you very much.

Banker Dawes Could Tell Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the American Banker:

BANKER DAWES COULD TELL THEM—FEDERAL EXPENSES WERE CUT OR ELSE WHEN HE WAS BUDGET DIRECTOR

If there is anyone around the White House or on Capitol Hill who is seriously interested in economizing on nondefense items in the Federal budget, there is a banker who could tell them in a very few words how to do it.

That banker is Brig. Gen. Charles Gates Dawes, former Vice President of the United States, and previous to that first Director of the Budget, under President Harding, and from 1897 to 1901 Comptroller of the Currency.

After World War I, the problem of cutting Government costs back developed after the 1920–21 slump in business and prices. The high cost of living had been a factor in popular resentment toward the Government's policies, and the consequent recession and collapse in prices had had a sobering economic effect. Wherefore the back-to-normalcy slogan and objectives of the incoming Harding regime in 1921.

General Dawes was given the budget post. A man of authority, character, and respect among both Government and business circles, General Dawes was given full responsibility by the President for seeing that Federal departmental spending was reduced, and the authority to make that objective effective. The President let it be known that the Dawes orders were law, and when he ordered a sizable percent lopped off some department's expenses, no one was permitted to interfere. Expenses were cut or else.

Cabinet members who tried to protest to the President were told General Dawes' word was law, and it is surprising how many ways departments found to economize. And General Dawes became known by newspaper readers as "Hell and Maria Dawes."

Of course, there were the same arguments then as now, that to reduce this or that item of spending would cripple an essential Government service, and cause great political repercussions. The budget chief, however, was firm, and within the year, a substantial budgetary surplus was achieved, which continued through 10 years of Republican administrations. The budgetary surplus fed the capital markets with debt retirement

payments, and thus aided in the upswing of business. This in turn brought about a situation in which taxes could be reduced, which aided still further in the stimulation of business. The political repercussions were all favorable.

General Dawes, now in his eighty-sixth year, and serving in an advisory capacity as chairman of the board of the City National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago, is the prototype of the sort of executive who sooner or later must be given budget balancing authority in Washington. As was the case nearly 30 years ago, that authority must be absolute, and absolutely effective, so far as reducing nonessential Federal expenses are concerned. If the Truman administration cannot bring itself to this decision and find the right man for the job, then some future administration will. But the fiscal economy of the United States will not be sound until the right man is given this job with full authority to require economy, and real prosperity for the United States will continue to be an inflationary mirage.

Forest Service Spoils System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, this week I formally requested our colleague, HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to hold hearings for the purpose of limiting the power of the United States Forest Service over the sale and distribution of national forest timber. At these hearings I intend to propose amendments to the present sustained-yield law which will prevent the Forest Service from arbitrarily picking and choosing among competitors for public timber.

This action is the result of the decision by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan in sustaining the establishment of the Lakeview sustained-yield unit, which limits competition for the timber around Lakeview to the mills very near to Lakeview itself and puts the Willow Ranch Co., the oldest and most substantial lumber company in the area, out of business.

CAN LIMIT COMPETITORS

The decision of the Secretary of Agriculture was not surprising. Cabinet officers hardly have the time to make the detailed investigation of individual cases which is required and must and do depend on their subordinates for information, which in this instance, of course, was the Forest Service.

The basic issue involved in this matter is not whether a sustained-yield program should be followed. We all agree with the sustained-yield program. But sustained yield can be secured by limiting the cut out of the national forests. The Forest Service proposes, and under the present law not only has the power, to limit the cut, but to limit the competitors. I am in favor of limiting the cut in order to follow sustained-yield practices in the national forests, but I am against giving any Government bureau the power to pick and choose among competitors in an area for this valuable natural resource.

FOREST SERVICE SPOILS SYSTEM

The language of the present law is the framework for one of the biggest scandals in history. These national forests are worth literally billions of dollars. They do not belong to the Forest Service, or its present employees, to be peddled noncompetitively to Forest Service favorites—or used to reward the friends and punish the enemies of the Forest Service. While Congress was preoccupied with the war in 1944, and under the favored title of "sustained yield," the Forest Service slipped language into the statute giving them unprecedented and dangerous powers in distributing a fabulous public resource. You would have the same thing if the Secretary of the Interior could hand the oil reserves of the Nation around to his friends, or anyone he pleased, on a noncompetitive basis—just he and the friend agreeing on the price.

SHOULD AMEND LAW

In my opinion, the law should be amended in such a way as to continue the power of the Forest Service to limit the cut out of the national forests, thereby assuring a sustained yield, but eliminating the power of the Forest Service to pick and choose among the bidders for public timber in the particular area. Open, competitive, and public bidding has been the traditional method of protecting the public interest in the buying and selling of public property. There is no reason or excuse for varying that traditional rule in dealing with the national forests—and it is not necessary to do so to maintain a sustained yield program.

I am in hopes the Committee on Agriculture will give me an early hearing. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and the entire sustained-yield program, worthy in itself, can be permanently lost in one or two flagrant cases of Forest Service mismanagement.

The Late June Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to June Green, who was called by her Maker on the 21st day of February 1951. June was a member of the Negro race and lived at Pampa, Tex. She had been employed in my household for several years, and her ministrations to my children in sickness and in health, her wholesome philosophy, and her sterling character provided my children with an understanding that will serve them well in treating the problems of life. June's greatness was not evidenced by public proclamations and was perhaps not known by a great number of people, but her greatness was indelibly attested by the love, respect, and confidence of children, a greatness that is sought by many but attained by few. The color of her skin did not dim the vision of those children nor detract their ability to see and appreciate the understanding, the tenderness, the kindness, and the sterling qualities of Christian character with which she was so richly endowed. She was truly one of God's children—one of his better children.

Congress Must Safeguard Food Production in New Draft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, new proof comes to light daily of the damaging effects to the Nation's economy and war effort of a bureaucratic program which does not let its left hand know what its right hand is doing.

The following is from a news item appearing in the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News of February 16, 1951:

The first outright request for Michigan farmers to increase production came from the Government today. The Federal Production and Marketing Administration now asks farmers to step up their 1951 acreage of corn, barley, and soybeans—crops vital to defense.

The State as a whole was asked to boost corn acreage 130,000 acres to 1,820,000; barley acreage, 24,000 acres to 150,000 acres; and soybeans, 13,000 acres to 130,000.

Consider this call for more production—farm defense production, if you please—in the light of the present selective-service policy of drafting all farm labor except in extreme hardship or dependency cases.

Of course, the impact of the Government's call for increased farm production has not been felt yet on Michigan farms. But the impact of the farm-labor shortage, aggravated gravely by the draft, is being felt already.

One Calhoun County, Mich., farmer, who happens also to be the supervisor of his township, wrote me February 17:

The condition of the farm-labor situation in Calhoun County has become very critical. We are now unable to replace farm labor with younger or older men. This has caused a striking reduction in the numbers of livestock on our farms today and is going to decrease more. The number of farm-auction sales, due to lack of farm labor, are increasing.

All of this is causing a reduction in the assessment of personal property, which already has become startling. I will compile and send to you in the near future the exact amount of this reduction.

Coupled with the demand for increased farm production and the farm-labor shortage, aggravated by the draft, is the marked trend toward fewer and larger farms in Michigan. I have previously cited some impressive figures on this subject, under extension of remarks February 6, 1951, page A694 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Information provided in an article by Robert Enlow, Enquirer and News farm reporter, under date of February 18, throws new light on this trend in the Third Congressional District of Michigan. It shows the following decrease in the number of farms as between 1945 and 1950: Branch, 2,446 in 1945 and 2,240 in 1950; Calhoun, 3,106 and 3,060; Eaton, 3,326 and 3,107; Hillsdale, 3,329 and 3,295; and Kalamazoo, 2,703 and 2,516. That represents a total of 692 fewer farms in my district in 5 years.

This reduction in the number of farms means, in the main, larger farm units, made possible through increased mechanization. It may be argued that, in some respects, the trend is beneficial, from the standpoint of more efficient, economical, and profitable farm operation, with greater output from less labor.

But by the same token, this trend makes it increasingly imperative that the farm labor be highly skilled. And it means that the fewer the persons employed on the individual farm—whether they are members of the owner's or tenant's family, or hired hands—the more indispensable those few are to the interrupted operation of the farm.

It means something else, too. It means that there will be—indeed already is—much less of an actual or potential pool of farm help for the busy season or for the emergency periods of increased farm production such as the Nation now faces. The effect is fewer opportunities for farm youth to become farmers; fewer opportunities for the type of individual who worked on farms, by day or month, or season, years ago. The trend of this potential farm labor is more and more to the cities and the factories—a trend further stimulated by higher wages.

Thus we find it reported that already in Calhoun County farmers are short of help 2 months before the critical period normally begins, and that there are four or five farmers after every available man.

All of that, incidentally, before receipt of the word from Washington to increase production of specific defense food items anywhere from 6 to 14 times.

Unless food production is to be thrown into utter chaos, the Congress must see to it that the draft law is modified to safeguard, fairly but surely, the manpower already on the farms and essential to farm operations.

There is no more vital defense or war production in the entire economy of the Nation.

Mandel Nieder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article on the late Mandel Nieder, one of the Pacific Northwest's outstanding citizens, appeared recently in the Roosevelt American. I feel a great personal loss in Mr. Nieder's passing, as do many others who were inspired by his constancy of purpose and high ideals:

MANDEL NIEDER

(By Adele Parker)

Mandel Nieder, a well-known and popular figure in liberal politics in Seattle, Wash., has departed this life, remembered by thousands of friends, especially for his devotion to public power, to the cooperative movement in all its phases, and for his hearty support of the New Deal in American politics.

Mandel was born in Chicago in 1890. He came to Seattle in 1901. His father, a little earlier, had been attracted to the Pacific Northwest by the Alaska gold rush in the Yukon, where he made himself famous by being the first of the gold seekers to build himself a boat out of a tree.

Mandel secured his formal education at the Old South School, at Broadway High School, and as a graduate from the University of Washington. He served in France in the First World War in the Medical Corps of the Ninety-first Division, and was cited by Gen. John J. Pershing for bravery under enemy fire.

Active in the Norris-LaGuardia organization for the reelection of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to his later terms, Mandel was also president of the Washington Public Power League, he was treasurer of the committee known as the League for CVA, and he was appointed by Gov. Mon C. Wallgren to the Washington State Resources Council.

Taking an active part in the original organization of Seattle's Group Health Cooperative, Mandel also helped organize the first group called the Progressive Citizens of Washington—a group which later became the Americans for Democratic Action, and in recent years he also served on the Committee for Academic Freedom at the University of Washington.

In the past 10 years Mandel's health had been precarious, yet, with frequent periods of rest, he accomplished a huge amount of work in the interest of democracy and the general welfare. On January 20, 1951, the end came quietly while sitting with his family at home listening to the opera on the radio. Not only Seattle but the entire State of Washington will miss his pleasant smile and his devotion to the cause of freedom, peace, and brotherhood.

Indians Will Be Made Homeless by Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, for those who follow the affairs of the American Indians, the Hualapi Tribe of Arizona will present an interesting case history. Twice the Supreme Court has intervened to keep the white man from chasing these Indians off the ground belonging to them by agreement with the Federal Government. Their long struggle to stay on their land will be lost, however, if Congress approves of the central Arizona project. I wish at this point to insert in the RECORD a memorandum on the history of this Indian tribe and the effect the central Arizona project will have upon it.

MEMORANDUM RE PROVISIONS OF S. 75 AND H. R. 1500, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, AFFECTING RIGHTS OF INDIANS OF THE HUALAPAI TRIBE

I. IN GENERAL

This memorandum reviews provisions of S. 75, H. R. 1500, and related bills to authorize the central Arizona project, which authorize the Secretary of the Interior to divest the Hualapai Indians of lands within their reservation, for flooding, for construction of camp sites, and for other uses incidental to the project.

II. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HUALAPAI (WALAPAI) RESERVATION

The ancestral home of the Indians of the Hualapai Tribe is located along the Colorado River in northwestern Arizona. In 1874, over their vigorous objection, the Hualapai were forcibly removed from their home range to the Colorado River Reservation, created by act of Congress in 1865, by the Indian Office of the United States Government. Referring to this attempt the Supreme Court has stated that "their forcible removal in 1874 was not pursuant to any mandate of Congress. It was a high-handed endeavor to wrest from these Indians lands which Congress had never declared forfeited."[1] The following year, 1875, the Hualapai left the reservation and returned to their own lands after which it was decided "to allow them to remain in their own range during good behavior."[2] Speaking of the forced removal of the Hualapai, General Scholfield reported on May 24, 1875, to the Adjutant General, as follows:

"The Hualapai Indians have been our firm friends for many years, and our active allies whenever their services have been required against the hostile Apaches. In return for their fidelity they have been treated with great injustice and cruelty. They were forced to leave their homes in the mountains and go upon a reservation in the Colorado desert, where they have suffered from the extreme heat, to which they were unaccustomed, from disease, and from hunger.

* * * * *

"The injustice and bad faith shown by the Government toward the Hualapais and the Indians which General Crook had collected upon the Verde Reservation are calculated to undo as far as possible the good work which General Crook and his troops had accomplished with so much wisdom and gallantry. It is useless to attempt to disguise the fact that such treatment of the Indians is in violation of the just and humane policy prescribed by the President and a disgrace to any civilized country."[3]

In 1881 the Hualapai, assembled in council, proposed to an officer of the United States that he "aid them to represent to the proper authorities," the following proposal:

"They say that in the country, over which they used to roam so free, the white men have appropriated all the water; that large numbers of cattle have been introduced and have rapidly increased during the past year or two; that in many places the water is fenced in and locked up; and they are driven from all waters. They say that the railroad is now coming, which will require more water, and will bring more men who will take up all the small springs remaining. They urge that the following reservation be set aside for them while there is still time; that the land can never be of any great use to the whites; that there are no mineral deposits upon it, as it has been thoroughly prospected; that there is little or no arable land; that the water is in such small quantities, and the country is so rocky and void

[1] *United States* v. *Santa Fe Railroad Co.* (314 U. S. 339, 355, 86 L. Ed. 260, 274).

[2] Walapai Papers, S. Doc. 273, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 104.

[3] Walapai Papers, op. cit., p. 108.

of grass that it would not be available for stock raising. I am credibly informed, and from my observations believe, the above facts to be true. I, therefore, earnestly recommend that the hereafter described reservation be, at as early a date as practicable, set aside from them."[4]

Pursuant to the above proposal a reservation consisting of some 1,000,000 acres was constituted on July 8, 1881, subject to the approval of the President. President Arthur signed an Executive order creating the Walapai (Hualapai) Indian Reservation on January 4, 1883.

The Hualapai Tribe today consists of some 500 members. It is one of the most self-reliant Indian bands in the United States, the members of which make their livings primarily from livestock. The tribe is today entirely self-sustaining and is not a drain upon the United States. They own and maintain some of the finest cattle herds in Arizona. Within a 2-day period in June 1948 they sold $150,000 worth of cattle on their reservation.[5]

III. SUBSEQUENT EFFORTS TO DIVEST THE HUALAPAI

The rights of the Hualapai to the lands within the reservation granted to it were affirmed in 1941 by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Santa Fe Railroad Company* (314 U. S. 339, 86 L. Ed. 260). That case arose out of efforts of the Department of the Interior to give a railroad, predecessor to the Santa Fe, some of the land within and without the Hualapai Reservation. The United States in its own right and as guardian of the Indians brought suit to enjoin the railroad from interfering with possession and occupancy by the Hualapai of the lands. In an opinion rendered on December 8, 1941, the Supreme Court decided that the land within the reservation was created by agreement between the United States and the Indians as a permanent, not a temporary, reservation which could not be taken from them and given to a railroad. "Such statements by the Secretary of the Interior," said Mr. Justice Douglas in the opinion of the Court, "as that 'title to the odd numbered sections' was in the respondent (railroad) do not estop the United States from maintaining this suit, for they could not deprive the Indians of their rights any more than could the unauthorized leases in *Cramer* v. *United States* (261 U. S. 219)."[6]

IV. PENDING EFFORTS TO OUST THE HUALAPAI FROM THEIR RESERVATION

If after the 1941 Supreme Court decision in the Santa Fe case, the Hualapai felt secure in their tenure of their reservation, they did not reckon with the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation or the other proponents of the Central Arizona (Bridge Canyon) project.

Section 14 of S. 75 and H. R. 1500, the present bills to authorize the project, contains the following provisions re the Hualapai lands:

1. That in aid of construction, operation, and maintenance of the project "there is hereby granted to the United States" all the right, title, and interest of the Indians, including easements, rights-of-way, etc., in and to such tribal and allotted lands, including sites of agency and school buildings and related structures," as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary of the Interior in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of said works and any facilities incidental thereto, or for the relocation or reconstruction of highways, railroads, and other properties affected by said works"; it is also provided that before designation of lands or interests the Secretary shall endeavor to negotiate a contract of purchase from the Indians and failing in that, shall proceed with the designation.

2. That the Secretary of the Interior shall himself "determine the just and equitable compensation to be made" to the Indians, which compensation shall be in money, property, or other assets, including rights to electric energy developed at any of the plants authorized in the legislation.

3. Amounts of money determined by the Secretary as compensation for tribal lands are required to be transferred to the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the tribe. Amounts due individual Indian allottees are require to be paid "to the superintendent of the appropriate Indian agency, or such officer as may be designated" by the Secretary of the Interior for credit to the accounts of the individual concerned.

4. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to use funds deposited to the credit of allottees, in his discretion, for the acquisition of other lands and improvements, the relocation of existing improvements, the construction of new improvements on the land so acquired, etc.

5. Where required for the purposes of the act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to remove Indian cemeteries, and in his discretion, in lieu of requiring payment therefor, to establish cemeteries on such other lands as he may select and acquire for the purpose.

6. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts . . . to carry out the provisions of this section.

In short, we find that section 14 of S. 75 grants to the United States as of the date the bill becomes law, all rights, title, and interest of the Hualapai Indians to lands, cemeteries, facilities, etc., within their reservation as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as needed "in aid" of the central Arizona project. Furthermore, it constitutes the Secretary of the Interior as the judge of what lands shall be taken and the amount and form of compensation to be paid therefor. Provision is made that the Secretary shall before designating tribal lands make every reasonable effort to negotiate with the owners, but he alone is the judge of what constitutes a reasonable effort. Compensation is required, but it may be in the form of "money, property, or other assets" at the discretion of the Secretary. Although the lands may be taken at the time of the passage of the bill, compensation may be paid some time later, also at the discretion of the Secretary. The Secretary is to pay whatever compensation he deems just, not to the Indians whose lands are taken but to the United States Treasury in the case of tribal lands, and to the Superintendent of the Indian Agency, in the case of individual allottees.

The powers granted to the Secretary under section 14 of S. 75 and H. R. 1500 are so broad and all embracing as to recall the attempt of the Indian Department in 1874 to remove the Hualapai from their aboriginal home to the Colorado River reservation, an attempt which as previously stated the Supreme Court labeled "a high-handed endeavor to wrest from these Indians"[7] lands which belonged to them. It is to be noted that the entire section 14 of S. 75 and H. R. 1500, save for two paragraphs, was submitted to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the Department of the Interior.

V. HUALAPAI EFFORTS TO RESIST TAKING OF THEIR LANDS

The Hualapai made representations before the Senate and House committees considering the central Arizona project authorizing bills during the last Congress, protesting the arbitrary seizures of their lands which it authorized. The tribe council passed a resolution approved March 8, 1949, which was sent to members of the Arizona delegation praying "a recognition of the rights of the Hualapai Tribe" in connection with the central Arizona project bill. To date, their prayer has met with no success.

[4] Walapai Papers, op. cit., pp. 134–135.

[5] Testimony of Barnett E. Marks at hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Public Lands on H. R. 934 and 935, 81st Cong., 1st sess., serial No. 11, pt. 2, p. 858.

[6] *United States* v. *Santa Fe Railroad Co.* (314 U. S. 339, 360, 86 L. Ed. 263, 277).

[7] Supra, n. 1.

Cut Unnecessary Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. R. D. Scamehorn, president of the Morgan Co., of Oshkosh, Wis., on the need for reducing unnecessary Government expenditures. The letter is typical of others reaching my office pleading for economy. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There has just come to my desk from the National Small Business Men's Association figures on actual expenditures in peacetime by several different departments of our Government showing the terrific increase that has occurred between fiscal years ended June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1950. All of us know that Government spending has been increased by leaps and bounds but actually, I, for one, did not realize that some of the increases had been so fantastic as this report shows.

Frankly, I had not realized that the Department of Commerce expenditures had been increased more than 1,100 percent, nor that Department of Interior expenditures had been increased about 800 percent. Department of Labor shows even a larger increase, being approximately 1,400 percent.

While the Department of Justice shows increased expenditures of a little less than 20 percent, I can understand the reasons why there would be such increased personnel costs. I can also understand why there would be a great increase in the operating expenses of the State Department because of increased personnel, etc. Nevertheless, the increase that has occurred in the State Department in the last 10 years would seem to indicate that our Government authorities have lost all sense of balance. In the matter of independent offices, I don't understand an increase of nearly 300 percent, however, it still isn't so fantastic as the increased costs in the Department of Commerce, Department of Interior, Department of Labor, and the State Department.

I realize that here and there businessmen, as well as others, have been asking for more Government services, and all these things cost money. Nevertheless, I feel there is no excuse for Government bureaus attempting to not only satisfy every whim but also to provide great quantities of statistical and factual information, little of which is ever used.

Also in this morning's mail has come to my desk the regular monthly copy from the United States Department of Labor covering "Monthly report of current wage developments, No. 3." This is a regional report from the Chicago office. Also in this morning's mail was a monthly report entitled "Current Wage Developments" which gives the national picture. The regional report covers some 19 pages full of information regarding reported wage changes in this area in different industries. The monthly report entitled "Current Wage Developments," from Secretary Tobin's office, has 66 pages of similar information, some of it being a duplication. It is nice for business to have this information, but totally unnecessary, and if the cost of providing this and many other kinds of data is the reason for an increase in the budget in 10 years of 1,400 percent, then it seems to me that we had better dispense with a lot of these nice but unessential services.

So long as the taxpayers' money is being spent for things of this kind, business interests would be foolish if they didn't accept them for whatever the information contained therein may be worth. However, many thoughtful people feel that there must be a sharp and immediate reduction in a lot of unnecessary Government expenses, and right now is the time to do it.

When our Nation is threatened, most of us are willing to accept added tax burdens to cover the cost of defense preparation. I say this in spite of the fact that many wonder where the so-called best implements of warfare that we had only a few years ago have gone to (this statement allows for obsolescence). We also wonder what has happened to the billions that have been appropriated in the last 3 or 4 years for defense efforts, which apparently had not shown up in completed implements of warfare when trouble appeared in Korea a few months ago. Nevertheless, I fully believe we must be ready for all real (not purposely concocted) emergencies. Because we make ready to defend ourselves at a cost of billions is all the more reason why a lot of other unnecessary billions of expenditure should be cut out. It will take drastic thinking and drastic action to accomplish the objective, and I am writing you again on matters of national legislation because I feel so strongly that the welfare of our Nation is hanging in the balance. Let's have the courage to really pare off every penny of nonessential spending and then see to it that the personnel of overstaffed Government bureaus is trimmed off and available to make up the manpower shortage which now obtains in many parts of the country and which other Government bureaus are talking so much about. A substantial number of your constituency with whom I am acquainted subscribe thoroughly to this viewpoint.

Yours very truly,
R. D. SCAMEHORN,
President.

Our Most Precious Possession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Albert C. Jacobs, chancelor, University of Denver, entitled "Our Most Precious Possession," before the Civitan Club, February 14, 1951:

Mr. President and members of the Civitan Club, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to meet with you today and to discuss more fully a proposal which a week ago I outlined rather briefly to the University of Denver faculty. This proposal concerns our most priceless possession—the Nation's manpower.

In this time of crisis the wise and intelligent use of our manpower is the Nation's most crucial problem. Upon the effective resolution of this vexing question depend the solution of many major current issues, the morale of the youth of our land who have the courage to face anything but uncertainty, and the preservation of our cherished freedoms.

In resolving this critical problem, it is imperative that two vitally important necessities be coordinated with the greatest of wisdom: First, the strengthening in the defense of our way of life of our military forces; and, second, the preservation of the enduring objectives of higher education, namely, basic research, training of specialists of all kinds, and, through education in the liberal arts building the citizens and leaders of tomorrow. The second necessity demands that educational opportunities be available to a sufficient number of qualified students. These two basic necessities must be constantly before us. How then are we to guarantee their effective and coordinated accomplishment?

We start out with a fundamental premise. Our Nation and the civilized world today face an emergency of grave import; freedom is undergoing a challenge without parallel in our history. We are involved in a world-wide conflict testing not merely our military, political, and economic strength, but also our spiritual and moral foundations. The struggle is one of life and death between two entirely irreconcilable concepts of political organization and human relationships; two entirely irreconcilable concepts as to the dignity and integrity of the individual.

What form the conflict in which we are now engaged will ultimately take is not at the moment clear. At present it threatens world war III. The Korean situation, due to the menacing activity of Communist China, for months has been a keg of dynamite. Western Europe and certain other areas continue zones of potential explosion. But then if the current conflict does not result in the catastrophe of total war—and we pray it will not—and I am by no means convinced that our opponents mean a full-scale shooting war—the tension creating this emergency threatens to dominate world affairs for years to come.

We must therefore strive unceasingly to make our Nation strong—strong physically and economically, strong intellectually, and strong morally and spiritually. If we are to build and maintain this essential strength, if we are to gird for the defense of our free society, we must be strong in conviction and strong in action, tough with ourselves and tough with those who seek to enslave the world. Let it never be forgotten—we have not and never have had imperialistic aims—we seek only to allow the people of the world self-determination and the right to enjoy the freedoms of freemen. According to the tenets of God and the principles of democracy, we seek respect for the individual.

If we are to be tough with ourselves, if we are to gird for the effective defense of freedom, all Americans today, and perhaps for many years to come, must actively accept the concept of service to the Nation. Each and every one must according to his particular ability do his part in maintaining the blessed freedoms upon which our Nation was founded.

In time of emergency, and our Government has recognized its existence, the individual citizens to some extent at least may have to subjugate personal desires to the greater needs of the Nation. One of our present needs is for trained men who can be called upon if there is further actual physical threat to our security. We do not want war, in fact, we loathe it, but we cannot tolerate additional aggression against us. We must be ready to back up our beliefs and convictions with proof to aggressors that we are ready with men, trained and tough, and with materials, the best our scientific and technical know-how can produce. The men in the Kremlin, just like other dictators before them, respect only military might and physical strength.

The material phase of America's strength causes me no concern. The preparation of materials is and always will be easy for us. Our factories can readily gear up to emergency needs. We can out-produce any nation on earth. No one can rival our productive genius.

The preparation of men, however, is our major problem. Getting tough with ourselves and gearing up our manpower is much more difficult than our material productivity which the whole world respects. We do not and will never relish the thought of becoming a warlike people. We love peace and abhor the interruption of normal peacetime pursuits. The unnecessary injury or death of one human being is contrary to our total philosophy and to our religious outlook.

What then, in view of the nature of the emergency, is the most effective resolution of our manpower problem? Our Nation, I repeat, today and during the emergency requires services on two broad bases. The Armed Forces, which everyone agrees must be strengthened, must have intelligent, trained young leaders and personnel. At the same time our Nation must maintain its scientific, technical, industrial, professional, and cultural leadership.

In seeking a solution of the all important manpower problem, one of the Nation's most distinguished educators, President James B. Conant, of Harvard University, has sponsored the universal military service plan whereby every man, at the age of 18, would be drafted; there would be no exceptions—those who might ordinarily be IV-F's would be inducted for limited service, or put into activities which they could perform. Note carefully—all at 18 would be required for a period of time to perform service according to their capabilities.

This plan would provide the Nation with the needed physical and military strength so sorely needed, thereby attaining the first of the major requirements I have noted. But it would not provide a solution to the second, namely, the continuance of the enduring objectives of higher education; basic research, training specialists of all kinds, and through education in the liberal arts building the citizens and leaders of tomorrow. At the best, under this plan, education would be postponed in the hope it would be resumed at a later date. Furthermore, the military would have complete control over these young men during their most formative years.

On the other hand, Selective Service, with the difficult questions of deferment and assignment—deferring Dick and calling Tom—cannot of itself insure our needed military strength nor guarantee the continuance of the enduring objectives of higher education. In favor, however, of such a plan, my former colleague, now the very able president of Amherst College, Dr. Charles W. Cole, argues: "Defer young men capable of profiting from further training (as revealed by tests). Let them go to college at their own or private scholarship expense. Permit them to remain only so long as they meet specified high standards. Require them to serve, after training, 1 month for every month of deferment." I cannot agree that such a plan

would most effectively meet our Nation's long-time needs.

After much thought and with due humility I venture to suggest that the most effective handling of our manpower would be by means of a National Service Act which would require all young men from 18 through at lease 25 to devote a minimum of 2 years to national service, longer if the emergency should so demand. Note, I say national instead of military service. I do not contemplate sending all young men into military service. I am proposing during the continuance of the emergency a total draft; there would be no IV-F's; all would be required to render some kind of service, even though it be limited in character.

Why do I urge a suggestion so drastic in nature? I do so frankly because of the character of the emergency in which we are involved. We are constantly threatened with devastating war, a war in which the releasing of the atom could well destroy the civilization we have known. But with World War I, and again, in incomparably greater degree in World War II, war became a great destructive, systematic business, a business in which today, more than ever before, it is necessary for a nation, and for all individuals in that nation, to stand together when the dire emergency comes. Our 150,000,000 citizens must be ready for that day. And war, as we now know it, is not merely a battle of military forces; it is an all-out test of a nation's entire strength.

I therefore propose a minimum period of 2 years in the national service not only to provide urgent military strength, but to insure the scientific, technical, professional, and cultural leadership so desperately required. Everyone must perform service of some kind. In this performance the largest freedom of choice consistent with national security should be allowed.

Those young men who, on the basis of adequate and effective testing, are found to have a superior capacity for training in higher education or who possess special technical aptitudes, should be given the opportunity by the Government to go to institutions of higher learning or to technical or trade schools. In the case of institutions of higher learning, these should be, if possible, schools in which there are ROTC units, which units could be utilized for military training purposes. These young men, while continuing their education, would receive basic and further military training. They would not, however, be exempt from active military service, but would be called upon for such when required by the Nation. The colleges would be in charge of the admission of students and in control of education except the military training. Except, however, in rare cases no one should be required in the performance of his national service to continue against his will his educational activity.

In developing this part of my program, I want to make one point clear. What happens in this emergency to any one institution of learning is not my main concern. What happens to the Nation and to all free nations is my prime concern.

The young men not qualified to continue education, or who do not desire to do so, and who are found fit for military service, would immediately be given the necessary military training. I want to make it clear, however, that no boy would be sent to combat duty until he had passed his nineteenth birthday.

Young men found not qualified for further education or technical training, or for service with the Army, Navy or Air Force, would be utilized according to their capacities for limited service of other kinds. There would, as I have said, be no 4-F's.

The program which I have had the temerity to suggest would, of course, involve a most careful survey of our American youth in all three categories. Testing services which have been developed over the years are fully capable of assuming this great responsibility and would be effectively utilized to complement the selective-service mechanism now in use. Selection must of course be in the hands of highly competent experts—testers and educators—free from all pressures of special groups and individuals.

The program which I have outlined would permit the strengthening of our Armed Forces as well as the continuance of essential education. In the assignment to national service, the individual's freedom of choice should be respected wherever possible. And it would in a great number of cases, I submit, since the desire of an individual is inextricably a part of his natural aptitude. Control, however, would be necessary to prevent large numbers of young men who, irrespective of their capacities, desire to take up arms. This has happened in every war. And, in every war, America has lost great numbers of young men whom the Nation should later have had as civilian leaders. The young man who, on the basis of conclusive tests, showed superior potentialities for a career in the science laboratory, in medicine, in dentistry, in languages, in teaching, in government, or in work in the skilled crafts, would have the opportunity for further classroom training in the interests of greater usefulness to the Nation during and after the conflict, while at the same time receiving military training.

Remember, if we fail to produce replacement crops of scientists and technicians, administrators, and humanists, our national health and welfare, our scientific progress, our material production, our cultural growth will be seriously impaired. While the educational cost to the Government might be large, it would be small in comparison with the loss the Nation otherwise would suffer.

The purpose of this proposal is to employ to the fullest degree possible the young manpower of this Nation, our most priceless possession, to the end that during and after the emergency we would continue to have an adequate group of leaders in the professions, occupations, and pursuits upon which our Nation must fundamentally depend in the maintenance of our way of life. We would also have the physical strength which we will sorely need for years to come. And further, in the interest of economy, we would be utilizing to the utmost the existing and available facilities of our institutions of learnings, institutions which have throughout our history been the strongest guardians of our freedom.

To be frank with you, I dislike intensely the idea of requiring anyone to perform service of any kind. Would that we lived in a world where such would never be necessary, but unfortunately we do not at this moment. We have had to have price and wage controls, priorities on basic materials. And, if we are to emerge victorious, we must during the current emergency have certain personnel controls. American youth must be asked temporarily by their fellow citizens to serve their country in the most effective manner so that the wellsprings of strength which virtually dried up in World War II will not again be impaired.

My proposal is the opposite of regimentation, which is so contrary to the American way of life. It is built upon the major premise of permitting the fullest possible development of an individual's capacities, consistent of course with the national welfare in the time of emergency. It aims to permit the maximum of education for those qualified therefor, but at the same time providing them with military training. It is not in the national interest for a boy obviously qualified for treatment of the sick or wounded to be assigned arbitrarily for a period of time to guard duty or to flying an airplane.

We are not doing business as usual today. We are in a serious emergency. It is a stepped-up, accelerated education and training about which I am talking, a realistic facing of needs, and of action appropriate to the needs. But on this stepped-up plane, we must allow a new business-as-usual attitude if our Nation is to survive the attacks from without and be strong from within. With this in mind, I have submitted my plan.

I appreciate sincerely the opportunity to discuss these important matters with such an intelligent citizenry and to develop more fully the views I presented to our faculty. You and I have but one interest—the preservation of our freedoms and the American way of life.

A Sordid Story of Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Ames Daily Tribune, Ames, Iowa:

GENERAL FILTER AND THE AIR FORCE—OR A BID IN THE HAND IS WORTH TWO IN THE BUSH—MAYBE

(By Bernie Kooser)

Winston Churchill had once said it something like this:

"Never have so many owed so much to so few."

Mr. Churchill was referring to Great Britain's beleaguered millions in the position of the debtor and to an air force as the creditor.

Last week as a small-business man from the Middle West boarded his plane for home after a week's visit to the Nation's Capital, Congressmen, taxpayers, and believers in governmental efficiency were phrasing it thus:

"Never have so few owed so much to so many."

TRUTH WANTED

In the position of the debtor was an air force. The commodity owed was truth as to why a low bid for Air Force demineralizers had been rejected. The small-business representative tiredly hurrying back to his business was Joe P. Lawlor, president of the General Filter Co., of Ames.

TARGET AIR FORCE

The Ames man, a veteran of both World War I and World War II, had operated in close support of the United States Air Force as a commander in the United States Navy, Civil Engineer Corps during the last war, but as he moved in on Washington, he was attempting to bring down to earth that same air force—and he found willing helpers.

Lawlor, who last month estimated that 50 percent of his business dealings have been with governments, had increased that percentage considerably in the 10 days he spent in Washington, as he talked with Representatives and Senators, newsmen, and all others—and there were scores—who would listen to his story.

That story included, if one may draw conclusions:

1. One of the best run-arounds since the epic chase of the monkey and the weasel around the mulberry bush.

2. Behind-the-scenes maneuvering on war contracts bids.

3. An apparent abandonment of the idea that to the low bidders—other things being approximately equal—go the contracts.

4. A hint as to how millions of dollars of defense money is being spent, or misspent.

FLYING SAUCER

Those who listened to the story told by the businesslike Mr. Lawlor also could find in it a hint that the United States does possess flying saucers several times faster than anything yet conceived by man.

There also was a tip-off that the United States Air Force, which was having troubles on the filter market, had itself developed a filter, apparently of revolutionary concept, which screened out and discarded lowest-cost bids while allowing bids more costly to the Government to pass through.

As he returned to Ames, Saturday afternoon, Lawlor was resigned to having lost the contract for 105 demineralizers for the Air Force, was proud of the newspapers and newsmen who had carried the story of his fight to get the contract.

That fight had included months of planning, research, analyzing, contacting suppliers, screening quotations, assembling data, making arrangements for testing and finally submitting, on November 13, 1950, a bid of $348,591, as compared to the bid of $409,842 which won the contract for another corporation.

The fight also was marked by General Filters careful following of regulation channels and rules for bidders on Government contracts.

But while he returned to Ames resigned to having lost the contract, the headman of the Ames firm was not reconciled to certain statements reflecting on his company, and he was not reconciled to the way the Government was spending money.

AID PROMISED

Behind him in Washington, D. C., he had left several who promised aid.

Senator GUY GILLETTE, the Democratic Iowa Senator, had promised to help.

In complete agreement with Senator GILLETTE was Republican Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER. Senator GILLETTE was on the Senate Small Business Committee and in position to level guns at the high-flying Air Force.

In the House, Representative PAUL CUNNINGHAM had taken the floor to tell his colleagues:

"No satisfactory explanation has been given to the General Filter Co., of Ames, Iowa, as to why its bid was rejected. Explanations have been offered as a result of protests filed by the General Filter Co., of Ames, and each explanation is different than the previous one, and each one is just about as ridiculous and unfounded as the fact that $61,250 of the taxpayers' money was spent unnecessarily on a $350,000 to $400,000 contract. I have computed the amount of money lost to the taxpayers by rejecting the bid of the General Filter Co. and awarding the contract to the Rifinite Corp. of Omaha to be approximately 15 percent.

"Mr. Speaker, if all the contracts now being let, and to be let, by the Government are to be awarded on this kind of basis, it means that $150,000,000 out of every $1,000,000,000 will be an absolute loss to the taxpayers, or $1,500,000,000 out of every $10,000,000,000; $3,000,000,000 out of every $20,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000 out of every $100,000,000,000.

"Is it any wonder that the people are dissatisfied with the way the Government is handling its business affairs? Is it any wonder they are protesting additional taxes when they know things like this are going on? Just why, Mr. Speaker, when sealed bids are called for and a responsible company submits a bid, supported by a sufficient performance bond and proper financial statements, is such a bid rejected, and it awarded another company whose bid is 15-percent higher. Is this favoritism, or is it just plain stupidity?

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which reports many things, reported no answers to PAUL CUNNINGHAM's question.

UNEASINESS

But there seemed to be an increasing uneasiness accompanying an increasing awareness by the Nation's lawmakers that all has not turned out well with legislation giving blanket authority to the President.

Most recent of the Executive orders resulting from that blanket authority had carried this illuminating paragraph in authorizing the Department of Defense to enter into contracts:

"Advertising, competitive bidding and bid, payment, performance or other bonds or other forms of security need not be required."

Several thousand words later, the Executive, apparently as after-thought, said:

"The provisions of * * * this order are hereby extended to the Department of Commerce."

It wouldn't have surprised lots of people had another paragraph made the order retroactive to the Civil War. But that may come later.

Still coming up in the case of General Filter and its bid is a hearing by the Senate Small Business Committee at which Lawlor will seek a retraction of the statement by the Air Force that the local firm did not have the facilities to handle the order for 105 mineralizers.

But though the full story of the case was discouraging to taxpayers, there were certain phases of it which might possibly be regarded as amusing if they had not been part of the whole. One of them concerned a telephone call made by Mr. Lawlor to Maj. W. C. Nichols, chief of section of the Procurement Field Office at Chicago. Mr. Lawlor asked the whereabouts of Albert King who was supposed to have been in Ames at the time of the phone call, inspecting facilities of the local company for Major Nichols.

Before the call was ended, King walked into the office of Major Nichols and was put on the phone.

A possible explanation of this is that King was transported back to Chicago from Wichita in time to talk to Lawlor and that this may be the tip-off that the United States does possess flying saucers capable of meeting just such schedules, but up to now used only in such emergencies.

As Lawlor today scouted around for other work for his company to do, he estimated that the unsuccessful attempt to secure the contract for demineralizers had cost his company about $3,000. It was agreed generally that it would be the best $3,000 ever spent if it could do anything to make government more efficient.

Manchester Boddy on the Struggle for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a part of the RECORD the thought-provoking article by Manchester Boddy in the Los Angeles Daily News of February 16, 1951. Manchester Boddy has an extremely broad grasp of the world situation, and although his penetrating analysis of our current troubles is not consoling, it does, I think, help us to face up to the basic problems. The article referred to follows:

GREAT DEBATE STIRS BROTH OF CYNICISM

The great debate continues. There is a wider gulf between former President Herbert Hoover and his fellow Republican, Gov. Tom Dewey, than ever there was between Democrats and Republicans in a national election.

While Herbert Hoover has changed his position somewhat since his so-called isolationist pronouncement of December 20, 1950, he is still opposed to sending masses of American land soldiers and huge quantities of things to Europe as the most effective means of stopping aggression by Russia.

Governor Dewey, on the other hand, speaks for a very large section of the Republican Party that believes the United States should consider Europe and Asia as front-line battlegrounds in the defense of the United States.

Listening to the debaters one gets the uncomfortable feeling that there are two sure ways in which the United States can commit suicide: one, by following Herbert Hoover's advice; the other, by not following it.

As usual, even the great debate with all of its implications is being studied by a relatively small minority of American citizens. The vast majorty assumes that the problems of the moment have been created by the blunders of irresponsible, stupid politicians.

These impatient people, annoyed by the inconveniences of a national emergency, like to do their duty by repeating over and over: "Aren't we all silly? Why don't the world leaders just sit down around a table and say: 'Come now, let's have peace.'" Or, they suggest some other bit of magic that could cure the world of its ills practically overnight if our leaders had the courage, or the sense, or the patriotism to act. "But," the talk goes on, "since they won't do the right thing, why should I be bothered?"

Constant criticism of the Government gives moral support to the citizen who wants to find an excuse for business, politics, and social life as usual. "After all," he argues, "if the people in Washington are all wrong, why should I be right? When the powers that be decide to run the Government and its foreign policies my way, they can count on my support—but not until then."

The wise individual, it seems to me, will think through and beyond the loud and convincing words of the current debate and seek a solid foundation of fact. If he succeeds, he will be able to measure the true value of speeches, editorials, radio comment, laws, policies, and actions dealing with the world crisis.

For what it is worth, here is an outline of my own thinking on the matter of our world crisis:

1. All nature is constantly seeking balance.

2. The relatively sudden advent and development of modern science has created a temporary state of terrific unbalance in the world:

(a) Western civilization did not expand the area of its growth. (b) World populations jumped from approximately 860,000,000 at the turn of the eighteenth century to more than 2,250,000,000.

3. Instead of using science to produce the means of survival for this new mass man, western civilization used it to destroy productive wealth:

(a) The last two world wars destroyed more wealth than all other wars combined.

4. Mass man could win his struggle for survival in only two ways:

(a) Using science to produce sufficient food, clothing and shelter, and (b) using a world organization through which injustices in

distribution of opportunities could be corrected and basic freedoms guaranteed, or

5. Western civilization could solve the problem by continuing warfare until world populations have been reduced to the point where people and earth are once more in balance.

6. After making the best efforts possible, considering the state of the world and the degree of wisdom possessed by its people, western civilization has been forced to adopt war, and preparation for war, as the means of insuring survival.

This being true, we may expect the years ahead to be filled with peril. The incessant, irresistible movement toward balance will be characterized by bloodshed, disease, abject poverty—and eventually the destruction of vast numbers of people.

The United States has enjoyed vertical growth and today towers high above the quivering, struggling population mass of the world. Can we maintain our position?

I find it worth while to study the great debate with that question in mind.

Dr. Lee de Forest, the Father of the Electronic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to authorize the President to award the Medal for Merit in the name of Congress to Dr. Lee de Forest, "The Father of the Electronic Age."

Congress established the Medal for Merit in 1942 to honor civilians who "distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services." Most awards of the medal were made before 1948 to honor those making particularly valuable contributions to the prosecution and winning of World War II.

A total of 404 persons have received the award, leaders in industry, government, and science. The most recent recipient was Ambassador John J. Muccio, who served as United States Ambassador in Seoul, Korea, through the evacuation. President Truman presented the Medal for Merit to Muccio at his historic meeting with General MacArthur in the mid-Pacific last fall.

It is my belief that the recognition extended to the scientists who developed the atomic bomb and radar should also be given to Dr. de Forest, who invented the three-electrode tube upon which radio, recording, radar, and even splitting the atom are based.

Modern living and modern warfare would be impossible without the contributions made by Dr. de Forest.

In 1906 Lee de Forest invented the audion, or three-electrode tube, first as the most sensitive radio detector known, later as an amplifier capable of amplifying infinitesimal electric currents by more than 100,000,000 times, and later as an oscillator, or generator of electric currents of any frequency up to 10,000,000,000 cycles per second—a generator destined shortly to replace every other type of radio—telegraph and telephone—transmitter. This promethean tube has been recognized by the highest authorities as the most important and most useful invention of the twentieth century—Nobel prize winner Dr. I. I. Rabbi describes the three-electrode tube as "so outstanding in its consequences that it ranks with the greatest inventions of all time."

Charles F. Kettering wrote:

> The spectacular growth of electronics to an enormous industry employing over a million workers and benefiting untold millions of people in all parts of the world may be said to have begun with that event—
>
> The creation of the tube.

Dr. Irving Langmuir, Nobel prize winner, wrote:

> The revolution—brought about by this tube—has been as great in its way as that which may now be envisioned in other fields through our new control of nuclear power.

This electronic amplifier of Lee de Forest has made possible all long-distance wire telephone, transoceanic radio telephony and picture transmission, facsimile, radio broadcasting, the public address system, the talking-motion picture, perfect recording and reproduction of phonograph music. Modern aviation and the automatic pilot would be impossible without it. Our guided missiles and the proximity fuse—the present rapid calculating machines for range finding—all attest its priceless value in warfare. Radar, loran, and sonar depend throughout on its magical aid. Even the atom bomb requires the tube in the manufacture of its ingredients. With it the engineer can now command the electron to do his bidding. For the first time he has a hold on electricity itself, not just its manifestations. The electron tube enables the scientist to split the atom, and measure the heat from stars infinitely distant, extending boundlessly man's knowledge of his universe.

Already this thermionic tube is at work in a thousand industries. It will enter thousands more. Electronic devices control highspeed wrapping of packages, delicately fill bottles to the proper level, remove slate from coal at the mines, level elevators, open doors, detect smoke and fumes, measure vibrations and thickness. In uncounted factories electronic energy heats, welds, cements, selects, and counts, saving man from limitless hours of tedious toil. A hundred technical institutes devote their resources to research and study in electronics.

Not content with the achievements of this promethean tube, Dr. de Forest devoted 10 years of his active manhood to the pioneer development of sound-on-film talking pictures. Years before the Jazz Singer film was heard, the de Forest phonofilm was installed in New York Broadway theaters, and in various cities over the East and South. He it was whose heroic efforts in the early twenties broke down the skeptical producers' insistence that "the public did not want motion pictures." Here was another instance of his heroic pioneering which has completely revolutionized another gigantic industry, just as the radio broadcast and television have totally metamorphosed our home life and the political thinking of every civilized people the world over. Dr. de Forest has been awarded many honors, among which are the Legion of Honor and Prix la Tour by France, the Elliott Cresson Medal of the Franklin Institution, the John Scott Medal of the city of Philadelphia, the gold medal of the Institute of Radio Engineers, of which he has been president and cofounder, gold medals of St. Louis World Exposition and Pan-Pacific Exposition, and the Edison Medal of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers. Honorary degrees have been conferred upon him by Yale University, Syracuse University, and the Lewis Institute of Chicago. He has been awarded nearly 300 United States patents.

Dr. Lee de Forest, now in his seventy-eighth year, is still busily at work on electronic problems in his Los Angeles laboratory, a hale and hearty American, universally honored for his priceless contributions to our modern living. He most richly deserves the honor which the here-proposed bill will confer upon him.

Will War Come in 1951?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in reading the mail that comes to me from the district and from throughout Arkansas, I find that many questions are asked which are most pertinent to the issues with which we are confronted. What are the chances of war with Russia? Will war come this spring or during the year 1951? Should the satellites, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, attack Yugoslavia, would that mean all-out war? These questions indicate the thinking of the American people; they are concerned about the danger which our Nation faces. They want to know what measures are being taken to protect our interests.

Should Moscow order a march on Yugoslavia, it would mean the start of world war III. There is little doubt about it. The Western Powers would join hands with Tito's forces in an all-out defense of that country in order to prevent the spread of the aggression to other countries in Europe. The United Nations would be appealed to for an immediate declaration of aggression against the satellite countries and, further, would ask for troop aid for Yugoslavia.

The steps that are being taken by America in the present crisis would provide only partial mobilization. Enough of an effort is being made which is intended to bring out unequivocally that this Nation means to prepare on a sound basis to meet any threat which might ensue. The door is left open at all times to discuss fully with Russia a complete settlement of all differences which exist.

The Government of the United States is engaged in a long-range program of preparedness—not an overnight mobilization effort. Apparently the leaders in our Armed Forces set-up feel that the chances are better than a 50-50 proposition that Russia will not move in 1951. It is felt that to increase our forces to 3,500,000 is most desirable. The Air Force has moved up from 54 groups to 70 and is undergoing another expansion at this particular moment to a 96-group force. General Spaatz is urging a 300-group Air Force. This, in my opinion, is quite a bit optimistic.

More emphasis is being placed on providing a reservoir of trained men through the medium of universal military training. Under UMT the young man would enter the service of his country immediately upon completion of his high school course or upon attaining his eighteenth birthday, whichever is later. The idea is to give him 27 months service prior to his entering college or business.

The stockpile of atomic weapons being produced by the Nation is steadily increasing. This alone has been one of the principal factors in no aggressive move being made by Russia in the Middle East, Yugoslavia, Berlin, or Vienna. There are advantages in Russia moving this spring. Yet it is believed that the disadvantages outweigh whatever gains she might have by attempting to overrun Western Europe. The main deterrent to such an aggression by Russia is the known fact that should she start a war in Western Europe, every industrial center in Russia would be hit by atomic attack through the medium of the long range bombers which could be based at fairly close range.

There are many significant factors which attest to the futility of Russia's attacking in 1951. Among them are:

First. Russia could not win a long war with the United States.

Second. It would be unlikely for the Soviet Union to attempt a war in Europe while the Korean conflict is in progress.

Third. Russia's oil supplies are short.

Fourth. The Soviets are dubious about the reliability of the satellite nations.

Russia is strong today, and America is just beginning a real program of defense. To strike now would be tempting, as the industrial capacity of Western Europe or the Middle East oil resources would be prizes of major proportions. The gamble, however, is too big.

United States Needs Press Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bay Ridge Record:

UNITED STATES NEEDS PRESS AGENT

What this country needs is a good press agent, a competent man or woman who will publicize the power and the might and the ability of the United States.

The nearest we have come to this point in recent years is the series of stories that are coming out of Las Vegas, Nev. In truth and in fact these, stories, true or false, are enough to put real fear into the hearts of the communistic Russians and to make them think a dozen times before they tempt us to drop our bombs on Russian territory.

"Flash Seen 500 Miles Away"—"Explosions felt hundreds of miles from the testing grounds"—"Radioactive clouds hover at 11,000 feet over Sunrise Mountain." Power of such stories should not be underestimated. It is to be assumed the Russians have imagination and that they can visualize what would happen to their country if the bombs were dropped on Russia rather than in mere experiments in Nevada.

For too great a time we have had disgruntled people in the United States who constantly kick and gripe at everything, the taxes, the draft, the high cost of living, our foreign policy, the actions of the President, and scores of other matters and while there may be and doubtless is considerable basis for such discontent it would be far better, particularly at this time, to keep such thoughts and kicks to our individual selves.

It gives Russia much happiness to read and learn that there is so much apparent discontent here. It would be real smart if the people here would reverse their attitudes for the time being and have every man, woman, and child, start acting like high-priced, high-powered press agents for the United States. We receive little, if any, bad news about the Russians but we do hear enough to give us the impression that everything in Russia is hunky dory; that everyone is happy, well fed, and contented and able to take on the United States and the world at any time it wishes to do so.

Small Businesses and Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter sent to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] by Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Joint Committee on the Economic Report,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: We are happy to reply to your letter of January 24, inquiring the reaction of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., to "the main recommendations made by the President in his Economic Report * * *."

First. The membership of the federation has expressed itself repeatedly in favor of balanced Federal budgets. Therefore, we feel safe in stating that they would favor a pay-as-you-go tax program. Their approval of such a program is contingent, however, on two factors: (a) That the weight of the tax load be not so great as to promote the same inflation as would follow from deficit financing; and (b) that the weight of the tax load be not so great, or so inequitably distributed, as to destroy small and independent business, whose continued vital existence is proof of the presence of freedom of opportunity and competitive enterprise in our country, and which can make such great contributions to national stability.

Your attention is called to the fact that during the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress, efforts which happily failed, were made by giant industry groups to "sell" Congress on a substitute for the proposed excess-profits tax law which would have burdened consumers, unincorporated businesses (which are mainly small and independent enterprises), and small and independent corporations very heavily, while permitting giant firms to get off with much lighter tax loads than under the excess-profits law (see copy of our testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, Dec. 6, 1950). These efforts would have gone far, had they been successful, to accomplish the damage to small and independent business outlined in the paragraph above.

In this connection we point out that small and independent enterprise is particularly susceptible to tax damage at this time because of the impact of the defense program, or, shall we say, the inequitable administration of this program. Letters are received by us daily from small and independent businessmen who have been foreclosed from their normal civilian production because of materials shortages. Yet these businessmen in many instances have not been able to secure compensating defense production orders. In face of these facts, they are having to contend with the inflationary upsurge which is continually raising their costs of operation. They are undergoing a squeeze, and any tax program which will add overheavily to their burden may destroy them and deprive the Nation of their needed services. Elimination of these small and independent businesses will deprive Government of an important source of tax revenue. In our opinion, the consequent expansion of giant enterprise to fill the gap will not provide sufficient tax compensation to overcome the revenue loss caused.

Also in this connection we strongly urge Congress to close the loopholes in present tax law. Our membership has recommended repeatedly that cooperative business enterprises be compelled to pay taxes in the same manner as their unincorporated and corporate enterprise competitors. We are conscious of the fact that differences in tax structures exist between unincorporated and corporate forms of business organization, that even within these forms of organization disparities exist. However, these differences, both external and internal, are not so great, neither are they so lethal, as those existing between unincorporated and corporate forms of business organization, on the one hand, and cooperative forms of business organization, on the other. It seems that a greater question than that of raising money for defense expenditures is here involved, and that that question is one of fair sharing of burdens. It is in this spirit that we recommend action on the tax loopholes available to cooperatives.

Second. It is the sense of our membership that economies can be effected by Government in both the defense and nondefense fields.

Defense-spending economies can be effected, first, through extension rather than contraction (as is now the case) in advertised-bids methods of procurement. The advertised-bid method of procurement permits

more widespread small and independent business participation in the defense production effort, strengthens the element of competition for Government procurement, and logically should result in lower costs for the military and lessened Government spending. Substitution of the advertised-bid method of procurement for negotiated-type procurement should effect great savings, particularly in highly concentrated industries, like steel, aluminum, copper, and rubber, where the tendency on the part of smaller firms is to conform to the price leadership of giant firms.

Greater use of small and independent business facilities in the defense effort should have other economy-making effects. First, it will eliminate the necessity for construction of additional big-business plants, which is a drain on stocks of short-supply materials, and in many instances on United States Treasury funds—either through direct Government spending or tax favors. Second, it should stimulate technological advances, resulting in the manufacture of better products for the same costs or products of equal quality at lower costs. Third, it should help eliminate wasteful build-up of backlogs in giant plants and wasteful use of manpower productive.

In this connection, members of the federation have recommended to their Congressmen favorable action on bills introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, House Small Business Committee chairman, and Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Senate Small Business Committee chairman, for establishment of a Small Defense Plants Corporation. These bills, with which Members of Congress are familiar, would, it is felt, establish an agency in Government which would be capable of providing the small and independent business participation in the defense program which is so badly needed.

Economies can also be effected in this defense effort by more willingness on the part of the military to listen to small and independent business suggestions. For instance, within the past few months, one of our members, a firm in the motor-vehicle-rebuilding field, suggested to the military that the reconditioning surplus World War II vehicles now in the hands of exporters and dealers for military and civilian defense use within the confines of the continental United States. This federation member suggested that such rehabilitation of these old vehicles could be accomplished at a fraction of the cost to Government of new vehicles. At the same time, it is logical to comment that this suggestion would curtail the drain on short-supply materials and release manpower for other tasks. Yet, so far as we have been able to determine, his suggestions have gone into the scrap basket somewhere along the line. We are sure that this condition has been repeated, and is being repeated, over and over again by the military in their procurement and spending program.

In this general connection we strongly urge that greater care be taken to secure appointment of bona fide small and independent business representatives in the various Government agencies supervising and consulting on the defense program, that the recommendations of presently existing bona fide small and independent business representatives in these agencies be given greater weight in the reaching of decisions. We are happy that such representation as does exist in these agencies does exist. But we know from practical day to day dealings that this representation is not adequate. And we know that this inadequacy is to a great degree robbing the fine small and independent business policies ordered by the administration and the Congress of much of their vitality.

In the field of nondefense spending, economies can be effected through curtailment or complete elimination of Government subsidy programs to business as well as to agriculture and of so-called social welfare programs. We are now entering on a period of high business activity and high wages and salaries promoted to a great degree by Government spending for defense. Government subsidies to agriculture, in the form of price support programs, seem dangerous and senseless, dangerous in the sense that they inject Federal competition with consumers, senseless in the sense that with high stabilized wages sufficient demand exists to care for farm output. Government subsidies to business are in the same category—for business activity is equally assured. The social welfare program—such as compulsory national health insurance and expanded security programs—seem equally unnecessary in this period of assured employment at relatively stable, high personal income. Briefly, at a time when the drain on the Federal purse is so great, what is the point in trying to help those who are able to help themselves?

Third, there is considerable opposition among our members to indirect controls such as consumer and business credit controls. However, our membership has indicated that the indirect controls are favored over direct price controls and wage controls and rationing. There is a considerable segment of our membership which feels that controls now existing in certain lines are useless since they do not go far enough, that they merely restate the conditions of sale which soundly operating independents had been imposing all along. Some feel that the controls have brought about some greater equality between giant and small and independent sellers. Others of our members who had complained of the dampening effect of the controls now state they are no factor in the demand situation, since materials shortages are dominant. In all this we strongly recommend that the Congress consider the fact that the controls as they exist are no deterrent on well-fixed consumers, of which there evidently are a considerable number, but that they definitely are a serious deterrent on lower wage groups whose actual needs are more real and more pressing than those of their financial betters.

Fourth, the Federation membership has voted time and again against Government price and wage controls and rationing. Generally it can be said that there is preference within limits as set forth in the preceding paragraph, for indirect controls. However, it may be significant to note that in 1947 only 15 percent of our members favored reimposition of price and wage controls, while in September 1950, 44 percent favored imposition of these controls. The big question, so far as small and independent business is concerned, on price and wage controls is that of administration. Surveys by this organization during mid-World War II revealed general small and independent business backing of such controls, but as time passed and regulations adversely affecting independent enterprise were enforced, this backing turned to opposition. This is a matter which might be given some deep consideration by those in the Price Stabilization Office who desire to limit black marketing (which we heartily despise) by freezing the channels of particular business vocations, evidently indiscriminately. In any event, personal contact with some of our members desiring direct controls indicates that they desire the controls across the board; in short, the feeling is that you can't regulate prices unless you regulate costs. How, logically, Government could regulate prices and wages without rationing, as much as it is despised, is a question we do not feel competent to answer.

Finally, we cannot urge too strongly the importance of a continuing, vigorous antitrust enforcement program to our Nation. Had such enforcement taken place in years past it is entirely possible that many of the dire shortages which now confront us and which are being used to plague both the Nation and small and independent business would not exist. Albeit, vigilant enforcement of these laws at the present will do much to preserve the vitality of small and independent enterprise and insure its continued ability to serve the Nation's needs. More than this, such enforcement will safeguard our American tradition of freedom of opportunity, which so sharply differentiates our Nation from the dictatorships whom we are fighting, and which makes our system such an inspiring beacon of hope to oppressed peoples all over the world. Our membership has voted time and again for continued, vigorous enforcement of these laws, and insists that now is not the time to discontinue such enforcement on specious pleas of war necessity by companies under prosecution. Periods of grave national emergency like this are traditionally times of great expansion on the part of giant enterprise. We must be on guard to insure that this expansion, as so easily could happen, does not occur at the expense unfairly of small and independent enterprise.

In this connection, we call your attention at this point to the fact that our vice president, George J. Burger, a member of the Business Advisory Committee to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has repeatedly stressed, in Business Advisory Committee meetings, the need for continuing vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws to bring about increased production. It is needless to belabor this sound point, since it is only necessary to recall to memory the deadening effect of monopolies and cartels on the productive resources of Europe and Asia.

We thank you for this opportunity to present our viewpoint to your committee, and assure you of our continued cooperation in any and all of your committee's important endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

C. WILSON HARDER,
President, National Federation of Independent Business.

A Distorted Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Philadelphia Bulletin:

A DISTORTED PICTURE—TRUMAN IS NOT THE SMALL, INCOMPETENT MAN HIS DETRACTORS WOULD PAINT HIM

(By Ralph W. Page)

A serious handicap to the effectiveness of the national effort in times of stress is our custom of deprecating our own chosen leaders.

Popular appraisal of public figures is based upon stereotyped descriptions incessantly broadcast by partisan political propagandists. These consist almost exclusively of detractions and belittlements.

The resulting picture is usually a distortion so absurd that it takes years for serious historians to dispel the muck and present a factual portrait.

This consistent defamation has applied particularly to our Presidents. The more capable they appear in retrospect, the greater was the intemperate abuse to which they were subjected when in office.

Grotesque and indecent representations and accusations were common currency against Washington, Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt.

Now it is the fashion to turn this customary flood of criticism and sneer upon President Truman. He is the chosen leader of our people carrying an impossible burden of choice in a dread crisis, unavoidably compelled to make decisions unpopular with one or another of our powerful conflicting factions.

SAME AMMUNITION ALWAYS USED

People who accept and retail the version of his detractors that he is a small, incompetent, uninformed mistake should reflect that precisely the same thing has always been, and would be, proclaimed about any conceivable man in the same position.

The bane, of course, is all-pervading politics. Opinion is not either realistic or objective. It is directed either by intent to influence future elections, or by particular protagonists whose personal interests are interfered with by the inevitable regulations of the crisis.

In a series of articles in the New York Times Arthur Krock, the dean of Washington correspondents—who usually doesn't agree with Presidential policy—has rendered the Nation a great service by stripping this veil of belittlement and presenting a reasonably true picture of the earnest, capable, studious, and purposeful captain of the American team, a captain who would enlist the support and consideration of the members if he were captain of any other kind of American team.

Take Your Choice, Buddy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and privileged, for the second time, to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a Freedoms Foundation award editorial written by Charles Francis Coe, chief editorialist for the Perry newspapers of Florida. This editorial was published in the Palm Beach Post-Times, March 16, 1950, and won third place in the 1950 Freedoms Foundation awards. The editorial is a repeater as Mr. Coe won Freedoms first prize editorial award for the best editorial in the United States during 1949.

As long as I have an editor in my congressional district who writes such splendid editorials and obtains such recognition among the editorial writers of this Nation, then indeed it is a pleasure to ask the privilege of placing such editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a part of my remarks I include this editorial:

TAKE YOUR CHOICE, BUDDY

(By Charles Francis Coe)

Americanism: Trust in God; freedom of worship; government by elected representatives; trial by jury; human freedom.

Communism: Denial of God; worship of dictators; government by Politburo; "purge" by politicians; human bondage.

Here it is. Step right up, Mr. and Mrs. America. The curtain has risen. The big show is on. The chips are down. "You pays your money and you takes your choice." Americanism. Communism.

Take a good look at Mr. Enright's cartoon. Weigh in your mind the offerings shown on opposite pages of the ledger, as Uncle Sam points them out. Soberly, in deep conscience and impartial solemnity, make your choice. It is yours for the taking. Uncle Sam will follow your direction. You are the boss. He is your ready and able servant.

The citizens of Florida are given outstanding opportunity to make resonant over the whole world, the choice they determine. The issue is clearly laid for them. This Nation joins the civilized world in palpitant interest in that choice. That you may make it in the presence of Almighty God; that you may know the composure of duty honorably done, we attempt this brief inventory of the philosophies between which you must choose.

AMERICANISM

Places its trust in God, who created mankind and endowed it with powers to achieve His own image.

Declares that man has a soul, which deserves individual dignity and demands the freedom of self government.

Grants constitutional liberty with rights certain, among which are the pursuit of happiness, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of the home.

Provides government by the governed.

Maintains courts created by the citizen. Grants trial by a jury of citizens.

Provides a fair trial for all men and demands immediate action against any accused.

Enforces education. Maintains public schools. Develops private enterprise. Rewards individual initiative. Accords the right of succession by will, but denies estates in tail.

Stands firmly upon the precept that all men are equal before the law.

Keeps its military accountable to the citizens. Governs by representatives chosen by the citizens.

COMMUNISM

Denies the existence of God and prohibits His worship.

Recognizes a supreme state, of which individual man is the vassal, not the master.

Sets up privileged classes under permanent rulers.

Scorns property rights, as it does human rights. Confiscates all, in the name of the state supreme.

Makes a mockery of law by "drumhead justice" and the murder of those accused for the convenience of dictators.

Purges humans in their search of freedom from bondage.

Permits humans to rot in dungeons while awaiting trial on trumped-up charges.

Denies education, except in the interest of the state.

Patterns the steps of the son in those of the father, so denying individual opportunity.

Invades the home without due process of law.

Governs by the dicta of rulers.

Centers all power in a dozen men. Denies men representation in their governance.

These are a few comparisons. Only a few. They are the roots from which the future will be grown. Americanism is the truest, the most dignified, the freest and the most productive plan ever devised for human liberty.

Communism is the most centered, dictatorial, ruinous blasphemy ever imposed upon the souls of men. It is human degradation in its concept; human bondage in its results.

Take your choice, buddy. The campaign now waging in our State of Florida gives you that choice. You have alternatives clearly defined, a choice inescapable. You take Americanism or you take communism.

May the God of the Republic abide with you as you choose.

Hindsight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a short article in Human Events by Frank C. Hanighen entitled "Hindsight," which in reality proves the prophetic foresight of many of our colleagues in the House of Representatives:

HINDSIGHT

The word "hindsight" comes readily, and inevitably, from the apologists of our foreign policy of the last 15 years. When a political administration errs gravely in its acts, what course is more obvious than to accuse its critics of being wise after the event? Unfortunately for the State Department spokesmen, a number of Members of Congress can produce their own prophetic speeches in re the Marshall plan, or the administration policy in China as an effective answer. Yet the cases of ECA and China are comparatively recent items in the long record of blunder. How about earlier, more fundamental mistakes, such as our affectionate embrace of the Russian bear in 1941 and following years?

There is, in fact, a splendid handbook which offers rich documentation—although the editor of the volume hardly anticipated such a use for his labors. The editor was none other than Mr. Rex Stout, now returned to the more grateful pursuit of "whodunit" fiction, but a decade ago one of the great proponents of a crusade against Hitler and a love affair with Stalin. The book was entitled "The Magnificent Dunderheads," published in 1942 at a time when so-called isolationists were even more fair game than now, and any Member of Congress who tried to talk sense to the public became per se an object of hate and ridicule.

Anyway, for the Magnificent Dunderheads, Mr. Stout provided a preface by Frank Sullivan, who was, may still be, a professional funnyman. In his prefatory remarks, Sullivan was alternately righteously angry and satirical at the "Dunderheads." Quoth Sullivan: "The book is a collection of some of the silliest, stupidest, and most dangerous statements that have been made by men laying claim to being leaders of the American people." We would like to see the pans of Stout and Sullivan as they now read some of the "dangerous" statements from the Magnificent Dunderheads.

First, let us lead with Congressman Hamilton Fish, one of the major butts of this pair of elves. On August 5, 1941, he was guilty of the following: "I think the best thing that could happen on the vast steppes of Russia would be to have the Nazis and Communists continue to fight it out and destroy each other." Oddly enough, a certain Senator Truman, from Missouri, said much the same thing about the same time. But he is not quoted in the book.

Next, there was Representative JOHN VORYS, of Ohio, who (Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 13, p. A3917) said: "We know that peace is not made wisely in the flush of victory. For this reason we do not want to see the peace dominated by a triumphant Germany, or Russia, or Japan, or Britain. We can make peace better now when there is no victor." Simply killing, isn't it?

As for Senator Bennett Champ Clark, he dundered thus, on June 24, 1941: "Once we have crawled in bed with 'Bloody Joe' no restraints are possible on the spread of Com-

munist propaganda in this country. What profit is it to a God-fearing people to gain dominion over the earth in union with communism and lose our own souls? Why should American money, made by the toil and sweat of her taxpayers, be poured out to protect Russia?"

Then there was Representative Frederick Smith from Ohio who declared: "In defending Russia, the President is forcing our Nation to defend communism and everything that this hellish cult has done since it started in Russia 24 years ago." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 5, p. 5669.)

And Representative Mason, from Illinois, said: "One of these days the policy of collaboration with the totalitarian tyrant in Moscow is going to be revealed as one of the tragic mistakes of the era." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 7, p. 7543.) We note similar sentiments from Senator Wheeler, Congressmen Stratton, Robsion, James O'Connor, Jonkman, etc.

Now these ideas may still seem perfectly preposterous to Mr. Stout. But since those quoted who are still in Congress continue to say much the same things, one fact is certain, they are not guilty of hindsight.

Extract From Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, Before Republican State Convention of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an extract from the address delivered by me before the Republican State Convention of Michigan on Saturday, February 17, 1951, at Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a general proposition I am convinced it is well established that it is a constitutional duty of the President to consult the Congress with respect to policy for the use of troops unless the situation is so immediately critical that to spend time in consultation and debate might increase the national peril. When there is time, there ought to be consultation.

But in the so-called great debate now sporadically raging with respect to the use of our troops in Europe, it should be clearly remembered that the United States has continuously used our troops in Europe for more than 5 years since the end of World War II. Our military forces in Europe have even been used aggressively during this period as in the instance of the Berlin airlift. This use has been sanctioned by more or less general acquiescence of a bipartisan nature.

I am purposely eliminating a discussion of the President in connection with this point, because I strongly feel this should not be a political matter. We all have the common goal of preserving the peace. We must all join in attempting to arrive at a forceful American foreign policy tending to secure peace, shorn of all political consideration whatsoever.

In reality, what is now being debated is whether or not the judgment of our military high command is sound in seeking at this time to increase the number of our troops employed in the European theater. This is not a matter of foreign policy; actually it is interference with due military procedures and military estimates of the over-all situation.

The men in charge of our Military Establishment are substantially the same group of generals who were responsible in World War II in the European theater for the greatest military success in the history of the American people. There is no reason to suppose that either their patriotism or their military judgment at this hour of grave crisis are less valuable or less dependable than they were at that other great time of crisis during World War II. And if they are, and I am sure they are, it would seem to be unwise to attempt to interfere and hamstring them now in the exercise of their judgment of what is best in a military way for the protection of this country. In World War II their judgment was completely trusted. It is necessary that they be trusted on this decision unless we propose to permit a nonmilitary branch of the government to fix arbitrary limits within which the military branch may be permitted to exercise their discretion.

We have been assured by the military high command that the purpose of more troops for Europe at this time is to make world war III less inevitable.

We all realize that world war III, if it comes, with all its terrible means of annihilation, will destroy victor and vanquished alike.

We also know that as a result of demobilizing our troops at the end of the shooting in World War II, without securing the peace, by permitting Russia to build a vast military machine while we have allowed ours to deteriorate, that we face the most serious crisis in our history.

The immediate problem is not how to be strong enough to win world war III. But how to be strong enough to prevent world war III from taking place as a consequence of the tremendous disparity right now between Russian military might and our own.

Getting Western Europe on our side, and, even more, denying it to the Russians, is a vital United States interest.

It is wrong to say, "The Europeans aren't doing enough, let's pull out."

It is equally wrong to retort, "The Europeans are doing fine, so let's help them."

It is correct to say, "The Europeans are not doing enough. Neither are we. Let us urge them to do more, and do more ourselves—because all our lives depend upon what happens."

The crucial necessity at this time is for the United States to regain the initiative. So long as Russia has the initiative (and she has had it for the past 5 years) war is inevitable. Because Russia will continue the policy of aggression that has characterized her continuous action since World War II. If, on the other hand, the United States can regain the initiative, we may be able to avert another war by channeling the energies of the world, and particularly of the free peoples of the world, into peacetime pursuits.

We can never gain the initiative merely while waiting for the Europeans to act. If they believe our policy is to wait until they are attacked before committing troops to help them, they will hold off. They dread, of course, another war upon their own soil. They will join us, but they will not lead us. We must lead them. But above all else we must follow the judgment of our military advisers as to what is necessary to be done in a military way in this situation. We have been advised that it would be a fatal mistake to arbitrarily limit our military leaders in the exercise of their best and considered judgment.

In the debate on European policy, the area of agreement is greater than the area of disagreement. Almost all the leading figures in this debate concede the necessity of more troops to Europe. They differ on limitation of number. In this phase of their argument I feel they are clearly wrong, because that decision is a military decision and not a civilian one.

But since the debate has tended to divide the country into camps; and to confuse our people with respect to the essential character of the problem, I feel that the President of the United States at this time can render a tremendous service to the American people by doing something specific to insure the constant and consistent formation of a bipartisan foreign policy. Then the debaters will have no excuse for ranging themselves along party lines. On the other hand they will be obliged to commit their arguments solely to the basis of how to best unify the country and to build up a bipartisan policy. Such a policy at this critical juncture will command both the respect and the support of the American people. All the best efforts of both parties should be directed to that end.

South Dakota Newspaper Poll on Foreign Policy and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think Members of Congress will be interested in the results of a recent poll conducted by the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a daily newspaper which is the largest of its kind in a great five-State area of the upper Midwest.

The results of this poll indicate rather clearly that the citizens of this country have some definite ideas of their own concerning the problems which have grown out of the collapse of our American foreign policy and the tendency to permit the palace politicians in the White House to usurp or exercise the authorities of Government which the Constitution clearly reposes in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERDICT OF POLL: LEAVE KOREA—MAJORITY FOR KEEPING TROOPS HOME

Withdraw from Korea. Keep American troops at home. Foreign nations should supply the bulk of United Nations armed forces.

That's the consensus of 3,453 Argus-Leader readers who voted in this newspaper's United States foreign policy poll.

The majority of readers also are against drafting 18-year-olds, don't want the A-bomb rejected as a weapon of war, don't want the A-bomb dropped now, and don't want to continue sending substantial aid to foreign countries.

GOOD REPRESENTATION

The number of readers who sent in completed ballots is considered an excellent representation of opinion on important questions, particularly when compared with ballot returns of the Chicago Daily News and the Detroit Free Press.

These two papers, the News, with a circulation of 560,000 and the Press with 460,000 circulation, received only 3,347 and 4,109 ballots respectively from the same poll.

The Argus-Leader, with a circulation of 52,500, collected 3,453 votes, an overwhelmingly greater percentage of reader participation than was evidenced in the two larger papers.

Results of the Argus-Leader poll are being forwarded today to Senators KARL MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE, and Representatives HAROLD LOVRE and E. Y. BERRY.

LETTER FROM EDITOR

To each of these Senators and Representatives, Fred C. Christopherson, editor, wrote an accompanying letter which stated:

"The Argus-Leader just has concluded a poll among its readers on various aspects of American policy.

"When the poll was announced it was explained that the votes would be tabulated and the results forwarded to the South Dakota Members of Congress so that they could study this expression of sentiment in connection with their own deliberations.

"In accordance with that promise I am enclosing herewith a copy of the final tabulation of the poll, as published in the Argus-Leader today.

"You will note that the vote was abnormally heavy—far larger than usually obtained in such polls. This suggests a deep interest in the subjects.

"Our readers would like very much, I am sure, to have comments from you on the poll generally and the specific topics included in it. I am hopeful, therefore, that each of you will be kind enough to forward to the Argus-Leader, as promptly as possible, a statement for publication on these matters."

As soon as those statements are received, Christopherson said, they will be presented to the readers of the Argus-Leader to allow them to study the reaction of our Members of Congress.

How the readers voted

Percent		The questions	Actual vote	
Yes	No		Yes	No
78	22	Should we withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible?	2,667	755
27	73	Should we stay until we can give Korea a government chosen by its people?	870	2,328
14	86	Should we drop the A-bomb now and take chances on reprisals?	450	2,822
25	75	Should we reject use of the A-bomb as a weapon of war?	828	2,451
30	70	Should we continue to send substantial aid to foreign countries?	938	2,269
27	73	Should we draft 18-year-olds?	918	2,518
21	79	Should we send American troops to Europe?	727	2,653
89	11	Should nondefense spending be cut drastically?	2,992	385
18	82	Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations?	579	2,654
92	8	Should we expect foreign nations to supply the bulk of U. N. armed forces?	3,006	255
79	21	Should we simply defend our outlying bases with air and sea power and keep our armies at home?	2,655	722
74	26	Should we have stiff price and wage controls?	2,358	797

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have read a great deal recently about investigation of the RFC, its directors, and the transfer of correspondence between RFC files and the White House. I simply take this opportunity to make the public statement that the President is welcome to publish in every newspaper in the United States every letter I have written to the RFC during the past 16 years. There is nothing there of a confidential nature. I am delighted to know this investigation has been and is being made, and I think we ought to clean house down there, generally speaking.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Washington-Lincoln Celebration, Frederick, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, last Saturday evening, February 24, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] delivered a very excellent and enlightening address upon the occasion of the meeting of the Washington-Lincoln celebration of the Republican clubs of Frederick County at Frederick, Md. I know this speech is of great interest not only to the people of Maryland, but to the people of the United States generally, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deeply appreciate the high honor of addressing this meeting of patriotic Americans who are loyal to the principles of the Republican Party.

It is an honor and a privilege to come to the Free State of Maryland and to tell you of my high regard and admiration for your Republican United States Senator and your Republican Members of the House of Representatives.

The great Republican victory of last fall was a real tribute to their Americanism and their devotion to public service.

During the last 4 years the Republican members of your delegation have been attending the luncheon meetings of Pennsylvania's Republican delegation. That has given me an opportunity to know the splendid caliber of the men who represent your State in Congress.

It is a sincere pleasure to report that your distinguished Senator, JOHN BUTLER, has already become recognized as one of the strong men of the Senate. He is taking an outstanding part in the battle for sound American principles.

I need not tell you how much we value the vigorous and courageous services of your Republican Congressmen, BEALL, MILLER, and DEVEREUX. You know them as great patriots and great Americans and as fighters for our country and our flag in peace and war.

The people of Maryland are to be congratulated on having Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin as their Governor. He became a national figure when he won on American issues. His election points the way to greater Republican victory in the national election of 1952.

We are assembled to honor the memory of George Washington, the military genius of American independence, and Abraham Lincoln, a plain man of the people, who preserved the Union.

Historic Frederick is a most appropriate place to pay tribute to the illustrious achievements of these greatest of all Americans. Each in his day was called by destiny to serve God and humanity.

We honor all that is truly American when we assemble each year in the month of February to observe the birthday anniversaries of Washington, our first President, and Lincoln, our first Republican President.

In Pennsylvania we look upon the fine people of Maryland as good neighbors. We know that so much of the spirit of America has gone into the building of your State. We share your pride in its glorious history.

Like Pennsylvania, Maryland is the home of many faiths and creeds, living in tolerance and good will. Three hundred years ago the Provincial Assembly passed the Maryland Toleration Act which has been described as one of the great landmarks of religious liberty.

Many events worthy of patriotic commemoration were enacted within your borders. Thomas Johnson, a member of the Continental Congress and later your first State Governor, nominated George Washington for commander in chief of the continental armies.

The Continental Congress was in session at Baltimore in December 1776, when it granted General Washington full military powers for the prosecution of the war for independence. Seven years later, when Annapolis was the temporary National Capital, Congress received Washington's resignation as the military leader of the new Nation.

As we turn back the pages of history we recall that among the first settlers of old Frederick Town were 100 German families, who came down from Pennsylvania. They were sturdy, hard-working, God-fearing men and women. Their descendants, both here and in Pennsylvania, represent all that is best in American citizenship.

We recall the great westward migration over the National Road, much of it passing through Frederick and across the mountains to open new frontiers of American progress.

We recall General Braddock and his British regulars stopping here to prepare for his ill-fated expedition against the French and Indians at Fort Duquesne.

In Lincoln's time the great internal upheaval tore at the heart of Maryland. Brave sons of Maryland fought with equal valor on both sides of the conflict.

Twice occupied by Confederate forces, Frederick endured its share of war's hardship and tragedy. After the battles of South Mountain and Antietam the women of Frederick worked side by side, caring for the wounded of both armies, no matter whether their sympathies were with the blue or the gray.

Names which loom large in the history of our Nation are associated with Frederick. Francis Scott Key won immortal fame as he watched "o'er the ramparts" at Fort McHenry and was inspired by the sight of the flag to write our National Anthem. Roger Brooke Taney rose from the practice of law here in Frederick to become John Marshall's successor as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Familiar to every school boy and girl is the legend of Barbara Fritchie and her defiance of Gen. Stonewall Jackson as she waved the Union Flag from her window.

I have discussed these high lights of history because memories of the heroic past enrich our patriotism. They stimulate a deeper appreciation of the freedom we enjoy through the toil, struggle, and sacrifice of our forefathers.

In these days of crisis, when the future of freedom in the United States and in the world hangs in the balance, we can find

guidance in the virtues of Washington and Lincoln.

Today our Republic faces a crisis just as grave and just as challenging as it did in 1776 and 1861. The basic issue confronting us is the preservation of freedom and peace in the United States and in the world.

We face a well organized, well prepared and well disciplined enemy who knows no truth, no honor, no justice, and no God. His weapons are lies, deceit, treachery, and force.

The time has come when the American people must know the plain truth. "We the people" are the American Government—not the President, not the State Department, not the Congress, not the courts—but "We the people."

Our objectives and our foreign policy must be set forth in the language the people can understand.

Within the limits of security they have a right to know the obligations we have undertaken in secret agreements. We know that much of the trouble we face today is the result of secret agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. We know also that one of the men who influenced those agreements was disloyal to our country.

It is not my purpose tonight to review the terrible mistakes, the glaring blunders and the confused bungling of the past. But it is pathetic to look back only 5 years and to realize that in that short period we have dissipated and squandered so much of the strength that made us the most powerful Nation of all time.

And when the Communist forces of aggression launched their brutal invasion of South Korea we were totally unprepared, even though nearly $50,000,000,000 had been appropriated to prepare for such an emergency.

The American people are aroused. They are fully aware of the dangers forced upon us by Communist aggression. They are prepared to make every sacrifice demanded for the defense of the American way of life. They are ready to fight to the death to preserve their rich heritage of liberty and independence.

All they ask is leadership. In this hour of peril they want leadership in which they can place their full trust and confidence.

They look in vain to Washington for leadership that will rise above deception, double talk, and the shifty trickery of the machine politician.

They look for leadership that will respond, honestly and sincerely, to the overwhelming demand for the strictest economy in Government spending not related to national defense.

We Republicans are not alone in that demand. It comes also from patriotic Democrats. Every right-thinking American sees danger of national bankruptcy in the determination of the Truman administration to continue its reckless and extravagant spending for nonessential purposes.

In the face of a great national emergency, and with the greatest debt ever carried by any nation in the history of the world—a debt which might destroy us—President Truman has ignored the demand that domestic spending be reduced.

His budget for 1952 recommends spending for nonmilitary purposes of over $30,000,000,000.

That is an increase of more than $6,000,000,000 over this year's figure.

And furthermore, the budget is loaded with all the excess baggage of the Truman administration's socialistic programs which have been rejected by one Congress after another.

Let me remind you that President Truman, in his state of the Union speech, made this statement, and I quote:

"The Government must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

I charge that President Truman violated that pledge when he included in his budget such dangerous and extravagant proposals as the Brannan plan, to regiment agriculture at a cost of billions of dollars, the vicious scheme to socialize the practice of medicine, the outrageous proposal to place education under Federal regulation, and other socialistic schemes which would restrict freedom of the individual.

My good Jeffersonian Democrat friend, the able and distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD, had this to say about Mr. Truman's budget, and I quote:

"In my experience of 18 years, considering the perils that confront our country, this message represents the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

With all the sincerity at my command I submit that this is no time for fiscal irresponsibility or any other nonsense, on the part of those at the head of our Government.

I repeat, the American people want leadership to which they can safely entrust the security of the Republic.

We do not have that kind of leadership in the White House.

We do not have that kind of leadership in the State Department.

That, my fellow Americans, is one of the reasons why our people are worried, confused, and perplexed.

In considering our problems it seems to me we should direct our aims toward four essential elements of our national strength—military, industrial, financial, and spiritual.

We must not be swayed by emotion or hysteria. We must remain cool. We must resist the call of the demagogue. Our decisions must be based on sound, hard, common sense. Name calling has no place in our present critical situation.

One of the big problems is whether the President is authorized to send troops outside the United States. While that may be a question for constitutional lawyers, yet the people are vitally interested and gravely concerned in the decision.

I have the greatest confidence in our military, naval, and air force leaders, but the sending of troops to Europe is only a part of the problem. It is not entirely a military issue. It involves economics, diplomacy, and leadership for peace. Sending divisions to Europe may open the door to war.

It seems to me the President should desire the advice of Congress because Congress is the direct representative of the sovereign will of the people.

Government that ignores the will of the people will degenerate into dictatorship.

I should like to offer, in brief outline, some steps which, to my mind, should be taken for the preservation of freedom and peace in the world.

1. We should develop the greatest potential military strength the world has ever known. Reserve military power must be provided by universal military training. There must be no exceptions.

Every American must have military training. In that way he will become a better American. He will learn how to protect himself under conditions of hardship and danger. He will learn that he has an obligation to his comrades and to the flag.

2. We should have the most powerful navy and the strongest air force in the world. American supremacy on the sea and in the air might preserve peace in the world.

3. The ground forces should consist of a small Regular Army. It should be the fastest, the best trained, and with the greatest fire power of any army in the world.

4. We should have enough Regular Army officers selected by merit to instruct the men of universal military training age and aid in the training of the Reserve components.

5. A military and economic survey should be made of the whole situation. We should know the extent to which the other free nations are willing to sacrifice in defense against Communist aggression. We should have a complete understanding that they will stand by their commitments.

We should know the strength of our enemies and particularly the morale of their people.

With this information we can arrive at intelligent decisions as to how we can defend ourselves.

6. We must place in high gear all of the great productive capacity of the United States, industrial and agricultural. Our production of planes, ships, tanks, munitions, equipment, and food must surpass any of our past outstanding records.

7. We must do everything possible to save manpower. Wars are won by men, not by machines or appropriations. We must cut down unnecessary personnel in government, in industry, and even in the armed services.

For example, the Federal Government has been increasing its payrolls by 1,000 employees a day. That is equal to a battalion of infantry. In 150 days we have increased the Federal employees by a number equal to the total of our Armed Forces in Korea.

If war comes, every man saved hastens the day of peace. We must avoid strikes and slow downs. The soldier who goes a. w. o. l. is frowned upon by his comrades. One absentee worker in war production may deprive a soldier of a rifle, an overcoat, or an emergency ration. It may also mean a military casualty.

8. We must have economy in government. We must eliminate or drastically reduce every function not related to national defense, including services which may be desirable. We must have sound fiscal policies which will preserve the value of the dollar against the destructive power of inflation. Even though we defeat Communist aggression in battle, our freedom can be lost if our country is plunged into financial collapse.

The strongest line of defense against inflation includes economy in government, a balanced budget, adequate taxation, and restriction of credit.

If we have economical government we can lower the tax burden. Therefore, in all levels of government we must have sentinels on the ramparts, on the quarterdecks, and in the cockpits who make economy the watchword.

9. We must have none but loyal Americans in government, in our industries, our schools and colleges, and in our churches.

10. Every American should be a part of civilian defense. Our provisions for the education of our children and the protection of the health and safety of our people must be the best that can be conceived.

11. The United States must never depart from its historic position as a leader for world peace and disarmament. While we cannot take our guard down we must not abandon hope that we can have peace. We must win the cold war of propaganda so that the world will know that the United States has no plan for aggression or conquest.

Before we commit Army divisions into any part of the world we must give careful thought to the possibility that it will be considered aggression on our part.

12. Finally, let us, by our example of right living and by obeying the laws of God and man, show the world that the American system has given more of the good things of life to more people than any other form of government ever conceived.

Let us live in peace, righteousness, and good will, doing our full duty as Americans.

In conclusion I would like to quote the words of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. In his famous Farewell Address, Washington admonished the people of the young Republic that religion and morality are indispensable supports of political prosperity—the great pillars of human happiness.

"Observe good faith and justice to all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all," Washington said.

In an address at Springfield, Ill., Abraham Lincoln expounded a lesson in right living which gives new patriotic inspiration with every reading.

I quote from Lincoln's speech as follows:

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his posterity swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate, in the least particular, the laws of the country, and never tolerate their violation by others. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap, let it be taught in the schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice."

We can strengthen our country if we all resolve to live by the precepts of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

In a country blessed like the United States there should be no law evasion.

There should be no racketeers lurking in the dark shadows of the criminal underworld. There should be no black markets, no profiteering, and no tax dodging.

Everyone should accept personal responsibility to maintain the highest standard of honesty in our dealings with one another. The strong should realize that each of us is his brother's keeper.

We must have a moral and spiritual rearmament in the United States. Our churches should be filled with people who love God and realize that individual liberty and the dignity of man are the greatest gift to mankind—that they are God given.

We should be organized in strong battalions willing to go out and teach to the world the blessings of peace and good will.

If we are strong enough in the faith and patriotism of Washington and Lincoln and strive in our daily lives to exemplify the American way of life, we can overcome threat of war and bring peace to the world.

Son Dies in Korea; "Why?" Asks His Dad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Son Dies in Korea; 'Why?' Asks His Dad," published in the Rochester Times-Union of Rochester, N. Y., on December 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SON DIES IN KOREA; "WHY?" ASKS HIS DAD

"Where does the responsibility for this whole nasty mess (in Korea) rest?"

That's the question asked—and answered—by the father of a central New York marine who died in action in Korea November 29.

The father, W. J. Corwin, was an assistant professor at the University of Minnesota College of Agriculture until 1929, when he moved to New York to farm. His son was Marine Sgt. Mac R. Corwin.

The letter, to the Syracuse Post-Standard, says:

"This afternoon, Mrs. Corwin and I received a wire that our son was killed in Korea on November 29.

"Now, this is no harder for us to bear than for thousands and thousands of other parents. But right now I want to call attention to one question: Where does the responsibility for this whole nasty mess rest? It is easy to say, 'In Moscow.'

"But is it?

"In my opinion, it rests not with our President, not with the State Department, and not with any particular individual or group or class of individuals, but with me, with you, and every mature voter in this great United States. They are the ones who have the death of our boys in Korea on their heads tonight.

"There will be more tomorrow night.

"When so many voters fail to vote or see to it that only the best qualified, high caliber men are chosen and delegated to do our work as we want it done, there are always plenty of misfits, cheap politicians, and gangsters standing ready to slip in and very adroitly take over.

"When we, the public, wake up, the damage is done and your son's and my son's lives are sacrificed to the voter's indolence and failure to choose and keep strong, qualified, fearless men on our job, men able and willing to kick all quislings out as soon as spotted.

"Yes; such men are scarce and the entangling meshes of money and influence are great but the power of an aroused, demanding electorate is more powerful. We have the power and the privilege today, but unless the voters use that power and transmit their demands to our present employees in the White House and Congress, soon more homes will get that sad message and more American boys will die from American-made materials while the men in Moscow smile at our gullibility.

"Now is the time to act and write your Senator and Congressman.

"W. J. CORWIN."

MEXICO.

Proposed Amendment of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several editorials regarding proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act. These include editorials from the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Providence Journal, and the Galveston Tribune, and the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 22, 1951]

END THESE DELAYS IN DRAFT DECISIONS

Week follows week in Washington with plenty of argument but no action on the vital problem of military manpower. Both House and Senate committees still have a week or 10 days of hearings.

Raising a little more than 3,500,000 men by June 30 of this year demands early decisions. There are not 5½ months remaining to whip legislation for national—universal—training and service into shape and get it into operation.

Fateful questions press for prompt dispositions. Our problems of national safety and survival have become insistent.

With Russia building a war machine even more mighty than the huge one it has maintained since the end of the Second World War, the controversial issue in America of drafting 18-year-old boys cannot be permitted to stall the whole manpower program.

The question is whether, by excluding the 18-year-olds, we could raise 3,500,000 men or anything like that number, by June 30. It is recognized that leaving them out of the present draft would be a seriously limiting condition, in conjunction with the exclusion of veterans, sweeping rejections for disability, and various deferment loopholes.

These matters must be considered dispassionately and with appreciation of the urgency of the Nation's needs in the face of illimitable perils. Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall has stated the case about drafting 18-year-olds in well-weighed terms in his explanation that under the service and training program "virtually every able-bodied man would be inducted at 18 and given 4 to 6 months of basic training: after that some would be sent to college and some would finish out their term in one of the armed services."

The question for Members of Congress and just plain citizens to answer for themselves is whether adequate defenses of America can be established without 18-year-old recruits. The cold statistics regarding the manpower pool under the present draft say that the job cannot be done without taking in the younger soldiers.

But it isn't the whole job. Top military leaders, returning from the Far East, declare it is more than likely that our defense forces will have to be enlarged much above the currently proposed figure of 3,500,000.

Congress should be looking now toward that possibility. It has to consider—whatever the size of our manpower demand—the importance of preserving, so far as it can be done, the supply of workers in agriculture and industry without which tremendously increased programs of production in both fields cannot be realized. Early attention should be given, in whipping new draft legislation into shape, to drafting also large forces of men not physically acceptable for combat duty and using them for the innumerable bookkeeping and housekeeping jobs of the Armed Forces.

We don't have to scan the unhappy stories of fighting in Korea to realize the need for larger forces of capable combat troops. We had to create them in the Second World War—sometimes on the fields of battle. We've always had to improvise them, spending months getting them equipped and ready.

No one can possibly cherish the idea that Russia would give us time to build up and train our fighting men. But the democratic process of discussion—so long protracted—has lost enormously valuable time. Both Congress and the administration are to blame for this.

The situation should be immediately corrected. Washington must reach proper decisions and translate them into action swiftly on the basis of this unassailable condition: The United States must have, as rapidly as it can be procured, a powerful defense force, well trained, fully equipped, and backed up by vast production of food and weapons. While we delay we invite war. The sooner we act the better our prospects of preserving peace, or at any rate, ourselves, will become.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 18, 1951]

DRAFT ALTERNATIVES

Support by two of the Nation's leading educators for the plan to draft 18-year-olds for a period of training and military service serves to focus the argument on the real issue of the military manpower question.

Nobody likes the idea of drafting 18-year-olds, and particularly of sending them abroad, if the need should develop. We don't like to take them out of school or jobs, and we don't like the idea of sending young men—who seem to their elders to be mere boys—off to learn to be soldiers or sailors.

But the alternative, as Karl Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harold Dodds, president of Princeton University, told a Senate Committee, is to draft older men. This might mean taking veterans, or family men, or both.

Our big problem is to make sure we have the military strength necessary to face the present emergency. As long as there is no all-out war we must get the manpower with the least possible dislocation to homes and careers. We must prepare for a long emergency by insisting that all young men get at least basic training, even if they are sent back to school for training in the technical and scientific skills we need. And it is important that those physically or mentally unqualified for service be given compulsory jobs to aid defense.

Those are the principles indorsed by educators whose own institutions would be seriously affected by the proposed draft. They deserve sober consideration by Congress in deciding on a military manpower program.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 12, 1951]

UMT WOULD STABILIZE OUR MILITARY FORCES

Defense Secretary George Marshall's proposal for compulsory military training and service of 27 months for all men reaching the age of 18 makes a heap of sense. It would, as he put it so succinctly, "give us a durable layer of military protection that would survive the alternate moods of public alarm or complacency."

We have never had universal military training in this country, the traditionalists will promptly note. And the realists must reply, this country has never been prepared to meet a war emergency. In past wars, fortunately, we have been able to buy enough time to build adequate military forces. But in this age of supersonic planes and atomic weapons the next gamble with a lack of trained manpower could prove fatal.

"We must not," said General Marshall, "continue to make short-term plans for immediate emergencies to be followed by abrupt demobilization and the withdrawal of authority to train the men necessary to a reasonable posture of defense."

It may be argued that 27 months is too long a time to ask the Nation's youth to sacrifice in the cause of preparedness. But this objection is met in a provision that "when emergency abates the President would have the right to reduce or eliminate service requirements on a uniform basis for all inductees and all services. Training requirements of 4 to 6 months would remain, but the President could modify the type of training."

In other words, every youth sound in mind and body would be required to take basic military training for not more than 6 months. After that active service in the Regular Armed Forces could range from zero to 23 months at the discretion of the President on the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Provision would be made to keep the educational pipelines open. Eighteen-year-olds would be allowed to graduate from high school before being called for training, provided graduation was prior to the nineteenth birthday. Those who started a college year before the eighteenth birthday would be permitted to finish the year. The President would be authorized to suspend temporarily the active service of up to 75,000 students so they could complete college training important to the national interest, following which they would owe the Government 23 months of service. Another 50,000 in active service would receive college training on military scholarships.

The Marshall plan represents a departure from the administration's pre-Korea UMT proposals, which would have provided brief sugar-coated military training separate from the Regular Military Establishment.

It recognizes that the Nation is going to have to raise military manpower either through the draft, which now takes those between 19 and 26 for 21 months and is turned on and off as the world situation changes, or through universal training and service aimed at a stabilized flow of manpower.

Of the two courses, we much prefer the latter. It would give assurance both at home and abroad, where our major allies have long had similar programs, that we will not continue to fluctuate dangerously between mobilization and demobilization. It seems to us a conscientious and realistic effort to meet our present and future military manpower needs with a minimum of sacrifice.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of January 15, 1951]

UNIVERSAL SERVICE

It should be understood at the outset that the universal military service and training program outlined to a Senate committee by Secretary of Defense Marshall and his assistant, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, is long-range in character—10 years at least—and not merely for the immediate emergency.

This is in line with Secretary Marshall's fundamental thinking on military manpower in a volatile democracy. The program is designated, in Secretary Marshall's words, "to train the men necessary to a reasonable posture of defense" in order to eliminate, in Mrs. Rosenberg's words, "the peaks of panicky rearmament in periods of emergency and the valleys of post-haste demobilization when the situation eases."

The problem before Secretary Marshall was twofold: One, military, how to secure an enlarged combat force for the emergency and a continuing base for military strength for defense; two, economic, how to secure these forces with the least harm to the Nation's productive power and without sacrifice of medical, scientific, and technical skills necessary for future balance and leadership.

Secretary Marshall, as a seasoned soldier and statesman, understood, when tackling the problem, that our people are hot for building a gigantic military establishment when emergency breathes down their backs (witness Governor Dewey's recent speech) and then for disbanding it as speedily when a pause comes and the gigantic standing army is literally standing around at tremendous cost to the taxpayers. Moreover, a moral rot sets in among the soldiers themselves when the purpose of their military life is vague and indistinct.

Therefore, the proposal is to call youths of 18 into service for 27 months—4 to 6 in basic training and the rest in regular military service—and then to pass them into the National Guard or Organized Reserves. The Marshall proposal differs from the Conant-Wriston plan primarily in that it offers greater flexibility in officer training in colleges and wider deferments for specialized training in medicine, science, and technology. The principle of universal service for 18-year-olds is the same.

Through this steady and consistent flow, it is anticipated that the Military Establishment will get manpower for immediate emergency needs and also will be building an ever-growing reserve that will be the backlog and bulwark of our armed strength and preparedness over the years.

It is argued reasonably that 18-year-olds (they probably would not enter for 4 or 5 months beyond their birthday) are for the most part not married and without children and that family life would not be disturbed; that they are at the turn from high school to college; that they have no roots sunk and have not entered into permanent vocations; that the domestic, financial, and emotional shock would be less for a boy of 18 than an older person; that they can be trained with a minimum of drain on business, science, education, and the life of the community generally. Secretary Marshall quoted his own words from an earlier report that the 18- to 20-year-old group made the best, toughest, and most alert fighters in the other wars.

It is also pointed out that whereas the induction and training of married men, with or without children, would cost $978,000,000 annually, the same for unattached 18-year-olds would cost $466,000,000—a difference of $513,000,000.

Outside of deferments for special training, only physical, mental, or moral unfitness would disbar an 18-year-old from universal service. The needs of industry and agriculture would be met by deferments in the 19- to 26-year-old group under selective service.

It is apparent from the testimony of Secretary Marshall and Mrs. Rosenberg and the general outlines of legislation later to be introduced that great thought has gone into every avenue of exploration, with the security and the best interests of the Nation as a whole the criterion of judgment. Its design is to gain essential military strength in the most efficient and least painful manner, without fits and starts, advances and retreats, on the basic assumption (which we believe holds) that public opinion is favorable to universal military service until tension in the world is satisfactorily resolved.

[From the Galveston (Tex.) Tribune of January 11, 1951]

WAR SERVICE MANPOWER

The Defense Department, which is to say the Armed Forces, wants to draft as quickly as possible some 450,000 boys in the 18-year-old age bracket. The Department also wants to put more young women in the uniforms of the WACS, WAVES, and Marines. How many more has not as yet been made clear.

Gen. George C. Marshall, the Secretary of Defense, so advised Congress Wednesday. He asked for speedy revision of the draft act and lifting of the 2 percent ceiling on the feminine branches of the services.

By coincidence, almost at the same time, General Marshall was making his request, American Legion National Commander Earle Cocke said in St. Louis that 18-year-olds should be drafted because they made better combat soldiers than men over 27 years old.

However, there was an implication the 18-year-olds would not be sent into combat until they have reached their nineteenth birthday anniversary. That, however, would be subject to change without notice, of course, dependent on conditions and the size of the trained forces.

Boys in the 18-year-old bracket should be cautioned, though, by their parents and their teachers not to rush pell-mell to the nearest recruiting station to enlist. It would be far wiser, if they are in school, to continue on with their education until called. Deferments probably would be granted for that purpose.

Increasing the size of the feminine contingents in uniform would release, as it did during World War II, a comparable number of uniformed soldiers, sailors, and marines for active duty. That, of course, is desirable because it would lessen the demand for manpower which might adversely affect war production.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of January 18, 1951]

UMST IS HIGHLY NECESSARY, BUT DETAILS ARE DEBATABLE

The case for the drafting of 18-year-olds into the armed services for universal military service and training, as urged by Defense Secretary George C. Marshall, has not been well presented to the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Committee. This has brought a poor reception for the proposal at the hands of that body.

One trouble was that Secretary Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg changed their figures in the middle of the hearings last week. They called first for a total of 3,200,000 in the Armed Forces, but some days later upped the number to 3,462,000. This gave enemies of the whole idea of UMST an opening and they took advantage of it.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, one of those chiefly responsible for the hysteria after World War II which resulted in "bringing the boys home," leaped upon the UMST plan as "undemocratic and un-American." Although it had been fully approved by General Marshall, Senator JOHNSON persisted in calling it "the Rosenberg plan," and he pronounced it, absurdly, "the most brash and shocking ever made to the Congress in 162 years of existence."

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, chairman of the committee and another critic of the plan, kept his feet much more definitely on the ground, and his opposition may have been more damaging for that reason. He contended that it is unnecessary to draft 18-year-olds in order to make up a total of 3,500,000 in the Armed Forces by June 30. He also lectured Mrs. Rosenberg for the delay in producing an actual bill. He said there have been promises of a bill "every day or two" since last September.

Mrs. Rosenberg suggested, in reply, that the committee was in some measure responsible for the delay, since it had said that before the bill was presented, it should have the approval of all interested Government agencies. She said it was undergoing last-minute revisions at the hands of those agencies.

An actual bill is important, of course, before the committee can make up its mind. Final and authoritative information as to whether the draft of 18-year-olds is essential to achieve the goal fixed for the Armed Forces also is necessary.

Undoubtedly a lot of opposition to the drafting of 18-year-olds is building up in the country. But as Dr. Karl T. Compton, of MIT, told the committee yesterday, "simply to say that we do not like the drafting of 18-year-olds means almost nothing."

The alternatives have to be considered. Is it better to draft those from 19 to 26, even though many are married men with children to support? Chairman JOHNSON contends that this group will furnish the needed manpower. It is up to him to produce the evidence of this, if he has it.

Nobody likes to draft boys of 18 into the armed services if it can be avoided. The question is whether it can. Nor does anybody want to send them out of the country until they are 19, but General Marshall says that to prohibit this would cause much confusion and greatly hamper the defense of the country.

We must get all the light we can on this matter, especially with respect to the conflicting statistics involved. If a force of 3,500,000 can be had 6 months hence without dipping below age 19, that will be one thing. If it can't, that will be something quite different.

It does seem necessary to set up a system of universal military service and training for the defense of the Nation. The details remain to be fully worked out, but the basic idea is sound.

Peace or World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the question, Will it be peace or world war III? delivered by me last Sunday evening over the ABC network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, will it be peace or world war III? That question is on every tongue. Properly so too because the lives of everyone of us are affected by that question. In anticipation of the answer our youth are again called from the usual routines of peaceful American living—from their homes, their schools, and from the farms, mills, mines, and workshops all over America. Every purse is affected. The ordinary expenses of living are mounting beyond reach. More and more restrictions are daily imposed upon our ordinary living. Soon the whole population will be groaning under the heaviest load of taxes we have known. This complete disruption of our lives is occasioned by that fateful question—will it be peace or war?

No one has a right to doubt the peaceful intentions of the United States. America cannot possibly gain anything from another world war. We must have peace. Because if we have war, it will be horrible beyond imagination with atomic bombing, with possible H bombing and with chemical and bacterial warfare, so that all of us may be destroyed—victor and vanquished alike.

Despite America's peaceful intentions, despite the inconceivable horrors of another world war, the evil men in the Kremlin are nevertheless stirring up hatred everywhere in the world. The puppets of the Kremlin are carrying on war in Korea, in Indochina, in Tibet, and fomenting possible additional war in peril points everywhere. Both our lives and liberties are theatened thereby.

The world has become so small that America is affected by what takes place in Europe as though it were on our own soil. Last week a British bomber flew from an airfield in Ireland across the Atlantic to Gander Air Field at Newfoundland in Canada in 4 hours and 37 minutes. That flight ought to convince even the most skeptical that what happens in Europe can happen fast right here in America. Four hours and 37 minutes from Europe to America. It takes the fastest express train almost twice that long to run from east to west across the State of Pennsylvania.

We must approach this problem facing us, not under the fear that we will have war; but with the fixed determination that by constructive action we can and will have peace.

The world is divided into two camps. The Russian camp that wants war and the free nations who want peace. Theirs is a camp of slavery—ours of freedom. In this division we must have England, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Italy and the other free peoples on our side. There is little time left. We must decide right now. We will either have them as our allies in this struggle for freedom, or they will fall and become satellites of Russia, by our refusing now to collaborate with them effectively for peace.

The American people must be united in a determination to prevent another world war. We can only be so united when everyone takes the time to understand clearly the ramifications of this tremendously important problem.

General Eisenhower submitted a report to the Congress of the United States and to the American people. I had the honor to hear that report. In my judgment it was able, sincere, and above all other things hopeful in its attitude of what could be done in a constructive way for a build-up to prevent world war III. General Eisenhower's report was concurred in by General Marshall, General Bradley, and other high military authorities, who in World War II were the very men upon whose shoulders we placed the supreme responsibility of guiding us to victory. Are we to repudiate them today when they tell us now how to protect ourselves best against world war III. These men have already proved they are entitled to the best consideration of the American people; not on the basis of mere promises but as the result of proven performance of the first order. These men now join in recommending certain military dispositions of our troops, whereby some will be stationed in Europe. These troops are to be sent to Europe not to bring on world war III, but in an endeavor to prevent world war III, by taking proper measures to that end with our allies under the Atlantic pact. They are troops for peace, not for war. Surely the one best way to protect our future is to follow the advice of the men who in the past have successfully guided us to victory and to peace.

To prevent world war III Europe must be denied to Russia, because Russia must have the productive capacity of Europe to successfully attack the United States. Let us in America constantly remember that the people in western Europe have the same know-how as we do. Take the automobile for example. Without the discoveries and inventions of Western Europe we would not have today's automobile. The fact is that the people of western Europe, plus the people of the United States, are responsible for more than 90 percent of all the inventions and improvements responsible for modern living. America cannot risk being deprived of that enormous know-how that with our own know-how can rule the world for peace; but split can arm Russia with power that might rule the whole world.

While Europe is closer to the Russian menace than we in America; nevertheless the final objective and goal of Russia is the destruction of the United States. We are the nation Russia must destroy if it is to rule the whole world as it seems determined to try.

While the United States was the sole possessor of the atomic bomb, we were constantly shown diagrams of how far it was from the United States to Moscow and to Stalingrad and to other prime targets in Russia. Now that the Russians have acquired the same secret we must surely realize that it is no further from the United States to Russia than it is from Russia to the United States. Atomic bombing will move on a two-way street in the event of world war III.

Russia has surrounded herself with satellites. Her method is like a wolf pack with

a flock of sheep—pick off the outside stragglers one at a time until they are all gone. Ultimately this process will swallow up all of Europe unless something is done now to prevent it. Eastern Germany has already been Sovietized. Now Russia's clear purpose is to cave in Western Germany.

We in America are the leaders of the free people in today's world. We must act as that leader since we have the responsibility or the whole cause of freedom will fail.

The free peoples of the world must unite. We must stand together against communism—because communism is united. Unless we stand together, we will ultimately fall together. There is no easy way to peace. Although clearly there is a very easy road to war. The free people must stand together with a united front, and with a full determination to resist to the end. That is the one conceivable means of preventing the horror of world war III.

If we are to be successful, we must follow the judgment of our top military men—men in whose patriotism and in whose judgment we have every reason to believe on the basis of past performance. It may well be a fatal mistake in this critical hour if we substitute political opinion for military judgment in what is clearly a military matter. This is no time for politics. This is a time for Americanism. As a united people with a common purpose, with a common determination, and with a bipartisan policy with respect to world affairs, we may be able to preserve world peace—nothing less will prevent world war III. In today's tortured world troops for Europe are not troops for war, they are troops for peace. And the only possible hope for peace is to follow the judgment of those whose business it is to know the way to have peace if peace is possible to be found.

During World War I, Theodore Roosevelt defined our responsibilities when he said:

"We here in America hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years. And the shame and the disgrace be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve be dimmed, if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men."

Civil Defense and Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there is growing awareness, I believe, among the Members of Congress, and particularly of those who have been State officials before coming to Washington, of the necessity of strengthening Government on the local and State levels against the possibility of too much centralization in Washington.

Lack of initiative by State and local officials in handling successfully vital problems that are constantly developing often has been cited by those who would further centralize operations in Government on the Federal level. For this reason it is particularly gratifying to note that the American Public Welfare Association has established a Committee on Civil Defense and Public Welfare which will concern itself with the duties of public-welfare agencies in organizing welfare services under the civil defense program, so that fullest use may be made of all community resources in the event of enemy attack.

It is particularly appropriate that a Marylander, Mr. J. Milton Patterson, director of the Maryland Department of Public Welfare and deputy director of Civilian Defense, should be named chairman of the new committee, for the people of Maryland have always been strong in the conviction that government should be close to the people, and have been outstandingly successful in governmental operations on the State and local levels.

This concrete evidence of the readiness of the States and localities to take the initiative in moving forward in the field of welfare and rehabilitation deserves to be given widespread attention, and I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that an enclosed statement released by the American Public Welfare Association be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Fred Hoehler, president of the American Public Welfare Association, today announced the establishment of a Committee on Civil Defense and Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of Mr. J. Milton Patterson, director of the Maryland Department of Public Welfare and Deputy Director of Civil Defense for that State. This committee, composed of representative public welfare officials from all parts of the United States will concern itself with the responsibilities of public welfare agencies in advancing the organization of welfare services under the civil defense program in order to assure full utilization of all potential community resources in the event of enemy attack. Among the State welfare departments already well advanced in developing these plans, according to reports reaching the association, are those in New York, California, Washington, Illinois, Missouri, North Carolina, Nevada, Tennessee, Minnesota, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

"The emphasis in the present civil defense program on the utilization of existing governmental agencies to carry out the responsibilities of civil defense makes it particularly important that State and local public welfare departments mobilize themselves for the crucial tasks assigned them," Mr. Hoehler pointed out. "In most States and in key communities throughout the country public welfare departments, under the supervision of the civil defense organization, are already at work preparing plans for registration and information units, for mass feeding, housing, shelter arrangements, for the provision of clothing, and for welfare services related to possible evacuation. Arrangements are being developed for the mobilization of all available voluntary social agencies and volunteer personnel as a part of the total plan."

The American Public Welfare Association, organization of State and local public welfare departments and public welfare personnel at all levels of Government, has offered the services of its committee to Governor Millard Caldwell, Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in helping to advance this program. Mr. Fred Hoehler, president of the association, is director of public welfare for the State of Illinois and is responsible for the welfare aspects of civil defense in that State.

Other members of the committee are: Vice chairman, Charles I. Schottland, director, California State Department of Social Welfare; Alden E. Bevier, administrative staff officer, New York State Department of Social Welfare; Raymond M. Hilliard, commissioner, New York City Department of Welfare; Maurice O. Hunt, administrator, Indiana State Department of Public Welfare; W. J. Matey, director, Michigan State Department of Social Welfare; J. O. McMahan, commissioner, Tennessee State Department of Public Welfare; George P. Mills, executive director, Allegheny County Board of Assistance, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Roderic Olzendam, director, Washington State Department of Social Security; Alvin E. Rose, commissioner, Chicago Department of Welfare; E. H. Schuneman, director, Wyoming State Department of Public Welfare; Gerard M. Shea, director, District of Columbia Board of Public Welfare; Sherwood H. Smith, commissioner, Florida State Welfare Board; Patrick A. Tompkins, commissioner, Massachusetts State Department of Public Welfare; Robert W. Beasley, Social Security Administration.

Excessive Taxation

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received in the mail some rather unusual presentations to Congress: a pair of pants and the pockets from a pair of pants. The man who sent these pants that I hold in my hands was a printer. He had been doing some praying, apparently, because the knees are out, and the pockets are also well worn.

These taxpayers are protesting the high taxes being imposed upon them. They are willing to pay the taxes if the Government will show a willingness to cut down on some of the unnecessary spending. It is quite evident that the New Deal, in packing the Appropriations Committee, has made it almost impossible to make any substantial cuts. They certainly are going to control the purse strings. While the Republicans have a representation of 46 percent in the House, some of the subcommittees are represented by only 29 percent Republicans.

A Senator from the other body has insisted that nearly $9,000,000,000 of fat could be trimmed from the Federal budget. This should be done.

Mr. Speaker, there are two Frankenstein monsters who can destroy this country just as well as a military defeat. They are inflation and excessive taxes. This Congress has a solemn obligation to tackle both these problems without fear or hesitation.

The letters follow:

QUIZ INDUSTRIES, *Ord, Nebr.*

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There were many times out in the South Pacific that I knew it would be necessary to turn loose, quite unwillingly, of something quite precious in order that my country might live.

But I never dreamed it would be my pants.

But if other taxpayers, like myself, are willing to give up their pants, it would seem entirely logical that our Government would be willing to unshackle itself from the countless useless bureaus, commissions, and practices which are dragging it down to the police-state level just as surely and as quickly as the Reds would drag us down to communism. The latter, I believe, is just another name for the type of government which our dreamers and planners would like for us to have, whether they call it communism, facism, socialism, New Dealism, or what. Some onions, you know, are red, some are white, but they all stink.

Congress alone has the power to cast off these shackles. I thank you for your work in the past, but you're not swinging hard enough.

Very sincerely,

EDGAR R. APKING.

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.,
February 23, 1951.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the movement of your pants to your Congressman, being immodest by nature and teachings and having only one pair of pants left, have cut the bottoms of the pockets to show you their condition from digging for taxes. Now the serious side of the affair, am glad to tell you that some of the most radical Democrats have really turned against the present administration.

Yours very respectfully,

A CONSTITUENT.

Federal Taxation of State and Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is now holding hearings on the President's $16,500,000,000 tax bill. One of his proposals is to tax the interest on State and municipal bonds, thus imposing heavier taxes on the citizens of our several States and upon the taxpayers of our cities and villages.

There appeared before the Ways and Means Committee on Monday, February 26, 1951, Mr. Austin J. Tobin, secretary, Conference on State Defense, in opposition to the Truman tax proposal. Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as part of my remarks the statement of Mr. Austin J. Tobin heretofore named:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appear here as secretary of the Conference on State Defense which was organized in 1938 by the attorneys general of the States, and other State and municipal officers, who considered it essential at that time, and, since that time, to take a united stand in opposition to this proposal which seeks to establish Federal control through the power of taxation of State and local financing. I have been asked by my fellow public officers, the president of the National Association of Attorneys General, the United States Conference of Mayors, the American Municipal Association, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and the Municipal Finance Officers Association—all of whom will be represented at these hearings—to outline for the convenience of the committee the points which we will submit once again in opposition to this proposal.

The telegram which we have received from the clerk of the committee asks that we limit our testimony to methods of raising additional revenue. In accordance with your wishes I shall first address myself to that problem. I will demonstrate that the Federal revenues which can be obtained from this proposal are nonexistent or insignificant.

However, before I turn to this first point I should like to recall that this proposal has been submitted to Congress upon one theory or another on many occasions over the past 30 years, and that on each of those occasions it has been overwhelmingly rejected. It was rejected in 1918 and in 1924 when it was supported by the utility companies in a misguided effort to block the development of municipal light, power, and transit systems. It was rejected in the early 1930's. It was rejected by this committee in 1939 and again in 1942.

It was rejected on the floor of the Senate in 1940 by a vote of 44 to 30, and again in 1942 by a vote of 52 to 34.

After Congress had so decisively rejected the proposal the Treasury and the Department of Justice turned to the courts and commenced test actions against bondholders of the Port of New York Authority and the Triborough Bridge Authority. In a press release issued when these cases were started the Treasury said that they were intended ultimately to prove in the courts that the Federal Government has the right under the Constitution to tax the income from all State and municipal securities. The courts rejected that contention. It was rejected by The Tax Court of the United States and in the circuit court of appeals for the second circuit in an opinion written by Judge Augustus Hand. In 1945 the Supreme Court of the United States rejected the Government's petition for a writ of certiorari reviewing the decisions of those courts.

In 1939 and 1940 and 1942 the officers of the States and cities considered it their duty to come here, as they do again today, and to appeal to their Representatives in Congress to prevent the damage to local institutions that is implicit in this destructive proposal. We believe that this committee will conclude, as did the report submitted to the Senate by the Honorable Warren Austin in 1940 that—

"We have not here the partisan testimony of persons interested in pecuniary gain for themselves, or in the accomplishment of some ulterior objective. These witnesses were public officials charged with the duty of protecting the interests of their communities. They had no personal ax to grind. Anyone who sat through the hearings must have been impressed with their sincerity and their conviction that it would jeopardize the financial welfare of their communities and that it was their duty to oppose it.

"In the face of such unanimous State and municipal opposition, our duties here, as representatives of the States under a Federal system, based upon a constitutional guaranty of their sovereignty, compel the conclusion that we, too, must oppose this measure."

I turn, then, to the first point of the States and cities: That no Federal revenues can be obtained through this proposal.

The responsibility placed upon this committee in providing the resources with which to pay for our national defense is a grievous one. In meeting that responsibility the committee has been urged to look to new sources of revenue and to recommend a tax program including such additional revenue at an early date. The inclusion of this proposal in the Treasury's recommendations at this time is therefore quite perplexing, for the Treasury itself has always admitted that the taxation of future issues of municipal bonds would produce practically no Federal revenues for the next 10 years, and no substantial revenues for the next 20 to 30 years. In 1939, Under Secretary of the Treasury John Hanes said that the revenues which could be obtained from this proposal were unimportant. And Secretary Snyder's statement to this committee of a few weeks ago made no claims that the proposal would add to the Federal revenues at this time.

While the Secretary's statement was phrased in rather general language I assume that the proposal to which he directed the committee's attention had to do only with Federal taxation of future issues of State and local bonds. Now, the average rate of issuance of municipal bonds over the past 30 years has been about $1,000,000,000 a year, so that we are talking about a tax next year on the interest paid by the States and cities on about $1,000,000,000 of bonds. The present average interest rate on State and local bonds is 2 percent, but it is generally recognized that a Federal tax would increase that rate to at least 3 percent. That means that the theoretical maximum in the way of additional Federal revenues is a tax on 3 percent of $1,000,000,000, which is to say a tax base of only $30,000,000.

But not all of this base could be taxed. The Treasury reports that Government funds, pension systems, mutual insurance companies, and savings banks, which pay no Federal income tax, hold about 25 percent of all State and local bonds. With the higher interest rates available on taxable bonds, these investors would increase their holdings from 25 percent to, let us say, one-third of the total of new issues. That brings us down to a tax base of $20,000,000 on which a Federal tax could be imposed next year. However, we must allow for the average amount of bonds which are bought by corporations and by individuals in the lower income-tax brackets. The Treasury itself reports that individuals only buy about 40 percent of our State and local bonds. So that, if the tax payable by individuals on such interest runs as high as 50 percent, individuals would pay about $5,000,000, and corporations, even at the new 55-percent rate proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury, would pay about $4,000,000.

The end result is a maximum Federal tax potential of $10,000,000 from a tax next year on new issues of State and local bonds; a revenue yield so small that you could hardly find it in the estimates of Federal revenue.

It would take at least 20 years for such a tax to reach its maximum potential. Even then, with income taxes at the present rate, it is estimated that the Federal Government would derive no more than $300,000,000 by taxing our State and local financing.

The task of this committee in this time of emergency is to find new revenue sources which now, during the next few years, will meet the Government's revenue requirements. This source could not possibly average more than twenty-five to thirty million dollars a year over the next 5 years. In the field of Federal financing this is hardly a sum attractive enough to justify the disruption of our constitutional system, by the establishment of a Federal power to tax and so to control the financial operations of the States.

And that immediately brings us to the view which will be expressed here today by the attorneys general of the States and the city attorneys who will appear here in opposition to any proposal to tax local securities. They will tell the committee that such a tax is unconstitutional and would be so held if it came before the Supreme Court.

This committee is looking for money to buy tanks, ships, and planes now. They cannot be paid for by 3 or 4 years of litigation leading up to the Supreme Court and depending there on a reversal of the established law of constitutional immunities, which the Court has upheld since *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* And the Court's

most recent rulings in the test case on the bonds of the Port of New York Authority, and the opinions of the majority of the Justices in the Saratoga Springs decision of 1946 encourage no hope for a reversal of the doctrine of the Pollock case. Even before the set-back of the Treasury and the Department of Justice in the Port Authority test case in 1945, and the opinions expressed by the majority of the Court in the Saratoga Springs case in 1946, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation had reported to this committee that—

"It is the opinion of this office that a constitutional amendment is the only effective way by which the Federal income tax may be applied to this interest (on State and municipal bonds)."

When I said, therefore, at the outset that the additional Federal revenues to be gained through this proposal were unsubstantial or nonexistent I meant it quite literally.

In his recent statement before the committee the Secretary of the Treasury referred to the immunity of State and local bonds as "a long standing barrier to the achievement of equity in the distribution of the individual income-tax burden." We submit to the committee that this so-called loophole has been grossly exaggerated.

The report which Senator Warren Austin submitted to the Senate in 1940 and 1942, and which was supported on the floor of the Senate, said:

"(This proposal) is based upon a theory of tax evasion that is not supported by the facts. Though it has been popularized with the public as a device to obtain additional taxes from the wealthy, it would in reality place upon the States, and particularly upon the cities, a heavy burden of increased local taxation. Stripped of its popular catch phrases, it would simply shift a further, and perhaps, unsupportable burden on the home owner and the rent payer."

The Teasury's own statistics admit that about 60 percent of our municipal bonds are held, not by individuals, but by Government agencies, pension systems, sinking funds and other institutional investors which are not subject to progressive personal surtaxes. With reference to the remaining 40 percent of these bonds held by individuals, the estate tax returns show substantial holdings in smaller estates.

The Treasury's statistics reveal also that the severity of income tax rates has had no relation whatsoever to the percentage of municipal bonds held by individuals. Although taxes rose steeply from 1937 to 1945 the percentage of State and local bonds held by individuals in 1945 was actually somewhat less than in 1937. So also consider the fact that in 1937, with an effective tax rate on a $50,000 net income of 17.8 percent, the percentage of outstanding municipal bonds held by individuals was 45 percent; whereas in 1947 with an effective tax rate on a $50,000 net income of 49.6 percent the percentage of municipal bonds outstanding in the hands of individuals had dropped to 41 percent.

The fact is, also, that the State and local bonds held by individuals do not on the average constitute any substantial portion of their wealth. The Treasury's analysis of returns for taxable decedents' estates since 1927 shows that on the average only 12 percent of the wealth in estates of $1,000,000 and over has been invested in State and municipal securities. In other words, over seven-eighths of their wealth has been invested in corporate and other forms of securities. So, too, a study prepared by the staff of your own Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in 1939 shows that only 6 percent of the incomes in the million dollar brackets were derived from interest on State and local securities. Such percentages fit the picture of normal diversification of investments far better than the Treasury's picture of tax avoidance.

Finally, as the committee knows, anyone who purchases a municipal bond pays a heavy tax to the State or local issuing body at the time he buys the bond in the form of a much lower interest rate than he would accept if the same bond was taxable.

I think that most of the members of this committee are familiar with the heavy impact of this proposal on the cost of providing State and municipal facilities. There would seem to be general agreement that that increase would probably be about 1 percent or more in the interest rate, or an increase in State and local borrowing costs of 50 percent on a 2 percent municipal bond. On the present volume of State and local debt, that means that this proposal would undoubtedly impose a burden of added costs on local government running upward of $200,000,000.

It is true that this total would be reached gradually, just as the relatively meager Federal revenues could only be realized gradually. However, the full weight of the tax on individual States and cities and on local projects would be felt immediately. If the city or town you live in needs a new school, a new hospital, a sewage-disposal project, or an irrigation facility next year your local taxpayers will feel the heavy impact of this proposal at once. If the States of Ohio or Pennsylvania or New Jersey or New York wish to construct or add to their new systems of turnpikes and through ways next year, or the year after that, the full weight of this Federal tax proposal on those projects will be felt at once. If the Chicago Transit Authority must purchase new busses by the sale of bonds next year it must anticipate a 30-percent or a 50-percent increase in its financing cost.

The difficulties faced by local government since the last war in providing the essential services which the people of your localities require are, I believe, well known to the members of this committee. Population increases of 50 percent in new suburban areas and a well-defined shift of population to the Western States have created needs for schools, roads, and utilities which would be hit at once by this proposal. You will bear in mind too that the immediate needs and requirements for the extension of utilities, the construction and repair of streets, and for schools and fire and police protection, brought about by the construction and expansion of defense plants, must be met, and are being met today, by the municipalities.

Some 90 percent of all State and municipal bonds are issued by the local governments. As you know, our cities and towns are hard pressed themselves to find sources of revenue, or perhaps I should say in just squeezing the old real property tax to meet the needs of their people for hospitals, schools, streets, sewers, transit, and a decent standard of living for their civil servants. There is no fair comparison in this proposal between the impact of a 50-percent increase in the cost of local financing, and the comparatively meager return that could be hoped for by the Federal Government.

Much has been said about the necessity of perfecting the progressive character of the Federal income tax. We submit that not enough thought has been given to the fact that this proposal would have just the reverse effect on the local tax structure, where its burden would be borne almost entirely by property owners whose taxes are not levied in accordance with ability to pay. The municipalities, as I have said, issue 90 percent of our State and local debt, and they derive almost 85 percent of their revenue from real-estate taxes. Yet the same tax perfectionists who keep bringing this issue back to this committee year after year, would admit that the real-estate tax is one of the most regressive forms of taxation.

In many circumstances, however, the consequences of this proposal would be even more serious than the increase in cost and the consequent increase in local property taxes. It would frequently involve the ability of the community to finance a needed improvement at all. When we were before this committee in 1942 Mayor LaGuardia and Commissioner Moses emphasized the fact, as will Mayor Impellitteri today, that the heavy addition of interest costs would mean that many of our new self-supporting public projects in New York City could not be financed at all. The estimates of cost and revenue upon which we must go to the market for the financing of transit systems and toll bridges and tunnels and turnpikes and airports and public terminals are frequently quite marginal. It requires close figuring to demonstrate that these projects can meet their operation and maintenance charges and their debt service. In these estimates interest costs are frequently the deciding factor. The Chicago Transit Authority could not have been financed if its bonds were taxable by the Federal Government. Detroit could never have effected its tremendous refunding program after its depression of the 1930's if its bonds were subject to Federal tax.

We must build a new tunnel under the Hudson to cope with metropolitan congestion in northern New Jersey and New York. We have been working on the estimates for that project for the past year, and I must say frankly to this committee that there is no possibility of financing such a tunnel on a self-supporting basis if the Treasury succeeds in its efforts to tax our bonds.

Is it the purpose or objective of this proposal to increase the need and pressures for Federal aid? Are the States and cities to be forced to call upon the Federal Government to finance projects which they could have financed themselves if the Federal Government had not disrupted local financing by taxing municipal bonds? That would certainly be a wry outcome of a revenue bill addressed to the problem of additional Federal revenue.

We submit that much of the misunderstanding of this proposal arises because the Treasury discusses it simply as a problem in taxation or in alleged tax evasion. But this is not a problem in abstract economics. The answer is not to be found by adding up possible Federal tax revenues on the one hand, increased interest costs to local government on the other, and then substracting the two totals. The real nature of this problem is one of the preservation of independent local government, of the continuance of true federalism under our Constitution. It is a problem that reaches into the very nature and quality of the democratic process. As Senator Bailey, of North Carolina, said when this proposal was debated on the floor of the Senate in 1940 "the really great issue here is not one of revenue. The really great issue here is the power of one sovereignty to tax another, and the wisdom of it, even conceding that the Federal Government has the right to tax the credit of my State, for that is what it all amounts to."

If the functioning of local government is vital to our liberties in times of peace, it is vital to our national existence in times of war. This is particularly true in a war that will be fought in city streets and by the cities themselves.

National defense calls for the fullest cooperation of States and municipalities in the maintenance of city services and the construction of municipal facilities vital to the war effort. It requires the strengthening of their credit standing and the utmost efficiency in the administration of their local affairs. The cities are loyally meeting these proper demands; local government is enlisting "for the duration." Nothing would injure this unity of purpose and effort more than for the Federal Government to attempt to tax municipal securities, to increase our local interest costs and to move, at this time, toward the disestablishment of that federalism which is the real strength of these 48 United States.

The power to tax always carries with it the power to exempt and to classify the subjects of taxation. Thus, any future administration controlling the Federal Government could, through the power to tax our securities, and through the power to exempt and to classify within the activities of local government, control every operation of the States and cities. This was pointed out by Justices Douglas and Black in 1946 in the Saratoga Springs decision when they said:

"A tax is a powerful, regulatory instrument * * * the power to tax lightly is the power to tax severely. The power to tax is, indeed, one of the most effective forms of regulation. And no more powerful instrument for centralization of government could be devised. For with the Federal Government immune and the States subject to tax, the economic ability of the Federal Government to expand its activities at the expense of the States is at once apparent."

We understand that when the Secretary of the Treasury submitted this proposal a few weeks ago he said in response to a question by one of the members of this committee that the Treasury relied in its claim for the constitutionality of this proposal on the study submitted to the Senate in 1939 by the Department of Justice. We submit to the committee that the propositions of law advanced in that study were completely repudiated in the opinions of Chief Justice Stone and Justices Reed, Murphy, Burton, Douglas, and Black in the Saratoga Springs case in 1946.

That study, on which the Secretary of the Treasury told this committee that he relied upon, frankly asserted the supremacy of the Federal taxing power over the functions of local government. That proposition was rejected by the Chief Justice in the Saratoga Springs case when he said:

"The counterpart of such undue interference has been recognized since Marshall's day as the implied immunity of each of the dual sovereignties of our constitutional system from taxation by the other" *McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316).

And by Justices Douglas and Black when they said:

"The power of one sovereign to tax another is an innovation so startling as to require explicit authority if it is to be allowed. If the power of the Federal Government to tax the States is conceded, the reserved power of the States guaranteed by the tenth amendment does not give them the independence which they have always been assumed to have. They are relegated to a more servile status. They become subject to interference and control both in the functions which they exercise and the methods which they employ. They must pay the Federal Government for the privilege of exercising the powers of sovereignty guaranteed them by the Constitution, (when) they issue securities or perform any other acts within the scope of their police power."

So too in the Department of Justice study of 1939, which the Secretary of the Treasury has said he relies upon, it was argued that many of the activities of the States were proprietary and so taxable. This distinction was rejected by all eight justices in the Saratoga Springs case.

In short the Supreme Court seems to have left nothing but shreds of the opinion on which the Department of Justice relied when it went into the test cases involving the bonds of the Port of New York Authority and the Triborough Bridge Authority and on which it relied also in the Saratoga Springs case.

Chief Justice Vinson became a member of the Supreme Court after the decision in the Saratoga Springs case. He had led the fight against Federal taxation of municipal bonds, even by constitutional amendment, when he was a Member of the House in 1924. And it was Mr. Justice Burton who led the fight against taxation of municipal bonds on the floor of the Senate in 1942.

The real issue here should be very clear. It is an issue that transcends the field of taxation or the field of mere fiscal argument. It rises beyond the niceties of legal debate and distinctions.

If Congress has the power by simple statute to tax State and municipal bonds, it has inevitably the power to control State and municipal financing.

Without control of its own financing no government can continue as a free and independent state.

That is why the States and cities believe that this is the chosen battleground upon which they must make their stand for the preservation of local government and all that it means under our constitutional system.

Under that system democracy itself is completely dependent upon the continued freedom of the States to carry on the functions of local government without Federal interference. So long as such a system is to be maintained, tax interference by one government with the functions of the other can only be prevented by reciprocal constitutional immunity.

In the words of the memorandum in opposition which the American Federation of Labor submitted to this committee in 1942: "To preserve the sovereignty to our several and separate State governments, and the home rule of our cities, the credit and borrowing capacity of our several States and political subdivisions should be taxable only by the respective States, thus reserving to the States exclusively this field of taxation, preventing the coercion of the States by the Federal Government and preserving local self-government."

The States and cities are confident that this committee will reject this destructive recommendation as it has on every occasion in the past when it has examined its demerits.

Retreat From Victors' Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by William Henry Chamberlin showing once more the crimes committed by us and our allies as victors in the name of justice from Human Events of February 21, 1951:

RETREAT FROM VICTORS' JUSTICE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is remarkable how fast we are retreating, or attempting to retreat, from the consequences of a military victory so abused and so bungled that it has become a major national security risk. As the sixth anniversary of Yalta passes and the sixth anniversary of Potsdam approaches not a single achievement of these wartime conferences seems either durable or desirable.

What intelligent American today feels happy over the mutilation and abandonment of Poland, the giving of Manchuria to Stalin, the grotesque, new Polish-German and Polish-Soviet frontiers, the uprooting of many millions from homes which their ancestors had occupied for generations, the total disarmament of Germany and Japan? Most of these decisions were crimes against elementary humanity; all were grave blunders from the cold-blooded standpoint of American national interest.

Now there has been a substantial and welcome, if belated retreat from the unsound conception of "victors' justice," to use the phrase of the British publicist, Montgomery Belgion, which found expression in the Nuremberg trial and in the many subsequent trials of alleged German war criminals by American courts.

High Commissioner John J. McCloy and Gen. Thomas T. Handy, commander of United States forces in Europe, recently announced the completion of their review of 101 sentences imposed on prisoners held in the Landsberg prison. The revision of these sentences was so drastic as to throw considerable doubt on the justice of the original sentences. Twenty-one out of 28 death penalties were commuted.

Thirty-three criminals, including all the industrialists who had been sentenced in one of the flimsiest of the trials, were released. Mr. McCloy offered the comment that the confiscation of the property of Alfred Krupp was generally repugnant to American concepts of justice and reversed this sentence. Thirty-five prison terms were reduced.

It was natural that this decision should be met by outcries of enraged criticism by two groups in this country and abroad. There are those who want their pound of flesh of vengeance. And there are others who, because of active participation or expressed approval, have built up an emotional vested interest in vindicating the justice of the war-crimes trials.

However, there seems no reason to question the sincerity of Mr. McCloy's statement:

"I have made every effort to decide each individual case objectively, dispassionately, and on its merits. All of my decisions have been rooted in the firm belief in the basic principle of the rule of law which all must respect and to which all are answerable. With this principle I have striven to temper justice with mercy."

Indeed, one might well go further and, in the retrospect of the years which have elapsed since the end of the war, say that the decisions to set up victors' courts to try members of the vanquished nation for war crimes was a moral, judicial, and political mistake and should never be repeated.

II

The most obvious objection to the war-crimes trials, and it is one which a less intelligent and literate people than the Germans would scarcely have failed to appreciate, was the complete absence of two indispensable attributes of any genuine legal tribunal: impartiality and universality. The Germans were judged and condemned not because they had committed crimes of appalling character, as some of the defendants unquestionably had; but because they were defeated.

One could offer many concrete illustrations of this proposition; but two may suffice. The planning and waging of aggressive war was one of the principal items in the Nuremberg indictment. But it was widely known at the time, and has subsequently been proved by documentary evidence, that Stalin was a full-fledged partner in the first phase of Hitler's aggressive war, up to the point of concluding advance agreements as to how the human and territorial spoils of aggression in Eastern Europe should be shared. But representatives of the U. S. S. R. were not in the dock at Nuremberg; they sat on the bench with the other judges.

Few war crimes exceed in atrocity the cold-blooded massacre of thousands of Polish war prisoners whose bodies were discovered in 1943 in the Katyn Forest, near the town of Smolensk, in western Russia. The circumstantial evidence that this massacre was carried out by the Soviet political police in the spring of 1940 is overwhelming. The Nuremberg tribunal itself, certainly not inclined to give the Germans the benefit of any doubt, refused to find them guilty of this particular outrage, although it had been listed in the indictment. But no one proposed to call the Soviet authorities responsible for this violation of international law and elementary humanity to account.

And Count Stauffenberg, cousin of the officer who was one of the leaders of the plot against Hitler of July 20, 1944, voiced a not unnatural sentiment when he recently proposed the prosecution of "those Allied war criminals who were guilty of raping and plundering the German people when the Allies advanced into Germany."

III

It is this obvious absence of any attempt to apply even-handed justice in the punishment of offenses against humanity that explains the cynical apathy with which most Germans have reacted to the war crimes trials. Had a genuinely international tribunal, including judges selected from neutral countries and from non-Nazi Germans, been set up after the war for the purpose of investigating all offenses against humanity, the effect would have been impressive and edifying.

But a long series of trials of vanquished by victors could only be expected to produce among the vanquished at best indifference, in some cases sympathy with the accused. The inconsistency was too glaring, especially after the cold war heated up and the western powers and the Soviet Union began to accuse each other of the crime of preparing a new aggressive war.

Apart from this general inconsistency, there were grave objections in detail to the conduct of many of the war crimes trials and the assumptions on which these trials were based. In the trial of 12 members of the Krupp firm there was an avowed determination of the prosecution to get a Krupp, regardless of how little evidence there might be against him. As Alfred Krupp wrote to General Clay after his conviction:

"During the whole procedure I felt that I was standing before prejudiced and biased judges."

The counsel for the defendants, in their appeal, asserted that all the questions put by the judges aimed at implicating the accused, that no witness for the prosecution was cross-examined for credibility, whereas this method was applied to witnesses for the defense, that documents were misused and cited out of context. The court held the Krupp firm responsible for measures prescribed by the Nazi government for the treatment of foreign laborers and paid no attention to evidence that the firm did what it could to improve this treatment.

As in many other cases, notably in the trial of such former members of the Foreign Office staff as Weizsaecker and Woermann, there was a deliberate or unconscious ignoring of the psychological condition under which men lived and worked under Hitler's dictatorship. Long prison sentences were imposed not for acts of spontaneous cruelty and inhumanity, but because industrialists and diplomats did not file protests which would have been useless to the victims of the Nazis and self-destructive for themselves.

IV

Still more sinister were the methods used to extort confessions from German soldiers accused of having killed American prisoners in the Malmedy region of Belgium during the Battle of the Bulge. According to Judge Edward Van Roden of Pennsylvania, who investigated this case for the Army, physical torture and mock trials and threats to families of the accused were employed on such a scale that "it is impossible to know whether the men being hanged are guilty or innocent."

Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin, who denounced this perversion of the ideals of American justice on the floor of the Senate, suggested one of the explanations: "Many members of the interrogation team were American citizens of very recent origin—German political refugees from Hitlerian Germany—employed by the Army because of their hatred for the defendants for the purpose of getting confessions from the accused."

All in all, the purposes of justice and American political interests were badly served by the war crimes trials. High credit is due to a few men who spoke out against the abuses of these trials, to investigators like Judge Van Roden, to Judge Wenerstrum, who sharply disassociated himself from the spirit and methods of a trial of German generals, to Judge Powers, who presented a powerful dissenting argument in the case of the Foreign Office officials.

A German of outstanding political intelligence, with whom I discussed the recent revision of sentences, predicted that this would lead to better understanding and added:

"There is nothing to be said personally in favor of the seven men whose death sentences were upheld. They were proved mass murderers. The only argument for commutation in these cases is that the death penalty has been abolished in the German Federal Republic. I think there is a case for further modifications of the sentences passed on some of the generals. They have been condemned for dealing harshly with guerrillas; but your own experience in Korea shows that guerrillas cannot be handled with silk gloves."

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the remarks of Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, made at a luncheon honoring the four high-school winners of the Voice of Democracy contest, held at the Hotel Statler in Washington on February 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a time for fundamentals—for straight talk about freedom, democracy, and brotherhood—for clear thinking about the spiritual values that have made our Nation great. If we mean to preserve our heritage and save western civilization, we must grasp the full meaning of individual dignity and equal opportunity, and we must put these ideas to work in our daily lives.

Sham, hesitation, or double-talk will not suffice on this anniversary of Washington's birthday, for the hour is perilously late and the danger to our way of life is total and relentless. At this moment, the disciples of Communist imperialism are beaming their great lies about the free world, about the United Nations, and about the United States to every corner of the globe. Their "upside-down talk" makes mockery of our institutions and our beliefs. It is of crucial importance that we seize every opportunity to speak out against the evils of totalitarianism, and at the same time affirm our belief in and devotion to the ideals of democratic living.

It is especially significant, therefore, that today in Washington we are paying special tribute to four young people who speak for democracy. These high school students—two girls, age 16, and two boys, age 17—have shown that they know how to talk straight and think straight about the fundamentals and about the moral principles that really count in this free society of ours. They are about to receive scholarship awards honoring them as winners of the fourth annual Voice of Democracy contest. In this contest the United States Office of Education has taken a part since its inception in 1947. One and one-half million young people took part in this year's contest in the second, third, and fourth years of high school.

It has been apparent to those who have heard their words that our young people fully understand the meaning of democracy and appreciate the significance of the present attack upon its values. Their statements bear eloquent testimony to the fact that in our schools young people learn that democracy is as democracy does. Our youth know what they believe in and what they are willing to defend. In these words a former winner of the Voice of Democracy contest recently explained why it is important that young people speak out for democracy. He said:

"America never has had, and most likely never again will have such a need for reaffirming support of democratic principles. The Voice of Democracy contest did this for me, for I can see that only democracy and its degree of individual freedom can stand as the ray of hope beyond the blackness of tomorrow. Working among America's high school generation, the contest is of highest importance in helping young Americans grasp that thread of idealism which is the only hope for maintaining our national integrity."

The contest awards to 1951's eloquent spokesmen for democracy will be presented by the Honorable Frank Pace, Secretary of the Army.

(At this point, Commissioner McGrath introduced Secretary Pace who spoke in tribute to the Voice of Democracy contest and presented the 1951 awards to the four winners: Robert A. Burnett, of St. Louis, Mo.; Marcia Anne Harmon, of San Bernardino, Calif.; Norita Newbrough, of Baton Rouge, La.; and Ricardo Romulo, of Washington, D. C. Portions of the award-winning broadcasts were then read, after which Dr. McGrath adjourned the luncheon with the following remarks):

I believe that you, like me, must get a great elevation of spirit in hearing the expressions by these young people of the ideals and the ideas for which this country stands. I am sure, too, that you, the adult members of this audience, feel very humble. I am sure you feel some soul-searching is necessary to discover to what extent we live up to these high ideals. I never leave these meetings without feeling a great deal of satisfaction and a great sense of security with respect to the future of this great country. The other members of this audience will forgive an educator if he says that in a small way he gets personal satisfaction out of being associated with a profession which, to be sure, is not entirely responsible for these performances because it shares that responsibility with the church and the home, but which nevertheless has these young people in hand for a large portion of their daily lives. I feel, when I hear these statements, that the school teachers of the Nation are doing a pretty good job in perpetuating the traditions and the ideals of our country. For you I express to these two young ladies and two young gentlemen a great admiration for what they have done and through them to a million and a half others. I am sure that I on their behalf express their gratitude for the distinguished group that has come to meet with us here today.

No Indians Will Be Made Homeless by Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on pages A989–A990 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 26, Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, of California, extended his remarks under the title "Indians Will Be Made Homeless by Central Arizona Project." In the course of his introductory remarks Congressman ENGLE says concerning the Hualapai Tribe of Arizona:

Their long struggle to stay on their land will be lost, however, if Congress approves of the central Arizona project.

Following this Congressman ENGLE inserts a lengthy memorandum on this Indian tribe to substantiate his statement.

Perhaps Congressman ENGLE has not seen the canyon area in which the Bridge Canyon Dam is to be built. I urge him to go with other members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to see whether any land occupied by dwellings of these Indians will be taken from them should a dam at the Bridge Canyon site be built. This is about the wildest terrain on the North American Continent. Although it lies outside the Grand Canyon National Monument and many miles outside the Grand Canyon National Park, it is a region just about as rough as the Grand Canyon area itself. The Hualapai Indians do not live in and never have lived in, their livestock do not use and never have used, that part of the canyon which would be flooded. It is erroneous to assume that because the Fort Peck Dam on the Missouri River will flood some Indian homeland, causing villages and cemeteries to be moved, that the same is true concerning the Hualapai Indians in the deep canyon where the Bridge Canyon Dam is to be built. The two cases are not at all similar.

The only land which the Government would require of these Hualapai Indians—and that part is worthless land for Indian purposes—is just enough canyon wall and bed rock on which to build the dam, plus the bottom of the canyon where the river flows, a temporary site for the work plant during the construction, and a right-of-way for a road to bring in materials, and so forth. Ample provision is made in the bill to recompense the Indians justly for any loss incurred because of this construction.

Furthermore there would be great benefits accruing to these Indians temporarily and permanently should this construction be done, and the Hualapai Tribe would be exceedingly heavy losers if this dam were not built. As proof that the Hualapai Council does not agree with Congressman ENGLE I cite a resolution passed by the governing body of the Hualapai Tribe and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 2, pp. 2043–2044. The Hualapai Indians have officially sanctioned the program as contained in the legislation before Congress. Their resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION 200 OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE HUALAPAI TRIBE OF THE HUALAPAI RESERVATION, A FEDERALLY CHARTERED INDIAN CORPORATION

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States legislation known as Senate bill 75 covering the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam on the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, and for other purposes; and

Whereas in the event said Bridge Canyon Dam project should be constructed and operated, the lands and rights of the Hualapai Tribe would be materially affected in that the dam, and the townsite for the dam and a great many of the rights-of-way would be on the Hualapai Reservation, and unless said lands and rights of the tribe are protected, the tribe and its members will be severely damaged; and

Whereas there has now been proposed a compromise amendment to section 14 of said Senate bill 75 which compromise amendment in substance meets the major requests of the Hualapai Tribe for the protection of their rights and interests by giving the Indians a chance to negotiate a voluntary sale of their land and a right to a fair jury trial on compensation if no voluntary agreement is reached; and

Whereas the Hualapai Tribe realizes the great importance of the Bridge Canyon project to the State of Arizona and in the interest of the people of the State of Arizona the Hualapai Tribe now desires to lend their endorsement and support to S. 75 with the attached proposed amendment to section 14 being made a part thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Hualapai Tribal Council in meeting assembled this 16th day of February 1950, That it endorse S. 75 as amended by the attached proposed amendment; and by it further

Resolved, That the Hualapai Tribal Council, expressing deep appreciation for the sympathetic support for the protection of the tribe, given by civic and labor organizations, and by many Senators, respectfully urges Senate endorsement of S. 75 as amended; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the members of the Arizona congressional delegation and to other Members of Congress and other organizations concerned with the protection of Indian rights.

CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, as secretary of the Hualapai Tribal Council, hereby certify that the Tribal Council of the Hualapai Tribe is composed of nine members, of whom eight, constituting a quorum, were present at a meeting thereof this 16th day of February 1950, and that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by an affirmative vote of eight members.

LEO B. ANDREWS,
Secretary.

"Things Past Redress Are Now With Me Past Care"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, Political Observer Bob McManus, of the Binghamton Press, now covering the Albany scene, reports that reapportionment of New York's congressional districts will not be made known until long after next September.

I could have told him that. I had just talked with the oracle who visits me every time he gets something hot off the wire.

The last story he related was perfectly amazing. It was about face from the one before.

He said he was in a well-known pub a few days ago in the State capital when a couple of boys "in the know" accosted him.

"Tell that guy HALL," they spluttered, deep in their cups, "we're going to carve his district into beefsteaks."

"We've got plans, and he ain't goin' to like 'em. Only he won't know soon enough to do him any good. We'll show him what a gerrymander job really is."

This latest report upset me no end, because it was an about face from what I was told would be the new congressional district.

I find it difficult to believe that the underlings my friend refers to would deliberately go out on a limb contrary to the wishes of just about everybody.

The Governor himself expressed publicly, several weeks ago, that they ought to get the redistricting job out of the way as soon as possible.

I fail to see how anyone can profit by our being kept in the dark until the eve of the next election as to where the new districts will lie.

They seem to take special delight in rubbing this into me. They gloat over the idea that they are accomplishing a grand coup by worrying me over the make-up of the counties I must run in next year.

This is strictly small potatoes. I long ago made my plans. I am keeping them to myself, but I can assure you this much: I will be campaigning in every direction at once and I will be lining up support in every prospective county.

After all, they cannot eliminate all the other counties up-State from the Broome orbit, regardless of how much they might want to declare us a foreign State. Moreover, they cannot keep me from campaigning in the other counties. It is still a free country, I guess.

Of course, it is an insult to up-State to try to take a single Congressman away from that mighty area.

But, as I say, I have made my plans. I have tried my best to see an open, aboveboard fight out of this thing, but I am doomed to disappointment.

Come what may, I will be in there pitching. It will be necessary to expend a little more energy going all over the territory, because I am not absolutely sure of the new district set-up, but it will be good exercise. I will get better acquainted this way also.

So, for the benefit of those who think their procrastination on the most important subject before the people this year, that of preserving our American system, is annoying or irritating me, I say, have your fun.

In the words of a line from Richard II, "Things past redress are now with me past care."

Let Us Utilize Our Defense Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, in these perilous times, when the very preservation of our Nation may depend upon our wisdom in properly utilizing our resources, it is inconceivable that our defense authorities would close their eyes to the value of any of the important facilities constructed at such great cost during World War II. Yet that is just what is happening to a major air installation in the heart of our country. I refer to George Field, located in eastern Illinois and in the center of a network of rail and highway facilities vital to the defense effort.

In the light of present conditions, calling for greatly expanded military effort, it would seem logical to utilize George Field, for it represents a modern, complete air center available for immediate use. Residents of the area, realizing its possibilities and alert to the needs of the hour, are very properly calling on their Government for an immediate consideration of reactivating the base.

Under permission granted to me, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a communication I have just received, signed by a large number of prominent residents of Lawrenceville, Ill. The communication sets forth once more the salient facts in connection with this important matter. It follows:

LAWRENCEVILLE, ILL., *February 10, 1951.*

Hon. EDWARD JENISON,
United States Representative,
Paris, Ill.

DEAR SIR: We have not bothered you much until now for we have felt that the Government would open up George Field. We see where they are opening up many fields in other places, and we cannot understand why we are being passed up. Recently a letter to the chamber of commerce here in Lawrenceville stated that George Field is not included in the present Air Force expansion program. It went on to say that the field is being constantly reviewed and that means that there might be a future possibility that George Field may be reactivated.

Indiana people are doing all they can and are getting letters back from Washington stating that they are inclined to believe that as our defense program develops that George Field will be utilized.

It looks to us like that if our Indiana and Illinois men in Washington would get together on this they could do a lot of good.

There are plenty of good reasons in favor of reactivating, and our asking your help is not altogether selfish. Before this field was put on a stand-by basis we prepared a book on the advantages of George Field. This book was a lengthy explanation of the many advantages and was prepared by good men, and presents enough good reasons to back up any request you might make for us.

These books, giving the advantages of George Field were sent to our Representatives from both States in Washington at that time, and we received letters back telling us that these books were being filed with the War Department. We suppose that they are still there and think they should be dug out of the moth balls and reread as they present the best possible reasons in our favor.

There are hundreds of good reasons in favor of George Field, but to look at its location should be enough. It is also entirely owned by the Government and there are dozens of good buildings and hangars in good condition just standing there, also acre after acre of thick good concrete runways large and good enough to take care of the largest type of planes. Roads, water system, electric system, large well-built housing area, railroad switch into field from main line of B. & O., warehouse, store, post office; in fact everything is standing there ready to be put back in operation. They tell us that field cost about $100,000,000 in 1941 and was only used in the last war so it is not old enough to be worn out or obsolete.

This field has never been flooded, and has been cut off by high waters only twice as far back as anyone can remember. This field is definitely above any and all high water, and by raising the road to the field a couple of feet in some low places, the road would be above any and all high water.

George Field was inspected as a possible location for the proposed West Point of the air and the engineers told us at that time a small levee could be built for nearly nothing that would forever stop any threat from high water. Surely a $100,000,000 investment won't let a few hundred dollars stand in the way of its being used.

When George Field was in operation planes from other fields were flown here to get them out of the heavy winds that destroy planes at other fields. George Field's location would save the Government enormous amounts of money every month, being located in the center of the densely populated area that it is; there would be less freight and transportation cost on personnel and supplies; and, being on the main line of three prominent railroads, the B. & O. running east and west and the C. & E.-I. and the Big Four running north and south, and on the two most prominent highways in the country, U S 50 running east and west and U S 41 running north and south. In fact, we challenge anybody to find a location that even comes close to George Field.

It is true, of course, that the reactivation of military bases is a primary responsibility of the Defense Establishment, and the representatives of the area involved will continue to press diligently for consideration of the problem in that quarter. But the Members of Congress, as a whole, will want to be informed on this and similar problems across the country at a time when vast funds are being sought for the creation of new facilities connected with the defense effort. It should be remembered that our resources are not unlimited, and we should first make the best use of available facilities before we embark on any program of new construction. It is to be hoped that our defense authorities will see both the wisdom and the necessity for such a course in the immediate future.

Fred Earle Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to announce the death of one of the outstanding citizens of my congressional district, Fred Earle Taylor, which occurred on February 19, last.

I deem it of importance to many of us in Government to make this announcement here due to the fact that Mr. Taylor performed an outstanding service during both World War I and World War II. He was president of the Realty Board of Portland, Oreg., in 1916 and in 1920 was president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. In 1939 he represented the national association at an international housing conference in Stockholm, Sweden.

Throughout his entire career, Mr. Taylor devoted a substantial amount of time and effort toward raising the standards of the real-estate profession and assisting his country and community. It was largely through his efforts that one of the first real-estate license laws in the United States was adopted in Oregon in 1919. During World War I, he was a dollar-a-year man with the United States Housing Corporation. As NAREB president, Mr. Taylor traveled 28,599 miles and saw NAREB board membership double. During his tenure seven State associations were formed, and convention attendance that year was almost triple that of any previous year.

With the advent of World War II Mr. Taylor returned to Government as head of the Office of Decentralization Service. Under his guidance, the Decentralization Service accomplished the difficult task of moving 14 Federal peacetime agencies and 40,000 employees from Washington to other cities. The celerity and smoothness of the operation won high official praise.

Mr. Taylor leaves surviving him his wife, Fanny S.; a son, Arthur, of Portland, Oreg.; and a daughter, Mrs. Glen W. Lundberg, of Los Angeles, Calif.

I join with the many friends of Fred Taylor in sorrow at his passing. My State and the Nation has lost a devout and loyal worker in the cause of good government.

Man of the South for 1950—Article by Huber F. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Man of the South for 1950," which appeared in a recent issue of Dixie Business.

This relates to Reuben B. Robertson, of Asheville, N. C., who established and developed one of the greatest industrial plants in our State, the Champion Paper and Fibre Co., located in Canton, N. C.

The selection of Mr. Robertson as "the Man of the South for 1950" had the hearty endorsement of the people throughout the country, and this article gives an account of the Reuben B. Robertson Day Observance at Asheville on December 16, 1950.

I also wish to have included the editorial from the Asheville Times of December 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1950

(By Hubert F. Lee)

The man who in the days of his young manhood had come to the tree-covered mountains of North Carolina nearly a half century ago to help build a paper and pulp mill, and stayed to become one of America's greatest industrialists and leaders, was honored by friends he had made over the years on December 16 as few men are honored during their lifetime.

And on the evening of the day that had been designated "Reuben B. Robertson Day" in western North Carolina he heard his life and works praised to the heights of the Land of the Sky by some of the South's outstanding leaders of business, education, industry, finance, and government * * * and the Dixie Business "distinguished service award" presented to him, formally proclaiming him "Man of the South for 1950."

It was an impressive testimonial dinner his friends gave him by their presence and their words and handclasps. He termed it one of the highest honors ever to be bestowed upon him. The testimonial had been arranged by some of his old friends who had formed a sponsoring committee to do him honor when he was elected "Man of the South for 1950" by some 6,000 votes from more than half of the States over the Nation.

Reuben B. Robertson, the "Man of the South for the Year 1950," stands at the gates of the second half of the twentieth century as a symbol of all the great leaders and men of achievement over the South who in their lifetime have set in motion forces that will work for the betterment of mankind through the years.

And some 175 of his friends let him know it at the testimonial dinner in the ballroom of the swank Battery Park Hotel in Asheville, and at the mill in Canton, and in letters and telegrams from leaders over the Nation.

The theme was "Free Enterprise and the Community—A Case History," and the story of the chairman of the board of the Champion Paper & Fibre Co. was reviewed in retrospect by old friends * * * when bread had been broken and Rev. C. Grier Davis had delivered the invocation.

The character and greatness of Reuben B. Robertson, the man, was formed by the influence of his mother and his father when he was a child in Cincinnati, Judge and Mrs. Charles Robertson, an old friend of his father, Judge Alfred K. Nippert, said in reviewing the life of Robertson and tracing the history of his forebears. Judge Nippert told of Robertson's home life, his childhood, his boyhood, and of his courting and marrying Hope Thomson on June 7, 1905, and how she had gone with him for the rendezvous with destiny in the mountains of North Carolina. He said Robertson had inherited his father's "Viking spirit." His words were intimate and heart-stirring as the distinguished judge turned back the pages of time for a glance at the beginning. And hearing him were Reuben L., Jr., and Dr. Logan Thomson Robertson, the two sons of the Robertsons who were born in North Carolina, and Dwight J. Thomson and the nieces and nephews of the Robertsons. They heard tributes paid also to Mrs. Robertson's father, the late Peter Thomson, who founded the Champion Paper & Fiber Co., with a few thousand dollars of borrowed capital in 1894 * * * at Hamilton, Ohio, and whose vision it was that led to the selection of Canton, N. C., as the site for the second pulp mill that was built in 1907.

In the keynote address, United States Senator CLYDE R. HOEY, Democrat, North Carolina, expressed the sentiments of those present and thousands who were unable to be there in person:

"We do honor to ourselves for by his many acts of service, his wisdom, and his judgment, Reuben B. Robertson has honored us far more than we are honoring him.

"His unfailing faith and courage is the type of spirit needed by Americans to meet the present world crisis.

"Under the leadership of men like Reuben B. Robertson, America has demonstrated the great power of the free enterprise system—a system which has survived many crises before, and will prove equally strong to meet the present emergencies.

"He makes me able to say, in the words of William Allen White: 'I have seen yesterday, I have loved today, and I face tomorrow unafraid'."

Senator HOEY paid gracious tribute to Mrs. Robertson, saying she had walked the road of high adventure with Robertson and shared all his triumphs and disappointments.

Tull L. Jamison, who had helped make paper at Canton for 41 years and is now retired, rose from his seat of honor at the speakers table and traced the history of Champion at Canton from the beginning to the present and there was a note of high praise as he declared Reuben B. Robertson has "built up a spirit of friendship and cooperation that nothing can shake loose."

Dr. Frank Graham, with whom Robertson had served during World War II on the National War Labor Board, credited him with helping stabilize "through the creative cooperation of organized business and organized labor, the mighty American production which helped to defeat the Fascist dictatorship and is now getting ready to resist, if necessary, to the utmost another monstrous enemy."

Dr. Graham declared Robertson is "a much beloved man of the North Carolina mountains and an enterprising and distinguished pioneer in the development of the Southern wood and pulp industry; that he has been an important factor in the growth of the South * * *."

North Carolina's Commissioner of Labor, Hon. Forrest H. Shuford, termed Mr. Robertson's industrial labor program "one of the finest labor relations programs in the Nation."

R. J. Stockham, president of the Stockham Valves & Fittings Co., Birmingham, immediate past chairman of the Southern Industrial Relations Conference, said that "much of the superior relations enjoyed in human relations in industry resulted from Reuben B. Robertson's leadership and example."

Robert M. Hanes, back from 2 years as head of the ECA mission in Belgium and Germany and head of the Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., and one of the South's 50 foremost leaders named with Robertson in 1949, praised Robertson's ability as a banker and his "unquestioned integrity and good judgment."

Earlier in the evening, when Mr. and Mrs. Robertson had been escorted to the dais, it was Robert M. Hanes who rose and led the assemblage in singing For He's a Jolly Good Fellow.

Ernest E. Norris, president of the Southern Railway System, was unable to attend but his words of high praise were read by Robert Darden.

William A. Kirkland, executive vice president of the First National Bank of Houston, Tex., praised Mr. Robertson "Texas style" and said that "Texas has tried hard to lure him from North Carolina, so we'd have something more to brag about."

Also, from Texas, were the "Four Flats From Houston," a quartet, including Leon Shiro Rolland Storey, Charles Underwood, and Charles Wallace, who provided mirth and comedy and entertainment and brought loud applause when they sang one of Mrs. Robertson's own compositions and a song of their own, The Man of the South.

The editor of Dixie Business, in making the Man of the South award, traced the history of the "South's hall of fame for the living" movement back to 1946 when Thomas W. Martin was named for the honor. He gave full credit to the editors of trade publications and magazines and newspapers and hundreds of others who, more than himself, had started a chain reaction of interest that has spread over the Nation. He unveiled and presented the illuminated scroll in the name of the 6,000 who had voted for Robertson and for the editors of Dixie Business.

In his response, Mr. Robertson said the testimonial was, to him, "a focal point in an adventure in kindliness."

"I have been given personal credit for what, in the most part, has been done in a representative capacity. I have endeavored to represent stockholders, workers, and associates to the best of my ability * * *."

He said the growth of the Champion Paper & Fiber Co. was due to many people. "It constitutes a tribute, not only to the loyal men who made these things possible but to the enduring principles of free enterprise without which no such progress would have been possible."

He gave credit to Mrs. Robertson, who had shared all the things of his life for 45 years and given him encouragement and understanding and inspiration.

And as I listened to him sharing his honors with so many others, I thought back to a day when his name first came to have a meaning to me. I was 22 and the year 1923. And already the leadership of Reuben B. Robertson had become a legend in the paper industry and in the leadership of men.

The late L. A. Thomas, a great paper maker and inventor, and I were embarked on an adventure in trying to build a newsprint mill to use southern pine—he to furnish the know-how and supervision and me to raise the capital. The plan failed because of my lack of ability to promote the idea. Mr. Thomas told me of what others were doing in the pulp and paper industry and what we could do.

Had Reuben B. Robertson remained with his father's firm of Robertson & Buchwalter in Cincinnati, he would have been a member of the Supreme Court today, no doubt.

Had his leadership talents turned to the military, he would be wearing the five stars of a general. As it is, today he has been the dynamo that has built his company from a small enterprise of a half a century ago to one with an annual sales of $100,000,000, giving employment to workers in North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, Georgia, and furnishing a pulpwood market to hundreds in other States.

The Human Relations in Industrial Relations that 20 years later was to inspire the founding of the Southern Industrial Relations Conference began with Mr. Robertson when he first came to the mountain country.

Donald Comer, Man of the South for 1947, whose example at Avondale Mills is one of the finest, in his letter of ratification wrote:

"Back toward the beginning of my association with Avondale I have been much interested in the Southern Conference on Human Welfare. This is a conference of a cross section of southern industry, employer and employee, union and nonunion. For several days we live together under the same roof; we sit together for three meals a day and we listen to speakers from all walks of life and we discuss together our common problems and come away inspired and refreshed in our determination to improve industrial relations.

"I mention this because Mr. Reuben Robertson has been the inspiration and leader in all of these conferences year after year. His enthusiasm has permeated the group.

"It is a boost to the hope for the future that a man like Mr. Robertson can be selected Man of the South of the year * * *."

Perhaps it was because Mr. Robertson came into the woods before the mill was built and helped with its planning and came to know the men who worked to cut the trees and saw the lumber and helped construct the mill.

And in January of 1908, while his workers were learning the science of making pulp and paper, he was learning how to operate a mill.

He respected the dignity and integrity and intelligence of the men whose forebears had come as pioneers when the Nation was young and settled the area. He liked them and they liked him. They like his sense of fair play in all his dealings with them. They admired his sound business judgment and his executive ability. They liked him for his human qualities * * * his dynamic energy and his jovial disposition.

Thus began the epic story of free enterprise and the community as exemplified by Reuben B. Robertson and the men who make the Nation's finest paper and pulp.

It was in the days of the horse and buggy and mule and wagon and the slow mode of transportation may have influenced a program that has become far reaching and made Mr. Robertson a pioneer in reforestation and protection.

At any rate, he saw that a pulp mill could not be pulled up and moved like a small sawmill.

For him and his workers and associates and stockholders there could be no policy of "cut out and get out" so far as the supply of pulpwood was concerned.

So he set about on a program of reforestation and protection. Not only were seedlings planted to replace the trees cut for pulpwood in Champion's own forest holdings, Mr. Robertson set in motion a crusade to encourage others to do the same.

He was one of the first to apply the technique of extracting tannin materials from chestnut wood and making bleached pulp from the spent wood. As a result of his early efforts there is today at Canton the largest single tannin extract plant ever built.

Thirty years ago, Mr. Robertson realized the importance of developing the full potentialities of the rapidly growing southern pine and began working on the problem of developing a satisfactory bleached pulp from pine. He overcame many technical difficulties and the Canton division became the first mill in the Nation to produce an excellent quality of this bleached pulp from southern pine. His success led to the construction of the Houston, Tex., division of Champion in 1936.

He was an early promoter of a systematic program of safety and accident prevention. He has led in adopting many employee programs now in general practice in industry. He authorized the publishing of the Log, one of the early company house organs to keep his workers informed about what other workers were doing and giving them features on many subjects.

The North Carolina State College in 1932 bestowed on him the honorary degree of doctor of science for his achievements in science, in industry, and in promoting social welfare.

Not only has Mr. Robertson been a leader in the pulp and paper industry, he has been in the forefront of many movements for the advancement of his fellow man.

At various times he has served as president of the Canton Civitan Club, president of the Asheville Pen and Plate Club, chairman of the City-County Debt Committee of Asheville, director of the Wachovia Bank and Trust Co., member of the North Carolina State Planning Board, member of the advisory board of the Charlotte branch of the Reconstruction Finance Committee, president of the North Carolina State Planning Board, president of the North Carolina Forestry Association, a member of the North Carolina Highway County Debt Commission, trustee of the Asheville School for Boys, and where a large dormitory bears the name "Reuben Robertson Hall," chairman of the board of trustees of Western Carolina Teachers College, and trustee of the University of North Carolina.

He has served as chairman of the Asheville community chest and chairman of the American Red Cross fund for Canton.

He served with great success this fall as regional director of the Crusade for Freedom.

As one of the Nation's top leaders, he served as a member of President Roosevelt's labor-industry conference of 1941, as a member of the National War Labor Board, as a member of the war committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, and director of the National Association of Manufacturers. He was president of the American Pulp and Paper Association.

He is a graduate member of the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce, a member of the Industrial Relations Counselors of New York City and a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development.

Whenever the call for service comes, Reuben B. Robertson is ready today, as he has been for half a century, to give his time and talents.

THE ANNUAL ELECTION

In the beginning of the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living" movement the title given to the man of greatest achievement in all the South was "South's Man of the Year."

The idea of honoring one man a year to honor many met with such a response that the editors of Dixie Business in 1949 changed the title to "Man of the South" to closer conform to the evolution that was taking place in the movement to give "flowers to the living."

When it was decided to expand the program by naming the South's 50 Foremost Business Leaders in 1949, Reuben B. Robertson was one of the first to be named and in the winter of 1948 issue of Dixie Business the announcement article by the editor said:

"* * * I quote these letters as Mr. Kurth will be among the South's 50 Foremost Business Leaders—as will Reuben B. Robertson * * *."

Ernest L. Kurth was elected Man of the South for 1949 and Reuben B. Robertson for 1950.

This year the concept of permitting leaders in all fields to be nominated and 50 more top leaders were selected. Mr. Robertson was thus elected from 100 of the South's foremost leaders who were named in recognition of a lifetime of distinguished service to the South.

Mr. Robertson's election was ratified by the four past Men of the South: Thomas W. Martin for 1946; Donald Comer for 1947; C. Hamilton Moses for 1948; and Ernest L. Kurth for 1949.

The news of the election electrified Mr. Robertson's many friends in Canton, Asheville, Houston, Tex., Hamilton, Ohio, and over the Nation.

A group of outstanding leaders formed a committee to sponsor Reuben B. Robertson Day and the testimonial dinner for the presentation of the man-of-the-South award.

The committee included J. Gerald Cowan, Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., Asheville, chairman; Ernest E. Norris, Southern Railway System, Washington, D. C.; Don S. Elias, the Citizen-Times Co., Asheville; Richard W. (Dick) Wortham, Jr., Southland Paper Mills (headed by Ernest L. Kurth, man-of-the-South for 1949) Lufkin, Tex.; Harrison Jones, the Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta; Robert E. Henry, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Greenville, S. C.; and Richard J. Stockham, Stockham Valves & Fittings Co., Birmingham.

Thus another honor is accorded a man who over his lifetime has merited honor.

There are thousands who echo in their hearts the sentiments expressed by C. Hamilton Moses, man-of-the-South for 1948, who wrote:

"I am proud of this selection. His business and civic accomplishments are known throughout the Nation. Mr. Reuben Robertson is a credit to our American system, and the story of his life work with its great contribution to his people could have been written in no country besides America."

[From the Asheville Times of December 16, 1950]

REUBEN B. ROBERTSON, 1950 MAN OF THE SOUTH

This is Reuben B. Robertson Day in western North Carolina. Some of Mr. Robertson's special friends and admirers have designated it that because this evening the "Man of the South" award for 1950 will be presented to him at a testimonial dinner in his honor.

If all the people in this mountain region who know Mr. Robertson personally or by reputation—and who doesn't?—had been asked to pass on the decision and plans for this occasion we are confident the vote of approval would have been unanimous.

Now in his seventy-first year, Mr. Robertson has been intimately associated with the life, growth, and progress of western North Carolina for 43 years. He joined the Champion Fibre Co. in 1907 and in 1912 became general manager of the Canton plant. He became president of that company and held that position until 1935 when it merged with the Champion Paper & Fibre Co. and he was appointed executive vice president. He became president of that great industrial organization in 1946 and in July of this year was named chairman of the board. At that time his son, Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., succeeded him as president.

For many years now Mr. Robertson has been one of the top industrial leaders not only of the South but of all America. Many honors have been bestowed upon him for his distinguished achievements in science, in industry, and in promoting the social welfare. During World War II he served for nearly 2 years on the War Labor Board by appointment of the late President Roosevelt.

Mr. Robertson's counsel and support have been sought in innumerable worthy causes and enterprises for the good of his community, region, State, and Nation. His response was always generous, wholehearted, and effective. His words, his deeds, and attitude have marked him as a man of outstanding vision, wisdom, tolerance, and humanity.

As one of the Nation's great industrialists Mr. Robertson has been a leader in the movement to better employee relations. He has practiced as well as preached his conviction that high morale and good teamwork are essential to successful business. This quotation from a speech Mr. Robertson made some years ago gives the gist of his philosophy and policy as head of a vast industry:

"The building and maintaining of congenial and constructive attitudes and relationships within the human organization of enterprise can be successfully achieved only as the methods employed are of the kind that stimulate the better emotions of people, promote loyalty, inspire cooperation in a search for mutual welfare, create confidence, and remove distrust."

We salute Reuben B. Roberston, the "Man of the South" for 1950. He deserves this and all the other honors that have come to him because he is a big man by any yardstick—big physically, big mentally, big in heart, and big in achievement. This man is truly one to match our mountains.

Our Present Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy relative to our postal service. The Postmaster General on April 17 issued extremely drastic orders curtailing vital and important services to the American people. The majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, by a decisive vote, demonstrated that they thought these orders were unnecessary and unwarranted.

Appearing in the Postal Record for March 1951 is an article by a very distinguished retired postal official, who voluntarily retired on October 1, 1950. James J. Doran has a most distinguished career. He started his service as a letter carrier in Waterbury, Conn., in 1906. He succeeded the present Postmaster General as Chief Inspector in August 1945, which position he held until July 1949. He was Director of Budget and Planning in the Post Office Department from July 1949 to August 1950, and Director of Rates from August 1950 to October 1, 1950, when he voluntarily retired.

He has written a most thoughtful article on the subject of our present postal service. This article should be read by every Member of the House of Representatives, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It follows:

OUR PRESENT POSTAL SERVICE

(By James J. Doran)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
January 18, 1951.

Mr. JAMES J. DORAN,
Chevy Chase, Md.

DEAR MR. DORAN: You are undoubtedly familiar with the present postal curtailment program and the existing controversy resulting from the orders contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18, 1950. As one who has spent a lifetime in the United States Postal Service, I am convinced beyond words that a statement from you would be of great importance at this particular time.

I am in a position to publish whatever statement you care to make in the monthly organ of this association, the Postal Record. It goes without saying that whatever your approach to the postal problem, this association will publish your views verbatim.

It is my firm conviction that you will be rendering a great public service by making known your views on the present-day postal system.

With kind regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.

CHEVY CHASE, MD., *February 14, 1951.*

WM. C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOHERTY: I have given a great deal of consideration to your letter of January 18, 1951, in which you invite me to make a statement on our present day postal service to be published in your official organ, the Postal Record. I note that you have agreed that anything I might offer in the way of an article will be published verbatim.

I have decided to accept your offer and I do so in the hope that some part of the article which I will submit may in a small measure lead to a settlement of the present-day postal controversy. Some of my friends will perhaps think that it was unwise on my part to become involved in this controversy, but to those who would form such an opinion, I call their attention to the possibility that any dispute, disagreement, or controversy stands a better chance of being adjusted and settled equitably if all of the truth is known and understood and not just a part of the truth. I believe that I have in my possession and I am setting forth in the article certain features of the rate situation and the postal curtailment matter that have not been given very much publicity in the past.

I thank you for your offer.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DORAN.

Until shortly after World War II the average American, and in fact all Americans, took our postal service for granted. It was looked upon with confidence and faith in its honesty and efficiency. Its rank and file could, if they so desired, boast of a fidelity not easily equaled and never surpassed. If its laws were broken or violated its inspection service went into action and stayed at it until the law breakers were in custody and punished. It could match its performance with any of its fellows in the National Government and do so without apology or explanation.

It was generally credited with doing a fine job during the war and was praised highly for contributing a great deal to our fighting men's morale by its prompt and efficient handling of the military mail. It did all this in spite of the absence of thousands of its best employees who were in the war. After the war rising costs of operation brought on staggering deficits which aroused Congress and brought considerable criticism from a variety of sources. This made a strange and not easily understood picture—with a less experienced force during the war we were praised; with our experience and efficient men and women back at work, we were being charged with waste and inefficiency.

There had to be a reason for this change and the reason was not hard to find. The Department wanted a raise in postal rates and the publishers and heavy mail users said, "No. It was not justified. Cut your costs. Put in up-to-date methods. Avoid your duplication. Dispose of useless records," and on and on. The deficit had grown steadily until in each of the fiscal years of 1949 and 1950 it exceeded $550,000,000. All concerned became postal deficit conscious.

The Department and other parts of the Federal Government had been investigated by the Hoover Commission. After the task force that spent the greater part of a year in its work on the postal service made its report a claim arose that a yearly savings of more than $200,000,000 was possible if up-to-date methods were used and modern mechanical equipment bought for the field service. This was just the kind of charge the opponents of the increased postal rate bill wanted and they used it to the best of their ability and capacity.

Just about the time it seemed nothing more could happen to or be said about the postal service that would add to its worries and troubles, the Post Office Department, yes the Department itself, decided otherwise. The Department reached the conclusion it had to curtail and eliminate postal service throughout the country. Accordingly on April 18, 1950, there appeared in the Postal Bulletin one of the most drastic orders ever written by a Postmaster General. You are familiar with the order which has been properly labeled the curtailment order.

Now for the reasons for the order. The Postmaster General said Congress and the Bureau of the Budget has reduced his requests for appropriation by such amounts as to compel a curtailment in postal service all over the Nation. He explained there was no other way in which to meet the situation and the order was placed in effect despite the opposition of Congress, the public, business, and the labor unions of postal employees. There had been substantial reduction in the amounts asked by the Department by the House of Representatives, and the Postmaster General took the viewpoint the Department would not be allowed to proceed on a deficit-spending basis. The Senate had not yet acted on the appropriation bill.

If I or any other person were to say the order was a mistake, that there were other means of reducing the over-all costs of operating the postal service, and failed to produce evidence to support and substantiate such a contention, you the reader would promptly and properly proceed to the conclusions my views and opinions were worthless. In place of setting my views and opinions on whether the order was a mistake, I am going to place before you facts, clear undisputed facts, all of which have been published by the Department at one time or another. All that is contained in this article is public property and a matter of public record. If perchance some of these public documents conflict with or contradict the efforts and representations of the Department in its fight for higher postal rates, then the Department must truly accept the responsibility so created. And if these public papers or some of them cast an element of doubt on the validity of the Department's case before Congress and the

people, then the Department can blame itself for a not too carefully prepared and presented line of evidence to establish the proof that higher rates and service curtailment were absolutely necessary.

Your organization contends the postal establishment is a public service and the need for a balanced postal budget is not as vital as the Department claims. You have called attention to other departments of the National Government that produce little or no revenue and yet obtain their appropriations without apparently too much trouble. All Americans use the postal service. Therefore it is a public service. As to the value of the contention that it should be supported by congressional appropriation regardless of the disparity between income and expense, that at first glance seems a wide departure from what might be considered the good, old-fashioned "earn your own keep" American methods. But if we look into the history of the postal service right down to the present moment we find considerable support for that very theory. Yes, the records of the Department will show that more than 39,000 of the more than 41,000 post offices of the country could not operate without what is truly a postal subsidy.

These 39,000 offices are of the second, third, and fourth class and are called district offices. At none of them are the receipts more than $40,000 a year and many have annual revenue of only a few hundred dollars. But they are necessary and perform good service, a service that our people could not and would not be expected to give up. Far from being self-supporting they cause an annual deficit of about $130,000,000 and this does not include the cost of mail transportation to and from these offices. The Department says its mail transportation costs amount to over $420,000,000 a year. It would be difficult to apportion the exact amount of the total transportation charges to these district offices, but recalling they are located in 39,000 different places in all 48 States and our possessions, an estimate of $50,000,000, which is slightly over 10 percent of the whole cost, would certainly not seem too high. At any rate a very substantial deficit is to be expected year after year and it can only be met by congressional appropriation.

Suppose the Department got a 20 percent increase in rates, the added revenue at these district offices would amount to probably not more than $10,000,000 unless the rate on first-class matter were raised. All the efforts of the Department up to the present were for increases on everything except first-class mail. Congress can never be expected to hike postal rates sufficiently to wipe out the deficit in these district offices and it should not attempt to do so.

The Postmaster General and other officials of the Department have stated on many occasions that the cost of free postal services to other Government Departments and agencies, free in county newspaper handling, etc., amount to $150,000,000 a year. Add this to the annual deficit at the district offices and you have $280,000,000 or more than one-half of the entire postal deficit. And if we add the $50,000,000 (estimated) for mail transportation to these 39,000 offices we have a total of $330,000,000. This amount we will agree takes quite a slice out of the total postal deficit of $570,000,000. And if you add to that the subsidies given the air lines and other carriers of mail, you have accounted for at least $400,000,000 of the deficit. Subsidies should be recognized and labeled as such and there is no justification for the postal service being saddled with them. If Congress decides to reduce the amount of postal subsidies given, it can do so by increasing postal rates, but it cannot wipe out either now or in the future the subsidy it is giving to support the district offices.

The 39,000 represent 94 percent of all the offices in our postal service. The other 6 percent make a profit, and they, the 6 percent, were the ones most affected by the curtailment order. If a postal rate increase is granted it is their profits which will be increased. But is it a fair arrangement to expect the larger offices to produce enough revenue to wipe out the deficit, excluding the $150,000,000 which is the cost of the free services? Any increase in postal rates will be effective at all offices, but unless the Department changes its stand and asks for an increase on letter mail postage—on which it claims to make a profit—the added revenue at the district offices will be slight compared to that of the 6 percent now more than earning their expenses. Until this subsidy to the postal service is recognized and treated as such and not placed on the mail users at the profit making offices there can be little or no hope of proceeding in a fair and equitable manner in this matter of rates. Certain rates should be raised, particularly those on second- and fourth-class, but all concerned should be certain of the equity involved in the increases requested.

The Department's basis for asking for increase in postal rates is to be found in its cost ascertainment figures and statistics. Cost ascertainment is a time, weight and count study on all the mail handling and special service operations made at more than 500 offices of all four classes located in various parts of the country. From this study the Department puts forth the information that certain specified losses are incurred in handling second-, third- and fourth-class mail, and all the special services excepting postal savings. The opposition to the rate increases, and this opposition is numerous and forceful, says the cost figures are not accurate; that the Department does not know what its costs are, and furthermore it cannot be expected to find out what its costs with relation to each operation are under its present system of cost ascertainment.

Congress has a real interest in the postal service. True it has not passed the rate bill; probably because the Department said we lose so much on each operation and each class of mail except first, but it apparently did not produce enough proof to satisfy Congress on that issue.

The postal service should pay its personnel good wages, better than at present, and improve working conditions where possible; and the personnel owes it to itself, the Department and the people to do the best job possible. Postal employees have a great investment in the service. The best and greatest investment possible. It is themselves as people and their future, and it is upon them that the country must depend for an efficient service. The employee, like the Department must be realistic and recognize conditions and facts as they exist, if they can be changed for the better, well and good. If not, they must be faced. And one of the important facts to face is the cost of operation in the largest offices.

Cost-ascertainment figures show there is a difference in cost, a great difference; and, until it is wiped out or plainly explained and accounted for, the entire service is on weak ground in trying to convince anyone, especially Congress and the publishers, that an appreciable boost in rates is justified.

The Department has accepted cost-ascertainment figures and bases its efforts for increased rates on these figures. The Department claimed it could not continue to give the country the postal service that was in existence on April 17, 1950, and for some time prior thereto, because it was not getting the money needed for that service, and curtailment was the answer to the problem created by reduced appropriations. The head of the Department said he disliked to curtail the service, but as the entire postal service was operated economically there was nothing else to do. Savings were not possible in any other way. Sounds reasonable; doesn't it? A frank statement made about a frank and drastic order.

Now, no one who knows the officials and those holding high places in the Cost Ascertainment Division as I do, would charge these officials and employees with a desire to work against the Postmaster General. On the contrary, they are loyal honest people. Their responsibility is to put the data and statistics together in the form of reports of costs on different postal activities. These figures are gathered in the field. Under date of March 15, 1950, such a report was prepared and it was issued about the time of the April 18 bulletin—perhaps a few days later. This particular report contradicts the assertions that savings could only be made through curtailment. Yes—if the report is accurate, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary it should be accepted as accurate—this particular report dealt with the cost of operation in the 20 largest offices of the country. On one item, the cost of handling first-class mail, one office showed a cost of 133 percent more than the one that operated at the least cost. The average cost for the 20 offices was almost double that of the best office. Just imagine spending $5 for a piece of work in one office and getting that same piece of work done in another for $2.75.

Would it seem that savings could be made with such conditions existing? Yes, if the report accurately portrays present conditions and costs in the 20 offices in question, a savings of over $45,000,000 a year could be made in the handling of first-class mail alone. There was no explanation why such difference in operations cost should exist. There are bound to be some differences in costs of many postal activities but any report which showed such glaring disparity costs should be most carefully examined and analyzed before being made public. There were other differences of costs in other operations at these same 20 offices, but I might be considered as trying to build up a case if I offered additional detail. The report in question is not a secret. I am quite sure the congressional committee got copies of it and your organization may also have one.

The question will naturally arise in the minds of men of good sense—was this condition known to the officials of the Department and, if known, what, if any, action was taken? Let us again look at the record. The report of March 15, 1950, was not the first of its kind to be printed and issued. Others in years and months past had been distributed and showed similar conditions existing at the time specified on each report. The Department officials were aware of this disparagement in costs for the same kinds of work and in some of the reports discussions were had on what was termed "variables." Variables were introduced to offer some reasons why a difference might justifiably exist. But what kind of a variable it is that permits one office to spend the $5 for the same amount and kind of work and another only $2.75.

Could it be that the over-all management was satisfied to obtain and print cost figures and their related data and then go on to something else? Is it possible that the present postal management considered it had adequately and competently discharged its duties and responsibilities by gathering and publishing these very detailed reports on the operation costs in the 20 largest offices and then ignored the very conditions its own reports brought to light? If so the conclusion is and must be there is something wrong in that kind of management.

Each and every matter I have discussed in this article I brought to the attention (in writing) of the present postal management at one time or another. Only two of my memoranda were acknowledged. I felt I owed it to the postal officials to call to their attention the conditions, some of which at least, were in strong contrast to the representations that savings could only be made through curtailment of service. I have always considered it disloyal to keep from my superiors any information which had a bearing on any of their policies or programs. It was a duty to call attention to the unpleasant and contradictory conditions—and one I tried to carry out under all conditions. There may be some who disagree with such procedure.

I Need Not Point Out to the Members of This House the Great Service Which Stu Symington Is Rendering His Country—We Know and Love Him as an Able, Sincere, Trustworthy, and Great Public Servant

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, many Members share my belief that one of the best-known, highly regarded, and most popular National Broadcasting Co. programs, either on radio or television, is the program, Meet the Press, which follows Battle Report, Washington, Sunday afternoon.

On this program, high-ranking Government officials are, each week, interviewed by top-flight Washington newspaper correspondents on questions with respect to their own or the activities of the organizations over which they preside.

Members of the Senate and House, of the President's Cabinet, of the diplomatic corps, together with other top-rank military, as well as civilian executives, have appeared as guests on this program at various times.

There is no prior rehearsal. No holds are barred. Nothing but a high sense of propriety and of common respect, one for the other, establishes the criteria as to the questions asked by the news correspondents of their various guests.

I have long tuned in this program. I have done so in order to avail myself of the wealth of information imparted with respect to current problems which this half-hour question-and-answer period provides.

Mr. Speaker, there is probably no board ever established by Congress or appointed by the President, the results of whose influence could be of greater importance to the Nation, in peace as well as in war, than those of the National Security Resources Board, established under Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress.

The major function of that Board is to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. These include advices as to policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization that would insure maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower—the Nation's maximum effective use of natural and industrial resources—the maintenance and stabilization of civilian economy in time of war to implement the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions. Moreover, the National Security Resources Board establishes policies for unifying Federal Agencies and Departments of Government concerned with the production, procurement, distribution, and transportation of all supplies, materials, and products—civilian as well as military. Additionally thereto, it advises the President with respect to policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical materials, and the conservation of the same, as well as strategic relocation of industries, Government, economic, and other activities essential to the Nation's security.

Mr. Speaker, some several weeks ago, the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, was the guest of the afternoon on the Meet-the-Press program.

While I well know that newspapermen always regard Stu Symington as good news copy—I want to say that no public official who has appeared, to my knowledge, on Meet the Press, has evidenced more complete, forthright, and greater alertness, or ever made a more unequivocal statement—than did Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

At the conclusion of the telecast one could not help but feel that here was a business executive of great ability, of great power, courage, and the will-to-do—who was unselfishly sacrificing much of his own personal interests—in order to serve his Government in these troublesome times.

Mr. Speaker, I need not elaborate on or even point out to the Members of this House the great service which the Honorable Stu Symington is rendering his country as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. We know him and love him as an able, sincere, trustworthy, and a great public servant.

It is because of these facts, and in order to bring the Meet-the-Press interview with Stu Symington to the attention of all Members of this House, that I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include same in the RECORD.

The program was as follows:

The ANNOUNCER. Our guest of the afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, will be Mr. W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. And, now, ladies and gentlemen, meet the press.

Ready for today's unrehearsed, spontaneous press conference are four of America's top reporters. Please remember that their questions do not necessarily reveal their point of view. It's their way of getting a story for you.

Now, meet Mr. Frank McNaughton, of Time magazine; Mrs. May Craig, of the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald; Mr. William White, of the New York Times; Mr. Marshall McNeil, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Finally, Miss Martha Rountree, moderator of Meet the Press.

Miss ROUNTREE. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, members of the press, and Mr. Symington. I understand, Mr. Symington, this is actually your first appearance on any radio or television program, so we are not going to waste any time breaking in.

I see Mrs. Craig has the first question.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, as a member of the Security Council, you are a very close top-level adviser of the President, aren't you?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I am a member of the Council and I am an adviser.

Mrs. CRAIG. And it is a very small top-level body?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, Mr. Symington, I understand that you have made some pretty strong proposals to the President as to what we ought to do in the Far East. Would you tell us today what you think we ought to do about Red China?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, it's a difficult question to answer from the standpoint of what I personally feel.

Mrs. CRAIG. Yes, I know.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But I believe that in the Far East we should utilize to the fullest our sea power and our air power where I believe we are superior.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, do you think that we can stay in Korea if we do not get the full backing of the United Nations?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think that we should stay in Korea if our military people think it is the right thing to do.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Symington, would the recommendations of your Board have a good deal to do with strategy in the end? Don't they go from you to the National Security Council of which the President is Chairman?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That's right, Mr. White, but our recommendations would be primarily on the basis of resources and not on the basis of strategy.

Mr. WHITE. Not on a military basis?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; they wouldn't be, except from the standpoint of resources.

Mr. WHITE. Well, what resources do you refer to?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, for example, the question of shortage of materials, and where we would stand if we lost Asia or Africa, South America. How self-sufficient we were. I don't mean by that as members of the Council that we nevertheless don't feel that we have a right to talk about those matters, but we try to have more of a positive position on those matters which directly affect resources.

Mr. WHITE. Would that affect manpower?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Oh, yes; that's a resource.

Mr. WHITE. Military manpower?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That's right, sir. That's a resource.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. To get back to your mention, Mr. Symington, before of the utilization of air power and sea power, do you mean a blockade of the China coast as recommended by some Senators and the bombing of bases in Manchuria from which the attack is coming?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I don't think I should answer that question because whatever my own personal recommendations were, they would not be final, nor is it my primary responsibility.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Well, you said in your speech out in St. Louis the other day that Russia had a 5-year lead on us in preparing for war. You were a former Secretary for Air. I want to ask you if you think this country is preparing fast enough now?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I'll put it to you this way: The faster we go, I think the better we are.

Mr. MCNEIL. Mr. Symington, in that same speech in St. Louis you said, "Soviet-built jet fighters sent against our airmen in Korea proved truly superlative in performance." In a speech on the same day at Philadelphia, Charles E. Wilson, the defense man, said: "Their"—meaning the Russians—"jet planes under war conditions have been no match for our newer jets." There seems to be some sort of a conflict there. What about these Russian jets?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I don't think there is a conflict. We have three type jets: P-80,

P-84, P-86. It's my belief that the P-86 is probably superior to the MG-15, the Russian-built Chinese jet, both with swept-back wings. It's my understanding that the Russian plane is superior to the P-84 and the P-80.

Mr. MCNEIL. We have got one that is better than that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think we have, or just as good.

Mr. MCNEIL. What about their bombers?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, as we know, they have a great many of the so-called TU-4 bomber, which is a B-29 type, and presumably they have improved it like we have improved the B-29 type into the B-50, which is primarily an improvement in engines. Also, they have some jet bombers which presumably are better than the B-29 type.

Mr. MCNEIL. You spoke a minute ago of this using of air power in the Far East. Who stopped the Air Force from bombing those hydroelectric plants on the Yalu?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That I couldn't answer, Mr. McNeil.

Mr. MCNEIL. If you were Secretary of the Air Force, would you be in favor of bombing them?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, if I were Secretary of the Air Force, I'd like to see air power used just as much to our advantage as it was possible because, certainly, manpower, one of the assets of our opponents, is being used to its fullest advantage.

Mr. MCNEIL. Well, you stand with Rosie O'Donnell?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I don't know exactly what it was that Rosie said, but I will always stand with Rosie O'Donnell, if possible, because I think he is a fine American and a great fighting man.

Mr. MCNEIL. He wants to use the big bomb. At least, that's what the papers reported, some of them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. On the basis of using the big bomb in China—and, again, I am out of my field, I think it would probably be a mistake.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Symington, you are Washington's greatest advocate of airpower, I think. Certainly, you were when you were Secretary of the Air Force. Do you think that the success of the air arm in Korea has been enough to justify your own earlier conclusions and predictions?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I certainly do. We didn't build an Air Force to fight Korea. We built an Air Force to defend ourselves against all people and primarily against the Soviet. When we had to cut because we didn't have enough money, we cut the two things that we thought would be less necessary if we were attacked as against the two we thought would be more necessary.

Mr. WHITE. What were the two that you cut?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Air lift and tactical air considerably more than air defense and strategic air.

Mr. WHITE. Has tactical air been, rather, well, not too good in Korea?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think it's been—I think, considering what we had, they have done a magnificent job, and people who have come back, Mr. White, told me we would have been out of Korea long ago if it weren't for the wonderful job being done by the Air Force and naval aviation.

Mr. WHITE. I'd like to ask one other question; going back to Mr. McNeil's on this Russian bomber you mentioned, what is its effective range?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, the effective range of all bombers that I know of, except the B-36, means that they cannot hit this country and return home if they were coming from Soviet territory. On the other hand, people should realize that they could come here on a suicide mission and parachute down and be imprisoned and protected—as we don't shoot prisoners—or through the process of refueling in which, as you know, nearly 2 years ago we sent a plane around the world that never came down once; on the basis of refueling, they could come over and they could go back.

Mr. WHITE. When you say "here," do you mean anywhere in the United States?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Oh, yes; anywhere in the United States.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, Senator DOUGLAS in his great speech in the Senate the other day said that we should let Russia know that the next satellite that strikes, we will hold Russia responsible. Do you agree with that, and how long do you think we ought to be bled by satellite wars?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, Mrs. Craig, I think that what we should do as much as possible is to face up to whatever the problem is. I believe our policies should be based in the future on policies of action as against policies or reaction to action. In other words, if I may just for a minute add to that, I think from here out, regardless of what anybody else does, this country should get strong and stay strong and should get strong just as soon and as quickly as possible and then stay strong.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, Mr. Symington, I'd like to go back to my first question. I'd like you to tell me a little more fully as to what you think we ought to do about Red China now because that is a very pressing problem, isn't it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think it's a very pressing problem and one of the most important problems in the world. I don't think I ought to answer that question based on my position on this program publicly.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, let me ask you then a side question. Do you think that we should assent to the seating of Red China in the United Nations?

Mr. SYMINGTON. My personal opinion on that is that the President is a hundred percent right, and we should not agree to the seating of China in the United Nations.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. I'd like to revert back to the question along the line Mrs. Craig asked. How long can we continue, Mr. Symington, to put up with allowing the Soviets to bleed us white in actions like Korea or maybe in Western Europe? Where do we draw the line? Senator DOUGLAS said we ought to draw it now. Do you agree that we should?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, if I had as many constituents as Senator DOUGLAS had, I think I'd be more sympathetic with his position.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Do you agree with him that we ought to have 6,000,000 men in the Army as soon as we could by the end of this year, in the Army and Navy?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think the number of men that we have in the services depends upon the over-all decision with respect to strategic planning, because the one thing that we do have in this country is productive capacity, and if we put so many people into the Army and the Navy and the Air Force, when our allies have a lot of people, to the point where we affect our civilian productive capacity, then I think that would probably be a mistake. When I say "civilian productive capacity," of course, I mean for war materials and essential civilian economy to support those materials.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. When you said in answer to my first question that the faster we went and the farther we went, the better it would be so that the more we get in right away, the more defense we will have, won't it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think so, but I think it's more important to approach the problem as it is today, considering the world situation, from the standpoint of all-out production than it is to approach it from the standpoint of all-out people in uniform and production, because all-out production, as we move into that type of mobilization, requires an awful lot of people in the plants themselves.

Mr. MCNEIL. I want to ask you something else about that St. Louis speech—that's a darn good speech about it, wasn't it? You said that equality of sacrifice is now the only path left to our security. Well, there are a lot of folks around here who are wringing their hands by inflation, "It's bad, it's terrible," they say, but do you know anybody that's really doing anything about it? Do you share the belief of some that the administration wants inflation and that perhaps they want a little of it, but they got too much and now don't know what to do about it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, answering the last part of your question first, I am absolutely certain that our President not only doesn't want inflation but wants to do whatever is necessary to prevent inflation.

Mr. MCNEIL. Well, why don't he do something? Why don't they freeze wages and prices? Why haven't they done that since Korea? They have the authority, I believe, haven't they?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, can I try and answer it?

Miss ROUNTREE. Go ahead, Mr. Symington.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, it was very difficult to freeze prices before you had the beginning of an organization, but more important to me was the fact that we had very little military orders for months after Korea going into the economy. Now that has been corrected and the justification for the freezing of prices and wages, which, incidentally, I am for and have been for for some time——

Mr. MCNEIL. Yes; I know.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is based on the fact that you now are getting a military impact and that you now have the core of an organization.

Mr. MCNEIL. Well, there was some difference on that, of course. A very smart cookie, Mr. Baruch, said that you should have done that a long time ago, and he's no novice at this thing. He said you could have done it at the start, so there is a conflict of opinion about that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That's right. I used to get quite a few letters and telegrams and have conversations with him about it, but I claim that the military should force the recognition of the importance of it because I thought the horse should be the military orders and the cart should be a result in the form of price and wage controls, that military orders should be first and price and wage controls should be second. That's the way it's going to be now. You have already got a great deal of new military orders coming into the economy.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, a lot of people are interested in your future. When you left being Secretary of Air, there were many people who thought you would come back eventually as Secretary of National Defense. Could you tell us anything about that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I certainly can. I am certain that I will not go back as Secretary of National Defense. I believe that the American people have great confidence in General Marshall and in his aide, Mr. Lovett, and I am quite happy where I am.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Symington, there are three great boards in Washington about which the people know very little. One of them, of course, is the National Security Council—you mentioned one as your own board—and one is the Atomic Energy Commission. Do you feel comfortable that people know so little about what is going on in those agencies since they affect them so much?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think you have a very good point there. I believe the more we tell the American people about what we are doing, provided it's not obvious that what we say helps the enemy, the better off it will be for the country.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask this question—if it is unfair, please consider it withdrawn. You are almost uniquely qualified to express an opinion, if you care to do so—I suppose no one but Stalin knows the answer—but what is your opinion, is it your opinion that a world war is more probable than a mere long period of tension like we have now or not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I'd like to answer you one that would fit the way I did in that speech. I think if we get strong and stay strong, regardless of the cost, that we might avert a world war. If we don't, I think we are going to have one, and I think we are going to lose it.

Mr. WHITE. Would you define a little more what you mean by strong? That is something with generality. You mean a great deal stronger than we are today, or a great deal stronger than we may be in a year?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think last year we were putting around 5 to 6 percent of our gross national product into our defense, and I think in 1944 we were putting about 40 percent in our gross national product in the 1 year. Now, I'd rather see—and I don't know yet, I don't think anybody knows too much just how much of that gross national product is going into our national defense—before I state "yes" or "no" whether I felt that we were going fast enough. Does that answer your question?

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much.

Miss ROUNTREE. Do you still feel that the B-36 is as powerful and effective a weapon as you testified when you were Secretary for Air?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I certainly do.

Miss ROUNTREE. Do we have enough of them now? If we really tomorrow had to fight up to a war, could we do an effective job?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I'd like to answer this way: Based on the size of the ship and the job it has to do, I don't think we can have too many of them.

Miss ROUNTREE. Do we have enough now?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, the more we get, the better. I don't know what the figure is. I know we are building more, and I know we are going to build a lot more than originally planned.

Mr. MCNEIL. Mr. Symington, this job of yours as head of the Security and Resources Board, you are supposed to know whether we got the stuff to win this war if we ever get in it. You are supposed to know whether we got the tin and the lumber and the oil and the manpower and everything else; isn't that right?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, that was—primarily, Mr. McNeil, I am an adviser to the President on the integration of the military and the industrial with the civilian.

Mr. MCNEIL. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Now, many of the normal peacetime duties of the Resources Board will be taken over by Mr. Wilson as Director of the department of OPD. He'll handle those.

Mr. MCNEIL. Still aren't you the man that signs the final certification for handling the steel plant?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, I do; but I am only doing that until he is ready to take it over because we have agreed together, with complete agreement, that he should take that over because primarily that's an operating matter.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. I'd like to nail this down a little harder on just what we should do, Mr. Symington. Since you advise the President on these matters, let's hear just how many men you think we should have in the Army, say, at the end of this year? How many air squadrons you think we should have, and what you think about that? You have talked in generalities here. You said if we didn't get going, we might lose the war. Now, what does it take within this next year so that we can be sure that we are not going to lose it? How many men in the Army? How many men in the Navy? How many air squadrons?

Mr. SYMINGTON. My impression is that we are putting just as many people in the Army and we are building just as many groups and we are having just as many task forces as we believe it is necessary from the standpoint of stategic planning which, of course, is not discussible at this meeting, and we think we can handle. In other words, we could only digest so many people into the economy—or, rather, into the military from the economy, and I honestly couldn't answer how many people I thought should be in the Military Establishment at this time.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Well, do you say then that the defense preparations are going fast enough to suit you?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thought I answered that to Mr. McNeil when I'd rather see how much of our gross national product we are putting into the defense effort as against, for example, what we put in in 1942 or 1944—I think was our biggest year when we know we were in trouble.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, in that speech you said that it was vital for us to be fully mobilized now. Do you think we are even planning full mobilization?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think that we are planning for as many people now as we can use. I think in the last few weeks the decision has been made on materials and men to go faster than was the previous decision. To be frank, not too long ago I didn't think we were going fast enough, but I happened to have a chance to digest the new situation and again I say that I think that how fast we go depends upon how much of our national product we are going to put into it—in other words, how many guns we think we can have and how much butter we think we can have based on the emergency.

Mrs. CRAIG. There has been a good deal said here about men and manpower and people today. Now, it seems to me that when you were Secretary of Air, you did not like that idea of balance between air, ground and sea, that you felt air power should have preponderance. Now, do you still think that today? Is air power sufficiently preponderant in this mobilization?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, there is a big difference between what it is today and what it was then, because then we had an arbitrary shielding established on the amount of money we were allowed to spend. Now, I believe, in the Air Force—and that was good because I thought we should have a greater proportion of that limited amount of money, but, on the other hand, I was fully sympathetic with those of the other services who felt that they should have a greater proportion of that amount of money. Today, there isn't a limitation, and they go based on a plan which is a military plan presumably, as against a fiscal limitation as a premise to their development.

Mrs. CRAIG. But as a top-level adviser looking at all three, do you think that the air is getting the preponderance you always believed in?

Mr. SYMINGTON. From the figures that I have heard—now, I am out of the Air Force and I can only speak personally—but from the figures that I have heard, I believe we are building an air force which is an adequate air force to face up to the emergency. Now, if at any time for any reason like conciliatory gestures or any other reason we don't go through with the plans that we have, then I reverse myself and say that we are not carrying out our planning on an action basis. We are reacting to what other people do and I think that's wrong.

Mrs. CRAIG. Senator Taft, you know, as you recollect, said we should concentrate on sea and air power and not on ground forces.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think that what we should concentrate on depends upon what the President and General Marshall and the military chiefs think is right. I believe implicitly that air power is absolutely essential to the security of the United States, and I think that sea power, control of the seas, is essential to the security of the United States, and I also believe that we have got to have a good army.

Mr. MCNEIL. You said something about conciliating somebody a minute ago, and earlier you talked about a whole strategic plan that we have. Are we building up something here to conciliate somebody about something?

Mr. SYMINGTON. What I meant is if we listened to what the Nazis said they were going to do, why, we would have been better off than not believing them. If we listen now to what the Russians said they are going to do and then don't when they say, "We are only fooling," in my opinion we would be better off and I'd like to see us go ahead regardless of any conciliation. I have always been willing to negotiate for peace, but negotiate on the basis of a strong background instead of the basis of a weak background.

Mr. MCNEIL. As a man who did more selling around this town of the necessity for a big air force, I think you'd feel pretty happy about "Stu" Symington now—they are talking about a hundred group air force.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, bygones are bygones.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Well, it was about 3 years ago here, I think, Mr. Symington, that you were walking around with some nine hundred million in your vest pocket for airplanes that you couldn't spend. That was withheld from you, wasn't it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Withheld?

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. You weren't allowed to spend it at any rate. Do you think it was a mistake to have taken that action at that time?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think anybody who did anything to reduce our strength 3 or 4 years ago now realizes that was a mistake at that time.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Who did that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think it was done by—I think it was done by the administration and also by the Congress, and I'd rather stick to issues than to get into personalities on that point.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. They started us out late on our actual rearmament, didn't they, the action taken then?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; but that was only one point. I think our greatest mistake for 5 years has been that we were fighting for peace while these other fellows have been fighting to get ready for war.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, how long do you think we have before we have got to be ready to fight? It's an opinion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I couldn't answer you directly because I might be giving a date away of being an established date, but my own is the sooner that we are ready to defend this country with that strength we think is essential to defend it, the better it will be for the American people.

Mrs. CRAIG. Maybe this year?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The sooner the better.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Symington, I have heard it said in the Pentagon that in 18 months, if we go fast, we might be in a position where we couldn't be challenged by the Russians. Is that too optimistic?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I wouldn't want to date myself on that.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The sooner we are ready, I think, the better it is for the country.

Miss ROUNTREE. I am sorry, we don't have time for any more questions, Mr. McNaughton. Our time is up. This concludes our latest edition of Meet the Press; and thank you, Mr. Symington, very much for being with us.

Wisconsin's Quality Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under its competent and dynamic director, Don McDowell, the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture is doing much to expand and justify Wisconsin's Nation-wide reputation as America's dairyland.

Since Wisconsin supplies such a large amount of dairy products to all parts of the country, its quality milk program is of interest far beyond the boundaries of the State.

I am inserting herewith, Mr. Speaker, that portion of Mr. McDowell's biennial report which deals with the department's quality milk program:

QUALITY MILK FROM FARM TO TABLE: A MID-CENTURY CHALLENGE—AS DAIRYING GOES, SO GOES WISCONSIN

The dairy business, from the farm to the table, is the economic lifeblood of Wisconsin's agriculture. No other business enterprise means so much to the general welfare of Wisconsin people. It supplies the Nation with protective, health-giving dairy foods. It is the greatest single factor in conserving the soil resources of the State. The dairy industry provides the home and livelihood for 160,000 Wisconsin dairy farmers and their families. In addition, the dairy industry employs the largest number of people of any agricultural pursuit in the State. On the farm alone it represents an investment of over $2,000,000,000.

Wisconsin citizens cannot afford to take lightly the welfare of dairying. The dairyman's welfare is the State's economic barometer. While the future success of dairying in Wisconsin rests largely with farmers themselves, no other social or economic group can prosper in the face of a distressed dairy industry.

DAIRYING NO ACCIDENT

Wisconsin's leadership in the Nation's dairy industry is the result of hard work and the practical use of the State's natural resources. Pioneers who settled this State came largely from the Northeastern States or from northern Europe. They saw in Wisconsin's rich soil, favorable climate, and rolling countryside a land particularly suited to dairying.

Early dairying in the State did not follow an orderly and well-planned course. In the pioneer days wheat-growing was the main source of income. It was the day of the family cow. But as transportation improved and markets were created through the growth of villages and cities, a dairy industry slowly emerged. Scientific developments like the cream separator, the Babcock test, and improved factory processing equipment spurred the growth of the industry.

In 1916 income from milk amounted to $62,000,000, or about 38 percent of Wisconsin's cash farm income. By 1949 income from milk had soared to $453,000,000—nearly 50 percent of the State's gross farm income.

STABILITY IN DAIRYING

Cash receipts from milk are vital to the stability of Wisconsin life and business. Milk checks received monthly or semimonthly by farmers provide the purchasing power for most of the necessities of farm living. Except for 3 years, the cash income from milk has accounted for at least one-half of the annual total farm income since 1923. Even during the depression, when milk prices were at an unusually low level, the percentage of the total farm income from this source was the highest on record for Wisconsin.

Often the income from sales of cattle, hogs, and other livestock are used for taxes, new equipment, repairs, and payments on loans. Compared with the 46.7 percent of 1949 cash farm income from milk, the sale of cattle and calves accounted for 15.3 percent, hogs 12.1 percent, poultry 11.2 percent, other livestock less than 1 percent, and crops 13 percent.

Not all of the importance of dairying in Wisconsin can be measured in terms of income from milk. Wisconsin is internationally known for its dairy breeding stock. Income from breeding cattle sold makes up a large part of the returns from the sale of cattle and calves, which in 1949 were estimated at $146,000,000, or about 15 percent of the annual cash farm income.

TAKES BIG INVESTMENT

With today's heavy use of machinery and the inflated costs of equipment, the investment in Wisconsin's dairy industry is staggering. In many instances a dairy farmer's investment equals or exceeds the capital investment of the merchant he trades with in his home town. In addition to land, buildings, and machinery for crop production, he has a substantial investment in his herd and the dairy equipment so essential for efficient production of top quality milk.

Wisconsin's dairy herds alone had a farm value of $520,000,000 at the beginning of 1950. The total value of all cattle was $647,000,000.

Farm investment is only one part of the capital required in the entire dairy industry. Millions are invested by farmers and others in the State's 2,274 dairy processing plants. The investment in Wisconsin's 5,800 milk trucks alone probably exceeds $20,000,000.

A LIVELIHOOD FOR OTHERS

Wisconsin's billion-dollar dairy industry is the largest single factor in the State's economic system. The State's 160,000 dairy farmers are heavy purchasers of machinery, equipment, feed, fertilizer, household and personal goods which directly affect thousands of nonfarm citizens. The dairy farm creates business for truckers, cattle buyers, wholesalers, retail stores and many others. Thousands are employed in the processing, distributing, and marketing of more than a billion pounds of Wisconsin's milk every month.

WHAT IS SOMETIMES OVERLOOKED

Our dairy industry provides 150,000,000 Americans with an economical and dependable source of health-giving protective minerals, vitamins, and complete protein essential to good health.

Our dairy industry encourages the conservation of our soil and natural resources through the encouragement of grassland farming. It is the only system of agriculture which improves rather than depletes the priceless fertility of our cropland. The dairy cow is the most efficient machine the world has ever known for converting plant roughage into a palatable, concentrated human food.

Wisconsin's dairy industry plays a vital role in our American way of life. Today, as a Nation, we find ourselves assuming difficult and complex responsibilities in attaining and maintaining a peaceful world. America must be strong. A well-fed Nation has strength.

The stakes are high—we all have a share in the future of America's dairyland.

MEETING TODAY'S CHALLENGES

The continued success of any business in America today depends largely upon how well it can cope with sudden as well as long run changes. Keeping up with the times in such a complex decentralized industry as the dairy business is an ever-present challenge.

AN OUTSTANDING PRODUCTION RECORD

Wisconsin dairy farmers have proved that they can produce dairy products. Wisconsin today produces 15,500,000,000 pounds of milk a year—about twice as much as its closest competitor. This is 13 percent of all the milk produced in the United States. We rank first in production of cheese, condensed and evaporated milk, powdered milk and malted milk. We lead in the number of milk cows. We rate third among the States in the production of butter.

A large part of the Nation's total dairy production comes from Wisconsin. We produce one-half of the Nation's cheese, slightly less than one-half of the powdered whole and skim milk. Three-fourths of the Nation's malted milk powder is produced in Wisconsin and one-fourth of the condensed and evaporated milk.

NEED NATIONAL MARKETS

Our major outlets, therefore, are beyond the State's borders. Wisconsin has more at stake in developing national dairy markets than any other State.

About 21 percent of our total milk production was marketed as fluid milk in 1949. Twelve percent was shipped to out-of-State fluid markets, and another 9 percent consumed in the State in fluid form.

Approximately 70 percent of our total milk production was used for the manufacture of dairy foods. In 1948, 87 percent of these foods found markets in other States. This included 95 percent of our cheese, 95 percent of our evaporated milk, 96 percent of our powdered whole and skim milk, and 65 percent of our butter.

These foods move through a complex network of trade channels which are very hard to trace. But we do have reports from several large market centers which give an indication of how widely some of our products are distributed.

First let us look at cheese, one of our most important dairy foods. Reports are available of receipts of cheese at 10 major markets and the origin of these shipments. They show that in 1948 these markets received about 286,000,000 pounds of cheese, with more than 166,000,000 pounds coming from Wisconsin—58 percent of all the cheese received and one-third of Wisconsin's total cheese production. We still had nearly two-thirds of our cheese to be sold in hundreds of other markets throughout the Nation.

Or we might look at butter: These 10 major markets in the same year received about 33,000,000 pounds of Wisconsin butter—again about one-third of all the butter we produced in 1948. Another third went to other widely scattered markets.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION AMERICANS IS OUR MARKET

In the final analysis our market is every one of the 150,000,000 of American people—men, women, and children. For many years much emphasis has been given to the importance of plenty of milk and dairy products for children. Today, with the average life span greatly lengthened, we are just beginning to realize that milk is also very essential to good health among adults—particularly older people. Recent research has shown that one of the essentials to a vigorous old age is plenty of calcium. Milk and dairy foods are the chief sources of calcium in the diet. They also supply many other food elements essential to good health during the later years of life.

During the past 10 years there have been some important shifts in the consumption of dairy foods which have brought about corresponding marketing developments. Because of the greater emphasis upon the use of all food elements found in milk, particularly during the war years, there has been a marked trend toward marketing whole milk. In Wisconsin, for example, deliveries of whole milk to dairy plants increased 64 percent, while deliveries of cream dropped 84 percent.

This brought widespread changes in the type of products manufactured, including a much greater use of milk solids and a drop in the production of butter.

Today the American people drink more whole milk and eat more cheese, ice cream, and evaporated and powdered milk than ever, but consume less butter. Here are the comparative figures for per capita consumption during 1949 and the average for the five prewar years:

	1935-39 average	1949	Increase	Decrease
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Cheese	5.5	7.2	1.7	
Butter	16.7	10.6		6.1
Ice cream	9.5	16.3	6.8	
Evaporated milk	15.0	17.7	2.7	
Fluid milk and cream	340.0	382.0	42.0	
Total consumption (milk equivalent)[1]	801.0	758.0		43.0

[1] Milk equivalent means the total amount of milk represented by all the various types of dairy foods.

A GREAT POTENTIAL MARKET

The question of too many dairy products is not new. Sixty years ago many Wisconsin people thought we had expanded our dairy industry to the point where we had too much milk and too much cheese and butter. At that time we were producing less than 3,000,000,000 pounds of milk a year. Since then we have increased our output to five times that amount.

Immediately someone is going to ask: "But what about the surplus of milk and dairy products?" Without digging into the deeper fundamentals of today's situation, there may seem to be justification for the question. Let's look at it for a moment.

We have pointed out that the United States consumption of milk and dairy foods in 1949 totaled 758 pounds. Our peak national consumption was 839 pounds per capita in 1942. If we had had a per capita consumption in 1949 equal to that of 1942 we would have had no surplus. Instead, we would have been 6 percent short of having enough milk to go around.

But that isn't the whole story. Americans consume much more milk and dairy products than do the people of most other countries, Dr. Hazel K. Stiebeling, Chief of the United States Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, says "we cannot be satisfied with only passable nutrition." Recent surveys point out that some 40 percent of the families need more calcium in diets, 20 percent need more food supplying the B vitamins, and 10 percent need more protein and iron in their diets. Dairy foods are excellent suppliers of all these important requirements.

Nutritionists recommend 1 quart of milk a day for children and at least a pint a day for adults for adequate nutrition. Based on our present distribution of population, this would require nearly double the amount of milk now being consumed.

On the basis of all these studies and years of painstaking research into the part an adequate nutrition plays in good health, the United States Department of Agriculture has suggested that an annual consumption of 150,000,000,000 quarts a year is a goal that can be achieved in the Nation. Our present national production is about 60,000,000,000 quarts a year.

MARKETING CHALLENGES CAN BE MET

Wisconsin's dairy industry has outstripped the production records of any other industry in the past 10 years. Dairy farmers have proved they can produce. But nutrition authorities tell us that American families should consume nearly double their present consumption of milk and dairy foods.

Some people will argue that families do not consume more dairy foods because they don't have the money to buy them. Certainly our dairy industry must constantly strive for more efficient production and marketing methods to give consumers dairy foods at the most economical cost. But the facts do not bear out the claim that the purchasing power of consumers is the only factor affecting consumption. Dr. Stiebeling, of the United States Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, points out, in a recent survey, that almost 40 percent of our families even with incomes as high as $7,500 per year live on diets which are low in calcium. Why don't these families consume enough dairy products to make up this deficiency when a quart of milk per day or its equivalent in other dairy foods supplies 100 percent of an adult's calcium needs?

The dairy industry must face this question squarely. It presents one of the basic needs of our marketing program. The answer can come only from the dairy industry through a new and more vigorous use of three age-old marketing tools:

1. An all-out sincere quality program.
2. A greatly expanded advertising and promotion program.
3. Continuation and expansion of sound research to lead the way.

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR QUALITY

Consumers demand good quality dairy products. They want the quality of their products to be good day in and day out. If Madam Consumer buys dairy foods on Monday and likes them she'll be back to buy more on Thursday. If she doesn't like the product she gets on Thursday she won't be back to buy more on Saturday.

If Wisconsin cannot live up to this challenge for uniform quality products which are attractive to consumers the results to dairy marketing will not be pleasant. These are among the possibilities:

First, Wisconsin may lose the markets it now has, as well as lose the opportunity to develop any future potential outlets for dairy foods.

In the second place, synthetic and substitute products will have a better chance to take over our markets. Herein lies a constant and serious challenge.

Finally, consumers will continue to insist on good quality products, and they will be supplied by other areas which can give them the products they want.

NOT A NEW PROBLEM

Quality-wise thinking is not new in the Wisconsin dairy industry. It is as old as the industry itself, and during the past 75 years it has passed through a long process of gradual growth and evolution. No word has been heard more frequently among dairy farmers, field men, plant operators and others in the dairy industry than the word "quality."

Better quality was taught by the early Wisconsin dairy leaders. Then, as dairying expanded, it became a cooperative job, spearheaded by the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association. This association not only talked quality, but it took the lead in actually showing how cheesemakers and buttermakers could do a better job.

When the dairy and food commission was created in 1889, quality became its watchword. It took over the field work started by the Dairymen's Association, and its field inspectors became an important part of the State quality program. When the dairy and food commission, the Department of Markets and the old Department of Agriculture were consolidated into the present Department of Agriculture, dairy quality continued to be one of its major activities.

When we speak of quality milk today we have in mind something quite different from the generally accepted concept of that term 50 years ago. As our dairying has changed so have our ideas of quality. Quality standards have moved steadily forward as the industry changed from a small-scale production for home or community consumption into a modern large-scale operation for the national markets.

QUALITY EVERYONE'S JOB

Quality dairy production in Wisconsin today means the continuing cooperation of 160,000 individual dairy farmers. Producers must make a sincere, consistent, and diligent effort every day to meet many routine but important details.

Production of top quality dairy products on the farm is a wonderful beginning. But milk haulers, dairy plant fieldmen, employees and managers of over 2,200 dairy plants must work together and with the farmer to make certain that the natural goodness of the milk and dairy products are preserved all the way from the farm to the consumer's table.

Dairy plant operators and fieldmen, dairy organization leaders, extension specialists and State inspectors serve the industry all the way along, helping to keep it alert to undesirable practices affecting the salability of dairy foods.

Quality milk today means good quality dairy foods on the tables of 150,000,000 Americans from Maine to California and from Washington to Florida. That brings into the team all of those who assemble, transport, wholesale, and distribute these dairy products at retail to all the homes in the Nation.

TEAMWORK BEGINS ON THE FARM

High quality dairy products cannot be legislated. It is not enough to produce them in a scientific laboratory. They can be made only through sound quality production practices on the farm, followed by careful handling in transportation and skilled processing in clean, well-equipped, and properly managed dairy plants.

It is fundamental that our dairy products cannot be better than the quality of the milk from which they are made. Healthy dairy cows are the beginning.

HERD HEALTH VITAL

Wisconsin began its fight against livestock diseases when our dairy industry was still in its infancy. Much progress has been made, but the job is not finished.

One of the first diseases against which a State-wide campaign was launched was tuberculosis in cattle. Wisconsin has been a leader in the eradication of this disease. It too was accomplished through teamwork between dairymen, veterinarians, and State and Federal agencies over a period of 20 years. Latest tests indicate that Wisconsin has virtually eradicated this disease.

Another cattle disease which has more recently come into the spotlight is brucellosis, or Bang's disease. Concerted action against this disease was started about 15 years ago, and while considerable progress has been made, much greater strides will be necessary if we are to eradicate it completely. Attention was directed to the need for prompt action against brucellosis by recent announcements that future milk market requirements may exclude any milk except that produced from brucellosis-free herds.

Recent area tests in certain sections of Wisconsin indicate that less than 5 percent of our livestock is infected with brucellosis. These tests show that less than 20 percent of the herds in these areas have any infection at all. A recent survey in one county further shows that about 40 percent of the infected herds had less than 1 cow out of 10 infected with the disease.

Like any quality program, fighting livestock disease also requires teamwork. Only through the cooperation of farmers, livestock dealers, and veterinarians, and with the help of latest scientific developments, Wisconsin can eradicate brucellosis.

Another livestock disease which is causing dairymen concern is mastitis. Much progress is being made in controlling it through good herd-management practices and through new discoveries in the field of medicine.

A QUALITY CODE DEVELOPED

Although there had been much earlier talk about better dairy products, dairy farmers during the 1920's began to realize that a greater insistence on quality was inevitable. The immediate cause for this realization was the interest shown in sanitation by the United States Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Administration and a tightening of requirements in certain milk markets.

No concerted action was taken, however, until a bill to create milk production standards was introduced in the 1937 legislature. While the bill failed to pass, it probably laid the foundation for the adoption of a dairy quality enabling act by the 1939 legislature. This measure authorized the department of agriculture to establish standards and regulations for the production of quality milk.

Immediately after the passage of this law, farmers, other members of the dairy industry, and governmental and educational agencies joined hands in launching a State-wide educational program for the production of clean milk. This program, set up on a county basis, was voluntary. Quality meetings were scheduled in almost every schoolhouse in the State. This program continued until 1942 when war demands for increased production overshadowed everything else.

NEW INTEREST AFTER WORLD WAR II

After the war, interest in quality improvement was renewed. The Wisconsin Dairy Industry Committee, which had been active in the prewar quality campaign, was reorganized into the Wisconsin Dairy Federation. This industry-wide group represents every major segment of the dairy industry.

As its first job the federation made a study of the problems of dairying. On the basis of its findings, quality improvement in milk and cream was selected as the No. 1 need of the industry. A quality improvement committee was therefore named.

For nearly 2 years this committee studied dairy quality, and at the end of that time submitted a set of proposed standards based on the provisions of the 1939 law. Then followed months of further study and deliberation and consultation with farmers, dairy plant operators, educators, and scientists. The revised draft was then submitted to the board of directors of the federation and in February 1948 the proposed standards were presented to the State department of agriculture with a request that steps be taken to embody their provisions in a new department regulation.

In May 1948 the department announced a series of nine hearings at which all interested persons would be given an opportunity to express their opinions for or against the proposed regulations. When the hearings were completed all testimony was carefully studied, and changes made in the standards to comply with the needs of the dairy industry.

Between January 1949 and November 15, 1949, when the regulations went into effect, hundreds of meetings were held with farmers, milk haulers, dairy plant employees, quality fieldmen, inspectors, and others. The purpose was to explain the reasons for the new standards, how they had been prepared, and the purpose they were designed to serve. Announcement of the regulations in final form as General Order 124 was made by the department of agriculture on August 15, 1949.

HELP DEVELOP TEAMWORK

The purpose of the milk quality standards is to help dairy farmers develop teamwork in their industry. Their goal was the production of high quality milk—a uniform minimum code to encourage cooperation and participation by all.

The standards were developed in recognition of the fundamental fact that it is the quality of the product when it reaches the consumer that determines whether or not we maintain and expand our dairy markets. As William F. Groves, president of the Wisconsin Dairy Federation, has so often said, "It is the consumer that writes the ticket."

Leaders in the dairy industry, as well as other industries, have long recognized that the success of new business depends upon consistent production of high quality products. Consumers want to feel confident that the goods they buy are of uniformly good quality—day in and day out.

But the problems of the dairy industry are more complex than those of many other industries. Consistent production and marketing of high quality dairy products involves the cooperation and teamwork of thousands of individuals in the many steps which lead from the farm to the consumer's table.

A year of operation under the minimum quality standards has not solved all quality problems. They have not performed miracles and they have not been a complete cure-all. But great forward strides have been made. Results this past year have been acclaimed by many as the greatest forward step in improving dairy quality ever taken in the history of Wisconsin's dairy industry.

These standards have given farmers a better understanding of the part they must play in any quality improvement program. At the same time, processors, and handlers of milk have gotten a clearer understanding of the farmer's quality problems.

Here are a few typical quotations from a large number of statements by dairy fieldmen and plant operators:

"Quality is a lot better than it used to be."

"Milk has improved this year over last."

"Butter scores are improving."

"Cheese working better than ever. No trouble at all this year."

"Best sediments this year we have ever had."

"We have never had such good milk in the history of our company. Made the best cheese this year in the 35 years we have been in business."

"The effect of this program is quite evident in the improved quality of milk being delivered by our patrons."

Other accomplishments during the past year include doubling the number of covered milk trucks, a rapid increase in milk house construction, improved farm conditions, and a marked improvement in the general level of milk quality.

The Wisconsin dairy industry should be commended for its progress in improving the quality of its finished products. The heroes are the thousands of farmers who have had enough pride in their business to take the extra care needed to make sure they are doing the best job at all times. Credit is also due dairy industry leaders who have been farsighted and constructive, even in the face of many obstacles, in developing the teamwork required within the industry to put the over-all program into high gear.

PLANT STANDARDS NEXT STEP

Nor are these standards the final step in the evolution of our dairy quality program. As a further help in developing better teamwork in the industry, the Dairy Federation is now working on a set of minimum quality standards for all Wisconsin dairy plants. Like many farmers, a number of our dairy plants are today operating under quality standards which are as stringent, or even more exacting than those set up in the proposed plant regulations. But again, these standards are being prepared as a means of developing better teamwork, and as guideposts for the further improvement in the quality of our products.

As we have seen, the purpose of quality dairy production is to put the best food on the dinner table of Mr. and Mrs. America—today, tomorrow, and every day. To accomplish this requires quality on the farm, in transportation, in processing, in storage, and retailing, and good methods of handling dairy foods in the home.

Any break in this quality chain spells doom. Farmers can't do it alone. Neither can processors or salesmen, nor laws and regulations. Real progress is being made through teamwork. Pulling together for quality will play a major role in the future success of Wisconsin's dairy industry.

LET'S TELL THE WORLD

"We farmers have done a wonderful job of producing but we have been the world's poorest salesmen." This bit of wisdom has been repeated often by Milo K. Swanton, Wisconsin dairy farmer and farm organization leader.

Wisconsin's dairy industry has met a real challenge in setting the enviable record of production it holds today. But in meeting this production challenge so much of the industry's power has been used up that there hasn't been enough steam left to blow the whistle. Certainly the industry is doing a much bigger and better job in consumer education and advertising than it did 50 years ago. However, it must be recognized that today's economy calls for many times the sales effort than was necessary a half century ago.

Conditions today are not the same. Families no longer get their milk from the family cow. Butter no longer comes from the family churn. Today's dairy producers and consumers are often thousands of miles away from each other. These miles of separation have done more than increase the cost of the finished product on consumers' tables—they have caused lack of understanding. Producers are not always aware of the desires of the modern consumer. Consumers do not always appreciate the many complex problems involved in putting their daily milk supply on their doorsteps and dairy foods on the food counters. All this means that the dairy industry must do a better job in consumer information and selling than ever before.

WE HAVE A THRILLING STORY TO TELL

The dairy industry has a much better story to tell its customers about milk and dairy products than we had 50 years ago. Only during recent years have we realized the importance of milk as a food. We are learning more every day. We have the advantages of better manufacturing methods, more attractive packaging and improved means of distribution and display. We also have more media for bringing our message to our potential customers than ever before. We are improving out distribution system. Refrigeration has opened up new markets.

Our markets are growing as science explores new fields in the study of nutrition. We have heard much about the importance of plenty of milk for growing children. Only during the last few years have we begun to realize its value for good mental and physical health among adults and for older folks. As medical science increases the average length of life the importance of proper nutrition during the sunset years becomes increasingly important. Here again milk plays a vital role.

MILK IS OUR MOST NEARLY PERFECT FOOD

Dairy foods—milk and its products—are universally recognized as the most nearly perfect food. This makes a strong dairy industry, furnishing a large and constant supply of these essential foods, a matter of public necessity. A sound dairy industry is very much a matter of public interest.

Dr. E. B. Hart, famous University of Wisconsin biochemist, has said that "if you had to choose a single food on which to live for the rest of your life, your wisest possible choice would be milk."

Milk and dairy products, scientific studies show, provide a major part of the daily nutritive needs of the American people. They supply one-half of the average family's nutritive needs and do it at a cost of only one-fourth of the total food budget!

A quart of milk or its equivalent in other dairy products supplies approximately the following percentages of the daily nutritive requirements of an average man:

	Percent
Calcium	100
Riboflavin	82
Phosphorus	67
Protein	49
Vitamin A	30
Vitamin B	22
Calories	22
Vitamin C	19
Niacin	6
Iron	3

Nutrition studies leave no doubt of the importance of dairy foods in the diet. These facts substantiate the claim that milk is the most nearly perfect food. As Americans, in spite of our high nutritional standards, we are not consuming nearly as many dairy foods as we should. Increased use of these products is one of the foundation stones of good national health and strength.

TRANSLATE NEEDS INTO WANTS

The fact that Americans need more milk and dairy products does not necessarily mean that they will buy and consume them. We don't always buy things because we need them. Frequently we buy the things we want.

Here then, is today's big problem: We know that the American people need more dairy foods. We know that the dairy industry has these foods to sell. How can we translate these needs into wants? Here is where education of consumers through Nation-wide advertising and promotion can make a real contribution.

In this part of our program of moving dairy products from the farm to the table we have failed to do the job on the scale it must be done today. We have failed to tell the story of milk and milk products with the power, the continuity, and the drama that it deserves.

FIELD IS HIGHLY COMPETITIVE

Today's food field is extremely competitive, with scores of products fighting for the consumers' dollar. On every side advertising dollars are being spent in record-breaking amounts, all for the purpose of making the consumer want the foods being advertised. National magazines, newspapers, radio, and television networks are all being used to sell food.

During the first 6 months of this year nearly $61,000,000 were spent for food advertising through magazines, radio and television networks. For every dollar spent for advertising dairy products, $15 are spent for advertising other foods.

Nutritionists tell us that dairy foods should account for one-fourth of the family food budget. On that basis we should have spent about $15,000,000, or nearly four times our actual advertising budget.

DIMES AGAINST DOLLARS

When we look at advertising for other products we are even further behind. Less than $6,000,000 were spent in national newspaper advertising for all agricultural products in 1949. Expenditures for competing products include one hundred and twelve millions for groceries, forty-two millions for alcoholic beverages, eighty-five millions for automobiles, and twenty millions for tobacco.

These are heavy odds. Because of this intensive advertising barrage, the consumer now wants these other products. These desires are like powerful magnets pulling at the consumers' pocketbooks.

There is only one effective way of counteracting this magnetic pull. That is to create a desire for more dairy products, to change needs into wants. It can be done only by effective advertising telling the story of dairy products with all the dramatic intensity the dairy industry can develop.

TEAMWORK CAN DO THE JOB

How can the job be done? There is only one answer: more teamwork. No one group, no single unit in the dairy industry can carry the load alone.

For many years the American Dairy Association has served as the backfield for our dairy advertising team. Small contributions from hundreds of thousands of dairy farmers have provided an advertising fund which has made it possible for dairy products to meet, at least in part, the advertising pull exerted by competing foods. Starting in a small way with three States—Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa—the ADA now unites the efforts of dairy producers in 41 States. Within the limits of the available funds it has done a marvelous job of year-around advertising to create an increased desire for dairy products throughout the Nation.

Your Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, through its dairy promotion section, has added its voice in proclaiming the story of dairy foods. Its work is made possible by the cooperation of the State legislature in making funds available for the promotion of dairy foods. Through the dairy promotion program your department of agriculture over the years has teamed up with the industry in "spreading the gospel" about dairy foods across the country. Most large national conventions now have a small carton of Cheddar cheese at each plate, made possible through dairy promotion funds. Dairy cookbooks, menus, and place mats are being universally distributed. All these have helped in Wisconsin's dairy food sales efforts.

Large dairy companies have joined their dollars and the power of their sales organizations. Nationally and in the communities where they operate, they have preached the thrilling story of better health and greater vigor through dairy foods.

Other allied food industries have also cooperated—foods which are logically used in combination with dairy products. The influence of their assistance is hard to measure but it has been extremely effective.

HAVE ONLY SCRATCHED THE SURFACE

But in spite of all we have done, we have only scratched the surface. Since 1940, dairy products have gained 4 percent in volume of sales (by weight). Using the same period, fresh produce sales gained 13 percent, meats 17 percent, and eggs and poultry 32 percent. Is the dairy industry keeping pace?

Perhaps what is needed is more emphasis upon taste-appeal—dairy products taste good, they are refreshing, you will enjoy eating them—in addition to the appeal they are good for you and you need them. More emphasis upon the pleasure of good eating may be more effective.

Today's greatest need is for increased advertising teamwork—teamwork where everyone gets into the game of boosting the product. Wisconsin's dairy industry can and should sell dairy foods, the greatest family of foods known to civilization.

RESEARCH: THE KEY TO PROGRESS

Through research, the dairy industry has made great progress. Not only have increased nutritional values been brought to light, but great strides have been made in the fields of better production, processing, and distribution methods. Research efforts have given us new labor-saving equipment, together with improved tools to measure quality.

Several agencies are today's members of the dairy research team. Through the National Dairy Council and other organizations, the industry itself has made important contributions. Research laboratories in our own university and agricultural college and other schools have offered many discoveries to the dairy industry, not to mention the vital role which private industry has played in progress through research.

But in spite of the knowledge which has been gathered about milk, there is still much to learn. Each day brings new horizons in the possible uses of dairy products.

MILK IS REAL BRAIN FOOD

For example, only recently we have learned that a direct relationship exists between the amount of sugar in milk and the size of the brain. A compound known as galactose, found only in milk sugar, plays a big part in brain development. Here is the key to the added mental alertness obtained from milk and dairy foods; here is the real brain food—milk.

Research leads the way in discovering new uses and new products in the dairy industry. It has revealed that whey, a dairy byproduct, contains forms of hydrolized proteins. These same proteins, when injected into the blood stream, exhibit remarkable properties in reviving human beings suffering from starvation. It is research such as this that must lead the way in developing and expanding the use of dairy products.

FEARFULLY AND WONDERFULLY MADE

In spite of the many discoveries already made, milk continues to be an inexhaustible source of new marvels. Says a famous biochemist: "Milk is fearfully and wonderfully made. The more science studies milk, the more wonderful milk becomes, the more there is to discover of nature's secrets. Nature put something into milk that cannot be duplicated in the laboratory."

To strengthen this observation, one recent study lists 274 known constituents and properties of milk and 255 chemical components. And there remain unknowns which science, as yet, has not been able to isolate.

These new facts are the basis of a program to inform consumers about dairy products. The unknowns in milk serve as a challenge to research to continue patiently the hunt for more information to aid in improving the health and well-being of our people through the use of dairy products.

By developing new products, finding new uses for our present products and byproducts, helping to reduce manufacturing costs, improving our methods of packaging, seeking new ways of merchandising, research renders a great service to the dairy industry. Research and progress are inseparable.

Research must lead the way. It must be miles ahead of actual practice.

SUMMARY

The future welfare of dairying is vital to all citizens of Wisconsin. Splendid progress has been made among the State's 160,000 dairy farmers and 2,274 dairy plants in maintaining a record production of dairy foods so essential to the State and Nation. But 1950 finds the industry facing new problems and new challenges. Marketing is the No. 1 challenge facing America's dairyland today. The dairy marketing program is being strengthened through teamwork in an industry-wide milk-quality program, combined with more emphasis on advertising, promotion, and research. Wisconsin's State Department of Agriculture has a part to play in helping the dairy industry meet this midcentury challenge.

A Representative of the Free Nations of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass.:

AMBASSADOR OF GOOD WILL—LYNN GI IN KOREA LAUDED BY BUDDIES

How a Lynn soldier is serving as an ambassador of good will in Korea was revealed today in a letter to the Telegram-News from two buddies in the war zone.

Impressed with the philanthropy of Pfc William F. Pierce, whom they said has gone far to instill confidence of the Korean people toward the Americans, Corp. Bennie C. Rich and Corp. L. P. Fennessey wrote the following letter:

"EDITOR, TELEGRAM-NEWS:

"Since the beginning of time, people have sung the praises of great deeds done on the battlefields, but often as not the man behind the man, is forgotten. His is an important job also, since the front line men can't function without him.

"Many such stories as the following have probably crossed your desk, and no doubt after a period of time they become boring. But in all sincerity we feel that this one should be shown to the public. It portrays the American soldier, who has been called upon for every conceivable task since the beginning of the Army.

"We feel sure that when and if the people of Lynn read this they will be proud of the fact that one of their boys has gone a long way toward showing the Korean people our way, the democratic way, of life.

"Pfc William F. Pierce since his arrival in Korea has continuously dreamed of his home town, his family, friends, and his girl that he has left behind, but has not forgotten his duty as a representative of the free nations of the world. He has shown a remarkable ability in improving the relationship and general feeling among the Korean people toward the Americans as a whole. He has gone far in teaching the people of the world the wisdom in the old adage: 'Build your house by the side of the road and be a friend to man.'

"Bill staged an 'amateur show,' with candy and chewing gum as prizes, among the children of a wayside town that the train on which we were riding stopped for a few hours. If the people of Lynn or any other American city or town could have seen their expressions, different from the ones seen on the faces of our own American children, different because of their clothes, which for the most part were ragged and torn, covered with dirt and filth, shoes that were not shoes at all, potbellies caused by malnutrition, children, both male and female, of school age, with younger brothers and sisters strapped to their backs in the Oriental manner, although this does not call for these children to be bearing the burden of hunger and want; yes, these children were different because they had seldom been treated with the kindness and consideration that was shown to them in the following few hours, the consideration that they would probably never have received if it had not been for Bill. If the people of America could have seen this, they would grasp a firmer understanding of the way of life we are attempting to, and will, preserve. The expression of fear and awe that showed on their faces as they looked at the dusty, tired American soldiers who stepped out of that train to get a breath of fresh air and stretch their legs.

"They approached singly and in pairs, and then they seemed to appear out of nowhere, when they discovered that we did not come to loot, burn, and destroy as other nations had before us. They stood in line, if it might be called that, as we all know how hard it is to have children line up in an orderly fashion, but they came to Bill as he passed out candy and then when he tried to have them sing, they pulled away as any other child would, but with them it was more pronounced. But Bill's overwhelming smile and personality turned the trick.

"He called them over and overcame the language barrier by signs and actions. The girls at first, they sang their quaint native songs in a reserved manner at first, and then with increased gusto. When the boys chimed in they sang in a boisterous and braggard manner, symbolic of an adolescent who is trying his best to outshine the girls. When the initial prizes, which he got from his own personal rations, were distributed, donations were made by the other GI's who were affected by the spontaneous response by the children. When the train continued on its weary journey it left many a saddened heart behind, but left many a pocket bulging with candy, gum, and other goodies, also a group of better citizens of a nation now in jeopardy because of the aggressive tactics of the North Koreans. This was made possible only by the philanthropy of Pfc William F. Pierce.

"Truly, sirs, this epitaph of an ambassador of good will, as well as a representative of our country, in the present crisis, will be remembered long; and as it is retold along with countless others, the beauty of the scene will undoubtedly be enhanced.

"The soldier, Bill Pierce, does not know that this is being sent to you, for if he did, we feel sure that he wouldn't approve of its being written.

"Sincerely yours,

"Corp. BENNIE C. RICH.
"Corp. L. P. FENNESSEY."

Not a Word About Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Liberty (Ind.) Herald of February 22, 1951:

NOT A WORD ABOUT ECONOMY

The administration's tax message to Congress calls for very heavy increases in corporation and individual income taxes, on top of the boost which went into effect last October. It also asks for big jumps in the excise taxes on automobiles, household appliances, and other commodities.

All of this was generally anticipated before the message was made public. But the startling part of the matter is that not a word is said about cutting nonessential Government costs. That was also true of the President's budget message, which went to Congress early in January. This blueprint for the coming fiscal year actually envisioned substantial increases in nondefense spending, to be piled onto a huge military budget.

Here is a policy which, if we accept it, can only lead to the impoverishment of our people, the sapping of our energies and resources, and, in time, to the breakdown of our system of government. We are in a very different position now than we were in 1940, when the last defense program got rolling. Then taxes—local and State, as well as Federal—were low by comparison with the present. So was the national debt. And the family cost of living was about half of today's figure.

It has been authoritatively said that the budget can be cut by as much as $8,000,000,000 in fields which have nothing to do with the defense effort. That is not far from the amount the currently proposed tax bill is designed to raise. It is the plain duty of Congress to make every possible economy before approving new taxes. The people will pay what they have to pay, and make whatever sacrifices are necessary—but they cannot be expected to supinely accept "politics as usual" in this grim era of our history.

Plenty To Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of February 7 relative to the increase in retail stocks. This article should make very interesting reading.

PLENTY TO BUY—RETAIL STOCKS TOWER, SUPPLIES KEEP COMING AS SCARE SALES EBB—DETROIT STORE'S REFRIGERATOR STOCK UP 120 PERCENT IN YEAR; BIG TV RISE IN PITTSBURGH; SOME MERCHANTS ARE NERVOUS

When New Yorkers thumbed through their ad-fat newspapers last Sunday they found big Macy's department store sale-ballyhooing a $550 television set for $329.

The sale was symptomatic of a little noted fact of the hour: Despite the cry of "shortages," and despite the drain of January's pell-mell scare buying, the Nation's retailers are still loaded to the gunwales with consumer goods.

The pattern is the same everywhere. A Wall Street Journal 10-city survey finds store after store with the biggest stocks ever—and continuing to receive a tremendous flow of goods from manufacturers.

"No items are short, not even ammunition in our sporting goods department," says a Los Angeles department store executive.

SOME ARE NERVOUS

Some merchants are growing a little nervous about their lapful. They've had several psychological jolts this week. After watching Nation-wide department sales roar 32 percent above a year ago in the 4 weeks through January 27, they saw sales in New York stores reported only 6 percent over 1950 in the week through February 3—and Philadelphia sales charted 6 percent under 1950.

Sales trends have been zigzagging so much in recent months, of course, that there's no assurance this slow-up will continue long. It's possible another burst of consumer buying could be induced soon by Treasury Secretary Snyder's call for a 25-percent manufacturers excise on big home appliances. Since retailers' present inventories would be free from this tax, these might move out in a hurry.

Consumer hard goods—on which most of the shortage talk centers—is the field in which the retailers appear to be most heavily loaded.

A big department store in Detroit has on hand nearly five times as many television receivers as at this time last year. Its stocks of refrigerators are up 120 percent, of furniture 11 percent.

ACROSS THE BOARD

One of Pittsburgh's biggest stores gives this account of its inventory situation, compared with a year ago: Television sets, up 200 percent; rugs, up 75 percent; refrigerators and stoves, up 40 percent; furniture, up 35 percent; toiletries and perfumes, up 25 percent; clothing, up 10 percent.

In Cambridge, Mass., Filler's, a furniture and appliance emporium, says its stocks average 20 percent greater than a year ago, with the biggest increases coming in washing machines, refrigerators, and television sets.

And one of the owners of the Good Housekeeping Shops, Inc., a chain of five furniture and appliance stores in Chicago, says his firm now has the largest inventories ever carried. Each store, he adds, has an average 90-day supply of television receivers, refrigerators, washing machines, and furniture; a normal stock, he figures, would be enough to last 30 days.

MORE COMING IN

On top of the higher inventories is the continuing heavy delivery of goods by manufacturers. Robert Gorman, appliance manager for Plunkett-Rogers Co., an appliance and furniture shop on Chicago's West Side, calculates television sets are pouring in at a clip 50 percent faster than a year ago. The pace on refrigerators, washing machines, and stoves, he says, is up 30 percent.

An official of a Detroit department store puts its receipts of goods of all kinds in January at 20 percent above the like 1950 month. And he thinks deliveries will continue to outstrip last year's for some months to come.

For another indication of irony in shortage talk, listen to Marvin Cossy, partner in Edward B. Dublin & Son, Chicago appliance store: "Television sets are supposed to be on an allocation basis, but it's a funny thing that manufacturers keep calling up and asking if I want more merchandise."

"ALWAYS THE LAST"

The Los Angeles store which finds not even ammunition in short supply adds that it recently received more of the stuff. "And though we've been told by the manufacturers this was the last shipment," says a spokesman, "we've been told that for the last several orders."

And retailers have some sizable orders still sitting in manufacturers' files. If any considerable percentage of these is filled, retail stocks may be heaped higher yet.

The Plunkett-Rogers store in Chicago now has on order six times as many refrigerators, stoves, and washing machines as a year ago.

In Boston, Harry Sussman, president of appliance-vending National Sales Co., says he's put in blanket orders with all his supply sources and will take all they can give him.

MORE MEN'S WEAR, MORE MUSIC

The general manager of a big Detroit men's wear store has ordered about 10 percent more than last year for the forthcoming spring season, and he's trying to get the spring finery delivered in February instead of March.

And Robert Benson, proprietor of Chicago's Benson Music Shop, Inc., reports: "I'm buying further ahead now than last year, about 60 days against 30 days last February."

If a peace scare should come along soon, the resultant dip in public purchasing might prove a severe blow for some stores with heavy inventories, say some retailers.

In case of such a slump, predicts a Boston TV dealer, "a lot of banks will find themselves in the television-set business."

R. C. Bernier, of Bernier's Radio & Electric Co., in Cleveland, who's not ordering far in advance, observes, "The grass will be awfully brown if we should suddenly come into a peacetime economy."

THE TREND IS STINKO

The merchandise manager of a big Pittsburgh department store sees the present buying trend as a possible index to the future, and remarks: "The scare buying spree started to taper off the last week in January. The first day in February was stinko."

And Jim Earle, who runs Chicago's Woodlawn Radio & Music Co., utters this word of caution: "The combination of an early Easter and a continuation of the cold weather may give a set-back to a lot of dealers getting up to their neck in merchandise that is costing plenty to finance."

The general abundance of things to buy doesn't mean, of course, that absolutely every consumer item is still untouched by war. There are exceptions. The copper-bottomed frying pan situation, for example, is not so good.

Titche-Goettinger Co., one of Dallas' leading department stores, reports its supplies of copper-bottomed frying pans are just about cleaned out. An official order has banned their manufacture after March 1. Other stores the country over are running short of this ware.

Foam-rubber mattresses are increasingly scarce, finds Arthur Larson, advertising and sales promotion manager for big Powers Furniture Co., in Portland, Oreg. And a Pittsburgher reports low-price bed sheets hard to come by.

A Lesson in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 22, 1951:

A LESSON IN SOCIALISM

Students in a Yonkers, N. Y., high school have a far better understanding of the fallacy of the Socialist theory of "take" and "give" as result of the ingenuity of a teacher of economics and history in that institution of learning.

Recognizing that these students had lived their lives exclusively in an atmosphere polluted by the propaganda of the Socialist planners who held the reins of government, the teacher struck upon a novel method to show how false is the theory which his pupils generally had been led to accept.

But we'll let the teacher tell his own story that you, too, may recognize the dangers that lie ahead if we blindly follow the preachments of those who would guide us down the path to a welfare state.

"As a teacher in the public schools, I find that the Socialist-Communist idea of taking 'from each according to his ability,' and giving 'to each according to his need' is now generally accepted without question by most of our pupils. In an effort to explain the fallacy in this theory, I sometimes try this approach with my pupils:

"When one of the brighter or harder-working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points and give them to a student who has made only 55 points on his test. Thus each would contribute according to his ability and—since both would have a passing mark—each would receive according to his need. After I have juggled the grades of all the other pupils in this fashion, the result is usually a common-ownership grade of between 75 and 80—the minimum needed for passing or for survival. Then I speculate with the pupils as to the probable results if I actually used the socialistic theory for grading papers.

"First, the highly productive pupils—and they are always a minority in school as well as in life—would soon lose all incentive for producing. Why strive to make a high grade if part of it is taken from you by authority and given to someone else?

"Second, the less productive pupils—a majority in school as elsewhere—would, for a time, be relieved of the necessity to study or to produce. This Socialist-Communist system would continue until the high producers had sunk—or had been driven down—to the level of the low producers. At that point, in order for anyone to survive, the authority would have no alternative but to begin a system of compulsory labor and punishments against even the low producers. They, of course, would then complain bitterly, but without understanding.

"Finally, I return the discussion to the ideas of freedom and enterprise—the market economy—where each person has freedom of choice, and is responsible for his own decisions and welfare.

"Gratifyingly enough, most of my pupils then understand what I mean when I explain that socialism—even in a democracy—will eventually result in a living death for all except the authorities and a few of their favorite lackeys."

A Sly Back-Stabber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission given, there is printed herewith one of Drew Pearson's recent syndicated articles:

THE DAILY WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—The bitter row over labor participation in the mobilization picture boils down partly to a clash with Gen. Lucius Clay, former military governor of Germany, now right-hand man to Defense Mobilization Czar Charles E. Wilson. There is also a lot of peeve against Harry S. Truman personally.

Clay, a hard-hitting, hard-working Army officer, accustomed to giving and taking orders, was continually clashing with civilians when he served as right-hand man to War Mobilizer Jimmy Byrnes in World War II. Later, while in Germany, he established what is probably a record for any American official. He cabled his resignation to the State Department as military governor of Germany three times in 1 day.

Illustrative of Clay's difficulties with labor leaders is one backstage incident involving the appointment of a manpower commissioner.

President Truman had telephoned Mobilization Czar Wilson asking him to appoint ex-Senator Frank Graham, of North Carolina, as Manpower Commissioner. Former

president of the University of North Carolina, Dr. Graham served as a member of the War Labor Board in World War II and played a potent part in keeping labor relations on an even keel.

Wilson seemed to welcome Truman's suggestion, but later, when Graham called on Wilson and General Clay, the latter made it clear that Graham would be only one of six assistants, and would report not to Mobilizer Boss Wilson but to Clay through Wall Street Investment Banker Sidney Weinberg.

Under these hamstringing conditions Graham politely declined.

NOTE: Graham subsequently went to Alaska, showed how skillful he was in handling labor relations by smoothing out a difficult situation threatening to stop vital construction of Air Force housing and Army fortifications.

CLAY STAGES A VISHINSKY

On another occasion General Clay had called a closed-door conference attended by Secretary of Labor Tobin, Selective Service Director Hershey, and Presidential Aide Daniel H. Stowe to discuss manpower problems.

Clay at that time was all set to announce his own man as Manpower Commissioner, but he had scarcely begun to talk when White House Assistant Stowe interrupted. He advised that he had instructions from the President that the manpower commissionership was not to be discussed.

Stowe did not say so, but the President knew, even then, how vigorously labor felt on the subject, and he did not want General Clay dictating the appointment.

Faced with this message from the White House, Clay got red under the collar and stamped out.

Later he got his way. His own candidate, Arthur Flemming, of the Civil Service Commission, became Manpower Commissioner—after being pushed through by Wilson himself.

This is one of the reasons labor is so sore.

BIG-BUSINESS TYCOONS

Another reason is the number of big-business tycoons around Wilson and the manner in which they dominate the mobilization picture. Here are some of them:

General Clay, on leave from Continental Can; Fred Searls, on leave from Newmont Mining, a J. P. Morgan firm; Sidney Weinberg, head of Goldman, Sachs, investment bankers; Howard Chase, of General Mills; Alfred Howse, of the Forest Land Development Co., general economic adviser to Wilson. The operations of Weinberg's Goldman, Sachs investment house during the depression, incidentally, was one of the reasons why Congress passed the Securities and Exchange Act.

While these are skilled businessmen, they serve as "no dollar" men. In other words, they are paid not by the Government but by their own companies, thus are in the difficult position of serving one master but being paid by another.

Federal Patronage in Mississippi

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, betrayal of a public trust is one of the most despicable of all crimes. Charges were made in the other body last Wednesday, and with good reason, that Federal patronage jobs in Mississippi were being bought and sold like sardines across the counter. These charges are serious. They have long been the subject of common, everyday conversation in the State of Mississippi. There is evidence that in some instances jobs have been sold. I hope in the interest of honest government and sound administration the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will see that these charges are thoroughly aired, and, if substantiated, those responsible for perpetuating these crimes will be brought to the bar of justice.

Shipment of Critical Materials by Great Britain to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter to me from Judge Henry Ellenbogen, of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pa., a former Member of this body, dated February 23, 1951, and an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press dated Thursday, February 15, 1951, on the subject of sale and shipment of critical defense materials by Great Britain to Soviet Russia:

JUDGES' CHAMBERS,
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 23, 1951.

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of Thursday, February 15.

The editorial is startling, and it appears to be absurd that we and our allies should fight Communists in Korea, while, at the same time, we or our allies should supply our enemies with the means to fight us. Many of our brave boys have been killed or wounded with the material furnished to the enemy, and many others will suffer and die in the trying days ahead.

The legal situation appears to be that the United Nations has branded both China and North Korea as aggressors. Great Britain is an important member of the United Nations. A decent respect for the resolution of the UN should cause England to suspend further shipment of all materials to China—at least until the United Nations has decided what sanctions should be applied against the aggressor nations.

If a resolution of the United Nations does not carry that much weight among its own members—and Great Britain voted for the resolution—then such a resolution would appear to have little value.

If all free nations stand together in a determined resistance against the Communist aggressors, who would enslave all peoples and degrade mankind, the cause of freedom is sure to triumph. But if Great Britain pays no attention to resolutions of the United Nations, which have been solemnly adopted after much deliberation, and sells critical materials to China that strengthen her in the fight against the United Nations, then the free world is indeed in jeopardy.

I hope that you will call this matter to the attention of our Government, with the view that our Government may take effective steps to cause Great Britain to suspend its trade with China. I would also appreciate it if you would bring this matter to the attention of your fellow Congressmen, and the country at large, by having this letter and the enclosed editorial inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY ELLENBOGEN.

BRITISH LET US DOWN

British shipments of iron and steel to Red China last December alone were almost as much as her total shipments for 12 months of 1949.

British woolen goods exports to Red China shot up from $2,000 in December 1949 to $300,000 in December 1950. And in the same related periods, British shipments of assorted machinery, also vehicles of various kinds, rose from a few thousand dollars to hundred of thousands.

Britain in 1950 sold 20 times as much raw rubber to the Soviet Union as in 1949.

Right now two shiploads of rubber totaling 10,000 tons are at sea between Singapore and Hong Kong, destined for a Communist enemy which British troops are fighting on two fronts.

And the socialistic British Government says it has no intention of stopping these shipments.

A Conservative member of Commons got a brush off this week when he asked Prime Minister Attlee whether he was aware that British rubber was moving to Hong Kong and what he proposed to do to prevent the loss of this strategic material.

An under secretary merely confirmed that the rubber, worth $10,000,000, was on the way and said the Government intended to do nothing about it.

No British paper printed the story, or mentioned the huge rubber shipments, according to a London dispatch.

Small wonder. Reports from Korea yesterday said that Red tanks and self-propelled guns spearheaded a drive which threatened to cut off 100,000 Allied troops including British around Seoul.

If those tanks weren't made of British steel, if those self-propelled guns weren't moving on British rubber, they could have been—or more like them will be.

How can we win a war when an ally persists in selling much needed raw materials to the enemy?

Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, repeatedly has called attention to the "alarming proportions" of strategic materials exports from Britain to the iron-curtain countries. In the first 10 months of 1950 these exports have aggregated $68,000,000.

His subcommittee on export controls and policies is doing valuable work in disclosing Britain's trade with the enemy. Its findings should get closest attention as Congress looks into the foreign-aid proposals in the Truman budget.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously passed by the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors representing 61 county-wide districts in the State of Wisconsin. This resolution was sent to me by Mr. Herbert Meyer, secretary of the association.

It is needless for me to extol at this time the virtues of soil conservation. We are accomplishing great things in Wisconsin through the application of intelligent soil-conservation methods. All groups are working in harmony, which probably is greatly accountable for the results being obtained.

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS,
Baraboo, Wis., February 2, 1951.

Hon. GARDNER R. WITHROW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WITHROW: As secretary of the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, representing 61 county-wide districts in the State, I have been instructed to transmit to you the following resolution:

"Whereas conservation of our soil and water resources is essential to the vigorous health and high morale of our people, a strong national defense, and our democratic system of government, is an established and accepted truth; and

"Whereas soil-conservation districts, democratically organized and locally controlled local units of State government, have proved to be an effective group through which this vitally important national assignment can be accomplished; and

"Whereas soil-conservation district supervisors have secured excellent cooperation from State and Federal agencies and organizations, particularly the Soil Conservation Service, in working toward a well-rounded program of proper land use and soil and water conservation, and since continuation of this essential work is dependent on keeping a strong and adequately financed Soil Conservation Service; and

"Whereas rumors in the press indicate that various reorganization ideas are under consideration, which would weaken or destroy the direct technical assistance the Soil Conservation Service is giving districts: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Members of Congress, and the United States Secretary of Agriculture be informed that soil-conservation district supervisors in assembly at a State meeting in Madison, Wis., on February 1, 1951, hereby enthusiastically endorse the work of the Soil Conservation Service and do further petition that this agency be administratively strengthened, kept a separate bureau in the United States Department of Agriculture, given full responsibility for Federal help on soil and water conservation, and given adequate appropriations to take care of technical needs of farmers of the Nation through the medium of our soil-conservation districts."

Your consideration and support of our resolution will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT R. MEYER,
Secretary.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article which appeared in the Boston Globe, Boston, Mass., on February 26, 1951:

T. G. M.'s COLUMN

RFC NEED MAKE NO APOLOGIES FOR ITS SMALL LOANS

These are unhappy days for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The agency seems to be up to its neck in a hot brew of Lustron (housing), Texmass (oil) and various other none too savory ingredients. Presiding, of course, is chief chef Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, and assistant chefs, Senators TOBEY and PAUL DOUGLAS.

The RFC, in short, stands charged with yielding to political influence in the granting of loans.

A secondary but almost equally uncomfortable situation has been brought about by the curious coincidence that about 11 different employees of the agency have resigned over the past few years and then shown up a few weeks later with fat jobs with some of the agency's largest borrowers—by chance only a few weeks after these companies had been loaned money.

All in all the giant $2,000,000,000 lending agency is in a mess, a fact which causes no great sadness in the hearts of the many who for some years have had their scalping knife out for the RFC anyway on the theory that it represented an infringement of the principles of free enterprise and offered a dangerous degradation to the whole structure of private credit.

Even the White House has gone skittish in this mess, ordering copies of the agency's correspondence with Members of Congress on the subject of applications for loans and playing a sort of on-again-off-again game as to whether to turn control of the agency over to a single man or to continue its present five-man Board of Directors.

NINETY PERCENT OF LOANS UNDER $100,000

All of this is too bad.

It is too bad because over the years the RFC has done a rather remarkable job of playing "poor man's bank" to thousands of small-business men who might otherwise have gone to the wall.

Less than 10 percent of the agency's loans are for an amount in excess of $100,000, and hence come to the Washington office for approval—and it is in the Washington office where the political pressure has been applied apparently.

The average small-business man must first go to his commercial bank. Only if this and other sources of private credit have been exhausted may he apply to the RFC, which thus gets only risks which commercial banks either cannot, or do not, wish to undertake.

If his application is among the 90 percent under $100,000—4,904 last year out of a total of 5,506 loans, for instance—it is authorized or rejected by the regional office having jurisdiction in the city where he lives. Only if he is after big money does he enter the Washington picture.

Even with such political abuses as have no doubt occurred, the RFC has an interesting lending record.

It has authorized a total of 59,000 loans amounting to $4,600,000,000 since it was founded by Congress in 1932, a pet anti-depression measure of President Hoover.

Although these loans include the so-called defense loans during World War II and loans under the National Housing Act, total losses have been only $101,000,000, out of which $35,000,000 was in the one loan to Lustron, which was made only after its O. K. by a highly respected private engineering firm and receipt of a signed letter urging its granting from Dr. John Steelman on White House stationery.

On its normal peacetime lending program the agency has suffered a ratio of loss of less than three-fourths of 1 percent, a record comparable to that of most banking institutions.

AID TO AUTO DEALERS AND SMALL GROCERIES

The big loans that the agency makes—the ones that perhaps go sour or turn up with suggestions of improper political influence—are the ones that make the headlines and hold public attention.

But what of these—the 159 motor vehicle dealers who last year borrowed $4,795,000 from the agency, an average of $30,000 each—the 119 grocery stores which borrowed on the average of $1,500—the 103 motels and auto courts which borrowed less than $3,000 each—and the other 2,800 borrowers for amounts less than $25,000? Or the other 2,000 who borrowed between $25,000 and $100,000?

These loans—not the politically pressured Lustron, nor the rich man's tax high jinks of Texmass—make up the great mass of RFC loans.

These are almost entirely term loans of the sort which commercial banks do not make, so-called capital or term loans in order to expand or resuscitate a small business.

Perhaps the RFC should have its ears pinned back by being prevented by statute from making loans in the larger amounts, and be forced in the future to confine its activities to the small business loans with which it has done such a spectacular job.

It has been big business, not the little fellows, which has been singing siren songs to the agency.

JOHN HARRIMAN.

America the New Canaan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 22, we listened to the reading of Gen. George Washington's immortal address. This wonderful speech, and the unselfish patriotic and distinguished service of this great man always serves as an inspiration to me, and, I believe, to this body.

I am wondering if it would not be well that we consider the omnipotent hand of God in the fashioning of a man like General Washington and every other citizen that has made any enduring contribution to our Republic and way of life, and in the creation of our country?

The day of miracles has not passed. Our country is a miracle, for it had a spiritual birth. No one can ever convince me that the winning of our independence was not a miracle performed under the approval and guidance of Almighty God by patriotic, poor but pious, men and women, willing to be led by God and that God looked down from heaven and smiled on their ambitions to set up a Republic, governed by representatives of the people.

I will always believe that God intended this country to be a new Canaan. A home for disciplined and godly people. God disciplined the people of old Canaan before permitting them to set foot upon that land.

Anyone studying history, especially biblical history, must be impressed with

the similarity of the people's ambitions for old Canaan and the ambitions of our forefathers for this new Canaan, in that they desired God as their King and their guide, and must be impressed with the similarity of God's omnipotent hand in His provision for leadership.

As Joshua was the leader into old Canaan, George Washington was the leader of the new. The comparison of these two figures is interesting to me. Both of these men were permitted to see the lands before fighting upon them. Joshua saw old Canaan when he went as a spy. General Washington saw the land he was to fight for as a citizen, as a surveyor and as a soldier. Both were commanders in chief of their respective armies. They both fought a 7 years' war. They both fought against terrifying odds numerically, and both had their tempers and faith sorely tried. They both established 13 colonies, one of which was my native State of Georgia. One might say, there were only 12 tribes of Israel, and that is correct, but we must not forget that the portion of Joseph was divided between Ephraim and Manessah. Both were the first presidents of their respective republics. Both were humble enough, and thank God, big enough and wise enough to give God the entire credit for their victories, and to remind their people that their country's destiny was dependent upon their submissiveness to God.

Consequently, our form of government was spiritual in its origin. Democracy is not, and cannot be for other than spiritual people. In some quarters today it is considered smart to deny God. Yet, those people are now partaking of fruits, and reaping generously where they have not sown, all the gifts of the God they deny.

Our forefathers had their problems. General Washington had his. There was the atheist then as now. Then there were the Tories. As a boy, I wondered what manner of men were those Tories. What was their thinking that they could object to a government by men? And, how could anyone object to such a Government as our patriots had conceived? I searched the books for the answer, and found it. I read many of their speeches, and was startled to find that these people opposed our freedoms upon the premise that history had indubitably proven that no democracy had existed more than 200 years, and contended that within 200 years the people would become so corrupt, so greedy, so power-conscious, so demanding of the Government's obligations to them whether real or supposed, while so thoroughly forgetful of the practical fact that the Government could give nothing that the citizens had not already in the performance of their obligations given the Government, that they would pull down the pillars that supported the temple of democracy.

Our forefathers knew this history, and they did not deny the arguments of facts the Tories set forth. But our people and General Washington said: "That need not be the case at all, for so long as we walk with God and serve Him. He will be merciful and our Government will endure." That has been the touchstone of America. That explains the fact that from our humble but spiritual beginning we have become the greatest and richest nation the world has ever know. In the light of the Tories' argument, however, it is exceedingly worth while that we now appraise their predictions. We are now approaching 200 years as a Republic. What is the situation today concerning the greed, corruption, power madness, and demands of the people without any thought of those people as to their duties and obligations to the Government?

It is pitiful to see so many in the so-called name of higher education attempting to destroy God as our leader, and to wipe out every concept that made our country great. In these times of crisis surpassing any other crisis of the human race, we could do no finer thing or more patriotic thing than to firmly resolve to go back to the God and the faith and the concepts of our founding fathers and General Washington.

Mr. Speaker, February 22, was not only Gen. George Washington's birthday, but was also the birthday of another great American, and a product of the little, but fine county, Lee County, Ga., where I was born and reared. I refer to Hon. Frank Lebby Stanton. This man and his weekly newspaper published at Smithville, Lee County, Ga., caught the eye and won the admiration of all America. Born in poverty, he did not consider poverty a disgrace, nor did he appeal for help from his Government. Living as he did, shortly after the War Between the States, he in common with his people and section knew the touch of poverty, famine, and oppression. But he knew and his people and section knew the promise of America. Our Government had said to him and to his and to every citizen, "You can go as far as your will to work and ability will permit you to go." He knew, and we know, that is all that any honest government can say. That is all any honest man can desire that his government say. With a heart full of love for his people, his family, and his country, and a belief in all of them, he put his head, his hands, and his heart to work. In a short while this country boy was with the Atlanta Constitution, then the South's greatest newspaper, and with the immortal Henry W. Grady, who was one of the greatest orators, newspaper writers, and Americans this world has ever seen.

Mr. Stanton was a poet. The South's sweetest singer. Everyone has heard that beautiful song, Mighty Lak a Rose. Perhaps you do not know Mr. Stanton wrote that song in the matter of a few minutes and immediately after he had stood by the bedside of his little son who was stricken with infantile paralysis. As that little mite of humanity lay on his bed in pain with cheeks reddened by the heat of a high fever, Mr. Stanton's mother said, "He looks like a rose." Mr. Stanton left the sick room, took up his pencil and wrote that song which the people of this Nation still sing.

Mr. Stanton loved his family. On one occasion, Mrs. Stanton went to South Carolina to visit relatives, leaving Mr. Stanton at home. Mr. Stanton, coming home from work, immediately missed the companionship of his wonderful wife. There was the empty chair, so he sat down and wrote his wife a letter in song. You know it, and America sings it, the title being "Just a Wearyin' for You."

Mr. Stanton loved our country. On one occasion a depression visited our country and section. Our people were in despair. There were problems to be faced and to be solved by a resolute people, and not by people who despaired. In his desire to build up the morale of the people by a message in song, he wrote those words:

This old world we are living in, is mighty hard to beat;
Oh, you get a thorn with every rose, but ain't the roses sweet.

The heartthrobs of America were always sweet to Frank L. Stanton, of Lee County, Ga. Mr. Stanton left that feeling with his people. Today I proudly say to you that the people of our section love this country with a devotion second to none. And our section loves God also. Some writers and newspapers have referred to us in tones of disparagement, criticism, and pity as "the Bible Belt." We take that reference as a great compliment and accept the title with thankfulness. As our junior Senator, Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, observed, however:

It is refreshing to note that some of those higher critics now realizing the dangers of an atomic bomb, have suddenly become quite anxious that we move over a little and let them claim the protection of a God they had denied.

Wherever you see godly men and women, and ministers of God, those whom God has put his infallible finger upon and said, "I want you," preaching the Book as it was written and not the interpretations some men placed on it about 10 years ago, there you will see the principles of General Washington and Frank L. Stanton not only enduring, but prospering every hour.

I thank God for these men I have mentioned, and for all men and women of like mind over the 48 States and the world. And we have many, and no section has a complete monopoly, and I hope they rise up with the courage God gives his true servants and assert themselves boldly in this critical hour.

The Selective Service Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the present operation of the selective-service draft, if continued, will have a disastrous effect on the farm production in North Dakota for 1951 and 1952.

As everyone ought to know, farming is now done by tractor power—practically everything is done by power machinery on a farm. The old men were used to horses and horsedrawn machinery, and it is the younger men who are

operating the tractor power. Practically every one of these boys is a mechanic, many schooled in that work, and the old men cannot operate without some of these boys. I understand that the Army wants them—more than any other class—because they are mechanics and the Army is now tractor-propelled.

The Army seems to think other men can be supplied and the production will go right along. We had experience in that in the last war. Men were sent out to the farms that could not tell a combine from a road grader. They attempted to operate tractors and combines. They smashed up more machinery than they were worth even if they had worked for nothing. Evidently the Army does not want these men and is trying to pawn them off on the farmers of the Northwest.

Production of food is an important business to this country and to those of our allies who are actually fighting with us. This food must be produced.

I know any number of farmers who produce twenty to thirty thousand bushels of grain annually where their boys are being drafted and the old men will simply have to quit farming. The draft boards, the appeal boards, and the whole machinery of the selective service is guided by one thing and one thing only. What does the Army say about this? If the general of the selective service says draft, draft it is.

Congressmen do not like to interfere and ask deferments, as it would look like a sabotage of the war effort. It seems to me the Army ought to know, without any congressional appeals, that production is vital to the war effort.

The Legislature of North Dakota has spoken of this subject by a concurrent resolution and I submit the resolution herewith:

House Concurrent Resolution C

Concurrent resolution urging that the draft of essential agricultural labor be kept at a minimum and not materially reduce essential agricultural production and the harvest and care of agricultural resources

Whereas it is absolutely essential for the best interests of the people of the United States and of the State of North Dakota that maximum and uninterrupted production of all agricultural crops and livestock ordinarily raised and grown in the State of North Dakota be maintained during the period of the present emergency; and

Whereas, to produce and harvest a crop in North Dakota and otherwise to engage in agricultural pursuits to the maximum capacity of the farmers of this State, it is absolutely necessary that adequate help be available on the farms of this State; and

Whereas it now appears to be the policy of selective service to draft and induct into the service of the United States farm boys essential to the operation of the farms of the State of North Dakota and to the production of the maximum amount of crops and the proper harvest and care of our agricultural resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That we do hereby urge and request that the drafting of essential farm help in the State of North Dakota be kept at a minimum, and that no farm boys or farm help be drafted or inducted into the service of the United States where such draft will materially reduce the operation of farm units to maximum capacity; and be it further

Resolved, That veterans of World War II who are now actively engaged in farming be given priority over nonveterans, insofar as agricultural deferments are concerned; be it further

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service be apprised of the action of the thirty-second legislative assembly by the adoption of this resolution, and that a copy be forwarded to him; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the entire congressional delegation from the State of North Dakota.

LEO STUKA,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Whisky Ocean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article, which appeared in the February 7 issue of the Wall Street Journal, which deals with and points out the fact that ever since the Korean crisis, the distillers of this country have been upping their output in some instances more than 50 percent. There is no shortages; in reality, there is a "glut."

WHISKY OCEAN—DISTILLERS HIKE BOURBON, RYE OUTPUT BY 50 PERCENT; TIPPLERS ARE LETHARGIC—WHOLESALERS, RETAILERS BOOST STOCKS AGAINST SHORTAGES; COULD THERE BE A GLUT?

(By T. A. Wise and Michael J. Saada)

Whisky, whisky everywhere.

Since Korea, the pipelines from still to retail store have filled to near the bursting point. The Nation's distillers have hiked their whisky output by 50 percent. Wholesalers have built their stocks from a 47-day supply to an estimated 60-day one. Retailers have increased their buying by 17 percent.

"There's more bourbon, rye, and blends in this country today than at any time in history," declares one big eastern wholesaler. "There's enough in stock to fill demand for eight peacetime years; when World War II broke out stocks were equal to about 4 years' demand."

Adds one in New York: "There's so much whisky stacked on Manhattan that an A-bomb blast would plaster half of Philadelphia."

TIPPLING NOT BRISK

The reason for this feverish stockpiling of firewater, of course, is the fear that the Government may restrict whisky output as it did in World War II. But how about the Nation's tipplers? They've barely increased their buying of potent beverages. Most retailers report little or no gain in whisky sales. At best the storemen find sales up 3 percent from this time last year.

Question: Could either a "peace scare" or a sharp demand drop bring inventory discomfort to the whisky merchants?

A stiff hike in the Federal excise tax from $9 a gallon to $12, as proposed by President Truman, might bring a sharp sag in demand. In November 1942, when excises were raised, case sales of whisky plunged. In Michigan, for example, the drop was nearly 40 percent. In North Carolina it was 43 percent.

WORRY SIGNS SLIGHT

If the whisky makers are worried they show little sign of it. Big distillers like Publicker and Schenley and little ones like Glenmore are still operating full blast. And they are increasing their bulging storage space to cram in more whisky.

For example, National Distillers, which just finished building two new warehouses, is building five more. Brown-Forman recently purchased an old lumber mill in Louisville and turned it into a warehouse.

Calvert Distilling Co., a subsidiary of Distillers Corp.-Seagram, is putting up six 500,000-gallon tanks for storage of spirits at its Relay, Md., plant. Each of those tanks could theoretically take care of 1 day's whisky consumption for the entire Nation. Calvert has also leased more space for aging whisky—some 60,000 square feet, or nearly the area of three football fields.

And it isn't just the giants of the industry that are acquiring more space to cache their product. Stitzel-Weller Distillery of Louisville is one of the smaller concerns which is doing the same thing. It has jumped storage capacity by building four new warehouses.

"MONOPOLY" STATE BUYING UP

The whisky trade, from distiller to retailer, has long been chary about releasing figures on stocks. But a good indication of how they are mounting at the wholesale level comes from the public figures of the 17 "monopoly" States. Liquor boards in these states buy from the distillers and direct retail sales.

These commissions have been among the heaviest stocker-uppers. Present supplies on hand in the warehouses of the various States run from 15 percent to 50 percent greater than at this time last year.

Take Virginia. On the 1st of January that State had 108,000 cases of one well-known brand of blended whisky. A year earlier it had well under half that number—about 49,000.

Normally the State carries a 6- to 7-week supply of all brands. It is now carrying a 15-week stock and steadily expanding this inventory. The State has rented an extra warehouse on the James River to "freeze" a large supply of liquor; it would be "thawed" only in an absolute emergency.

Michigan, another monopoly State, has been placing orders with distillers in bulk quantities for the first time, asking for delivery over regularly spaced intervals. The State's liquor commissioners think they'll have a better chance of getting orders filled by taking this tack; it permits the distiller to schedule his own purchases of bottles, cartons, and caps, for example. For the first quarter Michigan has ordered 15 percent more whisky than in the like period a year ago.

JOBBERS' STOCKS HIGH

Monopoly States are not alone in building up their stocks, of course. Jobbers and retail stores in big cities of free States also have been putting away spirits. One distiller knows that a New York City jobber has 30 percent more stocks in his own and rented warehouses today than he had last October, when supplies are normally at their annual peak, just before the holidays.

A spot check of liquor stores in New York shows inventories up sharply. Liquor dealers in the big city were carrying about a 4-weeks' supply last June—about half what they consider normal. Now they've built stocks to a point where a 12-weeks' inventory is standard. On some items like low-priced blends and scotch they're piling up a 16-weeks' supply—perhaps more in some cases.

Many retailers expect a marked spurt in business from tipplers rushing to beat the proposed Federal tax hike. It would lift the price of a fifth of whisky by about $1.

One likely result of the tax hike will be an increase in moonshining—clandestine whisky-making to avoid the Federal tax.

Illicit distilling has already jumped markedly since 1947. No one knows how many sub-rosa stills there are, but one measure is the number seized by Bureau of Internal Revenue agents each year. In 1947 the "revenuers" closed up 6,000 stills. The following year the number mounted to 6,700 and in 1948 leaped to over 8,000. Last year 10,000 were put out of business.

Moonshining is by no means confined to the backwoods of Kentucky and Tennessee. Within the past 2 months a 1,500-gallon still was closed in Haverhill, Mass. A 700-gallon outfit was seized at Liberty, N. Y., in the heart of a big resort area. A 500-gallon still was also taken at Babylon on New York's Long Island.

Your Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the American Legion magazine of March 1951:

WILL YOU PAY MORE THAN YOUR SHARE OF INCOME TAXES?

Income taxes have increased tremendously in this country in the last 11 years—and the man who has borne a heavy share of the burden of the increase is the taxpayer in the low and middle income brackets. From 1939 to 1945, the tax of a man making $5,000 a year actually rose 689 percent. And taxes are going up again.

This is a shocking and frightening thing, especially since large taxes (without wage stabilization) taken out of middle incomes are apt to have an inflationary effect on everything we buy. And the situation is complicated further by inequities in the tax law that make the $5,000-a-year wage earner the butt of some very unpleasant and unfair practices.

Before we get into the bad things, however, let us take a look at some breaks the new tax law gives to two groups of taxpayers: the veterans, and present members of our Armed Forces.

If you are an enlisted man or a commissioned warrant officer you are not taxed on any pay you get for time spent in a combat zone. Even if you serve in the combat zone (combat zones are designated by the President) for only a single day in a month, the entire month's pay is tax-exempt.

This is admittedly earning a tax exemption the hard way, but is nonetheless a benefit which is given solely to members of the Armed Forces. Commissioned officers get the same break on the first $200 of each month's military pay earned in a combat zone.

For all ranks there will be no more withholding tax on any pay earned in combat zone.

Other breaks given servicemen, ex-servicemen and their families are: Family allotments are not taxable; dividends on GI insurance are not taxed; armed-service members can apply for extensions on paying income tax until 6 months after service ends.

There are other important details to know about income taxes paid by former members of the Armed Forces. If you are receiving retirement pay for disability, you may get a break by electing to have that pay recomputed under the new Career Compensation Act. Your collector of internal revenue can supply details. But for the great mass of those out of service, even these small advantages are missing.

The tax law contains a number of practices which are, to say the least, illogical. At worst, they can be called downright unfair and unjust.

As Government gets more expensive, and taxes go up, these inequities in our tax law give one man an even greater advantage over another man. And, more than ever, it becomes necessary to do something about them. Agreeing on the principle that we all have to pay more taxes, and being 100 percent unified on the purpose for which the money is being spent, still, as Americans, we reserve the right to protest when the law that raises the money is unfair.

The tax law was written by Americans to extract money equitably from Americans. When it fails in its purpose, it is high time not only to protest but to get a new law.

One of the things that ought to be changed is the forms themselves. When a man is supposed not only to keep tabs on what he owes and to pay it in hard cash, but he has to go through a set of mathematical computations that would baffle the average atomic scientist in order to do it, then it is time to call a halt and to simplify the tax returns. It can be done. It has been done for some of us. Let's get it done for all of us.

One of the most unfair aspects of the tax law is the different treatment received by a business and by an individual. For instance, when a Midwestern corporation decided to train its salesmen in a special school, the total expense of the course to the firm was allowable as an income deduction. But when the salesmen who attended the course were inspired to do some studying on their own, and subscribed to correspondence courses to further their progress in their company, they were not allowed to deduct the expense from their taxable income.

It is a known fact that there are business people who pay for their homes, servants, liquor, speedboats, baseball tickets, automobiles, and just about everything else on expense accounts that are eliminated from taxed income. You remember the fabulous expense accounts of some of our Washington 5-percenters. The parties thrown by them for all sorts of people, including some who work for the Government, may be counted as legitimate business expense items and deducted as tax-free from their income. And Restaurateur Toots Shor is allowed to deduct the cost of his baseball tickets from his income tax as a business expense.

An employee who decided to entertain his boss in lavish style, in the hopes of getting a raise or a better job, would not be allowed to deduct the cost from his income. And whereas a businessman can travel tax-free around the world, if necessary, to get an order for his factory (and take his wife with his as secretary, if he wishes), the man who has to commute to work because he can't find a home near enough to his job, is not allowed to deduct this necessary travel expense from his income.

And here's another example of the illogic of our tax law: A large company recently decided to move from New England to New York City. Now it is very expensive to move a business, especially since important records must be kept in order so that the operation can start functioning the minute the staff is set down in the new location. All of this tremendous expense—thousands of dollars—was considered part of the company's normal overhead, and was tax-deductible.

The company also paid for the moving expenses of some of its top brass. But there were hundreds of other employees affected by the move. If they wanted to keep their jobs, they had to sell their homes—either at a profit, which was taxed, or at a loss, which was not deductible. Then they had to buy new homes on today's inflated market. On top of this they had to pay for moving their furniture several hundred miles. None of what this cost them was considered, under the present tax laws, to entitle them to any deductions.

Perhaps the most glaring inequity of all is the medical expense allowance. As you know, you're allowed only the medical costs over 5 percent of your income as a medical deduction. So a man with a $5,000 annual salary has to spend $250 on which he pays a tax before he is able to start curing himself, or his family, tax-free.

This, it seems to us, is the most ridiculously illogical of the injustices under the present tax law. The least the Government can do is to apply the same logic in treating the cost of keeping its citizens in good repair which it uses in handling the maintenance cost of machinery in factories.

A business is allowed to deduct the full cost of repairing any and all of its equipment from taxable income. If an executive uses his car for business, he can even deduct the cost of a smashed fender—all of it—from his tax base. But if one of his employees becomes seriously ill, the man is not allowed to start deducting the cost of his operation and hospital bill until he has spent 5 percent of his already tax-pared income on curing himself.

And if, as in one family with a $10,000 income, disaster strikes, the tax law again shows how inadequate it really is. In the family we mean, the mother was stricken with cancer, the child got polio, and the father, worn out by sleeplessness and worry, fell asleep while driving his car and smashed into a telegraph pole. His total cost for medical and hospital bills that year was more than $6,000. He had to go deeply into debt to meet the expense. His salary was mortgaged for the next 4 years. Yet only $3,750 of his $6,000 cost was tax-free. This seems patently unfair. It is bad enough to have to suffer worse to pay for it. By what logic must the Government add its burden of tax onto these unfortunate people?

There are many other inequities in the income tax laws that should be corrected. Some of them don't hurt individual taxpayers as much as they hurt all of us together. For instance, charity. Charitable deductions are limited by law to 15 percent of adjusted gross income. Many wealthy people would give much more than that if their donations were exempt from taxation. And many people would like to help others directly, but the law prohibits any except certain specified charities from receiving gifts if the donations are to be tax-deductible. So many deserving individuals never get the help they need.

One reason the small taxpayer gets so many bad breaks is simply that he is not organized. Of all the lobbies in Washington, none represents him. Unless he organizes himself, or unless some organization takes up the cudgels in his defense, the small taxpayer will pay more than his share of our ever-growing tax burden.

Even organized pressure will not correct the abuses of the income-tax law overnight, however. If Congress should suddenly become aware of all inequities and decide to correct them, it would take months of legislative maneuvering before the law was actually changed. And it could not take effect on your tax for at least another year.

What can you do about your tax meanwhile? The answer is, plenty. Not all the unnecessary costs of income tax are in the law. Many people pay more than they owe because of their own ignorance of the law. Their own mistakes cost them real money.

Knowing your rights can save you hard cash. Remember, you are not tipping the Government when you follow the tax rules. You are merely doing your duty as a well-informed citizen. And you have nothing to fear so long as your return is honestly computed.

One of the most frequent errors is the choice of the wrong income-tax blank. Most people do not know that there may be several different ways of figuring their income tax—and that each way may give a different result. On a $5,000 income, the difference in tax between using one method of figuring and another may be as much as $162. Each case is different, so no blanket rule can be given, except figure your tax in all ways open to you before selecting your form for filing.

It is wise to do this early because, contrary to what most people believe, it is not possible to change your method of filing after the due date of the tax. You can change your method of filing even though you may have filed if you refile before the tax due date.

Possibly the biggest source of overpayment by small taxpayers is in their failure to take legitimate deductions. There are literally hundreds of items which are not listed on income-tax blanks and which are nevertheless, perfectly legitimate deductions from taxable income. It would take too much space to list them here. Those most frequently omitted include many medical expenses (such items as nursing care, surgical appliances, and even necessary travel prescribed by a physician).

Many people also forget to claim all their dependents' medical expenses, as well as all of their own charitable contributions, up to 15 percent of their income. You may deduct the value of clothing and furniture contributed to charity; even gas and oil used in legitimate charitable work are deductible. Other people overlook the full value of legitimate deductions from compensation income. Many professionals and businessmen do not take all the deductions pertaining to their occupations to which they are entitled.

Many husbands and wives frequently ignore the benefits of one of the biggest breaks all married people get: joint filing. The advantage is that it is cheaper to pay the tax on two small incomes than on just one that is twice as large. Under joint filing you may declare your own and your wife's income as two equal incomes—one yours, one your wife's. You may do this even if you earned all the money. But don't forget that both husband and wife must sign a joint return.

There are many other sources of common error resulting in overpayment of many millions of dollars to the United States Treasury every year. Not claiming all the exemptions due you is one. Not spreading income over prior years is another. Authors, composers, inventors as well as others can get quite a break here. Some people mistakenly pay tax on exempt interest or dividends. Some pay too much on annuities or pensions. Others include in their income money paid by estates that are not taxed. Still others fail to claim all deductible taxes. These are only a few of the errors you, too, may make that can cost you money.

If you discover you've overpaid on your income tax, you can file a claim any time up to 3 years after the tax was due. Likewise, the Government has 3 years to get after you if you've underestimated your tax. After this 3-year period set by the statute of limitation neither party can do anything about mistakes, if nothing has yet been questioned. However, there is no statute of limitations on fraud. The Government can prosecute on a fraudulent tax return any time.

Federal Judge Learned Hand once said, "Nobody owes any public duty to pay more than the law demands; taxes are enforced exactions, not voluntary contributions." In other words, the Government neither expects nor wants you to pay more than the law requires of you.

Many people make mistakes, both of commission and omission, on their tax returns which are never caught and which, after the 3-year limitation, go into the limbo of dead files forever. But even the small taxpayer is not immune from Government inspection.

The first thing that happens after returns are sent in is that all returns are checked for mathematical errors. Then about 15 percent of returns (the big personal incomes, the big corporate returns) go to Washington for more careful reading. Of the 85 percent which remain right where they were sent, a certain percentage is spot-checked.

If an error, excluding a mathematical one, is found on your return, then upon examination the agent is given a report of your past returns. Your name does not go on a blacklist for future checking, however. Once you've been called in and have either explained your case satisfactorily or have paid up, you're nothing more to worry about—except that the Government expects you to be routinely honest.

The income tax law is unique in that you must prove your deductions to the tax authorities if it is decided to question you. You may plead that you've kept no records, but that does you no good at all. If you can't prove that you're right, you can be held wrong. This is the reverse of our theory of criminal law, which holds every man innocent until he is proved guilty.

Two Terms Only for Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the good news today is that in the future no President will be permitted to serve more than two 4-year terms. The twenty-second amendment to the Constitution will prevent it.

Upon the occasion of the ratification of the twenty-second amendment to the United States Constitution yesterday by Nevada making the necessary majority, I wish to express the deep satisfaction I feel in the fact that this great reform has now become a permanent part of our Constitution.

The Republican Eightieth Congress was a Congress of significant accomplishment. Of the many valuable pieces of legislation that were enacted by that Congress, I believe the most important will prove to be the resolution limiting the President to two terms. In the years ahead historians will undoubtedly look back on the record of the Eightieth Congress and agree that it was the twenty-second amendment that had the greatest effect in shaping the future course of our Republic. The twenty-second amendment will prove to be our strongest barrier against a totalitarian government in this country. It will prevent any President of either party from acquiring a monopoly on the office and perpetuating himself in power by building up a huge machine that will control millions of votes. America does not want one-man government. That principle is the source of our strength, for it assures that ours will always be a government of the people—not of one man.

For 150 years every President of the United States obeyed the unwritten law against more than two terms. Many of them, including Washington, Jefferson and Jackson, spoke out emphatically against third or fourth terms. But we realized in 1940 that an unwritten law was not enough. The tradition had to be put in writing and given the force of a Constitutional amendment. The conduct of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations with their relentless drive toward a socialistic America is the best proof of the wisdom of the twenty-second amendment. Socialism is totalitarianism; the twenty-second amendment is directed against totalitarianism.

It is fitting that ratification of the new amendment has occurred so close to the anniversary of the birthday of Washington, who refused to serve more than two terms and believed he was establishing a precedent. I salute the 36 States that have already ratified the twenty-second amendment, and I hope that before long the remaining 12 States will see fit to approve the amendment as well. The people of America will always be grateful for what they have done.

Let's Build the St. Lawrence Waterway Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a most important project, and one that has been discussed for a number of years, is the St. Lawrence waterway. The close economic ties between the United States and Canada and the unity of the two Nations is now more important than ever from a standpoint of hemisphere defense.

We should draw the hearings and debate to a close and seek action in the very near future.

A number of important facts on the proposed St. Lawrence waterway have been brought out in an article published in the magazine, Inspiration, published at Duluth, Minn., by Charles L. Hood. For the information of the Members of Congress, I am inserting this article in the RECORD. It follows:

BUILD THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The St. Lawrence waterway is nothing new. In 1825 the Assembly of Lower Canada considered the idea of building canals around the rapids between Lake Ontario and Montreal. The thought developed and they were built wholly on Canadian soil and still today are the only aids to navigation. Smaller ocean boats make use of them but for many years the building of larger canals, dredging of channels and the generation of hydroelectric power has been urged by a joint commission of Canadians and Americans. Complete development of the river requires a treaty ratified by both governments. The only obstacle to opening the

Great Lakes to international communication are the small canals around the rapids in the river; the international section covering a distance of about 45 miles. Canada built the new Welland Canal around the Niagara; we built the larger Soo canal and did a lot of dredging. Opening these lakes by enlarging the waterway will create a fourth coastline reaching into the heart of North America. It has been said that a 27-foot channel will admit 90 percent of ocean-going craft. Doing so means that our productive power will forge ahead to new and greater heights.

Already a power shortage confronts this Nation, and although millions have been spent building power dams yet we continue neglecting the greatest undeveloped source of power on the St. Lawrence River. It is said that a total of 6,000,000 horsepower of electric energy is waiting to be made available, although present plans contemplate the generation of only 2,200,000 horsepower. The power-hungry districts of New York, New England, and Quebec are not only in dire need but will quickly use it for the common good.

Nature's law is inexorable: Either grow or die. Too long the progress of this Nation has been locked by failure to develop low-cost water-borne transportation and the wasted energy of a mighty river force whose aid would promote growth. Manufacturers cannot compete in world markets if over 300 miles from ocean coast. An illustration is that of a Duluth manufacturer who responded to a call for bids supplying some machinery to an English firm and notified of its acceptance. Seeking to learn about getting it there, he found that the all-rail shipment to the coast, and also the combined lake and rail shipment, plus the ocean haul and final rail shipment to its destination would eat up all the profit, resulting in rejecting the offered contract. Were it possible to have loaded that shipment in Duluth and unloaded it in Liverpool, the contract could have been accepted and money earned. Long rail haul and frequent handling bars such competition. While we are willing to spend billions for defense, yet the cost of failure to promote and develop national growth is much more expensive. Without St. Lawrence River power which can be produced at a third of the cost of steam-generated power, New York's only possibility of meeting demands to supply growth and defense would be to build steam plants. With the power shortage now existing, current rates are high, growth stifled, old industries consider moving out, new ones hesitate moving in, and 10 years of steam-generated power would pay New York's share for developing the St. Lawrence.

Four things are necessary to create a high standard of living:

1. Freedom to think and act.
2. Raw materials.
3. Creation of productive means.
4. Transportation.

Consider them:

1. Freedom of thought and action is guaranteed by our Constitution.

2. While we have large quantities of some raw materials, yet others must be bought in world markets.

3. No nation has equaled the United States in producing such vast quantities of agricultural and manufactured products, but great as that is it still can be multiplied.

4. Adequate transportation is necessary to get raw materials to producers at lowest cost and to consumers of finished products. Some must be transported in quicker time, hence all form of water, rail, and air communications are needed.

Consider the Department of Commerce report on potential traffic via the St. Lawrence waterway, listing four bulk commodities moving through it.

1. Grain—six and one-half million tons annually to seven and a half million tons. Estimates of savings to farmers amounting to 10 cents per bushel are not excessive, but realizing that agriculturists constitute such a large part of our citizenry, and one of the largest buying groups, money added to their income is reflected in greater prosperity.

2. Petroleum: Six million tons likely increasing to 20,000,000 tons. The demand for oil is constantly increasing. Imports of oil will move upward but with Canadian Oil going down the Lakes and an open waterway, it likely will become an export product thereby increasing tonnage movement.

3. Coal: Four to six million tons. A few million tons will enter our ports but it affords a far greater opportunity to export American coal abroad. Look to Buffalo to become a great coal export center.

4. Iron: Thirty to thirty-seven and a half million tons annually. This latter item is of intense concern because the right answer will yield increased national prosperity. The wrong answer will be a serious blow to millions of Midwest citizens. Waterways are instruments of commerce, increasing the value of merchandise by transporting from producer to consumer at lower cost, or the obtaining of raw materials. As lower cost increases the number of buyers, a clear understanding for the necessity of bringing Labrador ore to central State smelters and mills will be gained by considering the related facts.

This Nation has drawn heavily on its raw material resources. Particularly is this true of iron. For many years the Lake Superior region has supplied 85 percent of national requirements of iron ore, and the Mesaba Range contributed most of it, supplying American industry with the iron that made possible the greatest productive power the world has ever known, but building our industrial machine, plus two wars have exhausted the major part. Another war would so far exhaust the balance that with Mesaba ores depleted, other United States mines could not supply more than a third of the amount necessary to keep mills operating at full capacity. Knowing that the last war subtracted 121,000,000 tons from the Hull-Rust group of mines at Hibbing, Minn., surely it will not be difficult to realize that no mine can operate indefinitely at that rate of withdrawal. Other mines were correspondingly affected.

Labrador ores are vitally needed to conserve the remaining Mesaba ores, at least while the processing of taconite ore is being sought. It is true that there are billions of tons of this low-grade ore, but methods of effecting commercial recovery is still in the making. Mining companies have spent millions of dollars in building test or pilot plants and research but the big question remains—can a merchantable ore be produced at costs that will meet the competition of other ores? Although much time has been spent in seeking a solution, yet up to date no commercial plant has been evolved. The iron occurs in two forms: a magnetite and a hematite. Both need crushing to a powdery form to extract the iron particles. From there on, different processes are used to effect a final recovery. Heavy, expensive machinery is necessary; solidly built plants to house them, separation and washing plants, and finally a method of fusing the fine ore to prepare it for the smelter. To produce the equivalent amount of iron as is now mined will require the best part of a billion-dollar investment and upwards of 20 years of time obtaining the necessary equipment, installing and getting it to working satisfactorily. What will Midwest mills do in the meantime?

This will be best understood by considering the location of mills and smelters and why they are there. The automobile industry is an excellent example of cost. High cost of early autos meant only a few buyers. Selling later ones for a few hundred dollars put America on wheels. Reducing cost increased the number of purchasers. What applies to autos applies also to every other product. As this Nation operates under the profit system and costs of assembling raw materials is a factor, then the area where all materials can be brought together at lowest cost is the best. Doubly so when it also is the largest consuming market.

Ten States, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri represent that low-cost section. More than 50 percent of iron and steel products are produced within those States. Competent authority says that the section comprising Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Chicago contribute more than 75 percent of blast furnace capacity. These mills are there because Lake Superior ore is unloaded from the boats with only short rail hauls, 126 miles from Ashtabula to Pittsburgh; 177 miles, Toledo to Hamilton, Ohio; 249 miles to Ashland, Ky. Where then can these Midwest mills turn for a supply? Consider relative distances. From Duluth to Ashtabula, 876 miles; from Seven Islands (shipping point for Labrador ore) to Ashtabula, 952 miles. If the St. Lawrence is not opened to general navigation so that Labrador ore can be unloaded at lake ports, then that ore will go down the coast some 1,550 miles to Baltimore, or other coast towns. The distance from Baltimore to Pittsburgh, Ashland, or Hamilton by rail is more than double that now used to transport ore. Longer hauls mean extra cost in getting raw materials, thereby increasing the cost of steel. When costs of assembly become too high, moving to a more suitable location is a solution. This being true, stockholders will resist the idea of letting their investments wither on the limb and quickly demand that plants be moved to the ocean coast or north into Canada where large supplies of high-grade ore are available. It literally means that two of every three Midwest plants are threatened with being torn up by the roots and relocated in congested areas along the coast. That such a move would be little short of a calamity to millions of people is readily understood. Such a dislocation of our economic structure as it would create will take years to effect a readjustment. Viewing the enormous national debt, any let down in production may have serious consequences.

Finally, the problem of our national defense must be thoroughly and intelligently considered. Bringing Labrador ore through an interior waterway affords greater protection to transport than can be given boats on the open sea. During the last war, one convoy bound for Murmansk, Russia, lost more than half its fleet on a single trip. Today's improved means of destruction has a serious import. In fact we dare not depend, in time of war, on ocean transport for a supply of iron. Interior waterways can be protected by submarines, submarine nets, coast artillery, and antiaircraft guns. Boats plying between the Seven Islands and lake ports would have maximum protection.

Moving steel plants to the coast adds greatly to the hazard of protection. In the last war, flights of enemy bombers bent on attack, clearly indicated that a majority of them would be successful in reaching the area of objective. Can coast mills successfully hope to escape? Guided missiles from surfacing submarines may well be within the picture. Instead of concentrating industry in vulnerable spots along the sea coast, move them into the interior for greater safety.

Needless delay in ratifying the treaty is retarding the growth of this country and Canada. If the Canadians are restless because of our unwarranted delay in carrying out the agreement to build the waterway, then realize that they have an escape route from the enforced stagnation. They can enlarge their own small canals or build bigger ones on their own soil, and that without a treaty. That some have been urging such a course is not surprising. Should they do so, the power developed will be their own and we will pay such tolls for using the waterway as they impose. Considering what we have already invested toward completing the waterway, will it be wisdom to sacrifice the millions of dollars already spent by failing to go ahead, when Canada has already invested four times the amount we have and yet ready to join with us in mutual promotion of that great enterprise? Dare we neglect developing the power resource when that at Massena would equal the entire output of the Tennessee Valley project.

Decentralization of industry has long been urged, but industry cannot be decentralized unless adequate low-cost transportation enables them to supply their customers. Firms located on the sea coast and competing in world markets dare not move inland unless ocean shipping follows them. Only the seaway will make decentralization possible.

Tolls will repay the cost of building. We pay only our share for navigation. New York State pays the cost of electric power installations.

With these Lakes open to international navigation, the power thus made available would have shortened the last war. It would have furnished the energy necessary to sustain the increased war effort. Lake shipyards could have aided such construction and all would have forged ahead much faster.

Realizing that 75 percent of blast furnace capacity is between the points mentioned; that more than 50 percent of iron and steel products are made and consumed within that same section, surely then before deciding to plunge the country into an economic readjustment by moving the steel mills, the resulting loss of employment and necessary slow down before we could get moving again, some soul searching may help determine whether national welfare precedes that of selfish interest. Ratify that treaty and build for the future on sound grounds of live and let live.

How to Surprise Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Farm Journal entitled "How To Surprise Congress":

HOW TO SURPRISE CONGRESS

Not spending money apparently is the hardest thing a government faces. Spending is easy. Everybody seems to like that. Paying the bill is not so pleasant.

The President urges economy in all but defense. That's what he says.

What he does is quite different. He has asked Congress to appropriate nearly $10,000,000,000 for purposes other than defense. For the same class of purposes back in 1946 Government got along with $3,600,000,000—nearly two-thirds less—and that seemed needlessly extravagant then.

Unless public opinion sharply notifies Congress that the people do not want $10,000,000,000 added to their tax burden, the money no doubt will be voted.

Senator BYRD suggests that by watching a few corners on defense and by trimming closely on other expenditures, the total budget for next year can be reduced by $9,100,000,000. That would be a long step toward making things come out more nearly even, so that the Government would not be putting out more than it would be taking in.

Someone will be in Washington to appear before the Appropriations Committees in favor of every one of the vast expenditures proposed by the President. Some one, probably some one now on the Federal payroll, will be there to argue that the money is badly needed; probably to argue that it will help the defense program.

Nearly every Member of Congress will get a few letters from home, perhaps receive a delegation or so, pressing him to support and get other Members to support this or that little appropriation of interest to his district or State. He will also get some letters urging him to economize, but on something else. He will take all this in stride as part of his job.

One thing, though, will make him sit up and take notice. If he begins to get letters saying: "Sure, we want this, but not now. We can get along at least until after the defense business has been paid for"—if he gets a few letters like that he will be so surprised that he will do something about them. He will realize that some people put a solvent country and a safe dollar above their other immediate interests.

Is there a spending proposal affecting your area or your particular interests that can wait? If so, your letter to a Congressman, or the resolution of your organization, can serve your country well.

For involved in all this is far more than the ordinary prudence of Government economy. The future value of the dollar is at stake. Needless spending now will not only cause needless taxes, but more deficit borrowing; and that means higher prices and more inflation.

Here is a time and a place where responsible citizenship has a job to do.

Pearson: Always Sniping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a piece by Westbrook Pegler and his own column shed light on Drew Pearson's almost daily efforts to smear anyone and everyone who opposes the New Deal or who is disliked by Red sympathizers:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

This will be an unadorned statement showing that Drew Pearson plugged for Army commissions for Communists in his column which was published in many papers.

Already, I have exposed Pearson's ballyhoo in behalf of John Gates, who became a Communist in 1933 and was editor-in-chief of the Daily Worker. Gates was one of the notorious 11 Communist Party leaders who were convicted in Judge Medina's Federal court in New York of conspiring to overthrow the National Government.

Pearson apparently was in close communication with Gates, because, in his column in the Washington Post of April 14, 1943, he quoted verbatim from a letter which he said Gates had written to President Roosevelt demanding that he be allowed to "fight for his country."

Subsequently, Gates testified that he would not fight for the United States against Russia. In no case where he pleaded for a commission for an individual did Pearson intimate that the individual was a Communist.

Not only was Gates editor in chief of the Worker, he had been a colonel in Stalin's foreign legion in the Spanish civil war. He had been an organizer of the Young Communist League in Youngstown, Ohio, in 1933, where he was active in the riotous insurrections against the authority of our Government.

He was also director of veterans' affairs for the Communist Party and director of its legislative program. He joined the party in 1933. Pearson did not say that Gates was an assumed name.

In the same column, Pearson lauded Capt. Hermann Battcher, whom he described as the Sergeant York of the Pacific. Without any reference to communism, Pearson wrote that when men who had joined the Lincoln brigade in Spain enlisted in the American Army, they were cross-questioned as though they were social outcasts.

He did not say that the Lincoln brigade was Stalin's foreign legion. Captain Battcher got into the American Army early before the War Department clamped down a thinly veiled discrimination against veterans of the Abraham Lincoln brigade, and thus was able to become a captain.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, an analysis of Pearson's pro-Communist propaganda, inserted by Senator JOE MCCARTHY, states that Battcher was a member of the Communist Party.

In his column of June 1, 1943, in the Washington Post, Pearson complained that Malcolm C. Dobbs had the duty at one Army post of helping his colonel keep a record of his winnings on the races. Presently he was sent to a post which serves as a dumping ground for undesirables. He depicted Dobbs as an admirable young man and good officer material.

The Daily Worker, the official Communist paper, on December 19, 1940, listed Dobbs as one of a group who signed a petition to waive criminal charges against a notorious Communist.

In its story on the American Peace Mobilization, in Chicago, in September 1940, the Worker published a picture of Dobbs and identified him as "one of three young southerners" who took part in the mobilization, and as "president of the League of Young Southerners." This Chicago meeting, held during the alliance between Hitler and Stalin, opposed "war and conscription." Pearson said nothing about that.

On April 14, 1943, Pearson wrote that Sgt. Irving Fajans, on the eve of graduation from an officers' school at Fort Benning, had been told he could not graduate and was transferred to another post. The Daily Worker of March 28, 1943, listed a man of the same name as a member of the Communist Party.

Irving Fajans also is listed as a member of the national board of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Also on April 14, 1943, Pearson complained that "for some mysterious and unexplained reason" Morris Brier, who had soldiered in Spain, was denied a commission after he had qualified for one in an officer candidates' school.

"These," Pearson wrote "are only a few of many cases in which an unseen hand, similar to the influences found in both the State and War Departments in the past, have (sic) reached in to penalize youngsters who were farsighted enough to see what was going on in Spain and to risk their lives to stop it."

A man of the same name, Morris Brier, is listed as a leader of the Young Communist League in New York, in the Young Communist Weekly Review of May 19, 1942. A man of the same name is listed also as a speaker

along with the old battle-ax, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, on a program at the Premier Palace, Brownsville, Brooklyn, January 16, 1950, to get subscriptions for the Daily Worker.

A man of the same name also is shown in a picture in the Daily Worker, May 19, 1942, feeding a belt into a machinegun. The scene was said to be Spain.

THE DAILY WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Probably the only American who has ever met Stalin's mother is Carleton Smith, director of the National Arts Foundation, who, while traveling near Tiflis in 1936, was taken to a village where Stalin's mother lived.

Her home was a mud hut dug out of the side of a hill, and she proved to be a wrinkled, kindly old lady. Telling Smith how she had raised her son to be a priest, the old lady added:

"I hear he's now running all of Russia, but I don't believe it."

A year later Smith was in Moscow at the Bolshoi Theater when Stalin was also present, and had an interview with the Russian dictator. Among other things, he told him about the visit to his mother.

Stalin maintained an icy silence. He did not seem interested in his mother.

VICTORY IN KOREA

Gen. Matthew Ridgway personally is largely credited with turning the most humiliating defeat in 85 years of American military history into gradual victory in Korea.

Military men say that Ridgway has done an amazing job. Yet he did it with almost no reinforcements and with a larger number of enemy forces against him than faced UN forces when General MacArthur was in direct command. For an estimated Chinese force of 276,000 men plus 191,000 revitalized North Koreans face Ridgway today, more than the Communist army that knocked MacArthur off balance in North Korea and drove him back across the thirty-eighth parallel.

Not generally publicized is that almost sole responsibility in Korea has now been given to General Ridgway. For all practical purposes, MacArthur has been relieved of the fighting Korean command. Technically, of course, this is not true, because MacArthur still remains supreme commander. Actually, however, MacArthur virtually washed his hands of the Korean War after Washington refused to send him the four National Guard divisions he requested early in January.

Furthermore, Ridgway, coming direct to Korea from the United States has been more independent than the field generals who had served under MacArthur in Japan and who, having been close to him, looked to him for direction.

Pentagon officials emphasize that there has been no friction between MacArthur and General Ridgway. The latter has merely used different tactics. He has quietly shaken up his command at the divisional level, has profited from MacArthur's mistakes, has given the UN Army a new shot in the arm and has turned a defeat complex on the part of the troops into a new fighting spirit.

THE DAILY WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Some Senators seem to believe that it is a criminal matter for a newspaper to criticize military mistakes. This is a view also shared by many brass hats, though not all.

However, mistakes are sometimes rectified chiefly through knowing about them, and a case in point is the magnificent manner in which Gen. Matthew Ridgway has profited from the mistakes of General MacArthur in turning a tragic defeat into Korean victory.

While the very loyal MacArthur clique may argue that he is still supreme commander in Tokyo and, therefore, deserves credit for the current victory, the indisputable facts are that General Ridgway was sent to Korea direct from Washington where he had been deputy Chief of Staff and, as such, was in close contact with the Pentagon's views of warfare. It is also an indisputable fact that Ridgway won his victory with no fresh troops and facing a somewhat strong r enemy than MacArthur.

According to military observers who read the battle dispatches, here is how Ridgway profited by mistakes and accomplished his remarkable feat.

Careful intelligence; MacArthur conducted only limited patrolling for 3 or 4 days before launching his attack. Then after the attack boomeranged, the Eighthy Army retreated so fast it lost all contact with the enemy and for several weeks didn't know where the Communists were.

In contrast, Ridgway conducted aggressive patrolling for 8 to 10 days before kicking off his offensive. He sent heavy patrols deep into enemy territory in so-called "reconnaissance in force." His orders were to disrupt any Communist build-up, to inflict as many casualties as possible, and to survey enemy positions. The lack of patrolling by MacArthur failed to detect the Chinese Communist build-up that swept our armies back to the 38th parallel. However, Ridgway's troops knew exactly what to expect.

Public relations: MacArthur announced his offensive the same morning it was launched, predicting his troops would be "home by Christmas." Ridgway waited until his offensive had been rolling over 24 hours before announcing it.

Poor battle liaison: MacArthur struck in all directions at once. His troops were fanned out from one end of North Korea to the other, in no position to head off a surprise counterattack. The Eighth Army and Tenth Corps also had no battle liaison, had to coordinate their actions through Tokyo.

In contrast, Ridgway opened his attack on the western front, but didn't order his eastern front to move until 9 days later—after he was sure all was going well. He had the added advantage of being in full command in the field, and wasn't forced to direct two fronts by remote control from Tokyo.

Contrast in casualties: MacArthur suffered devastating casualties after the Chinese hit, lost more than 15,000 casualties in 2 weeks. Later, the Marines, who broke out of the Chosin Reservoir trap, mowed down the Chinese at a ratio of 20 to 1. However, Ridgway's losses during the first 2 weeks of his offensive were the lightest of the Korean War. He suffered less than 1,500 casualties, at the same time taking a toll of 52,000 Communist casualties.

In fairness to MacArthur and in tribute to the Air Force, Ridgway has been meeting more scattered opposition. This is largely because the Air Force has raked enemy positions with devastating fire bombs and rocket fire. Ridgway's aggressive armored patrols also killed and rooted out Communists along the path of the offensive.

Stop Abolition of VA Contact Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass.:

NEEDED: MORE PRESSURE

It is indeed heartening to see that at least one local veterans' organization and the Chelsea Board of Aldermen are awake to the threat of a needless hardship which is due to be imposed on veterans and their dependents from this city and surrounding areas.

But if enough pressure is to be brought to bear on those who can do something about the impending closing of the Chelsea VA office, added strength must be forthcoming from areas outside this city which have hundreds of veterans who have been aided in their VA problem here in the past and who will need this aid in the future.

Statistics compiled at the Chelsea city hall VA office show that during 1950, 13,919 contacts had been made between the officials here and veterans, their wives and children in need of aid and advice. In addition, 831 correspondence forms were prepared here, 2,753 other forms, and 2,026 benefit applications handled through this office.

Of the thousands of persons helped, 50 percent were from this city; 30 percent from Revere; 10 percent from Winthrop and the remainder from East Boston and Everett.

For all this service, the VA has had only to pay the salaries of its two-person office staff. All other costs are borne by the city.

The closing of the Chelsea office on April 1 will hurt these out-of-towners just as much as those Chelsea veterans who will be forced to undergo the trip to Boston and the confusion and hub-bub of the intown headquarters.

If a protest movement is to be of any value, all the local vet organizations must make their feelings known to our national legislators, as well as the municipal governments and veteran groups of other cities whose veterans have been courteously and efficiently served here.

Address of Rev. Edward A. Keller, C. S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the RECORD a copy of a speech by Rev. Edward A. Keller, C. S. C., director of the bureau of economic research, Notre Dame University, which he delivered at Los Angeles.

Father Keller is an able economist and a great American. He has made and is making a fine contribution to the religious and civic life here.

Father Keller points the way in this speech to maintain the American way of life here in America.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE LOS ANGELES ROTARY CLUB, JANUARY 26, 1951, BY REV. EDWARD A. KELLER, C. S. C., DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH, NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY

The present emergency has created an hysteria which makes very difficult, if not impossible, a clear, rational appraisal of the problems that confront us as a Nation. Such an appraisal would necessarily take into consideration the fact that we are entering upon a period of emergency which will extend over many years, 10, 15, maybe even 25 years; we really are entering upon a new way of life not merely a temporary emergency. Because of the lengthy duration of the emergency, programs should not be adopted except those which will assure,

at the termination of the emergency, the preservation of our free institutions.

The actual policies adopted have not been carefully and objectively thought out. We have adopted or are about to adopt policies of such rigid controls over the life of our Nation, that their only effect can be a totalitarian type of regimentation. Now for the first time in our history, either in peace or war, plans to draft and regiment all manpower are being seriously proposed. It would be a tragic victory, indeed, if in defeating world communism we enslaved ourselves with the same chains of totalitarian regimentation that have destroyed all personal freedom in the Communist countries of the world. The Council of Economic Advisers in their December 1950 report to the President advised: "It is superficial and dangerous to conclude that a defense emergency must convert us into a totalitarian state."

The Council of Economic Advisers further stated:

"The popular discussion of controls versus voluntary action has tended to obscure a very basic issue. This issue is what middle ground between the freedoms we enjoy in normal peacetime and the unlimited compulsions of a State economy will maximize our strength for the task ahead. To assume that there is no middle ground would be to acknowledge that we can contest Stalin's aggressive designs effectively only by aping all of his methods. That would also assume that in peacetime there are many differences between our kind of economy and political institutions and those of the Soviets, but that in a hot or cold war there are no differences. The whole history of our achievements in war no less than in peace belies these naive assumptions." (The Economics of National Defense, Fifth Annual Report to the President by the Council of Economic Advisers, December 1950, p. 24.)

I would question the advisability of scrapping, without trial, the middle way of voluntary cooperative action to solve the problems that lie ahead with a minimum of mandatory controls. Such a program was advocated by former President Hoover at the beginning of the Second World War before a congressional committee on December 16, 1941, on the basis of experience gained from the First World War. Mr. Hoover pointed out that the controls in the First World War were exercised by committees representing industry, trade, agriculture, etc. These committees did the policing required by the voluntary controls. They operated under the direction of Government officials, with the full authority of the law back of them. In other words, the controls were operated by private citizens, not by bureaucrats. The results were outstanding: Under the Food Control Act of World War I, 250,000 licenses were issued, of which only 200 were canceled for repeated and most grievous violations. There were 8,000 cases of violation of the Food Control Act, of which most were dismissed; the others were dismissed upon the making of a contribution to the Red Cross. Mr. Hoover in his testimony made the following wise comments:

"I should like to emphasize the necessity of more organized voluntary cooperation to effect these ends now that we are actually in war. Nothing affects so many people and requires such delicate handling if morale is not to be impaired as these control measures. It is a job of steering between the rocks of economic disturbance through rising costs of living, legitimate and stimulative prices to producers, avoidance of the appearance of dictatorial action which creates resentment and trespasses upon the accepted freedoms of men as little as possible.

"It seems to me that every industry, trade, and calling involved in war action that is not already organized (and some are already set up) should be organized by calling upon such groups to appoint their own committees, whose leadership they will accept, freely to represent them. Before any of these measures are put in action effort should be made to come to voluntary agreements covering many of these problems. The industries and trades can invent and put into action far more increased production and conservation measures than any governmental agency can think of. They can in most cases be brought to agree upon prices, margins, and other measures in this category. They can do a large job in rationing, especially of industrial commodities, among their members where that is necessary. The only force necessary in such cases would be upon the small fringe that will not comply.

"I need scarcely mention that this was the fundamental basis of our actions in World War I. And I may mention here that the Commodity Control Act in that war contained the following provision: 'That in carrying out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to enter into any voluntary arrangements or agreements, to create and use any agency or agencies, to accept the services of any person without compensation, to cooperate with any agency or person.'

"We availed ourselves of this authority every hour of the day, and 90 percent of restraint on prices and the other measures was accomplished in this fashion.

"That a large measure of controls as to price and other measures can be effected by voluntary agreement and cooperation is therefore not conjecture. And in many fields the powers to enforce were rarely, if ever, required. The whole Food Administration, the War Industries Board, and the Commercial Economy Board, under Mr. Arch W. Shaw, which subsequently became the Conservation Division of the War Industries Board, from the first relied upon agreement and persuasive powers, although always conscious of the fact that there was authority behind them.

"At once our great industrial raw materials, which are produced and distributed by limited groups, can be controlled by voluntary agreements with a modicum of legal authority to compel some minor dissenter to go along. It is more difficult in the widespread consumption industries, but it can be done to large extent.

"We have to remember also that we have 130,000,000 people widely spread and in varying economic surroundings in which cooperation is far more flexible than forced regulation. Our basis of action in the United States during World War I was entirely different from the formula applied during that time in France, England, and Germany. They were all pretty hard and fast mandatory systems. Often enough these systems were accepted as a challenge to a battle of evasion and ingenious violation. They required elaborate and exasperating policing that resulted in large expense and a great waste of energy. Their effect on the popular morale was most demoralizing and the results were not as effective as our American methods. * * *

"I dwell upon this subject of voluntary agreement for reasons which I believe are of the first importance. I may repeat that we are 130,000,000 ingenious and intelligent people. Our fundamental sense of freedoms makes force measures most irksome. We are naturally suspicious of all governmental interference even in war. Yet, on the other hand, ours are the most cooperative people in the world and the most willing to make sacrifice. It is this spirit which I hope will be invoked in the formulation and administration of these measures. Moreover, nothing will more greatly give confidence that our social and economic system will be preserved than cooperative action." (Addresses Upon the American Road, 1941–45, by Herbert Hoover, pp. 151–154.)

As you all know, Mr. Hoover's advice was not followed. Instead of adopting a voluntary, cooperative system of controls, the Government imposed a system of rigid, mandatory controls operated by bureaucrats. "Rigid general price and wage controls do not fit the present situation, for they only postpone the effects but do not prevent inflation as we learned in World War II." (A. F. of L.'s Labor's Monthly Survey November-December 1950.) The rigid controls of the last war curtailed production, created black markets whose prices became the real market prices once the controls were taken off.

It is very doubtful whether during this very long-drawn-out emergency the effects of inflation can be postponed for 10 or 25 years. Most likely the controls, which merely put the lid on the steaming kettle of inflation, will at some time be blown off by the inflation. The only way this could be prevented would be by converting us into a totalitarian state.

But it is argued with prices rising as rapidly as they have in the last 6 months, mandatory controls had to be imposed; voluntary cooperation simply could not work. I maintain that voluntary controls could not work because an all-out effort to make them work was never tried. With their war experience of shortages and black-market prices so vividly in their minds, our people could not be expected to act any differently than they have done in the last 6 month.

Despite the fact that it is now idle speculation, I think, that if our Government had promised the people that no rationing or price or wage controls would be imposed and if the Federal Government had appealed to the American people in their own self-interest for cooperative action in fighting inflation and meeting the other problems of the emergency, the American people would have responded wholeheartedly. However, with the beginning of the Korean war the impression was given that controls would be inevitable. The natural effect could only have been the panic buying of last summer and the drive since by organized labor to increase its wages to beat the wage freeze, and the drive by management to increase prices to beat the price freeze.

This does not preclude, however, the adoption even now or at a later date when the hysteria has died down, of an all-out effort to try the middle-ground system of voluntary controls advocated by Mr. Hoover and bolstered by the indirect controls of tax and fiscal policies.

I am convinced that the rigid controls that we have already imposed and in the future will impose, if continued for 10, 15, or 25 years, will make it impossible for us to survive a free nation. While there might be justification for the imposition of such rigid controls at the beginning of a hot war whose termination is expected to be a matter of a few years, the imposition of such controls over the period of the present emergency will mean that our people will be so conditioned over the next 10 or 15 years to such regimentation that it will be impossible ever to take off the controls. It is my firm conviction, therefore, that we cannot and will not emerge from this period of so-called emergency, with our fundamental freedoms intact.

I realize full well the grave problems confronting this Nation at the present time; the problem of avoiding inflation and of getting sufficient productivity to make possible our keeping a step ahead of the Communist regime.

The best method of controlling inflation is by the indirect controls of tax and credit policies. We must adopt as an anti-inflation program the pay-as-you-go policy. This would necessarily entail the increasing of taxes all down the line to get as much revenue by this method as possible, and

to sop up defense-created excess income. It would be grossly misleading, however, to permit our people to believe that adequate tax return can be obtained by soaking the rich. If all the income of those in the upper income bracket were taken by taxation the revenue obtained would not cover Government expenses except for a short period. Therefore, a pay-as-you-go program necessarily will mean that most of the increased tax burden will have to be borne by individuals and families in the middle and lower income brackets.

Even the American Federation of Labor admitted this when it said:

"Millions of workers will have more money to spend in 1951. Overtime pay will increase, more will be employed, and wages are rising. Business' income will increase too, but more of this will be taken in taxes and much of the rest must be spent for plant expansion. This new income, earned by workers and management in manufacturing military equipment, will total at least $20,000,000,000 per year * * * Most of the new income will be paid to workers * * * Much of the new tax money will be raised by heavier taxes on business; but business cannot foot the whole bill. As workers we must bear our share of the tax load. For total workers' income is 40 percent more than all other groups combined—business, farmers, management and investors." (Labor's Monthly Survey, American Federation of Labor, November-December 1950.)

However, with an announced budget next year of $71,000,000,000, I doubt if adequate tax revenue can be raised. Therefore, the Government will be forced to adopt a program of borrowing. If the borrowing is from private individuals and nonfinancial corporations, such borrowing would not be inflationary because it would result in the transfer of already existing purchasing power in the hands of private individuals to the Government. If, however, the Government, for whatever reason, refuses to face up to the realities and refuses, by taxation and by borrowing from private individuals to take the necessary income from the great mass of the people, the Government will be forced to resort again to deficit-financing on a large scale. Such a program will by its very nature, be extremely inflationary, since it would amount merely to the creation of new money through the monetization of the national debt. If, over the long period of the emergency the Federal Government resorts to such monetization of the national debt it will create such an inflation as to make even the most mandatory rigid controls ineffective. Such an inflation would destroy our economy as surely as a military defeat.

I would point out that if the Federal Government demands such sacrifices of its citizens the Government itself should set the example of equal or greater sacrifices by the elimination of all unnecessary nondefense expenditure. A recent report of a House Investigating Committee showed a very large amount of overstaffing in all the agencies of the executive branch of our Federal Government. The report stated that there are a minimum of 500,000 unnecessary Government employees. Discharging of these unnecessary civilian employees would bring a saving of at least $2,000,000,000 a year. At the same time it would give to our economy 500,000 much needed workers. Other gains by way of elimination of unnecessary expenditures by Federal, State, and local governments would bring an estimated savings of at least $10,000,000,000 a year.

The recent budget message of the President showed no evidence on the part of the Federal Government to effect any real economy in nondefense spending despite the fact that in his state of the Union message the President promised that nondefense would be cut to the bone. Fortunately, we have in Congress such men as Senator BYRD who said Congress would cut $7,000,000,000 out of the proposed budget.

The second great problem confronting this Nation is that of maintaining and increasing the productivity of our industrial and agricultural plant. Since the enemy which confronts us both on the battle front and on the home front outnumbers us on a ratio of about 15 to 1, obviously our only hope of ultimate victory is to close that great gap by increasing the productivity of our outnumbered workers. Increased productivity is also the second most important curb on inflation.

Three things will be essential to increase productivity at the required rate:

1. More efficient management in the utilization of our limited natural resources.

2. Greater work effort on the part of our workers (which might necessitate a return to a 44-hour week).

3. The giving to our workers more and better tools to work with.

However, the improvement and expansion of the tools of production to meet the extraordinary defense demands and maintain our standard of living will require tremendous capital funds. In the five postwar years most of the funds for the great expansion and improvement program we have enjoyed came from plowed-back earnings. From 1946 through 1949 corporations plowed back, after taxes, 62 percent of their earnings and paid out in dividends to the stockholders only 38 percent. In the 1950 report of the Council of Economic Advisers it was pointed out that profits over the next 5 or 10 years would have to be maintained at the present level or increased to get the necessary funds for expansion and improvement since in their estimation profits would remain the main source of capital funds for the expansion and improvement of the tools of production.

The grave problem confronting us then is that with increased taxation upon corporation earnings and especially with the imposition of an excess-profits tax, capital funds will not be adequate from this source to finance the absolutely essential program of increasing production per worker. True, some relief will be obtained by permitting rapid amortization of defense facilities; this, however, will not be sufficient.

The only remaining private source of capital funds will be the savings of individuals in the middle-income brackets, because savings as well as income are concentrated in their hands. I would, therefore, advocate a program of austerity savings by all our people and the investment of these savings in corporate stock. We would by this method make as broad as possible the ownership of American business; prevent socialism by keeping the ownership of business in the hands of private individuals and lastly prevent inflation by curtailing spending and by furnishing adequate capital funds for the expansion and improvement of the tools of production upon which will depend our survival in this long drawn-out war against world communism. I fully realize what a burden will be imposed on those in the middle-income bracket by heavy taxes and the purchase of Government bonds and corporate stock, but I am certain that if the great mass of Americans realize that their survival as a free people depends on this, they will come through with flying colors.

If adequate funds cannot be obtained by this means then it looks as though the main source of funds will be the Federal Government. The financing of a program of expansion by Government funds over a long emergency will spell the death knell of our private-enterprise system because we will end the period with such a large amount of Government ownership as to have effective socialism.

In conclusion, I would advocate eternal vigilance on the part of our people of their basic liberties. They should demand that Congress set up a "watchdog committee" to see that any controls imposed do not encroach more than is absolutely essential upon their liberties. They should further demand that a time limit of 1 year be put upon every control so Congress can each year scrutinize the effect of the control and question its renewal. Finally, they should demand that mandatory controls be completely terminated as soon as possible and that a system of voluntary controls by cooperative action be substituted as soon as possible.

I could not conclude with a better quotation than that of the American Federation of Labor:

"Because Moscow's war against the free world may last 10 or even 20 years, and because we face a long period of sacrifice and hard work on the home front, it is essential that we organize our effort so that those free and voluntary institutions which are our greatest strength may be preserved and may serve us now. The dynamic quality of our economy which has its roots in free alert citizens has made America the most productive country in the world. This will be our basic weapon in fighting an enemy that hopes to force its tyrannical controls on all nations, and to eliminate self-government throughout the world. The people know how grave the situation is. If labor, management, and farmers are consulted and given the facts to make clear their duties and responsibilities, they will do their part.

"A self-governing country cannot mobilize its full powers without voluntary organization through which to channel the joint efforts of its free citizens who are responsible for economic life—whether they are management, labor, farmers, bankers, or consumers, and so forth. We are fortunate that dependable voluntary organizations already exist in these groups. It remains only to coordinate them under the Defense Administration so that a united effort will result—to get out defense equipment with all speed and to maintain the life and welfare of our Nation. Such coordination can easily be accomplished, as President Green has suggested. He proposes that Defense Authorities consult with joint committees composed of representatives from management, labor, farm, and other organizations, and that these committees be responsible (1) to cooperate in formulating defense policies, (2) to mobilize their membership for compliance and maximum effort. By providing for such joint committees at national, industry, and plant levels and by arranging for periodic meetings with factual information on developments and reports on compliance, this voluntary organization could become the basic force for effective action on the home front in the years ahead. Free men will find the best way when they have the facts before them and an organization through which they can participate.

"Production and inflation control require joint effort in which each group performs a necessary agreed-on function in accord with plans made by the joint committee. The effort to stop increases in automobile prices was an example of the unnecessary difficulties arising when representatives of the industry are not called in to work with the Defense Administration, study the facts and develop satisfactory methods for voluntary controls. Obviously what happens in steel affects automobiles and many other industries and all must hold the line if a price ceiling is to stay firm. The defense effort must be based on the principle of equal sacrifice. The main function of Government is to see that sacrifices are equal, to furnish information, call together the organizations of labor, management, and others, and coordinate all plans and activies, but not to dominate or dictate." (Labor's Monthly Survey, November-December 1950, pp. 2-3.)

Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include part of my remarks at the dedication of the Armenian Community Center at Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 25, 1951:

The Armenian people are one of the oldest races in this world.

Your homeland lies between the Black and Caspian Seas, partly in Russia and partly in Turkey.

It is the northern gateway to the rich and important oil fields of the Middle East, and to the land bridge between Europe and Asia.

Your ancestors had to be tough in order to survive.

Small in number, they have come through wars and conquests, because they have strong bodies and strong will-power.

Love of their land and of their families are the reasons why Armenians are a brave and a proud people.

Many times through history, conquerors have swept across your country, killing and stealing and leaving only the bare, scorched earth behind them.

Time and time again, Armenia seemed doomed by the cruel and savage lust of invaders who resented the fact that you would not bow the knee to them, and in their fury tried to turn your meadows and your mountains into lifeless desert.

But Armenians had an inner source of strength that neither sword nor fire could reach.

That unconquerable spirit was based on your belief in the Creator of all things—and of your right to live according to His teachings, devoted to your families, at peace with your neighbors, filling the years with good and productive effort.

Having weathered all the fierce moods of Nature, from the pleasing winds and blazing summer suns that tried to rout you from the highlands, you had developed the vigor to endure the persecutions of man.

After each wave of aggression had passed over you, and the crimes of evil men had been locked up in history, you struggled to your feet once more and out of the ruins began to build again.

Armenia is not too far away from the place where the Son of God came upon this earth. As His message spread to you, there came the wisdom of His infinite patience.

The experience of your people, tested as they have been by physical and human forces that seemed to be completely lacking in mercy, has proved to you that the faith of man in God gives him a power greater than all others combined, and more.

It is this that has enabled the people of Armenia to rise above all fear and suffering. And they sent it as a gift through their sons and daughters to America.

You and I, and the descendants of all those other people who were persecuted elsewhere, have found sanctuary in this New World where we are building together a society of mutual understanding and respect.

I am of Irish ancestry. I am naturally proud of the culture that I inherit, and I am glad to see the contributions it is making to the glorious progress of the United States.

But that is not all.

If I confined myself narrowly to this I would miss the splendid talent and character that all other peoples are pouring into the veins of our Nation.

Never before has there been such an experience in human fellowship like the one that is succeeding in the United States today.

Here we are witnessing the intermarriage of races and the creation of one human family where all are partners.

And the secret of this is that one does not try to dominate the other and force the surrender of that precious quality that is known as the soul of a man or a woman.

This Sunday marks a real achievement for those citizens of Greater Lawrence who treasure the values that are honored by the name of Armenian.

At last you have a community center of your own where you can meet in a group larger than your immediate family circle to enjoy the comradeship of men and women who share your memories and your customs.

No race or creed can ever claim a preferred position in this great American Republic.

We are here as equals.

I know that I will visit this friendly center many times in the years to come so that I may learn your ways as you learn mine.

You and I are making an important discovery on this 25th of February in 1951. We are related, and we are united, without having to think and act and pray alike. We are happy and progressive in the variety of our brotherhood.

We used to think of American freedom as an escape from the oppressions of the Old World.

That was our first thought.

Now we know that freedom also means the right and the responsibility to do for ourselves and our neighbors. To be true to ourselves, in a way that will be good for us, and for our fellow citizens no matter what their origin may be.

This community center is your contribution to the social life of the city, that we welcome with open hearts.

It will preserve and propagate Armenian culture for the enrichment of every man, woman, and child in the big and generous home that we call Lawrence.

An American Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Mr. Harold Riegelman, a leading citizen and distinguished member of the New York Bar Association to the People's League for World Order at Gramercy Park Hotel February 24, 1951:

AN AMERICAN POLICY IN ASIA

(By Harold Riegelman)

You have asked me to speak about an American policy in Asia. Obviously, our policy in Asia should not, and cannot sensibly, be separated from our total foreign policy. That policy has had a constant base throughout our history: To insure to America the security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness through the medium of a form of government which is subordinated and consecrated to the inviolability of human rights.

Our foreign policy has been reoriented from time to time to meet circumstances affecting that security. It has at different periods pivoted upon Great Britain, South and Central America, Germany, and Japan. Presently it pivots on Russia. The basic factor there is a Communist philosophy centering in Russia which, by its very nature, is expansionist. It has preached and demonstrated its incapacity to thrive in contact and competition with those institutions which we and other free nations accept and are determined to preserve.

It is hardly possible to avoid the conviction that Communist leadership is dedicated to the destruction of our political, social, and economic concepts, and has been so dedicated from the beginning. The pattern of Russian behavior during all but a few of the past 34 years indicates to many observers that this has been, and is, a long-range dedication from which there will be no voluntary, lasting deviation. That pattern also indicates that the Soviet program has been planned in logical, progressive, and overlapping phases. I believe these phases are discernible, and that the first phase has naturally been to make communism secure in Russia. The second phase, to soften other countries by propaganda, infiltration, subversion, and fifth columns. The third, to create as many satellite nations as possible by sabotage, coup d'état, and civil war. The fourth, to use the satellite countries as agents of aggression, without commitment of Russian manpower but with a significant flow of Russian matériel and guidance. This fourth phase is war by proxy. Its objectives would be to build up control of a vast preponderance of manpower, to create an acceptance of Communist invincibility, to seize and deny to the free nations main sources of uranium, manganese, tin, rubber, and oil, and to sap the productive and human resources of the free nations by engaging and dissipating their power in many widely separated areas while the Russian war machine is left intact and unexposed.

Credible reports, some issued by the Soviets themselves, disclose that concurrently with these phases, stockpiling of war materials and the training and equipment of vast armies go on apace. The very size and power of those forces are strong evidence that there is yet another, probably a final, phase. That final phase would logically be the full employment of those forces when conditions promise greatest success at lowest cost in overrunning those portions of the free world which shall not have yet succumbed to the techniques of the preceding phases. This means global war.

We had a revealing foretaste of the fourth or proxy war phase in Greece. But now we have entered in earnest upon that fourth phase which may well be the last step before a cataclysmic war. If we interpret the Russian pattern aright, it would seem that the only chance of avoiding such a cataclysmic war is to prevent the fourth phase from progressing to a point where conditions favorable to that war are fulfilled. I would suppose that such a war could occur in three contingencies:

1. The substantial achievement of the objectives of the fourth or proxy phase.

2. An economic collapse of America and Western Europe.

3. A miscalculation as to whether the objectives of the fourth phase have been sufficiently achieved, or as to whether the economy of America and Western Europe has been sufficiently sapped to assure impotent resistance against a determined attack.

One may not exclude the additional possibility that a failure of the fourth phase could catapult Russia into war regardless of our economic vigor, but the whole course of Russian history greatly discounts that contingency.

There is a sufficient foundation in the pattern of the last few decades of Russian behavior to require that our foreign policy face the first three of these contingencies realistically and practically the world over.

The application of that policy to Asia is clear. Nowhere else does the fourth phase of the Communist program reveal itself more plainly. When satellite North Korean forces were inadequate to enforce Communist rule south of the thirty-eighth parallel, satellite Chinese Communist forces were thrown into that war with every expectation, I am sure, that the entire peninsula would speedily fall under Communist control.

There is evidence of the fourth phase in Tibet and in Indochina. It is not too difficult to project this pattern into Burma, Thailand, and Malaya, and from thence to Indonesia and the Philippines. In those circumstances Japan and Formosa could hardly be held, and our Pacific line of defense might well be forced back to the shores of Washington, Oregon, and California. Certainly the successful exploitation of the fourth or proxy phase in Asia could release 700,000 crack Russian troops presently in Siberia, for reinforcement of already overwhelmingly large Communist armies in Europe, or even for an assault upon Alaska.

If this reasoning is correct or partially correct, it would appear vital to stop phase four in its tracks now, before it is too late. This would explain and justify our action in defense of South Korea.

It would follow that in Formosa our policy should be to give an adequate measure of supply and guidance to the anti-Communist forces. We would withdraw our prohibition against attacks by those forces against the mainland, and provide them with the means of making their attacks effective. We would aid them to aid the anti-Communist guerrillas on the mainland with small arms, mobile ordnance, and ammunition.

I see no possible justification for using any American troops in these operations. Their use is unnecessary. Their use would be the kind of dispersion of the most precious of our resources, which should be avoided except when military contingencies leave us no alternative.

I submit that the immediate aim of our China policy should be to provide within practicable limits munitions sufficient to enable the anti-Communists to seize, hold, organize, administer, and defend all of China south of the Yangtze River, thereby insulating the Communist Indochinese from further Chinese Communist reinforcement and ending further armed Communist penetration in Burma. It would seem needful that the coast of Communist China be blockaded by the free nations, if the Communist supply of essential fuels, metals, food, and munitions is to be cut off.

That the United Nations would support this policy is devoutly to be wished. But we must face the fact that that potentially great instrumentality for peace might be slow to respond to the challenge. We should press the need for action with patience and restraint, but with an eye on the clock, lest what comes may come too little or too late.

Within and outside of the United Nations we must consider the problems peculiar to our friends and to the far-eastern area.

In Asia, France's part is chiefly in Indochina, and I believe that in that extraordinarily complex situation she is doing what she can with what help she can get from us.

Britain, for reasons which have seemed proper to her, has been an unwilling partner in the Far East. Her traditional aptitude for getting along with competitor nations has served her well in the past. And this experience perhaps obscures the fact that communism is not that kind of competition. There are able British leaders who are aware of that unpleasant truth. We can hope that their counsels may prevail.

As to India, it may well be that her own internal problems are so critical that she will not risk external complications any sooner than she has to.

The political attitudes of the great mass of Asiatics is not quite the same as ours. We think of our freedoms as multiple and abstract. Too many Asiatics are of stark necessity concerned with but one material freedom: freedom from misery. To millions who are under constant threat of starvation, rice and wheat can be a more compelling motivation than a yearning for freedom of speech, press, assembly, or worship. If any political economy will promise freedom from misery, its underlying philosophy is not likely to be too carefully tested.

These are circumstances, and there are others, which make the containment of communism more difficult.

A sound foreign-relations policy would recognize that we may not wisely withhold from starvation areas our excess food staples. We should not at any time relax our efforts to acquaint the Asiatic people in every way we can with the real spirit and purpose of our institutions, without insisting that these institutions are the sole and only possible vehicles of those purposes. Where inexperience or centuries-old tradition create weaknesses in administration, we should be slow to condemn, and should make some effort to encourage the building up of reservoirs of trained indigenous administrative talent. In offering advice, we should be humbly aware that our own governmental practices often fall far short of standards we proudly profess.

We must recognize, too, that the gap between our precept and our practice is not limited to government. For there are also areas of our conduct in relation to people of color in America which do not make good anti-Communist propaganda among the colored races of Asia or elsewhere.

Time may well be on our side if we make good use of it. Long before this, people have been subjugated for extended periods, and have at last freed themselves from yokes as securely fastened upon them as communism appears to be upon those whom it has enslaved.

There are indeed signs that all is not well behind the iron as well as the bamboo curtains. In time, these portents can materialize. This is not wishful thinking. If communism is bad for people; if communism cannot compete or even survive in free contact with liberal political philosophies; if communism must conquer the world or die, and its aggression is effectively blocked, an end must come to this menace. I believe an end will come, and in our generation. But only if we possess a conscious and resolute awareness of what needs to be done and have the wisdom, imagination, courage, and discipline to do it.

Philanthropist Finds Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Montreal Daily Star of November 11, 1950, about Mr. Max Abelman, of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

PHILANTHROPIST FINDS PEACE HERE

(By Frank Lowe)

If this ever seeps back to "da Borough of Dem Bums" the repercussions could be serious, but in the interests of truth it should be printed here that the man who is known as "Brooklyn's official ambassador of good will" always comes to Montreal when he wants to relax.

This startling information regarding his deviationist tendencies came from none other than the good-will ambassador himself, genial Max Abelman.

"Whenever I feel the need of a change and a rest," he said today as he rested in the Mount Royal Hotel, "I come to Montreal."

This love for a community not bordered by the Gowanus Canal springs from the fact that for the last several decades Mr. Abelman has found in this area the peace and quiet he desires, after such herculean feats as raising $1,000,000 for charity (Brooklyn charity, of course) at a single dinner.

In 40 years of philanthropic endeavor in the world's most publicized community (Brooklyn again, of course) he has, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, raised more than $100,000,000 for various charities and war bond drives.

Right now his interest is the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, an institution he has served by acting as both secretary and public relations director. This spot he has turned into something of an art center as well as a medical center by insisting that the walls of the institution would be better aids to healing if they were decorated.

So he hired artists to turn the drab walls into art galleries—and then brought public attention to bear by having such men as the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie autograph the works.

Lord Halifax, the suave British Ambassador to the United States during the difficult war years, was another famous figure who helped Mr. Abelman to make these walls the keepers of priceless autographs. Gen. George Marshall, Gov. Tom Dewey, and Cardinal Spellman are others who found themselves contributing to the worthy cause of making a hospital in Brooklyn the most written-about health institution in the world.

Mr. Abelman's biggest fund-raising chore, though, was in World War I, when he had quit the job of banking to devote himself to philanthropy, and was asked to sell Liberty bonds. He held just one meeting at the Brooklyn Academy of Music and there sold $49,000,000 (count those zeros) worth of bonds. Now a man in his 60's Mr. Abelman has slowed down a bit. He would probably not promise to raise more than a few million in one evening—and indicative of his slacking off is the fact that he has resigned as secretary of the Jewish Hospital and now acts as public relations director exclusively.

"The other day, though, I felt I needed a rest even from this," he said. "So I packed a bag and came to Montreal. Now I feel a lot better."

But don't think a chubby dynamo like this can relax completely. While in Montreal he visited quite a few of the friends he has made over the years—one of them being Dr. Cyril F. James, principal and vice chancelor of McGill University.

"Now there's a fine man," he said, "the kind of man I'd like to have visit our hospital."

And, knowing Mr. Abelman's powers of persuasion, don't be surprised if you read of Dr. James making a trip to Brooklyn in the near future.

Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Megaro Welfare Association of Newark, N. J., endorsing H. R. 2473, which I introduced on February 7, providing for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia:

Whereas the members of the Megaro Welfare Association, 335 Roseville Avenue, in the city of Newark, county of Essex, State of New Jersey, at a meeting held on the 19th of February 1951, having been apprised of the present legislation before Congress concerning the Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor; and

Whereas the members of this association, having been organized primarily for the purpose of aiding the underprivileged youth of the community, feel that this movement to honor Christopher Columbus will aid in the harmonious relationship between the peoples of the American and Italian race: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this organization go on record as officially endorsing the views of the honorable Congressman, PETER W. RODINO, Jr., and HUGH ADDONIZIO, who have introduced legislation before Congress to set up a memorial which is to consist of the planting of trees in arbor effect, representing each State of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in a Federal park, in the Nation's Capital, and be it resolved further that since the cost of building this memorial is to be met by private citizens through the Citizens Committee for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor, we, the members of the Megaro Welfare Association, agree to contribute to the cost of building said memorial as soon as the proper legislation is passed upon.

Signed by the officers of the Megaro Welfare Association, on the date and year first above written.

ANTHONY MARINELLO,
President.

Attest:

FRANK ROSANIA,
Secretary.

The Republican Party Can Lead This Nation Out of the Valley of Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be one of many Republican Members of Congress who participated in the Nation-wide celebration of Lincoln's Birthday. All of the Lincoln Day dinners were well attended and abounded with enthusiasm which gave every indication that the Grand Old Party is steadily gaining ground.

One of the several addresses I delivered was at Butler, Pa., at the annual Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Butler County Republican Committee.

My address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct honor to accept your kind invitation and to join such a representative group of Americans in honoring the memory of the immortal Lincoln.

My remarks this evening are going to be straight from the shoulder and while they will not be devoted entirely to the Great Emancipator, they will reveal conditions today comparable to those faced by Lincoln as he labored to hold this Nation together.

Before discussing present-day conditions, let us refresh our memories of Abraham Lincoln. We all know of his humility, his hardship, his deep reverence for God, his unfailing faith and determination, and his honesty and integrity that have become a symbol for all mankind. Even foreign nations revere the qualities of Abraham Lincoln and point to him as an example of the leadership needed in the conduct of public affairs.

This great Republican President did not reach the heights of world acclaim without experiencing heartaches and bitter disappointments. A close study of his many reverses in life reveal that few men could have weathered such a series of trials and tribulations.

When you read of Lincoln's life you are reminded of his statement in speaking of his lack of formal education when he said, "I didn't know much—my schooling was limited to readin', writin', and cipherin' to the rule of three." This statement reveals the humility and sincerity of Lincoln, who was not ashamed of his early life and his humble surroundings.

This humility of Abraham Lincoln was reflected in his first campaign for a political office when he was a candidate for the State legislature in Illinois in 1832. At that time Lincoln said, "I presume you all know who I am. I am humble Abraham Lincoln. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal-improvement system, and high protective tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles."

Yes. On clearly defined political principles Abraham Lincoln was content to place his future in the hands of the American people. It took courage on his part to stand on his principles and to bypass the political magic of promising everybody everything in the hope of garnering a vote, a practice so popular today with the New Dealers and Fair Dealers. Lincoln, because of his courage and convictions, went down to defeat in 1832 as a candidate for the legislature.

He was defeated again in business in 1833 and lost everything of a material value. In 1838 as candidate for speaker he was again defeated.

In 1840 he lost as a candidate for elector. In 1843 he was defeated as a candidate for Commissioner of the General Land Office, and also as a candidate for nomination to Congress.

In 1848 he lost in his campaign for reelection to Congress.

In 1855 he was the losing candidate for United States Senator.

In 1856 he was defeated as candidate for Vice President.

In 1858 he was defeated as candidate for United States Senator.

But in 1860 he was elected as the sixteenth President of the United States. What a glowing tribute to Lincoln's perseverance and to the truth of the old saying, "You can't defeat a man who will not quit."

When Abraham Lincoln assumed the Presidency of the United States he became the first Republican ever to hold that high office. He became the leader of a new political party born in 1856 in the midst of the turmoil and terrible disagreements which preceded the Civil War.

While Lincoln was President he gave to the American people a type of leadership that preserved the Union and its cherished ideals handed to us by the founders of this great Republic. Last, but not least, he gave all of us a symbol of hope by the manner in which he met the challenges to American unity and emerged victorious under most trying conditions.

It was 142 years ago that Abraham Lincoln was born, and for nearly 20 years we have heard over and over again these words: "God grant that we had another Lincoln to lead us out of the present-day wilderness of despair."

Yes, we Americans are reminded of the conditions that prevailed when Lincoln delivered his Gettysburg Address—conditions that are comparable to those facing us today.

At that time this Nation was threatened with destruction by disunity within, and its future hung in the balance. It was Lincoln's stirring reminder that we could not "live permanently half slave and half free" that fired men's hearts and resulted in saving this Nation.

If Lincoln had failed we would have found ourselves a divided nation as Korea was when the Communist hordes descended upon it. We would have had a North and a South working at cross purposes and against each other. Yes. We could have suffered the fate of Korea instead of welding ourselves into the greatest and strongest nation on earth financially and physically.

We reached this pinnacle of strength among all nations because we followed the philosophy of government conceived by our forefathers and embodied in that historic document—the Constitution of the United States.

For nearly 20 years we have lived under the banner of the so-called New Deal-Fair Deal and in reality Raw Deal concept of government. As a result we have seen the Constitution of the United States ridiculed and ignored while socialism and communism have been encouraged.

The word democracy was given a new definition and used as a cloak by the New Deal-Fair Deal forces in Government, in carrying out their program of deception. They have been so successful in applying the term democracy that the American people have been fooled into using this New Deal word in describing our form of government. Yes; even some Republicans have fallen into the trap, by discarding the word republic when speaking of the type of Government intended for this nation.

It is well to recall at this time the inspiring words contained in the pledge of allegiance to the flag, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible with liberty and justice to all."

I say to you in all fairness that this is not a democracy—it is a republic!

The New Dealers in following their program of deceit experimented with every phase of our economic life and to such an extent that they lulled the American people into a sense of false security. They promised everybody something for nothing—even luring many Republicans with their sugar-coated economic remedies.

To be frank, in 1936 and again in 1940, the New Dealers had convinced many Republicans that their party had no future and it has not been so long ago that some Republicans actually apologized for their Republican faith. With such a condition prevalent throughout the Nation our party was faced with extinction and serious consideration was asked that the name Republican be changed and another adopted in its place. Mind you, this is the same party founded by Abraham Lincoln.

Fortunately, some of us refused to accept the New Deal philosophy of a more abundant life, and girded ourselves for an all-out battle against the New Deal forces. Those of us who were in Congress recall that during the early days of the Roosevelt regime we were publicly ridiculed because we refused to follow the dictates of the Chief Executive, who at that time had as his advisers, Harry Hopkins, Rex Tugwell, Henry Wallace, Alger Hiss, Lee Pressman, and others of their stripe.

From this loyal opposition to the devastating policies of the New Deal clique there developed a growing resentment against the socialistic and communistic trends that were discernible at that time. It was difficult to convince a lot of good Americans that they were being used as pawns in the New Deal program which Rex Tugwell aptly described when he said, "Let us roll up our sleeves and make over America."

In our opposition to the New Deal policies we continued to rebuild our party with the result that in 1944 we showed signs of regaining our former strength. We were still pitted against the master politician in our bid for control of the White House and Congress and with swollen Government payrolls and millions of people who regarded Uncle Sam as Santa Claus, we found that millions still voted against us.

By 1946, the Second World War had been concluded and the American people began to realize that the double-talk, the distortion of facts, the coddling of Communists, and the general mismanagement of government with its enormous cost and mounting taxation had brought this Nation to the brink of disaster. It was then that the American people gave control of the Eightieth Congress to the Republican Party.

When the Republican-controlled Congress convened in January 1947, it inherited the colossal mess resulting from 14 years of New Deal blundering, boondoggling and inefficiency in Government reflected in countless bureaus, and commissions whose overlapping functions and duplication of efforts saddled the American people with high taxes and 76,000 useless Government directives that controlled their daily lives.

We found that Communists, fellow-travelers, and parlor-pinks were occupying high positions of Government and had a firm foothold in the State Department. This radical-minded mob on the Federal payroll were writing directives designed to regiment the American people and destroy our form of government.

Regardless of the iron curtain of secrecy that the Truman administration threw around the affairs of the various departments of Government, the Republican Eightieth Congress reduced the national debt by $7,000,000,000 and at the same time cut income taxes despite several vetoes by our letter-writing President. These income-tax reductions benefited millions of persons in the lower-income group. We freed the American people of some 76,000 Government rules, regulations, directives, and orders, and balanced the national budget for the first time in 16 years. In fact, the fiscal year of 1948 ended with a surplus of $8,500,000,000—the biggest Treasury surplus in the history of the Nation.

Despite the fine record of the Republican Eightieth Congress, the American people allowed President Truman to label the Eightieth Congress as the worst Congress in existence. The Chief Executive was aided unknowingly by the marked apathy on the part of members of the Republican Party who preferred to consider the election "in the bag," and who were lulled into a deep sleep. Those who refused to listen to the President or to be lulled to sleep went fishing. As a result, we failed to get out the vote—even our own Republican vote. Because 52 percent of all eligible Americans failed to vote in 1948, this Nation suffered the greatest political catastrophe in its history. We Republicans can accept the blame, for we are responsible for the listless campaign we waged in the belief that victory was assured.

As we compare 1948 with the election held on November 7, 1950, we find significant results of our efforts to expose the New Deal-Fair Deal regime. Last fall's election brought forth a definite vote of protest against the mismanagement of the biggest business on the face of the earth today—the Government of the United States. Yes, it revealed that the American people at last began to realize that they had been outrageously betrayed by the Roosevelt-Truman regime.

Never before in the history of our country has our national honor suffered such humiliation and disgrace as by the crimes committed at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam. The crimes of Pearl Harbor, the partitioning of Germany, the appeasement of Russia, the coddling of Communists in high Government positions, the dismantling of our national defense, and our blundering foreign policy which plunged us into the so-called police action in Korea constitute national sins that cry to heaven for vengeance.

Today Washington is in a state of confusion. We have the national administration controlling Congress—the legislative arm of Government—and dominating the executive branch of Government as well, yet it has no blueprint for the present or future problems of our country. As a result, the fate of this Nation hangs in the balance. With scandals being unearthed daily in various Government departments and the cost of government mounting to where taxes are oppressive, our Nation lacks the leadership sorely needed to lead us out of this period of national crisis.

Speaking of the high cost of government, the President in his annual budget message requested $71,600,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1. To provide the money the President has asked that new taxes be levied and present taxes increased. His proposal will impose upon the shoulders of the American people the greatest tax load in the history of this Nation.

In one breath the American people are told to tighten their belts and to practice economy in all phases of daily life. But hidden away in the President's budget proposals are large amounts of money for the Truman socialistic program, which includes socialized medicine, the Brannan plan, and the eventual socialization of all industry.

Jeffersonian Democrats in Congress and even some administration wheel horses admit publicly that the budget can be reduced if the President has the will to do so. They are of the opinion that over $9,000,000,000 can be eliminated if the President will heed their advice and drop his socialistic program.

The old New Deal philosophy enunciated by the late Harry Hopkins when he said, "Tax, spend, elect, for the people are too dumb to understand," is still the accepted doctrine of President Truman and the New Deal-Fair Deal forces. Even though we are on the brink of economic ruin and faced with the most critical period in our history, the administration is trying to change our form of government by deception or in plain words by trying to fool the American people.

They fail, however, to realize that the overwhelming majority of the American people are utterly disgusted with the present administration in Washington and if the 1952 election were to be held today, they would repudiate the Truman clique with an avalanche of votes in protest against the monumental blundering and stupidity that have characterized the handling of the affairs of government.

As I said previously, for nearly 20 years now we have been hearing the prayerful utterance over and over again, "God grant that we had another Lincoln to lead us out of the present-day wilderness of despair."

The Republican Party can again lead this Nation out of the valley of destruction if it accepts the challenge that we are confronted with today in providing real leadership. We must bury any selfish desires, settle peaceably any party squabbles, and determine to build a fighting party of real Americans who revere the Constitution of the United States as the cornerstone of our liberty and freedom.

The time has arrived to stand up and be counted. We must erase from our minds any defeatist attitude and recall how Abraham Lincoln after suffering 10 crushing defeats from 1832 to 1858 finally emerged triumphant in 1860 by being elected the sixteenth President of the United States.

Let us at this time rededicate ourselves to the principles of Abraham Lincoln and to the Republican Party. In so doing we are simply rededicating ourselves to the principles of Americanism as embodied in our republican form of Government.

The American way of life—yes, the fate of our great Republic—is at stake—and facing such a challenge, let us as loyal Republicans leave this banquet room tonight with the determination to remember the truth of the old saying about Abraham Lincoln, "You can't defeat a man who will not quit!" In such a spirit let us sound this clarion call: "We Republicans have just begun to fight!"

John Steelman, the Assistant to the President, One of the Most Able Men in All the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, this marks the twenty-sixth Battle Report, Washington, made by Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, in his series of documentary telecasts produced by Ted Ayers and sent out over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network and cables to the American people each Sunday afternoon for the last half year.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago, in an address to this House, I told of hearing the president of one of the largest corporations in the United States at one time declare that John Steelman, the Assistant to the President, is one of the most able men in all the world, and, Mr. Speaker, he has grown immeasurably in stature every single day since I made that prophetic statement.

I venture the suggestion that no one in the White House is earlier at his desk than John Steelman. To him, it is still midday when others go home. His is not a 9 to 5 o'clock job—it is a 24-hour-a-day, round-the-clock job—and President Truman knows where he can get in touch with his trusted assistant, Mr. Steelman, every minute of every night, as well as every day.

While many persons associate Mr. Steelman largely with labor relations and labor problems, I know that these are but only a part of his daily duties.

Noted for his humanities, he is probably the greatest living labor economist. In his mediation and labor conciliation experience activities, and between the years 1937 to 1944, John Steelman induced embattled protagonists, in more than 80,000 cases involving labor-management shut-downs, to settle their labor problems and squabbles without lay-offs and without strikes. Yet, Mr. Speaker, his labor activities today are but one in a long catalog of assignments which he accomplishes each day.

Characterized by his integrity, all men, from the most obscure representatives of labor or management to the highest, can each look forward to receiving equity and justice under law—from the head, the heart, and the hand of this able Assistant to the President.

Mr. Speaker, Battle Report, Washington, as sent to the American people last Sunday afternoon, was peculiar and unique in more ways than one. It was unique in the tremendous listener interest aroused by the masterful work done on that part of the program devoted to a description of conditions in Berlin, as depicted by Lou Hazam.

For his radio and television writings Lou Hazam has long been distinguished by his receipt of many awards. The magnificent word picture which he painted of the sociological, ethical, moral, physical, educational, spiritual, financial, military, and political values as they exist in Berlin today stamp him as probably the greatest documentary writer in the business today.

Additionally thereto Mr. Steelman brought to NBC television, and to the American people, the Honorable Earl D. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Army, just returned from an inspection trip to Korea. Secretary Johnson discussed the reasons which give rise to the existent high morale of our troops in Korea as well as to the quality of leadership which he found in the combined troops of the United Nations—inclusive of the Turks, Greeks, Australians, British, New Zealanders, and our own boys from the United States of America.

Also on the program was the Honorable Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Mr. Thorp discussed the many causes which led to the famine conditions prevailing in India and the proposal to ship the 2,000,000 tons of American wheat.

Mr. Geoffrey Lewis, Director of the Bureau of German Affairs of our State Department, spoke briefly on the attitude of the people in Berlin that lent factual support to the brilliant exposé of actual conditions so eloquently expressed by Lou Hazam.

Mr. Speaker, last but not least, was the unfoldment and presentation of the soul-stirring pictures taken by the Jones brothers behind the iron curtain within the last 10 days, and about which I advised you 2 weeks ago would be available to the American people within a fortnight.

Thanks to the magnificent teamwork of these colorful twin newsreel photographers, the National Broadcasting Co. was able to bring to television and pictorialize Hazam's writings, by way of Battle Report, Washington, the actual scenes, taken but a few days prior, of conditions as they exist today behind the iron curtain.

Because of the tremendous reader interest in these subjects, I am making unanimous request for insertion into the RECORD as part of my remarks the twenty-sixth teledocumentary, Battle Report, Washington.

This reads as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. McCORMICK. As the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hears our top defense officials on the subject of troops for Europe, NBC television in the Nation's Capitol turns its cameras upon some top guests of its own, that you may hear your twenty-sixth Battle Report, Washington.

Washington, its streets revealing the stepped-up tempo of mobilization as more men in uniform fill the city—while in Korea our troops battle new Communist attempts to breach the UN line of the central front.

But, first, let us hear from the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Behind the iron curtain the tyrannical exploitation of human beings still goes unabated. The propaganda machines of the Kremlin still give out their messages of hatred day in and day out. In Korea, the mad fury of the power-drunk despots is sending tens of thousands to their deaths—tens of thousands of peace-loving, generous men who ask only for an opportunity to find happiness in their own way.

We know these men who are being sent to the slaughter. They have been our friends for generations. We hope and pray the day is not far distant when they will break their chains and see their greedy masters for what they really are.

And so—on to agenda of Battle Report today. First, we will hear from the Assistant Secretary of the Army who has just returned from an inspection trip to Korea, Secretary Earl D. Johnson.

Next, a word about the starvation crisis in India, and American response to its call for help, from Mr. Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Then, Mr. Geoffrey Lewis, Acting Director of the State Department's Bureau of German Affairs to put a spotlight on Germany. Germany, from which today we will show the first of the films that NBC's Jones Boys are shooting to document Europe for you.

Mr. McCORMICK. Stand by, then, for Battle Report, Washington.

As China rang in its new year—the year of the rabbit—the Chinese Communists on the battlefront in Korea began this belated new year—to abuse a pun—definitely "in the red." Up to 75,000 of them fell before the persistent limited offensive of our UN troops. Apparently regrouped again, they are now seeking to break through the Allied line along the Han. Latest reports concede them certain successful penetrations. But they appear to have broken off their Wonju drive, and far from accomplished the damage they hoped. To report to you on what he found to be the all-important factor bolstering our troops in Korea, we focus now upon one of our top Defense Department officials who has just returned. He is the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Earl D. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. Morale is a term which is very difficult to define, and over the years I have tried to determine in my own mind just what it means and what it implies.

From my experience in the past I have come to the conclusion that it is largely an expression of the degree of confidence possessed by the soldier. This confidence is related to the quality of his equipment, the state of his training, the support he receives from the home front, the support he receives from his sister services, and the quality of his leadership. Perhaps it would be advisable to review each one of these in turn.

First, in regard to his equipment, our soldier knows from actual experience in the battlefield through the use of his equipment that it is equal to any and superior to most of the similar equipment that the enemy has. Also, he knows that he has a larger supply and a more ready supply of equipment than his enemy. Next, in regard to training, his proficiency in the use of his superior equipment has constantly increased. He knows that the replacements who are coming in to fight alongside of him have achieved a higher degree of training than was possible in the initial operation in the beginning of the Korean campaign, so that today he has real confidence in his force's capacity.

Next, in regard to the support from the home front, he, just like you and I, can pick up the paper and the various periodicals, and listen to the various broadcasts, and realize that there is an increasing flexing of the military muscles of the Nation and that the public is rallying to his support in ever increasing numbers.

Next, in regard to the support from his sister services, he has the demonstrated success of the Inchon landings, the valiant withdrawal of the Marines and his brother soldiers from the Chosin Reservoir, the constant support from tactical aircraft, the combat cargo command, and all the related services in the rear areas. He knows that they have confidence in their own field equipment as he has in his.

Next, in regard to the quality of his leadership, just as the individual soldier has grown in military stature in the discharge of his daily duties, so have his officers. He has seen the superb tactics of withdrawal and the manipulation of limited reserves which General Walker has displayed. He has seen how brilliantly his commander conducted the offensive which swept the Korean forces back to the Yalu River. More recently, he has seen again the use of our troops' greater mobility by their withdrawal sufficiently far beyond the reach of the Communists to allow complete regrouping of forces and equipment, and now he has seen the magnificent, dynamic leadership of a new Commander, General Ridgway, who, having had time to achieve an estimate of the enemy's capacities, is leading our troops in a stubborn offensive.

In addition to this, he has come to know his enemy and knows that, in virtually every respect, the UN soldier is superior.

One last point that has added greatly to his morale is the fact that this is not an individual action of the United States but is the combined action of the United Nations. This is important because he has now fought alongside the Turk, the Greek, the Australian, the British, the New Zealander, and he knows that they are companions in arms who can well carry their end of the burden.

All of these have combined to add to the growing high morale of our forces.

Mr. McCORMICK. You are looking at film shot by NBC front-line cameramen showing our forces at the height of their offensive in Korea. Heavy fire from ships like these, laid down by the battleship Missouri off shore. UN forces were sparked by tanks covered by tremendous artillery barrage. Not until our troops reach the open plain below Seoul do the Reds surge forward in a suicidal charge, waving their flags and blowing their horns as they go to their death by the thousands. Not too far from this scene of fighting, another kind of struggle is going on, a struggle against starvation in India. To report to you upon that struggle, we bring you now Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Mr. THORP. This is Sunday, and many of us have eaten a good American dinner. However, on the other side of the world, in the crowded country of India, families are less fortunate. Let me tell you what a poor family in the famine area of northern India had for its Sunday dinner. There was only a thin wheat pancake, with a sauce made of chickpeas. If the family is fortunate enough to own a cow, there might have been some milk or butter.

Food like this would be a starvation diet, according to American standards, but in India, even that simple meal is threatened by the famine that hangs over the lives of millions of people.

Many factors caused this famine—earthquakes, floods, droughts, and plagues of locusts. Unless India imports 6,000,000 tons of grain this year, millions of people will die from starvation, or from disease against which undernourished bodies cannot survive.

The Government of India has already made arrangements to buy 4,000,000 of those tons with her own funds. Last December, India asked the United States to help her to secure the remaining 2,000,000 tons. The President ordered an intensive study of the Indian famine situation and of our own supply of grain. The experts arrived at two general conclusions: (1) that the need was real and urgent; and (2) that the United States could supply the grain from its reserve.

The President has asked Congress to pass legislation authorizing the Government to give the grain to India, as a grant, not as a loan. The cost to us would be about $190,000,000. India would pay the shipping costs. The grain would be distributed to the people through India's ration system, at the special low prices fixed for that system. The Indian Government would be expected to deposit in a special account the rupees which it received for the grain. The money in this account—known as counterpart funds—would be used for economic development programs with special emphasis on projects to increase agricultural production. The Indian Government would agree to insure that the grain is distributed fairly and to make certain that the Indian people are told that the grain which helped to save their lives came as a gift from the American people.

There have been differences of opinion between the United States and India, but I know that all Americans of good will agree that we shall do all we can for starving people. We don't make our help conditional on whether they completely agree with us.

We have already shown our real interest in India's future. For example, United States point 4 projects are being carried out in India to improve farming methods and solve the water shortage so that famines may be eliminated.

India is the largest and potentially the richest democracy in Asia. The 350,000,000 people of India cherish their freedom as ardently as we do. Freedom doesn't thrive in the face of famine. Our 2,000,000 tons of grain will save millions of lives, and also help to preserve freedom for the Indians and for us.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Remember this? Germany under the mad administrations of Adolf Hitler. The hour of the dictator, the concentration camp, the book-burning—one of the darkest chapters in man's long history. But today—far different from the scenes you see here—there is a new Germany aborning—at least in that part of it occupied by the West. The spirit of this new Germany—symbolized by free Berlin—gives hope that the Germans will be among our stanchest allies in Europe in our struggle against communism. Today, we turn the spotlight on Berlin, and our cameras upon one of the Nation's leading German experts, that you may hear from his lips the significance of what is transpiring there—the State Department's Deputy Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, Geoffrey W. Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS. Every man in the world today is involved in a struggle to determine whether he will be a free man or a slave. In Korea, in Indochina, that struggle is joined in open warfare. Elsewhere, it takes other insidious forms.

Europe in the last 5 years has experienced the struggle with Soviet communism in every way short of formal war. By subversion, by treachery, and the threat of the Red army, many of Europe's peoples have already been swallowed up by imperialistic communism. The countries which have resisted Soviet pressure thus far face the possibility—now an ugly fact in Korea—that Communist dictatorship will commit aggressive war, if lesser means fail, in its march toward world domination.

Today the United States and the other North Atlantic Treaty nations are embarked on a joint effort to build military strength to convince the Kremlin that aggression against the free world will not pay. But until this strength is a reality, we, our allies, and the free peoples everywhere, must endure sacrifice and tension, sometimes under the very shadow of the evil force which seeks to impose a way of life we despise.

At the very center of the European struggle is Germany. That is why Germany is one of the tension areas of the world today. Germany doesn't yet have the protection offered by members of the North Atlantic Treaty organization to one another. As I see it, there are three big reasons why Germany has not fallen before the onslaught of the Communists. For one thing, we are there. While our occupation forces are not large, they are symbolic of both American power and American determination to resist Soviet aggression. For another thing, we have let the Kremlin know that, as far as we are concerned, an attack on Western Germany or on Western Berlin will be considered an attack on us. But thirdly, and perhaps most important, there are the indomitable people of Western Germany and Western Berlin. Berliners, particularly, are strong on one item—courage. They refuse to be intimidated. They were blockaded for almost a year, and at the end of that time they were even more anti-Communist than before.

What does Berlin have to do with us? The people of Berlin lead their daily lives amid sacrifice, tension, and heartbreak. These tragic people are surrounded by that evil force and despised way of life. How do the Berliners feel about it? How do they keep their courage, their nerve, their will to go on? What are they like now, after daily exposure to both worlds—the world of freedom, and the world of terror and the secret police?

You and I—across a small ocean from Berlin—are just beginning to feel the great struggle come close to us. Our mettle is beginning to be tested by the Communist threat of world domination. How we meet the test can well determine whether we have peace and freedom or total war. As a people who have already met the test, we may well take a look at the men, women, and children of Berlin.

Mr. MCCORMICK. To bring Europe into your living room, America, NBC television recently sent abroad its prize-winning cameramen, the Jones brothers, whose pictures from Korea—shown time and again on this program—made news-reporting history. We asked them to train their cameras first on Berlin. Berlin, because in no other city in the world is the struggle between East and West—the most pressing problem of this mid-twentieth century—so symbolized and so concentrated. The pictorial evidence Battle Report, Washington now invites your attention to the first of NBC's exclusive teledocumentary reports on Europe—Battle Report, Berlin.

"This . . . this is Berlin.
Out of the rubble of postwar Germany,
Out of the bomb-rocked horror that
shattered all normal existence.

"And from a fate
That found it stripped by the Russians
Of everything of real value,
And looted with so-called invasion
currency,
Slowly,
By the sweat of the brow
And the pain of the back—
Stone by stone,
Building upon building,
Street by street,
Like a giant stirring to life,
Was born a new city—
A dynamic city,
A vibrant city,
An island of freedom in a sea of tyranny!
The key to Europe's future
And perhaps to our own destiny as well!

"From the beginning—
Over this new city—
Loomed the threatening shadow of communism,
Symbolized by this Soviet war memorial
Built in the British sector by the Russians
Even before our armies entered.

"At first, through the Kommandatura,
The four allied powers—
Each responsible for his own sector—
Sought to administer the city jointly
Result? Red arguments . . . threats . . .
recriminations.
Finally came the day
When Russia refused to 'hang its hat' in
the Kommandatura
Alongside the French,
The British,
The U. S. A.

"Thus the city was divided—
Divided as if a gigantic axe
Had crashed upon it.
And so now Berlin—
As this fenced street which marks the division shows,
Is two Berlins:
Free Berlin—under the democratic Allies,
And slave Berlin—
The Russian sector.

"Determined to resist Russia's attempts
To force us
From this city behind the iron curtain—
This 'democratic thorn in communism's
hide'—
Allied forces still patrol the western sectors,
Determined to hold our ground!
And lending courage to the people—
People who have proved their dislike of
communism—
Are the troops of the Western Powers on
duty there.
Troops like these famed Scots of the Black
Watch,
Making the streets echo with their marching
As if to say—
'We are here, Berlin.
We mean to stay here.
We will not forsake those of you who love
freedom!'

"Hand in hand with the Germans,
American architects are helping to rebuild
the capital.
Marshall plan aid—
Converted into lumber, paint, bricks—
Is literally changing the face of the city
That not long ago lay prone beneath the
paralysis of destruction.
We are lifting the spirit, too,
By feeding the body.
In a free school-lunch program throughout
Berlin,
American-financed meat, potatoes, and vegetables
Are being invested in the future of Germany,
Strengthening further the will to resist
Being stamped with the label 'Made in
Moscow.'

"And do not think
That Berlin has not responded.
Time and again
Berliners have physically demonstrated
their faith in the West,
(As you see them here—
Defying the Soviet terror!)
And when the first democratic election in
14 years was held
Ninety-three percent chose western democracy over eastern communism.
Put in office Mayor Reuter,
The greatest single opponent of communism
In all Germany!

"When Russia,
Seeking to chastise this spirit,
Cut off the electric power it controlled
From the western zones,

We flew in this new power plant,
Piece by piece,
By way of the dramatic Berlin airlift.

"We said:
'Let there be light.'
And throughout the free sectors of Berlin,
There was light.

"Power to light up the truth
Through this, the biggest news sign in the
world.
Truth flying on kilowatt wings
Across the boundary that Russia has drawn
in Berlin.
Erected by the free German newspapers on
the west
Without a nickel of American money.
Each night this sign flashes uncensored
news
Into the Russian sector.
Yes; despite a canvas shield
The Reds once built to try to hide it,
Only to have it blown down in a storm.
Despite a brick wall
They raised before it,
Only to see people step to one side of the
wall.
And despite the time they turned a hose
upon it,
Hoping to short it.
Today, thanks to these brilliant letters,
In defiance of the Russians
The truth burns bright the western sky
To challenge their lies.

" 'RIAS' is still another way
By which we penetrate the Communist
darkness.
'RIAS' stands for 'Radio in the American
Sector.'
Operated by a staff of 976 people.
Broadcasting round the clock, day and
night, in the German language.
It is the most powerful station in western
Europe—
Covers not only Berlin
But all of Germany
That is under the hammer and sickle!
Add, too,
As a 'winner of friends and influencer of
people' for democracy,
The free university in Western Berlin
To which many from the Russian section
come.
This was built brick upon brick
By the students themselves,
Fed up with being taught the Communist
line
In the university the Reds control.

"But perhaps one of the most courageous
stories
To come out of Berlin today.
Is how men are risking their safety
To spread the truth behind the iron curtain
In the form of the printed word.
To follow this 'verboten' tabloid edition of
a regular German newspaper
Into Russian-controlled territory,
The Jones brothers themselves risked
danger
Being smuggled with their cameras
Late at night into the Russian zone,
And hidden in a house overlooking the
borderline.
The whole time they saw no one
But the stranger who brought them
And took them out,
And the whole time they were there
It was so dark,
They didn't even know what part of the
Russian zone
They were in.
For an exclusive story
Such as never before screened,
Let us—with the Jones boys—
Keep our eyes on this man
With his brief case stuffed with
The newspapers to be sneaked into Russian
territory.

"Through the streets of Berlin
Starts—the truth!
The truth, in this instance—
As the Jones brothers wrote—
'A small, scared little man
With death in his bag—
Headed east.'
Up one street
And down the next,
He carries the paper dynamite in his brief
case.
His rundown heels,
And his shabby attire,
Purposely designed to disguise a hero.
Then—suddenly—
An abrupt turn in the opposite direction.
Passing women gossiping on the street
corner,
Like women anywhere,
He takes a deep breath and
Passes from the 'land of the free'
Into the 'home of the slave.'
Then, as the Jones boys remember it,
A policeman patrolling the Russian zone
Stops him, asking for identification.
We kept shooting for what seemed an
eternity
But he was passed
After a few terrible seconds.
Into the east
Disappears the scared little man with the
truth,
Pointing at the heart of the Soviets
The moral—
'In the beginning was the word.'
'Thus, though inside the iron curtain
'And connected only by a narrow corridor
with Western Europe,
'Berlin stands as both a fortress and a
showcase
'For democracy—
'Its people—who know communism best—
'Among the most anticommunistic in the
whole world.'
Even the young, as the Jones boys discovered,
Prizing their freedom.

"From this 'other side' that's bad.
From the totalitarian zone of Germany
To this island of democracy that is Berlin,
Come the oppressed refugees,
Who can see and compare for themselves
The differences in the two ways of life.
Some 250 a day escape to the West.
Like this man you see being interviewed.
Military men say
They add their knowledge and strength
To the struggle against communism—
A struggle that wins from our new top commander
Of our military in Berlin—
General Mathewson—
This appraisal.
'The role that free Germany will play
In the broader defense of freedom
Is still unclear.'
But this much we can count on—
That if Russia should march tomorrow,
These German police of the West
Will be on our first line of defense.

"This, then, is Berlin, America—
Where the Second World War in Europe
And the third could officially begin.
So far,
Communists' coercion, threats, propaganda,
and political action
Have failed to rock it—
And because we have stood firm,
Berlin stands today
As a symbol of political and social freedom
To all down-trodden Europe.
Look well, then, upon these faces.
The faces of the people of Berlin
Who have proved their passion for democracy.
For these are the faces of your future allies
In the struggle for peace."

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; Berlin's is a story of courage. Those of us in the Government, dealing every day with the people of our occupation areas in Germany, never cease to be amazed and encouraged by the kind of spirit depicted in the television documentary you have just seen. I hope you share my feeling that such spirit is ringing proof that humanity can rise above the paralysis and despair the Stalinists would make the means of erasing freedom from the earth.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another Teledocumentary—this, then, against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your twenty-sixth Battle Report, Washington.

They Are Truman's Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium of February 22, 1951:

THEY ARE TRUMAN'S POLICIES

President Truman's foreign policies are not popular here at home. They are shot through with inconsistencies and they mirror great confusion.

Many persons who have subscribed to the New Deal and Fair Deal leadership know this. Some want to remove the weight of guilt from Mr. Truman's shoulders.

The Forum article printed in another column of this page is an example of this wriggling to find a hole to squeeze through. But it cannot be done.

Mr. Truman will not let us forget for a moment that he is Commander in Chief. And he makes our foreign policy.

Not long ago he criticized longshoremen who refused to unload Russian goods sent here. Truman said he made our foreign policy.

He told the Congress to keep its fingers out of the pie. He does that even in the face of the truth that he has no right under the Constitution to wage war whenever and wherever he pleases.

The authority to go to war is vested in the Congress. But Truman insists on being a law unto himself.

Exception is taken in the Forum article to our statement February 15 that "President Truman refuses to release Nationalist Chinese troops against the Communist Reds."

It was Mr. Truman who, on June 27, 1950, directed that the United States Seventh Fleet be prepared to intervene to prevent any Communist attack on Formosa. In the same order he told Chiang Kai-shek to cease attacks on the mainland of China.

Mr. Truman has never rescinded that order. To this day, the Nationalist troops are bottled up by our Seventh Fleet. Truman's order stopped attacks of the Nationalists against the Communists who took over China. It protects the Reds in China.

Offers of Chiang of troops to be used in fighting the Reds in Korea have been refused.

The only time that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, top military commander in the Far East, tried to express himself on this and other policies of defense he was rebuked by Truman who ordered MacArthur's letter to the Veterans of Foreign Wars withheld from the public.

Truman, he wants everyone to know, is Commander in Chief.

With this point clear, the references in the Forum article to Republicans serving in the Truman administration are side issues. There always are men in both major political parties who would rather hold office than be right.

But the real bungling is done by the top man. That's Truman. The men holding posts under him are appointed because they eat out of the same bowl. The trouble now is the milk has soured.

My Countrywomen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, last, the anniversary of the birth of the first President of our Nation, there appeared in the Oregon Journal a guest editorial by Lillian Porter Say, a Washington correspondent of the Journal, which is most apropos today.

This excellent editorial in the form of a letter which might have been written by Martha Washington, will appeal to all who have or have had loved ones in the service, as well as to the many who have great compassion for the families of those serving our country through its military ranks. I include the editorial as a part of these remarks:

DEAR COUNTRYWOMEN

(Today's guest editorial takes the form of a letter written by Lillian Porter Say, Journal Washington correspondent, as one which might have come from the pen of Martha Washington addressed to the wives and mothers of men in the armed services.)

MOUNT VERNON, VA., *February 22, 1951.*

DEAR COUNTRYWOMEN: On the eve of the birthday of the general I am thinking of you whose men are in the armed services of our country.

I am not unacquainted with your sufferings consequent upon parting with your husbands and sons. As the wife of a military man, I lived always in the shadow of war. Our very marriage was postponed until the French and Indian wars were successfully ended at Fort Duquesne. I heard the first shot of the Revolutionary War and the last.

My son by my first marriage, John Parke Custis (I called him "Jackey"), served the general as aide-de-camp. During the siege of Yorktown, Jackey was stricken with camp fever and died. He left a young wife, Eleanor Calvert, of Mount Airy, Md., and four small children. George Washington Parke Custis and Nellie Parke Custis were then in our home at Mount Vernon. At the time of their father's death, the general turned to me and said tenderly, "I adopt the two younger children as my own."

Most carefully he cherished these grandchildren of mine. He supervised their morals and their learning. When he returned home after the Revolutionary War he wrote to the overseer: "Let the house in the upper garden called the 'schoolhouse' be cleaned and got in order against I return."

During that bitter winter at Valley Forge my heart bled for our soldiers. If you visit the house that the general and I lived in, you may see my sewing bag. It was a minor hardship to wear the harsh cotton woven in our own colony. Previous to the Revolutionary War, material for the general's and my clothing—silks, velvets, satins—came directly from the mother country. Now I personally assisted in the making of cotton dresses striped with silk from the ravelings of old silk stockings and faded damask chair covers. My spinning wheels were never idle.

You have complained that at my husband's passing I burned his letters to me—that you have read but the one written before he left for Boston as head of the Continental Army:

"You may believe me, my dear Patsy, when I assure you, in the most solemn manner, that, so far from seeking this appointment, I have used every endeavor to avoid it * * * that I should enjoy more happiness in 1 month with you at home than I have the most distant prospect of finding abroad."

You women married to men in public life can surely understand that I was impelled to keep his communications to me sacred forever. We had so little private life together. The one time that we dined alone at Mount Vernon the general noted in his diary: "Mrs. Washington and myself will do what I believe has not been done within the last 20 years by us—that is sit down to dinner by ourselves."

On his last birthday Nellie was married to his nephew, Lawrence Lewis. Maidenlike, she asked the general to wear his best uniform on this occasion. She envisioned the one with the epaulets and gold embroideries.

Those of you who cherish worn khaki in old chests will know my emotion on Nellie's wedding day. The general did indeed wear his best uniform:

"He had spoken true.
He stood there in the worn old buff and blue.
Faded in great campaigns, long, long before."

Finally, my countrywomen, let us remember, "We are placed among the nations of the earth and have a character to establish. * * *"

I am, my dear countrywomen,
Your most respectful,
Mistress MARTHA WASHINGTON.

The Farmer's Fair Share

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Farmer's Fair Share," written by me and published in the February 1951 number of the Ohio Farm Bureau News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER'S FAIR SHARE

(By Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE)

We farmers are no strangers to the problem of surplus crops. Farmers have worried over these recurring surpluses for many years. Not only our annual income, but sometimes even our whole way of life on the farm have been at stake.

For decades we were accustomed to see our crops and those of all our neighbors and those of all the Nation's farmers pile up at the end of the season so much in excess of the capacity of the market, either national or international, to absorb them that the prices paid us dropped below even what we had invested in time and money to produce the crop.

ABUNDANCE A BURDEN

Surpluses, not so long ago, used to spell black ruin to the farmer. Abundance often proved a burden instead of a blessing.

During the past few years the whole American people has begun to worry about this problem. Whereas, in the past, surpluses were of primary concern only to those in agriculture, today they are a national problem. This problem should always have been one of national concern.

NATIONAL CONCERN

Whatever difficulties this newly awakened public interest in agriculture may temporarily cause us, we farmers should welcome this national concern as an encouraging sign. The task of those who speak for agriculture in these days is to assure, to the extent they can, that the public's understanding of the farm problem shall be equal to public concern.

The questions about agriculture asked most frequently by citizens appear to be these: Why are farm surpluses a problem while millions of people in the world are starving? Why must food rot in warehouses while our own poor people go hungry? Why are food prices for the consumer so high, when there is so much food produced each year beyond what is consumed? What's wrong about our national agricultural program? What's the matter with our system of distribution? Who's to blame and why can't something be done about it?

REASONS FOR SURPLUSES

The recent great war gave a demonstration of the gigantic strides in productivity that have been made on our farms. By a prodigious effort American farmers met and surpassed the combined demands of the civilian population, the Armed Forces, and our allies.

Production in agriculture during the war came as the fruition of long, patient, and arduous study, experimentation, and labor in the laboratory and in the field. The gains made then were gains that won't be unmade.

World War II solved the problem of surpluses. Perhaps the present world crisis will solve the surplus problem by liquidating the stocks once again. This is the greater reason why we must find a solution that doesn't depend on destruction by war and famine caused by war.

New seeds, new fertilizers, and new techniques have raised the productivity of each acre faster than the population is growing. The prospects now are that America will always be able to keep ahead of any really dangerous shortage in food.

PERISHABLE SURPLUSES

It is this kind of surplus—in perishable foods—that worries people the most. It is impossible for a moral individual to view dispassionately the piling up of huge stocks of milk, eggs, butter, potatoes, etc., while he knows that millions of people are undernourished and that millions of others are prevented from buying them because of skyhigh retail prices.

No farmer really wants not to produce as much as he can. His purpose in life is producing the greatest possible amount of foods and fibers and forest products from his land. No farmer ever liked plowing under every other pig or keeping part of his acreage out of cultivation. Every farmer likes it even less when he knows that new methods make his potential production so much greater.

Finally, as we so often point out, the agriculture industry, unlike other types, must produce in accordance with the seasons of the year. Once the crop is in the ground, the farmer cannot halt production, lay off workers, or close his plant if he sees the market for his crops disappearing. Yet his market does sometimes virtually disappear, just when his crop is ready to harvest.

FARMER'S LOSS IS NATION'S LOSS

In the past the farmers themselves took the losses when they had to sell their produce at a certain time for whatever the buyer would offer. The farmers' losses, of course, meant a drop in purchasing power for goods produced in the cities, and thus contributed to lower income not only for the farmer and his family but for the rest of the Nation as well.

To help meet the physical and psychological conditions under which farmers work, the Government now provides crop loans. The Government takes the losses. One big question is whether this is a full answer to the farm problem.

The price-support system which our present agricultural law has set up to help the farmer maintain his income level is by no means perfect. I have grave doubts about certain applications of this law.

There is no doubt that price supports have encouraged overproduction in many commodities, especially perishables, which would not otherwise have been produced in quantities so far beyond the power of the Nation's consumers to purchase them at the prices asked. In these instances price supports are working neither in the best interest of the whole country nor in the best interest of the farmers. We are all aware of what happens when prices go too high—the market for a given food product dwindles or disappears.

For all these reasons, farmers are thinking as never before about a long-range agriculture program that will eliminate the unsatisfactory effects of the present law, and that will at the same time solve the farmer's special problem.

LESS THAN HALF OF CONSUMER'S DOLLAR

In recent months, especially since the start of the Korean war, food consumption has risen substantially. This fall, I am informed, per capita food consumption was running about 11 percent above the 1935–39 average, although some 6 percent under the 1946 postwar high. Demand this year has been heaviest for livestock products, as is normally the case when money for food is relatively plentiful. At the same time, supplies of food have proven to be more than ample, despite military purchases and foreign-aid shipments. Still, even now, we all know that millions of our lower income people are not receiving sufficient nourishment. They simply can't afford it at these prices.

We have found, in our months of investigation, one striking fact to be true: On the average, the farmer—without whom there would be no food to process, distribute, or sell—is receiving less than half of the consumer's food dollar; that is, more than 50 percent of the dollars paid out by the consumer at the grocery counter goes to the various middlemen who stand between the farmer and the consumer for processing, packaging, handling, transporting, wholesaling, and retailing.

Much of these in-between charges, of course, are absolutely necessary. But some of them, we are convinced, are absolutely unnecessary, and add a heavy burden on the consumer who buys the finished product. We are sure that great gains are possible in reducing distribution costs and thus narrowing the spread between what the farmer receives and the consumer pays.

DISTRIBUTION COSTS

Sometimes, it must be acknowledged, the consumer insists on too fancy a packaging and servicing for an otherwise simple item. Many city dwellers insist on milk being delivered to their doorsteps, or buy a handful of potatoes neatly wrapped in cellophane, or one dill pickle in a plastic sack. Whether the customer insists on this special treatment or the merchant presses it upon him is a question with many arguments pro and con.

There is much that can be done to simplify, speed up, and cut costs of distribution in the food industry. It may be, for example, that the present method of milk distribution in cities could stand a change. Studies made recently in Buffalo, N. Y., indicate that to deliver a single quart a day to a household and collect cash for it each time costs 13 cents per quart, while to deliver 4 quarts each delivery and collect payment at the end of the month costs only 3 cents per quart. Yet the person buying 1 quart pays the same price as the person buying 4.

Also the charge for home delivery is partly levied against those who buy their milk at the store. It is certainly unfair to spread these high costs of delivery to all who buy milk. An improvement can be made here.

Another factor rarely noted as contributing to price inflation is the use of the percentage mark-up instead of what can be called a unit mark-up. The percentage-type of mark-up is widely employed by both wholesalers and retailers. In effect, those who use it assure themselves a higher profit per unit the more they pay for the item originally.

An item which once cost 50 cents and which the grocer marked up his usual 20 percent—or 10 cents—may now cost him $1. He doesn't add a 10-cent mark-up as before, however, but rather his usual 20 percent—that is, 20 cents on the dollar. The consumer pays the grocer $1.20. Yet the labor of handling this item on the shelves of the store is no more, when the item costs $100 than when it cost 50 cents. The difference is that the customer is charged 20 cents instead of only 10.

Naturally, this is supposed to work the other way when prices descend—but today we are in a period of price inflation and prices are not descending. Too few customers realize the importance of this method of mark-up in their cost of living.

FARM PRICES DROP

In the past 3½ years we have watched the prices paid to the farmer for his produce drift downward—not, of course, to the point of ruin—but, nonetheless, lower. At the same time we have seen the prices paid for food by the consumer rise higher and higher. This is an unhealthy state of affairs.

Of course, wages and other costs have risen in the food-processing industry as in others. We all realize that. But, have they risen to the point of justifying the current, unprecedentedly high food prices? Such investigations as we have conducted indicate that some processors are demanding and receiving—exorbitant profits at the expense of the consumer and without benefit to the farmer.

Unfortunately, the philosophy of too many food processors is summed up in the statement expressed before our subcommittee by a vice president of a major meat-packing company, who declared: "In the meat business you take advantage of any increased demand by the raising of your price."

My own opinion, based on testimony heard over the past year, is that certain processors tend to anticipate increased demand by raising their price in advance, and later letting it drop a bit if the pill is too bitter for the consumer to swallow.

The over-all picture is one of a few powerful companies strategically placed in the economy who operate on the principle of charging whatever the traffic will bear.

It would seem reasonable for the consumer to expect that a drop in prices to the farmer would be reflected in a comparable drop at the retail store at least as soon as the normal turn-over of inventory takes place. It would also seem proper that when the commodity prices are rising the consumer should expect to pay higher retail prices as soon as stocks on hand at the earlier price level have been exhausted.

What we have learned, however, in our studies of domestic food and fiber price spreads—as well as in our look at coffee prices—is that food processors do not readily lower their prices in accordance with lower costs of raw materials (that is, when they pay the farmers less for the crop), but that they are ready, willing, and eager to raise prices the minute the basic commodity market begins to advance—and even to ask more than the advances could possibly warrant.

The food processors have been exacting full benefit from the inflation, and using the abnormal profits therefrom to finance an expansion of facilities rather than passing profits on to their stockholders in the form of dividends.

CONSUMERS GOT BILL

Were the consumers now or in the future likely to benefit from this increased plant capacity by lower prices based on greater output, one might well make a case justifying this strange form of consumer investment. I fear, however, that there are few signs of such a happy outcome. The stockholder, at least, got new equity from this expansion but the consumers got the bill.

Since the start of warfare in Korea, food prices once again have begun their upward spiral. The farmer, as you farmers know, has seen little change for the better in terms of higher prices for what he produces.

It now seems almost impossible that we can avoid imposition of strict price controls by the Federal Government.

None of us wanted this if it could possibly be avoided. A heavy share of the responsibility for Government price controls will have to be borne by those who have driven up retail prices in the past several months.

Another potent influence on prices, we are finding, is the concentration of industry. The Big Threes, the Big Fours, and the Big Fives in soap, baking, dairy products, and son on, seem to have reached such dominant positions in their industries as to allow them to set prices without too much regard to competition. Although Congress has for nearly 60 years sought to control or limit the concentration of industry by antitrust laws, the problem is more acute today than ever before.

AIDED BY ADVERTISING

The great aggregations in the food industry have certainly been assisted in attaining their dominant positions in the market by the use of extensive advertising. For example, in the prepared cereal industry we have found it not unusual for advertising expenditures to run from 10 to 15 percent of the sales. In some cases, when a new product is being introduced on the market, advertising has taken 20 percent of the sales.

We have learned that large food-producing groups spend from 5 to 10 percent of the sales income on advertising their brands. Vegetable and meat canners spend only about 1½ to 3 percent of their sales revenue on advertising. Chain-store advertising, while large in quantity, generally runs less than 1 percent of total sales, as does that of the large meat packers.

All these expenditures for advertising, of course, are deducted from taxable income as costs of doing business, and, like the individual package for the humble dill pickle or the fancy pants on a lamb chop or chicken leg, are all paid ultimately by the consumer.

There is no doubt in my mind that heavy advertising for brand A as against brand B—both being practically identical products from different companies—adds measurably to the retail price paid by the consumer.

BOLSTER ANTITRUST

Unless we have hard-hitting prosecution under existing antitrust laws and unless present loopholes in those laws are plugged, the trend toward gigantic aggregations of corporate power will surely lead to absolute control by them of the market for food and, thus, control of the prices consumers have to pay for food. Most likely, too, in such a framework, the farmers would receive an even smaller part of the consumers' dollar.

Every farmer in the United States has a vested interest in the success of anti-monopoly legislation and antitrust prosecution. It's too bad they don't make their voice heard more loudly on this in Washington.

Beyond this, however, we must find another way of handling the so-called surpluses in perishables. Either we must rigorously curtail production or we must somehow expand the consumption of perishable foods. It is impractical and immoral to continue amassing them in storage.

EGG SUPPORTS REMOVED

The Secretary of Agriculture has announced that as of December 31 price supports on eggs have been withdrawn. This is drastic action, taken reluctantly, after the Government has invested about $100,000,000 in dried eggs purchased under the support program. Dropping the support rate 10 cents a dozen from last year's rate still failed to discourage overproduction. Now all supports are removed.

This may not help dispose of much of the surplus eggs now in stock but it ought to discourage farmers from producing too many eggs next year. Yet, if it is proper to remove price supports from one perishable, is it not equally proper, under similar conditions, to remove them from others? But how, then, can it be considered fair to spend taxpayers' money to support some groups of farmers but not others?

In the past 20 years we have tried to settle the question, first, by controlling production on the farm, then by controlling surpluses after the harvest. We are still far from finding a full solution.

One thing is certain: We must find a closer balance among effective demand, available supply and consumer prices. There is no logic and no justice, for example, in storing away tons of butter, letting it turn rancid, giving it away or selling it for next to nothing abroad, and keeping the market price to the consumer at a rate which cuts down consumption. This holds equally true for other perishables as well.

Our rule must be to find a price that is neither so high as to discourage consumption, nor so high as to encourage excessive production, nor so low as to endanger the income of the farmer. This won't be easy. We have not succeeded with the price-support program in perishables, however well that program may appear to be working in storables.

I do not regard the food-price problem as unsolvable. I do not believe, either, that it can be solved by any single, simple panacea. Solution will demand a concerted attack from all angles at once, an attack that gives proper weight to the farmer's right to a living income, the middleman's right to a sufficient profit, and the consumers right to adequate nourishment at prices he can afford to pay.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

My own plan of attack is a multiple attack. It does not by any means include all the possible or necessary steps that will have to be taken. But it operates in an area where much more can be done than has been done.

First, I hope to see created a special, independent, continuing Senate watchdog committee on prices to stand guard in the present war economy over the just interests of all our citizens in their role as consumers—and we are all consumers.

Second, we must have rigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, especially in the food-processing and distributing industry, as well as enactment of such additional legislation as will curb the trend toward greater and greater concentration of industrial power and as will flatten the trade barriers that are rising in our economic system.

Third, we need constant efforts by industry, under the watchful eye of the public's representatives in Congress, to improve current methods and practices in food processing and distribution, with a view to reducing costs, eliminating duplication where wasteful, and bringing food to the Nation's tables at the lowest price consonant with reasonable profit to those in business.

Fourth, we need thorough reevaluation by farm organizations, by the USDA, and by the Congress, of the present farm laws as they affect surpluses and consumer prices, and amendment of those laws in the interest of the greatest possible market for farm products at prices farmers can afford to work for and consumers can afford to pay.

Finally, we need continued exploration of industrial uses for agricultural products to put existing surpluses to work and to expand markets for farm crops.

The Fantastic Arizona Project Denounced in All the Hearst Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Members to the editorial published in all Hearst newspapers on February 15, 1951, on the fantastic central Arizona project—S. 75 and H. R. 1500—now the subject of hearings before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The editorial follows:

A FANTASTIC PROJECT

While the Nation's economy ponders how it can underwrite the staggering cost of the rearmament program, support foreign beneficiaries, finance cherished administration schemes like the Brannan plan, and still survive, the State of Arizona is trying to force through Congress the greatest of all boondoggling projects.

Aptly called the Nation's most fantastic project, the central Arizona irrigation district would spend $2,075,720,000 over 75 years to pour Colorado River water on land worth $300 an acre at the cost of $1,838 per acre.

All but 1 percent of this sum would be paid by the other 47 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. Between New York's share of $304,509,000 to Nevada's $2,698,000, the other States would be mulcted in proportion.

This represents benefits of $550,000 each to the landowners of the irrigation district, more than half of which is held by 420 individuals.

These figures, preposterous to the point of incredibility, were compiled by Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman.

Undeterred by the astronomic cost and the palpable injustice of demanding that the entire country stand the expense of benefiting a handful of land speculators, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has reported favorably on the project.

After debate in the Senate it will pass to the House Public Lands Committee, and may in time become law unless Senators and Representatives from all States but Arizona again defeat it as they did in the last Congress.

Arizona's raid on the national resources and Treasury, proceeding by the light of "politics as usual," depends largely on the presence of her Congressmen in positions and on committees of importance: Senator MCFARLAND, the majority leader; Senator HAYDEN, of the Appropriations Committee; and Representative MURDOCK, chairman of the House Public Lands Committee.

To southern California alone this claim on the precious and strictly limited waters of the Colorado is a deadly threat against her continued development as the country's third largest center of industrial production, and the home of 5,000,000 people.

To other States it is a heavy drain on their funds with no promise whatever of any benefit. Many of them, in fact, would be paying for a prodigal gift of new arable lands to Arizona while their own agricultures have been cut back 20,000,000 acres.

No wonder the President, the Departments of the Army and the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget have all opposed the proposal.

Determined opposition in both Senate and House by Members whose viewpoint and conviction extend beyond the commercial ambition of a privileged few can and should stop this dangerous and extravagant scheme.

Simple Justice Demands Lithuania's Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the address I gave, and the resolutions adopted, at a mass meeting of Lithuanians on February 18, 1951, in Our Lady of Vilna Parish Hall at Worcester, Mass., held to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of Lithuania's independence day. The resolutions were adopted at the conclusion of the speaking program.

The address and resolutions follow:

MR. DONOHUE'S SPEECH

I am very glad to be able to accept the kind invitation to take part in this commemoration tonight of the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, not so much as your Congressman, but more as your friend and neighbor.

This annual program is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians and their friends, because it is held to recollect that day of February 18, 1918, which marked the end of well over a century of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule.

Thirty-three years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny.

In this year of 1951, our observance here tonight is, unfortunately, shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

The world does not know all the terrible details of what has happened and is happening to Lithuanians behind the dark, impenetrable iron curtain. However, we do know that behind that dreadful iron curtain hundreds of thousands of God-fearing Lithuanians have been liquidated, martyred for their patriotism, their religious faith, their steadfast resistance to tyranny.

Hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians have been torn from their families and their homes for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor that Stalin is using to equip Russia for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, and, perhaps, even for war, and a substantial part of the slave force has been kidnaped from Lithuania.

Certainly we cannot continue, and must not continue to close our eyes to this injustice, to close our ears to the calls for help, to close our hearts to the suffering we know is going on behind the iron curtain. Without losing our honor, we cannot much longer ignore the human tragedy the iron curtain conceals. We cannot much longer endure the shame we feel by tolerating the maintenance of such brutality. We cannot much longer hold up our heads in self-respect, if we continue to give silent approval to a group of aethistic political leaders who have demonstrated themselves to be devoid of Christian humanity and any sense of Christian justice.

The principle of political independence enunciated in the declaration by the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter, is a hollow mockery in the present suppression of the Lithuanian people. Lithuania is undergoing a shameless conquest, the victim of as bold and cynical a diplomatic campaign as any big state has ever waged against a gallant, honorable, but weaker neighbor.

Although we mourn over her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressors.

All over the world, Lithuanians are gathering, at this time, to renew their vows to work for the independence of their homeland. Here in the United States, I earnestly believe that most Americans are becoming increasingly more concerned about the fate of Lithuania, which stands in accusing testimony to our failure to live and act according to the principles for which our people have fought and died in two world wars. I consider it the solemn duty of every officer of our National Government to reveal the truth of the extinguishment of self-government, that is being forced upon the smaller nations, like Lithuania, by the Russian Government policy of expansion through fraud, intimidation, and coercion. World War II was fought with the clear understanding and pledged purpose that common victory should bring restoration of self-government and territorial integrity to the oppressed nations of the world. That pledge must be carried out.

The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples.

In simple justice, our Government must insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

You must dedicate yourselves today to the determined revelation and presentation—to the world—of the facts and truth about Lithuania, so that the United Nations shall accept the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring the independence of Lithuania. May God grant that this will be accomplished within the year.

RESOLUTION

At a mass meeting of Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., held under the auspices of the Knights of Lithuania, Chapter 116, the Lithuanian Catholic Federation, the Lithuanian Societies and the parish of Our Lady of Vilna, on February 18, 1951, at Our Lady of Vilno Parish Hall at Worcester, Mass., the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas Russia, by force of arms and in utter violation of all legal and moral laws, continues to occupy the Republic of Lithuania, to deport, execute, and imprison Lithuania's Nationals, to commit atrocities against the government and civil population of Lithuania, to systematically destroy Lithuania's democratic form of government: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful, by force of arms, occupation of the Republic of Lithuania; against Russia's deportation, execution, and imprisonment of Lithuania's Nationals; against Russia's commitment of atrocities against the Government and the civilian population of Lithuania; against Russia's systematic destruction of Lithuania's democratic form of government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do hereby most fervently petition Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America, to use to the utmost, the influence of the Government of the United States of America, to the end that, all Russian military forces and government be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania, and that Lithuania and her people be liberated and Lithuania be restored as a free and independent republic among the nations of the world according to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts, and to the press."

WILLIAM J. KISSELL,
Chairman.

MRS. TEKLA B. MAZEIKA,
Secretary.

Air Travel From Puerto Rico to the Mainland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, including extraneous material, I am including herewith an editorial from the newspaper El Mundo, one of the most important papers in the island of Puerto Rico, concerning air travel between Puerto Rico and the mainland.

I believe that the position of the editorialist of El Mundo is very well taken. The people of Puerto Rico, as citizens of the United States, have a right to ample and convenient transportation service from their island to the mainland at fair rates. There is no better way to attain this end than by competition. Monopoly in air travel between Puerto Rico and the mainland would have the same bad effect that monopoly has wherever it is present. Puerto Rico has been subject to such monopoly for a long time. The time has surely come when it should be freed from this very undesirable situation.

The editorial follows:

A STEP BACKWARD?

Pan-American Airways has made a petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board to reconsider the authorization given to Eastern Air Lines to supply service for passengers and cargo on the route between San Juan and New York.

Pan-American is trying to protect their monopoly which they have had for some time on this route, but we doubt that whatever their reasons and arguments may be, they would carry more weight than the convenience and the well-being of the people of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico also have their rights.

It should be understood that the certificate given to Eastern by the Civil Aeronautics Board is not only the result of the efforts of Eastern Air Lines to extend their services to this part of the national territory, but the authorization, which has been delayed through a number of years, is the answer to the demands of the people of Puerto Rico for better services and lower rates in air transportation.

The Government of Puerto Rico through their most distinguished representatives was heard through the press and in a long and detailed campaign; also numerous local industries and civic clubs were heard in this case giving all their efforts to promote what they considered the best for the public of the island and most convenient for their economic development.

The Civil Aeronautics Board did not decide this case right away. It took them many months and years to study and restudy the case notwithstanding the efforts of those interested parties in giving the island a better air service. The Civil Aeronautics Board took all the time needed and even more in checking and investigating the arguments on both sides, particularly those arguments against the granting of a new franchise.

The situation was a rather difficult one, not because it was difficult to decide what was evidently a necessity and a convenience to the island, but because there were many petitions before the Civil Aeronautics Board from different airlines offering new services to Puerto Rico. Eastern requested much more than what was given to them. Finally the Civil Aeronautics Board decided the case granting Eastern the direct route from New York to San Juan and Riddle Aviation the route Miami-San Juan for cargo.

And now that the situation is about to start with more ample services and competition between two of the first-class airlines, Pan-American wants us to go back and start all over again. Is not this an injustice to the public that has given Pan-American Airways so much business and had to struggle so much for its demands to be heard?

The funny part of it is that Pan-American has given us a definite proof of how healthy it is for Puerto Rico to cope with a competitive situation as this. Their directors announced a few days ago a reduction in their tourist and excursion rates, also the increase of some of their services. The reduction of these rates is to become effective precisely at the same time that Eastern have announced the beginning of their new services and precisely the same reduced rates on their direct route to New York.

Unless there are more serious reasons, we believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board should not hurt the interests of the Puerto Ricans by leaving this matter in the air again.

The case has been studied, analyzed, and solved. Let us give this island the opportunity to enjoy their success.

Manpower Is Vital to Milk Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the ability of a country to supply both civilians and soldiers with adequate food is one of the most important considerations in the conduct of war. Without food, the people cannot live, work, or fight. To produce necessary food, we must have adequate manpower, machinery, and equipment. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that the Selective Service System adopt a uniform manpower policy that will properly classify essential farm workers, so that such essential farm workers can continue in food production.

The dairy industry is one segment of agriculture, which is being particularly hard hit by the drafting of men into the armed services. This week I received a petition signed by 351 dairymen, 7 creameries, and 1 large dairymen's association in my district, protesting the injury to the dairy industry, which is resulting from the loss of manpower through the draft. These dairymen own in the aggregate thousands of acres of land, on which are raised thousands of dairy cows which produce millions of gallons of milk.

The petition follows:

To Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Lewis B. Hershey, Director of National Headquarters of the Selective Service System; Chairman, National Selective Service Appeal Board; Director, California State Director of Selective Service:

We, the undersigned residents of the San Joaquin Valley in the State of California, do respectfully petition the President of the United States, and the officers and directors of the Selective Service System, to interpret the present selective-service laws and regulations or to amend the same if necessary, in order to protect the welfare of these United States, by protecting the milk industry, which is an agricultural industry necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, and interest.

We request that agricultural workers in the milk and dairy business be classified in class II-C, as set forth in the rules and regulations of the Selective Service System, as being engaged in a necessary agricultural occupation on the ground of the following reasons and conditions:

1. Where the registrant dairy employee is and has been engaged in that agricultural pursuit.

2. Where the registrant dairy employee cannot be replaced because a shortage of qualified persons exists to do that type of work.

3. Where the removal of the registrant dairy employee is and will cause a material loss to the dairy industry, in that many dairies will have to be closed down, the stock sold or depleted resulting in a decrease in the production of essential milk and butterfat products, thus endangering not only the industry, but the welfare of the people of the United States at large and of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(Signatures omitted.)

Campbell "Doc" White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would today like to pay tribute to a man whose fearless nature has led him through a career of law enforcement which make him the envy of all who fight to uphold justice and to insure a safer way of life for the citizens in this country.

Although he is now retired, and lives a relatively quiet life with his wife in Austin, Tex., Mr. Campbell "Doc" White has unselfishly given 42 years of his life to the pursuit of those who would endanger the lives of you and me. It is courageous men like "Doc" White to whom we owe a debt of gratitude. Although this country is by no means free of crime, it is the work of men like "Doc" White which has practically exterminated the lawless, brazen desperadoes of the past.

In the February issue of the Texas Parade, a monthly publication of the Texas Good Roads Association, there appeared an article about "Doc" White which I would like to call to the attention of every Member of Congress. I respectfully submit this article for insertion in the RECORD:

A RANGER REMINISCES

(By Leonard Mohrman)

The chickens had started to roost, two Chihuahua pups—Tita and Pancho—and a terrier nestled in corner bunks. Dolly and her colt were up for the night.

Campbell "Doc" White, 66, retired FBI agent and former Austin policeman, United States customs service agent, and Texas Ranger—42 years of criminal chasing in all—settled into an easy chair.

His rock home 14 miles west of Austin was a long way from Chicago and the menacing thirties—"Ma" Barker, "Machinegun" Kelly, and Dillinger.

Doc lighted a cigarette; its smoke curled up under a mounted 11-point deer's head. Mrs. White sat alongside in her wheelchair. The invalid descendant of Texas' famed Gen. Benjamin McCulloch had covered her pet parrot's cage. She no longer worried when the telephone rang, and when it didn't.

"I used to tell her," laughed Doc, "it was like Big Foot Wallace said. "A man born to hang would never die of shot."

The veteran of FBI special squad duty was back home—returned from a heap of travel to the Cedar Valley tract once his father's. It is just 9 miles from Doc's log cabin birthplace.

Twilight had come. Doc could think serenely about that fence he plans, the garden or, like the crack of a pistol, snap his thoughts back to those fabulous yesteryears.

They started in 1905. Doc's father, Robert Emmitt White, was Austin's mayor when Congress Avenue was paved, a Travis County sheriff, then the county judge when the South Congress Bridge went up over the Colorado River. His father waived juvenile rights on the 20-year-old son and Doc reported to Capt. John R. Hughes as a Texas Ranger.

Brother Tom also was a ranger and later, too, became an FBI agent. Tom, warden of the Federal correctional institution at La-Tuna, Tex., still nurses a left arm shot-riddled in 1931. It was at Leavenworth, Kans., Federal prison that seven convicts took Warden Tom White hostage in a brazen escape plot.

And John Dudley, the third Ranger White. He was shot down while on duty in east Texas. Doc's eyes narrowed as he told how a wife and three children were left—a son, John Dudley, Jr., is now a ranger.

Crockett "Coley" White, another brother, served as Travis County sheriff. He lives in Austin as does a sister, Mrs. Della Carwin.

Little wonder a long-time Austin resident commented that he had never known a White who knew fear.

In 1909 Doc had switched from the rangers to Austin's police force.

In 1913 Doc left Austin for the United States customs service and rode the valley and along the border until 1917 when World War I bugles sounded.

A military intelligence major, Doc grudgingly recalls, thwarted his only chance to see Europe. "I fooled around over here," growled Doc, "and went back into the customs service when I got out."

It wasn't long until Doc thoroughly tested his father's teachings. "Get all the evidence you can, son," Robert Emmitt White had instructed, as Doc recalls, "then put yourself in the criminal's place * * * think it out * * * plug up those holes, son."

In 1924 Doc joined the FBI and later heard Director J. Edgar Hoover admonish: "Don't think you have a corner on brains * * * if a county constable has a better plan, use it."

"It worked many a time," Doc nodded, adding, "Mr. Hoover is the greatest organizer of law enforcement."

"It's interesting to match wits with a criminal," Doc said, "but," he added with a growl which aroused the dozing pups, "most gangsters will shoot you where your suspenders cross."

A slight undertone of respect threaded his bellowing mention of Ma Barker. She was tabbed by G-man Hoover as the most dangerous lawbreaker in my experience.

When Ma, who with her gang had run up a string of bank robberies, hold-ups, and murders, stepped over the Federal line with the $200,000 kidnaping of Edward G. Bremer, the FBI moved in.

Doc was there—behind a shrinking tree, as he recalls—when Ma met her match at her Oklawaha, Fla., hide-out. Her favorite son, Freddie, fell with her in the FBI's hail of bullets.

"But old Creepy Karpis—he was hooked up with them—was yellow as a pumpkin," scoffed Doc. "The boys tell me that when Karpis and Harry Campbell were caught in New Orleans," Doc snarled, "old Creepy darn near pushed out the top of the car getting his hands up; he had a pistol and rifle in that car, too."

"The nerviest gunman I ever saw," Doc confided, "was Harvey Bailey." Wanted for bank robbery, Bailey joined the Machinegun Kellys and the Texas Shannons. Kelly kidnaped wealthy Charles F. Urschel, Oklahoma City oilman. The hunt was on.

"The Kelly gang's hide-out was in Wise County near Paradise, Tex.; we moved in at night," Doc recounted.

"Harvey awoke looking into a gun muzzle; he didn't budge," said Doc.

"Why don't you go for your gun?" an FBI agent taunted Bailey.

Harvey just looked around, grinned, and replied:

"Hell, I don't want it now."

Address of Hon. W. Averell Harriman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, delivered on February 25, 1951, at the Emergency Conference sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations, held at Chicago, Ill.

I highly commend to my colleagues this very important and thought-provoking address:

I appreciate greatly the opportunity to open this Emergency Conference of the American Association for the United Nations.

First, I want to congratulate you on the subject selected for this conference—Our Responsibility for World Leadership. The free peoples of the world look to us for leadership. Their hopes for the future rest on their faith in us. Their faith comes from the fact that we have not used our preeminent position to dominate others, but rather to inspire cooperative action among nations and to give a helping hand to others in an effort to build a neighborly, decent, and peaceful world. They have confidence in us because they have seen us carry out this new concept of leadership through imaginative and vigorous action.

Yes; we have made mistakes. Some of our expectations have not been fulfilled. We have not always been foresighted. But the truth is that never in history has a nation acted with such high purpose and with such vision as has the United States during the past decade. As Americans we can all take pride in the role that our country has played. Yet, with humility, we must recognize that the tasks ahead may require a measure of greatness even beyond that which we have already achieved.

I need not speak to you of the noble part we played in the war to destroy the Axis. I do want to review briefly our policies and actions in the more complex field of world-wide human relations which is commonly called foreign affairs.

Our postwar objectives were first defined in August 1941—even before we were at war—when President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill met at sea and framed the Atlantic Charter. In this historic document the principles were set forth on which hopes for a better future for the world could be based. These principles included the respect of the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they would live; the desire to bring about the fullest collaboration among all nations for economic and social advancement; the right of every nation, great or small, to access on equal terms to raw materials; the establishment of peace under which all men might live in freedom from fear and want; and the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security. The principles of the Charter have guided our actions during the past decade.

In January of 1942, 26 nations, including the Soviet Union, subscribed to the Atlantic Charter in the declaration by United Nations. Later the other nations who joined in forming the United Nations at San Francisco in 1945 subscribed to these principles.

In attempting to develop the collective action envisioned by the Charter, it was recognized from the beginning that, because of the ideology of its rulers, we would encounter great difficulties with the Soviet Union. Special efforts were therefore made during the period when we were united in war to try to find a common basis on which to build a peaceful world community.

In spite of everything that has been said to the contrary, there is actually no mystery about our wartime relations with the Soviet Union. The prime objective of the British Government and ourselves was to maintain the Soviet Union as an effective ally in the war against Hitler. In this we were successful. They were effective allies. At the time we landed on Normandy the Russians were fighting the major Nazi armies, some 180 divisions.

Concurrently with our military negotiations we discussed postwar problems. You will recall that in October 1943, at the Moscow Conference, Mr. Hull and Mr. Eden negotiated with Mr. Molotov an agreement known as the Moscow declaration. In this declaration the Soviet Union joined with the United States, the United Kingdom, and China in recognizing the necessity of establishing an international organization, based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving nations, for the maintenance of international peace and security. This conference laid the foundation for the United Nations.

Subsequently we discussed specific political matters in Europe where difficulties were most likely to occur. It was evident that the Red Army would occupy the countries of Eastern Europe and the Balkans. We were fearful that the Soviet Union might use its military power to take them over. These discussions culminated at Yalta.

At Yalta the Soviet Union undertook definite commitments with the United States and the United Kingdom to respect the sovereignty of these liberated countries and to work with us to assist the people in holding free and unfettered elections to establish independent democratic governments. If the Soviet Union had honored these commitments, Poland and Eastern Europe would be free today, and the whole scene in Europe would be different.

We also carried on discussions with the Soviets about the war in the Pacific. I always believed that they would attack Japan before the war was over. In fact, Stalin told me as early as 1942, when I was in Moscow with Churchill, that he intended to do so after the defeat of Hitler. What was not clear, however, was whether the Soviets would come into the war in time to help us defeat Japan, or whether they would hold off until the going was easy. They could then readily occupy and retain control of Manchuria and Korea.

These discussions also culminated at Yalta, where Stalin agreed to enter the war against Japan within 3 months after VE-day. We must remember that at the time of Yalta the atomic bomb was not a reality and that the military estimated that unless the Russians tied down the Japanese armies in Manchuria the defeat of Japan would be long delayed at great cost in American lives.

In the Yalta agreement Stalin also undertook to enter into a treaty of friendship with the Chinese National Government and to recognize the sovereignty of that Government over Manchuria. A treaty of friendship between the Soviet Union and Chiang Kai-shek's government was subsequently concluded. In that treaty the Soviet Government and the Chinese National Government promised to work together in close and friendly collaboration, to respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and not to interfere in each other's internal affairs. The Soviet Union went further and promised to give the Chinese National Government, and only that Government, moral support and military and other supplies. The Chinese Government for its part agreed to the return to Russia of limited railroad, port, and naval base rights. However, the Soviet Union never lived up to its pledges to the Chinese National Government, and this started the postwar difficulties in the Far East.

The strength of the moral position of the free world today is founded on the fact that the United States and Great Britain made every effort during the war to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union. The fact that the Soviet Union broke its agreements helped to awaken the people of the free world to the duplicity and the aggressive designs of the Kremlin.

What are the designs of the Kremlin? The men of the Kremlin were a part of an international Communist revolutionary movement. It so happened that in the chaos caused by World War I they were able to seize control of Russia. Russia is now the base of the operations of this international movement, and the men in the Kremlin are now the leaders of that movement. I remember when I was in Russia 25 years ago, one of the commissars with whom I talked said that it was unfortunate for them that it happened to be Russia. He said that the Communists would have preferred to have seized control of a more developed, a more industrialized country than Russia, for instance, the United States. Actually, they had expected to seize Germany too.

This Communist international movement is determined to force its will on the peoples of the world. In fact, its teachings have been that a Communist state cannot, in the long run, survive in a capitalist world.

Within the Kremlin thinking there are two divergent pressures: One, the need to strengthen Russia as the base of operations, and the other, the program for world domination. After World War I, having failed to seize control of other countries, they soft-pedaled external aggression and brutally regimented the Russian people to industrialize the country. They might have followed a similar policy after the devastation of World War II. The failure to carry out the Yalta agreements definitely indicated a decision to pursue a plan of external aggression. The extent of their schemes has been revealed by their subsequent actions.

They have maintained vast military forces. They have exploited their satellites for their own purposes. They have oppressed and impoverished the peoples behind the iron curtain. The effect of this program is causing increasing discontent and unrest, particularly among the satellites, but also within Russia. We see clearly the difficulties Kremlin aggression is causing the free world, but it is hard to appraise fully the difficulties behind the iron curtain.

We should not confuse the aggressive intentions of the Kremlin with historic Russian imperialism. Russian imperialism had limited objectives, whereas Soviet Communist imperialism has unlimited objectives—the domination of the world. The men of the Kremlin are convinced that societies based on freedom will destroy themselves and that their totalitarian system offers the only lasting organization of human life.

Theirs is a long-term plan. They have developed a strategy on a global basis. They encourage dissension and discontent. Wherever possible they fan racial conflicts. They foment insurrections. They attempt to control and subvert labor unions to bring about political strikes to create economic chaos. They have developed a world-wide propaganda machine. Through rumors and lies, they engender fear and confusion.

In Greece, Malaya, and Indochina they have incited and supported civil war, causing untold death and misery to their subservient puppets and unhappy victims alike. They have plunged their North Korean satellite and the Chinese Communists into war with utter disregard for the welfare or the wishes of the people of Korea or China.

They have maintained strong military forces to support their puppets in the countries they took from the Nazis. They are also using these forces to intimidate their neighbors, but as yet they have not used them directly in a manner which they felt would involve them in a major war.

They believe by these tactics they can undermine the life of free peoples everywhere. They are convinced that the free world cannot stay united, and that they will be able to divide and take over the free nations one by one.

The policies of the United States have been exactly the reverse—to build unity among nations for human welfare.

After the war the United States took leadership in organizing united efforts to help people who had suffered so greatly from the war to get back on their feet. And as the Communist aggression has unfolded we have taken vigorous steps to deal with it. Our aid to Greece and Turkey has enabled those countries to maintain their freedom. Working with the peopl of Western Europe through the Marshall plan, we have checked and rolled back the Communist advance. We have joined with the nations of Western Europe in the North Atlantic Treaty. Together we are now organizing unified forces to deter or to deal effectively with military aggression. A supreme commander has been selected for these unified forces—our great Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In Western Europe the free people have taken the initiative and we are gaining the initiative in other parts of the world. The effect of the initiative in Europe has already penetrated the iron curtain in the defection of Yugoslavia. Tito was unwilling to have his country exploited by the Kremlin and wanted to participate in the improvement he saw developing in the West. This has been a major set-back for the Kremlin.

In the Far East events have not moved as well. With its progress checked in Europe, the Kremlin put greater pressure on the east. Both Lenin and Stalin have in the past stated that Europe can be brought to its knees through the East, through denial of raw materials upon which both Europe and our own country depend.

It is interesting that Karl Marx taught that the exploited industrial workers would be the fertile ground for Communist revolution, and that it would be difficult to subvert those living on the land because of their strong individualism. Industrial workers, however, have shared in the economic expansion of the West and have now a real stake in a free society. On the other hand, the misery of peasants in the East has provided the fertile field for Communist penetration.

The Economic Cooperation Administration, under Paul Hoffman's leadership, has developed a program of rural rehabilitation which brings to the individual peasant some of the simple technology of the West which can vastly improve conditions. This was started in China, but was too late to be effective. It is working in Formosa and is beginning to work in other eastern countries. It requires a minimum of money and a maximum of technical assistance. It includes malaria control, innoculation of people and their livestock against disease so devastating in those countries, simple improvements in tools, in fertilizer, in irrigation and drainage.

In Korea we have seen the results of our assistance. The people of Southern Korea have shown that they have a real stake in the independence which we helped them to gain. Their troops have fought gallantly and the civilian population have supported military operations in every way they could.

In dealing with the people of the Far East, we must recognize their sensitivity to anything which looks like western interference. They have pride in their ancient culture, and have today a strong determination to free themselves from western exploitation and colonialism. Our policies have recognized the justness of these aspirations. We have given the Philippines its independence and are assisting that young republic to get on its feet. We welcomed the decision of the British Government to give independence to India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma, as well as that of the Netherlands to work out the independence of Indonesia.

So many people in the Far East have never had any hope for a better life. They are therefore more susceptible to the false promises of communism than are the people of the West. All western countries, including ourselves, must show the peoples of the Far East and the Near East that we consider that their welfare is our welfare, that they are a part of and a full partner in the political and economic life of the free world. The point 4 concept has been hailed in all of the underdeveloped countries. We must press forward and expand this program. There is a great field for useful work by private organizations of labor of farmers, of business, and of schools to interest themselves as the missionaries have done, in the welfare of the people of the East. With new hope through association with the West, it will be easier for these peoples to understand clearly that communism is merely a tool of Soviet imperialism.

We have a great opportunity in India today. As a result of a series of disasters—drought, floods, earthquakes, and locusts—there is a grave food shortage. I hope that President Truman's proposal to give food to India, which is supported by many members of both parties in the Congress, will be approved promptly. This is a unique occasion for the American people to show their friendship for the people of India at the very moment when there are some political differences between the Indian Government and our own. It will be further proof to the people of the world that we have no intention of using economic aid to interfere with the political decisions of other free countries.

Of profound importance in the East, and in fact everywhere, has been our support of the United Nations in resisting aggression in Korea. Fifty-three countries, all the free members of the United Nations, have endorsed this action. Fourteen have contributed fighting forces and 40 have given some form of assistance. It is inspiring to the people of the free world that their soldiers are fighting with great courage under one flag. We are deeply moved by the stories of heroism of our own men, of the men of Britain, of France, of Greece, of Turkey, and of other nations. They are fighting to prevent another world war.

I wonder whether it is fitting for us to question the will of our allies to fight. I was in Britain during the year that nation stood alone. I saw the spirit of the British people—men, women, and children. I was in Italy when the French Army fought bravely with us. For over 3 years the French have been fighting Communist aggression in Indochina, suffering severe losses. Now we see in Korea that with leadership and with adequate equipment, our allies fight for our common freedoms with the same gallantry as is the pride of the American tradition.

The preponderance of economic strength lies with the West. The North Atlantic community has 80 percent of the heavy industry of the world. Our job is to convert that strength to support an effective military force. Two-thirds of that strength is in the United States. Europe can supply more men for the armies because of its greater population, but a major part of the equipment must come from our factories.

To do this job will require sacrifice on the part of all our people and deeper sacrifices on the part of our European friends. When we think of our own sacrifices, let us stop to think for a moment of what this new effort means to the British housewife. For over 10 years she has had a weekly ration of meat which would be barely enough for one serving in an American family. Except for children, milk has been scarce and often unobtainable. She has been closely rationed on many items of food, clothing, and other household needs. Now she faces a new austerity.

American leadership and American participation have brought confidence to our European associates that an adequate defense force can be created—with confidence has come determination to do the job.

I have more faith today than at any time since my return from Moscow 5 years ago that the free world can win the struggle against the new form of tyranny we face. My confidence stems from the leadership which the people of the United States have already taken. They have supported, year after year, unprecedented programs to meet the situation as it unfolded—programs proposed by President Truman and developed in cooperation with the leaders of both parties in the Congress. I cannot believe that we will turn back now.

I firmly believe that not only can we win this struggle, but that we can prevent another world war, provided we carry on with our policies and programs and take advantage of every opportunity to press forward the cause of freedom throughout the world.

The Kremlin has a global strategy. Our strategy must always be on a global basis. Of first importance is unity in the free world. The United Nations has been a forum where issues could be discussed on a world-wide basis. It has been an effective forum in uniting public opinion in the free world. I need only to recall the fact that 53 countries supported the action in Korea.

We should not be discouraged by failure to attain unanimity of the free nations on all issues. One of our basic principles is that all countries, large and small, have a full right of independent expression. We have fostered this democratic principle among nations. Let us always remember this is the basis of the confidence of the free world in our leadership.

We must understand that other countries have varying problems and aspirations, that things don't always look the same to people in Europe, the Near East, the Far East, or Latin America as they do to us in the United States.

The responsibilities of world leadership call for patience, humility, and understanding, combined with vision, vigor, and determination. We must show these qualities in our support of the United Nations and in all of our relations with other countries. Only in this way can we cement unity in the free world.

On the military side we must press forward unhesitatingly in the development of our own military strength and give help to other free countries who are prepared to do the same. The free world cannot remain exposed. The Kremlin will use force if it believes that victory is easy.

On the economic side, we must continue assistance not only to help other countries develop their military potential, but also to increase their productivity. This is not a one-way street. An expanding economy at

home requires an expanding economy throughout the free world. Increased quantities of raw materials are needed not only for ourselves but for other industrial countries.

But above all we are fighting an ideological battle—truth against false doctrine. We must expose the international Communist revolution for what it is, a reactionary counter revolution. Ours is the true revolutionary cause for which man has struggled through the centuries—freedom, the dignity of the individual, the right of man to worship as he chooses, the state as the servant of the people.

The creed from Moscow that people are a mass, fit only to serve the State, is old stuff. That concept has been beaten in the past by men who loved freedom. It must be repudiated again. It will be a long and arduous struggle. Unlike military conflicts, ideological conflicts have never been settled by victory in battle on a given day. One concept grows in vitality, while the other recedes and decays. I can only believe that with the growing strength and unity of the free world—militarily, economically, and spiritually—the pressures behind the iron curtain will increase; the rulers of the Kremlin will find greater and greater difficulty in keeping their unhappy people subjugated.

If we fully accept our responsibilities for world leadership on a global basis, if we act with wisdom and vigor, prepared to make present-day sacrifices for the cause of freedom, there can be no doubt of the outcome. We have written an honorable page in history during the past 5 years. I believe that we will write a glorious chapter in the days ahead.

The Shield of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes a phrase tells more than a sentence, a paragraph, or any speech. Such a phrase is one used by Joseph and Stewart Alsop to describe American strategic air power, and its value as a deterrent of war. The Alsops call it "The shield of the free world."

Our primary purpose in strengthening our military establishment is not to wage war but to prevent war—and to be able to end it quickly if war should come in spite of the best efforts of diplomacy to prevent it. If we say that the purpose of our military establishment is to defend America we are saying the same thing with a different emphasis. We defend America better if we maintain the peace, than if we have to fight a war to restore it.

Our strategic air power is growing so strong, the Alsops remind us, that "there is no reason why the veiled threats of the Kremlin should have the shattering effect which the Kremlin so clearly desires." The Alsops conclude that, in order to prevent our building a solid ground defense in the west as an accompaniment of our crushing air superiority, Stalin and the Politburo may yet defy American strategic air power and accept war. "Yet at least," their column ends, "it is still possible to entertain the perfectly rational hope that a sort of long armed truce, based on a true power balance, may yet ensue. This is now the best that we can hope for. And it is thanks to American strategic air power, the shield of the free world, that we can hope for this."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop in the Washington Post of February 21, 1951:

The column is as follows:

THE SHIELD

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

Josef Stalin's recent menacing statement hinted very clearly that really serious preparations by the Western nations to defend themselves would make war inevitable. This is why it is deeply important to understand that American strategic air power is increasing by a sort of arithmetical progression. If this is understood, there is no reason why the veiled threats of the Kremlin should have the shattering effect which the Kremlin so clearly desires.

There is one way to measure the growth of our striking power. If war comes, the task of the Strategic Air Command will be, of course, to smash the industrial war potential of the Soviet Union decisively, and as rapidly as possible. The power to accomplish this task will be doubled within 6 months. And a year later, it will be doubled again.

Assume, for purposes of illustration, that the Strategic Air Force could now complete its mission within about 60 days of the outbreak of war (which is probably a reasonable estimate, provided forward bases were not neutralized). Then, 6 months from now, the mission could be completed within 30 days. And 18 months from now, the strategic air force should be able to finish its terrible task in little more than 2 weeks.

This extraordinary rapid increase in projected strategic power does not derive simply from increased production of atomic bombs and heavy bombers—neither the atomic bomb nor the B-36 can be rolled off production lines, like passenger cars. Much of the increased power comes, instead, from simple efficiency in operation.

The case of the B-36 provides the best example of this increased efficiency. An operational altitude of 40,000 feet has for a long time been publicly claimed for the B-36. This claim was true, but only in a literal sense. The B-36 could indeed climb to 40,000 feet. But it could maintain this altitude only at great risk of engine failure, for short periods, and with much sacrifice of speed, range, and load.

This is no longer so. A number of technical and necessarily secret improvements now permit the B-36 to fly many thousands of miles at 40,000 feet and more, without essential sacrifice of efficiency. What this means is very simple. The best of the Soviet jet fighters, like the MIG-15, are known to operate sluggishly at this height. One expert guess is that a Soviet jet which actually located a massed flight of B-36 bombers flying at full speed at 40,000 feet could get in at best a single pass against the concentrated firepower of the bombers.

Thus a very much higher proportion of any given flight of long-range bombers would get through to target than would have been possible only very recently. It is true that the best estimates are that if forward bases for the shorter range jet bombers were neutralized, the time required for the strategic air command to complete its mission would be more than doubled. But B-29s and B-50s could also reach Soviet targets from bases in this hemisphere, using refuelling techniques, although these planes are, of course, more vulnerable than of B-36s. Thus the important fact is that the strategic air mission could still be performed, even under the worst possible circumstances.

Moreover, the Soviet Union simply cannot match this country in the air. Careful analysis by Air Force experts has led to a startling conclusion. Even assuming that the Soviet Union were capable of producing an air force equivalent to the air force this country will soon have, it could not be maintained. To maintain it, for example, under training conditions for 1 year, and under combat conditions for only 3 months, would require more than half the yearly production of oil in the entire Soviet empire.

No nation, of course, could conceivably commit half its entire oil resources to its air force alone. Moreover, the Kremlin could not solve the problem simply by capturing the Middle East. Largely because of lack of transport, there would be no more than a trickle of oil to Russia for at least 3 years after the Middle East had fallen to the Kremlin.

In short, what is now in prospect is a crushing American air strength, which the Kremlin simply will not be able to equal. To be sure, this gives no grounds for complacency. For the Kremlin will nevertheless quite soon be able to deliver large numbers of atomic bombs to targets in this country and elsewhere. Moreover, this country and its allies will also never be able to match Soviet ground strength in terms of numbers of men on the ground.

Yet by a determined effort, a balance of power can still be achieved by combining a solid ground defense in the West with crushing air superiority. This is what Stalin and the Politburo are now determined to prevent. It may be that, in order to prevent it, Stalin will defy American strategic air power and accept war. Yet at least it is still possible to entertain the perfectly rational hope that a sort of long armed truce, based on a true power balance, may yet ensue. This is now the best that we can hope for. And it is thanks to American strategic air power, the shield of the free world, that we can hope even for this.

Capital-Gains Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President in his proposals for a $16,000,000,000 increase in the Federal tax burden has recommended that the maximum tax on capital gains be increased from 25 to 37½ percent. There may be some need and justification for an over-all increase in this rate, but such an increase would accentuate in at least one instance what is already a gross inequity in the law. I refer specifically to the imposition of the capital gains tax on the profit on the sale of a home where the individual reinvests the proceeds in another home.

Recent testimony before the House Committee on Ways and Means has

brought to the forefront the need for a revision in existing law. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation 2 years ago recognized the gross inequity in the present law and recommended that legislative action be taken to remedy the situation. The Treasury Department says it has the matter under study.

I firmly believe the Congress should take the necessary action during this session. In January of 1950 I introduced H. R. 6815 which would to a substantial degree handle the situation. On January 9, 1951, I reintroduced the same bill in the Eighty-second Congress. It is my understanding that other proposals of a similar nature are before the Committee on Ways and Means.

At the present time the Treasury, and it would be worse if the President's tax recommendations are approved, has a heads-I-win-tails-you-lose policy. The Federal Government says to its citizens, you cannot deduct a real loss on the sale of your home in computing your income tax and at the same time makes its taxpayers pay a tax on purely theoretical gains.

Recently a witness before the Committee on Ways and Means gave the following testimony in reference to this problem:

Let me give you a glaring example of what the present law does. Suppose that in 1946 I bought a home in Detroit for $10,000 and my brother bought one in Cleveland for $10,000. As a result of the cheapening of the value of the dollar the fair market value of my home in Detroit is now $15,000 and the fair market value of my brother's home in Cleveland is similarly $15,000. I am transferred to Cleveland from Detroit and my brother is transferred to Detroit from Cleveland, and we decide simply to trade homes.

The law now says that I realize a taxable gain of $5,000 when I take over my brother's house, and he realizes a taxable gain of $5,000 when he takes over my house. Because we were transferred in our jobs, we are each penalized to the extent of the tax on $5,000 worth of increased value which is not real gain.

Let us take another example. I have been employed by the X Corporation in Midville, United States of America, for 20 years. Midville is essentially a one-industry town. The X Corporation at its plant in Midville produces aluminum windows. It also has a plant in Centerville, United States of America, where it produces various other aluminum products. The National Production Authority prohibits the Midville plant from making any more aluminum windows, and the Centerville plant has received a large order from the Military Establishment for the production of vital parts for military aircraft. Because of the National Production Authority order it is necessary to the X Corporation to close down, at least temporarily, its Midville plant, but it needs all of its key Midville employees to work on the military contracts at its Centerville plant. I am one of the employees transferred to Centerville.

Because of the closing down of the plant at Midville, I, along with many other employees in Midville, am forced to sell my home. But because Midville is essentially a one-industry town, and the industry is shutting down, I cannot sell my home even for what I paid for it and I am forced to take a substantial loss. Yet, when I purchase a new home in Centerville, I am compelled to pay a higher price.

Here is another situation. Under existing law, if for example Mr. Jones' home is destroyed by fire, or by flood, or by some other catastrophe, or if it is taken by the Government for public purposes, the gain, if any, resulting from the insurance indemnity or the condemnation award is not recognized, provided I use the proceeds thereof to acquire another home. But if Jones is forced to move from one city to another because of a change in his job, he is caught in a trap. If his old home has increased in value over the original purchase price, this increase will be taxed to him as a gain, yet at the same time he is required to pay a comparable price for his new home. Jones had a home, and now all he has is another one, the cost of which takes all the proceeds from the sale of his first home. Neither residence is worth any more or any less than the other. But in changing his home, he has incurred a substantial tax liability to the Federal Government. Naturally the home owner does not believe that this sort of treatment is fair.

It is most important during the critical mobilization period that the Congress help rather than hinder the mobility of our working men and women. The adoption of the President's tax recommendations without a change in the Internal Revenue Code along the lines contained in my bill will definitely penalize citizens who must move from one place to another in order to find employment in the defense rearmament program. The perpetuation of the present law with a 20-percent increase in the penalty for small income home owners will hamper and impede our mobilization effort. Furthermore, it is morally indefensible to continue this "heads-I-win-tails-you-lose" policy. Congress must do something this year to alleviate this unwarranted hardship on a vast segment of the American people.

Shipment of Vital Materials to Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following from the minutes of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor executive board meeting of December 9, 1950.

Board Member Kennell moved and Board Member Parker seconded that the executive board of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor go on record in this meeting protesting the shipments of vital materials to Communist China and a copy of this resolution be sent to Secretary of Commerce, Charles Sawyer, and asking that the names of companies that have shipped these materials be published in the public press. Also included in this motion was that the Senators and Congressmen from the State of West Virginia receive copies of this resolution.

Whereas the United States Government is now engaged in one of the most costly wars in its entire history, both financially and in lives lost;

Whereas there seems to be a number of citizens and business organizations that seemingly think more of profits than they do of the lives of our young men by continuing to do business with Communist China;

Whereas we want to preserve this Government of ours and we feel that most of our citizens feel the same as we do and will pledge their full support. However, we do not think that any firm, business or citizen should be allowed to sell, barter or trade vital materials with a nation that is sending its soldiers on the battlefields and killing and wounding our soldiers. Such are not worthy of being harbored under our flag: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in this executive board meeting of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor we protest to the Honorable Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, United States, Washington, D. C., asking that the shipping of all vital materials to Communist China be stopped immediately; furthermore that the names of people and firms who have been shipping vital materials to Communist China be made public.

E. A. CARTER, *President.*
VOLNEY ANDREWS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*
J. M. PARKER,
H. RICHARD KENNELL,
A. H. BISHOFF,
Mrs. ELIZABETH KERR,
EARL TINNEY, *Board Members.*

No further business appearing, on a motion by Board Member Parker, seconded by all, we adjourned at 2:45 p. m.

Revised Indiana Plan for the Maintenance of National Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 I inserted in the RECORD of that date a copy of the Indiana plan for the maintenance of national manpower, which was presented by the Indiana Conference of Higher Education representing 31 public and private colleges and universities of the State of Indiana. Since that time this organization has kept in close touch with the development of legislation on this subject and on February 12, 1951, at a special meeting revised the original plan. I wish to insert a copy of the revised plan in the RECORD for the benefit of those who have expressed interest in the plan as previously presented:

THE INDIANA PLAN FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF NATIONAL MANPOWER—REVISED

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

1. The American college and university recognizes the gravity of the present crisis in world affairs and is sensitively aware of the fact that the national welfare must take precedence over other considerations.

2. Charged with the responsibility of leadership in American thought and life we must constantly point to the clear and present danger of the short view which would seriously impair our tradition of freedom under God. We must proceed on the commonly accepted assumption that our present situation must be viewed as a long term phase of our national preparation for any eventuality. Though victorious in our conflict with an alien and vicious ideology we could lose so many cultural and spiritual values that our victory would be empty.

In the light of these considerations we strongly take the position that present proposed legislation should not constitute a permanent national commitment to any program of universal military training and service. Proposed legislation should be enacted for a limited period of time and made subject to review by each succeeding Congress.

3. It is our profound conviction that in any plan of national mobilization we must maintain the values for which American colleges and universities have stood throughout their history as an expression of the heritage of our people. This means that definite and intelligent provisions must be made, even in a time of national emergency, for the uninterrupted training of the leaders of tomorrow. The American college and university must make a continuous contribution to the national welfare in terms of supplying manpower needs in every field of learning during this crisis and beyond it. Thus it is in the national interest that every man pursue his formal education for as long a period as he is willing and able and so long as he can be spared from military service.

STATEMENT OF PLAN

1. Upon the basis of these principles we affirm our conviction that those sections of the present selective-service law which provide for registration at age 18 with induction not before age 19 should be retained.

2. The length of military service should be extended from 21 months to 27 months.

3. Standards of induction should be lowered until approximately 78 percent of all young men are taken into the Armed Forces.

4. All freshmen who are attending college and are doing passing work at the time they receive their call should be deferred to the end of the academic year. All students who during their freshman year ranked in the upper half of their class should be deferred to the end of the sophomore year. All students who ranked in the upper two-thirds of their sophomore class should be deferred to the end of their junior year. All students who ranked in the upper three-fourths of their junior class should be deferred to the end of their senior year. Students should be deferred for graduate study if they have graduated in the upper one-half of their senior class, have been accepted by an established graduate school, and continue to maintain satisfactory progress in a program leading toward an advance degree.

5. All students who are deferred to continue in college shall attend college on a round-the-year program consistent with high academic standards.

6. Because continuance in college on a year-round program will impose a significant additional financial burden on the average American family and because participation in this plan should not depend upon the financial circumstance of the student, it is recommended that the Eighty-second Congress pass enabling legislation which will permit any student who is deferred under this program to borrow from the Government up to $100 per month during the period he is attending college.

It is further recommended that interest on this loan shall be at a rate of one-half of 1 percent greater than the going rate on long-term Government bonds at the time the loan is made, and repayment of the loan shall be made on the basis of annual payments equal to 25 percent of the participant's Federal income tax.

STATEMENT OF MANPOWER SITUATION

The testimony of Mrs. Rosenberg and General Hershey before the House Armed Services Committee established the fact that if the strength of the Armed Forces is raised to 3,500,000 men by June 30, 1951, and if present standards of induction and deferments are maintained, the national pool of acceptable inductees will be reduced to 411,000 by that date.

It was also established by the same testimony that this pool can be increased to 1,218,000 men in the following manner:

Number in pool by present standards June 30, 1951	411,000
Addition of college students by graduation and nondeferment	200,000
Reclaimed by lowering standards of IV-F deferments	250,000
Reclaimed from deferments by induction of men with one dependent	220,000
Inducted draftees now in National Guard and Reservist units	137,000
Total	1,218,000

In an Armed Force of 3,500,000 it is estimated there will be approximately 1,500,000 career men and men who serve for more than 27 months. This means that approximately 2,000,000 men will need to be replaced every 27 months or at a rate of about 900,000 each year.

Approximately 1,050,000 men reach a given age annually. Of these about 800,000 can be used in the Armed Forces if approximately 100,000 are used on limited service. This leaves a deficit of 100,000 per year which will be subtracted from the pool of 1,218,000. Allowing 600,000 as the minimum safety margin to be kept as a cushion in this pool, it is clear that there is no present need for lowering the induction age below 19 nor to modify the existing regulations with regard to the deferment of college students.

MEMBERS OF INDIANA CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Anderson College, Ball State Teachers College, Butler University, Canterbury College, DePauw University, Earlham College, Evansville College, Franklin College, Goshen College, Hanover College, Huntington College, Indiana Central College, Indiana State Teachers College, Indiana Technical College, Indiana University, Jordan College of Music, Manchester College, Marian College, Marion College, Oakland City College, Purdue University, Rose Polytechnic Institute, St. Joseph College, St. Mary's College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, Taylor University, Tri-State College, University of Notre Dame, Valparaiso University, Vincennes University, Wabash College.

The Preservation of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial written by Clifford B. Ward, which appeared in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel on February 15, 1951. Certainly the ideas embodied in this editorial are representative of the thinking of many people in our Nation today:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

What is needed most in this country is a conference of national leaders, whose patriotism is unquestionable, to sit down and work out a program or outline a set of principles to guide our national course. What is the general over-all principle that must always be kept in mind by our Nation? I think the answer to that is very simple: The preservation of the United States. Is there any American who does not agree to that?

When we speak of the United States, we do not speak of a geographical thing only, but of a spiritual thing comprised of our beliefs and traditions.

Now how best can we work for the preservation of the United States, while at the same time not being indifferent to the obligations which we have in common decency to see to it that other nations like us, also survive? The only justification that we can have for belonging to the UN or any world organization is to work ultimately for the preservation of the United States. The only justification we can have for the Marshall plan or anything like it is to preserve ultimately the United States. If we do not have in mind at all times and in all things that we do, the preservation of the United States, then we are wrong.

NECESSARY FOR ALL

The preservation of the United States is not only necessary to us who are Americans, but it is very necessary to every nation in the world that thinks as we do. The greatest blow that could happen to England, France, Italy, Spain, Canada, Australia, South America, and all the rest of the so-called free world would be the downfall of the United States. These nations have a stake in our survival, almost equivalent to their stake in their own survival because without us they are in for evil days.

The UN, looked upon by many as a step forward which it might have seemed to be in some respects, can actually be a step backward. This country, by reason of its political philosophy about the importance of the individual as a creature of God, was unique among nations.

It was unique because it alone said that man's rights come from his Creator. It is now a member of the UN and has subscribed to the Old World principle that man gets his rights from the State by parliamentary grant. The UN doctrine of human rights, which threatens to supersede the American constitutional freedom of unalienable individual rights, is all based on the notion that government can give rights and because it can give them can limit them when necessary and take them away completely when necessary. In our subscription to this principle we have taken a step right back into the oldest forms of tyranny.

IN WRONG SPOT

Our spokesmen in these UN formulations of a doctrine of human rights was Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. Even the most charitable individual in the United States would have difficulty in declaring Mrs. Roosevelt's mind to be one of our best. Even giving Mrs. Roosevelt the most generous treatment that charity could give her, she cannot be compared to any one of the founding fathers of this country whose works on human rights she is in a very real sense editing and revising. Our Bill of Rights compared with what

the UN has come up with is like comparing a child's scribbling on his nursery walls with the literary skill of a Thomas Jefferson, yet we are putting ourselves in a position to be bound by the UN formula, not our own.

Are there brains in this country? There certainly are and in both political parties. But these brains are not in charge of our national destiny at present and the present time is one that is testing whether this Nation or anyone like it shall survive. There is indeed need for prayer by everyone.

Drafting Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leland J. Melrose, editor, Minnesota Farm Bureau News, St. Paul, Minn., wrote to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Chief of Selective Service, a letter which so well describes the farm-labor situation in our State that I am inserting that letter herewith, in accordance with permission previously received. We cannot afford to have idle land and vacant dairy barns, as Mr. Melrose writes, because of mistakes made by selective service in its zeal to obtain needed men for our armed services. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1951.

Maj. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Chief, Selective Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: Proof mounts up that the selective-service set-up as currently administered in rural areas is a menace to any hopes we may hold for victory. Your military experience and mine has taught us that soldiers cannot fight on empty bellies.

We here at the Minnesota Farm Bureau office have read everything available on selective-service rules. On their surface, the rules seem to be based on common sense. But we have also read with deep dismay the reports that come to us from Minnesota farmers.

There will be idle land and vacant dairy barns unless some semblance of judgment is applied by local draft boards. Proof of that is seen in letters received from aged farmers, whose irreplaceable help has been ordered into uniform.

Local draft boards have high authority and appeal boards are loath to upset their findings. Many farmers will not carry their cases beyond the local level. Some of these local boards have little conception of their responsibilities. Their responsibility is to serve America rather than to sabotage the production program which is the first essential to military victory.

There will be no strikes on the farms of America; there will be no slowdown in production, except that decreed by inept application of selective-service regulations. But even on farms, where the part-time work day and the part-time workweek are unknown, there are definite limitations on what men may do.

Editorials in Minnesota's largest newspapers, within the past month, have praised the attitude of Minnesota Farm Bureau members on the question of selective service. The Farm Bureau does not seek to make the farm a haven for slackers. But the Farm Bureau does have a major responsibility in the field of farm production.

We here at Farm Bureau headquarters maintain contacts with State selective-service officials. We hold them to be men of good judgment, but somewhere, either above or below them, conditions have developed that strike at the very heart of America's effort to defend herself.

Specific cases will be furnished you if you desire.

Yours very truly,
LELAND J. MELROSE,
Editor, Farm Bureau.

We Shall Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech which was given by the Honorable A. A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, at the convocation exercises at Hollins College, Virginia, on February 21, 1951. This speech entitled "We Shall Prevail," represents what I believe to be a very sound and sensible approach to the present world situation. His ideas about pressing our present campaign on peacemaking set forth objectives which all of us should strive to attain both on a long-range and short-range basis.

WE SHALL PREVAIL

(Speech of Congressman A. A. RIBICOFF delivered at convocation exercises, Hollins College, Va., February 21, 1951)

We meet together on founders day to talk about our world. Many Americans are perhaps thinking about little else than the world situation—and deeply resenting the fact that they must.

Unquestionably, there is on the part of our people a feeling both of danger and of frustration. There is a general desire to understand how it got like this and why it got like this. There is a gnawing sentiment of our own failure. And there is an overpowering urge to see how we can properly get out of the present grim crisis. This problem is to us the more oppressive because we never faced anything like it before. In fact, habitually, most of us have never paid much attention to international affairs. The United States seemed so snugly sheltered behind the two great oceans that most of what went on over the rest of the globe seemed no concern of ours.

Today—as we are learning the hard way—the whole position is different.

Over the last few decades, the whole world has undergone radical change. For this the scientists are chiefly responsible. Their theories, inventions, and technological wonders have altered the world we live in.

Because we can travel so swiftly and communicate with each other almost instantaneously, we sometimes speak of our rapidly shrinking world. This phrase conjures up a picture of millions of little, antlike creatures who have been taken off a football and put to live on a marble. That is only one side of the picture.

Our world, as far as experience and range of activities are concerned, has expanded astronomically. Human relationships have been modified on a global scale. Contacts between peoples in the remotest areas have become possible. Their culture, politics, philosophy, and strategy have repercussions on all other peoples.

It is but a half century since the United States came into a position of great power. Our country lies in both the Northern and Western Hemispheres, the hemispheres of great land mass and population. It lies on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, the two greatest highways of commerce and strategy. No other great power has found itself in such a situation. Yet we are new on the world's stage. The implications of our changed status have been slow to sink into the national consciousness. We do not yet realize that everything we do affects other nations. Nor have we learned that we ourselves can now be subjected to pressures and new kinds of attacks that could never have touched us before.

All this is true. And yet in many respects the crisis we face is not entirely different from that faced by other peoples at other times. One such crisis occurred in ancient Greece. The Greek city-states—tiny, divided, jealous of their independence—found themselves threatened by what we would call the national state of Macedonia. Together, the city-states had nothing to fear; they were stronger than their adversary. But they could not unite. One man saw the danger, the statesman and orator, Demosthenes. In a famous series of speeches, directed against King Philip of Macedonia, he urged the Athenians to realize that Philip was aiming to take their cities one by one and that they must act in time.

"It is shameful to cry out, when some event hath surprised us, heaven who could have expected this? We should have acted thus and thus to have avoided these and these errors * * *. Every state that hath been destroyed can mention such things * * *. Therefore, Athenians, while ye are yet safe, possessed of a powerful city, favored with resources, prepare your transports, your forces and all necessities of war * * * at present your conduct must expose you to derision * * * opportunities escape you, your treasures are wasted, you incriminate each other * * *. By the powers you are acting as if Philip's wishes were directing you! You have never, Athenians, armed yourselves in time.

"Call on other states to do their duty that ye may have sharers in the dangers and expense which may arise. I do not mean we should try to raise that spirit abroad which we ourselves are unwilling to assume, but all were willing to confederate with those whom they see prepared and resolved to exert themselves as they ought. In the name of heaven, can any man be so weak as not to know, that by neglecting this war, we are transferring it from that country to our own."

But the Athenians adopted the delaying tactics urged by Philip's agents in their midst, and this led to their downfall. I read you this today because, like the Greeks, many Americans still do not realize their danger. They simply do not grasp the fact that for the first time in history our very national existence is at stake.

We know that other great nations, before us, have perished. It is indeed the fate of mighty civilizations to flourish for a period, then decay and vanish. We can count many such on our fingers. There were the Syrian and the Egyptian before the Greek and Roman. Others, too, have had their day and disappeared. It is high time we realize that our fate could be a similar one.

A friend of mine once remarked that one of the great fallacies of history arises from the fact that history books are divided into chapters. We tend to think that history

occurs in chapters too. We try to estimate events year by year and crowd its entire course within our own lifetime. Yet history is an endless process. Consequences have a way of reverberating down the ages. Epics are long. The great test of courage and determination between the free nations and the slave system, whose headquarters is in Moscow, has not yet run its course. The next 50 years may well determine the course of civilization for the next 2,000 years. And it is our country's task to determine whether freedom or slavery is to be the principle to survive.

Why did catastrophe overtake those early civilizations? The historian Arnold Toynbee reminds us that it was essentially their inability to meet some challenge. It was a failure of mind and spirit to rise to a new and great opportunity. It stemmed from the leaders first. They lost their creative power, that magic compound of vision and resolute action which compels the loyal allegiance of the people. The people are quick to sense this loss; they become bewildered, passive, callous.

One of the greatest threats to civilization has been the outstripping of spiritual values by material development. Rome did not fall because it was physically weak. Rome was rich and still great—on paper. A mere two of its legions of ancient days could have dealt with the barbarians at its gates. But the Romans were soft with easy living. The people were sharply divided into opposing factions. A narrow selfishness kept them blind when their own preservation demanded a world-wide outlook and the most heroic resistance measures.

In today's great debate on foreign policy, we have heard much about the American standard of living. Do we mean by that the amount of physical goods consumed, or shall we widen the expression to include all the standards by which men have measured the essentials of civilized life? If the latter, then we shall sense in its meaning the common destiny between ourselves and the rest of the human race.

This means that our relations to other peoples are a matter of vital concern to all of us. It forces us to learn—what every nation has had to learn at some period or other—that foreign policy takes precedence over domestic.

Domestic problems are very visible and direct. But the really decisive events are those which involve international action. Foreign policy makes history and we cannot escape history.

We know that Russia is engaged in a campaign of hate against us, the like of which has never been heard before. Mixed with this attack is a phony campaign for peace intended to confuse peoples and separate them from their governments.

This peace propaganda is just another tactic used by the enemy to destroy society and further the Communist revolution. Yet, so deep is the world's desire for peace, that the Russians can use it as an effective weapon against us.

Today the world is in crisis. This dangerous crisis exists because the two last great wars upset world equilibrium. Formerly important countries have fallen into secondary positions. Two nations alone remain at the center of power—the United States and the Soviet Union. They are worlds apart, with the United States standing as champion of the peoples who still respect the values of freedom and justice in international life.

For the first time in history one nation has strayed into a position of leadership without wanting it. Yet, nonetheless, the whole free world economically and militarily depends on us. It is this brutal fact that helps increase our frustration and our soul searching. Why, O God, we cry, just we? If we do not lead, no other free nation can take our place. If we do not lead, Soviet Russia will rush into the vacuum created by our abdication.

Matters are further complicated by the fact that in 1945, along with other western countries, we disarmed, confidently expecting permanent peace.

But Russia did not disarm.

It talked disarmament in the United Nations, but meanwhile increased its forces. It created new armies in the captive countries of Eastern Europe, and has succeeded in turning the oriental hordes of North Korea and China into first-class fighting units.

Thus the world has drifted into two camps. One is centrally controlled from the Kremlin, a solid bloc united around a crusading idea that is superficially attractive to the unthinking. It is made up of 800,000,000 people, all of them expendable.

The other, the free world, comprises about two-thirds of mankind, with considerably more than half the world's production. It has a superiority of A-bombs and H-bombs, together with a widespread reluctance to use them. It has a sure majority in the United Nations Assembly. The United States is the nucleus of this non-Communist world, but there is no central control, no compelling unifying idea. We have associates, some of them firm and close allies; others spiritless and unconvinced of the necessity of self-defense.

This division came to a head in the Korean conflict.

That conflict has had two important results.

It has dramatically opened our eyes to the dangers that confront us. It has also revealed the weakness of ourselves and our allies.

In consequence, one fact overshadows all others. Our present policy is bigger than our present means. On this issue we divide. One group of Americans argues that we should shorten our commitments to our means. The other answers that we should multiply our means to cope with our commitments. I belong to the second camp. To me, those who would abdicate and decrease our commitments appear to be overlooking some very grave realities.

We no longer live in the carefree times when we could ignore the rest of the planet. No portion of the world can defend itself against Soviet aggression without the help of the United States. What we announce we will not defend, the other side automatically takes. Whatever cards we throw away, the Kremlin will pick up—as it tried to pick up South Korea once we proclaimed our lack of interest.

Second, no portion of the non-Communist world is without importance to the defense of the whole. While I, too, believe that Western Europe is our primary concern, in south and eastern Asia, let me observe, there are hundreds of millions of people of the type that Russians have shown they can turn into first-class soldiers. There are also proven soldiers like the Japanese. There are our old friends and allies, the Filipinos. In this section, too, there are the largest known sources of tin and rubber which, if lost, would be very hard to replace.

With Asia gone, the Middle East would surely go too. Apart from its immense oil reserves, this is an area of such critical strategic importance that its loss would make the defense of Western Europe well-nigh impossible. Think what this would entail:

1. We should be deprived of the largest single pool of skilled technicians;

2. Of the second largest industrial complex;

3. Of the largest number of people politically, socially, and religiously akin to us.

Moreover, we should lose Europe's legal title to the African continent.

If we abandon Europe, consider for a moment how we should stand with regard to Africa. From there comes most of the uranium we need for our super bombs. Renunciation of Europe, then, would mean renunciation of Africa as well, unless we fight to keep it. And if we are going to fight to prevent Russia getting the uranium, what would have been gained by the abandonment of West and South Europe?

To me these facts are eloquent to show that the global policy rather than the Kennedy-Hoover policy is the right one. If so, then we must increase our power. The simplest, easiest way is to bring as much of the non-Communist two-thirds of mankind into a single defense bloc with the United States.

This does not mean that we might not be forced out of one or another area if war comes. But there must be no voluntary renunciation of any large area.

Outside the United States, we must try to create a single, automatic military alliance embracing all countries willing to join, concentrating on Western Europe as the most valuable, but not overlooking other localities.

We should create local centers of strength able to deal with second-degree aggression, beginning with a far eastern pact—not unlike the North Atlantic Pact—and a Mediterranean pact. For if this second-degree aggression cannot be handled chiefly by local forces, we either have to submit to it or else fritter away our strength as we are being forced to do in Korea. Those who fear the 800,000,000 Communist-inspired peoples forget that the non-Communist world numbers 1,600,000,000 people. An example of local defense is the Greek-Yugoslav-Turkish combined forces which can probably handle possible aggression from the captive countries of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, now threatening Marshal Tito. Earlier rearmament of the Japanese, for instance, would probably have prevented Chinese intervention in Korea.

This Nation's policy was a good policy, a necessary policy. Its weakness was that it was built on sand. We boldly stated we would contain Russia everywhere—then we went on with business as usual, politics as usual, luxury as usual. Korea suddenly showed us that we were living in a dream of blueprint defense. Apart from atomic weapons we were woefully weak. The jolt shocked us into reality. As a nation we must be sure that our commitments and our capacity march side by side.

Today at long last we are turning potential military power into actual military power at home. Even so, there are limits to what we can do by ourselves. If we alone must individually police the world, we shall end up exhausted and defeated. That is why we must have as many allies as possible and learn to get along with them.

It is clear that the American people cannot continue to defend peoples unwilling to defend themselves and their associates. On the other hand, it is also clear that if we show such peoples we are going to throw them to the wolves, they are not going to stick their necks out. Instead, they will try a little appeasement in an effort to remain neutral. They will turn their backs on us and try to form a "third force." But Russia permits no third force. Eventually, having lost our protection, they will be taken over, just as Czechoslovakia was taken over.

Our Nation, moreover, has to keep in mind always the peculiar position of the United States as the one great source of military, political, and economic strength for the entire free world.

Because of our geographical position and interests in both the Northern and Western Hemispheres and between the Atlantic and the Pacific, we must keep in balance our policies as to Europe, Asia, and the Americas. We cannot separate our world relations and responsibilities and treat them separately from one another. A commitment in one

area must not be permitted to endanger our capacity to act in others.

We cannot unilaterally promise each nation and each segment of the globe that we will defend it without getting in return its promise to help us when necessary. Since defense, moreover, is global in scale, we must have commitments from those with whom we are allied to help us in the other areas of the world. By the Rio Pact and the North Atlantic Pact we have stabilized common defense. We must do the same in the Far East, as President Quirino of the Philippines and Prime Minister Holland of New Zealand have been urging.

Our friends must understand our situation. At the same time we have to understand the difficulty of acting as one nation, even though the leading one, in a coalition. We need allies as much as they need us. Our interests are in common. Unlike the Russians, we cannot treat our allies as satellites. No nation sees all the world's problems from the same point of view. It takes time, humility, and patience to find common denominators of purpose so that nations can stand together rather than apart. There is nothing easier to conquer than those who are divided. To impress Russia we must agree among ourselves. We must constantly consult, deliberate, and use all our strength to establish the position of the free world on a solid foundation, and be united before the event instead of falling out with one another and then reconciling in a spirit of bitterness and recrimination. To hammer out our differences in the United Nations in the presence of our opponents plays into the hands of Moscow. Division between friends makes the victory of the tyrant so much easier. We must find a common policy, and then follow it together. We, as a nation, cannot afford to lose friends. We cannot afford to undermine mutual trust. To do so plays into the hands of the Communists. Coercion is not effective between allies in an alliance, and an alliance is a relationship among equals. Differences must be worked out by compromise. We need a common world-wide policy with our closest allies. We will indeed fail if we think that we can act unilaterally at all times.

Finally, by appropriate organs, we should try to weld our camp into an effective instrument to make it as solid as that of our opponent. There are signs that we have made some progress. There is, for example, the pooling of military components under General Eisenhower in Europe; there is the proposal to pool European economic interests under the Schuman plan.

'Til now I have been talking about some corrections in the short-term basis of our foreign policy, and of the necessity of building up our military strength in the most effective way.

But along with this military strength must go a positive plan to offset the lure of Russia's false appeal. We need to develop a dynamic policy to weld our side into a single crusading unit. We must recapture from the Communists not only the military initiative but the political, social, economic, spiritual, and psychological factors without which military strength usually fails.

The Communists have stolen our symbols of freedom and democracy—they who have no freedom and whose democracy is a farce. Their offer of bread and land is as fraudulent as their peace campaign. Nationalized farms, famine, and disease follow in the wake of their so-called liberation; their confessed intention to destroy us makes their peace the peace of a soldier's grave.

Yet we offer no alternative to Russia's glittering promises. We have mounted no political and social offensive of our own.

Just to be against communism is not enough; antisomething is no weapon of offense.

We know that Russia aims to split us from our allies, to sow discord and to stimulate distrust. But while we struggle with short-range policies and day-to-day arrangements, we overlook the chance to create an all-embracing, long-range plan for peace and freedom.

We falter because, all unconsciously, we have been befuddled by the Communist argument. Because the American promise of security and equality is not 100 percent perfect, we concentrate on our failures and lose our energies in domestic squabbles. We must believe in ourselves again before we can inspire others.

Now is the time to renew our faith in our own institutions. With this change in our inward being we shall regain the sense of national purpose which gives vitality and confidence to life—whether of individuals or the whole Nation.

No great civilization has ever been destroyed from outside unless it has already decayed from within; no nation falls prey to invaders unless it has first destroyed itself. We are still the masters of our own destiny; not spectators of our own downfall.

We can take courage from what we have already achieved. For it is we who have won a battle in Western Europe with our food and credits and raw materials. It is we who are sending technicians and field workers to backward and undeveloped countries. It is we who in all the specialized agencies and commissions of the United Nations struggle daily with the long, slow process of facing world problems and working out their solutions.

Spiritual power is the ultimate key to the world's ills. We must supply that power. As a nation we must set peace and freedom as our goals, believe in them and find a way to achieve these goals. The heart of the world must be touched. Minds can still be influenced. While we rearm, we must not sidetrack other methods of avoiding war. Along with freedom and democracy, the Soviet has also stolen the symbols of peace. With the best moral case in the world we still remain on the defensive. We cannot lead if we are not guided by a moral and spiritual force of our own. We must work for a cause that appeals to the world. We must have the vision and imagination to contribute ideas as well as dollars and soldiers.

Together, let's discuss some of our available ideas. The cynical will say that these ideas are difficult, impractical or impossible to accomplish. But we as a nation must set a goal, believe it can be achieved and then use our energies, our resources, our imaginations, and our faith to figure out the way to accomplish the goals we have decided upon. If we are to remain the great leader in the cause of peace and freedom, we cannot let discussion of the means obscure or hide the ends we have in view. This Nation never became great because it was disheartened or cynical or afraid of difficulties. Only to the extent that we voluntarily involve ourselves in a spiritual and moral rebirth can we expect to rejuvenate others. The world wants to know that we seek the end of war.

Though terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to rearm, we must never forget that war is the last push that topples civilizations. Let us press the campaign on the front of peacemaking and not only the front of armed opposition.

1. As a nation, we must proclaim that our goals for the world are similar to the goals of this Nation from its founding. Paraphrasing the Constitution of the United States, they are: A more perfect world, common security, the establishment of justice, universal tranquillity, the securing of peace in our own land and throughout the world, general welfare of all peoples, the securing of the blessings of liberty for all peoples and for posterity. As a young nation, we represented the most revolutionary force in the world. Yet we allowed the most reactionary of all governments, one which would take the peoples of the world back to the middle ages of slavery and feudalism, the Soviet Union, to capture and use the revolutionary ferment now going on in the world. Let us renew our birthright with zeal and offer it to all who need it.

2. As a nation, we must proclaim that we are for universal disarmament and international control of weapons. That means international control of atom bombs, based on a system of adequate inspection and enforcement. The hydrogen bomb, too, must be included under a similar system. The system must extend to the equally frightful weapons of chemical and biological warfare. Inspection and control must not stop there. It would be vain to regulate and forbid production of the so-called unconventional weapons, as advocated by the Stockholm peace petition, while leaving nations free to exploit the advantages of superior resources in manpower and conventional arms. The system must extend to all types of weapons and must be undertaken simultaneously and proportionately throughout the world.

3. As a Nation we must proclaim that American wealth, American resources, America herself, are not the ends but the means to an end. The Creator did not endow this Nation with all its vast potential merely that Americans might luxuriate in the midst of a depleted, dismayed, and disheartened world. We hold this wealth in trust for mankind's betterment, free from exploitation. We should tell the world that this is the hope and aspiration of our people and our Government. We should tell them that we are willing to adopt a peace budget instead of a military budget once we eliminate the scourge of war. Under an international program similar to point 4, we shall raise the backward peoples of the world out of ignorance, poverty, and disease. This is a worthy purpose for a great people. It would be the most potent weapon against communistic imperialism, which promises everything to all men and never delivers. A satisfactory economy is the keystone to political stability. As we unanimously and without a quibble commit all our resources for war, we should be ready to commit a fraction of it for peace.

4. The McMahon-Ribicoff resolution introduced in Congress 2 weeks ago has its place in this program. This resolution is a declaration of friendship of the American people for all other peoples of the world. It emphasizes the desire of the American people for peace, friendship, and brotherhood with all men throughout the world, including those of the Soviet Union, and calls upon the government of the U. S. S. R. to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution. This resolution places Congress on record as standing for peace, not war; for life, not death. By adopting this resolution, we can get our story across to the people of Russia. It would really give strength to the Voice of America. Common sense in the place of confusion is a must.

5. Finally, to make all this possible, we must take the lead in transforming the United Nations into a world organization able to enact, administer, and enforce world law. This will require fundamental revisions in the United Nations Charter. These changes can be limited and confined to those matters relating to the prevention of war. Such a body would have to have adequate military strength through a world police force that has unquestionable power to enforce disarmament and suppress any threats to its authority.

For our generation and all mankind one question overshadows all others. Are we going to be able to work out the problems that came in the Second World War, or will world war III follow?

Big though our task may be, it is not beyond our ability if we have the will. It is a challenge for American leadership. We shall accept. We shall prevail.

Monsignor Bela Varga Expressed Views of Exiles From Countries Behind Iron Curtain

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, a celebration of immense significance was held in Philadelphia. Its significance should not be lost to the Congress.

Gathered in front of Independence Hall were 225 exiles from 10 countries behind the iron curtain. These men—political, cultural, and religious leaders, driven from their country by communism—signed a declaration asserting the unity of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe and their solidarity with the free world. The celebration was sponsored by the National Committee for Free Europe.

We hear doubts—absurd doubts to my way of thinking—about whether our allies in Western Europe can be counted on, whether they are willing to follow our leadership. One quotation from the document signed in Philadelphia by 225 exiles manifests the support for our cause from the oppressed peoples behind the iron curtain and their expectation that our purposes will ultimately prevail. Representatives of the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes declared:

> All our people from the Baltic to the Black and Adriatic Seas, from the iron curtain into the heart of the Russian lands * * * are confident that the spiritual and material forces gathering under the leadership of the United States of America are capable of establishing a peace based on freedom and justice.

It was propitious that this demonstration was held at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. The Declaration of Liberation read and subscribed to on February 11 owes much of its inspiration, I am convinced, to the American Declaration of Independence signed on that same spot. Like the Founding Fathers of America, these national leaders from the iron-curtain countries asserted their belief in man's inalienable right to liberty. Both declarations point to the source of natural rights in man's equal creation by God.

Another feature of the declaration signed by the exiles that merits the attention of the Congress, it seems to me, is its insistence on the unity of Europe. Culturally and economically, Europe is a single community. We must never narrow our vision when we think of Europe merely to Western Europe. We must not forget the 120,000,000 people of Central and Eastern Europe for whom these exiled leaders spoke. In their declaration they reminded us that—

> The world can have no peace so long as no real peace remains in Europe. This cannot be achieved so long as that continent is sundered in two. The iron curtain divides Europe into halves which are vitally necessary to each other. * * * Liberation of Central and Eastern Europe is, therefore, a condition essential to the establishment of international, democratic order, justice, and lasting peace.

The specific aims set forth in the declaration are of such interest that I have asked leave to have them printed in the RECORD for the perusal of the Members.

After the ceremony at Independence Hall there was a luncheon. Spokesman for the peoples of the 10 iron-curtain countries at that luncheon was Msgr. Bela Varga, president of the Hungarian National Council, exiled speaker of the Hungarian Parliament. His address, pointing up the significance of the occasion, strikes me as being worthy of the attention of this House, and I, accordingly, have asked leave to have that speech printed in the RECORD.

Monsignor Varga has an interesting background—one that gives added significance to the words he spoke in Philadelphia on February 11. As a leader—with Ferenc Nagy and Tibor Eckhardt—of the Small Holders Party in Hungary, Bela Varga fought the Nazis in his mother country from 1936 on. In 1939 the German Panzer Divisions forced a flood of 120,000 Polish refugees—20,000 of them Jews—across Hungary's borders, seeking asylum. Most active in the program for the care of these refugees was Msgr. Bela Varga, who established a special home for Jewish children. His rectory at the Balaton Boglar housed a secret radio connecting the Polish underground with the government in exile in London. The first documents and microfilms of the Warsaw ghetto and of the Auschwitz horror camp were brought out of Poland in August 1942 by Taddeus Dzsidek, a paratrooper now living in Paris. Bela Varga guided Dzsidek through Croatia and Italy to Switzerland in clerical clothes and on a passport issued to his Jesuit brother, Andrew Varga. Funds for the Jewish community in Poland, sent to the chargé d'affairs in Budapest, Edmund Fietovics, were smuggled across the border into Poland by Monsignor Varga's underground. The monsignor was later assigned by Cardinal Mindszenty to organize the hiding of Budapest's Jews in convents and monasteries as the Nazi terror reached its hideous climax.

America is fortunate to have men like Bela Varga—and his associates from Central and Eastern Europe who formulated and signed the declaration of liberation—on its side today.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include remarks of Msgr. Bela Varga:

REMARKS OF MONSIGNOR BELA VARGA

It is a signal of honor to arise as the spokesman of 10 ancient nations, 10 nations now shackled in Soviet slavery. It is heartening for us, representatives of these enslaved nations, to be privileged today to associate ourselves—and our cause—with such outstanding representatives of the democracy and freedom that is America. It was a thrilling experience for all of us to make this pilgrimage to Independence Hall to renew our faith at your historic shrine in the imperishable principles of your Declaration of Independence. No more significant site could have been chosen for the reading of our declaration of liberty and the signing of our pledges to that document. It is a document which owes much of its content and its inspiration to the declaration American patriots signed in this city, more than 150 years ago.

Finally it is especially gratifying for all of us from the 10 enslaved countries that this ceremony takes place on the eve of the birthday of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. For it was Lincoln, who realized that freedom is indivisible. It was Lincoln who said that the world cannot for long endure, half slave and half free.

It is a source of great satisfaction that all of us—Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Yugoslavs, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, Albanians—are united today in such a strong and striking demonstration of solidarity. At such a solemn hour, however, we cannot forget what we owe to you Americans—the proud, great, free people who produced Abraham Lincoln. My words today, therefore, will be an expression of the yearnings of the millions and millions of oppressed peoples behind the iron curtain.

Those oppressed peoples—our peoples—are today silenced by an alien tyrant. But they are anxious to send you words of thanks, of gratitude and of their abiding faith. For their faith is unshakeable in the persistent devotion of the American people to freedom everywhere in the world, to the ultimate freedom of the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain. Our people are strengthened in their hour of bitter suffering by the assurance of Abraham Lincoln. The Great Emancipator spoke not merely for his own country when he said that the world cannot long endure half slave and half free.

Before the war there were disagreements among some of our nations. Today, behind the iron curtain, all peoples are united, united by a common bond of slavery. The Kremlin has forged a single chain of tyranny. That chain lies heavily on the bodies, the minds and the hearts of every man and woman, from the Baltic to the Adriatic. That monstrous chain has tied to the tyrant 120,000,000 people. But it has also united them in a common, unshakeable belief, a belief nobly expressed by the man whose memory we honor today, a belief that the world cannot long endure half slave and half free.

Gathered here today you see a group of exiles from the iron curtain countries. We represent not only 10 nations. We represent also all shades of political opinion, the whole range of political parties, all categories of personalities from the national life of our oppressed countries. We are all united by a common determination. We are determined that the sacred soil of our countries will never, never become provinces of a greater Siberia. We are united in another common determination. We are also determined that the common experiences and hard-learned realizations which have united

us in our sorrow, our misery and our exile, shall be the cement of a closer union of our nations, a union created by our common struggle, a union continuing beyond the final liberation of our countries.

On these two common determinations—the determination of unceasing resistance to Soviet slavery and the determination of perpetual solidarity—we humbly and earnestly ask the blessings of God. Your Declaration of Independence declared that all men are created equal by God and that, in consequence, all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these are the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These same rights God gave the peoples behind the iron curtain. We ask His help that these rights may soon be secured for our suffering people.

We are united, I said, in a common determination that our common experience will produce a closer union of our peoples. The former Thirteen Colonies of this blessed land found their unity in a common struggle. That unity has lasted and has raised America to the lofty heights of world leadership.

Our people are united behind the iron curtain in a common yoke of Soviet slavery. How were they enslaved? In the presence of representatives of these ten nations, I feel it is my imperative duty to remind the free world that the 120,000,000 people behind the iron curtain are not responsible for their present desperate fate. One by one our countries were swallowed up by the most rapacious empire the world has ever seen. The might of the Soviet military machine is today challenging even the greatest of the democracies, the United States of America. What, then, I ask, ladies and gentlemen, could our 10 small nations have done when faced by the lying propaganda backed by the naked power of the Soviet empire?

Today the free world, accepting the courageous leadership of the United States, has taken up the challenge of world communism. For it is world communism that invaded our countries and now is invading Korea. I am sure that I am expressing the sincere sentiment of all my fellow exiles, when I declare that our fellow countrymen at home would count it a privilege to be fighting shoulder to shoulder with the heroic troops of America. Penned up behind the iron curtain, our fellow countrymen are absent in body. But they are with the Americans in Korea in spirit. They are wherever freedom is pitted against Communist savagery and Soviet tyranny.

Indeed, they are with you in more than spirit. Behind the iron curtain at this very minute, on the banks of the Danube and the Vistula, in the mountains of the Balkans, and the plains of the Baltic, countless heroes are waging their silent struggle for freedom. In those almost forgotten countries hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children of our 10 nations are ready to lay down their lives rather than submit to despotism. Countless numbers of them have already given their lives for freedom. They are the nameless and unsung heroes of a cause in whose service Abraham Lincoln laid down his life. They are witnesses to the words of the Great Emancipator, that the world cannot long endure, half-slave and half-free. Like the Unknown Soldier of Arlington, these unknown heroes behind the iron curtain will be the honored dead of a free world of the future.

Let us not forget them today. By their bitter suffering and by their blood spilled in the torture chambers of the secret police, they are demonstrating their determination to translate into reality the ideas of freedom enshrined in your Declaration of Independence. Their sufferings, their supreme sacrifices have sealed a bond between us and you, between the iron-curtain countries and the free world that America, under God, today leads. Such a bond is more enduring than formal alliances and treaties. It is a bond of the spirit. It is a bond based on eternal principles of freedom under God as expressed in your Declaration of Independence.

Let us hope that this bond between our nations will lead eventually to a union in brotherhood of all men, to a solidarity established in sacrifice sustaining a world of freedom and peace. The peoples of our 10 countries are just as determined as you are that there will come a time—and may God grant that it will be soon—when no iron curtain will block the free union of all men, a union founded on the principles that are the fabric of American democracy, a union on a worldwide scale that will be enduring. Abraham Lincoln warned not merely America, but all mankind, that the world cannot long endure half-slave and half-free.

We must, in conclusion, turn our minds to the memory of the heroic dead of Korea and the heroic dead of the lands behind the iron curtain. There is no message, more noble in meaning nor splendid in form, to pierce the iron curtain with greater sharpness and deeper penetration, than the words which came from the Great Emancipator's lips, as he stood over the nameless graves of Gettysburg: "That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Text of Liberation Declaration by Exiles From Communist Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include text of Liberation Declaration by exiles from Communist lands:

TEXT OF LIBERATION DECLARATION BY EXILES FROM COMMUNIST LANDS

I

Whereas the peace ardently desired by the peoples of the whole world requires conditions of order and justice;

These times of great trouble will persist in the world so long as peoples aspiring to liberty are kept in isolation from the free world and in slavery;

This trouble prevails particularly in Europe, where the peoples, brutally separated from each other by an arbitrary will, see the ancient ties, both spiritual and material, ties formed by history and a common civilization, severed between them;

This division in Europe keeps the West in a continual state of insecurity and weakness, depriving the countries that are still free of conditions indispensable to well-being and to the reestablishment of strength;

This division isolates the countries of Eastern Europe and, despite their aspirations and natural tendencies, confines them against their will in the sphere subjected to Soviet communism;

Whereas the isolation of an entire part of Europe can be maintained only by constraint and terror exercised equally against nations and individuals;

The nations held prisoners in an enemy camp are arrayed against the West as the advance guard of the new aggression which is being prepared;

Individuals tortured in mind and in body must suffer an unnatural warping of their spirit by a despotic rule or perish;

In the domain of fact, the Communist experiment is doomed to failure; the economy of a country subjected to incessant levies, deprived of its markets and its natural outlets, moves toward catastrophe; the social order succumbs under a dictatorship which abolishes liberty of thought, creativeness, research, and enterprise, deprives the peasant of his land, the worker of the product of his labor, separates the child from the customs, faith, education and patriotic inspiration of his parents, and denies to an entire category of citizens the right of life;

In the domain of the spirit, the pitiless struggle of communism against man leads to the debasement of the human being; in spite of the heroic resistance of our martyrs, to whom we render a tribute of deep emotion, our most precious heritage and our highest values, the very groundwork of our civilization, must suffer outrage and violence from a hostile mentality; in the systematic spreading of moral confusion, with no distinction between good and evil; the only law is an immense and brazen falsehood;

Under cover of a treacherous system of thought, designed to gain command of the mass mind but incapable of fulfilling its promises, obscure forces are at work hostile to the entire world, whose only aim is to exercise absolute and limitless power; the exercise of this power becomes an end in itself, with the world as its victim; and the unlawful occupation of the Eastern European countries is the starting point for new conquests.

II

Whereas, moreover, the dangerous process of disintegration which threatens to extend over all Europe cannot be checked without restoring a rule of liberty to the countries in the East; and these countries are worthy of such a rule, having fought through centuries on the front lines of Europe to win freedom for themselves and for the continent;

The word "liberty" has gained heightened meaning and new value through the sufferings endured by these countries, sustaining their peoples in hope of the deliverance for which they long with all their hearts;

Whereas such a deliverance calls for a great effort of constructive organization fired by a creative urge;

This effort must air at the liberation of man as well as nations;

The liberation of man must restore his natural rights—fundamental, inalienable, not to be proscribed, but protected in their very finality against the abuses of power and the interference of public authority;

This liberation, consecrated by legal guarantees of a national and international order, must deliver man from the fear that has permeated his being and give back his indispensable sense of physical and spiritual security; the freedom thus assured must be the essential element in the formation of states, and of those ties which are destined to draw more and more closely together the commonwealth of man;

The freeing of the nations must put an end to unlawful dominion by any alien power acting through the intermediary of servile government imposed and maintained by violence;

It must restore to the people their right of adopting freely the laws and institutions of their choice, so that the just power of

governments shall derive from the consent of the governed;

Further, it must provide means for remedying as promptly as possible the social ills produced by Communist rule, which has created a much sharper social division than existed before between ruled and rulers, between the mass of half-starving and downtrodden people and a small upper ruling group, politically and economically privileged and self-perpetuating, which wields power of life and death unrestrained by any civil or moral law; this deadly distinction must be abolished; and

Whereas the reconstruction of Eastern Europe involves problems of a political, economic, and social order beyond the capabilities and powers of nations to resolve separately; the dangers to which they remain exposed have prepared them to seek salvation through union; this tendency toward close international collaboration is in harmony with the present order of events; the federal principle, signifying union in liberty and implying the creation of organic ties, is the most appropriate and sure means of uniting the states; the peoples of the East are resolved to apply this principle to the regional organization which they envisage; these same peoples proclaim their right and their desire to take part in a united Europe on a federal basis, which they regard as the realization of all their prayers; and in spirit these continental and regional unions signify further steps along the road to the indispensable organization of the free world as a whole;

The great movement which carries the people of the East toward union springs likewise from a desire for security, from their need of opposing unitedly the menace of any totalitarian dictatorships whatsoever and of preventing any imperialist power from subordinating their countries to its will—as happened with Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia;

Consequently the peoples of the East feel themselves brothers not only to all the free nations of the West but also to the Russian people and all the other peoples of the Soviet Union aspiring to a common deliverance; and

III

Whereas, finally, continents, like men, are related to each other, and in the sense of the words spoken by the great American, Abraham Lincoln, whose memory we honor at this time, the world cannot live half free and half slave;

The principles written into the Atlantic Charter could assure peace to the world under conditions of order and freedom; the present crisis results from the fact that certain of these principles have been abandoned; to cope with this crisis, and with the grave disorder provoked by the division of the world, there is no better way than to return to these principles and to restore to the Charter its original authority; in order to bring about this restoration it is necessary to possess a definite program and real strength;

The people of the United States of America, conscious of the mission before them, have resolutely given leadership to the free world in order to create, through new efforts and sacrifices, the preponderant strength able to assure a just and durable peace;

The free world is the bearer of a political idea which it must share with all people eager to rally in a great and just cause; it is now for the United States of America, the Nation which marches at the head of the line, to speak the word; here where the representatives of the people, in a time of revolution against autocracy and in touch with the most enlightened minds of the Western World, once gathered to inspire the Constitution of a free people, and where the wisdom of a free people with authority gained from glorious experience can restore to the world, in a time more infinitely troubled, the belief in liberty.

IV

Now, therefore we exiles from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, loyally united and single in thought, dedicated by the profound sufferings and the high aspirations of our native lands;

Faithful to the example predecessors who, in the course of centuries have forged, in exile but in contact with the free world, the framework of the institutions, the laws, the liberties of their countries.

Wish to send from the great Republic of the United States of America, where we have the good fortune to see the forces of freedom assembling, a message of confidence to our far away peoples;

And to proclaim solemnly together the principles and aims of liberation:

1. All men and all nations are endowed by their Creator with an inalienable right to liberty. The cause of freedom is, like the cause of peace, one and indivisible. The suppression of freedom in one part of the world endangers the freedom of all nations and of all men.

2. The principles of law and liberty embodied in the Atlantic Charter offer solid foundations for just peace in our time. Therefore, as an earnest of the determination in the free world to replace lawlessness and tyranny now rampant, with liberty under law, there must be a return to the principles of the Charter.

3. The world can have no peace so long as no real peace reigns in Europe. This cannot be achieved so long as that Continent is sundered in two. The iron curtain divides Europe into halves which are vitally necessary to each other. In the eastern half a ruling group irresponsible to the will of its own people is forging powerful arms for an aggressive war. Liberation of Central and Eastern Europe is therefore a condition essential to the establishment of international democratic order, justice, and lasting peace.

Having been violated by the same Soviet Communist aggressor, the freedom and independence of our peoples deserve to be defended with the same determination as that with which the United Nations are defending the freedom of the Korean people.

4. The great powers cannot achieve their purpose of safeguarding Western Europe if they base their endeavors upon a recognition, even implied, of the present enslavement of Central and Eastern Europe. Let the free world give to the oppressed peoples of Eastern and Central Europe at every possible opportunity assurance that its purpose is to bring the principles of the Atlantic Charter into effect in their unhappy lands. It is for the free world to demand that all further deportations from our countries cease, that prisoners of war and persons deported from their homes be repatriated immediately, that all Soviet troops and foreign police units be withdrawn, and that all political prisoners wherever they are held be set free. The deliberate destruction of the best in our nations, steadily pursued, must be stopped. The first goal is the establishment of democratic governments and the holding of free elections under effective international supervision.

5. All our peoples, from the Baltic to the Black and Adriatic Seas, from the iron curtain into the heart of the Russian lands, anxiously await action that would herald their approaching liberation. They are confident that the spiritual and material forces gathering under the leadership of the United States of America are capable of establishing a peace based on freedom and justice. Despite its impressive military might, the ruthless power confronting the free world is undermined by hatred and latent revolt among the peoples it oppresses. Their contribution to the fight for freedom can lead to decisive results only if it is related to positive and determined action by the free world.

6. The peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are firmly resolved, upon their liberation, to join the community of free nations and to establish government of the people by the people and for the people. The right of habeas corpus, as well as freedom of religion, freedom of research and artistic creation, freedom of opinion and of information, freedom of assembly, among other essential freedoms and fundamental political and social rights, shall be assured. No one shall be barred from education because of national origin, religious or political belief, or social and economic circumstances. Parents shall have the right to send children to such schools as they may establish or choose. There shall be special care for the oncoming generation of the young, who have a right to the widest opportunities to use their enthusiasm and capacity in building a better new order of society. The machine of mutual extermination shall no longer roll through our countries. Crimes against humanity shall be dealt with through the regular process of justice and on grounds of personal responsibility for definite acts. Eastern European democracy cannot be revived through vengeance. Thou shall not kill is the basic commandment for us.

7. The movement of ideas and persons, goods, and services shall be free. Individual initiative shall be stimulated. Choice between private and public enterprise should be determined on the basis of merit; those methods which can produce better results both for consumers and workers should have preference.

There shall be no more iron curtains. Our countries shall again be integrated into the world economy and be able to raise their standard of living and add their contribution to general welfare.

8. The land shall be owned by the peasant as his private property in accordance with the desire of the whole peasantry, which forms a major part of our populations and the backbone of our nations. Cooperatives and other forms of association voluntarily entered into by the peasants for economic ends shall be free from Government interference. Advanced scientific methods and modern implements will help to raise the standard of living of the rural and urban populations.

9. The workers, manual and intellectual, shall be protected against exploitation whether by private or by public enterprise and shall be free from the fetters of arbitrary and competitive forced standards in work as from repressive labor laws. They shall be free to choose their employment and the places where they wish to live and work. Free and independent trade unions and organizations shall be the guardians of workers' rights and interests. There shall be responsibility on the part of the public authorities and private administrators that technological and scientific resources be employed to increase output and improve levels of living. The workers shall be entitled to a just share in the profits earned by their industries. Before the interest of the machine comes the interest of man.

10. The peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are eager to take their natural place in the great movement of free peoples toward better relationship and closer union. They are desirous of establishing among themselves strong ties of a Federal character and of jointing in the formation of a United Europe. Such a fraternal federation must prize and respect the distinctive values of each nation, for the common good

of our European civilization and for the cultural heritage of mankind throughout the world.

Our belief in the need of close and loyal cooperation has prompted us to come forward with this joint declaration. We pledge ourselves to remain faithful to this belief after liberation.

In this great country, where the idea of liberty is so closely bound to that of union, we pray God to give us the strength we need to bring to a successful outcome the fight for the freedom and the union of our nations.

Insurance Has Total War Ally in Grand Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anthony W. Fitzgerald, of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

INSURANCE HAS TOTAL WAR ALLY IN GRAND JURY—REGARD BOTH AS INTERDEPENDENT IN UNIFIED PATTERN OF DEMOCRACY—INSURANCE BOTH DIRECTLY AND INDIRECTLY AFFECTED BY GRAND JURY WORK—PROPOSED GOAL FOR INSURANCE ADVERTISING SUGGESTED

(By Anthony W. Fitzgerald)

In this age of revolutionary movements and international crises, it is interesting to recall that the product of one of the most noteworthy attacks on vested power was the Bill of Rights, the embodiment of much that our own American revolutionaries fought and died for amid upheavals similar to those we witness today. One hundred and fifty-nine years ago last December 15 the Bill of Rights became the law of the land and one of its most important provisions, article V, reads in part as follows: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury * * * and since that time the grand jury has continued to be, as it was for many centuries prior to the revolt of the American Colonies, a bulwark of our liberties, a defender of the individual against unjust prosecution, an arm of justice in bringing malefactors to punishment. The reader may well wonder by what tenuous thread the two apparently widely diverse ideas—of insurance, a complex world in itself, and of the grand jury, an essentially judicial body—are entwined. The answer is simple: In this highly developed civilization that we call democracy each component part is mutually interdependent to such an extent that it forms a unified pattern in a total war of ideas against a barbarous concept of life, also unified but on a quite different ground, the negative principle of annihilating whatever stands in its way.

GRAND JURY A SAFEGUARD

Whether the grand jury had its origins in the perfect democracy that was Athens or in the feudal system of justice in Normandy, legal historians generally agree that by the fourteenth century in England, during the reign of Edward III, it had assumed the peculiar characteristics and functions which it still possesses today. Then, as now, it served as a buffer between overweening power (of king or nobleman) and the helpless commoner and acted as an arm of the judicial branch of the government in tracking down crime within its bailiwick and assaying the strength of the prosecution's case before actual trial. Today its ancient home, England, has abolished its services and many States of the Union have followed suit; but in the majority of States and in the Federal courts the grand jury is still regarded as a vital force both as a shield and a spear of justice. The very nature of the grand jury, namely, the selection by lot of 23 representative and intelligent members of the community, insures impartiality and careful weighing of evidence for the protection of the accused and for the counterbalancing check on an overzealous prosecutor. The community is served especially by the unique power of the body to initiate an investigation of its own motion, without regard for the district attorney who acts as its counsel or the very court which brought it into being; it derives from its own strength the power to subpena witnesses and possesses the mighty weapon of punishment for contempt for the recalcitrant ones who defy its authority. Another safeguard of our liberties—although it may seem much abused in these days of a national emergency—accompanies certain testimony before the grand jury, namely, the waiver of immunity, the cloak of protection against self-incrimination which the same article V of the Bill of Rights assures every person in reasonable fear of prosecution.

Cases appearing before a grand jury in which insurance is directly interested, are many: Arson matters, offenses of bonded public officials, larceny cases where a cargo or truckload is insured are commonplaces in the grand-jury room. Even life insurance may enter collaterally into a case before the body, as for example an occasional homicide caused by an overeager beneficiary or an attempt to cheat tax laws or bankruptcy statutes by secreting of assets.

Indirectly insurance is connected with other types of cases handled by the grand jury and not the least of these was exhibited at the trial of the 11 alleged Communists in the southern district of New York during most of 1949. At that trial defense counsel assailed the system of selecting grand jurors in the district for seven long weeks and more than 2,500 pages of testimony. Every effort was made by the defense to drag in the whipping-boy of discrimination in order to discredit the grand jury which had rendered the true bill of indictment against the 11 accused. The mere fact that a grand juror worked for an insurance company caused loud cries and moans of pain among their thespian attorneys; and if a grand juror happened to live in one of the large housing developments owned by an insurance company, the defendants hastened again to scream "discrimination" and to try in every way their ingenious minds could twist to tie up insurance with hatred of certain races and the "capitalistic, fascistic, warmongering aggressors of Wall Street." Somehow insurance withstood the blasts of rage from Foley Square even as did the learned Judge Medina on the bench and the trial jury which found the 11 guilty as charged.

INSURANCE A VITAL FACTOR

An interesting side-line in this connection has been the realization by insurance companies of the possibility of great damage being wrought by Communists and fellow-travelers of various hues, should they infiltrate into grand or petit juries. In the latter type of jury there has long been a suspicion that verdicts, excessively high in accident or injury cases, were brought about by persons "planted" on juries with the express purpose of causing trouble for the "capitalistic" insurers. Does it seem far-fetched when we consider that quite frequently repeaters occur on juries as volunteers with little or no check on their backgrounds? The Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the Eastern District of New York has gone so far on this point as to sponsor legislation in Congress to compel all jurors, grand or petit, to take a solemn loyalty oath in addition to possessing other qualifications so that a charge of perjury will await any one thus falsely swearing upon entering into his duties as a juror. Granted that one who does not believe in the sanctity of an oath will not hesitate in performing what he considers an empty ritual; nevertheless, by so binding himself under oath the perjurer would subject himself to penalties under the law.

It is also interesting to note that insurance executives as well as employees of insurance firms make excellent grand jurors. In most jurisdictions representative groups of citizens such as clergymen, doctors, dentists, druggists, attorneys, and newspaper editors are exempt from grand jury service and the result is that the jury board has great difficulties in finding individuals to serve who are competent, impartial, and intelligent enough to weigh the evidence and reach a just verdict. In the New York City area it is to be noted that a large number of insurance men not only serve gladly on grand juries but also participate actively in the work of the various grand jury associations which aid the courts in their work and attempt to educate the general public in the important part played by the grand jury in the life of the community. Insurance men bring a wealth of experience and training to jury work and, although generally they are challenged, especially in petit jury trials involving liability, they are welcome on the grand jury as an invaluable aid in its work.

Whether the temperature of the war be hot or cold, our way of life is faced with a mortal enemy, a cunning foe who probes and seeks out and then exploits our weaknesses and faults, no matter how insignificant or seemingly unrelated to the general pattern of our democracy that they may be. We have noted with amazement and concern Communist infiltration into our classrooms—for they know how important to the continuance of democracy the education of the young is—and Communist seizure of control of labor unions, communications, Government positions—for, according to Marxist doctrine, each of those fields is a critical one in the life of a nation. We have been aware of their use of the very constitutional safeguards which were intended not as a shield for the evil, but as protection for the good citizen: the plea of self-incrimination, the disavowal of guilt by association, the claim to the right of self-expression. Is it surprising then that the enemy has attacked directly two important institutions of our national life, the grand jury and insurance, which each contribute in its own way to the interrelated whole called democracy? Anything which affords security must be assailed by the enemy both because it encourages our own citizens to uphold their form of government and because it is an encouragement and a goal for others, not as fortunate as ourselves, to yearn for and to seek. Both insurance and the grand jury are a bulwark for the individual and for the state; for the individual because they protect him against the hazards of daily life whether these threaten his property or his very existence; for the state because they assure a protected continuance of those principles for which the original Bill of Rights was enacted.

Could the Communists convince the common man that the grand jury is an anomaly, a mere judicial appendage which should be discarded without any loss to him, and could they succeed in urging upon the individual that insurance companies are indeed soulless aggregations of wealth and power in the hands of a few mercenary capitalists, then their ultimate remote goal would be fully realized in the distrust and dislike the common man would feel for both insurance and the grand jury. There might be a lesson in this for our insurers, a guide for their advertising programs and contacts with the general public. Should they not emphasize the salient part they play in today's titanic conflict between contentment and greed, between the haves and the have-nots, between civilization as we know it and the utter barbarism of the East? Surely it would not be too ambitious an undertaking for insurance companies to match the efforts of our grand jurors' associations in trying to educate the public to an awareness of all the vast blessings of our national life, whether these be found in the existence of the grand jury or in the prosperity of insurance companies—both controlled not by selfish and venal prosecutors or moneyed tycoons, but by the common man himself as participant or owner.

Congress Falls Heir to Perplexing Problems

REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

I

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this Congress falls heir to the greatest volume of perplexing problems of any Congress of which I have had the honor of being a Member.

We fall heir to the accumulated mistakes of the past 5 years, and we cannot in conscience, as representatives of the American people, deny that the responsibility for their solution rests upon us.

One virtue in looking back over the incredibly stupid statesmanship that preceded our present dilemma and which culminated at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, is to understand how inescapable our responsibility is.

It is true that part of the responsibility for the solution of the present day international problems must rest with other free nations of the world, but no American can deny that the Frankenstein monster now at large bears the label "Made in America."

The astounding and frightening concessions made to communism by a pitifully sick, old man under tremendous intellectual pressure from advisers, whom we shall charitably term incompetent, although we now know many of them, like Alger Hiss with whom he went to Yalta, were downright subversive, were not made with the consent of the nations now in imminent peril of being crushed under the red boots of the Communist horde.

While it would be naive to ask our free allies to do nothing but give our troops access to the enemy, it would be unjust and dishonorable to ask them to bear the full burden of destroying a menace for which we alone are responsible.

Because of this we must as an honorable nation bend our backs to the greatest financial, economic, and military burden in our history.

II

As a result, our Nation now faces a new period of Government intervention in the personal and economic life of the people.

No one will deny the need for this.

But it behooves this Congress to make certain that the emergency powers extended for this purpose be applied properly and wisely so that there is a minimum of disruption of the people's daily lives consistent with adequate national defense.

I am frightened sometimes by the sweeping powers being demanded by the Federal, and by some State, executives. The startling implications of the legislation requested by the President to guard against air attack authorizing peacetime seizure of property on an unparalleled scale and paralyzation of the Nation by Presidential order is one fearful example.

This thing we call an emergency may last the rest of our natural lives, and every time this Congress surrenders any given power to the executive branch, it must be with the realization that it may never be returned in our lifetime.

Even if we were to engage in, and win, an all-out war within the next few years, the production emergency would simply shift over to a rehabilitation program.

And we would probably still have to police the peace for the balance of the century.

III

All this points to the need of maintaining civilian life on as high a plane as possible, because whatever our way of life is to become, it will probably be, to all practical purpose, our permanent way of life.

I am deeply convinced that this Congress has a sacred duty to the American people to keep the military burden on the economy as light as is possible without endangering their safety.

As we all know, and as General Eisenhower recently—NAM convention, New York, December 1950—stated, every general asks for far more than he needs, and I say bluntly and without apology that we, in Congress, owe it to our constituents not to be timid about examining and evaluating the magnitude of military requests.

Hand in hand with that goes the responsibility to courageously deny unreasonable requests for power on the part of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

IV

Here again I wish to speak bluntly.

There are in the executive branch today many influential administrators who would like to use this permanent emergency to socialize America.

This is their golden opportunity to panic the Congress into hasty, unwise, and destructive decisions, all cloaked in the impressive language of national defense and preparation for survival in the event of atomic attack.

These administrators do not call themselves Socialists or Communists, they call themselves planners, and their goal is the British type of welfare state.

I believe that I have a pretty good idea as to how they might be approaching this campaign of economic sabotage.

The job could be done in three steps.

The first step would be to impose so many unworkable economic controls and embark upon so much unjustified stockpiling of basic materials that production—and, therefore, employment—would unavoidably drop to a dangerous low.

The second step could be to take advantage of the suffering caused by unemployment and by the shortages of goods and impose rationing and planned production.

The third step would be to continue the policy of deficit spending, piling up the national debt with all of its inflationary forces, and adopt a socialistic policy of taxation which would destroy the incentive and ambition of our people to produce.

They could say: "Private industry has tragically demonstrated that it is incapable of meeting the Nation's production goals. In the interests of national health and safety, Government must plan the national production and control the instruments of production."

Thus, 100 years of industrial progress and well-being could be swept away and this great Nation would sink to the drab sustenance level common to all state-administered economies.

V

The resulting tragedy would be played in two parts.

First, the people would be stripped of the right to make personal economic decisions or to better their economic condition except through the political patronage framework of the state.

Second, their productivity, without incentive, would dwindle to the point that one of two things would happen: either the state administration would stimulate production with bayonets and work permits, or the production would be allowed to sink to a point where our national defense could not be maintained, making us easy prey for the Red Fascists of the East.

We may as well face two facts: A free America must remain strong in order to survive, and America cannot remain strong in the absence of individual economic decisions and personal incentives.

The only guardians of the people's freedoms are the people's elected representatives in Washington.

What this Congress does will be written—for good or for bad—in big red letters on the pages of twentieth century history.

We, alone, stand between the endless requests of the administration and the welfare of the people.

We must be aware of our dual responsibility to support adequate arms and proper regulations for defense, and to oppose unnecessary inroads upon the people's purse and upon their freedoms.

VI

It seems to me that, in the past, some of the committees of Congress have suffered from a form of inferiority complex

in dealing with administrative experts in the fields of economics and fiscal policy.

It also seems to me that this stems from undue modesty in applying the basic laws of common sense to superficially complex situations.

Needless to say, there are very few of us who qualify as technical experts in these fields, but it is also needless to say that there are very few among us who do not or could not easily understand the underlying principles of production and finance.

In our dealings with administration spokesmen, we cannot, in conscience, forget that in a very real sense of the word, each is a special pleader for a special cause—a member of a superlobby.

Unfortunately, some of them consider Congress an unnecessary road block to the achievement of their specific programs.

As a result, they show at times a tendency to either overwhelm us with their special knowledge and prestige, or retire in the ivory towers of their postgraduate scholastic honors.

As some of my older colleagues may recall, I used to be a school teacher.

In fact, I taught economics at New York University, which might qualify me as an expert.

I can tell you, however, that there is very little in classical economics that would be useful in running a war-production program or finding the money with which to pay for it.

Every intelligent adult can master the fundamentals involved by simply calling upon his common sense.

VII

I want to say at this time that I am very optimistic about America's ability to retain a high standard of living in spite of the military burden upon our economy—if the people are allowed the proper degree of freedom to produce.

There is, to my knowledge, no acute shortage of anything that could not be overcome within 2 or 3 years at the most.

America has doubled its productive capacity with the last quarter century and can do it again if the conditions are suitable.

We can have both guns and butter, after a short intermission for intensive rearmament, if the productive processes are not hamstrung by bureaucracy.

The other day I saw an article on this subject. It is a good summary of the problem:

There is nothing impossible about our production problem unless we think there is.

After all, what is production—what are its elements?

Anything and everything manufactured is no more than some natural resources whose form, condition, and place have been changed by somebody applying to them some human energy with the aid of some tools.

That's all there is to production—natural resources, human energy, and tools.

So if we cannot increase production, it will be because we cannot or do not have enough of these three things.

First, let's see how we are off for natural resources.

The most important of these is steel, and we now have 30 percent more capacity than we had during the last war.

On top of this, the Government does not need as much steel this time—we have an enormous amount of things made of steel left over from the last war.

Unless we bungle the handling of our steel supply, we will get along pretty well.

As for copper, zinc, nickel, etc., there is as yet no evidence that their present short supply is going to be a long or insurmountable problem.

We have made good progress toward reducing our need for the tin and natural rubber from which we could conceivably be cut off in Asia.

We have the best food production in all the world.

We will probably be short of cotton and wool for a while, but the situation does not look alarming.

The plastic supply is in real trouble due to the benzol shortage, but that can be solved by making it synthetically.

In fact, any and every shortage must be looked upon as temporary and as a challenge to our ingenuity and determination, and Government must allow us as much freedom as possible to overcome them.

If we have trouble with lumber, tile, brick, etc., it will be because of a shortage in our second factor of production—human energy.

How are we off for human energy—our working force?

No one believes that mobilization will cut down the total number of people engaged in productive work.

There is an enormous force of highly capable women (and retired men) able and willing to step into industry.

So the quantity of human energy does not seem to present any serious problem.

But the quantity is only half the human-energy problem—in most industries the quality is just as important.

This quality problem is not a problem of the people themselves: it is a problem of whether the people are given an understanding of the importance of their production and properly trained in the work they are asked to do.

If all of us know that the quality of our work will largely control our standard of living, we need not worry very much about that work being well done.

To bring out this high quality of human energy, all we need to do is be sure that we do know what the problem is.

Last but not least, we come to the third factor of production—tools.

Here we have two problems: (1) the existing tools must be replaced as they wear out, and (2) extra tools must be added.

The excess-profits tax on the payments for the use of the tools (business profits) makes both of these problems extremely serious.

The best-kept secret in American business is that the high profits of 1948, 1949, and 1950 are not high at all: They simply look high because the tools being worn out are carried on the company books at the acquisition price instead of their greatly increased replacement price.

The cost expense item called "depreciation of plant and equipment" should be at least twice as large as it is.

As matters now stand, business is not able to put aside enough money to replace the tools that will soon have to be scrapped, let alone attract new investment to increase its stock of tools.

For the moment, let's ignore the welfare of the investors who own these tools and look at the other people who will suffer if tools disappear.

Those other people are everybody, because these tools account for 94.7 percent of our production.

These tools make the difference between the American worker and the Chinese coolie—they make the difference between the American standard of living and mediocre poverty.

In the long run, our material welfare is going to be what our tools of production make it.

We can make some immediate progress by using the tools better, but that will never be a substitute for adding more and better tools.

If we do not do that, then nothing else we can do will save our living standards.

It can be done, however, if our Government will let industry correct its cost accounting.

VIII

The ideas set forth in that rather heartening quotation seem to me to be the basis of a pretty good checklist of the things that Congress could and should keep its eye on.

Naturally, no administration and no bureau of the administration wants to be heckled while it works, but any good administration or good bureau welcomes constructive criticism.

And the people have a right to demand that Congress keep a watchful and helpful eye on the people who are carrying out the intentions of the Nation.

For example, there seems reason to believe that there is considerable confusion regarding certain scarce metals because of the administration's policy regarding stockpiling.

The criticism that has appeared in the press concerning the plans for the stockpiling of aluminum in ingot form when there are idle facilities for converting it into sheets seems well grounded.

Another example, one which has been going on for many years, is the administration's stockpiling of tungsten, a metal supposedly in short supply.

I quote from the Wall Street Journal of October 25, 1950, written by R. C. McKenna, a recognized authority on the subject:

The folly of additional stockpiling—

Writes Mr. McKenna—

is well illustrated by the fact that at the time of Pearl Harbor the Government stockpile was approximately 6,000,000 pounds of contained tungsten metal, and by the end of the war this emergency stock had been increased to 33,000,000 pounds.

Thirty-three million pounds represented more than sufficient for three war years of maximum production.

As a matter of fact, during a world-wide war, the 6,000,000 pounds on stockpile at the time of Pearl Harbor were not used.

The records show that the stockpile was increased by 27,000,000 pounds.

It can be assumed that since VJ-day, the Government has added approximately 14,000,000 pounds to the stockpile.

That would indicate a total stockpile now of about 47,000,000 pounds.

Since the average annual consumption in this country during 1945–49 was about 8,000,000 pounds, this would mean enough tungsten for 6 years' use.

Yet the Government plans to add 10,000,000 pounds more to its stockpile.

The price of metallic tungsten in ore has increased since the invasion of Korea from $1.50 a pound to $2.25 a pound.

Even the $1.50 price was artificial, for it was at this price that our Government was buying all the production of American mines.

The complaint involved here seems to me to justify serious consideration.

After all, the purpose of stockpiles should be to prevent shortages during emergencies.

In the case of tungsten, however, the stockpile seems to be aggravating the shortage.

IX

It goes without saying that no sensible person would deny the existence of some critical shortages.

But that is all the more reason why the handling of the available supplies should be scrutinized.

The people's living standards and, in some cases, the people's employment require that government should not unnecessarily withhold scarce materials from civilian production.

I believe it the duty of Congress to appoint committees to listen to any citizen or group of citizens wishing to present proper protests or to make constructive suggestions.

We must not be deterred by emotional claims that such action would penalize our chances of victory or give aid and comfort to the enemy.

It is all very well to dramatize the situation and to tell the people that they must make heavy personal sacrifices for the sake of survival, but there is no sense in imposing a single sacrifice that is not necessary, and there is no justification for Congress not doing all it can to detect and prevent needless hardship.

Moreover, the speed with which we can overcome these shortages will, to a large extent, depend upon the degree of freedom with which business can exercise its ingenuity and resourcefulness. Any unnecessary restrictions placed upon practically applied imagination and creative determination of our industrial leaders only means prolonged shortages and prolonged sacrifices on the part of the people.

The creation of new methods, the discovery of new sources, both natural and synthetic, must be encouraged by giving man the freedom to develop them.

X

Another responsibility which, in my opinion, rests squarely upon the shoulders of Congress is that of insuring proper revenue methods.

We know, by now, the deteriorating effects of deficit spending. We know from experience that monetization of the public debt is just as inflationary as the printing of greenbacks.

We also know that the sale of Government bonds to the people will not close the gap between tax receipts and Federal expenditures.

It is a healthy sign, therefore, that the administration has asked for a balanced budget.

The question, however, is how to balance the budget—and the Constitution places the burden of solution squarely upon the House of Representatives.

The first question regarding the budget should be the size of the budget. Until we decide that we will not know the magnitude of the problem.

This will also be affected by the size and type of our Armed Forces, a matter which Congress should not fail to examine with great care and speak upon with complete candor.

It is futile to wrangle with the administrators of our Federal bureaus as to which nonmilitary expenses shall be cut and how much.

In my opinion it is up to Congress to tell the nonmilitary bureaus how much money they can have and let them decide where the reductions are to be made.

That is what we all, as private citizens, must do when we get into a financial emergency: we see how much we have left and then decide how to use it.

The administration has submitted to Congress a budget of 71,500,000,000 "bucks"; in addition to this, the continuing obligations, loan and contract authorizations amount to about another $20,000,000,000, which brings the actual budget submitted up to about $90,000,000,000.

XI

Even after Congress fries much of the fat out of this budget it will still be several billion higher than our present revenue, which means that taxes must be raised if the budget is to be balanced.

The question now is how they should be raised.

Will this revenue emergency be used to further extend the socialistic principle of progressive or graduated taxation of personal and corporate income?

The pressure upon Congress to do so will be tremendous.

We will hear impassioned speeches extolling the virtues of the tax methods used in Socialist Britain—the methods which are destroying Britain's creative middle class.

We will be urged to require equality of sacrifice from the so-called privileged classes.

What is equality of sacrifice in regard to personal income tax?

If a man who makes $50,000 a year pays 10 times as much as a man who makes $5,000 per year, is that equality of sacrifice?

Very few Americans today seem to think so. We are mostly agreed that the $50,000 man should pay more than 10 times as much as the $5,000 man.

But how much more?

The $50,000 man is now taxed about $25,000, while the $5,000 man is taxed about $1,000.

That is 25 times as much.

And there will be, appearing before the Ways and Means Committee, people who will want to make it much more.

I am profoundly convinced that unless this Congress stands firm and holds the line on this Socialist-inspired principle of taxation, we will destroy the most precious asset we have: the aggressive initiative, imagination, and ambition of the producing members of our society.

And, again I say, whatever we do this year will not be undone for many, many years to come.

To all practical purposes we simply must regard the present situation as being permanent.

XII

What then should be the principle behind our 1951 revenue policy? The principle should be one that will preserve and encourage the incentive and ambition of our people. Our forefathers gave us a political system that was unique in the world. It was the only private-property system in existence at that time.

The Constitution, which is the basis for our private-property system, is the greatest political invention in all history, and it embodied the idea that every man, regardless of origin or station in life, could become just as prosperous as his energy, ability, and determination could make him.

This idea was the atomic power of the eighteenth century. It split the atom of human energy in the North American wilderness and released a current of activity and individual planning that carried our people farther and faster down the road of progress than any other people had ever traveled before.

Call it anything you wish—sales tax; most of our taxes embody some form of tax on spending; excise or corporation income tax—the result is the same: the people who do the spending pay the tax in proportion to what they spend.

In my opinion, the most practical, inexpensive, and painless method would be a flat increase—not a graduated increase—on corporate income.

The collection of such a tax is certain, inexpensive, and the volume of revenue to be derived from it can be pretty accurately forecast.

A flat sales tax would be even more predictable, but it would be more expensive to collect and more unpopular with the people.

This so-called corporation tax would not actually be a tax on the corporations. That idea is fiction because all corporation taxes have always been anticipated by management and made part of the price that must be collected from the customer.

The law may state with all piety that corporation taxes must not be passed on to the customer, but common sense tells us that there is no place for the corporation to get the money except from the customer.

This tax, therefore, would be an invisible war tax collected from the people by the corporations and passed on to the Internal Revenue Department.

There is no reason to believe that corporations would object to this role of tax collector because they have been doing it ever since corporate incomes have been subject to Federal taxes.

XIII

There is another phase of corporate taxatiton to which, in my humble opinion, this Congress should address its careful attention.

As was mentioned a few minutes ago, there has been no provision made in the present law governing corporation income taxes for the recovery of the replacement cost of the assets of production—the tools which are responsible for the amazing productivity of our Nation.

Every man who owns a house knows how the cost of replacing it would compare with the amount he paid for it.

The reason, as we all know, is the monetary inflation—the deficit spending on the part of the Federal Government.

This inflation affects industry the same way it affects individuals.

An industrial plant that cost $10,000,000 ten years ago would cost about $25,000,000 to replace today.

Yet the tax law forbids the corporation to apply more than $10,000,000 to its depreciation reserve.

As a result, the corporation is forced to overstate its profits, pay profit taxes on amounts that are not in any sense of the word profits, and put part of the proceeds into what is erroneously called the surplus account.

Using this method, which is the only method available to business, the corporation wishing to replace the $10,000,000 plant would have to overstate its profits by $25,000,000 and pay about $10,000,000 tax.

That would leave it the extra $15,000,000 needed to make up the deficit in the replacement reserve account.

XIV

This is not an academic problem.

It is one that must be solved in order to protect the tools of production which constitute the big difference between America and the rest of the world.

The tools may be precious to the people who own them and get dividends for their use, but they are far more precious to the men who make their living using them.

As matters now stand, if the corporations collect enough so-called profit to be able to replace the tools when they wear out, they are castigated as profiteers and there is a renewed hue and cry to raise their taxes.

American business has probably overstated its profits by $50,000,000,000 during the past 4 years and has been subjected to a vicious campaign of vituperation for having apparently made exorbitant amounts.

The central problem involved here, however, is not the welfare of the corporations, but the welfare of the Nation as a whole, which depends upon the proper renewal of these corporate assets.

It is naive for us to assume that the Internal Revenue Department will voluntarily take any action to grant relief to the corporations: their business is to collect taxes and collect as much as they can.

But Congress cannot ignore the long-term implications of this situation.

Without its magnificent stock of tools of production, America would be no more than a third-rate nation.

The Communists have often boasted that if they could not conquer American capitalism, they could trick it into spending and taxing itself to death.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, and we of the Eighty-second Congress must not be guilty of introducing or perpetuating destructive methods of taxation.

Drafting of Ex-Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 months my congressional office, like many others, has received numerous complaints in connection with the drafting of ex-service men. In my humble opinion the inactive reservist is being discriminated against. He has not been receiving pay for his services and never thought he would be recalled just to build up a defense program. The active reservist who has been drawing money is in an entirely different category than is the inactive man.

It does not seem fair to recall those in the inactive reserve until all those who have been receiving money for their services have been recalled. The following letters are self-explanatory:

TROUBLES, AGE, AND WORRY SAP MORALE OF RESERVISTS

EDITOR, BEACON JOURNAL:

I have just returned from a 6-day visit to Fort Lawton, Wash., where, living on the post during that time, I was in an excellent position to observe the general morale in the camp.

I found that the morale of the Regular Army officers and enlisted men there is good. I did not find, however, that this condition exists with the inactive reservists, category four, who were activated only a month ago and were already packed up and waiting shipment there for Japan and Korea.

My observations, of course, deal with more than 100 Ohio inactive reservists who have received direct overseas orders and not with the many thousands of other inactive reservists who have been called recently into the armed services. But I imagine that if they, too, received direct orders for overseas, this same lack of morale probably exists in their cases also.

The chief complaints of these men are:

They have been called back into the service with no consideration shown them by the Army in regard to their personal responsibilities at home or for hardships which are being suffered by many of their families while they are away. Many of the men made application for hardship appeals while at Fort Lawton, but these applications were turned down.

They also complain bitterly against the Army's system of calling them directly to overseas active service (combat in most cases) while much of the Regular Army and many of the active reservist units remain comfortably safe in the States.

They further complain that they, who have had no Army training since their release several years ago, are being given a mere 96-hour refresher classroom and field training course before they are shipped to Japan and Korea. Furthermore they are angered that the firing weapon they trained with during this 96 hours was an old type carbine. As far as the men could learn, they will use a new type carbine in the Korean battle.

They also were instructed that they would use a new 57-millimeter recoilless gun. The men received classroom instruction on firing this gun. But not one of the men who will use this gun has ever seen it fired.

There are other complaints, but I feel they can be set down to the usual Army spirit of grousing.

For your added information I would like to list a few personal hardship cases which I ran across in this group of men. Worries at home are one of the chief reasons why these men feel they should not be sent overseas and into battle for a second time.

One case is a first lieutenant from Cuyahoga Falls. He went into the Army for the first time when he was 18. Of his 4 years in World War II service, two of them were spent overseas. He had three tanks shot out from under him. He was hospitalized twice for wounds received in action and his feet were frozen once.

This man was an outstanding soldier in the Second World War. He was commissioned on the battlefield and also received the Silver and Bronze Stars. But he had had enough of Army life and upon his release he refused to sign a paper joining a reservist unit.

Today this man is on a ship heading for Japan en route to Korea. His orders are that he will lead a platoon of tanks.

At home he leaves an 18-month-old daughter and a wife who, in a few days, will undergo an operation. He has the usual mortgage and other financial responsibilities, and his Army pay is about half what he was receiving in civilian life.

The lieutenant is more than mad. He feels he has been literally shanghaied.

What is his attitude about going overseas again? He says, "I hope my men are brave, because they are going to have the yellowest platoon leader that ever set foot in Korea."

There is the infantry captain from Youngstown with a bad case of varicose veins. The Army passed him on his physical. But at Fort Lawton one Army doctor advised the captain "not to be on your feet much."

Another captain comes from Perry, Ohio. The man has already spent 6 years in the Army. Now his wife must sell their home because they cannot afford to keep it. The captain has two sons, aged 6 and 2. The oldest son has been and will be bedfast for some time with rheumatic fever. The captain stated also that he would probably be more of a hindrance than a help to the defense effort.

Other men with problems just as bad or even worse are more inclined to brooding rather than talking about the positions in which they find themselves and their families. Others are making more of a career of silent, gloomy drinking than of learning to be handy with a rifle or bayonet.

The average age for infantry platoon leaders in this group is over 30. The men not only feel their responsibilities weighing on their shoulders but they also feel their age.

One captain from Painesville spent 18 months overseas in World War II. The man is now 40 years old. He feels he is hardly at an age when he can keep up with 19- or 20-year-olds, much less lead them in battle.

An Akron lieutenant served 4 years in World War II, two of these years being spent in Africa and Europe. Up until the Army recalled him he was receiving 20-percent disability compensation for wounds he received in Europe. During field training at Fort Lawton the wounded leg flared up again. The lieutenant was still limping badly when I saw him 5 days after his training was finished.

He is also angry. Besides the leg trouble the lieutenant has a wife, two small stepchildren, a mortgage on the house, and his wife had just written him that they will have a child in August.

The man honestly does not want to be away from home under these circumstances. His worries are certainly not about how to fight the enemy. Like the rest of the officers he will spend his waking hours thinking of ways to protect himself so as to get home safely.

I wonder if something can be done to help relieve some of the worst hardship cases of these inactive reservists who have been sent overseas. I feel that a directive releasing those with three dependents or those who have already seen combat duty in World War II and were wounded in this combat would be extremely helpful to the morale of these men.

At least, thereby, even those who would not be affected by such directives would realize that they have not been entirely forgotten by their Government.

I also believe that for efficiency purposes these men now are unhelpful, uneconomical, and a liability to our defense effort. Many of them would be more helpful as civilians than if they continue to serve their country grudgingly.

VIRGINIA ROLLER BAYDORFF.

THE MID-WEST INSURANCE AGENCY CO.,
CLEVELAND, OHIO, *February 22, 1951.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. AYRES: During a recent address before a group of our local executives, at the Akron City Club, I am informed you expressed disfavor of the method now employed by the armed services of recalling inactive reservists to active duty when no apparent critical need or actual duty assignment exists. The above was relayed to me by my father, W. H. Hackett, of B. F. Goodrich, whom you may recall having met after the dinner.

It is particularly heartening to learn of your views toward this subject as I am one of those inactive reservists apparently looked upon by the Army as essential to the redevelopment of the service. I am inactive to the extent of never having participated in a single Reserve activity since release from active duty in 1946. I have never spent 5 minutes on Reserve matters or accepted 5 cents of the so-called participation pay for spending 2 hours an evening for a full day's salary.

My Reserve activity has so far consisted of signing my name on the Reserve list when separated at Camp Shelby, after I had been asked, "If your country was attacked again would you be willing to serve?" There is but one answer to that question and my signature followed. Attempting not to burden you with a lengthy letter, the following is my present status:

1. Head up insurance agency business (six employees) which would be forced to cease operations with my recall to the service. No available successor.

2. Four-year veteran (Capt., MI), age 34, wife and two small children. Health questionable.

3. Now on 90-day delay in call, ordered to report to Reception Center, Fort Meade, Md., April 16, 1951.

My situation obviously parallels hundreds of those in similar circumstances and like others of our generation I ask the question, "Just where does the end of our responsibility to the Government lie?" I do not believe it fair or just, nor do I believe the Government feels it so that any veteran of 4 years service should be recalled at the expense of his financial ruin, personal and family hardship. To be uprooted from a position which has taken years to obtain and faced with the proposition of starting all over again (?) years later is a burden unfairly imposed upon the writer or any other person similarly situated. If I honestly felt that my efforts in an Army uniform could be of any measurable assistance to the present effort I might feel less embittered toward having to make the required sacrifices. Ten years ago the burden of my responsibilities was not an issue; let those of fewer responsibilities fill the required quotas now.

The consensus appears that inactive reservists are receiving little if any consideration in matters relating to their personal, family, or business responsibilities. To substantiate this I enclose copy of my letter written December 18, 1950, requesting a 6-month delay in call, which, I was informed, was in every event required prior to making application for discharge from the Reserve program altogether. Instead of 6 months, I received 90 days. As one small-business man to another, would your reaction to the prospect of losing your business and fortune be much different than mine?

All that is asked is an honest review of individual cases rather than the present cursory treatment all too frequently afforded by lower echelon subordinates. If such a review was made many injustices would be obviated. Your voice in behalf of those of our unfortunate generation, or category, will be greatly appreciated.

Looking forward to your early reply, I am,

Very truly yours,

J. R. HACKETT.

AKRON, OHIO, *December 19, 1950.*

Subject: Delay in call to active duty, Capt. James R. Hackett, MI, United States Air Reserve.

ADJUTANT GENERAL, STATE OF OHIO,
Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is respectfully invited and thorough consideration earnestly solicited to the following circumstances responsible for prompting the writer's request for a maximum or indefinite delay in call to active duty.

The undersigned is president of a company, employing six persons, which would be forced to cease operations with my departure. The writer would, in addition, experience extreme personal and financial hardship in being called to active duty as of January 17, 1951. My leaving would unquestionably cause a dissolution of a business enterprise, founded and incorporated in 1925, and involve loss of personal fortune.

The unfortunate aspect of the situation lies in the lack of an available successor or adequate replacement who could carry on in the writer's absence. Our personnel includes but one other man, whose health will not permit his working more than a maximum of 2 hours per day. This person (Mr. M. J. O'Connor) has but within the past month returned to work following a third heart attack within the past 14 months and his condition will not permit an additional burden without risk of fatal consequences.

The business of the Mid-West Insurance Agency Co. primarily involves the procurement of insurance protection for large manufacturing concerns who are presently engaged in the production of vitally essential war material, including airplanes, airships, rubber, and classified weapons. In order to serve these industries, the services of qualified and experienced persons are necessarily required. As such persons are not readily obtainable on such short notice, a delay in call is of paramount importance to our clients as well as the future existence of our company.

In view of the above, the undersigned indeed trusts and most urgently requests that favorable consideration be made for a 6-month delay in call. I shall indeed be pleased to supply any additional information required, or appear in person, at my expense, to further enlarge upon the paramount importance of my request.

Yours very truly,

J. R. HACKETT,
Captain, MI, United States Air Reserve.

Legalized Scientific Pocket Picking of American Taxpayers Must End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have now reached the stage in the New Deal-Fair Deal administration where the pockets of the American people are being legally and scientifically picked to support all kinds of programs entirely foreign to the concepts of constitutional government and the ideals of the founders of this Republic.

Our people are being taxed to provide gifts, hand-outs, and bribes, or loans, if you please, to nations in various parts of the world.

The tax burden is now almost unbearable for those in the lower-income groups; and if this burden gets any heavier, it will remove one of the principal incentives to the competitive free-enterprise system which has made this country truly a free nation.

Today many of our small-business men find that they are unable to buy the necessary nonferrous metals needed in their normal trade.

Already copper, lead, zinc, nickel, and many other nonferrous metals have been placed under strict controls.

Meanwhile, the American consumer or businessman who cannot get these nonferrous metals is being taxed to supply the gift dollars with which the Marshall-plan nations have been and still are obtaining these critical and strategic metals from this country.

Mr. Speaker, in the period from April 3, 1948, through September 30, 1950, the Marshall-plan countries have received over $100,000,000 worth of copper, lead, zinc, and nickel from United States production. Besides, we have paid for many millions of pounds bought from Canada, Latin-American countries, and other sources. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, when the Congress must act to stop this legalized pocket picking of the American people for the benefit of the people of other countries.

To illustrate the folly of our ways, I submit as a part of my remarks, under consent heretofore granted, a table from the Washington News Bulletin of February 28, 1951, detailing the shipments of nonferrous metals to the Marshall-plan countries from the United States:

ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS IN STRATEGIC NONFERROUS METALS SHIPPED TO EUROPE UNDER ECA PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS

From the commencement of the ECA aid programs, cumulative paid shipments of copper, lead, zinc, nickel, brass, and bronze, and other nonferrous metals, through September 30, 1950, total well over $100,000,000. Other procurement authorizations made in the past 5 months will considerably increase the total of our gift shipments to the Marshall-plan countries. Many of the shipments were authorized at the very time the

Economic Stabilization Agency was placing restrictions on domestic uses of such strategic nonferrous metals.

The details of the cumulative paid shipments, in dollar volume, are shown in the table following:

Paid shipments of nonferrous metals to ECA countries for the period from Apr. 3, 1948, to Sept. 30, 1950

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Copper	Lead	Zinc	Nickel	Brass, bronze
Austria	2,077		222	24	722
Belgium-Luxemburg				10	
Denmark	3,788	43	923		77
France	18,876	1,370	1,736	440	4,932
Germany	7,874		1,640	3	
Greece	222		10	3	16
Italy	11,125				
Iceland	10				3
Netherlands	16,983	49	2,668	202	608
Norway	1,233				5
Sweden	10				58
Trieste			34		
United Kingdom	4,711	527	17,840		
Total	66,909	1,989	25,068	682	6,441

Besides the metals listed above, a total of $8,846,000 in other nonferrous metals, excluding aluminum, but including precious and semiprecious metals were also shipped.

As the further shipments authorized by ECA go forward, the domestic supplies in our own stockpiles will dwindle, so that American consumers and especially small-business men who handle items requiring these metals will be sorely pressed to find appropriate substitutes.

Tribute to Lewis H. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 27, 1951, which is a particularly appropriate tribute to a great American, Mr. Lewis H. Brown, whose death occurred on Monday, February 26, 1951. I also ask that there be printed an editorial from the Herald Tribune of February 28 relative to Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown devoted himself unselfishly to public affairs as well as to his personal business, in which he was an outstanding success.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 27, 1951]

LEWIS BROWN, JOHNS-MANVILLE CHAIRMAN, DIES—SUFFERED HEART ATTACK IN FLORIDA; NOTED FOR LIBERAL CREED OF MANAGEMENT

DELRAY BEACH, FLA., February 26.—Lewis H. Brown, 57, chairman of the board and chief executive of the Johns-Manville Corp., died unexpectedly of a heart ailment here this morning. Apparently in good health, he had come here for a few days' rest. His home was in Deer Park, Greenwich, Conn.

Mr. Brown was born in Creston, Iowa, and began working on a farm at the age of 10. He worked his way through the University of Iowa and was graduated in 1915. He began his business career in the sales department of the Fort Wayne Corrugated Paper Co., but left in May 1917 to join the Army. He served in France as a captain of infantry until May 1919.

On his return he was engaged by Montgomery Ward & Co. in the personnel department, and within 8 years was assistant general operating manager of all plants. The late T. F. Merseles, then president of Montgomery & Ward, took Mr. Brown with him as assistant when he became president of Johns-Manville in 1927. Mr. Brown succeeded him to that post on his death in 1929.

As a manufacturer of housing materials, Mr. Brown pioneered in encouraging self-liquidating mortgages during the depression. He was also among the first business executives to adopt the 40-hour week and collective bargaining polices before they became law, to hold regional informal stockholders' meetings and make financial reports to employees, and to indemnify directors for expenses resulting from litigation involving the company. In 1938 he promulgated a creed of management embodying the principle that business management is a trusteeship for the mutual benefit of stockholders, employees, customers, and the public.

Mr. Brown was the first recipient of the Vermilye Medal of the Franklin Institute of the State of Pennsylvania in 1939. He also received the Medal for Merit in 1946 as a result of his services as adviser to the Army Chief of Ordnance during World War II.

He was elected chairman of the board of Johns-Manville in 1946. He was also a director of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Surviving are his wife, the former Mary A. Allen, and three daughters, Mrs. Edward Townsend, Mrs. William Homer Sweney, Jr., and Mrs. Charles E. B. Griggs.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 28, 1951]

LEWIS H. BROWN

Lewis H. Brown, who at 35 became president of one of the country's great corporations, lived well and usefully throughout his 57 years. A farmer in his youth, a captain of infantry in France during the First World War, an outstanding leader of the business world, he knew many kinds of work and responsibility, facing them all with energy and breadth of view. It was in the Johns-Manville Corp., however, that he found the chief outlet for both his administrative ability and his vision. He pioneered in the field of self-liquidating mortgages during the depression; was in the van in introducing the 40-hour week and collective bargaining, and brought both stockholders and employees into close participation in the company's progress. As president and later as chairman of the board, Mr. Brown made the name of Johns-Manville synonymous with sound products and enlightened management.

Inevitably there came to him calls for a wider service, and he responded to these in a characteristic spirit. His best known governmental work was his survey of Western Germany, made in 1947 at the request of General Clay. His conclusions, set forth in a lively volume, foreshadowed many of the economic developments which have since taken place in that area. But this was only one of many public undertakings; and the last began this month, when Mr. Eric Johnston named him to an advisory committee to help in problems of economic stabilization. His unexpected death has deprived the country of a citizen whose services would have been of great and growing value in difficult days.

Responsibility of Public in Guarding Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington newspapers recently an article by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which cites the responsibility of the public in guarding our security. This article was prepared at the request of the Associated Press. It diagrams the responsibility in the security field, including the role of the private citizen. I ask that the article be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FBI CHIEF CITES RESPONSIBILITY OF PUBLIC IN GUARDING SECURITY

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

The internal security of the United States can be maintained only with the full cooperation of all patriotic Americans. As our mobilization program becomes a reality we must expect that those who would like to weaken America will move into action.

The Communist Party, United States of America, has become more and more an underground organization.

It is imperative that the public understand the present program of security and know the duties of the various agencies which have been designated to guard the Nation's military and economic secrets from foreign agents and its vital industrial facilities and critical areas from potential saboteurs and subversive groups within the country.

Every loyal citizen has a share in this responsibility and if he knows and understands the importance of his role as it relates to the general program, the task ahead will be approached with national unity and full confidence. The plan is cast on a Nation-wide basis. Certain investigative responsibilities have been delegated to various agencies of the Federal Government.

RESPONSIBILITIES ARE OUTLINED

The public is aware that the FBI has been given the general responsibility for the investigation of espionage, sabotage and subversive activities within the United States under the security program as defined by Executive orders and congressional enactments. Other phases of the responsibility have been assigned to various other agencies of the Government, for instance:

The United States Coast Guard has the primary responsibility for the security and safety of the Nation's harbors and water fronts.

The prevention of the illegal entry of aliens into the United States is the responsibility of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The United States customs service of the Treasury Department has the responsibility for detecting the entry of contraband into the country as well as the export of restricted materials from the United States. This includes the exporting of arms, ammunition, and implements of war which require an export license.

The exportation of critical materials from the United States is prohibited by the Export Control Act unless such shipments are licensed by the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce. Such shipments are policed by the Bureau of Customs and the Office of International Trade investigates violations of the Export Control Act. Also in the Department of Commerce, the Office of Technical Services acts as a clearing house for businessmen, scientists, public officials, and private citizens who would like to get the views of appropriate Government agencies regarding the advisability of releasing or withholding specific technical information in their possession.

RADIO CONTROL UNDER FCC

The Federal Communications Commission has the responsibility for detecting the operation of unauthorized and clandestine radio transmitting stations within the confines of the United States and the Territorial possessions.

The issuance of visas for aliens to visit this country and passports for Americans going abroad is strictly a function of the State Department.

The Atomic Energy Commission has the responsibility for the physical security of all atomic installations. It is also responsible for the security of classified documents and records within the confines of these installations and for personnel security.

The security of military and naval reservations as well as the investigation of civilian personnel for employment on these reservations is the duty of the intelligence and security agencies of the armed services.

The physical protection of the Nation's industrial plants engaged in the manufacture of materials vital to the defense effort is handled by the Munitions Board under the Office of Secretary of Defense. The Munitions Board is responsible for formulating the policies, procedures, and standards from a security standpoint in those plants manufacturing defense materials.

FBI COMBATS ESPIONAGE

The general responsibility for coordinating the investigations of espionage, counter-espionage, sabotage, subversive, and other related intelligence matters within the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico is a specific responsibility of the FBI.

Intelligence operations outside the continental limits of the United States and its Territories and possessions are handled by the Central Intelligence Agency and not by the FBI.

Through established channels of liaison there is a free flow of information between the various agencies which have designated responsibilities in the various fields pertaining to our national security.

In the Presidential directives of 1939, 1943, and July 24, 1950, which established the FBI's basic responsibilities in the internal security field, each individual citizen was requested by the President to assist in carrying out these duties by promptly reporting directly to the FBI all information which relates to espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities. This is a responsibility placed on all loyal citizens and patriotic organizations and a role which is vital to the successful operation of the Nation's general security program.

The FBI's function in the security field is purely investigative in nature. It does not grant clearances of any type, nor does it classify any individual or organization as subversive.

Espionage may be generally defined as the obtaining of confidential information regarding the national defense and furnishing it to unauthorized persons to the detriment of the United States or the advantage of a foreign power.

Sabotage is any act designed to destroy or damage national defense materials—to impede production, injure plant premises, to destroy public utilities, or to produce defective national defense goods.

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY STRESSED

Under the term "subversive activities" would be activities on the part of any individual or organization which are intended to forcibly overthrow the American Government or to give aid to its enemies.

While these are only general definitions, the public should be alert to report all information directly to the FBI which relates to the following specific matters:

1. Allegations of espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities.
2. Foreign submarine landings.
3. Suspicious parachute landings.
4. Possession and distribution of foreign-inspired propaganda.
5. Theft or unauthorized possession or purchase of large quantities of firearms, ammunition, or explosives, or short-wave transmitters and receivers.
6. Poisoning of public water supplies.
7. Chartering of airplanes for flights over restricted areas.
8. Fires and explosions of an unusual nature affecting any phase of the defense program.
9. Suspicious individuals loitering near restricted areas.
10. Possession of radio-active materials.

The protection of the Nation's internal security is a twofold responsibility. It must encompass not only the safeguarding of the Nation's secrets and vital areas, but also guarantee that the civil liberties of the citizen himself will not be violated.

Private citizens are warned against attempting to conduct their own investigations or engage in the circulation of malicious gossip or idle rumor. Vigilante action and "witch-hunts" only contribute to hysteria. The task at hand must be carried out in a calm and organized manner if the results are to be effective.

Local, county, and State police agencies since the inception of the emergency have been lending their assistance to the FBI and plans have been worked out to meet any eventuality which might arise.

By making their information available to the FBI and the other interested agencies of the Government, without attempts at evaluation or to draw conclusions, private citizens, law enforcement agencies, and patriotic organizations will not only be safeguarding the rights of the innocent, but will also be making their own important contribution to the Nation's general internal security program.

Development of the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on February 14, 1951, Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power Development, addressed the annual meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association in Lincoln, Nebr.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Secretary Warne's speech inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ACHIEVEMENT IN COORDINATION

(By William E. Warne)

A new standard in cooperation and coordination has been established by the Federal and State agencies engaged in the development of water resources in the Missouri River Basin. The differing backgrounds, interests, and authorities of these agencies have been successfully blended in the spirit of doing well a very large and complex task.

The Flood Control Act of 1944, incorporating the approval of the Pick-Sloan plan, enunciated a refreshingly new concept of basin-wide development. It was the first clear policy statement by the Federal Government on the problem in the West of the interrelationship of water and other resources. It recognized conservation and control of water and soil as the key to broad-scale use of all resources and to general economic expansion in the Missouri River Basin. It placed irrigation and other repayment determinations on a regional basis for the first time. This made possible the carrying out of an irrigation program in the high plains where the reclamation law, by itself, had proved inadequate.

The legislation approving the Missouri Basin project created no new Federal department or agency. Instead it provided a vehicle whereby the existing agencies, through joint effort, could do the job that needed to be done. The Missouri Basin plan put all the Federal programs for water and related resource development into the same hopper where they were fed into an over-all plan, and provided a means for drawing out the elements one by one in accordance with that plan. Some of the individual programs had to be speeded up. Some had to be broadened. Every one of them had to be geared to the needs of the whole and to the tempo of all the others.

The strength of the plan is derived in large part from its flexibility and its responsiveness to the needs of the people in the basin.

But the authorization of the program was only the foundation. We can be proud of the structure which is being erected on that foundation.

The Missouri River Basin occupies one-sixth of all the area in the continental United States. Ten States are drained in whole or in part by the Missouri River. Water use and control, or lack of it, in the upstream States obviously has a profound effect on those downstream. Clearly the task was beyond the scope and authority of the State governments. Nevertheless, each State has its own rightful interests in the

way its resources are developed through the Federal project.

The Missouri Basin Interagency Committee was established to provide a formal means whereby coordination could be achieved among the Federal agencies involved and, no less importantly, between these Federal agencies and agencies of the States of the basin. This committee was established in 1945 by the Federal Interagency River Basin Committee, just a few months after the Missouri Basin plan was enacted into law. The Missouri Basin Interagency Committee includes representatives of five departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and five State governors, selected by the chief executives of the 10 Missouri Basin States. All 10 governors belong to a parallel Missouri River States Committee. The five Federal members of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee are the Departments of the Army, the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Federal Power Commission. Since its organization, the committee has held 45 meetings in cities throughout the region.

At each meeting of the committee, the Federal representatives discuss what is being done and what is being planned. The host State and local agencies discuss their programs that are affected by the Federal project. These presentations are frank and open. They are fully reported to the people through the press and radio.

Many times there has been disagreement in the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. Strenuous opposition has developed to a number of the proposals advanced by the Federal or State members. But from the discussion there has come understanding and adjustment, and there has developed strong support for the coordinated plan and the way it is being carried out. Never in its 5-year history has the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee faced a difference it was unable to settle. Machinery exists whereby unresolved questions can be referred by the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee to the top level Federal Interagency River Basin Committee in Washington. But the Missouri group has so far not found it necessary to use that machinery.

One of the most useful contributions of the Interagency Committee to the orderly development of the Missouri River Basin project has been the publication annually of a moving 6-year program. This program contains the advance plans for investigation, construction, and operation of the related features of the project by all of the Federal and State agencies having an interest in it throughout the basin. By this means, every agency, Federal or State, engaged in the program is advised 6 years in advance as to exactly what is contemplated by all the other agencies. Through the same medium, the people of the basin learn of the work contemplated and can see what adjustments in the program they might find to be desirable.

The coordination machinery operates in a broad field. The Interagency Committee deals not only with dams, reservoirs, and levees, power plants, and transmission lines—the impressive engineering structures. The committee also deals with other phases of resource development such as soil conservation, enhancement of fish and wildlife values, investigation and development of minerals, acquisition of basic data, and watershed management.

The recently issued report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission advocates the principle of "One basin—one plan." This is the same objective we have been pursuing here in the Missouri River Basin. That report may lead to further strengthening of river-basin planning, carried out on an integrated basis.

The policy of coordination in the Missouri Basin has been effectively applied at levels of Government below that of the Interagency Committee. The Missouri Basin Field Committee of the Interior Department, for example, brings together for coordination and long-range program development the principal field administrators of the seven departmental bureaus working on the Missouri Basin project. This type of coordination is geared to the work of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. The field committee chairman represents the Department of the Interior on the Interagency Committee.

Another example of secondary coordination, this time on the State level, is found right here in Nebraska. In all of the States of the basin, there are agencies whose business is resource development. In your own State, you have the Department of Roads and Irrigation. But you also have the recently formed Nebraska Coordinating Committee.

The job of this coordinating committee, as Governor Peterson so aptly put it, is to act as a clearing house and to provide a means of facilitating and implementing the Missouri River Basin project as it concerns the State. The Governor said that he was anxious that the State should not be found wanting. He wanted the committee to be in a position properly to inform him of the developments, the possibilities, the problems, and the suggested action programs in order to assist him in his work in the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee.

The Nebraska Coordinating Committee held its first meeting a little over a year ago. Since that time it has done a yeoman service toward bringing an understanding of the Missouri River Basin project into every farm and town in Nebraska. This is the sort of cooperation and coordination that will guarantee the successful culmination of the Missouri Basin project.

Let's look at a couple of specific examples of how this coordination machinery has worked in providing recognition of State views on the development of the Missouri River Basin.

Some time ago, Avery Batson, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, explained in an interagency meeting the plan for Glendo Dam and Reservoir on the North Platte River in Wyoming. The North Platte River, as you know, is an interstate stream and involves Nebraska, Wyoming, and to some extent, Colorado. Governor Peterson told the committee that the State of Nebraska would not go along with the Glendo plan the way it was originally drawn. He asked that more study be given to the plan with particular reference to the height of the dam and its effect on the water supply for projects already built in Nebraska and those in prospect. The Bureau of Reclamation took another look; in fact, it took several looks. The Bureau drew up a number of alternative plans for the operation of the reservoir. It also made additional extensive studies of the effect of the reservoir on the water in the stream. The discussions continued until a plan was proposed which seemed agreeable to all the parties concerned. As soon as that plan is formally agreed to, construction at Glendo can proceed.

Here's another example. About a year ago, at one of the regular interagency meetings, Governor Mickelson, of South Dakota, and Governor Aandahl, of North Dakota, expressed concern lest their States be precluded from securing power from the main-stem hydroelectric plants. The two Governors urged that the power policy of the Interior Department be set forth clearly in order that their States could plan to make the best use of the power that was to become available. The Secretary of the Interior enunciated a policy. Everyone concerned took another look at the immediate needs for power. Your Governor announced that he felt North Dakota and South Dakota should have their fair share of the kilowatts available. Action followed in those two States. Transmission lines are being constructed there today. An equitable solution was found for another knotty problem.

The machinery of coordination in the Missouri Basin has been a revelation to all of us, even those of us who helped to plan it. This pattern of coordination and cooperation is getting results in the Missouri Basin, results in terms of control of floods, of concrete and steel placed in dams, results in the form of irrigated agriculture and in kilowatts of low-cost energy.

As of today 17 dams in the basin with an aggregate storage capacity of somewhat more than 3,000,000 acre-feet have been completed or nearly so since the Missouri Basin over-all plan was approved. These are in addition to the two score Federal reservoirs in the basin which were constructed under previous authorizations and which have a total capacity of about 23,000,000 acre-feet.

In 1946 Federal hydroelectric power plants in the Missouri River Basin generated 384,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power. In 1950, the Federal power plants increased their generation by approximately 75 percent to over 607,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

During 1950, two additional power plants were put into initial operation, Estes in Colorado and Kortes in Wyoming. Kortes is the first power plant to be finished under the Pick-Sloan authorizations. The two new plants have an ultimate capacity of 81,000 kilowatts.

Irrigation development has proceeded at a somewhat slower pace primarily because it must await development of storage facilities. So far irrigation water has been supplied to 50,000 acres of new lands, largely in extensions of projects authorized prior to the adoption of the Pick-Sloan plan.

Already a great deal of effective flood control has been provided by the dams, reservoirs, and other works which have been built. Even now many communities which formerly were devastated by floodwaters are relatively safe from further damage on this account. Last year, floods which would have caused hundreds of thousands of dollars in damages at Mandan, N. Dak., were averted by the storage in the Heart Butte Dam, completed shortly before. Here in Nebraska, the people who live in the upper Republican River Valley have new security, provided by the Enders and Medicine Creek Dams, against the flood rampages of that unruly stream.

Fish and wildlife resources have been maintained and improved, and the beginnings of development of new recreational sites are taking shape.

Construction is now going on at 11 dams with reservoirs having a combined storage capacity of 56,000,000 acre-feet. When they are all completed, major floods arising in the upper main stem of the Missouri River will be only an unhappy memory. The hydroelectric power plants of projects under construction will have an aggregate installed capacity exceeding 750,000 kilowatts by the middle 1950's. Another 750,000 kilowatts will be ready by the end of the decade. The Missouri Basin project backbone transmission lines completed or under construction have a combined length of over 2,400 miles. Irrigation distribution systems to serve 850,000 acres are under way.

It will be apparent, from these facts, that construction of the Missouri River Basin project is in high gear. The region is on the verge of realizing tremendous benefits. Now is the time to push forward harder than ever.

Let us look for a moment at the activities of the Missouri River Basin project in the Cornhusker State. Nebraska's share of the over-all basin project will include, ultimately, the irrigation of approximately 1,400,000 acres of new land, the provision of supplemental water supplies for an additional 400,000 acres now irrigated, and the installation of hydroelectric generating capacity totaling 67,000 kilowatts. In addition, Nebraska will share in the production from main-stem power plants, notably Fort Randall and Gavins Point, near its borders. Storage reservoirs planned for Nebraska call for 4,000,000 acre-feet behind 23 dams.

So far, the Medicine Creek and Enders Dams have been completed, providing 167,000 acre-feet of storage capacity. Harlan County and Trenton Dams, currently under construction, will provide an additional 1,100,000 acre-feet of storage.

In August 1950, a 115-kilovolt line was completed from the Fort Randall dam site in South Dakota to O'Neill, Nebr. Lines from Casper, Wyo., to Gering, from Gering to Sidney and Alliance, and from Sidney to Sterling, Colo., were also finished during 1950. Construction is under way on lines from Alliance to Chadron, from Sidney to Ogallala, and from Pine Bluff, Wyo., to Kimball.

These lines will strengthen the State network bringing power to markets which need it urgently. Negotiations are now under way to coordinate the Federal power development with the State public power developments for the benefit of the people in Nebraska. This coordination is expected to make available to Nebraskans adequate low-cost power without jeopardizing State investments already made. We expect that public-power Nebraska will share fully in the Federal hydroelectric power development of the basin.

Recently 11,500 acres were added to the Mirage Flats project in the Niobrara Valley near Hay Springs. Investigations are being made to determine the feasibility of other irrigation in the Platte and Niobrara Valleys.

On the Missouri itself, the major construction job in Nebraska has been the Omaha project of the corps of engineers. It consists of levees and flood walls which proved very effective in the 1950 flood. Remaining work consists of completion of internal drainage and pumping station facilities and revetment work. Bank stabilization and channel improvement continues as funds permit.

The coordination which has achieved such fine results in the planning and construction of the project thus far will be carried on and intensified. It will be continued, I hope, into the operation phase of the project to assure that the benefits of basin-wide development on a coordinated basis will be fully realized.

An interagency subcommittee is now collecting data on water supplies, use, and requirements in the Missouri River Basin. These data will be useful in the development of a plan for coordinated reservoir operations so that the reservoir system will provide maximum benefits in the generation of power, the control of floods, the irrigation of land, and the other purposes of the project. Here again these results are expected to be achieved through existing agencies by means of voluntary coordination, with adequate recognition of State interests.

The spirit behind the coordination in the Missouri River Basin, the universal desire to see the project carried to its conclusion, is something that you can't write into law and you can't create artificially. Fortunately, it was here in the Missouri Basin, even before the Missouri Basin plan was formulated, and it has grown stronger as the Missouri Basin project has evolved.

The economic power that the project has added and will add to the Nation stems not alone from the reservoirs and the hydroelectric plants. The vigor of the project and its benefits to America are founded no less in the demonstrated desire of the people in the Missouri Basin to work in harmony with their Federal and State Governments, a desire which has been fully reciprocated by these governments in pushing toward the splendid goals of the project.

Conditions in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a special dispatch from India, recently published in the Saturday Review of Literature. This dispatch was sent by Mr. Norman L. Cousins, the editor of the Saturday Review, who has been touring in Asia. He makes some very interesting observations on conditions in India which are pertinent in connection with our forthcoming consideration of legislation for emergency food aid to India.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DELHI.—Once you have seen the look of hunger on the face of a man it is difficult to put it out of your mind. I have seen the look of hunger on the faces of thousands of men, and I know I shall never forget it.

I first saw the hungry in a jail on the island of Ceylon. They were illegal immigrants fleeing the famine in the south of India, and the Government of Ceylon was detaining them in a prison in Jaffna until arrangements could be worked out for their return to India. They had come by small boat, landing during the night on the north coast of Ceylon, where some of them had been picked up by the police. No one knew how many Indians had fled to Ceylon in this manner.

In the jail at Jaffna I spoke to a woman of 55 who looked closer to 80. I doubt that she weighed 80 pounds. Her face was little more than a bare skull out of which small eyes glowed feverishly. She had come to Ceylon to join her married daughter, who had escaped successfully 2 months earlier. This much she was willing to tell, but she would not tell the police where her daughter might be found, even though it meant she herself would be returned to India alone.

I next saw the hungry in the south of India, where the suffering is most acute. I saw them against a background of parched and browned fields, with pale stubbles where rich rice paddies should have been. The reason for it was that the rains never came this year. They didn't come last year either, or the year before that, or the year before that.

"Four years, no monsoon," one of the elders in a village 40 miles from Madras told me. "The older people have thought hard but they do not remember when before the fields have been so dry. The wells are very low."

He looked up at the scudding clouds.

"Clouds like this used to bring rain. Now they go out to sea and drop their rain where there is no need of it. The old people can eat little. If they are thin, it is no great harm. Gandhi was thin. But the children are thin and they become sick quickly. Smallpox has killed many of them. Thirty had smallpox in this village. Sixteen died.

"We send men into the cities to work so they can buy rice to bring back to the village. But there is so little rice and the rations have been cut again, and what they bring back cannot fill the bowls of many persons. We eat what we can—bananas and some coconuts—but very many people here are starving."

I next saw the faces of the hungry on the streets of Calcutta. Many of them were homeless. They had lost their homes during the partition of India when Pakistan was created. They were Hindus, who feared the Muslims, and they had abandoned their homes in Pakistan and crossed over into India. In India there are perhaps twelve or fifteen million such refugees—it might be millions more; no one knows exactly how many. Thousands of them came into Calcutta, the world's largest city, looking for food and homes. They slept in the street. Wherever you went at night, on the main thoroughfares or in the alleys or in the hallways, you could see the human forms huddled together against the cool night. During the day they waited in lines for Government food or they begged.

Near the luxurious Grand Hotel in Calcutta was a child of 8 or 9, with not enough clothes to conceal the bloated, empty belly of hunger. He was looking in the streets for scraps of food. Near by was a young woman of about 20, her body covered by the rags of what once must have been a handsome sari. A child of 2 was on her hip. The child was badly undernourished and his head rested on his mother's shoulder. His face was empty and expressionless.

I also saw the hungry of Bangalore. They sat against the walls of buildings and waited.

Then I saw them in Delhi. There are more of the hungry and homeless in Delhi than in any other city in the world. As in Calcutta, many of them are refugees—maybe 500,000 or 600,000—and they have crowded into the city, setting up crude wood-and-straw shelters, most of them closest size. And every day the dead are carried out—by men who are little more than half-alive themselves. I stood on the corner of a busy street in Delhi and watched the refugees as they passed. For a full hour I watched to see whether I could spot a single person out of thousands who would be considered plump by American standards. I saw only two.

The Indians are reluctant to talk about themselves or their hardships, but after a while I was able to win over the confidence of the attendant assigned to my room. He told me about his 6-year-old son, the one with tuberculosis. He said his son had been praying a great deal recently, much more than usual, and he had asked his son what he had been praying for. "My son was praying that he might die. He wanted to die and he wanted God to make him into a crow. I had told him about the crows that fly into the open windows of the hotel rooms and pick up food on the tables and then carry the food off. My son said he wanted to be a crow so he could fly wherever there was food and bring it back to our family."

Then the attendant, whose name was Arun, turned away from me and knelt down to fix the fire. "India has been hungry for many months," he said. "They are saying that America has known about this need and that America has not wished to send us food."

I replied that what he had been told was not true. What had happened was that we had been too slow in responding to India's need, and that was bad enough. Americans had to operate through their Government and often democratic government is slow in doing what has to be done promptly. I asked him to believe that millions of Americans were deeply concerned and were prodding our Government to action. I told him that we would do our best, our very best, and that the American people would be angry if any attempt were made to deprive other people of food because we might disagree with their leaders. * * *

Should we be so short-sighted as to send no wheat, let Congress finish the job. Let

Congress recall the appropriation for the Voice of America and for all our information services abroad. Let us shut down all our efforts to combat Communist propaganda against us. There is no point telling our story to the world if there is nothing for us to say. All the Voice of America can do is to try to provide a real, true account of what is happening in America. What we say can and should be a reflection of what we do.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about the need to speak to peoples and not only to governments. The most powerful language in the world today is food. It is clearly understood. It builds bridges mightier by far than radio broadcasts or published material, especially when people have no radios or cannot read.

My purpose in coming to India was to try to tell the Indian people about America and to try to answer the many lies being told about us. Those lies are aimed at splitting America off from the rest of the world.

Yet there is nothing Soviet propaganda can say about us that can do nearly the harm that we can do to ourselves if we should turn our back today not only on India but on the meaning of America itself.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Aprendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Dispute Could Have Been Settled in 24 Hours," published in the February 1951 edition of Labor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL DISPUTE COULD HAVE BEEN SETTLED IN 24 HOURS—GOVERNMENT REFUSED RESPONSIBILITY AFTER SEIZING CARRIERS; CRACKED DOWN ON WORKERS

Labor wants to say once more—and it's an appropriate occasion to say it—the controversy over hours, wages, and rules on the railroads could have been settled at any time, and within 24 hours—if the Government, after seizing the railroads, had assumed the responsibility which attaches to control and operation of the Nation's transportation system.

Instead, an Army officer was made a mere figurehead for Uncle Sam, and the same old hard-boiled managements were left in full control of the carriers, their profits, and their employees' wages and working conditions. The managements felt they were sitting pretty, because railroad employees could not strike against the Government. The Government, so far as we know, did not make the slightest effort to adjust the employees' grievances.

Under those circumstances, management saw no need to make concessions. It was content to operate as usual, ignore the union's offers of settlement, and pocket the profits.

This was a deplorable and unnecessary situation and it has had, and will continue to have, most deplorable consequences. The best that can be said is that the President was ill-advised by his assistant, Dr. John R. Steelman. The latter did not know how to meet the problem, or did not desire to do so.

But the President of the United States, busy as he is, could afford to take the time to acquaint himself with issues so vitally affecting railroad workers, the great railroad industry, and the entire Nation.

Labor repeats: If this controversy had been handled with ordinary common sense, it could have been settled within 24 hours on a basis just to the employees, the carriers, and the Nation.

Senatorial Election in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Miss Bertha Adkins, Republican national committeewoman from Maryland.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALISBURY, MD., February 21, 1951.—Miss Bertha Adkins, Republican national committeewoman from Maryland, today issued the following statement:

"The voters of Maryland will resent the reflection upon their intelligence in the surprising statement of Millard E. Tydings before a subcommittee of the United States Senate.

"Ex-Senator Tydings now claims he was beaten last November by last-minute campaign literature. This statement contrasts strangely with the interview he gave to the United States News and World Report immediately following the election. Then he attributed his defeat to a factional fight within the Democratic Party in Maryland.

"Does Mr. Tydings feel compelled to blame his defeat on somebody—anybody—rather than himself? Has it ever occurred to him that Maryland voters, to the tune of a 43,000 plurality, preferred Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER?

"Let Mr. Tydings honestly face the facts. The recent election reflected the desire of Maryland citizens for a change. Our Republican Governor, Theodore M. McKeldin, received the biggest vote given any gubernatorial candidate—Democrat or Republican—in our State's history. Representative GLENN BEALL'S plurality of 27,178 was the largest he ever received. Representative EDWARD T. MILLER'S majority was 8,910 compared to 2,600 in 1946. General JAMES P. DEVEREUX carried the Second District by 3,000 votes against a Democratic plurality of 22,922 in 1948.

"The people of Maryland are intelligent, independent voters who want good government—and they vote their convictions. If the election for Senator were held tomorrow, I am convinced the plurality of the Republican candidate would be even larger than Senator BUTLER'S because of the obviously inept and scandal-ridden administration of President Truman.

"Mr. Tydings said the pamphlet, From the Record, was sent into 500,000 Maryland homes in the last minute of the campaign. I have checked with Republican officials in the counties where Senator BUTLER received his large majorities. These officials have advised me that they didn't distribute this material nor can they find it was used in their counties. Here are the counties, and the majorities they gave Senator BUTLER:

"Montgomery, 5,000; Prince Georges, 5,000; Anne Arundel, 4,000; Allegany, 6,000; Washington, 4,000; Frederick, 2,000; Baltimore, 3,000; Wicomico, 500.

"How could the voters have been influenced by something which they never saw?

"Mr. Tydings has been in politics long enough to know that the custom of sending out last-minute campaign literature is so well established in Maryland that the voters have become immune to such appeals, whether true or false.

"He should accept his defeat with good grace."

Establish the Office of Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fine Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman KLEIN and I have introduced a bill to establish the office of Assistant Secretary of Fine Arts of the Department of the Interior. For as long as our great country has been in existence, the encouragement and development of the culture of the Nation has been an all-pervading and consistent desire. Many cultural institutions and organizations have thrived and added a dimension of color, brilliance, sensitivity, and understanding to our lives, and their significance increases as they preserve the cultural heritage and yearnings of our people. The infinite lift of morale which they engender can hardly be measured both in times of stress and in times of peace. It is the purpose of this bill further to encourage and assist the growth of the fine arts in the United States.

The Assistant Secretary of Fine Arts would be appointed by the President, not to control or direct but only to assist entities which are now engaged in the presentation, perpetuation, or development of the fine arts, and to aid civic nonprofit organizations in their endeavor to develop the fine arts, as expressed in the living drama, music, literature, architecture, sculpture, painting, ballet, dance, and the like. Civic nonprofit organizations are defined as any public or private foundation, charitable trust, accredited college or university, or other organization—whether or not incorporated—no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any of its stockholders or members.

In addition, performances and productions of civic nonprofit organizations would be exempt from the Federal admissions taxes. Educational, charitable, and other civic nonprofit institutions are tax exempt except in their presentations of fine-arts programs, one of the great cultural tasks which they were designed to perform. It is manifestly unfair to put obstacles in their development.

The widening horizon of cultural attainments and greatness which can be envisaged in our Nation is a limitless one.

No thought of domination, no inkling of control over the fine arts, can have a place in this endeavor, and is so stated specifically in the bill. The purpose of this bill, as clearly outlined in its provisions, is only to promote, encourage, and develop a richness already latent in our heritage.

The following is the text of the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act, in recognition of the tremendous contributions made by the fine arts to the morale, health, and general welfare of the Nation, to aid in preserving the priceless American cultural heritage from destruction by its enemies, foreign and domestic, and to encourage the growth and development of the fine arts throughout the United States.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. There shall be in the Department of the Interior an Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fine Arts, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fine Arts shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

SEC. 102. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fine Arts, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall—

(1) administer and have jurisdiction and control over the agencies, and exercise the functions, transferred by the President to the Department of the Interior under section 103 of this act;

(2) encourage and assist but not dominate or control civic nonprofit organizations in the presentation, perpetuation, and development of the fine arts in the United States.

SEC. 103. All agencies primarily engaged in the presentation, perpetuation, or development of the fine arts in the United States, and all functions exercised by other agencies with respect to the presentation, perpetuation, or development of the fine arts in the United States shall, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 104. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "fine arts" includes living drama and music, literature, architecture, sculpture, painting, ballet, and dance.

(2) The term "agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government, including all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof; but such term does not include the Library of Congress or any agency under its jurisdiction or control.

(3) The term "civic nonprofit organization" means any public or private foundation, charitable trust, accredited college or university, or other organization (whether or not incorporated), no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any of its stockholders or members.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. Subchapter A of chapter 10 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on admissions) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1705. Exemption From Tax.

"No tax shall be levied under this subchapter in respect of any admission to a performance, show, exhibit, or other production in the field of the fine arts conducted or presented by an organization engaged primarily in the conduct or presentation of such performances, shows, exhibits, or other productions, if no part of the net earnings of such organizations inures to the benefit of any of its stockholders or members. For the purposes of this section, the term 'fine arts' includes living drama and music, literature, architecture, sculpture, painting, ballet, and dance."

SEC. 202. The amendment made by this title shall be applicable only with respect to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 5 days after the date of enactment of this act for admissions on or after such first day.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, indeed, with the ready response this bill has received and include herewith an article by Richard L. Coe, drama editor of the Washington Post, which appeared on February 28, 1951:

BILL GIVES BREAK TO THE FINE ARTS

(By Richard L. Coe)

A sensible approach to the matter of American fine arts seems to have been made in a bill introduced in the House Monday by New York's EMANUEL CELLER and ARTHUR G. KLEIN.

This would provide for an Assistant Secretary of Fine Arts in the Interior Department. Such an official, to be appointed by the President, would:

1. Coordinate existing agencies in the Government which have to with the fine arts.

2. Aid civic nonprofit oranizations devoted to such spheres as music, dama, painting, architecture, ballet, and sculpture.

Such enterprises of nonprofit organizations would be exempt from Federal taxes which, as things now stand, are anywhere from 50 to 100 percent of the annual deficits of such groups. It would, for instance, cut down or even eradicate the increasingly troublesome annual fund drives of such oranizations as the Metropolitan Opera, the National Symphony, and the New York Philharmonic Symphony.

The most importan point of their bill, its cosponsors feel, is that the duty of the new Assistant Secretary would be not to control or direct, but to encourage and assist the growth of the fine arts.

This, they emphasize, is to remove any taint of politicking and also to forestall criticism that arose against the public works programs of the early Roosevelt administration.

The good that the Federal Theater and the art projects under Edward Bruce did in vitalizing the best of past and contemporary culture for the masses of the present is something that detractors of government-in-the-arts cannot effectively argue about.

Viewed from the perspective of history, the artists of the past were encouraged by a handful of the wealthy; with the rise of the masses, the most significant development of our time, has come the need to encourage a growth whose previous source of income has vanished.

Both CELLER and KLEIN have been identified in the past with efforts to bring official recognition to the fine arts and so have numerous other Members of Congress. This bill, H. R. 2890, however, is the first this session to take a soundly practical approach, noting in the tax-exemption clause that while the income to the Federal Government is but a drop in an enormous bucket, the figure can mean life or death to culturally invaluable organizations.

Their bill has been referred to the House Ways and Means (money) committee, and while it would be entirely too rosy to think it has a fruitful immediate future, it is at least a step which merits the thoughtful consideration of all concerned with the preservation and growth of our rich land's fine arts.

One can expect the sneers of the cheaper sections of the press and the hate-provoking commentators as well as cracks that Democrats CELLER and KLEIN are simply thinking of their New York constituents, but the fact remains that something must be found to replace the great, ebbing fortunes, long the chief supporters of the arts.

The Switchmen's Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Is the Truth," published in Trainman News of February 5, 1951. The editorial deals with the switchmen's strike.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE TRUTH

On the 21st of December 1950, at the conclusion of a White House session which lasted almost continuously for 25 hours, Presidential Assistant John Steelman presented to us a proposal leading to the settlement of our nearly 2-year-old dispute with the railroads.

We advised Dr. Steelman and the railroad representatives that we would present this proposal to our organizations for consideration. Dr. Steelman announced at a press conference held in the White House that the proposal was subject to ratification.

General chairmen, representing members of all four organizations, shortly thereafter assembled and considered the Steelman proposal. It was unanimously rejected by all four organizations and the respective chief executives and their negotiating committees were directed to return to Washington and to continue negotiations leading to a satisfactory and just settlement.

The presidents of all four organizations notified Steelman at the White House that the Steelman proposal had been unanimously rejected, and that they were available to resume negotiations. (These telegrams are at the White House.)

Through the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, the presidents of the four organizations were requested to return to Washington for a meeting at the White House scheduled for 10 a. m., January 17, 1951. The chief executives and their negotiating committees respected this request from the White House, and on January 17, 1951, they were in Washington, and notified the White House that they were available to resume negotiations.

The presidents of the four organizations met with Steelman at the White House for 2 hours and 50 minutes, commencing at noon, January 18, 1951. Representatives of the negotiating committees were not present at this session in keeping with Dr. Steelman's request. At the conclusion of this session it was agreed that negotiations would be resumed as of 10 a. m., the following day, under the jurisdiction and in the presence of the National Mediation Board.

Accordingly, the four presidents and representatives of their negotiating committees met with the National Mediation Board as of 10 a. m., Friday, January 19, 1951, until 1 p. m., that day.

At the conclusion of this session they were told by the National Mediation Board that the Board would meet with representatives of the railroads that same afternoon, and that a joint session with representatives of the four operating brotherhoods and the railroads would probably take place the same day, or perhaps Saturday morning, January 20, 1951. Late the evening of January 19, 1951, the brotherhood presidents were advised that the National Mediation Board again wished to confer with them at 10 a. m., the following day, Saturday, January 20, 1951. This request was respected.

The four brotherhood presidents and representatives of their negotiating committees did meet with the National Mediation Board for 1 hour and 30 minutes. The presidents of the brotherhoods and their committee representatives were advised that the railroads had taken the position that the Steelman proposal was, in fact, a firm contract, and that they, the representatives of the railroads, would meet with the negotiating committees of the four organizations only to complete the unfinished details relating to the Steelman proposal.

To all intents and purposes, this attitude on the part of the railroads can be regarded as a refusal to bargain collectively, for Dr. Steelman, as the President's assistant and appointed mediator in this dispute, had directed that renegotiations commence under the jurisdiction of the National Mediation Board as of January 19, 1951.

Every day since the 20th of January 1951, with the exception of Sunday, January 21, the presidents of the four organizations and representatives of their negotiating committees have responded to requests to meet with the National Mediation Board, and in every instance representatives of the railroads have not been present in joint session to bargain collectively for a settlement of this nearly 2-year-old controversy.

The contention in newspaper ads throughout the country, over the signature of the eastern, southeastern, and western railroads, in view of the above, is of course untrue and absurd.

Gambling With American Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Dangerous Gambling," published in the Washington Daily News of February 27, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGEROUS GAMBLING

"Our basic problem in manpower is this: We must, with fewer men, do more than our enemy does with abundant men.

"America's manpower pool is shallow; our enemy's pool is deep. From this fact there is no relief. We must stand or fall, succeed or fail, with what we have.

"Obviously, we can gamble on getting by for a few more months without making additional manpower eligible for military service. But the gamble is dangerous. Under present circumstances, it could be fatal."

That is the cogent warning of able Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in reporting out the universal military training and service bill. The measure goes before the Senate for debate today.

The Senate bill authorizes the drafting of men at 18, but only after local boards have exhausted their pool of eligibles in the present 19–26 bracket, including nonveterans with not more than one dependent.

The House Armed Services Committee is still trying for a compromise on the age issue. A bill introduced by Chairman VINSON puts the draft age at 18½. And the committee has started another long series of hearings to listen to the arguments of Defense Secretary Marshall, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, General Bradley, and the Chiefs of Staff on the administration program—particularly on the eligibility age.

This newspaper believes a clear and strong case has been made for drafting the 18-year-olds and for universal training and service in general. We gamble against time as we quibble and search for compromise. Congress should act with all speed possible to equalize the odds.

Mayor Impellitteri Opposes Taxation of Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Vincent R. Impellitteri, mayor of the city of New York, before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 26, 1951:

It is a token of the seriousness of the issue we are discussing today that the greatest city in the country is as deeply concerned as the thousands of small municipalities throughout the country. Size is no protection against the devastating effect of the proposed tax on municipal securities.

Nor are political differences involved. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, one of my predecessors as mayor of New York City, had a very different political background. Yet, when the Treasury Department proposed that the exemption of municipal bonds should be ended, Mayor LaGuardia, faced with the same problems of preserving the financial credit of the city of New York, spoke from this witness chair against this proposal, as all municipal officials must. He said that this proposal came 150 years too late because the present exemptions are part of the scheme of our Federal system. They are a part of the whole fabric of our financial structure. Twelve additional years have done nothing to alter the soundness of that basic truth.

This committee, after hearing the evidence of State and municipal officers from all over the country, declined then even to report the matter to the floor of the House. And when the matter was moved in the Senate by way of floor amendments, it was decisively defeated in 1940 and 1942 by large nonpartisan majorities. Nothing has happened since to change the judgment of Congress. Then, as now, the argument was raised that a war emergency required the tax. Then, as now, the exaggerated issue of tax loophole was raised, and then, as now, the serious consequences to local governments were clear.

I hesitated quite a while before asking for time to be heard on this subject. I respect the opinions of such well-known authorities as Secretary Snyder and those who advise him. I did not decide to oppose this proposal until I had fully convinced myself that their perspective was wrong. Knowing some of the history of this question and the problems it poses, I cannot understand how it can be pressed now as an urgent measure required to meet an emergency. Contrary to what has been inferred, this recommendation, whatever its merits may be, shifts the tax burden to the millions of home owners throughout the country who must under our present tax system carry the onerous burden of paying the cost of local government. This proposal will rob Peter to pay Paul, and Peter is already up to his ears in financial difficulties.

This proposed tax is designed to increase Federal revenue by shifting the burden to municipalities in the form of increased interest costs. If adopted, however, it will achieve only one of these two aims. The shocking fact is that the increase in Federal revenue will be relatively small, but a crushing burden will be placed on local governmental bodies.

Let me demonstrate this. As I understand it, this is to apply to future bond issues only. There has been no serious suggestion that good faith be abandon d and suits for breach of contract invited by imposing the tax on interest from outstanding bonds. On its face, it is obvious that a tax on new issues can, at best, bring in only limited revenue for a number of years to come. When the issue was debated in this room a decade ago, Under Secretary of the Tresury Hanes conceded that the measure could hardly be supported on its revenue aspects alone. We may assume that some of these tax-exempt bonds are owned by millionaires and other wealthy investors, although this assumption is to a large extent contradicted by inheritance tax and other available statistics. It is well known, however, that a very substantial proportion of these bonds are owned by institutional investors which are not affected by the progressive rates of the individual income tax or are not at all subject to tax. It is conceded that the imposition of the tax will increase the rate, of interest which municipalities and States will have to pay in order to market future bond issues. Experts in the field of municipal bonds agree that the increase in interest on New York City bonds would at present be about 1 percent. But, consider how this would affect the individual of wealth who is seeking to reduce his taxes by ownership of tax-exempt bonds. Would he be hampered? Would his taxes increase? For many years he can continue to escape taxes to the same extent as at present. The tax-exempt bonds that are now his, he can continue to own until they mature, and most of these bonds were issued for long terms. Nor will he have any great problem in purchasing additional tax-exempt bonds. They will be readily available on the market since the corporations and institutions which do not pay a progressive tax or are tax-exempt will be glad to sell their holdings to be replaced by the new municipal bonds issued at the higher interest rate.

The proposal is a delusion. It will not effectively close tax loopholes for years to come; it will not greatly increase Federal revenue.

One thing alone will be accomplished. The costs of local government will be increased—increased to a point which will curtail vital improvements. Municipalities which have to come into the market next year to finance needed public improvements or refund outstanding issues will be hit hard, and hit hard at once, by the extra interest cost they will be asked to pay. That extra interest cost is not a matter of conjecture. The Secretary of the Treasury in his opening statement to this committee 2 weeks ago very frankly said that he was, in effect, asking this committee to recommend an increase in the cost of local borrowing.

You gentlemen know as well as I that the one level of government where there is almost no remaining ability and elasticity to meet fixed added costs is municipal government. When the mayor of an American city recognizes that the cost of living has far outstripped the salary scale of faithful municipal employees, he has a titanic and frequently impossible burden to rectify the inequity because of his inability to raise the money needed to meet the pay raises. Our power to tax is strictly controlled by the State and by existing taxes imposed by the Federal Government. Local government has been left only the financial crumbs in taxes which are the most unpopular and the hardest to impose and collect. This is the equivalent of pilfering governmental poor boxes. The income tax, the estate tax, and all the other taxes that have any relationship to ability to pay have been preempted at the Federal and State levels. Real-estate taxes are concededly at the limit presently permitted by law. My city has already imposed the sales tax, and we are seeking to increase it. We have imposed a gross-receipts business tax, a utility tax, and an occupancy tax. We are planning to impose the other taxes, nuisance taxes though they are, which the State has given us power to impose. All this is essential to meet the current needs. We in municipal finance and our citizens who must pay the bill are at our wit's end and simply cannot stand the additional burden you propose to ask us to assume.

The imposition of this tax would not hit the target aimed at. It would really hit the local governments of the country. We would be forced to pay the bill in the form of increased interest costs or to give up many needed local improvements which, since they are essential to our community life, would then have to be financed by the Federal Government with the taxes you hope to collect by taxing our securities. All that would have been accomplished would be a shift in powers and a further weakening of the democracy which inheres in strong and free local self-government.

The city of New York, and the huge metropolitan area of which it is the heart, have specific plans for municipal improvements essential to our millions of citizens. These are not luxury items but badly needed public improvements and improved services. We have not yet caught up with the need for schools which our increasing and shifting population forces upon us and which the postponements of World War II have aggravated. We need approximately $200,000,000 to catch up on our deferred needs without even attempting to meet the petitions for an expanded school system. We are fighting a transit problem with which we can hold our own only by the expenditure of more than one-half billion dollars for new construction of rapid transit. We have on the drawing boards plans for a Second Avenue subway which cannot be fulfilled too soon to keep abreast of the need. We have approval from the State for the issuance of $150,000,000 of debt for badly needed hospital construction. To meet increased costs and needs, this must be increased to $300,000,000. Our port facilities, upon which the Nation must call for wartime shipments, need one hundred millions for modernization. We are plagued, as most cities are, with an enormous parking and traffic problem which requires capital expenditures of at least $100,000,000 to alleviate the problem and millions more to solve it. You have passed a civilian defense law which asks New York State and New York City to raise $250,000,000.

The foreseeable program within the city of New York for the next 6 years will require an expenditure of more than three and one-half billion dollars. An increase of 1 percent, which is equivalent to 50 percent in the present interest cost, on this program would mean a substantial curtailment in the amount of work done and in some cases complete abandonment of essential improvements. The above figure includes a $1,315,000,000 for public housing. In the case of public housing, the increase in interest cost would mean either higher rent for people who cannot afford it, or an increase in subsidy by the Federal and State Governments, which means you again increase your own problem. The taxing of municipal bonds which must be sold to finance the public improvements mentioned above, would in the present market mean an increase in interest cost to the city of as much as $35,000,000 in a peak year. If this increase were effected, only a small portion of this amount would finally reach the Federal tax collector. The main effect would be the serious curtailment of our program.

Municipal governments have had their full share of financial concerns during the last two decades. With the ability to issue our securities on the traditional tax-exempt basis, we have done, in my opinion, an amazing job in meeting the major responsibilities of local government. If we are to continue to meet the tremendous problems which are so close to the lives of our people, we cannot stand the new and unreasonable costs which taxation of our instruments of credit would thrust upon us. In recent years, it is only by means of the ability to issue our securities without Federal taxation that we have been able to keep pace with the growth of our population and the demands which the Nation has placed upon us as the major metropolis of the country and the principal port on the eastern seaboard.

Frankly, gentlemen, I am surprised that you who have such close ties and such intimate knowledge of your home communities are considering seriously the proposal to tax State and municipal obligations. These are times when the Federal Government must extend itself to foster unity and cooperation between it on the one hand and State and local governments on the other. We must march shoulder to shoulder to achieve the solution of the great problems which have been thrust upon us. At a time of crisis which calls for strength, we should not weaken local governments by placing added and crushing burdens upon them.

I feel sure that at the close of this hearing you will reach the conclusion, as did your predecessors, that this proposal must be rejected.

Wake Up, Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Wake Up, Labor," published in Trainman News for February 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, LABOR

If the rest of the labor movement still has any Fair Deal stardust flecks obscuring its vision, now is the time to apply the towel and face reality.

Those timid elements which feared that the railroad man was rocking the boat should be told that the old tub was full of holes like a sieve and ready to sink anyway.

The unstable wedding of President Truman to the basic principles of his Fair Deal program was evident to us long before he lowered the boom on the long-suffering railroad worker.

It showed up in many ways but especially in his handling of the defense mobilization program and the stabilization safeguards which American workers needed to keep them from being swallowed up by the fires of inflation.

Labor's interests were sidetracked in practically every move and major appointment the President has made since his reelection by the votes of the United States working men and women. While the big business point of view is being protected—and projected—in Government by a galaxy of big business appointments to high offices, labor must be content with second- or third-string places in the picture.

The result of this has been fantastic profits for industry and an invitation to malnutrition for laboring men and their children.

We have a great deal of respect for the integrity and ability of George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, but his appointment as an underling to Stabilizer Eric Johnston is nothing but window dressing calculated to fool labor into thinking it finally was going to get some protection.

President William Green of the A. F. of L., which, along with the CIO, is trying to keep diplomatic relations going with the White House while it searches its heart and mind for the best move to make in the interests of labor and the Nation, had this to say:

"The American worker is expected to carry a disproportionate share of the fight against inflation.

"We find, for example, that under the Defense Production Act the Government has unlimited and effective powers over the worker's income. On the other hand, under the same act, the Government's power over the prices of goods and services the worker has to buy are limited and substantially less effective. Food prices, in particular, cannot be subject to effective price control. Control over rents at the present time is only partially effective.

"On top of this burden, the worker is expected to pay substantially higher taxes, while, at the same time loopholes in our present tax structure are likely to remain open for use by higher-income families and corporations."

If Mr. Truman as Chief Executive had remembered his pledges to the American people made at Philadelphia when he was nominated and upon which this brotherhood and almost the entire labor movement based their support of his candidacy, the mess described by President Green just could not have occurred.

This bungling not only threatens the interests of railroad men and labor generally, it jeopardizes national welfare since it fans discontent and unrest at a time when unshakable unity is needed to fight an unscrupulous and propaganda-wise foreign foe.

Communism is nurtured and thrives on the kind of unrest that grows hourly in America. When men are oppressed they are unreasonable.

The Russian press must be having great sport today showing how American rail workers like those of Argentina, a dictatorship

country, are under the heel of the military and big business and that their just grievances have been turned aside to the vindictiveness of a head of state.

We hasten to explain that Russian rail workers are not as well off under their yoke of totalitarianism but that doesn't prevent the U. S. S. R. from using this insidious weapon against us in our fight to save democracy elsewhere in the world.

When the late A. F. Whitney made peace with Mr. Truman in a move which he sincerely believed to be in the interest of labor, and we believe that at the time it was, President Truman said that the 1946 disagreement was the result of bad advice. The President is still surrounded with those bad advisers and apparently he still follows their advice, much to the sorrow of the workers of this country.

Those men are weak, shallow men who haven't the slightest conception or appreciation of the grave problems that face our people at this late hour. The liberal, capable assistants Mr. Truman inherited from Franklin D. Roosevelt have long since either quit in disgust or been fired. At any rate they did not fit in with the shocking mediocrity of the administration.

At a time when depth and statesmanship are desperately needed, the President's cabinet, aside from two or three, are limited men who have peculiar persuasion to big business' point of view and an aversion to broad national interest.

How, in a dispute as old as ours and in which the union case is so sound and where the workers involved have been so patient, could the President make or cause to be made three separate appeals during the unauthorized strikes that ignored any management responsibility at all for the trouble and challenged only the patriotism of the workers?

More bad advice? Whatever it was, great and grievous damage has again been done, as in 1946, against a fine, loyal group of American workers and humiliated those working hard to sell democracy abroad.

This bitter piece is not to be construed as a blanket indictment of the Democratic Party or a bid to labor to team up with any other party. Although we have good friends in the Republican Party, the fact remains the bulk of the Democrats have shown a more favorable action and attitude toward the interest of the working man.

We are suggesting that labor make its plans now for 1952 and that the eligibles of both major parties be studied for support in the primaries and at the national conventions.

Some consideration should be given to Senator WAYNE MORSE as a Republican standard bearer and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS as a Democratic standard bearer. Both are courageous, honest liberals, who, regardless of the complexion of Congress, simply are incapable of leading the country into a mess like today's but would surely lead us out of it.

Television Channels for Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I submitted a resolution, which has not yet been acted upon, asking that the Senate express as its opinion that the Federal Communications Commission should reserve for educational institutions certain channels available for television transmission and reception. At that time I was asked by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] for the names of the land-grant colleges in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the list, together with three articles dealing with the subject matter covered by the resolution, published in the Chicago Daily News, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES IN THE UNITED STATES

Alabama A. & M., Normal, Ala.
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.
Alaska, University of, College, Alaska.
Alcorn, A. & M., Alcorn, Miss.
Arizona, University of, Tucson, Ariz.
Arkansas A., M. & N., Pine Bluff, Ark.
Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville, Ark.
California, University of, Berkeley, Calif.
Clemson Agricultural, Clemson, S. C.
Colorado A. & M., Fort Collins, Colo.
Connecticut, University of, Storrs, Conn.
Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Delaware State, Dover, Del.
Delaware, University of, Newark, Del.
Florida A. & M., Tallahassee, Fla.
Florida, University of, Gainesville, Fla.
Georgia State, Savannah, Ga.
Georgia, University of, Athens, Ga.
Hawaii, University of, Honolulu, T. H.
Idaho, University of, Moscow, Idaho.
Illinois, University of, Urbana and Chicago, Ill.
Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, Ames, Iowa.
Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, Manhattan, Kans.
Kentucky State, Frankfort, Ky.
Kentucky, University of, Lexington, Ky.
Langston University, Langston, Okla.
Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo.
Louisiana State University and A. & M. College, Baton Rouge, La.
Maine, University of, Orono, Maine.
Maryland State, Princess Anne, Md.
Maryland, University of, College Park and Baltimore, Md.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.
Massachusets, University of, Amherst, Mass.
Michigan State, East Lansing, Mich.
Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mississippi State, State College, Miss.
Missouri, University of, Columbia, Mo.
Montana State, Bozeman, Mont.
Nebraska, University of, Lincoln, Nebr.
Nevada, University of, Reno, Nev.
New Hampshire, University of, Durham, N. H.
New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, State College, N. Mex.
North Carolina A. & T., Greensboro, N. C.
North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill, N. C.
North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, Raleigh, N. C.
North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. Dak.
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Okla.
Oregon State, Corvallis, Oreg.
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Prairie View, Tex.
Puerto Rico, University of, Rio Piedras, P. R.
Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Rhode Island State, Kingston, R. I.
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, Brookings, S. Dak.
Southern University Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, La.
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State College, Nashville, Tenn.
Tennessee, University of, Knoxville, Tenn.
Utah State Agricultural, Logan, Utah.
Vermont, University of, and State Agricultural College, Burlington, Vt.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.
Virginia State, Petersburg, Va.
Washington, State College of, Pullman, Wash.
West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va.
West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
Wisconsin, University of, Madison, Wis.
Wyoming, University of, Laramie, Wyo.
State Colored Normal, Industrial, Agricultural, and Mechanical College of South Carolina, Orangeburg, S. C.

[From the Chicago Daily News of November 25, 1950]

FCC GETS PLAN—URGES TV CHANNEL FOR EDUCATION

(By Jack Mabley)

No proposal before the Federal Communications Commission makes more sense than the request of educators that one TV channel in every city be set aside for noncommercial use in education and public service.

Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles have seven channels each. Can there be any normal person in these cities who does not want one of the seven channels put to constructive use?

The channels—the space in the broadcasting spectrum—do not belong to the broadcasters or the advertisers or the FCC. They belong to the people.

If the people do not make themselves heard, everything in television is going by default to commercial broadcasters to use to sell soap and used cars and mouthwash.

The Joint Committee on Education Television, made up of seven of the most important educational groups, is carrying the request to the FCC.

They said they are acting because of experience learned from "commercial radio's unkept promises."

There is absolutely no indication today, after 2 years of full-scale commercial television, that television is going to pay any more attention to the welfare of the public than has radio.

It certainly is not unreasonable to ask that 1 station in 7, or an eventual 25 percent of the 2,000 TV stations, be used for noncommercial purposes.

Getting the channels will take some doing.

Freida Hennock, the only woman member of the FCC, is strongly for it, and recognizes the struggle ahead.

"The boys in education move so slowly," she said, "that the boys with profit motive move in ahead."

I can think of few worthier projects for Chicago organizations, or for individual TV owners, than to make their opinions of the educators' plan heard in Washington.

Wayne Coy is Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. The address is Washington, 25, D. C.

[From the Chicago Daily News of January 27, 1951]

LEADER ROLE—TV IGNORING A DUTY?

(By Jack Mabley)

A week ago Thursday night, at about 5 minutes after 9, a reader phoned the Daily News city desk.

He had just seen a television show in which a game of Russian roulette was played.

In Russian roulette, you put one bullet in a revolver, spin the chamber, put the gun to your head, and pull the trigger. The chances are one in six that you'll kill yourself.

The caller was irate. "Have they no sense at all," he asked. "Don't they realize that kids are up at that hour, and watch these shows, and pick up these ideas?"

On Monday, this newspaper carried on page 1 a story about five South Side teenagers who watched the game on television, and decided to try it.

One of them, 16, shot himself on his third try. He has since died.

This was not an isolated incident. It was merely more dramatic and more immediate in its results.

It would be good if American youngsters could take care of themselves. Unfortunately they can't. They need leading.

Leading them to Russian roulette, to crime, to passion, to horror, as shown on so many television shows, is the height of irresponsibility.

The death of this boy makes rather hollow the protest of a radio-TV spokesman that educators, who want some TV channels, "have failed dismally" in realizing the full potentialities of broadcasting.

The implication is that the commercial broadcasters have succeeded—that they alone are capable of assuming the new responsibilities that television has brought to the Nation.

The stupidity of such statements only emphasizes the need for educational and noncommercial control of at least one TV channel in every large community.

[From the Chicago Daily News of February 6, 1951]

FULL POTENTIALITY

The Federal Communications Commission has been asked to reserve 25 percent of television channels for educational purposes. Commercial television asserts that education really is not entitled, on past performance, to any part of the broadcast spectrum. It cites the record in radio.

With one or two exceptions, the TV spokesman told the FCC, educators in their use of radio have shown a dismal failure to realize the full potentialities of the medium.

This criticism is probably to some extent justified. And 25 percent of the channels sound like a lot of channels. But television would seem to have tremendous possibilities for visual education.

TV's statement may lift a few eyebrows even among the frank lowbrows. Are we to assume that commercial video itself has been realizing the full potentialities of the newer medium? Would "full" include wrestlers' biceps and girl singers' necklines?

Pegler Says the Judge Mistakes the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted there is printed herewith a recent article by Westbrook Pegler:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

My respect for Judge Michael L. Igoe, of Chicago, exceeds my regard for most of our judiciary, but it would be well to read him a lesson on the essentially evil nature of our unionism. Judge Igoe revealed a want of knowledge in his pointless lecture from the bench in the switchmen's case at an hour when most of the railroads were out of business.

He teed off with several irrelevancies, such as the hard and hazardous nature of the switchmen's work and the debatable conditions of their employment.

"Nobody has questioned the patriotism of these men," he continued. "The only issue here is whether or not the sovereignty of the United States is going to be sustained."

The judge tipped his hand, disclosing an ignorance common to even the best of that sordid bund known as the New Deal, when he said the issue here was an issue of the sovereignty of the United States. No such issue was present.

A fraudulent edifice of assumptions had been erected since 1933 by a great band of traitors and racketeers on the pretext of a spontaneous, peaceful revolution by labor.

In the fateful days which debauched the workers, Judge Igoe may not have been able to grasp the deep meaning of the acts that were put over. They were contrived to confuse. One, which seemed benevolent, was the assumption that the Government could umpire disputes over wages without becoming, in the end, the arbiter of wages.

When the Government says how much you shall get and no more, that is fascism. That interference violates your right of contract. Then, having delivered you into this fix under unionism, the Government appoints a judge out of its own political ranks who says you violated the sovereignty of your country in going off the job, en masse, in protest against the insufficiency of the wages which the Government has fixed.

It is sedition to flout the sovereignty of government. The penalty of sedition may be death.

Why didn't Judge Igoe get to grips with those facts?

The railroads were put under legal compulsions right away. But the unions are a political annex of the party in power and a source of campaign funds. The unions never have been put under serious compulsions.

Theoretically, the union in the case before Judge Igoe was guilty of a crime. But the total punishment which he imposed on both civil and criminal counts was a mere fine of $25,000. So, working men are, constructively, subject to the punishment for treason for going sick in concert, but the union, which managed this challenge to national sovereignty was dealt with almost affectionately.

Why didn't the union bosses go to prison for the maximum term?

Judge Igoe was nasty to the civilian railroad executives, poor, embarassed masqueraders in soldier suits who were ordered into the Army months ago to accommodate a fraudulent subterfuge of the President.

These men are not soldiers. They are railroad men. They include some of the best railroad men in the world. As soldiers they couldn't make corporal, but when Truman again invoked the fraudulent device of "seizing" the railroads and turning them over to the Army the process consisted solely of a change of clothing by a few hundred sedentary civilians who can't even salute.

But, even in their masquerade, these railroad men still couldn't cope with the unions which Roosevelt and Truman had embraced as their political partners in crime.

Finally, the farce exploded in the sickstrike. The railroad executives weren't malingering. They were on the job long hours, doing their best while Truman's friends in the unions were holding up supplies for the Army that he sends away and disowns as soon as the ships tie loose from our ports.

Igoe bawled out "some of those Army officers who have been strutting around this courtroom. Not men from the Fifth Army but the individuals who have been appointed to run the railroads. If they were performing the duties of an officer of the Army, they would get some men to run the trains and they would get some soldiers to see that the roads operate.

"They might better be concerned with that kind of activity rather than sitting around this courtroom and displaying the uniform that the Government has put on them."

Even a New Deal jurist could wish he never had said that. Those men weren't strutting. They were in uniform against their own will to help a corrupt political administration to redeem its mischief.

If we are ever to untangle this horrible situation we will have t first abandon such hypocrisy and start fresh.

Drafting of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., February 18, 1951:

DRAFTING OF WOMEN WOULD MEAN THE END OF AMERICAN LIFE WE CHERISH—SHOULD KAYO PROPOSAL PROMPTLY—PEOPLE WERE REVOLTED WHEN IDEA SIMILAR TO IT CAME OUT OF POLICE STATES

(By John Griffin)

Mrs. Mildred McAfee Horton, former commander of the WAVES and former president of Wellesley College, has suggested that the women of the United States be drafted for the armed services. And the proposal is being taken seriously.

That, more than anything else in recent days, gives an idea of the twisted thinking that is dominating America's emergency period, and is indicative of the change in values that certain American leaders are trying to foist onto the people.

Of course, Mrs. Horton's suggestion is not new, because it was advocated several years ago in wartime by Mrs. Roosevelt and by Miss Virginia Gildersleeve, president of Barnard College. Now, in peacetime, we have it again, and the strange thing about it is that it will be taken seriously by many people.

One editorialist referred to the suggestion in a wishy-washy manner, ending up by stating that the idea is "premature." Well, if Americans stand for that kind of nonsense, there isn't much cause for optimism as to the future of this country.

The very fact that the suggestion isn't ridiculed into obscurity indicates the length to which confused thinking has gone in this country. And that source of the suggestion is really quite remarkable, for Mrs. Horton's reason for the idea is that the present manpower policy "implies a fundamental dissimilarity between manpower and womanpower, which tends to put all women in the category of a national luxury instead of an available asset."

ONLY THE FIRST STEP

In the first place, there is no need for the drafting of women, for General Hershey, director of the draft, stated explicitly that they aren't needed. But that, of course, has little to do with Mrs. Horton's suggestion or the

approval of Mrs. Roosevelt, for that is just an excuse they are using to put over a change in the status of women and to help remake the American system of life.

Remember when such a suggestion was made in Hitler's Germany and all America was horrified? Remember the revulsion in this country when it was reported that the Russians and Japanese had women and girls in their combat units?

But, these new remakers of America would say, this draft of women would not be for combat but would be for services connected with the Army in order to permit more men to be in combat. You can believe that one or not, but one thing is sure, that the move proposed now is only the first step and combat training would come after a while.

This is the time to stop the nonsense, not when the first step has been taken, not when girls are torn away from their families and their place in life as part of a scheme designed to turn America into something different from what it has been.

Apparently some people are convinced that Army service is something that is great for the character and the moral and spiritual well-being. For Americans it has always been a duty of the male population to be ready to fight to protect the country, but it has never been a work that appeals to democratic Americans. It is something that the young men of the country must be prepared to do when the necessity arises; it is definitely not an excuse to reduce the freedom and opportunity for peacetime pursuits.

STANDARDS BROKEN DOWN

As a matter of fact, the principal motive for young men in fighting for America has been to protect and preserve the home and the way of life. Which is another way of saying that they want to protect the women of America.

I suppose that sounds pretty corny in these days of strange activities, but a little analysis, based on fundamentals, will surely bring most people to a realization of its basic truth.

What sort of faith in America have these people who want to disrupt the homes more than is necessary? One of them at least ought to qualify as an expert on broken homes. Another, Mrs. Horton, apparently has had some regard for traditional home life, for the reason she gave up her position as president of Wellesley College was to be with her husband in New York.

Over the recent years, so many strange proposals have been taken seriously that a large number of Americans have become inured to suggestions that are obviously designed to change the American way of life. They became astonished, alarmed, and indignant at the start, but constant assailing of moral positions has served to make them lethargic.

And unless this proposal for the drafting of women and girls meets with an intense and resentful opposition it will be pretty clear that the standards are being broken down through a sort of moral erosion.

SHOULD TAKE ANOTHER LOOK

There has been, for the last few weeks, a sharp difference of opinion about the drafting of 18-year-old boys. Would the advocates of drafting of women support the drafting of 18-year-old girls? And would any appreciable number of people go along with that idea?

Well, at least one editorialist has no aversion to the proposal except that he thinks it might be a little premature. And another, whose editorials run in a paper with the greatest circulation in the country, thinks Congress ought to look into it, and "adopt it if it is found to have as much merit as it seems to have at first glance." Let's hope he takes another look.

If the suggestion for the drafting of women is just a trial balloon, which is a practice of trying out an idea on the people in order to learn their reaction, we can only hope that the reaction is as violent and immediate as it should be, so that once and for all, such proposals will be ended.

Maybe it is just nonsense but it looks suspiciously like part of the scheme to break down the family and home life of this country, to obliterate all moral sense and set up the theory that the State is all.

Fair Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman and his political leaders in Congress are always yelling about the need for unity; always crying and insisting that Republicans should join in backing the President's policies, whatever they may be.

Then Mr. Truman and his northern leaders insist that we must have FEPC, so everyone will be dealt with fairly, justly.

But, when it comes to something that concerns Mr. Truman or his program, or even just a little part of it, how he and his leaders in the House put on the squeeze.

One of the latest examples of Mr. Truman's high-handed, arbitrary maneuvering was when—defeated in the drive for the one-package appropriation bill, in which he was able to hide many of his requests for so-called social legislation under the guise of appropriations for the national defense—Mr. CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, tyrannically—and, I might add, with malice aforethought and because he was motivated by revenge—set up subcommittees to which will be assigned the task of passing upon the requests for money which come up from the Government agencies.

Because party control of Congress may shift from time to time, it has always been the custom, in order to maintain some degree of fairness, to give the minority membership on subcommittees in the same ratio that the minority has in the House itself; that is, if the House was divided 5 to 3 between Democrats and Republicans, membership on committees and on subcommittees would be 5 to 3.

But Mr. CANNON, who is determined to have his way, come heck or high water, mad and revengeful because his pet scheme of considering all requests for appropriations in one bill was turned down, refused to follow the old, equitable rule in setting up subcommittees.

To two of the subcommittees, he named five Democrats and two Republicans. On three other subcommittees, he named four Democrats and two Republicans.

Now, in the House, there are 233 Democrats and 199 Republicans—a ratio of approximately 5.4 Democrats to 4.6 Republicans. That is, 46 percent of the membership is Republican.

But again just take a look at what Mr. CANNON, with his great, big heart, did to the Republicans. Five to two on two subcommittees; four to two on three subcommittees.

Mr. CANNON surely must have been afraid of those Republicans. Or was he afraid that some Democrats might show a little independence and refuse to trail along at his chariot wheels? You figure it out. I don't know.

But one thing I do know—if the Republican leadership takes it lying down, Republicans will not deserve anything better than they are getting.

If they will not even fight against an outrageous insult like that and if the fair-minded Democrats who do believe in fairness and precedent—and there are plenty of them—will not go along, and right this grievous wrong, then Congress might just as well fold up; let Mr. Truman, Dean Acheson—Hiss' sponsor; Mrs. Rosenberg and General Marshall run the show.

Louis Henna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, during these days of strife and worry, when selfish interests seem to predominate, it is often difficult to realize that there are still some people to be found whose love of mankind and desire to do for others rather than for one's self enrich the lives of all who know them.

Mr. Louis Henna, who lives in Round Rock, Tex., is such a man. His life is one which is filled with acts of generosity and a strong desire to do good for his fellow man. His sincere endeavor to help those around him is evidenced throughout the community.

In the February issue of the Texas Parade, a monthly publication by the Texas Good Roads Association, there appeared an article about Mr. Henna which I believe should be read by every Member of Congress. I, therefore, respectfully request that this article be inserted in the RECORD:

LOUIS HENNA: HOBBY—ORPHANS

(By Jimmy Banks)

Louis Henna has made and given away several fortunes since 1931, when he borrowed enough money to buy a Round Rock filling station that was famous for going broke. Henna, now only 36 years old, stood toe-to-toe with the great depression, slugged it out, and won.

He found hard work, the ability to make wise decisions quickly, and the American free enterprise system a winning combination. Those 16-hour days he used to work regularly—and which he still puts in when necessary—paid big dividends. Henna now owns three automobile agencies and large chunks of valuable real estate.

But more important to Henna, and to his pretty young wife, than the things he owns are those he has given away. They include a $200,000 haven for homeless children, $14,000 toward the cost of a new church, a modern, $8,000 dental clinic, a truck for an orphanage, and many miles of paved streets.

You have to find out about those things from Henna's friends. That takes in just about every one of Round Rock's 1,486 citizens. Louis is much too modest to talk about his own accomplishments and his generosity.

Quiet and unassuming, Henna is tall, handsome, has black wavy hair and friendly, sincere eyes. He always has been deeply religious.

His pride and joy is the $200,000 Texas Baptist Children's Home, a friendly, cheerful place that was opened last fall. It is a home for 60 children of all faiths, including other unfortunates as well as orphans.

Henna, who had owned the 112 acres of fertile land on which the home is situated, built it and then presented a debt-free deed on the whole thing to Texas Baptists.

Twenty children are housed in each of the three main buildings. They are modern, cut-stone dwellings of colonial-type architecture. In them, children live in real, home-like units. Even the menus of the three dormitories are different each day because Henna and H. D. Dollahite, the home's superintendent, want it to be different from most institutions.

The children attend the public schools and the churches of their choice in Round Rock.

Henna did the contracting on the home. He also did a lot of the hard labor that went into it. Other workmen followed the example he set and, as a result, the home was built in the near record time of just 3 months.

"It was just like prewar days," Henna said in praising the efforts of workmen who toiled at unusually low hourly wage rates and worked as fast as possible. Henna estimated the home would have cost at least $100,000 more without the wonderful cooperation he got from workers, contractors, and lumber dealers. All of the materials that went into the home were the best that money could buy, but for this worthy cause practically all of them were sold at cut rates.

Henna's only regret is that he could not make the home bigger. But he hopes to help it expand to an eventual capacity of 300 or 400 kids.

"Louis can do anything but make a speech," Dollahite said when the home was formally dedicated. "I feel sure he could do a wonderful job of that, too, if he would just try."

Henna was too modest to even take part in the dedication program other than to actually hand the deed to the Baptist leaders for the benefit of the photographers. He had been scheduled to make a speech, but instead he persuaded Dollahite, a friend of long standing, to substitute for him in performing that chore.

Round Rock brags that it has more miles of paved streets than any other town its size in Texas. And it brags that Louis Henna put most of them there. He is a hometown hero who has been interested in Round Rock's civic welfare practically all of his life. In addition to providing most of the leadership necessary to get the streets paved, he put in a great deal of the money.

When Louis' father casually mentioned one day that the town badly needed a dentist, young Henna went to work on the problem immediately. His efforts unearthed a prominent dentist's opinion that no member of his profession would go to such a small town, where "he would probably have an office in the back of a drug store or something."

Henna constructed a 2-story dental clinic. When it was completed, he advertised in the Texas Dental Journal for a dentist. A few weeks later, Round Rock got a capable, popular young dentist who saves the townspeople countless trips to larger towns.

Henna noticed one day that a truck belonging to the Lutheran Children's Home was about ready for the last mile. He bought a new truck, drove it out to the home and left it there without further ado.

When told that construction of the First Baptist Church in Round Rock would have to be stopped for lack of funds, Henna went to the pastor and asked how much was needed. When he was told $14,000, he calmly sat down and wrote a check for that amount. When the church runs low on operating funds, Louis usually deeds it a piece of property to tide it over.

Henna got a private flier's license before the start of World War II and after Pearl Harbor served for a while as a civilian instructor for the Army Air Corps. Later, without trying to pull strings and get a commission, he went into the Army as a private.

Most of his business ventures have been highly successful, but even this modern Midas who apparently has the touch of gold has had his failures. He has drilled a few wildcat oil wells around Round Rock. His friends are convinced he was aiming more at the prosperity oil would bring to the town rather than personal gains. At any rate, his wildcatters were all dry holes.

Henna, his wife, and their two children live in a very modest house.

But the big-hearted, kind Louis has provided a comfort for his big St. Bernard dog that few dogs have, even in such fabulous places as Hollywood, Calif. When he noticed his pet suffering from the Texas heat, Louis went down and bought a big fan that he installed in his garage. He then turned the air-cooled garage over to his St. Bernard.

The American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Patriotic Citizenship Association, Thomas F. Flynn, chairman:

RESOLUTION SPONSORED BY THE PATRIOTIC CITIZENSHIP ASSOCIATION

Whereas the flag of the United States of America was first adopted by the American Congress on June 14, 1777, with 13 stripes, alternate red and white, and the union of 13 stars, white with a blue field, representing a new constellation and said date is now observed as Flag Day throughout America; and

Whereas our flag took the permanent form as we have it today under an enactment of Congress on April 4, 1819, decreeing that the flag of the United States be 13 horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; that the union have 20 stars, white in a blue field; that on the admission of every new State into the Union, 1 star be added to the union of the flag, and that such addition shall take effect on the 4th of July next succeeding such admission; and

Whereas the colors of the flag of our country depict and represent the following attributes: The red is for valor, zeal, and fervency; the white is for hope, purity, cleanliness of life, and rectitude of conduct; the blue, the color of heaven, for reverence to God, loyalty, sincerity, justice, and truth, all of which commend themselves to their invocation by the youth of America; and

Whereas George Washington, the Father of our Country, in interpreting the symbolism of our flag enunciated: "We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty"; and

Whereas the flag of the United States is unique in the deep and noble significance of its message to the entire world, a message of national independence, of individual liberty, of idealism, of patriotism; and

Whereas, our flag symbolizes national independence and popular sovereignty, in that it is not the flag of a reigning family or royal house, but of a hundred and fifty million free people welded into a nation, one and inseparable, united not only by community of interest but by vital unity of sentiment and purpose; a nation distinguished for the clear individual conception of its citizens alike of their duties and their privileges, their obligations and their rights; and

Whereas the flag incarnates for all mankind the spirit of liberty and the glorious ideal of human freedom; not the freedom of unrestraint or the liberty of license, but the ideal of equal opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, safeguarded by the stern and lofty principles of duty, righteousness and justice, and attainable by obedience to self-imposed laws; it embodies the essence of patriotism; its spirit is the spirit of the American nation; its history is the history of the American people, emblazoned upon its folds in letters of living light are the names and fame of our heroic dead, the fathers of the Republic who devoted upon its altars their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor; twice told tales of national honor and glory cluster thickly about it; and

Whereas our late President Theodore Roosevelt, in a last plea for Americanism, proclaimed: "We have room for but one flag, the American flag, and this excludes the red flag, which symbolizes all wars against liberal government and civilization just as much as it excludes any foreign flag of a nation to which we are hostile"; and

Whereas for generations our school children have been taught the loyalty pledge as follows: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I, therefore, believe it is my duty to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag and to defend it against all enemies, for I am an American"; and

Whereas such pledge necessarily includes and constitutes a commitment to support the authority of the Nation in its effort to safeguard this and future generations of our people by promoting the objectives of just world order and international peace; and

Whereas this Nation, by solemn treaty, is now a member of the United Nations, a group of many independent nations, organized to further those objectives; and

Whereas it is contemplated by certain school authorities that the flag of the United

Nations is being distributed or is about to be distributed for display in the assembly rooms of the public school systems throughout the several States of the Nation is to be displayed and flown continuously from our public school buildings; and

Whereas it appears that such continuous display, as distinguished from a display on particular occasions for educative or informative purposes, may tend to confuse and dim the obligation of loyalty to this Nation and its flag by the introduction of a dual, divided, or additional allegiance; and

Whereas such continuous display of the flag of the United Nations beside and accompanying the national flag may likewise tend to cloud and confuse the understanding of our people and particularly of our children respecting the functioning of the organization of the United Nations itself, and so to limit the usefulness of the United Nations in advancing the salutary purposes to which it is dedicated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this organization petition the Congress and President of the United States to enact a law forbidding the continuous display on school buildings or other public buildings of any flag constituting the emblem of any nation or group of nations other than the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for ratification by the several States of the Union in essence adopting the flag of the United States in its permanent form as the standard emblem of our Nation; and to adopt a loyalty pledge of allegiance to our flag and to no other standard; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to pass punitive legislation in respect to the compliance and enactment of the provisions of such proposed amendment to the United States Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Members of the Eighty-second Congress of the United States and members of the State legislative bodies of the several States of the Union.

THOMAS F. FLYNN,
Chairman.

Attest:

CHARLES O'HARA,
Secretary.

Investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Final Touch," which appeared in the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., on Tuesday, February 27, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FINAL TOUCH

When a liberal Senator like CHARLES W. TOBEY recommends that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be abolished and when one of the directors of the Corporation itself admits that the board is bad the rest of us need no longer be in doubt as to the manner in which this organization has been administered. It is true that Mr. TOBEY is listed as a Republican but he is sympathetic to many of the aims of the Fair Deal and he has often voted with the political opposition.

As anyone who has read the testimony will agree, Mr. TOBEY's declaration that the RFC has become a political trading bureau rests on a sound basis of fact. It is as sordid a story as has come out of Washington in years. It is a story of fast and loose play with the taxpayers' money, of loans of small amounts made for useless purposes and of loans of large amounts made as the result of influence, friendship, and favoritism. Compared to this performance the 5-percenter affair, ill-smelling though it may have been, was picayune business.

If Mr. Truman still thinks that the charges which have been made against the RFC are asinine he is either completely blind to what is going on around him or ready to overlook the moral and ethical delinquencies of the men he has appointed to office. So far as we are concerned he can have his choice.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the House Public Works Committee is holding hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway project. Important new factors are thus being made available to the Congress.

On February 21, Mr. John D. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, Department of Defense, stated that the St. Lawrence seaway project is needed in the mobilization program from a logistic point of view, because it will supply a short inland transportation route for raw materials and a short transportation route for goods and material to our Armed Forces abroad. Mr. Small proved that the St. Lawrence project would save the country large amounts of short supply materials because it would provide needed transportation and hydroelectric power where otherwise they would have to be provided by more costly and more insecure means.

He stated that there was a possibility of growing danger to industrial plants on our sea coasts from guided missiles fired from submarines which would be able to approach fairly close to our coast line.

The St. Lawrence seaway, he went on to point out, would reduce the task of providing patrols and convoys and would decrease loss from enemy action.

Mr. President, the testimony of Mr. Small indicates that those who are opposing and obstructing the St. Lawrence seaway and its related power plant are, in fact, opposing the national defense program.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Small's testimony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

(Statement of Mr. John D. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives in connection with hearings on House joint resolution, to authorize the St. Lawrence project, February 1951.)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been designated by the Secretary of Defense to explain in detail the Department of Defense views with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which legislation now before you would authorize. The Department of Defense and its predecessor departments have consistently supported this legislation which would permit initiation of work on the St. Lawrense seaway and power project. We are favoring this legislation now, even more strongly than in the past.

Much has been said and written on this subject. Practically every facet of the problem has been carefully examined for many years. The project is important from a Defense Department point of view, and has our full support.

In summary—the projected seaway will give us an alternate transportation link to the Midwest of tremendous industrial and logistic value. In time of war, it would relieve the heavy rail traffic toward east coast ports and some of the Atlantic port congestion. The power project will furnish large quantities of additional cheap and dependable electric power. The seaway and power projects would permit a good spread in the build up of our heavy industry, such as aluminum plants and shipyards. Fortunately the construction of these projects at this time requires so small a fraction of the available supply of such materials as steel, copper, and cement, as well as of manpower, that we need not hesitate to make this investment in additional productive capacity and industrial strength.

A factor with which we must steadily live is the gradual depletion of the Mesabi deposits of high-grade iron ore. This was stressed in our testimony last spring and it warrants renewed emphasis today. There are two alternate sources of supply open to us, namely the use of low-grade domestic deposits and the importation of foreign high-grade ores. The importation and development of foreign ore must be accelerated, because the extensive and costly research and development work and the construction of facilities required to perfect the beneficiation and use of taconite is a slow process requiring years to complete.

There are two principal sources of foreign high-grade iron ore in this hemisphere, South America and Labrador. The high-grade ores of Labrador are of particular importance to national security. In time of war, if the seaway were completed, ore from Labrador could move to the Lake area by a sheltered route as contrasted with the hazardous open ocean routes from that source and from South America. To the extent that the seaway will be available instead of ocean routes the demands on our Navy for convoy escort will be reduced accordingly, permitting that branch of the armed services to devote its attention to the other pressing demands it will have to meet.

Another important aspect of the availability of the seaway for the shipment of Labrador ore is that it provides a much more direct route to the steel mills than if

we must rely on open sea transport to east coast ports, where the ore would have to be transferred to what will then be an already heavily burdened rail system. The shorter and more direct route will result in a much shorter turn-around period. Fewer vessels can carry the same quantity of ore from Labrador than would be required for the longer open-ocean route to east-coast ports. These vessels would be of the lake bulk carrier type. Ore carriers designed for ocean services require 11 percent more steel than lake-type carriers of the same capacity. This potential lessening of the drain on our steel supplies is worth striving for. Benefits of the more direct route, I might point out, will be equally available when we are not engaged in hostilities to the extent that the ultimate price of steel and steel products should be lower than it would be if longer routes are used with consequent higher shipping charges.

Still another important factor affecting industrial mobilization is that when the need arises these Labrador sources, which are open pit operations, can be expanded readily by the simple expedient of using more mining equipment. This has a great advantage when considered in connection with the availability of the seaway, for it would not be reasonable to expand this source of iron ore unless transportation of the ore could be accommodated readily. The seaway is a highly expandable traffic artery, which means that its availability will vastly increase the possibilities of exploiting the Labrador fields.

There are other logistic implications in the seaway which are of very substantial importance. The additional transportation facilities would remove, to some extent, the strain on other types of transportation in time of war. Cargo from the Middle West destined for overseas points could be loaded at Great Lakes ports for final discharge at destination, thereby saving the rehandling of thousands of tons of cargo at seacoast ports. This would effect a very considerable saving of manpower and thus permit speedier delivery to points of destination. Direct shipment from the Great Lakes ports would have the additional advantages of providing a wide distribution of port facilities and of reducing transportation and storage bottlenecks. Short hauls from factories to shipping ports would release rolling stock and other inland transport facilities for other uses.

Another important logistical consideration is that the seaway would reduce, by about 1,000 miles, the open sea route between the lake ports of the United States and the British Isles. This would reduce the task of providing our naval patrols and convoys, and would decrease losses from enemy action.

The hydroelectric power which the St. Lawrence project can furnish will be both plentiful and cheap, both characteristics which make it particularly desirable in defense production. Experience has demonstrated that defense production must be expected to add very substantially to power demand. This is being superimposed upon the steady rise of normal demand, one which was earlier estimated to require by 1960 in the region served by the St. Lawrence several times as much power (in addition to that already planned) as the St. Lawrence project can supply.

With respect to the effect of the proposed Seaway on the shipbuilding and ship repair industry, a study of the experience of the last war indicates that it was necessary to use such facilities on the Great Lakes as were available to their maximum capacity at that time in carrying on a small boat and bulk-type lake carrier program and in the construction of combat-service and supply ocean vessels for the armed services. Vessels constructed in Great Lakes shipyards designed for ocean service were routed to the open sea by way of the existing 14-foot St. Lawrence Channel, which limited the size of those which could be built in the St. Lawrence area, or, with the aid of pontoons fitted at the expense of time, manpower, and materials, had to be floated to the Gulf of Mexico by way of the Mississippi River system.

The St. Lawrence seaway would provide a gateway for vessels directly to or from the open sea, thereby permitting the Great Lakes shipyards to build practically all types of cargo vessels designed for use with the United States sea-going merchant fleets. It would also permit Great Lakes shipyards to do part of the repair and reconversion work now performed by the tidewater shipyards. While shipbuilding and repair yards on the seacoast are now capable of caring for peacetime construction or repair programs, the additional facilities that would be available in the Great Lakes would be of distinct advantage in the event of war.

This advantage has another side. There is a possibility, which has been mentioned in the press, of a growing danger that industrial plants on sea coasts may be subject to attack in future wars by guided missiles fired from submarines which would be able to approach fairly close to our coast line. To the extent that an industry vital to our war machine, such as our shipbuilding industry, can be maintained at locations remote from coastal areas the possibility of damage by such attacks will be reduced. In effect, then, the seaway is a contribution in the direction of dispersion of manufacturing and industrial facilities.

Question has been raised as to the vulnerability of the major installations of the project to determined air attack. That vulnerability is recognized. However, the same objection could be raised to any future project of a similar nature at any continental point. If this objection were to be the controlling factor we would be limited to the development of only minor and widely dispersed natural resources. Further, the area is already one of high defense priority. The project will, therefore, not require commitments for defense of the area that do not already exist in large part.

It is also recognized that the seaway is admittedly susceptible to serious traffic interruptions by enemy action, particularly sabotage. Although precautions against sabotage would be necessary, vital portions of the project can be given defense protection on a par with that accorded other comparatively vital installations. Reasonable protective measures will to a large extent minimize the risks. In this connection, it has been pointed out that to destroy locks or render them inoperable for an appreciable period is one matter when done as a defensive measure and another when performed as a matter of sabotage. To accomplish such damage would normally require prolonged access to the lock and the installation of a considerable quantity of explosives.

In summary, the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects are assuming an ever increasing importance, especially from industrial and logistical viewpoints. We need the power which it can produce. We need this reasonably safe and sure means of supplying the steel industry of the size which our industrial progress warrants and our security demands.

We can use to full advantage a new water-communications link from our industrial Midwest to the areas of our national interest throughout the world. We believe that a prompt start must be made so that these projects may be completed as soon as possible. The payoff may be sooner than we think. Thank you.

Twenty Years of Ridiculing the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest Lincoln Day speeches delivered in my congressional district last month was by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress from the Blair-Centre-Clearfield district in Pennsylvania. The occasion was the Lincoln-Victory dinner sponsored by the Council of Republican Women of Erie County and held in the Lawrence Hotel, Erie, Pa., on the evening of February 15.

Representative VAN ZANDT was elected to Congress in 1938 and before that time he had served three consecutive terms as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. He later served in the United States Navy during World War II, resigning his seat in Congress when called for active duty. He was discharged in 1946 with the rank of captain, United States Naval Reserve.

Representative VAN ZANDT's speech was well received by the large number of persons in attendance at the Lincoln-Victory dinner and was also the subject of several editorials in Erie County newspapers.

The following editorial is taken from the February 17 issue of the Erie Daily Times:

[From the Erie (Pa.) Daily Times of February 17, 1951]

TWENTY YEARS OF RIDICULING THE CONSTITUTION

Representative JAMES VAN ZANDT has long been a Member of Congress. He represents the district embracing Altoona. He is known for his straightforwardness, no pussyfooting, determined stand on national problems. He is a veteran of World War I.

His congressional record matches his war record—outstanding. His constituency representing all planes of life and political beliefs, must have faith in him. They've reelected him again and again.

Representative VAN ZANDT gave one of his straight-from-the-shoulder talks in Erie, Thursday night. The occasion was the Lincoln-Victory dinner by the Council of Republican Women. Whether the occasion was partisan-sponsored would make no difference to the Pennsylvania Representative, who has observed at close range the operations in Washington for many years.

"For nearly 20 years we have lived under the banner of the so-called New Deal-Fair Deal and in reality raw deal concept of government. As a result we have seen the Constitution of the United States ridiculed and ignored while socialism and communism have been encouraged," he declared.

"The New Dealers in following their program of deceit experimented with every phase of our economic life and to such an extent that they lulled the American people into a sense of false security. They promised everybody something for nothing, even luring many Republicans with their sugar-coated remedies."

And putting the finger on wishy-washy Republicans, he said:

"To be frank, in 1936 and again in 1940, the New Dealers had convinced many Republicans that their party had no future and it has not been so long ago that some Republicans actually apologized for their Republican faith.

"With such a condition prevalent throughout the Nation the Republican Party was faced with extinction and serious consideration was asked that the name "Republican" be changed and another adopted in its place. Mind you, this is the same party founded by Abraham Lincoln."

Representative VAN ZANDT recalled that during the early days of the Roosevelt regime, he, with other Members of Congress, were publicly ridiculed because they refused to follow the dictates of the Chief Executive, who, at the time, had as his advisers Harry Hopkins, Rex Tugwell, Henry Wallace, Alger Hiss, Lee Pressman, and others of infamous Commie stamp.

Like many other America-loving Members of Congress, Representative VAN ZANDT was pilloried for his defense of the ideals that made this country great.

He fought the battle with little support from the White House and even his own colleagues of his own party, against the fellow travelers and parlor pinks occupying high positions of Government and who had a firm foothold in the State Department. This radical-minded mob on the Federal payroll were writing directives designed to regiment the American people and destroy our form of government.

What did JIMMY VAN ZANDT do about this? He knew that the situation existed. He fought the battle, the good fight, but he was outnumbered; he was smeared, like many of his sincere colleagues. But he kept up the battle as he is today.

"Never before in the history of our country has our national honor suffered such humiliation and disgrace as by the crimes committed at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam. The crimes of Pearl Harbor, the partitioning of Germany, the appeasement of Russia, the coddling of Communists in high Government positions, the dismantling of our national defense, and our blundering foreign policy which plunged us into the so-called police action in Korea, constitute national sins that cry to heaven for vengeance."

That is the picture he gave to his listeners. Harsh, fiery, but unfortunately truthful. The confusion in Washington is appalling, and the American people are entitled to be told the truth, and it would take an army of JIMMY VAN ZANDTS to give America the scandalous picture, with the hope that such revelation would stir up patriotism and a drive to the ballot box for a change to some form of honest administration of our country.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 the Council of Lithuanian Societies in Baltimore again joined with Lithuanians all over the world, in celebrating the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. Unfortunately, this celebration could not be a very joyous occasion, in view of the situation which still exists in Lithuania. But such an occasion can serve to remind us that we must continue our efforts to fight the spread of communism and to endeavor to work out, through the United Nations, a plan for the liberation of the countries enslaved by Russia.

It was my privilege to attend the banquet held by the Council of Lithuanian Societies in Baltimore and I would like to place in the RECORD the address delivered by the Honorable J. Kajeckas, counselor of the Lithuanian Legation on that occasion:

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

(By J. Kajeckas)

One more anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuania's Independence is being commemorated in mourning. An anniversary without a krivule (a crooked staff used by Lithuanians in olden days to convoke their meetings), without a trumpet, without any propaganda whatsoever, dispelling everything that divides us, and in the name of that Lithuania, Lithuanians all over the world are united by common pain, common longing for right and justice for the Lithuanian Nation, by common aspiration for Lithuania's independence. Wherever a Lithuanian may be today, in his homeland or in exile, free or enslaved, he lives with the one and the same thought, that Lithuania be freed.

This anniversary is accompanied by numerous tears, especially in the homeland and in exile in Russia. It is not Herodotus' envoys today who rage in Judea to murder innocent children; neither is it Nero's hangmen raging in the streets of Rome in hunt of a Christian victim. According to Maironis:

"The famous power of Caesar is asleep.
The joyfulness of the Colosseum is long silent.
'Circenses,' screams are no longer heard."

But this time, it is the terrible scourge of the twentieth century, far more bloody and brutal than that of Herodotus, or Nero, of Genghis Khan, or of Attilla that has affected holy Lithuania. It carries death, suffering, enslavement. The Kremlin's Bolshevik imperialism, violence, the violation of the Lithuanian Nation's rights, are the causes of our pain.

The Golgotha of the Lithuanian Nation has been going on for nearly 11 years. But in that Golgotha we note rays of hope which are both comforting and encouraging. During all these years the Governor of the State of Maryland has solemnly and publicly proclaimed Lithuanian Day. Today again he reminds the world that the first victim of Bolshevik violence is not Korea but Lithuania. These proclamations have announced and continue to announce that the trampled rights and freedoms in Lithuania must be restored. We witness every year on this anniversary the brave proclamations of the mayor of Baltimore and the appropriate resolutions of the House of Delegates of Maryland. On this anniversary we have had here in our midst, as we have today, either the Governor himself or his delegate, the mayor of Baltimore, honorable Senators and Congressmen, and numerous friends who are in sympathy with the Lithuanian cause. To all of them is due the deepest appreciation of the Lithuanian Nation.

Significant rays of hope during the last several weeks have multiplied. Here are but a few examples:

1. On the radio and in the world press we hear the following responsible statements:

"We are struggling * * * to uphold the basic values of freedom—of peace based on justice. * * *

"We must remember that the fighting in Korea is but one part of the tremendous struggle of our time—the struggle between freedom and Communist imperialism.

"Our objective is to build a world order based on freedom and justice.

"The moral and spiritual dangers that flow from communism are a more serious threat to freedom than its military power." (From President Truman's address to Youth Conference, New York Times, December 6, 1950.)

"The threat of world conquest by Soviet Russia endangers our liberty and endangers the kind of world in which the free spirit of men can survive. This threat is aimed at all peoples who strive to win or defend their own freedom and national independence. * * *

"The threat is a total threat and the danger is a total danger. All free nations are exposed and all are in peril. * * *

"The imperialism of the czars has been replaced by the even more ambitious, more crafty, and more menacing imperialism of the rulers of the Soviet Union. * * *

"The free nations believe in the dignity and the worth of man. We believe in independence for all nations.

"Korea * * * is also a symbol. It stands for right and justice in the world against oppression and slavery. * * * The free world must always stand for these principles—and we will stand with the free world. * * *

"We will continue to work for peaceful settlements in international disputes.

"But we will not engage in appeasement." (From President Truman's annual address to joint session of Congress on State of the Union, New York Times, January 9, 1951.)

These words are the words of the President of the United States. The Lithuanians understood their meaning and they are close to their hearts. They mean that we are not alone in our struggle and that the greatest enemy of Lithuania is also the greatest enemy of the free world and of all mankind. They also mean that our aspirations are based on solid principles and that Lithuania's freedom is not an empty dream.

2. Hon. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, spoke as follows:

"It gives me particular pleasure to participate in the opening program of the Lithuanian language transmissions of the Voice of America, on this day, February 16, when Lithuanians and their many friends everywhere are celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day.

"The people and the Government of the United States, through these broadcasts, will seek to convey the genuine interest and concern which they take in the welfare of the Lithuanian people. The concern which is felt for the position of the Lithuanian people is not new. It was most forcefully expressed in a statement issued by the United States Government on July 23, 1940. On that date the United States Government issued the following declaration:

"'During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

"'From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independent and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"'The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"'These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"'The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.'

"That was a United States Government statement issued July 23, 1940.

"The adherence of the United States to the fundamental principles expressed at that time is indicated by the fact that this Government has not recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the U. S. S. R. and continues to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of Lithuania in the United States.

"The Lithuanian broadcasts of the Voice of America will convey to the Lithuanian people a factual unbiased picture of the motives and aims which guide the United States in its international relations. Our aims are: Peace, freedom, and justice for all.

"These broadcasts will also endeavor to bring to the people of Lithuania a true report on the contemporary American scene and the efforts of the people of the United States to achieve a fuller and richer life for all those who cherish freedom and liberty.

"It is with these thoughts that I transmit to the people of Lithuania my own greetings as well as the greetings of the people and of the Government of the United States." (Department of State, Press Release No. 119, February 15, 1951.)

3. On this same occasion today the Lithuanian Minister to the United States, Hon. P. Zadeikis, spoke as follows:

"Beloved brothers and sisters, as the song goes, today is a holiday in my soul, so, it is for me today. As the duly accredited Minister and Envoy of the free Republic of Lithuania in the United States, I have the significant and memorable honor and duty of greeting my countrymen in our native language on this 16th day of February, which commemorates the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration in Vilnius of Lithuania's independence.

"The inauguration of broadcasts by the Voice of America in the Lithuanian language on our national holiday indicates the importance which the free world continues to attach to the commemoration of Lithuania's Independence Day. On this significant occasion, the thoughts of Lithuanians and their many friends abroad everywhere turn to you who remain in the homeland carrying silently but steadfastly in your hearts an abiding faith in the future of free Lithuania. That faith receives a mighty measure of assurance from the fact that the right, which must ultimately prevail, is on our side.

"The difficult conditions under which you must keep that faith and the tragic situation in Lithuania since 1940 are well known and viewed with the greatest sympathy in the Western World. As your official representative in this great land of freedom, the United States of America, I assure you that the American people are outstanding in their friendship and sympathy toward the Lithuanian people and I remind you that this attitude of the American people is reflected in the official refusal of the United States Government to recognize the enforced incorporation of our country into the Soviet Union. I also wish to remind you that the United States is not alone among the countries who have refused to recognize Soviet sovereignty over Lithuania, which reflects the friendliness and sympathy of other peoples as well. I should like to mention finally that the plight of Lithuanian people in the homeland has also been the subject of concern to delegates of various nations to the United Nations who have expressed their anxiety and sympathy on many occasions.

"May this first attempt by the Voice of America to speak to you in the Lithuanian language, despite the so-called iron curtain established by the Soviets, be a signal to you of renewed hope for the restoration of the right of self-determination in Lithuania and the other countries of the world presently enslaved by the Communist horde.

"Bowing my head before the altar of great hopes and of supreme sacrifices placed there by the fighters for Lithuania's independence, I conclude my remarks with the conviction that, with God's help, the sun of freedom will again shine upon our native country and that we must work in unity toward that great goal.

"Such broadcasts in the Lithuanian language are of great value. They are a great comfort to the crucified Lithuanian nation in general and to its underground in particular.

"One could mention in this connection also the Declaration of the Aims and Principles of Liberation of the Central and Eastern European Peoples, adopted and signed in Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Pa., on February 11, 1951, by representatives of nations behind the iron curtain, including Lithuania."

4. The New York Times of this morning commenting on the above-mentioned wrote in an editorial which I quote:

"THE VOICE OF LIBERTY

"In a further effort to penetrate the iron curtain the Voice of America adds today another foreign-language program to the many it is broadcasting around the world. The new program is in Lithuanian and is timed to begin on the thirty-third anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence during the First World War. That independence has since been obliterated by Soviet Russia, which annexed Lithuania and the two other Baltic states, Latvia and Estonia, as a result of its deal with Hitler.

"Lithuanians who have managed to escape from behind the iron curtain have joined with representatives of other East European nations under the Soviet yoke in a continuing struggle for liberty. Several hundred such representatives from 10 countries met this week in Independence Hall in Philadelphia to issue a declaration of their own independence from communism. This declaration calls for the formation of a European federation modeled after the United States. The new program of the Voice of America offers evidence that our Government continues to recognize the independence of the Baltic states." (The New York Times, February 16, 1951.)

These are all rays of hope, they are the first swallows announcing the approach of spring for the oppressed peoples. This time it comes not along the Carpathian Mountains but from along the shores of the Atlantic.

No despot is eternal. Each and every one of them has reached the same end. According to the Lithuanian poet prophet:

"Each scourge
After scourging justice breaks each day."

Let us have confidence in Lithuania's freedom of tomorrow, let us work and let us sacrifice toward that end. The chains of slavery are breaking. Freedom's sun will rise again. The future belongs to the free nations, to oppressed peoples, including Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to insert in the RECORD a copy of the resolution approved by all those present at the banquet:

We, citizens of Baltimore, Md., gathered under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies, in commemoration of the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people Lithuania, held on the 16th day of February 1951 at Lithuanian Hall, after due deliberations regarding the present international situation, take note of the following:

The United States of America, together with other United Nations members, is engaged in a bloody struggle in Korea defending the freedom of peace-loving people against Communist aggressors.

We believe the bold and determined steps taken by the United States of America to protect a defenseless people emerging into a status of independent statehood rallied the forces of freedom everywhere and revived suffering mankind's faith in American policy objectives.

Let it not be forgotten, however, that the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia constitute the original "Korea," since they were the first to be overrun by the Communist forces more than 10 years ago. These same nations are still under Communist domination and they are being inhumanly subjected to extermination by the genocidal policy of the Soviet rulers.

Furthermore, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were members in good standing of the League of Nations. On the other hand, the Soviet Union, which had been expelled from the League because of the aggressive war it waged against Finland, is a member of the United Nations with a veto power to block the complaints of the victimized Baltic States.

We agree with the statement of the President of the United States in his last state of the Union message to Congress, that free and independent nations can band together in a world order based on law, and that the cornerstone of such a peaceful world has been laid in the United Nations. But the President's further statement: "The imperialism of the czars has been replaced by the even more ambitious, more crafty and menacing imperialism of the rulers of the Soviet Union," indicates to us that the Soviet Union does not intend to abide by the Charter of the United Nations.

Wherefore it is respectfully requested that the United States of America continue to maintain its world leadership in its efforts to achieve international peace founded on principles of freedom and justice and we urge the President and the Secretary of State to adopt appropriate measures in order to accomplish the following:

1. To bring up the matter of the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, in the open international forum of the UN;

2. To invoke the aid of the UN in condemning and stopping the crime of genocide which is being perpetrated in Lithuania and other Baltic countries by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its ruling Communist Party;

3. The release of all of the political prisoners now in concentration camps and under forced labor in the Soviet Union;

4. To allow freedom of religion to all people;

5. To assist the Lithuanian Nation and the other Baltic States when the forces of Communist imperialism are crushed, in the reestablishment of a separate national sovereignty and true freedom and independence; and

6. To demand the ouster of the Soviet Union from membership in the UN if it continues with its flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES,
ANTHONY J. MICKENA, *President.*
MARTIN RAILA, *Secretary.*

Thought for the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following Thought of the Week address delivered by the Reverend Philip E. Dobson, S. J., director of St. Peter's College Institute of Industrial Relations, to 600 adult students at the institute on Wednesday, February 21, 1951. St. Peter's College Institute was founded in 1945, and nearly 3,000 members of labor unions and leaders in management have availed themselves of the courses in labor-management problems given each fall and winter. The main purpose of the institute is to build up moral armament in labor and management against the evils of communism. I commend to my colleagues this thought-provoking address by Father Dobson:

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK—THE REAL BATTLE FRONT: YOUR HOME AND YOUR JOB

In this hour of our country's gravest peril, when our natural resources, our manpower, and our production machinery are being geared and channeled into the building of a great war machine, some may have a mistaken impression about the true nature of the titanic struggle in which we are being involved. In the frantic rush to turn out battleships, airplanes, guns, and tanks when there is little time for meditation and quiet thinking, there is a danger that our people will pour out their very lifeblood to beat the Communist world menace, in vain, unless they realize just what is at stake, unless they comprehend what it is that makes inevitable the fight to the death which we are facing between Christianity and communism.

The cause for the spread of communism goes further and deeper than the imperialistic ambitions of Josef Stalin and the Politburo. The spread of communism is an effect. It is not the basic cause of the present world conflict. Communism is rolling in to fill the vacuum caused by the crumbling of a decadent western civilization.

Father Gorman, in this month's issue of the Sign, dissects masterfully the diseased carcass of our western so-called Christian civilization, and lays bare the wounds, the sores, the deterioration which have left that body a ready prey to all types of social diseases. That it is communism now is quite incidental.

To paraphrase Father Gorman: Why does communism have such a tremendous appeal to so many millions? Let us roam the world and find out. Why do our arguments against communism avail so little? Let us stack our arguments against reality and soon we shall know. The answer is that we have been false to our Christian religion. We have given it lip service, but in our daily lives we have been greedy materialists. We have sacrificed our ideals on the altar of pomp and power and pagan worship of our bodies with its pleasures.

What does the share cropper in the South, wringing a miserable existence out of the wretched soil, care about our argument that the Soviet farms are collectivized? He couldn't be worse off than he is. We think we can turn people away from communism by pointing out that there is one ballot in Soviet Russia. To the Negro in the South that is better than no ballot.

The French dock worker who lives like the rats that scurry around the wharves is not impressed by statistics pointing out Soviet Russia's low standard of living. Rhetoric on the glories of Christian civilization hardly impresses the Italian tenant farmer living with his family in a cave, whose very lifeblood, so to speak, is drawn off by an absentee landlord to purchase a mink coat for his mistress. For that farmer, any change would be for the better.

Certainly our appeals to the Asiatics and the people of Africa fall on deaf ears. The white man's record on these continents should make decent men blush with shame. The imperialism of the western nations gouged these countries of their wealth and their resources. The white lords condemned and despised the natives. They degraded them, ground them down, prevented their realizing the advantages of education and their rich native culture.

Is the white man qualified, then, to warn the people of Asia and Africa that with communism comes slavery?

Society can be compared to a building. Just as a building is erected by placing one brick upon another and the quality of the building is known by the quality of the bricks, so society consists of you, and you, and you, as individuals and the moral texture of society is the sum of the moral characters of the individual citizens. When a society consists, for the most part, of people who observe the law of God, abstain from debilitating vices, are hard working, healthfully independent, and dedicated to high ideals in life, that is a sound society. With this description of a healthy society as a background, I ask you to estimate the caliber of our present so-called Christian civilization.

With the passage of time every empire the world has known has decayed, crumbled, and fallen. The classic example is that of the Roman Empire. These empires crumbled, not because they lacked men with brains and ability at the top. They decayed and fell apart because the great mass of citizens, the bricks of society, became soft, amoral, and unprincipled. The empires crumbled because the human bricks individually crumbled.

These considerations should bring home to each of you, with devastating clarity, how important each and every one of you are in the crisis which looms before us. Unless we can point to Joe Citizen after Joe Citizen and claim that they are moral, God-fearing, good-living, upright, hard-working, dedicated citizens, it is in order to ask the questions, "Have we anything worth fighting for?" I say this because if, after estimating citizen after citizen, we should find them wanting, then we are forced to conclude that our civilization resembles the decadent state of the crumbled empires and certainly such a civilization is not worth the outpouring of the blood of millions of people.

I say then, that the real battleground in this crisis is found in your homes and on your jobs. Military might is undermined and sapped of its strength unless it has as its foundation morally healthy homes and members of labor and management who practice justice and charity. Should we squeeze through to victory in the present crisis, just before we become too decadent, the hosannas of triumph will turn to the rattle of despair and the statues of victory will be pulverized into ashes.

This will be so unless our homes and unless our families are free of the debilitating vices which have undermined other world powers. This will be true unless social justice and social charity are practiced by labor and management in their wage policies, in their handling of grievances, in their attitudes toward each other, in the setting of production policies and in their attitudes toward the public.

Our Lost Spiritual Fortitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the editorial entitled "Our Lost Spiritual Fortitude," which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, published at Tulsa, Okla., Saturday, April 8, 1950, is worthy of being reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This editorial was written by my fellow townsman, Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones, one of America's great editorial writers.

This editorial was awarded an honor medal award from the Freedoms Foundation. The award was announced at Valley Forge, Pa., by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in an address by General Bradley on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1951. The news item from Valley Forge giving an account of the announcement of the award by General Bradley and reciting that the recipient of the award was chosen by a distinguished awards jury composed of State supreme court jurists and executive officers of national patriotic and service organizations, whose chairman was Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State College, follows the quotation of the editorial to which I have referred.

May we have more such spontaneous declarations and patriotic reminders and pronouncements of those capable of influencing the citizens of this country in the right direction—America-ward.

The editorial follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of April 8, 1950]

OUR LOST SPIRITUAL FORTITUDE

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Everywhere, on every land, in every clime, life should be lovely. Every human being, who is not crazy, loves to live. He wants to see, see the color of the earth, the green of the trees, the blue of the seas, the radiance of the flowers, the brilliance of the sun, the beauty of the stars, the majesty of the moon. He wants to see.

He wants to hear. Hear the voices of kinfolk, neighbor, and friend. He wants to speak and be spoken to. Most of all he cherishes that interchange of thought that induces laughter. He wants to smell the sweetness of the air, the aroma of the new-tilled earth, and the fresh-mown hay. His nostrils sniff life with rapture.

War is waste, wreckage. War is murder. Why must we have mass murder? No sane mind wants it.

We Americans are worried, fearful that we may again be drawn into another war. Our scientists have made mass murder appallingly massive. Life can be annihilated if we war again. Then why do we have it?

Our is a beautiful country. America is a land worth loving. As each loves his own home, every good American has learned to love our collective home. We have rules to make home pleasant. By those rules we live happy home lives. We have rules to make our collective living pleasant.

The makers of our Republic recognized the individual's rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. No less they recognized the common responsibility that every citizen must accept if we are to protect the freedoms in which we may live our lives in largeness.

We have rules for living together. They make the Oregonian feel happily at home in Ohio or Oklahoma. And the Missourian in Massachusetts or Mississippi.

All that any of us want is the right to live in freedom, in peace, unafraid of any wild and ferocious beast who, like the untamed Russian bear, watches with covetous eyes, ready to pounce upon us, and destroy us.

We talk of World War II as a triumph for our fighting forces. But we lost that war. America never carried the Stars and Stripes onto any field of battle except to widen the horizon line of human freedom until this Second World War. The military historian insists we won that war. But the honest historian is already telling the tragic truth of our surrender. Our Commander in Chief surrendered at Yalta, at Quebec, and at Tehran.

All people, even the Russian people, want peace. They all want to live, they all want liberty and the right to pursue happiness.

The world was eager to believe we meant what we said about "four freedoms." But we no sooner proclaimed the "four freedoms" than we sat down with Stalin, the mad marshal of mass murder, and wiped out the freedoms of millions. Instead of being free from fear, we hurled the whole world headlong into fear. Free men became slaves, armies rushed again to their gun racks.

Because of betrayals, the war that does not end, now compels us to fear devastating attacks upon our own soil. Something has happened to us that our house, so long in order, is falling in decay. The greatest danger that confronts us is not Stalin, nor the loss of the liberties of millions of people that we betrayed into slavery, but the indifference of our own people to the menace of the political mess we have made. This indifference has already gone far to destroy our own freedoms.

At long last we have begun to convict some who have betrayed public trust. It is shocking to learn in the Hiss case, as one, that 10 years before he was brought to trial all the truths and facts that convicted him were known to such men in positions of public trust as Dean Acheson, A. A. Berle, William C. Bullitt, Ley Henderson, Cordell Hull when he was Secretary of State and Frank Murphy when he was our Attorney General. And nothing was done. They had all the records, and they hid them.

Have we Americans become a gulleless, gullible people? We ourselves have given administrative powers to men who care little about our life, our liberty, and our pursuit of happiness.

Freedoms are firm. Every courthouse is built to so testify. In every State, in every county and in every town we have laws that protect the invasions of our homes by bandits, burglars, sneak thieves, murderers. But it has come to pass that the Supreme Court of the United States has so far departed from the constitutional foundations of our Republic that it defends any alien who comes onto our shores as a spy, as a foe, of our freedoms.

This is not fantastic. Our highest judicial tribunal has thrown hurdles and stumbling blocks in the way of our peace officers who would protect us from the subversive spies. Our highest tribunal befriends the alien who pilfers the secrets of our defenses. Our State Department and our courts throw their protection around Communist agents. If these public officials are not smart enough to cope with insidious criminals, then they are not competent to be the defenders of our freedoms. If they are smart enough to recognize an enemy, and shield him, then we should not allow our liberties to be entrusted to their care.

Why are our life, liberty, and our pursuit of happiness subjected to this studied encroachment on our freedoms? We have done this to ourselves. While we listened to the pleasing platitudes of four freedoms they were repudiated. We have listened to two Presidents hold in contempt the patriotism that made America. Love of country has been scoffed at, treated with sneers. Ridicule of our country has become the thesis which conscienceless book publishers and periodical makers have smiled upon with favor and promoted.

When the bugles blare and the drums rattle our flag flies before marching men. We become patriots again. Something is wrong when it takes a war to make us patriots. It takes a war to silence the contemptuous sneer of the shallow conceited intellectuals who betray us and bring to our lovely land the fear of Communist tyranny.

Something beside fertile soil and vast resources made us the richest Nation on earth. Because we have been the richest Nation we can and should be the most powerful Nation on earth. A power for peace. We betray our heritage. We betray our children and our children's children so long as we keep electing public officials who have been responsible for the growth of the New Deal and Fair Deal, both of which have repudiated the laws and principles that made us mighty. And we are going to grow weaker so long as we keep a President who has shown a disposition to protect aliens who wish to destroy us.

There is a hopeful trend dawning. Sensible writers and commentators are in revolt. They are beginning to tell the truth about the betrayals that have been destroying our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. There is an increasing number of nonprofessional historical writers who are reviewing the years of our Nation's creation. As our national existence is threatened we are becoming once again interested in our heritage. Once again we learn that our seemingly insuperable obstacles were overcome by the spiritual fortitude of our fathers. The spiritual fortitude we have been schooled to lose.

We do not want to destroy ourselves. Nor do we want to lose our liberty. We want to live. We love life. We want all peoples to have the right to live as they choose to live. But we have weakened ourselves by choosing weak leaders. Observing this, spiritually impoverished but physically mighty powers seize upon our sleeping patriotism. If we are to save the life we love and live it as we all want to live it, we must again be Americans.

MEDAL FOR FREEDOM EDITORIAL AWARDED TO TRIBUNE PUBLISHER

Richard Lloyd Jones, publisher of the Tulsa Tribune, will receive an honor medal award from the Freedoms Foundation for an editorial titled "Our Lost Spiritual Fortitude," it was announced today at Valley Forge, Pa.

The award was announced by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and was among a series of honors bestowed on leading Americans and organizations for "outstanding contributions to freedom during 1950."

General Bradley, in his speech prepared for the Freedoms Foundation's presentation ceremony, said the United States has "ample strength" to share with its free-world allies until they become "self-sufficient and independent of our aid."

And the combined industrial production and skill of the free nations "will assure our military supremacy if we need it," the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said.

He added, however, that the avowed intentions of communism provide little chance that America's military load can be lightened soon.

The North Atlantic treaty organization is a stronger combination than "the compulsory league of Soviet satellites," Bradley said.

Naming of the recipients was part of a special Washington's birthday ceremony.

They were chosen by a distinguished awards jury composed of State supreme court jurists and executive officers of national patriotic and service organizations. Chairman of the jury was Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State College.

Basis for the judging is the official credo of the Freedoms Foundation, which defines the American way of life as an indivisible bundle of economic and political freedoms as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, based in turn on a fundamental belief in God.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, over 90 percent of every 1,000,000 postal cards sent through the mails are sent by business enterprises such as advertising agencies and other business firms. For every million such postal cards so mailed, those business enterprises pay $10,000, and the taxpayers pay $18,000, resulting in a clear subsidy to business. A like subsidy at taxpayers' expense is also enjoyed by newspapers and magazines.

I was pleased to see both the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News strongly support the adjustment of rates to eliminate this hand-out of public funds. I ask unanimous consent to include with these remarks in the RECORD a copy of each of those editorials, the first one from the Washington Daily News of February 28, and the second from the Washington Post of March 1. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 28, 1951]

RAISE POSTAL RATES

President Truman has sent Congress his annual plea for higher postal rates. Congress should, by all means, raise rates.

He estimates that, at present rates, the post office deficit would be $521,000,000 in the 12 months beginning next July.

Unsound at any time, such a deficit would, as he says, be worse than unsound now when the taxpayers must carry a heavy burden of defense costs.

Mr. Truman proposes to cut the deficit to $160,000,000—the cost, he figures, of services the post office performs for the Government itself.

But there is no assurance that the rate increases he seeks would make the deficit that small, for, as he points out, postal costs will rise if railroad and airline mail-carrying charges are boosted, and—though he doesn't mention this—these costs will rise further if Congress gives postal workers the higher wages they want, need, and deserve.

However, judging by past performances, there will be a lot of boggling in Congress over Mr. Truman's request for $361,000,000 in additional postal revenue, to be raised by—

Doubling the 1-cent rate on postcards, circulars, and advertising matter; doubling the rates on newspapers, magazines, and other publications; making parcel-post rates high enough to cover costs; and raising charges for registry, insurance, c. o. d. mail, and special-delivery services.

This newspaper agrees with the President that now, more than ever, it is wrong to ask the taxpayers to bear costs that should be borne by users of the mail service, many of whom have enjoyed large special privileges in the form of low, subsidized postal rates.

The Scripps-Howard newspapers have said repeatedly that they want no subsidy from the Government; that they are willing to pay the full, accurately determined cost of delivering that part of their circulation which goes by mail.

The increases, of course, should be fairly applied. There should be few, if any, exceptions to the rule that private users of postal services must pay their own way. The Government should cut down its own extravagant use of those services, and Congress should put into effect without more delay the Hoover Commission recommendations for divorcing the Post Office Department from politics and making it a more efficient, more economical business institution.

[From the Washington Post of March 1, 1951]

POSTAL RATES

There is an inescapable logic in the President's message to Congress asking for increased postal rates. Under the rates now in force the Post Office Department anticipates a deficit for the 1952 fiscal year of $521,000,000. As the President pointed out, "a postal deficit of more than half a billion dollars is obviously unsound, especially at a time when every effort must be made to reduce the size of the Federal budget." It must be considered irrational and peculiarly exasperating, as well as unsound, when it is considered that this particular deficit has to be borne by the whole public for the special benefit of those using the postal service.

A portion of the deficit, approximately $160,000,000, is incurred through the handling of mail sent on official business by the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. Since this serves general public purposes, the general public must pay for it in one way or another. But the balance of the deficit is incurred in providing service for private users and amounts to a subsidy of their business enterprises. For instance, penny post cards, used in large part for commercial and advertising purposes, entail a handling cost of 2.8 cents each. The cost ought to be borne by the users.

But the largest loss to the Post Office Department comes from the handling of second-class mail. The rates in this category, which covers newspapers and magazines, were intentionally set low on the theory that they would encourage the spread of information and education. But since newspapers and magazines are sold for private profit, subsidization of them—at least on a scale so generous as that now prevailing—involves a serious inequity. The cost of carrying them exceeds the postage paid by their publishers in the amount of $200,000,000 annually. A theory applicable when the country was in its infancy can scarcely be held to justify such a hand-out to mass circulation media with a large advertising content today.

The President has recommended that Congress provide for modest rate increases in respect of post cards, periodicals, and also third- and fourth-class mail. He does not seek an immediate wiping out of the whole deficit in post office operations, but asks that the Postmaster General be given authority to revise rates from time to time in order to keep them in line with costs. This newspaper urged the same remedy some months ago. Postal deficits represent a burden imposed on the many for the benefit of the relatively few. There is neither reason nor fairness in this kind of financing.

Propaganda Machine of Stalin & Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excerpts of a speech given by Thomas Dorgan, clerk of Suffolk Superior Civil Court to members of the Dorchester Kiwanis Club at this luncheon at the Uphams Corner Market Restaurant on Tuesday, February 27, at 12:15. Mr. Sidney G. Harris, president of the organization, presided at the meeting. The above-mentioned follows:

It is an amazing fact that during the past 5 years, Stalin's empire has grown from 190,000,000 people to more than 900,000,000. Thirty-seven out of every hundred people in the world today are under the domination of the Communists because of the deceptive ideas given to the workers of the world. It is still more amazing that all the land and peoples taken over by the Communists were acquired through propaganda and infiltration by the fifth columns within those countries.

Americans are considered experts in the mechanical know-how but when it comes to propaganda we are babes in the woods compared to Stalin and company. The basic policy of Stalin and company is to achieve world conquest by force, violence, trickery, fraud, and the big lie. If we can draft boys to carry a gun, why not draft them to carry the principles of American democracy, based on justice and truth, to all the nations of the world?

The biggest lie of all that has been sold to the workers of the world is the part of the Communist Manifesto which read, "Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains." Instead of the workers losing their chains, the Commies have put a lock and key on them all over the world. However, it is not enough to abuse Russian communism and to publish the horrors of its physical application and it will not be enough to defeat it physically. We must defeat it by a stronger idea and we have that idea here in America—the Constitution of the United States. We should sell it to the world—not by lend lease, gifts, or loans—but by training our bright young men in our colleges and universities and sending them to every country in the world as ambassadors of good will to spread the principles of American democracy. We could draft many of our best students in our colleges, being sure that they possess not only ability, character, and integrity, but, most important, loyalty to the American way of life.

We must get rid of the fifth column of Russian conspirators in this country, we have tolerated them for too long. The Kremlin conspirators train their students to destroy the true way of life such as freedom, liberty, and religion. We should see to it that the students in our colleges are trained to sell our way of life, which is based on truth and justice for all, to the nations of the world. This would be in keeping with the wishes of the founding fathers who commanded the preceptors of our colleges "to go forward and teach the youth ideals of love of country, chastity, obedience, and all those virtues which are the ornament of human society and upon which our Constitution was founded.

Our Lord sent His Apostles out to the highways and the byways to sell the common people the true way of life. Can you imagine the force of 12,000 or 20,000 students imbued with knowledge of our Constitution and our way of life going forth to the nations all over the earth—a sixth column for justice and truth? In World War I and World War II, we won the war but lost the peace. You cannot win peace by guns alone, it must be accomplished by truthful propaganda. That is the only way to destroy for all time the big lies which have been planted in the minds of the workers of the world by tyrannical dictators

---

The Houston Port and Traffic Bureau, Inc., Houston, Tex., Adopts Resolution Opposing the St. Lawrence Seaway Project Because It Is Unsound and Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Port and Traffic Bureau, Inc., of Houston, Tex., conscious of the devastating effect of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project on the economy of the entire United States, adopted the following resolution January 23, 1951, condemning such an economic monstrosity.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas it has been reported in the press that a bill has been presented to the Congress recommending that the United States Government participate with Canada in the construction, maintenance, and expense attendant upon the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas this project has been defeated several times in recent years because it is both unsound and unnecessary; and

Whereas this project would result in diverting export and import business originating and terminating in the Midwest area from the Gulf ports to Canadian ports by enabling oceangoing vessels to call as far West as Lake Superior; and

Whereas land-transportation rates from a large portion of the West and Midwest to the Great Lakes ports are more favorable than to the Gulf ports there would be a resultant loss of revenue detrimental to the Gulf ports and the citizens of Texas; and

Whereas large sums of Government and private funds have been expended to build Gulf ports and terminal facilities for the purpose of handling midwestern business that would be diverted to Canadian ports; and

Whereas unnecessary Government spending when economy is in order as the means of aiding our national defense program, is contrary to public interest; and

Whereas the 27-foot channel proposed would not be able to carry fully loaded modern cargo vessels, and cost to deepen it later to 34 or 36 feet would be extremely heavy; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence River is unusable due to ice conditions during a considerable part of a year: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Houston Port and Traffic Bureau urge the Senate and the House of the United States Congress to oppose this proposed legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressmen and Senators in all States of the Union that are affected by the proposed project; to all salt-water ports in the United States and to the Association of American Railroads in Washington, D. C.

A Challenge to the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 19, 1951:

A CHALLENGE TO THE SCHOOLS

Figures on Army draft rejections do not afford a sound basis for scientific generalizations, since they merely reflect an opinion as to the minimum requirements for a good soldier. It is disheartening nonetheless to learn that one out of every three young men called up fails to qualify, that about one in six the country over is turned down for "mental" reasons, and that in the South rejections for "mental" reasons run to 38.7 percent. It is wise to put "mental" in quotation marks, for the wide variance here is certainly more related to education than to native intelligence. In the country as a whole, as well as in the South, illiteracy has been steadily declining, but there are many who are "functionally illiterate"—that is, able to read but unable to make easy use of printed matter—and their plight is the result of poor schooling.

The most loyal southerner would not maintain that Negro schools in the South have had as much money spent on them, or have been as good, as the white schools. Efforts are being made to improve the situation, but the disparity largely remains. It must be admitted, too, that schools in the poorer parts of the South, white and Negro, have suffered because there was too little money to support them adequately. This has been true even when a given southern State spent a larger fraction of its total income on education than is common in the North.

If we are to have universal military service and training, which the world situation demands, the argument for Federal aid to education will be strengthened. It is both unfair and unwise to let young men come to military age without the basic schooling which will enable them to make the most of military training. We can take some comfort from the fact that rejections for functional illiteracy dropped greatly between the two World Wars. Nevertheless it is clear that the task of educating our people to be effective citizens as well as good soldiers is far from completed and has become a national responsibility.

A Second Try

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include herein an article by Walter Lippmann, which I hope everyone will read. The Federal Reserve System should be above any pressure from outside and I hope they follow through on their position regardless of those pressures. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 1, 1951]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A SECOND TRY

The President has now intervened for the second time in the controversy between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. This meeting differed from the first one, which was held on January 31, in that the President has now come to see that the issue is not one that can be settled by calling in the Federal Open Market Committee and asking them to be good boys and to do what John Snyder wants to have done.

At the meeting this week the President recognized—at least in theory—that there is a problem still to be solved, that there are divergent policies which have still to be reconciled. This time the Treasury, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Council of Economic Advisers were also present, and the President instead of talking off the cuff read a memorandum, appointed a committee to make a report, and expressly did "not ask those present for any commitments on the subjects under discussion."

This is a decidedly better way to come at a great question of this sort. But it is not nearly good enough. The report which the President asked for is to be made by Messrs. Snyder, Keyserling, McCabe, and Wilson. What two out of the four members of the committee—namely, Mr. Snyder and Mr. Keyserling—are going to report we already know; they have put out a preview of it in the memorandum that the President read and that they—or their staffs—must have written. Thus half of the committee to study the problem has written its own views about the conclusions of the committee into the directive which the committee is to follow.

Mr. Wilson, the third member, has a tremendous interest in any measure which will reduce the inflationary pressure on the price and wage ceilings for which he is responsible. But Mr. Wilson has been subjected to pressure. In fact to unfair pressure. In effect he has been put in a position where he cannot side with the Federal Reserve without coming into open disagreement with the President of the United States, who is his immediate superior.

The fourth member of the committee is Mr. McCabe, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. His position is even more difficult than Mr. Wilson's. For Mr. McCabe has duties under the law which direct the Federal Reserve to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction. It is, I believe, the fact that all the members of the Federal Reserve Board and of the Federal Open Market Committee are agreed—including in his private views even Governor Vardaman—that the Treasury's insistence on the rigid support of a fixed-interest pattern is causing injurious credit expansion that is highly inflationary.

Mr. McCabe and his colleagues of the Federal Reserve are under the law an independent Government establishment. They are not supposed to take orders from or to be subjected to the pressure of the administration. President Wilson, who was responsible for the creation of the Federal Reserve System, treated the members of the Board with the same scrupulous respect for their independence that he gave to the judges of the Federal courts. There can be no doubt that it has been the intention of Congress that the Federal Reserve System should be independent. To emphasize this view Congress in the Banking Act of 1935 removed the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency from the Federal Reserve Board. Congress acted then upon the advice of Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, who had been Secretary of the Treasury under President Wilson. Senator Glass told the Senate that all Secretaries of the Treasury including himself have exercised undue influence over the board and have treated it rather as a bureau of the Treasury instead of as a board independent of the Government * * * not to be used to finance the Federal Government, which was assumed always to be able to finance itself.

Mr. Truman does not, it appears, recognise that the Federal Reserve is an independent establishment with duties which are laid upon it by the law, duties which it cannot, or at least should not, abandon because he asks the Board to do that. Mr. McCabe and his colleagues are in the awkward predicament of being asked, indeed, heavily pressed, by the President of the United States to do what under the law and their own unanimous judgment under that law they ought not to do.

The President's memorandum comes close to saying that if they do not obey the Treasury, they will be interfering with the defense effort. This is duress employed to override their independence of judgment. It is not fair, indeed, it is highly improper, for the President to place them in a dilemma where if they do their duty under the law, they are made to appear as obstructors of the national defense. If the President believes the emergency is such that the Federal Reserve System should cease to be independent and should become, as Senator Glass put it, a bureau of the Treasury, then he should accomplish that by asking Congress to amend the law and not by pressure from the White House.

In what was surely one of the ablest speeches delivered in the Senate for many a long day, Senator DOUGLAS said at the end, "I conclude with the plea that the Treasury abate its policies and yield on this issue. May I also enter a plea that the Federal Reserve Board gird its legal loins and fulfill the responsibilities which I believe Congress intended it to have?"

It is asking a good deal of any board—especially in a time of national emergency, especially in a field which so few understand well enough to have strong views—that it should gird its legal loins and defy the President and his administration. Since Mr. Truman seems determined to make the issue one where the Federal Reserve must choose between following its own judgment and obeying his instructions, there is an issue which Congress alone can decide. Senator DOUGLAS has a resolution which would

decide it, and it should be brought forward—far enough forward at least to offset the heavy pressure which is being exercised upon the President's committee by the White House.

Trim the Fat From the Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the Sanger (Calif.) Herald of February 22, 1951. Certainly the ideas expressed in this editorial are representative of the thinking of many people in our Nation today. There is nothing sacred about the military budget. The nature of military operations makes some waste inevitable; nevertheless, every effort should be made to get the most out of money appropriated for defense.

The editorial follows:

There is an old adage that says where there's smoke there's fire. Experience has proven that this is true in many cases. Experience has also proved that in the Federal Government investigation has shown this to be true even when nothing was done to correct the faults. The wishy-washy military situation as far as manpower and efficiency is concerned seems to have thrown up a lot of smoke. Certain investigation has shown that there is a certain amount of fire in back of this.

But the military has always been more or less of a sacred cow in this country, without too many persons paying attention to it in peacetime. In wartime everyone treats the brass with kid gloves and gives them accolades if they happen to succeed in doing a job for which they have been trained and paid.

The citizens of this country must awaken to the realization that money does not grow on trees—for the Government no more than for the private citizen. The tie-up between the Government and the military from the supply and manpower standpoint is extremely loose and inefficient, many times stupid and wasteful. The excess money being spent to keep the armed services going must be eliminated or the country's taxpayers will be in bad shape and worse humor.

It has come to light that it takes four men to keep an American soldier at the front, while in Russian and Chinese operations one man can keep from two to four men at the front. It is logical to assume that if we are to fight the Chinese and Russians and use our manpower to the utmost, we must take steps to cut down this huge differential.

Everyone who has been in the Army knows the waste of money there. This extends from the Pentagon in Washington down to the mess halls in the camps. The men in the military service should be treated well, but they need not be pampered and feted. Special services, entertainment teams, waste in the kitchens, and too many personnel for the same job are but a few instances.

The biggest waste of money is the jealous purchasing end of the deal. With millions of pounds of butter and eggs stored in caves around the country, the Army officials went into the open market and placed orders running into the millions of dollars for butter and eggs. There was no effort at cooperation between the Agriculture Department and the Army. And the stored butter and eggs? They were practically given to European countries who have been extorting the United States ever since the war for money and materials with the threat that they will go Communist if not taken care of.

All this is quite senseless. And it means money out of the pocket of every taxpayer. And who isn't a taxpayer these days? It is up to the people to put the pressure on Congress to put the pressure on the Government bureaus and the armed services to straighten up and begin acting in the interests of the United States. We are in for a long siege of military preparation and action. Let us trim our Armed Forces down to a fighting organization and take out the hoopla and drug store generals.

Let us prepare to fight anywhere in the world, but in doing so let us not simper around the foreign countries and hand them lots of goodies just so they will say, "I might be on your side some time." Time has shown that when the chips are down, most of these countries say, "I am on your side (just a little bit)." There are too many countries with vacillating Great Britain the chief offender and pussyfooter, doing business with the Russians to make a dollar and then standing up in the United Nations and saying what bad boys they are.

Lest We Forget the Conspiracy To Defame Anna Rosenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the newspaper column by Walter Winchell which appeared in most newspapers subscribing to the column on January 11, 1951. This particular column is from the New York Daily Mirror.

Since the column was printed the Committee on the Armed Services of another House has acted wisely and magnanimously in referring to the Department of Justice for appropriate action the perjured and vicious testimony offered in derogation of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, who has been confirmed as the Assistant Secretary for National Defense in charge of manpower problems, and who already has proved the astuteness of the Secretary, General Marshall, in choosing her.

It is my sincere hope, and I know that it is the sincere hope of every decent American, that grounds can and will be found for appropriate legal action against the witnesses who falsely accused her of a multitude of sins.

Our libel laws do not permit of action against others, not witnesses, who pursued this valiant and intelligent woman with crude vulgarities and unspeakable innuendoes; I hope that some good can come from the evil that has been done by increasing the possibility of enactment of group libel laws as Members realize how little protection the individual has against political vilification.

Ordinarily I would see little point in the insertion of matter almost 2 months old.

Here, however, we have an example of deliberate effort to destroy the character and reputation created by a lifetime of hard work—an effort which seems to have many of the components of a conspiracy, and definitely to bear the infamous brands of perjury and malice.

We must not forget, and we must not allow the law enforcement agencies to forget, that this happened. Mr. Winchell's column is a concise summary of events and an excellent reminder.

I am sure that you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that what we seek here is not any limitation on the right of individuals to come forward with views and opinions on pending legislation, including the examination of nominees for high office.

What we do want is to make sure that no person, in the name of free speech and democratic privilege, shall needlessly defame a public figure from malice or from mere publicity-seeking. We are protecting the right of free speech and the sanctity of the oath as well as protecting public servants from baseless canards.

The text of the column follows:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of January 11, 1951]

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

MEMO TO THE EDITORS (AND THE U. S. SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE)

Three weeks ago 13 members of the United States Senate completed taking testimony against the new Assistant Secretary of Defense, Anna M. Rosenberg. When all the evidence was in, the committee—and the Nation—were convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that the accusers were guilty of making charges based only on hearsay, unsupported rumor, and probable falsehood.

Mrs. Rosenberg was cleared, though her reputation was tarred and feathered without mercy. The committee itself had been forced to waste 10 important days at a time when the Senators and Mrs. Rosenberg could have been making vital decisions in preparing America's defenses against an imminent war with Russia.

There was talk of perjury indictments—but only talk. Nothing has been done to bring the culprits to task. Here's the whole dirty behind-the-scenes story. We offer it in the hope it will prompt the Senate committee to recommend indictments—in order that this near "Dreyfus case" never be permitted to happen again in this country.

On December 5 the committee announced it was reopening the hearings on the nomination of Mrs. Rosenberg. A Congressman had advised he had a witness who wished to testify that Mrs. Rosenberg had been a Communist fellow traveler, active in the John Reed Club movement.

The witness presented was one Benjamin Freedman. Let's lift the manhole cover just a little and take a peek at this man's sewer: Freedman is an ardent admirer of Hitler's friend, the Grand Mufti. Two years ago Freedman was described by a New York judge as a "crackpot and international meddler." For the last couple of years he has been the financial angel of Common Sense, the dirtiest hate sheet in the East.

What was Freedman's testimony? That other people told him the new Assistant Secretary of Defense had planted Commie agents in the New York City educational system; that she was an active worker in a

Communist transmission-belt organization, and that the FBI files would prove Mrs. Rosenberg was a serious security risk.

Were these statements true? The person named as Mrs. Rosenberg's "agent" for planting spies in schools appeared before the committee and testified that the accusation was an outrageous lie. The charge that the Assistant Defense Secretary was active in the Commie-front known as the John Reed Club was also proved false when the FBI produced the "Anna Rosenberg" actually involved. Freedman's sworn testimony that the FBI files challenged Mrs. Rosenberg's loyalty was exploded when J. Edgar Hoover opened his records. Senator CAIN, who examined them, reported that the file "was highly complimentary to the personal character, to the competence and capacity and to the loyalty" of Mrs. Rosenberg.

(Freedman named a former Dies committee investigator as his source for the alleged FBI opinion. When that source was called to testify, he swore that his source was two ex-FBI agents, one of whom was Ted Kirkpatrick, editor of Red Channels. The G-men had told him, the ex-Dies committee detective said, that a William Harris had informed the Bureau that Mrs. Rosenberg had been a member of his (Harris') Commie cell, but Kirkpatrick appeared and testified that he had never told the Dies man or anyone else any such thing—and that in fact he had never heard any such story from Harris. Then Harris appeared before the committee and confirmed Kirkpatrick's testimony. Harris swore he never made the statement.)

The second witness against Mrs. Rosenberg was one Ralph DeSola. A glance at his record: DeSola was a member of the Communist Party from September 1934 to January 1937. During that period he was the managing editor of two Commie publications and a leading figure in the John Reed Club.

DeSola swore to the committee that he was a member of the John Reed Club with Mrs. Rosenberg. He named James Magraw as the individual who had identified Mrs. Rosenberg to him as an important CP member. But Magraw came before the committee to swear that he (Magraw) was never a member of the John Reed Club; never knew Anna Rosenberg and never identified her to DeSola.

DeSola also swore to the committee that he had talked about Mrs. Rosenberg several times to George Starr, an FBI agent. But ex-FBI Agent George Starr (who later became State Department security officer for New York) then came to testify DeSola had never mentioned Mrs. Rosenberg to him in any way whatsoever.

This is to tell the Senate committee that Freedman and DeSola were not operating alone. They were part and parcel of a whole bigoted movement, created to destroy the new Assistant Secretary of Defense. Take a look at some of the hate rags and hate mongers who supported the efforts of the two discredited witnesses:

(1) West coast bigot, Maj. Robert H. Williams, professional pamphleteer (who uses his former Army rank for prestige), published all the false charges and advised his readers to urge Congress to act against Mrs. Rosenberg's appointment.

(2) Wesley Swift, Gerald Smith's California stooge, urged his followers to write to Washington to protest Mrs. Rosenberg's appointment. Swift told his suckers General Marshall's new assistant was not only a Jewess, but an alien from Budapest with socialistic ideas.

(3) From Arcadia, Calif., came a filth sheet called National Defense, published by ex-Congressman John P. Hoeppel (the former mis-Representative who went to prison for selling West Point appointments). Hoeppel urged Mrs. Rosenberg be turned down as a menace.

Of course, Gerald Smith was active behind the scenes from the very dirty beginning. Smith distributed an anti-Rosenberg circular throughout Washington, mailing it to every Senator and Representative.

From Washington, Smith sent his followers a series of messages during the course of the Senate investigation. Smith took a major share of credit for bringing Anna Rosenberg's Red record to the attention of the Armed Services Committee. Excerpts from Smith's drivel: "I spent all of yesterday working on a very important and strategic enterprise. * * * I organized a staff of three people who immediately began to contact Members of Congress and the United States Senate, while I, in turn, contacted several. We succeeded in delaying the confirmation of the Rosenberg appointment. * * * We contacted three important committees and 10 Members of the United States Senate."

Obviously, a fraud has been perpetrated on the Senate of the United States. The only way to guarantee against a repetition of this kind of slimy racket is to indict those responsible for it.

Testimony of Hon. Albert W. Hawkes at the Joint Hearing on the Wherry Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony of Hon. Albert W. Hawkes at the joint hearing on the Wherry resolution before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, on February 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Albert W. Hawkes, of Montclair, N. J. I am a former United States Senator from New Jersey and have been president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and am now chairman of the executive committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Societies of the United States.

I appear here today at the invitation of this joint committee and my testimony will be offered both as that of an individual American citizen and as an expression of the position undertaken by the American Coalition.

May I explain that the American Coalition is comprised of 96 societies representing more than 5,000,000 Americans from all sections of the United States. It does not necessarily speak for every individual in these societies, but the results from a vote in these organizations is similar to the election vote in our Nation—it speaks for the majority. As it is constituted, its board of directors is made up of the heads of these individual societies, and the head of each individual organization votes as the representative of his group at the American Coalition meetings.

Last Saturday, February 17, 1951, at a meeting of 570 members of 58 societies participating in the American Coalition in New York City, the following resolution was unanimously adopted as the American Coalition's position on the vital question before the country as to the advisability of garrisoning a large standing army in Europe for an unknown period of time:

"As representative of 58 patriotic organizations in convention assembled—

"We pledge to the Congress of the United States our support in the exercise of its constitutional authority to determine when and where American troops shall be garrisoned in foreign lands.

"We urge the President and the Congress to avoid commitments abroad of our military and economic resources which may weaken the defense of this hemisphere, or jeopardize the independent action of our own Government.

"We further urge that the President and the Congress, in the exercise of their separate constitutional functions, exact from our allies adequate military guaranty to avoid another Korea in which American troops are called upon to do most of the fighting and dying."

In appearing here today, I wish to emphatically state that I am not a military expert, nor do I appear here for any other purpose than to bring about unity among our Representatives and the people of the United States on this vital question before the committee.

Unity of purpose, if possible to obtain, is more important than anything I can think of, except fidelity to the Constitution and one's own conscience.

In an 8,000-mile trip I have made from coast to coast, on which I have talked to thousands of our citizens, I find them all wondering why the President of the United States does not crave congressional authorization and approval of such a momentous question as sending hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our boys into foreign countries to engage in a possible world war III. Some of his supporters say the Congress is too slow to act. Hence, they would circumvent, if not violate, the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

His supporters are willing to violate the intent, if not the letter, of the Constitution, as well as the intent, if not the letter, of the so-called North Atlantic Pact.

The people generally controvert this statement by referring to the fact that it took less than an hour for the Congress of the United States to declare war at the start of World War II. Some Senators even failed to be in their seats for the vote because it happened so quickly.

I think the Representatives of the people in Congress can be trusted to do what is necessary to protect the welfare of the people if we or the nations party to the Atlantic Pact are attacked by some other nation determined to make war.

Even the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, said in the report of his committee to the Senate on June 5, 1949, referring to the North Atlantic Treaty (and I quote from page 19, as follows):

"It has been questioned whether a treaty subordinating action to the constitutional processes of 12 democratic nations offers sufficient certainty and immediacy of action effectively to deter aggression. The committee is convinced that it does. The expression of the will of a whole people offers far more certainty than any commitment by a dictator. The action of the democracies in the past great war is concrete evidence of their ability to act with the necessary speed in the event of an emergency."

It was statements like that and the reply of Secretary of State Acheson to Senator HICKENLOOPER and the statements of the senior Republican Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, as well as the telegram sent by President Truman from Potsdam at the time of our entering into the United Nations, all of which statements were to the effect that the

question of sending troops to fight under the United Nations and the question of sending troops abroad to function under the North Atlantic Pact, should be left to Congress—which influenced many Senators in voting for both the United Nations and the North Atlantic Pact.

One of the great objections the American people have against a dictatorship is that one man, supplemented by a few members of the inner circle, deems himself wise enough to decide the fate of vast numbers of people without consulting them through their chosen representatives. Again, I say, I should think the President of the United States would welcome the acceptance of responsibility in this vitally important question by the Congress of the United States.

My experience in my interviews with great numbers of the American people is that our efforts to stop war and fulfill our obligations under the North Atlantic Pact will be fruitful only if the will of the people is back of them—only if they are satisfied that their chosen representatives are acting wisely in the use of our manpower and economic means. Our people are fast becoming aware of two things: (1) That the waste of our economic means, if continued, leads to national bankruptcy, and that leads to socialism or communism, and (2) the waste and destruction of our manpower and the brains required to lead the Nation likewise leads to socialism or communism. If anyone doubts this, let him talk to the best informed Britishers.

It is for these reasons and many others, with which I will not take up your time, but which reasons are in the minds of all alerted Americans today, that I personally, and as the representative of the American Coalition above referred to, am wholeheartedly in favor of the resolution adopted by the representatives of 55 of the participating organizations assembled in New York City last Saturday, February 17. It is for these reasons that I favor the Wherry resolution (S. Res. 8) of January 8, 1951, which reads:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress."

My only son is buried in Arlington Cemetery as one of the casualties of World War II. I am certain, gentlemen, if I had two or three more boys subject to draft or enlistment I would not want them precipitated into a situation which borders on war and precipitated from that border into a fighting war on foreign soil because of the opinion and decision of one man, even though he be the President of the United States. I would want them to respect the law. I would want them to do their full duty in military service to defend their country. But I would want the chosen representatives of the people in Congress assembled to determine their fate of life or death.

I would like to have inserted in the minutes of this hearing my address before the Sons of the American Revolution and Daughters of the American Revolution on February 18, 1951, in New Jersey.

The Big Steal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks, I include therein an editorial which appeared in the February 24, 1951, Vet-Times, the national newspaper of veterans' affairs. As a Member of Congress, I sincerely hope that the conferees will be able to work out a satisfactory solution to the problems presented by the passage of H. R. 1 by the House of Representatives. The editorial follows:

THE BIG STEAL

The big steal is on.

A lazy Congress—playing puppet to the inefficient Veterans' Administration and looking for a cheap way out—was prepared this week to rob past, present, and future veterans of their long-cherished and valuable right to obtain and retain low-cost Government life insurance, one of the few permanent benefits veterans derive from service to their country in time of war.

Aside from the traditional laziness of Congress and the extravagant inefficiency of VA, we think the blame for this unconscionable robbery lies directly at the doorsteps of three of the major veterans' organizations—the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS). To a lesser degree, it also lies with the American Legion.

Under the temporary free-insurance plan, which the House has twice passed and which the Senate is scheduled to pass at this writing, the Government assumes no greater responsibility for paying benefits to survivors of insured men killed in action than it already shoulders. The plan does deny to those not killed or disabled the opportunity to retain and pay for low-cost Government insurance after their separation from service. It sends them back into civilian life uninsured, subject to high commercial rates which increased during their service, and in many cases economically unable immediately to take out the commercial protection which their families need.

The major vet organizations advance the rather specious argument that failure of some 9,000,000 World War II veterans to keep their national service life insurance policies indicates that there was no real interest in retaining this benefit. This is nonsense, pure and simple.

Just what significance do the VFW, DAV, and AMVETS attach to the fact that more than 6,000,000 did hold onto their policies; that a great many of them converted to permanent plans of insurance; or to the fact that thousands upon thousands of War I veterans still retain—and pay for—United States Government life insurance protection?

We appreciate the desire of the veterans' organizations to make certain that the families—or the survivors—of servicemen are equally and adequately protected against the extra hazards of war. On that score we agree that every man entering the service should be given a free $10,000 policy. But this should be in addition to any other Government insurance which he has or would like to have—and for which he pays out of his own pocket.

Since the end of World War II, the veterans' organizations have been in the vanguard of those urging that compensation rates be increased to meet the ever-rising cost of living. Certainly, the harsh economic facts of life justify such agitation.

Why then do these same organizations completely ignore the effect of the cost of living on those families whose bread winner has given his life to his country?

The free insurance bill soon to become law limits total Government insurance—either free or in the form of paid NSLI or USGLI—to a maximum of $10,000, payable over a 10-year period, in monthly installments of $92.90—about $23 a week.

If a veterans already is carrying NSLI—and is paying for it out of his own pocket—why can't he, too, receive a $10,000 free insurance policy so that his family will be protected adequately in the event of his death? Similarly, why can't a young man entering the service for the first time receive the free indemnity insurance and also buy and pay for additional NSLI insurance?

A $10,000 insurance policy today is worth just about half what it was worth during World War I or the early days of World War II. Yet the major veterans' organizations which presume to represent the Nation's fighting men have not even suggested that Congress make some adjustment. Clearly, those organizations which support the $10,000 maximum coverage are either blind to economic reality, hypnotized by tradition, or careless of the welfare of those whose dollars and support they seek.

We'd venture to assert that a commercial life insurance agent would lose his job tomorrow if he failed to advise a prospective client that a $10,000 policy today is worth only half as much as a similar policy 15 or 20 years ago.

If, in these days, the leaders of our major veterans' organizations think that the widows and children of men killed in action can exist—let alone survive—on a meager $23 a week, they are living in a fool's paradise.

Universal Training: A Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, entitled "Universal Training: A Fraud," by Hoffman Nickerson.

I recommend its reading to my colleagues:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING: A FRAUD

(By Hoffman Nickerson)

Compulsory universal military training without automatic liability for service is an absolute fraud. Universal military training and service are frauds as far as the present emergency is concerned because it is physically impossible to start such a system quickly. Universal liability for service and compulsory selective service are necessary evils in an emergency.

On the other hand, since compulsion is at best a necessary evil, and since one of the worst features of our time is the widespread enthusiasm for clubbing people into uniformity, lovers of liberty should do their level best to make certain that the present emergency shall not be used to put our country into a permanent strait-jacket. The iron logic of military necessity and military efficiency should be our sole guide, and the "mania for compulsion"—as a recent number of the Freeman aptly called it—should be shunned like the plague.

Of course, a minimum of compulsion is necessary in every organized society; there must be laws and policemen to enforce those laws. In war and in preparing for war this compulsion must take a harsh form; the members of the armed services must be protected against their natural weaknesses, such as dislike for hardships and fear of getting hurt, by knowing that they will be heavily punished in one way or another if they yield to those weaknesses. In other words, war is a communal thing, and the great wars of our time make huge doses of compulsion necessary. Thus, war has been the food on

which the monstrous leviathan states of today have grown so great. Historically, the longest single invasion of individual liberties was perpetrated when the Revolutionary French Republic proclaimed the levy in mass not merely for home defense but for general military service. Napoleon continued the system; after his fall, Prussia added compulsory and universal peacetime training, and, after 1870, all Europe more or less copied Prussia. Oddly enough, although sociologists are now as thick as flies in summertime, the relation between war and the social order has been little studied. If the statement that mass armies and great wars have been a chief factor in pushing Europe toward Marxism seems a little bold, at least they have not prevented most of Europe from going Marxist.

For years past an active propaganda has tried to blur the truth that compulsion is at best a necessary evil. The ink was hardly dry on the German and Japanese surrenders before the War Department began hollering for universal compulsion; not for any emergency then visible to the public or apparently to our leaders but just for the hell of it. In the first place, a peacetime mass army is inappropriate to the geographical situation and therefore to the national strategy of the United States—a fundamental point to which we shall return later in this article. In the second place, the raising of a mass army would have flatly contradicted the wholesale demobilization of our Ground Forces then in progress, which demobilization was based upon the idea that the Soviets would honor their obligations; nor is there the slightest reason to believe that the high command of our Army was more foreseeing than our political leaders, as to what the Soviets would actually do, for not one Army officer risked his career in order to protest publicly against the general demobilization of 1945, as various naval officers afterward protested against what now appears to have been a subsequent error in military policy; i. e., overemphasis upon that form of wholesale baby killing politely known as strategic bombing.

The high point of compulsion plus military inefficiency was reached in the 1947 report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. That military monstrosity would have forced all our young men into uniform for 6 months without adding a single recruit to any of the active services, and would have increased the civilian components only slowly and uncertainly by means of a complicated series of options, which in many cases could have been juggled around until the cows came home. This feat of now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't prestidigitation would have been accomplished by setting up an enormous training corps, not under military law but only under a watered-down version thereof. The resulting need for a considerable army of instructors and caretakers from the regular services would have seriously diminished the available striking power of those services. The scheme also sprouted a lush crop of political jokers, all calculated to increase centralized Federal power without even a pretense of genuine military advantage. Congress rightly refused to enact the absurd proposal, but its soul still goes marching on—or rather lurching on—as we shall see in a moment.

Instead, in 1948, Congress enacted a sensible selective service law under which the drafted men, after a necessary minimum of recruit training, go directly into organized, regular units where they can learn from their more experienced comrades as well as from their instructors. A notable merit of such a system is that it is flexible. Within wide limits it permits the speeding up or slowing down of recruitment according to the evident necessities of the near future.

So matters stood when our President took the doubtful step of scrapping the Defense Department war plan which called for only the use of American naval and air forces in case of an invasion of South Korea.

The hell which promptly broke loose after the landing of United States ground troops in Korea has at least had the melancholy merit of reminding us of realities.

Alas, our military age of innocence is not yet over. Only the other day Oscar Ewing proposed high-school universal military training. That apostle of socialized medicine said that "if * * * necessary the high-school period might be * * * 5 years instead of the present 4 in order to achieve the basic training goal," and that under his plan the young would be "kept out of Army camps almost until the time they were ready for field service." In other words, near readiness for field service is to be developed on the athletic fields of high schools. Similarly, the senior high-school students of a New York Times youth forum unanimously agreed that universal military training should be instituted now.

Disregarding these straws in the wind, a sinister symptom of the attempt to rivet permanent compulsions upon us under cover of the present emergency appears in the current circular of the Military Training Camps Association. That body is the successor of the so-called Plattsburg group which, in collaboration with the late Gen. Leonard Wood, did admirable work in training prospective officer candidates just before our entry into World War I. Today its letter paper is headed by the names of three civilian aides to the Secretary of the Army, and its executive committee includes a number of eminent and greatly respected men, most of them from the New York area and practically all of them of a conservative sort.

Unfortunately, however, they consider that permanent universal military training and service would strengthen our institutions and our social order, and seem blind to the social aspect of the matter as a step toward socialism by increasing the already excessive powers of our nominally Federal Government. Accordingly, their circular recommends "a durable military manpower law suited as well for times of peace as for partial and for total mobilization." The first of their alternative proposals is "universal military training at 18 for 1 year with service only if called"; their second "universal military service at 19 for 2 years"; and only in third place do they speak of "selective service at ages 19 to 26 for 2 years."

Proposal No. 1 is unrealistic in itself and unrelated to the present emergency. As far as purely military policy is concerned, training without liability for service is only a complicated mumbo-jumbo which would produce a minimum of actual military results at a maximum cost in money and loss of manpower. No. 2, although not a sham like No. 1, is nevertheless unsatisfactory in point of age, and still more because it would be an inflexible, rigid method of raising a large army. The average company commander would much prefer to have a sprinkling of men in their early twenties and even in their late twenties as ballast for his 19-year-old recruits. The personnel section of any general staff would like to be able to regulate the flow of recruits according to the need for them instead of having to train an annual "class" of fixed numbers.

The same fault of rigidity characterizes the plan proposed by President Conant, of Harvard, who would like to see all valid young men drafted for 2 years or 27 months of military service at 18 or at the end of high school, whichever is later. He also suggests that those physically incapable of armed service should be drafted for such duties as they can perform. Those familiar with his political attitudes, his scandalous tolerance of fellow-traveling professors, his enthusiasm for raising the already confiscatory rates of the inheritance tax, his desire to put our universities under Federal control by grants of Federal tax moneys, and his repetitions of the Communist slogan of "a classless society," will not be astonished at his desire to regiment even those physically handicapped.

Fortunately, the Conant plan has been promptly attacked by the executive committee of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, which committee has pointed out the educational and military unwisdom of calling up entire age groups at one time. General Hershey's Selective Service Scientific Advisory Service Committee has done even better. Under the leadership, so it is said, of President Charles W. Cole, of Amherst, that body has opposed universal training altogether, and is advocating extended selective service instead.

When counsels are divided, it is wise to go back to first principles. First, where and for what purposes was universal training developed? Next, how does geography necessarily affect our national strategy? Finally, what is—so far—the nature of the present emergency?

Universal training originated in Europe among nations separated only by land frontiers across which men can walk, or by rivers across which bridges can be thrown. Under these conditions military efficiency meant the cheapest possible method of raising the largest possible trained army which could be hurled into action at the utmost possible speed. Before World War I every valid Frenchman was trained and kept with the colors for 3 years, while other countries followed the same pattern a little less strenuously. The essence of the system was the enormous mass of trained reserves, of which the younger classes in various countries were kept up to scratch by frequently recalling them for maneuvers. After about 20 years of universal training, a general mobilization would call up a tenth of the entire population, say roughly a fifth of all males. Every reservist knew the exact place at which he must report within a few hours, and at that place his entire equipment was waiting for him. Next to numbers, the prime necessity was speed. One day saved in mobilizing might well make all the difference between triumph and disaster. For instance, in 1914 it was the Germans' ability to use reserve divisions from the first days of mobilization which brought France to the ragged edge of immediate and total defeat. But note well that in order to get the full benefit from such a system you must have land frontiers, numbers rather than highly specialized equipment must be decisive, and the system must have been practiced continuously for the better part of a generation.

Now as far as all other great powers are concerned, the United States is strategically an island. Flying has, indeed, altered the applications of this truth, but the basic truth remains. If anyone thinks that airplanes have abolished the effect of distance and salt water upon strategy, he should get his head examined. In any great war we or our opponents must cross either vast oceans or almost uninhabitable Arctic wastes. Command of the sea, insofar as the sea and the air over it can be commanded, is vital.

Thus the bottleneck of military effort on either side cannot be merely the number of trained men available. It must be the fighting and carrying capacity of the available planes and ships. Since shipping and plane tonnage are the necessary foundation of all United States strategy, the ideal United States Army would be a sort of glorified Marine Corps, an elite body which strives for quality rather than quantity for the simple reason that one good shot makes at least as many hits on the enemy as two bad shots, and requires only half as much cargo-carrying tonnage to support him overseas. Of course, there must also be a cadre of officers

and noncoms to train replacements and reserves. But no United States mass army, even if complete to the last button, could ever be rushed into action like the continental European armed hordes. The reader may ponder the title of a book on the supply system for the Normandy campaign, Ten Million Tons to Eisenhower.

Finally, even the outlines of the present emergency are not clear. This is by no means a plea for sitting back and taking things easy—far from it. It is a mere statement of fact that our chief possible enemy, who is known to hold strong cards, has not yet fully shown his hand, and that there is grave doubt as to who would really be on our side in a show-down, and to what extent.

These uncertainties demand the utmost elasticity in our own military policy. In any case we must be strong at sea and in the air—the two are today inextricable. We must also be much stronger on the ground than we now are; the idea of getting a military decision by air alone against an enemy who holds a vast continental land mass is too doubtful to bother about. The real questions are: How much of our total resources should go into armed preparedness and how much into strengthening our own economy? Also, what proportion of our armed preparedness should go into a ground army?

The present emergency results from the clash between Communist expansion and Soviet imperialism on one side and the Truman doctrine of "containing communism everywhere" on the other side. Since the United States has only about 6 percent of the world's population, the simon-pure Truman doctrine is bunk—if any sufficiently large local group of the remaining 94 percent choose or permit themselves to go Communist, we could not stop them with United States armed force alone. Even if we made ourselves a semi-Sovietized slave state, still our resources would be insufficient if we did not have strong non-American support.

If we do not limit our military commitments, we should prepare our minds for a series of bigger and worse Koreas. In the Far East we have little choice except either to get off the Asiatic mainland or to use armies of Asiatics to do most of the fighting. In Europe, General Eisenhower, as Hanson Baldwin truly says, commands only a "shadow force" of 19 western divisions, whereas the Soviets have 30 divisions in Eastern Germany, 60 in their European satellites, and 145 in the U. S. S. R., a total of 235. Should the Red Army march, we would be lucky if any European front forward of the Pyrenees could be held.

The proposition is up to the west Europeans. If they cannot begin promptly to do a great deal more for themselves than they have been doing, then our only logical moves will be either back to pan-Americanism or the holding of minimum footholds in the Old World from which future offensives could be launched. For such strategies, sea and air power plus a moderate-sized army would suffice. The existing situation puts a premium on the flexibility which selective service can give, and universal service by "classes" cannot.

Joseph H. McGann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the article appearing in yesterday's Evening Star by Mary McGrory about one of the finest and most faithful men who has ever served his country, Joseph H. McGann, the clerk of the Committee on Public Works.

Ever since I came to Congress about 8 years ago, when I became a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I have had the pleasure of being more or less closely associated with Mr. McGann and in a position to observe him. For about 50 years he has served on the staff of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and he continued when later it was absorbed into the Committee on Public Works. His patience and unfailing courtesy is only matched by his sincere love for the work that he is doing and the vast knowledge which he has acquired about the physical problems and the natural resources of the United States.

His character and trustworthiness have been recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike throughout the years because he has always been selected to continue at his important post, no matter what party was in control.

Mary McGrory in her article tells the story of Joseph McGann's success, which is simply that he is so happy and engrossed in his work that he has no idea of retiring because, as he put it, "I wouldn't know what to do."

I wish every Member of Congress could have had the opportunity and the privilege of knowing this man as I have because I can testify that his friendship is an inspiration to every good American. Mary McGrory's story follows:

JOSEPH H. MCGANN KNEW CONGRESS WHEN

(By Mary McGrory)

Last week, for the fourth time since 1941, hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway opened before the House Public Works Committee. As usual, the proceedings were stage-managed by Joseph H. McGann, clerk of the committee and its faithful servant for 49 years. Once all the relevant documents were on each Member's desk and all the witnesses and spectators herded in, he sat down at his desk in front of the chairman and began to take a few selective notes in the Pitman shorthand he learned so long ago in his native town of Cleveland, Ohio.

Man and boy, Mr. McGann has been listening to the pros and cons of the St. Lawrence scheme, and could probably pinch-hit for any of the witnesses on either side. An inland-waterways man from way back, he's been wondering about it since the days he worked for the Great Lakes Steamers in Cleveland.

It was during the 8 weeks' off-season in the office, when the Lakes were frozen over, that Mr. McGann, then 29, was prevailed upon by Representative Burton, Republican, of Ohio, to come down to Washington and give him a hand temporarily with the work of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which Mr. Burton was then chairman. Mr. McGann was reluctant, but he finally agreed. Like almost everyone else who ever came to Washington temporarily, he stayed on. Now, at 79, he has rolled up the longest record of uninterrupted service in congressional annals.

A spry, neat, dry little man, Mr. McGann looks back over a lifetime of hard work and considerable change in the congressional world he knows like the palm of his hand. One of those dedicated, anonymous Government workers whose job has become his life, he is better at figures than at names. But he can reel off the nine committee chairmen he has served without a moment's hesitation.

His memory goes back to a more inconvenient, informal era in Congress, when the House had only 357 Members, and only Members lucky enough to be committee chairmen had offices in the Capitol.

He can recall, for instance, when the House had its own mail delivery system, and horse-drawn wagons made the rounds eight times a day to Members' boarding houses or apartments. Most of the legislators had to conduct their business at home.

In November of 1902, when Mr. McGann brought his bride back from Cleveland to a boarding house on North Capitol Street, the congressional secretaries who lived above and below them used to be clacking away at their typewriters far into the night. It was the only time and place they could do their correspondence.

Looking forward to their golden wedding anniversary, the McGanns now live at 1345 Park Road NW.

One of the big considerations in a Congressman's life, in those old days, was seeds—vegetable and flower seeds, five varieties of each, sent on request to constituents. Congress voted $50,000 a year for the purpose.

The seeds, packed in envelopes and gathered into huge mail sacks, used to be delivered to the congressional secretaries for mailing at the boarding houses.

"Some nights I'd come home and the sacks would be piled so high around the door I couldn't get in," says Mr. McGann. "Then we'd leave them lying around the office at the Capitol, and the mice would get into them. Oh, we'd have an awful time."

The first bill the young McGann worked on was the rivers and harbors bill of 1902, which carried an appropriation of $63,000,000. This year, the President asked for $620,000,000 for rivers and harbors and flood control.

Another change Mr. McGann has observed is that they don't have the orators they used to. He can remember when Representative Burton would call them up to hurry over whenever one of the House's real spellbinders got to his feet. Mr. McGann's favorite was John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, Democratic floor leader from 1903 to 1907, "the best rough-and-tumble debater in the House." E. Bourke Cochran, a Democratic Member from New York, was another one who could make the rafters ring. Now, of course, under the 5-minute rule in the House, a man can scarcely clear his throat, much less work up to the classical references.

Hearings were a much more perilous business. Everybody jammed into the one-room committee office, and the air got so foul that on several occasions Congressmen collapsed. They had some sort of ventilation gadget, but it poured cold air down the nearest legislator's neck, so they couldn't use it.

The work isn't as hard as it used to be in the old days when they worked 14 hours a day getting bills ready. But it still absorbs Mr. McGann. And he is not looking forward to retirement.

"I wouldn't know what to do," he says.

The Quest for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Grabbing the Peace Ball," written by Malvina Lindsay and published in the Washington Post of March 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRABBING THE PEACE BALL

(By Malvina Lindsay)

TREND FROM NEGATIVISM

There are some faint signs that at last Americans are doing a little more to grab the peace offensive from the Kremlin—and this despite the current louder noise made by the war-is-here, drop-the-bomb crowd.

A movement is growing here to differentiate between the Russian people and their rulers. There is also increasing popular demand that the Nation announce and reiterate its ultimate peace aims. The constructive idea of war prevention back of point 4 is beginning to take stronger hold of the imagination of grass-roots leaders, and the American prayer movement for peace—recently given momentum by the United Laymen's noon prayer practice instituted on Washington's Birthday—is snowballing.

One handicap to peace strategy here has been that the Soviet, having appropriated the word "democracy," then took over the word "peace"—lock, stock, and barrel. Many of the peace movements in this country and elsewhere have been Communist-inspired.

Many timid, expedient, and even normally self-protective Americans have been so frightened by such things and by the general jitters over communism that the Soviet has been left alone with the peace ball to make a big play to the grandstand.

But now there is some clamor that this country, and the western democracies as well, stop being outmaneuvered on the peace front. One of the first steps in doing this, many authorities on the Soviet Union believe, is for both citizens and leaders alike to try more of Stalin's technique in their public utterances. The fact that Soviet leaders have been careful to direct their vituperation to American imperialists, Wall Streeters, governmental warmongers, and not to the American people shows Kremlin respect for such strategy.

Yet loose talk about the evil Russians—rather than their tyrants—continues to be heard in Congress and on every streetcar. A pledge on the part of every American to substitute Soviet, Kremlin, Politburo for Russian in speaking of Soviet aggression might be one simple step in peace strategy.

Experts on the Russian situation constantly advise that the West's best hope of stabilizing the world lies in not alienating the great masses of Russian people because they may ultimately be its best help in removing history's latest upsurge of tyranny. The newly organized Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom are working along this line.

David J. Dallin, a leading authority on the Soviet Union, emphasizes in his just published book, The New Soviet Empire, that the Russian revolution has lost the devotion of the Russian people, though it still retains a large measure of their loyalty.

Several moves in peace strategy have recently been made in Congress. Senator BRIEN MCMAHON and 22 other Senators introduced a resolution expressing friendship for the Russian people. Americans discontented over their country's negativism in the cold war should see that this resolution is adopted with all the attendant publicity possible.

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS recently called for more disarmament proposals. These at least would provide peace propaganda for the Voice of America and other information agencies to hurl at peoples behind the iron curtain and around the world. As Pastor Martin Niemoeller, of Germany, recently pointed out, one of the major problems confronting Germany today is how to combat, in non-Communist terms, the peace offensive with which it is daily battered by Communists. He emphasized that proposals had to be made in order that counterpropaganda could answer the Cominform.

The most vigorous, spontaneous expression of the American search for a peace formula is the prayer movement. This is becoming something more than a vague supplication for the millennium. Many of the manifold prayer groups now operating—one started by a State Department employee as a personal project has enlisted 1,700 organizations—are engaged in meditation, study, self-searching.

The United Laymen, a group of business and professional men which is trying to coordinate the Nation's prayer force, is especially seeking concrete action. Its prayer formula is that each individual ask guidance about what he personally can do to further peace in the world—and naturally in his own environment and in himself. Quiet though all these efforts have been, they possess a vitality that holds promise of reviving in the Nation its old positive spirit of leadership that it has manifested in the highest moments of its history.

Address by Former Senator John A. Danaher at the Banquet of the National Ladies Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, extracts from remarks of former United States Senator John A. Danaher, of Connecticut, on the occasion of the annual banquet of the National Ladies Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, held in Washington on February 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam president, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, one may sometimes wonder why Americans willingly become the most talked-at people in this world. The simple answer is that we like to be confirmed in our beliefs. It is part of our nature. There is little I can say tonight that you cannot say or that has not been said before—and said better. Even so, the observations of another speaker may suggest a fresh point of view, and the sum total of my presentation may prove helpful. If I at least did not hope so, I could not justify my acceptance of your gracious invitation to address you. As the Ladies Auxiliary of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, you are entitled to our salute if for no other reason than that you are ladies and affiliates of a great organization whose ideals you share. Last week our Nation celebrated the birthday of the Great Emancipator just as this week, we celebrate the birthday of the Father of our Country. Ninety years ago this very week at Independence Hall in Philadelphia Abraham Lincoln said: "I have never had a feeling, politically, that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence." What did he mean?

A partial answer, at least, can be found in a resolution adopted by the Jewish War Veterans at its last national convention, a portion of which describes the Jewish War Veterans as "an organization composed of men who served the Republic in time of war, devoted to the principles embodied in the Constitution of the United States and the American way of life, which principles stem from the basic tenets of Judaism, and have their origin in the concept that God created men in his own image, endowed with an inalienable individual right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness * * * irrespective of race, creed, color, or national origin."

This magnificent statement reflects the principles underlying the Declaration of 1776. The founding fathers then insisted that the American people are entitled to that station "to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them." Not the law of the king. Not the law of some parliament.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," they said. Truths? A truth is something that is verity; it is immutable; it is persistent; it is living and vibrant. "That all men are created," the founders continued. Created?—not like animals but by a Creator, and we reach back thousands of years to the writings of the earliest prophets of Judaism for the assertion of that truth.

As Lincoln pondered the philosophy of the Declaration it is small wonder that he found in it an outline of the basic faith of all Americans, people endowed with rights, possessed by virtue of law higher than can come from any government.

Why are there Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America? Why are there any war veterans? Because we know that if we are to maintain our inalienable rights, we must have government, a Government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. We will fight, as we have always fought, to make our Government secure. We Americans preserve our own form of self-government in the sure knowledge that unless we govern ourselves, we will be governed by others. No other peoples in all history's pages have governed themselves so long or so well as we Americans.

Let us then pause to inquire into some of the characteristics of Americans.

It is of the essence of the American scheme that our Creator had invested us with individual sovereignty, a part of which we yielded up when we entered into the compact to form our Government. Hence it is that the authority of the United States of America derives from the people in that through the organic act called the Constitution we have consented to be governed. Thus we choose from among our number those representatives who will stand in our places and who will decide for us, as surely as though we were personally present, just what laws shall be enacted and how they shall be executed. Thus simply stated we have an outline of the principle of self-government in which—characteristically—Americans believe, and which, patriotically, we have sworn to support and maintain.

The first characteristic, admittedly, is that of our adherence to the principle of self-government.

If self-government is the largest common denominator, characteristic of the American people, have we achieved some degree of eminence because we are all of one race? Clearly not. From one motherland country? Clearly not. Our people are made up of emigrants of various races, from all sections, from every nationality.

The one thing that all had in common was a desire to come to America. No matter what the risks, they came. No matter the heartaches at leaving home and loved ones, they came. They could have remained in the countries of their origin, and they could have accepted the status of the government in each of such countries, but they

came. They sought opportunity here. They sought to live under the beneficent rule of the very people among whom they would live, and with whom they would share the tasks, the obligations, the duties as well as the rights and privileges afforded by the United States. Thus, a second characteristic of the American people might be said to be their love of opportunity.

Those from other shores and their children, become Americans, found yet another characteristic of our people, that of self-determination. This meant not only freedom in the governmental sense but the exercise of a personal choice to do or to attempt to do, those things which the individual feels will be to his greatest advantage in life. It means that the American people believe that if they risk much, they are entitled to profit commensurately. Whether they be prospector or shipmaster, whether in the factory or on the farm, Americans seeking to satisfy their own wants and desires, found they must equally satisfy the wants and desires of others. They established the interdependence of all Americans, upon one another and upon the goods and services of each. Hence in the creation of a successful economy, self-determination urged on by ambition is disclosed as another American characteristic.

These elements so peculiarly admired in Americans have combined to invest our people with a psychological attitude, unique in itself. It has pressed us on to what some will say is the greatest development among all peoples. Other nations are expansive, other nations contain larger populations. Some of them possess larger and more extensive natural resources. Americans however have not only developed their own sources of raw materials but have actively promoted the development of those owned abroad. The impelling desire, so generally prevalent is for an expansion of opportunity for ourselves and our families. More, this attitude has led the American people to a willingnees to share both at home and abroad. Twice in 25 years we went to war against those nations which had reduced their people to puppets and which would destroy the dignity of the individual. In the aftermath of war we have willingly poured forth our billions to alleviate the suffering and reduce human misery. None can justly charge at the bar of world opinion that our Nation has sought material gain for itself in any single respect. Thus, magnanimity is a characteristic of the American people which ranks itself with the most noble impulses of mankind.

Clearly the evolution of these characteristics of Americans stems from our exercise of our inalienable rights which long anteceded the formation of our Government. Obviously, if we were to admit that an individual derives his rights from government we would equally be bound to concede that government could take those rights away. No constitution controls, the basic principles which underlie our very lives, do. It is of the utmost importance that we realize this fact. When Hitler assumed control in Germany, he purported to act legally under the Weimar Constitution. Who controlled Germany thereafter? The Weimar Constitution or Hitler? Let us analyze a little further the point now involved, for all too often we find Americans taking our natural heritage for granted. Yet our concept of life is under assault, and it sometimes may seem that the background of American life is not being properly defended. We assume that freedom, like sunlight or fresh air, belongs to us and need not be defended. We make too little effort to ascertain the forces against which we must contend.

We say we can out-produce any country that has ever existed. We have more automobiles than all the rest of the world put together. We have more telephones, more bathtubs. Are we to assume that our strength derives from these material aspects of our life? Did the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America send thousands of young men into battle on that account? I venture to say that our spiritual strength is our true bulwark.

And now we find the America we have made, the America we have lived in, under gravest assault. There are forces abroad which would challenge our very being and which would destroy us if they could. Some of the same forces threaten within our very midst. We have seen whole peoples elsewhere become the ready prey to the fanaticism of scheming dictators. Some of them yielded up their rights as individuals, fondly hoping that they might achieve security. Others, through outright persecution and mass murder, have been abjectly forced into a life of despair which knows no measurable depth.

The challenge to the American way of life is vast. It is cunningly contrived. It is mercilessly directed. The state which now seeks to impose its will upon the world is one which has completely repudiated the basic, fundamental, spiritual essence of mankind. The materialistic state admits no power superior to itself. It asserts the authority to plan and direct the life of every person, at all times, and in every field of activity. It sets itself up to men as their highest good—to be served without question and without reservation.

If I have set before you understandably two wholly different concepts of government and its functions I will feel rewarded. Go out knowing that freedom transcends every other phase of our societal life. With freedom comes incentive, with incentive comes work, with work comes production, with production come the means to satisfy our wants. Thus do we achieve that standard of living we discussed, a state of national well-being, and the maintenance of life, liberty, and the pursuits of happiness. Those are the ends for which our Government was formed—for these things have we fought.

Our fight is not over. It must go forward—and you are part of it. Only eternal vigilance can sustain us. That same great Abraham Lincoln once asked: "Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its people or too weak to maintain its own existence?" Our Government at this very moment is seeking the answer to this question. The National Ladies Auxiliary can enlist with us in a great cause—the American cause.

You may erect mammoth marble halls to house the Supreme Court—and surround it with the appearance of dignity and the trappings of the state. Its sessions will be in vain if it will not uphold the moral and constitutional rights of mankind.

You may insist upon majority rule according to the American process, but you will be bound by the tyranny of your own Government if you choose as your rulers those who would sabotage the institutions of liberty and abrogate the freedoms inherent in man.

You may install the Declaration of Independence upon a pedestal, you may put a gold frame around it, you may set soldiers to guard it by day and by night. It will be but "the faded memento of mankind's bravest dream if you will not defend the proposition that God has endowed each one of His children with definite rights."

Our form of government will be preserved—by the patriotism of our people. Our freedom will be guaranteed—by our vigorous and constant defense against all assaults upon it. Our institutions will thrive—not on musty parchment nor on the yellowed page. You cannot save them merely locked behind bars of steel. They will live—if they are to live—in the hearts of men.

Endorsements of the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have called the attention of the Congress on many occasions to the many expressions from all sections of the country, in newspapers and in other media, pointing up the tremendous importance of the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. I have pointed out that never before has there been a clearer recognition on the part of our people of the absolute importance of this project.

I have indicated that there are some few persons who feel that now may not be the right time for the completion of the work on the project. It is my personal feeling, however, that now is a splendid time and it is far better than 1 day from now or 1 week or a year from now. Of course, this project should have been acted on years ago, but there is no reason for any further delay.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following items:

First. The text of an excellent article by the associate editor of the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer-Press, Mr. Alfred Stedman.

Second. The text of a resolution adopted by the Sheboygan, Wis., Common Council.

Third. The text of an editorial in the Great Lakes Harbors' Outlook.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer-Press]

OURS VERSUS RUSS SEAWAY

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Russia has stolen from us and is busily shaping to her aims the basic principle of our own long delayed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. That is the principle of opening a deep waterway from the ocean to inland lakes or seas, and of developing vast hydroelectric energy from its dams and reservoirs.

Right now while the United States of America is still arguing the strategic value of our seaway, the U. S. S. R. is building her version for herself. Next year she will partially open and in 1957 fully open her deep channel linking the Black Sea and the Caspian with the Baltic Sea and the Arctic Ocean. The map shows her route. Russia expects to gain tremendous military advantages: (1) From water transportation of strategic materials, (2) from stepped-up war production with electric power, and (3) from ability to move naval ships inland from sea to sea. Russia's steal of our seaway idea was for a long time one of her guarded military secrets. Back of the iron curtain, war prisoners and other forced labor rushed the work. And now the key link, a dam on the Don and a deep canal connecting the Don with the Volga, is headed for completion in 1952. Two more dams, further deepening the Volga, are

to be finished in 1957. Existing northern canals in the network are being improved. At last the Russian censors are allowing or ordering their press to tell their story. Recently details of the Russian project have been printed in the United States by the New York Times.

So what are we going to do now about building our seaway? We can't safely dodge the question any longer. Russia's completion date of 1957 is about when we can get our seaway built. Not that ours and Russia's waterway problems are identical: far from it. But her hard-headed militarists now show, not by their words but by their acts in sparing nothing to rush her seaway, the high military valuation they place upon it. Thus our seaway question is brought to a head by one of the greatest forces that can be felt by any nation—which is the leverage of seeing a military advantage slipping away to a competing and warlike power.

Our great question is whether the St. Lawrence seaway would or would not be a real military asset to Canada and the United States of America. Until now, the dispute has been running to extremes. A pamphlet called the project loeway. A college professor wrote flatly that it lacks any economic or military merit. A publicist for the seaport-rail-power lobby called it a laugh and a scream. A Texas newspaper dismisses its defense claims as "sleazy" patriotism, the last refuge of the damned scoundrel. But now the bloom is off this type of argument. In the light of this country's danger, Congress has got to get down to the facts and the sober judgment of authorities responsible for this Nation's safety.

Here are answers, straight from such sources, to real questions about our seaway:

As to bombing. The chance exists that a lucky bomb hit might disable the seaway for a considerable time. But the seaway's benefits fully justify any such danger. And the strategic risk can be minimized to a large extent by the taking of reasonable precautionary and defensive measures. Russia's much greater risks due to our superior air power and atom bomb power are not stopping her from rebuilding the great Dnepropetrovsk Dam on the Dnieper or the three big shipway dams on the Don and the Volga.

As to strategic materials. Steel requirements in construction should not be a serious deterrent. And the seaway's purpose to give access to great alternative supplies of iron ore in Labrador would obviously benefit national defense. Great Lakes shipbuilding would be of distinct advantage.

As to ice. On the average, Lake Superior is closed 4½ months and other lakes 3½ months a year by ice. Russia's shipway, especially the north end giving its only direct access to the ocean itself, would be closed much longer, but she still considers her seaway of great strategic value.

As to channels. The increase now proposed from 27 feet to 30 feet depth would accommodate a majority of merchant vessels at an added cost of $250,000,000. A 35-foot depth to Lake Ontario would admit to that lake at moderate added cost all freighters and all naval ships except capital ships. If the 35-foot depth later were extended to Duluth, the total seaway cost would be increased from $966,000,000 to $1,920,000,000.

As to electric power. The United States would get an average output of 6,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. From a national defense viewpoint, there would be great advantage in having available this large source of cheap, dependable power.

As to the railroads: These would no doubt do another heroic job as defense transportation mainstay. But in event of war, they would be laboring under intense strain that the seaway could, to some extent, relieve.

As to coastal ports and terminals. It is up to Congress to find out whether these main foes of the seaway are not themselves among the most vulnerable atom targets, and whether reducing the risks of snarled traffic in them isn't a militarily sound reason for building the seaway.

One place to turn for counsel on our seaway's value is to the recommendations of the Permanent Board on Defense for the United States and Canada. Another is to the words of the late Secretary James Forrestal, who literally gave his life in devotion to defense.

The joint defense board unanimously found that our seaway would be of great economic and defense value, found its defense benefits so great as fully to warrant any risks of attack, and urged that the seaway be built as a joint power and navigation project. Forrestal told Congress that "from the viewpoint of national defense, the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway and power projects would be clearly advantageous."

In a country like ours, the opposition always has a right to its say. But, ultimately, perhaps democracy must make decisions if it is to survive. Our time of decision on the seaway seems to have arrived.

Whereas the St. Lawrence waterway has been endorsed by all major political parties as essential to the continuing strength and commercial betterment of this Nation; and

Whereas this municipality as well as the surrounding area would participate in and benefit directly from such project; and

Whereas despite obvious economic justification, a minority opposition has been able to forestall creation of the proposed waterway to the detriment of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and common council of the City of Sheboygan, Wis., That by and through the adoption of this resolution that the common council reiterates the hope of this community that the St. Lawrence waterway may be realized in fact and that necessary legislation and treaties be consummated on the Federal level in the near future, and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed to forward certified copies hereof to the President and Vice President of the United States and to our representatives in the Congress of the United States.

LESTER SCHILD.

[From the Great Lakes Outlook of January 1951]

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-ONE MAY WELL BE THE YEAR OF DECISION FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

In his annual economic message to Congress on January 12, President Truman called for a national increase in electric generating capacity of more than 20,000,000 kilowatts during the next 3 years, to increase national defense production and to expand power resources. Again vigorously recommending the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to the Congress, the President said that the country "should start at once on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project so that imported iron ore can be shipped efficiently by water to the great steel-producing centers of the Middle West." He said that the project was vital for the preservation of the steel industry and when developed will furnish a major part of the country's new power needs.

Thus, the issue of the St. Lawrence seaway project is again before a new Congress. Time may be running out on the American people and on western civilization, but in the time remaining much could be done to assure our future national security by adding the St. Lawrence project to the transportation and power resources of the United States and Canada.

The patience of our good friends and allies in Canada is wearing thin. Another clarion call for the St. Lawrence project was recently sounded by the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport, who warned bluntly that unless the United States resolves its differences and undertakes the St. Lawrence seaway project as called for by the 1941 agreement between the two nations, Canada will do the job alone. A similar frank statement of Canadian position has been made publicly by Prime Minister St. Laurent on more than one occasion during the last year.

In this hour of decision, we see the North American Continent in peril, with a great demand and need for quick expansion of national production and transportation. Simultaneously, we see the spectacle of selfish and sectional interests working unceasingly to throw roadblocks in front of a project which will accomplish two of our most vital objectives—expansion of power for national defense production and increased transportation to move the goods.

The well organized and financed opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project probably does not appreciate the responsibility which history may attach to them. Dr. N. E. Dandelian, seaway authority, pointed to the responsibility which these men have assumed, when he said in a recent address:

"I do not believe these railroad and power officials would join with Stalin in bombing Grand Coulee out of existence and yet they achieve the equivalent of that when they prevent the St. Lawrence power project from being built.

"I do not believe these men desire to increase the cost of steel by several hundred million dollars a year, or to endanger the life of our youth on the high seas in time of emergency, and yet that is the result of their obstruction of the seaway.

"I do not believe they wish to treat Canada, our best customer and our last line of defense, as a second class cousin, and yet that is the result of 30 years 'kidding' we have administered to our most patient and loyal friends by dallying with their most cherished project."

There is still manpower, materials, and money sufficient on both sides of the international boundary between the United States and Canada to start the seaway rolling. The manpower and the material may not be available several years hence. It is no longer a question of whether the United States and Canada want the project, or whether certain influential interests do not want it—we simply cannot be without it for the critical years ahead and the critical decades ahead.

Freeman Lincoln predicted that the 50-year fight for the St. Lawrence project is approaching its final phase, and said in the December issue of Fortune magazine, "Whether the unsophisticated citizen bases his judgment on no more evidence than a map of North America or whether he carefully studies the volumes of testimony for or against, he can scarcely escape the conclusion that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should be built because it is inevitable and essentially right. There is always the pious thought, however, that the things that should be done in the world eventually seem to get done. The seaway must be such a thing."

Export Losses of Gold Soar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Export Losses of Gold Soar," published in the Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, Wash., December 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORT LOSSES OF GOLD SOAR—DEVALUATION BLAMED FOR RAISING METAL'S VALUE ABROAD

The United States may have to resort to raising the price of gold or revalue the currency to stop the loss of gold by export, Frank Lilly, Spokane mining man and head of the Mines Research Bureau, said yesterday.

Citing the largest value of gold exports in history during 1950, he declared that it was "comparatively small losses that led to the Government placing an embargo on gold exports in 1933 and to its increasing the price of gold."

According to figures tabulated by his organization, the United States Treasury lost $1,722,000,000 during 1950 up to last week and estimated the total for the year will come about $1,800,000,000. This, he said, compares with the loss of only $446,000,000 in 1932 and $173,000,000 in 1933.

UNITED STATES HOLDINGS SHRINK

He said that in September 1949, when Great Britain and its affiliated countries in the sterling bloc devalued their currencies, the United States Treasury's gold holdings totaled $24,601,000,000. At the beginning of last week United States holdings had shrunk to $22,795,000,000.

"The why of our loss of gold is inevitably linked up with devaluation," he continued. "In other words, devaluation had the effect of increasing gold's measure of value in over 30 foreign countries. For example, the London price of gold is now, and has been since devaluation, equivalent to $102.17 an ounce on the basis of legal monetary parity.

"This fact gives Great Britain a tremendous advantage in trading with us. As a result, our imports have been exceeding our exports, after elimination of gift exports under the Marshall plan, every month since Great Britain's devaluation. International trade operates on a gold standard; therefore we must pay trade balances in gold—hence our loss of gold.

"Since we in this country are so accustomed to think in terms of billions, the loss of one or two billions of gold may not, on the surface, seem a serious matter. However, when we consider the fact that each billion dollars' worth of gold lost means the loss of the required legal backing for four times as much in Federal Reserve notes we begin to realize something of the danger involved in the decrease of our gold reserve, because these notes constitute the bulk of our folding money."

RUSSIAN DOLLAR VALUE SECRET

"True enough, we still have more gold than any other nation, but our debt and responsibilities are also far greater than those of all other nations combined. The fact that Russia revalued its currency in gold last March has given Russia an advantage in trade, not only with countries behind the iron curtain, but also with some countries of the sterling block which still trade with Russia.

"The equivalent dollar value of gold in the Russian economy is not definitely known but that it is very high may be judged from reports that a good dinner for three costs as much as $125 in United States currency; and from the fact that Poland has recently revalued its zloty in gold on the basis of 100 to 1 or, in other words, has raised the price of gold 100 times.

"President Roosevelt raised the price of gold only after Great Britain had increased her price for it, and this move stopped the flow of gold from the United States, except for short periods, until September of 1949 when Great Britain, by devaluation, again increased gold's measure of value in the sterling bloc.

"This country may be forced again to raise the price of gold as Great Britain has done, or revalue its currency in gold as Russia has done because the economy of nearly 2,000,000,000 of the world population functions in one or the other of these two blocs. Without such a move, we will inevitably lose all of our gold and our economy along with it."

Military Housing in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of articles now appearing in the Scripps-Howard newspapers by Mr. Andrew Tully. Mr. Tully, now in Alaska, is viewing at first-hand the situation with respect to the housing of our troops in the Territory.

(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, Alaska, February 22.—Corliss Ann Hamilton, a pretty little girl of 3 years, is dead today because her soldier father—sent here to help defend America—couldn't find a decent place for his family to live.

Corliss Ann burned to death the other night in a fire that destroyed her home, a home-made two-room cabin. Apparently an oil lamp, the cabin's only illumination, turned over. It was all over in about 10 minutes.

They say there was a smile on Corliss Ann's face when they dug her blackened body out of the smoking ruins. That's possible because she had been asleep and little girls dream the pleasantest of dreams.

But Corp. Thomas Hamilton, her father, wasn't smiling. The neighbors had to pull him away, screaming, when he tried to run into the flames to get Corliss Ann. He already had carried 2-year-old Johnny out of the inferno, but no man could have gone into that cabin again and lived.

Mrs. Hamilton wasn't smiling either. She hasn't smiled since. For Johnny is in a hospital with burns over three-quarters of his chubby body and he may not live. And everything the Hamiltons had in worldly possessions is gone.

Corp. Tom Hamilton had been a pretty proud man, too. He came to Alaska 10 months ago, leaving word with his wife that she and the kids could follow as soon as he found a place for them to live.

He took a look at the one-room shacks without plumbing where the local landlords get $85 a month and up and decided to take matters into his own hands. He bought a little plot of land and built his own home.

What he built wasn't much. It wasn't as good, for that matter, as the shacks he had turned down. They at least had electricity, but there was no line on Muldoon Road so Corporal Hamilton had to be satisfied with oil lamps.

But he had his own well, and a pretty comfortable privy, with a couple of little seats for kids. And he partitioned the 10-by-18 cabin into two rooms so the kids could get to bed early and not be kept awake by lights and the parents' small talk in the evenings.

The Missus and the two children came to Alaska last September. The cabin wasn't what Mrs. Hamilton had dreamed of but it was home and it was where Tommy, her husband, was. That was important. That made up for no sink.

That made up for heating water for hours on the stove for laundry, and for midnight trips to the privy, and for the hard times they had getting doctors to come when one of the kids was sick.

And, after all, several hundred servicemen were living in houses just as bad—and paying outlandish prices to private landlords for the privilege. This was the Hamiltons' own home, and the back of the hand to all landlords.

Now, today, Mrs. Hamilton isn't so sure she wants to make the effort of living in Alaska so her husband can be content while he helps defend America. She is thinking of going back home to Victoria, Tex. It seems almost too much to take, just as it seemed too much to take for Mrs. Virgil Miller, wife of one of those dashing jet pilots you hear so much about.

Mrs. Miller left today for home in Nebraska—just her and the two kids, Kit, 3½, and Johnny, 2½. Lt. Virgil Miller couldn't go with them, because he was dead.

Lieutenant Miller was dead because he was serving his country when his jet cracked up in the weather. This was not considered unusual because a jet pilot realizes he is risking his neck daily in this Alaska weather and these Alaska mountains and you are not supposed to be corny and talk about it or else somebody will think you think you are a hero or something.

So they buried Lt. Virgil Miller, the boy from Nebraska, with full military honors, which was nice for those who can see them. And the officers' wives came to see Mrs. Miller and were sorry because officers' wives in the Air Force know how it is. Their husbands fly, too.

Then, today, after everybody said what little could be said, Mrs. Miller left.

She didn't leave much. For Lt. Virgil Miller, crack jet pilot, lived with his family in a trailer.

It's a funny thing. Back in Washington people wouldn't spend one night in the Millers' trailer for fear they'd catch cold. But the Millers, living in a country where the mercury drops to 25° or 30° below zero, thought they had quite a good deal.

That's because, unlike most servicemen around here—or anywhere in Alaska—they had running water. They also had a little lean-to attached to the trailer which they had fixed up as a bedroom for the kids. They had an electric refrigerator, which sometimes worked for as long as a week at a time. They also had an inside toilet, but this was just for show. The water was always freezing, so they used the community outhouse up the rubbish-littered alley.

It is nice to know that the Millers and Hamiltons put up with all this, that they are willing to live like they did because America needed them. But it makes you kind of

ashamed of yourself. And because you saw Corliss Ann Hamilton's body a few hours ago, it makes you pretty mad at the people who run things back in Washington.

The Millers and Hamiltons stood for all these hardships because they had hope. Things were going to be better, everybody said. But things are almost as bad here today as they were 2 years ago. Washington seems to have forgotten there are people named Miller and Hamilton up here defending their country.

(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, February 23.—Servicemen in Alaska get $60 a month as a cost-of-living allowance. In addition, enlisted men draw overseas pay of $8 to $22.50 a month.

But this extra dough doesn't mean much in a country where the necessities of life cost roughly twice as much as in the United States and where rent control is a farce.

It isn't so bad for those family men who can live on the base. They get rent free in place of their rental allowance. They are close to the commissary where food and other things can be bought for the same prices they bring in the States.

But since only about one-fourth of our military personnel in Alaska can be accommodated on bases, the lucky ones are the exception rather than the rule.

The rest have to shift for themselves among the money-hungry civilian landlords. They usually end up in one of Mountain View's one-room cabins with no inside plumbing, for which they pay from $85 to $100 a month, plus about $50 a month for heat.

This is real rough on the private, who draws $224.50 per month, less insurance and income-tax deductions. It is almost as rough on corporals, who draw $241.05, and on staff sergeants, who draw $319.60. It is not considered exactly easy on first lieutenants who draw $433.88.

All of these men, of course, are entitled to buy food and other supplies at the commissary. But if they don't live on the base, this if often impracticable. You just don't walk 2 or 3 miles every time you run out of bread, so you pay the civilian grocer 40 cents a loaf. You pay 20 cents a gallon for fuel oil. And you pay 40 cents a quart for fresh milk. Not at the end of the month, though, when you're running low on money. Then you pay 23 cents a quart for "recombined" milk, which is powdered milk with water and vitamins added. Or you buy frozen milk from Seattle at 19 cents a quart.

If you feel like a couple of beers, that's 1 buck, brother—50 cents a bottle. If you don't have a car, it costs you a minimum of $1 for a cab ride, or 2 bucks if you live outside the city limits, which don't extend more than a mile or two in any direction.

The big bite, of course, is your rent. That, also, is where you find the big gimmick.

Technically, Anchorage is under rent control. But since most of the shacks available to military personnel were built after August 1947 they don't come under the regulations. Thus the landlords can charge whatever they can get.

Even if you find a shack where the rent is controlled, however, that doesn't mean much. The landlord can get $20 more a month under the table from somebody else if you don't want the place. That's what you're going to pay. Or else he has put in improvements. This usually consists of a new shelf or a storm door or a flimsy partition. But it means he can jack up prices.

Most landlords have the same story when you talk to them. They pay the same high prices everybody else does, except more so. They point out that a house which costs $5,000 to build in the States costs $15,000 here.

This is not too convincing when you've just been inside one of those one-room cabins in Mountain View, but you can't argue with shrugged shoulders.

One character, though, was brutally frank.

"Sure," he said, "I'm getting away with murder. But why not? Maybe next year there won't be any Army here at all. You never can tell when those people down in Washington are going to put on another economy drive. So I figure I better get mine while the getting's good. When I get enough, I'm getting the hell back to civilization."

There are a lot of fly-by-nighters like this guy. And there doesn't seem to be much that can be done about them. Half the time they can't find anybody to run the local rent-control office. The director now, Miss Jean Camon, has only been here since last August and before that the office was closed for several months.

But it seems, putting it mildly, rather bad taste for the richest country in the world to let an American soldier with a wife and four kids live in a one-room cabin. Especially when that soldier would not be here if his country had not sent him.

(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, February 24.—Less than one-fourth of the servicemen entitled to live on the base are now being accommodated on Alaska's three major military installations.

And of that number, almost one-half, most of them with children, are living in substandard quarters which would be uncomfortable in a New York winter.

Yet these people are considered well off here. Most of the rest, including lower grade enlisted men not entitled to live on the base, are living in one-room cabins with no plumbing or toilet facilities and paying a civilian landlord $135 a month, including heat, for that dubious privilege.

If you want to extend callousness to the nth degree, you can wash your hands of these lower-grade enlisted men. Technically, they are not supposed to have families here. They are not even supposed to be married.

But all the rest is strictly Uncle Sam's responsibility. Under military regulations, the Government is required to provide housing on the base for all officers and the first three grades of noncommissioned officers.

Those regulations are a tragic joke in Alaska.

At Elmendorf Air Force Base and nearby Fort Richardson in Anchorage, a total of 4,167 family units are required to house those entitled to base housing. Only 1,332 families are now being taken care of and 517 of those are living in tarpaper shacks, converted latrines, and "temporary" Quonset huts which the military deems substandard.

The story is the same—or worse—at Ladd and at Eielson Air Force bases, both in the Fairbanks area. Ladd needs 1,906 family units. It's got 457, of which 171 are substandard. Eielson needs 1,014. It's got 208, every one of which has been ruled unfit for occupancy. It was 40 degrees below zero in Fairbanks the other day.

In most of these glorified chicken houses occupied by officers with children there are three or four rooms—each about the size of a large bathroom back in the States. But there are plenty of children living in two-room shacks designed for childless couples.

They all have inside toilets and running water. But they are heated with inadequate oil stoves which aren't much help against arctic winds that seep through the tattered tar-paper exteriors. The only time they're really warm is just after there's been a heavy snow. Then the man of the house banks snow high around his dream castle to keep out drafts.

"What's being done to improve the situation?" The answer is not much. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson need a total of 3,252 additional housing units, and only 672 are either under construction or will be started during the next building season. Only a small percentage will be ready for occupancy by next winter. Another 434 units have been approved and money is available to build them. But nobody knows when they'll be built.

Ladd Field, at Fairbanks, needs 1,620 additional units. None are being built now and only 355 are planned for the future. Eielson needs 1,014 units; 112 are under construction and 378 have been approved for future construction.

Only here in Anchorage is there any immediate hope of the military getting a new slice of civilian housing. The Pacific Alaska Building Corp., with FHA funds, is building a new apartment project. Because it's Government property, the Government has earmarked 464 of these units for use by either the military or civilians employed by the military.

Units—one- and two-bedroom size—will rent for $100 to $135 a month, including all utilities and garages.

These apartments will be heaven for those lucky enough to get them. But for a long time to come, there won't be enough heaven to go around in Alaska. For a long time to come, most servicemen will continue to exist in what is a rough approximation of hell.

International Japanese Trade Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of the growth of good will between Japan and the United States, Seattle, Wash., is undertaking the first International Japanese Trade Fair, scheduled for June 17 to July 3, 1951.

This worthy project will reflect the growth of business and trade between the Pacific Northwest and Japan. Those responsible for the program are to be commended. The following is a résumé of plans and accomplishments:

JAPANESE TRADE FAIR TO BE STAGED IN SEATTLE, WASH., JUNE 17–JULY 3, 1951—FULL SCOPE OF MODERNIZED JAPANESE INDUSTRIES TO BE SHOWN UNITED STATES BUYERS

Inquiries regarding the first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair, which will be staged June 17 to July 3, 1951, in Seattle, Wash., have been arriving in quantity since the fair was first announced, Herbert S. Little, chairman of the fair, has stated in Seattle.

Honors for the first Japanese space reservation went to the city of Osaka, whose Foreign Trade Association cabled the fair committee to hold a large exhibition area open for a full showing of Osaka's products and cultures. The second Japanese reservation came from Mie Prefecture, which requested that substantial space be set aside for the showing of cultured pearls, fishing equipment, and porcelain ware. Between 200 and 500 of the latter manufactures will be shown, Little was informed by the Mie group.

Since the first two Japanese space reservations were made, Little stated, a number of other Japanese areas and individual manufacturers have sent in their space reservations, and every mail is bringing more.

The first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair will be one

of the most colorful and unique to be staged in the world during 1951. The fair's staging is being financed by the people of Seattle and the State of Washington as a good-will gesture toward the people of Japan. No fees or charges for exhibition are being asked of the Japanese who send displays. They are only required to ship their displays to Seattle, Little said. The rest is free; financed by the paid-display space being purchased by American exhibitors, and by donations being made to the production budget by Seattle and State of Washington business firms, commercial associations, and private individuals.

First donation to the $100,000 production and promotion budget was a contribution totaling $8,000, presented to Little by E. H. Savage, president of the Port of Seattle Commission. The port of Seattle's contribution includes the services, at the request of the fair committee, of John M. Haydon, port director of public relations. Haydon is serving as director of the fair.

Site of the fair is the University of Washington's famed Edmundson Pavilion. More than 60,000 square feet of display space will be devoted exclusively to Japanese merchandise, trade goods, products of both light and heavy industry, processed material, food products, textiles, china, and other retail merchandise items from every classification, plus cultural, educational, recreational, and entertainment displays. Use of the pavilion was donated by the University of Washington. It is Seattle's largest and finest public building.

Foreign traders have described the first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair as a prime opportunity for retailers, wholesalers, buyers, suppliers, contractors, manufacturers, and others from the fields of export and import, transportation, industry, and commerce to study at first hand the improved quality, craftsmanship, and originality of goods and materials now being produced by a revitalized Japanese industry for consumption in America and abroad.

Fair officials said that the dates, June 17 to July 3, 1951, were chosen for two reasons. First, so that buyers placing orders would be allowed ample time for seasonal delivery, and second, so that those attending the fair, which will be held at the best part of the State of Washington's cool and green summer season, will be able to bring their entire family for a vacation in Washington. "Many will take advantage of the opportunity to fly on to the Orient over Seattle's shorter, Great Circle routes," Little said, "and others will wish to visit the Old World atmospheres of nearby British Columbia, or to journey throughout the State to such scenic wonders as Grand Coulee Dam, the last frontier stretches of our rugged Olympic Peninsula, the romantically lonely beaches along the sandy Washington-Pacific Ocean coast line, the forest and river areas encircling Washington's snow-capped mountains, and by sea and air, to the grandeur of Alaska." Little stated that many buyers would find the cost of their vacations paid for by the commercial relationships established at the fair. Many entertainment features have been planned to take place in Seattle during the fair's presentation dates, and visitors will be given a royal welcome by the city of Seattle, which is just entering its centennial year.

The first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair is under the sponsorship of International Trade Fairs, Inc., a nonprofit organization which includes officials of the city of Seattle, port of Seattle, State of Washington, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Washington State Foreign Trade Council, Pacific Northwest Trade Association, Greater Seattle, Inc., World Trade Club of Seattle, Propeller Club, port of Seattle, and many other groups and organizations from all levels of Seattle and State of Washington culture, industry, commerce, labor, recreation, transportation and other fields.

Commenting on the fair, Seattle's mayor, William F. Devin, said, "Not only will this Japanese trade fair strengthen trade patterns with Japan, but it will help carry out America's political, economic, and social philosophies abroad, and at home. Not only will it assist the Japanese, but it will spread to the world a picture of how the strength of free nations depends upon their ability to expand their trade with each other and to outproduce their aggressors."

Mayor Devin toured Japan last year with a Seattle Chamber of Commerce good-will tour to the Orient, and he returned home convinced that the nations he had seen had to be helped in every way back to high levels of production, and to a state of self-reliance, so that they could take their place with other strong and peaceful nations. While in Japan, Devin, along with other members of the tour party, discussed the possibilities of holding a Japanese trade fair in Seattle with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and with other high SCAP and Japanese Government officials. All expressed enthusiasm and the fair is a natural outgrowth of those talks.

RADM Gordon Rowe, commissioner of the port of Seattle and also a member of the tour party to Japan, describes the forthcoming fair as a real example of democracy at work. Instead of merely giving gifts, we are going to provide the Japanese with a working opportunity to do and build for themselves. Obviously, if Japan is to be built as an ally of America and the other free nations, she must be helped toward a self-supporting economy. This fair will be a major step in that direction.

Formation of the committee to stage the fair came following approval and endorsement of the project recently by the board of trustees of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, which directed Robert C. Story, manager of the chamber's world trade division, to carry out the initial work under the direction of the division's membership and its chairman, Maurice C. Rattray.

Another member of the party which toured the Orient was Sol G. Levy, now serving as vice chairman of the fair committee. "Japan is beginning to get back on her feet industrially and culturally," Levy said. "This International Japanese Trade Fair will make Seattle a giant showcase for Japan's products, and a living textbook of ways and means and rules and regulations for traders and businessmen who are looking for new, profitable lines and ways in which to expand their trade with Japan and the rest of the world."

Committee appointments made include fair chairman, Herbert S. Little, Little, LeSourd, Palmer & Scott; vice chairman, Sol G. Levy, senior partner, the Commission Co.; site and dates, Fred W. Geibel, publisher of the Marine Digest; ways and means, Sol G. Levy; products and exhibits, Douglas Egan, United States Department of Commerce; and promotion and advertising, John M. Haydon, director of public relations for the port of Seattle.

Chairman Little has described the fair as a chance for Seattle to take a solidly constructive step toward strengthening her position in international trade, and further improving her place as closest American port to the Orient and the natural gateway to Japan and the other countries of the Far East.

Following announcement that the fair was going to be held, a letter received from Maj. Gen. William F. Marquat, Chief, Economic and Scientific Section, SCAP in Tokyo stated, "This will be an outstanding event for both Japan and Seattle. We will do everything necessary from this end to make it a real success."

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON of Washington stated in the Nation's Capital, "I wish to congratulate those who are working to put on the first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair. It will be of tremendous value, not only to Japan, Seattle, and the Pacific Northwest, but to the Nation as a whole."

Robert O. Edwards, manager of the port of Seattle foreign trade zone, wired from Chicago where he was talking with Midwest importers and shippers, "Announcement of Japanese trade fair received with wide interest here. This will mean much, not only to Japan, but to State and city as the country's major gateway to the Orient."

State of Washington Governor Arthur B. Langlie declared that the State was fully behind the venture, and described it as a major step forward in the economic, cultural and promotional progress of the area. Governor Langlie said that he would extend a personal invitation to Japan's Premier Sigeru Yoshida to be his guest at the opening of the fair.

Official offices for the fair have been set up on the second floor of the Central Building, Seattle, Wash., adjacent to the offices of Toshio Urabe, chief, Japanese Overseas Agency. Fair Director Haydon stated that many cultural, educational, and entertainment features and displays would be produced for the fair to add color and excitement to its business attractions and to interest attendance on the part of the general public. He said that the first week of the fair would be restricted to buyers and businessmen, and that a premier opening would start off the second week of the fair, which would then be open to the general public, with certain hours set aside for late-arriving buyers. Telephone number at the Japanese trade fair office is Elliot 2010.

In Japan, up-to-the-minute information about the fair, preparation of exhibits, shipping information, and other data is available to Japanese exhibitors at the Promotion Bureau, Promotion Section, Ministry of International Trade and Industry, Tokyo, and from the chambers of commerce and industrial associations in individual cities.

Japanese exhibitors are asked to construct display surfaces, shelving, and tables, in addition to providing themselves with booth decorations, draping, table coverings, background material, and other such individual design material which will carry out the theme of their display and portray the cultural, social, and economic background of the goods displayed and the life of the workers who produced them. The fair committee will provide the basic booths, internal decorations and lighting, and will make additional decorative materials available.

Products and Exhibits Chairman Douglas Egan stated that space reservations from United States firms and organizations are now being accepted on a first come, first served basis, since space was limited. Egan said that firms handling Japanese products for sale to retail or wholesale markets were invited to exhibit, and that it was not necessary for such firms to be located in the State of Washington. On the same basis, Egan said, exhibits are being accepted from service, social, and cultural organizations, regardless of geographic location, and from business firms anywhere that handle associated products which would not detract from the over-all Japanese theme of the fair. Egan stated that firms which were uncertain as to the eligibility of their proposed exhibits should immediately contact the Japanese Trade Fair office for a ruling. Egan also warned that space was going fast because rates were being kept as low as possible. He stated that no merchandising schemes of high pressure or gimmick nature would be allowed. Space contracts will be distributed as fast as inquiries are received, Egan said.

In summing up the purposes of the first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair, Chairman Herbert S. Little said, "This is, first of all, a good will gesture toward the people of Japan. Secondly, it is an opportunity for Seattle once again to emphasize dramatically the advantages of her port and her Great Circle routes to the Orient. We intend that this fair will do as much as it possibly can to reestablish friendly trade relations and permanent cultural and social ties with Japan and her people. We believe that this is in keeping with America's current international efforts to promote world peace."

Let's Get an Effective Stabilization Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the Nation has full cause for real concern over the recent developments in the Office of Defense Mobilization. The action of the labor members in withdrawing from the Stabilization Board can easily lead to an eventual complete breakdown of our economy stabilization unless our own Government takes immediate and positive action to correct the conditions which threaten to bring about the breakdown.

Let us fairly analyze the facts which led to the situation as it exists today.

We have thus far failed to effectively stabilize our economy. Our first steps toward stabilization were weak and gave not enough hope for eventual success because they were haphazard, half-hearted, and in many instances inequitable. Though we might excuse some of their deficiencies because of the haste in which they were put into effect, this should not deter us from constructive criticism to help bring about the results which all of us seek.

I am confident that free American labor, which so gloriously proved itself in World War II, is ready and willing again today to do its share in the serious war for survival with which we are faced today.

But Congress and the mobilization agencies must also furnish their share of responsibility for a fair and equitable stabilization and mobilization policy which should take into consideration the welfare of the majority of the people.

Such a policy must be premised on equality of sacrifice by all groups of the civilian population, based on their ability to pay. It must include all areas of the economy and provide an over-all system of anti-inflation controls.

Because the present program fails fundamentally to include these considerations, the present crisis in our program was brought about. It still can, and must, be corrected, but only by insisting on more fair and equitable controls.

As I have previously pointed out in this House on February 12, the price order of the Economic Stabilization Agency of January 26, 1951, was unfair because it completely failed to roll back prices and gave legal sanction to the post-Korean highest price level in our history as the base from which future price stabilization action was to be taken. It gave comfort to those who had engaged in speculative manipulations in the commodity market and who engaged in an orgy of profiteering, all at the expense of the American housewife and the laborer.

No effective provision was made to hold down retail food prices, the major item in the cost of living. And nothing has yet been done to extend the control over rents.

The only field in which a rigid control is provided is in the control of wages. The inequity of this condition should be readily apparent to all of us, as it is to the workers who are compelled to live on frozen earnings without any over-all stabilization policy, thus cutting deeply into their living standards.

As far as they are concerned, there is no stabilization program in effect, except as to wages. Stabilization cannot be effected piecemeal, nor by controlling one group of the population. It should not place an undue share of the burden on those who can least afford it carry it. Reduced living standard of the workers is not the effective or proper antidote for business profiteering and speculation.

Our stabilization program must permit flexible wage adjustments based on increased living costs. Lower- and middle-income families should not be called upon to assume the burden of taxation. That burden should bear heaviest on individuals with high incomes and on corporations with large profits. It is unthinkable to compel low- and middle-income families to pay taxes high enough to cut too deeply into their basic living standards.

Let us hope that those responsible for our stabilization and mobilization program will strive to remedy the present inequities and thus avert the calamity which must follow if labor finds itself unable to participate in the program. And this Congress must also bear these same considerations in enacting its tax program for the ensuing year.

The Blood of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, orders were issued last Saturday for the Forty-fifth Division to be sent to Japan for training and duty. Since this division is the Oklahoma National Guard, and since it contains more than 11,000 officers and men who are Oklahomans, these orders naturally created a great deal of interest throughout my great State.

For many months I have been seeking unsuccessfully to find a way to stop the unequal drain on Oklahoma manpower for the Armed Forces. My intense feeling in regard to this unfairness shall cause me to continue my efforts and I shall propose amendments to the forthcoming manpower bill to prevent by law a recurrence of such a situation in the future.

These editorials included herewith give dramatic evidence of the way Oklahomans feel about this situation. Oklahoma, always in the front ranks in voluntary participation in all of America's defense efforts, is justly proud of her contributions now. We are proud of this division of troops. Surely, my colleagues, this is sufficient evidence to persuade all of you that our plea for a more equitable distribution of the manpower burden is due these patriotic citizens of my State.

These editorials, one titled "Oklahoma's Own," is from the Daily Oklahoman, of Oklahoma City, and the other, titled "Oklahoma in the Orient," is from the Daily World, Tulsa, Okla. They follow:

[From the Daily Oklahoman]

OKLAHOMA'S OWN

Oklahomans generally regret the necessity for sending the Forty-fifth Division to the Orient. It is a sad thing to see men going out on the grim adventure from which many never return. We who escape the call because of age or lack of training cannot fail to look upon any mobilization with a feeling of deep regret.

But according to those who are governing the Republic the necessity is there. Trained men are needed beyond the Pacific, in the opinion of those who are supposed to know. And the Forty-fifth is a trained division. It happens to be one of the few National Guard divisions of the entire country that is anywhere near the required standard, so the call comes to these young soldiers to prepare for their departure for the other side of the world.

All Oklahomans have reason for pride in the fact that Oklahoma is one of the handful of States whose organized militia was ready for activation when the first call to the Colors came. The guards of far more populous States have not yet received the initial call. And of all the National Guard units of America only those of Oklahoma and California have been called for service overseas. This is a great tribute indeed to the patriotism and fighting spirit of the lads of Oklahoma.

While it is a sad thing to see these boys in uniform called to action, it is a proud thing to live in a State where so many thousands are willing to go, and as the event proves, ready to go. Never in the State's trying history has Oklahoma failed to do her part in a crisis. Just now it cannot be denied that Oklahoma is doing more than her part. Eventually perhaps the sacrifices of all the States may be equal, but just now Oklahoma is carrying a double load.

As these thousands of spirited, young Oklahomans go forth to meet whatever fate may have in store for them, they will not be unmindful of the name they bear. There is illustrious blood in their military ancestry. On the battle flag of the Forty-fifth there are many shining names. There are inscribed the names of Sicily and Anzio and Salerno and the invasion of France and the dash across France and the bloody bayonet thrust into the heart of Bavaria. It is a proud record, and they who bear the flag of the Forty-fifth in 1951 will add to the

luster of that record, if they are given the opportunity.

If any ineptitude or blundering has helped to create the crisis that is calling these Oklahomans across 2,000 leagues of ocean, these boys are in no sense responsible. It is not theirs to create a crisis or to formulate a policy. It is their duty to go wherever the bugle calls and to support the policy that has been formulated. No doubt some of them will recall the words written by an Oklahoma soldier who fell at St. Etienne:

"Statesmen may fume and brag and lie
Winning the fame they seek,
But when we are weary of liars and lies,
Then the guns, it is theirs to speak."

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World]

OKLAHOMA IN THE ORIENT

Ordering of the Forty-fifth Division to Japan has, for Oklahomans, two principal phases—the intimation that the command is to be active in the Orient and that it is largely Oklahoman in personnel. The State is proud of the Forty-fifth; it won many honors in World War II and was in some of the worst fighting of that war. Its members brought home medals for valor and composite distinctions.

Tulsa has five units in the division. Our interest, then, is great, personal, direct. The Thunderbirds are a valiant force, and it is evident they are to have a large place in American military history and world developments. There is both pride and partial resentment in the public feeling of Oklahoma. The Forty-fifth is a National Guard command, one of the two of its type ordered to Japan. There is an underlying feeling that Oklahoma is being penalized to some extent for proficiency. Whatever familiar or personal feelings there may be, we all realize now far more than we did last week, that the world situation is full of meaning to this area and that we are to take a real part in whatever far-away activities there may be.

Two ideas quickly arose when the two National Guard divisions were singled out for duty in Japan. One was that the real destination would be Korea, and Washington was quick to deny that they would be used as replacements. The second, which came to general notice Monday, was that there may be a struggle in and over Japan. It seems to be expected that China and Russia will try to crowd into Japan or hem it in; that was undoubtedly on the Russian agenda when the Kremlin prompted the Korean war. There is pending a treaty with Japan, and apparently this country and Japan are to be in a military pact. We will probably exact bases and will necessarily have considerable forces there. European service, which the Forty-fifth had come to expect, may still be an eventuality.

The situation in Korea is actually much larger than our people had surmised. The war in Korea now engages 250,000 Americans, according to figures from Gen. Omar Bradley. The struggle is considerably of the seesaw variety; the Americans are alternately successful and unsuccessful; apparently they are heading into a big test of strength well up toward the thirty-eighth parallel.

The involvement of Japan in whatever may develop in Asia is acute. Formosa and Korea are just starting points for trouble. Thus, when the United States sets up a force and training grounds in Japan it is preparing for a real struggle with the whole Orient, which has been staked out for Communist domination.

In all this, Oklahoma has poignant interest. The commitment of the Forty-fifth Division to the Orient links us closely with far-flung and partly unseen events.

The Obligation of Americans to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address entitled "The Obligation of Americans to America," delivered by the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes, at the annual meeting in honor of George Washington, held under the auspices of the Sons of the American Revolution and the Daughters of the American Revolution on February 18, 1951, at the First Congregational Church in Montclair, N. J.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the address will occupy two and one-half pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OBLIGATION OF AMERICANS TO AMERICA

Let me say, no man living knows the answer to the thousands of distressing problems which have been created for the people of this country and the people of the world, by large groups of self-seeking politicians and dictators whose interest seems to be personal power first and the people's welfare second, if there is any welfare left. It is too late for any of us to lose our patience and temper or to cease striving for a sense of humility. No one can hope to be all right or to find the other fellow all wrong in the situation of mad confusion which faces the people, due to the concentration of power in a centralized government, which power has either been unwisely voted or improperly seized by those in authority. Mass confusion, in the minds of the people, has always preceded the downfall of any great government or organized effort of man.

In attempting to appraise our commitments of every kind, made to foreign governments or groups of governments, and their commitments to us, and in trying to ascertain the billions of dollars we have given away in the two World Wars, and since the cessation of actual fighting in 1945, up to the time of the Korean event plus the billions of dollars we are yet obligated to put into the foreign situation—I am unable to find a man in Washington, or elsewhere, who would even attempt to evaluate the situation. Practically all who are in a position to know considerable about the situation, recognize and admit that the loans or gifts, whichever you wish to call them, will eventually be charged off to profit and loss.

I think we should stop making any further commitments abroad and first appoint a committee of the ablest lawyers, statesmen, economists, accountants, and financial minds of the country to take an honest nonpolitical, nonpartisan inventory of our present economic and defense equipment and abilities; second, this committee should list all of our commitments and show all the gifts and loans, with their total sum, since World War I. Then we should determine whether it lies within our power to fulfill all the commitments made or promised in good faith and whether the nations to whom the promises were made can fulfill their part of the commitments and if they have acted in complete good faith.

The majority of this suggested committee should not be men or women who have already been instrumental in leading us along the path we are now following, but rather the majority should be other fine American men and women seeking only to fulfill the obligation of Americans to America. From the report of such committee, perhaps we can formulate a foreign policy clear enough and definite enough so that the American people themselves and the men on the firing line can understand it and know for what they are asked to sacrifice their lives.

Then we should try to find out whether the mothers and fathers of the United States are in favor of having their boys sent all over the world to fight battles in which I, personally, believe there is no way to do more than win a physical victory here and there without any of the fruits of peace and good will to follow the physical victory.

Americans forget too soon and forgive too often. Woodrow Wilson, a great and distinguished American, who took us into World War I, was elected for his second term, in which we became embroiled in foreign alliances, by this slogan, "He kept us out of war." I remember the posters all over the United States of a mother standing with her hand on her son's shoulder, saying "My son, vote for Woodrow Wilson; he kept you out of war." I will not analyze the right or wrong, but just take this look at the facts.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to his third term, principally through a campaign speech he made in Boston, when he said to the mothers and fathers in the United States the following: "I say to you again and again and again, that your sons will not be sent to fight on foreign soil." It is quite reliably reported by those who heard the speech and I was one of them—that the words which were later found inserted in the manuscript "unless we are attacked" were not used in the speech when it went to the ears of millions of Americans. My only purpose in reemphasizing this fact, is that it convinces me that our American people never wished to be drawn into the wars of foreign nations, which have been going on for centuries.

Both Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt will probably occupy a distinguished position in history, and were beloved by millions of our citizens. That does not change the fact that the people did not want their sons sent to foreign soils and did not want to become involved in foreign entangled alliances.

Certainly, it is true that none of us know what George Washington might say today to the American people in a farewell address, but I want to ask every American to think carefully as to whether the morals, the character, and the spiritual development of a vast part of the world justified or justifies us in changing our position of living under our American way of life and contributing all within our power to help others to find the way of improving their lives and freedom.

As one American, to those who are willing to listen to what I say in good faith, my answer is that we have entered into partnership and alliances with political powers, leaders, and dictators whom no intelligent American citizen would choose as a partner in his life's work.

Let us always keep in mind two of the cardinal rules of equity which are fundamental in all human relationship:

1. He who asks equity must do equity.
2. He who comes into equity must do so with clean hands.

Perhaps we are moving too fast. Perhaps we are forgetting how the tide of good has come in over the last 2,000 years, only to recede to points further away from our objective than they have frequently occupied over the centuries gone by.

I ask you if anyone in this room feels that this world is better after World Wars I and

II than it was before World War I, when the Constitution of the United States was supreme with us and the American flag occupied first place in our hearts, minds, and souls?

A relatively small percentage of our people appreciate that a treaty made, executed, and ratified with a foreign power takes precedence over our Constitution and the law of the land.

A still smaller percentage of our people realize that our commitments to the United Nations and the new treaty-making processes evolved during the last 10 years are apparently circumventing our Federal Constitution, amending it without the process established for its amendment, and some say we have already abrogated vital constitutional provisions and guaranties as is evidenced by the recent decision of the California Supreme Court.

Only a few of our people have made the understanding of government important enough for them to realize that when we go into a world government, that we have lost control of our own affairs and have become just a part of a muddled, confused world. A world whose selfish motives and objectives dictate their vote.

If socialism and communism are predominant, then we have thrown our fine system and way of life into a kettle of international dictatorship, there to become part and parcel of the conglomerate whole, where the state is master and man its puppet or serf.

Then there will be no leader of freemen left to hold the light of liberty and opportunity aloft, to lead others out of the darkness and despair brought about by rulers who have all the iniquitous qualities of the worst kings and emperors of the past, regardless of the name by which you call them.

Perhaps power-seeking politicians and leaders are trying to change the quality and character of humanity faster than it can be changed.

Perhaps they are hoping to accomplish by force and subsidy those things which can only be accomplished by spiritual development and decency of purpose on a voluntary basis in keeping with the spirit of the Golden Rule.

Perhaps they are trying to change humanity by force faster than God ordained it should be changed.

A human life is but the wink of an eye or the break of a wave as compared to the known time of the past. I am not saying that some day the world may not be right for world government, but I am saying if we try to force it on the people of the United States in view of the conditions confronting us, and considering the character of the people of the world now, we will destroy the greatest accomplishment of mankind in the history of the world. I refer to the American form of government and way of life.

Regardless of what anyone may say or how much it may hurt the feelings of some people in the world, I claim that the United States of America has been the greatest charitable organization ever known in the history of the world in its attempts to do good for others without seeking anything material in return. I also claim that, in our great zeal to do good, we have overpromised ourselves, or agreed to things which, if pursued, will wreck this greatest charitable organization in the world.

If any great charitable institution within our borders were to become emotional or overzealous in promising to do things which its board of directors and contributors found could not be done without destroying the institution, then, it is my opinion, that board of directors would be forced to take inventory and reappraise its powers and the relative importance of the things it would like to do. Then the members of the board would be forced to say, "We have undertaken to do more than is possible with our manpower and material wealth without jeopardizing and destroying our whole effort in charity." I think they would be courageous enough to say we have overestimated our power to do good, and they would be compelled to adjust themselves to the doing of things within the limits of their known, or at least their probable, income and manpower. Thus they would preserve their great charitable institution to do good within the scope of its ability.

No decent American ever wishes to defy the law of his country. No decent American ever wishes to evade military service required to protect and preserve our great country. But if we are a free people, every American should have the right without smears or reprisals to say openly how he feels our welfare and purpose in life are to be best served and accomplished. If, because we are in a great emergency; if, because we are involved in some kind of a war that our leaders do not call war; if, because we are on the brink of a great war, possibly engulfing the world, we stop the citizen from expressing his honest, patriotic views, then, indeed, have we become a dictatorship where those in power in the Government are the masters and the people its puppets.

Right now I would not attempt to appraise who is responsible for the dilemma in which we find ourselves. Nor would I urge others to do so. Two great World Wars fought to victory by the men in the field; two great opportunities for the establishment of peace or ways to peace forfeited or bungled away by the political leaders because selfishness could not be made into intelligent self-interest, and our leaders compromised principle. They let idealism blot out realism almost completely. Theodore Roosevelt said, "A pure idealist is often one of the most dangerous men in the world, because frequently he is very sincere and convincing, but he has no foundation in the realism of life."

I often think of the admonition I gave to our political leaders and the leaders of the world, in the speech I made before the GI Forum in Rome, in June 1945, less than 3 weeks after VE-day. I had had conferences with the Honorable Winston Churchill and a delightful visit with His Holiness, the Pope—four other Senators being present. The substance of what I said was this. We have spent probably $200,000,000,000 to get an Army of 3,400,000 of the best trained and equipped American soldiers on the European Continent, and to assist our ally, Britain, in getting 785,000 of the best trained and equipped British soldiers on continental Europe. Then I asked the question why shouldn't we announce to the world in simple unambiguous language, the objectives for which we fought the war, and our objective in securing peace, before we take this great Army back home, and ship the equipment to other parts of the world. All I wanted to do was what any plain, ordinary, American citizen should have wanted to do, viz: that is help make peace possible while power was present.

For making that statement I was blasted by the socialistic, communistic, New-Dealish sympathisers, as a warmonger. Now I am receiving letters from the most distinguished men in the country, saying that I was one of the few people who saw the picture clearly and expressing great sorrow that no heed was taken of that speech except by the smear artists and character assassins. The only object I have in referring to this—which is water over the dam—is to prove that all we have thus far done is to win physical victories and bungle away the peace. Why should we expect the political leaders now in power in the world, to do a better job if we win another physical victory, after the loss of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of our fine young manhood.

No, I reiterate, they in Europe, should call to arms, all of their available manpower, to defend themselves, before we take another step with land forces into the foreign arena. I do not mean we should fail to support our boys in Korea or in Europe. But we should think well about maintaining land forces, for our own soil, and the return of our men from Korea, in an orderly way. I would adopt some sane program for pretraining our youth for armed service in case of necessity and not call upon them to fight wars without training. I would build and equip an army for the defense of our country, and it seems to me that Senator TAFT's figure of a million and a half men, over-all, with a backlog of trainees, should be our first step.

Then an appraisal and inventory of our resources, manpower and abilities to do things, should be made available to guide the American people and their representatives in Congress as to how far we can go with any degree of safety in the future. Nothing is more vital than that Congress and not any one man, or group of men, should have the power to say whether our young manhood shall be sent to fight on foreign soil.

I firmly believe that the duty of every American is to make the saving of the United States his No. 1 job. I do not believe in the slogan, we must save the world, if we would save ourselves. That slogan has already led us into the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives, the crippling of hundreds of thousands more of our citizens, and has put us well on the way to national bankruptcy. National bankruptcy of our country can accomplish all of the wicked objectives of the Communists and destroy the cause of freemen throughout the world for centuries. I would change that slogan to read, "We cannot save the world unless we save ourselves."

I would ask those in authority to truly appraise the atomic bomb and not distress and terrify the people with imaginary things that may never happen, neither would I overemphasize the importance of dangerous things that may happen. Certainly, what General Bradley said is true, "We may be bombed." But I would like to ask you, fellow Americans, whether we are any less likely to be bombed if we send more troops abroad and thus weaken our defense at home? We will never be overcome, as a Nation of freemen, except by great land forces, landing on our own shores, and greater than we can combat. Hitler had one of the greatest armies in the world, and he got to the shores of the English Channel. England was on her knees, crippled from tensions and ruthless attacks from the air. Hitler did not dare attempt to cross the Channel, 22 miles. Russia would have to bring a man force of tremendous magnitude some 4,000 miles, if she started from home, and some 3,000 miles if she started from the shores of our former allies in Europe. It is inconceivable that she could transport a large land force either across the Atlantic Ocean or across Siberia down through Alaska. We can likewise bomb, providing we spend all that is necessary to be supreme in the air and maintain supremacy on the sea.

I said on the Senate floor almost 5 years ago that Russia would never need to precipitate an open war with us in order to accomplish her objective of destroying our way of life. I made this statement on the basis that we were and are spending ourselves into national bankruptcy, and national bankruptcy would sound the death knell of the free-enterprise system. I agree with what Abraham Lincoln said when he was 29 years old: "No power on earth can over land a force in this country to overcome us. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide." Tolerance, patience, equity, and justice in our dealings amongst ourselves are the things required

to build national unity. If we can build real unity, no one can overcome us. Then we will set an example to the world which freemen can follow if they are willing to pay the price of liberty.

Our people favor air and naval supremacy, but they are opposed to our sending millions of men to fight on foreign soil side by side with people whose political philosophy and economic objectives are certainly not stabilized and unified any more than all of their morals and character are stabilized and unified.

What if these countries who are leaning strongly to socialism, should change their course, while a vast army from here is on foreign soil?

Yes, I would take an inventory right now regardless of what the world might think of us. The better people of the world would thank us later for having done it.

When I was on the Air Policy Board of the Congress, I told the committee and the high command of the various branches of the armed services that I would vote for any amount of money necessary to make us supreme in the air and on the sea as fast as we could lawfully and intelligently spend the money.

I would not say now what we should do to help other nations who believe sincerely and are on record as being in favor of the freedom of the individual. I would let them know their Uncle Sam cannot do their job for them, no matter how kind his heart is. The best work of all men in the world has been done when mother necessity stood back of them with a broomstick, and, particularly, when freedom and self-preservation were their objectives.

I hear Americans say, "Wouldn't you send even 10 divisions to Europe or to Asia, just to show good will?" My answer is: If you send 10 divisions anywhere and the vast hordes of any nation, which is our enemy, is putting them and our supposed full-fledged allies to rout, then, in the name of decency and honesty, we will have to send as many hundreds of thousands or millions more as is necessary to support them, protect them, and save them. We can't just send our boys around the world and, if they fail, let them be massacred.

No war can be conducted under the direction of the United Nations, which takes 2 or 3 months to give a go-ahead signal in every case, except when they voted to resist the Communist advance from North Korea, and we furnished 90 to 95 percent of all the aid given to the South Koreans.

Can anyone doubt the ultimate failure of our arms on foreign soil when they see how General MacArthur's men of the so-called United Nations forces in Korea have been handicapped by the indecision of the United Nations. Just this week the Prime Minister of Great Britain has suggested the United Nations forces should not go north of the thirty-eighth parallel. General MacArthur had the communistic forces on the run last fall, when he was ordered not to proceed further. The Communists reorganized, rearmed, and reinforced their ranks and drove our Armed Forces almost to the sea. About 10 days ago, our Army started to make heavy gains and drove the Communists back again. Now, there is talk of stopping MacArthur again. If that happens, the Communists' forces from a population of nearly a billion people, will reinforce, rearm, and again take the offensive. Meanwhile thousands of American boys are making the supreme sacrifice, and I suggest you ask yourself, "Where will this all end?" and further ask yourself the question, "What will we really accomplish if our forces overcome the Communists in Korea?" My opinion is, the communistic designs to destroy the cause of freemen will break out in other parts of the world thousands of miles from our shore. I am convinced that the manhood of 150,000,000 people in the United States cannot supply land forces to fight a billion people throughout the world without bringing disaster to themselves.

Some of our top politicians are saying we can't refuse to send armies abroad without forsaking our allies. I suggest they begin to think a little about forsaking ourselves and begin to recognize that the opposing forces of communism versus the cause of freemen are in a death grapple which will not be settled in any one part of the world so long as hundreds of millions of people are wavering in their minds as to which cause they will support. The nationalization of industry in Great Britain and the three defeats administered to the Honorable Winston Churchill within the last month should make all freemen who believe in free competitive enterprise stop and think.

I voted for the United Nations and it may yet serve a purpose, but when our fine ally, Great Britain, is holding Red China by one hand, while with the other she is patting us on the back and asking for more help and more favors, and took several months to vote Red China the aggressor, it does not seem to me to justify the sending of our fine boys to all quarters of the earth to fight battles for what we believe in, but apparently not the things in which the present British Government and some others believe in.

Let us not forget that those in authority in England have not yet shown her colors in regard to Red China becoming a member of the United Nations, and thereby further contaminating it with communism.

Of course, every decent American would help feed those in need and deserving, even if it means sacrifice at home.

Of course, every decent American wants to keep his promises within the limits of his ability, but the bankruptcy law, which helps individuals who have overreached themselves and failed, does not help nations who do the same thing. Of course, every decent American is interested in lending aid and help to nations who truly believe in the cause of freemen and who themselves are willing to pay the price to fight to the limit of their ability for that cause; therefore, I would be in favor of giving all possible help in the air and at sea to such nations, so long as that does not jeopardize the life and the preservation of our American people and their system of freemen.

Ex-President Hoover did the people of the United States and all the decent people of the earth a great service when he made his radio address on December 20, 1950. The gist of his speech meant to me this—we cannot save the world unless it first does everything in its power to safe itself.

We must stop where we are, take an inventory of our assets and liabilities in this world mess, then if not too late, make certain we save ourselves, otherwise all will be lost.

Why not consider Spain as an ally, in our great need to protect the lives, liberty, and property of the American people? Spain protected by the Pyrenees Mountains with 400,000 men now in arms, ready to fight Communist aggression and probably 1,000,000 more men who soon could be in arms, should have our consideration as an ally, and a protected base for our Air Force and Navy. Think carefully of some of the allies we now have in and out of the United Nations, before we ignore this available ally.

I am urging the people to demand of their Representatives in Congress that without delay an inventory be prepared of what we have left, after where we have been, what we have done, and what we have promised, or agreed to; so by that light, then and only then can our people know what we yet have to do with, and urge their representatives to use our remaining strength in the most effective way to save the United States, so that we can help others to save themselves.

I ask you, is that not sound as against plunging headlong and recklessly into war all over the world only to lose ourselves and gain nothing for anyone?

Senator HARRY F. BYRD has been almost a lost voice in the wilderness, wisely urging the curtailment and elimination of nonessential expenditures, so that we may pay for the essential things and not neglect self-defense, and avoid habits that lead to national bankruptcy and suicide. I have always agreed with him, that we should pay as we go and not deprive our air and sea defense of anything necessary to prevent an attack upon our shores. We should make an honest, earnest appeal to all of our people to stop demanding extravagant, nonessential expenditures, and to tighten their belts and do their full citizen's duty to defend this Nation against whatever may be ahead of us. Then, as our forefathers did, we should ask God's guidance and help in keeping our cause righteous and making it successful. Let us not forget the Declaration of Independence, and the constitutions of 46 out of the 48 States make a direct appeal to God Almighty for His help and guidance.

In closing, I think every American mother and father should make it their duty to notify their representatives in Congress and in the executive branch of Government how they feel and what they expect of their elected and appointed representatives. It is not a question of right to speak, but duty to speak. I would urge that it be done now, so that these representatives may understand, and be encouraged by the wish and will of the people. I would urge the people to carry that wish and will through to the next election, for if the people sit idly by and watch their rights destroyed one by one, and, later, try to arise to action, they may find they have lost the power of action.

If the people are masters in this country of ours, they must act like masters, because when the people abdicate to the government, their servant, they are no longer the master, and the dove of peace and the flower of liberty will have vanished and faded away.

"With malice toward none and charity for all" let us build unity and strength in the land of the free, and thus create an example for the world to follow. An example that may spell peace on earth under God.

Placing Figures of Great Americans on the Walls of This Chamber

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a day or two ago, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] took me to task for not mentioning certain Indians when I was naming great Americans whose figures should be placed on these walls to take the place of those caricatures of ancient aliens and enemies of America you see there now.

He named Tecumseh, a Shawnee Indian chief, as a red-blooded 100-percent American whom he said I had overlooked.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] ought to read American history. Then he would not attempt to

put Tecumseh on a parity with glorious old Benjamin Franklin, and other great Americans I have suggested for these places.

Tecumseh was a traitor to the United States in the War of 1812. He went down into Mississippi and tried to induce the Chickasaws and Choctaws to join the British in their war against the United States. Pushmataha, a Choctaw chief of Chickasaw descent, who was perhaps the greatest Indian America ever produced, answered him. I am going to put an account of their debate in the RECORD for all of you to read.

In 1921, Hon. Charles D. Carter, a Member of Congress from Oklahoma, who was part Indian himself and knew more about the history of the Chickasaws and Choctaws than any other man I have ever known, made a speech at the tomb of Pushmataha, out here in the Congressional Cemetery, in which he said:

The War of 1812 was impending and the British authorities were doing all in their power to stir up antagonism between the Indians and the Americans. The astute Shawnee chief, Tecumseh, was sent on a tour by British agents to organize all Indians west of the Alleghenies with the purpose to expel the white American beyond the mountains. One of the first tribes he visited was the Choctaw. After his mission had been explained to Pushmataha, the wise old chief advised Tecumseh that he was only one of the three chiefs of the Choctaw Nation; that the Choctaws could only take part in any war upon the decision of the general council of the tribe; and that before this was done they would probably desire to consult their kindred tribe and ally, the Chickasaws. Tecumseh then requested that both tribes be called together in order that he might lay his plan before the council. After a consultation with the other two Choctaw chiefs, Mashalatubby and Apuckshinubby, and the principal chief of the Chickasaws, a general council of the two tribes was called.

Tecumseh was classed by many of his contemporaries as the most powerful debater of his generation, and this was saying much, for it was during the day of Clay, Calhoun, and Webster. Realizing the full power of his oratory, Tecumseh surmised if he could get to speak to the Choctaw people in general council they would not be able to resist his magnetic logic and eloquence. The council was assembled, and Tecumseh, with his suite of 30 warriors bedecked in panoply of paint and feathers, filed in before the council fire to deliver his address. We must bear in mind that the Shawnees spoke an entirely different language from the Choctaws and Chickasaws, the Shawnees belonging to the Algonquin stock and speaking their dialect, while the Choctaws and Chickasaws are of the Appalachian stock and spoke the Muskogeon dialect. Therefore it was necessary for each speech to be translated by an interpreter so all might understand.

The great Shawnee chief was thoroughly familiar with past relations between all Indian tribes and the whites, and he began by recounting all the wrongs perpetrated on the Indians by the palefaces since the landing of Columbus. He related how the white man had beguiled the Indians along the Atlantic coast to part with their lands for a few trifling beads, and a little fire water, leaving them beggars, vagabonds, peons, and strangers in their own land, to be scorned and despised by their paleface neighbors. He told how the Shawnees and other northern tribes were being stripped of their patrimony. He laid down the principle that the Great Spirit had given the Western Hemisphere to all red people in common and that no particular tribe had anything more than the right of possession to any lands, and therefore asserted any relinquishment of title by one tribe to be null and void, because many of the owners had not joined in the transfer. These wrongs discussed, he declared, had been made possible by the ingenuity of the whites in attacking only one tribe at a time, but if all Indians would join and combine their forces in one attack at one time, the white man could be driven back over the mountains whence he came; that the golden opportunity was now at hand to join hands with the British and scourge from their revered hunting grounds eternally the hated paleface. He closed his eloquent address with a stirring appeal to the patriotism of the Choctaws and Chickasaws, asking if they would await complete submission or would they now join hands and fight beside the Shawnees and other tribes rather than submit?

Evidently Tecumseh's purpose had been fully accomplished. His magnetic words seemed to arouse every vindictive sentiment within the souls of the Choctaw and Chickasaw warriors; their savage enthusiasm had been stirred to white heat when Pushmataha calmly strode before the council fire and began his wonderful reply to Tecumseh's speech. What a pity that no accurate account of this wonderful debate between these two giant primitive orators was at that time preserved. Lincecum, Pickett, Randall, and other historians have left us brief excerpts; Cushman undertakes to give Pushmataha's speech in full, but his recital does not even do faint justice to the original and in no measure conforms to the Choctaws' account of it. For many years it was handed down from generation to generation by tradition to the Choctaws and Chickasaws, but it can be easily understood how that method might fail to preserve all the virile force and eloquence of this wonderful address. I will undertake to give it to you in part as nearly as I remember hearing it told by some of the old Indians many years ago. Pushmataha began his address as follows:

PUSHMATAHA'S REPLY TO TECUMSEH

"Omiske, tushkahoma ho chukma hashche yumma. Anumpa tilofash ish huklo."

("Attention, my good red warriors. Hear ye my brief remarks.")

"The great Shawnee orator has portrayed in vivid picture the wrongs inflicted on his and other tribes by the ravages of the paleface. The candor and fervor of his eloquent appeal breathe the conviction of truth and sincerity, and, as kindred tribes, naturally we sympathize with the misfortunes of his people. I do not come before you in any disputation either for or against these charges. It is not my purpose to contradict any of these allegations against the white man, but neither am I here to indulge in any indiscreet denunciation of him which might bring down upon my people unnecessary difficulty and embarrassment.

"The distinguished Shawnee sums up his eloquent appeal to us with this direct question:

"'Will you sit idly by, supinely awaiting complete and abject submission, or will you die fighting beside your brethren, the Shawnees, rather than submit to such ignominy?'

"These are plain words and it is well they have been spoken, for they bring the issue squarely before us. Mistake not, this language means war; and with whom, pray? War with some band of marauders who have committed these depredations against the Shawnees? War with some alien host seeking the destruction of the Choctaws and Chickasaws? Nay, my fellow tribesmen. None of these are the enemy we will be called on to meet. If we take up arms against the Americans, we must of necessity meet in deadly combat our daily neighbors and associates in this part of the country near our homes.

"If Tecumseh's words be true, and we doubt them not, then the Shawnees' experience with the whites has not been the same as that of the Choctaws. These white Americans buy our skins, our corn, our cotton, our surplus game, our baskets, and other wares, and they give us in fair exchange their cloth, their guns, their tools, implements, and other things which the Choctaws need but do not make. It is true we have befriended them, but who will deny that these acts of friendship have been abundantly reciprocated? They have given us cotton gins, which simplify the spinning and sale of our cotton; they have encouraged and helped us in the production of our crops; they have taken many of our wives into their homes to teach them useful things, and pay them for their work while learning; they are teaching our children to read and write from their books. You all remember well the dreadful epidemic visited upon us last winter. During its darkest hours these neighbors whom we are now urged to attack responded generously to our needs. They doctored our sick; they clothed our suffering; they fed our hungry; and where is the Choctaw or Chickasaw delegation who has ever gone to St. Stephens with a worthy cause and been sent away empty handed? So in marked contrast with the experience of the Shawnees, it will be seen that the whites and Indians in this section are living on friendly and mutually beneficial terms.

"Forget not, O Choctaws and Chickasaws, that we are bound in peace to the Great White Father at Washington by a sacred treaty and the Great Spirit will punish those who break their word. The Great White Father has never violated that treaty and the Choctaws have never yet been driven to the necessity of taking up the tomahawk against him or his children. Therefore the question before us tonight is not the avenging of any wrongs perpetrated against us by the whites, for the Choctaws and Chickasaws have no such cause, either real or imaginary, but rather it is a question of carrying on that record of fidelity and justice for which our forefathers ever proudly stood, and doing that which is best calculated to promote the welfare of our own people. Yea, my fellow tribesmen, we are a just people. We do not take up the warpath without a just cause and honest purpose. Have we that just cause against our white neighbors who have taken nothing from us except by fair bargain and exchange? Is this a just recompense for their assistance to us in our agricultural and other pursuits? Is this to be their gracious reward for teaching our children from their books? Shall this be considered the Choctaws' compensation for feeding our hungry, clothing our needy, and administering to our sick? Have we, O Choctaws and Chickasaws, descended to the low estate of ruthlessly breaking the faith of a sacred treaty? Shall our forefathers look back from the happy hunting grounds only to see their unbroken record for justice, gratitude, and fidelity thus rudely repudiated and abruptly abandoned by an unworthy offspring?

"We Choctaws and Chickasaws are a peaceful people, making our subsistence by honest toil; but mistake not, my Shawnee brethren, we are not afraid of war. Neither are we strangers to war, as those who have undertaken to encroach upon our rights in the past may abundantly testify. We are thoroughly familiar with war in all its details, and we know full well all its horrible consequences. It is unnecessary for me to remind you, O Choctaws and Chickasaws, veteran braves of many fierce conflicts in the past, that war is an awful thing. If we go into this war against the Americans we must be prepared to accept its inevitable results. Not only will it foretoken deadly conflict with neighbors

and death to warriors, but it will mean suffering for our women, hunger and starvation for our children, grief for our loved ones, and devastation of our beloved homes. Notwithstanding these difficulties, if the cause be just, we should not hesitate to defend our rights to the last man, but before that fatal step is irrevocably taken it is well that we fully understand and seriously consider the full portent and consequences of the act.

"Hear me, O Choctaws and Chickasaws, for I speak truly for your welfare. It is not the province of your chiefs to settle these important questions. As a people, it is your prerogative to have either peace or war, and as one of your chiefs it is mine simply to counsel and advise. Therefore, let me admonish you that this critical period is no time to cast aside your wits and let blind impulse sway; be not driven like dumb brutes by the frenzied harangue of this wonderful Shawnee orator; let your good judgment rule and ponder seriously before breaking bonds that have served you well and ere you change conditions which have brought peace and happiness to your wives, your sisters, and your children. I would not undertake to dictate the course of one single Choctaw warrior. Permit me to speak for the moment, not as your chief but as a Choctaw warrior, weighing this question beside you. As such I shall exercise my calm, deliberate judgment in behalf of those most dear to me and dependent on me, and I shall not suffer my reason to be swept away by this eloquent recital of alleged wrongs which I know naught of. I deplore this war, I earnestly hope it may be averted, but if it be forced upon us I shall take my stand with those who have stood by my people in the past and will be found fighting beside our good friends of St. Stephens and surrounding country. I have finished. I call on all Choctaws and Chickasaws endorsing my sentiments to cast their tomahawks on this side of the council fire with me."

The air resounded with the clash of tomahawks cast on the side of the Choctaw chief and only a few warriors seemed still undecided. Tecumseh seeing the purpose of his mission thwarted and thinking Pushmataha could not understand the Shawnee language, spoke to his warriors in his native tongue, saying: "Pushmataha is a coward and the Choctaw and Chickasaw braves are squaws," but Pushmataha had traveled much and knew a smattering of many Indian dialects. He understood Tecumseh and turning upon the Shawnee with all the fire of his eloquence, he clinched the argument and settled the decision of the few wavering Choctaw braves by saying:

"Halt, Tecumseh. Listen to me. You have come here, as you have often gone elsewhere, with a purpose to involve peaceful people in unnecessary trouble with their neighbors. Our people have had no undue friction with the whites. Why? Because we have had no leaders stirring up strife to serve their selfish, personal ambitions. You heard me say that our people are a peaceful people. They make their way, not by ravages upon their neighbors but by honest toil. In that regard they have nothing in common with you. I know your history well. You are a disturber. You have ever been a troublemaker. When you have found yourself unable to pick a quarrel with the white man, you have stirred up strife between different tribes of your own race. Not only that, you are a monarch and unyielding tyrant within your own domain; every Shawnee man, woman, and child must bow in humble submission to your imperious will. The Choctaws and Chickasaws have no monarchs. Their chieftains do not undertake the mastery of their people, but rather are they the people's servants, elected to serve the will of the majority. The majority has spoken on this question and it has spoken against your contention. Their decision has therefore become the law of the Choctaws and Chickasaws, and Pushmataha will see that the will of the majority so recently expressed is rigidly carried out to the letter. If, after this decision, any Choctaw should be so foolish as to follow your imprudent advice and enlist to fight against the Americans, thereby abandoning his own people and turning against the decision of his own council, Pushmataha will see that proper punishment is meted out to him, which is death. You have made your choice; you have elected to fight with the British. The Americans have been our friends and we shall stand by them. We will furnish you safe conduct to the boundaries of this Nation as properly befits the dignity of your office. Farewell, Tecumseh. You will see Pushmataha no more until we meet on the fateful warpath."

As I said, Pushmataha was a great American, a brave and heroic patriot. He was never a Member of Congress, but I would not object to seeing his figure placed on these walls, or a monument erected to him in a prominent place here in the Nation's Capital, because of the great services he rendered to his country.

He fought with Andrew Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans, and when he finally died, here in Washington, where he came to confer with President Jackson about matters concerning the members of his tribe, he was buried with military honors out here in the Congressional Cemetery, at the end of East Capitol Street.

If he could press back the veil that hides us from that mysterious realm where he has taken his place in the silent halls of death, look down the century that has passed since his exit from this world, and see his likeness being placed by the side of that of Tecumseh, or even by that of Hammurabi, or any of those other ancient aliens, he would probably arise and shout: "Ex sho! Ex sho!" in righteous protest against such humiliation.

What Are We Fighting for in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column by Mr. W. H. "Hi Waters" McWilliams, published in the Martins Ferry (Ohio) Times-Leader. It gives in clear language the answer to the question, "What are we fighting for in Korea?"

The column follows:

RIGHT AROUND HOME

A lot of letters have come to me recently. They say, "What are we fighting for in Korea?"

As near as I can say, it's this: It seems a lot better to stop communism on the slopes of cold Korea than on the sunny streets of Adena, Ohio.

Communism is a little like cancer of the big toe—unless you stop it below the ankle it will kill you above the shoulders later.

We're hacking off the short weeds in the garden of humanity now in Korea so we won't reap a full crop in our backyards in the fall.

It's the old story of the rotten apple in the barrel. We're removing it from the top today so we won't have to throw out everything from the bottom up tomorrow. The boys who slave and die by regiments to stop communism in the East are doing it so that we won't slave and die in the West—by millions.

Because as sure as the daylight in August, if communism gathers strong in the Land of the Rising Sun it will mean a hurricane over the plains across the world at eventide.

We are pinching off the bean stock as it peeps through the ground in distant Korea so that it won't harbor a giant when it grows big and entwines over the Statue of Liberty here.

That, in brief, is why we are now fighting a hard war on the other side of the world and must fight it to a finish—it's self-protection by remote control.

Our Communists Can Cripple Our Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to commend for your reading an editorial which recently appeared in one of my district's leading daily newspapers, the Escanaba Press, titled "Our Communists Can Cripple Our Industry:"

OUR COMMUNISTS CAN CRIPPLE OUR INDUSTRY

Half a million native-born fanatics, loyal to Moscow and entrenched in key American industrial areas, are ready to strike from within if Russia attacks from without, says Changing Times magazine in its February issue. The Communists will try to sabotage factories, break down transportation, disrupt communications, create panic in the cities and crush our morale says the magazine.

Will such attempts succeed? It all depends, says Changing Times, on how well loyal Americans are prepared to meet the Communists' attacks.

If the Russians make a surprise attack, as the Japs did at Pearl Harbor, it is likely that top Communists here will try to organize a simultaneous blow from within. Then it will be a split-second race between the Communists and the FBI. A few hours, or even minutes, might make the difference as to whether the FBI nabs the leaders before serious damage is done.

Be suspicious of anyone who asks a lot of questions about local conditions, especially questions having to do with manufacturing, electric power, transportation, or communications. Report it if you notice trespassers in defense plants, power plants, transformer plants, or railroad yards. Suspect anyone who tells you Communist-line stories that reflect on your country, its leaders, or its war aims.

Be security conscious especially if you work in a defense plant. Remember that red tape such as fingerprinting and filling out of forms is only a means of preventing sabotage and espionage. Be careful about joining a strike movement in a defense plant unless you are sure you have a legitimate grievance that outweighs any slow-down you may cause in the armament program. Inspired strikes are one of the Communists' chief weapons.

Don't sign petitions unless you know what you are doing. The Communists would love to get millions of mothers to sign a petition demanding repeal of the draft law. Perhaps a mother might conclude that the draft law was a bad thing but before she signs a petition she should be sure she is speaking her own mind and not being a dupe.

Don't join groups unless you have first investigated them. The Communists are continually forming shadowy organizations for propaganda purposes. If you can't find out just what the specific purpose of the organization is, or exactly who is behind it, give the whole thing a miss.

Be ready for an attempt to terrorize yourself and your family if war should come suddenly. What do you do? Be calm and sit tight. If you have taken the proper precautions in advance you will have right in your own home light, food, water, heat, medical supplies and means of getting correct information on what is going on.

If war comes, says Changing Times, it may bring with it an all-out terrorizing attack on industry and civilians. The two qualities that will stand the country in best stead are coolness and old-fashioned courage.

Unified Atlantic Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following letter addressed to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower by 22 prominent American businessmen concerning the necessity of a unified Atlantic defense program:

We, the undersigned members of the National Council of the Atlantic Union Committee, carry responsibility for the administration of a wide variety of American business enterprises.

Our experience in attempting to encourage the growth of national and international commerce, and to broaden the horizons of economic opportunity for all men, has given us opportunity to gain wide perspective on the organization of free society.

It is our view that there is among free nations an urgent and immediate need for a common democratic authority.

We therefore noted with deep interest your statement on your departure for Atlantic capitals: "There is power in union," and your statement on your return urging that "first priority" be given to achieving "the unity of freemen."

We wish respectfully to extend to you our sincere appreciation of the dedicated spirit with which you have accepted the supreme responsibility of commanding the forces of the free world. We are encouraged by the directness with which you have surveyed and reported on the transatlantic resources that must be pooled to preserve freedom.

We are not among those who misinterpret as defeatism the reluctance of European nations to put all their eggs in the United States basket. If we expect Europe to take this risk, it seems obvious that we should provide the strongest possible basket. Instead we have provided a committee structure, from which any nation can withdraw at any time and which has authority only to recommend and not to act. Russia is now actively engaged in publicizing and exploiting the divisions among the North Atlantic allies.

Even without the injection of Russian propaganda, the uncertainties of American foreign policy, and the contradictory statements of some American statesmen must themselves give rise to doubt around the world as to how far the United States intends actually to pursue the goal of total defense against the forces of tyranny.

We believe, with you, that the speedy construction of an adequate joint military defense in Western Europe, including American and Canadian troops, is the best medicine for the fears—both real and imagined—of the allies on whom we must depend. We believe that the Atlantic democracies should agree to an unqualified pooling of all defense resources, in order to turn blueprints into troops and build an Atlantic Army capable of deterring, or if necessary, rebuking Communist aggression in Western Europe.

The Atlantic Union Resolution, introduced last month in the Eighty-second Congress, provides the best opportunity for such agreement.

It requests President Truman to call a convention of the democracies that sponsored the Atlantic Pact to see how far they can apply among them the principles of the union to which you have referred. The full text of that resolution is enclosed and we should appreciate your comment.

It is our belief that a single Atlantic policy of defense and foreign affairs—instead of the present twelve—is vital to prevent repetition in Western Europe of the Korean misadventure.

It is our hope that the effort to create a single policy will help the United States to meet peril with characteristic American boldness and decision, and thus aid you and your associates in expediting the defense timetable for the free world.

Albert G. Agnew, Attorney at Law, San Francisco, Calif.; Percival F. Brundage, Price Waterhouse & Co., New York, N. Y.; Harry A. Bullis, Chairman of the Board, General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.; W. R. Burwell, Chairman of the Board, General Mills, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio; Will L. Clayton, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.; Gardner Cowles, President, Cowles Magazine, New York, N. Y.; W. B. Harrison, former officer, Union National Bank, Wichita, Kans.; Leland Hazard, Vice President, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Ernest M. Hopkins, Chairman of the Board, National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier, Vt.; P. W. Litchfield, Chairman of the Board, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio; Hugh Moore, Chairman of the Board, Dixie Cup Corp., Easton, Pa.; Edmund Orgill, President, Orgill Bros. & Co., Memphis, Tenn.; H. W. Prentis, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.; Gwilyn A. Price, President, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Alexander P. Reed, President, Fidelity Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Harry Scherman, President, Book-of-the-Month Club, New York, N. Y.; Walter W. Schroeder, Vice President, National Bank of Commerce, New Orleans, La.; William Stern, President, Dakota National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak.; L. A. Tobie, President, Meriden Savings Bank, Meriden, Conn.; H. F. Willkie, President, Kingan & Co., Indianapolis, Ind.; W. T. Wynn, Director, National Cotton Council of America, Greenville, Miss.; Darryl F. Zanuck, Vice President, Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., Beverly Hills, Calif.

A Parable About the Pilot Fish Points Up Dangers of Red Hunting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, let us stop, and look, and listen. Here is a warning given to us by Ernest Lindley in his column which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of February 25.

His article is as follows:

A PARABLE ABOUT THE PILOT FISH POINTS UP DANGERS OF RED HUNTING

(By Ernest Lindley)

Among the interesting people to be found in Washington—and elsewhere—are the pilot fishermen. The pilot fish are the fish which swim in front of the shark to guide him to his prey. The pilot fishermen are, of course, the men who fish for the pilot fish. We have had active pilot fisherman in Washington for at least 15 years. In recent years, the sport has become quite popular. A number of the pilot fishermen have become well known and have a gallery of admirers.

It would be generally admitted, of course, that the pilot fish is a very undesirable variety of fish. We certainly don't want the pilot fish nosing around in sensitive places. Many of us would like to exterminate them.

Undoubtedly, some people were very slow to recognize that there is such a thing as a pilot fish and even slower to realize how diligently and faithfully he works for the shark. Many others who knew of the pilot fish did not realize for a long time that the pilot fish is often very skillful in concealing his stripes.

When the net is cast for the pilot fish, it is likely to bring up a lot of other fish. Some of them may look suspiciously odd and may not be very desirable even though they are not pilot fish. Many of them are quite innocent creatures—indeed so innocent that they probably didn't even know that there were any disguised pilot fish in their vicinity.

It takes experts to distinguish a well-camouflaged pilot fish from harmless and altogether respectable varieties of fish. Among the amateur pilot fishermen in Congress and elsewhere, there are not many such experts. Being unable to distinguish camouflaged pilot fish from harmless and respectable fish, some of them conclude that every fish they bring up with their nets is a disguised pilot fish. Also, like other zealous fishermen, the amateur pilot fishermen like to boast about their catches. They are not above describing a 6-inch minnow as a leader of the pilot fish. Nor are they above spinning tales about the big ones they saw but which got away.

Some of the pilot fishermen have become fanciers of pilot fish—of reformed pilot fish, that is. They keep them around as pets and seem to regard them as the finest species of marine life. A reformed and repentant pilot fish undoubtedly is much to be preferred to an unregenerate one. But it is not easy for objective observers to comprehend why a reformed and repentant pilot fish should be regarded as nobler than all the millions of fish which had the ordinary common sense—and patriotism—never to work for the shark.

Another curious characteristic of some of the pilot fishermen is that they evince so little interest in the shark. Some of them have been opposed to buying a supply of

harpoons to kill the shark and even to dropping a net around the beach to keep him away. They have protested at the expense or scoffed at the idea that the shark would really bite. (Perhaps they fear that if the shark were killed or cornered, there would be no more pilot fish for them to have the fun of catching.) Some of them wouldn't even toss a life line to a man overboard. They seem to regard the pilot fish as more dangerous than the shark.

Let Peace Not Die of Neglect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George F. Kennan in the magazine section of the New York Times:

LET PEACE NOT DIE OF NEGLECT

(By George F. Kennan)

The air vibrates with controversy about America's proper course with respect to Russia. Much of it, it seems to me, is shallow or prejudiced or ill-conceived. It is hard to imagine that ever at any time in history has more error ever been poured out upon a single subject. And one enters with misgivings into this disorder. Where so much confusion lies about, what can we do in a few brief moments to disentangle the snarled skeins, to assemble and sort out and put together again the broken pieces of thought, to bring order out of the chaos—even assuming, which is not proven—that we might have some greater clarity in our own minds? How can we avoid adding to the bedlam, heaping confusion upon confusion?

The only hope I can see of avoiding these pitfalls lies in attempting to rethink our problem, but with a little greater depth in time than we are accustomed to give to it these days.

Thirty-three years ago—not two or three, mark you—thirty-three—there was a revolution in Russia. That revolution brought into power a political movement already committed and long and deeply committed, to an attitude of hostility toward our own social and political system and to many other things elsewhere which we believe to be essential to world stability.

It is important to recognize that we did not create that attitude, nor was there really much we could do to prevent its rise or to alter it after it appeared. It arose out of ideology and preconception, out of things which were not our doing. To say that it stemmed only from the Allied intervention in 1919, or from the way we Westerners treated the Soviet regime generally in the early years of its power, reflects a very superficial view of the origins of the Bolshevik movement.

Lenin and his associates, I am sure, would not have been grateful for the implication that their views about the capitalist world were so shallowly rooted that they could be basically altered by subjective reactions on their part to the actions of capitalist governments in the period immediately following the revolution. They would have rejected with resentment and contempt the implication that they could have been gladhanded into the abandonment of ideological principles to which they had devoted their lives.

This new political power, while not entirely a Russian phenomenon, did succeed in establishing itself in Russia and in bringing under a form of effective and stable control the energies of the peoples and the natural resources of that area. This fact—namely, that those energies and resources should have fallen under the control of a power hostile to western civilization—was a serious and disturbing thing. It presented a major complication in the progress of the west. Those of us who were professionally occupied with Russian affairs in the twenties and thirties were very much aware of that fact. Perhaps that is why we are somewhat less than impressed when we are told today, by agitated and vociferous people, that this is the fact and that we ought to be much more excited about it than we are.

The Bolshevik leaders, in accordance with their ideology, did their best, in the years that ensued after the revolution to achieve the breakdown of non-Communist power in Western Europe, in this country, and elsewhere. They operated Communist fifth-column organizations in practically every area in the world. They unleashed civil wars and revolutions wherever they saw a chance. They sowed confusion and suspicion.

They peddled bitterness and bewilderment and despair. They earned a great deal of resentment in return, and no doubt a certain amount of subversive activity directed against themselves and their system, though nothing near what they claimed. They were a nuisance and a danger to everyone else. In these circumstances everyone else—inevitably and unavoidably—was a nuisance and a danger to them. Their relations with other countries faithfully reflected that fact.

Yet for over two decades nothing frightfully crucial happened in these relations. The Bolsheviks didn't succeed in destroying anybody; nobody succeeded in destroying them. Life was awkward—unnecessarily so—but not impossible. The impact of this Bolshevik hostility and dissatisfaction upon the mellow old democracies of the west led to many remarkable and usually unpleasant things; but it did not lead to war. It was not until another violent and neurotic political movement had raised its head in a neighboring country, Germany—a movement as hostile to Soviet Russia by preconception as Soviet Russia had been hostile to the capitalist west—that major war ensued.

But then, it was not a war between Russia and the western democracies. The blow struck both Russia and the western democracies together—like a bolt of lightning, like a reminder to them, from some disgusted deity, of the tragedy and unhappiness of their division.

The war that ensued had two main consequences which we ought to note here. First, by eliminating the armed power of Germany and Japan from certain very important areas of human habitation it opened up new and delicate sources of difference and controversy between the Soviet leaders and the west. These geographic areas, which had been placed by the outcome of hostilities in what might be called a power vacuum, included certain of the world's most sensitive spots, from the strategic and political standpoint. There was no reason to suppose that agreement about their future disposition, as between Russia and the west, would be easy to achieve. There was particularly no reason to assume this, because in a totalitarian regime like that of the U. S. S. R. defensive and offensive motives are always inextricably intertwined, and the anxieties of such a regime for the safety of its own internal power prevent it from reacting normally, or even from speaking frankly, in problems of this kind. All that was known long before the war.

So there these new problems were; and they proved, indeed, to be anything but easy; and because of them it even turned out to be impossible, in the immediate postwar years, to negotiate peace treaties at all. And meanwhile the disputed territories lay there, completely vulnerable in each case, as it happened, to the armed strength of the U. S. S. R., which wholly overshadowed that of the western powers in the immediate vicinity. And there were many foreign ministers' meetings, many disputes, many disappointments, and much tension—but there was no major war.

The second consequence of World War II that I wish to mention is the establishment of the United Nations. We Americans took a leading part in this. The Russians reacted to proposals from us. You will recall that they were quite emphatic in their insistence on the veto power in the Security Council. This meant an insistence that the UN should not be used to settle security problems except where the great powers were in agreement. This applied particularly to precisely the problems we have just noted—the ones arising from the immediate dislocations of the recent war; and this was given indirect recognition in the Charter of the UN itself.

Now some of us liked these veto provisions and others didn't; but no one can say that the Soviet Government was not frank in stating its position at the time, or that we were not warned that there might be categories of problems which would be less susceptible than others of treatment in the UN forum.

Finally, we should note that when we established the UN we placed no barriers to the membership in it of Communist governments. We raised no objection to the Soviet Government's belonging to it, even though we knew it was a Communist government. We didn't ask how it had come by its power—whether by fair means or foul. We didn't ask it to disavow its ideology. We didn't even object to the admission of some of its satellites. It was clearly our view at that time that the UN was to consist of both Communist and non-Communist powers.

And we were plainly warned, I repeat, of what logic should have told us anyway: that there were distinct limitations on what such a universal organization, embracing both Communist and non-Communist governments, could be expected to achieve in this immediate post-hostilities period, and that among the things it could not be expected to do would be to serve as an invariably successful forum for the settlement of the problems arising out of the war, or for the resolution of the ideological differences between communism and all opposed to it.

Now we have on our hands today a situation the seriousness of which no one would deny. We find ourselves involved in a local military conflict, replete with the most grievous implications, over the problem of disposal of one of those disputed areas from which we required that the power of our recent adversaries be withdrawn. We are indignant over the refusal of Communist China, which is not a member of the UN, to recognize the authority of that body in the dispute, and over its action in opposing that authority by force of arms. It is worth noting that, whereas we introduced our forces into the conflict, and I think properly and wisely so, the Soviet Government did not. It has preferred to operate, to date, with the forces of its puppets.

Meanwhile, we have come to the conclusion that the general world situation is one which requires a major effort of rearmament on our part and on the part of other Western nations. With this, again, I have no quarrel. I have long believed in the necessity for such rearmament. I think it should have come, to some extent, much earlier. But what I want to get at is not the fact of rearmament, it is the rationale of it.

We know many people in this country are coming to believe that war is not only unavoidable but imminent, and that the reasons for rearmament lie not even possibly in the long-term requirements of a relationship with Communist power short of major war, but in some new and recent developments, some new elements of menace in the Soviet attitude, which entitle us to despair altogether of avoiding major war for any considerable further period.

Now this is a very difficult thing to put forth, because anyone who tries to urge caution and sobriety in the judgment of these matters is apt to be accused of having said that war is definitely not coming, that we are not going to be attacked, that our fears are baseless, that we can relax and go home.

Let me make it plain. I am saying none of these things. Of course war is possible. Of course no one can say that we will not be attacked or that major war will not develop from the impetus and the cumulative complications of this situation. Who can say for sure what is in the minds of the Soviet leaders? Who can guarantee their behavior? Who can assure that they, peering out at the world through the muddied and myopic lenses of their bitter and fear-ridden ideology, have not come to the conclusion themselves that war is unavoidable? From such a conclusion anything could flow.

My purpose is not to make a plea for any certainty of a continued absence of major war. It is to make a plea against the assumption of any certainty that war cannot be avoided. It is to plead that before we assume that the world situation has turned basically and irrevocably against the chances of peace we make absolutely sure that we know what we're doing—that we test our views and retest them, putting aside all emotion and irritation and everything subjective—that we take care to see that we are not being carried away here by false assumptions or short memories or emotion.

Let us look carefully at these things which are often cited as the sources of despair.

It is true that the Kremlin is hostile and secretive, and a constant source of worry, danger, and annoyance to us all; it has been that way for 33 years.

It is true that Western Europe is overshadowed by Soviet armed strength; it has been that way since 1945, and to some extent even earlier.

It is true that Russia has the atomic bomb. Did we then lack warning of this development? Does anybody suppose that we were in a position to assume, let us say 3 years ago, that they would not have it; that they would refrain from developing it out of some delicate regard for our feelings? I am not saying that these things are pleasant. I am asking whether they are new or unexpected.

It is true that the Kremlin unleashed its Korean puppets against the South Korean Republic. But there is nothing in this fact which is out of accord with the pattern of Soviet behavior we have known for three decades. At no time has there been any reason to suppose that they would not do this sort of thing, if circumstances seemed propitious. The assertion was made in a magazine article 3 years ago that the main concern of the Kremlin was to make sure that it has filled every nook and cranny available to it in the basin of world power. There was no objective reason to assume that the Soviet leaders would leave the Korean nook unfilled if they thought they had a chance of filling it at relatively minor risk to themselves and saw time running out on them. I am not trying to justify their action. I am challenging our right to be surprised about it or to call it a manifestation of some new aggressiveness on the part of the Soviet Union.

Finally, it is true that Communist China has defied the United Nations. It is true that Communist China has committed acts in Korea which no one can condone and for which its leaders bear the gravest responsibility. If anyone needed proof that these Chinese Communist leaders are behaving hysterically and violently, with a distorted concept of the interests of their own people, and with no understanding at all for the nature and ideals of the non-Communist world, they have it, of course, in these events in Korea.

But the question at issue here is not, and has never been, whether the Chinese Communists were nice people. The question lies in the amount of damage they are capable of doing, and are apt to do, to world stability. The question lies, for us, in the extent of the threat: in the measure of what we might call the intrinsic tolerances of the far eastern area against the effects of these tortured and neurotic attitudes we see in Peiping, and of what then remains to be done, and can only be done, by outside forces, and how much of that is within our capabilities.

Are we sure we have this so carefully figured out? Are we sure we have calculated correctly all the factors involved? China is a strange entity. She is called a world power, and doubtless deserves that designation from the standpoint of cultural and spiritual resources in her people. Actually she is the only country so considered which does not have the wherewithal to manufacture the sinews of her own military strength on a great-power scale. She has to get her major weapons from outside. I dare say that to date a considerable portion has come from us. Must that always be? It is true that China's resources as of today, while limited, are not negligible, and that they are in the hands of people who are foolish and excited and irresponsible. That is a dangerous and worrisome fact. But let us measure realistically the actual extent of this danger; let us be guided by that alone, and not by irritation over the fact that they are foolish and excited and irresponsible. They are not the first people that we have known that were that way, and they will not be the last; and we are not the keepers of their souls.

Now all of this might conceivably add up to the necessity for another world war; but before we decide that it does, let us be terribly, terribly sure we are right. In the old carpenter guilds there was a principle that you should measure seven times before you cut once. Are we sure we have measured here for the seventh time, or even for the third or the second? This is no time to make a false incision. The material will bear no more than one mistake.

A major American weekly recently devoted an article to combating the theory that coexistence with the present Soviet system may be possible. It attacked the Secretary of State for adhering to what it called "this pernicious fallacy." It called upon the President to drive from his councils at long last "all who have sold and fed him on the pap of coexistence with Soviet communism."

Now these are tricky words, and no one can ever be entirely sure what they mean. But if they mean what I take them to mean, I would range myself squarely and emphatically with the culprits: with the objects of these attacks and criticisms. What is the phenomenon of extremism and despair with which we are confronted?

Can this be realism, or is it a shrinking away from the first harsh implications of world leadership? Whoever said that world leadership would be easy or comfortable? Coextensive with Soviet communism, as we have seen above, has been possible for 33 years. I do not know whether it will continue to be possible for a long time to come. But I would submit that these people who wrote this article do not know for sure that it won't; and in attempting to persuade the public that it won't they have taken upon their shoulders a grievous responsibility and one which I should never wish to have on mine.

They should not try to comfort themselves and their readers with the flimsy pretense that this counsel of despair does not mean war. It does; and if this is the view they are going to take, let them have the forthrightness with themselves and with others to come out and say that what they are talking about is war and tell us how and to what ends and with what resources they propose we conduct that war, and how we are to assure the agreement of the members of a great coalition to a course founded on preconceptions which they do not share, and how a better world is supposed to emerge from the other end of this entire process.

But better still, for them and for all of us, would be not to take this view at all; to admit that the dimness of our vision gives us the right neither to a total optimism nor to a total pessimism, and that our duty to ourselves and to the hopes of mankind lies in avoiding, like the soul of evil itself, that final bit of impatience which tells us to yield the last positions of hope before we have been pressed from them by unanswerable force.

As long as there is a one-thousandth chance that a major world conflict can be avoided—and I hold the chance far greater than that—let us guard that chance like the apple of our eye—let us remain considerate of the hopeful possibilities as well as the discouraging ones—let it not be said of us that we allowed any hope for the avoidance of war to die, like an unwanted and unappreciated child, by abandonment and neglect.

I know that this is the view which has been held by my former associates in the Department of State, and that they will continue, despite all discouragements and opposition, to act on this. If these efforts succeed, the world will have been spared a great catastrophe. If they fail, there will always be time for the other things, the unhappy things, later.

Resolution of Society of Old Brooklynites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Society of Old Brooklynites, which I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues.

I heartily endorse this resolution.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OFFICE MUST BE MAINTAINED IN BROOKLYN

Whereas it has been stated on reliable authority that the Veterans' Administration in Washington plans to remove the Brooklyn regional office of the Veterans' Administration from Brooklyn; and

Whereas the present Brooklyn regional office is located at 33 Ryerson Street, in a building which may have to be taken over by the Mergenthaler Linotype Co. for war work; and

Whereas nothing should interfere with speedy mobilization measures, and no objection is interposed, so long as the Brooklyn regional office remains in Brooklyn: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Society of Old Brooklynites, in meeting assembled, Wednesday evening, February 7, 1951, goes on record as objecting to the removal of the Veterans' Administration regional office from Brooklyn.

Labor Leaders Balk Efforts To Halt Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the eminently fair, if not dangerously soft, wage control formula determined by Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston, the AFL-CIO United Labor Policy Committee continues to balk at any participation whatsoever in efforts to halt inflation and get the Nation on an adequate war basis.

The United Labor Policy Committee has taken this attitude obviously because labor leaders in the United States intend to dictate, if they can, the whole wartime economic policy of the Federal Government.

What other interpretation can be put upon their action, when it is universally conceded that in a free Nation like ours, no really effective attempt can be made to create a wartime economy, without the consent and loyal support of labor, as well as of business and industry? We are either a Nation united, or a Nation disunited. There can be nothing halfway about it.

The vote to continue and make complete the labor boycott of participation in the war effort—for that is what the vote amounted to—was taken by the AFL-CIO United Labor Policy Committee. It was not taken by the vast membership of organized labor. I do not think for an instant that the action of the committee represented the attitudes or opinions of labor's rank and file.

If the United Labor Policy Committee persists in its present attitude of sabotaging the effort to create an effective national defense, and thus to preserve the Union, I believe its members soon will feel the wrath of labor unionists throughout the country.

Especially will this be true if the United Labor Policy Committee passes the word to union officials everywhere that now is the time to call a strike, and help to assert the complete political ascendancy of labor unions in the United States.

Ballot results in last fall's election proved beyond any doubt that American labor unionists consider themselves Americans first, and unionists afterward. Labor leader members of the AFL-CIO United Labor Policy Committee would show good judgment, if they should refer this question of policy back to the membership of all union locals.

It is my conviction that the answer they would get would cause them to reverse themselves in a hurry. The rank and file of labor would tell them to get back in there and pitch. At the same time, no doubt, they would be instructed to keep up the pressure, by legitimate means, for greater labor participation in the councils of Government boards and agencies responsible for mobilization and the economic controls of temporary value in making that mobilization possible.

Stalin and his Politburo must be watching with broad grins this evidence that American labor leaders are thinking first of political power, and last of all the welfare of their country. If this attitude is continued for long, the American people may begin to doubt the protestations of labor leaders that the unions have been purged of communism.

The American people are likely to doubt, because they know that Eric Johnston has provided in his formula for cost-of-living escalator wage contracts, for fringe benefits in the way of health, welfare, and pension plans, and for adjustment of hardships and inequities on a case-by-case basis.

These concessions are greater than those being granted to any other segment of the American public. What more can the labor leaders ask?

A Prayer of Thanksgiving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "A Prayer of Thanksgiving," which was composed by Irvin E. Perigo, Indiana's poet-pianist, and read on Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, 1951, at Lincoln City Park, Ind.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING

Where our flag of freedom flies,
'Neath the soft blue Hoosier skies;
Where the birds sing songs of cheer,
O'er the grave we hold so dear,
We would look to God to pray
In our own true Hoosier way:

"God of heaven and of earth,
Thanks! to Thee for Lincoln's birth;
Thanks! to Thee for holy love
Sent this mother, from above;
Guiding Abe in childhood days;
Keeping him in wholesome ways,
That he might fulfill each task;
Do whatever Thou might ask.

"God of heaven and of earth,
Thanks! to Thee for Lincoln's birth."

So, we bring our flowers today,
O'er this mother's grave to lay;
As we look through grateful tears,
Back through all those stirring years;
Back to Lincoln's humble birth—
Love's gift to a needy earth.

So, our joys and tears today,
Bind us, as we humbly pray:

"God of heaven and of earth,
Thanks! to Thee for Lincoln's birth.
Amen."

—IRVIN E. PERIGO,
Indiana's Poet-Pianist.

Modern American Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many stories of bravery have come out of Korea during the past 8 months. Since these acts of heroism on the part of our boys occur in our own days and under the tension of world events, it is perhaps a little difficult for us to evaluate them fully and to realize how each of these heroic deeds contribute to the safeguarding of our freedom. Many nations are fighting side by side in Korea against a common and ruthless enemy. Men of different religious beliefs and different races have joined in the struggle for a free world. This, in itself, should be encouraging to all of us.

A story depicting the experiences in Korea of an American marine of the Jewish faith was recently written by Billy Rose in one of his famous columns Pitching Horseshoes. I think it is one of the great stories of bravery to come out of Korea, a story of sacrifice involving a Jewish corporal and his Irish captain. It is also a story of faith. I am sure my colleagues will enjoy reading this brief but very human and characteristically American story of present-day heroism. It is as follows:

YOM KIPPUR IN KOREA

(By Billy Rose)

When Eleanor and I were in Tokyo a little over a year ago, we got to know Col. Anthony Story, General MacArthur's pilot. This morning I got a letter from Tony with a Korea date line and it contained a story which I think is worth passing along.

In one of the Marine Corps regiments which recently slugged into Inchon there was a corporal named Abraham Geller who had been brought up a nickel phone call away from Delancey Street. Abe is the son of a rabbi, and even at the front where sleep is the most important thing in the world, he never failed to wake a half hour before his buddies and go through the ritual of the orthodox morning prayers.

On September 20, Abe's regiment crossed the Han and cut the Seoul-Kaesong road and, what with snipers in every rice paddy, by dusk the men were glad to dig in and catch a few hours of clammy sleep—especially since they knew that the drive for the Korean capital itself was scheduled for sunup.

An hour before dawn, aside from the sentries, only two men in the company were awake: Corporal Geller, bent over his prayer book, and Capt. George O'Connor, surveying the terrain and figuring out how best to deploy his troops in the coming action.

When Abe was finished, the captain said, "Go back to the chow truck and get yourself a cup of coffee."

"Thanks, Captain," said Geller, "but today's Yom Kippur, and I'm not supposed to eat until sundown."

"You mean to say you're going to fast the day we bust into Seoul?" said the captain.

The East Sider grinned. "I figure I've got enough calories packed away for 24 hours," he said.

Well, as the papers have told you, the marines ran into plenty of trouble the first day of the drive, and along about sundown Captain O'Connor's men were inching their way across a field littered with dead North Koreans. One of the Commies, however, though badly wounded, was only playing dead, and as the officer came within range he rolled over on his side and aimed his pistol.

Abe, who was only a few feet from his commanding officer, saw the body move. He jerked his bayonet out of his belt and made a dive for the enemy soldier, but in finishing him off he got the three bullets which had been intended for O'Connor.

The captain did the best he could for Abe, but at this stage the situation was what military commentators called "fluid," and it was almost 3 hours before the corporal got a shot of penicillin and was carried to a hospital tent.

The operation lasted over an hour, and when the surgeon finally came out Captain O'Connor was waiting for him.

"How does it look?" he asked.

"The kid's doing fine," said the surgeon.

"I figured he was done for," said O'Connor.

"So did I," said the surgeon. "The bullets went through his abdomen and several loops of intestine and wounds like that are generally fatal if penicillin isn't administered pretty fast. The spillage almost always causes peritonitis."

"I don't get all the words," said the captain, "but his pulling through seems like something of a miracle."

"In a manner of speaking it is," said the surgeon. "Geller owes his life to the fact that when he was shot there was hardly any food in his stomach."

Resolution of the New York Young Democratic Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following resolution, adopted on January 31, 1951, at a regular meeting of the New York Young Democratic Club.

I heartily endorse the views expressed therein.

The resolution reads as follows:

The New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., resolves, That the United States should give to the people of India the 2,000,000 tons of wheat it needs to prevent famine. This food should be sent at once and with no political strings attached.

Regardless of any differences we have with India over China or otherwise, let us not defame ourselves by giving even a shred of justification to the charge that we could let people die of hunger because their government did not vote as we would like it to vote.

Let us not as a government do what no decent American would do himself if it were his personal responsibility to give or withhold out of his surplus food for men, women, and children dying of hunger.

Let us rather hereby reaffirm our belief in the dignity of the individual man.

Proposed Amendments to Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several editorials regarding the proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act.

These include editorials from the Washington Star, Indianapolis News, New Orleans Item, Christian Science Monitor, and Newark News.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of January 19, 1951]

WE MIGHT NEED THEM TO SURVIVE

The Department of Defense has gone about as far as it reasonably could be expected to go in the direction of sparing 18-year-olds from combat service. The bill which Defense Secretary Marshall has proposed would guarantee that no draftee under 19 would be sent into combat without adequate training. This provision, General Marshall assured Congress, "would virtually wipe out, except in time of dire emergency, the probability that any young man brought into the service in the early days of this program would go into combat before he was 19." Presumably the Department's policy will be to give every draftee considerably more than the minimum 4 months of basic training before he becomes eligible to be sent overseas.

This is a sensible modification of the Department's original plan for induction of 18-year-olds for training and service. The program combines universal training with selective service in such a way as to provide not only the men needed to build up our present forces to required strength, but to provide a permanent pool of trained citizen-soldiers in reserve. Strong reaction had developed in Congress, however, against lowering the draft age without a statutory restriction against sending the younger men into combat. The congressional reaction reflected an understandable reluctance of parents to having youths of 18 thrust into the midst of war's horrors.

Conditions being as they are today, however, the time conceivably might come when we would need the services in combat of every able-bodied citizen, regardless of age. Secretary Marshall was not stating an empty fear when he warned that a legislative prohibition against use of men under 19 could "cripple the services in meeting a sudden, ruthless, and violent action by our possible enemy." If such an extreme emergency should develop, the Army's hands should not be tied by well-meant but risky limitations on use of younger men.

[From the Indianapolis News of January 12, 1951]

THE BEST AGE FOR SERVICE

Building projected Army Ground Forces of 3,500,000 men will require drastic expansion of the present exemption-hedged Selective Service Act. A Senate Armed Services subcommittee now is being acquainted with the hard fact that unless 18-year-olds are made eligible for service young married men and veterans of World War II, up to 35, will have to be called.

In the interests of equity, of physical and mental capacity, and of obtaining the maximum amount of service at an age which would cause the minimum of disruption to individual lives and to the national economy, the Defense Department's proposal to build up the Armed Forces with 18-year-olds is inescapably logical. The proposal, as outlined by Secretary of Defense George Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg, properly would not only fill present emergency requirements but also would create a long-needed, permanent reserve of trained manpower.

Secretary Marshall told the Senators that a system of "universal military service and training represents what I believe is the best way to meet our immediate need for enlarged combat forces and at the same time to provide an enduring base for our military strength." In other words, the combination of immediate draft authority and universal youth training on a reserve basis would end the dangerous cycles of complete demobilization of strength which have so weakened the Nation in the last generation.

Since 1945 this newspaper has been a consistent advocate of universal military training for the Nation's youth. It probably is not too much to say that had an adequate system of this kind been in operation, giving the United States a ready reserve of trained men, the Reds would not have dared to attack in Korea. Instead, our weakness invited attack and our reverses can be traced to our own blindness and unpreparedness.

With or without total war, the next decade will be for our country one of constant threat and alarm, in which we can afford no longer not to be prepared for the worst. It is with common prudence, therefore, that the Defense Department is urging on Congress manpower-skill training legislation broad enough to take care of the future, as well as the urgent necessities of the moment. The resultant law should not be of the piecemeal character of past efforts. Too long the United States has suffered from short-term military policies, expedients, and improvisations. Universal service, at the age when it can most easily be borne, is the best answer.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Item of January 17, 1951]

NEW DRAFT REQUEST—FOR BOYS OF 18: A UNIFORM

The immediacy of the danger we face is driven home again by Secretary Marshall's urgent request for the drafting of 18-year-olds.

The simple fact is that the Armed Forces are working for a goal of 3,500,000 men in uniform within the next 6 months. And the present draft law can't supply that many.

A substantial proportion of the 9,000,000 men registered in the 19-through-25 bracket are subject to deferment. This group includes veterans, reservists, those who hold essential jobs in industry, those responsible for the support of dependents, and those who fall short physically or mentally.

The deferment policy can be tightened, and the length of service for draftees, now 20 months, can be extended. Still the current reservoir will not supply the necessary manpower.

For this reason the Defense Department is requesting immediate military service for 18-year-olds, starting with a draft of 450,000. (More than a million youths reach 18 annually, but present standards would permit calling only 700,000.)

Secretary Marshall says "Universal military service and training represents what I believe is the best way to meet our immediate needs for enlarged combat forces and at the same time to provide an enduring base for our military strength."

Marshall is speaking of permanent legislation designed to provide the greatest long-term security with the lowest cost in men and money.

The general's proposal is not pleasant news. But we are facing a fight for survival—a fight that calls for both immediate and long-range strength.

It is clear, as the nonpartisan Committee on the Present Danger recently declared, "the time has come for a new concept that universal service in defense of our freedom is a privilege and an obligation of our young men."

Marshall's plan is designed to further this concept and yet create the least possible interference with family life and with the Nation's ability to produce for defense.

There would be hardships, of course, particularly in education, although the plan includes these provisions:

For the first 3 years, 75,000 youths a year would be deferred—after basic training—to study medicine, the sciences and other needed specialties. Others already studying in these fields would be deferred upon graduation in sufficient numbers to meet civilian requirements.

The Navy's officer training program in civilian colleges would be expanded to cover the other services.

The services would send another 50,000 to colleges for training that would help the military.

Many of those drafted would probably go to college after their tour of duty; others would not resume their education.

Any way you look at it, colleges would be hard hit, and some might be forced to close their doors.

But, in a sense, that is only another side to the sacrifices that must be made by the hundreds of thousands of individual boys who normally would be thronging the classrooms.

We must face up to the fact that preserving the peace or winning the war, if it comes, will require many harsh programs. Freedom does not come cheap or easy.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of January 23, 1951]

SOMEBODY HAS TO SERVE

These are times when the human mind finds few painless answers to the challenges and all of the answers call for courage. These are times, also, of decision. And the necessity of decision brings all the contradictions of wishful thinking out in the open. It is not a happy season for Congress.

Congress knows it dare not fail to provide the Nation with military manpower sufficient to meet today's crisis and the probability of continuing crises over an unknown number of years. Yet it is being bombarded by constituents who urge earnestly that 18-year-olds are too young for actual military service, by others who demand that neither veterans nor fathers shall be drafted, and by colleges which, fearing an unbridgeable period devoid of male students, plead for broad deferments.

Secretary Marshall's order permitting students to enlist in the service of their choice even after being called for preinduction examination should end the current wave of panic enlistments. But the long-term outlook for the colleges is still undecided, and the struggle between the champions of the 18-year-olds and of the veterans and fathers still goes on.

For the immediate build-up it is hard to defend further exemption of young veterans of brief noncombat service who have not acquired family responsibilities. Perhaps their inclusion in the draft might permit assuring 6 months' training to 18-year-olds before they are sent outside the country.

As for the needs of the long haul: We have yet to hear of any system other than near-universal service for at least 2 years and beginning at age 18 which would maintain the Armed Forces' ranks in a ready condition and build the pool of trained reserves against an all-out war, and do both jobs with so little disruption of the Nation's social and economic structure.

One thing is certain: Any answer to the military services problem will demand sacrifices of many. We think the American people are readier to make them than Congressmen's mail may indicate.

[From the Newark (N. J.) News of January 13, 1951]

UMST AND THE COLLEGES

On the same day that Secretary of Defense Marshall introduced before the Senate subcommittee on preparedness the plan for compulsory universal military service and training, the Association of American Colleges in Atlantic City was drawing up a "declaration on manpower." The Defense Department's plan was for 27 months of training and service by all able-bodied youths from the time they reached the age of 18. The colleges, representing 650 institutions, were for keeping the induction age of 19, and for keeping the draft out of certain professional schools.

The Department of Defense in its UMST plan has taken cognizance of the need to "keep the educational pipeline from drying up." As the plan was discussed before the same subcommittee by Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, it does not meet the wish of the colleges to keep the induction age at 19. But it does provide that in each of the first 3 years, after 4 months of preliminary training, the President may suspend temporarily the rest of their service to 75,000 youths to permit them to complete college courses, at the conclusion of which they would have to put in their remaining military service. Further, there is the implication that the colleges may get as many as 50,000 military personnel not connected with UMST, to pursue "specialties of value to the military."

Admitting that national welfare must come first, the colleges express the view that there should be deferment for students in professional schools of theology, medicine, dentistry and related health fields, and in the graduate schools in mathematics, engineering, and physical and biological sciences. They urge also that youth, generally, after basic training, be furloughed to the colleges of their choices for further training.

It is obvious that as this proposal by General Marshall is crystallized into legislation, the colleges cannot get all they want. But it is plain that the attitude of the Government toward them is sympathetic, and that some way may be found whereby weaker private institutions will not be driven to the wall by depletion of their student bodies. The very emergency that projects universal military training cannot be adequately met at the price of a partial educational collapse.

The Marshall-Rosenberg program represents a real advance, from the point of view of the colleges. Once in effective operation, it would be far better than the present inchoate mixture of draft, enlistment, Reserves, and National Guard. But college administrators and trustees will, for the visible future, face enormous difficulties.

Delaware Senator, Foe of Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article concerning the very distinguished and able senior United States Senator from the State of Delaware, the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

This article was written by the very able columnist, Herman A. Lowe, and appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 24, 1951:

DELAWARE SENATOR, FOE OF WASTE, SHOWS UP COSTLY CHEESE NONSENSE

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, February 24.—They pay considerable attention in the Senate when JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the thin man from Delaware, begins to speak. This grain dealer-solon from the second smallest State in the United States of America, talks in a dry, slightly harsh voice and with hardly more oratorical gesture than a cigar store Indian.

What counts is not how he says it, but what he has to say. For he's a quiet Galahad on behalf of the taxpayer's buck. He tilts endlessly against waste and extravagance and, unlike some of his colleagues, votes the way he talks.

He was up again, briefly, this past week with a typically WILLIAMS piece of information. He had learned that the 50,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese which this Government sold at a price of 15 cents per pound although our Government had purchased it as surplus for about 31 cents a pound.

But it was the second part of what he said which was the snapper.

At the same time our Government was holding this cheese off the American market to keep up prices to the American housewife, and selling at half cost to a foreign nation, American food firms were forced to import about 13,000,000 pounds of the very same kind of cheese.

They got it from the British Commonwealth units of Canada and New Zealand at prices ranging from 21 to 37 cents per pound, as contrasted with the price at which we were selling it to Britain.

It was similar to the instance brought up recently by another Senator that we were exporting surplus butter at 17 cents a pound while American housewives paid up to 80 cents.

WILLIAMS first teed off, a couple of years back, against the Federal pension system which was then—and probably is yet—shot full of inequities.

He brought out such examples as the substitute mail carrier who contributed $116.11 to the fund. On the basis of his normal life expectancy, WILLIAMS pointed out, he would get a total of $17,850 from the fund. Another employee, who had contributed a total of $72.86 to the fund, was drawing an annual pension of $251.64.

A year later WILLIAMS disclosed that the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation showed a discrepancy of more than $366,000,000. A lot of it subsequently proved due to the world's worst bookkeeping system, but considerable money was collected from private debtors and accounts were straightened out with other Federal departments and agencies which owed CCC.

By mid-1950, unaccounted-for items were down to $96,440,497; the administration felt it ought to just write this off so as to get the books back into balance. WILLIAMS raised the roof and the work of trying to clear up the accounts goes on.

WILLIAMS has attacked the Maritime Commission, whose records rival those of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Thanks to his goading, the Commission collected for the taxpayers several million dollars owed by private business firms.

Although a dealer in grain and from a State with considerable agriculture, WILLIAMS has fearlessly attacked what he regards as wasteful farm subsidies.

He's quite a guy.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of New York Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of February 17, 1951:

MIGHTIEST FLEET HAILS NAVY YARD, 150 YEARS OLD—ITS FIRST WARSHIP, FRIGATE, HAD 74 GUNS, AND NOW IT CONVERTS HUGE CARRIERS

(By Edward J. Mowery)

A workman in a yellow helmet surveyed the teeming, 288-acre New York Naval Shipyard today, threw out his chest, and observed:

"Next Friday we're goin' to be bustin' out all over. Team work—that's the answer."

Across the network of streets, ways, and drydocks which punch their way into the brine of Wallabout Bay, Rear Adm. Paul B. Nibecker, commander of the world's largest shipyard, agreed.

"Yes, because of excellent teamwork through the years, we'll proudly commemorate this yard's one hundred and fiftieth anniversary February 23, and at the same time try to dispel the element of mystery inside our gates.

"There's a lot of big stuff going on in here, but we don't use any mirrors."

CARRIERS STRESSED

The admiral—an expert naval architect—conceded that a lot has happened to the seagoing silhouette since Robert Fulton's 2,000-ton "floating teakettle" first slipped down the Brooklyn yard ways in 1815.

"The emphasis," he said, "is on carriers, which have more than demonstrated their value in Korea. And this is the Nation's lead design yard for carriers. We've modernized one, two other similar jobs are under way—*Wasp* and *Bennington*—and we have information that we'll take care of others.

"It's a 3-year converting program and each modernization costs around $38,000,000. We're removing gun turrets to equip the flat-tops with escalators, installing stronger catapults, arresting gear, and flight decks to handle bigger planes.

"And * * * one of these days we're going to put a new slogan on our letterhead. We'll call this the Can Do Yard.

SLOGAN JUSTIFIED

Glorious tradition, accompanying America's rise in sea supremacy, more than justifies use of the slogan at the New York base, established in 1801 on a 42-acre plot of land purchased from John Jackson, a shipbuilder.

Three years before, Jackson built a small frigate (the *Adams*) for the Government in the tiny yard made up of swamps and mud flats. The yard didn't mature until 1812, when the Nation's second vital conflict thrust the construction of more than 100 vessels upon its limited facilities.

The challenge was met and conquered by ingenuity, improvisations and sweat. And in 1817 the yard began work on its first naval vessel—the 74-gun frigate *Ohio*, largest ship built in this country up to that time.

In the ensuing years of peace the navy yard flexed its muscles with new shops and a $2,000,000 drydock (completed in 1851). Then came the Civil War's unprecedented demands for 16 new fighting craft and 416 conversions of merchant ships. Again the New York yard, employing 5,500 trained workers, spewed forth fighting craft.

With the ebb and flow of peace and war, the New York shipyard responded with appropriate facilities and personnel. Lawns and trophy halls which delighted sightseers gave way to larger shops, railroad tracks, and piers. Fast building ways blossomed and gargantuan drydocks, which overcame substrata quicksand, dotted the cavernous water front.

When the rumble of war swept the Continent in 1917, the yard was one of America's top naval workshops. Employment jumped to 18,000. One herculean task was construction of 40 submarine chasers to meet the U-boat threat.

And as American sea power grew, so did the keels of powerful dreadnaughts. Up to this time, the yard had launched 50 vessels of varying tonnage and armor, starting with the line ship *Ohio*. They included sloops, cutters, paddle-wheel steamers, torpedo boats, cruisers, and the venerable but deadly battleship *New York* (1912).

BIG BATTLE WAGONS

From 1915 to 1922, eyes of the naval world focused on activities in the Brooklyn yard, where five first-class battleships with tremendous fire power were taking shape. They were the *Arizona*, *New Mexico*, *Tennessee*, *South Dakota*, and *Indiana*.

Then came the disarmament conference which halted work on the last two vessels, February 8, 1922. They were one-third finished.

As air power became more potent in the late 1930's, the New York shipyard kept abreast.

From December 7, 1941, to 1945, the yard repaired more than 5,000 ships, converted 250 others and turned out these battlewagons—*North Carolina*, *Iowa*, and "*Mighty Mo*," on whose deck the Japs signed their unconditional surrender.

PARADE OF CARRIERS

The carrier parade picked up immediately. Three were of the Essex class (*Bennington*, *Bon Homme Richard*, and *Kearsarge*). The *Franklin D. Roosevelt* followed, and the last, the *Oriskany*, has just undergone complete modernization.

At the peak of the yard's World War II production, 69,000 workers manned the maze of building ways, drydocks, and foundries.

Next week, national, State and city officials will pay tribute to the rich traditions of the New York yard which has contributed so much to America's safety and strength.

AS A WORKER PUTS IT

Gazing at one of the grayish hulks in drydock, Robert E. Hanlon, 69, of 1517 East Twenty-ninth Street, Brooklyn, put it another way:

"I came to work here 46 years ago and I've watched all kinds of ships slide down the ways. They've been awfully good to me—the Navy personnel. And we've always tried to do the job well.

"I'll never forget working on the first oil engines for the battlewagon *Arizona*. We built 'em under the supervision of Adm. Chester Nimitz. And when I read about him in the last war, I wasn't surprised. He's brilliant and has a fine personality."

"You know," the public works foreman added softly, "I get just as big a thrill at seeing a modern craft launched as I did the older type vessels. You get sort of a patriotic chill that runs up and down your spine."

History of the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the story of the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R. I., has been told many times. It is appropriate, however, that we repeat it today.

I am therefore placing in the RECORD the story as told in the Metropolitan Star of February 1951.

UNCLE SAM GOES TO SYNAGOGUE: HISTORY OF A NEWPORT SHRINE

(We celebrate Washington's Birthday this week. The Touro Synagogue in Newport is now a national shrine. Its worshipers played important parts in our revolutionary cause and in 1790 Washington visited the synagogue. It was in a letter to this synagogue that he quoted his never-forgotten words: "For, happily, the Government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanctions." It is fitting therefore, that we review the history of this national shrine in Newport during the week of Washington's Birthday.)

One hundred and eighty-eight years ago a small group of Jews gathered for their first service in their new synagogue in Newport, R. I. This was their first temple in their new land. Most of their fathers and mothers and some of them had fled religious persecution in the Old World and had found respite and a new home in this newest of lands—America. For over a hundred years now they had lived in freedom and tolerance in this land and had worshiped God in their own fashion—in the same manner as had Abraham and all his seed.

But previously the worship of God had been carried on in one or another private home. The members of the congregation had prospered in the new land, and now they decided to build a new temple to praise the Almighty. One of the finest architects of the day, Peter Harrison, was called in to design the synagogue.

This first house of worship of the Sephardic Jewish colony in Newport weathered many of the storms breaking over the handful of colonies, which later became a federation of States, and today stands out as one of the spiritual, moral, and physical leaders of the world. Recently the Government of the United States, recognizing the fact that the temple had lived the history of this country and survived as the oldest synagogue in America, designated the Touro Synagogue a national historic site.

TOURO FIRST RABBI

After the founding of the synagogue, in 1763, the congregation asked Isaac Touro, an immigrant from Holland, to act as its first rabbi. He led the congregation until

1780, when the Revolutionary War caused the temporary closing of the temple. Touro left Newport and went to New York to act as rabbi for the Shearith Israel congregation. Later he migrated to Kingston, on the West Indian island of Jamaica, where he died.

Many members of the congregation took part in our Nation's early struggle for liberty. They included soldiers, businessmen, and financiers. Aaron Lopez, one of the latter, sacrificed his entire personal fortune to further the American cause.

In 1790, George Washington visited the synagogue and later wrote its congregation an expression of religious liberty, which is as valid today as it was on the day Washington wrote it. It reads:

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship.

"It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights."

NO SANCTION TO BIGOTRY

"For, happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Although Touro had left the country, his family remained associated with the temple. Both sons became leading citizens of the country as well as of the Jewish community. After Isaac Touro's death, his wife, Reyna, and his sons, Judah and Abraham, returned to Boston. The youngest brother remained in the East, but Judah, after one business voyage for his uncle, decided to set up in business for himself and went off to New Orleans. Here, despite the fact that Jews were theoretically barred from the city, under an old colonial law, Judah became a successful businessman and a prominent civic leader. In the defense of the city against the British during the War of 1812, he was one of the 13 men wounded among the American forces.

During his convalescence, Judah, who had by this time become a wealthy man, decided to use his wealth for philanthropic purposes. His first act was to purchase the land and building of the local Unitarian Church, whose minister was his friend. After the sale, which was forced by the church's indebtedness, he turned it back to the Unitarian congregation. Some years later after a fire had destroyed the building, he supplied the Christian congregation with another house of worship.

His donation of $10,000 toward the completion of the Bunker Hill Monument received great publicity—so great, in fact, that Touro told his old friend, the Unitarian minister, that he would like to take back the money because he had been promised anonymity, and the publicity disturbed him.

HELPED ALL FAITHS

Under Touro's inspiration, New Orleans established, in 1853, a Hebrew Foreign Mission Society to help Jews abroad. A year earlier, he had bought a large estate and built a hospital there, which he left to the city upon his death. During the last years of his life, he donated a considerable sum to Mount Sinai Hospital in New York. His will provided for over $200,000 for Jewish purposes and another $150,000 for various Christian and nonsectarian charities.

Both Judah and his brother donated funds for the upkeep of the Touro Synagogue, which was named for their father. In his will Judah left $75,000 to the congregation for the cemetery and the salary of the rabbi of the synagogue, while Abraham left $10,000 to the State of Rhode Island to maintain the building and another $5,000 for the city of Newport to repair the street leading to it.

The building itself is considered one of the finest examples of colonial architecture. Its designer had previously built King's Chapel in Boston and Christ Church in Cambridge. The woodwork in the synagogue is all hand carved and the masonic structure of the building follows the Temple of Jerusalem. Twelve columns, each a solid tree trunk, represent the 12 tribes of Israel. The central candelabrum is wrought of silver and is a beautiful example of contemporary art. No metal was used in the building, every unit was dovetailed and joined by dowel.

Although the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior will aid in caring for the synagogue, the ownership of the building will remain with the congregation and it will continue to be used as a place of worship.

Bled White by Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Michigan Tradesman, a widely read semimonthly business publication which well expresses opinions of business and professional people of my State. This editorial, "Are We Being Bled White by New Taxes To Protect a Europe That Won't Defend Itself?" should be read by every Member of Congress. The editorial follows:

ARE WE BEING BLED WHITE BY NEW TAXES TO PROTECT A EUROPE THAT WON'T DEFEND ITSELF?

Once upon a time we had a President who told us "all we have to fear is fear itself." Through the years this advice has given the people of the United States a kind of false courage to undertake and do things beyond their capacity and beyond the bounds of common sense. Wishful thinking by the man who thought up the nifty saying and on the part of others whom he influenced, has helped to get the country into its present nightmare of confusion.

At this time the people of the United States crave leadership in which they can have confidence. If ever a big man were needed, he is needed today—a man of clear thinking, sound common sense, acquainted with history, with knowledge of economics, business, finance, domestic and foreign commerce, the science of government, fundamentals of law. This man should not be so self-confident and willful that he will not seek and accept good advice.

We have been through an era of dreams. We have followed leaders, who, doubtless with good intentions, led us into uncharted courses fraught with unseen dangers. They started with the faulty notion that other peoples are like Americans and that they will react to certain conditions as our own people do. They thought all peoples loved peace so greatly that they would take any kind of sensible action to attain and preserve peace, when all history teaches us that mankind seldom is without wars.

And so, today we have a United Nations organization which is supposed to represent all nations but doesn't, because Communists cannot join in any endeavor with non-Communists. And worse, those who formed the United Nations gave the Russians a veto on its decisions.

Even while long-winded orators speak nonsense at meetings of the members of the United Nations, an army supposed to represent the world organization but really is about 80 percent American, is at war with Communists of Korea and China, while Communist Russia decries the United States and encourages the armies opposing Yankees in Korea.

BLED WHITE BY TAXATION

The United States Government is bleeding its own people white through taxation to finance an unprecedented program of preparedness against war. The Government has tried to persuade us that to protect ourselves from Russian aggression we must go to meet the Communists inside the continent of Europe. Our frontier has been placed even beyond the Rhine—on the Elbe.

Our President claims he has the right to send American fighting men wherever he thinks they should be sent. It was he—and he alone—who sent American boys to fight in Korea, where we already have had a casualty list of around 50,000. The thought must occur to every good American: "Why would any man crave the authority to send American soldiers to their destruction?" It seems that every good American would shudder to have and to exercise such fearful authority.

In conditions as they are and our Federal Government demanding such shocking sums as $70,000,000,000 for defense purposes, our domestic situation becomes confused. The Government wants ever more control of the people, and especially of their purse. It seeks control of prices, of metals, foods, imports, exports, distribution, manufacture, wages, hours, living conditions. And it plasters a tax on everything we make, handle, use, consume. Rarely, and probably never in history, has any country struggled under such crushing taxation as the United States of today.

GIVE US OUR DAILY SCARE

How can any people be at ease when forced to go through the scares as daily come to us via our newspapers or are thundered at us over the radio? We read that "the family food bill is going up again, perhaps March 1." At breakfast we read that another big strike is looming in the automobile industry. Again we are told wool manufacturers will be forced to boost men's wearing apparel 30 to 50 percent by the spring of 1952, or that carpet manufacturers have stopped taking orders because they can't survive under controlled selling prices but no control over prices of imported wool they have to buy and use in manufacturing processes.

In Government positions of importance are blundering jobholders who drive the public into scare buying because they predict a shortage of production in automobiles, television sets, textiles, plastics, wearing apparel, shoes, etc., etc. They place more stringent controls on credit to hold down purchasing. They express their fears of inflation, which only add to the fear the public already has of the shrinking value of the dollar.

INFLATION IS A REAL THREAT

As a matter of fact, inflation really is the greatest of the threats that stultify progress in this country right now. How to stop it claims the attention of good business and sane men in public offices.

Most men who are trying to think and act straight are of opinion that deficit financing

by the Federal Government lies at the base of inflation. They are of opinion also that to best fight inflation the Government must formulate and stick to a "pay-as-we-go" program. They say we can pay as we go, no matter how high the price of preparedness against war may be. Some of these men are advising resort to the sales tax. Unfortunately, the sales tax itself suggests unrest and leads to a new kind of fear. However, a sales tax hits everybody—even those who foolishly think "a little inflation is a good thing."

Some people in Washington suddenly have been struck with the thought that it might be a good thing if the Federal Government itself exercised a little economy, although our Kansas City President challenges anybody to cut his latest proposed $71,000,000,000-plus budget. A great many other people have been suddenly struck with the thought that possibly all this present war scare may have been just imagined and that we, the people, ought to have a little more information on the whole big problem confronting the public.

HAVE ANOTHER EMERGENCY

Somehow, some of the people holding big jobs in Washington manage to build up an "emergency" at just the time when they need one to carry out their own programs. This country was going along at a fairly even pace before our President, on all but a sudden impulse sent our fighting men into Korea. If there hadn't been an "emergency" before that time, there certainly has been one since then.

The sad fact is that the mutual calling of names by the United States and Soviet Russia cannot go on forever without ending in a hot instead of a cold war between the two nations. The Secretary of State informed the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees that the Federal Administration intends to send 100,000 additional American Army troops to Europe as part of a combined defense force against Communist aggression. Defense Secretary Marshall disclosed plans to double 100,000 of American ground troops in Europe this year.

MINORITY REPUBLICANS ALERT

There is definite indication that the Republican party opposition to the Democratic Administration's policy is getting stronger. Recently 118 of 199 Republican members of the House of Representatives, signed a declaration of foreign policy which asks for a reexamination and a revision of the so-called bi-partisan policy which has clamped a silencer on much needed criticism of our foreign policy as fixed by Roosevelt, Truman, et al.

These Republicans believe that American foreign policy should be based on protecting the safety and welfare of the American people at home, more than on protecting foreign peoples. Ten of Michigan's 12 Republican Congressmen have signed this declaration, which says that our foreign policy has been "in large part a costly failure." The declaration makes the following as a suggestive basis for our foreign policy:

"1. Whatever our future military policy is to be, it must be determined with full participation and approval of the Congress.

"2. Make this country impregnable to attack.

"3. Reduce nonessential civilian expenditures.

"4. Build a strong defense system in the Western Hemisphere.

"5. Build a strong defense line in the Atlantic and Pacific. Refuse further aid of any kind to western Europe unless persuaded that western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden. In any case, invite Britain and the British Government to participate fully in this program.

"6. Conclude peace treaties with Germany, Japan, and Austria."

A reexamination of the whole situation in Europe might reveal that the people over there are more or less reconciled to a Russian invasion and are not eager to rearm and fight the Communists, because they dread most of all another bombing in which both friend and enemy might engage in case world war III is fought. We must not be misled into committing ourselves to fight in a Europe laboring under this impression or delusion.

BIPARTISANSHIP A FAILURE

We need, and must have, an alert, energetic, determined opposition party. We have had entirely too much of the so-called bipartisanship that proved to be so ineffective. The party in power commits the Government to a policy and sets a course that cannot be altered, then asks the opposition's approval. Only "me-too-ism" can result from that kind of bipartisanship.

Note: Members of the Michigan Republican delegation in Congress who signed the foreign-policy declaration referred to in the above editorial are: PAUL W. SHAFER, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, JESSE P. WOLCOTT, FRED L. CRAWFORD, RUTH THOMPSON, CHARLES E. POTTER, JOHN B. BENNETT, GEORGE A. DONDERO, and ROY O. WOODRUFF.

Leave Voice of America in State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 22, 1951.

This editorial, entitled "No Need to Change a System When It Is Working Well," sets forth clearly some of the cogent and compelling reasons for keeping our overseas information program in the Department of State where it can maintain close working relationship with the policy-forming branch of the Government on foreign policy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 22, 1951]

NO NEED TO CHANGE A SYSTEM WHEN IT IS WORKING WELL

When Senator WILLIAM BENTON first proposed, 2 or 3 years ago, that the Voice of America and other media of our official information program be taken out of the State Department, the Courier-Journal was attracted to the idea. It seemed to offer something along the line of the British Council, a semiofficial agency which does a major part of the British Government's cultural and propaganda work abroad.

Although he has offered no concrete plan in connection with his recent advocacy of his idea in the Senate, what the Senator had previously proposed, and it may be assumed what he will propose in a bill, was that a public-private corporation, be set up, composed of about 15 leading citizens of the country and a representative of the State Department. The Senator's idea is that, although the State Department must always be responsible for foreign policy, it would be easier for a distinguished group of public citizens to draw support from high-powered propagandists than it would be for an Assistant Secretary of State to command such talent.

That is perhaps a valid argument, but it does not seem to us to be the overriding consideration. The President's Advisory Commission on Information, set up under the Smith-Mundt Act, studied the operations of the old OWI and came to the conclusion that there should be a much closer liaison between policy making and policy exposition than ever existed between OWI and the State Department. As a matter of fact, OWI got most of its policy lines from the White House and not the State Department.

The Advisory Commission has consistently contended that representatives of the Public Affairs Branch of the State Department, which controls the information program, should sit on the major policy-planning group, participate in all meetings at which policies are considered, have access to all materials concerning policy, top secret included, if it was to be an intelligent voice of the American Government. Over the protest of some of the traditionally minded Foreign Service officers, the Commission won its point and there exists now the very closest relationship between all policy officers of the Department and the information specialists.

It works well, too. Foreign Service officers who never had any understanding of public reaction and consequently made policies in a vacuum, now take into consideration what that reaction will be, what the proper timing of a statement might be, and other matters that go into influencing people to think our way. There is no need to change the system and there is no apparent benefit to be gained from changing.

Soil Conservation Challenges the Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding speeches on soil conservation that I have ever heard was delivered by Rev. John Fred Streng, pastor of St. John American Lutheran Church, of Beatrice, Nebr. This address was delivered before the Nebraska Town and Country Church Conference held last month on the campus of the College of Agriculture at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

I wish to extend my remarks to include this fine address:

SOIL CONSERVATION CHALLENGES THE CHURCH

The struggle for survival tops the world's 1951 agenda. Victory will come to that side which can best answer the question: "When do we eat?" Here lies the difference between Europe and America, between poverty and prosperity. And that's a matter of life and death. It involves both church and state. So both had better get down to earth, coordinate their marvelous resources, and then look from clod and sod to recognize Almighty God. Bringing Jesus Christ to

rural Nebraska is the theme of this conference. That clearly defines our subject matter. Where Christ goes, His method and message inevitably intervene. In His program and prayers we note an enduring emphasis upon man's stewardship of the soil. He asks us to pray: "Give us this day our daily bread." God's answer to that petition is seen today in the miracle of modern crop surpluses and world consumption.

The church's people—priority—and prosperity depend directly upon soul and soil conservation. Notice the "u" and "i" relationship in soul and soil. So the church's basic institution for teaching understanding and appreciation of the soil, its meaning, capacity, and limitation, is the Christian home. Parents and children must learn to love the soil. Children are the most important bumper crop; they love to learn. We adults won't change our minds.

When little Ruthie dusts window sills and furniture, and exclaims: "Mother, I hate this old filthy dust," it's time for mother to begin a 3-minute rest period, and utilize it for a capsuled course in soil conservation. Says mother: "Look, honey, that isn't really filth. God made the dust; it's part of our soil. It's our bread and butter. We belong to the land. If we take good care of it, it will take care of us."

Here is the heart of soil conservation, and the church's future depends on what her God-fearing members do to, and with, God's good earth in time. For, soul and soil erosian are twins. Man and soil are of the dust of the earth. To it we shall return when our work is done. "The earth is the Lord's"—that's what God said. It does not belong to us; we are but God's farm managers, His stewards. Whether we disk, one-way, cultivate, plow, or duckfoot the land, we either bequeath a garden spot or a mixture of gumbo and gullies to the next generation.

How must soil conservation challenge the church. Ninety-five percent of Nebraska churches are rural. And since main street is but the business end of a country road, we may say that all churches in the Cornhusker State are directly affected by changes in agriculture. Roughly, Nebraska has 1,325,000 citizens. Only 2 cities are above 25,000; only 8 others above 10,000. Shifting populations in 20 countries chosen at random, and recently published in the Nebraska State Journal, show one-half gained, one-half lost.

Only 16 percent is engaged in farming; the remainder are country ladies and gentlemen living in town. With this minority, agriculture as a means of prosperity takes on a different angle. Strangely, the canning industry and truck gardening are rising leviathans. Overmechanization of farm equipment has led to excess borrowing. We demand a higher standard of living than our income can maintain. If time saved by machinery can develop other farm operations, they will pay out. But equipment that can be used only 1 or 2 weeks out of the year, may not be very profitable, especially if purchased on time payments.

Other factors complicate this modern puzzle even more. (1) The church, like other agencies, has wrongly emphasized production more than distribution. (2) The poor farmers are not poor because they are exploited, but because they are unproductive. Some are just plain lazy; they don't care how they farm. (3) In 1945 almost 10,000,000 people in the U. S. A. were over 65 years old; in 1970 we expect over 16,000,000. This vast army of silver-haired pioneers can no longer help conserve, but must be conserved. (4) In recent years we've heard much about specialized farming. The church must emphasize that prosperity is not so much farm culture, as common sense and reverence for and knowledge of the soil. The earthworm knows more about keeping soil clean and soft than a one-way. (5) The modern four horsemen threatening to plow under the rural church, farm, and family, include: Corporation farming, the canning industry, the giant truck-garden syndicates, and soilless farming. One inch of topsoil, valued at $1 per ton, when once lost through erosion, costs the owner $15,000 to replace per acre. No wonder some farmers are poor. Six out of every 10 people in the U. S. A. live in cities; they are consumers, not producers. They do long-distance farming which ofttimes does not help the rural church. The clean property around the little white church used to be the pride and joy of father and son; today much of it is owned by someone living thousands of miles distant, who has no interest whatever in the church. The farmer has a strategic position in this immense hierarchy of country community welfare. The church must encourage the Christian farmer to recapture the security of his God-given status as steward. In the proportion that man loses sight of the idea that the world is here for his profit and pleasure by d'vine right, the more greedy, arrogant, and destructive he becomes in working with natural resources.

The church's duty is to inform man of his divine prerogative as ruler over the animal world. Thus man must seek to conserve the earth as a medium of happiness for both. The church is built on the land; lives off the land, and cannot prosper without good farmers. No magic or mineral will save precious top soil; just common sense mixed with the fear of God will work wonders. If we keep it fresh, clean, and productive, our children will not be paupers. Man is just beginning to use science to help him study the effect of soil and its products on the human body, on industry, on national and international relations. Behind it all he will find the guiding hand of God. A thousand and one things depend upon common sense grass-roots democracy, and appreciation of God's miracle of life.

Every church denomination might well establish soil conservation districts, alert and active to preserve high Christian standards. Every clergyman should subscribe to a good farm magazine, attend county soil meetings, and insist that the congregation choose a committee on agriculture. The Lutheran church, among others, operates an efficient church-wide placement bureau which directs Nation-wide activities within its denomination. There is no limit to constructive surveys and service of a church council or board of elders, as pertains to rehabilitation of souls and soil. Landowners and tenants joining hands and hearts in church on Sunday morning will boost more peaceful relations during the week. The whole congregation must mobilize against its common enemies; erosion and depletion. Farm owners best know their land troubles; these might profitably be discussed by church societies from the standpoint of the Christian steward. Ailing humans call a doctor; ailing land needs the careful diagnosis of a conservation specialist.

The church should be deeply interested in how drainage ditches, county, State, and Federal highway construction, irrigation canal designs, railroad tracks, and other devices cutting through church territory, will affect the future of the congregation. There are only two ways to make conservation work; passing laws, or voluntary practice of the Golden Rule. Putting such a plan and program into effect cannot be accomplished in one day. The church is a long-range spiritual adviser. Her members come and go, at last to sleep beneath the sacred soil of God's acre. But the church teaches one generation after another that when land is treated as God's property on a share-and-share-alike basis, financial drives will not be necessary.

No government can subsidize God's land into prosperity. Only the family that owns and honors the land will demonstrate by its progressive methods that church and community are priceless. The owner-operator must realize that rain, sunshine, and good crops are not his doing alone. And the tenant must remember that he owes the boss and God an account of how he treats rent ground. Let the church's voice be heard in these days of high prices, greed, and selfishness, that cause overproduction and ruination of the land. No land can bear more than its share; therefore intensive cropping without rotation is dangerous. When huge corporations and foreign financial interests destroy family size farms, they annihilate church, public school, and community. And where there is no community life, people cannot live, love, or labor together. The church must stress the meaning of custodianship and trusteeship as a matter of self-respect.

Each farm has its problems; it may be the soil, or water management, or mineral deficiency, or topsoil contour. Anyone can ruin a farm, but only a good steward can improve it. Experiments and experience show that the so-called 10-year farm improvement and development plan works best in most cases. This plan is geared so that an average farm improvement will pay for itself, when financed as follows: 59 percent for minerals; 23 percent for erosion control; 10 percent for fences; 5 percent for building repairs; 3 percent for pond and shelter. Somewhere in this program, proportionate giving to the Lord must be added. Detailed costs and increased returns are necessary for the land and the good Lord in successful farming. As stewardship in the church is a slow program, so is soil conservation. Tithing for the land and careful conservation of soil are on the same side of the fence.

As the human body is able to do twice the work after a good night's rest, so soil needs a Sabbath, too. What summer vacation is to the human body, summer fallow is to exhausted soil. Balanced farming means sharing with the Lord. He makes soil productive; we work it, and live like kings from it.

The economic impact of 10 to 20 farmers practicing soil conservation in a group is tremendously important; like, when 10 to 20 church members begin using Lord's treasury boxes to introduce proportionate giving. That means all church debts liquidated, decent living for pastor and parish, well-kept church premises, including care of the silent acre of God's permanently retired saints. Why enthuse farmers of America when their elders ruin the home place because they look for the dollar sign on every fence post? If one-third of the productive soil in the country is conserved, new production increases by a million dollars. The way to make money is to take God in as partner. He who would prosper cannot park on Main Street all day. It's simple to raise corn and hogs; it takes a lifetime, however, to train intelligent Christian farmers who remember that they are tilling holy ground that belongs to God.

The more a government pushes parity, the less it relies on God. Church people need to ponder our strange modern mode of living. A soil expert recently made the statement that here once virgin soil produced 150 bushels without fertilizer, only 55 bushels now grow aided by artificial respiration. Worn-out soil results in higher prices, sky-high taxes, increased relief rolls. Depleted land produces mineral-deficient crops, malnutritioned livestock, resulting in low-quality milk, butter, cream, and eggs. Healthy citizens do not thrive on eroded soil; aggressive Christians need vigorous stewardship to bring forth good fruits.

It's a tragedy that our Middle West has done so little to conserve its heritage. Only 1 inch of topsoil is left in some counties in Nebraska according to statistics; some prairie areas suffer from sheet erosion. Silt-laden rivers tell the story against which there is no argument. River beds full of black soil reflect greed. All the black soil in the field

dam has lost its value; dams are not the answer to soil erosion. Every ruined farm anywhere in the U. S. A. costs us all money. Conservation means to live happily and usefully. It's a way of life. God gave us earth, water, air; these three. We must live in harmony with them or lose our birthright. Even the climate becomes a pattern factor in the use of the land. When, for instance, civilization makes a mistake about a raindrop, history records the eviction of man from the landscape. Historians draw maps of lost countries. That wasteland began with an army of innocent raindrops that splashed to the ground. One thousand five hundred cubic miles of raindrops fall on the U. S. A. per year. One-half evaporates, one-fourth flows off in surface streams; the remainder works its way into the earth crust and staves off starvation. The raindrop is either man's terrible enemy, or friend; depends on where and how it falls. If we would harness the raindrop we wouldn't need expensive dams. Terraces, contour plowing, strip cropping, and similar methods, make the raindrop walk instead of run away. The mud-splash of the raindrop is a blasting force. The soil becomes puddled and floats away; only sterile ground remains. So the raindrop must be intercepted before it strikes home.

Since Nebraska slopes from west to east, lowlands in southeastern Nebraska should be seriously interested in flood-control measures. Development of the North and South Platte River beds, the Missouri River Basin, the Republican River watersheds, are of prime importance. Citizens of Lincoln and Beatrice should be alert about what goes up Salt Creek or down the Blue River. Underground water moves in an easterly direction also. Floods have gone far beyond the occasional stage. Dams completed in western Nebraska will be a great blessing, but smaller water courses must be controlled also if we are to escape serious damage. In passing, let me use this illustration just to show that we are our brother's keeper. The life of a New Orleans citizen depends upon the change of a water stream hundreds of miles away, namely, whether a sheepherder in Montana overgrazes bottomland, or a lumbermill in Minnesota overcuts its quota, or some farmer in Illinois overplows his land, which mistake in either case permits water to escape and converge on helpless, innocent inhabitants down Mississippi River way, flooding them out of their homes.

The church must preach vigorously against soil erosion. Every clergyman ought to make an inspection tour of the farm land in his parish. Soil erosion has evicted nations with more finality than any invading army. We are told we lose the equivalent of 10,000 100-acre farms each year from water erosion alone. A thimbleful of topsoil contains well over 2,000,000 particles necessary to keep soil sweet and fresh. If a certain soil can produce only 30 bushels, it must not be overfarmed. A good deal of what is called agriculture is really mining, just plain exploitation for quick profits. That is contrary to God's law. Human erosion is just as bad. God intends for man to live with dignity in accord with his high calling and destiny. The gully on the neighbor's place is a danger signal that ought to be discussed in a Christian manner, before it crawls under the fence and across the township line. The rape of the land has been horrible; 100,000,000 acres lost; 100,000,000 acres depleted seriously; 560,000,000 to be conserved. With huge areas across the world today totally arid, conservation is the only answer to starvation of increased world population. Shifting populations and civilizations move only because of ruined land.

The marvels of the eighties here in the Middle West include the rise of teeming cities. With them came new agriculture, farming ideas, and the institutional church. The pioneer broke up the tough prairie sod, hardened by cowboy horse hoof, Indian stampede, wagon wheels, and thundering herds. Today the church must remind her people of the hardships, and the return to homesteading unless we learn to appreciate what God gave us.

Christ in His parable recognized that soil is not all alike; neither are people. But the sense of the responsibility remains the same. Twenty-seven million of 53,000,000 rural people are unchurched. Only 53 percent of the people in the United States of America attend church; 39 percent of the rural population, and 48 percent of city people in Nebraska are church members. Most unchurched people live in the rapidly expanding suburban areas. The rural parish must not die. It is of basic fiber to American life and living. Though some rural areas never will be self-supporting, the church should persuade more fortunate communities to subsidize the less fortunate and lend a helping hand. This is God-pleasing to both.

Christian countries have always been the most destructive of soil. Records show that civilization has nearly always raped the land and treated it inhumanly. So-called heathen countries do not seem to have much trouble with depression or starvation, except where the white man has come, not to bring the Gospel, but to tap virgin resources in order to get rich quick at the expense of primitive people.

Surely the farmer knows nature and life better than anyone because he lives so close to the soil. He should live closer to God also because his living and livelihood are so closely related to God's handiwork. The church cannot live without her rural constituency. From the country parishes have come most of our church leaders in pulpit and pew. Country congregations have better records for benevolences because they are not slaves to budgets and salaries and wage control. Cities maintain themselves only because farmers retire. No city ever thrives of itself or its industry without farm support. But when we remember that 65 percent of the people in the United States of America are unchurched, then what about Christian leadership in the future? If our rural churches are permitted to close their doors, where shall the lifeblood of the church at large come from in the next decade?

Nor will the rural church be saved through co-ops, which seem to become necessary to maintain our modern standard of living. Restricted membership make it an isolated institution to which not all members of the church may belong, thus creating differences. The most successful co-op is the one which gradually absorbs all competitors. Thereby it becomes a monopoly and defeats its purpose. Soil conservation teaches us, oddly enough, that man does not live by bread alone. A better understanding between owner and operator is the churches' duty; that's where brotherhood begins. There is a definite connection between empty pews and sour soil. A golden era of agriculture lies ahead for the Middle West according to soil and watershed experts.

The church should speak more of soil building than soil conserving, because so much of our Midwest land is torn by deep ditches. Many a gully was once an innocent wagon track or cow path that someone left unguarded. Good farms, beautiful yards, painted buildings, adequate machine sheds, usually point to a well-kept church. It's a good sign of faith in God and the good earth. In the wake of continued demolition of the farm home follows the little white schoolhouse in many areas. Mechanization of the farm eliminates much human labor; chain farming and land barons ignore the God-intended owner idea. We must preserve the family-size farm. When the church is the hub of community life, all are happy. Therefore farms must ever remain in the hands of worthy people. The great majority of bad farmers hate farming and livestock, and their neighbor. In the years gone by a thrifty, farsighted farmer bought six quarters for his six sons; thus six new members joined the church later on. Today the picture has changed. Deserts and dust dunes do not feed hungry people, for lost soil always means thinning of population. Too many farm boys are employed in factories to be healthy for the future of the country church.

History shows that Babylon, Greece, Persia, China, and other nations were once world powers. Today they are international corpses due to land hunger. Doping and drugging the soil with all types of stimulating fertilizer will never keep alive the earth that breathes. Each square inch is a miniature beehive. Millions of tiny bacteria live there; this is their home and grave, and they give back to Mother Earth their life and enrich her. The unaffected soils of the tropics or prairie or forest primeval all have a harmonious communion of life. Nowhere, at no time, are deserts a natural phenomenon. Nature knows no waste places. Today's arid areas are monuments to man's mighty blunders. Beneath their sands sleep once thriving civilizations. Where soil changes, climate changes, people change. In the smallest clod of earth is more live and creative activity, than in the highest skyscraper.

The Christian farmer cannot approve of unsound, deliberate ruination of soil. He improves his farm so that others may admire his industry and integrity. He makes home, church, and school the very center of his family life. He is active in all of them, and thus undergirds the spiritual life of the community. He knows that it is more blessed to give than to receive. His cows may not know it's Sunday, but he and his family do, and they aim to keep the Sabbath day holy.

Country-church worship might well take into consideration the work schedule of the farmer. He becomes an irregular attender, not for lack of desire but because there are no short cuts to good choring even on Sundays. There is need for study toward a convenient timetable especially during winter.

The Christian farmer should be affiliated with progressive farm organizations and marketing groups, not as a pressure union but to develop and promote general welfare. He ought to make his voice heard against unfair practices, unsanitary methods, and unwise regulation. The Christian farmer elects to office such men and women as serve the community best without bribe or pressure. All this is a part of soil conservation.

Volumes have been written on the scientific angle of soil conservation. The church must speak out in simple terms about God's glorious earth and His divine laws which govern summer and winter, sowing and harvest, rain and sunshine, day and night. God wants man to exercise dominion over the earth. And that's a mighty big responsibility. It's a high calling to preside over the mystery of growth in nature.

In less than 300 years, under God's providence, America has grown from a tiny settlement to world leadership. Happiness and welfare of today's world depend so much upon Christian principles and attitudes. Successful churches are not only those polled and publicized; others have made just as enduring an impact upon community and national life. A successful church cannot be gaged by size; it's the spiritual life that counts. There are features that tend and trend to keep rural churches from experiencing that growth which progressive city churches normally expect because of citizen influx. Too many young men cannot rent a small farm because some rich man has bought up everything and mechanized it. So many farmers already belong to city

churches. The rural church and community are the very backbone of the American way of life, the one everybody hopes will remain for centuries to come.

By 1976 there will be 7,000,000 more children in American elementary and, we hope, Sunday church schools, than today. They must be taught about soul and soil conservation as a means of survival. A careful analysis of soil, self, and soul, are important to keep America spiritually sweet and clean. That's our job, and it's a mighty serious one in which church and State must work together, or hang separately.

There isn't a more wonderful place on earth, none closer to paradise, than a well-kept, peaceful countryside. On such farms the day is never long enough to complete all the tasks that demand attention. But that's where people really live. And when near that farm stands the sturdy country church, rearing its tall white spire unto God, calling its members together for prayer, praise, and parting, surely this is a bit of heaven on earth. Of such is the kingdom of God, of such faith and fiber is the stock of Christian citizenship in America. May God graciously protect and prosper it.

"O look upon Thy garden, Lord, the one
which Thou hast planted,
According to Thy promised word, on plain
and hillside slanted.
Enrich the soil, Thy light bestow, and soften
it with rain;
Let everything that ill winds blow result
in strength and gain!"

Appeasement and Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of our foreign policy, the American people are entitled to know the truth. It is our duty to give it to them. What is happening in Asia today vitally affects the freedom and security of our Nation. It is for this reason that under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement made by our former colleague in this House, the former President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, when last January before the political committee in Lake Success, he fought the passage of a resolution on Korea that to him, as to most of us, seemed to be both craven appeasement and blackmail.

The position taken by General Romulo has elicited the admiration of the American people, and it has shown once more that we have in him a true and loyal friend. General Romulo's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE PHILIPPINES, IN THE POLITICAL AND SECURITY COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS ON THE KOREAN CEASE-FIRE PLAN, JANUARY 13, 1951

Mr. Chairman, last December the Philippines joined the appeal of the Asian and Arab states asking the Peiping regime not to allow its troops in North Korea to cross the thirty-eighth parallel and suggesting that, in the meantime, measures might be explored for the peaceful settlement of the problem of Korea. Subsequently, the Philippines also sponsored jointly with the same states a resolution creating a committee of three to formulate the basis for a possible cease fire in Korea. Both the 13-nation appeal and the proposals of the committee of three have been rejected outright by the Peiping regime.

We supported these efforts in good faith in the context of the circumstances obtaining at that time—circumstances which gave some hope that the stabilization of a line somewhere along the thirty-eighth parallel would have permitted a just and honorable settlement of the Korean problem. However, the Peiping regime has ignored our repeated entreaties and its soldiers have pressed their assault against the armed forces of the United Nations. The political and moral basis for a cease fire has thus been altered by Peiping's rebuff of our proposals and by its continued hostility toward our troops and aggression against the Republic of Korea.

Though the time for a just and honorable settlement of the Korean problem is not past, we must clearly recognize that the margin of success has become pitifully small. However, believing that this narrow margin still exists, the Philippines continues to support the principle of unconditional cease fire—a cease-fire aiming at subsequent negotiations but not extorted at the point of a gun.

We submit, Mr. Chairman, that the principles set forth in the supplementary report of the committee of three and now embodied in the draft resolution submitted yesterday by the delegation of Israel do not envisage this kind of a cease fire. The report, in its paragraph 5, represents a retreat from the position taken by the Security Council on June 27, a retreat from the position taken by the General Assembly on October 14, and yet a further retreat from the position established in our resolution of December 14.

How far, sir, can the United Nations keep retreating from established sound moral positions without courting final disaster?

A retreat in the course of battle is understandable and sometimes inevitable, but a retreat from right principles while a battle is being waged for those very principles cannot be justified on any ground whatever.

Paragraph 5 represents, in our opinion, a surrender to intimidation and blackmail. The Peiping regime has made it utterly plain that it would not stop fighting the United Nations until we have agreed to hand over Formosa to it and allowed it to sit in the United Nations. Peiping has had the temerity to demand these conditions even while it continues to ignore our entreaties and proposals and while it continues to soak its hands in the blood of our soldiers.

My country, sir, knows the nameless terror and agony of war as few countries around this table do. Therefore, we understand the anxious desire of many delegations to exhaust every possibility of avoiding a general war. But we also know that there is at least one thing that is worse than war itself, and that is the degrading enslavement that would surely follow an abject surrender before the threats of a fanatic and implacable aggressor.

We hold that paragraph 5 constitutes just this kind of abject surrender. Having turned our right cheek to Peiping, and the left cheek also, we now say to Peiping in paragraph 5: "You may stop hitting me now and killing my boys so that we can discuss how to reward you with the gift of Formosa and a seat in the United Nations."

I beg the honorable delegates who have drafted or supported this paragraph to correct me if I am wrong in thinking that this is the essential impression that lingers in the mind after a careful perusal of this paragraph.

Paragraph 5 attempts to purchase peace at the price of appeasing and encouraging a power that may be expected to take the fullest advantage of any sign of weakness that we show. The history of totalitarian aggression teaches us that this is the road to disaster. The march of Communist aggression cannot be arrested by a policy of moral retreat and surrender. Every such retreat from a position of moral strength and every such surrender of basic principle but serve to whet the appetite of the aggressor and to egg him on to further adventures.

The goal of international communism is the domination of the world, and no show of weakness or attempt at appeasement like that which is evident in paragraph 5 will deter its leaders from that ultimate goal. Communists may change their tactics and modify their methods, but their final goal of world domination stands unaltered through all such cunning wiles and opportunistic stratagems. They will, as they did in the last war, accept very eagerly the benefits of lend-lease and the benefits of UNRRA, and they will even abolish the Comintern in order to mollify their allies and set their suspicions and fears at rest. But as soon as the crisis is over and the free world is completely disarmed, the Communists take off the mask of peaceful coexistence and resume their relentless march toward their goal.

This, sir, is the kind of force we are contending with, and Peiping merely happens to be the latest and most formidable instrument of that implacable force.

A show of weakness and the surrender of principle will encourage, not deter, the aggressive designs of Peiping and its allies. The only thing that can deter them is a convincing demonstration of the firmness and solidarity of the free world.

Munich showed the way to appeasement and disaster. But the United Nations has since blazed a new road of nonappeasement that runs through Iran, Greece, and Berlin. Because we stuck firmly to this road, the line against aggression was held.

Today the road of nonappeasement has been extended to the valleys and jungles of Korea. Upon this road the United Nations stands today. If it abandons this path and out of misconceived prudence takes the tragic road back to Munich, it accepts defeat and loses its reason for being.

We have heard moving appeals to the free nations of the world to close ranks. Such appeals to solidarity cannot be met on the basis of an admission of weakness and abject surrender to the aggressor. Our solidarity must rest on strength and firmness, on readiness to resist aggression, to identify it as such, and to name its perpetrators. There is no other basis for the common faith and common action of the free nations of the world.

The only just and proper demonstration of solidarity which, in our judgment, the free world ought to make at this crucial hour is to approve a resolution containing paragraphs 1 to 4 of the supplementary report of the Committee of Three. If this is rejected by Peiping, we must then approve forthwith a resolution pinning the label of aggressor on the Peiping regime and providing for further collective measures as may be required to check the aggression.

However, having made sure that this is the plane of principle on which the Philippine delegation stands, and having regard for the views expressed by many delegations, we shall not stand in the way of this resolution. Accordingly, we shall abstain on paragraph 5, and if this is adopted, we shall abstain on the whole.

Our attitude is not in any way influenced by the anticipation of Peiping's possible acceptance or rejection of these principles. It may well be that Peiping would accept paragraph 5 and reject the rest. Surely, what some consider to be principles acceptable to the aggressor cannot be regarded as the proper measure for the action of the United Nations. The only proper measures for our action are the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Krupp: What Price Expediency?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD an article entitled "Krupp: What Price Expediency?" written by Joseph W. Kaufman, and which appeared in the February 26, 1951, edition of the New Republic.

Mr. Kaufman is a New York lawyer who was formerly deputy chief counsel for war crimes at Nuremberg, and chief United States prosecutor in the Krupp case. During World War II he served as general counsel of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and in 1949 and 1950 was chief counsel of the House Small Business Committee.

The article follows:

KRUPP: WHAT PRICE EXPEDIENCY?

(By Joseph W. Kaufman)

(Joseph W. Kaufman is a New York lawyer who was formerly deputy chief counsel for war crimes at Nuremberg and chief United States prosecutor in the Krupp case. During World War II, he served as general counsel of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and in 1949 and 1950 was chief counsel of the House Small Business Committee.)

The recent freeing of the Krupp defendants by United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy in Germany and the restoration of the Krupp industrial properties to Herr Krupp have come as a real shock to the American people. Americans who remember World War I still have not forgotten the stories of "Big Bertha," the monster gun named after Bertha Krupp, defendant Krupp's mother. And Americans of World War II cannot forget the awesome reality of the main Krupp works at Essen until the pinpoint demolition of these plants; nor can they forget the other formidable mining and industrial properties of the far-flung Krupp empire. When the Krupps are not only set free but restored to their largess, apparently rehabilitated with ECA funds, ordinary American folks throughout the country intuitively feel that the whole thing must be wrong. Perhaps they vaguely remember that it was from the same Landsberg prison that Hitler and Hess were freed under the German Republic.

The wholesale clemency now being practised toward war-crime defendants cannot be justified even as expediency. The Krupp action, on the contrary, supplies the Russian Communists with new propaganda material to the effect that we are now playing ball with the group which led the German industrialists in putting Hitler into power and in subjecting to Nazi control not only the labor unions but also the rest of German industry. Still worse, if we have freed the Krupps in order to be assured of their support against the Communists, the Russians may actually be laughing up their sleeves.

As proved in the war-crimes trial, the Krupps freely and actively collaborated with the Russian Communists. For about 3 years prior to Hitler's rise to power they were able to develop and perfect their blitzkrieg tanks secretly from the rest of the world only because Russia permitted them to do so in Russia. In return, Krupp experts, wearing Russian officer uniforms, taught and instructed Russian cadets as well as German personnel. Finally, in 1939, when Hitler signed up with the Russian Communists he had lambasted, and commenced World War II, the Krupps, unlike Fritz Thyssen, did not leave Germany and forfeit their properties, but found it congenial to be on the side of the Communists.

The prosecution and trial of the Krupps was no mean undertaking to be set aside lightly by the stroke of a pen. The trial lasted over 6 months. There were 250 witnesses called by one side or the other, and 4,500 documents were introduced into evidence. Each of the 12 defendants was permitted two German lawyers, and Krupp had an American lawyer also. Three judges from American courts presided. Significantly, if only in connection with the sweeping clemency now accorded the defendants, no Krupp defendant ever took the stand to defend himself or to submit himself to cross-examination on the charges.

Eleven of the twelve Krupp defendants were convicted, and all received jail sentences. They were convicted on the basis of personal guilt, not guilt by association, and they were convicted by proof beyond a reasonable doubt as required by the best American standards. The 11 defendants, including Krupp, were convicted of the infamous crime of using and abusing slave labor. Six of them, again including Krupp, were convicted of spoliation and plundering—of using the German war to enlarge and extend the Krupp industrial and economic empire.

None of the defendants was convicted on the aggressive-war count, charging the actual planning of aggressive war. However, the Krupp indictment charged the agressive-war allegations not only as a separate war-crime count by itself but also as part and parcel of the slave labor and the spoliation counts. This was for the purpose of showing that the Krupps, by indulging in their slave labor and spoliation activities, were not in the category of patriotic citizens obeying orders in time of war or acting under Hitler's duress; that, in view of the Krupp part in secretly planning for war before Hitler and then boosting Hitler into power, the Krupps committed their war excesses with malice aforethought and criminal intent; and, most important of all, that in view of this past history they were not entitled to any mitigation of punishment on a plea that they acted under higher orders. The judges were entitled to give weight to the aggressive-war proof for this limited purpose, and perhaps this helps explain why the sweeping property-confiscation decree was added to the prison sentences.

Judge William J. Wilkins wrote a concurring opinion stressing the point that the prosecution's aggressive-war proof was so convincing and so compelling that there was "built up a strong prima facie case, as far as the implication of Gustav Krupp and the Krupp firm is concerned." Gustav was defendant Alfred Krupp's father and could not be tried because of his senility. Judge Wilkins also stated that he concurred in dismissing the aggressive-war count against the defendants only by giving them "the benefit of what may be called a very slight doubt, and although the evidence with respect to some of them was extraordinarily strong."

The judge summarized the high lights of this uncontroverted proof—the Krupp firm's clandestine development of armament, tanks, and submarines in violation of the Versailles Treaty; its actual war plans and preparations, even before Hitler came into power, "in order that Germany may rise to fight again," as stated and fully described in the firm's own files; and Gustav Krupp's leadership of the industrialists' financial fund, which played such a vital part in boosting the then tottering Hitler into power. Defendant Alfred Krupp started with the firm in 1925, was a deputy board member in 1936, and a full board member in 1938. He certainly had knowledge of this background, and as a board member he participated. Moreover, as an early member of the Nazi Party and a colonel in the Nazi flying corps, he could not have been unsympathetic. He could hardly claim that he perpetrated his slave labor and spoliation crimes only because of Hitler and was, therefore, entitled to mitigation of punishment.

The prosecution also proved that defendant Alfred Krupp received a very handsome reward from Hitler for his continued participation in international criminality. This reward was the Krupp industrial properties. They had never belonged to Gustav, his father, who was not really a Krupp but had married Bertha, the Krupp heiress, and had adopted the Krupp name. And it was not preordained under Krupp tradition or by the firm's set-up that Alfred would take over the properties even on his mother's death. Hitler, however, issued a special decree in 1943, the Lex Krupp, which placed the properties in Krupp family ownership in perpetuity, much like a kingdom of its own, and stated that this was done in recognition of Krupp's incomparable efforts to boost the military potential of Germany. With Nazi approval Alfred took over.

The proof against the Krupps, including defendant Alfred Krupp, on the slave labor count in the trial was devastating. It was shown that the Krupps employed 75,000 foreign workers, 25,000 prisoners of war and 5,000 concentration-camp workers. Their crimes against foreign workers were not only against Russians and Poles, whom the Germans frankly treated as slaves and "subhumans," but extended to western workers—Dutch, Belgian, and French. Many of these workers were picked up in their own countries in manhunts, sometimes right off the streets, and required to go to Germany to work for Krupp. Those who attempted to escape would find themselves in one of the Krupp "penal camps." A Catholic priest was an inmate—and prosecution witness. Other recalcitrants would be sent to the Gestapo. All the pertinent provisions of the Geneva Convention for prisoners of war were violated, and Alfred personally participated in instigating violations.

Defendant Alfred Krupp approved and signed an appropriation of 2,000,000 marks for constructing a Krupp plant at Auschwitz, where concentration-camp workers would be freely available. At Essen, where he and his colleagues in crime could be eye-witnesses, 520 "Hungarian Jewesses," imported from concentration camps, were forced to engage in cruelly heavy labor outdoors and indoors. The girls, shorn of their hair and almost all clothing, lived a life of horror—with a bare cellar or worse for lodging, an open trench for air-raid shelter and filthy starvation rations for food.

On this record—and on a record of spoliation and plundering activities of gigantic dimensions and ruthless scope which will not be described here—defendant Alfred Krupp received a sentence of 12 years in jail, which does not seem excessive; and all his property was ordered confiscated. Great pressure was brought on Gen. Lucius D. Clay to disaffirm all the Krupp sentences, particularly the confiscation. But after protracted study by his legal department and careful consideration, he affirmed; the property, however, "to be subject to" confiscation.

During the administration of John McCloy, who, as high commissioner, succeeded Clay, nothing was ever done to put the confiscation into effect. In now annulling the confiscation, McCloy asserts that confiscation was not decreed in any other Nuremberg case, that nothing special was proved against defendant Krupp to warrant such discrimination against him, and that American tradition does not favor confiscation. He forgets that the proof against Krupp was very special—that Krupp obtained the industrial

properties with Hitler's aid as a reward for criminality, that he used them as the instrumentality for perpetrating his slave-labor crimes, and that he enriched them by criminal spoliation and plundering.

What price expediency? Krupp has been welcomed back by the Germans as a war hero, instead of a war criminal. The English, including conservative newspapers, have expressed bitter indignation, and so have the French. The Russians have been arming themselves with this new propaganda material, perhaps while wondering if they can make another deal with the Kruppe. We, who criticise the UN on China, have created a new kind of international crime—crime without punishment.

H. R. 1, Veterans' Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me several days ago to extend my remarks, I am inserting a joint letter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and AMVETS to each Member of the United States Senate, which makes quite clear the views of these veterans' organizations on the amendment of H. R. 1, the veterans' insurance bill, which passed the House on January 24, 1951, by a vote of 390 to 0. The letter referred to follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned, are concerned and confused by the announcement made on the Senate floor on February 22 that a motion is to be made by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, probably on Monday, February 26, to substitute the bill S. 84 for the twice House-passed H. R. 1 which was also unanimously reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

It is our opinion that S. 84 is merely stopgap legislation and highly discriminatory against the service-connected disabled ex-serviceman. We concede that S. 84 will take care of the able-bodied veteran.

We are convinced that H. R. 1 is good and meritorious legislation. It provides (1) universal, automatic, gratuitous protection for all persons entering into the Armed Forces after June 27, 1950, in the amount of $10,000, (2) it provides protection for those individuals who are disabled by reason of service-connection disability by granting them the right to procure insurance at standard Government rates after discharge, (3) the bill will result in substantial savings to the United States Government of an estimated $60,000,000 per year and will, in the final analysis, remove the Government from the insurance business, (4) the bill would eliminate the need for excessive civilian and military manpower in administering an insurance program in time of national emergency. The Assistant Administrator for Insurance of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Harold Breining, has stated that we should not repeat the experience of the last war where manpower was not available to adequately administer this program.

The principles outlined in H. R. 1 have been advocated by the President in his budget message for 1951. They have been endorsed by the Hook Commission, which was specifically established to study ways and means of improving the efficiency of the military service. They were also proposed by the Hardy subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, after 9 months' extensive investigation. H. R. 1 is endorsed by the undersigned three major veterans' organizations who have specific mandates from their membership urging the passage of the bill. H. R. 1 is endorsed by the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget as well.

Finally, H. R. 1 received extensive consideration over a period of about 8 months in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, which on two occasions unanimously reported a bill carrying out the general provisions of a gratuitous indemnity approach. As a result of their recommendations on two occasions, the House of Representatives has approved the proposal unanimously.

It is inconceivable to us, in view of all the endorsements which H. R. 1 has received, that we could be very wrong in urging its passage. We therefore urge your serious consideration in opposing S. 84 which is to be offered.

Should S. 84 be adopted by the Senate in lieu of H. R. 1, it is our considered judgment that the House conferees will not accept this proposal and thus kill all chances of vitally necessary insurance legislation in this Congress. The adoption of S. 84 in lieu of H. R. 1 would be a method of killing with kindness a progressive and meritorious piece of veterans' legislation.

In the firm belief that the primary responsibility of the Federal Government insofar as subsidized insurance is concerned is to the service-connected disabled and does not extend to the able-bodied veteran, we urge that H. R. 1 be passed by the Senate as reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Legislative Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Legislative Director, Disabled American Veterans.

RUFUS H. WILSON,
Acting Legislative Director, AMVETS.

American Taxpayers Reduce National Debts for European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a radio talk broadcast over Michigan stations this week:

My fellow Americans, only once in the past 19 years has our Federal Government made a payment on the national debt of the United States.

That was done by the Republican Eightieth Congress, which reduced the national debt by $6,000,000,000. It was done over the protests of the Truman administration, and was one of the reasons the President so vigorously denounced that Congress.

In view of this record, it is a startling thing to learn that, in the past 2½ years, American tax money has gone to reduce the national debt of five European countries to the tune of $1,200,000,000.

You who are taxpayers in the Third Congressional District of Michigan have a share in this amazing bit of administration generosity to foreign countries—even though it was done without your consent and, very likely, without your knowledge. Your share in this unauthorized gift, figured conservatively on a per capita basis, was nearly $3,000,000.

Today I want to tell you how it has happened that the administration's only debt-reduction program has been one for the exclusive benefit of foreign countries and foreign taxpayers—at your expense.

In order to make clear just what I am talking about, let me ask you to suppose that you had given a friend or relative a certain amount of money with which to start in business. Understand that you gave him the money—not merely loaned it to him. And your purpose in giving him the money to start the business was to enable him to be independent and earn his own way thereafter. Then suppose that you found that, instead of using the money to start in business, he had used all, or a large part, of that money to pay off old debts. I do not need to put your reaction to that into words.

That, in simplest terms, is exactly what has been happening under the so-called Marshall plan. Since 1948, the United States has given the countries of Western Europe some $10,000,000,000. These gifts were intended, primarily, to help these countries restore their productive capacity and so earn their own way. Instead, five European countries have used part or virtually all of the money to pay old debts.

The story of what has happened is disclosed in the latest report of the Economic Cooperation Administration. As you know, ECA is the Federal agency responsible for carrying out the Marshall plan.

Here's the record of the payments made in this manner on the national debt of these five foreign countries:

Norway has paid off $73,500,000 of its national debt: Denmark, $68,300,000.

Austria, who was our enemy in both world wars, had paid $85,000,000 on its national debt. France has paid $171,400,000.

Britain's socialist government has cut its national debt in this manner a total of $784,100,000, or more than three-quarters of a billion dollars.

That's a grand total of foreign debt reduction of $1,202,300,000. All by courtesy of the American taxpayer.

And this has been done with the approval of ECA—the Federal agency created by the Congress to supervise the Marshall plan and direct expenditures made under that plan.

Perhaps you will be interested in knowing just how this has been worked.

Under the Marshall plan, ECA makes available from funds voted by the Congress—that is, from American tax moneys or from money borrowed by your Government—specific amounts to the countries participating in the plan.

These foreign governments, in turn, use this money to buy specific items of machinery, raw materials, and other goods. The governments then sell these materials to the individual citizens or business concerns of their respective countries. These individual purchasers pay their government for these materials in the currency of their country.

This currency is deposited in a special fund, called a counterpart fund. Five percent of this counterpart fund is set aside for the United States, to pay the ECA administrative expense and to buy strategic materials which our country needs. Incidentally, the United States has found it very difficult to get the countries we are helping to sell us the strategic materials we need. But that is another sorry story.

The remaining 95 percent of the moneys deposited in the counterpart fund is given to the government of the particular country, to be used for purposes approved by ECA. It has the intent of the Congress that this money should be used primarily for productive purposes—that is for investment in industry and business which would help stimulate economic recovery and put the European countries back on their feet.

That sounds fine, doesn't it?

Yet a former ECA official admits that in certain countries almost the entire amount of counterpart funds has been used for the retirement of debt—that is, for paying off the national debt of those countries.

The latest ECA report bears out this statement. It shows that of the total counterpart funds which had been approved by ECA for use by foreign countries as of November 30, 1950, 23 percent—nearly one-fourth—was used to reduce the national debt of those governments.

The excuse offered for ECA approval of this use of Marshall plan funds is that it would have increased inflation in these countries to use the money to build up productive enterprises. Apparently it never occurred to the planners in Washington that this money could have been paid back to the United States and used to reduce our national debt of $256,000,000,000. Moreover, these very countries, whose national debt has been reduced by American taxpayers' money, are now looking to the same hard-pressed American taxpayers for many more billions to help finance their military defense program.

It's interesting to note, in this connection, that the per capita national debt of every one of these five European countries was already lower, in 1948, than the present per capita national debt of the United States. In fact, our country's national debt, per capita, is 22 times that of Denmark's—one of the beneficiaries of the administration's generosity.

The administration always has one stock answer, one threadbare plea, whenever it is proposed to cut ECA appropriations, or whenever objection is raised to Marshall plan nations diverting products to iron curtain countries, or whenever any other criticism of the Marshall plan is offered in Congress.

We must not, we are told, "do anything to cause the people of Europe to feel that the United States no longer cares for their well-being," or that "we are no longer standing in their corner in the fight against communism."

They offer this plea, despite the fact that admittedly the people of Europe either are largely unaware of the $10,000,000,000 thus far spent under the Marshall plan or are resentful of American "charity."

There are some of us in Washington (in Congress and not in the executive branch of the Government, I can assure you) who have felt for a long time that some of this tender concern for people's feelings should be directed to the American taxpayer. Isn't it just possible that he sometimes wonders whether anyone cares for his well-being?

I believe that more and more American people are feeling that way. I believe that their mounting concern and anger arises not primarily from hurt sensitivities but from grave alarm over the threat which this and myriad other forms of the administration's wastefulness hold for the solvency and security of the Nation. It was that very concern which prompted me, among other reasons, to vote against the Marshall plan in the first place.

It was just because of this urgent need for concern for the American taxpayer—and the American economy—that I introduced a joint resolution in the House this week, calling for revival and permanent establishment of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Department. I believe the Nation, and the Congress, are in desperate need of the continuing counsel and aid of this highly competent national "citizen's committee." That need is underscored by the President's grandiose 1952 budget proposals.

Yes; concern for the American taxpayer and his burden of national debt is long overdue. At stake are all of the things we cherish; at stake are our economic stability, our freedom, our military security, the preservation of our republic form of government—and even our cherished, and oftimes misguided, desire to be a good samaritan to the rest of the world.

Appeal for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the following petition received by me from the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, together with the supporting statement signed by its directors:

APPEAL FOR UNITY

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 11, 1951.

There is such disunity and cross purpose in our country today that it is the duty of organizations such as ours to express their views to those who hold in their hands the destiny of our country and the peace and welfare of the world.

We believe that both in and out of Congress free expression of views should be encouraged, and that those who state their opinion should not be subjected to personal attack or intimidation.

Bitter personal attacks upon our President and Secretary of State have seriously undermined the influence of this great Nation, particularly in carrying out its foreign policy. Our billions and the young men we are calling to the colors at great sacrifice will lose much of their effectiveness if these attacks continue.

The attacks against Woodrow Wilson began much as those on the President and Secretary Acheson. They grew out of honest differences of opinion, but soon developed into a shameful orgy of misrepresentation and villification. In the end the peace was lost, the League was hopelessly crippled, and a Second World War was in the making.

It would be a catastrophe if the United States should for the second time within the memory of living men forfeit the leadership of the world. This could easily come about. Other nations are not unmindful of our historic about-face following World War I, when the policies of Woodrow Wilson, which had won almost universal support and had literally become the hope of the world, were repudiated.

We doubt if democracy, as we have known it, could survice another and more terrible world war. This appeal is addressed to Congress in the hope that the representatives of the people will stand firm for those fundamental policies which have the approval of a vast majority of Americans and represent our best hope for avoiding another world war.

LOUIS H. PINK,
Chairman,

CLEVELAND RODGERS,
Vice Chairman,

ERNEST L. BOGART,
Treasurer,

LENORE TURNER,
Secretary,

Citizens Conference on International Economic Union.

NONPARTISAN SUPPORT OF ENLIGHTENED FOREIGN POLICY

United States: We have asked the nations to put their faith in us but we do not trust each other. The personal attacks which have been made upon our Government, and our Secretary of State, in carrying out the mandate received from the Congress and the President, have weakened the confidence of the world in our leadership and our ability to carry on consistently and courageously a guided, desire to be a good samaritan to the democratic nations.

United Nations: When the United Nations was born at San Francisco we believed that world unity had been achieved; that peoples would plan together and work out their problems; that there would be an end to major wars.

Despite the many advances made through the United Nations and the great hope which still clings to the possibilities of that body there is far less unity and understanding today than at San Francisco in 1945. Not only are the nations further divided—they are compelled to choose between two bitterly hostile blocks. But we must not lose faith in the United Nations. It is still our best hope for peace.

Korea and China: While our main problem lies with Russia and Europe, the Korean situation causes grave disunion in Congress and among our allies; it affects the sound development of all fundamental policies. We should have done a better job in rehabilitating South Korea, as the Citizens Conference pointed out over 3 years before the attack by the North Koreans. If the United States had built up a stronger South Korea and had made it clear when we removed our Armed Forces that we would return to defend the Republic against military aggression, there might have been no attack.

Mistakes have doubtless been made in appraising the strength and will of Communist China. If we had admitted the Peiping government to the United Nations as our allies wanted us to do, and had not backed a regime which no longer governs China, events might have been different. If our forces had stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel, or with the taking of the northern capital, the Chinese might not have attacked. But despite errors of judgment, the United Nations and the United States made no mistake in going into Korea to repel the aggressor and succor the Korean Republic which we had jointly created. Had we not done so, we would have sacrificed almost at its birth the power of the United Nations and its future usefulness. Had we failed to take the risk, small nations everywhere would have given up hope and made the best deal they could with the great powers.

The strength and influence of the League of Nations was sapped when it allowed Italy to attack Abyssinia and Japan to take over Manchuria. Then and there the hope for the League as a world order which would protect small peoples against aggressive war ended.

In principle we did the right thing in Korea, though we have not yet succeeded in this difficult humanitarian adventure. We must see it through, but in doing so we must realize that China is not a natural enemy of the United Nations or the United States. We should not appease. Neither should we sacrifice civilization in North and South Korea and the lives of our own youth and of our allies to save the face of any individual, or the United Nations, or the United States.

The solution of Korea must be evolved at the council table. Shall it be now or after more blood has been spilled? Obviously we cannot admit China to the United Nations so long as it is at war with the body it seeks to join. But to shed more blood to uphold procedure will not be tolerated by our people or our allies. All vital matters affecting Korea and Asia can and should be discussed

over the table. The discussion should include the future admission of the Chinese Government, when it is no longer at war, and has agreed to a program approved by the United Nations.

Aggressive communism: The aid we are giving to Yugoslavia has had a sobering effect upon that opinion in the United States which sought to combat communism as an anti-religious force. Can we not now say that as a matter of national policy it is not communism as such we are arming to combat, but revolutionary, expansionist communism which seeks to spread its doctrines not by legitimate example, but by terror and force. A religious war against communism as such would be as futile as the religious wars of Europe which ravaged the Continent, brought hunger and misery, set back civilization, and promoted neither Catholicism nor Protestantism.

For the North Atlantic Defense Treaty: Mr. Hoover's appeal, which has received consideration because he speaks above political partisanship, offers an easy but unthinkable retreat from the responsibilities we have assumed. The United States must go through with the obligations which it has pledged to Europe. We have covenanted not only support to the UN, which we must continue in all honor, but (with the almost unanimous ratification of the Senate) to carry out the North Atlantic Defense Treaty, along with Canada and 10 European countries. The treaty has been implemented at Brussels by the appointment of General Eisenhower as Supreme Commander. General Eisenhower cannot succeed unless he is backed by a large majority of Congress.

Such arms and aid as these nations need we must help to supply. Our allies must be assured that they can rely upon the United States to carry out its obligations in good faith and full measure. If there is any doubt of our commitment and our intention, Russia may consider our weakness an invitation to aggression, as happened in Korea.

Rearming of Germany: There is great perplexity in the public mind regarding the rearming of Western Germany, not only in the United States but in the United Nations and among our allies. We must not forget that we fought the biggest war in history, at untold cost in human life and money, to disarm Germany and Japan and bring them as partners into a society of self-governing nations devoted to peace and international cooperation. Neither can we overlook the fact that the rearming of Germany will be a direct challenge to Russia which may help to promote a shooting war. More than military strategy is at stake. The decision so far as Germany is concerned should be made primarily by the European nations close to both Germany and Russia, and by the Germans themselves.

Point 4: The development of technical assistance for backward areas known as point 4 and carried on in cooperation with the United Nations is one of the most necessary and hopeful activities in which we are engaged. Revolutionary communism is the product of hunger and misery more than of Marxian doctrine. To secure peace we must tackle the fundamental causes of war and follow up technical assistance with capital. European recovery under the Marshall plan is a tangible example of what may be accomplished under point 4 on a more adequate scale.

Support for President and State Department: If our President and Secretary of State are strengthened by support at home and we provide sound leadership we can build up the defense forces of the free nations to effective strength and jointly provide for the common defense of our homes and those human rights without which life is not worth living.

We canot succeed in this great undertaking if the carping personal attacks upon our Secretary of State are continued in rancor and to serve party purposes. All people pray against resort to war. Only a strong and unified United States, in full cooperation with the United Nations, can preserve the peace.

Signed by the following directors of the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, 80 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.: Louis H. Pink, chairman of the board, Associated Hospital Service of New York; Cleveland Rodgers, member, City Planning Commission, New York City; Ernest L. Bogart, professor of economics emeritus, University of Illinois; Arthur E. Albrecht, chairman, Department of Business Administration, CCNY; Harry Best, professor of economics, University of Kentucky; George Boas, professor of philosophy, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; Gladys Boone, chairman, division of social studies, Sweetbriar College, Va.; Louis E. Pine, lecturer and lawyer, New York City; Rt. Rev. Charles K. Gilbert, suffragan bishop, Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York; Karl W. H. Scholz, professor of economics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.; Lenore Turner, secretary, Citizens Conference, New York City.

Tribute to Thomas A. Edison by George E. Stringfellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gratefully We Honor Thomas A. Edison," published in the Call, of Paterson, N. J., on February 10. The editorial makes reference to the tribute paid to Mr. Edison by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N. J.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRATEFULLY WE HONOR THOMAS A. EDISON

Tomorrow is the birthday anniversary of New Jersey's illustrious inventor, who is still in the forefront of the great inventive geniuses of America and the world. Thomas Alva Edison first saw the light of day 104 years ago, and while still in his teens began his phenomenal inventive career that was to bless humanity with the marvels of electric light, power, and heat, and with hundreds of other inventions that brought us such universal joys as the phonograph, the talking motion picture, and the improved telephone.

Paterson Rotary, which believes with the Call that Edison's birthday should be honored and commemorated by every American, especially here in his home State of New Jersey where these modern miracles flowed from his inspired brain, practiced what it preached at Thursday's meeting by devoting the program hour to pay homage to this truly heroic American. And no more appropriate way could this outstanding Rotary Club find to high-light the occasion than to have as the orator of the day, George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Edison Industries, who worked side by side with the wizard of Menlo Park with tireless devotion to produce and make available the products of Edison's genius to every home and to every nation in the world.

Stringfellow inspiringly recounted the obstacles and handicaps, which would have made most men give up in despair, but which Edison with his never-give-up philosophy turned into stepping stones of success. One of these misfortunes was his deafness, caused by a conductor who picked him up by the ears at the age of 12, an affliction which instead of crushing his optimistic spirit goaded him on to the discovery of the phonograph and an improved telephone transmitter that first made the telephone commercially practical, because Bell's magneto receiver was too weak for long distances.

The spirit of Thomas A. Edison, the eternal optimist and champion of free American enterprise, is needed today as never before to lighten our way and lift us through the world's encircling gloom victorious. Through his inventions and scientific discoveries, this beloved genius and benefactor of mankind has placed in our hands unlimited possibilities, which if rightly utilized by an appreciative citizenry, all working together, in a spirit of patriotism to step up production instead of pulling apart and laying down our tools in a spirit of selfishness to cripple it, will once again bring us safely through the shadows and dispel tyranny's latest threat in the guise of godless communism.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway, made by Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, before the House Committee on Public Works.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES E. WILSON BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

I am here this morning to support legislation that will enable construction to begin as soon as possible on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as one that is both vital to our national economic strength and urgent in terms of our mobilization requirements.

My remarks this morning will be brief, the details concerning this project being supplied by other witnesses who will appear before you or have already done so. I wish to limit myself to the central facts of the matter as I see them as Director of Defense Mobilization.

In approaching this matter I have, of course, availed myself of the studies that have been made by other agencies of the Government, including those of the National Security Resources Board. I understand that the Board's report of last spring, together with the recent supplement bringing it up to date, has already been placed before you and incorporated in the record. I have

examined these studies and concur entirely in their conclusions and recommendations.

The mobilization problems we face today have been set forth very clearly and succinctly by the President. In his recent Economic Report, he said: "In the first place, we must achieve a large and very rapid increase in our armed strength, while helping to strengthen our allies. This means more trained men in uniform, more planes, tanks, ships, and other military supplies. Second, we must achieve, as rapidly as possible, an expansion of our capacity for producing military supplies. This * * * must be large enough to enable us to swing rapidly into full-scale war production if necessity should require. And third, we must maintain and expand our basic economic strength * * * so that we can continue to grow stronger rather than weaker if it should prove necessary to continue a defense effort of great size for a number of years."

I need not elaborate on the central and critical importance which steel has in a program to step up our military strength, expand our industrial capacity, and strengthen our industrial base generally. At all times—in peace, in war, and in every stage of preparedness for war—steel is fundamental. Our entire industrial economy is based upon it. Steel is required for producing munitions and military supplies of almost every character and it is required for the expansion of our capacity to produce these vital items. Moreover, during periods of emergency many of our most critical shortages are traceable to the fact that large quantities of steel must be diverted to the defense effort. With respect to problems resulting from the steel shortage during World War II, the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, said:

"Steel, always the backbone of America's economy, is the keystone of our war production. But it has come very close to being the stumbling block. Almost all of our strategic material shortages today could be relieved sooner if we had steel. The aviation gasoline program, the synthetic rubber program, the shipping program, the aircraft program, all have suffered for lack of steel. We have been short of both gross tonnage and the specialized types of steel. Our fuel oil and gasoline shortages, our farm machinery shortage, our railroad problems, our housing difficulties, could be relieved if sufficient steel were available."

With this recent experience in mind, the expansion of steel capacity and related facilities is being pushed to the fullest extent possible. As this expansion proceeds, we face a steadily growing problem of securing a supply of iron ore that is adequate for the expanded steel-making capacity. Without a matching increase in the supply of iron ore, an increase of capacity, whatever its size, can do us no good.

At this critical juncture we must face the fact that the reserves of high-grade ore which have been the mainstay of the steel industry for 50 years are running out. Whether their practical exhaustion is only a decade away or will not overtake us for two or three decades more, we face the hard fact that the annual supply which they yield is dwindling year by year. Meantime our requirements of ore are moving up sharply. This means that our dependence on foreign ore will increase year by year. It means that because of this growing dependence we must be concerned with the development of foreign sources and with means of insuring that supply from these sources actually reaches American steel mills.

The dimensions of this problem can be quickly stated. The ingot capacity of the American steel industry is now being expanded to an expected total of 115,000,000 tons by the end of 1952. It is believed that further expansion at a rate of about 2,000,000 tons a year is feasible thereafter, provided the necessary ore can be brought in. Our thinking, therefore, must be in terms of a capacity of 130,000,000 ingot tons by 1960.

The NSRB report before you sets forth the compelling reasons to believe that to operate a 130,000,000-ton steel industry in 1960 might require as much as 160,000,000 gross tons of ore. Furthermore, if the ore requirements run that high, we would be forced to look to sources outside the United States for more than 40,000,000 tons of ore a year. Unless we plan now to assure a supply of this size in 1960 we may find ourselves unable to utilize the steel industry we can have by then, vital as it is sure to be to our economic strength and military security.

We are using 1960 as a goal simply because this represents about the longest look ahead that we can reasonably take in staking out our plans for the longer pull. It should be emphasized, however, that the task of obtaining sufficient ore in 1960 is but a prolongation of the task of obtaining sufficient ore during the intervening years. It is widely felt in the industry that as early as 1955 we shall begin really to feel the pinch of our dwindling domestic supply.

Other witnesses will testify to the efforts that have been made by a number of our steel companies to discover new reserves of iron ore. One such reserve—very large and very promising—is now in process of development in South America to meet the growing needs of American steel mills. Another important and promising reserve has been discovered on this continent in Labrador.

These iron ore reserves lie close to the surface, which makes them of particular importance in a situation where other sources may be cut off either partially or entirely. Once active production is under way, it can be rapidly expanded by the simple device of putting additional scoop shovels to work. This is a characteristic possessed in the past by much of the Lake Superior reserves, where open-pit mining continues to be the predominant method. As the operation proceeds, however, less and less of the remaining reserves is capable of being immediately opened up. That is why our annual supply of iron ore from these reserves is dwindling and why we must look elsewhere for the readily expansible supply that we must have in time of emergency.

These are the fundamental considerations that have brought me to the conclusion that the St. Lawrence seaway—in addition to its undoubted general contribution to our transportation system—is essential if we are to put our steel production, which is to say our entire mobilization effort, on a solid and secure foundation. Without the seaway we shall become steadily more vulnerable in this most strategic of all strategic industries. We must not permit that to happen.

This is a dual-purpose project, however, and the seaway is only one of its purposes. In my own thinking this phase alone provides the overwhelming case for approving the project and rushing its construction. But electric power is also essential to defense production.

At the outset of World War II the private and public power systems of the Nation had substantial reserves of electric generating capacity. By contrast, however, recent estimates indicate that in many regions margins of reserve capacity are now relatively small and in certain areas there will continue to be shortages for several years in spite of major capacity expansion programs.

Moreover, experience in 2 years has demonstrated that although capacity may be adequate to meet civilian loads, the impact of mobilization requirements must be expected to make an additional cheap power supply essential. Increased production of the aluminum, ferro-alloys, and other electrometallurgical and electrochemical products which mobilization requires can be achieved only by increased use of electric power. That is why electric power projects throughout the country are being pressed to early completion and new ones are being planned. None of these is more important than the St. Lawrence project which will furnish large quantities of additional power to important industrial areas where critical shortages were felt in both wars. We need the seaway and we need the power too, both for the special needs of defense and for our economic strength over the longer pull.

In all this our Canadian neighbors have a joint interest. We all realize that the national security of our two countries is closely linked. Our defense plans have to a significant degree been worked out jointly and it is the joint operation of our free economies that gives this continental defense effort its essential industrial base. The new transportation route and the additional power supply that the St. Lawrence dual-purpose project will make available will contribute to the development of Canada's huge resources and to making her an even stronger partner of the United States, whether in peace or in war.

As Director of Defense Mobilization, I have had to weigh the advantages I have discussed against the cost, in terms of manpower and materials, which the construction of this project would impose. My support of the project, therefore, takes into account this important consideration.

To explain my judgment on this let me point out that none of the materials requirements set forth in the NSRB report constitutes as much as one-half of 1 percent of our annual supply. For example, the 30,000 tons of steel a year required for the project is something less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent of our current ingot production. The copper requirements of 500 tons a year amounts to one-twentieth of 1 percent of the annual supply from domestic ores alone. Even in the case of cement, where the fraction is largest, 750,000 barrels a year is approximately three-tenths of 1 percent of the annual supply that can be counted on during the 5-year period of construction. In each instance, therefore, the amount of materials required is so small as to be negligible in the total mobilization framework.

The same is true in the case of manpower. In addition to the manpower engaged in producing and moving the materials needed for the project, its construction will require 7,000 American workers on the site. This is equivalent to hardly more than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of our civilian labor force.

It is with these insignificant fractions of our available supply of materials and manpower that we can purchase, if we act wisely and promptly, the vital and strategic advantages that construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project can confer. It is my hope that promptly upon conclusion of these hearings the committee will overwhelmingly approve this legislation and send it to the floor of the House for early action.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday I had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, before a

House committee, in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway. I neglected to ask consent to have printed in that connection General Marshall's introductory statement, which should have been printed preceding the printing of the testimony of Mr. Small. I now ask unanimous consent to have General Marshall's introductory statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The testimony of Mr. Small, to which General Marshall referred, was printed in yesterday's RECORD.

There being no objection, the introductory statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

(Statement of Secretary of Defense General Marshall before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, Wednesday, February 21, 1951)

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, the Department of Defense, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, supports the House joint resolution now before your committee which would permit implementation of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and recommends its adoption by the Congress.

Our support is based on the advantages to national defense that this project offers.

First, the seaway, when completed, will increase the flow of high-grade iron ore for the production of steel for munitions and other purposes from the Labrador-Quebec area, which is now being developed. Unless the seaway is built, obtaining ore from this new source will present serious problems of transportation, including the hazards of wartime sea transportation. On the other hand, the accessibility of the Labrador-Quebec area made possible by the seaway would supplement our present supply and would furnish a substantial additional source if our present primary source should be seriously reduced. Freedom from submarine attack does not, of course, mean full security. The risk of interruption of the new seaway by enemy sabotage must be faced. The danger of sabotage, however, is already of critical importance at the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, through which our Lake Superior ores are brought in such vast quantity. Until the seaway is built, almost the whole of our iron-ore supply is subject to interruptions by a single act of sabotage there.

Second, the power project in connection with the seaway will provide additional sources of cheap and independent power so necessary, especially in the case of an all-out mobilization.

Third, the seaway will facilitate the transportation of munitions to overseas bases. Moreover, in case of atomic attack, transportation could be diverted from one city to another. It is realized that the seaway will be closed for months every year because of ice conditions, but that is equally true of the present Great Lakes transportation route from the Mesabi Range to which all interested parties have successfully adjusted their operations.

Fourth, the seaway will afford access to additional shipbuilding and repairing facilities always very necessary in time of war to the maintenance of our supremacy on the high seas.

Finally, it should increase the capabilities of mutual defense between Canada and the United States.

I have brought with me Mr. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, who can explain in some detail the industrial mobilization aspects of the project.

For the record, I want to add that the project has had the approval of the Department of Defense in the past and that I supported it before a committee of Congress as Secretary of State.

We are still in the fortunate position of being able to buy time, insofar as this project is concerned. We have not yet run short of iron ore in continental United States. Our annual supply from the Lake Superior region is declining, however, in a period when our requirements are mounting rapidly. We must have other sources readily available. It is urgent that this project be begun promptly, so that by the time we must depend heavily on foreign sources of ore supply it will be ready.

Negro GI Record in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging military developments in our history has been the participation of colored Americans in the fighting in Korea. My own experience both with the American and the French Armies, long ago impelled me to urge that colored and white soldiers be integrated as much as possible. In this connection, the dispatch by Mr. Robert R. Brunn in the Christian Science Monitor, which has been called to my attention by Mr. Clifford C. Douglass, of Boston, is of particular interest. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NEGRO GI RECORD IN KOREA COMBATS FOE'S "BIAS" TUNE

(By Robert R. Brunn)

SAN FRANCISCO.—The record of American Negro troops in Korea has been of tremendous value in combating Communist racial discrimination propaganda against the United States in Asia, reports Thurgood Marshall, special counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Marshall had just returned to the United States after more than a month in Korea and Japan where he completed the first nongovernmental investigation of treatment of American Negro soldiers at the front ever made.

OUTSTANDING RECORD

Negro troops have established a record that defies comparison with whites, Mr. Marshall believes, despite segregation in Korea which he claims has led to hurried, unfair courts martial and heavy sentences which have amounted to discrimination.

Through the NAACP, Mr. Marshall will continue to press for the reversal of all but 3 of 50 court-martial convictions of Negroes to date. This follows front-line talks with troops involved, the men themselves, and examination of court records. Mr. Marshall received the fullest cooperation from General MacArthur on down.

He makes a plea for the complete integration of Negroes into Army units, defining this as fitted in as to merit, wherever a man is needed. At present, he said, Negroes in American forces are usually not integrated below a battalion level. That is, the smallest mixed unit is a battalion with all-Negro and all-white companies.

LONG BATTLE SERVICE

He reports that the all-Negro Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, with predominantly Caucasian officers, has been fighting at the apex in its United Nations sector almost always since entering battle in July last year.

It is his conviction that an equally trained and educated Negro soldier will run no faster and no slower than any other man in battle. He told of Negro bravery, devotion to duty, and staggering casualties.

As for the courts martial of 50 Negroes, 32 of them for misbehavior in the presence of the enemy, he believes this an unrealistic figure. This figure is for the Twenty-fifth Division, of which the Twenty-fourth Infantry is a part. In this division the ratio is one Negro to between every three and four whites. Yet, he says, only 2 white soldiers were convicted compared with the 32 Negroes.

UNEQUAL PENALTIES CHARGED

He gave parallel cases which, he said, were typical. One was that of a white soldier at a forward position who disappeared and later was found way behind the lines. He was given a 5-year sentence, later lowered to 1 year by the division commander.

J. P. Morgan, a Negro, was charged with being absent from his outfit and sentenced to life imprisonment. He had shown he was hospitalized at the time, during a period of manpower shortage when only great need would have allowed hospitalization. On NAACP protest, this sentence was commuted to 5 years and suspended by the Army review board in Washington.

WANTS MASS TRIALS ENDED

Mr. Marshall told of many other cases of court martial in the heat of battle where he feels discrimination, which he traces to segregation of Negroes in the Army, operated to bring a finding of guilt and unusually long sentences that were not justified.

In his report to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Mr. Marshall asks that what he calls mass trials be ended—that is, a practice which he describes as running them through one after another. He asked more time for the preparation of defense cases, and trial in an atmosphere where justice is more possible.

He told of several trials which lasted less than 50 minutes, including all arguments, statements, and formalities. Most of these brought life sentences.

NEGRO COURT AIDES

Without waiting for a complete report from Mr. Marshall, the NAACP has represented 21 Negro servicemen before the review board in Washington. Four men who received 10 years each were exonerated. Six others had life sentences commuted to 20 years, another to 15, another to 10, four sentenced to 20 years were reduced to 5 years each. There were other reductions.

In Korea, he said, the men have had the right to ask for enlisted men on the court, and Negro enlisted men have sat. One defense counsel was a Negro officer. Some of the charges have been preferred by Negro officers.

He said that both the Navy and the Air Force in Japan have racial integration, and, to the best of his knowledge, the Air Force is the most complete of all. This integration includes officers.

But, from his observation, the Army in Japan has absolutely no integration. He said there was not a single Negro among the hundreds of soldiers and officers in the Supreme Command, Allied Powers headquarters in the Daichi Building. He also remarked the absence of Negroes in the elite military police force which guards General MacArthur.

An independent investigation of court-martial conditions, down to the smallest detail, is being made by the Judge Advocate General's office in Tokyo.

Opening of Meetings of United Nations With Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Altoona Mirror, sent to me by Hon. J. Banks Curtis, a former distinguished Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, who suggests that it is fine reading. I have gone over the editorial myself, and it is a magnificent one, suggesting to the American people the religious side of life during the critical period in which we are living.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FATHER'S LAND

This is our father's land. The argument advanced in some places that the sessions of the United Nations cannot be opened with prayer for fear of offending some of the member nations which do not profess Christianity should be judged against that fact. Our father's land has been bought with the blood of many generations, consecrated by the lives of devout men and women, blessed for many generations with an abundance that is not and has not been equaled in the realm of recorded history.

Why should we hesitate to give unto God the praise and credit for the many blessings that have been bestowed upon us? Have we also supinely surrendered to the UN our constitutional right of freedom to worship? Many guests from many lands have been entertained throughout the years in your homes and in mine and at least the right to give thanks at mealtime has never been suspended out of deference to the tender feelings of any guest or friend. I do not believe that any Christian American takes offense when traveling abroad when the hour of prayer comes and the inhabitants of that land turn their faces to Mecca or to some other shrine.

The nationals of other lands love their fatherlands, but Americans have more than a fatherland to love and revere. They share with but one other nation the certain knowledge that here is a land that is dedicated to the Almighty. There was no doubt about this in the minds of the founding fathers. There was no doubt in the minds of the framers of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution. There was no doubt about it in Abraham Lincoln's mind when he breathed life into immortal words at Gettysburg. There is no doubt about it in the minds and hearts of millions of Americans of February 1951 vintage.

If our shores are to give shelter to the United Nations and our tax money erect the buildings which will house the representatives thereof, we have the right to insist that those who believe in Almighty God have the right to call upon His name and seek His guidance. It would be better for us to withdraw now from any alliance that denies us this right.

Americans have the right to know, and to know now, just what other American liberties are being infringed upon or given away on the pretext of uniting the world. Our liberties are sacred to us and it is beyond the power of either Congress or the executive branch of the Government to dispense with them.

Four score and seven years ago last summer 53,000 brave Americans were casualties in a 3-day battle that stands out in history as one of the costliest military engagements of all times. In the blazing heat of midsummer, wave after wave of brave men charged up the rugged hills and across the crested wheat fields of a Pennsylvania farming community, to be met time and time again by resolute men who threw them back with minnie ball and rifle bullet, with bayonet and clubbed rifle, and finally in desperate hand-to-hand encounter with Bowie knives and other odds and ends of equipment.

That battle and that baptism of blood was the turning point in a great struggle between brothers to decide for all time whether this Nation could exist half slave and half free. Is that dearly bought treasure of human liberty to be offered also on a pagan altar of appeasement? America has paid the price for liberty. She has paid her price for internal unity; but the bloody sacrifices at Gettysburg, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness, and innumerable other spots were not made to lower the sum total of individual liberty and human dignity.

The battle of the States was won and the peace that followed that war preserved because men on both sides were the descendants of men who believed in the essential dignity of man and acknowledged the presence and guiding power of a Supreme Being.

Grim men marching south to the martial music of tattered bands in blue, singing under the stars and in the blistering heat of midday "Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory of the Coming of the Lord," winding up the affairs of a Union of the States until at Appomattox an honorable surrender was arranged and a lasting peace conceived. Tattered, war-weary men in gray and blue wending westward for years after that war seeking new homes, building sod houses, conquering hostiles and adding breadth and dignity to a growing Nation. Glowing campfires, bleached bones along the trails, a period of lawlessness and then inevitably the church and law and order and a new State with a Constitution acknowledging the supremacy of God and guaranteeing the freedom of the individual.

Are all these also to be added to the sacrificial loot on the pagan altar of appeasement? What gods shall we appease, what manner of men are these that the descendants of the Pilgrims, the men in tattered colonial uniform, the men in blue and the men in gray and the men in khaki should bow the knee to them?

We have fought six major wars for that pearl above price—human freedom. We won all of them on the battlefields and will win the one in which we now are engaged on the battlefield. After our first major war for freedom, the American Revolution, we won the peace also because we entrusted that freedom to the consecrated men and women who had won the war. We won the War of 1812 to reaffirm our right to that freedom and once again we won the peace that followed because it was entrusted to the mass of people, those who had won the battles.

We came through the great cauldron of the Civil War and won a setting for the pearl of freedom that encased it with the fine gold which was purified on the altars of a thousand battlefields so that another race of men who dwelt with us might be free. That peace was preserved for us also because it was subjected to the great debates of freemen, openly arrived at decisions and mutual understanding.

In 1898 our men rallied to the banner of freedom from oppression for a neighbor and Cuba was liberated.

Then in 1917 our boys fought again, this time to "save the world for democracy." The boys won the battles, but the peace was lost. We should have learned then and there that individual liberty and national freedom can be preserved only by those who really believe in the sacredness of the individual and in government, by the people, for the people.

Once again in 1941 we rushed in to battle to preserve the free way of life. It is a little too early to say that that peace has been entirely lost. In one nation at least there seems to be hope for the future and that nation oddly enough has entrusted its freedom to a great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Has he ever been afraid to call upon his God for aid and guidance? Has he ever failed to give testimony to the source of his power? Would he be silenced in the halls of the United Nations or anywhere else when it came time to ask for the aid that cometh only from on high?

The battle is joined in Korea. For eight torturous months men have fought against overwhelming odds and in their moments of agony have called upon the God of their fathers to ease their pain, to give to them the victory.

Is that God now to be denied in the halls of the United Nations? "What shall it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul?"

Statement by Hon. John Marshall Butler, of Maryland, to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections on February 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of personal privilege. Before this committee begins its deliberations, I wish to raise the question as to the type of jurisdiction that the committee proposes to exercise and as to the nature of these proceedings. I shall confine myself to these questions in a brief statement, which I trust the committee will permit me to make, therefore, without interruption.

I am not here in response to any invitation to testify, but solely for the purpose stated. I have been informed that at this hearing witnesses are to be publicly heard whose testimony may involve criticism of me personally, my qualifications, and my conduct of my campaign. I, therefore, earnestly insist that before the hearing of any testimony it is essential for the committee to determine the character of the hearing.

There are only two constitutional powers under which this committee may be acting. Under article I, section 5, clause (1) of our Constitution, the Senate is the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members. Under its legislative powers, it has the authority to make investigations. Since the procedure is totally different and wholly different considerations govern, I submit at the outset it is necessary to determine which kind of hearing is to be conducted. While I have requested information, I have received none, nor have I been given notice

as to any specific charges that the committee's 3 months' investigation may have disclosed which would warrant any contest as to my election, the returns, or as to my qualifications.

First, it must be conceded that I have been duly returned as elected to the United States Senate by the proper Maryland authorities. There is therefore no occasion for the exercise by the Senate of its powers with respect to "elections or returns." The official vote was 236,291 for me and 203,180 for my opponent, showing a majority of 43,111.

Secondly, no question has been raised in Maryland as to my own complete compliance with the Maryland State Corrupt Practices Act. All reports were filed as required by me and my duly registered political agent, Mr. Mundy. Under the Maryland Corrupt Practices Act (Md. Ann. Code, 1939, art. 33, sec. 226), my opponent—or, indeed, any 10 duly qualified voters—could within 30 days after the election have had a complete and speedy investigation by a Maryland court and jury into any alleged violation of the statute. The result of any such judicial investigation would have been under Maryland law made available to this committee and the United States Senate.

Our Maryland law has provided adequate, impartial, judicial means of determining whether Maryland law has been violated. No petition was ever filed in any Maryland court, either within the statutory time or at any time, by my opponent or by any 10 voters, alleging any violation of the Maryland statute.

Does this committee, then, intend to disregard the fact that the Maryland authorities have found no reason to proceed or to take action on any alleged violations? Neither my opponent nor any 10 voters has dared submit such a question to a Maryland court and jury as provided by Maryland law.

Next, I have no personal knowledge of any violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. I filed—and my treasurer has filed—complete statements which I believe were a full compliance with that statute. I have never run for an elective office before, and I do not claim to be an expert in political procedures. In my campaign there were many citizens who volunteered to assist me—a large number of whom had had no prior experience in politics. Since my victory, I have learned that many people unknown to me at the time of the campaign were working independently to assist me.

It is thus impossible for me to state that the investigators of this committee may not have found some technical violations, as, indeed, I suspect could be found in a 3-month investigation of any political campaign. But I can state wholeheartedly and without any qualification whatsoever that I never knowingly have violated a single provision of any statute, and that if any of my supporters have done so, any such violations were technical in character and relatively trivial, and due to inexperience and not to intention.

There is no suggestion that the total amount of my expenditures was excessive compared to expenditures in other senatorial campaigns. It will also be found they were well within the limits of either State or Federal statutes.

As I understand it, during the past 3 months, this committee has been performing a function analogous to that of a grand jury, which is to determine whether there is any probable cause for further action, and to do so in a manner which will protect citizens against frivolous and unfounded public charges.

When it comes to a question of a public hearing, then I submit that before any such public hearing, in a similar manner, this committee should find that there is probable cause therefor. If it found that there was any such probable cause, then may I respectfully remind the committee that the Supreme Court has held (*Berry* v. *Cunningham* (279 U. S. 597, 615)) that in that event this committee acts in its judicial capacity in exercising the power to judge the qualifications of its members. It inevitably follows therefore that if the purpose of this hearing is to inquire into my qualifications or to reflect on me, I am entitled to notice of the charges made, an opportunity to prepare my answer, to assemble my evidence, and an opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, as required in every judicial trial. As the Supreme Court said in *In re Oliver* (333 U. S. 257, 273):

"A person's right to reasonable notice of a charge against him, and an opportunity to be heard in his defense—a right to his day in court—are basic in our system of jurisprudence; and these rights include, as a minimum, a right to examine the witnesses against him, to offer testimony, and to be represented by counsel."

I have no information whether any charges have been made against me. There is not and cannot be any suggestion that any technical or trivial irregularities that the investigators may have found in this case are comparable to the wholesale fraud, bribery, or tremendous expenditures which have served as a basis for unseating an elected Senator. No Senator has ever been unseated because of mere irregularities in procedure. In all cases where Senators have been unseated there has been proof of widespread fraud, bribery, or such large expenditures as to suggest wholesale vote buying and that the election was not a true expression of the voters' will. The Supreme Court has said in *Berry* v. *Cunningham*, *supra*, the obvious purpose of the provision in the Constitution empowering the Senate to determine the qualifications of its own Members "was to vest the Senate with authority to exclude persons asserting membership who either had not been elected or, what amounts to the same thing, had been elected by resort to fraud, bribery, corruption, or other sinister methods having the effect of vitiating the elections." I feel certain that the committee, in its 3 months' investigation, found no evidence that would meet this test. Therefore, its purpose must be to conduct an investigation preliminary to possible legislation and not in regard to my qualifications. Such an investigation involves completely and widely different considerations, and I shall be most ready and eager to be of assistance.

The considerations to which I refer are:

First, the question before the committee should not be the Maryland campaign alone, but the campaigns in all 48 States. There is no reason for singling out the State of Maryland.

It is, of course, true that in many States there are political machines and charges of wholesale vote frauds, as the Senators know. I do not need to name the States.

There is no Republican machine in Maryland, which has ever been charged with vote frauds or scandals of that kind. There was no Republican machine in Maryland at the time of my election. Indeed, there had been no Republican governor elected in Maryland since 1934, and only three since the Civil War. There had been no Republican Senator elected in Maryland since 1928. In view of the national publicity as to vote frauds and machine politics in many cities and States of this country, it would seem a little strange for this committee to single out Maryland as a State to be first investigated.

Second, in any investigation as to possible legislation, where it involves the inquiring into a campaign in any State, it may also reflect upon the conduct of the Senator from that State.

Therefore, if ultimately this committee investigates election practices in any State, in all fairness the Senators from that State should have the opportunity to know what witnesses are to be examined, the nature of the testimony proposed to be offered, and an opportunity to produce testimony and cross-examine witnesses.

The Senators know only too well that campaign gossip may be distorted without warrant into charges reflecting on a Senator's honor and integrity. Even if accorded a later opportunity to testify, the truth would never catch up with such charges. If, in an election which I won by the largest majority that has ever been given a Republican senatorial candidate in the history of my State, this committee is going to permit my opponent to use the investigative process as a rostrum to repeat his campaign arguments or to explain away his defeat, then surely this committee is establishing a precedent under which every defeated candidate, especially in close elections, will attempt to do the same thing.

I earnestly suggest to the committee that there would be great danger that hearings conducted to permit defeated candidates to rehash political arguments of a campaign will degenerate into smear attacks on the reputation of Senators under the guise of investigation as to legislation. Moreover, examination of witnesses at public hearings where no bill of particulars has been given as to any complaints inevitably means a fishing expedition which will give wide publicity to vicious campaign gossip.

To restate concisely the question of personal privileges which I have raised about procedure, I submit that the following courses are open to the committee:

1. If it should determine that its preliminary investigation discloses probable cause for my disqualification, I should be given notice of the charges, a list of witnesses, an opportunity to prepare for my defense, and the usual rights accorded in a judicial hearing.

2. If the committee should, as I confidently expect it will, determine that there has been no sufficient evidence produced at its preliminary investigation to warrant an election contest, then it should so report to the Senate. To do otherwise would be manifestly unjust, as it would amount to a prosecution of an elected Senator under the guise of preliminary studies for legislation, without giving him the constitutional rights of a judicial hearing.

Finally, I deeply resent the fact that ex-Senator Millard Tydings emphatically repudiated by the voters of the great State of Maryland, be allowed to blacken the name and reputation of Maryland.

I speak for the Democrats, a large majority of whom voted for me, as well as the Republicans in my State when I charge that my recent opponent, by his reckless and unjustified attacks upon me, is in reality attacking the intelligence and honesty of the voters of Maryland, who have supported me by an unprecedented majority. Despite the fact that on November 7, with a majority of 43,100, the voters of Maryland decreed that ex-Senator Tydings should no longer represent them in the Halls of the United States Congress, he is attempting to go behind their backs and get this committee to overrule their decision.

Do As I Say, Not As I Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, just before he recently left for his European tour and study of conditions abroad, Drew Pearson penned a column in which he set out the goals and obligations of columnists and commentators. Ostensibly intended as instructions for his staff, his ideas and observations might well serve as a bible of conduct for the fourth estate.

Drew Pearson's column, which appeared in the Washington Post on February 28, 1951, follows:

[From the Washington Post of Wednesday, February 28, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

NEWSMAN'S OBLIGATIONS CITED

Drew Pearson, departing for a news survey of gathering European war clouds, left the following instructions for his staff:

To the staff: I shall be traveling in Europe and countries adjacent to the iron curtain for the next 2 or 3 weeks. During that time you may have to write an occasional emergency column in case I get too far away from a cable office or the going gets tough.

In writing such columns please bear in mind the following:

Don't hesitate to admit an error. Double and triple check in order to avoid errors, but if you find you are wrong, say so. It is only fair to the man you have wronged, in addition to which the public will respect you for being fair.

If you are sure you are right, however, stick to your guns and if necessary we will battle it out.

Never bear grudges. If a President or a Senator calls you a name, don't call one back. Because he is puerile or small is no reason for you to sink to his level. Write facts; don't go in for name-calling. Any scrivener can fill a column with abuse. Epithets can be culled from any dollar dictionary, but it takes good journalism to ferret out graft or the backstage doings of diplomats or the income-tax cheaters—and then make what you say stand up in court.

SMOKE-FILLED ROOMS

Remember that it is part of your job to right some of the news wrongs of the Capital. The big newspaper chains can be ruthless, their newsmen in a hurry. It is your job to probe deeper than the hand-out or the official statement. You are to pick up where the spot-news men rushing for the telephone or grabbing for the headline, leave off. Frequently the best part of the story is after the spot-news cream has been skimmed.

Remember also that ever since politicians became politicians, the thing the public was not supposed to know has taken place in the private lobbies and the smoke-filled rooms. Yet what is hidden from the public is usually what the public is most entitled to know about, and the job of a good newspaperman to report.

Remember that in our system of government by checks and balances, it is your job to help in the checking. Government is so intricate and detailed today that Congress no longer can do all the checking. Furthermore, Congressmen themselves have to be checked. Most Congressmen are honest and reasonably conscientious, but it is your job to smoke out the Parnell Thomases, the Andy Mays, and the "Doc" Brehms, and report the facts about them—even if it means a tough battle.

FAITH IN GOVERNMENT

However, it is also important to remember that the Government is neither all good nor all bad. There are bureaucrats who are woefully inefficient, and bureaucrats who are a credit to mankind. It is your job to discriminate.

Government is only as good as the men in it. And since men are human, they are subject to all the frailties that make up mankind—laziness, inefficiency, greed, graft, temptation.

But they are also subject to great effort, sacrifice, inspiration.

It is your job as a newspaperman to spur the lazy, watch the weak, expose the corrupt. You must be the eyes, ears, and nose of the American people. Yes, the nose, too, is important. For no matter how much stench you may be exposed to, never lose your sense of smell.

But likewise remember that there are scores of underpaid Government servants dedicated to the cause of good government whom the public never hears of. It is your job to encourage them. It is also your job to let the public know that these men are working for them.

For the public must never lose confidence in its Government. Should it ever take seriously the scoldings of some of my competitors and lose confidence in our form of government, then the principle we are fighting for would be no more.

DEFEND LITTLE FELLOW

Remember also that it's the little fellow who usually gets kicked around. It's the little-business man, the GI, the guy in the lower-bracketed incomes who needs a friend. He has few friends in high places, no big politicians to pull wires, no one to speak for him on interlocking boards of directors. He has only the American public's strong sense of right and wrong to back him—and it's your job to spell out those rights and wrongs so the public can know what cooks.

This applies to minority groups as well as little people. Sometimes these groups, such as the Negroes or a minority religion, need a little more encouragement than the folks who are doing all right anyway.

Finally, remember that though the world moves slowly toward its two great goals—peace and the brotherhood of man—it is your job, when possible, to help accelerate the pace.

Sometimes it is better not to report a delicate diplomatic negotiation. Sometimes the cause of peace is best served by sacrificing a news story until a difficult diplomatic hurdle is over.

But if the diplomats fumble, if they betray their trust, then it is your job to be ruthless in exposing that betrayal. You must be their watchdog. You must let them know what the publicity penalty is—if they fail.

Finally, when you write anything, remember that the fewer words you say it in, the better.

These are the goals of the Washington merry-go-round which I have not lived up to. Perhaps you can.

Truman's Budget Carries His Socialistic Platform and Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith an article from the A. F. of L. Weekly News Service:

TRUMAN BUDGET ASKS FUNDS TO HELP DEFENSE WORKERS, EXPAND BENEFITS

WASHINGTON.—President Truman's record-breaking peacetime defense budget submitted to Congress on January 15 outlines a broad program to help workers in defense industries and to expand benefits for all workers.

Mr. Truman asked for $71,594,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. He estimated receipts at more than $55,000,000,000 with the remaining $16,000,000,000 to be raised by new taxes.

He said 60 percent of the total, or $48,900,000,000, would go for military purposes and building up our Armed Forces to resist Soviet Communist aggression.

The President noted that the budget also contained expenditures for programs which will maintain and develop our national strength over the long run, keeping in mind that the present emergency may be of long duration and we must, therefore, be prepared for crises in the more distant as well as in the immediate future.

He thus keyed to the defense program a number of previously recommended Fair Deal measures and reiterated his requests for enactment of legislation necessary to carry them out.

They included health insurance, aid to education, a Fair Employment Practice Act, expansion of social security, and a farm program along lines proposed by Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture.

The President also recommended anew and budgeted funds for a dozen other items requiring legislation, including authority to construct defense plants, higher postal rates, a St. Lawrence seaway and power project, loans for Indians, defense housing incentives and extension of authority to control exports, rents, prices, wages, and the distribution of materials.

Changing Age Distribution of the American Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensation of an article on the first national conference on aging, which appeared in the January 1951 issue of the Industrial and Labor Relations Review, published by the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University. The article, written by the Assistant Federal Security Administrator, Mr. John L. Thurston, tells how this important conference on this all-important subject came into being and was conducted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AGING: A PREVIEW OF MATURITY

(By John L. Thurston)

The first national conference on aging was held in Washington August 13–15, 1950. On that occasion 816 delegates from all parts of the country met to consider the total range of problems presented by the changing age distribution of the American population.

The conference was organized around 11 broad subject-matter fields. Non-Government planning committees did the preparatory work on content, conducted the conference work sessions, and are now preparing

reports of the work of the delegates in their sections. The comprehensive volume is expected to constitute a bench mark in the effort of American society to adjust to this major social change.

The total conference is seen as having three phases. The first consisted of the preliminary determination of subject matter to be covered, identification of individuals and interest groups concerned with aging problems, and the selection of delegates. The second phase was that in which the delegates met in Washington to get acquainted with one another, to share their experiences and knowledge in the aging field, and to develop principles and lines of action for the guidance of the many individuals, groups, agencies, and organizations concerned. The third phase is that of disseminating the findings of the delegates through all available media for their stimulus value and for the direction they may afford persons throughout the United States who wish to initiate programs. It is anticipated that this phase will be accomplished by numerous public and private agencies through the printed word, the radio, local conferences, small meetings, discussion groups, and formal courses and lectures.

ORIGIN OF THE CONFERENCE

The conference on aging had its origin in the felt need and requests for help from a varied and growing number of persons and groups who were confronting problems that were not being solved through ordinary techniques, programs, and services.

Medical practitioners and researchers were becoming aware of multiplying numbers of older people with chronic illness and infirmities of aging. Management, labor, and employment offices were becoming concerned over longer-lived workers who wished to remain in gainful employment. Welfare workers were meeting more and more demands for living arrangements for older people. Legislators were continually beset by demands for financial assistance. Here and there communities were finding demands for recognition of older persons in educational, recreational, counseling, and home-service programs. Homes for the aged and mental hospitals were taxed to capacity. Slowly, American society was becoming aware that there was something new and that it required attention.

The problem of aging came to the fore during the 1920's and 1930's in the form of a large surplus of older, unemployed workers, and provided the final impetus for the passage in 1935 of the Social Security Act with the old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance programs. During World War II, it was noted that older workers were making effective contributions in most employment fields. The suspicion arose that there were errors in our notion of the unemployability of older workers and in our assumption that financial need represented the only problem of older people.

In the spring of 1948 the National Health Assembly pointed out that there was a complex of aging problems somewhat related to, but actually quite apart from, the problem of chronic illness. Following a recommendation of the assembly, the Federal Security Agency set up a working committee on aging, composed of representatives of the constituent units. After surveying the field through the literature and with the aid of their colleagues and of competent outside persons, this committee issued a progress report which was sent to several hundred informed people for comment.

In the meantime various groups who had been developing trial programs in their own establishments and communities began to recognize that some aspects of the aging problem were national in scope and would need to be handled accordingly. These groups took the initiative also in asking the Federal Security Agency for a facility through which they could become acquainted with other workers in the field and could check their programs against those being conducted elsewhere.

Late in the spring the President of the United States felt the time had come to make an assessment of the total situation and requested the Federal Security Administrator to do so.

The conference on aging, on a national scale, was called by the Federal Security Administrator in response to this evident mounting interest—the stimuli from outside sources, the immediate and provocative response to the Agency's working committee report, and the desire of the President.

AN EXPLORATORY FORUM

The first decision made was that the conference should be an exploratory forum to be held as soon as it could be organized. It was recognized that, while many people were interested in various aspects of the problem, there was little systematic knowledge on which to organize a definitive program.

The second decision was that the conference should be broad in scope. The studies of the Agency committee had shown that the problems of individual and social adjustment to aging are as broad as life itself. The breadth of subject matter covered is shown in the following 10-section outline around which the conference was organized:

I. (a) Aging research—biological, medical, psychological, sociological aspects.

I. (b) Population changes and economic implications.

II. Employment, employability, rehabilitation.

III. Income maintenance.

IV. Health maintenance and rehabilitation.

V. Education for an aging population.

VI. Family life, living arrangements, and housing.

VII. Creative and recreational activities.

VIII. Religious programs and services.

IX. Community organization.

X. Professional personnel.

The next decision was that the conference should be essentially a conference by, of, and for persons outside the Federal service. In the end and at the request of the planning committee about 40 Government employees were invited as full-fledged delegates, representing themselves, however, rather than the organizations in which they work.

The decision as to nongovernmental responsibility and participation grew out of the twofold recognition: (1) That, whereas Government workers have expertness in some phases of the financial and health aspects of aging, the broad and varied experience needed in a comprehensive conference could come only by involving persons with a great variety of situations and interest fields and (2) that, since most of the work with the aging will always be done by varied groups at local and State levels, persons from those levels should from the start work out the solutions and actions to be employed.

The final major preconference determination was that the group process of discussion and decision making should be employed throughout. This decision was consistent with the state of knowledge in the field and with the nature of the conference. It has the further and compelling merit of making active participants of all who are involved.

OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of the conference were stated as follows:

I. To provide a forum for persons concerned with aging.

II. To revaluate the potentialities of older people toward insuring their useful and satisfying participation in the life of the community.

III. To stimulate the exchange of ideas among persons of varied experience, with a view to solving problems of the aging through voluntary and public organizations in each State, city, and community.

IV. To define the nature and extent of these problems as they affect the individual, his family, and his community.

V. To promote research on aging in such fields as employment, health, education, recreation, rehabilitation, and social and psychological adjustment.

VI. To transmit the findings of this conference to interested groups, including the Federal Government, as guidelines for developing policies with regard to our older people.

CONFERENCE DEVELOPMENT

The conference began to move in May when an advisory committee of outstanding persons and experts from many fields was appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. The individual committee members rendered invaluable service in reviewing the plans for the conference, nominating delegates, and affording guidance on several questions of policy. Later in the same month a small central office staff was set up, and a secretariat or committee of from five to a dozen Government staff members was created for each of the subject-matter areas or conference sections. Most of these committee members were from the Federal Security Agency, but representatives of seven other Government agencies were drawn in at appropriate points. There was representation from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Labor, and from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Library of Congress, and the Veterans' Administration.

The first task of the secretariats was the development of a preliminary outline for each section, detailed enough to determine the interest fields that should be involved, and, hence, to nominate appropriate persons from outside the Federal service to serve as members of the planning committees. The planning committees, in turn, were to assume responsibility for the subject matter content of the sections.

Planning committees consisted of from 9 to 13 persons, invited to serve by the Federal Security Administrator. Each committee held a 1- or 2-day exploratory meeting in June. Most met again during July, and all held meetings on the day preceding the conference.

It is a tribute to these committees and to American democracy that in every instance the planning committees accepted the invitation extended to them, made a preliminary outline for the section, nominated persons to be invited as delegates, and developed plans for conducting the August work sessions. With the help of the secretariats the committees cast the outlines in the form of questions which were mailed, together with background data, to the delegates in order to start their thinking prior to arrival in Washington.

Between planning committee meetings the secretariats worked on the delegate invitation lists, striving to achieve a balanced representation in each section. The committees had decided to seek broad interest representation within each section to insure expression of diverse points of view and to avoid narrow conclusions.

One of the first results achieved by the conference was the creation of a file of names of more than 2,000 people known to be concerned with some facet of the aging problem. The 816 delegates were selected from these names.

All delegates were invited as individuals representative of a field of interest and because of reported activity in that field. The conclusion was reached early in the group planning meetings that this procedure would yield a more informed group of delegates than would the procedure of inviting organizations to send official representatives.

The final step of this phase was an orientation meeting held the day before the conference opened for secretariats, planning committees, discussion leaders and recorders, reporters, and all other persons with specific responsibility for some aspect of the conduct of the meetings.

THE CONFERENCE

The conference on aging convened on Sunday morning, August 13, 1950. Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing addressed the entire delegate body on the origin of the meeting and the significance of the subject. Dwight Cooke, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, then conducted his weekly panel discussion program, People's Platform, from the head table, with three conference delegates participating. The assistant administrator for program of the Federal Security Agency, in general charge of the conference, explained the role of the agency as the servicing unit of the conference, charged the delegates with their responsibility, and turned the conference over to them. Before the first work sessions convened, the University of Chicago Round Table program, also with three delegates comprising the discussion panel, was broadcast from the conference rooms.

The creative work of the conference went forward in work sessions held on Sunday afternoon, Monday forenoon and afternoon, and Tuesday forenoon, and in numerous unscheduled meetings of small groups whenever time was available. According to prearrangement, most of the sections broke down into subsections for the major portion of the work period. Usually 33 group meetings were in progress simultaneously. Planning committee members and discussion leaders kept the groups organized and moving.

Besides the opening meeting, there were two general meetings. A dinner meeting on Monday was addressed by Prof. Edmund V. Cowdry, Dr. Alvin Johnson, and Miss Frances Perkins. Mr. Ewing took this occasion to award a citation to Miss Ollie A. Randall, of New York, for her pioneering work with the aging. The final conference session was a luncheon meeting. The program consisted of a fast-moving summary of conclusions and unanswered questions presented by Dwight Cooke, CBS commentator, as conference rapporteur, with the assistance of the section chairmen.

It is worthy of note that the desire for a forum type of exploratory conference carried through to the very end; not one action was proposed or taken by the delegate body as a whole.

SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

It is too early, at this writing, to state many of the conclusions reached in the conference. The several section committees are now engaged in preparing their final statements. What can be done here is mainly to report on the principal topics that came up for discussion. There was general agreement that the situation is already so critical as to require the immediate attention of all appropriate groups and interest in society.

Older people constitute the most rapidly growing segment of our population. There will be some 20,000 persons 65 years of age by 1975. The principal factor in their percentage increase has been the declining birth rate over the past century. Improvements in health have been a secondary factor but may become more important as a result of research and improved medical care.

Largely by reason of aging of the population, the average number of older dependents per worker has increased by 50 percent since 1900. Another set of factors contributing to this increase includes technological changes, shifts in the demands for labor in different occupations, shrinkage of opportunity in self-employment, changing employment practices, and compulsory retirement programs. Only 45 percent of men over 65 are in the labor force now compared with 68 percent in 1890.

These changes have a good many implications for the American economy. The delegates appeared to be in agreement that older people need to receive financial support sufficient to sustain at least their primary needs. Some income needs appear to decline with age but others, as for medical services, increase.

In two or three sections, much of the discussion was devoted to consideration of how financial support is to be maintained. The old-age and survivors insurance program, together with old-age assistance, is expected to continue to provide the core of income for many of those (and their dependents) not gainfully employed, but it was suggested that the breadth and amount of coverage need further consideration. The role of private pension systems and their ability to meet the needs of the individual and of society were discussed.

Many delegates saw the solution to the problem of adequate financial support for older people in continuing employment. This solution has the added advantage of contributing to the production of goods and services to supply the needs of the total population—a point that assumes particular significance during the present national emergency.

Separating continuing employment from chronological age, and relating it to capacities and desires of individual workers instead, appeared to present one of the knottiest problems raised by the delegates. The prospect of growing numbers of years in retirement was impressive, as was the consequential need for increasing support. There were conflicting beliefs regarding the interests of workers themselves in the matter.

Raising the retirement age would constitute reversal of the long-time trend which would be difficult in view of growing output per man-hour and other factors already mentioned. It was pointed out, also, that raising age limits would be contrary to habits of thinking regarding employability of older workers, habits that resulted in the general establishment of compulsory retirement ages. Reversal of this thinking would require wholesale change of attitudes.

While many delegates argued for flexibility in withdrawal from the labor force, they recognized that there are difficult problems of administration. It was pointed out that the worker's desires in the matter are conditioned by his financial situation and by his need for status within his family and among his fellows, and that we lack objective criteria for determining employability. In addition, there is a complicated two-way relationship between retirement policies and pension systems, which might be further complicated by introducing flexibility into retirement systems. Other delegates indicated that continuing employment of many older workers would necessitate job shifts as the effects of aging appear, and would necessitate counseling, special placement, retraining, and, perhaps, modification of jobs and adjustment in rates of payment.

The point on which there appears to have been almost total agreement is that we lack sufficient data to answer any of the questions raised in this connection. Over and over again, the delegates pointed out that the field for research is large and that the problems are numerous and varied. There is no question about their importance.

In addition to considering the implications of aging for the economy as a whole, all conference sections appeared to start with certain fundamental assumptions regarding older people as individuals. Briefly stated, these are: (1) Older people exhibit all of the fundamental needs or desires found among people at any age; (2) satisfaction of needs continues, as in all adult life, to be primarily a matter of individual effort; and (3) older people can find satisfaction only in a favorable environment. The sections recognized, further, that aging affects not only the individual but also his family, the community in which he lives, and the whole of society. Much of the discussion, therefore, concerned factors in individual adjustment, and adaptation of knowledge and social institutions to aging.

POSTCONFERENCE ACTIVITIES

Since the close of the conference many letters have been received regarding the significance of the conference and the impetus it may have given to the thinking and planning for our aging population. Some of the delegates have indicated that they expect to see things move ahead in their home communities, while others state that they have already gotten things underway.

It is reported that one State may set up a commission on aging and that another State is calling a meeting of all delegates to the conference to determine what the next steps should be. A third State and several communities have asked for all of the information available from the conference for the use of commissions or committees already established. One large city has indicated that it will request its mayor to set up a commission to deal with the entire range of problems in that community. Another large city is setting up a demonstration research project to observe the effects of introducing an activity program into homes for the aged.

A number of professional organizations are bringing the conference results to the attention of their memberships through articles in their journals or through addresses at meetings. One such organization has prepared a symposium on education for aging. Already there have been several requests for consultation on proposed educato sink very slowly.

To the extent that such interest is maintained and activities are developed, the conference on aging will have been successful.

A Visit to a Korean Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith an article by United Press staff correspondent H. D. Quigg, describing a visit to a hospital in Korea:

HARD TO TELL LIVE FROM DEAD, FRONT HOSPITAL—WOUNDED LIE ON CANVAS LITTERS, DUST-CAKED AND BLOODY

(By H. D. Quigg)

A HOSPITAL IN KOREA, February 21.—The receiving room is large and high-ceilinged and filled with the chugging of the motor of a blower which sends hot air into the room through two big canvas tubes lying on the floor.

The ambulances back up to the receiving-room door, and the wounded come out on canvas litters, covered with olive-drab blankets, their faces showing dust-beards, their arms lying limp. It's hard to tell whether some of them are alive or dead.

Ten soldiers lie on litters on the receiving room floor. Some smoke and gaze at the lights glowing dimly on the high ceiling. Some just lie, their eyes closed, faces sick and gray. They're waiting to be checked in,

screened, and treated. Many still wear their green field caps. Dried blood mottles their stiffened clothing. Here and there a first-aid splint shows on an arm or leg.

Other wounded, starting to get treatment, are on a row of Army cots. An attendant with knife and scissors cuts off their clothing. Two or three are getting whole blood from pint bottles hung above them on iron frames. If you watch, you can see the pink blush of life coming back to their faces.

An Army nurse with fluffy blonde hair crooks her finger at me as I sit on a bench at the side of the room. As I approach she hurriedly hands me a pinched-shut portion of rubber tube hanging from a blood bottle.

"Hold this, will you?" she says, and I choke off the flow of blood in the tube while she begins probing in a soldier's arm with the large hollow needle at the end of the tube. The soldier below us on the cot is in a state of deep shock, which has caused his veins to contract.

The Nurse, Lt. Margaret Feil, of San Francisco, can't get the needle in a vein. She probes and probes, and the wounded man jumps and rolls his head at each probe. A medic pulls off one of the soldier's boots and he writhes in pain, for he has a mortar wound in the leg.

A doctor takes the blood-giving needle from the nurse and tries to get it in a vein lower in the arm, but it's no use. They have been working on the soldier's left arm. His right arm is a stump, blown off below the elbow. It is wrapped in a huge rolled white bandage, soaked with blood.

The head surgeon, a major, comes over and takes a syringe needle and begins probing deep in the man's thigh for a blood vessel. The guy is conscious and the surgeon says, "How do you feel now?"

"I don't feel bad at all," the guy says. He takes a cigarette.

A medic approaches and looks at the record card tied to the soldier's clothes and goes away, shaking his head. The case is critical. The important thing is to get blood into him. The surgeon has given up probing and is cutting into one of the big veins at the ankle. No blood comes out as he cuts. He thrusts a hollow metal tube through the incision and into the vein and attaches the bottle tube to it. The blood level of the bottle begins to sink very slowly.

The soldier has lost consciousness. As I leave he is lying still, his head fallen to one side, the arm stump hanging down over the cot edge. He probably will live, because someone has given the blood to keep him alive.

Gray's Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gray's Elegy," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAY'S ELEGY

England just now is celebrating the bicentennial of Thomas Gray's famous Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard. The poem was published by Robert Dodsley in quarto in February 1751, and it was "greatly successful from the very first." Composed by "the slowest of bards," it represented 7 years of consideration on his part. He was 35 when it finally was issued and had only two decades of life before him—and nothing much worth doing with the time. Richard Garnett and Edmund Gosse, in their History of English Literature, refer to him as being "altogether too delicate for the rough age he lived in." It served him to little effect that he was "perhaps the most learned man in Europe." Loneliness and gout afflicted him. He was constitutionally too fat, too shy, and too weak of body and spirit. Yet he could and did write lines as simple, as graceful, and as richly beautiful as:

"The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
The lowing herd wind slowly o'er the lea,
The plowman homeward plods his weary way,
And leaves the world to darkness and to me."

Nothing more compelling of its kind exists in English letters than the whole picture painted in the elegy. Each single word of it obviously has been chosen with meticulous discrimination. The poem is a tour de force of taste. If proof of its power be wanted, it may be found in this stanza, often quoted even now after two centuries:

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

Gray's mood throughout is melancholic. He faces the universe as a philosopher and as an artist, too, but he is sad and sorrowful—there is no exuberant joy in his work. The youth "to fortune and to fame unknown" is himself, and he mourns his frustrations, his disappointments, his pathetic griefs. At the last of the lament he affirms that heaven has granted him the friend who was "all he wished," but the elegist's history contradicts the claim. His immortal poem stands today as an appeal for a type of human fellowship—an authentic mutuality—which rarely, if ever, develops anywhere on earth. It is a cry for mercy which many great souls have helped to raise, all too often in vain.

Coming His Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is included herewith an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

Some of the professional—being for hire—New Deal, left-wing smear propagandists are having it handed out to them. Naturally they resent it, for they have proceeded on the theory that no one dare criticize any of their output.

The editorial from the Chicago Tribune—and there was one like it in the Washington Times-Herald — indicates that this little "holier than thou" group will have to expect an exposure of their motives—the falsity of their conclusions.

The editorial is as follows:

ONE WINDBAG WHO'S IN NO DANGER

Quentin Reynolds [chatter and opinions for hire] was heard the other day on a program sponsored by a television manufacturer. Reynolds is the New York night-club warrior who appeared before the Democratic National Convention in 1944 to plug for the fourth term, asserting that he spoke for the boys in the front lines.

He had no commission from them to back up this contention, but it is plain that he did walk away with a check for $2,000 from the Garsson boys when they threw a party to celebrate their receipt of an "E" award from the Government for their glorious contribution to the "wah effoht." Later they were sent to the penitentiary with the New Deal statesman, Representative Andy May.

Reynolds can always be counted upon to bleed at every one of his copious pores out of reverence for the New Deal, but sometimes he changes his pace and loses himself in rhapsodies dedicated to the Soviet Union. He was 1 of 16 alleged writers who contributed to an extraordinary smear campaign in 1945 intended to damn W. L. White's critical Report on the Russians as "the book the Nazis like." Reynolds therein confessed his "love" for the Red soldiers who now form the basis of Mr. Truman's "tizzy."

The latest Reynolds offering starts off as follows: "The headstone over the grave on the grassy slope at Arlington Cemetery is a simple one with a simple inscription. It merely says, 'James Forrestal, 1892–1949, lieutenant, United States Navy.' Another line should be added: 'That one should read: 'Murdered by the American people.'"

Reynolds develops this astonishing theme by citing the fact that "we," meaning the people, put overwhelming burdens on "our public servants" until finally "some of them crack under the strain." He professes to see this happening again, although he concedes that Truman is fit, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder puts in 8 hours in bed, and the rest of the crowd are not complaining. The principal manifestations that something is wrong with Truman have been provided by that gentleman himself, in various quixotic letters and statements.

"As the tension mounts, as the responsibilities increase," Reynolds intoned, "we can expect more tragedies. We not only give our public servants impossible jobs to do; we snipe at them carelessly, criticize them unmercifully if their conception of the job does not conform to ours. Today there are a great many men in key defense posts in Washington whom we, the American people, have virtually sentenced to death—Harry Truman, Charles E. Wilson, General Marshall, Averell Harriman, Cyrus Ching, Frank Pace, Stuart Symington, General Bradley, Eric Johnston, General Collins, just to mention 10 men."

It may be asked why these people are exposing themselves if they don't like the work. Truman nearly broke his neck 2½ years ago to make sure that his job did not get away from him. The rest of the crowd can resign any time they want to. Many of them are politicians who are in the business for the power and perquisites, and the generals have been rewarded with their present station for playing ball.

With the exception of Mr. Truman, who got elected, but wouldn't stand a chance of repeating in the light of current sentiment, these public servants that we are supposed to have put in authority hold no mandate from the people to do 2 percent of the silly things that they have taken on themselves in their current zeal to latch onto wars and wreck the country generally.

Reynolds is at the same old confidence game of saying that nobody must criticize a New Dealer. If his examples are going to crack up, it would be convenient if they did so before they see that the country does. As to the crack-up, other reasons have been advanced, one of them being that members of an administration who invariably put foreign interests ahead of their own country's

inevitably become victims of psychological conflict, remorse, and loss of control.

To accuse the American people of murdering men who won't let go of power if they have anything to say about it is as shameless a libel as could be advanced. As long as the honorarium comes in from the sponsor, Reynolds himself is in no danger of sacrificing himself. As long as chumps can be found to pay money for windy vacuity, this perambulating tub will, unfortunately, be with us.

Statement of E. C. Hallbeck Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, legislative representative, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on Monday, February 26, 1951. He testified before the subcommittee on behalf of Senate bill 355 and related measures. His testimony, the result of much study, was so outstanding that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with appendix A and appendix B.

There being no objection, the statement and appendixes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF E. C. HALLBECK, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, ON S. 355 AND RELATED MEASURES, BEGINNING ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1951

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name, for purpose of the record, is E. C. Hallbeck, and I am the legislative representative of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, with offices at 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Ours is a voluntary organization and is composed entirely of post office clerks in more than 5,000 post offices of the first, second, and third class, located in every State and in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

It is my understanding that you are today considering four bills, S. 355, S. 376, S. 414, and S. 415, all of which relate to the pay or compensation of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. If it be satisfactory to this committee, I shall comment on each bill in turn, placing by far the greater emphasis on the bill S. 355 which, to the people I represent, is certainly the most important and for which there is a very pressing immediate need.

Prior to July 1, 1945, the Postal Classification Act provided five automatic grades for post-office clerks with salaries ranging from $1,700 to $2,100 per annum. There were in addition two grades known as special clerk grades at $2,200 and $2,300 per annum respectively. These latter grades were limited entirely to first-class post offices and were created as an incentive to industry, efficiency, and the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of the postal service and its requirements. Needless to say, promotion to such grades was extremely rare except in some of our largest post offices. For all practical purposes it is correct to say that only five salary grades existed insofar as most offices were concerned.

With the enactment of Public Law 134 of the Seventy-ninth Congress the number of automatic grades was increased from 5 to 11 with a spread of $1,000 between grades 1 and 11, the salary range being from $1,700 to $2,700 per annum. The same number of grades with equivalent hourly rates were provided for substitute employees.

Both Senator CARLSON and yourself were Members of the House of Representatives during the Seventy-ninth Congress, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure both of you will recall the circumstances that led to the enactment of that legislation. You will recall, I am sure, that President Roosevelt had set a figure of $150,000,000 as the maximum cost of such a measure, and that the then Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House, under the leadership of Chairman Burch, was more or less required to work out a satisfactory formula within that limitation. Chairman Burch and his committee had the advice and technical assistance of three extremely capable postal officials, the late Smith W. Purdum, then Second Assistant Postmaster General; the late Mr. Joseph F. Gartland, Director of Budget and Administrative Planning, and Mr. Archie A. Imus, the then Commissioner of Administrative Planning. While it is true that the representatives of the employees were consulted at practically every step, it is also true that the law as finally enacted was to a very considerable degree the brainchild of Mr. Gartland and Mr. Imus. It was they who developed the formula by which additional grades were superimposed on the existing five-grade structure, leaving the first five grades at the same rate as that originally provided in 1925, in order to keep down the cost estimate of the bill.

There was a feeling, and, I think, with good reason, that since no one knew when permanent classified appointments would again be made (we were still at war when the legislation was being considered), entrance salary grades presented a purely academic question that could easily be solved whenever permanent appointments were again authorized. Unfortunately, things did not work out that way. The end of the war and demobilization were almost coincident with the enactment of the 11-grade structure and the Post Office Department in 1945–46 was offering 1935 entrance wages to the returning veterans anxious to rehabilitate themselves in a peaceful society. Every man appointed since is still trying to catch up and is at least four grades or $400 behind on the economic merry-go-round.

While there is justification for a spread in grades based on the relative worth of a new man and an experienced and trained man to the postal service, there is no justification for the present 11-grade spread. In the branch of the service which I represent, and it is by far the largest branch of the field service, the vast bulk of the employees are engaged in the distribution of mail which requires a specialized knowledge that can only be acquired by experience. Mail is distributed, or sorted, by means of what we call schemes which require a knowledge of schedules and routes of each railroad and the time of arrival in each city and the time and places where those railroads intersect other railroads or star routes in a given State or group of States. Some of those schemes are extremely involved and many of them require 3 or 4 years of constant application before an employee completes his entire assignment and is a qualified competent workman. Obviously his value to the postal service is not as great in his first year as it is in his fourth or fifth year, but if he isn't a qualified journeyman at his position after his fifth year, he never will be. If he is thus qualified then he should be paid at the rate paid to other competent workmen and not required to work another 6 years at an inferior rate of pay, before receiving the same pay as others doing similar work.

We feel that the change from a 5-grade to an 11-grade salary structure was a mistake and believe that section 1 of the bill S. 355 is the best way to correct the existing condition.

Section 2 of the bill S. 355 requires no extended explanation. It would increase all field postal service salaries by 17 percent of the first $5,000 of such salaries. We realize that it will be necessary for us to justify the figure of 17 percent, and we are prepared to do so.

First of all, let me say that the 17-percent figure is not something picked out of the air, nor arrived at in any haphazard fashion. The best possible illustration of this lies in the recent report to this committee submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission. According to that report, the cost of living advanced 16.1 percent from 1939 to November of last year. During that same period of time the average wage of a post office clerk advanced from $2,125 per annum to approximately $2,500 per annum, an increase of only some 11.8 percent, or a net loss of 16.3 percent. It should be borne in mind that the figures used were for November of last year, and that the index has risen something like 3 or 4 points during the interval between the date of the report and the present time.

To cite a specific example, using the formulas of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the group I represent has suffered a minimum loss of $6.64 per week in net spendable earnings, an amount which in terms of current dollars is equal to $12.27 per week, or $638.04 per annum, which would justify an increase of more than 18 percent based on current prices and earnings. We all know from bitter personal experience that prices are still going up despite price controls, and I think it would be perfectly safe to say that a 20-percent increase could easily be justified by the beginning of the next fiscal year.

In the past 10 years the postal wage has continually lagged behind the cost of living, and, as a result, postal employees have been going deeper and deeper into debt with each passing year. It has become necessary for an ever-increasing number of employees to seek additional part-time employment, and an even larger number of employees have their wives and children gainfully employed in order to supplement their postal income. This is not a healthy situation. It is disruptive of home and family life and could well be a contributing factor to the current increase in juvenile delinquency.

We feel that early enactment of S. 355 is desirable not only from the personal standpoint of the employee but because it will be reflected in improved morale and efficiency within the postal service as well.

With respect to the bill S. 415, "To provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices," I had an opportunity to go into that briefly at the initial meeting of this subcommittee on February 2. I am attaching as appendix B a reprint from the Postal Bulletin, the next to the last paragraph of which deals with this subject in the fewest possible number of words.

Theoretically at least, a regular clerk in an office of the third class is on duty 8 hours per day, 7 days per week. Unlike all other classified regular employees, all services of 8 hours or less performed on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays is performed gratis, and without compensation either in time or money. In our view, this is an entirely unwarranted and unjust discrimination. Surely a Government that requires private employers to pay premium rates for hours in excess of 40 per week should at least grant compensatory time during the following week

to the employees of that Government who are required to work more than 40 hours per week.

We believe that the bill S. 415 by Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, will correct this unfortunate condition and urge its early enactment.

Another bill before this subcommittee, S. 414, deals with the same subject and would amend the present law so as to give the employee an option of accepting either the compensatory time now provided or additional pay at the overtime rate for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays.

Obviously, it would be difficult for the representative of any group of employees to oppose legislation which gives employees a choice of benefits. Certainly the principle of a premium pay for such service is pretty well established in private industry. However, we must also recognize that the task of moving the mail is a 24-hour-per-day, 7-days-per-week job and that unlike a manufacturing or mercantile establishment it is not practical to close the doors on Friday or Saturday evening and keep them closed until the following Monday morning. We also recognize the fact that a considerable amount of the work of substitute employees results from the compensatory time given to regular employees. If regular employees generally were to accept overtime pay rather than compensatory time, the work opportunities presently provided for substitutes would be drastically reduced.

Giving due consideration to these facts, our executive committee approved a resolution referred to it by our national convention which in substance provided that employees who perform service on Saturdays should be given 90 minutes of compensatory time for each hour of Saturday service, and 2 hours of compensatory time for each hour of service on a Sunday or holiday. We feel that this is a better approach to the problem. It would first of all, by administrative means, reduce Saturday, Sunday, and holiday work to the essential minimum. Secondly, it would provide a premium rate for Saturday, Sunday, and holiday service, in common with private industry, without adversely affecting substitute employees.

While it is true that the bill as introduced would perhaps augment present inadequate salaries, we do not believe that overtime work, even at a premium rate of pay, is a cure for that evil. We, therefore, recommend that the bill S. 415 be amended to provide that employees who are required to perform service on Saturdays shall be given 90 minutes of compensatory time for each hour of such service and employees who are required to perform service on Sundays and holidays shall be given 2 hours of compensatory time for each hour of such service, and that the bill as thus amended be enacted.

The fourth and last bill under consideration at this time is S. 376. This bill would provide a salary reclassification for postmasters and supervisors and would not directly affect members of the organization I represent. While recognizing that there are inequities in the present set-up, I do not consider myself competent to discuss this legislation at length. However, I do feel that there is considerable controversy in connection with this legislation and believe it should be considered on its own merits and not made a part of a general bill dealing with wage adjustments such as those contemplated in S. 355.

We sincerely appreciate the time and attention being given to this subject by the members of this subcommittee and hope that as a result of your deliberations the Congress will be prevailed upon to take necessary corrective action at an early date. We especially hope for an early favorable report on S. 355 as introduced by Chairman JOHNSTON of the committee.

Thank you.

APPENDIX A

NET SPENDABLE WEEKLY EARNINGS

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, the average weekly salary multiplied by 0.819 plus $7.31 equals the net spendable weekly earnings after allowance for income and social-security taxes for a family of four.

To adjust weekly earnings with the same earnings expressed in 1939 dollars, the current Consumers Price Index is divided by the 1939 index. The net spendable weekly earnings divided by the quotient thus obtained equals the current wage expressed in 1939 dollars.

Present approximate annual wage of $3,500 equals $67.30 per week; $67.30 multiplied by 0.819 plus $7.31 equals $62.42; $62.42 divided by 179.4 equals $34.79.

1939 annual wage of $2,165.21 equals $41.63 per week:	
1939 wage	$41.63
Present wage in 1939 dollars	34.79
Deficiency in 1939 dollars	6.84

$6.84 in 1939 dollars equals $12.27 in December 1950 dollars; $6.84 multiplied by 179.4 equals $12.27.

(Source: Handbook of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor.)

APPENDIX B

[Reprint of notice which appeared in the Postal Bulletin of October 12, 1948]

INSTRUCTION OF FIRST AND FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS GENERAL

OVERTIME AND COMPENSATORY TIME FOR THE DECEMBER 1948 QUARTER

The attention of postmasters is directed to the necessity for the exercising of the utmost care in the use of overtime during the December 1948 quarter, and it is the duty of each postmaster to give this important matter detailed and personal attention and not to handle it in a routine manner.

* * * * *

Attention is called to the fact that clerks at offices of the third class are not subject to the provisions of the 40-hour workweek law, and may not be paid overtime, nor granted compensatory time, for the first 8 hours of service performed on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays.

The matter of the judicious use of overtime, for regular employees as well as supervisors, is one of great importance, and postmasters will be held personally accountable for the use of funds in that respect. It is imperative that overtime in all instances be restricted to emergency needs only, and postmasters must see that these instructions are given strict attention and full compliance.

Proposed Amendments to the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several editorials regarding the proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act. These include editorials from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union, the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, the Philadelphia Bulletin, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the Dallas News.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of January 12, 1951]

UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Defense Secretary Marshall presented to Congress Wednesday a balanced program of universal military service beginning at the age of 18 and continuing for 27 months in active service. The bill begins service a year younger than the present law and continues it longer than formerly contemplated in universal military training proposals. The more emotional opposition will be centered upon the first point.

No age is a convenient age to take 27 months out of one's plans for the future. But when the first emotional reaction is spent we believe that most boys and most parents will conclude that starting required service at 18 is an over-all time saver.

Deferments will be granted to permit finishing high school and for completing a college year if started before a youth's eighteenth birthday.

Normally an 18-year-old has completed high school at that age. A delay of a year for most boys would be a wasted year. The only jobs open to him would be restricted by his liability to service after a few months of work.

Starting early and getting it over with without loss of time in their main plans for life will be accepted by most young men.

What appears to be ample allowance for higher training of qualified candidates is included in the Defense Department plan. The Nation cannot afford to permit a gap in the training of doctors, scientists, leaders, and technicians.

If the provisions of this bill are linked in all the States with an accelerated educational program such as is being studied by the board of regents of New York, all the 27 months of service need not be reckoned as "lost" time.

Our men will be just as well educated, if not better, and have the added personal satisfaction of having done their duty to their country.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of January 15, 1951]

ARBITRARY AGE LIMITS

Letters to Congressmen protesting the drafting of 18-year-olds and proposals that 18-year-olds who are old enough to fight are old enough to vote both emphasize the fact that there really are no pat and perfect ages for beginning or ending anything.

Something of the same sort applies to retirement ages firmly fixed in the rules of some organizations and agencies, pension plans, and the like. There is no clear set age at which every boy reaches readiness to vote or fight and no age at which it can clearly be said that a man is finished and ought to get out of the job and out of the way.

Some boys certainly seem babies who ought to be protected at 18 from the harsh realities and dangers of military service. Some men at 65 or even 70 are at the prime of their usefulness and ability in their jobs.

The unfortunate fact is that in dealing with large numbers of people some arbitrary ages must be set. That was done long ago when we settled quite arbitrarily upon 21 as the age of maturity in citizenship. Clearly, however, some people are much more qualified for the exercise of the suffrage at 18 than some others seems at 65.

Every age can be wrong. Some very immature boys will be subject to selective service at 19 and even at 20. Some able, useful, and experienced men are summarily separated from their jobs by retirement rules long before they should be. And some at 40 and 45 are already worn out as far as usefulness in their jobs is concerned. There will be much debate on this 18-year-old draft proposal as about other age limit rules. Everybody has a right to be heard with regard to it. The one certain thing, however, is that wherever the draft age is fixed it will not fit every boy neatly. Somewhere, however, an age must be fixed and the best place to fix it will be where it best serves the present and the future security of the Republic. And there will be no unanimity of opinion about that.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of January 19, 1951]

MARSHALL'S DRAFT PLAN

Sentiment has been making itself felt in Congress against the Defense Department's desire to lower the draft age from 19 to 18. Twelve months make a great difference in a teen-ager's mental and physical development, but it is questionable whether the difference between 18 and 19 is as great as some have pictured it.

In shifting manpower as well as industry to military purposes, the ideal is to achieve the desired end with the least possible dislocations. This is General Marshall's most telling argument in favor of lowering the draft age. He could get the needed manpower from the 19 to 26 age group, but he would have to take husbands and fathers, and this would mean a greater social damage than the drafting of 18-year-olds.

Drafting of young men at completion of high school would mean fewer family hardships. Also, as it now stands, a young man has a time finding a job between high school and being drafted at 19; or if he goes on to college, generally speaking, it means breaking off after 1 year.

Right now these youths are perplexed, not knowing which way to turn. All uncertainty never will be eliminated, but General Marshall's plan is aimed at doing away with some of it, at the expense of heartbreak to parents.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 26, 1951]

BUT IV-F'S CAN'T FILL ALL DRAFT NEEDS

Relaxation of the mental and physical standards for draft inductions is a necessary prerequisite to the drafting of 18-year-old boys, but it can hardly be regarded as a substitute for a thorough program of training and service for the Nation's younger men.

Assistant Defense Secretary Anna Rosenberg's disclosure that the qualifications for military service will be lowered is welcome for one big reason: it contains hopeful assurance that large numbers of older men will not be allowed to avoid some form of defense service while their younger brothers are being drafted.

The policy of excessively high physical and mental standards combined with wholesale deferments for other causes had just that effect during the last war. It meant that men with minor disqualifications not only avoided combat service; they didn't even serve in behind-the-lines jobs where their defects couldn't possibly have interfered with performance of duty.

It is not only that many men in the public eye were excused from service, although the classification of apparently hale and hearty athletes and movie actors as IV-F understandably aroused public disapproval. Large numbers of men were deferred—and they are still being deferred under present draft regulation—who were fit to carry out all but the most arduous front-line duties.

For every dubious IV-F who was exempted, a man who could meet all the requirements had to be drafted. That is unfair in any event; it will be doubly unfair if additional 18-year-olds have to be called because some older men are kept from the services without good reason.

Unquestionably some of the reasons for the needlessly high physical and mental standards goes back to the individual military services. There is as yet no uniformity on qualifications among the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and this applies to men who serve in noncombat positions as well as those who do the actual fighting.

Mrs. Rosenberg's statement that qualifications will be lowered indicates that some of the services will have to make use of men they have previously rejected, and it is about time. There are scores of jobs in all the services which can be filled satisfactorily by men barred by present draft standards.

But it doesn't follow that all our military manpower needs can be met by lowering the standards. Mrs. Rosenberg estimates that 150,000 more men could be added under the present 19-to-26 draft by this move. If we are to build up our Armed Forces to 3,500,000 by June 30 of this year we'll need many more than that.

Objections to drafting 18-year-old boys are wholly understandable. Nobody likes to see boys of this age taken away from their families and schools or jobs.

The world situation, however, makes a build-up of military strength imperative. It demands not only an immediate increase in the size of our forces, but a system of training for all young men so that we will never again have to send green, untrained troops into battle, if war should come.

It is better for the 18-year-olds to receive basic training now than to run the risk of being called suddenly later and thrown into combat without proper preparation. Their own chances of survival would be better and so would the Nation's.

Certainly provision should be made that any draft of young men would not completely disrupt our educational system. Those who qualify for further education, especially in the fields of science and engineering which are vital to national security, should be allowed to continue schooling after basic training is completed.

But the important thing is that the Nation face the facts on its manpower needs. Those facts call for a swift build-up of the armed services, using all available manpower, and a system of training for the younger men to prepare them for the part they may have to play in safeguarding the Nation's security.

[From the Dallas News of January 20, 1951]

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD DRAFT

The verbal sparring in Washington over whether to draft 18-year-olds is largely pointless. If full-scale war comes, we will have to do it. We had to do it in 1917–19, we had to do it in 1941–45, and we will have to do it again whenever the enemy strikes, be it 1951 or at some future date, say, in the 1960's.

The only point is whether these youngsters shall be properly trained to defend themselves and our country. President Karl T. Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is on sure ground when he asks that the draft be lowered from 19 to 18 years. He couples it with a plea for universal military training for all men between the ages of 18 and 27.

Congress and the Nation erred in not heeding Dr. Compton's plea for universal training 5 years ago. He made it as head of a committee of distinguished Americans who studied our defense needs and came to this conclusion. We would not find ourselves in the box we do today if we had paid attention to him then.

Defense Secretary Marshall says it is not the intention of the Armed Forces to send 18-year-olds overseas. Nor do they want to use them in any possible combat before they have had at least 4 months' training. Such a policy is both wise and possible at the moment. But General Marshall refuses, rightly enough, to be bound by such restrictions under all circumstances. They could be disastrous in the event of sudden, all-out, and undeclared war. Such a policy would have to be chucked out the window the instant Russia or any other enemy cut loose on us.

Have We Any Friends?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Have We Any Friends?" from the February 1951 issue of Fortune magazine.

This is a remarkable piece on the ideological struggle throughout the world. In the midst of our debate about army divisions and production, Fortune argues our greatest enemy may well be a myth—the myth believed by millions throughout the world that America is a country without a soul.

Make no mistake—

Says Fortune—

if we do not destroy this myth, it will destroy us.

Fortune's editors believe the United States should spend $500,000,000 a year on the international information and educational exchange program, in order to replace this myth with a world-wide understanding of what Fortune calls the American proposition.

I am informed that the article is estimated by the Public Printer to make three and two-thirds pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $300.68.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE WE ANY FRIENDS?—YES; BUT THEY ARE BEFUDDLED BY A MYTH; AND A MYTH PARTLY OF OUR OWN MAKING

It might one day be written that the free world destroyed itself because of a myth. It would not be the big lie of the Russians; only the fools believed that. It would be something much more inexplicable; the myth that for all our bathtubs and our cars and our skyscrapers we are without moral purpose; that we are the new Carthage—all money, no spirit; that we are, in short, a country without a soul.

Make no mistake; if we do not destroy this myth, it will destroy us. Already it has sapped the will of our allies, made those who benefited from the ECA cynical of its purpose; and each month it grows more in virulence, ready to attack at each crisis. But even more terrible has been the effect on us. For when we hear it played back to us, we grow petulant and disturbed, and in our anger many of us can think of nothing but to pull down the pillars on a world that does not understand.

Yet the West is desperately eager to listen. That it tragically misunderstands us

is not easily explained by the accusations that come so readily to American minds. Nor is it simply a matter of slicker gimmicks or extra kilowatts or more pamphlets. The failure is not technical: it is national. We have sold the world many things—sold them so well half Europe would pack up and come over if it could. We have left unsold the ideas that would destroy the myth.

We talk of a campaign of truth. This, certainly, is in order. But what is the truth? Speeches? Statistics? A day in the life of a Wisconsin farmer? Our congenital dislike of abstract thought has at last come home to roost. We have failed to determine what it is we wish to communicate.

MYTH BY DEFAULT

Once we knew very well what we were and what we wanted to be, and we thought it out into some of the most contagious prose of all time. But we went on to become the great pragmatists, so eager to be on with the job, so impatient of theory and reflection, that we worked ourselves into a moral isolationism. Why analyze America? It worked, didn't it?

Curiously, by keeping our philosophy so tacit, we have managed to show ourselves to the world as little different from the Marxists—seeming, like them, to believe that material prosperity is an end that in itself will bring all the other qualities. Instinctively we know better, but we have never bothered to articulate for ourselves what we take for granted, much less convey it to others. And so we have talked of the manifestations of our success rather than the causes. Not for us wooly headed theories or impractical idealism; instead, down-to-earth, hard-rock facts; the miles of cement, the telephones, the cars laid end to end—all the things, in short, our friends have envied and our enemies have conceded.

But what made the telephones and the cars possible? When we have tried to explain, it has been in a lazy man's shorthand that has obscured our national character rather than illuminated it. Thus have we prated of individualism, when we have achieved the most horizontal, cooperative of all societies; of competition and incentive economy, when we have achieved the kind of security that socialists everywhere hunger for. And we wonder why the audience is confused.

And not only have we failed to define what we are to say; we have failed to define why we want to say it. Of all the many aims of our propaganda, which is to be primary? Interestingly, almost every private organization that has thought of an overseas propaganda program of its own has stumbled on precisely this question. More to the point, so has the Government.

What is the aim? Friendship? To many Americans this is the end-all. And nothing has done us more grievous harm—for we are offended terribly when love is not forthcoming from others.

It's quite impossible anyway. We have only to look at India; since their departure, the British, who never gave a damn whether anyone liked them or not, have become increasingly popular, while we, who did our best to expedite that departure, are becoming increasingly unpopular. The fruits of leadership do not necessarily include love, and we would do well to take the fact in our stride.

To Americanize people? No one ever puts it quite this baldly, but there lurks deep in some American breasts the feeling that there is a mystically beneficent quality in certain of our folkways, and that if only they could be exported, the chasm in understanding would be bridged. Again, we have a failure to isolate the particulars from the principles. After all, what was so Japanese as baseball?

To refute Communist lies? Obviously, this is an important part of any propaganda program, but as the primary aim it is a defensive course that would foredoom us to a constant shellacking. They'll always be a lie ahead. Furthermore, we must recognize that anti-communism does not fill vacuums, nor is it necessarily pro-United States; indeed, our biggest problem lies in those people who think we are as bad as the Russians.

To enlist support for American foreign policy? This is generally considered the primary aim of our propaganda effort. Spelled out, it means stressing the mutuality of each country's interests with ours; thus have we pushed ECA, North Atlantic Pact aid, the idea of national freedom, survival of the west. Is is enough? These policies are so demonstrably in the common interest that by all standards of logic they should be galvanic. Yet they are not, and the very people the policies benefit view them with mistrust. Why do they? The fact that we must ask ourselves this question helps answer the other.

Clearly, something more dynamic is needed. It is too late for mere information. If we wish our proposition to survive, we must now not only describe the revolution we began; we must extend it; and it is the Europeans themselves, as we shall see, who make the point.

THE GLOSSARY OF MISUNDERSTANDING

The obstacles to success may seem appalling, for even when we have articulated our philosophy we have the task of projecting it over the tremendous gap in attitudes and environment that separates us from other people, and it is a gap, unfortunately, that we do not readily appreciate.

We have been so unaware of basic differences that we have persisted in talking to the Europeans in terms for which there is no foreign equivalent—participation, community relations, incentive, public relations, productivity, man in the street, public opinion; the very listing itself produces a syllabus of the American philosophy, and a glossary of misunderstanding.

Taking the evocative power of these words for granted, we have assumed that hard facts will do the job—and that, in a sort of question-and-answer fashion, we can use prepackaged nuggets of truth to beat down each fallacy we come across. It won't work. Like the hydra, the myth is proof against piecemeal attack. Americans are barbarians. The United States is a dehumanizing technocracy. Here are the two chief elements in the myth—yet both are so mutually supporting that to refuse either we must trace them back to their common source.

THE BARBARIANS

Europe today presents an odd paradox. While "neutralism" has been reduced politically—in the words of one observer—to a "hard core of jerks," emotionally it has never been more powerful. Its underpinnings go something like this: Since there is no spiritual base to the United States, it is as culturally barren as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; its people are barbarians, and any who must accept succor from them should hate themselves for it. It is, of course, put much better than this. Essayists have a whole new lexicon of psychiatric and anthropological terms for the job, and they have been using it with increasing frequency to demonstrate that the jukebox, the milk shake, or some such thing is the universal clue to America's "infantilism," "reverted uncle complex," "Kino-Wellschmerz," etc.

The frightening thing is that it is the top intellectuals—the cream of Europe's professional class—who have convinced themselves most deeply. The bulk hate and fear Russia, yet the myth has so distorted their vision that, as one Frenchman has pointed out, what non-Communists seem to be fighting most is anticommunism. And this attitude, unfortunately, cannot be shrugged off as the affectation of a small coterie. The intellectual in Europe still retains a much more commanding position in society than his American counterpart. And though he has abdicated many of the responsibilities of his leadership, every poll and survey indicates that, if nothing else, he has been saying what the majority of his countrymen feel.

Why do they think us barbarians? First, because we paint ourselves as such. Few nations have put their worst foot so far forward; by our asinine emphasis on the material goodies we have seemed, by implication, to deny the existence of anything else in American life worth bragging about. Even during the most desperate days of the war we got our message of hope so tangled up with refrigerators and cars that, as one OWI worker put it, we could have billed it as "The War That Refreshes." The commercial projection of America has gone a step further; while our information people spend millions trying to demonstrate that we are really cultural after all, the biggest information agency in the world, Hollywood, has been exporting films that seem to demonstrate the opposite—so persuasively, it might be noted, that in Austria the Russians have been saving their breath by letting several of our gangster films quietly circulate in their occupation zone.

In their own way our intellectuals have joined in the chorus. How is the world to believe that there is any spiritual content in American life, the European asks, when American higher literature is so full of despair? In part, of course, the indictment is a misreading: Certainly America's literature is a long way from Whitman's ideal to report all heroism from the American viewpoint. Yet it is not quite so far as Europeans think, for they lack the context to see much of it for what it is—a self-criticism, a searching for values that in itself indicates a good bit of spiritual vitality in American life.

An appalling amount of our higher criticism, however, is a vituperation almost psychopathic in its intensity. "The emptiness of our American life," "bourgeois industrialism," "the grand canyon of the big money," "the dull horror of our lives." So goes the familiar litany. In part it is merely verbal revenge on a social structure that does not pay obeisance to the intellectual, and the European can sense it as such. What he does not realize, however, is that many of the critics have remained so unaware of the profound changes that have taken place in our society that they are still addressing themselves to the twenties—occasionally the 1890's.

But influential as our own self-criticisms may be, it would be a mistake to assign them a preponderant share in the formation of the myth. The myth reflects quite as much about the audience as about the United States it is supposed to describe—and the fact, for example, that Rage de Vivre (originally, Really the Blues—all about marijuana, hot jazz, etc.) is currently a best-seller in Paris demonstrates nothing so much as the extraordinary affinity Europeans have developed for such stuff. Furthermore, their attitude has now attained such a high degree of what the psychologists would call structurization that if we didn't supply them with the material they would probably make it up themselves. As indeed they have; two Frenchmen, for example, have been making quite a good thing of turning out novels of Stateside sadism and perversion as translations from the American. The myth has become self-perpetuating.

Here we see the folly of assuming mere information to be the cure for misinformation. The myth satisfies. In it the intellectuals find the rationalization for their own spiritual vacuum. For bewail as they may Europe's entrapment between les deux colosses, they have been unable themselves to come up with a valid alternative. Why?

They look away from themselves to chewing gum, bathtubs, and Coca-Cola for the answer.

Esthetically, the impact of America's culture gives them a point—even the American must feel queasy when he sees a grand canal plastered with Coca-Cola signs. But this is not their point. "What the French criticize," says Le Monde, after a swack at Coca-Cola, "is not so much Coca-Cola, as its orchestration, less the drink itself than the civilization of which it is a mark and the symbol." Le Monde goes on to bemoan Buicks, Chryslers, nylon stockings, and chewing gum. "As soon as they appear these habits become an invasion. It is a question of the entire French moral landscape." Throughout Europe intellectuals throw up their hands in the same fashion; a culture based on such wealth, goes the theme, cannot help but be contaminating.

But is even this the nub—this question of whether material riches can be reconciled with spiritual force? No; Florence, Rome, and Athens answered this one in the affirmative long ago. There is something else, more subtle, in the intellectual's animus, and it runs deep in current essays on United States culture. Why, the question keeps obtruding, is it so contagious? As he writes his farewells to happier days—the days when taste was still undemocratized and peasant girls were plump and didn't shave their legs—he writes his answer. It is a popular culture.

For here lies the true contagion of American culture. Whatever its aesthetics, it is above all else a proclamation to the world of the cultural enfranchisement of the common man. It is his culture, his own version of the pursuit of happiness—and a raucous ultimatum to a society that never allowed him to trespass quite so far. But to a Europe that is still culturally an aristocracy the symbols of his enfranchisement are often vulgar and shoddy. Is it the vulgarity of these symbols or their implicit revolutionary promise that makes them so profoundly disturbing? It is the Europeans, let us remember, not ourselves, who are seased by the bathtub.

THE TECHNOCRATS

Why is American culture barbarous? Europeans have an easy answer: it is the product of a business civilization. Thus we come to the second great element in the mythology. For the European does not see the rapidly changing, socially conscious capitalism of 1950; he sees Wall Street, Mammon—and he trembles aloud over all the false dilemmas it would imply for Europe.

Thus, it is written, America's technological triumphs pose for Europe nothing less than the issue of man versus machine. Again we are back to the old spiritual theme. True, Europe wants America's mass-production techniques—but it is haunted by the fear that in adopting them it is making a compact with the devil. To many, American technology means the dehumanization of man—Charlie Chaplin poised in the gears is still a vivid symbol—and a Europe still deep in the old craft tradition is only now beginning to grasp the compatibility of mass production with quality and humanity. Somehow we have failed badly to show that, far from being narcotized by the machine, we have been invigorated by it.

But this failure in turn stems from a greater one: our failure to demonstrate the tremendous difference between our capitalism and the capitalism of Europe. In this respect it is startling to listen to an American businessman just returned from Europe; almost invariably he will so revile its low-wage, high-mark-up, monopoly economics that he sounds much more the howling revolutionist than the European Socialist who so mistrust him. His philosophy, however, remains uncommunicated. Not only have European capitalists remained utterly unconvinced of its value; the European masses have remained ignorant of its existence.

This double failure has had a deep effect on our relations with Europe. Translated by unregenerate European capitalism, ECA productivity has too often meant few benefits for the worker, but such profits for management that in Italy alone it has been hazarded that per capita there are more $1,000,000-a-year men—paying less taxes—than there are in the United States. To a dangerous degree, our efforts have appeared to the European worker simply a collusion between reactionary blackguards; he still can conceive of American capitalism only in terms of his own—and he is sick of it. It is high time the American businessman realized that it is not European socialism but European capitalism that is the chief block to free enterprise. "The problem of Europe," as one observer puts it, "comes down to who is to liquidate the capitalists of Europe: the Russians—or the Americans."

THE LESSONS

Well, there it is—myth piled on myth, all synchronizing on the one great theme of spiritual impoverishment. And only recently have we begun doing something about it. After virtually leaving the field to the Russians after the war, in 1948 we authorized the State Department to set up an information and educational exchange program, and within a year this was further supplemented when ECA's information program was organized. We remained pikers, however. And it wasn't until after Korea that Congress decided a campaign of truth was in order and voted the money to get it going. (Total United States propaganda budget for the year ending June 30 is about $190,000,000.)

Will we get our money's worth? In view of the recent rise in American unpopularity it is easy to assume that our propaganda dollars are going down the drain. But the feeling of futility is unwarranted—certainly if ECA had been a complete propaganda failure there would be no "neutralism" problem in Europe to worry about. We're fairly new to the game, but—as even the avuncular British concede—we have been learning fast. We are ready to turn pro.

What have we learned? First, that we need much more of a sharpshooting approach to our "target" groups. There is no "European mind," but scores of group attitudes compounded along all sorts of professional, economic, and geographic lines. And the best way to get at them is through people that talk the separate lingoes. We have had a hard time talking to European intellectuals, for example, yet so far we have used few intellectuals for the job. The work of our "labor diplomats," in the toughest sector of the fight, underlines the same moral. How do they go about it? "You talk to the brothers," says one of them. "You go around and you talk to the brothers."

Next, we have learned that one of the principal reasons for the disbelief in American culture is, simply, the high cost of it. Stroll along the Kaertnerstrasse in Vienna, for example, and you will have a hard time finding a bookstore with any decent assortment of moderately priced American books in German—that is, until you come to the Communist information center, which has quite an interesting selection. Because of the lack of financial guaranties, European publishers have been loath to publish translations of anything except our sure-fire sex-and-mayhem fiction. So with the theater; stiff royalties—payable in dollars—have inhibited widespread production of the United States plays, and while the American companies that have gone over have dispelled a lot of European delusions, they have been far too few to make a deep impression. Patently, if we wish to project American culture rather than talk about it, a much more vigorous subsidy program is in order.

More important, we must develop far better means of reaching the masses. Considerable ingenuity has been brought to this problem; our people have put documentary films into thousands of commercial theaters, taken them in trailers to rural villages, brought showboats to Mediterranean coastal towns, subsidized troubadours to sing our story in Sicily, floated message-bearing toy balloons all over Europe, distributed household pamphlets and comic books by the millions. But though it is difficult to think of a bet that has been overlooked, we have made only a dent.

Why don't we merely expand all this? The answer, unfortunately, is not that simple. Europe has had a bellyful of propaganda these last 10 years, and after a certain point—and it is a very arguable point—you run not only into diminishing returns but rapidly increasing resistance.

There is, however, a way out of the dilemma—the participation of foreign nations in the job. "Let me get the facts about Korea to one pro-United States union man over here," says a United States propagandist, "and he'll be worth a thousand posters." There are many ways to invoke this aid. But there is one so effective, so destructive of the myth, that it has come to be the most promising weapon in our whole armory.

THE DISCIPLES

It was in Paris in the summer of 1948; Sir Stafford Cripps and ECA Boss Paul Hoffman were talking about productivity. How, Cripps asked, did the Americans do it? It was a question to delight a salesman's heart. "Let's bring your people over," Hoffman answered, "and we'll show them how."

So, with great vigor, we proceeded to do. Before long United States firms, labor unions, and professional groups were playing host to scores of European "productivity teams"; by the end of last year over 2,750 had made the trip and returned home—somewhat numbed, but enthusiastic—to tell what they had learned. The result, in increased productivity, is now a well-known story—and a good story it is. But there is another story that is not so well known.

What was conceived of as a technical measure turned out to be one of the most effective propaganda tools ever handed us. What was it the Yanks had over there? Was it, as people had said, the number of gadgets and gimmicks we had? Fortuitous national resources? Ruthlessness and overwork? Or was it something more profound? We gave Europeans a chance to come over and discover for themselves. And gained ourselves disciples.

Here—in excerpts from productivity-team reports—are some of the things they had to say to their countrymen:

"A visit to the United States gives one greater confidence in the ability of democracy to solve its problems. * * * The country is still * * * moving forward both culturally, socially, and economically." (Norwegian trade-unionists.)

"American unions' attitude to company profits is typical of their acceptance of a capitalist economy. However high, profits, at least in competitive industry, are not regarded as immoral or a social evil; indeed, they give proof of solvency and assured employment * * * the main concern of unions is to obtain a fair share of them." (British trade-union officials.)

"Contrary to the impression gained from many American films only a small percentage of American workers and their families live in tenements." (British trade-union officials.)

"There appeared to be a most friendly and genuine attitude of cooperation between management and labor and suggestions made by one side appeared to receive careful consideration, and in most cases support, from the other." (British rayon-weaving team.)

"The relations between management and labor in the great majority of mills which

we visited were excellent. There was often a sense of camaraderie based on mutual respect." (British cotton-spinning team.)

"Sometimes we had to ask ourselves whether it was manufacturer or union member speaking to us." (Danish ready-made-clothing team.)

"The big surprise to me was the importance American bosses give to human-relations problems. The American employer seems to be a psychologist aware that his prosperity is tied directly with that of the workers." (French unionist.)

"Both management and labor have taken steps to give greater efficiency in production and more understanding in relationships. When we return to Belgium I intend to recommend better management-labor relationships be created in our mines. I will see that this is done at Charbonnages de Houthalen, the mine I am managing." (Belgian coal-mining team.)

"If members of the team had learned nothing else from their travels in America and Britain, they would have learned one valuable thing, namely, the remarkable amount of good will which exists between people in the Western Hemisphere." (British gray iron-founding team.)

It is difficult for an American to appreciate what revolutionary documents these are. The British trade-union officials' report, for example, became a front-page story and gave British labor a resounding intellectual jolt. The Norwegian report, coupled with the report of a similar team that went to Russia, opened the eyes of left-wingers in a way that all the money in the world would not buy us. Throughout Europe, on a small but appreciable scale, doctrinaires of one kind or another are being provoked to rethink long and dearly held conceptions.

What gives the reports their impact? In an indirect way, the answer is to be found in the very criticisms they make. The teams make it plain that there are a good many aspects of the American way of life that they believe are either undesirable—the pace, for example—or inapplicable. But this leads them to a more important observation. These are only particulars, they say to their countrymen, they are not organic, and the essentials of the American success can be had without them. Which is what this issue is all about.

The technical-assistance teams are only one of the ways we have to go about the proselyting job. Thanks to the machinery set up in 1946 and 1948 by the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts, and to special programs for Germany, Austria, Finland, China, and Iran, State is bringing over students, teachers, professional people, specialists, and leaders. The Defense Department is doing the same with Japan. Both State and ECA are placing foreign trainees in United States industry, farms, and Government agencies. Altogether, the Government is now bringing over about 13,000 people a year for observation, study, teaching, training, and indoctrination. Cost: about $45,000,000.

But by far the biggest contribution of all has been made by private organizations. This year they will have arranged roughly 40,000 exchanges of their own, and in addition will have footed a large share of the local expenses of many of the people brought over by the State Department. The 4-H Clubs have been exchanging young farmers; the Rotary Clubs have been bringing over students; the Girl Scouts, youth leaders—the list encompasses almost every kind of organization in American community life.

Measured against the need, however, our over-all exchange effort has been piddling.[1] There is a sort of geometric progression to exchange; since the clue to its success is applying the proposition, it follows that the more people engaged in it, the more effective each individual's work becomes. It has been very frustrating for many middle-management people, for example, to return to Europe all steamed up about, say, labor-management councils, only to realize that no one else in the outfit has got the word. Like plasma, exchange is best in massive doses.

We have a tremendous opportunity before us. We should seize it by expanding our total propaganda budget to at least $500,000,000 a year—and of this devote at least $180,000,000 to exchange. We could not legislate a bigger bargain for ourselves. For every Government dollar we put in the exchange kitty, we stimulate at least two matching dollars from private groups here and organizations and governments on the other side. As a result, by priming the pump with $180,000,000, we could step up the exchange to roughly 50,000 people a year to the United States; at least 10,000 in the other direction.

Mere expansion, of course, is not enough. Much more follow-up is needed abroad; equally important, much more preparation on this side. Exposure to America, as we have learned, does not itself produce understanding. The mayor of Graz is a case in point; when he got back he wrote the State Department that the Communist claim of imminent American bankruptcy might be correct; he had noticed that almost everyone in America seemed to be buying on the installment plan.

To do the job properly we should greatly extend our present system of orientation centers, and develop more provisions for working the stranger into community life. Here again, we have a tremendous asset in our private organizations. Already they are doing a tremendous job in welcoming and shepherding strangers, taking them on historical tours, plant trips, to PTA meetings, town meetings, and, in general, making them feel at home. And it is this, it might be added, that visitors talk about most often when they get home.

What has impressed the visitor points a moral for us as well. For when we assess our whole communication effort we find that, as in industry's communication effort, participation lies at the heart of our successes. It is not merely a question of manufacturing propaganda. Nor it it merely a Government matter. The problem encompasses all of us—for it is only as the diverse groups that make up our society, get involved in the job that our words carry real dynamism. And the potential is tremendous.

United States business, for example, has already contributed to our communication effort, but there is still more to be done. For the one area that remains virtually untouched is the one area for which United States business is the best-qualified group in all the world: getting the American idea across to European top management. It is hardly necessary to suggest the means; there could be seminars and international conventions—organizations such as the International Chamber of Commerce are ready-made for this—trips and private exchange of all sorts, and, as the success of the sales troupe "Red" Motley took to England suggests, some good old-fashioned barnstorming as well.

The more fields one thinks of, the more opportunities become evident. Labor, for example, is fairly bursting its seams to do more missionary work in Europe—and the more this is encouraged, the quicker will we reach European labor. So with all of our groups. The success of our communication efforts will depend ultimately on their initiative. And this is the way it must be. The American revolution is a challenge, not to states, but to free men, whose never-ending task is to seize their opportunities.

WHY THEY DON'T LIKE US—EUROPEAN NON-COMMUNIST INTELLECTUALS ON THE UNITED STATES

"It is not what separates the United States and the Soviet Union that should frighten us, but what they have in common. * * * Those two technocracies that think themselves antagonists are dragging humanity in the same direction of dehumanization * * * man is treated as a means and no longer as an end—this is the indispensable condition of the two cultures that face each other." (Francois Mauriac, Catholic anti-Communist, in Le Figaro.)

"Americans appear the true successor of the Germans. America differs from Europe and resembles Russia, adorer of the technical." (Andre Siegfried, Protestant anti-Communist, in Le Figaro.)

"In all the homilies to which I listened, the word 'God' did not reverberate more often than the word 'money.' * * * It is perhaps because too often they have emptied European religions of their intellectual content that they have no choice except between music and convulsions." (Georges Fradier, in Esprit.)

"Of even the beginnings of the minutest embryo of a homogeneous culture there was no sign. * * * A general preoccupation with trivia—I mean coke machines, launderettes, laxatives, and baseball—I construed as the American attempt to exclude the bigger reality." (Robert Robinson, in the Isis (Oxford University).)

"Why they should not be originally creative is puzzling. It is possible that the lack of the organic sense, the conviction that man is a machine * * * turns them into technicians and cuts them off from the chaos, the accidents and intuitions of the creative process." (V. S. Pritchett; the New Statesman and Nation.)

"They come here, these barbarians, to teach us architecture—we, who are the sons of Michelangelo." (Italian educator.)

"The Russians used to rape 80-year-old women. * * * And after that, instead of being sick they simply drank vodka. You [Americans] wouldn't do that, I'm sure. You give them chocolates and contraceptives when you make love to them. * * * Every people has its own customs. But don't worry. You'll never feel sick, whatever you do." (From Virgil Gheorghiu's The Twenty-fifth Hour—Europe's No. 1 fiction best seller.)

"American influence has been harmful, for it has already begun the scaling down of aesthetic values so as to be within the intellectual grasp of the average city dweller * * * [it] will end, not with the debasement of taste, but with the disappearance of the word from our vocabulary." (Martin Cooper; BBC broadcast.)

"Thus, if France allows itself to be influenced by the whole of American culture, a living and liveable situation there will come here and completely shatter our cultural traditions * * *." (Jean-Paul Sartre; A European Declaration of Independence.)

"Jazz is their music, comic strips their most admired pictures, magazine stories their literature, Hollywood films their most popular entertainment, skyscrapers their architecture and their newest ball-point pens can write under water. * * * We know, too, that God could make America a wonderful country if he only had the money." (George Mikes in How To Scrape Skies.)

"America—the only country that's gone from barbarism to decadence without being civilized in the meantime." (Anonymous.)

---

[1] NOTE.—Koreans brought to Moscow between 1946 and 1949: 2,600. Brought to United States in same period: 60.

War Casualties of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith, Michigan war casualties:

TWENTY MICHIGAN WAR CASUALTIES

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Twenty Michigan men were listed in the Korean casualty report issued today by the Defense Department.

Three were killed in action, 12 were wounded, 3 were injured, 1 was missing in action, and 1 was returned to duty.

KILLED IN ACTION

Army: Corp. Leonard J. Boger, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Boger, of Detroit.

Pfc. Lawrence J. Bouchard, son of Mrs. Mary Ann Bouchard, River Rouge.

Pvt. Herman L. Rembert, son of Mrs. Ruby Rembert, Detroit.

WOUNDED

Army: Pfc. Max E. Depoy, son of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Depoy, Niles.

Pvt. Richard C. Fockler, son of Mr. and Mrs. Vernon B. Fockler, Lapeer.

Pfc. George H. Guenther, husband of Mrs. Constance Guenther, Birmingham.

Cpl. Richard Idzior, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Idzior, Detroit.

Sgt. Arthur G. Proper, son of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Proper, Tawas City.

Cpl. Arthur F. Seitler, brother of Mrs. Jackie L. Seitler, Battle Creek.

Sgt. Thomas C. Harris, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas C. Harris, Sr., Detroit.

Sgt. 1/c Odvin Martinson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Martin J. Martinson, Iron River.

Cpl. Louis M. Quinn, husband of Mrs. Ruth J. Quinn, Lansing.

Cpl. Dale W. Siebenmark, son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred W. Siebenmark, New Buffalo.

Cpl. Richard M. Zoltowski, son of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Zoltowski, Detroit.

Marine Corps: Tech. Sgt. Elmer J. Pappert, husband of Mrs. Elmer J. Pappert, Detroit.

MISSING IN ACTION

Marine Corps: Pfc Roy L. West, son of Olin V. West, Dansville.

INJURED

Army: Pfc Vermont S. Johnson, husband of Mrs. Alice Johnson, Flint.

Cpl. Howard R. Mann, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold R. Mann, Detroit.

Cpl. Maurice C. Roberts, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jammie L. Williams, Pontiac.

RETURNED TO DUTY

Army: Pfc Paul B. Haynes, son of Mrs. Lena Haynes, Benton Harbor.

Address by Governor Battle, of Virginia, to University of Virginia Alumni

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of the most worth-while address by Gov. John S. Battle, of Virginia, before the Washington Chapter of the University of Virginia Alumni on February 8. As an alumnus of that great university, I naturally found this address of special interest, but its appeal and significance are not limited to those who have spent their college days on the campus at Charlottesville. For there are expressed here some fundamental ideas with regard to education which I believe to be of the greatest importance. Never before in the history of this country has there been a more urgent need for the truth clearly told and clearly understood. Every citizen has an unfailing responsibility to see to it that our educational processes are eternally dedicated to the attainment of that fundamental end. I consider it a privilege to commend to the attention of the Senate this worthy and thought-provoking address by Governor Battle.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As alumni of the University of Virginia, we are interested in the program afforded by our alma mater, the physical improvements that are now under way, and the contribution the university is making to the educational and cultural life of the Nation.

I wish I could take the time to outline in some detail the progress being made in all phases of the university's activities. I shall not undertake such a discourse, but I do want those of you who have not had the opportunity of maintaining close contacts with Charlottesville to know that the university is doing a magnificent job under the leadership of President Colgate W. Darden, Jr.

Mr. Darden, from the very outset of his administration, set his course so as to not only carry forward the fine work of his predecessor, President Newcomb, but also to strengthen and bulwark the position of the university, as originally conceived by Mr. Jefferson, as the capstone of the Virginia system of education. The noteworthy accomplishments in this direction are a high tribute to the President and the faculty as well as to all those loyal alumni who have so generously and wholeheartedly given their support.

We have given a great deal of thought to our entire program of education in Virginia and particularly to our free public schools, which provide the foundations of education for the great bulk of our citizenship.

For some time prior to my entering upon the duties of Governor, I had the very definite impression that there was room for substantial improvement in the character and caliber of instruction offered in the public schools. This impression was buttressed by further acquaintance in offices and in business with some of our high-school graduates, and also by the results of a study undertaken by a Virginia legislative commission of the teaching of history and government in these schools. It became evident that many high-school graduates not only were not well versed in history and government but that they were far from well grounded in grammar, reading, and elementary mathematics.

I set as one of the prime goals of my term of office the improvement of this situation. I am glad to say that all concerned in our State are working earnestly toward removing the causes of such deficiencies. The General Assembly of Virginia has increased appropriations for teacher pay, liberalized retirement benefits, and enlarged scholarship aid for teacher training in order to help attract and keep well-qualified teachers—and they, of course, are the key to the success of any program of education. I know that our teachers, as a group, are intensely interested in doing well the job that is entrusted to them. Our school administrators, together with the teachers and patrons, are joining efforts to reevaluate the teaching program in order to make sure that the public-school graduates are firmly grounded in the fundamentals of learning.

It is my considered judgment that the fundamentals—the three R's and history and government—cannot be overemphasized. It is upon these that all other learning rests.

We are determined that our children shall have full opportunity to develop the mental and moral capacities that are essential to the preservation of our civilization as we know it today. We cannot escape the realization that this generation, perhaps more than any other in history, is confronted with a maze of ideologies which requires the utmost discernment for the selection of that which is based upon truth, right, and justice.

In this conflict of ideologies, we see every day the emission of great streams of propaganda from those who have utter disregard for the truth; we see the truth distorted, twisted, and colored, and misrepresented to suit the tastes of tyrannical governments whose sole purpose is to confuse, undermine, and weaken those of us who still enjoy the greatest blessing known to mankind, the blessing of living in a free land where we can think, and speak, and worship as we please.

Only by an intimate acquaintance with the history of these liberties and some knowledge of the sacrifices on the part of those who so fearlessly and valiantly safeguarded them can the young men and women of today develop an appreciation of their meaning. With such an appreciation, the individual then is able to distinguish the false from the true; he can recognize propaganda for what it is and fact as fact; he can understand and espouse the principles and motives of democratic peoples, well aware that by them alone can he hope to enjoy and transmit to his children the opportunity to live, work, and play in the bracing atmosphere of freedom.

Can we afford not to exert ourselves in the schools, in the homes, and in the churches toward better informing our boys and girls on these matters? I say we cannot and that it is our duty to teach and to instill these truths indelibly in the minds of the youth.

It is one thing to read the Virginia Bill of Rights without any background knowledge of the struggle, the debate, and the study that led to its adoption. It is entirely a different thing to restudy this outline of our fundamental freedoms in the light of an acquaintence with George Mason and a clear insight into the era that produced this great document.

Built on the firm foundation of historical truths, and grounded in the basic skills of reading and writing and, at least, rudimentary figuring, our system of education then will have the means by which it will produce not automatons nor machinelike specimens of uniform but doubtful texture and resiliency—no, not such as these at all; rather, it will produce men or women of individual abilities with the capacity to think and act for themselves and with the determination to defend and strengthen the society in which they live.

I have mentioned these aspects of what we are striving for in Virginia because I believe that the same tenets are applicable to the Nation; certainly we all have the same goal, which is the preservation of those inherent rights of the enjoyment of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness and safety.

With sound public-school training, the great numbers of our young people who never reach college will be more adequately equipped to take their places in life as independent, self-reliant citizens. Our colleges

and universities, in carrying out their important functions, must build upon the base provided by the public schools for those schools are the first training ground of the majority of our college students. The better the public-school program, the better opportunity the higher institutions of learning will have to develop the technical skills and specialized abilities of their students.

I am happy this evening to say to you that the University of Virginia is fully and faithfully carrying out its high duty of training men and women in the way they should go; that Virginia men and women still seek to carry out the admonition of the ancient Greek philosopher so appropriately inscribed over the facade of Cabell Hall, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free" and as they go forth from the university, they carry with them something of the spirit of that place; and although the words of the inscriptions over the main gate may fade from their memories as the years pass, they do not forget that they have entered that gateway where they have sought "the way of honor, the light of truth, and the will to work for man."

In times such as these, we necessarily evaluate all our governmental enterprises on the basis of what they can contribute to the national defense and what are essential to the safety, health, and welfare of the people. In Virginia, we are, of course, giving first attention to the national and civilian defense. If some of the normal services must be curtailed, by reason of personnel or materials or other causes, it will be done. I think I should add that it will be done readily and without complaint, because without national security there can be no normal activities.

I am proud to serve in the government of our Commonwealth, because Virginia has conscientiously labored through the years to maintain the type of administration which does credit to the democratic system. We have succeeded in living within our means; in fact, our State constitution wisely makes this mandatory. We have restricted our governmental programs to those deemed to be essential and have striven steadfastly to return to the taxpayers a full dollar in services for each dollar contributed to the treasury. We have been fortunate to attract and retain capable, loyal, and civic-minded employees whose desire to do a good job and perform a real service provides the impetus for ever greater accomplishment.

This spirit and will for meritorious achievement is reflected in not only our improved school system but also in our good roads—unsurpassed in the Nation—in health, medical and welfare services, and in many other phases of the operation that constitutes the State government. I say this not in boasting but in all humility, because I feel sincerely that the principles followed so consistently in our Commonwealth could be applied with equally favorable results in some other echelons of government.

I purposely have avoided in these comments tonight any discussion of the issues uppermost in the minds of all of us at this time, the issues relating to our foreign policy and the strategy that might best be followed in the interest of national defense. These questions do not come within my purview as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and I claim no special qualifications to pass upon such grave national matters. Had I those qualifications, I still would hesitate to express my opinion, because it would remain only a personal opinion; but I do want to say that Virginia insofar as I can legally and properly guide its efforts will do its part, and more, to keep this Nation strong and secure against the tide of tyranny that already has encompassed such a large sector of the globe.

If more of the people of the world had the benefit of the knowledge and teachings of Thomas Jefferson, we might look to the future with greater confidence and hope. Would that all could adopt and adhere to his philosophy that "the care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

Address by Hon. Herbert A. Lehman, of New York, at Conference of Civil Liberties Clearing House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excellent speech on the subject of the relation between our civil liberties and our foreign policy, which was delivered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] at the National Conference of the Civil Liberties Clearing House in Washington, D. C., on March 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The common purpose for which you meet and which you pursue through your individual organizations has become increasingly significant and meaningful in the light of developments in this country and throughout the world. Communism has advanced in large areas of the world, in some by subversive stealth and in some by naked force. Its advance has been marked by a brutal violation of the basic rights of man. To stem this advance the United States has sought to help strengthen internal democratic forces in many parts of the world. In this country we, too, have been confronted with the threat of Communist infiltration and corruption.

The problem of preserving our civil liberties at home while bearing the responsibilities which rest on us because of our position of world leadership constitutes a critical challenge.

Interdependence of civil liberties and world leadership is inescapable. There is a vast difference between being a world power and being a world leader. Leadership implies a degree of social and moral responsibility which cannot be identified with any nation which attains power by force alone. If the United States should ever lose its leadership, it would be because we had abandoned morals and principles in a naked struggle to survive in a slave world where survival alone would not be worth much.

The determination as to whether our power carries with it the indispensable elements of moral and social influence rests to a very large degree on our own behavior at home. Nations, like individuals, cannot have two sets of manners and morals.

Nazi Germany was unquestionably a dominant world power a decade ago and for a breathless moment in history it seemed that her power might prevail and the whole free world would go under. It took the determinated might of the entire free world to shatter the power of the Axis. But it could not have been accomplished had we not been fighting for a great moral principle.

And what was our position when the Second World War was finally over? We had certainly suffered the least of any nation involved in that war. And our power had increased enormously. We were in a position where we thought we could relax in the belief that the world at last was free again. How mistaken we were. We have had a rude awakening.

Thank God we have awakened. We have taken affirmative action, because we have recognized that military victory did not automatically insure freedom and security in Europe or even here in the United States.

The original concept of aid to Greece and Turkey and the later and broader concept of a vast cooperative European aid program restored economic security to Western Europe and marked an historic turning point in international relations.

The Communists did everything in their power to move into the vacuum that existed in Europe following the war. The people of Europe were physically exhausted and spiritually depleted. They faced the almost hopeless task of rebuilding their economic and their productive machinery.

Under these circumstances no wonder that the Communist appeal was almost irresistible. Unlike fascism, communism was arrayed in all the false trappings of peace and plenty. It boasted that it possessed the only formula for achieving economic restoration and social justice.

I do not think that there is any serious doubt in the mind of any man that the European aid program has been almost wholly responsible for the fact that the nations of Western Europe today are relatively vital and remain democratic. Of equal importance is the fact that they have regained their economic and military vigor.

The problem in Europe is, of course, quite different from the challenge that confronts us today in Asia. Most European countries have enjoyed some form of democratic experience. They have been constantly exposed to Western culture and politics. Tragically, some central European countries succumbed to overwhelming military force and did slip into the Soviet-Communist orbit. But we knew that Europe, or at least Western Europe, could be stimulated to take the democratic initiative if we could administer the necessary economic and moral aid.

It is clear that the allied victory over the Nazi empire, while it made us a tremendous power—as it did Russia—did not in itself insure for the United States a position of world leadership.

It was because we took a realistic approach to our moral and social responsibilities that we gained this position of leadership it was presaged in the formation of UNRRA, to which we contributed great sums to save millions of lives and to rehabilitate whole nations. And the broad economic aid programs which came later again reflected a moral and humane conscience as well as enlightened self-interest.

I dare not think what the world situation might be today if we had refused to heed our conscience and had ignored the political potentials in Europe.

Today the continuing threat of Soviet or satellite aggression is frighteningly real in Europe, as it is elsewhere. The tensions and anxieties have correspondingly increased. But the miracle is that Western Europe has achieved not only the capacity to care, but the will to resist.

We can expect to encounter fierce and ruthless pressures from the Soviet-dominated Communists everywhere. We have so far been safe in our assumption that Soviet Russia would prefer to entrap the world through a political and economic rather than by a military offensive. But the current situation may change at any time. Accordingly military strategy and preparedness cannot and must not be neglected. We must take every possible measure to be ready to meet aggression in all vital areas. But we must at the same time make it clear to the world that our purpose is to maintain peace, not to wage war.

Meanwhile the Eisenhower report has averted the threatened deterioration of our European partnership. Our objectives are substantially clearer than they were 2 months ago. But this apparent respite offers no reason for complacency. Our joint efforts with the free world to build an impregnable defense must go forward unhesitatingly and with all possible speed. Any sign of neglect of our obligations in Europe would be disastrous. I hope that Congress will act speedily and affirmatively to reject any suggestion to limit the Presidential power to commit troops to Europe as proposed by Senator TAFT, Senator WHERRY, and others.

I strongly suspect that many who are engaged in a dispute about how many troops should be sent and when they should be sent and whether the President has the power to send them at all are actually in favor of sending no troops at all. The dangers to our own security that would result from such policies are palpably clear, but it will take coherent leadership to discredit the arguments of this powerful group of latter-day isolationists. Acceptance of the fantastic Hoover plan would mean the abject surrender of all of Western Europe, all of Middle Asia, and much of Africa. It would mean that most of the free nations of the world would sink into the abyss of slavery. It would mean that the United States, isolated from the rest of the world would, I believe, ultimately collapse either by attack from without or deterioration from within.

But our policy in Western Europe is only one part of our total world problem. It appears now that a major test of our world leadership may come in our policy toward Asia.

The Korean war is, of course, a major factor. It has sharpened our national awareness of the possibility of an all-out military conflict. It has intensified our emotions and heightened our anxieties.

I shall not attempt to judge the merits or the fallacies of American postwar policy in the Far East. I do not know whether under any circumstances, western democracy could at that time have captured the imagination and loyalties of the Communist-led revolutionists in China. In any event, we gave our support to the regime of Chiang Kai-shek and that regime collapsed. Its collapse was followed by an organized and concerted attack on our State Department as being somehow responsible for the tragic events in China. The charge was made that Communist sympathizers controlled or influenced our foreign policy. This, in turn, loosed a flood of prejudice and intolerance that has resulted in irreparable injury to the careers and reputations of a great many innocent people. At the same time, these loose charges undermined confidence in our Government and persuaded free peoples abroad that we were a house divided against itself. These attacks inevitably came to permeate the whole fabric of our thinking.

If it is true that moral and social responsibility must be a constituent part of our foreign policy, then it is possible that we have lost some authority in the world because we have endured and accepted these unwarranted, unjustified assaults on our Government and on our fellow citizens.

It is only a few years since American foreign policy reached a noble peak in implementing our world responsibilities in peacetime. Our own best instincts as a people made effective a policy based on the great American tradition that we must do everything in our power to assist in extending freedom and security to all people everywhere.

But somehow we slipped from the peak. The descent was not sharp. But our objectives and our world relations and our methods of achieving them become momentarily clouded. There is some evidence that foreign policy has been at least partially responsive to these violent pressures here at home. As our foreign policy reacted to these pressures history will undoubtedly record the fact that there was also a notable decline in the state of our civil liberties.

Obviously we must not underestimate the real dangers of Communist subversion in our midst. I realize, of course, that some practical curbs must inevitably be placed on individual freedom of action when it becomes a tool in the hands of the Communists or others whose real objective is to destroy freedom.

We have good reason to fear communism. Its subtle and devious approach is beguiling. The Communists have searched out every chink and weakness of our armor of faith in freedom. But if we drop that armor, we stand stark in utter fear and futility.

There is no historic justification for fearing that we cannot detect and contend with our internal enemies if we act firmly and justly within the framework of our democratic institutions. If, however, we deny that the very strength and dynamism of democracy is rooted in the right of criticism and opposition to the status quo—then at least part of the meaning of freedom has escaped us and added confusion will be projected into our relations with the rest of the world. Such confusion is a manifestation of weakness and of fear—fear of economic, political, or social change.

This concept of democracy certainly cannot be expected to have any great appeal in Asia. We may not ignore the fact that there exists in Asia a genuine revolutionary spirit among vast numbers of peoples who have lived for centuries in misery and poverty. To ignore this would be to blind ourselves to one of the most compelling facts of contemporary history. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that today in great backward areas of the world the common people are on the march and they will not be stayed.

The main international challenge that confronts us in Asia now is to make certain that there will be no repetition of the Chinese experience elsewhere in the Far East. The problem is far greater than the one in postwar Europe. Programs such as point 4 and economic aid constitute the first step. The food-aid proposal to help India is a concrete and practical demonstration of our intentions and I most earnestly hope that this proposal will meet with speedy approval in Congress. These programs are of vital importance.

There will, of course, be inevitable disappointments and disillusionments even in this area of our endeavors. Many of the complexities will arise from the sheer vastness of the territory of Asia and from social, political, and economic diversities. But the demand for social reform is as great a compulsion in Asia as the deep urge for economic betterment. Our whole program must be oriented in the direction of encouraging these reforms.

The millions of people in Asia, unlike the Europeans, have had little democratic experience. The word "Democracy" means many things to many people. In some areas it is just a slogan. It is therefore imperative to demonstrate by our own acts and our own record rather than by mere words that democracy offers a better hope than communism for equality and freedom as well as for economic security.

Military effort and a sincere and honest determination to merit the confidence of the free world are inextricably interwoven—neither will be enough by itself to assure either security or lasting peace. We must not sacrifice the latter to our preoccupation with the former.

Dr. Ralph J. Bunche said only a few days ago, "Security today is a universal problem and a matter of friends as well as guns and planes and ships. In the ideological struggle now going on it is people who in the end will count more than armaments." I am afraid that we are not yet making the effort required to convince the peoples of the world that we are the most sincere exponents of the democratic ideal. We still have not convinced the world, not even some of our own friends, that we reject all forms of imperialism and seek no ends save freedom and peace for all people.

During my long public life I have come to know quite intimately the strengths and weaknesses of the democratic processes. I have learned, too, that deliberations and even great debates do not automatically guarantee wise decisions.

But my faith in democracy is unshaken and I have learned that in faith there is no room for fear.

A few weeks ago I warned the Senate of the current dangers of public hysteria when I said, "There is fear, there is panic. There is fear on the part of people that if they raise their voices in any way in defense of the American tradition of equality, justice, and law they will be accused of being sympathetic to communism."

The panic of which I spoke was revealed in the passage of such repressive legislation as the so-called McCarran bill. It is demonstrated by increasing indifference in Congress to civil-rights legislation. It is demonstrated by irresponsible and unsupported charges which blacken the reputations and weaken the influence of patriotic, loyal Americans, even men of the stature of General Marshall, Secretary Acheson, Philip Jessup, and Cordell Hull. It is reflected in the reluctance of certain newspapers to give adequate coverage to those who dare to oppose the black evil of McCarthyism.

In our relations with each other we have manifested fear and suspicion that are entirely alien to our great traditions of tolerance and faith. That course is sinister and dangerous beyond description.

If we are to accomplish the almost overwhelming global tasks that confront us, we must do considerably more than we are now doing to prepare ourselves spiritually as well as militarily for our assignment. If we are to give the world a convincing example of democracy unafraid, we must show not only a militant insistence on liberty, equality, and justice and law for the world at large but a sustained insistence on these values in our daily lives. The greatest threat to democracy comes not so much from sudden or revolutionary change. Its greatest danger comes through lethargy, and through failure of the people to defend their fundamental rights against gradual and sometimes cleverly disguised encroachment.

Loyal and devoted citizens of our country, liberals and conservatives alike, regardless of political affiliation, must join hands in the fight against abridgement of civil liberty under the guise of military necessity. A determination to defend and protect our rights and liberties and those of others will give strength and cohesion to our foreign policy and help to assure our position of world leadership.

And the free world needs our leadership as greatly as it needs our dollars and our men.

Pray God we will be wise enough and strong enough in hand and heart to make our leadership a blessing to all the world.

Statement of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding American participation in the defense of Europe, presented by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University, and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, to the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, on February 20.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In being given this privileged opportunity to testify before you gentlemen, at the very outset I can candidly state that by virtue of my organizational associations much of this testimony is fairly representative of the thoughts of several millions of Americans of Central and East European background whose knowledge of the Soviet peril is intimate, broad, and keen. Uppermost in the minds of these citizens, including those whom I directly represent, are these three cardinal factors of orientation toward the issue at hand: (1) The secure defense of Western Europe, and therefore of the United States, against threatening Soviet aggression, (2) the consequent, hoped-for preclusion of world war III, and (3) if this proves unrealizable due to disastrous Soviet miscalculation, a full vantaged preparedness insuring the best possible chance for military and political victory over Russian Communist imperialism. Geared to these fundamental points of interest, a reasoned analysis of the problem confronting us can only lead to the conclusion that the Senate should reassuringly resolve not to predicate executive assignment of more ground forces in Europe on any congressional adoption of a policy on the subject.

UNSTATED PRECONCEPTIONS OF THE WHERRY RESOLUTION

This recommended determination of the resolution is founded not only on certain guiding pragmatic principles posited in a dimension of thought scarcely considered in discussions on this issue, but also on a necessary assessment of the underlying preconceptions and the spirit animating the resolution, this despite its neutral verbal formulation. For (1) the suggestive note of conditioning executive troop assignment to Europe by a congressional policy beyond the determining principle of common defense that Congress has already adopted strongly implies a defeatist skepticism of that very principle in the measure of underrating the ability of free Europe to contribute materially to the common defense of Western democracy; (2) the animus of this resolution engenders a groundless doubt in the competency of our executive agencies to execute and properly implement the crucial policy principle already embraced by Congress in its acceptance of the North Atlantic Pact; (3) it nurtures the ugly possibilities of hampered military planning and the hazardous encumbrances recently displayed in the relations between the United Nations and the UN command in Korea; and (4) its spirit is permeated with an indiscriminate fear of mass Soviet power which, if affirmed, would constitute an open invitation to the Soviets into Western Europe and deprive us, in this unhappy event, of certain military advantages both outside and inside of the Iron Curtain. In brief, this resolution was conceived in cringing timidity, not strength, and the affirmation of its intent would only underwrite the former.

CERTAIN GUIDES OF ACTION IN A BROADER DIMENSION

Affixed to our original cardinal factors of general objective and in concise refutation of the preconceptions noted, the following pragmatic principles may be advanced for your able consideration in making possible the realization of our stated objectives and thus responding to this resolution in the negative:

(1) An observed distinction between the principle of common defense and its content. The principle revolves simply on the basic question of whether to support or to abandon free Europe against possible Soviet aggression. In effect, this has already been resolved in the form of the North Atlantic Pact, and this all-determining principle reflects adequately the policy of Congress. If it is admitted that to all intents and purposes this principle of mutual support is unalterable, then it follows for competent authorities to determine the content of this principle, which involves the flexible determination of the magnitude of troops in Europe as expertly evaluated by them in terms of adequation of means to the end imbedded in the policy already established by Congress. Logically, in order not to inhibit adjustments necessitated by conceivable changed circumstances, it would follow further that the rigidity of any mathematical ratio be avoided. Yet, without any mark of contradiction, Congress should continually demand that every practicable means be explored to bolster and equip our anti-Communist allies, not only in Western Europe but anywhere they can be found. The certainty of our integrated participation in European defense has inspired overflowing vigor and rejuvenation in West European rearmament, apparently sufficient to calm the fears of many. But also, let me emphasize, it has symbolized in another dimension American strength of leadership for the millions in Central and Eastern Europe upon whom we might crucially have to depend in the event of war.

(2) An appreciative recognition of the interdependent relationship between American power in Europe and Central and East European anti-Communist resistance. No one here will deny the vital importance of underground resistance behind the Iron Curtain for our paramount concern in the defense of Western democracy. To the extent that the existing underground network, operated by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the Slovak, Lithuanian, and Polish resistance movements, persists in its sabotage, sporadic skirmishes with Communist security troops, anti-Communist propaganda, and steady infiltration of the Red armies, to that extent it clearly conduces to our defense objective. For any plan of Soviet aggression on Western Europe would have to consider this deep-rooted internal weakness twice, especially if it must account also for stern Western military resistance. Today, for example, Soviet propaganda is exerting every effort to overcome this critical weakness in the Ukraine by pointing to the contemplated remilitarization of Western Germany in the hope of recalling Nazi ravages in the minds of the undependable Ukrainians. Reciprocally, to the degree that we ably defend ourselves in Western Europe, obstruct any Soviet conquest of its mighty industrial capacity, and show promise of maintaining ourselves there in case of war, to that degree, by sheer causal impact, we lend every encouragement to essential resistance activity behind the Iron Curtain.

(3) A forthright repudiation of the myth of Russian invincibility in land warfare. A logical examination of the arguments of the few who seek to withdraw or sharply restrict American ground troops in Europe discloses as their overplayed major premise the myth that "we can't beat the Russians in land warfare." This concoction, which unfortunately has been left unchallenged in recent debate, represents the acme of gullible absorption of Soviet propaganda bluff. The unthinking propagators of this psychologically destructive myth flagrantly ignore the fact that the "if," or real possibility, in history is just as real as the actual. To adduce the Hitler debacle in support of their fallacious contention, they betray a profound ignorance of the events in Eastern Europe during World War II. As is generally known in circles dealing with the subject, in the first six months of the Soviet-German conflict over 2,000,000 non-Russians, and even Russians, of the multinational Red army willingly surrendered in the fervent hope of taking arms against the Kremlin to realize the freedom of their respective peoples. But for incredible Nazi stupidity, had this and more come to pass, the Soviet power would certainly have collapsed. As underground operators well know, mere quantity does not reveal the true story about the flaunted Red armies.

(4) Serious consideration of an American foreign legion in a buttressed defense of Western Europe. Because of the immensely strategic importance of free Europe in the defense of Western democracy, there is no reason why this defense cannot be further solidified by the rapid formation and presence of an American foreign legion in Western Europe, such as Senator LODGE has long advocated. Consisting mainly of Central and Eastern Europeans drawn from all parts of the world, indeed even from inside the Iron Curtain, such a legion, by its very existence, would complicate additionally any prospective Soviet plans of aggression into Western Europe. For in Soviet Communist eyes there is a no more contaminating influence than contact between a free and an enslaved brother speaking the same language and with a common heritage.

For these coordinate reasons and on the basis of an abiding trust in the specialized competence of our military authorities, I earnestly urge that your unanimous report on this resolution be in the negative. However, to lend positive affirmation to your overwhelming reasons, a substitute resolution should be conceived for joint passage with the House of Representatives, in which a resounding approval of executive dispatch of more ground troops to Europe be boldly registered, in which a strong urging for practical aid to all anti-Communist allies, including those behind the Iron Curtain, be fearlessly made, in which on these basic issues the full unity of America be clearly reflected for all the world to witness.

How To Win the War of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on the night of February 27, at the Uphams Corner Market Restaurant, before members of the Dorchester Kiwanis Club, the Honorable Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the Suffolk Superior Civil Court, delivered an extremely interesting address on the way in which university students could help to win the war of ideas. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an amazing fact that during the past 5 years, Stalin's empire has grown from 190,000,000 people to more than 900,000,000. Thirty-seven out of every hundred people in the world today are under the domination of the Communists because of the deceptive ideas given to the workers of the world. It is still more amazing that all the land and peoples taken over by the Communists were acquired through propaganda and infiltration by the fifth columns within those countries.

Americans are considered experts in the mechanical know-how, but when it comes to propaganda we are babes in the woods compared to Stalin and company. The basic policy of Stalin and company is to achieve world conquest by force, violence, trickery, fraud, and the big lie. If we can draft boys to carry a gun, why not draft them to carry the principles of American democracy, based on justice and truth, to all the nations of the world?

The biggest lie of all that has been sold to the workers of the world is the part of the Communistic Manifesto, which reads, "Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains." Instead of the workers losing their chains, the Commies have put a lock and key on them all over the world. However, it is not enough to abuse Russian communism and to publish the horrors of its physical application and it will not be enough to defeat it physically. We must defeat it by a stronger idea, and we have that idea here in America—the Constitution of the United States. We should sell it to the world, not by lend-lease, gifts, or loans, but by training our bright young men in our colleges and universities and sending them to every country in the world as ambassadors of good will to spread the principles of American democracy. We could draft many of our best students in our colleges, being sure that they possess not only ability, character, and integrity but, most important, loyalty to the American way of life.

We must get rid of the fifth column of Russian conspirators in this country; we have tolerated them far too long. The Kremlin conspirators train their students to destroy the true way of life such as freedom, liberty, and religion. We should see to it that the students in our colleges are trained to sell our way of life, which is based on truth and justice for all, to the nations of the world. This would be in keeping with the wishes of the founding fathers who commanded the preceptors of our colleges "to go forward and teach the youth ideals of love of country, chastity, obedience, and all those virtues which are the ornament of human society and upon which our Constitution was founded."

Our Lord sent His apostles out to the highways and the byways to sell the common people the true way of life. Can you imagine the force of 12,000 or 20,000 students imbued with knowledge of our Constitution and our way of life going forth to the nations all over the earth—a sixth column for justice and truth? In World War I and World War II we won the war but lost the peace. You cannot win peace by guns alone, it must be accomplished by truthful propaganda. That is the only way to destroy for all time the big lies which have been planted in the minds of the workers of the world by tyrannical dictators.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stop Stoking Inflation," from the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, February 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP STOKING INFLATION

The controversy between the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board may sound like a high-flown, theoretical matter, but it has a lot to do with the price of hamburger. And of socks, suits, carpets, carfare, frying pans, coal, milk, bread, bobby pins, and everything else that money buys.

Because it has most to do with the value of money itself. The rate of interest on new issues of Government bonds is the price the Government pays for borrowing. There is a point at which, even for the Government, borrowing ought to begin to become expensive.

President Truman has supported the Treasury in simply setting its own interest rate, around 2½ percent, and expecting the Federal Reserve system to buy enough bonds to keep them up to par in the market. This puts more bonds and money into the banks of the country, where they become the basis for more and more loans to increase business or finance holding of stockpiles and inventories.

The result is that prices go up. Prices of virtually everything. Because money, or credit, has become more plentiful, while the supplies of goods are reduced by defense production.

Ordinarily it would be a matter for apprehension to see Government bonds, of the older, lower-rate issues, go below par. But while uncomfortable for the holders, such a development at present would be salutary to the extent that it reduced the base for lending, and there is little danger that it would go far.

New York's Federal Reserve bank last week reported credit expansion at a pace more than double the preceding week. For the country at large, the week ended February 7 saw an increase of $80,000,000 in money in circulation and of $209,000,000 in reserve bank credit.

Behind that lies the fact that the 12 Federal Reserve banks combined now hold more than $22,000,000,000 of United States Government securities compared to less than $18,000,000,000 a year ago. The Treasury should find a market for its additional bonds outside the banks, and should pay enough interest to attract investment by individuals and nonlending institutions.

To be sure, this will increase the cost of "service" or interest on the public debt, which everybody has to help pay. But the way matters are, the country is paying a great deal more in inflated prices for almost everything it buys, including even defense equipment, than the $1,250,000 it would pay in an additional one-half percent on the public debt.

Meanwhile, the Government, responding to public indignation, goes through frenzied motions of trying to establish workable price and wage controls. By resisting credit control, the full costs of national debt are kept from showing up on the Treasury budget but they show up in everybody's grocery bill, clothing bill, and tax bill for munitions.

Instead of letting the Federal Reserve Board regulate the engine to keep it at a steady working pressure, the White House has the Economic Stabilization Agency hang weights on the safety valve while the Treasury continues to shovel coal on the fires of inflation. That way lies an explosion.

Such a contradiction in policies is not good finance, sound economics, nor intelligent management. If the American people come to understand clearly what is being done to them by this process, it will not even be good politics.

Tribute to Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Indomitable Spirit," published in the Lake Land (N. J.) News of February 5, 1951. The editorial is in tribute to Thomas A. Edison.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INDOMITABLE SPIRIT

The one hundred and fourth anniversary of a distinguished American who spent most of his life within a few miles of Morris County will be observed Sunday. He is Thomas Alva Edison, who has been hailed by some as the greatest inventor of all times and definitely is one of the great ones if not the greatest. He carried on his experiments in Newark, then for a longer period in Menlo Park, near Metuchen, and for more than half of his life in West Orange.

Edison is generally known for some of his more spectacular inventions such as the incandescent light, motion pictures, and phonograph. An even greater insight as to the source of his genius might be found in listing, instead of his successes, some of the handicaps and misfortunes he overcame. He, himself, actually counted them as benefits and as having made a direct contribution to some of his best-known inventions.

When he first started school his teacher sent him back home as not being bright enough to continue, suggesting that he be sent to a State school for subnormals. When he was 12 years old and earning his own living as a butcher boy on a train, a conductor lifted him up by his ears and caused the start of a deafness that grew progressively worse. Yet he felt no bitterness and said that it was a help rather than hindrance, probably drove him to reading. He attributed at least two important developments to the necessity of adapting his experiments to his affliction—the telephone as we know it today and the phonograph.

"In experimenting on the telephone," Edison explained, "I had to improve the transmitter so I could hear it. This made the telephone commercially practical as Bell's magneto telephone receiver was too weak to be used as a transmitter commercially. It was the same with the phonograph. The great defect of that instrument was the rendering of the overtones in the music and the hissing consonants in speech. I worked over a year, 20 hours a day, Sundays and all, to get the word 'specie' perfectly recorded. When this was done I knew that everything else could be recorded."

Edison was always happy to recall that a dozen men and himself formed a $300,000 corporation whose chief asset was his 31-year-old brain. He invented the incandescent lamp 361 days later and then perfected his great power system that spread electricity across the Nation. Yet for another group he used up $3,000,000 in perfecting a process for mining and milling low-grade iron ore only to have all the time and money wasted because deposits of ore were discovered elsewhere.

Later he invented a new kind of battery and put it into manufacture with a complete plant. However, when he discovered

that the product was not as good as he demanded, he closed the plant down and started experimenting all over again, finally succeeding in getting the battery he sought, now the most profitable product of the Edison Industries. At another time, almost his entire West Orange plant was destroyed by fire. But as he watched from a nearby vantage point he started sketching plans for the new plant that would take its place.

Such indomitable spirit could overcome virtually any handicap.

Herbert Hoover: A Prophet With Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call attention to a challenging editorial on American foreign policy and a most revealing summary of some of the remarkable prophecies and predictions made through the years by that great American statesman, Herbert Hoover. In the extremely difficult task of forecasting ahead of time the results of public policies, Herbert Hoover clearly stands without parallel or equal among his contemporaries of the past two decades.

The Huron Daily Plainsman is one of the great daily newspapers of South Dakota. Its editorials are the careful product of two well-informed and able men—Robert D. Lusk, publisher of the paper, and Bruce Campbell, the editor. From extensive reading, from studious research, from frequent travels, and from numerous contacts with American leaders, these two South Dakotans join in producing a most informative and illuminating editorial page which is read by large numbers of citizens in the upper Midwest area of this country. The editorial merits the careful reading of all Americans as we face up to the difficult decisions which are ahead. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROPHET WITHOUT PROPER CREDIT

One of the most arrogant things which the ardent supporters, in Congress and outside of it, of the troops-to-Europe plan have done in the course of arguing for it is to try and write off Herbert Hoover as a man with no sense of history and no grasp of the foreign situation. They even have employed the meaningless but scornful word "isolationist."

They have done this thing after Hoover gave his famous speech of December 20, 1950, to the Nation, in which he suggested that the United States preserve the Western Hemisphere by building air and sea power to hold one frontier in Britain and one in Japan and by keeping economically sound, and by demanding proof that Western Europe even is willing to fight Russia before sending any troops to Europe.

What are the facts?

The facts are that Hoover's observations on foreign policy the past 10 years have proved remarkably accurate and that his speech of December 20, 1950, was part of a pattern of foreign policy speeches he has given the past few years.

JUNE 29, 1941

Perhaps the reason so many administration spokesmen have attacked Hoover is that time has proved him so uncomfortably correct in a notable speech of June 29, 1941, a week after Hitler attacked Russia.

At that time Hoover urged that the United States make no pact whatsoever with Russia because it would advance communism and "make the whole argument of our joining the war to bring the four freedoms to mankind a gargantuan jest."

He pointed out that in 1940 the Dies committee reported unanimously and specifically that the Communist Party in the United States and anywhere was a Moscow-directed conspiracy and worked against the United States Government people. This violated the agreement made in 1933 when the United States recognized the Soviet officially. Russia had agreed to refrain from any propaganda or any move to injure the United States in any way in any part of the United States.

Hoover pointed out how Stalin had conquered and enslaved the nations the United States had helped create at Versailles after World War I—Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and how it helped Hitler rape Poland.

"If we go further and join the war and we win," he said, and remember that this is Herbert Hoover speaking on June 29, 1941, 6 months before Pearl Harbor, "then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia, the enslavement of nations, and more opportunity for it to extend in the world. We should at least cease to tell our sons that they would be giving their lives to restore democracy and freedom to the world. * * * War alongside Stalin to impose freedom is more than a travesty. It is a tragedy. * * * As great a violation of everything American as to aline ourselves with Hitler."

He said then the United States should "arm to the teeth for defense of the Western Hemisphere" and wait the moment after Russia and Germany had knocked each other out to step in and "promote a just and permanent peace."

During the war, naturally, Hoover as a patriotic citizen did all he could to help win the war.

APRIL 1950

In April 1950, he again appraised the world situation in a speech in New York. He grimly recalled his talk of June 21, 1941. His chief theme at that time was that the United Nations was the hope of the world but was being stymied by the Russians and should therefore be reorganized without Communists in it and that "if that is impractical, then a definite new united front should be organized of those peoples who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion and who love freedom."

JULY 11, 1950

On July 11, 1950, after the Korean war started, Hoover spoke in Emporia, Kans. He pointed out that the only justification for war is as an instrument for a specific consequence and that for America that consequence was peace, but that we had strayed from that objective in fighting World War II, as well as World War I. The United States concentrated on winning battles and it had no well-defined political objective by which to chart military action.

He urged at that time a regeneration of spirit in the United Nations and a clarification of thinking and determination of purpose in the United States and UN. "Military strength is no substitute for sound policy," he reminded, and World War II furnished him with a perfect sample.

OCTOBER 19, 1950

On October 19, 1950, he spoke out again. He challenged the will of Europe to fight and the ability of the United States to finance and send abroad large bodies of troops. He agreed that "the greatest danger point to all western civilization is Western Europe. It is obvious, with the threats in Asia, that the United States can supply only a minor part of this huge European deficiency even with our present program."

And he said then that: "We should say, and at once, that we shall provide no more money until a definitely unified and sufficient European army is in sight. And further that 10 American divisions will not be landed until then."

He urged getting down to brass tacks with other nations, after having sent $20,000,000,000 to Europe in 5 years with no results and said: "If we do not find real military action of powerful strength in Western Europe; if there is no definite and effective mobilization of the other members of the UN so as to take up the major burden of their own defenses, then we had better reconsider our whole relation to the problem. In that event we had better quit talking and paying and consider holding the Atlantic Ocean with Britain, if they wish, as one frontier and the Pacific Ocean with an armed Japan and other islands as the other frontier."

DECEMBER 29, 1950

Then on December 29, 1950, he made his forceful radio address which drew so much criticism. It was really no departure from his previous warnings. It went a little further in that he cited the fact that the United States had to furnish more than 90 percent of the foreign forces in Korea and suffer over 90 percent of the dead and injured in a supposed United Nations fight. He cited the land power of Russia and compared the vast advantage it has in manpower and he cited the strong points of the United States.

And he called for a policy to "preserve the Western Hemisphere." His critics immediately twisted that to say that he advocated "retreating" to America. He did not say so. He said "to preserve the Western Hemisphere" by holding the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with large sea and naval power and land forces where needed in Britain and Japan and the Philippines. He called also for a sound economy at home and that probably is what made so many administration spokesmen attack him.

The course of current events has seemed to vindicate Herbert Hoover's public utterances and policies. They deserved a much greater exploration and hearing than the administration has given.

But the public can remember, and must.

Postal Aide, Trolley Line Plan New Road Hazards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, owing to the discussion which is presently being had relative to the carrying of mail by the different common carriers, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Postal Aide, Trolley Line Plan New Road Hazards," written by Ivan H. Peterman, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, February 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL AIDE, TROLLEY LINE PLAN NEW ROAD HAZARDS

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

For those of you who risk life and limb daily on our crowded highways, two items of special interest appeared in yesterday's news:

1. The Post Office Department plans a major shift of short-haul mail from railways to contract truckers.

2. The Liberty Bell Line, for 50 years a speedy, picturesque, carbon-monoxide-free rail route through the Lehigh Valley, wants to give up, and add more busses to traffic.

Almost any motorist, having completed a run from anywhere to Philadelphia, would veto both proposals without a second reading.

Certainly any car commuter, negotiating the city's drives, or completing the ordeal by Chestnut Street into town, any morning except Sunday, will agree we have neared the saturation point. He will say: "Let's abandon no railways for more busses, and for the love of Allah, keep the mail on the rails. We have enough careening mail trucks now."

Nevertheless the Public Service Commission has heard application for a fleet of new, scheduled busses that will further congest the north and west approaches to this bottlenecked city. Why? Because the company doesn't wish to repair its roadway. The inference, of course, is that the motorist, paying his annual fee, can better afford to restore the highways.

As to the United States mails further cluttering the roads, that bright suggestion comes from our old pal, Jack Redding, formerly chief propagandist for the Truman Fair Deal, but lately switched to Assistant Postmaster General. Mr. Redding was voted "least likely to succeed" by every war correspondent after he completely botched the Army's handling of the liberation of Paris story.

On the memorable Paris occasion (August 25, 1944) the then Lt. Col. John M. Redding superseded our adequate and practical First United States Army press arrangements, with what we lightly dubbed "Task Force Redding." This organization was to enter Paris with the French armor or United States Fourth Infantry Division, Redding at the head. Shepherding the correspondents, Redding decided on aircraft to fly our reports back to London, Normandy, Algiers, or Capetown—anywhere but the places to which our reliable jeep drivers had been ferrying them, and from where each night they were transmitted by press-wireless. Everything was to be practically foolproof.

But alack and alas, "Task Force Redding" got involved in the joys of liberation, the sporadic shooting caused delays, the aircraft flew to wrong fields, or refused to fly at all when came the dusk. Those that finally took our stories shuttled them back and forth across the English Channel for three dreary days. There was no relay from the airfields. The only ones who got the story of Paris to your ears were four tough scribes who violated censorship, went on the liberated radio, and broadcast the wild doings to the world. Redding suspended all four, sent them home.

We didn't hear of Colonel Redding for months after that prize snafu. And then it was to learn he had won the Bronze Star for his meritorious press handling of the Paris story.

So you may see why this taxpayer hesitates to applaud Redding's diversion of the United States mails. I'd like to get my letters this year, not next. And if we must be run down by truck, let it not be United States mail truck, from which it's hard to collect damages.

According to the new Assistant Postmaster General, a 95-percent increase in mail-pay rates over 1947 caused the decision to shift $100,000,000 worth of business from the railroads to public highways. Naturally this loss won't help the railways, without which the country cannot operate. Certainly not in wartime. So, no doubt, the Government will eventually subsidize this loss, while a host of additional trucks wear out the pavement.

Surveys have been made around several large cities, including Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Harrisburg. Hauls of 200 miles or less will be involved. "Through rain and sleet, by day and night * * *." Toot your horn, friend. Here they come, on the open roads.

This observer may be a laggard, but remembering the last sudden clampdown on gasoline, rubber, vehicular traffic in general, this year, with Joe Stalin stoking up his tanks and puppets more suggestively each day, seems hardly the time to abandon rail routes in order to clog the roads with more busses and trucks. As one who has inhaled more than his share of fumes, this gear-shifter objects.

I don't know if the Lehigh Valley commuters want busses to replace the comfortable, fast line they have. I don't know if the Hoover report suggested mail trucks to replace the mail cars already in use. But both busses and trucks wear out, the change-over costs plenty, the roads are overcrowded, and, anyway, why not let the customers have a voice in these things, for once?

Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have long had very strong personal convictions on the importance of books in our cultural life, in education and in that broad public discussion of national and international issues which is so fundamental to the democratic process. For this reason I was very pleased to see the discussion of the problem of book distribution in the President's message of February 27 on postal rates. In dealing with the inequalities in postal rates which now exist as between magazines and newspapers on the one hand, and books on the other, the President said:

These excessive subsidies for newspapers and magazines are not only wrong, they are seriously inequitable. Books, which are surely as important as newspapers and magazines in disseminating information, and mail-order catalogs, which carry advertising generally similar to that in newspapers and magazines, are classified as fourth-class mail. Under the recommended rates, there will be little, if any, subsidy in carrying these publications—a startling discrimination in comparison to the situation on second-class mail.

The current issue of the Saturday Review of Literature contains a very enlightening editorial on this problem and the President's reference to it, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCRIMINATION

For some time the threat of higher postal rates on books has been giving anxious days and nights to publishers, already harassed by the almost prohibitive costs of printing and paper. It was a cause for jubilation when President Truman in his message to Congress on February 27 attacked the discriminatory clauses in the postal rate bill and said: "These excessive subsidies for newspapers and magazines are not only wrong, they are seriously inequitable. Books, which are surely as important as newspapers and magazines in disseminating information * * * are classified as fourth-class mail. Under the recommended rates there will be little, if any, subsidy in carrying these publications—a startling discrimination in comparison to * * * second-class mail."

There is a long history of injustice in this latest attempt to blackjack the three hundred or so publishers of hard-cover books in the United States into paying still higher postage rates. In 1938 postage on books was on a level with the reading matter in magazines. At that time President Roosevelt, who must have been aware that the United States was almost alone in this postal-rate discrimination against books, stated that "the interests of the public in the promotion of the cultural growth, education, and development of the American people" required the rate that was then established on a parity with magazines at one and a half cents a pound. Nevertheless, in 1943 the book rate was 3 cents a pound, and a surcharge of 1 to 6 cents was added, amounting to 4 cents for the first pound and 3 cents for each additional pound. In 1949 the rate was again increased to the present 6 cents for the first pound and 4 cents for each additional pound. During this period postage on magazines has remained the same. If the latest proposals of the Post Office Department are approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, book publishers will be confronted with a flat rate of 10 cents for the first pound and five for each succeeding pound. Furthermore, this will apply only to book packages up to 10 pounds as compared with 70 at present. The vast number of packages over 10 pounds will then be charged at full parcel-post rates applicable to general merchandise.

Few people outside of the publishing business, bookstores, libraries, and educational, technical, and religious institutions are aware of the vital role of the postal system in the distribution of "hard-cover" books. After the substantial orders for new books and reprints have been sent by railway express or motor trucks the post office takes charge of the distribution of all small purchases and reorders mailed in packages which it would be uneconomic to send in any other way. Over 10,000 new titles are published each year in this country, and at least a hundred thousand titles are kept in print. It is the duty of the Nation's bookstores and the larger libraries to have in stock a fair representation of this mass of literature of every type. A large volume of books is also sold by mail direct to the purchaser, especially in rural areas and smaller cities and towns in which there are no bookstores. Millions of books are sent out in this way every year by great or small book clubs. It is obvious that a large part of the distribution of books throughout the country is dependent on the post office and that higher postal rates will have to be paid by the consumer, in addition to the steadily increasing retail prices that publishers are forced to charge for their merchandise to meet their expenses.

For the coming year the post office is faced with a deficit of over half a billion dollars. For many years the mailing costs of magazines and newspapers have been heavily subsidized. In his message to Congress President Truman said that the present rates applicable to them were close to the level of 70 years ago. He also protested against asking the taxpayers to continue generously subsidizing the advertisers and others who use the mails for business.

There is little question that the post office will continue subsidies for magazines and to a lesser extent for books. The argument that it is in the public interest to have informative and cultural literature distributed as widely as possible is too powerful to be dismissed. Nevertheless, there are inequities in the present system that should be remedied. It is absurd, as Mr. Truman said, that the post office should be asked to distribute the digest-type magazines at the rate of 1½ cents a pound. Based on simple arithmetic three copies of the average digest magazine weigh 1 pound, so that a single copy can be transported anywhere in the United States for half a cent, while it costs more to handle a copy than it does an ordinary letter, for which the writer pays six times as much postage. Newspapers and magazines now are carried at a cost of $242,000,000 a year, though the postage paid amounts to only $42,000,000. For the year 1952 it is estimated that some 6,000,000,000 of individually addressed periodicals and newspapers will be carried through the mails. The larger mass-circulation magazines carrying a great number of pages of advertising pay only a small percentage of what it costs the post office to deliver them, so that the taxpayer is paying for advertising that goes into American homes at less than cost. "Surely," the President added, "advertising was not a part of the public information and education which Congress intended to subsidize 70 years ago when it established second-class mail."

In view of the huge deficit faced by the post office for the coming year book publishers can hardly expect to have the present rates reduced. But they may hope that common sense will dictate that the absurd discrimination against books will not be continued by increasing the postal rate on them until there will be little if any subsidy for books, while magazines and newspapers continue to cost the taxpayer four or five hundred millions a year. Our cultural past and the knowledge and wisdom in the future will be enshrined, as it has always been, in books—not in magazines designed for entertainment and for carrying vast quantities of advertising. We believe that magazines of this nature should pay a higher postage rate than the weekly, monthly, and quarterly periodicals which are cultural and educational and which cannot hope to obtain either large advertising revenues or a great number of subscribers. By their nature these magazines are limited in appeal to tens of thousands of readers rather than millions, but they are nevertheless a vital link in the immense process of educating, informing, and entertaining the public.

H. S.

Kenneth C. Vipond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in last Thursday's issue of the Evening Star of this city, which pays a deserved tribute to Kenneth C. Vipond, who is retiring an Assistant Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission, after a service of 47 years with that body.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNETH C. VIPOND

A notable career in the Civil Service Commission has come to end with the retirement of Kenneth C. Vipond, Assistant Executive Director, who steps out after 47 years.

When the young Vipond, Canadian-born, came into the Government back in 1904, the Commission itself was only a tiny agency, and the entire Federal Establishment was giving no hint of the tremendous proportions to which it would burgeon. As Government grew and Commission work increased, so also did Mr. Vipond's responsibilities. He developed into a recognized authority on procedure and policies, and his counsel for years has been solicited from one end of the Government to the other, whenever changes were in prospect. "Ask Vipond," became as much a part of the scene as payday.

As was natural, Mr. Vipond's name often figured in speculation when an appointment as Commissioner was in the offing, but he was happier in other fields. Some years ago he declined—with thanks—a special assignment tendered by the White House.

Despite his always-crowded hours, Mr. Vipond never succumbed to the in conference virus which has afflicted so much of the Government brass. Any caller was always certain of an audience, even though it might be delayed.

His retirement is a loss to the Federal service.

Mineral Engineering School Enrollment, United States and Canada, 1950–51

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report by William B. Plank and Henry J. Petrie:

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON MINERAL ENGINEERING SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, UNITED STATES AND CANADA, 1950–51 [1]

(By William B. Plank and Henry J. Petrie [2])

The following preliminary summary of the tenth biennial survey of the mineral engineering schools of the United States and Canada, made by the writers under the auspices of the mineral industries education division of the AIME, indicates that there are 12,624 students enrolled in these schools in the current academic year 1950–51. Fifty-nine out of the sixty-four schools in the United States and all of the eight schools in Canada are covered by this preliminary report. The former complete survey was made in 1948–49 and was published in the journals of the institute in August 1949.

This enrollment of 12,624 mineral engineers in both countries is 16 percent smaller than the enrollment of 15,028 in 1948–49, the peak year, and is about the same size as it was in 1946–47. The decrease since 1948–49 was 15 percent in the United States schools and 28 percent in the Canadian schools. The data for these comparisons are shown in table III. In the United States 37 percent of the mineral engineering students are veterans as compared with 67 percent of the group in 1948–49. Thirteen women are studying to be mineral engineers in the United States but none in Canada.

Since the enrollments of engineering schools being gathered by the ASEE and the United States Office of Education are not yet published, no exact figures on these can be presented here. It has been estimated by Dean S. C. Hollister, of Cornell University, however, that the present number of undergraduate engineering students in the United States is 130,000, or 48 percent less than in 1948 and 28 percent less than in 1949.[3] By comparing these figures with those given above, it is seen that the mineral engineering enrollment has fallen off only about one-third as rapidly as the whole engineering group.

Considerable concern is being shown by engineering educators and industries over the engineering manpower shortage that is predicted as a result of the increasing demand for trained engineers not only by industry but by the armed services. This is in the face of a decreasing supply, as is shown by this and other studies. Not only has the number of entering freshmen been decreasing since 1947, because of a decrease in the number of high-school graduates entering engineering, but the total number of high-school graduates will continue to decrease until 1958 because of the lowered birth rate during the depression years.[3]

Table V shows that next June there will be approximately 35,000 engineering graduates, and in June 1952, there will be 25,000. These figures are from a paper by Henry H. Armsby, Associate Chief for Engineering Education of United States Office of Education presented at the ASEE in Seattle, June 22, 1950. In addition the estimated 51,000 men who received their first degrees in engineering last June have been absorbed by industry, and all branches of engineering have been listed as critical by the Secretary of Labor. In the light of these facts, it is easy to foresee the shortage in the supply of engineers that is alarming Government and industrial officials.

Not only are engineers vitally needed by industry, but in this present national emergency, begun when the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel on June 25, 1950, all branches of the armed services have been taking their toll of engineers through the Selective Service, by enlistments and by the recall of reservists. As has been pointed out by a number of educators and representatives of industry in the congressional hearings on the pending universal military training bill, it seems plain that to maintain our national defense, both in industry and in the Armed Services, there should be a continuing supply of college-trained engineers.

It will be to our national interest to make it possible for more 18-year olds to enter engineering colleges rather than to induct them into the armed services. If we are to graduate 50,000 engineers annually we must have at least 100,000 freshmen entering the engineering schools instead of the 30,000 men now in the freshman class. The 75,000 18-year olds proposed to be allotted to the colleges for scientific and technical education would supply only about 37,000 graduates in all branches of science and engineering.

[1] A paper read before the Mineral Industry Education Division, AIME, St. Louis, Mo., February 19, 1951; to be revised.

[2] Head of department of mining and metallurgical engineering and instructor in mining, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.; member and junior member, AIME, respectively.

[3] News release of the ASEE manpower committee, October 11, 1950, George D. Lobinger, chairman.

The number of freshmen to be sent to college should be at least twice that contemplated in the pending bill. The proposal of Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, Chairman of the Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee of the National Security Resources Board, as reported by Dr. Howard A. Rusk in the New York Times, of February 11, 1951, for a Reserved Specialist Training Corps of 75,000 men in addition to a Reserved Officers Training Corps of 75,000 men in our colleges has great merit as a possible solution of the scientific, engineering, medical, and military needs for the national defense and industry.

As to a prediction of the supply of mineral engineers it is seen that the number of men receiving their first degrees in that field has increased 12.5 percent in 2 years as compared to a decrease of 25 percent in the whole engineering group in the same period. Next June it is expected that 3,240 men will receive their first or bachelor degrees in mineral engineering but in the succeeding 4 years this supply will sharply decline unless something is done to stimulate enrollment in the field.

Apropos of this, it is encouraging to note the increased efforts in this direction. Especially commendatory and worthy of support is the proposal to be presented by the Minnesota section of the AIME at the annual meeting at St. Louis "to study the means of encouraging youth to study in the mineral engineering field."

Of the 2,948 mineral engineers to receive their first degrees next June in the United States schools, 452 will be in mining, 735 in metallurgy, 855 in petroleum and natural gas, 274 in ceramics, 618 in geology, and 14 in fuels. The industrial placement officers have been on the college campuses offering jobs since before the first of the year and a government agency is actively seeking mining engineers. One large industry announced several months ago that it would hire all engineers that would apply. There is an encouraging increase in the number of graduate fellowships available, especially to metallurgical engineers. What are needed now, however, are more undergraduate scholarships such as those available through the Coal Division of the AIME, the National Coal Association, and several other industrial organizations.

TABLE I.—*Mineral engineering student enrollment by courses, 1950–51, United States, 59 out of 64 schools* [1]

Course	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Total undergraduates	Graduate students	Grand total	Canadian B. S. degrees
Mining	365	382	448	485	1,680	113	1,793	452
Metallurgical	512	581	636	727	2,456	607	3,063	735
Petroleum and natural gas	655	667	782	729	3,034	143	3,177	855
Ceramic	158	171	222	280	831	123	954	274
Geology	442	447	605	658	2,152	418	2,570	618
Fuels	7	12	9	14	42	25	67	14
Specials					101		101	
Total	2,140	2,260	2,702	3,093	10,296	1,429	11,725	2,948

[1] In the 5 missing schools there are 2 mining, 3 metallurgical, and 1 petroleum curricula. Data from tenth biennial survey by Mineral Industry Education Division, AIME, Nov. 15, 1950.

TABLE II.—*Mineral engineering student enrollment by courses, 1950–51, Canada, 8 schools* [1]

Course	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Total undergraduates	Graduate students	Grand total	Canadian B. S. degrees
Mining	62	55	65	100	282	1	283	108
Metallurgical	41	34	49	73	197	25	222	73
Petroleum and natural gas	8	18	27	26	79	0	79	26
Ceramic	1	1	6	10	18	0	18	10
Geological	47	41	53	78	219	78	297	86
Total	159	149	200	287	795	104	899	292

[1] Data from 10th biennial survey by Mineral Industry Education Division, AIME, Nov. 15, 1950.

TABLE III.—*Engineering student enrollment, 1940–41 to 1950–51, undergraduates and graduates, United States and Canada*

	1940–41 [1]	1944–45 [1]	1947–48 [1]	1948–49 [1] [2]	1949–50 [3]	1950–51 [4]
Mining	1,978	224	2,459	2,632	2,223	2,075
Metallurgical	2,450	472	4,121	4,158	3,387	3,285
Petroleum and natural gas	2,877	376	4,665	4,147	4,175	3,256
Ceramic	843	190	1,108	1,214	998	972
Geological	792	(?)	(?)	2,777	(?)	2,867
Fuels	44	(?)	(?)	47	(?)	67
Specials	149	(?)	(?)	53	(?)	101
Total mineral engineers:						
United States	9,133			13,760	11,283	11,725
Canada				1,250		899
United States and Canada		1,262	12,353	15,028		12,624
Chemical		5,082	26,972	23,610	19,976	
Civil		3,537	31,849	33,861	29,109	
Mechanical		6,965	56,551	53,642	45,632	
Electrical		5,934	58,408	53,774	45,711	
Others		18,852	68,117	72,909	46,555	
Total engineers	114,116	41,632	262,260	249,915	[5] 226,383	

[1] Mining Engineering, May 1950.
[2] Mining Engineering, May 1950; data on mineral engineers from Mineral Education Division study; other engineers and total from Journal of Engineering Education, February 1949.
[3] From Journal of Engineering Education, February 1950.
[4] Study of Mineral Education Division, AIME, Nov. 15, 1950.
[5] Includes 21,466 United States engineers from non-ECPD schools and 6,521 Canadian engineers, unclassified.

TABLE IV.—*Graduate students in mineral engineering, United States, 1933–34 to 1950–51* [1]

	1933–34	1934–35	1935–37	1938–39	1940–41	1942–43	1946–47	1948–49	1950–51
Mining	40	55	49	44	44	38	70	93	113
Metallurgical	116	90	121	172	236	137	470	[illegible]	607
Petroleum and natural gas	15	29	38	43	73	27	187	[illegible]	143
Ceramic	19	36	46	64	[illegible]	19	137	154	123
Geological	66	62	34	86	177	[illegible]	127	197	418
Fuels	4	10	15	[illegible]	9	10	10	10	25
Total	263	285	320	415	[illegible]	[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,[illegible]	1,429

[1] Data from Mineral Industry Education Division, AIME, studies.

TABLE V.—*First engineering degrees, United States and Canada*

Year	All engineers [1]	Mineral engineers [2]
1942–43	14,714	
1943–44	11,155	
1944–45	4,724	
1945–46	8,219	
1946–47	19,373	
1947–48	30,038	
1948–49	46,034	[3] 2,[illegible]
1949–50	[3] 51,000	3,130
1950–51	[3] 35,000	[3] 3,240
1951–52	[3] 25,000	

[1] Data from Journal of Engineering Education.
[2] Data from AIME, Education Division studies.
[3] Estimated.

TABLE VI.—*Teachers in mineral engineering schools, United States, 1950–51*

	Professors	Associate professors	Assistant professors	Instructors	Assistants	Others	Number of schools
Mining, min. dress	43	20	22	12	13	2	32
Metallurgical	78	41	45	56	60	31	45
Petroleum and natural gas	22	13	19	13	33	4	19
Ceramic	31	14	20	11	17	0	14
Geological	55	35	41	36	56	8	31
Fuels	0	2	1	1	0	0	3
Total	229	126	148	129	187	46	145

TABLE VII.—*Teachers in mineral engineering schools, Canada, 1950–51*

	Professors	Associate professors	Assistant professors	Instructors	Assistants	Others	Number of schools
Mining	11	5	4	2	3	7	8
Metallurgical	11	4	1	2	4	13	6
Petroleum and natural gas	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
Ceramic	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Geological	18	5	13	4	22	15	7
Total	41	14	19	10	30	36	23

Fifty-four Fatherless Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Maine Coast Fisherman of March 1951:

FIFTY-FOUR FATHERLESS CHILDREN

Owners of fishing vessels must recognize that the unusual loss of life in the numerous

sinkings during the past 6 months is a matter of growing public concern. The most recent tragedy—the disappearance of the 17 men on the *Gudrun*—has left 54 children without fathers. Certainly fishermen and their families—and the public—are justified in demanding that every possible precaution be taken to make these boats seaworthy.

In the past, similar tragedies and similar demands have brought about the required Government inspection of even the lowliest public excursion boat. Yet the larger fishing vessels—all carrying crews of from 8 to 18 men—are not inspected for seaworthiness by any authority. Navigational equipment carried is whatever the owner desires. And after sinkings have occurred, the occasional investigations can only be guesses at what might have happened in the reaches of the sea. Even when inquiry boards decide on preventive measures, there is no one to enforce them.

One thing the owners can and should do is paint all boats and rafts international orange. The Coast Guard recommends this as a result of the inquiry into the loss of the *Theresa A.* International orange is the most visible of all colors and will help searchers spot anything drifting on the water.

Fishermen themselves can take a step for their own safety and the future of their families by getting support for the Nicholson bill which was recently submitted to the House of Representatives by Congressman NICHOLSON, of New Bedford. This bill (H. R. 1762) will require the Coast Guard to make an annual inspection of every fishing vessel over 15 gross tons. It specifies the type of equipment to be carried, and owners will be required by law to have hulls checked by drydocking and hauling at least once a year.

The Nicholson bill deserves your strong support. Write to your Congressman today urging its passage. Required annual inspections will help reduce the recurring deaths at sea and hold the ever-present risks of fishing to a minimum.

The Cumberland and the Tennessee: Two Great Rivers as One—Report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the President's Water Resources Policy Commission has recently issued a report of Ten Rivers in America's Future—a voluminous report reflecting an exhaustive study, and particularly important at this time when power development for both domestic use and for purposes of national defense are of major concern.

This is the type of report which is of great interest to those who are concerned with and interested in the development and improvement of our country and the proper use and conservation of all of its vast resources. The report contains flattering, though factual, references to the accomplishments of the Tennessee Valley Authority and make further recommendations with respect to the development of the Tennessee River—one of the mentioned 10 great rivers in the country. It also takes cognizance of the development of the Cumberland River by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army—the development to date and its future development and the integration of the Cumberland River program with the Tennessee Valley Authority. The integration of the Cumberland River with the TVA has long been one of the aspirations of the people of middle Tennessee. The study and report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission should hasten this dream into a reality.

I commend this report to the Members of Congress, and also the reading of an editorial in this connection from the February 27, 1951, edition of the Nashville Tennessean, which under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks.

The editorial, entitled "Two Great Rivers as One," is as follows:

TWO GREAT RIVERS AS ONE

A powerful and perhaps decisive voice has been added to those which have long urged full development of the vast resources of the Cumberland River.

It is the voice of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, which has called for the integrated management of the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers as part of a far-reaching development program for 10 major river basins scattered over the country.

In recommending that the entire program be carried out along the Tennessee Valley Authority pattern, the Commission gave flattering but altogether natural recognition to the TVA for the sweeping transformation it has wrought in our own region. As those of us in the Tennessee Valley know so well, the TVA experiment has proved to be an astounding success, and there is every reason for duplicating it in other regions so its political, social, and economic benefits may be even more widely felt.

Of especial significance to our region, however, is the fact that one of the basins the Commission believes particularly adaptable to a TVA-like development also lies in our own midst.

"In the Cumberland River below Nashville," said the Commission's exhaustive report, "there is a series of low navigation dams, inadequate for modern navigation and providing no flood protection. Accordingly the most pressing current issue relates to the method of future development of the lower portion of the river."

As for this method itself, the Commission gives strong support to a high dam like that proposed by the Army engineers for construction near Grand Rivers, Ky.

"A dam on the Cumberland near Kentucky Dam on the Tennessee and near the mouths of these two rivers," says the report, "affords definite possibilities of advantage in terms of the coordinated hydraulic development of the two rivers."

Carrying this idea of coordination even further, the Commission reports that "by interconnecting the two reservoirs by a canal it would be possible to use water from both rivers to greater advantage through the two powerhouses than would be possible if the rivers were treated as separate and distinct."

Nor would the advantage of such integration be limited to power production alone, the report continues. Navigation would be enhanced by shorter routes and lower costs for navigation structures, and "benefits for flood control" would be derived.

In substance, this recommendation for integrated development of the two rivers and for connecting their reservoirs with a canal closely parallels the course of action recently urged by the TVA in a study made for the President. Far from relying on the TVA's position, however, the Water Resources Policy Commission submitted some strong arguments of its own for tieing the two powerful rivers together. Said the report:

"The close cultural, economic, and political connections between the communities of the Cumberland Basin and the communities of the Tennessee Basin present advantages for managing the two basins in an integrated manner. The fact that both the Tennessee and the Cumberland are part of a single electric power marketing area, the similarity in agricultural problems, and the presence of both basins in the same two States favor a closely coordinated operation of the two."

Finally, the report takes note of the "great need for power in the TVA power marketing area at the present time," a factor which it says weighs heavily in favor of "rapid development of the Cumberland."

A similar observation, it will be recalled, was contained in the TVA's recent study, which noted that the need for power is so great that it overshadows the question of what Government agency shall undertake the development necessary to produce the power.

Apparently sharing this view, the Water Resources Policy Commission made no recommendation as to who should develop and manage the Cumberland. Its emphasis rather was on getting the job done and on coordinating the resources of the river with those of the Tennessee.

In effect, this leaves the door open for speedy congressional authorization of development of the Cumberland by the Army Engineers, who already have undertaken preliminary work on the Grand Rivers high dam.

Similarly, it paves the way for cooperation between the engineers and the TVA in bringing about the integration of the two great rivers which together can lift our already rising region to even greater heights and serve the Nation well in both war and peace.

Threat to Schuman Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 28 I called attention of the House to the threatened collapse of the Schuman plan. At that time I expressed my concern occasioned by the activities of American lawyers who were intervening with our own representative in Germany on behalf of the German monopolists. This morning Mr. Walter Lippmann, in his always carefully considered and lucid column, refers to the same situation. The Washington Post also carried an explanation by Mr. Robert P. Patterson of his own activities as an attorney in connection with the Schuman plan. The only comment the explanation calls for is that the statement of the Senator from Arkansas relative to the moral level of our Government should be broadened

somewhat to cover the activities of those who have gained great prestige by virtue of high Government position. I am asking that both the Lippmann column and the newspaper account of Mr. Patterson's explanation be included in our RECORD:

[From the Washington Post]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A BAD SET-BACK

The position of the Western Powers has been seriously undermined in Germany as the new discussions with the Soviet Union are about to begin. It is possible that the Ruhr industrialists, the masters of the coal and steel combines and cartels, have succeeded in frustrating the Schuman plan. If they have done that, these great private monopolists who have so long dominated the industrial life of Europe will be able to play a principal part in any German settlement.

The history of German-Russian relations for 150 years under the emperors, the Communists, and the Nazis, shows that while Germany is a difficult country to Russify or to Sovietize, there is always a good chance that Russia can come to terms with a reactionary Germany. This breakdown of the Schuman plan, which can be averted only by heroic measures, would mean that behind the facade of western German democracy the effective power to negotiate arrangements would lie in those powerful, quite unscrupulous monopolies which have no reason to like or to be loyal to the western democratic society.

The Schuman plan bears the name of the French Foreign Minister, Robert Schuman, who proposed it last spring. The negotiations to draft a treaty to carry out the plan have been carried on since last May by delegates of the six governments—France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg. The principal negotiators have been M. Jean Monnet for France and Mr. Walter Hallstein for West Germany.

The object of the Schuman plan is to create in these six countries a single free and competitive market for coal and steel—a market, as M. Monnet has described it, where all consumers can have access to coal and steel on equal terms, without monopolistic discrimination and subject only to differentials in the cost of transportation. This proposal has had the enthusiastic, indeed the passionate, support of disinterested and informed men here and abroad. They believe it holds the first convincing promise of a Franco-German reconciliation and with that the promise that the dead hand of monopoly and restriction will begin to be lifted from the industrial practices of Western Europe.

By January of this year the draft of the treaty had been completed and agreed to except for the two articles which we shall come to in a moment. The treaty as it stands now deals substantially with the complex political, legal, and technical questions that arise in this new and unprecedented project of a single free open market for steel and coal in Western Europe.

The two articles which have not been completed have to do with the problem of monopoly. On these two articles the Schuman plan may founder. For without them there would come only a giant monopoly instead of free and competitive enterprise within the wider European market. One of these articles is designed to prevent cartelization. The other is designed to prevent the formation of the vertical and horizontal combines which have been so characteristic of the Ruhr industries.

It stands to reason that if there is to be a single free market in the six countries, then the German monopolies of the Ruhr must be broken up—in the language of the occupation statute they must be deconcentrated. Otherwise, the free market will simply mean the complete and the unopposed domination of that market by the German monopolies.

The occupation statute calls for the deconcentration of the German monopolies. As a matter of law, the three occupying powers could impose the deconcentration on the Ruhr monopolies. But such an imposed solution is no longer possible or desirable. The Germans would resent it and in their resentment they would certainly refuse to vote for the Schuman plan, which cannot come into existence except by their free and equal consent. For these reasons the fulfillment of the deconcentration policy of the occupation statute has not been imposed but has been made a matter of negotiation at Duesseldorf—actually between Mr. McCloy and the Germans.

The authors of the treaty for the Schuman plan have acted on the hope that the Duesseldorf negotiations would succeed, that the Germans would be induced to agree voluntarily to a plan of deconcentration, and that then the Schuman treaty would perpetuate as the general law of European industry the principles of a free market.

What has happened is that the German industrialists have felt themselves strong enough to reject deconcentration and the creation of an open market. It may not be a mere coincidence that they have precipitated the showdown on the eve of the meeting of the four powers. In any event they have waged a violent, elaborate, and expensive campaign against the basic conception of the Schuman plan. They have won the support in other countries of those vested interests, of those collectivists who are so habituated to restrictive practices and monopolistic purposes that the very idea of a free economy seems to them intolerable. They have set in motion a wave of reaction against the kind of progressive and competitive economy which the Schuman plan envisages.

This rebellion of the reactionary monopolists in Germany has been aided and abetted from this country. Indirectly, and no doubt unwittingly, this has been done in the first instance by the naive military men who have so foolishly believed, and so curiously persuaded Mr. Acheson to believe, that German divisions could be raised before Germany had recovered her sovereignty—that West Germany could be at one and the same time a military satellite of the United States and also a loyal and willing ally.

The rebellion of the Ruhr industrialists has been openly aided and abetted by a bevy of American lawyers, headed by the former Secretary of War, who—believe it or not—has actually gone to Germany to argue their case before his own former subordinate in the War Department, the present United States High Commissioner, Mr. McCloy. The monumental impropriety of this performance has cast the utmost doubt on the good faith of American policy in Germany—on the declared policy of full and enthusiastic support of the Schuman plan.

For how—without a renewed and unequivocal restatement of our policy—are we now to persuade the people of Europe that the former Secretary of War—under whom the occupation of Germany was instituted—is now so private a person that he can appear in Germany at this critical moment and that his appearance has no significance?

[From the Washington Post]

PATTERSON EXPLAINS HIS TRIP

Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, who returned recently from a visit to Germany in the interests of clients, the Association for the Protection of German Stockholders in Steel and Coal Industries, made a statement yesterday explaining his trip. He advised his clients, he said, that the formula of John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner, on coal holdings should be accepted. His statement follows in part:

"Some months ago an association of shareholders in German steel and coal companies * * * requested my legal opinion in regard to a decartelization law relating to those industries. That law was enacted in 1950, 3 years after my resignation as Secretary of War. In the legal opinion which I submitted I made it plain that I would have no share in any effort to challenge or thwart the basic policy of decartelization. * * * I pointed out, however, that in my view the law omitted safeguards against arbitrary action. * * *

"I went to Germany for further discussion with my clients. * * * The outstanding matter on which agreement had not been arrived at was the percentages of coal requirements the steel mills might retain. With other American lawyers I conferred with Mr. McCloy on this subject. The importance of an agreement in promoting adoption of the Schuman plan was thoroughly discussed.

"As a result of these conferences I advised my clients that in my opinion the formula on coal holdings proposed by Mr. McCloy before my arrival in Germany should be accepted. * * * They have told me that it was my recommendation that broke the deadlock on this point.

"I wish to point out that I went to Germany simply as a lawyer representing investors who were entitled to have their viewpoint presented. I had been out of public office for 3 years. There were no reasonable grounds for anyone to assume that I still spoke for the United States Government."

Our Commitment in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, many conflicting statements are being made today by so-called authoritative personalities either interpreting this Government's foreign policy or advocating a foreign policy of their own for adoption by the United States. These views are so conflicting in nature so that to say that the people are confused would be minimizing the entire matter. This confusion is evident from some of the mail I am receiving from a portion of my constituency with particular reference to the Korean situation.

Although I am not a member of either the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Armed Services Committee of the House, as a Member of the Congress, I am called upon to vote either by way of legislation implementing our foreign policy or by appropriations to effectuate that policy. In view thereof, I am, of course, obliged before voting to study and fully understand to the best of my ability our Government's policy in joining with the United Nations in resisting Communist aggression in Korea, and in the determination of the United Nations to remain in Korea until such time as the

aggressors are defeated or until our military position becomes so untenable as to justify the withdrawal of United Nations troops from that area.

I feel it necessary, therefore, to state for the record my understanding why the United Nations intervened in Korea with the full support of the United States Government and why we are determined to see the matter through in the interest of our own safety and welfare as well as world peace.

In June 1950 world communism decided its usual methods of subversion and penetration were not meeting with success in Korea. The unprovoked and sudden attack on the Republic of Korea that followed this decision represented a new phase in Communist tactics—a resort to open aggression. This was the first occasion of open aggression since the formation of the United Nations. If left unchallenged, it would have destroyed the security and way of life of the free world by embarking us on the same dismal road which led from Manchuria to Ethiopia, to Poland, and to Pearl Harbor.

The United Nations acted quickly and courageously in undertaking to oppose Communist aggression in Korea with force, if necessary. In carrying out this decision the United States has taken the leading part. The decision was taken in order to dispel immediately any Kremlin hope that aggression would pay big rewards and go unchecked from one success to another, thus chewing up the free world piecemeal. When the United Nations forces were on the point of accomplishing their objectives and preparing the way for a unified and independent Korea under United Nations auspices, the Chinese Communists compounded the aggression by open intervention in Korea.

The Chinese Communists, by their actions, defied the authority of the United Nations and the world's deep-rooted demand for peace. Repeated efforts by the United Nations to bring about a peaceful settlement in Korea have failed. The Communist dictators have thus far refused to take steps to end the fighting and bring about a peaceful settlement in accordance with the United Nations objective. On February 1 the General Assembly found the Chinese Communist regime guilty of aggression and expressed the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression.

The United Nations and the United States cannot abandon their moral commitments against aggression as manifested in Korea. Korea is a symbol of the free world's resistance to the forces that would make a mockery of international law and order and of the world's hope for peace.

By standing and fighting in Korea we are, in effect, defending our own land and people from the disastrous results which would surely follow upon any belief in the Kremlin that the world is too weak or uninterested in its liberty to resist this latest effort to impose tyranny upon us all.

We are staying in Korea because we and the other free nations of the world, united under the United Nations banner, must make aggression too costly a policy for any regime. The world Communist command must not be allowed to conclude that aggression is easy and that it pays dividends.

We are staying in Korea because our presence there serves as a deterrent to aggression in other places. If the Communists are plotting other acts of aggression in Asia or elsewhere in the world, they must not be given the idea that they will meet with no resistance and that they can act with impunity where and when they wish. Such an idea could only lead to greater disasters which a continuation of our present resolute action might prevent.

The aggressor forces in Korea are meeting with effective resistance from the United Nations forces and are receiving such heavy punishment that the Communist aggressor must face the fact that his crime will not pay. At the same time our actions in Korea are pinning down major Communist forces and may force the Kremlin to change its plans of aggression.

We are staying in Korea because withdrawal from Korea would have a serious effect upon many of our friends. A withdrawal now might undermine the resistance and confidence of countries living in the shadow of militant Communist imperialism and result in their capitulation to the threats of the Kremlin. Their freedom and independence and our united determination to cooperate in maintaining their freedom and independence are of great importance to the free world and to the United States.

We are staying in Korea because we must defend a small country to which the United Nations, under our leadership, has made a serious commitment. The Koreans have fought valiantly in their own defense. To abandon the Korean people now would indicate that our friendship means little in the face of adversity. If we did abandon them we could not hope to provide a rallying point around which the spirits and energies of the free world can be mobilized to meet the world-wide threat which the Kremlin now poses to the free world.

The initial United Nations action last June in support of the principle of collective security to resist aggression was widely acclaimed by a large majority of the American press and public. The entry of the Chinese Communists into the fighting does not alter the fact of aggression nor does it change the basic aims and objectives of the United Nations. It is not a question of wanting war with the Chinese people. Our traditional friendship for the Chinese people is a matter of record. It is a question of whether unprovoked Communist aggression shall be allowed to defy the principles of the United Nations and threaten the security of the entire free world.

It is easy to understand why many Americans, not in a position to realize the enormous importance to our future of the degree of determination and perseverance which the United States and the United Nations showed in Korea, should urge that we withdraw. There are sound reasons for such determination on the part of the United States and the United Nations. The issue in Korea is how the free world will react to aggression. We can face it or we can run away from it. The old League of Nations ran away from it in China and Ethiopia and made World War II inevitable. If we face aggression now and put it down, keeping our courage and our determination even when the going is very hard, we can have some hope that we shall not have to suffer the untold death and destruction of a world war III. If we give up now we will make clear that the wages of aggression is victory—and another world war will be unavoidable except by total surrender.

These, I think, are the primary reasons why we went into Korea and why we are staying there.

Pay Inequity Between White- and Blue-Collar Workers Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Jerry Kluttz, whose column, the Federal Diary, appears daily in the Washington Post, recently had this to say about Congressman CLINTON MCKINNON, of California:

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

PAY INEQUITY BETWEEN WHITE- AND BLUE-COLLAR WORKERS CRITICIZED

Representative MCKINNON (Democrat, California), has put his finger on the real sore spot in the Federal salary picture—the growing inequity between the pay of white-collar and blue-collar employees.

He told the House that the blue-collar employee had been given a substantially larger increase in salary than his white-collar colleague since 1940. He then said:

"In watching its (inequity) effect on the caliber of employees initially recruited over the past 10 years it is clearly indicated that there has been a gradual decline in the desire of young people to make a career of Government clerical and administrative work as compared with the blue-collar work."

MCKINNON then produced an eye opening chart which compared white-collar with blue-collar salaries paid by the Navy in San Diego, a city he represents. In general, the startling results would have been the same no matter what area was studied.

On November 19, 1940, for example, a GS-2 clerk was paid $1,440 compared to $1,248 for a laborer. As of today the clerk gets $2,450, the laborer, $2,630. The clerk had received a 70-percent raise; the laborer 110 percent. MCKINNON suggested a 49-percent pay boost for the clerk to place his salary on an equal basis with that of the laborer.

He next compared a grade 4 clerk with a helper. In 1940, the clerk was paid $1,800 compared with the helper's $1,331. Today the clerk gets $2,875, the helper $2,891. The clerk has been given a 60-percent boost; the helper has received 117 percent.

MCKINNON then explains that a grade 6 employee and a machinist had comparable salaries in 1940. But since that time, the machinist has been given an increase of 82 percent, the grade 6 employee only 50 percent.

A grade 12 employee was paid $4,600 in 1940, compared with $2,808 for a blue-collar foreman. Today the grade 12 gets $6,400, a 39-percent increase; the foreman is paid $6,245, a 122-percent boost.

The California Congressman wasn't critical of the wage increases given blue-collar workers. He insists, however, that salaries paid white-collar people must be increased to provide a proper differential between the two groups of workers.

But what it all boils down to is this—Congress fixes the salaries paid the 1,500,000 classified and postal employees, the agencies themselves set salaries for the 600,000 blue-collar people. The agencies are required to pay their laborers, mechanics, and the like prevailing wages of private industry. Wages of per diem, or blue-collar workers have been adjusted frequently since 1940, as they should have been, to keep pace with higher living costs.

But the high cost of living has hit the classified and postal worker, too, and all he can do about it is to go through the long and painful process of urging members of Congress to do something about it and then retire to pray and hope.

It has reached the point now where employee leaders are seriously considering some plan to have salaries of postal and classified employees set by local wage boards, based on living costs and salaries paid private employees in similar jobs. They believe such boards would be more alert to the pay problem of these 1,500,000 postal and classified people. A look at the salary adjustments given blue-collar people proves that point.

Mr. Speaker, Jerry Kluttz is one of the outstanding authorities on Federal personnel matters. He recognizes in Congressman MCKINNON one who has the intelligence and the courage to tackle one of the most complicated and complex problems in Government.

There Is Great Need for Reasonable Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and. There Is Ample Cash Funds on Deposit To Justify Increased Payments at This Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have in my district in Kentucky a large group of very fine American and Kentucky citizens whose life work is and has been that of railroading These men and women constitute one of the most respected, honorable, and dependable groups of citizens that could be found anywhere. A large percentage of them own modest homes, they have lived in their same communities mostly for many years, they are and have been a part of the community and civic life of their respective towns and counties and are, in fact, everything that could be expected of good law-abiding dependable citizens

These men and women, as a class, for many years, have been contributing each month out of their earnings a relatively large percent of their salaries in order to build up and accumulate an adequate and sufficient retirement fund for themselves and their wives and children

Practically every other Member of the Congress of the United States has in his home district a like and similar group of fine dependable citizens who are in the employment of some railroad company.

These railroad men and women have for many years been paying a relatively high percentage of their salaries each month into a joint fund so as to guarantee for themselves adequate and sufficient retirement funds so that they and their dependents may have this security in their old age or in case of their passing away and leaving dependents.

Under the present rate of payments to retired railroad annuitants and their widows and children, these payments are so small that the very purpose of the Railroad Retirement Act is being defeated. Those railroad employees who have retired do not have anything like an adequate sum paid to them upon which to live and those who are looking forward to retirement cannot under the present rates of payment expect anything like enough to support themselves upon or have enough for their widows and children to live on in case of their death.

This condition has caused great unrest and dissatisfaction among the railroad employees generally and they are looking to the Members of Congress to remedy this condition. To begin with, in order to increase the payments under the Railroad Retirement Act to the men and women who have built up this fund and who have retired and will retire in the future, it is not necessary to cost the taxpayers of America anything.

The funds that are paid out were accumulated under the laws of the United States over the past several years by each railroad employee paying a percentage of his salary into this fund each month and his employer, the railroad companies, paying a similar sum and the moneys which are being and will be paid out come from this fund and they do not cost the taxpayers of this country anything.

At the present time this railroad retirement fund is possibly the largest and strongest retirement fund ever accumulated in the history of the United States by any group of employees in any one industry. I have obtained the figures which show the amount collected into this fund each year and the amount paid out, as well as the amount remaining in the fund from the beginning of the Railroad Retirement Act up to and including the first day of January 1951.

For the benefit of the Members of Congress who are vitally interested in amending and improving the Railroad Retirement Act for the benfit of the railroad men and women who are their constituents and live in their districts, I am setting down this table showing the tremendous growth and present condition of this fund:

Fiscal year	Tax collections	Benefit payments
Total through June 1948	$189,477,379	867,109,181
1938-39	109,256,540	107,131,436
1939-40	120,966,719	114,[illegible],141
1940-41	126,942,076	121,799,908
1941-42	170,011,601	126,656,781
1942-43	208,794,692	136,962,977
1943-44	267,094,303	133,215,339
1944-45	285,857,362	142,687,642
1945-46	282,610,497	153,815,252
1946-47	320,057,125	173,101,153
1947-48	357,088,782	234,871,297
1948-49	563,832,724	263,063,623
1949-50	550,172,200	301,542,273

It is very impressive to know that this great accumulated fund now contains in it a balance as of January 1, 1951, of $2,369,008,240. If these figures will be studied by the Members of Congress, it will at once become apparent that the excess each year of the amounts paid in by these men and their employers over the amounts being paid out is from 150 million to 200 million dollars per year.

There has been no increase in the percentages of the benefits that are being paid out to the railroad men and women from this fund for the past few years, yet on the other hand during the past few years there has been a greater increase in the cost of living to these men and women than at any time in the recent history of the United States.

Recently our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table showing the tremendous increases in the cost of living in recent years. From these figures we find that in the past 10 or 12 years the ordinary family in buying the absolute necessities had to pay 99 percent more for food, 92 percent more for clothing, 16 percent more for rent, 33 percent more for fuel, electricity and refrigeration, 87 percent more for household furnishings, and 48 percent more for a great many miscellaneous items, making an average increase of 71 percent in the cost of living and these figures only bring us up to November, 1950. Since November 1950, there has been a considerable increase in the cost of living.

While it now costs the average railroad man and his family about 75 percent more to live during all these years, this railroad retirement fund has only been increased a very small amount, the last increase several years ago being 20 percent.

In view of the change in our times and the tremendous increase in the cost of living, and in view of the universal demand on the part of the railroad employees and taking into consideration the huge sum that has accumulated in this fund, I have introduced a reformed and amended Railroad Retirement Act in the Eighty-second Congress. My bill is H. R. 2533. Briefly, my bill increases the payment of retirement benefits to these employees who have already retired by 25 percent, it increases the benefits by 25 percent to those who will retire in the future, and it provides that when a railroad employee passes away that his

widow, so long as she does not remarry, shall immediately, without regard to her age, receive 75 percent of the amount that her husband would have been entitled to had he lived and retired.

It provides full annuities to railroad employees, both male and female, after 30 years of service regardless of age, but it does not require any compulsory retirement before the age of 70. There are other very beneficial improvements provided in this bill.

I most sincerely invite the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues and especially the members of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the facts and figures I have cited and recited above. I do hope that this great committee will give us a hearing on this effort to improve the Railroad Retirement Act and that all Members of Congress who wish to improve the lot of their railroad employees in their home districts will join me in presenting the case of the railroaders to this committee in the hope that we may get out and pass a good bill for them.

Furthermore, I sincerely hope that the great railroad brotherhoods of America and their officials and especially their legislative representatives will become very active in assisting Members of Congress who believe that this act should be amended in helping them to get up the facts and figures to present in evidence before the committee and will lend every constructive legitimate aid possible to the passage of this bill.

Exemption of Municipal Bonds From Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, Resolution 1700, adopted by the Common Council of the City of Kokomo, Ind., under date of February 26, 1951:

Resolution 1700

Whereas interest on municipal bonds heretofore issued by political divisions has been exempted from Federal income tax; and

Whereas it has been suggested that in the adoption of a new internal revenue code by the Congress of the United States, the interest from said bonds be no longer exempted from tax; and

Whereas in the opinion of the Common Council of the City of Kokomo, Ind., the taxing for Federal income-tax purposes of the interest on said bonds would greatly increase the amount of interest which said city will be compelled to pay on obligations to be sold by it and thus make it more difficult to finance its obligations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Kokomo petition the Congress of the United States to cause the interest of municipal bonds to be exempted in any new internal revenue code adopted.

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of Kokomo, Ind., this 26th day of February, 1951.

JAMES H. MCGUIRE,
Mayor, Presiding Officer.

Presented to me for approval, and approved by me this 26th day of February 1951.

JAMES H. MCGUIRE,
Mayor, City of Kokomo.

Puerto Rican Regiment in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1951, Mr. FRANK T. BOW, the gentleman from Ohio, introduced for the consideration of the House of Representatives, House Concurrent Resolution 74 to commend the United States forces and units of the United Nations forces in Korea. I wish here to express my support to this deserving measure and to express my profound gratitude to the gentleman from Ohio for his kind remarks about the outstanding performance in Korea by the Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment, composed entirely of Puerto Ricans.

Puerto Rico is justly proud of these soldiers of the Sixty-fifth who ask no quarter and give none. They seem to confuse their Chinese opponents with their quasi-guerilla tactics and bold attacks, and they have been most effective in their contacts with the enemy. Oddly enough, although coming from the sun-bathed warmth of the Caribbean, they bear up well in the deep freeze of Korea.

Puerto Ricans serving with units other than the Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment also are attracting national attention for their heroism in Korea. One of them, Corporal Angel Gomez, is a triple amputee at Walter Reed Hospital. Gomez, who was attached to the Seventh Cavalry Regiment, has become, in Puerto Rico, the dual symbol of sacrifice and inspiration for total defense effort in this perilous period. In action against the Chinese Communists, "Andy," as they call Gomez at Walter Reed, sprayed 10,000 rounds of ammunition into the enemy before his steaming machine gun betrayed his position. He was hit by a mortar shell.

Puerto Ricans have proved themselves good soldiers under all conditions. But they seem to do especially well when fighting as a unit. Perhaps this is because of the heritage, customs, and language which they share together. These seem to make for effective teamwork, integrated, coordinated, and fluid to meet the changing conditions of battle.

Puerto Ricans have also proved themselves willing soldiers. Naturally, the selective-service laws apply equally in Puerto Rico as in the States, and there are Puerto Ricans in uniform who were drafted, as well as those who volunteered. But I should like to point out, as I have indicated on this floor before, that even without the selective-service laws, I believe an army of 75,000 Puerto Ricans could be raised merely by permitting them to volunteer. Such is their patriotism and their spirit.

No Congressman at Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram and Times:

[From the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram and Times of February 27, 1951]

NO CONGRESSMAN AT LARGE

Michigan is entitled to another Representative in Congress on the basis of the 1950 population count. The State now has 17 congressional districts. It has grown big enough to have 18. Should the boundaries of all the present 17 districts be reshuffled to come up with 18, or is there an easier way? Any way that it is done, there probably will be an argument.

Two bills for increasing the State's congressional delegation have been introduced in the legislature. One by Senator Nichols, of Jackson, dodges the whole thorny issue of redistricting by proposing that the new Member of the House be elected from the State at large.

Senators Higgins, of Ferndale, and Reid, of Detroit, suggest that the new Eighteenth District be carved out of the present Seventeenth. Both vote in that district which now includes Oakland County plus Detroit's twenty-second ward and Northville, Plymouth, Livonia, and Redford townships of Wayne County. They would make Oakland County the new Eighteenth District, with the Seventeenth retaining the four Wayne County townships and Detroit's twenty-second ward.

This plan involves changing the boundaries and the constituencies of only one congressional district. The present seventeenth district which Senators Higgins and Reid propose to split up has had a remarkable population growth in the last 10 years. Oakland County had a 139,000 growth, by far the largest of any county in the State outside of Wayne. Macomb County was closest with a 76,000 increase. Wayne County grew by 404,000 with a very large part of that growth outside Detroit's city limits. Oakland County with 393,467 people has a population 13,000 more than the combined total of the four counties in the second congressional district. So there is definite merit to the Higgins-Reid proposal.

There is virtually none in the Nichols plan to elect the new congressman-at-large. The most that can be said for it is that it would assure for Michigan the added congressional representation to which the State is entitled. But the idea of electing the new Congressman-at-large is not a good one. No person so elected would be as apt to give the multitudinous, and often conflicting, interests of the entire State the careful attention he would give to the interests of a single district. Moreover, a Congressman thus elected would have his responsibility spread very thin; he would be responsible to Michigan voters generally and to no geographical area of the State in particular. But the chief objection to the idea is that it runs counter to the constitutional concept of the House of Representatives.

Members of the House are supposed to be close to the people, to have ready contact with them at all times. They are the direct representatives of the people in the national legislature. The larger a State grows in population, the more Representatives it is entitled to in the House. For that reason the section of the Constitution setting up the House provided also that a national census be taken every 10 years. And that is why the term of office of Representatives is fixed at 2 years; the people can turn out an unsatisfactory Representative within 2 years.

Terms for Members of the Senate are 6 years. And the Constitution provides that the terms of only one-third of the Senate expire at any 2-year interval. The Senate is a continuing body. The House reorganizes every 2 years, the terms of its Members expiring simultaneously. Members of the House always have been elected by the people directly. For more than 100 years Members of the Senate were elected by their respective State legislatures.

A Representative at Large is a sort of Senator sitting in the House. A congressional district-at-large in a State with enough population to have more than one district denies that State's people the kind of representation to which it is entitled. Such arrangements are almost always the result of reactionary partisan political thinking. The party in power in a State fears that by creating a new congressional district the opposition party may be able to elect its candidate therein. So it creates a district-at-large, counting on the prevailing political sentiment of the State to elect a man from the party in power.

Michigan is entitled to a new Congressman. He should be elected from a specified district, whether that district be preponderantly Republican or Democratic. The political complexion of the district does not matter so much as that the greater number of people are better served by its creation. By all means let us avoid the dodge of electing a Congressman-at-Large. Let's keep our representative government truly representative.

Televised Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of March 2, on the subject of televised testimony.

Of course the matter has had no judicial determination and what the courts may finally decide is only conjecture. However, it raises many interesting questions. If witnesses may be forced to testify before congressional committees when the proceedings are being televised, who will do the forcing? By whom will the decision be made? Will it be by majority vote of the committee or will it be by the chairman? If the decision is to be made by majority vote of the committee, will an exception be made when the chairman is the only sitting member?

If television is to be made legal usage in such hearings, will the witness have the right to refuse to testify unless his testimony is televised? The witness may feel that he has some startling information that will contribute to the public weal; that should be given immediate and wide publicity. The manner in which he gives it might be most important. The facial expression, the tone of his voice, his enunciation and the emphasis of proper gesticulation might be lost to the world without the television.

If congressional investigations are to be televised, what about the courts? The arguments used in favor of televised criminal investigations are equally persuasive when applied to the trial of criminal cases; and perhaps more so. If a congressional committee investigating monopolies is to use television, then certainly the antitrust suits should be televised. Again we must know by whom the decision will be made. Will it be the judge or will it be the jury? Will it be the plaintiff or will it be the defendant? Supposing the A. & P. Co. decides it is being unjustly proceeded against. Judging from letters which I received last year, this is not an unreasonable assumption. Would the company have the right to demand that the trial be televised, so that its position would be better understood than it might be if the public had to rely on sketchy news articles? Senator KEFAUVER's position is that one purpose of the investigations is to enlighten the people and that television is a medium of public information as are the press and radio. If this is correct and if the A. & P. feels that it is the innocent and injured party, should it not be entitled to make the decision rather than the trial court?

There is no doubt but that the Senate Crime Investigating Committee is doing much good in exposing crime and the tie-up between organized outlaws and some of our politicians. We cannot condone crime in any form. However, we should never let these investigations deteriorate into forums of entertainment nor should they be used to assassinate character.

The crime committee, in its report, has seen fit to make serious inferences against the attorney who appeared for the witness, James J. Carroll. These inferences had no basis in fact. Mr. Morris Shenker is a capable, an upright, and distinguished member of the Missouri bar. He has a large and lucrative law practice. He has never been cited for violation of legal ethics and no bar in the union is more alert toward proceeding against unscrupulous lawyers than is the bar of Missouri. Mr. Shenker was well within his rights in appearing for Mr. Carroll or any other witness and his conduct was in keeping with propriety. It is not to the credit of any congressional committee to take advantage of its position and seek to castigate or discredit an attorney when he is merely fulfilling his sworn duty to his client.

The witness, Carroll, offered to testify if the proceedings were not televised. When Senator KEFAUVER refused to hear his testimony, excepting under the terms dictated by the former, there arises the question of whether the Senator was most interested in getting the facts or in getting the fullest publicity.

As previously suggested, there is no more reason for televising crime investigations than there is in televising criminal trials. Of necessity, many of our criminal cases develop lurid and obscene testimony. Some of it is unfit to put in public print. Certainly it is unfit to go out over the air waves. Many witnesses would despair at the thought of testifying when they were being viewed by television. It is bad enough for a timid witness to face a small courtroom of spectators; but it would be far worse if that person knew that he or she was being spied upon by television addicts all over the Nation. Certainly it would not be conducive to clear thought or expression. I cannot feel that the courts will ever force witnesses to subject themselves to this needless procedure. To me the whole idea is inane and repulsive. It would bring the Congress to a new low level in public esteem. The dignity of the courtroom would become only a memory while its sacred portals became a testing ground for the future Faye Emersons and Jimmie Durantes.

I agree fully with the sentiments expressed in the following editorial:

TELEVISED TESTIMONY

Senator KEFAUVER's attempt to compel James J. Carroll, a St. Louis betting commissioner, to testify while the proceedings of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee were being televised raises interesting questions of public policy as well as of law. Apparently the witness was willing to answer the committee's questions. But he objected to having his appearance televised on the ground that it would invade his privacy and subject him to ridicule. Senator KEFAUVER replied that the hearing was public, that television is a medium of public information no less than are the press and radio, that one purpose of the investigation is to enlighten the people, and that if the witness did not answer the questions, he would be cited for contempt.

Does the public interest in the exposure of crime demand that all witnesses before the committee, whether or not they are accused of crime, speak under the glare of television?

What the decision of the courts will be is open to wide speculation. If they follow precedent, they will be extremely reluctant to interfere with the conduct of congressional investigations. In any event, the larger question is whether it is sound policy to force testimony from witnesses under the distracting influence of television lights and microphones. We think it is not. In this instance Senator KEFAUVER may readily be absolved of headline hunting, but the regular use of television in committee investigations would certainly encourage the inquisitors to put on a show instead of calmly seeking information. Witnesses likewise would be tempted to resort to spectacular stunts and colorful charges. Fact-finding would almost inevitably degenerate into circus antics.

No doubt this is why Congressman CASE included in his code of fair procedure for congressional investigating committees, now under study by the House Rules Committee, a provision that "no photographs, moving pictures, television, or radio broadcasting of

the proceedings shall be permitted while any witness is testifying." The courts do not subject their witnesses testifying under oath to such impediments to candor. It is difficult to see why the fact-finding committees of Congress should.

Chicago's Forgotten Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the full text of an article entitled "Chicago's Forgotten Hero" which appears in the March issue of Coronet magazine.

This article describes the unrewarded heroism of Frank Bukovsky, of Chicago, who is believed to have saved the life of Theodore Roosevelt during an attempted assassination in the city of Milwaukee in 1912.

I have today introduced a bill proposing that the Congress take appropriate cognizance of this man's brave deed, even though almost 40 years have elapsed. I feel that the people of America owe this gallant immigrant belated appreciation and I trust the House will concur in my opinion.

The article from Coronet follows:

CHICAGO'S FORGOTTEN HERO

(By Milton Golin)

Frank Bukovsky got no medal for his courage in 1912, yet he feels amply rewarded.

Frank Bukovsky ran all the way up the three flights of stairs to his flat to show his wife the newspaper headline:

"Marie, look! It says, 'T. R. in Milwaukee Auditorium Tonight.'"

Marie had not yet learned to read English, so she could not tell what the headline meant.

"T. R.—that's Teddy Roosevelt," said Frank. He went to a rickety bureau and fished out a document. "See, the same name as on the paper I got 6 years ago when I came to America, 'President Theodore Roosevelt.' I must go to see him tonight. I'll eat when I come back."

Marie Bukovsky put the children to bed, wondering what it was like to stand near a great man like Theodore Roosevelt. Frank knew what it was like—nothing at all like in native Bohemia, where soldiers with rifles guarded the emperor in the passing coach. Here, on the evening of October 14, 1912, the great man with the mustache who had let Frank enter this country was walking through the Milwaukee crowd as if they were all his friends.

Frank was downtown early, outside the Gilpatrick Hotel. He could almost touch the car which was to take Teddy from the hotel to the auditorium a few blocks away, where several thousand people were waiting for him.

Now—he was coming out of the hotel. Frank cheered with the rest. The former President stepped into the car and stood in the back seat. He grinned and waved his wide-brimmed black slouch hat to the smiling crowd.

It was then that Frank Bukovsky noticed the wide-eyed man standing next to him. Suddenly the man reached inside of his coat and pulled a revolver. The next moment he was taking aim at Roosevelt's heart—a heart only 7 feet away. As the gun went off with a roar, Frank slammed his hand against the man's right arm. Then he knocked him to the ground so there would be no more shooting.

"Kill him! Kill him!" Frank shouted in English. Then he added in Bohemian: "Kill this crazy man! He shot our great Roosevelt."

The shocked crowd understood only the American words. They thought that Frank, the curly haired man with the foreign accent, was trying to kill Roosevelt. Some of them piled onto Frank and the gunman. A policeman swung his club on Frank's head. His clothes ripped, his hat smashed, Bukovsky tore himself away and ran home. Marie listened as he blurted out his amazing story.

Next morning he read the newspapers. His name was not mentioned. The paper said that Elbert Martin, Roosevelt's secretary, had saved the President's life by snatching the gun from the assassin, John Flammang Schrank. The paper also said a man in the crowd had hit Schrank's arm so that the bullet, instead of entering Roosevelt's heart, struck him in the right side of the chest, first passing through the 100 pages of his speech.

Roosevelt, shocked and bleeding, made the speech anyway. Later, at the hospital, he remarked:

"It takes more than one bullet to kill a Bull Moose."

Three weeks later Frank Bukovsky voted in his first presidential election—for Theodore Roosevelt, the Bull Moose candidate. He was not perturbed when Woodrow Wilson won. That was democracy.

Years went by, and Frank's family increased. He saved his money. His idol, Teddy Roosevelt, died. Together with his wife, his three daughters, and a son, Frank Bukovsky went to Chicago, where he bought a bakery on the southwest side. Here there were neighbors from old Bohemia.

Frank often chatted with a special neighbor—Anton J. Cermak, mayor of Chicago, and a lover of Frank's pastries. Until this time the story of Frank's role in the Roosevelt shooting had been told only in the Bukovsky family circle. But to Anton, the mayor, Frank told all. Cermak listened and smiled.

Frank never could tell whether the mayor believed him, but he used to say: "Well, I would do the same if the chance came."

One day in 1933 the news wires crackled with the story of how Cermak stopped with his body an assassin's bullet aimed at another Roosevelt—F. D. R., President-elect. Dying, Mayor Cermak muttered to Roosevelt: "I'm glad it was me instead of you."

The Bukovskys lost everything in the depression—the bakery, the home, the bank account—more than $40,000 saved over many years. They lost everything but their spirit and their faith in their adopted country.

"Our children must go to high school, and then to college maybe," Frank and Marie agreed. But for a long while Frank could not find steady employment. Marie helped out by working in restaurants, kitchens, hotels—wherever she could do a job and earn some money.

In 1943 Frank read in the newspapers that John Schrank had died in a Wisconsin asylum. And the story of the attempted assassination was revived. A newspaper revealed that Frank Bukovsky had been written up in an old history book as the man who really saved Theodore Roosevelt's life. The book mentioned half a dozen people who actually saw how Frank upset Schrank's aim. But the newspaper also said that Frank could not be found—that he was probably dead.

Frank Bukovsky turned the page. His white mustache shimmered as he mused. He was not seeking any notoriety.

Today, at 68, he still works nights in Zeman's bakery on West Twenty-sixth Street in Chicago. New friends listen to the story of what Frank did that October night 39 years ago. When he is through telling it, the friends ask:

"No medal, Frank? No reward?" No; no medal, no reward.

"Not even a letter—a note from somebody in the Roosevelt family?"

No; not even a letter; nothing.

Then Frank points to the pictures of his four children on the wall of his flat on South Avers Avenue:

"This is Frances," he says, "my youngest daughter. She graduated from a nurses' school, became a train stewardess, married a conductor, and went to live in Arizona.

"Here is my Marie. She went to college, the University of Illinois, graduated as a pharmacist, married, and went to live in California.

"This one is Elizabeth. She became a bookkeeper, married, and also made her home in Arizona.

"And here is my boy, Joseph. He went to college, married, went to war, and stayed overseas 3 years. He came back a major.

"Reward, did you say? Do I need any greater reward than my four children—all of them educated, successful, happy? Me, a poor immigrant from Bohemia?"

Frugality in Government Advocated by Bartlesville (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most carefully worded resolutions I have seen in recent years, and one that certainly goes straight to the heart of a situation that seriously confronts the American people today, is the following resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Bartlesville, Okla., some 2 weeks ago.

This resolution humbly and emphatically requests the President and Congress, servants of the people of this great Nation, under their oaths, not to levy heavy taxes upon the people while at the same time the President and Congress are squandering the substance of the people. Frugality in government is advocated by the Bartlesville (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce in this resolution, which I now quote:

Whereas the Government of the United States of America is a government of the people and owes all of its just powers to the consent of the people; and

Whereas there has been a growing tendency on the part of those in Government offices of trust and profit to lose sight of the fundamental truth that our Government was instituted for the benefit of the people; and

Whereas there is evidence that at least some of the servants of the people seem to think that our people exist for the benefit of the Government; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon the people to observe scrupulous frugality in the conduct of their private lives and to forego luxury for their common good; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon the people to sacrifice their lives and fortunes for the common good; and

Whereas the President has called upon the Congress to balance its disbursements by the levy of taxes upon the people; and

Whereas the President has a right to and is bound by his solemn duty to call upon the people and its Congress as he has; and

Whereas the President and Congress as servants of the people of this Nation have no right, either in morals or in law under their solemn oaths of office, to levy heavy taxes upon the people while at the same time this Government is squandering the substance of the people; and

Whereas the example set by public servants in spending in the coming months will inspire the people to great sacrifice if that example is one of frugality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of Bartlesville, Okla., in regular meeting assembled, That the Congress of the United States, as the direct representatives of the people be and they are hereby requested to eliminate all nonessential spending in government to the end that frugality in government will inspire the people to gladly and willingly sacrifice in this time of national peril; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Congressman from this district and to each of the Senators from Oklahoma.

[SEAL] BARTLESVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
K. S. ADAMS, *President*.

Attest:
R. S. BEDFORD, *Secretary*.

An American Political Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January issue of the magazine Here in Ohio:

[From Here in Ohio magazine of January 1950]

AN AMERICAN POLITICAL TRAGEDY

For the past decade a stark tragedy has been enacted on the American political stage—a tragedy which, ironically, stands illumined by the spotlight on Republican victories in the election of November 7, 1950, throughout the country—but most notably in Ohio.

A tragedy—because of the failure of the Republican Party to offer to the people, in sufficient quality and quantity, candidates for national office who represented a clear-cut, forthright, unapologetic alternative to the party of increasing socialization, of bureaucracy, of concentration of power in the National Government.

A tragedy—because through three presidential elections, through too many senatorial and congressional district elections in too many places, the Republican Party cowered timidly, bankrupt in courage and intellectual honesty, afraid to offer clean alternatives to candidates of the hand-out state sworn to do the bidding of special economic groups instead of standing guard over the public welfare.

A tragedy—because the Republican Party became the party of cowardice, since it was afraid it would be defeated if it said frankly that it would yank away special privileges, instill order and economy into Government, and restore a reasonable balance of power among the dominant economic groups—industry, agriculture, and labor.

And what was the result?

Defeats, ignominious defeats, one after another; a weakening of the two-party system to the point where many thoughtful men feared for the very existence of this bulwark of the American form of government; bungled foreign policy, and inflation that expunged the apparent financial and social gains of a large part of the population.

The Republican Party sacrificed character, principle, and courage for political expediency, in a vain effort to entice the voters with gangbuster personalities, glamor boys from the public utilities and slick-paper magazines, and with me-too-ism—with political sex appeal instead of political fortitude and candidates with the guts to stand up and say:

"I will not permit objectives that may be, in themselves, laudable, to be used as cover for the acquisition of power by those who think they possess some godlike capacity to shape the people's destiny. I will not permit government of the people to be become ruinously costly, sloppy, and inefficient, and bloated with power in the hands of a few who scheme for more power."

The Republican Party, by and large, thought only of: "How can we win without saying plainly to the recipients of Government favors we will not be as generous as the New Deal and the Fair Deal?" And, of course, it didn't win; it just kept soaking up one beating after another.

Then came 1950 and ROBERT A. TAFT, who had in 1944—when Dewey took licking No. 1—won without compromising his principles. Against what has rightly been called the most formidable opposition that ever confronted a candidate for the United States Senate, TAFT won, the man whom Republicans nationally recognized as their foremost exponent of statecraft, but who they said couldn't win because he was too honest and frank and he lacked political "it."

Well, TAFT won, not because he mesmerized the voters with his voice or drenched them in glamour. He won because he stirred the hearts and the minds of tens of thousands of every economic and social class by his earnestness, his industry, his intelligence; the deep-seated quality of his sincerity that emanated right across the platform and out of the radio speaker; his willingness to tell the people just where he stood on every important issue; his impress upon the voters of a conviction that, even when he didn't promise what some of them wanted, TAFT would endeavor to the utmost to fulfill the commitments he did make and not employ them, cynically as Harry Truman does, as continuing issues as the basis for the next campaign.

TAFT set splendid precedent in the 1950 senatorial campaign in Ohio. He demonstrated so clearly, so vigorously, that a man who doesn't use honeyed words to gloss over hollowness of thought can literally captivate the people. He showed that a man of brains and courage and proven statesmanship can get people who never before exhibited anything but indifference or disdain toward political affairs not only to vote for him but also to get out and do conscientious, fruitful work for him.

The people of Ohio, no different from the people of any other State, showed that they want a man who stands on a high moral and intellectual plane. Given the alternative of a statesman or a hack politician, they choose unerringly and unequivocally.

The man who couldn't win, won—TAFT, who is at once a man of great independence of thought and yet of deep understanding of the people's problems and their welfare; who is a leader without having a leader complex.

The man who couldn't win, won—TAFT, whose almost belligerent penchant for coldly, analytically discussing the issues and criticizing who he thought needed criticizing, masks an innate shyness and a gracious personality in ordinary social intercourse.

Not within memory of most of us have the people given such a convincing demonstration of their thinking and their ability to distinguish between the real and the sham, as they did in Ohio on November 7, 1950.

Here was TAFT, the target of concentrated opposition by powerful forces—the New Dealers and Fair Dealers, the labor barons and their political and propaganda arms, radical "liberals," and wild-eyed internationalists. The CIO and A. F. of L. leaders themselves laid down the gauge of battle; they themselves designated ROBERT A. TAFT as their special and principal target. Even the proprietors of syndicated columns, as well as national radio commentators, with a Fair Deal slant, joined in the fight.

And the man who couldn't win—the man of competence in statecraft who, they said, couldn't attract the voters—carried 84 of Ohio's 88 counties, including every industrial county in the State.

The GOP would do well to ponder long and thoroughly some of the really significant issues the people of Ohio decided at the November 7 outpouring. For in the action of the Ohio electorate there's a clear invitation to the Republican Party to get the lead out of its knapsack, to forget the promotion of glamor boys and men who have nothing to recommend them but cold, calculating, self-advancing qualities in administration of public affairs.

Let the Republican Party remain humbly conscious of the tragedy that beset it in three presidential elections.

Let the party remember the disastrous, enervating consequences of its action in 1940, when it went outside its own political realm to come up with the late WENDELL WILLKIE, GOP Presidential nominee by virtue of the activities of the internationalists and the high-powered promotion boys of the advertising agencies.

Let the party remember that it saw a candidate for whom no genuine enthusiasm could be developed, go down to defeat once—and then shattered precedent by choosing him again.

Let the party, and the people, not be beguiled by the presumably "new" personality in Albany, who, though he is the first major politician effectively to use television, and who, though he apparently won votes by kissing his wife over that medium, is still Tom Dewey—the twice defeated.

Let the party remember that while Dewey was entertaining the New York electorate (or a television-set-owning segment of it in the boroughs of New York), ROBERT TAFT was out in the hustings telling people just where he stood, just what he intended to do. Let the party remember that TAFT won an historic election, even though he rebuffed the sob-sisters who would have written sympathetically of the Senator's loss, through his recent campaign, of his right bower, his wife, because of the state of her health. But TAFT simply didn't want sympathy to influence the voters.

Let the Republican Party follow TAFT in throwing off the tag of "reactionary." Let the party come to stand, as he does, for the common welfare as against special interests. Let it understand, as TAFT does, that the clock can't be turned back, that all which the Government does is not socialistic, and that the Federal Government can help in housing and education and medical care without unduly extending Government influence in State and local affairs.

The experience of November 7, 1950, in Ohio particularly, shows that the public will choose wisely if it is given a choice of sanity, integrity, and courage in public affairs, on the one hand, and incompetence and unwholesome commitment to one economic group on the other.

The people have lost confidence in the present administration for its incompetence in domestic and world affairs, and for the ward-heeler character of political thinking that characterizes the administration. They want—and deserve—something better. The people still cherish the old tried and true foundation of freedom to work, live, worship, and vote as they please.

Unless the Republican Party comes forward with a man who champions these causes, it will again go down to defeat in 1952 at the hands of a minority, because the majority will not vote if they are deprived of the clear alternative they were so long denied.

Ohio has such a man. It commends him to the Nation and it urges that men of good will, of high principle, in the Republican Party start now to smother any efforts by the adherents of lesser men to win control of the party by the time of the GOP National Convention in 1952.

Five Hundred Million American Gift Dollars Used To Buy Critical and Strategic Metals for Marshall Plan Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the period from April 3, 1948, through September 30, 1950, more than $500,000,000 picked from the pockets of the American taxpayers has been spent by the European Cooperation Administration to purchase for European countries critical and strategic nonferrous metals which now are under such stringent controls that the American consumers and businessmen who normally use these metals find that they will have to either do without or find substitutes for the most part.

Besides the shipments already made to September 30, 1950, additional millions of procurements have been authorized by the managers of our give away program under the Marshall plan.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the American consumers and the small businessmen of this country, I once again rise to protest against this continuing abuse of the American people, by this administration. Why, Mr. Speaker, must our people be taxed to provide things for the peoples of other countries, that they cannot buy for themselves?

As part of my remarks, under permission previously given, I offer a table from the Washington News Bulletin of March 1, 1951, showing the details of the transaction under which our taxpayers paid for these critical and strategic metals bought from other countries.

FIVE HUNDRED MILLION AMERICAN GIFT DOLLARS SPENT FOR CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC NONFERROUS METALS UNDER MARSHALL PLAN

(By Paul O. Peters)

In the period from April 3, 1948, through September 30, 1950, more than $500,000,000 American gift dollars went into shipments of copper, lead, zinc, nickel, brass and bronze, and aluminum to the European nations participating in the European Cooperation Administration's programs.

In Bulletin No. 43, the details of procurement of the nonferrous metals from United States sources of supply were shown. The total was over $100,000,000.

Besides the critical and strategic nonferrous metals purchased in the United States, an additional $293,098,000 was procured from Canada, Latin America, and the participating countries. This sum together with purchases of over $100,476,000 of aluminum places the total expenditures for shipments already made to well over $500,000,000. As usual, the United Kingdom was the principal beneficiary of American aid, as shown by the table following, which details the shipments by country and commodity:

Paid shipments of nonferrous metals to ECA countries from sources outside the United States for the period Apr. 3, 1948, through Sept. 30, 1950

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Copper	Lead	Zinc	Nickel	Brass, etc.	Total
Austria	589	155	468	278	1,091	2,581
Denmark	2,032	1,312	831			3,675
France	67,313	5,192	3,449	2,574	114	78,642
Germany	3,171		1,129	1,702		5,996
Greece	396					396
Italy	13,662			193		13,855
Netherlands	3,039	11,960	285	27	67	15,378
Norway	519	2,164				2,683
Trieste	75					75
United Kingdom	97,289	32,315	30,743			160,317
Total	188,055	53,098	45,509	5,074	1,272	293,098

The shipments of aluminum for this same period total $100,476,000 with $101,819,000 going to the United Kingdom and purchased with American gift dollars in Canada.

Verily the pockets of the American taxpayers are being legally and scientifically picked to continue these foreign-aid programs, including the purchase of critical and strategic materials which are now being denied to legitimate American consumers.

Tax Preferences Unpopular—They Are Un-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, in recent years certain preferences have been shown in matters of taxation, which have become very unpopular.

I refer primarily at this time to tax exemptions or preferences, in favor of the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and of the Members of Congress.

If there is anything that the American people believe in, it is fair play. Anything that smacks of unfairness, preferences or favoritism in a tax system designed to raise money for the support of our Government, causes resentment by the people.

It is not so much a matter of dollars and cents. The actual amount of taxes for a given individual or a group is more or less immaterial. It is the principle that is involved. The people simply do not want the President to have a part of his salary exempt from income taxes, while people who make the same amount of money from other sources do not have a like amount of their taxes exempt. Similarly, they protest against the exemption from income taxes of a part of the salary of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and every Member of Congress, while they do not enjoy such exemptions.

Especially is this resentment pronounced at this time, while the President is asking the people to tighten their belts and telling all of us that we must be willing to be taxed and pay taxes until it hurts. They are retorting in no uncertain language that they think the President, the Members of Congress, and other public officials who enjoy tax preferences should be the first to see that the preferences are abolished and that all be treated alike.

Therefore, I say tax preferences are unpopular — they are un-American. They are unpopular because they are un-American, because they are not in keeping with the spirit of American ideals. Discriminations and preferences are un-American, and wherever they exist they should be removed by appropriate legislation.

Let me give you a few facts. The President of the United States receives a salary of $100,000 annually. He is paid an additional $50,000 expense account, which is tax free. He is provided with a mansion in which to live. Incidentally, the improvements and repairs to the White House which are being made at this time will cost more than $5,000,000, and while these repairs are being made, the President is living across the street luxuriously in Blair House, which has been reserved for many years for dignitaries from other lands who may be visiting here. In addition, the President has a special yacht, the *Williamsburg*, a luxurious airplane, a battleship, a cruiser, and a special railroad train. All of these are furnished, maintained, manned, and operated, with a multitude of servants, at great expense to the taxpayers. Another $40,000 per year in addition to his $100,000 salary and $50,000 tax-exempt expense account above mentioned, is provided. The President, therefore, enjoys a tax preference of $33,744 annually, as compared with any other person in this country similarly situated who receives a salary of $150,000 per year.

I understand the Vice President and Speaker of the House of Representatives, each is paid a salary of $30,000 per year and in addition, is paid a $10,000 a year tax-free expense account. They are furnished high-priced sedans for their use, with chauffeurs at the expense of the taxpayers. This results in a tax preference in favor of each of the men holding these offices of $4,184 per year over an ordinary or private citizen with the same income.

Each Member of Congress receives a salary of $12,500 a year, and $2,500 for expenses which is tax exempt. I understand that the recent rulings of the Treasury Department are to the effect that the Members do not have to account for the $2,500 they receive as an expense account. I have always accounted for mine, and incidentally, I voted against the law which allows this $2,500 tax-exempt expense account. Members of Congress, Senators and Representatives, enjoy a preference in Federal income taxes of $597 over and above private citizens with an income of $15,000 a year.

People are saying that before the President and the Members of Congress raise taxes for private citizens to pay, we should be willing to forego our special preferences or preferences allowed by law and should pay taxes on our entire incomes. I realize that many citizens do not appreciate the fact that we, and the President, Vice President and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress are called upon to incur great expense that the average private citizen who makes a comparable salary or has the same income that we do, does not have to pay. I realize also that most people who are employed on a salary are allowed their salary net and are paid travel expenses and the expenses of lodging and meals and other incidentals while they are away from home, which are not furnished to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress as such, except as may be paid from these tax-exempt sums. It seems to me that we have gone at it the wrong way. If we had provided for the payment of expenses incurred by these officials in the conduct of their offices and work incident thereto, the same as traditionally has been provided for people engaged in private enterprise activities, the people would have had a better understanding of the situation. Then each item of expense would have been subject to scrutiny and would be allowed and paid whenever found to be legitimate and proper. But only such items as would meet the test would be paid out of public funds—which is exactly what happens in the conduct of private business, and is what the people are accustomed to and have grown to recognize as the proper method.

Therefore, I have introduced in the House of Representatives in Congress a bill which, if passed by Congress and approved by the President, as must be the case before any bill can become a law, the President's $50,000 per year tax-exempt expense item, the $10,000 per year tax-exempt item of the Vice President and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the $2,500 expense account for each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives of Congress, will immediately become subject to the payment of Federal income taxes. If these items are stricken from the favored or exempted list, by the enactment of my bill into law making them taxable, they will likewise become taxable for State income purposes for those States which have laws providing for the payment of income taxes by individuals.

Again I say that tax preferences are unpopular because they are un-American. They do not coincide with American traditions, American practices and American ideals. In the older countries where kings, czars, emperors and others of dictatorial authority ruled, and whose will became the law, regardless of the will of the people, tax preferences and tax exemptions were the order. But not so in America.

Therefore, historically, the matter of tax preferences and discriminations is un-American and the people of this country did not favor the enactment of the laws which granted these preferences. Now they bitterly resent being told that they must be willing to be taxed until it hurts or pains them, and becomes a genuine sacrifice, while their public officials, the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress and every Member of Congress continues to enjoy tax preference in the amounts and in the order which I have outlined. Tax preferences are unpopular. They are un-American.

The RFC Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of February 27, 1951:

THE RFC MESS

More than enough evidence of the perversion of its original purpose has come to light in the Senate's Reconstruction Finance Corporation inquiry to justify not only a thoroughgoing investigation but a reshaping of the agency itself. In its present structure and personnel the RFC has forfeited public confidence and thus terminated its usefulness.

The RFC was originated by former President Herbert Hoover, who got Congress in 1932 to approve a Government lending agency to help banks, railroads, and large interstate businesses with Fed ral loans. It was a sound proposal for providing finances at a time when the regular sources for loans were incapable of lending money.

Under the New Deal RFC was altered radically. Its lending powers were broadened to permit loans to any business, to States, cities, and other governmental agencies. And with the war the RFC became the Federal bank for financing industrial changeover to war production, synthetic rubber, stockpiling, etc.

An RFC subsidiary, the Defense Plant Corporation, took over the local Republic Steel plant, refitted it for aluminum press forging and built Darlinton Place.

In 1947 Congress attempted to regain some control over RFC, which it had not had under the long regime of Jesse Jones as chairman, by restricting its use of funds and designating public interest as a requirement for eligibility for loans. This reform, it is the purpose of the Fulbright committee to show, has not been effective. And the committee is attempting to adduce evidence not only that White House influence plays a key part in the allotment of loans but that a fee system has been operated to offer that influence for sale.

These are grave charges. They brought an immediate reaction over the week end when RFC turned over to the White House a large file of letters intending to show that Members of Congress likewise applied their influence in getting loans for constituents. Some of these letters apparently were written by members of the Fulbright committee.

The use of Government funds for business loans is fraught with peril. It is a far cry from the original purpose of the RFC, which was to enable sound banks and interstate businesses to continue operating after all regular sources of financing were cut off by the depression.

In its operations since, RFC has lent taxpayers' money to help establish new auto plants, to finance wildcat petroleum exploration, and to build lush resort hotels in such places as Reno and Miami Beach. It poured more than $38,000,000 into a single prefabricated home corporation which failed.

On top of this the Fulbright committee apparently is convinced that the White House had a direct influence in obtaining RFC funds for favored applicants and that payments have been made to individuals for the exercise of influence in getting loans. That is why we say the investigation not only should be pursued to the limit but that Congress, with the facts thus adduced, should rewrite the charter of the RFC.

What a Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

More and more astounding facts are brought to light by the special Senate committee that is presently investigating and reviewing the record of the RFC. The admissions, flat contradictions, and improbable tales developed by the testimony definitely points to political manipulations and pretentions to influence

those in charge of RFC operations. The testimony developed by the committee replete with contradictions, incriminations, denials, and accusations, charges, and countercharges, are not only disgraceful but disgusting in the extreme. In fact, the charges are of such a nature and character as to shock the conscience of every honest and fair-minded citizen.

The committee is serving a twofold purpose. It is developing facts and performances in the RFC of which the public has heretofore been ignorant and kept in the dark. The exposé in connection with the investigation can lead to but one conclusion: There must be a moral realinement and awakening among public officials entrusted with a public duty and official responsibility. Nothing is so wholesome to bring that about as swift and sure justice meted out to all those who would sell their honor and trust for "30 pieces of silver."

What our country needs now is not a 5-cent cigar, we need more two-fisted militant and courageous United States district attorneys who are ready to work in conjunction with persevering and high-minded juries. It is apparent that nothing can be so effective in Washington in cleaning up the immoral and despicable mess floundering around and about the RFC as a goodly number of indictments, followed by speedy trials and vigorous prosecutions.

The shades of the Teapot Dome scandal are falling fast—or would it be more appropriate to quote Goldsmith's lines: "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey, where wealth accumulates and men decay."

The editorial in the Chicago Daily News as of February 26, which follows, expresses in clear and concise terms the resentment that is taking form throughout the Nation about continuing a bureaucracy that has become famous largely through promiscuity in disbursing tax funds to political favorites:

THE RFC MESS

President Truman's "counteroffensive" against Senators who are investigating the RFC proves nothing except that seats at the pie counter are not reserved exclusively for the administrative branch of the Government. Nobody supposed that they were.

The RFC files yielded hundreds of letters from Congressmen urging favorable action on loan applications. The probability is that these represented the ready response to the appeal of an influential constituent, such as Senator DOUGLAS' plea for the Waltham Watch Co. A union official wanted it, to keep men at work.

Mr. Truman must have been taken aback by the reaction of the investigating Senators. Far from being intimidated, they confessed their own indiscretions, and vowed to dig deeper into the use of official influence in allocating RFC loans.

A sufficiently scandalous situation has already been revealed to prove that politicians should not be trusted to play banker with public funds. Loans that require the intercession of the "right people" are not likely to be in the interest of the taxpayers who provide the money.

A favorite RFC maneuver was for the examiner investigating the merits of a loan application to recommend that it be granted and then accept a fat-salaried job from the successful applicant. The temptation in this procedure is so raw that a responsible banker would have sought some means to cancel the loan arrangement, on principle, if not on evidence.

Even loans which had the appearance of having a sound business basis were tinged with political considerations. The $37,000,000 poured into the floundering Lustron prefabricated housing venture is an example.

Many shrewd, energetic, and well financed corporations have tackled the prefabricated housing field. Problems of manufacture, distribution, and erection always appeared to keep the prefabs from being a complete answer to the low-cost housing need.

Nevertheless, the pressure to show up the real-estate lobby and the backward construction industry was strong and persistent from the New Deal-minded who believe that the Government can do anything better. The result was a monumental failure at taxpayers' expense. They are still eager to pour more millions into it.

The Senate investigation has at least succeeded in tumbling Mr. Truman from one of his more arrogant gestures of defiance. In the face of Senate criticisms, and a recommendation that abuses could be lessened by placing the agency under a single head, the President reappointed the five RFC directors.

The storm of resentment that followed was too much even for Mr. Truman's calloused hide, and he has concurred in the Senator's recommendation.

As with so many other governmental follies, the defense emergency is now advanced as a reason for perpetuating what in normal times would have become unendurable. It is argued that only the RFC can finance the plant expansion necessary to handle our production needs.

This may be true. War and the preparation for it call for speed and a disregard of possible waste that override ordinary prudence. But if RFC is to continue, the best course would be to make it an arm of the mobilization office, with its activities limited strictly to defense requirements.

With this limitation, under a responsible head, and with the salutary effect of the present disclosures, the agency might be useful. But Congress should have learned enough by now never again to let it linger on as a political grab bag after its specific purpose has been served.

United States To Pay for Hoosier Boy's Eyesight Damage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gene Dawson, able Washington correspondent for the Indianapolis (Ind.) News:

UNITED STATES TO PAY FOR HOOSIER BOY'S EYESIGHT DAMAGE

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The last election may have been pretty important to Jimmy Shellberger, Jr.

Jimmy is a little over 4 years old. His father is a Mishawaka veterinarian who formerly was an Army captain.

Jimmy was born January 8, 1947, at the Sixty-first Station Hospital at Leghorn, Italy, during his dad's military service.

At the hospital somebody made a bad mistake. They were supposed to put the normal silver nitrate solution in his eyes.

Instead the Senate Judiciary Committee decided yesterday, the solution they used was either some other chemical or a silver nitrate solution much too strong.

Whatever it was, the solution robbed Jimmy of the sight of his left eye (it may have to be removed) and left him only 50 percent vision in his right optic.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART went to bat for Jimmy in the last session of Congress. The bill he introduced to give Jimmy $50,000 damages was pushed through the Senate last December, but got bogged down in the House Judiciary Committee.

Yesterday, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER again shoved it through the Senate committee, of which he is a member, and reported it personally to the Senate.

Jimmy's Congressman was changed last November and the new one, Representative SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, JR., just happens to be a lawyer.

He also happens to be a member of the House Judiciary Committee, and that's what it takes, sometimes, to get things done for the Jimmy Shellbergers.

Incredible Irresponsibility Shown in Truman Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Syracuse Post Standard of March 1, 1951, dealing with the fiscal policies of the Truman administration. The tax burdens facing the American people are appalling. Before any further tax is imposed upon us, I think it is imperative that we have full and exact information as to what the expenditures—save for an all-out conflict—will be for the fiscal year 1952. Every nonessential program must be eliminated until the emergency is over. The American people are willing to accept their responsibility if they find the Government doing its part in an honest effort to institute sound business management in its programs. Government waste of the taxpayers' money, as outlined in the following editorial, does not lend to the public having confidence in the present administration's ability or interest to effect such policies. As the editorial points out, this is probably one of hundreds of such examples of gross extravagance and the lack of wisdom in the management of affairs by the administration.

The editorial follows:

INCREDIBLE IRRESPONSIBILITY SHOWN IN TRUMAN FINANCING

The incredible irresponsibility of the Truman administration is nowhere more clearly shown than right here in up-State New York.

The Sampson air base, formerly a naval base, has been permitted to go to wrack and ruin, with no effort of any kind made either to protect Government property or to salvage sound and expensive equipment.

The picture is one of unbelievable waste and carelessness. It is clear that the administration did not even care.

The story gathered by news reporters is one of valuable property such as boilers and stoves being carried off without let or hindrance, of buildings allowed to fall to pieces, with the help of vandals, of an investment of millions given not the slightest protection and, in fact, completely ignored.

When the Air Force decided to take the base over in its expansion program, it was estimated that it could be put back in shape again for from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000. Now the estimate has been raised to $12,000,000 and some are convinced that from $18,000,000 to $20,000,000 will have been spent before it is once more in shape.

Twelve million dollars, even $20,000,000, may be considered peanuts by an administration that is spending $70,000,000,000 a year. But if this waste and irresponsibility is permitted here, in just one instance, imagine what the total must be for the whole country.

It is well known, although an investigation has never been permitted, that materials worth hundreds of millions were stolen from Government depots in the Philippines, that equipment for 60 divisions was abandoned in Europe, that the disposition of war surplus has been a scandal whose stench rose to high heaven.

Now, with this record, we come to the present time, when the American people are giving the Government $50,000,000,000 a year to spend and going into debt for $20,000,000,000 more.

The people, contributing so mightily for the good of their Nation, have the right to ask whether this awful carelessness, this utter disregard for fundamental supervision of activities, is to continue.

Is the squandering of money and property to continue?

Or are Army, Navy, and Air Force procurement and maintenance to be placed on a sound, incorruptible, and lawful basis?

Are the rights of the people to be safeguarded, so that inflation is halted with Government financing on a responsible basis a factor in it?

Is nonessential spending to be cut out, adding still more strength to a Government budget that needs strength?

If the people of this country do not insist upon answers to these questions—and satisfactory answers—they will pay heavily for it. The burdens upon us are so great that the welfare of all depends upon an end to the reckless policies of the administration during the last 5 years.

President Truman has called upon the people of the country to pay additional taxes of $16,500,000,000 this year, asking that an immediate imposition of $10,000,000,000 and a later law providing the additional $6,500,000,000. The second package can be eliminated entirely and it is probable that a large slice could be cut out of the first total.

For instance, nonessential spending has been increased by $6,000,000,000 in the last 3 years. It certainly can be dispensed with; the kind of extravagance of which Sampson is an example, plus more orderly military procurement would reduce the cost by at least $2,000,000,000 more.

There is no least question that the proposed tax bill could be reduced substantially and the budget balanced, halting dangerous inflation, by sound financial and administrative methods.

We cannot afford to make the mistake of underrating the importance of drastic improvement of national financial methods. The Nation must be strong internally as well as against external foes.

An Obvious Rebuke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in all of the comment, in the press and elsewhere, which followed final ratification last week of the proposed constitutional amendment limiting the length of time any one man can be President of the United States, one fact apparently has escaped notice.

I refer to the significant point that, by voting to ratify the proposed amendment, the legislatures of nine States reversed the position taken by their respective delegations in the National House of Representatives when the House approved submission of the proposed amendment to the States on February 6, 1947.

Although House Joint Resolution 27 passed the House by a vote of 285 to 121—well over the required two-thirds majority—a majority vote in support of the resolution was cast by the House delegations of only 33 States. The vote was a tie in 3 State delegations, while the delegations from 12 other States cast a majority vote against the proposal.

Something apparently has happened since 1947 to prompt the legislatures of 9 to these 12 States to reverse the stand taken by the majority of their Representatives in the National House.

It is interesting to note the list of these States and the vote of their house delegations in 1947 on submission of the proposal to the States. Here's the record:

Arkansas—2 to 0 against.

Mississippi—5 to 2 against.

New Mexico—2 to 0 against.

North Carolina—6 to 4 against, two Members not voting.

Tennessee—6 to 3 against, with one Member not voting. Two of the three votes for submission were cast by the Republican Members.

Texas—13 to 8 against.

Virginia—5 to 3 against, with one Member not voting.

The vote of the Montana and Utah delegations was, in each case, a 1 to 1 tie, with the Republican member voting for the proposal in each delegation and the Democratic member voting against it.

Since that time, the legislatures of all nine States have voted to ratify the proposed constitutional amendment. Seven of these 9 States were among the 12 States which voted ratification since the first of this year.

I believe that there is a very definite reason for this grass roots evidence of a reversal of sentiment.

It is obviously a rebuke, amounting to a "no confidence" vote, directed at the present administration in the wake of Korea, the demands for unprecedented tax increases, and claims to more and more executive powers. I believe it was so intended even though the present occupant of the White House is technically exempted from the limitation imposed by the twenty-second amendment.

Moreover, I believe this is also a grass roots repudiation of the "indispensable man" theory, an un-American theory which is completely discredited now that some of the tragic fruits of the Nation's departure from the two-term tradition have become more fully manifest.

The Real Forgotten Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial published in the Sun-Tattler, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers of Florida, published at Hollywood, Fla., in my district.

I think this editorial has so much merit that it should have a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

THE REAL FORGOTTEN MEN

Under the current Army pay system, the real heroes in the Korean War are drawing the least pay. They don't even get a fair share of the glory when the publicity and medals are dished out.

These unsung heroes are the infantrymen, who form the Army's battering ram, but who are not paid as much as the technical men and the pencil pushers behind the lines. The average monthly pay of a member of a rifle company is $135, as compared with $226 for an Air Force combat crewman and $172 for a submariner. Combat infantrymen once got $10 a month bonus, but this is no longer given.

Moreover, infantrymen are actually the poorest paid of all the troops in the Army. Ordnance, signal corps, armored force, quartermaster, artillery, and everyone else does better financially. And the ironical part of it is that all the other troops are, basically, simply the infantry's support. They exist for the sole purpose of aiding the infantry in its grim task of closing with and capturing or destroying the enemy. If the infantry fails to do that, the cause is always doomed.

Relatively little stress was placed on the infantry in the so-called "new army" we heard so much about a year or so ago. This was to be pretty much the mechanized army, the push button army, in which almost everyone would be a technician of some kind. The Korean war changed that concept, and with a vengeance. It was infantry, the poor, bloody infantry of legend, that fought the delaying actions in the dreadful early weeks. At times the situation became so desperate that service troops had to be given rifles, canteens, and bandoliers of ammunition, and sent into the line as infantrymen. And, finally, it was infantry, Army and Marine, which accomplished the brilliant later successes.

Infantry takes the beating in war. It suffered 70 percent of the casualties in World War II, perhaps a higher percentage in Korea. Yet, in World War II it got only 11.6 percent of the medals. And, as noted before, it is way down the line at the pay table.

It can be argued that mere money is a small recompense for asking a man to risk his life in war and, at best, live miserably. But it is the only recompense possible, no way exists to make the infantryman's lot an easy, pleasant one. It is certainly a reasonable assumption that the footslogger with a rifle in his hands deserves a better break than he's now getting.

Charles Broughton Day Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February we honor the memory of many great American statesmen and many times overlook those who are still with us. In the Sixth Wisconsin Congressional District there are many who have served their country and fellowmen in many outstanding ways. Included in that group of distinguished citizens is one we all know as Charlie Broughton, president and editor of the Sheboygan Press, an outstanding Wisconsin daily newspaper. Politically Charlie and I are not always in agreement, but aside from that we have many, many areas of agreement. So, because of his outstanding record in community activities as well as the State and the Nation, I want to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a speech made by Attorney Gerard M. Ungaro, legal counsel for the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, on February 22, 1951, in presenting a plaque to Charles E. Broughton, who served on the board of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago for 15 years and 12 years as the board chairman.

The excerpts follow:

Dear friends, with all due respect to George Washington, whose birthday we honor on this date, it is fitting and proper that this meeting of the Federal Home Loan bank has been set aside in honor of our good friend, Charlie Broughton.

I am certain that all of us deeply regret his announced retirement from the bank and as its chairman.

You know, no matter where he goes, he is always referred to as just Charlie. I believe the only time that he was ever called Mr. Broughton was at his very first meeting and even then, before the session was over he was called Charlie.

Seriously, Charlie is an outstanding man and truly it can be said of him, he was a public interest member of the Chicago bank. He was willing to give of his time and energies and efforts in attacking and solving problems not having direct relationship to his own business. He personally had nothing to gain.

He became a member of the board of directors some 15 years ago and was chairman for almost as long a period of time. His nature and his character are indicative of the many facets of community life, local, State, and national, in which he has participated over the span of years.

AN ACTIVE MAN

Charlie is an active man and although his many activities belie the number of years that he has been around, I'll let you in on a secret. Not too long ago he celebrated his sixty-fifth year in the printing office. We here in this association are privileged and we think that Sheboygan can be most proud of Charles E. Broughton.

He is an outstanding man among the Elks and served as the grand exalted ruler.

His main interest here was in the Federal home-loan bank. He has been an ideal chairman and could always be counted upon to exhaust every phase of any topic or problem placed before the board of directors, and whenever he believed that a discussion had gone long enough or became too involved, he would always manage to steer to a vote or go around it.

Since it becomes his choice to retire after long and faithful service, it is, I believe, fitting and proper that he does it at the same moment when the Chicago Federal Home Loan Bank returns from public to private ownership.

I would like to quote a bit of an editorial which appeare in his newspaper in the year 1916. At that time he had well indicated that he was fearless in policy and strong in adherence to the system of fair play. His editorial went something like this:

"Friends, you cannot compromise while there is an issue involving the welfare of your city, State, or country, but this does not mean you cannot be fair. You can fight on a high plane or you can surrender. If right is on your side, there can be no surrender.

"The writer would rather go down waging a fight than win financial gain by compromising with wrong."

VALIANT FIGHTER

I think that his life's work can be marked by his editorial which in effect said that you cannot surrender. I believe there is a great analogy between Charlie and the president of our bank, A. R. Gardner. Both are valiant fighters and they always have fought fairly in your behalf.

Charlie, you have served us well and have earned a rest. In all sincerity and as one who cherishes your friendship, it give me great pleasure and privilege to present this plaque as our expression of the esteem in which you are held.

Overloaded Trucks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sacramento Union, Sacramento, Calif., of February 6, 1951:

OVERLOADED TRUCKS

Highway truckers are not treating California highways lightly.

In 1941, a total of 113 individual trucking companies or operators were arrested 20 or more times for overloading in California. Of these, 95 were licensed as for-hire truck operators, the remaining being people who carried their own goods in their own trucks. Of this group of 113, 1 operator was arrested 209 times, and 9 others more than 100 times each. Some of the largest trucking companies are right up there high on the list of offenders.

They come from everywhere. Of the 16,118 overloaders arrested in California in 1949, out-of-state licenses were borne by 1,759, nearly 10 percent of the arrests. There were 440 registered from Texas, 38 from Florida, 32 from Kansas, 22 from Minnesota. Violators came from 31 different States and from British Columbia.

These overloaders carried nearly everything. There were 168 illegal truckloads of beer, 352 of cement, 362 of gasoline, 501 of crude oil, 1,714 of logs, 1,543 of lumber, 254 of meat, 263 of potatoes, 72 of wine.

One truckload of beans with a Texas registry was 16,900 pounds overweight. Butter, in an Idaho truck was 14,400 pounds overweight; liquor in a Texas truck weighed 14,370 pounds too much; potatoes, in an Arkansas truck, 19,900 pounds overweight; shrimps on a Texas truck 16,450 pounds overweight, and so on.

An overloaded truck is not a safe truck. Brakes are not designed to handle the burden imposed on them by overloads. Your safety as a motorist is jeopardized when an emergency stop is forced on an overloaded vehicle.

The American Automobile Association has reported: "Billions of dollars' worth of the Nation's finest highways are being pounded to pieces by overweight and overloaded commercial vehicles."

Representative John Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, John Sullivan, that distinguished son of Missouri, that superb gentleman of St. Louis, has passed from among us, and our sorrow is real. Our colleague's friendship was to be prized. He was an innately friendly man. He was, too, a man of genuine dignity—one whose respect for the trust placed in him by the good people of the Eleventh Congressional District of Missouri served as a bright example to all of us.

It was my privilege and pleasure to serve with John Sullivan on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He made a major contribution to the deliberations of the committee, and his conscientious attention to the problems at hand was an inspiration in the consideration of legislation which often had highly technical aspects.

Mr. Sullivan took a broad view of every legislative decision. He strove always to shape his determination of the issues in the interest of the Nation as a whole. In the process, however, he remembered always the particular applicability of each proposal to his beloved State of Missouri and the city of St. Louis. His district and his State received painstaking representation from him, and the entire United States share in the results of his careful study of all measures entrusted to the committee.

We have heard today of John Sullivan's devotion to his God. He was reverent. He accepted willingly the responsibilities of his faith. All who shared

in his bountiful store of friendship knew from the first stages of their pleasant and rewarding association that the Master had been welcomed to his rightful place in the life of this humble man. Quietly, but with uncommon diligence, he served his church. With this spirit of religious service, he combined a true tolerance. I am certain that no Member of this House—or, indeed, anyone privileged to share John Sullivan's friendship—ever heard him utter a syllable of disparagement toward any other creed, race, or nationality. He represented all classes of humanity, and no class had a priority on his attention, or on his high competence.

We shall miss John Sullivan deeply in this House. On many days, we shall stand in dire need of his strength, his encouraging example.

As we mourn him today, our thoughts must turn to Mrs. Sullivan, the active partner in his public service through the years. We can only hope that her pain will be eased by the realization of the esteem in which he was held by all who knew him—and by the knowledge that he passed to his reward as he certainly would have wished—while in the discharge of the public trust he so truly respected.

World War II Amputees Show Ways of Life to Korea Wounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Wallace E. Clayton from the Washington Sunday Star of March 4, 1951:

WORLD WAR II AMPUTEES SHOW WAYS OF LIFE TO KOREA WOUNDED

(By Wallace E. Clayton)

Twenty-five successful World War II veterans went out to Walter Reed Hospital yesterday to talk about a subject on which they are experts.

It wasn't job advice they gave the Korean War veterans they visited. They offered no generalities about making a better world when the war was over. Their discussions added up to one thing; practical application of the "keep-your-chin-up" theory.

The visitors were men who lost limbs in the last war, and overcame their handicaps to get jobs, start businesses, get married, have families. They spent most of the day chatting with patients in the hospital's amputee ward.

"You've got to take it in your stride or you're lost," Stanley Zybort, 31, a teacher, of Maplewood, N. J., told Sgt. Raymond Duffy, 24, of West Warwick, R. I. Mr. Zybort, who lost his left leg in a German prison camp, added that "if you're self-conscious, you have two strikes against you."

Mr. Zybort, typical of the delegation from the New Jersey Amputation Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, told of an incident in a streetcar.

"A lady stepped on my foot—the artificial one," he said. "She apologized, but I assured her I couldn't feel it. When she found out I had lost the leg, she was much more embarrassed than I was.

"You'll find you won't mind about things like that," he said.

Henry Preckajlo, 29, of Newark, N. J., boosted himself up on the bed of Pfc Lawrence Jantz, 20, of Shutesbury, Mass. He lost both his legs after being wounded in the China-Burma-India theater.

"You just have to recognize your limitations," he told Pfc. Jantz, who lost his left leg in fighting near Hamhung, Korea. "After you get used to your artificial leg, you've just got to realize there are some things you can't do anymore. Once you've made your mind up to that, you'll be O. K.

"Some things you can do better" said Mr. Preckajlo. "I'm a better swimmer now than I was before. And I never could float. You should see me now."

Mr. Preckajlo is a dispatcher at a garage. "Must be doing pretty good, too," he said. "I've had two raises in a year."

Of being confined to a wheelchair, he told Pfc Jantz: "I figure you can chase a woman faster in it than running."

Pfc. Harry Carter, 21, of Bridgeton, N. J., who Friday underwent an operation on the stump of his left arm, said he would be satisfied if he could get a job selling insurance when he got home. He was reassured by Moe Goldberg, 35, of Hillside, N. J.

"Look at me," Mr. Goldberg said. "A truck driver before the war. Then I lost this arm. I had a long time to think it over, and decided I wanted to do more than drive a truck, anyway.

"Some people—good Samaritan types—offered me sympathy jobs. Not for me. I didn't want to go into the Government, either. They don't even want you to go out for coffee.

"So I knocked on office doors till I found what I wanted. Now I'm a food broker. I'm doing all right.

"And if I can, so can you, kid."

Sam Mazor, 33, an accountant of Hillside, N. J., a triple amputee, summed up the thoughts of the visitors.

"These boys here will be o.k.," he said. "Maybe our visit cheered them up a bit, and showed them what they can do—showed them they aren't cripples at all. But with the spirit they have, there's nothing to worry about."

Let Us Alone Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Joplin Globe of March 3, 1951:

LET US ALONE CLUB

Down in Mississippi they have recently announced the organization of a new club. Membership, it is stated, is "small, exclusive, and anonymous." There are no dues and no officers. At the first meeting a statement of principles was drawn up, as follows:

"We don't want no pensions.

"We don't want no minimum wages.

"We don't want no Government houses to live in.

"We don't want no Government loans.

"We don't want no subsidies.

"We don't want no bureaucrats telling us how to make a living.

"We don't want no socialized medicine or no socialized nothing.

"We don't want to have to pay no poll tax, but as long as we do have to, we don't want nobody paying it for us.

"We just want to be left alone to make our own way as best we can and as long as we can."

At last accounts the membership was undecided as to a name for their organization. Some stood out for "Let Us Alone," but some others thought "We Don't Want Nothin'" would be better. Anyway, the name isn't important with an organization which has such refreshing objectives.

The Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of boxcars is creating a hardship throughout the agricultural Middle West. This is especially so in my own State of Nebraska. It is reported that there are 1,600 blocked elevators in our grain-producing areas. This is an unusual and bad situation, especially for this time of the year.

It has been pointed out by the senior Senator from Nebraska, the honorable HUGH BUTLER, that the beginning of 1949 the number of boxcars suitable for transporting grain was 729,637 and that at the beginning of 1951 it was only 710,350.

We need more boxcars. The cut-back by the National Production Authority in the boxcar production was ill-advised and a mistake. We also need to investigate the use and distribution of the cars that we have. Recently the secretary of the Nebraska Grain and Feed Dealers Association wrote me as follows:

You are undoubtedly familiar with Nebraska's problem of moving grain during the current boxcar shortage. The situation is now very critical, and Nebraska producers of corn and wheat are in danger of taking a terrific loss. The only answer to the problem of moving grain is boxcars; never in recent years has the situation been so acute. We have in the State of Nebraska millions of bushels of grain that is and will go out of condition unless it is handled immediately. Much corn is still on the ground and much that is in the cribs carries from 17 to 22 percent moisture. This will spoil as soon as warm weather arrives.

The car shortage is now preposterous. Former claims of the railroads that they could not be expected to move a whole crop in a few weeks is entirely meaningless. Many, many of our elevators are blocked and have been so since the first part of November. They will soon receive shipping orders from CCC which will complicate the problem. Failure to supply this area with sufficient numbers of cars will mean a great loss to this country both industrially and agriculturally. We need immediate alleviation of the shortage and then a definite program to provide the railroads with an adequate boxcar building program.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution which is a companion to the resolution introduced in the Senate by the Nebraska senior Senator calling for an investigation. That resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to insuring an adequate supply of materials necessary for the production of 120,000 railroad cars during the calendar year 1951.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the House at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable for the purpose of securing such production.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that speedy action can be had on this resolution.

Resolution of Oklahoma City Retail Grocers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma City, Okla., retail grocers have resolved and, in so doing, have expressed themselves vividly on the subjects of price controls and rationing, war-emergency sales taxes, and inflation.

Copies of their resolutions have been sent to me. Their sentiments are expressed in the following resolutions, which I quote:

Resolution on price controls and rationing

Whereas price controls have been enacted by the Government of the United States as a measure to curb further inflation and to prevent war-time profiteering and inequitable distribution; and

Whereas foods constitute a major item in controls; and

Whereas a hardship may be imposed on the retailer unless controls include controls at all levels; Be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma City Retail Grocers Association here assembled on this sixth day of February 1951, endorses the code of rules submitted to the ESA by the board of directors of the National Association of Retail Grocers:

1. That the Government eliminate all nonessential spending and waste of food and other materials;

2. That price controls and rationing be used only to meet the existing state of emergency;

3. That price controls be established from production through distribution;

4. That fair and equitable price controls must include controls on raw products, transportation, supplies, wages, and all costs that go into the product;

5. That special provisions be made for services such as credit and delivery or other services and functions performed by the retailer;

6. That rationing not be considered on any item except as the supply indicates necessity for rationing to equitably distribute the basic or important food;

7. That penalties be invoked only against persistent and flagrant violators; and

8. That the Government remove these controls as soon as they have served their purpose.

Resolution on war emergency sales taxes

Whereas the Congress of the United States has been asked to increase taxes materially for defense purposes; and

Whereas a luxury tax, national sales tax, and other taxes are likely to be imposed which affect the small merchants; and

Whereas the collection of such taxes would requires a lot of time in making collections, keeping records, etc.; and

Whereas thousands of merchants would be affected by it: Be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma City Retail Grocers Association here assembled on February 6, 1951, go on record as recommending that such taxes be imposed at the manufacturing source, thus confining the collecting and record keeping to a minimum number, relieving the thousands of small merchants of these burdens and at the same time alleviating the work required by the Revenue Bureau; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the Oklahoma Members of Congress in Washington, D. C.

Resolution on inflation

Whereas inflation is an acknowledged and deadly enemy of any free enterprise system and to our economic American way of life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma City Retail Grocers Association here assembled on this the 6th day of February 1951, pledge their full support to the officials in charge with the duty of preventing inflation in the United States of America.

To the Unknown Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, each year representatives of my home city place a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier as a tribute to the war dead and the ceremony is known as Corpus Christi Day in Arlington Cemetery. This year, Miss Mary Toomey Tompkins, a member of the By-Liners Club, has written a poem in commemoration of that occasion and under leave to extend my remarks I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

To you, sleeping in this hallowed tomb as
symbol of our soldier-dead,
We bring our wreath of remembrance.
We offer it in special tribute to our courageous buddies
Who perished on the icy battlefields of Korea.
They met a double foe—not only the human
enemy but bitter, relentless cold.
Humbly we gather at this national shrine
to honor them and do homage to their valor.
And, in this memorial place sanctified by the
blood of heroes,
We bow with reverence and appreciation.
Gold Star mothers, holding precious memories in each tear-stained heart,
Have sent the star of flowers.
Our flag, there, symbolizes the peace-loving
Union of free people
Who believe in liberty and justice for all.
In defense of these noble ideals brave men
have sacrificed their lives throughout
the years.
This let us never forget. As long as we remember, they are with us yet—
For "they are not dead who live in the hearts
they leave behind."

—*Mary Toomey Tompkins.*

FEBRUARY 22, 1951.

Shipment of Strategic Materials to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered what became of our stockpiling of strategic materials. Three times have we voted hundreds of millions for that purpose. Perhaps this news item from the Sunday, March 4, Chicago Tribune gives us a key to the mystery:

SEVEN BRITISH PORTS PILED HIGH WITH UNITED STATES GIFT METALS—BIGGEST HAND-OUTS ARRIVE AS ECA EXPIRES

(By Arthur Veysey)

LONDON, March 3.—The biggest gift shipments of metals in many weeks are being unloaded in British ports, the Marshall-plan office announced.

At seven ports, ships are discharging 4,857 tons of aluminum, 1,440 tons of copper, 1,416 tons of steel, 900 tons of zinc, and 600 tons of lead. Other shipments, paid for by the American taxpayer and sent to Britain as a gift, include 13 tons of carbon black for tires and 4,285 tons of milo starch.

The Marshall-plan office said that although its hand-out program is officially over as far as Britain is concerned, gift cargoes will continue to arrive here for several months. Metals shipped to Britain under the Marshall-aid program already have cost $311,000,000, and Marshall-plan officers estimate gifts costing another $100,000,000, most of it in metals or machinery, are still to come.

INCREASE METAL GIFTS

Gift metal shipments to Britain have increased in recent months as the metals have become scarce and as metal prices have multiplied.

At British ports, the metals are turned over to the British Government which sells them to British industrial users. Much of the copper goes to electrical manufacturers who are turning out generators and other goods which the British Government uses as barter with Russia in exchange for timber and grain.

The money the British Government receives from British manufacturers for the gift metals is used to pay off the British debt. During the Marshall plan program, the British debt has gone down at the fastest rate in British history. At the same time the American Government's debt has gone up.

EYES UNITED STATES STOCKPILE

EASTBOURNE, ENGLAND, March 3.—High Gaitskell, Britain's economic chief, has emphasized Britain's need for some of the raw materials the United States is stockpiling. They are needed, he said, to stave off an economic crisis in this country.

Without these critical raw materials, said the chancellor of the exchequer, Britain's export drive, the key support in her own defense program, would collapse.

Speaking to a convention of more than 500 of Britain's dollar export manufacturers, he said the Government attaches "enormous importance" to the satisfactory outcome of discussions now under way in Washington by international commodity committees. These groups are studying ways of reallocating raw materials.

ILLUSORY ASSET

Gaitskell said: "We really must remember that we are rearming in peace time, and that if peaceful trade and economic stability were gravely weakened for lack of raw materials, then the heaping up of unused materials in stockpiles would, even in a military sense, be an illusory asset."

He estimated that Britain's increase in production this year would be 4 percent over 1950. Then he added:

"But if the 4 percent increase were not achieved—and it certainly could not be if raw material supplies fell seriously short of requirements—then the economic outlook would, of course, be far worse."

Security Secrets Cloak Bungling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the March 1 issue of the Holland Sentinel, the daily newspaper in Holland, Mich., a challenging article appeared by one of Washington's most reliable and astute correspondents, Junius B. Wood.

The fundamental question raised by Mr. Wood must be answered if the citizens of this Nation are to make the necessary effort in this critical period. I join him in urging that some of the plans and programs be revealed, at least the blueprints for the future, so that America will know the long-range benefits to be derived from the proposed burdens of nearly overwhelming magnitude.

Mr. Wood's remarks follow:

SECURITY SECRETS CLOAK BUNGLING

(By Junius B. Wood)

"Our Nation has won two wars and twice lost the peace," the Senator said. He was from an Eastern State. It was one of those off-the-record talks so popular in the National Capital, where an official edifies a small audience with startling statements but does not accept responsibility for any of them.

The Senator explained that the peace was lost on each occasion for lack of planning. "Win the war and forget it," Washington had said, "Why bother planning for the future. The future will take care of itself," was the brush-off.

With two such costly lessons and a third war rising over the horizon, the natural question was: "What are our plans if and when we win the next one?" Nobody answers. Washington's plan, if it has any, are security secrets. A glassy-eyed owl may be wise or it may have nothing in its head. Official Washington is the same. The Senator talked freely on party policies. Joked about other officials and touched on passing sensations but did not express an opinion on the vital question—the future of our Nation.

That is typical of Washington. Anyone who reads knows the National Capital is a bedlam of talk. He sees a modern version of the Biblical tower of Babel—warring political parties, officials scrambling like ants, one idea today and a new one tomorrow, fighting for the spotlight, grinding out statements, sounding off for the public and, more appalling, each one competing with all the others. From a President and Cabinet with other cabinets pyramided on top, down to hundreds of Congressmen and lesser officials, each has his own act. The man on the flying trapeze stays up in the air as long as he attracts attention and applause from the juggling act in another ring. The public doesn't know where the country is going or why but it is on the way.

The citizen whose part in public affairs is limited to a vote on election day and paying taxes every day wants to know. That is his right in a democracy, but he waits in vain for Washington to let him in on the secret. Instead, his attention is diverted—investigations of elections, of city crime, of missing millions and of loyalty, new projects and new proposals, debates over wages and prices, feuding between President and Congress, arguments, personalities, and wisecracks—whipping up emergencies but never a promise of what our world will be when the next emergency ends.

Official confusion spreads across the country. Business does not know what is ahead and humble households are helpless. They deserve more than the owlish alibi security secret. They answer the country's call in lives and taxes. The young and the aged, the city workers and farmers, the businessman and every other taxpayer can ask: "And what are we to have after the fighting ends?

"Another war may be in the making. Why not tell the people now what we will get out of it?" was the big question which the Senator did not answer. Stalin was looking ahead in the last war as we've found out. But the world's troubles today are due to the lack of planning by others who sat in those big conferences. Their slogans were good. The new ones are today. Slogans disappear like paper posters after an election.

In wars, a few get profitable contracts, Federal funds are spread in favored districts and colonels become generals, the dollars of others melt faster than they are earned, and thousands of our young people never return. Everybody knows that. Washington, now sounding a third call to war, might tell the people what they can expect after paying such a terrific price.

Merlin Casterlin, Political Leader of Sincerity and Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to praise the New York State leader of the Townsend movement, Mr. Merlin Casterlin, for his years of forthright espousal to the cause of America.

Ever since I have served the people of my district in Congress, I have been the target of some of the most unprincipled attacks in local political history. At all times, I have been supported by Mr. Casterlin's never failing words ringing true in my defense.

At times, the gunfire from the mouths of enemy cannon has been so terrific, that men less courageous have been silenced or subdued. Mr. Casterlin has never hesitated to spring to my aid, when the lions became so out of hand, I could not handle them alone.

I appreciate friendship of this kind. It is easy, when the smoke of the conflict has cleared, and one emerges the victor to receive the accolades of praise from fair-weather sailors.

But when the chips are down, it is a simple thing for us to cross over to the other side of the street to conveniently avoid having to take up the cudgel for a friend in need.

Down through the years, Merlin Casterlin's defense of your Congressman on the home front has, on many occasions, held back the hosts of demons who would destroy him.

I am grateful to my friends and, as one of the foremost among them I am grateful to this unselfish, civic minded, public-spirited friend, not only of the old folks, but to all the people.

That man is Merlin Casterlin and with a hundred stout-hearted men like him we could go on to the White House within the next few years.

Platform of Thirty-second Annual Convention of the Mississippi Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform adopted at the thirty-second annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 13, 1951:

1951 PLATFORM

The Mississippi Valley Association is dedicated to the full use for beneficial purposes of the controlled waters of the Mississippi Basin through the development of navigation, irrigation, flood control, power development, soil conservation, wildlife conservation, reforestation, and recreation. This region, which comprises a major part of 28 States, is the section to which the Nation must look if it is to continue to grow and prosper. We dedicate ourselves anew and pledge our continued support and effort to the achievement of these objectives.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES

Because of the magnitude of the public debt, we recommend that Congress confine Federal appropriations as far as possible to the construction of projects which will contribute to the national defense, and which will create new and additional economic opportunities for the people.

INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEMS

We consider the development of the authorized inland waterway system of the United States to the point where it can carry tonnages required for a national war effort to be of immediate urgency. We call specific attention to the need for improvements of the connections of this inland waterway system to the Gulf of Mexico and to the Great Lakes; and for the earliest possible completion of the Missouri River channel and the great reservoirs required to maintain channel depths through periods of low stream flow.

Specifically, we recommend that work be expedited on the Garrison, Oahe, and Fort Randall Reservoirs, and that work be started at once on the Gavins Point Reservoir, which is required for the regulation of channel depths below Fort Randall. We recommend that Congress authorize and appropriate for construction of projects embraced in the Kansas River report of the Corps of Engineers. We recommend that work on the authorized stabilization works to Sioux City, Iowa, be prosecuted vigorously.

MERCHANT MARINE

The grave international situation, our increased mobilization, and our participation in the Korean conflict reemphasize the necessity for keeping strong and well-balanced our fourth arm of national defense, the American merchant marine.

The United States faces a deficiency of fast passenger vessels speedily convertible to troop transports. Also needed is a more specific national maritime policy. To remedy these deficiencies we urge and recommend that a long-range legislative program be enacted immediately to—

(a) Encourage private enterprise to build, operate, and maintain fast passenger-carrying vessels for both our commercial and defense needs;

(b) Guarantee an orderly replacement program for all types of American merchant vessels by adequate trade-in and building provisions; and

(c) Clarify the 1936 Merchant Marine Act so that Government agencies mandated by the Congress to promote and encourage an adequate privately owned and operated merchant marine will be able to speedily and efficiently administer the law.

That in the light of world conditions our reliance not be placed solely upon foreign shipping for our national security, but upon the American merchant marine, and that to encourage such a fleet the Armed Forces make the fullest use of American shipping services.

That we support the policy of our Government in granting financial aid for the operation and maintenance of regularly established United States-flag liner cargo and passenger service. To carry out this policy there should be no restrictive or limiting provisions in appropriation bills, other than the actual amount of money made available for such purposes.

That in event of total mobilization the merchant marine be placed under jurisdiction of a National Shipping Authority and that officials of United States steamship lines, with their experience and knowledge, participate in the operation of such an authority. Further, that priorities for ship repairs and maintenance and deferments from military service for personnel in critical maritime occupations be provided through such an authority.

That policies expressed in any peace treaties with Japan and Germany which bear upon their merchant shipping should be based upon policies governing the American merchant marine.

We pledge our active support to the protection and maintenance of a strong, well-balanced, privately owned and operated United States merchant marine to provide the shipping services essential to our business and agriculture, and thereby be immediately available for our national security.

FLOOD CONTROL

We consider protection of the lives and property of the people of our valley against the hazards of floods and droughts to be part of the national-defense effort. To that end we recommend that flood-control projects be prosecuted to completion as vigorously as possible with particular efforts to expedite those projects which not only will provide protection from floods and droughts, but will contribute to the development of navigation, the security of municipal and industrial water supplies, irrigation, and the incidental generation of hydroelectric power. We believe the solution of our water-control and utilization problems will be found in the 1936 Flood Control Act and continuing directives of the Congress, addressed to the Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

We further recommend the continuance of congressional policies of appropriating flood-control funds usable any place over the United States, not exceeding $100,000 annually, for any one small stream watershed not sufficient in size for an individual flood-control program. We also recommend the continuance of congressional policies of making adequate appropriations for emergency repairs to all flood-control structures.

SOIL CONSERVATION

One of the great needs in the United States is a sound land-use policy. This policy should—

1. Provide for the permanent conservation, improvement, and development of the Nation's agricultural land and water resources.

2. Recognize that research, education, on-site technical assistance, together with material and financial aid are obligations of the Federal Government in cooperation with subdivisions of Government and other local agencies and individuals.

3. Consolidate all activities of the Federal Government in the field of soil and upland water conservation and land management into one Federal agency within the Department of Agriculture. This agency should have no other duties than those pertaining to the administration of the soil and upland water conservation program, and should coordinate its activities with the program for flood control and for irrigation in charge of the United States Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation.

4. Place in the hands of the Federal and State agricultural extension services the authority and the responsibility for the necessary educational programs.

5. Make technical assistance available to all soil-conservation districts organized under State laws and to all other organized groups recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture as capable of efficiently using technical assistance.

6. Greatly expand the program of research, and in cooperation with the States, speed up the mapping of the physical land resources, and determine accurately the location, extent, and quality of the Nation's productive lands and their capability for use.

7. Completely separate any economic stabilization program from soil and water conservation programs.

REGIONAL VALLEY AUTHORITIES AND ADMINISTRATIONS

There is a continuing effort on the part of certain elements in Government to extend regional valley authority plans for the development and control of the valleys of the United States. These authorities and administrations become superstates very quickly. The powers of existing authorities and administrations have to a certain extent been delegated to them by the Congress. To a much greater extent, however, they have been assumed by the authority or administration itself, or have been obtained through a bureaucratic directive issued without congressional approval. These authorities now transcend State and local governments, and ordinarily are not even subject to further control of the Congress or proper regulatory and auditing branches of the Federal Government.

We strongly oppose the expansion of the regional valley authority or administration plan of valley control. We urge upon the Congress that necessary legislation be passed providing for valley control and development by existing agencies of the Government, such as the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and others, which are fully equipped to design and construct necessary flood control, navigation, and reclamation projects, and to operate and coordinate them upon their completion. Such a plan will result in more efficient operation of projects, the saving of millions upon millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money, and the protection of our private enterprise system against encroachment by subsidized Government-in-business operations.

We further urge that Congress amend or strengthen existing laws to prevent authorities or administrations from circumventing the will and intent of the Congress in order to achieve their bureaucratic aims and plans.

It is our sincere conviction based on the outstanding progress being made in the Missouri Basin, that all legitimate objectives of land and water conservation and use can be achieved faster and more efficiently under the coordinated direction of existing Federal agencies without the threat of state socialism inherent in the regional authority program, no matter under what guise it is offered.

FORESTRY

We recommend a systematic and scientific program of reforestation, forest conservation, and forest-fire prevention.

We specifically urge that the Congress expedite the Nation-wide forest survey, conducted by the United States Forest Service, as authorized in 1930 by the McNary-McSweeny Act.

We recommend cooperation between the States and Federal Governments to stop needless forest destruction and to keep forest lands, both publicly and privately owned, in a state of productivity.

We favor adequate appropriations for (a) Federal-State cooperation in forest-fire protection on State and private forest land; (b) production and distribution of forest planting stock to private land owners; (c) farm forestry extension work; and (d) technical services and assistance to private forest land owners and to processors of primary forest products.

We also recommend that the various State governments, through their forest service departments, cooperate to hasten the potential development of a comprehensive reforestation program throughout the United States.

WATER RESOURCES

We recommend continuing studies of all matters affecting our water resources, such as drainage, precipitation, evaporation, infiltration, surface runoff, underground movement, quality of water and water tables, together with the protection of underground and surface waters from pollution and waste. We particularly endorse the work along these lines being carried on by the United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, in cooperation with States and other agencies, and recommend to the Congress and State legislatures adequate appropriations for the carrying on of these activities.

Continuing development of our water resources for flood control, irrigation, navigation, recreation, and other possible benefits is of prime importance.

We realize that water is a vital natural resource, essential to our expanding economy, and we believe that every measure should be employed to safeguard the supply and promote the beneficial use of water. We know that the public receives many intangible benefits from water conservation projects, such as, the storage of water for future use, recreation, pollution abatement, and kindred uses, and that none of said uses can readily be evaluated in monetary terms. The results of said uses are all essential to our economic well being.

It is therefore the sense of this association that the Public Works Committee of the Congress establish a formula for use by the Corps of Army Engineers and other agencies which will operate to give an economic valuation basis to all beneficial uses and that credit be included in computing the cost benefit ratio in all projects involving water conservation.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

It is recognized that in a comprehensive plan for the development of our valleys to provide for flood control, navigation, and irrigation, in many localities dams can be constructed of the so-called multiple-purpose type without serious impairment of the primary purposes for which the dams are constructed. It is urged that, wherever such conditions exist and multiple-purpose dams can be economically justified, Congress proceed as quickly as possible with the authorization and appropriation of the construction of such multiple-purpose dams.

Due to the nature of the stream flow in the Mississippi Valley area, power and energy generated from any such multiple-purpose dams in the area will vary materially with rainfall. Therefore the production of power must be purely incidental to the primary purposes for which the dams are designed. For this reason, and in order to protect the primary purposes of the dams, it is urged—

1. That the incidental power and energy produced at such multiple-purpose dams be sold at the bus bar or from high voltage lines constructed by government agencies to existing agencies, both public and private, engaged in production and distribution of electric power and energy in the contiguous areas, for resale by them to their customers without discrimination or preference;

2. That wholesale rates for such sales be set by the Federal Power Commission;

3. That sale and accounting for such incidental power and energy should be made and carried on by the existing agencies of the Federal Government designing and building and operating such multiple-purpose dams, i. e., the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Reclamation;

4. Purchasers of wholesale power should pay to the Government as a minimum the actual cost thereof including, in addition to ordinary operating expenses, interest at average rate on governmental borrowings and amortization of the cost of the project allocated to the power production over not to exceed a 50-year period; and

5. Any and all savings or profits accruing to the purchaser at wholesale rates under what similar quantities of electrical power and energy would have cost the purchaser to produce by the best and cheapest alternative method should be passed on to its retail customers in the area, in the amounts and in the manner prescribed by proper regulatory authorities.

FEDERAL STEAM PLANTS

We believe that controlling floods, providing and improving navigation, reclaiming arid lands, protection of soil against erosion, and the generation of hydroelectric power incidental to these functions are proper activities of the Federal Government.

The construction of steam plants for generation of power for commercial resale puts the Federal Government into the power business in direct competition with its citizens and is not a function of government.

We particularly oppose the use of money from continuing funds by the Department of Interior for the purpose of inducing rural electrification cooperatives to build steam plants and high-voltage transmission lines for direct sale or lease to the Department of Interior. Such loans avoid the clearly expressed intent of Congress to control the operations of these two departments of government through annual appropriation bills.

We emphatically oppose the Federal Government, its authorities, administrations or agencies, constructing steam-generating plants for the production of power for resale.

USE OF EXISTING AGENCIES

The Mississippi Valley Association endorses the excellent work of the existing Federal agencies responsible for the development of land and water resources of the Mississippi River Basin. These agencies include the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army; the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; the Federal Power Commission; and the Bureau of Reclamation and the Geological Survey, Department of Interior. We oppose the creation of any public works department of Government for consolidating the work and duties of these agencies long expert in their respective fields, or for any other purpose that would interfere with, or interrupt, the progress now being effected by these agencies.

We specifically insist that no organization plan of the Congress shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan should take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this statement. The elimination of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers would destroy one of the most valuable and efficient operating agencies in the Federal Government. With virtually the stroke of a pen such a recommendation, if not disapproved by the Congress, would eliminate all the experience gained by this single agency over the last 100 years, would scatter its trained personnel, and would destroy the esprit de corps that has made its work outstanding throughout the world. To transfer this function from the Department of the Army to a civilian agency would take away from the Army a valuable peacetime training activity, which has proved its worth on the battlefields of the world, where our troops have fought and now fight for freedom of all mankind.

RECLAMATION

Next to the consumptive use of water for municipal and domestic purposes, we consider the development of arid and semiarid lands by irrigation as the highest beneficial use of water in the 17 Western States. We therefore endorse the construction program of the Bureau of Reclamation and ask Congress to provide adequate construction funds to complete the reclamation program.

Reclamation by controlled drainage could add many millions of acres of highly productive lands to the agricultural assets of the country. We recommend that the Federal Government make adequate investigations of this most important matter.

SNAGGING AND CHANNEL CLEARING

There is now allocated to the chief of engineers $1,000,000 annually for cleaning out and straightening the channels of small streams. We recommend and urge that this amount be increased to $5,000,000. It is reported that in certain States $1,000,000 annually for this channel snagging and cleaning could be properly expended in 1 year.

We recommend that Public Law 526—Seventy-ninth Congress—be amended so that "Cleaning and grubbing" may be interpreted to allow complete and full removal of stumps and trees in interior drainage work.

We recommend and urge that drainage districts, in which the previously dug ditches have filled and grown up to a point that drainage is totally inadequate be included in the scope of streams participating in this fund—(notably such drainage districts where the Commissioners have not levied any taxes in 5 years or more, having practically "gone out of business"). We urge the importance of including those abandoned drainage districts.

FEDERAL BARGE LINES

We endorse the action of the board of directors in its approval of the recommendations of the special committee made in February of 1949 concerning the future of the Federal barge lines. We request the board of directors to continue this committee to advise with and keep the board of directors informed as to proposals for the disposition of the Federal barge lines.

WORK STOPPAGE

We believe work stoppages in industry jeopardize the health, safety, and economy of this Nation. We believe that the right to strike must be curtailed short of the right to injure the public welfare. To this end we urge Congress to amend the antitrust laws in a manner that will make them applicable to labor organizations to the extent necessary to restrain, and make illegal, monopolistic practices.

WORLD TRADE

One of the primary objectives and aims of the Mississippi Valley Association is to further and increase the world trade of the Mississippi Valley area of the United States.

It is recognized that imports play a vital part in the maintenance and increase of such trade, and certain other organizations have signified their intention to embark on a coordinated program to stimulate imports into the United States.

We hereby signify our desire and intention of participating in this movement and joining with the International House of New Orleans, New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, Memphis International Center, National Cotton Council, Mid-Continent World Trade Council, and other organizations in this activity.

We authorize our president or duly authorized officers to take such steps as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT

Our international air transport, like our merchant marine, is a vital link in the Nation's transport system. Efficient air transport services overseas, operating on dependable schedules, and backed by a sound aircraft construction industry at home, are vital to our national defense. The association urges that all necessary measures be taken to assure proper place for United States flag services on the world's air routes.

SUBMERGED LANDS AND WATER RIGHTS

Whereas the United States, under recent court decisions, may raise the claim to the ports and the beds of the navigable streams as well as to other submerged lands; and

Whereas the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation have asserted in Federal courts that there can be no private rights in the waters of a navigable stream: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association urge that the Congress promptly adopt legislation recognizing or vesting in the several States, and those who hold title from said States, the absolute title to the submerged lands within the respective State boundaries. We reaffirm our policy to recognize all water rights vested under State law.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

We again disapprove the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway for these reasons:

1. There never has been an economic survey made of the project by the Corps of Army Engineers.

2. The charging of tolls would probably result in the imposition of tolls on all the navigable channels in the United States, thus ending the free use of them.

3. The seaway would further handicap the American merchant marine.

Son John Now a Leading Candidate in His Own Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the great frustrations I have with the deliberate stalling on congressional reapportionment in New York State is being uncertain whether or not that mighty and patriotic American county of Madison is to leave my district.

Suffice it to say, some of the finest friends I ever knew sprang to my defense in Madison last year when I was challenged by the ghastly crew.

Brave citizens took up the cry for freedom against the anti-Hall gang and rallied a powerful opposition to the punk powers that be up there.

For a moment, I am stymied for obvious reasons, but Madison's leading smear sheet, the Oneida Daily Dispatch, has already started to beat the drums of war.

Time was when the policy of the Dispatch was dictated by a worthy father of the unworthy son, now in command. Unfortunately, the "Young Turk" element has taken over. God help the Dispatch.

The Dispatch editorial, probably written by "my son John," smears your Congressman as usual but goes further in exhorting those "who voted against HALL should be giving some thought to replacing him with a good man." As though just about all the boys were not.

What John really means is that he considers himself congressional timber and is itching for his friends to start slapping him on the back and start telling him he is the man.

While I was campaigning in Madison last summer, I made special inquiries among those who know what goes on behind the scenes up there.

One man spilled a lot to me. In answer to my question about what had made the Dispatch go so haywire, he replied:

"Public relations were grand until the young fella come home and took over. Then he made everybody there goose step and tried to do the same thing in Oneida.

"For a long time young Tuthill has hankered to run for Congress but hasn't got up nerve. That's the reason he hates you so, because you stand in his way."

Well, I certainly would not stand in John's way. I think it is about time he tried his wings. He has been so anxious to smear me from his ivory tower. Let him come forth now and do battle like a man.

Let the rank and file of our people, whose Representative he derides and taunts, get a good look at the bounder.

Most Courageous Comeback in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the Eightieth Congress, many wise measures were taken in the field of foreign affairs. In particular, the aid which was extended Greece and Turkey has paid rich dividends in terms of national security and the performance of the Greek and Turkish troops in Korea has been an inspiration. But, certainly, none of the many wise and far-seeing measures which were enacted during the Eightieth Congress have paid richer dividends than the Marshall plan. Without it, most of the western world would have been seriously, if not fatally, weakened by communism. Thanks to it, all these nations are now in a position to develop some real strength for human freedom so that we will not need to carry the whole burden alone. I am particularly proud of the part which members of my own party took in the development of that legislation. I am also proud of the extraordinarily able administration of the Marshall plan by Paul Hoffman without which this success would not have been so great.

We are now entering a new phase in Europe in which the Marshall plan will be modified so as to fit the needs of an increased emphasis on building military power, which, as I just said to the Senator from Utah, should have come much sooner. It seems, therefore, that this is a fitting time for Senators to sum up in their own minds what the Marshall plan accomplished. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article in a recent issue of Life magazine by Paul Hoffman which is a summation of what has been accomplished.

I have asked the Public Printer to estimate the length of the speech if printed in the RECORD. He says it will cover 3⅔ pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $300.68. I ask unanimous consent that although the printing of the article will take up more than the usual length of such speeches, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOST COURAGEOUS COMEBACK IN HISTORY—THIS YEAR EUROPE'S FARMS AND FACTORIES ARE PRODUCING MORE THAN BEFORE THE WAR—ECA'S FORMER DIRECTOR ASSESSES THE GREAT RESURGENCE AND ITS LESSONS FOR FUTURE

(By Paul Hoffman)

(In April 1948 Paul Hoffman took over the unprecedented job of directing the Marshall plan program to bring Europe back from the verge of collapse. Four months ago he resigned after an unprecedented success to which the figures on page 107 attest. As a result, even if war should come in Europe, the West is, economically at least, strong and healthy. Mr. Hoffman has written a book which reports on the first years of ECA and makes recommendations for the future. From the book, which Doubleday will publish April 19, under the title Waging the Peace, comes the article which follows.)

In one very real sense the contest between freedom and despotism is a contest between the American assembly line and the Communist Party line. In this arena the Economic Cooperation Administration is America's boldest experiment in waging the peace. In order to support its activities, the American people, through their Congress, have already appropriated more than $12,000,000,000 for European recovery, $556,000,000 for Korea, and $275,000,000 for other Asiatic countries.

ECA is also the story of the most meaningful 2½ years in my own life. The story began on a bright April day in 1948 when we started operations in room W-900 in Washington's Statler Hotel.

The year 1948 was a fateful one for Western Europe, menaced by Kremlin conspiracies. No less an authority than British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin had said that Western Europe was on the verge of collapse. There was ample ground for this pessimism. Already the Red wave had moved west from its own frontiers. It had swept over the once-independent states of Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. Fifth columnists were hard at work in France, Italy, and Germany. In all these countries the Communists were busy exploiting the hunger and the hopelessness and the lack of of jobs among tens of millions of people. Broken factories were operating only fitfully. Farmers raised little more than enough to feed themselves. The transport system was in too sad a state of disrepair to carry even the slight food surpluses to undernourished city dwellers. To compound all these troubles, Western Europe found itself host to millions of refugees and displaced persons who had fled the Kremlin's terror in Eastern Europe.

Facing all these problems, the nations of Western Europe were shackled by their own destructive economic practices. When I made my first visit to Europe as ECA administrator back in July 1948, I saw that Western Europe's economy then was like a crazy quilt whose varicolored squares had been cut out but not sewn together. For 50 years, indeed, Western Europe had been moving in the direction of economic nationalism. Countries competed with each other in intensifying trade restrictions, in raising tariffs and in imposing import quotas and exchange controls to "protect" home industries.

The harm done by trade barriers among the European nations is best illustrated by comparative production figures between Europe and the United States. In 1900 the per capita output of the European worker and the United States worker was virtually the same. Both lived on about the same scale. Yet in 1950 the United States, with a population of 151,000,000, turned out a gross national product of $289,000,000,000 in contrast to Western Europe which, with 274,000,000 people, turned out a gross national product of only $170,000,000,000. If, however, European per capita output had been on a par with ours, its gross national product would have been around $507,000,000,000. Of course Europe lacks both the raw materials and the horsepower for this rate of production, and its progress was badly set back by a war that increased our output. Its application of the industrial arts will lag behind ours for an indefinite time. Yet a free-trading European market, unhampered by tariffs and controls, might well have given Western Europe $100,000,000,000 more production. That extra $100,000,000,000 would have made it far easier for Europe to move both toward higher prosperity and faster rearmament.

Such was life in Western Europe in 1948.

It is enough to say that today—2½ years later—Western Europe's industrial production has been lifted, not merely to prewar levels, but 27 percent above them. The output of crude steel has been increased 24 percent, motor vehicles about 90 percent, and textile yarns about 25 percent. Farmers in 1950 had bumper crops, and production of livestock products reached the prewar standard. Production of electric power has gone up more than 80 percent. Currencies are stabilized. People are eating regularly and working hard; let no one tell you that they are not. And, in the broadest sense, the vices of economic nationalism, though not wholly erased, have in part been removed; the wiser temper of the new times reflects itself in schemes like the Schuman plan for pooling the coal and iron resources of Western Europe. This change—this comeback—has been called "the most courageous in history." I support that verdict.

From the record of this comeback I wish to draw some important lessons that must become the signposts of the future. The first of these is the principle: We can help only those who help themselves.

Even during those rushed early days of planning and in the difficult months of putting the program across, we at ECA never had the slightest disagreement on one vital matter—the basic concept of the job itself. General Marshall had said at Harvard: "The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so." These words, then, became our text: Only the Europeans themselves can save Europe. ECA has never departed from that idea.

In putting that idea into action we were immensely aided by the remarkable "counterpart" clause that Congress had written into ECA legislation. I can say, flatly, that it made the difference between success and failure for the Marshall plan in every nation that had a shaky government, and it helped mightily with those that had strong ones.

DOUBLE-DUTY DOLLARS

In briefest outline the counterpart arrangement requires all governments receiving outright grants to match every dollar with its equivalent in their own currency—in francs, pounds, lire, or whatever. Of this foreign currency 5 percent is turned over to the United States Government. It is used for such purposes as running ECA missions to individual countries and the purchase and stock-piling of strategic materials. The remaining 95 percent is then put into a fund available to the Marshall-plan governments for recovery projects approved by ECA. Thus America's dollars do double duty. They provide the Marshall-plan nations with foreign exchange for vital commodities, and they encourage the governments of those nations to use the counterpart—which is currency actually acquired by the sale of those commodities—for building up their economies.

If this sounds like fiscal fantasy, let's look at the process in action. The French had made a valiant comeback in their cotton industry, restoring some 80 percent of prewar capacity. Raw materials ran out. The mill owners had plenty of francs, but the American cotton grower couldn't use them. Then the Marshall plan came along. The mill owners took their francs to the French exchange control, traded them for dollars (after their requests were approved by French officials and ECA), bought the needed cotton with the dollars and kept their mills going. What about the mill owners' francs? They went into the recovery fund and became counterpart—to be used for some such worthwhile project as building a highway or creating new farm land by draining a swamp. Thus the same dollars that kept the French mills active and thousands of French workers at their jobs also provided the French Government with a sackful of francs for recovery projects.

In thus helping those who help themselves we learned in ECA a second imperative principle: We must guide our dollars.

The ECA legislation itself was based upon some of the most protracted hearings in congressional history—the testimony filled five volumes and contained 6,594 pages. When the law finally emerged from these hundreds of necessary but wearisome hearings and conferences, it included among its provisions a directive that the European nations (1) submit a detailed program of their needs, (2) discuss with the ECA administration the trade and fiscal policies they would follow, and (3) allow ECA to make end-use checks to determine that American aid was spent as agreed. These provisions are actually nothing more than the realistic lending policies of your local banker transferred to the international stage.

A short case history of Italian recovery offers a prime example of the "guided dollar" principle.

At war's end Italy was struggling under more burdens than John Bunyan's famous hero. Fortunately an interim program of United States aid had been made available, and it did much to save Italy from going Communist in the elections held in April 1948. When ECA's James Zellerbach and his special mission to Italy arrived that summer, they required no long series of conferences to verify the continuing urgency of Italy's need for help. For two decades the nation had exhausted itself in efforts to fulfill Mussolini's mad ambition to be the first of the new Roman emperors. The results were plain on the gaunt faces of the Italians—in their exhaustion and in their cold homes and apartments.

They needed food and warmth. We shipped wheat and coal. They needed raw materials for the factories that still stood. We shipped cotton and steel and copper. At the same time work was begun on the more far-reaching plans to revive and rebuild the Nation. After exhaustive study ECA and the Italian Government agreed upon an over-all recovery program that emphasized (1) machines for gutted factories, (2) power to run the machines, and (3) more land and improved land cultivation.

UNDERGROUND BOILERS

A good example of the first was the Fiat plant at Turin, which had been 75 percent destroyed during the war. But Fiat obtained a $23,000,000 loan and new American equipment. Now Fiat is producing more than 100,000 passenger cars a year, in addition to a long list of busses and trucks, and has again become one of the automotive leaders of Europe.

Rebuilding Italy's power output was a problem, not only of engineering but of of finance. Italy's coal deposits are poor; to import coal would be to lose foreign exchange. One answer was to harness more of the water that fell through the Alpine gorges of the north. This made good sense and new generating equipment was ordered. But even the Alps have occasional years of light snows, and the Italians wanted a hedge against that kind of failure. Accordingly the Italian investment and import programs have placed heavy emphasis on projects for thermal-generating plants to insure and to safeguard production against threat of electricity shortages. In a remote section of Tuscany, about 40 miles south of Florence, they found their insurance: "geothermic power." There, for years, huge jets of steam, the product of water seeping through semi-porous rock to deep-lying lava beds, had erupted into the air. Even before the war Italian engineers had drilled through those underground boilers and harnessed the pent-up steam pressure to produce electricity. Then the retreating Germans had blasted their work to rubble. By the time ECA arrived on the scene Italian engineers were hard at work rebuilding but in desperate need of new piping and turbines. ECA not only provided these but encouraged the Italians to enlarge greatly their geothermic power plants by drilling new wells. By the end of 1951 the plants will be producing 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, accounting for one-twelfth of Italy's total power production.

The land problem is more complex. ECA has helped raise soil yields. Farm mechanization has been encouraged, modern fertilizers introduced and experts sent to show Italian farmers how to control pests and parasites. But land is a social, political, and mathematical conundrum. Along with the question of absentee landlords is the problem of tens of thousands of small farmers who are trying to eke out a living on two or three acres, or even tinier parcels. Italy has faced the needs not only of breaking up large estates but also of consolidating small ones. At the same time steps must be taken to see that the land acquired by the peasants—often neglected or unfarmed over many years by its previous owners—is developed to the point that it can be productively tilled. This requires large-scale public works in irrigation, drainage, reclamation, and roads, as well as making available to new owners the tools and credit to improve their own plots.

To meet this double challenge of land improvement and land reform, ECA is using one of the most potent weapons in its economic arsenal—its influence over counterpart funds—and now has more than 200 projects in the works. These extend from Sardinia (where a cooperative ECA-Rockefeller Foundation program is ridding the island of its centuries-old scourge of malaria) to the fertile plains of the Po to the rocky toe of Calabria. It was here, in the Sila area of Calabria, that the ceremonies marking Italy's first land division took place in the fall of 1950. Four hundred peasants, whose names had been drawn by lot from a box, took possession of 9-acre plots—the first bit of land most of them had ever owned. With tears in his eyes, their leader voiced their thanks: "Since the world began, we never thought to see so luminous a day."

From all this it is easy to see how quickly the economic functions of ECA mesh with political and social issues—and how widely and deeply they affect the life of any nation receiving American aid. Here, I believe, is the supreme political significance of the ECA: It has developed techniques of collaboration under which a powerful nation like the United States could establish an effective working partnership with a less powerful nation, without exacting from the latter any surrender of the right to rule itself. The ECA is, therefore, the first major experiment in the history of world politics where a strong power, while participating in the internal affairs of a weaker one, has not only refused to infringe upon freedom of

choice, but rather invoked every means to conserve that freedom.

A FEW MANUFACTURING SECRETS

I come now to a third lesson of ECA: We must export our skills—our know how—as well as our dollars. This is, in fact, the basis of the technical assistance (TA) program at ECA. I have always been convinced that the adoption of American labor and management practices would be a great boon to European labor, European management, and the European consumers. My chance to do something about it came one warm summer day in Paris in 1948. Sir Stafford Cripps, then Britain's ascetic Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I were talking over the economic recovery obstacles that lay ahead. "If we are to raise the standard of living in Great Britain," he said, "we must have greater productivity." My heart quickened; this was the kind of talk I wanted to hear from a European. Then he continued. "Great Britain has much to learn about that from the United States and," he paused, "I think we have a few manufacturing secrets we've been concealing for a generation or so that you might like to learn. Why don't we interchange this information?"

Naturally I jumped at the idea. "We'll set up a system of trans-Atlantic visits," I replied, "taking British management and labor on tours of American factories and shipping Americans to Britain for a look at your shops." Sir Stafford made the deal right there and within weeks he had thrown his amazing vegeterian energy into the creation of an Anglo-American Council of Productivity. Top figures like Philip Reed, of General Electric, and Victor Reuther, of the CIO, were enlisted to represent American management and labor. The late Sir Frederick Bain, deputy chairman of the Board of Imperial Chemical Industries, and Lincoln Evans, general secretary of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation, were brought in for the British. The first British team to arrive in the United States represented labor and management in the steel industry. This group spent 6 weeks over here, exploring our factories, taking notes by day and chewing over them in the evenings. These were no junketeers; they came with determination to learn. When they returned to England they sat down and wrote a report so much of an eye-opener that it sold 25,000 copies in a fortnight and went into three extra printings. Its gist: productivity per man in American foundries was from 50 percent to 90 percent higher than in British foundries; the latter must mechanize and raise output or workers' living standards would fall even lower.

At the same time that we were trying to help increase productivity in Europe with our large-scale technical assistance program, we were also experimenting with another sort of technical aid in China. The China Aid Act of 1948 provided for the formation of the five-member Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction and sponsored a novel attack on conditions behind the growing unrest in rural areas—conditions which had made China (and southeast Asia) especially vulnerable to Communist agitation.

Chinese and American agricultural survey teams had, in 1946, pin-pointed areas in which rural reform was needed. In some places rents were as high as 50 percent of the farmer's crop. Tenancy contracts were a mockery. They could be altered or abolished at the whim of the landlords. Middlemen profits cut the farmer's earnings, and excessive tax rates bit deep into the meager remainder. Nearly 80 percent of Asia's one and one-quarter billion are farmers, so they were susceptible alike to the growing demand for rural reforms and to the propaganda of Communist agents who quickly assumed the guise of agrarian reformers in matters of political importance.

PRODUCTION UP, COMMUNISM DOWN

The JCRR was designed to fight on this front and to gain three major objectives simultaneously. It began a social justice program to improve health, to insure fair rentals and increase production. Unlike missions, whose members spend their time at their desks, the JCRR went out into the hills and worked with the people. There they lived and talked with the peasants. I do not hesitate to say that not since Lawrence's days in Arabia has a more sensitive or successful venture been carried out by any westerners in the Near or Far East. It was in the very provinces that the JCRR program had got underway—in Szechwan, Kwangsi, and Fukien—that the Communist invaders found some of the most stubborn grass-roots resistance to their drive. What a different story might have been told in China if this alternative to Communist strategy had been started a few years earlier.

The work of the ECA has everywhere proved, whether in Asia of Europe, the validity of its basic assumptions; physical well-being, or the promise of it, provides the hope and the faith which permit free people to make rational judgments.

The correlation between material benefits and election results backs up the point. There were, of course, other influences—the revival of prodemocratic political forces, the church's crusade against communism, the increasing awareness among all groups of the difference between its rosy propaganda and its ruthless barbarism. Even when all these are taken into account, however, there remains a very definite connection between economic recovery and anti-Communist votes, as the balloting before the Marshall plan and afterward attests. In Belgium, for instance, industrial production has gone up 12 percent since the advent of the Marshall plan. At the same time, Communist strength in the Parliament dropped from 17 seats to 10. In Norway production is up 23 percent and Communist seats in Parliament have fallen off to zero. In the Netherlands, where industrial output is up 51 percent, Communist seats in the provincial assemblies have declined from 10 percent in 1946 to 5 percent in 1950. In Denmark output is up 31 percent and the Communist showing is down from 12 percent of the popular vote (in the 1945 elections) to 4 percent (in the 1950 elections). In Austria production has risen 140 percent; Communist mayors in 30 cities were all out of their jobs by 1950. In Britain, as in Switzerland, communism has never been a serious problem; the Communist Party as such is outlawed in Greece, Turkey, and Portgual. In Italy the very announcement of ECA aid did help to decrease Communist representation in the National Assembly, and the 27 percent hike in industrial output since then has been a hard blow at Communist strength within the labor forces. In France the advent of the Marshall plan prevented, in all probability, a Communist take-over.

With these proved lessons behind us, where do we go from here?

First, I have one urgent legislative measure to propose on the basis of our experience: to get maximum efficiency out of the dollars we spend abroad, whether they go for recovery, for development of retarded economies, or for building up military defenses, one Government agency must have the primary responsibility for allocating all funds. Only by concentrating control over our economic activities abroad in the hands of a single agency can we—

1. Properly apportion aid among countries (several agencies working separately often tend to give one nation too much help, another too little);

2. Avoid waste of dollars with a country (two or more agencies often duplicate functions); and

3. Control the impact of our dollars upon the economy of a recipient country (too great a pressure for rearming on a nation of full employment, like Britain, could unduly drive down the standard of living; the same dollars applied to rearming in a nation of unemployment, like Germany, would raise the standard of living).

To tackle all this, we urgently need an overseas economic administration—of Cabinet status—to take over the present set-up of ECA, absorb the point 4 program now administered by the State Department, supervise at least the economic side of all sums to be spent on European rearmament under the mutual-defense-assistance program, and give policy direction to American representation in the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

If this new agency is to wage the fight for peace effectively, there is something else the United States must do which may seem a good deal more painful than creating a new Government office: it must revise its whole attitude toward foreign trade. The great giver of peace, Great Britain, in the nineteenth century advanced international stability and amity by means of a world trade that benefited everybody. The United States must build to the same end. For a century we have hidden behind our tariff walls, protecting our infant industries, bulwarked by the self-sufficiency of our immense resources. We have sold to the world but have been reluctant to buy from it, and world trade has been thrown badly out of balance. The real volume of goods imported into this country between 1929 and 1948–49 increased about 5 percent at the same time that the real domestic output (our national farm and factory production) increased 60 percent. Under such circumstances other nations could not afford to continue buying from us unless we gave them money. And that is, of course, exactly what we have had to do through a dozen loan and grant schemes, starting from after World War I right down to our present ECA. American aid to Western Europe during the last 35 years has amounted to $22,000,000,000 exclusive of direct war outlays. This was—apart from genuine philanthropic motives—a way of subsidizing our exports; for practically all the American money that went abroad never stayed there: it always returned to buy American goods.

All this means that we should take a hard look at both our tariffs and our customs regulations. Despite some progress since 1934, we still charge duties of up to 110 percent on some items. Moreover the entire procedure for determining them is antiquated and obstructive. Our tariff art has several thousand classifications, many of them capricious and arbitrary. Some imported cotton carpets, for instance, are subject to a 10-percent duty, but if they have fringe at the ends they may be subject to four times as much duty. Clearly, Congress should immediately pass the Customs Simplification Act that it now has before it. It should also, I believe, give the President wide discretionary powers to modify customs procedures to cope with special situations.

WORLD'S LARGEST PRICE UMBRELLA

Perhaps the Achilles heel of our foreign trade is our domestic agricultural policy. Like Topsy, it has been allowed just to grow. Over the past 3 decades little thought has been given to its impact on the rest of the world. The nub of the present policy is the guaranteed minimum price to the farmer for his produce. The guaranteed minimum price was originally designed to protect farmers against loss from a few key crops such as cotton and wheat. But its coverage has been

persistently extended until today more than half of farm commodities have been placed under this largest price umbrella in the world.

This excessive bolstering of farm prices tends to restrict markets both at home and abroad. Consumers cannot afford to buy the entire available supply. Surpluses pile up in warehouses and in caves. And, since American prices are so unrealistically high, overseas farmers are pushed into uneconomic planting of such crops as cotton and wheat, thus reducing United States export of these items. This shrinkage should cause everybody genuine concern, since agricultural products have comprised 24.5 percent of all United States foreign trade. Moreover entire areas in the southwestern cotton belt, for example, largely depend upon foreign customers. What applies to Texas and Oklahoma in cotton applies to various wheat States, such as Kansas and Washington. As one who believes that the mainspring of free enterprise is to expand production by means of high volume output at lower unit cost, I cannot help but be troubled by the deadening effect on American agriculture which comes from reversing this process. Present fixed and rigid prices not only violate the supply and demand equation, but also foster an ever-greater amount of Government regulation, intervention, and control. By mid-1950 the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is the Department of Agriculture's price-support agency, owned or had loans on $4,500,000,000 worth of surplus grains, eggs, butter, soybeans, and a long list of other farm products. To try to dispose of such surpluses, the Department has been compelled to resort to what amounts to "dumping" overseas, a procedure which induces anger on the part of foreign farmers and retaliation on the part of their governments. I am not a farm economist, but on a commonsense business basis it seems to me that the solution is to be found in the area of more sensitive and flexible price supports. Farm spokesmen for the countries of the free world should be able to sit around the conference table and reach agreement on how continuously to modify internal agricultural programs, bringing them in harmony with today's need for expanding world trade. We must seek and achieve a denationalizing of agricultural programs inside the countries of the free world.

From all that I have said it must be plain that I, like most Americans, am convinced that two world wars offer at least circumstantial evidence that the United States cannot stand aside, and alone, if chaos and destruction swirl about us. And some circumstantial evidence is very strong. If you are sitting on a fence and a bullet whizzes by, perhaps no conclusion can be drawn; if a second bullet takes a similar course, you are warranted in entertaining a suspicion that all is not well. However, if a third bullet puts a hole in your hat and parts your hair, you are justified in concluding that someone is out to get you.

World politics today shape our lives more tellingly than ward politics. A coffee blight in Brazil, a famine in India, devaluation in Britain, the almost perpetual cabinet crisis in France, the discovery of uranium ore in Africa, a political assassination in Lebanon, all have an increasingly direct and pervasive influence upon decisions which determine our destiny as individuals and as a people.

THE "AMERICAN ISLANDERS"

There are, of course, a few people who, despite two world wars and much other "circumstantial" evidence, still hold that we can abandon Europe and Asia and do business as usual on our great island continent. They insist that we should keep all dollars at home and devote them to throwing up bastions that stop at our own borders.

The simplest facts of economic life argue against these "American islanders." Let us look at the comparative resources of ourselves, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union.

In many important items we outstrip both the Kremlin and its satellites. The United States will have in 1951 the physical capacity to produce 95,000,000 metric tons of crude steel per year, and Western Europe 55,000,000. The Soviet sphere will probably be able to produce only 33,000,000 metric tons. The United States can produce if necessary between six hundred and seven hundred million metric tons of coal as against Western Europe's four hundred and fifty to five hundred million, and an annual output in the Soviet and its satellites of less than 400,000,000. The United States can produce about 2,300,000,000 barrels of oil, and Western Europe about 25,000,000. In addition the remainder of the free world, in South America, the Near East, and the Far East, can produce an additional 2,000,000,000 barrels. The Soviet Union and its satellites will probably produce in 1951 about 350,000,000 barrels. The United States will probably turn out 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity in 1951, and Western Europe 250,000,000,000, as contrasted with some 140,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its satellites.

No one who reads these figures can fail to note what a vital proportion of our production potential is provided by Western Europe. Let those "realists" who would abandon Western Europe to its fate remember that if Western Europe were taken over intact by the Kremlin, and its resources added to those of the Soviet sphere, the net result would be that the resources controlled by the Kremlin would in many essentials equal those of the United States. I think this is proof positive that we cannot wage the peace by ourselves.

Waging the peace is about the opposite of preventive war. I do not believe that we are faced by a dilemma so direful that we have no choice but to cast mankind into the darkness of global war. I believe that an attempt to crush communism with atomic bombs would be to miss the objective, like the bull that charges the cape instead of the matador. To wage a preventive war against the Kremlin would be to substitute emotion for intelligence, panic, or resourcefulness. You do not prevent a war by starting one.

We can prevent war—and wage effective peace—only by a positive program that goes beyond mere containment. It calls for wresting the initiative from the U. S. S. R. not only by anticipating its moves, and thus thwarting them, but even more importantly by eradiciting the social and political and economic conditions on which communism thrives. In this respect the Marshall plan has been and remains the pilot plant and proving ground for an American foreign policy that is firm, constructive, and far-reaching. For the first time the Soviet Union's boring-from-within strategy has been halted and hurled back as the Marshall plan's hydroelectric power plants and housing developments and tractors and seed have been set against Marxist dialectic; as the Marshall plan's bread and butter are set in contrast to the hollow cake of the big lie.

One of the prime necessities in such a program is to assure our military defense in ways that make economic sense. Our military leaders report that we must spend some $50,000,000,000 annually for defense. Of this sum, some $15,000,000,000 will go for the new equipment required by our own enlarged Armed Forces. Fortunately, much of this new equipment will represent what business calls capital outlay, such things as materials, factories and plants that do not become obsolete and so require only infrequent replacement. Thus, after the third year, and when our Armed Forces have been built up to a posture of defense, we should be able to prune our spending to some $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 a year, until the world reaches a durable peace. This estimate is based on the assumption that the present small war doesn't erupt into the big war; if it should, we would of course have to scrap such figures and return to deficit spending.

ECA IN ASIA

The relationship between what we spend on defense and our gross national product ($279,000,000,000 in 1950) is a very sensitive one. I think that if we can hold our defense spending to the levels I have suggested, and can sharply reduce them after the third year, we will not seriously endanger our economy. But to do this we must change some of our ideas of soldiering. Right now the average American private is paid about $3 a day plus allowances. He needs it—for many of our boys in uniform are the sole means of support of young wives and children. But we simply can't pay three million or more soldiers in uniform $3 a day in peacetime and stay within that 20 to 25 billion dollars a year bracket that the country is able to carry over the long term. The answer, to my mind, is universal military training—taking all male Americans at about 18, before they have assumed family obligations, and paying them perhaps $1 a day. (A Turkish soldier gets $1 a month in cash.) When they are released at 20, they can return to their jobs or continue their schooling. Both militarily and economically this is the only program that seems to me to make sense.

What, meanwhile, will it cost us to wage the peace abroad? No one can forecast too accurately, but I am willing to make an estimate and put it on the record. Before doing so I would like to repeat that no one in his right senses is thinking of an all-embracing Marshall Plan for the world. However, many men of good sense in many countries are thinking in terms of strengthening those areas vital to the security of the free world. Here is my estimate:

Economic aid to those countries in whose development is important to the security of the United States and the free world	$2,000,000,000
Political activities	850,000,000
Informational activities and propaganda	800,000,000
Total	2,650,000,000

These figures for economic aid may seem low in view of what has been spent on the Marshall Plan alone. The explanation, however, is quite simple. Out of the nearly $11,000,000,000 that the Marshall plan has cost so far, an estimated $7,500,000,000 was for relief and rehabilitation stemming directly from the war itself—some of it for emergency food supplies for the undernourished; more of it to rebuild and re-equip bomb-damaged plants. In other words, not more than one third of our ECA expenditures covered the normal postwar needs for economic expansion.

Another reason why economic aid can be held within the figures I have cited is that ECA operations are now expanding only in southeast Asia. There are good reasons—aside from better earnings from exports such as rubber and tin—why this first year's program in southeast Asia requires the relatively small sum of $84,000,000. Southeast Asia is a largely agricultural community and will remain so for many years. The emphasis, therefore, is on agricultural development; on shifting from wooden to steel plows; on better seed and irrigation and soil care. In some areas we will use the techniques we

found so effective with the rural rehabilitation program in China. In other areas, however, we must first fight debilitating diseases before we can even begin to help modernize agricultural methods. In Viet Nam (one of the three associated states of Indochina), for instance, the great problem is malaria. Thus our top-priority project there falls into the health and sanitation field.

To wage the peace and win it is an aim that so transcends any other reasons for investment in the recovery of other nations that only with some hesitation do I suggest it is to our commercial as well as to our political advantage to strengthen the free world. Every businessman knows how difficult it is to build a profitable business in a community that is broke. Every successful businessman also knows that he must invest a certain amount of his company's annual income to develop markets. Usually that amount ranges from 2 to 5 percent, depending on how much of his advertising program goes into building future, as against current, sales. The sum I propose is less than 1 percent of our total gross income. Perhaps even from a practical business standpoint that is not too much for a prosperous America to invest in developing world prosperity. If these expenditures help to bring about successful resistance to the Kremlin's internal aggression, they must be regarded as one of the best-paying investments ever made by any people, any time, anywhere.

A third world war would not only necessitate genuine sacrifice, but would also bring individual tragedy and perhaps even national disaster. How disastrous a third world war would be can best be shown by taking a backward look at World War I and World War II. The only cost of war that can be stated in figures is the dollar cost. The out-of-pocket cost, or the shooting expense for World War I, was approximately $22,000,000,000; for World War II, approximately $340,000,000,000. However, Gordon Gray, ex-Secretary of the Army, reckons that the ultimate cost of World War II, before the last pension is paid, will be approximately $1,300,000,000,000. When I look at that figure, when I note the great increase in the loss of lives in World War II over World War I, when I think of the atom bomb, guided missiles, bacteriological and gas warfare, I find myself overwhelmed by the nightmare of what world war III would do to us and everybody else.

The prospects of any such catastrophe, if nothing else, should goad us into getting on with waging the peace on all fronts and keeping at it until it is won.

Divided Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the clip sheet:

DIVIDED RESPONSIBILITY

Divided responsibility is at the very heart of democracy.

The country fully realizes the critical nature of the emergency which faces the United States and the entire free world.

It also realizes the necessity of dealing with this emergency efficiently but without developing totalitarianism, against which we arm.

There is no more corrupting influence than the development of ever-swelling power.

For this reason, and with entire sympathy for the Armed Forces in every legitimate and reasonable demand upon Congress and the American people, we suggest the high importance that Congress shall not forget its own responsibility. For the elected representatives of the people to put the stamp of approval upon every request of the Armed Forces even when those requests are within the area of congressional responsibility and run counter to the considered opinions of the legislators, would be an abdication which the people would regard with profound unease. Have we not been warned that we cannot defend ourselves without losing everything we want to defend? We do not believe this to be true; it is ours to see to it that it is not allowed to become true.

There was reason in Representative MUNDT's suggestion that even the contemplated expenditures for defense should be subjected to close scrutiny for possible savings.

These thoughts are prompted by the failure of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in the bill it is reporting, to provide for protection of the men in the Armed Forces against systematic exploitation by the liquor traffic. Many of these men will be very young and many of them—we believe on the average, the best of them—will come from homes where they are encouraged to abstain from liquors. Indeed, the majority of them will have been taught in their schools and in their churches that abstinence is the better and safer way of life.

The American Legion, in a bill it proposed to the committee, made very clear its attitude that such protection should be offered in any system of military training or service. Members of the Senate committee considering this legislation, men of great experience and prestige, believe that such provisions should be made. So far, they have not been made, and this failure seems to be due to an uneasy deference on the part of the legislators to all suggestions from the Pentagon. Too great a deference may lead to a customary bypassing of the elected Representatives of the people, to reach an autocratic group holding all power of decision.

There are men high in the Armed Forces who are evidently disturbed by the number of alcoholics among veterans. When an abstainer becomes a drinker he incurs a certain liability to alcoholism, a greater liability to ordinary addiction, and a very formidable liability to involvement in alcoholic misfortunes which are almost infinite in variety.

For this reason we suggest that the matter should receive adequate consideration in general debate. Why are not the provisions of existing law carried out? Why are there persisting rumors, and more than rumors, of unsatisfactory conditions in the occupation area in Germany? Why these humiliating stories of misconduct, so damaging to the prestige of the United States? Is it because examples set the men are bad? Is it because no standard is raised, no high ideal of morality is set before the men in regard to alcoholic indulgence?

We believe that others in places of responsibility should share the evident concern of General Eisenhower in this matter. Too much is at stake for them to fail to do so.

In the meanwhile, the responsibility primarily rests upon Congress. There should be no rubber stamping.

GENERAL EISENHOWER AND BEER IN THE ARMY

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate, February 2, 1951, made the following significant statement:

"I will tell you this about the American soldiers. When I finally got enough shipping to send home for something of that kind for our soldiers after the first landing in Africa, I conducted a Gallup poll and found that instead of beer, they wanted Coca-Cola, which was easy because you can bring over the sirup and make it there."

The statement appears on page 1194 of the hearings, Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951.

NOTE.—This statement was in reply to a question by Senator SALTONSTALL: "He also buys Coca-Cola, does he not?"

Opposition to Taxation of State and Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, local governments everywhere, including both municipal and school districts, are alarmed over the proposal by the Secretary of the Treasury to abolish the tax-exempt status of future issues of State and municipal bonds. The Federal Government has today entered every field of taxation except real estate, so that localities are hard pressed to find sufficient tax resources to finance essential services. If now the Federal Government removes the tax-exempt status of State and munipical bonds, the localities may well find it impossible to finance current operations and long-range capital improvements.

Many local officials, groups, and agencies have written me urging that this proposal be dropped. Among them are the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin; the Village Board of Warsaw, N. Y.; John J. Hickey, the president of the Board of Education of Letchworth Central School, Gainesville, N. Y.; Mark Heath, county attorney of the county of Orleans; Joseph B. Boyle, legal adviser to the county of Monroe, speaking for the Board of Supervisors of Monroe County; Edward F. N. Uthe, executive secretary of the Association of Towns of New York State; the County Officers Association of the State of New York; Mayor Elbert H. Carver, of the village of Scottsville, N. Y.; and the council of the city of Rochester.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a duly attested resolution adopted by the council of the city of Rochester on February 27, 1951, petitioning the Congress of the United States not to enact this proposed legislation.

The resolution follows:

Resolution 51-19

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the council of the city of Rochester, that the Treasury Department of the United States has again renewed its efforts to obtain congressional legislation imposing taxes on income derived from State and municipal securities, in spite of the fact that such proposal has been several times rejected in the past by the Congress; and

Whereas this council is advised that such proposal is now pending in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the council is of the firm opinion and has been advised that such proposal is both economically unsound and unconstitutional; and

Whereas such a tax would be reflected in substantially higher interest rates upon bonds and other securities issued by the States and their municipalties, which increases would result in substantially increasing the tax burdens of citizens of the States and the municipalities issuing bonds and particularly the tax burden on real estate; and

Whereas such legislation would, in the opinion of the council, do violence to the fundamental concepts upon which our constitutional Government is based, in that it would tend to destroy the dual sovereignty of the Federal and States' Governments and tend to make the States and their municipalities in all things subordinate to a central government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council does respectfully petition the Congress of the United States not to enact such proposals; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested, be forwarded to the Congressman representing any part of the city of Rochester, N. Y., and to each member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

Two Thousand Two Hundred and Twenty Dollars Per Acre Cost of Central Arizona Project, President's Water Policy Commission Finds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, California has always contended that putting water on the land under the central Arizona project would cost close to $2,000 per acre in capital investment. But Arizona has always pooh-poohed those charges. Now we have it on high authority: The President's Water Resources Commission. The commission puts the capital cost of a full supply of water for the land under the central Arizona project at $2,200 per acre on 1948 price levels. Moreover, the commission points out that for the lands under the project which will receive only a supplemental supply of water, the cost will be $620 per acre. A supplemental supply is added water to make up a full supply for lands which do not have sufficient, but have some water. These figures fully verify the charges made by California against this fantastic project, and the verification comes from experts of high authority and unquestionable impartiality. The statement of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission appears in volume II of their report at page 384, and reads as follows:

In many places the acreage of lands needing supplemental water is much greater than new irrigation lands. Among these the central Arizona project is an important one. Tentative allocations indicate that the capital costs per acre of irrigated land on this project would be approximately $620. This per acre cost is under the assumption that 640,000 acres of land will be benefited with supplemental water supply by the project.

However, it has been estimated that approximately 467,000 acres of these 640,000 could be irrigated with the present water supply in the area to be benefited. The additional equivalent acreage which would receive full water supply through the central Arizona project, therefore, is about 173,000. Calculated on this basis, the costs of irrigation are about $2,200 per acre benefited. (Basis of estimate: Allocation to irrigation of $397,093,000, as given in H. Doc. No. 196, central Arizona project, Washington, 1949, p. 208. A 1948 price level is assumed.) Costs of other supplemental water supplies on other projects generally are less, some being as low as $200 per acre on the basis of price levels in several different years between 1946 and 1949.

The Tragedy of George Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Tragedy of George Marshall," written by Walter Trohan, and published in the American Mercury for March 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRAGEDY OF GEORGE MARSHALL

(By Walter Trohan)

At a corner of one of the vast avenues in the Pentagon, erect in a high-backed chair, sits a tragic old man. He is George Catlett Marshall, General of the Armies, Secretary of Defense, former Secretary of State, adviser to Presidents, and, in the eyes of Harry Truman, the "greatest living American." He is the devoted old warrior—patriotic, loyal, courageous; yet his life is a tragedy, both for himself and for the cause of mankind, because his unsound judgment has helped to lead his country from one disaster to another.

On March 12, 1950, General Marshall announced that he would not write his memoirs for these remarkable reasons:

"To be of any historic importance they have got to be accurate; that is, one mustn't omit and make it pleasant reading. Now, if you do put it all in, you may do irreparable harm. You almost ruin a man, but if you don't mention that, it is not history."

From the lips of a leader of freemen these are disillusioning words. They say, in despair, that freemen must not be told the truth; they indicate that the speaker is in a mental purgatory for hidden sins which he has either observed or committed, and they emphasize the graver tragedy: that an old man who must conceal past errors from his countrymen is still exercising powers of decision.

Can freemen trust a leader who will not trust them with the truth? By what right does a public servant say to freemen: "You trusted me with leadership, but I will not give a true accounting because the truth might do irreparable harm"?

This is the same General Marshall who, in December 1939, said to the American Historical Association: "I believe that much of the colossal waste, much of the tragedy of warfare, is due to the ineffective manner in which history is written and taught." Yet he now seals his lips on historical truth.

The tragedy of George Marshall is that his vision has never matched his courage. As a young man at military school he was accidentally transfixed by a bayonet and endured his wound, not unlike the Spartan lad with the gnawing fox, without identifying the man at fault. He is self-disciplined and loyal. In a quiet way he possesses charm. But, strangely, while refusing to trust the American people with the truth, he has always been quick to blame the people for mistakes. On November 30, 1950, alibiing for the war in Korea, he said: "The basic error has always been with the American people."

If the general only trusted the people, he might make some valuable additions to our history, for he has been present when most of the critical decisions were made since 1939. And, according to President Truman, he has a phenomenal memory. Truman once told two Congressmen: "I've got a mighty great man working for me now." Why, do you know he has an absolutely phenomenal memory? He can even tell the day and hour, and exactly what was talked about, without any notes."

But here are some examples of the general's memory:

Before the Senate Armed Services Committee on September 19, 1950, he disclaimed any personal responsibility for the disastrous China policy which he had implemented in his 1946 mission to China. He said "the policy of the United States was . . . issued while I was on the ocean, going over there."

But in the authorized biography of President Truman by Jonathan Daniels, Admiral William D. Leahy is quoted as saying: "I was present when Marshall was going to China. He said he was going to tell Chiang that he had to get on with the Communists, or without help from us. He said the same thing when he got back."

Former Secretary of State Byrnes, in his memoirs Speaking Frankly, says:

"As soon as President Truman appointed General Marshall his personal representative in China, I asked the general to study the draft (of policy) so that he could help prepare the final statement for presentation to the President. The Sunday before I left for Moscow, Under Secretary Acheson, General Marshall, and members of his staff met in my office. By the end of the morning's discussion, we had agreed upon the statement of policy. Thereafter the President made no change in that policy except upon the recommendation of General Marshall or with his approval."

When General Marshall left for China he carried with him, not only the documents setting forth the policy of enforced coalition, but a letter from the President which said: "I understand that these documents have been shown to you and received your approval."

In June 1950 General Marshall wrote a letter to Senator Millard Tydings saying that so far as he could recall, "I have met Mr. Owen Lattimore." Yet, during a State Department seminar in October 1948, for 3 days Lattimore sat within five feet of Marshall and obtained permission to express his views at least 15 times. And several times Marshall was observed greeting Lattimore warmly.

The general has had difficulty remembering the names of his closest associates. During the Second War he referred to General Eisenhower as the "red-headed fellow down the hall," and to Gen. Bedell Smith as "the fellow with the red eyes." In January 1951 he told a Senate committee that he couldn't remember the strength of a Second War division, but he could recall the strength of a First War division.

The most notorious lapse in the phenomenal memory of Marshall, in the generally favorable ability to remember what he was doing on

the eve of Pearl Harbor, the most important night of his life.

In testimony before a congressional committee General Marshall admitted that he knew, following a meeting at the White House on November 25, 1941, that the United States was likely to be attacked by December 1 and that the attack was likely to come without warning. He further admitted that he knew on December 1 that Hawaii was alerted only against sabotage. Then came the fateful moment at 9:30 p. m. on December 6 when President Roosevelt, on being handed the decoded Japanese ultimatum, exclaimed: "This means war."

Few knowledgeable persons in Washington believe that Roosevelt went to bed on December 6 without communicating this fateful news to Marshall. But Marshall has sworn before Congress that he can't remember where he was, that he has no recollection of the night of December 6, and that he didn't get the message until he had returned from a horseback ride at 11 a. m. on December 7.

Marshall still had 2 hours to save lives at Pearl Harbor, but he disdained the scrambler telephone on his desk, declined Admiral Stark's offer of Navy radio, and sent his message to General Short by commercial cable without even marking it "Urgent." By the time the message was decoded in Hawaii, 2,326 Americans were dead.

This is the essence of the tragedy of George Marshall. Wherever the American people have depended on him in the clutch, he has come up with advice or decisions which have led to disaster.

General Marshall was born in Uniontown, Pa., on December 31, 1880, the son of a Kentucky coal and wool dealer who had moved north after the Civil War. Because his father, a solitary Democrat in a Republican community, could not wangle him a West Point appointment, he went to Virginia Military Institute. Although just above the middle of the 1901 class scholastically, he was first captain of the cadet corps and an all-southern tackle at 165 pounds. His first Army assignment was map making in the Big Bend country in Texas. His career followed the regular Army pattern of waiting and serving. In 1907 he was made a first lieutenant and sent to the Army Staff College, where he graduated at the head of his class. He became known as a "staff man" rather than a command officer among his superiors. In 1916 he was made a captain.

Upon America's entry in the first war Marshall was sent to France to serve on the staff of the First Division, and was promoted by General Pershing to operations officer of the First Army. After the war Pershing made Marshall his aide-de-camp while Pershing was Chief of Staff.

Up to the early thirties Marshall's career was one of slow but steady progress. He had a deep personal loss in 1927 in the death of his first wife, but was remarried happily in 1930 to Mrs. Katherine Boyce Tupper Brown, of Baltimore. With 14 years to go to the mandatory retirement age of 64, his future appeared serene, if undistinguished, especially since Pershing, a retired but influential old dog of war, had promised to have him made a brigadier general. But here Marshall met his first failure.

True to his promise, Pershing called upon Douglas MacArthur, then Chief of Staff, and asked that his protégé be made a general. MacArthur was ready to oblige, but insisted that the promotion go through regular channels. Pershing agreed, confident Marshall could clear the hurdles. Friendly examination of the Marshall record showed what his superiors regarded as insufficient time with troops. MacArthur proposed to remedy this by giving him command of the Eighth Regiment at Fort Screven, Ga., one of the finest regiments in the Army.

Marshall was moved up from lieutenant colonel to colonel, but his way to a general's stars appeared to be blocked forever when the inspector general reported that under 1 year of Marshall's command the Eighth Regiment had dropped from one of the best regiments in the Army to one of the worst. MacArthur regretfully informed Pershing that the report made promotion impossible. To this day Marshall is uneasy in the presence of MacArthur.

In 1936, after MacArthur had been succeeded by Gen. Malin Craig, Pershing tried again. But this time, knowing that the Army would never make Marshall a general, Pershing went directly to the White House. He persuaded Roosevelt to promote Marshall; and 3 years later when Roosevelt was looking for an agreeable Chief of Staff, he chose Marshall over 20 senior major generals and 14 senior brigadiers.

Marshall is, therefore, a "political" general—a general by virtue of Presidential favor. It is unlikely that he would ever have become a general on his Army record.

Early in the Second War Roosevelt told Pershing that he expected to make Marshall "the Pershing of the Second War"; and there are conflicting theories as to why Marshall never assumed field command. One theory is that Churchill acquired an intense dislike for Marshall at Tehran when Marshall advocated the cross-Channel invasion in support of Stalin and opposed the Balkan invasion which Churchill preferred.

The more likely theory is that Marshall himself, remembering his failure with an Army regiment, chose to remain in a staff position. Admiral Leahy writes that Marshall and Sir John Dill, British member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, were "as close as the proverbial peas in the pod"; and Dill could probably have persuaded Churchill to accept Marshall. Instead, Dill used his influence to keep Marshall in Washington—but this could have been on instructions from Churchill. At any rate Marshall repaid his friend Dill by burying him on the best acre of ground at Arlington National Cemetery, and by having Truman dedicate an equestrian memorial over Dill's grave. Dill has more ground and a larger monument than any American hero, not even Pershing or Dewey or Sheridan has a monument to match Dill's.

The dispute at Tehran illustrates how Marshall's feeble judgment has led to tragedy. There were two proper concerns for the representatives of free men at Tehran in 1943. The first concern was who would hold what when the German Army was defeated; the second concern was the defeat of the German Army. Churchill, at least at the outset, seemed to have these two concerns in their proper order: He was primarily concerned with keeping Russia out of Europe. But poor Marshall—at a tragic cost to all of us—had the two concerns reversed: He was primarily interested in the destruction of the German Army, and he evidenced no concern over how far Russia advanced into Europe.

This is the essential tragedy of American leadership during the last decade. Our leaders have evidenced no broad vision or deep wisdom; they have made decisions on the emotions of the moment. And the failures have not been failures of the people—as General Marshall would have it; our failures have been the failures of trusted leaders like Marshall.

George Marshall was the willing instrument of the tragic policy which held that Russia was an ally to be trusted, that Joe was "good old Joe," that the way to peace and serenity was to destroy Russia's enemies and let communism work its will in both Europe and Asia. Marshall was the willing instrument of the Hisses and the Acheesns, the Lattimores and the Jessups, the misguided men who let American boys die to make Eurasia safe for communism.

If Marshall is the greatest living American, why didn't he stand up at Tehran and prove his greatness? Why didn't he raise his voice against the sell-out of Poland and Czechoslovakia? Against the marooning of Berlin in a Russia sea? Against the whole traitorous process by which the Reds were invited to sack western civilization?

Numerous associates of Marshall have reported that in 1943 he seemed much more interested in furnishing arms to Russia than in equipping our own forces. He answered all criticism with this remark: "The fastest way to kill Germans is to send tanks to Russia." The thought of what would happen when an all-powerful Russian Army stood astride Europe—apparently no such thought ever crossed his great mind.

At the Yalta Conference in February 1945, General Marshall helped to deliver Asia to Russia just as he had helped to deliver Europe at Tehran. Japan was beaten and would have surrendered to us within 6 months, but Marshall was so anxious to cooperate with Russia that he approved the granting to Russia of Port Arthur, Dairen, preeminent rights in Manchuria, the Kurile Islands, the southern part of Sakhalin—everything that would enable Russia to dominate Asia.

The man who sat next to Marshall at Yalta was Alger Hiss, and Hiss was the exponent of the Acheson-Jessup policies in the State Department, the men who believed the destiny of China lies with the Communists." On no point at Yalta did Marshall disagree with Hiss.

After the war the Hiss-Acheson-Jessup group squeezed the last drop of usefulness out of the greatest living American. They sent him to China to compel the Chinese Nationalists to quit fighting and come to terms with the Communists. It was Marshall who embargoed arms shipments to Chiang Kai-shek, and it was Marshall's personal order which allowed the first Chinese Communist armies to enter Manchuria.

One of the Americans who patiently briefed General Marshall on the Chinese situation was Col. Ivan D. Yeaton, who had been assigned to Yenan, headquarters of the Chinese Communists. Colonel Yeaton warned Marshall of Mao's close ties with the Kremlin. But Marshall completely disregarded this advice; he listened instead to the pro-Communists in the State Department; and when he forced Chiang to cut his army down to 50 divisions, he forced numbers of Chinese Nationalist troops to join the Red Army so that they could get food and pay.

When Marshall returned from China, which he had helped deliver to the Communists, and was made Secretary of State, his first action was to name Acheson his chief of staff with "complete authority to cleanse the Department."

In 1947 Marshall sent Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer to China. When Wedemeyer's report did not ratify Marshall's findings—when it urged instead that we erect a bulwark against communism in China—Marshall angrily suppressed the report and banished Wedemeyer to an obscure post. Marshall, on his record, is a man who believes in suppressing reports; he doesn't believe that the people should have the truth; he blames the people for disasters.

Before he left his post of Secretary of State because of ill health, Marshall gave his name to the European-aid plan. Actually the plan was first proposed by Dean Acheson, speaking for Truman, in the little town of Cleveland, Miss., May 8, 1947. Truman called it the Marshall plan, but a few weeks after the plan's promulgation Marshall was unable to say under questioning whether or not Eire was included in his own plan.

In 1949 Marshall retired. In retirement he was given the post of head of the American Red Cross. His retirement pay as a five-star general was, with living allowances, $18,761 a year, but he accepted from the Red Cross an additional $22,500 a year as salary and $6,000 a year as expenses. His

predecessor, Basil O'Connor, had served the Red Cross without pay.

When Truman was considering whether or not to send ground troops into Korea, he sought the advice of his "greatest living American." Marshall advised him to send in the troops—and this is now conceded to have been one of the most foolish and disastrous decisions ever made by an American Government. After suffering 50,000 casualties we are now struggling to get out of Korea so that we can exploit the advantageous position which we were in before Truman, Marshall, and Acheson committed our ground troops.

As Secretary of Defense, Marshall's war planning is now gravely distrusted by the ablest officers in the Armed Forces. He and his manpower assistant, Anna M. Rosenberg, want a vast land army with 18-year-olds as the core. On December 15, 1950, he was called in to confer with Truman and the leaders of Congress. Three times Marshall spoke up during lulls to say: "I'm going to build a big new army." This was his only contribution to the discussion, and each time he made the pronouncement he smiled proudly. Members of Congress left the conference shaking their heads.

Marshall planned the second war with airplanes having the lowest priority of all armaments. He conferred weekly with the eighty-odd-year-old Pershing, and Pershing detested airplanes—he told Congress that "no airplane had ever affected the course of a battle."

Today it is feared that Marshall is planning to fight the Russian and Chinese hordes with manpower. When the Air Force sends suggestions to him, he merely draws a line through the pages and sends them back.

In January 1951, Marshall made another remarkable appearance before a Senate subcommittee. Talking about his 18-year-olds and his big new army, he said, "I sometimes think that our standards are too luxurious. I think sometimes we provide more than is advisable. When I was in the Army, we didn't have turkey and chicken. This is off the record, of course, I wouldn't want the troops to hear it."

In the room where Marshall was speaking thus off the record were at least 300 persons, including representatives of Tass, the Soviet news agency.

Perhaps Truman is correct. Perhaps Marshall is, indeed, the greatest living American. But the free world will certainly have to be strong if we are to survive much more of his advice.

California's Democratic Attorney General Denounces Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from Edmund (Pat) G. Brown, attorney general of California, regarding the proposed central Arizona project—S. 75 and H. R. 1500—now before both Houses of Congress.

Speaking as the chief law officer of California, Mr. Brown states that the first objective must be the decisive defeat of this legislation, and he reiterates his intention to support fully the members of the California congressional delegation in their effort to win that objective.

Mr. Brown points out that the present central Arizona bill gives only lip service to California's repeated efforts to take the Colorado River controversy before the Supreme Court for final adjudication. He expresses his disapproval of the present bill's subsidiary provision for Supreme Court review, which, he declares, has been tied as a tail to the central Arizona kite, and binds litigation to prior congressional approval of the fantastic project.

Terming the central Arizona bill a "serious threat to the national economy," Mr. Brown states that it entails staggering subsidies amounting to billions of dollars, which would be an additional burden on the Nation's taxpayers.

The complete text of Mr. Brown's communication follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ENGLE: Since assuming the office of attorney general of California and surveying the problems that confront the State in which the attorney general has an official interest and responsibility, I have become convinced that none of these is of more immediate and far-reaching concern than the proposed central Arizona project.

A review of the record in the current and earlier Congresses convince me that our California delegation in both House and Senate has been vigilant, courageous, and vigorous in opposition to what is obviously a serious threat, not only to the national economy, but to California's right and need to the use of the waters of the Colorado, confirmed to various California public agencies under Federal contract. It is gratifying to me personally that you and your colleagues have made such a splendid record and have held the line so well. As the chief law officer of the State I propose to support fully the work you and they have done and are doing. You may be assured of my earnest and complete support also in the handling of the many legal problems involved in which my office may be of service to you.

The first objective must be to defeat decisively the pending bills on the central Arizona project. It is unsound and infeasible. Power which could better be used for the needs of industry in the Southwest must not be dedicated to the relatively uneconomic pumping of water for irrigation of ordinary field crops. The project would entail hidden subsidies in a staggering total amount by diverting the interest component in power rates to repayment of the capital cost of irrigation works. The proposed financial scheme provides no revenues to pay the interest on the national debt which would necessarily be incurred to construct the works; and it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation over $2,000,000,000 in interest over the 75-year financing period. The cost of the works themselves is wholly disproportionate to the value of the lands involved.

After the defeat of the central Arizona project, which I trust will be the result of your efforts directed against the bills, there will remain a serious controversy between California and Arizona over the rights of each to the use of the waters of the Colorado. This dispute must be settled, in the interest of interstate harmony and in fairness to the great economic considerations at stake. If negotiation fails, then the issues should be submitted to the only tribunal authorized to determine them—the United States Supreme Court. I am in accord with the efforts that have been made by California's Representatives in Congress to bring about the necessary waiver of Federal immunity as a foundation for such litigation. I cannot approve the subsidiary provision for Supreme Court review that has been tied as a tail to the central Arizona project kite, because it gives only lip service to a solution through the Supreme Court and binds this to prior congressional approval of the proposed fantastic irrigation venture. Certainly the availability of the needed water should be decided before the costly Arizona proposal is given congressional approval, contingent or otherwise.

We in California are confident, morally and legally, of the soundness of our position founded upon the water rights we hold. We have been and are willing to submit the points at issue to the Supreme Court, and to do this without any $2,000,000,000 string attached. The efforts of you and your colleagues will surely bring this reasonable course to realization.

Railroads: A Vital National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address delivered at a meeting of the Missouri Pacific Club of St. Louis, Mo., on February 15, 1951, by former Congressman Leonidas C. Dyer, of St. Louis, Mo. Mr. Dyer served as a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the Sixty-second to the Seventy-second Congresses, inclusive.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROADS: A VITAL NATIONAL ASSET

(By Leonidas C. Dyer)

I wish to speak to you about the Nation's transportation facilities, with special reference to the railroad system.

I need not emphasize the vital importance of adequate transportation to our economy and national security. Without a high degree of mobility, economic activity would revert to a primitive state; and our means of defense against aggression would be crippled. Movement is an essential adjunct to extraction and utilization of raw materials, manufacture, distribution of commodities, and countless other operations embodied in our complex and highly developed economy. Transportation provides valuable social advantages, and makes possible the economic and political unity of a country whose territory stretches from coast to coast. In times of national emergency, such as war, our armies would be helpless without transport, and we should be able to move neither men nor equipment. The urgent military requirement of "getting the matter there the fastest" would be an impossibility.

The United States has transportation facilities superior to, and more abundant than, those of any other nation in the world. Our country comprises about 6 percent of the land area of the world; we have about 7 percent of the world's population, but our means of transport represent a much greater proportion of world totals. For example, we possess 33 percent of the world's railroad mileage, about 70 percent of the world's motor vehicles, and a large percentage of the world's improved highway mileage.

It is my firm conviction that certain transportation problems exist which, if not

solved, will eventually cause serious deterioration in our national transport system. I shall try to point out, briefly, some of the developments now taking place which are definite danger signals.

Let me review briefly the development of transportation in this country. First, of course, there was the post road and the canal. By 1830, rail service made its appearance. During the next 100 years, railroads made one of the most remarkable growths of any mode of transportation in all history. The railway network increased from 23 miles in 1830 to 199,000 miles in 1900, and further expanded to a peak of 254,000 miles just prior to the First World War. Rail transport service, during that time, became available from coast to coast and from Canada to Mexico. Since then, railroad efforts have been devoted chiefly to intensive improvement of existing facilities rather than to further expansion of the network.

Following the First World War, came the rise of motor transport. Today, a total of 36,300,000 passenger cars, 7,693,000 trucks, and about 135,000 buses are in operation on the Nation's streets and highways.

In the decade following the First World War, air transport emerged from its experimental state and became an accepted means of commercial transport for passengers, mail, and express. In 1949, domestic scheduled air carrier operations included movement of 15,120,015 revenue passengers, and transport of 41,418,156 ton-miles of mail and 123,001,652 ton-miles of express and freight. These totals are rising sharply.

The last three decades have witnessed a renaissance of inland waterway transportation, due chiefly to large expenditures by the Federal Government for improvement of inland waterways, such as rivers and channels. In the first 90 years of Federal Government, expenditures on waterways (including seacoast harbors) totaled less than $90,000,000. In the decade following the First World War, they aggregated $492,000,000; in the decade of the thirties expenditures rose to $1,206,000,000; and in the decade of the forties despite postponement of work because of war, the total exceeded $933,000,000. In fact, during the past 20 years the Government has spent almost twice as much on rivers and harbors as had been spent in all our national history, prior to 1930.

As a result of these large expenditures by Government, the volume of traffic moving over our inland waterways showed a marked increase. Roughly, the tonnage of waterborne commerce moving over rivers, canals, and connecting channels increased threefold between 1922 and the beginning of the Second World War in 1939. Since that time there have been further increases.

Despite all this recent development and expansion of other forms of transport, the basic element in our national transportation is still the railway. Now almost a century and a quarter old, the railroads, as the Interstate Commerce Commission once pointed out (178 ICC 580), "now furnish the backbone and most of the other vital bones of the transportation system of the country, and we believe this will be the situation for a long time to come."

The railroads, virtually the sole means of common carrier transport available to shippers and travelers for many years, now find themselves faced with a mounting tide of competition, which has developed largely since the close of the First World War. The conditions under which this competition is permitted to operate, constitute a serious and growing threat to the continued welfare of the rail industry. Unless steps are taken to relieve this situation, we shall be guilty of permitting the essential railroads, the very foundation of our national transportation system, to deteriorate to a point where they cannot provide the volume and quality of services so vital to our economic welfare, and to our national security. This danger becomes particularly significant in times like these, when the international situation is fraught with uncertainty and peril.

I am not taking a position inimical to the new modes of transport which have come into being during the past 30 years. I believe there is a distinctive place in our national transportation system for motor transport, for water-borne facilities, and for air transport. Insofar as they provide services characterized by advantages which are inherent in these new means of moving property and people, they should receive every legitimate encouragement, both by Government and shipping and traveling patrons.

The railroads only object to discrimination. What are the inquities in competition of which the railroads complain? They may be grouped under three general heads: subsidies, inequality in regulation, and the varying degree to which the several modes of transportation are subjected to taxation. The effect of such inequities is, of course, loss of rail traffic and revenues, increased costs of operation, and consequent inadequate net earnings which make it difficult for the railroads to obtain capital funds for essential improvements at moderate cost.

Motor transport, water carriers operating on our inland waterways, and domestic air transport operate with extensive facilities provided at public expense. In some instances, as in the case of air mail, outright subsidies are paid to carriers competing with the railroads. In most cases, no user charges are assessed against those carriers making use of the publicly provided ways over which they operate, or for various other facilities such as navigation aids for water and air carriers, airway markers, air-traffic control, and the like. Commercial motor carriers using the highways usually pay less than maintenance cost and interest on the investment involved.

The result is that rates quoted by the carriers which use such public facilities do not represent the full cost of the services they render the public. Railroads, on the other hand, which provide and finance all their own facilities are forced to compete on a rate basis with carriers whose sole investment is that required for procurement of equipment.

The result has been to build up additional competition for the railroads, with little thought for the welfare of the railroads, or for integration of the various facilities into a sound national system, in which each mode of transport would, if unsubsidized, serve the purpose for which best fitted.

It is hardly necessary, I think, to enlarge this picture of a transportation situation with which you all are familiar. What I would emphasize is the detrimental effect, of course, to divert important elements of traffic from rail carriers. Not only is the volume of such diversion increasing, under present governmental policy, or lack of policy, but traffic thus weaned away from the rails is, in most instances, higher-rated types, the loss of which bears heavily on railroad revenues. Unlike the railroads, which constitute the only 100-percent common-carrier mode of transport, competing carriers are permitted to pick and choose what they will carry. Naturally they select the better-paying types of traffic. Railroads, on the other hand, must and do carry every type of shipment offered. The monetary disadvantage such a situation creates is exemplified by the fact that the average ton-mile revenue received by highway carriers, common and contract, which report such figures to the Interstate Commerce Commission, is about four times the average ton-mile revenue of the railroads. This indicates the extent to which highway freight carriers select the traffic they wish to haul.

I have mentioned certain inequalities in regulation. Let us consider some of these inequalities and their effect on railroads. A few examples will serve. Although the Transportation Act of 1940 brought water carriers under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, that law provided for so many exemptions that a large proportion of inland waterway movement, which is directly competitive with the railroads, is permitted to operate without any economic regulation whatever. These unregulated carriers move a large percentage—probably as much as 70 or 75 percent—of all inland waterway traffic. Thus, the highway regulated railroads are forced to compete for a large part of inland waterway traffic with carriers over which the Government exercises no control, as far as economic regulation is concerned.

Similarly, the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, exempts certain important classes of truckers from regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. One of the escape provisions of that act relieves from the usual regulations motor vehicles used in carrying agricultural products, livestock, and fish. These exempt truckers are estimated by the Commission to number approximately 40,000 which is twice as many as the 20,000 regulated motor carriers of property. Virtually half the fruit and vegetable crops of Florida, for example, are moved by truck which, with very limited exceptions, are exempt from any economic regulation. Such traffic is highly desirable from the standpoint of the railroads, but they must compete for it against motor trucks which are subject to no restraint as to rates or other restrictions under which the railroads operate.

Railroads operate under a heavy burden of taxation. Like any other self-supporting business, railroads provide and maintain all of their facilities and pay taxes on them. These include cars and locomotives, shops in which such equipment is repaired, office buildings, and other structures, as well as roadways, tracks, signal systems, and numerous other properties.

These facilities are distributed throughout the United States and are therefore subject to taxation by the several States and their various subdivisions. In addition to such taxes, railroads also pay Federal income and other taxes, besides being taxed heavily to support the retirement and unemployment insurance systems administered by the Railroad Retirement Board. Taxes constitute a heavy drain on rail revenues, and currently take about 10 cents out of every dollar of operating revenue.

In contrast to the railroad tax situation, such carrier groups as motor carriers, water carriers, and air transport, are relieved in large measure of tax burdens.

In measuring the economic value of the railroad industry as a national asset, we should recognize that in addition to providing a facilitating service—low cost, mass transportation—so necessary to the smooth working of our economy and so vital to our national security, the railroads contribute heavily to the welfare of the country as purchasers, as employers, and as taxpayers.

In normal years, railroads purchase about 23 percent of our bituminous coal production, about 19 percent of the fuel oil output, approximately 16 percent of the timber cut, and about 17 percent of the iron and steel output. In 1949, railroads of class 1 spent $1,641,000,000 in direct purchases of material and supplies. Of that total, fuel purchases aggregated $554,000,000; expenditures for forest products totaled $142,000,000; outlays for iron and steel products amounted to $454,000,000; miscellaneous purchases amounted to $181,000,000.

The railroads also, in 1949, spent $1,312,200,000 for additions and betterments to their properties; employed on the average 1,191,500 employees, and disbursed over $4,378,000,000 in wages and salaries. The tax bill of the railroads in 1949 aggregated about $833,000,000, or more than $2,200,000 a day. Incidentally, railway taxes took 9.7 cents out of every rail operating revenue dollar, a fact to which I have already referred.

In closing, I would reemphasize our critical need of railroads in times of national emergency. In the supreme test which this country faced in the last war, the railroads carried nearly three-fourths of all the Nation's freight traffic, more than 90 percent of war freight and more than 97 percent of organized military travel. In view of the present disturbed condition of our international relations, the need for seeing that our railroads are kept in sound physical condition, is more pressing than ever before. This can be accomplished only by giving the railroads opportunity to earn enough to meet the capital outlays which the industry must make in order to provide a vitally needed transportation service.

Railroads cannot continue indefinitely to provide the high class of service they do provide, and to which the public is entitled, on the meager returns of recent years. Unless relief is afforded, our basic agency of transport will deteriorate. We should not and cannot let this happen.

UNESCO and the Cultivation of Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Dr. Richard H. Heindel, Deputy Director, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State, before the 1951 Convention of the American Association of School Administrators meeting at Atlantic City on February 22. Dr. Heindel until a year or two ago served on the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; prior to that as a valued associate of mine in the Department of State. I have long argued that UNESCO cannot stand apart from the ideological struggle that is rending the world; that it must become a vigorous champion of freedom. Herein lies its great immediate opportunity. Thus I am glad to see Dr. Heindel arguing that "when confronted by the poisoning of minds, the stifling of the sciences, the imposition of canons of taste in art, and the subversive attacks on the cultural values of peoples and on the orderly improvement of disadvantaged countries," UNESCO must work to "protect the integrity of education, science, and culture against the inroads of tyranny, totalitarianism, and—darkness."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNESCO AND THE CULTIVATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(By Richard H. Heindel)

UNESCO can be viewed as a revolution. If the title of this session—"UNESCO as a World Force in the Establishment of Human Rights"—is taken seriously, UNESCO is certainly much more than an academy.

No one declaration, no one program, no one agency can comprehend the establishment of human rights and the staggering responsibilities which always accompany such rights. But I like to think that everything UNESCO touches, and everything that men and women of talents and good will do for it, alone or collectively, in any part of the world, advances the cause of human rights.

Examine a few of the related, major UNESCO activities which are "directed toward the peace and prosperity of mankind" at a time when "human solidarity is under trial and when human rights are in peril." You may conclude that UNESCO can be interpreted as an agent of brain-power and leadership—to guide the present revolutions against oppression and poverty into more democratic channels, and to inject a leaven of universalism into the stirring nationalism of many areas of the world.

I am certain that UNESCO's dyanmic role does not frighten us. Even Karl Marx once said, "In the eighteenth century, the American War of Independence sounded the tocsin for the European middle class • • • in the nineteenth century the American Civil War sounded it for the European working class." Recently, Justice William O. Douglas suggested that the United States "direct the revolutions of the world into democratic channels;" if we do, he adds, "We will at once enlist the support and enthusiasm of the peoples."

Time and time again, American scholars, educators, and intellectuals have tried to do something about the situation described by the Director General of UNESCO when he spoke in Cleveland, April 1949—"The most dangerous division in the world is the one between education and ignorance, between the culturally privileged and the culturally underprivileged, between the intellectual 'haves' and the intellectual 'have-nots'."

I am saying these things because I believe the fundamental objectives and priority directions of UNESCO coincide with United States foreign policies generally, and with the basic motivations of American scholarly and creative workers. I am saying this, too, because forces hostile to UNESCO and to us have been debauching the integrity of education, science, and culture, they have stolen and perverted our most cherished words and values, and they have generally fouled international semantics and the channels of communication.

In my reading of American history, of American education, I find a democratic, dynamic political and social heritage; a population of many nationalities, creeds, and races; the willingness to share ideas and experience through education and by mass media; a concern for civic responsibility and individual dignity; technological skills for a world that is being rapidly changed by the impact of science; and broad as well as specialized accomplishments in many fields of knowledge and creation. I do not find, in sum, a dreary record of reaction, war mongering, incurious provincialism, obscurantism, dilettantism, or cultural imperialism.

I believe this analysis explains in part why the United States takes, and ought to take, such a deep interest in helping UNESCO find its vital role in the present world situation. Besides, there are many advantages, for ourselves and for the rest of the world, in testing and sharing American strengths and ideas through a multilateral agency of many nations and cultures.

1. In waging peace, in establishing the bedrock of human rights, the widest of the central themes running through the UNESCO program, UNESCO has begun to concentrate some of its efforts on fundamental education, within its regular program and possibly in a special project which would apply $20,000,000 over a period of 12 years for various areas such as equatorial Africa, Latin America, the Far East, India, and the Middle East.

The masses want education and give it a higher priority that we might imagine under the present circumstances. Projects aimed at preparing the illiterate, the unfranchised, and the young for useful national and international participation require zeal, patience, diplomacy, and skills. Here is a task which may very well involve the competences and contributions of all the scholarly and creative fields presently identified with UNESCO. Of course, this is a long-term process. But immediate, vigorous, and proper execution now will yield immediate values and results which are urgently needed.

I am confident that American education has much to contribute in know-how, personnel, and spirit to this priority, to this revolution if you like. And you can work on it at home or in the foreign fields.

2. Economic well-being is an aspiration for all people throughout the world. UNESCO has got under way its share of the world's work in technical assistance and has agreements with 13 countries. Basically, this also includes the encouragement of improved training for tomorrow's leaders in education and science. Possibly, if one looks at the time tables, at the urgencies, secondary education may need as much invigoration as a program for universal literacy.

Here again all the disciplines and specialties can participate, perhaps not so much to elaborate as to share the world's store of knowledge. Yes, UNESCO is as revolutionary as the spirit behind our great elementary and secondary school system, and behind the act of our land-grant colleges and universities.

But this is not enough. And, fortunately, UNESCO does not think so either.

3. It is heartening to hear the Director General of UNESCO declare that: "UNESCO is first and foremost an organ of education for peace under the law." This must certainly mean a vigorous and effective support for the United Nations' system, human rights, collective security, and the development of a sense of loyalty to international cooperation.

The programs of "education for international understanding" and of "teaching about the United Nations and the specialized agencies," one may surmise, will enable influential leaders and major public opinion groups to play a more effective, intelligent part in influencing the course of international affairs toward peace and security. A positive educational program in support of the kind of international life the UN stands for is necessary on a world-wide basis. This seems to me political education of the highest order—political literacy is added to literacy. A thinking citizenry cannot but be an appropriate concept for UNESCO.

It appears to me, to adapt the words of the executive board's resolution about Korea last August, that these programs will help to reinforce "in the minds of men the intellectual and moral defences of peace through law." This is important, even though we must admit that only free minds have alternatives from which to choose.

This work will help to correlate intellectual enlightenment and the maintenance of peace and justice. Once more, this activity helps us to achieve a synoptic view—it is not just what UNESCO can do for particular educational, scientific, or cultural activities, it is also what education, science, and culture can do for UNESCO.

So much for these three priorities.

There are other projects and instrumentalities which are related to today's theme, and also to what you are doing and can do in your own community.

You are a contributor to and beneficiary of whatever helps to carry out the demonstration of world cultural interdependence.

Certain of you, for example, have been trying hard to broaden and deepen foreign area studies in your school systems. A sincere recognition of the achievements of other cultures helps to promote solidarity among diverse peoples. UNESCO, through activities in the field of book and gift coupons, translations, the interchange of persons, and the removal of barriers, has aimed at widening and improving the sharing and interchange of essential scholarly and cultural data.

There is little doubt that UNESCO has to solve a communication problem in the relatively new field of intercultural relations and cultural diplomacy. This is not easy because in many countries the intellectuals have not solved communication among themselves or with the masses of their own country. The way is wide open for social inventions, workable devices, and the testing of traditional methods in the field of international cultural relations. UNESCO has also to recognize and digest the growing knowledge about social action and the roots of social behavior. It will have to identify basic predispositions and motivations, and it will have to find the best ways for UNESCO to influence and modify attitudes and behavior.

UNESCO cannot be designed merely as an arena for genteel discussion on seemingly irrelevant topics, or for neutral aloofness when confronted by the poisoning of minds, the stifling of the sciences, the imposition of canons of taste in art, and the subversive attacks on the cultural values of peoples and on the orderly improvement of disadvantaged countries. UNESCO and its national commissions can and should develop the prestige which would help to achieve balance and perspective in a troubled world, and which would help to maintain the unity and morale of the UNESCO world. UNESCO, as many of us here may view it, has a particular responsibility to protect the integrity of education, science, and culture against the inroads of tyranny, totalitarianism, and—darkness.

Yes, the cultivation of human rights is a plodding, searching, arduous task which is only occasionally lighted with drama. It is good that UNESCO is an ally in that task.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fourth Class Service," which appeared in the Chicago Daily News recently.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOURTH CLASS SERVICE

A Daily News staff member who has lived in many parts of the world, and who is now in New York City, has been keeping tabs on the mail service between Chicago and New York. He says that ordinary mail from here to his home in Queens takes 4 days—about the same time as air mail from Chicago to Rome.

His conclusion is that the United States now has about the same letter service as a second-rate Latin American country. It's better in Brazil and in many European countries whose governments we subsidize.

If the time ever comes when our Government finds a decreased need for raising living standards all over the world, perhaps some of the savings could be devoted to improving the mail service in the United States.

Beloit (Wis.) Buccaneers Basketball Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article which has been prepared by Mr. Jud Allen, publicity man for Beloit College, on his favorite subject of the Beloit College basketball team. I am submitting his statement which brings worthy recognition to a small Midwestern College which has only 400 eligible men for varsity athletics yet is in big-time basketball in this country. I am proud to present the article in question:

Beloit College's basketball team has often been referred to as "the smallest school in the big time."

The 104-year-old liberal arts college located on the southern boundary of Wisconsin has slightly less than a thousand students, with only 400 men eligible for varsity athletics. While it has made an impressive basketball record since the arrival of Coach Dolphe Stanley following the war, like any small school, it must defeat an army of sports skeptics before gaining any recognition in athletics.

The unheralded Buccaneers made their debut in the big time several weeks ago when they met a strong DePaul University team at the Chicago Stadium. What resulted was one of the most surprising exhibitions of basketball ever seen in any arena this or any season.

Before the largest crowd of stadium season (more than 13,000) Beloit defeated DePaul 94 to 60, to set a new stadium scoring record, previously held by Kentucky and the University of Illinois (86 points). It was DePaul's only decisive defeat of the season, having lost by three points to Kentucky, the Nation's number one team, and in a double overtime to Oklahoma A & M. DePaul also listed the University of Illinois as one of its victims. Illinois is currently leading the Big Ten.

Here were some of the comments by the Chicago scribes following the game:

"Beloit gave the most amazing exhibition of speed and ball-handling I've ever witnessed," said sportscaster Joe Wilson.

"Beloit easily belongs among the Nation's top 10. It is the most beautifully conditioned club I've ever seen," said Bob Russell of the Chicago Daily News.

"I was tired just watching them. Nobody can run that much," commented Dutch Lonborg, athletic director of Kansas University.

"I'd rank the Buccaneers among the first 10," said Ed Sainsburg of the United Press.

"Beloit is the runningest and best passing team I've ever seen in my coaching career. After Kentucky and Oklahoma A & M, they are as good as any team in the country," said Ray Meyer, coach of DePaul.

"Isn't it wonderful that a little school like Beloit can have a team like that. Amazing," said Tug Wilson, Big Ten Athletic Commissioner.

These were just a few of the comments made by a completely surprised crowd of basketball fans.

Coach Stanley had this to say after the game:

"I only hope that this game will help the cause of all small colleges who may have everything but the recognition they deserve. So many people seem to forget that excellence has always been based on quality, not size."

Lebanon, Conn.: Example in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, under the page 1 heading "Booklet on Connecticut village going to Russia to answer lies."

Mr. Speaker, this refers to Lebanon, a town in New London County in my district, and I would like to say that I share with every citizen of Lebanon the feeling of pride that this town has been selected as one of the typical communities in the United States, to demonstrate to the people of other lands, the kind of lives we lead and the type of folks that we are.

I would like to say, also, Mr. Speaker, that I commend the State Department for its judgment in the selection of Lebanon as an exemplary community. It is one of our historic towns, having been settled in the closing years of the seventeenth century, named in 1697 for Lebanon in the Near East, and incorporated in 1700. It was the home of Gov. Jonathan Trumbull, the celebrated War Secretary referred to by George Washington as "Brother Jonathan," and it was from the War Office in Lebanon that much of the business of organizing and equipping and supplying Washington's armies was transacted.

That is not its only claim to fame, by any means. It is a beautiful and peaceful community whose citizens are regular, freedom-loving Americans, with reverence for the great past of our country, and concern about its future, and about the peace of the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOKLET ON CONNECTICUT VILLAGE GOING TO RUSSIA TO ANSWER LIES—STATE DEPARTMENT PRINTING 500,000 SHOWING DEMOCRACY IN LEBANON—DISTRIBUTION PLAN IS SECRET

(By Bernard Peyton, Jr.)

The State Department announced yesterday in New York and Washington that it has prepared a 24-page pamphlet about an American village and will print 500,000 copies, many of them for distribution behind the iron curtain, to combat lies about this country there.

The Department picked out Lebanon, Conn., a rural and unsophisticated dairy town of 1,400 population, 25 miles southeast of Hartford, as best exemplifying the democratic process in action. This town, which was founded 251 years ago, and has never yielded very far to big city attractions or pressures, should appeal to peoples all over the world, the Department indicated.

The pamphlet, filled with photographs of village activities, will be printed in 18 languages including Russian. Michael J. McDermott, press officer of the State Department, declined to state how it would be distributed within Soviet-controlled areas.

"If I told you, maybe we couldn't distribute it," he said.

The cover of the pamphlet bears a picture of children in front of a library, and the story opens with an aerial view of the rolling countryside in which Lebanon is situated. The commentary begins:

"Beset by anxiety, a tiny farming village has an air of unreal tranquillity. To the casual eye such would be the first impression of Lebanon—a little cluster of buildings some 50 miles from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean in the northeastern United States. Each rocky field is bounded by waist-high fences of stone, culled from the earth through the 200 years the fields have been cultivated. Little traffic passes by."

The narrative carries the reader through town meetings, social get-togethers at homes, and the various occupations of the residents. A theme links the successive lay-outs: The young couples in town feel the need for a kindergarten, but are opposed by the elders, who feel the need is not too drastic.

The young members work up interest in their project, and ultimately, through a process indigenous to democracy, put it over. This situation, the Department said, closely reflects its actual prototype in Lebanon.

Lebanon's historical importance, proclaimed by its own residents and by State chapters of patriotic societies, which hold their annual conventions on the village green, did not influence the selection of the town for the pamphlet, according to the Department.

Nevertheless, it conceded that the homebred background of the village's residents—many of whom are descendants of the original settlers—has been responsible for maintaining the village heritage. Headstones in the town cemetery are inscribed with the names of Revolutionary War soldiers, and the famous village green, a mile long and 500 feet wide, was a camping site for Lafayette and a French detachment for 8 months during the war.

HAS HISTORIC CHURCH

At the south end of the green, known as Lebanon Common, stands the Lebanon Congregational Church, founded the year the village was started. John Trumbull, the painter, designed the present replacement for the original structure. His father, Jonathan Trumbull, was the only governor elected by the people and not an appointee of George III, and inspired the people of the State to help General Washington in his bleakest hour. Governor Trumbull, a resident of Lebanon, delivered 300 cattle to the American forces at Valley Forge when their provisions were almost exhausted.

The town in those days was the fifth largest in the State, with a population of 4,000. Its residents employed themselves much as they do now—in farming. Today dairy herds graze over many hillsides nearby, with chickens and vegetables adding to the farmer's fare. There are no industrial plants, and most of what is grown is consumed locally.

The disinterest in an export economy is typical of the residents. The town was once a stagecoach stop on the New York–Boston road. When the railroad pushed through, the citizens vigorously opposed it, and today the Willimantic branch of the New Haven bypasses the town to its junction 5 miles north.

TOWN HAS FOUR CHURCHES

Lebanon, besides its kindergarten, boasts an elementary school and the Tisdale High School. Although the Congregational Church is most prominent, with its command of the green, the residents attend a Baptist, a Roman Catholic, and a Methodist Church, with pride in the influence these churches have had on community development.

"Lebanon people do not ask anyone else to accept their ideas," the pamphlet states, "but they do have some beliefs which are perhaps larger in scope than this one small village:

"They believe: The needs of the individual are the concern of the community; the community can act successfully to meet those needs; the goals of stability and progress can be attained within the framework of a free society.

Foreign Policy Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me by the House, I include a draft of a letter and a form of foreign policy questionnaire, which I propose to send to people in my district. I shall later report the results with the hope that we may obtain some help from a cross-section opinion of my area.

The letter and questionnaire follow:

MY DEAR FRIEND: Most problems now facing the people have their root in one thing: The foreign and military policy of the United States. For example:

1. Upon the nature of our policy depends the severity and duration of the draft of our young men. Their very lives depend upon decisions in the immediate future.

2. The President's budget calls for $71,000,000,000 cash, a Federal tax increase of approximately sixteen billion. New Jersey's share is calculated at nearly two and a half billion or about $2,000 for the year from the average head of a family of four. A large percentage of this money is allocated to the support of a possible global war. Taxes are high and will be very much higher. Very few begrudge any sacrifice necessary for America's defense, but millions object to preparing for a vast land war in Asia.

3. Prices are high, and despite controls, will be higher. Goods of all kinds will be scarcer; restricted. Black markets will be back; possibly rationing. These are incident to a war economy, which in turn depends on the wisdom or the folly of the foreign policy.

Illustrations could be multiplied. You can be sure that the subject of paramount importance in the whole world today is the foreign policy of the United States.

Therefore, I am issuing a short special questionnaire, devoted to this single subject. Many of you know my views. I want to know more about yours.

That's the way a representative government works the best.

Your prompt answers will help me to decide issues now before us, and you will be participating in what is called the Great Debate.

Sincerely,

MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress.

Return to me at 1504 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

QUESTIONNAIRE

"The great debate" now proceeding in the country and in the Congress, concerns itself with a fundamental question of whether the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, may, by his own action, send them into war in Korea, or send them, as he now proposes, to occupy Europe, or whether Congress, having the sole right to make war, must approve basic policies which involve war or the possibility of war. What do you think?

1. Committing ground troops to Europe, or elsewhere outside of the continental United States:

☐ A. May be done by the President alone.

☐ B. Must be done only with the consent of Congress.

☐ C. Should not be done at all.

2. Dealing with question No. 1 a little further, Senator TAFT argues that if Russia intends to attack Western Europe, it will do so now, and certainly not wait the two or more years it will take to prepare defenses there; moreover that no land army can be built sufficiently large to resist the huge numbers that Russia can bring to the attack. Eisenhower feels that Europe has the will to resist, and if encouraged by our leadership and divisions, will build up a strength that will deter war:

Which is closest to your position?

(a) ☐ Give Europe all the aid necessary in an attempt to build strong defenses there.

(b) ☐ Send the four divisions now proposed, but no more.

(c) ☐ Send no men, but supply Europe with equipment.

(d) ☐ Send no equipment or aid, unless Europe raises its own adequate army.

(e) ☐ Keep out of Europe entirely.

3. If Russia attacked Western Europe tomorrow, should we:

(a) ☐ Continue to mobilize a large land army to fight Russia in Europe, Asia, or both.

(b) ☐ Concentrate our Air Force in England, or at any other available point, and attack and harass the Russian Army in Europe.

(c) ☐ Attack Russia itself by air.

(d) ☐ Let Europe protect itself and concern ourselves exclusively with the defense of this hemisphere.

4. On June 25, 1950, the North Koreans launched an attack on South Korea. Following the Truman doctrine, which assumes it to be our duty to help any free people anywhere resist aggression, the President ordered the Navy, Air Force, and most of our Army and Marine Corps into action.

What was originally described as a police action has resulted in 50,000 American casualties. Was the action justified? What should we have done, or now do?

(a) ☐ Send the Navy and Air Force to harass the North Koreans, but kept away from a land engagement.

(b) ☐ Done nothing on the assumption that our vital interests were not affected.

(c) ☐ Waited to see if the United Nations were willing to do their full share.

(d) ☐ Gone ahead as we did to uphold the principle of collective security.

(e) ☐ Now that we're in it, fight it out.

(f) ☐ Withdraw from Korea.

5. Nearly all Americans agree that the freedom of the United States must be defended at any cost. The question is where and how? Leading Americans have recently declared a variety of views. They are summed up here very briefly. Mark the one closest to your opinion:

(a) ☐ Truman administration: Support free people everywhere in resisting aggression. "Contain" communism wherever it seeks to dominate. For example, fight in Korea, assist and perhaps fight in Indochina, Iran, India; lend our men and arms to Europe. In short, fight wherever Russia, or those influenced by Russia, fight.

(b) ☐ Kennedy: Give up Asia as a bad job, and leave Europe to protect itself. Withdraw to the Western Hemisphere, and build strongest possible defense for North and South America. Russia will bite off more than it can chew, and will be unable to maintain its dominant position.

(c) ☐ Hoover: Concentrate on defenses of Western Hemisphere, but maintain our surrounding positions as in Japan, the Philippines, etc. Aid Europe only after it proves its willingness to help itself.

(d) ☐ Taft: Much like Hoover. Is willing to send a limited number of divisions to Europe, but insists that Congress must approve, not just the President.

(e) ☐ Dewey: The administration position, except that he favors all-out mobilization, including at least 100 divisions.

6. A group of 123 Republican Representatives recently filed a six-point Declaration of Policy, under which they propose to change the course of the administration's foreign policy. How do you feel about each point?

Yes ☐ No ☐ 1. Whatever our future military or political policy is to be, it must be determined with the full participation and approval of the Congress.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 2. Make this country impregnable to attack.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 3. Reduce nonessential civilian expenditures.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 4. Build a strong defense system in the Western Hemisphere.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 5. Establish a strong defense line in the Atlantic and Pacific. Refuse further aid of any kind to Western Europe unless persuaded that Western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden. In any case invite Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations to participate fully in this program.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 6. Conclude peace treaties with Germany, Japan, and Austria.

7. Do you favor—

Yes ☐ No ☐ Draft of 18-year-olds.

Yes ☐ No ☐ Draft of married men between 19 and 26.

Yes ☐ No ☐ Draft of veterans.

8. Of the principal branches of the armed services, which does the strategy of this country require to be at top strength?

(a) ☐ Army.

(b) ☐ Navy.

(c) ☐ Air Force.

Sign only if you choose.

Name _____

Address _____

Free Wheat to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Elkhorn Independent on Thursday, February 22, entitled "Free Wheat to India." The editor raises this important question in connection with the current legislation: "Shall the American taxpayer alone pay the bill for free wheat to India?" What about the United Nations helping out? The editorial follows:

FREE WHEAT TO INDIA

India appealed to the United States for millions of bushels of wheat to avert a famine and there are indications that the wheat will be given without charge.

That is typical of American generosity, and the urge to take care of unfortunate people who are starving is traditionally American. We hope that wheat is furnished immediately.

But why didn't India ask the United Nations instead of the United States? Dozens of countries in the UN raise wheat. Of course, the answer is obvious. America doesn't sell anything to people in trouble; it is all free, and the American taxpayer foots the bill.

We'd like to ask whether wheat that is paid for wouldn't alleviate a famine as quickly as free wheat? Some of the richest people in the world live in India.

Ten Billion Dollars Budget Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Federal Tax Policy has just proposed a comprehensive plan to reduce the $71,600,000,000 Federal budget by $10,000,000,000. I am in hearty accord with the objective of many of our leading citizens and leading organizations to cut nonmilitary spending. I believe that many billions of dollars can be saved the taxpayers of this country by a broad program of fiscal retrenchment.

The plan proposed by the Committee on Federal Tax Policy is a step in the right direction. Some conclusions by the committee I cannot completely agree with. But I do think that this exhaustive study is timely and the plan merits the thorough consideration of the Congress and the people.

The proposal of the committee follows:

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Immediate suspension of all nonmilitary Federal spending programs for the fiscal year 1952 was proposed today as the first step in a plan to cut $10,000,000,000 from the projected $71.6 billion Federal budget.

The plan, which was accompanied by a breakdown showing areas where savings could be made, was proposed by the Committee on Federal Tax Policy, composed of five leading fiscal authorities.

Following suspension of "the operation of every provision of the law now in force requiring expenditures or appropriations," these further steps would effect the saving:

1. Congress, with the cooperation of the President, would ask the Budget Bureau to prepare a new budget on a clean-slate basis, with no commitments to any program or group, the total being $10,000,000,000 below the present $71.6 billion.

2. Congress would then consider the revised proposals on a clean-slate basis and would permit no additional expenditures not proposed by the Budget Bureau, unless a corresponding amount were cut from other Budget Bureau proposals.

There should be no exceptions in the suspension of spending "except for direct (not indirect) military expenditures or international aid," said the committee, pointing out that no detail is shown for these two categories in the President's new budget for fiscal 1952. Laws relating to interest on the public debt would be left undisturbed.

The recommendations were contained in a 32-page study made public by Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, who is chairman of the committee. Other members are Fred W. Fairchild, Knox professor emeritus of economics, Yale University; Rowland R. Hughes, comptroller of the National City Bank of New York; Walter A. Cooper, well-known accountant and former chairman of the Committee on Federal Taxation of the American Institute of Accountants; and Thomas N. Tarleau, former tax legislative counsel of the United States Treasury.

"We are recommending this clean-slate approach to Federal spending as a sheer necessity at this time," said Mr. Magill. "Few people seem to realize that some $35,000,000,000 in the proposed budget comes from previous authorizations and commitments, making it virtually impossible for the present Congress to effect needed reductions in these areas. To avoid an intolerable tax burden, Congress must act firmly.

"The drastic demands of the present situation require drastic action. Budget paring is essential. But no one believes that paring will do the whole job. The need is to start with a clean slate, so that only expenditures that can be proved necessary under today's conditions will be authorized. With teamwork between the executive and legislative branches of the Government and the understanding and alert support of the public, this can be done."

The committee said that a clean-slate policy will have the additional advantage of strengthening the appropriations procedure by giving Congress better annual control over expenditures. For some years, it was contended, the appropriations and expenditures have been getting further apart. By June 30, 1952, unspent appropriations under the budget will have accumulated to $81,300,000,000.

Most of the study, entitled "Financing Defense: Can Expenditures Be Reduced?", is devoted to a detailed discussion of nonmilitary Federal expenditures. Instead of the customary functional breakdown of expenditures, the committee rearranged the budget into new groupings: Loans, $2,100,000,000; public works, commodity inventories and equipment, $3,700,000,000; aids and special services for programs of State and local governments and others, $9,600,000,000 (domestic) and $7,000,000,000 (international); and other current operating expenditures, $2,400,000,000.

This total, which the committee designated the reducible areas, comes to $24,800,000,000.

"Not every item in the nondefense area of expenditure can be eliminated," said the study. "However, under present-day conditions and necessities, the burden of proof is not upon the citizen to demonstrate where reduction can be made. Rather, the burden of proof falls on the Government and its departments. Each item should be justified for retention only after a thorough review of its purposes without regard either to any previous approval of its programs or to legislation on the statute books."

The committee's review of reducible areas includes the following recommendations to reach reduction goals:

1. A prompt withdrawal of the Federal Government from the lending field, and a limitation of its future operations to servicing and collecting outstanding loans, with an estimated saving in fiscal 1952 of $1,500,000,000.

2. A deep cut in the public-works program and a suspension of all projects not contributing directly to some essential defense purpose, with a resultant saving in fiscal 1952 of $750,000,000.

3. Drastic curtailment of Federal aid, grants, subsidy, and special services programs, largely by making the States responsible for various services now supported by the Federal Government, with an estimated saving of $3,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952.

4. Immediate application of remaining reforms outlined by the Hoover Commission and a general tightening up of Federal management to eliminate waste, with a saving of $1,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952.

Adding another $2,000,000,000 in savings resulting from sale of loans, mortgages, and commodities, the committee arrived at a nondefense reduction goal of $8,250,000,000. It warned, however, that "the precise amounts in the budget total that can be eliminated by applying standards of prudent judgment will have to be carefully worked out by the Congress, with the aid of the administration and the alert and continuous active support of the public."

With respect to defense expenditures, the committee noted that no attempt was made to determine how much could be saved from the $7,000,000,000 included in the 1952 budget for international aid, or in the $41,000,000,000 listed for the military. It also suggested further savings by more exhaustive inspection of civilian expenditures.

"Giving recognition to the very many additional opportunities for saving, it is conservative to conclude that a reduction of at least $10,000,000,000 is possible, while still leaving intact all the government that a free nation requires."

The committee based its recommendations on the fact that "we must look forward to an extended period, possibly 10 years or more, of tensions abroad and huge budget demands at home."

Pointing out that there is little prospect of a large budget deficit in fiscal 1951, ending June 30, the committee added that there are just three ways to make up the gap of $16,500,000,000 expected between revenues and expenditures for fiscal 1952: reduce expenditures, increase taxes, borrow.

In supporting the principle of pay-as-we-go, the committee explained:

"To increase our present peak tax bill of $55,100,000,000 enough to cover expenditures of $71,600,000,000 is to strain our economy and heavily burden our whole people. To borrow the money to meet such a budget is to fan the flames of inflation. On the other hand, even if budget expenditures are cut substantially, very generous provision will still be made not only for all defense requirements but for essential and reasonable nondefense activities. We can then tax ourselves enough to meet the total bill. * * * Our citizens must tighten their belts. They can fairly require the Government to show similar prudence in spending."

India Wants To Pay for Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of misinformation about the so-called gift of grain to India which is supposed to take care of starving people in that unfortunate land. As a matter of fact the Indian Government did not ask for a gift of wheat for this purpose but it suggested to our Government that it would be willing to pay for any grain that we sold them on a long-term credit basis. Why then should the American taxpayer be asked to foot the bill for this grain when the Indian Government is willing to pay for it? The answer to that question can only be secured from the planners in the State Department and those who advance the threadbare argument that a gift of this grain will stop communism in India.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by that well-known newsman, Mr. Henry Hazlett, who has an article in the current issue of Newsweek entitled "How To Cause a Famine." I commend this article to all Members of this House:

HOW TO CAUSE A FAMINE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

"This program," said President Truman, in asking Congress to give the Indian Government 75,000,000 bushels of grain, "does not constitute a precedent for continuing to provide food to India on a grant basis or for providing similar aid for other countries." But it does, of course, constitute precisely such a precedent. We cannot do less in future for India or any other country without being accused of less generosity or plain discrimination.

Famine and starvation should, of course, always be prevented or relieved when humanly possible. But we must also ask what caused it, whose duty it is to relieve it, and what steps are essential to prevent its recurrence.

It has gradually, precedent by precedent, become the assumption of most foreigners and most American Fair Dealers that when any real or imagined deficiency of anything whatever exists anywhere on earth, it must be made good primarily, if not solely, at the expense of the American taxpayer. Yet even the Indian Government did not ask us for more than a long-term loan to enable it to buy this grain. Given reasonable prudence, it could easily have repaid such a loan. Why did Mr. Truman recommend a gift?

The process will be this. America will give the grain. But the average Indian (nearly 85 percent of the Indian people are illiterate) will probably never know this. For the gift will be to the Nehru government, and the Nehru government will sell the grain to India's hungry. Moreover, the Nehru government will be allowed to keep for statist schemes even the counterpart funds it gets for selling what we give.

Just as Mr. Truman ascribed the Yugoslavian food shortage solely to the drought, so he now ascribes the Indian famine solely to natural disasters—earthquakes, floods, droughts, and plagues of locusts. Yet the famine has at least been intensified, if not principally caused, by the economic policies of the Nehru government.

1. The Nehru government is a planning government, a Socialist government. Like all such governments it has embarked on a grandiose industrialization program. This means that it has diverted land, labor, and capital from agricultural to industrial production. This has directly reduced India's production of food. Mr. Truman apparently approves of this compulsory diversion. For he wants to compel American taxpayers to subsidize it. It is explicitly because he wishes the Nehru government to have funds to continue this long-range economic development program that he thinks American and not Indian taxpayers should be asked to pay for the present Indian food deficiency.

2. Specifically, the Nehru government intensified India's food shortage by its isolationist efforts to become independent of Pakistan (or anywhere else) for cotton and jute. It ordered a reduction in crops-growing acreage to increase cotton and jute acreage.

3. The Nehru government has not permitted free markets in agriculture. It has put price ceilings on grain. These have, as always, discouraged and reduced the production and sale of grain. The government has resorted to forced government procurement of grain from peasant growers. Our Government is asking American taxpayers to suffer from these policies and is not suggesting any change in them. Therefore the food shortage is likely to recur.

The argument that India cannot pay $190,000,000 for grain because it has only limited foreign exchange reserves and an unfavorable balance of payments is economic nonsense. These conditions are the result of the Nehru government's own exchange-control measures. It has made dollars scarce in the same way as it has made foodstuffs scarce—by putting artificial price ceilings on them.

In this grain discussion the whole emphasis has been on distribution. But in the long run nothing can save India or the world from poverty and famine but greater production. And there is willful blindness to the fact that governing planning, price-fixing, and socialism inevitably discourage, reduce, and disrupt production.

The Sampson Exposé As Told by George O'Connor, Newshawk De Luxe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago my good friend, George O'Connor, Binghamton City councilman, reporter, and radio commentator, made some startling revelations in the Binghamton Sun through his daily column, City Desk.

Mr. O'Connor spent several days at Sampson, near Geneva, N. Y., which was used as a training station by the Navy in World War II, and recently has been taken over by the Air Force.

Mr. O'Connor's investigation is an eye-opener, to say the least. I feel sure his disclosures, which follow in part, will be of deep interest to all the countless readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. O'Connor's report on Sampson herewith:

[Station WINR, City Desk Broadcast, February 28, 7 p. m.]

Our operation Sampson started officially as we walked up to the main gate of the sprawling former Naval station.

Blue-clad Air Force guards with guns stood at the gates to stop visitors. It looked as if we might have a tough time getting in without explaining what we were there for—to have a look at what makes the place tick.

We walked into a small building near the gate—a place bearing a sign reading "Security Office."

A sergeant behind the desk looked up, asked what we wanted. We said we would like to go into the base.

"O. K.", he replied cheerfully, "do you want a temporary or a permanent pass." Not one question as to who we were, what we wanted or what we planned to do inside

We said we just wanted to go in and he told us to drive right in. For all the guards knew, we might have had the back end of the car filled with bombs, poison, or both. But we said nothing about the lack of security, and drove inside.

Here was an important military installation, where thousands of Air Force boys are to be trained, and anyone, Russian or anybody else, can drive in and out without asking any questions.

Of course, we're not at war, but there certainly should be a little security where human lives and military installations are concerned.

Inside the base it's hard to believe what you see. The once shipshape buildings are sprawling in disrepair in a sea of dirty, waist-high weeds. The sleeping giant that once was potent, vigorous Sampson, is a down-at-the-heels military wreck. Stark brown buildings, with paint peeled off, are pitted with thousands of broken windows and cracks. Doors creak on sagging hinges, porches sag, and wind whistles through the broken windows and doors. The plumbing that wasn't stolen by looters, is almost useless.

Crews of workers—some making up to $300 a week—are trying to put the place back in shape. But it's a big job. When the Navy left Sampson in 1946, it left in a hurry. Workmen told us of finding molding food in the big electric ovens in the mess halls. The plumbing was split and cracked, and many boilers were flooded because of someone's neglect. Expensive electrical equipment had been ripped from the walls and must be replaced.

From the time the Navy left, Sampson was at the mercy of the looters. They didn't miss much, including just about everything that could be carried away. Squatters lived in the furnished buildings for months after the sailors moved out, and apparently no one paid much attention to poor old Sampson.

Sampson was built in 1942, at a cost of $52,000,000. The rebuilding job may run almost that much. The first contractor got the contract on a bid of $2,677,731, but that was only the beginning. Last Friday, when the contract was terminated, the contractor said he had spent almost $5,000,000.

Now there's a new contract. This one calls for repair work to the tune of about $18,000,000, and new construction amounting to $12,000,000. This is going to be a cost-plus proposition. Meanwhile, the Air Force is going ahead with its job of training recruits—and doing a good job despite the big handicaps at the rundown base.

We'll tell you more about that tomorrow.

[Station WINR, City Deck broadcast, March 1, 7 p. m.]

For the last couple of days we have talked about the run-down, dilapidated physical plant at Sampson, or what was left of it when the Air Force moved in to set up shop.

Then the contractor took over and started putting the place back together.

This was a tremendous handicap to the Air Force, which had to wait, before occupying buildings, until repairs had been made by the civilian workers.

As of last week, there were 4,700 trainees on the base, occupying only a small part of the rambling installation.

Two mess halls had been repaired to the point where they were usable, and enough barracks were fixed up for the airmen to move in and clean up.

The Air Force cut off the flow of recruits into Sampson on February 16, because of shortages of uniforms and equipment.

New recruits will start arriving at the rate of about 80 a day beginning on March 6.

As it is, the Air Force is operating under tremendous handicaps—handicaps that might not exist if the base had not been permitted to fall apart at the seams through sheer waste and neglect.

Much of the millions of dollars in repair work now in progress could have been avoided, if just a small working force had stayed on the base after the Navy left in 1946, to keep the place in shape.

Unfortunately, that's now water over the dam, and the blame will probably never be placed where it belongs.

Uncle Sucker, or rather the millions of taxpayers, are paying and will be paying in withholding taxes, for a colossal case of neglect and short-sightedness.

When the first batches of trainees arrived, there was a shortage of mattresses.

The Air Force had to use mattress covers stuffed with pillows and blankets so some of the youngsters would have a comfortable place to sleep.

Now, despite the confusion at the base, the Air Force is doing its best—and doing a pretty commendable job—of running a training operation.

We had lunch in one of the mess halls—only the Air Force doesn't refer to mess—but as breakfast, luncheon, and dinner.

We went through the line with the base public information officer, Bob Merritt, who is doing a good job of trying to keep the public and the parents of the trainees informed as to what's going on.

Luncheon consisted of some vegetable soup, hot dogs and sauerkraut, a slab of American cheese, some plums—which we skipped, bread and butter, and coffee, plus a green salad.

It was good, nourishing chow, not perhaps served in Waldorf Astoria style, but nevertheless pretty solid stuff for hungry airmen.

Most of the equipment in the mess halls is brand new, installed for the Air Force. Just what happened to the Navy stuff, no one seemed to know quite clearly.

At this point, there isn't much the Air Force can do in the way of furnishing leisure-time recreation for the trainees.

There were bowling alleys in the ship store buildings, but some of them have disappeared. We tried to find out where they went but no one seemed to know.

They're working on the theater buildings and drill halls, which also have swimming pools, to get them in shape for use—but it will be a long time before they're back in class-A shape.

By spring, perhaps the base will start functioning the way it should.

But it's going to cost John Q. Taxpayer a barrel of dough.

The contractors' men—plumbers, electricians, steamfitters, etc.—draw big money especially when they work overtime. We saw check stubs that ran up to $300 a week's work.

But the place wasn't usable the way the Air Force found it, and there was nothing else to do but start spending.

The base cost $52,000,000 to build back in 1942.

And before it's back in shape, with repair work and new construction, the bill might well run almost as much as it cost to build the base in the first place.

It's been a pretty sad and expensive lesson and the taxpayers are learning it the hard way.

But maybe it will smarten up the people who let the place go to the dogs after World War II.

Perhaps next time—if there is a next time—someone will figure out that it's worth spending a little money to protect a $52,000,000 investment—on the long chance that the place might be needed again.

Restore the Constitutional Powers of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a radio speech delivered by my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], over radio station WOL on Sunday, March 4. Mr. HAND clearly states the position of the great weight of authority of those who believe that the President has the right to dispatch military forces abroad only with the consent of Congress. I am including his speech at this point in the RECORD. It is a remarkably clear statement and I commend it to all Members:

RESTORE THE CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF CONGRESS

(By Hon. T. MILLET HAND)

A few weeks ago a respected newspaper of this city said, in part:

"There can be little doubt that the Constitution invests in the President the right, the duty, the authority, and the power to order, without prior consent of Congress, the dispatch of American military forces to foreign areas when and if he finds that such action is necessary to safeguard the interests and security of the United States. This principle—a principle put into action by several of our past Chief Executives—is so deeply rooted in our history and system of government that it now seems to be far beyond the reach of any effective legal challenge."

This is a clear expression of the administration's view. I flatly challenge it. I challenge the dangerous theory that by the device of labeling a war as a "police action," one may decree that we engage in battle with the North Koreans, with the Chinese, in Indochina, Iran, Tibet; in fact with anyone anywhere, if he and he alone sees fit. So holding is to ignore not only the plain words of the Constitution, but the essential meaning of our representative form of government.

The Commander in Chief has the power to direct the movement of the Armed Forces, but only after the war-making powers of Congress has been exercised. "He has no more power to make war, than one of his inferior officers," says General Eisenhower.

Article 1, section 8, dealing with legislative powers, provides, in part, that "Congress shall have the power—to declare war—to make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies—to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

I have referred to these powers in detail to indicate the painstaking care used by the Constitutional Convention to make sure that the high responsibility of raising and regulating the use of armies was exclusively vested in the Congress, hence, by representation, in the people.

In addition, Congress has complete control of our money, without which no troops can be sent anywhere.

In contradistinction to those broad and detailed powers, article II, section 2, briefly provides that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States; * * *"

This is the only reference to such powers. Can we infer from this a power to start and maintain a major war, as in Asia?

Those who support the President's powers rather glibly refer to a large number of precedents and Supreme Court opinions. They don't bear careful analysis. It is of course true that from 1798 on, marines and limited forces have been dispatched to protect American lives or property, usually as a result of a civil war or internal disturbance which could not be controlled by the local government. Such temporary emergencies are hardly to be compared with a permanent policy of occupying Europe with large numbers, for long years; or with fighting in Korea the fourth worst war in our history, with 250,000 troops, 50,000 casualties, and 15,000 monthly replacements, a war in its ninth month, now involving us with the most numerous nation on earth; a tragic war in which the end is not in sight.

While I am satisfied, as a lawyer, that the President is without constitutional right to fight all over Asia, or to occupy Europe, without congressional sanction, it is even more important that he should not attempt to involve the Nation in such vast projects without an assurance of the Nation's will, and the backing of its representatives. Obviously he must come to Congress to implement his actions. How much wiser to obtain their approval in advance.

You don't avoid war by omitting a formal declaration of war. We are presently engaged in a major war which may suddenly or by degrees become a world war. To suggest that such a course may be pursued without action by Congress is to reduce its authority, and hence the authority of the people, to a debating society, with some limited function of approving the appropriation of money demanded by the President. To so limit the Congress and exalt the Presidency, is, of course, to abandon democracy and surrender to a dictatorship.

On January 15, Senator TAFT said:

"The basic liberties of the people * * * are imperiled unless we can retain in Congress the right to pass on policies affecting [their] very life and being. * * *"

I agree. I am not prepared to surrender in whole or in part the power of the people exercised by their elective representatives.

Neither am I prepared to deliver the fate of this country solely into the hands of President Truman.

Are you?

Why All Three Services Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview with Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, appearing in the February 23, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report:

WHY ALL THREE SERVICES ARE NEEDED

Question. Admiral Sherman, do you think you can draw a line of demarcation today between sea power and land power and air power, and treat them as three separate, autonomous factors in war?

Answer. I don't see how you can draw any sharp line between sea power and air power. I have spent nearly 30 years working in both at the same time. I don't see how you can separate what you might call land power from air power. Certainly one gets nowhere without the other. I don't see how you can separate land power from sea power unless you're going to defend yourself on your own continent. I think we have to talk about the military power of the United States, and get away from being too compartmented.

Naval strategy, in its broader sense, has always involved the use of troops as well as ships, military positions on shore as well as fleets deployed at sea, and the coordination of naval action with military and political action as well. It seems to me that the time has come to talk in terms of national strategy involving all elements of our national strength, rather than in terms of power in only one or two elements.

Question. When you speak of air power being tied in to land power, do you mean in the support that bases and overseas stations have to give to land power?

Answer. I think it has been demonstrated that an army in the field cannot achieve the best results unless it is aided and supported by air. Certainly air cannot be maintained without antiaircraft artillery to defend its bases, without ground troops to defend its bases, or, if the air power is overseas, without sea power to project the air bases overseas and sustain them there.

Question. Isn't the impression that air power can act independently based upon the belief that there are bombers now that can fly from our continent to another continent and back?

Answer. If you try to survive with nothing but the resources of North America against the combined resources of the rest of the world—that's what you would be coming to if you go to the thesis of nothing but intercontinental air warfare—I believe that in the long term you would be doomed to defeat.

Question. Suppose you had sea and air combined—that seems to be the new conception——

Answer. I doubt that we can sustain the allies that we must have, unless we are prepared to exert a balanced effort. I refer, of course, to collective balance. To the degree that your allies can contribute locally any of the components in the required over-all military effort, we can concentrate on the other components, but in the long run, if we are going to have allies and other nations friendly to us, those nations will have to be defended by the combined efforts of regional organizations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Inter-American Defense Organization, and their defense will have to be accomplished by the required combination of military effort in all three spheres.

Question. We would have to supply troops as well as airplanes and pilots?

Answer. Each situation will have its own requirements.

Question. Should our air power be possibly considered in two phases—the initial phase of a war, where the long-range intercontinental bombers inflict immediate reprisals, and then the second phase, which would be conducted from shorter ranges and overseas bases—is that part of the general concept?

Answer. Well, viewing the world's strategic situation broadly, it would seem to me that our national security must involve several concepts. Being surrounded by great oceans we must control those oceans, make sure that we can use the sea and make sure that war cannot be brought to us by sea. Then certainly we must have an adequate air defense of the United States and we should have the capability of prompt and severe retaliation by air in case of attack. But ability only to retaliate is not enough. If we concede that we need the support of allies with whom we have entered into a regional pact and to whom we have made commitments, then it seems clear that we must stand ready to assist them in a way which gives them a chance of survival. Pounding an aggressor at long range cannot be the whole answer.

Question. There is some talk now of our being strong at home and probably maintaining Britain, Spain, and north Africa, and forgetting Europe. Would that concept—that is, drawing back from Europe presumably because we couldn't defend it anyway—be logical from the point of view of sea power?

Answer. I think the British have long believed that the survival of the United Kingdom required that no unfriendly nation be on the opposite shore of the English Channel.

UNITED STATES INTEREST IN WESTERN EUROPE

Question. Haven't we as a Nation always felt the same way about Western Europe, too? That is, that we shouldn't have an unfriendly power controlling all of Europe opposite us?

Answer. We should remember the days of 1940 when the total strength of the Axis navies was greater than the strength of our Navy, and the total ability of the shipyards of Western Europe to produce ships was greater than the ability of our shipyards to produce ships, and we felt that if all of Western Europe were overrun, and if the British Fleet were removed from the balance of power we would then be on the weaker side, even in terms of sea power alone, and the Axis powers with control of all Western Europe in time might outbuild us, and achieve control of the Atlantic.

Question. But isn't one theory now that air power could keep their factories reduced over there so that they couldn't use them to build up their armament?

Answer. The difficulty with that theory is that the distance is the same westbound as it is eastbound.

Question. You mean they have planes, too, and they could hurt our industry as well as we could hurt them?

Answer. It seems to me that the security of the United States lies in keeping war as far as possible from home.

Question. Does that require occupation of territory or having friendly armies to keep back potential enemies?

Answer. It certainly requires the ability to project our military power overseas into the areas that are selected by us, and in the form that is required by the particular situation.

Question. Well, in Europe, would that include land troops?

Answer. At the present time purely military reasons require that it include a certain proportion of troops. Psychological reasons also require that it include troops.

NEED FOR SUPPORT OF ALLIES

Question. So that we probably wouldn't be wise to depend upon just our Navy and Air Force?

Answer. We might depend on the Navy and Air Force in the short term, but in the long term our security requires the maintenance

of a free world, which includes countries on the other side of the Atlantic.

Question. Do we need allies?

Answer. I believe so. And if we want them we must prepare to support them resolutely.

Question. And we need an army, then—a big one?

Answer. Yes; of course we need an army—a much larger peacetime army than we have maintained in recent years.

Question. In other words, we couldn't get along with air power and sea power alone?

Answer. We need a balanced force, with the proper proportion of air, sea and ground elements.

Question. As a matter of fact, in the pursuit of your enemy in modern warfare, can you actually achieve success with any two components, or would it require all three?

Answer. It is very dangerous to rely on an unbalanced force. Curiously enough, when you have an unbalanced force, it's usually the soldier who gets hurt. During my service command in the Mediterranean recently I made a very thorough study of the Battle of Crete, in which the Germans had an army, and an air force, but no significant naval force, while the British had ground troops and a fleet but practically no air. The net result was that the German soldiers were slaughtered in great numbers by the British ships as they attempted to cross from Greece to Crete. On the British side, the British soldiers received heavy casualties because of a lack of air cover. The lesson seems to be that, when you have unbalance, the doughboy is more apt to be hurt than anyone else.

Question. But, from the point of view of winning victory, there is no way, realistically, whereby an air force can occupy a country or a navy can occupy a country, is there? Haven't you got to have sufficient troops to occupy and to defeat the enemy on the ground?

Answer. I think that our own history will prove that. You will recall that after the battle of Manila Bay our Asiatic Fleet had to remain at anchor and wait for an army to arrive before operations could be initiated.

Question. And then in World War II in the Pacific, you had to have troops to take these islands, didn't you?

Answer. In the Pacific war we found that every operation called for a combination of land, sea and air forces to achieve victory.

Question. You were Chief of Staff to Admiral Nimitz during what period?

Answer. I was Admiral Nimitz' Deputy Chief of Staff from November 1943 until the war was finished.

Question. So that you were in on the planning?

Answer. Under Admiral Nimitz I was responsible for the planning of the Central Pacific campaign.

Question. That included all the island campaigns and the later campaign in Okinawa, and you would have been a part of the planning of the invasion of Japan if that had been consummated?

Answer. I worked very hard on the plans for the invasion of Japan.

Question. Did you contemplate in that invasion that we could do it with sea and air power alone?

Answer. No.

Question. Has it ever been recorded how big an army we thought we might need for that invasion, roughly?

Answer. It involved all the troops that General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz had been using, plus a redeployment of troops from the European theater.

Question. Approximately how many ground troops do you think that would have involved?

Answer. Over a million.

DID THE ATOM BOMB DEFEAT JAPAN?

Question. Would you say that the atom bomb dropped from the air won the final victory, or would you say that a serious weakening of Japan was accomplished by sea, land, and air, preceding that?

Answer. I think that the end of the Japanese war was brought about by the destruction of the Japanese fleet, destruction of sea communications—in which our submarines figured very importantly and also our air—the complete isolation of Japan so far as sea communications went, the damage that was done to Japan by air, and the threat of an invasion. After the fall of Saipan and the fall of Okinawa, it was certainly obvious that the tide of war was headed for the main Japanese islands.

Question. In other words, here was an island empire with lots of islands and you conquered the islands with ground troops, and forced them into a corner in their own homeland, and then sea power blockaded and starved them?

Answer. They were cut off by sea power—or rather by the action of ships and aircraft—aircraft figured very importantly in the destruction of Japanese shipping.

Question. Applying the same reasoning to Europe, we had there not an island enemy but an enemy with a large land mass like Germany, and we had to land and use, in the Normandy invasion, large numbers of ground troops, plus air, plus the sea blockades. That was the pattern of the last war. Now bearing in mind that pattern, would you say the situation has changed, in any particular, so far as Europe is concerned?

Answer. Well, it has changed in detail, but not in principle. In principle you still require the combination of land and sea and air action.

WHAT NAVY COULD DO TO EUROPE

Question. But an enemy which controls the whole land mass of Europe couldn't very well be blockaded as Japan was blockaded, could it?

Answer. Not if one power controlled the whole Eurasian land mass, no. On the other hand, there are certain coastal communications that are quite vulnerable to action from the sea.

Question. Even in the case of the largest power?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is the Mediterranean an important defense perimeter, from the Russian standpoint—is it a vulnerable point for them?

Answer. Russia is not in the Mediterranean now. The importance of the Mediterranean is that it is an avenue by which naval, air, and ground forces can be projected deep into the heart of the great land mass of Europe, Asia, and Africa. It is important because it offers a means of exerting our military power readily in any of the Mediterranean countries where we choose to exert it. It is also important as an essential line of east-west communications with the Middle East and because it covers the southern flank of the European peninsula.

Question. Isn't it being assumed pretty generally that the need for land armies has only to do with the march across the main continent, from Russia across to France? Wouldn't land armies also be able to deploy or operate from the Mediterranean countries?

Answer. The importance of being a very strong sea and air power is that we can take relatively small numbers of troops and we can deploy them in areas of our own choosing, where, in their relatively smaller numbers, they can be most effective. The selection of such area calls for a great deal of judgment. I think if you examine the history of the wars between France and England you will find that England as a sea power used at will small numbers of troops very effectively in many areas where they could be moved, landed and supported by sea, even though in the continent there was an overwhelmingly strong land power. The introduction of air has complicated the problem, but it hasn't changed the underlying principles.

Q. You spoke a moment ago of using the Mediterranean to project air, land, and sea power into two continents. Does that mean long-range Navy bombing?

Answer. No. I had in mind that because it is a sea area, you can move troops, including ground components of the air forces—these can be moved to the Mediterranean littoral, as well as to the Atlantic coast of Europe.

Question. Isn't there a good deal more emphasis being given today to the possibility of land operations being confined to the area of Germany and France with much less thought being given to the possibility of land operations coming up through what is called the underbelly of Europe?

Answer. I think that the possibility of fighting in Central Europe is more apparent. The history of these matters is that wars tend to spread and become global in character. I think it would be a mistake to assume that a war which started in one area would end in the same area. The Seven Years' War of the eighteenth century, for example, started between the British and French in the vicinity of what is now Pittsburgh. It spread to Canada and the West Indies and then pretty well around the world. There was fighting in Europe, on the West Coast of Africa, in India, and in the Philippines.

Question. In any planning of military operations for the security of this country and its allies, would you say that we've got to be thinking flexibly in terms of land armies as an essential part of our operations—is that the sum-up of your view?

Answer. Yes. The security of the United States requires that we have a good army and that our forces be so proportioned that we can operate a balanced force wherever it is required.

Question. By balanced force you mean a combined force, do you not?

Answer. I mean a force of all arms.

REGIONAL DEFENSE OF NORTH ATLANTIC

Question. Is it better to have a force in Europe while you hold Europe, or while you have friendly nations there, or to let Europe be overrun and then try to retake the area later?

Answer. It would be much better to defend Western Europe than to let it go and to have to recapture it—better for us and exceedingly much better for Western Europe.

Question. Well, from a strictly military point of view, given the defense of Europe and given the defense of the United States, is it your view that the two things are interrelated?

Answer. I think that they can definitely be combined into a problem called the defense of the North Atlantic region.

Question. And all our thinking is in terms of the North Atlantic region, up to now at least, rather than just the defense of the United States?

Answer. Certainly we have devoted a good deal of thought to the defense of the North Atlantic region because of a doubt that we could make the United States secure without making the whole region secure. Of course, we have a similar problem in the Pacific, but less acute, because of greater distances.

Question. Speaking of attack on the United States from other countries, would you say that the territory of the United States is definitely subject to attack by air and by sea by planes and guided missiles from submarines?

Answer. In theory, yes. But in practice there is the question of scale of attack.

Question. But definitely the military man conceives of the United States as being subject to attack by air—there is no question about that, is there?

Answer. The possibility of an attack on the United States by air is great enough now to necessitate the creation of an adequate air defense, and the prospect is that the exposure of the United States to air attack will increase as the performance of airplanes increases.

Question. So that while there is no threat to us from an army coming 3,000 miles, airplanes can easily come 3,000 miles; is that the essential difference between this and the situation we faced in World War II?

Answer. Yes.

DIFFICULTIES WITH ENEMY BASES

Question. If that's the case, is there any defense concept better than trying to get at the operating bases from which the enemy planes come?

Answer. Certainly we should keep those bases as far away from us as possible. Similarly, we should keep submarine bases as far away as possible. The most difficult times we had with submarines in the Atlantic in World War II were in the period when there were enemy submarines in the Bay of Biscay on the Atlantic coast of France. It is very necessary to keep enemy air bases and submarine bases as far away as possible.

In that connection, the air-defense problem, and the antisubmarine problem have certain points of similarity. The worst place to protect a ship is where the ship is. The worst place to protect a convoy is at the convoy. The worst place to protect a city from air attack is at the city. The best place is at the bases from which the airplane or submarine comes. The next best place is en route—the worst place is at the target.

Question. To get at those bases you've got to capture them or intercept at the bases?

Answer. We should prevent our enemies from getting bases nearer to us.

Question. In getting at the enemy's bases, then, you have to use sea power, air power, and possibly land power?

Answer. To accomplish the desired result calls for a combination of all three elements.

Question. In the Korean War, we use all three, but for a brief time there was an impression that we could use two, and the first few days we did use sea and air and then supplemented our action with land troops. Now, why was it not possible for sea and air to win the Korean War alone?

Answer. Air attack and naval gunfire alone will not drive determined soldiers out of an area. When they're properly dug in and properly dispersed, they can stay and fight. Certainly that was our experience in the Pacific war, where we poured into small islands terrific quantities of naval gunfire and terrific quantities of preliminary bombing, and yet when the assault troops hit the beach they always found important fighting to do.

All the way across the Pacific we demonstrated that naval gunfire and bombing and strafing can do great damage to troops that are dug in on shore, but still not destroy them completely.

ENOUGH TROOPS TO DO THE JOB

Question. I think in the popular argument it is agreed that there should be land fighting, but the argument rather turns on whether we as a nation can minimize participation in land fighting abroad. The argument is that Great Britain, with control of the seas and a few soldiers, dominated much of the world for a long time. An analogy is drawn that we can do the same. Is there a difference between our position and that of Britain?

Answer. No; I don't think there is, in principle. For instance, in the Napoleonic wars the British carried on a rather protracted campaign in Spain.

Question. Did they use many troops?

Answer. Yes.

Question. The theory is that Britain got along without a large army, and that we therefore can get along without a large army——

Answer. But Wellington had a large army under his command in the Battle of Waterloo.

Question. They weren't all English——

Answer. There were enough British troops at Waterloo both to inspire their allies to fight and to take their own part.

GROWING IMPORTANCE OF CARRIERS

Question. Is there any shift in emphasis in the Navy itself, for instance, away from battleships and toward carriers, as a result of the way things are going now?

Answer. I can answer that best with some statistics as to where we were in 1940 and where we are now. In 1940 we had in commission 15 battleships and 6 carriers of various size. The program we are now engaged in calls for building up to 27 carriers of various sizes and only 3 battleships.

Question. We are pulling battleships out of moth balls, apparently. Is there still a place for them in the fleet?

Answer. Yes; but they are used for rather specialized purposes now. It is now pretty generally accepted that the aircraft carrier is the ship of the line and the core of naval offensive power, which is the place that was held by the battleship in World War I but which passed to the aircraft carrier during World War II.

Question. General Collins has spoken several times about the possibility of developing atomic artillery. Is there any prospect that the Navy could use atomic artillery—turn the 16-inch guns into guns that will shoot atom shells?

Answer. There are very definite prospects of the Navy using atomic weapons for naval purposes.

Question. Are you speaking of missiles or conventional weapons?

Answer. Missiles.

Question. The Navy has planes now big enough to carry atomic bombs—the old-style atomic bombs—and it also has carriers that could handle those planes, doesn't it? So that in the event of war, the Navy as well as the Air Force would be able to deliver the atomic bombs within a certain range?

Answer. We will be able to deliver atomic bombs, if required to.

Question. So atomic energy is now diffused in all three services, in the use of weapons?

Answer. It definitely has become possible to develop tactical applications of atomic weapons. I think that in the future you will find all the services prepared to use those applications.

HOW NAVY WOULD USE A-WEAPONS

Question. What would tactical application be so far as the Navy is concerned?

Answer. Destruction of a submarine base might be an example.

Question. You could cover the landing of troops, too, tactically?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you could use the power of the atom to run submarines or ships, couldn't you?

Answer. We're making good progress in that direction.

Question. It's pretty generally recognized that Russia since the war has been concentrating her naval effort in the development of a large fleet of submarines. What would you say about the progress that we have made with antisubmarine measures?

Answer. We have made great progress in our development of countermeasures against submarines; the equipment that we use, the weapons we use, are much better than they were. New equipment has been developed which we are putting into our destroyers. On the whole, our ability to cope with submarines is improving. On the other hand, there is always the other side of the shield, which is the rate at which the capabilities of the submarines develop.

Question. Are there new methods that have been developed, or is it a matter of getting the teamwork?

Answer. We've developed new equipment over the past 5 years. Also we have learned to use it.

Question. Last year, wasn't the whole fleet "sunk" in maneuvers by theoretical submarines in spite of the best equipment developed?

Answer. No. However, if a submariner didn't believe that submarines were capable of sinking a whole enemy fleet, he would not be as enthusiastic as he should be. On the other hand, if the people who operate the surface ships don't feel that they can accomplish their mission in spite of submarines, they're not as enthusiastic as they should be. It is a mistake to accept zeal and enthusiasm as completely factual.

PROGRESS IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Question. What would you say about the progress we're making in all three services in the field of invention in military science?

Answer. I think we've made great strides. We've had a quite well coordinated program. We have converted some of our development projects into hardware and into useful supplies of weapons, and others are still in the development stage. I consider that the money we have invested in research and development has been well spent, and we're better equipped as a result of it.

Question. Are we too gadget minded?

Answer. I think not. As far as I know, the responsible senior officers in the services are thoroughly aware of the ultimate importance of personnel, that gadgets do not replace personnel. I've recently been asked a great many times how long it takes to take a carrier out of "moth balls" and get it operating. The real answer to that is the length of time it takes to assemble the crew and to train the crew to operate the ship. Personnel is the governing consideration in making divisions and armies, in making ships and fleets, and also in making air squadrons.

Question. During World War I, when the country was frightened by the submarine menace, scientists and inventors went to work to try to find something to detect the submarine—detection was the great objective. Is it possible to describe some of the objectives today—is science seeking a way to intercept the plane that is coming to attack us?

Answer. The development both against aircraft and against submarines falls into two fields. One is the location and the other is the destruction.

IMPROVING THE PROXIMITY FUZE

Question. The proximity fuse, which was used widely in World War II, has often been discussed as one of the inventions that revolutionized World War II's operations. Would you say that the proximity fuse still has great value?

Answer. It's an essential device.

Question. Can it be said that it has been developed for greater usage—that there have been improvements made in it?

Answer. It has been improved.

Question. Do you think that guided-missile ships may replace the aircraft carrier as the main "ship of the line" within the next 5 or 10 years?

Answer. Probably not within the next 5 or 10 years. It may eventually, but that's getting pretty far into the realm of speculation. I think that the use of guided missiles in naval warfare will increase steadily.

Question. Can you visualize the type of warfare in which a guided missile could be useful if we had war, say, in the immediate future? What part would the guided missile play in the general strategy—helping to interdict, helping to reduce bases?

Answer. Guided missiles, of course, fall into a great many categories—for example, air defense missiles, missiles to be used from

one airplane against another, and longer-range missiles which in effect are long-range artillery. The time may come when long-range missiles of considerable size will begin to replace bombers.

Question. Is it possible that guided missiles are so far along in their development that the Navy will be unable to operate within a range of, say, 100 to 150 miles of enemy land bases on account of guided missiles—can they be made that accurate within the next few years?

Answer. No.

Question. Are they active enough to be a menace to navies—those missiles in the hands of the enemy?

Answer. Well, guided missiles are just another type of weapon that we will have to resist. The more they develop the more of a problem they will be, but I do not think they will be a controlling weapon at any time in the near future, insofar as the operations of ships are concerned.

TACTICAL ANSWERS TO ATOM BOMB

Question. How vulnerable would the fleet be to an atom-bomb attack in an amphibious landing such as the Normandy landing in the last war?

Answer. The enemy's possession of atomic weapons forces the necessity for a greater degree of dispersal.

Question. Would that dispersion have to be of such an extent that it might jeopardize the success of landings?

Answer. I think not. The tactics of amphibious operations have usually been able to respond to the character of the weapons that confronted them. I think that will continue. It is inevitable that tactics will conform to the situation and take into account the weapons that the enemy has.

Question. Won't it be necessary, if the enemy possesses guided-missile bases, to capture those bases by a combination of sea power, air power, and land power—to get at them if guided-missile bases are very extensive?

Answer. We had an example of that in World War II, when the existence of bases for V-1s and V-2s had a pronounced influence on the requirements for land operations on the Continent.

Question. In other words, air power was not able to reduce those, apparently?

Answer. It accomplished a lot but couldn't deliver 100-percent results. To get 100-percent results on the ground usually requires action on the ground.

Question. How soon will we get the big new carrier?

Answer. I would estimate that as a 3½-year job.

Question. In the meantime we will be dependent on World War II carriers, largely, won't we?

Answer. We will be dependent on World War II carriers, so the program of modernizing the World War II carriers is of primary importance.

Question. For this new carrier, can the keel of the United States be used?

Answer. Nothing from the United States is useful in the new carrier, except certain design features.

Question. Would you say that, in the interval that has elapsed, you have learned some new things that will make this a better carrier than the other would have been?

Answer. I think so.

Question. Has the idea of a flush deck been abandoned?

Answer. There is a great difference of opinion in the Navy about the desirability of a small island versus the desirability of a flush deck.

Question. Now that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have carried on in the postwar period for at least 5 years, can you say that the coordination or the joint planning has undergone great changes from what it was in World War II?

Answer. Yes, I think since World War II the work of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff has improved greatly. There are more and more officers who understand the problems of all the armed services. At the top level I think there is a greater understanding of the problems of the other services. I can assure you that even during the short period of time that I've been here there has been a steady improvement in the functioning of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff.

HOW JOINT COMMAND WORKS

Question. Would you say the Joint Chiefs of Staff function now to some extent as an operating agency?

Answer. The Joint Chiefs of Staff were never an operating agency in the accepted sense of the term. Our duties are laid down by law and have to do with military advice to the President and the National Security Council, with strategic direction of operating forces, preparation of plans, and the allocation of forces to the various field commanders.

Question. So that the joint operations today are theater-of-command operations, and the Joint Chiefs are concerned with strategic planning rather than operations?

Answer. Strategic planning and strategic direction.

Question. So that in the far eastern theater there exists at the moment the only joint operations we have?

Answer. The only joint operations in combat—but of course we have a series of unified commands. Admiral Radford has a very important one in the Pacific Command which, among other duties, has to support the Far East Command. We have a unified command in Germany, one in the Atlantic, a unified command in the Canal Zone, a unified command in Alaska, and several other unified commands under the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Question. And the designated commander, whether he be an admiral or general, is the representative of the Joint Chiefs?

Answer. He exercises command under the Joint Chiefs of Staff and commands elements of all three services.

Question. Is it regarded as important that Formosa be kept out of the hands of unfriendly nations?

Answer. I consider it important.

DEFENSE LINE IN FAR EAST

Question. Would you say that the defense line of this country extends to far-eastern waters, so far as the security of the United States is concerned?

Answer. I think the security of the United States requires that we be able to control the Pacific and prevent any action in the Pacific, by any unfriendly power, which would impair our security.

Question. Particularly from overseas territories that might be occupied by an enemy? In other words, the absence of an enemy fleet in the Pacific doesn't diminish your task, does it?

Answer. The Pacific Fleet has been kept pretty busy right in the Far East even though there has been very little hostile naval action.

Question. What about the impression that the Navy wouldn't have been able to accomplish the landings at Inchon or the operations on the east coast of Korea had there been present a hostile air force or a hostile navy?

Answer. We would have accomplished them, but with more difficulty than we actually experienced.

Question. Do you make that statement on the basis of any particular incident in World War II, where we had the hostile navy and the hostile air force present?

Answer. We had a hostile navy and hostile air forces all the way.

Question. At Okinawa?

Answer. At Okinawa, at Iwo Jima, in the Philippines, we had them both.

Question. But you don't consider that the presence of a hostile air force or a hostile navy necessarily prevents us from landing troops and carrying on land, sea, and air combination operations?

Answer. It makes it more difficult, but it certainly doesn't make it impossible.

Question. At what distance inland would you say that the Navy's operations have made land operations hazardous for the enemy in Korea?

Answer. All the way across the country. We've been bombing west coast ports from carriers in the Sea of Japan and we've bombed the east coast ports from carriers in the Yellow Sea.

Question. Well, I meant for land operations along the seacoast—how about bombardment of coastal points?

Answer. Well, right up to the limit of naval gunfire.

Question. You can protect and destroy coastal communications at least 15 miles inland and the carriers can destroy communications farther inland?

Answer. Yes, carrier aircraft have ranged all the way across Korea.

Question. But your naval gunfire has made it difficult for the enemy to keep the troops on the coasts of Korea and forced the fighting into the center?

Answer. It covers the whole coast.

Question. You've never had any question about blockading the northern area of Korea?

Answer. We blockaded it in June and it's been under blockade continuously.

Question. How far up do you go?

Answer. The whole coast is under blockade.

Question. Up to the Yalu River?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is there any Russian navy around Korean waters?

Answer. The blockade is a United Nations operation but there are no Russians participating in it.

Question. Is it possible that a lot of the recent gossip about the Army's not doing well in Korea might have been based on initial operations with raw troops?

Answer. At the beginning of the fighting in Korea we had occupation divisions at half strength and had to send them into action. They're still in there. They're still fighting and they seem to be doing pretty well. Their morale and conduct and training and discipline have improved steadily.

I believe that, when adequately trained, our soldiers are superior to any soldiers anywhere. However, they cannot be made ready without training. The United States Army is entitled to the full support and full confidence of the country for which it fights. The morale of an army normally reflects the morale of the country.

OPTIMISM OVER KOREA

Question. How do you feel about the long-range view of the Korean operations—in a tactical or a strategic sense?

Answer. Our Army is giving a good account of itself and will continue to give a better account of itself, and I think the Chinese are being punished terribly. Whatever the next move the Chinese make, I think it will be the result of their feeling that this is a bad show, that they've got to do something different, do something to change the unhappy situation they find themselves in.

Question. Has the napalm bomb been a very important factor in our advance, recently?

Answer. It's been a very effective weapon in Korea.

Question. Does the Navy use it, too, or only the Army Air Force?

Answer. The Navy and Marine Corps used it very extensively in World War II, and more recently in Korea.

Question. With respect to Korea, would you say as a military man that Korea is of vital importance to Russia and Communist China, the Communist world—that it is important to them strategically to hold Korea?

Answer. I don't think that Korea in the hands of only the Koreans is very much of a threat to the Russians or the Chinese. I don't think Korea in the hands of only the Koreans would be much of a threat against Japan or against ourselves.

Question. But, conversely, the possession and occupation of Korea by a power unfriendly to us would be a menace to us?

Answer. Occupation of Korea by forces unfriendly to Japan would be a menace to Japan or to anyone charged with the defense of Japan.

EFFECTIVENESS OF BLOCKADE

Question. Hase there been any naval interdiction of enemy supply lines to Korea?

Answer. A naval blockade of Korea was established in June. It has been almost completely effective and has been respected not only by the nations who have been fighting in Korea, but also by the Russians. It's a United Nations blockade, and as far as I know it has been respected by all the members of the United Nations.

Question, Admiral, we have talked about land forces, air forces, and sea forces. There is one force often described as a mobile force. Do you see in the future picture of our strategy a more important place for such a mobile force—the Marine Corps—than it has had before?

Answer. It is pretty generally believed that the Marines are an indispensable part of the naval service. I certainly believe, in connection with my own responsibilities, that we must have a strong fleet marine force in each fleet. It must include not only its ground elements but also its own air elements. I think the effectiveness of such force has been demonstrated once more in Korea, as it has many times before in the existence of the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps is a necessary part of the naval service.

Question. The President has said we have now in the armed services about 2,500,000 men, and the goal is 3,500,000. What is the Navy's share in that figure?

Answer. The present program involves something over 800,000 officers and men in the Navy and around 200,000 officers and men in the Marine Corps.

Question. Can you tell us, Admiral, very briefly, what the Navy's Reserve policy is now?

Answer. Our program is to call only those we need and to try to let them know well in advance when they are to be called up. However, our program is only as good as the assumption on which it is based. It is based on carrying out the planned program of expansion and not having an increased emergency during that time.

Voluntary Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the Pasadena Property Owners Committee, a nonprofit California corporation, is endeavoring to create a plan of selfcontrol of rents through the cooperation of business and civic groups, tenants, and property owners. The following I present for the RECORD: a letter addressed to me by Robert H. Aarons, general counsel; a typical letter soliciting the cooperation of a chamber of commerce; and also a letter addressed by the president of the Property Owners Committee to the President of the United States. In this connection I present also the following newspaper items referring to this subject.

PASADENA PROPERTY
OWNERS COMMITTEE,
Pasadena, Calif, January 29, 1951.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
Twentieth District, California,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. HINSHAW: On January 4, 1951, a copy of letter addressed to the President of the United States, together with copies of news items appearing in the Los Angeles, Pasadena, and surrounding areas press, were sent you. There was also copies of the enclosures sent to Allen Valentine, economics stabilizer, and other Government officials in charge of economic controls. No replies to these letters have been received.

There is enclosed herewith a copy of letter sent to 170 chambers of commerce in the Los Angeles defense area. The replies have been gratifying, and there is manifested everywhere a spirit of cooperation.

There is going forward an invitation to all of the realty boards in the Los Angeles defense area to join in the participation of this program.

Most of the people whom we have contacted on the subject appear to be pleased with the program, and are happy to aid in an endeavor that it may be successful in avoiding distasteful Government controls. It also appears that their experience with Government controls have left them in no mood for its reimposition. However, as above stated, the President and his appointees have not shown any interest in the matter, and by such lack of response, it is indicated that they have no confidence in the people.

It is our opinion here that Congress should be informed of our efforts, and citizens and groups throughout the country likewise informed, and perhaps by such publicity something worth while can be accomplished.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT H. AARONS.

THE PASADENA PROPERTY
OWNERS' COMMITTEE,
Pasadena, Calif., January 5, 1951.

SIERRA MADRE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

GENTLEMEN: We enlist your cooperation and support in connection with our endeavor to carry out a plan for self-control and self-discipline on the part of residential income property owners of housing accommodations which have been released from rent control since April 19, 1949.

We are confident that our purpose can be accomplished if the plan is properly publicized and cooperation from substantial and reputable organizations of your type is obtained. We believe that your organization stands for the preservation of the way of life, which has made our country the inherently wonderful nation that it is. These are not mere words and to many of us, as it must be to you, they have a profound meaning.

With more and more economic controls followed by regimentation, the free enterprise system, must necessarily be stifled. It is therefore highly advisable to curb and prevent such inequities unless the country is in such actual danger, that the imposition of all such controls is unavoidable and our war effort or preparedness program would be endangered or placed in jeopardy. However, lest there be any misunderstanding, we emphasize that we are for all proper methods so that patriotic duty in all respects may be discharged.

We have no politics to play and have not the slightest or most remote motive in that direction, therefore let us find out if we cannot employ methods of public meetings and the like to bring about fair and harmonious dealings with landlords and tenants. However, we don't concede that thus far there has been anything unfair. But, the precipitant action of some few irate landlords may furnish the persons seeking rent controls for political purposes, a claimed cause for reimposition of such rent controls.

With the above end in view, will you therefore, join in our program? You are hereby requested to nominate either yourself or some other person of your organization and one or two public-spirited income property owners, preferably in your vicinity to attend a meeting of many such persons to map out and execute plans to attain the aims above described. May we hear from you with your nominations at the earliest possible moment.

Thanking you for your cooperation, we are,

Yours truly,

PASADENA PROPERTY OWNERS' COMMITTEE,
WILLIAM CHRISTEN, *President.*

DECEMBER 27, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Enclosed please find some news items in reference to the efforts being made by owners of residential rental property, in southern California, to prevent unreasonable rent increases.

We believe that cases of undue rent hikes are in the small minority. However, we do know that it is the example of the few unwise landlords, that may make out a case for new rent control. We would like for you to believe that our effort to moderate the actions of those few unreasonable landlords is not only for the purpose of alleviating the situation and making new rent control unnecessary, but also, it stems from a patriotic duty and feeling so that the war effort would not be impeded. We firmly believe that given a chance, the vast majority of Americans, yes, even landlords, are good citizens and sincerely desire to aid the war effort in every way by the exercise of self-restraint on the part of such landlords, and the desired ends could be accomplished without the necessity of rent controls.

This is particularly so, since so many of the owners of property are small people, and in the light of the past, they really would appreciate an opportunity of proving their loyalty to their country and practice of justice to their fellow man.

We know that you are a busy and harrassed man, and we know that you have suggested rent control to the Congress, but we feel that inherently you do have faith in the millions of Americans who happened to have placed their life savings and other small meager funds in investments in residential income property.

Will you help us give our plan a fair trial?

Respectively yours,

WILLIAM CHRISTEN,
President.

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News of December 21, 1950]

PROPERTY OWNERS PLAN SELF-CONTROL RENT BOARD

A resolution authorizing the formation of a rent control board to help stabilize economy and aid the war effort was adopted by the board of directors of the Pasadena Property Owners' Committee at a meeting last night.

The board will be formed with the purpose of creating a plan of self-control of rents and will be composed of a group of rental property owners, representatives of

business and civil groups, and tenants, the resolution said.

TO ADOPT SCHEDULES

Under the plan, the board will set up schedules and rules for the conduct of the board and of owners of residential property in connection with rents and rental conditions.

In the resolution, owners of rental units were urged to exercise self-restraint in fixing rents and to cooperate with the Property owners' Committee on plans to prevent any unreasonable increases in rents.

Through such cooperation, landlords not only will be cooperating with the Government's request for voluntary price freezes but also will eliminate the need of any reimposition of rent controls during future emergencies, Robert H. Aarons, Pasadena attorney, told the committee directors at the meeting.

SUPPORT URGED

Directors expressed the hope that other areas throughout the Nation which have campaigned successfully for rent decontrol would take similar steps in forming self-control organizations.

The present rent-control law, which expires December 31, recently was extended by the Government for 90 days and applies to all areas which did not take the initiative to decontrol rents before the December 31 expiration date.

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Independent of December 22, 1950]

PROPERTY OWNERS USE VOLUNTARY RENTAL FREEZE

Members of the board of directors of the Pasadena Property Owners Committee yesterday adopted a resolution to voluntarily stabilize rents and urged other organizations throughout the country to follow suit to forestall the return of rent controls.

The resolution suggests that landlords exercise restraint in fixing rents so that the Economic Stabilization Authority in Washington will include rent control in its contemplated voluntary price-wage freeze plan.

Creation of a board to draw up a self-control rental plan was called for in the resolution which ordered inclusion of representatives of business, tenants, and property owners on the board.

At the directors meeting, Attorney Robert Aarons discussed Effects and Advantages and a Voluntary Price-Wage Freeze.

He said that if landlords could restrain themselves from making abnormal increases in rents, possibly there need not be recontrol of previously decontrolled areas.

The resolutions adopted by the board reads:

"Whereas the existence of a national emergency has been declared by the President of the United States under congressional authority given last spring; and whereas the Government, through the agencies set up by the President, have requested the people of the country to set up a self-controlled and voluntary system to the end that inflation be halted and that prices be stabilized so that the war effort would be aided; and whereas controls and regulations are generally abhorent and obnoxious to the American people, except only in the case of real necessity; and whereas the residential income property owners, as well as other real estate owners, desire that there be stability in the American economy and desire to aid the war effort, and desire further to cooperate and heed the request of the Government with the end that there be no reimposition of rent controls; and whereas heretofore, the unexplained cases of a few landlords who sought large increases have been unjustly used for the imposition of controls on the large majority of property owners who have been fair in their dealings, and such action has been found to be intolerable: Be it

"*Resolved as follows:* That the Pasadena Property Owners' Committee pledges its support of a plan for the stabilization of the economy of the Nation on a fair and equitable basis; and to that end, be it further

"*Resolved*, That a voluntary board be, and is hereby, established for creation of a plan for self-control of rents, and rental and kindred conditions for dwellings commensurate with price index and wages: be it further

"*Resolved*, That the board shall be composed of rental property owners, representatives of business, tenants, and public-spirited persons: be it further

"*Resolved*, That the board set up schedules and rules for the conduct of the board and conduct of owners of residential property in connection with rents and rental conditions. Be it further

"*Resolved*, That owners of rental units, associations of owners of property or individual owners, be requested and admonished to adhere to the suggestions contained in the foregoing and to exercise self-restraint in the fixation of rents and by so doing and joining, with representatives of the Pasadena Property Owners' Committee or its representatives, to work out and follow through on plans in order to prevent any unreasonable increases in rents, and to hold the line on all prices and living cost; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the boards which may be set-up in cities throughout the Nation will, by fair and impartial and patriotic conduct, obviate any alleged reasons which may be interposed for the reimposition of controls."

Resolution adopted December 19, 1950, Pasadena, Calif.

PASADENA PROPERTY OWNERS' COMMITTEE.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of December 23, 1950]

LANDLORDS OFFER VOLUNTARY CONTROL—PASADENA PROPERTY OWNERS SUGGEST PLAN TO SETTLE RENTAL PROBLEM

Now comes the suggestion of a voluntary rent control set-up by landlords. The idea originated and is being promoted by the Pasadena Property Owners' Committee. The committee made its suggestion in the form of a resolution which it adopted at a meeting Thursday night.

Directors of the Pasadena group called upon similar organizations throughout the Nation to follow their plan as a means of heading off possible new control of rents and "for the stabilization of the Nation's economy."

They proposed a Federal board composed of representatives of business, property owners and tenants to draw up a self-control rent plan.

COPY TO TRUMAN

Copies of the Pasadena committee's resolution were sent to President Truman, Congressmen, Price Administrator Allen S. Valentine, and Housing Expediter Tighe Woods.

Meanwhile, decontrol of rents in Los Angeles still failed to create the big splash many expected.

Typical landlord operation was that of the owner of a building containing furnished apartments and which is located near the Ambassador.

The owner of the apartments reported that 60 percent of his tenants will get no rent raise. The other 40 percent will be raised from 5 percent to 25 percent, the average being about 15 percent. These increases are not for eviction purposes, the owner said, but to bring those units in line with the other 60 percent.

For the moment, the increases will range from $2 to $13.50 a month.

ONLY TWO DISSATISFIED

The landlord reported that, of his 60 tenants, only 2 have signified a tentative desire to move. So he hung out the vacancy sign. And, although price of the apartments was not indicated, he had no takers.

Patrick J. O'Donovan, secretary-manager of the Apartment Association of Los Angeles County, reported yesterday that a preliminary survey of 7,500 apartments in Los Angeles revealed that the over-all rent increase after ceilings were lifted here has averaged 11½ percent.

Meanwhile, the Apartment, Hotel, and Motel Association of California called for investigations by the county and Federal grand juries of reports that certain persons were advising tenants to disregard rent increase and eviction notices.

Too Much Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in Barrons on February 19, 1951. The writer of this article points out that our economic system is being expanded way out of proportion and this has been done because of practices initiated by Leon Keyserling, the President's No. 1 economic adviser. Mr. Truman is leading this country to economic disaster. I am including the article in question:

TOO MUCH EXPANSION—IS THE UNITED STATES BUYING MR. KEYSERLING IN UNIFORM?

The latest plan to come out of Washington, and certainly the most important for United States business, is what for want of a better name, but at the risk of some injustice, may be called the Charles E. Wilson plan for the expansion of the American economy.

The essence of this plan, as often reported in the press, is that by making capital expenditures today at the expense of the consumer, the United States by the end of 1952 can achieve a new plateau of prosperity. On that plateau it can afford military expenditures of $50,000,000,000 (as against $20,000,000,000 today) and at the same time restore the lush civilian economy of mid-1950.

So stated, the plan is extremely enticing, yielding the American people some definite goals and providing the administration with what the London Economist in a happy turn of phrase once called the Carrot and the Stick. Today, the stick of controls, exhortation to sacrifice, and appeals to patriotism But ahead, the carrot, the glistening goal of heavy tanks rolling off, or capable of being rolled off, the production line at the new tank arsenal building in North Carolina, as well as Dynaflow Buicks and Cadillacs coming off the production lines of Detroit.

Nevertheless, despite its enticement, and its boldness, we believe that this plan deserves the utmost scrutiny. That scrutiny should begin with asking just how much investment the administration contemplates this year and next in order to make the miracle of late 1952 possible. It may be conceded that the military do need a new tank arsenal, since 50-ton tanks cannot be made with present facilities. The same may well be true of new weapons of various kinds.

But this is by no means the only kind of expansion contemplated. Through the issue of over $2,000,000,000 worth of 5-year depreciation certificates, the production authorities are speeding a big increase in steel and aluminum capacities as well as an increase in copper output, the theory being that these raw material bottlenecks must be

broken. Moreover, and this is the critical point, the expansion of these so-called basic industries is apparently going hand in hand with other types of capital expenditures.

There is a special program for petroleum, freight cars, locomotives, merchant ships, and farm machinery to mention but a few. As the Wilson plan is working out (whatever its theory), one type of capital growth is not displacing another, but rather there is already an over-all upsurge in private plant and equipment expenditures. In 1951 these may well reach an all-time peak of over $25,000,000,000. While there will be a reduction in housing, a vast investment boom is in the making.

Once this point is grasped, the plan to hoist America by its bootstraps to a new production plateau looks a lot less attractive. Its immediate cost is a tremendous increase in inflationary pressures. It is a truism to say that it takes steel to make steel, so that each ton of new capacity built temporarily increases the steel shortage. But it is also true that where total investment pushes ahead of real savings the result is an upward price pressure on the whole system. Since the Korean War began inventories have leaped up by $7,000,000,000, financed not by savings but largely by bank credit, e. g., new money. Now plant expansion is taking the place of this inventory spree.

The immediately inflationary implications of overinvestment are, of course, recognized by the planners. Hence the need today for price controls which are, however, to drop off in the benign year of 1953. But will they? And with what result? Politically, controls once invoked are difficult to get rid of (witness rents). Moreover, as the American postwar experience shows, price controls, if effective at all, do not eliminate inflationary pressures; they simply bury them. During World War II the Government created a vast amount of new money through deficit spending just as now new money is being created by overinvestment. In the end this new money, as it always must, burst the bounds of controls and the American price level openly moved up to accommodate it. Such is bound to happen in 1953 when and as controls are taken off, so that the promise of avoiding inflation through increased production is really a phony one.

This suggests one further comment on the so-called Wilson plan. By a process of legerdemain and juggling with inflated gross national product figures it is always possible to prove that by doing this or that, total American output can be vastly increased. That perpetual optimist, Mr. Leon Keyserling, is forever citing wartime statistics to this end. Alas, for Mr. Keyserling. Debunked for inflation, and the deterioration of the dollar, the Department of Commerce has shown that between 1941 and 1949, for instance, gross production in real terms moved up very slowly by only 2 to 3 percent per year—its normal increase over the decades. Washington planners, according to our calculations, are counting on a substantially bigger increase between now and 1953. We doubt if they will get it, especially as much of the new plant they are bringing into production is essentially high cost and hence inefficient.

To sum up, the Wilson plan, as it is unfolding, is not only inflationary now, but its longer term premises are at best dubious. This is not to say that Mr. Wilson's heroic efforts to emphasize production are misplaced. It is to say that his press agents may be doing him a bad turn by holding out promises that cannot be honored. The immediate task is not to push the country into a general investment splurge, but to expand plant where it clearly must be expanded, and for the rest, put on the dampers. It is not to make business borrowing easy, but to make it hard. Above all, it is to keep our eyes fixed on the present rather than on a gilded future. The United States, in this year of decision in Asia and Europe, needs arms now, not 2 years from now. For this the people will make real sacrifices. What they will not sacrifice for, and should not be asked to sacrifice for, is a new angled Keyserling plan which is no less suspect because it happens to have put on a military uniform.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech by William Henry Chamberlin, of Cambridge, Mass., as one of a series entitled "Justice for Poland" over WSPR in Springfield, Mass. These programs are under the sponsorship of the Polish American Congress, western Massachusetts branch.

Mr. Chamberlin was for 18 years foreign correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor. He is editorial writer of the Wall Street Journal and a contributing editor of the New Leader. He has been the author of eight books, including European Cockpit and Russian Enigma.

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

There is a relentless unbroken line of connection between the appeasement of Stalin, which was a cardinal policy of the Roosevelt administration, and the fact that American soldiers are dying today in the snow-struck fields of Korea.

The most glaring example of this appeasement was Anglo-American acquiescence in the destruction of Poland's independence and territorial integrity at the Tehran and Yalta Conferences in 1945 and in the many intermediate diplomatic steps which made Tehran and Yalta possible. Now, as the eleventh anniversary of the beginning of World War II approaches, we should remember that the global conflict started with the German-Russian invasion of Poland.

One wonders what would have happened if the British Government, when it offered its guaranty against aggression to Poland in the spring of 1939 had added this warning:

"You must understand that this guaranty is valid only against Germany. If the Soviet Government proposes to take almost half of your territory and to impose a Communist-dominated government on what is left of Poland you cannot count on our help. On the contrary, we will make no serious effort to prevent the Soviet Government from accomplishing these designs and will even support its case against yours."

One may also wonder as to how the Yugoslav Government of 1941, pushed and prodded by the Roosevelt administration into entering an unequal struggle against Germany, would have reacted if some candid and farsighted American diplomat had said:

"Your country will experience all the sufferings of foreign occupation. More than that, there will be a savage civil war. In this war the Moscow-trained Communist, Josip Broz Tito, will win the support of America and Great Britain. You and other Yugoslav non-Communist patriots will be lucky if you save your lives in exile or in obscurity at home."

And it would be interesting to know how the American people would have felt if some correct prophet would have said:

"Our policy of inflexible support for Chiang Kai-shek's regime in China will almost certainly lead to war with Japan. This war will be prosecuted to the ruin of Japan and its destruction as a great power. But we will not worry about Soviet and Communist aggression against China. In fact, we will bribe Stalin, at China's expense, to join in our crusade against Japan. As late as 1945 high State Department officials will be giving Communist sympathizers access to confidential information. The upshot of all this will be that China will fall under the domination of Communists, disciples of Moscow, who will show the bitterest hostility to this country."

Such things were not said by people in positions of influence in the years of decision about America's entrance into the war. But they are a faithful preview of what has happened, of what a reasonably intelligent student of foreign affairs might have expected to happen.

The betrayal of Poland was the greatest and most flagrant of the three, because the Second World War began ostensibly over the issue of Poland's independence and territorial integrity.

The Soviet Government, in fullest agreement and complicity with the Nazi dictatorship, set out to blot Poland forever from the map of Europe. The record on this point is unmistakably clear. The Soviet-German so-called nonaggression pact of August 1939 was really a pact of mutual aggression against Poland. Its secret clauses providing for a partition of Poland and for the inclusion of the Baltic Republics in the Soviet share of the spoils, are now well known.

Molotov made the Soviet attitude plain when he declared at a session of the Soviet parliament on October 31, 1939: "Two swift blows to Poland, one from the German Army, the other from the Red army, and nothing remained of the ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty."

Annexing and incorporating into the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Republics almost half of Poland's territory, inhabited by about one-third of the Polish population, the Soviet Government tried to insure its position by the usual brutal totalitarian methods. About a million and a quarter people were deported to the Soviet Union, the majority being sent to slave-labor camps. When the Polish Government was able to investigate what had happened to these deportees, during the period of Soviet-Polish rapprochement which followed Hitler's invasion of Russia, it reached the conclusion that about 300,000 human beings had perished of hunger and maltreatment.

Especially sinister was the mysterious disappearance of some 10,000 Polish officer war prisoners. Letters from these men stopped abruptly in the spring of 1940. For almost 2 years Polish diplomatic representatives in Russia, furnished with detailed lists of names, sought vainly for information about what had become of these prisoners.

The case was repeatedly taken up with the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and was brought to the attention of Stalin himself. This matter came to a head when the German radio announced that thousands of bodies of Polish officers had been discovered in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, in western Russia. The Polish request that the matter be investigated by the International Red Cross was seized on by the Soviet Government as an excuse for breaking off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government. The virtual certainty that the Soviet authorities were responsible for this massacre of war prisoners was confirmed when the International Tribunal at Nuremberg, certainly not lenient in its attitude toward the accused German war criminals,

did not find Germans guilty of this atrocity. These points of circumstantial evidence about the responsibility for the Katyn massacre would seem to be decisive. First, all letters from the imprisoned officers to their families ceased not in 1941 when the Germans invaded Russia but in the spring of 1940. Second, never, until the bodies were discovered, did the Soviet authorities place the responsibility on the Germans by saying the prison camp had been abandoned. Third, neither the Soviet Government nor the Communist-dominated regime in Poland after the war made any attempt to investigate the details of the Katyn Massacre. Fourth, it is unthinkable that thousands of Polish officers would have waited passively to be captured by the Germans if the camp had been abandoned. In this case there certainly would have been some survivors. The completeness of the extermination suggests that there was no confusion and no opportunity for any of the victims to escape. With characteristic cynicism the Soviet Government used the discovery of its own crime as an excuse for breaking off relations with the generally recognized Polish Government-in-exile in London. This was in the spring of 1943. The Kremlin stepped up its pursuit of its two main objectives in Poland. The first was to retain almost all the Polish territory which had been acquired as a result of Stalin's deal with Hitler. The second was to prepare for the new Poland, mutilated in the East, artificially enlarged in the West, a made-in-Moscow government.

Both objectives were achieved with the acquiescence or, at most, the very weak opposition of Washington and London. When Anthony Eden, as British Foreign Minister, went to Moscow in December 1941, he found Stalin inclined to demand the recognition of the annexation of eastern Poland as the price of signing an Anglo-Soviet treaty alliance. A firmly negative attitude on the part of the American State Department blocked acceptance of this demand at that time.

But the American attitude weakened, curiously enough, as the American military position grew stronger. Less is known about the Tehran Conference, held at the end of November 1943, than about Yalta. But the comment of a Polish diplomat of long experience in the United States holds true: "Our territorial integrity was sacrificed at Tehran, our national independence at Yalta."

Certainly Churchill launched a vigorous campaign, in parliamentary speeches and in private communications to the Polish Government-in-exile, upholding Stalin's claim to the so-called Curzon Line frontier. The factually absurd argument was used that Russia had twice been invaded by Germany through Poland and was therefore entitled to security. This overlooked the historical truth that at the time of the First World War most of Poland was part of the Russian Empire, while at the time of the Second World War, Poland's territory had been partitioned between Stalin and Hitler. In neither case was Poland in the slightest degree a partner in the German invasion of Russia.

The Yalta Conference, held in February 1945, placed the final seal on the betrayal of Poland. No representative of Poland was present at this meeting. The Polish Government-in-exile, the successor of the regime with which Great Britain had concluded a treaty of alliance, was treated as nonexistent.

Stalin's territorial demands were accepted after one or two faint and unavailing pleas from Roosevelt and Churchill that the city of Lwow, culturally and ethnically Polish, and the oil wells of East Gallicia should be left to Poland. The face-saving verbal assurances about free unfettered elections and about reorganization of the Communist-dominated puppet government which entered Poland in the baggage trains of the Red army were proved empty frauds by the subsequent course of events, which led to the steady clamping down of a routine Communist dictatorship in Poland.

Apologists for the policy of appeasing Stalin which reached its climax at Yalta adopt two lines of argument. Some contend, like the late Edward Stettinius, that Yalta was really a great victory for the West because Stalin made a number of promises which he broke almost before the ink on the Yalta documents was dry. This is about as convincing as suggesting that a man achieved a great financial triumph by accepting a large sum of worthless checks.

There is also the argument that America and Britain needed Soviet military aid and could not effectively restrain Stalin's moves in Eastern Europe. This line of reasoning, however, overlooks the fact that the Soviet Union was more dependent for its own security on maintaining the coalition than was the United States. There was certainly no valid moral or political reason why the United States and Great Britain should have actively cooperated in the territorial mutilation of Poland and in recognizing a government that was a complete negation of the Atlantic Charter principles and violently hostile to the West.

Today's headlines from Korea furnish eloquent, decisive proof that the wartime appeasement of Stalin was a practical failure as well as a confession of moral bankruptcy. Let us now repudiate the sordid deal at Yalta. Any validity this disgraceful agreement may have ever possessed has been lost because the Soviet Government systematically violated all the engagements which it undertook at Yalta. Facts come out with all the weight of the official authority with the whole terrible truth about Katyn. Only by such action can we show that we turned our backs once for all on the policy of appeasement which has borne such bitter fruits for our dead and wounded in Korea.

Wage Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an advance editorial which appears in the March issue of the International Chemical Worker entitled "Wage Controls Now Are a Product of Stupidity and Greed," written by Mr. H. A. Bradley, president of the International Chemical Workers Union:

WAGE CONTROLS NOW ARE A PRODUCT OF STUPIDITY AND GREED

(By H. A. Bradley)

The antics of big business have ceased to be funny as far as their attempts to dictate the wage policies of this Nation are concerned. We have waited a long time for a proper and fair wage control order. As this is written, they are still trying to force labor to accept a few crumbs while industry gets the loaf.

The information at press time is that an order will be approved allowing 10 percent wage increases over January 1, 1950 and that escalator clauses and pension plans, negotiated prior to June 1, 1950, will be permitted to stand but any such plans negotiated since June 1 would be taken into account in the 10 percent formula. If anyone on the present board, or within the administration, has the idea that such a formula is conducive to industrial peace, he should have a psychiatrist test his mental capacity.

In the period between January and June of 1950 there was no spectacular rise in the cost of living or in wages. When the Korean situation broke in June, however, almost every item of food began to rise in cost by leaps and bounds. This phase was followed by unreasonable and unnecessary price increases in almost every other item. No economist in the world can truthfully claim that labor costs had anything to do with these rising prices because labor did not try to get any unusual wage increases until it was actually faced with the inflationary rise in the cost of living. The formula, as it is now being discussed, can only penalize those workers who renewed their contracts in the normal course of events, and in the normal manner, prior to June 1, 1950. It would also increase inequities throughout all industries that would, beyond question of a doubt, create industrial strife such as this country has never known.

There has been entirely too much pointing of the finger at the wage earner. The cost of living must be controlled before any fair wage formula can be effective. This means that someone is going to have to have the courage to talk to, and to talk about, the farmer, the wholesaler, and people in like positions over whom there is no control whatsoever at the present time. Wage controls have no value whatever if they are unworkable, unfair, and not conducive to industrial peace. For those gentlemen in Congress who frame our laws, the members of the various boards who have the responsibility of formulating orders and those of the executive branch of Government who have the authority to sign orders affecting the welfare of the wage earner, I recommend that they do not lose sight of the fact that a wage restriction imposed upon a wage earner is paid by the wage earner himself and that the wage ceiling or so-called parity prices given to the farmer is paid by the taxpayers which includes all wage earners. I recommend that these people do not overlook the fact that almost every wage earner has to pay in hard cash for everything he uses and every necessity of life, even to the most fundamental things. I remind them that the wage earner must buy even the water and the paper for his necessary toilet while the Lord above supplies the water to the farmer and Sear, Roebuck still furnishes the paper.

If these gentlemen in authority insist on imposing unworkable and unfair restrictions upon the wage earner, it will be they, and they alone, who must shoulder the responsibility for any failure in our industrial plans or our stabilization effort, both of which are so vital at the present time. Stupidity in these times is a luxury and not a necessity.

Address of Charles H. Silver at Beth Israel Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address by Charles H. Silver, president of the Beth Israel Hospital in New York City, delivered by him at the graduation exercises of the nursing

school of the hospital on February 28, 1951:

As president of Beth Israel Hospital one of my very pleasant privileges is to attend the annual graduation exercises of our school of nursing. It is an experience that I have enjoyed for many years, yet each time I come away stimulated and inspired by what I have seen and heard. For it seems to me that when these young women in white are now ready to take their place as trained experts in the world of medicine, in a sphere where tender care, sympathy, and understanding play such a great part, we are witnessing a phase of human existence that is indeed very noble and beautiful.

These young women are the ambassadors of good will of the hospital; they are constantly at the side of the patients, they are with them at all times and they reflect the relationship between the hospital and those who have come to it for solace and healing.

They must be cheerful without being patronizing, stern without being too forceful, sympathetic without being maudlin, and reassuring without being deceitful. That is a very difficult job, my friends, and these young women who have finished their training at the nursing school of Beth Israel have all these qualities, I am sure, for they have been trained under the direction of one of the ablest women in the nursing profession.

I am referring to Miss Clare M. Casey, the head of our nursing school, whose abilities are recognized not only among those in her own profession but by medical men and hospital administrators. Those who work with her have the highest respect and admiration for her as a nurse and as a human being. She is capably assisted by her two aids, Miss Rose Muscatine and Miss Gladys Scott, and they make a very effective team under whose guidance the nursing affairs of Beth Israel are being carried on. I am sure I reflect the feeling of my associates on the board of trustees when I say we are all very proud of them.

I want to take this occasion also to say a word about our executive director, Dr. Maxwell S. Frank, with whom I have had occasion to work very closely. He is recognized as an able hospital administrator and I am sure that I reflect the sentiments of his staff, the members of the medical staff, and our board of trustees when I say that he has rendered highly skillful service to Beth Israel.

Our graduation exercises this year have an unusual significance. For we are honored by the presence of the chief executive of our great city, Mayor Impellitteri, who has shown such a deep interest in the hospital activities of New York City.

Mayor Impellitteri understands hospital problems. I have heard him discuss them in public and it is gratifying to us as hospital workers to know that we can count on him for encouragement in carrying out broad hospital programs so that the people of our city may be served more efficiently than ever.

And speaking of hospital programs, I am sure, Mr. Mayor, that you are familiar with our own expansion plans. We have acquired the adjacent property to our present structure; the plans for new buildings have been approved by the building department but we still face the problem of demolishing some of the buildings which are occupied because the tenants have been unable to find other quarters. We are, of course, reluctant to do anything that would cause them inconvenience or hardship.

But we hope, Mr. Mayor, to begin some of the work this spring. We plan to break ground on the plot immediately adjoining the hospital upon which will be erected a structure to handle out-patients.

The pressure of the present facilities of the out-patient department is so great that it is essential that additional quarters be constructed inasmuch as this department handles ambulatory cases. The hospital will be in a position to take care of a greater number of patients. I say this with a full understanding by my associates and myself of the imperative need to carry on this program to a successful conclusion. We serve one of the most thickly populated sections of our city.

I think it is a typically American community for here you can find more than a dozen nationalities living in harmony and friendship side by side and it is this spirit that makes our country so great. As mayor of the city of New York, Mayor Impellitteri presides over the lives and health and welfare of 8,000,000 men and women and children. He holds a public office which is only second in importance to that of the President of the United States. May I express the fervent hope that he will have the vigor and health to carry on for we now know that he is doing a mighty good job.

We have been reading and hearing about the plans for civil defense which the mayor has inaugurated. Not a single loyal American will fail to cooperate with those who are carrying out the mayor's plans, but there is also need for hard practical work so that the civil-defense organizations of ours will stand on a solid foundation. The stakes are too high to permit mistakes. We must be sure of our ground.

In this defense set-up of New York the hospitals must of necessity play a very vital part. Beth Israel has already answered the call and under the direction of the hospital administrators we are working on civil-defense plans that will harmonize with those that are being developed by the city.

And while I stand here, Mr. Mayor, to greet you at our nurses' graduation, I want to pledge to you and your entire administration the full and unstinted cooperation of Beth Israel Hospital in solidifying the civil-defense program. I want to pledge to you the willingness, capacity and experience not only of the administrative staff but of the doctors, the nurses, technicians, and general hospital workers.

All of us at Beth Israel hospital will follow through and we stand alert and ready to give the best in us.

May I close by saying how happy I am as president of Beth Israel Hospital to be with you this evening and greet you in behalf of the board of trustees. A very interesting program has been planned and I am sure you will have a very pleasant evening.

None of us knows what is ahead of us in these very critical days. We are a peaceful people and, of course, we shall hope and pray that we will come through these troubled times without heartbreak and misery.

But as much as we all desire peace and friendship among the peoples of the earth, we shall not sacrifice our heritage of human dignity and individual freedom by yielding to the ideology and practices of a slave state. I say again that we work and pray for a peaceful solution, but if our way of life is threatened we shall be ready to defend it and by that I mean not only those of us at Beth Israel Hospital but all institutions in every field of human activity will be prepared and alert to uphold our democracy. Thank you.

This Nation Founded To Make Men Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bethlehem (Pa.) Globe-Times of February 20, 1951:

THIS NATION FOUNDED TO MAKE MEN FREE

For the first time since the American Revolution, with the exception of the War Between the States, the people of our country are faced with a stark test of faith. The conflict with world communism now is not to save the world for democracy, but to repel an enemy who is determined to destroy in our own land the Christian ideal of human dignity and individual liberty and the political system which upholds that ideal. Our faith and our strength is this ideal.

As a Nation, we came through World War II with little discomfort. Living standards have risen to record levels. So has the public debt which is exacting its toll in depreciating money. However, it is evident that devalued dollars have not yet cramped our style. Last year, according to the Commerce Department, United States citizens spent a staggering $178,832,000,000. The fabulous "American way" is well illustrated in a current joke which defines a pedestrian as a motorist who has found a place to park his car. The list of American "haves" could go on indefinitely. Already there are 8,000,000 television sets in our homes—homes which are equipped with tens of millions of deep freezes, refrigerators, electric stoves, radios, washing machines, ad infinitum.

In retrospect, after nearly two centuries of freedom and the boundless progress that only freedom could have achieved, it would be a wonder if we were not confused when suddenly confronted with prospect of a fight for actual survival. But the time when we can afford confusion has nearly run out. These words of Lenin, uttered 30 years ago, ring with new significance: "As long as capitalism and socialism remain we cannot live in peace. In the end, one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism. * * * We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealment, and veiling of the truth."

This is the ruthless concept, backed by vast military force, which is confronting America and the world. To meet it we will need more than arms and men. We will have to lay our sights on primary objectives and keep them there. We must forget the adolescent notion that material security is an unqualified right. The rights embodied in the American ideal are few and elemental. They include equality of opportunity, freedom of speech and religion, and the protection of private property. They are the tools with which the individual may achieve life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

In a word, it is time we again understood what this country really stands for. John Dos Passos, the distinguished American author, has said, "this country was not founded to furnish glamorous offices for politicians, or to produce goods and services, or hand-outs of easy money. This country was founded to make men free." In the wealth of material comfort we have enjoyed so long, we have tended to forget that great truth. Now we must return to the simple fundamental—"This country was founded to make men free."

We face a two-faceted task. We must fight with all we have against our enemies outside. And, while we are undergoing all the sacrifices and trials that may involve, we must keep our people free. One of the greatest dangers is that we may grant so much unlimited authority to the Government that the system of checks and balances which stands between us and tyranny will be permanently destroyed. The problem of economic controls is a perfect example here. They should be imposed only if they are clearly necessary to implement the war effort. Otherwise, we will have control for control's sake—which is the essence of dictatorship.

Then our productive capacity will be crippled and, far more important, we will no longer be a free people—we will have lost the battle.

We Americans have come to a climactic phase in the history of the good life. It is our duty to hold together for future generations the framework of freedom which made that good life possible.

Labor's View on Defense Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the March 1, 1951, issue of the Machinist, the official weekly newspaper of the International Association of Machinists, on labor's view on defense mobilization:

LABOR'S VIEW ON DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Organized labor, speaking through the United Labor Policy Committee, has been criticizing the way defense mobilization is shaping up. To help IAM members understand what has been going on in Washington, the Machinist here answers some of the questions being asked by thoughtful union men and women.

Is big business really in control of defense mobilization?

It has been up to now. Last December, President Truman granted full authority to Charles E. Wilson, former president of General Electric Corp., to get defense production going and to control inflation. Wilson is Director of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. Wilson has had two principal assistants, Gen. Lucius Clay, chairman of the board of Continental Can Co., and Sidney Weinberg, senior partner of Goldman, Sachs & Co., Wall Street bankers. Under Wilson are Eric Johnston, Director of Economic Stabilization, and William H. Harrison, Defense Production Administrator. Johnston is president of the Motion Picture Producers Association and former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Harrison is president of International Telephone & Telegraph Co. Most of these men are drawing their salaries from their companies—not from the Government. Only Eric Johnston, up to now, has made any real effort to bring labor in to help run his organization. Since labor's protest, however, Mr. Wilson has offered to appoint a labor man as his third assistant.

What's wrong with business executives doing the defense job? Don't they know the most about production?

There is nothing wrong with production men doing a production job. Certainly, businessmen can be just as patriotic and self-sacrificing as any other group of Americans. However, production is only one of the Government's mobilization problems. In most cases, big corporation executives have had little experience in running an organization in which the plain people have a voice and a vote. A Government, such as ours, can operate only with the consent of the governed. Therefore, the first job in defense mobilization is to establish a policy and a program that will win and hold the enthusiastic support of all Americans. No one group in our country should have the power to use the Government to impose a set of arbitrary controls on other groups.

Won't more business efficiency be a good thing in Government?

Normal business methods may not prove efficient when they are used to govern a democratic people. The job of governing is as different from the job of making a profit as day from night. For example, big businessmen naturally feel that big producers are more efficient than small producers. So far, mobilization plans have failed to recruit the useful production facilities of small business. That is the opposite of efficiency. It is a waste of an important part of our productive capacity. This is one example of how big business thinking can be wasteful when it is applied to Government. In broader terms, the dollar is what counts in business; human welfare is what counts in government—human welfare in the home, on the job and on the battlefield.

Isn't the attempt to stop inflation a good thing, even though it seems to be unpopular?

Labor was one of the first groups to ask for a stabilization program to fight inflation. Controls are never popular with the group being controlled. But everyone, including those who complain, benefit from stabilization if the controls are fair and equitable. The present anti-inflation program is based on the idea that the economy can only be stabilized by reducing the purchasing power of the great majority of the people. That theory is the basis of the proposed tax program. In addition, industry and public members of the Wage Stabilization Board have voted for a rigid, inflexible wage order. At the same time, the Office of Price Stabilization is allowing prices to continue to rise. Even the price stabilizer admits that prices are going to go up an average of 6 percent in the next few months. This is almost as big an increase as took place from March 15 to December 15, last year, before the freeze. And that doesn't include what may happen to rents.

Is all the shouting just for an extra 2 percent more on wage rates—the difference between the 10 percent voted by industry and public members and the 12 percent asked by labor?

It is much more than that. The 2 percent is important. It would mean an average of almost 4 cents an hour to IAM members. But even more important are a half-dozen other sections of the proposed wage order. As it was originally voted, the freeze order would virtually end collective bargaining for millions of union members for the duration. It would prevent the correction of injustices and inequities. Anyone who has had a raise of 10 percent or more since January 1950, would get no more raises. Furthermore, the order cancels raises provided in union contracts agreed to months ago—long before the freeze. Under the original order, employees who do not already have pension plans and health and welfare benefits, couldn't even hope for them until the emergency is over. Pensions are not inflationary. Neither are sound health and welfare plans. Yet, the wage board voted to prohibit all future pension plans and health and welfare benefits unless they are charged off against the 10 percent raise allowed over the rates of January, 1950. In the same fashion, anyone who doesn't now have a paid vacation, paid holidays or other standard non-wage benefits would be denied them.

How is the wage order going to be enforced?

The law makes it illegal for any employer to raise wages beyond what the Wage Board allows. If he does, then he cannot charge off the raise as a business expense on his income tax. That is enforcement enough to make any wage regulation stick tight.

Suppose the men become dissatisfied and strike?

There is no law against strikes, providing due notice is given under the Taft-Hartley Act. A no-strike pledge has not even been asked from labor so far. However, if the President declares that a dispute threatens the national safety he can invoke the emergency provision of Taft-Hartley and appoint a board of inquiry. Those factfinders cannot even recommend a settlement. After 80 days the men can strike. However, the President has authority to seize the plant and order the men back to work as Government employees. The company would continue to draw its profits.

What if the men get stubborn and won't go back?

Then they face the possibility under Taft-Hartley of loss of their seniority and of discharge.

And, if they still won't report back to work?

Then presumably Congress could act to give the President the police power to break up their union.

Is this the way wage stabilization worked in World War II?

No. The old War Labor Board, for all of its shortcomings, was, flexible and allowed room for bargaining on fringe issues and for correcting inequities and injustices. Organized labor while far from satisfied was able to accept the formula and support the stabilization program. When trouble came, labor helped work things out without use of troops or police.

Will the use of police power protect production?

Labor doesn't think so. Labor believes that the order proposed by industry and public members of the Wage Board will hurt production. That is why labor has been trying to persuade the Government to adopt a flexible formula that will allow room for settling grievances and hardship cases and give some consideration to the men and women who work in the plants and shops.

Is there any danger that a man will be frozen to his job or ordered to take a job he doesn't want?

Not at this time. In some industries, the immediate problem for many families is the prospect of a long lay-off. Some manufacturers are being forced to shut down civilian production lines even though no defense orders are ready for them.

Suppose the Russians attack, will job control come then?

It may. That is the door Mr. Wilson and General Clay are leaving wide open. General Clay favored drafting men for jobs in defense plants during World War II. Then, however, labor had a direct voice and a vote on the old War Manpower Commission. Both labor and management representatives on that Commission voted against General Clay's proposal. The manpower problems of World War II—and there were serious problems—were all solved by voluntary methods, not by force. This time, Mr. Wilson has set up a manpower committee made up entirely of Government officials to fix manpower policy.

Didn't the country accept controls during World War II and come out all right?

The country accepted controls voluntarily during World War II. Labor and management had an equal voice in the making of policy from the beginning—William S. Knudsen for industry, Sidney Hillman for labor. True, no group liked the controls over its activities, but in every case controls were made acceptable to the interested groups before they were imposed. No group was asked to make a greater sacrifice than any other. This is the way a democracy meets a crisis—through the voluntary acceptance of controls during an emergency. So far, it has looked as though Mr. Wilson intends to impose controls by force this time without regard for any group except business.

Is labor trying to get an advantage for its own members?

No. It is not. Organized labor has not asked for a single advantage for wage earners over any other group. On the contrary, labor's entire struggle is to establish a policy based on equality of sacrifice. On the other hand, union officers are unable and unwilling to help impose upon their members a defense policy which they are convinced is unfair and unworkable. Labor believes that the present policies will hinder rearmament, that the only policies which can succeed are those which will convince every American that he is getting the fairest possible break under the circumstances. That has to mean lowering the standards of luxury before lowering the standard of living.

The Project Is Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by the Honorable Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, which appears in the February-March issue of the Democratic Digest. In this article the able Secretary gives details on the importance of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. His words will be of special interest to all Members of Congress at this time when we are once again considering the seaway. The article follows:

THE PROJECT IS VITAL

(By Charles Sawyer)

(In President Truman's Economic Message to Congress on February 12, he said: "Iron ore constitutes one of our most serious potential shortages. * * * We should start at once on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project so that imported iron ore can be shipped efficiently by water to the great steel-producing centers of the Middle West. The St. Lawrence project is vital also to bring in a new source of power for industry in the Northeast."

(The article herein, by Secretary Sawyer, gives details on the importance of the project. Legislation on the St. Lawrence seaway was introduced early in the present session of Congress, and hearings are scheduled for late February and early March.)

The essential facts about the St. Lawrence seaway and power project may be summarized quite briefly.

It is an international dual-purpose project to provide a channel for ocean-going vessels between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic and to harness the tremendous hydroelectric power now running to waste in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. Both the electric power and the transportation are badly needed to serve our steadily growing industrial economy and to assure that our defense requirements are fully covered. These are considerations that apply to Canada, our partner in this development, quite as much as to the United States. This is a North American resource which requires development for the industrial and military strength of the Continent.

The project will add a fourth coastline, 4,000 miles in length, to the United States, and add 700,000 kilowatts of dependable generating capacity to our power supply. The cost to the United States is estimated to be about $600,000,000 at 1948 cost levels. It can, moreover, be made fully self-liquidating. The power phase will constitute, after Grand Coulee, the largest single-dam project in the country, but a market is already in prospect for much more power than even this huge project can produce. Conservative estimates of traffic on the seaway make clear that it, too, could be made to pay its way through tolls.

The project has been under active discussion for many years and the present plan is based upon an agreement between the Government of the United States and Canada reached in 1941. The war caused suspension of the project's consideration, but since 1945 a joint resolution to approve the international agreement has been offered in every Congress. The President has again recommended approval of the agreement; legislation to approve it was introduced promptly after the convening of the new Congress, and hearings before the House Public Works Committee are scheduled to begin late in February. It is to be hoped that realistic appraisal of the urgent need for the dual-purpose project will lead to its final approval before summer.

PRESENT URGENCY

The urgency of the matter was made clear last spring in the course of hearings before the House Committee on Public Works and has been underscored by developments in Korea since that time. The project is of basic importance to the industrial strength of the country and is thus also basically important to our military strength. More than this, it has great strategic importance because of the growing dependence of our steel industry upon foreign sources of iron ore.

The outlook for iron ore, as summarized by the National Security Resources Board last April, assumed that by 1960 our steel industry's probable ingot capacity would be 110,000,000 tons. Operation at this level would call for about 125,000,000 tons of ore a year. Taking into account the maximum output to be expected of Lake Superior sources, of other ore-producing regions, and of taconite development, a deficit of about 25,000,000 tons a year—to be supplied by imports—was expected to develop by 1960.

Under present and prospective conditions, this outlook is greatly changed. Ingot capacity of 110,000,000 tons is now expected to be reached, not in 1960, but by the end of this year. By 1960 we may need as much as 160,000,000 tons of ore and of such a total more than 40,000,000 tons would have to be imported.

This means that over the next 10 years we must plan to meet a developing dependence on imported iron ore which at the end of that time will amount to about one-quarter of our total requirements. Unless this large fraction of our iron ore can be assured—and the only safe and efficient route of import is from Labrador via the St. Lawrence—we shall, in time of war, when we need it most, be under the constant threat of having to close down as much as one-quarter of our steel-making capacity. That is a grim prospect to invite through neglect of the opportunity now before us.

As for power, the Federal Power Commission estimated last spring, prior to Korea, that, in addition to the expansion of steam-generating capacity already planned, there would be required by 1960 about 2,700,000 kilowatts of dependable generating capacity in the region of the St. Lawrence. This is nearly four times as much as can be supplied by the project on the St. Lawrence.

Mobilization to meet military needs will require increased production of aluminum, magnesium, ferroalloys, explosives, chemicals and other products which require large quantities of electric power. Accordingly, it is essential to accelerate programs for increasing power-generating capacity. This applies to the steam plants of the private companies and it applies to the hydroelectric plants which Federal and State Governments are constructing on our great rivers. It applies, in particular, to the St. Lawrence project, for here lies the largest single unit of undeveloped hydroelectric power in the entire country, one, moreover, that has so uniform a flow of water as to be termed an engineer's dream. Here is a power resource uniquely associated with a key transportation route, making its complete and integrated development an incomparably valuable achievement.

IN THE LONG RUN

Important as it is that we move promptly, through construction of the seaway, to provide a sheltered route for the secure importation of vitally needed iron ore from sources on this continent, we must not overlook the broader requirements of transportation which the dual-purpose project on the St. Lawrence would enable us to meet. The volume of traffic that must be carried by our transportation system, by the railroads, and over the highways, by air and by water, is steadily growing and under the demands of mobilizing will grow even more rapidly than we have planned for. We dare neglect none of these means of transportation and particularly we must not neglect the provisions of a deep-water channel that will enable full use to be made of water transport between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic.

This is not a question of traffic being taken away from anyone. The railroads today are requesting enormous quantities of steel for freight cars to increase their carrying capacity. Substantial freight-car-construction programs have been approved. At the same time, however, we must also increase the capacity of this other vital element of our transportation system. We must enable this great arm of water transport to expand side by side with rail transport, so that our national transportation system may have the capacity, the flexibility, the efficiency that our growing and dynamic industrial economy requires.

EVERYBODY BENEFITS

In viewing the traffic prospects for the seaway, it is important to bear in mind not only that our requirements for total transportation are steadily growing, but that, of the traffic to be expected on the seaway, a very large proportion will be new traffic, which will not involve tonnage now moving by other forms of transport. The economic development encouraged by this opportunity to ship at low cost will tend, in turn, to increase the volume of goods transported by other carriers. In this connection we must bear in mind how greatly the railroads have benefited from development along the Pacific Coast, development that would not have reached its present stage except for the opening of the Panama Canal in competition with them. This benefit from competition is paradoxical, but genuine, and will, I am confident, prove equally genuine in the case of the St. Lawrence seaway.

One feature of the seaway has given concern to some. During 4 or 5 months of the year shipping on the Great Lakes is impossible because they freeze over. This will also be true of the seaway. Shipping on the Great Lakes during the open months is nonetheless tremendous in volume and the traffic estimates for the seaway that have been made by the Department of Commerce make full allowance for the closed season.

Because the 7 or 8 months of the open season extend into the peak weeks of railroad traffic, there is some tendency for Great Lakes shipping to aid the railroads by lowering the traffic peak for which the latter must have equipment ready. This is a minor factor because, for the most part, this seasonal problem is met—and on the seaway would be met in the same fashion—through storage and stockpiles accumulated during the open

season to last through the closed months. To such extent, however, as the seaway would create new traffic which, during the months the Lakes are closed, might alternatively be carried by rail, this diversion of traffic would occur at just the right time to help the railroads maintain their traffic volume after the fall peak was past. The fact that during the winter months the seaway would be closed is, therefore, in no way damaging to the railroads; indeed, its effect would tend to be helpful.

OUR NATIONAL STAKE

From every viewpoint the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is one that we simply dare not neglect any longer. Much of the opposition has in the past arisen because of the conviction that both the power and the transportation facilities could be used only at the expense of existing power plants and existing means of transportation. The rapid growth of our need for electric power has quite effectively brought a correction of this view so far as power is concerned. It should be apparent by now that in transportation, too, our needs are steadily expanding, so that the effect of expanded Great Lakes shipping will be to afford greater balance and flexibility rather than reduce the existing traffic of competing carriers. Incidental local adjustments will undoubtedly be necessary in the short run, but they are so minor as to be wholly offset by the broader advantages that will be gained.

In dollar terms the project can be made to pay its own way, but under mobilization that is not necessarily enough. The advantages it would bring must not be bought at too high a cost in materials or manpower, both of which are tight and will grow tighter. Fortunately, this project, huge as it is, will during its construction take no more than one-third of 1 percent of our annual supply of any of the principal materials going into it and will take the labor of hardly more than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of our civilian labor force.

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project goes to the very heart of our country's economic and military strength. That is why Americans in every section and every locality should seek to have its construction authorized and begun as promptly as possible.

Book Postage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent Congress a message on postal rates which was remarkable for balanced statesmanship and clarity of expression. In this message the President called attention to the long-standing discrimination against books which exists in the present postal-rate structure and which will be intensified if the Interstate Commerce Commission grants the application by the Postmaster General which is now pending and which the Postmaster General made in accordance with a directive which was included in the supplemental appropriation bill of 1951.

I have long felt that all users of the mail should more nearly pay the costs of carriage. At the same time, however, I welcome the President's evident desire to equate the rate for books and that for the reading matter portion of magazines.

Yesterday's Washington Post carried an excellent editorial on this subject, and I commend it to the attention of those of my colleagues who are concerned with the postal-rate problem, as well as to all Members who feel as I do that our free institutions depend in a great degree on the maximum use by the public of good books.

BOOK POSTAGE

In his message to Congress recommending increased postal rates, the President pointed out what he called "a startling discrimination" in the treatment accorded books as compared with newspapers and magazines. From the earliest days of the Republic, newspapers and magazines have been carried through the mail at a rate so low as to entail a generous subsidization on the theory that they would contribute to public education and enlightenment. Classified as second-class material, they are required to pay only 1½ cents a pound without regard to distance on the portion of them devoted to reading matter, plus a graduated rate for the advertising matter in them, rising from 1½ cents a pound, for distances up to 150 miles, to 7 cents a pound for distances over 1,800 miles.

Books, classed as fourth-class material, are charged 8 cents for the first pound, 4 cents for each succeeding pound. Moreover, the Post Office Department has asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to raise this rate to 10 cents for the first pound and 5 cents for each succeeding pound; and book packages over 10 pounds in weight would be required to pay the much higher regular zoned parcel post rates applicable to general merchandise. If these proposed rates are put into force, books—which, of course, carry no advertising matter—would be granted little, if any, subsidy.

There is a striking anomaly in this contract. Books, as the President observed, "are surely as important as newspapers and magazines in disseminating information." As matters stand now, the postage charge on Winston Churchill's memoirs, for example, would be over six times as high in book form as it would be if the same material were published in a magazine. This is a form of discrimination which virtually no other country imposes on its book publishers—or, to put the situation more accurately, on its book readers. Books, used in schools, colleges, and libraries, are an essential element in education—apart from their high value as sources of information and entertainment in general circulation. As we said in commenting the other day on the postal rates for periodicals, we think they ought to pay their own way when they use the mails. But every consideration of common sense and fairness dictates that books be put on a parity with newspapers and magazines.

Speaker Rayburn 38 Years in House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, no man in this Nation is held in higher esteem by the Washington press than the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. This is a singular honor to be so respected by these discerning men and women who represent our free press.

Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, wrote for his newspaper on February 11 an excellent article on the occasion of Mr. RAYBURN's attainment of the record in service as Speaker of the House.

Members of this body, and Americans everywhere, will want to read this story about a great American, by one of the Nation's outstanding newspapermen.

Therefore, by unanimous consent of the House, I am inserting this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 11, 1951]

SPEAKER RAYBURN, 38 YEARS IN HOUSE, SAYS PEOPLE JUDGE RIGHT WHEN THEY HAVE FACTS—TEXAN WHO HAS WIELDED GAVEL FOR 3,057 DAYS, BEATING HENRY CLAY'S RECORD, ALSO DRAWS ANOTHER CONCLUSION: "YOU CANNOT LEAD PEOPLE BY TRYING TO DRIVE THEM"

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—Representative SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, made formal history when he recently broke the record of Henry Clay, of Kentucky, by serving as Speaker of the House of Representatives for 3,057 days. Clay's record stood for 125 years; RAYBURN, 69 years old and from a district which reelects him almost automatically, is likely to set a mark that will endure for another century and a quarter.

In an exclusive interview with the Post-Dispatch, RAYBURN outlined some of his outstanding experiences and accomplishments during his 38 years in the House, first as a freshman Representative at the beginning of the Wilson administration; as an opposition leader in the administration of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover; as chairman of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commission; then as majority leader, and finally as Speaker during the war years of President Roosevelt and now as Speaker in the postwar years of President Truman.

Truman has called the Speakership "the second most powerful office in the Nation," and RAYBURN will go down in history as one of the great figures to hold this office which ranks statutorially after the Vice Presidency in succession to the Presidency. No other legislator has been more influential in shaping the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

TWO BASIC CONCLUSIONS

Seated in his small personal office next to the larger and usually crowded Speaker's room on the second floor of the Capitol, RAYBURN told the Post-Dispatch he had come to two basic conclusions during his Government service that began with his election as a member of the Texas House of Representatives when he was 24 years old.

"First," he said, "I believe in people and the soundness of their judgment when they have the facts. I know that 98 percent of the people have more good than bad in them and can be trusted to do the right thing.

"My experience with the Speakership has been that you cannot lead people by trying to drive them. Persuasion and reason are the only ways to lead them. In that way the Speaker has influence and power in the House.

"Second, I have seen a lot of politicians and officeholders in my day and there is no job so big that it should change a man's outlook and manners. When you see a man get stuffy or arrogant because he holds a big job, it means he was not big enough for the job when he got it. There is no reason why a man should not be able to look you square in the eye and tell you what he will or will not do. I've found that people respect you if you tell them where you stand. If you shilly-shally and are afraid to say, 'No', you'll get into trouble, and there's no reason for any man to get 'uppity' in a Government job."

"What about the Presidency?" I asked.

"That is an exception," he replied. "Any man would be changed by the responsibilities and requirements of the White House."

RAYBURN, who was one of the President's closest friends when Truman was in the Senate, unwittingly illustrated this point later when he told how he had called at the White House after Truman had succeeded Roosevelt in 1945. Truman had been in RAYBURN's office when he received word to come to the White House as quickly as possible that April day.

"The President and I discussed our long friendship," RAYBURN said, "and how he hoped it would continue. I told him, 'You are no longer Harry to me; from now on you are Mr. President.'"

AURA OF HISTORIC POSITION

As Speaker, RAYBURN is surrounded by the historical aura of the position. In his small office there are portraits of his early predecessors—Clay, who was an active candidate for the Presidency for a quarter of a century; James K. Polk, who became President, and Schuyler Colfax, who was Grant's first Vice President.

This office, with its red draperies and large gilt mirror that reflects an enormous crystal candelabra, also contains many personal mementos of his long service as well as the inevitable Texas souvenirs, such as a pipe with a carved steer's head for a bowl. A photograph of Chief Justice Vinson has a prominent place. It says: "Sam, I love you a lot. Fred."

The Speaker smoked several cigarettes during the interview, with bald head flushing when he laughed over some minor historical episode. He wore a well-fitting blue suit, enlivened by a dark red tie. He said he felt equal to the task ahead.

"My latest medical examination showed that I am in good physical shape," he said. "I weigh the same as I did 30 years ago and wear the same size clothes."

HE WALKS, RESTS, DOESN'T WORRY

Knowing that he did not go in for any sports, I asked him how he kept fit.

"I walk at least 2 miles every day," he replied. "I also stay in bed as long as I can. Although I don't sleep 9 hours a day, I know that when I am stretched out in bed, all my insides are relaxed. Also, I don't worry. When I leave Capitol Hill, I leave my work there."

RAYBURN likes to attend small parties in the evening, preferably where Texans are present. His greatest delight is to go to a friend's home where he can cook the meal. He will take a little "bourbon and branch water" before dinner but not after.

"Since I was majority leader," he disclosed, "I have not been in a cocktail room. It's not that I have any prejudice, it's just because I don't think a public official should be seen in such places. I remember going to cocktail parties during the war and seeing some high-ranking generals there who had arrived before I did. I wondered then why they weren't using the time to fight the war. Some people might have some such idea if they saw me in a cocktail lounge."

HE EXPECTS NO TROUBLE

As for the present session of Congress, RAYBURN thinks he will have little trouble in getting House approval of President Truman's defense program.

"We'll pass a reciprocal trade agreement extension and a good tax bill," he said. "And we'll give the President the appropriations for defense and foreign aid. The people are behind our security program and are willing to pay for it and make personal sacrifices in their daily lives. We should pay for this program as we go.

"A lot of people say they are afraid this will bankrupt the country. I don't think so. I remember back in 1932 our national income was only $39,000,000,000; last year it was up to $270,000,000,000. That means we can stand heavier taxes. But it also means we've got to keep our national income up."

"Do you think you will have opposition from the isolationists and the economisers?" he was asked.

"The best answer to that," he replied, "was the vote in the House the other day for the expenditure of $2,000,000,000 for fighting ships and naval aircraft. The roll call was 365 to 9. That's a pretty good index of congressional thinking."

PERSUADER, NO COMPROMISER

RAYBURN appeared to enjoy talking about the early years in which he gained experience to preside over a divided House. Henry Clay was known as the Great Compromiser, RAYBURN doesn't like, or fit, that description.

"I am not a compromiser," he asserted vehemently. "I'd rather be known as a persuader. I try to compromise by getting people to think my way. Of course, there are times when you haven't got the votes, then you have to make concessions. But in the main, you can get what you want by sticking to your guns.

"Champ Clark, of Missouri, was Speaker when I came to the House in March 1913. I was given a place on the Interstate Commerce Committee. One of my assignments from the Wilson administration was to get House approval of the first War Risk Insurance Act, which supplanted the old pension system. Later, on my own motion, I secured House passage of a bill requiring Government supervision of the issuance of railroad securities. I modeled this after the Texas 'blue sky' law and it was a forerunner of the Roosevelt securities and exchange legislation.

"Perhaps the most enjoyable period of service was when the Democrats were in the opposition from 1921 to 1931. The times seemed to be prosperous and under the leadership of John Garner we needled the Republicans. We had a great crowd in Bankhead and McDuffie, of Alabama, Rainey of Illinois and, of course, Hull of Tennessee."

MOST DIFFICULT PERIOD IN HOUSE

"What do you consider the most difficult period in the House?" the writer asked.

"Undoubtedly, it was the years before World War II, when the isolationists were trying to prevent legislation and appropriations for preparedness. The darkest hour was in September 1941—by that time I was Speaker—and the draft extension bill was passed by a single vote majority."

RAYBURN won't publicly admit it, but many observers believed his greatest parliamentary stroke was his gaveling of that bill through the House before any legislator could change his mind. Had it failed of passage, this country's defense would have been terribly weak at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack.

During the period from 1931 to 1937, RAYBURN's name was on much New Deal legislation, such as the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Rural Electrification Administration Act, the Communications Act and the Public Utilities Holding Company Act. Powerful lobbies worked against each of these bills and RAYBURN was able to get approval in the shape he and the White House wanted.

CORCORAN AND COHEN

RAYBURN's helpers on much of this legislation were Thomas G. Corcoran and Benjamin V. Cohen, the brilliant team that worked out of the White House.

"Taken together," RAYBURN said, "these two fellows made the brightest man I ever saw. They never insisted on their own views. When I told them what I wanted, they started to work to put it into the legislation, and they wrote it in such a way as to make it stick.

"I know that a lot of people say that Tommy Corcoran has made a lot of money. But he is a real Democrat and we could use some young fellows like him now."

When RAYBURN was asked whom he considered the ablest man he had known in the House, he countered by saying that he had asked the same question of Speaker Clark many years ago and got a vague answer.

"Clark said that if he had to select one man, he would choose Joe Bailey, of Texas, who was a Representative before he went to the Senate," RAYBURN reported. "The other man whose intellect he greatly respected was the Socialist Meyer London, of New York City.

EACH ABLE IN DIFFERENT WAY

"I could not pick out a single man as the ablest because there are various kinds of ability. John Garner was a man of rare intelligence and great industry and he left his imprint as a great Speaker and Vice President. The man who impressed me most for breadth of view was Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama, who would have been President had he come from a Northern State. Another man of great ability was LaGuardia, of New York. For sheer intellectual ability, quite aside from his political views, it would be hard to find a more incisive mind than that of Marvin Jones, of New York. As for men who got things done on the floor of the House, no one can ignore Fred Vinson, now Chief Justice of the United States, and Chief Justice Finis J. Garrett, of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals."

This writer, who has known all of the men mentioned by RAYBURN, will hazard a guess that if they could be polled about the men of ability they had known in the House, they would put RAYBURN among the top, if not at the top, of their contemporaries.

RAYBURN said he thought the Speakership had most of the power and as great prestige as it had in Uncle Joe Cannon's day.

HOUSE I. Q. HIGHER THAN EVER

"Times have changed," he observed, "and the House is a different body than it was when Cannon was the boss. The Norris 'lame duck' amendment did away with the so-called short session of Congress from December to March 4. Under present conditions we couldn't afford to have a short session in which a Member defeated in November returned for almost 4 months, and the man who beat him did not take his seat until 13 months after the election. It was in the short session that the Republicans pulled off some of their most important legislation.

"Our Representatives today are better educated, better informed on issues, and work harder and longer than in the old days. When I first came here I sometimes got as many as 10 letters a day. Now a Congressman's daily mail runs into the hundreds and thousands of letters and telegrams. Generally speaking, I think the intelligence in the House is higher than I have ever known it before."

"What about the Senate?" he was asked.

"A Member of the House," he replied, "shouldn't comment on the other Chamber. It is something of an index, however, that Senator TAFT is the spokesman for a majority of the Republicans over there."

NO SECRET AMBITION

RAYBURN said that what success he had had as majority leader and later as Speaker could be attributed to the fact that he had had no ambitions above the Speakership.

The writer reminded him that he had been discussed as a vice-presidential candidate in 1944, the year Senator Truman got that honor.

"Yes, I know there was talk about that but I told everybody that I wouldn't be selected. Frank Walker, who was then Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic committee, talked to me about it. So did his successor as chairman, Ed Flynn, and Ed Pauley, Ed Kelly, and Harry Truman. Before the convention, Truman asked me to come out to Missouri to make a speech for Representative Dick Duncan (now a Federal judge) who was having trouble. Truman said he wanted me to be there so he could say that I was his choice for Vice President. I told him that he had been mentioned for the place and he said he didn't want it.

"I knew I didn't have a chance. I came from the wrong State and I think Roosevelt remembered the trouble he had had with Garner. Roosevelt never spoke to me about it and I didn't take the other talk seriously. And I am glad I didn't get it."

ALWAYS A TEAM PLAYER

As Speaker and as majority leader, RAYBURN has regarded himself as a team player and not as an individual star. Although he sponsored and helped pass much New Deal and Fair Deal legislation, he does not classify himself as a New Dealer or Fair Dealer. Neither can he be called conservative or a middle-of-the-roader.

He was much impressed by Wilson's new freedom and he described the First World War President as the most detached person I have ever known.

"Wilson," he remarked, "was sheer intellect and he once told me that he knew he could never be loved by the people Yet he was working for their welfare all his life with the zeal of a covenanter.

"Roosevelt was the greatest humanitarian of these times and he held the devotion of the great masses. Although an aristocrat, he put through more social welfare legislation than any other President."

"Did you ever disagree with Roosevelt on his New Deal program?"

"Not publicly," RAYBURN replied, "I think his two greatest mistakes were his Supreme Court plan in 1937 and his attempted congressional purge in 1938. Officially, I had nothing to do with either.

IF OUTVOTED, HE GOES ALONG

"As I said, I am a team player and believe in working within the party organization. Even today, if we go to the White House and the President, the Vice President and the two majority leaders believe strongly one way and I believe the other way, I express my views as well as I can. If I am voted down, 4 to 1, I go along with the majority."

Most of the votes against Roosevelt and Truman measures have been determined by his Texas background. He voted with the southerners against antidiscrimination legislation, the Taft-Hartley Act and has been a principal figure behind the legislation to give the States the rich tideland oil reserves. He was also an active manipulator in securing congressional passage of the Kerr natural gas bill that Truman vetoed.

The writer also reminded him that in 1946 he had shown reluctance to run for reelection because he felt the Democrats would lose control of the House and he didn't want to step down from the Speaker rostrum to the minority leadership on the floor. He did run, however, and he did serve as minority leader while Republican JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, was Speaker.

HE ISN'T GOING TO QUIT

"I know I talk about it," RAYBURN agreed, "but I couldn't step out then because it would have been a public confession that I thought the Democrats would lose the Congress. I did want to go back to the farm and take it easy for a while. I felt a little that way in 1948, but then it would have been said that I was doing it because I thought Truman would be defeated. So I ran again. Those 2 years as minority leader had one compensation, however. See that silver plaque over there on the wall, the Collier's award for distinguished congressional service in 1948. Eric Johnston, who headed the award committee that year, told me I would never have won it as Speaker, so it was given me for my minority leadership."

"How about 1952?" the writer asked.

"It probably will be 1946 and 1948 all over and I'll have to run again. If I retired then, people might say I was doing so because I was afraid the Democrats would lose the elections."

Should the Democrats control the House after the 1952 elections, RAYBURN surely would be reelected Speaker and would set a record far beyond Clay's. Such a record would probably stand as long as the Republic retains the two-party system.

Tax-Free Expense Accounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Congress must pass tax-increase legislation at this session to support the Armed Forces and curb inflationary pressures.

Before asking the people to deny themselves and bear the heavy additional burdens of taxation which the President has asked in his recent message, the Members of Congress and other officials should set the pattern by removing the exemption on expense allowances which they enjoy. Those in authority in the executive and legislative branches of the Government should first repeal the provisions of the law calling for tax-free expense accounts. There is no reason that special privileges be enjoyed by any segment of the people. In this emergency all should bear his or her tax load on an equal basis.

In the Reorganization Act of 1946, Members of Congress, both Senate and House, were provided an expense account of $2,500 which could not be taxed. Under a special act of Congress in January 1949, just prior to the inauguration of President Truman, the President was given a tax-free expense allowance of $50,000 per year, the Speaker of the House a similar allowance in the amount of $10,000 per annum, and the Vice President an annual sum of $10,000 for expenses, which is tax exempt.

I am introducing a bill to repeal these tax-free expense accounts and provide that all such officials pay taxes on these sums, just as any other citizen would pay on his earnings. These public servants have always, and do now, pay taxes on their salaries. It is the allowances for expenses that carry the exemption from Federal tax that should be corrected. With the heavy preparedness program confronting the Nation, the budget for the new fiscal year July 1, 1951, will reach an astronomical figure.

In providing the necessary funds, tax increases will, of necessity, have to be made in individual incomes, corporations, and excises.

Taxes are high now. By increasing them as suggested, such heights are attained in many instances that there is little incentive for the individual to produce or earn more money. Too heavy a tax on individual incomes and corporation earnings may have the effect of reaching the point of diminishing returns.

There should be no objection on the part of the taxpayer to carry his individual burden in providing the funds that are needed to keep down aggression to defend the Nation from the threat of Communist totalitarianism. Every good citizen would want to participate and even make sacrifices in order that the precious heritage which we have inherited will be safeguarded and preserved. He wants to know, too—and he has the right to know—that the tax moneys he provides will be spent for the necessary preparedness effort or reasonable support of the departments of the Federal Government. He wants to know without equivocation that his tax dollars will not be squandered. He wants to know—and has a right to know—that all taxpayers are placed on the same basis and taxed accordingly. He wants to be assured emphatically that no person or group enjoy tax exemption when others in the same category engaged in the same business pay such tax.

All businesses for profit should pay the same tax as their competitors. It is a source of satisfaction to me that my bill to tax the untaxed businesses that operate for profit was introduced by me in 1948. It is believed that this bill was the first one on this question introduced in either House of Congress.

Perpetually in Favor of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by the Honorable Bruce Barton, entitled "Perpetually in Favor of War":

PERPETUALLY IN FAVOR OF WAR

(By Bruce Barton)

Abraham Lincoln liked to tell about a political friend of his in Illinois, a man named Butterfield, who was asked at the beginning of the Mexican War if he were not opposed to it.

"No," exclaimed Butterfield. "I opposed one war. That was enough for me. I am now perpetually in favor of war, pestilence, and famine."

That story deserves to be much better known. The good people of America, the haters of war, should cut it out and paste it in the top of their hats to remind them daily that, in their thinking about war and how to prevent it, they too often proceed on a fundamentally unsound assumption. They assume that everyone hates and opposes war. Whereas, all history shows that large and powerful sections of the population, while sincerely believing that they hate it, actually profit from war—politically, financially, or emotionally—and are therefore subconsciously divided in their opposition to it.

You can see our politicians already casting themselves in the brave role of war governors and war Senators. To them war comes as a kindly wind from heaven to blow away all discontent and criticism with their mismanagement of domestic affairs. There is no vote-getter so faithful as the old reliable "Don't change horses in the middle of the stream."

War means full employment, millions in dues for union leaders, and plenty of dough in the take-home envelope. It means big crops for farmers, at guaranteed high prices.

To all sorts of routine-bound business and professional people it means a tingling release into the wide world of adventure and irresponsibility.

Doctors and surgeons at the front have, in a few months, a variety of experience that would not come in years of ordinary practice, plus the tremendous satisfaction of giving relief where it is most bravely deserved and urgently needed. College professors have a wonderful chance to rush to Washington to be all sorts of important persons at much more money.

A young friend of mine, returning from the last war, told me he had decided to study law. "I talked with hundreds of men in the Army," he said. "The two groups that were most eager to get back to their work were lawyers and taxicab drivers."

"Which group was having the best time and hated most to go back?" I asked.

He answered unhesitatingly, "Teachers."

War is inflation, and a booming stock market. It is a black market from which the unrighteous garner billions. It can be a blessed escape for the man in the dreary job, for the husband with the nagging wife. Such men would be heels for turning their backs on their jobs and their homes in peacetime; in wartime they are heroes.

Like Lincoln's obscure and long forgotten friend, I, as an obscure Member of Congress, opposed one war. I am now doing my feeble best to oppose another.

But I have no delusions. I know how deep-seated and powerful are the hidden forces that, often with utmost sincerity and even in the name of peace, help to make broad and smooth the downward path.

Resolution by Juraj Onda District of the First Catholic Slovak Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution adopted by the Juraj Onda district of the First Catholic Slovak Union protesting the conviction of Rt. Rev. Bishop Jan Vojtasak, D. D.; Rt. Rev. Michael Buzalka, D. D.; and Rt. Rev. Bishop Paul Gojdich, D. D., by the people's court at Bratislava on charges of collaboration with the western powers.

I wholeheartedly join with these people in their protest against the injustice to these clergymen. It is clearly a case of religious persecution, and I believe every effort of the State Department should be exerted to rectify it. The resolution follows:

Whereas the district officers and representatives of the Juraj Onda district of the First Catholic Slovak Union, comprising of 28 senior societies and 10 junior societies of Westmoreland County, Pa., assembled at their regular quarterly meeting at the Holy Trinity School Hall, in the city of Greensburgh, Pa., on February 25, 1951; and

Whereas the Rt. Rev. Bishop Jan Vojtasak, D. D.; Rt. Rev. Michael Buzalka, D. D.; and the Rt. Rev. Bishop Paul Gojdich, D. D., were tried by the people's court at Bratislava for allegedly collaborating with the western powers; and

Whereas the Kremlin dominated court found the aforesaid, Rt. Rev. Bishop Jan Vojtasak, D. D.; Rt. Rev. Bishop Paul Gojdich, D. D.; and the Rt. Rev. Bishop Michael Buzalka, D. D., guilty on drummed up charges and were given 20-year sentence to life imprisonment.

We, the district officers of the Juraj Onda district of the First Catholic Slovak Union, numbering over 5,000 members in Westmoreland County, Pa., vigorously protest against the unfair, unjustifiable, and prejudicial trial of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Jan Vojtasak, D. D.; Rt. Rev. Bishop Michael Buzalka, D. D.; and the Rt. Rev. Bishop Paul Gojdich, D. D., as violative of the rules laid down by our own Justice Robert H. Jackson for the trial of war criminals and call upon the President of the United States and Congress of the United States to protest against the conviction based upon proceedings held by the People's Court of Czechoslovakia, and be it further:

Resolved, That this protest be spread upon the minutes of this our quarterly meeting, be disseminated through the various publications and copy thereof be forwarded to our United States Congressman, Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, at Washington, D. C., for the purpose of entering the protest in the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Adopted this 25th day of February A. D. 1951, Greensburg, Pa.

M. J. VARGOVICH,
National President.
FRANK MIZENKO,
District President.
STEPHEN P. UNGVARSKY,
Secretary.

Mink-Coat Standards of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 2, 1951:

MINK-COAT STANDARDS OF HONOR

The Star does not know whether Donald Dawson, the President's aide on personnel matters, intends to appear voluntarily before the Fulbright committee and give his own version of the "influence" he is alleged to have exercised with the RFC Board. He may yet intend to do so. If he does, it will be a creditable act on his part.

If he does not do so, he ought to be fired. In the Star's opinion, a failure to demand an opportunity to testify and tell his own story, especially in the light of the ugly mess already being developed by the Fulbright committee, will render him unfit for service in the White House or anywhere else in Government. Furthermore, his continuation in White House service under such circumstances would be an affront to public morals.

Mr. Dawson has not been charged with any illegal act. But that is not the point. The point is that here is a man occupying a position as one of the President's intimate advisers on personnel who has been publicly charged by a responsible committee of the Senate with having "apparently exercised considerable influence over certain directors of the RFC" in its business of lending public funds.

According to certain moral standards of honor and public service, which are felt rather than defined by decent people, this unwritten code would compel Mr. Dawson to demand the right on his own initiative to testify under oath before the committee and to explain in complete detail the nature of his relationship, if any, with the RFC. The fact that he has not done so, and in the present atmosphere at the White House it does not seem likely that he will, raises the cynical thought that Mr. Dawson is not following the old code of public service but is guided by what seems to be a new code, of which there is much disturbing evidence in public life today.

Under this code a woman assistant secretary at the White House can accept a $9,500 natural royal pastel mink coat from her husband who, according to his own story, not yet complete, is already in debt to a lawyer who has been active in business before the RFC, and who arranged for the purchase of the coat.

Under this code Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, military aide to the President, can continue to serve at the White House after being named by another investigating committee of the Senate as the man who made possible the "nefarious activities" of John Maragon, an "outright fixer," who subsequently has been convicted of perjury.

Under this code a woman alien from Australia can be brought to the United States and admitted to residence by a special act of Congress, approved by the President over the protest of the Department of Justice, which could not find in the records "any facts which would justify" the legislation. She turns up, too, at the White House, as the secretary of General Vaughan.

Under this code the President's press secretary, Joseph Short, can explain that the President "knows of no evidence of illegal influence on the RFC by any member of the executive branch or the legislative branch * * *" as if the "legality" of influence had anything to do with what is worrying the Senate committee—and the country.

Under this code it is the legality of conduct rather than integrity of conduct, which assumes importance. Loss of honor is accepted as perhaps the inevitable accompaniment of politics, which the public is being taught to believe is without honor. A double standard of morality for public office and private life is beginning to be cynically accepted as one of the facts of life.

If it becomes finally so accepted, the Russians and their masses of infantry are one of the least of the things we have to worry about.

The Late Honorable Delph E. Carpenter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has learned with sorrow of the passing of the Honorable Delph E. Carpenter, of Colorado; and

Whereas Mr. Carpenter was the commissioner for the State of Colorado in the negotiation and execution of the Colorado River Compact; and

Whereas Mr. Carpenter has been generally recognized as the father of the Colorado River Compact, both in the conception of this constitutional method of solving the interstate problems on the Colorado River, as well as in the negotiation of the compact itself; and

Whereas Mr. Carpenter was known and respected throughout the seven States of the Colorado River Basin, and held the deep affection of all those who knew him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives expresses its sorrow on the passing of Delph E. Carpenter, lawyer, statesman, father of the Colorado River Compact, and a leader of the West; and extends its sympathy and respect to the members of Mr. Carpenter's family.

Unanimously adopted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 1, 1951.

JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Chairman.

Attested to:

CLAUDE E. RAGAN,
Clerk, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

More Secure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic entitled "More Secure?" In this very concise and pointed argument, it is clearly shown that what we need is more unity and more faith in our professional military leaders:

MORE SECURE?

Whether in reaction to Russian Premier Stalin's recent "interview" in which he offered oily assurance that he doesn't want war; or because the fighting in Korea continues to show reverses for the Communists; or because General Eisenhower's report on conditions in Europe was more encouraging than had been expected; or because the mobilization of our industrial resources for defense purposes seems to be progressing satisfactorily; whatever the reason, or combination of reasons, the fact is evident that this country isn't so nervous about the international situation as it was a few weeks ago. At least there has been a resumption of "politics as usual" in discussing foreign policy, a free expression of criticism of the administration's methods and plans, and a general attitude that no considerations of national safety need interfere with our airing of our differences and disagreements.

Thus, arguments are continued as to the number of men we should send to Europe, and as to how definite should be the control of Congress over the Armed Forces, as if hard and fast answers could be established for these questions without putting invaluable information in the hands of our enemies, if war should break out; the opinions of such experienced military men as General Eisenhower and General Marshall—who happen to have had a leading part in winning the most terrific war in history—are denounced and belittled by individuals who certainly can't claim any military competence; abstract reasons why we should not have "peacetime" conscription and military training are put forward, as if the present days could properly be called "peacetime."

In a way, all of this is a tribute to the mobilization plans that have been undertaken; beyond doubt, they have already established a feeling that the danger of war is receding. But we ought to be more realistic than that; we ought to realize that security must rest on a firmer basis than plans, no matter how impressive. If we are to pass safely through this crisis we need far more concern for the common good, more submergence of prejudices and partisanship. We certainly cannot yet afford the luxury of disunity.

Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House is now conducting hearings on depletion allowance. My friend and constituent, Mr. R. B. Anderson, of Vernon, Tex., made a most excellent statement before said Ways and Means Committee in their hearings this morning on this subject. This statement should be readily available to Members of Congress and others who wish to be informed in the premises. I am, therefore, inserting it herewith in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF R. B. ANDERSON, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 6, 1951

I am grateful for the privilege of again appearing before this committee. I do not remember a period in contemporary history when I believed that the problems of our Nation were more multitudinous or complex. The future is full of imponderables, and America is undoubtedly at a point where it must make some fundamental decisions.

This Congress must make every effort to provide for the security of the Nation. You have a tremendous responsibility in trying to provide the money which that security will cost. We all agree that, if possible, we must finance the defense effort from taxation in order to curb inflation.

National security requires that we have an ample supply of the critical materials of war. There are 71 materials in critical short supply or which are not procurable in the Western Hemisphere. For some of these items we are paying a high price.

The Armed Services Preparedness Committee in its last report points out that tin has increased in price from 77 cents per pound in May of last year to $1.82. Copper has increased from 19 cents to 25½ cents. Lead has increased from 11 cents to 17 cents. Zinc has increased from 12 cents to 17 cents. Antimony has increased from 22 cents to 42 cents. These are only a few items on the critical list. Without them, the whole war machinery slows down.

There is no more vital commodity in the world than petroleum and its products. Oil and gas provide more than half of the energy in the United States. They are indispensable to military preparedness.

You are concerned here with a suggestion that you tamper with the depletion provision under which for the last 25 years the oil industry of this country has provided the petroleum necessary for our domestic economy and for our war machines.

You could not be asked to tamper with this provision at a more dangerous or difficult time.

Secretary Forrestal 3 years ago testified before the House Armed Services Committee that in the event of another world emergency the requirements of petroleum would be nearly double the requirements of World War II.

At the same time, Harold Ickes said, "And I will say further that, in the event of another war, we cannot rely on imports, with the possible exception of Mexico. In other words, you will not be able to bring it in by tanker. The airplanes will be so efficient that they will blow every tanker off the surface of the ocean. You cannot depend on that."

The chiefs of the armed services in January of this year advised the National Petroleum Council that an additional productive capacity of 1,000,000 barrels of oil per day is necessary in order to form a minimum cushion for security.

Today we are importing 950,000 barrels of oil daily. One year ago we were importing 684,000 barrels. Today, our domestic production is 5,900,000 barrels daily as compared to 4,900,000 barrels a year ago.

For the last quarter of a century the petroleum industry has met every requirement in war or peace. You gentlemen of Congress and your colleagues who have preceded you made it possible through the wise provision of percentage depletion for us to meet each new responsibility. We can continue to meet those responsibilities if we are permitted to operate under the same wise provisions which this and preceding Congresses have approved as necessary for a sound petroleum industry.

If in these difficult and dangerous times, you destroy the incentive which stems from the current depletion recognition and slow down the exploration and discovery of oil, then it, too, may become the next of the critical items for national security.

Think of the increased cost alone if this eventuality should arise.

We are preparing now to send armies abroad to defend sources of supply for some critical materials that are not procurable at home. I hope the time never comes when it is necessary to send our sons abroad to defend our sources of a part of our supply of petroleum.

Apparently the principle of percentage depletion is not an issue; however, as certainly as you reduce the established rate which has made possible the discovery and development of new reserves, you will just as surely lessen the supply of petroleum and

will just as surely have added to national insecurity and to the critical character of petroleum and its products at the most difficult time in the history of the Nation.

Just a little more than a year ago a nation committed itself to 48 air groups. Today we have 94 air groups. A few days ago, General Spaatz testified before this Congress that it might be necessary for us to have 243 air groups. Such an Air Force without an adequat fuel supply would be a national tragedy.

In 1934 we had a military budget of about $480,000,000. In 1939 the military budget was $1,074,000,000. In fiscal 1952 we will have a budget of $41,500,000,000 for preparedness. No one knows how much higher it will go.

We are advised by the Armed Services Preparedness Committee that if at current prices we complete our stockpile objective of tin, it will cost the American taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars. During the past year, the cost of rubber has reached a high of 400 percent and today is 350 percent higher than 1 year ago.

If Congress had been as wise in the development of such critical materials as rubber which certainly can be grown in the Western Hemisphere as it was in the provision for depletion which made possible the development of petroleum, we might today have neither the fear of scarcity nor the high price in dollars to pay for national security.

It is unthinkable in these days of doubt and danger that serious consideration should be given to the tampering with the depletion provision which inevitably means a reducing of exploration and a reduction in the flow of oil. The record will demonstrate who is willing to take chances with the national security in these times of preparedness.

I know that this committee is of necessity concerned about raising more money. We of this industry agree that, as nearly as possible, we should finance preparedness from current taxes.

Every barrel of oil we produce adds to the gross national income and to increased taxation. That is as it should be, but surely let us not engage here in a program that will result in producing less barrels of oil which will mean less tax resources in the vain hope that we might secure additional revenue from a reduction in depletion that will surely mean less production, less taxable income, and less national security.

You will actually force into early retirement thousands of marginal wells. You will discourage wildcatting and development. You will have caused to be lost forever as a national resource billions of barrels of oil that can be produced only through the expensive methods of secondary recovery.

Oil is a vital necessity to our domestic economy in both peace and preparedness.

Let us not forget that the consumer has a stake in your decision. Passenger cars carrying millions of men and women to work, used last year an average of 626 gallons of gasoline per car or 24,600,000,000 gallons for a national total. In 1920 the average per capita consumption of petroleum was 4.2 barrels. Today the average consumption exceeds 15.2 barrels and by 1960 it is estimated that each American will require 18 barrels.

With all the increase in demand, gasoline sells at a lower figure today than when percentage depletion originated in 1926, yet it is a tremendously improved product.

While gasoline is only one product of petroleum, it is an American indispensable. Of the gasoline consumed in automobiles, 84 percent is consumed in carrying men to work, the housewife shopping, children to and from school, and in all of the other vital purposes of normal American life; only 16 percent is used for social or recreational purposes.

If you here cut down the flow of oil, you will have taken a step that inevitably will increase the price of gasoline, you will have added fuel to the fire of inflation, you will have placed a new burden on American preparedness, you will have ignored the American consumer.

The demand for petroleum for 1951 will be one and one-quarter million barrels per day above the daily average demands in 1949. Compare this with the average annual growth in demand for the period 1941-49 which was only about one-fourth of a million barrel increase in demand each year.

Reserves of liquid hydrocarbons at the end of 1950 were 29.5 billion barrels. At the end of 1940 they were 26.4 billion barrels. While we added over a billion barrels to our reserves the increase in demand was such that our potential supply in relation to demand was not improved.

We do not cite this situation to alarm you, because it is not alarming to us when we can be assured that we will be allowed to exercise every ingenuity and every freedom and maintain the incentive to replace oil as rapidly as it is being used. Even with all of the incentive furnished by percentage depletion, a review of these ratios during the past several years shows that the industry's discovery of new reserves has kept the ratio between reserves and production almost constant despite record-breaking demands for domestic and military purposes.

At the beginning of this year, we had only 27½ percent of the world's crude oil reserves, but during last year we produced 52 percent of the world's total. The barest sort of insurance for our domestic needs and our military defense demands the uninterrupted activity of all of the capital, all of the daring, and all of the ingenuity that can be brought to bear in this industry to increase American reserves and productive capacity.

If we are to secure the million barrels of daily productive capacity required for national security we must find billions of barrels of reserve. The industry must invest between 5 and 6 billion dollars of private capital. We will not ask you to furnish it from taxation or from subsidies. We do ask that you leave alone the established incentive that has traditionally brought capital to the industry and we will require risk capital from hundreds of thousands of people in America to find those indispensable reserves. The proven reserves, however, are not enough. We must drill and equip the thousands of wells that will make possible the additional daily production.

The east Texas field is the largest in the Nation. It has estimated reserves of 2.2 billions of barrels. East Texas is producing 272,000 barrels per day. If we are to have a productive capacity of an added million barrels per day, we need the equivalent of more than three additional east Texas fields, yet there has been only one east Texas field discovered in this country in the past 90 years of exploration.

While we are talking about the huge resources that are necessary to furnish the additional production we need for security, I should like to comment briefly on some of the specific publicity that has come to some elements of the oil industry through the investment of individuals whose names have a popular or dramatic appeal.

In every business I know there are persons who spend their lifetime operating in a single field of activity, and there are others who become prominent in one field and cross investment lines into others.

Actually, the small independent operator is seeking capital wherever he can find it. His efforts do not afford bankable collateral. He is looking for anyone who is willing to risk his money on the operator's judgment. It cannot be otherwise so long as the demand for increased petroleum reserves is great, and the independent operator is constantly seeking new avenues for capital.

Then there are those who cross investment lines and buy producing properties. It has been suggested that they are simply seeking a tax advantage.

As a matter of fact, although criticism has been directed against these investors, they are not utilizing percentage depletion, but are utilizing cost depletion, which is their privilege and which would be the same procedure they would utilize if they were investing in any other business enterprise.

In the midst of fears for our national security, we are fearful as well of our national economy endangered by inflation.

When the Korean situation developed, our productive machinery was operating close to full production with full employment. Then came dramatically increased material demands. It was obvious that with all of our productive capacity, we could not impose on our economy in a short time the increases that were required to meet the joint Government and private demand for goods and services. During the last 6 months, currency in circulation and demand deposits of banks have risen more than $8,000,000,000. Private loans have increased during the same period by $8,800,000,000. There was a wave of war-scare buying on a large scale. The wage spiral has already begun. Price increases both actual and anticipated are being passed on to the consumer.

For the first time in many years, we are witnessing the flight of the dollar into equities, lands, and other economic hedges. Savings bonds are being redeemed more rapidly than they are being bought. Even now we have not felt the full impact of defense spending.

These factors are accountable in part for the problems we have here today. Some of the revenue which this Congress is required to provide stems not entirely from increased domestic and military demands but from our failure to make those great decisions which might have restrained the inflationary predicament in which our country is now involved.

We must make some of the decisions to control inflation now or subject ourselves to even more momentous problems in the days to come.

We must honestly confess the known realities of our economy. Our money supply is too large. Its expansion continues unabated. American goods and services are, and will continue to be, in short supply.

There is only one real cure for inflation and that is to increase the productive output of the American economic machine to the point that it meets the combined military and domestic demands so far as is humanly possible. To me, each conclusion leading to an achievement of this objective is a fundamental decision which must be made by Congress.

We must work longer hours. We must be willing to lessen our standards of living. We must make full use of our industrial and agricultural potential. We must do everything that is necessary to increase American production.

If you tamper with percentage depletion, you will have reduced the flow of oil; you will have slowed down the productive capacity of the petroleum industry; you will have curtailed the operation of each industry dependant upon petroleum for its source of power; you will have laid another stone upon the already crippling burden of inflation.

In a time of national emergency, you surely cannot want to accept the responsibility of lessening production, endangering our national security, and increasing the inflationary problems of our country.

You are seeking to raise more revenue for two reasons: One reason is to finance preparedness, the other reason is to drain off excess purchasing power in a period of inflation.

During the past 6 months the index of prices of raw materials has increased more than 40 percent. During the past 3 years, the price of crude oil has not increased. If you lower the depletion provision you would not be draining off profits for purchasing power that stem from the national emergency because in this industry the price of crude oil has remained constant despite the rising costs to the industry. Surely it would be a mistake to impose taxes of such a character or of such an amount as to discourage or reduce the production of essential raw materials.

While high taxes are inevitable and desirable, they should be to the greatest extent possible the type of taxes that encourage production of essential materials and discourage consumption of goods in short supply.

As we seek to secure additional money to finance preparedness, let us do so by producing more barrels of oil that will yield more tax—not fewer barrels and less tax. I sincerely believe that a reduction in depletion will result in a net loss of Treasury revenues. Left alone, there will be a net Treasury gain.

This is an hour of decision. The struggle of the free world is to remain free. We are outnumbered. Critical materials are in short supply and their cost is stupendous. We are preparing to defend our source of supply of some materials with armed forces because of necessity.

Through the wise policy of this and preceding Congresses, we have had security in petroleum. We cannot now tamper with the depletion provision which has historically permitted the industry to furnish adequate petroleum supplies and reserves. Surely we would not want to place oil in the same category as rubber or tin or manganese or other critical materials. History will pass in judgment upon any man or any Congress who dares in this difficult hour to take a chance with our national security.

Certainly we must have more money to finance our efforts but let that money come from the normal channels of taxation in which we will willingly share and do our part, but let it not come by tampering with the provision that has secured this Nation through two wars and which must secure it in the days to come. When we levy a tax, let it not be one that will stifle production but rather one that will curb inflation as well as provide revenue.

If the oil industry is left to its own resources with the wise incentive that has made possible its development during the last 25 years, I have no hesitancy in assuring you that the petroleum reserves and capacity of this Nation will be adequate and secure.

It is far better to have and not need than to need and not have.

In this hour of decision, we have confidence in the judgment of this committee.

Joint Committee on Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to include an open letter and resolution to the members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production from the Employers' Association of Chicago. The open letter and the resolution follow:

FEBRUARY 26, 1951.

GENTLEMEN: There is widespread feeling throughout the country, and particularly here in the Middle West, that the powers conferred upon the executive branch of the Government by the National Defense Production Act of 1950 will be employed by that branch to extend its control over the lives of the American people and perhaps beyond the limits intended by the Congress when it enacted the legislation.

The public is aware of the many attempts (some successful) that have been made in recent times by the executive branch to dominate the people, both economically and politically. The administrative agencies that have been created by it to effectuate the purposes of Congress have lent themselves well to the extension of executive influence and control.

Even now the Offices of Price and Wage Stabilization are being staffed, in the operative or control sense, by people of political sympathies in keeping with those of the executive and with little apparent regard for ability. This, despite the fact that the operation of these offices will affect the lives of all of the people for an indefinite period of time—perhaps for many years.

The Congress did well when it provided for the creation of a Joint Committee on Defense Production in enacting the National Defense Production Act of 1950. Many of us would be less fearful of the possible consequences to the fundamental liberties of all of us if we could be assured that the Joint Committee on Defense Production, of which you are a member, is functioning and to the end that the intent of Congress may be served rather than the ends of political advantage.

The attached resolution deals with the foregoing subject and is respectfully commended to your notice.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON L. HOSTETTER,
Executive Vice President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the National Defense Production Act of 1950 confers upon the President extraordinary functions and powers; and

Whereas an unreasonable or arbitrary exercise of such powers may result in injury to the general welfare of the people of the United States; and

Whereas Congress, in the enactment of said act, has provided against such possibility and to that end has provided for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Defense Production; and

Whereas it is the function of said committee to make a continuous study of the programs authorized by said act and to report to the Congress the results of its studies (including any defects which may develop in said act) and to make recommendations with respect to the same to the Congress; and

Whereas we believe it to be the function of this committee to guard the people of the United States against an unreasonable or arbitrary exercise of power by the President under the authority given him by this act; and to guard the people against any defects which may develop in said act or in its administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Employers' Association of Chicago urge that the Joint Committee on Defense Production convene regularly and scrutinize closely the operation of said act and all programs proposed or initiated under the authority thereof to the end that said act may be administered equitably and reasonably and any defects in said act be speedily rectified.

FEBRUARY 26, 1951.

Letter From a Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter written by a veteran, W. C. Carter, of Delaware, Ohio.

Although I do not entirely agree with all that is in this open letter, I firmly believe that all views on the question covered by Mr. Carter should be explained. The letter follows:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR: LENIN'S PROPHECY RECALLED BY WRITER

EDITOR GAZETTE: "The United States will spend itself into destruction"—so predicted Lenin, the high priest of communism—a prophecy that is being rapidly fulfilled. He should have added "and extend" to his prediction to have better envisioned our ruin, for we are both overspending and overextending our limited resources in manpower and wealth.

The tragic Korean debacle has already sacrificed 10,000 brave young Americans, national prestige, and vast military supplies, and is but a prelude to the grim outlook ahead. What should have been the responsibility of the United Nations was ineptly assumed by the United States, with disastrous results. That the United Nations has so far proven to be only a wrangling debating society and a propagator of Russian propaganda and appeasement is the fault of our State Department and the UN Secretary General, Trygve Lie.

Since the United States is host to the UN and we are carrying about half of its expenses—compared to Russia's 5-percent contribution—we have the right to expect that its proclaimed objectives will be advanced, our rights and dignity respected. Instead, confusion reigned, valuable time was wasted, and we were compelled to listen to the long-winded Russian insults, lies, and obstructions. Moral courage was lacking to call the Russian bluff, to place the blame for the Korean aggression squarely where it belongs.

If the United Nations is ever to achieve its purpose, recent events show that it must have, not a police force, but a complete military establishment, trained and ready to strike wherever aggression threatens. Considering the reluctance and puny efforts of the leading member nations to aid in Korea or to cooperate in the Atlantic Pact for their own protection, the building of such a military force would no doubt depend on the United States. The notable exception was Chiang Kai-shek's offer of 300,000 trained China National troops, declined by the Truman-Acheson regime and the UN, evidently fearful of offending Russia and Red China. After 5 years of fruitless palaver and frustration, and in the face of continued Russian threats and aggression, not even a police force was organized. When the Korean crisis came last June it was the United States Army, practically alone, that opposed the invading Communist hordes.

There are millions of disillusioned, able-bodied men of many nationalities who have

suffered under communism, who would gladly join an international military force to fight this monstrous evil. Such a needed force would also provide a haven for thousands of homeless refugees whose welfare is a serious problem. All they need is the invitation and pledge of protection and security to assure their loyalty to the United Nations. For many years France has had such a voluntary military force, the Foreign Legion, which has rendered loyal service, although made up from many different nationalities.

Instead of pouring more billions in credits and material into Europe to bolster up our uncertain friends, the United States should organize and equip an international military force whose services would be available to the United Nations. A logical recruiting ground would be in Germany—it might even attract a good part of the Russian Army. Such an organization could weaken and even eventually destroy communism, because it would be largely made up from the millions who had suffered most under Red tyranny.

W. C. CARTER.

Domestic Tin Smelting Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the attached article from yesterday's Washington Post brings vividly back to my mind the struggle we had last summer to pass the so-called tin-smelter bill. The United States has only one tin smelter which adequately refines the types of ore on which the Nation must depend for its tin supply.

The smelter, which is located in my home county at Texas City, Tex., is a Reconstruction Finance Corporation project. Its operation has been efficient and capable. The contract between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the operating company was to expire at the end of the current fiscal year. New legislation during the last session of Congress was necessary to extend the life of the present contracts.

I mention the matter now only to remind the Congress that the extension of the life of that smelter operation was very vigorously fought by an organization which frankly stated that their desire was only to close the smelter down. They adhered to this position throughout the hearings and the debate even when every defense agency cautioned them that tin was an essential commodity and one in short supply.

Fortunately, the sounder and more thoughtful Members of Congress prevailed and the life of the smelter was extended for 5 years. I trust that the Congress will never forget how essential it is to maintain a domestic tin-smelting industry.

Attention is invited to the article from the Washington Post which follows:

GOUGING ON TIN PRICE HIT BY SENATE GROUP

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee yesterday proposed that the United States stop buying tin abroad until some of our own allies cease their price gouging.

"We are no longer in a position where we must buy tin at any price," the subcommittee declared in a report, adding there is more tin in the United States now than at the time of Pearl Harbor.

The subcommittee noted that control of most of the world's tin is held by "a relatively few British, Dutch, Belgian, and Bolivian corporations, with interlocking connections across national boundaries."

For 30 years, the report said, those producers have joined in restricting production so as to guarantee a satisfactory price. Frantic speculation has driven the tin price to nearly $2 a pound from 75 cents just before the Korean war.

CONSERVATION URGED

The subcommittee called on the State Department to get the non-Communist world to allocate tin supplies and fix prices "so that we are not gouged by the mine owners and speculators for the privilege of defending them."

The report said the National Production Authority must set up industrial rationing and a stringent conservation program to make our current supplies go further.

DEVOID OF MORALITY

Chairman LYNDON B. JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas) echoed his subcommittee's report. He said: "The tin price gouging by some of our oldest international friends is entirely devoid of morality. The United States needs tin, but we don't need it so badly that we must bankrupt ourselves by paying anything and everything other nations try to charge."

The report declared world production of tin in 1941 was 50 percent higher than it is today.

The subcommittee said the United States is willing to help producer nations expand and even pay premium for tin in excess of current production.

Legislative Program of the Regular Veterans' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the legislative program adopted by the Regular Veterans' Association of the United States at their national convention, September 23, 1950:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE REGULAR VETERANS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ADOPTED BY ITS 1950 NATIONAL CONVENTION

NATIONAL DEFENSE

1. The immediate enactment of a universal military training law.
2. Mobilization of all material resources for war.
3. Legislation to effectively curb war inflation during the present emergency.
4. An effective national organization for civilian defense.
5. Creation of a national committee for the conservation of natural resources.
6. Issuance by the United States of an appropriate medal for service in the present Korean campaign.
7. Issuance by the United Nations of an appropriate medal for service in the present Korean campaign.
8. Appropriate United Nations rank for the present commandant of the United Nations forces in Korea.
9. Relentless war on Communist aggression.
10. Extension of all provisions of the GI bill of rights to all veterans of the Korean campaign.
11. Federal income-tax exemptions, the same as was extended to Armed Forces personnel during World War II, for all personnel engaged in the present Korean campaign—said exemptions to be retroactive to the beginning of hostilities and to continue for 1 year after they shall have ended.
12. Free postage for all service personnel during the present Korean campaign.
13. Immediate restoration of the World War II allotment system for the dependents of all service personnel.
14. Legislation prohibiting strikes or mass work stoppages in time of war or during military campaigns such as the Korean campaign.
15. Extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance coverage to all members of the Armed Forces, drafted for service, with the Federal Government paying the contributions.
16. All commissaries, exchanges, and ships' service stores to be operated strictly on a nonprofit basis and all merchandise sold in them to be exempt from Federal and State tax.
17. National Service Life Insurance to be supplanted with a flat $10,000 death gratuity.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. Continued support of the United Nations.
2. Vigorous fulfillment of our international commitments and agreements.
3. Restricted and screened immigration.
4. Continued cooperation with all nations for the promotion of international peace and the development of backward areas.

AMERICANISM

1. Legislation or 'lawing the Communist Party, and all other groups who advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.
2. Unequivocal denial of the right to vote and to hold public office, or to enjoy public employment, to those who are known to oppose our form of government.
3. A stronger Voice of America program and greater efforts to penetrate the iron curtain by educational means.
4. Deportation of all known alien and foreign-born Communists.
5. Praise and continued support of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its effective war on communism and subversive groups.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

1. Parity in pensions and disability compensation for all persons who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States at any time and parity in all widows' pensions, and in all pension payments to the dependents of deceased disabled veterans (S. 727 and H. R. 208).
2. Service pensions for all veterans who were engaged in hostilities against the hostile natives in the Moro Province and in the islands of Leyte and Samar from July 4, 1902, to January 1, 1914 (S. 482 and H. R. 308).
3. Vocational rehabilitation for all honorably discharged disabled veterans of the Armed Forces regardless of when the service was performed.
4. Civil-service preference, United States Employment Service preference, and preference on relief projects—when they exist—for all honorably discharged veterans of the Regular Establishment.
5. A uniform law, and uniform regulations, applicable to all disabled tubercular

veterans regardless of the date of service (H. R. 1038, 77th Cong.).

6. Legislation to reduce to 10 percent the disability requirement for entitlement to additional compensation for dependents of veterans.

7. Service pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II at age 55, in the amount of $55 a month with an increase of $2 a month for each year thereafter.

8. Legislation to increase pension-income limitation to $2,000 for veteran, or widow without dependents, and to $3,000 for veteran or widow with dependents.

9. Legislation to exclude commercial insurance payments from consideration as income in determining eligibility for non-service-connected death pensions.

10. Legislation, or an executive directive by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, requiring the Veterans' Administration to accept as evidence, for rating purposes, examinations made at any hospital approved by the American Hospital Association.

11. A substantial raise in pay to VA hospital attendants, especially to those in mental hospitals and contagious-disease wards in VA hospitals.

12. Opposing any plan to take from the Veterans' Administration, or its immediate jurisdiction and control, any function of Government having to do with veterans.

13. Continued hospitalization, in VA hospitals, for non-service-connected disabilities when facilities are available.

14. Out-patient treatment and medication for veterans receiving part III benefits at VA hospitals.

15. An identification card and lapel button to be furnished all service-connected disabled veterans by the Veterans' Administration.

16. Rescission of VA Circular 25, March 7, 1947, prohibiting VA employees from taking part in veterans' organizations.

17. Legislation requiring the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue explicit instructions that each and every decision of the VA in its agencies of original and appellate jurisdiction be supported by an adequately detailed recitation of the basis of finding of fact and to contain a statement that the policy of resolution of reasonable doubt has been considered.

18. A rating of permanent and total disability for all veterans who have a lung removed.

19. Amendment of R. and P. R. 2676 (b) 4 to permit acceptance of lay testimony in determining service connection for malaria.

20. The establishment of a VA hospital in Franklin County, Va., for Negro veterans, the birthplace of Booker T. Washington.

21. A minimum of two prosthetic appliances a year to eligible veterans.

22. A national cemetery in each of the 48 States.

23. Adapted housing for helpless disabled veterans of the Regular Establishment.

24. Adjusted service compensation for veterans of World War II, and the present Korean campaign, in the amount of $6 a day for foreign service and $3 a day for home service.

25. Legislation authorizing official representatives of veterans' organizations, accredited by the Veterans' Administration, to appear before any unit of the Federal Government on behalf of any veteran when properly empowered by the veteran to do so.

26. Maintenance of the United States soldiers' and naval homes in their present locations.

27. First priority for Philippine veterans and their dependents in the settlement of all World War II claims.

28. Compensation and pension for service-connected disabilities are rights and not gratuities. The Regular Veterans Association of the United States, therefore, urges the immediate enactment of legislation to subject all decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to Federal court review.

FRANK E. MCCLERNAN,
National Commander.

State Sovereignty Threatened by Tidelands Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, hearings have been concluded in the other branch of Congress relative to Senate Joint Resolution 20, a so-called interim tidelands resolution introduced by the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The hearings on the resolutions have served to clarify the issue between the States on the one hand, and the Federal Government on the other. Many of the advocates of Federal ownership of the submerged coastal lands within the boundaries of the Coastal States have heretofore deliberately befogged the real issue by accusing those opposed to Federal control of being interested only in protecting the rights of oil companies. These companies obtained mineral leases of parts of the submerged lands from the States, who were at the time considered to have full ownership of such lands. This occurred before the Supreme Court decision in United States against California, which was handed down only a few years ago—1947.

Actually, the tidelands issue is and always has been squarely between the States and the Federal Government, with the oil companies being merely innocent third parties involved in the controversy only because they developed the submerged areas pursuant to State leases. They did this with the full knowledge and consent of the Federal Government, which unequivocally maintained, until a few years ago, that the States owned the coastal submerged lands within their borders, and that the Federal Government had no powers over them, except control of navigation and similar national powers which the States have never questioned, and which are not involved in the current controversy.

While some of the proponents of Federal ownership were attempting to becloud the issue by using the oil companies as "whipping boys," responsible Federal officials were, at the same time, assuring the oil companies that their rights under the State leases would be respected if the Federal Government was awarded a decision against the States in the Supreme Court. In fact, the Attorney General of the United States said in open court during the trial of the California case, that the President had authorized him to tell the Court that equities acquired by third parties, in reliance on State ownership, would be respected. This promise was made on other occasions and has never been revoked. Nevertheless, the loudest proponents of Federal ownership have consistently directed their propaganda attacks against the oil companies, not daring to openly direct their attacks against their real target, the sovereignty of the States. This is the very heart of the controversy.

Senate Joint Resolution 20 has, I repeat, served to clarify the issue because it is sponsored by proponents of Federal control; is supported by the administration; and by its terms it definitely validates the oil leases issued by the States to the oil companies before the decision in United States against California, and also those issued thereafter pursuant to a stipulation between California and the Federal Government. This validating provision has caused the oil companies holding State leases to support the resolution, but the States have refused to do so. Although all parties realize that some temporary compromise may eventually prove necessary, the States are presently unwilling to accept the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 20 as even a proper interim compromise. The fact that the oil company lessees are in favor of the proposed temporary compromise, while the States involved are opposed to it, does show that the issue goes far deeper than the Federal ownership people were willing to admit while they were pretending to be fighting oil companies but actually confiscating State property—property which the Federal Government conceded to be owned by the States from the founding of the Nation until the filing of the Federal Government's suit against California in 1945 and the decision of the Federal Government's Supreme Court in favor of the Federal Government in 1947. This unprecedented decision set a new pattern of conquest or confiscation—a pattern which, if followed to its ultimate conclusion, could mean the complete destruction of the sovereignty of the States. It could obviously be used to confiscate privately owned property as well.

The California case is still referred to as the Tidelands case. The submerged coastal lands within the States' boundaries have always been referred to as tidelands, and they still are. Only by a strained, restricted, technical definition of the word "tidelands" was the Federal Government able to avoid the effect of the numerous decisions of the Supreme Court squarely holding that the tidelands belonged to the States. By limiting the definition of this word to mean only the small area covered and uncovered by the ebb and flow of the tides, the Federal Government was able to get around the previous Supreme Court decisions which had unfortunately used the word "tidelands" in its broad and ordinarily accepted sense. In this insidiously clever manner, the Attorney General of the United States avoided many past precedents and laid claim to the coastal submerged lands, actually

contending that they were owned by the Federal Government because the Federal Government was charged with defending them in time of war, and that they might become involved in the conduct of foreign affairs. It asserted its claim by filing an action in the Supreme Court of the United States, the members of which are Federal officials appointed by the President. These Federal officials ruled in favor of the Federal Government, and the States' property was, by this device, confiscated. This device circumvented the Constitutional prohibition against the taking of property without paying just compensation therefor. If the decisions against California, Texas, and Louisiana are allowed to stand, the Federal Government has paved the way for confiscating any property in the United States by simply contending that it has always owned it and thereafter suing in its judicial branch and obtaining a decision in its favor. This is the stark, ominous meaning of these decisions which have aroused and frightened all thoughtful people who have taken the time to study and understand the really serious threat to State sovereignty and private rights contained in the tidelands decisions.

The first persons to suggest that the Federal Government owned the coastal submerged lands beneath navigable waters were persons who filed claims on the oil-bearing portions of these lands with the Secretary of the Interior, claiming at the time that these lands were Federal public lands which could be filed on pursuant to the Federal Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended. These claim-jumpers instigated the whole sordid scheme. They now brazenly admit, as the testimony at the said hearings will show, that they expect to compel the Secretary of the Interior to void State leases and to issue Federal oil leases to them calling for a royalty to the Federal Government of 12½ percent; these Federal leases to cover the same areas where, pursuant to California leases, oil companies have developed oil structures and are paying the State about 35 percent. These claim-jumpers call themselves prospectors, but they want to prospect for oil where the shore line is thick with pumps producing oil. The Secretary of the Interior has ruled that the submerged coastal lands are not public lands which can be filed on pursuant to the Federal Mineral Leasing Act. If the Federal courts in pending cases decide otherwise, the States which made the leases, and the producing oil companies who took the risks, developed the deposits, and who pay high royalties, will see their properties turned over, not to the Federal Government, but to the so-called prospectors who fully expect to take over producing fields; to pay only a 12½ percent royalty to the Federal Government, and, of course, nothing to the States. These are the real facts underlying the controversy, and it is well that the hearings have made them crystal clear.

The so-called interim resolution does not purport to bring about a final determination of the controversy between the States and the Federal Government. It was introduced because legislation restoring or confirming the States' ownership was previously vetoed by the President after being passed by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress. Incidentally, legislation restoring title to the States has again been introduced by 34 Members of the other House. The authors of the interim resolution contend that this legislation restoring the States' rights will again be vetoed, if passed, and that therefore a temporary arrangement is necessary to permit oil development along the coast in the interest of national defense.

The interim legislation validates existing State leases, gives 37½ percent of the royalty payments derived therefrom to the States instead of 100 percent, and impounds the balance for future disposition. It substitutes the Secretary of the Interior as lessor in place of the States. It provides for issuance of future leases by the Secretary who would, of course, need to duplicate existing State agencies in order to carry out his functions under the resolution.

The resolution provides that the Secretary may suspend or terminate any lease by making payment to the lessee in an amount determined by due process of law. This could mean many things and might mean almost anything if a controversy arose which would be settled by the Federal Government's Supreme Court.

Although the States would like to get the whole controversy settled, they prefer to leave it where it is rather than to complicate it by temporary expedients which they fear might compound the confusion that already exists. They contend that the interim arrangement might endure indefinitely and diminish their chances of forcing a clear-cut decision on the principal issue involved, which is nothing less than the maintenance of the identity of the States as sovereign units of a federation in which all powers constitutionally remain with the States which are not delegated to the Federal Government by the States.

Looking into the unforeseeable future, it seems clear that a dictatorship could be established over this Nation only if the States are so subservient to the Federal Government that seizure of the Federal Government would invest the tyrant with irresistible control over the whole Nation. So long as we have 48 or more strong, sovereign States, the establishment of a dictatorship will be virtually impossible. The decision in the tidelands case opens the door to a new method of centralization which has shocked the lawyers of the Nation and caused grave concern to all people who have studied its full portent.

The California case is still pending in the Supreme Court because the Federal Government is not, at this time, claiming ownership of lands underlying navigable inland waters as distinguished from lands underlying waters not considered inland. The Court has so far been unable to decide where inland waters stop and others begin. In the meantime, close to $30,000,000 in royalties from State leases is impounded.

The State used its oil royalties, for the most part, to carry out its beach development program, acquiring privately owned beaches for the benefit of the public, not only of California, but of the entire Nation. While this program has been suspended, the beaches have increased in value so that the whole undertaking is jeopardized by Federal lust for power. Other coastal States use income from oil royalties for support of their schools. All have strict conservation laws governing development of submerged lands.

Aside from the desire to expand Federal dominium at the expense of the States, what explanation is there for the Federal executive department's stubborn refusal to restore the coastal submerged lands to State ownership? Any State which thinks it does not have a vital interest in the controversy should study this new pattern of expansion with an eye to the future. Today it is oil-bearing submerged lands, but tomorrow?

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, when necessary duties and functions that prompt organization of a public agency are fulfilled, private enterprise should then be given the opportunity to assume responsibilities of such functions.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, organized during a period of depression to meet the great financial demands of the public, seems to have filled the gap. Banks and other lending institutions in the field of private enterprise now appear adequately able to assume this burden.

In the opinion of a great majority of our people the RFC has fulfilled that purpose. Now many groups and particularly have I noticed where many newspapers have editorialized in favor of the liquidation of this function as unnecessary. The editorial which I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD is an example. We should take heed. Possibly this is an opportunity for the Congress to take action to eliminate a Washington bureau.

I personally would like to see our Government returned to local agencies, eliminating all unnecessary functions. The above-mentioned editorial follows:

[From the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat of February 16, 1951]

INDIFFERENCE TO RFC DISCLOSURES INDICATES DECLINE OF INTEGRITY

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a product of the Hoover administration to meet depression emergency need for loans to business. Nearly 20 years later, the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of

the Federal Government, recommended that it be abolished.

It has become a multimillion dollar lending agency largely for the benefit of those with enough influence or pressure on the five-man board to get loans often without regard to the financial stability of their enterprises. The Lustron Corp. fiasco is the most striking example. A Reno gambling establishment and the famous rattlesnake farm are others.

Since banks and other private lending agencies stand ready to loan money on all enterprises that stand up under investigation, it has naturally followed that many unsound projects which fail to qualify for private credit, turn to the RFC. It was this factor which prompted the Hoover Commission to recommend that the RFC be abolished.

Nothing has been done about it. Charges of favoritism, influence, and coercion are becoming so frequent in Washington that they no longer create enough public indignation to influence Congress.

But the recent report of Senator FULBRIGHT's Senate Banking Committee on the rankest kind of RFC favoritism leading direct to a White House aide, has churned up more than the customary attention from Congressmen.

Taxpayers interested enough in the RFC investigation to send to the banking committee for a free copy of its report (No. 76) will find disclosures which would justify them in demanding that the RFC be not, "reformed," as some Congressmen suggest, but abolished.

They will have further reason to be concerned since President Truman characterized the report as "asinine" and immediately renominated three of the directors on whom the shadow of suspicion was cast.

The reader will find on page 14 of the report, a chart which shows more clearly than words, the "favoritism and influence" charged by Senator FULBRIGHT's committee. The committee members made the chart for their own clearer understanding of who was related to whom in the maze of testimony.

It is made up of scattered boxes with criss-crossing lines. One box for instance, carries the name of Donald Dawson, an aide to President Truman and a former Director of Personnel in the RFC. A connecting line runs to the box labeled William Willette, a Democratic RFC Director.

Similar lines run to "expediter" Merl Young and Rex Jacobs, president of a Detroit company which borrowed $3,000,000 from RFC. Still another line shows Mrs. Donald Dawson as top supervisor of RFC files, and Lauretta Young, listed as secretary to President Truman's secretary, is the wife of Merl Young, the expediter.

Personal friendships in the Government are not subject to criticism until public funds are being dispensed to private firms and the evidence proves that these interrelationships result in favoritism and undue influence on the lending board.

To quote the Hoover Commission report: "Direct lending by the Government to persons or enterprises opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals or enterprises. It invites political and private pressure and even corruption."

The RFC has been useful to Congressmen who like to do a favor for a businessman in their districts once in a while, and there is no apparent inclination to abolish it. The Senate committee thinks things might be better if a single Governor is substituted for the five-man Board. Their reasoning, that he would be less subject to pressure and less able to escape responsibility, is not realistic.

Reforms cannot kill favoritism and influence in a Government which has been too long in office, and operates on a political pressure basis for its perpetuation. There are jobs, votes, and big interests that hinge on RFC's continued operation. Besides, the administration has now put a defense tag on RFC to uphold its continuance.

Time was, in the memory of some of us with gray hair, when the Government maintained a semblance of integrity. The principle of fidelity to the public trust was upheld by the President even though it sometimes required closing his eyes to practices which did not bear the light of day. Exposures brought reforms or honest attempts at reforms were made.

The voters are reportedly writing thousands of letters a day protesting the failure of price controls to stop inflation. If they will give an equal amount of attention to the stench which is the RFC, perhaps Congress will give it the decent burial which is overdue.

BERNIECE BATTERTON.

Address by Hon. Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, at Annual Dinner of Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made an outstanding contribution on the subject of the danger of nondefense spending during the emergency in an address which he delivered before the annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, held in Philadelphia, Pa., on February 27, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the coming years—and perhaps for generations—we will have two great burdens to carry:

On one hand we must make ourselves so militarily strong as to protect us from the aggression of communistic nations, and, on the other, we must preserve and fortify our free enterprise system, which, after all is said and done, is the real source of our strength and future security.

The free enterprise system is a greater deterrent to world conflict and a more dependable guardian of peace than a United Nations organization will ever be. It is the only force in the world today that Russia fears. It must be preserved.

Let us not be deluded: The emergency in which we now find ourselves will exist, in all probability, for many, many years. Today Russia has the timetable, and Russia has control of the initiative. She began the Korean War—costly to us in blood and treasure—but Russia has not lost a single soldier. We shall have to live for a long time in a period of crisis and must be on a war alert even though world war III does not materialize, and pray God it will not. In a democracy the threat of war over a long period can be nearly as destructive of our economic system as actual war.

If Russia determines on war, she can fix the hour and the place and the day of the conflict, or she can, for years to come, conduct against us a war of economic attrition, sapping our resources and weakening our system of government. This may be her sinister purpose—I am inclined to think perhaps it is—and in the past 5 years she has made great progress in this direction.

Then, too, if we should become involved in wars with Communistic China and Communistic Russia, it is not probable that a complete and clear-cut victory can be won against such adversaries—living on vast land areas with huge populations—such as was done with compact Germany and compact Japan.

Russia has succeeded in immobilizing practically all the well-trained troops of the three leading free nations—the United States in Korea; France in Indochina; England in her possessions in Asia.

For ourselves we have spent $60,000,000,000 for defense in the past 5 years and have only one well trained division at home, two in Europe and about 225,000 troops fighting in Korea. There we follow the flag of the United Nations but do so nearly alone. In Korea, exclusive of the South Koreans, 95 percent of the fighting is by Americans.

I am not an appeaser. Our future security demands a definite, as well as a very wise, foreign policy. Russia has such a policy—wise and practical from her standpoint—and has out-generaled us time and time again.

We jeopardize our future if we continue to pursue a vague policy of impractical altruism. It must be realistic. We serve neither ourselves nor the free peoples of the world when we undertake burdens beyond our ability to carry and make promises we cannot fulfill. We may be powerful but there is a limit beyond which we cannot go and survive. We cannot go over the world like Don Quixote tilting our lances at every windmill that may have a Communist behind it.

We cannot go over the world trying to make democrats of people who do not want to be democrats and who do not, in fact, comprehend what democracy means.

If first things are to come first, what we need above everything else is an impregnable defense at home. This may determine whether we will survive. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I pledge to you that I will do all in my power to provide an impregnable national defense. I am for compulsory military training. I am for a trained army within our borders. I am for an Air Force of 70 groups or more. I am for a radar screen around this country. These things I have been advocating and supporting for years. We do not have them now. We must do our level best to prod those responsible to get them quickly.

Will our economic system stand the great burdens we are assuming unless we first set our financial house in order?

On January 15 the President appeared before Congress and made this specific pledge:

"It (the Government) must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

Yet, a week later he submitted to Congress a budget which has actually increased nondefense spending to the highest level in the history of the Nation—whether in peace or in war.

Not only has he, in the time of our greatest crisis, failed to keep his pledge for a rigid reduction in domestic spending, but the President renews his advocacy of the socialistic measures known as the Fair Deal.

He asks citizens to make deep sacrifices in their daily living, yet he declines to make political sacrifices by the curtailment or

suspension of measures for the distribution of public funds for nonessential purposes.

In my experience of 16 years in the Senate, this message represents the very height of fiscal irresponsibility. Unity and the sacrifices necessary to save our country must be a two-way street. They must come from the Government as well as from the citizens. Fiscal preparedness is just as vital as military preparedness. I was greatly disappointed in the President's budget. I had hoped he would advocate an austerity budget; cut all nondefense expenditures to the bone; suspend for the duration all socialistic schemes. Instead he actually increased nondefense spending and renewed his support of his socialistic measures—the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, more socialized housing, expansion of Government-owned industrial production, increased Federal authority over unemployment State offices, Federal aid to education.

The estimated deficit under the President's budget is over $16,000,000,000. By saving $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000, new taxation of $9,000,000,000 would balance the budget. If we cut his total budget by 10 percent we can avoid 50 percent of the total of new taxes he requested.

In short, he proposes that the people who support the National Government practice rigid austerity for the preservation of democracy and free enterprise, but at the same time, he proposes a Federal budget under which the Government would spend lavishly and extravagantly, as if there were no clouds of grave danger on the horizon, not only for things we could do without but also for schemes which would socialize the food we eat, our health, and the roof over our heads.

In these perilous times we are confronted both with potential military aggression from abroad and potential fiscal collapse from within. We started World War I with a Federal debt of approximately $1,000,000,000. We started preparation for World War II with a Federal debt of a little over $40,000,000,000. We started the current preparedness program with a Federal debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars. Our only advantage over our potential enemies is in the productive capacity of the free-enterprise system. That cannot survive in either insolvency or an atmosphere of fiscal weakness.

Under these circumstances it becomes crystal clear that we must eliminate completely all nonessential expenditures. And not the least of these lie within our domestic-civilian programs, including the give-away schemes which have been developed in recent years. We must put Santa Claus in the cold freeze for the duration of the present emergency. I am willing to vote for taxes for national defense, but I do not like the idea of placing great additional burdens on an already overburdened people for wasteful political spending.

What we need is pay as you go by combined economies and, if necessary, new taxes which with economies can be much less than the President requests.

Eric Johnston and other leaders say deficit spending is one of the most inflationary factors.

Continued deficits encourage irresponsibility in appropriations and will end in disaster.

You can never go broke pay as you go.

"Byrdn"-eye view of the budget as requested by the President: Expenditures, $71,000,000,000; income, $55,000,000,000; deficits, $16,000,000,000.

To pass another "quickie" tax bill of $10,000,000,000 to be followed by another, as requested by the President, would be a most unwise procedure.

Two so-called "quickie" tax bills have already been enacted in the past several months. Including these two tax bills, the Treasury estimates that the tax take will be increased from $37,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1950 to $55,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1952, even if no further tax increases are enacted. We have taken off the fat. Further huge tax increases will dig deeply into the lean meat and possibly into the very bone structure of our economy unless they are eased by elimination of nonessential expenditures.

General Eisenhower has warned that our war alert status may last 20 or 30 years. Our real strain may be economic attrition. We must husband our financial strength and tighten our belts for the long struggle ahead.

The country is entitled to a firm financial program from the administration instead of piecemeal "quickies." Our financial preparedness cannot be attained by piecemeal implementation such as the President proposes. I repeat—it is essential to pay as we go, but the people of the United States will not accept huge tax increases in good spirit unless they are accompanied by:

1. Closing of all loopholes in existing tax laws. The start should be made with the tax exemptions now given to the President, Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and Senators and Congressmen. The President receives $50,000 tax exemption, the Vice President $10,000, the Speaker of the House $10,000, and each Senator and Congressman $2,500. If legitimate expenses are incurred, allowance should be permitted from their income tax returns, but all income should be taxed on an equal basis. No one should enjoy special privileges in tax exemptions at any time, but especially not now, when the tax burden must be vastly increased. I voted against these tax exemptions when they were enacted, and I will vote for the Williams bill now pending to cancel these exemptions. Common sacrifice for national unity requires that these tax privileges be eliminated promptly.

2. Improved tax assessment and collection system to prevent tax evasion.

3. Elimination of every dollar of nonessential spending.

After these things are done Congress can then determine the extent that new taxation is necessary in order to balance the budget.

My budget is an austerity budget. It will hurt but not so much as huge new taxes.

The rich cannot pay it all. If we confiscate the income of all those having more than $100,000 net income, it will net only $800,000,000 in taxes.

The President has "dared" the Congress to reduce his budget. He has spoken in a belligerent tone. His dare should be accepted. The Constitution gives only to Congress the power to appropriate public funds. The President can only recommend. To coerce or intimidate Congress in the execution of this constitutional power is a step toward dictatorship as the "power of the purse" in the hands of Congress is a major bulwark in our free government.

I propose, and have submitted in detail, reductions in the President's budget to the total of about $9,000,000,000. As a Member of the Senate I will fight for this reduction as a measure necessary to avoid disastrous taxation and ultimate insolvency.

On request I will have printed and send at my own expense to those interested copies of the congressional reprints indicating where and how these reductions can be achieved without impairment of national defense or essential Federal functions. I will merely cite now a few comparisons to indicate that the Presidential "touch me not" budget should be reviewed by Congress for the elimination of unconscionable increases in spending by nondefense agencies. I compare his proposed figures with the 1940 expenditures. I do not argue that these should be cut back to the 1940 figures, but I emphasize the amazing expansion of governmental agencies exclusive of the armed services.

These figures cover actual expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and the President's budget for June 30, 1952.

	1940	1952
Department of Commerce	74,[illegible],[illegible]	[illegible]
Department of Interior	71,[illegible],[illegible]	[illegible],[illegible],[illegible]
Department of Labor	15,[illegible],[illegible]	[illegible],[illegible],[illegible]
Department of Justice	58,[illegible],[illegible]	[illegible],[illegible],[illegible]
Department of State	20,[illegible],[illegible]	[illegible],[illegible],[illegible]
Independent Offices	2,[illegible],[illegible],[illegible]	8,[illegible],[illegible],[illegible]

The Federal Government is now adding 1,000 new employees each day, and I estimate that, unless checked by Congress, 600,000 to 800,000 new employees will be added to the public payrolls, on which there are more than 2,000,000 civilians at this time.

The President may want his budget to be a "sacred cow," but Congress will be derelict in its duty unless it explores every inch of it and trims off the fat which bulges out of its every part.

The people of America want nondefense spending cut to the bone. It remains to be seen whether an obstinate President, who has dared the Congress to reduce his budget, can defeat this overwhelming public sentiment.

The free-enterprise system operating in the fullest freedoms of democracy stimulates individual initiative to the development and production of more of what we need at a cost we can more easily afford from the earnings of our endeavor. I am for that. Among the central characteristics of socialism are Government subsidies with controls, and Government dole with regimentation. I am against that. The welfare state is that state of twilight in which the glow of democratic freedoms is fading beyond the horizon, leaving us to be swallowed up in the abysmal blackness of socialism or worse.

Socialism will not come to this Nation as long as it is fiscally sound. People are always restless and unhappy in debt. Debt makes slaves of people. There can't possibly be either military security or civilian welfare under conditions which are bound to exist in a nation which is constantly increasing its debt from a postwar base of a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Remember this: People can't cash war bonds of an insolvent nation. Fully solvent nations don't go socialistic. As I have said, the Federal budget can be cut without impairment of our military security or the impairment of any essential Federal function. You can bring this about by the use of the media at your command—your business, your newspapers, your radio stations, your organizations, your family, your associates—to press home the facts. Tell the facts over and over again. How could we finance another war, if it should come, with a debt already at a quarter of a trillion dollars?

I do not believe the people of this country want to live under a socialistic government or something worse. If we like what we are seeing in England we are justified in sitting on our hands while others bring it about in the United States.

Balancing the Federal budget and keeping it in balance during times of peace with no domestic emergencies is the first vital requirement for the preservation of our security and the security of democracy throughout the world.

I do not concede that either democracy, or free enterprise, or any other American freedom, has run the course of its usefulness in the world. They have been worth fighting for and winning for in the past against

both economic and military challenge, and I do not concede that they were any dearer to those who have fought and won before than they are to us today. We shall win again, but not until we begin thinking straight through all the double talk that we hear to the hard core of the problems that confront us, until we recognize the sacrifices we must make, until we see clearly the course we must take, and until we act accordingly.

In all of these, leadership, characterized by unselfish and selfless patriotism is the first requirement. We have had it in the past. It is not too much to ask now.

I have been frequently criticized by some of the New Dealers and Fair Dealers for voting with Republicans in the Senate, but I tell you now, as I have said before, the test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, are determined by the test of what I believe in my conscience to be the best for my country. I say with all the sincerity of which I am capable that such must be the test to be applied to everything by everybody in this country—in public office or out—for a long time to come, if we are to restore the peace and freedom for which this Nation was founded, and to which it is dedicated.

Depletion Allowance on Oil

REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN REGAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, some 25 or more years ago this Congress decided that, in order to encourage the development of our mineral resources, it would take care of those engaged in that risky business by giving them a certain depletion allowance on their discoveries if and when anything was discovered. That has gone on now for more than 25 years in a very successful manner, and we have developed our oil resources to the point that this country has never gone for want of this vital commodity in time of war. We are now about to get into another conflict and have been preparing for one, and again it has been suggested that the depletion allowance that has long worked so well for the development of the mineral resources of our country be reduced. I do not know why it should come up every year. Time after time Congress has decided on the worthiness of this depletion allowance program.

The talk by General Thompson, of the Texas Railroad Commission, explaining in detail the working of this program before the Committee on Ways and Means today, is as follows:

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. ERNEST O. THOMPSON, TEXAS RAILROAD COMMISSION, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 6, 1951

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Ernest O. Thompson. I was before you last year on this subject of depletion allowance on oil. You may ask why am I back here? The oil-supply situation today in the United States is much more serious than it was a year ago. That is why I am here.

I have no financial interest in oil. I own no oil production, no royalty or oil stocks or interests of any sort or kind whatsoever. None of my kinfolks owns any oil interests that I know about, and I think I would know about it if they did. My sole interest is that of a citizen soldier and as a conservation official.

I am a member of the Texas Railroad Commission, the State oil-conservation body. I have been in daily contact with oil conservation for 18 years in this capacity.

We have 2,268 separate oil fields with 126,231 producing oil wells, and Texas produces two and one-half million barrels of oil daily. The Nation is producing 5,850,000 barrels per day at this time. We will soon be at capacity.

Demand for oil was never so strong as it is today.

With the uncertainties of the future to be faced, we must find an additional reserve cushion of oil for our defense. Our safety margin is too short.

The question of depletion allowance here under consideration is the keystone upon which this added production can be built. It is a proven incentive.

ARMY AND NAVY CONVERT TO OIL

Today we are in a state of national emergency. Our men are fighting in Korea. Our national security is in peril. We need more oil-producing ability today, far more than we did a year ago. We face a pressing need for at least 1,000,000 additional barrels per day of ready producing reserve. Every possible incentive must be offered to get this added oil.

In War I we converted our navies to oil from coal and our Allies floated to victory on a sea of oil. Motor vehicles were just beginning to displace the horse as motive power for our Army. Our artillery was still horse-drawn.

In 1941, when War II came upon us, we were consuming in the United States 4,000,000 barrels of oil per day. We had at that time the ability to produce 5,000,000 barrels per day from wells already drilled. This was a producing reserve of 25 percent, and, mind you, only producing reserves are of any value for war.

When experts estimated that we would need 5,000,000 barrels per day to win the war, their prediction, though it seemed fantastic, proved to be true, and even civilian rationing was necessary. Sixty percent of all overseas tonnage in War II was petroleum. Our defense machine moves on oil.

Oil reserve for war must be ready in wells already drilled and hooked up to pipelines and refineries of ample capacity to produce the products of proper quality. You can't fight a war on undrilled oil wells. The wells must be ready within our borders, able to produce an additional million barrels per day, if, as, and when needed. We cannot feel secure with less, dependent as we now are on so much foreign oil. We cannot depend on foreign oil for defense.

In 1948 the man who headed our War II petroleum problem, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, told the House Armed Services Committee:

"The prudent man, instead of regarding the figure of our military leaders as excessive, must conclude that the only safe policy would be to regard them as an underestimate."

Quoting Secretary Ickes further from the same hearing:

"And I will say further, that in the event of another war, we cannot rely on imports, with the possible exception of Mexico. In other words, you will not be able to bring it in by tanker. The airplanes will be so efficient that they will blow every tanker off the surface of the ocean. You cannot depend on that."

I concur absolutely with this statement and cannot emphasize too strongly that we must develop our own domestic oil production. May I say that the Congress has been doing that for more than 25 years by the depletion recognition allowance. It is a proven method.

We are told that we are short of some 71 critical commodities today. They have to be imported.

If the Congress had pursued the policy of encouraging production of these commodities here at home as you have so wisely done in oil, we might not be so short of these 71 items.

Had you cut out or reduced the depletion incentive in the past, as you have each time wisely refused to do, we might today be compelled to depend on foreign sources for our defense oil.

Our reserve of daily producing ability today is relatively much smaller percentagewise than it was in 1940. We are consuming in the nature of 6,000,000 barrels of oil per day in the United States, and our reserve daily producing ability is not in excess of 600,000 barrels. So the reserve today is only about 10 percent as against 25 percent in 1940.

The late Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, testifying before the House Armed Services Committee in 1948, said:

"The maximum military requirements of petroleum in the event of a war emergency are now estimated nearly double the requirements of World War II. In other words, instead of 1,375,000 barrels per day, it would be about 2,750,000 barrels, which would be roughly 70 percent of our daily production before we entered World War II."

We are importing about a million barrels of oil per day into the United States from other countries, and were it not for these imports rationing of civilian gasoline would be on us today. A year ago oil imports presented a domestic oil problem. That problem does not exist today. Imports should come in only to supplement and not ever supplant domestic oil. You cannot depend on foreign oil for defense. This, to me, presents a real problem in the supply of oil, come war. In fact, it even presents a real problem to find oil for our rapidly expanding peacetime economy even if war is avoided.

CONSUMPTION IS INCREASING

Gasoline consumption is up 20 percent over last year. Twenty-seven thousand new motor vehicles were added each day last year. The railroads have largely converted to Diesels, which require much oil.

We have in storage at this time above ground 133,134,000 barrels of gasoline; but when divided by the number of vehicles on the road using gasoline—that is, automobiles, trucks, and buses—that gives only 114 gallons per vehicle in storage today. This does not include farm tractors or stationary engines.

HOW WILL WE GET OIL FOR TOMORROW?

It is proper for us to ask this question, then. What are we going to do for oil, come war, or even for the constantly expanding economy of the United States?

During the last reported week, in January, there were completed in the United States 848 new wells compared with 817 in the same week of January 1950. Wildcat or new-discovery completions gained 30 wells over last year for the same week to a total of 172.

There are 2,234 rotary oil-drilling rigs operating in this country today.

It is the plan of the Petroleum Administration for Defense to try to obtain enough steel to drill 44,400 oil wells in the year 1951. This compares with 43,000 drilled in 1950. During the year 1950 we brought in enough new discoveries to take care of the oil that we consumed, and added only around 1,000,000,000 barrels to our reserve. But the trouble with these reserve figures is that it takes a long time, a generation, to produce all of the oil in the known reserves. The early production, of course, is flush, but it takes a long time to bring the last part of the oil out of the ground. As fields get older they produce more slowly.

It should be borne in mind that in order to get an additional 1,000,000 barrels per day of ready oil reserve, there must be twice as many wells drilled as are even contemplated to be drilled in this year.

The method of calculation is easy. We drilled last year 43,000 wells, and with those additional wells we were able to only care for the normal growth in consumption of our constantly expanding peacetime economy and for the small additional requirements of the Korean War effort.

CRUDE STOCKS LOW

Oil stocks at the moment are dangerously low. Crude stocks above ground are 237,000,000 barrels. This is as low as stocks should be.

In 1940 at this time of the year we had 99,000,000 barrels of gasoline on hand, which averaged 134 gallons of gasoline per vehicle. In 1946 at this time of year we had 104,000,000 barrels of gasoline on hand, which was 120 gallons of gasoline on hand per registered motor vehicle in the United States. We now have the lowest inventory per vehicle on record. We are faced with our largest demand in history.

HOW CAN 20-BARREL WELLS COMPETE WITH 10,000-BARREL WELLS?

The average oil production per well in Texas today is about 20 barrels. The average for the United States is around 16 barrels per well per day. Some wells in foreign fields produce up to 10,000 barrels of oil per well per day. Our problem here in America is to find ways and means to permit our oil to compete in the world market with foreign oil. Our exports have been dropping. Our crude oil and products imports are increasing. This brings about, naturally, a question which faces the American people today, and that question is, How can 20-barrel wells compete with 10,000-barrel wells? We are going to have to spread our oil-well steel supply much thinner in order to get more barrels of oil per pound of steel expended in the effort. This inescapably means wider spacing of oil wells, more acres per string of pipe.

I ask you gentlemen again: "How can 20-barrel wells in America compete with 10,000-barrel wells in foreign fields?"

Certainly it is fair to assume that if the depletion allowance is reduced our oil supply will suffer. We are not now in any position to see our oil supply diminished. We cannot afford to let anything happen that would lessen the incentive to hunt for oil in the United States.

If we get into a general war, our tankers, unescorted, might be sunk and we would be denied the oil that we so badly need to keep our country going and at the same time fight even a defensive war. Many of our planes of tomorrow will be jet-propelled, and it is a well-known fact that jets consume vastly greater quantities of petroleum products per hour than do internal-combustion engines.

We are bringing out of moth balls two vessels per day for our Navy. Tanks are being ordered by the thousands. Our Army is properly being rebuilt. I say to you gentlemen that I do not believe that we should tamper in any way with the depletion allowance, which has been so successful in furnishing the incentive to hunt for new oil.

The depletion allowance does not guarantee to any oil operator that he will find oil. He is merely given the means from his own depleted capital to go and hunt for more oil. He just gets a hunting license to search for oil. This he almost invariably does. A great deal has been said about the independent oil man finding most of the oil. In all candor I must say that many of the independents who search for oil go to the majors for assistance in the form of bottom-hole money, dry-hole money, purchase of checkerboard leases, and other cooperative methods which help the independent to put down his wells. The oil searcher has to get capital wherever he can find it.

Inquiry has shown that the major companies have expended twice as much in search for and development of oil production as has been granted to them in the form of depletion recognition.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DEPRECIATION AND DEPLETION

I think it well to distinguish between depreciation, which is the granting of an allowance to rebuild something that can be rebuilt, while depletion in oil is the recognition of diminution of oil in the reservoir. Only nature can make oil. Man can only search for these deposits of nature.

After all, it is the consumer who must be served and served he will be. The consumer's wishes will best be served in our keenly competitive system, in which every man strives to supply the demands made upon him.

Incidentally, gasoline prices, excluding taxes, are no higher than they were 20 years ago, and the present gasoline is a far superior product to the gasoline of 1930. Crude prices have not risen for over 3 years. They have been steady.

The current press items carry the news that the oil industry has been called upon to furnish figures on the cost of adding 1,000,000 barrels per day to present capacity. Surely when one division of our Government thinks we should build up 1,000,000 barrels per day additional oil capacity, producing, transporting, and refining, this is no time to be taking away incentives which would make that increase in capacity all the harder to attain.

The Department of Interior also is considering the matter of coal-hydrogenation plants to guard against possible liquid fuel shortages in an all-out emergency. This talk is that 15,000-barrels-per-day-capacity plants would cost in the neighborhood of 250 to 300 million dollars. I am not talking against the construction of coal-hydrogenation plants, but the very fact that our Interior Department is considering or discussing the advisability of spending 250 or 300 million dollars to build two plants that would make 15,000 barrels per day each, or only 30,000 barrels per day, certainly emphasizes the extreme need to preserve the depletion allowance which made it possible last year to bring in enough oil to supply our needs and still add to our known reserves by 1,000,000,000 barrels—reserves that will require years to get out.

I cannot pass this over without calling the attention of the committee to this point. Here you are considering 300 million dollars added revenue by changing the long-proven depletion-allowance incentive, revenue you, of course, won't get anyhow. The reason being that development would be hampered.

The Government is considering or discussing the setting up of two plants to convert coal into oil that will cost 300,000,000 dollars to produce 30,000 barrels of oil per day. This Nation needs an additional million barrels of proven production of oil daily. Modern wars are won by production or lost by lack of production. This surely applies to oil.

The cold facts are, gentlemen, that we are growing so fast in our consumption of petroleum and its products that we are going to be hard put to keep up with the advance in requirements for petroleum. And as an oil conservation official from a State that produces 2,500,000 barrels of oil per day, and as a citizen soldier who appreciates that oil is ammunition, I respectfully suggest and recommend to you that you do not change the present 27½-percent depletion allowance as now provided in the statute. It has worked well through World Wars I and II, and has brought us thus far along in war "II½," and I trust that it will be kept in effect so that we may build up a reserve supply of petroleum that will help us avoid war III, or to be more nearly ready come war. We can avoid it only by being amply prepared to defend ourselves, and we cannot be amply prepared to defend ourselves unless we have ample oil supplies. Ample oil supplies will not be obtained, in my opinion, if you tamper with the 27½-percent depletion.

Back in 1918, when the discovery value was recognized by this Congress, oil had not become really so vastly important to our economy.

In 1926 when oil was more important to us the Congress wisely set up the 27½-percent depletion allowance recognition.

The Congress reviewed the whole question in 1942 and found it to be a proper and sound incentive to discover new oil.

It has become the keystone of our oil-producing industry.

Now in 1951 when our very freedom is at stake why tamper with this time-tested and proven method. To do so would endanger our defense effort. It would impair our peacetime economy.

I am an elected public official just like you gentlemen are elected public officials. I have my problems just like you have yours. My problem is to try to increase oil production. Your problem is to raise revenue. The way to raise the revenue of this Nation is to increase production. If we increase oil production, your revenue will be increased.

I know you want ample oil for defense. The reduction of the depletion allowance will reduce oil production for defense and will reduce your needed revenues for our war effort.

I know you do not want to do anything that would reduce oil production and revenue at the same time. To tamper with the depletion would do both. I know you need to raise taxes. I am for it. But do it for all alike in the same manner.

Outside of water and bread there is no more important commodity than oil to our existence today in this forward-looking Nation. Realistically, you couldn't get the bread without the gasoline. We cannot risk any possible shortage of oil. The retention of the depletion allowance will keep going the constant search for more oil by big and little operators all over our land. I hope they find it.

Here we have one branch of our Government talking about spending $300,000,000 to make 30,000 barrels per day of synthetic oil. Another branch of our Government says we must have an added million barrels per day available oil production for our defense. Then still another branch of our Government comes along here and asks your committee to cut the discovery incentive by 45 percent. This would reduce the oil industry's financial ability to explore for oil. It just doesn't make good sense. It doesn't even make good nonsense.

It is not too much to say that petroleum protects freedom. Our tanks, our ships, our planes, and trucks all require petroleum in great quantities. If we are to remain free, we must be strong. Our Armed Forces move on oil. One day without oil would paralyze our economy. Petroleum propels the machines of defense. Yes, gentlemen; petroleum protects freedom. I thank you.

Cost of Government Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of four articles from the Detroit Free Press, written by Mr. Paul R. Leach, the distinguished chief of that newspaper's Washington bureau.

These articles expose the huge Government propaganda machine which annually consumes and wastes millions of taxpayers' dollars. As the series reveals, much of this so-called Federal information service is designed to promote bureaucrats' pet projects and policies. It is a timely and important series on a phase of Government activity which is too little known, and is the product of an intensive investigation by an outstanding reporter.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 18, 1951]

UNITED STATES MACHINE FOR PROPAGANDA KEPT WELL OILED—45,000 PUBLICITY MEN ARE BOON TO BUREAUCRATS

(By Paul R. Leach)

WASHINGTON.—The American people are supporting more than 45,000 Federal employees who are engaged directly or indirectly, full or part time, in dispensing information, publicity, and propaganda.

A little-known report of the Hoover Reorganization Commission called much of this activity "thought control."

There have been congressional charges that there is great waste in the Government's publicity campaigns. A resumption of investigations into the whole picture is being sought by Republican critics of the Truman administration.

The 45,000 figure was supplied on congressional demand by the Budget Bureau more than 2 years ago. It is believed to be growing larger as emergency bureaus are formed.

Many of these 45,000 are said by congressional critics to be carried on the payrolls in capacities other than publicity venders. But they are used, part-time at least, to further administration ideas and aims, and to stir up pressure groups to influence legislation.

However correct that 45,000 is, there are more than 8,000—from stenographers to information officers—engaged directly in public-relations work.

Their annual pay runs from $3,000 to $10,300, with a few section chiefs getting $15,000.

The largest group, nearly 6,000, is employed by the State Department and the Economic Cooperation Administration at home and abroad.

The other 2,000 are scattered through domestic departments and bureaus in Washington and throughout the country.

Even the most severe critics of the Government information machinery admit that much of this work is legitimate and essential. These people inform the public, the press, and radio of the operations of a Government employing 2,100,000 persons and doing a $50,000,000,000 annual business.

They seek to spread the gospel of free America abroad as counter to Communist propaganda.

How much of it is legitimate and how much is waste only a full-dress congressional investigation can determine.

When Government publicity was last investigated by the Eightieth (Republican) Congress the total cost of direct and indirect publicity was estimated at $250,000,000.

The State Department employs 5,028 persons at a total salary cost of $14,015,670.

Of these 3,393 work overseas, 2,844 of them locally recruited from foreign sources. Only 549 are Americans.

The other 1,635 are employed in this country. This includes 148 in Washington who are directly concerned with supplying public information.

By far the largest portion of these State Department workers are connected with the Voice of America and the United States Information Office.

The USIS, mostly connected with our embassies abroad, dispenses American information in 62 countries.

The Economic Cooperation Administration has a total working budget for salaries, radio, publications, movies and still pictures of more than $17,000,000.

It employs 58 persons in Washington and 602 abroad in "selling" the Marshall plan as an antidote for communism.

Of those employed abroad 169 are Americans. An oddity of the ECA overseas cost total is that nearly $16,000,000 of it is paid out of counterpart funds.

Every country getting Marshall-plan grants from the United States must set aside the full equivalent in local currencies to be used internally for recovery. These are counterpart funds.

Five percent of this is collected by the United States Treasury for buying strategic raw materials and in meeting ECA expenses abroad.

The ECA information specialists abroad and some of the State Department's USIS people are irritating to other Americans overseas because they draw living expenses in addition to pay.

Thus, the top information man for ECA in Paris is paid $12,000 in salary and $3,000 for rent and servants.

Also, Foreign Service employees may have their personal automobiles shipped to them at Government cost.

Except for ambassadors in major capitals and two top ECA administrators in Paris, who are provided cars with chauffeurs, overseas employees get free transportation only from cars in Government-owned "pools."

Both USIS and ECA publicity offices are somewhat at sea now because of moves in the Senate to consolidate all overseas propaganda bureaus.

The ECA is to die legally June 30, 1952, but the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wants to carry its work beyond that time.

While there has been some criticism of the Voice of America in Congress, Senator BENTON (Democrat, of Connecticut), former Assistant Secretary of State in charge of all information activities, wants it greatly expanded.

The over-all cost of the Voice this year is $57,462,167. More than $40,000,000 is going into the building of new transmitters in America and in Europe.

Except for Joseph H. Short, White House information secretary, and Robert R. Mullen, head of all ECA, public relations, the Washington top for information men is around $10,000.

Short gets $17,000, and Mullen draws $15,000.

Employees in the United States do not get living allowances.

Here are high lights of other major Government offices:

The Department of Defense is second to the State Department in number of persons assigned to all forms of public relations. The total is approximately 1,800. The figure is hazy, because many officers handle two or more jobs including information.

The Department of Agriculture figures it has 400 people on information jobs, nearly half of whom give part time to it.

This figure does not include another 300 engaged in the research, writing, and editing of its many publications.

The Federal Security Agency employs 31 information specialists. It has 10 held offices, but in only one, Chicago, is an employee listed as doing public relations.

The Department of Labor has 30 persons in its public relations bureaus. The Veterans' Administration has 68 scattered over the country.

The Department of Commerce has 73 persons in its information and publications section.

The emergency agencies are just getting started. The price and wage offices have 10 men here and 50 in the field. The National Production Agency has 15 local men and 13 in the field.

So far Charles E. Wilson, "assistant President," in charge of defense mobilization, has only three information men on his staff.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 19, 1951]

CONGRESSMAN HITS UNITED STATES PROPAGANDA TO CONTROL THOUGHT—CLAIMS AGENCIES ATTEMPT TO GUIDE PEOPLE'S THINKING

(By Paul R. Leach)

(No. 2 of a series)

WASHINGTON.—"There can be no question that the greatest and most effective lobby in the country today is that conducted by the Federal administrative agencies," says Representative Bow (Republican, Ohio).

A freshman Member of the House, Bow was attorney and fact-finding chief of the Harness Committee of the Eightieth Congress which spent 15 months delving into propaganda to influence Congress by Government agencies.

He wants Congress again and more fully to go into the "location of and rooting out of the incipient dangers of Federal thought control." He charges that bureaucrats who are not a part of the legitimate Government information and public relations offices are promoting such activity.

He is especially interested in having Congress keep an eye on propaganda for the Brannan farm plan, prepaid health insurance, and activities of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

Bow explains "thought control" as "a system of Government propaganda which presumes to tell the people what they (the people) should think about certain grave issues, what kind of legislation they should demand." "This system builds up pressure groups to push administration bills," Bow claims.

The aim, he says is for more centralized Federal Government power, larger appropriations.

He recently charged that the Federal Security Agency is spending $2,000,000 a year on promoting "socialized medicine." President Truman again recommended this item in his 1952 budget message.

Bow recalled the row in Congress last year when Agriculture Secretary Charles P. Brannan summoned some 5,000 regional Agriculture Department employees to a meeting at St. Paul, Minn., at a cost of $200,000. The group heard a Brannan plan political speech.

This, Senator FERGUSON (Republican, Michigan), told the Senate at the time was a clear violation of the law.

In a recent House speech Representative LATHAM (Republican, New York), said that, although the St. Paul meeting was held 9 months ago, the Justice Department has done nothing about it.

"The administration has frankly begun to experiment with the mechanisms of official thought control," said LATHAM, "* * * at the direct expense of the American taxpayers."

The Hoover Reorganization Commission, in its unpublished report last year, devoted considerable space to another Department of Agriculture activity in 1948.

The House had made reductions in the soil conservation appropriation as recommended by President Truman. A telegram was sent from the Department in Washington to all State administrators of the program.

Regional meetings were held, the report recounted; letters were sent to county agents designed to stampede the Senate to restore some of the economies.

The Hoover Commission report pointed out "the potentialities of such a campaign looking to a telegraphic drive on Congress."

There are 3,029 county agricultural associations in the United States, it said. Each has its county offices. There are 9,067 county committeemen assisting the county agents.

"Under these county committeemen," the report went on, "are 97,529 community committeemen employed on a per diem basis. In addition there are 8,378 paid office personnel serving the county agents.

"All of these local information channels are brought together in each State under the State administrator, a full-time officer and staff, usually located in the capital city."

Among other inquiries which Bow recalled the Harness committee made, was one into Army propaganda for Universal Military Training. That was so unpopular at the time that Congress refused to consider it seriously.

Bow is now a member of the Public Lands Committee, which keeps an eye on the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

As attorney for the Harness Committee Bow wrote the report which charged the Reclamation Bureau with "evasion of the intent of Congress and wilful evasion of Federal Law."

That grew out of a long investigation into Reclamation Bureau lobbying for its projects, especially in the western States.

Echoing Representative LATHAM, Bow said that by its size alone the Federal domestic propaganda army of regular—not public relations—employees influences public thinking.

"The public is being conditioned by its own Government to demand more and more subsidies, guaranties and grants * * * and to defeat any Member of Congress who dares to raise his voice in protest."

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 20, 1951]

HOW MUCH WASTE?—UNITED STATES PRINTING SHOP LARGEST IN WORLD

(By Paul R. Leach)

(No. 3 of a series)

WASHINGTON.—The United States Government conducts the biggest printing and publishing business in the world, and it is growing much larger.

The Government Printing Office during the fiscal year ended last June spent $57,631,000. Its allowance from Congress for the 12 months ending next June went up to $62,234,000. A similar amount has been requested for the 1952 year.

Much of the Washington establishment's output, for Congress and all departments, and of smaller plants in a dozen cities, is necessary.

At the same time, that output furnishes publicity for administration-favored causes in countless ways.

How much waste is involved is a question Representative REES, Republican of Kansas, ranking minority member of the Civil Service Committee, wants Congress to delve into.

"The waste," he told the House recently, "is great but incalculable. The Government spent millions of dollars more than it should because of duplication and multiplication of effort.

"Furthermore, it prints a tremendous amount of material that is unnecessary."

REES pointed out that the printing-bill figures do not include the costs of writing, editing, and assembling countless publications, big and little. Those costs, he said, are three times that of the printing.

Senator BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire, ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, discovered a couple of years ago that more than 83,000 publications were issued by the Government Printing Office in 1 year.

He tried to make a complete survey but gave up after discovering that in 1949 the Superintendent of Documents issued 81,979,102 copies of Government publications.

Because we thought BRIDGES might have been exaggerating in that speech, we called a few days ago at the Office of the Superintendent of Documents.

In the reception room we picked up 52 catalogs, from 2 to 60 pages each, listing publications for sale. Prices for those thousands of pamphlets and books range from 5 cents to $5. They are carried free by the Post Office.

On top of the heap was a 10-page booklet listing 134 Government periodicals. These run from the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (proceedings of Congress), which you can get for $1.50 a month, to the official monthly organ of the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service. That costs $1 a year.

The monthly bulletin of the Social Security Agency, which has been accused in Congress of propagandizing for compulsory medical insurance, costs $2 a year.

The Rural Electrification News, bimonthly, can be had for 75 cents a year.

Most of these publications are sold at printing cost. This represents a loss to the Government because the preparation and editing is not figured in.

Here are high lights of just a few of the other catalog titles, each listing many separate publications:

Fish and wildlife: Nine pages. You can find out how to trap bobcats for 5 cents. For another nickel you can learn about the Turbellaria in the Philippine Islands.

Finance, banking, securities, loans: Seventeen pages. A nickel will get you the Bretton Woods agreement, but it will cost you 20 cents to learn how to select a store location.

Office of Education: 19 pages. The status of education in a dozen foreign countries will set you back from 10 cents (Austria) to $3.75 (The New Education of Japan).

Labor: 22 pages. Proceedings of the National Labor Relations Board run as high as $4.50 a volume. For a dime you can find out about paid vacations in the United States.

Occupations, professions, and job descriptions: 12 pages. What a rabbi, priest, or minister does, for 5 cents each.

Tariff and taxation: 19 pages. From Internal Revenue Bureau regulations, at 15 cents to $1.75 each, to regulations pertaining to liquor stills, at a dime.

The are many more of these catalogs covering the widest possible range of information, all prepared, printed, and mailed at Government expense.

Life is too short to count all the publications in those 52 catalogs. We're taking BRIDGES' word for it.

Undoubtedly many are valuable. Some of the cost is realized in sales.

But REES brought out the fact that "tons and tons of undistributed Government publications are sold as waste every year."

He found that some 5,000,000 back-number, nondemand copies are condemned each year.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 21, 1951]

AND PUBLIC PAYS—BUREAUCRATS BUILD POWER ON FAVORS

(By Paul R. Leach)

(No. 4 of a series)

WASHINGTON.—When you demand favors of your Congressman you may be helping Government bureaucrats influence the adoption of pet legislation and nonessential spending bills.

And, says Representative MEADER (Republican, Michigan), you weaken the ability of regular Senate and House committees to investigate impartially the far-flung activities of executive departments.

You also may become unwittingly a tool of the propaganda machine that seeks more power for individual bureau heads and the central Government and add to growing Treasury deficits.

"The country," says MEADER, "is dangerously close to something like state socialism because of an overgrown bureaucracy and weak congressional investigating powers."

To correct this tendency MEADER would have Congress do these two things in addition to doing more auditing of the executive departments:

1. Encourage the creation of special investigating committees. Their members would not have the close relations with any given executive department that standing-committee members have.

The congressional reorganization act discouraged special committees.

2. Greatly increase the professional staffs of regular and special committees.

Nearly 300 lawyers and trained investigators are now available for the tremendous job of seeing that the executive departments does with its money and laws what Congress told it to do.

MEADER would double that staff. The added costs would create savings a thousandfold, he believes.

Although a freshman member of the House, MEADER is far from being a stranger to how Congress works.

He was head of the legal and investigating staff of the Senate's Special War Investigating Committee. It has been credited with saving the taxpayers billions of dollars during and after the last war by its watchdog labors.

He is a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee of the House Expenditures Committee.

His subgroup, headed by Representative HARDY (Democrat, Virginia) has authority to investigate any Government department's activities. Among the things MEADER wants it to look into is pressure by bureau heads for legislation.

How favors weaken a Congressman's independence was told by MEADER.

"A new Congressman comes to town," he said. "He draws assignment to a standing committee which deals with one or more Federal bureaus.

"Immediately, those bureau heads and their deputies start being nice to him.

"It's never so blatant as providing wine, women, and song. They do things for him that his voters ask for.

"Some constituent wants his civil-service rating upgraded for better pay. Another

wants his son transferred from one military assignment to another.

"A business man or manufacturer needs help in seeing the proper people for contracts.

"The back-home mayor or governor or chamber of commerce wants a public-works project planned.

"School kids and researchers want information that will take days to compile.

"All these things and many more which are constantly being requested of Congressmen require help from some Government bureau.

"The bureau head, not the bureau's public-relations man, sees personally to the job of taking care of them, as promptly and fully as possible.

"Over the years these favors mount up.

"When a member, especially if he's of the administration's majority party, achieves seniority and authority in his committee, he is valuable to the favor givers.

"And because of those favors it is often difficult for a member in committee work affecting bureaus with which he has had to take a detached, penetrating viewpoint."

The very existence of special committees, such as that for which MEADER was chief counsel and which Senator FERGUSON, Republican of Michigan, wants to revive, serves to make bureau heads more careful of how they operate, MEADER believes.

Address by Gov. John S. Fine, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Dinner of Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, held at Philadelphia, on February 27, 1951, the Honorable John S. Fine, Governor of Pennsylvania, delivered an able address, in which he pointed out the duties of government and business in the present crisis. I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. JOHN S. FINE AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Gentlemen, I am glad to have this opportunity of talking to an organization of men who exert a distinct influence on Pennsylvania's growing economy.

As you well know, we are living in an atomic age. That connotes many things—among them, sacrifices, fear of global war, preparedness in the hope of avoiding conflict, readiness if we cannot avoid it.

We have need of many readjustments to our normal ways of doing things. Those readjustments apply to our everyday way of life. They involve business and industry. They apply to the conduct of government. Little, if anything, is outside the scope of change in our Commonwealth and in our Nation.

We must be prepared for anything and everything. Once again in far too short a span of time we have to gear for war. And that, basically, is industry's job. The time for theorizing is past. The practical man's day has come—is here again.

There never has been too much theorizing in business and industry—but there has been in Government. And there still is. That fact is largely responsible for the trouble we are in. Weak and deteriorating international negotiations, masking under the misnomer of diplomacy, contributed to our difficulties. Ill-considered judgments, which tore down our strength even while conflict raged, did not help us to solve the problems which have led to the predicament we are in today. Industry was expanded; then dismantled at the first thoughts of peace. Demobilization was hastened. The uncertainties of a precarious peace were further enlarged. Our productivity, which astounded the world and paved the way to victory, was constantly assailed by economic planners only because of its bigness, its efficiency.

Now those who produce the sinews of war and of defense, again knuckle down to hurried and expanded production. You will do it. Of that I am certain. You never have failed, and you will not fail now. While there is much lost motion in the process of rebuilding, potential industry will accomplish the gargantuan job with efficiency and economy of operation. Men of industry, as all other good Americans, are tremendously interested in preserving the American way of life.

That is why I believe that the seriousness of the times makes it imperative that we bypass wishful thinking in favor of direct and practical approaches to our manifold problems—problems of industry and of government. We will have to speak out, sensibly and to the point. There is nothing to be accomplished by indirectness or by minimizing our problems.

All of you realize that you can't do business as usual. And I don't believe you will be able to again in the foreseeable future. Conditions have changed because of a war economy which conceivably can spread to alarming proportions at any moment. Our whole scheme of things has altered. So has our economy not only in Pennsylvania but in every State of the Union. Costs mount. Taxes rise. Pay rolls increase. As men and women take up military duties man-power problems increase. These are worries that are common to all of us. They are not yours alone. They are bothersome to every man and woman in every hamlet and town in our Commonwealth. And you must not forget, they are the worries of your Government too. Like everything else, cost of government has risen. And we who administer your Government, like you in industry and business, will have to take it in our stride.

There is nothing else for us to do. The tremendous upsurge costs have taken, compels it. When rising prices come little by little over a period of time, we are apt to lose the true picture. Let me combine these rises into one package for you. As the present State administration begins, the general cost of living is up nearly 75 percent over the cost in 1940, a mere 11 years ago. Building construction costs are up three times as high and still soaring. Wages are up too, in some instances 100 percent. Administration of State government has risen as high as 75 percent in many cases.

This changed economy of which I speak, and which all of us I am sure, have recognized, demands immediate expanded production on your part. It calls for more man power, greater harmony between Government and industry and between labor and industry. Already, you are mobilizing your productive ranks. That mobilization, and its utilization, is a major part of the preparedness program. This program contemplates expenditure by the Federal Government of some $130,000,000,000. But that is only a start. Actually, the program extends over unforeseeable years at annual expenditures of probably in excess of forty to fifty billions.

This means accelerated production. New vistas of expansion open up to industry in Pennsylvania, and to your advantage. Pennsylvania has always been in the vanguard in assuring national security. It has been no idle boast to say we have been the arsenal of America. Our natural resources, our industries, our man power, our hearts, our will, our initiative have combined to make this a fact. For anyone to say we will be laggard in this emergency would be a slander or libel which we would not countenance, even momentarily.

And this is where you gentlemen, and what you represent, come forcefully into the picture. You must assume a part of the leadership so vitally necessary to insure strengthening our economy. You must work hand in hand with Government—State and National—accepting restrictions which seem inevitable, enlarging sufficiently to support full-scale war. You face sacrifices, as do all of us. You may need, perhaps as your Government most assuredly needs, to take a rereading on organizational efficiency, productive capacity, alertness of management. If there is room for improvement, you must improve. You will have to cut your cloth to the needs of the times. And, for that matter, so will your Government. We propose to pursue such policies in Pennsylvania, but we shall not be parsimonious in civil defense, health, and education.

We are not going to run hog-wild in expenditures for State government in this Commonwealth. I have said that the cost of Government has risen. That is true. But I do not wish to pass on every cent of that rise if economies can be obtained here and there in the conduct of Government and if greater efficiencies of operation can lessen the burden.

Additional taxes will have to be collected. There is no way of escaping that. But we intend to keep them at a minimum. Prudent management of State affairs will assist in that aim to some extent.

Unfortunately, there are some people who would gleefully burden business with most, if not all, of the additional revenues needed to run the State's business. This belief is engendered, no doubt, by the ease with which some look to business and industry as limitless sources of ready tax moneys. There is that group who will only direct collectors' hands to industry because they believe industry has inexhaustible finances easily accessible for taxation purposes. And then there are those whose policies are supported by the punitive attitude. That philosophy may be part of national thinking. It is not this State administration's thinking. We all know you can go to the industrial well once too often if the trips are frequent enough. Business moneys can be exhausted, just as the resources of individuals may vanish if they are overtaxed. That is why we intend to spread whatever needed additional revenues may be found to be necessary—spread them so that they will be uniformly applied and not be overly burdensome to any group or groups.

That is why we are not going to penalize industry in Pennsylvania. Why should we, when Pennsylvania sincerely welcomes business to this State? We are trying to make that welcome inviting and true. The number of new industries coming here, and the expansion those already here are making, are indicative factors that the businessman knows a good thing when he sees it. There is no exaggeration in saying that business already here is growing from little to big, to bigger, far out of proportion to growth in other States.

Taxation is a big consideration to an industry seeking location of its business. But it does not necessarily have to be the determining factor. Many times there are more important things than taxation to be considered. There are favorable labor conditions, and we have them. There is low local taxation to be considered; and in most of our industrial areas in Pennsylvania we offer more in that respect than do surrounding States. As the center of a great population area, we have rich markets at hand. We have the best transportation facilities in the country to make those markets easily and speedily available to our industry. We have an outstanding program of State health assistance to help keep your workers healthy and happy. We are cleaning our streams. That is a boon to industry. And with all this, when we consider taxes at all levels, from State level downward, our tax situation respecting industry is a favorable one.

One reason for this is that a large share of the burdens of local governments carried locally in other States, are assumed by the State government in our Commonwealth. That lowers local taxes on industry. For instance, the State carries the entire public assistance burden—thus relieving localities of this charge. The State carries a very high percentage of the cost of schools. The State government has taken over local burdens on highways which in many other States are paid for by the counties.

There is still another illustration where our counties are exempt from cost that normally is shared elsewhere. Here, the State provides for the care of mental patients.

These are some of the major ways in which the State relieves local governments. As a result, local taxes are comparatively low, either because of a low tax rate or because assessments are low, extremely, and oftentimes ridiculously low. That in itself is an invitation to industry not only to come into Pennsylvania, but to those here to expand. When you take our whole tax picture into consideration, State and local, we compare most favorably with the States around us. This favorable picture your administration will be most reluctant to alter.

We are, of course, still working on the State budget and upon the tax program. It is taking longer than ordinarily necessary to work these out because of certain imponderables which the emergency propounds. It was delayed, too, by family illness, which is daily being bettered.

We do not yet know what our civil defense program is going to cost. We will take every step necessary to properly and adequately protect our people against the possible ravages of war which might strike this Commonwealth. We are going to insure within our collective abilities that our industries are protected against sabotage and external attack. But we are not going to go overboard by providing unnecessary money for this protection. We are not going to throw money away. We are going to get back in protection the value of every dollar we put into it. Up to this moment we have pursued the policies and reorganization directives as drawn by that self-sacrificing American and outstanding Pennsylvanian, Gen. Richard K. Mellon.

Yet, with civilian defense as one of several imponderables before us, I can say to you now that the budget for State government for this biennium, outside of obligations for meeting the soldiers' bonus, mandated salaries for teachers, State authority rentals, and education appropriations required under existing law, will not be more than 3 percent over what was needed for the last biennium. This will be true despite increases in costs of State government, in salaries, wages, State purchases, and the like. We will see to this by paring the budget wherever it is possible to economize without losing efficiency. We have started the pruning, and we are still continuing the process of pruning.

While I have not yet made my final recommendations for additional revenue, I feel confident that the share that industry will be called upon to bear will not be larger proportionately than at present. True, we may find it necessary to defray a part of needed additional revenues by slightly increasing the corporate tax. If we can avoid the imposition of further taxes on industry, we will do so. If not, you may rest assured the increase will be light. I think we have gone as far as we can safely go at this time in imposing taxes on industry in Pennsylvania, particularly in relation to taxes levied by surrounding States. Nevertheless, we must recognize that the time is fast approaching, in fact not far distant, when the tax base in Pennsylvania will have to be broadened.

Our present attitude on taxes places responsibilities upon both of us. I have to see to it that industry in Pennsylvania—indeed Pennsylvania itself—is not hampered in its productive potential by excessive taxation. You have the responsibility of adjusting yourselves and your business to quickly expanded production.

Next to our spiritual strength, our productive capacity makes us a great Nation. The men who first came to our shores came here looking for God—not for gold. Their spiritual blessings were woven into the fabric of our Government. That is why we are willing to fight, if need be, to preserve freemen from subjugation by the Godless. But we have to implement that faith and that willingness to fight with weapons to translate our ideals into realism. That is where you come in with your productive capacity. There are those Godless people who cannot evaluate spiritual and moral values but who are fearful of our ability to produce everything we need. Our production is our bigness. You and I recognize that. It is this production which may thwart evil men, destroy the Godless, and save religion itself. Yet, we have in this country high-placed officials who in peacetimes condemn as evil, industry because it is big. There is no inherent wrong in bigness itself any more than there is virtue in smallness. Business, big or small, depends on how honestly and how morally it is conducted.

We need to be big to produce big, to accomplish big things. The prospect on conflict to save mankind, in which we would have to lead, dictates bigness not only in our production of materials to wage that prospective conflict, but in our viewpoint of how, why, what, and under what conditions we produce.

Our preparations to meet the challenge must be all-out preparations.

Upon the industrialists of the country may largely rest decision whether we have war or peace. Meet the crisis with the production of which American industry is capable; provide the tools and implements to fashion the style of peace, and Americans everywhere, fortified with a crusading spirit born of moral and spiritual values, will be fully prepared for peace without war, or a war for peace.

Reforms in Federal Communications Commission Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Plotkin Thickens," from Broadcasting magazine of March 5. It deals with the McFarland FCC procedural bill. Undoubtedly this very vital bill will shortly be worked out between the Senate and House.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLOTKIN THICKENS

It's happening again. The FCC majority, still hypnotized by its brain-trust lawyers, has authorized action that would sabotage the McFarland bill (S. 658) to institute desperately needed reforms in FCC procedures. The bill has been approved by the Senate for the third time—with no open FCC opposition.

It is in the House that the FCC legal cabal is at work. It is using practically the same script as a year ago, but with a defense twist.

The FCC lawyers want no new legislation that will wrest the control they hold over all FCC policies—engineering and economic, as well as legal. The McFarland bill would halt ex parte maneuvering, and place responsibility where it belongs—with the Presidentially picked and Senate-confirmed Commissioners.

In closed House hearings a fortnight ago, the FCC resubmitted its model bill. It saw no need for legislation along the lines of the McFarland bill. It wants merely three or four changes in the present act at this time. It blandly selected palatable parts and talked down changes in substantive provisions that would take away its gun (and the lawyers' powers).

As always, greatest secrecy surrounds the FCC's suggestions. The hearing was held behind closed doors—at the FCC's behest. But the model bill, which we reported in detail in our issue of January 30, 1950, is about as secret as yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Things have changed since the FCC lawyers did the machete job on the McFarland bill last year. Representative Sadowski, who introduced the FCC bill in January 1950, is now Mr. Sadowski, citizen. Senator MCFARLAND, who was a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last year, is now the majority leader—No. 1 party man in the upper Chamber.

House Committee Chairman CROSSER, who last year was told the McFarland bill was a radio version of the Taft-Hartley bill (he's a prolabor man) now knows the facts.

Of course, the Cottone-Plotkin-Goldman-Solomon quadrumvirate of FCC legal lights still has in its vest pocket the House communications expert, Mr. Kurt Borchardt. It was his collaboration last year that aided the FCC lawyers in thwarting remedial legislation, keeping inviolate the FCC's record of blocking any changes in the substantive law since 1934.

It is our guess, however, that the strategy won't work this time. The FCC wants, and perhaps needs, the authorization for new monitoring station facilities. It covets a radio-fraud law, similar to the postal-fraud law. It wants other sugar-coated provisions of the McFarland bill. Its device is to get them piecemeal, thereby kicking the bill in the teeth.

What will the Senate do? Communications bills automatically go to the Interstate Committee, headed by Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, and of which Mr. MCFARLAND remains the ranking majority member. While we do not have the confidence of these distinguished statesmen, we surmise they will see to it that these piecemeal amendments will be attached to the thrice-approved McFarland bill, and shunted back to the House. In fact, this happened Wednesday on the monitoring amendment.

Thus, if the FCC wants its monitoring money, or its sugar candy, it will have to

take them hand-cuffed to the lawyer wing-clipping provisions of the McFarland bill. They can play shuttle-cock that way all year.

How long this travesty will endure we do not know. It is our feeling, however, that a few well-timed speeches on the Senate and House floors, laying bare the artifices of the FCC's legal minions over the years, would yield the essential results.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement issued by the social welfare committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace, supporting the program of grain for India which I have joined in sponsoring. The statement concludes with the recommendation that "the Congress pass legislation without delay granting to the Government of India the food grains required and that it take this action without attaching to it political conditions of any nature."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN FOR INDIA

The issue of food grains for India breaks down into three questions of fact: Does India actually face a serious grain shortage? Can the Indian Government obtain such grain imports as may be needed through commercial transactions, either in the Far East or elsewhere? Should the United States, in view of its current and prospective heavy demand for grain, make sizeable shipments for India from its reserves?

The Indian Government requests 2,000,000 tons of food grains from the United States as the minimum to continue the ration in 1951 at the level prevailing in 1950 to build back India's depleted grain reserves to a minimum safe level. The Indian Government bases this request for aid on the contention that summer floods, earthquakes, and fall droughts have critically reduced domestic grain supplies.

So far as can presently be ascertained, summer floods in some areas did wipe out grain reserves held by Indian farmers and destroyed seed stocks as well. Earthquakes did destroy some villages and otherwise hampered production.

But most importantly, in some of the principal rice-growing provinces, autumn rainfall was far below normal, with very serious effects upon rice production.

The evidence on these points appears to be conclusive. So, too, is the evidence that the people of India are faced with a dangerous grain shortage unless additional imports are provided—though there is lack of full agreement as to how bad the situation actually is. It would appear to be significant however, that the per capita daily grain ration has been reduced by 25 percent in Bombay and other ration areas.

Regarding the second question of fact, whether the Government of India can obtain the required imports commercially in the Far East or elsewhere, the Government alleges that it has already arranged to import all of the grain for which it can make financial arrangements. In the absence of reasonable evidence to the contrary, it would seem that this contention should be accepted.

With respect to the third question of fact, while United States reserve supplies of grain are not as large in relation to current and prospective demand as seemed to be the case a few months ago, nevertheless, the United States entered 1951 with about 998,000,000 bushels of wheat in all storage positions, a stock exceeded only twice before in our history. The Nation's carryover of corn, 860,000,000 bushels last October 1, was an all-time record.

There is little doubt, therefore, that this Nation can spare the quantity of grain required, under present estimates, to tide India over this emergency, particularly since any deficiency in wheat supplies available for shipment could probably be made up out of barley, corn, and grain sorghums.

We should undertake this humane act in the spirit of Christian charity. We shall not jeopardize ourselves in any way.

The Social Welfare Committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace urges, therefore, that the Congress pass legislation without delay granting to the Government of India the food grains required and that it take this action without attaching to it political conditions of any nature.

Award to Lorenzo Lee Bean, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement issued by the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce with respect to the award made to Lorenzo Lee Bean, Jr., of Arlington County, as Virginia's outstanding young man of 1950.

This is a well-deserved honor, and I commend the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce for their custom of making a selection such as this each year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAMSBURG.—Lorenzo Lee Bean, Jr., 34-year-old Arlington attorney, was named Virginia's outstanding young man of 1950 and presented the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Service Award at a banquet here last night. Presentation was made by Dr. John E. Pomfret, president of the College of William and Mary.

The banquet was attended by Jaycees from throughout the State who are meeting this week end for a quarterly work conference. Also present were the four national winners of the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the United States Junior Chamber, National Association of Broadcasters, and Radio Manufacturers Association.

Bean was awarded the honor for his many civic contributions and for donating his legal services to a number of public-spirited organizations.

Foremost among the Distinguished Service Award winner's civic accomplishments was his work in helping to establish Arlington's Anderson Orthopedic Hospital, which will be opened in April. The idea for the $400,000 hospital was originated by Dr. O. Anderson Engh, Arlington orthopedic surgeon, and Bean, who was a polio victim while in college.

Construction of the 40-bed hospital was adopted as a project by the Arlington Junior Chamber in the spring of 1949. The chapter was a year old at the time.

Under guidance of Bean, the site for the building was cleared by Arlington Jaycees. Land was donated by Dr. Engh. Nearly all labor and materials were contributed by several building unions and contractors associations, mainly the Northern Virginia Contractors Association.

The hospital project earned a first-place national award from the United States Junior Chamber.

Other civic contributions which the Young Man of the Year made in 1950 include service as: A board member of the Community Chest campaign, a director of the Arlington YMCA, legal adviser and trustee of the Anderson Hospital, a director of the Family Service of Northern Virginia, and president of the Arlington Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Bean was also during 1950 active in mission church work, member of the Legal Aid Bureau of the bar association, and executive director of the Democratic Council of Arlington.

He has taken the leadership among younger members of the bar in urging them to donate their legal services to welfare groups and to participate in community life.

After studying prelaw at Hampden Sydney College, Bean was graduated from the University of Virginia Law School in 1941. He passed the bar a year before graduation.

Accepting a position with the United States Department of Agriculture, he became Chief of the Litigation Section of the Rural Electrification Division. He has been in private practice since 1947.

Nominations for the distinguished award were open to the public. Any Virginia man between the ages of 21 and 35, inclusive, was eligible. Judges this year were Dr. Pomfret, William H. Trapnell, vice president and general manager of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., of Virginia, and Lynn W. Franklin, retired United States consul general.

Bean was nominated by Charles R. Fenwick, Arlington patent attorney.

Closing Tax Loopholes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8900, the Revenue Revision Act of 1950, had a provision that closed a certain tax loophole then prevalent. It was a loophole indulged in by Charitable Trusts and Educational Institutions that engaged in unrelated business activities in competition with taxpaying business organizations. For example such as owning and operating macaroni factories, piston ring factories, and so forth. The net income received by these charitable trusts and educational institutions after January 1, 1950, from unrelated business activities is to be taxed under the provisions of the 1950 tax act on the same basis as corporations are taxed.

The following article, taken from the February 6, 1951, issue of a national magazine, the Reporter, and entitled "The

Financial Wizard of Omaha," is a graphic picture of the loophole in question that was closed. We hope the tax bill of 1951 will close other glaring tax loopholes, and put a stop to the taxdodging adventures of other tax exempts that are so prevalent today.

THE FINANCIAL WIZARD OF OMAHA

(By William S. Fairfield)

This is the story of an operator. His name is Gordon W. Diesing. That he is not better known may be just another tribute to his ability as an operator.

Diesing is an Omaha, Nebr., citizen who has never lived or worked on a farm. But until recent events slowed him down, he was well on his way to building a vast farm empire of which he would have had sole control by 1954. He started from scratch less than 3 years ago.

In 1948, Diesing was just another lawyer—a tall, easygoing bachelor whose receding but thick black hair and whose physique, only slightly gone to fat, belied his 42 years. Up to that time he had been practicing law for almost 20.

One day Diesing came across an article in Fortune magazine describing how many of our biggest charitable, religious, and educational foundations had bought and were operating private business tax free. Behind the practice, the article said, was a specific Internal Revenue Code exemption for such organizations.

Late in 1948 Diesing began to charter nonprofit foundations under Nebraska laws. Within a few months he had eight different foundations to his credit—some educational, some religious and charitable. They ranged in title from the Crusade for Freedom to the Sacra Coeur Foundation. In financial structure, they also varied from strictly nominal capitalization to no capitalization at all.

Diesing, faithful to the tradition of operators, didn't plan to spend much of his own money in any event. The largest amount at which any one foundation was capitalized was $10.

To be assured of complete control, Diesing appointed himself not only president of each foundation, but also treasurer, secretary, resident agent, general counsel, and chairman of the board of trustees. The charters stipulated that all activities should be managed and controlled exclusively by the president and the treasurer.

Diesing's next step was to put in a long-distance telephone call to Thomas D. Campbell, a man whose farm operations had earned him the title of "Wheat King of the World." Had Campbell, Diesing wanted to know, ever thought of selling his 65,000-acre farm in Montana? Campbell hadn't, but he was willing to start. A meeting was arranged.

Diesing arrived at the meeting armed with little more than photostatic proof of his tax exemption and a few cogent figures. To Campbell, it sounded then like the craziest deal in the world. It still does.

But Diesing's figures proved very persuasive. Campbell's farm probably averaged a profit of about $400,000 a year. But since the farm was incorporated, 38 percent of this amount, or $152,000, went to the Federal Government in corporation taxes. Out of the remaining $248,000 came State taxes and individual income taxes, the latter especially onerous for a man in Campbell's income bracket. After all these taxes, Campbell was left with possibly $50,000 out of his corporation's original profit.

If Campbell were to sell his farm to one of Diesing's tax-exempt foundations, however, the $152,000 in corporation taxes could be completely saved. Moreover, since the foundation had no stockholders clamoring for dividends, the entire $400,000 would remain intact. As for his foundation, Diesing would be satisfied with possibly 15 percent, or $60,000—thus leaving $340,000 to be returned to Campbell each year as an installment on the sale.

True, Campbell would lose ownership of the farm and with it $50,000 annually in take-home profits. Also, he would have to pay 25 percent of the sales price in capital-gains taxes.

But Diesing was prepared to compensate for these factors. He offered Campbell $2,000,000 for the farm, a figure Campbell has compared to the million and a quarter he'd have been lucky to get on the open market. The margin of $750,000 would cover not only the $500,000 in capital-gains taxes but also Campbell's $50,000 income for 5 years. And at $340,000 a year, the sale would be paid off in approximately the same amount of time. Also, Diesing offered to retain Campbell as manager of the farm at $12,000 a year until the sale was completed.

In the spring of 1949, Campbell signed the papers. Diesing had taken title to one of the Nation's biggest and best farms without paying a nickel down, according to Campbell.

"Diesing's exemption from corporation taxes is the key," Campbell has explained. "Without it, there would have been no deal." But conversion to a position to capital gain was also a prominent consideration. "Any financier will tell you that the only way to pile up large sums of money today is through capital gains." And Campbell wanted large sums, he has said, to expand another of his farm holdings, a 48,000-acre ranch in New Mexico.

A month after the Campbell transaction, another of Diesing's tax-exempt foundations bought a 30,000-acre cotton plantation in California for $4,078,000. The plantation had been owned by Russell Giffen and 12 other stockholders. As might be expected, the method of payment was much the same. Giffen did insist on a small down payment, the balance to come from the farm's net profits. Diesing's foundation was to receive 15 percent of these annual profits until the sale price was paid.

When the Campbell and Giffen purchases were made, Diesing made the mistake of bragging about his activities to friends. The news leaked out locally, and Diesing discovered the meaning of a bad press. He also learned a lesson; any more recent deals that may have been made through his eight foundations remain unknown. Diesing himself now claims that except for the Campbell and Giffen farms his foundations are all dormant.

What Diesing himself gets out of all this is difficult to discover. Officers of foundations generally receive an annual token fee for accepting the responsibility involved. Several independent foundations have quoted $1,000 as a quite modest token.

Nebraska law specifically forbids the payment of such a fee to only one class of foundation officers—the trustees. Implicitly, then, Diesing is left with a total of 40 positions—5 in each of 8 foundations—for which he legally could accept money. If he were to receive the above-suggested $1,000 for each position, Diesing would obviously be enjoying an annual "token" income of $40,000. On the other hand, Diesing may expect no earthly reward.

Soon after the Campbell and Giffen deals, Diesing's troubles began. First, it was his initial trustees: three female Benedictine and three male Trappist orders. Venerable Mother M. Dolorosa, primate-general of the Benedictine Sisters of Perpetual Adoration in this country wrote:

"We became trustees [in September 1948] in the first place only after much pressure had been brought to bear [by] Mr. Diesing, who had long been a friend of our community. * * *"

Whether or not Diesing himself later hinted at his real plans, the various trustees did get wind of them, even before the Campbell and Giffen purchases. On January 23, 1949, Mother M. Dolorosa resigned for the Benedictine Sisters. The Trappist groups all followed suit within the next few months. However, on April 25, Diesing wrote Mother M. Dolorosa, advising her of the Campbell deal and asking her to reconsider the Benedictine resignations.

According to Mother M. Dolorosa, Diesing's letter continued: "If you expect me to assist in paying your debts, I most certainly think the divine law of charity insists that * * * you consent to again be trustees. Your refusal will mean immense loss of financial assistance in future years to your convent."

On May 7, Mother M. Dolorosa replied, confirming the resignation as final. "Our bishop," she said, "highly disapproved of our being connected with any business enterprise which involves a tax exemption of this nature."

By June 8, all six former trustees had thus positively reaffirmed their resignations, but Diesing continued to use their names. Finally, all six were forced to take their cases to the office of the secretary of state at Lincoln, Nebr.

The letter from Father M. Robert, abbot of the Trappist-Cistercian Abbey at Conyers, Ga., was typical: "I stipulate that neither my name nor the name of (my abbey) should be used in any further connection with * * * any foundation or any corporation of which Mr. Diesing might be named president or chairman of the board."

All during early 1949, Diesing had also referred to Francis P. Matthews, who is now Secretary of the Navy, as a trustee. But Matthews, a prominent Catholic and an old Omaha friend of Diesing's father, was not to become a trustee until summer.

"Gordon had told me something about what he was doing and had been after me a long time," Matthews recalls. "Finally, I agreed to do anything I could to help the Trappists."

Matthews became a trustee on July 21. What Diesing evidently had not told him was that the last Trappist group had "completely dissociated" itself from Diesing's help some 6 weeks before.

Matthews lasted less than 2 months. Then, on September 16, he too resigned. "I had understood that Gordon was forming a foundation to help Catholic orders invest their money," Matthews explains. "Then I found out they didn't have any money to invest."

Nebraska law requires every nonprofit foundation to have a minimum of three trustees. But at several points Diesing was down to one—himself. He finally solved this problem, after Matthews' resignation, by appointing two laymen—men he personally has described as "close friends."

Diesing's next trouble came from Mark M. Mason, Republican Congressman from Illinois. On the same day the last Trappist group gave Diesing its resignation Mason had introduced a bill one of the provisions of which called for taxation of the "unrelated income" of all charitable, religious, and educational foundations. Such a measure, of course, would have completely sealed off Diesing's loophole.

Less than 10 days after Mason's first speech on the bill the stubby Congressman received a letter from Diesing: "I read an article in the Chicago Tribune stating that you gave a splendid speech in the House advocating the tax exempt. * * * Kindly send me several copies of your excellent speech, and send me several copies of the bill you introduced."

Mason complied. On July 9 Diesing wrote again, thanking him: "I would appreciate it very much if you would advise me as to the progress of your splendid bill through the [Ways and Means] committee and the House."

Mason compiled again, saying he didn't expect to press for passage of his bill until the second session.

Diesing's next letter to Mason, a month later, reported "tremendous interest in the bar association" in Omaha. "Kindly send me all the detailed information you have on the matter as promptly as possible," Diesing wrote. Also, in connection with three organizations named in Mason's speech, Diesing wanted to "know in detail how they own and operate such a business and not pay any income tax."

Possibly because of the reference to the bar association, Mason considered this letter important enough to turn over to the National Associated Businessmen, which was solidly backing his bill. And on August 26, Mason received from Loring A. Schuler, head of the NAB, a two-page "suggested answer to Mr. Diesing." It may be assumed that this answer satisfied Diesing's purposes, for he wrote no more. However, he didn't have much more time to write, for a month later Mason discovered the true nature of Diesing's interest in the bill. On October 6, Mason notified his Nebraska correspondent of this discovery by exposing the 8-month-old Campbell deal to the House.

"I think it's the funniest thing I ever heard of," said Mason's secretary, Mrs. Evelyn Krupp. "He acts like he approves of the bill, then organizes everything he can lay his hands on." But "the boss doesn't think it's funny at all," according to Mrs. Krupp. In fact, she says, Mason blames her because it was her idea to answer nonconstituents' mail.

The Ways and Means Committee, after extensive hearings, shelved the Mason bill last summer, and Diesing was apparently in the clear. He had two trustees he could count on. He had letters of detailed information from a Congressman—letters that much more than offset any harm that same Congressman's dead bill could do him. And he had his own ability to cope with situations as they arose. Perhaps his career had only begun. Campbell had said: "If I had a deal like that, I'd buy up the whole world."

But when I visited Diesing in Omaha last fall he looked and acted like a tired businessman. His manner of speaking was considered almost phlegmatic—though his chain smoking hinted at an inner tension. His answers were as evasive as I had anticipated, if not as skillful. When cornered, however, he had a perfect comeback: "It would only be personal vanity for me to talk about it." The interview was singularly uninformative.

If Diesing appeared more worn than usual during this period he had good reason. He had just returned from two disheartening weeks in Washington. It looked as if the legislators, in one game at least, were finally catching up with the operators.

With the Korean situation had come a demand for more money. Congress started all over on a tax law. And although the Mason bill itself wasn't dragged off the shelf, one of its segments was. Included in the final draft of the new bill was the exact provision Diesing dreaded, a provision specifically denying nonprofit foundations tax exemption on any income from business enterprises unrelated to the exempt purposes of the organizations.

Diesing's loophole was gone. His foundations no longer enjoyed any tax exemption.

His immediate goal was to salvage what he could. Both Campbell and Giffen had considered the loophole wrong from the beginning. And, expecting a change in the law, they had demanded escape clauses in their contracts. Diesing, of course, marshaled all his arguments to prevent these clauses from being invoked. "We spent a lot of time on the phone those days," Campbell recalled recently.

The details of these long-distance conferences must be filled in from peripheral information; but the results indicate that Diesing had some persuasive reasons for continuing the transaction, even without his tax exemption.

In the first place, as Campbell was no doubt reminded, the new tax law had not altered the capital-gains aspect of the deal. In fact, by increasing corporation taxes 15 percent and high-income individual rates as much as 13 percent, the new act actually strengthened this particular phase. Because of these increases, Campbell would now be enjoying only about $25,000 out of his farm's $400,000 income—as opposed to the $50,000 he got previously. And on the horizon was an excess-profits tax that might cut his take even further.

Then, too, Diesing had already paid one $340,000 installment, and would be able to pay a second before the new tax law took effect. Roughly, a third of the sales price, perhaps more, would be paid under the original agreement.

And finally, the installment payments could be continued, though the loss of tax exemption would necessitate a lower rate. Even under the original deal, the payments were to come out of the farm's profits. But Diesing's foundation could pay the new, much higher corporation tax on those profits and still have nearly $200,000 a year left to turn back to Campbell. And with about $700,000 of the $2,000,000 already down, it still would take Diesing only 9 years to pay off.

Campbell's only alternative was to go through the legal entanglements of repossessing his farm. Such a process would not only be messy but also, in the case of so sizable a piece of property, very expensive.

Campbell decided to play it Diesing's way. "The deal is still on," he says. "Now that it's gone this far, it's better to go the rest of the way." But, as Campbell had previously said, "It would never have started without the tax exemption."

Giffen evidently made the same decision. His lawyer wrote: "I wish to state that no change whatsoever has been made in the original transaction, and that the * * * stockholders expect the organization which Mr. Diesing represents to perform its agreement in accordance with the terms thereof."

The "terms thereof," however, call for "a minimum payment that must be met each year." Campbell's contract no doubt contains a similar stipulation. And it is possible that without his tax exemption, Diesing has trouble meeting these minimum payments. Thus, he may be paying off debts for a considerably longer period than 9 years.

Obviously, the new tax law has ended Diesing's dreams of expanding. He has his hands full.

In Diesing's particular game, the legislators have come from behind to tie the score. But other games are already in progress, in the oil fields and in the commodity exchanges, to name but two places. And where there are loopholes, such as depletion allowances and speculative freedom, there will be found the Gordon W. Diesings.

The Army's Contradictory Manpower Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in Vivian's Caddo Citizen, of Vivian, La., on February 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Army is doing a bang-up job of confusing us poor civilians. Statements issued by the Pentagon are continuing to be contradictory and making the men who are in the Armed Reserves tear their hair out by the roots.

A few months ago, the Army called for mobilization of all Air Force Reserves, and they emphasized that the need for manpower was so great that they felt the drafting of all 18-year-olds was imperative if the Nation hoped to survive an imminent war with the Russians. A few weeks later they decided that the Reserves were not needed. A few weeks ago the same thing repeated itself, this time actual orders went out to practically the entire Reserve Corps, telling them that they had 30 days in which to straighten out their affairs before reporting for duty. This time they said they weren't fooling.

So what happens, these men who received these orders started preparing to become Army men again. In a few cases which we actually know, they sold their homes, quit their jobs, or in one case a man who was in business, after trying to sell and failing, hired a man to run his establishment.

Now they say once again, "We are just fooling, we don't need you." They are even planning to discharge some of the men who are already in service. The same thing happened with the National Guard. Men high in guard circles definitely stated that everything pointed to practically all guard units being called to active duty by the middle of January. Now they say, they won't call any more National Guard units and plan to discharge the ones already in service at the end of 21 months.

Now, if they have no use for the men they already have in service and are not interested in the men who are already in the Reserves, why in the name of heaven do they want to draft the 18-year-olds? Why can't they wait until they reach the age of 19, and then induct them into the armed services? Personally, we can't figure this all out, and we are sure a great number of you are a little amazed at the shenanigans going on at the Pentagon. We have almost made up our minds that men in the Pentagon themselves don't know what is going on. We hope they don't fight battles the same way.

Proposed Liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution to liquidate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation effective June 30, 1951. I am convinced a mere reorganization will not provide a cure for the political paralysis which has RFC in its grip.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in today's

New York Times entitled "Reorganization—Or Burial?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REORGANIZATION—OR BURIAL?

While Senators dredging in the records of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation yesterday were bringing new evidence to the surface of the intimate tie-up between finance and politics in its affairs, a Member of the Senate was demanding the outright abolition of the agency. He is JAMES P. KEM, Republican, of Missouri. Proposals to reorganize the RFC, said the Missouri Senator, didn't go to the heart of the problem. The Government lending agency, he declared, has become a "political grab-bag of White House favorites." Even Congress, he added, "can't legislate honesty or good management."

Whatever their views may have been previous to the present hearings, many persons, we believe, will go a good deal of the way, at least, with Senator KEM. For our part, our mind is not closed to arguments for keeping the RFC alive temporarily as a strictly emergency instrumentality, with all nonemergency activities to be liquidated without any unnecessary delay. But in the light of recent revelations, the burden of proof even for this limited continuance of its activities has been shifted to the shoulders of its friends. As to reorganization, that has become a matter for discussion only after the more basic question has been decided.

The RFC was originally created in February 1932 as a temporary organization (with a life of 1 year) to help shore up distressed banks and other financial institutions, to keep the Nation's railroads out of receivership and to provide agricultural credit. In the conduct of its affairs in those days no such scandals developed as those whose details fill the news columns today. Was this a matter of personnel and organization? No doubt it was, in some measure. Certainly the country was fortunate to have as the directing heads in those early years such able financiers and administrators as Eugene Meyer and Jesse Jones. But a more basic consideration, we suggest, was the fact that the RFC, in those days was functioning in an economy which was at the outset in a state of shock and in the later years still convalescing. The Corporation's job, basically, was that of a stand-in for other institutions whose functions had been partly paralyzed by the crash of 1929 and the depression which followed.

Contrast that with the peacetime octopus into which the agency had grown in the early postwar years—a gigantic Government holding company with a string of subsidiaries that put to shame in number and variety the corporate offshoots of our most far-flung public-utility giants before the dissolution of these monsters. But worst of all, the RFC had now become a great lending institution, with no emergency to justify its lending. And what is more natural than that such an agency, with no basic economic justification for its banking activities, should find its particular justification in politics? By this we don't mean the acts of political collusion which are now coming to the surface; we are thinking rather in terms of the numerous lending fields into which the natural process of bureaucratic proliferation had drawn it. As Jesse Jones said a year ago in recommending "a decent burial" for the Corporation (a recommendation seconded by the task force of the Hoover Commission), "Government lending in competition with private business is not a proper function under our private enterprise system."

Statement of George J. Burger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1951, Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and made a very interesting statement. Mr. Burger expressed a definite fear that with increasing taxes and the tendency to give war contracts to the larger firms would result in closing up and probably bankrupting many of the small business operators throughout the Nation. Mr. Burger quoted from letters his organization had received from many small independent manufacturing firms throughout the country, each stating the fact that they were afraid of the impact on their firm if careful consideration was not given not only on taxes but in the letting of contracts and the supplying of raw materials to them during the war effort. I am sure you will find this statement well worth reading and I commend it for your serious consideration. It follows:

In his Economic Report to Congress this year, President Truman said: "In a defense emergency, all those on the home front should serve, to the limit of their ability, in the kind of work for which they are best fitted."

The 98 percent of all our businessmen who own and operate small and independent firms are ready and eager for this service.

In World War II, when they were permitted to use only a fraction of their potential, they provided almost 27 percent of the value of all war production. Today they are accounting for 24 percent of a much smaller defense production total.

As our Nation goes further into the defense program, more and more of these small and independent businessmen will be called on. Many of them will be required to expand their facilities. Their service, and constant readiness to serve, will provide our Nation with a great safety factor, as England learned in World War II after its centers of concentrated, giant production had been bombed out, and that nation forced to turn to its thousands of small and independent factors for needed defense production.

But, as matters stand today, many of these small and independent businessmen may be unavailable when the need for them arises. Their decentralized plant may be in disrepair, their pool of skilled labor dispersed, their magnificent productive potential completely lost.

For today literally thousands of these independents—some of them likely right in your own congressional districts—are rushing down the road to ruin. Not because of their own ineptness or mistakes. Rather because they are being squeezed to death between operation cut-backs caused by materials shortages and rapidly increasing costs, of which mounting taxes are part cause.

Let us illustrate by quotes from four of the hundreds of letters received from small and independent members of our federation within the past 30 days. Hear what these businessmen have to say:

A mail and independent plumbing manufacturer writes: "The owners of this company contribute substantially to the United States Treasury in the payment of taxes. However, due to its inability to obtain steel, copper, lead, and zinc, this contribution is about to cease unless materials for essential products are made available. We are holding urgent orders from jobbers requiring more than 40 tons of metals, which we cannot obtain. Military orders are being held, due to refusal of extendible ratings."

A small and independent plastics manufacturer writes: "We have a new plastics factory * * * completed late in 1948. It is equipped with one of the largest injection presses in the Middle West. We have floor space and modern, up-to-date equipment and could handle a prime contract for the mobilization program. Our inability to secure plastic molding materials is very perturbing to us as we have thousands of dollars in molds and other materials, and unless we can secure Government work or get materials for our items for the civilian market, we will have to close our $150,000 plant."

A small and independent farm-implement manufacturer writes: "The usual sources of steel supply for the small manufacturer completely dried up by middle September, and the gray market operators moved in to market the available supply—at a price. By late December, this price had risen to 20 cents per pound for certain steel items such as sheets, effectively closing the door on this, our last source of supply for sheet and strip steel. We could not hope to meet this price level. Our products simply would not sell for that kind of money. It is obvious that we cannot long remain in our present static position and simply mark time. If we are not soon able to obtain sufficient materials to maintain our manufacture the only alternative is complete and permanent closure of our plant."

A small and independent tire retreader writes: "We have been under the impression from news releases and bulletins that the rubber manufacturers have been instructed by our Government to channel a greater portion of their production to camelback. From the manner in which orders are being received in tread plants it appears that there has been a considerable reduction rather than an increase. We have been unable to secure any camelback whatsoever for 30 days. No operator can keep open and save valuable tires on such a basis."

Some of these businessmen are individual proprietors or partnerships, others are incorporated. Consider that the unincorporated businessmen were the last to receive tax relief after World War II, that they have already taken one tax increase, and are facing a second in the President's proposed tax program. At the same time, the incorporated firms who were, 1 year ago, paying 21 percent on the first $5,000, 23 percent on the next $15,000, and 25 percent on the next $5,000 are all paying 25 percent today, and are being asked to pay 33 percent in the President's proposed tax program. More than this, the so-called tax speed-up adopted in the last Congress is causing them to pay, temporarily, relatively greater amounts of taxes in relatively shorter periods of time.

What, we ask, would your outlook be as a businessman in the face of these increasing taxes and mounting materials shortages? Undoubtedly many of you, just as many of these businessmen, would be facing extinction.

In addition, for many years difficulty in securing financing has been a serious deterrent to the formation of new small and independent business enterprises and to the continuation and expansion of these enterprises, once founded. Our sales representatives contacting thousands of small independents at their places of business daily see evidence of this problem. The files of the House and

Senate Small Business Committees, and of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, contain much evidence of the problem. All three committees have held extensive investigations into the problem.

The reason for this difficulty is easily determined. Even in normal times the returns available are not sufficiently attractive for individual investors. The costs of stock flotation are prohibitive. Inability to build sufficient reserves prevents internal financing.

Now, even before any further increase in taxes, all of these stumbling blocks to continued small and independent business are greatly magnified. Where, then, if anywhere, are these small and independent businessmen to turn for a solution to their pressing financing problems? How are they to continue in existence?

Congress could, if it will—and as we hope it will, help smooth the extremely rough path these independents must travel if it will do any one or more of the following:

1. Refuse to raise taxes on small and independent business or to raise them to the confiscatory levels suggested so far; or,

2. While raising the tax level, either—

(a) Permit tax deductions for plant expansions or improvement, or

(b) Permit greater retention of earnings for reserves, or

(c) Eliminate double taxation of dividends, perhaps with some ceiling attached.

We recognize that any one of these suggestions will lessen the total revenue taken in by Government. Against this we are sure you recognize that if something is not done many of these businesses will no longer be a source of tax revenue; their payments to the Treasury will stop once and for all. More than this, we are sure you recognize that the easier Congress makes it for small and independent firms to secure private financing and to finance themselves, the smaller will be the demand for Government assistance, and the smaller will be the total tax bill Government will have to present to the people.

In this last we are not suggesting that private financing is now, or will be in the foreseeable future, an adequate source for small and independent enterprise. Much as the federation would like it to be, it just has not been so, and on the basis of all portents it is not likely to be so. But we are suggesting that Government can act now, by giving up a little at the present in order to gain more in the future in the way both of taxpaying competitive enterprise and national security.

Beyond all this, the loss caused by enactment of any one or more of these suggestions could be overcome, in great measure, by complete elimination of nonessential Government spending in both the defense and nondefense fields, and by closing the loopholes in present tax law.

Last month we recommended just this to the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report. We told the committee that economies can be achieved in the defense program by (1) extension of the competitive advertised bid system of procurement, which will permit greater small and independent business service to the Nation; (2) greater defense agency use of small and independent business facilities, which will reduce the need for direct and indirect Government financing of additional new plant and reduce product cost by eliminating the build-up of wasteful backlogs and the incomplete use of the labor potential; and (3) more willingness on the part of defense agencies to heed constructive suggestions, from small and independent businessmen, designed to cut armament costs. We pointed out also that savings can be effected in nondefense programs by holding up extensions or all social-welfare programs and creation of new programs of this type, and by eliminating all subsidies to business and agriculture, so far as is possible. We told the committee that in a period such as this of great business activity and high income, promoted largely by Government spending for defense, curtailment and elimination of these programs can be made without endangering the Nation.

On the other hand, as we recommended also to the joint committee, Government tax revenues can be increased by fair taxation of presently tax exempt organizations which compete daily with independently owned and operated unincorporated and corporate businesses. We refer here specifically to the so-called cooperatives, which should be taxed in the same manner as their independently owned and operated competitors. In this connection you will recall that apparently reliable witnesses before your committee last year estimated that during the years of World War II, cooperatives escaped payment of some $855,000,000 in Federal taxes. Since that time, the volume of business done by cooperatives has increased tremendously. So, obviously, has their tax advantage.

We need not remind you that a question greater than that of raising additional revenue—vital as that is—is here involved. President Truman put it well when he told the Congress, January 12: "Sacrifices must be shared fairly." Small- and independent-business men urge that Congress consider this principle when working on the problem of taxing cooperatives. All other considerations aside, it simply is not fair when co-ops do not have to pay the same taxes as their unincorporated- and corporate-business competitors. As a matter of fact, it might be said that the unincorporated- and corporate-business men are being coerced into paying the freight for their competitors.

Before we close, gentlemen, let us make one point very clear; as we told the Senate Finance Committee, December 3, 1950, small- and independent-business men are quite willing to assume their full tax burden. They do not desire to have anyone carry the load for them. They have never asked for any unfair shift of the burden from themselves to any other class of taxpayer.

But they realize as well as you that ruined businesses neither pay taxes nor contribute otherwise to national security. They know, too, that any expansions to fill the gap caused by their elimination will not provide Government with the same amount of revenues as it is now receiving.

Remember, many of these enterprises—as you have seen by their own testimony—are now close to ruin. Further tax increases, at least to the levels suggested in the President's suggested program, may push them over the brink to complete disaster.

Donaldson's Shocking Antilabor Tactics Cause Employees and the Public To Suffer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared February 23, 1951, in the Detroit Labor News, which is the official spokesman for the American Federation of Labor unions in Detroit and Wayne County, Mich.:

IT'S TIME TO GET A NEW POSTMASTER GENERAL—DONALDSON'S SHOCKING ANTILABOR TACTICS CAUSE EMPLOYEES AND THE PUBLIC TO SUFFER

(By Frank X. Martel, president, Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor)

Never in the history of the Post Office Department has any Postmaster General put into effect as many administrative policies that adversely affected the welfare of the employees as has the present head of the Post Office Department. Since his permanent appointment he has made no recommendations that would improve the lot of the employees. Despite his high-handed actions toward the rank and file, the Postmaster General has been most generous in recommending increases for ranking departmental officials of the Post Office Department, and extremely generous in recommending increases for the American railroads. He vigorously fought a sorely needed slight wage increase for World War II veterans. His record toward the employees has been a shocking one. A recital of a few of the many actions taken by the Postmaster General lowering employees' standards follows:

1. The Congress by law provided for the payment of 90 cents an hour or 7 cents a mile to special delivery messengers for the use of their automobiles. On the strength of this legislation, many messengers went into debt to purchase new cars. The Post Office Department, under General Donaldson, disregarding the intention of Congress, has leased automobiles from private contractors in many of the large cities, leaving the special delivery messengers holding the sack.

2. On October 27, 1949, the Postmaster General issued a down-grading order. He assigned a number of the duties that had been performed by skilled clerks in the post offices and by postal transportation clerks to mail handlers, at a lower rate of pay. This order also provided that all extra clerical and carrier work during the Christmas rush would be performed by temporary mail handlers. This action is comparable to using a laborer to do the work of a skilled journeyman.

3. With the advent of streamlined trains, the Post Office Department agreed to give a time differential to all postal transport clerks serving on speed trains, similar to the differential granted to railroad employees. This speed differential remained in effect from 1936 until June 30, 1950, when Postmaster General Donaldson abolished it.

4. The postal classification law provides two classes of postal transport employees—class A and class B. Class A employees are clerks on the minor branch lines. Main-line employees and those on the heavier branch lines are in class B. Based on the volume of work, clerks in class B are given $200 a year more than those in class A. Many years ago the Post Office Department established as a basis of distinguishing between class A and B the qualification of 450 units of work. This has been the qualification ever since, until the "great, career" Postmaster General increased the requirement from 450 to 600 units of work.

5. On April 17, 1950, Donaldson issued orders that have practically ruined the postal service. He made the job of letter carrier an intolerable one. Ironically, Jesse Donaldson himself was a letter carrier for a very short period of time 40 years ago. With the reduction of deliveries, carriers are required to remain on the street for 6½ hours and more without restroom facilities and without proper places to eat. Everyone is aware of the many inconveniences and the cost to the public resulting from the April orders, but this article is concerned principally with the hardships that it has caused the employees. Despite the misleading statements issued by the Postmaster General, letter carriers are compelled to carry much heavier loads. They have longer routes—with perhaps several hundred additional patrons to serve. Their routes are so heavy they seldom see their job completed. They must listen to patrons' endless stream of complaints without being able to solve them.

6. Congress made Armistice Day a national holiday. In the past, it has been the practice to permit postmasters to give service on holidays in cases where service may be necessary. However, when Armistice Day 1950 came around, the Post Office Department issued a flat order to deliver on Armistice Day. There was no latitude given to the postmasters. The order was absolute. The employees who worked on Armistice Day were not given double time for holiday service; they were not given time and one-half—they were given time off on a straight-time basis within the next 5 days. The holiday was taken from the men largely because mail was piling up and the Postmaster General was vainly trying to keep the real facts from the public.

IT'S TIME FOR A NEW POSTMASTER GENERAL

All in all, the actions listed above have resulted in little or no saving to the American taxpayers. They have, however, made the Post Office Department—once the pride of the Government—the despair of the public and the postal employees. It is ironic that the employees of an agency of Government in an administration that prides itself on its liberal attitudes should have to put up with the whims of an administrator whose sole response to the challenge of managing a big department is to issue orders ruining the service and wrecking the morale of the employees. The President of the United States should immediately seek a competent administrator to head the Post Office Department. The longer the change is delayed, the more difficult it will be for a competent man to bring order out of the present chaos. The President should find a man who understands morale, administration, and public welfare—one who is sympathetic to the employees. The bleating explanation by Donaldson that economy drove him to it is rather hollow in view of the recent agreement by the Post Office to pay the railroads an additional $312,000,000 for transporting the mails for the period February 19, 1947, through December 31, 1950.

It is unfortunate that the Post Office Department, in an administration that boasts of its friendship to labor, is now headed by a man who knows hostility to the labor principles insisted upon by President Truman. In October 1950, the National Postmaster General Donaldson attended the convention. The Postmasters' Association is presumably an independent organization. Dan L. Gibson of Albany, Ga., was a candidate for president and was the almost unanimous choice of all the postmasters for the position. When the postmasters arrived in St. Louis, they were informed that Donaldson insisted on Barney Dickmann of St. Louis for the position. Departmental officials put the pressure on postmaster delegates. At least one acting postmaster was informed that failure to support Donaldson's choice would result in failure to secure a permanent appointment. The newspapers told the story—the disappointed defeated candidate complained publicly. He stated that he knew he was defeated—he had it "from the horse's mouth."

Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES of Pennsylvania, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress a bill to firmly establish labor regulations in the postal service. Donaldson would have none of it. Company union procedures were more to his liking. In a letter to Congressman TOM MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, dated July 19, 1949, he declared:

DONALDSON OPPOSES ORGANIZED EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATION

"This measure would provide for representation of members of employee organizations only, and might possibly force all employees to join an organization in order to obtain the same consideration and treatment in dealings with administrative officials. * * *

"The present law recognizes the right of employees to become members of employee organizations and provides necessary protection to such employees incident to legitimate activities therein. During the many years this law has been in operation the Department's relationship with employee organizations has on the whole been amicable. The Department and its representatives are always willing to discuss problems in which responsible employee organizations have an interest at any time the representatives request such a discussion. Because of this it is in my opinion that H. R. 3702 is superfluous and its enactment would serve no useful purpose. * *

"Legislation of this nature will so encroach upon the administrative functions and responsibility of the Department, postmasters, and others charged with the administration of the postal service, that it would very seriously hamper the economic administration of this service.

"In view of the foregoing, this Department is strongly opposed to the enactment of this measure."

The Department recognizes unions on its terms only. The action of the "Career Postmaster General" at St. Louis indicates the nature of those terms. Discussion when the Postmaster General wants it, and numerous weak voices rather than a few strong ones, are much preferred by the present head of the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General when it served their purposes have refused to see representatives of the employees. The General is busy with the budget is the favorable excuse.

Recently, in an examination for the position of Post Office Inspector, an applicant was interrogated at length on his union activities and his attitude toward the curtailment order. In the Post Office Department these days, there is much talk about loyalty to the Postmaster General—loyalty not to the postal service, but to its temporary head. What Mr. Donaldson demands, however, is not loyalty, but subservience. Men, even in high position, who give loyal, intelligent—but unwelcome—advice, are quickly shunted from authority. Servile submission—not loyalty—is the demand of Postmaster General Donaldson.

Statement of Belt-Wide Cotton Producers Committee on Price Control for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by the Belt-Wide Cotton Producers Committee on price control for cotton:

It is obvious that only increased production can correct the world-wide scarcity of cotton. The world price at 70 to 75 cents a pound is almost 30 cents a pound above the United States price with present governmental proposals for ceilings. Export controls eliminating possibly 2,000,000 bales of the potential market for the American cotton grower are the reason for most of the difference.

In spite of the effort for price adjustments through export controls, the very high military and domestic demand is such that many people are advocating ceilings on raw cotton.

Unfortunately ceilings would not work at any price level. There are approximately 358 different staples and qualities in addition to weight considerations involved. The operating spot and futures markets have proven themselves to be the most efficient check and balance system for marketing the most complex commodity the farmers have to offer.

Ceilings would inevitably mean black-market operations in qualities and weights and would mean the substitution of a new and wasteful distribution system at a time when we cannot afford to waste manpower and resources.

Furthermore it is inconceivable that prices paid the grower could be closer than 8 cents a pound to the ceiling during the height of the season, October, November, and December. This fact would come from a situation in which cotton buyers meeting mill and export needs would discontinue their normal practice of buying large supplies during the height of the farmers' marketing, realizing full well that the market could not go up much and they could buy their requirements on a week-to-week basis through the year and the grower and his banker would be left to finance the crop.

It must be recognized that the congressional mandate given to the Economic Stabilization Administration is to protect the consumer against run-away prices. Therefore the American cotton growers recommend a ceiling on cotton textiles, with the removal of ceilings on raw cotton.

This would make it possible to reopen both the spot and futures cotton markets under the guidance of a market administrator to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. With the appropriate use of many influences affecting prices, the average cost of Middling 15/16 cotton to the United States textile mills during the calendar year of 1951 would not exceed an average price of 45 cents a pound, unless a crop failure occurred.

Several steps, which the market administrator could take to avoid skyrocketing prices would include the following:

1. Announcement by CCC of the sale of its remaining stocks as soon as the market reopens.

2. Announcement by the USDA that no further cotton export allocations would be made in the immediate future.

3. Announcement should be made by the ECA that no further cotton procurement authorizations will be issued in the immediate future and that authorizations which expire March 31 will be extended to permit shipment after that date if necessary.

4. Export licenses for the time being should be limited to those requested which were available at the Department of Commerce when ceilings were invoked.

5. Urge cotton exchanges to agree to raise margin requirements on all new speculative accounts in March, May, and July positions to a minimum of 50 percent of market value. If this is not sufficient to control excessive speculation then this margin requirement can be progressively raised to 100 percent.

6. Require the exchanges to reexamine all hedge letters so as to provide that no holder of a hedge letter could be actually net long the market in March, May, and July 1951, positions. All brokerage houses should be requested to notify their customers that within a 30-day period all existing open credit

for hedge accounts will be canceled and satisfactory margins not to be effective before May 15 and to end July 31, 1951, will be required on all contracts.

7. Prohibit any speculative purchases of cotton futures in the old crop months except in liquidation and prohibit purchases of March, May, or July against sale of later deliveries as a speculative straddle except in liquidation.

8. Limit daily fluctuations on cotton futures exchanges on the spot month to the same limit applicable to other months.

9. Request military to withhold purchases not deemed absolutely necessary until after September 1, 1951, and to make such purchases on (on call basis) until after such date.

10. In order to prevent a disastrous break in the cotton market which would prevent the production of 16,000,000 bales so badly needed, it is recommended that all of the above requirements be automatically lifted if and when the price of middling 15-16 inch goes below the price at which it was selling when the exchanges were closed on Friday, January 26.

11. If lifting of above requirements does not stop decline, issue announcement increasing export allocations.

12. Announce the intention of USDA to stockpile cotton through open-market purchases in normal trade channels whenever the anticipated domestic demand plus anticipated exports plus reasonable carry-over is exceeded by the anticipated supply.

The American cotton farmer is ready to make his decision as to the size of his acreage for 1951. He cannot have confidence in a market structure which will reflect arbitrary price ceilings. He must have the opportunity to receive prices for his product reflecting the supply he produces in relation to the available demand.

It would be disastrous for growers to pitch a 16,000,000-bale crop, then encounter poor growing conditions on top of high costs and have only 13,000,000 bales to market at the price level he would have gotten for a 16,000,000-bale crop.

Resolutions of New York State Civil Defense Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to three resolutions which have been adopted by the New York State Civil Defense Commission. In accordance with the suggestion contained in the second of these three resolutions, I am preparing and will introduce a bill to reactivate the insurance provisions of World War II to cover civil-defense volunteers.

The resolutions follow:

Resolution 1

Whereas the volume of correspondence and informational material to be distributed by the States and their political subdivisions, and by the Territories and the District of Columbia, in the execution of the national civil-defense program, has become a substantial burden upon the finances of the States; and

Whereas the present mailing procedure for civil-defense materials is definitely impeding the civil defense informational and educational programs due to the time element and manpower requirements involved in stamping, weighing, counting, and otherwise complying with postal requirements; and

Whereas the success of the national civil-defense program requires the fullest possible dissemination of instructions and informational material throughout the several States, Territories, and District of Columbia; Be it

Resolved, That this conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to recommend to the Congress the extension of the Federal franking privilege to all States and local offices of civil defense and to the offices of civil defense in the Territories and the District of Columbia for their official correspondence and the mailing of informational material, and to further recommend that a Federal appropriation be made available to the Post Office Department to cover the additional operating expenditures which this extension of the franking privilege would entail.

Resolution 2

Whereas the recruiting of civil-defense volunteers is being hampered in many States by the reluctance of citizens to expose themselves to danger without adequate insurance protection against injury or death sustained in civil-defense training and operations; and

Whereas the burden of such insurance protection is great; and

Whereas the overcoming of the effects both material and financial, of enemy attack and the preparation of civil-defense forces to minimize such effects is a matter of national and not merely local concern; Be it

Resolved, That this conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to recommend to the Congress the enactment of suitable legislation to provide adequate insurance protection to officially enrolled civil-defense volunteers throughout the Nation against injury or death sustained in active civil-defense training or in operations.

Resolution 3

Whereas the laws of the Federal Government and of the various States require the prompt establishment of an effective civil defense organization in the individual States; and

Whereas the Federal and the State plans recognize the necessity for procuring certain essential items of organizational equipment (including communication and air-raid-warning equipment) as promptly as possible; and

Whereas the Federal Civil Defense Administration will recommend to the Congress that Federal appropriations be made available to defray half the cost of such items; and

Whereas it is desirable that actual procurement not be delayed until the Federal appropriations are available; and

Whereas it is felt that the States who have shown initiative and foresight in procuring such equipment prior to the availability of Federal funds for such purpose should not be penalized for their forehandedness: Be it

Resolved, That this conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to include in this request to the Congress for appropriations a recommendation that the Congress authorize the Administration to utilize any such appropriation to pay half the cost of any items approved by the Administrator which may have been purchased by the States or their political subdivisions or by the Territories and the District of Columbia on or after the enactment of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 on January 12, 1951.

Outraged Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if a Republican uses the milder forms of a Democratic candidate's procedure at election time, the loser screams to high heaven. Under permission granted there is inserted herewith, as an illustration of what is meant, a discussion by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in his Washington Report of March 5, wherein he states:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Since his 43,000-vote defeat at the polls in Maryland, ex-Senator Millard Tydings has discovered that one of his constituents (who did not vote for him, by the way) was taken for an unmerry midnight ride in an argument over a letter.

Not satisfied with telling this story before a Senate subcommittee 4 months after he had been licked at the polls, ex-Senator Tydings is franking copies of his hysterical description of the alleged midnight ride at taxpayers' expense to Maryland voters.

A defeated Senator has the privilege of mailing at Government expense any words of wisdom he cares to put down on paper explaining his defeat, or on other subjects, for a period of 6 months after he is dumped by the voters.

To us taxpayers this may seem like unnecessary kindness for a defeated politician, but in Tyding's case it has its value. Each turn of the mimeograph tells us more about what manner of man this Tydings is.

For instance, William H. Fedder is the Baltimore printer who picked up $18,000 worth of business from Senator JOHN BUTLER's campaign headquarters and then ran to Tydings with a story that he had been mistreated. He has a next-door neighbor named Louis Fried.

Fried and Fedder got together, then called on Tydings and told a wild-eyed story of Fedder being taken for a ride. In a gesture of good will, Tydings didn't stand in the way of getting Fried a job on the very same Senate subcommittee which is investigating the Maryland election campaign.

Mr. Fried's presence in the story is somewhat curious in itself. Other than being a neighbor of Fedder's and having brought him to Tydings, there is nothing on the record explaining the subcommittee's need for his services as an investigator. Nor can much be learned about his investigative background, if any. He runs a garage and parking lot in Baltimore, next door to Fedder's printing shop.

For a spell, Tydings had members of my own staff involved in the kidnaping episode, which now turns out to have been a ride around Baltimore collecting Butler-for-Senator post cards so they could be mailed before the campaign was over.

Nobody in my shop was involved, and Tydings finally had to admit it, with a sort of offhand apology.

The campaign spending that the subcommittee sniffers are after is for post cards and a tabloid newspaper which showed Tydings and Earl Browder, the ex-Communist Party leader, with their heads together.

This cost BUTLER's headquarters a total of $18,000. A letter from BUTLER, which the committee has, guarantees payment of $12,000 of this sum. It was given to Fedder when he was squawking about not being paid for helping to distribute the cards and tabloids.

Fedder later was paid by BUTLER's campaign finance director, so this leaves the subcommittee about where United States Code, title 2, paragraph 248, comes in. It says:

"Money expended by a candidate to meet and discharge any assessment, fee, or charge made or levied upon candidates by the laws of the State in which he resides or expended for stationery, postage, writings, letters, printing (other than for use in billboards or in newspapers) or for distribution of letters, circulars, or posters shall not be included in determining whether his expenses have exceeded the sums in paragraph 1 or 2."

For your information, paragraphs 1 and 2 set forth an outright election spending limit for the candidate of $10,000, or a sum of 3 cents for each registered voter, not to exceed $25,000.

As to the picture Tydings is fuming about, it might be better for him to relax. Republicans on the subcommittee have quite a collection of pictures taken the day Browder testified before the Tydings subcommittee that whitewashed the Communist-in-Government charges made by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

They will be exhibited in connection with the question of just how close Tydings and Browder did get their heads together.

Actually, what the shooting is all aimed at is to embarrass Senator MCCARTHY. He hurt the Democrats as they've never been hurt before, and the Democratic National Committee knows it.

So the big pitch is to fix it so MCCARTHY won't be useful to any other Republican candidate for a Senate seat, or to the GOP Presidential nominee, in 1952.

MCCARTHY, in the Butler-Tydings campaign, rigged up the postcard idea and helped with the tabloid. The Democrats and Tydings know it only too well.

But not in all sections and branches of the Democratic Party are the standards of fair dealing, as is indicated by an editorial from the Washington Star of last week, which reads as follows:

MINK-COAT STANDARDS OF HONOR

The Star does not know whether Donald Dawson, the President's aide on personnel matters, intends to appear voluntarily before the Fulbright committee and give his own version of the influence he is alleged to have exercised with the RFC Board. He may yet intend to do so. If he does, it will be a creditable act on his part.

If he does not do so he ought to be fired. In the Star's opinion a failure to demand an opportunity to testify and tell his own story, especially in the light of the ugly mess already being developed by the Fulbright committee, will render him unfit for service in the White House or anywhere else in Government. Furthermore, his continuation in White House service under such circumstances would be an affront to public morals.

Mr. Dawson has not been charged with any illegal act. But that is not the point. The point is that here is a man, occupying a position as one of the President's intimate advisers on personnel, who has been publicly charged by a responsible committee of the Senate with having apparently exercised considerable influence over certain directors of the RFC in its business of lending public funds.

According to certain moral standards of honor and public service, which are felt rather than defined by decent people, this unwritten code would compel Mr. Dawson to demand the right on his own initiative to testify under oath before the committee and to explain in complete detail the nature of his relationship, if any, with the RFC. The fact that he has not done so, and in the present atmosphere at the White House it does not seem likely that he will, raises the cynical thought that Mr. Dawson is not following the old code of public service but is guided by what seems to be a new code, of which there is much dismal evidence in public life today.

Under this code a woman assistant secretary at the White House can accept a $9,500 natural royal pastel mink coat from her husband who, according to his own story, not yet complete, is already in debt to a lawyer who has been active in business before the RFC, and who arranged for the purchase of the coat.

Under this code, Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, military aide to the President, can continue to serve at the White House after being named by another investigating committee of the Senate as the man who made possible the "nefarious activities" of John Maragon, an "outright fixer," who subsequently has been convicted of perjury.

Under this code a woman alien from Australia can be brought to the United States and admitted to residence by a special act of Congress, approved by the President over the protest of the Department of Justice, which could not find in the record "any facts which would justify" the legislation. She turns up, too, at the White House, as the secretary of General Vaughan.

Under this code the President's press secretary, Joseph Short, can explain that the President "knows of no evidence of illegal influence on the RFC by any member of the executive branch or the legislative branch * * *" as if the "legality" of influence had anything to do with what is worrying the Senate committee—and the country.

Under this code it is the legality of conduct, rather than integrity of conduct, which assumes importance. Loss of honor is accepted as perhaps the inevitable accompaniment of "politics," which the public is being taught to believe is without honor. A double standard of morality for public office and private life is beginning to be cynically accepted as one of the facts of life.

If it becomes finally so accepted, the Russians and their masses of infantry are one of the least of the things we have to worry about.

Rural Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Clarence J. McCormick, on rural-manpower situation, made before the House Agriculture Committee on Monday, February 26, 1951:

I appreciate this opportunity to talk with this committee about the more essential aspects of the farm-labor-supply situation in relation to the national manpower picture.

We all agree, I'm sure, that in order to safeguard our American way of life, the Nation has no choice but to make the best possible use of its available manpower.

Making the best possible use of our manpower involves, first, providing sufficient and qualified personnel for our Armed Forces. This is an obvious fact that needs no elaboration. Nor do I need to elaborate on another obvious fact, namely, that farm people want to make their full contribution to meeting this phase of the present emergency.

But, as President Truman pointed out in his memorandum of January 17 to the heads of executive departments and agencies, "the needs of mobilization also require a vigorous civilian economy. The manpower necessary to defense production, to civil defense, to agriculture, and to the production of essential civilian goods and services and to sustain our commitments of aid to other nations, must be considered as integral parts of a balanced mobilization program."

Confusion sometimes arises from the fact that when people talk about the manpower situation they aren't always talking about the same thing. The manpower situation in terms of all-out war is one thing. The manpower situation in terms of less than all-out war—in terms of mobilization for what may be a 10-year-long or a generation-long preparedness effort—is something else. As the President has pointed out, the manpower measures of the present situation should be consistent with and should contribute to the most advantageous use of our manpower should full mobilization become necessary. But the situation we now face is still something less than full mobilization.

In agriculture, we are gearing for a long-pull effort. The Nation needs increased farm production in 1951.

But it may need even greater production next year, the second year, the third, fourth, or tenth year.

We are not in a one-shot situation. We can't afford, therefore, to neglect the fertility of the land, nor the conservation of farm equipment, nor the preservation on farms of sufficient skilled workers.

Our agriculture has always been a vital part of our national strength. But during and after World War II, the Nation learned anew the importance of food as a national asset. We learned that food is as essential to victory as planes, tanks, ships, and guns. It is precious in the same way as oil and steel are precious. It determines in large part the effectiveness of the fighting man.

It largely determines also the productivity of the civilian worker. In periods of mobilization, American producers, whether in manufacturing, mining, transportation, or agriculture, work longer and harder. Consequently, they want more food, and they have the money to buy it. Demand for food rises rapidly. Price pressures increase. Abundant farm production is necessary to lessen the dangers of runaway inflation.

Besides these contributions to our national strength, the American farmer contributes as an indirect producer of ammunition, tanks, aircraft, parachutes, and battleships. From his soil come the fiber and oil-producing crops which are used in the production of some of our most important weapons of war.

Cotton is one of the best examples. Cotton linters are used in making smokeless powder, plastics, and photographic film. A 500-pound bale of cotton linters (chemical grade) will provide enough smokeless powder for 100,000 rounds of rifle ammunition, over 20,000 rounds of machine-gun ammunition, 2,700 antiaircraft shells, or 85 rounds of heavy tank ammunition.

Long-staple cotton is used to make light, strong, wind-resistant, and water-repellent fabrics, yarns, and thread. It goes into the making of airplane and balloon fabrics and parachute cloth.

Agricultural raw materials provide the basic fabrics in the fighting man's clothing. It was estimated during World War II that clothing a soldier for a year takes all the wool of 26 sheep.

I could go on to show you the importance to preparedness of such other agricultural crops as hemp, flax, peanuts, castor beans,

and soybeans. But for reasons of time I will simply point out that agricultural products are not only important but absolutely basic elements in our national defense effort.

We have recently proposed acreage guides for 1951 designed to bring about the biggest agricultural production in our entire history. That statement has much more than ordinary significance when it is recalled that our agriculture in 9 of the past 12 years has either set a new record for production or has equalled the record then existing.

In 1948 and 1949, total farm output ran about 40 percent above the 1935–39 average. In 1950 output dropped off somewhat but was still about 37 percent above prewar. This year we are shooting for production about 45 percent above the pre-World War II level.

The acreage guides call for a very large increase in cotton—approximately 53 percent above 1950. We need substantial increases in the total acreage devoted to corn, wheat, and rice. The target for corn is an increase of about 6,000,000 acres, for spring wheat about 3,000,000 acres, with a smaller increase suggested for rice.

The Department has also suggested increasing the acreage of vegetables for processing 22 percent above the total planted in 1950.

On the whole, these targets for 1951 farm production are encouraging—but there is a catch in them. A figure on paper, no matter how carefully it has been arrived at, is not fiber in the warehouse, nor is it food on the table.

As the members of this committee know, food and fiber are not produced by land alone. A great many elements besides land and water resources go into farm production—machinery and equipment, fuel, tires, and repair parts, fertilizer, livestock, buildings, and plenty of disease-resistant and weather-resistant seed. But above all, food and fiber produced by the skill, sweat, and planning of farm operators and farm workers. The millions of skilled people who work on farms are the Nation's most valuable agricultural resource.

In 1949, the Nation's agriculture produced about 40 percent more food and fiber than the 1935–39 average, using about 1,938,000,000 man-days of labor in the process. Last year, we produced about 37 percent more than the 1935–39 average, and used 1,829,000,000 man-days of labor to do the job.

This year, shooting for a production target about 45 percent above the prewar average, we estimate agriculture will need about 1,936,000,000 man-days of labor. In other words, to realize the hoped-for production we expect to need almost as many man-days of labor as were utilized in 1949—and nearly 6 percent more than were used last year.

We have deliberately based this comparison on man-days rather than on the number of farm workers involved, for the reason that in periods of national emergency requiring heavy farm output, farmers have already worked harder and longer than under normal conditions. You will note that the estimate for 1951 anticipates greater efficiency and larger output per man-hour than in 1949.

The fact remains, however, that farmers, this year, are being called upon to produce considerably more food and fiber with considerably less manpower. During 1950, the number of workers on farms decreased sharply and some of these farm workers were absorbed in nonfarm employment. The average cash farm wage in 1950 was about 56 cents an hour. While this was more than three times the average wage for the 1935–39 period, it was still only 38 percent of the average factory wage of $1.46 an hour prevailing last year. The fact that nonfarm employment opportunities are increasing with the present expansion in defense industries will operate not only against the return of these workers to agriculture, but will draw still more upon the remaining supply of farm workers.

While it is true that a growing number of tractors, milking machines, combines, corn pickers, and other machines together with greater use of electric power have enabled agriculture to increase production, despite the declining supply of farm labor, these same factors have brought about a situation in which skill and experience are more important in farming today than ever before. We are proud of the fact that farm output per man-hour is now approximately 50 percent above the 1935–39 average. But we are keenly aware also that the loss of one skilled operator today is equivalent to the loss of one and one-half skilled farm operators in the pre-World War II period.

There just isn't any substitute for experience and skill on the farm. If I may speak about this in terms of my own farming experience, I think I can show pretty plainly what I mean. Like a lot of other farmers in the Midwest I've spent a good bit of time in raising hogs. I think I can spot a sick hog a long ways off. There's something about the way an animal's ears droop or his tail hangs when he's sick that an experienced hog raiser can see at a glance. That's the kind of skill that just can't be picked up overnight.

It takes a lesser amount of skill—but nevertheless a good bit—to handle a tractor or a milker or any of the dozens of machines that you find on the average well-equipped farm today. These machines cost the farmer a lot of sweat and toil. He knows how to handle them. His sons know how to handle them. But when a fellow without know-how gets to fooling with this equipment he's not only taking a chance on ruining valuable property, he's often taking a chance on his own limbs and life. Because, as this committee knows, farming is a hazardous industry. All—or nearly all—farm machines have moving parts that are dangerous—knives or cutters, gears, chains, rotating shafts, flywheels, and so on. They're not safe to be around when a fellow's body is on the farm but his mind is in the city.

It is absolutely essential that agriculture retain enough key men to provide the skills needed for planning farming operations, operating farm machinery, and directing the work of inexperienced laborers.

It is necessary also to recruit additional workers into the agricultural labor force in order to meet seasonal needs. Inasmuch as a good many experienced seasonal agricultural workers either have already been—or will be—absorbed by industry and the Armed Forces, it will be necessary to obtain workers from new and additional sources in 1951 if production targets are to be hit.

Obviously it is of great importance to the Nation's agriculture that the local selective-service boards understand the particular problems involved in the agricultural manpower situation. Many farm workers in the lower age groups are, in the truest sense of the word, skilled or key men. They have learned by watching and doing throughout their years on the farm. Many of them have added to their farm skills by agricultural courses in high school or even in college.

The Department recognizes that many local selective-service boards have actually met this problem. We believe that farm workers, on the whole, have been treated very realistically. However, we have received some apparently well-founded complaints about the existence of great variations in the practices and standards adopted by various local boards.

Agriculture should contribute—and it will contribute—men to the armed services. The problem before the local boards—and before the Nation as well—is one of determining which are the truly irreplaceable farm men, and which are those who would perhaps try to use agricultural deferment as a way of avoiding their obligation of military service.

It is vital, too, that local boards take into consideration the large number of family-type farm units producing substantial quantities for market which are operated by one or two men, for example, a father and a son in his early twenties. The mobilization effort demands that we keep at least one able-bodied man on each of these family farms.

Are We Fulfilling Our Obligations Under the Displaced Persons Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution calling for the extension of provisions of section 3 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, until final action shall have been taken on all applications which may have been filed under the act by June 30, 1951.

The Displaced Persons Act, as amended last year, will expire on June 30 of this year. By then it will have been on our statute books for 3 years, during which time close to a quarter of a million DP's will have entered the United States under this act. In the troubled and hectic years which followed World War II, we proved to the whole world that the United States is still a great humanitarian country, notwithstanding the vicious propaganda attacks by our enemies who would make the rest of the world believe that we are blood-thirsty warmongers and money-mad imperialists.

Our example, set nearly 3 years ago by the enactment of legislation to admit several hundred thousand homeless European DP's, was followed by several other countries who admitted considerable numbers of them. Among these countries are Australia, Canada, Israel, several Latin American countries, and others.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that under the DP Act, as amended in 1950, a total of 341,000 DP's were to be admitted to the United States, not including the so-called ethnic German or Volksdeutsche which come under a different category. According to the latest available figures, obtained from the Displaced Persons Commission, a total of 220,000 DP's have entered this country since the act went into effect in 1948. How many more will arrive in the United States between now and the end of June when the law expires we have no way of knowing, but I would venture to guess that it will not exceed another 20,000.

It may interest the members of this House to know that on the basis of religious affiliation, the DP Commission has found that the 220,000 who have entered until now, consisted of 45 percent Catholic, 34 percent Protestant, 20 percent Jewish, and others, including those whose religious affiliation is not known—1 percent.

From all indications, then, it appears that probably no more than 240,000 DP's—and possibly less than that—will have entered this country by the time the act expires at the end of June. This would leave approximately 100,000 visas, authorized by the act, as unused, voided, and totally lost. It would mean that the extra 100,000 DP visas, for which we fought so strenuously last year will not be used and despite our legislative victory of last year, the fight to gain admittance for a larger number of DP's will have been in vain.

Mr. Speaker, I believe if we allow the law to lapse without taking the necessary precautions to admit the number of DP's as prescribed by the law, we will have committeed a grave injustice to those homeless people who have been waiting all these years for an opportunity to reach the United States. I believe that the folly of such an act will reverberate throughout Europe and cause untold injury to the prestige and the good name of our country. It will be said that the great democracy of the United States refuses to abide by its own laws and to fulfill the provisions prescribed therein.

In the resolution which I am introducing today I aim to forestall this injustice and to provide for the fulfillment of our promise and obligation to admit the number of DP's as prescribed by this Congress. My resolution provides that the issuance of immigration visas to DP's under the amended DP Act "shall remain in effect until final action shall have been taken on all applications which shall have been filed on or before June 30, 1951, and the applicants found admissible, as provided by law, have had a reasonable opportunity to enter the United States of America."

Instead of the law expiring on June 30, 1951, and all our responsibility and obligations ending on that date, my amendment provides that all eligible DP's who file for admission to the United States by that date and are subsequently found admissible under our immigration and security laws should be granted the long-awaited opportunity to come here. Thus we shall make it possible for most of the 100,000 DP visas to be used in accordance with the law. This is the least we should do. Only in this way will we be able to claim that we have faithfully fulfilled our obligations in helping to solve the DP problem.

Justice for Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable complaint arising from reservists with respect to the conditions under which they are recalled for service. In many instances they claim to be doing only ordinary service that could be well performed by young men who have had no training, and, who should have such training. Furthermore, it is claimed that no consideration is given to the fact that the reservists have already given service to their country in time of war, and since the war have become married and have children dependent upon them. These and many other complaints are being made. The following letter is an illustration of the numerous letters being received by Members of Congress at this time:

WESTMONT, N. J., *March 3, 1951.*

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
United States Congress.

HONORABLE SIR: I am the mother of a World War II veteran who has been recalled to active service in the Navy through his continued service in the Naval Reserve. This has caused him to break up his home and to try to live in furnished rooms with his wife wherever it is possible to do so. He also had to leave a good position at home and, as is always the case, will probably find some younger man has stepped around him while he has been away.

Is this the American way of life? I know of many young men who are unmarried and with practically little or no responsibilities, who attend Naval Reserves drill each week and are trained as much as my son, who anxiously await a chance to get into the Navy but who are told there is no room for them at present at the receiving stations and the boot camps we now have opened are too full and insufficient to take care of them.

Couldn't something be done to give married war veterans a better deal than they are now receiving? With their broken-up homes and their married life damaged, couldn't they be replaced with the nonveteran Reserves who really are being held back. Their rates of pay are even greater than the nonveteran Reserves, thereby effecting a savings to the Government.

My son is a holder of the Purple Heart and the Good Conduct Ribbon from World War II proving he has stood his turn and would like to resume his interrupted married life. Surely it is only just that he be given this chance and I know he will serve just as faithfully in the inactive service of the Reserves by helping to train further the younger men who could replace him.

You would be better versed in the ways and means to rectify this unrest and unhappiness. Wouldn't you please take the necessary steps to correct this condition.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Mrs. ETHEL P. TURNER.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that the Armed Services Commitee will give consideration to complaints such as the above to the end that a more equitable system of calling to service may be adopted.

The Truman-Snyder Inflationary Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, for extension in the RECORD, I herewith submit copy of a radio address delivered to the good people who have given me the honor to represent them in the House of Representatives.

Perhaps the two greatest disturbances which daily aggravate you consists of: First, the declining buying power of your wages and your accumulated savings; and second, the contributions you have to make in the form of human flesh and blood and money to the war effort.

At the outset let me emphatically say that since 1933 the policy of the previous and present administrations has been directed toward a higher cost level, a higher wage level, and a higher selling price on the goods and services which you purchase.

This fact cannot be successfully denied by anyone.

In making these presentations it will be necessary occasionally to use a few figures, as much as we dislike to be burdened with them.

As citizens we cannot escape the fact that the sheer management—and here I am not referring to the payment—I repeat, the sheer management of the present Federal debt of $256,000,000,000 presents economic forces which, at times, literally guillotine your personal capital structures, and your buying power. At this very moment President Truman and Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, are pursuing an inflationary policy, with respect to managing and financing this devastating Federal debt.

This inflationary program, sponsored and administered by Messrs. Truman and Snyder, is so inflationary and highly destructive that you cannot rely for adequate relief on the other program of price controls, rationing, and allocations.

Price controls and rationing cannot possibly offset the damage of the inflationary program. I urge you not to be misled by political statements which so often come to you to the effect that price controls will make your economic pathway one easy to travel.

Too much of this Federal debt, to which I have referred, was sold by the Federal Treasury to the Federal Reserve banks and the commercial banks of the country.

Too much of this debt consists of short-term paper.

Too much of this debt consists of what is known as call paper. By this I mean to say that all of you who hold savings bonds can take those bonds to the banks and cash them any time during business hours. Thus you can call upon the Treasury to pay the savings bonds upon your option. Thus you determine the due date. You make the call on the Treasury. And the Treasury must stand ready to answer when you call.

The administration and the Treasury followed an unsound and dangerous fiscal policy in financing this debt in such a manner. Against this dangerous policy I have for years protested. I am here protesting again.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Truman and Mr. Snyder have, just recently, established a policy which literally converts the Federal Reserve Banking System and the commercial banks into an engine of inflation.

Therefore, the buying power of your savings declines daily.

This is a terrible fact which you now face. This is a fact you must understand. This is a fact you must help change, or we face financial disaster in this country such as other countries have suffered.

Not only do these constantly advancing prices reduce the buying power of your liquid savings and your current wages and salaries, but in addition the dollar value of your life-insurance policies are being destroyed.

Furthermore, here is another terrible fact: Everything the Federal Government purchases in connection with the defense program, or otherwise, carries a premium in price due to inflation which you, as taxpayers and bond buyers, must bear.

President Truman and Mr. Snyder excuse their action on the basis that they are holding down to a low level the interest rate on the Federal debt.

However, it would be much easier for the people of this country to pay $2,000,000,000 more per annum as interest on the Federal debt than it is for them to pay annually $25,000,000,000, or more, as a premium on what the citizens purchase and what the Government purchases for the defense program.

And, of course, you would much prefer to be burdened with a somewhat higher interest rate on the Federal debt than to have the value of your savings and insurance policies reduced more and more each month and year just as they have been reduced for the past several years.

These reductions have occurred by reason of the inflationary and unsound fiscal policies pursued by the administration in the form of deficit financing, easy money rates, too much Government lending and selling bonds to the banks and having the Federal Reserve banks guarantee the market price of the bonds.

Now, my fellow citizens, what I am saying to you today is not a clash of personalities, or a case of Crawford versus Truman and Snyder.

The one thing that is clearly at stake now, today, and which is of far greater importance to you than the position of any individual involved, is the buying power of your dollar.

Whether or not you have confidence in the American dollar at this moment is of supreme importance.

Do I need to tell you that the purchasing power of your dollar is rapidly shrinking right now. It has been shrinking for so long a time that we are faced with these makeshift proposals known as price controls, rationing, allocations, wage controls; and all with which the President is making so little progress.

Let this shrinkage continue and I assure you that public confidence in the American dollar will be destroyed. When that day arrives public credit will likewise be destroyed.

And when public credit is destroyed in this country, our individual enterprise system or capitalist society is done for. Then, you may rest assured, whether we like it or not, that we will move into some kind of a tightly regimented socialistic state.

This calendar year many billions of dollars of the Federal debt mature. The Treasury does not have on hand tax dollars with which to meet those maturing bonds. To get those dollars the Treasury must first sell more bonds which will mature at some future date. And to whom will the Treasury sell those bonds? To the Federal Reserve banks, or the commercial banks, or to the individual citizens?

If these refunding bonds are sold to the banks at a very low interest rate in conformity with the policy of the President and Secretary of the Treasury, you will witness more and more inflation, regardless of the price-control program.

But on the other hand, if the public—that means you—have little faith in the purchasing power of the dollar—its real measure of value—do you believe that the Secretary of the Treasury can sell to you and other private citizens forty or fifty or sixty billion dollars' worth of those bonds this year?

In no way do I mean to influence you against buying Federal bonds. Let me say that I, too, have some of these bonds—both marketable and savings. I have seen the "hound of inflation" eat up the buying power of my savings just as you have.

We should invest our savings in Government bonds to help finance what we believe is sound. But in turn, Mr. Truman and Mr. Snyder should have great respect for the rights of the citizens and be dead sure they advocate and support a sound fiscal policy of Government so that we will have faith in those bonds and so that our investment therein will not disappear through inflation.

Just why are you running away from the ownership of dollars into the ownership of goods? Simply because each day the dollar buys less. And for this good reason you hesitate in purchasing long-term Government bonds at a very low rate of interest because the experience of the past 10 years teaches you that your dollars buy less when your bond matures and you receive back your money, than it would buy when you bought the bond.

Thus the destructive hand of inflation writes on. President Truman and Secretary Snyder advocate a cheap money policy operating through the open market committee of the Federal Reserve banks and the member banks of that system.

The net results of such a policy allows for vast sums of speculative loans made by banks to individuals and corporations with which to go into the market place and bid up the prices on basic and raw materials, manufactured goods of all kinds, foodstuffs, fats, and fibers.

Thus, the whole banking system becomes an engine of inflation—and against this policy I protest.

Mr. Oscar Bledsoe, one of the leading cotton farmers of the South, the other day observed that—

> The strongest ally that communism has is inflation of the monetary system of this capitalistic Nation caused by the flagrant violation of the natural law of supply and demand, as if it did not apply to money. The Treasury Department is directly responsible by floating and supporting our tremendous Government bonded debt with our monetary system.

Mr. Bledsoe also said:

> The building of a price control dam down stream is no cure. * * * The morale of this Nation is the lowest in its history, with the loss of confidence in the dollar. The Treasury is now paying off its 10-year U savings bonds. The $75 investment is receiving $100 that will buy, as of date of investment, about $55 of goods, which is a loss of $20 of the original investment, plus the $25 interest.

The Washington Evening Star in commenting on this policy of Messrs. Truman and Snyder only a few days ago had this to say:

> It is interesting, however, that a group of economists from the University of Chicago have expressed the opinion that the price rise of the last 6 months could almost certainly have been largely or wholly avoided * * * if the Federal Reserve System had kept its holdings of Government securities unchanged instead of adding to them by $3,500,000,000.

In conclusion, let me remind you that years ago the Congress approved the Federal Reserve Act and brought forth the Federal Reserve banks designed to regulate the credit structure and to provide the necessary flexibility in our supply of money and credit to meet the economic needs of the people. Congress made this an independent agency and intended that the system be free of political domination. The system is charged by law with the duty of promoting commerce and industry, of conducting its operations with a view to the broad interests and needs of the national economy as a whole. This recent attempt of the President to dominate the system is the boldest attack yet presented by any Chief Executive since Congress approved the original law.

Let us hope that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury will immediately withdraw their demands and discontinue the policy which so many experts charge as being responsible for the destructive inflationary forces that now eat into your savings so disastrously.

Business Week in its editorial headed "Down the Inflation Road" had this to say:

> The Federal Reserve System is at a crisis point. Contrary to the intent of the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Reserve Board faces the loss of its independence to the executive branch. It has three courses open to it: (1) It can acquiesce; (2) it can resign in protest; (3) it can seek to get a public review of the issue.

My fellow citizens, I think the board should get the public—that means you—to review the issue. That is why I am presenting this case to you. I agree with Business Week when it says:

> What is at stake is no less than the preservation of our economy from the ravages of inflation.

Controls Hamper Government's Revenue Intake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by William C. Hope, legislative and market analyst of Robert Moore & Co., New York City:

CONTROLS HAMPER GOVERNMENT'S REVENUE INTAKE

(By William C. Hope)

A glaring example of how controls militate against one of the Government's major objectives at a time of international stress—that of increasing its revenue—is furnished by the cotton industry, an industry second only in importance to that of steel. Some 14,000,000 people are dependent upon cotton for a livelihood. Therefore, one can well imagine what will happen to an overwhelming majority of these people should the ESA adhere to its plan of placing a ceiling on raw cotton or should it fail to clarify its present freeze order on cotton—an order that has resulted in chaos and a complete stagnation of the cotton industry.

It is a recognized fact that the merchandising system applied to raw cotton is the most complex and intricate one in our economic structure. This is due primarily to the fact that hundreds of different grades and staples have to be dealt with. Therefore, any kind of control over this commodity—other than one at the mill level, accompanied by a liberal escalator clause—results in confusion and stagnation. Such stagnation prevails at present. Everyone in the industry—including grower, shipper, merchant, and futures broker—has remained bewildered and immobile since the promulgation of the ESA freeze order on January 26. The only sales reports received from the 10 southern spot markets since the institution of the freeze order show a total of merely 33,000 bales changing hands, compared with 776,000 bales changing hands in the month immediately preceding this order. (December 27, 1950–January 26, 1951.)

Furthermore, due to the hundreds of grades and staples concerned should a ceiling be placed on the raw commodity, we would be confronted with one of the most stupendous black markets ever witnessed in the annals of the United States. Thousands of taxpayers would be eliminated from the tax rolls while, at the same time, the United States Treasury would lose millions of dollars through these black-market operations.

As mentioned above, the cotton industry is so complex, it is doubtful that it could be successfully controlled, even after years of study on the part of the would-be controllers—be they men of the industry or be they politicians grasping for a higher rung on their own political ladder.

The present ESA freeze order reminds the writer of the sane advice given by Confucius when he stated:

"The men of old, when they wished their virtues to shine throughout the land, first had to govern their states well.

"To discipline themselves, they first had to set their minds in order.

"To set their minds in order, they first had to make their purpose sincere.

"To make their purpose sincere, they first had to extend their knowledge to the utmost.

"Since knowledge is acquired through a careful investigation of things.

"For, with things investigated, knowledge becomes complete.

"With knowledge complete, the purpose becomes sincere."

Examining the present situation in the light of the above rationalization, no reason is found to challenge the sincerity of the ESA freeze order on cotton, as it is fully realized that it was promulgated with the intent of placing a damper on inflation. However, there is ample reason why the method should be challenged. As long as the United States Treasury insists on a low interest rate of 2½ percent on Government bonds, the price of goods will be bid up to and above any line established by a wage-price freeze. There is also reason to question the knowledge upon which the ESA freeze order, insofar as it applies to cotton, was based. When the end product of such knowledge results in the complete stagnation of a major industry while, at the same time, posing a threat to ample production in that industry, it is time for the economic stabilizers to stop, look, and listen.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an excellent and thoughtful radio address recently delivered by Mr. Eugene Lyons, roving editor of the Reader's Digest, under the auspices of the Polish-American Congress for western Massachusetts.

This speech and this sponsorship offer striking proof of the unyielding determination of the advocates of the cause of a free Poland never to give up the fight for Polish freedom until justice has been done and Poland's freedom regained.

I shall continue to be in the vanguard of that fight.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, most of you, I'm sure, have heard of the strange new game called Russian roulette. In a pitch-black room, men shoot at one another—and sometimes someone is killed. They do it just for the fun of the thing, to titillate their nerves.

But let me tell you of another such game of chance, which we might call "Russian roulette for freedom." It is far more dangerous—and it is not played for fun. I refer to the grim game that has been going on since the end of the war in 1945—in which liberty-loving men and women stake their lives for the chance of winning freedom.

This tragic yet inspiring gamble goes on day after day along 2,000 miles of land and water frontiers that divide Stalin's part of Europe from the rest of that Continent. Every one of those miles is fortified and guarded, by border police, electrified barbed wire, police dogs, speedboats. But despite all barriers of danger, thousands of people—Poles and Germans, Hungarians and Rumanians, Baltic nationals, and even Soviet citizens—take the gamble of attempting to escape.

They know when they start that the odds against them are frightening. According to refugee officials who have analyzed the gruesome business, only 1 in 12 can expect to make it in the Balkan areas, only 1 in 8 in the Baltic areas. At best, in the German and Austrian occupation zones, where the attempt is easier, the chances of success—that is to say, of getting safely through the iron curtain—are about 50-50. And the penalties for losing are concentration camp, torture, and most often death.

Nevertheless, there are no lack of players. The awful game that began 5 years ago is still under way. From two to three thousand escape every month from under the iron heel of Red despotism. This means that at least eight or nine thousand make the try—and fail. Singly or in groups of two or three, these men, women, and children—yes, even children—match their courage and ingenuity against the terrific might of Stalin's secret-police and frontier-guard forces.

To reach the world of freedom—the world which you and I accept as a matter of course—these refugees from communism have crawled through swamps and tramped through forests. They have cut a path through barbed wire and bargained between life and death for days on floaty rafts or in rowboats.

It is for these heroes of our world in chains that I am here to speak. In staking their lives for liberty, they have given proof of the grandeur of the human spirit. They have established a powerful claim on our conscience. In simple truth they are fighting not only their own but our battle in the world-wide struggle between human freedom and totalitarian slavery.

Every one who succeeded in escaping has behind him a nightmare journey across hundreds of miles bristling with machine guns, booby traps, police dogs, informers. But what do they find when they pass our side of the iron curtain?

The sad fact is that after surviving the Russian roulette for freedom, these people generally face another nightmare. They face the ordeal of finding themselves homeless, hungry, unwanted surplus humanity—part of the huge army of wretched victims of total war who have come to be called displaced persons.

For the hope of a new life in freedom they have thrown away their native land, their language, their career, their worldly possessions. They imagined that the democratic peoples would make them welcome and give them a helping hand. Now they discover, in despair, that they are not regarded as comrades in a common fight but as a distressing nuisance. They find themselves interlopers in Germany or Austria or Italy—areas already suffering under a great load of refugees and DP's. Worst of all, the gates of democratic nations are almost entirely closed against them.

These thousands of escapees whom I have described are only part of the vast and suffering displaced population. They join the hundreds of thousands who have been in a similar plight for years. They join the hordes of victims of German concentration camps—the veterans of Hitler's gigantic slave-labor forces—the fugitives from a hated communism who followed the retreating Germans to avoid being overrun by Stalin's hordes armies.

At the end of the war, literally millions of men and women who had been dragged into the German slave-labor battalions or who languished in German prisoner-of-war camps, were liberated. These took the west—from Belgium, Holland, France, the Scandinavian countries—overcoat, eagerly and joyously.

But most of these men, too, also had no real home to return to. Their native

They know when they start that the odds against them are frightening. According to refugee officials who have analyzed the gruesome business, only 1 in 12 can expect to make it in the Balkan areas, only 1 in 8 in the Baltic areas. At best, in the German and Austrian occupation zones, where the attempt is easier, the chances of success—that is to say, of getting safely through the iron curtain—are about 50-50. And the penalties for losing are concentration camp, torture, and most often death.

Nevertheless, there are no lack of players. The awful game that began 5 years ago is still under way. From two to three thousand escape every month from under the iron heel of Red despotism. This means that at least eight or nine thousand make the try—and fail. Singly or in groups of two or three, these men, women, and children—yes, even children—match their courage and ingenuity against the terrific might of Stalin's secret-police and frontier-guard forces.

To reach the world of freedom—the world which you and I accept as a matter of course—these refugees from communism have crawled through swamps and tramped through forests. They have cut a path through barbed wire and bargained between life and death for days on floaty rafts or in rowboats.

It is for these heroes of our world in chains that I am here to speak. In staking their lives for liberty, they have given proof of the grandeur of the human spirit. They have established a powerful claim on our conscience. In simple truth they are fighting not only their own but our battle in the world-wide struggle between human freedom and totalitarian slavery.

Every one who succeeded in escaping has behind him a nightmare journey across hundreds of miles bristling with machine guns, booby traps, police dogs, informers. But what do they find when they pass our side of the iron curtain?

The sad fact is that after surviving the Russian roulette for freedom, these people generally face another nightmare. They face the ordeal of finding themselves homeless, hungry, unwanted surplus humanity—part of the huge army of wretched victims of total war who have come to be called displaced persons.

For the hope of a new life in freedom they have thrown away their native land, their language, their career, their worldly possessions. They imagined that the democratic peoples would make them welcome and give them a helping hand. Now they discover, in despair, that they are not regarded as comrades in a common fight but as a distressing nuisance. They find themselves interlopers in Germany or Austria or Italy—areas already suffering under a great load of refugees and DP's. Worst of all, the gates of democratic nations are almost entirely closed against them.

These thousands of escapees whom I have described are only part of the vast and suffering displaced population. They join the hundreds of thousands who have been in a similar plight for years. They join the hordes of victims of German concentration camps—the veterans of Hitler's gigantic slave-labor forces—the fugitives from a hated communism who followed the retreating Germans to avoid being overrun by Stalin's hordes armies.

At the end of the war, literally millions of men and women who had been dragged into the German slave-labor battalions or who languished in German prisoner-of-war camps, were liberated. These took the west—from Belgium, Holland, France, the Scandinavian countries—overcoat, eagerly and joyously.

But most of these men, too, also had no real home to return to. Their native

lands had been grabbed by the Communists and turned into satellites; or, as in the case of the Baltic republics and the eastern half of Poland, had been made part of the Soviet Union itself. For many of them going back would have meant jumping from the Nazi frying pan into the Communist fire.

And so immense numbers chose to take their chances as displaced persons in the free world rather than to don the chains of Soviet tyranny. They were Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Yugoslavs, and soon enough, as one nation after another was swallowed by Red imperialism, their numbers were swelled by Bulgarians, Rumanians, Hungarians, and finally Czechs and Slovaks.

Nor should we overlook the hundreds of thousands of Russians who form part of this uprooted humanity. They, too, had been in Nazi labor brigades, concentration camps, prisoners-of-war camps. The great majority had no choice but to return to their families in the Soviet homeland. Many others—to our eternal shame—were forced to go back at the point of American and British bayonets and machine guns, in accordance with an infamous secret covenant with Stalin made at Yalta. The rest, as we know, chose freedom. They did so knowing that they would be homeless and sometimes hunted vagrants in strange and not too hospitable lands.

A special group among the mass of displaced humanity deserves special notice. I have spoken of it before in this series of broadcasts. I refer to the Polish soldiers, sailors, and airmen who had fought gallantly side by side with American and British forces on every front of the war in Europe and Africa. For this "crime" they were labeled "enemies" by the new Communist masters of Poland. Most of them have found new homes, but thousands, with their families, still await resettlement, and their hopes, naturally, are focused on the United States of America.

The words "displaced persons" have a cold, technical ring. They have come to have vaguely annoying overtones, if only because they represent another "problem" to disturb our comfortable complacency. But under those words is the living reality of human beings who are being cruelly punished though they are innocent of any special sins. In the final analysis they are the victims of a historical struggle that is as much our concern as theirs.

We owe these people a great debt of conscience. We owe it to them as Americans, as freemen, as human beings, as a nation involved in a crucial showdown with godless communism. The displaced men and women and children have a first call on our compassion. But compassion, my friends, is not enough. What is needed urgently is immediate and practical help. That obligation does not rest on society in the abstract, nor even on governments. It rests on individual Americans.

A small but vital step was taken by the United States Congress 2 years ago, when it passed a law permitting the entry of 205,000 qualified DP's. This year the law was amended to make an additional 100,000 eligible to come to America, plus about 50,000 more in specific categories like the Polish war veterans.

In line with this congressional action, roughly 100,000 have already arrived. With few exceptions they have adjusted themselves readily to American life and are making valuable contributions by their labor. The agencies which have followed their fate here are all agreed that these newcomers will make first-rate Americans. A good many young men who only a few years ago were in DP camps in Germany or Austria are today fighting and dying for their adopted country on the battlefields of Korea—surely a dramatic symbol of our unity in the cause of freedom.

How many of the remaining 250,000 eligible to replant their lives in American soil will be allowed to do so depends on you. Yes, on you. In order to qualify for an American visa the would-be immigrants must be sponsored by American citizens. They must have what is technically called assurances of a job and a place to live when they get here. And you're the one who can provide them with those assurances.

Somewhere in a bleak DP barracks overseas there is a family waiting and hoping for you to act. Whether that family will be given a new lease on life, a chance to start fresh on some American farm, in some American industrial plant, or as a professional worker, depends on your willingness to sponsor that chance.

Two years ago, even a year ago, there was some justified fear of unemployment. Today that picture has changed, for the need of more and more working hands has become great and is growing more acute. Whatever the outcome in Korea, our country will assuredly continue the program of rearming on which it is launched. That's a good omen for the thousands seeking, and entitled under the law, to add their muscle power and their brain power to our common American pool. The last excuse for not sponsoring them has been removed.

But I do not want to rest this plea for your cooperation merely on economic self-interest. The challenge is to our every instinct of American decency and sportsmanship and Christian charity.

The necessary assurances are being collected by a great many religious and secular organizations—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish—as well as ethnic organizations of American Poles, Lithuanians, Hungarians, and so on. If you, or your church group, or some fraternal society of which you are a member, want, for instance, to become sponsors for a few Polish displaced persons, write to the Polish-American Congress, in care of the station to which you are now listening. I repeat, the Polish-American Congress, care of this station. You will be told precisely how you can translate your feelings of human sympathy into concrete assistance.

We must keep faith with those who died that a better world might be born. One immediate way to do this is to open for some victims of the war a new horizon of life and hope in our blessed America. We shall indeed be unworthy of our blessings unless we show the will to share them.

Secretary Acheson Convinces a Marine That the United States Has To Fight in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note the apparently wide publicity which was given over the week end by the press and by radio commentators to the recent letter written by Secretary Acheson to the father of the young marine in California who, in a letter to his father in New Jersey, described the state of confusion and frustration and expressed the doubts existing in his own mind, which I think is typical of that in the minds of thousands of people who are honestly and sincerely asking, "Why are we in Korea?"

I think it is significant that, upon reading the letter of Secretary of State Acheson, this young marine corporal, who had previously written that he and his friends can see "no cause to fight" in Korea, has been convinced that the United States has to fight in Korea. He is quoted as saying "His letter has convinced me, and I would like to get it across to all those people who do not think so."

It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that our leaders have not taken the initiative long before to explain in more detail, and more often to the people, the basis on which we are proceeding in formulating and implementing our foreign policy—to permit the people of this Nation, particularly the youth of our country, who are being called upon to make the supreme sacrifice, to realize that in the actions which we are taking, we have every reason to believe that only by following such a course do we have any hope of building the kind of world in which we all wish to live.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see these three letters, the one from the marine to his father, from the father to Mr. Acheson, and the Secretary's reply, a complete answer to the burning questions in the minds of many today, made available in a form which could be transmitted to all of our men in the services today in order that all doubts as to the necessity of our presence on the battlefields today might be removed. I think our Committee on Foreign Affairs might well consider the benefits to be derived from the publication of this series of letters.

Under the leave granted for the extension of my remarks, I am including herewith the correspondence between Secretary of State Acheson and Mr. Moullette, assistant to the mayor of Camden, N. J. Mr. Moullette had asked Secretary Acheson to help him reply to a letter he had received from his son, Corp. John B. Moullette, USMCR, Camp Pendleton, Calif. The following is the text of Secretary Acheson's letter, together with the letter from Mr. Moullette and Corporal Moullette:

FEBRUARY 23, 1951.

DEAR MR. MOULLETTE: I have thought a great deal about the letter from your son, which you sent me, and your problem in answering it wisely and helpfully. It brought back many memories to me of 10 years ago when my own son was in college, before he went to the Pacific, and I used to sit with him and his friends and talk over their problems which loomed ahead of them—and all of us.

I thought then, and think now, that the real problem lies deeper than the questioning of particular decisions, even the important ones which distress your son. It lies in the fact, for which we may thank God, that these boys have been brought up in the fundamental decency and rightness of American life. They have lived in communities where they have breathed in with the air truth and tolerance of others' interests, generosity, and good nature, hard

work, honesty, and fairness. To all of them opened the opportunity for happy and constructive lives, their own homes and families, work to do, a part to play in the community in a hundred ways. They saw no problems, here at home, that would not yield to effort, ingenuity, and the give-and-take of people who believe in the same right values.

Now, just at the moment when they were about to enter fully as grown men in this world, its promise is dashed. In its place, they find hardship, loneliness, uncertainty, danger. They are separated from family and friends. Even worse, they are denied the natural development of their lives. The fact that this happens to them because some distant and shadowy figures in the Kremlin, controlling millions of people far from them, are setting out to make impossible such lives as they had every right and hope to have, does not help their frustration and bitterness.

This agony of spirit, so understandable and right, makes it hard to believe that so monstrous an evil can exist in a world based upon infinite mercy and justice.

But the fact is that it does exist. The fact is that it twists and tortures all our lives. And, I believe, to each of us in this case as in so many others, the great thing is not what happens to us but how we bear what happens to us.

For our country, and for most of us as individuals, the period which has passed since VE- and VJ-days has been one of cruel disappointment, slowly forming resolution, and, finally, great determination and effort. The high hopes, for which great sacrifices were made during the war, did not come to ready fruition. That did not mean that these hopes—for peace, and for a good life for all—were wrong, or that the principles of freedom and justice on which they were based were not worthy of these sacrifices.

What it did mean was that it was going to be a good deal harder to build the kind of world we wanted, than we thought it was going to be.

We started out, even before the war had ended, building the foundation of the structure of peace, of law and order in the world, in the United Nations. We hoped that all nations would work together in bringing this about.

We came very close to realizing this aspiration. An international organization has been started functioning, and in some cases, it has performed extremely successfully. The role of the United Nations in the disputes in Palestine and in Indonesia suggest that, far from being discouraged, we should be heartened by the progress that has been made.

However, as it became clear that the rulers of the Soviet Union not only were not interested in cooperating with us, but were challenging the survival of our free institutions, and the independence of all nations, we have been obliged to build up our strength again, all of us.

In some ways, this is an ancient problem. Our forebears on this continent had it cruelly impressed upon them that the liberty we enjoy is not won and preserved without unremitting effort, without sacrifice, without "eternal vigilance." But we had for so long enjoyed the blessings of freedom, that we had come to accept this condition as automatically assured. It has fallen to us—to your son's generation, and to ours—to take up again the defense of freedom against the challenge of tyranny.

In other words, this is a new problem. Our country, which has risen to a position of unprecedented power and eminence in the world, is seeking to use that power in such a way as to help bring about a peaceful international order. This means that we have to be doing two things at once: While we move ahead in our efforts to build the kind of a world in which we can all live together peacefully and in common helpfulness, we are at the same time protecting ourselves from being overrun by the tyranny which is run from Moscow. I have sometimes compared this two-pronged effort as being like the way our ancestors had to have some men drilling and keeping watch from the blockhouses, while others went on, tilling the fields.

In a sense, we are standing with one foot in the world of our hopes for a future order among nations, and the other foot in the world of power. Both of these are part of the present reality. Unless we are strong enough—we and the other free nations—to prevent the Soviet rulers from extending their control over the entire world, then we shall never have the chance to help build the kind of a world we all want.

There are many terrible heartbreaks in this course of action, but there is no easier way to a peaceful world. Your son asks in his letter whether Korea proves anything. That he is heartsick over the loss of life and the destruction in Korea is right and good, and reflects what must be the instinctively humane feelings of good men everywhere. But I hope he will come to see that Korea proves—has already proved—a great deal. In Korea, the men and the nations who love freedom and who believe in the United Nations have made it clear that they are willing to fight for these things. By standing firm against aggression in Korea, we are doing our best to prevent the world from following the road which led us, twice in recent times, to world war. The heroic sacrifices which are now being made in Korea may enable the world to pass through this time of hostility and tension without the catastrophe, the greater destruction, and the immeasurably greater sacrifices of a world conflict.

I know that these thoughts I have written to you will not answer all the questions which you have touched on in your thoughtful letter, or which your son has mentioned. These are hard and complicated problems, for which there are no easy answers, and which a short letter could not deal with adequately. What I am concerned about is not that your son should feel that I, or the administration, or the Government is right on any particular issue. It is good that he should question whether the steps we are taking are right or are wrong. But what is important is that he feel, and that all our young people feel, a strong faith in the validity and the reality of the ideals on which this country was founded and on which it now endeavors to guide its actions. So long as our young people are steadfast in this faith, we can be assured of the vitality of our society, and its ability to go on meeting the challenges of the future.

Yours sincerely,

DEAN ACHESON.

CAMDEN CITY CIVIL DEFENSE COUNCIL,
Camden, N. J., January 19, 1951.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Enclosed, is a letter I received from my son this morning on my arrival at my office. I am sending it to you, since it is a letter which reflects the loose thinking on the part of many of our legislators and publishers—it is a letter filled with answerable questions, but questions which require much in knowledge, substantial qualifications which can and should be made understandable—since the American people as a whole are a provincial lot.

This lad of mine is 24 years old, a corporal in the Marine Corps at Camp Pendleton, Calif. He served with the First Division from 1944 to August 1946. Last September, he was hoping to enter Cornell University to take his course in hotel management. Instead, he went back in the Marine Corps, a Reserve. He was there, and I suspect now, bitter about it all. It so happens that in September 1949 I wrote him and so put too much stock in his future, since I was positive we would be involved somewhere in the world before another year was out. So, my wife and many of my friends made life miserable for me, since they said I was warmongering, when I was only evaluating the news as it was brought to me by a world press.

This lad has been raised in the traditions which have been prevalent in this country since colonial days, his schooling is that of the average public-school pupil, and he has had the advantage of books, magazines, newspapers from all over the world; he has traveled widely for his age, working on tramp steamers and tankers, and the United States is as his backyard at home, he knows it from personal visits.

The tenor of his letter about "foreign policy" leaves me cold and my reply to him will be an explanation that foreign policy is always fluid, that it must be so and has been so since 1914 because of certain inescapable facts. I will explain that we are a gullible people, that we won (or helped win) two wars and lost both times the peace, because we regarded winning wars in the same manner we regard winning a football match. I will tell him something of the different mores of various people, of their hatreds, their jealousies. I will tell him that the broad policies of our foreign policy is laid down in the Constitution of the United States in the convictions of our people, and their attitudes toward all peoples, all over the world.

I will send him a copy of an address of mine, which he said was too deep for him to understand when he read it in its formative stage. I will try to open his eyes to an understanding of the forces about him which are inimicable to the general good of our people, to the powers which can be wielded to destroy a man, no matter how stalwart and true he has been. I will cite the case of Forrestal, of Hiss, of others who were esteemed Americans of good understanding. I will indicate to him that the American people in their utter provincialism are tremendously jealous of their rights and prerogatives as free-born Americans, that they want the fruits thereof, but detest its responsibilities; that there are many men to advance their own interests against the interests of the whole people, take advantage of the situations brought about by the general misunderstanding which have been fostered by a press which is venal.

What I am going to tell him of foreign policy will be my experiences in most of the countries of the world, where I have seen my own countrymen reflect the worst of their natures, since they were of the opinion that they were a race apart. I will tell him something of the spread of the common law throughout the world by the British, whom he had been taught by a venal press to despise, and it has been hard to infect his distrust of the British even though he has close blood relatives in England, and more of them in Denmark and France.

Mr. Secretary, I have written you a long letter about a letter, but, what actually was also a motivation was a telephone call I received this morning from one of the principals of one of our high schools. He related to me that his teachers resolutely refused to take civil defense seriously, that it was a tempest in a teapot, and anyhow it was the figment of the administration's imagination that caused all the furore—that we would never be bombed or otherwise attacked, note the remarks of various Senators and Congressmen, and anyway, what was it you read in the press?

I have had members of my own party discount the sincere efforts of the President of the United States, simply because they wished in that way to resist the necessity of facing up to a world that is becoming increasingly more statistic and reprehensible.

Mr. Secretary, I have lived on every continent, worked in most of the countries of the world, or visited them, and I have a working knowledge of 10 languages, none of them taught to me academically but which I have learned because I needed them. I see about me so many things which are left undone, which should be done, and I want more than anything else to wake my countrymen up to the necessity of realizing we are not living in a chocolate-coated world, but one that is armed to the teeth against us by and through actual armor or armed against us in propagating the belief that we have only a nickel under foot to motivate our activities.

I know of personal knowledge that most of the peoples of the world have a sneaking respect for us, that they like us fairly well for ourselves alone, that they fear us far more than we fear them, but all of whom could be turned against us simply because they are jealous of our way of life which we have earned for ourselves by hard work and ingenuity. I hope you will help me with this letter to my son.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE E. MOULLETTE,
Assistant to the Mayor.

JANUARY 16, 1951.

DEAR DAN: I just finished reading from the Los Angeles Examiner the impeachment resolution against Dean Acheson which was introduced into the California State Senate by State Senator Jack B. Tenney, Republican, from Los Angeles. I can't help but think that the American people, Democrat and Republican alike, are fed up with the administration and its foreign policy.

The way Truman is appropriating money is outrageous. It is my belief that he is taking anyone's word for it and spending money uselessly and needlessly. At present he is asking Congress for $71,800,000,000 which would cost each American $468.

Do you not think that our foreign policy is fouled up a bit? What right have we to refuse Red China entry into the United Nations? I think she (Red China) has a right to voice her opinions about what is to take place in the Far East. After all, is she not a country out there just as Venezuela or Brazil is in our hemisphere? I say, "Let Red China into the UN and let her voice her vote and her opinions on what is to take place in the Far East."

The needless waste of life in Korea, on both sides, is shameful to the human race. Fighting will not settle anything. The only thing that I can see is being proven in Korea is: "Might over what may be right," Red China being the might. The problem of Red China versus the world, or the best part of it, has to be settled at the round table and eventually it will be. Red China will be admitted to the UN. So the UN will have lost the first round. We did better in the Boxer Rebellion.

I thought that only Congress could declare war. Why doesn't Congress either declare war against Red China or stop Truman from sending American troops throughout the world? Why should we take the brunt of it all? If the other countries in the UN won't supply the needed men and money then we should pull out of Korea and if need be, out of the UN and adopt something similar to what Hoover suggests.

The morale of the fighting man is very low. Mainly because the American people aren't behind him. Here at Pendleton most of these men know what war is or what its after-effects are and will be. Just last night at the "tiopahute" (beer-hall) the men, not one or two, but the majority, were complaining about the way we were tricked into this. Everyone seems to have nothing but disfavorable thoughts and remarks about the foreign policy. These men aren't afraid to fight, it's just that they have no cause to fight. If ordered to, we will but only because of the obligation we have to each other. I guess it's a form of "Brotherly Love."

Our only hope is that men our age throughout the world feel the same way and will state so to their leaders. By rebellion or other ways. After the loss of life, and property from the last war, everyone should want only peace. I believe that the people of our level want only peace but that the leaders (including Truman) are afraid to admit they are wrong and are ashamed to admit it for fear they will lose face. It looks that way, Dad!

I guess I've tired your eyes by now so I'll secure for now. Good luck in your defense job.

Love,

JOHNNIE.

P. S.—I may be a rebel but these are my own thoughts and convictions.

Northwest Power Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a radio broadcast entitled "Northwest Power Situation," delivered by Rudy Block over Station KOMO, Seattle, Wash., on Monday, February 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHWEST POWER SITUATION

(Radio broadcast by Rudy Block)

So great has been the spontaneous and organized pressure against Congress voting to spend $6,000,000 next year to link the electric power grids of California with the Bonneville Power Administration grid in Oregon and Washington that it appears certain the money will not be voted.

Actually the only possibility of building the controversial tie-in would be if the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Army, Navy, and Air Force tell Congress that as a national defense safeguard the power connection between California and the Pacific Northwest is vital.

In the meantime Congress has been swamped with letters and telegrams opposing the tie-in. Beside the Grange and chambers of commerce throughout the Pacific Northwest, the public utility districts and private power companies are lined up against the tie-in.

Even in the Department of Interior itself there is a difference of opinion as to whether the tie-in should take place and the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget where the project was screened before President Truman included it in the $71,000,000,000 budget stand out as the only proponents at this time.

When he was in our Nation's Capitol last week to appear before the House Appropriations Committee regarding next year's appropriations for Bonneville Power Administration, Dr. Paul Raver, the Bonneville Administrator, said he saw little hope for Congress to O. K. the tie-in item.

As in the case of all controversies between private and public power advocates the Bonneville Administrator in the case of the tie-in is trying to keep from taking sides.

"It seems to me that it is economically sound to have it possible for surplus California power to be sold in the Pacific Northwest and for surplus power in the Pacific Northwest to be sold in California," Dr. Raver said. "For example, if we have surplus Bonneville power and sold it in California it would help preserve oil for national defense."

At the same time the Bonneville chief said he appreciated the position of those on both the California and Pacific Northwest side of the proposed hook-up who fear the loss to their own industries which might arise if needed power were being sold to a far-away area.

The power situation continues to be a hot topic these days and besides the tie-in controversy the power fight is raging over the aluminum program and also over the Washington State squabble in connection with the proposed sale of the Washington Water Power Co. and public-utility districts.

This latter fight has centered at the State legislature but its Washington, D. C., angles include the decision last week by the Securities Exchange Commission that field hearings in the State would be held before the Commission acts on the proposed deal.

Another power controversy is the matter of where the Aluminum Co. of America will locate another aluminum production plant in the Pacific Northwest. Privately Alcoa is apparently hoping that it will set up its new plant near McNary Dam, but from recent conferences with Government power officials it became virtually certain that this plant will be located at Wenatchee. Until Alcoa signs its power contracts with Bonneville and the PUD, however, the deal is not set. In the meantime the town of Coulee Dam hopes it will get the Alcoa plant, but this appears to be a forlorn hope as Wenatchee has the inside track. Incidentally, once Wenatchee does get the Alcoa plant or any other new industry using Bonneville power, it will quiet a long-drawn complaint which see Wenatchee residents unhappy over the fact that their city is so near Grand Coulee Dam, but the big Bonneville transmission lines running through Wenatchee carry the dam's power to distant places.

The eastern newspapers have published little news about the important power situation, but last week Washington Representative HUGH MITCHELL attained widespread publicity when he made public his letter to Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman charging discrimination against the Pacific Northwest by the Defense Electric Power Administration.

Mr. Mitchell's blast was aimed at a reported memorandum issued by Defense Power Administrator Clifford B. McManus. Mr. McManus is a former Georgia Power Co. executive and his present attitude seems to favor halting new power projects in the Pacific Northwest. In place of this, Mr. McManus seems to feel, natural gas and coal in other parts of the Nation should be used.

For the last 2 weeks Senator MAGNUSON has been on top of this problem. In the hope of settling the issue without headlines, MAGNUSON talked to Secretary Chapman, to Dave Bell, the President's closest adviser on power matters, and to McManus himself. The gist of MAGNUSON's talks is: "We won't stand for discrimination against the Northwest in the allocation of defense industries."

Mr. Mitchell's letter actually puts Secretary Chapman on the spot to make public his position as to whether he favors the expansion of the aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest.

Looking at the situation impartially it appears from the testimony before the Celler committee investigating monopoly in the aluminum industry that new aluminum plants can be built quickly in areas where coal or natural gas are available. It is also a fact that such plants are cheaper than a power dam and that they can be built near centers of industrial production which are not as close to Soviet Russia as is the Pacific Northwest.

However, from a military standpoint, it is certain that in this age of aviation and guided missiles no part of the United States is out of reach of Russian air power, just as no part of Russia or Europe is out of reach of American air power.

And economically, while the first phase of a new aluminum plant might be cheaper if gas engines are used the maintenance cost and the ultimate increase in gas or coal due to depletion of resources, would make these plants costly to our national defense.

In other words the low cost of hydroelectric power makes this type of energy the most economical for aluminum production.

Alcoa, the giant of the aluminum industry, apparently realizes this or it easily could be planning its new plant in some other area of the Nation.

But the problem of Representative MITCHELL and other Pacific Northwest Members of Congress to sell their colleagues and Government agency heads on the fact that hydropower is the best power for aluminum production is not an easy one.

The South holds the key positions in the Eighty-second Congress and it is the Southwest and Texas where natural gas is plentiful. Eastern coal mine operators are also alert to the situation and see in the aluminum defense stockpiling a potential outlet for coal via steam plant.

Turning now to another phase of the power situation Congress is faced with the question of how much money to appropriate for new authorized dams. These dams, such as Ice Harbor Dam, would be added to the Bonneville grid and help meet the growing demand for power throughout the Pacific Northwest.

Secretary Chapman is also the head man when it comes to Interior Department requests for funds for new dams. His friends within the department are not too happy over his getting dragged into the controversy over whether the Federal Power Commission should issue a permit to the city of Tacoma for new dams on the Cowlitz River in the State of Washington.

The Fish and Wildlife Service within the Department opposes these dams as killers of fish while city of Tacoma boosters for the dams are not satisfied over Secretary Chapman's holding back on a strong appeal for the dams to be built.

Behind the scenes when the Cowlitz controversy was hot and heavy last year suggestion was made by some of Secretary Chapman's advisers that the Government should have approved the Cowlitz dams and then pass the controversy to the Washington State Legislature. The legislature, it was admitted would probably block the dams to protect the fishing industry, but at least the controversy would be away from Secretary Chapman and his Department.

C. Girard Davidson, the former Assistant Secretary of Interior, is a factor in the power controversy. This time it is not over Mr. Davidson's pet CVA project, but the overall power situation which involves the aluminum picture we have tried to describe.

As a consultant for the Interior Department Mr. Davidson has been working on a report to show the power potentialities of the Pacific Northwest—as they are today and as they will be next year, the year after and so on for the next decade.

His report is expected to offset the surveys which are the reported basis for the Defense Electric Power Administration attitude that the aluminum program in the Pacific Northwest should be halted. Incidentally, it will include a recommendation that three steam plants be built in scattered areas to help firm up the power pool.

Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement given this morning by Mr. S. Abbot Smith before a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee. This subcommittee, of which I am chairman, was set up by Chairman SPARKMAN to develop a report on the manpower problems of smaller independent business. I knew Mr. Smith during the war as a fellow member of the Committee on Small Business of the Committee for Economic Development and after the war as a fellow trustee of the Committee for Economic Development. He is past president of the Smaller Business Association of New England. Mr. Smith is an outstanding representative of independent business and I am sure my colleagues in Congress will agree that his statement of this morning shows he is not only well informed on problems arising from the current crisis but that he presents intelligent and constructive suggestions. I commend in particular the point illustrated by the two small companies in Connecticut which are troubled not so much by present ills as by the uncertainty which clouds their future. Businessmen operate largely on their guesses about the future. Obviously smaller independent businessmen cannot do an enterprising job when they live in daily fear they will be put out of business, their working capital will be lost, and their years of effort in building a business to a profitable point will be sacrificed.

Mr. Smith's leadership deserves the thanks, not only of the New England business community, but of businessmen everywhere.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF S. ABBOT SMITH BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, UNITED STATES SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON MANPOWER

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is S. Abbot Smith. I am president of Thomas Strahan Co., a small concern manufacturing fine wallpaper in Chelsea, Mass., a past president and still a director of the Smaller Business Association of New England.

I wish to thank you, gentlemen, for the privilege of appearing before you today and at the same time tell you how glad we small-business men are that you are holding this hearing now in time to ascertain the facts and then we hope to devise manpower policies which will avoid the mistakes and unnecessary disruptions of the last war. As we all know too well, many skilled men were ruthlessly plucked from their businesses and put into uniform with dire results to their businesses and the economy, but with little advantage to the Army beyond adding another man because their special skills were so seldom fully utilized.

Our armed services must have risen, but we also must maintain a strong and expanding economy for that is basically our most potent weapon against Russia. This period of tension may, probably will, go on for years. We cannot afford to stop expanding and growing now.

The strength of our economy lies in its being a system in which everyone can go into business or out at will. It is a system which automatically screens out the inefficient. The survivors go on and grow, some become big. It is a system which furnishes leaders for the country in all fields.

If all-out war comes, then we must have total mobilization of all resources, including manpower. But that time has not yet come.

Today it is more important to keep small companies going than just to get another man to swell the numbers in uniform and perhaps only to pound a typewriter at some base which in most cases could probably be done more efficiently by a WAC or a WAVE anyway. Yet in many cases the taking of just those one or two men if they are key men or specialists will wreck or seriously injure a small company.

That is what we must avoid until the emergency becomes really acute and there is no alternative.

Although this situation may and does occur in some of the larger "small companies," I am thinking now more particularly of the really smaller companies, those we'll say employing 100 or less which make up more than 90 percent of the businesses of the Nation.

Take the many cases where veterans of the last war have gone into business for themselves. They are the key men in these little businesses. Isn't it better for the country in the long run to let those men grow and expand, to prove their mettle, perhaps be amongst our top leaders 20 years hence rather than to pull them back into the Army and wreck the business they started with their savings, kept going with their sweat?

It takes years to train many of war specialists and skilled workers. They can't be replaced in 3 months or 6 months except by enticing a similar worker from some other employer. Where is the gain there? This brings up the whole question of labor piracting, a sore subject with many small companies, but with too many ramifications to take up now.

At this point let us consider for a moment how these key men are pulled out of these small companies. First there is the draft. So far the draft calls have not been heavy and draft boards have been lenient in granting deferments. From all indications, however, it appears it will be a different story by next fall as present deferments expire and the services need more men.

Secondly, there are the Reserves and the National Guard. Here we have to make a distinction it seems to me between the Volunteer Reserves and the officers of the Inactive Naval Reserve. Many officers signed up for the Volunteer and Organized Reserves seeing an opportunity to make some easy money. Thus you can say there is no reason why they should not be called when wanted no matter what they may be doing. They went into it with their eyes open and the employer who hired them did likewise. Nevertheless, I still say that we are being

"penny-wise and pound-foolish" if the calling of such men now means a small business must fold up.

In the case of naval officers there is a difference because they were not allowed to resign, but had to stay in the Reserves. There is therefore still more reason for not calling them at this time if they wish to continue in the small business where they are presently employed.

Many people will say we are creating a tempest in a teapot, that we are crying before we are hurt. In one sense that is true. Up to this moment not many key men have been called but I can tell you positively there are thousands of small concerns in New England who are scared to death as to what is going to happen to them a little later when present deferments expire, when draft boards needing more men become less lenient, when more and more of the Reserves are called back.

I know one small company started since the war which is just getting into its stride after tough sledding and now doing valuable military work. The business is entirely dependent on two young men both naval officers in the last war and still in the Reserves because they can't get out. Presumably the importance of the work they are doing will keep them where they are. But who knows? We saw queer things happen in the last war when highly skilled men were put in fields completely unrelated to their training.

I checked with a small company in Connecticut last week and tried to get one of the partners to come down here today, but they are tremendously busy and couldn't take the time off. One of their key executives is in the Naval Reserve, he was deferred but the case comes up again in May. Their foreman is in the Air Forces Reserve. They are terribly worried for fear they will lose these two men.

I know of another case in Massachusetts where the master mechanic, the "set-up" man in a small company, was in the Naval Reserve and was called last December. He got a deferment, but the appeal board has turned down a request for indefinite deferment and they don't know what they'll do.

There is another small company in New Haven, Conn., where the executives are cutting their hair because they and the superintendent are all in the Naval Reserve. They have had no calls yet but don't know when the lightning may strike.

That is another bad feature of this manpower situation—the uncertainty of it all, the lack of a clear policy which everyone can know and plan on. Any number of young men have come to our plant looking for a job. In spite of the need for men, no one will hire them for they are either of draft age or in the Reserves. Consequently, no one wants to hire them, spend time and money breaking them in, and then lose them just when they are becoming worth something in the job.

Over the radio the other morning I heard the announcement that Pratt & Whitney in Hartford is going to want 11,000 more workers this spring. That high lights another reason for letting the small companies keep their men—to avoid so far as possible the awful congestion we saw during the last war in the defense centers.

Surely it is ever so much better from every point of view to subcontract the work to the greatest extent possible to the small concerns in smaller towns where the workmen can live at home, where housing is already adequate and more housing does not have to be built, consuming additional critical labor and materials, where schools and public utilities are already available, rather than to close those small plants and force the men to move to already congested areas or at best spend unnecessary hours commuting long distances.

Some of you may have seen in the February issue of the American Machinist a report on the speech made January 31 in New York by Herbert F. Jahn, president of the National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, in which he said that the Nation's 3,000 contract shops are losing men to the armed services, and thus imperiling the rearmament effort through Selective Service Board failure to recognize that the supply of such craftsmen is short, about the same as 1941, and that it takes a long time to train them. This crisis has arisen in part, he said, because local draft board officials have sole power to decide if skilled workers shall be inducted. There is no single national office to which plants can appeal for release from further depletion of their vital manpower.

When discussing this subject of manpower we usually think of manufacturing, but to my mind key men of small wholesalers, retailers, or service industries are just as important. They serve a local need or they wouldn't exist. Even though the business in question is not listed amongst the essential industries I still think that until the emergency is more acute it is better for our economy in the long run to leave key men running those businesses, keeping our free-enterprise system alive and dynamic. Many will have to close anyway but insofar as possible we should avoid the wholesale closings which took place during the last war when hundreds of thousands of small businesses closed their doors, when the big became bigger and the small fewer.

Please do not misunderstand me, the national defense comes first, before every other consideration. Individuals and groups of individuals must be willing to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary for the good of our country as a whole. I firmly believe they are and will be willing to make those sacrifices if they are told clearly and concisely what must be done and why.

The armed services must have the number of men our experts decide is necessary. The only question is how can that number be obtained with the least damage to our overall economy. This means considering the individuals themselves and the occupations from which they are taken.

My personal feeling is that the draft should be lowered to 18. Those boys make good soldiers and after all they will be 19 before they get their full training. Having no established place in industry their drafting does less harm to their own future and to industry than does taking older men who have definitely started their careers, who in many cases have family obligations and who have already made a place for themselves in their businesses.

One of the major differences between large and small business is that large business has many men in each department and overlapping in their functions, while in small business there is usually only one man performing each function, if indeed the one man does not perform several functions. Take one or several men from the large business, there are others ready to cover up, but if one of these key men is taken from small business it leaves a hole which cannot be filled and frequently means the disintegration of the business.

To sum up, we need a clear national policy on manpower needs and the plans for filling those needs so that the individuals concerned both of draft age and in the Reserves and business know what to expect and can make definite plans accordingly.

There must be provisions specifying that skilled workers needed for defense work will not be taken for the armed services unless it is certain their skills will be of greater use to the country in the armed services than where now located and assuring that once inducted those skills are utilized to the full rather than not used at all as we saw happen all too often in the last war.

There should be a definite policy implemented by draft boards and the armed services that short of all-out war key men are not to be taken from small businesses whether listed as essential to defense or not. At this point they are essential to our overall economy and future growth.

Income-Tax Exemptions for Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the February 24 issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal. This publication, which has for so long dedicated itself to the interests of the Armed Forces of the Nation, makes some very cogent observations on S. 891, a bill which I and four other Senators introduced 2 weeks ago to grant special income-tax exemptions for all members of the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL-SERVICE INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN (Democrat-Labor, New York), acting for himself and a group of both Republican and Democratic Senators, is sponsoring legislation to apply a special income-tax exemption for all service personnel to replace the present military deductions confined to those serving in the Korean combat zone. Senator LEHMAN would allow a special personal deduction of $600 a year to all commissioned and enlisted personnel with an additional $100 exemption for each dependent in addition to the spouse. This basic figure is only one-half of that allowed to service personnel during World War II and should be increased to at least that figure. However, the principle of special military exemptions is well founded and amply justified. Already the tax laws provide extra personal deductions for persons over 65 years of age and for blind persons, thus recognizing the need for special exemptions to cover special conditions. Certainly the unsettled life of service personnel justifies special income-tax relief. Families are uprooted and moved from time to time. Additional expenses are incurred in educating children. Uniforms and equipment cost more than civilian clothing. Ownership and operation of a private car is almost a necessity on most posts where distances from quarters to duty are great and where many live far from the post itself. The Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee should study this situation carefully. We feel that the facts not only will justify the principle advocated in Senator LEHMAN's bill but will show the need for a more substantial basic military deduction. Special compensation for the men actually in the fighting zones can be handled better through the establishment of a system of combat pay such as that recommended by the Department and now awaiting consideration by the congressional committees. Both the over-all military income-tax deduction and the hazard pay for service in combat zones should be permanent legislation.

Communism in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by William Fulton entitled "Capitalist Money Helps Reds Carry Out Socialist Schemes," published in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, March 4, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITALIST MONEY HELPS REDS CARRY OUT SOCIALIST SCHEMES—HEIRS OF EARLY MILLIONAIRES PLAY ROLES AS ANGELS FOR MANY LEFT-WING GROUPS

(By William Fulton)

NEW YORK, March 3.—One of the strangest developments of the drive to saddle communism on the United States is the recruitment of millionaires whose fathers or grandfathers made their fortunes in a free, democratic, capitalist society.

Most of these hybrid offspring operate here in New York where the atmosphere of "foreignism" and "internationalism" suits them. Ever since the Bolshevik revolution, the Reds have cultivated idle men and women with money in this town.

FLATTERED BY PINKOS

Red organizers prey on the frustration these cafe society characters feel because they haven't achieved the fame of their ancestors. They have been made to feel important by flattering offices in Red-front organizations, by being hailed as "liberals," espousing causes of "social significance," or "freedom," or "democracy," by affixing names to petitions on behalf of Stalinoid characters and numerous other tricks through which the Communist underworld carries on its propaganda.

Pioneer patriarch of the Pinko flock is Corliss Lamont, son the late Thomas W. Lamont, multimillionaire partner in the John Pierpont Morgan banking firm. Corliss, former chairman of Friends of the Soviet Union, boasts 46 separate citations for affiliation with Red-front set-ups in Appendix 9 of the reports of the special House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The younger Lamont, after preparing at exclusive Exeter Academy and being indoctrinated at Harvard University, has been described as "the upper class near-intellectual driven perversely to assert himself by an extremist past."

REPEATED KREMLIN

Lamont conducted affairs of Friends of the Soviet Union along the same policy line laid down by Moscow as avowed Communist leaders in this country. For example, when Prof. John Dewey and other significant figures in American education condemned the 1937 Moscow purge trials and "confessions," Lamont rose to defend the Kremlin.

Shortly before the outbreak of World War II, Lamont sponsored a letter supporting the Soviet Union on every count. This epistle, for which Lamont garnered 400 signatures, denied the "fantastic falsehood" that Russia could have anything in common with Germany and called those who spread such a report "Fascists and their allies" out "to prevent a united aggression front."

Then came the Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact which opened the door for the invasion of Poland, Lamont allowed his Friends of the Soviet Union to disband without public announcement but he continued personally to hew strictly to the Moscow line.

REPRESENTS RED INTERESTS

Paralleling the Lamont career is that of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, millionaire representative of Red China interests in this country. He refused to answer questions of congressional committees investigating Communist activities and has been charged with contempt.

Field is the great-grandson of Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt, wealthiest financier and railroad magnate of his time. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. William Osgood Field, who are now dead, and grandson of Mr. and Mrs. William Douglas Sloane.

The great-grandson of the doughty commodore attended fashionable Hotchkiss Preparatory School and then went to Harvard. He also studied at the London School of Economics where he soaked up socialism at the feet of the late Prof. Harold Laski.

Field took out his Red card in the Socialist Party in 1928. Before the Second World War he bobbed into prominence as executive secretary of the American Peace Mobilization. This Red-facade organization was consistently antiwar during the life of the Soviet-Nazi pact but switched over after Hitler attacked Russia.

Louis Budenz, ex-Communist editor, told the Senate that Field was a member of the American Communist politburo from 1936 on and was assigned to infiltrate the Institute of Pacific Relations. Field became chairman of the board and Owen Lattimore, also accused by Budenz as a Communist agent, was editor of the Institute's magazine, Pacific Affairs.

Last fall Field registered as a foreign agent representing Red China financial interests.

MARSHALL FIELD FORTUNE USED

Another old fortune which has been poured into the left-wing propaganda stream in this country is that founded by Marshall Field, the Chicago department store king. His grandson, Marshall Field 3d, suddenly faced to the left in the 1930's and became a votary of the Roosevelt administration.

Educated at Eton and Cambridge in England, Field had gained prominence as an international playboy, racing stableman, grower of fancy flowers, and host at fashionable grouse shoots. For an unrevealed reason Field went to Dr. Gregory P. Zilboorg, a New York psychiatrist of Russian birth, for examination. From that time on Field sharply switched his course.

He started the alleged newspaper PM in New York, a happy feeding trough for left-wingers and Communists of all sorts. After sinking several millions in this venture he started the Sun in Chicago, it is said, at the behest of the late President Roosevelt. This paper also flopped and was merged with the Times.

Another piece of the old J. P. Morgan banking fortune is also finding its way into the New Republic, which is edited by the radical Michael Straight. The real angel is his mother, Mrs. Leonard Elmhirst of London, widow of the late Morgan partner, Willard Straight. Mrs. Elmhirst has bankrolled the pinkish New Republic to the tune of several million dollars.

Millions are also being funneled into Communist and left-wing drives via the big foundations. One of the most notorious is the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust and Foundation. Robert Marshall, son of Louis, a law partner of Justice Brandeis, left $1,594,000 in 1939 for the cause of trade-unionism, civil liberties and preservation of wildlife.

REVERSED DIRECTION

Recently the Marshall money went into the defense of William W. Remington, Commerce Department economic analyst convicted of perjury in connection with spying activities. Other Marshall money has been contributed toward the Rev. L. M. Birkhead's Friends of Democracy, well-known smear outfit of patriotic Americans and organizations.

Trustees of the Marshall Civil Liberties Trust include Roger Baldwin, who has been identified with organizations deemed subversive by the Government; Edwin S. Smith, former member of the National Labor Relations Board and later executive director of the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship; John F. Finerty, lawyer for numerous pinko causes; Gardner Jackson, Roosevelt intimate and now chairman of the Council for Pan-American Democratic Union which is on the Department of Justice list as subversive, and James Marshall, brother of the late Robert and member of the New York City Board of Education.

Ed Allen's Fireside Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ed Allen's Fireside Thoughts."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ED ALLEN'S FIRESIDE THOUGHTS

Within the past few weeks I have had occasion to travel from coast to coast, visiting with many people along the way. Everywhere I went, the people I talked to seemed to have one thing in common: fear. Of course, I do not say that my experiences reveals a true cross-section of the American frame of mind, but never in the current days following Pearl Harbor was I so conscious of such a lack of confidence in our destiny as I find now.

These fears were expressed in many ways: fear for the lives and future of our sons and daughters; fear for the construction of our economy; fear for a greater loss of our freedoms. In fact, fear for the loss of the American way of life, with all that it implies. It seems strange to me that I have found little concern of the atomic bomb or, in fact, of Communist aggression.

Since I have but little space, I have tried to boil my impressions down to my own and have come to the conclusion that these misgivings and fears have their origin in the failure of our Government in its dealings with other nations. There is widespread fear of what our Government will confront the American people to next.

It appears to me that people are afraid of Government, afraid of the social trends.

who have, in one way of another, come into the position of domination over the lives and the acts of the great majority of the people of the earth. Today, it would appear that any one of several world leaders can wake up on the wrong side of the bed and, with a single gesture, set millions of people at each others throats. Recall that but a few short days before the "police action" in Korea, the American people were assured that Korea was considered indefensible and not within our defense perimeter. What happened? Did someone get up on the wrong side of the bed? So far as I know, neither the American people nor Congress have been given any explanation for the change in attitude. Is it possible that we have so degenerated into statism that we are not entitled to know?

In one way or another, it's certain that we have been pushed, led, frightened and driven into a national emergency of unprecedented gravity, calling for the drafting of our 18-year-old children, controls of wages, production, and taxes until they hurt. Yet, strangely, there is no mention of vote-buying handouts here at home or the elimination of tax-free spending money of Government officials or, as a matter of fact, any real assurance that the new powers and money cannot be used so as to promote greater tragedies in the future.

As I see it, our greatest and brightest hope is that the new Congress will rise to unprecedented heights of statesmanship, that it will possess the foresight, the wisdom, the judgment, the unselfishness, and the courage to lead this Nation back to the principles upon which it was founded, to a position where its citizens may look forward to each tomorrow as we have in the past with dignity and confidence. It can be accomplished if the new Congress will lead the way.

In Fairness to Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of March 5, 1951, by Joseph Young.

Mr. Young, a staff member of the Washington Evening Star, is a recognized specialist on news concerning Government employees, and his column, the Federal Spotlight, is widely read.

It is pointed out by the columnist that the Civil Service Commission is planning a crackdown on inefficient and wasteful personnel practices. This action, Mr. Speaker, is one that is long overdue, not only because big government has become one of the most expensive items in the tax bills which bears so heavily upon everyone of us, but particularly because the faithful and diligent Government employee frequently has been placed at a disadvantage, and has had no alternative but to acquiesce silently in the continuance of job practices which would not be tolerated in private employment.

The article is as follows:

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT

(By Joseph Young)

RAMSPECK PLANS TO CRACK DOWN ON WASTEFUL PERSONNEL POLICY

A crackdown on inefficient and wasteful personnel practices wherever they are found in Government is planned by the Civil Service Commission under the leadership of Robert Ramspeck.

Mr. Ramspeck, who is expected to be confirmed soon as Commission Chairman, feels very strongly about the necessity of the Commission taking the leadership in seeing to it that the Government utilizes its own manpower to its fullest ability.

Mr. Ramspeck tells friends that's one of the main reasons he resigned his $25,000 Air Transport Association job to take the $16,000-a-year Commission chairmanship. He feels that the full utilization of manpower is one of the Government's gravest problems and one particularly urgent right now in the national emergency.

For many years, the Commission has hesitated to tell agencies how to run their personnel operations, feeling that it did not have the necessary legislative or executive authority to do so.

However, Mr. Ramspeck and Budget Bureau officials feel that the Commission does have the authority and should take the lead in this field.

Consequently, Commission investigators will probe the personnel operations of the various agencies to see if wasteful and inefficient practices exist. Any such practices will be brought to the agencies' attention, with an order to get their house in order. If this is not done, the Commission will report the condition to the Budget Bureau for appropriate action, and also to the proper committees in Congress.

This marks a radical departure from past Government personnel policy and conceivably could lead to large economies and much greater efficiency in personnel operations.

Veterans Subjected to Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Veterans Subjected to Fraud," published in the Washington Post, and reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., in the New York Times of January 31, 1951.

By pointing up an issue which is of such public importance as whether veterans are receiving adequate medical care in the veterans' hospitals, the International Latex Corp. is rendering a distinguished public service. In order to understand a controversy of this kind, it is important that the public be informed of the facts and of the different viewpoints about the controversy.

The editorial follows:

VETERANS SUBJECTED TO FRAUD

The only consoling thing about the departure of Dr. Paul B. Magnuson from his post as medical director of the Veterans' Administration is that the reasons have been frankly stated. Dr. Magnuson refused to enter into the usual interchange of sweet nothings; instead, he asserts that he was fired—and fired as the result of a long-continued squabble with Veterans' Administrator Gray over whether doctors or politically inspired meddlers were to run medical services for veterans. This candor from Dr. Magnuson at least gives the country a chance to see what is happening.

From our standpoint it is unmitigated tragedy, notwithstanding the amiability and good intentions of Dr. Magnuson's successor, Vice Adm. Joel T. Boone. More than any other man, Dr. Magnuson is responsible for building Veterans' Administration medical care from a fourth-rate, bureaucracy-ridden service to the best service available anywhere. He has done this by earning the respect, cooperation and active participation of the medical profession. He has insisted on locating hospitals near medical schools, thus enabling veterans to enjoy the services of the best civilian doctors. He has resisted every effort by Members of Congress and others to determine hospital sites by considerations of patronage.

A brilliant Chicago orthopedic surgeon and teacher, Dr. Magnuson has been singularly dedicated to the public service. A measure of this dedication is that he stuck to his job and refused point blank to resign despite a round of heckling, interference, and indignity that would have discouraged most men. When Gen. Omar N. Bradley and Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley in 1945 undertook the herculean task of modernizing the VA to serve 15,000,000 new veterans, Dr. Magnuson was especially chosen to enlist the interest of the medical profession. He had the full support of these two anchors of independence and succeeded to General Hawley's job as medical director when the latter left in 1948.

Even before General Bradley returned to the Army, however, he and his associates knew that they were fighting a losing battle. They had put too much faith in the loyalty of the top people they had inherited in the VA—people who quietly bided their time in order to sabotage reforms. It was this group that never accepted the apparently novel concept that medical men should be allowed to run hospitals.

The support which Dr. Magnuson enjoyed from Generals Bradley and Hawley has been conspicuously lacking from the present Administrator, Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr. Perhaps the most charitable thing that can be said about General Gray's performance is that he has tried to run the Veterans' Administration as he used to run the Chicago & North Western Railway. He has allowed himself to become the prisoner of the VA old guard, he has deferred ostentatiously to congressional whims, and he has declined to go to bat for the doctors against unwarranted cutbacks in the quality and extent of medical care.

Basically the trouble is that General Gray and the men around him never have understood the requirement for independence of medical direction. Dr. Magnuson has been further and further insulated from the top by an army of assistant directors, and General Gray has refused to make hospitals responsible to the medical director. The crowning blow was the appointment of a three-man board for the selection of hospital managers about which Dr. Magnuson was not even consulted. Concurrently, of course, political influence in the location of hospitals has been seeping in again.

This record makes the Gray explanation childish—that he acted on a previous resignation submitted by Dr. Magnuson. The fact is that Dr. Magnuson consistently refused to compromise the welfare of his patients and never ceased to fight the infiltration of red tape. For these reasons he

was ousted. The Administration and Members of Congress who have been justly proud of the VA medical record need to take a good look at the deterioration that has set in; perhaps a reawakening of interest will spare Admiral Boone the humiliation that Dr. Magnuson has undergone. Dr. Magnuson's indefatigable drive and salient personality will be a loss not only to official Washington but to the entire country. Most especially it will be a loss to the veterans. They have been outrageously defrauded. (Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.)

Address of Hon. Miles F. McDonald, District Attorney, Kings County, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by the Honorable Miles F. McDonald, district attorney of Kings County, N. Y., made before the Notre Dame Law Association luncheon on January 26, 1951:

I am grateful to you for this opportunity of talking to you on a subject which I believe is of vital importance, not only to the individual safety of the citizens of our country but also to the very existence of our country as a nation.

Bills have already been introduced in the House of Representatives under H. R. 406 by Congressman WALTER and H. R. 479 by Congressman KEATING and H. R. 1947 by Congressman CELLER to accomplish the purpose which I suggest and I earnestly hope that you will give the matter your careful consideration and, if you believe these bills to be in the interest of your country, that you express your views to your Representatives in Congress.

Fifty percent of my professional life has been devoted to public prosecution: I have been an assistant district attorney in the second most populous county in the country; I have been United States attorney in charge of one of the busiest Federal districts in the country; and, for 5 years, I have been the district attorney of Kings County, which is more usually described as Brooklyn.

In these years I have watched the ever-increasing power of the criminal combination, the gangster and the racketeer.

I have seen the power of the subversive forces work against our country—and I have come face to face with the insidious propaganda machine that has been built up to foster legislation that will make it easier for these vicious forces to avoid just punishment for their crimes.

I have heard the cry of civil rights from lips of those who would destroy the very Constitution that guarantees these rights.

This great shield of personal liberty has become in large measure the velvet glove that masks the iron fist of the dictator.

While this insidious attack is made upon our people and our way of life, the honest men, the loyal Americans have stood silently by unable to fight because they knew not where to begin.

Today I want to show you a starting point. I want to encourage you to forge a weapon with which the law enforcement of the United States can arm themselves in your defense—a weapon that we are denying to ourselves at the cost of our own lives and liberties.

All of you have read in the public press of the arrest and trial and conviction of Judith Coplin.

Those who followed the trial carefully are aware of the various rulings made by the trial judge concerning evidence obtained by the interception of telephonic communications.

All of you must have been shocked that the appellate court found it necessary to reverse the conviction partially because the Government did not prove that its investigation had not secured leads by the interception of telephone conversations.

Despite the fact that the court held the defendant was clearly guilty of the crime charged, Judge Hand, in writing the opinion of the court, said:

"For all the foregoing reasons, the conviction must be reversed; but we will not dismiss the indictment, for the guilt is plain, and it is possible on another trial that there may be more evidence of the likelihood of an escape; that the prosecution may decide to divulge the contents of the 'taps'; and that the examination as to the confidential informant may go far enough to show that he was not a wire-tapper."

Some of you may be familiar with the work I have been doing in fighting organized gambling and police corruption in the city of New York.

If you are, you will know that our investigation was largely successful because the law of New York permitted us to tap wires and that, during our supervision of the wires, the various subterfuges used by the gamblers and police to hide their corrupt agreements came to light.

When you compare the relative importance of my field of work with the importance of the preservation of our country against its enemies from within, you will see why I am of the firm opinion that we Americans must wake up and protect ourselves if we are to survive.

Let me make my position on this subject quite clear.

I am not here to defend nor do I condone unlawful wire tapping by anyone and that includes public officials, both State and Federal.

I do not propose nor do I urge that any Government agency—State or Federal—or any law-enforcement office—police or District Attorney—should have unlimited power to intercept the telephonic communications of others.

I contend with the utmost sincerity—and I hope with equal logic and vigor—that the right to intercept telephone communications in certain cases is a vital necessity to law enforcement and that, without such a right, the forces of law and order would be at such a disadvantage in the war against crime, subversion, sabotage and treason, that the peace and security, the property and the lives of the individual citizens and the existence of our country as a free Nation, could not be insured.

My position on this question perhaps can be best stated in the words of former Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, now a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, when he stated in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940:

"Wire tapping presents a problem of proper balance and nice adjustment as between rights of individuals on one hand and the needs and interest of society on the other."

I should like therefore to point out what I believe are the considerations to be taken into account in arriving at these balances and adjustments.

Let us go back through the years and try to determine the evils that the drafters of our constitution sought to combat by their prohibition against unlawful search and seizure.

In those days, when the Red Coats rapped their sabers on the doors of the sleeping villagers of Concord and Lexington, they sought to punish wrongs allegedly committed against the Crown itself, not crimes against the life or property of the citizens of the Commonwealth. Further, the crimes they alleged dealt with the proprietary interest of the Crown itself.

In this I believe will be found the historical basis for existence of the Federal rule.

The majority of Federal crimes are crimes against the proprietary interests of the Government itself, such as cases involving taxes and allied matters.

There are but few crimes under Federal law which directly affect the welfare of the individual citizen, or life of the Nation.

In the former class of cases—cases involving the proprietary interest of the Government, I will agree that wire tapping might well be prohibited or at least so carefully circumscribed as to make its use impractical except in the most serious cases, cases involving large criminal combinations and the purveyors of illicit drugs who, by their activities, imperil the health and life of their victims.

On the other hand, in cases where the safety of the citizens of the Nation is the prime concern, where the very life and existence of the Nation is at stake, the right to intercept telephone communications must exist.

To act otherwise is sheerest folly. I firmly believe that treason, sabotage, espionage, and seditious conspiracy are such crimes.

Remember, 99-9/10 percent of the people of the United States never engage in unlawful acts of this nature and need have no fear of any law that permits wire tapping for the purpose of securing evidence of crimes of that nature.

By the same token, the small percentage of people who seek to destroy our country are attempting to create a statutory protection for their nefarious acts as a means of destroying the Government behind whose laws they seek to hide.

The laws prohibiting unlawful search and seizure are based primarily upon the laws of fair play.

But we are not engaged in a game, the Communists and Russians and their satellites are not going to fight according to any rule.

They will take any dishonest advantage available to them.

To combat them without the privilege of wire tapping is like putting Joe Louis in the ring to fight Gargantua and insisting that Joe follow the Marquis of Queensbury rules.

Would you propose a statute that would provide that any person attacked by a rabid dog must not defend himself with any weapon stronger than a fly swatter?

Of course not, but that is what you seek to do when you tie the hands of the Department of Justice and the Army and Navy in cases of treason, sabotage, and espionage.

Of course, we want to defend the rights of the citizen against his Government but, to do that, we must defend the existence of this Government as a democracy or we will have no rights left to defend.

I am not aware of the provisions in the law in many of our States with regard to this matter but I can say that if you do not permit your law enforcement agencies to avail themselves of wire-tap evidence, you will never successfully overcome organized crime.

In cases arising within the sovereign States an even more liberal rule should be established for the vast majority of the crimes under State law are crimes against the individual citizens.

The prosecution is avenging not the State but the outrage perpetrated on the life and property of the law-abiding citizen of the community.

The rights of these law-abiding citizens cannot be left unprotected and the greatest deterrent to crime is the certainty of apprehension and punishment.

If you, by a foolish devotion to an abstract idea, so limit the agencies of law enforcement that the chances for apprehension and conviction become small, the criminal will continue to expand the circle of his depredations.

I agree with the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes that wire tapping is a dirty business but, if you were to ride with me through the streets of any large city in the early hours of the morning and view the bloody corpse of the victim of a gang murder or view the tortured body of a youthful narcotics user whose future has been destroyed to gratify the gangsters' greed for easy money; if you had seen, as I have seen, the poor and unfortunate victims of organized groups of confidence men who have lost their life savings; if you had been forced to cope with the revolting spectacle of a segment of the police department who had been corrupted by an unscrupulous gambler, you would agree that crime is an even dirtier business.

I have asked before and I ask again, What is so sacrosanct about a telephone that men can use it to plan murder or to steal the secrets of the atomic bomb, and the evidence cannot be used against them?

Is the right of privacy greater than a man's right to life?

Of course not.

Then, if you will prohibit wire tapping, why don't you disarm the police?

The reason is apparent; you trust in the policeman not to use that gun in an improper manner. The patrolman's revolver and club are your weapons, employed in your interest.

So is the wire tap.

This is the age of scientific progress. The criminal takes advantage of every known scientific aid to foster his nefarious acts.

Will you deny the benefits of technological progress to the agencies of law enforcement?

Mr. Justice Jackson, then Attorney General of the United States, writing to Representative Hatton Summers on March 19, 1941, said: "Criminals today have the free run of our communication systems but the law-enforcement officers are denied even a carefully restricted power to confront the criminal with his telephonic and telegraphic footprints."

For one, I cannot see the logic of the opponent of a measure to permit wire tapping under proper auspices and under reasonable restrictions.

To follow any such line of thought reduces us to the absurdity of taking the motorcycle away from the traffic cop and giving him back his bicycle.

Today a criminal can commit a crime in Massachusetts now and be in California in the morning. Should we be limited in our chase to a covered wagon or may we use a DC-6?

You may rightfully ask by what then will we protect ourselves against the inordinate and reckless use of this means of detection.

The answer is simple—by the same means you protect yourself from every other possibility of misgovernment—by the integrity of the officials in whom you place the right to exercise these powers.

If the government official violates this confidence, our democracy provides adequate means for you to turn the rascal out.

The minute a man becomes a prosecutor, policeman, or other public official, he does not lose all sense of decency and justice no more than a man becomes a criminal the minute he accepts a retainer as defense counsel in a criminal case.

There are a few erroneous ideas with respect to wire tapping I should like to correct.

First is the belief that law enforcement officials use wire tapping to a great extent.

I do not believe that this is correct.

In my first 4 years as district attorney, I have prosecuted more than 8,000 felony cases, approximately 30,000 misdemeanor cases, and have conducted many more investigations and yet, during that time, I have applied for orders to intercept telephone communications as follows:

1946	12
1947	6
1948	11
1949	1

a total of 30 applications, 14 of which dealt with homicides.

In addition, the cases in which we have used evidence resulting from orders obtained directly by the police does not exceed 25. The figures of 1950 were not yet available as I prepared this address.

The foes of wire tapping are attempting to guard the average citizen against an outrage to which he never will be subjected.

We might just as well adopt a statute making it unlawful for sea serpents to swim further north than the George Washington Bridge.

The whole subject cannot be better stated than in the words of Mr. Justice Jackson, to which I originally referred and which I should now like to quote in full:

"Wire tapping presents a problem of proper balance and nice adjustment as between rights of individuals on the one hand and the needs and interests of society on the other. Unrestrained and uncontrolled wire tapping, even on the part of law-enforcement officers, would constitute serious abuses.

"On the other hand, to prohibit law-enforcement officers from intercepting messages no matter what the circumstances may be, is to guarantee the safe use of the channels of wire and wireless communications to spies and criminals.

"One would not think of providing that a police officer shall not stop a suspect who is driving an automobile on the highway and yet today the criminal and the spy may use the highways of communication without restraint or even surveillance."

There is a fundamental principle that every right has its corresponding obligation and those who willfully refuse to accept the obligation cannot seek to protect themselves with the right.

The criminal, the spy, and the saboteur accept none of the obligations imposed by the laws of this country.

Surely you will not create for them a new and inviolable privacy to assist them in their attack on our way of life.

The recent statement of Mr. Justice Jackson to the effect that "There is a danger that, if the court does not temper its doctrinaire logic with a little practical wisdom, it will convert the Bill of Rights into a suicide pact" may well be applied with equal appropriateness to those who, in their sincere zeal to insure the blessings of the Bill of Rights to our citizens, impose restrictions on the agents of law enforcement which never were within the purview of that blessed document.

The so-called right of privacy, which is not guaranteed by either the State or Federal Constitution, should not be made to serve as a cloak of invisibility to Coplons, Hiss, Gold, and others of their ilk.

Let us no longer fool ourselves—we are at war with communism in Korea and in Russia and here in the United States.

The saboteurs are waiting to strike. The spies of the Kremlin are at every hand.

The telephone is more secret than the diplomatic dispatch case.

They avail themselves of it with impunity and with immunity.

Why must we forget the homely but sound advice that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

By intercepting and supervising the telephone conversations of Communist spies now, you may well prevent the sounding of the siren that will warn you that a jet bomber bearing a load of atomic bombs has pierced our radar screen—and that all that remains to be done is to cower in a cellar and pray.

Let us no longer behave like the monkeys that see, hear, and do no evil—but act like the minutemen who, in the days of our country's birth, used any weapon that came to hand, be it pitchfork or ax in their fight for freedom.

Is USAF Troop Support Adequate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following article by Ben S. Lee in Aviation Week of February 12, 1951, on the subject of the Army taking over tactical aviation from the Air Force:

IS USAF TROOP SUPPORT ADEQUATE?—CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION MAY POINT THE WAY TOWARD ARMY TAKING OVER CONTROL OF TACTICAL AVIATION

(By Ben S. Lee)

Steps to bring about a congressional investigation of the inadequacies of tactical air support provided by the USAF to the Army are being taken in Washington, Aviation Week has learned.

Figuring importantly in the over-all proposed inquiry is the specific question: Why has the Air Force failed to procure the Chase XC-123 assault transport, winner of a recent assault transport competition?

Natural channel for the investigation would be through the House Armed Services Committee. While some members of the committee favor such an inquiry, the final decision to project it will probably remain with its powerful chairman, Representative CARL VINSON.

FINE JOB, BUT—

While it is generally conceded that USAF has done a fine job in Korea despite obvious deficiencies in tactical air equipment available there, the deficiencies have pointed up the weakness in this phase of United States air power, a Congressman said last week.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur apparently shares this view, for acording to reports of his talks with President Truman in the Pacific last fall, he expressed dissatisfaction with tactical air support. The President promised that it would be bolstered immediately. "I have not noted that the situation has altered materially as yet," the Congressman said.

Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, following a recent visit to the Far East, also issued a staff report expressing no little concern over the quality of aircraft assigned to Korean effort, tactically, and to the over-all inefficiency of tactical air support techniques, a Defense Department source declared.

ARMY PURCHASING LIMIT

Several months ago, Army asked for removal of an Army-USAF agreement restricting Army to the purchase of fixed-wing aircraft weighing less than 2,500 pounds and helicopters weighing less than 4,000 pounds. The problem is still under consideration. Weight limitations virtually freeze Army to procurement of aircraft intended only for liaison.

"This situation," a high-ranking Army officer stated to Aviation Week, "would suffice, if Air Force cooperated with Army for its needs in heavier aircraft fields. Our needs in transport are totally ignored as are our concepts in fighter and fighter bombers in tactical support utilization.

"The Chase Aircraft Co.'s XC-123, for example," he said, "was built specifically to meet requirements of the Army in the medium transport field. It is what Army wants and what it needs to fight a war. After long, unnecessary delays, Air Force evaluated the plane with several others (Northrop C-125 and Fairchild C-82). The Chase plane won the evaluation virtually on every count, as we thought it would, but there is still no contract for its manufacture.

"If the present weight limitations were eased, we'd buy the C-123 ourselves," the spokesman said, "and it is my belief that a real scandal exists in the fact that Air Force hasn't contracted for the plane in quantity."

The entire problem of the application of air power to tactical support problems of Army has been under the eyes of Congress for some time. Late last year an investigation of tactical aviation was promised by House Armed Services Committee Chairman CARL VINSON. It was sidetracked when Air Force let it be known it "would do something."

ARMY FIELD COMMAND

There is a growing feeling in military quarters that tactical aviation should be placed under control of Army. From a practical point of view, top officials of both Army and Air Force claim it would be unwise to actually transfer tactical to Army. There is some consideration being given instead to correcting existing command relations between services.

This means that tactical air forces in support of armies would be placed under Army command instead of being offered for "cooperation whenever the over-all air situation permits."

Army planners do envision, however, establishment of an Army air logistics support group. Army would like to provide for its own internal needs much in the same manner as Navy's fleet air logistics. It has no desire to infringe upon the strategic airlift mission of Military Air Transport Service, it was said.

Congressman WALTER NORBLAD, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, is a firm adherent to the cause of Army in tactical air support. He told Aviation Week that he believed that all tactical and transport aviation should be transferred from the Air Force to the Army. "I have urged my committee to conduct immediate hearings on the subject.

"Many in high command," said NORBLAD, "including General MacArthur and Gen. Omar Bradley, have recognized the need for coordination between air support and the ground troops.

"The Marine Corps, with its own aviation, has coordinated its Korean air and ground attack in an excellent manner and has been the leader in precise close support. On the other hand, when the Army needed bomber or fighter support for its troops, it was necessary to go through an involved chain of command from one service to the other with a resultant waste of time and without the coordination found in the one-command system of the Marines.

"During air-ground combat operations the air was under one command and the ground troops under another. It simply isn't logical.

"The Air Force should continue to command and develop long-range strategic bombing on distant targets, but all of the short-range bombers, fighters, and transports should be returned to the jurisdiction of the United States Army," the Congressman said.

"I do not mean to imply that I am against the present air-development program—to the contrary, I have urged for several years that it should be expanded—but I do feel that we will have a much more efficient and capable fighting machine if this transfer is made."

NORBLAD was a combat intelligence officer in the Eighth Air Force during World War II. He is a member of the four-man Tactical Aviation Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

The Best Defense Is the Bold Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has always advocated a strong national defense in times of peace as the best way to prevent war, it is with great pleasure that I place in the RECORD, this editorial by former United States Senator Wilton E. Hall, of South Carolina.

Senator Hall is now publisher of the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S. C., which is today one of the South's leading newspapers.

Senator Hall through the years has consistently backed us in this fight for adequate and overwhelming air power, a force which he believes will contribute immeasurably to the preservation of peace. He realizes that air power is the only force today that can bring destruction immediately to the heart and homeland of Russia following a general outbreak of war.

Senator Hall is in daily touch with the American people. No defense program can be successful without the united backing of the American people. They are the ones who will pay the bills; they are the one who will do the dying in case of war. They should be heeded in their demands for a great air force which would prevent further aggression by this atheistic, communistic dictatorship.

Senator Hall is looking ahead into the future with the preservation of this great country in mind. He is to be commended for his contribution to our thinking. The above-mentioned editorial follows:

THE BEST DEFENSE IS THE BOLD ATTACK

The defeat of the Spanish Armada, famed in song and story, was not what broke the back of the Spanish fleet.

The intrepid Francis Drake did that job by hunting down and destroying Spanish vessels inside Spanish harbors. He was an advocate of the bold attack.

Stonewall Jackson was another advocate of such strategy. It was likewise the military belief of Gen. Bedford Forrest not only to "git thar fustest with the mostest" but to hit first.

The Air Forces General Vandenberg is of the same mind.

He points out that the United States could build a ring of steel and radar around its border but still 70 percent of an enemy's bombers could get through.

If this be true, it also means that 70 percent of our bombers could get through the network of defense thrown up by an enemy.

What Vandenberg is driving at is that America's best defense is the maintenance of an air force powerful enough to pulverize our enemies within hours after trouble breaks.

For the United States to strike first at Soviet Russia would be diplomatic suicide, or so we are told. That rules out the surprise attack, the "preventive" war idea.

But the bold attack thereafter must be mountable if the United States is to defend itself in modern war.

That is why the advocates of air power make so much sense, and is excellent enough reason for a thorough-going revaluation of the Nation's over-all strategy in this half-hot war with the Communists.

Small Business and Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, last, Dr. Ernest L. Stockton, formerly president of Cumberland University, of Lebanon, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent, and now economic consultant for the House Small Business Committee, spoke before a gathering of the eastern North Carolina area of the North Carolina Association of Chambers of Commerce Executives. Dr. Stockton addressed these businessmen on the topic entitled "Small Business and Mobilization" drawing upon his full knowledge of conditions in this regard as he has observed them and as they have been revealed to him in the line of his duties with the Small Business Committee.

This address is thought-provoking and deserving of the attention of all the Members of the House who are concerned with the role which our small-business enterprises wish to play and should be permitted to play in our current-mobilization program. I ask unanimous consent that the address of Dr. Stockton be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS AND MOBILIZATION

It is a pleasure to meet with this fine group of businessmen representing the great Tidewater and Piedmont area of the Southeast. Naturally you had hoped that a Member of Congress could be with you and speak ex cathedra on the many vitally important questions relating to small business. The voice of authority is always better than the opinions of an interpreter. You may be assured, however, that the opinions and facts which I attempt to present are in agreement with those of the distinguished chairman of the House Small Business Committee and its members. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN is the pioneer founder of

this committe, and for many years has been the courageous champion of the cause of small business. He has been chairman since the Hous of Representatives first established the committee in December 1941 (77th Cong.), with the exception of the 2-year period of the Eightieth Congress. The members of this committee would wish me to convey to you their greetings and best wishes.

ORIGIN AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Select Committee on Small Business was created 3 days after Pearl Harbor to insure the survival of small business in a wartime economy. The need for the committee has been recognized by each succeeding Congress.

Studies of the American economy have revealed the fact that, in periods of high profits, merger and consolidations in industry have greatly increased. Four such periods are readily apparent in a survey of the history of our economy: the consolidation movement of 1897–1905, the post-World War I movement, the period of the late twenties, and the present time. The precarious position of the small independent business has increased the urgency of action to remedy small-business problems.

The committee feels that its objectives can be most effectively accomplished by activity in the legislative field, and by working to alleviate problems common to all smaller business enterprises, rather than by conducting prolonged, extensive investigations to underline existing facts concerning monopoly and monopoly problems.

SMALL BUSINESS—FOUNDATION OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

It seems evident at times that some of our leaders forget the small beginnings of all American enterprises. Every big business today was a small business yesterday. Recently an 80-year old businessman wrote a brochure entitled "Progress in America Which I Have Seen Since the 1880's," a colorful period in our history when most of our great inventions, great industries, and our entire modern economic structure were developed and expanded to their present huge proportions during one lifetime. In his early life this man saw no streetcars and automobiles, no electric power and lights, no telephones, no bathrooms, no steel bridges, no rubber tires. In a few years, however, he could see a hot air engine, bathrooms with gas heaters, electric lights, high pressure water-tube-boiler engines driving large ships overseas, gasoline engines driving a horseless carriage called an automobile at the speed of 5 miles per hour.

These simple inventions have become vast industries which produce and supply us with the major products used by 150,000,000 Americans. It is a story of how great oaks from little acorns grow. We must continue to manage our economy so that the opportunity to found and to develop small businesses shall not be lost. Freedom to go into business and to stay in business, on the basis of efficiency, is one of the basic freedoms of our democracy. The meaning of this chapter in the history of our economic progress is that small business is always the broad and deep and strong foundation of our whole economic structure. We must not permit this structure to become too top-heavy with highly concentrated big industries which might weaken the foundations.

THE EMERGENCY AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

It has already been demonstrated since the declaration of a national emergency on December 16, that the problems of small business multiply during an emergency. The solution of these problems is exacting and requires continuous study and investigation. Some of these problems now under constant study are:

1. Defense prime and subcontracts.
2. Essential civilian supplies.
3. Scarce materials.
4. Financial assistance.
5. Plant utilization.
6. Retail and wholesale distribution.
7. Effect of price controls and rationing.

During the Eighty-first Congress the committee conducted a continuous study of Government procurement. The committee was able through negotiation and by other means to bring about changes in procurement methods which have been of material assistance to small business—

1. Convincing procurement agencies to classify more accurately small-business concerns in contract awards.
2. Establishment of a Board of Contract Appeals in General Services Administration.
3. Lengthening the period between an invitation to bid and the closing of bids.
4. Standardizing specifications of common use items and equipment.
5. Prompt notification of the closing of contracts.
6. Wider publicity on invitations to bid.
7. Establishment of Offices of Small Business in procurement agencies.

PROMISES NOT ENOUGH

In spite of the provisions in the Defense Production Act providing for full information to small-business enterprises, for fair representation on advisory committees, for allocation of materials and loan guaranties, it is evident that the only power exercised today in behalf of small business is the power of persuasion. Since the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Defense Production Administration were established, there are even fewer guaranties that small business will receive an equitable share of materials and contracts. However efficient the top leadership of the Office of Defense Mobilization may be and however optimistic pronouncements sound, nothing can be done within the organization with its present policies and methods of operation to utilize fully and effectively the manpower and productive facilities of the thousands of small businesses of the Nation. So far small business has only had what Hamlet said to Polonius: "Words, words, words"—only promises. Every NPA order contains this assurance: "To reduce to a minimum disruption of normal distribution," but what does this mean to a businessman who wants materials to keep his plant in operation. Further, it is promised that contracts will be spread as widely as possible. This promise sounds good but it does not provide materials and contracts. The Department of Defense Executive Order No. 1538-50, issued December 18, 1950, to speed up procurement actions in connection with the second supplemental fund request, declared that it is essential that contracts be spread across industry in order to broaden the industrial base of the procurement program.

NEGOTIATION THE RULE

Again, this sounds good until we read further: "Broadening of the base will require wider use of negotiation." It is reported that at this time approximately 98 percent of all procurement actions are negotiated.

No loyal American would object to negotiation of contracts if adequate material to meet the threat of aggressive communism is the only way to protect our Nation and other free nations against Red China, Red Russia, or any Red satellite. If negotiation is the only way to get weapons and supplies for our fighting forces, then all of us would say "Negotiate the contracts."

But common sense dictates the present state of world affairs does not appear to justify such desperate speed in volume production, particularly to an extent that would eliminate almost entirely small business participation in procurement. Furthermore, the mobilization effort can be weakened by failure to recognize the abilities and productive capacities of small business. The Small Business Committee of the House insists that procurement agencies could utilize more fully and effectively the many small plants throughout the country to increase the volume of total production and at the same time help small manufacturers in their struggle to survive.

HOW DO YOU GET A DEFENSE CONTRACT—NOW?

If negotiation is the established procedure, and if you do not receive notices of intent to negotiate, how do you get contracts—now? It is hoped that present policies and procedures of procurement may be modified, but small manufacturers whose civilian production has been cut back cannot afford to wait too long.

Then what can you do? First of all, do not depend upon a 5-percenter or a professional contact man. Small-business men who have succeeded against great odds in getting contracts involving considerable amounts have told the committee that a contract seeker at this particular stage of mobilization must depend upon his own ingenuity, energy, and persistence. He must knock on doors and continue knocking on doors of procurement officials and prime contractors until he receives fair consideration of his abilities and facilities.

The following steps are recommended as the best procedure for a prospective contractor:

1. Prepare a plain brochure and statement, including bank connection, financial rating, and size of contract that could be handled.
2. Make calls on officials in various procurement agencies and leave adequate information for examination.
3. Get clearance—technical, plan capability, financial stability, products, and security.
4. Repeat calls on the same officials to check on the consideration of your application.
5. Follow through on bids to see if they are completed and check, step by step, the progress on these bids in various agencies.

If a small manufacturer is interested in a subcontract, it would be necessary to examine lists of prime contractors and make contacts with them in the hope of producing some component part of the prime contract. In the Munitions Board and other agencies are lists of large contracts which have been awarded to prime contractors. These lists may be found in 6,000 or more "informational outlets" established by the Department of Commerce, in cooperation with the Department of Defense and General Services Administration, in local chambers of commerce, banks, and other places. Weekly synopses of contract awards in excess of $25,000 are available at these outlets.

OFFICES OF SMALL BUSINESS

The House Small Business Committee convinced several agencies to establish offices of small business to maintain liaison with procurement officials. These offices in NPA, Munitions Board, RFC, and ECA have been sympathetic with our objectives. They have cooperated to the fullest in providing information and guidance and in making recommendations to the heads of various departments of the Government, but they do not sit in the councils of the policy makers where final decisions are made. They are kind friends, highly intelligent officials, and courageous pleaders, but they do not have authority to guarantee materials and contracts to small business.

The fine cooperation exemplified in their attendance and messages at many clinics in almost all States has proved beyond doubt their sincere desire to be helpful. They have done their best to guide small-business men to the end of some rainbow where a potential supply of essential materials or an eagerly sought contract might be found. Whether or not the search could succeed, these officials of small-business offices have created in the public mind a keen awareness of the place of small business in the American economy, and they have pointed up more clearly to the necessity of further action to insure more equitable distribution of materials and contracts to small manufacturers.

DANGER IN DELAY

There is grave danger in prolonged delay in utilizing small-business potentialities. Decisive action should be taken at the earliest possible moment before the cream of prime contracts is negotiated, leaving only the skimmed milk for small business. If many small plants do not either obtain essential materials for civilian production or defense contracts, they will be compelled to cut back operations below cost of production or to close down. Such conditions would set in motion a chain reaction of successive shocks and irreparable losses to our economy—unemployment, migration of labor, loss of businesses in communities formerly dependent upon their own local industries, and not the least would be the great loss of revenue to our Federal and local governments. There are dangerous signs that these symptoms exist already. Many letters come to the House and Senate Small Business Committees from businessmen or their Representatives in Congress, with distress appeals like this: The limitations in NPA Order So-and-So were not intended to force anyone out of business, and some provision should be made to permit my company to obtain a sufficient quantity of material to continue operation. There are hundreds of thousands of small businesses all over the country in desperate need of a minimum of supplies with which to continue in business.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

The only thing that can save these many small businesses from famine or death is to provide some means by which they can secure needed materials or a fair share of defense contracts. This means is a legislative enactment by the Congress of the United States. Officials of the Department of Defense, the Office of Defense Mobilization, NPA, and other agencies may make eloquent commitments that materials and contracts will be scattered widely, but past records indicate that promises will not be translated into action unless Congress gives a mandate to officials requiring them to allocate a more generous proportion of contracts to small manufacturers.

It is a matter of record that each of the past two World Wars made a new crop of billionaires and millionaires. We are not opposed to billionaires and millionaires as such if their billions and millions are made and used in the public interest and for the national welfare with reasonable margins of profit, but there is reason to surmise that the profits they have received were not always in true balance with the public welfare.

Why not say that we know to be true in periods of national emergency and mobilization. Big industries are vital and indispensable, but they want too much of the lion's share of everything. The more they get, the more they want, and the more economic power they acquire. Well-earned power to produce the implements of peace and war may become entrenched power to control great concentrations of financial resources and productive facilities. If small business does not use some means of getting its deserved share, business will not be handed out to them without effort. Because of the recognized disadvantages of the weaker and smaller units in our business structure, some extraordinary measures must be adopted in crucial periods like this.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION

The Small Business Committees of the Senate and House believe that the best measure to protect and to preserve small business is the enactment of a bill (H. R. 1600; S. 353) to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise, introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN and in the House by Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, JANUARY 17.

The committee has learned from experience the virtual impossibility of properly utilizing the strength of small business in the national defense and in providing essential civilian supplies through the agencies presently established under the Defense Production Act. Those charged with administering the entire mobilization program, even though they have the inclination, cannot give adequate attention to the unique problems of small business in a wartime atmosphere. Therefore, the Small Business Committee feels that it is duty-bound and has the high responsibility to the House of Representatives to shoulder the burden of this problem and to see it through to a final conclusion. The committee believes the only feasible remedy is the one it has proposed.

Essentially, the SDPC bill provides for positive means to aid small business—

1. To secure a fair share of Government contracts under the national defense program;
2. To secure a fair share of scarce materials for essential civilian production;
3. To be assured fair and equitable treatment when acting as subcontractors;
4. To obtain loans for expansion and conversion in the interests of the national defense program; and
5. To achieve full economic and industrial mobilization.

In order to accomplish these major objectives, provision is made for—

1. The integration of this legislation with the basic legislation: The Defense Production Act of 1950 (sec. 2 (a)).
2. A revolving fund in the Treasury for the purpose of making loans and acquiring property.
3. The appointment of a board of directors representing small business, labor, and agriculture.
4. Banking powers vested in the Corporation to enable it to adequately finance small-business concerns for defense and essential civilian production.
5. The Corporation's entry into contracts with the United States Government for the purpose of furnishing equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government and to arrange for the performance of such contracts through the letting of subcontracts to small-business concerns.
6. Full mobilization and integration of small business in the national defense program by empowering the Corporation to make or arrange for a complete inventory of all productive facilities of small-business concerns which can be used for defense and essential civilian production.

The broad view, as we see it, involves the community life of America. No matter how long the emergency may prevail or what the future may hold, the communities making up our cities, towns, villages, and farms must be preserved in the glorious tradition of our history. We can all agree that we do not want to see mass migration of our people seeking work in defense plants far from home and fireside. The slogan of our national defense may well be: "Take the plants to the people and not the people to the plants." In this way we preserve, insofar as is humanly possible, the traditional American community with its churches, its homes, its factories, its stores, its farms, and its civic life.

Irish Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent release by the Irish Government which I think would be most informative for Members of the House.

It bears out a view which I have held myself for a long time that Ireland has great strategic potentialities in connection with the defense of Western Europe and in some conceivable circumstances in connection with the defense of the United States.

Obviously, it is most essential that we should continue to enjoy cordial and pleasant relations with the Irish Government. It is also important that we should not permit England or any other ally, or so-called friendly nation, to take action or pursue policies regarding Ireland which are calculated to cause resentment and breed unrest, dissatisfaction, and possible conflict within that nation. The Irish are our natural allies. Let us keep them as friends and allies throughout this crisis and in time to come. They have proved their loyalty to the cause of liberty. They have fought and died for freedom with unexcelled valor. Let us strengthen and encourage the Irish Nation and assist it to secure that unity and autonomy which the Irish people so richly deserve. The above-mentioned follows:

The Irish Government learned with grave concern and deep regret of the invitation issued by the British Admiralty to the Netherlands to send a naval air squadron for training purposes to Derry, Ireland. The fact that this announcement was accompanied by a statement issued by the British Admiralty to the effect that "this will be the first occasion in time of peace for Netherlands aviators to receive training on British soil" had heightened the public concern which, in any event, would be aroused by such a proposal. The Irish Government had not been consulted either by the Netherlands Government or the British Government concerning the coming of a Netherlands air unit to Derry for training purposes. The people of Ireland have no feeling other than friendliness toward the people of the Netherlands and have no desire to do otherwise than maintain the friendly relations which have always existed with the Netherlands. It is, however, necessary to point out emphatically that Britain's exercise of sovereignty over a portion of our country is in defiance of the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people and is repugnant to the national sentiment of our people. In the light of these circumstances, any invitation by Britain to another nation to send a contingent of its armed forces even for training purposes to our country and the acceptance of such an invitation can only cause deep resentment in Ireland. It would appear to me that the sending of military forces for occupation or training purposes by another state to territory which, to put it mildly, must be regarded as disputed territory is contrary to normal international usage. Such a step will no doubt be represented

rightly or wrongly as a taking of sides. It seemed particularly unfortunate that such an invitation should have been sent to the Netherlands at this particular stage in world history when democracy itself was on trial. The democratic system depended for its basis upon the right of the people of a nation to determine their own affairs freely and without outside interference. The partition of Ireland and the occupation of a portion of Ireland whether by British or other troops in defiance of the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people constitute a clear infringement of the principles upon which democratic rule rests. We have at the moment in Korea a tragic example of the results that flow from the undemocratic and unnatural partition of a country. One would expect that at this time more than any other time democratic governments in Western Europe would appreciate the vital necessity and importance of giving effect in practice as well as in theory to the principles of democracy. For the government and the people of the Netherlands we have nothing but the highest esteem and affectionate regard. We do not, however, wish to see them drawn into a position wherein they would acquiesce in an infringement of the sovereignty of the Irish people and of the fundamental principles of democracy.

Diplomatic correspondents in Dublin report that Mr. MacBride, Minister for External Affairs, had an interview with the Netherlands Minister in Dublin. His Excellency Jonkheer J. W. M. Snouck Hurgronje, on December 30 and on a number of subsequent occasions in relation to the announcement of the proposed visit for training purposes of a Dutch naval air squadron to Derry. It is understood that further exchanges on the matter are still taking place.

The Relative Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD L. SITTLER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brownsville (Pa.) Telegraph of February 20, 1951:

THE RELATIVE RIGHT

It is a common illusion of our time that what is "right" must inevitably triumph. This is proved to be an illusion, first, because it is impossible to determine precisely and absolutely what is right. Therefore it is impossible to know if "the right" ever does triumph, in any final and absolute sense. It may be the consensus of opinion that some idea is more right than some other idea, but no one can say, if this idea triumphs, that the outcome would have been worse if some other idea had prevailed.

But even if a society decides that a certain idea is more right than another, it does not follow that this idea, by virtue of its being more right, must inevitably triumph over opposing ideas. It is not inevitable, for instance, that the idea of American democracy will triumph over the idea of Stalinist communism, just because it is the consensus of American opinion—and perhaps of world opinion—that the former is more right than the latter.

It is occasionally necessary for us all to recall this hard fact in order that our efforts in behalf of our cherished ideas are not wrongly based. Quite a number of people, among those socially conscious enough to have faith in ideas, work and fight for right ideas in the fond belief that these ideas are automatically destined by providence to prevail. This is a dangerous illusion. Its result is that people come to judge the validity and worth of an idea according to its success in the world. Those who believe, for instance, that democracy must triumph because it is more right, must have suffered crushing disillusionment during this century, when the idea of democracy has lost out again and again. We may fervently want our right ideas to triumph in the world, but our belief in them is not soundly and firmly based when it depends on their success in terms of worldly achievement.

The only alternative to this fallacious kind of belief, and the only proper basis for a belief in an idea is the feeling that the idea should and can triumph. There is, admittedly, a very fine line between believing that something can triumph and believing that it will. But the distinction is fundamental to a sound faith. If we believe that something can win out—but may not—we are at once driven to valiant effort in its behalf and protected against the illusion of its inevitable victory. Such is the true faith of those who fight for ideas. They do not lean on the paper shield of inevitability. They ride the war horse of what-should-be.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway, published in the Indianapolis News, Thursday, March 1, 1951:

THE ST. LAWRENCE

The Washington administration is trotting out again all the old arguments for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, but with louder national defense overtones. The expenditure of new tax billions to build a waterway that would be frozen a great part of the year, in order to transport iron ore from Labrador, may have some justification, but it should be far down the list of national priority. The Panama Canal, for instance, is in far graver need of improved facilities and defenses.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has nailed down the real motive for the administration's inordinate interest in the St. Lawrence project. In advocating New York-Ontario joint development of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers, he told the New York Legislature that the Federal plan is to make the power facilities a "potential source of national revenue at the will of Congress for the indefinite future."

"This outrageous notion," said Governor Dewey, "is completely in the groove of thought of those Federal monopolists who would like to reduce the States to mere dependents upon the Federal Government and let their assets and authority be soaked up by ever-encroaching Federal power."

If the St. Lawrence is to be developed for shipping and electric power, it should be done by State-Province compacts, and not to set up a vast socialistic government monopoly with life and death power over State and private business interests.

Anything Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a House resolution which I have introduced today, and under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a portion of an editorial from the Washington Post commenting emphatically on the lack of moral and ethical standards of many public servants disclosed by recent congressional hearings. For the reason that it might be violative of the House rules, I have eliminated that part of the editorial which refers to alleged improper conduct by a Member of the other body. Nevertheless, there can be no double standard. Equally with the personnel of the executive branch, those chosen by the people to represent them in the Senate and House owe the duty to refrain meticulously from actions which might cause disrespect for government. The editorial from the Post follows:

ANYTHING GOES

"It is gone," said Edmund Burke in his Reflections on the Revolution in France, "that sensibility of principle that chastity of honor, which felt a stain like a wound." It appears to be, to say the very least, blunted among men in public life today. The appalling aspect of the disclosures—and one gets the impression that they are only a tithe of the sordid story—that have come out of the Fulbright committee's inquiry into the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is that the officials involved in them seem almost devoid of any sense of impropriety. Taxed with having accepted the hospitality of a Florida hotel for which he had been instrumental in obtaining an RFC loan, Hilton W. Robertson, an examiner in the agency, said: "I expect to pay the rate. They wouldn't take it. I did not know they were going to issue a courtesy card. Is there anything wrong about that?"

Well, Mr. Robertson, it all depends on your concept of right and wrong. It probably isn't a penal offense, if that's any comfort to you. The chances are no one will suppose you sold your influence for the paltry price of a free hotel room. But a man who holds a position of responsibility and trust in the United States Government can no more afford to accept favors than to grant them. Time was when this elementary point of honor seemed so clear that no one thought to question it. But in the blurred vision of today, anything goes, it seems, if you can get away with it.

It is somewhat harsh to point a finger at Mr. Robertson. Some of his bosses in the RFC saw nothing wrong, apparently, in taking a gratuity here and there from applicants for RFC loans. For that matter, Donald Dawson, White House aide in charge of personnel, did just what Mr. Robertson did. On three occasions, he was the nonpaying guest of the same hotel. If Mr. Dawson has any regard for his reputation, he will cease hiding behind his White House immunity and come before the subcommittee to explain his conduct. In the absence of an explanation, his unfitness for a post in the White House seems abundantly demonstrated.

Robert Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent article from the Clinton Daily Item containing two poems in reference to the immortal Robert Burns, the great and ever-to-be-remembered Scottish poet.

One of these contributions by Alexander C. Duncan bears particular significance because every year on January 25, in keeping with a long-established custom that fine gentlemen appropriately observes the birthday of the great Bard of Scotland. Time was in the town of Clinton, Mass., when this occasion was widely observed with festivities and celebrations arranged by old Scotch settlers and participated in by many people. Time itself has taken toll of many of those who arranged these annual celebrations and they are now but a sacred memory. Yet the spirit of Scotia and of Burns lives in the hearts of the loyal Scots and not a birthday of the great Burns passes without some reference to his memory and some tribute to his greatness.

It can truly be said of Robert Burns that he will live forever in the hearts of men. Some poets have written for kings and queens who were their patrons, some have sung their songs as poet laureates to the glory of great empires. But Robert Burns wrote his poems for the common people—for the poor, and the unheralded, and all the men and women of the rank and file who go to make up the fabric of every nation.

I cannot here give adequate utterance to the greatness of Robert Burns, nor can I recite his many contributions to human happiness. Others have sung paeans of praise to his name. The sparkle, gaiety, and brightness of his works will endure to the end of recorded time. The name of Robert Burns and what it stands for will never die. Men like Alex Duncan, loyal Scots, fine, proud Americans, will keep his memory warm and his beautiful poems and songs alive. All this for the sake of Auld Lang Syne. The poems follow:

ROBERT BURNS

(Born January 25, 1759)

"Our monarch's hindmost year but one
Was five and twenty days begun
'Twas then a blast o' Janwar' win'
Blew hansel in on Robin."

Thus Robert Burns wrote as to the time and circumstances of his birth, and in the same song he ventured what probably seemed to him a rash prophecy when he said:

"He'll hae misfortunes great an' sma',
But sy a heart aboon them a',
He'll be a credit till us a':
We'll a' be proud o' Robin!"

But rash as the prophecy was, it has been gloriously fulfilled, for not only are Scotchmen "a' proud of Robin" and getting "prouder" every day, but we are even "prouder" to see the warm place which Robert Burns has found in the hearts of people the world over. "When Scotland Forgets Burns Then History Will Forget Scotland."

ALEXANDER C. DUNCAN.

THE STAR OF ROBBIE BURNS

There is a star, whose beaming ray
Is shed on every clime,
It shines by night
It shines by day,
And ne'er grows dim wi' time.
It grows upon the banks of Ayr,
It shone on Doon's clear stream,
A hundred years are gone and mair,
Yet brighter grows its beam.
Let kings and courtiers rise an' fa'
This world has many turns
But brightly beams aboon them a'
The star o' Robbie Burns.
On Fames emblazoned page enshrined
His name is foremost, now.
And mony a costly wreathe been twined,
To grace his honest brow.
Auld Scotland's heart expands wi' joy,
When e'er the day returns
That gave the world—its peasant boy,
Immortal Robbie Burns.

Do We Want the RFC?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of March 2, 1951:

DO WE WANT THE RFC?

It's a perilous situation when politicians play banker with public funds. That is precisely what has been going on within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Money from taxpayers has been passed over the loan counter with its lending subject to political pressures, influence, and favoritism. Public confidence in the RFC was not great before the Senate committee's inquiry. Confidence has been shattered by the committee's disclosures.

Set up under the Hoover administration in 1932, the RFC served the public interest by keeping sound banks and large interstate businesses operating when they suddenly found themselves shut off from their normal sources of financial help. It was a depression agency designed to deal with the depression. It succeeded wonderfully in its original purpose. But over the years that original purpose has been perverted. RFC has become a tool for carrying out political goals of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. It has become a source of loans for the politically favored.

The RFC poured $60,000,000 into a prefabricated housing venture that went bankrupt. Other RFC millions enabled a new company to enter the automobile manufacturing field. Loans went into wildcat oil wells, into a plush resort hotel housing a gambling casino and into all sorts of other ventures, some successful, some not. About all the borrower had to show was that he could not obtain the money from private sources cheaply enough.

The stench of scandal hangs over the RFC. Examiners who passed on loan applications have been given fat salaried jobs by the loan applicants. A former lowly clerk in the RFC organization is shown to have bought stock in a company at $1 a share that quickly was worth $800 a share. He bought it by borrowing from an attorney representing a firm seeking an RFC loan. Meanwhile the wife acquires an $8,500 mink coat with the attorney footing the bill. The wife is a secretary at the White House. An RFC director testifies that he departed from the usual procedure as a personal favor in assigning an examiner to go over the loan application of a friend. That loan applicant subsequently became an RFC director himself.

After the Senate committee had reported that at least three of the five directors whom President Truman wanted reappointed to the RFC board had been subject to influence, the President first insisted on their reappointment and then relented. He was willing to have a single administrator with separate boards to determine loan policy and review loan applications. The trouble with that plan is that the RFC would continue as an executive agency subject to direct political influence. And the RFC record is proof enough that politics and banking are an unwholesome mixture.

The more the committee turns up in its public hearings the clearer it is a question whether the RFC should be continued at all. Does the country want and need it? The Hoover Commission in its report on Government reorganization declared that "the Government should not engage in direct lending where loans can be obtained from private sources on reasonable terms." That's a good principle to follow. Jesse Jones, long-time head of the RFC, recommended nearly a year ago that it be liquidated.

Matter of Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Stewart Alsop, which appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, March 2, 1951:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

THE KEY

A nightmare is beginning to haunt those principally responsible for American foreign policy. For it is now about as certain as such things can be that the Kremlin will soon formally propose a German settlement based on the unity of a "neutralized" Germany, after the staged withdrawal of all occupation troops. And it is even possible that the Kremlin will add glittering window dressing, by ostensibly accepting the principle of a free, secret, unsupervised vote to elect a single all-German Government.

This prospect has initiated a painful, agonized debate in the inner circles of the State Department and the Pentagon. For the objective of such an apparently reasonable Soviet offer would be to end Western rearmament, split the Western alliance, and thus knock the props right out from under American foreign policy.

The evidence is increasingly strong that the Soviets will produce some such proposal

at the forthcoming foreign ministers' conference. This evidence takes various forms, such as dispatches from Moscow, passed by the Soviet censors, reporting that the Soviets are now eager for a German settlement on generous terms. But the most convincing evidence is provided by the course of the campaign for "unity and neutrality" waged within Germany by the East German Communists.

At first, this campaign was based exclusively on the "Prague resolutions." The campaign made little headway, simply because the "Prague resolutions" are no more than a crude blueprint for the Communist capture of all Germany. But recently, East German Communist Chief Otto Grotewohl suddenly switched the line, more than hinting that the Communists would welcome free, secret elections throughout Germany as a basis for forming a united government.

Grotewohl acted, of course, on specific instructions from the Kremlin. And Grotewohl's line thus almost certainly foreshadows the Kremlin's line at the foreign ministers' meeting. Almost no informed official believes that a Soviet offer of a German settlement on such terms would be genuine. The reasons are obvious.

A genuine German settlement would also involve a genuine Austrian settlement. This would mean a Soviet guaranty to withdraw the Red army from all the satellites—and the satellites are more restive than ever before. It would mean the loss to Russia of the vital Erzebirge uranium mines in East Germany. A really secret vote would mean an overwhelming defeat of the East German Communist regime, and a deadly blow at Soviet world prestige. Finally, it would mean a pro-Western or at least strongly anti-Communist, all-German government, and however "neutralized" Germany might be, it is almost unimaginable that the Kremlin would accept such a risk.

For these reasons and others, it is believed that any Soviet proposal for a German settlement will be essentially a fake, a tempting trap for the unwary west. Yet even a fake proposal, cleverly camouflaged, could have disastrous consequences. American policy is now squarely based on the assumption that a true balance of power can only be achieved, and peace maintained, if Western Europe is rendered defensible.

The Pentagon is convinced that Western Europe can never be defended without German participation. A German settlement providing for withdrawal of all occupation troops and the permanent demilitarization of Germany would, it is feared, cause the Western European defense effort, now just getting underway under General Eisenhower's leadership, to crumble into nothingness.

Yet even if the Kremlin only seemed ready to offer a reasonable settlement involving the withdrawal of the Red army to the Russian frontiers, the offer would be almost unbearably tempting to the Germans, the French, the British, and even to many Americans. It might throw the whole Western Alliance into an uproar of bitter, mutual recrimination, causing the alliance to fall apart.

This is why the internal debate now going on is so vitally important. One school of thought particularly in the Pentagon, believes any German settlement at this time, on any terms, disastrous. This school would attempt to forestall the Kremlin with a prior American proposal for a German settlement festooned with conditions which the Soviets would not conceivably accept. Yet any diplomatic device so obvious and so clumsy might itself split the Allies by convincing the Europeans that the United States was interested only in war.

Another, smaller school of thought believes that German rearmament should be used as a bargaining counter; that it is not wholly impossible that Soviet policy may actually have reached a turn in the zigzag course prescribed by Lenin; and that we should be prepared to recognize this change of course and to take maximum advantage of it. One thing is clear—and it is the reason why one of these reporters has now left for Germany: The world struggle is now moving into a new stage of crisis which will almost certainly center around the country which Lenin called "the key to Europe."

Meat Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my recently expressed views on the question of meat prices.

Present meat prices are outrageous and in the interest of the health and welfare of the American people they must be reduced. If Government control agencies fail to act, this Congress must grapple forthwith with this vital problem.

The rise in the cost of living since Korea has been most alarming. It has inflicted real hardship on the consumers, particularly our working classes. General price levels of essential commodities and necessities of life used in the homes and in the every-day lives of our people have substantially advanced. For some time past, I have been strongly urging OPS Director Michael V. DiSalle to move along a broad front to bring these prices into line. From the standpoint of economic law, such action involves considerable difficulty but, nevertheless, the problem must be tackled without further delay.

I think that the recent slaughter order, which is designed to prevent the diversion of meats from established distribution channels, should be helpful. But it will not be sufficient to bring essential and necessary adjustments in the prices of meats. Steps must be taken to control effectively the large packers as well as the small slaughterers. I hope it will not be necessary to impose rigid restrictions upon any part of American business which will shackle initiative and tend to create black markets. But the American people will not long tolerate the excessive prices which now prevail over meats and other necessities of life.

I am, therefore, urging once again that the Government act as soon as possible to stabilize conditions in the commodity markets with special reference to meat, but including all other necessities.

Meat is such a vital and important protein food which is used and so urgently needed in the ordinary American family that an adequate supply of meat at reasonable prices is most essential.

I hope that early action will be taken to bring down meat prices. Otherwise Congress must enact special legislation to relieve present intolerable prices.

Commutation of Sentences of German War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary on the commutation of sentences of German war criminals, together with a pertinent letter of representatives of several organizations, members of the National Community Relations Advisory Council to the Secretary of State:

COMMUTATION OF SENTENCES OF GERMAN WAR CRIMINALS

One hundred and one individual cases were reviewed by Mr. McCloy and General Handy. Mr. McCloy's determinations were based in part upon recommendations made to him by the Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals, which he appointed in March 1950. Of the 101 cases which were reviewed, sentences were commuted in 89 cases and were reaffirmed in 12 cases. Twenty-eight of these 101 sentences were death sentences of which 21 were commuted, 15 to terms of life imprisonment, and 6 to varying terms of imprisonment. The types of criminals involved in both the commuted and reaffirmed sentences are indicated in the sections below dealing separately with the cases under Mr. McCloy's jurisdiction and those under General Handy's.

CASES REVIEWED BY GENERAL HANDY

The following data are taken from a press release of the headquarters, European Command, Public Information Division, January 31, 1951, marked EUCOM, release No. 51-91.

General Handy reviewed 13 cases, all involving death sentences. Of these 13 he reaffirmed 2 and commuted 11 to life imprisonment.

Of the 11 death sentences commuted to life imprisonment, 6 involved army noncommissioned officers and officers who were implicated in the Malmedy case.

Two of the 11 criminals whose death sentences were commuted to life imprisonment were SS sergeants who participated in concentration-camp brutalities; the remaining 3 were convicted of murdering Allied and United States airmen parachuting from disabled planes.

Reasons given for commutations: General Handy states that the commutations of the sentences of the six men involved in the Malmedy case were based upon the following considerations: The crimes were associated with a desperate combat action, were definitely distinguishable from the more deliberate killings in concentration camps, and were committed by men of comparatively low rank who did not initiate or advocate the orders leading to the crimes.

Regarding the two SS sergeants, it is said that they were in relatively subordinate positions and that "the records do not show that they went out of their way to add to the brutalities."

With regard to the three persons convicted of murdering Allied and United States airmen, mitigating circumstances are noted, such as excitement, the fact that the offenses were committed after severe bombings, and the fact that the crimes showed no special pattern.

CASES REVIEWED BY MR. M'CLOY

Mr. McCloy reviewed a total of 88 cases, of which he commuted 78 sentences, in general following the recommendations of his Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals. Of the 88 cases reviewed, 15 involved death sentences, 19 sentences to life imprisonment, and 54 sentences to terms ranging from 6 to 25 years. Of the 15 death sentences, 5 were reaffirmed and 10 were commuted—4 to life imprisonment and the remaining 6 to terms ranging from 9 to 25 years. Of the 19 sentences to life imprisonment, 3 were reaffirmed and 16 were commuted, 15 of them to terms ranging from 10 to 20 years, and 1 convicted criminal was released on medical parole. Of the 54 sentences to terms ranging from 6 to 25 years, 2 were reaffirmed and 52 were commuted to sentences ranging from time already served to 15 years.

The 88 cases are divided into 10 groups. A summary of the results in each group follows:

(1) This group of 20 defendants were SS officers in charge of extermination squads responsible for the murder of an estimated 2,000,000 people. Of these 20 defendants, the sentences of 16 were commuted; the 4 sentences which were reaffirmed were all death sentences.

Nine additional death sentences were commuted, four to life imprisonment and the remaining five to prison terms ranging from 10 to 25 years.

Two sentences to life imprisonment were commuted to 10-year terms.

Three 20-year sentences were commuted, one to time already served, one to 10 years, and one to 15 years.

Two 10-year sentences were commuted, one to time served and one to 8 years.

Reasons given for commutations: Regarding the death sentences commuted to life imprisonment, it is said that in these cases the individuals were guilty on a "less imposing scale" than those whose death sentences were reaffirmed. It is added that new evidence on some of the other cases indicated subordinate responsibility, relative remoteness of connection with crimes and refusal of the convicted to continue the work of extermination as ordered.

(2) This group of 15 defendants were administrators of concentration camps or SS economic enterprises run with slave labor, and some were directly identified with genocide activities.

Of the 15 sentences, 14 were commuted. The one sentence which was reaffirmed was a death sentence. Another death sentence was commuted to 9 years.

Four sentences to life imprisonment were commuted, 2 to 20-year terms and 2 to 15-year terms.

Two 20-year sentences were commuted, one to 15 years and one to time already served.

One 15-year sentence and six 10-year sentences were all commuted to time served.

Reasons given for commutations: In the case of the death sentence commuted to 9 years, it was said that new evidence dissociates the criminal from offenses on which the original death sentence was based. New evidence is also mentioned as the reason for commuting several other sentences in this group.

(3) This group of 9 defendants were physicians and soldiers who carried out experiments on concentration camp inmates.

The sentences of all 9 were commuted.

Five sentences of life imprisonment were commuted to terms of 15 to 20 years.

Four sentences of varying terms were all reduced to 10-year terms, except one which was reduced to time already served.

Reasons given for commutation: The reasons given are "lack of primary responsibility, age, and limited participation."

(4) This group of 7 defendants were leading judges, public prosecutors and government officials who "perverted law to suit the arbitrary requirements of Nazi racial ideology."

All seven sentences were commuted.

Four sentences to life imprisonment were commuted, 3 to 20-year terms and one to a release on medical parole.

Three 10-year sentences were commuted to time already served.

Reasons given for commutations: The only reason given is limited responsibility.

(5) These six defendants were military men of high rank who were personally responsible for ordering the killing and mistreatment of prisoners of war, and fostering and participating in the program involving the deportation and abuse of civilians in occupied areas.

Of the six sentences, three were commuted.

Of 2 sentences to life imprisonment, 1 was reaffirmed and 1 commuted to 18 years.

Two 20-year sentences were commuted to 12 years each.

Two 15-year sentences were reaffirmed.

Reasons given for commutations: It is said that the persons whose sentences were commuted had remoter responsibility according to evidence brought out mainly since the trial. Extenuating circumstances are mentioned, such as the attempt to moderate or resist orders to commit excesses.

(6) These eight defendants were generals in southeastern Europe, convicted for criminal disregard of the laws of war in their treatment of hostages and civilians.

Of the eight sentences, six were commuted.

Two sentences of life imprisonment were reaffirmed.

Two 20-year sentences were commuted, 1 to 10 years and 1 to time already served.

One 15-year sentence was commuted to 10 years.

Three sentences, of 12, 10, and 7 years each, were all commuted to time already served.

Reasons given for commutation: Some of the persons whose sentences were commuted had lesser responsibilities or showed "evidence of humane considerations." The 2 individuals whose life sentences were reaffirmed will be physically examined to determine whether or not they should be released on medical parole.

(7) These 6 defendants were high government officials in agencies which were involved in genocide through kidnapping children, performing abortions, sterilization, forced evacuation, and forced Germanization.

All these sentences were commuted.

One 25-year sentence and one 20-year sentence were both commuted to 15 years.

Two 15-year sentences were commuted, one to 10 years and one to time already served.

Two 10-year sentences were commuted to time already served.

Reasons given are the "relatively restricted nature of the relationship of these defendants to the crimes, their relatively subordinate roles, and certain other extenuating circumstances."

(8) These nine defendants were all executives in the Krupp Industrial Enterprises, and were convicted of collaboration with the government in the use of slave labor and in spoliation.

All nine sentences were commuted.

One sentence of 12 years and confiscation of property (Alfred Krupp) was commuted to time served and no confiscation of property.

Eight other sentences ranging from 6 to 12 years were commuted to time served.

Reasons given for commutation: With regard to all the cases it is said that the sentences were commuted to conform to other sentences in similar cases and that "it is extremely difficult to allocate individual guilt."

As for the commutation of the confiscation sentence for Alfred Krupp, Mr. McCloy states that inasmuch as he is the only Nazi criminal whose property was confiscated by Nuremberg, it would constitute discrimination against him to reaffirm this sentence. Mr. McCloy points out that Justice Jackson opposed "such sentences in connection with the jurisdiction granted to the International Military Tribunal."

(9) These eight defendants were high officials who played an important part in the political and diplomatic preparation for the initiation of aggressive wars, the violation of treaties, spoliation, and the diplomatic implementation of genocide.

All eight sentences were commuted. One sentence of 25 years and two sentences of 20 years each were all commuted to 10 years.

Three sentences of 15 years each were commuted, respectively, to time already served, 10 years and 9 years.

Two 10-year sentences were commuted to time served.

Reasons given for commutation: It is said that the defendant whose sentence was reduced from 25 to 10 years had intervened to save Allied officers and men held for liquidation or as hostages.

(10) This single defendant is Field Marshal Erhard Milch, State Secretary in the Air Ministry, convicted for advocating and exploiting slave labor.

His sentence to life imprisonment was commuted to 15 years. No reason is given for this commutation, but it is mentioned that Milch claimed "instability of temperament due to severe strain, aggravated by a head injury."

FEBRUARY 20, 1951.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY ACHESON: The undersigned national organizations, which together with 27 Jewish community councils throughout the country comprise the National Community Relations Advisory Council are greatly disturbed by the American authorities' recent commutation of the sentences of 89 German Nazi war criminals convicted of the most heinous crimes against humanity and democratic society. Among the criminals, 21 of whom now escape the death sentence and 54 are now set free, are Nazis who committed atrocities in the Nazi concentration camps, industrialists who collaborated with nazism, Nazi officials who planned and carried out Hitler's genocide program, pillagers and slaughterers in the Nazi-occupied areas and Nazi diplomats.

Until now we have withheld public comment on the commutation of these sentences because adequate information was not available in this country. Having examined the official report by the Department of State, we now see the full extent of the mistaken policy which the United States authorities are following in this matter. The official record shows that of 101 cases reviewed by John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner for Germany, and Gen. Thomas T. Handy, commander in chief, European command, sentences were commuted in 89 and were reaffirmed in 12 cases.

As the official report indicates, the criminals whose sentences were commuted had been convicted at Nuremberg of crimes, the cruelty and depravity of which are scarcely imaginable in the civilized world. The Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals, in recommending the reduction of sentences, pointed out that they were not entitled to great relief beyond that warranted by mitigating circumstances and fair consideration of individual situations. "Clemency," the Board further stated, "may be an encouraging example, but a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder would be a mockery. It would undo what Nuremberg has accomplished if in the end we were guided entirely by considerations of sympathy or generosity. Executive clemency does not exist to that end."

In our view these commutations are precisely a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder and constitute a mockery of what Nuremberg has accomplished.

These commutations are dangerous for four reasons, among others:

(1) The commutations tend to throw into doubt the entire basis, procedure, and judgments of the 12 trials conducted by 6 United States military tribunals at Nuremberg. It is gratifying to note that both McCloy and the members of his clemency board defend the standards and judgments of the Nuremberg trials and that they have rejected the arguments commonly made in defense of the criminals who were brought to judgment at those trials. In our view it would have been more appropriate, however, to honor the achievement of the Nuremberg trials by observing rather than by undoing their results. In setting forth the principles which governed the conduct of these trials, the United States was following a policy of high moral standard. In granting these commutations, however, expediency appears to have been a factor in seeking the approbation of those German elements whose devotion to democracy is justifiably suspect.

(2) At a time when it is contemplated to grant Germany greater independence, it is especially dangerous to reduce the sentences of the perpetrators of inhumanities in the concentration camps, many of whom are now able to return to public life. Such action can hardly be considered an encouragement of democratic elements in Germany. The immediate release of nine former executives of the Krupp enterprises is likewise unlikely to encourage German democratic elements, since the Krupp record as one of the leading industrial pillars of nazism is well known.

(3) The return of the Krupp industrialists to positions of power and the commutation of the sentences of Nazi war criminals implicated in the genocide program and in the pillage and slaughter in the concentration camps and in the Nazi-occupied countries of Europe cannot but alarm our allies among the democratic nations of Western Europe and among the partisans of democracy in the countries behind the iron curtain.

(4) These commutations, finally, were obviously intended to placate German opinion in the effort to make Western Germany a bulwark against the real threat of Soviet aggression. Such a policy of expediency, as years of experience shows, does not accomplish its purpose and usually leads to other evils. This case is no exception. Press reports already indicate that the Germans are not satisfied with the extent of the commutations. The United States and the West cannot safely copy the Soviet Union's technique of currying favor with former Nazi leaders. These criminals are totalitarians and hence are more reliable allies of the totalitarian East than of the democratic West.

We believe that a simple reading of Mr. McCloy's report will clearly show the extent of the error the United States has committed in reducing the sentences of these war criminals.

JACOB BLAUSTEIN,
President, American Jewish Committee.
Rabbi IRVING MILLER,
President, American Jewish Congress.
FRANK GOLDMAN,
President, B'nai B'rith.
ADOLPH HELD,
Chairman, Jewish Labor Committee.
HENRY ALBERT,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.
MAURICE N. EISENDRATH,
President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
IRVING KANE,
Chairman, National Community Relations Advisory Council.

Defense of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article on Alaska defense written by Andrew Tully, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers:

DEFENSE OF ALASKA
(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, March 1.—On the theory there is no point in biting off more than you can chew, the military is prepared to defend only about one-quarter of Alaska if war should come with Russia.

Our officers may be reluctant to discuss it, but the defense line is there for all to see. It begins with the Navy's installation on Kodiak Island, just south of Anchorage, and runs north through Anchorage and up the Alaskan Railroad to end north of the Alaskan Range in Fairbanks—500 miles in all.

The rest is expendable—despite the fact that it is a lot of real estate. It includes the old-time frontier town of Nome, the entire northland which ends at Point Barrow, the Aleutian chain and the southeastern area including the capital city of Juneau and the important cities of Sitka and Skagway.

In this decision—arrived at in Washington—the military is being merely logical. Nearly all of Alaska's population of 126,000 persons lives in the so-called heartland embraced by the defense line. It includes the country's only railroad. And it is the only part of the country which meets the military's requirements for bases that are defensible and suppliable.

Nome has nothing the military wants—or, it believes, Russia wants. It is isolated except by air and by ships a few months of the year. The northland is a barren waste. Southeastern Alaska is too mountainous and glacier-ridden to furnish good bases. And the Aleutians would take too many men and too much money to defend.

You can say yes, but what if Russia establishes bases in these places? And the answer will be, so what? In the first place, it's only a couple of hours from Siberia to Anchorage by fast bomber, so there's no point other than psychological in seizing any of Alaska's outlying real estate. And in the second place, the military figures it could cut off, bomb, and generally harass any bases anybody would like to set up anywhere in Alaska.

What Lt. Gen. William E. Kepner, commander in chief of the Alaskan theater, obviously wants to avoid is the mistakes of World War II. Then, when we discovered Japanese troops on Kiska and Attu in the Aleutians, we rushed 150,000 troops to the Aleutians and sent tens of thousands more to back them up on the mainland. As a result, throughout the war, we had what amounted to 10 divisions tied up in a largely noncombat theater.

Today Alaska's role is that of a base from which fighter planes can intercept Russian bombers and, possibly, as a forward base for our own bombers. The primary job of the infantry here is to protect the airfields—like Elmendorf here in Anchorage, Ladd in Fairbanks, and Eielson base, 25 miles from Fairbanks, which has the world's longest runways—14,500 feet.

Military personnel in Alaska has increased since the start of the Korean War—but it still isn't even a small percentage of what Uncle Sam had up here during World War II. Air Force strength is greater if you count all the C-54 transport planes. Most planes, though, are F-80 and F-82 fighters. The F-82's are being replaced by all-weather F-84 jets, equipped with radar.

But if Uncle Sam has shortened his Alaskan defense line and pulled in his belt on troop strength, he has not done so casually. Life in the Alaskan theater is the nearest thing possible to being in a combat zone. General Kepner runs his show on the theory an attack could happen any time.

This means frequent week-end alerts—so frequent they are getting on GI nerves. During an alert, every man stays on his job around the clock. An alert usually lasts a couple of days. Troops grab their rifles and report to strategic spots along highways or commanding airfields—and eat there and sleep there until the alert is over.

Antiaircraft crews live with and sleep with their guns—home to them is a tarpaper shack 20 feet from battle position.

Every military man at Alaskan Command headquarters here—including General Kepner—must sleep out once a month. At Big Delta, near Fairbanks, selected groups of officers and men get specialized Arctic training, learning how to live and operate in temperatures of 40 and 50 below zero.

Alaska's radar net, on which work began last fall, won't be ready for another 2 years. Even then nobody claims the Territory will be safe from air attack—you couldn't build that kind of a radar screen without the United States going broke. It will make an attack more trouble for whoever tries it, force them to use more planes and fly more carefully.

But General Kepner wants no hand wringing about Alaska back in the States. He says he can hold his defense line, now, with the troops he has—and make it uncomfortable for the enemy to boot.

The way General Kepner sees it, "He who holds Alaska will have a lot to say about who is going to hold the world."

How Big?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 2, 1951:

How Big?

We hope the Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will pardon us if we don't quite understand its expressed desire to avoid a "big quarrel with the White House."

That is the excuse the committee members give for not asking Donald Dawson, White House aide, to speak his piece before the committee about charges of political influence on the RFC from White House circles.

Dawson was mentioned in a committee report and the President called the references asinine.

Then the committee opened new hearings to prove the President was wrong when he belittled the committee's work.

Someone in the White House called for copies of letters from members of Congress to the RFC.

The Senators on the committee pounded their desks and said they refused to be intimidated.

How big can a quarrel get?

FTC at the Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include as a part thereof an article appearing in the December 1950 issue of the Michigan Bar Journal, entitled "FTC at the Gates," by James F. Hoge, of New York. The editor of this journal stated in the introduction:

There probably is no lawyer in the United States more qualified to write about the Federal Trade Commission than Jim Hoge, of New York. He has participated in numerous FTC matters, one of which required 10 years and resulted in 80,000 man-miles of travel for counsel representing the firms involved and the Commission. To the average practitioner this article will be enlightening.

Mr. Speaker, in offering this comprehensive statement on the functioning of the Federal Trade Commission, may I point out to the membership of the House that I have known Mr. Hoge since our undergraduate days in the Wake Forest Law School of North Carolina. He was admitted to the North Carolina bar in 1922, and later associated himself with an outstanding law firm in New York. He is a member of the American, New York State, and New York City Bar Associations. In addition to serving on numerous committees, Mr. Hoge is chairman of the National Trade-Mark Coordinating Committee, and a member of the Lawyer's Advisory Committee, of the United States Trade-Mark Association. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the Members will find in this stimulating article much food for thought on the scope of the operations of the Federal Trade Commission:

FTC AT THE GATES
(By James F. Hoge)

The Federal Trade Commission is at the gates of business.[1] It was put there in 1914 by Woodrow Wilson, but it was put there to open the gates, not to close them. Mr. Wilson had a great deal to say about the Commission. It was a creation in which he took considerable pride. Here are a few, out of a great many, of his sayings:

"What we are proposing to do, therefore, is, happily, not to hamper or interfere with business * * * or in any sense to put it under the ban. The antagonism between business and Government is over." Alas; he said that in 1914.

"I have taken a long time, ladies and gentlemen, to select the Federal Trade Commission, because I wanted to choose men and be sure that I had chosen men who would be really serviceable to the businessmen of this country, great as well as small, the rank and the file.

"This country, above every country in the world, is meant to lift. * * * That is the reason the Federal Trade Commission was established, so that men would have some place where they could take counsel as to what the law was and what the law permitted, and also take counsel as to whether the law itself was right and advice had not better be taken as to its alteration." That one is of particular timeliness.

"The processes of counsel are only the processes of accommodation, not the processes of punishment. Punishment retards but it does not lift up. Punishment impedes but it does not improve. And so we ought to substitute for the harsh processes of the law, wherever we can, the milder and gentler and more helpful processes of counsel."

He also commented on the fact that this Commission had been endowed with greater powers than any other similar agency or commission, but he said that those powers were put upon it in order that it might the better inquire into the needs of business, that it might the better learn the whole business structure of the country.

INCREASED POWERS

These powers have been greatly enlarged since President Wilson spoke. From the concept, purposes, and explanations stated by him, the Commission gradually moved into a different field of operation, into one of policing, of enforcement, of punishment. In this field, prosecution is a necessary function and, where there is prosecution, adjudication is essential. There is an unfortunate and key circumstance in this, and that is that the Commission combines both the prosecuting and adjudicating functions. It investigates, it issues and serves the complaint, prosecutes and adjudicates.

The Federal Trade Commission Act was passed on September 26, 1914. Since those early days the act and the functions of the Commission have radically changed so that the scope of the Commission's adjudicating powers has been immeasurably extended and the effect of its orders made the more severe as they bare on the rights of respondents.

The Commission was empowered originally to prevent unfair methods of competition in commerce. In 1938 the Federal Trade Commission Act was amended in numerous important particulars. That was accomplished by the Wheeler-Lea Act. It gave the Commission enlarged and specific powers for regulating the advertisements of food, drugs, therapeutic devices and cosmetics, and made other significant amendments.

Section 5 was changed to include unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce, as well as unfair methods of competition. Before that amendment it was necessary to show that the act complained of was a method used in competition. That is not now necessary. There is no requirement to show that competition is involved at all. It is sufficient to allege that the act or practice is unfair or deceptive.

A provision was inserted in the act by which an order to cease and desist becomes final.[2] If a respondent against whom the order is directed does not appeal, or if having appealed, the required number of days have elapsed since the disposition of the appeal, the Commission's order then becomes final.

A provision was added whereby one who violates an order which has become final shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation. That worked a vast change in the effect of these orders. Formerly, an an order was unenforceable and of no practical effect unless and until the Commission itself applied to a circuit court of appeals to enforce it. And at that time the validity of the order was open to attack by the respondent. That is still true as to orders issued by the Commission under the Clayton Act.

The penalty provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were materially altered by the so-called Oleomargarine Act of 1950 (15 U. S. C. A. 45). Not only does this act add to the duties of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to regulating the sale of oleomargarine, but the penalty provision was amended to provide that each single day of a violation should constitute a separate violation on which the penalty of not more than $5,000 should apply. Thus was the sphere of the Commission's jurisdiction and the severity of the penalty for the violation of its orders increased.

FTC AND OTHER ACTS

Therefore, at this time—36 years since the passage of the Federal Trade Commission Act—the Commission has taken on quite a different complexion from that given it at the time of its establishment. The Clayton Act followed closely in time upon the Commission Act and authorized the Commission to enforce against the persons, partnerships, and corporations subject to its jurisdiction sections 2, 3, 7, and 8 of the Clayton Act.

Section 2 dealt with discrimination in price, services, or facilities, and was greatly enlarged by the amendment in 1936 known as the Robinson-Patman Act. Section 3 prohibits tying of exclusive leases, sales, or contracts. Section 7 prohibits acquisition by one corporation of the capital stock of other corporations where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition between the corporation whose stock is so acquired and the company making the acquisition. Section 8 prohibits interlocking directorates under conditions specified therein.

The Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 was passed in 1940 (15 U. S. C. A. 68). It regulates the labeling of wool products. The enforcement of it was placed with the Commission and numerous powers were provided for the Commission's employment in the enforcement of it.

The manufacturers and distributors of food, drugs, therapeutic devices, and cosmetics have an immediate and direct concern with the Commission in that the administration of the Wheeler-Lea Act respecting advertising is entrusted there. Those who advertise drugs and devices directly to the public collide more frequently with the Commission in this field, but the act also applies to advertisements which are restricted to the profession—rather curiously worded, but it is there—and no drug or device manufacturer or distributor can ignore the Commission's powers in this field.

All manufacturers that are not specifically exempt, are subject to the Commission's powers under the other sections of its act and under the Robinson-Patman Act and other parts of the antitrust law. This has been brought home forcibly by the recent Supreme Court decisions in the Cement,[3] Morton Salt,[4] Steel Conduit,[5] and other cases.

Since 1947, the Commission has been empowered to institute cancellation proceedings in the United States Patent Office against trade-marks and collective and certification marks on numerous grounds.[6]

Another field of activity was opened to the Commission when the Supreme Court held for the first time, and over 50 years after the passage of the Sherman Act, that interstate insurance business is subject to the

---

[1] Under the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U. S. C. A. 41), the Commission has jurisdiction over persons, partnerships, or corporations except banks, common carriers subject to the acts to regulate commerce, air carriers, and foreign air carriers subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. A. 401), and persons, partnerships, or corporations subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 (7 U. S. C. A. 181) except as provided in sec. 406 (b) of said act.

[2] This provision applies to orders to cease and desist issued under the Federal Trade Commission Act. It does not apply to such orders issued by the Commission under the Clayton Act.

[3] *F. T. C. v. The Cement Institute* (333 U. S. 683).

[4] *F. T. C. v. Morton Salt Company* (334 U. S. 37).

[5] *Triangle Conduit & Cable Co. v. F. T. C.* (168 F. (2d) 175; aff'd 336 U. S. 384).

[6] U. S. Trade-Mark Act of 1946, 15 U. S. C. A. 1064.

antitrust laws.[7] Congress followed with the passage of the Insurance Anti-Trust Moratorium Act to provide specifically that the Federal Trade Commission Act as we" as the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act is applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that it is not regulated by State law.[8]

COSTLY LITIGATION

A proceeding leading to a cease and desist order (or possibly a dismissal of the complaint) is a luxury that only the wealthy can afford. A small-business man or a small corporation cannot "stand the gaff" of one. The respondent must have unlimited resources in order to see one of them through. There is no means for peremptory termination of a case. One may make a motion before the Commission but if the Commission denies it, he has no appeal. And the courts will not entertain injunction or declaratory judgment actions.[9]

CASES ARE PREJUDGED

Under the provisions of section 5 of the act, the Commission to a large extent prejudges a case. If it has reason to believe that one has been using an unfair method of competition or an unfair or deceptive act or practice, it may file its complaint. In other words, the Commission does not file a complaint until it has reason to believe there is a violation. Thus, at that point and for that purpose, it has reached a conclusion as to a violation.

One of the former Commissioners explained this. In outlining the Commission procedure and practice for the George Washington Law Review, he noted that a complaint is issued only at the direction of the Commission and that motions with respect thereto are permitted, but that "as a practical matter, very few such motions are briefed and argued to the Commission, and a great majority of them are denied, without prejudice to the right of the respondent to renew them at the end of the proceeding. The Commission itself has passed upon the question of its jurisdiction in advance of ordering the issuance of a complaint and in most cases has fully considered the questions raised by the respondent in the motion."[10]

COMMISSION PROCEDURE

When a complaint is issued, an attorney on the Commission's staff is assigned to prosecute it and one of the Commission's trial examiners is assigned to take the evidence. The Commission first sees the evidence, if it sees it at all, when the trial is over. Under the rules of practice which became effective June 1, 1950, the trial examiner makes an initial decision which becomes the decision of the Commission unless an appeal is filed by any of the parties or unless the Commission upon its own initiative reviews the case. Such an appeal is presented in the form of a brief, designated "appeal brief," which sets forth the exceptions and grounds for appeal, and no matter not included in the brief may thereafter be presented to the Commission. Upon such an appeal, the Commission will consider only such parts of the record as are cited therein or which may be necessary to resolve the issues presented.

Under this procedure the Commission itself becomes an appellate tribunal. And, as with such tribunals, whether the Commission sees the evidence on appeal by the parties or on its own motion, it sees it in transcript. That m y be a few hundred pages or, as in the Cement case, 50,000 pages, and 50,000 pages of exhibits.

In addition to the evidence, all the proceedings by way of motions and appeals from examiners' rulings must be reduced to writing and filed in multiple copies. It is humanly impossible for the Commission to read such a record, so it has to rely on assistants and advisers.

So here the ultimate authority, the Commission—the judge—does not see the witnesses; does not pass upon the qualifications before the evidence goes into the record; does not observe the demeanor of witnesses which in court is so important.

This is an assembly-line method of trying cases. It is a trial by organization. A respondent finds himself opposed to an organized mechanism where wheels within wheels grind out what has been called by one of the law writers "an institutional decision."[11]

Herein arises that "expertness" which the advocates of administrative law are prone to assert. The "expertness," if any, is not necessarily in the person of the Commissioners. Tenures of office may vary greatly in time and there may be periods of considerable turnover in the Commission's membership. Likewise, there is no reason for supposing that Commissioners become expert in the wide field of commodities and businesses affected by their act.

James M. Landis, who served a period as a Commissioner, put it this way: "To assume that any 5, 10, or 20 men have the ability to acquire, within their brief official lifetime, the expertness to comprehend the full range of our industrial problems, from aluminum to zinc, is once more to put our trust in supermen. In the business of governing a nation—to paraphrase Gerard Henderson again—we must take into account the fact that government will be operated by men of average talent and average ability and we must therefore devise our administrative processes with that in mind."[12]

What expertness exists in a commission is usually to be found in the staff. It frequently is related to the adjudicating process but anonymously and without responsibility for the decision.

The exercise of expertness and the doing of justice are not always synonymous. Frequently the contrary is the case. Sometimes there is more difficulty in arguing before alleged experts than before ordinary courts which must learn of the case from statements of counsel, from evidence, and from briefs. The expert, so often, has preconceived opinions.

APPEALS FROM COMMISSION

Finally, as to this process, on appeal from such institutional decisions, the law provides that the findings of the Commission as to the facts, "if supported by evidence,[13] shall be conclusive." That is about the same as saying there is no appeal. If there is a legal point, if capriciousness can be shown, if arbitrariness can be demonstrated, then the courts may interfere. But the courts accept this language of the act as forbidding them to review the record to determine where the weight of the evidence lies.

In the Steel Conduit case the circuit court of appeals said:

"In this state of the record it will be enough to say that Congress has left to the Commission the determination of the facts, *Federal Trade Commission* v. *A. E. Staley Mfg. Co.* (324 U. S. 746); * * * and the weight to be attributed to the facts proved and the inferences to be drawn from them" (p. 180).

In addition to this, the Supreme Court said in the Morton Salt case that it was enough to support the Commission's findings of injury to competition if there was a "reasonable possibility" that competition might be adversely affected.

Generally, in this state of the law, it would seem to be a waste of time to appeal. The Commission has, therefore, in effect become an administrative agency that can do about as it pleases in proceedings against business people without any real relief being available in the courts.

This situation represents a gradual development over the years since the Commission was created. It has come by statutory enactment, judicial interpretation and the burgeoning of administrative processes in Government. The fundamental evil is in the combination of the prosecuting and adjudicating functions. That is the root of the vine. It is axiomatic that one should not be judge in his own cause. That has been so stated for at least 2,000 years. As long ago as 300 years, Pascal put it in these words:

"It is not permitted to the most equitable of men to be a judge in his own cause."

Two approaches have been made toward tempering or overcoming this combination of prosecuting and adjudicating functions under the Federal Trade Commission Act. No move has been made with respect to the situation under the Clayton Act. The first was the Reece bill, H. R. 2390, introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It proposed an amendment to the Commission Act whereby, on appeal, the appellate court might review the record to determine whether the findings of fact by the Commission were supported by the weight of the evidence.

THE O'HARA BILL

The other approach is the O'Hara bill, first introduced in the Eightieth Congress, H. R. 3871, and again in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 1819, reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1948. It proposes that the Federal Trade Commission file and try its cases in the courts according to the rules of civil procedure. It says simply that in cases under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act the Commission ought hereafter be the investigator, the complainant, and the prosecutor, and that the regularly constituted courts of the land should be the adjudicators.

For a conclusion recall some of the words of Wilson quoted at the outset to the effect that antagonism between business and Government should cease, and that "this country, above every country in the world, is meant to lift." That, remember, was the basic reason for the creation of the Commission—that business might be aided in making its full contribution toward enabling this Nation to "lift."

If that was the important and primary function for which the Commission was created in 1914, then its performance of that function is many times more important in 1951, for the Nation is engaged in a fierce struggle ("hot" and "cold") on a worldwide front, and the issue of the struggle is the Nation's ability to see it through.

PEOPLE ARE BUSINESS

Business, in the final analysis, is not a thing apart; it is the people. Industries are owned by the people. Every one of the 50,000,000 Americans who has a savings account, each of the 54,000,000 who has a life-insurance policy, and each of the 14,000,000 who has a share of stock or an industrial bond owns directly or indirectly a part of American industry. And approximately 85 cents out of every dollar of sales by manufacturers go for salaries and wages. It will not do to separate big business and little business; little businesses become big and big businesses sometimes become little.

If the issue of the world struggle today is this Nation's ability to see it through, then the need is production—more business, not less; more invention, research, exploration, expansion, discovery and development of known and unknown resources here and in other parts of the world. And if the road is to be kept open for the achievement of those aims, it is now more than ever important that the Federal Trade Commission should be, and conceive itself to be, an agency really serviceable to the businessmen of this country, great as well as small, the rank and file.

It is unfortunate that through the years the processes of the Commission have become more and more the processes of policing and punishment, and less and less those of advice and counsel. It is true that this trend has been accelerated by successive legislative enactments conferring increased punitive powers. But the Commission still can, if it will, take stock of the purposes for which it was created and devote a greater portion of its energies toward their accomplishment. It can and should recognize that it can best serve businessmen and the Nation by smoothing the road of business and marking its boundaries rather than by setting up road blocks in the form of expensive and long drawn out administrative proceedings; by erecting signposts which all can read and supplying directions to those seeking a safe course, instead of playing the role of traffic cop lying in wait for the unwary who may go astray while groping his way through the maze of statutory do's and don't's.

The gates of business are the gates of freemen, and the Federal Trade Commission is one of the principal keepers of those gates. The hope of mankind is that this Nation and those who guide its destinies remember now its own founding hopes and its traditions and its faiths, to the end that the dynamic energy of freemen, the greatest power in the world, may be released as never before, and its great gates be thrown wide.

---

[7] *U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Assn.* (322 U. S. 533 (1943)).

[8] 15 U. S. C. A. 1011–1015.

[9] *Miles Laboratories* v. *Federal Trade Commission* ((C. A. D. C.), 140 F. (2d), 683; cert. den. 323 U. S. 752).

[10] Federal Trade Commission Procedure and Practice, Robert E. Freer, the George Washington Law Review, January–February 1949, vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 316, 323.

[11] Institutional Administrative Decisions by Prof. Kenneth Culp Davis, Columbia Law Review, March 1948.

[12] Administrative Process, 1938, p. 87.

[13] The courts have construed this—and the Administrative Procedure Act has defined it—to mean "substantial evidence" but at best it means little more than that there be some evidence; that there be more than a scintilla.

How Europe Feels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of March 4, 1951:

HOW EUROPE FEELS

Paul-Henri Spaak, the distinguished Belgian statesman who heads the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, has effectively summed up the European reaction to our great debate on the issue of sending American troops overseas to become part of the Atlantic Pact Army under General Eisenhower. Wholly apart from the many things that can be said against the essentially defeatist do-it-by-air proposals of Senator TAFT, former President Hoover and others of like mind, Mr. Spaak's views—as expressed the other night in New York—deserve careful attention in this country as a measure of how our allies abroad feel in terms of what is vital to them as well as to us. His words on the subject are worth extensive quotation:

What is the great fear of Europe? That America might refuse to declare war if Europe is attacked by Russia? No. The great fear is that the United States will decide that to defend Europe on the ground is impossible, that the United States will accept the idea that Europe must inevitably fall to the Russian conquerors in the first phase of war, and eventually be delivered by the victorious Americans after 2 years, 3 years, 10 years of occupation.

But I ask you: "What would be left of Europe after years of Soviet occupation?"

What we hope in Europe is that the United States will reject this fatalistic conception and that, from the very beginning of a war, they will be with us, with all their strength and with the precise objective of preventing the conquest of Europe.

There is for Europe only one hypothesis on which the chance of victory is great: It is that aid from America is given from the very beginning and completely; that the United States will engage itself without limit.

Is it not now the time—now or never—to repeat the immortal sentence that you have placed in stone on one of the most beautiful of your monuments?

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end do our duty as we understand it."

Defeatism at this stage is surely as unwarranted as it was before Pearl Harbor. In fact, in some ways—especially in view of the actual and potential might of America and the rest of the free world—it seems far more unreasoning now than it was then. The future of Western Europe is of vast importance to our own future. We simply cannot afford to write it off—even temporarily. Mr. Spaak has spoken timely words on that score.

One Big Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 4, 1951:

ONE BIG INVESTIGATION

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation mess says that the record may show the need for a "general investigation of the moral level of the Government."

We are glad to see an important Member of the Senate coming around to our way of thinking because he is in a position to do something about it.

We said in this column on Lincoln's Birthday that our Government has fallen far from the standards of integrity which prevailed in the days of Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, and the other great leaders of the past.

The "Washington fix," influence peddled for dollars or votes, the fast dollar, government by crony, officials on the open market for a price, are the standards now.

Let's have that one big investigation to see just how low the moral level of the Government has dropped.

United States Suspends Tin Purchases for Stockpile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post this morning I read an interesting article on the subject of the tin stockpile. The article, which is to be inserted below, points out that because of the present reserves of tin it is possible to refuse to buy tin on the foreign market at the exorbitant prices now demanded.

In my remarks of yesterday, I reminded the Congress of the legislation which continued the operation of the Government's tin smelter for 5 years beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1951. Had the opponents of that legislation been successful, the Government smelter would not be in the process of shutting down and going out of business and the United States would be at the mercy of foreign producers who are demonstrating their desire to gouge us.

Attention of all Members of Congress is invited to the article which follows:

UNITED STATES SUSPENDS TIN PURCHASES FOR STOCKPILE

The Government last night announced the sudden stop of tin purchases for the stockpile, implying that the present price of the imported metal was not at a "reasonable level."

The announcement, made by General Services Administrator Jess Larson, also declared that Government purchases of tin for industrial use would be held to the "barest minimum."

This policy will continue, he said, until tin prices reach reasonable figures.

Meantime, from other sources, there were intimations of "drastic changes" in the Government's thinking on the stockpiling of other nonferrous metals. Details were unknown, but it appeared that the trend was toward much reduced purchases for stockpiling of copper, lead, and zinc.

As in the tin situation, high prices of foreign exporters are believed to be a factor. But also an element, it is believed, is the problem of scarce supplies for the whole world, particularly Britain and other European countries beginning heavy, metal consuming rearmament programs.

The cessation of tin stockpiling followed swiftly the Senate Preparedness Committee's demand for such action on grounds this country's allies are gouging the United States on tin prices.

The committee said there is more tin in the United States than at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack, and asserted that this country is no longer in a position where we must buy tin at any price.

A Bureau of Mines official said the slash in buying might put producers in a difficult position.

But he estimated that supplies now in the United States, apart from those in the reserve, would be enough to meet needs for 2 years if tin use is cut to rock bottom.

This appeared to indicate that drastic new Government controls on use of tin may be

forthcoming. The Government previously ordered a 20-percent cut in civilian use of tin in February and March. Use of new tin was forbidden where secondary tin could be used.

Communism's Threat Within the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at Greer, S. C., March 6, 1951, before the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Lions Club:

COMMUNISM'S THREAT WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Ladies and gentlemen of Greer, again I consider myself extremely fortunate in being thus permitted to speak on this significant occasion during these perilous times. It is my purpose to speak to you somewhat in detail on the aspects of the spread of communism within the borders of our own great country.

By way of introduction, may I call your attention to the fact that more than 30 years ago, the father of the Russian revolution, Lenin himself, warned of the very events which are now coming to pass. Said Lenin:—

"We live not only in a state, but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic next to a number of imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either the one or the other will have the better of it. Until that end comes, a series of most terrible conflicts between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

These words can scarcely be misunderstood. The conflict predicted so positively by Lenin is inevitable not because of any refusal on our part to live and let live, but because communism cannot tolerate the existence of freemen anywhere; thus the Russian jail-keepers constantly seek the destruction of free nations everywhere. In recognizing the inevitability of conflict with Communist Russia we engage in no childish or neurotic flights into fear. Rather is our own purpose sharpened, our course of duty made clear.

I am not here to tell you that the Kremlin is working overtime to achieve our downfall. We all know that. I want rather to discuss with you the internal threat which communism poses—to our Christian morality, to our Constitution and liberty, to our national defense, and to our economic system.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO CHRISTIAN MORALITY

To begin with, communism repudiates everything we hold dear in Christian morality. At the outset, the Communist view of man is totally opposed to our own. They believe that everything in life is determined and shaped by economic arrangements—the means of production and the owners of those means. What this comes down to, is that the Communist seems to believe "man is what he eats." We know that the individual human being, while influenced by the material world around him, is not a slave to it; that every man, having within him a spiritual self, is free to live greatly or fall ignobly. To us, the individual is a gem worth saving; to the Communist, only a pawn to be used. Therein lies a basic conflict between communism and Christian society.

Communism asserts that it can solve all the troubles of mankind simply by eliminating economic sin or class exploitation. So it proposes to take us on a joy-ride through dictatorship and socialism to a classless society in the great beyond. But we are not fooled by either the diagnosis or the cure. As Paul told the Ephesians, we struggle as much against spiritual wickedness as against economic sin; and we know, furthermore, that you don't produce freemen by means of dictatorship. Did you ever hear of T-bone steaks coming out of a meat grinder?

As you might well expect, there is no place for a God in Communist materialism. It makes my Baptist blood boil when I read Lenin's repudiation of all God-given morality. "In what sense do we repudiate ethics and morality?" this Communist big-leaguer asks. Hear his reply:

"In the sense that they were preached by the bourgeoisie, who declared that ethics were God's commandments. We, of course, say that we do not believe in God, and that we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landlords, and the bourgeoisie spoke in the name of God in order to pursue their own exploiters' interests. Or, instead of deducing these ethics from the commandments of morality, from the commandments of God, they deduced them from idealistic or semi-idealistic phrases, which were always very similar to God's commandments. * * * We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat."

Note well the results of this so-called proletarian morality; the precept that the end justifies the means, the Hitler-Stalin pact, the illegal, secretive party programs, the false names, the special Communist language with double meanings (which the Communists themselves call "Aesopian").

We must make no mistake about it. Communism poses a direct threat to our whole fabric of Christian belief as to man, God, and right and wrong.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO OUR CONSTITUTION AND LIBERTY

The second target at which communism points a dagger is our Constitution and liberty. You know, the Communist is a lot like that little lizard which can change its colors; he may be a striker, an agitator, a spy, a traitor, a saboteur, a revolutionist, or very often, just a worm. You know how easily a couple of worms can spoil a few apples in the bottom of a barrel, which in turn spoil all the rest. That is just what happens when a handful of Communists succeed in taking over an organization—they are then able to control and spoil many other organizations and fronts.

That was the sort of thing J. Edgar Hoover had in mind a year ago when he said not to be fooled by the seemingly small 55,000 membership of the American Communist Party. Many of those 55,000 are strategically placed and devoted solely to the advancement of Communist aims. With them are 500,000 fellow travelers. Let us never forget that the Communists didn't have to throw bombs to take over Czechoslovakia; they did it by infiltrating strategic government offices—the police, the army and the courts.

I don't need to quote from the Un-American Activities Committee to tell you what the Communists are up to. Here is what the Manual of the Communist Party itself states:

"As the leader and organizer of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the United States of America leads the working class in the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of a Socialist Soviet Republic in the United States, for the complete abolition of classes, for the establishment of socialism, the first stage of the classless Communist society."

And in case that isn't clear enough, the Manual at another place says, "We do not question the theory of the necessity for the forceful overthrow of capitalism."

In their own words, then, Communists are a threat to our Constitution. That great charter of liberty provides the means for peaceful change of government. Any organization which repudiates those means and advocates force and violence instead is an enemy of the Constitution and is not a political party. It is an insult to our great Republican and Democratic Parties to put them in the same class as the Communist. The Communist Party, as an advocate of force and violence, is a revolutionary faction having no claim to any rights in our system. In order to have the laws explicitly recognize this, I have introduced a bill to outlaw the Communist Party, the same being designated on the House Calendar as H. R. 1037.

We must inquire beyond the immediate plans of the Communists and into their ultimate intentions should they ever succeed in overthrowing our Government. First off, they would establish what they call the dictatorship of the proletariat—which in plainer terms means dictatorship by the Communist Party over everyone else, workers and businessmen and farmers. Stalin has admitted that the dictatorship cannot be a complete democracy, for it will be based on the limitation of the rights of the former capitalists and directed against these capitalists. It is rule unrestricted by law. That strikes me particularly hard, as a lawyer, for I think it is plain to everyone that laws are a guaranty of freedom. When you take away legal restraints on a ruler's powers you have a Hitler or a Stalin. And you can't get rid of him.

Let us take one example of what the Communists would do when in power. Their president, William Z. Foster, tells that under the dictatorship all the capitalist parties, "Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc., will be liquidated, the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses. Likewise will be dissolved all other organizations that are political props of the bourgeois rule, including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, Rotary Clubs, American Legion, YMCA, and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, etc."

Ladies and gentlemen, he's talking about us, you and me. I belong to several of the organizations that Foster says will be abolished. We know they are not kidding about these intentions, either. On the 7th of February it was reported that the Salvation Army had been liquidated by the Communist government in the Baltic States. These boys mean business—dirty business—the wiping out of all voluntary groups.

So without even going on to discuss the absence of freedom of speech and other freedoms under Communist rule, I think you can appreciate the dire threat which American Communists pose to our Constitution and liberty.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

That threat is primarily a future danger. Let us now turn for a moment to a Communist threat which is clear and present—the threat to our national defense. The parade of confessions, convictions, and exposés in the last 3 years tell as grim a tale of espionage, sabotage, and treason as any fiction writer could ever dream up. One chapter was related during the trial of the 11 Communist leaders before Judge Medina by one of the FBI "plants" in the Communist Party. In 1945, Mr. Al Lannon, director of the Communist Party in Maryland, said that "The party would have to adopt a policy of sabotage not only for war industries but for every other industry. This would demoralize the population to the extent that they could not adequately support a war." Another undercover agent reported a statement by George Siskind, the party's education director. In December 1945 Siskind told members to get ready for the day when they would have to foment slow-down and strikes and throw bombs in machinery. Can there be any doubt that the Communist Party is a school for spies and saboteurs?

It is difficult to estimate how much damage has been done to our national defense by the invaluable information given to Russia by Communists in our atomic plants and Government offices. First there were the Canadian spies, then Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon, Klaus Fuchs, Harry Gold, David Greenglass, Sidney Weinbaum, Brothman and Moskowitz, and now William Remington.

And beyond espionage there is the serious matter of loyalty in wartime. William Foster has publicly announced that in the event of a war with Russia, the American Communists would "cooperate with all democratic forces to defeat the predatory war aims of American imperialism and bring such a war to a speedy conclusion on the basis of a democratic peace." These are the seeds of treason.

I am certain we must steel ourselves to the realities of the future. If war with Soviet Russia breaks out, we will see a fifth column that had no equal in World War II, here or in any other country. And right now, today, espionage is a clear and present danger to our security.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO THE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

The fourth and perhaps the most obvious threat of communism is the threat to our economic system of private enterprise. While they try to hide many things, the Communists have never hidden their desire to socialize the economy of the United States. They said, in their 1945 postwar program:

"We shall aim to convince the broad masses that the eventual elimination of the profit system and the establishment of socialism in the United States will usher in a new and higher type of democracy and a free road to unlimited and stable social progress because it will end exploitation of man by man and nation by nation, through the establishment of a society without oppression and exploitation."

The Communists' favorite sport is to sell the workingman a bill of goods to the effect that he is exploited by predatory capitalists. The only difficulty is that the Commies have a tough time getting our workers to come away from their TV sets long enough to listen. Even when they do get someone to listen, convincing a man who owns an automatic washer, an automobile, a telephone and refrigerator that he is exploited is rather hard to do, to say the least. But sometimes they do succeed in getting people to swallow their poison. They hold the promise of bread in exchange for a man's freedom—and the joke about it is that bread is all they give in return. Those who have gone to Russia as admirers of communism have returned again, disgusted by the universal poverty of the working people, the inequalities, the suffering. They have bread all right—three times a day with thin soup. Yes, communism has enriched some, to be sure—the party bigshots. The poor were never poorer under the Czar.

Why do we want to preserve this economic system of ours, where the bulk of decisions are made by private persons rather than government boards? Because we know that American capitalism has produced the highest standards of living, with the widest distribution of benefits, of any economic system in the history of the world. And the Communists would scrap private enterprise capitalism for the dead hand of socialism. We will neither buy their bill of goods nor be oblivious to their threat. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us recognize communism for what it is—a cancer in our lives eating away at our vitals. It would corrode our moral foundation, overthrow the Constitution, and take away our liberty. It would substitute socialism for free enterprise. And today, right now, Communist spies, saboteurs, and traitors are selling us down the river by doing all in their power to weaken our defense efforts.

Two thousand years ago the Apostle Peter, in his second epistle, gave a warning that I think applies to Communists in our own day. He spoke of the ungodly.

"But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness and despise government. Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities. * * * These, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption; and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, as they that count it pleasure to riot in the day time. * * * While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage.

"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."

I exhort you to recognize the menace of communism and to take action in the American way to preserve the American way.

One Hundred Years of Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the one hundredth anniversary of the first real effort on the part of Congress to build a civil service. It was on March 7, 1851, that Congress passed a resolution requesting President Fillmore and his Cabinet to formulate some plan to classify Government employees, apportion their salaries according to their service, provide a fair and impartial examination for appointment, and to set classification standards for promotion purposes.

A report issued by the Cabinet was concurred in by all except Daniel Webster, Secretary of State, who wanted a higher standard set for his Department than for others. In March 1853, the Congress enacted legislation based on this report of the President and his Cabinet. This act, and a similar one passed in 1855, established a salary for four grades or classes of clerks in the executive department and set up a system of "pass" examinations. These "pass" examinations were the basis of the competitive examinations established in 1872. In practice they proved ineffectual in that the department heads preferred to make political rather than merit appointments.

President Lincoln recognized the faults of the spoils system and stated at one time that:

I feel like a man so busy letting rooms at one end of the house that he has no time left to put out the fire that is blazing and destroying at the other end.

He truly was so busy "putting out the fire" that he had little time to build the civil-service system in which he believed.

The next step in the history of our attaining a good permanent civil service was made by Representative Thomas Jenckes, of Rhode Island, who in 1868 made a report to the House of Representatives that was a remarkable piece of research containing testimony of many public officials and comparisons of the civil-service systems of other countries. This report served as the basis for much of the discussion on the matter in the following years, and, in fact, was responsible for much of what was contained in the Civil Service Act of 1883.

A rider attached to an appropriation bill in 1871 authorized President Grant to prescribe regulations for the admission of persons into the civil service. The President issued several rules and regulations and Executive orders covering the personnel of the executive service under this authorization. He established a seven-man Board in 1871, known as the Advisory Board of the Civil Service. The Board existed for only a few years because Congress failed to make any appropriations for it after 1874.

It is one of the ironies of our history that the assassination of a President was the final factor in causing the Congress to establish a permanent civil-service system. When a disappointed office seeker assassinated President Garfield, the country and the Congress became convinced of the needs of a permanent civil service. The Congress then enacted the Pendleton Act, the Civil Service Act of 1883. This is still the basic statute upon which our civil-service system rests. It has been supplemented by a set of civil-service rules and regulations, by Veterans' Preference Acts of 1919 and 1944, by the Classification Act of 1923 and 1949, by the Retirement Act of 1948, and by other important statutes, Executive orders, and reorganization plans.

This hundredth anniversary of the first congressional legislation on civil service is a historic occasion. That joint resolution was truly one of the basic laws of this Nation. Under it the civil service has grown and become more efficient. A faithful and loyal civil service has been established and maintained.

We should always remember the many loyal men and women throughout the country who under civil service have worked anonymously at their tasks to build the greatest Government in the world. They are the ones who have made it possible for the Nation to carry on and prosper. They are the ones who have put into action the laws which this Congress made. They are the ones who have made the policies of this country both on domestic and foreign issues respected.

We must not forget them nor ignore them. Too often they have been ridiculed by the press and the public as lazy and inefficient. But we should remember on this one hundredth anniversary that the greatest Government serving the most productive Nation and the freest and happiest people in the world could not have been conducted by a civil service of second-rate people.

If we are to continue to maintain an efficient civil service and create a desire among young people to enter Government work we must treat them fairly. We must realize that they constitute the motive power of this Government. We must face our responsibility to them and bring the cost of living down to where they can live or their income up to where they can buy.

The first hundred years has seen the tremendous growth of civil service. As we enter the next hundred years world leadership has been thrust upon us. To discharge our great responsibility we of the Congress must rise to the responsibility of our part in maintaining and increasing the effectiveness of this loyal civil service.

Price and Wage Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the economic report submitted to the executive board of the Essex-West Hudson CIO Council by Mr. Joel R. Jacobson, executive secretary. At this time when the grave wage-price situation is of concern to all of us, I believe this statement is well worth reading and is deserving of careful consideration. From the information contained in this report it is readily apparent why the labor organization is concerned with the attempt to stabilize wages while prices and profits continue to zoom upward to new heights.

The report follows:

Perhaps one of the most important internal problems affecting the American people today is the question of stabilization. Government officials daily are wrestling with this issue and it must be admitted by all objective students that even the preliminary issue of the wisdom of over-all stabilization at this juncture is still an item to be questioned.

In particular, wage earners are specifically concerned with the persistent agitation to control their earnings at a time when living costs and corporation profits are establishing new records almost hourly. Wage earners have learned from bitter experience that stabilization all too often turns out to be wage stabilization and nothing else.

One thing is certain. There is no justice in any system of stabilization which freezes wages but permits price-gouging and profiteering to run rampent throughout our economy.

The words "price-gouging" and "profiteering," however, are not just propaganda bolts shot indiscriminately into the dark. To the contrary, much evidence is on the books to substantiate the CIO's charges that such conditions not only exist but, in fact, flourish right in our own back yard.

In order to high light this problem on a local level, the Essex-West Hudson CIO Council has prepared this report to compare the rates of profit and wage increases since the end of the war in 10 of the largest corporations in the Essex-West Hudson area, with whom CIO local unions have collective bargaining agreements. Before analyzing the figures, however, it is important to realize certain basic facts concerning the report.

The figures used for corporation profits are net profits, after taxes. The figures used for wages are gross wages, before taxes. Since economists have popularized usage of these figures on two different levels, we will comply for purposes of simplification. But it is obvious that the disparity between profits and wages is actually much greater than is depicted herein.

TABLE No. 1.—*Since 1945—Percent increase in profits over wages*

Corporation	1945 profits	1949 profits	Percent increase in profits	Percent increase in wages since 1945
Ronson	$598,409	$5,417,173	822	41
Koppers	3,241,784	11,615,498	205	46
Swift	12,203,807	25,826,129	109	39
Lionel	199,070	[1] 1,650,322	730	48
General Motors	188,370,919	656,526,969	249	31
Westinghouse	26,800,767	67,203,555	150	48
Worthington Pump	2,274,317	5,357,054	135	38
Congoleum-Nairn	1,617,214	3,782,516	134	53
Celanese	7,613,490	20,640,836	171	44
United States Steel	58,015,056	165,908,529	185	53
Average increase			289	44

[1] 1950 figures available.

TABLE No. 2.—*Since 1945—Percent increase in profits over sales*

Corporation	Percent increase in profits	1945 sales	1949 sales	Percent increase in sales since 1945
Ronson	822	$7,579,696	$32,128,076	337
Koppers	205	121,449,052	212,397,177	75
Swift	109	1,307,681,681	2,213,160,242	77
Lionel	730	6,424,409	15,260,777	137
General Motors	249	3,127,934,858	5,700,835,141	82
Westinghouse	150	664,730,060	945,699,382	38
Worthington Pump	135	93,994,066	88,843,553	−5
Congoleum-Nairn	134	32,319,003	43,062,762	33
Celanese	171	104,197,237	171,292,605	65
United States Steel	185	1,740,464,055	2,293,357,296	32
Average increase	289			87

TABLE No. 3.—*Since 1945—Comparison of percent increase in profits, sales, and wages*

Corporation	Percent increase in profits	Percent increase in sales	Percent increase in wages
Ronson	822	337	41
Koppers	205	75	46
Swift	109	77	39
Lionel	730	137	48
General Motors	249	82	31
Westinghouse	150	38	48
Worthington Pump	135	−5	38
Congoleum-Nairn	134	33	53
Celanese	171	64	44
United States Steel	185	32	53
Average	289	87	44

All figures on profits and sales are taken from Moody's and Standard & Poor's financial manuals.

In summary, the report amply demonstrates the following:

1. Since the end of the war, net profits, after taxes, for 10 of the largest corporations in the Essex-West Hudson area with whom CIO local unions have collective-bargaining agreements have increased an average of 289 percent, while wages earned by the workers employed by these same corporations have risen only 44 percent.

2. While the profits for these 10 corporations, since the end of the war, have increased 289 percent their gross sales revenue has increased only 87 percent. In view of the fact that management has been universally deploring its increased costs of operation—citing such factors as increased material, labor, and tax costs—it is now obvious that the higher rate of profits is reflected only because these 10 corporations have indulged themselves in a not inconsiderable amount of price gouging and profiteering.

It is very difficult to understand, for instance, how the Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp. could sustain a 5-percent drop in gross sales revenue from 1945 to 1949 yet, simultaneously, enjoy a 135-percent increase in profits during the same period of time.

3. In its proper light, industry's rather persistent claim that labor is responsible for increased prices and the high cost of living now appears as ridiculous as it actually is. Management has continually increased prices far above the commensurate percentage increase in costs caused by the wage boost. Even if we assume that prices must be raised because of wage increases—a false assumption as this report obviously demonstrates—it is apparent that management has used every conceivable opportunity to blame its workers for industry's profiteering schemes.

4. Workers' wages have been left far behind by prices and profits in the current economic race. In terms of purchasing power, a worker today has made no gains whatsoever during the past 5 years.

5. The future prospects for wage earners are gloomy. While the cost of living continues to zoom upward, wages are being frozen and workers are being forced to accept a completely disproportionate burden in the current emergency.

6. The future prospects for corporations were never better. Profits earned and dividends paid by United States corporations in 1950 have broken every record in the financial history of the country. From every indication, 1951 will be still another record-breaking year.

While this report is confined to a local level, it is a reasonably safe estimate that the figures contained herein are typical of the national scene. The following conclusions, therefore, must be reached:

1. A continuation of the freeze on wages, until glaring inequities pointed out herein have been eliminated, is an undue hardship upon all wage earners and will cause a serious dislocation in our national economy.

2. Because price-gouging and profiteering have been standard operational procedures since the end of the OPA, rigid price controls and a stiff excess-profits tax must be levied immediately if we are to put an end to our inflationary spiral.

3. There will be no equality of sacrifice if workers alone are asked to tighten their belts and sacrifice, while corporations enjoy the luxury of profits and business as usual.

Moral Training of Our Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Latrobe (Pa.) Bulletin. This editorial is timely. One of the great problems confronting the Nation is the moral standards of its people. This editorial

gives an insight into what is needed in our education system—moral training of our children. It follows:

Citing the increase of mental maladjustment and increase in divorce, suicide, and crime rates, Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, head of New York State University, reaches the conclusion that American education and home training are failing. He calls for a reexamination of the Nation's entire school system.

This is an old and frequently enunciated theme—that the schools and the homes are responsible for moral decline in America. Some blame what they assert they see on the politicians, but that seems a trifle far fetched. After all, the politicians simply reflect the voters of America.

How is the moral regeneration of America to be effected through the schools and the homes? No one ever says exactly. The schools and the homes turn out a certain product, generation after generation.

In the early days of the Republic it was one kind of product. At the turn of the century, before all the gadgets were invented and the high standard of living captured the fancy as the first of all considerations, there was a slightly different product.

Now the homes and the schools are turning out a product that is described as the end result of years of subscription to materialism—or the high standard of living—and some observers don't like what they see.

The way to dilute materialism is to introduce cultural and spiritual factors, make them seem more desirable than a high standard of living alone, comfortable and inviting as that is.

Perhaps the teachers can start such a trend in the schools and homes will fall into line. But, as the teachers are themselves members of this materialistic generation, it is possible that they will grope in vain for the starter button. But it is important that we keep trying.

No More Third Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Bordentown Register of March 2, 1951, a weekly newspaper that is published in my district. I think the editorial provides excellent food for the thoughtful consideration of all Members of Congress.

NO MORE THIRD TERMS

So now there will be no more third-term Presidents in the United States. This may be a very wise move and it may be a very foolish one. It always seems foolish to us to tie our hands with laws, when none are needed.

Until Franklin D. Roosevelt became President no other Chief Executive was ever in danger of being elected for a third term. Most of the Republican Presidents in the last 50 years have been fortunate to survive one term let alone three. Considering the terrific strain of the Chief Executive's job, most Presidents are glad to surrender their chains at the end of 8 years, if death has not claimed them before that.

Until recently New Jersey had a law limiting the Governor's stay to one term. Many times we had good Governors who could have done excellent work for the people of New Jersey had they been allowed two or three terms to promote their programs. Under the new constitution that has been changed so that a Governor can serve at least two terms.

Strong men make good executives whether they serve one, two, three, or four terms. When a strong man is not permitted to serve in an executive position he will serve behind the scenes for an indefinite period of time. We prefer him where we can see him in action.

The same principle applies to the matter of a law requiring Congress to O. K. the sending of armed forces outside the country in peacetime. The world we live in is an ever-changing one. Where once the oceans were our bulwarks today they are no more than rivers. What happens in Korea, or Tibet, or even in Iran is of vital importance to America, because it foretells a trend of which we must take notice.

Prohibition was one of those laws which seemed reasonable, but was not so good. We never know just how these laws will work until after we get them in action. Afterward it takes a long time to get rid of them. At the present time the no-third-term seems innocent since we doubt if Harry Truman would want a third term, let alone get one. But will we regret it sometime hence?

Why I Voted To Liquidate the RFC Back in 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1947, Congress had before it a bill to extend the life of the RFC. At that time I opposed that extension.

Recent disclosures about the RFC constrain me to renew my efforts to liquidate this agency, which has long outlived its usefulness.

Members sincerely concerned about the RFC breakdown of integrity and its effect on public confidence may find my analysis 4 years ago helpful.

Here it is from volume 93, part 6, page 7623, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, the RFC was created in 1932 when private credit facilities of the country were close to temporary paralysis. Its operations served to bridge the gap caused by that paralysis and to help restore private credit agencies to normal operation. In that emergency period the RFC served a critical and useful economic function.

However, in the final analysis the true test of whether or not that experiment in Government credit was successful will be determined by the ability of Congress to eliminate this instrument of state capitalism at the appropriate time.

It is my conviction that the appropriate time for the withdrawal of the RFC from the lending field has arrived. Bank deposits and currency outstanding in America as of April 30, 1947, approximated $165,000,000,000. This is not far from the highest amount of cash and credit available in our history. This cash and credit should furnish an adequate reservoir of capital for all justifiable private credit purposes.

If that is so active, continuation of the RFC will almost certainly result in Government competition with private credit facilities for the loaning of funds.

The impression has been created that this bill represents a rigid contraction of RFC lending and investment activities. Compared with the unlimited grants of power given the RFC during the war, that statement is correct. Compared with the prewar peacetime operation of the RFC, the statement seems somewhat overdrawn.

On December 31, 1933, the year end following the crisis in industry and finance, the RFC had loans outstanding of $1,719,602,000. This bill provides the RFC with $2,000,000,000 of loaning power, or more than the RFC was using at the end of 1933, when we were still in the valley of depression.

So it is perhaps significant that 14 years after the paralysis period the RFC is being continued on a basis which provides loans and advances up to $2,000,000,000.

Furthermore, as a matter of record, the loans and advances of the RFC on March 31, 1947, only amounted to $1,716,000,000. On this basis the RFC continues its operations with lending power substantially in excess of that in use as of the end of the first quarter of 1947.

The rise in the number of employees of this bureau affords a side view of the scope of its activities. On June 30, 1939, the RFC had 4,090 employees. On April 30, 1947, it had 7,892 employees. For an agency supposedly diminishing, as we get further and further away from the credit paralysis of 1933, this is a strange contradiction in employment totals.

Some members of the committee were satisfied that the hearings gave us adequate information on the operation of this public-credit colossus. I did not share in that conclusion. The committee heard only one witness, the present Chairman of the RFC Board.

The importance of a comprehensive understanding of the activities of the RFC by the House was pointed out by the Comptroller General in House Document No. 316, Eightieth Congress, first session:

"The desirability of financing the activities of RFC through borrowings has not been questioned in this report, but it should be pointed out that the Congress could improve its control over the enterprise through the requirement that its capital be supplied through appropriation rather than through borrowings."

As a factual matter, the Congress will do by adoption of this bill in the position of authorizing, without specific appropriation or further congressional action, Federal lending and investment up to $2,000,000,000, based upon hearings during which only one man was heard and that was the Government official heading the agency. Letters from Jesse Jones and Herbert Hoover were read into the hearings, and this was the only other evidence the committee obtained.

Perhaps the committee had adequate information to give carte blanche approval to the operations of the RFC, but to me that approval consisted quite largely as an act of faith.

The Comptroller General in a letter to the RFC Board of Directors in June 1948, after 8 months of examination of RFC records, declared:

"Nor do these records afford an adequate basis for a satisfactory report of the discharge of important operating and fiscal responsibilities assumed by the corporation or a satisfactory report of the discharge of the aggregate responsibility of the top management for any period."

On July 31, 1946, in House Document No. 674, the Comptroller General, reporting to Congress on the audit of the RFC then in progress by his Office, listed the following specific failures in the accounting functions of the RFC:

First. The Company does not control its $7,000,000,000 investment in property.

Second. The Company does not control its $800,000,000 investment in inventories of Defense Supplies Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, and U. S. Commercial Company.

Third. The Company does not control its cash receipts.

Fourth. The Company does not control rentals earned on its properties.

Fifth. The Company does not control certain important liabilities.

Sixth. The Company does not control recoveries due it on plant extensions built for utility companies.

Seventh. The Company does not control its surplus property disposal activities.

Eighth. The Company has no control over the activities of its affiliate, U. S. Commercial Company.

I have inquired of the Comptroller General to find out whether in the ensuing period he has had any occasion to revise these findings, and I quote from his letter to me on June 4, 1947:

"The views of the General Accounting Office concerning accounting of the RFC and other matters, as expressed in House Document No. 674 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, remain unchanged."

To agree to the active continuation of the RFC now the House must subscribe to the belief that private credit in the United States cannot operate without a public credit crutch at a time when American business is in the biggest boom in its history. I am unable to accept that conclusion. Further, it appears somewhat strange that we should be, in official oratory, at least, opposing the nationalization of credit in foreign lands while continuing to countenance its growth in this country.

To pass this measure in its present form the House must subscribe to the belief that politically selected money lenders, using other people's savings, can loan money with more wisdom and competence than private individuals and groups using their own funds. It must subscribe to the belief that the Government has a right to use arbitrarily assessed tax funds for risk-capital purposes in private enterprise.

To continue the RFC the House must subscribe to the belief that either an emergency exists in the field of private credit or that the private credit facilities of the Nation are so defective or so puny that an instrument of state capitalism must permanently both umpire and play in the contest of supplying credit to private enterprise. I cannot agree to this conclusion.

In its present lending to business firms, the RFC is doing one of three things (1) making loans that private credit institutions find economically unsound; (2) competing unfairly with private capital; or (3) making political loans.

This is not a healthy situation even though there may be a great number of private banks in this country who currently welcome the credit-crutch facilities made available by the RFC.

In the competitive-enterprise system there should be enough competition among the banks to see that every reasonably sound loan is made. If present laws prevent such loans from being made for one reason or another, such as capital requirements of small-town banks, then changes should be made in our banking laws to permit private credit to become mobile enough to supply such needs.

When the RFC makes loans that private institutions will not make, it imposes a judgment that overrules the competitive operation of the natural economic laws. It interferes with the operation of financial institutions whose progress and profits depend upon their ability and willingness to make every reasonably sound loan.

Mr. Chairman, theoretically the House has four alternatives before it on the RFC.

One is to do as the other body did, extend it for 1 year without change. That procedure seems utterly indefensible in a Congress pledged to get the Government out of business, to eliminate unnecessary bureaus, and to bring about economy in Government.

A second alternative is to abolish the RFC entirely. I am not inclined to favor that course. However, there is a significant body of opinion in this country that believe that to be the sound procedure, based upon the fact that the RFC was set up to tide us over an emergency and the emergency is over. Rather than the continuance provided in this bill, I believe the RFC should be liquidated.

A third alternative is the one selected by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is to continue this agency more or less indefinitely, although the stated period of the bill is 2 years, and leave it possessed with tremendous powers although shorn of the utterly fantastic wartime grants of power.

A fourth alternative is to preserve the RFC as a skeleton organization, as an instrument of public credit that could be reactivated in the event of another emergency. This was the course that I had hoped the committee would take in its action on this bill.

By retaining this agency on a stand-by basis the House would be preserving its utility in the case of another emergency.

In this way the potential usefulness of the RFC could be continued, but the evils which it brings into the normal operation of our private credit facilities would be ended.

In closing I want to point out to the House that this bill continues in the hands of the RFC, a politically controlled credit agency, vast powers to influence the course of economic affairs in this Nation.

For some time we have been in the throes of inflation, yet the RFC with continued power can add fuel to inflation by financing enterprises which are unsound credit risks.

While the bill provides that the RFC will not provide financial assistance unless financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, this provision is open to many interpretations. For example, in its current operations the RFC loans money at 4 percent. This interest rate alone has operated as an inflationary factor in the economy. It has undoubtedly encouraged the establishment of businesses that would not otherwise come into being at the height of a war-created boom.

It seems probable that the lending operations of the RFC have helped to accentuate the length and intensity of the present business boom. As a consequence, the bust—when it comes—will be of greater proportions than without the peacetime operations of the RFC in the field of private credit.

If that conjecture proves correct, then the peacetime RFC will have gone a long way toward nullifying its emergency usefulness.

If the Congress means business when it orates about eliminations of unnecessary bureaus the RFC is a good place to start. The creeping socialization that this agency is facilitating has no place in a Nation that owes its greatness to a genuine system of privately operated enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that only three Republican Congressmen voted to end RFC at that time.

Rubber Stamp Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the Congress continues to permit the executive department to usurp its functions it will become a rubber-stamp Congress, a useless expensive branch of the Federal government.

That some folks in the South realize we are well on our way toward that end is evidenced by an address from the Southern Conservative, Fort Worth, Tex., of February, which reads as follows:

PROVISIONS IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES ON LIMITATION OF POWER REPEALED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER—USURPATION OF CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY KNOWN BY ROOSEVELT REACHES PEAK UNDER THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

Harry S. Truman, who frequently suffers with the delusion that he is a Roman Emperor rather than an elected president of a constitutional republic, has announced that while he is perfectly willing for Congress to discuss the matter, he alone will make the decision about whether or not American troops will be sent to Europe and in what numbers.

No ruler is bigger than the written constitution of the country over which he presides and when usurpation of power by an arrogant leader is tolerated, it marks the first step toward the crumbling and decay of a sovereign state.

In our case, limitation of power was the most serious concern of the founders of the Republic and they put this safeguard into the Constitution of the United States in order that no political bantam rooster might ever be able to mount the public rostrum and boast of his power over the purse and the people.

Accordingly, they set up the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of Government with the powers of each specifically defined, with no overlapping jurisdictions, and in no case was it intended that one branch would arrogate to itself the authority and power bestowed by the Constitution on another.

Because of wholesale violations of these provisions of the Constitution in recent years, Congress has been compelled to surrender its power not only to the Executive, but to the judicial department of Government which frequently stepped in to pinch hit for Congress by passing social legislation, through judicial decisions, when Congress had failed, or refused, to pass such measures.

The action of the judiciary, however, in usurping power belonging exclusively to Congress deals only with the destruction of the Constitution and of our form of government, and the breaking down of our American institutions.

But the usurpation of power by the Executive in which the President purposes to declare war and send troops around over the world according to his own sweet will, involves human lives and it is to this phase of the violation of constitutional provisions that the American people should first address themselves.

Handicapping any attempts at retrieving lost power now, however, is the shameful memory of how far another American President was allowed to go in the usurpation of power from a subservient and spineless Congress.

During the decade beginning in 1933 we witnessed the debasing spectacle of a majority of the Members of both Houses of our national law-making body trying to outcrawl each other in knuckling and kowtowing to Roosevelt's demands for must socialistic legislation instead of displaying the courageous manhood Americans are entitled to expect of their representatives, and throwing it back in his teeth.

It was during that time that the precedent was set for a President exercising power specifically delegated to Congress and transgressions along this line since then have been so steady and gradual that

a President today actually dares to rear up on his hind feet and defy Congress to do anything about it.

If we are able to read, the Constitution confers the authority to declare war, raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces solely on Congress and the President as Commander in Chief is empowered only to carry out the mandates of Congress.

Pending the time that the voters themselves get another whack at him, we think it high time that Congress rise up in its might and reclaim its surrendered powers, whittle the President down to his proper size and put him back in short pants.

An Invincible Air Force—The Key to Military Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if we are to survive as a Nation in the atomic age, we must recognize the fact that our military strength rests in an invincible Air Force. In support of this theory a brilliant speech was made to the membership of this House the other day by our distinguished colleague, Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, an able statesman and veteran of World War II. Mr. DORN's speech deserves the attention of every thinking American, and I am sure that Members who heard it in person, or were privileged to read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, were impressed with its logic and sound expressions of common sense. Mr. DORN's speech received wide coverage in the press of our country and was the subject of commentary by many distinguished newspaper and radio men, not the least among whom was Fulton Lewis, Jr. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith Mr. Lewis' comment, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of March 3, 1951:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

A Member of Congress believes our military leaders, with the exception of those in the Air Force, ought to be put out to pasture.

Admittedly a partisan of the fly boys, W. J. BRYAN DORN, South Carolina Democrat, says our Army and Navy brass are antiques. He pointed out that the three greatest military leaders in history, Napoleon Bonaparte, Alexander the Great, and Hannibal, all led armies before their mid-thirties.

The Congressman is convinced that only in the Air Force can an officer reach the rank of lieutenant general at the age of 27 years, which was Napoleon's (equivalent) rank and age when he overran Europe.

This backhand swipe at the paucity of youth in the top echelon of our military leaders is not the only irritating idea the Congressman passed along to the Pentagon.

DORN thinks a balanced military effort—with about equal expenditures on the Army, Air Force, and Navy—is a dangerous gamble with security. He wants Air Force prowess increased, with less emphasis on massive ground forces. He quotes some pretty fair experts to back up his opinion.

Lieutenant General Koller, of the German Air Force, who was on the receiving end of more bombing raids than he cares to remember, has this to say about air power:

"The nation that controls the air will control the sea lanes of the world, will control the continents of the world. It will be an interesting game to watch from the sidelines, the game of power politics. The nation that controls the air will control this world and dominate this world for the next hundred years."

For those military experts who scoff at too strong a dependence on air power, DORN recalls a few incidents in the past so we can judge the fallibility of the experts.

Prior to and during the last war military leaders at one time or another stepped up and opined that the United States Pacific Fleet was invincible; that Japan would collapse in 6 weeks; that Hitler would not last through the winter of 1939; that the French Maginot line was impregnable; that the Nazis would never reach Paris; and that American boys would never be sent to Europe.

There are others, including the passionate propagandists who promised that the United Nations would make peace secure; and that Uncle Joe Stalin was the kind of guy we could all get along with after the war.

The Congressman admits that it might be a little unfair pulling the record on the experts now, but he says he is a young man and wants to enjoy life for a few years.

DORN wants to build an Air Force of 5,000 heavy bombers. This can be done with $17,000,000,000, which is considerably less than what we will be spending in Europe on relief and military aid.

Once we get the bombers, DORN wants the President to notify Stalin that we're all set and one false move will bring on an avalanche of atom bombs.

Russia has concentrated on a large land army. DORN is convinced we can only match the threat with an overwhelming concentration on air power.

He points out that the two greatest eras of peace in history were created by the powerful Roman legions and by the British fleet. No one for 500 years dared take on the Romans, and for 400 years the British Navy kept the world in order. Now, in DORN's opinion, air power is not only peace power but economy as well.

In 1947 DORN stepped up and demanded the biggest Air Force the world had ever seen. He said then that the only way to halt Russia was from the air.

For his pains Vishinisky, Russian representative at the United Nations, put DORN's name at the top of a list of Americans the Kremlin considered the world's worst warmongers.

Nothing since has aroused the Russians so much as DORN's speech in 1947. They got almost as mad in 1950 when he proposed using Marshall plan funds for building up the Air Force.

Apparently what they fear most is a powerful United States Air Force, several times bigger than the one being planned today. The Russians, also, have talked to a few German generals and they know just how rough a United States bombing attack can be.

Address by Mayor Vincent R. Impelliteri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the following remarks by Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri at graduation exercises, Beth Israel Hospital School of Nursing, Stuyvesant Square East at Sixteenth Street, New York City, on Wednesday, February 28, 1951:

Mr. Silver, Dr. Frank, Miss Casey, distinguished guests, parents, friends, and graduates of the class of 1951, my presence here this evening as guest speaker at these graduation exercises—I must admit—is due largely as tribute to a great New Yorker and American, one of our city's outstanding business leaders, who will be remembered for generations to come by his grand deeds of philanthropy in helping the sick and the poor and the underprivileged.

No man in our town better symbolizes the sterling qualities that have made our city great than the man who for a quarter of a century has been closely associated with this hospital, whose growth and development in the last 62 years has so many parallels to the growth and development of New York City.

When Charles H. Silver, early in 1947, took over the greater responsibilities as president of Beth Israel on the passing to his eternal reward of the hospital's honored and beloved president, David L. Podell, he had already been closely identified with the work—the joys and the sorrows of Beth Israel Hospital—for more than a score of years.

Beth Israel Hospital has had a glorious history—since its founding back in 1890 by a small group of immigrants, joined together in the humanitarian venture that was to become this great voluntary institution which today treats many thousands of patients, regardless of race, creed, color, or ability to pay.

The growth of Beth Israel Hospital under the aegis of David Podell, Charles Silver, and their associates is truly an affirmative answer to the ancient Biblical query: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

The question that always mystifies us is how great men, how busy men, find time to do so much. Guiding the destinies of a busy enterprise such as this would seem to be occupation enough for one man, but not for Mr. Silver. For him to be his brother's keeper means not only to help those of his own religious persuasion, but he lends his talents and time to all. He is one of Cardinal Spellman's close friends and associates, and for years has been spearhead and a directing genius of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation, which has constructed a large addition over at St. Vincent's Hospital, not too far from here, in memory of the Happy Warrior of our city and State.

Only recently President Truman appointed Mr. Silver the New York State member of the Internal Security Commission, of which Admiral Chester Nimitz is the chairman and whose roster is a veritable "Who's Who" of American religious, professional, business, and governmental leaders.

I am sure that the nurse graduates of Beth Israel—the good doctors and nurses who brought them through their arduous studies, their able and illustrious Director of Nursing Clare M. Casey, their parents who assuredly are awaiting that their diplomas be conferred upon them, and the guests and friends here

tonight—will forgive the time I have consumed in paying tribute to Beth Israel's top administrator.

Let me make it clear that Mr. Silver is not looking for a Commissioner's job although his rare abilities would grace any administration. I have been looking for a chance to tell the world what a truly great public benefactor he is.

I have always rather liked the words of Thomas Paine, one of our founding fathers, and I should like to use them as my text this evening:

"I love the man that can smile in trouble," Tom Paine said, "that can gather strength in distress and grow brave by reflection. 'Tis the business of little minds to shrink, but he whose heart is firm, and whose conscience approves his conduct, will pursue his principles unto death."

Our busy, hurried world with its swift strides in economic evolution and confusion, but with it all, social progress and particularly medical advancement sorely needs men and women who "can smile in trouble, gather strength from distress, and grow brave by reflection."

Around us everywhere there is need for abiding principles and ideals which we may pursue in our life's work, and unto death.

Graduation exercises too often are ponderous and dull, particularly where the guest speaker is concerned, and I hope that I shall not err too greatly on that score.

Nothing I shall say from here on is more important than a few words to the parents and families for whom this is the occasion they have eagerly awaited for 3 long years.

What worries and misgivings have been theirs. What sacrifices they have made. How proud they are tonight that one of their own is now and forevermore enrolled in one of man's nobler professions, for truly nursing is such a calling.

Helping a patient back to physical strength and well-being must give an inner satisfaction that is associated with few other types of work.

Nursing is a vocation as old as the history of man. It may rightfully be called an art, and as with the other arts, it has continued to develop, improve, and flourish until today it may be said then those who have mastered the craft of nursing are indeed professional artists in their own right.

In A History of Nursing by Sellew and Nesse, good nursing care is described as "a service which alleviates physical and mental suffering, shortens the period of illness, and increases the chance of recovery."

These are few words, indeed, with which to describe a life's work. Yet, it means that you graduates have selected a field wherein lies a golden range of opportunity for service to your fellow man.

Your American Journal of Nursing, the bible of your profession, has expressed a standard for nurses as follows:

"You should be strong, because people depend on you. You should be steady and self-reliant for you will many times be charged with heavy responsibilities. You should have a spirit of service and a sincere interest in human beings of all classes and kinds. Finally, you should be tactful, have a good sense of humor, be resourceful and always dependable."

So much has been written about your fascinating profession that one could go on ad infinitum and ad nauseum in quoting therefrom, but I should like to repeat just a few lines from Nursing in Modern Society by Mary Ella Chayer, former associate professor of nursing education at Teachers College, Columbia.

"The nursing profession," according to this authority, "is one of those human institutions that is more sensitive to its social environment than any other group, because its purpose and methods are close to the everyday problems and needs of the people."

You, the graduates of this fine school of nursing, have learned the truth of this statement from your own experiences in the classrooms and on the wards of this hospital and from the other hospitals with which you may have been affiliated.

The great Jewish philosopher, Maimonides, in a dissertation on the universe stated that the "ideal sets the sphere in motion." He was, of course, referring primarily to the universe, itself, but in the last analysis what he said applies most aptly to the sphere of nursing activity.

From the very beginnings of our present system of nurse education, it has been the high ideals of the leaders of your profession that have set in motion and widened the sphere of nursing progress.

While nursing care, or as more accurately stated, ministering to the sick, dates back to the very beginnings of man's endless struggle against pain, pestilence, disease, and death, nursing as a profession only today is assuming its rightful place in medical science.

Nursing education has come a long way since 1873 when the first three nurses' training schools in the United States, based on the Nightingale plan of training, were established. Incidentally, one of these three original schools was the one set up at nearby Bellevue Hospital.

Back in those days, a probationer or student nurse, with neither formal schooling nor much in the way of theoretical or practical experience in her one year's apprenticeship, was set to work in a hospital ward, usually without supervision.

Today's nurse's candidate, following her high-school graduation, must attend a school of nursing for three full years and following her graduation, must keep abreast of almost daily discoveries in medical procedures and nursing techniques. The highly technical duties performed by the modern "women in white" were not dreamed of by nurses 75 years ago.

And yet, despite these great advances, there has not been sufficient public awareness of the role played by the professional nurse in our far-advanced and rapidly expanding medical frontiers.

There still are sections of the country where nurses do not enjoy the shorter work-week and the salary levels that obtain in less skilled and nonprofessional categories.

In our own city, both the voluntary and municipal hospitals have done much in recent years to raise the economic level of nursing personnel commensurate with the essential and high service your profession renders.

The Beth Israel Hospital School of Nursing is one of the best in the country. Conducted under the able direction of Miss Casey, an outstanding nurse educator and administrator, it has kept space in its curriculum with the most advanced studies in the profession. Your school of nursing is accredited by the State Education Department of New York and is fully approved by the American Medical Association, the American College of Surgeons, and the American Hospital Association.

Before closing, I should like to thank Mr. Silver, his board of trustees, and his medical and nursing staffs for alerting all the resources of this great hospital and placing them at the call of the city of New York in its civil defense preparedness program.

Civil defense is something in which all of us must be joined. Although our national leaders are doing everything within their power to bring sense to the crazed war lords of Communist dictatorships, and though we pray to God that we be spared destruction by modern science's hellish weapons, civil defense preparedness is necessary and essential in these critical days.

Nurses, of course, are important in every phase of civil defense activity and they must take leadership in this vital undertaking.

Sir William Osler, great physician and spirit of our age, in addressing a nurse graduation exercise at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore in 1901 said to these sisters of yours of a few generations ago:

"Useful your lives shall be as you will care for those who cannot care for themselves, and who need about them in the day of tribulation, gentle hands, and tender hearts."

Some years later at a farewell dinner in our own city at the old Waldorf Hotel back in May 1905, Osler, in the memorable address in which he reviewed his philosophy of life, said in closing:

"I have made mistakes but they have been mistakes of the head and not of the heart. I can truly say, and I take upon myself to witness, that in my sojourn with you:

"I have loved no darkness
Sophisticated no truth
Nursed no delusion
Allowed no fear."

With this, the simple credo of a great mind, I salute the class of 1951 of the Beth Israel Hospital School of Nursing.

You are on the threshold of a great career of service to your fellow man.

May you in your life's work hold high the ideals of your profession.

And let me end this on the keynote of my opening remarks.

If you apply the education and the training obtained here at Beth Israel as selflessly as Mr. Silver and Mr. Podell before him—and emulate their high ideal of service to their fellow man—you truly will have been your brother's keeper.

To a higher trust none of us can aspire, because that is the command of the divine Ruler who rules us all.

Man in the Middle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article written by Peter Edson for the Washington Daily News. This article is a personality sketch of W. Elmer, Chairman of the RFC Board of Directors, and my fellow townsman from Shawnee, Okla. In the light of everything else being said and printed these days about the RFC, I am sure my colleagues will be interested to know more about the man who now holds the heavy responsibility of carrying on this vital and important governmental agency.

The article follows:

MAN IN MIDDLE

(By Peter Edson)

Man caught in the middle of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) is W. Elmer Harber, RFC Chairman since a couple of days after his appointment as a Director last October. All the stuff about $8,500 mink coats and alleged attempts at influence peddling through the White House happened before Mr. Harber arrived. He has tried to keep out of the whole mess. But his job now is to clean it up.

Ask him what's in those hundreds of letters from Congressmen which the White House requisitioned from RFC files, and Mr. Harber says: "I don't know. I never saw them and I don't want to see them."

As an afterthought he supposes that a lot of those letters should have been thrown in the wastebasket. That's how fresh and unspoiled his viewpoint is on Washington, where a letter from a Congressman has more weight than the tablets of stone handed Moses on Mount Sinai.

President Truman drafted Elmer Harber to try to straighten out some of RFC's troubles. This was shortly after Senator FULBRIGHT began kicking up a fuss on RFC's $37,500,000 loans to Lustron Corp., which later went bankrupt.

Mr. Harber had been Democratic national committeeman for Oklahoma. First thing he knew about the job was last July, when he found himself in the White House arguing with the President on why he shouldn't take it. He lost the argument. His draft is for 2 years.

Six months in Washington still haven't convinced him he wouldn't like to go back to Oklahoma. When an old friend came to see him recently, the parting was, "Don't let 'em get you in jail up here." Mr. Harber's reply was, "Sometimes I think jail would be more comfortable."

The thing that appealed to Mr. Truman in appointing Mr. Harber RFC Chairman was his practical banking background. He is little, medium sized, and big banker, all three.

Forty years ago he went to work as janitor in the First National Bank of Seminole, Okla. Ten years later he was president and today he owns controlling interest of it. It's a $5,000,000 bank with a $350,000 capital account. He is also president and controlling owner of American National Bank, Shawnee, a $12,000,000 bank. And he's a director of Liberty National Bank of Oklahoma City, a $100,000,000 institution.

It is Mr. Harber's experience as a small-town banker that he has drawn on in trying to steer the reorganization of RFC. "When you go into a small-town bank and ask for a loan, you get the answer right away. Some applications have been hanging around here 3, 4, and even 5 months. And it takes that long again to disburse the money," he says.

The RFC Board used to meet twice a week. It now meets first thing every morning. Then it may meet another half-dozen times a day whenever there is anything to decide. Fees and interest rates have been hiked. Personnel regulations have been tightened.

Also, RFC's staff has been cut way back—saving the Government an estimated $5,000,000 a year. Thirty-one branch offices have been reduced to 10. Employees have been cut from 3,600 to 2,600.

It is some of these discharged employees, Mr. Harber believes, who have been feeding scandal to the Fulbright committee. The Chairman doesn't particularly object to that. On the whole, he thinks the investigation and its disclosures have been a good thing. They have shown what has to be done to set the house in order.

Opposing Drafting of 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Advertiser, Boston, Mass., March 4, 1951, by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston:

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD DRAFT: OPPOSED ON MORAL, RELIGIOUS GROUNDS

(By the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D.)

I wholeheartedly oppose the drafting of 18-year-olds into the Armed Forces on moral and religious grounds.

I oppose this conscription because many, many of these boys will go into the military or naval forces as good, honest, moral, religious young men—and many will come out immoral, dishonest, irreligious, heavy drinkers, gamblers, and plain "no good."

Everyone who knows anything about what happens to a green boy when he is plunged into unbridled life within the Armed Forces knows this to be true.

The temptations that come to a more mature man are great enough, but what these temptations accomplish among the immature are horrifying.

Please do not misunderstand. Many, many of our finest and greatest men are products of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Life in the Armed Forces can accomplish wonders for some men.

But what I am talking about is the green boy who lives next door or down the street, who has been brought up in a sheltered atmosphere and knows little or nothing about life.

Let us assume that he knows little about the temptations he will face when he is inducted. In most cases this is true.

Then let us assume further that he is drafted. Pretty soon he begins to rub elbows with a few of the human vultures who prey on the innocent.

Within a period of months he is a changed person. He becomes lax in his religious practices, be he Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish. He starts to gamble, to drink, to become immoral. He may enter into a hasty marriage.

All of these hazards do in fact exist in civilian life. But they are peculiarly more insistent and more insidious in military life, especially for those who are not fully mature.

To those who feel that the ordinary religious and moral instructions which our boys receive are adequate for the situations which they will confront in military life, I recommend a reading of the pamphlets distributed by the military authorities concerning some phases of morality of World War II.

These pamphlets can give moral shocks and create confusion in young minds that have been brought up on high ideals.

Unfortunately parents are not so well aware of these moral and religious hazards in military life as they are in civilian life.

So I am taking this opportunity to point out to them that unless positive methods can be taken to improve to a very considerable degree the moral climate of military life, the official pamphlets, posters, and movies that are issued will continue to do as much as they have been in the past.

I am firmly convinced that 18-year-olds will be drafted. They want them and they are going to get them.

In that case, I, for one, prefer to have these hazards brought to teen-age boys before induction into the service. In that way it would be possible to cushion somewhat that moral shock, to the extent of pointing out the insidious philosophy that underlies these visual aids and to show the important part that God and religion can play in strong motivation to clean living in or out of military life.

I have no complete program to suggest, merely some ideas and suggestions which I hope will enable religious leaders of all faiths to develop more clearly under discussion.

For example, I suggest an organized program in the schools as a good way to meet the problem.

At a time when young men are only a few months away from induction into military service they may be expected to be reasonably interested in all phases of this new and different life which they are soon to enter.

Why should they not be particularly receptive to religious and moral instructions which are directly pointed to that life?

In a way, it can be a preview of that life in its moral and religious phases at a time when they have not so many other distractions. Once they are inducted into service there are so many new things to learn and so many new duties to be fulfilled that whatever instruction a chaplain may be able to give is in danger of going in one ear and out the other.

Therefore, I suggest to Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders to consider this fact:

From the standpoint of timing and psychology, some preinduction religious and moral indoctrination would seem to have advantages over whatever the chaplains may be able to do after induction.

Conservation: United States Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Bertram on the subject of conservation as it applies to our United States parks. There is no doubt that attempts are being made to change our long-established policy on this subject. Congress should be alerted to this danger to which this article calls our attention. The article, from the New York Times of March 4, 1951, follows:

CONSERVATION: UNITED STATES PARKS—DEBATE OVER DINOSAUR MONUMENT RAISES QUESTIONS ABOUT LONG-RANGE POLICY

(By John Bertram)

In the ousting of Newton B. Drury as Director of the National Park Service, the country loses (as of April 1) a valued public servant, and the Department of the Interior an effective conservationist. The circumstances surrounding Mr. Drury's impending departure have—rightly or wrongly—aroused grave apprehension over the future of the national park system. There are two major reasons why this is so, and the current battle over the Dinosaur National Monument illustrates both of them.

Originally a tiny tract set aside to preserve some prehistoric fossils (hence the name), the Monument was in 1938 enlarged to 190,000 acres for the express purpose of preserving from exploitation some of the most spectacular canyon wilderness left in the United States. But the Bureau of Reclamation has chosen two sites within the confines of the monument for the construction of tremendous dams which would still the rushing waters, deface the canyon sides, and alter forever the wild and untamed character of this rare bit of primeval America.

Qualified engineers have pointed out that the selection of certain alternate sites outside the monument might result in greater water storage and more power development at smaller cost. Mr. Drury vigorously opposed invasion of the monument for construction of these ill-advised dams; but Secretary Chapman overruled him, and the final decision is now in the hands of Congress. It is impossible to avoid seeing the larger implications of the Dinosaur affair.

SETTING A PRECEDENT

In the first place, the invasion of a national park (or monument) for extraneous purposes not only is contrary to the spirit of the laws which established the parks, but also sets a precedent under which incalculable harm can be done to other units of the system. Particularly amid the strains and stresses of a national emergency, terrific pressures are brought to bear against the resources locked up in our national parks; and only resolute determination to prevent their exploitation (except perhaps in case of the most desperate crisis) can protect them for future generations.

The ground work is already being laid for an assault on the timber resources of the national parks and forests in the name of defense. If Congress should approve construction of the Dinosaur dams, it will release the floodgates for renewed attacks on many national parks—Grand Canyon and Glacier, to name but two that have already been threatened in the same manner. In a speech recalling the damming nearly 40 years ago of the Hetch Hetchy Valley in California, an Assistant Secretary of the Interior recently said:

"If somebody made a proposal today that we put a large dam at the foot of the valley here to flood Yosemite, * * * the howl of protest from over the entire Nation would be so tremendous such a proposal would not even be considered. I think we must have that same kind of support in other areas so that any time we have another Hetch Hetchy * * * the people * * * will immediately conduct a strong campaign to stop such activities."

If "howls of protest" should rise with sufficient strength, Congress may yet prevent the Interior Department from committing at Dinosaur the very folly against which its own spokesman has sounded so eloquent a warning.

RECREATION QUESTION

Fear that the "park principle" may be violated more easily and more frequently in the future is, then, one reason why many conservationists are worried over Mr. Drury's forced resignation. The other fundamental reason revolves about the word "recreation."

Recreation, when applied to national parks, can mean the development of large-scale facilities for popular use, such as bathing, boating, and similar activities. But it can also mean the quiet and peaceful enjoyment of scenic grandeur, the contemplation of a lonely wilderness, camping beside white water, gaining spiritual values from nature far from the organization and appurtenances of our machine-made civilization.

Both forms of recreation are valid. But mass recreation—the recreation that implies elaborate equipment and extensive development—can be had anywhere, on a thousand man-made lakes behind a thousand man-made dams, in scores of State parks and playgrounds, in innumerable areas near cities, towns, and villages throughout the land. Facilities for this sort of recreation are necessary and desirable; but surely a small part of America should be left unspoiled for future generations.

Dinosaur Monument is one such place; and yet a Salt Lake City newspaper can say, "The reservoirs the dams will create will make available to the run of the citizenry the very sort of recreational facilities which * * * (the opposition) said they would destroy." Mr. Drury's departure may forebode a new stress on the promotion of organized recreation in our parks and monuments, and a slackening of interest in the preservation of untouched areas of wild and natural beauty for themselves alone.

NOTES

The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, at its recent annual meeting, has urged the Government to require watershed control to be closely integrated into all large-scale dam-building activity in the future * * * The second volume to be published by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission is called "Water Resources Law." The "central fact" revealed by the study "is the lack of a unified Federal policy respecting the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, including related uses of land."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Friday, March 2, 1951:

SEAWAY WOULD HURT NEW ENGLAND

As far as the St. Lawrence seaway is concerned, it's every man for himself, apparently. It's quite evident that not much thinking is being done in terms of the greatest good for the greatest number. Not especially, anyway. Take the steel industry, for example. Not so long ago, before depletion of Mesabi iron deposits was in prospect, the steel industry saw no particular reason why the seaway should be developed; it pointed to the tremendous cost of the project, and argued that small advantage would accrue to the country as a whole. But the steel industry has now reversed itself because its special interests will be served—and very handsomely—if the seaway is constructed. Labrador ore is the reason for the switch. Obviously, it would be far less costly to transport that ore by water than by water and rail, as will have to be done if the seaway doesn't get congressional approval. So steel is in there championing the cause of the seaway.

On the other side of the fence is the combined opposition of the eastern seaboard, which has a tremendous stake in the outcome of the battle, as battle it is. The ports of Boston and New York and eastern railroads, generally, would suffer huge annual losses because of the ocean traffic which would be diverted to the seaway. There would be a direct water route to the Midwest, and it is not hard to see what this would mean to coastal cities which have big investments in port facilities. Mayor Impellitteri, of New York, a vigorous opponent of the project, calls it a visionary and madcap scheme, but it isn't that, exactly, because it would have a practical value from the standpoint of Big Steel and other industries now remote from the sea. It would be better if the mayor admitted his sectionalism, which is nothing to be ashamed of, and attacked the project in terms of what it would cost New York.

In the first place, New York would have to bear its proportionate share of the billion-dollar outlay which the seaway would involve. This would not be so bad in itself, but the fact that it would undoubtedly have economic repercussions which would work a grievous hurt upon New York and other cities is another thing entirely. Neither New York nor Boston nor Baltimore nor Philadelphia can be expected to be jubilant about a project which, demonstrably, would react to their disadvantage. It seems to us that it would be nonsensical to expect to find in the eastern commonwealths the large stores of sacrificial zeal they would have to draw upon in order to put the concerns of Big Steel and the Midwest above their own. The very fact that the seaway would hurt the East, and seriously, is an excellent reason why the East should raise a clamor against it. Any project which has implicit in it such a burden of localized harm cannot be represented as universally beneficial.

As far as the steel industry is concerned, it will be remembered that it evinced little or no interest in the location of an integrated steel plant in the New England area. Such a steel plant would, of course, be good for New England industry, because it would reduce freightage and would thus narrow the competitive differential which has been, and is, a handicap to consumers of metal in this area. The steel industry, now faced with the prospect of having its margin of profit reduced by freight costs, is actually seeking to have itself subsidized out of its dilemma, and partially at the expense of the New England which it has consistently snubbed. Any New Englander would have to do a lot of concentrated thinking before he gave endorsement to the seaway proposal. It shapes up as one more obstacle in the way of New England's economic revival.

Reapportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt which appeared on March 2, 1951, in the Washington Daily News:

REPRESENTATIVE CELLER'S BILL RATES DEMOCRATIC AND GOP SUPPORT

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK, Thursday.—There has been a very important bill introduced in the House by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

The heading on the bill, H. R. 2648, reads: "To require the establishment of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territories in the election of Representatives and for other purposes."

Representative CELLER says that the simple question before the House is whether its Members should represent all the people fairly and equally, or allow the present inequalities and injustices to continue. He feels that each citizen through his Congressman is entitled to an effective and equal voice in his Government.

It is usually the State legislatures, rather than Congress, that fix the times, places, and manner for holding elections for Senators and Representatives. But Mr. CELLER maintains that the Constitution also provides, "That Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators." Then he cites a case in which the Supreme Court in 1948 "held that it is within the power of Congress to set up standards which the State must follow in enacting reapportionment legislation."

It would seem to me, therefore, that this bill will force the States into a position where they will have to remedy any inequalities that may exist within the State.

The bill provides that each State entitled to more than one Representative shall establish a congressional district for each Representative, instead of simply electing a Congressman at Large as has sometimes been done. It also provides that the district shall be composed of compact areas. This, of course, is designed to prevent the curious patterns that have been established in some States for political purposes and to make it impossible to maneuver the voters for political ends. This practice has been known as gerrymandering.

There also is a provision to make as fair as possible these divisions as to numbers of people voting in the different districts.

It seems to me that it is high time that some such regulation was passed, and I hope both Republicans and Democrats will join together to make it possible.

Problems That Confront Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in 7 of the 8 years I have served the people of the Fourth District of Nebraska as their Representative in Congress I have sought their reactions to the problems that confront our country by sending out a questionnaire. I have always received a good response, and many took the trouble to write letters. These questionnaires, I believe, serve two purposes; they bring me the private views of a larger number of people, as contrasted with the views of organizations that purport to represent them, and they stimulate more people to think about the problems that confront the country. I have an abiding faith in the good judgment of the people who live away from the confusing propaganda and pressures that pervade the very air you breath here in Washington. They feel and understand the basic concept of the freedom of the individual which our Government was set up to protect. They cherish their rights as individuals, and they resent the gradual encroachment of their Government upon them.

During the month just passed I sent 70,000 post cards to my district, about evenly divided between urban and rural addresses. On them we asked the following questions:

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

1. Should there be complete mobilization, including price controls, rationing, and wage freezes?
2. Do you favor universal military training?
3. Should the draft law have exemptions for farm boys, students, and other groups? Should 18-year-old boys be drafted?
4. Should we raise taxes and attempt to pay for the war as we go?
5. Should we eliminate the 40-hour week and overtime at extra pay?
6. Do you favor Federal aid to schools? Socialized medicine? Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law?
7. Should we limit farm price supports?

FOREIGN PROBLEMS

1. How do you feel about the United Nations?
2. Should we send ground troops to defend Europe and other parts of the world?
3. Should we withdraw our troops from Korea? Where would you suggest we take a stand?
4. How large an Air Force, Army, and Navy would you recommend?
5. Should Marshall plan aid and the point 4 program (aid to backward countries) be continued?
6. Should we recognize Red China?

Mr. Speaker, you will note that some of them were phrased in a way that they could not be easily answered by "Yes" or "No." I purposely did this to encourage the people to write letters. I also asked them to write me. The interest shown and the letters received far exceeded my expectations. There were a much larger percentage than from any previous poll I have taken. In addition to elaborating on their answers to my questions many expressed themselves on the general situation that confronts us. Throughout the letters ran a note of grave concern—what is all this preparedness program going to do to us and to future generations? Huge taxes, controls and regulations, universal military training, spreading our resources all over the world, and meddling in the affairs of other nations will make profound changes in our way of life. Many wonder whether or not we can continue down this road and preserve our liberties. There are honest differences of opinion just as there are among the various groups of leaders in both political parties. All the letters expressed the desire for a strong America with strong Christian leadership. They want an end to confusion, corruption, and communism. They crave peace, security, and freedom from unnecessary Government interference with their daily lives.

On domestic issues, opinion was about evenly divided on the questions concerning complete mobilization, price control, and wage freeze. Many of those who favored going all out on these did so as a temporary expedient, but expressed a lack of confidence in the Government's ability to administer them with even-handed justice. The spread was a little greater on rationing—56 percent opposed. On universal military training 56 percent approved, but only as a temporary expedient; 59 percent opposed exemptions from the draft for farm workers and students; 64 percent were against drafting 18-year-olds. Most people were bitter at the leadership for the way it has led us to the very brink of war by its appeasement policy toward Communist countries and its sudden reversal to armed conflict when we were ill-prepared and lacked the support of real allies, all of which made necessary a decision on these matters. The people have an ingrained fear of the military.

While the opinion was unanimous that the budget should be cut deeply and Government waste eliminated, 68 percent favored increased taxes to put the rearmament program on a pay-as-you-go basis. There was strong condemnation of the administration's failure to make deep cuts in the budget for nondefense spending and its attempt to put over its socialistic program in the guise of defense spending. On the elimination of the 40-hour week and straight time for overtime, 75 percent voted "yes." Socialized medicine and the repeal of Taft-Hartley were opposed by more than 90 percent, and Federal aid to education by 66 percent. On elimination of farm price supports, 73 percent voted "yes." Many felt that the big bureaucracy needed to administer the program should be dispensed with now that agricultural prices are good.

In the field of foreign problems, 56 percent expressed the feeling that the United Nations had failed in its mission and must be reorganized if it is to justify the heavy financial support we are giving it. On sending more troops to Europe, 60 percent voted "no." Strong support was given to the proposals of former President Hoover; 52 percent wanted our troops withdrawn from Korea; 59 percent opposed continuing Marshall-plan aid and the point 4 program. Most unanimous was the 92 percent registered against the recognition of Red China. Many expressed themselves bitterly on this subject. One put it this way: "Should I shake hands with the man who has given my children poisoned candy and call him a friend?" As a result of this questionnaire, Mr. Speaker, I have a splendid cross section of the thinking of the folks in the Fourth District of Nebraska.

Like the people of my State, Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about the future of my country. I am concerned about the secret commitments made at Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, and other places in the world. I am convinced that the administration has not told us of the secret commitments made under the Atlantic Charter, especially on the arming of Europe. Even so, if the administration has committed us to sending six divisions to Europe, I feel it must be fulfilled. I agree with former President Hoover that it would be impossible to protect Europe with a land army. I believe we should have an Air Force strong enough to strike every military and industrial target in Russia and to protect us at home, and a Navy that can control the sea. We should not be wasting our resources on nations that do not have the courage and willingness to defend themselves. I am also concerned that the strain of supporting an Army of 3,500,000 men, a 100-group air force, and an adequate Navy will break the back of the taxpayer. While I believe we should help other countries in the matter of public health, preventive medicine, and food within our ability to do so, we should not spread ourselves so thin that we will lose our economic balance at home.

On the domestic scene I am convinced that the attempt to control prices and ration scarce materials is doomed to fail. Rising prices at this time are due to Government spending, scare buying induced by the way the situation has been handled, and by the administration's cheap-money policy, championed by the Secretary of the Treasury but opposed by the Federal Reserve Board. There is no indication that the administration will abandon its spending policy, nor tighten up on cheap money. Trying to control prices without destroying the causes of

inflation is like sitting on the valve without drawing the fire from under the boiler.

Deep in the heart of our people is a natural resentment to Government control of our economy. To accept it they must have great confidence in the judgment, honesty, and fairness of the administration. The sudden reversal of policy that threw us into a full-scale war in Korea, with a casualty list of more than 50,000, and the fear of another and larger debacle in Europe has raised a big question as to its judgment. The revelations concerning the tie-up between goverment and crime, the disclosures of political influence in obtaining RFC loans, the staffing of control agencies by political patronage, and the sale of jobs in at least one Southern State has destroyed confidence in its honesty and fairness. If we are to avoid disaster, the administration must quickly restore the confidence of the people. It must stop playing politics and bring to its aid those whose judgment they will trust. It must cut nonessential spending to the bone and clean out the influence peddlers and machine hangers-on. It must get rid of those whose soft policy toward communism has gotten us into this critical situation. Only by taking such drastic measures can it do this.

Open Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an open letter to the Congress of the United States, placed in leading newspapers of the Nation Sunday, March 4, 1951, by the Isbrandtsen Co., 26 Broadway, New York. I commend this letter to all Members of Congress:

To the Congress of the United States:

So that you will know, and knowing, you will consider, carefully investigate, and clarify the deliberately created hysteria in the Capitol of the United States other than the subject of high appropriations.

You have built a Frankenstein monster. Politics contributed to laying the foundation and foreign influences completed the job—like the vampire bat it has sucked the lifeblood from the veins of our way of life.

Public indignation and your investigations have proved that in this new era crime and rackets have penetrated public, social, and political life—Hollywood has glorified the easy way to glamor—legal confusion has contributed to disintegration—you stand in the Hall of Congress apparently confused and often imposed upon by pressure groups, State, National, and international—many beat the drums of war to divert public attention from realities to a magnetic sap of unpredictable spending, stimulating the selfishness of men both home and abroad.

The Nation reflects strong emotions of danger in mind, home, and business—your campaign promises and duties are often overlooked for the sake of a political Napoleonic grandeur—this is not inspiring to the people and business who pay the bills, and leaves ambition and life itself questionable.

We stand confused in our all-out policy of a global war that promises only destruction—isolationism carries the scourge of leprosy—you leave the path of nationalism under the guidance of foreign hyphenated groups in the name of world peace.

Today we are still muddling and meddling in the Orient. East is East and West is West—the twain has met. Backward China in the early 1860's warned the Occidentals "You are all too anxious to wake us up and start us on a new road, and you will do it, for, once awakened and started, we shall go fast and far—farther than you think, much farther than you want."

China fought its way out of a drugged stupor forced on her by opium wars, and today stands in defiance of Occidental rule. They have erected an Asian-Arab bloc of 1,500,000,000 peoples in declaration against and resentment of political, economic, and religious interference—they will create their own doctrine and will retain their culture and philosophy. The vast world markets cannot be regained or conquered by war, ambition, or intrigue by any nation, or by military action to force economic or religious issues or beliefs which will only increase hate and the determination amongst them.

The Orientals, by weight of numbers, believe they have a justification to exert their influence in settling the Korean question. Korea is in their sphere of race, religion, and culture and in the orbit of Oriental rule.

The United Nations cannot force Occidental rule over the Orient. There is no explanation of our purpose in a costly war in Korea.

We have debated for a long time the pros and cons of Nationalist China and the Peoples Government of China—our only offered solution and action to date is the growing possibility of an all-out war—even that is without explanation as to its intent.

High military authorities point out the folly of a losing undertaking. But, somewhere there is an influence in this destructive plan which invites our ultimate disaster. Many in Congress know of what we speak.

A much-questioned program was launched to deplete our manhood and treasure. This action was born out of resentment of the other fellow's beliefs and views. We followed an academic crystal-gazing philosophy without intelligence or understanding. We made many enemies and few friends by interfering in political and religious issues fostered by minority groups.

Today we are challenged by racketeers, socialism, and a crack-up of the American way of life. Through the valor of ignorance and folly, dreaming of riches, we entered a spirit of carnival time—the wisecracks of parasites of pleasure have supplanted the warnings and utterances of statesmen. In orgies and revelry we celebrate the birthdays of the founding fathers. This week Washington's advices and preachments will again be eulogized and disavowed. A new era is born. Social life dissipates its inheritance in sensationalism and in a toast to the dance of demoralization.

The world knows all this and encourages our disintegration—many will cheer the fall of modern Babylon. Those nations participating in draining our wealth will then have to end their Roman holiday and reluctantly go back to work.

The efforts of business and the people pay all costs of government; destroy their efforts and you destroy government. Every person in public life is a servant and employee of the taxpayer—no one is immune to the voice, vote, or will of the people.

You should declare a moratorium during which we might get back to stability, factual bookkeeping, and common sense.

Sanctions and arrogance have supplanted realization and understanding of the issues we in this country have had a large part in creating. On the seas we replace the flag of commerce with the flag of ships of war—make enemies instead of friends. Already our flag of commerce is denied access to more than half the world. Already we are the highest-cost country in the world. Regulations and sanctions add to the almost impossible task of us taking an intelligent part in the competition for foreign commerce.

It is universally known that understanding between nations and peoples is fostered by the bonds of industry and commerce—the necessary flow of goods that keeps the wheels turning all over the world—is basic to peace, and that mutual sanctions do precisely the opposite.

What has been done may not be undone, but is there no solution that our statesmen have to offer—is there no end in sight? The answer to that question, gentlemen, rests in your hands. The time is here—people are tired, confused, and searching for courageous leadership.

ISBRANDTSEN.

Treaty of Peace With Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution which I have introduced, and which Senator WATKINS introduced in the Senate yesterday, if passed, will relieve Italy of liabilities which it is under at the present time, and which prevent it from taking an effective part in the defense of liberties of Western Europe.

Denunciation of the Italian Peace Treaty will open the way for Italy to build up her own defense against Communist aggression and effectively contribute to the defense of the whole of Western Europe. It should substantially reduce the number of ground troops which the United States may be required to send to Europe.

The Italian Peace Treaty levied severe economic and territorial tribute on Italy. It deprived Italy of its armed strength and gave it in most part to Russia and her friends, thus weakening Italy and strengthening the military potential of the forces of communism.

The Italian Peace Treaty deprived Italy of certain territory along its borders and placed the inhabitants of that territory under the sovereignty of other nations without consulting the will of the people concerned. This was a violation of the spirit of the Atlantic Charter.

The Italian Peace Treaty placed severe limitations on the number of men who may serve in Italy's armed forces.

I believe that Italy should be allowed to more adequately arm herself and more effectively contribute to the defense against Communist aggression. Therefore, I urge the passage of this joint resolution.

Point 4 Agreements With Israel, Lebanon, and Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the State Department made three important announcements which constitute significant steps in the direction of raising the standard of living in the Near East and improving the economic stability of the area. Agreements have been reached with the State of Israel, Lebanon, and Jordan to undertake development projects in those countries under the point 4 program.

The agreement between the United States and Israel, signed at Hakirya (Israel) on February 26, 1951, by Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett and United States Ambassador Monnett B. Davis sets forth the conditions of cooperation prescribed by the Act for International Development of 1950, under which the point 4 program was authorized. Under the agreement the United States will send American experts to aid Israel in the development of specific projects, and a number of trainees will be brought to this country from Israel for the purpose of acquiring wider knowledge and experience in the specialized fields.

The State of Israel is anxious to obtain the help of American experts in connection with road construction, railways, irrigation methods, public-health services, citrus-fruit production, and technical training. Trainees from Israel are interested in learning methods and acquiring experience in the United States in deep-sea fishing, railways, ship repairing, the ceramic industry, and others. All of this would be extremely beneficial in the fulfillment of the 4-year plan of economic development of Israel, which aims to develop the country's resources, improve working conditions, and raise the standard of living of its population.

Israel has been making tremendous economic progress since its establishment as an independent state nearly 3 years ago. The United States was the first to recognize the independence of Israel, and since then the relations between the two countries have been most cordial and friendly. The new agreement, just completed, is a further example of the friendly relations and the spirit of cooperation between Israel and the United States.

The agreement between the United States and Lebanon calls for a technical mission of 12 specialists from the United States Department of Interior's Bureau of Reclamation to aid in the development of the Litani River. Specifically, the mission will make a survey for the power and irrigation development of the Litani. It will be recalled that in 1949 a United Nations Economic Survey Mission, headed by Gordon Clapp, visited Lebanon and recommended the development of the Litani River as a means of increasing the country's industrial and agricultural production. Among the major projects intended to raise the standard of living in Lebanon are the development of hydroelectric power and irrigation.

The agreement with Jordan, signed at Amman, paves the way for cooperative action to develop that country's resources and improve the standard of living of its people. Jordan has requested assistance in establishing a laboratory to handle technological problems, health, and research in agricultural and industrial chemistry. The United States will also aid in cleaning, repairing and enlarging cisterns, which are vital to this arid country.

Lebanon is about the size of Connecticut with a population of 1,200,000; Israel is somewhat smaller than Massachusetts with a population of 1,300,000; Jordan is somewhat larger than Maine and has 1,200,000 people. All of them are primarily agricultural countries, with much of the land under cultivation devoted to raising fruits, citrus fruits and the like. All of them have a serious deficiency in the production of certain foodstuffs, making it necessary for them to import large quantities of their food requirements. The agreements provide for specific development projects in these countries which will help to increase their agricultural output and to make them self-sufficient in feeding their populations.

This great accomplishment redounds to the credit of the United States. It is another example to other countries of what can be accomplished through cooperation in good faith. With these agreements in the economic sphere as a start, the United States should continue to urge an early consummation of a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab countries in order to establish true economic cooperation and stability in the whole Near East.

Such an accomplishment would be a great boon to the free world. The United States ought to explore this possibility most seriously. It should be made clear to the peoples of the Near East—and also the Far East—that economic development and a higher standard of living will enhance the chances for true peace with freedom, justice, and dignity.

The Atomic Bomb and the Defense of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am very pleased to place in the RECORD a copy of the radio address by Dr. Vannevar Bush, president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, which he delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System network for the Committee on the Present Danger on last Sunday evening.

In this address, Dr. Bush has given a penetrating analysis of probably the most serious problem which confronts us today. The address follows:

THE ATOMIC BOMB AND THE DEFENSE OF THE FREE WORLD

(By VANNEVAR BUSH)

My fellow citizens, the Committee on the Present Danger is beginning tonight a series of weekly broadcasts on the path that lies before the American people and how it can be met. The committee is a nonpartisan group of citizens who have organized to work together as the Nation prepares to safeguard freedom. I have never been a "joiner," as we call them on Cape Cod, but I believe so strongly in what this committee stands for that I am glad to be a member of it. We believe the Nation's preparation to meet the danger must go on the same scale as the danger itself. We believe balanced armed forces are the heart of such preparation. And we believe the utmost speed is essential. I have been asked to begin this series with a reckoning of the probabilities of the defense of the free world, and how the atomic bomb affects them.

There is no doubt of the desire of the American people—and of our friends. We wish to avoid war. We wish to preserve our freedom and the free way of life. In a world where aggressive dictators are loose at large, there is but one way to achieve these ends. That way is: to be strong. I am confident that the American people realize this. But we need to study just how to build that needed strength.

The key to the matter, in my opinion, is the A-bomb. At the end of the war our allies were exhausted. We disarmed. We know what has happened. Russia moved in. Working by intrigue and by the subversive overthrow of governments, she took over enormous territory and millions of people. But Russia stopped. Russia stopped at the boundary where the Kremlin was sure there would be war with us if it proceeded farther. We saw the matter tested out at the time of the air lift in Berlin, and we know what we confronted the Russians with true strength they did not force the issue.

The deterrent is nearly as powerful today as it was then. If Russia sent its armies rolling across the German plains tomorrow, we with our A-bomb and the planes to carry them would destroy Russia. We could do it without question as matters stand today. We could destroy not only the key centers from which her armies would be supplied, but also political centers and the communications of the armies on the march. Initially equipped with weapons and supplies these armies might keep rolling for a time, but there would be no Russia behind them as we know it today. The answer on this is that the armies will not roll. So almost our is in sight for the immediate future unless they or we make some very serious error indeed. If Russia knows that she cannot go beyond certain boundaries without precipitating a war, she will not pass those boundaries and war will occur. This has been well shown in recent years. The only apparent exception is in Korea, and there we did not make our position clear.

The difficulty is that we cannot remain indefinitely upon strategic bombing as the sole means of averting war. Today, it gives us a military stalemate. To overcome that stalemate is the real problem.

Defenses against strategic bombing have been mounting ever since the war. Air pursuit ships unlimited as ground radar

can be enormously effective in bringing down high-flying bombers. Russia with its vast distances can have extensive early warning radar networks to alert its defenses. She can have great fleets of jet pursuit ships for defense, accurately controlled from the ground night and day. She can also have about her key positions modern antiaircraft artillery and also perhaps ground-to-air guided missiles. Russia in time can thus protect her key points. Note that I say in time. She cannot do it now. She cannot at any time safeguard all the places in Russia we might wish to attack. But in time there is a strong probability that she can defend key points to the extent that we could not penetrate to them without prohibitive attrition. She is also building a stock of A-bombs of her own. The deterrent of our A-bombs is real. But we cannot count on its remaining fully effective forever. I trust we have time—time to prepare the defenses that will continue the balance and avert war. But we do not have time to waste.

These defenses center in an allied army in Europe capable of holding a defensive line, stopping the Russian hordes if they should ever start, and so dissuading them from starting. That army must be well trained and it must be supplied with the very best of weapons of every sort. It must be created before our present enormous atomic advantage is seriously lessened. Of course it needs to be combined with continued development of our striking Air Force and support of our Navy to keep the seas open, but there must be an army in being and on the spot capable of holding back the hordes of Russia. Such an army does not now exist.

This need by no means be a matter of opposing hordes by hordes. We have no idea whatever of invading Russia by land, nor should we develop any such idea. Ours should be a defensive line, a line to hold back the hordes while we strike by other means.

Many elements enter into this. In the first place, take the matter of tanks. Russia has 40,000 tanks of various sorts. All her military doctrine revolves about the use of tanks and artillery. But there have been developed in the last few years antiaircraft weapons of great power. Relatively small recoilless antitank guns mounted on a jeep or handled by four men can put a heavy tank out of business, with a high probability of doing it before the enemy can get off his first shot, even at ranges of 1,500 to 2,000 yards. These guns can be built in quantity by the hundreds for the cost of a single heavy tank. When the countryside is invested by stingers of this sort no tanks are going to roam that countryside long. There will still be a function for the light tank and for armored vehicles of various sorts. But the big tank has met its match, and, unless techniques change in a way that I do not now see, it will become a liability rather than an asset in due time. I do not say that the big tank is now obsolete; I do say we can make it obsolete if we put our minds to the job and build the things to counter it. With that problem settled, the defense of Europe is simpler.

There is another factor, moreover, which is of enormously great importance. Out in the Nevada desert there have recently been a number of explosions. Presumably they mean the testing of new types of A-bombs developed by the Atomic Energy Commission during the past 5 years. I will not speculate as to their nature, but we can certainly assume that we have not been idle and that we have more effective bombs today than we had 5 years ago. They may indeed be far more adaptable for a very important purpose.

We have thought of the A-bomb as a means for attacking great military production facilities or centers of political power. The A-bomb can also have important tactical uses. Suppose that a war were to break out 3 or 5 years from now and that the Russian hordes were held up by a much smaller number of well disciplined and well armed divisions. If the line were not too thinly held, if it were defended in depth with the land mines, antitank obstacles, artillery, and other weapons that we can have if we choose, how would the Russians break it? They could do so only by a huge concentration of armies, artillery, and tanks—the kind of thing the Nazis did in 1944 just before the Battle of the Bulge. But with A-bombs in existence this becomes a very different matter. An A-bomb delivered upon such a concentration by an airplane, or possibly by use of a gun or a guided missile, would be devastating. In its presence, concentration of this sort would not make sense. Tactical use of the A-bomb thus will help to make the defense of Europe with reasonable numbers of men a practicable matter.

Further, Europe is regaining courage and spirit. The mission of General Eisenhower and the evident determination of the American people are aiding greatly in that regard. We can join our strong and well trained troops with those of our allies in Europe—we must assemble them in such numbers that they can hold the line. When enough men are mustered, there are important technical innovations to enable them to hold such a line against vastly superior numbers. It is not a matter of meeting hordes with hordes. Yet with even the most subtle of modern weapons there must be men to maintain the line and men to wield the weapons if they are to be effective.

I trust therefore that in our provision of manpower we will look well to the future. There is no thought in my mind that the men we bring in for training now will have to fight soon. Rather I think they will be the beginning of a well trained, well organized reserve. We need not only an army in being on the spot, but also behind it masses of trained men who can be called, if it becomes necessary, without a long period of indoctrination. If total war ever comes again it will break suddenly. I believe that the way to accomplish this purpose is to induct 18-year-olds to have approximately 2 years training and service and thereafter to go into the reserve to build up the essential body of trained men.

We cannot build the forces we need without sacrifice. This sacrifice must come in many ways, in foregoing some of the pleasures we like to enjoy, in increased taxes and heavier burdens, and above all in the selflessness of our youth as they devote a part of their lives to training for the defense of decency and freedom. In my opinion we shall produce less interruption in the life of the youngster if we train him in the years of 18 and 19, after he has finished high school before he launches his permanent career. Moreover the earlier the training starts, the longer will men be available for the Reserve. It takes young men to fight a war.

As I said when I started this talk, the object of the free world is not to fight a war but to avoid the necessity of fighting. If we are wise I feel sure that we can avoid that necessity. We have today an able group of military leaders. We have a strength which Russia fears. The Kremlin will not strike unless it makes a mistake or unless we by the utmost foolishness cause it to make a false move in the belief that it can do so without bringing our retaliation upon it. We must keep such strength that we cannot be overwhelmed, such strength that to attack us would be suicidal. If we do, the attempt will not be made and we can live without a world war III. The sacrifices we shall make to that end, heavy though they may be, will be small, indeed, compared to the sacrifices we would make if through weakness or hesitancy we allowed a war to come upon us.

Nor does America stand up to Russia alone. Russia today faces the entire free world, of enormous production capacity and enormous numbers of men, a vigorous free world. The free world has no idea of making war on Russia. But it is determined to live in peace and to be strong in order to do so. We, of the United States, have great allies. They are temporarily in some distress, for they suffered grievously during the war. But their might is rising. France is rising with all of its great traditions of strength and independence. Britain is rising with its pride at having maintained the peace of Europe by its strength for many years. So are other allies as well. Their growing strength combined with ours can be made ample to stand off the present danger. If it is held in check that danger will in time fade. We will face the threat shoulder to shoulder, and facing it thus we will keep the peace.

One World—Two Giants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edgar Shook, of Kansas City, Mo., the president of the Kansas City Council on World Affairs, has called my attention to the following address given by Dr. Clarence R. Decker, president of the university of Kansas City. Dr. Decker's speech represents an important contribution to increased understanding of the international problems which confront every citizen today:

ONE WORLD—TWO GIANTS

(By Clarence R. Decker)

I

Always at the New Year I find myself burdened with dark memories of another New Year—a New Year now 18 years ago. I was spending the year in Europe, studying in Europe's famed universities, hiking, and traveling over Europe's countryside, from Norway in the northwest to Greece in the southeast, and to Turkey in Asia Minor. It had been a beautiful year. Nature was never more generous. But already, in the world of men, there were ominous rumblings of portentous events. Mussolini's voice was growing more strident. Hitler was grasping for power. Within a short while von Hindenburg—then old and ill—would sign the fatal piece of paper that would drive Germany into ruin and degradation. Spain's civil dissension cast its shadow before coming events. Pierre Laval—pictured that winter on Time Magazine's cover as the world's man-of-the-year—had risen from an obscure slacker in the First World War to a sinister international figure. Stalin was restive and furtive. Baldwin was committing England to the fatal policy of appeasement. Here in our own country we were too preoccupied with the depression and an ideology of isolationism to worry about the problems of the rest of the world.

In January of 1932 I found myself in Geneva, Switzerland. Late one afternoon the Council of the League was hastily summoned into emergency session. Japan had just delivered an ultimatum to China, threatening to attack Shanghai and Chapei

unless certain humiliating conditions were met within 22 hours. The attack was to begin at midnight, Geneva time. China, as a member of the League, had appealed to the Council.

All of us at Geneva were deeply disturbed. The situation itself was grave, but graver still were its implications. Ironically enough, the statesmen of 57 nations were at that moment assembling in Geneva for the ill-fated Disarmament Conference. The Sino-Japanese "incident," as it was called, came at a critical moment. Now, if ever, the League might justify its existence, might prove itself a powerful agent for world peace. Now, if ever, the signatories to the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war might prove their good faith. Now, if ever, wars made by men might be prevented by men.

As we gathered that afternoon we could see through the battery of windows the rays of the setting sun illuminating the snow-covered Alps rising majestically beyond the blue waters of Lake Geneva. It was a peaceful, sun-flooded world, almost theatrical in its perfection.

But inside the assembly hall there was neither peace nor light. Hundreds of persons milled about seeking seats in the already overcrowded room. On the slightly raised rostrum, in the shape of a horseshoe, 13 vacant chairs awaited their occupants, the official representatives of the Great Powers. Contrasting the peaceful world of nature outside and the confused world of men inside, one could not help recalling Wordsworth's lines:

"To her fair works did Nature link
The human soul that through me ran;
And much it grieved my heart to think
What man has made of man."

The Council members at last took their places. A nervous hush settled over the room. On the wall, at one end of the hall, the hands of the large clock moved steadily ahead, a kind of nemesis that at midnight would declare the beginning of another war.

M. Paul-Boncour presided. First he called upon Dr. Yen, Chinese Minister to the United States and special envoy to the League. In an eloquent, moving appeal, quietly spoken, Dr. Yen recalled the unprovoked attack on Manchuria in the fall, the brutal demands of a power-mad Japan on an unprepared and weak China. He called upon the League for protection under article XV of the Covenant. When he finished, the reporters and other members of the audience, in violation of the rules, burst into spontaneous applause. The chairman rapped for order. The hands of the clock had moved 1 hour closer to midnight.

Mr. Sato, the Japanese delegate spoke next. He too was eloquent—this we had to admit, even though our sympathies were almost unanimously with China. He recalled the humiliations of his own country at the hands of the great powers, including the United States. He argued that Japan was the victim of race discrimination, that in America we looked upon his people as the "yellow peril," that we had passed the Oriental Exclusion Act, that the great powers were seeking to strait-jacket a little island smaller than California but with a population of more than 70,000,000 people. He reminded us that Admiral Perry had forced the open door upon his country, that we too were guilty of exploiting China, that Japan's imperialism—if it was imperialism—was simply the problem of survival in an already imperialistic world. As he took his seat, the hands of the clock had moved ahead another hour toward midnight.

Then Paul-Boncour arose and made one of the most tragic talks I have ever heard. Here we are, he said in substance, a small group of men, the representatives of supposedly civilized nations. We are thousands of miles from the scene of imminent conflict. At midnight the troops will move. He reviewed all the circumstances. He pleaded for patience and good will, only to reach the conclusion that under existing circumstances there was little the League could do.

Silently we left the hall. As we made our way back through the cold midnight streets to our hotel, many of us were overwhelmed with the feeling that the world itself, not China alone, was at stake; that Paul-Boncour's confession of defeat was the world's confession of defeat; that we had witnessed the beginning of the Second World War.

The following morning we read in the papers of the smoking embers of Chapei, a charnel house in which thousands of humble people—men, women, and children—were blown to bits by Japanese bombers and infantrymen, while 200,000 other civilians barely escaped with their lives.

The fires of Chapei soon spread over the world. Almost 10 years later to the day, our own country found itself attacked at Pearl Harbor by the same ruthless and lawless aggressor. In Europe country after country had been invaded, cities and countrysides laid waste, minority groups brutally herded into concentration camps and all but exterminated by crematoriums, firing squads, starvation, and disease. And today, 18 years later, we find ourselves faced with events and decisions of similar, if far larger, import. It is as if the long arm of destiny had begun to not too clearly understood.

II

To understand a little better for ourselves, Mrs. Decker and I were happy to accept the invitation of the American Association for the United Nations to represent it on the 1949 round-the-world seminar tour of the well-known radio network program, "Town Hall of the Air." Altogether 28 national organizations, whose memberships included some 30,000,000 Americans in all fields—commerce and industry, labor and agriculture, education and cultural affairs—were represented.

The purpose of this pioneering venture was to increase American understanding of world problems, to promote understanding of America around the world, and to advance through uncensored public discussion, the cause of freedom, peace, and well-being.

With such ambitious ends in view, we were naturally disappointed that our efforts to include meetings and broadcasts behind the iron curtain were unsuccessful. Yet, even without the hospitality of the Kremlin, we traveled 33,000 miles by air, visited 15 world capitals, held daily conferences with leaders in the countries we visited, inspected many of their most significant undertakings, and produced over 150 local broadcasts in addition to the 2 network series broadcast in the United States. The cost of the trip was approximately $200,000, financed entirely by private funds. While we enjoyed the active assistance of our State Department and the full cooperation of foreign governments, we had no official responsibility. We were likewise entirely free from official control. The whole undertaking was in the best tradition of American free enterprise.

The results were gratifying from many points of view. The leaders of the countries we visited appreciated the questioning interest we took in their problems. That we were seeking understanding rather than giving advice impressed them. They were also impressed by our frank method of discussion, especially by our typically American way of disagreeing uninhibitedly and good-naturedly among ourselves. In many countries our meetings were a revelation in the technique of democratic discussion.

Such a trip deepens one's conviction that we are living in times that offer magnificent opportunities for genuinely heroic and creative achievements, but that thus far our midtwentieth century, far from behaving either heroically or even as civilized, actually threatens to destroy itself. The critical problems we face center around three characteristics unique in the modern world: (1) The release of atomic energy; (2) the ideological nature of our political problems; and (3) the shift of the center of international political gravity from Western Europe to Asia.

III

Hiroshima and Nagasaki struck a profound fear into the hearts of men throughout the world. The feverish postwar race for the perfecting and stockpiling of the atomic bomb, and other even deadlier weapons of destruction, aggravates our global fear and hangs like the sword of Damocles over all the other fears of insecurity that beset the smallest villages in India no less than the greatest cities of the western world. It likewise affects political strategy on the highest levels. The colossal failure of statesmanship to placate this modern Nemesis must be accounted a major predicament of our century.

IV

The history of war has been the history of mankind, but even allowing for the holy wars of the past, the world has never before been more divided and endangered by conflicting points of view more completely ideological in character. The ideological struggle of our times has been brilliantly summarized in these words:

"There are at this time two great nations in existence which, proceeding from different points, appear to be advancing toward the same end. I mean the United States of America and Russia.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. * * *

"The American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people; the Russian centers all authority of society in a single arm. The principal authority of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude.

"Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

These observations were not written yesterday. They appeared in a book entitled "Democracy in America," written by the distinguished French traveler and philosopher, Alexis de Tocqueville, and published in 1835, 115 years ago and 14 years before the appearance of Karl Marx's Communist Manifesto. The ideological problem arose long before Karl Marx was born, and it will continue long after Joseph Stalin dies. It is the ancient and perennial question of two profoundly irreconcilable ways of life—freedom and servitude. Lenin, and later Stalin, imported Marxism from Germany and adapted it to their special purposes, but it is no longer even communism as Marx conceived communism; it is rather what we should call Stalinism, an instrument of tyranny and suppression as cruel and as destructive as anything the Caesars, czars, or Nazis ever perpetrated.

But even as we contrast Stalinism and democracy, we Americans must remember that the ways of democracy in the United States are by no means always identical with the ways of democracy in the other non-Communist countries of the world. Surely the fact that these other countries have far more government control than ours can be charged solely against Socialists, planners, and other devotees of the so-called welfare state. Conservatives themselves are often responsible for "statism." In America, as Arthur Schlesinger in his recent book, The

American as Reformer, points out, many individuals at once wealthy and conservative have been in the vanguard of economic and social reform. In England the seeds of socialized medicine were sown in 1910 under a Conservative government. Lloyd George and Churchill supported its principle 20 years ago, and the Beveridge wartime report recommended its extension. Radio was nationalized under the Conservative Baldwin, land under Lloyd George. Radio, railroads, and utilities in many European governments were nationalized by conservative or middle-of-the-road governments. In Israel, supported largely by American money, the cooperatives and collectives account for one-half of the agricultural economy. In much of the Near East the tyranny of statism is actively promoted by reactionary feudal and other vested interests. It is true that 6 of the 15 countries we visited—all thus far on our side in the struggle against Stalinism—are less than 3 years old politically and each is struggling in its own way and with its own conditions to work out its democratic destiny. Their way may not seem to us the ideal way, but the moral remains that if we apply our own peculiarly American point of view too rigidly or too arbitrarily to other peoples, we shall not only fail to understand them, but we may easily drive them into the camp of our real enemy. The United States thus walks a tight-rope in its foreign relations.

Nonetheless, with this caution in mind, democracies the world over—as opposed to the Stalin ideology that ideas and ideals are not only impotent but evil unless embodied in matter and the might of force—do share to a greater or lesser extent the basic belief that free inquiry, open competition, and reasonable compromise, if undisturbed on the open market, offer the surest hope in the long run for the greatest good for the greatest number.

Of the two major ideologies, Stalinism presents, at least on the surface, a united front, while democracy—an evolutionary way of life derived from the liberal philosophy of Locke, Hume, Bentham, the French Encyclopedists, Jefferson, Hamilton, and others—is usually slow to form simple, clearly defined patterns of action. Stalinism consequently holds certain immediate strategic advantages in its quarrel with democracy. The postwar strategy of the democracies, I take it, has been to hold the line, to play for time while we clarified our thinking and mobilized our divergent energies, but except for a tactical success in Europe under the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the Atlantic Charter, there is no conclusive evidence that we have held even our own in most of the other critical centers in the world. There are signs now, however, that we are ready to unite on a crusade for freedom to forestall the threatened loss of the free world by default.

V

The struggle has thus far centered mainly in Europe, but the emergence of Asia as a dominant force adds a third unique factor to the modern world. As the world chooses up sides, or as specific countries have one or the other side thrust upon them, Asia, with half the population of the world, occupies an increasingly pivotal role. There—in terms of territory, numbers of people, and in immediate human appeal—communism has thus far made the more significant gains. We have lost China, largely because, in an effort to choose the lesser of two evils, the western democracies during the thirties and early forties supported a corrupt reactionary regime out of touch with the people; we have found no way to secure Korea; and we could easily lose Japan once the occupation is withdrawn; southeastern Asia is drifting; and India, Pakistan, and the Near East—troubled by their own special problems—have yet to make up their minds. With the balance of power and influence in Asia—and with our own destiny in Asia no less than in Europe—we have yet to impress western democracy in understandable terms on the Orient. We have yet to impress it on many parts of Europe, but there we have at least not appeared indifferent.

The ideological war of our century is all the more ominous when we recognize that the appallingly low level of human existence throughout the world, especially in Asia, precludes for most peoples any real freedom to choose wisely among the alternatives. The vast majority of the world's population lives in filth, disease, poverty, and ignorance—a subanimal existence as low as in any previous period of remembered history.

The degraded level of life in much of our so-called modern civilization is, of course, aggravated by what we all hope are temporary dislocations. The refugee problem, for example. Racial and religious intolerance has literally driven millions of people from their ancient homes and lands. We saw them herded together in camps or slums like so many cattle: Jews from Europe and Africa in Israel; Arabs from Palestine in Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, and Transjordan; Moslem Indians from India in Pakistan and Hindus from Pakistan in India. In this last religious war, in the home of Gandhi's "passive resistance," more people were killed than our entire casualties in the war against Japan. Whatever the complicated reasons for the modern barbarism that has displaced millions of people, the unhappy fact remains that their lives can never be wholly or even adequately rehabilitated.

But even beyond the refugee problem, the grim truth is that for the vast majority, human life on this planet has neither dignity nor importance. As we drove one day to the sacred spot on the Ganges where Gandhi's ashes were strewn, we passed through the dirty crowded streets of Calcutta where literally millions of people live and breed in a squatter's existence, amidst a vast confusion of sacred cows, carabao, camels, goats, cats, dogs, chickens, parrots, and monkeys. For safety's sake we asked our young Hindu chauffeur to drive cautiously. He shrugged his shoulders and commented, "What is the loss of one more? We have so many!"

There are times, while encircling this sorry globe, that one is almost convinced that man is not only indifferent to his present state, but that he is intent on race suicide. The older civilizations of the world have all but destroyed the good earth—the mother of us all. Through centuries of waste and neglect—in Italy, Greece, Egypt, and Asia—man has decimated his forests, laid waste his soil. Egypt, once the bread basket of a civilization sustaining millions of people, is today in large part a boundless and bare desert whose "lone and level sands stretch far away." The cedars of Lebanon, once responsible for a magnificent maritime fleet that carried trade and commerce to all the corners of the known world, are no more. The fertile fields and timber-covered mountains of Greece, once the support of one of the greatest civilizations the world has ever known, are today barren and sterile.

Throughout the United States, we have lost from one-third to one-half of our top soil in little more than a century. Many of our raw materials are already expended. The great iron-producing Mesabi Range of Minnesota is nearing its end. Great civilizations of the past have gone the way of all flesh. There is no reason to suppose that we in the United States are immune. Although the world still has great undeveloped areas, there is no reason to believe that the resources even of our planet are limitless.

As we deplete the good earth that sustains us, population is everywhere increasing more rapidly than our techniques and resources for supporting it. In Japan alone—a country, I repeat, slightly smaller than California—the population today is 85,000,000 (15,000,000 more, in spite of all war casualties, than in 1932), and recent studies indicate that this already overcrowded population will increase another 20,000,000 during the next two decades. Birth control, important and helpful, has been accepted as official policy in most of the non-Catholic countries of the world, but that alone cannot solve the problem. Only a highly developed and balanced world economy provides the intelligence and ability to correlate resources with subsistence. But today vast extremes in power, wealth, and culture plague us everywhere. Less than an hour from relatively intelligent farmers plowing with modern tractors, primitive peasants still till the soil with crude wooden plows. Their grain is still harvested with hand sickles, threshed with wooden sleds, winnowed by tossing into the air against the wind. The grim fact is that mankind is caught in a back-to-the-wall struggle for survival in a world that is at least four-fifths slave and one-fifth free.

Under these conditions, we cannot wonder at the vast restlessness throughout the world. The climate is propitious for a bitter and suicidal war between the privileged and the underprivileged. The struggle is manifest in many ways—conflicts over color, race, and creed; the bitterness of 216,000,000 colonials toward imperialists; the historic antagonism of Asiatics toward westerners; the hatred of the poor toward the rich, the starving toward the well-fed. There is little or no formal education, but lack of education does not blind people to the fact that some have, but that most have not. Under these circumstances they will not—indeed, cannot—choose rationally between Stalinism and democracy. They stretch out desperate hands for the first crumbs that promise to satisfy their hungers.

VI

I have reported a grim picture of the state of man in this midtwentieth century. Candor compels me to do so. But what of the future? Is the world well lost?

I am not without hope, although I must confess that our planet seems to me in a bad way and quite capable of losing H. G. Wells' oft-quoted "race between education and catastrophe." The greatest hope for the future, it seems to me, is found in the heroic efforts of some men and women everywhere to give order and meaning to the chaos of our times. I speak of men and women, because people, far more than government, represent the creative forces of life. On the larger scale, I have seen what has happened to a country like Turkey in the past 30 years—a country transformed from feudalism into a partial democracy almost over night. I have seen the miracle of Palestine. On a smaller scale I have seen the building of hydroelectric plants, irrigation systems, universities, medical schools, hospitals, and health centers in Pakistan and India. I have met women, like the 70-year-old minister of health in Delhi, fighting hopefully against seemingly insuperable odds. Given the chance and tools adequate to the task, I am convinced that people want to help themselves.

Although we must rely ultimately on people themselves, government must open the way and facilitate their efforts. What is to be the role of the United States in the shaping of the world of the future?

I disregard the position of the isolationist. Although we still have isolationists among us, some in high office, I do not believe that any substantial group of Americans seriously believes that this country, with less than 7 percent of the population of the world, can live unto itself and survive. Less than 50 years ago the British Empire—then at the height of its power and influence—celebrated in gorgeous pageantry the diamond jubilee of Queen Victoria.

"There were miles of warships gathered at Spithead; feudatory princes from India and representatives of free peoples ruling over territories such as has never before owed allegiance to a single flag were assembled to do homage to the aged sovereign. The newspapers whose 'frantic boast and foolish word' gave utterance to the feeling of the nation from which those newspapers took their spirit, were not without excuse. But suddenly, upon ears still ringing with the blare of trumpets and hearts still elate with the proofs of material power, there fell the arresting voice which proclaimed the insufficiency and evanescence of all such power:

"'Far called, our navies melt away,
On dune and headland sinks the fire:
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!'"[1]

The British Empire, forgetting its larger responsibilities, even then was lost, but out of its revolution emerged the Commonwealth, which I hope will flourish because she is an essential and congenial partner in our common democratic cause. Yet the painful knowledge of the price the greatest and the most powerful Empire had to pay should give all Americans pause—"Lest we forget! Lest we forget!"

Just as I disregard the position of the isolationist, I assume in my own thinking that the United States, although it possesses half the manufacturing capacity of the world and the only highly mechanized agriculture, is not rich or strong or wise enough to underwrite the entire globe. But our possessions involve responsibilities. The task of our leadership is to give economic, technological, and financial help designed to open the way for friendly countries to get on their feet. The point 4 program of the United Nations, rather than the Marshall plan, indicates the road for our long-time policy. From our own selfish as well as altruistic point of view, an enlightened program would encourage foreign investments of private American capital on a competitive enterprise basis. Already we are investing some $18,000,000,000 outside the United States and approximately $11,000,000,000 from abroad is being spent here. A dynamic program of international trade and economic development would extend what ARAMCO is doing in the oil fields of the Middle East, Westinghouse and General Electric in the Far East, United Fruit in the Caribbean, Sears, Roebuck in Mexico and Brazil, and United States Steel in Venezuela, where the most far-flung and greatest of all ore searches has culminated in the discovery of La Parida, an area 11 miles long and 1 mile wide, containing the richest and greatest iron deposit in the history of the world. Like these larger industries, many smaller businesses are finding exciting opportunities throughout the world.

Such a program must be partnership-capitalism at its best, without colonialism, imperialism, or exploitation. It implies that we will negotiate treaties guaranteeing fair treatment for American private capital when it goes abroad, including an insurance program for these private investments. It means that we will provide technical assistance as rapidly as foreign countries can absorb it, especially through such missions as we have recently sent to Brazil and Iran to survey the over-all needs and resources of those countries. It includes government-to-government credit for undertakings outside the scope of private enterprise—the building of harbors, transportation, and communication facilities, sanitation and the like. It assumes that we will reduce tariffs, perhaps to a free trade level, for those countries who cooperate with us, in order that we may replace our own dwindling supplies of strategic materials—lead, zinc, copper, tin, manganese, uranium, and many others.

Never before has the United States held such a stake in world economy. Never before has the world held such a stake in American economy. The point 4 program—designed to bring food and electric power and health to the underprivileged—has so powerful an appeal that even Russia has not dared to oppose it.

But even as we extend our technological and economic way of life around the world, we need desperately to disseminate our spiritual way of life. It is essential to our own future that we win friends and influence people in the way we have never done before—in a way, I repeat, that is understandable abroad.

Even the most casual traveler around the world quickly senses a strange mixture of admiration, anxiety, and disdain toward us. My own general impression, contrary to that of some others, is that the people of the non-Communist world genuinely like most Americans, but that they hold certain strongly felt reservations, many of them psychological, about us. (1) We are the rich uncle and they often betray an understandable envy of the vast power, wealth, and world prominence we have acquired in a relatively short period of time. (2) They appreciate our economic help, but thoughtful Europeans know, as some Americans occasionally forget, that the Marshall plan was designed to save us as well as Europe. The Near and the Far East, on the other hand, wonder why we want only to save Europe. (3) They are inclined to feel that we are often excitable and inexperienced in our foreign policies, that we act first and reflect later, that we sometimes allow purely domestic considerations to influence international affairs, and that we are so far to the right that we cannot understand the peculiar nature of their social and political problems. Sometimes they suspect that we may try to force an imperialist capitalist democracy on all the rest of the world. They may admit that our democracy works reasonably well in the United States, but they object to the notion that it is invariably superior to their own or better adapted to their needs. (4) The Asiatics especially think we are hypocritical on matters of social justice. Our Negro problem, with the help of Communist propaganda, is played up everywhere. They may not actually be deeply concerned about our Negroes, but they see it in terms of the Oriental problem. (5) They are often offended by the naive insolence—the exhibitionist conduct and patronizing manners—of some occupation personnel and tourists. (6) They feel that while our culture produces high living standards with a large amount of personal freedom, it also produces high divorce rates, tawdry entertainment, and stomach ulcers. Our movies abroad, for example, convey an impression of immaturity, crime, speed without direction, materialism, and plushness. As Mayor Singh, of Delhi, phrased it in a talk before our group:

"When the West is purely materialistic in conception as well as in practice—and most of the ills of the modern world are due to this materialism—we feel there is much that the West can learn from us, as there is so much we in the East can learn from the West."

Unfortunately, Europe and, even more, Asia is convinced that what it can learn from us is purely technological. They do not believe that we have anything to teach them about a way of life.

Most Americans believe that these criticisms are either untrue or grossly exaggerated, but at this crucial moment in history the important fact is that they are widely believed. Our task, therefore, is to persuade the world in practical deeds that we are not a Frankenstein, not a technological monster and a crass materialist. Even as we send our bath tubs, tractors, turbines, and gadgets around the world, we must also share our nonmaterialistic culture—our literature, our art, our philosophy of the good life. The most precious things we have to share are our Bill of Rights, our Government of law rather than of men, our dynamic and creative culture. And as we export these spiritual values, we must indicate our willingness to import the rich cultural resources of other peoples who can become our friends or remain our friends.

Americans are famous for their salesmanship. No important business concern would fail to provide generously for its advertising and its public relations. Yet, until recently, our country has not really tried to sell its way of life to its friends. Stalinism understands the power of ideas and the value of propaganda in disseminating ideas. In a statement not long ago, Andrei Vishinsky made it clear that the Communists consider ideological weapons superior to tanks and bombs: "We shall conquer the world," he said, "not with atom bombs, but with something the Americans cannot produce—with our ideas, our brains, our doctrines." In this connection, I recall, among the many slogans scribbled on the walls of buildings, on sidewalks, on vacant spaces everywhere in the Russian sector of Berlin, this memorable bit: "Korea for the Koreans, Coca-Cola for the Americans."

In our stand against Stalinism, we are supporting the soldier munificently, as we should. We are supporting the statesman generously, as we should. But ultimately life is not military and it is not political, it is moral. There is no defense—not even an Atlantic Charter, a Marshall plan, a hydrogen bomb, or an international army—against Soviet ideology, except a superior moral and intellectual courage. That is why we need so desperately to develop ambassadors of good will and mutual understanding, whether they come from high Government levels and such official agencies as the United States Information Service, or, more important, whether they be industrialists, businessmen, teachers, artists, students, or simply tourists. These need to be encouraged to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature—the gospel of trade in goods, in services, in ideas, and, not the least, in ideals.

VII

A few days before we left Tokyo, Mrs. Decker and I called on one of Japan's elder statesmen. He had had a long record in Japan's foreign service—a record of devotion to his country's best interests. He had held various posts, including 3 years as Ambassador to Russia. His life had been one of profound anticommunism and pro-Americanism. He had withdrawn from all public life in 1941 in silent protest against Pearl Harbor. Now, as Director of the United Nations Tokyo Committee, he invited us to his quarters to meet with his committee. As the thin, gray, little man with a quiet, professorial manner greeted us, our minds went spinning back to the meeting of the Council of the League of Nations in January of 1932. Our host was Dr. Naotake Sato, whom we had not seen for 17 years. As we shook hands, he said simply, "I had a poor cause to defend that day." Now he is devoting his remaining years to a better cause, the cause of free men who would live in a free world. We can hope only for him, as for the millions of other men of good will throughout the world, that there is still time.

The day before we left Tokyo the city was shaken by earth tremors. A few hours later "Typhoon Kitty," the most violent since the war, clawed the Tokyo-Yokohama

[1] Hugh Walker, the Literature of the Victorian Era (Cambridge, University Press, 1921), p. 1.

district with an 80-mile-an-hour fury, uprooting miles of trees along the boulevards, destroying thousands of homes and leaving homeless some 150,000 persons, killing and injuring hundreds, creating millions of dollars of damage.

As we later boarded our plane for the last lap of our 'round-the-world flying-inquiring seminar, this willfulness of nature somehow symbolized the perverse and uncertain world of our twentieth century. We can now fairly closely predict the time, place, and force of typhoons. We cannot yet control their causes or mitigate their havoc.

So also with the typhoons of our political and moral world. Yet, though we have no clear assurance for our future, the will to survive as free men is deep, heroism and faith are still the dynamic virtues, and people the world over—like the men, women, and children of Tokyo the morning after the typhoon—are busily clearing away the debris and rebuilding with eternal hope for a better world.

A Capital Levy Sneaks Up on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, in addition to inflation, home owners are finding the capital gains tax not only burdensome but a confiscation of home ownership. Americans are a moving population—especially in wartime. A home owner in New York who paid $12,000 for his home in 1939 is compelled to sell and move to the Central West. He receives $25,000 for his old house. He pays a 25-percent capital gains tax, that leaves him $21,750, but he cannot buy a new house like the one he has just sold for less than $25,000. So he is short $3,250 of the purchase price of a new home, due entirely to a thoroughly unjust and confiscatory system of taxation. This same thing is happening to the farmer and the manufacturer as shown by Fred H. Sexauer in a recent issue of Spotlight:

A CAPITAL LEVY SNEAKS UP ON US

Inflation and capital gains taxes are a new method by which the home owner, the small businessman, and the farmer are having part of their capital taxed away. There is talk of raising the capital-gains tax but little thought is given to its effect on the little man. May I illustrate?

John Jones 10 years ago bought a house. He paid $6,000 for it. Since that time inflation has cut the purchasing power of the dollar in two. If he were to buy that house today it would cost him $12,000. John Jones finds he must leave his job and go to a neighboring city; so he sells his house for $12,000. He has gained $6,000. That gain is taxable. Let us assume, just for the sake of argument, that it is taxable for 25 percent. That means he pays to the Government $1,500. John now moves to the new city. There he buys an identical house and he pays $12,000. But he only has $10,500 to pay for it. That is his net on an identical house which he sold for $12,000. Now John Jones has a $12,000 house and a $1,500 mortgage. The Government has taken 12½ percent of his capital.

Well, let's take a farmer. Ten years ago he started farming with 20 cows for which he paid $200 apiece. That is $4,000. His son has grown up and he decides he wants to expand and change the breed of cattle. He sells the 20 cows for $400 apiece. That is $8,000. He has a $4,000 profit. Let us assume this, too, is taxable at 25 percent. So he has $7,000. His son now buys 20 cows of a different breed, paying $400 apiece. Farmer Brown only has $7,000 to pay on these cows; the Government has taken not a cattle-gains tax but a capital levy.

Inflation and capital gains deprive every man who must sell his property and change his location of a part of his original capital. This can be repeated over and over again with small business, professional men, everyone who for whatever reason must relocate but continues in the same field of activity.

The capital tax is sneaking up on the American public behind the twin camouflage of inflation and capital-gains tax. What is now done by indirection, if continued long enough, undoubtedly will be looked upon as sound public policy—to confiscate and redistribute wealth by such a concealed capital levy.

A Song for Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial and a letter relative to a contest looking to the selection of an official song for Washington, D. C., with a brief statement commenting on them. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and letter, together with the statement, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SONG FOR WASHINGTON, D. C.

On March 5, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for himself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] offered a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) relative to the selection of an official song for Washington, D. C.

In this period of strain and crisis, it is not only proper but also a dictate of wisdom that such a resolution, which calls upon the Congress to recognize the need for songs and singing, should be introduced.

During the depths of the depression in the 1930's, when fear and uncertainty stalked millions of homes and our great financial institutions were tottering, gloom was driven out, hearts were lightened, and we were taught to laugh and sing again by the minstrels and entertainers of stage and screen. Men like the late Al Jolson and Eddie Cantor did not solve the depression, but through their songs the strain was eased and the problem made to appear smaller. With songs on their lips, the American people found that the problem was just the proper size for them to handle.

Surely no Member of the Senate can hear or sing the Star-Spangled Banner without feeling the same strong surge of pride and confidence that the composer, Francis Scott Key, felt as he watched the valiant defense of Fort McHenry.

This country has been made great through the rhythms of its songs, the singing spirit of its people.

The great cotton plantations of the South were created and tended to the accompaniment of some of the world's great folk music. This Nation stretched its sinews westward to the Pacific, built railroads, and created cities and garden valleys while singing the songs of Stephen Foster and other composers of the people.

I have learned that music is of great value as a tonic for the soul, as a cultural balance for the home and for the Nation.

In perilous times such as this, we need songs—not just militant marching songs, but also hymns of peace and strength, ballads of love and home, and songs of civic and national pride.

Perhaps it was a similar emotion which led the Honorable Andrew Fletcher to say in 1703:

"Give me the making of the songs of a nation and I care not who makes its laws."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 17, 1951]

SINGING OF WASHINGTON

Mr. James H. Simon strikes a poignant note in his letter elsewhere on this page bemoaning the lack of a suitable song for the District of Columbia. There is no emotion more fundamental than the love of home, and there is nothing like a rousing song to stir State and community pride. But Washingtonians confronted with, say, a group of Iowans waxing forth with the Tall Corn Song can only mumble meekly, "We're from Washington—that's where we have no votes" or offer a subdued chorus of Somebody Loves Me, I Wonder Who? There are even some cynics who say that the District could appropriately take over the Missouri Waltz or start adapting Beautiful Ohio. No loyal Washingtonian, however, could agree to such intrusions.

Joking aside, the contest suggested by Mr. Simon is a constructive idea which, in addition to being a lot of fun, should serve to kindle community spirit. We congratulate Mr. Simon and the Motorola Co. on their enterprise. For whatever song is chosen should be a good one, sprightly and original, that captures the spirit of this beautiful Capital. Surely there are many embryo Francis Scott Keys along the Potomac of today who will want to try their hand at a composition which Washingtonians, both native and adopted, can sing with gusto.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 17, 1951]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A SONG FOR WASHINGTON

I am a native Washingtonian born and raised in good old Georgetown, and I am very proud of my home town.

I have occasion four or five times during the year to attend conventions which attract others from all sections of the country. These conventions usually end up with a big banquet. While dinner is being served, the orchestra will inevitably begin to play home town songs. As each home town or State song is played, the fellows at the table representing that section of the country will get up and cheer and join in the singing of their native song.

Time after time this has presented a most embarrassing situation for me, and it has reached a point now where I join in with the Maryland fellows singing "Maryland, My Maryland," or the Virginia contingent in helping them sing, "Carry Me Back to Old Virginny."

I have become quite used to taxation without representation, but I am getting quite tired of posing as an adopted son and using Maryland or Virginia as my excuse for being born in Washington. Why don't we have a song representing the Nation's Capital? The only one all of us know is, "Hail to the Redskins," and, while it is a good song, it is certainly not representative of all of the great things that our city stands for.

The situation has become an obsession with me and in discussing it with my friend, Paul Galvin, the president of the Motorola Co., he said, "You have a great point there. Why don't we do something about it? Suppose Motorola puts up some prizes and invites people to write a song for the Nation's Capital. We will set up a bunch of judges to pick the best song, and I think you will get a tremendous number of songs submitted for the contest."

This, Mr. Editor, is our idea and our aim. With your help in obtaining the great public interest this deserves, we might end up with something as catchy as California, Here I Come or Deep in the Heart of Texas. And what about Harry Truman and his Missouri Waltz?

Will you help us?

JAMES H. SIMON,
President, Simon Distributing Corp.

If This Be Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, here is a message from Edward R. Eastman, editor of the American Agriculturist, the oldest agricultural paper in the United States. It occupies a position of leadership and speaks for the farmers in the Northeastern States. If everyone who reads this article—whether he is for or against the viewpoint expressed by Ed Eastman—would speak up to his representatives in Congress, it would give Members of Congress helpful guidance in appraising what their constituents want at this time.

The article follows:

IF THIS BE TREASON

At a time when every person in this Nation (whether he realizes it or not) is struggling under a burden of direct and indirect taxes more ruinous than at any other time in the history of the Nation, President Truman submits another tax budget far greater than any other President has ever called for either in wartime or peacetime. His budget asks for $71,594,000,000 for the coming fiscal year.

No human being has any way of realizing how much a billion of anything really is, to say nothing of seventy-one and a half billion. But anyone who does any thinking at all knows what such Government spending will do to the Nation and to every individual in it.

Some of that huge expenditure is necessary for national defense. I have no quarrel with that. But in common with millions of other taxpayers I resent bitterly Truman's insistence that the cost of socialistic schemes—which not only help to ruin us financially but are contrary to our American liberties—be added to an already ruinous budget. These schemes, as you know, include: the Brannan Farm Plan; socialized medicine; Federal aid to education; subsidization of agriculture, followed by iron controls; further nationalism of electric power; and the expansion of Government ownership and operation of business.

Even great leaders of the Democratic Party like Senator Byrd, of Virginia, say that at least $7,000,000,000 can be cut out of this all-time high budget by some economy in domestic policies and enterprises.

No bureaucrat need ask me as an editor to help raise money to pay Government expenses as long as the national budget provides for the gradual taking over of our American way of business and of life by the socialists and the rapid destruction of our liberties. In the words of Patrick Henry: "If that be treason, make the most of it!"

Importance of Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial entitled "Strategic Air Power: The Big Stick Holding Back Kremlin's Aggression," which appeared in the March 1 issue of the Anderson (S. C.) Independent. No one can question the extreme necessity of maintaining an adequate ground force to protect this country from the spread of the evil communism, but we must also realize the important role strategic air power is now playing and will continue to play in national defense. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGIC AIR POWER: THE BIG STICK HOLDING BACK KREMLIN'S AGGRESSION

Not even the most ardent supporters of plans to send United States ground troops to Europe will say today that such a force would slow Soviet Russian advance into Western Europe.

The force is token. The four divisions contemplated at present for service in Western Europe would be there as indication of United States good faith in ability of the European nations to arm themselves.

It was as such that General Eisenhower recommended it, and it is as such that it should be approved.

The fact remains that fear of atomic bombing carried out by the Strategic Air Command is what is staying the aggressive hand of the Kremlin.

The Third District's Congressman BRYAN DORN made an effective plea recently for a defense policy based upon the Strategic Air Command.

It is DORN's belief that only top-heavy strength in bombers can continue to stay the Russian hand or, in case of attack, provide the best hope for eventual victory.

He charged that military thinking is in a straitjacket and that younger men, brains uncluttered by outmoded tradition, should have more say-so in the Nation's defensive and offensive planning.

In that he is supported by Alexander de Seversky, aircraft designer, and military student of note, who told the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees that a revised budget is needed with at least two of every three dollars going to the Air Force.

Like DORN, he contends that the present planning is dominated by men whose ideas are outmoded; that the Navy is utterly irrelevant as an offensive force in the present situation.

Obviously the United States is outmanned on the ground, and land war in Europe if pursued by large American armies would bleed the country white within a short time, and still with no guaranty of even stalemate or victory.

It is known that Soviet Russia fears attrition from the air. The Soviet productive machine, although increased enormously, is creaky and highly vulnerable to air blows.

Russia's armies could overrun better than half the world but, as DORN points out, they would find victory empty if their homeland was laid in ruins and millions of their loved ones sizzled in the flashes of atomic or hydrogen bombs.

Strategic air power, recognized as the one force holding back all-out Red aggression, appears to us the best hope for maintaining a precarious peace. Likewise, should war come, it is the only hope of survival.

Congressman DORN is to be commended for forcefully bringing this to the attention of all Americans.

The Moscow-Peiping Plot Against Asia's Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call attention to an article in the February issue of the American Federationist.

Written by Richard Deverall, a representative of the American Federation of Labor in Asia, it is titled "The Moscow-Peiping Plot Against Asia's Freedom." It details the Communist intent in Asia in a superior manner.

The article follows:

THE MOSCOW-PEIPING PLOT AGAINST ASIA'S FREEDOM

(By Richard Deverall)

Many of us remember well the raving pages of Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf, with its blueprint for the conquest of the west. Some of us found in Mein Kampf a clear warning of Nazi intentions. Others regarded it as the work of a madman, a wild dog, a screwball. But, as we know today, Mein Kampf was a document that clearly outlined the tactics and strategy of the Nazis.

So, too, today many who have read the collected works of V. I. Lenin and such books as Joseph Stalin's Problems of Leninism have been plainly forewarned by the Soviet slave masters that their objective is world domination and nothing less, that they plan to achieve conquest of the world by first conquering Asia and then using the men and raw materials of Asia to destroy the remaining portions of the free world.

Thus in one of the last articles penned by Lenin, found on page 854 of volume II of his Selected Works (Moscow, 1947), we read:

"In the last analysis, the upshot of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And it is precisely this majority that, during the past few years, has been

drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of socialism (Stalinism) is fully and absolutely assured."

There is no secret in all this. It is not Anglo-American or anti-Soviet propaganda. Following Lenin, Stalin has himself written on countless occasions of the intentions of the Soviet geopoliticians to conquer China first, then through China conquer Asia and, with control of the land mass of Eurasia, complete the conquest of the entire world. This follows the classic formulation of Lenin:

"The road to Paris is through Peiping."

Some persons profess to see in the Communist drive a "glorious and epic crusade" to free the world from imperialism and colonialism. They view the literacy, electric power, and collective farming schemes of Communist Russia as achievements of the Soviet regime. Such persons overlook the tens of millions of Soviet citizens who languish in slave labor camps because they dare to assert their God-given humanity and their human rights. Such naive persons overlook a Yugoslavia which, if it is Communist, is not under the heel of Stalin and which therefore, in Stalin's view, must be destroyed by a Communist Russia whose concept of democracy is utter surrender to the will of the Kremlin.

The Communist geopoliticians at Yalta in 1945 wrung from President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill amazing concessions which made straight the path for the advance of Soviet imperialism in Asia. Yalta guaranteed Russian control of Manchuria, guaranteed the encirclement of a disarmed and defeated Japan by Soviet military and naval power, and guaranteed the fall of democratic Korea under the weight of Soviet pressure.

When the war ended, the honest attempt made by the West to find the road to world peace was termited, as ever, by the Soviet butchers. They created the Cominform, pushed guerrilla activities through stooge Asian Communist parties, and most cynically used Japanese arms and the vacuum created by Japan's defeat to launch full-scale guerrilla warfare in China, in Indochina, and other Asian areas.

It must never be forgotten that so-called British imperialism has drastically retreated in Asia. British power has left India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, and other areas. The Dutch have been forced to relinquish political control of rich Indonesia. Throughout Asia the greatest phenomenon of the postwar era is the end of European power in Asia.

And in the Asian countries which have found freedom and national independence, indigenous regimes have struggled with the terrible social and economic problems which resulted from the brutal and wasteful occupations of the Japanese Army. These new regimes have struggled to emancipate their people and to resurrect and refurbish their century-old cultures and century-old civilizations. Yet Moscow has attacked each and every national regime in Asia—except those subservient to Moscow—as bourgeois, antinational, rotten regimes.

In essence the Soviet aim in Asia since the end of the Pacific war has been to wreck the new-found national independence of Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Indochina, Indonesia, Burma, Korea, and the Philippines. Stalin's actions clearly warn that Red China is the Asian base which the Kremlin is using to extend Communist domination across the map of ancient Asia. Where the British and Dutch and French have withdrawn, Moscow and its Asian stooges plan to march in. Nothing less than complete domination of Asia is the objective of the Kremlin and its Chinese Communist colony.

The Stalinist butchers use two tactics in the achievement of their aggressive strategy and warmongering.

One is the exploitation of overseas Chinese minorities in the Philippines, Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma to aid in the financing of Chinese Communist propaganda, penetration, and espionage. Anyone who listens to Radio Peiping broadcasts made daily to the overseas Chinese knows that the Chinese Communists are banking on use of overseas Chinese as a fifth-column in Free Asia.

The second tactic is use of the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions and its stooge unions to foment civil disorder, violence, sabotage, and juncture with Communist guerillas in the final all-out push to liquidate the governments of Indochina, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, Thailand, and the Philippines.

All this is a matter of the Communist record.

Early in September of 1949, Asian and Australasian Communist leaders and WFTU affiliates received invitations to attend a conference to be held in Peiping, capital of Communist China. The invitation requested complete reports on the situation in your respective countries, progress of your organizations, your problems and the means of solving them, and the assistance you wish to obtain from the WFTU. The WFTU conference met in Peiping on the 16th of November 1949 with some 177 delegates on hand, representing 13 countries, including Communist Russia, Communist China, Communist Mongolia, North Korea, Indochina, India, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, Ceylon, Malaya, Iran, and the Philippines.

The conference was formally opened by Liu Shao-chi, a vice president of the WFTU, trusted adviser to Mao Tse-tung and honorary president of the All-China Federation of Labor. With the geopolitical ambitions of world communism well in mind, Liu told the assembled delegates that over one-half of the world's population lives in the vast territories of Asia and Australasia; these territories have rich resources, industrious working peoples.

As even a blind man can see by reading Liu's speech, this was no conference of bona fide trade-union leaders promoting free-trade unionism but rather a top policy conference of military men, guerrilla tacticians, and quasi-trade-unionists plotting the military destruction of the hemisphere of Asia not yet under Soviet domination. Thus Liu said:

"The path which led the Chinese people [that is, the Communists—Editor] to victory is expressed in the following formula:

"(1) The working class must unite to form a broad, nation-wide united front.

"(2) This nation-wide united front must be led by the Communist Party.

"(3) It is necessary to build up through patient struggle a Communist Party equipped with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

"(4) It is necessary to set up wherever and whenever possible a 'People's Liberation Army' led by the Communist Party, an army which is powerful and skillful in fighting enemies, as well as strong points for the operations of these armies, and also to coordinate the mass struggles in the enemy-controlled areas with the armed struggle. Moreover, armed struggle is the main form of struggle in the national liberation struggle in many colonies and semicolonies."

And in case anyone doubted the intent of Liu, he added:

"This is the main path followed in China by the Chinese people (i. e., the Communists) in winning their victory. This path is the path of Mao Tse-tung. It can also become the main path of the peoples of other colonial and semicolonial countries for winning emancipation where similar conditions prevail."

On November 16 the executive board members of the WFTU were tendered a banquet by Chou En-lai, premier of the Chinese Communist regime. With Chou En-lai were General Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Chinese Soviet Red Army, and other top Chinese Communist and military officials. On November 21, Mao gave a huge banquet honoring the WFTU delegates.

And, as reported by the Indian Communist weekly, Crossroads:

"The delegates repeatedly toasted to the health of Stalin, leader of world working people, and Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Chinese working people."

As the smoke screen of public meetings, huge rallies, and banquets proceeded, super-secret military sessions were held by the top leaders with well-known Russian agents. These secret sessions pointed up the essentially military nature of the WFTU's Peiping conference. The Russian Communist warmongers, L. Soloviev and S. Rostovsky, were present at the secret meetings. The participants in the top-level meetings discussed the 1950–51 strategy of world communism, including the planned tactical struggle in Korea to secure that geopolitical bastion for the Kremlin.

The report of Louis Saillant, general secretary of the WFTU, clearly outlined the key role of the WFTU in undermining the freedom and national independence of the Asian nations. Comrade Saillant listed the several Cominform stooge organizations which would work with the WFTU in overthrowing popular governments throughout Asia—the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation, and the International Committee of Intellectuals. Saillant proclaimed the world aims of the Communist imperialist warmongers when he declared:

"We are forming the grand new coalition of peoples fighting for a new world, living in peace, making socialism a living reality, and laying the foundation of a new civilization on a world-wide scale."

Following Saillant, Comrade Soloviev of Russia warmly supported the recommendation of Saillant that an oriental bureau of the WFTU be set up in Peiping. He outlined the antinational and espionage role of this agency when he said it would be "responsible for the consolidation of contracts between the countries of Asia and the WFTU, for the provision of mutual exchange of information, implementation of the decisions of the leading bodies of the WFTU, for rendering assistance to national trade union centers of countries of Asia."

And, as Saillant noted in his closing speech, the WFTU described a three-tiered category of Asian countries:

Tier 1—China, Mongolia and North Korea.

Tier 2—South Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines.

Tier 3—India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran, and Japan.

Obviously the Tier 1 countries are those dominated by the Soviets and presently behind the Kremlin's oriental iron curtain. And if the Peiping conference considered the Tier 3 countries as still difficult, the implication is clear that Moscow's plan of aggression in Asia comprehends guerrilla warfare and the overthrow of democratic regimes in the Tier 2 countries—South Korea, Indo-China, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines.

Another proof of the tactics and strategy can be found in the speech of Li Li-san. He pointed out that the Chinese Communists had learned that they had to stir up agrarian unrest and promote revolutionary land-reform programs, that they had to unite with the bourgeoisie in the urban areas and thus build a united front. Second, Li Li-san said, guerrilla struggles over a period of years would form the base for the People's Liberation Armies. Third and most fundamental, the Chinese Communist movement has always been under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, which has always accepted the theoretical guidance of Marxism-Leninism.

Clearly Li Li-san was hammering home the warmongering, death-to-liberty theme expounded at the conference by Comrade Liu.

Significantly, Ban Se-yang of South Korea, led off in presenting reports. He noted that since October of 1946 the WFTU forces had led mounting guerrilla warfare against the Republic of Korea (South Korea). He called upon other Asian nations to boycott the United Nations. And after him came Choi Ho-min, of North Korea, who demanded that UN advisers in Korea and American troops in Japan leave at once. Each speaker underlined the activities needed to pave the way for the coming Communist aggression against South Korea.

As Indochina is the next on Stalin's timetable in Asia, it was not surprising to find that Luu Doc Pho reported in turn. Representing the Vietnam trade-union movement, he emphasized guerrilla struggles and the war for emancipation. Luu Doc Pho said that such emancipation would be brought to a successful issue only if the working class of every country follows the example of China.

Next came the report of Vas Sunderachamara of Thailand, who reported on the progress of the labor movement in that country. After describing the wartime role of the Anti-Japanese Volunteer Corps (the Communist wartime front) and "their struggle against Japanese militarism and the Phibul Songgram clique," this Communist then told of the emergence of the Bangkok Federation of Labor, and pointed out how the wartime struggle brought "unification of Siamese, Chinese, and workers of other nationalities." After attacking the government of Thailand, Vas ended thus:

"Long live the new democratic republic of China. Long live Mao Tse-tung. Long live Stalin."

The report of Lu Cheng, of Malaya, emphasized the role of the Communists in building guerrilla forces under the Japanese occupation. He told how after the war the Communists formed the Pan-Malayan Federation of Labor to launch revolutionary general strikes. Then he told the story of how after June of 1948 the Communists and their trade union allies went underground to mount the present civil war in British Malaya.

Comrade Ali Marjono reported for Indonesia. He told how the Communists formed the SOBSI in November of 1946, attacked Hatta as an imperialist tool, and described Premier Nehru, of India, as leader of the reactionaries in southeast Asia. This Indonesian Communist let the cat out of the bag when he declared:

"The great victory of the Chinese people and its working class, guided by the Chinese Communist Party and the leader, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, is a victory for our people."

Comrade Aun-Win reported for Burma. This Communist denounced the Thakin Nu government. The Communist-led unions of Burma, he said, would fight for "complete destruction of the Fascist system of the Thakin Nu government."

The report from India was unsigned, but it was given in the name of the Communist-led All-India Trade Union Congress. It denounced the "bourgeois Congress government." It denounced Prime Minister Nehru. It denounced both the Hind Mazdoor Sabha and the Indian National Trade Union Congress. It also denounced the American Federation of Labor "who have spent many months (and dollars) in India training up their Indian prototypes." But for Stalin, Mao and the WFTU it had sweet words. Them it hailed as saviors of Gandhi's India.

The program of the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions and its Russian and Chinese Communist backers is crystal clear. The record speaks plainly. There can be no doubt that the criminal Communist aggression against South Korea is but the first move in the conquest of the Tier two countries—Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya and the Philippines. And once they are conquered and transformed into Kremlin colonies, then will come India's turn and the turns of Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran and Japan.

No sane person can talk of neutrality in the face of this clear Communist-WFTU blueprint for the conquest of Asia, which has already given evidence of its authenticity through the brutal Communist aggression against Korea.

As the Communist record shows, the Communist Party in every country mentioned is committed to the service of Stalin in the subversion of the now independent and free nations of Asia.

And in Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, the Philippines, India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran, and Japan, the WFTU-affiliated unions, by their own pronouncement, are traitorous, subversive agencies seeking to use armed guerrilla forces, pledged to serve as espionage agents for their Kremlin-Peiping masters and acting as the running dogs of world Communist imperialism—the highest stage of international Stalinist communism.

In these countries the Communist Party is not a political party but the advance military base of Soviet imperialism and the coordinator of armed terror, arson, bloodshed and unremitting guerrilla warfare. The Communist Party in every country is not a political party but, by its own frank admissions, an armed military group. So, too, the agents of the WFTU and their affiliated members throughout the world are not trade unionists but the running dogs of the Kremlin, the espionage agents for Soviet Russian imperialism, the paid puppet fomenters of bloody revolution, the precursors of totalitarian coups d'etat aimed at throwing into the ashcan of history the hard-won freedom and independence of the Asian countries which have struggled, in the face of all difficulties, to extend freedom and raise living standards throughout Asia.

The blueprint for Communist aggression against all Asia outlined at the Peiping conference of November-December, 1949, is proof positive of the vast plot now unfolding throughout Asia. Asia has been warned. Let him who has ears hear!

Asia has indeed been warned! Courageous action today may secure freedom, peace and national independence tomorrow.

But action tomorrow or the day after tomorrow may be too late.

How to Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have groped helplessly for a solution to what seems hopeless involvement of America in world war III. I have seen attempt after attempt on the part of the United States to bring about peace go down to defeat and disappointment, especially at the United Nation's meetings.

Not long ago, a young Cornell man, David Repass, whose home is in Binghamton, visited my office. He told me he had made a special trip to Washington for the purpose of presenting me with a thesis he had written on how to fight communism.

As I perused this, I realized Mr. Repass has struck upon a unique and highly practical method. To be able to combat communism without shedding the blood of our boys, yet just as surely, seems to me to present about the happiest solution to life's No. 1 problem I have been lucky enough to learn about.

I was so impressed with Mr. Repass' essay that I feel he has made a real contribution to our ceaseless efforts toward peace. I am, therefore, taking the liberty to incorporate his words in the RECORD:

Is there going to be a third world war? If so, how can we prevent it? These are the questions that all Americans are asking themselves today, for a world war will have deep effects on the lives of all of us. These questions are not easy to answer, but if we face the facts and analyze these facts, we will be able to draw conclusions that will give us the answers.

WHAT WE ARE FIGHTING

The first fact we must face is that the third world war has already started. It started in 1917 when the Communists seized power in Russia. This is a bold statement to make, but if we regard, and we must regard, the present world war as a war against communism, it must have started with the first Communist revolution. To make this point clearer, let us see what communism really is. After all, if we are fighting a war, we must know who and what we are fighting, a rather obvious fact; yet it is a fact that many people seem to have forgotten.

The original theories of Marx have been modified somewhat by Lenin and Stalin, but they are still followed by all Communists today. These theories are not too difficult to understand. Marx believed that class struggle between the rich, propertied (bourgeoise) class and the poor, propertyless (proletariat) class was the cause of all social, economic, and political conflict. Since the bourgeoise own property (capital), they have control of the means of production and, therefore they have power over the proletariat who cannot live without the products of capital. Thus, the capitalists can rule and exploit the propertyless. As a result of this unjust power that the few capitalists have over the great number of proletariat (workers), said Marx, capitalism is bound to disintegrate for the mass of workers will revolt against the capitalists and establish communism. According to the Communist Manifesto: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite." After these revolutions, Marxist formula called for socialization of the means of production by a dictatorship of the proletariat (a dictatorship to work for the benefit of the proletariat). As soon as this dictatorship established a uniform, classless society there would no longer be a need for state rule, or any form of government at all. Everyone would rule themselves since there no longer would be classes to cause conflict.

In 1917 Lenin and Stalin, guided by these principles, led the proletariat of Russia in a revolution which destroyed their existing government. At this time the Communist

leaders expected the workers of the rest of the world to revolt against their governments also, and thus establish communism throughout the world. This did not happen, so the leaders had to modify their plans. In accordance with the Marxist theory, they established a dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, and waited for the proletariat in other countries to follow their example and revolt.

In a dictatorship, all opposition has to be eliminated. Thus, the Communist leaders had to kill or ship to Siberia all people who acted or even spoke against their exact views. They had to establish a totalitarian police state in order to keep their Communist homeland free from enemies (those who oppose communism). Thus, the people of Russia found that they had lost their freedom to speak and act and were under the iron hand of a police state.

Communist leaders are at work in every country of the world preaching the ideals set forth by Marx; trying to stir up a revolt. People who are dissatisfied and who are living in chaos are very susceptible to Communist doctrine, for it offers them a way to overcome their dissatisfactions by destroying the society that causes them. Thus, the Communist leaders, with the aid of propaganda from the Communist homeland (Russia), have won many thousands of people to their way of thinking. These many thousands of people who have been converted to communism have revolted in almost every country. These revolutions have succeeded in winning Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Hungary, and all of China, to the Communist cause. These revolutions take the form of guerrilla fighting in French Indochina and on the border of Greece. These revolutions have taken the form of riots in France, Germany, Italy, and many South American countries. These revolutions are no different from the first revolution in which Russia was made communistic, and they are all part of the great plan for world revolution against all existing forms of government.

We are fighting Communists. We are fighting Communists no matter if they are in Russia, or France, or right here in the United States. We are fighting communism because it seeks to destroy our free, democratic way of life, and we have always fought to preserve democracy and freedom wherever it was in danger.

HOW TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

Now that we know that we are fighting Communists, and that they have been fighting us (and every other existing society) since 1917, we must learn how to fight them. It seems very late to start wondering how to fight them now that they have been at war with us for so long, but perhaps it is not too late.

The most intense fighting has been in the last 5 years since the end of World War II. It has been referred to as the "cold war". The main Communist weapon during this war and throughout history has been words. They use words to preach the gospel of communism. By this preaching, they convert many thousands of people to their way of thinking, which is the way of world revolution (war). These many converts preach to make more converts, until there are enough Communists to revolt and take over the world, country by country. These words must be a very potent weapon, for the Communists now control over 800,000,000 people.

Every conference in the "cold war" has been a battlefield for the Communists. We have lost every battle, because we did not use the proper weapon—truthful words. Truthful words are a far more potent weapon than lying words. The only way to fight Communism is with the truth.

Instead of using words of truth to fight communism in Europe, we use money (Marshall plan). We do not even tell the people who receive this money why we are giving it to them, so the Communists tell them that we are imperialists trying to buy control of their countries. Thus, this money actually has a bad effect. The Communists use the UN as a soap box from which to preach their gospel to the world, and we sit by and let them do it, not even preaching our own ideas. We do not use the weapon (truthful words), the only weapon that can defeat communism. We only use money, and now armed might to fight words.

We must start fighting back with words now. We must tell the world the truth about communism. We must devote our defense efforts to telling the world the truth. We must build huge radio stations to broadcast the truth around the world. We must bomb countries behind the iron curtain with pamphlets, magazines, and books so that they will know the truth. We must fight with strong, cutting words at every conference. We must fight this war of words and ideas with better words and ideas.

What should we say to the people of the world? What is the truth? The answer to this question is in the hearts of every freedom loving person. Marx forgot one important thing when he developed his theories. He forgot that men desire freedom as much as life itself. Yet in the period of dictatorship of the proletariat that is to follow the revolution, all freedom is taken away. This, as has been pointed out before, is the situation in Russia today. It is the situation in all Communist dominated countries today—there is no freedom. People are much worse off than they were before they revolted. They revolted because they were dissatisfied, and now they are in misery with no freedom. Tell the people in the countries that have not yet fallen to the Communists what will happen if they support a Communist revolt. Tell them that if they follow the Communist preaching they will lose their freedom. Tell them that we stand for the free rights of men and to follow us in preserving these rights. Tell the people behind the iron curtain about the United States, about its high standard of living, its free enterprise system of economy, and all about its freedom.

If we drown out the Communist lies with our truths, communism will be defeated. If we tear communism apart with words, people will no longer believe the Communists, and their weapon of words will be ineffective. People behind the iron curtain (800,000,000 of them) will fight the Communists to gain back their freedom, and thus, in time, communism will disintegrate.

Lessons From the Founding Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Modern Americans Can Learn Much From Founding Fathers," by Drew Pearson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERN AMERICANS CAN LEARN MUCH FROM FOUNDING FATHERS

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—When George Washington and the Founding Fathers first tried to make a go of this Nation against the British, not many of them knew much about Korea. Nor did they dream that some day their descendants would be fighting communism all the way from Indochina to Italy.

However, some of the ideas which the Founding Fathers hatched are directly applicable to Korea, Indochina, and the rest of the world today.

Roy Norr, the publicist who made the American Tobacco Co. cry uncle in the famous reach for a lucky instead of a sweet campaign, has been doing important research on this point and reminds me that, when the British imported Hessian troops to do their fighting, George Washington decided to undermine them with propaganda. Only Washington used more high-brow words than propaganda, namely exciting a spirit of disaffection and desertion.

Anyway, Washington appointed a committee of propaganda experts, including the three top men in the would-be Nation—Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin. And they devised a plan whereby Congress offered every Hessian who would desert the British 50 acres of free land.

In short, the Hessians were invited to quit fighting and make their home in the United States.

In addition, Benjamin Franklin wrote a propaganda letter, which was pure fiction and which he signed "Count von Schaumberg," regretting that so few Hessians had been lost in the battle of Trenton. Naturally, the letter didn't make the Hessians feel too kindly toward their British-German masters.

On top of this, Franklin wrote a series of propaganda leaflets which were wrapped around quids of tobacco and smuggled into Hessian hands.

Net result of this propaganda was that, out of 30,000 Hessians, 6,000 deserted. George Washington had 6,000 fewer mercenaries to fight.

In contrast, here are some of the things we are not doing, and which the Communists are doing in different parts of the world.

Contrast No. 1: Congress last week cut $20,000,000 from the State Department's propaganda budget. The Senate originally voted all the money the State Department requested, but when House and Senate conferees got together, House Members chopped the appropriation by $20,000,000.

The Congressmen who ignored the example of George Washington, Ben Franklin, et al., were:

CANNON of Missouri, GORE, of Tennessee, WHITTEN, of Mississippi, ROONEY, of New York, GARY, of Virginia, RABAUT, of Michigan, Democrats; and TABER, of New York, WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, and STEFAN, of Nebraska, Republicans.

Contrast No. 2: First things the Korean Communists did when they advanced into South Korea was redistribute the land. Dr. Syngman Rhee, president of South Korea, had long been talking about land reforms, but never did anything about it. The Communists, taking a leaf from George Washington's book, beat him to it.

The same thing has happened in Communist-held French Indochina and in China. Free land to pinched peasants has had a greater effect than all the quinine, medicine, and technical advice we have flown in to help the Indochinese.

Contrast No. 3: Dan Bell, former undersecretary of the Treasury, has just returned from the Philippines with a similar report. Dan is no radical. He is president of the American Security and Trust Co., one of the biggest banks in Washington, and went to the Philippines as head of a commission to see what we could do to prevent the island from going Communist.

He reports that the land reforms long promised by President Quirino have never taken place. Quirino is a friend of the big landowners, including Col. Andres Soreanos, a former aide to General MacArthur. So the big estates have not been broken up, and communism is spreading like wildfire among the peasants, many of whom operate under slave labor conditions.

Contrast No. 4: In Southern Italy the situation is somewhat similar. There the chief weapon of the Communists is the vast landed estates, held by a few, while several million peasants are landless. For some time, Premier de Gasperi has considered land reform, but has been advised by American ECA officials that this would create a bad impression in Congress. Senator TAFT, de Gasperi was warned, would feel toward Italy as he did toward the British labor party and its nationalization proposals. Thus, ECA money for Italy might be jeopardized.

Yet, if there isn't land reform in Southern Italy, it is fairly certain to suffer the same fate as Northern Italy, now dominated by the Communists.

I doubt if George Washington would have agreed with our ECA officials in Italy.

The Federal Trade Commission Reports on Interlocking Directorates of Major Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the impact of our mobilization program has focused attention strongly in recent months on certain weak aspects of our Federal statutes by which our business life is guided for the protection and strengthening of our small-business enterprises. I refer specifically to our antitrust laws such as the Clayton Act, the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Robinson-Patman law, and others.

In this connection I wish to commend to every Member the reading of the 1950 report of the Federal Trade Commission, the agency of our Government charged with the enforcement of our antitrust laws and the protection of our economic life from the stifling effects of unfair methods of competition in business.

The 1950 report of the FTC, recently issued, unfolds to us the story of the so-called interlocks—a device by which big business is able to dominate and control our economic life through the means of interlocking directorships, and other tie-in relationships which make possible inflexible control in certain fields of business.

This story becomes all the more important in its relation to our current mobilization program and the increasing burden of proof that big business in our country continues to get the defense orders and that small business can get only the crumbs from the table of our preparedness program and its attendant procurement orders.

I acknowledge the fact that much of this situation is attributable to the fact that big business is geared to take care of large orders, but it does not alter the proof that, as a whole, small business is being left out or not given a fair and proportionate share of Government contracts.

The report of the FTC for 1950 makes some startling disclosures on the interlocking device in the operation of big business in this country—among the facts being pointed out is the interlocking relationship of 1,000 manufacturing corporations listed as largest by the Department of Commerce to many additional thousands of banks, investment trusts, insurance companies, railroads, public utilities, and distributive enterprises.

These relationships, Mr. Speaker, have been termed as "kissing kin" by a widely read Washington columnist which, the columnist declares with realism "makes it a cozy family affair" in our great economy—a family affair which has only one end result—the stifling of competition, the squeezing out of small business, the discouragement of new business, the creation of despair among management of small business enterprises—not to mention the maintenance of artificially high prices to consumers and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the fact that big business performed magnificently in the last war—albeit for a proper price for what they produced—I want to point out that big business, as we all know, emerged from the war bigger and stronger than ever, and with its interlocking devices intact and even strengthened. During this present emergency and conflict our Government should take steps to insure that big business not be permitted to become monopolistic giants by repressing small business and do this at the expense of the taxpayers, the consumers, and the public generally.

There is now pending before the House a bill to create a Smaller Defense Plants Corporation—to safeguard the interests of the smaller industrial plants and business of the Nation during this period of expanding production and war emergency. This measure deserves the attention of every Member interested in preserving the small-business enterprises of the Nation—and should be enacted into law.

I believe that the Members of the House will agree with the correctness of these statements if they will read and appraise the recent report of the Federal Trade Commission and particularly that portion dealing with the interlocking directorates of certain of the industrial concerns of the Nation. I should also like to point out that the same portions of the FTC report wisely could be borne in mind when the membership may be called upon to consider a pending measure to preclude by statute the operation of devices not now clearly defined as illegal and monopolistic—but which are, nonetheless, destructive of healthy competition in our economic life. I again refer to the problem and question of "interlocking" directorships in business and also to the proposal which has been made to amend and strengthen section 8 of the Clayton Antitrust Act in this connection.

In this regard, I wish to have included with my remarks the following significant excerpts from this worthwhile FTC report.

The excerpts are as follows:

[Excerpts from the Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, 1950]

INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATES

The report on interlocking directorates summarizes the interlocking relationships among directors of the 1,000 manufacturing corporations which are listed as largest by the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce, and also the interlocking directorates between these 1,000 corporations and a selected list of banks, investment trusts, insurance companies, railroads, public utilities, and distributive enterprises.

The report covers not only direct interlocks among these companies but also indirect interlocking relationships which are established through the presence of directors of two corporations on the board of a third corporation.

The interlocking directorates that have been examined fall into six different patterns, which differ in their effect upon competition. These are:

1. Interlocking directorates between competitors, the tendency of which is to reduce or eliminate competition.

2. Interlocking directorates between companies in closely related lines of production, which are capable of forestalling the competition that might develop from the normal expansion of these companies.

3. Interlocking directorates between companies that face similar or closely related problems, the tendency of which is to consolidate communities of interest among these companies and to create a united front against enterprises that threaten the habitual relationships, ways of doing business, or established preeminence of members of the group.

4. Interlocking directorates between companies and their suppliers or their customers, which may bring about preferential treatment in prices, in the distribution of materials that are in short supply or in access to market outlets.

5. Interlocking directorates between manufacturing corporations and financial institutions, which may give such manufacturers preferential access to credit or may constitute an obstacle to the access of competing enterprises to credit.

6. Interlocking directorates which express a desire to protect an underlying ownership interest.

In the survey of interlocking directorates, the Commission has not found it possible to examine closely each of the apparently significant relationships that were found. The potentialities of the various patterns have been analyzed, and interlocks have been classified in accord with these potentialities; but the report does not seek to determine whether or not the possible effects upon competition from various interlocking relationships have actually appeared.

THE OUTSTANDING INTERLOCKS IN VARIOUS INDUSTRIES

The food industry exhibited an extensive array of interlocking directorships which appeared to be significant both for competition within the industry and for its relations with other industries. In the meat-packing branch of the industry, Armour & Co. was indirectly interlocked with the third and fourth largest packers; three of the largest meat packers had indirect ties with three of the largest bakers. Armour and Swift & Co. had direct interlocks with equipment manufacturers.

Three of the 10 largest dairies were directly or indirectly interlocked with each other; the 3 largest dairies were also indirectly interlocked with General Foods Corp., Standard Brands, and Best Foods. The largest

of the dairy products companies was indirectly interlocked with 2 large baking companies, which were potential customers, and with a large manufacturer of metal and paper containers.

Four of the 12 largest canners had direct or indirect interlocks with companies producing competitive products. The direct interlock between Libby, McNeil & Libby and Minnesota Valley Canning Co. is illustrative of the probable competition-reducing ties found in the industry.

Six of the 12 grain-mill-products companies had interlocking relations with competitors. General Mills, the largest, had a direct interlock with Best Foods and indirect interlocks with Pillsbury Mills, International Milling Co., and Russell-Miller Milling Co. The three large milling companies also had one or more direct or indirect interlocks with bakers or distillers. Both General Mills and Pillsbury Mills were directly interlocked with a large manufacturer of kraft paper. Pillsbury Mills was also interlocked directly with a food-container stock manufacturer.

The producers of bakery products were also tied together through interlocking directors, 6 of the 10 companies being involved. Purity Bakeries Corp. interlocked directly with American Bakeries Co. The two largest—National Biscuit Co. and Continental Baking Co.—had indirect interlocks with each other and with a number of other baking companies. National Biscuit was also directly interlocked with American Sugar Refining and had indirect ties with five other potential suppliers in the food industry; one of its most notable ties outside the food industry rested upon five directors in common with American Can. United Biscuit, Ward Baking, and Interstate Bakeries also had direct interlocks with container stock or container manufacturers.

A highly concentrated pattern of interlocks occurred among the sugar companies. Sixteen of the 23 largest of these companies had direct or indirect ties with each other. Six Hawaiian sugar companies were both directly and indirectly interlocked with each other, while sugar companies outside Hawaii were equally intricately interlocked. The sugar companies also had direct or indirect ties with the country's largest producers of dairy products, bakery products, and beverages. American Sugar Refining alone had direct and indirect interlocks with 16 potential customers.

Eight of the 23 largest beverage products companies were directly or indirectly interlocked with each other. Canada Dry Ginger Ale, for example, had a direct tie with National Distillers Products; both companies manufacture soft drinks as well as alcoholic beverages. Ties between beverage manufacturers and potential customers or suppliers were varied and numerous. National Distillers Products, the third largest of the distilled-beverage manufacturers, for example, had indirect ties with the largest corn products and sugar-refining companies. It also had a direct tie with the country's largest manufacturer of glass bottles.

General Foods, Standard Brands, and Best Foods were interlocked with each other through a variety of third companies. General Foods also had direct ties with the country's two largest dairy companies, and indirect ties with the largest bakery company and the two largest grain-mill-products companies, all of which manufacture products with which General Foods' lines compete. General Foods also had a direct interlock with American Can and with the Mead Corp., which sells paperboard.

The interlocking relations within the primary iron and steel industry fell into four major categories. United States Steel maintained indirect interlocks with 11 other members of the industry—7 integrated steel companies, a nonintegrated strip-steel producer, a coke and chemical company, and 2 ferroalloy companies.

The second group of steel companies included Republic Steel Corp., Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Inland Steel, Wheeling Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin, and National Steel Corp. These companies were all interlocked through a group of important Cleveland companies, including four ore companies and two Cleveland banks. The interlocks consisted of both stock ownership and common directors.

The third group centered in the Mellon family and in a number of companies in the Mellon sphere of influence, including Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., Gulf Oil Corp., Koppers Co., Pullman, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., and Westinghouse Electric Co. Through these corporations, interlocking relations were maintained among Bethlehem Steel Corp., Armco, Crucible Steel, A. M. Byers, Superior Steel, Granite City Steel Co., and Vanadium Corp. of America. In addition Jones & Laughlin provided a point of contact between the Mellon group and the Cleveland group; and United States Steel was linked to the group through Pullman.

Finally, Pittsburgh Steel Co., Alan Wood Steel Co., Follansbee Steel Corp., and Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co. were interlocked through ties among themselves and with the peoples First National Bank & Trust Co. (Pittsburgh). This group was interrelated with the Mellon group through Jones & Laughlin and with the Cleveland group through both Jones & Laughlin and National Steel.

The nonferrous metals industry was characterized by multiple indirect interlocking relations among companies within the industry, principally through financial institutions but also through a number of leading industrial corporations. The concerns thus interlocked were among the industry's most important. Within the industry, American Metal Co. interlocked with 10 companies; Kennecott Copper Corp. and Phelps Dodge Corp. with 8; Anaconda Copper Mining Co., St. Joseph Lead Co., and American Smelting & Refining Co. with 7; United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co. with 6; Magma Copper Co. with 4; and National Lead Co., New Jersey Zinc Co., Mueller Brass Co., Doehler-Jarvis Corp., and Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. with 3.

Several of the integrated producers of primary metals are also fabricators and thus compete with their customers, actual or potential. There were a relatively large number of interlocks between fabricated and primary metal producers. Some of these vertical interlocks—for example, that between the Sharon Steel Corp. and the Mullins Manufacturing Corp.—appear to have been the equivalent of forward integration. Other interlocks—for example those between United States Steel, Babcock & Wilcox, and American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.—provided the basis for establishment of a community of interest among companies dominant in their respective fields. The interlocks of fabricated metal producers with users of their products consisted primarily in 36 interlocks with the machinery industry; 24 with the transportation equipment industry; and 19 with the electrical machinery industry.

Companies in the machinery industry were linked primarily with banks, primary metals producers, transportation-equipment companies, and electrical-machinery manufacturers. In every branch of the industry, competing producers were directly and indirectly interlocked. Among the farm-machinery manufacturers, International Harvester, Allis-Chalmers, and J. I. Case were indirectly interlocked with each other and with two of the other six largest producers; the Oliver Corp. was indirectly interlocked with two other farm-machinery companies; and Deere & Co. and Minneapolis-Moline Power Implement Co. were interlocked indirectly with each other. Eighteen competing engine producers were directly or indirectly interlocked, five being classified as manufacturers of engines and turbines and the remainder being otherwise classified. Ten of the large machine-tool manufacturers were indirectly interlocked with one another, as were the seven largest manufacturers of office and business machines. Of the four largest producers of textile machinery, the two largest were directly, and all indirectly, interlocked with each other. They were also directly linked with four of the country's largest textile mills and indirectly with nine others. Six of the major producers of pumping and drilling equipment had direct or indirect ties with one or more competitors. The four leading manufacturers of road-building and earth-moving machinery were indirectly associated through muptiple interlocks. The machinery producers were also involved in direct vertical interlocks with primary-metals producers and with numerous potential customers.

In the electrical-machinery industry, the big four manufacturers—General Electric, Westinghouse Electric, Western Electric Co., and Radio Corp. of America—were indirectly interlocked on a multiple basis through six large commercial banks, two of the largest life-insurance companies, a public utility, a railroad, and an industrial company. This industry also presented a pattern of interlocking relations extending backward to suppliers of metals, plastics, and the like, and forward to users of electrical equipment. The interlocking directorates between General Electric and New York Central and between Westinghouse and the Pennsylvania and New Haven Railroads appear to be particularly noteworthy.

The transportation equipment industry presented a picture of extensive and complex interlocking relations. Significant interest groups centered around General Motors Corp.; and the Victor Emanuel enterprises linked companies in all of the major subdivisions in the industry. The railroad equipment companies appear to have established a close network of interlocks—12 of the 15 interlocked directly or indirectly with other railroad equipment companies. Two manufacturers of railway air-conditioning equipment—Safety Car Heating & Lighting Co. and the Carrier Corp.—were directly interlocked. The only two manufacturers of railway air-brake equipment—Westinghouse Air Brake Co. and New York Air Brake Co.—had multiple indirect interlocking relations. Pullman, an important manufacturer of railway cars, was the nucleus of a far-reaching system of interlocking directorates. Other indirect interlocking relations existed among manufacturers of locomotives, railway rolling stock, and other special types of railway equipment. In the aircraft group there was a direct interlock between Douglas Aircraft Co. and Curtiss-Wright Corp., which, however, appears to have been discontinued. The aircraft group also had a chain of indirect interlocking relations that linked not only aircraft manufacturers but also producers of specialized equipment.

In the motor-vehicle field, direct interlocks between the large automotive manufacturers and the parts manufacturers appear to have been of principal importance. No significant interlocking relations were found in the ship- and boat-building field. As in other large and important industries, the pattern of interlocking relations between transportation equipment companies and finacial institutions was extensive.

Through directors and officers of leading New York banks, the chemical industry maintained many indirect interlocking relations; there were few direct interlocks. Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corp., Mathieson Alkali Works, Inc., American Enka Corp., North American Rayon, Davison Chemical Corp., and American Bemberg were indirectly interlocked through Chase National Bank. Union Carbide and Carbon, Commercial Solvents, North American Rayon, Sun Chemical, and American Bemberg were indirectly interlocked through Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co. American Cyanamid Co., American Home Product Corp., General Aniline & Film Corp., Sharp & Dohme, and the Lambert Co. were indirectly interlocked through Manufacturers Trust Co. (New York). The chemical industry also exhibited a significant array of vertical interlocks that related producers to sources of supply and to outlets for their products.

The leading petroleum companies—Standard of New Jersey, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Texas Co., Standard of California, Standard of Indiana, Gulf Oil Corp., and others—were closely tied together by indirect interlocking directorates or by joint ownership of affiliates. The most significant interlocking directorates were through Chase National Bank. On that board were directors of Standard of Indiana, Standard of California, Gulf, and Continental Oil. Texas, Shell Union Oil Corp., and Tide-Water Associated Oil were indirectly interlocked through Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.

None of the rubber manufacturers had any directors in common in 1946. Indirect interlocking relations existed among the large tire manufacturers, between the large tire companies and some of the smaller tire manufacturers, and between some of the other rubber companies. The most significant of the interlocking relations were apparently those between United States Rubber and General Motors, resting on du Pont investments in both companies and the presence of du Pont directors on both boards. Three of the large tire manufacturers—Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., United States Rubber, and B. F. Goodrich Co.—had direct interlocking relations with chemical companies producing materials used in the manufacture of tires.

The textile industry had an extensive network of interlocks, with 39 of the 85 companies interlocked with one another. Although members of the same industry, these companies produced a diversified list of products. A large number of interlocks appeared to have been among companies that were currently producing competing products. Forward vertical interlocks appeared more significant than those reaching backward to sources of supply. Several of the textile mills had indirect interlocks, principally through financial institutions, with retail outlets, largely chain clothing and department stores.

In the apparel industry interlocking relations existed through banking interests and factors. The outstanding interlocks brought together on the board of Van Raalte Co., directors of Cluett, Peabody & Co., Manhattan Shirt Co., the Hat Corporation of America, and A. Stein & Co., thus creating a community of interest potentially significant for competition. Apparel manufacturers also interlocked with textile mills: Cluett, Peabody & Co. with Sidney Blumenthal & Co., Botany Worsted Mills, United States Finishing Co., and Cheney Bros.; Hat Corporation of America with Sidney Blumenthal. In turn, Cluett, Peabody & Co. had directors in common with National Department Stores and Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Manhattan Shirt was also directly interlocked with the Hecht Co. and Gimbel Bros.; A. Stein & Co. was represented on the boards of Sears, Roebuck, Bond Stores, Inc., W. T. Grant Co., and S. H. Kress & Co.; the Hat Corporation of America was interlocked directly with Bond Stores. The strong position of Van Raalte and its interlocking relations with apparel manufacturers reflected in part the presence of two Goldman, Sachs & Co. partners and a Lehman partner on the board of Van Raalte.

The paper and allied products industry had a chain-like network of interlocking directorates connecting 22 of the 31 large companies with one another. There was no one company from which these interlocking relations radiated; the ties were as characteristic of the smaller as of the larger companies.

The printing, publishing, and allied industries had no directly interlocked directorates and relatively few significant indirect interlocks.

The lumber and wool products industry and the furniture and fixtures industry had few significant interlocking directorates.

In the glass industry the direct and indirect interlocks between Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. and Owens-Illinois Glass Co. appear to have had significance in supporting a division of fields between the companies. Several of the glass companies also had vertical interlocking relations with important outlets.

Interlocking directorates in the cement industry appeared to be important principally on the Pacific coast. Significance may have attached to the interlocks between refractories manufacturers and cement and steel companies. The gypsum manufacturers had their most important interlocks with financial institutions.

None of the larger companies classified in the leather products industry were directly interlocked. However, indirect interlocks existed between some of the important companies: Endicott Johnson Corp. with Florsheim Shoe Co., and the latter with George E. Keith Co.

No significant interlocking relations were found among the companies classified in the tobacco products industry.

In the professional and scientific instrument industry the few insignificant interlocks were between companies the products of which were complementary or which might provide components for finished products.

In the miscellaneous manufacturing industry the interlocks, direct and indirect, involved supplier-customer relations.

CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusions that emerge from the Commission's analysis of interlocking directorates among the 1,000 largest manufacturing corporations and between these corporations and some 330 nonmanufacturing corporations follow:

1. Among the largest companies there was in 1946 a substantial and significant variety of interlocking directorates, which, by virtue of the character of the businesses of the companies, involved reasonable probabilities that competition would be reduced thereby.

2. Some of these interlocks appeared on their face to be violative of section 8 of the Clayton Act.[1] The majority of them, however, did not fall within the prohibition contained in that act.

3. Many of the interlocks which were capable of reducing competition were lawful under the provisions of section 8 of the Clayton Act because the interlocked concerns, though potentially competitors, had not been competitors in the past, or because the interlocked concerns were related to each other as actual or potential suppliers and customers rather than as competitors, or because the individuals through whom the interlocking relationships were maintained were officers or stockholders rather than directors, or because the companies involved, instead of having common directors, had directors who were jointly members of the boards of third companies.

4. In certain cases interlocking relationships involving several directors from the same company provided a broad base for the development of common policies and attitudes. In certain industries directors from various important companies sat together on particular boards which served as focal points of interlocking relationships. In certain other industries, though there were no focal points, there was such a multiplicity of interlocking relationships as to constitute a network in which it was evident that the effect of any one interlock was strengthened and supplemented by the existence of the others. The Clayton Act contains no recognition of the significance of multiple, focal, and network interlocks, as distinguished from single interlocks.

5. The most common interlocks were those that linked a seller of goods or services with a buyer thereof. In a substantial number of cases the importance of the seller, the buyer, or both was such that substantial of preferential or exclusive-dealing relations between them might be expected to have adverse effects upon the opportunities of their competitors. This was particularly true in the case of interlocks between industrial companies and financial institutions. The problems raised by interlocks of the supplier-customer type appear to be similar to those which led the Congress to prohibit such interlocks in the case of common carriers except where steps are taken to assure arm's-length dealing. Nevertheless, there is no legal limitation upon this type of interlocking relationship among industrial and commercial companies.

[1] Section 8 of the Clayton Act provides in substance that no person may be director in two or more competing corporations, any one of which has capital, surplus, and undivided profits aggregating more than $1,000,000. (This provision is not applicable to banking institutions and common carriers, which are covered under other sections of the statute.)

Working Hours of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Farmers Said Now Working 70 Hours for 40 Hours' Pay," published in the Leader, of Bismarck, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS SAID NOW WORKING 70 HOURS FOR 40 HOURS' PAY

CROOKSTON, MINN.—Farmers today are putting forth 70 hours of hard work a week to match the earnings of 40-hour-per-week city workers, says John Brandt, of Minneapolis.

Pointing out that many farm prices are still below parity levels, Brandt, president of Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., said the present high cost of living was due principally to the high cost of getting products of the soil to consumers rather than to the prices farmers get.

"When the Nation as a whole puts forth the same hourly effort on a basis comparable with that of the farmer we will have true parity in price levels," Brandt Wednesday night told an audience at the Red River Valley midwinter shows here. "Then, and only then, will the cost of living start downward.

"We cannot and should not depend upon war as a means of maintaining a prosperous

agriculture, as war itself can bring only temporary booms."

Brandt said that livestock farming had always been a stable and reasonably safe pursuit, adding that "there is nothing on the horizon that points to a reversal of this situation."

The Record of 32 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, last Sunday, March 4, 1951 in the capital city of my State, Arthur Capper, a distinguished former Member of the Senate of the United States, made a radio address over Station WIBW.

What he had to say on that occasion, after 30 years of service in this legislative body, is most timely for us to consider. He points out the changes that have come over our Nation and where some of our present policies, if pursued, will lead us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPPER NOT SURE ALL CHANGES IN 32 YEARS ARE FOR BEST INTERESTS OF UNITED STATES AND WORLD

(Senator Capper discussed the things that have happened to the world and the United States in the past 32 years since he went to Washington as Senator, in his weekly radio talk over WIBW Sunday. He also was gratified over ratification of the anti-third-term amendment, and paid his respect to the would-be dictators in Government.)

Thirty-two years and 30 minutes ago, at noon on March 4, 1919, I became a United States Senator from the State of Kansas.

You Kansas people kept me in the Senate for almost 30 years after that.

Due to the adoption of the so-called "lame duck" amendment to the Constitution, terms of United States Senators and Representatives, starting in 1934, have begun their regular terms of serving on January 3 instead of on March 4 following the general election.

For that reason I did not serve a full 30 years. My fifth and last term ended January 2, 1949. The following day at noon my successor, former Gov. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, took office. My impression is that Andy is doing a good job.

I certainly enjoyed my nearly 30 years in the Senate, and appreciate more deeply than I can tell you the honor you people of Kansas accorded me by electing and reelecting me five times to that high office.

During those years I represented you to the best of my ability. I tried sincerely to follow this rule: On every piece of legislation I cast my vote as I believed the majority of the people of Kansas would have voted, if they had the same information and understanding of what was involved which I believed I had.

But all that is water over the dam. Only I just couldn't help reminding you that today is one of my anniversary days—and a very happy one for me, personally.

There have been a lot of changes in America, in the world in those 32 years. Not all of them have been for the better.

Actually, although few of us realized it at the time, the wheels of fate already had started whirling us into the era of the great change in America, the American way of life, the American form of government.

In 1919 we were just emerging from World War I which we thought we had won. We had defeated Germany, broken up the Austrian Empire, and, so we were told, had made the world safe for democracy.

As it has turned out since, there are grave doubts whether our American First Crusade promoted the interests of democracy, to say nothing of making the world safe for democracy.

Instead, World War I just paved the way for World War II, which we also thought we had won, 5 years ago. We destroyed Germany and Japan—and apparently also have made Soviet Russia dominant in the Old World; also seem to have made Russia a threat to the New World. So now we must build up Germany and Japan.

And also, judging from the plans we are making for the future, World War I and World War II just paved the way, combined, for world war III.

Instead of bringing the four freedoms to the peoples of the world, we assisted in making Joseph Stalin the dictator over one-third the people in the world; gave Britain a Labor-Socialist government which will become a dictatorship if ever we quit pumping funds into Britain to keep the Labor-Socialist government in power.

And there are some in our own country who believe we are headed toward a dictatorial form of government in the United States, as a result of our world crusades.

I think it is at least correct to say that to date our participation in three world wars—we are in the third one now, whether we are willing to admit it or not—has decreased rather than increased the freedoms of the individual, here and overseas.

When a government spends as much as one-third of the nation's income; taxes its people for one-third of their incomes; depreciates the value of its currency more than one-half in less than a generation; loads a bonded debt larger than the national income upon its people; and proposes universal service for all its citizens—

Where those conditions prevail and are in prospect indefinitely into the future, one cannot truthfully proclaim that such a people is a free people—at least not as we understood was the word "free" in those pre-World Wars days.

Briefly, those are some of the reasons I raise the point that all the changes in the 32 years—and 30 minutes—since I became a Member of the United States Senate, have not been changes for the better.

Not but that I believe the American people, the American way of life, and the United States Government will rally and survive the perils that obviously lie ahead. I do believe we will survive—but only if we have the will to survive, and to fight for survival.

By the way, I received another letter from Dwight Hauptman, of the Hauptman Family Farm, Brewster, Kans., the other day.

In this letter Mr. Hauptman said so much in so few words that I cannot resist repeating them to you. Mr. Hauptman wrote us this way:

"It seems to me the little Napoleons in the administrative branch of the Government are intent upon dissipating the accumulated wealth of past generations, the earnings of the present, and are wishing to mortgage the earnings of the future citizens of America.

"It was only a few years ago," our farmer friend from Brewster, Kans., continues, "we farmers had only to contend with drought, grasshoppers and hail. But today we look with apprehension toward Washington for some new fiat or directive in keeping with the perpetual state of emergency or crisis in which we live—

"A crisis so admirably maintained by the ponderous and burdensome machinery of government."

Then Mr. Hauptman concludes with this call to duty, which I in turn pass on to you with the suggestion you take it unto yourselves to carry on—

"Please continue, Mr. Capper, the good fight in behalf of the individual, who, after all, is the strength of America," Mr. Hauptman, of Brewster, concludes.

One of the bright spots of last week was the action of the Nevada and Utah State legislatures in ratifying the twenty-second amendment to the constitution. The following day I believe Minnesota also did, but the Minnesota action in a way was superfluous.

When Nevada acted, following by a few minutes only the ratification by Utah, the amendment was ratified, 36 States having approved it.

The twenty-second amendment prohibits anyone—except President Truman himself—from being elected to serve a third term as President of the United States.

This action at least is an attempt to return to a form of government in which all powers are not centered in the executive branch of the Government.

But the Congress itself, as I see it, faces the job of asserting itself in the matter of war making. As I mentioned last week, I believe, the forefathers who wrote the Constitution did their best to vest war making powers in the Congress, rather than the President.

They had seen, some of them at first hand before coming to America, what evils were wrought in Europe through the war-making power being lodged in the hands of rulers.

So I say, Congress has a job to do. I hope it does that job. And more power to Senators Taft and Wherry and to Herbert Hoover and others who are making the good fight.

Some 10 days ago I had the pleasure, and the mental and spiritual profit, of hearing an address at the Hi Twelve Club by Dr. Eugene Frank, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Topeka.

It was an inspiring speech, and I would like to give you all of it. But I am going to give you just one or two ideas among the many that he gave to us.

Dr. Frank was speaking on "brotherhood"—week before last was Brotherhood Week, I believe.

He listed several basic assumptions, as he said it, that are necessary if the idea of brotherhood is to prevail.

In the first place, Dr. Frank said, only a free people can do anything about brotherhood. Free people must be free to think their own thoughts, speak their own minds, choose their own friends, and so on.

"You cannot crowd brotherhood down people's throats," said Dr. Frank. "You cannot get brotherhood at the gun point.

"Subservience is a barrier to brotherhood."

"For that reason," he continued, "militarism is the enemy of brotherhood."

"And when you have universal military training in America, same as under Hitler, Napoleon, Mussolini, Stalin—any dictator—then you have militarism, and that is the end of freedom of the individual.

"Without freedom you cannot attain the brotherhood of man," Dr. Frank explained further. "You cannot have freedom under militarism; therefore you cannot have brotherhood under universal military training. Military discipline supersedes democracy when we are at war.

"It also supersedes democracy when it is fastened on a people between wars. Universal military training means a subservient people, whose thinking is done by others, whose decisions are made by others, whose actions are ordered by others. That is the end of democracy, the end of freedom, the end of hope for brotherhood."

He said something else which I wholly approve.

"Government subsidies," he declared, "are the enemy of freedom, the enemy of brotherhood. Subsidies set group against group for manna from government; subsidies bring about subservience, which destroys the freedom of the individual.

"Socialism," said Dr. Frank, "sounds to the uninformed like the brotherhood of man. But it is just the opposite; socialism is based on the idea that men cannot govern themselves."

I wish we had more men like Dr. Frank in the ministry, in business, in public life—and holding public office.

Am looking forward to talking to you again next Sunday.

Navajo Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Aid Program Lags, Navajos Complain," published in the New York Times on February 25 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID PROGRAM LAGS, NAVAJOS COMPLAIN—SCHOOLS, HOSPITALS, ROADS ARE BEING BUILT BUT INDIANS ARE LIVING IN SQUALOR

WINDOW ROCK, ARIZ., February 24.—Roads are being built, schools expanded, hospitals enlarged, and water facilities surveyed under the 10-year $88,500,000 rehabilitation program for Navajo Indians and their Hopi neighbors, authorized by Congress and begun last October. But accomplishments are too slow, according to Sam Ahkeah, chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council, which met here recently.

The tribal council is an elected tribunal looking after the interests of the Nation's largest Indian tribe. The reservation spreads over much of northwestern New Mexico, northeastern Arizona, and southeastern Utah and entirely surrounds the less populous Hopi pueblos in Arizona.

It is a desert land, where Navajos live in illiteracy and squalor. A year-long drought has added considerably to the burden. "Our people still need the aid of such men as Bert Pousma, of Gallup," says Mr. Ahkeah.

NAVAJOS LONG NEGLECTED

Mr. Pousma heads Navajo Assistance, Inc., a nonprofit organization set up to dispense direct relief to the Navajos and to promote causes beneficial to the tribe.

Eight decades of Government neglect have contributed to the present Navajo plight.

In 1868, the Government returned the Navajos to their traditional homeland after 5 years' exile at Fort Sumner, N. Mex. This has become known as the Bosque Redondo incident. There were only about 10,000 Navajos then, but now the population is over 61,000, and the parched land cannot support a third that number.

After the exile, a treaty was drawn up guaranteeing a school for every 30 Navajo children between the ages of 6 and 16. Some schools were built, and through the years many Navajos have attended them, but the facilities have never been adequate. Today the illiteracy rate for this tribe is 80 percent—highest for any ethnic group in the Nation.

Residents of Cheechilgeetho and Thoreau, two Navajo communities near Gallup, N. Mex., petitioned in 1948 for the reopening of their schools, closed for several years because funds for maintenance were lacking. The long-range rehabilitation program provided for conversion of these facilities to boarding-school status, along with others at Hunter's Point and Kaibeto. Water has been proved in adequate amount for the Thoreau, Hunter's Point, and Kaibeto plants, and construction will begin as soon as the weather permits. Plans for the Cheechilgeetho school are awaiting a water survey.

SCHOOLS STILL INADEQUATE

But the situation continues bad, with 22,000 Navajo children of school age, and only 8,000 able to crowd the inadequate Government and mission facilities of the area. "On account of closing some schools, and using schoolrooms for sleeping purposes in others," Mr. Pousma says, "the seating capacity on the reservation is 1,315 less now than it was 10 years ago."

Illness and death rates among the Navajos are out of all proportion to the country as a whole. Tuberculosis is estimated as 10 times the national average. Mobile X-ray units have discovered thousands of tubercular Navajos, but hospital facilities are so scanty that those with the most active cases must often return to insanitary hogans, where in many instances the disease is passed on to small children and others. About 3,000 die from tuberculosis on the reservation annually.

A 700-bed hospital is planned for Fort Defiance, Ariz., as a part of the rehabilitation program, but even the funds for its blueprints won't be available in the current fiscal year.

Shortage in the Accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding a shortage in the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation, published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of February 28, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD WORK, SENATOR

For nearly 2 years Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has been hammering away at a $336,000,000 shortage which he uncovered in the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senator's persistence has been producing some noteworthy results.

By last June the General Accounting Office reported that the deficit had been reduced to $96,440,000. It said this amount was uncollectible because no records had been kept of where it went.

Senator WILLIAMS refused to accept this explanation as final. It turns out he was right. The Delaware Senator was able to report to the Senate the other day that more than $16,000,000 more has been recovered. Some of it has been collected from private citizens, some from foreign governments, and the remainder from the Department of Defense.

This constant prodding has already saved the taxpayers millions, and that's no trifle even in a day when the Government is dealing mostly in billion-dollar chips. It ought to save additional millions by forcing Government agencies to tighten up bookkeeping practices so faulty that $336,000,000 can get lost.

Anybody, including Uncle Sam, can go broke quickly with that kind of hole in his pockets.

The Unconstitutionality of a Federal Tax Upon State and Municipal Bond Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following very excellent memorandum prepared by the distinguished Attorney General of the State of New York, the Honorable Nathaniel L. Goldstein.

Although it was prepared with specific reference to the pending tax bill, the underlying principles of the law are of the greatest importance to all legislators. The matter referred to follows:

MEMORANDUM PRESENTED TO CONGRESS IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSAL TO TAX STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST—THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF A FEDERAL TAX UPON STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST—THE CONSTITUTIONAL IMMUNITY OF STATE AND MUNICIPAL SECURITIES

STATEMENT

This memorandum, submitted in opposition to a proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury, to tax State and municipal bond interest, deals with the absence of power in the Federal Government, under the Constitution of the United States, to impose such a tax.

The fiscal and economic effects of Federal taxation of interest upon bonds issued by the State and its local subdivisions are being presented by the Comptroller of the State of New York and the State superintendent of public works in oral testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and by written statements.

Such effects, they have shown, would be to add staggering amounts to the cost of State and municipal financing. The additional cost would be so formidable a burden upon the people of the State that the certain, inevitable effect would be to put a halt to the provision of essentially necessary facilities for the people, by the State, its counties, cities, towns, villages, school districts, improvement districts, fire districts. Public housing, the elimination of water pollution, the building of State hospitals,

the State throughway, and other State highways could not go on. The local communities—some desperately requiring new facilities because of growth in population in recent years—could not provide the schools, hospitals, streets, transit, sewage, water supply, and fire-fighting facilities that they so urgently need. Not only could the increased cost not be absorbed but the tax-exempt feature gone, the municipals particularly and the State bonds as well, would lose their sales appeal, and the source of State and local funds by borrowing would be vastly and seriously limited.

Thus, it is indisputably clear that such a tax would place a burden, actual, substantial, direct and tangible, in nowise merely conjectural or uncertain, upon the State in the performance of the functions which in the very nature of our constitutional system of government are those of the State and local units of government. It is a judicially recognized fact that the imposition of such a tax which would cut off the ability of State and localities to provide these facilities for the people, both by making the cost burden one that cannot be met and by impeding the power to borrow, could spell the end of State and municipality as vital units of government.

Under the Constitution of the United States, such a tax may not be levied. The Supreme Court of the United States so holds.

Immunity has its source in basic constitutional provisions and principles

Proposals to tax State and municipal bond interest have been before the Congress recurringly during the last decade, but the Congress has either declined to consider such measures or rejected them after consideration.

The invalidity of such a tax is implicit in the basic framework of our Federal system of government. Our Government was formed of a union of States (Preamble to the Constitution; cf. Mr. Justice Frankfurter in *Graves v. New York ex rel. O'Keefe* (306 U. S. at p. 488); Mr. Justice Douglas in *New York v. United States* (326 U. S. 594, 596–597)). It was not a central government in its origin, divided into units by a central power. It was the States through which the people spoke in ratifying the Constitution. The National Government is one of delegated powers. The people and the States which united to form that National Government retained all powers except those which they surrendered to the Federal Government (tenth amendment). Governmental power over internal affairs is, by the Constitution, distributed between the National Government and the several States (*United States v. Belmont* (301 U. S. at p. 330)). Each is sovereign in its own sphere.

From this basic concept the courts have drawn and developed the principle that taxes may not be imposed by the Federal or State governments, the one upon the other, which would burden and obstruct the operations of either.

In order that this Federal system to include the States, cities, and other units of government shall endure, in order to protect "the continued existence of the state" (*Helvering v. Gerhardt* (304 U. S. at p. 421)), no taxes by the Federal Government may be levied which would straiten them by depriving them of the means of performing those functions which it is their province to exercise for the people (Mr. Justice Douglas in *New York v. United States* (326 U. S. at p. 598)).

The immunity of the States from Federal taxation, which would hamper them from performing their essential functions, flows from the same basic principles as the Federal Government's immunity from State taxes which would have the same effect. The necessity of that immunity to the National Government as essential to permit it to function is one of which the Congress is entirely aware.

I. To preserve our dual system of government, Congress has the responsibility not to enact a law which would hamper and ultimately destroy the ability of the States to exercise the powers expressly and deliberately reserved to them in the Constitution (tenth amendment)

The responsibility of the Congress to preserve our dual system of government, particularly to preserve and maintain the integrity of the States and their governmental subdivisions, is profound. It is a responsibility which is primarily that of the Congress. Only if the Congress has not fulfilled that responsibility, is it the province of the courts to declare its action unconstitutional. The United States Supreme Court approaches the construction of statutes which present the issue of encroachment of the Federal Government upon the States, on the assumption that the representatives of the States in the Congress would decline to surrender the independence of the States. So in *Helvering v. Gerhardt* (304 U. S. at p. 416), the Court said:

"The very fact that when they [representatives in Congress] are exercising it [the national taxing power] they are taxing themselves, serves to guard against its abuse through the possibility of resort to the usual processes of political action which provides a readier and more adaptable means than any which courts can afford, for securing accommodation of the competing demands for national revenue, on the one hand, and for reasonable scope for the independence of state action, on the other."

See also *New York v. United States* (326 U. S. at p. 582).

Thus, the courts point to the initial duty of the Congress to abide by the declaration of the Constitution (tenth amendment) that those powers not granted to the Government of the United States are reserved to the States and, abiding by that constitutional declaration, not to enact any law which would render that reservation meaningless by stripping the States of the wherewithal to exercise the powers which the people declined to surrender to the National Government and were deliberate in reserving to the States.

"The ultimate touchstone of constitutionality," said Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the *O'Keefe case* (306 U. S. at p. 491), is "the Constitution itself." It is the constitutional duty of the Members of Congress to refrain from the imposition of taxes which would render the States powerless to function by making the cost so excessive that it cannot be met, and by reducing dangerously the ability to raise money through sale of bonds. For so the existence of the States as free, independent units of government which the Constitution intended and provided, could end. The United States Supreme Court has said:

"It rests on the law of self-preservation, for any government, whose means employed in conducting its strictly governmental operations are subject to the control of another and distinct government, exists only at the mercy of the latter" (*Ambrosini v. United States* (187 U. S. 1, 7)).

That is simple fact for the Congress to consider carefully and seriously.

II. The United States Supreme Court has never departed from the principle that the Congress may not enact a law which will obstruct the functioning of State government

The several opinions of the United States Supreme Court in *New York v. United States* (326 U. S. 572), decided in 1946, make it indisputably clear that the Court deems the States immune from Federal taxation where such taxation would impede or curtail them in the performance of their sovereign functions. Five of the eight Justices who sat in that case are members of the Court today.

In one of the prevailing opinions, Justices Reed and Burton concurring, the late Chief Justice Stone unmistakably forecast that the Court would disapprove any Federal tax which would—

"So affect the State, merely because it is a State that is being taxed, as to interfere unduly with the State's performance of its sovereign functions of government. The counterpart of such undue interference has been recognized since Marshall's day as the implied immunity of each of the dual sovereignties of our constitutional system from taxation by the other. *McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316)."

The issue in that case was considered and determined by the Court on the premise that a tax is invalid which "unduly interferes with the performance of the State's functions of government" (p. 588), and declared it "plain" that a tax is invalid which "infringes" "in some manner" upon the State's performance "of its functions as a government which the Constitution recognizes as sovereign" (p. 588), continuing (pp. 589–590):

"The problem is not one to be solved by a formula, but we may look to the structure of the Constitution as our guide to decision. * * * neither government may destroy the other * * * or * * * seriously * * * impair * * * the appropriate exercise of the functions of the government affected by it. *Metcalf & Eddy v. Mitchell* (supra, 523–524)."

Another opinion in that case said squarely (p. 584):

"All agree that not all of the former immunity is gone."

The dissenting opinion in the case written by Mr. Justice Douglas in which Mr. Justice Black concurred, was strong in its emphasis upon the sovereignty of the States in our scheme of government and upon immunity from Federal taxation as an essential concomitant of that sovereignty. He said (taking as granted that the Constitution gives to the States "immunity from a tax on the issuance of securities" (p. 591)):

"The sovereignty of the States * * * has been understood throughout our history" (p. 592).

"Woodrow Wilson stated the starting point for me when he said that 'the States of course possess every power that government has ever anywhere exercised, except only those powers which their own constitutions or the Constitution of the United States explicitly or by plain inference withhold. They are the ordinary governments of the country; the Federal Government is its instrument only for particular purposes.'" (p. 592).

"It is antagonistic to the very implications of our Federal system to say that the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes—article I, section 8—includes the power to tax any State activity or function so long as the tax does not discriminate against the States" (p. 592).

Going back to earlier decisions of the Court he quoted:

"As stated in *United States v. Railroad Co.* (17 Wal. 322, 327–328), 'The right of the States to administer their own affairs through their legislative, executive, and judicial departments, in their own manner, through their own agencies, is conceded by the uniform decisions of this Court and by the practice of the Federal Government from its organization. This carries with it an exemption of those agencies and instruments from the taxing power of the Federal Government. If they may be taxed lightly, they may be taxed heavily; if justly, oppressively. Their operation may be impeded and may be destroyed, if any interference is permitted'" (pp. 592–593).

Specifically, State and municipal securities were to him a fortiori constitutionally immune from Federal taxation:

"Can it be that a general Federal tax on the issuance of securities would be constitutional if applied to the issuance of municipal securities or of State bonds or of the securities of public-utility districts organized by the States" (p. 593)?

"As stated in *United States v. California* (297 U. S. 175, 184, 185), the immunity of State instrumentalities from Federal taxation 'is implied from the nature of our Federal system and the relationship within it of State and National Governments, and is equally a restriction on taxation by either of the instrumentalities of the other" (p. 592 footnote).

He cautioned:

"A tax is a powerful, regulatory instrument. Local government in this free land does not exist for itself. * * * Local government exists to provide for the welfare of its people. * * *. If the Federal Government can place the local governments on its tax collector's list, their capacity to serve the needs of their citizens is at once hampered or curtailed. The field of Federal excise taxation alone is practically without limits. Many State activities are in marginal enterprises where private capital refuses to venture. Add to the cost of these projects a Federal tax and the social program may be destroyed before it can be launched. In any case, the repercussions of such a fundamental change on the credit of the States and on their programs to take care of the needy and to build for the future would be considerable. * * * The power to tax lightly is the power to tax severely. The power to tax is indeed one of the most effective forms of regulation. And no more powerful instrument for centralization of government could be devised" (pp. 593–594).

"The Constitution was designed to keep the balance between the States and the Nation outside the field of legislative controversy" (p. 594).

He recalled:

"The immunity of the States from Federal taxation is no less clear because it is implied. The States on entering the Union surrendered some of their sovereignty. It was further curtailed as various amendments were adopted. But the tenth amendment provides that 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.' The Constitution is a compact between sovereigns. * * * If the power of the Federal Government to tax the States is conceded, the reserved power of the States guaranteed by the tenth amendment does not give them the independence which they have always been assumed to have. They are relegated to a more servile status. They become subject to interference and control both in the functions which they exercise and the methods which they employ. They must pay the Federal Government for the privilege of exercising the powers of sovereignty guaranteed them by the Constitution * * *" (pp. 594–595).

Worthy of particular note is his view that a tax which would curtail State activity in many fields would have an adverse effect on the Federal tax burden:

"There is no showing whatsoever that an expanding field of state activity even faintly promises to cripple the Federal Government in its search for needed revenues. If the truth were known, I suspect it would show that the activities of the States in the fields of housing, public power and the like have increased the level of income of the people and have raised the standards of marginal or submarginal groups. Such conditions affect favorably, not adversely, the tax potential of the Federal Government" (p. 598).

See also pages 594, 596–597.

Thus, the current United States Supreme Court writing in the contemporary scene maintains the sovereignty of the States and the attendant principle of immunity from Federal taxation as an indispensable essential of that sovereignty and, indeed, of their continued existence.

Between Chief Justice Marshall's statement of this unalterable truth as arising from the fact that "the power to tax is the power to destroy," and Mr. Justice Douglas' statement of the reason as that "the power to tax is indeed one of the most effective forms of regulation. And no more powerful instrument for centralization of government could be devised" (326 U. S. 594), have been a long succession of decisions affirming and reaffirming the doctrine of immunity.

In considering the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, we are taking the most recent cases first, for the argument of those who urge a tax by the Federal or State Government upon the other is based on a mistaken or wishful theory that the Court in recent years has decimated the immunity doctrine to the point of extinction. It is not so. New York against United States, from which we have quoted at length, supra, is the most recent case which discussed the principle extensively and showed that it is still very much alive.

In an even more recent case, one decided approximately a year ago—*Wilmette Park District v. Campbell* (338 U. S. 411 (December 1949))—the Court in an opinion by Mr. Justice Clark, affirmed the principle that a tax does not offend the principle of immunity only "when the burden on the State is so speculative and uncertain that if allowed it would restrict the Federal taxing power without affording any corresponding tangible protection to the State government" (p. 419). At page 420 he also indicated unmistakably that a tax which would cause "the volume of its [the State's] revenues" to suffer, would be unconstitutional.

In 1944, in *United States v. Allegheny Co.* (322 U. S. 174), Mr. Justice Jackson held distinctly that "the trend of recent decisions" was not in the direction of "impairing the immunity of the State or Nation itself" (p. 186; see also p. 194).

In *Alabama v. King & Boozer* (314 U. S. 1), in an opinion in which, of the present Court, Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, and Douglas concurred, Mr. Justice Stone made clear his acceptance of the doctrine that a tax would be invalid where "the economic burden" thereof would fall upon the Government (p. 12) or where it was "an infringement of the Government immunity" (p. 14).

Going back to 1938 and 1939, to *Helvering v. Gerhardt* (304 U. S. 405), and *Graves v. N. Y. ex rel. O'Keefe* (306 U. S. 466), the cases which held that the salaries of State employees are taxable by the Federal Government and the salaries of Federal employees are taxable by the States, the opinions in those cases leave unimpaired the immunity of the States from a Federal tax, where the burden upon the State function is "actual and substantial" (*Helvering v. Gerhardt* (304 U. S. 421)). The Court in the Gerhardt case recognized that "the basis upon which constitutional tax immunity of a State has been supported is the protection which it affords to the continued existence of the State," and that a tax is invalid which "precludes or threatens unreasonably to obstruct any function essential to the continued existence of the State government" (304 U. S. at pp. 421, 422; see also p. 424).

In the O'Keefe case, the Court was again explicit in expressing its continued acceptance of the doctrine of immunity. At pages 477–478 it said:

"The theory of the tax immunity of either government, State or National, and its instrumentalities, from taxation by the other, has been rested upon an implied limitation on the taxing power of each, such as to forestall undue interference, through the exercise of that power, with the governmental activities of the other."

See also page 480 where the Court recognized "the purpose" of the immunity as one "to avoid interference with the functions of the taxed government," and page 481 where the Court pointed out that the argument for constitutional immunity would be "that the economic burden of the tax is in some way passed on so as to impose a burden" "tantamount to an interference by one government with the other in the performance of its functions." At pages 483–484 the Court again said that the "purpose of the immunity" is "to prevent undue interference with the one government by imposing on it the tax burdens of the other." Finally, at page 488, the Court accepted the principle of immunity where the effect of the tax is that a "tangible or certain economic burden is imposed on the government concerned." Justices Black and Reed of the present Court concurred in the majority opinion in this case.

In a concurring opinion Mr. Justice Frankfurter declared (p. 492) that—

"Neither [the State nor Federal Government] through its power to tax can be allowed to cripple the operations of the other. Therefore, State and Federal Governments must avoid exactions which discriminate against each other or obviously interfere with one another's operation."

Shortly before the decision in the Gerhardt case, the Court in *Helvering v. Mountain Producers Corp.* (303 U. S. 376 (1938)) tested the validity of a tax by whether it was "a direct and substantial interference" with State government (303 U. S. at pp. 384, 387). See also, *Helvering v. Therrell* (303 U. S. 218, 233).

Thus, it is abundantly clear that in the last dozen or more years, through depression years, defense years, war years, and the uneasy postwar years, on examination and reexamination of the theory underlying immunity (*Graves v. New York ex rel. O'Keefe* (306 U. S. at p. 483)) by a Supreme Court of changed personnel, there has remained the basic doctrine of immunity of the States from taxation by the Federal Government, where that taxation will interfere with the performance by the States of their functions. There has remained the appreciation by the Supreme Court that such interference would endanger the very existence of the States as such. There has remained the cognizance by the Court that the Constitution designed a role for State government as well as for the National Government. There has remained the respect by the Court for the role of the States in our constitutional scheme of government.

No serious question exists in any mind as to the strength of the doctrine of immunity prior to 1938. Therefore to keep this memorandum within temperate bounds, we merely list without discussion or quotation some of the numerous cases, never overruled, that have sustained it:

Trinityfarm Co. v. Grosjean (291 U. S. 466). See especially page 471.

Indian Motorcycle Co. v. United States (283 U. S. 570). See especially page 575.

Willcuts v. Bunn (282 U. S. 216). See especially pages 224–225.

Metcalf & Eddy v. Mitchell (269 U. S. 514). See especially pages 521, 522, 523.

Ambrosini v. United States (187 U. S. 1). See especially page 7.

McCulloch v. Maryland (4 Wheat. 316). See especially pages 429–430, 431.

Brush v. Commissioner (300 U. S. 352). See especially page 354.

South Carolina v. United States (199 U. S. 437). See especially page 452.

Pollock v. Farmers' Loan and Trust Co. (157 U. S. 429). See especially pages 583–584, 603.

United States v. Railroad Co. (17 Wall. 322). See especially page 327.

See also the decisions cited in point III, infra.

III. A Federal tax on State and municipal bond interest is, under express decisions of the United States Supreme Court, an unconstitutional direct burden on the States

The United States Supreme Court has consistently held, from its earliest decisions on the subject to the present day, that to tax the interest on Government bonds—Federal, State, and municipal—would be to disastrously affect the borrowing power of these governments, and thus under the Constitution to be mutually prohibited.

The power to borrow money is so indispensable to government that it is expressly provided for the Federal Government in the Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 8) and like provision is made in State constitutions. It is that power which a tax upon State and municipal bond interest would endanger.

In December 1944, in *Smith* v. *Davis* (323 U. S. 111), the late Mr. Justice Murphy in a unanimous opinion of the Court, noted that interest-bearing securities of the Government are tax exempt and this for the reason that they would "diminish" "the market value or the investment attractiveness" of the obligations issued to "secure necessary credit" (p. 117). Justice Murphy cited cases reaching back to early decisions of the Court sustaining such tax immunity (p. 115). See also Mr. Justice Douglas' opinion in *New York* v. *United States* (326 U. S. at pp. 591, 593).

Smith v. *Davis* was in turn cited only a year ago in *N. J. Ins. Co.* v. *Div. of Tax Appeals* (338 U. S. 665 at p. 675).

Decisions by the United States Supreme Court holding Government bond interest tax exempt because of the deleterious effect on Governments' borrowing power are legion.

An opinion of not long ago (December 1937) which enjoys high prestige with the Court today, *James* v. *Dravo Contracting Co.* (302 U. S. 134) held (p. 153, Chief Justice Hughes):

"That doctrine recognizes the direct effect of a tax which 'would operate on the power to borrow before it is exercised' (*Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.*, supra), and which would directly affect the Government's obligation as a continuing security. Vital consideration are there involved respecting the permanent relations of the Government to investors in its securities and its ability to maintain its credit, * * *."

A few months later (March 1938) in *Helvering* v. *Mountain Producers Corporation*, the Court pointed out (303 U. S.), at page 386:

"The interest payable on State and municipal bonds has been held to be invalid as a tax bearing directly upon the exercise of the borrowing power of the Government (*Weston* v. *Charleston* (2 Pet. 449, 468, 469); *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S. 429, 586))."

In prior cases, whose authority, as we have seen, is undiminished, the United States Supreme Court has repeatedly voiced this view. We quote from just a few of the very many cases that are in accord: *Indian Motorcycle Co.* v. *United States* (283 U. S. 570), at pages 576–577:

"It has been adjusted that bonds of the United States issued to raise money for governmental purposes, and the interest thereon, are immune from State taxation, because such a tax, even though inconsiderable in amount and imposed only on holders of the bonds, would burden the exercise by the United States of its power to borrow money. *Weston* v. *Charleston* (2 Pet. 449, 468); *The Banks* v. *The Mayor* (7 Wall. 16); *Home Savings Bank* v. *Des Moines* (205 U. S. 503, 513); *Northwestern Ins. Co.* v. *Wisconsin* (275 U. S. 136, 140). * * * It also has been adjudged that bonds of municipal corporations in the several States issued to raise money for public municipal purposes, and the interest thereon, are immune from Federal taxation, and this on the ground that * * * under the implications of the Constitution the governmental agencies and operations of the States have the same immunity from Federal taxation that like agencies and operations of the United States have from taxation by the States. *Pollock* v. *Farmers Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S. 429, 584–586, 601, 652, 653; s. c. 158 U. S. 601, 618, 693)."

Willcuts v. *Bunn* (282 U. S. 216), at pages 225, 226–227:

"A tax upon the obligations of a State or of its political subdivisions falls within the constitutional prohibition as a tax upon the exercise of the borrowing power of the State. *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Company* (157 U. S. 429, 584–586; id., 158 U. S. 601, 618); *National Life Insurance Company* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 508, 521).

* * * * *

"In the case of the obligations of a State or of its political subdivisions, the subject held to be exempt from Federal taxation is the principal and interest of the obligations. *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Company*, supra. These obligations constitute the contract made by the State, or by its political agency pursuant to its authority, and a tax upon the amounts payable by the terms of the contract has therefore been regarded as bearing directly upon the exercise of the borrowing power of the Government. In *Weston* v. *Charleston* (2 Pet. 449, 468, 469), where the tax, laid under an ordinance of the city council upon United States stock which has been issued for loans made to the United States, was held invalid, the principle was thus stated by Chief Justice Marshall: 'The right to tax the contract to any extent, when made, must operate upon the power to borrow, before it is exercised, and have a sensible influence on the contract. The extent of this influence depends on the will of a distinct government. To any extent, however inconsiderable, it is a burden on the operations of government. * * * The tax on Government stock is thought by this Court to be a tax on the contract, a tax on the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States, and consequently, to be repugnant to the Constitution.' This language was applied by the Court in *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Company*, supra (157 U. S. at p. 586) in holding invalid Federal taxation 'on the interest' from municipal securities."

Missouri v. *Gehner et al.* (281 U. S. 313), at pages 320–321:

"It is elementary that the bonds or other securities of the United States may not be taxed by State authority. * * * The power of Congress to borrow money on the credit of the United States would be burdened and might be destroyed by State taxation of the means employed for that purpose. As the tax-exempt feature tends to increase and is reflected in the market prices of such securities, a State tax burden thereon would adversely affect the terms upon which money may be borrowed to execute the purposes of the general government."

The Macallen Company v. *Massachusetts* (279 U. S. 620), at pages 624, 629:

"Of course, in respect of United States securities, the statutory exemption is superfluous. A State tax, however small, upon such securities or interest derived therefrom, interferes or tends to interfere with the constitutional power of the general government to borrow money on the credit of the United States, and constitutes a burden upon the operations of government, and carried far enough would prove destructive. The principle set forth a century ago in *Weston* v. *Charleston* (2 Pet. 449, 468), has never since been departed from by this Court:

"'The right to tax the contract to any extent, when made, must operate upon the power to borrow before it is exercised, and have a sensible influence on the contract. The extent of this influence depends on the will of a distinct government; to any extent, however inconsiderable, it is a burden on the operations of government. It may be carried to an extent which shall arrest them *entirely*.' (*Home Savings Bank* v. *Des Moines* (205 U. S. 503, 513).)

* * * * *

"In the consideration of such legislation, the controlling principle, constantly to be borne in mind, is that the State cannot tax the instrumentalities or bonds of the United States, or, what is the same thing, the income derived therefrom, directly or indirectly—that is to say, it cannot tax them in any form."

National Life Insurance Company v. *United States* (277 U. S. 508) at page 521:

"It is settled doctrine that directly to tax the income from securities amounts to taxation of the securities themselves. *Northwestern Mutual Life Ins. Co.* v. *Wisconsin* (275 U. S. 136). Also that the United States may not tax State or municipal obligations. *Metcalf & Eddy* v. *Mitchell* (269 U. S. 514, 521)."

Farmers Bank v. *Minnesota* (232 U. S. 516) at pages 526–527.

"But we deem it entirely clear that a tax upon the exercise of the function of issuing municipal bonds is a tax upon the operations of the Government. * * *. And to tax the bonds as property in the hands of the holders is, in the last analysis, to impose a tax upon the right of the municipality to issue them. (Quoting from *Weston* v. *City Council of Charleston* (2 Pet. 449, 466, 468); *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316).)

* * * * *

"It is on this ground that United States bonds have always been held exempt from taxation under authority of the States. By like reasoning it has come to be recognized that bonds issued by the States are not taxable by the Federal Government, and it was upon this ground that this court held in *Pollock* v. *Farmers Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S. 429, 584), that the income tax provisions of the act of August 15, 1894, were unconstitutional in that they imposed a tax upon the income derived from municipal bonds issued under the authority of the States."

Hibernia Savings & Loan Society v. *San Francisco* (200 U. S. 310) at page 313:

"The efficiency of the Government service cannot be impaired by a taxation of the agencies which it employs for such service, and, as one of the most valuable and best known of these agencies is the borrowing of money, a tax which diminishes the slightest degree the value of the obligations issued by the Government for that purpose impairs pro tanto their market value."

It is unnecessary to quote from the pioneer cases holding that Government bond interest may not be taxed because of its burden and inevitable effect upon the power to borrow the necessary funds for the operation of Government, even to the point where it could arrest them entirely (*Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S. 429, 586). See also pp. 585, 601, 652, 653; s. c., 158 U. S. 601, 618, 693). Their frequent citation in the later cases has made them and the well-known subsequent cases familiar, e. g., *Weston* v. *City of Charleston* (2 Pet. 449); *Bank of Commerce* v. *New York City* (2 Black 620); *The Banks* v. *Mayor* (7 Wall. 16); *United States* v. *Railroad* (17 Wall. 322); Pollock cases, supra; *Home Insurance Co.* v. *New York* (134 U. S. 598); *Home Savings Bank* v. *Des Moines* (205 U. S. 503); *Smith* v. *Kansas City Title Co.* (255 U. S. 180, 213); *Metcalf & Eddy* v. *Mitchell* (269 U. S. 514, 522); *Northwestern Ins. Co.* v. *Wisconsin* (275 U. S. 135, 140); *Hale* v. *State Board*, (302 U. S. 95, 107).

It is thus clear beyond doubt that the United States Supreme Court has held and holds that to tax the interest on Government bonds is to tax the means (*James* v. *Dravo Contracting Co.* (302 U. S. at p. 153)) by which Government raises the money without which it cannot function, because such tax would not only increase the cost of Government but would inevitably curtail the market for the bonds. The disaster that would be the product of such tax is one that the National Government may not constitutionally visit upon the States and their subdivisions—the partners in our governmental system as created by the Constitution.

CONCLUSION

This memorandum is but a summary of the principles under which a Federal tax upon State and municipal bond interest is unequivocally unconstitutional. An extended study developing these principles and citing other principles supporting the conclusion of unconstitutionality would but be laboring the point, and we have therefore confined the length of our discussion.

There is not a Member of the Congress who would forfeit the existence of his State, his county, his city, town or village. If he were to impose the proposed tax he is on the way of doing just that. He is imperiling the highways, schools, hospitals in his home State and community, the needed fire fighting facilities, the public housing development—all the essential and enterprising activities of his home State, his home city or village. He is stopping their progress and growth on the day he votes for this tax. For by imposing costs that he knows full well his State and community cannot meet; by taking away the ability of his State, his county, his school district to market their bonds holding out the attraction of freedom from Federal tax on the very modest interest rate which the purchaser receives, he is drying up the funds of his home State and community without which they cannot continue to progress.

The framers of the Constitution recognized that such is the danger in surrender of State power to the National Government, and reserved therein the powers of the States. The courts translated that principle into immunity of the States from National taxation which actually and substantially places a burden on the States' functions. Holding that immunity essential to the independence of the States—and the independence of the States the essence of our form of government—the courts have to this day held a Federal tax constitutional only when its impact upon the States is merely conjectural and uncertain. They have held it invalid and unconstitutional when the impact upon the States would be to hamper them in the exercise of their powers as the vital units in our system of government that they are.

"The very nature of our constitutional system of dual sovereign governments is such as impliedly to prohibit the Federal Government from taxing the instrumentalities of a State government, and in a similar manner to limit the power of the States to tax the instrumentalities of the Federal Government.

* * * * *

"* * * recourse may be had to the reason upon which the rule rests, * * *. * * * it rests on the conviction that each government, in order that it may administer its affairs within its own sphere, must be left free from undue interference by the other. * * * neither government must destroy the other nor curtail in any substantial manner the exercise of its powers." (*Metcalf & Eddy* v. *Mitchell* (269 U. S. 514, 521, 523).)

Dated: March 1, 1951.

Respectfully submitted,

NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN,
Attorney General of the State of New York, Capitol, Albany, N. Y.

Galeton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article by Ann Fields from Coronet for June 1950:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 1, 1951.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Pursuant to our discussion several days ago relative to the possibility of a military or naval installation securing the property of the Galeton Foundry Co.

May I suggest that you use your good offices in influencing the authorities in either leasing or purchasing this property. During the last war the Department of the Army used the Lyman Run CCC camp which is 17 miles from Galeton as a prisoner-of-war camp and the prisoners cut chemical wood for the Susquehanna Chemical Co. at Roulette, Potter County. Potter County has the largest acreage of State forest lands in Pennsylvania.

The General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania recently completed the construction of a million dollar recreational lake near the old Lyman Run Civilian Conservation Corps camp which buildings are still in good condition. During the depression we had eight CCC camps in Potter County. It appears to me that the Galeton area would be a fine location for an Army installation or convalescent camp as we have land, pure mountain air and water, finest hunting and fishing in the eastern part of the United States. We also have a need for these facilities as our foundry closed in October 1949, laying off 150 male employees, and some are on the relief rolls and others are drawing unemployment compensation. This would give employment and purchasing power in an area which is certainly in need of consideration at the earliest date possible.

I refer you to the June, 1950 edition of the Coronet magazine which clearly indicates what the people of "Galeton, the Friendly Town" have gone through and what they have accomplished, and that they are still determined to go forward.

I feel confident that Potter County can contribute a great deal toward the defense effort, and may I also suggest that the proper authorities investigate the possibilities of developing this area as it has a great deal to offer.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE CROSETTO,
Owner and Publisher, the Leader-Dispatch, Galeton, Pa.

FORTUNE SMILES ON "FRIENDLY TOWN"

(By Ann Fields)

As the little one-coach train puffed along the lonesome wishbone of track skirting the Allegheny Mountains, a happy chorus of children sang: "Back to Galeton—we're going back to Galeton."

The children were from the sweltering streets of New York City's lower East Side, which they were leaving behind to become the summer guests of strange mothers and fathers in the heroic little town of Galeton, Pa.

When the train came to a halt in the heart of Galeton, half the population was on hand to meet the children. There were hugs and gay shouts as each youngster hunted the mother whose name was written on the card pinned to shirt or blouse. And anxious Galeton mothers, taking a child for the first time, eagerly read tags to find the boy or girl assigned to them.

The children were representative of the great metropolitan melting pot—Protestant, Catholic, Jew—of French, Spanish, German, and Italian descent—for the mothers of Galeton play no favorites. They simply say: "Send me a child." And now here were the children, happy, carefree—thinking only of the sunlight and the fishing, the green yards and miles of forests.

They could not know, nor would they know, that their coming meant genuine sacrifice on the part of the little town. For the people of Galeton have been hit by almost every possible disaster. Destroyed three times by fire, washed out by floods, their giant lumber and tanning industries closed, they have watched their population shrink from 4,100 to a mere 1,800. And yet, they have refused to admit defeat.

Schooled by hardship and solitude, the people of the near ghost town have learned a philosophy of living that is unique in our time. It has become a kind of folk-religion with them to think of others. No one can be a stranger in Galeton, and the atmosphere of friendly peace and happy living has made it a second spiritual home for the so-called tenement kids.

The children are guests of the fresh-air fund, a program sponsored by the New York Herald Tribune to give vacations to city children who can't afford them. The fund pays train fare, and the homes into which they go take care of their meals and recreation.

Speaking of the town and its people, one of the executives of the fund summed it up: "You might say the people of Galeton are sharing what they have with magnificent pride—God bless them."

To the children assigned to Galeton, it is a dream town. Tucked in a green valley of eastern Potter County, it is hemmed in by two chains of the Alleghenies. Pickle Pine Creek, sometimes rambling, sometimes boisterously rushing, divides the town in two. Deer roam in herds, fox and porcupine scurry through the brush, and streams are abundant with fish.

Into this paradise come the children from Manhattan, many of whom have never even seen a live cow or chicken. Wonderful things happen to them, and to their summer parents as well.

For example, little Ann, an Italian child, was taken into the home of Danny del Grasso. Danny, survivor of a wartime torpedoing, had had 5 years of military service when, with his wife and a pension, he came back to the quiet and peace of his mountain town.

The Del Grassos fell in love with little Ann, kept her all summer, and visited her later in New York. Next year they brought her back, along with her brother, and had the mother and father and one other child as visitors for a week.

Little Marilyn, age 11, almost didn't make it to Galeton, which she now considers would have been high tragedy. Mr. and Mrs. Nick Hitsell live in the factory section where houses are old and many unpainted. Nick Hitsell works in a small factory that makes powdered milk. They have two children of their own, and their worry was that a city child might be disappointed with their simple way of living.

There was no need to worry. Little Marilyn took one look at the spreading lawn, the huge trees and the stream running by the door, and gave a delighted whoop!

The man who started Galeton on its happy career is the Rev. Robert S. Cocks, minister

of the Presbyterian Church. The Rev. Mr. Cocks had been active in the work of the fresh air fund during a pastorate in New York; and when he came to Galeton he invited his congregation and other churches to participate. He was astounded at the wholehearted response. Eight churches (including three from nearby communities) came in, as well as all civic organizations.

The minister himself took four robust boys ranging in age from 8 to 11. He cooked for them, took them hunting, fishing, and swimming, and trained them to help him with bachelor housekeeping.

"They ate me out of house and home," he says, "putting on weight even with my cooking. I don't know which of us loved it most."

Since one of the boys was a Catholic, the Reverend Mr. Cocks took him to mass on Sunday morning. Then the lad looked after the house while the minister preached his own 11 o'clock sermon.

The Galeton hosts are all plain working people, but there is no lack of entertainment for the children. Every day is full of magic for them. Everybody wants to entertain them—and does. And they give the children the time of their lives.

The favorite treat is what is called "putting the deer to bed." Each night, cars loaded with children drive out of town and, as the caravan creeps along, spotlights play on fields and hillsides where hundreds of deer graze unconcernedly, ignoring the procession.

Unintentionally, the youngsters have been a means of focusing attention on the plucky town and its hard-luck history. Back in 1885, the Galeton section was the largest hemlock and pine empire in the world. Into this timber bonanza moved the Goodyear brothers, Frank and Charles, buying an 80,000-acre tract. Then the combine ripped through the hills, cutting 50,000,000 feet of timber annually, tearing the bark from the great trees to feed the tanneries and leaving the trunks to rot on the ground.

More and more men were needed as faster and faster went the saws. Giant tanneries sprang up. A horde of itinerant workers moved in. The railroad yards alone had a crew of 700 men, with up to 10 trains a day pulling out, loaded with Galeton's lumber gold.

More homes were needed and built. A raucous, rowdy, robust town replaced a placid village. Liquor flowed, guns barked, gambling houses ran round the clock.

Then, through the ghost of the once-green forest, swept a fire which blotted out almost the entire business section and hundreds of homes. Patiently, Galeton set about rebuilding. But the fire came again in 1899, and still a third time in 1916, and destroyed all of Main Street.

Then, one day in 1920, the boom was over. The raped hills were barren areas, and the timber barons and the floating population moved on. In the years that followed, little Galeton really knew hard times. There were no jobs, no industries. But the faithful people stuck it out.

In 1942, nature struck the hapless town again. This time a raging flood tore through Pine Creek. Railroad tracks were ripped apart, homes were uprooted, farms destroyed, and the people fled to the hills for their lives.

A second flood came in 1946. When it was all over Galeton was shut off, isolated from the world. No railroad remained to take them out or bring the world in. The once-teeming car barns and sheds were empty. No one cared whether a train ran to Galeton or not.

But the people cared. A meeting was called of local businessmen, for in the heart of the town were several large railroad buildings, now unused, which could be turned into a foundry. A committee was appointed to contact the Lennox Furnace Co., which needed additional foundry capacity, and persuade them to open a branch in Galeton. Finally, the manager agreed, provided the people of Galeton would put up $15,000 to help get the buildings back in order and show good faith in the new industry. The hard-pressed little town subscribed not $15,000, but $30,000, and the Lennox foundry has been a lifesaver, employing 150 men.

The people of Galeton now hope that United States Highway No. 6, which was once an impersonal "hurry road" through their town, will soon be clogged with vacationers from Washington, New York, and Philadelphia, who seek peace in the woods and hills. Meanwhile, the local streets are filled with smeared jerseys and sun-tanned legs as 44 laughing, happy children mingle with Galeton's own.

The struggles of the people along the creek and their wholehearted sharing among themselves and with others have become a part of everyday living. Their reward, they feel, came in the words of a little girl who had spent two summers with them. As she tearfully boarded the train for New York, she said:

"If I can't come back here, I don't ever want to go any place."

Shipment of Rubber to Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks made yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in which he stated he had just received an article from a paper published in Hong Kong, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum nearly 1 week before the Senator's remarks yesterday. The article is entitled "The British Attitude Hard to Understand."

I also ask to have printed an article entitled "United States Slaps New Ban on Use of Rubber," which appeared recently in the press.

I call attention to the fact that the article in the Forum states that "10,000 tons of rubber are on the high seas en route to Communist China from British Singapore." It is also stated that "British woolen goods exports to Red China shot up from $2,000 in December 1949, to $300,000 in December 1950."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum]

THE BRITISH ATTITUDE HARD TO UNDERSTAND

It is difficult to understand the British Government's policy in respect to shipments of goods and materials to Red China.

Here is a story from the London bureau of the Baltimore Sun:

"Ten thousand tons of rubber are on the high seas en route to Communist China from British Singapore, and the British Government says it has at present no intention of stopping the shipment.

"The rubber valued at more than $9,800,000—is being carried in two ships."

Then we read this from another source: "British woolen goods exports to Red China shot up from $2,000 in December 1949, to $300,000 in December 1950. And in the same related periods, British shipments of assorted machinery, also vehicles of various kinds, rose from a few thousand dollars to hundreds of thousands."

UNITED STATES SLAPS NEW BAN ON USE OF RUBBER

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Government Monday banned or limited use of natural rubber in more than 40,000 civilian products, ranging from inner tubes to falsies.

The order is to be effective March 1.

The order, which will be issued formally by the national production authority (NPA) in a day or two, bans use of natural rubber in some items and limits it severely in others. Sporting goods are hard hit.

Officials said the order will not mean any cut in over-all production of rubber goods since synthetic rubber may be used wherever the use of natural rubber is banned.

An average of only 15 percent natural rubber was allowed for the production of most small and medium-sized automobile tires, but those over 7.10 inches can be made with 22 percent.

Natural rubber use in heavy duty truck tires ranged up to 92 percent and to 100 percent in airplane tires. No natural rubber will be permitted in passenger car and light truck tire tubes.

Smaller auto tires now are being made with 25 percent natural rubber, while larger passenger car tires are manufactured with 35 percent. Present limitations on the tire industry permit auto tires with 35 percent natural rubber.

NPA said none of the restrictions will affect the appearance, performance or safety of the rubber items, adding that about 300 rubber industry officials helped draft the order.

NPA said the order is aimed at holding civilian consumption of natural rubber to 25,000 tons a month. It averaged slightly higher than that this month and last.

There was speculation that the action might be followed by an order cutting auto tire prices because of the mandatory reduction in the use of more expensive natural rubber.

The Federal Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bewildering Tax Structure Needs an Overhauling," which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on March 4 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEWILDERING TAX STRUCTURE NEEDS AN OVERHAULING

Next to military defenses and safeguards against inflation, this country badly needs simplification of its entire hodgepodge tax structure, Federal, State and local.

Not only are taxes reaching staggering proportions, they are so many and so complex that we doubt Dr. Einstein, even with the aid of a mechanical brain, could keep track of them.

Everybody knows that, in addition to income taxes, corporation taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, school taxes, and so on, there are hundreds of hidden taxes on practically everything we eat, wear, and use.

But that's not all. According to a study by the Tax Foundation, New York, and printed in its magazine, Tax Outlook, many States, searching high and low for new revenue, have taxes based on trades, occupations, foods, and manufactures. For instance, Virginia has an apple excise tax; Colorado, a tax on bedding manufactures; Idaho, a beans excise; Maine, a blueberry tax; Texas and Maine, a tax on bank-night awards; and Florida and Vermont, a tax on copyrighted music.

In addition Massachusetts taxes entertainment on Lord's day; Delaware has a feed dealers' tax; Indiana, a tax on fertilizer inspection; Oregon, a hop inspection tax; Georgia, a tax on mattress inspection; Kansas, a quail tax; and California, a tax on upholstered furniture.

These are only a few samples. And the United States Government, the State, and the municipalities are always on the alert for something else to tax. With Federal taxes soaring, Pennsylvania and Philadelphia, among other States and cities, are on the hunt for new taxable items.

Congress and State and local governments should make a vigorous attempt, not only to cut out extravagance, but to revise and simplify their taxes to take a little of the present worry off confused and weary taxpayers. Certainly not only the total cost but the bewildering multiplicity of seen and unseen taxes is a rank injustice to the millions of Americans who want to be good citizens but are being driven crazy by complex, often overlapping, tax demands on their hard-earned pay.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Wisconsin Builders' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, March 5, it was my pleasure to address a joint conference of the Wisconsin Builders' Association and the Madison Builders' Association on the theme Building America's Values. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of my address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Address by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, before Wisconsin Builders' Association, Madison, Wis., Monday, March 5, 1951)

It is a great privilege to be back in the capital of our State to address this important gathering of leaders in the field of construction.

Certainly there are few more inspiring themes than that of "building." Yes, I know that you gentlemen who have put on the landscape thousands and thousands of splendid structures—that you get a tremendous sense of satisfaction when you look about your community and see the buildings which you have developed from the drafting board to the foundation. Today, our entire country is building in a new way—building the bulwarks not only of our own defense, but of the defense of western civilization.

BUILDING AMERICA'S VALUES

Speaking to you, therefore, as builders, may I say that what we need is more men with the building concept and less with the "tearing down" idea. In other words, what we need to do is build up the great values which have characterized the American scene.

Of course, you and I know that there are times when the only way to put up a new structure is to tear down an obsolete old one. But you have to be mighty sure that you are not tearing down something far more beneficial than what you are building up.

During the 1930's this country spawned a great number of fuzzy-minded people—some supposedly well-educated—who wanted to tear down the structure of American society, to tear down the free-enterprise system, to tear down the constitutional system. They wanted to replace it with some such structure as that of the Soviet Union, a structure which is nothing but a new disguise for the old idea of human slavery, a structure based on the fanatic idea that man is a materialistic brute who must be controlled and who must be dictated to in every single essential of his life.

THE TEARERS-DOWN INSIDE GOVERNMENT

The result of this spawning of the "tearer-downers" is shown in the headlines of 1951. More and more instances are coming to light where these wrong-minded individuals got key positions in the Government and proceeded to tear down from within.

Today, a subcommittee of our Senate Judiciary Committee is making a complete investigation of these tearer-downers and the extent to which the Department of Justice has interpreted or misinterpreted the anti-subversive law which we in the Congress enacted.

HOW AMERICA CAN BE TORN DOWN

You and I know that there are many ways by which an individual can tear down. He can tear down by spreading hatred among his friends, neighbors, business associates, and acquaintances—hatred between classes, religions, races, regions. He can tear down by constantly expressing a philosophy of gloom, fear, pessimism, and anxiety. He can tear down by actively becoming a seditionist.

The only ways to combat such an individual is by the public light of exposure and by the healing forces of truth.

THE ONE BASIC ISSUE OF OUR TIME

And, speaking of public light, let us remember that we in Washington have been working on bringing before the public attention the crucial issues involved in the shaping of America's future foreign policy. I believe that the discussion which has been held on the Wherry resolution has been tremendously constructive to the future of our Nation.

Now, my friends, there are many aspects of your own building situation that you and I could discuss—for example, the newly required licensing of commercial construction, the tightening of building credit restrictions, and a great number of other regulations which have recently been enacted by Washington officialdom. All are worthy of your study and mine. And, yet you and I know that there is only one real crucial issue in our time, and that is the issue of war or peace, survival or destruction, freedom or slavery. And so with your kind permission, I should like to devote these thoughts to this great issue.

USING BEST POINTS OF EACH VIEWPOINT

I am not one of those who feels that there is a monopoly of truth on any side of this great discussion. I believe that each of the differing viewpoints which has been expressed most prominently by former President Hoover, by Senator TAFT, by Senator WHERRY, by Senator CONNALLY, etc.—that each of these viewpoints has some element of truth and justice, and that what we ought to do is distill from all of these various ideas a basic policy statement which will clarify the issue and serve to unite—not divide—the American people.

POINTS OF AGREEMENT ON FOREIGN POLICY

There is a tremendous amount of agreement among these various approaches, just as there is considerable disagreement. Let us not forget therefore, these points on which practically every one is agreed:

1. Russian communism does present a menace to the American way of life. The world is so contracted that every nation is in every other nation's backyard.

2. America has no alternative but to build up her defenses so that she is second to none in the world, particularly in air force and naval power.

3. America cannot hope to match the mass land armies of the Soviet Union.

4. America must not allow herself to be sucked into another Korea-like trap in which we are bled in a costly venture which cannot possibly achieve complete success.

5. The only way that unity can be attained is by having the President consult with the Congress as a full partner.

PRESIDENT DOES HAVE WIDE INHERENT POWERS

6. The President already has sufficient authority to station occupation forces abroad, and as a matter of fact over 100,000 Americans are now located in Germany and Austria.

7. The President already, moreover, has sufficient authority to deploy United States Naval and Air Forces abroad in order to maintain an outlying ring of bases for the defense of our country, and, yes, if need be, for possible offensive operations and he has done so and is so doing.

What, then, is in dispute if practically all of these points are in complete unanimity?

IT IS CONGRESS WHICH SHOULD IMPLEMENT PACT

Well, for one thing there is a dispute as to whether or not the President has inherent power to decide independently to contribute American troops to an international land army.

Involved in this question is whether or not the North Atlantic Pact is self-executing or whether it requires congressional act for implementation. I personally feel that there is a moral obligation that Congress should determine the policy in relation to implementing the Atlantic Pact with ground troops.

My basic conviction on the matter is that the Congress and the President must try to come to agreement on the basic essentials of defense of Western Europe. This makes it absolutely necessary that the President consult with the Congress in the actual formulation of policy. By consultation I do not mean merely reporting to the Congress after a decision has been made. Congress represents the people. It must never and will, I trust, never become a mere rubber stamp of the Chief Executive.

UNITED STATES' OWN DEFENSE IS PARAMOUNT

Now, my friends, practically no one has urged that America send an unlimited number of troops abroad. I for one, of course, have completely rejected any such proposal. Obviously we cannot send so many troops abroad as to:

(a) Strip our own continental defenses of essential manpower.

(b) Give Europe the notion that Uncle Sam all by himself is going to defend it, and

the European countries need do little, if anything, in their own behalf.

AMERICA MUST PROVIDE WORLD LEADERSHIP

But I have said it before, my friends, and I think that it is urgent that I repeat it, that there can be no retreating from history. Whether we like it or not, there is simply one country in the remaining free world which is the hope of mankind, and that country is, of course, the United States.

We cannot and will not retreat from our military, political, and spiritual obligations. When a tremendous fire is blazing in your town or mine it is up to the fire chief to lead his men in putting out that fire. This does not mean that the fire chief should try to do the job all alone, or, for that matter, that he should sit back in the fire house to see if his men can do the job all by themselves.

It should be the role of the leader to be right on the scene, to coordinate, to encourage and to give the benefit of his experience and know-how. But yes, if necessary, he must be ready to man a hose himself. However, the whole fire department has to work together as a team. The members of the fire-fighting forces cannot start to argue who has the right to use the hose in putting out the fire.

In other words, my friends, I do not think that it is time for the Congress or the President to knock each other out in a dispute as to who has the power to do what. Teamwork is essential regardless of who has the power.

PEOPLE HAVE LOST CONFIDENCE IN ADMINISTRATION

Now I personally feel that much of the present foreign-policy dispute would have been avoided if there had been justified a greater confidence on the part of the American people in the present administration. I feel that this administration has lost much of the confidence of the people, largely due to its own mistakes. It made an agreement as to occupied Berlin, for example, but failed to even provide a cow path to it. It naively gave Joseph Stalin pretty much what he wanted in Europe and Asia, and never sought a concession in return. It negotiated with him in a series of secret agreements on the silly idea that Stalin was a right-good fellow who would keep his bargain. And the administration committed a great number of other blunders. I say that wholly aside from partisan differences.

It is small wonder, therefore, that the American people are so disturbed and concerned about their future. Naturally, too, when with each day's newspapers, we read more and more reports of casualties of our boys in Korea, there isn't any American who does not wince at the thought of these young smiling faces, fallen in combat on the frozen battlefields of that far-off peninsula. There isn't any single American who does not seek in his inward heart for a way that will prevent the further spilling of blood.

ALLIED WEAKNESS INVITES WAR

But, my friends, in this present period, weakness and timidity will definitely not prevent a further spilling of blood. On the contrary, strength and strength alone—moral strength and physical strength—are necessary for this present critical hour. When there is a pyromania—a fire maniac (like a fanatic Communist) free in town, the only thing that will deter him is the presence of a lot of cops on the beat. If he doesn't see any cops on the scene while he is roaming the streets, there is more likelihood that he will proceed to set fires.

If, however, he sees practically every corner patrolled by a well-armed policeman and backed by an alert and intelligent citizenry, that fire maniac will think twice before he sets fires.

PRESENCE OF UNITED STATES TROOPS WILL HELP PREVENT WAR

So the basic question over this European troop production boils down to whether or not the cops should go on the beat before the fire has started or whether they should go after the fire has started. It is my personal feeling that the presence of a small number of American troops will prevent the fire from breaking out in the first place.

We cannot and should not contribute a completely disproportionate number of United States troops as we have in Korea. It is only stating a fact that I point out to you that it is American boys by and large who have one the bleeding and dying on that battle front. This lopsided situation must not happen again. We are willing to carry our fair share of the load, but we are not willing to carry the entire brunt all by ourselves.

YOUR LETTERS ARE WELCOME

I receive a tremendous amount of mail from Wisconsin on both sides of this problem. I welcome all expressions which come to me, whether or not they agree with my own views. I earnestly consider the views of my constituents. All I ask of them is that they, in turn, consider the fact that by colleagues and I are trying to arrive at an honest, sound decision which will accord with the best interests of our own American people first and foremost.

We recognize that any policy which is harmful to America is in the long run harmful to the world. We recognize that any policy which strengthens America strengthens the foundation of freedom in the world.

PREVENTING RUINING OF A DOLLAR

In the final few moments, I should like to turn to the subject of economic strength and leadership just as I have already spoken of military and political leadership.

We recognize that a solvent America is absolutely necessary if she is to meet her challenges. That is why I have repeatedly suggested on the Senate floor, and it is why I will continue to suggest certain actions designed to save the taxpayers' money and prevent further inflation.

I know that there isn't a man or woman in this audience tonight who is not concerned about the continued ruinous depreciation of the dollar. We all realize that the 100-cent dollar has become a 40-cent dollar. Why? Well, in part, due to spendthrift policies of Government which have resulted in more and more cheap printing-press money. Now what are we going to do about it?

I have made four suggestions:

1. The armed services procurement program must be tightened so that every single dollar provided to our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, gets 100-cents in value. There must be greater coordination among the procurement agencies, and our military services must recognize that while we will eagerly give them every penny that is necessary, this is not an excuse for extravagance or wastefulness on their part.

2. A second way of securing economy is by postponement of all proposed projects not absolutely essential right now to the national defense. You know, my friends, when a country is in a crisis, it is no time to be indulging in luxury pursuits.

WE NEED EFFICIENCY EXPERTS IN AGENCIES

3. A third suggestion that I have made is that Congress set up efficiency committees which will actually check into every Government agency on excess manpower, excess functions, etc. We know that Senator BRIDGES' Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures has done a fine job; but what we need is an actual pool of trained efficiency experts—men such as those whom you would hire to look into your own company to learn how to save money in very specific ways.

I shall follow through on this matter of setting up such efficiency committees in order to put the agencies on their notice that the Congress is ready, willing, and able to cut down on unnecessary appropriations.

4. Still another approach for saving money is by utilization of the latest technical weapons which will make unnecessary any attempt at having, for example, a hundred divisions or any such unsound total. In other words, if we can tap the technical genius of American industry by turning out superplanes and other essential new weapons, guided missiles, etc.—if we can do that—we will help assure defense without attempting to match Russia's mass land power.

Now, my friends, these are but four ways by which we can achieve this great economy objective. The sum and substance of what we are aiming at is that we balance the budget by pay-as-you-go financing and by cutting out all unessential items. The net effect to you and to me and to the man in the street is that we will protect the value of the dollar, which means the purchasing power that is available to every American family.

CONTINUED RELIANCE ON DIVINE PROVIDENCE

May I conclude now on a note which I believe is appropriate to this solemn hour in American history. On another occasion, at the establishment of this Republic, the founding fathers of this great Nation expressed in no fewer than four specific references in the Declaration of Independence our universal dependence on God. May I, therefore, recall to you these references which I think can guide us today as they guided the patriots of 1776:

1. In the first sentence, the authors of this great charter of our freedom wrote: "To which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them."

2. Then in the second sentence, they wrote: "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

3. Then in the next to the last sentence: "Appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world."

4. Then finally, my friends, the authors of the Declaration of Independence wrote in the final sentence: "With a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

With that same firm reliance today, with that same faith which we are told moves mountains, I know that America will be adequate to the challenges of this challenging hour. Thank you.

The Key to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article signed by a clergyman dealing with a book entitled "The Key to Peace." The article is entitled "Superficial Book," and appeared in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPERFICIAL BOOK

(Under the above title, the National Catholic Welfare Council here has released the following review of a book called Key to Peace, by Clarence Manion, Notre Dame's law dean. The assistant director of the social action department of NCWC says the book may insult our allies and "is likely to do a lot of harm." The book is currently being serialized by the Times-Herald.)

(By Rev. George C. Higgins, assistant director, social action department, NCWC.)

Clarence Manion, dean of the law school at the University of Notre Dame, recently published a book entitled "The Key to Peace," which has aroused a degree of public interest out of all proportion to its length and importance.

One reviewer—Walter Trohan, well known correspondent for the Chicago Tribune—refers to it unqualifiedly as "the finest politico-spiritual study of America I know."

"I read it twice in one night," he says, "have returned to it many times, and expect to do so as far in the future as my road may go." Others have praised it just as highly.

LIKELY TO DO HARM

Under the circumstances, therefore, it is more than a little embarrassing for the present writer to be among the first to sound a sour note and suggest that The Key to Peace is a very superficial book.

Our discomfiture is all the greater in view of the fact that the book is obviously well-intentioned and so deeply spiritual and religious in tone. Nevertheless, we cannot help but think that it's likely to do a lot of harm, particularly if it falls into the hands of our beleaguered allies in the struggle for international peace. The free nations of the world are likely to be insulted—as they have a right to be—by its exaggerated "Americanism" and its all too conspicuous contempt for "Europeanism," whatever that may be.

IMPLIED INDICTMENT

Inasmuch as Manion is a Celtic name, the present writer—a fellow immigrant, two generations removed—is particularly bewildered by the author's implicit indictment of the Republic of Ireland.

Dr. Manion says, by obvious implication if not in so many words, that the Government of the Republic of Ireland (and of all other nations on God's green earth, with the sole exception of the United States of America) holds to "the proposition that Government once installed is unlimited in its power over its subjects."

His thesis is that "Americanism offers the only valid formula for the ultimate achievement" of the ideal of human brotherhood. The "genuine and really precious diamonds of human civilization," he says, are to be found "only in this—the United States of America." It is unfortunate, he adds, that "every political system in the un-American world officially and categorically denies the sacredness of human personality."

If this means anything at all, it means that Ireland (among other countries) is either actually or potentially a totalitarian dictatorship.

Dr. Manion's definition of "Americanism" is a mixture of fact and personal opinion. I, for one, couldn't possibly accept it as it stands, any more than I could possibly go along with the following generalization from an address he delivered on February 9 before the First Friday Club of Detroit:

"For a quarter of a century many influential people in America have flirted coyly with Socialist-Communist economics, Socialist-Communist sociology and Socialist-Communist materialism in general. The flirtation becomes an outright scandalous association in many, if not most, of our schools and colleges, and from them it invaded our politics. * * *"

"Most of our schools and colleges," in other words, are teaching Socialist-Communist economics and Socialist-Communist sociology.

We simply don't believe it. And we don't think Dr. Manion can prove it. Or as the Latin motto puts it very bluntly: "What is freely asserted can be just as freely denied."

But Dr. Manion's definition of "Americanism" is beside the point. So is mine. Americans can agree to disagree, amicably and sincerely, about this and similar issues—such as the extent of Socialist-Communist teaching in our schools and colleges—as long as the argument is kept within the family.

On the other hand, however—unless we have completely misunderstood the meaning of this morning's headlines—Americans can ill afford to go around insulting the honor of all the other free nations of the world by condemning the whole kaboodle of them (including Ireland, I insist) as totalitarian dictatorships. The United States of America is a wonderful place in which to live, but it's probably not as good as Manion says it is, nor are the other free nations of the world (including Ireland) quite as bad.

BRITISH SOCIALISM

Take the case of British socialism as an example. Dr. Manion writes it off in sweeping generalizations as a "totalitarian" system of government—communism on a slow train. The professor is entitled to his own opinion, of course, and is unquestionably on solid ground in his opposition to unnecessary governmental intervention in the field of economics.

Let us not forget, however, that there is another side to the picture of British socialism.

Our information is that approximately 75 percent of British Catholics voluntarily vote the Labor ticket and that the bishops of England have publicly and officially ruled that Catholics are free to belong to the Labor Party if they so desire. I myself happen to know a lot of British priests who belong to it.

That doesn't mean, of course, that British socialism is better than Americanism, nor does it mean that the bishops and the Catholic clergy and laity of England are completely satisfied with the program of the Labor Party. It does seem to mean, however, that the bishops of England—unlike Dr. Manion—have not yet decided that the program of the British Labor Party is totalitarian.

I think the rest of us can afford to be as tolerant as the bishops.

Break the Inflation Stalemate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the February 28, 1951, issue of the Christian Science Monitor there appeared an editorial which merits consideration by Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAK THE INFLATION STALEMATE

Few fires would be put out if firemen stopped to argue who should make the first move or take the greater risks in tackling a blaze. But isn't that about what America's anti-inflation firemen are doing today?

Everybody is against inflation, but virtually every economic and political group is holding back, insisting that somebody else make the first move to halt it. The stalemate between those who seek price rises and those who press for wage increases is bad enough. But on the governmental front the deadlock between the economy-first advocates and the taxes-first school is even more harmful. For it is delaying teamwork between the executive and legislative branches on the essential steps to deal with the causes rather than the symptoms of inflation.

The basic hope is for measures to siphon off the pressure of excess buying power. Three principal steps hold promise. Higher taxes, curbs on credit, and measures to encourage saving. Congress is directly responsible for the delay in taxes. The people should make it clear that they prefer to pay fair taxes rather than tribute to the cruel caprices of inflation.

Congress finds an excuse if not a reason for delay on taxes in the failure of the executive branch to move more resolutely against inflation. Many Congressmen have declared that they will not vote taxes until assured that nondefense spending will be cut. They were outraged by the President's inclusion of costly social welfare projects in the budget.

There must be economy. If the Government is going to ask citizens to tighten their belts, it must show a willingness to do some reducing itself. Those shiny new social experiments should be laid on the shelf; savings that will not destroy efficiency can and should be squeezed from all Government costs—including those for defense. This is not wholly up to the President. Congress can cut the budget. It can revise legislation in which it has given expensive favors to special-interest groups. It can move to tighten credit.

But President Truman might well take the lead. He could offer to drop the fancy nondefense spending from the budget. He could more urgently drive for economies in the executive departments. He has now appointed a committee to study additional ways to curb credit through the Federal Reserve Board. He could give more positive support to such measures—even at the risk of some damage to the Government's market for bonds. He could more resolutely back price and wage controls—even where they pinch politically powerful groups.

Such leadership would leave Congress with no shadow of excuse for slacking in the fight against inflation. It could not long hold back and dodge the voting of higher taxes. Mr. Truman has chosen able men for the Office of Defense Mobilization. We expect a good job on the production and controls ends of the problem. But their efforts can be largely nullified unless the President and Congress act vigorously to take off the inflation pressures through taxes, credit curbs, and the promotion of saving.

Unless the Government soon shows real determination to take these basic measures against inflation the public will continue to try to buy ahead of rising prices—and thereby push them up another notch. But once the executive and legislative branches display even a firm intention of stopping inflation much of this pressure will subside. Let the fire chief lead the way, and the firemen will have to stop arguing about whether economy should go before taxes or taxes before economy. Tackling the fire as a team, they can put it out.

Grain and Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter I have received from Peter Weinhardt, of Glen Ullin, N. Dak., dealing with the subject of grain and food prices.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLEN ULLIN, N. DAK., *March 3, 1951.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We read so much about a set price on wheat in parity of other goods.

You know that wheat is selling for $2.13 today. How can we pay all the taxes forced upon us, and for the high-priced machinery. One three-bottom plow costs $390; a 10-foot drill between $800 and $900; a 10-foot self-propelled combine $5,000; and every other item is out of line with our commodities.

In 1943 I purchased a 9-4-foot press drill for $316. Wheat sold around $1.54; now wheat is a little over $2 and the drill $800. Why do we have to go broke under a monopolized system; under a free people Constitution? We have no free bargaining; the prices are all the same wherever we go

What about the antitrust law passed in 1914, I believe? The larger a company or owner gets, the worse we common people are off, because they control the prices by money power.

I want to let you know honestly that we farmers cannot exist under this tax and profiteering system. One crop failure, and the farmer has to mortgage some property or land.

I break even and farm 480 acres. Now I need a barn bad, but I don't know whether enough money can be made to pay for it. This little barn will cost me more than I can sell cattle for in 4 years.

Mr. LANGER, we know and see that the odds are against us but we as free people cannot, nor dare not, do or say something. If we do we are called Communists. There are taxes imposed upon us that are unconstitutional, but we are at war, we are told. But I think we are only at war to impose those unjust and destructive taxes.

Mr. LANGER, the only thing that is free is, we can work 24 hours a day. And if we want to be loved or admired by some, then give everything away, then you are a patriot.

I don't expect you, Mr. LANGER, to try and change this situation alone. I don't believe that some of our leaders know what is going on, and I also don't believe some of them care about the common people, because a human being is the cheapest weapon, and want to destroy some of them anyway.

Yours truly,

PETER WEINHARDT.

Minority Opinion on the Proposed Merger of Colorado Interstate Gas Co. and Canadian River Gas Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, today Commissioner Buchanan, of the Federal Power Commission, rendered a minority opinion in the matter of the proposed merger of the Colorado Interstate Gas Co. and the Canadian River Gas Co.

Denver, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Cheyenne, and other cities in the Rocky Mountain area being served with natural gas by these companies are growing so rapidly that new supplies of natural gas must be obtained. If the proposed merger is approved, I am assured that a pipeline will be built promptly; the Canadian River Gas Co. reserves will be protected from the encroachment of competing gas producers; and an adequate supply of gas for these communities will be forthcoming. I urged the Federal Power Commission to look with favor on the proposed merger, provided, of course, that the terms of the merger are reasonable and in the public interest.

I have read Mr. Buchanan's minority report with surprise. I disagree completely with respect to his pessimistic conclusions. All of the points which he raises were before the Commission when the case was heard and they were rejected on their merits.

The important point, which Mr. Buchanan apparently has failed to grasp, is that an adequate supply of gas for Colorado consumers, and not the price of gas, is the issue in this particular matter. Denver now enjoys, and will continue to enjoy under the merger, lower natural-gas rates than many other cities. For example, in 1949, the Denver home owner who heated his house with gas and who used 20,000 cubic feet of gas monthly—a typical bill—paid 43.8 cents per thousand cubic feet, or a total of $8.87. This is in startling contrast to the Fort Worth, Tex., family, deep in the heart of the gas and oil country, who paid 59.8 cents per thousand cubic feet, or $11.96 for 20,000 cubic feet. Colorado Interstate's wholesale rate at the Denver City gate at 17.1 cents per thousand cubic feet is one of the lowest rates in the entire country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of my letter to Chairman Wallgren, of the Federal Power Commission, a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Denver Post of March 3, 1951, and a copy of Commissioner Buchanan's press release of March 7, 1951, regarding his minority opinion, which I have just referred to.

There being no objection, the copy of the letter, the editorial, and the press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1951.

Hon. MON C. WALLGREN,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MON: I am much interested in the proceeding now pending before the Federal Power Commission, in which Colorado Interstate Gas Co. seeks authority to acquire the natural gas leases, gas wells, and pipeline facilities of Canadian River Gas Co. For 20 years Colorado Interstate has been supplying natural gas for distribution in all the principal communities in my State, and has performed an outstanding job. The citizens of Colorado have benefited greatly from the sound business practices of the company.

Regulation by the Federal Power Commission has been beneficial, too. A substantial rate reduction was made in 1942. In 1947 the Commission authorized the building of a pipeline to Kansas to obtain additional gas from the Hugoton field. The proposal now before the Commission strengthens the gas supply for Colorado and provides for an additional delivery of badly needed gas.

I understand that the proposal now under consideration would put in Colorado Interstate the ownership of large gas reserves in the Panhandle field now owned by Canadian River. By reason of the ownership Colorado citizens would be assured of a gas supply for many years at a very low rate. A contract between the two companies, under which gas from the Canadian company's reserves is available to Colorado Interstate, has been before you a long time, but I am advised that you object to certain features of that contract, and that is holding up the building of a second pipeline from Colorado to Texas.

I realize that the Federal Power Commission will protect the public interest and approve the terms of the proposed merger only if reasonable and in the public interest. I have no knowledge as to that matter, but I do urge upon you the importance of an assured gas supply for the citizens of Colorado. There are no complaints about the present rates and no agitation for lower rates. The only worry is with respect to delivery of a sufficient supply. In view of the constant increase in the prices of coal, oil, and other necessities of life our citizens are not likely to complain about rates for gas which were fixed on the basis of 1940 costs.

It is my understanding that no increase in rates will result because of the merger; and unless other costs increase beyond the present levels, there will not be any request for higher rates in the near future.

I repeat, the most important consideration is an adequate supply of gas. Unless the terms upon which Colorado Interstate would acquire this fine gas reserve are clearly unreasonable, I am convinced that the welfare of the people of Colorado will be served by the Commission's approval of those terms at a very early date.

I hope that an early decision will be forthcoming so that the proposed second line to Texas can be constructed. It takes time to build such a line; and unless action is speeded up, the allocation of pipe already arranged for this job may be withdrawn.

Sincerely,

EDWIN C. JOHNSON.

[From the Denver Post of March 3, 1951]

Approval by the Federal Power Commission of the proposed merger of the Colorado Interstate Gas and Canadian River Gas Cos. is welcome news to Denver. It insures an additional supply of natural gas for this city before next winter. And assurance is given that the merger will not increase gas rates.

Merger of the two companies is necessary to increase the borrowing capacity of Colorado Interstate so it can finance an $18,000,000 expansion of its pipeline system. This includes construction of a 215-mile line from the Amarillo, Tex., gas field to Kit Carson, Colo., where it will connect with the line running into Denver from the Hugoton, Kans., field. That will take care of increasing gas demands in Colorado and Wyoming and leave a comfortable surplus. Senator JOHNSON, of Colorado, and Congressman ROGERS, of Denver, merit commendation for their efforts to speed up FPC action.

[Federal Power Commission press release]

COMMISSIONER BUCHANAN FILES STATEMENT DISSENTING FROM FPC ACTION IN APPROVING COLORADO INTERSTATE GAS CO.-CANADIAN RIVER GAS CO. MERGER

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 7, 1951.—Commissioner Thomas C. Buchanan has filed a statement dissenting from the February 28 decision of the Federal Power Commission authorizing Colorado Interstate Gas Co. to acquire and operate the facilities of Canadian River Gas Co.

Mr. Buchanan said he was dissenting "because (1) in my opinion the decision unjustifiably deprives the gas consumers of Denver, Cheyenne, and the Rocky Mountain area of a saving in gas rates of approximately $800,000 on an annual basis; and (2) the decision is completely at odds with fundamental principles of regulation vigorously espoused by this Commission and approved by the United States Supreme Court."

In his 20-page dissent, Mr. Buchanan reviewed in detail the history of the two companies and the merger plan, under which Colorado is acquiring Canadian from Southwestern Development Co. through a plan which will, among other things, give Southwestern title to all liquid hydrocarbons associated with the natural gas underlying Canadian's acreage.

Mr. Buchanan asserted that the merger is entirely one of increased gains for the stockholders. He said that Southwestern will receive more than $20,000,000 from natural gasoline revenues while the value of its stock holdings, which cost it nothing in the first instance, will be increased by several million dollars.

Commissioner Buchanan said that "I am not objecting to Colorado's stockholders making a profit from the sale of their stock holdings. That is one of the privileges of our free enterprise system. But where free enterprise and the public interest come into conflict through a public utility which Congress has expressly made subject to regulation, the situation is different and the congressional policies must prevail without choice."

Discussing the effect on the rate payers, Mr. Buchanan said that through the merger, the gas consumers and not Colorado's stockholders pay Colorado's cost of acquiring Canadian's stock which, he said, has already been paid for by Colorado.

"This is the first instance, to my knowledge," Mr. Buchanan continued, "where a regulatory agency has sanctioned the diversion of operating revenues to pay for the stock of another utility corporation. Colorado's customers will continue to pay a fair return and depreciation on Canadian's net investment of approximately $9,000,000, but in addition, will have to pay Colorado's cost of acquiring Canadian's stock amounting to more than $20,000,000. In my opinion this is an unreasonable and unconscionable burden on the gas consumers of Denver, Cheyenne, and the Rocky Mountain area."

Concluding, Mr. Buchanan stated: "My dissent does not mean that I am opposed to a merger if the public interest were fully protected. Quite the contrary. A merger in the customary or orthodox sense, without the diversion of Colorado's operating revenues to Southwestern as payment for Canadian's stock, would have been in the public interest. No such proposal, however, is before us."

Near East—New Center of Infection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including, as part of my remarks, an article that appeared in the Evening Star on March 7 by that well-known commentator Mr. Constantine Brown, who clearly points out the danger that exists in the Near East today as it affects the Moslem world. I commend this article to all Members who are interested in the subject of peace in this vital area of the world:

NEW CENTER OF INFECTION—MOSLEMS FROM INDIAN OCEAN TO ATLANTIC IN STATE OF FERMENT DUE TO RED PROPAGANDA

(By Constantine Brown)

Regardless of whether the news from Egypt about the rebellion in Morocco and repressions by French troops is exaggerated or not, the Moslem peoples from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic are in a state of ferment today.

Popular meetings have been held from Karachi to Cairo protesting alleged drastic French methods of reprisal and demanding freedom for the Moroccans.

Normally this would be a symptom of a minor condition which could be cured with tact and patience. Unfortunately, in the present world tension the addition of another potential center of infection could have serious repercussions on western preparations against aggression.

The Muscovites are playing a cagey game. They do not attempt to propagate communism among the millions of Arabs. They represent themselves as the torchbearers of nationalism, freedom and equality among peoples. The Arabs have not had the same chance as the peoples of Europe to see the Soviet brand of freedom. They resent the French and British, whom they accuse of continuing a policy of colonialism, which has been abandoned in other parts of the world, particularly the Far East.

Russian propaganda shows that the Mohammedans of Indonesia, for instance, have their own national government, without interference of any kind on the part of their former masters, the Government of the Netherlands. They also are reminded that another overwhelmingly Mohammedan country, Pakistan, is as free and independent as the free western nations.

The rulers and leaders of the Arab kingdoms can see easily through the Soviet game. But the people themselves—and particularly the young intelligensia—are so anxious to emulate their brethren who have obtained complete independence that they are inclined to speed up the move for complete political and economic liberty, even at the price of a physical struggle. This is bad news for our military men in the present crisis.

Military forces of the European nations are dependent on the oil resources of Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq. In the event of a conflict with the U. S. S. R. in Europe, it will be almost impossible for us to provide the Allied air forces, navies, and mechanized units with needed gasoline and oil from the United States. This not only would be difficult physically, but Western Hemisphere supplies would not be sufficient for the enormous requirements of a military campaign in which gasoline and oil will play a preponderant role.

Moreover, although this matter is seldom discussed in public, the top military strategists believe that if Russia starts an aggression much earlier than is expected, North Africa will play a far more important role than any other part of Europe.

France, Belgium, and the rest of the continental Western European nations may be overrun. This happened in 1940. But the aggressors would have as hard a time as the Nazis had in World War II to establish themselves solidly on the southern shores of the Mediterranean, so long as the native inhabitants continue to be friendly to the west.

The fact that the Arabs in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia remained faithful to France in its direst hours and were friendly to the American and British forces in November 1942 when the invasion was made, was of great help to the American commander, General Eisenhower.

If they had been in the ugly mood they are reported to be in today, there is no question that things would not have run as smoothly as they did. In addition to these international considerations, which can affect the free world's war effort, the reported restlessness of the Arabs in North Africa can impair greatly France's own military preparedness.

Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolutions protesting the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Whereas the present political division of Ireland, whereby a part thereof is subject to British rule, is not in keeping with the principles of self-determination and is not based on the racial, economic, or historical background of the people of Ireland: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts recommends that the Congress of the United States be urged to use its influence to abrogate the present political division of Ireland, and to protest the presence of British troops in that country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted February 21, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 28, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are those who say that Europe is the only vital area to our national security. Mr. Constantine Brown, the outstanding columnist, writing in the February 25 issue of the Sunday Washington Star, indicates that the Far and Middle East are just as important.

Under unanimous consent, I am including the article as part of my remarks:

EUROPE ISN'T THE ONLY AREA VITAL TO OUR SECURITY—FAR AND MIDDLE EAST ARE TERMED JUST AS IMPORTANT

(By Constantine Brown)

Those who listened to the testimony and colloquy between Pentagon representatives and members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees last week are puzzled over interpretations put on those hearings, to the effect that there are important differences between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

The Senators and the spokesmen for the Armed Forces agreed that the four American divisions, which it is intended to send to Europe this year, are more of a morale booster for our allies than a force which is able to defeat the Russians if they attack in the next 12 months.

The witnesses and the members of the two committees also agreed that congressional approval would be very important, since it would show the world that the American people are united in their decision to resist communism at home and abroad.

Finally, Secretary of State Acheson and the representatives of the Military Establishment concurred with the views of the Senators that we must utilize to the fullest extent all other military forces outside the Atlantic Pact which are willing to join in the defense of Europe. They want the 81 available combat divisions of Spain, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey to join with the Atlantic forces as soon as possible.

Nobody seems opposed to the plan that an American force—limited, according to Secretary Marshall, at first to only four additional divisions—is essential to bolster the fighting willingness of our allies. None of the military men expressed the belief that such a force could by itself stop the Reds in their tracks.

BROADER PICTURE

They all agreed that all other non-Communist forces should be permitted to join in the defense set-up. They all agreed that American air and naval power can be only an adjunct of the general defense plans of free Europe. Nobody vaguely suggested that we abandon Europe.

Meanwhile, it has become obvious to all but the politically blind that our own present task is not confined to "saving" Western Europe alone. In the present conflict with the U. S. S. R. and her satellites there are two other immediately critical areas: The Far East and the Middle East. They are as vital to our national security as Europe is.

A good deal of emphasis is placed on Europe's raw materials and manpower, which totals 200,000,000. But the Far and Middle East, with a population four times as large as Europe's and with vast resources of basic raw materials, are mentioned only casually by advocates of Europe first.

The point of view of some of our legislators, that our responsibility for the security of our continent extends equally to the Asiatic Continent, is seldom heard or fully appreciated. And yet, it is fully appreciated by the military men, who cannot insist on its importance because the politicians in the executive branch of the Government do not want it emphasized at this time.

These are the same political considerations which have prevented us from fully enlisting the support of the large available forces of the Mediterranean countries. Generals Eisenhower, Bradley, and Vandenberg, as well as Admiral Sherman, have urged for some time that we bring the Mediterranean states into the defense set-up. These nations have a military potential which is believed to have slowed down Soviet aggressive aims in Europe.

CONDITIONS FAVOR REDS

While the West is capable, with the support of the Spanish armies, of fighting a delaying action against the Red forces in the west, the threat of a military operation on the highly sensitive Soviet underbelly—Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, all of which are hankering for liberation—could cause definite collapse of any Red aggression against the West. Thus, the European picture appears less glowing to some professional strategists than it is generally painted.

The situation is far less favorable in Asia, where Russian aggression is now in full swing.

In the Far East we are fighting a seesaw battle with the Chinese Communists in Korea. They have poured about 60 of their best divisions against the numerically inferior United Nations forces. These have been checked. But so long as no diversions are created on other fronts in the Far East, the Chinese commander in chief, Gen. Chu Teh, will be able to use fresh troops out of the pool of 400 divisions he now has available.

So long as we refuse the proferred help of the Chinese Nationalist armies in Formosa we risk a continuation of the futile loss of life in Korea and cannot put the brake on Communist plans in Indochina, Malaya, Burma, and Indonesia. Chu Teh knows that as long as the United Nations are not relieved by the creation of a second front, he can hold us in North Korea while his reserves operate freely in the south against the French, the British, and the newly created Asiatic independent states.

He is firmly convinced that we will not bomb the lines of supply and the industrial centers which are providing his armies with arms and ammunition from Manchuria. And whenever he is ordered by Moscow he can use his vast reserves in theaters of operations which may be far more important to Russia's plans this summer than Korea. He can hold us at the thirty-eighth parallel, while the rest of his forces are performing bigger and better deeds for the Kremlin.

The situation in the Middle East is equally alarming. With the exception of Turkey there is not a single military power in that area. Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Iran, are the most vital spots which concern the western defense planners, since they contain vast resources of oil.

Russia cannot hope to fight a successful war against the West without adequate oil supplies. She has important oil resources in the Baku area, at Grozny in the Caucasus, in the Ploesti region of Romania, and some additional supplies along the Volga, in Poland, and in Austria. But considering the great requirements of modern weapons, tanks, trucks, planes, and ships, the available quantities are nowhere near large enough to wage a long war. Hence, the U. S. S. R. must obtain the oil resources of the Middle East.

The extremely mild and courteous attitude of Stalin himself toward Iran, coupled with our own indifferent attitude toward that country, appears to give the Russians the advantage in that oil-rich area. Nobody in Washington or in London will be surprised to hear that the Teheran Government has decided to nationalize the oil fields by paying off the stockholders of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co., and later to hear that the new commercial agreement between Russia and Iran gives the U. S. S. R. practical control over that important source of strategic materials.

This has not been accomplished yet, but appears to be in the making. And the more we give the world the impression that we are confining our efforts mainly to Western Europe and the more we say that America's security will be in a desperate plight if we do not put all our eggs in the Western European basket, the more the Middle East will lean toward full cooperation with the U. S. S. R.

The Arab countries, which have even larger quantities of oil—Saudi Arabia and Iraq—are instinctively friendly to us. But they are completely powerless to meet a Russian aggression, once the U. S. S. R. has established itself by a friendly agreement in Iran. Both of these oil-rich countries have armies which can be described best as military police. They are even less prepared to cope with a Communist aggression than the South Koreans were last summer.

RICH PRIZES

But neither we nor the British have the necessary strength at this time to help them effectively. Our limited available ground forces are ear-marked for Western Europe. The British are no better off. Air and naval power cannot stop the Russians in the Middle East.

We may be able to pinprick the Russians with our Air Force from land bases in Africa or from carriers. But on the admission of Admiral Sherman, the Chief of Naval Operations, and General Vandenberg, the Air Force Chief of Staff, naval and air power alone cannot succeed against an aggression by land forces, supported by an air umbrella.

Arabia and Iran are, in the opinion of most military men, far richer prizes for the Russians at this time than Western Europe, because of their unlimited oil resources. Much emphasis has been placed on the danger to us if Russia were to take over the Western European industries and its skilled workers. But these, in a moment of tragic necessity, could be reduced to impotence by the Air Force.

This is not the case with the oil supplies. Oil wells can be destroyed by air bombardment, but this would be only a temporary condition, since they can be drilled in other parts of the vast oil fields.

The defense of that area, say our military in off-the-record conversations, can be assured by the acceptance of all Mediterranean nations into the coalition as full partners.

But whatever means for the protection of the oil nations may be, it is essential that we not overlook the fact that Russia has a keen eye on the Middle East, where it can find the oil for a long war and also can deny us the same advantage with little effort at this time.

Exchange Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, unless we of the free world win the war for the minds of men against the totalitarians, we cannot place final reliance upon success on the battlefield. We must sell the American system, our ideals of freedom and democracy, to the young men and women who will be the leaders of the other countries of the world tomorrow.

The various programs for exchange students are the best example of fruitful work in this field. Under unanimous consent, I submit an article from the Sunflower Tocsin, published at Indianola, Miss., describing the experiences of an exchange student in Mississippi:

GOVERNMENT PROGRAM MAKES GERMAN BOY HAPPY AT BLAINE

Twenty-year-old blond William Wufka has rosy cheeks, twinkling blue eyes, and a graphic conception of democracy in action.

Wilhelm, or William, as we call him in America, is a bright-faced German youth who is studying Mississippi agriculture and American democracy on the 240-acre Delta farm of Mr. and Mrs. C. K. Fisackerly, 5 miles northeast of Sunflower.

Jointly sponsored by the American Farm Bureau Federation and a division of the United States Department of State, William's entry to the United States was arranged under the direction of the Mississippi Farm Bureau and many families of warm-hearted Americans. He arrived in Mississippi last July 1 and will return to Germany this July to take first-hand observations of American life back to his native Germany.

Last week this writer spent a day with William, and observed a remarkable adjustment in a boy with an eagerness to do a gobd job in his mission to America.

When this writer arrived at the Fisackerly farm William was busily sloshing through thawing ice to dump sweet-smelling bales of lespedeza hay into racks for the varied livestock on the farm. He placed the cured hay before some 197 head of feeder sheep. Then he shucked ears of corn for Duroc Jersey brood sows, and he leaped over a stall door to sift mixed feed in troughs for 10-month-old Aberdeen Angus heifers.

Less than an hour earlier William, dressed in a maroon corduroy sport coat and comfortable American slacks and shoes, waved farewell to school chums on a Sunflower County school bus and entered the large white house of the Fisackerly's. William is a freshman student at Sunflower Junior College. He divides his time between class work, home work, farm chores, and a normal social life with boys and girls in the neighborhood.

The life, William will tell you, is vastly different from that of the 10 previous years of his life.

In a little stone house at No. 94 in the village of Mallersdorf, Bavaria, there's a comely brown-eyed brunette 24 years old, named Herta. She is 50 percent of William's remaining immediate family—his only sister. She wonders how William is making out in English-speaking America. She is anxious for July 1951, when William comes home.

Herta and William, teamed up by fate to overcome many humanly depressing obstacles, remember well, when as children, they lived in a castle at Karlsbad, in Czechoslovakia, where their father was overseer of some 500 acres of land. He was mayor of the village.

Then came war. William's two brothers, Walter and Erich, entered the German Army. His mother contracted a disease and died in 1943. In 1944 Brother Erich was reported missing in action against the Russians in the vicinity of Ilman Sea.

VE-day, May 8, 1945, William was 16 years old. The American and Russian armies met head-on in their east-west slash across Germany. Russian soldiers occupied Karlsbad and took Father Wufka away. Walter was placed in a concentration camp and later released. Father Wufka was unheard of again.

German subjects were asked to move into Germany proper, so William and Herta left their destroyed castle and boarded a train with thousands of Germans and headed back into Germany. William was now 16. Herta was 20.

At Mallersdorf, Bavaria (a part of Germany), the pair rented a part of a house and set up housekeeping with the 280 pounds of luggage and housewares which they brought with them.

Herta obtained employment as a secretary in August 1947, 14 days after their arrival. Her salary provided for their most critical needs—and in March 1948, William enrolled in a German farm school, or landwirtschaftschule.

Under this school plan William and other German youths worked on farms during crop months and attended classes from November through March.

During his second year an announcement was made in the school that a scholarship was being offered to top German students, providing for a year's study of agriculture and democracy in America.

William applied for the scholarship and following an intensive screening, was selected over seven other boys in Mallersdorf. Next he was interviewed in Niederbayern or Regensburg. William was accepted as one of 138 boys and 36 girls to come to America for the democratic and agricultural study.

On June 14, 1950, a troopship steamed from Bremerhaven Harbor. Nine days later eager German youths lined the ship's rails to snap pictures of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor.

Unity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the following letter by Mr. J. Webb Saffold to the editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which appeared in that paper on Sunday, January 28, 1951:

WRITER TO EDITOR SAYS UNITY IS ESSENTIAL TO SURVIVAL; SEEKS BASIS FOR IT

UNITY?

EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER.

SIR: Unity is now the basic essential to a wholehearted national effort to meet the crisis of the Russian menace to world peace and our American way of life. Stirring appeals for unity are being made hourly by prominent people and it is obvious that unless we first have real national unity at home we cannot save the nations abroad.

But it takes more than stirring pleas and promises to gain real unity from the American people. They must have a solid and adequate basis for unity, a sufficient confidence in their leaders to enable them to rally round those leaders and give them wholehearted support without hesitation or mental reservations. Such confidence the American people do not have in their present leaders who are the Truman-Acheson-Marshall group. Why? "Look at the record" as a great genuine Democrat used to say. Former President Franklin Roosevelt prided himself upon being "left of center," but the Truman administration has prided itself upon being centered in the left. From the very start it has pursued a policy that has led this Nation rapidly down the road to socialism and done it in the name of democracy.

That policy has done much to build Russia up from a second-class power into the colossal threat of the most powerful totalitarian nation on earth today and the American people know this to their sorrow financially and in every other way. We are now reaping the whirlwind from the wind that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations have sown and we are literally and morally "in the red." Now this same administration is faced with a war of survival against that Red Russia which it has helped so much to build up, especially in China, and it is the mad scramble of the Snare Deal to get over on the American side of the fence in time to save itself and this nation that is causing the furious maelstrom of confusion in Washington today.

The men who have led us into this tragic mess are not the men to lead us out of it. They are in power, they are the government and the law so they can take our sons and fathers from us and send them to die on frozen foreign battlefields. They can tax us beyond our capacity to pay and so destroy our ability to support the national effort, and they will smear any man as an isolationist who does not agree with them and can put any man in jail who refuses to hand out his very living to support policies which he opposes. But they cannot force any man to give them wholehearted loyalty in support of men and policies which he feels in his heart are wrong, and which are simply more of the same thing which this Nation has suffered continuously for the past 15 years. That record is only too well known to the people of America; just a brief résumé of it is sickening to any real American, especially those mothers who have lost a son in Korea. That record is what begets the firm conviction that this beloved land of ours has been sold down the Volga River, and a surprising number of citizens have said just that to me in recent weeks.

It is impossible to heal a wound until you get all of the infection out of it, no matter how many fancy bandages you put on it. I refuse to "unify" around the men and policies that have led us into this apparently bottomless morass, but I will gladly give my full support to men who are rooted and grounded in basic American principles as stated in our Constitution which is the rock on which this Republic (not democracy) was built. It is because politicians (not statesmen) have departed from these principles that we find ourselves in this predicament today and unless we have real leaders who will return to those principles we do not have a Chinaman's chance to survive in this great crisis regardless of how many billions of our inflated money we hand out, how much production we achieve, or how many millions of the flower of our young manhood pour out their American blood on foreign battlefields.

Unity is given, it cannot be enacted nor extracted and it will only be given if and when it is deserved.

J. WEBB SAFFOLD.

CLEVELAND.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], is one of the United States representatives in the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the Birmingham News of February 21, 1951, there appears a most timely and interesting article by Mr. McClellan Van der Veer, the distinguished editor of the News, entitled

"JOHN SPARKMAN's Hope of Peace." I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN SPARKMAN'S HOPE OF PEACE

(By McClellan Van der Veer)

Back home in Alabama JOHN SPARKMAN Monday talked about his hopes for peace and national security. He gave a remarkable extemporaneous exposition of American foreign policy in an address at Jacksonville State College. He pursued the subject in extended personal conversations. He was, as usual, lucid, frank, sincere. Much of encouragement and reassurance must have been obtained by many who heard him, although JOHN SPARKMAN is not one to minimize the continuing gravity of the world situation, the frightful costs it is now exacting, the persisting danger of far greater conflict.

Our junior United States Senator, however, is a strong supporter of our Government's foreign policy. He believes that it has gotten substantial results and may produce still greater achievements, though he would not claim it has been perfect or guided by unerring foresight. It is easy, he says, to criticize one phase or decision in a many-sided foreign policy, and on that basis condemn a whole program. But that is not a fair or intelligent approach to the matter.

As a very able and highly respected Member of the Senate, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, as one of the delegates to the General Assembly of the United Nations, JOHN SPARKMAN is exceptionally qualified to appraise the international crisis. He flatly disavows ability to foretell with assurance what is coming. He is no superficial optimist. But he has clear ideas as to the general lines along which he believes this Nation should work; he is himself working vigorously along those lines; he believes progress has been made in some particulars; he does have hope for the future.

So confused and uncertain does the situation appear to many Americans at times that they are not infrequently tempted to feelings of bewilderment, discouragement, and helplessness. It is good, and inspiriting, to obtain a clear conception of what so competent, highly placed and sincere a student of the Nation's present position is thinking. This is an attempt to grasp and pass on the outlines, at least, of that conception.

WAR NOT INEVITABLE

JOHN SPARKMAN does not believe that general war is inevitable. On that he is emphatic. What are the bases of his hope in that respect?

A demonstration of the will and the ability to withstand aggression, he thinks, may lead to a decision by the Kremlin to enter into negotiations that may produce a real settlement.

It is to be remembered that no perfect peace has ever been made, that governments are naturally influenced to a great extent by national interests, by expediency, by many other factors in reaching agreements. When agreements can be reached that are in the interest of all concerned, they have a good chance of enduring.

If Stalin and his associates are convinced that they have no favorable prospect of serving their own ends by a continuation of their recent tactics, including the maintenance of a vast military establishment, they may clear the way for a settlement.

But can any reliance be placed in any agreement with Moscow?

JOHN SPARKMAN points out that an individual leader's own reliability, or lack of it, would not be the only factor in any such settlement. Stalin or any other dictator may take arbitrary action, making for war or peace, but even dictators must function within a set of conditions which may greatly curb their tendencies to excess.

The Russian leaders are generally considered to be very calculating as to their moves. They may make many mistakes. They may at times be governed by impulse and misconception. But it can at least be hoped that the Russian leaders can be constructively influenced by an over-all situation making both aggression and noncooperation for peace very uninviting and unprofitable. And thus conceivably they might be brought not only to an agreement but to a continuing adherence to that agreement.

At least, in JOHN SPARKMAN's view, that is the objective toward which we should indomitably persist, as long as possible.

President Truman and Secretary Acheson have repeatedly emphasized unity and strength among the free nations as the possible basis for a settlement with Russia. One of the criticisms of the administration—not without point and force—has been that along with the emphasis on force there has not been an adequate continuing persistence in quest of effective negotiations. Now the administration, with its emphasis on our persisting desire for an acceptable settlement in Korea and its proposals for a general peace discussion by the four-power Council of Foreign Ministers, seems to be making more positive moves in that direction.

But it is to be remembered that it is extremely difficult to carry on such a program while intensive efforts are under way to arouse peoples to a tremendous defense effort involving great sacrifice. The dangers calling for such sacrifice must be seen if such an effort is to be of maximum effectiveness. If dangers are seen, distrust, fear, and animosity are bound to be intensely evoked. Such trends do not make for the most favorable conditions for peace talks.

Even so, as Senator SPARKMAN sees the record, our Government has steadfastly put peace as its fundamental objective—and still does.

At what point of the upbuilding of western strength might it be hoped that effective negotiations could go forward? Who knows just where that point is? And who, aware of the perils of an arms race, particularly in this atomic age of heightened fear, can fail to realize that the nations suddenly may be precipitated into illimitable conflict?

But in every course there are dangers. And in a dual policy of firm strength and calm, peaceful intent, Senator SPARKMAN sees the best hope of preventing another world war and moving onward in the establishment of international cooperation for true peace. This is a high and supremely difficult objective. But the Alabamian does not by any means consider it absolutely unattainable.

As for negotiations, he believes that we should constantly make it clear that we are ready to discuss differences. He, like General Marshall, believes that we should be first to respond and act in behalf of any chance to advance real peace.

JOHN SPARKMAN is not inclined to estimate the odds as to another world war. We can't know what the men in the Kremlin will do, he says. If they want war, they can quickly produce it. If they really want peace, they can clear the way for it. But as to just what they will do, we can only speculate and hope. And trust in strength and a resolute, active will to peace.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Senator SPARKMAN believes United Nations forces should remain in Korea, at least for the time being, under present military conditions, in pursuit of the goal of frustrating aggression and establishing a unified, free nation. But he admits that we might be confronted by a situation which would make it wise to withdraw.

He is impressed, on the other hand, by the confidence expressed by our military leaders that our forces cannot be decisively defeated.

He hopes that the Chinese Communists may come to the conclusion that their whole adventure is costing too much and failing to show any promise of attaining its end, and therefore may be disposed to an acceptable settlement.

That seems to summarize Mr. SPARKMAN's conception of the Korean struggle now. But he does add that abandonment of Korea now would open a vast far eastern area to much more effective Communist infiltration.

Many other able students are not as hopeful as Senator SPARKMAN seems to be that a satisfactory conclusion of the struggle in Korea can be wrought. It is not easy to have confidence that the Chinese Communists, with their low regard for human lives, will be shot and blasted into a willingness to accept a really free Korea. But it can be hoped that the new Good Offices Committee of the UN. Assembly, which this week is renewing peace efforts will be able to find a way of progress.

PROGRESS SEEN IN EUROPE

Senator SPARKMAN sees very concrete and heartening results from our efforts to check Communist expansionism in Europe. He points to our aid to Greece and Turkey as having been notably effective. We turned to such steps, he said, only after persistent efforts to work with the Russians had failed.

Mr. Acheson, the Senator said, first suggested the underlying idea of the Marshall plan in Mississippi, and then General Marshall further developed it at Harvard. It has been a wonderful success in SPARKMAN's estimation, having stopped the advance of the Communists in Western Europe, particularly in Italy and France.

Then came the North Atlantic Defense Pact. Our own human and material resources, together with those of Western Europe, give us a great security potential. The defense program now under way in the west aims at swift and adequate translation of that potential into reality. If Western Europe were lost, the balance would swing dangerously the other way.

In our Senate's ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty, the area it covers has become our own defense area in which SPARKMAN maintains the President has clear power to deploy our troops—just as he has power to deploy them in Alaska or other parts of our own territory. The Senator emphasizes the Senate approval of this defense program in its ratification of the treaty. The issue here is no longer political, but military, he contends.

It is in this great united endeavor that he sees a major hope of demonstrating a "will and ability to withstand aggression" that will keep the Russians from plunging the world into all-out conflict.

But the junior Senator from Alabama would not raise any false hopes. He feels that already enough has been done to make the prospect of peace much better. He works and has the faith that that prospect may be improved in the months ahead. Thus, he is a man of restrained and realistic hopefulness.

The carefully reasoned, orderly basis for his views is impressive. Even those who do not see things just as he does can find much in what he says to lift their own spirit.

STILL STRONG FOR UN

Beyond a possible resolution of the present crisis without general war, Senator SPARKMAN sees the possible opportunity for great new strides in behalf of a stable world order through further development of the United Nations. That organization, for all its weaknesses, has gone further to serve its purpose, he says, than any other organization in history. It can, he believes, go further still. He calls upon all Americans to stand by it in faith and devotion. This realistic, analytical man still finds in it a vision of a far happier day for all mankind.

The Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge," delivered by me at the thirty-first anniversary dinner of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, at Norfolk, Va., on March 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In Locksley Hall Lord Tennyson told the British that they were the heirs of all the ages. Nineteen centuries of the Christian era, during which mankind was constantly struggling for personal freedom, for a higher standard of living, and for a type of government that would make both possible, was the foundation upon which civilization made its most remarkable strides in the first half of the twentieth century. But, ironically enough, man's progress in the social sciences in the twentieth century did not keep pace with his progress in the physical sciences, with the result that future historians may record the twentieth century as the century of fear—fear based upon the belief that engines of destruction developed by man's ingenuity may ultimately destroy him or leave him cowering behind a windbreak or in the disease-soaked ruins of a slum.

The first half of the current century has seen the death of the horse-and-buggy days and the birth of motor transport, of the airplane that wipes out space, the radio that has taken the wings of the morning, and, last but not least, the production of the atomic bomb, the reckless and indiscriminate use of which may result in international suicide. In the confusion that surrounds us, in the loss of faith in ourselves, in our fellow man, and to no small extent in God, many today share the pessimism of the English writer, Matthew Arnold, who said that we were "wandering between two worlds—one dead and the other powerless to be born."

I grant that the old order is rapidly passing away, I grant that many ancient landmarks both here and abroad have been moved in violation of the injunction to be found in the Book of Proverbs: "Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set." But the theme that I covet to present to you tonight is that if America has the wisdom and the courage to assume in these troublesome times the role of world leadership which is its manifest destiny and can find a way to complement its unparalleled wealth and physical strength with unparalleled moral strength the new world that will emerge from the ideological conflicts of the first half of the twentieth century may well be the best world that civilization has ever known.

I never visit this historic and second oldest city in Virginia without recalling that Thoreau once said: "To him whose vigorous and elastic mind keeps pace with the sun, the day is a perpetual morning." I love Virginia and I am proud of the high privilege of being a Member of the United States Senate from Virginia. There is no section of the Old Dominion that has not made remarkable progress during the past half century and no section of which I am not proud. But I never visit Norfolk and the ports of Hampton Roads without a thrill of pride as I recall the remarkable changes that have occurred in this area during the intervening 45 years since, as a college boy, I visited Norfolk to see the annual Thanksgiving game between Virginia and Carolina. At that time Norfolk had a population of about 47,000, Portsmouth about 17,500 and Newport News about 20,000, the shipyard there having been largely responsible for a jump from 4,449 in 1890 to the larger figure in 1900.

Considerable progress, of course, had been made in the development of the ports of Hampton Roads prior to World War I but it was that war which impressed upon military leaders a fact that we in Virginia had always known—Hampton Roads is the greatest harbor in the world and of necessity must play a vital part in any war effort. Today, Hampton Roads has the country's heaviest export tonnage and biggest naval installation in the world. It's 300 wharves, providing more than 30 miles of berthing space and connecting with 150,000 acres of warehouse and transit shed areas can accommodate any type of shipping expansion which a national emergency may require. More coal is transshipped at Norfolk than at any other seaport in the United States and the loading docks here supply a proportional amount of bunker coal to vessels of all classes.

In 1949, and figures for last year are not yet available, Hampton Roads accounted for 55 percent of overseas coal exports from the United States and 50 percent of all bunker coal supplied to both foreign and domestic vessels along the Atlantic seaboard and that was the third successive year in which Hampton Roads exceeded all Atlantic coast ports in movement of outbound cargo.

This export trade is made possible by such modern facilities as the Norfolk & Western's new $6,000,000 pier, which can handle four of the largest ocean-going vessels at the same time; the same railroad's public grain elevator, which can berth three vessels and load at the rate of 75,000 bushels an hour; the Army base at Sewall Point, with berthing space for 8 to 12 ships at a time, and the storage and handling facilities which include 37 public warehouses and 50 acres of open storage space for public use. The ports of Hampton Roads not only can accommodate great fleets of warships and merchant marine but they also can build any type of ship afloat and repair any type. Norfolk, for instance, has three floating drydocks, 24 marine railways, and 47 piers, wharves, and docks operated in connection with shipbuilding. The Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., which built 18 standard and special type of merchant cargo and combination cargo-passenger ships, totaling 213,000 deadweight tons between 1939 and 1945, is now at work on the 48,000-ton superliner which will be a sister ship to the *America*, has a backlog of nearly $100,000,000 of major contracts and the prospect of being awarded a contract for the construction of the largest airplane carrier the world has ever known.

The Welding Shipyards at Norfolk built 13 large tankers during the World War II period and since 1945 has built some of the largest new tankers, one of which I saw launched in the fall of 1948. And across the river at Portsmouth is not the largest but the most efficient shipbuilding yard which the Government owns and operates. With respect to the future operations of that shipyard, I was recently advised by Admiral Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, that at the outbreak of hostilities in Korea the level of employment at the Norfolk naval shipyard totaled about 9,700. To meet the ever-increasing demands of our current emergency and to increase the material readiness of the fleet, employment at the Norfolk naval shipyard has been raised to approximately 12,700, while the prospective workload for that shipyard is expected to rise to approximately 15,000 by the last of the year. The Navy also has plans, as previously indicated, for awarding new contracts to the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., which will measurably increase the employment at that fine plant. "With its long and creditable record of Navy ship construction," said Admiral Sherman, "Newport News can expect to receive a proportionate share of the shipbuilding and conversion contemplated in the program." Admiral Sherman also informed me that in the Navy's program for fiscal year 1951 are numerous projects for the development of the activities of the Norfolk area. In general these projects are for provision of additional facilities at established activities in the following categories:

(a) Development of permanent facilities at Little Creek.

(b) Development of additional aviation facilities at Norfolk and Oceana.

(c) Construction of additional covered storage.

(d) Construction of additional aviation-gasoline and jet-fuel bulk storage.

(e) Dredging in the harbor area to provide an increased anchorage area.

(f) Rehabilitation and alteration of present facilities.

(g) Additional communication facilities.

I once heard of a white man who congratulated his colored friend upon the improvements he had made in what had previously been a rather poor and rough piece of land, saying: "John, you and the Lord have certainly done a fine job in improving this farm." "Yes," said John, "but you should have seen this farm when the Lord was handling it alone." Of course, we are proud of the kind of natural harbor that God gave us in Hampton Roads but this Maritime Association can take pardonable pride in the fact that through active and intelligent participation on its part a better job has been done.

In 1870 the Congress authorized the Corps of Engineers to commence work on the improvement of the James River channel. Every student of history is intrigued by the part that great rivers have played in the course of civilization. On the broad bosom of mighty rivers was floating man's first venture in commerce and on their banks man has built his centers of commerce and citadels of defense. When I went to Europe 2 years ago with a congressional party there were two rivers I was especially anxious to see—the Danube, famed in song and poetry, and the Tiber, famed as a natural moat defending the inner city of Rome—the river bravely defended by Horatio, inspiring Macaulay to say: "And how can man die better than in facing fearful odds for the ashes of his fathers and the temples of his gods."

I shall frankly admit that I was disappointed in both of them but I shall never be disappointed in our river named for King James, the site of the first permanent English colony in America and the river of which Daniel Webster said: "We are justly proud of being descended from men who have set the world an example of founding civil institutions on the great and united principles of human freedom and human knowledge. To us, their children, the story of their labors and sufferings can never be without interest. We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth, while the sea continues to wash it; nor will our brethren in another early and ancient colony forget the place of its first establishment, till their river shall cease to flow by it. No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood, will lead the Nation to forget the spots where its infancy was cradled and defended." It was at the mouth of the great and historic James that early Virginia settlers decided to start a settlement which is now the thriving city of Norfolk.

During the intervening years since 1870 the deep-channel security of anchorage, capacity, and freedom from ice in Hampton

Roads; the ease with which vessels can enter and leave, the location near the center of the Atlantic coast, the many miles of interior tributary waterways, and the service afforded by the lines of nine railroads radiating to the North, South, and West have made this an important center not only for shipping but for constructing and repairing vessels.

Because of the importance of the ports of Hampton Roads not only to our commerce and industry, but also to our national defense, I have been able to give full support to the activities of the Corps of Engineers in this area without in any way altering my position with respect to the need for economy in Federal spending and the importance of postponing or abandoning public-works projects which are not necessary in this time of crisis.

I challenge anyone who attempts to put the "pork barrel" label on the completed deep-water channels of Hampton Roads which proved their usefulness during World War II and the more recently completed improvements, such as the 12-foot channel into Hampton Creek and Herbert Creek, the 12-foot channel through the municipal harbor in Newport News Creek and the 25-foot navigation channel from the mouth of James River to the terminal at Richmond.

I also am convinced that the ratio of benefits to costs will amply justify the expenditure of funds needed to deepen the York Spit Channel and the branches of the Elizabeth River in Norfolk Harbor.

I assure you, too, that I shall continue to give close attention to the various studies being made by the engineers of additional projects, including more anchorage areas, channel dimensions to meet the needs of the new, deeper-draft vessels, and improvement of Chuckatuck and Hampton Creeks, James River, Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay, and Norfolk Harbor. If a case can be made for these on sound economic grounds and they are shown to be necessary to our defense effort, they will have my support. If an adequate case cannot be made for any of them, I am confident you who live in this area will agree with me that they should not be undertaken.

The kind of project which I am most happy to endorse is illustrated by the $50,000 which I had the Senate include in the 1948 appropriation bill for dealing with oil pollution in Norfolk Harbor. I know that illegally discharged oil was seriously damaging the oyster and fishing industries of Hampton Roads, which represent a $10,000,000 annual return, and that it was injurious to the $40,000,000 resort industry. I also was interested, as a lover of wildlife, in stopping the destruction of migratory birds by the oil-polluted water.

But what appealed to me the most about this item was that, instead of having the Federal Government take on a job and continue to do it for all time, the proposal was for Federal-State cooperative demonstration that would pave the way for private handling of this problem at no public expense.

As many of you know, a Federal-State oil collection service provided at a low cost to shipowners was started in July 1949, with the help of the appropriation which your able Representative [Mr. HARDY] and I were able to obtain. In December 1949, the operation was discontinued because by that time the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Corp. had started a commercial collection service on the same cost basis.

This oil collection program, combined with educational efforts and more rigid law enforcement resulted in only two cases of oil pollution being reported in the calendar year of 1950, as compared with 47 cases investigated and 16 convictions obtained during the 18-month period before the collection service was started.

Thus, in brief summary, I have given you some of the reasons for my pride in the ports of Hampton Roads and some of my reasons for believing that our future is not as dark as certain pessimists in the country would have us believe.

But my major source of pride not only in the Hampton Roads area but throughout the entire State is the character of our citizenry, the contribution made by colonial Virginia to the birth of a nation and the determination I know to be latent in the heart of every Virginian to pass on to generations yet unborn those precious principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased by the blood of our founding fathers. However, if Virginia—the mother of States and of Presidents—is to furnish leadership in this crisis to save the institutions she did so much to establish, we must have a clear conception of the difficulties confronting us and a willingness to sacrifice, as our ancestors did, in overcoming them.

It is as true today as when Patrick Henry made his memorable speech in old St. John's Church that life is not so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. It is as true today as when the victor at Yorktown told the First Congress of the new Nation: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

I recognize the difficulty of some Christian men and women in trying to reconcile the Sermon on the Mount with war or preparations for war. It is my belief that the fundamental principle of self-defense includes the defense of our Nation and all other freedom-loving nations who subscribe to our belief in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We must recognize the fact that we face tyrannical and barbarous leaders of perhaps 800,000,000 willing or unwilling Communist followers and that a program of pacification or of unpreparedness on our part will not change their hearts or their plans for world domination. And if we believe, and I think we do, in the principle of self-defense and that the Bible condemns the suicide of an individual, we must of necessity believe that the Bible justifies us in preventing the suicide of Christian nations by permitting barbarians to become the exclusive possessors of modern instrumentalities of human destruction.

In 1802 Thomas Jefferson, whose principles of democracy I endeavor to understand and strive to follow, wrote Dr. Priestley: "We feel that we are acting under obligations not confined to the limits of our own society. It is impossible not to be sensible, that we are acting for all mankind; that circumstances denied to others, but indulged to us, have imposed on us the duty of proving what is the degree of freedom and self-government in which a society may venture to leave its individual members."

With all the sincerity of which I am capable I tell you that I prefer peace to war and it is only because at the moment I feel that the best means of preventing war is to be prepared that I am willing to endorse universal military training, a tax program that will hurt, controls over credit and production that will involve inconveniences and personal sacrifice, drastic economy in public spending at the expense of many worth while domestic projects, and price and wage controls that seriously impinge upon that type of freedom of action in a system of private and competitive enterprise to which in the past we have been accustomed.

I have but two sons, both of whom are of military age, one of whom is a second lieutenant in the Marines now serving in Japan and the other a Reserve officer in the Navy not yet called to active duty. And over and above that, I have on my heart the plea made to me by my mother on her ninetieth birthday to keep us out of another war, saying that she had lived through four wars and that was enough war for one lifetime. She saw her father and nine of his brothers go into the Confederate Army in which five lost their lives. She saw three sons go into military service in World War I and two grandsons in World War II, one with the first bomber squadron that landed in Africa and the other in the bloody fighting in Italy and finally through the torture of the Battle of the Bulge. But my mother was not a pacifist but rather a militant Christian leader who believed that neither our Nation nor the other Christian nations of the world had ever adequately employed moral force for the preservation of peace. Her big and sympathetic heart knew only too well that it is the mothers of men who suffer the most when statesmanship fails and nations resort to the arbitrament of war in the settlement of their differences.

"Mothers of men!
The sea is not so wide nor the war so long,
The dead so many, nor human misery grown so old
That we forget the words you did not speak
When your sons went off to war.

"You did not speak! And yet
We heard you say more noble things and brave
Than any man or woman has said aloud,
We heard you speak of dear-remembered days,
Of chubby, tiny fists that clasped your fingers tight.
You said this, more than all your life, you'd give your son.
And yet you did not speak!"

In raising vast armies and providing vast war equipment for what now appears essential for our survival in a hostile world, it is my prayer that the Congress and that the American people will realize that we labor in vain to build a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of spiritual force.

Conservation of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday, March 3, it was my privilege to address the fifteenth annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation, including outstanding conservationists from all over America. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address I delivered on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELLING CONSERVATION TO CONGRESS

(Text of address delivered by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY to National Wildlife Federation Conference, Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., Saturday, March 3, 1951)

I am profoundly delighted to address this outstanding gathering of conservation leaders of the Nation. You leaders are not only conservation-minded but conservative-minded, I dare say, except when you may be describing that fish that got away.

The fifteenth annual meeting of your federation is another important occasion in the history of the conservation movement of our country. We of Wisconsin are proud that you have honored us by your presence here in Milwaukee.

We feel there is sound logic in your choice because it is a fact that Wisconsin has pioneered in so many of the great conservation

advances of America. Today, the Badger State is more keenly interested in the preservation of our great outdoor heritage than ever before in our almost 103 years of history. The Wisconsin Conservation Congress in particular with its representation from every one of the 71 counties of our State has shown the tremendous grass-roots interest of the rank and file citizens of this State in preserving outdoor values.

MORE AND MORE AMERICANS ENJOY OUTDOOR SPORTS

As I speak to you this afternoon, the guns are firing, but they are not being fired in outdoor recreation alone. Rather, they are booming in a life and death struggle against the forces of international communism in far-off Korea. Brave Americans are sacrificing their all that this land and its values might endure.

It is characteristic of our national defense that American markmanship has attained legendary excellence. Why? Because of the fact that so many millions of Americans have enjoyed the experience of hunting. Fifteen and one-half million fishing licenses and 12,500,000 hunting licenses—there is a record of which we can all be proud. And with an ever higher standard of living to be enjoyed by the American people, we know that there will be a constantly larger increase in the number of Americans enjoying these outdoor pursuits.

CONSERVATION HAS AIDED AMERICA IN MANY WAYS

I need not point out to you, my friends, the many ways in which the conservation movement has contributed to this country's development wholly aside from enjoyment, relaxation, and recreation.

You are all familiar with the importance of the fur industry in giving our Armed Forces clothing for protection against cold temperatures. You know how important our commercial fisheries are to the feeding of our people. You know that during the early part of World War II a tremendous amount of rifles, revolvers, and other firearms were voluntarily collected for our defense and the defense of our Allies.

AMERICANS AND CANADIANS ALONE FREE TO POSSESS ARMS

It is a fact of which we may all be proud that America virtually alone in the world (with the exception of Canada) is about the only place where a man can possess firearms in his home without fear that a government storm-trooper will march in, confiscate his gun, and send him off to prison for planning a revolution. In other words, the American Government has confidence in the hunters of America. It knows that the American people can be trusted to exercise judgment and discretion in their possession of weapons.

Soon we will be confronted with a tremendous civilian defense program throughout our country, and we know that the conservation leaders will be among the leaders in that movement.

CONSERVING AMERICA'S VALUES

On the subject of conservation, itself, it seems to me that there are few more important themes in all this world than that of conserving values. As you know, my friends, I have just been participating for the last 2 weeks in hearings conducted before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee on the highly controversial question of assignment of troops abroad.

I will not take this occasion to go into this question, although I know it is of deep interest to all my listeners. Let me, however, mention that in my approach to this problem and to other problems, I try to find a path which will conserve the great constitutional system of which you and I are heirs. In other words, my friends, under the United States Constitution, there is a four-fold separation of powers, among: (1) the legislative branch; (2) the executive branch; (3) the judicial branch; and finally, (4) there is a great residue of powers vested in the States and in the people.

FIDELITY TO LETTER AND SPIRIT OF CONSTITUTION

When we approach a question like this matter of American foreign policy, or for that matter, any other problem, we must never forget that whatever decision we come to, we must be in full accordance with firm constitutional principles. I am not one of those who believes that the Constitution—with its basic theme of separation of powers—can be forgotten when it does not accord with our own personal views. Rather, I feel that we must interpret the Constitution faithfully according to its letter and spirit, and in so doing, we will conserve one of the great landmarks of western civilization.

AMERICA AS A LIGHTHOUSE

Before I leave this theme of conserving values, may I mention that you and I, my friends, are in effect lighthouse-keepers amidst the long night in which the world now finds itself. We must keep on our guard so that the light of our lighthouse continues to shine forth as a great beacon to all the world. Darkness covers a great mass of the globe, including 800,000,000 people. The military forces of darkness have never been stronger—175 divisions in Russia alone. The revolutionary allies of those forces have never been stronger. Let us therefore preserve on this continent the one great remaining lighthouse, a lighthouse of civil liberties, a lighthouse of faith in the dignity of man and in the fatherhood of God, a lighthouse of fraternity between men and all races, all creeds, all colors. This is the challenge to you and to me as American citizens.

PROBLEM OF CONTACTING CONGRESS

The theme of your conference is selling conservation to Congress. In many respects, that is not too difficult an objective, because among the 531 Members of the Senate and House, there are a great many men and women who enjoy as I do the thrill of outdoor sports whenever they can get the rare opportunity to do so.

On the other hand, the objective is not an easy one, because as you know, over 15,000 bills are introduced in the average Congress and conservation bills may tend to get lost in the shuffle. This can happen unless you, the conservationists of our country, exercise sound, farsighted contact with your Congress. And so, let me mention to you just a few instances in which conservation can possibly suffer unless you are in close contact with your legislative officials.

FUNDS NEEDED FOR CONSERVATION AGENCIES

In the first place, there may not be sufficient funds provided for the United States Forest Service, for the Fish and Wildlife Service, for the Soil Conservation Service, and for other essential Government conservation activities.

We all know that the budget of our country is tremendously strained, and naturally Congress is finding it increasingly difficult to provide appropriations for peacetime services. Therefore, it is essential that care be exercised so that these vital conservation agencies are not forgotten when funds are allocated.

TAXES THE OUTDOORSMAN PAYS

Let's never forget that the hunter and fisherman in considerable part pays his own way. Let's just take a look at his tax problem.

The sportsman pays directly for the administration of the wildlife which he is permitted to capture and reduce to the bag. He buys his hunting and fishing license, and this fund is set up within the State for the administration of the resource.

He pays 11 percent excise tax on every box of shells; every new gun, whether it is a rifle or a shotgun, on every box of cartridges which he purchases, and this goes into an earmarked fund provided for in the Pittman-Robertson Act of 1937.

This money, which is collected by the United States Treasury from the manufacturers of sporting arms and ammunition, is set aside in a special fund called the Federal aid to State wildlife restoration projects. Up to date about $70,000,000 has been earmarked into this fund. All but $13,500,000 of it has been allocated to the States for wildlife rehabilitation and restoration.

The man who shoots ducks and other migratory waterfowl has to buy what is known as the Duck Stamp which, until 1949, cost $1. The Congress increased the cost of this to $2 that year. Well over $20,000,000 has been paid into this migratory bird conservation fund through the sale of these stamps since the act became effective in 1934.

This money has been used for the purchase of refuges and their operation, maintenance, and protection.

Last year the Congress passed what is known as the Dingell-Johnson bill (a previous version of which has been vetoed by the President). This new law earmarks the 10 percent excise tax on sport fishing tackle to be allocated to the States for fishery restoration projects. This will produce about $3,000,000 a year. All three of these funds—the Pittman-Robertson fund, the duck-stamp fund, and the Dingell-Johnson fund—are administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

So, let it not be said that the outdoorsman has not been willing to carry his part of the tax burden.

ANTIPOLLUTION FIGHT

Now, having looked at the appropriation question, let us move on to the antipollution program of our country. Obviously, it still has a long way to go. I need not repeat to you the grim facts of the befouling of our streams and the fact that actual work under the Taft-Barkley Pollution Water Control Act of 1948 has barely gotten underway. It is a fortunate circumstance for this Nation that the conservation director of your distinguished organization, Mr. Carl Schoemaker, is a member of the advisory board pursuant to that act. If we had more selfless men like Carl Schoemaker, men with outstanding experience in the field of conservation work, we would be further along in this problem's solution. The pollution challenge is a tremendous one, and action against it must be stepped up in full cooperation between the Federal Government, States, and localities and promote industry and farming.

NATIONAL PARKS MUST NOT BE DESTROYED

Now a third vital front on which conservation can suffer would be the continued despoiling of our great national park system. You and I know that these parks must be preserved as inviolate sanctuaries. No hunter is permitted in them, but fishing is one of the great activities there, under careful regulation. Fishing, the very mention of the word, makes a man's heart thrill, even though one fellow once said: "There are two kinds of fishermen, those that fish for sport and those that actually catch fish."

More than 30,000,000 people visited the national parks last year, and around a similar number visited the national forests in one way or another. And yet there are those inside and outside of Government who would initiate policies which would destroy these national parks and national forests, and as a result future generations would not know the glories of outdoor scenes such as we of this generation have enjoyed. Why do we enjoy them? Because previous farsighted Americans preserved them for us.

Thus we see a third vital front on which conservationists must maintain contact with Congress.

TECHNIQUES OF CONTACTING CONGRESS

Well, my friends, granted that we are agreed that conservation is a vital front for the Congress to be contacted on, just how can you go about it There are several specific ways, and I would like to mention them briefly now.

In the first place, constructive correspondence is a tremendously important means of contacting your legislator. When you hear in your club, read in the newspapers, in conservation magazines, when you listen over the radio, or see on the television screen, that matters affecting conservation will be coming up in the Congress, do not hesitate to write to your legislator, to both your Senators and to your elected Representative.

First, however, inform yourself as fully as possible exactly what you want to write about. Is a bill good or bad, in whole or in part? Find out the bill's number, if you can, the name of the sponsor, the current status; then phrase exactly what you respectfully feel your legislator should do. Do you want him to vote for some particular amendment to it, for example? Do you want him to vote for it in its original form? Do you want him to contact the Department of Interior about it in some way, etc.? Do you want him to speed the hearings or to speed the report on the work of the conference committee?

GIVE REASONS FOR YOUR VIEWS

When you have these facts, when you have clearly decided what you want in your own mind, put your thoughts on paper. Try to keep your message as brief, as clear, and as much to the point as possible. Present the actual reasons why you feel the policy should be supported. Your legislator will be happy to get your judgment. He will be pleased to analyze the logic of your argument. He may not, however, be able to respond in as great detail as he would like. For example, I receive over 300 letters per day, and it is almost inevitable that my replies must necessarily be brief and in fact, it is almost inevitable too that some of my responses must be form letters.

In addition, since I am not a member of any of the Senate committees which directly handle conservation affairs, I must necessarily first contact those committees and defer my personal conclusions until I can get the committee's expert judgment, rather than simply come to an off-the-cuff personal decision without previous study.

These are some of the facts which you must bear in mind. In addition, of course, you will want to remember that each legislator will be attending primarily to committee work within his own jurisdiction. My own field of endeavor is the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. These three groups alone could take 24 hours of work a day. And so it is necessary that the amount of time available for other work must be rather thriftily scheduled.

I present these facts to you, my friends, because I think that they will help contribute to your understanding of the problems that almost any legislator faces. Because what I have said in describing my own work could be duplicated in the case of virtually any other legislator.

SEEKING LEGISLATOR AT FIRST HAND

Now, my friends, if it is at all possible, there is nothing superior to face-to-face contact with your legislator. If you get the chance to come to Washington, don't hesitate to write to your Senator and/or Representative in advance and they will undoubtedly be happy to try to arrange for an appointment with you. Moreover, when Congress recesses, try to contact your legislator when he or she is at home, and present facts to him on the conservation situation as you see it.

He is particularly interested in the local phase of conservation on which you, in particular, are most expert. In other words, he can get the national picture through national magazines and national organizations. But what he wants and needs to secure most of all is your concise report on the conservation problems affecting you and affecting his particular congressional district or State. Naturally, however, he is happy to get supplementary information on the over-all problem.

USING YOUR ORGANIZATION

Another way by which you can contact your legislator is, of course, through your organization by resolutions which you adopt in your Rod and Gun Club, or by resolutions of the National Wildlife Federation, or by contacts made by executive secretaries of your organizations. In this way you and your friends can simultaneously contact your legislator and get the full benefit of mass support of your position, rather than merely doing so as an individual.

The more you acquaint your legislator with what your fish and wildlife club is doing, the better are the chances of sound representation of your interests. Send him news reports of your club's activity. Invite him to your meetings. Ask him to speak before you or to serve on a panel. He may not always be able to accept, but he will be happy to be in contact with your group.

CONCLUSION

Now these are but a few of the ways by which you can sell conservation to Congress. Of course, you will want to be active in contacting your State Conservation Commission too. As a rule, there are a wide variety of other State and local officers who work on the problems affecting conservation. You and I know that there are many problems which can only be handled by Uncle Sam, but there are a great variety of problems which can be met effectively on the State and local level.

I want to thank you for the kind attention to this address. I hope that it will be but the opening gun in a long series of other contacts which you and I will have together and which you will have with your own legislators.

Good luck to you. Good fishing, good hunting, and good conservation.

Congressman Doyle Explains Congressional Committees for Information of Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, many inquiries I have received from residents of the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I am now representing for a third time, request information about the various standing committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Inspired by these inquiries is my own realization that only an informed electorate can act intelligently, and only an informed democracy can endure.

These realizations have caused me to go to the personal expense of having an informative outline set up and following this the further personal expense has been undertaken of causing this compilation of interesting and highly informative matter to be published and sent out to the very many persons who are interested, so that they may add to their enlightenment about the congressional committees; and, for their interest and guidance in having pointed out to them the names of the committees and the representatives on the committees, to whom these interested citizens may wish to forward opinions or ideas; or from whom these interested citizens may desire to obtain information about national affairs.

The presentation of information of which I speak promises to be of use to the thousands of residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California who share a very active American desire to be more fully informed—and thus able to act intelligently—as they fulfill their needs to know these things.

Also, Mr. Speaker, since I receive many requests asking me for information as to what congressional committees I am myself a member of, and requests for an explanation of the jurisdiction of these committees in this session of Congress, I have mentioned the two committees on which I serve—the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Un-American Activities—and in addition to this, I have itemized the jurisdiction and responsibilities of these two committees, as is set forth officially in the text of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 753, second session.

As all of the text which follows is verbatim from Public Law 601, entitled "An act to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government," I am hopeful that in its being cited in this connection, and thus made available for the quick information of the public, that my compilation of this information may prove of value to many students and scholars in their studies in schools and colleges, and other groups, as well as of additional important service to older citizens, whose interest in Government at the national level may be thus facilitated and made to become more alert and vigorous.

Standing committees of the United States Senate

	Number of members
Agriculture and Forestry	13
Appropriations	21
Armed Services	13
Banking and Currency	13
Civil Service	13
District of Columbia	13
Expenditures in the Executive Departments	13
Finance	13
Foreign Relations	13
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	13
Judiciary	13
Labor and Public Welfare	13
Public Lands	13
Public Works	13
Rules and Administration	13

Standing committees of the House of Representatives

	Number of members
Agriculture	27
Appropriations	43
Armed Services	33
Banking and Currency	27
Post Office and Civil Service	25
District of Columbia	25
Education and Labor	25
Expenditures in the Executive Departments	25
Foreign Affairs	25
House Administration	25
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	27
Judiciary	27
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	25
Public Lands	25
Public Works	27
Rules	12
Un-American Activities	9
Veterans' Affairs	27
Ways and Means	25

(b) (1) The Speaker shall appoint all select and conference committees which shall be ordered by the House from time to time.

(2) At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the Members thereof; in the temporary absence of the chairman, the Member next in rank in the order named in the election of the committee, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall act as chairman; and in case of a permanent vacancy in the chairmanship of any such committee the House shall elect another chairman.

(3) All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more.

* * * * *

(2) Each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.

(3) Each standing committee is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am serving on the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Un-American Activities, the jurisdiction of which is set forth in Public Law 601, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any members designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

1. Common defense generally.
2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.
3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.
4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.
5. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces.
6. Selective service.
7. Size and composition of the Army and Navy.
8. Ports, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.
9. Ammunition depots.
10. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.
11. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.
12. Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

CONFERENCE RULES ON AMENDMENTS IN NATURE OF SUBSTITUTE

SEC. 135. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order.

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

PRESERVATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 141. The Librarian of the Library of Congress is authorized and directed to have bound at the end of each session of Congress the printed hearings of testimony taken by each committee of the Congress at the preceding session.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

SEC. 203. (a) The Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to establish in the Library of Congress a separate department to be known as the Legislative Reference Service. It shall be the duty of the Legislative Reference Service—

(1) Upon request, to advise and assist any committee of either House or any joint committee in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative proposals pending before it, or of recommendations submitted to Congress, by the President or any executive agency, and otherwise to assist in furnishing a basis for the proper determination of measures before the committee;

(2) Upon request, or upon its own initiative in anticipation of requests, to gather, classify, analyze, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations, and bulletins, and otherwise, data for a bearing upon legislation, and to render such data serviceable to Congress, and committees and Members thereof, without partisan bias in selection or presentation;

(3) To prepare summaries and digests of public hearings before committees of the Congress, and of bills and resolutions of a public general nature introduced in either House.

IMPROVEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 221. The Joint Committee on Printing is authorized and directed to provide for printing in the daily RECORD the legislative program for the day, together with a list of congressional committee meetings and hearings, and the place of meeting and subject matter; and to cause a brief résumé of congressional activities for the previous day to be incorporated in the RECORD, together with an index of its contents. Such data shall be prepared under the supervision of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, respectively.

SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

SEC. 243. (a) The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, acting jointly, are authorized and directed to enter into an arrangement with the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the education of congressional pages and pages of the Supreme Court in the public school system of the District. Such arrangement shall include provision for reimbursement to the District of Columbia for any additional expenses incurred by the public school system of the District in carrying out such arrangement.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the District of Columbia in accordance with the arrangement referred to in subsection (a).

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, said page or pages may elect to attend a private or parochial school of their own choice: *Provided, however*, That such private or parochial school shall be reimbursed by the Senate and House of Representatives only in the same amount as would be paid if the page or pages were attending a public school under the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

Citizens desiring to communicate with any committee of Congress should address their letters as follows—to illustrate: Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; or, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

To communicate with me, as representing the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, address letter to: Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress, 1030 House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Need for Approval of Eagle Gorge Flood-Control Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by John L. Fournier, editor of the Kent (Wash.) News-Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

(By John L. Fournier)

EMPHASIZING THE NEED

Nothing could emphasize the need for approval of the Eagle Gorge flood-control project more than the near-disastrous flood of the past week end. Once again the Green River has risen to flood stage and caused extensive damage throughout the length and breadth of its watershed. Beyond the actual damage there is the secondary and potential damage that is caused by the ever-recurring threat of flood-borne disaster.

There is no question in the minds of the people of this community as to the real and growing need for the Eagle Gorge flood-control dam. There is also the recognition of the fact that it will be difficult to obtain flood-control appropriations during a period of national emergency. But for those who are willing to examine the situation here, there is the apparent immediate need for flood control and protection of vital defense areas here in the valley. That need, if properly evaluated, should bring action at this session of Congress for approval of the Green River flood-control project. For those who live here there is no more urgent or necessary project. Those who face the flood threats from year to year recognize the manifold benefits that will be derived from flood control on the Green.

Investigation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Probe of RFC Mess Must Be Pushed," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 4, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBE OF RFC MESS MUST BE PUSHED

In view of the sensational testimony concerning peculiar activities in and around the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the public will find it difficult to understand the desire now voiced by members of the investigating Senate subcommittee to wind up its inquiry as quickly as possible.

An early end to this probe might make it easier for all concerned. It might relieve the perplexed members of the investigating group from the duty of trying to find the truth in what Chairman FULBRIGHT has denounced as "lying" testimony.

But it wouldn't restore public confidence in a Government loan agency so tangled up in tales of mink coats, influence, and the "Washington fix." Nor would it furnish the vitally necessary assurance that the general moral level of all Government agencies is what it ought to be.

Senator FULBRIGHT has overwhelming backing for his contention that the subcommittee report charging improprieties in the RFC is anything but asinine, as President Truman characterized it. Every day of open hearings before the Senators demonstrates that their report fell short in only one respect—it didn't go far enough.

The probe still hasn't gone far enough. Whether the Senators are satisfied or not, the public has a right to know the answers to dozens of questions raised by testimony taken under oath before the subcommittee. And in the numerous cases where this sworn testimony is palpably conflicting, those proven to have perjured themselves ought to be punished.

What about the charge hurled by a Detroit industrialist that a Washington lawyer claimed to have two RFC directors in his hip pocket? Are such serious charges to be let go with a simple accusation and denial, or will the committee dig into the whole matter to find out the truth?

What about the serious statement made by Carl G. Strandlund, head of the Lustron prefabricated housing enterprise, that one RFC director headed a clique that tried to wrest control of Lustron from him? Lustron had borrowed $37,000,000 from the RFC, and ultimately the loan was foreclosed.

There are other matters hanging fire as a result of disclosures before the committee, and not the least of them is the curious role of E. Meri Young, one-time RFC examiner whose wife got the $8,540 mink coat charged to a Washington attorney alleged to be influential with the RFC. Young also jumped from his modest RFC position to two jobs, at salaries totaling $28,000 a year, with two separate RFC borrowers, and FULBRIGHT says he is still trying to find out what Young did to earn these salaries.

So is the public. More importantly, the public is trying to find out why the services—and proposed $100,000 fee—of a lawyer were rejected because it looked like "the Washington fix." Is the "fix" such a common operation in Washington that it can be readily spotted?

President Truman has moved belatedly in this situation by offering a plan to reorganize the RFC. But he could and should go much further. He ought to demand, on the basis of the disclosures up to now, that the whole mess be thoroughly investigated until all the charges are explored.

Whatever the President does, FULBRIGHT and the other subcommittee members should not let the investigation die. Yet FULBRIGHT has announced that he wants to wind up this week the hearings on what he terms "this cockeyed thing."

It's cockeyed, all right, but it's much more than that. It raises grave doubts whether the RFC has been run for the benefit of the country or on the basis of influence and favors. It casts reflections on various Washington characters whose stock in trade seems to be knowing Government officials.

The RFC mess carries grave implications about the conduct of the Government. It must not be half exposed and then brushed aside and forgotten.

Commemoration of the Christianization of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on occasion of outstanding interest to the many persons of Lithuanian birth and descent in Maryland was held this past Sunday at St. Alphonsus Church, Baltimore, Md., to mark the seven hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the Christianization of Lithuania.

Present at the services at which his excellency, the Most Reverend Francis P. Keough, presided, were 500 displaced Lithuanians who have arrived in Maryland in the past 18 months, to give thanks for the freedom they now enjoy. The Reverend Louis J. Mendeles is pastor of this large congregation of splendid Maryland citizens.

Because of its pertinence to conditions throughout the world today, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the sermon delivered on this occasion by the Reverend John J. Duggan be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is singularly appropriate that at the gracious invitation of your reverend pastor, we should gather today at this solemn mass presided over by our most reverend archbishop, to commemorate the Catholic baptism of Lithuania over seven centuries ago, and at the same time to join with you exiles of that martyred daughter of the church in hymns and prayers of thanksgiving for the favors which God has bestowed upon you, not the least of which is the haven of hospitality enjoyed by you in this State of Maryland and city of Baltimore. It is Laetare Sunday when the church bids her children who have been so far engaged in penitent works, to look up and beyond Calvary and see in the first rays of the Easter sun the risen Christ who brings them redemption, and to rejoice.

We live in one of those interludes of history that come upon us once every few hundred years. A twilight zone when darkness seems so real and the light seems so far away. The whole world is on tenterhooks, possessed of a sense of impending catastrophe when war, defeat, persecution of religion, frustration of hearts, enthronement of violence, and a gnawing fear would turn us into prophets of despair. We who believe in God cannot share the pessimism and despair which speaks of the return to barbarism.

There are three notes of hope today for us who believe in God which keep us from sharing the pessimism, hopelessness, and defeatism of those who have forgotten their God.

The first lesson is this: A great calamity is often the eve of a great spiritual awakening. In such moments of defeat man's pride is most humbled and his soul thus prepared for the help of God.

The second reason for hope is that in the lifetime of all of us the church has been more and more emerging into the world from which she was exiled 400 years ago. Nothing better symbolizes this progressive influence than the manner in which the last two Popes have been crowned as successors of St. Peter. Both pontiffs were crowned on the portico in the piazza of St. Peter.

The third and final reason for hope is that the strength of material opposition has no relation to the possibilities of spiritual victory. That is why we who believe in God and Christ's victory over the powers of darkness and the victory of spirit over matter will not be without hope for America, so long as it trusts in God.

May you who have come from the old country, a Lithuania that was baptized in the faith 700 years ago, now help us to continue our trust in God. You have been the recipients of the magnificent care and generosity of the Resettlement Committee of the National Catholic Welfare Conference under the energetic and most gracious leadership of our most reverend archbishop. You who are most anxious to show your gratitude can do so in no better way than by living catholic lives. Good example from you at work and in your homes will surely bring back God into main stream of American life. Your attendance at Sunday mass and frequent reception of the sacraments as witnessed by us this morning will be the best compensation for the hospitality of our country. You who have witnessed disloyalty of your own in face of tempting promises from without help us so that the epidemic of Benedict Arnolds in this country may be stopped completely. You who have seen faithful souls apostatize in face of adversity and of tempting promises of fool's gold, worldly prestige, and impossible utopias please help us to be self-disciplined and faithful under our present trials and penance. We are your debtors because you are the servants of the suffering Christ who have given us the precious opportunity of being another Veronica and Simon of Cyrene as you tread your sorrowful journey carrying so courageously and hopefully your burden of the cross.

Life Insurance for GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the Washington Post of yesterday in regard to the bill now in conference providing life insurance for GI's.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE INSURANCE

Of the two bills to provide free life insurance for GI's, the Senate version is much to be preferred. This bill, which would furnish free insurance to men on active duty, also would permit them to continue it after discharge by paying the premiums themselves. The House bill, on the other hand, would require that the insurance privilege end upon discharge from the service, with no provision for continuance.

There can be little question that automatic insurance is desirable for men on active duty. It is a form of protection for families which is obviously necessary; for no matter what the inducements to take out insurance on a voluntary basis, the casualty records always include some men who for one reason or another do not have a policy. Whether the insurance is given free or is made mandatory by pay deductions is not important; the need is to see that everyone has it. Actually, free insurance may prove to be cheaper to the Government than the present system through elimination of an inordinate amount of paper work.

With respect to veterans, however, the House bill would take away a privilege which has been accorded veterans of two World Wars. Even though it would not affect existing policies, it would deny new veterans the right to keep their insurance in force. This right to continue Government life insurance is, to be sure, a form of subsidy in that the Government assumes the cost of overhead and the premiums are cheaper than on comparable civilian policies. It is a subsidy, however, for a worth-while purpose, and one that means far more to veterans than most of the other benefits that generous legislators conjure up. Undoubtedly the administration of Government life insurance could be simplified, but we hope that Senate conferees will stick to their guns in continuing the privilege for men who have earned it.

Abolition of Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which urges the abolition of discrimination, separation, segregation, and inequalities applying to certain minority groups living in the United States. The resolution is from the Reveille Club, of New York, whose membership is composed of distinguished citizens of my own State. The position taken by this group is that inequalities based on race, color, or creed, are contrary to our principles of democracy, hamper our mobilization effort, and should be eliminated. In this position I wholeheartedly agree.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVEILLE CLUB OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y.

"Resolution advocating the abolishment of discrimination, separation, segregation, and inequalities to certain minority groups living in the United States

"Whereas the President of the United States declared a national emergency, requesting of the Congress extraordinary powers; and

"Whereas it appears that a third world war involving Russia and other communistic countries against the United States and other free nations appears inevitable; and

"Whereas such a world war would be catastrophic and more devastating to the free nations and western civilization than all the other wars in history; and

"Whereas the United States is known as a democratic country but in reality numerous groups of its citizenry suffer from diverse discriminations and inequalities despite advances made with regards thereto toward the broadening of the democratic base during World War II; and

"Whereas discrimination, segregation, or separation in any form, to any group because of race, color, or national origin is contrary to the concept of our democratic principles; and

"Whereas the communistic enemies of the free nations are successfully using these facts to undermine the prestige of the United States throughout the world, to increase her enemies and dispel trust in the free nations' advocacy of democracy; and

"Whereas the colored peoples of the world have long resented the many slights and inequalities meted out to them, and this is particularly true of the Negro minority as well as other minorities in the United States; and

"Whereas they, with the other colored peoples of the world, look forward to and demand equal treatment for equal abilities since they, as American citizens, are to take a part in a war against communistic aggression; and

"Whereas the United States and the free nations of the world can only meet the aggression of communistic countries by being totally unified: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to exercise the full power and authority vested in him as President and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, by Executive orders or otherwise, to the end that discrimination and inequality against any groups of persons because of race, color, or national origin throughout the United States, and particularly in the so-called Southern States, shall be eliminated immediately, and that all laws, customs, and practices contrary thereto shall be abrogated; and that the Congress in such instances as may be necessary implement such Executive orders by law."

The above is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Reveille Club of New York at a meeting held the 13th day of January 1951.

IRA L. ALDRIDGE,
Secretary.

Five Basic and Explosive Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable article from the New York Times Sunday magazine section written by Lester Markel, the Times' Sunday editor. The article is headed "Five basic and explosive fallacies" and is based on a series of recent interviews by Mr. Markel with Government officials in Washington.

Mr. President, these five fallacies underlie much too much of the thinking and the debating now going on in Washington. I hope this article may be widely read by Members of the Congress. I particularly commend Mr. Markel's prescription, his recommendation to carry on the work in each of the four great areas where public opinion is made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE BASIC AND EXPLOSIVE FALLACIES—AMERICAN POLICY IS INFLUENCED BY MISCONCEPTIONS THAT REVEAL THE NEED OF A BETTER INFORMED PUBLIC

(By Lester Markel)

Washington at all times strives to be many things to many men—an international as well as a national capital, a monitor for the world and a sounding board for the Nation.

Now it strives especially to be the last. The White House keeps its collective ear as close to the ground as physics permits. The Congress tries almost desperately to discover the wishes of the country. Increasing attention is paid to the mails and the polls; politics makes uneasy as well as strange bedfellows. What is thought on Main Street—or rather what Washington thinks Main Street is thinking—has a profound effect on the Capitol.

Washington today is overhung with uncertainties, abnormal fogs added to the normal mists of the capital—the political and ideological miasmas and the clouds of gossip that are wafted from the cocktail lounges into the innermost sanctums of government.

To the degree that the Nation is confused and uncertain, so is the Capital. If many among us are uninformed or misinformed, then we are likely to move by emotion rather than reason. Unless public opinion is steady and sane we shall not fulfill our role in the world and thus we shall invite incalculable danger.

There is convincing evidence that we are not as informed as we need to be informed to meet the present peril. Specifically, there are five prime fallacies that have wide currency in the Nation. Even though, as is undoubtedly true, these views are not held by a majority of the people, they are held broadly enough to exert a compelling influence on national policy.

What follows is a statement of these five fallacies and a report on their effects, as the visitor to Washington observes them.

I. THE ATOMIC BOMB

The belief: This is a twofold conviction: First, that in the atomic bomb we have the decisive weapon; second, that we should proceed now, if not with the atomic bomb, at least with atomic speed, to shoot the works, to move with everything we possess, so that we can have it over with and return to normalcy as quickly as possible.

The fallacy: The atomic bomb, it is true, is a most potent arm and a mighty deterrent to Soviet Russia. But it cannot be conclusive in a war with Russia. As for a program for shooting the works, in that direction may lie an economic defeat more overwhelming than a military one.

In Washington the atomic fallacy results in a spurious reliance on the bomb—and in some instances, fortunately rare, in a demand for a preventive war. Those who advocate this kind of program do not carry it beyond the first blasts. You ask, for example, what do we do if, immediately the war is on, the Russians move into Europe, our critical bastion? The only answer you get is that we shall then destroy Europe's factories. What an impression that formula must make on countries such as France, still struggling with the wreckage of the last war and still dazed from the occupation.

A second important effect of the atomic fallacy is the call for full mobilization—for many more troops, for complete controls, for arms in vast quantity—now. The pressures are fairly evident in the White House, on Capitol Hill, and especially in the echoing halls of the Pentagon.

The men in charge of the mobilization deplore these pressures. If we yield to them the Kremlin might stampede us into economic disaster. General Marshall is emphatic on the point. "We must," he says, "build up our productive capacity; the stockpiles will come later." As he sees it, the job is not one of day-by-day improvisation, but the development of a 10-year plan. If the effort is concentrated in a single year and the war continues cold instead of hot, then the let-down will be tremendous and the future will be in grave jeopardy.

For this is not a reckless foe we face; this is a cool, calculating enemy. Averell Harriman tells of a conversation he had with Stalin 3 years ago about Hitler's course. Hitler's mistake, Stalin said, was that he became impatient; he tried to force matters, he failed in his timing and so he was defeated.

We can be sure of little about the Kremlin except that it will not act until it believes the time is ripe—and this regardless of what we do, either by way of firmness or appeasement. To those who, like Mr. Harriman, have had experience with the men that walk and act like bears our course is clear. We must build up our strength steadily and surely and calmly, unswayed either by Russian threats or by Russian promises.

II. THE GEOGRAPHIC FALLACY

The belief: This takes three forms: First, the conviction that, if we choose, we can withdraw to a western Gibraltar and from there defy the Russians and all the forces of ideology and economics; second, closely allied with this, the theory that we can achieve sea and air control and so utterly safeguard our shores; third, that what we face is exclusively a military problem.

The fallacy: There is no Gibraltar, no fortress, that can be made surely safe against atomic attack. Second, sea and air control implies bases and bases imply allies. Finally, this is not fundamentally a military problem or even a geographic one; it is one to be solved, ultimately, not with arms, but with doctrine.

The geographic fallacy is highly potent in Washington. It expresses itself in a demand that we do something—exactly what is never clearly defined—about Asia and that we tell Europe where she gets off.

The answer from the White House and Pentagon is this: As for Asia, the problem is one that dates back deep into history and requires time, patience, and fortitude; as for Europe, where she gets off is almost precisely the place where we must get off.

The talk of a Gibraltar of the west is likened to the talk 10 years ago of an invincible Maginot line. To those who minimize and criticise Europe the Pentagon leaders answer that the Continent is vital to us, first, as a production area, and, second, as a citadel. In the hands of the enemy the European workshops might well tip the scales against us. Even Mr. Hoover's plans call for the holding of the British Isles; but without Europe, the military leaders say, it will be very difficult to hold the British Isles; and without the British Isles a crucial base will be lost.

That is why, it is argued, we must send troops to invigorate the European defense. Even though the forces may not be sufficient to hold the continent indefinitely against a Russian onslaught, they can at least check the attack, so that a breathing spell will be provided during which our air arm can go into action.

But the main defect in this kind of thinking, as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS puts it, is that most so-called geographic problems are not military and not even geographic. We must surely build up our strength so that Russia will not dare to move; then will come a period of armed truce during which the two systems will be tested. But no ultimate victory is possible unless psychology and economics are on our side.

"That means a double effort; we must make our own system stronger and we must help others to achieve like security." There are no doubts about the outcome if we make this effort, for then the moral and industrial potentials of the free states are certain to prevail against those of the slave nations.

III. THE M'CARTHY FALLACY

The belief: This is the suspicion that the Government is riddled with Communists or soft sympathizers with communism; that few in these parlous days are to be trusted; that those farthest right are likely to be nearest right.

The fallacy: First, even though constant screenings of Government ranks are necessary, the large majority of Government workers are loyal and faithful. Second, it is surely a blazing non sequitur to conclude that any argument advanced as an anti-Communist argument is per se a good argument.

The shadow of the McCarthy fallacy lies heavy over Washington. The Republicans are very conscious of the fact that the issue made by the Wisconsin Senator helped them win important victories in the 1950 elections and they look to it hopefully for 1952. Foreign policy, says Mr. TAFT, will be the issue next year. He defines that issue as the "ousting of communism from Government." And the administration is, of course, acutely conscious of the challenge.

Over the State Department the cloud hangs blackest. The charges have made State officials very cautious, even timid, and this is reflected in our policy. So deeply has the doubt penetrated that there are officers abroad who are reluctant to make true appraisals of the Russian situation for fear that sometime someone will come upon their reports in the Department files and accuse them of subversion.

A current of dank anxiety runs through the departments of Government; and many good men will not take Washington jobs because they are unwilling to submit themselves to the kind of ordeal by adjective and by fire to which others have been subjected.

The Nimitz Commission—appointed to examine the twin problems of security and individual rights—may take some of the heat off. But basically what is needed is a sterner resistance, by both the public and the Congress, to the trend toward suspicion and witch hunting.

IV. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS FALLACY

The belief: This is the conviction that, because our idealism is strong and our cause just, the world should recognize them as such; that the American way—our economic and social system—is the only way; and that socialism is something as evil as communism.

The fallacy: It is undoubtedly true that we rate high in idealism and altruism. But the fact is that a large segment of the world does not acknowledge this; the huge lies of the Communist propaganda machine have had their effect. Moreover, much of the world believes in the Socialist creed and has an inherent distrust of capitalism. This suspicion is fostered by our unconcealed antagonism toward socialism—which puzzles and angers the Socialists inasmuch as they are among the most dedicated of communism's enemies.

The righteousness fallacy is reflected sharply in both thinking and action in Washington.

Our opposition to socialism leads us into such blind and dangerous alleys as distrust of laborite Britain, even though Britain is inevitably the first of our allies; reliance on the old rightist elements in such places as Germany; acid debates with those who disagree with us about the Far East.

Mr. Harriman, who saw the problem closely as head of the ECA operations abroad, puts it this way: "I do not believe in socialism. But the only test we should apply in our judgment of any nation is whether the basic freedoms are being preserved."

The fallacy has large effects also on our propaganda operations. The Voice of America is likely to put the emphasis on such themes as the high standard of living in the United States; the importance of democracy (difficult to convey because of the confusions the Russians have injected into the dictionary); the worth of free enterprise, and the like.

But peoples who have been subjected to a propaganda barrage for all these years do not easily recognize truth and are not interested in facts or words without acts. The two great themes of the Kremlin's propaganda machine are capitalism and warmongering. Paul Hoffman, who has studied the public opinion operation intensively, insists that these must be met head-on.

We must make clear, he says, that our kind of capitalism is not the European kind. Capitalism in Europe and in Asia connotes monopoly and the sweating of labor and unconscionable profits: capitalism here means mass production, a high standard of living, and social welfare.

The charge of warmongering—its effectiveness for the Russians can be measured by the success of the Stockholm peace appeal—can be met only by demonstrating that we do not need and do not want war. But the best propaganda is acts.

"When men are starving and you offer them the choice of the four freedoms or four sandwiches," Senator DOUGLAS points out, "they are likely to take the four sandwiches." Until, in brief, their economic problems are solved, men do not consider their political problems, even though the solution of the first depends on the second.

V. THE LEADERSHIP FALLACY

The belief: There is a profound conviction that a strong man in Washington can solve all our problems for us, showing us where to go and how to get there (without too much discomfort)—a Moses who can reveal the way through the "red sea" of communism.

The fallacy: No leader can do the job by himself. Leadership arises primarily from the people, from the main streets of the Nation rather than from Pennsylvania Avenue. Unless the average citizen performs his duties as a citizen, dealing responsibly with the great issues of the day, leadership will fail.

The leadership fallacy serves as a manna-like alibi for the hungry habitants of Capitol Hill. Because the Nation's attention is focused on the White House, many in the Congress dodge decisions and bestride the fences; they seem to forget that representative government requires the exercise of judgment, that it is not a rubber-stamp or carbon-copy process.

Nevertheless the feeling is strong in Washington, among adherents of both parties, that there should be a firmer assertion of leadership at the top; that the issues should be made clearer to the people, especially by the President (whose voice cannot avoid being the only real voice of America) and the Secretary of State.

Take, as an outstanding example, the case of Korea. There is, as Mr. Acheson says, a great moral issue involved. When we went into Korea to counter the aggression, the Nation as well as the world applauded; while we were winning, the applause continued; but when the Chinese threw us back, it began to be said that we should never have gone in. As Mr. Acheson points out, the fact of defeat does not change the principle involved; it was right to go in and even though we may still be forced out, not to have gone in would have been a moral surrender of untold consequence.

But this has not been put in this way to the people and so the fundamental issue is not clear to them. The top officials will agree about the need of such explanations, but they add that there are so many other pressing things to be done, so many immediate problems. They do not recognize that none of these other problems can be solved unless the basic problem is met—the problem of informing the people.

OUR BASIC STRENGTH

There is much evidence that we do not have the knowledge of world affairs and the interest in them that are vital for our future.

There are those who contend that we are better informed than most other nations; that there is manifest in many quarters a desire to know, and that history reveals, clearly and convincingly, that the American people have a basic common sense which eventually asserts itself.

All this is true, but the overriding fact is that we are not sufficiently informed to meet the present dangers. Somewhere there is a failure of the supply of information and a failure of the absorption of information.

To correct these failures requires a major effort in many directions. In each of the four great areas in which public opinion is made the work must be carried on: (1) The mass media must do a better job—the free press must be also a fully responsible press; (2) education must educate for good citizenship and link the schoolroom and campus more closely to the outside world; (3) the beacons of adult education must reach further into the darkness; (4) Government—and this includes Congress as well as the President—must do much more to inform and to lead.

Leadership is required; there must be no doubt on that score—leaders who lead rather than follow or are pushed on from behind; leaders who decide upon the right course and follow that course, the polls and the commentators notwithstanding. And leaders with courage. "A leader," says General Marshall, "is one who continues to fight even though the odds are 10 to 1 against him."

But more inspired leadership and broader education and better information cannot do the job unless the individual citizen does his part too. He must do his best to insure that the right men are elected to office; that the great issues are debated fully and fairly, and that those on whom he depends for guidance are doing their jobs competently and responsibly. Above all, he must cultivate tolerance and a decent measure of humility.

Then there will emerge the basic strength and the basic unity of the country. Then, through leadership and the response to leadership, we shall develop the white faith that alone can turn back the black challenge that confronts us.

Alaska Girds To Preserve Its Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, after careful research and 6,000 miles of travel in Alaska, Mr. Louis R. Huber, of Seattle, has written and the Christian Science Monitor has printed several articles under the general heading of "Alaska girds to preserve its wildlife."

Because of the national importance of this problem, I include the articles in the RECORD for the information of Members of Congress:

ALASKA GIRDS TO PRESERVE ITS WILDLIFE—FURS AND HUNTING SLASH BIG GAME AND FISH TOTAL

(By Louis R. Huber)

SEATTLE.—Can Alaska's magnificent wildlife be saved?

Many Alaskans are asking this question because, in their spacious land (586,000 square miles), which is as yet only sparsely populated (128,000 people, about 1 for every 5 square miles), wildlife is decreasing.

The northland is supposed to be capable of supporting a population of 12,000,000, eventually. As they come, will the wildlife have to go?

Alaskans hope not—and they are studying ways to insure the permanency of their wildlife neighbors.

"Most of the land in Alaska is of greatest value for producing wildlife, but great changes have been made in the numbers of our big game and fish," says Neil W. Hosley, head of the cooperative wildlife research unit at the University of Alaska, near Fairbanks.

FIRE TAKES TOLL

"To use only one illustration, the herds of caribou, which 25 years ago were estimated in the millions, are now down to about 160,000. Fires which have burned a large part of the Alaska interior have often destroyed the lichens on which the caribou depend, and it takes decades for this growth to develop again.

"Along with this has come a big increase in hunting. Nonresident hunting and fishing licenses issued in the Territory have increased sixtyfold since the late 1930's. At the same time, resident hunting and fishing licenses have increased seven times since 1936," says Mr. Hosley.

In brief, the balance of nature has already been rudely upset by man in Alaska, with grim consequences for the wildlife. Unless swift and adequate steps are taken, the scales may tip over—with important members of the wildlife family lost to the northland.

SPORT HUNTER EYED

"There are important differences and many similarities between Alaskan and State-side wildlife problems," says Winston A. Elkins, wildlife management supervisor of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service office here. He adds:

"The term 'meat hunter' would be generally regarded as having a stigma in the States, but Alaskans would consider it praiseworthy and, indeed, would look askance at the sport hunter.

"Wildlife in Alaska is a resource that means food and clothing to many people. The resident hunter in Alaska is interested in a permanent wildlife population, with fish in the streams and lakes for all time to come.

"But the transient hunter and fisherman are too often motivated by the souvenir instinct. The fisherman is too intent on getting whoppers to take home for mounting and neglects to throw back the fish he doesn't intend to keep.

WOLVES AND COYOTES

"The hunter must have a brown-bear rug, a set of caribou antlers, or a goat head to show the folks back home. What if he shoots three bears before getting one in the trophy class, or if his first two goats are crippled and fall down the cliff?" asks Mr. Elkins.

At the same time, due to various factors associated with the overturned balance of nature, the number of wolves and coyotes throughout all Alaska has increased alarmingly in recent years. Predators of the worst kind, wolves have killed thousands of deer,

moose, caribou, mountain sheep, and mountain goats.

The Alaska Legislature meeting here in 1949 set the bounties on wolves at $50 and on coyotes at $30—a move which has resulted in destruction of more of these wanton killers than was the case when smaller bounties were in effect.

The Fish and Wildlife Service at the same time has carried on a poison-setting program which is declared to be a success. The poison used is said to be selective—attractive to wolves only and not eaten by other fur-bearing animals.

In McKinley National Park during recent years the wolves increased to such numbers that the famous big-horn Dall mountain sheep living there were threatened. Then permission was given park rangers to shoot wolves, even though shooting in the national park otherwise is forbidden.

From a low of 300 sheep that remained after long-unmolested depredations by the wolves, an increase to 1,000 sheep—with prospects for further increases if the shooting war against wolves is continued—has occurred, says Grant Pearson, park superintendent.

Paradoxically, the Fish and Wildlife Service says that destruction of caribou in the Arctic portions of Alaska is caused chiefly by the people who depend on them for food and clothing—the Eskimos.

CURB ON ESKIMOS

Early last March a caribou herd passed near the Eskimo village of Noatak, 225 miles north of Nome, and 37 Eskimos shot 230 of the animals, according to Wildlife agents who investigated the affair.

For centuries the Eskimos have killed caribou as they pleased, but now, with these animals disappearing, the Federal Agency declares firmly that Eskimos must sharply curb their traditional slaughter. A limit of one caribou and two polar bears apiece annually has been set.

In the Noatak case—not the only one to occur recently—the guns of 7 of the 37 hunters were confiscated, for those 7 had killed a total of 107 caribou.

The story does not end there, for the Eskimos strongly resent the taking of their guns and they dislike the Wildlife agents. Lt. Col. Marvin R. Marston, chief organizer of the Eskimos into the Alaska National Guard as "human-radar" watchers against the possibility of enemy invasion, thinks he may have a solution.

WHALES SUGGESTED

"The Eskimos can hunt whales, if they are given the right equipment; and they can use some of the half-wild reindeer that are still found in the Arctic," he suggests.

In any case, the difficulty between Uncle Sam and his Eskimo citizens is a matter worthy of prompt and careful attention. It will call for greater understanding on both sides, and for a high degree of tactfulness on the part of Wildlife agents.

Members of the Armed Forces, too, have been accused of much of the unwarranted slaughter of wild animals in Alaska—as have the thousands of construction workers who go north for varying periods to help build military installations.

This writer talked to one Wildlife agent, Jim Wood of Naknek, who reported notable cooperation after he made a candid appeal to civilians and military men in his area. His direct, trusting approach has paid off, he says, in sensible, law-abiding hunting and fishing.

LARGER APPROPRIATION URGED FOR PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Saving the wildlife of Alaska is a costly job—and growing more costly as the northland population grows.

"It's a field of great concern to all Alaskans, but entirely outside their jurisdiction for action," says the Anchorage Daily Times.

"For years, Alaskans have hammered the Fish and Wildlife Service to do a better job * * * but each year little or nothing is done. The service continues its operations with one agent trying to do the work of ten."

The Anchorage newspaper goes on to explain that the fault in Alaska wildlife management is due almost entirely to niggardly appropriations. Last fiscal year the Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska operated on a budget of $2,150,000.

BUDGET BUREAU HIT

The Times accused the Bureau of the Budget for this low figure, insufficient, it said, for an area one-fifth the size of the United States. In an editorial it quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, giving the colloquy between Albert Day, head of the Federal agency, and Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio.

This revealed the over-all Fish and Wildlife Service budget for the 1951 fiscal year to be $14,350,500, which is less than $2,000,000 more than for 1950.

Mr. Day said before a congressional subcommittee that his agency did not have enough to carry out an effective wildlife program, and he added, "We can only ask Congress to appropriate what the Bureau of the Budget has approved."

This year, Alaska received some additional help from funds distributed under the Pittman-Robertson Act for the restoration of wildlife. A total of $75,000 was given to Alaska. This was $50,000 more than was available last year.

WALTON LEAGUE BUSY

The Izaak Walton League has taken an active interest in securing greater help for Alaska wildlife. Last year it tried to get Congress to plow back into Alaska the Government's profit from the annual fur-seal harvest on the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea.

"But the congressional committee to which we presented this plan asked for more time to study it—and that was the last we heard of it," said Burton H. Atwoord, a national director of the league.

The Wildlife Management Institute of Washington, D. C., also has taken a lively interest in Alaska wildlife. Two high officials of the institute, which is financed by donations from business firms and private individuals, visited the northland last summer.

RESEARCH UNIT SET

They were Ira N. Gabrielson, formerly head of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Territory, and Clinton R. Gutermuth, institute vice president.

While in Alaska they formally installed one of their organization's cooperative wildlife research units at the University of Alaska, near Fairbanks. About 18 similar units already are operating in land-grant colleges in the United States under the aegis of the institute.

BISON HERD THINNED OUT

The only buffalo (bison, that is) on the open range under the American flag today probably are those in Alaska.

Twenty-three of the big, shaggy animals were brought here from the Plains States in 1928. Now they number 350. They are the first bison to live in the northland, the species not being native here.

Elk, likewise not native to the territory, were brought to Alaska in 1929. Eight of the animals were placed on Afognak Island, adjacent to Kodiak Island. They now number more than 200.

Both the elk and the bison were judged in need of "thinning" for the good of their herds by United States Fish and Wildlife Service biologists last year, so a restricted "open season" was arranged for 50 elk and 25 bison.

The bison forage by themselves and are among the few large wild animals that can hold their own against wolves.

BISON REPEL ATTACK

"When a wolf pack closes in on a herd of buffalo, the big animals don't run as moose and caribou do," says Edward F. Chatelain, biologist of the Fish and Wildlife Service. "The bison stand their ground, their shaggy heads lowered and their horns ready for action."

The task of catching and transporting the 32 young bison to the new Copper River range was a "wild-north" epic calling for new techniques.

A corral was built and the bison were enticed into and made used to it by salt-lick blocks and alfalfa. When the "roundup" began, the corral gate was dropped—and the fun began.

The top bull in the herd had been locked out—but that didn't last long. While the "cowboys" watched in apprehension, the big bull battered down the rail fence, leaped a 6-foot barrier and joined his range mates.

LURED INTO CRATES

After the animals stopped milling around, the wildlife men opened a chute in one side of the corral and waited for a buffalo to wander into it.

When the chute contained one of the desired young animals, they closed the chute entrance and prodded the buffalo into a heavy crate, which was then hoisted onto a truck.

But the buffalo wouldn't stand quietly in the crates—until Mr. Chatelain suggested shrouding each one with canvas. Thus sequestered, the animals became quiet.

Latest reports are that the transplanted bison are doing well after their highway journey of more than 100 miles, in future years, wildlife agents say, more buffalo will be taken to other suitable range areas in Alaska.

KEEP THE RIGHT ANIMALS

"People back in the States are always getting excited about the wrong things in Alaska." This was a statement by an Alaska guide at Kodiak, who makes his living by escorting hunters into the haunts of the huge Alaska brown bear, largest carnivore on earth, and other wild animals of the northland.

He was referring to recurrent efforts to preserve the bald eagle and the Alaska brown bear.

"The bald eagle thrives in Alaska. We've had a bounty on that bird for most of 33 years, even if it is our national symbol by act of the Continental Congress in 1782. If the bounty is taken off, there will be too many bald eagles, and they'll destroy too much other wildlife," he said.

As for the brown bears, they are scorchingly criticized by farmers of Kodiak Island and other localities, who find it impossible to raise beef cattle on account of them. The bears delight in killing the beef cattle, and the game laws prevent the farmer from taking retaliatory measures.

"Those bears are far too numerous. There should be open season on them all the time. Don't worry; they'll take care of themselves. Besides, there are plenty of refuges for them, totaling nearly 2,000,000 acres on Kodiak and Uganik Islands," said one Kodiak Island farmer.

"On the other hand," reflected the guide, "people in the States seldom get worked up about the plight of caribou, mountain sheep, mountain goats, and, to some extent, moose. These animals really need some help.

"People in the States forget, or don't realize, that wolves and coyotes are the greatest enemies of wildlife up here. So are the forest fires, against which Alaska has almost no protection."

How To Write Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, each session every one of us is buried under an avalanche of mail. Few of us dare talk back to our correspondents. Most of them are well-meaning. Some are merely misinformed.

The following guide will ease our burden, if our constituents would only heed its excellent advice. It appeared in the January 1949 edition of Kiplinger magazine. It is worthy of reprinting now:

HOW TO WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN—PUT ASIDE THAT PEN AND PAPER UNTIL YOU HAVE READ THIS LIST OF DO'S AND DONT'S

You may have strong ideas about what the new Congress should do. So perhaps you will write a letter to your Congressman. But you will waste your time unless you know how to write him.

If your letter is a gripe or a whine, it will be brushed off. If it is a long-winded essay, it may never get read. If it can't make a definite point, it will invite a similar reply.

The basic rule is to write a simple, concise statement of your position, plus your reasons for that position. Your Congressman will read such a letter carefully.

To make your letters most effective, follow these suggestions. They come from Congressmen themselves.

Do make your letter short and to the point. If your letter runs less than a page, all the better.

Try to base your views on local observations or experience. Congressmen want to know the effect of their action on their home district.

When writing about a specific bill, try to use the bill's number or its popular name. Thousands of bills pass a Congressman's desk each year and it helps to know which particular one you are talking about.

When writing about something on which you have a special knowledge, state your experience in the field. A Congressman doesn't know about everything, and a specialist's views will help him make up his mind.

Time your letter to reach your Congressman when the subject you are discussing is alive. A letter on a bill months before it comes up is almost as useless as one on a bill months after its disposition.

Write your Congressman when you think he has done something good. He likes praise as much as anyone.

Don't write letters which threaten him with defeat at the next election if he doesn't vote your way. Reasons are more effective than threats.

Don't tell your Congressman how influential you are in his district. If you are, he probably knows it; if you're not, he'll resent your letter's implication that you can bring pressure to bear.

Don't merely "demand" or "insist." He doesn't know whether your reasons are good unless you tell him what they are.

Don't get caught in a pressure letter or telegram campaign. A batch of identical letters, obviously inspired by a pressure group, gets very little attention. If you agree with a group's position, use your own words, not the group's.

Don't swamp your Congressman with letters on the same subject. When you've expressed yourself once, you've made your impression. One good letter is worth 10 bad ones.

Don't write Congressmen from other than your home district, unless it is to the chairman of the committee discussing a specific bill. Congressmen aren't swayed much by outsiders.

On Working Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "On Working Together," published in the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga., of February 28, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON WORKING TOGETHER

Hard-shelled, dyed-in-the-wool Democrats, who think that every Republican is equipped with a pair of horns, and Republicans who feel the same way about members of the opposition party, should take a cue from the working relations of Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK's Banking and Currency Committee.

While in this locality yesterday to study community service needs in the atomic-energy-plant area, the members of the Senate committee showed every evidence of being a great working team.

Of the four committeemen here, two were Democrats—MAYBANK, of South Carolina, and FREAR, of Delaware—and two were Republicans—CAPEHART, of Indiana, and BENNETT, of Utah.

There was no partisanship evident. There was no bickering, no unfriendliness. There was, indeed, a noticeable spirit of camaraderie, and genuine evidence of mutual respect. Obviously, they were intent only on doing a good job—working together, Democrats and Republicans.

And that is as it should be. After all, they are all Americans, and party labels shouldn't count for too much when the welfare of the Nation is at stake.

What You Can Do Personally To Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following interesting and concrete idea which appeared in Woman's Home Companion of December 1950.

Let us get together and stop communism by being for Americanism.

WHAT YOU CAN DO PERSONALLY TO STOP COMMUNISM

(By Howard Whitman)

You, all by yourself, can strike repeated blows—day in and day out—to stop communism. Does that seem fantastic? Has it seemed that stopping communism is a job which only the President or the Army and Navy or the FBI can do? Have you wished you actually could do something?

You can.

You will not get a medal for it nor will you see your picture on page 1. But deep inside you there'll be a warm glow. For in your daily private life you will personally be contributing to the preservation of freedom and turning back the dark shrouds of Communist repression. You will be defeating totalitarianism with the sole weapon which is capable of defeating it: individualism.

As you read the specific suggestions below, bear in mind the oft-told tale of the Reverend James Keller, founder of the Christophers. Father Keller was speaking at the Los Angeles Coliseum, expounding the Christophers' thesis that individual people, by their simple, everyday acts, can change the world. In this huge arena, under a starless sky, Father Keller said, "Don't be afraid. All the lights are going out."

Then he struck a match. It was a tiny pin point of light. The area was still shrouded in gloom.

"But suppose every one of us strikes a light," Father Keller went on. And at his signal, men and women in the audience—a hundred thousand—each struck a match. Now, instead of a pin point, the entire arena was bathed in light. The darkness was gone. Father Keller had driven home his point.

One soldier cannot take a beachhead, but without the acts of individual soldiers no beachhead can be taken. The fight against communism cannot be won by machines, by weapons, by congressional committees, by laws, decrees, or speeches. Nor can it be won by you alone. It can only be won by all of us, each acting alone; and yet, in a larger sense, all acting together as holders of the tiny pin points of light, which, combined, dispel the darkness.

What have you done lately to make our free-enterprise system free and enterprising? Perhaps you never have thought of yourself as an economic unit, but you are. If you hire a maid in your house you are very much a part of the free-enterprise system. Perhaps she already has fair working hours, prescribed in advance, and a regular vacation. But when she does extra-good work do you give her a bonus? Not a hand-out or a tip, but a bonus—something she has earned. After all, reward for individual initiative is the very heartbeat of free enterprise.

Or if you work in an office and one of your subordinates is long overdue for a promotion, do you go to bat for her? Do you stand up—even at some risk to yourself—for her right to share in a system which thrives on each individual's hope to climb up the ladder?

There are a thousand and one little things you can do.

When a new grocer or radio repairman or dry cleaner opens a store in your neighborhood you can give him a chance at your trade. Ours is the competitive system. If he is a better grocer, repairman, or cleaner he deserves it. And don't be afraid to tell him, "I like dealing here. It's a fair well-run establishment." Give him a free-enterprise pat on the back.

When you go into a big department store don't treat the saleslgirl as if she were a robot. Speak to her as though it were her store, her merchandise. Indeed it is, in the sense that her daily labor is invested in every bit of it.

Opportunity for youth is another bulwark of our system. Have you supported it lately—personally?

I tried an experiment I think is working well. My car needed washing. I got a teen-aged boy named Tommy to do it. Tommy did such a fine job that I told him he could

consider me a regular customer. Then, a few months later, we had a new shingle roof put on our house. The old shingles needed to be carted to the back lot and burned. Why not give another boy a job? This time I got Donald. His eyes shone like light bulbs when I handed him his pay. He had savored the good feeling of earning his own money for his own work.

Perhaps you are in a position to do much more than that. You may be able to hire a teen-aged boy or girl for part-time work after school or on Saturdays. You may even be in a position to give a young high-school graduate a job with your company—or get your husband to do it—and thus afford that youngster a chance to start at the bottom and work up—just as far up as he can work.

One of the most vulnerable chinks in our national armor is the race problem. There is no sense pretending it isn't there. We have a race problem. The Communists smash at it incessantly; they try to turn the many-colored peoples of the world against us by portraying us as Negro haters.

What can you personally do about that?

A friend of mine, Arthur Gordon (a native of the deep South, by the way), wrote an enlightened novel against race prejudice.

We can't all write novels.

A woman I met in New Haven, Conn., Mrs. Gertrude Hart Day, got a taste of prejudice (not against Negroes but against a migratory mother with three children, to whom nobody wanted to rent a house) when she followed her Army-doctor husband around the country during World War II. She came back and founded the New Haven Neighborhood Project, dedicated to combating every prejudice.

We can't all start neighborhood projects. But we all can do little things. Little things which when multiplied by millions become the most invincible forces on earth.

A woman I know heard the barker at a country fair repeatedly refer to a small Negro boy as "snowball" and "chocolate drop." She went up to the barker and said quietly: "The boy's name is Edward. Wouldn't it be far more American to call him that?"

An alumnus of a middle western college received a questionnaire from his alma mater. Among its dozens of blanks was one which recalled to his mind old campus battles on discrimination in education. It said, "Race ———." He simply filled in "Human."

Communists sneer at our belief in human dignity and the supreme worth of the individual. They say it is hypocritical. Can you prove them wrong?

Harry E. Humphreys, Jr., president of the United States Rubber Co., once said: "Any person in a managerial position, from supervisor to president, who feels that his employee is basically not as good as he is * * * lacks the necessary qualities for human leadership—to say nothing of human friendship."

If the head of a huge corporation can take that attitude, can't you and I? Try it. Try regarding the rubbish collector, the waitress in the restaurant, the elevator man, the bootblack, the salesgirl as, in the eyes of God and in the heart of democracy, fully as good as President Truman, King George, or the Shah of Iran.

Set yourself a private little job: get to know just one of the people you might have written off before as, well, a bit inferior. See if you don't begin to see the light of human dignity shine through.

I tried it with a garbageman (that had always seemed to me, since childhood, a "low" profession). I broke the ice by discussing politics with him. What a grasp he had. I started by talking down to him, ended by looking up to him. We discussed our families and our problems with our kids—and we still do, every time I see him.

The Communists would love to see us bickering among ourselves. "Divide and conquer" is their watchword.

What can you do about that?

You can cultivate the "we" feeling. An English friend of mine says he can always tell Americans from Englishmen by the way they use their pronouns. An American, complaining that the streets in his city are littered, says, "Why don't they keep their streets clean?" An Englishman with a similar complaint says, "Why don't we keep our streets clean?"

The "we" feeling isn't difficult to cultivate. Next time you talk about "the Government," try saying "our Government." Not "those people in Washington" but "our people in Washington." Try saying, "Our corporations, our labor unions, our schools, our farms, our factories."

The "we" feeling not only spikes the Communists' divide-and-conquer technique. It also has a personal dividend for you: a healthy sense of belonging, of participation, of shared experience. Psychiatrists tell us that's the basis of this thing we call security.

Another club the Communists hit us with is perfectionism. "If we're not perfect, we're no good"—that's what the Communists would like us to believe. They bury their own imperfections under a blanket of lies and tempt us to do the same thing; for they know that lies smother freedom, our life breath.

I visited Yale University recently to inquire into a course in the "American way" being given to students from foreign lands. I wanted to see how we turn the mirror on ourselves. I was proud of what I saw. Assistant Dean Harold B. Whiteman, Jr., in charge of the course, acquainted the students from 16 foreign countries with the real America we love—no image of perfection, but an image of human striving with plenty of failures and shortcomings, but an everlasting bent toward progress.

These students became acquainted both with our healthy democratic processes and with unhealthy machine politics; they visited East Harlem slums in New York and spent week ends with families in Westport and Stamford, Conn.; they saw movies ranging from the saga of migrant workers, Grapes of Wrath, to a General Motors production film; their guest speakers included a CIO organizer and a chamber of commerce executive.

"We want to show them our good side, our bad side, our hopes, our progress, our plans, and our aspirations," Whiteman said.

A little later I sat in Vanderbilt Hall with one of Whiteman's boys, a scholarship student, George Chranewycz, Ukrainian. His family had been driven out of the Ukraine by the Communists, out of Poland by the Nazis—and finally to a DP camp. When I asked, "Well, what do you think of America?" George answered, "In Europe I was in a DP camp. Here I am at Yale."

His was an eloquent answer.

Sure, let's face up to our shortcomings. Let's admit our failures. We are not a finished product and we never will be, so long as we are free to grow. Nazi Germany thought it was a finished product, and it was—finished.

When alleged Communist perfectionism is hurled your way, reply as Whiteman does at Yale: "We have many imperfections—but we're working on them."

There is a positive side, too, to this war of ideas. It is not enough to be against communism. What are we for? The Americans who fought in 1776 knew very definitely what they were fighting for. They were afire with bright new ideas—freedom, equality, the inalienable rights of man.

That was their religion. What's ours today? If you ask the first person you meet on the street, you may get a reply such as this: "We've got to keep communism from spreading. We can't let it engulf the world."

Entirely negative.

A New England woman, Mrs. John L. Senior, recently endowed a new professorship at Cornell University. It is a chair in "American values." I went to see her, questing for our positive position in the war of ideas.

"Just what are the American values?" I asked. This woman, a widow, of Lenox, Mass., listed six of them: "The supreme worth of the individual; the soundness and basic rightness of the great mass of the people; every individual's right to think, feel, and speak as he likes; freedom of the individual to achieve what he can, on his own, without interference; individual initiative and responsibility; and, finally, freedom—the touchstone of them all."

Can you, for your own part, make a similarly positive declaration? Do you know what you are for? Just think of the moral force which would be turned loose in the world if 150,000,000 Americans firmly knew—and believed in—the ideas they were fighting for, not just fighting against.

That moral force starts with you. Think about it. Set down in your mind—and on paper, if you wish—your own personal list of American values.

Finally, beliefs must be lived, not simply believed. Action is the key.

Action begins at the grass roots—in your community, your circle of friends, your home.

You can live your belief in Americanism by being active in your local parent-teachers association. You can live it by doing voluntary work for the Red Cross, by serving on the library board, by being a leader of Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts, by supporting civic betterment movements, by working for civilian defense, by volunteer social work or child welfare work. On one afternoon a week you might give your time to a mother who cannot afford to have a baby-sitter. Or even offer your yard, if you have one, to neighborhood children where playgrounds are scarce. There are a thousand and one things you can do.

Never mind the thousand. Try at least one.

Mrs. Ralph B. Morris, president of the New York City League of Women Voters, holds out another line of individual action. "A person is living his beliefs in Americanism when he takes his voting responsibilities seriously, when he votes at all elections and primaries, and finds out as much as he can about the candidates and the issues," she says.

And beyond that, she continues, "He takes his other citizenship responsibilities seriously. He doesn't get out of jury duty just to get out of it. He doesn't tip a traffic cop to avoid a ticket—and then complain about police corruption. He doesn't try to get favors from political friends—and then rail against the 5 percenters."

Individual action, in its purest form, may actually be the quiet little acts you hardly think twice about. They are the little things of beauty, the gems. A man picks up a piece of waste paper from the street and carries it to a trash bin. A woman helps a cripple across the street. A motorist stops to patronize a children's vegetable stand. A bus driver waits for a man who is running to the bus stop. The man says, "Thanks." A woman shopper helps another shopper with her packages.

This is the blood in the veins of democracy. It is the people living together for the common good.

What quiet little act can you perform—today?

Price Regulation Ceiling on Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have written to Mr. Michael V. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, relative to the need for a change in the present interpretation of the recent margin freeze order on agricultural commodities, in order that both the farmers and consumers may be better protected.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 6, 1951.

Mr. MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Director, Office of Price Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DISALLE: This refers to the series of conversations which I had with Mr. J. Howard Houk and Mr. Allan Rubin, of your Office, last week relative to the interpretation which has been placed upon section 11 (e) of the price regulation order of January 26, 1951, with particular reference to the ceiling on poultry. I was very much concerned to find that an interpretation had been placed upon this regulation to the effect that while margins of profit would be sealed as farm prices were in a continuous advance, such margins of profit for the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer of poultry products would not be frozen in a declining market; that is, as it was pointed out to me, as farm prices advanced each 1 cent or fraction thereof, all prices could be advanced automatically up the line with the increased cost being passed on to the consumer; however, once new ceiling prices had been established at some projected level, I found that a decline of even any insignificant fraction would unlock all margin freezes, thereby making it possible for poultry prices at the farm level to decline substantially while at the same time retail prices to the wholesaler and the consumer could be maintained at near-ceiling level.

The excuse offered was that it was hard to arrive at a fair or normal margin of profit to an industry and that permanent ceilings on margins during a price freeze would not be administratively feasible. I cannot follow that line of reasoning, since surely, if profit margins can be established and enforced as prices advance, why can they not be in operation in reverse?

The present interpretation is affording a golden opportunity to wartime profiteers to extend their margin far beyond that which is normal to the industry and at the same time cloak their profiteering as legal under the Defense Production Act.

That this opportunity is not being overlooked is evidenced by the market conditions of live poultry on the farms in Delaware and on the Delmarva Peninsula generally as shown by the retail prices which are reported and filed by the Marketing and Facilities Research Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture.

I am seriously concerned with this interpretation and the effect which it will have not only upon the cost of living but also upon the poultry growers on the Delmarva Peninsula. Other Senators who are also seriously concerned have joined me in introducing Senate Resolution 93 to correct this interpretation. A copy of this resolution is enclosed herewith.

I express the sincere hope that it will not be necessary for the Senate to be compelled to amend the legislation when the intent of Congress in this matter is clear and that you will accordingly correct this interpretation immediately, thus removing the necessity for action by the Senate. However, in the event such correction is not made, I shall feel compelled in the interest of the consumers and the farmers on the Delmarva Peninsula to insist upon action by the Senate.

An extra cent spread in the margin of handling poultry that moves from the Delmarva Peninsula in 1 week means about $80,000 to the Delmarva farmers. A 3- to 4-cent extra spread in the margins between the New York wholesale market and the farm price as it now exists means a loss to our farmers and an extra profit to the middleman of about a quarter of a million dollars each week.

If this same interpretation prevails in relation to all other agricultural commodities, I can visualize where the farmers and the consumers could be robbed of millions.

I think in the light of these figures you will agree with me that we must have immediate action.

Will you please advise me promptly your reaction to this request and what steps you intend to take in the matter?

Yours respectfully,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Curtailment of Mail Deliveries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Stephen L. DeBalta which appeared in the Hagerstown Morning Herald on Thursday, March 1. The article deals with the service rendered by the Post Office Department.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARYLANDERS IN WASHINGTON

(By Stephen L. DeBalta)

In every community of our land, big and small, tearful mothers, wives, sweethearts, sisters are impatiently waiting every day for news from Korea, Japan, Germany, the Near East, wherever members of our dispersed Armed Forces may be. But the letters are slow in coming when they do come at last. It seems that some cruel hand is holding up the delivery of the anxiously awaited messages from the beloved ones. This hand is the clenched fist of a willful man who, with the amazing defiance of the very people who employ him, imposes upon a whole nation his arbitrary will. Last April Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson decreed a drastic curtailment of the postal service throughout the country. Post offices were ordered to adopt a banking-hours' schedule, to deliver mail only once a day, to make fewer collections, and to call it a day at sunset. This wanton destruction of a long-established public service brought in its trail idleness and distress to many employees, particularly in the lower-wage brackets, and aroused the violent protests of the National Association of Letter Carriers. Vainly, Senators, Congressmen, chambers of commerce, civic organizations remonstrated with the former Shelbyville mailman, but of no avail. The spiteful potentate thus got even with Congress after having been refused the credits he had asked, adopting the proverbial motto of the Chinese laundryman: "No tickee, no washee."

One would expect such dictatorial attitude from one on a higher administrative level but not from a minor member of the Cabinet, intent upon settling a personal peeve regardless of the hardship it brings to the whole Nation. In a great metropolis like New York, for instance, a letter mailed after 6 p. m. to a next door neighbor is delivered not the next morning but the day after. On Saturdays and Sundays, when the average citizen can indulge in catching up with his correspondence the post offices are closed and stamps are hard or impossible to procure. The entire postal service is disorganized and demoralized and causing, as usual, more inconvenience to the individual taxpayer than to the large business concerns.

James J. Doran a former colleague of Postmaster Donaldson, who held a top position in the Post Office Department until he voluntarily resigned 4 months ago, finally had the courage to come out with a vigorous denunciation of the reckless sabotage of our postal service. In an article to be published in the March issue of the Postal Record, official organ of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mr. Doran expressed opposition to the mail curtailment in effect since last April and quoted the Department's own figures to show how savings could be effected without mangling the service or raising rates. The real cause of the huge deficit is seemingly to be found in the reckless operation of the 20 largest post offices in the country. It is there, according to Doran, that savings should and could be effectuated, and in the 39,000 small post offices of the second, third, and fourth class, which could never operate nor should be expected to operate without a postal subsidy. The former chief inspector concludes in stating that Congress can never be expected to hike postal rates sufficiently to wipe out the deficit of the small district offices and should not even attempt to do so.

The sooner Postmaster Donaldson will concur in Doran's sane views and will bring to an end his personal feud with Congress, the happier the country will be.

Death of Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article in tribute to the late Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore, of Maine, written by me, and published in the Bangor (Maine) Evening Commercial of March 5, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S CAPITOL

(By Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—The Nation has lost a leader in the death of Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore. My State has lost one of its most illustrious sons, as General Moore came from Ellsworth. I have lost a friend.

It was not until the fall of 1947 that I really got to know General Moore. At that time I was a member of a House Armed Services Subcommittee that made an inspection trip of our military bases in Europe and the Middle East. General Moore was the commanding officer of the United States troops in the Free Territory of Trieste.

At that time Yugoslavia had designs on Trieste and was on the side of Russia. There was the constant threat of a Yugoslav invasion, which would have meant war.

The Yugoslavs were constantly creating incidents and disorders that tested the fortitude, patience, judgment and diplomacy of General Moore. In fact, Trieste was the powder keg of the world at that time.

SUPERB PERFORMANCE

General Moore's assignment was to hold the so-called Morgan line in Venezia Giula. When disposition of this territory was made, General Moore then had the job of protecting the American part of the Free Territory of Trieste. His performance was superb, had it been anything less, Russia might have made war on us in 1947.

The importance of General Moore's performance becomes all the more apparent when a review is made of our relations with Yugoslavia and their effect upon the strength of Russia.

Tito's Yugoslavia was originally in the Soviet camp and was shooting down our aircraft and murdering our airmen. Yugoslavia was a source of terrific leverage for Russia in the Balkans in threatening war and exercising dominating influence over that area.

YUGOSLAV SWITCH

But now Tito and Yugoslavia have broken with Stalin and shown complete independence and defiance of Russia. The slave has thumbed his nose at the master.

He has switched sides. And his action has given courage to other slave nations in the Balkans to break with Russia—and to the free nations to remain independent of Russia. The whole switch and its significance is summed up in the word "Titoism."

Had it not been for General Moore this encouraging development would not have been possible.

SOLDIER AND DIPLOMAT

There were two people who stood out in my mind on that trip. One was General Moore. The other was George V. Allen, our Ambassador in Iran, who did such a wonderful job in keeping Iran and her oil away from Russia.

Interestingly enough, George Allen is now Ambassador to Yugoslavia. Between General Moore and Ambassador Allen, our country has been most effectively represented in relations with Yugoslavia and the results have been gratifying.

Being a military leader and a successful diplomat is rare. Gen. Bryant Moore was that rare combination, just as General Eisenhower is.

Statement by George J. Burger Before Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it must be understood that the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California is a nonpolitical organization.

The principal and main objective of this organization is to protect the free enterprise system and secondly, the people we represent, independent business and professional men.

The record will show that the federation has the largest individual membership of independent business and professional men of any business organization in the Nation.

It must also be understood for the record that whatever position the federation takes is taken only after a poll has been made through its official publication the mandate, of the entire Nation-wide federation membership. The mandate ballot is voted by the individual member and turned over by him to a district chairman who in turn mails the individual ballots from that district to the respective Member of Congress. In this way, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the majority opinion rules in setting the policy to be followed by the executive officers of the federation. In other words, no executive officer can speak for the federation until the entire membership has expressed its opinion one way or the other. Of course, the question before the Nation of sending troops abroad during an emergency period outside of an actual true state of war is of considerable interest to independent business and professional men and their dependents. In our opinion it is a most major question and it can be said for the record that in an actual state of war we believe there would be no question in the minds of anyone that the President as Commander in Chief, would have the power to send troops wherever it was necessary in the best interest of protecting the Nation's welfare.

The subject matter, Senate Resolution 8, was presented to the Federation members in the following manner:

Pro: The President has exceeded his powers by sending and promising to send soldiers to Europe without first securing congressional approval. More than this, he has dangerously undermined our own national security by so doing. First, troops sent and promised may just be going into a bottomless hole, for our so-called allies have shown no great progress in strengthening their own defenses. Second, the President may be maneuvering us into a position where we will be forced into disastrous large-scale land war with the Communists. It is not logical to think that Russia will remain idle while we garrison Europe. Likely she will strike first. And without the needed moral and physical support of the people we are defending, we are more than likely to lose our troops and all. This is a most serious question, one which—since we are not formally at war with Russia—only the whole American people, through their Congress, should be permitted to decide.

Con: This bill is founded in defeatism and is dedicated to the selfish proposition that the United States should assume no risks to preserve and extend the ideals of freedom it preaches. It can serve only to delay our aid to Europe, thereby wreck the great efforts made thus far to build a world-wide defense among free nations against communism—without which Russia cannot be checked. It can, therefore, result only in Russian domination of, first, Europe and Asia, then the entir world. In assessing this question there are some things we must decide in all humility. First, our European allies are "going slow" because devastating war was fought actually over their own countries recently—something we very fortunately escaped. Second, because they fear, with good reason, that we may leave them in the lurch. They need the encouragement the presence of additional United States troops already promised can give them. We need their assistance—or our own safety will be out the window.

The result of the poll of the Nation-wide membership is as follows: 75 percent of these Federation members voted for Senate Resolution 8; 22 percent voted against the bill; and 3 percent gave no opinion at all.

I would like to ask at this time that the copy of the mandate in which this poll was made as well as the copy of the press release which shows the results of the poll appear as a permanent part of the record of this hearing.

Independent small business and professional men of this Nation who have a vital interest in this tremendous undertaking as a result of the serious difficulties they are now facing in carrying on their individual businesses have expressed their majority opinion from the grass roots of the Nation, and as the accredited spokesman for independent business of this Nation we urgently request that the deepest consideration be given by this commitee as we believe this is the voice of America.

Thank you.

An Intangible Weapon for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered by Mr. J. S. Kroh at several places in Nebraska. Mr. Kroh was formerly the publisher of a newspaper and is one of our most civic-minded citizens. His address, I am sure, will interest the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I consider it a real contribution to the study of many of the serious problems facing our Nation.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INTANGIBLE WEAPON FOR DEFENSE

(By J. S. (Jack) Kroh)

This is the fifty-first year of the twentieth century A. D.—the beginning of an era of grave problems and consequences for the United States.

It is a gloomy moment in our history.

Our people live in fear of the trend of creeping socialism for they know socialism is but one short step to communism.

They are being taxed beyond reason because for the past 17 years our policy has been to tax, and spend, and spend.

They note the ballooning of our national debt because of the increase in the Government payroll with its rapidly increasing number of bureaucrats and bureaus.

They note with growing fear that politicians in high offices would burden us still further with socialized medicine, the Brannon plan, etc., while we are spending billions of dollars for war.

They fear our country will soon become bankrupt, Stalin's greatest hope.

Our people have a feeling that we have been forced into this, the third world war by bungling and appeasement because of the presence of termites which are gnawing away at the American structure.

Yes, our people are bewildered because the United States lacks leadership.

It is true that there are those among us who have not forgotten our purpose, but in this new world of United Nations alliances the chain of the cooperation is only as strong as the weakest link.

Will we have allies in Europe and Asia or will we stand alone?

We have been hoping that the 60 or more member nations of the UN offered the best opportunity to work for peace in the world.

But these nations have not yet used their full power, nor have they shown the moral courage to take a firm stand against those who are continuing to make war.

The United Nations have bowed to big aggressors to date and unless it shows results now it will go the way of the League of Nations. It will be washed up and there will be no need to continue it as an organization.

On the other hand the American people have been admonished to seek help in the only place where mankind has an abiding faith—in the leadership of God.

But prayer to Almighty God will not avail, however, if we are not ready to face truth within ourselves.

Prayer is a two-way line of communication, we, meaning the administration, the Supreme Court, Congress, and all individual citizens, must surrender selfishness to intelligent and spiritual service if we expect guidance in return.

When we are willing to enlighten ourselves and clean house at home we will be strengthened to resist evil abroad.

Therefore I have chosen for this address just one idea not advanced or considered for the past century for our defense, and victory.

AN INTANGIBLE WEAPON FOR DEFENSE

Five years and 4 months after the Japanese surrender, we find ourselves engaged in a real shooting war, and this marks our active participation in three big wars in 34 years.

Once more we are forced to take stock of our preparedness, and the picture is not a reassuring one. Nearly $50,000,000,000 have been spent on defense in 5 years, and if we are correctly informed, only one billion was spent for the defense of our own Nation. The balance, or $49,000,000,000 in money and substance was given to other nations of the world in the pretext that it was for national defense.

And so, today, we find we are far from prepared for protection to our homeland.

I fear that in part our unpreparedness is the result of the wishful belief, that our scientists, if given a little encouragement and much money, could produce some miraculous form of weapon which, by pressing a button, would give us immediate victory anywhere in the world.

In the frantic haste of rearming there is always the danger that we may overlook weapons which are available, particularly if they are intangible. It is concerning one of these weapons that I would like to talk with you today.

It is not a secret weapon, nor is it new, but it is essential.

Let me introduce it by telling you of a conversation in Paris last summer between Professor Morris, of Tulane University, and a Polish ex-patriot. This Pole, who was an outspoken anti-Communist, an educated man, trained as a lawyer, and a colonel in World War II, was asked how it was possible that a country as fiercely patriotic and nationalistic as Poland, a country which prospered under the capitalistic system, fell so easily for the delusion of communism.

The Pole told how his country suffered unparalleled loss of life and the destruction of cities, railroads, and other national assets.

But the major cause of the tragedy he said was this: For 6 years all the schools and colleges were closed, the educated Poles were killed, and the young people uneducated. The result was that they unwittingly accepted the glowing promises of communism.

Note that he gave this as the most important single cause of the collapse of a free government in Poland.

This is the intangible weapon about which I wish to speak today—learning and education—a weapon which kills no one but without which our Nation is not secure.

More particularly I refer to what is known as the liberal education in contrast to the practical and professional education—or, if you will, I refer to the type of education which many people consider to be a sheer waste of time.

There is no necessity of making a case for the need of practical education, because our economic life is firmly based on technical skill, and the lessons of the last war are still fresh.

Our country will long remember its dependence during the last war on our scientists and engineers in so many fields—not only the atomic bomb which served only to terminate a war already won, but equally in many fields where we were hard pressed indeed.

We remember how one of our scientists and his associates devised ways to check the submarine when this was sinking our shipping; how another scientist tracked down the operations of the U-boats—one of the most thrilling detective stories of all time; how another German menace, the airplane, was checked with the development of radar; nor does any one need to be reminded how our engineering skills in oil refining, in making steel, in production-line methods of manufacturing furnished many tools and materials of war.

But I wish to emphasize the need to continue and to reemphasize the so-called liberal arts, not only as adjuncts to gracious living, but as valuable weapons of defense against not only external enemies, but against those within who either from ignorance or maliciousness would tear down our heritage.

A good case could be made for many of the liberal disciplines, but let us choose ancient history as an example, particularly that of Rome and Greece.

From the beginning of our Republic and up to a century ago this formed the core of all formal education, but today the vast majority of high school and college students complete their education with only the basiest notions of the ancient world—its study having been pushed out by including subjects of more practical value.

The claim was made that while it might be interesting it certainly was not important, and if one must study history, at least it should be something of some value—American history or Nebraska history.

While I have no quarrel with these, and, in fact would like to see more American history taught, such subjects do not by any means replace the broad view gained from the over-all study of the rise and fall of these ancient civilizations. But what, some of you may ask, has the knowledge of these long dead civilizations to do with our Government and what has a knowledge of such subjects to do with defense, or the preservation of our Republic? I think a great deal and I ask you to bear with me while we consider this point.

Let us go back to the beginning of our Government, to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The men who formed this Government did not by some sudden flash of inspiration conceive the form of Government which for at least 160 years proved so successful. Quite the contrary: these men—Jefferson, Adams, Witherspoon, Livingston, and others—were steeped in the learning of the past. They planned the new Government based upon the wealth of experience over the ages.

They knew the dangers of a too centralized Government, the hazards of a Government too easily swayed by momentary popular whims and passions, the need of separate legislative and executive departments, the necessity of an independent judiciary, the need to avoid all possibility of the military assuming control of the Government—all this they knew because liberal education stressed the study of ancient culture.

Such matters as I have just listed were "old stuff" to them and with this background they proceeded to build a form of Government which has justified the confidence they felt. How do we know that these men were influenced by their liberal training? Well for many reasons. In the first place we are familiar with their education; secondly, we have the record of their discussions during the period when these documents were drawn up; and lastly, we have the internal evidence of the documents themselves.

Have you ever thought how the Declaration of Independence opens? After an opening sentence which merely states that "When in the course of human events" it became necessary to revolt, the decent thing to do is to state clearly to the world your reason for doing so.

The Declaration proper begins: "We hold these truths to be self-evident." This has a familiar ring. It is the identical phrase with which Euclid begins his monumental text on plane geometry. In the latter case—in the only school text which has secured world-wide adoption for over 2,200 years—Euclid proceeds with his axioms, the self-evident truths, from which he deduces step by step the laws of geometry.

In the former are listed the basic concepts of government—"that men are created equal" and so forth. It is no coincidence that the framers of our Government drafted this Declaration in the form and words of Greek philosophy.

These men were as familiar through their liberal education with past political thought and experience as our great generals of the Civil War were with past military tactics and campaigns.

Every one of us who appreciate the privilege of living under our Government owes a debt of gratitude to these men and should be thankful for the fact that they possessed the liberal learning that gave them the vision and judgment required.

Under our present educational system it would be hard to find a group with such a background. With few exceptions our so-called statesmen today lack even a pretense of such a background. Yet these men have no hesitation in proposing to modify our social, economical, and political set-up.

If the people listening to the political speeches which are all too common in our country could realize that all the tricks used are old stuff, perhaps they would not fall such easy prey to glib promises. Note the general advice given on political speech-making by old Aristotle 2,300 years ago.

Here is how Will Durant summarizes Aristotle's comments:

"Success is the only measure of a telling speech, and the appeal is primarily to the emotions rather than to the reason.

"Indeed the test of a good orator is his ability to arouse the prejudices of his audience and to enlist them on his side. In accomplishing this, sentimentalities and moral aversions and convictions of his hearers are the orator's best friends, and by carefully stringing together platitudes and maxims that reflect their outlook on life

he can win for himself the reputation of being a man of sound moral character, and a clear thinker, and give to his discourse a counterfeit logic.

"According to Aristotle, the assumption of a high moral tone suggests that the speaker has a noble nature—a suggestion that carries all the more weight the less intelligent the audience is."

The above, gentlemen, is from Aristotle's Politics written 2,300 years ago.

Who, familiar with the fact that these hints are well over 2,000 years old, will let himself be fooled by them? On the other hand, as we know all too well, these tricks work today as well as ever—and seduce even those with formal education. I submit to you that the plausible-sounding, pious-speaking, self-seeking politicians would find it more difficult if their hearers knew how old this sort of guff really is, and I suggest that the study of the life of Rome and Greece would have taught this.

And if knowledge of the past may save us from falling headlong for the wiles of the politician, may it not also save us from swallowing hook, line, and sinker some of the cure-alls offered today?

Again and again (and again) we have presented to us new ideas, those which are hoary with age. All too often these ideas are snapped up by the populace under the impression that they are original with the advocate.

In many cases knowledge of history would show that these ideas have been advanced often before and have a long history of failure.

Examples of such ideas which have been swallowed whole under the impression that they were original brain children of their advocates are numerous—too numerous to mention more than a few.

Almost every country has recently devalued its currency. We did it in 1933 and called it "revaluing the price of gold," thereby making it seem as if it affected only a few wealthy persons; no mention was made that it would inevitably raise all costs so that it partially confiscated all savings, life insurance, etc.

Is this a new idea? Far from it. About 600 years before Christ, Solon devalued the Athenian drachma by almost exactly the same percent as Britain recently devalued the pound, and if the British do not have happier results than the Athenians did they are going to be very much disappointed.

Devaluation was resorted to over and over again in Rome during the Republic, again under Nero, again under Aurelius, again under Commodus and again under Severus. Always more and more inflation, and each time followed by sky-rocketing prices until finally Diocletian attempted in A. D. 301 to stabilize the currency but it was too late.

In Britain today, we find a war-weary nation, victorious in war but economically crushed, placing its hope in the nationalization of industry, many naively believing that this is an original thought of the labor government now in power. Is it new? Let me quote from Will Durant's interesting history of Rome entitled "Caesar and Christ." I think you will agree it has a modern ring. He is speaking of the time of Diocletian about A. D. 300:

"Diocletian, in his new deal, brought many branches of industry under complete state control beginning with the import of grain; he persuaded the shipowners, merchants, and crew engaged in this trade to accept such control in return for government guaranties of security in employment and returns.

"The state had long since owned most of the quarries, salt deposits, and mines. It went on to control establishments producing for the army, the bureaucracy, or the court. In munition factories, textile mills, and bakeries the government required a minimum product, bought this at its own price and made the associations of manufacturers responsible for carrying out orders and specifications. If this procedure proved inadequate it completely nationalized these factories. Gradually the majority of industrial establishments were brought under the control of the corporate state.

"Such a system could not work without price control. In 301 Diocletian and his colleagues issued an edict fixing prices and wages.

"He fixed the price at which 700 or more articles could be sold and he fixed the wages of many different kinds of labor including the carpenter, the painter, the writer, the teacher, the advocate or counsel for presenting a case, and he even fixed the price to be paid to baby-sitters.

"The weakness of this managed economy lay in its administrative cost. To support the bureaucracy, the court, the army, the building program, and the dole, taxation rose to unprecedented heights."

But why go on except to say that the whole effort ended in miserable failure so that Rome collapsed under Diocletian's successor. The voters of Britain might think twice before going further in this direction if they realized that nationalization is no bright new idea.

Example after example of old notions now pulled out of the hat in this country and offered as new could be given, so let us take but one more—one which today is the matter of extreme concern to us: communism.

It is foolish merely to denounce communism with such expressions as "I don't see how anyone can be a Communist," or to imagine that all Communists are sodden, bushy-haired clouts or ape men.

Unfortunately it appeals to hundreds of millions of people, even including a surprising number in our own country. The vast majority of these are sincere idealists. Make no mistake.

Its leaders may be in it for personal power and wealth but it must be supported by followers who believe in it.

To many of these communism is offered as a new solution (at least no older than Marx) and this claim is accepted at face value. But this is far from true. Its general principles were considered long ago and even old Aristophanes poked fun at them 2,300 years ago in his hit play Ecclesiazusae. In this play a lady Communist says:

"I want all to have a share of everything and all property to be common; there will no longer will be either rich or poor; no longer shall we see one man harvesting vast tracts of land while another has not ground to be buried in; I intend that there shall be only one and the same condition of life for all; I shall begin by making land, money, everything that is private property common to all.

"But who shall do all the work?" asks Blepyrus, another character in the play.

"Oh," says Praxagora, "we shall have to have slaves."

Twenty-three hundred years ago this was written; so you see our student of Greek culture will not be taken in by any illusion that communism is something that has just been pulled out of the hat.

Time and patience limit me from giving example after example of how training in the so-called "useless" field of classic history would make our students sophisticated in the good sense of the word. I suggest that such learning would give our children the opportunity of leaving school with the vigor of youth and the vicarious experience of the ages, whereas most of our present training tends to turn them out with competence in a trade but with the innocence of babes. And why shouldn't they be innocent? All their lives have been spent in learning plastics or electronics or air-conditioning or salesmanship, or what not, and if perchance they have been given a year or so in English it is carefully explained that this will enable them to make a sales talk or write a letter to a customer.

I have recently been informed that there are 1,726 of the 2,500 high schools and many colleges and universities in the United States who are using textbooks infiltrated with un-American propaganda, presumably written by Socialists or Communists for the purpose of indoctrinating millions upon millions of our young people in socialism and communism, another one of many tricks of the Russians to destroy the American way of life.

This should alarm us to another need for a greater study of ancient history, and I suggest that professors, teachers, school board members, and parents make every effort to protect our young people.

The defense of our country demands that our citizens have more than competence in a trade in order that they and their leaders make wise decisions on the problems now before us. We have paid and are paying heavily for this lack of capable leadership.

If ever we needed an informed citizenry and leadership, it is today. It is a trite remark that the United States has a way of winning wars but losing the peace. If we are to play a prominent role as a world power, the only strong power adhering to a democracy, we desperately need to be prepared to understand not only ourselves but other people as well.

We can no longer afford the luxury of unsophisticated leadership and an unenlightened citizenry, and I believe the best way to secure this is through liberalizing our education by the study of ancient history.

Do not mistake me. I certainly do not mean that training in engineering, law or medicine has no technical content, but I do contend that space should be found for the liberal subjects which alone can make a man at home in all places and in all ages.

I believe the man with a mind trained and familiar with all the foreign ideologies and isms, including communism, will for that very reason the more firmly hold to our system, and moreover, have a reason for the faith that is in him. In fact, I think this is far more effective, at least at the college level, than all the special courses in why I am an American, which are so often proposed.

These all too often amount to nothing more than the shameless boasting of our material wealth.

We need to emphasize the things that make people great instead of the things that make them merely comfortable.

And now in closing:

May I remind you that few, if any, civilizations have fallen from outside attack. The downfall of nations, particularly the Roman Republic, was the fact that they changed from a frugal, efficient government to an inefficient and lavish government with subsidies, doles, and other socialistic plans, thus creating bureaucracies and dictatorships with resulting confiscatory taxations.

America today is facing difficult times, because there is the possible danger that we, too, might join the long list of fallen nations. Only Americans can save America. And we cannot stop the trend without vision.

We have already discovered that we do not receive vision by inspiration. But it is not too late to discover that vision is the product of information and thought, and make no mistake, we must have vision. For it is as true today as when Solomon said it.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." Thank you. And God save America.

The RFC Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from yesterday's Washington Star entitled "The Dollars Would Pour In." It relates to the investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation being conducted by the subcommittee of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is the chairman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOLLARS WOULD POUR IN

The RFC investigation by Senator FULBRIGHT's committee is now scheduled to end on April 30. But there is only one date on which this investigation properly can be brought to a close. And that is the date on which the committee finds there are no more stones left unturned.

The committee began its work in February of 1950. Its investigation has been conducted with a relatively small staff. It received an original authorization from the Senate to spend up to $50,000. Last summer it received $35,000 more. Last January Senator FULBRIGHT requested a final $20,000. Senator MCKELLAR was doubtful. Senator FULBRIGHT explained: "We ask only for an extension to April 30. I can absolutely assure the Senator that I will not ask for any further extension of money beyond that date." Senator MCKELLAR replied: "With that assurance I withdraw my objection."

Senator FULBRIGHT, therefore, may be foreclosed from making another request for funds from the Senate. He might, it is true, apply to the RFC. In the circumstances that might be of doubtful propriety. But if he needs any more money, the Star suggests that he appeal to the American people to supply it by voluntary gifts.

The results of such an appeal would be overwhelming. The money would roll in from citizens of high and low degree. For this investigation has revealed a condition in Washington that reflects on the integrity of our Government. And one of the most important things that this or any other congressional committee can do is to keep probing without let-up until every sinister area thus exposed has been explored to its roots. If there is the slightest suggestion that the committee is ending its work before the task it undertook has been completed, the people will resent it.

We talk a great deal in this country about our high moral principles. But when we compare these lofty ideals, that we are spending the lives of young men and our substance to preserve, with the sleazy moral standards of people in high places in Washington, the disillusionment of the people is bitter and their loss of confidence can be dangerous. A good many people are bewailing this loss of confidence now.

But one looks in vain for any sign of righteous indignation by the President, ordinarily associated with high standards of public morality, any expression of which from him would go far to restore confidence. All they find there is loyalty to his friends. The President, it is true, does not turn his back on them. But he seems to have come very close to turning his back on the rest of us.

If Senator FULBRIGHT's committee needs more money, all he has to do is to ask for it.

How Sick Was President Roosevelt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Vice Admiral (retired) Ross T McIntire, addressed to the Washington Evening Star, and printed in the last Saturday edition of that newspaper under the headline "How sick was President Roosevelt?"

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW SICK WAS PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT?

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The leading editorial in the Star of March 6 gives me cause for considerable concern. The statement that President Roosevelt was a dying man in the summer of 1944 is not new to me, as it has been made time and again by certain columnists and writers seeking the sensational. To have this charge appear in the Star is something else. I have ignored the attacks and statements that have been made by irresponsible people. But when a publication as responsible as yours makes the statements that I find in your editorial, I feel that I must, in justice to the excellent doctors who worked with me and whose reputations cannot be challenged, bring to your attention a few facts surrounding my statements that appeared in the press throughout the year 1944.

The statements that were given were the result of careful examinations and evaluation of the findings made by the doctors who worked with me. As far as President Roosevelt himself was concerned, he had a clear understanding of his own physical condition at all times. To say that he deliberately practiced calculated deception in this regard is completely false. If this is an accusation against me, then I take it as one against all the doctors who worked with me. I do not believe that the Star cares to make such a statement.

As far as the year 1944 is concerned, we had a very difficult 2 months in February and March. April saw great improvement, and by early summer all signs of the President's recent illness had completely cleared. Anyone who was with us on the Pacific cruise, and had the opportunity to see the tremendous activity carried out by President Roosevelt in Hawaii, would bear me out in my statement. During our 3-day stay in Honolulu the President covered all military installations, including the military and naval hospitals. He spent hours going through the wards, visiting thousands of wounded in these hospitals. He carried out long and exhaustive conferences with General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz. His stay in the Aleutians was equally strenuous.

One comment on his campaign trips: It is noted in your editorial that the New York trip was used as an argument that the President's health was excellent. I did not consider this trip in the rain of any great significance, as the President was accustomed to exposure in all sorts of weather and climate. The fact that he took it in his stride was no more than I expected. The entire campaign was strenuous and demonstrated his return to good physical performance. It should be remembered that he took part in the Quebec conference in October with Mr. Churchill, working on a schedule that carried them through the day and far into every night.

I am sorry Mr. Farley felt that he must write as he did in his letter to the New York Times. It could not have been his personal observation that the President was a dying man. Mr. Farley and the President saw nothing of each other for a period of several years, for reasons well known to all.

The consensus of the doctors regarding President Roosevelt's condition and his future was that if he would live within his physical reserve, it was believed he could carry on the strenuous and exacting work of the Presidency.

During the summer and fall of 1944, I had very little complaint to make regarding his daily conduct. While he did a tremendous amount of work, he was able to take moderate exercise and secure the needed rest.

Following the election, with the rapidly approaching victorious end of the war, and the United Natons project always before him, the President labored strenuously and partially neglected his own well-being. By inauguration time, fatigue was again becoming a real problem. The period around inauguration demanded a great deal of him, due to certain social obligations as well as the framing of his inaugural address.

He left immediately for the Yalta Conference; the long sea trip to the island of Malta did much to provide the rest he needed. But the Yalta Conference called for a great output of energy over a period of 8 days, during which he was constantly in conferences with Mr. Churchill and Premier Stalin. This conference, too, involved day and night sessions, together with the needed work with his own staff. Even so, at the end of these talks he was able to fly to Egypt where he received the King of Egypt, the King of Abyssinia, and the King of Saudi Arabia. In all the days I saw President Roosevelt in action, I cannot remember one where he was more alert than during the days of these conferences.

The long trip home was marred by the death of General Watson, his military aide, which saddened him greatly. He continued to work on the Yalta report to be presented to the Congress. Following his return he went through strenuous days picking up the events that were necessary for his congressional report, at the same time putting the finishing touches on preparations for the United Nations Assembly to be held on April 21.

In this period the President was unfortunate enough to pick up a virus infection which destroyed his appetite and lowered his physical condition. It was because of this that he went to Warm Springs to regain his strength, so that he might carry out his plans to address the United Nations Assembly.

At the same time, Admiral Wilson Brown and I were working out a schedule for his trip to the Far East, where he planned to visit General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz again, and review plans for the closing phases of the war. In addition to this, plans were being made for him to visit England in June. It is apparent that at the time of his death the President was planning for the future, with no thought of impending disaster.

I hope this letter will clarify again for your readers the true facts in this unfortunate controversy.

ROSS T MCINTIRE,
Vice Admiral (M. C.) United States Navy, Retired.

Western World Is Pacifist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson on the theme that the western world is pacifist. I hope most earnestly that our diplomats, statesmen, politicians, military leaders, and citizens generally will give heed to what Miss Thompson has said, lest we aspire to be the leader of the leaderless. Military strategy not supported by the people must end in disaster to everyone.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN WORLD IS PACIFIST—PROFOUND DISTRUST OF FOREIGN POLICY SHOWN BY PEOPLE OF UNITED STATES AND EUROPE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The governments of the United States and Europe need to be more aware than they apparently are that the present foreign policy has very little popular support, and that without popular support no defense effort on the scale envisioned can be successfully maintained. This hiatus between government policy and the instinct of the people is at present more dangerous to democracy than communism.

Every Gallup poll thus far shows that an overwhelming majority of the American people believe that the Korean War was a mistake, that the UN forces never should have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, and that we should try for a truce at that line. Five to one oppose a war with China, believing such a war would only serve Russia's interests, and a majority believe we should try harder than we have done to reach an agreement with China.

What has been called "the science of engineering consent"—and the practice of this science is by no means confined to totalitarian states—is not functioning, according to plan, in either the United States or Western Europe. Communism is on the wane in all countries, but the decline is not accompanied by a rise of confidence in existing anti-Communist governments.

With very few exceptions, not a European government can claim more than a precarious margin of popular support. Nor, in my opinion, can our own. There is no Churchill, or Roosevelt, to rally the British or American people into enthusiastic unity and trustfulness. And this is not merely due, I think, to the absence of dynamic personalities. Neither Roosevelt nor Churchill, or other personalities as dynamic, could, I believe, do it again—and I seriously doubt whether Stalin could.

The western world, at least, as a result of World War II, is profoundly and instinctively pacifist. And the people of this world are not convinced that the American policy of peace by the threat of overwhelming force, and postponement of serious attempts at a settlement until such force exists, is the road to peace. Although an immense selling campaign has been put on for this policy, it has not been sold.

I recently had an opportunity to test this. The Town Hall of the Air staged a debate on the issue Roads to Peace in 1951. Of the three participating speakers, this columnist alone strongly criticized the Government's peace theories. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo naturally (and ably) upheld the United Nations' view; William C. Foster, an official of the ECA, naturally (and ably) defended our Government's policy. But the mail that has come in to the Town Hall has been almost unaimously in favor of the viewpoint I expressed—that our Government is not sincerely, intelligently, and energetically trying to reach a settlement which would protect all alike, but is making political action subservient to military strategy, and that this is highly dangerous to peace.

Now, I do not believe that radio audiences are converted to a viewpoint by any speaker, and especially not in a program of compact brevity, but only react favorably to the articulation of views they already hold or against views they have already rejected. And I do not believe that the profound distrust of present policy, both here and in Europe, can be overcome by any amount of exhortative propaganda. In propaganda a law of diminishing returns also operates.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a telegram from Mr. Curtis Hatch, president of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, and the text of an editorial from the Spooner (Wis.) Advocate as reprinted from the Eau Claire (Wis.) Leader, both of which heartily endorse prompt action on Great Lakes waterway legislation. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection the article and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *February 23, 1951.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator:

The Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation is very keenly interested in the proposed plan for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway. Our policy of long standing has been in support of this project for its great potential benefits to midwestern agriculture and industry, its value from a defense standpoint makes it doubly important at the present time.

CURTIS HATCH,
President, Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation.

[From the Spooner (Wis.) Advocate of February 22, 1951]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, who for many years has been an ardent advocate of a St. Lawrence waterway to open the Great Lakes to ocean shipping, is still carrying on a determined fight. This time he may succeed.

Senator WILEY has introduced a resolution authorizing immediate start on construction. The resolution has 23 co-sponsors, Republican and Democrat.

Chances for congressional approval are brightest in the project's long history.

President Truman has given the proposed seaway strong endorsement as a defense project. Sponsors say it would assure the United States of an adequate iron ore supply during the national emergency and provide additional electric power for defense. Senator TAFT has given strong endorsement.

The plan provides for tolls to pay off the original cost, estimated at $800,000,000 in 50 years.

It is about time Congress recognized the needs of the midwest and the benefits to accrue to the Nation through opening up a channel for ocean ships into the Great Lakes. Opposition in the past has centered in transportation groups and eastern and southern port authorities who fear a loss in revenue. Such opposition should not be permitted to block a move in the public interest.—Eau Claire Leader.

Price Control Is Not Working

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the price-control program cannot be made to work so long as farm products are exempted from control until they increase in price to a point above the minimum fixed in the Defense Production Act of 1950. Wage earners whose salaries are less than is needed to purchase a reasonable amount of food do not have their wages exempted from wage controls, although they certainly have as much right to an exemption as have producers of food. Naturally, our labor leaders are disgusted and worried. How can they support a wage freeze when the most important item in the family budget is exempt from control? The whole price-control program is becoming a ghastly and cynical farce. It is a danger to the economy of this Nation. Even authority to greatly increase bank reserves was left out of the 1950 act, and this fact is partly responsible for the controversy raging over the need to prevent further monetization of the public debt.

Under the circumstances, it is heartening to see some groups voluntarily offer to forsake their special privileges. The powerful farm organizations which have obtained Government subsidies are apparently beginning to question the value of subsidies which inevitably are accompanied by Government controls. Important food merchants are beginning to question the wisdom of the present exemption of food from price controls. Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an interesting newspaper article by Joseph Alvarez and also a copy of a telegram to the President from the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.:

BUTTER-AND-EGG MAN URGES PRICE CEILINGS ON EVERY FOOD PRODUCT

(By Joseph Alvarez)

Alfred Rich, business manager of the Butter and Egg Merchants Association, today called upon President Truman to demand a revision of the Defense Production Act to permit the imposition of ceilings on farm commodities now selling below parity.

The change, said Mr. Rich, would stretch price controls to every food and farm product.

The request was made in a telegram and incorporated into a special bulletin sent to the association's 250 wholesale food dealers.

SEVENTY ITEMS EXEMPT

Under the present law, which Mr. Rich charged, "is written solely to fatten the bank accounts of farmers," about 70 important food items are exempt from controls. Among these foods are eggs, butter, milk, wheat, corn, and potatoes.

"This is a wedge that ultimately will destroy all effective price ceilings since each unregulated commodity must necessarily unbalance the entire economic stabilization program," Mr. Rich asserted.

"Labor will not stand for a wage freeze when it sees that food, which constitutes about 25 percent of the cost of living, keeps right on climbing."

CITES OVERPRODUCTION

Expressing great disappointment with the Government's freeze order, Mr. Rich declared that President Truman should not have permitted the imposition of controls under the inequitable Defense Act.

"He should have recommended a change in the law to bring farm prices selling below parity under control.

"During the past several years," Mr. Rich continued, "the powerful farm bloc succeeded in obtaining support on all basic farm products at 90 percent of parity and nonbasic commodities at 60 to 90 percent of parity.

"Production was tremendous at these support levels, resulting in large surpluses. So great were these surpluses that it became necessary to curtail production through acreage allotments. Price supports on potatoes, poultry, and eggs, at 60 to 75 percent of parity were discontinued this year due to overproduction."

FARMER PROFITED

Mr. Rich added: "It is reasonable to assume that the support levels were high enough to return a good profit to the farmer, otherwise they would not have overproduced.

"This," he said, "is one reason why controls on farm products should be imposed below parity."

Mr. Rich asserted the farm bloc was instrumental in changes in the method of figuring parity that jumped butterfat from 63.1 cents a pound to 69 cents; cattle from $13 a hundredweight to $16.90; wool from 43.9 cents a pound to 50 cents a pound; and milk from $3.84 a hundredweight to $4.21. In a quart price to the milk consumer, this is a jump of 1 cent.

Mr. Rich, an economist and market analyst, blasted parity as the bunk. (Parity is the formula that expresses a relationship between what farmers must pay for commodities and what they are paid for their crops.)

"A most important factor has been omitted in computing parity, which if included would adversely affect the farmer. It is the element that has enriched the farmer at the expense of consumer," said Mr. Rich.

"We refer to the incredible rise in the rate of production.

"For example," he said, "the yield per acre of potatoes increased from 107.8 bushels in 1914 to 237.9 in 1950. Egg production per hen per year increased from 135 in 1940 to 163 in 1948. Pounds of milk per cow per year went up from 5,780 in 1940 to 6,450 in 1949.

"These production boosts greatly lower the unit cost of production, yet this factor is completely ignored in the parity index," Mr. Rich said.

"In view of the present emergency which entails large expenditures of public funds, heavy taxes, and sacrifices on everyone's part, no favoritism should be shown."

MARCH 6, 1951.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Key West, Fla.:

Today, an awakened public opinion among men and women in all walks of life gives you the opportunity and support needed to carry through a program that will stop inflation, keep down costs, enormously strengthen our defense efforts, and give us for the future a dollar of constant value and a stable level of average prices, thereby strengthening economic freedom.

Congressman JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in the Eightieth Congress and now ranking minority member, in a recent spotlight statement points out that, through the Bretton Woods Agreement, the currencies of all major countries except Russia are tied to the American dollar, and that, therefore, further shrinkage in the value of our dollar must immediately reflect itself in the value of currencies throughout the world.

Experience shows that no stabilization formula can be found that will do justice to all groups if we allow inflation to proceed and living costs to rise. But the response of hundreds of thousands to our committee's direct-mail inquiry demonstrates that citizens in all walks of life can be rallied to support and keep permanently in effect a policy of pay-as-we-go, a balanced budget, and price stabilization.

In 1933, when President Roosevelt lifted the United States out of the depression, New York State agricultural leaders gave major guidance to the organized agriculture of the entire Nation. Now they are moving again to give organized and highly effective support to our Government in stopping inflation. The Northeast Farm Foundation, comprising 11 major State-wide farm organizations and cooperatives in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, now patriotically offer to give up all subsidies and special interest favors. Its March bulletin says:

"The New York State Farm Bureau Federation has wisely and courageously called for an end of Federal hand-outs to farmers, even of such things as lime, fertilizer, etc. These aid programs were put into effect when farming was in a severe depression. Now, however, the farmers of New York State feel that their enterprise can and should stand on its own feet. They believe that it is time to balance the national budget and ward the national economy for whatever may come. They believe that all groups should now put country ahead of self-interest, and they are prepared to back up this sentiment by example.

"Moreover, the farmers of this State, by and large, are firmly opposed to the controls which are the inevitable price of subsidies. The State Grange, the Dairymen's League, and other farm organizations have condemned subsidies and the Government controls that go with them.

"The State Conference Board of Farm Organizations, representing eight major State-wide organizations, has time and again expressed its firm stand against socialistic schemes and for free institutions, including free markets, free enterprise, and those basic individual freedoms which have made American farms and American life the best and most fruitful on this earth.

"Never have the farmers and their leaders been more solidly alined, shoulder to shoulder, on the major economic and social issues of the time than they are today in New York State.

"As we interpret this united voice, it stands for the very fundamentals that our forefathers stood for and fought for when they built this Nation. It is, in one word, the voice of freedom. It is the voice of patriotism.

"We think that the community at large will not underestimate the position of a united agriculture; not merely because it represents the stand of that important group who grow our food, but because, now, as in times gone by, it is the resolute core of resistance to socialism, despotism, and all other isms that menace the American way of life."

Only the 15 percent of our people included in pressure groups receiving direct payments from the Treasury or plowed on islands of special privilege have any chance of profiting from inflation; and many of these 15 percent groups will also suffer serious losses if inflation occurs.

But 85 out of every 100 persons entitled to vote stand to lose heavily if their dollar, worth 100 cents in 1941 and 60 cents now, shrinks during the years ahead to a 25-cent value. In the Nation, there are 76,000,000 life-insurance policyholders and more than 10,000,000 bank depositors. As our dollar becomes cheaper, the stored savings of these thrifty citizens fade. Most life-insurance beneficiaries are women. If they realize that inflation, rotting their money, destroys the protection their husbands have worked hard to provide, they will support sound money policies.

The millions owning Government bonds and the forty to fifty million citizens who have an investment in social security will, if made aware of the damage inflation does to their interests, give wholehearted support to whatever measures are needed to protect the value of our dollar.

John L. Lewis and other labor leaders have invested years of effort in building up insurance protection for members of their organizations. Inflation undermines these savings. Moreover, without a stable dollar, the rising cost of living will constantly encroach upon the workers' wage rates.

Insurance companies, financial institutions and other corporations having tens of billions in bank deposits, all stand to lose—all have vital interests in maintaining a stable price level. If leadership is given, they will stand ready to give whatever support is needed to stop inflation now.

If farmers can be assured that the dollar will have the same purchasing power a generation hence as today, the example and leadership of the Northeast Farm Foundation and the American Farm Bureau will spread throughout organized agriculture, for the farmer will know that he will be protected against such disastrous deflation as occurred between 1929 and 1932. This patriotic stand of farm groups willing to abandon Federal handouts will save the Treasury large amounts and set a pattern for reducing nonessential Federal expenditures, saving possibly seven billions annually and making it easier to balance the budget.

Past experience has demonstrated the futility of trying to hold the price line if monetary and fiscal policies are allowed to create continuing inflation. Today there is better understanding than ever before of the dangers of inflation and just what steps are necessary to prevent it. Government and citizens alike have now the best chance in decades to establish permanently a sound fiscal policy. But top-level leadership in Washington, and a Nation-wide campaign of education are needed to establish in public opinion once for all, such an understanding of the problem that 85 percent of the citizens in every district will support their representatives in doing whatever is necessary to stabilize the dollar's purchasing power.

Our Constitution gave freedom and released the creative powers of men as never before in any society. It provided that Congress should establish units of measurement—the pound, the yard, the gallon, and "coin money and regulate the value thereof." It also permitted man freely to make voluntary contracts in terms of these units, and the Government itself undertook the task of enforcing such contracts.

What would happen if, without rhyme or reason, the foot were to shrink to 6 inches; the gallon from 4 to 2 quarts; and the yard from 36 to 18 inches—just what happened to the value of our dollar during the last decade?

Lenin and the Communist revolutionaries well knew that inflation, disrupting the monetary mechanism for the exchange of goods and services, prepares the ground to break down the free enterprise system and to open the way for collectivism. He said, in substance: "We will print so much money and so many bonds that the capitalists will choke on them."

In the interest of the defense effort, of maximum production, and of the preservation of our system of free enterprise, we must stop inflation here and now, and establish for the future a dollar of constant purchasing power.

Our committee has carefully explored this problem. Our chairman, Dr. Willford I. King, has on record with the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, statements setting forth the mechanism for attaining price stability. Various organizations and many other outstanding leaders in economic thinking and public policy have discussed the same problem.

If, in this emergency, our Washington leaders will move immediately and with determination to stop inflation at once and to give us a stable dollar for the future, many of the serious problems besetting us will disappear, and the overwhelming majority of our citizens will rally to their support.

To establish a dollar of stable purchasing power will, historically, be a contribution comparable in importance to that of Julius Caesar and Pope Gregory the Great, when they standardized the calendar.

The foregoing program, if adopted, will strengthen the defense effort and unite our people. Our Committee pledges its utmost effort to carry across the Nation understanding of this program and to rally all groups in its support.

SUMNER GERARD,
Trustee, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

Administration Morals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of March 12, 1951:

ADMINISTRATION MORALS

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, who once openly called for President Truman to resign, now is convinced that Congress should undertake an investigation of the general moral level of the Truman administration. He is led to that conviction as a result of the evidence of influence and favoritism disclosed in his own inquiry into the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"I have never heard so much lying in my life," the Senator asserted, in calling on the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to launch a full-scale inquiry into moral corruption. He plans to finish up his own subcommittee's RFC study this week because he doesn't want to spend the rest of my life on this cockeyed thing.

The RFC disclosures to date provide a startling parallel with the revelations of another Senate committee last year which delved into the 5 percenters. That was the inquiry which brought to light White House intimate John Maragon's smelly bottle of perfume and White House aide Gen. Harry H. Vaughan's freewheeling deep freezers. In the present instance it is Donald Dawson, the White House patronage aide, who is involved in accusations of influencing RFC loans, some of which had juicy fees for the arrangers.

Similarly, the Fulbright committee has blazed a trail to the White House which somewhat parallels that blazed by the Kefauver committee in disclosures of racketeering and gambling on a national scale. Close alliances between the racketeers and some of the State and city political machines on which the White House depends for support have at least been indicated in the Kefauver public hearings.

More pertinent, perhaps, have been the revelations by both committees that the United States Treasury Department, under White House domination, has exhibited a peculiarly tender attitude toward the income tax returns of persons involved in both the RFC mess and the gambling syndicates.

All of these inquiries, going back to Senator CLYDE R. HOEY's 5 percenter investigation, have been in the hands of Democratic Senators, it is interesting to note. How much further they would have been pursued under Republican leadership it is only possible to conjecture.

But Senator FULBRIGHT at least is convinced that something definitely is wrong with an administration that permitted the mess in the RFC to get out of hand. On the basis of this single segment of administrative ineptitude he now calls for a thoroughgoing inquiry into the moral structure of the executive branch. It remains to be seen whether his Democratic colleagues will take up the challenge in an effort to get to the bottom of the unsavory situation.

The Need of National Representation for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for Mr. Jesse C. Suter, a newspaperman with the Washington Star, who, I believe, knows more about the District of Columbia than any other living man. He has made such a thorough study of all matters concerning the District of Columbia and has such a sincere desire to be of service to his fellow man here that I think his views on the so-called home-rule bill should be given very careful and serious consideration.

If the citizens of the District of Columbia want to really have a say in their government, national representation will afford them this opportunity, whereas the so-called home-rule bills utterly fail in this respect.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include several items beginning with Mr. Suter's column of February 18 entitled "Need United Effort To Americanize Washingtonians." I also wish to include editorials and additional articles which have the following titles: "Mr. West and Home Rule"; "Senator MONRONEY's Fish Story"; "How May Uncle Sam's Face Be Saved?"; and "S. 656 Criticized Constructively":

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 18, 1951]

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—A COMMON GROUND FOR UNITED ACTION

(By Jesse C. Suter)

NEED UNITED EFFORT TO AMERICANIZE WASHINGTONIANS

In the long fight by the voteless and unrepresented Americans of the District of Columbia for an enabling amendment to the Constitution of the United States under which the Congress would be empowered to grant these people voting representation in the House, Senate, and electoral college, there have on a number of occasions cropped out legislative proposals for an elective local government. These proposals have been due in a large measure to impatient ones who seek a short cut for obtaining some kind of suffrage in the District.

Invariably the supporters of such proposals declare their belief in and their support of proposed constitutional amendments for national representation, but insist that the process of obtaining amendments requires too much time.

That the greater number of the citizens of the District of Columbia, either as individuals or as members of organizations, favor national representation has been demonstrated clearly on a number of occasions. Analyses of the situation show that there are organizations and many individuals who support the proposal to give District of Columbia people an effective participation in the National Government but at the same time are very much opposed to the setting up of an elective local government.

There are others who are ardent advocates of national representation who would favor the creation of an elective local government after the acquisition of American citizenship on the national level. Some unqualifiedly favor both national representation and suffrage for local offices. Some of these insist that a vote in local affairs should be acquired first, leaving national representation for a later period.

And then there are encountered those who declare their opposition to the granting of any kind of a vote to the people of the District. It has been found in the unofficial referenda that the opposition to the election of local officers is far greater in numbers than to the election of Senators, Representatives, and Presidential electors. Of course, this analysis does not include people who seem utterly indifferent as to participation in government, local or national.

It has been repeatedly charged by workers for local suffrage, miscalled home rule, that those who advocate only national representation are insincere and support the national only as a means of defeating the local. A most interesting development of this idea was included in a very able statement of the late Henry H. Glassie, a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, in the course of the hearing on House Joint Resolution 18 for national representation, before the House Committee on the Judiciary, in the first session of the Seventieth Congress, in 1928. The following is quoted from Mr. Glassie's statement as reported on page 72 of that hearing:

"One principal ground or suggestion in the way of opposition is that we are not quite open, and that we stultify these American principles by not claiming the right of local self-government; that we come into court, so to speak, weakened by not claiming that right.

"Now, if the gentlemen of the committee please, coming from words to facts, what was the claim of the Americans to full participation in the Government before the Revolution? Participation in local government? Not at all. They had that. It was participation in that sovereign imperial parliament which made the law.

"We have been reproached with the idea that we do not want local government and therefore do not want self-government. But mark the distinction. Local government may be a mere matter of municipal administration. But what self-government means is that the people who are to obey the laws shall have a share in the making of the laws. You (the Congress) make the law. Under the constitutional provision you will always make the law. Under the principle that the Federal Government shall be supreme, you must continue to make the law.

"Therefore, when we come to you humbly, and say, 'Admit us to participation; admit us to your councils in the making of this law,' we are asking for local self-government.

"True it is that we do not ask that we shall appoint the dog catcher. True it is that we do not ask that we shall elect the school board. True it is that we do not ask at this time, coming as a united body, for any of those usual municipal functions as to which it is still a question, after 100 years of self-government, whether they are better done by a vote or by a city manager or by a commission.

"So I say to you gentlemen, with profound deference, that these things, first from one side and then from the other, which are continually thrown against us, will hardly bear scrutiny. We do want self-government, and the essence of self-government is the right to send a man from your community into your legislative representative body which can send you to war, tax your property, do what it pleases with your will, control your domestic relations, your relations to your family, your wife and children, and do all those things which make a government, a government touching intimately the life, as the learned gentleman suggested—and I thank him for the suggestion—which touch intimately the life of the community. Those are the things that are dearest to you, and those are the things which, in your respective States, you insist upon having, and which you will never surrender."

American citizenship as possessed by the citizens of the States of the Union is shown by Mr. Glassie to touch far more intimately the life of the citizen than the mere participation in a local municipal government.

The numerous attempts to acquire elective participation in the government of the District of Columbia, though sought as legislative short cuts, have all failed. At the same time, the mounting obligations imposed upon all American citizens by the National Government have increased to such an alarming extent that the need for participation in the Government of the United States has increased materially.

The community is confronted by a problem of highest importance, and that is to bring about a practical union of the forces for obtaining the amendment to the Constitution for national representation. It must be conceded that many improvements may be desirable in the form and operation of the local government. Surely, with our own representation in the two branches of Congress and the possession of the right to vote for the President of the United States, the people of the District of Columbia would find themselves in a far better position to gain any improvements in the local government they desire.

A combined effort applied intelligently and persistently by all of those who favor the Americanization of the people of the District of Columbia would prove to be an irresistible force for putting through the proposed amendment to the Constitution and its ratification by the States.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 22, 1951]

MR. WEST AND HOME RULE

In the current hearings on home rule Corporation Counsel Vernon E. West, testifying for the Commissioners, has rendered a valuable service to the people of Washington, and, one would think, for Senator NEELY and the members of his subcommittee.

But Mr. West got rapped over the knuckles by Mr. NEELY for his pains. He was accused of trying to defeat the bill. And how was he trying to defeat the bill? By examining its provisions in detail and suggesting that somebody ought to take a second look at some of them; by pointing out contradictions, inconsistencies and one or two passages of gobbledygook that even a lawyer cannot understand. He also expressed warranted skepticism as to whether the people of the District, at least the owners of property, were not being sold down the river in such important fields as zoning regulation.

Had Mr. West taken a leaf from the productive political experience of his soon-to-be-boss, F. Joseph Donohue, he would not have used this approach. He would have given three cheers for home, mother, and the American flag, endorsed home rule by uttering irrelevant generalities concerning the right to vote and acknowledged the plaudits of Senator NEELY and assembled guests.

But Mr. West happens to belong to a possibly vanishing school of public servants who believe that their official testimony on pending legislation should be directed to perfecting it, and who are willing to leave the policy of enactment to the legislators. That is what he did, and he did it very well.

The Star happens to agree with Mr. West that the bill raises a serious question of constitutionality which may not be answered finally for many years, and that in the meantime such routine transactions as the execution of real-estate deeds, should this bill be enacted as it is, would be thrown into confusion. The Star also agrees with Mr. West that the powers of a city council to put the city in debt for as much as $62,000,000, while placing the burden of debt repayment only on real estate and tangible personal property, is a threat to everybody who owns Washington property. And when this situation is coupled with voting rights for everybody who lives in Washington for a year, without affecting his voting status as a resident of a State, the hazards of the local property owner, who claims only Washington as his place of residence, are even more manifest.

There are many other criticisms of the bill with which anybody who reads Mr. West's careful analysis should agree. For there is nothing frivolous or picayunish in what he had to say. But this is the identical bill that passed the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress, without discussion on the floor, and the same procedure may be followed this term. When Mr. Donohue is confirmed and sworn in, he may want to read the bill. It would be part of his job as Commissioner to read it. If he then suggests that it be changed, he will be criticized for trying to save his job by working to defeat home rule. Perhaps he can take that sort of buncombe without batting an eye. If he wants to be a Commissioner, he should learn to take it now.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 24, 1951]

SENATOR MONRONEY'S FISH STORY

One argument for home rule is based on the theory that Congress devotes too much time to the trivia of local legislation. This may be true. There are practical and unutilized methods of reducing the time thus spent which have nothing to do with home rule.

But when such an outstanding Member of Congress as Senator MONRONEY libels the succulent rockfish of our own Potomac River as a waster of golden congressional hours, the time has come to protest. A number of fish stories about home rule have been told to Senator NEELY in the past few days, but here is the specific whopper that Mr. MONRONEY told:

"One of the examples that I think points this up most clearly was 2 or 3 years ago when we had the question of the British loan. Some billions of dollars was involved therein, and high international policy. We had to quit in the middle of that loan so that we could spend a whole afternoon discussing whether rockfish of 10 or 12 inches long could be sold in the District, and we spent the whole afternoon on the subject of rockfish."

Now, Mr. MONRONEY. The rockfish bill, amending a statute of 1901, and changing from 10 to 11 inches the minimum length of rockfish legally sold in Washington, was passed by the House on Monday, September 24, 1945. That was a District day. There are two such days set aside each month for the disposal of local legislation, if there is any, and if nothing else of importance is pending.

Jennings Randolph, then chairman of the House District Committee, looking around at the empty seats which are a distinguishing feature of District day, announced that there was some local legislation but that two distinguished Members wished to speak on matters of national importance. So, he said, he would yield part of his time to them in the hope that more Members would stick around and listen.

He brought up the rockfish bill and immediately yielded to Mr. MAY, of Kentucky, who made a speech about demobilization centers. He then yielded to Delegate ROMULO, who made a speech on Philippine-American trade relations. Mr. Randolph then answered two questions about the rockfish bill. It was passed without debate and without dissent. The whole business took less space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than the Chaplain had taken that morning in asking divine guidance for the House. From the House the fish bill went to the Senate, where it was passed without objection, and sent to the President, who signed it without recorded comment.

That same day the House disposed of a few more routine local bills without spending more than a few minutes on any of them. Most of the time was given over to debating a health program for Federal employees, which was not local legislation. As for the British loan, Mr. MONRONEY is possibly confused—but aren't we all? We do not lend money to the British or anybody else. We give it away.

Senator MCCARRAN, incidentally, has been trying for a year or more to get another rockfish bill enacted. That may be bad news for Mr. MONRONEY. It would prohibit the sale of oversize rockfish—laden with roe—in the District of Columbia, such sales now being prohibited in Maryland and Virginia. The commercial fishermen, who dump these forbidden fish on the District market, may object through their Representatives in Congress. But it is an important conservation measure and should be passed. The rockfish may be all gone by that time, however, like the sturgeon that once swam in the Potomac.

But the rockfish are not to be blamed. They did not hold up the British loan. Nor would home rule change the situation one way or another.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 25, 1951]

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—HOW MAY UNCLE SAM'S FACE BE SAVED?—S. 656 CRITICIZED CONSTRUCTIVELY

(By Jesse C. Suter)

EMBARRASSED BY OUR UN-AMERICANIZED CAPITAL

The complete and inconsistant lack of political status by citizens of the District of

Columbia is a frequent source of embarrassment to our legislators and diplomats. The United States, being committed to the fundamental doctrines of the United Nations Charter, is in a difficult position when the wide variation between our preaching and practice is noted. The Charter abounds in solicitude and promise of participation by all peoples in the governments of their respective countries. If they have not yet attained a condition for such participation, the promise is to prepare them for the ultimate enjoyment of such rights and privileges. The voteless and unrepresented Americans of the District see in such promises a bright ray of hope. Our country is now definitely committed to putting these high ideals into practice for all peoples.

Under such conditions, how can one explain why a large community of American citizens, exceeding in population each of 13 States and the combined population of 3 States, is denied the least vestige of participation in the government of their country? In dealing with other affiliated nations, there can be conceived no satisfactory explanation which would save Uncle Sam from a charge of gross inconsistency.

Some legislators would grant these people a limited participation in their local government and call it home rule. But such rule would continue to be under the autocratic control of the Congress, in which these people are without representation.

Such a grant of limited participation would fall far short of purging the Nation of gross inconsistency at its heart. The only way to save the face of Uncle Sam would be through a grant of national representation, which would involve the election of Senators and Representatives and Presidential electors from the District.

HOME-RULE BILL CRITICISMS AND CHANGES ARE DUE NOW

The Senate District Committee began hearings on the Kefauver District of Columbia home-rule bill, S. 656, on Tuesday morning. The bill is identical with S. 1527 of the Eighty-first Congress, which was passed by the Senate in 1949 but tabled in the House District Committee. The first session of the hearing was somewhat of a field day for advocates of the bill, some of whom indorsed it only in principle but did not say they had read it.

A discordant note was sounded in the views expressed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, presented by the corporation counsel. The Commissioners declared their belief in the principle of home rule for the District, but pointed out what they considered some defects in the proposed legislation.

Many ardent supporters in private conversation admit that there are numerous features of the bill which they do not approve. However, they insist that after the enactment of the bill, corrections may be made by subsequent legislation. Some of the more conservative regard this as a very uncertain method.

True home rule for the District of Columbia would of necessity include national representation. Hatton W. Sumners, then chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, in the course of explaining his proposed amendment to the Constitution for District national representation, in 1945, among other things, said:

"Thus far, I have discussed this matter solely from the standpoint of local government, because the Congress is the local government. * * * The Congress and the President are a part of the local government for the District of Columbia. Why these people should be denied the right thus to participate in the selection of these agents, if such participation on their part would not conflict with the Federal interests, and it would not, it is very difficult to understand.

"Looking to this matter from a national standpoint, these people are a part of the Nation's citizenship."

It is believed that the pending bill would provide only a very limited gesture toward home rule, which could be obtained only through the acquisition by the people of the District of the political status of American citizens through national representation.

SOME PERTINENT CRITICISMS

The chief criticisms which have been heard regarding the Kefauver bill are as follows:

1. That the qualifications for holding office as a member of the council lack requirement of District residence equivalent to that now required by law for civilian members of the Board of District Commissioners.

2. That the rate of compensation and expense account for the council are too high.

3. That the two appointed members of the council to represent the interests of the United States are unnecessary for the reason that the overriding authority of the Congress is a sufficient guaranty that the interests of the Nation will be amply guarded.

4. That the proposal to abolish the Board of Library Trustees, transferring its functions to an executive department under the District manager, is contrary to the best recognized library experience and practice.

5. That the qualifications for holding office as a member of the Board of Education do not require the selection of persons of long enough residence in the District to be proper representatives of the local community in directing the operations of the public-school system.

C. Serious criticism is raised against the qualifications of electors as provided in the bill, which would permit voters in the States to qualify as electors in the District. Such dual voters would thus possess the right of suffrage not only in their local, State, and National elections in their home States, but also in the local elections in the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED

The above criticisms could be overcome mostly by suitable amendments, as follows:

1. To provide in section 302 of the Kefauver bill the requirement that a candidate for membership on the council at the time of nomination shall have been an actual resident of the District of Columbia for 3 years next before such nomination, and have, during that period, claimed residence nowhere else. Such an amendment is needed as a substitute for clause (2) of the section. The qualification thus suggested follows existing law as to the two civilian Commissioners (District Organic Act of 1878).

2. As membership on the District council is not supposed to be a full-time job, it has been suggested that the compensation for members be reduced from $5,000, as carried in the bill, to $2,500, and that of the chairman to $5,000 instead of $7,500, and that the chairman's general expense account be reduced from $3,000 to $2,000 per annum. This would be a saving of $23,500 per year (based on a council of nine elected members).

3. The theory of two appointed Federal members of the District council to safeguard the interests of the United States is entirely erroneous and out of place in legislation purporting to establish even a limited form of home rule in a community which by the Constitution is completely under the control and domination of the Congress representing the Nation. Elimination of the salaries of the appointed members would make a further annual saving of $10,000 at the rate carried by the bill, or $5,000 at the suggested reduced rate.

4. To overcome the fourth criticism, it would be necessary to amend section 901 (a) by striking out the "Department of Libraries" from the list of executive departments named therein and in section 909 to strike out the "Department of Libraries" and transfer the entire section 909, with further amendments, to a new title XII—Board of Library Trustees, renumbering the section as 1201. The section now numbered 909, on page 57 of the bill, would be further amended by striking out the provision transferring to the proposed Director of the Department of Libraries the functions of the Board, also striking out the proposed abolishment of the office of the librarian. In place of the matter struck out, language should be inserted providing that the functions of the Board of Library Trustees and the librarian are hereby "continued, together with all powers and duties as provided under existing law."

A further amendment suggests a new subsection providing for the qualifications and appointment of members of the Board of Library Trustees. It should provide that such persons shall have been actual residents of the District of Columbia for not less than 3 years next before their nomination and have, during that period, claimed residence nowhere else. The trustees shall be nominated by the chairman of the council and be confirmed by majority vote of that body.

5. The qualifications for members of the Board of Education would be amended so as to require 5 years' residence in the District of Columbia immediately preceding their nomination for office. (Required under existing law.)

6. To rid the pending bill of the so-called dual voting provision, which proposes to qualify as electors persons possessing voting rights in other jurisdictions, two amendments appear to be necessary. Section 1206 (a) should be amended to read as follows:

"To be qualified to vote in the District, a person must be an actual resident of said District without voting rights in another jurisdiction." Strike out the last sentence of section 1206 from lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 82 of the bill, reading as follows: "A person who is otherwise qualified shall not be disqualified by being entitled to vote in another jurisdiction."

Other fair criticisms were in the Star editorial of February 22.

The only reasonable insurance of a fair and stable local government for the District of Columbia is to be found in the possession by the District people of their own elected Senators, Representatives, and electors of President and Vice President. The American Government rests upon this well-tested and proven foundation.

"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 25, 1951]

RIGHT TO VOTE FOR WHAT?

There has been a great hullabaloo about this Taft-Kefauver bill. There was a distinguished list of men and women testifying for home rule at the NEELY hearings. One can't help wondering how many of them had read the bill and realized how little was to be the reward for such effort.

The new commissioner, Mr. Donohue, is in favor of it. "Our American heritage," he says, "depends upon the privilege and exercise of the right to vote." To vote for nine councilmen and a seven-member board of education?

Mr. Donohue says he was in a bombardment group in England during the 1944 election. It was his responsibility to distribute absentee ballots to some 1,600 men under his command. He says he was impressed at that time that he, "as a soldier, was denied the right to vote." Does Mr. Donohue think that this home-rule bill would give him the right to vote in the 1952 election as a soldier or any other way? Pressed by Senator CASE, Mr. Donohue conceded he had not given detailed study to the bills.

That grand person, Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, Democratic National Committeewoman for the District, says: "All I have to say is that, of course, I'm for home rule. It's horribly embarrassing that the Capital City is so uncivilized and its citizens are not allowed to vote."

What connection does Mrs. Harriman have in her mind between home rule and the civilized American right to the ballot? Can she put such a high value on the purely municipal right to vote for a council and a board of education? After all, many of us vote for presidents of social and civil charitable organizations now.

Of course, it is humiliating that the people of the District are disfranchised and un-American. It is cruel and unjust that soldiers from the District cannot vote like soldiers from neighboring States. But the Taft-Kefauver bill will do nothing to remedy this injustice. Only District representation in Congress can do that.

The object of the home-rule bill would seem to be to divert the minds of the 500,000 potential voters of the District by offering them a shuffling of the local set-up. All decisions, of course, would remain subject to congressional approval. Washington taxpayers—men and women in Government and the military services—should read the bill—all 119 pages of it. They should not be satisfied to be made one-half a citizen.

NATIVE WASHINGTONIAN.

Cost of Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Interior Oscar L. Chapman has estimated the proposed central Arizona project, now before Congress, will cost the taxpayers of the Nation $2,075,729,000 in lost interest alone.

I believe Members of Congress will be interested to see how much of this tremendous additional tax burden the taxpayers of their own respective States must bear, should this legislation be passed.

A State-by-State tabulation follows:

State	State's percent of total [1]	Cost to taxpayers [2]
Alabama	1.17	$24,286,000
Arizona	.37	7,680,000
Arkansas	.72	14,945,000
California	8.32	172,701,000
Colorado	.80	16,606,000
Connecticut	1.67	34,665,000
Delaware	.40	8,305,000
Florida	1.29	26,777,000
Georgia	1.40	29,060,000
Idaho	.32	6,642,000
Illinois	7.59	157,548,000
Indiana	2.29	47,534,000
Iowa	1.58	$32,797,000
Kansas	1.15	23,871,000
Kentucky	1.20	24,909,000
Louisiana	1.22	25,324,000
Maine	.44	9,133,000
Maryland	1.68	34,872,000
Massachusetts	3.40	70,578,000
Michigan	4.71	97,767,000
Minnesota	1.86	38,609,000
Mississippi	.71	14,738,000
Missouri	2.53	52,516,000
Montana	.35	7,265,000
Nebraska	.86	17,851,000
Nevada	.13	2,698,000
New Hampshire	.29	6,020,000
New Jersey	3.29	68,291,000
New Mexico	.28	5,812,000
New York	14.67	304,509,000
North Carolina	1.59	33,004,000
North Dakota	.34	7,057,000
Ohio	5.78	119,977,000
Oklahoma	1.17	24,286,000
Oregon	1.04	21,586,000
Pennsylvania	7.62	158,171,000
Rhode Island	.56	11,624,000
South Carolina	.76	15,776,000
South Dakota	.36	7,473,000
Tennessee	1.37	28,438,000
Texas	4.38	90,917,000
Utah	.34	7,056,000
Vermont	.18	3,736,000
Virginia	1.49	30,928,000
Washington	1.65	34,250,000
West Virginia	.92	19,097,000
Wisconsin	2.10	43,590,000
Wyoming	.18	3,736,000
District of Columbia, Hawaii and Alaska	1.48	30,721,000
United States total	100.00	2,075,729,000

[1] Percentages of total tax burden that each State will bear were computed by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

[2] Cost to the Nation's taxpayers of $2,075,729,000 is an official estimate of Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior. It is based on the provisions of S. 75 (central Arizona project bill) and the following specified conditions: construction cost estimate of $705,780,000 made by the Bureau of Reclamation (S. Rept. No. 832, 81st Cong., 1st sess.); an interest rate of 2½ percent; an 8-year construction period; and a 75-year financing period. The Secretary's statement appears in his letter dated June 28, 1950, to J. Hardin Peterson, chairman of the House Public Lands Committee. The statement was approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

These figures prove that the central Arizona project will not be self-supporting, as claimed by its promoters. Actually, it will cost taxpayers of all the States billions. Spending this huge sum will not help the current national defense effort in any way. Instead, it would divert and use up manpower and large supplies of steel, cement, copper, and other critical materials.

Joint Statement of Gov. Allan Shivers, Attorney General Price Daniel, and Commissioner of the General Land Office Bascom Giles Concerning Senate Joint Resolution 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are anxious to see that the production of oil and gas and the additional exploration for this oil and gas and other minerals will be continued, especially during this national emergency until permanent legislation as to ownership of the so-called tidelands is firmly established.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the joint statement made by Gov. Allan Shivers, Attorney General Price Daniel, and Commissioner of the General Land Office Bascom Giles, regarding pending legislation on the subject of tidelands:

The undersigned officials of the State of Texas, in addition to their capacities as Governor, Attorney General, and Commissioner of the General Land Office, constitute the School Land Board of Texas, which has charge of the leasing of public-school lands for oil and gas development in this State.

In view of the short time allotted for the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 20, and since our views as to permanent legislation and interim legislation have been expressed previously to this committee, we submit this joint statement for the purpose of summarizing our previous testimony and present views concerning Senate Joint Resolution 20.

We favor the general purpose of interim legislation as expressed in Senate Joint Resolution 20. We recognize that continued production and additional exploration for oil, gas, and other minerals are essential to the welfare of our people in this time of emergency. Pending permanent legislation on the subject, we will support any reasonable interim bill which would permit exploration, development, and production of essential natural resources to be continued on this property, provided the interim legislation does not contain anything which would prejudice our State in its effort to obtain permanent legislation restoring the ownership which it claimed and enjoyed prior to June 5, 1950.

The present emergency and the need for interim legislation should not be used by either party to gain a point which may weigh in its favor or against the other party when permanent legislation is reached for consideration.

We believe that Senate Joint Resolution 20 can be amended by your committee so as to accomplish the desired purposes of interim legislation without giving either the States or the Federal Government any undue advantage with reference to permanent legislation. In this connection, we present the following objections and suggested amendments for the consideration of the committee:

1. The first sentence in the preamble recites that the resolution is to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States. It would seem only fair that protection of any equities which the States may have should be added to the purpose clause by the insertion of such words therein. These words should also be inserted in the last paragraph of the preamble.

2. Section 4 (a) provides for leasing of the entire Continental Shelf by the Secretary of the Interior during the interim, making no distinction between that part of the shelf lying within the original boundaries of the States and that part lying seaward of the original boundaries. Since the coastal States have claimed and enjoyed ownership and management of that part of the shelf within their original seaward boundaries continuously for more than 100 years and now have the machinery, personnel, and experience necessary to continue managing the area without additional expense and without employing additional manpower, and since a majority of the House and Senate on several occasions have indicated that this land should be restored ultimately to the States in permanent legislation, we believe that an interim bill should not give the Secretary of the Interior exclusive management and leasing powers within these traditional boundaries. Adoption of this feature of the bill might be used as a precedent which would prejudice the States when permanent legislation is reached for consideration. For the reasons heretofore stated in our previous testimony, we believe that more production will be obtained and more revenues received during the interim if State operations are continued within the traditional boundaries. However, if the committee believes that such arrangement would give the States an undue advantage with reference to future permanent legislation, it would seem that a plan for joint action could be devised and written into section 4 (a) along the lines of the present stipulations between the United

States and the State of California. At least, some amendment with reference to lands within the traditional seaward boundaries should be made so as to render the present bill fair to both the States and the Federal Government insofar as this point may bear hereafter upon consideration of permanent legislation.

3. We believe section 5 (a) (1) should be amended so as to authorize payment to the States of at least 37½ percent of the revenues received from the entire Continental Shelf. Payment of 37½ percent of the revenues to the States during the interim is limited by section 5 (a) (1), as now written, to those revenues received from lands lying within 3 miles of shore. Both the States of Texas and Louisiana extended their boundaries beyond their original limits to a distance of 27 miles prior to President Truman's Continental Shelf Proclamation. The States have already contributed and will continue to contribute to the claim of the United States (and its political subdivisions) as against other nations to jurisdiction over that part of the Continental Shelf lying beyond traditional State boundaries. This was recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in its opinion in *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699, 706 (1950)), in which the Court said: "Louisiana's enlargement of her boundary emphasizes the strength of the claim of the United States to this part of the ocean and the resources of the soil under that area."

4. The term "seaward boundary of a State" is defined in section 9 (b) as "a line 3 miles distant from the points at which the paramount rights of the Federal Government * * * begin." This is less than some of the coastal States have claimed, with approval of Congress, for many years. In the case of Texas, the seaward boundary was fixed at 3 leagues (9 marine miles) from shore in 1836, and this boundary has been recognized continuously by the United States and other nations of the world. It was so recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent case of *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950)). Therefore, it is submitted that this definition of "seaward boundary of a State" should be amended to provide that the term means "a line 3 miles seaward from the coast, or such further distance as the seaward boundary of any State existed at the time such State became a member of the Union."

It is our sincere hope that the committee will adopt the suggestions herein offered in order that our full support may be given to this legislation.

ALLAN SHIVERS,
Governor of Texas.
BASCOM GILES,
Commissioner of the General Land Office.
PRICE DANIEL,
Attorney General of Texas.

The Atlanta Journal Lauds the Honorable Henderson Lanham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in one of the South's leading newspapers, the Atlanta journal, a tribute to our able and respected colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM]. This deserved tribute calls attention to his spirit of independence, his courage, and his devotion to the public interest. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN LANHAM SPEAKS OUT AGAIN

HENDERSON LANHAM attained something like Nation-wide attention when on Tuesday he expressed emphatic disapproval of the cease fire proposal to Communist China. He moved in the forthright manner that seems characteristic. He put his views directly and in plain words to Secretary Acheson and our delegate to the UN, Senator Austin.

Mr. LANHAM held that the proposal was a betrayal of our men who have died in Korea or are still fighting in that attempt of civilization to resist and punish aggression.

Many saw it as did Mr. LANHAM, many disagreed. So, also, many Americans favor recall of our forces from that desolate and tragic battlefield, while others believe we should keep them there so long as we can hold out. From divided counsel, from indecision, must come decision and unity. As to the wisdom of the course that is taken, history alone can determine from the perspective given by time.

But we find ourselves interested in the boldness of Mr. LANHAM'S action. He takes a stand. A politician would say he goes out on a limb, and that, of course, is a hazardous thing for an officeholder to do. It might be sawed off, and that would cost votes. It might alienate friends, and that would be expensive, too.

But Mr. LANHAM has been taking stands and going out on the limb pretty regularly since he entered Congress as Representative of the Seventh Georgia District in January 1947.

He is counted and listed in all roll calls. He dodges no issues. He weasels no words. He was elected as a Democrat and as a liberal. He campaigned as a believer in unionism. He remains a Democrat but he does not follow the party's line when it divagates from his conviction as to principle. He was the one Member of the Georgia delegation who voted a few weeks ago against the restoration of autocratic, undemocratic power to the House Rules Committee. He remains a liberal in his voting as well as in his profession of faith, but he seems to have both feet on the ground and to look at questions with clear and not starry-eyed gaze. Still a believer in unionism, he has not hesitated to speak bluntly about abuses of power that labor has been led into by some of its more ambitious and less wise satraps.

This newspaper would not stultify itself, nor do Mr. LANHAM a disservice, by imputing to him all wisdom. It is not unlikely that there are errors of omission or commission on the tally sheet.

But we do suggest that Georgians keep score on his actions in the House. There are all too few Members whose vision encompasses more than their home fences. Those who grow to statesmanly stature should be given recognition and intelligent support, without which their efforts cannot have maximum success.

Labor's Walk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently certain labor officials walked out on the organization headed by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, which was created to best utilize our production machinery.

The walk-out, if my reading is correct, was because of Wilson's refusal to take into the organization the official representatives of organized labor.

There is no question but that Mr. Wilson's program cannot succeed without the cooperation not only of labor, but of industry, farmers, and practically everyone. So far as I have been able to remember no other group has fought coordination of the war effort by insisting that its authorized representative, speaking for it, shall be made a member thereof.

Again, if information is correct, Mr. Wilson before he accepted this position severed his connections with industry. He does not speak for the National Chamber of Commerce, nor any other group representing industry.

As a result of the action of these officers of organized labor, it is my understanding that farm groups will demand recognition.

When, if ever, will the representatives of organized groups forget, as they should, that when we are at war they are not spokesmen for certain groups or interests, and act in behalf of all the people?

A Congressman must represent all the people of his district, not just that particular group which is the most vociferous, claiming to have, or has, the greater number of members.

But the people as a whole believe that all rather than this or that or the other organization should be represented not only by those elected to Congress, but those appointed, as is Mr. Wilson, to carry on a program. The thought is indicated in an editorial in the Chicago Tribune of March 9, as follows:

MR. CAREY'S BELATED BOLT

James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, announced in a spacious way recently that organized labor may bolt the New Deal as a consequence of disgruntlement over the mobilization program. Mr. Carey may regard this as a formidable threat which Mr. Truman will take to heart, but we cannot see that he is speaking for anyone except himself.

The fact is that, although people like Carey and Philip Murray in the CIO, and William Green and the bosses of the AFL, think that they have an organized voting bloc which they can deliver by imperial command, the election of 1950 showed that they were very wrong. They marked up an extensive list of Republican Congressmen who were to be defeated, and, with few exceptions, all of the men they opposed rode triumphantly into office.

Their particular efforts were leveled against Senator Taft in Ohio, who trimmed them by more than 400,000 votes and carried every industrial county in the State—a feat which he could not have accomplished without very extensive support from rank and file union members.

When Mr. Carey indulges the pretense that he can lead citizens who happen to be union members in whatever direction he pleases, he is talking through his hat. His supposed followers traveled in the opposite direction in Ohio and many other States. If he makes good his threat to bolt Mr. Truman and the New Deal, he will find that he is a one man rear guard far outdistanced by a multitude of union members who arrived at that decision long before he did.

Additional Strength for Our Navy and the Merchant Marine—Revival of Shipbuilding Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted, I am inserting as part of my remarks two editorials of the Courier-Post newspaper, published at Camden, N. J. These editorials clearly and forcibly state the case for additional strength for our Navy and the Merchant Marine, and, the resultant revival of the shipbuilding industry of our country.

It is extremely gratifying to me to realize that the importance of building an adequate and up-to-date Navy and Merchant Marine is now recognized by the Congress. The recent action of Congress is a long step forward in meeting the deficiency that now exists. Not only will it bring strength to these two important branches of our national defense, but, it will also revive our languishing shipbuilding industry. All of this means much to our future security as a nation.

The editorials to which I refer are as follows:

NEW NAVY BUILDING PROGRAM SHOULD HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY

First of the administration bills introduced in Congress to build up the Armed Forces, in keeping with President Truman's plans as announced in his state of the Union message, is a $2,000,000,000 shipbuilding program for the Navy.

Sponsored in the House by Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the bill has the indorsement of both the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. The latter has often curtailed or completely blocked naval and other military expansion in the past.

The new bill calls for construction of more than 173 ships and the modernization and conversion of 291 others. The new ships will include 52 mine-sweepers, seven snorkel submarines, two rocket launchers, and a super-aircraft carrier.

The carrier, of flush-deck type, will be 5,000 tons lighter than the one which was started and then cancelled under the economy program of former Defense Secretary Johnson after its keel had been laid down, and after a long and bitter controversy at Washington.

The decision to go ahead with the new carrier thus is a palpable policy reversal and a victory for the air-minded Navy officials who were overruled on constuction of its predecessor.

Construction of the carrier is expected to take 3½ years, according to VINSON, and it now is clearly unfortunate that the earlier ship was scrapped. Not only has precious time been lost in building it, but due to inflation, the cost of the new carrier now is estimated at $235,000,000, whereas the other ship would have cost only $189,000,000. The remainder of the Vinson bill program can be completed in 2 years, it is said.

The new Navy program will be a needed stimulus to shipbuilding in this country. Over and above that, it will furnish necessary additions to the naval arm of our military forces, which has shown in Korea that it is anything but obsolete, and remains an integral and major element of our defense establishment, and whose brilliant work in support of our land forces, in supplying and transporting them and in participating heavily in actual combat, is one of the bright spots in the whole Korean War.

The House committee has acted with commendable speed by reporting the bill at once to the floor for consideration. That's the kind of action we need at Washington in remobilizing—and get little of.

The program should have full right of way and early passage in Congress.

CONGRESS VOTES BUILDING OF 50 FAST CARGO SHIPS

With final passage of the $20,000,000,000 supplemental appropriation bill, Congress has at length taken a major step toward strengthening our merchant marine and reviving our shipbuilding industry.

Included in the bill is a $350,000,000 appropriation authorizing the Maritime Administration to go ahead with its program for construction of 50 fast new cargo ships.

The fund was stricken out of the bill last month by the House, although the House Appropriations Committee had approved it. It was restored by the Senate, and in the final hours of the Eighty-first Congress the House also voted to replace it in the bill as it went to the President.

Vice Adm. Edward L. Cochrane, Maritime Administrator, and shipping exports have been fighting for the appropriation for many months as vital to our national defenses. Plans for the ships have been in preparation and actual work on them can begin as soon as bids and contracts are negotiated.

The ships to be built under this program can be used as troop carriers if necessary, but are primarily modern, speedy cargo vessels of a type almost nonexistent in our merchant marine. They will have a top speed of 22 knots, far faster than the obsolete World War II vessels. They will carry their own torpedoes, guns, and helicopters which, combined with their high speed, will enable them to travel alone instead of in convoy and yet be adequately defended against submarine attack.

At present the United States has only 15 passenger and cargo ships that can do better than 20 knots.

The new ships are to be about 525 feet long, of more than 12,000 deadweight tons, and will have interchangeable parts.

Washington officials say that the first of the 50 ships can be in service within 18 months from now, if an accelerated building program is adopted, and the Maritime Administration, fortunately, is committed to getting them on the ways as soon as possible.

These ships are badly needed now to meet competition of other maritime nations for peacetime trade, and in a full-scale war they would be absolutely essential—in fact, we would want many more like them.

Their construction should be the biggest stimulus the shipbuilding industry has had in many years and provide employment for large forces of skilled shipworkers who otherwise might have drifted away and been lost to the industry forever.

Camden's New York Shipbuilding Corp. expects the Government to invite bids on the ships shortly, possibly calling for formal submission of bids about January 24. New York Ship, which has received copies of the design and is equipped to construct vessels of the new type, hopes to be able to submit bids and receive some of the work.

Congress has done the right thing in furnishing the money for the building program. Now it is up to the Maritime Administration and the builders to push construction along at top speed.

In the Interest of Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

NEW YORK STATE
CIVIL DEFENSE COMMISSION,
New York, N. Y., March 6, 1951.

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: On February 12 the civil defense directors of the 48 States were called to Washington for a conference with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to discuss current problems, policies, finances, and impending legislation. The following day the directors met by themselves, as the National Conference of State Civil Defense Directors, and after discussion of the information given them by the Federal Administrator adopted the enclosed resolutions, which I believe speak for themselves.

I can certify that in the operations of this commission the volume of mail and informational material originating at Federal, State, and local levels constitutes a very heavy burden on our budgets, and the extension of the Federal franking privilege to this mail would undoubtedly increase the coverage and therefore the education of our population through authoritative civil defense publications.

The question of insurance protection for civil defense volunteers has arisen in every one of our 104 local offices of civil defense, and the lack of proper coverage has definitely impeded our efforts to build up a strong civil defense volunteer force. It is my understanding that the McKinnon bill, now pending before the House of Representatives, is intended to provide Federal assistance in making appropriate insurance protection available.

The last resolution regarding the reimbursement of States and their political subdivisions for the forehanded procurement of civil defense items, approved by the Administrator, is vital in the State of New York. We are informed that it is the intention of the Federal Administration to participate in the cost of a number of communications and public-warning items of equipment, but under our State law, and with the very real sense of urgency which prevails in our great target cities, neither this commission nor the cities have felt justified in refusing to set up adequate alerting systems pending availability of Federal funds. This action is entirely in keeping with the policy and statements of the Federal Civil Administration, which has emphasized the fact that attack may come at any time and that a city properly warned can hope to reduce its casualties by as much as 50 percent. It does not seem equitable nor in the public interest to penalize those communities which have acted promptly in accordance with these official assumptions and policies in favor of other communities which have been content to do nothing until Federal funds were given them.

It is recognized that the retroactive features of the resolution would not normally recommend themselves to the Congress, but it is urged by all State directors that the special circumstances surrounding the inauguration of the Nation-wide civil-defense program be taken into account and

that the Federal funds, when appropriated, be made applicable to federally approved items of equipment purchased after enactment of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

I believe you are aware that in the State of New York we have not been holding back on our civil-defense program and waiting for the Federal Government to pay all our bills and instruct us in every last detail of our job. Nevertheless, we do feel that Federal assistance in the fields covered by the enclosed resolutions is essential, and since we have been joined in this conclusion by the directors of the other States, we feel justified in urging that you as the State's representative in the Congress introduce or support bills accomplishing the purposes set forth in the resolutions.

I sincerely hope that you will be willing to give this added boost to the vital civil defense program.

A further matter which was not considered by the National Conference of Civil Defense Directors, but which is of very real and immediate significance in New York State is the question of the loyalty oath to be taken by all civil defense volunteers. In Niagara Falls and other border communities, there are a large number of resident Canadian citizens who have been taking an active part in our civil defense organizations and are exactly the kind of people that we want as volunteers. Under the terms of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as interpreted by counsel for this Commission, and for the Federal Civil Defense Administration, we cannot enroll these Canadian volunteers unless they take the loyalty oath provided by the act; if they do take the oath, they imperil or lose their Canadian citizenship.

You will note that the act specifically permits the Federal Civil Defense Administration to enroll a limited number of British or Canadian citizens without taking the loyalty oath, but this exemption is not extended to State civil defense organizations. I urge that an amendment to the act be introduced permitting the enrollment of Canadian citizens, otherwise meeting the qualifications required from civil defense volunteers, without taking that portion of the oath which reads, "I, ———, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

If there are any aspects of the above proposals which are not entirely clear or on which you wish further information, I would be honored to hear from you.

Respectfully yours,

L. WILKINSON,
Acting Chairman.

Resolution 1

Whereas the volume of correspondence and informational material to be distributed by the States and their political subdivisions, and by the Territories and the District of Columbia, in the execution of the national civil-defense program, has become a substantial burden upon the finances of the States; and

Whereas the present mailing procedure for civil-defense materials is definitely impeding the civil defense informational and educational programs due to the time element and manpower requirements involved in stamping, weighing, counting, and otherwise complying with postal requirements; and

Whereas the success of the national civil defense program requires the fullest possible dissemination of instructions and informational material throughout the several States, Territories, and District of Columbia: Be it

Resolved, That this conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to recommend to the Congress the extension of the Federal franking privilege to all States and local offices of civil defense and to the offices of civil defense in the Territories and the District of Columbia for their official correspondence and the mailing of informational material, and to further recommend that a Federal appropriation be made available to the Post Office Department to cover the additional operating expenditures which this extension of the franking privilege would entail.

Resolution 2

Whereas the recruiting of civil-defense volunteers is being hampered in many States by the reluctance of citizens to expose themselves to danger without adequate insurance protection against injury or death sustained in civil-defense training and operation; and

Whereas the burden of such insurance protection is great; and

Whereas the overcoming of the effects, both material and financial, of enemy attack and the preparation of civil-defense forces to minimize such effects is a matter of national and not merely local concern: Be it

Resolved, That this conference request the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to recommend to the Congress the enactment of suitable legislation to provide adequate insurance protection to officially enrolled civil-defense volunteers, throughout the Nation against injury or death sustained in active civil-defense training, or in operations.

Resolution 3

Whereas the laws of the Federal Government and of the various States require the prompt establishment of an effective civil-defense organization in the individual States; and

Whereas the Federal and the State plans recognize the necessity for procuring certain essential items of organizational equipment (including communication and air raid warning equipment) as promptly as possible; and

Whereas the Federal Civil Defense Administration will recommend to the Congress that Federal appropriations be made available to defray half the cost of such items; and

Whereas it is desirable that actual procurement not be delayed until the Federal appropriations are available; and

Whereas it is felt that the States who have shown initiative and foresight in procuring such equipment prior to the availability of Federal funds for such purpose should not be penalized for their forehandedness: Be it

Resolved, That this Conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to include in his request to the Congress for appropriations a recommendation that the Congress authorize the administration to utilize any such appropriation to pay half the cost of any items approved by the Administrator which may have been purchased by the States or their political subdivisions or by the Territories and the District of Columbia on or after the enactment of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 on 12 January 1951.

Militarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, letters from mothers are pouring in from the district which I have the honor to represent protesting against the drafting of 18-year-old boys. The overwhelming number of letters are opposed to sending our boys to Germany. Moreover, the majority of those who write to me on the subject see in the proposed universal military training program nothing but an attempt on the part of the Army to Prussianize our country. They see in the military proposals the first step toward military domination of civilian life, and ultimately a military dictatorship.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from a letter written by a mother of eight boys, of whom five are now in the Army, and three more soon to go into the service:

We can no longer boast of a free democratic country. Just think how we talked about Hitler and Stalin. What's the difference? Now when a boy is out of high school he is forced to go into the Army just the same as Hitler's and Stalin's.

I have had five boys in the Army and it isn't a very pleasant thought to know that when my other three finish school they will be forced to go, even in peacetime. What has a parent to look forward to? Educate their children, then turn them over to the Government? And if the Congress and Senate think they have helped the morale of our boys they are mistaken. I know boys, not my own, who say, "What's the use—we have to go in the Army anyway." After they once leave home they never return the same any more.

They will spend all that money training 18-year-olds instead of putting it in the Air Force and building more planes, which, if they would use more of, instead of so many troops in Korea, we would be better off.

Here we've sent all those boys to Korea just to be slaughtered. We can't win there in this long time and they expect to defend Europe with less. I don't know how stupid we can be. If Russia wants to fight she could wipe those out any time, and if she doesn't want to fight, why send our troops over there?

I still think it is foolish to think our boys can defend every country that causes a disturbance. That's all Russia wants anyway is to get our boys scattered all over the world She will be able to take over without her country being touched. Who is going to guard our country?

I say if Russia won't have peace, why fight in all these other countries, tear up other peoples' homes, and destroy everything, like we are doing in Korea. Why not start at the source of the trouble, in Russia, and not with our troops, either. What did we spend so much money on bombs for, and if we use them put them in the right place.

We should do everything in our power to have peace first, but this constantly talking of war and planning for war—compulsory training, sending troops to Europe, getting ready for all-out war, will never bring peace. All anyone hears is preparing for war; why not talk more of peace?

Are we going to leave our boys in Korea till they are all slaughtered? Are we going to send more over to feed the machine guns of the Communists? That could go on for years as long as we keep sending troops over. The only thing that will stop it, unless they come to a peace agreement soon, is to furnish enough airplanes and give someone power to bomb the Chinese supply line.

Compulsory training will never bring peace—it has never brought peace to the countries that have had it before us. All it is good for is to upset every home in the United States, take boys away from their homes before they are ready, and put them with all kinds, where they learn everything they shouldn't learn.

We've passed the first step against freedom.

Do we have enough planes to protect our country? We will spend all that money on training 18-year-olds—then they won't have any protection.

Pipeline Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of H. R. 88 which I have filed and which would provide for certain jurisdiction in the Federal Power Commission with reference to safety requirements for the operation of natural-gas pipelines, I wish to include a recent editorial from the Boston Herald. It is as follows:

NATURAL GAS DANGERS

Natural gas is on its way to New England, and that is good, but we should not assume that it is all unalloyed bliss. There are troubles connected with it. One is explosions and fires in the big pipelines. Another is shortages during peak loads. A third is failure to odorize the gas sufficiently. A fourth is politics.

None of these are unavoidable dangers, but they are dangers we need to watch.

Pipeline explosions are not frequent. Considering that there is a greater mileage of pipelines now than of railroads, the frequency of such accidents is small. But a series of blasts around St. Louis, including one that formed a blowtorch with flames 40 feet high, is being investigated by a grand jury. The gas is carried through the lines at a pressure around 750 pounds a square inch, rather more than the pressure of two-tenths of a pound at the gas stove in the home. It can make a nice little blaze.

In Massachusetts the State department of public works is supposed to check where pipes go under State highways, and the department of public utilities under local roads. The Federal Power Commission ought to have general responsibility, and Congressman HESELTON has a bill to make it definite.

Possible shortages are just one of those things. To build a pipeline from Texas to Boston to take care of the highest peak load on the busiest and coldest winter day would be uneconomic. The line would be almost empty on summer Sundays. It is possible to do two things. One is to store a supply of gas in old exhausted gas wells in central Pennsylvania, which mitigates the problem a little. The other is the use of stand-by manufactured gas facilities.

This last will be done in Boston, where some manufactured gas will be mixed at all times with the natural gas, but more during peak load periods. The danger here is not so much that the companies concerned will fail in their responsibility to maintain pressure, but that political demands in the department of public utilities or the legislature will bring unsound restrictions.

Finally the odor. Manufactured gas has a smell that gets there in manufacture. It doesn't have to be added, so there is no human fallibility involved. But natural gas is odorless, and if enough smell isn't added, a leak may go unnoticed.

The smell ought to be added before the gas goes into the pipeline at the source so, that anywhere along the way a leak may be detected. Some transmission companies do this voluntarily; it should be required.

These are not in the least arguments against natural gas. Indeed, there is no worth while advance unattended by some new dangers. The automobile is welcome despite the hazards of the highway. But it does mean that we should make certain that the dangers are minimized.

Hell of a Way To Run a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 9, 1951, speaks for itself:

HELL OF A WAY TO RUN A WAR

Never in history has an army commander fought a war under more frustrating circumstances and conditions than handicap General MacArthur in Korea.

A powerful foe is throwing all it has at him—and General MacArthur can't throw all he has back. It's true the Chinese Reds have little more than massive manpower, but this is particularly effective for two reasons: Allied manpower in Korea is limited. And the Chinese Reds are drawing on an inexhaustible source in an area we can't touch.

General MacArthur has overwhelming airpower, but can't use it to destroy Communist bases just across the border in Manchuria. Why? Because he is taking his orders from the United Nations.

And the United Nations, so far as the Korean War is concerned, has deteriorated into little more than a debating society—which isn't even debating these days.

How can effective orders or decisions come from a discussion group which is split four ways—the Russian bloc openly helping and encouraging the Chinese Communists; the nations, bellwethered by Britain, which have recognized the Peiping regime and want to do business with it, even admit it to the UN; a sizable group apparently uninterested; and a United States delegation trying to play Happy Hooligan to all sides?

No wonder General MacArthur bitterly concludes that under existing conditions the allied forces in Korea have absolutely no chance of winning the war from a military standpoint.

His hands are tied. He can't do a thing but hold on with all he has and trade punches indefinitely with the growing Chinese armies.

Never before has a military commander had a narrower field for individual judgment and decision. Every move he makes he must submit beforehand to an inert UN.

When General MacArthur confesses he is at the end of his tether, that he can do no more until vital decisions are made, what happens?

At Lake Success: United States Delegate Ernest A. Gross says it is only an analysis that General MacArthur cannot make any recommendations. Moreover, the United States delegation has had no instructions from Washington to ask the UN to let General MacArthur blast Red bases now immune. Within a few days, the United States may present some ideas for steps to be taken against Peiping, but they'll be in the nature of trade restrictions.

In Washington: With President Truman in Florida, and Secretary of State Acheson in Bermuda, Assistant Secretary Webb declines positive comment, except to say that General MacArthur's appeal is under study.

So, the big run-around goes on.

Meanwhile, American casualties have reached 52,448. We're sending in more troops, but no other members of the UN have moved to increase their token forces in Korea. Nor is anyone pressing them to do so.

It's a hell of a way to run a war.

Resolution of the Senate of the Sixty-Seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the conflict of interests between an expanded bureaucracy and the proper functions of the sovereign states is well illustrated in a situation called to the attention of the Congress in Resolution No. 24, adopted by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois. Because it is a matter of grave concern to all the States, I am including the text of the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under permission granted by the House.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Congress of United States by amendment to the Federal Social Security Act has provided that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public-assistance programs operated by the various States in conjunction with the Federal Government under provisions of the Social Security Act shall be limited to purposes directly connected with the administration of these programs; and

Whereas this injunction of secrecy imposed on the States by said amendment to the Federal Social Security Act is a matter which causes great public concern, and is directly responsible for numerous injustices, abuses, and fraud by permitting many individuals not actually in need to receive assistance and to escape detection because of the stringent regulations guarding the names of recipients of public assistance, thus creating dissatisfaction with the public-welfare program in many communities of the State; and

Whereas said secrecy provision violates the fundamental principle that any expenditure of public funds should be subject to public audit; and

Whereas members of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois repeatedly have expressed themselves as favoring an amendment to the Public Assistance Code of Illinois, which would make available to public inspection and sound use a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State, only to be advised that such an action would be in conflict with the Federal Social Security Act and would result in loss of Federal funds for public-assistance purposes; and

Whereas the so-called Federal funds were collected from the taxpayers of Illinois to the extent of almost $3,940,000,000 during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, while less than $3 out of every $100 collected from the people of Illinois was returned to the State of Illinois in so-called Federal aid for all purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we go on record as recommending to the Congress of the United States that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible date amending pertinent sections of the Federal Social Security Act in such a manner that State legislative bodies desiring to do so would be permitted to remove restrictions in State laws concealing the identity of public-assistance recipients and to provide that a list of the names of all recipients of assistance be available for public inspection in a proper public office; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eighty-second Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of March 8, 1951:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The Kefauver committee reports: "It was no secret in the State of Missouri * * * that the State government and its administration had narrowly escaped falling under the control of gangsters with criminal affiliations in the election of 1948."

This does not make pleasant reading about any State or city, but this is what that same report says about St. Louis:

"* * * in St. Louis, Morris Shenker appeared to have a substantial portion of the legal trade involving bookmakers who had fallen into the clutches of the law. It is noteworthy that Shenker appeared before the committee as counsel for William Molasky, one of the owners of Pioneer News Service, the racing wire news distributor in that city.

"He also appeared as counsel for Joe Uvanni, race-track come-back money agent for John Mooney, of St. Louis. According to testimony before the committee, Molasky contributed $2,000 to the gubernatorial campaign fund of Forrest Smith on condition that Smith would name Shenker to the police board (of control) of St. Louis if elected."

Again, the report states:

"There is considerable evidence in the minutes of the testimony concerning contributions to political campaigns by gamblers and gangsters."

So, we come to the curious election which is to take place in St. Louis next Friday. Congressman John Sullivan, Democrat, representing the Eleventh District, having died, March 9 was set for a special election.

His widow, who had been the Congressman's secretary, expected to be the candidate. She was rejected by the aforesaid Morris Shenker, who controls what is roughly called the democracy. Shenker thereupon nominated Harry Schendel, sales manager of an automobile agency, as his candidate. The Republicans nominated Claude I. Bakewell, a former Congressman.

The real issue in this contest is the power and authority of Morris Shenker, the mouthpiece. He is said to be unusually able. His own view is that he can separate his law practice from his political activities, which would be an interesting feat, if accomplishable.

In a telegram to Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, he wrote:

"I have never permitted my political activities to interfere with my practice of law, nor have I attempted to associate the two. I have never solicited or accepted a political contribution from any of my clients."

Shenker is the lawyer who raised the question of the use of television in public hearings. One of the most valid purposes of congressional hearings is that they give the people an opportunity to know of corruptions, distortions, and treasonable conduct of individuals. The newspapers, radio, and, now, television bring these hearings close to the people. In the case of James J. Carroll, who calls himself a betting commissioner, Shenker said:

"Forcing a man to give testimony before television is an invasion of his privacy. A person cannot be put in such a position that he is exposed to public ridicule. While the hearing was public, it was not contemplated that the person of the witness should be televized for everyone to see within a 75-mile radius of St. Louis."

The Kefauver report on St. Louis makes very ugly reading, particularly the tie-up between gambling, crime, and politics. And it is obvious that even in this special election for a Member of Congress the power of the gamblers and the criminal elements is an important consideration.

What goes on in St. Louis, it is true, goes on in many American cities where the Mafia has gained an unbelievable power due to the apathy of Americans who have permitted these specialists to take over the political machinery.

The real trouble is that our people are not ashamed of the degeneration of public morals. In other periods of our history, such exposures as those of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees aroused public opinion to action.

Today, we witness an appalling apathy. The word "Missouri" has become in Washington a synonym for corruption.

It is for this reason that this special election is of national importance. Will Missouri use it to protest against the libel on that State?

Destroying Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there appeared in the press a dispatch from Presque Isle, Maine, containing a report that the Federal Government has ordered the dumping of about 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes in Maine. The report follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 11, 1951]

FIFTEEN MILLION BUSHELS OF SPUDS ORDERED DUMPED IN MAINE

PRESQUE ISLE, Maine, March 10.—The Federal Government has ordered the dumping of about 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes in Maine, the retiring executive secretary of the Maine Potato Industry Council said today.

Herbert W. Moore charged "there is no reason for dumping" the potatoes, valued at about $9,000,000.

Moore said the potatoes would make about 9,000,000 gallons of commercial alcohol, needed in the defense effort.

Moore said the Government will purchase 25,000,000 bushels of spuds in Maine this year, from a 1950 crop of about 62,000,000 bushels. Of the total Government purchase, he said, about 15,000,000 bushels will be dumped.

Lawrence Chatto, State head of the Production and Marketing Administration, said the Government has found the conversion of potatoes into commercial alcohol too expensive to be practical.

Mr. Speaker, this is most disturbing in terms of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation during the first 7 months of this fiscal year. The report for January 31, issued last Friday, shows that on June 30, 1950, there were no potatoes on hand, but that through January 31, the Department of Agriculture purchased 2,519,363,500 pounds for $25,683,046.94; that it paid for carrying charges $357,249.01; that it disposed of 169,370,100 pounds as donations; that it sold 2,347,450,400 pounds; that it received on sales only $1,490,295.07 and that there was a net loss of $24,548,255.28.

If these additional 15,000,000 bushels are destroyed, the loss in this fiscal year could well approximate the loss in 1950, which was $75,090,315.

Let's Have the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot of March 7, 1951:

LET'S HAVE THE FACTS

The Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is wrong when it refuses to press an investigation into the matter of Senators who might have been nonpaying guests at the Saxony Hotel at Miami Beach.

We understand that the Senate has some very nice rules of conduct and that it regards itself as the "most exclusive club in the world." The rules of the club prevent the members from casting reflections on each other or questioning their honesty. It's a dignified way to run a legislative body and holds the name-calling to a minimum.

But the public isn't going to be a bit satisfied with rules which permit muckraking in the executive branch of the Government and call for putting the rake away when it comes near a Senator's coattails.

If Senators did have a free ride on the easy hospitality of the Saxony Hotel, one of the many centers of the committee's searching inquiry, let's go into the matter and find out who got just how much.

We have defended the writing of letters to the RFC by Senators and Representatives. That is within the scope of their normal duties. We believe that the White House was preparing to do a little unjustified mudslinging when it called for those letters. A Member of Congress should not be smeared because he attempted to run an innocent errand for a constituent.

But, if a Congressman wrote a letter and was rewarded in any way, either through a free vacation at a hotel or any other means, then he becomes a subject for investigation.

Any influence which he uses in return for favors is "improper." And, as we have said before, the purpose of the inquiry is to reveal instances of use of improper influence.

We can't agree with Senator Fulbright that the matter is "outside the scope of the inquiry."

The committee has made quite an issue of the manner in which the RFC loan to the hotel was made. Surely any favors granted by the hotel management to anyone in either the executive or legislative branch of the Government are pertinent to the inquiry.

The Fulbright committee has done a good job. It has proceeded with a certain dignity and has shown a tendency to root out the facts and follow leads wherever they go.

The work of the committee should not be discredited by a maneuver which the public might interpret as a move to cover up for Members of the Senate.

Thirty-Third Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, in Philadelphia recently, Americans of Lithuanian origin met—more than a thousand strong—at the Lithuanian Music Hall, and in an inspiring session, adopted unanimously a resolution, which it is my high privilege to call to your attention. I urge all Members to support its proposals and to make their views known to the State Department, through which Department alone action can be taken.

The resolution follows:

Know all men by these presents that the Lithuanian-American citizenry of the city of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and its environs, meeting in solemn session on Sunday, February 18, 1950, at the Lithuanian Music Hall, Tilton Street and Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, on the occasion of commemoration of the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, solemnly and unanimously proclaim the following:

"Whereas the unlawful and predatory occupation of the land of Lithuania by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic continues with unabated terrorism, having for its obvious objective the extermination of the Lithuanian people; and

"Whereas it has been established that more than 1,000,000 citizens of Lithuania have surrendered their lives or liberty, directly as a result of Soviet brutality and efforts to provincialize the population of Lithuania; and,

"Whereas it has further been demonstrated that Lithuania's churches have been abolished and her schools appropriated solely to propagate materialism; and

"Whereas the citizens of Lithuania, in their own country, are deprived of all four freedoms, solemnly declared in the Atlantic Charter as inalienable rights of all nations, large or small; Now, therefore, it is here highly

"*Resolved*—

"First. That the United States Government through our President, Secretary of State, and the Congress, be urged to take immediate and effective steps, without further delay, to halt the Soviet program of furthering the genocide of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian peoples; and

"Second. That the United States Government through its representatives propose that the Council of the United Nations adopt a resolution placing upon the UN agenda the question of the right to sovereign status of the Baltic lands; and

"Third. That the Council of the United Nations without delay insist upon immediate measures to permit its own representatives to visit the Baltic lands and conduct an investigation involving aforesaid accusations of Soviet brutality and terrorism; and

"Fourth. That the United States Government through its Department of State officially again issue proclamation to all nations and particularly Soviet Russia that this Nation does not recognize the Soviet occupation of the Baltic countries, and that no permanent peace can be concluded without the restoration of democratic self-government within those countries; and

"Fifth. That this Nation's most illustrious men, distinguished by their noble efforts in the fight for freedom for all nations, large or small, continuously employ their abilities and influence for the purpose of preventing further extermination of people and of restoration of independence in Lithuania and of all the other lands enslaved by the Soviets; and that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State."

Poll on Foreign and Domestic Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on January 25, 1951, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of a poll on our foreign and domestic policies conducted by an outstanding Missouri newspaper, the Rolla (Mo.) Daily News.

The results of similar polls by several other newspapers over the country have now been announced. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Edward W. Sowers, publisher of the Rolla Daily News, summarizing the results of this poll of more than 10,000 Americans. I commend it to the attention of Senators who may have more than a passing interest in what the people back home are thinking.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN THOUSAND AMERICANS VOTE TO WITHDRAW FROM KOREA, TO QUIT MEDDLING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, AND TO CUT SPENDING—BALLOTS FROM CHICAGO, DETROIT, CLEVELAND, AND ROLLA SHOW UNITED STATES THOUGHT

(By Edward W. Sowers)

Over 10,000 thinking Americans have voted for drastic changes in United States policies, including withdrawal from Korea, less meddling in foreign countries, and drastic cuts in Government spending.

The trend of opinion on those and other issues has been brought before Congress by a public-opinion survey by the Rolla Daily News on January 12 and copied by metropolitan newspapers in Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, and other smaller cities.

Tabulation of ballots, printed in the several newspapers and voted by an estimated 10,150 citizens, gives strong majorities for early withdrawal from Korea, against drafting of 18-year-olds, against sending troops to Europe, against continued aid to foreign countries, for drastic cuts in nondefense spending, against use of the A-bomb now, but for retention of it as a weapon of war.

The survey disclosed an even stronger trend toward so-called isolationism in the big cities than in smaller rural centers like Rolla, where conservatism was once supposed to predominate. Instead of isolationism, we would prefer to call it Americanism, as it is nothing more than a policy of America first.

A nearly complete count of ballots received by this newspaper and the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, and the Cleveland (Ohio) Daily News gives the following results:

Should we withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible? Yes, 6,321; no, 2,902.

Should we stay until we can give Korea a government chosen by its people? Yes, 2,726; no, 5,614.

Should we drop the A-bomb now and take chances on reprisal? Yes, 1,831; no, 6,754.

Should we reject the A-bomb as a weapon of war? Yes, 2,168; no, 6,478.

Should we continue to send substantial aid to foreign countries? Yes, 3,831; no, 5,078.

Should we draft 18-year-olds? Yes, 3,791; no, 5,381.

Should we send American troops to Europe? Yes, 3,007; no, 6,003.

Should we expect foreign nations to supply the bulk of UN armies? Yes, 7,854; no, 1,262.

Should we simply defend outlying bases with air and sea power and keep our armies at home? Yes, 5,961; no, 3,090.

Should nondefense spending be cut drastically? Yes, 7,565; no, 1,611.

Should we have stiff price and wage controls? Yes, 7,073; no, 2,029.

Many of the ballots received by the newspapers were accompanied by caustic comments, critical of present United States policies. They consistently condemn United States meddling in foreign countries, particularly foreign wars.

It has been our outspoken opinion for some time that this is the way the majority of Americans feel. Now, with so many other Americans joining us in this way of thinking, and saying so on the thousands of ballots in widely separated sections of the Nation, it would seem to further justify such a policy of Americanism rather than foreignphobia.

Continuing Losses in Government's Purchases of Food Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture's report on its food purchase and sale program for January was published last Friday.

This 37-day delay in making the report is undoubtedly one of the prime reasons

for the fact that this program is beyond salvage.

In January alone this Department ran up its losses by $26,719,240.92 on butter, dried milk, cheese, and dried eggs. The total losses on these four commodities for 7 months ending January 31, including the cost of storage, was $112,670,971.37. This is dismal news for the overburdened taxpayer now sacrificing to pay to the Federal Government hard-earned or saved money so that it can continue such extravagant and useless activities. It is equally bad news for everyone who has been trying to find enough money to buy these or other foods.

But that is not the end. On January 31 the Department had on hand 419,326,976 pounds of those four commodities. The losses incurred were in the disposition of 375,086,811 pounds. Consequently we can expect at least an additional loss of $115,000,000. And there is no indication that the Department has any intention of stopping this indefensible program of buying, hoarding, and then selling at further losses.

This offers part of the reasons why the entire program of purchasing food commodities which cannot be stored indefinitely should be reexamined immediately. The Department should not be permitted to continue it unless clear and convincing reasons can be given for such continuation. Its operations at a time like this may well bring about an aroused demand for the elimination of the entire program.

Immorality in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 6, 1951:

IMMORALITY IN GOVERNMENT

Senator FULBRIGHT took a look at the stench uncorked by his committee's RFC investigation and suggested it indicates a need for a general investigation of the moral level of our Government. The only thing wrong with that remark is it is too far behind public sentiment. For months the sidewalk citizens of this country have stood aghast at the evidence of nonchalant immorality in the highest places, and the devastating effect it is having on the Nation's whole code of political ethics.

Claude I. Bakewell, Republican candidate for Congress from the Eleventh District in the election to be held next Friday, is making Government and party morality the dominant issue in his campaign. "The chief enemy of America," he says, "is not the Russians, the North Koreans, nor the Chinese Reds. It is not inflation, although that is bad enough. It is something much more deadly—cynicism."

And this cynicism has its origin in the miasma of corruption in high places, among those to whom the public should look for honest leadership at Federal, State, and local levels. But coupled with cynicism is an appalling apathy among decent American voters which has permitted the control of Government to slip by default into the hands of gangsters, hoodlums, and corruptionists.

Mr. Bakewell's plea is for the voters to be not only aghast at what is happening in America but to do something about it—elect men to office who will be no part of the plunder bund and employ courage and intelligence and native honesty to the effort of cleaning the Augean stables.

Let us look at the recent record:

The multi-billion-dollar RFC all but convicted of requiring only that loan applications be made through the right people, who in turn collected handsome fees and saw to it that persons close to the White House received suitable gratuities.

The Fulbright committee's corrective efforts ridiculed as salvine by President Truman, a reckless brush-off of evil in government only slightly less inept than his branding of the Communist investigation as a "red herring."

Gen. Harry Vaughan, long-time, loose-tongue crony of the President, associated with gifts of deep-freeze units made to win government favor—and with never a rebuke from the White House, much less a dismissal.

Another Truman pal, John Maragon, using White House friendship for personal profit. Maragon is unique among favor-peddlers in that he was convicted. But only of perjury, a technical appeal from which now has a Washington court of appeals tied in knots.

The Kefauver crime inquiry, which has begun to reveal government at local levels rotten with the bribery and corruption of organized gambling.

The Tydings campaign investigation in Maryland, and its evidence of politics at an unbelievable level of degradation. And in Mississippi, where Federal jobs were frankly and openly sold to the highest bidder. Would this have happened had Washington not offered the cue in ethics? And earlier, the Taft election battle in Ohio, where anti-Taft campaign tactics reached an all-time high in viciousness.

Along a slightly different line, we have Price Controller DiSalle demonstrating the reckless attitude of officialdom in spending $17,000 of the people's money to telegraph lengthy instructions to local price chiefs instead of writing them at a fraction of the cost.

And what are the effects?

In New York a group of miscreant teenagers listened to a lecture from the judge on respect for the law, then inquired casually why they should have respect for Government when their seniors, among them Government's own officials, show scant respect for it. Surely such stunning truth from the generation next to have charge of this Nation's future should wake us up.

And to go on up the age scale: College youths succumbing to the lure of easy money through fixed basketball games; a rash of income-tax evasions by upper-bracket persons—all demonstrating that too many people feel themselves above the law. How can our democracy hope to survive amid this ruinous psychology of "anything goes that you can get by with?" How can it be stopped?

Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion implied a morals investigation by congressional committee. But is the hour too late for that?

One cannot forget that President Truman's neat trick of getting copies of all Congressmen's letters to RFC produced an instant committee disinterest in pursuing the RFC inquiry much farther. It is to end this week. So there follows an inevitable suspicion that congressional hands as a whole are so soiled their owners prefer a charge of whitewash to an appearance in the court of public opinion. Certainly Congressmen have a duty to introduce constituents around Washington. If their introduction letters were no more than that, why are they so apprehensive of embarrassment?

So arises the clamoring question: Has Government immorality now gone so far—become so all-inclusive—that it cannot now be trusted to find the truth and remedy it?

It seems to us nothing will suffice now but an outraged revolt by the people themselves; a revolt which will force upon Government, despite all political resistance and organized entrenchment, a tidal wave of simple, old-fashioned religion.

Morals in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of March 7, 1951.

MORALS IN GOVERNMENT

Scarcely had the country had time to consider the comments of one Senate committee on how menacingly powerful has organized crime become in the United States before another Senate committee suggested the need for a congressional investigation of "the general moral level" of the Federal Government's executive branch.

In the first instance the Kefauver crime commission was reporting that its investigation showed the existence of a crime syndicate so powerful and so widespread in its operations that it could easily be switched into an underground movement capable of taking over the Government itself. In the second instance Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of a committee that has been investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, points to "a double standard of morality for public office and private life." His committee has been looking into the use of influence, pressure, and favoritism in obtaining loans from the banking agency.

Both investigations and their resulting reports deal with the morals of Government. A crime syndicate of the proportions described by the Kefauver committee cannot exist without the knowledge, and even consent, of officials at various levels of government. And the committee has heard convincing evidence of official knowledge and noninterference. As for the Fulbright committee's investigation of the RFC, it is a sordid account of official pressure, influence, and favoritism exerted to get big loans of public funds for business ventures of dubious worth, some so shaky that the enterprises failed despite the millions poured into them.

Nothing actually forbidden by law and therefore punishable by the courts has been produced by the FULBRIGHT investigation. Nothing has been shown to have been illegal about RFC loan policies. But things may be legal and still be wrong and improper. That's a distinction not to be ignored. For as Senator FULBRIGHT points out, "Too many people seem to think that just because an action by a Government official is legal, it is therefore right."

Neither the Kefauver nor the Fulbright committees' finding can be said to be biased or prejudiced by partisan political considerations. The chairmanships and the majority of committee posts are held by Senators belonging to the same political party as that of the administration. But political parties have little to do with American Government these days, for our Government for the last 18 years has been one of personalities rather than parties.

Upon his election in 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt began working for his reelection 4 years in the future. But he did not do it by trying to bring together dissident factions within the Democratic party which had nominated him in Chicago. He began building his own party. He appealed to various income groups with promises of what his administration would do for them. He depended upon the gratefulness of those groups and the influence of powerful political machines in the biggest cities to perpetuate himself in power. And these machines were gangster-ridden.

Harry S. Truman depended even more than did Roosevelt upon promises of special favors and a record of performance of favors to win in 1948. To labor leaders he promised repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and to farm groups he declared they should vote for him out of a sense of gratefulness for the benefits they got from price-support laws and other farm legislation. And even more than his predecessor at the White House, he relied upon the machines in the big cities to deliver the vote. Meanwhile he ran a government by crony, passing out fat appointments to close friends and acquaintances, preferably to men from his home State of Missouri.

It is small wonder that moral standards in government have fallen to a new low. Small wonder that the "Washington fix" has become commonplace, that influence and favorable treatment from officialdom is peddled for money or for votes.

Morals in government will be exactly of the standard that the people insist that they be. Higher standards can be had when the public decides that politics is something from which it dares not stand aloof, when it realizes that politics is something in which it must take an active and continuous part. Far too many of our people these days have a patronizing attitude toward politics and holding public office. They "don't care to mix politics." They will have to "mix in politics" if ever there is reform.

Post Office Department Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the deficiency in the Post Office Department of over $500,000,000 is the subject again before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Postmaster General reports that $160,000,000 of this deficit is due to penalty and frank mail, that is Department and Congressional mail. That amount cannot be charged as a part of the Post Office expense and is not carried that way on the books, but this amount does show up in the general deficiency. There is no good reason why the cash users of mail should have to pay more postage in order to allow this penalty and frank mail to be handled. The Government should make a direct appropriation for this the same as any other department expense.

We therefore deduct this $160,000,000 from the deficit and that leaves $340,000,000, the amount that the expenditures of the Post Office exceeds the income.

There is another item that should be determined by Congress and that is how much annually should the Post Office Department be subsidized for the educational value of the service to the people. Various amounts have been suggested, but I think $100,000,000 annually could be well spent in this country in order to disseminate information. The newspapers do a lot of printing for which they derive no revenue. For example, newspapers carry, or most of them do, news from Washington, telling all about what is going on here in Congress. That informs the people—not only those who take a newspaper but everyone who reads them. That is a definite service which all the people—the taxpayers—receive and I do not believe any taxpayer would object to allowing newspapers some reasonable low rates to compensate them for free printing.

Now, deducting this $100,000,000 from the $340,000,000 would leave $240,000,000 that will have to be made up with increased postage. When the Government sells postal cards for 1 cent each, it loses a quarter of a cent on each card. This is not justified and the people will not object to paying more for this postal-card privilege. It is found that 90 percent of postal cards are for advertising purposes and advertising cannot be obtained anywhere for less than cost, except the Government.

Magazines that carry 50 percent advertising or more are receiving a ridiculously low rate for the distribution of their advertising. No such advertising can be obtained from any place else, and where the advertising is presumed or intended to increase sales and make profits, the users ought to be willing to pay a higher rate. This second-class mail shows an annual loss of $200,000,000.

The correction of these two items alone, postal cards and advertising would balance the loss in the Post Office Department, without interfering with present rates on nonprofit mail such as the distribution of religious, educational, and paternal literature. Newspapers—the small newspapers—would not be materially affected and the larger dailies, with page after page of advertising, should be willing to pay more for that part of their publications carrying advertising.

Fourth-class mail, or parcel post, is another item of heavy annual loss. We have been running the parcel-post system with an annual loss of $105,000,000. The law providing the set-up for parcel post said specifically that this department must pay its own way. The Congress will not have to act on this matter, however, as under the law the Postmaster General can apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission to raise the rates. This the Postmaster General has done and the case is now pending.

It looks now as though the great deficit in the Post Office Department can be wiped out, at least down to the $100,000,000 which Congress can earmark as an educational or subsidy fund for the dissemination of information, which the people will never have access to unless this subsidy is provided. There never was a time in the history of this country when the people needed more information than they do now. Newspapers and magazines, which now carry important information for which they are not directly paid, should have some encouragement to continue by participating in a favorable postage rate.

In order to keep this deficit down and obey the commands of Congress, the Postmaster General has reduced the service. This was a mistake, as there is no reason why the people cannot have good service. The fault, though, in curtailing this service, was the responsibility of Congress and not the fault of the Postmaster General. The service can be reestablished, salaries to postal workers can be raised so that they may exist under a decent standard of living, and still the deficit can be kept down to $100,000,000—the subsidy fund—if postal cards, second-class mail, and parcel-post rates are increased.

This parcel-post venture has had a disastrous effect on the express companies. They cannot carry material at a rate to meet the rates of parcel post—the Government cannot do it either, as now they are running behind $105,000,000 annually. These present Government rates have injured the express business to the extent that 40,000 express employees were laid off last year. Not only is the Government losing on this venture, but, at the same time, it is taking jobs away from men and women in private industry, and if kept up will finally put every express company out of business.

The users of parcel post are willing to pay higher rates, and when the rates of parcel post and express are in proximation the business will go back to the express companies, at least there will be no great money incentive to send parcels by parcel post, because it is so much cheaper than express rates.

Dr. Jay McLean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent newspaper article from the Savannah Press paying tribute to a Georgian who has achieved a high degree of success in the field of medicine. I join with Americans everywhere in paying tribute to Dr. Jay McLean, who has contributed so much toward saving lives of our fighting forces in the armed services.

The article follows:

SAVANNAH DOCTOR HELPS SAVE LIMBS OF FRIGHTING MEN—HEPARIN, DISCOVERED BY DR. MCLEAN, BEING USED IN KOREA

Heparin, an anticoagulant currently credited with saving the frostbitten limbs of hundreds of Americans fighting in Korea,

was discovered by a Savannahian, Dr. Jay McLean.

Dr. McLean, who has for the past couple of years been connected with the Savannah Tumor Clinic, discovered heparin in 1916 while doing research work at Johns Hopkins.

The current issue of Life magazine carries a feature article headed "New treatments for frostbite—they save limbs of Korean casualties," in which it describes treatments given fighting men in Korea suffering from frostbite. The article explains that these injured men, unless otherwise wounded, are given shots of heparin to prevent the clotting of blood in the injured parts.

An article appearing in the Evening Press of January 11, 1950, told of Mr. McLean being included in the eighth edition of American Men of Science, which had just been published at that time, and stated that "Dr. McLean is known internationally for his discovery of heparin, the substance of the body which keeps the blood from clotting."

Dr. McLean holds a decree of bachelor of science from the University of California, a master of science degree from the University of Pennsylvania, and received his doctor of medicine degree from Johns Hopkins where he served as assistant resident surgeon for a number of years prior to 1923 when he was awarded a National Research Council fellowship and went to Europe for postgraduate studies at the universities at Berlin, Leipsig, Heidelberg, and Paris.

Why I Want To Grow Up in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call to the attention of all Members of Congress the remarks of a 15-year-old constituent of mine who has recently won a $2,500 scholarship for his statement Why I Want To Grow Up in America. The boy's name is Richard Henderson, of Mount Holly, N. J. When Dick Henderson heard of the national letter writing contest sponsored by an anonymous Californian, he sat down and wrote the following letter in a few minutes. This letter, the one to be judged the winner of 9,582 letters, is being broadcast by the Voice of America to all the peoples of the world. It speaks for itself:

WHY I WANT TO GROW UP IN AMERICA

(By Richard Henderson, Mount Holly, N. J.)

DEAR FRIENDS ACROSS THE SEA: From the heart of a small town of friendly people, I want to tell you why I love America and why I want to grow up here.

In our school we have almost every nationality, color and creed and we get along together, too. My best pal is an Italian boy. When a new student comes to our school from another land, we try to make him feel at home, simply because we like him.

If you should move next door tomorrow, I'll wager the neighbors would soon let you know that they would be hurt if you needed anything and didn't ask for it. The majority of Americans are like that and don't let anyone tell you different.

The great heart that is America is not votes as dictators would have you believe, but it is good, strong and steeped in the idea that all men deserve their individual freedom.

We have fought to preserve it for ourselves and for the world and the biggest tribute to that fight are the peoples of the world, who come to our shores and remain to love and cherish our way of life.

Some day I pray that we may walk in any country in the world, as all may walk in ours now, not to kill or enforce our government or our laws upon you, but simply to say, "I come here as your friend."

God bless you all.

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of RECORD the first of a series of 22 articles which have been written by Mr. Selig Greenberg and which appeared in the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, a newspaper published in the city of Providence, State of Rhode Island, entitled "Medicine in Crisis." These articles present a very impartial and objective discussion of the conditions faced by our medical schools and the medical profession in general.

I feel that the Members of the Senate would be very much interested in reading these articles in connection with their consideration of S. 337, which is a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

I am asking that the articles be inserted in a piecemeal fashion because the entire series has not yet been published and will be made available some time after April 1, which might well be after S. 337 has been acted upon. However, I feel that the articles which have appeared thus far will be most helpful and assure the Senate that from time to time I shall request to have the remaining articles inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—MEDICAL EDUCATION FACING PROFOUND FINANCIAL CRISIS—AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ALSO HAVE SERIOUS INTERNAL PROBLEM OVER SCOPE OF TEACHING; OFTEN AT ODDS WITH ORGANIZED LEADERSHIP IN PROFESSION

(By Selig Greenberg)

American medical education—the keystone of what has long been represented as the finest system of health care in the world—is confronted with a profound crisis.

The crisis is twofold.

First of all, the Nation's medical schools are faced with the most critical financial emergency in their history.

Secondly, the institutions training the doctors of tomorrow are going through a serious internal crisis. In this crisis of function, of determining what they should teach to keep up with the constantly expanding frontiers of medical knowledge and of how they can teach it most effectively, they frequently find themselves at loggerheads with the conservative leadership of the organized medical profession.

Both aspects of the crisis are of far more than academic significance. Indeed, they affect vitally all of us.

Our medical schools are by all odds our most important asset in the health field. They are the tools with which this country has wrested world leadership in medicine from the great European universities. Many of the spectacular advances in medical science, which to an unparalleled degree have warded off death and made life longer, easier, and safer, have been achieved in their laboratories and teaching hospitals.

Because of the high quality of their training in the diagnosis and treatment of disease, you feel secure when you call a doctor for a sick member of your family. It is futile even to talk about various proposals for improving the distribution of medical care in the United States unless there is assurance that our medical colleges can continue turning out competent physicians and can train them in adequate numbers.

There is no such full assurance today.

The desperate financial plight of the medical schools, the reason for which will be discussed in subsequent articles of this series, holds the direct sort of threat to both the quality and quantity of medical education.

MIGHT LOSE MOMENTUM

Many of the schools already have been forced to curtail their activities or to defer essential expansion of the scope of their teaching, thereby impairing its quality. Unless some way can be found to ease their financial difficulties, all of them will have to lower their standards or reduce the number of students they can train. Some may have to do both.

Such a development would be tragic. For we might actually lose the momentum of medical progress. The kind of medicine we get depends fundamentally on the kind of medical education we have. The quality of medical care and research we can expect in the years to come will be determined primarily by the adequacy of our facilities for the training of good doctors.

Dr. Alan Gregg, director of the medical sciences division of the Rockefeller Foundation for the past 20 years and one of America's most distinguished authorities on medical education, recently summed up the situation succinctly when he said that support of medical schools of the highest quality was "the only way in which older people can look after their children after they are gone."

SCHOOLS BEING "STARVED"

"If we let medical education in this country slip," Dr. Gregg warned, "then it is our children and our grandchildren who will be paying for the inadequate training of men to use medicine as best it can be used."

Dr. George Packer Berry, dean of Harvard Medical School, feels just as strongly that the maintenance of top-grade medical education is our paramount task in the health field. In one of two interviews I had with him he pointed out that while millions of dollars were being spent for research into the causes of specific disease, the medical schools were being "starved for bread-and-butter money." This, he thinks, puts the emphasis in the wrong place.

"We must focus our attention," Dr. Berry said, "on the goose that lays the golden eggs—the training of people who can furnish the medical care we are now capable of giving and who can do the research to improve that care still further. Or to put it in another way, we must never forget that the main stem of medicine is the production of doctors of the highest quality. There isn't much sense in concentrating on the branches while neglecting the main trunk."

WILL WIDEN EXISTING GAP

The threat of cutbacks in medical education comes at a time of expanding demands for medical service and of an anticipated sharp rise in such demand because of the national emergency and the threat of a new world war. Men in uniform require a great deal more medical personnel than civilians do. Even without all-out war, the armed services are certain to dip deeply into our reservoir of medical manpower within the next few years. This will widen still further the gap which many authorities believe already exists between the available number of physicians and our needs for health care.

The progress in medical science during the past 50 years has been described as greater than the advance made in the 2,400 years between the time of Hippocrates and the dawn of the twentieth century. But along with the triumphs of medical knowledge have come growing complexities. These have made medical education the longest, most arduous, and most expensive form of training we have. They also have set in motion forces which are gradually revolutionizing the day-to-day practice of medicine.

Medical education has set the pace for the far-reaching changes in medical practice and has at the same time had to adapt itself to these changes as they came along. This has not only led to a steady increase in the cost of training doctors but has embroiled the medical schools in the crisis of function with which they are now struggling.

SEEDS OF INTERNAL CRISIS

It is relatively easy to put your finger on the aspect of the emergency involving the dollars and cents of mounting operating deficits. But though it is much less tangible and most laymen have never even heard of it, the second aspect is just as compelling. While not quite so immediately threatening as the money troubles, the friction with powerful segments of organized medicine caused by the reappraisal of medical school functions holds serious possibilities.

The internal crisis stems, briefly, from the growing conviction of many medical educators that—

1. The job of the medical colleges extends beyond the education of new physicians, the advancement of knowledge through research and the care of patients in teaching hospitals and clinics. It is also their function to furnish continuing education to established doctors to help them keep abreast of rapidly developing new knowledge and methods.

2. The medical schools have to provide a constantly widening range of community medical services through the hospitals and clinics which they use for teaching. They have to do this if they are to give the kind of training which will be both adequate scientifically and in touch with the environment where the medicine they teach will eventually be practiced.

3. Medicine cannot be taught in a vacuum. It is a social as well as biological science, and its teaching cannot be divorced from the problem of the economics of medical care. It cannot be disassociated from the challenging issue of how the benefits of modern medicine can be made available to all, regardless of economic circumstances; of how we can bridge the chasm between the knowledge of the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of disease and its application to the needs of individuals and the community, between what medicine can do and what it actually does for a large proportion of the population. It is the duty of the medical colleges to instill within their students a wider awareness of the social and economic factors in the practice of medicine. It is furthermore part of their responsibility to join with others in providing the leadership for a frontal attack on the still unsolved problems of the most effective organization and distribution of medical care.

This conception of the responsibilities of medical schools has brought them into conflict with the American Medical Association and some of its component societies. In trying to serve as a stimulus and corrective for the medical profession, the schools have also become an irritant.

CLEAVAGE HAS DEVELOPED

While there is some reluctance on both sides to discuss the matter, there is little doubt that a cleavage has developed between the leadership of the organized medical profession and many of the men who are training the new generation of doctors. This split obviously has far-reaching implications, which will be gone into in later articles.

All that need be said here is that it is a disagreement on both theory and practice. The theory pertains to the role and responsibility of the medical profession in providing the American people with more adequate medical care. The practical questions have to do with the degree to which medical training—which to a striking extent is learning by doing and thus frequently constitutes actual medical service—tends to touch the economic interests of private practitioners.

The medical colleges are now going through a significant and extremely interesting process of intellectual turmoil and reassessment. This reporter ran quickly into this undercurrent of soul searching and inner ferment.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS SOUGHT

I started out about 3 months ago looking for answers to what appeared to be these relatively uncomplicated questions:

a. Are there enough doctors in the United States?

b. If there is a shortage, what are some of the reasons for it?

c. Just how serious is the financial problem of the medical schools and what are some of the possible remedies for it?

d. What are the medical colleges doing or considering by way of curricular changes to turn out doctors who are not only competent but also have a better undestanding of the social and economic scene in which their patients live and which directly affects the patients' physical and mental health?

But I no sooner started to ask these questions than I found that they were closely intertwined with the broader problems of the future of medical practice and medical care in this country.

ADEQUATE FOR WHAT?

When I asked, for instance, whether we had an adequate supply of doctors, men on the faculties of some of our best medical schools came back with these questions:

Adequate for what? Why don't you define, first of all, what you want the physicians to do and how they are going to do it? Are you talking about a set-up under which, as is now largely the case, the amount of medical care given is substantially determined by ability to pay for it? Or do you have in mind some broader system we may be able to devise under either voluntary or Government auspices which would make it possible to meet to a greater extent the needs for medical services? And what sort of practice are you talking about—the present system of individual practice or wider adoption of group practice which would permit doctors to pool their skills, equipment, and auxiliary personnel much more effectively than they do now?

I found the same thread of the over-all issues of medical care and practice running through the other questions I set out to ask.

We will inevitably encounter these issues throughout this series, which will include a discussion of such questions as the adequacy of our present number of doctors and medical training facilities; the factors which have limited medical-school expansion; the terrific competition for admission to medical schools; the financial crisis of medical education and the controversy over the proposal to help solve it through Federal subsidies; the extent and meaning of the cleavage between the medical faculties and some of the private practitioners; the role of medical education in the friction between doctors and hospitals; the problem of specialization versus general practice; the light shed by the income of physicians on the operation of the law of supply and demand in the medical profession; the pressure exerted by medical educators to streamline medical practice and thereby help reduce the spiraling costs of medical care; and some of the new ideas on the scope and methods of medical teaching which are hailed by authorities as a turning point in medicine.

MOST QUITE CONTROVERSIAL

All of these questions, as you can readily see, are important and complicated. Most of them are quite controversial. They can easily trap the unwary layman into unjustified assumptions and conclusions.

For this reason great care was taken to consult some of the leading authorities in the fields of medical education, care, and economics in the United States. As you can see from the list of those interviewed, which is published in an adjoining column, various views were represented among the men with whom I talked in New York, Chicago, Washington, Boston, and New Haven.

Because of space limitations and the technical nature of the material, some of the documentation will have to be omitted. Nor will it be possible to quote directly some of the men interviewed who would consent to talk freely only on an anonymous basis. But throughout this series every effort will be made to discuss the issues carefully and with full realization that they are not only technically complex but have an immediate bearing upon the health and welfare of the Nation as part of what Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, dean of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, has described as America's most essential industry.

Friends of United States of Latin America—FUSLA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to call to the attention of the Congress a most important project which a group of private citizens has undertaken to carry out in Latin America. For a little more than 3 years a small organization composed of public-spirited citizens of the United States and of several Latin-American nations has been quietly building the basis for an improvement program in Central America which may have the most profound effect in developing inter-American friendship. The organization to which I refer is known as the Friends of the United States of Latin America. It is headed by Stanley I. Posner, prominent Washington attorney and senior partner in the firm of Posner, Berge, Fox & Arent. Mr. Posner has voluntarily taken time away from his professional

life, in order to devote a substantial part of his efforts to launching this public-spirited undertaking which is already showing by tangible results what can be done to promote the sound economic and political development of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Though sometimes we should like to forget it, we of the United States have a lot to live down in our relations with the governments and peoples south of the border. A lot must be done to erase past impressions which still remain from older policies pursued by this Government some 50 or 60 years ago. We sometimes forget, for example, that it was not until January 1933 that the last American Marine was pulled out of Nicaragua. The United States formerly was opposed to any efforts by the Central American and other Latin-American countries to unite politically or economically on any common purposes which might tend to permit the growth of a strong nation or group of nations to the south of us. For years the idea of pan-Americanism was a stepchild. For a time there was fear in business circles that any strong union of Latin-American countries might lead to repudiation of debts. During a long period our pan-American policy, if it could be called that, was in the hands not of our Government but of some five or six private business corporations. It was a privately managed policy, alleviating a little distress here, winning the support of a few important men there, as business conditions dictated. Then, after the construction of the Panama Canal, it was feared that any regrouping which strengthened these nations might constitute a threat to the Canal. In net effect the whole policy was one of "divide and rule" rather than one of encouraging the growth of a united Latin-American neighborhood on a solid foundation. All of these things which we would like to forget are still matters vivid in the memories of our neighbors to the south.

Today none of these impressions is an accurate reflection of the true official policies of the United States Government. If any of the reasons for our former policy of restriction and frustration were ever valid—and this is a matter on which there could be some dispute—certainly they do not apply today. Among all our present worries it is not from a strong and unified nation or group of nations in Latin America that the United States needs to fear trouble. In any of the tropical and semi-tropical areas near the Panama Canal, far greater trouble would come from a low level of nutrition or from disease, unrest, dissatisfaction, and the general unhappiness which a low standard of living brings, than from any amount of political union and economic development. A sound, healthy economy supported by a happy, healthy, and industrious people would be no threat to any one.

Mr. Speaker, I want to describe what this organization, the Friends of the United States of Latin America, has been doing to further the sound economic and political development of the important region comprising the five traditional Central American republics and the Republic of Panama. It is a fascinating and inspiring story of private initiative devoted to a good cause and on a nonprofit basis. In this case a private organization is doing something which it is doubtful that government alone could do. By person-to-person contact with citizens and civic organizations in Central America, it has been quietly cutting through many of the barriers of skepticism which the unfortunate policies of earlier years had planted in the minds of our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the hopes of these neighboring peoples have been maturing for a long time. Over a hundred and thirty years ago the Latin American countries achieved their independence from Spain and began their tortuous struggle for economic independence to match their newly won political freedom. The great liberator, Simon Bolivar, always dreamed that one day the countries of Latin America would be united into a federation which could become a United States of Latin America. The dream was never realized in Bolivar's lifetime, nor has it been at any other time up to the present.

It is true that in 1821 the five states of Central America—Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, which together had constituted the vice royalty of Guatemala under Spanish rule—formed themselves into a Federated Republic of Central America. However, they could not even agree on a constitution until 1825, and the union stumbled on unhappily for some 15 years until it finally was dissolved in 1840. From 1840 until we built the Panama Canal, sporadic attempts were made to recreate the Federated Republic of Central America. At least a dozen times the matter was taken up, each time with no result.

The immediate cause for failure was always some residue of interstate jealousy left over from the Spanish period. But fundamentally behind all the failures was the shadow of the Central American jungle and the difficulty of maintaining an interconnected working economy among all the participating countries. To this day it has been practically impossible to maintain any kind of all-weather road system connecting the principal cities of these Central American republics. Swamps and mountains, and jungles which grow almost overnight, have always been more than a match for people armed only with hand implements. Without roads to get products to market, the agriculture of the territory has been limited largely to bananas and coffee. Without modern equipment and the knowledge of how to use it, this area—peopled though it is by human beings of marvelous culture and great potentialities—has seemed destined to be nothing but a balkanized area of banana republics, living in a constant state of threatened revolution.

Mr. Speaker, here is something to challenge the imagination of anyone who will take the time to think of the changes that some unselfish, friendly help might make in this troubled area which borders on our Caribbean lifeline.

The idea of fostering political unification of the Central American republics by making possible, first, the growth of their economic interdependence, had its beginning in 1947 when Stanley I. Posner represented the District of Columbia Bar Association in the Annual Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association in Lima, Peru. At that time a wave of revolutions had been sweeping through Latin America. There had been nine since July 1946. It would have been hard to avoid contrasting the realities of Latin American politics at that time with the history, at least in Central America, of constant though unsuccessful efforts to reunite the areas which at one time had been a federation in fact. It was at this conference in December 1947 that Dr. Humberto Ugolotti Dansay, an outstanding expert in Latin-American affairs, proposed that the Inter-American Bar Association throw its support behind a program which could lead to a political union of South and Central America. He pointed out that the constitutions of El Salvador and Guatemala, among others, already contained provisions looking forward to membership in a Latin-American confederation, and that many people throughout Latin America could be counted upon to help crystallize the idea.

Though Dr. Ugolotti's sweeping proposal was not immediately adopted by the Inter-American Bar Association, it was enough to lead Mr. Posner to incorporate the Friends of the United States of Latin America with the purpose of encouraging efforts toward political and economic union in Latin America. The Friends of the United States of Latin America, also known as FUSLA, was formed on May 26, 1948, as a nonprofit corporation under the laws of the District of Columbia. The purposes of the organization as set out in the charter are:

First. To promote and encourage the study of the economic and other advantages of the political union of all the Latin-American Republics, or any two of them.

Second. To provide scholarships to graduate or advanced students of any country in the Western Hemisphere for research or graduate study connected with a proposed political union of any of the Latin-American Republics.

Third. To undertake research activities and issue publications related to a proposed political union of any of the Latin-American Republics.

Fourth. To sponsor the interchange of cultural, economic, and social information concerning proposed political union of Latin-American Republics—provided, of course, that all the activities of the association must be of a character permitted by the laws of the United States and of the Latin-American Republics concerned.

At the time FUSLA was incorporated, in 1948, a strong sentiment for federation already existed among groups of citizens in the five Central-American Republics and the Republic of Panama. What these Central Americans needed was coordination, the asssurance of friendly understanding from their neighbors up here in the United States, and some immediate help in the form of technical education. They also needed some prospect of future help in procuring materials and equipment for public works like road building and sanitation.

As a step toward its over-all objective, the FUSLA organization decided to concentrate its first efforts into helping nonpartisan citizens' groups in the six countries just mentioned. The officers and advisory board of the FUSLA group have four reasons for believing that they might succeed where others during the past century have failed. They have a definitive program, they have an organization, they have the enthusiasm of a great moral crusade; and last, but not least, they have the knowledge that the economic means are now at hand—provided they can be mobilized—to overcome the obstacles which have proven insuperable in earlier times.

Not only are the economic means within the realm of possibility, but considerable spadework has already been done on particular economic problems in various localities of Latin America. When the FUSLA organization was formed there were already some 32 private international organizations and associations devoted to the promotion of inter-American cooperation. Also there were a number of Latin American schools and other institutions working toward economic improvement of specific areas. For example, there are agricultural experiment stations in all six Central American countries. At Turrialba in Costa Rica is the Inter-American Institute of Agriculture, which is backed by the Organization of American States, where great strides are being made in conquering tropical plant diseases. All of these private efforts have added to the totality of knowledge and experience which now make the time ripe for a unifying idea. This unifying idea is being supplied by the Friends of the United States of Latin America, which has frankly dedicated its first efforts to the proposition that there should be a political union of all the Central American Republics, based on a sound economic and social development of a region which can function as an economic unit once the physical limitation of jungles and swamps can be mastered.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that our Government has officially adopted a long-range policy which is friendly toward the technical and economic progress of other lands. In the now famous fourth point of his inaugural address in 1949 President Truman called for the adoption of a bold new program of technical assistance for the underdeveloped areas of the world. The Congress started this idea on its way toward practical realization in the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950. But Government can only go so far and so fast. Latin-American nations are already showing signs of impatience over the time it is taking to complete officially sponsored plans for a program of economic development. There is, furthermore, the danger that in the shuffle of our own rearmament program we may again let out official devotion to the "good neighbor" idea slide downhill as we did a few years ago, at the end of World War II.

The Friends of the United States of Latin America is still ahead of us in pointing the way to the kind of political stability which economic progress makes possible. This effort has already started producing concrete results without waiting for someone to draw a blueprint of the entire operation by which economic and political union of the states of Central America can be achieved.

At first an arrangement was begun for the exchange of university students at the graduate level between universities in the United States and Central America. It was hoped that the idea might take hold over the years on a large enough scale to provide a reserve of knowledge and understanding cutting across national boundaries. Meanwhile another plan was started, looking toward the vocational training of mechanics and craftsmen to maintain and repair mechanical equipment.

The most recent evidence of the work of the FUSLA organization is a project now being carried out in Nashville, Tennessee, by a group of educators and civic leaders who have found themselves drawn into an experiment in international cooperation by the sheer logic of an idea. A few weeks ago a group of 18 Latin-American students arrived in Nashville, 3 from each of the six Central American Republics. Two others from Mexico also joined the group. These young men arrived to start a course of training in the maintenance and repair of agricultural and road-building machinery, including gasoline and diesel engines, welding, and the other basic techniques on which the economic development of their countries must ultimately rest. This training is being provided at the level needed for real help to the countries from which these students come. When they complete their training and return home to teach others what they have learned, the members of this nuclear group, and their successors over the years, may ultimately spark an industrial revolution that will make constant political revolution a thing of the past. The trainees have the opportunity to learn about the United States at first-hand, without the intervention of Government agencies, and without any attempt at indoctrination. Here is a privately operated venture which may well point the way to an effective Point 4 program for Central America, starting literally from the grass roots.

The Nashville project has been undertaken by H. O. Balls, president of the Nashville Auto-Diesel School, who offered to provide free scholarships and financial assistance almost immediately after he caught the spirit of the FUSLA idea. A citizens' committee has taken hold both to see that the students are provided with opportunities to learn about the community around them and also to see that they are protected from overentertainment or lionizing. This committee is headed by Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancelor of Vanderbilt University, and includes outstanding civic and business leaders of Nashville.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more to the story, but what I have already covered is enough to indicate the importance of this work. The men who formed the Friends of the United States of Latin America are not unaware of the obstacles which might make it difficult to achieve their objective. They realize that among the 20 republics which make up Latin America are both large and small states, industrialized and backward countries. They know that there are racial problems, age-long disputes, and prejudices, economic rivalries, and even in some cases simple obstinacy based on the history of past wars and inter-American plundering. However, the advisory council which Mr. Posner has managed to assemble includes men with enough vision to see beyond the obstacles of the moment. This group consists of Capt. Colón Eloy Alfaro, for many years Ambassador of Ecuador to the United States and almost every other country of the Western Hemisphere; Prof. Richard Behrendt, director of the inter-American studies at Colgate University; Honorable Carlos Dávila, former President of Chile and distinguished author; Prof. Harold E. Davis, director of the division of inter-American studies at the American University; Dr. Paul F. Douglass, president of the American University; Prof. A. L. Gitlow, professor of economics at New York University; Philip Leonard Green, outstanding writer and authority on Latin American affairs; and Lt. Comdr. Alvin E. Moore, retired, exponent of a plan for world government.

The idea of these men is not to meet the obstacles head on, by becoming embroiled in all of the historical tag ends left from a century and more of frustrations and mismanagement, but to try instead the cultivation of the Central American garden. They started first arranging exchanges of graduate students. They have now moved to a more immediately practical stage of technical training for economic development work. They are encouraging the development of regional schools of vocational training throughout Central America for the furtherance of economic and social integration, along with road building, and other integrating public works. All of this is to be done on a voluntary basis so that it need not be accepted by any government or individual in Latin America who does not agree. But so far no one has disagreed. It is one of the heartening things about a great idea that so few people disagree with it.

Mr. Speaker, efforts in this field are all too few; and particularly, efforts which try to point beyond the immediate details of health centers, experiment stations, schools, and the like, to a unifying idea such as this one for regional integration both economic and political. We have heard of many inspiring projects for human betterment and international cooperation, but up to this time I have heard of no other similar attempt to get to the roots of the problems of Latin American unity.

Our Government should welcome and encourage such activities on the part of public-spirited private groups, and we should hope that more people will join in contributing services and funds to support an organization like the Friends of the United States of Latin America.

India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the gift of grain for India was proposed, our office sent for any available information on Indian famines from the Library of Congress. The legislative reference service of the Library of Congress sent us the History and Economics of Indian Famines, by A. Loveday, B. A., late scholar of Peterhouse, Cambridge. The same was published in London by G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., in 1914. Besides the introduction it contains a chapter on famines previous to the English predominance, that is previous to 1770. Chapter II is on famines and the East Indian Company. Chapter III contains famines from the abolition of the East India Company to the present day, namely, 1907, and their summaries. Chapter IV contains relief organization. Chapter V contains protective measures and wider economic problems. "Appendix A" of this interesting book contains the date of the famine or flood, the locality, the state, the reference and the remarks. The first reference to any famine in this appendix which was merely a legend, carries the date of 297 circa. The next one was 445 circa with the date not definitely known.

Starting with the year 917, I have separately attached a sheet as outlined under appendix A. This sheet contains from the year 917 to 1907, approximately 102 famines or floods. The years involved total 990. This shows an average major flood or drought every 9 years for almost 1,000 years.

Having always heard of droughts, floods and locust swarms in India, I wondered who supplied them grain prior to the request that the United States supply it to the extent of $190,000,000 or 9,000,000 long tons or 336,000,000 bushels. To maintain the rationing system, even at a level below last year's the Government of India finds that it will have to import close to 6,000,000 tons in 1951. India is procuring almost 4,000,000 tons of this total through the use of its own foreign-exchange resources, and the $190,000,000 worth or the remaining 2,000,000 tons, about 75,000,000 bushels, would have to come in a large measure if not entirely from the United States.

I was also curious to know just how a foreign government requested such help or assistance as was asked of the United States. I found that M. K. Kirpalani, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Embassy of India in Washington, on February 8, 1951, transmitted a letter to Mr. Acheson, the Secretary of State. Mr. Kirpalani in his letter explained under instructions from the Government of India—

I have the honor to communicate to you the following:

* * * * *

2. On account of a succession of natural calamities cereal production in India in 1951 is expected to fall short by at least 5,500,000 tons as compared with 1950. Although vigorous attempts have been made and are being made to increase production, floods made worse by earthquake and subsequent drought have seriously handicapped efforts.

3. In 1950, 3,000,000 tons of cereals—2,100,000 tons from imports and 900,000 tons from government stocks—were distributed in addition to the grain available within the country. In spite of this, rationing broke down in many parts of India and the ration had to be reduced to below 12 ounces in most states for a long period. Now the ration has had to be temporarily reduced to nine ounces all over the country.

4. Cereals form the principal part of the diet of the people and 12 ounces provides only 1,200 calories. It is estimated that about 9,900,000 tons of grain will be necessary to enable government to meet its ration obligations in 1951. Out of this quantity approximately 3,500,000 tons is likely to be procured within the country. Government of India is arranging to import 4,000,000 tons of grain in 1951, which is all that can be paid for with available funds. This leaves a requirement of 2,400,000 tons uncovered.

5. Government of India is facing an exceedingly difficult food situation. Semi-famine conditions prevail in many areas and it is apprehended that unless a major part of the deficit is made good by large imports, acute famine conditions are likely to develop later in the year and the situation may well get out of hand.

6. In accordance with the representations that have already been made to you by the Ambassador on December 16, 1950, the Government of India requests the United States Government to give them ad hoc assistance during 1951 to obtain 2,000,000 tons of food grains and would greatly appreciate if the grain be supplied on special and easy terms. I avail myself of the opportunity to convey to you, Mr. Secretary, the assurances of my highest consideration.

M. K. KIRPALANI,
Chargé d'Affaires Ad Interim.

Please note in the second paragraph, Mr. Kirpalani stated that on account of a succession of natural calamities cereal production in India in 1951 is expected to fall short by at least 5,500,000 tons as compared with 1950. Please note he states that it is expected to fall short. He did not say that it has.

In the introduction of Indian Famines, the book which I mentioned previously, on page 4, it states:

> The frequency and extent of famines in India should be no cause for surprise. That they are not more extended in area and more tragic in their effects is due on the one hand to the size, and on the other to the varying elevations of that country.

It further states:

> History gives no example of a drought extending over the whole of India; and meteorologists declare such an event impossible.

While this book was published in 1914, the elevations in India, no doubt, except for erosion, are the same. I believe the climatic conditions remain the same, also.

Paragraph 4 of Mr. Kirpalani's letter states that cereals form the principal part of the diet of the people and 12 ounces provides only 1,200 calories. Naturally, 1,200 calories is not very much. The same paragraph estimates that about 9,900,000 tons of grain will be necessary to enable the Government to meet its ration obligations in 1951, and out of this quantity approximately 3,500,000 tons is likely to be procured within the country and that the Indian Government is arranging to import 4,000,000 tons of grain in 1951, which is all that can be paid for with available funds. This leaves a requirement of 2,400,000 tons uncovered.

Paragraph 5 states that India is facing an exceedingly difficult food situation. Presumably this is another of their every-9-year famines for approximately the last 1,000 years. The paragraph further states that semifamine conditions prevail in many areas, and unless the deficit is made up by imports that acute famine conditions are likely to develop later in the year, and the situation may get out of hand. The droughts and sand storms in the United States in the thirties got out of hand, but we survived. Please note that in paragraph 5, Mr. Kirpalani states that the situation may get out of hand.

In paragraph 6, Mr. Kirpalani states that the Government of India requests the United States Government to give them ad hoc assistance during 1951 to obtain 2,000,000 tons of food grains and would greatly appreciate it if the grain could be supplied on special and easy terms. He did not request a gift.

Next, I was curious to know or to read the message asking the Congress to provide assistance to India to meet the request as outlined in Mr. Kirpalani's letter. It is contained in House Document No. 56, Eighty-second Congress, first session. The recommendation was made by the executive department to comply with the request of the Indian Government. The request of the Congress was not made on a basis of special and easy terms. It was made on what is called a grant which actually means a gift, and remember Mr. Kirpalani's letter asked for easy terms. The recommendation to the Congress by the executive department was, in part:

> We would also expect the Government of India to do all it can to expand supplies and otherwise to lessen the danger from crop shortages in the future.

I wish to remind you that under the Indian Famines book from the Library of Congress, the record shows that they have had a famine every 9 years for 1,000 years.

The message further stated that—

> Shipments must begin by April.

Mr. Kirpalani's letter stated that the 1951 crop is expected to fall short, and the Indian famines authority from which I have quoted, states that it is possible to raise three crops a year in India.

How proud of the United States American citizens should be, supporting a Republic such as ours, a nation of 150,000,000 people made up of immigrants from all countries of the world, 175 years old, being able under the two-party system to be in such a position that a nation of 350,000,000 souls and over 1,000 years old would request help even on a pay-back basis as outlined by Mr. Kirpalani.

Again referring to paragraph 6 of Mr. Kirpalani's letter wherein he asks that the grain be supplied on special and easy terms, it seems to me that we are not even complying or attempting to comply with the request. A Christian gift of $190,000,000 worth of grain to a starving nation is one thing; but we are not doing that as evidenced by the executive communication and Secretary Acheson's statement before the Foreign Affairs Committee. The grain is proposed to be given to the Government of India to be put in with that part of their shortage which they have purchased and are paying for from Communist China, Canada, and Australia. These countries have sold them their part while our part was asked for on easy terms. Again, our part of the grain is not to be given to starving people of India but to be placed in the hands of the Indian Government again with that part that they are agreeing to pay for and then sold by the Indian Government to their own starving people.

It is proposed by the executive department of the United States Government that the funds derived from the grain from the United States be used to further the economy of the Indian Government which, with Pakistan, was given its freedom by England in 1947.

If it is to be done on a humane basis to save the lives of starving people on their every 9-year famine average, why should it be sold to them. Our office is reliably informed that last year India produced $349,000,000 worth of manganese, mica, jute, cyamite, and monazite sands used industrially and that the United States purchased $101,000,000 worth, not quite one-third of the total.

The only conclusion I can reach after reasonably studying the matter is that India wants food grains from the United States as part of a total on easy terms and that the executive department has asked the Congress to authorize it on a gift basis. The Indian Government in turn is to sell it to her people should the 1951 crop condition prove a failure or a partial failure. There is no proposal of any strategic material which we can use to be taken in exchange either now or at a future date for stockpiling.

The Pakistan League of America, Inc., mailed to all Members of the Eighty-second Congress a very interesting four-page pamphlet. The religion of Pakistan is Mohammedanism and that of India, Hinduism. In 1947 when the two nations were formed, millions of Mohammedans migrated from India to Pakistan and millions of Hindus in Pakistan migrated to India. The testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee was to the effect that they left their crops standing in the fields, their religious immigration being made in such haste. The Pakistan memo states:

> 1. It (India) refused to buy 600,000 tons of food grains which Pakistan offered to sell below world prices.
>
> 2. It reduced its purchases of food grains from the United States from $63,000,000 in 1948 to $24,400,000 in 1950.

It further states that on the other hand it stepped up its purchases of raw cotton from the United States from $4,000,000 in 1948 to $68,000,000 in 1950, and that this was because India was refusing to buy Pakistan cotton in an attempt to cripple Pakistan's economy.

The Pakistan pamphlet further states that India declined to buy its normal offtake of raw jute from Pakistan, thus losing in terms of manufactured jute goods approximately $100,000,000 in dollar exchange which it could have applied to food purchases in the United States. If this had been done, this would have made India's request for easier terms easier.

The pamphlet continues as follows:

> If there is famine in India today, it has not been brought about by natural calamities. It is the direct and inevitable result of the Government of India's plans to break Pakistan's economy. India has been waging economic war against Pakistan since September 1949. In an attempt to force Pakistan to devalue her currency, India stopped all trade with Pakistan from that date.

Again remember that these two nations were established in 1947 when England gave India its freedom.

Why should the United States get involved in foreign, religious controversies?

Will India's request for $190,000,000 worth of grain on easy terms stop famines, floods, pestilence, and locust swarms which have occurred every 9 years for 1,000 years? If I believed it would, the $190,000,000 worth of grain should be given them as a gift. I do not believe it will stop it for 1 minute.

The Indian peninsula stretching as it does from the eighth to the thirty-eighth degree of latitude having innumerable variations in climate, political, social, and racial conditions, is not going to change in 1951 from what has been taking place for the last 1,000 years. Monsoon storms beyond control occur in India. With a 6-month rainy season and a six-month dry season, either floods or droughts can cause the trouble. The autumn crops in India are reaped in September and December, and the dry crops reaped in March and April.

The $190,000,000 worth of grain for India according to Secretary Acheson is not included in the seventy-one billion-dollar-plus budget—1951–52—of the United States.

How far can the United States go with its resources on such a budget and such an additional request of $190,000,000 which is gone forever?

Our office receives daily many letters protesting unnecessary Federal spending. This legislation as proposed in the form of a gift is just that. If this proposal were changed whereby the United States might obtain some strategic material in exchange for grain, I might have a different viewpoint.

I do not believe this country can afford this authorization on a gift basis. I do not believe it should, as India has not asked for it under such conditions. For my part I will not support it.

Everyone knows what a farce and loss the China programs proved to be and which, as one Member of Congress, I had no part of. I will not be a party to a repetition of it in India.

Date	Locality	State	Reference	Remarks
97 circa	Magadha	N	Dutt, Hist., vol. ii, p. 317	This is merely a legend.
45 circa	Kashmir	N	Ibid., vol. iii, p. 57	The date is not definitely known.
17–18	do	N	Stein's Rajat, bk. v., VV. 271–7	Great mortality; no apparent steps taken to mitigate distress.
1033	Hindustan	N	Dow, vol. i., p. 85; Briggs, vol. i, p. 103	In many parts of the world; accompanied by jowdry plague.
1116–19	Deccan and Burhanpur	N	Elliot, vol. viii, p. 36	
1230	Bombay	N	Eth., p. 88	Legend that it lasted 12 years.
1259	do	N	Imp. Gaz. Ind., vol. i.	
1291	Delhi and Siwalik district	N	Elliot, vol. iii, p. 140; vol. vi, p. 47	"Next year such rain fell as but few people could remember."
Between 1296 and 1317	Delhi country	N	Briggs, vol. i, p. 556; cf. Elphinstone, 360	The exact date of this famine is not ascertainable; probably circa 1305.
1343–45	do	N	Briggs, vol. i, p. 428; Elliot, vol. iii, pp. 235 seq., 612, 630.	People migrated to Bengal, also Malwa.
Between 1351 and 1363	Kashmir	N	Briggs, vol. iv, p. 457	
1396	Deccan	N	Eth., p. 99; Scott, vol. i, p. 56	Reported to have lasted 12 years.
1425	do	N	Briggs, vol. ii, p. 495, Scott, vol. i., p. 102	The Sultan prayed in 1426, and rain came.
1471–72	Bijapur district, All Bahmini kingdom and Bombay	N	Briggs, vol. i, pp. 402–4	No grain sown for 2 years.
1494	Delhi country	N	Elliot, vol. vi, p. 157	
1500		N	Baber's Mem. Talbot, p. 61	All relief prevented by wars.
1530	Bombay	N	Eth., p. 100	Caused partly by war; no relief.
1627	Sind	N	Eth., p. 16	Lasted 6 months; caused by crop burning.
1640–43	do	N	Eth., p. 17	Same cause, then 2 years' drought.
1640	Coromandel Coast	N	Investiga. Portug., vol. xvi, p. 279	Spread over the east coast of the Bay Bay.
1554–55	Delhi, Agra, and Bajana districts	N	Elliot, vol. v, p. 400	People fed on acacia seeds and leaves of cattle.
1556	Hindustan	N	Elliot, vol. vi, p. 21	People fed on each other.
1576	Delhi country	N	Elliot, vol. vi, p. 297	No relief.
1577	Kutch	N	Eth., p. 26	Liberal relief and cooked food.
1592 circa	Sholapur district	N	Scott, vol. i, pp. 314 and 360	Also a pestilence.
1594–98	Central India, Hindustan	N	Elliot, vol. vi, pp. 94, 193	Reported all over Asia; also apparently plague; lasted 3 or 4 years.
1613–15	Punjab	N	Elliot, vol. vi, p. 346	Afterwards plague.
1629	Gujarat, Ahmedabad	N	Eth., p. 49	Not severe, and stores proved sufficient.

Date	Locality	State	Reference	Remarks
1628-29	Hoscoor	N	Eth., p. 63	Dogs and men eaten.
1629-30	Deccan	N	Dow, vol. iii, pp. 128-9, 341; Elliot, vol. vii, pp. 24-5, 263, 246-7, etc., vide text.	Also pestilence; spread over nearly the whole of Shah Jehan's dominions; extensive relief and more extensive mortality.
1630	Ahmedabad	N	Eth., pp. 37 seq	Lasted several years; grain imported; also plague of locusts and cattle disease.
1640	Aurangzib's	N	Elliot, vol. vii, pp. 246-8, 263; Dow, vol. iii, pp. 310, 341; Scott, vol. ii, p. 47; Eth., vide text.	Evidence only shows Bengal and Bombay as definitely immune.
1676-77	Hyderabad, especially Culburga district	N	Mackenzie MSS., vol. vi, pp. 33-35; Scott, vol. ii, p. 47.	Apparently caused in the first place by excessive rains.
1685	Deccan and Hyderabad	N	Elliot, vol. vii, p. 328	War prevented any relief.
1703-04	Bombay and Deccan	N	Scott, vol. ii, pp. 112-114	
1709	Bombay district	N	Der Neue Welt Bott, pt. vi, p. 67	Prices rose to 32 times the normal.
1718	do	N	Eth., p. 40	The extent of this famine is not known.
1737	do	N	Baird Smith	
1739	do	N	Scott, vol. ii, pp. 210-211	Also pestilence.
1746-47	Bombay district, Kutch	N	Eth., pp. 28, 40, 60	Cooked food given in Kutch.
1759	Bombay district	N	Eth., pp. 17, 19	Caused by war mainly; short; but also general over other parts.
1770	Bengal	N. B.	Orissa Report, passim. Hunter, Rural Bengal, etc.	Vide text.
1781	Madras	N. B.	Madras Manual of Admin., vol. i, p. 298	Caused partly by Hyder Ali's devastations.
1782	Bombay and Madras districts. Hyder Ali's country.	N. B.	Eth., p. 17	2½ years; caused partly by burning of crops.
1783	Bengal, Bellary, U. P., Kashmir, and Rajputana.	N. B.	Orissa Report, passim	E. I. Co. show greater energy.
1787	South Mahratta country	N	Eth., p. 103	Caused largely by locusts.
1790-92	Bombay and in Hyderabad, Gujarat, N. Madras, Kutch, Orissa.	N. B.	Eth., pp. 22, 50, 55, 105, etc	In Dharwar women and children sold. Corn imported from Bengal.
1790-1801 to 1802-4	N. W. Province, Bombay district, Central India, and Rajputana.	N. B.	Vide text, numerous	Vide text.
1806-7	Widespread, especially Carnatic	N. B.	Madras Manual of Admin., vol. i, p. 298, Eth., p. 12	
1812	Bombay, Agra, and Madras districts	N. B.	Eth., pp. 33, 78, 126, etc., vide text	Locusts in Bombay; pestilence in Ahmedabad, vide text.
1819-20	N. W. P., Rajputana, Deccan, Broach	N. B.	Eth., p. 79; Baird Smith, etc	In Broach for 2 years excessive rainfall; panic occurs; migration.
1830 and 1832	Upper Sind	N.	Eth., p. 18	Ameers throws open Government granaries.
1834-35	Deccan and Bombay, Madras	N. B.	Eth., pp. 79, 98, 134-137. Madras Manual Admin., op. cit.	British Government appoints a committee of wells and tanks also relief. It was not acute in Madras.
1833-33	Sholapur, N. Madras	N. B.	Eth., p. 101; B. Smith; various Comms., etc.	Vide text.
1833-34	Cujarat, Kandish, N. Deccan, and parts N. W. P.	N. B.	Eth., p. 79; various Comms., etc	Vide text. In Cujarat partly due to locusts. Nowhere very severe.
1853-55	Bellary, and S. Madras and Deccan, Rajputana, part of Bombay district.	N. B.	B. Smith; Eth., p. 80; various Comms., etc.	In Thana and Kolaba, followed by excessive rains in 1854, culminating in a hurricane.
1860-61	Parts of N. W. P., Punjab and Rajputana and Kutch.	N. B.	B. Smith, etc	Vide text. First famine after abolition of E. I. C.
1866	Deccan	N. B.	Eth., p. 80	Not very intense.
1866-67	Orissa, Behar, Ganjam, Bellary, Hyderabad, S. Mysore.	N. B.	Orissa Report, etc	Vide text. Failure in Orissa in relief organization.
1868-70	S. N. W. P., Punjab, Gujarat, parts of Central Prov., N. Deccan, Rajputana.	N. B.	1880 Comm., etc	Vide text. Terrible mortality in Rajputana. British relief better organized, but financial strain.
1873-74	Behar, Bundelkhand, S. W. Prov	B	1880 Comm., etc	The "Panic Famine."
1876-78	Madras, Bombay, Mysore, and Hyderabad.	N. B.	do	Vide text.
1877-78	U. P., Kashmir	N. B.	do	Do.
1878-80	Ganjam, Native Orissa States	N. B.	1888, etc	Relief too late.
1896-97	N. W. Provinces, Bengal, Bombay, C. Provinces, Berar, Madras, Delhi district, Parts S. India, Hyderabad, N. W. Rajputana.	N. B.	do	Vide text.
1899-1900	C. Provinces, Hissar dist., Bombay, Berar, Hyderabad, Rajputana (and Ajmare), Central India.		1900, etc	Vide text. The greatest famine history records.
1899-1900	Baroda, Kutch, Kathiawar, Native states of C. Province, S. Punjab.	N. B.	do	The drought affected also, less severely, Bengal, Agra, S. Madras, Delhi district.
1900-2	Cujarat	B	Report on relief	
1906-7	Darbhanga district	B	do	Extensive floods.
1907	United Provinces	B	do	Extraordinary success in decentralized relief.

Immediate Hearings on Railroad Retirement Legislation Are Necessary To Relieve the Plight of Retired Railroaders or Their Survivors

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, early in January I introduced three bills all of them designed to liberalize provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and to increase present benefits. These measures and scores of similar bills were pending in the Eighty-first Congress, being introduced by Members of Congress like myself who represent heavily populated railroad districts where retired railroaders and their dependents are near starvation levels because of the inadequate benefits received under the Railroad Retirement Act.

On January 22, 1951, I wrote to Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and renewed my pleas that I made to him over a period of the last 2 years that action be scheduled on railroad retirement legislation. My letter to Chairman CROSSER was as follows:

Hon. ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CROSSER: As you know, I represent a heavily populated railroad district in Pennsylvania and for the past 2 years I have made a sincere effort to get action on amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act that were pending before your committee.

With the convening of the Eighty-second Congress and with the cost of living still skyrocketing, I have introduced H. R. 1404, 1405, and 1406, designed to liberalize the provisions of existing law and to increase benefits to not only annuitants and pensioners, but also to widows and other survivors.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board, the average age of the disabled and retired annuitant is 70.2 years and the pensioner 81.9 years; while the average age of the widow is 72.8 years. The average monthly benefit received by the annuitant is $82.81 monthly, the pensioner $70.60 monthly, and the widow $29.59 monthly.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, the cost of living as of November 15, 1950, has increased 71 percent over the cost of living in 1937. For an illustration, food has increased 99 percent; wearing apparel 89.7 percent; rent 24.3 percent; fuel, electricity, and so forth 43.4 percent; house-furnishings 94 percent and miscellaneous 58.9 percent. While these increases have taken place since 1937, the only percentage of increase in retirement benefits was 20 percent granted by the Eightieth Congress.

I am fully familiar with the actuarial studies made from time to time and while the retirement fund was said to be unable to stand an increase in benefits the past 2 years, it is my opinion that the fund is capable of such an increase when you take into consideration the increased income of the fund resulting from increased wages and high employment in the railroad industry.

You may not agree with me when I say that I have retired employees and survivors of deceased employees in my Congressional District that are actually hungry and living under conditions that you and I would find repugnant to the American way of life. These people are the victims of a frozen income over which they have no control. Congress, as custodian of the retirement fund, is obligated to provide relief to these people by immediately considering legislation that will remedy their plight.

There is general sentiment in railroad circles that the fund will stand an increase in benefits and we are guilty of gross neglect if we do not do something immediately to relieve the distress of annuitants, pensioners, and survivors under the Railroad Retirement Act.

I sincerely hope that you will give serious and favorable consideration to my plea for early action on pending amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

JANUARY 22, 1951.

On February 26, Chairman CROSSER replied to my letter by advising "careful studies are now being made and I expect a report thereon very shortly."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is the same old story that studies are being made despite the fact that we were given the same excuse in 1949 and 1950. While these so-called studies are under way the cost of living has skyrocketed to an all-time high and the letters I am receiving from recipients of railroad retirement benefits reveal the widespread misery caused by the refusal for over 2 years in scheduling action on amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. I have talked with other Members of Congress from railroad districts, and they inform me that they too are receiving pathetic letters urging action on railroad retirement legislation.

How would any of us feel if forced to live on one meal a day? Well, that is the situation with thousands of retired railroaders and their dependents who are trying to exist on the present scale of retirement benefits.

There is something radically wrong either with the Railroad Retirement Act or the administration of it. Instead of the age-old excuse that studies are being made, let Congress get busy with hearings on the subject. We are the representatives of the people and they have a right to expect action from us.

I want to be fair in my request that prompt action be taken and that hearings be held on railroad-retirement legislation, yet I do not propose to be charged with evading my responsibility to the retired railroaders or their survivors.

The Stars and Stripes Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been evidence of a growing movement in this country to relegate the flag of the United States to a secondary position, and to implant the flag of the United Nations in its stead. Certain groups have been active in obtaining special recognition for the United Nations flag, and near riots occurred in some localities where patriotic citizens vigorously protested the display of the United Nations flag unaccompanied by the flag of the United States.

It is high time that appropriate action is taken by the Congress to protect the flag of the United States of America and to prevent the use of any other flag in its place. For this purpose I have introduced House Joint Resolution 167 which would establish a rule that no foreign national or supranational flag shall be publicly displayed unless it is accompanied by the flag of the United States.

And to stimulate greater interest in the proper and frequent display of our Stars and Stripes, I have also introduced House Resolution 64 to encourage all citizens to display our flag whenever possible.

In the United States today there is a growing need for the spirit of patriotism, devotion to country, and willingness to sacrifice for those ideals which were the flaming torch that lighted the way of our valiant ancestors who bore arms at Bunker Hill and stood steadfast with Washington at Valley Forge.

Though outnumbered many times, without provisions, without money, and without adequate arms, those patriots of the Revolution were willing to die for the freedom they cherished, and fought the might of Britain to win the blessings of liberty which have been the birthright of Americans for more than 160 years.

Today we do not have the dedication to purpose and ideals which the founders of our Nation possessed. And today our beloved Nation is in danger. Let us make no mistake about that. The Communist threat throughout the world continues unabated, changing direction continually and moving constantly from a position of threatening belligerence to one of soft-spoken pleas for peace. But whatever front is presented to the world at large, the fixed purpose of the Communists to undermine the United States of America, divide the western alliance, and destroy our Nation through internal collapse or through open aggression, remains.

KEEP STRONG YOUR FAITH IN THE UNITED STATES

We need today in the United States a rebirth of the patriotic spirit of 1776 which is symbolized by the American flag. We need the faith in God and in right that brought liberty and established a free nation on our shores. We need a rededication of every American citizen to the purposes and ideals upon which this Nation was founded, and we must uproot and destroy treason and communism wherever it is found.

During recent years a move has appeared in our land to convince Americans that patriotic pride in America is isolationist, that it is wrong to believe the United States the greatest and finest country in the world, the only land Americans are willing to fight for and die for.

How long must this internationalist policy which is so dear to the administration continue before we awake to our danger, and call for a return to good old-fashioned American patriotism. It is true we are no longer in the horse and buggy days, but honest patriotism taught by parents and teachers to the youth of our Nation, the flying of the Red, White, and Blue, and the celebration of the Fourth of July in the town squares throughout the land brought forth Jackson, Grant, and Lincoln, not Coplon, Remington, and Alger Hiss.

We Americans should wake up to the fact that we must look out for the interests of our Nation and our people while we pour out our resources to save the rest of the world and risk the loss of our own freedoms and our own system of free enterprise. We can in the spirit of brotherhood and cooperation, and with the honest desire to follow the Christian principle of helping our neighbors, do what we can to help them to raise their standards of living and strengthen their defenses against the common enemy.

But we cannot look out for the interests of all the rest of the world at the expense of our own Nation and our own people. We cannot risk economic collapse and the loss of our own freedom. We cannot adopt a policy of America last while no other Nation in the world has evidenced any willingness to relinquish its own self-interests in behalf of the United States.

The recent campaign sponsored by the administration through the Department of Agriculture to fly the flag of the United Nations in every city, town and village in the country, was an example of the campaign to undermine and destroy American patriotism.

KEEP OUR GLORIOUS FLAG FLYING

The proud Stars and Stripes which was adopted as our national flag on June 14, 1777, has become a symbol of liberty and freedom throughout the world. And our flag is the only flag in the world that is never dipped to any individual, not even to the President.

Americans have loved and respected our flag since it first unfurled in the breeze. It has moved westward across the Nation with our pioneers. It has accompanied our troops into battle on land and on sea. It is far more to a loyal American than bits of bunting stitched into a design, it is a hallowed emblem of the spirit of America.

I have long recognized the need for a revival of honest American patriotism in our land as the best answer to those enemies of democracy who would spread the insidious lies of communism. And I believe one of the best ways we can foster a resurge of American spirit throughout the United States is through greater display of Old Glory and assurance that no other flag shall usurp the place of honor which should be accorded in this Nation to our own flag.

For this purpose I have introduced House Resolution 64 and House Joint Resolution 167, and these resolutions, if adopted by Congress, would spark a campaign to keep the flag flying on high from every flagpole in the land, a banner of hope and freedom, a symbol of national unity and faith in the future of the United States of America.

As forcefully expressed by the American poet, Henry Holcomb Bennett:

The colors before us fly;
But more than the flag is passing by.

Sea fights and land fights, grim and great,
Fought to make and to save the state;
Weary marches and sinking ships;
Cheers of victory on dying lips.

Days of plenty and days of peace;
March of a strong land's swift increase;
Equal justice, right and law,
Stately honor and reverend awe.

Sign of a nation, great and strong,
To ward her people from foreign wrong;
Pride and glory and honor—all
Live in the colors to stand or fall.

Congressional Committee Doubts Reliability of CASBO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 1951 issue of the Nation's Schools:

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE DOUBTS RELIABILITY OF CASBO

"The lady doth protest too much, methinks." Shakespeare put these words in the mouth of the Queen replying to Hamlet, but the same good counsel might appropriately be addressed to the organization that identifies itself as the Conference of American Small Business Organizations (CASBO).

This group is one of the 10 identified by the field secretary of the NEA Defense Commission as agencies whose good intentions toward public education are doubted. It campaigns for permission to "evaluate" textbooks and supplementary material used in public schools, especially those dealing with American history and social sciences. It publishes the Educational Reviewer, which it describes as "a quarterly review of educational materials."

Since CASBO presumes to take over a function that legally belongs to school boards—namely, the evaluation of instructional materials—it is important for school administrators to know that this organization has been the subject of a special study and report by the House of Representatives through its select committee on lobbying activities, under the chairmanship of FRANK BUCHANAN of Pennsylvania. This House Report No. 3232 was ordered printed on December 26, 1950, and can now be obtained from the United States Government Printing Office.

Inasmuch as the Educational Reviewer has been plugged recently by Radio Commentator Fulton Lewis and has been wholeheartedly endorsed in an editorial (January 29, 1950) in the Chicago Daily Tribune, friends of education really should read the full 73 page report. The Tribune maintains that "Every school trustee in this country and every school administrator ought to subscribe to the Educational Reviewer." It asserts that "the reviewers whose work appears in the periodical are chiefly concerned with discovering the bias of textbook authors and exposing any propaganda which results from it," and declares that "the learned reviewers are liberals in the old and respectable sense of the word."

A much different conclusion was reached by the congressional committee after its extended and thorough investigation. The report reads:

"CASBO makes a more ingenious contribution to the encyclopedia of pressure tactics with the Educational Reviewer, 'a quarterly review of educational materials' published for CASBO's committee on education. The Reviewer's avowed function is to examine textbooks from the point of view of their attachment to the principles of 'personal liberty and economic liberty,' and their freedom from 'concealed theories of collectivism.' The Reviewer's consulting staff consists of William Starr Myers, professor emeritus of politics at Princeton University; Lewis H. Haney, journalist and professor of economics at New York University, and O. Glenn Saxon, professor of business administration at Yale University.

"The general tone and viewpoint of the textbook reviews found in the Educational Reviewer are difficult to describe briefly," the congressional committee report continues. "A few samples are set forth in the appendix to this report. * * * What matters, of course, is not that CASBO's viewpoint is either broad or narrow but that it has gone to such lengths to put it into operation. The long-run aim of this program is obvious, and this is nothing less than the establishment of CASBO's philosophy as the standard of educational orthodoxy in the schools of the Nation.

"We all agree, of course, that our textbooks should be American, that they should not be the vehicle for the propagation of obnoxious doctrines. Yet the review of textbooks by self-appointed experts, especially when undertaken under the aegis of an organization having a distinct legislative ax to grind, smacks too much of the book-burning orgies of Nuremberg to be accepted by thoughtful Americans without foreboding and alarm. It suggests, too, that the reviewers profoundly distrust the integrity, good faith, and plain common sense of the school boards and teachers of the country. If these educators are so utterly naive and untrained as to need help from a lobbying organization in selecting proper classroom materials, then our educational system has decayed beyond all help. This proposition we cannot accept.

"For good or ill, CASBO is doing essentially what many other pressure groups are trying to do. These groups have long since recognized that lobbying of the traditional variety is not enough to insure lasting legislative success. As a consequence, they have entered upon a far-reaching and ineffectively ambitious struggle to control public opinion. The effort to reach this opinion in the bud through dictation of educational materials is only one aspect of this struggle. Wherever opinion is made there can the resourceful pressure group be found. The implications of this heavy and relentless assault on the Nation's mind—by all the CASBO's, big and little, liberal and conservative—have yet to be fully realized."

Through its editor, the Educational Reviewer has demanded apology for certain references to it that were included in our January article, They Sow Distrust, by Robert A. Skaife, field secretary for the National Educational Association Defense Commission.

The Nation's schools does not question the right of any group to organize for lobbying or propaganda purposes, nor do we defend all that appears in textbooks. We agree that every citizen has the right to criticize the curriculum. It is not, however, the function of any self-appointed interest group to decide what shall or shall not be taught in the schools. It would be just as logical for a group of restaurant owners to decide what shall be taught in home economics courses, or for the amalgamation of ash haulers to determine the qualifications of the school custodian. Such decisions are the responsibility of the school board or the State legislature, legally representing the interests of all the people.

Normally, the school board operates through its administrative and teaching staff. If the board feels the need of additional or other expert advice, it is obligated to seek impartial and unprejudiced assistance.

Whether the Educational Reviewer meets such qualifications must be answered in the light of other significant findings of the House select committee, such as:

"We have already indicated how CASBO both creates and then assesses the 'deliberated opinion' of its membership" (p. 6 of H. Rept. No. 3232).

"Both the language and the lay-out of these materials (CASBO letterheads) might give the impression that CASBO and its committees are working under direct congressional sanction. The suggestion that CASBO is an adjunct of the United States Government is preposterous but is nevertheless put to frequent use in recruiting members and soliciting money" (p. 7).

"A closely related technique and one used frequently by CASBO is to disparage the honesty and effectiveness of competing small-business organizations" (p. 8).

"Neither the Congress nor the public nor the small-business men of America can rely on CASBO's reports under the Lobbying Act as a full and accurate disclosure of its sources of financial support. For all its posturing as the spokesman for small business, CASBO has made devious and sometimes successful efforts to secure big-business support for its activities" (p. 11).

The final judgment of the House select committee as to whether CASBO represents what it professes to be is repeated here. It comprises the last two paragraphs of the committee's report:

"As for CASBO's claim that it voices the 'deliberated opinion' of small business, its methods of ascertaining and formulating such opinion, sometimes through loaded questionnaires, prepared resolutions, and otherwise should make the Congress wary of any figures which CASBO offers as a measure of small-business opinion.

"We repeat our conviction that it is proper and desirable that small business be represented before Congress; but if such representation is by persons or groups whose single-minded attachment to the special interests of small business is open to question, the Congress cannot rely on their expressions as to the true needs and interests of small business. Such a situation can only work to the detriment of Congress, the public, and small business itself" (p. 23).

It seems evident that Congress cannot rely upon CASBO as actually representing small business. Neither can the public schools rely upon it for unbiased evaluation of textbooks.

Gifford Pinchot National Forest, American Shangri-La

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the March issue of the magazine Eagle appears an article by Richard L. Neuberger, an Oregon writer and member of the Oregon State Senate, entitled "American Shangri-La."

This article is about one of our most picturesque national forests extending northward from the Columbia River into the State of Washington. Mr. Neuberger's article is both interesting and factual and worthy of wide reading. I am including it here as a part of my remarks:

AMERICAN SHANGRI-LA

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

In the fast-changing Pacific Northwest, the Gifford Pinchot National Forest stands as a monument to a great conservationist and the glory of nature. America's greatest missing-link scare occurred some years ago when a party of frightened prospectors staggered down to the Washington State city of Kelso with fearful tales of apes swinging from rope ladders in Mile-Deep Canyon below the glaciers of Mount St. Helens.

This picturesque Columbia River community, the site of Eagle Aerie No. 1555, was stirred by the episode. Soon the news hit the front pages of papers all over the Nation. Reporters arrived from almost everywhere. The far-off New York Times had a correspondent at the scene. Into the timbered wilderness the journalists trekked.

They clambered over the threshold of forbidding chasms, they gazed at heights of eternal snow and ice, and they struggled across strange deserts of pumice stone which would float in a bowl of soup. No gorilla or Neanderthal man did they see. Not even a Tarzan in leopard skin leaped among the fir trees.

Yet, when the fruitless search for the missing link ended, the reporters were unanimously agreed that the mission had been far from unsuccessful. How could it be considered a failure when they had looked on the grandest outdoor vistas any of them ever had experienced?

This American Shangri-La then was known as the Columbia National Forest, 1,450,000 acres of wooded uplands and carpet-like meadows in the southwestern corner of the State of Washington. Today, this realm of natural grandeur has a brand new name, and thereby hangs a tale.

The United States Forest Service wanted to honor the quiet man with handlebar mustaches who had been its founder and first chief. Biographies of all the 152 national forests under the American flag were sent to the family of Gifford Pinchot, father of the conservation movement in this country. Forests in Pennsylvania, where Pinchot had served as Governor, instantly attracted the forester's redheaded widow.

"Yes," explains Cornelia Bryce Pinchot, "almost against my will, I found myself curiously drawn to another forest 3,000 miles away."

It finally was the solid choice of the Pinchot clan that the Columbia National Forest, where the white cones of dead volcanos are rimmed with green hills and blue lakes, was more qualified than any other to pay tribute to the memory of the man who originally protected this wilderness from ax and saw and fire. By proclamation of Harry S. Truman, the Gifford Pinchot National Forest now stretches northward from the Columbia River to the ramparts of Mount Rainier.

Mention an outdoor pastime common to the temperate zone, and the Gifford Pinchot National Forest has it.

Sheep and cattle forage on the steep slopes that join the sagebrush of the Inland Empire. Elk and deer compete with domestic stock for grass. Cougars lope along the rim rock, and bears inhabit the windfalls. Steelhead and rainbows lurk in a thousand murmuring creeks. And the full-throated rivers are host in the spring and autumn to innumerable thrashing king salmon, up from the salty Pacific to lay their eggs and die. More than 15,000 fishermen and at least 7,000 hunters plod through the dense reaches of the forest every year. Another 12,000 adventurers seek handholds on the precipitous peaks. A substantial number of these backwoods visitors are eagle brothers, for eagle cities surround the mountain citadel like a stockade.

Vancouver, Stevenson, and Goldendale guard the approaches to the Gifford Pinchot National Forest in the south. Kelso, Centralia, and Chehalis greet its rangers and hikers in the west. Below the meadows which fringe the forest on the east, sprawls bustling Yakima, orchard capital of the Northwest and headquarters of Aerie No. 269. Undoubtedly there would be eagle communities along the northern boundary of the forest, too, if it did not bump directly into the icefields of Rainier National Park.

Even eagle brothers with empty creels and no deer for the larder come back to civilization in a pleasant mood. The greasy rugs of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest—rugs decorated with borders of firewood and Indian paintbrush—offer unparalleled camp grounds.

The forage brushes against a horse's cinch strap. Cold springs dot the meadows. Alpine fir grows in convenient clusters. A lake for a quick dip is invariably at hand. Steelhead soon sizzle in the pan, flavored with strips of bacon and garnished with a mound of hash-browns. The fish was flipped from water to skillet with one quick twist of the wrist.

Overhead towers the symmetrical mound of St. Helens or the rugged dome of Adams. Rainier may be visible in the distance. The great snowcaps are like hooded goblins at a council fire—silent, majestic, and ominous. All who come to the forest feel their brooding presence.

Once each of these mighty craters belched rock and fire. Lava chunks the size of five-room cottages were thrown higher in the sky than frail man yet has flown. Air holes were blown in boulders, and this weird symbol of bygone ages still blankets the moraines at the foot of Mount St. Helens. It is called pumice.

The rock is pocked with tiny cavities, put there by the terrible unseen forces which lurk at the earth's core. Small boys who visit the forest throw the pumice on the surface of a lake. Miraculously, it floats, and they have had an outdoor lesson in volcanic power and fury.

St. Helens, Adams, and Rainier last were violently active in prehistoric times. No man or beast could have survived the baleful fire which they spread across the land, flame throwers on a cosmic scale. Yet as late as 1841, St. Helens smoked forebodingly. Steam issued from fissures on its flanks and from the crater at its crest. Frontier families in the Northwest wondered if some grim Pompeii-like doom was to be their fate.

But St. Helens smoked no more, and jittery settlers returned to their cabins. Yet an ascent of the mountain today, over a century later, still is tinged with awareness that this was the last true lava volcano in continental United States to signal its fiery origins.

The Pacific Northwest abounds in magnificent vistas, but one particularly appears on more calendars than any others. Spirit Lake stretches placidly at the base of Mount St. Helens, a tureen of blue nectar below a vanilla ice-cream cone of universal dimensions. Governor Adlai Stevenson of Illinois called it a landscape to excel anything he had seen on tramps through the Swiss Alps. Spacious lake, comfortable foothills, and fragile yet sinister mountain are blended into a classic painting by the Master Hand of creation.

This is a family forest, with attractions for all ages. Grandparents can idle on the veranda of Harmony Falls Lodge and watch a younger generation leap and frolic in the cold water of Spirit Lake. Yet perhaps grandma and grandpa can reach the formidable summit of St. Helens. It has been done by those in the sunset of life, under the expert guidance of the region's most famous mountain-climbing club from Portland, 99 miles away. "Mazama" means mountain goat, and the human Mazamas display this agility as they get old-age pensioners, legless newsboys, and all others with courage and determination to the top of the dizzy peak.

The Gifford Pinchot National Forest is predominantly a domain for recreation and inspiration. Yet it is something more.

With the country again desperately needing lumber for barracks and military projects, Douglas fir timber is felled on the Iron Creek drainage in tremendous quantities. Yet rangers supervise the cutting. Only ripe, mature trees can be brought to the ground. Blocks of timber must be spared to reseed the area. Lookouts vigilantly watch for fire from logging operations. One stately, blonde lookout even married the head ranger of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest a few years ago, so romance, too, is here.

Lumbering is carried on carefully for more reasons than one. At least a dozen important rivers foam off the slopes of the forest. These provide drinking water for all the Eagle cities along the perimeter of the mountain domain. They also irrigate the plaided acres of orchards which have made Yakima famous for apples.

Not many profound changes have disturbed this United States version of Shangri-La. Behind its protecting buttress of foothills and canyons, the Gifford Pinchot Forest still is a haven for the old-time prospector and lumberjack who carries his sourdough jar with him to get the biscuits and hot cakes started at the next camp. Many of these men sleep with the jug in their bed rolls to keep it from freezing on frosty nights. Occasionally a red-hot argument starts when some interloper insists that the right kind of syrup is more important to a stack of "hots" than the fermenting bacteria in that yeasty jar.

Twenty-second Constitutional Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the

following statement by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, on the passage of the twenty-second constitutional amendment:

The passage of the twenty-second constitutional amendment by 36 States limiting Presidents to two full terms, thus making it the law of the land, represents the sentiment of millions of people in this country and gives unmistakable approval to the position of those who have long maintained that no man elected to this office should serve more than two terms.

It is only natural that I should be gratified by the action of the 36 State legislatures because I was the center of considerable controversy, and I might even say the object of rather harsh criticism, when I took the unqualified position in the 1940 Democratic Convention in Chicago that I was opposed to a third term.

I held this view because it was my inner conviction that the presidency should be limited to two terms and that it was so intended by the founding fathers, although they did not put it into law.

Many of my close friends and associates from all over the country did not think that I should declare myself on this subject, but to have held back and said nothing would have meant that I was not faithful to the principles which governed my public life—namely, that it was my duty to give my honest opinion on matters of public interest, regardless of how it would affect me personally.

It is not my purpose now to speak in a spirit of vindication or to proclaim that I was right. But I do feel that the legislatures of the 36 States, which are the voice of the people, have indicated that they shared my viewpoint because they believed that the two-term law was in the best interests of our country.

Fair Play and the Mobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by CIO president Philip Murray delivered over the National Broadcasting Co. network, March 5, 1951:

Good evening. I want to talk to you tonight about the tremendous and complex problems that we, the American people, face at home and abroad. Our America is caught in the web of a great international crisis—a crisis resulting directly from Communist aggression. Tonight, as we sit in our homes, boys from our factories and farms and schools are fighting for freedom's cause in the snow and mud of Korea. Throughout the entire world, men and women who believe in freedom and human dignity are taking more effective steps to resist totalitarian dictatorship.

Here, in the United States, we have long since made our great decision. Together, with the other peoples represented in the United Nations, we are resolved to mobilize our resources in defense of the democracy we love and cherish.

Our skills, our resources, and our spirit have given us the leadership of all the democratic world. In that role of leadership, we must show intelligence and imagination, courage, and boldness. Those are the qualities expected of leaders. And the American people have those qualities.

On the field of battle against Communist aggressors, the men and boys from our cities and hamlets are showing intelligence and courage. But, on the home front, there is confusion.

Malignant inflation is feeding on the vitals of economic life. It affects each and every family; nobody ever escapes the effects of inflation.

You know that. Every salary and wage earner knows it. Every housewife meets the byproducts of inflation on her trip to the grocer or the butcher. Prices have gone up too high. They are continuing to rise too fast, right now. And there is no adequate mechanism at work to halt that terrible inflation, which steals food from the tables of our families and bullets from the arsenals of our Armed Forces.

Inflation must be stopped. Inflation can be stopped—if we meet this major problem of the home front with the same boldness, intelligence, and courage that our Armed Forces are showing in Korea. Thus far, Congress and our mobilization officials have not met this problem head-on.

As president of the CIO, and a cochairman of the united labor policy committee, I can state with conviction that Americans are determined to halt the steady upward march of the cost of living. Certainly, the men and women of our labor unions have repeatedly shown their desire to stabilize our national economy.

Last summer when the outbreak of war in Korea first began to place its burden on the American economy, organized labor called for prompt and vigorous Goverment action to curb inflation. We said then and we say now, let us defend ourselves against the economic fifth column that will destroy our standards of living. We said then and we say now, let us meet this challenge of world conflict by the democratic principle of equality of sacrifice; let there be a sharing by every group in the land of the burdens and responsibilities which we as free men must assume.

This demand for equal sharing of our common burdens and responsibilities has been voiced by many segments of the population. Americans know instinctively that our defense mobilization program must play fair with all the people—with labor and with management, with the farmer and the consumer.

However, our mobilization program is not now being conducted with equity and justice for all. It is not drawing fully on the abilities and skills of all the people. Now, while there is time, it is essential that these basic defects be corrected.

The United Labor Policy Committee, representing 15,000,000 workers, has made protest about this serious situation. We have done so not to impair the defense mobilization program but to improve it. And it urgently needs improvement.

Our criticisms are not those of labor alone but of millions of Americans in every walk of life.

It is not just a labor problem when consumer prices go up, or an inequitable share of the taxes are imposed on the lower income groups. It is not just a labor problem when the future of rent control is in danger. Unions are not the only groups concerned when wages and salaries are threatened with a straitjacket, while the dollar loses value.

We are supposed, for example, to have price controls. Yet, the consumers price index just published is at the highest point in our history—and our price administrators tell that prices will continue to rise still higher.

The Consumers Price Index, published by the Government, provides ample proof that present price-fixing policies are simply a hoax. The hypocrisy of this present system of alleged price control demonstrates an utter lack of morality—for it provides bonuses to profiteers at the very moment it works new hardships, of a discriminatory nature, upon the working men and women of America.

Moreover, the latest so-called price regulation does not establish firm ceiling prices. Neither you nor any other consumer is protected by this order, which cannot—by its very nature—be effectively enforced.

This is not real price control with teeth in it. This is a license to charge whatever the traffic will bear. A change is needed—or the national welfare will suffer.

The tax program is the second example of unequal burdens. Your Representatives and Senators are considering tax proposals that will favor the high incomes and bear down on lower incomes. Under this tax program, if you are earning $3,000 or $4,000 a year, you will have to pay the same amount of income tax you paid at the height of World War II. But if your income is $500,000 a year, you will be permitted to pay $40,000 less than in 1944—and you'll have additional loopholes to save you still more tax money. There's no equality of sacrifice in this type of tax program.

Another case in point is rent control. Under our present weak law, millions of families have been forced to pay much higher rents. Yet, no rent-control law, with really effective provisions, is anywhere near passage in the Congress. If nothing is done by March 31, tenants in every part of the Nation will be confronted with the specter of rent increases of 10 or 20, or even 40 percent.

On prices, on taxes, on rents—you, the ultimate consumer, are being asked to bear the heaviest share of this increasing burden.

On the other hand, corporation profits have reached an astounding all-time high. Nothing effective is being done to make those superprofits bear their fair share of our national burden. At the same time, while you are carrying the extraordinary burden, a new unfair wage and salary formula has been promulgated by the Government. The net effect of this Government order is to keep wages and salaries down. This combination of heavier expenses and restricted income will cause real hardship among millions of moderate income families.

Our complaint against the stabilization program is that it is not geared to curb inflation. Rather, in the name of fighting inflation, the program will lower living standards while safeguarding swollen profits.

On the one hand, flabby treatment of the wealthy and gingerly treatment of profiteers; on the other, severe controls over people in the lower and middle income levels.

That is the reverse of fair play.

Who is to blame for this lop-sided approach to our inflation problems?

First, the conservative coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats who dominate our Congress. They have given us a law that cannot effectively keep prices down and thus far, they have failed to improve the law to make it workable.

Second, an equally conservative coalition of big-business-minded officials who direct our defense mobilization program.

No one can object to the desire of businessmen—big or small—to serve their country. But we can and should object when representatives of big business monopolize the top levels of our defense mobilization program. That program is supposed to serve all the American people. Representatives of labor, of agriculture, and of small business thus are entitled to a significant place—in the policy and operating levels of our mobilization agencies. These spokesmen for major groups in the American public would not serve narrow interests—they would contribute their skill and their viewpoints to building a defense program thoroughly attuned to the needs and the problems of every citizen.

This would help to insure a fair deal for every American citizen—rich or poor, city worker, or rural farmer, housewife or school teacher, people at work and people who have been retired on meager pensions.

Americans want a defense program that will give our Armed Forces the supplies they need—when they need them and in abundant quantity.

Americans want equitable treatment for the millions of the civilian population. That means: price controls that work, and an equitable wage and salary policy.

Americans want rent controls extended. They want a tax program that will not permit any section of the public to avoid its share of the revenue burden. They want corporations to make reasonable profits—but not a license to profiteer at the expense of the people during an emergency.

The American people have shown time and again that they insist upon fair play.

Let us start now to get fair play in the mobilization program. Let us halt inflation and promote equality of sacrifice throughout the length and breadth of America.

That is labor's program. That is the American people's program.

Let us all work together to attain it.

We of labor stand ready to do everything in our power to achieve the equality of sacrifice needed in this time or crisis.

Textiles for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I attach hereto an editorial from the Observer, a splendid weekly newspaper printed in my home town of Greenville, S. C. In view of the importance of textiles in the defense effort, this editorial is most encouraging. It follows:

TEXTILES FOR DEFENSE

In these days, when so much confusion is evident in both official and unofficial circles, it is encouraging to note that a major industry has voluntarily initiated a program designed to make the most of its vast resources. Such a move by the far-flung American cotton textile industry promises to be of tremendous help to the country's defense activities.

Few persons realize the complexity of this industry. More than 500,000 workers in one-thousand-two-hundred-odd separate mills produce a bewildering variety of goods. These mills annually pour out billions of yards of yarn and fabrics, ranging from surgical bandages to heavy duck cloths. In 1950, the combined value of these products was approximately seven and one-half billion dollars.

No industry is more basic or important to the security of the Nation than textiles. Its consumption of cotton provides livelihoods for millions of farmers, processors, and handlers. Its finished products go into countless items, like garments, conveyor belts, or tire fabrics.

Yet, its very size and diversity present a peculiar problem in times of emergency. Immediately following Pearl Harbor, for instance, grave confusion resulted from overhasty plans attempting to coordinate the production of hundreds of cotton mills, large and small, in various sections of the country. It was months before red tape was eliminated and Government planners were able to utilize more fully the knowledge and advice of experienced textile men.

The cotton textile industry is taking steps to forestall similar difficulties in the current emergency, no matter how severe are the demands made upon it. All the various segments of the industry have been organized so that they can offer their services to military and civilian planners. Systematic planning will permit the industry to realize its full potentialities. It will prevent, for example, one mill from being overtaxed in turning out an important type of fabric in a limited time when some facilities of another mill might be easily shifted from less essential goods to speed production.

Textile leaders point out that physically the industry is in its best shape in history. More than a billion dollars has been spent for modernization since World War II. Its plant facilities, plus such intangibles as "know-how" gained in the war, equip it to handle almost any demands for military and civilian production.

With its voluntary program well under way, the cotton textile industry has in effect said to the Government, "We stand ready for any task. Let us know what you want. Give us the raw materials and we have the loyal workers, managerial ability, and plant equipment to produce as needed."

Interlocking Directorates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement entitled "Interlocking Directorates" by James M. Mead, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, March 7, 1951:

It gives me great pleasure to present to this committee the report of the Federal Trade Commission on interlocking directorates.

For a number of years the Commission has been endeavoring through its economic reports to help the Congress and the public discover the extent of the concentration of economic power, the means by which concentration is achieved, and the results that are to be expected therefrom. In 1946 the Commission submitted a report on the merger movement which showed that in 8 years about 5 percent of the assets of all American manufacturing corporations had been absorbed through mergers and that many of these mergers had been of a kind tending to reduce competition. Partly on the basis of this report your committee sponsored a bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act, which became law last December. In 1949 the Commission made a report showing the concentration of control over productive facilities which prevailed in 26 manufacturing industries in 1947. In 1950 the Commission published a report showing the extent to which the concentration of production in large companies was due to the use of large plants and the extent to which it was due to other factors. Your committee held hearings on both of these reports and thus brought them to the attention of the Congress and of the public and made their significance clearer.

The report on interlocking directorates is a study of the way in which the largest manufacturing corporations are bound together through the presence of the same persons on their various boards of directors. Thus it presents some of the information that is needed to determine whether these companies may be expected to compete with each other or to act together in ways capable of reducing competition. It also provides some of the information that is needed to determine whether or not Section 8 of the Clayton Act, through which the Congress sought to prevent interlocking directorates that injure competition, is fulfilling its intended purpose.

The Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act were developed on a bipartisan basis after the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in 1912 had emphasized the importance of strengthening the antitrust laws. The provision about interlocking directorates was included in the Clayton Act in response to a specific request in President Wilson's message to Congress in 1914. He asked for a law "which will effectively prohibit and prevent such interlockings of the personnel of the directorates of great corporations—banks and railroads, industrial, commercial and public-service bodies—as in effect result in making those who borrow and those who lend practically one and the same, those who sell and those who buy but the same persons trading with one another under different names and in different combinations and those who affect to compete in fact partners and masters of some whole field of business." The committee report on the Clayton Act emphasized the same point, saying "The truth is that the only real service the director in a great number of corporations renders is in maintaining uniform policies throughout the entire system for which he acts, which usually results to the advantage of the greater corporations and to the disadvantage of the smaller corporations which he dominates by reason of his prestige as a director and to the detriment of the public generally." In the debates on the bill the sponsors of the provisions about interlocking directorates emphasized the fundamental principle that no man can serve two masters.

The Clayton Act contains three different types of prohibitions applicable to interlocking directorates. One of these in section 10 of the act applies to common carriers. Another in section 8 of the act applies to banks, and a third, also in section 8, applies generally to other types of corporations, although by later legislation air carriers and communications companies have been made subject to special statutes. The provision about common carriers is designed primarily to prevent these concerns from being interlocked with enterprises which deal in their securities or furnish them with supplies. It provides that if the board of directors of a common carrier includes any person who is at the same time a director or manager of purchasing or selling officer of an enterprise that has such dealings with the carrier or if any such person is the carrier's president or manager, or purchasing or selling officer, all the carrier's transactions with the enterprise must be by competitive bidding followed by an award to the lowest bidder under regulations prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This effort to secure arms-length dealing and competition among those who deal with a carrier has been supplemented in the Interstate Commerce Act by a provision that no person may be an officer or director of more than one carrier unless his dual role is authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission after a finding that neither public nor private interests will be adversely affected. Thus the present law applicable to common carriers

contains broad precautions against interlocking relations either on a horizontal basis among the carriers themselves or on a vertical basis between the carriers and those with whom they deal. It seeks to prevent those linkages not only where they consist of having directors in common, but also where they are brought about through the officers of the various enterprises.

The rule applied to banks in the Clayton Act prohibits interlocking directors, officers, or employees unless the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System explicitly permits a particular type of interlock by regulation. This rule is subject to certain exceptions, the most important of which exempt banks which are engaged in different classes of business and operate in noncontiguous territory. This rule is generally designed to prevent interlocks between banking corporations that are or may be in competition with each other. It does not, however, attempt to prevent interlocks between banks and their customers. Like the rule about common carriers, it applies not only to directors but to officials as well.

The rule generally applicable to industrial and commercial companies is much more limited than those which govern common carriers and banks. It prohibits the holding of directorships in two or more corporations if any of the corporations has capital, surplus, and undivided profits aggregating more than a million dollars, and if the corporations have been competitors so that elimination of competition between them by agreement would violate the antitrust laws. Unlike the law applicable to banks and common carriers, this provision exempts all noncorporate business and the smaller corporations. It is limited strictly to the maintenance of competition between competing corporations and does not touch the vertical relationship between a corporation and its suppliers and customers. Moreover, the rule applies only to interlocking directors and has no bearing upon interlocks that may be accomplished through officials other than directors.

The Commission's report has not attempted to ascertain the situation as to interlocking relationships among banks or among common carriers. It is limited strictly to the interlocking relationships among the larger manufacturing corporations and between these corporations and a selected sample of other large corporations. However, it has taken account of the principles that had been applied by the Congress to interlocks by banks and by common carriers for the sake of ascertaining whether or not similar problems may arise in the manufacturing field.

On the basis of the facts disclosed, the Commission has concluded that Section 8 of the Clayton Act does not adequately cope with the competition-reducing effects of interlocking directorates in ordinary manufacture and commerce.

The principal weaknesses of the present law are these:

First, it can be so easily evaded as to be scarcely worth enforcing. This law is violated if a director of one large concern is also a director of its large competitor. However, there is no violation of the law if one concern's president is director of the other, or if the president of one company is sales manager of the other. The result is that when an interlocking directorate is questioned, a mere change of form without change of substance is sufficient to bring about technical compliance with the law. For example, several years ago the board of directors of General Steel Castings contained the president and two vice presidents of American Steel Foundries, all of whom were also directors of the latter company and also contained the chairman of the board and the president of Baldwin Locomotive, both of whom were also directors of that company. When the Department of Justice questioned these interlocking directorates, the directors from American Steel Foundries and Baldwin withdrew from the General Steel Castings board. Their place was taken by two vice presidents and the comptroller of American Steel Foundries and two vice presidents of Baldwin Locomotive. But since none of these officials was a director in any company but General Steel Castings, the new arrangement satisfied the requirements of section 8 of the Clayton Act. There is no reason to believe that the closeness of the executive and policy-making ties between the three companies was in any way reduced by the changes.

Second, the present law is applicable only to direct interlocks as distinguished from indirect interlocks. The indirect interlock is by far the most common type of interlocking relationship among competitors. Such an indirect relationship is established when two or more competitors have directors who sit jointly on the board of directors of a third company. For example, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Standard Oil Co. of California, Gulf Oil Corp., and Continental Oil Co. all had directors on the board of the Chase National Bank. Similarly, the Texas Co., Shell Union Oil Co. and Tidewater Associated Oil Co. all had directors on the board of Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co. of Chicago, and Standard Oil Co. of Indiana and the Texas Co. each was represented on the board of Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Co. of Chicago. The significance of such indirect interlocking relationships differs from case to case. It tends to increase when more competitors are represented on the same board, when each competitor has more than one representative on the board, and when the same competitors are represented together on the boards of more than one company. It also tends to increase when the company on whose board the various competitors are represented has a business interest in the terms of the competition between the represented companies. When several competitors are represented on the board of a bank which finances them all, or of a large buyer of their products, or of a large supplier of their raw materials, there is a strong probability that the indirect relationship will impair competition. Indeed, it is hard to see how the directors from the various competing companies could perform their duties as directors except by working together to keep the competition of their companies within limits that would not adversely affect any of the companies involved. Decision of major policies of purchase and sale by the directors of the company in whose board the interlock takes place can scarcely fail to produce a working understanding as to the respective shares of that company's business to be enjoyed by the competing customers or suppliers from which the directors come.

Third, the present law makes no attempt to prevent injuries to competition that may be produced through interlocking relationships between suppliers and customers. Interlocking directorates which connect a supplier with his customer are common. Their typical purpose appears to be to create a two-way preferential relationship which gives the customer assurance of supplies on favorable terms and gives the supplier assurance of an outlet for his products. In other words, such an interlock has a purpose similar to that of vertical integration. Like vertical integration, it may be sometimes harmless and sometimes seriously harmful. So long as neither the supplier nor the customers has an important part of the total market, it is probable that the vertical relation between them will not jeopardize the opportunity for other concerns to sell or obtain goods. However, if the supplier is an important concern the loss of equal access to his products may be harmful to competition among the customers, and if the customer is an important concern the loss of the sales outlets which he controls may be harmful to competition among the suppliers. If a large supplier and a large customer work out a preferential trading relationship, there is a strong likelihood that other large suppliers and large customers will find it expedient to do the same thing in self-protection; and when such dancing-partner arrangements become general the effect is not only to give each of the dancing partners a good deal of relief from competitive pressure but also to make it difficult for small companies that have not been able to find dancing partners to have any share in the party.

Vertical interlocks are particularly serious when one of the interlocked companies is a public utility that has a duty to serve all customers without discrimination. The establishment of preferential relationships with such a utility defeats one of the basic purposes of public utility regulation.

The interlocking directorate report shows the prevalence of indirect interlocks between competitors and of interlocks both direct and indirect between suppliers and customers. On the basis of this report I am convinced that section 8 of the Clayton Act as now written would cover only a small part of the problem of interlocking directorates even if it were effective in preventing direct interlocks between competitors.

Section 8 should be amended to take care of the inadequacies which have come to light. The amendment should tighten the law against evasion so that where a directorate may not be held by the director of another company it may also not be held by an officer, employee, agent, or substantial stockholder of that other company. The amendment should broaden the law to cover the kinds of indirect interlocks between competitors in which a substantial lessening of competition is reasonably probable. It should also broaden the law to cover the kinds of vertical interlocks between suppliers and customers in which there is a reasonable probability that competition will be reduced. The Commission is now preparing draft legislation designed to accomplish these purposes.

Legislation Desired by Federal Trade Commission as Presented by Hon. James M. Mead, Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there are few of us here without a personal acquaintance with former Senator James M. Mead, of New York, who is now continuing his able public service as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission—certainly none to whom his name is unknown.

When the Chairman appeared as a witness before my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by invitation of our esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], to present a formal statement outlining legislation which the Federal Trade Commission deems desirable in the Eighty-second Congress, his statement aroused so much interest I am taking

the liberty of inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it will be more readily available to all Members and to thousands of interested citizens.

The statement follows:

I deeply appreciate this opportunity which you have afforded me to discuss with the committee legislation that may be needed in the emergency. I regard it a matter of real importance with highly constructive possibilities toward advancing the cause of good government for agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission to be able to consult closely with appropriate committees of Congress and to discuss questions of mutual concern. It is for such purpose, I understand, that the members of the committee have taken the time to assemble this morning to hear agency representatives.

With your permission, and by way of background, I shall refer briefly to the relationship of the work to the Federal Trade Commission to that of your committee, and shall then detail certain items of possible new legislation which are of concern to the Commission, either from the standpoint of the present emergency or as important to the public interest from the long-range viewpoint.

We in the Commission feel very close to this committee. The original legislation under which the Federal Trade Commission was created, when passed in 1914, was in charge of this committee. That statute introduced into our Federal law the principle that unfair methods of competition in commerce are unlawful, and the Commission was established as the agency to uncover such methods and upon proof and hearing to issue cease-and-desist orders against the offending parties. That act has become a landmark in our laws designed to maintain and protect our system of free competitive enterprise. Much subsequent legislation with which the Federal Trade Commission is concerned has likewise come through this committee, such as the Wheeler Lea Act of 1938 and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939. The statutes mentioned together with the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act amendments, and other legislation, materially enlarged the duties of the Commission, which is an agency established directly by act of Congress. Our principal functions and responsibilities as specified by law may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. To promote free and fair competition in interstate commerce in the interest of the public through prevention of price-fixing agreements, boycotts, combinations in restraint of trade, other unfair methods of competition, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices (Federal Trade Commission Act, sec. 5).

2. To safeguard the consuming public by preventing the dissemination of false or deceptive advertisements of food, drugs, cosmetics, and devices (Federal Trade Commission Act, secs. 12 through 15).

3. To prevent unlawful discriminations in price and other discriminations; exclusive-dealing and tying contracts and arrangements; mergers of competitors through acquisitions of capital stock or assets; and certain interlocking directorates between competitors (Clayton Act, secs. 2, 3, 7, and 8).

4. To protect producers, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers from the unrevealed presence of substitutes and mixtures in manufactured wool products by requiring content labeling (Wool Products Labeling Act).

5. To supervise the registration and operation of associations of American exporters engaged solely in export trade (Export Trade Act).

6. To petition for the cancellation of the registrations of trade-marks which were illegally registered or which have been used for purposes contrary to the intent of the Trade-Mark Act of 1946 (Latham Trade-Mark Act).

7. To gather and make available to the Congress, the President, and the public, factual data concerning economic and business conditions as a basis for remedial legislation where needed, and for the guidance and protection of the public (Federal Trade Commission Act, sec. 6).

8. Under the Defense Production Act of 1950, the President is authorized to enter into voluntary agreements and programs to further the objectives of the act and to request industry to conform to such agreements and programs. Persons complying with such request are to be accorded exemption from the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act, upon clearance of the program through consultation with the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General and approval by the Attorney General. Under these provisions the Chairman of the Commission as well as the Attorney General has the duty of examining into such agreements and programs and according them appropriate clearance pursuant to law.

ITEMS FOR POSSIBLE NEW LEGISLATION

While the Federal Trade Commission's duties are numerous, they are all in line with the objective of protecting industry, trade, and the buying public from the use of practices or methods in commerce which are unfair or contrary to the public interest as destructive of the freedom of competition. Many competitive problems which vitally affect our economy have been studied and reported upon by the Commission during the period of its operations. Many of these reports have formed the basis of new legislation. Our experience currently points up the need for additional legislation on several matters which I believe will be of interest to the representatives on the committee.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 11, CLAYTON ACT

When your committee processed the legislation which resulted in enactment of the Wheeler-Lea Act of 1938, provision was thereby made to the effect that orders to cease and desist of the Federal Trade Commission shall become final if appeal is not taken to the court of appeals within 60 days. It was further provided that violation of such an order after it became final shall be subject to civil penalties up to $5,000, which the United States district courts are authorized to assess in a suit brought by the United States. These measures for enforcement of cease and desist orders under the Federal Trade Commission Act proved highly beneficial. In the absence of such provisions Commission cease and desist orders never became final and appeals were possible at any time, even many years after the trial had been concluded and the decision of the Commission had been made. Further, the civil penalty provisions put teeth into Commission orders after they had become final, and the Commission through the courts was thereby enabled to apply a more effective measure of compliance than was possible under the old method of contempt proceeding which theretofore was the only means available for enforcement of orders.

We recommend legislation whereby the same type of provisions be applied to Commission cease and desist orders under the Clayton Act, including the Robinson-Patman Act, as has been applied by the Wheeler-Lea Act to Commission cease and desist orders under the Federal Trade Commission Act. This would require amendment of section 11 of the Clayton Act, the procedural section, to introduce into the Clayton Act the Wheeler-Lea Act type of provisions respecting finality of orders and civil penalties for violation.

The original Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act, both passed in 1914, as you may recall, were closely related bills. Both were under consideration in the Congress at the same time and both were aimed at curbing various unfair and restrictive practices in competition. The procedures in the two bills which provided for enforcement by the Commission through issuance of cease-and-desist orders were in practically identical terms, and the same considerations apply to Clayton Act orders as those which led to the amendment of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Commission considers such amendment of section 11 of the Clayton Act as a highly important need by way of new legislation.

The Commission recommends this legislation to make its orders more effective against price discrimination, illegal tying contracts, acquisition of competitors, and the like.

Since these orders of the Commission under the Clayton Act are designed to preserve competition and prevent the growth of entrenched monopoly, the public interest requires that they become effective and enforceable without delay, whereas at present the proceeding may be prolonged almost indefinitely by the offending party, and the Government put to the necessity of proving him guilty of violation of law three successive times before reaching the point where the court may apply sanctions which must be by way of contempt action.

We have prepared draft of a bill for the purpose mentioned which will be made available for congressional consideration.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8 OF THE CLAYTON ACT

Section 8 of the Clayton Act prohibits interlocking directorates between competing corporations of a certain size. The section has proved to be weak and inadequate to accomplish its purpose of preventing intercorporate relationships which are destructive of competition and lead to undue concentration of economic power. We believe that such section 8 on interlocking directorates should be amended to take care of the inadequacies which have come to light. This proposal is based upon a Commission report on interlocking directorates which is now being printed. The relationships among large companies, as disclosed by this report, supply striking evidence of the inadequacy of the portion of the section directed against interlocking directorates among competing corporations other than banks and common carriers. The Commission makes no recommendation for amendment of the part of section 8 of the Clayton Act which applies to interlocking directorates among banking corporations nor for amendment of section 10 of the act, which applies to interlocking directorates among common carriers.

The defect of the present law, as applied to manufacture and commerce, is twofold: First, the offense is so narrowly defined that the law is easily evaded; and second, various types of interlocking relationship which impair competition are not covered by the statute.

Evasion of the intent of the present law is possible by placing an officer, employee, agent, or substantial stockholder of one corporation upon the board of directors of another corporation where it would be unlawful for the same person to be a member of the boards of directors of both corporations. For practical purposes, there is little difference between an interlock of corporations through common directors and an interlock through a director of one corporation who is an official or substantial owner in another corporation. This point has been recognized in the present statute in the case of common carriers and banks. The proposed amendment would apply the same principle to manufacture and commerce.

The most common type of interlocking relationship which impairs competition but is not covered by the present statute is that in which competing corporations are indirectly

interlocked through the fact that officers or directors of each of them are members of the board of directors of one or more concerns which supply them with goods and services or which buy their products. In this type of situation, decisions of major policies of purchase and sale by the directors of the company in whose board the interlock takes place produces necessarily a working understanding as to the respective shares of that company's business to be enjoyed by the competing customers or suppliers from which the directors come.

Another type of relationship which endangers competition is that in which one of a group of competitors is represented on a board of a public utility company that is so affected by a public interest that it is required by law to serve all customers without discrimination. Preferential relationships between this competitor and the public utility company are to be expected in such a situation.

A third type of problem is created by the direct vertical interlock of a buyer with a seller in cases in which either concern has such power in the market that if the other is given preferential treatment the other's competitors will find it difficult to compete with the preferred concern.

The Commission is now preparing draft legislation to amend section 8 so that it will no longer ignore important interlocking relationships which impair competition in manufacture and commerce.

This legislation, in our opinion, is urgently needed not only during the present emergency but also from the long-range view of strengthening our antimonopoly laws.

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

The concentration of economic power in the hands of the few and the consequent suppression of small independent business constitute perhaps the greatest present-day threat to the competitive system. Bear in mind we are not against bigness as such but we are concerned over the future of small business. Over the past year or more the Commission has sent to Congress a number of reports revealing data touching this subject. There are reports of the Federal Trade Commission with the following titles: "Concentration of Productive Facilities, 1947," 96 pages; "The Divergence Between Plant and Company Concentration, 1947," 163 pages; "The Merger Movement—a Summary Report," 134 pages; "International Cartels in the Alkali Industry," 96 pages; "International Steel Cartels," 115 pages; "International Electrical Equipment Cartels," 106 pages; "Manufacture and Distribution of Farm Implements," 160 pages; "The Fertilizer Industry," 176 pages.

During the Eighty-first Congress a number of bills had been introduced to deal with certain aspects of the problem. Among these are bills proposing to strengthen the antitrust laws by increasing the penalties for violation. One of the bills, H. R. 7327, passed the House on June 5, 1950, and provided for increasing the criminal penalties for violation of the Sherman antitrust law from $5,000 maximum to $50,000 for each count.

Quite obviously the penalties for violation of the antimonopoly law have been too light to provide an adequate deterrent. In my opinion steps to sharpen the teeth of the antitrust laws are needed and should be taken. Dangers due to the accelerated tendency of mobilization toward concentration and the submergence of small independent business are such as to warrant classification of legislation of this type as an emergency measure.

LABELING LEGISLATION

The wholesome functioning of competitive business for serving the needs of the public depends in no little measure upon truthful and informative labeling under which merchandise reaches the ultimate purchasing consumer. Such honest informative labeling is often of greater importance in times of emergency than otherwise because scarcities of tried and proven materials bring about extensive use of substitutes which, unless scrupulously disclosed by proper labeling, tend to deceive and defraud the public. Moreover, the stress imposed upon the people by high prices and the necessity to stretch the consumer's dollar to the limit are more keenly felt in times of emergency. These require that greater attention be given to the type of consumer legislation which is directed toward assuring that the things the consumer must buy for himself and his family are properly labeled to enable him to buy intelligently and without being misled by deceptive appearances or representations.

Legislation of this character, which has proved to be such a boon to the consuming public as well as a matter of major protection to honest and scrupulous manufacturers and merchants, is the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 which was handled in its legislative journey by your committee. In the Eighty-first Congress your committee also produced the Fur Products Labeling bill (H. R. 5187) which was passed by the House on July 14, 1949, but failed of being reached on the Senate calendar before the end of that Congress. I am gratified to note that fur labeling legislation has again been introduced, known as the O'Hara bills; also that in the Senate fur labeling legislation has already been reported out of committee. Since the entire subject was fully developed in extensive hearings under the jurisdiction of this committee both in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, I need not undertake to speak of the great need for this legislation to afford adequate protection to the consumer and the scrupulous manufacturers and merchants against deception and fraudulent practices in the fur business.

I regard the passage of the fur-labeling legislation as a measure of real importance in the emergency as well as in the long-range viewpoint. It is legislation which is necessary not only to protect the consumer from deception and misnaming of furs, but also to protect our infant fur-farming industry and honest business from the harmful and destructive tendencies that flourish when the market place is beclouded by dishonesty, confusion, and deception which have been altogether too prevalent in the marketing of fur products.

LABELING OF MANUFACTURED TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS

Another area in which informative labeling is a matter of special significance is that of the labeling of products made in whole or in part of manufactured textile fiber. In the past few years the chemical laboratory has brought to us many synthetic textile fibers with different properties and characteristics. These have found extensive use throughout the textile industries in clothing, household fabrics, and other textile uses. They are woven separately and in blends of one with another, or with the fibers produced by nature, into fabrics of such close simulation to products made of the natural textile materials, such as wool, linen, silk, etc., as to be indistinguishable by the ordinary purchaser.

During the Eighty-first Congress a manufactured fiber-products bill had been introduced in the Senate, known as the Green bill, S. 283. Although no hearings were held on the bill and it had not yet gone through the refining processes which committee scrutiny would bring about, the synthetic textile situation is such that labeling legislation of this general character is needed. The legislation should provide appropriate procedures for determining proper nomenclature for the respective new fibers, in collaboration with the industries and trades concerned, and for nondeceptive informative labeling to bring the adequate content disclosure to the ultimate consumer.

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION FOR SMALL BUSINESS

As previously indicated, one of our major problems in the mobilization is to provide ways and means of affording necessary protection to small business to the end that it may come through the emergency in a strong and healthy condition, able to offer vigorous competition with larger business. This is essential to the future of competitive enterprise.

There are a number of steps which I believe can and should be taken in the emergency to effect the needed protection to small business.

We should make, and bring up to date from time to time, a study of the idle capacity available in the United States, particularly that in the hands of small business. We should also study the idle manpower that is available, particularly in the smaller communities. In the light of these studies, we should review the distribution of Government procurement, of industrial subcontracts, and of order backlogs for the sake of shifting orders from the overused to the underused facilities, and from localities where labor is short to localities in which it is more plentiful. We should examine the size of inventories and review allocations of scarce materials to avoid tying up such materials in congested establishments where their turn-over will be slow. We should avoid withholding such materials from plants which could use idle facilities and idle labor in the defense effort.

We should set up special machinery for placing Government contracts directly with small enterprises. We should use that machinery also to assure so far as possible that subcontracts placed by large concerns shall go to small enterprises.

We should encourage expansion by small enterprises as well as by large ones. We should take steps to make available to small concerns loans and tax amortization privileges comparable to those that are extended to large companies that undertake strategically desirable expansion. Wherever practical we should encourage expansion in dispersed small units capable of being built and operated by small companies rather than in large concentrated units which, aside from promoting concentration of economic power, are more vulnerable to attack in this atomic age.

We should make production methods and techniques available to small companies as fully as possible. We should consider a policy of making research grants to small companies that have appropriate research facilities. We should consider requiring that technology which has strategic value and has been financed by the Government be made available on reasonable terms without undue restrictions to concerns that will use it for mobilization purposes.

Legislation has been introduced in both Houses of Congress for establishment of a Small Defense Plants Corp. I refer to H. R. 1600 through H. R. 1604, and the companion bill in the Senate, S. 533. This type of legislation, I feel, is in the right direction and should materially assist us in coming through this period of emergency mobilization without undue impairment of our free-enterprise system.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AS AN ARM OF CONGRESS

When Congress passed the original Federal Trade Commission Act, it wisely lodged authority in the Federal Trade Commission whereby Congress may utilize the Commission to make studies and reports to it of antitrust problems and practices affecting our economy or the operation of industry and trade. (See sec. 6, FTC Act.) On numerous occasions this authority, which may be brought into operation by joint

resolution of Congress, was availed of for studies and inquiries to aid Congress in its legislative work. These inquiries have brought together the data and the facts upon which Congress has seen fit to legislate in many important respects.

For example, at the direction of Congress the Commission made the public-utilities study which entered so largely in passage of such statutes as the Public Utility Holding Company Act, Federal Power Act, and the Natural Gas Act of 1938. Other instances could be cited. Likewise the Packers and Stockyards Act followed upon investigation and studies made of that industry by the Commission. The chain-store inquiry of the Commission preceded passage of the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act.

I feel that the machinery which Congress, through this committee, has made available in the Federal Trade Commission for conducting large inquiries can fruitfully be utilized in the present emergency to develop facts needed by the congressional committees in their consideration of legislation affecting our economy, whether of the emergency type or of permanent character.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I wish also to say the Commission has aimed its work to furnish the fullest measure of assistance possible to the Government in the emergency. We wish to be of every assistance to this committee and to the Congress, and we shall be happy to respond to any suggestions which you may have in this respect.

Why Are We in Danger of Losing the Ideological War With World Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Washington's birthday, Thursday, February 22, at Princeton University there was held in connection with the Washington's Birthday celebration a discussion panel on the subject, Why Are We in Danger of Losing the Ideological War With World Communism?

Those who participated in this panel, while all Princeton graduates, were at the same time individuals prominent in public life. They were: Arthur Krock, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, and moderator of the panel discussion; Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs; Allen W. Dulles, Deputy Director of Central Intelligence; William E. Eddy, former Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Saudi Arabia and former special assistant to the Secretary of State in charge of research and intelligence; Charles D. Jackson, president of the National Committee on Free Europe; H. Alexander Smith, senior Senator from New Jersey.

The subject under discussion is of such current interest and has such an important part in the pending consideration of our foreign policy that I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the discussion as it appeared in the March 9 number of the Princeton Alumni Weekly be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have received from the Public Printer an estimated cost of printing the manuscript which indicates that printing the transcript will take one page more than the two pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $246.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY ARE WE IN DANGER OF LOSING THE IDEOLOGICAL WAR WITH WORLD COMMUNISM?

Mr. BARRETT. The question seems to be: "Why are we in danger of losing the ideological war?" My answer to that is that, if we are, it is in large part because we fear we may be losing it. Our greatest risk today is, I think, our own unjustified self-doubt in the people.

It is high time that we Americans stopped being so defeatist about military matters and about psychological matters. Who says that we are losing the ideological war? The Kremlin certainly doesn't say it today in Western Europe. They are in effect crediting us with such success that they are urging the people of Western Europe to believe that their own governments have sold out to us. Don't misinterpret me. I don't think we ought to be complacent. I think we have a whale of a long way to go. And we will discuss later a great many things which need to be done. But the record shows the very opposite of what the apostles of self-doubt and despair are preaching.

Let's look back a little bit. In 1947 Europe was in very bad shape as far as public morale was concerned. Communist forces could call a political strike in any country they wanted to and tie up industry and the entire economy of the country for an indefinite period. That situation does not exist today.

In France today, the Communists haven't been able to pull a major strike in 2 years. They failed in their efforts to block the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to block the military-aid program. They flopped badly in their efforts to stage a great demonstration against General Eisenhower. They failed in their efforts to block the unloading of ships with supplies. In France today the Communist-dominated federation in the labor field has lost two-thirds of its members. The chief Communist publication has gone down from 500,000 to 200,000 circulation.

Much the same sort of thing can be found in other countries in Western Europe. In country after country the Communist vote has decreased very substantially. Even Austria, which is still one-third under the heel of the Soviet army, voted to kick out Communist officials. The defections of key Communist leaders in Italy are significant. *

Even in the satellite areas, which have been under Soviet control and domination for 5 years, they have not been able to win over the people despite the most intensive propaganda campaign. Today it is clear that 60 to 80 percent of the satellite peoples are anti-Kremlin.

In the Far East the picture is not so rosy. But even there, for complicated reasons which we can go into later, I feel that the tide, after reaching a very low point, has turned and that there is definite improvement in the area. In the Middle East and Africa we have a great deal to do, but the situation is clearly better than it was a year ago.

We have a great deal yet to do in all of these fields. We have to get more spiritual lift into the psychological fight of the free world cause. We have to persuade other governments and other peoples to take a much greater part in this ideological war. We have to step up our own campaign of truth.

But I say in all seriousness that I am convinced that the tide has turned and turned very definitely in the so-called battle for men's minds. There is one ingredient that is particularly needed in this battle today—the ingredient of American confidence and faith in ourselves and the future. Whenever we show self-doubt, whenever we begin to waver, that fact is reflected around the world and throughout the free world. The world is watching us, and we have got to show the courage, the spunk, the moral strength, the confidence, and the faith that we have a right to show.

Mr. DULLES. Mr. Barrett has very largely stolen my speech from me. I maintain too that we are not now losing the ideological war with communism. In fact, I believe that the tide has turned, that it turned about a year ago, and that we are beginning now to see the way it is running.

Stalin and his Cominform have produced no new ideas during the past year, and there has not been a single Communist conquest in this last year—the only year in which one can say that since 1945. Bolshevism is checked in Europe. It is blocked in Yugoslavia, which is now a thorn in the side of Moscow. The defections of the Communists in Italy, where a split exists in the Communist Party, is one of the most significant events of recent years. Every single free election that has been held in Europe in the last 5 years has shown a gradual lessening of Communist strength. And every single controlled election that the Communists have held in their areas has been a greater and greater farce (the election they held recently in the eastern zone was the greatest electoral farce that has ever been staged). One of the most interesting developments is that those people who are nearest to the danger point in Berlin and Vienna are the ones who are stoutest in their determined opposition to communism.

The reason that some of us feel that we may be losing the ideological war is that we don't realize the handicap under which we started. It took us too long to realize from 1945 on what we were up against. Like a runner in a race, we had hundreds of yards to make up. I say that in the last year, particularly in the last 6 months, we have made that up and now we are going ahead.

What do we need now to insure victory in that area? I think we need the same type of united action of peoples in this field of ideological warfare that we are now seeing in the field of defense. America cannot do it alone. We must do it with our allies. We have an Atlantic Pact in the field of defense. What we need is an Atlantic Pact to bring all the free peoples together in this warfare of ideas and ideals.

Great movements in this field, as history shows, have again and again centered around a man. Now we have a great leader in Europe who takes over the united command of the forces of the free world in Europe. I believe that that same man can help support the united front of the free peoples in the war of ideas.

(Because of a temporary breakdown in the public address system, a complete transcription of Mr. Eddy's opening remarks is not available.—Editor.)

Mr. EDDY. My remarks will be based largely on my observations in the Arab world * * * the only part of the world * * * that is still not definitely in anybody's pocket.

It is safe to say, with some pride, that what work we have done in this field is being done largely by Princeton men. Not only our * * * and diplomats but also missionaries, educators, and doctors have been Princeton men and we can be proud of them.

Unfortunately there is a tendency to belittle the Near East as a vacuum. * * * They forget that a vacuum has a terrific

suction power and the wind is blowing over there with some velocity.

I don't like to be a Cassandra in this war of ideas. We have a 100-year record of American philanthropy, education, and medical work and friendship of the Government. It is a clear record, but still we are in danger of losing the war there for other reasons.

First is our failure to define the proper target. It is communism or Russian aggression? The same front page of the paper acclaims Senator McCarthy's attacks on communism and acclaims * * * Tito. We have to appeal to the bulk of the people of Asia and inform them of our liberties. * * * We must invite to our camp meetings all the angels and devils who are willing to fight against Russian aggression.

Secondly I think we would do well to stop serving the middlemen—and speak with our own voice of our own business. Too frequently we have served the interests of colonialist powers and have regarded their actions as an extension and ratification of our policy. This is not appreciated by the people who live in those countries. They would like to feel that what is happening in Korea is happening for Koreans as well as for the world.

There was consternation in imperial circles when FDR met Ibn Saud exactly 6 years ago this week. * * * Frantic measures were taken by Churchill and the Foreign Office to cancel the effect of this interference with the British preserve. One of the great items of loss in the death of FDR may prove to be that he did not live to establish the natural precedent of direct dealings with these people of the Near East.

Third, I think we should talk of joint defense and not in terms of occupation of our own forces. We should offer to help Asiatic peoples to defend their own lands. * * * Let us not talk about aid and hand-outs and taxes. We are doing these things for our own defense. * * *

It is appropriate to say on Washington's Birthday that Lafayette was welcome in this country and is pleasantly remembered because he came to help George Washington save this country. Lafayette did not come to demand in perpetuity a French base on United States soil.

Finally, if we are going to win this war, I think we would do well to engage in personal warfare as well as modern arms. Victories on the Korean battlefield have less significance on the Korean than on us. I should not like to see a plebiscite in Korea taken today.

Twenty million friendly Egyptians would make the Suez Canal much more secure than 20,000 Egyptian soldiers there against the will of the Egyptians. Singapore fell in a very few hours when it was isolated because across the water natives were no longer friendly. So will Hong Kong and Japan fall tomorrow. * * *

The significance of using Darlan in the North African landing was not only to make the landing less costly in lives but the fact that Darlan ordered them to lay down their arms and made it unnecessary for us to police and occupy all of North Africa. We could turn ourselves directly against a common enemy.

The West cannot hold down these millions of Asians by planting a few soldiers and forts every thousand miles as the British have done for 300 years and still think can be done today. The alinement of these Asians in the war will be determined by the people of Asia and by nothing else. Unless they hate Russian domination, our cause is lost.

Mr. Jackson. I believe that Messrs. Barrett and Dulles were gratifyingly hopeful, but I am afraid that they may have been just a trifle misleadingly hopeful about the way things stand right now. The last part of Colonel Eddy's talk, I believe, put very forcefully some of the real dangers that still face us in the world. We still could lose this ideological war. The most that we can be happy about today is that possibly we have fought this battle of psychological warfare back to the thirty-eighth parallel. We certainly haven't crossed it, and unless we do, we just aren't going to win it.

The ingredient that is going to make us win it is fanaticism. The outstanding characteristic of the enemy, the world enemy, both in his own country and wherever he is operating, including this country, is his fanaticism. We have got to have our own fanaticism for our own cause, but more important and even more difficult, we have got to instill fanaticism for our cause in a lot of doubtful friends and even more doubtful on-the-fencers. It doesn't do us any good in this country to work ourselves into a feverish lather unless some of that lather can be communicated to the Frenchman, Italian, Korean, Chinese, and others all over the world. Their fanaticism has got to be part of our struggle.

Psychological warfare is a very peculiar animal. To oversimplify it greatly perhaps, may I point out a reason why we are having such difficulty with it, the fact that it is all so new to this country. Prior to the fall of France in 1940, this country just simply did not know that it had to be in the psychological-warfare business. We sat in the movie theaters and giggled at the Goebbels, the Mussolinis, and the Hitlers. It just wasn't our kind of stuff and they were not our kind of folks. Gradually we began to realize that we had to get into what we then called the information business.

Another odd thing about this psychological-warfare business is that we visualize and think of Russia as a monolithic, solid, ponderous bureaucratic outfit, where there is no maneuverability at all. Everything finally has to go back to Joe Stalin for decision, and then it goes out into the world, into the various tentacles of the system. Interestingly enough, the Russians seem to have all the maneuverability and we have much less maneuverability. We are really so self-conscious about this new "dirty tricks world" that we are always looking around to some secretary or other or to some boss or other to see if it is O. K. to do something. And all of us in this game are trying to do exactly the same thing at the same time to everybody everywhere. And that isn't the way the war is going to be won. We have to have flexibility and maneuverability; and if a message or idea of psychological warfare is applicable to the French, that does not mean that exactly the same thing has to be applicable to the Yugoslavs.

The three big ingredients of psychological warfare are (1) money, (2) no holds barred, and (3) no questions asked. I look to my great pal and colleague, now Assistant Secretary of State, Edward Ware Barrett, and ask him if he feels quite free on the no holds barred and no questions asked. The poor guy is just in a terrible swivet all the time. Yet of all the incumbents who have held that post, with the strait-jacket factory in the next block, I think he has done the most absolutely extraordinary job. When you see anything adverse about the Voice of America or Ed in the press, take it from me "it ain't so." He is doing a terrific job under conditions which are absolutely insupportable.

There is an important job to be done, and no one way of doing it. In this labyrinth that we are in, there is just one thing that is absolutely sure: that if world war III is to be avoided without appeasement, psychological warfare ranks on a par with dynamic diplomacy and the defense effort as an outstanding weapon.

Senator Smith. Are we in danger of losing the psychological war? I think we should accept the fact that we are in danger of losing it. Although in saying that I want to pay the same high tribute to my friend Ed Barrett that C. D. Jackson has just paid him. He has done a magnificent job, but I believe that he has an enormous job ahead of him still to do.

As I have studied this problem and, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I have been dealing with the war side as well as the psychological side of military defense. I agree with Mr. Jackson that ideological warfare, this battle for the minds of men, is just as important if not more important than military preparedness. Unless we can win the battle for the minds of men, the other war might well be lost.

The reason we are in this difficulty, as I see it, is that the Russians, by their very astute propaganda, have tended to isolate the United States from the rest of the world because of their particular hatred of us. They have tried to present a picture to the world of a conflict between, on the one hand, Russian communism which is aimed at helping the poor downtrodden peoples to be liberated, as against what they call capitalistic, imperialistic, wealthy America. The issue is totally wrong and we all know it. But they have been very successful in convincing an area of the world that is not as familiar with us as possibly some of the western part of Europe is.

May I illustrate this point by telling about a session that I attended in Dublin just this last fall at the Interparliamentary Congress, where we had representatives from 40 nations. Part of the program called for each nation to state his case before the rest of us. That show was stolen by the representatives of the Far East, who said to us: You western powers are missing this picture, because we don't understand practically anything that you are talking about. You have to tell us what you mean more effectively, more practically. We can't understand why you are throwing surplus away when people are starving in other overpopulated areas of the world. We don't want to become tools of the Russian Communists, but we are in danger of having our people pull us there, because of the great promises which these people are making. And you're not meeting that issue.

I was shocked. I felt that I shouldn't resent their statements. I knew it wasn't true, but I realized that we hadn't sold them the big issue before the world, and that we had to do it almost immediately. That issue is simply this: That we who have inherited the traditions of human freedom from our ancestors who came over here—freedom of the press, of religion, of free speech—have not made it clear that that is the big issue of the world, as opposed to totalitarian strength. An atheistic Marxism as opposed to the western traditions of freedom under Almighty God. That is the job we have to do. If we can once get to the world that this is the issue they'll take it, I haven't the slightest doubt that they'll take it. The question is how?

May I suggest that the way to get at it is the way that Colonel Eddy suggested a minute ago. We have to spearhead a missionary crusade of people who are willing to go to these countries and do what the Russians have done. The Russians sent their scouts into these countries before they tried to do anything else to find out the cause of unrest and dissatisfaction, and to show how they, with their communism, would meet those needs of unrest and dissatisfaction. We have got to do exactly the same thing. We have got to go into those countries with a crusade and understand what the people's problems are on the ground—to find out what they are, and then indicate, by the proper method of

missionaries, educators, and other people, that we are prepared to sell our traditions of freedom on that basis. I haven't the slightest doubt that if we can make that approach we can win this war.

We mustn't be isolated as the one champion of freedom, whatever that might be, to people who don't understand it. They are weighing whether it would be wiser to get under the iron curtain or take the American side in this contest, and some are saying that they think it might be better to be neutral. How can anybody be neutral when the issue is freedom against slavery? That is the thing we have got to get across.

I think we are doing it; I think Ed Barrett is moving into that area. But I can't emphasize too strongly the need for this living missionary crusade to tell the people of the world the kind of freedom that our ancestors gave us. They fought, bled, and died so that we would have what we have in this country, and what the western nations have. We mustn't be left isolated. We must be willing to say that this freedom is the freedom of the western nations.

I have said to Ed that I wish we could change the Voice of America, much as I honor that, to the Voice of Freedom, to the Voice of the Free Peoples of Asia, of Europe, of Scandinavian countries, of Switzerland, or any area of the world that is free, and keep that voice going, going, going until the issue is clearly stated and understood.

Mr. Knock. Mr. Barrett, in connection with defeatism as a danger, do you think that a tendency to emphasize the faults in our system to the young rather than to emphasize a feeling of pride in our achievements, an attraction to professions of idealism under other systems, had something to do with the creation of this symptom?

Mr. Barrett. I suspect so. I think domestically that the tendency to examine our own faults is as healthy as it can be. Over the long pull it is one of the things that make us strong. But I think that in times of national danger like this we had better stand off and look at the country and realize how well we have done. I think that we should look more at the plus side, less at the negative side, and realize that we as a Nation have made tremendous progress internationally as well as nationally. We only got to our present role in world affairs at the time of the start of lend-lease and through the last war. Since then has come the Marshall plan with all that it did to bolster morale of Europe.

We don't realize how much progress we have made and how much ground we have for a feeling of confidence, pride, and determination. We should show more of this side to the world, and less of the side of self-criticism and squabbling among ourselves.

Truth is an extremely powerful weapon. We are now beginning to reap the dividends from the fact that we are believed, because we have stuck to the truth in our official propaganda output, whereas other powers are not believed. That has become particularly apparent in the last 6 months. The Soviets put on an enormously intensive campaign to try to prove that we were the aggressors in Korea. That campaign has failed dismally in most of the world, and it backfired badly because it proved to millions of once-credulous people that the Kremlin group was a group of incredible liars. The fact that we had built up credibility for the Voice of America and other official channels of the United States has paid off, is paying off, and will pay off. The truth can be used to build up confidence, "spunk," and determination in the free world. The truth can be used to enlist a really enthusiastic desire for cooperation with us in the cause of the free world. The truth can be used to undermine and disprove the Soviet lies in other free nations. The truth can be used to erect barriers against further Communist aggression on both sides of the iron curtain. The truth can be used to build up a spirit of resistance.

On the strait-jacket point, I admit that it is difficult to carry on an information service within the structure of the United States Government, bound by all United States Government policies. But as far as the official Voice of America is concerned, I don't know how it could be otherwise. The Voice is going to be interpreted as the official voice of America regardless of where it is located in Washington, and what it says is going to be interpreted as a commitment of this Government wherever it is located.

There has been a healthy recognition of possible limitations of this situation in the organization of a committee for free Europe by a group of private citizens, which is not an official voice of the Government. One of the great things that has happened in that field is that a number of individuals have put the heat on C. D. Jackson to persuade him to take over that very difficult job. There is nothing more healthy in the entire psychological-warfare field than his appointment.

Senator Smith. Mr. Barrett, there is another part of your work—the exchange of students between countries—that I have been interested in for many years. It furthers the idea of giving others personal contact with our own people here. Could you tell us how that is developing? I am sure this audience at Princeton would be glad to know more about it.

Mr. Barrett. There has been no more outstanding champion in the entire field of exchanging persons than Senator Smith. He has been a pioneer in the field and a consistent supporter.

I am convinced, after some skepticism, that it does pay off, and in a big way. We are seeing proof of it right now in many parts of Latin America. Students brought here 10 or 15 years ago are now emerging in positions of leadership. We have seen how Latin American countries have placed their confidence in this country, are all working together in the UN, and so on.

That program is moving along at a rapid rate. There will be about 8,000 persons exchanged between this country and others within the next year. There is one shift in emphasis within the program. It is a shift to leadership groups, including student leaders, to people who are in touch with a great many individuals—editors, labor leaders, and so on. That shift was made because we obviously reap quicker dividends from that kind of group than from concentration on the others. There are those who say that this kind of program is only long-term in its effect. I deny that.

One quick illustration. There is today in Germany a young labor leader, who made a trip here 8 months ago. He addresses audiences throughout Germany and starts each speech with these words: "When I sailed into New York harbor, I sneered at the Statue of Liberty as an empty symbol; when I sailed out 3 months later, I bowed to the old lady because I found she really stood for something fine and decent and strong." That is the reason for my enthusiasm for that part of the program.

Mr. Jackson. The student exchange program is absolutely right. One of the basic criticisms that can be leveled at American propaganda is that it is frequently not on the human level. There are geographical reasons for that; it is very difficult to be human via a microphone and a radio wave. But whenever we can get on the human level—an American to another human being—we score 100 points just automatically. The more of it that can be done the better. If the Fulbright funds are ever in danger of being extinguished, I hope that Senator Smith sees to it that they are replenished mighty quick. All of that activity is splendid, because it is human.

Mr. Emy. We have got to get more people telling the truth on our side, all the dope fiends and all the peddlers and all the cutthroats who hate Russian domination. We need Franco and Tito and Mao and all of them, and we can't tell them apart by the color of their eyes.

Mr. Dulles. We are not really novices in this field. I go back quite a long way, to World War I, when a great Princeton president, then President of the United States, was a master in this field. I happened to be at the other end of the line in Berne, Switzerland, during the build-up of psychological warfare when truth and tricks were mixed together. Wilson, in a masterful way, was able to divide the Kaiser and his military leaders from the German people. Before the radio and all the modern gadgets of intercommunication with peoples, he was able, by the use of this weapon of psychological warfare, to bring the First World War to a close when the German armies were still intact on French soil.

How did he do it? He did it because he was able to divide and conquer, to show the German people that they had nothing more to fight for, and they gave up their support of the armed forces in the field. The 14 points and his negotiations brought the war to a close when the fighting forces were still intact. I think that is certainly the most masterful achievement in the field of psychological warfare in this century.

We can use the same tactics today. Those 12 men in the Kremlin can be divided from the Russian people, and they can be divided from the satellites, from the people of the satellite countries. One of the most able moves in the field of psychological warfare came the other day from Yugoslavia (and revealed that maybe our Communist friends will be able to help us, too) when Tito pointed out that Stalin was a retrograde, that Stalin was no longer the one that had a right to speak even for communism. There we have a wedge driven. We have many other ways in which we can drive a wedge between the rulers and the satellites and the people whom they oppress. We can go back to Woodrow Wilson to help us do it.

Mr. Jackson. In line with this extraordinary kaleidoscope of truths, half-truths, and untruths, if anyone in this audience were suddenly asked to step up to one of Ed Barrett's microphones (or one of the Radio Free Europe microphones) and speak to all of these countries, how would you describe the enemy? You would have a perfectly terrible time. Would you say it is the Kremlin, the Politburo, communism, Stalinism, Marxist-Leninism, totalitarianism, etc.? What the people in this racket have got to realize, and what you have to realize, is that we must be terribly smart. We have to be smarter than we have sometimes been in the past. If you decide for instance to attack Stalin's Russian imperial tyranny, that goes for Yugoslavia; but if you start opening your mouth shouting just communism at the enemy, you can't say that to the Yugoslavs. We expect those Communists possibly to die for us this summer. You cannot, out of one corner of your mouth, say, "Get in there and fight, boys," and out of the other corner of your mouth try to destroy communism to the Yugoslavs. It's a terribly complicated business.

Mr. Knock. In this morning's newspaper (the name of which I shall not mention) was a dispatch from a British correspondent in India who had just been in China. He describes Mao Tse-tung as follows: Though he takes long views, he is nonetheless a firm believer in what he calls Marxist-Leninism. He will accept coalitions, he regards some of Chang's capitalists as his present friends, he

wants to encourage private enterprise, he recognizes the bourgeoisie as a permanent element in society, he does not contemplate rural collectivism, etc. What of that, Colonel Eddy?

Mr. EDDY. It doesn't mean anything at all to me. It seems to me that there is only one thing we can be sure of—that in each nation of the world these people want to be free from domination, free to misgovern themselves, to ruin themselves, to damn themselves, to be Democrats or Populists. We must appeal to them and say that if they want to stay free we will help them.

Senator SMITH. I was in the Far East a year ago and went through a number of the areas out there and talked to many of the people. I was in Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Korea, and Hong Kong. The only thing that people were talking about there was to be free to express their own individualities, and not to be exploited by any greater power. They were critical of what they called imperialism and colonialism; they were critical of the United States because they said we had been the partners of those who had been guilty of these things in the Far East. What they wanted was to be free for self-expression and all they wanted from us was assistance in getting that freedom.

I agree with what Mr. Eddy said. I think that what comes from Mao is simply coming from Moscow. We know that China was conquered by Moscow. We know that there must be millions of people in China today who are yearning to be free just as much as those in these other countries. The question in my mind is whether we are going to win the confidence of the people in Asia who want to be free. There's where our danger is—the great masses of people in the Far East who don't understand us adequately. As I said earlier, we need a real crusade to tell them what it is all about and give them what they are yearning for.

I have been in contact with Mr. Dulles' brother, John Foster Dulles '08, very closely in the last few months. The wonderful job that he has done in Japan is worthy of our consideration all through here in his efforts to convey to the Japanese people our eagerness to give them the kind of freedom they want. To work out a peace treaty and yet give them the protection they need to prevent their being overrun by this Russian menace.

I think Mr. Barrett will agree with me that it is different from the problem in Western Europe.

It is something we have got to face with courage, realizing this yearning for freedom and the necessity of the United States properly interpreting that freedom to them. We must understand their problems and not sit in an ivory tower here and say that because we are free, therefore you ought to be free. It can't be done that way. It has to be done by personal contact, personal understanding and the man-to-man approach.

Do Corporation Lobbyists Swarm Over Capitol Hill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 1951 issue of Sales Management, the magazine of marketing:

DO CORPORATION LOBBYISTS SWARM OVER CAPITOL HILL?

(By Jerome Shoenfeld)

(The results of a congressional inquiry may disappoint the public and perhaps amaze most businessmen. Here's a report on how much corporations have spent and for what.)

From much that's being written, you get the impression that the head of a company spends most of his time, not to mention his company's money, crusading. His crusades—at best indirectly, often remotely and sometimes not at all—sell his company's products or reduce its costs; their connection with the earnings statement can be perceived only by the elite policy makers, not by mere operating men. He crusades because he's scared; scared of socialism, of government extravagance, of labor, of regulation. In command of a great company, he finds ever so much money to indulge his personal neuroses by mailing books all over the county, blanketing the press with institutional ads. As for himself, has he anything else, really, to do?

The caricature gets a suggestion of accuracy, perhaps, from the literature circulated by the publicity staffs of associations to which most of the big companies contribute. There were the irate and, so to speak, red-faced ads exploding that free enterprise is breaking down; there are the more recent patronizing ads featuring two men, one in a business suit and the other in overalls, in which the terms "profits," "free enterprise," "sales costs," "high productivity," etc., are explained or defended. Whether it's the business suit or the overalls that's talking, is sometimes made clear by the presence or absence of grammar. There are also the booklets on all sorts of things—taxes, labor law, etc., and the books, among which, in the past year, John Flynn's the Road Ahead, has taken the lead.

Rarely does the picture fit anybody you meet, even though he happens to be the chairman of some board. He doesn't sound or look like a canned institutional ad, even when the conversation shifts to the institutional subject matter; he's more likely to have some angle, which, plausible or silly, is his own and interesting. And, despite the great war of books, booklets and ads, by now it's probably a rare company chief who isn't in some way working with the Government or who hadn't been during the war.

GROUP INFLUENCE

"Our investigation," declares the report of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities issued on January 1, "has convinced us that the business of influencing legislation is dominated by group effort, and that individual activities by persons known as lobbyists are subordinate. Much of the money expended to influence legislation is spent on pamphleteering or advertising to obtain legislative aims."

Previously, the House committee had published a booklet, Expenditures by Corporations To Influence Legislation, in which major companies tell what propaganda they've circulated, what propaganda ads they've published, etc. Company by company, you get the answers to a long series of questions. Going through about 500 pages of tables, you come out with the impression that most of the big companies most of the time mind their own business. Their crusades are usually close to home: power companies against public power, railroads against some twist in the regulations, ordinary vendors against a sales tax, liquor companies against the WCTU.

The questions by the committee covered: (1) trips to Washington; (2) maintenance of District of Columbia offices; (3) distribution of literature dealing with legislative matters; (4) institutional ads of the same kind; (5) contributions to various propaganda agencies; (6) lobbying expenditures not covered otherwise.

Take the expenditures for institutional ads. Detroit Edison from 1947 through 1949 spent more than $200,000, but didn't report where or why. Late in 1948 Ford placed displays in each Washington, D. C., newspaper, repeating the testimony of one of its executives before a congressional committee. General Electric didn't report to the Lobbying Committee; General Motors, which circulates pamphlets, didn't advertise; Georgia Power reported upward of $100,000 spent as "its share of the electric companies' advertising program" (presumably run by N. W. Ayer & Sons, Inc., over CBS). Gulf Oil placed seven ads in 1940, spending $150 on the average, "favoring business profits." International Latex merely cites five editorials that it republished, not listing the papers that were favored nor telling how much it spent.

LISTS ADVERTISING COSTS

Ohio Edison's tabulation covers nine and one-half pages. The business goes to dailies and weeklies within its territories. Its subject matter has two themes: public power and creeping socialism. In addition to its own advertisements, the company through the last 4 years spent around $70,000 explained thus: "payments to N. W. Ayers & Sons, Inc., Washington Square, Philadelphia, Pa., the advertising agency that is conducting the electric companies' advertising program in various magazines having national circulation and radio broadcasts over CBS network."

Early in 1948 Schenley spent $279,370 on one ad: An ad that appeared in "daily newspapers throughout the country, in licensed beverage business papers and magazines, financial newspapers and magazines, news and press magazines, and similar publications." It dealt with the Luckman Committee, which was tying up the grain supply. This spring it spent $14,000 in business papers to urge liquor dealers to fight the excise tax.

These are some of the big ones. Most concerns do little or no advertising, the committee's tabulation indicates. If the reports are accurate and representative, companies don't stray far from business. The greatest spenders are the utilities, which are the rarest among product advertisers.

Several companies spend a lot of money for books and pamphlets, chiefly about socialism, published by such organizations as American Enterprise Association, America's Future, Committee for Constitutional Government, Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation, Economists National Committee for Economic Policy, Foundation for Economic Education, Public Affairs Institute, etc. Copies go to dealers, to employees, to executives, sometimes to customers. Hearings brought out that the organizations try hard to sell bulk subscriptions. One gets the impression that, with a few exceptions, company chiefs are prompted not so much by their own crusading zeal as that of the energetic publishers. Among companies that reported the distribution of this literature were:

Allied Chemical, to supervisors; American Gas, "office use"; A. T. & T., evidently for the company library, judging by the small amount spent; Armco Steel, employees, supervisors, executives; Carolina Power, personnel, stockholders, "other friends"; Central Power & Light, employees; Champion Spark Plug, to people who request; Chrysler, not reporting recipients; Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric, employees, stockholders, and visitors in company lobby.

Literature circulated by companies consists mostly of stuff written by their own

staffs or ad agencies and deals with things they're directly interested in. Here are some examples of big spenders:

A. T. & T.: Its officials have repeatedly testified before various committees and commissions. The company circulated their testimony, chiefly to the press. This is simply a service to the reporters. Testimony also goes to people within the organization directly interested and to interested Government officials.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe: Its officials make speeches, which are circulated, among others, to newspapers—again a service.

Detroit Edison: Literature from just about everywhere, mostly for the help and the customers.

Erie Railroad: All sorts of literature, distributed almost everywhere—employees, civic associations, papers, etc.

Ford: Dealers get testimony before Congress.

General Motors: For dealers, the testimony of C. E. Wilson; company booklets reprinting radio speeches to a list of 30,000; company official speeches to dealers, Congressmen, employees, papers, etc. One of the greatest spenders.

RCA: Company testimony goes to the press, licensed stations, distributors, etc.—distinctly a service.

Schenley: Press releases prepared by Carl Byoir distributed nationally; literature on excises, grain allocations, etc., sent to distributors. Some press releases get special distribution, for instance to the labor or the medical press.

Most of the money consists of contributions. The average big company joins chambers of commerce and trade associations all over the place. From the tables, you can see that there are thousands of them.

What corporations spent on lobby ads

Name of corporation and total expenditures reported under Federal Lobbying Act (Jan. 1, 1947–June 30, 1950):	
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	----------
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co	$15,255.00
Aluminum Co. of America	----------
American Automobile Insurance Co	----------
American Can Co	----------
American & Foreign Power Co., Inc	----------
American Gas & Electric Corp	----------
American Gas & Electric Service Corp	----------
American Power & Light Co	----------
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	103,632.01
American Tobacco Co	42,104.48
American Viscose Corp	----------
Anaconda Copper Mining Co	----------
Armco Steel Corp	----------
Armour & Co	----------
Armstrong Cork Co	----------
Association of Casualty & Surety Companies	29,882.56
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co	63,732.02
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co	----------
Beech Aircraft Corp	----------
Belden Manufacturing Co	----------
Bethlehem Steel Corp	256.75
Borden Co	----------
Burroughs Adding Machine	----------
Carolina Power & Light Co. (North Carolina)	----------
Celanese Corp. of America	----------
Central Power & Light Co. (Texas)	----------
Champion Spark Plug Co	----------
Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co	2,149.97
Chrysler Corp	----------
Cities Service Co	----------
Name of corporation—Continued	
Coca-Cola Co	----------
Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co	----------
Commonwealth Edison Co	----------
Commonwealth & Southern Corp	----------
Connecticut Light & Power Co	----------
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc	----------
Consolidated Vultee Corp	----------
Consumer Power Co. (Michigan)	----------
Continental Can Co., Inc	----------
Curtiss-Wright Corp	----------
Deere & Co	----------
Delaware Power & Light Co	$7,719.05
Detroit Edison Co. (Michigan)	----------
Distillers Corp.-Seagrams, Ltd	----------
Du Pont, E. I. de Nemours	51.16
Eastman Kodak Co	----------
Electric Power & Light Corp	----------
Empire Gas & Fuel Co., Ltd	----------
Empire State, Inc	----------
Erie R. R. Co	----------
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	4,504.50
Florida Power & Light Co	----------
Ford Motor Co	----------
Fruehauf Trailer Co	4,500.00
General Electric Co [1]	48,427.33
General Motors Corp	135,165.06
Georgia Power Co	6,385.08
Goodrich, B. F., Co	18,254.75
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co	----------
Great Northern Ry. Co	3,784.69
Gulf Oil Corp	----------
Harnischfeger Corp	3,576.72
Humble Oil & Refining Co	19,440.66
Illinois Central R. R. Co	----------
Indianapolis Power & Light Co	----------
Inland Steel Co	10,900.00
International Elevator Co	----------
International Harvester Co	----------
International Hydro-Electric System	----------
International Latex Corp	----------
International Nickel Co., Inc	----------
International Paper Co	----------
International Telephone & Telegraph Co	----------
Jersey Central Power & Light Co	----------
Johns-Manville	12,749.31
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp	----------
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp	----------
Kaiser-Frazer Corp	----------
Kaiser Industries, Inc	----------
Kaiser Steel Corp	----------
Kresge, S. S	----------
Liggett & Meyers Tobacco Co	----------
Lilly & Co., Eli	----------
Lone Star Gas Co	----------
Mellon National Bank & Trust Co	----------
Middle West Corp	----------
Monongahela Power Co	----------
Monsanto Chemical Co	----------
Montana Power Co	----------
Montgomery Ward Co	----------
Mountain States Power Co	----------
Name of corporation—Continued	
Nash-Kelvinator Corp	----------
National Dairy Products Corp	----------
National Distillers Products Corp	----------
National Power & Light Co	----------
National Steel Corp	----------
New York Airbrake Co	----------
New York Central R. R. Co	----------
Niagara Hudson Power Corp	----------
Norfolk & Western Ry. Co	91,881.90
North American Co	----------
Northern Indiana Public Service Co	----------
Northern Pacific Ry. Co	2,503.99
Owens Illinois Glass Co	----------
Pacific Gas & Electric Co	99,912.22
Pacific Power & Light Co	----------
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co	----------
Pennsylvania Electric Co	----------
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	----------
Pennsylvania R. R. Co	96,471.82
Petrol Corp	8,976.66
Philadelphia Electric Co	----------
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co	----------
Potomac Electric Power Co	----------
Procter & Gamble Co	----------
Public Service Co. of Colorado	----------
Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc	----------
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire	----------
Public Service Corp. of New Jersey (Public Service Electric & Gas Co.)	----------
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	7,289.85
Public Service Electric & Gas Co	----------
Puget Sound Power & Light Co	----------
Pullman, Inc	----------
Radio Corp. of America	----------
Reading Co., The	----------
Republic Steel Corp	6,949.00
Reynolds, R. J., Tobacco Co	57,375.38
Schenley Distillers Corp	169,997.22
Seagram & Sons, Inc	----------
Sears, Roebuck Co	5,721.84
Shell Oil Corp	----------
Singer Manufacturing Co	----------
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	86,020.13
Southern California Edison Co., Ltd	----------
Southern Pacific Co	14,969.01
Southern Railway Co	122.78
Southwestern Gas & Electric Co	12,728.95
Standard Oil Co. of California	----------
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	2,000.00
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)	----------
Sun Oil Co	----------
Swift & Co	----------
Texas Co., The	----------
Texas Electric Service Co	----------
Union Carbide & Carbon Corp	----------
Union Electric Co. of Missouri	----------
Union Pacific R. R. Co	547.31
United Gas Improvement Co	----------
United States Gypsum Co	----------
United States Rubber Co	----------
United States Steel Corp	----------
Utah Power & Light Co	3,014.83
Virginia Electric & Power Co	----------
Washington Water Power Co., The	----------
Western Electric Co., Inc	----------
Westinghouse Electric Corp	----------
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co	18,375.67
Total	776,495.93

[1] $61,909.58 expended by General Electric Co. for distribution of a questionnaire "How Would You Revise Our Labor Laws?" not included in this total. The fact that the expenditure had been made was announced in a "Schedule B" filed at the same time as the quarterly lobby report in April 1949, but GE did not include the amount on the form as an expenditure stating: "The company does not believe that such publication comes within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act since no opinion was expressed and no position taken or advocated one way or the other on the question listed."

Source: "Expenditures by Corporations to Influence Legislation," by House Lobbying Committee.

Totals reported in response to questionnaire

	Corporations reporting expenditures	Amount
Subdivision (a)	66	$227,256.62
Subdivision (b)	7	346,807.65
Subdivision (c)	65	1,511,520.24 377,301.31
Subdivision (d)	31	2,013,369.72
Subdivision (e)	125	25,941,452.57
Subdivision (f)	37	406,787.27
Grand total		$32,124,835.38

The Bankers' Observation of the Value of Soil Conservation District Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech made by Mr. E. P. Vickers on November 20, 1950, before the Georgia Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors. Mr. Vickers is president of the Citizens Bank & Trust Co., of Bainbridge, Ga., and former president of the Georgia Bankers Association.

The speech follows:

They say that an honest confession is good for the soul. Most of the progress I have ever made has been forced upon me. I say that, not with pride, but with shame and regret.

Three years ago I was elected vice president of the Georgia Bankers Association. That meant that at the next convention I would be elected president. Shortly thereafter I was requested to attend a soil-conservation district award meeting, make a speech on soil conservation, and deliver the awards. If I had been asked to make a speech on astronomy, or the fourth dimension, or the nth degree, I would not have been any more at sea. There I was, running a bank with resources of $3,500,000, with half of my loans to farmers, and utterly ignorant of the fact that our country, our State, and our Nation are suffering untold damages from soil erosion, exhaustion, and depletion, and likewise ignorant of the fact that a remedy is at hand. Do not misunderstand me—I do not think that my feeble efforts since that time have corrected the situation or made any great contribution toward its correction. I do say that I have become alive to the importance and implications of the subject and am doing my best to make up for lost time.

My subject is entitled "The Bankers' Observation of the Value of Soil Conservation District Work."

I may have approached this subject from the wrong angle—I took it to mean that I am to appraise the appreciation of the banking fraternity of the value of soil-conservation district work, and my remarks will be predicated accordingly.

Before I conclude I hope that I shall convince myself and you that the average banker does have an appreciation of the value of soil-conservation district work, even though there is much room for improvement.

The first genuine broad public interest in the conservation of natural resources was stimulated by Theodore Roosevelt during his Presidency. Attention was given, however, principally to plans for conserving mineral, forest, and water resources, and no official attention was directed to the conservation of the soil until 1929.

In that year the Department of Agriculture began setting up erosion-control experiment stations and an intensive study of soil erosion was commenced. In 1933, when the depression was adding to the farmer's difficulties, the Soil Erosion Service was set up in the Department of the Interior, and it began operation of erosion-control demonstrations in problem areas.

In 1935, this service was transferred by act of Congress to the Department of Agriculture, and its name changed to Soil Conservation Service. This Service is purely a technical agency, staffed by soil scientists, engineers, biologists, chemists, hydrologists, agronomists, and other specialists, whose services are available to other Federal, State, and local agencies, which are engaged in promoting the soil-conservation movement. Through its research, educational activities, and on-the-job cooperation it has provided the basic leadership for the whole movement.

Today, under this national program, 48 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, and Alaska have passed enabling acts for the establishment of soil-conservation districts. Nearly 2,300 local districts are in operation embracing approximately 1,205,000,000 acres and 4,661,000 farms. Approximately 240,000,000 acres of the farm land included in the local districts have been covered by individual farm-conservation plans totaling approximately 873,000. A conservation plan, based on the needs and capacities of the land, and the means of the farmer, has been made for each farm. The practices called for by the plans have been put into effect on nearly 121,000,000 acres of this land.

The soil-conservation law of Georgia is found in Georgia laws of 1937, pages 377 to 404, as amended Georgia laws 1945, pages 190 and 191, and Georgia laws 1949, pages 584 to 587. These laws deal largely with the creation of the State committee, define its functions and powers, with the creation of the districts, and the appointment and election of supervisors. Throughout it all is the feeling of utter democracy that inheres in all of it.

Now as to the banker's role in all this vast movement.

The American Bankers Association, through its agricultural commission, has given a great deal of time and study to soil conservation, and has prepared and distributed a considerable amount of valuable literature on the subject to its members. Its 1946 program for country banks, issued January 7, 1946, lists soil conservation as item No. 1, and states, with respect thereto, that the support of soil conservation should be a Nation-wide effort of organized banking.

The then chairman of this commission, C. W. Bailey, president, First National Bank, Clarksville, Tenn., is one of the earliest and most ardent supporters of conservation. As proof of the fact that he practices what he preaches, it can be said that his bank has pioneered in soil conservation loans, and is actively and aggressively encouraging farmers to adopt better farming practices. In this connection his bank distributed in September 1945, to the farmers in the community a very fine 4-page pamphlet captioned, "Take Care of the Soil—It Will Take Care of You," which explains in simple language the need for soil conservation, the procedure to be followed by the farmer for having his farm surveyed, and the benefits of soil conservation. The pamphlet also urges the farmer to discuss with the bank any financing that might be needed in the program, and in this connection the following statement is included: "The men who manage this bank think that there is nothing more important in farming than building up the soils * * * and keeping them productive." It is interesting to reflect that Mr. Bailey has served with distinction as president of the American Bankers Association and is now much in demand as a speaker on agricultural subjects.

The agricultural commission of the American Bankers Association has recently issued a booklet outlining the entire soil problem from the point of view of what the bankers can, and should, do about it, and how they should proceed in fulfilling their obligations in this respect. This booklet, entitled: "What Bankers Can Do About Soil Conservation," is highly recommended as a "must" in the files of all banks.

The contributions of two of the Federal Reserve banks to the soil conservation program have been outstanding, and the probabilities are that, as a result, the bankers in their respective districts have a much clearer realization of the importance of conservation, and their responsibility in the program. These banks are the Federal Reserve Banks of Cleveland and St. Louis. Both of these banks have on their staffs agricultural economists who are intimately familiar with the soils and soil problems of their respective districts, and who devote their full time to the development of programs to acquaint the bankers of the need for soil conservation and improvement.

I would be doing my friends over at the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta a great injustice if I should not say that it, too, has for several years been an earnest advocate of soil conservation. It has two agricultural economists who are very capable and well informed and are always available when they can be of service in the cause. Their Bankers Farm Bulletin, which is published monthly, constantly exerts in favor of soil conservation.

Many State bankers associations have taken an active part in furthering the banker's participation in soil conservation. As evidence of this is the fact that the Kentucky Bankers Association recently decided to spend $10,000 a year for three years to promote good farming practices in Kentucky. Further, the New York State Bankers Association has been very active in urging bankers to attend a special five-day course in agronomy and farm management designed especially for them, which is being offered by the Agricultural College of Cornell University. Numerous other State bankers associations have also taken positive action on the subject.

Clearing house associations in many communities are taking a realistic view of the problem, as is shown by the decision made in April 1945, by the St. Joseph, Mo., association, to earmark for soil conservation loans $500,000 of its $7,500,000 postwar credit pool.

There is no question that perhaps thousands of individual banks have management that is alert to the opportunities and obligations presented to the banks in the soil conservation movement. We know in countless communities scattered throughout the land, the banker is among the leaders of, and very active in soil conservation work. A great many banks have farm specialists on their staffs, and are therefore in a good position to embark on this comparatively new type of lending. However, the average country banker has been accustomed to making the conventional type of farm loans, such as feed, seed, and crop loans, which are usually short term. He does, of course, make

some long-term mortgage loans, but these are generally on the best farms and to the best credit risks. Soil conservation loans will fall in between the conventional short-term loan and the long-term mortgage loan, as they will generally require three to ten year maturities. They will also require a knowledge and understanding of the conservation program of the farmer, and of the loan repayment possibilities of the program. In other words, the country banker will have to acquire the know-how to make a type of loan he is probably not familiar with. The great danger in this situation is that too many bankers may feel it is too much trouble and effort to take on these loans on the theory that some other lender will take care of the prospective borrower. The banking profession should never permit this to happen, as the inevitable result will probably be the familiar cry that the banks are not doing their job. In this event the Government would probably feel it must take over the soil conservation financing job, and private banking would receive another set-back. Therefore, in the final analysis, the job of the banker in the soil conservation program must be done by the individual banks.

For many of the statistics used, many of the thoughts expressed, and much of the language employed in the foregoing, I am indebted to a book, Soil Conservation and the Banker, by George H. Emde, of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. To the author of this book I express my apologies for any liberties I took and my thanks for the pleasure I had in reading it.

Frankly, I think that the Georgia Bankers Association was among the first of the State associations to acquire an adequate appreciation of the importance of the whole matter—the loss or exhaustion of soil and the importance of preventive measures. It started its system of awards to soil conservation district cooperators in 1943 and since that time it has held 26 meetings and has given 2,007 awards to farmers who have made the necessary 90 points out of a possible 100 and have achieved some proficiency in each of the listed practices.

During the last 2 years, under the leadership of George Bazemore, as chairman of the agricultural committee, the Georgia Bankers Association has devoted more time, effort, and money to the encouragement of soil conservation than it has to any other subject. This has been done through and by working with the State committee, districts, Soil Conservation Service conservationists, technicians, and county agents.

And yet I fear that a great percentage, I would not say a majority, of individual bankers are not using the district and technicians to the extent that they could. Perhaps I should not head the list. But it is not the fault of the organizations, the supervisors, or the technicians. I have never found them too busy to talk to me or to go to any farm and help the farmer if I could assure them they would be welcome.

So it is refreshing to get a letter like this one, which I received from a banker friend in a neighboring county:

"My observation is the banks and the farmers are missing a good bet in not using the soil-conservation program more extensively. Some years ago we had a good farmer with a large family who was barely meeting his interest payments each year. All of his children worked and often had to say out of school to help with the farm. Much of his land was low and wet and his row crops frequently were drowned out. I called him in my office one day and had a long talk with him, the net result of which was he agreed to let me bring a soil-conservation man out there to study his problem.

"——— was our soil conservationist at the time and he did an excellent job. The first thing he did was to back off from the proposition and call in help to get a proper analysis of the soil. So many weeks passed that I thought the matter was going by default.

"One day ———, another soil man, and the farmer came in my office. They had a complete new file, new aerial photographs of the farm, and a complete program outlined. I was amazed at the work and the careful attention which had been given to this man's program. Their recommendations boiled down to a change in the system of terracing and drainage, abandoning row crops on some of the land and substituting pastures and livestock. It all looked good to me and I turned to the farmer and asked him if he was willing to try. He said, 'Mr. ———, I am desperate. I'll do anything these men say that you approve.'

"I told them all right. I had stuck my neck out and would finance him and asked what the cost would be. They said, 'We don't want any loan. The man is in debt. We don't want him to get any deeper in debt. He may have to borrow $125 for wire to construct one cross fence. Otherwise, we want him to do it on his own resources.'

"Last spring I stopped by this man's home. He was sitting on his front porch. When I drove up he walked barefoot out to my car and crawled up in the front seat with me. He said, 'I was just thinking about you a few minutes ago and my wife and I were talking about what a wonderful thing you did for us.'

"I explained to him that I had done nothing, that he himself had done it with the help of the soil conservation program. I had merely directed him to the right parties.

"This man has had the money for 2 years without borrowing. He is ahead of the payments on his insurance mortgage on the land. His children are in school, they are well fed and well dressed and the whole family are happy. This is a true story exactly as it happened.

"Since that time I have steered other customers to the soil conservationists in our county. They have been most cooperative and they are doing a good work in ——— County."

So you can see that the conservation movement and the State committee and districts and technicians are not without friends. Progress may be slow but I can assure you that bankers everywhere are becoming more and more appreciative of your efforts.

Time does not permit, nor do I need to talk to you about soil conservation. You are its apostles. But I wish indeed that somebody could speak with a voice as loud and impressive as the thunders that came down from Mount Sinai and say: Our institutions are in danger—our homes, our businesses, our schools, our banks—indeed everything. Our population is increasing fast—our cultivatable land is decreasing, not as fast as it was, but fast nevertheless. Under the impetus of price supports we are working our land for all its worth, and under our benevolent attitude toward other lands and peoples we are sending away the strength of our lands to foreign countries, whence it never returns. Can a crisis be long deferred? Not unless everybody—not alone the banks—becomes interested in soil conservation.

The absolute necessity, the "without which not," of soil conservation is the soil-conservation district. Through it work the State committee, the supervisors, and technicians and without them the whole effort would lack system, form, and body.

That, my friends, is the way one banker feels about the matter you assigned me. And I thank you sincerely for the honor you conferred on me—and the banking fraternity, in inviting me here.

Ishpeming GI Tells of Low Troop Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, an army is as good as its morale. I have contended that revision of the policy covering our reservists is of immediate importance. Under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to commend for your reading the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Mining Journal, Marquette, Mich., which quotes a letter from one of our soldiers:

ISHPEMING GI TELLS OF LOW TROOP MORALE

ISHPEMING, March 3.—"I've never seen the morale of troops so low before."

So writes Pvt. Charles Cowpland in a letter to the Mining Journal from Pusan, Korea. The soldier, formerly of Ishpeming, is the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Elliott Cowpland and the grandson of Mrs. C. C. Cowpland.

His letter, sounding a heavily pessimistic tone, is based on a series of searching questions. Reprinted in its entirety, the letter reads as follows:

"DEAR SIR: Myself and a few thousand other GI's would like to know the answers to several questions. The biggest question at the present is, Just why are we over here? The Army has tried to answer that for some time now, but I've yet to hear anyone say he's convinced we ought to be fighting. The Korean people certainly aren't glad to have us. I've seen that with my own eyes. You'll notice I said the people, and not the politicians. After all, it is the people of this world whom we are trying to satisfy, even though the scales show otherwise.

WHERE WILL IT END?

"Another good question is where will it all end, and to what advantage? Also, do the people back home realize how disgusted the reservists are at the quick shuffle they've gotten? I've never seen the morale of troops so low before.

"It just about all boils down to this: How is a man going to fight or give his all when he can't see anything worth while behind it? No one has satisfied us yet, so think twice before you try."

QUESTION OF RESERVISTS

"Another question which all reservists would like answered: When we signed up after the last war we were led to believe we wouldn't be called until a national emergency existed. Most of us were called before the emergency was declared. To us it was kind of a low blow dealt from what we once called a democratic nation. It's rough to be lied to, by our own Government, at that. This may sound harsh, but it's not half as harsh as all of us feel.

"Why is it that our PX (post exchange) shelves are bare when the black market thrives to such an extent that the streets are lined with shops selling American cigarettes, candy, toilet articles, stationery, and every item of GI clothing—not used (BAD) but new?

BRITISH IN AMERICAN GARB

"Why is that our engineer battalions have to drive trucks and equipment made in Japan, when the Koreans use United States equipment and tear it up within a month?

"Why was it that the reservists, the majority of whom were more than qualified, weren't held in (the) States to train draftees instead of being sent overseas?

"Why is it that British soldiers, from the nation which claims to have the best tailors in the world, are seen wearing GI field coats and carrying M-1 rifles as they stroll through the PX buying up our 'scarce' items? Why, too, are Korean police, civilians, and soldiers wearing our GI uniform? How is an American soldiers supposed to respect his uniform when it's being worn by everyone in the world?

IMPOSING EDIFICES

"Why is it that the British, Dutch, and other European legations are housed in imposing edifices when that Nation that foots the bill for the whole show is in a dump by comparison?

"You try to answer these questions. We, the expendable GI's, can't!

"CHARLES C. COWPLAND."

Anyone who feels he can answer some of Private Cowpland's questions can reach him by addressing the envelope to Pfc Charles Cowpland, ER 46044518, 378th Engr. Util. Det., APO 59, care Postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.

Operations in the Chosin Reservoir Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

OPERATIONS IN THE CHOSIN RESERVOIR AREA

1. Early in November the First Marine Division launched a drive from Hamhung toward the Chosin Reservoir. The Seventh Marines, in the lead, advanced north steadily and by aggressive and determined fighting finally decimated the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth CCF Division in the vicinity of Chinhung-ni. The advance continued to a point west of Yudam-ni, when, on November 29, due to the deteriorating situation on the Eighth Army front and the appearance of several fresh Chinese divisions in the Chosin Reservoir area, orders were received to withdraw toward Hamhung. This withdrawal, which was concluded when the last elements of the division closed the Hamhung area on December 11 will become an epic in the annals of the Marine Corps. Seldom, if ever, have marines been forced to battle against comparable odds. The enemy in overwhelming force was on all sides, necessitating determined attacks to the front to clear the way, resolute rear guard actions to keep the enemy from closing in, and flank protection to guard the trains and the wounded in the center of the column. Step by step the division fought its way for a distance of 35 miles, always against unremitting pressure from the enemy. First the Fifth and Seventh Marines, with attached units, fought their way out of Yudam-ni, over a 4,000-foot mountain pass and into Hagaru-ri. The losses were heavy but the column was strengthened by the garrison at Hagaru-ri, the Third Battalion, First Marines, the Forty-first Royal Marine Commandos, and headquarters and service units. Then the column fought its way from Hagaru-ri to Koto-ri. Again losses were heavy but the column was strengthened by the addition of the headquarters of the First Marines, the Second Battalion, First Marines, and attached units then in garrison at Koto-ri. For the final drive from Koto-ri to the relative security of Chinhung-ni at the southern end of the tortuous mountain road below Koto-ri the entire division participated. While the bulk of the division fought down the mountain, the First Battalion, First Marines, fought up the mountain to a juncture, thus permitting the trains to descend the mountain with reasonable safety. Much of the road over which this withdrawal was conducted was tortuous, narrow, and snow- and ice-coated. Temperatures ranged from 8° to 20° Fahrenheit imposing extreme hardship on men and causing considerable difficulty with motor vehicles. There were road blocks, blown bridges, and cratered roads. Yet in spite of determined enemy resistance, hazardous roads, and bitter weather the division emerged from its ordeal a fighting division and inflicted heavy casualties on the six enemy divisions encountered. All wounded were evacuated, there were no stragglers, and usable equipment was not destroyed except by enemy action.

2. The performance of officers and men in this operation was magnificent. Rarely have all hands in a division participated so intimately in the combat phases of an operation. Every marine can be justly proud of his participation. In Korea, Tokyo, and Washington, there is full appreciation of the remarkable feat of the division. With the knowledge of the determination, professional competence, heroism, devotion to duty, and self-sacrifice displayed by officers and men of this division, my feeling is one of humble pride. No division commander has ever been privileged to command a finer body of men.

OLIVER P. SMITH,
Major General, USMC, Commanding General First Marine Division.

Confusion's Ultimate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from a recent edition of the Commercial Appeal, which is as follows:

CONFUSION'S ULTIMATE

There are limits to everything, even confusion.

Price Stabilizer DiSalle achieved the ultimate Saturday when he released the cotton trade from the handcuffs of his first price ceiling order of January 26 and replaced them with a strait-jacket and leg irons.

The chaotic conditions of the cotton trade, which has persisted for five long weeks, thus has been made most confusing.

Contrary to the claims of Mr. DiSalle and his propagandists, the cotton trade is not asking for higher prices for cotton, even though it is asking that no ceilings be imposed.

It is fighting for its existence as a business and a marketing system, and has agreed to rigid and severe regulations to prevent any rise in prices if only the market is left intact.

The futures and the spot markets, as now constituted, are essential for the marketing of the cotton in an orderly manner. Without one, the other cannot function efficiently and effectively. If the buyer of cotton has no hedge in the futures market, he cannot afford to buy the farmer's cotton in the fall. If the merchant cannot buy the cotton, the problem of holding the cotton until there is a market reverts to the farmer and his banker, neither of whom is fitted to carry the burden.

The cotton trade—producers and merchants—have been fighting alone to prevent the end of their marketing system, while the public and other industries stand by with little show of interest in the outcome. They are carrying the fight to Congress in the hope that the decisions of Price Stabilizer DiSalle and his staff of entrenched bureaucrats can be reversed.

They point out that the communistic tactic when it desires to take over an industry is to make rules which hamper operation, then rules which stifle business. Then they say, "You have been unable to operate, so we must take over."

They point out that the British cotton industry was nationalized by the same plan and the same procedure.

They know that if they are unable to function as a market the Government will use that as an excuse to take over the buying and selling of cotton. They know they cannot function under the price-control program outlined by Mr. DiSalle.

They know that they must win this battle or become the first major industry to be socialized in America. They do not know which will be next, whether coal, railroads, transportation, including railroads and truck lines; textile mills, automobile factories, insurance companies, or doctors. But they are certain that if one industry is socialized, it will be easier to nationalize the second, and the third.

This is not cotton's fight alone. It is a fight in which everyone has a stake and in which every believer in free enterprise should join.

Why We Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Bruce Barton, from the Washington Sunday Star of March 11, 1951:

WHY WE FIGHT

(By Bruce Barton)

I was interested in a news dispatch which read: "Officers representing the Secretary of Defense and the Armed Forces began yesterday a revamping of orientation programs, to help service men and women understand why they are being asked to risk their lives in the defense of democracy." This comes after a long series of dispatches reporting that GI's in Korea do not understand why they are there.

As a student of history and a patriotic American, I am impressed by the fact that the wars of our country divide sharply into two categories—those that every soldier understood, and those that many, if not a majority, did not understand.

There was no need for an orientation in 1775. The embattled farmers at Concord were fighting for their independence and for that they were willing to die.

With our Spanish-American War our perplexities began. We just couldn't quite make up our national mind whether we were fighting for the freedom of the Cubans and the Filipinos, or whether, as Senator Beveridge blurted out: "American factories are making more than the American can use; American soil is producing more than he can consume. Fate has written our policy for us; the trade of the world must be ours."

In World War I—the war to end all wars—we set up only a relatively small orientation establishment. In World War II, a host of "orientationers" was required—press agents, broadcasters, lecturers, mimeograph operators, makers of documentary films.

Now in world war III we must have uncounted hordes of explainers.

In the same week I read two statements by Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, commander of the forces in Korea. The first, presumably the work of one of the orientation boys, was a very exalted message to the troops: "The real issues are whether the power of Western civilization as God has permitted it to flower in our own beloved lands shall defy and defeat communism."

The second declamation came a few days later. God had been dropped from the ranks along with the high-flown talk: "Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway said today that his 13-day-old offensive was aiming at killing the most Communists at the least cost, and had no geographical objective."

A long, long road we have traveled since 1775. From "We hold these truths to be self-evident * * * that all men are created equal," all the way down to "killing the most Communists at the least cost."

Ceiling on Raw Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, chairman, March 9, 1951:

Mr. Chairman, it is always an honor and a pleasure to appear before your distinguished committees, but especially am I honored today in thus addressing my own senior Senator's committee. Assuming that my colleagues and those present are not as familiar with Senator MAYBANK's background as we are, I would remind you that the Senator's entire background is wrapped up in the growing, marketing, and processing of cotton. In our State, the names "Maybank" and "cotton" are synonymous. There are few men in the country and none in the Senate, in my judgment, who know quite so much about cotton as does the chairman of this distinguished committee. You will pardon me for a brief personal reference to my own background when I tell you that I too might be thought of as a product of the cotton industry. I grew up with cotton and now have the privilege of speaking for more textiles than any other Congressman in the world.

As evidence of the seriousness of the proposal to put ceilings on raw cotton, I quote below a series of telegrams which I have just received and my reply thereto:

"On behalf of membership we urge your support removal ceilings raw cotton and support of industry plan adopted by Department of Agriculture for control raw cotton prices.

"J. P. MCLAURIN,
"President, Carolina Ginners Association."

"Textile industry our State supports position of National Cotton Council on maintaining open market on cotton. We hope you agree and will work in this direction.

"JOHN K. CAUTHEN,
Executive Vice President, S. C. Cotton Manufacturers Association."

"Request you attend Maybank meeting tomorrow urge rescinding of cotton ceiling and adoption of industry plan endorsed by Department of Agriculture.

"FRANK A. JONES, Jr.,
"Greenville, S. C."

"I strongly recommend that you join with Senator MAYBANK in presenting the united front in testifying to the unworkability of the recent ceilings on raw cotton. I believe it to be imperative that Congress back up the Agriculture Department's plan of stabilizing prices on cotton which would prevent runaway prices without resorting to price ceilings. This program is workable and would have the full endorsement of the farmer as well as cotton merchants resulting in harmony which is so necessary at this time to get out the very large quantity of cotton in this growing year to supply our vital textile industry.

"WALTER RUDNICK,
"Joanna Cotton Mills Co., Joanna, S. C."

"Senator MAYBANK has called meeting of congressional "watchdog" committee for tomorrow to hear United States Department of Agriculture present its view on cotton price ceiling controversy. Secretary Brannan's testimony will also represent cotton industry's position. Since this whole matter of such paramount importance would appreciate your attending hearing and obtain details of plan suggested by cotton people to stabilize cotton prices without resort to price ceilings. Regards.

"ROBERT R. COKER,
"Hartsville, S. C."

"Urge you protest ceiling on cotton at joint committee meeting on defense production to be held March 8 and suggest the adoption of the industry plan as indorsed by Department of Agriculture.

"REMSON BAUGHNIGHT,
"Vice President.
"D. W. ANDERSON,
"Assistant Vice President.
"J. LAKE WILLIAMS,
"Secretary, Alice Manufacturing Co."

My answer to the above telegrams was as follows:

"Have vigorously protested cotton ceilings. Shall follow through.

"JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
"Member of Congress."

Of all the features of the many controls imposed during the last war, those relating to cotton and textiles worked most satisfactorily. It will be recalled that no effort was made to put ceilings on raw cotton then. The controls were placed upon the finished products. Why past experiences were so suddenly and completely disregarded and this new unworkable plan instituted is beyond my understanding. In law, we follow the rule of "stare decisis"—stand by a decision. In this instance, no effort is being made to stand by a decision which was workable. I do not know Price Director DiSalle, but I am informed that he has had no experience whatsoever in dealing with cotton in any of its phases. I fear that he has not conferred with those best qualified to advise him on this intricate and involved subject. In this connection, I am reminded of a story about some government agent who came into our fair country years ago for the purpose of ascertaining the cause of hookworm. After spending much time and money, this agent filed a report stating that the presence of hookworm in the South was attributable to the excessive use of a drink peculiar to our country called cotton gin. This report stated that the natives went in for the manufacture of this drink on a large scale for at the principal crossroads would be seen sizable plants bearing large signs reading "Cotton gin." The conclusion was reached that hookworms were caused by drinking "cotton gin." This story illustrates the fact that there are those who know very little about cotton.

It is inconceivable that controls could be imposed on raw cotton since there are more than 400 different varieties and staples of cotton. At best, controls are objectionable but right thinking people are reconciled to the fact that controls are necessary during emergencies such as the present. Unless we approach this difficult problem in the right attitude, greater confusion than we have ever known will ensue. I respectfully urge that the present theory or plan of controls be reconsidered and that further study be given to the system used in the last war.

Livestock Ceiling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following statement adopted by the board of directors of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., in regular session on March 8, 1951, on livestock ceiling prices:

Indiana farmers have heavy investments now in abundant production. Latest national figures indicate 6 percent increase in spring pig crop, with 4,000,000 more hogs for slaughter expected this year compared with last year. Cattle in Nation's feed lots 5 percent more now than a year ago. This extra meat production, as encouraged by free-market price conditions, can prevent rationing, while a discouraging, risky controlled-market-price situation would eliminate the emphasis on full meat production and thus hasten the day for meat rationing and resulting food subsidies.

Indiana farmers would far rather take the financial risks of livestock production in a free market than gamble with a Government-controlled market price where supply and demand are shoved aside for governmental considerations and decisions that no one can anticipate in long-range livestock planning.

Our livestockmen have now filled their feed lots with purchases from free markets and if the rules are changed, these farmers with heavy investments could be facing known losses by having to sell in a set, controlled market. As the swelling flood of increasing costs chokes off livestock production under conditions of price fixing, confusing meat rationing, and costly food subsidies will follow directly, as ample World War II evidence shows. Despicable black markets, waste of valuable animal byproducts, and

disruption of normal channels of trade also go along with Government fixing of livestock prices. World War II experience displays.

In short, Indiana farmers are strongly opposed to Government tampering or fixing of prices for live hogs and cattle or other farm animals. Price ceilings on livestock are taking production down the wrong road and hazards the Nation's food supply and strength now when we are mobilizing our might for the defense of freedom.

Hasell E. Schenck, Lebanon, President; Larry Brandon, Auburn, First Vice President; Mrs. Russell Cushman, Fortville, Second Vice President; Emil Bannwart, Michigan City; Elmer Kolmerten, Fort Wayne; Arthur E. Arnott, Rensselaer; C. E. Moseley, Peru; J. Walter Thompson, Crawfordsville; Wayne Mann, Orleans; Ernest Freeman, Muncie; George Doup, Columbus; Lowell Taylor, Owensville; George W. Elliott, Rising Sun.

Food-Price Spiral and Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter, as signed by Mr. Roy Stokes, president, and Mr. Joseph Stempnik, legislative chairman, Local No. 295, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Detroit, Mich., and also a clipping from the Detroit Free Press of January 11, 1951, entitled: "Detroit Food-Price Spiral Continues Unabated."

Spiraling living costs, as they affect the post office employees, are a direct concern of this Congress and I willingly call it to the attention of my colleagues.

There is proposed legislation pending in Congress to increase the salaries of our faithful postal employees and it is hoped by many Members of Congress that early action will be taken.

The letter and article follow:

DETROIT FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Detroit, Mich.

Hon. LOUIS RABAUT,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RABAUT: Enclosed is a clipping from the Detroit Free Press dated January 11 which clearly illustrates how the price of food has increased from 10 to 15 percent over the prices shown for the same commodities as of last June. The cost of living index as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics has risen to new heights making the salaries of post office clerks and Federal employees totally inadequate to maintain a respectable standard of living.

Private industry and local and State governments have granted wage increases in the past few months to their employees to offset the excessive rise in the cost of living, while Government employees must await favorable salary legislation by the Eighty-second Congress.

The postal deficit, the size of the national budget for the 1952 fiscal year nor a price and wage freeze law should be used by Congress to deny Government employees equitable salary legislation.

The postal deficit is not due to inefficiency on the part of the postal employees, but due to the high cost of operation, large subsidies paid to the transporters of the mails plus congressional reluctance to increase outmoded postal rates.

The $71,000,000,000 national budget for fiscal year 1952 is due to heavy military expenditures while allowing only a small increase over the amount granted in the fiscal year 1951 budget for nondefense items.

Wage-freeze laws in the past have always provided exceptions to cover wage contracts being negotiated at the time the wage-freeze law went into effect, also permitted annual automatic raises and allowed wage increases after prior approval of a wage board or designated agency.

S. 355 and H. R. 244, H. R. 340, H. R. 437, H. R. 452, and H. R. 1546 have been introduced by either the chairman or members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in order to alleviate the economic distress of Federal and postal employees caused by their low wages and the high cost of living.

The membership of Local No. 295, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, appeals to you to urge the chairman and members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to schedule early hearings on remedial salary legislation.

We thank you for your past interest in the welfare of all Government employees.

Respectfully yours,
ROY STOKES,
President, Local No. 295, NFPOC, Detroit, Mich.
JOSEPH STEMPNIK,
Legislative Chairman, Local No. 295, NFPOC, Detroit, Mich.

[From the Detroit Free Press of January 11, 1951]

DETROIT FOOD-PRICE SPIRAL CONTINUES UNABATED

(By John Griffith)

Detroit food prices continued their steady advance Wednesday except in pork where prices were steady to slightly lower.

A spokesman for a major independent supermarket chain said: "Prices are going up every day; they are not firm in anything. Nothing is stable."

Meantime, Windsor food prices also edged higher but on a lesser scale.

Canadian price increases were smaller and there were numerous reductions from 6 months ago.

Detroit meat prices Wednesday generally averaged about 10 to 15 percent higher than in June, a survey revealed. In that time, the cost of living index has risen 5.4 points to 175.6.

Detroit dairies, meanwhile, announced that the price of home-delivered milk would be raised to 21½ cents a quart within a few days, the second increase in 30 days.

Alex Bell, Detroit retailer, and spokesman for the Associated Food Merchants of Greater Detroit, listed prices in effect Wednesday for top grades of meat.

Round steak was 98 cents to $1.05; porterhouse, $1.15 to $1.20; rib roast, 90 cents; pot roast, 75 cents; pork chops, 80 cents; hamburger, 65 cents, and lunch meat 7 percent above 6 months ago.

At that time, he said, round steak was 90 cents; porterhouse, 98 cents; rib roast, 80 cents; pot roast, 65 cents; pork chops, 85 cents (the only price drop); and hamburger, 55 cents.

In dry groceries, a 5-pound bag of flour was 49 cents to 51 cents, due to a recent 2-cent increase. Tomatoes were two cans for 35 cents in contrast to 6 months ago when the charge was two cans for 27 cents.

Powdered soaps, 32 cents a box, against 25 cents; shortening, 3 pounds $1.07 now and 91 cents in June; coffee, 89 cents and 77 cents 6 months ago.

Peaches now 47 cents a can against 36 cents; sliced pineapple, 39 and 35 cents.

The supermarket spokesman, who supplied the grocery figures, outlined some of the reasons for food cost increases.

"There is a general tendency on the part of manufacturers to edge prices upward, sometimes only 15 cents a case," he said.

"Retailers can absorb only so many of these boosts and then we must pass them along to the customer.

"Cost of paper bags and butcher paper have gone out of sight," he said. "Containers of all kinds, cardboard, glass and tin cans are all more expensive."

In Windsor, meanwhile meat prices were as much as 33 percent lower for similar meat cuts and grades than in Detroit butcher shops.

Ralph Polsky, operator of an independent supermarket at East Chatham and Macdougall, quoted the following prices:

Round steak, 75 cents; porterhouse, 85 cents; rib roast, boned and rolled, 72 cents; pork chops, 59 cents; hamburger, 57 cents; pot roast, 63 cents; leg of veal, 59 cents; sliced bacon, 55 cents; and smoked hams, 59 cents.

Polsky, who said his prices were representative of Windsor supermarket operation, said his prices in June were:

Round steak, 77 cents; porterhouse, 79 cents; rib roast, 59 cents; pork chops, 57 cents; hamburger, 39 cents; pot roast, 54 cents; leg of veal, 51 cents; sliced bacon, 55 cents, and smoked hams, 59 cents.

His vegetable prices were higher, however, than those in Detroit, he said. Canned tomatoes were quoted two of the 34-ounce cans for 33 cents, against two cans for 35 cents in June.

Milk sold generally in Windsor at 20 cents for the large Canadian quart, five of which would make six American quarts. This was 1 cent higher than in June.

Bread was 17 cents, coffee $1.05, lunch meats were 49 and 59 cents, while canned milk was sold at two for 29 cent

Letter of Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter written by Mr. William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, which was sent to Life magazine in answer to that magazine's editorial on January 15 entitled "This Way to Suicide":

JANUARY 20, 1951.

The EDITORS, LIFE,
New York City.

GENTLEMEN: Because it calls exactly for the fatal step that will destroy our free society, and reduce the world to chaos where communism can thrive, I rise to protest your editorial of this week, "This Way to Suicide."

When you denounce the President and Mr. Acheson for believing in the possible coexistence of communism and Americanism; when, in addition, you demand the destruction of "Soviet communism," its ambitions and sources of power, you make mandatory that the people of the United States mobilize forthwith and wage a total war for completely unlimited objectives. You confidently assume that such a victory is possible and that, although such a gigantic war will destroy much of Europe, once it is won there will be brighter possibilities of peace.

May I suggest that you read your history? Never in all history has any one idea, nor any one government, ruled all the world. Every time any nation has tried to do it, failure has resulted. Imperial Rome was not able to destroy Christianity. Neither could Charlemagne, with his Holy Roman Empire, impose it on all the world. Mohammedanism spread like a prairie fire until it was stopped by brave Christians, but Christians could not destroy Mohammedanism. It still exists. That communism is a similar historic force would be foolish to deny.

Conflicting great powers, espousing conflicting ideals, have lived in this world in coexistence since the beginning of time. That they have fought each other is a matter of record, but the records also show that when one has tried to destroy the other, they have usually exhausted each other to such an extent that the basic vitality of both has been sapped.

Communism will not be destroyed by destroying the present regime in the Soviet Union. What will take its place will be a Russian regime, most of whose personalities know nothing but communism. What will follow will be a typically Russian autocratic, brutal, restless regime.

To assume that the vitality of the Communist idea will disappear amid the ruins of Western Europe, I believe is absolutely unwarranted. To the contrary, the total exhaustion of Western Europe would create the very revolutionary situation where organized Communists could seize power. Certainly it will mean the end of democracy.

You are calling for more political capacity than exists in America or anywhere in the world. To assume that here in the United States, after fighting such a war, with its subsequent period of disillusion which is sure to follow, we shall have a democracy, is, in my opinion, a specious assumption.

In the circumstances that exist today I would call attention to the very quotation from President Truman and Secretary Acheson which you criticize:

"If we build our strength—and we are building it—the Soviet rulers may face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world. That is what we hope will happen, and that is what we are trying to bring about."

That is the only realistic road to peace, and represents the basis of a wise policy. Whether we like it or not, America and organized communism are going to coexist for many decades, if not generations, to come.

During those decades, there is bound to be conflict, just as there has always been conflict between opposing political interests.

Surely, after the experience of two World Wars, in which we futilely sought to win unlimited and impossible objectives, our future policy should be to keep our objectives limited and within our political capacities to support. At this time in our history we ought to be maturing to the point where we see wars as a social disease which can never be eliminated, but which can be reduced in their virulence and destruction.

The same criticism I am writing to you I have already written editorially numerous times when President Truman, for instance, in his speech dedicating the United Nations building in New York, said in substance that there can be no peace until our (note that word) ideals of freedom prevail everywhere. Note the unlimited scope of the word "everywhere." That is an unlimited objective. On the other hand, the statement made by President Truman and Secretary Acheson and quoted by you above, confines our objectives to historical realities and within our capacity to support.

No editor in the United States has fought communism longer and more persistently than I have. I can produce a written record to show the warnings I sounded about our dealings with Soviet Russia in the last war. What I write comes from a great deal of experience at home and abroad and from the reading of history.

If this country should by chance shout itself into the total war that you and Governor Dewey call for, I have made up my mind what I am going to do. I am going to do my best to organize a rebellion against it. No plea for unity is going to silence me into meekly submitting to fighting a third world war for the unlimited objectives you proclaim, but which history shows no nation has ever won.

Respectfully,
WILLIAM R. MATHEWS,
Editor and Publisher, the Arizona Daily Star.

Interoceanic Canals Commission Is Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have studied the question of transisthmian canals with particular reference to the problems of national defense, including the atomic bomb. The RECORD is replete with authoritative information on these subjects by distinguished Members of Congress.

The situation presented by this vital issue clearly calls for the creation of a broadly based and independent interoceanic canals commission composed of the best qualified men available under congressional authorization. This idea was evidently contemplated by Chairman E. J. HART of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the report on the activities of his committee during the Eighty-first Congress—House Report No. 3246, Eighty-first Congress.

An editorial supporting this proposal was published in Marine Progress of February 1951. It emphasizes the need for any such commission to be broadly based and to include representation from the maritime agencies which use the canal.

The entire editorial is quoted:

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

In a review of the work done by the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries there is a report on the findings and recommendations of the subcommittee delegated to make a study of the transisthmian canal route question that has demanded the attention of the Congress for some time. Representative EDWARD J. HART, chairman of the committee, has suggested that a study of the transisthmian canal question be made by qualified engineers so that a good canal can be had, either through the modernization of the present waterway or the construction of a new canal at this or some other site.

Congressman HART's suggestions has considerable merit but it is obviously necessary that any commission appointed to study this problem must have on it representatives from the Armed Services, from the Canal Zone Government and most particularly from the maritime industry which will not only use the canal but will also pay the greater part of its cost. To restrict the commission to engineers will result only in an engineer's waterway, one that may be perfect from a technical standpoint but may not be suitable for the practical operation of large and fast vessels. Let the users of the canal outline in detail what they want, let the Armed Services show what must be had from their standpoint and then let the engineers build the waterway to meet these requirements. In that manner we shall be getting the best canal possible.

Wrong Approach to Cotton Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March issue of the South Carolina Farmer with reference to the wrong approach in placing ceilings on cotton and cotton products:

To the average man who grows cotton, the action of Price Administrator DiSalle in clamping a ceiling on raw cotton just doesn't make sense. Senator MAYBANK expressed the thoughts of several million southern people when he dubbed DiSalle's action as "nonsense—just another bureaucratic order."

For every action, particularly for one of so great importance, there must be a reason. The public mind is confused as to Mr. DiSalle's real reason for taking this action. Obviously, it is not in the public interest, it will not do the thing that Mr. DiSalle says that he intends it to do—work in the interest of the consumer to protect him against higher prices in clothes and cotton goods. Any third grade school child of average intelligence would be quick to realize that only ceilings on cotton textiles would serve to protect consumers against higher prices.

During World War II, ceilings on textiles with a free market operating underneath proved fairly effective. Why does Mr. DiSalle evade the use of this method and insist upon trying something new that everyone who knows anything about the cotton industry knows will not work?

Could it be that the huge profits being made in the textile industry have made the owners of this industry silent partners to Mr. DiSalle's action in order to protect the wide spread now existing between the price that the farmer is paid for his cotton and the price that the consumer pays for textile products? Or could it be that the forces of organized labor, in the hands of its selfish leaders, are behind this movement to protect this wide spread in order that plenty of leeway be provided for justification of demands for increased wages.

Almost 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln said, "public opinion is everything. With it nothing can fail; and, without it, nothing can succeed." In this case public opinion does not support DiSalle's action. The public mind is confused. There is no clear picture of the need for or any sound reasoning behind this action.

While "big industry" and "big labor" argue as to who is in charge of our Government, neither accuse agriculture of being in charge.

Forty-five and seventy-six one-hundredths cents per pound as a ceiling would not be too bad if that were actually what the average farmer could expect as an average price

for his 1951 cotton crop. During the fall months when farmers must dispose of their cotton, mills will be prone to buy sparingly because, under this ceiling on raw cotton, they would be protected against any advance in price. They would be sensible in waiting for a lower price. This depresses the market. Most of the 1951 crop must wait to find a ready market. This means that the farmer who produces cotton must take enough less than 45.76 cents per pound basis middling 15/16 to fully compensate those who buy and store this cotton for the expense of handling and storing and paying interest.

So the prospect is for an average price to our South Carolina farmers for 1951 cotton of something considerably below 45.76 cents per pound and perhaps much nearer to the prospective 90 percent of parity support price level of a little more than 36 cents.

Experience has taught us (taught cotton buyers particularly) that farmers will not refuse to sell cotton at any price above the support-price level. This support price cotton loan would afford farmers an opportunity to obtain 90 percent of its parity value and then store and hold and sell this cotton later; but experience has taught buyers of cotton not to fear this action, since farmers will not take advantage of it. If farmers would use this means of withholding the 1951 crop from the market, the lid would blow off soon.

The net result of the whole thing as it applies to cotton is this—farmers must again enter into the production of an unusually high-cost crop, with labor scarce, wages higher, fertilizer more costly, insecticides higher in price and short in prospect, and faced with a ceiling price but no real floor price. A big crop, boll-weevil damage, storm damage during harvest time, late picking due to labor shortage, drought, wet weather—anything can put a farmer's average price far below ceiling or parity prices; but it takes good management, good luck, good weather, good machinery, good labor, and the good graces of the Almighty for him to come out anywhere near the point in profit that the pencil pushers and experts tell the public that he has made.

This ceiling price on raw cotton will have little direct effect on the farmer's pocketbook until another crop is made. It will have only served to further confuse and discourage him — destroy his confidence in those charged with controlling his price destiny. Since the 1950 Defense Production Act authority for this kind of controlled economy expires next June 30, Congress will have an opportunity to take another look prior to extending authority for continuing this confusion. Senator MAYBANK, chairman of the joint Senate-House "watchdog committee," seems in a mood to take a good look.

Congress has conferred upon the President certain powers under the Defense Production Act of 1950. The President has in turn conferred upon Mr. DiSalle certain powers and responsibilities for doing a job of price control. Mr. DiSalle is besieged from every direction with suggestions and advice and demands that are conflicting. Perhaps he is doing his dead-level best under the circumstances.

Having been a successful politician as mayor of Toledo is no qualification for being a successful price administrator. Complete lack of knowledge of the production, marketing, and processing of cotton perhaps made Mr. DiSalle easy to mislead in judging his duty with respect to ceilings on raw cotton. He has at least one good quality—that of determined action, whether right or wrong. Sooner or later Mr. DiSalle will find out that he has made a mistake if he were sincere in trying to act in the public interest and not in the interest of some special group closely allied with the political kingdom of which he is a part.

In the meantime, ceilings on raw cotton, radio and newspaper publicity on mink coats and bribes, and shady political maneuverings are undermining public confidence in the integrity and ability and sincerity of many of those in high places in our Government. This Nation has more than once demonstrated its willingness and ability to gear into a war economy and to produce and win. The only thing that will eventually make this impossible of attainment again is the destruction of public confidence because of the failure of our leadership. Our love of freedom demands action for the defense effort. That same love of freedom demands action against Government regimentation and a tax-and-spend policy if it be only under the guise of emergency.

Maybe Mr. DiSalle will soon become wise enough to substitute common sense for political sense. Let us hope that the present state of confusion does not last long enough to destroy public confidence and to wreck our national economy. Although there is not much in the picture at present upon which to base any great degree of hope, we should produce all the cotton that we can this year without disrupting our individual balanced farm program in the hope that Congress will act, or that Mr. DiSalle will be forced to act, to correct this evil situation before our crop is ready to market.

Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the following article which was printed in the Shell Rock (Iowa) News:

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN IN THE STATES

(By Florence A. Armstrong, Ph. D.)

Several of our States have taken quite an enlightened and realistic position in respect to their women citizens. They have—some of them—even put equal rights for men and women into their State constitutions; some have demanded, through their State legislatures, that Congress approve the equal rights amendment and pass it on to the States so the people may have a chance to pass on it in their State legislatures. They merit much praise.

The Wisconsin Legislature, in 1921 almost immediately after the ratification of the suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution, wisely passed a law giving to women the same rights and privileges under the law as men in the exercise of suffrage, freedom of contract, choice of residence for voting purposes, jury service, holding office, holding and conveying property, care and custody of children, and in all other respects. (Section 6.015 of Wisconsin Statutes). If the same thing had happened on a national scale, the country would have benefited immeasurably.

Besides Wisconsin, three other States have equal constitutional rights for men and women: Missouri, New Jersey, and Wyoming (the Equality State). Since some opponents of the equality principle for women and men almost shriek their alarm at the idea of the havoc it would cause, they should notice how these States move along smoothly enough. New Jersey, for example, took care of the minimum wage law (that bugaboo of labor and welfare workers) by simply amending it to delete the existing definitions of women and minors and substituting the term "any person" for the words "a woman or minor" throughout, thus extending coverage to all workers (N. J. A. 166, 1950). Could not any of the so-called "protective" (restrictive) laws be so handled after the equal-rights amendment passes? If existing laws of that type are undesirable, as some are, they could just be dropped, not extended to men also.

On the Pacific coast, California, and on the Atlantic coast, New York, and some States in between, have engrossed resolutions to the Congress calling on the Members of both Houses to respond to the demand of American women, for equal rights in the laws of the Republic, by approving the equal-rights amendment and sending it to the States for consideration and final ratification. Other States will doubtles pass such resolutions this year. Many people do not realize how much the States want to treat their women more justly than they have been treated under the old English common law, which gave women very low status.

Over the years, some States have removed some of their most flagrant discriminations, in response to the efforts of organized women's groups. I have been told that the National Woman's Party and the National League of Women Voters were each able to get about 150 discriminatory laws removed soon after the suffrage amendment was passed. After those 300 or so were taken care of, many hundreds more remained. Year by year, some progress has been made but new discriminatory laws have been added too. So the most courageous and constructive of the women leaders, and women's groups have turned to another Federal amendment as the only practicable instrument of doing the whole job. The National Woman's Party introduced the Lucretia Mott amendment, popularly known as the equal rights amendment, in 1923. It reads:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"The Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment is supported by effect 1 year after the date of ratification."

This amendment is supported by more than 30 national groups and by innumerable individuals, men and women, in the States.

I am asked very frequently what specific discriminations would be removed by the equal rights amendment. People want to know specific cases. I have myself seen seven types of discriminations which seem most harmful to women. No doubt each woman would make a somewhat different list. My list includes: (1) Restrictions on hours and pay in gainful employment (12 States have passed laws requiring equal pay. These are very complicated). (2) Restrictions on ownership of property. These old unjust laws cause untold hardship and agony to women, most of whom know nothing about property laws before they marry. Such laws can easily be studied. The Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, Washington 25, D. C., publishes a pamphlet (1948) on the laws of each State which may be bought for 5 cents from the United States Government Printing Office. No woman should be without such data. In fact, until our laws become more workable for women, through the equal rights amendment no study could be more interesting and valuable for women than the laws affecting their lives in every sphere. (3) Restrictions on guardianship of minor children. The worst laws give all rights to the husband, even to disposal of children unborn, without the consent of the mother. (4) Occupational restrictions based on sex and not on competence are particularly

harmful and cruel nowadays when more and more millions of women are employed. (5) Restrictions on the right of women to sue result in bad situations, as in cases where a husband can sue his wife if she assaults him, but the wife cannot sue the husband if he assaults her. Virginia and several other States still have these restrictions. (6) Restrictions on the right to ownership and control of her own earnings after marriage may wreck a woman's life, as in New York, etc. Some States like Iowa have modified the old common law (which treats women as chattels) and provide for her the right to her separate earnings (code, sec. 597.16). Lastly, (7) outmoded laws, originally discriminatory, have become worse, with time, even ridiculous. An example of such is the old Iowa law (sec. 627.6, subsec. 22).

In seizure of property for debt, the husband may keep the tools of his trade, but the woman may keep only one sewing machine and $50 worth of poultry. No one should be sad to have such laws—and many outmoded ones remain—made equally suitable and just for men and women alike.

The picture is bright for equality in respect to jury service in the States. After extensive effort on the part of organized women 40 States and 2 Territories now provide for women to serve on juries. The latest addition to the list is Virginia, in 1950. Still lacking it are Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia. The various laws vary considerably as to requirements, applications, and exemptions. The Federal equal rights amendment would probably improve this situation without changing it much, except to extend it to all citizens.

I went over to Congress on February 2 to hear Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE (Republican, New York) make a fine speech on the equal rights amendment (H. J. Res. 52) and introduce the 103 names of Members of the House who are sponsoring this nonpartisan measure. She called for straightforward action: "Let us stop hypocrisy in this amendment or else drop it from our national platforms and tell the world that the women of the United States prefer special privileges for the few rather than equality for all."

On February 5 I heard Senator HERBERT O'CONOR (Democrat, Maryland) in the Senate Chamber introduce the names of 27 Senators who are sponsoring the equal-rights amendment. He made a brief speech in support of his bill, Senate Joint Resolution 3. He spoke frankly to his colleagues, referring to its being "a late day to have decided the simple and single issue of whether such a great proportion of our population should be guaranteed similar rights and privileges as are enjoyed by the remaining citizenry. Especially at this period of conflicting ideologies should it be declared in unmistakable terms that American citizens of both sexes are accorded equal rights. Those who espouse foreign ideologies point critically to the fact that women are denied certain privileges in the United States while members of their sex are entitled to every right guaranteed to men under foreign flags. We should tolerate no such conditions which is seized upon by our enemies to decry our institutions."

He then pointed out the singular fact that though this amendment had been before Congress since 1923 it has never received an unfavorable report, yet has never achieved approval by both Houses.

Senator O'CONOR tossed us a lovely bouquet in referring to the need for the peculiar talents and abilities which the women of America can bring to bear upon today's problems. "In my own State of Maryland," he said, "during the 8 years in which I was privileged to occupy the Governor's chair, we found it desirable, and in many cases I might even say necessary, to call upon outstanding women of the State for assistance in matters of government. We can no longer tolerate discrimination against American women either in the Nation as a whole or in the several States. The equal-rights amendment is the instrument by which this discrimination can be eradicated."

These words sound very good to women in every State who are trying to measure up to the demands put upon them without the rights that ought to go with their responsibilities.

The IV–F Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, despite the insistence of the military that we must draft 18-year-olds, the obviously unsound draft standards have not been corrected. The military still rejects many men capable of serving in the Armed Forces. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "The IV–F Scandal," by Milton Lehman, appearing in the March 1951 Cosmopolitan:

Today, in the midst of the Nation's greatest peril, the Armed Forces are rejecting usable men at a hideous rate. As a result of arbitrary physical and mental standards, hundreds of thousands of potential soldiers, sailors, and airmen are turned away. Deferments and exemptions are granted to pressure groups who declare that Uncle Sam needs you, but not them. We are still listening to the voice of smugness and complacency in the name of democracy—when our democracy itself is threatened.

After World War II, the Nation was shocked to discover that in the raising of an armed force of 14,000,000 men, more than 6,000,000 men had been rejected as IV–F's. Every city and town across the country watched the IV–F's come home, having been turned down by the military's induction centers. Vastly alarmed, ministers, journalists, and clubwomen declared that America must be a Nation of physical and mental weaklings. There would have been cause for alarm if the Armed Forces' standards had been reasonable. But the cause for the huge military rejections during World War II was the military's lofty standards, which created an Army of discarded IV–F's greater than the Armed Forces that served us in Europe. Among these IV–F's were highly usable troops. The motion that we were weak in potential military manpower was the military's own delusion.

This bleak view of America's manpower is even more alarming today than it was in 1941. Despite the present emergency and the brave plans to expand the services to a standing force of 3,000,000, 4,000,000, or possibly 5,000,000 men, the Armed Forces are now screening Americans as if they were considering applicants for King Arthur's Round Table. By force of habit, they are still assuming that the model soldier, sailor, airman, or marine must have both the physical stamina of an infantryman, who is sometimes obliged to march 20 miles with a full field pack, and the mental agility of a judge advocate general. Unless they abandon this medieval, encrusted attitude, we shall be ill-prepared indeed.

Considering the Armed Forces' standards of what makes a rookie, as well as congressionally approved laws on deferments and exemptions, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, director of the Selective Service System, recently observed: "I don't believe that out of 150,000,000 people in the Nation today, there are 6,000,000 who could pass present-day standards for induction into the armed services. Obviously we can't fight a war with such standards."

All of us, especially the military services, have a great deal of malarkey to get out of our systems—particularly if we are faced by a monolithic Russia with no Pollyanna in its nature. At this writing, less than 25 percent of men in the draft-age group—19 to 26—can actually get into the armed services. While this age group provides a manpower pool of 8,000,000, the pool is quickly drained by deferments and exemptions. For instance, 3,000,000 veterans are exempted by law. Another 1,150,000 men with dependents are exempted from the draft. Another 170,000, largely farmers, are deferred for occupational reasons. The pool is further reduced at the insistence of college presidents, who feel this is no time to wreck their freshman classes, and by men with crippling mental and physical defects whom the draft boards never send to the induction station in the first place.

Unless draft standards are drastically changed, we shall never produce a 3,500,000-man force, let alone the more ambitious 6,000,000-man armed service. Of our original 8,000,000-man pool, selective service is able to offer about 3,000,000 men to Armed Forces induction stations. From this decreased reservoir, the Armed Forces between last July and October turned away 40 percent. These final rejections were based upon the Armed Forces' physical standards, and its remarkable mental qualification test. Because the Army alone is now dependent on selective service, it has borne the brunt of the protests against unreasonably high standards.

Compared to what the Air Force, Navy, and Marines are doing, the Army has a case, which we shall examine later. The three sister services are turning down volunteers at an even more shocking rate than the Army rejects selectees. Since the end of the last war, the services all handled budget cuts by raising their standards, and thus reducing their numbers. They introduced a controversial mental examination, which has been responsible for the rejection of almost half the selectees, and they raised their physical standards above the requirements of World War II. In the present emergency, however, the services must drop their soldier-as-usual concept as fast as the Nation must give up its business-as-usual fantasy.

But today, unless the Armed Forces are ordered to open their doors, they will continue to screen usable Americans into the IV–F junk pile. Consider this colloquy between Congressman CARL VINSON, the acidulous chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Maj. Gen. Clovis Byers, an officer in the Army's Personnel Division:

"Representative VINSON. What you want is men; what you want is soldiers, isn't it?

"Major General BYERS. No, sir.

"Representative VINSON. All right, what do you want anyway, Ph. D.'s?

"Major General BYERS. I want a force—a leaven to put into the mass of Americans when any emergency comes—that is capable of expansion effectively into combat units.

"Representative VINSON (considering that rejoinder). I doubt whether Alvin York would have passed your test. * * * No, sir, you've got those standards too high, General. This country is disturbed when so many men are sent back home because you keep on saying, 'Why, you just don't fill the bill.'"

Under pressure, the Armed Forces are now modifying their postwar entrance requirements in order to permit the acceptance of more men. Simply loosening the reins a bit or accepting 18-year-olds won't do the job

if war comes. What is required is the total uprooting of the military's hidebound concept of suitable manpower. The basic notion of the all-around, Class-A fighting man is purest nonsense. Any veteran of World War II can tell you that there is a vast difference between the duties of the combat soldier and the rear-line soldier; and he will also point out that the rear-line soldier is greatly in the majority. While the front-line GI Joe needs a high level of physical and psychological stamina, he doesn't require a knowledge of Cicero's orations. And his far more numerous buddies behind the division level can certainly manage their jobs with flat feet, myopic eyes, trick knees, slight hernias, or even mild heart murmurs.

But today, the Armed Forces have raised, instead of lowered, the unreasonable standards they applied during World War II. They have added an I. Q. test to determine whether to take men in, not merely what to do with them once they've got them.

This new mental test would have eliminated some of our best fighting men in World War II, as Mr. Vinson suspected. It would even have knocked out Congressional Medal of Honor boys. I knew some of these heroes during the war and remember meeting them in Chicago in 1946, when they assembled as guests of the American Legion with all expenses paid. Maybe most of these Congressional Medal winners would have scored well on the present Armed Forces qualification test, but at least one of them would have flunked miserably.

I interviewed this lad in southern France 7 years ago for the Stars and Stripes. He had just received the medal. A western farm boy, he'd never gone past the fourth grade, and he answered questions in grunts. As one of his buddies told me, "Henry don't say much because he can't think of all the words." But Henry, who didn't go to high school, saved his platoon at Anzio by wiping out two German machine-gun nests single-handedly with his BAR.

One veteran infantry officer, who survived Italy's backbreaking campaigns, is now assigned to classifying registrants at an induction center, and he isn't sure he likes the Armed Forces' current standards. Especially when he thinks back to his jeep driver in Italy.

"Now there was a great soldier," this officer told me. "Johhny was a successful, intuitive fighting man. But he would flunk our present mental test, and I'd have to turn him away. Fact it, Johnny was illiterate. I had to read him the letters he got from his girl friend back home and write out his answers."

A North Carolina draft board recently had the same unhappy feeling when it turned down a Negro registrant who really wanted to fight. The boy's brother had been killed in Korea, and this registrant wished to take his place. When he called his draft board to see how he had made out on the preinduction examination, the board clerk informed him: "We're very sorry about this. You passed your physical examination nicely, but you didn't do so well on the mental test."

"I don't get it," the boy replied. "Say, what kind of war is this anyway—a figurin' war or a fightin' war?"

What kind of war this is deeply concerns General Hershey, the draft director, who is the Nation's sharpest critic of present military draft standards. "On the battlefield," he told me, "you throw away all this baloney and make do with what you have—and we find we have plenty. What counts is when the doctor says a man can't walk and he walks, when he says a man can't survive on so little food and still he survives. With all these tests, these attempts to find the perfect soldier, they aren't measuring the most vital aspect—the will to survive and the desire to fight."

It's hard, if not impossible, to measure this vital quality, General Hershey believes. "I'm a careless sort of person," he says, "and the perfectionist scares hell out of me. Trouble is, there aren't many perfect things or people around, but there are more than enough good people. I'm afraid of echelons and inventories and classifications whenever you get too stuffy about them, because you can finally classify out everybody who might play on your team."

Of all the tests, General Hershey is most suspicious of the qualification test, a mental examination now administered to all men approved by their Selective Service boards. The military argues that any man who has gone through the fifth grade can pass the test with its minimum rating of 13 and that standards go no lower, but there are two soft spots in this reasoning: First, many unschooled men can't get a passing grade might be highly useful soldiers; and second, the test is being given to men who may not yearn to pass it.

As General Hershey observed to the House Armed Services Committee: "This mental test is probably good, but not to apply to a man who is not seeking a job. It's all right to take a dozen people wanting a job and test them to find which one you are going to hire. But it is no good when the fellow doesn't have any strong motivation to pass it. I don't mean that he is necessarily going to lie down on the test. He just doesn't get up.

Several weeks ago I took the test, referred to officially as AFQT-1, in a barracks at Arlington Farms Induction Center. I was there as a reporter, not a selectee. I had no reason not to try for a high score. But I'm not sure my feeling was shared by everyone in the room.

The test took me the full 45 minutes allotted, and I was unable to complete all the questions. I didn't have any trouble figuring out synonyms; they are part of my business. I managed fairly well on arithmetic. But although the patterns problems—trying to work out how an unfolded blueprint would look if you folded the pieces together—would not have troubled an engineer, they gave me plenty of worry.

The Armed Forces, aware that their mental test can be beaten by any average American who does not want to be a private, have ordained that all high-school graduates be accepted whether they pass the test or not. The induction sergeants make a little speech urging registrants to try for high scores because their military futures depend on it. Also, induction officers are empowered to interview men who flunk, and to induct those who they think purposely failed the test.

The obvious flunker was never better revealed than by some doctors recently called to service. Although these men had gone through high school, college, medical school, and active practice, some of them still managed to flunk the mental test. When they were challenged, they admitted sheepishly that they might do better if they were obliged to take the test again.

Despite the checks and double checks on flunkers, 50 percent of the men rejected by induction stations between last July and October were turned down for failure to pass the mental examinations. After unfavorable comment in the press and a flurry of public criticism, the Armed Forces have now reduced the number of these rejections. But it is remarkable that the mental examination is still considered a wise device for selecting soldiers, and even more remarkable that it is administered to men who may not choose to pass.

Physical standards are taking an equal toll of the available manpower. At this writing, one out of every four registrants is rejected for physical defects. Let's look into a Maryland induction station and watch the IV-F's pile up. In one day, a roughing-machine operator failed for malocclusion—his teeth didn't meet in a proper bite; a carpenter was turned down for a perforated eardrum; a truck driver was rejected for flat feet; a real-estate broker flunked because of asthma; a lathe operator was dropped for a hernia. "If you get that hernia fixed, we'll be glad to take you," the induction officer told him. The lathe operator merely smiled.

Induction-station doctors give a very thorough physical examination, using the best of modern medical techniques. No one can quarrel with their methods. They are told to examine the registrant for his physical capacity, his upper extremities, his lower extremities, his hearing, eyes, and neuropsychiatric stability. When they finish the examination, they must grade the registrant 1, 2, 3, or 4 in each of these categories according to carefully specified standards. If the registrant gets one 4 on his physical examination, he's out.

During World War II, these physical examinations turned up 6,419,700 IV-F's, and we are now on the way to building a similar army of rejectees. Most of the IV-F's took a beating back home; many would have gladly exchanged their uneasy freedom for a uniform. Probably half of them could have served in uniform in the thousand and one jobs behind the line if the Army hadn't applied combat standards to base-command privates.

Of all IV-F's, the services had the most trouble explaining the rejected athletes. Sports writers gave them unwelcome attention. There was Byron Nelson, the greatest golfer of that day, rejected for hemophilia—his blood wouldn't clot; George Myatt, second baseman for the Washington Senators, rejected for a trick knee; Dave Ferris, Red Sox pitcher, for hay fever; George W. Case, one of the fastest runners in baseball, for a sinus ailment; Frank Sinkwich, professional football player, for flat feet; Creighton Miller, Notre Dame's All-American football star, Hal Newhouser, left-hander for the Detroit Tigers, and Russ Christopher, winning pitcher for the Philadelphia Athletics—all for heart murmurs; and even Lippy Leo Durocher, who might have made a fine topkick, for a punctured eardrum.

As the Army points out, the public was wrong in thinking of these athletes as class A fighting men. "It should be realized," an Army spokesman says, "that there is a vast difference between the long and frequently arduous assignment of a soldier and the comparatively brief period of exertion encountered in a ten-round boxing match, a nine-inning baseball game, or a five-minute tap dance." But this adroit reply doesn't explain why these men and many of the 6,000,000 IV-F's weren't used in jobs in which no one expected a class A fighting man.

A Washington physician who served 4 years in the Army in the last war and rose to major in the Medical Corps still has trouble understanding the Army's Surgeon General. "I started out at an induction station, examining recruits," he told me. "I applied all the proper standards, and naturally, I kept rejecting men. Back then, I really believed that every soldier ought to be a perfect physical specimen.

"But when I got overseas, these standards no longer made sense to me. In Oran, 200 miles behind the front, we had a base hospital staffed by perfect physical specimens who took temperatures and emptied bedpans. We could have used plenty of mild hernia cases to do their jobs and even a few heart murmurs. I could have recruited our whole enlisted contingent from the men I had rejected back in the States."

Col. Warner Bowers, chief surgical consultant to the Army, also believes that the wholesale rejection of selectees was and is today a national disgrace. He said so at a recent meeting of Army officers, not realizing there was a newspaperman in the room. He advocated that all men with minor physical defects be classified for limited duty, and that the Army prepare to use these men in the millions of posts behind the combat lines. He even drew up a memorandum showing that the IV-F's could handle more than 50 percent of the Army's jobs.

The memorandum has since been placed in a confidential classification, and only a curtailed report of Colonel Bowers' comments appeared in the press. When I asked the Surgeon General's office about the colonel's proposal, they referred me to G-1. And G-1 said, "No comment."

Under the mounting pressure for a powerful armed force, the United States Army will have to give better answers than that. Furthermore, the Army does have a case. While it has borne most of the criticism for absurdly high standards, it is actually the least guilty of all the services. The Army is largely dependent on selective service to fill its ranks, unlike the Air Force, Navy, and Marines, who pride themselves on taking only volunteers. Under pressure of the general draft, thousands of young Americans rush to these services as shot-gun volunteers, rather than take their chances on the less glamorous Army. In recent months the Air Force, Navy, and Marines have combed over these volunteers and picked only the ones they like best. In this great grab act, they have rejected almost everybody who doesn't resemble the square-jawed man in the recruiting poster.

But the Army also likes these square-jawed heroes and has pegged its standards in order to get its share. One Army spokesman, after asking me not to use his name, put the Army's case frankly: "If our present tests mean anything—and they aren't entirely meaningless—they give us an indication of a selectee's physical and mental ability. The ones who do well on the tests will probably make more noncoms and officers than the ones who do badly. The ones who fail will probably turn up more men for sick call and the guardhouse. But we mustn't follow these tests too far, and we know it. What the Army objects to is the Navy and Air Force's making privates of men we could use as company commanders. If every service were required to take its fair share from the same manpower pool, we wouldn't have any complaints."

An Air Force general, who also prefers to remain anonymous, agrees in part with the Army man. During World War II, he says, he was appalled at the number of potential officers serving as Air Force privates. "I saw them at every air base," he says. "They'd come up to my plane to tote my Val-a-Pak, they'd tend bar at the officers' club and fill out manifests at headquarters. Some of these privates would have made excellent Army lieutenants and captains. We had plenty of topflight men whose talents were wasted."

But neither the Air Force nor the Navy will say such things in public. They are still behaving with the acquisitive instincts of a supply sergeant, who stores up all the good things he can get his hands on, just in case he'll ever need them. While skimming the cream off the top of the vat, they look with outraged innocence at their critics. "Why, we're just following the good old American volunteer system," they say, "We're giving men a chance to choose their branch of service. A common manpower pool would wreck the volunteer system."

At recent hearings of the House Armed Services Committee, Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, declared it was essential to man the Navy with volunteers and frowned on the common manpower pool. "Life on board ship," he reasoned, "is different from life on shore. Some people like it, others do not. It is very important, with men cooped up in small space, that as far as possible they be men who choose that way of life."

To such reasoning, General Hershey of Selective Service shouts foul play. "I'm not quarreling with the Navy and Air Force's taking volunteers," he says, "provided they really take the volunteers instead of rejecting most of them. Let them all come to the same pool and draw from it vertically all the way down to the skimmed milk. If you let them skim off the whipping cream, you're going to cheat the Army. They know it, and the Army does too."

Despite this knowledge, it will still take an act of Congress to unify the Armed Forces on manpower. It may take another to make them recognize that their chief manpower shortage may be the shortage they create themselves. They must learn what every veteran knows: that the combat soldier and the rear-line soldier are two different men, and that we need them both.

Cotton Price Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in connection with ceiling price regulation 8, issued on March 3, 1951, as it affects the production of cotton.

There is no doubt but what an enormous problem exists from the viewpoint of the price stabilizer and from the viewpoint of the cotton industry. All of us are fundamentally concerned with the same thing—adequate supplies at reasonable and stabilized prices. Some of us may differ as to the means by which we accomplish the ends, but certainly we are agreed as to what the ends should be.

The means adopted by ceiling price regulation 8 are unworkable and unnecessary when they place a ceiling on raw cotton. That order of March 3 should be immediately rescinded.

It should be pointed out that consumers are at the present time fully protected by ceilings on the finished cotton products which they buy. However, the Office of Price Stabilization has stated as a reason for the necessity of regulation 8 that price rises on raw cotton will create sufficient force to increase the ceiling on consumers' products.

I believe there is no one in this House who does not realize that the cotton industry is not seeking higher prices for cotton, and I doubt if there is anyone in the Congress who does not feel that during these days of rapid economic change to meet an emergency, sympathy should not be shown any farmer who is dissatisfied with the price of his commodity when the market price is as far above parity as cotton is today.

At the outset I want to make myself clear that I agree with you in those sentiments and to tell you that within the past few weeks leading representatives of the industry have worked out with the Department of Agriculture a cotton price stabilization program which would assure that cotton prices would not average for this year a figure higher than the one now prescribed by the Office of Price Stabilization in their March 3 regulation.

I am, therefore, not talking to you about whether cotton prices should be stabilized. The industry and all of us agree that that end should be accomplished. My remarks are directed in criticism of regulation 8 and its prescription in how stabilization should be accomplished.

The cotton industry and the Department of Agriculture, which is the only Government agency qualified to deal with this subject, have recommended a stabilization program that will accomplish the objective without seriously disrupting the efficient operations and marketing traditions of the cotton industry. The Office of Price Stabilization, speaking through Mr. DiSalle, stands opposed to that program. Seeking to accomplish the same laudable purpose by wanting to function through his powers, Mr. DiSalle has said that the Office of Price Stabilization will not accept any method of stabilization of the price of raw cotton except a fixed ceiling on the producer no matter how much damage it may cause.

I think everyone familiar with the cotton industry knows that regulation 8 can only result in damages that will be enormous. Cotton's highly efficient marketing system is marked for destruction. All of those who depend on that marketing system in their daily business transactions—farmers, merchants, and mills—will suffer severe hardships. These losses cannot help but slow down their operations and decrease their respective productivity during wartime.

It would seem that we might learn something from past experience. During World War II, the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board both learned that the fewer units with which they had to deal the more effective their controls became. This was true both as to price enforcement and as to distribution and use of materials. For instance, it is obviously easier to control the sellers as a whole, rather than buyers in the retail markets because the sellers are much fewer in number. I doubt if any of us know a single buyer who ever got into serious trouble violating a price regulation. The effective place to control prices was learned to be at the point of selling. Sellers were controlled effectively because the means of enforcement reached them first. They were numbered in the thousands, whereas consumers were numbered in the millions. For example, the Office of Price Administration had prices on various sizes and grades of lumber. Generally enforcement was effected at the saw mill—not at the consumer level.

In the case of cotton, the least number of people that will need to be controlled would be at the mill level. Yet, under this new, unworkable regulation 8, the Administration has taken the largest number, the producers, and then added to that all the merchants. It should be obvious to them, and I am inclined to think that it is, that they not only have made their problem a millionfold more difficult, but they have literally made it impossible.

The speed of a railroad train is not determined by the amount of steam available through the size of the boiler. It is determined at the throttle. We

should apply the same principle in the cotton business and put the controls at the smallest bottleneck, which is where the smallest number of people are.

The problem of enforcement will increase in geometrical proportion as the number of people the Office of Price Stabilization seeks to control directly by their orders increases. This is bad administration.

We have also learned from the past that which we may say here in the present in regard to these new cotton ceilings—they cannot be enforced because of the nature of the commodity, and all manner of bad practices, black markets, and chicanery will develop.

We should also give attention to the 16,000,000 bale crop for this year, which has been the goal of the Government and the industry since the present scarcity developed last fall. That production is now being jeopardized. The ceiling price level of approximately 45 cents per pound, which the Office of Price Stabilization has set, is certainly not so low as to discourage production. However, farmers must have reasonable assurances that they will get somewhere near this price when they sell their cotton next fall, and they must have some reasonable assurance that their cotton can be easily turned into cash. If they do not have those assurances, the cotton industry now feels that we will not reach our 16,000,000-bale goal. With the traditional marketing system in a state of chaos and collapse, farmers and banks and production credit agencies who finance them know that 16,000,000 bales of cotton could not be absorbed in the 3 or 4 months of the harvesting season without disastrous effects on the price.

Last year, when we passed the Defense Production Act, we inserted section 402 (f), which emphatically authorizes the President to exempt certain products from price ceilings where such ceilings are, first, unnecessary; or, second, not in the interest of national defense. Raw cotton is one of such products as was recognized in both World War I and World War II. The cotton industry knows that a price ceiling on raw cotton is unnecessary in view of the alternative program that can be taken to effectively stabilize cotton prices, and such a ceiling is not in the interest of national defense because of the serious damage it will do to the efficient operation and to the production of all branches of the cotton industry from the farm to the mill.

I also want to point out that the cotton growers of California have protested against having the freight from California to the Carolinas deducted from their price as now set forth in ceiling price regulation 8. We in California cannot understand such tactics or the purpose behind them. A large portion of the California crop has gone for export each year and we think that the worst that should happen is that the prices in Los Angeles and San Francisco should equal the price in the Carolinas.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that a meeting was held a few days ago, attended by Mr. DiSalle, and proper representatives of our Military Establishment and duly authorized representatives of leading cotton mills. The question under discussion was whether the mills would enter into contracts to produce desired matériel for the Military Establishment. They stated that they were ready to go into production provided they could protect themselves on the cost of cotton after signing the contracts. I am advised Mr. DiSalle refused to recommend any procedure by which they could protect themselves on the futures market. Certainly price regulation 8 does not solve that problem. He, like many other men in our bureaus, seeks to control every field of American business through the exercise of the powers of their bureau. I am not one to plead for the excess or opportunity for speculators on the commodity market. I do, however, believe it is necessary that our mills and producers buy and sell on the futures market for their protection.

I think we have to assume that before ceiling price regulation 8 was issued, the proper officials of the Office of Price Stabilization considered the traditional means of marketing cotton in this country. I believe that we must also assume that they understood the certain consequences of their action. It, therefore, appears that they have created chaos in the cotton industry without regard to the results of such action. They set a ceiling on raw cotton knowing that cotton mills wanting to produce war matériels would have to protect themselves on the futures market. As reasonable men, they should have known that as soon as the restrictions against dealing on the futures market were removed, that the price of cotton would immediately move to that ceiling, and that cotton would still not be available to fulfill the contracts of the contracting mills in the production of war matériel.

Mr. Speaker, that happened this morning. The conclusion is obvious. Either the Office of Price Stabilization does not have the capacity to formulate workable regulations or they have deliberately planned a chaotic condition to force Government regulation of agriculture in all of its phases, commencing with the highly important war crop—cotton.

There is language in ceiling price regulation 8 which should be a warning to this Congress as to the intentions of the Office of Price Stabilization in the field of agriculture. In the third paragraph of their order, the following language is set forth:

> Under the general freeze, raw cotton was exempted when sold by producers, since a freeze order at the farm level would be meaningless, but it was controlled when sold by merchants and other dealers in cotton.

I assume "freeze order" and "price order" to be of the same significance, yet in the next paragraph the statement is made:

> The structure of ceiling prices. This regulation establishes ceiling prices for American upland cotton in mixed or odd lots, by grade and staple and by location for every seller including producers.

Mr. Speaker, by their own language, the Office of Price Stabilization, through ceiling price regulation 8, has interfered with the production of a commodity the value of which we hope will be $3,000,000,000 this year. In their own language, they state that their regulation providing such interference will be meaningless. Yet they did it knowing that it destroys any understandable means in free enterprise by which producers may turn their raw cotton to cash, or the financiers of producers may protect themselves from the destruction of a reasonably average yearly price by necessary quick sale of 16,000,000 bales during the harvest season.

How To Obtain an RFC Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have received several inquiries in the past few days from businessmen inquiring as to the procedure necessary in obtaining a Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan. Apparently the RFC investigation conducted by a Senate committee has caused many small-business men to wonder if such Government loans are available to any deserving business organization. On the basis of the disclosures made in the Senate investigation to date, I have listed some of the steps which might be taken by those desiring to obtain an RFC loan:

First. Be prepared to contribute $1,000 or more to the Democratic National Committee and get to know personally high-ranking Democratic Party leaders.

Second. Obtain the services of a 7½-percenter—the rates of 5-percenters have gone up because of inflation.

Third. Present a mink coat to a White House secretary, natural, royal, pastel mink preferred.

Fourth. Invite an RFC official to spend several weeks at a fashionable resort hotel. Caution: Be sure to pick up the check.

Fifth. Be prepared to employ in your company one or more former RFC officials at a handsome salary immediately after the loan is obtained.

Sixth. Seek a personal interview with an RFC director. If the director is not in his office, he might be found in the hip pocket of a Washington influence-peddler.

Seventh. If some difficulty is encountered in obtaining admission to the RFC offices, repeat the password "asinine" to the receptionist three times.

Note: In addition to the above suggestions, the chances of obtaining the loan are enhanced if your company has notoriously poor management or if one or more of the officers or directors of your company are under Federal indictment.

How Stupid Can We Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a letter I received from L. A. Pettit, Jr., vice president of the Central Cable Corp. ends with the thought "I just don't know how stupid we can get." I rush to agree with the writer.

His reference is to a clipping he enclosed relating to the shipment of metals under ECA to Britain. The metal is used to manufacture products which, in turn, are exported to Russia in exchange for timber and grain.

A corollary dispatch relates that Britain's economic chief attaches enormous importance to the satisfactory outcome of discussions under way in Washington to divert United States stockpile materials to the British.

Brass workers in Connecticut are on part-time—plants throughout the Nation are experiencing difficulties in obtaining raw metals for processing—yet we blithely, under ECA auspices, give these materials for eventual use by Russia. Only through concerted effort was it possible to reduce copper stockpiling by 50 percent to aid distressed American industries, but we seriously consider diverting stockpile materials to Britain, which trades directly with our potential enemy, Communist Russia.

I do not know how stupid we can get.

CENTRAL CABLE CORP.,
Freeport, Ill., March 5, 1951.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I very much appreciate your letter of February 28 and wish to compliment you upon the forthrightness with which you approach problems of vital public interest.

I am enclosing newspaper clipping under London date line, which states that seven British ports are piled high with United States gift metals, including 1,440 tons of copper, while other cargoes are en route.

The article also points out that copper turned over to the British Government is being sold to British industrial users for the manufacture of electrical generators and other goods which the British Government in turn uses as barter with Russia in exchange for timber and grain.

I just don't know how stupid we can get.

Again thanking you, I remain,

Yours truly,

CENTRAL CABLE CORP.,
L. A. PETTIT, Jr.,
Vice President.

SEVEN BRITISH PORTS PILED HIGH WITH UNITED STATES GIFT METALS—BIGGEST HAND-OUTS ARRIVE AS ECA EXPIRES

(By Arthur Veysey)

LONDON, March 3.—The biggest gift shipments of metals in many weeks are being unloaded in British ports, the Marshall plan office announced.

At seven ports, ships are discharging 4,857 tons of aluminum, 1,440 tons of copper, 1,416 tons of steel, 900 tons of zinc, and 600 tons of lead. Other shipments, paid for by the American taxpayer and sent to Britain as a gift, include 13 tons of carbon black for tires and 4,265 tons of milo starch.

The Marshall plan office said that although its hand-out program is officially over as far as Britain is concerned, gift cargoes will continue to arrive here for several months. Metals shipped to Britain under the Marshall aid program already have cost $311,000,000, and Marshall plan officers estimate gifts costing another $100,000,000, most of it in metals or machinery, are still to come.

INCREASE METAL GIFTS

Gift metal shipments to Britain have increased in recent months as the metals have become scarce and as metal prices have multiplied.

At British ports, the metals are turned over to the British Government which sells them to British industrial users. Much of the copper goes to electrical manufacturers who are turning out generators and other goods which the British Government uses as barter with Russia in exchange for timber and grain.

The money the British Government receives from British manufacturers for the gift metals is used to pay off the British debt. During the Marshall plan program, the British debt has gone down at the fastest rate in British history. At the same time the American Government's debt has gone up.

EYES UNITED STATES STOCKPILE

EASTBOURNE, ENGLAND, March 3.—High Gaitskell, Britain's economic chief, has emphasized Britain's need for some of the raw materials the United States is stockpiling. They are needed, he said, to stave off an economic crisis in this country.

Without these critical raw materials, said the Chancelor of the Exchequer, Britain's export drive, the key support in her own defense program, would collapse.

Speaking to a convention of more than 500 of Britain's dollar export manufacturers, he said the Government attaches "enormous importance" to the satisfactory outcome of discussions now under way in Washington by international commodity committees. These groups are studying ways of reallocating raw materials.

ILLUSORY ASSET

Gaitskell said: "We really must remember that we are rearming in peacetime, and that if peaceful trade and economic stability were gravely weakened for lack of raw materials, then the heaping up of unused materials in stockpiles would, even in a military sense, be an illusory asset."

He estimated that Britain's increase in production this year would be 4 percent over 1950. Then he added:

"But if the 4 percent increase were not achieved—and it certainly could not be if raw material supplies fell seriously short of requirements—then the economic outlook would, of course, be far worse."

The Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane, former United States Ambassador to Poland:

THE KATYN MASSACRE

(By Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane, former United States Ambassador to Poland)

One of the least publicized actions during the last war, yet one which had the most far-reaching consequences, was the murder of over 4,000 Polish officers in the forest of Katyn near Smolensk in the Soviet Union. This crime was so horrible that many persons hesitate to retell it. Yet the barbarity of the murder, which was discovered in April 1943 when the Nazis were in occupation of Smolensk in Russia, 15 miles west of the Katyn Forest, was shown by the condition of the bodies. They had been found with their hands tied behind their backs. All the men had been shot in an identical manner, a bullet in the back of their necks. Some men who apparently had bitterly resisted at the moment of execution carried cruel bayonet wounds. All wore great coats, indicating that the murder had taken place during intensely cold weather.

When the Nazis declared publicly in April 1943 that seven mass graves containing these Polish officers had been found two most important developments took place: (1) The British and American Governments were strangely silent, being allied to the U. S. S. R. at that time. The Office of War Information, however, a United States agency, adhered to the thesis that this crime had been committed by the Nazis. (2) The Soviet Government immediately broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in exile in London, because the latter had had the alleged impudence of suggesting that the International Red Cross should impartially investigate the murder. From that moment on the Soviet Government continued to show its hostility not only toward the constitutional Polish Government in London, it also showed openly that it intended to set up a Communist Government within Poland and completely to destroy the independence of the Polish Nation.

Despite the infamy of the murder of these Polish officers, human memory is so short that many of us have forgotten the facts. Let us recall them.

In September 1939, when the Soviet forces invaded Poland for the purpose of freeing Poland, so Molotov said at the time, from its Fascist masters, over 15,000 Polish officers and noncommissioned officers were taken to three camps—Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostachkov. Four hundred of these prisoners of war, so-called despite the fact that the Soviet Union never declared war on Poland, were later found in another camp. It is through their testimony, as well as through the record of the diplomatic conversations between General Sikorski, General Anders, and Ambassador Kot, on the one hand, and Stalin, Molotov, and Vishinsky, on the other, that it is possible today to reach a conclusion regarding the responsibility for the Katyn crime.

After the arrival of the Polish officers in the three camps they were permitted as nominal prisoners of war to correspond with their families in Poland. All letters, however, stopped in April and May of 1940. At that time, according to the testimony of some of the 400 who were transferred to another camp, the three camps were dispersed. It had been previously arranged among the officers that messages would be written secretly in Polish in the prison trains which conducted them elsewhere telling of their fate. According to some of the 400 survivors, the writing on the walls of the prison trains indicated that those who disappeared were taken to a place near Smolensk, where the Russian prison automobiles, known as the "black ravens," headed the victims off to an unknown destination, later identified as the Katyn Forest. It should be emphasized that in April and May 1940 the Smolensk area was occupied by the forces of the Soviet Government, which was still on friendly relations

with Hitler. In April and May in the northern climate of Smolensk it is still cold, and during the year 1940 the weather was especially rigorous at that season. The wearing of greatcoats was, therefore, understandable.

After the Nazis attacked the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, the Soviet Government, largely on the suggestion of the British Government, established diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in London. One of the conditions of recognition was that all Polish nationals in the Soviet Union should be freed and that a Polish Army should be recruited in the Soviet Union to fight against the Nazis. Accordingly many conversations took place in Moscow between the highest officials of the Soviet and Polish Governments.

One of the principal questions continually raised by the Poles was the fate and whereabouts of the 15,000 officers who had been in the three camps. The answers of the Russians were evasive and inconsistent. On one occasion Stalin said that the officers might have escaped to Manchuria; on another occasion Molotov said they probably had been repatriated; and on another occasion Vishinsky said that the Soviet Government had no information about them.

When the Soviet Government refused to be a party to any investigation of the Katyn murder by the Internatonal Red Cross, that organization declined to participate as it did not wish to be a party to any political controversy. Thereupon, the Nazi authorities invited an international medical commission composed of well-known doctors of Italian, Danish, Yugoslav, Bulgarian, Roumanian, Hungarian, and Swiss nationality to make a technical examination of the bodies. It is true that with the exception of the Swiss doctor, Professor Naville, all of the countries of which the other doctors were nationals were then under the domination of Nazi Germany. For that reason the Soviets have claimed that these doctors were terrorized by the Nazis to make accusations that the crimes were committed in the spring of 1940 and thereby putting the onus on the Soviets. While Hitler was capable, as was shown by the extermination of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto, of perpetrating genocide, in this case he was so convinced of Soviet guilt that he invited, first, the International Red Cross, and later eminent doctors whose integrity was beyond question, to make an investigation. For once, he knew that his hands were relatively clean.

The unbelievable part of the Soviet story regarding the crime is that 15,000 officers in Polish uniform could have mysteriously disappeared in a police state where even a person in civilian clothes is suspected unless he belongs to the ruling class. But the greatest inconsistency in the Soviet version was the Soviet reaction to the Nazi disclosure of the existence of the mass graves in April 1943. Then Pravda, the official Soviet newspaper, calmly stated that the Nazis had perpetrated the crime; that these 15,000 missing Polish officers had been working on the roads in the region of Smolensk in August 1941 when the Nazis invaded that area and had been summarily executed by the Nazis. In August 1941 the weather records show that the weather was extremely hot in northern Russia. Why did all the officers wear great coats? Why had all their correspondence with their relatives in Poland ceased between April 1940 and August 1941? And why did the Soviet Government tell General Sikorski in July 1941, one month earlier than the alleged murder by the Nazis, that there was no trace of any of the 15,000 in the Soviet Union?

The Katyn story should be retold at the present time for two very practical reasons: (1) The same fate of the Polish officers has been meted out to many American GI's in Korea. Mass graves have also been found there, filled with bodies of American soldiers with their hands tied behind their backs. Let us also remember Molotov's statement in 1939 that the Soviet Government desired to free Poland from its Fascist masters. Compare this with the Communist-inspired statement of June 25, 1950, that the North Korean drive toward South Korea was to free Korea from its Fascist masters—this time the United States of America. (2) The methods used by the Communists will stop at nothing in order to achieve the Communist goal. In 1939 and 1940 the aim was to destroy the Polish nation. Today, it is to destroy all free nations, including the United States. We must fight this destructive policy—to achieve world domination and world revolution—with every weapon we have, whether it be physical, financial or moral. It is only through union that we can win. It is up to us Americans—and as Americans, proud of our citizenship, there is only one answer. We must win, no matter what the cost.

Federal Tax on Local Government Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Cooper Green, mayor of the city of Birmingham, recently appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in opposition to the levying of a Federal tax against local government securities.

Mayor Green is immediate past president of the United States Conference of Mayors, is the present president of the Alabama League of Municipalities, and has established an outstanding record as the mayor of the great city of Birmingham. His statement on the question of taxing local government securities is of vital interest to all of our people. It follows:

Shall the income from future issues of local government securities be subjected to Federal income taxes, is the question again before us. I definitely feel that the same exploratory and conclusive statements against this proposal made at previous times before the Ways and Means Committee, should have the same continuing effect. Neither theoretically nor practically do we believe that present needs for additional Federal revenue justify a change in the position taken by committees and Members of Congress on other previous occasions. The idea of the Federal Government taxing the instrumentalities of the local government is just as repugnant today in our constitutional set-up of dual sovereignties as it was at the time of similar hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means in 1939 and in other recent years.

The question is not what has been or can be done, but whether as Representatives and citizens of this Nation, we should take any step which might threaten the position of local governments as independent units of our American democracy, or which would restrict the freedom of their political actions in their own respective territories any more than is imperatively required to preserve this Nation and what it stands for.

The issue before us goes no further. It is proposed to tax the income derived from securities which may be issued in the future by local public agencies of this Nation. If that can be accomplished, who is there to say that the next step may not be to tax the securities already issued, or even the revenues earned by our public agencies in carrying on their public activities? If the one step is constitutionally sound, the other naturally follows.

To the average citizen, the question of whether or not Congress is empowered to lay and collect taxes on income derived from investments in local government securities, is of secondary importance to the principle involved in so doing, and the effect such taxation would have on local governments' ordinary prerogatives. In any event, with our long-standing American tradition of dual sovereignty in government, it is significantly important that technical legal rights as between the Nation and the State, should be asserted only as an urgently necessary and final resort.

Under the clamor for additional tax revenue, the Federal Government must be careful not to encroach further on the domain of the local governments lest the basic conception of dual sovereignty be utterly destroyed. An example of such encroachment is the legislation under which our citizens are now required to pay a Federal admission tax for the privilege of using our city swimming pools and other recreational facilities. Thus, the purpose of our cities to cut down on crime and juvenile delinquency is being obstructed and thwarted by the Federal Government itself.

The power to tax is unquestionably the power to destroy. In this instance it would be the power to destroy local governments which are the keystone of our American democracy. The imposition of this tax as proposed, would materially increase the cost of local government financing—in some cases even to the extent that the financing would not be possible. This unjustifiable interference by the Federal Government in purely local governmental affairs is almost unthinkable. Financial and tax analysts are certain that the proposed taxation would increase local government financing costs as much as 50 percent, or an increased interest cost of perhaps as much as 1 percent. That amount of additional interest cost can very well put the cost thereof beyond the local ability to pay. There can't be any honest denial of the fact that practically all of this additional cost is passed back to the issuing authority with only a very small part of it, if any, assumed by the security purchaser.

In our immediate case, we are in the midst of negotiating a purchase agreement for the local domestic water plant, involving an expenditure of some $22,000,000. If the proposed tax became effective before these bonds were sold, the additional annual interest cost of $200,000 or more, could very well kill the entire proposal. Birmingham's situation in that way is no different from that of nearly every local government authority throughout the United States.

Some 3 weeks ago, the Southern Natural Gas Co. of Birmingham, a very splendidly operated and financed company, sold $17,500,000 of taxable revenue bonds. Their interest cost was 2.86 percent. We have repeatedly been told within recent weeks, that our tax-exempt water revenue bonds should sell on a 2 percent or less interest cost, thus reflecting a difference of nearly 1 percent in interest savings to the city. It is being saved to the city—not to the investor, as some would have you believe.

Birmingham has bonds outstanding at this time amounting to about twenty million dollars. Assuming that the income from those bonds was taxable at an increased interest cost of 1 percent, we would have an additional annual interest cost of $200,000 today on these bonds, plus what would amount to approximately $200,000 additional interest cost on the proposed water revenue bonds, or a

total additional annual interest cost of $400,000 or more. That would mean that we would simply have to do one of two things, either raise taxes to cover this extra cost, or curtail local services. Either would be serious.

Of course, authorities differ to some extent, but not greatly, in their estimate of the added interest cost that may be expected to follow. Proponents of the tax, most of whom perhaps have more of a theoretical viewpoint than one based on actual investment experience, claim that the differential between yields of completely taxable and wholly tax-exempt high-grade securities, varies from about ¼ percent for the short maturities, to ½ percent for the long maturities. Compared to the foregoing is the estimate of a conservative group of experienced dealers, to the effect that the approximate minimum increased average interest cost would be as much as 1 percent or more.

Of course, local governments are not concerned as to whether or not the Federal Government taxes its own securities. That is their business to do as they see fit. Local governments insist that legally, and equitably, they should be accorded the same privilege.

In the investment field the buyer largely creates or at least controls the market through his price-fixing methods. If this buyer knows in advance that the Government will demand additional taxes on income derived from certain investments, such taxes will be absorbed through a reduced price paid for the investment, or what amounts to the same thing, an increased interest cost that will be paid by the issuing authority rather than by the investor. A number of the Government's own actuaries and staff members admit as much.

The investor will remain only the medium through whom the tax will be collected. There will be no escape for the local issuing authority and its tax-paying public.

Local governments must remain untrammeled by the Federal Government, if they are to discharge those responsibilities that are properly theirs.

Let us preserve America as we have known it and have nothing to do with this proposal of Federal taxation of State and local financing. The Federal Government does not need this method of financing; we as a Nation should not for a moment hazard the dangers it may foretell to our political system.

Let us rather preserve to the Federal Government those powers and functions which rightfully belong to it and to local governments those rights and privileges which are theirs, and not mix them in any common pot out of which no one can say what may come.

If this type of income is ever to become taxable, it should be done only after our entire people have been given an opportunity of expression thereon through the use of a constitutional amendment.

We must preserve our local governments and their freedom of action in local government affairs. It can't be done if the Federal Government is given the proposed strangulatory power.

Fitchburg Man Heads "Red Devils"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous content to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the celebrated Boston Post entitled "Fitchburg Man Heads 'Red Devils.'"

This fine account makes reference to the outstanding work of the Red Devils of the Ninety-second AFA Battalion commanded by my constituent, Lt. Col. Leon F. Lavoie, of Fitchburg, Mass. As Americans we can all be very proud of the gallantry and heroism of men like Colonel Lavoie and the boys of his command and those associated with them in the Korean campaign.

FITCHBURG MAN HEADS "RED DEVILS"—ARMORED OUTFIT HAS SUPPORTED EVERY UNITED STATES CORPS

(By John Thompson)

CENTRAL FRONT, KOREA, February 24.—The American Army some day probably will get around to replacing World War I towed artillery with self-propelled artillery to support the Infantry.

MODERN WARFARE

Meanwhile, the three self-propelled (SP) Artillery battalions in Korea are proving to the satisfaction of cannoneers and many and many infantrymen that this is the way artillery should move in modern warfare. Unattached (SU) battalions are armored field artillery (AFA), for only armored divisions are authorized to have such mobility.

This is despite the fact that division commanders of the World War II in their joint information exchange after the war ended, voted unanimously in favor of (SP) artillery.

One of the big tests of modern mobile artillery has been racked up by the "Red Devils" of the Ninety-second (AFA Battalion, commanded by Lt. Col. Leon F. Lavoie, of Fitchburg, Mass. His unit, taken from the Second Armored Division at Fort Hood, Tex., has supported every American corps, every American infantry division except the Second, several South Korean divisions, and now the marines.

MOVES MORE QUICKLY

The United States Army is heavy with towed artillery. (SP) guns and towed artillery guns are identical. The difference is one of mobility and maneuverability.

The Ninety-second, which has 155-millimeter howitzers on the chassis of an M-24 light tank, moved forward 4 miles today over an unbelievably poor road and was in position and ready to fire in 75 minutes. Towed battalions of 105-millimeter guns took 4 hours.

Address of Judge William T. McCarthy to Members of the Massachusetts Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech made by one of the great judges of Massachusetts and the United States district court, the Honorable William T. McCarthy. The occasion was the recent conference of the members of the Massachusetts Bar Association, held at Springfield, Mass.

I want to express to Mr. Sears, Mr. Schneider, and the other members of the committee at the outset of my remarks my sincere appreciation for the invitation extended to me to speak at the midwinter dinner of the Massachusetts Bar Association. I have been particularly honored to be here at the head table because I have this privileged to break bread with a fine American gentleman whose presence on the district court bench of the United States is a source of comfort and consolation to those who are anxious to preserve a godlike American civilization. I have read with considerable pride the decision of the circuit court of appeals in the case of *United States v. Dennis*. I was deeply interested in this case when I was United States attorney because the presentation of the evidence to the United States grand jury against Dennis and his associates was under the watchful eye of a then Assistant Attorney General by the name of Vincent Quinn. He is my very dear friend. I therefore long before the indictment was returned had a little knowledge of its background. The guiding hand of the Almighty never was more conspicuously displayed than in the choice of the coprosecutors Vincent Quinn and Judge McGohey, who at that time was United States attorney, and the presiding judge at this long and arduous trial, at present our guest, Judge Medina. I know of no better compliment that could be paid to a God-fearing man than the simple sentence from the long decision of Judge Learned Hand in which he said that his charges and the rulings were, if anything, too favorable to the defense. I speak of this only because I want to extend to him my greetings as a great American and as an associate of the United States district court and with no desire to invade the territories set aside for Judge Hudson. All the hurricanes from hell never caused him to shrink one minute from the obligation he owed his God and his country, so that I am happy for that reason alone to be present at the head table. I am also happy to meet the members of the bar of the State and Federal courts who practice in this western section. I feel honored and I want to assure them that I am here with the deepest of appreciation and humility. I have a golden treasury of friendships in this section of the great Bay State which go back many, many years starting with my college days and continuing down to the present. They represent men of all races and religions and their friendship and regard is near and dear to my heart. I am also happy to be present at a head table where the American Bar Association is blessed by having a man at its president who has had the courage to appoint a committee to combat communism. I want to congratulate him on his appointment of Jackson Holtz to that committee. It is indeed inspiring to me to know that the American Bar Association has begun to realize the almost irreparable harm that has been done to the civilization of the world.

I want to leave a thought with you members of the bar of Massachusetts in these most critical days when we are having a rendezvous with destiny, when we are living in a civilization torn apart by isms, by peculiar philosophies of life, by strange ideologies, by the mouthings of men and women who if they had their way would obliterate the sanctity of family life. The Pilgrim Forefathers who came over here to this land of ours to escape persecution and the first civil documents drawn up on our shores by them acknowledged the supremacy of a God because they solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another covenanted and combined together into a civil body politic. The early charters and compacts gave a definite place to God. On December 7, 1682, a great pronouncement was made in Pennsylvania which read as follows: "The glory of almighty God and the good of mankind is the reason and end of government. Therefore government in itself is a venerable ordinance of God." Notice these two ideals. Government is for God's glory and was ordained by Him. In

the Declaration of Independence the framers of that noble document three times emphasized God's part in their struggle for independence and the closing paragraph furnished the finest basis in the world, that this Government was founded upon a natural order because it closed with the following phrase, "with a firm reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence." And if that is not a statement of the firm conviction prevailing in the hearts and minds of our founding fathers, then I must confess that I do not know the meaning and implication of words and phrases. Through these early days these men were the signers of this imperishable declaration and were men who represented all races and all religions. They left their imprint in the early growth and development of this great republic of ours. Their philosophy was found in the utterances of the first President of the United States. They were found in the official pronouncement of Thomas Jefferson who in the early eighteenth century became the first president of the University of Virginia and who was responsible for establishing a school of religious training at the expense of the people of Virginia open to boys of all religious denominations. Even such an unorthodox character as Benjamin Franklin said that there was no substitute for religion. We have had in history the lives of simple great Americans who believed in the principle of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man and who more important than anything else practiced it.

What a tragic transformation the little church in the village, the big church in the suburb, freedom of religious worship, men and women living in abodes of peace where men live and let live by looking toward a Supreme Being for guidance—the history of the great missionaries who helped to bring order out of chaos, Protestants, Jews, and Catholics, all a part of an army of fine men and women—the use of symbols such as found on our coins, "In God We Trust," fine men and women leading in the fight to put down racial and religious discriminations and out of the mists of disbelief and treachery came these diabolical ideologies and unworthy leaders. And you can trace these ideologies back for over 50 years and through the writings of intellectuals they have received their impetus from the dangerous legal philosophies advanced by legal minds, minds that should have known better, men and women, advocates of the jungle law, who preach the principle that the essence of law is physical law. It has spread its tentacles into law schools and it has raised up Frankensteins in our institutions of learning. It has given us the course of secularism and it is inescapably clear that the contributing factors have been powerful minds of the profession of the law. I have no desire to be unkind whatsoever, but the obligation that a man owes to his own conscience, the obligation that a man owes to his own family, and the obligation a man owes to a God-like civilization compels me to speak out. There is a studied effort being made today to obliterate due process. There has been a studied effort, and I am sorry to say it has been successful to a degree to write into the opinions of our courts these secular views which are the negation of law, the right of morality, of truth, and of man's place in the world. These false legal prophets have very diabolically succeeded in undermining our system of jurisprudence because they practice the principle that the essential of law is physical force and it is inescapably certain that the corollary from that principle is one that might makes right.

Examine, if you will, the two recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the Treasury Bus case and the Illinois Release Time case. I do not intend to criticize the courts of the United States, but it is right and proper to refer to the fact that the strange ideologies advocated by a godless and un-American school of thought find a full expression in these cases, particularly the Illinois case. Witness, if you will, the unjust imprisonment of churchmen in Communist-controlled countries. We deplore the menace of atheistic communism, and yet, leaders of some of the great institutions of learning encourage the presence on their faculties of men and women who openly advocate atheistic communism. And this, if you please, is from the soil of the United States made sacred by the sweat, blood, and tears of God-fearing American men and women. The most effective way to defeat atheistic communism is to see to it that written into our decisions is the philosophy underlying the natural law. Its contribution toward the maintenance of a decent civilization is written into the story of the development of the arts and the sciences and the culture of the centuries. It was expressed in the philosophy of the great leader of Judaism, Moses, who propounded to the then world the Ten Commandments, among which were the first two, "Love thy God" and "Love thy neighbor." It was expressed in the philosophy of Socrates. Its leader in the court room was Demosthenes. So I travel down through the golden corridors of centuries with men like Cicero and Justinian carrying the torch. Under its aegis great jurists lived and carried on and under its inspiration members of the bar did their duty toward their God and their country. Its true meaning was expressed in the writings of the great philosopher St. Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages. He it was who said that all man-made laws must conform to the natural law and so on down the line came these great leaders of legal thought down into the early days of the American Government, climaxed when from the pen of Jefferson came the famous preamble of the Declaration that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and the purpose of this Government is to secure these rights. It is inescapably clear that the unity of America lies in the recognition of the principle that the inalienable rights of the individual rest upon a foundation eternal and immutable. I pay my homage to Mr. Justice Douglas who recently said that in the domain of conscience there is a moral power higher than the State. Ladies and gentlemen, this is our birthright. This is our haven of rest. This is the challenge to the jungle law school of philosophy which under the leadership of treasonable men has placed our country in jeopardy. Let us rededicate ourselves to the philosophy founded upon the respect for God and duly constituted authority. Let the members of the bar assume the leadership in the fight against these diabolical ideologies. I warn you that unless you do something about it, our standard of citizenship will change from freedom to that which is the denial of freedom—tyranny. Let all leaders of all religions manifest a spirit of love and affection for those who teach the undying philosophy that there is a brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. Let us drive the money changers out of the temple. Let us be God-fearing men. Let us be courageous men and women. Let us be stout-hearted men and women. Let us think of the classical lines which run as follows:

"God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flattery without winking;
Tall men and sun-crowned who live above the fog
In public duty and private life."

Yes, we need responsible leadership in our bar associations, but our greatest need is for men and women who believe that fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, men and women who believe that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, men and women who believe that the priceless heritage of American citizenship is founded upon eternal truths, challenged today as they are, by false prophets in this country and in other countries of the world, who bask in the sunshine of Karl Marx and his earthly representative, the outlaw of the Caucasus, Stalin. Let us safeguard our American civilization so that it will continue to be a haven of rest for men and women of good will. This is the issue that we face today. The lines have been drawn. What are you, Mr. Toastmaster, and your colleagues and brothers in the bar associations of this country going to do about it?

Let me, in conclusion, urge you to cast aside partisan feelings and remember that a person's duty to God and his country is not bounded and described primarily by his loyalty to either one of our major political parties. The maintenance of a two-party form of government is essential to our country's welfare. I pay homage to a great American in the person of our beloved President who has been a powerful leader in the fight of our American civilization against atheistic communism. He is a God-fearing gentleman. He believes in the kind of an American civilization that is worth while maintaining. I urge you to be loyal and faithful to him as the first citizen of the land and as our commander-in-chief. I urge you to support the fine American leaders of both parties in the legislative halls of the United States, Members of the Senate, Members of Congress. And when I speak of Members of Congress, I ask you to remember that one of the outstanding forces for the maintenance of a Godlike American civilization is one whose friendship I cherish, whose incorruptibility was never questioned, whose liberal point of view toward all religions is a matter of common knowledge, a powerful leader in the fight for the preservation of our American civilization against atheistic communism. I mean my cherished friend, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

I bespeak of you forbearance, patience, loyalty, and support for all our leaders, members of the Cabinet, the President, and other high officials of the executive branch of the Government, leaders of our Armed Forces here and abroad, and for our judiciary, Federal and State. May Divine Providence give them the strength of mind and body to carry on, so that the United States of America will continue to be a shield of protection for those peoples who believe in the perpetuity of a worth-while civilization.

We Should Save Waste Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the present critical period, and into the foreseeable future, our Nation will undoubtedly be confronted with serious shortages in various vitally essential raw material fields. In many cases we can reduce the harmful impact of these shortages by common-sense conservation programs and through the cooperation of our citizens in preserving waste products and channeling them back to industry.

My purpose today is to outline the serious situation confronting one of our most important industries and to call the attention of the American people to the fact that the situation can be greatly alleviated through increased effort on their part in returning to industry waste materials we can no longer afford to destroy.

I will discuss the paper-and-pulp industry primarily, although I am quite sure that a similar situation confronts many other industries and can probably be eased if the American people are made aware of the facts. There is no question but that the return of waste paper, through normal trade channels, will go far toward helping the paper-and-pulp industry meet the heavy demands which are now being made upon it.

Right now, the pulp and paper industry faces a most serious situation. An unprecedented demand, both military and civilian, for paper, paper products and paperboard has created serious shortages in the raw material field making it more difficult each day for a manufacturer to schedule his operations. Normal patterns of distribution have been disrupted because of shortages and the nonintegrated mills—those who do not manufacture their own pulp—find themselves in serious difficulty in replenishing raw material stocks.

The Association of Pulp Consumers says, for example, that an optimistic estimate of market pulp available in 1951, under a relatively normal economy and without the added defense demand, would be 14 percent less than 1950, or a decrease of 440,000 tons. The full impact of this shortage cannot be accurately predicted because of the many variables in the picture, including the amount of increased demand, both military and civilian, and the extent of the shortages of both pulp woods and chemicals for the industry.

The shortage of new materials in the pulp and paper industry has been aggravated due to the requirement that sulfur, an essential chemical in the production of sulfite pulp, be exported in greatly increased quantities to Europe. As a result, one large producer of sulfite pulp has announced a cut of 15 percent on all pulp contracts, and it is anticipated that other producers will be forced to follow at the same rate. This rate of reduction reflects the reduction necessary because of the allocation of sulfur on the basis of 85 percent of former tonnage by sulfur suppliers to pulp manufacturers. A 15 percent reduction in sulfur results in a like reduction of sulfite pulp production.

One of the immediate effects of a shortage of pulpwood and sulfur will undoubtedly be that integrated mills will withdraw their surplus pulp production from the pulp market and consume it in their own mills. This has already been done by several large domestic and Canadian producers who formerly were important sources of supply for nonintegrated mills. This will cause a disruption of output from the mills as nonintegrated mills are forced to reduce their production or change the grades of paper produced because of lack of raw materials.

Pulpwood inventories in the United States at the end of October 1950 were 3,746,000 cords as compared with 6,000,000 cords late in 1948. This inventory of 3,746,000 cords is slightly more than 2 months' supply based on October production. Wood-pulp inventories at all paper and paperboard mills, integrated and nonintegrated, were 400,000 tons on October 31, 1950, as against 650,000 tons during the high point of 1948. Thus, inventories on hand constituted less than a 10-day supply based on October consumption. This reduction in pulpwood and wood-pulp inventories has occurred at a period of expanding production in the paper industry. Total production for the month of October 1950 was 14 percent higher than October of 1949. At the same time, inventories of pulpwood at mills declined 28 percent from October 1949 to October 1950, with consumption 14 percent higher than a year previous. Consumption of wood pulp increased 23 percent during 1950 over a comparable 1949 period.

The only remaining source of supply to the pulp and paper industry is waste paper. Waste-paper receipts for the first 10 months of 1950 show an increase of 22 percent, or 1,143,000 tons, over a comparable period of 1949. Consumption for a comparable period has increased 21 percent and mill inventories at the end of October were below those of a year ago. At the end of October, there was less than a 15-day supply on hand, based on current usage.

From these facts, it can be seen that if we are to meet the growing need for paper and paper products with a decreased supply of pulpwood and wood pulp, it can only be done by increasing the use of waste paper. Increased use of waste paper is dependent upon increased supplies being made available through citizen help.

The immediate steps which can be taken by all Americans are these:

Save all waste paper.

Assist in the collection of waste paper.

Deliver all collected paper into regular trade channels so that it might be processed by the pulp and paper industry.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that "scare-buying" of paper products, or the purchase of products for which there is no immediate need, will only serve to make the situation critical. While the situation is undoubtedly serious, it will not reach a critical stage unless foolish hoarding takes place, particularly if the utilization of waste paper can be stepped up.

We can all cooperate by making the great need for waste paper known to the American people, and I am confident that they will then cooperate in saving it for reuse. By so doing, they will be making a sound contribution to the defense effort by helping to increase vitally needed pulp and paper production.

Who's Unpatriotic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to Murray Kempton's article which appeared in the February 21, 1951, issue of the New York Post under the caption "Shearing the sheep." The accusing finger has long been pointing at the average workers of America, who, without organized labor, might still be forced to exist under sweatshop environments without a living wage. Since this is a fact, it cannot be right to make this country's industrial magnates the forgotten men when their subversive a tics, going unnoticed, can cause a greater breakdown than those caused by strikes instigated by members of organized labor. Mr. Kempton's column is a perfect portrayal of my thoughts on this matter.

SHEARING THE SHEEP

(By Murray Kempton)

Last week end, 79,000 CIO woolen workers went on strike for a wage increase. It was the first major walkout since the collapse of the Wage Stabilization Board. Naturally, there were headlines all over.

What the headlines didn't say was that wool had been on strike anyway all through February. From the January 26 price freeze to last week end, the wool industry had refused to sell to the Government or to the consumer until it was allowed to raise prices. The CIO was just following its boss to the picket line.

President Truman has not yet announced that the National Association of Wool Manufacturers is acting like a bunch of Russians. Charles E Wilson has made no comment. Westbrook Pegler on February 13 said it was time for certain lying, double-crossing traitors to stop helping the enemy in time of war.

But "Peg," like the President, was talking about the railroad workers. The wool companies were averaging 15 percent gross profits on sales when the strike began, so, of course, no one can classify them with second-class citizens like the switchmen.

But, if this isn't a strike against the defense effort, I'd like to know what is.

On January 26, Michael DiSalle froze the price of wool. Three days later, Arthur Besse, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, wired DiSalle that the industry cannot operate.

After January 26, the wool companies stopped bidding on military contracts. On February 8, Women's Wear Daily reported that:

"Many (wool) firms are reportedly reluctant to take military contracts until they have more formal assurance from OPS that they will not be caught by the April 1 cut-off date and forced to return their prices to ceilings."

Last February 6, industry representatives visited price control officials to warn that "military contracts would continue to go begging" unless DiSalle dumped the price ceiling on finished fabrics.

The next day, DiSalle promised to ease the wool price freeze to take care of "individual hardship cases." Industry spokesmen said

the promise was too vague and that "further clarification would be essential before the industry is in a position to fill the Government's needs."

The fix wasn't yet tight enough. On February 13—Peg's day for the trainmen—the Daily News Record reported that military procurement officers couldn't get a satisfactory bid on an Air Force serge contract.

So last Thursday, the Pentagon's Munitions Board asked DiSalle to "lift its entire General Ceiling Price Regulation as applied to military goods until some of the more pressing current contracts have been placed."

The next day, DiSalle caved in and took wool textile orders for defense off the price control list.

Wool wasn't alone on the price picket line. The Government hasn't been able to let a cotton fabric contract since February 6. Yesterday the Journal of Commerce reported that the Cotton Exchange remained closed for the twentieth successive day of its strike against "unworkable" price regulations.

The defense economy as of this moment is a moral shambles. Here a hungry $11.56 a day trainman is a "lying traitor" and these not-yet-surfeited managers of a $2,500,000,000 industry are all honorable men and pillars of society.

Mail Service in Tri-City Area of the Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington:

"STATE OF WASHINGTON,
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the honorable members of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

"We your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas that area of the Columbia Basin known as the Tri-City area, comprising the cities of Pasco and Kennewick, the unincorporated area of Richland, and the rural area immediately adjacent thereto, now has a population of some seventy-five thousand; and

"Whereas the importance of the Tri-City area as an atomic and national defense center makes it vital that rapid transportation facilities exist; and

"Whereas the said Tri-City area now has no direct or convenient air communication with coastal cities in the Northwest; and

"Whereas the public convenience and necessity of such air transportation service to the coast from the Tri-City area already has been proved: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully petition the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board to act promptly to certificate regularly scheduled local airplane mail and passenger service from the Tri-City area to Seattle, via Yakima and Ellensburg; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to transmit copies of this memorial immediately to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, to the honorable chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Washington."

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the house of representaitves on March 1, 1951.

S. R. HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

President Truman Presents First Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the business mobilization dinner of the Society of Business Magazine Editors in Washington, D. C., at which the President of the United States was the honored guest and at which he presented the first Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications, Inc., Washington, D. C., to Paul Wooton for most distinguished services to the Business Press through his development of better understanding and more productive cooperation between the various agencies of the Federal Government and the trade, technical, scientific and professional publications of America.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN JOHN W. MCPHERRIN, PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY OF BUSINESS MAGAZINE EDITORS

Mr. President, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, as president of the Society of Business Magazine Editors, it is my great honor to welcome all of you to this business mobilization dinner. The Society of Business Magazine Editors is a professional group like the Society of Newspaper Editors.

We have sponsored this occasion, because, as business editors, we realize that the most important business of America right now is to demonstrate the productive power of free people in competition with those who produce by slave power. We believe that this production job is too big a job for big business alone. Small business must get in the production line, too. In other words, total mobilization of productive capacity requires that all participate.

This means that every business magazine editor, whether his readers are in small or big business, has the responsibility of letting each reader know what this war requires of him and why. We must make our readers understand that this is a world struggle between those who believe in mankind and those who do not, and that it is a showdown between slave workers and free workers as to who can produce the most of the best.

This present world struggle may be the last opportunity to prove that free workers led by free management can produce more and better materials of war than slave labor driven by the whip of tyrants. America has created production tools and methods that are the envy of the world. They are so good that the Communists claim to have invented them. They have at least copied them and, by using millions of slave workers, it is possible that the Communist world may match our past production records.

That does not frighten us. We have in America something more important than machines and methods. I refer to the free spirit of the American people, and it is found among bench workers as well as board members. If that free spirit can be aroused, it can give our modern equipment the power to produce all that is needed and more. The problem is how to awaken it, and that is where we business editors may be helpful in this great national effort. The 100 editors of this society are thinking of their two and one-third million readers in business and industry. They are even now wondering how their editorial pages can best express the idea of this meeting and arouse that vital spirit among their 2,000,000 readers.

I can assure you, Mr. President, that the free spirit of each editor is enough to make him want to do something about it. And your presence here tonight, sir, is a great stimulus to our desire to help. To us, it is evidence of your knowledge of the Business Press and what it has done. We hope you have faith in what we can do.

If so, we believe your faith in the Business Press is largely due to one of our members who, for over 30 years, has been creating mutual understanding between Government leaders and business magazine editors. His statesmanlike service as a business magazine editor has been so notable that one of the national associations of publishers has selected him to receive the first award of its kind for outstanding service to the Business Press of America.

To tell you more about the award and the man it honors, it is my pleasure to introduce Mr. Rufus Choate, who will speak as vice president of National Business Publications—Mr. Choate.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SILVER QUILL AWARD BY RUFUS CHOATE, VICE PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., AND PRESIDENT OF BOOKBOUT-CHOATE-SCOTT, INC.

Mr. President, distinguished guests, members of the Society of Business Magazine Editors, fellow publishers, ladies and gentlemen, over the years the editors and publishers of the Business Press have worked harmoniously and understandingly with men of responsibility in Washington and elsewhere in the American economy. Many have participated in that effective and essential assignment. But, to some it has been given to render long and outstanding service and, as is so often the case, in high and low places, the service has been its own reward. We publishers who are members of the association known as National Business Publications desire that due recognition be given where it is so rightly deserved, and to that end the silver quill of NBP annual award has been created.

Those business publishers charged with the responsibility of selecting the first recipient of the silver quill of NBP did not face a difficult task. Thirty years of conspicuous endeavor in behalf of the business press and the public interest had already determined the individual. To every member of the Business Press, it is a matter of signal pride that the first citizen of these United States should so graciously agree to be with us tonight as we honor the man and the task to which his energies have so long been dedicated.

Mr. McPherrin, we of NBP are highly honored to have President Truman present this, our first annual silver-quill award, to his good friend and ours, Paul Wooton, for most distinguished services to the Business Press

through his development of better understanding and more productive cooperation between the various agencies of the Federal Government and the trade, technical, scientific and professional publications of America.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

President TRUMAN. It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Paul, to present this award to you. I have known you for a great many years. And knowing you that long—I still love you. [Laughter.]

I know you have earned this award. I know, for example, that twice a month or so you had these gentlemen in to talk to me and sell me a bill of goods. And they have succeeded. [Applause.]

(The presentation of the silver-quill award was made at this point.)

President TRUMAN. It seems that this occasion will not be complete if a politician doesn't get a chance to say a few words. [Laughter.]

I am glad to congratulate Paul Wooton on this, because when I first came here to Washington in 1935 Paul was our neighbor. And he was a real neighbor. You never forget your treatment when you move into a strange place.

Just to show you the difference in attitude of people when a strange man comes to town, my daughter at that time was about 10 years old. And I hope you won't spread that around. [Laughter.]

Paul Wooton lived in the apartment below us, and he was as kind to Margaret as anybody could be. And when anybody is kind to Margaret, I never forget it. I don't even forget it when they are not. [Laughter and applause.]

Paul Wooton has done a great service to the city of Washington. He had so many honors that I don't know whether I could name them all or not. Joe Short, coming over here, said that Paul was the president of the Press Club 2 years before he was, and he taught Joe Short how to introduce distinguished people.

He was instrumental in bringing his organization to the White House, as I say, at least once a month since I have been President, and twice when he could get in. [Laughter.]

This silver quill presented to Paul is because of his work with this organization. And I think he has earned it. I have always been pleased when this organization has called on me. We have always had a good time. They have always given me some information that I couldn't use [laughter] and a great deal that I could, for which I was highly appreciative.

We are faced with two things right now. We are faced with aggression. And we are faced with inflation. I want this organization to help the Government of the United States to meet both. And you can make a great contribution if you do that. I know you will, as your president has said.

We are faced with inflation because of the conditions in the world. I don't think there is any man here who would want to see the thing for which we are fighting lost because we are not able to control ourselves. I think we can control ourselves. I think we can meet this situation. I think that every man who has studied the position and the condition of the United States is in favor of trying to meet this program that the Government is now putting out with everything that he has. I don't care whether he is in business, whether he is in politics, or whether he works with his hands for a living. I think that every patriotic American—and I don't know any unpatriotic ones at this minute—is anxious to see our success in meeting our home situation. And I think they are just as anxious to see us meet the situation with which we are faced, because fate has made us a leader in the world. We shirked it in 1920. We can't shirk it now because it is on us. We must meet it. But it will take everything we have, with all the brains we can mobilize, to meet it.

I don't pretend that I know everything that should be done. I have tried to surround myself with men who understand various branches of government, who understand the world situation; and by pooling all those brains and all the others that we can mobilize, we will be able to meet the situation.

It is a struggle between people who believe in spiritual values and people who believe in nothing but materialism. We are fighting for freedom, for the right to worship as we please in any church we choose to attend, the right to read what we please, and the right to speak what we please, and the right to elect public officials of our own choosing—and then to give them hell after they are elected. [Laughter and applause.]

Dictators don't believe in that. There is no difference between dictators. If you will study your history, there hasn't been any difference in any police state that ever existed in the history of the world. They are all alike. They are all for the enslavement of the individual for the benefit of the state. We believe that the state exists for the benefit of the individual, and that is what we are fighting for.

There isn't any difference between Hitler and Mussolini, the Tarquins of ancient Rome, the kings of Sparta, Charles the First of England, Louis the Fourteenth—and Stalin. They are all just alike. Nicholas the First of Russia was just as much of a dictator as anyone who ever lived. He believed in the enslavement of the common people.

This Republic of ours has been founded on a different program. I think the greatest part in the Constitution of the United States is the Bill of Rights, and I believe that we ought to give everything we have to see that that Bill of Rights is maintained, for the benefit of the individual. [Applause.]

It is not the first time in the history of the world that the moral forces have been displaced by the materialist forces. When you go down through your history, you will find that this is just one of the incidents in which the fight has been to maintain the right to worship as we please, to talk as we please, to act as we please, as long as we don't interfere with the rights of others. That has all down through the ages been the struggle. I am just as sure as I am that I stand here that we will win that struggle, because there have been times in the history of the world when we have been much closer to losing than we are now. There has never been a nation in the history of the world that has been placed on a stronger foundation than ours. There has never been a nation in the history of the world as unselfish as ours, with ideals that include a belief in the welfare of every individual in the world as well as those of our Nation. There has never been another nation in the world that in time of victory has helped the vanquished to recover. See if you can find a situation like that. I don't think you will find it in the history of the world anywhere.

We have our troubles. Somebody sent me a cartoon from Punch a day or two ago in which the cartoonist was depicting an argument in the senate of the Carthaginians. And one able senator of the Carthaginians was saying that "Hannibal should not be allowed to use elephants in Italy, because the senate should control the use of those elephants." [Laughter.] That has been going on ever since we have had senates and senators. And I have served 10 years in the Senate, and I know just exactly how they feel. I know just exactly what the difficulty is. And we will meet it. There isn't a Senator in the Senate who isn't just as anxious to see the United States Government continue as the free Government that it is as I am. And I know that no matter what they say for publication, when the time comes for action they will be right there. I am just as sure of that as I can be.

It is an interesting thing, the study of the history of these things. When Louis the Fourteenth was trying to be the master of all Europe, there were men in the Parliament of Great Britain who decided that the best thing to do would be not to try to defend the forts of Belgium and the Continent but withdraw to the Island of Great Britain and wait for Louis the Fourteenth to come and get them. Thank God they didn't do that. They didn't do it. They met the situation, and freedom prevailed in the world. We are going to meet it, and freedom is going to prevail in the world. But in order to do that, we must have the cooperation of the people who make up this great Nation of ours.

I am appealing to you gentlemen to put out the facts. Honest criticism is necessary. I don't object to that. There is nothing you could say about me, anyhow. [Laughter.]

But honest criticism is helpful. Nobody objects to that. And when it comes to the fundamental things, I know that every one of you will be in there pitching.

I wish I could have been here and had dinner with you, but, you know, in these times I have so many documents to read and so many papers to sign. Up to now I have had to sign my name 600 times a day, and now I think it is going up to 800 times. I don't have a chance to and I can't do the duties I am supposed to do and attend functions of this kind for pleasure. I came over here merely because Paul Wooton was our good neighbor, and because I wanted to say that I hope you will cooperate to the fullest extent possible to meet this situation with which we are faced.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF PAUL WOOTON AFTER RECEIVING SILVER QUILL AWARD

Mr. President, Mr. McPherrin, Mr. Choate, ladies and gentlemen of the National Business Publications have conferred an honor on me which I appreciate profoundly. You, Mr. President, have enhanced that honor by presenting me with this impressive symbol of their recognition. The fact that I am to head a list of those who will receive this award in the future is a further honor.

It seems to me that this presentation is evidence that the publishers have overvalued what I have done. There is one thing, however, that they cannot overestimate. That is the depth of my appreciation for this award and for the understanding behind it. I also am greatly indebted to President Truman for many favors.

You publishers give me credit for having worked hard in your interest. What I do for you is not work. To represent you in this fabulous city, where everybody treats you better than you deserve, is a thrilling assignment. To be able to gather the extract of great minds and give it circulation is not work. It is pleasure in its most exciting form.

When you regard as worth while my efforts to encourage the Business Press to pay more attention to Government and to encourage Government to make more use of the Business Press, it makes me very happy.

In that activity I have consistently had the cooperation of the several Presidents, but this is the first time a President of the United States has recognized the Business Press to the extent of addressing one of its dinners. All of us appreciate, Mr. President, that your sanction is very valuable.

I have been requested to say a word concerning the purpose of this gathering. Our ability as a nation to defend ourselves is

geared directly to the speed with which our factories can supply the needs of Army, Navy, and Air Forces. Speed depends on know-how. The Business Press is the chief purveyor of that type of intelligence. Also it is a vast reservoir of past experience that again can be applied usefully.

During World War II, the Business Press used thousands of pages describing improved methods and practices for performing the innumerable jobs connected with war production. The essentiality of your publications during that struggle has been acclaimed in the highest terms. It takes a lot of brawn to fight a war. It also takes a lot of brains.

The Business Press is invaluable in making our brain power more effective and in giving it precise direction. It is an extraordinarily potent instrumentality that is indispensable to the efficient conduct of business and industry. You men of the Business Press are as important to a war effort as are the trained officers of the fighting forces.

Again I thank you, Mr. President, for attending this dinner and thus giving impetus to the vital part the Business Press is taking in the defense of our fireside.

Conditions at Fort Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD BREEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, my office has from time to time received numerous letters detailing unfavorable conditions existing in various Army, Navy, and Air Corps installations. Generally these letters have come from parents anxious and concerned over the welfare of their sons and it has been the policy of our office to refer these criticisms to the appropriate legislative liaison offices for an on-the-scene report of these alleged conditions.

The Army, Navy, and Air Corps liaison offices have been very helpful and cooperative at all times in getting the requested information. However, Mr. Speaker, in many instances it has been found that the alleged abuses have largely been the result of that human quality of exaggerating details and adding a few embellishments at each retelling.

The following newspaper article written by Harrison Beardsley of the Dayton (Ohio) Journal-Herald staff, I believe, speaks for itself.

In the same mail that I received this newspaper, I also received several letters based on soldiers' reports to their families of an alleged freezing to death at their camp. Undoubtedly other congressional offices have received similar reports and perhaps Mr. Beardsley's article will be of interest and assistance.

ANYBODY PARENTS' LETTERS PLAGUE ARMY TOP BRASS—COUGHS AND COLDS ARE PLENTIFUL AT FORT KNOX; RUMORS FLY, AND LETTERS START ROLLING IN

(By Harrison Beardsley)

FORT KNOX, KY., February 26.—Mom and dad are among the United States Army's biggest troublemakers.

With an assist from a Congressman or VIP, they can raise more feathers and fur on this post than a hundred feuding sergeants. Their unwilling copartner is the mailman, who each day drops at least one letter from mom or dad on the commanding general's desk.

The complaints and instructions in these messages make the top brass yearn for the sweet clover of retirement.

It is not uncommon for mom or dad to charge that the Army has defranchised American youth or that it is engaged in a mass conspiracy to maim or dismember our boy.

It would be unfair to say that all these letters are the overflow of distraught parental love.

In most cases our boy is as much to blame for them as anyone else. He has written home about the Army. His letters boast of the rough treatment he has taken. As any former GI knows, those first letters home put Izaak Walton to shame.

But when he tells mom and dad about those two guys who froze to death last night it's too much.

Mom and dad are alarmed, and rightfully so.

The trouble is mom and dad don't know that those two guys freeze to death at every Army post in the United States any time the mercury dips near zero. It was that way in World War II—and the Medical Corps is still looking for the bodies.

It's another one of those fabulous Army rumors. Here's how the rumor was reborn at Fort Knox just a month ago:

One night the temperature fell below zero. A colonel became concerned about the welfare of men camping out in the hills. He decided to go see how they were getting along. He called the motor pool for a jeep. The jeep was frozen. The impatient colonel told the motor pool to get the jeep de-iced in a hurry because maybe some of those boys are frozen out on bivouac.

HOW RUMORS START

Next day the word was all over camp that "two men had froze to death."

It took another day or so for the letters to get back home and then the general's telephone began to ring.

An investigation disclosed that during the particular cold spell in question there had been only one casualty. A recruit suffered frostbite on one ear. He got it standing in an outdoor phone booth waiting for a long-distance call through to home, the investigating colonel told us.

But for weeks the recruits were talking about "those two guys who froze to death."

This is not to say there isn't a cold or a case of pneumonia at Fort Knox. This military establishment is a city—the second largest in Kentucky—where more than 84,000 live and work. There's bound to be trouble somewhere.

LOTS OF COUGHING

The cold, the cough are the trademark of a recruit.

Walk into any classroom and you can hardly hear the instructor above the hackhacks. Everybody at basic is coughing. It's like touring a TB hospital.

Recruits put their shelter halves (two of them make a pup tent) up alongside their bunks at night to keep from coughing on each other.

It's too bad. But the Army has 14 weeks to get our boy ready for combat and it cannot cancel training—rain, snow or 10 below zero.

Blizzards don't stop the war in Korea and they don't stop basic training.

But to top all this cold and cough business every now and then the barracks boiler breaks down. During one week of extreme cold there were 50 boilers "on the bum." Fifty barracks were ice cold—50 barracks built 10 years ago to last 5 years.

BASIC IS NO PICNIC

Is it the Army's fault? us civilians ask. Or is it the fault of an economy-minded former Secretary of Defense who let Army installations fall apart? as Army officers say.

The latest word is that Fort Knox is due for a Senate investigation.

What will the Senators find?

They will find that basic training here is no picnic. They will find 2,000 recruits who cough. Two thousand recruits who in 14 weeks can be in Korea where things are a lot colder, a lot wetter and a whole lot deadlier.

The question they should decide is not whether basic training is too tough but whether it is tough enough.

Address of Hon. Sean MacBride, Minister for External Affairs for the Republic of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a speech delivered last Saturday at the Clover Club in Boston, Mass., by the Honorable Sean MacBride, the Minister for External Affairs for the Republic of Ireland:

One of the more hackneyed functions of a foreign minister is to compose little speeches which refer, as gracefully as possible, to the links which have always linked Ireland and other countries. This pastime is, I believe, irreverently known in my department as "linking the link." However, there are occasions, and this is one of them, where the links are so solid and real that to link them is no trouble at all.

I was reminded the other day, by a rather amusing coincidence of reading, of how close and intimate the relations between Ireland and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts really are. I had been reading a book which, I am sure, is familiar to you all, and as to whose merits and accuracy I hasten to say that I am not competent to form an opinion—The Proper Bostonians, by Mr. Cleveland Amory. The end papers of that volume display a map which purports to represent the true Hub citizen's conception of the world which revolves around him. I was tickled to see in this that, although a great part of the United States is very sketchily drawn—the whole of the great Middle West is, for instance, covered by the sweeping description "The Western Prairies"—the solitary outside country shown (I hesitate to call it foreign)—Ireland—is fairly accurately drawn and on it are plainly marked the names of Limerick, Cork, and Killarney. I noted sadly that the northeastern corner of our island faded off on this map into a misty obscurity. Reading Mr. Amory's psychological geography, I was reminded of a work by one of our leading humorists—Myles no gCopaleen. That work, of which the name in Irish means "The Poor Mouth," also contains a map of the universe, this time as seen by an inhabitant of the Blasket Islands. It is considerably more rudimentary than Mr. Amory's but it does show two objects of external interest. One is England and the other, written in much larger and more affectionate-looking letters, is Springfield, Mass. I think these two independent observations, humorous as they are, do illustrate something serious and real: The mutual consciousness and affection of two peoples.

That affection, of course, arises primarily from the fact that so many Irish men and women have made their homes here. But even apart from that, we, in Ireland, should have a warm regard and admiration for your historic city. The part which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the city of Boston played in the War of Independence and, later, in the preservation of the Union, have gone down, along with the names of Washington and Lincoln, as part of the real history of human freedom. The Irish people place on freedom the value which you put on something for which you have had to struggle hard and long; it is natural, therefore, that we should admire your historic traditions and struggle for liberty. We respect your traditions all the more because we have reason to know that they are, for you, not mouldering parchments in museums but living and active principles.

We, in Ireland, have learned to apply critical tests to professions of political idealism. We were governed for many years by people who had developed the most admirable principles of civil government—and kept them to themselves. There is a Gaelic proverb which says "that the attention one pays to a sermon on consideration for others is greatly increased if the preacher has the delicacy not to be standing on one's face." After a long period of this treatment we have become, as it were, connoisseurs of liberalism. When we hear high principles expressed we ask ourselves whether these principles are to apply to us or whether, as in the past, Ireland is supposed to exist in a kind of moral vacuum where expediency alone takes over. The answer in the case of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is, I am proud and grateful to say, an affirmative one. You have high principles, and you do not hesitate to apply them in the case of Ireland. Your legislature has condemned the partition of Ireland in no uncertain terms, and your Senators and Representatives in Washington have also done all in their power to expose that injustice. We, in Ireland, behold this, not only with gratitude for what you are doing for us, but with the thrill of pride and pleasure one derives from seeing high political ideals being put into action. Your statesmen show that they believe that the freedom of small nations is something which is both just and expedient now; not merely, as others would have us believe, an obsolete wartime slogan or an aim to be realized in a mythically remote future, like the famous Communist doctrine of "withering away of the state."

I have said that freedom is also expedient, and I think it may be well to say something of why this is so, specifically in the case of Ireland. The basic fact is that there is such a thing as an Atlantic community and that Ireland is a member of that community. I say a member—not a part of another member or a piece chipped off another member, but a nation in her own right, one of the oldest in Europe, with her own unique and individual voice. She is that strange anomaly, a European nation with most of her people in America, and that, I think, makes her a member of the Atlantic community in a special sense. I was reminded of this today as I came through one of the older parts of your city. One feels that it is a place where the old world and the new have met and formed a harmonious and fertile union. On the other side of the Atlantic, Ireland is potentially in a like position. There is nothing either cheap or superficial about the deep American sympathies of the Irish people.

Ireland, as I see it, is a point of attachment between America and Europe. She is a small but powerful engine of the most genuine kind of international cooperation and understanding. The tragedy is that this engine has been, to a great extent, put out of gear. Ireland is, indeed, playing a certain part, not, we think, without value, in international cooperation. In the two principal international organizations to which she belongs, the Council of Europe and the OEEC, she has played a progressive part. In the OEEC we have, from the beginning, pressed for a quicker tempo of trade liberalization and a speedier integration of the European economy. In the Council of Europe all our representatives, who include representatives of both the Government and the opposition—Mr. de Valera's party—have consistently favored the strengthening of the Council of Europe. In principle we have favored moving forward toward the concept of a Parliament of Europe.

You will want to know our position in relation to two other organizations, the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

As regards the United Nations the position is that, being willing to accept all the responsibilities of membership, we applied but our candidature was vetoed by Soviet Russia. Marshal Stalin, I am sorry to say, does not consider that we are a democratic or peace-loving people.

As regards the Atlantic Pact the position is that we were invited to join but we refused. That refusal may seem strange to many of you, but, in fact, it was the only course open to us, the only course which could have been taken by an Irish Government under the present circumstances, as is, I think, shown by the fact that it had the unanimous support of all parties in our Parliament. The reason is tragically simple. It is that for us, unlike all the other members of the pact, the invitation was not an invitation to a free nation to join other free nations in the bearing of arms for the preservation of peace. It was an invitation to a nation, part of whose territory is occupied by a foreign power, against the will of the overwhelming majority of our people, to enter into a military alliance with that power. Worse still, it was, in our case, an invitation to underwrite that power's territorial integrity in our country—that is to say, we were in fact being asked to underwrite the border which divides our country.

It may be argued that, in this great crisis of our time, it would have been the part of magnanimity to disregard these matters, to set the interests of the Atlantic community, as a whole, above what is often described as a "local grievance"—in short, to forget about partition and come into the pact. That was not the response of the Irish people. The Irish people, like other people, test all professions of principle by the things they know and have experienced. They have no illusions about Russia. No European nation has less illusions or is more solidly anti-Communist, but they simply do not accept, as a champion of liberty, the nation which refuses to recognize democratic rule in Ireland's case. Many in Ireland have cause to remember the recruiting posters which the British Government put up in every town and village in Ireland during the First World War. One of these posters—"Ireland and the peace conference" began "The Allies declare in specific terms that they are out to give freedom to small nationalities. They cannot, then, in the face of Europe give freedom to the small nations and leave Ireland out."

Another British poster, showing an awareness of Irish distrust for British promises, cashed in on Ireland's trust in America: "America, speaking through its President, said this piece of propaganda, "declares that the liberties of every other people are as valued and are to be made secure, aye, as the liberties of America. Will Ireland fight for this freedom? America will see her rights are secured."

Many thousands of Irishmen, believing such words and believing that Ireland was, in truth, one of the allies fighting in the common cause of all, fought and died in that war. At the end of it the promises were dishonored and Irishmen had to fight long and bitterly to obtain even a limited degree of freedom for a partitioned island. This might almost be described as an education in political cynicism, but I don't think our people are cynical. They believe in the principles professed by the Atlantic powers but they want to see those principles put into effect in Ireland. They are not bargaining about partition. There can be no question of a bargain where the rights of a nation are concerned. For Ireland, partition, in this context, represents two things—an absolute present bar to participation in a military alliance with Britain and a test of the reality of democratic principles.

As I see it, the wall which divides our country has already been undermined and it will collapse under a strong and resolute push. Those of you who put your shoulders to it are doing a great historic work. Remember that the fracture in Ireland is also a fracture in the Atlantic community—a community that can ill afford division.

It was a joyful day for the Irish people, as well as for America, when on St. Patrick's Day, 1776, the British troops evacuated your city and General Washington gave the countersign, "St. Patrick." On that far-off day, Britain left behind a former victim and an enemy and found before long that she had gained a trusty friend. I look forward to another evacuation day and to a similar outcome.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, as a further step toward national bankruptcy, we are now being urged by Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, to give 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India, with no strings attached.

Meanwhile, our farmers are suffering from a shortage of burlap to sack potatoes and other farm products; and there is an acute shortage of manganese and other strategic metals which are absolutely essential to our defense effort. India is the major producer of these materials but has shown no inclination to exchange them for wheat, preferring, apparently, to sell them to Russia or other countries and discriminate against the United States by imposing heavy export taxes.

The two letters appended express my views and the views of my constituents regarding the strange proposal of Dean Acheson in whom I have absolutely no confidence.

IDAHO-OREGON SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
Parma, Idaho, February 22, 1951.

Hon. JOHN T. WOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOOD: In light of recent proposals to send foodstuffs to India for the purpose of relieving the famine, we should like to call your attention to the present situation regarding the supply and costs of burlap used extensively in our industry and obtained primarily from India.

Members of this association, representing the major portion of shippers of fresh fruits and vegetables in this southwestern Idaho and eastern Oregon area, find that most of the companies supplying burlap to the trade believe they will have supplies of burlap on hand sufficient to cover the needs of the industry here during the months of July, August, and September. However, many of these companies presently will not offer those supplies to farsighted shippers, nor will they indicate definite prices. They give as a reason the present tight supply and price level.

India has, as we understand, a reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina wherein they trade burlap for wheat. Our members feel we should be in at least a similar position in light of our efforts to remedy India's famine.

Members of the potato and related shipping industries have requested that you be informed of this situation and that you be asked to exert your utmost surveillance both from a supply and a price standpoint. They also request that every consideration be given to a demand for a reciprocal trade agreement with India involving an exchange of burlap for foodstuffs supplied by our Government.

Our members feel that the bag-supply companies should be consulted and that the matter should be thoroughly coordinated with them. They believe that other industries using burlap such as the peanut industry and the grain industry, as well as the Textile Bag Manufacturers Association, should also be consulted with regard to this matter. Our members feel that the congressional delegates from all other potato-producing States will be equally interested in this problem and urge that you solicit their support and aid in working out this program.

Yours very truly,

WORDEN A. DAVIS,
Executive Manager.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1951.

Mr. and Mrs. GILBERT PARCH,
Potlatch, Idaho.

DEAR FOLKS: I can appreciate the fine Christian spirit shown in your recent letter requesting my support of legislation to send 2,000,000 tons of wheat for free to India.

The American people have always been ready to extend relief to the hungry and needy in all parts of the world. A readiness to help might be considered a national characteristic.

But I resent the efforts of the State Department to stampede Congress by widespread propaganda to put over this gift of wheat to India for the following reasons:

1. No information has been supplied Congress as to why such a gift is required, nor as to how it is to be distributed.

2. Mr. Nehru has even stated that the request for the wheat was unauthorized by him, and that if the wheat comes he does not want it as a gift. My understanding is that India has plenty of money, but due to the fact they planted their wheatlands into jute instead of wheat, they do not have the wheat, of course.

3. However, they do have an abundance of jute, which we need very badly; in fact I am getting letters from farmers complaining of their inability to get sufficient quantities to take care of the needs for this year at any price.

4. For the first time in the history of nations, I believe, India has placed an export tax on jute. They have doubled and trebled it within the last 2 years, and it is due to take a still larger rise immediately. My information is that this will make the price of jute prohibitive to the American farmer. One can understand a tax on imports, but one on exports does not seem to make much sense, unless a gouger is successful in getting away with it.

5. India has an abundance of manganese. We do not. We need it badly in our steel program. She does not offer to give us any. She should be willing to trade it for wheat. She also has other strategic metals which are in short supply here.

All of them she could spare could be traded for the wheat. I think it is very necessary for you to understand that this wheat famine is not because the farmers of India did not have a crop, nor because they are any poorer than our farmers. It is simply due to the cause I have already mentioned.

I might also point out that there is absolutely no provision within the Constitution whereby Congress may give anyone anything. Congress has no right to give your money or goods to anyone without value received.

Hoping this may clarify the subject in your mind, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN T. WOOD.

"On What That Money Buys and How We Buy It—Hinges the Real Security That the Air Force Can Give the People of This Country" (Eugene M. Zuckert)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it affords men no end of pleasure to join in class reunions—there, to brush elbows and again break bread with men whom they knew in the formative years of their lives. It is, likewise, a distinct honor for any man to be given opportunity to address the Harvard Business School Club at any time.

It was, therefore, a happy combination of circumstances which found Eugene M. Zuckert of the Yale class of 1933, Assistant Secretary of the United States Air Force, and one-time member of the Harvard Faculty School of Business Administration, addressing, but a few short weeks ago, the members of the Harvard Business School Club of New York City, the place of the Assistant Secretary's birth.

Mr. Speaker, Eugene Zuckert is no stranger to the Members of this House—nor to a great majority of those who sit in the Senate on the other end of the Capitol. We who know him well know that there are few men in Washington who so nearly fulfill the criteria that might be established to choose the ideal career man in Government more than does Eugene Zuckert.

Upon his graduation from Yale, Mr. Zuckert entered upon a combined Yale Law-Harvard Business School course—a pioneer, experimental course conducted by those two great universities, the purpose of which was to supplement legal training with business training in order that its graduates better understand the problems of business and of Government, as well as those of law—and, at the same time, coordinate them to the benefit of the Nation's welfare and the profit of the American taxpayer.

There might be other men in public life who elected to undergo such training and follow such a career, but there is none who has made greater sacrifice of his personal time and fortune in order to translate his learning into action programs that looked to the eventual introduction into Government of the same high standards of business administration that characterize our multi-billion-dollar corporations.

The postgraduate work which Eugene Zuckert took comprised a first year in Yale Law School—then, a second year in Harvard Business School—succeeded by two final years in the Yale Law School—during which Harvard Business School instructors did considerable of the teaching.

Even in this formative period, Eugene Zuckert was, first, an assistant director, and then later, director of the Yale moot law court. Upon his graduation, he received not alone the degree of bachelor of laws, but a certificate for the completion of the combined law-business school of both Harvard and of Yale.

Upon leaving college, he was admitted to the bar in the State of Connecticut, as well as New York, and while he practiced law in both States, most of his adult life as well as professional career has been devoted to public service, and, of a certainty, I think all who know him will agree that there are few men in Government who—because of their innate ability, character, and integrity—merit the confidence of this Congress more than does Eugene Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of Air.

While a member of the Harvard faculty, Mr. Zuckert served as a special consultant to the commanding general of the United States Air Force in developing statistical controls, and while an instructor of the Air Force Statistical Control School at Harvard, trained more than 3,000 Air Force officers, with rudiments of good business practices and administration which, today, are found grounded in Air Force administration at every level of command.

In addition to his duties with the Air Force, he served a full year in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations in connection with the Navy inventory control program. In September 1945 he was relieved of his command as a naval lieutenant to become the Assistant to the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, W. Stuart Symington. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the Hon. W. Stuart Symington, when he became Secretary of War for Air, named Mr. Zuckert as his special assistant?

Mr. Speaker, it was, indeed, no happenstance that, when the United States Air Force became an independent Department of Government, coequal in all matters with those of the Army and the Navy, in the National Defense Establishment, Mr. Zuckert became the first to be named Assistant Secretary of the United States Air Force.

In addition to his duties as Assistant Secretary, United States Air Force, Mr. Zuckert serves as Air Force representative on the personnel policy board as well as on the management committee, both of which are high policy-making agencies within the office of the Secretary of Defense.

In the field of management, he exercises supervision over the Air Force's cost control plan. This, of itself, established a new high in sound business administration within the military organization. He, likewise, has charge of the statistical control system; the development of organizational policy; civilian and military personnel policy; budgetary policy, as well as the educational and the training program.

Mr. Speaker, probably the most significant thing that brought good business practice to Government administration in the last 20 years was the establishment of a performance-type budget developed by Mr. Zuckert for use by the United States Air Force. This single accomplishment was of such moment and so vital to the economic administration of Government affairs that the establishment of this type of budget was acclaimed by Herbert Hoover's Commission, set up by Congress to study the reorganization of the executive departments of Government. That distinguished committee, whose report was acclaimed Nationwide—recommended to the Congress that the performance-type budget should be adopted in all armed services budgeting.

Mr. Speaker, the talk that Mr. Zuckert delivered at the Harvard Business School is exactly the kind of a talk that you would expect from a top-flight business executive. It is a discussion, among many, many other things, of the management problems common to all large business concerns.

It is exactly the kind of a talk that we would like to hear from all of our executives in Government. It comes from one whose duties make him responsible for the management of one of the greatest business concerns in all the world—the United States Air Force—a concern carrying on its payroll, at the present time, nearly a million persons, and with disbursement that runs into billions of dollars annually.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the great interest that every Member of this House has in the things that the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force has to say that I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD this wonderful talk by Eugene M. Zuckert.

That talk was as follows:

As things go in Washington, 5 years is a long time for an appointive official to stay within the same organization. I think if anybody asked me what was the common denominator that has emerged in my 5 years in the Air Force, I believe I would say it is the respect that I have gained for our military leadership.

It has become a constant source of amazement to me how quickly people are likely to seize upon the appellation of "brass," the most derogatory word in talking about our military leadership. That word "brass" seems to have acquired a connotation of a Colonel Blimp type of character with the most reactionary blind type of mentality. And, yet, when you hear the top military leadership abused, and the military itself, you sometimes wonder whether it could have been a coincidence that we were able to defeat Germany and Japan, that we were able to get thousands of bombers into the air, that we were able to get troops to Europe by the thousands in the last war, that submarines perform the miracles that they do.

Inevitably, you must draw, as I have drawn, the conclusion that all these things, and the combination of them, is not the result of a series of fortunate accidents, nor solely the result of the work of junior officers and Reserve officers brought in from civilian life. You inevitably reach the conclusion that our top military management does do an outstanding job under the most difficult conditions.

It has been a real experience to have been associated with Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley, Tooey Spaatz, Hap Arnold, Vandenberg, Collins, Admiral Sherman, and the rest, and not only them, but the people behind them. You grow to respect their real honesty, their basic self-sacrificing honesty, and their ability. Not completely without fault, but nevertheless, in my mind, the military has a quality of management that permits the attainment of objectives that seems impossible in contemplation, yet is overlooked in retrospect.

As I have said, this has been a tumultuous 5 years with changes up and down, cut-backs, and expansions of program. In 1946 when I first became associated with the Air Force, you will remember the Air Force and every other branch of our service was at its lowest ebb. The year before World War II had ended, the people back home had said, "Bring the boys back home."

In time—a matter of weeks—that demand was sweeping the Nation. It was loud and insistent, and, as it turned out, was not to be denied.

In 1946, we were still spilling men out of uniform. And as we did, we found we could not afford to keep much of our equipment. To begin with, we didn't have the manpower to handle it and, even where we had manpower, we found that our appropriations were cut so deeply that we just could not afford to spend for its upkeep.

What we were able to, we sold as surplus, in order not to burden our overhead. A lot of you well know that some of the surplus rotted on islands in the Pacific, at deserted bases in England, and here at home.

And today, in a few short years, the cycle is suddenly reversed. We find that now we are again building, and this time, apparently, building in earnest. We have made mistakes already in this building process. We have been thrust completely into a new emphasis. But it would not seem to me humanly possible not to make mistakes when today we are planning for more than double the number of men with which we started this fiscal year, and the spending in this year alone of $14,000,000,000.

The important point, I think, is that today we are profiting in the Air Force from our experience 10 years ago. There still are key men with us who learned the hard way back in 1940 and 1941.

Their guidance and their work down the line is going to help us stay along the right road. Not only that, but I think the Air Force has another very definite advantage in that we are relatively young and, being young, we are able to adapt ourselves readily to new methods and plans where it is proven that the present ones are faulty.

In short, I believe that the Air Force has the all-important essential of leadership, the youth and the flexibility to do the job we are facing, and to do it well.

Some of you may wonder why we didn't have our defense ready even when we were reducing our size back 5 and 6 years ago.

Well, we have had mobilization plans. Plans which we have worked hard over for the past 5 years.

But, if you have plans, you might ask, why haven't you followed these plans instead of starting off on relatively unchanged paths and succeeding apparently in confusing many, many people?

The answer is that while we planned for either of two possible eventualities, we got a third and a new one.

We drafted and we consciously followed a peacetime program of preparation. We had another plan on the shelf in case of war.

And then we found ourselves settling into the quicksand of something new in history.

We found ourselves—not at war—not at peace—but in a gray zone where we needed vast armament in order to preserve the peace and not go to war. Our plans to transform the civilian economy and swing into full war manufacturing—if war came—do not fit the situation at present.

So today we are faced with a new problem. And compared with it, I can tell you that war is a simple thing. When war begins, only the winning of the war matters. Everything else goes out of the window.

War, too, has a definite terminal point, and very tangible objectives along the way. But this gray war—this hot and cold war—can go on indefinitely. And we must fight it while at the same time maintaining our economy.

Thus, we are faced with the problem of building a large-scale, atomic-age war machine while, at the same time, maintaining a strong civilian economy, and the tax revenues it produces to pay the tremendous military bills.

Immediately before Korea, the entire defense budget had a $13,000,000,000 ceiling. This year, as I mentioned before, the budget for the Air Force alone is $14,000,000,000.

This year, in 6 months, in the Air Force alone, we have already committed over $8,000,000,000 merely for procurement.

On what that money buys and how we buy it hinges the real security that the Air Force can give the people of this country. And it is a security that we cannot turn off and on like a magic faucet. This seems to me the major factor underlying every decision the people of the United States and the Government must make; there must be a continuing purpose in our efforts, and there must be a continuing sense of the urgency of the problem if the costs and hardships they entail are not to be vainly suffered.

Getting down to the specifics of the situation, and only getting down to the Air Force situation; to begin with there are hundreds of specialties in which we must train our personnel. Getting them into uniform, telling them how to march, indoctrinating them, is only the first step. The training steps take from 6 months to several years, depending on the particular field that they work in. Therefore, we cannot, when things look good for the moment, stop our training program and 6 months later, when the storm clouds gather again, suddenly have the needed trained men.

It might interest you to know that today 33⅓ percent of our manpower is either in training or connected with this large and complex training program.

Our basic personnel problem is not in getting men. It is in getting men by specialty to fit into our complex operation. Trained men, alert men who can handle their assigned roles in modern warfare with its complex equipment, its jet planes, its radar.

Just take one simple example. One of our major radar operating in our air defense employs 1,300 different tubes, weighs 240 tons and requires adjustments down to a thousandth of a microsecond. Think of the training and the skill needed for men to be able to work on this one radar unit, to keep it in order, and actually to operate it for the purpose for which it is designed.

The man in uniform today has to have a basic education in order to be sent through

any one of the many highly specialized training schools. And this, let me repeat, takes time. Our technical courses average about 10 months.

It would take less time if we would somehow reach the plateau of our scientific knowledge. Then we could teach by rote; the men could memorize what they need to know.

But that is not the case. Our men must be trained so that as new developments are achieved, literally every week and every month, their background will be broad enough for them to adapt themselves to the latest discoveries and theories and types of equipment.

It's been a long time since a soldier could be prepared for war by being taught merely to fire a gun.

The equipment of modern warfare becomes more complicated each day too. And it takes longer to design, develop, and manufacture.

There must be months of planning before an order is placed; once the order is placed there are months—sometimes 2 or 3 years in the case of our long lead time items—before delivery can be made.

Our original planning visualized a D-day on which peacetime contractors would be expanded to all-out production, civilian producers converted to war work, standby plants reopened and new plants built. However, this is not our present situation.

While we are anxious to continue the greatest possible civilian production we, nevertheless, face the fact that shortages, rationing of essential materials, and credit restrictions are idling some plants. This presents a serious economic situation. It is only logical that the idle hands from auto, home appliance, and other industries should be put to work on defense goods.

In absorbing this capacity which would otherwise be dissipated, we have sought to avoid worker migrations with its attendant difficulties.

It also has long been Air Force policy to broaden the productive base. We have sought to involve as many separate factories as possible in peacetime aircraft production and production of the necessary components. This has resulted in the creation of a diversified industry network which, now that expansion has become necessary, can grow more rapidly because not only the brains of big industry but those of many small suppliers are devoted to the job of getting out more—quickly.

This policy will be of increasing aid to that vital segment of our business structure—the small manufacturer.

It is also one of the foundations upon which we base our hopes of achieving the production goal set forth by the President—a fivefold increase by December 1951 of the December 1950 plane-production capacity.

Automotive firms are already augmenting the output of the aircraft industry: Kaiser-Frazer is preparing to build Fairchild C-119's, Packard is getting ready to the build J-47 jet engines; Ford is tooling up to produce Pratt & Whitney engines in Chicago; General Motors is going to manufacture Republic F-84 fighters and J-65 engines.

The aircraft industry proper is going to be called upon for far more production than it is delivering at present. And as long as it is a gray, rather than an all-out war, the converted civilian plants are going to operate at far below their full wartime potential.

Normal aircraft-industry plants and converted plants will be capable of vastly increased capacity.

We will thus have substituted many sources of supply for the few we had in peacetime.

This will be vitally important if war should strike.

For it would mean that we would have avoided the bitterly slow process of having to build new plants, hire men, locate management, produce, and install complicated machine tools before getting increased production.

We will be prepared to expand with greater ease to the output needed to hit our potential enemy with the results of full production from the greatest industrial machine in world history.

We are also getting better geographic distribution of essential production.

We cannot transplant our entire industrial organization to midcontinent in the hope that it would be out of the range of an enemy.

If, as we are told, there is no hiding place for us as individuals, how can we expect to find a hiding place for our vast industries?

Many have expressed concern at the slowness with which much of our equipment is turned out. These people overlook one important factor: That much of our needed fighting equipment is new, barely out of the development stage.

Take electronics for example. We can't move in and take away from a company that is manufacturing some electronic device upon which we are depending strongly. Many of our new electronic devices are scarcely out of the breadboard stage. Throughout the early part of their production they cannot be taken away from the mothering of the engineers.

In aviation we are in a constant state of evolution; each day brings advances in almost every major item. Therefore, we are not faced with a production problem alone—it is also a problem of engineering.

One of our major electronics producers has 6,500 employees. Of these 6,500, 1,295 are fully qualified engineers and 20 percent of the latter have graduate degrees. That, I think, is a good indication of the complexity of the equipment and the production problem in modern aviation, and the extent to which production and engineering are inextricably tied together in getting out the tools with which we would have to fight a war and which must be produced in quantity if we are to be prepared.

I have been talking tonight about limiting myself pretty much to the problems of the Air Force. But the same principle holds true for the other services. The complexity of our job, the number of individuals' lives we are concerned with, the share of the economy which must be dedicated to preparedness, make one problem overshadow all else and that is the road ahead.

Every step we take, every decision we make will affect each one of us. This fight against communism, imperialistic communism, is going to mean more to you with the passing of each day than a clash of ideas and ideals.

The clash will be felt in specifics that will touch on our daily lives.

It will be noticed at the neighborhood hardware store, for example. Machine tools may not be built for any other purpose but defense plants for the next 3 to 5 years. Naturally, this will mean a drying up of production for other items.

Even the hand tools that you use in your basement carpentry—if you happen to be handier than I am—will not be produced in the quantity they have been.

Automatic washing machines, television sets, irons—just about any product you can mention will gradually be cut back. All of this will mean that our living standard will also cut back.

High living standards cannot help but be limited to a certain substantial degree. That is a fact we will face.

How will we face it?

You may remember that shortly after the outbreak of the Korean war, when the going was tough, a national weekly magazine took a poll in a Midwest town. It printed the pictures and reactions of a cross section of that typical American city.

At that time those interviewed were almost unanimous in approving our action. They were all for holding high the torch of freedom in that far-off oriental land.

Well, that was back last summer. About a month ago the same magazine made the same survey in the same town.

What did it find?

It found that those people preponderately now believe we should get out of Korea; that Korea was, to sum it up briefly, all a mistake.

Underlying that is something of gravest importance to you and to me. For it means that if this town in the Midwest is representative of the American people in the thousands of towns in the rest of that and the other 47 States, then perhaps we should have a floating foreign policy. We should be against aggression in Korea one day; passive about it the next. We should be ready to defend the free nations of Europe today and abandon them tomorrow.

In other words, if we were to follow the lesson of this survey in one representative American town, we should have a foreign policy that ebbs and flows.

Because I am with the Air Force, one of the tools used in enforcing that foreign policy, I fear for the future if we are to toy with the idea of embracing an "on again, off again" approach to international affairs.

The question is, Are we willing to assume the role that has been forced upon us? The role of world leadership which this poll seems to indicate we are trying to push aside.

It has always been my confident opinion that we are capable of accepting our rightful leadership.

But the test is today and tomorrow.

It is no longer enough to honor our illustrious forebear; to talk about the courage of the Pilgrims, the vision of the pioneers, the ability of our industrial leaders who made the machine age possible.

We can no longer rest on past glories.

Today, in Korea—and in the rest of the world for that matter—we have accepted the challenge of communism.

Do we mean it?

I can't answer that question, but I believe I know when the answer will be available.

It will come after we are hit with greatly increased taxes—it will come when we begin to feel the impact of some of the sacrifices and restrictions that I have mentioned before. It will come when perhaps there is no Korea. It will come when there is a temporary stalemate or, perhaps, a turn for the better in international affairs.

An insidious combination of these two things might be too heavy for us. We might look, for example, at that big boost in our income taxes and the calm diplomatic waters and ask, "What's going on here * * * why should we be spending this money when there is no longer any threat to our freedom?"

That, gentlemen, will be the theme of decision.

Will we then want to turn back, or even to procrastinate?

I hope I have shown that the nature of modern warfare, the nature of air war means we cannot start and stop; that we cannot be on guard one day, at ease the next.

National security is a long range project. It will not allow us the luxury of slacking off when we become disgruntled with our tax bills.

But the choice is always ours.

We made it in 1940—we made it, in another direction, in 1945.

Happily, under our system in this country, the people have the final say. The Pentagon building and every plane, tank and ship it is charged with are all under one command—the citizens of this country.

I feel that the decision they make, you make, as we smooth out our course, will be the right one. Only then can we insure peace and freedom.

Virginia's Man of the Midcentury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an abridgement of an article by Virginius Dabney, esteemed editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, which appeared in the magazine Virginia and the Virginia County:

VIRGINIA'S MAN OF THE MIDCENTURY

(By Virginius Dabney)

United States Senator HARRY F. BYRD has had a long public career, distinguished by a number of qualities seldom combined in one individual. He has shown high ability, great industry, and extraordinary capacity for handling men. An expert administrator, he is also a profound student of government. More than all this, he has evidenced a ready willingness, rare among officeholders, to express unpopular opinions. In other words, he has valued his own intellectual integrity from time to time above the prejudices and whims of the electorate. This last-named quality of independent thinking was most notably displayed in the 1930's, when Senator BYRD was usually to be found in opposition to the overwhelmingly popular New Deal policies of President Roosevelt.

Many disagreed sharply with Senator BYRD when he was attacking the Roosevelt program. They felt that he was ultraconservative, if not reactionary; that he was alined with groups which were using arguments against Federal expansion and in favor of States' rights as a smoke screen for exploitation, and that, in general, he was sadly out of tune with the times.

Today, as the senior Senator from Virginia is chosen Virginia's Man of the Mid-Century, a goodly number of his former critics, of whom this writer is one, are happy to acclaim the appropriateness of the selection. Some of us still do not agree with all his views, but we are glad to acknowledge the great service he rendered as Governor of Virginia, and his equally great service as United States Senator from Virginia.

The apple-cheeked apple grower from the Shenandoah Valley is one of the few people in Washington who not only says he believes in Federal economy, but who actually does something about it. He is also one of the Nation's most forthright advocates of States' rights, and hence one of the principal foes of federalization and socialization. This is not to say that he is against all the innovations in government introduced by President Roosevelt. For example, he was strongly opposed to social security at first, but observation of the system in operation convinced him that he was mistaken. He is now a supporter of social security, for he has concluded that the provisions for State and local matching serve as protection against the evils which he feared would flow from unemployment relief, old-age pensions, and assistance for dependent children and the blind.

Mr. BYRD's early skepticism concerning this program sprang from his ingrained and deeply felt conviction that citizens of a free country ought to make their own way, insofar as possible, without the aid of any governmental agency, whether local, State, or Federal. Doubtless this feeling is strengthened and fortified by his own ruggedly individualistic career. He went to work before he finished high school, made a conspicuous success in newspaper publishing and apple growing, and then entered politics. Except that his family had been prominent in the Democratic organization (his father, Richard E. Byrd, having been speaker of the house of delegates, and his uncle, Hal D. Flood, United States Representative from the Fourth Virginia District), young HARRY BYRD made his way upward strictly through his own efforts. If he enjoyed a certain amount of pull at the outset of his plunge into politics as a member of the Virginia General Assembly, he soon revealed extraordinary political acumen.

HARRY BYRD was born 63 years ago in Martinsburg, W. Va., where his family happened to be living, but they brought him to Virginia as an infant, and he has been a resident ever since. A direct descendant of the Byrds of "Westover," one of whom founded the city of Richmond, he was of aristocratic Virginia lineage, and determined to become worthy of his heritage. He grew up in Winchester, and attended the public schools there as well as nearby Shenandoah Valley Academy. When his father's newspaper, the Winchester Star, became practically bankrupt, young HARRY left school at the age of 15, and took over its management. He soon had the paper back on its feet. From that day forward he was marked for success.

In 1915, at the age of 27, BYRD entered the State senate, where he served for a decade. He was one of the younger members throughout his career in that body, and was a hard worker who made few speeches. Always closely affiliated with the organization, he so impressed its leadership that he was made chairman of the State Democratic Committee at the age of 33. The following year he was named to head the pay-as-you-go forces who were fighting a proposed $50,000,000 bond issue for highways. So effective was his work in that contest that the bond issue was beaten by a substantial majority. HARRY BYRD promptly became a State-wide figure, destined for high office.

"Pay-as-you-go" had been a cardinal tenet with Senator BYRD since before that highway referendum back in 1923. Unbalanced budgets and spending beyond one's ability to repay have always been deemed by him nothing less than ruinous. His whole career has been molded by this philosophy. It is one of the things which does most to explain his opposition to many policies of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

While his success in the road-bond campaign did much to make him a potential candidate for Governor, young BYRD had not planned to run in 1925. However, he got into the same taxicab with Bishop James Cannon, Jr., the powerful and devious prohibitionist leader, during the 1924 Democratic National Convention in New York, and Cannon unintentionally caused him to enter the race. The bishop inadvertently achieved this result by telling BYRD not to run, since "we," meaning the bishop and his cohorts, "have decided to elect Walter Mapp." This made BYRD so furious that he ran against Mapp the following year, and defeated him by a large majority.

The youthful executive opened his gubernatorial career by attending his inauguration in a derby hat, instead of the conventional "stovepipe" worn by governors at inaugural ceremonies from time immemorial. He did this to please a farmer who had expressed the hope that he would not put on the dog when he went to the governor's mansion.

The derby he wore was typical of the unassuming character and undramatic dress of the new governor.

The members of the general assembly were not disturbed by these manifestations, however. On the contrary, the 38-year-old executive soon had them practically eating out of his hand. This, despite the fact that he made it clear in his inaugural address that he intended to embark upon some extensive and sorely needed reforms in the State government. With his unusual ability to analyze popular trends, HARRY BYRD had seen that the time was ripe for these reforms, and that if the organization refused to heed the signs of the times, it might go down to defeat 4 years later. By putting through his progressive program, he had much to do with consolidating the hold of the organization on the State, a hold which has been maintained almost without interruption from that day to this.

The manner in which BYRD secured the adoption of his program as governor could well serve as a model for those wishing to combine practical political accomplishment with idealistic objectives. He instituted an extensive reorganization of the State government at the session of 1926 immediately following his induction into office and performed such near miracles as abolishing 99 surplus commissioners of the revenue. A whole series of reorganization bills, many of which had been overwhelmingly defeated during the administrations of his predecessors, went through with scarcely a hitch. The largest adverse vote on any of them from the House's 100 members was 15, while not more than 6 of the 40 Senators could be mustered in opposition at any one time. A number of the measures went through both branches unanimously.

At subsequent legislative sessions his record was comparable. The 100-odd departments, agencies, and bureaus of the State government were consolidated into a dozen departments. Various changes were made in the interests of simplification and economy, and some $400,000 a year was saved. Those were the days when $400,000 was a lot of money, and not just an amount tossed down a Washington rathole at almost any hour of the day or night.

Governor BYRD also made county government in Virginia more flexible by securing the enactment of a constitutional amendment which permitted the voters of any county to adopt one of several new governmental forms and to abandon the rigid form previously prescribed.

The short ballot was likewise adopted during the Byrd administration. This much-disputed reform is still being hotly debated. It was recommended in 1928 by nearly all the leading students of government in the United States, and it squeaked through by a small majority. It has remained in the organic law ever since, despite criticism from various directions.

The accomplishments of the Byrd administration were by no means confined to overhauling the antiquated State and county governments. State appropriations to roads and schools were unprecedentedly large. The tax structure was revised, and so many new industries were attracted to Virginia that the total value of these new plants acquired in 1928 surpassed similar acquisitions for that year in every other State in the Union.

Yet it would not be at all accurate to say that Governor BYRD was excessively partial to business or industry. On the contrary, he fought bitter battles with the oil companies and the telephone company and defeated them. His run-in with the oil companies had to do with the price of gasoline in Virginia, and over their violent protest he rammed a bill through the general assembly requiring them to furnish the Governor with their wholesale and retail gasoline prices in Virginia and other States.

His successful contest with the telephone company had as its purpose the checkmating of that concern in its plan to put increased rates into effect before this had been authorized by the State's highest court.

His administration was likewise notable for the enactment of the first strong anti-lynching bill of its kind in the United States, a bill which doubtless is at least partially responsible for the fact that there hasn't been a lynching in the Old Dominion in the 22 years since it was passed.

The Byrd gubernatorial administration was regarded as the most notable of any Virginia Governor since the Civil War. Mr. BYRD was praised and his record was reviewed in many national magazines, his reforms in Virginia were studied by visiting delegations from other sections of the Union, and he was invited to deliver numerous addresses.

He was considered one of the leading progressives in the Democratic Party. His victories over the oil and telephone companies, his pioneering sponsorship of a strong anti-lynching bill, and his fearless approach to governmental reform caused him to be the subject of a laudatory article in the Nation, of New York, a weekly with rather leftish views.

When Governor BYRD left the mansion in Richmond to return to his apple orchards and to indulge in his favorite sports of hunting and hiking, he said he had no further political plans, and that was true. But his name was presented to the Democratic National Convention of 1932 as Virginia's candidate for the Presidency. It seemed highly improbable that he would be named, and nobody was particularly surprised when Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, was chosen. It appeared evident, however, that the man who had attracted such attention from the Nation during his gubernatorial term in Virginia would be prominent in the councils of the party if the Democrats won the election, particularly since he was so enthusiastic in his approval of the platform on which President Roosevelt had been nominated.

President Roosevelt's selection of United States Senator Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia, as his Secretary of the Navy, left a vacancy in the Senate from Virginia, and Gov. John Garland Pollard promptly appointed Mr. BYRD to fill it. Thus began the senatorial career of the gentleman from Virginia, as he took his seat in 1933 beside Senator Carter Glass.

At the outset, Senator BYRD was in sympathy with much that President Roosevelt did, but when the Chief Executive abandoned the platform of 1932 calling for reduced Federal expenditures, a balanced budget and the return of rights to the States and embarked upon a program almost diametrically opposed to that platform, the junior Senator from Virginia refused to go along. He not only spoke out against the spending, but he also opposed such measures as the National Recovery Act (NRA) and the Guffey Coal Act, both of which were later declared unconstitutional.

As the New Deal developed further in various directions, Senator BYRD became increasingly convinced that he couldn't go along. He knew that this was an unpopular course, not only in Virginia but throughout the Nation, but he refused to get on the bandwagon. When Mr. Roosevelt was reelected by a landslide in the Roosevelt-Landon contest in 1936, the Virginia Senator did not alter his position. Somewhat later the Court-packing plan and the Presidential attempt to purge various Members of Congress made Mr. BYRD more certain than ever that the occupant of the White House was following policies to which he could never subscribe.

One of the most important tasks Senator BYRD has carried out in Congress has been as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Expenditures. Organized in 1941, this agency is still functioning, despite the efforts of wild-eyed Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and others, to abolish it. Competent authorities estimate that the committee has saved at least $2,500,000,000 since it was created. Its chairman kept the committee operating at one time by using his own office staff when Congress refused to vote additional funds.

On the foreign front, Virginia's senior Senator has been more sympathetic to the program of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, although here again he has exercised his own judgment, and has shown the same sort of independence that has characterized his attitude toward New Deal and Fair Deal domestic policies.

Before and during World War II, Senator BYRD was a stanch supporter of plans for the arming of America against the threat of the Axis. His three sons entered the Armed Forces after Pearl Harbor and he himself did his utmost to further the successful prosecution of the war. When it neared its end, he went to the United Nations conference at San Francisco and urged adoption of the charter, but advocated elimination of the veto. It is now clear that Russia's reckless and indiscriminate use of this veto power has greatly weakened the UN's effectiveness.

Since the end of the war, Senator BYRD has supported some of the key measures designed to strengthen the Western World against the Soviets. He voted for the Atlantic Pact, upon obtaining assurance from Secretary of State Acheson that by so doing he was not committing himself to support the peacetime arming of small nations in various areas of the world. He voted against the Truman program for aid to Greece and Turkey, taking the position that it was a violation of the United Nations Charter for this country to arm another country without first getting UN approval.

More recently he went on record as favoring universal military training, a 70-group Air Force and a radar screen for the United States. But he has frequently expressed apprehension lest our commitments in all parts of the world, added to the cost of arming ourselves at home, will so weaken us financially, and will so undermine the private enterprise system that we shall be unable to make effective resistance to the Soviets. Senator BYRD has often declared that the free world cannot remain free, unless the United States remains solvent and maintains its ability to out-produce the rest of the globe in implements of war.

Anyone who wishes a superlative example of his incisive way of handling a fiscal problem should read his letter to Chairman Marriner S. Eccles, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 16, 1939. This reply by Mr. BYRD to a letter he had received from Mr. Eccles is one of the clearest and most convincing arguments against continued Federal spending that this writer has ever seen, and is in rebuttal to the argument that Government debts and deficits are good for their own sakes. In it Senator BYRD shows himself to be a master of fiscal principles, as well as the wielder of a pungent pen. His statement was truly devastating, for he not only answered Eccles' arguments, but dug up quotations from Eccles' own addresses in which Eccles contradicted and answered himself.

In recent years, Senator BYRD has become a convincing and forceful speaker.

An impressive example of his latter-day platform technique is seen in the transcript of an address he delivered last April before the Academy of Political Science. He spoke from the same platform with the scholarly Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and the two men appeared on virtually opposite sides of the topic "American Democracy and the Welfare State." The striking thing about this occasion was the manner in which the well-informed audience clearly preferred Mr. BYRD's presentation to that of Mr. DOUGLAS. This is shown in various ways. The words "laughter" and "applause" punctuate the transcript of the Byrd address far more frequently than that of his senatorial colleague. Furthermore, at the close of Mr. BYRD's speech "the audience rose and applauded," whereas it had not risen for Senator DOUGLAS. If anybody needs to be convinced that HARRY BYRD has become a finished public speaker, the proceedings of the Academy of Political Science for May 1950, are heartily recommended.

In appraising the public service of Senator BYRD, one must also appraise the political organization in Virginia of which he has long been the recognized leader. Admittedly the "Byrd machine" have its faults, and this writer has often been at pains to point them out. Yet any balanced view of this machine must credit it with giving Virginia honest and relatively economical and efficient government.

The high caliber of most of the men who direct the various State departments and agencies under the Byrd organization should be mentioned. This is one of the sources of the machine's strength, and one of the things which differentiate it sharply from such notorious political aggregations as those of Hague, Crump, and Tammany. The almost complete absence of graft also is noteworthy, and in contrast to the situation prevailing in some States.

The Democratic organization in Virginia has not been as closely run by Senator BYRD in recent years as it once was. He has been busy with national affairs, and hence has not kept his fingers so constantly on the State's political pulse.

But the dominant wing of the Democratic Party in Virginia still bears the strong imprint of the Byrd personality and character. He became its leader a quarter of a century ago, and his name has been associated with it in the public mind ever since. If some persons outside Virginia are so uninformed as to compare the Byrd machine with the notoriously crooked and corrupt political organizations in other parts of the Nation, they are merely displaying their ignorance. As noted above, there is no justification for such comparisons. Whatever one may think of Senator BYRD's extremely conservative philosophy, every one who knows him is aware that he would never tolerate thievery and skulduggery.

One of the best touchstones of his character is to be seen in the fact that although he is legally entitled to substantial soil conservation payments from the Federal Treasury, in connection with the operation of his vast orchards (the largest privately owned apple orchards in the world), he has declined to accept them. He does not feel that a Senator should take any money from the National Government except his salary as a Member of the Congress. Senator BYRD estimates that the soil conservation money he has refused amounts to some $8,000 a year for 15 years, or approximately $120,000.

Such is the high code of personal integrity which guides Virginia's senior Senator. It is a code which might well be emulated in our public life, and it is one of the various reasons which might be given in support of his selection as Virginia's Man of the Mid-century. No Virginian of this generation, it seems safe to say, is more representative of the courage, the ability, the honesty, and the self-reliance that we like to associate with the Old Dominion.

India Scorns Reds' Peace Offer—Party Pledges Are Held Worthless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the attached news story from the New York Times of Sunday, March 11, speaks more eloquently and officially about the position of India than rumors and surmise or the unauthoritative speeches of lecturers in the United States. Whatever else may be clear one this is sure—India is against communism and Communists:

INDIA SCORNS REDS' PEACE OFFER—PARTY PLEDGES ARE HELD WORTHLESS

(By Robert Trumbull)

NEW DELHI, INDIA, March 10.—In a formal policy statement laid before Parliament today the Indian Government flatly rejected a peace offer by the Indian Communist Party and showed that the official attitude toward the Communists had hardened.

The brief document also made it clear for the first time in public that New Delhi had taken official note of the international character of Communist aggression and was not merely opposed to the Indian Communist Party on the sole ground that this organization used terroristic methods.

Chakravarty Rajagopalachari, the senior statesmen of the cabinet, presented the statement to the House. In it he dealt sarcastically with the value of promises made by the Communists. He said that in "each single member" of the Communist Party anywhere the "sense of scruple or moral hesitation is totally wiped out."

Mr. Rajagopalachari, as Home Minister, is directly responsible for curbing Communists lawlessness, which is a serious problem in south and northeastern India. In his statement today he firmly refused the published offer of the Indian Communist Party, implying that it would reform and become a constitutional and peaceful political group if the Government would revoke the Preventive Detention Act.

Under this law, recently extended for 1 year, suspected subversives can be held in jail without bail for as long as the act is in force provided the Government proves firm grounds for detention to the satisfaction of a panel of retired high court justices. This must be done within 10 weeks after an arrest.

Mr. Rajagopalachari made it clear that he was unwilling to accept at face value any assurances of any nature from the Communists and challenged them to prove their good faith first. Meanwhile, the Preventive Detention Act, which he put through at this session of Parliament, will stay on the books and be enforced by him. In the same statement he applied this policy equally to the Hindu Mahasabha, a party that wishes to convert India into a Hindu religious state. This organization also recently affirmed its peaceful intentions, but Mr. Rajagopalachari today demanded to be shown by deeds rather than promises.

Mr. Rajagopalachari's influence in the Cabinet is thought to be second only to that of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. His utterances on communism since becoming Home Minister have indicated an even more uncompromising attitude than that of his predecessor, the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, who was generally regarded as representing the right wing in Indian politics.

At any rate, whatever policies are set forth by Mr. Rajagopalachari in such an open and official manner as today's, can safely be taken as being more nearly representative of the Indian Government's frame of mind than the leftist speeches of comparative nonentities that have received wide publicity in the United States.

RED DOCUMENTS QUOTED

Mr. Rajagopalchari's statement on the Communist Party and the Mahasabha contained significant excerpts from Communist documents showing the party's intentions in India. His statement follows in part:

"The attention of the Government was drawn to a press item dated February 17, 1951, to the effect that the Communist Party challenged the Home Minister to withdraw the Preventive Detention Act and do certain other things and then it was stated that they would act as a regular political party in the open, presumably dropping their present violent and secret activities.

"If the men who have grouped themselves and practice terrorism and sabotage in the name of communism will not merely issue challenges and make conditional offers of adopting peaceful and open political life, but will back profession with practice, we could take the risks involved in trusting them. Past conduct cannot just be wiped out by the simple press statement.

"Such declarations should be backed by actual behavior.

"Honorable members have read the narrative of Ignazio Silone (noted Italian author) of the meeting of the Communist Party at which, when the British Communists were asked on their return home to make a public declaration in a certain sense but actually do the contrary, and one of the British Communists exclaimed: 'But that would be a lie.' Loud laughter greeted this simplicity, and filled the hall. The Communists could not understand the Englishman's stupid objection to making a misleading or false declaration."

SENSE OF SCRUPLE WIPED OUT

"The fact of the matter is that the Communist Party's discipline evolves a psychological mechanism whereby each single member becomes progressively identified with the collective organization until a sense of scruple or moral hesitation is totally wiped out. Ethical objections become just ancient wrongs worthy of scorn and derision.

"Three leading Indian Communists issued to their comrades a statement on September 23, 1950. It is categorically stated therein that the party should 'put the peasant movement progressively on the rails of the armed struggle and that in agrarian relations they should by mass mobilisation and direct action, as in Telengana (Hyderalas) create armed forces in rural areas and strong bases for their operation. It is further categorically stated therein that there is no question of liquidating Telengana but that on the contrary it is a question of raising the movement in the rest of the country to the level of Telengana.'

"The Politburo of the Communist Party of India issued a policy statement on November 15, 1950, in the following terms:

"'Finally it is necessary to clearly grasp the truth that the armed struggle has become the principal form of struggle in the present agrarian revolutionary stage that our national liberation movement has grown to.'

"It was added that simultaneously they should adopt and coordinate all other conceivable forms of struggle, such as economic and political strikes, demonstrations, agricultural, labor and tenant struggles, signature collections for peace pledge, and election contest and so on.

"An important foreign Communist who was invited to advise the Indian Communist Party gave the following speech in December 1950:

"'It is the task of the Communist Party to skillfully utilize the stand of the Nehru Government on questions like Korea, the atom bomb. Regarding the "armed" struggle, as we have stated in our letter, we do not deny that ultimately the revolution in India will and must take the form of an armed struggle. It is hardly to be debated.'

"It is thus clear that we cannot accept declarations and challenges but must await facts and whether the crime reported from Telengana, Madras, and Assam and elsewhere shows substantial decrease.

"The attention of the Government was also drawn to a statement on behalf of the Hindu Mahasabha dated February 18, 1951. It is gratifying to read in it that their policy of communalism does not include violence. But there is the basic fact that their policies have an inherent tendency to rouse strong passions between communities and generate violence.

"Their line of thought and propaganda, and therefore of action, are inconsistent with the basic principle of our Constitution. What is communalism to us is nationalism to them.

"All the same we can tolerate anything if deception and violence be truly shut. The Hindu Mahasabha claims that it is a bearer of culture. There could be no difficulty if the Hindu code of conduct were truly respected and followed. In the pattern of behavior known as Hindu culture there is no room for violence or hatred."

Rigid Ceiling on Cotton Invites Cut in Production and Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished and able colleague, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, for the great fight he is making in behalf of the cotton farmers of the South. Mr. BROWN is vice chairman of the joint "watchdog committee" on defense production. Mr. BROWN has lived with the cotton problem night and day for almost a generation.

I only wish those who are responsible for this ceiling on raw cotton would consult with men in the south such as Mr. BROWN who are familiar with the cost of raising cotton.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members of this House will read the following editorial by former United States Senator, Wilton E. Hall, now publisher of the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S. C., one of the South's greatest daily papers:

RIGID CEILING ON COTTON INVITES CUT IN PRODUCTION AND DISASTER

The Nation's cotton supplies already are a cause of concern in the textile trade.

Should unforeseen demand confront the industry there might be a definite shortage.

Because of the importance of cotton to the defense effort, the Government has called upon farmers to produce at least 16,000,000 bales this season.

In the face of this, the Office of Price Stabilization has arbitrarily set a ceiling on the price of raw cotton—something that was never done during World War II.

Indications are that this action was taken without consideration of the advice of men who know cotton, its marketing and the intricate problems involved.

It is proper that Representative PAUL BROWN of Elberton, Ga., vice chairman of the House "watchdog" committee on defense production, has called for a congressional inquiry into the cotton order.

He wants to know why the stabilization office has "fixed rigid ceilings on raw cotton instead of using textile ceilings and the cotton price stabilization program recommended by the Department of Agriculture to halt inflation."

Congressman BROWN believes that everything possible must be done to stop inflation and stabilize the cost of living.

But, as he points out, "in the case of cotton, the consumer is fully protected by ceilings on finished goods. Besides, the price of a man's shirt, which is too high already, would hardly be affected if you gave the cotton away in the first place. "The farmer," Representative BROWN declared, "gets only about 20 cents in a $4.50 white shirt. A fixed ceiling price on raw cotton tends to destroy the entire marketing system and as a result may depress cotton prices for the new crop.

"This will discourage the farmers in their efforts to attain the 16,000,000-bale crop so urgently needed in the Nation's mobilization effort."

He makes this important point:

"Farmers are not asking for higher prices but they are entitled to protection against prices below their production costs before they go all-out in planting."

With the price of cotton rigidly set, mills and cotton merchants will not buy and stock cotton for future requirements as has been the practice.

The tendency will be to wait pending a time when the market is well loaded with cotton and to take advantage of correspondingly lower prices.

Obviously there is need for adjustment in the cotton price order for two ample reasons: First, out of fairness to cotton farmers; second, to encourage all-out production of cotton that will be needed if there is a spread in the war.

A short cotton crop this season could be the Achilles heel in the whole defense effort. If OPS refuses to recognize that fact, Congress should take the necessary steps to protect the Nation.

The Battle of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on Sunday last the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and I participated in a discussion on the American Forum of the Air, the founder and moderator of which is Mr. Theodore Granik. The subject was announced as the Battle of the Budget. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the discussion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Here with us today on the American Forum of the Air are Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming, a leading member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, second ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, appearing in the absence of Senator SYLES BRIDGES, who is ill.

Now, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. The $72,000,000,000 budget requested by President Truman for this year means higher taxes for individuals and for business. On Capitol Hill the President's budget is the center of controversy. Heavy defense spending brings a demand for cutting of nondefense expenses to the bone. The President himself stated it would not be possible to cut the budget. If it is to be cut, Congress must do the pruning job; and some questions confront our Congress.

Can the defense effort be put on a pay-as-we-go basis? What new taxes are needed and how do we get them?

Now, Senator O'MAHONEY, do you think Congress can cut the budget or find ways to bring in more income?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I think Congress can do both. I think Congress ought to do both. But it will take a lot of courage and a lot of sacrifice and a lot of hard work. Ninety percent of the budget which is now before us is for war-connected expenditures of one kind or another. And the last two Congresses, the Eightieth and the Eighty-first, have added new expenditures which the Congress must decide whether or not to maintain.

For example, last August we passed an extension of social security, adding some 10,000,000 people to the coverage and increasing the public assistance payments to the States by about $200,000,000. That bill came out of the Finance Committee of the Senate which is one of the most conservative committees in the Senate. There was no minority report except a dissenting view by Senator BUTLER of Nebraska who said that although the Government must provide social security, he didn't believe it was doing it the right way in this bill. That was an increased expenditure which was approved in the Senate by a vote of 81 to 2.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator FERGUSON.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, I agree we must do both things. We have to cut the size of the budget, and we have to see that we do not have deficit spending. It will all depend upon whether or not we can cut the budget enough as to whether or not we have to increase the taxes. If we cut the budget enough, then we won't have to increase the size of the taxes, or as much.

I think there are probably four ways that we can cut this budget. First, we can cut out the new spending. And then we can make very definite cuts on public works, and what departments are doing. Then we can cut out authorizations. We have got to remember that the Hoover Commission didn't go into functions of the Government at all. They only went into whether or not there was duplication and overlapping and inefficiency. So there is a program we can go after. That is in the functions of the Government, to see whether the Government is doing the things that the people must have done, or whether or not some of these things cannot be done by the people back home in one of two ways, either by themselves or by their local government or by their State government. Finally, there are the Hoover Commission recommendations for economy and efficiency, which we should pursue diligently.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator O'MAHONEY.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Senator FERGUSON is quite right, but the problem is: How are you going to do it? What functions shall we drop? Let us look at Federal aid to public highways. The trucking associations are interested in that problem. The budget this year carries about $464,000,000 for Federal aid to public highways. Most of that is to pay for commitments already made. The States, upon the authority of the extension of the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved by the Eightieth Congress and also approved by the Eighty-first Congress, have already undertaken contractual work to improve the highways. To what extent, therefore, are we going to cut the appropriations for Federal highways without injuring business?

I have addressed a letter to every governor in the United States asking all governors to advise the Joint Economic Committee to what extent Federal aid to highways can be cut, and I have as yet received no suggestion for a cut from any governor of any State.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator FERGUSON.

Senator FERGUSON. Of course, I know what we are up against in the cutting of this budget. One trouble is with the people back home. Let's face it. The Government is trying to satisfy too many people. And as long as you are going to spend dollars, whether it is on highways or any other way, the people, naturally, who are interested in those particular projects want more dollars.

Now, let's get back to this question, as indicated, that 90 percent—I don't think it is that high—of the present budget is going to be for military expenditures. Now, the question is: Can we cut anything out of the military expenditures?

Moderator GRANIK. Do you think we can mobilize during the emergency and still have a balanced budget?

SENATOR FERGUSON. I really think we can mobilize and have a balanced budget. In fact, if we don't have a balanced budget we are going to depreciate the dollar just that much. We know today—and the people back home must realize—that the dollar is only worth what it will buy in groceries, in wearing apparel, or any other things they need, including guns. Now, if they don't want to balance the budget, then they are going to find that this dollar is worth less money, and they are going to buy less groceries, less rent, less clothing, less housing, less everything. It has been estimated now that the dollar, compared to 1939, is worth about 46 cents. I got those last figures from the Secretary of Commerce.

Now, if the people insist upon getting everything from the Federal Government, then they are going to have to pay the bill. Now, they say, will Congress do anything about it? Not alone. You know that, JOE, and I know that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is right. Senator FERGUSON and I are both members of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Appropriations, and we know the gravity of the task that confronts us. For example, the Senate last week, with only five dissenting votes, passed an extension of the draft and universal military training. Now, that provides for at least 3,500,000 men. It costs about $5,300 just to clothe, feed, and provide small weapons for a soldier. That means about $19,000,000,000 for that purpose alone. Almost twice as much as the entire cost of the Federal Government 10 years ago.

Now, there are other expenditures which are war-connected, but are not defense spending. Take, for example, veterans' pensions and benefits. Congress can't cut those pensions and benefits unless it is willing to amend the law and reduce the pensions and benefits. And certainly Congress is not going to do that. It costs almost $5,000,000,000 a year to meet these pensions and benefits and to provide hospitalization and medical care for the veterans of past wars. And then there is the interest upon the national debt. These two categories represent about $11,000,000,000 which cannot be cut.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator, will you agree with Senator FERGUSON that we can mobilize during the present emergency and still have a balanced budget?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes, if we have the courage to tax ourselves. We ought to plug every single loophole by which tax revenue is escaping; but, at the same time, Congress owes it to the people who are going to pay the taxes to scrutinize every dollar in the budget to make certain that we shall not be wasting a single penny of public funds.

Senator FERGUSON. Of course, that is exactly what I think about it. I think it takes courage on the part of the legislators also to vote these cuts. But I want to say that we need more courage over in the White House and the Budget Director's office, too. The President comes before Congress today and puts in a budget of $71,600,000,000, and that isn't the whole budget. We are going to be asked to appropriate $94,400,000,000. That $71,600,000,000 is only the expenditures for this year. The $94,400,000,000 is what will be appropriated not only for the 1952 budget but for authorized spending that won't actually be paid during that period. If we are going to have a $16,500,000,000 deficit this year on this spending budget, requiring new taxes in that amount, wait until we feel the impact of that future authorized spending. Now, the President said this is a tight budget, that no items can be cut. In other words, he says that you can't take one dollar out of this budget. We just found the other day, JOE, remember, where they didn't put in the budget the overtime pay for a certain department. They are coming up for a supplemental appropriation on that. That will add almost a third to that payroll. They knew that requirement, but they didn't put it in the budget. Is that a "tight" budget?

Right here I want to say something about payrolls generally. When you people back home realize how much leap year is going to cost you because it has one more day in it, then you will appreciate the size of the Government's payroll. I'm getting those figures for the Government as a whole. Government employees are paid on a basis of 260 days a year. And when you get a leap year, then you have this extra day. And in this one department it ran well over $200,000 for the 1 day. It indicates how large this payroll is getting. And now we are putting on better than a thousand people per day to the payroll.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the amount of nondefense spending. I brought here, Mr. Moderator, a summary of the President's 1952 budget prepared by the staff of the Joint Internal Revenue Committee. That shows that the major national security program, including military, international, atomic energy, defense production, and so forth, amounts for 1952 to $52,000,000,000 plus, leaving $19,000,000,000. Then deducting from that sum the major fixed and continuing charges, interest upon the national debt, which we can't cut, veterans' services and benefits, which I have already discussed, permanent and indefinite appropriations, like the 30 percent continuing appropriation of all customs receipts which Congress has designated for the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities, we have another $13,900,000,000, leaving only $5,100,000,000 for the normal functions of the Government.

And when you analyze those, you find that it is impossible to make anything more than a $2,000,000,000 cut out of nondefense—and if we do that we will be very lucky.

Moderator GRANIK. How about that, Senator FERGUSON?

Senator FERGUSON. If we cut $2,000,000,000 out of that, and then $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 out of the military, we'll be well on our way. I want to say a word to the people about the military today. We need defense, but there is nothing sacrosanct about its budget.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you recommend cutting $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 out of the military?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, and I think it can be done. I say we need defense. There isn't anyone who is sincere about America who doesn't want this country to be defended. But the question is: Can we afford to do what the military are trying to do in this particular year, this particular day? That is the question. When we figure that out of the $50,000,000,000 spent for the military between 1946 and up to 1950, outside of another $30,000,000,000 or $40,000,000,000 to liquidate war costs, and we couldn't put really two divisions in the field, there is simply something wrong with the expenditures.

Now, personally, I believe that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps have got to get down to reckoning on the basis of fighting a possible war with Russia, not with anybody else. That is where the enemy is. That is the problem in terms of military science. If we ever have to fight that war, we ought to be prepared to fight it the way that we want to fight it, where we want to fight it. The time, naturally, will be determined by Russia. Instead of spending money everywhere on everything, we ought to get down to brass tacks and say, "Here, we will have to fight a certain war, if it comes to us. We want to prepare for that kind of war, and we want to prepare for it within our means." What is the use of preparing to fight a war if we are going to destroy America in the preparation?

Moderator GRANIK. Do you think we are going to destroy America in the preparation?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Not if we have the courage to pay as we go for the defense effort. And I would like to have a word to the people, just as Senator FERGUSON has.

I want to tell you first that Under Secretary of Defense Bob Lovett has indicated to me in three or four conferences we have already had that he is screening every money request made by the military in order to cut down the cost of defense.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you think we could cut four or five billion dollars out of it, Senator?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I wouldn't be a bit surprised but that we can reduce these expenditures. No military officer was ever court-martialed for having too much. But it is up to Congress to make sure that they don't have too much. We must not build up unnecessary inventories of war materials.

But I want the people to know also that Mr. Wilson, head of the Defense Mobilization Office, testified to the Joint Economic Committee only 2 weeks ago that applications by industry for reduction of taxes by way of accelerated amortization have amounted to something like $8,000,000,000. And more than $2,000,000,000 of that has already been allowed. That means that in 5 years industrial plants which expand for the defense effort can write off the entire cost of the plant, thereby cutting down taxes. And then communities all over the United States are writing their Congressmen and asking for defense installations of one kind or another. The people will have to pay. We should not ask for anything that we do not need. We should not spend a dollar that we can save.

Senator FERGUSON. Here is the difficulty also. The President says he needs between 60 and 70 billions of dollars for the military. Now, he didn't send up anything specific to support that request. He literally drew that figure out of the air. And the difficulty is that he has then told the various defense officers: "You figure out what you need." Well, it is about like telling your wife: "Here. You can have this much money. Now, you figure out how you can spend it." I know my wife, and some of the others, will find out how they can spend it, because they have not been cautioned that a part of it should be saved. But here is the difficulty. We come back to this 60 or 70 billions of dollars. We haven't got the details yet. And as soon as that comes up, I am sure they are going to give us more items than 60 or 70 billions of dollars. Well, we know what will happen. They will put almost everything in. As the Senator from Wyoming said, no officer was ever court-martialed for having too much. People want a plant built here, and they want a plant built there. They never think that it is going to take their tax money to build highways out to that plant, and all the other expenses. It is going to involve the building of homes around that plant out in the cornfield. It is going to involve the building of schools, sewers, and everything else, and they are going to pay for every one of those things, and they are going to pay for them at a high expense.

We need cooperation, first in the White House, then in Congress, and then from the people back home.

Senator O'MAHONEY. But the White House has already cut many of the appropriations that we authorized.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, Senator. The White House just hasn't cut.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Now, Senator FERGUSON.

Senator FERGUSON. Let me give you some examples. I thought we were going to get through without an argument, JOE, but it is impossible, I guess.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In the budget that has been sent up to us, more than 100 flood-control and rivers and harbors projects and reclamation projects have been cut back by the President and the Bureau of the Budget. No new starts have been approved except for power.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, the President gave out a statement that he was cutting 120 items in this budget a total of $5,750,000,000 below what it was last year. We have carefully checked those facts, and what we find is that instead of $5,750,000,000 they are only going to save $327,000,000. He was only in error about 95 percent.

Now, one of the items that he wanted to tell the people he was going to cut was the Census Bureau. Well, the Census Bureau had a big job to do, to take the census of everybody last year. And this year the President has said he is going to cut it from $38,000,000 down to $8,000,000.

Well, why not? They haven't any census to take this year. Does he call that a cutting of the budget? I don't. There are a lot of phonies in this thing.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Oh, give me a chance, now.

Last December $1,900,000,000 was added by Congress when it passed the Defense Production Act. That amount, $1,900,000,000, is not recorded by some of our budget cutters as a war-connected expenditure. It is not only a war-connected expenditure, but it is absolutely new. And because Congress passed that law, the so-called nondefense expenditures are up.

Senator FERGUSON. Just a moment. I am not going to defend the Congress, because I think we need a lot more courage and a lot more determination up in the Congress to do this job of cutting Government costs.

Moderator GRANIK. I will take the first question. Go ahead, sir, please.

Colonel HUNTER. I am Colonel Hunter of the Army, a student at the National War College.

My question is for Senator O'MAHONEY.

Senator, how realistic can this budget be without an effective system of wage and

price controls? In other words, how can we continue to get 46 cents for our dollar?

Senator O'MAHONEY. We can't. The budget has been going up steadily because of inflation, because we delayed too long in imposing inflationary controls. Inflation knocks airplanes out of the sky more rapidly than any enemy could do it, merely by increasing the cost of making them.

Senator FERGUSON. It also knocks the groceries into the sky.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Right. The cost of living and the cost of defense are going up hand in hand because of inflation.

Moderator GRANIK. May I take a question from the lady, there? Go ahead, please.

Question. Senator FERGUSON, I wanted to know what the unorganized small-income group can do to register a protest against Government extravagance.

Senator FERGUSON. Madam, we are getting that protest daily from the people back home. I think they are pretty well organized, and they are telling us in Congress, which is a good thing. What I would like to see today also is 5,000,000 people writing a letter to the President of the United States telling him exactly what they think about this budget and the fact that as a result of its deficits prices are going up and their incomes are not going up with them, that they are getting a lower standard of living. And maybe the President of the United States, where this whole thing must originate, will move in the direction we want, toward a balanced budget.

Will the people back home today, 5,000,000 strong, write letters? Let's tell the President how much a million is, and send them to the White House and tell the President what they think about these expenditures and how they think they can be cut, maybe we will get somewhere.

Moderator GRANIK. You don't want them to send a letter to JOE O'MAHONEY?

Senator FERGUSON. We will get our share of them. And I will answer them. I think the people back home ought to speak, because if they don't speak there is a misinterpretation of their silence down here in Washington.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Write to Congress also. Ask Congress to increase postal rates, for example, so as to eliminate the subsidy to mail order houses and periodicals. Write to Congress also about repealing the aviation subsidy. Write to Congress to cut and repeal and modify the laws which compel the President and the Bureau of the Budget to send these estimates in.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, JOE, you know, you and I have been working for quite a number of years to get them to cut the subsidy on aviation.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Right.

Senator FERGUSON. To get it out in the open, so that the public will know how much it really is.

Senator O'MAHONEY. What we ought to do is to separate aviation subsidies from airmail pay.

Senator FERGUSON. That is right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. They have no place together.

Senator FERGUSON. And then we ought to cut them out.

Moderator GRANIK. I will take another question.

Mr. DUBY. Nathan Duby, Jr., attorney, of Los Angeles.

Senator O'MAHONEY, wouldn't the elimination of the capital gains tax stimulate small business and furnish again a pool for risk capital?

Senator O'MAHONEY. If by that question you mean that the 25 percent rate on capital gains should be increased, I think it ought to be increased.

Mr. DUBY. I think it should be eliminated altogether.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That would be cutting the revenue, brother.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for summaries.

Senator FERGUSON, your summary, please.

Senator FERGUSON. All I can say in this short minute summary is that the successive Democratic administrations in the last two decades—that is a long time—have followed this policy of deficit spending. This policy has contributed to inflation. It has resulted in the highest prices ever known to the American people. It has resulted in the Truman dollar, which is now worth about 46 cents. My theme is that it is better to cut spending than it is to raise taxes.

The Republican Eightieth Congress believed that and did cut the expenses. It was the first reduction in 18 years. It was the first balanced budget in that period.

The Democratic Party, under the leadership of the President and the Fair Dealers, control the administration, and they today control Congress. The minority Republican Party can only help in cutting these expenses. We are willing and determined, but need action and not only words, both in the White House and in Congress.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, Senator FERGUSON. Senator O'MAHONEY, your summary.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Theodore, I thought there might be a political twist, so I came prepared.

The Eightieth Congress, a Republican Congress, increased the pay of Federal workers by $550,000,000.

The Eightieth Congress passed the Economic Cooperation Act and the China Aid Act, which added $1,245,000,000.

The Eightieth Congress passed the National Science Foundation bill with a large new authorization.

The Eightieth Congress passed a bill adding $6,650,000 to pay Philippine veterans.

The Eightieth Congress added flood control and rivers and harbors in the amount of $80,000,000 and many others, because the people wanted these services.

We must all stand together instead of throwing political balls at one another.

Senator FERGUSON. All right. Just let me say this: We did cut expenses, notwithstanding all of these things, and reduced the people's taxes and gave them a balanced budget.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen.

Our speakers have been Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan. Thank you very much.

Crisis in the Medical Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more of a series of 22 articles which have been written by Mr. Selig Greenberg, and which appeared in the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, newspapers published in the city of Providence, State of Rhode Island, entitled "Medicine in Crisis."

I feel that these articles are very timely as they present a very impartial and objective discussion of conditions faced by our medical schools and the medical profession in general.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of February 28, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—SUPPLY OF DOCTORS FAILS TO KEEP PACE WITH MEDICAL-CARE DEMANDS—SERIOUS MALDISTRIBUTION OF PHYSICIANS OBSERVED; TREND TOWARD SPECIALIZATION AND AWAY FROM GENERAL PRACTICE SEEN; AMA TOUCHY ON SUBJECT

(By Selig Greenberg)

Are there enough doctors in the United States?

The preponderance of expert opinion is that there are not.

But, like almost everything else relating to the distribution and economics of medical care, the issue of the adequacy of the supply of physicians in this country is highly controversial. It also involves some factors to which there is no precise answer and which are contingent on changes going on all the time.

The American Medical Association, which insisted until recently that there was no shortage of doctors but now concedes that in an emergency of any duration a further increase in the production of physicians will be necessary, is sensitive about the whole issue.

This sensitivity appears to have several aspects.

Practitioners and medical educators alike fear that pressure for increased enrollment in the medical schools without commensurate expansion of their faculties and facilities may impair the quality of training.

Aside from this, there is the apparent conviction of the AMA leadership that anything pertaining to medicine is its own business exclusively and that laymen lack sufficient knowledge to understand what it is all about. Furthermore, the question of the sufficiency of the present number of doctors has a direct bearing on the profession's income. A larger number of physicians would mean that at least some of the present practitioners would presumably make less money than they do now.

But there seems to be still another reason for the profession's touchiness on the subject. Any admission that we need more doctors also raises these questions: What's behind the shortage? Why has the expansion of medical education lagged so markedly behind the development of training facilities in other professions? How much substance is there to the charge that some parts of the organized medical profession have sought to limit the opportunities for entry into the practice of medicine in order to restrict competition and thereby protect the economic interests of those already in the field?

An attempt to answer these questions will be made in subsequent articles of this series. Today we will take a look first at some of the basic facts in the situation.

The latest count published by the AMA last year reported 201,777 doctors in the United States.

ONE FOR EVERY 750

This is one doctor for every 750 persons. It is the highest ratio for any country in the world, with the exception of Israel, where there has been an influx of refugee physicians. But this fact alone is no ground for complacency. As the dean of Tulane University School of Medicine has put it, just because "there are more physicians in this country per unit of population than there are in other countries does not necessarily mean that there are too many physicians here. It may be that there are not enough there."

Nor does the total in itself mean much. What is important is what the doctors do, where they do it and what has happened to the demand for medical services.

There is a serious maldistribution of physicians in this country; the growing complexity of medicine has led to a startling increase in specialization, and the supply of doctors has failed to keep up with the demand for medical care.

INCREASE OF 8 PERCENT

The total of 201,777 includes retired and salaried physicians. Some of the latter furnish direct medical service but among them are also hospital administrators, public health officials, medical-school teachers, research men and others not available to patients. Authorities agree that the pertinent figure is the total of 151,267 private practitioners.

The population of the United States increased 15 percent between 1940 and 1950 and so did the number of doctors. But the proportion of salaried physicians, many of whom do not care for patients, increased at an even greater pace. As a result of this, the number of doctors classified as in private practice rose only 5 percent during the past decade, according to an analysis made by the United States Public Health Service.

The AMA's count—the figure is as of July 1, 1949—showed a ratio of 1 physician in private practice for every 981 persons. But when the ratio is broken down State by State, it reveals glaring divergencies between the richer and poorer States. In New York, the figure was 1 private practitioner for every 620 persons. In Massachusetts, it was 1 for every 767. In Rhode Island it was 1 for every 981, which is the national average. But in Alabama it was 1 for every 1,675 and in Mississippi 1 for every 1,668.

AREAS UNDERMANNED

Nor do the over-all State figures tell the whole story. Physicians have for years tended to concentrate in the big cities, leaving the rural sections undermanned. Boston has a ratio of 1 doctor for every 263 persons and New York City 1 for every 447 residents. In Autauga County, Ala., the ratio is 1 physician for every 2,620 persons. In Smith County, Miss., it is 1 for every 4,850.

Just as important as the geographical distribution of medical personnel is its composition by professional field.

The AMA's 1950 directory gives a breakdown of 96,218 general practitioners and 55,049 physicians whose practice is limited to a specialty. The number of general practitioners has actually declined about 13 percent since 1940 while the number of specialists has risen sharply. This has had an important effect on the quality and cost of medical care.

RACIAL GROUPS SUFFER

There are, in addition, critical shortages in the supply of physicians for minority racial groups and in certain special fields.

While Negroes compose about 10 percent of the population, less than 2 percent of the doctors are Negroes. We need at least three times as many psychiatrists as we now have. There are only 4,000 pediatricians in the United States, and three-fourths of them are concentrated in cities of more than 50,000 population. In Massachusetts there is 1 pediatrician for every 5,000 children. In Mississippi the ratio is 1 for every 35,000 children. There is an acute need of personnel in public health, industrial medicine, pathology, radiology, medical administration, and medical teaching.

A major problem right now is the need of the Armed Forces for physicians. There already are 10,000 doctors on active military duty, and it is estimated that 7,500 more will be required by July 1. A new world war would, of course, mean a much heavier drain on our supply of medical manpower. In the last war, more than 60,000 physicians were in uniform.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of February 28, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—17,000 TO 45,000 DOCTOR SHORTAGE SEEN BY 1960

(By Selig Greenberg)

The United States Public Health Service, which holds that the lack of sufficient medical personnel is the Nation's No. 1 health problem, estimates that by 1960 we will have a shortage of from 17,000 to 45,000 doctors.

This estimate covers only the civilian population and does not take into account the increased demands of the Armed Forces. With about 17,500 doctors expected to be in uniform by July 1 and further medical requirements by the military probable, the shortage is likely to be all the more serious.

RHODE ISLAND THIRTEENTH ON LIST

The wide range in the USPHS estimates is due to different standards of what constitutes enough doctors. The 17,000 figure was reached by using the ratio of physicians to population which prevailed in 1940 through a large part of the country and taking into consideration increased demands for public health and research personnel. The top figure of 45,000 uses as a yardstick for the whole country the 12 States which now have the highest ratio of doctors. Rhode Island, by the way, just misses the top classification, being thirteenth.

The Public Health estimates have provoked controversy and have been attacked by the American Medical Association. Some AMA spokesmen say we actually have a surplus of doctors. But Dr. Donald G. Anderson, secretary of the AMA's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, is on record that "there are many indications that the country could use more physicians" and that we may have a shortage of as many as 15,000 doctors by 1960, aside from military requirements.

SUMS UP SITUATION

The dean of one of our leading medical schools summed up the situation neatly by saying that the probable 1960 deficit lay about half way between the AMA's figures and the maximum set by the USPHS.

There may be some validity to the AMA's argument that not all sections of the country need quite as many doctors as there are in our richest and most populous States. On the other hand, many authorities raise the point that there is no evidence that there are too many physicians in the 12 States with the best showing.

The trouble is that there is no generally recognized standard of adequacy of medical personnel. Criteria vary widely because of the many factors involved.

Persons interested in extending the benefits of medical science to all parts of the population make a different evaluation than those who measure the need largely on the basis of ability to pay. There is a similar gap between those who think primarily in terms of emergencies, of waiting for people to get sick, and those who believe that much of the future of medicine lies in the preventive field.

BASIC QUESTION

Any realistic appraisal must take into consideration such elements as the inequalities in geographical distribution of doctors, the increase in specialization, changing concepts of the pattern of organization of medical practice, expanding demands for medical care, the rising proportion of aging physicians in rural areas and the professional competence of some of our doctors.

Much of the debate is centered around the basic question whether we now need a higher or lower ratio of physicians than we did years ago.

AMA spokesmen contend that we can get along with a lower ratio because the practitioner of today is much more efficient and has at his command far more potent tools than his predecessor did. They point out that the doctor now knows his job better, that he gets around more easily, that he can use powerful new drugs and more effective equipment, that he works with more nurses and technicians and, therefore, can achieve more in less time.

While conceding much of this, critics of the AMA line maintain that the doctor's increased efficiency is more than offset by new demands for his services.

COMPLEXITIES CITED

They cite the growing complexity of medicine, the demand arising from greater health consciousness of people and the sharp rise in our national income and standard of living, the greater needs resulting from a higher proportion of older people, and the wider use of medical personnel and facilities stemming from the rapid growth of voluntary hospital and medical care insurance plans. With medicine able to do a lot more than years ago, the average patient now demands far more from his doctor than his parents did, they point out. Furthermore, there are increasing requirements for physicians in public health, teaching, and research positions.

The consensus among some of the country's top medical educators is that the great discoveries of the past few decades have increased rather than diminished the demand for physicians and that we need more doctors if we are to make the benefits of medical progress available more widely. Crucial in this connection, of course, is the question of how the average American is to pay for these benefits.

GROUP PRACTICE

There is widespread agreement among experts that the complexity of medicine and the specialization that goes with it make the teamwork represented by group practice more and more necessary. These authorities feel that the traditional form of individual practice is becoming outdated. They are convinced that more effective and economical medical care can be provided where a number of physicians combine their practice and thereby pool their skills and equipment. Such use of the doctors we have is the means, they hold, for relieving to some extent the need for more doctors.

Expert opinion is that the benefits of American medicine, both curative and preventive but particularly the latter, will remain unequally distributed and continue to lag far behind their possibilities unless we increase our production of doctors, reorganize the pattern of medical practice, and devise some more effective method of spreading the cost of disease through insurance prepayment.

The RFC Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Anything Goes," relating to the investigation of the RFC, published in the Washington Post of March 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANYTHING GOES

"It is gone," said Edmund Burke in his Reflections on the Revolution in France, "that sensibility of principle that chastity of honor, which felt a stain like a wound." It appears to be, to say the very least, blunted among men in public life today. The appalling aspect of the disclosures—and one gets the impression that they are only a tithe of the sordid story—that have come out of the Fulbright committee's inquiry into the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is that the officials involved in them seem almost devoid of any sense of impropriety. Taxed with having accepted the hospitality of a Florida hotel for which he had been instrumental in obtaining an RFC loan, Hilton W. Robertson, an examiner in the Agency, said: "I expected to pay the rate. They wouldn't take it. I did not know they were going to issue a courtesy card. Is there anything wrong about that?"

Well, sir, Robertson, it all depends on your concept of right and wrong. It probably isn't a penal offense, if that's any comfort to you. The chances are no one will suppose your cold your influence for the paltry price of a free hotel room. But a man who holds a position of responsibility and trust in the United States Government can no more afford to accept favors than to grant them. Time was when this elementary point of honor seemed so clear that no one thought to question it. But in the blurred vision of today, anything goes, it seems, if you can get away with it.

It is somewhat harsh to point a finger at Mr. Robertson. Some of his bosses in the RFC saw nothing wrong, apparently, in taking a gratuity here and there from applicants for RFC loans. For that matter, Donald Dawson, White House aide in charge of personnel, did just what Mr. Robertson did. On three occasions, he was the nonpaying guest of the same hotel. If Mr. Dawson has any regard for his reputation, he will cease hiding behind his White House immunity and come before the subcommittee to explain his conduct. In the absence of an explanation, his unfitness for a post in the White House seems abundantly demonstrated.

Flexible notions of propriety are by no means confined to the executive branch of the Government. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, it appears, sees nothing wrong in having interceded with the RFC to secure a loan for another hotel—for the successful negotiation of which his son received a fee of $21,000. Senator MURRAY's statement explaining his action seems to come down to an assertion that it was routine procedure of a sort indulged in by most of his colleagues. We should not be at all surprised. The allegation derives considerable color from the Fulbright subcommittee's decision to keep secret the names of Senate Members who accepted free vacation stays at the swank RFC-supported hostelry in Florida.

The departed "sensibility of principle" revealed in the RFC probe is far from isolated. It is not very different in essence, when you come to think about it, from the resort to back-alley footpad tactics in political campaigns, from the abuse of the privilege of congressional immunity, from the dispensing of complimentary deep-freezes, from the 5 percent influence racket, from the acceptance by Senators of salaries from private employers. Perhaps even the disgrace that has befallen so many college basketball players is not unrelated. Nothing is so contagious as dishonor.

Ground Breaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ground Breaking," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 5, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROUND BREAKING

The other afternoon Mr. Benjamin Fairless, a former newsboy of Cleveland, Ohio, dug up some Pennsylvania dirt in the presence of some 600 leaders in industry, banking, and government.

The Pennsylvania ground breaking was rightly a cause of special ceremony. It marked the start of a new steel mill, the largest single integrated steel mill ever built at one time, in this country or anywhere else.

A lot of people celebrated for private reasons. Mr. Fairless, doubtless, in pride that it will be named after him and serve as a reminder of what can happen to newsboys even though Horatio Alger is dead. Steel workers and their union leaders because of the new work opportunities it will provide. Bankers because they helped finance it. Railroad officials because they will supply it and deliver the finished product. United States Steel stockholders because they acquire a new equity in production. Army and Navy officials because it will produce material for new ships and guns.

We fit in none of these categories. But we celebrated because we felt richer nonetheless. All of us will be richer by 1,500,000 tons of steel which the plant will roll out each year. A million eight hundred thousand tons not only for guns to protect ourselves but for buildings and railroads and automobiles and refrigerators—all the things made from or by the use of steel.

This tradition of making a ceremony of a ground breaking is an old one and it seems to us a good one. For it means that something new is being added to the sum total of the Nation's resources. It may be only a small, one-family house, or a grocery store, or as here a mammoth steel plant. But whatever it is, it enriches not only the people who will live in it or work in it but also the whole community.

Death of J. Frank Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the request of my colleague [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief tribute to a very intimate friend of my colleague's, namely, J. Frank Wilson, editor and manager of the Woodbury (N. J.) Daily Times, who died yesterday, and whose funeral my colleague is attending. That is why he cannot himself ask to have this article published in the RECORD. So I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD with these few remarks of mine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. FRANK WILSON, TIMES PUBLISHER, DIED LAST NIGHT

J. Frank Wilson, editor and manager of the Woodbury Daily Times, and widely known here and in the State as a church and civic leader, died last night at his home, 349 Glover Street, Woodbury. He was 66.

Although Mr. Wilson had been ill since last August, his death shocked friends and associates since he apparently was on the road to recovery after many weeks in the Underwood Hospital.

He was first stricken seriously ill last August and underwent two operations, from which he recovered and returned to his home. Mr. Wilson recuperated to the extent that he visited the newspaper offices for brief periods, but then was taken ill with pneumonia. Complications developed and he was critically ill in the Underwood Hospital for several weeks before he appeared to take a turn for the better and was finally able to again return to his home about 3 weeks ago.

A native of Woodbury, Mr. Wilson was born November 7, 1884, the son of the late J. Frank and Mary L. Wilson.

He attended Woodbury public schools and since boyhood had been associated with the Times, learning various branches of newspaper work under the guidance of his father.

Mr. Wilson became editor and manager of the Times in January 1918, following the death of his father. Under his editorship the established policy of publishing a community and home newspaper was continued.

TRUSTEE OF CHURCH

A member of the Kemble Memorial Methodist Church, Mr. Wilson served for many years as a member of the board of trustees and had been president of the board since 1943. He was a past president of the Busy Men's Bible Class and was one of the leaders in the organization of the Gloucester County Federation of Men's Bible Classes, which he also served as president. He was active also, for several years, in the New Jersey State Federation of Bible Classes and was serving as executive vice president of the State group at the time of his death.

He was interested in many community and civic activities, giving freely of his time and ability to various projects that had as their objective the helping of the community or its residents.

MANY CIVIC ACTIVITIES

He was a member of the Woodbury Kiwanis Club, serving as its president in 1937; a member of the Friendship Fire Company and a life member of the State Firemen's Relief Association, and a member of Woodbury Lodge No. 54, IOOF. He was a member, also, of the P.O.S. of A., Woodbury, until the lodge was disbanded.

Mr. Wilson was a member and chairman of the Woodbury Park Commission, on which he had served for several years. He was a member of the board of directors of the Woodbury Trust Co. During the period when Woodbury had a Chamber of Commerce, which preceded the Woodbury Business Association, he served several years as president of that organization.

Mr. Wilson was president of the Lake Gilman Chapel Association.

As a young man he was active in athletics, having played on the Woodbury basketball and football teams, when they were rated as among the best teams in this section of the State.

Mr. Wilson also served in old Company I, Third Regiment, New Jersey National Guard.

Surviving Mr. Wilson are his wife, Fannie Hendrickson Wilson; a son, Harry F. Wilson; a daughter, Mrs. Marian Hecht; three brothers, Harry E. Wilson and Howard W. Wilson, of Woodbury, and Robert H. Wilson, of Fortescue, and a sister, Mrs. Ethel M. Keat, of Woodbury.

FUNERAL ON TUESDAY

The funeral will be held on Tuesday, March 13, with services being held at 3 p. m. in Kemble Memorial Methodist Church in charge of the Rev. Fred W. Stacey, pastor of the church. Burial will be made in the Wenonah cemetery.

A viewing will be held on Monday evening at the Davis Funeral Home, 171 Delaware Street, Woodbury.

It's Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Daniel Francis Clancy.

John McGee was erroneously credited with authorship of "It's Indiana" in the House of Representatives on February 27, 1950, whereas Daniel Francis Clancy is the actual author of this tribute to Indiana, which has been described—Indianapolis Times, June 18, 1950—as having "already taken its place with the historic hymns of homage to Hoosierdom." Mr. Clancy, formerly of Logansport, Ind., and now of Springfield, Ohio, is the only man except the late Ernie Pyle to win two consecutive National Headliner Club awards for outstanding achievement in journalism. The article follows:

It's Indiana where springs are sweetest and autumns gayest; small towns with Indian names. The Wabash sparkling white under a summer moon; green fields of slowly waving corn. Autumns full of the smell of burning leaves and hushed harvest fields stretching away into a saffron setting sun. Bittersweet and basketball, paw-paws and pumpkins. Country church crowds on sunlit Sunday mornings, courthouses with worn-down front steps, and trotting races at the county fairs. Land of Lincoln-like lawyers; Brown County and Turkey Run. State that remembers canals and covered bridges, Thomas R. Marshall, Albert J. Beveridge, Benjamin and William Henry Harrison. Where everyone is said to be a politician; literary land of poets and writers, James Whitcomb Riley, George Ade, Booth Tarkington, Theodore Dreiser, Meredith Nicholson, and Abe Martin. Where many women spend a lifetime driving country roads to bring books in a traveling library to farm boys. Land haunted by redmen whose canoes still seem to drift down blue-green curving rivers. Land of the speedway, sycamores, and friendly or sensational folk. On the Banks of the Wabash. Hoosierdom and home. (Daniel Francis Clancy.)

Entertainment for Servicemen by the Loyal Order of Moose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Moose Show for Troops," which appeared in the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News of March 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOOSE SHOW FOR TROOPS

The Moose are always doing something for somebody. They are brotherhood in action. Their school and home for children at Mooseheart is everyday inspiration for us, their neighbors. It prepares the young of departed members of the order against the day when they are grown and must go on their own to their benefit and that of country.

So it occasioned no surprise when it was learned that the east central district of the fraternity—Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and New Jersey—was sending to Europe to play for our soldiers stationed there a star-studded professional theater unit.

It will leave Friday, March 16, for a 27-day tour of the Army bases, we are told by Malcolm R. Giles, director general of the international society.

The group already has performed for more than 50,000 servicemen in the northernmost outposts on our defense perimeter—Alaska, the Aleutians, Newfoundland, Greenland, and Labrador. It will take off in a United States Air Force plane from the Baltimore Municipal Airport after a previous performance for military and Government officials.

The unit is headed by Roy Acuff and his Grand Ol' Opry cast. It is believed to be the first servicemen's entertainment troupe financed by a private organization to go abroad during the present emergency. It was formed by J. "Jack" Stoehr, the regional director of the Moose.

He has hopes of making the big jump to Korea to round out the program.

We hope that he realizes on his aims. Certainly the fighting men in that sad country will welcome the entertainers. It will be like a visit home.

On the trip to Europe all expenses, except transportation and housing, which are being furnished by the Army Air Corps, will be paid for by Moose lodges in Stoehr's jurisdiction.

The artists will entertain several hundred thousand servicemen in Army bases and hospitals in Germany, Austria, and England before returning to New York on April 11.

The show is titled "A Night With the Moose." It is intended to give the valiant troops a good hour. It is the Loyal Order of Moose way of saying "thank you" to the fine young men who serve our country.

The itinerary of the troupe will be as follows: March 16, the Army base in the Azores; March 17, 18, and 19, performances at the Four Hundred and Ninety-fifth Station Army Hospital and Air Base at Wiesbaden, Germany; March 20, Rhein Main Air Base; March 21, the Army post at Birkenfeld, Germany; March 22 and 23, return to Wiesbaden for two more performances; March 24, Kassell, Germany; March 25 and 26, Berlin; March 27, Wurzburg, Germany; March 28 and 29, Vienna, Austria; March 30, Freyberg Air Base, Austria; March 31, Lembach Air Base, Austria; April 1, the Ninety-eighth General Army Hospital and the air base at Furstenfeldbruck, Germany; April 2, Erding Air Base, Germany; April 3, Gablingen Army Post, Germany; April 4, Berchtesgaden, Germany; April 5, Wiesbaden, Germany; April 6, 7, and 8, Army bases in England; April 9 and 10, Newfoundland air bases.

My Responsibility to My State Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in an effort to stimulate thinking among the young people of South Dakota, the State Young Republican organization, under the direction of Mr. Howard Wood, chairman, held an essay contest on the subject, My Responsibility to My State Government.

The winner of this contest was Miss Virgene Westergaard, of Worthing, S. Dak. The essay indicates some mature thinking on the subject, and I feel that it reflects patriotic sentiments to which we all should give special thought.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would like to have this essay inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO MY STATE GOVERNMENT

America stands before the world dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal. I believe each citizen has the privilege and obligation of sharing this aspiration with others. I am going to try to grow steadily in my ability to understand this democratic aspiration and strive to contribute to its enrichment.

In a bygone day Thomas Jefferson wrote "How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of." To the thinking citizens of South Dakota these words mean much. It is easy to feel we have always had these blessings and always will, but they must be carefully guarded, if we are to keep them. This I feel is my greatest responsibility. In order to do this, I must have a continuous, active interest in current happenings and elections. I know that when I am able to vote I will vote for honest, responsible officials to head our government. They will safeguard the blessings we have inherited.

If we try to understand that our local government is part of the general State government, it will mean more to us. I believe we should try to understand current issues and people, and form definite opinions, supported by facts and our own reasoning. This will fit us for the future, when we have to defend our opinions, think clearly and reason correctly—if we are to find our rightful place in this government of which each of us is an important part.

Wise Up, Mr. President, and Wield That Broom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Sunday Herald:

WISE UP, MR. PRESIDENT, AND WIELD THAT BROOM

One of President Truman's most admired traits, his dogged determination, is showing up in its unlovelier lights these days. It won him one election against long odds, 28 months ago. It may well lose him another, if he chooses to chance it next year.

For there are no two ways about it: the smell rising from the scandal pot in Washington is nauseous.

And the President, who can't properly be expected to know everything that's cooking on every little stove in Washington and therefore couldn't properly be held responsible, insists on lifting the lid and sniffing the brew and maintaining that it is sweet.

Part of the President's doggedness—and it has led to a good part of his trouble—is his intense loyalty to persons whom he likes and whom he has chosen to be his aides.

It has led him to defend stoutly Secretary of State Dean Acheson—"the only way they'll get him out is to impeach me"—and there's a good chance that history will say he is right.

But it has led him to give the same unswerving support to the Harry Vaughans, to try to give responsible posts to the Mon Wallgrens, and to lash out before he has facts at hand at persons who assail the least member of the White House staff.

The charge that patronage is being peddled over the counter in Mississippi is made by the President's political enemies; but it is easier to believe it is true than wrong. The picayune nature of the offense makes it more repugnant. This is a time to show some of the famous Truman courage, admit an egregious error, and throw the rascals out.

The revelations about some Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans show the tawdriest sort of dealings, panderings to untrustworthy characters out of the basest pecuniary motives.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate's subcommittee investigating the operations of the RFC, whose report the President characterized as "asinine," said a "disinfection" is necessary in Government, because "only in this way will the people regain their conviction that their Government is honest and fair in all its dealings.

"If people lose faith in the honesty of their Government by reason of rather recent developments here, we will be in greater danger from within than from without. Loss of confidence in our Government is as great a menace as is communism."

There is only one way to meet the Fulbright revelations. They must be welcomed. The investigators must be given every assistance in tearing them wide open.

If this isn't done, the first damage may be that Congress will heed the cries that the RFC be abolished. That would end such things as the Miami Beach affair. It would also put hundreds of small and deserving companies out of business; for 80 percent of the RFC loans are for $50,000 or less, and its workaday unpublicized business has been tiding good little enterprises over the bad times.

But the results of the President's stubbornness can go much further. It gives encouragement and nourishment to all his enemies, who hate him not for an RFC scandal but because of the issues to which he pledged himself in 1948—the people's issues, which, if carried out indifferently by President Truman, would be killed outright by his opponents.

Creation of a Freedom Corps Opposed to Soviet Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest hopes for peace lies in the surging and ever-mounting spirit of opposition and resistance to the expansion of Soviet slavery.

This feeling is especially prevalent and forceful among those people who have escaped beyond the iron curtain but endure agonies of soul as they are compelled to stand by futilely while the strangling grasp of Moscow fastens its death clutch on what were formerly free, proud peoples.

For these displaced persons, these soldiers without arms, these expellees whose main and guiding purpose is the return to their respective countries in a new day of untrammeled freedom, ways must be found, opportunites must be created, so they can give practical expression to their opposition to Stalinism.

Sometimes, in our determination to halt Soviet imperialism, we in America I feel, are prone to overlook the large numbers of other nationals, especially refugees from the terrors of Stalinism who are willing and able, given the chance, to help in the struggle for peace and liberty.

We frequently mistake, too, the aspirations and objectives of those displaced patriots. Much as they may admire America, they yearn not for the sight of our beloved shores, but rather live in the hope that one day they may return in security and liberty to the lands of their birth, and there in true freedom, amid the blessings of their rich national traditions, culture, and the warmth of familiar things, take up their lives anew.

This we must understand and respect, and understanding and respecting, take steps to help them forge their ranks in the ever-swelling legions of the freedom loving.

It would be a serious mistake at this important juncture in history for us to assume we have a monopoly on the impulse to thwart tyrants—ours by a fateful course of events is the role of champion of the democratic world, and in that capacity we have the task and the duty to make it possible for all who thirst for freedom to take their rightful place in the fight against the extension of Soviet aggression, spiritual and physical.

Furthermore, an additional and compelling advantage of this program is the great beneficial effect it will have by giving heart and increased courage and strength of resistance to the Soviet captives behind the iron curtain. This activity will spark the embers that will one day fan the fires of liberation.

To this end, I propose the creation of a freedom corps, a military organization in which men of all nations opposed to Soviet aggression may shoulder arms, giving signal strength to the free world's growing forces of peace.

The Let-Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Washington News of Saturday, March 3, 1951, entitled "The Let-Down":

THE LET-DOWN

Only 2 months ago, Defense Secretary Marshall just told Congress he was being criticized for not asking a strength of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 men in the Armed Forces.

"Today," he added, "the atmosphere is quite different. Now the questions are, not how much more we need, but why we are asking so much."

Drawing on an old soldier's memories, General Marshall went on:

"I saw the Army disintegrate in General Pershing's lap after World War I. I saw the selective-service law come within one vote of repeal only a few months before Pearl Harbor. I saw us cast aside our strength again after VJ-day.

"These things are familiar to me. But I must confess I was not prepared for the speed with which the present shift in sentiment developed."

General Marshall is correct.

There has been a swift—and deadly dangerous—shift in sentiment.

Its effects are evident not only in Congress and the administration but throughout the country.

In the time wasted in quibbling about whether the draft age shall be lowered to 18½ years rather than 18 and the delay in voting higher taxes.

In the squabbling over how the defense mobilization and the war against inflation shall be conducted.

In the Government's irresolute attitude toward pressing problems.

That sense of terrible urgency which was strong after the first reverses in Korea, which revived when the Chinese Reds came into the war—that has dwindled and all but disappeared.

In its place there has grown a feeling of optimism—foolish optimism—without foundation.

Our country's peril is no less real than it was 2 months ago.

The threat of a third world war is no less great.

The problems of defense and industrial mobilization and control of inflation are no less grave.

If we believe we are doing enough to frighten the rulers of Soviet Russia, to deter them from their plan for ultimate world domination, we are deceiving ourselves and playing their game.

Our goal is not to fight and win another world-wide war—unless we must.

Our true goal is to prevent another world-wide war.

Our hope of attaining that goal depends upon developing with utmost speed such actual and potentially ready military strength that Soviet Russia will not dare risk forcing us to fight.

We can't do that by feeble, half-hearted efforts.

If we want safety in a peaceful world, the price in toil and treasure must be paid. It will be worth the price a thousand times.

We are letting down when what we need is to speed up.

Rice and Propaganda for the Chinese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Des Moines Register points up again the value of rice as a propaganda weapon in Asia. In the struggle for supremacy in Asia, the free world can make no better investment than the creation of a "rice bank" as a weapon against communism. The editorial follows:

RICE AND PROPAGANDA FOR THE CHINESE

The Nationalist China Air Force based on Formosa has made at least eight different flights to the mainland recently—to drop food, not bombs.

The food was rice, paid for by the voluntary China Mainland Flood and Famine Relief Association of Formosa, and with it went bundles of letters of sympathy. The drops were made in famine- and flood-stricken districts of Fukien and Kwangtung provinces.

Firebrands in armchairs and swivel chairs in America are all for declaring war on Red China, having American planes drop bombs on Chinese ports and industries, and helping Chiang Kai-shek invade the mainland to restart the civil war he has been fighting ever since 1927.

Rice and letters are more effective.

The Chinese Communist and anti-Communist, are sick of civil war. They have had no real civil peace and effective civil government for 100 years. They welcomed the Communists with a sort of despairing hope that these strong men out of their wild west would bring them peace at last.

The strong men brought them not peace but a grenade. They lowered the rents and parceled out the land—but they raised the rice tax and the blood tax of young men to still steeper levels. From system-less anarchy and graft, China is moving to totalitarian tyranny.

But we are doing far more for Chiang Kai-shek by letting him use his air force to drop rice than if we gave him the American LST's and PFC's he would need for an invasion of the mainland. We are doing far more for the people of China, more for the safety of our own policy in China, and the world.

While we were letting Chiang drop rice to hungry mainland Chinese, Soviet Russia was voting "no" to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund against granting $22,000 to supplement the diets of hungry Formosa children with dried milk. Russia said any aid to Formosa should go through the Red Chinese government in Peking—which would allot it to Formosa "if necessary."

The people of China will learn eventually who the "good neighbor" has been.

Pfc Robert James McKenna, USMC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to Judge Samuel A. Weiss, of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pa., a former Member of this body, by Brig. Gen. W. J. Scheyer, United States Marine Corps, dated February 23, 1951, which depicts the interest and help given to the families of its personnel:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES
MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1951.

Judge SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Court of Common Pleas,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

MY DEAR JUDGE WEISS: I have your letter concerning Pfc Robert James McKenna, 1037485, United States Marine Corps.

No additional information has been received from the field relative to the status of the above-named man. However, in view of the information contained in your letter, I have taken steps to have George Bradley interviewed by a marine officer stationed in Philadelphia in an effort to ascertain further facts. I have also requested Col. Ewart S. Laue, Director, Fourth Marine Corps Reserve district, Philadelphia, to pay a personal call on Mrs. McKenna for the purpose of assisting and advising her with any problems arising from the status of her son.

The interest you have shown the above case and the advice and assistance you have rendered Mrs. McKenna are deeply appreciated. I have been gratified to note your interest and confidence in the Marine Corps.

I assure you that this headquarters will continue its efforts to obtain further information relative to the location of Private First Class McKenna, and that everything possible is done by the officers and men in the combat area to learn the fate and whereabouts of their missing comrades. Any such information received will be promptly furnished Mrs. McKenna.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

W. J. SCHEYER,
Brigadier General, United States Marine Corps, Assistant Director of Personnel.

Statement Issued by Hon. Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, on the Opening Program of the Voice of America on February 16, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me for the opening program of the Voice of America on February 16, 1951:

My name is DAN FLOOD. I was elected by the people of my district in Pennsylvania, a district in the hard-coal-mining belt of the State. My constituents live in Luzerne County, the principal city of which is Wilkes-Barre. Among the people who have asked me to represent them in the Congress of the United States, there are more than 30,000 of Lithuanian stock. Most of them are third-generation Lithuanians, which means that already their grandparents immigrated to this country. When they came here, they found the opportunity which America offers to all those who cherish freedom and who are ready to work to build up their own lives and the future of their children. I am glad to say that all these Lithuanian-Americans are well-established American citizens now who uphold the democratic ideals and traditions of this country and who are highly respected by their fellow Americans of other origins. It is one of the great privileges of American citizenship that we who are loyal to the United States of America do not forget our ties with the country of origin of our ancestors. We cherish and continue many of the good European traditions within the framework of our American way of life. And this is also true of the Lithuanian-Americans in my constituency. They have formed Lithuanian-American societies and clubs, and they have many churches in which the parish priests are Lithuanian-Americans who preach to their flock in Lithuanian.

Now all these Lithuanian-Americans speak Lithuanian among themselves a great deal and celebrate today as every year, on February 16 the birthday of the republic of Lithuania, with folk songs and festivals.

It is therefore my particular pleasure, as a representative of those citizens, to take the opportunity of the first Lithuanian language program of the Voice of America, to relay my best wishes as well as those of my constituents to the people of Lithuania.

My Lithuanian-American constituents are very proud of the fact that the United States has refused to recognize the Soviet claim to the Baltic states and that we recognize the Minister of Lithuania to Washington as a representative of the Lithuanian people in the United States. My Lithuanian-American constituents look forward to the day when the Lithuanian people will again have their free choice as to their form of government and their national life.

Among these Lithuanian-Americans many have achieved positions of respect and importance in our community. As an example, I can cite Mr. Peter Margis, a businessman of Wilkes-Barre who is a senator in the legislature of the State of Pennsylvania.

All these people, as American citizens, are supporting fully the policy of peace with freedom and justice for all people, which is the policy of the Government of the United States. And that is why I think that on this day I can speak for all of them when I wish you, the people of Lithuania, that you may regain your freedom and may be able to work out your own destiny. It is with these thoughts that I am repeating to you what my Lithuanian-American constituents always says with conviction and confidence: Kas Bus Nebus, Lietuva Nepranus (no matter what will happen, Lithuania will not perish).

Where Is Our Foreign Policy Taking Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own

remarks, I include a copy of an address which I recently made over radio station WJR at Detroit:

Whether we shall have peace—or whether our present foreign policy is heading us for world war III—is the most vital problem concerning the American citizen today. What is done in the months ahead may help keep peace or it might involve us in the most disastrous war the world has ever seen—one which may destroy the liberty and freedom our predecessors fought so hard to establish and which we ourselves would give anything to preserve.

One thing which I believe to be most dangerous to our future is the failure of the President and his advisers to take the American people into their confidence—before making momentous decisions—instead of afterward. No single fact is more disturbing to the rank and file citizen than his bewilderment about where the President is taking this country, and why. It would be useless for me to dwell upon the subject except to remind you of something you already know, namely—that our predicament is due primarily to the fact that the peace following World War II was made by secret negotiation and agreement and without any advance information to the American people. It doesn't make any difference whether we like it or not, the plain fact is that once a secret agreement is reached between our country and some foreign nation—right or wrong—that agreement or commitment becomes the fixed obligation of 150,000,000 American citizens. Despite the tragic consequences which followed the secret agreements of World War II, President Truman has learned nothing by that important experience and is still pursuing the same dangerous course.

Neither Congress nor the American people were consulted when the President committed our troops to Korea. Whether such action was right or wrong—whether we like it or not—once the President made the commitment he irrevocably tied the hands of every citizen in this country.

Today we are faced with another momentous question. It is whether the President, acting in his own discretion, shall have the right in time of peace to commit unlimited numbers of American troops to be joined with other nations in forming a land army in Western Europe. He has arrogantly assumed autocratic authority to carry on this project and has castigated those who have the temerity to disagree. By acquiescing in this authority on the part of the President, we are giving him the irrevocable right as a single American—without anyone else's consent—to determine whether we shall fight another disastrous world war. Where is the present urgency that requires such dictatorial authority in the hands of the President? There is no war in Europe today. Surely there is ample time for the President to consult the American people and give them an opportunity to decide how far they want their country to go in recruiting an army to be stationed in Western Europe.

It is the rank and file citizen who is being called upon to carry the burden of the President's fabulous foreign policy program. It is he who wears the uniform; it is he who pays the higher taxes and accepts a lower standard of living and the Government controls that are necessary in a wartime economy.

But notwithstanding these sacrifices, you, Mr. Average Citizen, unless you are a mind reader, know nothing about the President's aims or purposes in his global program that is now in the making. But you aren't alone in the darkness; you are in the same position as your Representatives in Congress, who know as little about what is in the President's mind as you do.

All we know is that those who demand that foreign policy decisions be subjected to public scrutiny and debate, are labeled by the President as obstructionists or if you become bold enough to assert that the advice and consent of Congress should be obtained before troops are sent to foreign battlefields to fight other peoples' wars, you are given a more odious label—you are an isolationist.

So here we are in the birthplace of democracy ridiculed and stigmatized if we dare to say that no man is big enough or great enough in a free country to ignore the collective wisdom and judgment of 150,000,000 people in reaching decisions which affect their lives and their liberty.

We have seen people in countries with totalitarian dictators plunged into war against their will—but I ask you—have we reached a point in this country where we want to follow a practice for which we so bitterly assail totalitarian nations?

I realize the serious concern with which you must view our present predicament and I think all thoughtful Americans have similar feelings. If there ever was a time in our history when political differences should be laid aside in an effort to resolve our difficulties, it is now. My own views on the subject are in no sense partisan because my thinking is as far out of line with some of our Republican leaders as it is with President Truman's.

In the past decade we have moved from a policy of extreme isolationism to one of extreme internationalism. If we must choose one of these two extremes, I prefer the former because I think we could follow it and still survive as a free nation, while the latter I believe will ultimately destroy us. I think we ought to participate in the settlement of world problems and assume our just share of the burden but, in my judgment, we must gear our participation in direct proportion to our ability and capacity in terms of manpower and resources. If we follow such a course, we can definitely assist in keeping peace in the world and at the same time maintain our own national solvency and the integrity of our form of government. On the other hand, if we pursue the policy which commenced following World War II of singlehandedly assuming the financial, economic, political, and military burdens of the rest of the world, it can mean nothing but eventual bankruptcy for us and the loss of our own liberties. I agree that survival is worth any price—except the price of our own freedom. Surely it would avail us little to have saved the freedom of other peoples if we lose our own in the process.

But even if I am wrong in my conclusions that another global war would lead to our insolvency and emasculate our freedoms, there are other compelling reasons why we should change our course. Without assessing blame or responsibility for the peace that was botched, it is an uncontroverted fact that World War II caused more problems than it solved and that the world is further away from peace today than it was in 1941. Can anyone assure us that the defeat of communism in Europe and Asia will bring us any nearer to peace?

In the course of our own lives we have seen Europe dominated in the west by the military rule of the Prussians, and in the east by the czars of Russia. Following World War I we witnessed the rise of a Communist dictatorship in Russia, and Nazi and Fascist dictatorships in Germany and Italy. There never was any real difference between these types of government. They have all had for their purpose the destruction of the liberties of the people by one method or another, and each has caused a war of aggression against other nations.

In World War II we destroyed fascism and nazism and made communism one of the strongest political and military forces on earth. If we now undertake, and are successful in destroying communism in Europe and Asia one may well wonder what form of political oppression will take its place. We propose, for example, to ally ourselves with Tito and Franco in the all-out struggle against Russian communism. Would one of these latter two—made powerful by our help—be the next tyrant with whom we would have to deal?

This possibility is bad enough, but there are some that may be worse. In pardoning the German war criminals the hypocrisy of our diplomacy in attempting to regain the friendship of the Germans reached its zenith. I presume, if we are going into an all-out land war with Russia, we would be well advised to rearm the Germans because they are probably the best fighters in Europe. We need them on our side in any all-out struggle with the Communists. To accomplish this would, of necessity, require that Germany as a nation be reconstituted on something like a basis of equality with our so-called European allies. In such circumstances what would we do with the German nation and its army, after the Russians were defeated? Do you suppose the Germans in such a case would agree to disarmament and again be relegated to a second-rate power; or do you think they would insist upon equality? With the Russians licked and the Germans powerful again, what problems would be posed for our diplomats insofar as European or world peace is concerned? Might we not be back where we were before World War II started?

While the situation is not completely analogous, the future status of Japan is likewise a problem that we cannot ignore in our program of world-wide diplomacy. If we are to carry on an all-out war with communism in the Far East as well as in Europe as we seem headed for, we will need to rearm Japan and write a peace treaty that will establish that country on an equality basis in the community of nations. What would we do with Japan after the Communists have been chased out of Asia? Do you think we could thereafter relegate her to an occupied-nation status? Do you believe a revitalized Japan would present any future dangers to world peace and, if so, how would we guard against it? Or should we put off the evil day in considering these questions?

These are all real practical problems that cannot safely be ignored—when you fight your former friends and ally yourself with former enemies. But these problems are too real and too practical to be thought about by our starry-eyed diplomats who are too busy rushing headlong and haphazardly into another world conflict without having the slightest conception of where it will eventually lead us; or what new and momentous problems it will create.

My point is, there is no real basis for assuming that we can ever solve the political and military problems of Europe with any degree of permanency. The political upheaval going on over there is not new. It is centuries old. To assume that we can settle these controversies by fighting wars in Europe and Asia is wishful thinking indeed.

Because of my deep conviction that we can never settle the problems of Europe and Asia, I think we should go easy on the extent we implicate ourselves. We can assume some of the burden of suppressing world aggression—but not all. That, I think, is the crux of the problem. We can furnish the atomic power; some of our Navy and a part of our Air Force. We could furnish manpower in small degree for strategic operations, and last but not least, we can furnish military equipment and supplies. But I am unalterably opposed to committing millions of men to make up a land army in either Europe or Asia, which is the plan now being contemplated. Such a course will

mean our ultimate ruination because of its cost in men and resources, to say nothing of the fact that we would again have created more problems than we solved.

Finally, in assessing our future commitments we must consider the cost of rehabilitation in Europe and Asia when the fighting is over. Because, who, except us, would assume that burden? The rehabilitation program following World War II, which has cost us billions, would be peanuts compared to the postwar costs of world war III. How much more strain would our economy stand after another devastating war? These are questions which deserve serious consideration in connection with our ultimate survival, and yet they are lightly brushed aside by those who are laying out this extravagant program.

We may still be the richest and strongest Nation on earth, but anyone who cares to think realistically knows that we can reach the breaking point. When we reach that point who will save us?

Finally, I believe that if we do not rechart our course very soon, we will ultimately be as bankrupt as the rest of the world and end up with some totalitarian form of government on our own doorstep.

Why Is My Son in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, there appears in the March 16, 1951, issue of the weekly magazine United States News and World Report, a most remarkable statement in answer to the question "Why Is My Son in Korea?" It is an editorial by that outstanding publisher, editor and columnist, David Lawrence, whose penetrating editorial comments contribute so much to the desperate need of objective evaluation and sane, calm judgment in times of unparalleled confusion and irresponsibility. Mr. Lawrence's editorial is the finest thing of its kind I have seen. He says much more eloquently and effectively what I tried to say 8 months ago in my nationally syndicated column of July 18, 1950.

I commend the David Lawrence editorial to all Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be placed in the RECORD, together with a copy of my column.

There being no objection, the editorial, together with the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States News and World Report of March 16, 1951]

"WHY IS MY SON IN KOREA?"

(By David Lawrence)

The mother of a boy twice wounded in Korea asks this writer: "Why is my son fighting in Korea?" The question was not a protest but an earnest search for a definition.

American boys are fighting in Korea—

1. Because the sacrifice being made in Korea can save millions of young men now at home—the 18-year-olds, the 16-year-olds, the 12-year-olds—sparing them the necessity of fighting another world war.

2. Because from those who fought at the Marne and Chateau-Thierry, in Tunisia and at Anzio, in the Battle of the Bulge, at Midway, on New Guinea, Guadalcanal, the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa—from those brave men, there has been passed down the responsibility to preserve the American tradition for which so many of them died. This generation now is demonstrating in Korea that a great nation, untainted by the materialism of territorial ambition or the greed of conquest—having twice fought for principle and laid down its arms without a single act of selfishness toward its allies or a single act of dishonor toward its enemies—still will fight for principle and the cause of humanity.

3. Because America sees in the Korean war a challenge to freedom everywhere. Korea, the small helpless nation trampled under the heel of the Red invader, is the Cuba of Spain's cruelty in 1898, the Belgium of the Kaiser's invasion of 1914, and the Britain, the France, the Holland, and the Belgium, the Poland, and the Norway of Hitler's aggression of a decade ago.

4. Because an attack against freemen anywhere is a menace to democracy everywhere. A readiness to meet the aggressor in Korea can deter the master of that same aggression from precipitating a larger-scale war elsewhere.

5. Because America cannot allow the aggressor to come by sea or air or land to our shores. If aggression were to be successful in Korea, the Russian-Chinese alliance could then invade Japan and its northern islands and secure air bases for attack on nearby Alaska. If Northwest territory were threatened, so would our own Pacific coast cities soon be threatened, too.

6. Because America must mobilize her strength and not risk the defeat that can come if the whole free world is conquered and the total resources of our present allies are then appropriated by our enemy and its satellites for a final strike against us.

7. Because misguided minds among our own allies are ready to yield to the aggressor and run away, little realizing that by their defeatism they are encouraging another dictator even as they unwittingly did in the Rhineland episode of 1936 and at Munich in 1938.

8. Because today statesmanship is lacking, leadership is lacking, moral scruple is lacking, and the need is for sacrifice to raise aloft the banner of great ideals—so that once more the souls of men may be saved through the power of heroic example.

9. Because it is essential to the peace of the world that an International organization, such as the United Nations, stimulate a will to peace, and this means also a will to fight against aggression. Unhappily among our allies it has been questioned whether a shell-shocked populace can regain the will to fight. What we do in Korea can revive the fighting spirit of European peoples and demonstrate to peoples everywhere that the American will to fight for a just cause has not perished.

10. Because the American boys who fought and came home and the boys who never came back from World War I and World War II will have fought in vain if there now is a disintegration of spirit, a dissolution of the great moral purpose that guides brave men to give their lives in a noble cause.

11. Because, just as Christianity does not condone the suicide of the individual, Christianity rejects the suicide of the State—the basic fallacy of pacifism.

12. Because we are our brother's keepers and because as we see a drowning man struggling to reach the shore, the instinct is to go to his rescue. What that instinct means to the individual, it means to a nation whose greatness today, as in the past, is still sublimated by an unselfish effort to relieve human suffering and to emancipate men, women, and children from slavery. On the battlefields of Korea our youth is saving our own democracy from its sins of materialism and its indulgences and making it strong again. And it must be strong to insure the survival of the forces of good in the world and their triumph over the age-old forces of evil.

13. Because the troops in Korea and the airmen and sailors nearby are the crusaders of our times—crusaders for justice and crusaders for the rights of freemen to live in this world free from fear, free from the perennial terror imposed upon us by evil men.

14. Because the brave youth in Korea are putting to shame those thoughtless brethren in Britain and France and even in America who begrudge the dollars and pounds they now must forego, who worship the false gods of creature comfort even as the battalions in Korea, despising such weakness, lift their faces to the next ridge with the immortal courage that makes them worthy of man's finest accolade.

WASHINGTON AND YOU

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

WASHINGTON.—A constituent in Maine writes me that his wife has asked him several times during the past few days: "Why is it necessary that our boys should be sent over to Korea to labor, suffer, and die for the South Koreans who hate us? What business is it of us Americans? Why not let them fight out their own squabbles?"

The writer said that he could give the answer to this, considering the ultimate aims of the Communists, the commitments of the United Nations and other factors. But he claimed that he was not good at explaining his inner sensings of such matters.

I am sure he is like many of us. He paid me an unwarranted honor when he expressed confidence that I could give a clear, concise, and simple answer to his wife's questions and suggested that I do so in my column. I'll try.

The most direct answer is that Communist aggression any place in the world is a threat to the peace of the world—and to our own national security. With each bit of territory the Communists gobble up, regardless of how far away from our shores, they come that closer to us. Not only do they come closer but they conquer that many more people to be enslaved in the aggressive designs for conquering the entire world.

Why then do we choose to make a stand and fight in Korea when we didn't in China or any of the Balkan states?

The occupation of Korea was divided at the end of World War II between Russia in Northern Korea and the United States in Southern Korea. That division may have been wrong. But it was made principally because of the aggressive designs of Russia. To the rest of the world, Northern Korea was Communist Russian and Southern Korea was American.

Brushing aside the diplomatic frills, the North Korean attack was considered by the rest of the world a test attack of Russia through her puppets on that part of Korea for which the United States has assumed responsibility. In other words, Russia was making an indirect attack on America through Korea.

It is true that Russia has literally gobbled up the Balkan states and that her Chinese puppets have taken over China without direct American intervention. But her action in these areas was not an attack on America, direct or indirect. We didn't have any commitments in those places nor were we occupying any of them.

If we were to back down and withdraw from Southern Korea, we would have saved the lives of many Americans, who, it is true, have died for Southern Korean. But backing down there would not settle anything

except temporarily. What lives our moral surrender there would have saved would be very, very few compared to the number that would late be lost.

Why? Because we would have returned to the policy of appeasement. And that is nothing more than surrender on the installment plan. It didn't work with Hitler. Why should we expect it to work with Stalin?

Appeasement in Korea merely would have been followed by a Communist attack somewhere else—again and again and again—until finally we would be forced to stand up to Russia and say, "This is as far as you can go without making war on us." It is better to do it now than to wait until later when Russia has gobbled up most of the world and attacked us. It is like cancer, which kills gradually if not stopped early enough.

In the Korean test of courage and position, had we backed down we could hardly expect the Western European members of the North Atlantic Treaty to show any more bravery against aggression than the United States. Had we turned our backs and run we could hardly expect the United Nations to keep from folding.

In short, our boys are fighting and dying in South Korea to try to stave off death for you and me here in America from a possible Russian aerial assault. The Korean war is the business of America because peace is our business, especially in those areas we are occupying. We are not letting the North Koreans and the South Koreans fight out their own squabbles simply because basically it is not their own squabbles. It is an indirect squabble between Russia and America, a test squabble started by Russia against America.

The stronger we stand now the better our chance to discourage Russia from her design of world conquest and the better the hopes to peace in Russia's realization that we will fight instead of surrendering on the installment plan.

In South Korea we rejected the first installment.

Increase in Living Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the American Federation of Labor News of March 6 on the subject of inflation.

This article gives figures on the rise in the cost of living from December 15 to January 15. It is a startling piece of information and points again to the fact that it is of the utmost importance that the cost of living be controlled so that our people do not suffer unnecessarily.

The article follows:

COST OF LIVING SHOOTS TO NEW PEAK UNDER FAKE PRICE ORDER

WASHINGTON.—The price rise has become a stampede.

The United States Department of Labor reported that all items in the cost of living rose 3.2 points—or 1.5 percent—between December 15 and January 15.

Prices last January 15—11 days before the so-called price freeze—were 7.9 percent above the same period a year ago.

Undaunted, Price Stabilization Director Michael V. DiSalle approved a 3½-percent increase in prices for automobile manufacturers.

Food prices, which are uncontrolled, rose 2 percent more between January 15 and February 15.

The increase in cost of living has been so rapid that millions of workers have been forced to cut living standards and are still unable to make ends meet.

Two further factors in the piecemeal botched-up defense mobilization program being carried out by big business under Defense Mobilization Czar Charles E. Wilson and Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston compound the difficulties. These are:

1. Wages are frozen tight and Mr. Johnston is making decisions on the basis of expediency to take care of big-business friends like Mr. Wilson's own General Electric Co.

2. Mr. Wilson's failures in over-all direction of the set-up threatens to throw thousands of workers temporarily out of employment—with little or no income at all to meet the rising prices. Because of the lack of planning so that defense orders are ready to go when the production of civilian goods ends under the materials cutback plans, many plants will be forced to shut down.

The Labor Department reported that its new adjusted Consumers Price Index stood at 181.5 on January 15, a new record high for this index.

Between December 15 and January 15, the Department said prices of food rose 2.6 percent, housefurnishings 2.1 percent, apparel 1.5 percent, fuels 0.4 percent, rent 0.2 percent, and miscellaneous goods and services 0.9 percent.

And all of these items are due to go up more under the profit margin markup retail price order issued February 28 by Mr. DiSalle.

The United Labor Policy Committee called this order legalized robbery and the whole price-control program under the Defense Production Act of 1950 a cynical hoax on the American people.

The committee has called for recommendations to Congress that the act be amended to provide genuine price controls, but no action has been taken by President Truman, Mr. Wilson, or any other official with power to make such recommendations.

Government Hand-Outs and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ralph Turner, publisher of the Temple City Times in Temple City, Calif., has written a very forthright and interesting editorial on the problem of inflation. This editorial appeared in the Temple City Times on March 8, 1951, and I call it to the attention of the Members of the Congress as it presents some very worth while comments on one of the greatest problems now before us.

The editorial follows:

FIXED INCOMES, SMALLER DOLLARS

The greatest sufferer from the current and apparently continuing wave of monetary and price inflation is the person trying to live on a fixed income.

This person may be a retired school teacher, Government employee or business executive on a pension. He may be a person who put all his savings into insurance or bonds. He may be living on rentals from income property. In any of these cases, he or she is trying to get along on a certain number of dollars each month or year. And he finds these dollars buying less and less.

It can be, and it is, a desperate prospect for many people.

There is special interest, therefore, in the recommendation which the Price Controller, Michael DiSalle, made to a congressional committee the other day. He suggested that social-security benefits be raised for persons living on pensions or fixed incomes. Enabling such persons to survive in a time of rising national income and prices is "one of our toughest problems," he said. He admitted it was almost impossible to bring prices down to a level which would bring any relief to such people.

Mr. DiSalle's statement is true, but to find the answer will complicate enormously the already fouled-up mess of taxes and inflation. The Times starts today a series of articles explaining the recently liberalized social-security law. Evidently, even before the law becomes effective, we must consider granting still greater social benefits.

And at what "fixed income" are we going to draw the line for determining what individuals are entitled to greater Government aid?

Are we going to proceed even further and provide, by some financial magic, a greater return on Government bonds, savings accounts, and life insurance? Will we recommend greater purchase of common stocks or land as an inflation hedge? Or will we simply raise everybody's pension at the source (granting pensions, of course, to everyone who doesn't have any) and thus try to hold down the extra social-security payments?

Mr. DiSalle seems to be approaching the problem from the wrong end. He and his Government associates had better expend more of their energies controlling inflation at its source in correcting misconceived Federal financial policies (as evidenced by the row between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board over interest rates) and in cutting nonmilitary expenditures to the bone.

The Government simply cannot run hog-wild, and deuces wild, financially and expect extra hand-outs in the form of social security to make up for their own financial follies. That only will mean compounding the evil, adding more expense, more deficits, more taxes, and more inflation.

More About Defending Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1951, there was transmitted over station WGN a very enlightening and interesting broadcast by Bob Siegrist. His message contains material that should be both informative and instructive. Mr. Siegrist has given a great deal of thought and study to the question of properly fortifying the territory of Alaska against Russian attack and aggression. In his message, he cites facts and figures which are very illuminating and should have a tendency to alert the people of America to the danger to which the Alaskan territory is presently being exposed.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a broadcast made by Bob Siegrist over Station WGN, Chicago, Ill. The remarks of Mr. Siegrist, as noted in his broadcast, follow:

SITZALING THE HABOMAI ISLANDS

(By Bob Siegrist)

Moscow's cannon fodder is tightening its resistance against our drive in Korea. The First Marine Division, which registered several important gains west of Hoengsong earlier today, as it spearheaded the central-front drive, now is seriously engaged with the China Reds. On the east-central front, our Second Division also is finding tougher going, although it registered a mile gain today. And the Reds also continue to resist heavily on the western front near Seoul. The increased Red resistance cropped up simultaneously with renewed air activity. For the first time in nearly a month, Russian jet planes appeared over the Yalu River base of Sinuiju. They attacked four American jets in a 10-minute dog fight. When it was over, three of the Red planes were damaged and the Americans flew away unhurt. In an effort to cope with General MacArthur's killer offensive, the Red Chinese and their North Korean helpers appear to be fighting strictly a delaying action below the thirty-eighth parallel. The main enemy defense line on the central front has been set up in a horseshoe-shaped perimeter between Hoengsong and parallel thirty-eight. In the west the Reds appeared determined to hold Seoul.

However, several Chinese Red officers who were taken prisoner in the past few days told American Intelligence that the Chinese are planning a major offensive this month. They would unleash more than 250,000 men, which would include the Third Chinese Field Army, and Russian jet planes would aid in the drive. The objective would be to smash United Nations troops and force one or more Dunkerque evacuations.

The captured Reds say it would be a final move by Mao Tse-tung. And in connection with the Korean War, reports out of Hong Kong today say the cream of the Chinese Communist Army has been decimated in Korea. The Hong Kong story adds that an estimated 35 percent of the Chinese Reds' entire military strength has been made ineffective. Heavy reinforcements are said to be under mobilization so that more troops can be sent to the front. General Lin Pao's Fourth Field Army is believed to have suffered the heaviest casualties. And another Hong Kong report claims the Chinese Reds have issued an urgent appeal to Moscow for more weapons. It quoted an aide to a Chinese general as saying that staggering losses in Korea prompted Mao Tse-tung to ask for help from Moscow. General MacArthur said today that North Korean civilians during the Allies' December-January retreat expressed their complete aversion to Communist rule. The Allied Commander, in a report to the United Nations, said the North Koreans "Welcomed our forces as liberators when we went in and sought to withdraw with us when we withdrew."

Bitter feuding is reported between pro-Communist and anti-Communist factions called by Tibet's Dalai Lama at Yatung. These reports, filtering through the frontier Indian town of Kalimpong, say the pro-Communists are led by an official Tibetan trade agent named Pangdatsang. He's pressing for acceptance of demands by Moscow's China puppet that six high Tibetan officials be dismissed from the government and turned over to Chinese Communist authorities. Among these is the former regent, Takta Rimpoche, who ruled in the 16-year-old Dalai Lama's name until only recently. Takta, the 73-year-old former regent, is reported heading opposition to the Communists on the grounds that the China Reds are hostile to the Tibetan religion—as the Reds are hostile to all religions. These reports add that he's urging the Tibetan Government to hold out for genuine guaranties before negotiating with the conquering Chinese, which proves that Takta, even at his supposedly sagacious age, is far from realistic as far as feeling that the Communists, any Communists, are ever capable of guaranteeing any truth and sticking with it. The more realistic of the opposing Tibetan faction leaders would seem to be the pro-Communist Pangdatsang—for, when one adds to the fact that he's an official trade agent, the report that Pangdatsang is, as would naturally seem to follow anyway, the richest man in Tibet—it's obvious that Pangdatsang as too often is the case, is weighing his patriotism in terms of how much money he can make in trading with the commies. But here Pangdatsang, too, floats hopelessly into the unrealistic—since he apparently fails to realize that when the day comes, he too, can be a very impoverished, and a very dead Communist-appeasing Tibetan duck. Meanwhile, the Chinese Communists are doing their best to force the Tibetan hand by moving fresh saber-rattling troops into both eastern and western Tibet.

In Washington, there's no further public indication as to what the official Acheson-Truman reaction may be regarding yesterday's charge by their adviser and special ambassador, John Foster Dulles, that Moscow has further abused the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, and the official American complacency by stealing the Habomai Islands, which lie so very strategically, between Japan and the Russian-occupied Kuriles. At Yalta, Roosevelt, advised by the now convicted Alger Hiss, handed the Kurile Islands to Stalin, along with the several other fatal concessions including the division of Korea—all of which led in turn to the disaster in China and the present serious crisis in Korea, in which we've already suffered more than 51,000 American casualties. Yesterday, as we reported, Dulles, just back from Japan, where he's been discussing that long-overdue peace treaty, broke the news to a press conference. He said we'd simply not recognize the latest Stalin grab from beneath our noses. Even so, the cold, hard fact will remain that Russia has seized this six-island chain, posing just one more Russian threat to our own shores through the Pacific Basin. It means that Russia has been permitted to further cut our vital chain between threatened Japan and our own virtually abandoned Aleutians. It means that Russia has been able to extend her Yalta-handed grab of the Kuriles which she's built up as a stronghold for future attack against us—southward to the very tip of Japan—just one more Red-held dagger poised at the strategic heart of our defenses.

Actually, the Potsdam Conference, which Mr. Truman attended, must get a share of the credit for making this latest disaster possible, since, as in the case of the division of Korea, it was formalized at Potsdam, with the Russians taking full advantage of typically Communist manipulation of language, facts, and geography while our representatives sat and watched and agreed; just as they there agreed to settling for a mere island in a Red sea in Germany—a western Berlin to which we had no official access. Now the big question arises here: Why wasn't this quiet Russian steal of further property to which Moscow had no right in the world discovered long ago? Where's our intelligence? Or, if it was discovered long ago, if our intelligence did operate, and make its report to the diplomatic and political corps—which perhaps it did—what happened? The answer, obviously, is nothing at all.

But, at least, why did the administration wait until this tragically belated moment to tell the American people the truth of the situation? Certainly John Dulles, who failed to recognize imminent aggression at Korea's thirty-eighth parallel just before it came, didn't discover this new Russian grab all by himself. As a matter of fact, we've had reports for some time of Russian ships operating about the Habomai Islands, seizing Japanese fishing ships. Certainly Washington could not have been unaware of that; any more than could Washington really have been unaware of the years of conflict and bloodshed at the thirty-eighth parallel before the total blow came last June 25, in Korea.

Frank Boykin Arises at About 4:30 a. m., and Is at Work in His Office on Capitol Hill Long Before 6 Each Morning—He Jams More Work Into a Single Day Than the Average Individual Does in a Whole Workweek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, it would be physically impossible for any man to continually exhibit more unbounded energy, nerve, stick-to-itiveness, and devotion to the interests of his Alabama constituency, than is made manifest—every day and every night throughout the year—by our good friend and colleague, the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN.

Mr. Speaker, no man in this House knows FRANK BOYKIN better than your own good self, and I know that you regard it as no overstatement when I say that no Member of this House has ever worked harder in the discharge of his official duties than the gentleman representing the first district of Alabama.

With a belief in his fellow man that is God-given—and believing, also, in private initiative and rugged individualism—FRANK BOYKIN has established a most enviable record in helping men to help themselves. To my personal knowledge, he has spent thousands upon thousands of dollars in his endeavor to bring more new and bigger industries to his Alabama district. It is, indeed, no happenstance that agriculturally, industrially, commercially, and financially, the first district of Alabama has shown more real development and growth during the time that BOYKIN has represented that district here in this Congress than marked it in all the years that passed since the establishment of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, FRANK BOYKIN arises at about 4:30 a. m., and is at work in his office on Capitol Hill long before 6 o'clock each morning. That is a life-long habit, well known to all business associates for more than the past 50 years. That habit, coupled with his unbounded vigor, has enabled Congressman FRANK to jam more work into a single day than the average individual will put out in a whole week.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of yesterday, Sunday, March 11, on its page devoted to national affairs, as written by Robert C. Albright, carried a short-homey, frank, honest, and candid story about my good friend, and the good

friend of every Member of the Congress that meets on both ends of the Capitol.

It is a simple story, telling of but four of the hundreds of industries and other business projects that FRANK BOYKIN has brought to the First District of Alabama, and which have resulted in the employment of thousands of men and women.

The industries referred to in Bob Albright's story, and now employing more than 2,000 men and women, are those of the Vanity Fair Mills—located at Monroeville, Demopolis, Jackson, and Atmore, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, at this very hour, there is still another huge industry in the making on the Tombigbee River and on the Southern Railroad, at McIntosh, in Washington County, Ala.—brought there, wholly and solely, through the efforts of Congressman FRANK W. BOYKIN. It is a new chemical plant, which will avail itself of the great deposits of salt unearthed at McIntosh by the Congressman.

The plant is to be constructed by the Mathieson Alabama Chemical Co., and will involve an initial expenditure of an excess of $10,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, again, FRANK BOYKIN creates still more opportunities for hundreds of his constituents and their families to enjoy higher and better standards of living, education, and life.

All hail to Congressman BOYKIN. May his shadow never grow less.

Recognizing, in common with all in this body, his integrity and unblemished honesty, in private dealings as well as in public service, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues of this House to extend my remarks, and insert into the RECORD of our proceedings, the story taken from the Washington Post of Sunday, March 11, and as reported by Robert C. Albright.

The article reads, as follows:

GALLERY GLIMPSES

(By Robert C. Albright)

Alabama's FRANK W. BOYKIN (Democrat) for years has risen before dawn, gone to his office around 4:30 a. m., and done his day's dictating into a machine. At least once, the "early bird" routine paid off in a big way. Here's the unbelievable story:

Leaving his office for coffee about 6:30 a. m. a few years back, BOYKIN saw a big, heavy-set fellow pacing up and down in front of an office across the hall.

"When will this Pennsylvania Congressman get in?" the stranger asked BOYKIN.

"I dunno," replied BOYKIN, "but come on out and have a cup of coffee with me."

The stranger introduced himself as Howard Smader, head of the Vanity Fair Mills, of Reading, Pa., specializing in women's smart clothes.

Over coffee, BOYKIN dwelt on the undeveloped glories of his Alabama district, the undiscovered mill sites, the dreamboat opportunities awaiting employer and labor alike.

Smader never went back to see the Pennsylvania Congressman. Instead, he sent scouts to BOYKIN's Tombigbee River. Within 2 years, he moved his first mill there from Pennsylvania.

Over the years he moved more of them, until today the thriving business operates almost entirely within BOYKIN's district, with plants at Monroeville, Demopolis, Jackson, and Atmore, Ala.

Why was the Pennsylvania Congressman?

"I'd rather not say," evades BOYKIN. "But it pays to get up early in the morning."

"The Nation That Controls the Air Will Control the Continents of the World"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I remember some prominent German Air Force general, noted for his skill and ability in aerial warfare, being quoted as saying: "The nation that controls the air will control the sea lanes of the world, will control the continents of the world; the nation that controls the air will control this world and dominate this world for the next hundred years."

Personally, I am disposed to feel as did that Germany military leader, and it is because of that fact that I was particularly interested in an article in the Washington Post of March 2, 1951, telling of a new type of jet plane which Secretary Thomas K. Finletter said "will even surpass our B-36."

Mr. Speaker, the more critical that world conditions become, the more I become convinced that not alone are American defenses primarily dependent upon the strength of our air power, supported, let us say, by land power, rather than by land power afforded so-called tactical air support. My good friend, the Honorable JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, gave voice to a truism when he stated, in the cloakroom, but a few days ago: "If we are to survive as a nation, we must recognize the fact that our military strength rests in an invincible Air Force."

It is only, in part, because of these things that I was pleased to note Secretary Finletter's statement that the Air Force is now going into the production of a new heavy bomber—a Boeing jet-engined B-52, as well as a radically different jet version of the B-36.

In the news account of the interview, Mr. Finletter went on to tell about the development of an even newer plane that is likewise going into immediate production. This plane, it is reported, will have a combat altitude in excess of 10 miles—and the first production models will be delivered in the current calendar year.

It is now universally agreed that were it not for our Air Force our ground troops would have been thrown out of Korea months ago. There remains no doubt whatever of the wonderful tactical support which our Air Force gave to the air-ground operations in Korea. In this support, the United States Air Force alone contributed, under the most adverse conditions, almost 100,000 flights or sorties.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have often said on the floor of this House, "Air power is truly peace power," and, certainly, the most economical way of defending our shores. The world is now convinced that the only thing which has contained the Russians, and thus far prevented world-wide global warfare, is the power of the United States Air Force and its ability to deliver the atom bomb.

Stalin, Vishinski, Malik know, as well as does every other competent military and civilian head in Russia, that the United States Air Force has a hundred Russian cities marked for absolute annihilation if Russia ever so much as loses a single blast at the homeland of the U. S. A.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of its timeliness, and of the deep and continuing interest of the American people in the planning by our Air Force for the economic defense of this country, that I ask unanimous consent of this House to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD a news account of Secretary Finletter's statement entitled "Boeing's B-52 Global Bomber Ordered Built."

That article reads as follows:

BOEING'S B-52 GLOBAL BOMBER ORDERED BUILT—FINLETTER ALSO TELLS OF PLANS FOR NEW JET TYPE OF B-36

(By John G. Norris)

The Air Force is going into production with a new heavy bomber—Boeing's jet-engined B-52—and will build a radically different jet version of the B-36.

One or the other—or both—eventually will replace the present Convair B-36 as the backbone of the Nation's Strategic Air Command, relied upon to carry A-bombs from American homeland bases to any point on the globe, United States Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter said.

At the same time, Finletter announced that there no longer is any question about the ability of the United States to build an atomic-powered airplane. This determination, he pointed out, is a "development of the greatest importance."

Such craft, it is clear, would revolutionize air power, making it possible for aircraft to travel indefinitely without refueling. Finletter cautioned, however, that the conclusion that an atomic aircraft engine is feasible does not mean we'll have one flying soon.

The Atomic Energy Commission revealed last week that this project had entered a new phase, and it is expected that the aircraft-engine division of General Electric and Convair Aircraft will join in developing such a plane.

Finletter also announced that the Air Force pretty well decided to adopt the British Canberra jet bomber as its new light bomber and build it at the Glenn L. Martin plant in Baltimore.

Martin's three-engined jet B-51—rival of the Canberra in the light-bomber competition—will not be completely shelved, Finletter said. Development work will continue on it, for possible future production, he added.

Decision of the Air Force to place production orders now for the B-52 is a sound calculated risk, even though the craft has not yet flown, Finletter told reporters at a Pentagon briefing session. Two prototypes of the big B-52 are now building but are not expected to fly before fall. The production model B-52's will be constructed at Boeing's Seattle plant, the company announced.

He said the risk of financial loss through failure is well worth taking because the B-52 is really a considerably bigger B-47. The latter is the Air Force's new medium bomber, a high-speed comparatively short-range craft, considered the best in the world. It has been thoroughly tested and mass production is under way.

Both planes have swept-back wings and cigar-like fuselages. The B-52 is expected to have a speed well over 500 miles per hour, a combat altitude in excess of 55,000 feet, and a range somewhat short of the B-36's 10,000 miles. That will be the first version of the craft, which is expected to be equipped

with 8, as yet unannounced, Pratt & Whitney jet engines—the J-57, which it is hoped will develop about 10,000 pounds thrust.

Later, the Air Force plans to put turboprop engines in both the B-52 and the new B-36. Such engines—which harness jet power to propellers—give much greater range than present jets.

The new B-36 will be jet-powered and have swept-back wings. New versions of the present B-36's have six piston engines and four jet engines. The latter, however, are for take-off and emergency bursts of speed only.

First production models of the B-52 and the two prototypes of the all-jet B-36 will be delivered late this year, Finletter said. They'll be in competition and quantity orders of one or both will follow exhaustive tests. No short cut, such as is being taken with the B-52—ordering production before experimental versions are tested—is possible with the new B-36, he said.

The latter is entirely a new airplane, though probably it will be called a B-36, Finletter declared. There'll be no cut-back on production of the present B-36, he explained.

Oil Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time to address the membership of this House and convey to them the strenuous opposition of my constituency to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce the percentage depletion allowance granted to the oil industry, in computing Federal income taxes where such income is derived from the production of oil and gas.

My constituents are generally very much opposed to having any change made in the present system of taxing the oil industry. This is because most of them are either directly employed in the oil industry or they prosper by having this industry in their midst. As a result, I am sure I speak for my entire district when I say that we do not want Congress to do anything which will slow up the operations of the oil industry, particularly with respect to exploration activities which are so important to the future welfare of the industry.

In order to illustrate the importance of the oil industry in my district, I would like to call attention to the fact that in 1949 our crude oil production aggregated 102,000,000 barrels, or approximately 30 percent of the total production of the State of California. That production has substantially increased as of this time. In the Tenth Congressional District of California we have approximately 10,000 oil and gas wells. They are owned by over 450 different oil companies and operators. Many thousand people are participating owners in such companies. Several thousand persons are directly employed in the industry and many thousands more owe part or all of their support to oil operations.

I am sure that this Congress is already in possession of a vast amount of information on the subject of percentage depletion and that it would be presumptuous of me to go into technical details. On the other hand, I wish to speak generally with regard to the matter and to indicate to you why I am registering this protest in behalf of my district and the oil industry as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, as the result of my long acquaintance with oilmen, I find that incentive is an essential element in their operations. They will risk their capital, and insofar as they can borrow money, they will risk it too to finance their exploration activities. Four out of five wildcat wells drilled, as you know, turn out to be dry, but in spite of this chance of losing, oilmen consider the ultimate reward worth the risk. On the other hand, if they are to take all the risk and only receive a limited portion of the reward, their incentive is correspondingly reduced.

Financing oil operations is always a problem with most operators. The uncertainty of finding oil is so great that financial institutions are reluctant to lend money on such ventures. As a result, the initial investment in a wildcat operation is usually the venture capital of an individual or a group of individuals. Without some reasonable assurance that this investment may be returned out of production, they are inclined to go slow. Thus, percentage depletion serves to add to the income of those who are successful in drilling a productive well and this provides capital for further exploration activity. I am confident that the industry as a whole spends much more for exploration and development of oil than the benefit it derives from the depletion allowance.

When I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee last year, I said, in part:

> It is with considerable interest that I note that the principal argument for reducing excise taxes is to encourage greater consumer interest in buying the product so taxed. It is curious that the administration would recommend an action which would discourage the production of oil in order to stimulate the consumption of the products of the other industries. This amounts to robbing Peter to pay Paul, when the better way would be to give more serious consideration to reducing Federal expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from a rather extensive tour of our Pacific coast and Western States. I find that the American workingman and his wife, both in and out of organized labor, are becoming aware of the realities of high Government taxation and political support through hand-outs of power and tax money to pressure groups. The accumulated evidence is now irrefutable and establishes past unconscionable political tactics against the interests of the average American working person employed in those industries where labor demogoguery and a controlled labor press are supposed to be able to turn over the vote.

Commencing during the last war, this administration aided and tolerated certain labor organizations to bargain across whole industries. That political tactic now operates in such industries as coal, steel, autos, household appliances, electrical appliances, clothing, and many others. Such increased labor costs when forced upon a whole industry are not paid by the employer, but, rather, are paid by the consumers, 90 percent of whom are other workingmen. The employers in such industries act as tribute collectors for such special treatment in organized labor, just as they act as tax collectors from workingmen to raise our national budget.

In these special industries workingmen now have a shorter workday, a shorter workweek, most of the so-called "fringe" benefits, and receive over three times as much as an hourly wage as is the minimum wage to employees in interstate commerce.

On January 25 this administration then froze those conditions. It is now estimated that such freeze may last for at least 10 years. These special industries are supposed to be those where a handful of labor leaders can turn over the vote. Two days after wages were frozen John L. Lewis put over an increase of about $1.70 per day in the coal fields. We are now advised that the Price Stabilizer is going to allow escalator clauses to increase wages for about 800,000 auto workers.

I know you gentlemen realize that there is no justification for a $16 per day minimum wage in the coal fields, plus about $1.50 per day in the retirement fund, when those wages are paid by other workingmen who buy automobiles, baby bottles, bicycles, and other necessities made through the consumption of coal.

The Ways and Means Committee is reconsidering this subject at the request of this administration, after having solved the same subject in favor of the general welfare of our country last year. To me, it is inconceivable that a nation living under antitrust laws for over 50 years should have tolerated the political tactics employed in special industries for the past 8 or 10 years. It is certainly impossible for me to believe that this Congress will now destroy the ability of the oil industry to both employ its present personnel, or do more for them, so that those employees, as consumers, can pay special tribute to employees of another industry. It is understandable that human beings heading labor movements should be joined together and act in collusion with politicians if they gain additional power by such action. However, why labor leaders of men working in utilities, whose wages cannot be raised without the consent of rate payers, are able to join in such tactics is beyond my understanding. Probably the answer is that the workingmen they represent have no effective secret ballot through which to put such leaders out of office. I submit, however, that this Congress might better consider authorizing such secret ballot to workingmen rather than spend time considering a proposition that is designed to destroy existing jobs for men in industry necessary for our defense.

I know this subject is now important to this Congress because coal miners who get a minimum salary of $17 per day are tax collectors from railroad brakemen who only receive $11 per day, even though they must spend $125 per month living away from their home. The coal miner is in a higher tax bracket and, as I have

pointed out, his wage differential is to be found in Ford automobiles and washing machines.

The request of the Secretary is in effect a statement by this administration that it is welching on the expressed intent of the Congress last year. Oil companies in the past have expended moneys borrowed on their future production in presently producing wells to drill dry holes. They relied on expressed congressional intention. Favorable action on the Secretary's request means deliberate fraud and deception. A change in the existing law so that marginal producing oil companies cannot do more for their employees when those employees are forced to pay the bill for this administration's political briberies in other industries is also a fraud against such employees.

This is the same subject which has been considered by this administration's advisers and who then very wisely said that it is the little man who will pay additional taxes. The little man will have to carry the major share of any tax increases, just as he will have to pay for the past industry-wide bargaining. This fact is brought out clearly by the testimony of Secretary Snyder before the Senate Finance Committee on August 2, 1950. It shows that the great bulk of income available for additional taxation lies in the low-income groups. He did not have the courage to say that we are going to collect taxes from the large corporations for pure demagoguery. He would not say that those people were to be made the tax-collection agent for Government and collect those taxes from the consumer.

The January report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers—Keyserling and company—speaking of the matter for higher taxes, said:

> By far the largest part of additional revenue must come from the middle and low tax brackets. These are the brackets in which the great bulk of income is located. Of the total net income shown on all taxable rates, 86 percent of the amount remaining after Federal income taxes is estimated to be received by taxpayers with net incomes of less than $10,000.

Gentlemen, this House will shortly be called upon to consider a budget involving about $2,300 for each family in America. As Lenin prophesied, we are spending ourselves into bankruptcy. If you will add to that figure about $700 for each family for State government, $500 for county government, and $300 for city government, I believe you will agree with me that the Members of both parties of this Congress must insist that the "gimme" domestic program costing a total of $30,000,000,000 per year must stop. This administration, whose Secretary of the Treasury proposed the destruction of the oil industry last year, has returned in an effort to obtain more money and demands that the Congress destroy that industry this year. Under such circumstances, we need no enemies abroad, the very ticking of the clock in marking off the hours will ruin us.

Mr. Speaker, if our Nation is to keep strong, both internally and with respect to defending ourselves against a possible enemy from without, we should not take any action which will deprive ourselves of an adequate oil supply in the years to come. In order to obtain $200,000,000 in additional Federal revenue from oil operators, are we not jeopardizing a multibillion-dollar investment in national defense?

It is my belief that we cannot afford to take this chance and that is why I urge the membership of this House to refrain from making any change in the percentage depletion allowance granted to the oil and gas industry, which is so important to my district and to the Nation.

I have heard it said that in the present budget the President has $1,000,000,000 that he can use in the national interest whenever he finds that private industry is no longer able in "know how" America to meet the needs of our domestic consumption. I am also advised that present arrangements are being made whereby in the long run the American taxpayer will stand the bill for the expansion of United States Steel to the extent of over $450,000,000 in new plants and comparable expenditures by other members of our steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, we in the West want to develop our own resources, through private industry and private enterprise. We believe that great oil fields of the West are still to be uncovered in eastern Washington and Oregon and other areas. We know from experience that as oil depletion allowance in the amount of that presently existing is needed to induce exploration to depths now exceeding 16,000 feet. We have many modern devices, but it is still the core bit 3 miles deep that tells us whether or not oil exists in a particular area. That knowledge is in the national interest and is vital to the war effort. The right to develop such resources, pay good wages, and build good schools is the birthright of the people of the West and other areas of the United States where such explorations might reasonably be made.

There is no need of repeating the words of our Supreme Court that the power to tax is the power to destroy. I know it must have been repeated many times in this House.

In closing, I merely want to point out to the membership of this House that you are not just considering increasing the amount of tax levied on an industry, as you have done year after year in this body to support unnecessary Government waste and spending. You are actually considering at this moment the destruction of private enterprise in a particular industry—oil.

Pulaski Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following speech I delivered on Pulaski Day at Ware, Mass, under the auspices of the Massachusetts Polish Congress:

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Father, distinguished guests, members of the various Polish-American organizations, and fellow citizens and friends of the radio audience, it is a high privilege, indeed, for me as your Representative in the Congress of the United States to join you in this most impressive celebration of Pulaski Day.

It is fitting that we should join together here this afternoon in such large numbers to pay our heartfelt tribute of respect and affection to such a great Polish patriot and such a great friend of our own country and also by our presence and declarations rededicate ourselves with high courage and unyielding resolution to the exalted principles and the lofty purposes by which he lived and died.

Let me heartily congratulate all those who are responsible for these noteworthy exercises. There has never been a time in the history of our country when the need for stalwart Americanism, high ideals, and dauntless spirit was greater than it is today. Everywhere liberty is under challenge by ruthless dictators. Everywhere freedom is being assailed and attacked by power-crazed tyrants. Everywhere conspiracies are being carried out against democracy and justice and unless we move quickly in defense of our priceless free institutions, everything will be lost.

How inspiring it has been to me to observe the reactions of our Polish-American friends to the dangers of the present. On every hand through the Polish-American Congress, through many organizations of persons of Polish blood, through countless leaders, you have taken up the battle against totalitarian dictatorship and in defense of the principles of America.

I cannot find words adequately to compliment you upon the sterling patriotism and tireless unselfish devotion which you have displayed in fighting against the great menace of human slavery which is presently overshadowing the world. It has been a high privilege for me to have taken part in this campaign to preserve the American way of life and to redeem the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Not long ago on the eleventh anniversary of the iniquitous attack upon Poland, I spoke in the House of Representatives to remind the American people of the tragic events which led up to the betrayal of Poland and to serve notice upon the Soviet Union that true Americans would not cease to agitate the sacred cause of Poland until Poland had again taken its place as a self-respecting member of the world community of nations.

We cannot possibly measure the unspeakable infamy by which the noble Polish people have become enslaved, the first in the then free world to feel the bitter sting of the tyrant's lash in World War II. At the time Poland was a brave, free nation embracing a peace-seeking, liberty-loving, devoted Christian people with the rich tradition of loyalty to human freedom. It was brutally assaulted by international brigands and racketeers who disregarded all the laws of God and man and broke all the express terms of existing and valid nonaggression treaties in order to encompass the liquidation of a democratic Poland and ruthlessly confine its people behind the iron curtain.

There was no color of legality to this shameful act. Poland at the time was a member in good standing of the League of Nations and a faithful ally of France and Great Britain. Her people had struggled long and sacrificed bitterly to establish their free government. Yet without provocation and without warning Hitler's bestial hordes attacked defenseless Poland on September 1, 1939, just as the Soviet-led, Moscow-directed

forces of North Korea attacked the helpless democratic minded people of South Korea about 3 months ago.

As I said in my speech on the floor of the House, the duplicity and treachery behind this savage attack on Poland constitutes one of the blackest pages in world history. As a result Poland was put on the carving block and cut up between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Instead of protesting and nullifying this unconscionable act as all decent-minded nations should have done, it was ratified and approved virtually in its entirety at the Yalta conference. Thus our own country became a party at least so far as the Russian Government and the rest of the world was concerned to the dismemberment of Poland and the enslavement of her people by the Soviets.

But I have taken the position, and I will continue inflexibly to take the position that this action which is deprecated by all real freedom-loving Americans never had the official sanction of this Government. It was a mere Executive agreement never ratified by the United States Senate. As such it is illegal, unconstitutional, and not binding upon the United States. No American official was authorized to agree to the shameful abandonment to a cruel enslavement by the Soviets of our warm friends, faithful allies, and noble people of Poland. We must never cease our activities until we have canceled and annulled the provisions of that incredible and unconscionable document.

You are fully aware of the current world situation. One great aggressor against freedom has been despatched by force of arms and in that glorious victory boys of Polish blood rendered a magnificent service second to none. But has that fact stopped aggression in the world? It has not. Hitler is gone but a new and more widely spread and subtly organized aggressor lifts his ugly head and casts a cloud upon freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. Hitler has been liquidated but Stalin has taken his place preaching the goepel of hate against his fellowman and carrying the torch of rebellion, insurrection, and conspiracy to the far corners of the earth.

It is the everlasting credit and glory of the Polish people that they have never willingly surrendered their rights, they have never forfeited their freedom, they have never bowed to enslavement, they have never ceased their resistance to tyranny. To the contrary, this brave courageous people is still asserting the sovereignty of their nation, still working for liberation from Russian bondage, still ready to sacrifice to recover the liberties which were stolen away from them by a shameless perfidy and ruthless armed might. The united nation of Poland stands today before the whole world proclaiming its independence to all, reiterating its determination to strive and fight until its freedom has been regained.

We welcomed our Polish allies during the war, we are proud of their loyal unswerving allegiance to the ideals of democracy and freedom which we ourselves profess. We are grateful for their loyal support of our cause and for the association which we have had with them in fighting against the common enemies of freedom.

So today, in the name of that freedom, in the name of our American democracy, in the name of the justice of the living God whom we revere, in the name of our Nation, and in the name of every decent principle of civilized man, let us reiterate our loyalty to Poland and her sacred cause of liberty. Let us express our determination that she will soon be liberated from the oppressor and be restored to her place among free nations.

Let us renounce and reject once and forever the unconscionable agreements by which she was consigned to Soviet domination. On this great anniversary of one of her immortal heroes, let all true Americans rally to her side, encouraging her leaders and her sons and daughters who are still fighting to recapture their liberty, pledging our assistance to them in their struggle for independence, offering our friendship, our support, our help to them in this hour of their great trial.

And so, my friends, let us accept this mighty challenge that has been flung from the Kremlin against the very existence of the democratic way of life. Let us maintain an armed strength here in our Nation that will keep our country secure and that will enable us through union with other freedom-loving nations in the United Nations and elsewhere to move speedily to the protection of democracy and freedom and justice and human liberty.

And may the day soon come, pray God, when peace may dawn upon this sorry world. When the evils of totalitarianism shall be removed forever. When Poland is freed from the chains of slavery and restored to her rightful status as a free and independent nation.

With courage in our hearts let us be rededicated today to the great and noble purposes of Pulaski and go forward fearlessly to establish a genuine lasting peace on this earth.

Keep the Commandments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following sermon entitled "Keep the Commandments," which was delivered by The Reverend Vito C. Mazzone, pastor, St. Mary Magdalen DePazzi Church, Philadelphia, Pa., at the fifty-third annual communion high mass of DeSoto Council, No. 315, of the Knights of Columbus on Passion Sunday, March 11, 1951. The entire sermon, which was broadcast over radio station WJMJ, follows:

Today we are assembled in this church to render a public manifestation of faith and loyalty to God in return for the many benefits granted to us. With this attestation of faith we proclaim that we are the children of God and that we owe to Him homage and filial devotion.

Man is a rational, social, and political person. There are in human beings gifts, rights, and values which transcend political society and which exist neither by virtue of the state nor for the state, and which are outside the state.

The taproot of human personality is not society, but God; the ultimate end of man is not society, but God; the center where the person makes more and more perfect its very life is on the plane of eternal things.

The philosophy of Charles Marx, Hegels, Lenin—on which Russian communism is based, is materialistic, and therefore atheistic. It denies man's personality, man's rights. According to Communist doctrine man is pure matter, a mere cog in the machinery of the state. There is no difference between body and soul; no survival of the soul after death; no future life. The state is God and religion is called the opium of the people.

We are living today in an age in which the genius of evil is seeking to spread rebellion and hatred against God, His church, and His disciples. We are living in a world in which man considers himself a superman, forgetting that he is not his own creator, forgetting that he is not the result of evolution, forgetting that he is only the masterpiece of God's creation. We are living in an era of deicide and homicide, for man has denied both God and the most essential part of his own being, his soul.

While in godless Russia and her satellites, churches and Catholic buildings are confiscated or used for profane purposes—while bishops, priests, nuns, and Christians are murdered, exiled, or imprisoned—we must be thankful that we live in this great and blessed country. This country in which we live is destined by Divine Providence to save the whole world from the menace of communism, to bring to all men the blessing of freedom and independence.

It is true that in all Russia there is one Catholic priest, the Reverend Father Adomovich who is an American and resides in Moscow, through an agreement between the late President Roosevelt and the diabolical Joseph Stalin.

But when you consider that this Catholic priest is not free to exercise his priestly office—he is always surrounded and watched by spies—he is not allowed to extend his apostolate publicly and to other people, but only to the personnel attached to foreign embassies, then you will understand that this is not freedom of religion and worship.

Yes, the Kremlin government recognizes the Orthodox Church. Do you know, my dear Catholic men, that this church is used for political purpose to spread its propaganda abroad and is the servant of the state and the head of this puppet church is a layman—George Karpov who is an atheist?

You, my dear people, are truly fortunate to possess the faith of our fathers. Faith in God, in Three Divine Persons, and in that church bequeathed to us by Christ, watered by the blood of the Divine Martyr, faith in that church which alone has the marks of unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity.

Be extremely proud, because the faith which is yours comes from Rome, the cradle of justice and civilization, the mother of heroes, martyrs, and saints.

In their wishful thinking the enemies of our religion imagine that the days of the church are numbered. Throughout the centuries, the Catholic Church has been calumniated and persecuted. However, she has emerged from each attack rejuvenated, more vigorous, and vitalizing than ever.

Man's life is fleeting, empires and kingdoms have passed, but the Catholic Church will not pass.

My dear friends, we are facing today the greatest foe of our time. This is the fight between light and darkness, right and wrong; between Christ and the anti-Christ; between the true followers of Christ and the disciples of His eternal enemy, Satan. You are called upon to do your share in this bitter struggle. The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. You know who our foe is. He disguises himself as the benefactor of mankind; he teaches equality and man's welfare; he teaches that his philosophy can solve all social-economic problems. He is well trained, and while his tactics are changeable according to world conditions, his basic purposes are achieved by deceit and double-dealing, force, and violence, the enslavement of all people. The Communists are bold and skillful liars. The Kremlin-trained Communists are the professed enemy of God, nations, and the people. They are the enemies of God because they seek to destroy what is in the nature of every human being, the inalienable right of belief in God. They are the enemies of nations because they endeavor to install a totalitarian government which would exercise ruthless control. They are the enemies of the people because they are trying to eliminate the family, man's rights, and even man's personality.

This is why you Catholic men today have a great mission to accomplish. The Communists constitute a minority, and yet we cannot help but admire them for what they are accomplishing. If even a minority of Christians, and particularly Catholic men, were as enthusiastic and fervent in spreading the doctrine of Christ as these Communists are in spreading the doctrine of Satan, the world would soon be living the teachings of Christ. Catholics and non-Catholics should be united not in the doctrinal but in the social field to combat and unmask the Communists who are today the greatest enemy of mankind. We must live the doctrine of Christ. In the shop, in the home, on the street, in the Government, in our recreation, we must be Christophers, Christ-bearers, bringing by our way of life, Christ into the lives of others. This will be accomplished by teaching and spreading, by our good example, the unchangeable and everlasting truths of our Divine Master.

It is up to us, my dear friends. Only the Ten Commandments, which are the unchangeable and eternal law of God can solve the problems of the world. While rulers, legislators, and diplomats are wasting time and money to find the way of solving these most important problems, the Ten Commandments are the only valid tenets, the only true road. Millions of laws have been made, and yet there is no peace in the world.

In conclusion, I would like to leave with you one thought: You will remember that when Christ was asked by the young man: "What shall I do to save my soul?" He gave a very brief answer. The answer which the Saviour gave contains in its entirety the information sought in the question, "How shall we find world peace?" That answer is, "Keep the Commandments."

Hint Kaiser-Frazer To Avoid RFC Quiz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James M. Haswell, from the Chicago Daily News of March 9, 1951:

HINT KAISER-FRAZER TO AVOID RFC QUIZ—DEFENSE WORK CHANGES PICTURE

(By James M. Haswell)

WASHINGTON.—The RFC loans to the Kaiser-Frazer Corp., which started the Senate investigation of the Government's lending policy, probably are not going to be aired before the hearings conclude.

Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the inquiry, says such hearings would be "like beating a dead horse."

Times have changed, says FULBRIGHT. The loans that looked risky in 1949 now look safe in view of defense work coming up.

The auto industry expects to sell all the autos it can make in 1951, since dollars are cheap, metals are short, and the Government may put a quota on car production later in the year.

FULBRIGHT says the Kaisers are not involved in the influence aspects of the RFC investigation.

If hearings were held they would not show the Kaisers brought improper pressure on RFC directors, or invoked White House aid to gain favors from money-lending agencies.

Despite its determination to close the record without a public airing of the Kaiser-Frazer loans, the Senate committee is under great pressure to change its decision.

A group of former Kaiser-Frazer dealers is urging the Fulbright committee to open its book and show the public what it has learned in a year's investigation.

Late last summer a Kaiser-Frazer hearing was scheduled by the Fulbright committee. The committee staff had explored the details of the multimillion-dollar transactions, and was all set to make a record of the affair.

Before it could be held, however, President Truman sent to the Senate nominations of three new and two current RFC directors.

Acting under orders, the staff pushed aside other plans and launched into its influence inquiry.

And that's the odd story. The Fulbright committee has no present intention of making a public answer to the question it started out to investigate: Why did the RFC lend Kaiser-Frazer so much money?

Should the Steam Shovels Start Digging the St. Lawrence Seaway, There Will Be American Tax Dollars in Every Bucketful of Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be invited by Georgetown University to participate in a forum discussion on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, over the Liberty Network, radio station WARL, Washington, D. C., Sunday, March 11, 1951, at 1 p. m.

In opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence project I made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to participate in this forum discussion on the St. Lawrence seaway project because I am opposed to its construction.

My opposition to the construction of this economic monstrosity which has been before the American people since 1895 stems from the fact that it is as unsound today as in the past.

This subject has been before the Congress of the United States time and time again, and not once have its advocates been able to justify the investment necessary.

There is nothing new to the arguments of the proponents except that we are now told the seaway is needed to provide a submarine-safe passage for iron ore from Labrador to the Great Lakes.

The catch in this reasoning is that this Nation will have won or lost its security long before this project could be completed because it is the opinion of expert engineers that it will require from 5 to 7 years to complete its construction.

Meanwhile, money, material, and manpower urgently needed for mobilization would be diverted to a scheme that will ultimately benefit Canada more than the United States where only 15 percent of our population would receive any benefits.

There is nothing new about the hysteria each year for the St. Lawrence seaway except that something new is being continually added to the propaganda for its construction. As previously stated, the seaway project has been before Congress time and time again and each time it has been decisively rejected.

If one reads the hearings containing the arguments for and against the project, one will find that congressional rejection was based on the following reasons:

1. The St. Lawrence seaway's value as a transportation artery has been vastly overrated, mostly because it would be closed to navigation for at least 5 months or more each year when the St. Lawrence route is blocked by ice.

2. The proposed 27-foot channel would be too shallow for 91 percent of our own merchant vessels, while, on the other hand, foreign-flag ships which are smaller in size would enjoy a field day in dumping cheaply manufactured foreign products on the American market at the expense of the American wage earner.

3. The Nation would lose by spending huge sums of money to establish a costly form of transportation on which could exist only because the burdened taxpayers would provide and support it, but which would nevertheless disrupt long-established and satisfactory commercial arrangements, would intensify transportation problems, would add to unemployment, and would cost the American taxpayers many more dollars than it would save them.

These are only a few of the reasons why Congress has rejected the flimsy arguments for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

During this critical period in world affairs with our country on the brink of world war III and with the American taxpayer paying about 35 cents out of every dollar earned for tax purposes, the advocates of the St. Lawrence project now come forth with the proposal that its construction is necessary to provide a secure route for steamships to bring in only 10,000,000 tons annually of iron ore from the Labrador-Quebec area as compared with our annual need of 100,000,000 tons.

The need for Labrador ores is based on the argument that such ores are indispensable to our own national security and defense because of an impending shortage of domestic high-grade ore principally from the Mesabi Range in Minnesota.

While there have been conflicting statements regarding the remaining deposits of ore in the Mesabi Range, the facts reveal that from 1917 to 1948 for every 12 tons of ore shipped, 7 tons of ore were added to the ore reserves of the Nation.

In the postwar period 1946–49, for every seven tons of high-grade ore mined, six tons were added to the reserves. In addition to this high-grade ore, huge deposits of taconite—a lower-grade ore—have been located in Minnesota.

According to my colleague, Congressman BLATNIK, he stated on February 23, 1951, before a congressional committee that "Taconite concentrate will compete favorably with direct-shipment open-pit ore."

In addition to the high- and low-grade ore reserves of the Mesabi Range, there exists on the north shore of Lake Superior at a site known as Steep Rock Lake, in Ontario, a source of high-grade ore that, according to the United States Bureau of Mines, may amount to no less than 1,000,000,000 tons. Transportation for this ore deposit is already available by utilizing existing railroad facilities from Steep Rock Lake to Port Arthur, where iron-ore vessels now plying the Great Lakes can carry it to its destination.

In addition to iron-ore deposits in Minnesota, both high and low grade, and the deposits in Ontario, we cannot ignore the huge deposits of ore in Venezuela and Chile that have started to arrive in this country this week. Today we have four principal sources of iron ore, all of them developed in the spirit of free enterprise with adequate transportation facilities available to transport the ore to the mills.

Back of the argument that the St. Lawrence seaway is necessary to transport ore

from the Labrador-Quebec area is the fact that a half dozen Midwest steel companies are promoting the Labrador-Quebec project and they see in the St. Lawrence seaway the opportunity to subsidize the transportation costs of bringing the ore to market. Such a subsidy would affect the price of Labrador-Quebec ore and put it in competition with ore from other sources. In other words, six Midwest steel companies have invested in the Labrador-Quebec project and they are asking the American people, now burdened with high taxes, to finance the St. Lawrence seaway so that they can get cheaper transportation rates.

While these Midwest steel companies are feathering their own nests by asking for a subsidy from the American taxpayers, very little is being said of the over-all cost of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. We are being told that it is only going to cost the American taxpayers a half billion dollars, but let me leave this thought with you: Should the steam shovels start digging the St. Lawrence seaway, there will be American tax dollars in every bucketful of earth, for this project, plus the necessary deepening of lake harbors and defending it, is expected to cost better than a billion dollars, with two-thirds of it to be sweated out of American taxpayers.

Worse still, a billion dollars is only the estimate of what the project will cost. Bonneville Dam cost nearly twice as much as estimated; the Suez Canal cost 2½ times, and the Chicago drainage canal 3½ times as much as the engineer estimated. The original estimate of the Panama Canal was $160,000,000 dollars, but the total cost amounted to $375,000,000.

Finally the St. Lawrence seaway would cost annually millions more of tax dollars to operate and maintain it. So let's add it up—thousands of Americans would lose their jobs and the rest of us would face lifelong taxes that would reduce our already dwindling purchasing power due to high living costs.

The average American citizen, in my opinion, is tired of being fooled with subsidy schemes and with high taxes. He will certainly be fooled if the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should ever become a reality.

Our Best Air Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, Thursday evening's Washington Star carried an editorial which said, in part:

It is reassuring to hear from Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter that the radar screen being built around the continental United States will be completed this year and that an effective Alaskan network will be operating in 1952.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Force is to be congratulated on the rapidity with which they are completing the radar network and fence around the country, and particularly in getting the men trained and fitted to run its complex operation.

When one speaks of a radar outfit, it brings to mind some sort of light structural steel or other metal, mobile, radio-like tower surmounted by a scanning device. That description, however, does not apply to the radar system used now to discover planes traveling in the stratosphere and at supersonic speeds. The fact is that one single type of radar operating in the air defenses of this country now employs 1,300 different types and sizes of electronic tubes, weighs nearly 250 tons, and requires actual adjustments of its working parts down to one-thousandth of a microsecond, or, to express it another way, it is built to measure time and operate within a trillionth part of one second.

Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing that could more clearly exhibit the degree of technical training and scientific abilities necessary to the operation of our Air Force than does this one-trillionth part of a second which enters into mathematical calculations that must be made in order to bring down enemy-operated airplanes through the use of a modern system of radar detection and range-finding.

The man in the Air Force uniform today must certainly have a basic education in many fields of science, and, in addition thereto, is being sent through highly specialized training schools in order to fight the costly, modern, scientific type of warfare that has evolved in these last two decades.

The Evening Star's editorial writer aptly observed:

Our best security against atomic attack from the sky is the development of retaliatory power formidable enough to make the Kremlin realize that it cannot hit at us without instantaneously erposing Russia to far more terrible counteraction. We are capable of that right now.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of that capability that the advocates of air power make so much sense; because the Russians know full well that air power is the only thing within our bag of tricks that can bring destruction to the heart of their Russian homeland, if ever she should give cause for general all-out global warfare.

It is the timeliness of this article, when we are concerned with the drafting of our youth, that causes me to direct this article to the attention of my colleagues.

In order that all may read the same, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD this editorial clipped from the Evening Star of last Thursday, March 8.

This reads as follows:

OUR BEST AIR SECURITY

It is reassuring to hear from Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter that the radar screen being built around the continental United States will be completed this year and that an effective Alaskan network will be operating in 1952. This means that the Nation will be in a much better position than it has been to cope with possible atomic bombing. But there is no reason for complacency. The simple but grim fact is that our country, if war comes, will almost certainly suffer from such attacks regardless of the elaborateness of our defenses.

Thus, although of vital importance, our radar screen can do no more than give an advance warning—a matter of minutes, not hours—of the approach of enemy bombers. After that, interceptor planes, antiaircraft artillery, and supersonic ground-to-air guided missiles (still in the process of development) would have to be depended upon to head off and destroy the attackers. Given enough such planes, artillery, and missiles, a heavy toll could be exacted of the enemy, but the chances are that many of the attacking craft would still reach their targets. Indeed, in the judgment of General Vandenberg—our Air Force Chief of Staff—we must base our calculations on the assumption that as much as 75 percent would be able to get through to our cities despite the best kind of radar screen and over-all defensive system that we can set up in the years immediately ahead.

But the same holds true for the Soviet Union. If its bombers struck at us, it would be at least equally vulnerable. In the last analysis, therefore, our best security against atomic attack from the sky is the development of retaliatory power formidable enough to make the Kremlin realize that it cannot hit at us without instantaneously exposing Russia to far more terrible counteraction. We are capable of that right now. In fact, as Dr. Vannevar Bush has just asserted, there is no question, as matters stand today, that we could literally destroy that country with our strategic Air Force. That is one of the key reasons why we can still hope to prevent another world war—a hope that will grow steadily stronger, as Dr. Bush has said, if our aerial might is supplemented with good defensive ground forces in Western Europe.

Statement of Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, Executive Director of the Reserve Officers' Association, Before the House Armed Services Committee, February 28, 1951, Regarding H. R. 2811, Providing for Universal Military Service and Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the following statement by Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers' Association, before the House Armed Services Committee, February 28, 1951, regarding H. R. 2811, providing for universal military service and training:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Reserve Officers' Association deeply appreciates the opportunity of appearing before your committee in connection with the proposed legislation affecting the utilization of manpower.

The Reserve Officers' Association has consistently, year after year, maintained its belief in a system of universal military training. We have also consistently held to the type of military organization for this Nation which was enunciated by Gen. George C. Marshall in a circular published under his name on August 25, 1944, at which time he was Chief of Staff of the Army.' In this circular, General Marshall directed that the plans for a postwar peace establishment be "based upon the conception of a professional peace establishment (no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements) to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from a citizen army reserve, effectively organized for this purpose in time of peace, with full opportunity for competent citizen soldiers to

acquire practical experience through temporary active service and to rise by successive steps to any rank for which they can definitely qualify."

General Marshall stated in this circular that this was the type of military institution which President Washington proposed to the First Congress as one of the essential foundations of the new American Republic.

In order to effectively create this type of military institution, and in order that a proper level of security may be maintained under present world conditions, it is essential that there be a system evolved whereby young men of the Nation are given a thorough basic training and then assigned to the reserve components of the several services. Such a plan is provided in the bill now under consideration by this committee.

In reference to the bill now before you, namely, H. R. 2811, and with specific reference to the National Security Training Commission, we note that a change has been made from the concept of the commission in previous UMT bills in that the commission is placed on a per diem basis rather than on a full-time basis. Inasmuch as it is felt that the importance of this commission is such that it will require the full-time services of its members, we suggest that the per diem plan be deleted and that members be selected on a full-time basis.

We note several deletions in the paragraph referring to the power given to the National Selective Training Commission, and strongly suggest that the wording of the Senate bill be used. H. R. 2811, for instance, states that "The National Security Training Commission is subject to the direction of the President and will establish policies with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps." We suggest the wording of the Senate bill which directs the National Security Training Commission to establish such policies and standards, etc., etc. The Senate version has these additional words which we strongly recommend be placed in H. R. 2811: "Establish such policies and standards * * * as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and shall, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission."

We are somewhat concerned in connection with the follow-through of an individual's service in the Reserve components after he has completed training, or has completed training and active duty service. The Reserve components are supposed to receive enlisted men today who have completed a 1-year enlistment, but these men are certainly not in evidence, and I have no doubt but that the reason they are not available to us is because there is no method of following them up to see that they carry out their obligation. This suggestion has been made—and we think it worthy of consideration—and that is that once an individual has completed his training, or training and service, and has become available for assignment to the Reserve components, that he be reported to his local board upon release from the service, and that the local board be charged with the keeping of records that would indicate whether the individual is or is not carrying out his obligations under the law. We are also concerned in reference to the possible penalty clause which would make the individual subject to the penalty as set forth in the present Selective Service Act in the event he fails to carry out his obligation to serve his total number of years in the Reserve components. If the present penalty clause does not cover this portion of his obligation, then we strongly recommend that the wording be changed to make it apply.

We have no particular quarrel in reference to the age when young men will be drafted, or with the period of time required for present-day service. We feel that this is a policy matter that can best be determined by the Congress of the United States based upon the over-all manpower needs of the Nation.

You can readily see from my previous remarks that we are in agreement with the basic concept of the proposed bill. We are concerned, however, with the fact that it appears to be necessary to maintain an active duty force of approximately 3,500,000.

We have no means of determining, and we must therefore accept the fact that an active duty strength of approximately 3,500,000 is required under present world conditions. But we do become alarmed when we listen to statements made by members of the Defense Department that this strength may have to be maintained for many years to come. This country cannot possibly stand the tremendous continued cost of maintaining large active duty forces year after year after year. We can think of nothing that Soviet Russia would like better than to have us wreck ourselves economically. If it is necessary to maintain a security level as represented by the 3,500,000 active duty force, we contend that it is possible to accomplish this security level by building up the effectiveness of the Reserve components to a point that would soon allow a substantial reduction of the active duty forces. The cost of maintaining an active duty force is probably 10 times greater than that of maintaining a similar force in the Reserve components, and obviously any shifting of the security load from the active duty forces to the Reserve components would bring about substantial savings to the taxpayers of this Nation.

The terms of the proposed bill, taken together with the statement of Pentagon witnesses appearing before the Congress, indicate that it is the intention of eventually building up the effectiveness of the Reserve components. But this cannot start until individuals who are drafted will have completed their service and will have been transferred into the Reserve components. This means then, in general terms, that it will be approximately 2 years before any substantial amount of strength is added to the Reserve components.

Why is it necessary to wait these 2 years in order to start building up the effectiveness of the Reserve components? If we wait for 2 years to start, it will certainly be a year or more beyond that time before we can begin thinking in terms of reducing the active-duty forces and still maintain the required security level to meet world conditions. Every year that we wait in starting to build up the effectiveness of the Reserve components costs this country $35,000,000,000. We would like to see the start made now—not 2 years hence. It is true that there is a provision in the bill which would allow individuals to be released from service in order to accept enlistments in the Reserve components, but nowhere do we find this enunciated as a policy which would be put into effect without delay. It may well be that this is a contemplated, but I again repeat that there appears to be too much emphasis upon maintaining and supporting this tremendous peacetime establishment over many years to come, rather than a maximum effort to work out a plan of maintaining a security level by the utilization of effective Reserve components now in order that this country and the people of this Nation will not be burdened with overpowering taxes.

We in the Reserve Officers Association much prefer to accept into the Reserves only those men who had received a basic training. This is the only way in which the Reserves can be made truly effective. We had hoped that it might be possible to create a plan whereby a certain percentage of the individuals who were drafted and who had been given their basic training could be released to the Reserve component units, thereby eliminating the 2-year wait.

Under present conditions, with a substantial proportion of the Reserve components on active duty and making up a fair share of the 3,500,000 active-duty force, we find ourselves in the position for the next year and a half to 2 years of having substantially depleted our Reserve forces. We feel rather strongly that during this period of time, when the Reserve forces are being utilized in building up the active-duty force, that when units are ordered to active duty they should be replaced in number, consistent, of course, with over-all mobilization requirements. Officers exist in the Volunteer Reserve that could be utilized for this purpose, and if some plan could be worked out that would start assigning men to Reserve components immediately after basic training was completed, such a plan would be possible. It is realized that this would require the drafting of additional men in this first 2-year period, but if the situation is serious enough to call for the maintenance of this size active-duty force, then it certainly must be serious enough to make us consider without delay the raising of the present effectiveness of our Reserve components, be they National Guard or the Reserves of the several services.

We are not taken into the confidence of the Department of Defense or the Departments of Army, Navy, and Air, in connection with the over-all considerations that would prompt the creating of a large active duty force for an indeterminate number of years. We are therefore unable to dispute the wisdom of such a move. We cannot then in good conscience advise against the passage of the bill under consideration, as it is a basic bill and does provide the means whereby those things which we feel should be done could be done. What we are concerned about, and what we feel sure must be in the minds of many of you, as well as people throughout this Nation, is the fact that there appears to be no direct evidence that the military are bending every possible effort to develop ways and means whereby a security level may be maintained by immediately building up the present effectiveness of the Reserve components, thereby making it possible to consider reducing the large contemplated active-duty force.

For years the Reserve Officers' Association has been very much concerned with the lack of proper implementation of Reserve programs of the several services, because these programs, with few exceptions, have not created effective Reserve component forces. New plans will soon be forthcoming from the Department of Defense which should present a more effectual picture than has existed in the past. These plans, however, must still be properly implemented, and we feel certain that you gentlemen of the House Armed Services Committee feel as keenly as we do about the necessity of such a proper implementation and will therefore take such steps as may be within your power to see that it is done.

On behalf of the Reserve officers of the Army, Navy, Air, Marines, and Coast Guard, I thank you for allowing us to present our views.

"Why Our Country Is Great" and "The Challenge That Confronts Us"—By A. M. Piper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, Council Bluffs, Iowa, has been

known far and wide over a period of many years for his down to earth, clear concept of our God-given American way of life, what has made America great, and what needs be done to keep it blessed in greatness, goodness, and freedom. The Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge on March 4 awarded a well-deserved certificate of merit to Mr. Piper on two of his editorials which appeared in the Council Bluffs Nonpareil on August 6 and October 9, 1950, and which I here insert, along with my sincere congratulations to my good friend, Mr. A. M. Piper, for his good works.

[From the Council Bluffs Nonpareil of August 6, 1950]

THE CHALLENGE THAT CONFRONTS US

"It is a great time to be alive," Harry Emerson Fosdick declared in a sermon during the First World War.

A majority of Americans agreed with him. They were confronted with a challenge which called for the best that was in them, and they met it in a spirit of sacrifice.

There were exceptions, of course, but most people were ready and willing to consecrate their all to God and country. Few grumbled or complained. Nearly everybody was enthusiastic, confident, ready to volunteer for service.

In times of crisis people are driven to prayer, the power line that connects with the wisdom and powers of the Infinite.

It was so during both of our world wars, and it will be so again if we are dragged into a third.

But the American people no longer have the enthusiasm and confidence with which they were imbued in 1917 and 1918.

There is a feeling that we have been betrayed, that we have lost our way in the quest for peace. More and more people are wondering why God permits such terrible things to happen in His world.

When we stop to think we are constrained to admit that God is not to blame, that as free moral agents, we are responsible for the evil as well as the good in human relations.

But this realization does not solve our problems. Instead, it leaves most people more confused than ever. So many great plans have been formulated to make the world better and so many have failed that discouragement is widespread. We are inclined to throw up our hands and say, "What's the use?"

Such an attitude gives the enemies of Christianity their great opportunity. A Communist is reported to have said: "Yes, you have your Christ but we shall win in the end because we are putting in all we have and are willing to sacrifice. You who call yourselves Christians are no longer willing to do so."

Our Nation became great because so many Americans had faith in God and were willing to back up their faith with sacrifices.

In war and in peace they put their country ahead of everything except their God.

We have lost some of the religion and some of the patriotism that inspired our forefathers to build the Nation in which we live.

But it is not too late to correct our mistakes and overcome our shortcomings. If we put God and country ahead of our own selfish interests, the opportunities that have been ours will be available to those who come after us.

[From the Council Bluffs Nonpareil of October 9, 1950]

WHY OUR COUNTRY IS GREAT

If the United States is to maintain leadership in the battle to preserve a free world, we must regain our belief in our immortal destiny, the Right Reverend Austin Pardue, bishop of Pittsburgh, said recently.

The materialism of our generation, he declared, is bringing about the destruction of our most powerful motive force. The best remaining forces in America today are those inspired by the faith of our fathers.

There is a popular notion that the United States has become rich solely because with the great national resources available, we couldn't help it.

If that were true, many other countries rich in natural resources, would be further along than we are.

America is great because something different took place in our country.

The founders of our Republic, as a people, were convinced that they came to this country because God led them here. They put their faith in the Christian idea that man, under God, should be his own master.

They maintained that he is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. The securing of these rights is what they meant by freedom.

The church and the social order were not set against each other in the United States. To the contrary, the social order was fashioned to express the belief, preached by the church, of man's importance and his unlimited capacities.

Our forefathers had the one quality most necessary for the upbuilding and preservation of a nation—a belief that they were part of God's plan and that nothing could overcome their destiny.

They prayed with an utter simplicity of faith and never doubted that God would see them through their apparently unconquerable difficulties.

He did. A Constitution was adopted which gave us the best Government in the world. Then came prosperity unparalleled in the history of the world.

The economic promise of our resources has been realized because free men, in our free system, have developed them. Our economic prosperity is not merely a vindication of our system. It is a vindication of Christianity.

The trouble with us today is that trust in education and in material prosperity is taking the place of trust in God. That is why we are bewildered and confused as we move from one crisis to another.

If we are to maintain our leadership in the world, if our Nation is to endure, Bishop Pardue asserted, three basic beliefs must be preached and practiced:

"That God Himself destined this Nation to provide a way of life that would give the greatest good to the greatest number. That the Bible is the revealed word of God and that his supernatural power is with us. That each of us is immortal and that we must face a day of judgment when we shall be required to make adjustments of the suffering we have caused or idly stood by and permitted."

Our forefathers held these beliefs and practiced them. We must follow their example if we expect to preserve the way of life we enjoy, and pass it on to our children.

Total Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of United States News and World Report there is an article that deserves the widest possible circulation. The article is entitled "The Growing United States Air Force" and is an interview with Hon. Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force. The article impressed me because I find Mr. Finletter's point of view to be quite similar to my own. What Secretary Finletter believes in primarily is air power—and in his own words "this includes the carrier air and the Marine air as well as the Air Force."

Secretary Finletter's answers to the questions put to him by the representative of United States News and World Report are as revealing of the Secretary as of the state of the Air Force. Secretary Finletter is no narrow-minded partisan of one service or one kind of air power. In answer to a query about carrier air and the Navy, Secretary Finletter made it crystal clear that in his opinion carrier air must remain in the Navy. "I think," he said to his questioner, "that what you are intimating is a one-service, one-uniform setup, and I should personally regret that, because I think the specialization function and the morale factor and all that is absolutely essential, to say nothing of the effectiveness of effort. It looks awfully nice on paper, one service, but I'm not for it."

It is equally apparent that Secretary Finletter believes in total air power, though he places emphasis on strategic air power because it is through strategic air power that the atom bomb can be used to strike at the enemy's heart. Secretary Finletter's remarks about strategic air represent the core of his interview, and furnish the truest measure of the man. Of this violent and destructive weapon he says:

Politically, strategic air is the thing which has the real possibility * * * of making an enemy think before he hits us, and thereby of giving us a breathing spell by which we may be able to work out some way of not destroying ourselves in a third world war. That's the political side of the thing, and I want to emphasize that very strongly.

Its a peculiar business, gentlemen, to be spending your time working with such a horribly destructive operation, and I can't tell you how destructive it can be both ways. But the only thing that makes it bearable is the fact that it may be the one thing which will take this terribly serious international situation that we have, and provide the stimulus which may make men really get together and use their brains and not destroy each other.

Mr. Speaker, I think Secretary Finletter appreciates, as do other responsible leaders, that air power must grow apace with the Army and Navy and in partnership with the Army and Navy. It is most encouraging to find the evidence provided by this article of the leadership Secretary Finletter is bringing to the solution of the problems of the Air Force.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, the Growing Air Force, by Hon. Thomas K. Finletter, from the March 2, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report.

The article is as follows:

THE GROWING UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

(An interview with Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force)

Question. What kind of job, Mr. Secretary, has the Air Force done in Korea?

Answer. I would much prefer to answer in terms of air power, and to talk about what

the Navy and the Marine air did as well as what the Air Force did. But I will answer it strictly on the Air Force, since that's the way the question was put.

What did we have in the Korean area when the North Koreans attacked? We had a lot of planes whose purpose was to defend the island of Japan against attack, and specifically against airborne attack. They were therefore interceptor planes, calculated for air defense. The same thing, by the way, was true of the Army troops. These ground troops were troops of occupation—they weren't intended for a campaign in Korea. The airplanes of the Air Force were the F-80's, which is an interceptor, and World War II F-51's, which are very good piston-engine fighters. The result had to be an improvisation. So that's the first point which was difficult.

Now the second point was favorable, and that was chance—that there wasn't any effective air enemy opposition so we didn't have to worry too much about air superiority—there wasn't any major problem. The severity of the ground attack against us in the early days was such that almost the entire Air Force effort went into close support of the Ground Forces. Army leaders have had the highest praise for what was done in this connection. After a visit to Korea in September, General Collins (Army Chief of Staff) said: "Like the Army, the Air Force had to switch from peace to wartime operation overnight. Gen. Walton Walker testifies that, but for what the fliers did those first few days, we would have lost Korea."

Question. Was the job of interdiction reasonably well done?

Answer. We sent out a commission to Korea under President Stearns of the University of Denver and asked him to look into the thing, and all I can tell you is that the answer that we got back from him seemed to indicate that on the whole there was a good job done. I may tell you that his report said more than that. His report said there was an extremely good job done. But I would limit myself for the present to the proposition that the job was well done.

The question arises: Why then didn't the air stop the North Koreans completely and the Chinese completely? To which the answer is, gentlemen, that probably not even a 100-percent perfect job of interdiction can do that, immediately—the efforts are cumulative. You can't expect the air to prevent absolutely everything from getting to the front lines.

Question. But an awful lot did get through?

Answer. Comparatively little. When you stop to think of it, if you meet someone who claims that the air can prohibit everything from getting through, then you're talking to the uninformed, because it is just about impossible. How can you possibly expect to stop people infiltrating at night down through rice-paddy country?

Question. You might stop their railroads——

Answer. Well, we did knock the dickens out of the railroads—but, even with that, you can't stop every single piece of line. They would run the track up to a certain point, we'd knock out the bridge and then they would carry the things on coolies across the place—you can't knock all that out. All I can tell you is that anybody who expects the air—and I'm going now to shift from the Air Force to air power—anybody who expects air power—and this includes the carrier air and Marine air as well as the Air Force—to be able to stop everything from getting to the front line is simply posing an impossible problem. Nobody ever supposed any such thing could be done, and the question is unanswerable because it isn't within the framework of common sense.

Now, as far as the close-support job goes, it's a highly technical question. I can tell you that a good job was done on close support under the circumstances, and with the number of planes available.

Question. But isn't it said that the Army and the Air Force haven't been working together?

Answer. I don't agree with that at all. Perhaps, initially, there was something to be asked. After all, how could you expect the Army and Air Force, trained for defensive work against invasion of Japan, to have trained together for a job that they never were expected to do? Today, however, support of Ground Forces by the Air Force has been—in General Vandenberg's (Air Force Chief of Staff) words—"magnificent."

Question. But weren't the Marines pretty well trained?

Answer. Well, of course the Marines were trained because they were trained for that kind of job.

Question. Why couldn't the Army have been trained?

Answer. Because this was a force which was out there for primarily a different purpose.

Question. But isn't it being assumed that they should have been out practicing—that they shouldn't have been idle——

Answer. General MacArthur had them there as occupational troops and they were performing occupational duties. However, there was some joint training.

Question It sounds like the official answer, doesn't it?

Answer. I'm not giving the official answer—I'm just talking about this thing sensibly. I am perfectly willing to examine any possible complaint. And maybe these troops and air which were intended to be interceptors should have been trained more as close-support fighters—I don't know.

CHINESE AS BETTER TARGETS

Question. But doesn't it look now as if they are working out well? In the last few weeks haven't they been devastating the enemy, apparently——

Answer. I think that's for another reason. I think what's happened is that the Chinese lines of communication have gotten extended—interdiction is really showing its effect—and they weren't as adept—the Chinese weren't—at fighting in the hills as the North Koreans were, and they've been better targets.

Question. But there has been improvement?

Answer. Yes, they have improved, but—of course they've improved in the course of battle. But I don't want to give the impression that this problem is anywhere near solved as a general matter—it isn't.

Question. The Air Force and the Army are working closely together?

Answer. Yes.

Question. They are two different services and yet they are integrated in that field?

Answer. Well, they are certainly doing their best to work together.

Question. And is there no feeling between the services that would keep them from working together?

Answer. No, on the contrary—I really think it's just the opposite. I can only report on what I've seen.

EMPHASIS ON TACTICAL AIR

Question. Could you tell us how the tactical air would work as it's being revised?

Answer. Well, the tactical air command is one of three Air Force commands out in front.

Question. On the ground, how would it tend to improve the efficiency?

Answer. Well, it would—you mean how would it operate in the training?

Question. How would it change the present system by setting up a separate command—what would the practical results be?

Answer. Oh, the only effect is to place more emphasis on tactical air by making it a major command, which we did last December.

Question. Operations in the field are not affected, then?

Answer. Not in the slightest.

Question. Would it be a good idea to put the Marine tactical air force under this command—just have one tactical air force?

Answer. I don't think so. It seems to me that the Marines are a separate unit with a separate function, which is a rather specialized one, and the thing has worked extremely well when you look at the history and record of the Marines. I don't see why, when something has worked as well as that, that you don't leave it alone. Now the Marine operation is one which is to a large extent amphibious in its nature, and it's a unitary operation. It assumes that the air superiority is there, presumably from the carriers. And the Marines are a specialized operation which has demonstrated its success with a magnificent record.

Question. Why wouldn't it be a good idea for the Army to have its tactical air right along with ground troops in the Army rather than the Air Force?

Answer. That is the situation which existed up to the time of the Kasserine Pass, if you will remember. And it's a conceivable way of operating, but it has this one difficulty, and that is that it doesn't provide for a unified control over the fighter planes available so that they can get the command of the air.

Because if you, say, have allocated one group for a division, and you have, let's say, 10 divisions at any one point—that would be very good for the close-support function. But it wouldn't work for the interdiction function, because the interdiction targets might not be right in front and nicely distributed along the line. And it would be extremely bad for the air-superiority function, because all the enemy would have to do would be to come in and knock one of our groups off at one end and then switch all its power over and knock one off on the other end.

And that is a theory which I don't think anybody seriously advocates any more, because that would almost insure air superiority to the enemy, and of course, as you know, that is the situation which was such a failure at the Kasserine Pass and was changed by General Eisenhower thereafter. I have never heard anybody suggest it since.

JET FIGHTER-BOMBER IN KOREA

Question. Does the Air Force now have fighter-bombers or other tactical units in Korea?

Answer. Yes; we have the F-84, which is a fighter-bomber, and it's got good range and good attacking power, and it has been doing quite well out there.

Question. And that is a jet?

Answer. That's a jet.

Question. The British keep insisting that our jets aren't as good as the Russians'. Is there any basis for that?

Answer. Do the British say that?

Question. Didn't some British magazine say that?

Answer. The facts are, I think, that you are speaking of the MIG-15, which is the only Red jet plane which has been used in Korea, and it is superior in speed to our F-80, our oldest operational jet. But it is not superior to our F-86, and, of course, it's a different kind of plane from our F-84. The MIG-15 is an interceptor, and our F-84 is a fighter-bomber, and they are different kinds of planes. I am not too worried about rumors that their jets are superior. I do think, however, it is worth while pointing out that the MIG-15 is an extremely good plane, and I think it ought to be a lesson to us to stop this theory that nobody else can do these things except us.

Question. Is that Red jet a model of a British plane?

Answer. Oh, no.

Question. Do the MIG-15's all have Chinese pilots?

Answer. That we don't know.

Question. How good are the MIG pilots, would you say?

Answer. From the people I've asked, the general answer is that they are extremely good fliers, and the news we've had from Korea, in general, has been that they were excellent fliers—fly well in formation, get off the ground well, scramble well and in general there is a respect on the part of our people for their performance.

Question. Do you foresee a time when we will need two sets of fighters, one for interception and one for ground support?

Answer. That might very well be if resources were unlimited. That's what you do have, in a sense, in one part of our air power. The Navy's carrier air is the air which does get control of the air, presumably, and the close support, Marine air is the one which does the close support. To a certain extent there you do have that specialization of function. And a very good thing it is for that operation.

Question. Does the Air Force now accept the need for carriers?

Answer. They have never contested it.

Question. Wasn't there some argument about it?

Answer. No.

Question. The Air Force never did raise that?

Answer. No; not that I know of. I think what you are referring to is the question as to who should carry on the strategic air—the B-36 investigation some time ago. But our position on that is quite simple—and that is that matters of interservice rivalry (which, incidentally, is a very good thing—it keeps everybody on their toes) must not be allowed to interfere with what is the best for the over-all effort. And our attitude is that in the strategic air we have the main responsibility pinned on us, but, to the extent that the carrier air can participate in that, obviously, we are all for it, because we want the maximum effort—quick and effective.

Question. So if carriers could carry planes that would deliver the atom bomb, there would be a place for them?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Should it be under the over-all direction of some higher command?

Answer. I hadn't thought about the command question, but I don't see any reason why the two services can't operate side by side.

NEED FOR CARRIERS

Question. Should carrier air remain under the Navy or is there any feeling that it should be—that all of our air should be—under one command?

Answer. I don't think so. It would seem to me that you've got to have the carrier air in the Navy.

I think that what you are intimating is a one-service, one-uniform set-up, and I should personally regret that, because I think the specialization function and the morale factor and all that is absolutely essential, to say nothing of the effectiveness of effort. It looks awfully nice on paper, one service, but I'm not for it.

Question. There is no question that the Navy can carry the atom bomb?

Answer. I'm sure they can.

Question. You told us, Mr. Secretary, about the planes for interception. Can you tell us what the principal fighter types will be this time for escort of the bombers?

Answer. Well, for any escort operation we would obviously want a long-range, fast plane. And the F-84 is that.

Question. And can you tell us anything about the range of the F-84? In other words, what kind of escort operations can we provide? This was one of the great problems in the Second World War. Have we gotten longer legs for our fighter planes since the war?

Answer. Yes; the fighters are getting longer legged all the time, and also there are refueling techniques which will add to their range, and other methods are being studied which will increase the range of the escorts.

Question. Maybe the techniques won't be the same in another war.

Answer. That's right.

JETS' RANGE EXTENDED

Question. Can we escort our bombers to Russia from the bases that we have?

Answer. All I can say on that is that the escort problem is one that is being studied, and that the ranges involved now create difficulties which were not existent in World War II, and that requires new techniques, and we are working on those new techniques, and the only thing I can say so far about them is that the range of the modern jet fighter has already been extended by fuel-conservation techniques and other improvements.

In this connection, I want to repeat the obvious fact that the jet engine is in a sharp evolution, unlike the airplane, which is a slow development. The curve of improvement in jet engines is drastic—where we were talking in terms of 2,000 pounds we are now talking in terms of several times that.

Question. Can the F-84 be used as escort for, say, B-36's, which must be considerably slower?

Answer. Oh, the speed factor can be taken care of. All these jets can slow up.

Question. Who is going to make the jet engine? Is there a tendency to concentrate in the air industry itself, or are you attempting to go out and create new sources?

Answer. As you know, the major piston manufacturers were so busy in World War II that as the jet was being developed they couldn't get in on the business, so it went to Westinghouse and General Electric and General Motors. Now, however, the jet engine is made generally in the engine industry.

Question. Are you going to depend upon the established producers?

Answer. In part, yes. In general, both for engines and for airplanes, we want to spread the mobilization base.

The theory we are following is to broaden the base of production to:

First, have an aircraft-production capability for doubling production should full mobilization come.

Second, get multiple sources of supply geographically separated and,

Third, to take up civilian slack to reduce unemployment and labor dislocation.

Question. Are you bringing new producers into the engine field?

Answer. Yes. Packard, Studebaker, Chevrolet, Buick, Ford, and others.

Question. Isn't the aircraft industry itself somewhat concerned? Don't they feel that outsiders are getting into a business that is their business?

Answer. I would like to make one point about that, as a matter of policy, and that is this: If we do, for example, take some item made by company A, and we ask them to license company B to make the item, we intend to see to it that product remains an A product—in other words, that the original developer of the airplane gets the full credit for it, that it remains his machine and that everything is done to preserve his prestige in having created this accepted article.

Of course, an argument is made against that sometimes on the theory that the American taxpayer pays for the development of this by A and therefore A has no proprietary right in it, and therefore that there is no reason why the Government shouldn't pass that right out to B and C. The Air Force doesn't agree with that. The Air Force thinks that although it is true that the cost of development has been borne by the Government, we want to see to it that the fellow that really develops the machine gets the credit.

Question. Wouldn't he rather expand and fill the whole order than see someone else licensed?

Answer. That's right. And that's where we run counter to him because his interests run counter to ours. We don't want to create a condition where we can't expand rapidly, and we, therefore, want, as I said before, to have a base which is not jammed up with three shifts a day and hasn't absorbed all of its machine tools.

Question. Will it be decentralized pretty much—it won't be concentrated?

Answer. No. It will not be concentrated in any one place.

Question. Are you planning to remove any plants from what might become a dangerous area?

Answer. We have no plans on that, no.

NO LABOR-MATERIAL DELAY

Question. Mr. Secretary, are any of your projects held up now for lack of labor and materials?

Answer. I know of none.

Question. Are you expanding your production quite rapidly?

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. Will the 50,000-plane goal be reached?

Answer. That figure was not a figure of production; it was a figure of capacity. And, in general, the capacity to produce at that rate in all of the services is a feasibility, but only if we do what I am saying now. There is no present plan to produce 50,000 planes.

Question. Are you planning on any new factories?

Answer. Under present plans, there will be no new factories built by the Air Force because we have two sources which we can tap. The first is the existing factories doing other kinds of business which are not fully occupied, and, secondly, other factories on which we have a recapture clause or which are owned by us and are not being used.

Question. Is your program going to force the automobile industry to make fewer cars in order to go into the airplane business?

Answer. No; our business won't do that—the natural course of events may, or other economic factors. And if they do, we will take advantage of that unused capacity in all probability.

Question. Do you expect any difficulty in manning a 95-wing air force?

Answer. No. We do not. We expect an organic difficulty by reason of the very rapid growth of the force. The force is now being built up to 971,000, and the target date is the middle of this calendar year, which is, roughly speaking, 1 year ahead of the attainment of the matériel aspects of the 95-wing program. And there is a tremendously rapid build-up, and therefore produces difficulties, hardships, and so on.

Question. Do you think that is going to be a permanent strain?

Answer. The only thing I am sure of is that international conditions are not going to remain static. I think that they are going to get worse or get better. Of course if they get worse that figure is going to increase substantially if we have to go substantially above that. But I think that even if conditions get better, it is not, I regret to say, to be anticipated that they will get so much better that we can afford to dismantle our air power and the military power which we now have. I am inclined to think that that figure will be compressed a little by efficiencies, but I think that the demands will probably make it increase.

Question. Is there a pilot shortage?

Answer. No; not at the moment. In general, we are able to keep our personnel situation up with our material situation. There

is no problem of getting airplanes that can't be flown or can't be maintained. And what we are doing is: We are aiming our personnel build-up toward mid-1951, and our matériel build-up toward mid-1952.

RAPID GROWTH AHEAD

Question. Is the Air Force on the verge of a rapid growth? Are we really set to go?

Answer. Yes; we are on the verge of a rapid growth. We started out the fiscal year with about 48 "wings" [groups] with a budget of around $4,000,000,000. Now we've got a budget of around fourteen billion. That doesn't mean to say we're going to have three and one-half times as many "wings" within a year. And the reason is that it takes time to build planes and to form "wings."

Question. What is our goal?

Answer. As soon as possible—which will run well into the latter part of 1952, and that's optimistic—we are aiming to have 95 "wings."

Question. How many "wings" did we have in World War II?

Answer. It was slightly more than 240.

Question. Were they comparable in size?

Answer. Yes; they are comparable in size, but as far as the fire power goes there is all the difference in the world. You take the striking power of a group of B-36's or B-47's as compared with B-17's, which was the biggest plane we used in bombardment in Europe, and the increase is just terrific. And the present-day horsepower is up, too. For example, you take a B-47 with six jet engines—you've got a real increase. At high speeds, the added power is something unbelievable—to say nothing of the weapons they carry.

Question. The weapons are bigger?

Answer. The weapons are geometrically more powerful.

Question. What was the horsepower in the last war?

Answer. The horsepower of a B-17 in World War II was 4,800.

COMPARISON WITH WORLD WAR II

Question. With those 95 "wings" we now plan, would we be anywhere near World War II, so far as striking power is concerned?

Answer. You can't make a comparison because the element of atomic power is present. Let's put it this way: You've got three main fighting commands in the Air Force—you've got air defense, you've got tactical air, and you've got strategic air. Now everything feeds up to them. That's your end product, as it were. The production back of that and, of course, the transport, the training, proving grounds, research—everything else feeds up to those three things out in front. Now therefore, if you want to figure out how you stand in terms of power on those, you've got to look at how each of those is going to be developed.

You take air defense, for example. It's entirely new, not comparable to what it was before, because it is air defense of this country against possible atomic attack.

Question. How good is our air defense?

Answer. Well, it's fairly good. We are aiming to create the best conventional air-defense system we can—that's our present objective—and to then go on and see how we can improve on it in unconventional terms.

Now by "conventional" I mean that air defense is simply the old job of radar, interceptor planes, and antiaircraft guns—the same kind of thing that you had in World War II. It's nothing new, but there is considerable improvement in the radar, and in the antiaircraft and, of course, in the interceptors, but it's still the same old thing, and the same rules apply to it, and you're going to knock down only part of the enemy bombers.

And the difference in the rules of the game now is that this time they may be bombers carrying atomic bombs. In World War II if you could knock down 5 percent of an attacking force you could put the enemy's air out of business pretty quickly. They couldn't take it. For example, in the Battle of Britain the rate was 3 percent, and that was something that the Luftwaffe couldn't take and they lost the Battle of Britain on 8 percent. But how good is 8 percent when 92 percent of atomic bombs come through? Obviously that's a very bad situation, and, good as the conventional air-defense system is going to be, it's never going to be enough to protect the United States against atomic attack.

Question. What do you mean by "unconventional"?

Answer. What I mean by that is that science may develop new types of ways of knocking down enemy bombers. The obvious one is the guided missile. And, as you know, some people place great reliance on the guided missile, and we do know that we are going to have ground-to-air guided missiles at some time which will be capable of vastly increasing the power of defense.

But I think that those who rely on the increase of defensive power are leaving out of consideration one general fact, and that is that the offensive power of the guided missile will grow with its defensive capabilities, and the problems of this are, in the main, two—first of all, the question of power, and secondly the question of guidance, for when you get the guidance and power to make a good defensive missile, you get the guidance and power to increase the power of the offensive missile.

Question. Mr. Secretary, can you say anything about the production effort on guided missiles? Is there anything to indicate the scale of that effort?

Answer. I think in general you can say that that is a rapidly developing field which has not yet gotten very seriously into the production aspects and will not get there for a short period.

Question. Do you think the guided missile will take the place of the piloted plane very soon?

Answer. Not very soon, no. And I would think that even though one may assume that some day it will, I think you're going to pass through a long preparatory period where both exist and both have a function.

NEW TYPES OF PLANE

Question. Is the Air Force concentrating on one type of plane, or is it broadening its field?

Answer. For air defense we have the F-80, F-94, and the F-86 as interceptors. The F-89 is also a newcomer in this field. The F-80, as you know, is the interceptor plane which was used in Korea. It gets up in the air fast, is maneuverable, but has short range. That's what an interceptor is. The F-80 has been in Korea and that's the oldest jet plane that we have, and it is getting older.

Now the F-86, which we sent out there is the newest of our interceptors, but present operational models are day interceptors. That is to say, it is not all filled up with radar to enable it to operate at night; and it's a one-seater plane.

We have a so-called all-weather interceptor which is called the F-94 which is in use, and that is full of radar, has great climbing capability, and can function at night. Our objective is to get the whole interceptor fleet all-weather, and none of the planes limited to operate only by daytime.

Parenthetically, we're doing the same thing with radar in this air defense—we're getting modern radar in just as fast as we can and we're expanding the radar coverage.

Question. Is radar effective in any event?

Answer. Radar is simply a method of trying to see things—our present radar is a direct line of sight and can't curve around the earth or go through it, so therefore it's governed by the curvature of the earth. Roughly speaking, 125 to 150 miles is about all you can see, and you can figure what that is with the speed of modern planes. For example, if a plane is going only 375 miles an hour—that's only 20 minutes.

THE RADAR SCREEN

Question. About a month ago there was some discussion of this so-called radar screen—that a lot of civilians would be brought in as spotters, and that sort of thing. Will there be less emphasis now on that?

Answer. No; there is going to be more emphasis. Up to the fiscal 1950 budget we didn't have enough money to build a system of radar which covered the entire area of the United States from the west coast to the east coast. While we have got that money, we are building that whole set of radar, which for convenience you may call a screen. We also have made arrangements for the development of radar in Alaska and elsewhere, for the obvious reason that we want to know and be able to track these planes as they come in.

There are two jobs that radar does. One is that it acts just to locate incoming planes and shows where they are, and the second job is what is known as GCI—ground-control intercept—which guides our own interceptor up, and shows him where the enemy plane is. There is increased concentration now on radar.

Question. Did you say everything is covered, or everything will be covered?

Answer. Will be fairly well covered when it is complete, and construction will be reasonably complete within the continental United States sometime this year.

Question. What would be the chance, roughly, of spotting an enemy plane after the screen is built? Would you be quite sure of spotting it, or fairly sure?

Answer. You would be fairly sure of spotting it. But the answer of whether you would spot it in time is another question. Of course, this is a game of the offensive versus the defensive, and this is a defensive job, and the other side, of course, is planning methods of mixing up our radar and putting it out of commission not only by physical attack but by various electronic measures. And in that battle I should say that we are reasonably sure of seeing enemy planes coming over.

Your questions reveal to me that you are placing a degree of reliance on the radar and the antiaircraft and the interceptors which I think is unjustified. I think you expect that defense system to be able really to stop everything.

Question. That's what the American people believe, isn't it?

Answer. The point that I want to make entirely clear is they can't do it. If you asked me what percentage of enemy bombers are going to be knocked down I would have to say it depends on the warning, not from the radar but from the other circumstances. If, for example, the political situation were such that we knew an enemy was about to attack and everybody was out there sitting on pins and needles with their eyes glued to the scope and all that sort of thing, that's one state of affairs, and the other state of affairs is where an attack would creep in unexpectedly, and that makes an awful lot of difference.

But even if you take the first condition—a condition of complete alertness, with everybody waiting, you cannot completely stop an enemy bomber attack—a certain percentage is going to get through and that certain percentage could be very large.

WARNING PLUS SPOT DEFENSE

Question. Is our system of defense a fence around the country, or a group of islands around the cities?

Answer. Both—what you call the "fence," which is for the purpose of getting warning at the earliest available moment that enemy planes attack us, and also a series of spot defenses at strategic points.

Question. They're more likely to come from the north across the Atlantic?

Answer. They wouldn't come across the Atlantic.

Question. Will the Alaskan radar be completed this year?

Answer. No, it will not. The Alaskan will follow along next year.

Question. You mentioned, Mr. Secretary, the "unconventional" methods of air defense, and guided missiles as one item—can you say anything about other possibilities?

Answer. This condition of affairs that I've just described, about the lack of ability of the conventional air-defense systems to stop something, obviously makes your mind jump to another conclusion, which is: Well, we've got to do something really drastic here. And all I can tell you is that that is very firmly in our minds and we are trying to do something about it.

Question. If we can't stop an enemy attack, by the same token they couldn't stop one of ours, could they?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Are we better able to attack them than they are to attack us?

Answer. Yes. Remember, I said there were three things—air defense, strategic air and tactical air. Now we move into the realm of strategic air. And I would like to get off a couple of basic facts about this strategic air, before we get down into technical details.

Air defense is indispensable—we've got to do the best we can. But I don't think the amount of losses that we could cause is going to stop anybody from starting a war. Now when we get to tactical air, you'll see that that is part of the ground job and that isn't a complete deterrent because, usually the aggressor figures he can lick the other fellow on the ground.

But this strategic air really could be a very serious defense for us, because strategic air is, of course, the air that takes the atom bomb and strikes at the enemy's heart, and the violence and destructiveness of that thing are really catastrophic.

After all, look at what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki and think that that was two bombs. And think what can be done with a greater number, a very much greater number of these weapons, and you have something which really raises the question as to whether any civilization can take it and survive. And our potential enemies know that. And obviously they are going to, I think, think several times before they move against that sort of thing.

So that, politically, strategic air is the thing which has the real possibility in my opinion of making an enemy think before he hits us, and thereby giving us a breathing spell by which we may be able to work out some way of not destroying ourselves in a third world war. That's the political side of the thing, and I want to emphasize that very strongly.

It's a peculiar business, gentlemen, to be spending your time working with such a horribly destructive operation, and I can't tell you how destructive it can be, both ways. But the only thing that makes it bearable is the fact that it may be the one thing which will take this terribly serious international situation that we have, and provide the stimulus which may make men really get together and use their brains and not destroy each other. And that is the cardinal political point, in my opinion.

B-36 CAN GET THROUGH

Question. If we do have to attack in self-defense, can the B-36 get through?

Answer. Yes; I think it can.

Now, to get to the technique of the strategic air, we have two types of planes in the main—the intercontinental bomber, the B-36, and the medium bombers, which are now the B-29 and the B-50. The B-50, as you know, is the development of the B-29. We are trying to improve our medium bomber fleet, because all three of those planes I've just mentioned have piston engines and, therefore, are relatively slow, in modern terms. We want to speed them up. And the B-36's have already had four jets added to them in the new models.

Question. They are for a certain short range, aren't they?

Answer. No; it's not one of these jet assists; this is a real jet engine which can be used for extra speed or power whenever needed. And then we're doing the same thing with a medium bomber. We're concentrating on the B-47, which is a swept-back-wing plane. The present model has six jets in it and is very much faster than any other bomber.

Question. Does it have range?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is it faster than anything else we have, or faster than anything else anybody else has?

Answer. It's the fastest bomber we know of in the world.

Question. Does it compare with the B-50?

Answer. It's a medium bomber like the B-50.

Question. It can carry the atom bomb?

Answer. Yes. The strategic air fleet must be able to.

BASES ABROAD NEEDED

Question. You would need bases in other places besides the United States?

Answer. Yes; we would, because the medium bombers are not intercontinental, on the same terms as the B-36. And we are also working, but at a much earlier stage of development, on the B-52, which is a much bigger B-47 and would be intercontinental, and we're buying two prototypes of that. It's a superb new plane. I scrambled around one the other day at the factory.

Question. Can you tell us how soon we could deliver bombs after we were attacked?

Answer. You want to know the amount of time it would take to mount the offensive?

Question. Yes.

Answer. I assure you nothing is receiving more careful attention than the readiness of the strategic air offensive and of our defense.

Question. So we haven't wasted our money and time on the B-36?

Answer. We certainly have not. But, on the other hand, don't think the B-36 is the strategic bomber to end all strategic bombers. It isn't. Already we've got the B-29 and the B-50 working with it, and already we're trying to make all of those planes just as fast as we possibly can.

Question. But at this time has the B-36 turned out a wise investment?

Answer. Absolutely. I think that to have relied exclusively on the medium bombers both as a deterrent and a force for victory would have been a most improvident thing.

Question. With respect to Korea there has been a feeling in various quarters that the Air Force has fallen down somewhat; is that justified?

Answer. Now we're moving into the third phase, tactical air.

Question. But that isn't quite tactical—wasn't there a strategic problem there?

Answer. No, there wasn't any real strategic problem in its true sense in Korea. We were bound by two ground rules there; one is—oh, by all sorts of ground rules—one was that you couldn't go beyond a certain territory, the Yalu River; secondly, that you couldn't use your heavy weapons, and, third, that you weren't really in all-out war. The strategic air force is such a serious business that you don't bring it into play unless you are in all-out war. And this thing in Korea is not all-out war.

Question. So you really didn't bring strategic air into it?

Answer. Not in the way we would in all-out war. Our policy has been to keep the bulk of strategic air here. But we did have some medium bombers out there which did some strategic bombing and assisted in a job that tactical airplanes could have done. Korea was essentially a tactical job.

Tactical air is, of course, the job that you do with the Army. And it has three main purposes:

First of all, it is necessary to get air superiority. It must achieve the condition that we had on D-day and afterward in Normandy, where our planes were the planes that dominated the air, and which was just the reverse of the situation in 1940, say, when the German Stukas were climbing down everybody's neck. That's the first thing, to get air superiority.

The second thing is the job of interdiction, which is to try to knock out the stuff coming up along the roads—knock out the locomotives, the bridges, and all that sort of thing and try to interfere with the supplies that are coming from the main concentration point. Back of that, the strategic air is trying to knock out the sources of all of these things. But the tactical air is trying to interdict their coming up to the battlefront—to isolate the battlefields.

And then the third function of tactical air is close support of the ground forces—right in front of them—knock out pillboxes, knock out artillery and all that sort of thing, knock out anything that is shooting at the ground forces.

HELPING THE ARTILLERY

Question. It's doing an artillery job, really?

Answer. Well, doing a superartillery job, if you will. I don't think it is fair to say that the artillery alone should do that, because the air ought to be able to help the artillery.

Let me repeat—there are three things: Get air superiority, one; do the interdiction or isolation job, two; and the close support, three.

There has been a lot of talk about this tactical-air thing since Korea, that either the thing has been done terribly badly, or terribly well, and so forth. And sometimes the charge was that the Air Force has neglected it in favor of strategic air. I think I have said what I think of the cardinal importance of strategic air. And this is not to say that we don't need tactical air, too. But it must grow apace with the Army and it must grow in partnership with the Army. And we are working in partnership with the Army. Secretary Pace (of the Army) and myself, General Collins and General Vandenberg are working jointly and cooperatively on this question of tactical air, and we are working out our plans for the future.

The Dispersal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over the NBC network, Friday, March 9, 1951:

I am glad to have the opportunity to discuss with you the dispersal bill before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives authorizing a program providing for construction of Federal buildings

outside of but in the vicinity of and accessible to the District of Columbia.

This bill authorizes the Administrator of General Services to acquire sites located outside of the District of Columbia and to construct eight buildings to house Federal employees at an expenditure of $190,000,000. The Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee amended this bill to authorize only $145,000,000, cost of constructing of six buildings, including utilities, roads, highways, et cetera, and made an unfavorable report to the full committee.

I am worried over the continually increasing taxes and ever-mounting number of civilian employees of the Federal Government, and I am definitely opposed to any unnecessary expenditures.

Our attention was called to the fact that the civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased by 69,804 during the month of January, bringing the total employment to 2,245,275. This increase, averaging approximately 2,000 a day, nearly doubled the daily average increase of approximately 1,000 a day during the last quarter in the calendar year 1950.

The Military Establishment increased civilian employment during January by 55,-388. This was a ratio of 3 civilians for every 4 men called in the 80,000 January draft quota. Civilian employment in the Military Establishment totaled 1,046,889, passing the 1,000,000 mark for the first time since December 1946. The civilian employment by the executive branch, outside the Military Establishment, totaled 1,198,446 in January, an increase of 2,906 over December. These figures are summarized from reports from 67 agencies as submitted to the joint committee on the reduction of nonessential Federal expenditures.

Payroll costs necessarily lag a month behind employment figures, so I will give you those for December instead of January. Civilian employment in the executive branch totaled 2,184,681; the payroll was running at an annual rate of $7,950,000,000 which, with pay-rate increases to be taken into account, may be compared with the annual rate of $8,300,000,000 at the peak of World War II.

I fully realize many Federal employees are needed and many are doing a good job, giving dollar service for the dollar received. However, I believe that we have many on th Federal payroll who are not essential and who are not rendering the service for which they are paid.

With this thought in mind, I feel we should call a halt to increasing Federal payrolls with employees not absolutely essential to our war effort, and removing from the payroll those not giving the service required. We have requests every day from the heads of the various departments of our Government for more personnel. We, as Congressmen, do not have the office help nor the time to investigate all of these requests, with the result our Federal employment is increasing as I have shown in actual figures given above.

If dispersal is necessary to protect our Government and to prevent it from being destroyed, the removal of fringe agencies and commissions connected with the Government will scarcely be adequate, because the main departments of Government will be left in the same concentrated situation, in the same spot, in the District of Columbia. The Department of the Interior could be moved from the District of Columbia and set up to function in the interior part of the country. The Department of Labor does not necessarily have to be located in Washington. The Department of Agriculture could be placed in a different location and still function as it does today. Of course, the heads of these Departments could have their offices in Washington to be available to the President and the Congress, but the entire Department does not have to be located here. It would be difficult to move the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury away from Washington but the Departments already mentioned, in addition to others, might well be situated in other parts of the country. This is an idea which has not been discussed but it might well be developed into a 10-year plan for the general benefit of everyone concerned. By separating these great Departments of Government, a measure of security to our main Government organization would be brought about and it would be more difficult for an enemy to destroy it.

Now the question arises just what we are going to do about it. I do not criticize the General Services Administration as I feel Commissioner Reynolds of the Public Buildings Service under this agency is most sincere in his endeavors to hold down expenses, but it is his duty to furnish office space demanded to house additional personnel brought into our Federal Government. However, we are faced with the facts, and with taxes as they are, with programs dealing directly with the war effort, and with our indebtedness in excess of $260,000,000,000 it is time we carefully analyze any additional expenditures.

The dispersal bill, in my opinion, should not be passed until a careful study is completed and a determination made on what agencies can be moved out from the area of Washington where rental costs and construction costs are so high.

The buildings that are requested in this legislation are supposed to house approximately 45,000 workers. I feel that we should know the number of Federal employees that can be moved to other sections of the country and determine what office space might be available by such dispersal or decentralization before we are called upon to furnish additional buildings.

Washington is congested and this congestion is due to the many agencies of the Government recently created and the plain fact is that this dispersal program is put forward in order to make room for more Government employees.

The dispersal subject is not new to us who have served in Congress a number of years as it has been presented to us on many occasions, but now it is submitted by stressing the possibility of an atomic attack. I personally feel that these reasons are simply a camouflage for the construction of new office building space.

The removal of these fringe agencies to centers 10 to 20 miles from the District of Columbia will only tend to add to the expansion of the area now occupied by the Nation's Capital. The city of Washington, made possible by the generosity of the States of Virginia and Maryland, occupies a 10-mile-square area and if the agencies of Government are moved out only 10 to 20 miles away, it means that a greater area will be occupied by Federal Government agencies and the States of Maryland and Virginia will be contributing in a larger measure to that expansion. In many instances no revenue is received from Government-owned lands and buildings and the same problems will be developed in these proposed areas which now exist in the District of Columbia which requires a substantial cash contribution from the Federal Government in order to meet the expenses of maintaining the expected facilities.

In the event of an attack no one knows where the bomb would fall. The target might be 20 miles as well as 2 miles from the Capitol, and I raise the question if we are to protect the 45,000 workers that would be in the new buildings requested, what would be done with the other Federal employees that are not so protected. None of these buildings are to be occupied by military units, legislative units, judicial units, or executives in high places in this administration. If the workers of six or eight agencies are to be protected, the question arises as to the protection of their families. If a bomb dropped in a residential section, fathers and mothers would immediately do everything in their power to get home to learn what effect it had on the lives of their children and their property. Should we attempt to protect the workers in the six or eight new buildings, what are we to do about the workers in other departments in the District of Columbia and in departments possibly more essential to our Government which are scattered throughout this Nation, in Chicago, Detroit, or in other cities. I feel those people would have a right to ask for the same protection because a person working in Washington is not entitled to preferential treatment over those working in other areas for the same Federal Government.

The transportation problem must also be given serious consideration. If the bridges or arterial highways leading to these projects were destroyed by bombs, access to them would be practically impossible. These are but a few examples of changes that would be made without hindering the efficiency of our Government's operation. Therefore, I believe that the cry that these buildings are needed because of the threat of an attack carries very little weight.

So, the question arises are we going to construct buildings costing $190,000,000, continue putting civilians on the payroll, forcing an increase in Government expenditures, which would result in either increased taxes and/or increased national debt.

May I call to your attention a statement made by Lenin, the Russian dictator who said: "Some day we will force the United States to spend itself into destruction." I am wondering if this terrible prophecy is coming true.

Seaway "Economy" Blasted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in the Times-Leader, the Evening News, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on Tuesday, February 13, 1951:

SEAWAY "ECONOMY" BLASTED

At this writing there are known to be 914,000,000 tons of ore in Minnesota. The owners are paying taxes on this quantity. There are 146,000,000 tons in Michigan and 6,000,000 tons in Wisconsin—a grand total of 1,066,000,000 tons. If we use this at the wartime (1941–45) average of 84,000,000 tons, there is only an apparent 12½ years' supply.

In the spring of 1520 the apparent reserves of Lake Superior ore were 1,547,000,000 tons. Since that time 1,686,000,000 tons were shipped, and there are still a proven 1,066,-000,000 tons in the ground. Thus, while we shipped 1,686,000,000 tons, the depletion of apparent reserves was only 481,000,000 tons. To put it another way, for every ton shipped only 0.28 of a ton disappeared from the reserves. This is the story from 1920 to 1950.

Looking at only the postwar years, May 1, 1945, to May 1, 1949, the apparent reserves dropped from 1,186,053,378 to 1,116,069,058 tons, or 69,984,320 tons but in those 4 years 301,700,000 tons were shipped, or 0.23 ton loss of reserves per ton consumed.

There are two excellent reasons for what seems to be a statistical paradox. The first is that there are thousands of acres of land that in every probability contain ore but which has not been proven by drilling because any deposits thus proven would become taxable. Tax-forfeited and other State lands contain substantial deposits paying no taxes and, consequently, are not enumerated as part of the reserves. Secondly, there are unknown ore beds beneath higher proven deposits. They come to light only after the upper material has been mined. Because of these two situations there are millions of tons of ore added, every year, to the list of reserves.

Not listed in the U. S. A. reserves are the Steep Rock deposits 40 miles north of the Canadian border where drillings and the most conservative of estimates indicate a minimum of 300,000,000 tons of very good ore. There are at least 100,000,000 tons in the Michipicoten area at the east end of Lake Superior. Added up, these apparent reserves total 1,466,000,000 tons. We may conservatively assume the discovery of one-half ton of new ore for every ton shipped instead of the three-fourths of a ton found in the past. On this basis we have 2,199,-000,000 tons of ore reserves which will last 23 years with shipments as high as 96,600,000 tons per year, or 15 percent above the World War II average.

Along with all of this direct loading ore there is, at or near the ground surface, many billions of tons of taconite. A plant is now reducing this basic ore to a product containing 64 percent iron and possessing highly advantageous properties in blast and open hearth furnace operations. The plant cost is $15 per ton of capacity. The only ultimate limit in producing ore by this process is the amount of investment funds and the capacity of lake boats to move the product. The use of processed taconite will substantially increase the output of pig iron blast furnace-hour, which would make possible much added steel output without building a single new blast furnace.

If the St. Lawrence seaway is built, this country and Canada will have to spend a billion dollars for a facility that will have annually only eight or ten million tons of Labrador ore to handle, which is an investment of $100 to $125 per ton of ore. It would be far less expensive in terms of capital, labor, and critical materials to expand our ore output by building taconite processing plants—United States facilities for United States ore, instead of a Canadian waterway for Labrador ore—and obtain a product of much greater value in the blast furnace.

Faith in the Principles for Which Men Fight—Address by the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call the attention of all the Members of this great legislative body to the address by the President of the United States, delivered at the dedication of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 3, 1951.

Granting, Mr. Speaker, that many Members of this Congress have probably heretofore read much of this address by the President, I am, nevertheless, hopeful that my calling the full text to the attention of all the Members will make it so easily available that the reading of it will be of great value to all. Certainly the opinions of the President of the United States on this important subject are always of value to those who vigorously, vigilantly place the welfare of the Nation ahead of petty partisanship or petty political advantage or disadvantage.

Accompanying the President's speech are two other documents which I feel are of great value to all the Members of Congress and to all American citizens, to wit: First, The Strategy of Freedom, an address by Secretary of State Acheson, which was broadcast from Washington to the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States at its annual meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, on November 29, 1950. This will be featured in another extension of my remarks of this date. Second, Assurance of World Security Through American Leadership, remarks by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, in a broadcast from Washington on February 2, 1951. This speech by this distinguished American will also be found in my remarks of this date.

These speeches by these three American leaders, taken together and read together, should be of inestimable value to conscientious, patriotic American citizens.

The speech by the President of the United States follows:

FAITH IN THE PRINCIPLES FOR WHICH MEN FIGHT—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT[1]

This chapel commemorates something more than an act of bravery or courage. It commemorates a great act of faith in God.

The four chaplains in whose memory this shrine was built were not required to give their lives as they did. They gave their lives without being asked. When their ship was sinking they handed out all the life preservers that were available and then took off their own and gave them away in order that four other men might be saved.

Those four chaplains actually carried out the moral code which we are all supposed to live by. They obeyed the divine commandment that men should love one another. They really lived up to the moral standard that declares:

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

They were not afraid of death because they knew that the word of God is stronger than death. Their belief, their faith, in His word enabled them to conquer death.

This is an old faith in our country. It is shared by all our churches and all our denominations. These four men represented the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jewish beliefs. Each of these beliefs teaches that obedience to God and love for one's fellow man are the greatest and strongest things in the world.

We must never forget that this country was founded by men who came to these shores to worship God as they pleased. Catholics, Jews, and Protestants—all came here for this great purpose.

They did not come here to do as they pleased—but to worship God as they pleased, and that is an important distinction.

The unity of our country comes from this fact. The unity of our country is a unity under God. It is a unity in freedom, for the service of God is the perfect freedom.

If we remember our faith in God, if we live by it as our forefathers did, we need have no fear for the future.

Today, many people have become fearful. If we reaffirm our common faith we can overcome these fears.

This does not mean that we can always be sure what the future will bring. We cannot always know what the outcome of events will be. As President Lincoln once said:

"The Almighty has His own purposes."

But we need not be afraid of the outcome if we go on trying to do the right thing as God gives us to see the right.

RULE OF LAW IN WORLD TODAY

That is what we are trying to do in the world today. We are trying to establish world peace, so that all men can live together in brotherhood and in freedom. And to do that, we are working with other nations to create the rule of law in the world.

What does this rule of law mean? Let me give you an example. In the early days of our western frontier, law and order were not yet established. Disputes were settled in favor of the man who was quickest on the draw. Outlaws terrorized whole communities.

Men who wanted to see law and order prevail had to combine against the outlaws. They had to arm themselves. At times, they had to fight. After they had put down lawless violence, the courts took over and justice was established. And, then, it was possible for all citizens to get on with the important work of building up their own communities, paving the streets and building new schools, and giving all people a chance at the right kind of life.

This is just what we are trying to do today in the international field. If we can put a stop to international aggression, order can be established and the people of the world can go ahead full speed with the constructive tasks of peace.

We are not trying to do this job by ourselves. We could not do it by ourselves if we tried. We are acting as one member of a whole community of nations dedicated to the concept of the rule of law in the world. As in all other communities, the members of this community of nations have many different ideas and interests and do not all speak with one voice. Some are cautious and some are impatient.

We cannot always have our own way in this community. But we have a tremendous responsibility to lead and not to hang back.

Fate has made this country a leader in the world. We shirked our responsibility in the 1920's. We cannot shirk it now. We must assume that responsibility now, and it will take everything we have—all the brains and all the resources that we can mobilize.

Leadership carries with it heavy responsibilities. Good leaders do not threaten to quit if things go wrong. They expect cooperation, of course, and they expect everyone to do his share, but they do not stop to measure sacrifices with a teaspoon while the fight is on.

We cannot lead the forces of freedom from behind.

RESTRAINING AGGRESSION

The job we face is a hard one. Perhaps, it will be harder in the few years immediately ahead than it will be in the years thereafter. If we can get over the present crisis successfully—if we can restrain aggression before it bursts out into another world war, then things will be easier in the future. And I think we can do this. We can't be sure, of course, but there is good reason to hope for success.

In recent months, the United Nations has been faced by a serious challenge. But it is meeting that challenge courageously, and it

[1] Delivered at the dedication of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 3 and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

is still man's best hope of establishing the rule of law in the world.

General Eisenhower has brought home the report that the people of Europe, in spite of their difficulties and their many problems, want to preserve their freedom. He has told us of the effort they are making. They are working very hard, and, if we all work together, we can be successful.

When things look hard, there are always a lot of people who want to quit. We had people like that in the Revolutionary War, and we have them in every war and every crisis of our history. Thomas Paine called them the summer soldiers and sunshine patriots. If we had listened to them, we would never have been a free and independent nation. We would never have had a strong and prosperous country. We would not be strong enough now to stand up against Communist aggression and tyranny.

The sacrifices that are being made today by the men and women of this country are not being made in vain. Our men are in Korea because we are trying to prevent a worldwide war. The men who have died in Korea have died to save us from the terrible slaughter and destruction which another world war would surely bring.

Their sacrifices are being made in the spirit of the four chaplains, to whose memory this chapel is dedicated. They are being made in defense of the great religious faiths which make this chapel a place of worship. These sacrifices are being made for the greatest things in this life, and for the things beyond this life.

I have faith that the great principle for which our men are fighting will prevail.

The Strategy of Freedom—An Address by Secretary of State Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this day I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the President of the United States entitled "Faith in the Principles for Which Men Fight," which was delivered at the dedication of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 3, 1951. The President's speech appears on another page of this daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I respectively call the attention of yourself and of my colleagues thereto, for I feel it and the address by Secretary of State Acheson, which follows, should be read together:

THE STRATEGY OF FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ACHESON [1]

I regret that I have not been able to come out to Cleveland to meet with the National Council of Churches, as I had hoped to do, and that it has been necessary for me to talk to you instead from my office at the State Department in Washington. The events of the past few days, as I know you well understand, raise innumerable questions which require almost hourly study, consultation, and decision.

This coming together of many great sources of spiritual strength in our American community is an event of historic importance. If ever a time imposed a test, not alone of strength, but of character, upon our people, this is such a time. All the resources at our command, of wisdom, of conscience, of character; the finest traditions of our people; our deepest wells of faith, must guide us in fulfilling the responsibility which history has placed upon our country. The great increase in the power and the effectiveness of the Christian communions which are now uniting to form the National Council of Churches will encourage millions of people throughout the world.

The remarks that I had planned to make this evening were prepared several days ago. I had planned to discuss with you some of the basic problems, some of the underlying issues which concern us in our relationship with the world. I know, from the long record of intelligent and responsible participation which your separate organizations have had in foreign policy matters, that you have given much serious thought to these issues. I had not planned to discuss current day-to-day developments on this occasion.

But now a serious situation has arisen, one which holds grave danger for the peace of the world.

AN ACT OF BRAZEN AGGRESSION

I would like to talk to you about the meaning of this situation which has been created in Korea, before going on to discuss some of the broader questions I had in mind to raise with you this evening.

An act of brazen aggression has taken place in Korea, the second such act in 5 months. The harsh significance of this act, and its complete disregard of any kind of moral standard, can best be understood when it is looked at against a background of what the United Nations has been trying to do in Korea.

First of all, the United Nations itself represents a commitment on the part of the nations of the world that they will stand together in support of an international order based on justice and dedicated to the peaceful settlement of disputes. The first article of the first chapter of the Charter of the United Nations says that one of the primary purposes of the Organization is to suppress acts of aggression. That is why, when the armed forces of North Korea, without any pretense of legality attacked the Republic of Korea on June 25, the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations supported immediate and effective action by force to put down this act of aggression. For the first time in history, a world organization has rallied to put down by force of arms a crime committed against the international community.

The only exception to the unity of this action in support of the Charter was the Soviet Union and its satellites. In defiance of the 53 member nations who upheld the authority of the United Nations, the Soviet Union sought to impede the action in Korea, to give aid and comfort to the aggressors, to give matériel support to the act of aggression, and to break up by obstructive acts the work of the United Nations. Despite this defiant behavior, this tremendous experiment, in behalf of international law and morality, went forward. Across vast seas and from distant lands, men of many nations came together under the flag of the United Nations to push back the invaders. They came to fight for a principle. Many of them have given their lives that men someday may be free of this scourge of war.

After many discouraging weeks, the United Nations forces, under the command of General MacArthur, made their way up the peninsula, driving the aggressors before them. They were approaching the successful conclusion of their mission, which was to enable the United Nations to carry out what has been its purpose from the very beginning—to help the people of Korea establish their own free and independent government. Plans were moving forward in the General Assembly for the reconstruction of the country, and the nations which had contributed forces to this heroic effort were looking forward to the return of their troops to their home countries upon completion of their mission.

Then came this second shocking act of aggression. This is not merely another phase of the Korean campaign. This is a fresh and unprovoked aggressive act, even more immoral than the first.

CHINESE COMMUNIST INTERVENTION IN NORTH KOREA

Even before the attack in June, the Communist authorities in China had aided in building up the forces of the North Koreans. This was done by turning over Korean soldiers in their own armies and by munitions and supplies. The Chinese also moved some of their own armies from South China to Manchuria. After the North Korean attack started, more matériel and fresh soldiers came across the Manchurian border in greater and greater numbers. After the North Korean defeat the cloak of pretense became thinner. Chinese military formations were moved into Korea under the guise of volunteers.

Now, no possible shred of doubt could have existed in the minds of the Chinese Communist authorities about the intentions of the forces of the United Nations. Repeatedly, and from the very beginning of the action, it had been made clear that the sole mission of the United Nations forces was to repel the aggressors and restore to the people of Korea their independence.

In behalf of the United States, President Truman declared that it is the intention of this country to localize the conflict and to withdraw its forces from Korea as soon as possible. In the Security Council, this Government was one of the sponsors of a proposed resolution which affirmed that the policy of the United Nations was to hold the Chinese frontier with Korea inviolate, and that legitimate Chinese and Korean interests in the frontier zone would be fully protected.

The peaceful nations of the world made it unmistakably clear that if the Chinese Communist intervention had a limited motivation, if it sprang from an uncertainty regarding the intentions of the United Nations forces, the matter could be settled without enlarging the conflict.

But, at the very moment when representatives of these Chinese Communist authorities appeared at the headquarters of the United Nations, claiming the right to speak before this world organization in the name of the Chinese people, the cloak of pretense had been thrown off. In great force, the armies of the Chinese Communists have streamed across the Manchurian border, engaging the forces of the United Nations in a new encounter. Against these new, fresh, and numerous forces, our United Nations troops are fighting bravely. But the conditions are difficult; terrain and weather, long lines of supply, and the wear of an arduous campaign have been met with heroic fortitude.

UNITED NATIONS NOT INTIMIDATED BY NEW CRISIS

We have had dark days before in Korea. When the first wave of aggression, with the advantage of initiative which the aggressors always have, had driven us back to the bridgehead of Pusan, and the outlook was not bright, the UN forces showed no weakness of spirit or of determination because they were fighting for a principle. And I am confident, too, that the United Nations will not be found lacking in firmness of spirit or determination in responding to this new aggression.

The United Nations has a special relationship with the people of Korea. It has resolved to help the people of Korea establish a free and independent government of their own choosing. It has helped them to set up an independent republic which, had it not been for the veto of the Soviet Union, would today be a sovereign member of this world organization. The United Nations cannot be intimidated by this new challenge to its authority into shaking off its responsibilities to the people of Korea.

Now this new act of aggression has created a new crisis, a situation of unparalleled danger. For if the Chinese Communist authorities continue to impose upon their people this warring against the United Nations, they will vastly increase the danger to the whole fabric of world peace. And among the tragedies of this reckless course would be that it would spring from no interest of China or the Chinese people. If these Chinese Communist authorities have any real concern for the well-being of their people or for the regard of other nations, they now have the opportunity to show it. This is their hour of decision. The authorities of Communist China stand before the bar of the judgment of mankind. The world will watch their actions in Korea and at Lake Success. Will they represent their own interests, or will they let themselves be the dupes of others? If they defy the United Nations and mock the Charter, then no lies, no bluster, and no veto will conceal from the people of the world the evil of their action.

These are questions that affect all the members of the United Nations. The United States has no special interests or interests different from those of the majority. From the very beginning of the Korean crisis, the United States has sought complete solidarity with the majority of members.

WORLD ENDANGERED BY COMMUNIST DESIGN

The questions raised by these acts of aggression in Korea go far beyond the contours of this small and remote peninsula. They have to be viewed as part of a world picture. To be fully understood, they must be seen as part of the world-wide operations of the international Communist movement. The increasing boldness of the international Communist movement, its willingness to use overt aggression, and to accept the deliberate risk of war make it increasingly urgent for all American citizens to face squarely the danger that confronts us and to give vigorous and united support to the measures we must take to meet this danger. Those who control the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement have made clear their fundamental design. It is to hold and solidify their power over the people and territories within their reach, however ruthless the means required. The danger to the rest of the world created by this design arises out of the belief made amply clear in Bolshevist political writings that the holding of power by the rulers of the Soviet Union requires the complete subversion or forcible destruction of the countries now free of their control. They are encouraged to act on this belief by the illusion that, in so doing, they are helping along the inevitable course of history. According to the Bolshevist interpretation, history points to the collapse of non-Soviet states and their replacement by Soviet-style and Soviet-controlled states. Conflict is anticipated in Bolshevist theory as an inevitable part of the process.

The hostility of Soviet intentions, if taken alone, would not produce so grave a threat. But the combination of these intentions and Soviet military power creates very grave danger to the survival of free nations and free institutions, a danger which must not be underestimated. All governments which are now free and all responsible citizens of free societies must face, with a sense of urgency, the capabilities for conquest and destruction in the hands of the rulers of the Soviet Union.

The problem we have been called upon to solve, therefore, is: What course of action will enable us to maintain our freedom and bring about a peaceful resolution of this world crisis, or if despite our best efforts, aggression does take place, will provide a basis for defeating it?

Our essential purpose is, as it has always been in our history, to preserve our free institutions, so that freedom and justice may survive and continue to flourish. We wish to do this peacefully, because peace is the climate in which our free institutions flourish best. But we have shown in our history that we hold these values so dear that if we must fight, we will fight for them. The course of action we have chosen is to join with our allies in building the strength of the free world as a bulwark against Soviet aggression. The purpose of this strength is not aggression. It is the very opposite. It is to deter such aggression. This involves building military strength, but it requires no less the buttressing of all the other forms of power—economic, political, social, and moral—and the utmost resolution and unity among the free nations of the world.

Over the period of time the rulers of the Soviet Union, confronted by a strong and confident free world, may be obliged to abandon their expansionist aims. To build the strength of the free world is a hard course. It involves great effort and much sacrifice both by our own people and by all the people of the free world. It offers no promise of relief from these burdens in the near future. It makes no guaranty of peace. But it is rooted in the principles by which we live, and it offers us the best realistic approach to the problem of peace and the preservation of our freedom.

ELEMENTS IN STRATEGY OF FREEDOM

The main elements of the strategy by which we are seeking to carry out this course of action—the strategy of freedom—are now well established as national policy. They have emerged as practical responses to the problems we have encountered, and they have found general support in the Nation. I want to try to bring these elements together and develop their interrelationships because it is essential that the whole pattern and single purpose of our actions be clear to us.

There are six main elements in the strategy of freedom.

INTERNATIONAL ORDER FOR PRESERVATION OF PEACE AND FREEDOM

First is the development of an international order for the preservation of peace and freedom under the United Nations. The Charter of the United Nations expresses the universal aspirations of mankind, and the organization itself is a symbol of these aspirations. But the United Nations is also more than a symbol. It is a means through which we can take practical, day-by-day steps toward the building of a stable international community. As an organization in which most nations participate, the United Nations can also help to bring about the accommodations of interest and the adjustments of differences which are essential to peace in a world of change.

Our action in Korea, as we have seen, is intended to support the authority of the United Nations against aggression. In the current session of the General Assembly, we have initiated a number of measures designed to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations action against aggression. We intend to do our full part in helping the United Nations to grow in strength.

REGIONAL GROUPINGS FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY

The second element in the strategy of freedom is the development of regional groupings, within the framework of the United Nations. To insure their collective security, free nations are engaged in cooperative defense measures, not possible on a universal basis at the present time. The keystone of the defense system of the free world is being built in the North Atlantic community, and among the states of the Western Hemisphere.

A whole network of cooperative institutions has been developing among the free nations of the North Atlantic and Western European area, each a practical response to a felt need. The problems they face are extremely complex, but progress has been made toward overcoming ancient national hostilities, and in developing a common will and a sense of confidence in the potentialities of the North Atlantic community, working together as a community.

In this hemisphere, the accomplishments of the Organization of American States in promoting unity of action have been remarkable. Support of this organization is fundamental to our policy.

The essential ingredient in these regional developments has been a sense of community interest among neighbor nations. The development of further regional organizations depends in the first instance upon the existence of this community sense among the people of other areas.

RAPID BUILDING OF MILITARY STRENGTH

The third element in our strategy of freedom is the rapid building up of military strength at home and among our allies. I stress the word "rapid" because the period of greatest danger is directly before us. Our defense must not only be strong enough, it must come soon enough.

There is only one test of whether our defense preparations are adequate: That is to measure them against a sober calculation of the danger which faces us.

So measured, the defense efforts of the United States and other free nations are inadequate. A greatly increased scale and tempo of effort is required on the part of all free nations to enable them to overcome this inadequacy at the earliest possible moment.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The fourth element is economic cooperation. This has a dual character. It contributes powerfully to the building of our defenses against external attack. It also is an instrument for helping to build healthy societies in which the vitality and the promise of freedom find practical expression—in comparison with which the decadence and despair of Communist tyranny is starkly exposed.

Although the amount of resources available for economic assistance is limited by the defense requirements imposed upon us by Soviet action, even under the burden of rearmament, free societies can more effectively provide for human well-being and advancement than tyrannical regimes. The productive power of free men, who are aware of the dangers that face them and who are determined to meet the challenge to their freedom, cannot be matched by authoritarian societies.

With our technical assistance, the resolve of the free peoples of Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East to better the conditions of their lives can become a powerful drive against the age-old banes of poverty and disease and the political instability which often accompanies them. Men everywhere have awakened to the opportunities for progress which modern science and technology have opened. We can help them to help themselves, and it is in our interest to do so.

[1] Broadcast from Washington to the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States, which was meeting at Cleveland, on November 29 and released to the press on the same date. Also available as Department of State Publication 4094.

Our technical assistance is not philanthropy, for here our principles and our self-interest coincide. As the people of underdeveloped areas rise from poverty, not only will our own economy benefit, but also and even more important the real promise of freedom will expose the false promises of Bolshevik imperialism, and the peoples of these countries will grow in their recognition of the common interest and purpose of the free nations.

So far as possible, economic cooperation, like defense cooperation and collective security programs, is being carried on through the United Nations and regional organizations in order to strengthen international institutions devoted to peace and security.

READINESS TO NEGOTIATE SETTLEMENTS

The fifth element in the strategy of freedom is a readiness at all times to negotiate just settlements of international disputes and to find just accommodations of conflicting interests. Our experience has demonstrated that the Soviet rulers cannot be expected to accept fair and equal negotiation so long as they feel capable of imposing their own terms or exacting their own price. Their concept of negotiation is that it should record the facts of power rather than the requirements of justice. We shall not seek to use our power in this way, but as the free world develops strength, the Soviet rulers may find it advantageous to adjust differences equitably rather than to seek to impose their demands. The free nations must always be prepared to enter into genuine negotiations, and even to take the initiative in efforts to bring about honest negotiation.

If the issues are clear, free men will not be prey to unrealistic expectations, nor to propaganda abuse of the negotiating process. It is in the long perspective that results may be expected, not in the fits and starts of shifting tactics.

Because our earnest desire is peace we shall remain constantly receptive to genuine negotiation. With the confidence that comes of strength and the humility that comes from our devotion to Christian principles, we shall be endlessly patient in working for peace. And we shall at the same time be endlessly alert to defend the bases of our national life.

FIRM ADHERENCE TO MORAL VALUES

The sixth element in the strategy of freedom is a firm adherence in all our actions, at home and abroad, to the moral values which give meaning to our lives.

We are a young country, an enthusiastic people, and despite our great interest in material progress, we are an idealistic nation. The principles to which our common life is dedicated are powerful forces for good in the world. The affirmative values of our society have been deeply inspiring to those who have seen and felt their great creative force. We do not always present our best side to the world. In our enthusiasm and drive we often do not take care to make ourselves understood, and expect others to recognize us for what we are. We have launched a greatly expanded information program to bring knowledge of ourselves to other peoples, a program which the President has called the campaign of truth.

It is our purpose to carry to all parts of the world the facts about what is happening in America and in the world, because it is a fundamental part of our democratic faith that people, if informed of the truth, will make sound judgments. What is even more important than what we say to the world is how we conduct ourselves at home and abroad. The force of example and action is the factor which finally determines what our influence is to be.

If we are to be worthy of the leadership that derives from our power, we must be sure that we are true to the values and principles upon which our society is founded. It is the example of democracy at work, vigorous, healthy, respectful of its first principles, growing in freedom and justice and opportunity, that can inspire ourselves and others to meet the tasks ahead with hope and confidence.

Without this, which depends on every one of us, on the everyday conduct of each citizen, the strategy of fredom would "become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal."

ALL AMERICANS RESPONSIBLE FOR PEACE

These are the elements of our national foreign policy of the strategy of freedom. This is the course by which we seek to avoid war and to secure peace. No one can guarantee that war will not come. The present crisis is extremely serious. Whether reason will prevail is only partly for us to decide. We must hope and strive for the best while we prepare for the worst.

This is a responsibility, not just of a few public officials, not just of the Congress, but of the whole American people. The qualities we must demonstrate—steadiness, moderation, restraint, constancy of purpose, and flexibility in action, imagination, wisdom, maturity—these qualities are possible for us as a Nation only if the American people participate as individuals in striving to make our society worthy of the hopes that free men everywhere have placed in it.

A deep understanding of the forces we are dealing with, and the role we must play, must be acquired by each of us. Every single individual has a share of this responsibility.

The six elements of the Strategy of Freedom, support of the United Nations, development of regional organizations, the rapid building up of our strength in partnership with our allies, economic cooperation, readiness to negotiate, and a firm adherence to the fundamental purposes and principles of our society, constitute a national policy, not a party policy. They have emerged from a long process of discussion and consideration as the practical requirements of a policy adequate to the problems which confront us. They are rooted in our traditions. They find general support in both parties.

It is right and proper that there should be differences of opinion among us about the execution of this policy, and about questions of emphasis, priorities, application and administration. No one has a monopoly of wisdom and the vigor and vitality of a democratic society derive from free discussion and debate and the consent which flows from understanding. However, vigorous our debates may be, it should be made clear to all that our country is united in its determination to hew to the strategy of freedom which is our national policy.

The Nation's peril is our challenge. The united will of the people must be our answer.

Assurance of World Security Through American Leadership—Remarks by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have this day inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the President of the United States entitled "Faith in the Principals for Which Men Fight," and also an address by Secretary of State Dean Acheson entitled "The Strategy of Freedom." I am now privileged to call to the attention of all my colleagues in this Congress the radio remarks made by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, from Washington, D. C., on February 2, 1951.

These three important documents by these three Americans so recently made and on closely related subjects will surely add to the information and inspiration of all who read them.

The remarks by General Eisenhower follow:

ASSURANCE OF WORLD SECURITY THROUGH AMERICAN LEADERSHIP—REMARKS BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE[1]

As a soldier, I have been given an Allied assignment that directly concerns the security of the free world, with special reference to the countries bordering upon the North Atlantic Ocean. I have approached the task, aiming at the good of the United States of America, conscious that a strong, solvent America is the indispensable foundation for a free world. While I have reached certain conclusions, the subject of the free world's security is so vast and complex that no man could hope to master its elements to the last critical item or, in a quarter hour, to answer all questions in his fellow citizens' minds. Consequently, though I speak to you out of deep conviction, I do so in all humility, trusting to your sympathetic consideration.

Our hope remains the achievement of peace based on understanding and forebearance, the only sure foundation for peace.

We must never lose faith that such a peace can be ultimately established. We seek such a peace, and no one can honestly interpret our current modest preparations otherwise.

But we should examine the current situation fearlessly and clearly, neither shutting our eyes to obvious dangers nor permitting fear to warp our judgment. America's record and America's strength certainly should prevent hysterical apprehension of the future.

Today we are faced by an aggressive imperialism that has more than once announced its implacable hostility to free government. Therefore, we strive to erect a wall of security for the free world behind which free institutions can live. That wall must be maintained until Communist imperialism dies of its own inherent evils.

NECESSITY FOR EFFECTIVE COOPERATION

One of the great questions before us is the will and capacity of Europe to cooperate effectively in this aim. Unless there exists in Europe a will to defend itself, no amount of outside help can possibly make it secure. A nation's defense must spring from its own soul; and the soul cannot be imported.

For years, we have heard that Western Europe is plagued, confused, and divided far more seriously than we are; we have heard that in their homes, in factories, on the street, millions of honest workmen are daily subjected to Communist bullying, that their days and nights are haunted by the specter of invading hordes whom they cannot hope to equal in numbers or physical strength.

Furthermore, the discouragement, destruction, and confusion visited upon the peoples of Europe by two world wars sapped their productive capacity and, in some instances, reduced them to levels of near starvation. More than this—their spirit was smothered in war weariness.

[1] Broadcast from Washington on February 2 and released to the press by the Department of Defense on the same date.

That is a story often told. If it were the whole story, then all I could honestly do would be to recommend that we abandon the NATO Treaty and—by ourselves—attempt, however, futilely, to build a separate fortress against threatening aggression. Two striking facts make such a recommendation, for me, impossible.

PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN DEFENSE

The first fact is that the utter hopelessness of the alternative requires our participation in European defense. We can all understand that America must be strong in air and sea power. These elements are vitally essential to the defense of the free world and it is through them that we protect the approaches to our homeland and the routes of commerce necessary to our existence.

But this alone is not enough. Our ships will not long sail the seas, nor our planes fly the world airways, if we stand aside in fancied security while an aggressive imperialism sweeps over areas of the earth with which our own future is inseparably linked.

Western Europe is the cradle of our civilization; from her originally we drew our strength, genius, and culture. But our concern in Europe is far more than sentimental. Our own security is directly involved. Europe is a highly developed industrial complex with the largest and most varied pool of skilled labor on earth. This huge potential would be a rich prize for a totalitarian invasion. Its direct importance to us is the stark fact that its possession by Communist forces would give them opportunity to develop a preponderance of power. Even this disaster would not tell the whole story.

If Western Europe should be overrun by communism, many economically dependent areas in Africa and the Middle East would be affected by the debacle. Southeastern Asia would probably soon be lost. Thus, we would be cut off from the raw materials of all these regions—materials that we need for existence. World destiny would then be dictated by imperialistic powers whose avowed purpose is the destruction of freedom.

POWER OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The second fact bearing upon our participation in European defense is that the people of Europe are not spiritually bankrupt, despite the validity of many pessimistic reports. Great sections of its population have for years labored on and fought the creeping paralysis of communism. Now, the North Atlantic Treaty has brought new fuel to the flames of hope in Europe. It has noticeably lifted morale, the fundamental element in this whole situation—the force which powers all human progress.

In every capital, there is growing a desire to cooperate in this mutual security effort. All the governments that I have recently visited agreed that their defense programs must be stepped up despite economic and other difficulties—in spite of preoccupations that constitute abnormal drains upon particular nations. For example, France now wages a relentless and costly war against communism in Indochina. Britain, still existing on an austerity level, shoulders heavy burdens in Malaya. However much those nations may differ from us in their diplomatic thinking with respect to Asiatic states, there is no question concerning their solidarity in opposing Communist aggression.

They, and others on the continent, are taking measures to effect substantial increases in their defense establishments. Within the past few days, Britain has stepped up drastically its rate of preparation. The new military service program in France bars all exemptions of every kind whatsoever. The Norwegians impressed me with their unshakable determination that never again will they be victims of occupation. To, them, a fighting resistance, even to their own destruction, is preferable. And in Italy, there are unmistakeable signs of a stiffening courage and determination. The same is true of Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Portugal, Luxemburg, and Iceland.

In every country, I saw heartening evidence of a regeneration in Europe's spirit. Its morale, its will to fight, will grow with every accretion to physical strength. The arrival in Europe of new American land and air units, though modest in protective influence by themselves, will certainly produce added confidence and accelerate the production of military force throughout the member nations.

The European nations must, of course, produce and maintain the great bulk of the land forces necessary to their defense.

THE STOREHOUSE OF RESISTANCE

For this purpose, the most immediate need of Europe is munitions and equipment. Everyone of the continental nations I visited can rapidly and markedly increase its resistance power if it can be promptly furnished additional supplies of this kind. To fill this need, our loyal neighbor, Canada, with Britain and others, is shouldering part of the load.

In military potential, the free nations have everything they need, natural resources, industrial genius, productive capacity, and great reservoirs of leadership ability. Given the ingredient of morale, the determination to combine for mutual protection, the military strength necessary will be produced at a speedy pace. With every increase in strength, there will be an upward thrust in morale, resulting in an ever-mounting spiral of confidence and security.

With respect to time, no man can know at what hour, if ever, our defensive organization may be put to the ultimate test. Because our purpose is entirely defensive, we must be ready at the earliest possible moment. Only an aggressor could name the day and hour of attack. Our current mobilization, properly adjusted to our peaceful security needs, should be as rapid as any required by the emergency of war.

To you, the people of America, I repeat, as I have to the Congress and to the President, that I believe,

First, the preservation of free America requires our participation in the defense of Western Europe.

Second, success is attainable. Given unity in spirit and action, the job can be done.

Third, while the transfer to Europe of American military units is essential, our major and special contribution should be in the field of munitions and equipment.

By no means, do I believe that we Americans can support the world militarily or economically. In our own interest, we must insist upon a working partnership with every nation making the common security its task of first priority. Every one of the member nations must realize that the success of this combined effort to preserve the peace rests as directly upon America's productive, economic, and political strength as it does on any amount of military force we can develop. Only cooperative effort by all of us can preserve for the free world a position of security, relative peace, and economic stability.

Attainment of this result is largely a matter of morale and the human spirit. The free world now must prove itself worthy of its own past.

If Frenchmen can rise to the heights their fathers achieved at Verdun in 1916; if Italians can recapture the fervor of Vittorio Veneto; if the British can relive the days of 1940 when they stood alone against Hitler; if our other allies can react to today's threat in the mode of their own revered patriots; if we, here in America, can match the courage and self-sacrifice of the ragged, freezing members of Washington's army at Valley Forge; indeed, if each of us now proves himself worthy of his countrymen fighting and dying in Korea, then success is sure—a glorious success that will bring us security, confidence, tranquillity.

Each of us must do his part. We cannot delay, nationally or individually, while we suspiciously scrutinize the sacrifices made by our neighbor, and, through a weasling logic, seek someway to avoid our own duties.

ACCOMPLISHMENT BY AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

If we Americans seize the lead, we will preserve and be worthy of our own past. Our children will dwell in peace. They will dwell in freedom. They will read the history of this decade with tingling pride and, from their kinship with this generation, they will inherit more than can be expressed in millions, in acres, or in world acclaim.

It is not my place, as a soldier, to dwell upon the politics, the diplomacy, the particular treaty arrangement that must accompany and go forward with such an effort. But I do conceive it my duty to report from time to time, both to this Government and to all others in the coalition, as to progress achieved. Thus, our own and all other peoples may constantly review their decisions and plans—and, if necessary, revise them.

This evening, I come back to you only as one with some experience in war and peace, of some acquaintanceship with our friends of Western Europe, to bring you what is in my heart and mind. I shall go about my own task in this undertaking with the unshakable confidence that America will respond fully when the basic issues are understood. We know that 150,000,000 united Americans constitute the greatest temporal force that has ever existed on God's earth. If we join in a common understanding of our country's role today and wholeheartedly devote ourselves to its discharge, the year 1951 may be recorded in our history in letters as bright as is written the year 1776.

The Man Who Transformed the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a prologue to the religious drama entitled "The Man Who Transformed the World."

This play will be presented on March 16 and 17, at the National Guard Armory in Washington under the sponsorship of the Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. Part of the proceeds from this presentation will be turned over to the fund for medical attention for the children of the men who died in the service of our country. Mrs. Edward H. Jordan, of Washington, is the chairman of the board. The part of Jesus Christ will be portrayed by Mr. Jean Gabrieli, of New Jersey, and a cast consisting of the Passion Players of America, who have given this performance for a number of years.

The Christian Voice, New York City, in commenting on this play said:

Religious leaders and organizations: The Story of the Man Who Transformed the World will do more for your community than all other attractions together.

In these critical days when foreign and godless ideologies menace our lives and the lives of future generations, it would be well for us to be more conversant with the Greatest Story Ever Told.

The prologue follows:

THE MAN WHO TRANSFORMED THE WORLD

Two thousand years ago, from within a defeated and embittered nation, held in bondage by a tyrannical empire, there arose a Man, a Leader, who inspired the people of that nation, healed them, and gave them new courage to live. He conceived a formula for curing the ills of humanity by striking at the root of evil. He established a pattern for mankind to follow, based upon the imitation of God. This Man in 3 short years revolutionized the entire pattern of thought and philosophy of life. They call Him, "Master," "Messiah," and "Son of God."

Mercy, love, and universal forgiveness of injuries, He preached, yet 19 centuries later, we still haven't learned to abolish force, abolish hate, abolish revenge. How long does it take man to realize the meaning of His words?

The Man's profound wisdom, superior intellect, and inspirational ideals were so advanced as to be inconceivable to the minds of His time. His enemies, in alarm and fear, sought to stop Him and still His voice. They succeeded in destroying His body, but they could not still His voice. His name has become such a cornerstone of humanity, that to tear it out from this world would be to shake its very foundations.

A Soldier in Korea Asks Some Unanswerable Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include herewith a letter from a soldier in my district who is now fighting in Korea. His letter was written to the Marquette Mining Journal. It presents some unanswerable questions which those in charge of our foreign policy program might profitably read:

DEAR SIR: Myself and a few thousand other GI's would like to know the answers to several questions. The biggest question at the present is, just why are we over here? The Army has tried to answer that for some time now, but I've yet to hear anyone say he's convinced we ought to be fighting. The Korean people certainly aren't glad to have us. I've seen that with my own eyes. You'll notice I said the people, and not the politicians. After all, it is the people of this world whom we are trying to satisfy, even though the scales show otherwise.

WHERE WILL IT END?

Another good question is, Where will it all end, and to what advantage? Also, do the people back home realize how disgusted the reservists are at the quick shuffle they've gotten? I've never seen the morale of troops so low before.

It just about all boils down to this: How is a man going to fight or give his all when he can't see anything worth while behind it? No one has satisfied us yet, so think twice before you try.

QUESTION OF RESERVISTS

Another question which all reservists would like answered: When we signed up after the last war we were led to believe we wouldn't be called until a national emergency existed. Most of us were called before the emergency was declared. To us it was kind of a low blow dealt from what we once called a democratic Nation. It's rough to be lied to, by our own Government, at that. This may sound harsh, but it's not half as harsh as all of us feel.

Why is it that our PX (post exchange) shelves are bare when the black market thrives to such an extent that the streets are lined with shops selling American cigarettes, candy, toilet articles, stationery, and every item of GI clothing—not used, but brand new?

BRITISH IN AMERICAN GARB

Why is it that our engineer battalions have to drive trucks and equipment made in Japan, when the Koreans use United States equipment and tear it up within a month?

Why was it that the reservists, the majority of whom were more than qualified, weren't held in the States to train draftees instead of being sent overseas?

Why is it that British soldiers, from the nation which claims to have the best tailors in the world, are seen wearing GI field coats and carrying M-1 rifles as they stroll through the PX buying up our scarce items? Why, too, are Korean police, civilians, and soldiers wearing our GI uniform? How is an American soldier supposed to respect his uniform when it's being worn by everyone in the world?

IMPOSING EDIFICES

Why is it that the British, Dutch, and other European legations are housed in imposing edifices when the Nation that foots the bill for the whole show is in a dump by comparison?

You try to answer these questions. We, the expendable GI's, can't.

CHARLES C. COWPLAND.

Thirty-third Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution just received by me from Mr. Joseph Maceina, chairman of the Joint Committee of the American-Lithuania Council, Inc., Pittston Chapter, and Lithuanian Relief, Chapter 44, Pittston, Pa.:

PITTSTON, PA., *February 18, 1951.*

DEAR SIR: At a mass rally of Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in the city of Pittston, Luzerne County, Pa., on Sunday evening, February 18, 1951, to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the country of their forefathers, the enclosed resolution was adopted by the unanimous vote of the participants.

Tribute was paid to the Government of the United States for their courageous stand in defense of liberty of people everywhere, being particularly concerned with the destiny of Lithuania, whose people desire nothing that is not rightfully theirs.

This meeting requests the Government of the United States of America to initiate appropriate measures (1) to induce the Soviet Union to withdraw its army of occupation and administrative forces from the territory of Lithuania, and allow the Lithuanian people to exercise their sovereign rights of an independent nation in conformity with the international treaties and the principles of the international charters subscribed to by the Soviet Union, and (2) to induce the Soviet Union to stop its genocide practices in Lithuania and to repatriate those many thousands of Lithuanians who were deported to Siberia during their occupation of Lithuanian territory.

We feel confident that the Government of the United States of America will spare no efforts in bringing about conditions which would enable the Lithuanian people, as well as other nations behind the iron curtain, to regain their lost freedom and to resume their rightful place as independent nations.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH MACEINA,
Chairman of Joint Committee of American-Lithuanian Council, Inc., Pittston Chapter, and Lithuanian Relief, Chapter 44, Pittston, Pa.

At a mass rally of Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in Casino Hall, 91 North Main Street, Pittston, Pa., on Sunday evening, February 18, 1951, to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Lithuania, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas for 21 years (from 1918 to 1939) the Republic of Lithuania was a free and independent nation, and during that period proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that she is fully capable of self-government. They were released from the yoke of subjugation by decree of the League of Nations; and

"Whereas historians tell us that Lithuanians settled on the shores of the Baltic Sea as early as the eleventh century, and spoke a language very similar to the ancient Sanskrit; and

"Whereas Lithuania, as a neutral country, was the victim of ruthless warfare and pillaging during World War II, is presently occupied by Soviet Union armies and administrative forces; and

"Whereas the principle of political independence enunciated in the declaration of the United Nations, and in the Atlantic Charter, is a hollow mockery in the light of the situation in Lithuania as it exists today, particularly the genocide practices which constitute a flagrant violation of the law of nations in general and of the United Nations Charter in particular: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That request be made on the Government of the United States of America to initiate appropriate measures (1) to induce the Soviet Union to withdraw its army of occupation and administrative forces from the territory of Lithuania, and allow the Lithuanian people to exercise their sovereign rights of an independent nation in conformity with the international treaties and the principles of the international charters subscribed to by the Soviet Union, and (2) to induce the Soviet Union to stop its genocide practices in Lithuania and to repatriate those many thousands of Lithuanians who were deported to Siberia during their occupation of Lithuanian territory; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America; to the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the United States Senators from Pennsylvania; and to the Congressman from Luzerne County, Pa."

JOSEPH MACEINA,
Chairman of Joint Committee of American-Lithuanian Council, Inc., Pittston Chapter, and Lithuania Relief, Chapter 44, Pittston, Pa.

Fight Against Philadelphia Wage Tax Must Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is unjust, and, in the opinion of some it is unconstitutional, for the city of Philadelphia to levy a tax on the workers employed in that city regardless of their place of residence even though it be entirely outside the limits of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania.

The fight against this iniquitous tax has been carried on in the Council of the City of Philadelphia, the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, and in the Congress of the United States. As yet no satisfactory results have been obtained.

On February 22 of this year, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2830, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration. On February 27 I introduced another bill, H. R. 2945, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for its consideration. Both of these bills sought to repeal the effect of the Philadelphia wage tax in its application to nonresident Federal workers in the city of Philadelphia. Although drawn in different language they are nevertheless the same in purpose. In addition to these bills I have also introduced, on March 5, another bill, H. R. 3054, that would extend the principle of the above-mentioned bills to all workers, and, not merely Federal workers. This bill has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I hope that committee hearings will be held on the bills I have introduced and that favorable action will be taken to relieve workers of these unfair and unjust taxes wherever they exist, Philadelphia, or, elsewhere throughout the Nation.

As an illustration of the widespread interest that is being taken in the effort to eliminate taxes on wage earners who do not reside within the jurisdiction levying the tax, I include as part of my remarks, under the unanimous consent granted, an editorial appearing in the March 8, 1951, issue of the Courier-Post, published at Camden, N. J., reading as follows:

WAGE TAX FIGHT SPREADING—HOPE OF VICTORY IMPROVING

Never before has the fight against Philadelphia's wage tax on nonresidents raged on so many fronts as at present.

The New Jersey State Senate, by a vote of 17 to 0, has just passed a resolution, sponsored jointly by Senators Wallace, of Camden County, and Hannold, of Gloucester County, calling on Congress to outlaw the tax.

A resolution by Assemblymen Neutze and Meloni is pending in the assembly which would ask Congress to relieve all persons living in one State from paying wage or income taxes in another.

A resolution has been introduced in the Pennsylvania Legislature by the State senator from Delaware County to outlaw the Philadelphia tax on any nonresident of the city, whether he lives in the State of not.

Congressman WOLVERTON has sponsored a bill at Washington to make Federal employees subject to taxes only in the State in which they reside.

Congressman HOWELL has sponsored a broader bill which would exempt all nonresidents of a State from its wage or income taxes, and WOLVERTON has said he also will introduce a similar bill. A third measure to this effect has been introduced by Representative JOSEPH O'HARA, a Minnesota Democrat.

United States Senator SMITH of New Jersey also has announced he will offer anti-wage-tax legislation in the Senate, the first time such a bill has been initiated there.

Despite all this activity against double taxation and taxation without representation such as the Philadelphia wage levy imposes on workers who do not live or vote there, the battle really is only beginning.

Any action taken by the New Jersey Legislature can do no more than demonstrate to Congress and to Pennsylvania how deeply New Jersey resents this iniquitous tax. New Jersey cannot compel Congress or Pennsylvania to end it.

The Pennsylvania suburbs of Philadelphia have never gotten to first base in previous efforts to have that State's legislature ban the wage tax. Since, in the past 2 or 3 years, many other Pennsylvania municipalities have adopted a levy like Philadelphia's it is probably useless to hope for relief from that source.

Congress has always been reluctant to intervene in tax matters pertaining to the States and curtail their taxing powers, as anti-wage-tax legislation would do.

Many States impose income taxes on nonresident workers. New York has done so for years on north Jerseyites and would lose large revenues if Congress forbade the practice. Hence these States can be counted on to oppose Federal legislation.

Yet the national situation is changing, partly due to the very fact that so many States have income taxes and so many citizens as a result pay taxes in two States. Dispersal of Federal bureaus from Washington into the adjoining States of Virginia and Maryland, confronting many thousands of Government workers with the dual tax problem, is bringing it sharply to the attention of Congress as a whole for the first time.

The fact that a Minnesota Congressman has introduced a bill against dual taxation is significant, showing that south Jersey no longer stands alone in the crusade against it as we once did.

Now there is talk of a movement, if Congress will not act, to initiate a constitutional amendment which would bar double taxation. There certainly would be widespread popular support for such an amendment all over the country.

The fight may not be won this year, or the next, but it is growing warmer and wider. It should be carried on more strenuously than ever on our part, and there is reasonable hope of eventual victory.

Crescent City, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March issue of Good Housekeeping:

CRESCENT CITY, CALIF.

The place was Crescent City, a 3,000-person town pocketed dramatically between the giant redwood forests of northwestern California and the rugged, rock-strewn coast of the Pacific Ocean. The time was October 1949. The atmosphere was one of deepest melancholy. Sirteen Crescent City businessmen and businesswomen stood looking at their crescent-shaped harbor; gloom clouded every face. For the fifth time in 32 years, their bid for a Government-financed dock had been rejected. Why? Because Crescent City didn't have the shipping business to justify such expense. The argument of Crescent Citians—that they couldn't get the business until they had a dock—was smothered under an avalanche of statistics. The brutal truth was upon them: Their town could never really prosper.

Not one of those men and women remembers who uttered the fateful words that changed the whole course of Crescent City history. "Let's build our own dock," somebody said. And, as the townspeople put it, "At that moment, civic lightning struck Crescent City."

That very afternoon a citizens dock committee was formed. The next day, Saturday, a dozen subcommittees went to work, making a house-to-house canvass for voluntary donations of money. On Sunday a volunteer engineer completed his plans for dock construction. On Monday morning the necessary rights-of-way were obtained, and that afternoon volunteer truckers started dumping rock into the road fill leading to the dock site.

For the next 6 months little Crescent City worked itself to the civic bone to reach its fantastic goal. "The fever got us," says Mrs. Emma Cooper, county clerk. "Every one of us, from 8 to 80."

A $10,000 quota was set. Within 2 weeks, $17,000 was raised. Truckers, foresters, and dockers—222 in all—donated their services. The Hotel Lauff offered lodging, gratis, to out-of-town workers. Local businesses donated gasoline, water pipe, auto parts, wiring, repair services, lumber, food, and drink. The Shamrock Cafe gave free lunches to workers. Crescent City's 55 professional men practice worked after hours on the citizens dock books and records. The employees of Brownie's Cafe joined in a payroll contribution plan. The bus station served free coffee to workers at all hours. Mrs. Illene Moore, a dairy farmer from Del Norte County, donated a 6-month-old heifer for auction. Result: $200. Paul A. Brunk, local landowner, auctioned 24 lots and presented half the proceeds to the citizens dock committee. Result: $1,200. The local branch of the Bank of America gave, besides cash, the services of one teller each day for dock work.

Crescent City's women exhibited mammoth energies during that heart-stirring half year. Members of the Woman's Club and the Business and Professional Women went from door to door and sold $465 worth of tickets to a benefit double feature at the Mecca Theater. The Ladies Auxiliary of the American Legion held a build-our-dock dance and cleared $271. The Elk Valley Club, a rural organization, presented the committee with $100. A department-store clerk donated a bolt of red cloth which was used for dockside flags. Waitresses and high-school girls toted hot coffee and doughnuts to the dock, where workers labored voluntarily through savage winds and rains.

On March 18, 1950, the citizens dock was finished—a $200,000 project that cost the town's residents $17,000 in cash and an awesome number of man- and woman-hours of physical work. Mayor Al Manuel declared March 18 an annual legal holiday, and

announced a day-long celebration to commemorate the occasion. Fishing-boat races, a parade of old-timers, a contest to name Miss Citizens Dock, a gigantic crab feed, and an official christening of the dock kept the town and its 5,000 visitors pulsing until far into the night. "On March 19," recalls Alyce Moseley, county judge, "you could shoot a cannon down Main Street and not hit anybody. The reason: Everybody was getting some sleep, at last."

Today Crescent Citians look with almost tearful pride at their dock—a 900-foot pier projecting into the blue waters of Crescent Harbor and right-angling into a fisherman's pier, a lumber wharfhead, and a loading platform. And they gaze sentimentally at the big, handsome, redwood-bound scrapbook encased in glass at the chamber of commerce office, on Second Street. On its pages are listed the names of all the people who contributed to the building of Citizens Dock. "There are more than 700 names in that book," says Bill Mason, local realtor. "It represents, without a doubt, the most stupendous example of civic cooperation this region has ever known."

Already the town is realizing many happy returns from its labors. A fishing fleet of 130 boats uses the dock; 3,000,000 board feet of lumber and 120,000 tons of oil are shipped each month through the harbor; and oil tank farm is being constructed at the south shore of the bay; new lumber mills are moving in. More than $1,500,000 worth of cargo has already left Citizens Dock, slipped past Pelican Rock, and headed for ports all over the world. The town that "could never really prosper" is, within a year, booming beyond its citizens' dreams.

Crescent Citians are taking their prosperity in exuberant stride. "We weren't exactly loafing before," they say, and point to their other projects, such as the Business and Professional Women's 2-year-old plan for Crescent City's high-school girls. "The women of this town," says Alice Mather, housewife and professional bookkeeper, "discovered our girls weren't fitting themselves properly for after-school professions." So in 1948, members of the club invited the town's high-school girls to spend a week inspecting local businesses. Last year, 80 girls signed up for this tour; they watched the inside workings of department stores, restaurants, motor courts, public-health laboratories, law offices, schools, and hospitals. At the Seaside Hospital, 16 girls visited the laboratories, surgeries, incubator rooms, and kitchens. Four of these girls thereupon chose nursing as their careers, and plotted their schooling accordingly.

The plan has also led to congenial part-time work for some. Sixteen-year-old Gail Barnum, who was elected Miss Citizens Dock on gala March 18, learned she adored secretarial work, and now spends 18 profitable hours a week at the local food-locker plant.

A lot of new things are being planned for Crescent City. There's a greensward to be planted along the scrubby 2-mile shore line. There's a highway-beautification plan presently under way, in which Crescent City's women, working in teams, are clearing underbrush and planting seasonal blossoms so that throughout the year color and beauty will beckon motorists toward the little city. Downtown, too, is being spruced up. One section of Second Street has become a gay stretch of green, blue, pink, and yellow store fronts.

"Yes, we have a nice town," says Bill Mason, who forsook his real-estate business to serve as the Citizens Dock Committee's unpaid financial chief. "We have our river. We have our trees. We have our rugged shore line and our crescent-shaped bay. Now all we need to do is make ourselves as good-looking as our surroundings. We will, too. Our dock has made us town-proud."

Procurement of Paint for the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MERCHANT'S & MANUFACTURER'S PAINT CO., INC.,
Louisville, Ky., March 5, 1951.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORTON: A most serious matter has come to the writer's attention which I desire to convey for your consideration and possible action. Through conversation with suppliers of paint raw materials and other paint manufacturers the writer learned that the Navy Department, Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, had bid forms on requisition EP 3727-51 out for quotation. This bid is for 6,487,000 gallons of paint. I have been told this is larger than any bid requested during World War II.

The story which is a general topic of conversation in the paint industry is that the Aviation Supply Office is procuring this tremendous quantity of paint for the United States army engineers and that it is to be packed in quarts, 1-gallon and 5-gallon containers. The procuring agency went to four large paint companies and asked them to take the business. When informed it was too much business for them to handle the procurement agency then opened it up to 50 large manufacturers to bid on.

On February 23 our company wired for copies of this requisition. Today we received the following letter dated February 28: "Your wire request for bid forms on requisition EP 3727 is acknowledged. The solicitation of bids under this requisition is closed."

The writer's gripe over this manner of doing business is as follows: Isn't this inconsistent with the Government's stated position of helping the small companies to stay in business during this national emergency? The writer checks daily the United States Department of Commerce Field Service, Consolidated Synopsis of United States Government Procurement Information and has never seen this bid advertised. This is probably the largest paint bid ever released for quotation, and it is being handled as a negotiated bid amongst the select and chosen few. While here we are a small manufacturer trying to obtain D. O. business so as to aid in the defense effort, and at the same time have enough business to make up for the loss of civilian business and are feverishly quoting on formal and negotiated bids for a few hundred or thousand gallons of business, it looks like the big boys get the cream and the little boys the milk.

Our company has been a bidder on various paint requirements of the Aviation Supply Office in the past. Now here is probably the biggest paint bid of all times and we are not given the opportunity of quoting.

When the Federal Government in one bid requesting delivery in 120 days for 6,487,000 gallons of paint does this, it affects every paint manufacturer. It upsets the already aggravated market of paint raw materials. It is reported that this bid will require over 3,000,000 gallons of synthetic alkyd resin. It is estimated, working day and night, it would take 20 days to produce this quantity if every manufacturer of alkyd resin in the United States were to devote their full plant facilities. This one bid will take away from the civilian trade approximately 1 month's production of alkyd resin. This means that the small paint manufacturer's quota on alkyd resins will be cut and we have had no chance to quote on any of the paint under this bid invitation. Is this fair and equal treatment?

Hoping that some good will come out of this, we remain,

Very truly yours,
MERCHANT'S & MANUFACTURER'S PAINT CO.
WM. D. MENEFEE.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution in regard to St. Lawrence seaway project, adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, March 2, 1951:

Whereas for the past 100 years the navigation of the St. Lawrence River by ocean-going commercial vessels has been possible on a limited or restricted basis; and

Whereas despite the hazards and limitations of said navigation, commerce has continued on an increased basis through recent years; and

Whereas by this commerce, the practicability of a navigation route for maritime commerce between the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes has been demonstrated to a degree which would assure that in the future, navigation on said water highway will increase in a manner commensurate with the improvement of locks and channels which govern the navigable capacity of the St. Lawrence River; and

Whereas the construction of the Panama Canal and the operation of commerce through said canal has placed the Mississippi Basin at a disadvantage in the over-all commerce of the United States and has to a certain extent retarded the industrial and commercial growth of said Mississippi Basin; and

Whereas the improvement for barge navigation of the Mississippi system of waterways has demonstrated the need for the addition of water transportation and the commerce resulting therefrom has grown steadily to the present volume which is far in excess of the original predictions based on reliable studies and estimates; and

Whereas great as the development of the Mississippi system of waterways has been, it is not completely adequate, the inadequacy being apparent in an analysis of the economic needs of the upper mid-continental area of the United States which is still sorely in need of an adequate outlet by water to the ocean and to the markets of the world; and

Whereas over the past 30 years the United States engineers, economists, and other authorites have made complete analysis with regard to the economic desirability of the improvement of the rapids section of the St. Lawrence River for modern ocean-ship navigation and have repeatedly confirmed the judgment that such a water highway is needed and that its cost can be economically justified; and

Whereas during both world wars and in the present national emergency it has been repeatedly and forcibly demonstrated that the upper mid-continental area of the United States has grown in stature and importance because of its productive capacity in agriculture, minerals, industry, and manufacturing, and that said area of the United States is indispensable to the economy of the country as a whole, both in wartime and in peace; and

Whereas due to the heavy drains on the iron ore deposits in the Lake Superior region during the past 35 years it has come to light that a depletion of said ore supply is not an improbability; and

Whereas there has been established along the southern shores of Lakes Michigan and Erie a tremendous investment of private capital amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars in plants and industries for the manufacture of steel and its subsidiary products, which steel industry is vital to the United States, both in times of peace and in times of war, and which industry must be maintained at all costs for the security of the United States; and

Whereas the discovery of rich deposits of ore in Venezuela and Labrador assure a continued supply of raw materials, which in the natural course of events should be directed to supplying the afore-mentioned steel plants located in the region of the Great Lakes to permit their continued operation and manufacture of vital materials and products; and

Whereas the President of the United States in a recent declaration has stated that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway is a must for the future security of the United States from the standpoint of self-defense and also productive capacity in time of national emergency, which declaration has caused the Congress of the United States to hold hearings on the advisability and immediate objective of bringing about the St. Lawrence development; and

Whereas a former mayor of Chicago has appeared at Washington at congressional hearings concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and has, in the name of the City of Chicago, argued in favor of the construction of the seaway; and

Whereas the city council is on record as having adopted a resolution calling for Federal endorsement of the waterway project and the early completion thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Chicago does hereby again record itself in favor of the development of the rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and other channels and harbors to accommodate modern commercial ocean-going vessels in order that the midcontinental area of the United States be supplied with this additional transportation to insure its future development and to safeguard the economic stability of the United States in peace and in war; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and he is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and Members of both Houses of Congress from Illinois.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of that certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held the 2d day of March A. D. 1951.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 6th day of March A. D. 1951.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

What Should Be Our Policy With Respect to Our Reservists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable dissatisfaction with the manner in which Reserves, active and inactive, have been called into service. The complaints seem to be based: First, upon the injustice of expecting men who served in World War II to serve in the present emergency when there are thousands of individuals who did not serve in the last war and are physically fit to do so at this time; second, the failure to take into consideration the family status or other personal considerations that heretofore have controlled the calling of men into service under the selective service procedures.

As an illustration of the kind of complaints being received, I include as part of my remarks, under the unanimous cansent granted, the following letter received by me from a young man now in service in the Korean campaign. I have for obvious reasons eliminated his name and station of service. The letter reads as follows:

The Honorable CHARLES WOLVERTON,
Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOLVERTON: Undoubtedly your office has been the focal point for numerous letters written by reservists. I assure you that each and every one of us has broached the subject of Reserve policy with an objective attitude. However, there are occasions when it is rather difficult to arrive upon justifiable conclusions without prejudice. Ostensibly, the Navy Department has recalled Reserves in order to fulfill the pressing urgency demanded by mobilization. It is the opinion of this writer that the Navy Department has lost sight of its original purpose. The present naval complement (composed to a great extent of Reserves) is in excess to the number actually needed. This condition is manifested not only on this station, but also on other bases as well. It is quite obvious that the Navy Department has overmobilized. Let us consider the facts.

Not long ago the Navy Department waged a campaign to recruit men for the Reserve program. At the time the contract was consummated, we were assured that Reserves would not be called unless a national emergency was declared. I suppose this was to be taken as a gentleman's agreement, for many of us were recalled 6 months prior to such declaration. Moreover, those of us who were in the inactive Reserves were told we would not be recalled until the ranks of the Organized Reserves had been depleted. Evidence strongly supports the falsity of such a statement. Not only do I question the integrity of the Navy Department, but also the constitutionality of such a move. It seems to me that decisions of such magnitude should rest with Congress and not within the individual powers of one man—at least, that is my conception of democracy.

Secondly, the Navy Department has repeatedly stated that there is no need for drafting men—that the Reserves and volunteers have satisfied the personnel requirements. Who, then, is going to relieve us? Why should we, men who have served 3 or more years duty in World War II, suffer for the lack of perspicacity and the cupidity of the Navy Department? Many of us are 25 years old or more and have families. Is it fair to deprive us of our valuable and productive years when there are 18-year-olds and men who served less than a year in service in the last conflict walking the streets? Perhaps I've permitted cynicism to warp my thinking; however, I assure you that these opinions coincide with those of fellow reservists.

Another point which warrants promulgation is the fact that these same Reserves would probably be the first to volunteer their services in the event of all-out hostilities. What we do object to is the involuntary recall to active duty just for the sake of mobilization, when already there are two and three times as many men as are actually needed. May I further state that this is at the taxpayers' expense—a gross misuse of Federal funds. The entire situation seems to be one of confusion and incompetency on the part of the Navy Department. It seems as if they—the Navy Department—were interested only in their own expediency, regardless of the cost to the people.

Thirdly, is it too much to ask for the formulation of a Reserve plan whereby we will be released? As it stands now, our future is uncertain—clouded by the fear of war. Certainly, enough time has elapsed for some steps to have been taken regarding this matter.

Inasmuch as I am a member of the community of ———, I am familiar with your past congressional record. I implore you to consider the facts as I have endeavored to present them and to render a just and fair decision. May I further ask how you intend to vote regarding the impending extension of enlistment?

Very truly yours.

Teaching of Moral and Spiritual Values in Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am again including an editorial from the Latrobe (Pa.) Bulletin on the important subject of teaching moral and spiritual values in our public schools. It is most important today, for a dangerous situation is arising, and the time to combat it is now. The editorial follows:

To a chaplain who administered the final sacrament an hour before her execution at the hands of the Germans in Brussels in 1915, the British nurse Edith Cavell made the remark "Patriotism is not enough."

The truth of this observation the world must learn anew. Americans must learn it because this is a world in which moral and spiritual values are under grave challenge. Of those values, patriotism can be a part, or not a part.

In the name of patriotism, Mussolini conquered Ethiopia and Hitler conquered most of Europe. The moral and spiritual values in fascism and nazism defied determination.

Communism denies the existence of a moral order.

Patriotism without moral and spiritual roots can be a noxious growth. That thought without doubt animated the 100-page statement on moral and spiritual values in the public schools issued at the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, which 14,000 teachers, superintendents, college officers and other educators attended.

The report warned there could be no social survival without a moral order. No improvements in government structure, no statutes and ordinances, however elevated their aims, could produce a good and secure social order if personal integrity, honesty and self-discipline were lacking, it was found.

The social effect of recent war has without doubt been more severe than most persons imagine. They see the trees of their individual environment and fail to see the forest which composed the atmosphere of the national scene. The increasing amount of aimless leisure, the changing patterns of home life, and the current international tensions, all represent challenges to moral strength.

In the public school the child is taught the facts about the origin, progress and ideals of the United States. It would be hard to learn about Washington without becoming aware of elements of moral grandeur. The child is quick to recognize what is good. It should be the task of all educators to increase his awareness of the moral and spiritual values on which civilization rests and upon which its survival depends. The national defense can rest upon no stronger foundation.

Nation-Wide Publicity Received by Phariss Family Over Radio Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the beauty of the Ozarks of Missouri has been recognized by novelists, poets, artists, photographers, and vacationists. Those of us who are natives of the Ozarks and have grown up in those hills love them—but we take a special pride in the people, and are happy when recognition comes to any of us.

My faith in our American family life has been strengthened to know that the Phariss family, of Monett, Mo., has received the W. G. Skelly agricultural award. Raymond Phariss was born at Mount Vernon, Mo. His father died when he was 7 and his mother died when he was 13. He started farming for his uncle when he was very young. He has continued to farm, and now owns 160 acres—and rents another 40 acres. He is a scientific farmer, who can talk about nitrogen and phosphorus needs of the soil as an experienced chemist. He understands rotation of crops—and a farm in the Ozarks is not a one-crop farm—he produces barley, oats, corn, hay, and pasture—and has dairy cattle, hogs, chickens, to say nothing of a strawberry patch.

Raymond Phariss is a real farmer—not afraid of work, and always eager to keep up-to-date in farm methods—but the award was given to all four members of the Phariss family. He and Mrs. Phariss were married in 1932—during depression years. They have two daughters now in high school. Mrs. Phariss considers the chickens her pet project, but from the information I have been able to obtain, each member of the Phariss family can handle any part of the operation of their now modern farm. Mrs. Phariss and her daughters make their own clothes—and even find time to help neighbors and friends.

Much hard work, careful planning, and a fine Christian home have contributed to the success of the Phariss family. I am happy to join their many friends in the community in paying tribute to them.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Monett Times of March 3, 1951, which includes the radio program describing the winning of the W. G. Skelly agricultural achievement award:

MONETT AND BARRY COUNTY COME IN FOR COMMENT—NATION-WIDE PUBLICITY RECEIVED BY PHARISS FAMILY OVER RADIO TODAY

Monett, Barry County, and Roaring River came in for some good Nation-wide publicity this morning when the Raymond Phariss family was honored by achieving the W. G. Skelly Agricultural Award.

Recognition was given over the National Broadcasting Co. Skelly-sponsored program, which is heard in this area over KOAM at Pittsburg, Kans., and KGBX at Springfield.

The broadcast was heard at the breakfast here and a complete transcript follows.

A wire recording was made of the broadcast by Kenneth G. Meuser, publisher of the Times. It will be transferred onto a wax record and will be presented to the Phariss family.

Here is the broadcast:

"Mr. BURLINGHAM. Good morning. This is Lloyd Burlingham greeting you on behalf of your Skelly jobber dealer, Skelly farm service man, and Skelgas dealer. Alex Dreier is here with highlights of the morning news.

"Today's agricultural achievement award goes to a fortunate quartet of fine people far toward the southwest corner of Missouri. There in the rugged hills of the Ozark Mountain country is Barry County. There Roaring River, a tremendous underground stream, bursts from the base of a beautiful bluff, daily pouring out 28,000,000 gallons of crystal-clear water, forming two lovely lakes, tumbling over three waterfalls and flowing away through a most pleasant valley.

"Mr. DREIER. Roaring River. Wonderful rainbow trout. Lloyd, we ought to be there—not here talking about it.

"Mr. BURLINGHAM. You've had some grand times there, I know, Alex. And we've been invited for today, by J. F. Black, of the Barry County Bank. He tells of last year's 200 cars of strawberries shipped from Cassville and a new industry—"poke greens," and asks us to try both—strawberries and poke greens with sow belly. Canned, now.

"Mr. DREIER. I can wait.

"Mr. BURLINGHAM. Give us your summary of what goes on in the world and 'waiting.' We'll try to make ourselves believe we're in Barry County, Mo.

* * * * *

"Besides being a great vacation area, southwestern Missouri, turns out a lot of food. It has to, in order to take care of all its visitors. It is important in its dairy and poultry productions and in its harvests of fruits and vegetables. Last year's strawberry crop totaled more than 1,000,000 quarts, Barry County alone producing well more than a third of the million quarts. May's the time to be there. Alex.

* * * * *

"Mr. DREIER. The hills of Missouri are beautiful. Clifford Newlin wrote of them:

"'The Lord pushed up the Ozarks to the sky,
Then, through the ages, humbled them to hills.
The stubborn granite never could deny,
The constant grinding of the silent mills.
Then, over all the verdant billowy mass,
He planted dogwood, oak, and sassafras.'

"It's a great thing when an area can be so attractive as the Ozarks country and, at the same time, highly productive.

"Mr. BURLINGHAM. Today's award story illustrates that. It tells of the work of the Raymond Phariss family on 200 acres on Kings Prairie near Monett.

"There are four of the Pharisses—Raymond, Lois, and their two daughters, Nora Lee, 17, and Noveta, 16. They own 160 acres, rent 40 more, and turn out these totals: 145,000 pounds of Guernsey milk, 2,800 dozen eggs, 4,000 pounds of pork, $450 of poultry meat, $1,800 of beef. They market 275 crates of strawberries. Field crops include 15 acres of red clover, 10 of oats and lespedeza, 11 of oats and red clover, 10 of barley and sweet clover, 5 of barley, 16 of lespedeza meadow, 24 of corn, 6 of Atlas sorga, and 1½ acres of strawberries.

"The crop yields are highly satisfactory, which Mr. Phariss credits partly to his use of clover in rotation with other crops. Though the farm is in Kings Prairie, some of it slopes. That part of the farm is kept in grass and not plowed up. As insurance against soil erosion, strip cropping is followed. Fertilizers used are those recommended following soil tests.

"That's a good job. Alex?

"Mr. DREIER. Mr. W. V. Davis, Monett banker, speaks up for our awardee—better for him than our bankers would for us, Mr. Burlingham.

"Mr. Davis has watched Raymond Phariss since he was a small boy and says, 'I have perfect confidence in his ability to make good on any commitment. He has built slowly but substantially, earning the money with which to pay for his constantly improving enterprises.' That from his banker.

"Mr. BURLINGHAM. His neighbors do quite as well by him—in fact, they first drew the attention of the Committee on Awards to the fine Phariss record.

"These neighbors tell of the good Raymond Phariss and his family do for those about them. Mr. Phariss is a director of the Monett, Mo., Farmers Association Exchange and of the Ozark REA board. He has served for 15 years as a commissioner of the Kings Prairie special road district. He is a board member of the First Christian Church in Monett, all four Pharisses being members. Mrs. Phariss is vice president of the Kings Prairie home economics extension club. Nora Lee and Noveta are in Future Homemaker work in the Monett High School. Nora Lee has been a member of the high school debating team for 2 years, the team winning the big eight championship both years.

"That's the story authenticated by County Extension Agents M. B. Carpenter and his successor in Barry County, Robert Kelley.

"Here is a man who started with a small acreage and enlarged his land holdings gradually. He developed a 353 pound dairy herd and sells a quality product, grade A milk. He has handled his land in strict conformity with sound conservation practices. He has made his home modern and comfortable and his livestock structures convenient and practical. And in the entire Phariss record the good will of neighbors has been earned and maintained. Best of all is the Phariss success as a family. All four are interested and all four pitch in and work together. Raymond Phariss credits the progress accomplished to the cooperation and careful planning by the family unit. This last in the feeling of the Committee of Awards is the climax of the substantial accomplishments by Raymond Phariss.

"The agricultural achievement award is therefore made to the quartet, to Raymond, Lois, Nora Lee, and Noveta Phariss, the award including a $100 United States Savings bond, a gold lapel pin and handsome scroll. Many, many friends have the Pharisses—good friends who rejoice in this recognition of the fine Phariss record: 90 of these neighbors are in Monett right now, at the Hatchers Cafe. There they are breakfasting together, celebrating the fine works of the four Pharisses. Mr. W. G. Skelly sends his best wishes to the four. His personal representative, Mr. A. Vavra, of Joplin, is at the breakfast and will present the award."

State Department Blind Spot—The Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our military leaders tell us that the Middle East area is highly important for strategical reasons. The State Department, however, refuses or ignores 200,000,000 people in that part of the world who want to be our friends and without cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, that outstanding military man, Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, calls attention to some important facts in a leading article that appears in the March 12 issue of the Freeman, which I include as part of my remarks at this point:

THE STRATEGIC MIDDLE EAST

(By Bonner Fellers)

Lenin once said that the road to communism is through preaching nationalism to subject peoples. Today Communist agents in the Middle East are busy preaching this Lenin doctrine. Unfortunately for the free world, their audience is receptive.

A million Arab refugees, homeless, undernourished, living in caves; 30,000,000 nonindependent north Africans smarting under French domination; peoples of Iraq, Jordan, and Egypt irate under occupation by British troops, are all making the going easy for the Communist agitators.

The negative policy of the United States toward these critical areas serves to aggravate the situation. The fault lies largely in the fact that we deal with the Middle East through the eyes, interests, and prejudices of our European allies. Britain is accorded primary interest; it is British policy which we follow there. The United States is represented not by traditional American love of freedom but rather by those European powers, especially Britain, which tell us where to stand so as best to further their own aims.

The unfortunate part of our policy is that the allies who influence us are colonial powers, interested in the exploitation of the Middle East and north Africa. Consequently, their position there is most unenviable.

Since 1882 the British have dominated the Egyptians by force. British troops on the Suez are unwelcome. The Egyptians want to guard their own territory. The dispute over the Egyptian Sudan remains unresolved. The failure of the UN to act on these issues drives Egypt from closer association with the Western Powers.

In North Africa the situation is worse than in Egypt. There the French maintain a colonial administration which amounts to serfdom. Morocco had been independent of European domination for more than a thousand years. It was not until the nineteenth century that the French, British, and Spanish made heavy inroads of empire. In 1912 Morocco became a French protectorate with loss of liberty and individual freedom. Tunisia, under French domination, is stricken with poverty, and the people have been crushed by force.

While passing through the Mediterranean in 1943, President Roosevelt—possibly with tongue in cheek—promised the Sultan of Morocco: "I will never allow this state of things to exist after the war. This exploitation by foreigners is not in the interest of the people." And the Sultan of Morocco is still loyal to America, hoping constantly that this pledge will still be honored by the freedom-loving American people. Yet when the oppressed Arabs and Jews of North Africa protest their troubles, they find that the United States is strangely silent and, behind the scenes, supports the European powers.

Communists from France and Russia, protesting their objective to be liberty for all, are pressing for an Arab alliance. And thus, in spite of the solemn commitment of the United States to contain communism, our policy in the Middle East and North Africa actually furthers its extension.

The incomprehensible part of this policy is that it is contrary to our own best interests, for the Middle East is critical, key terrain, vital to our success against Communist expansion. The Middle East is a fabulous land which has been fought over for centuries. It is the bridgehead to three continents. In it lie vast oil fields, the Suez Canal, and potential strategic bases.

If war comes, the collapse of our 50-division European defense would appear certain. Against it Stalin can hurl a formidable Red army which can be stepped up readily from its present strength of 200 divisions to 500 or even a thousand, should he need them. Only an extreme optimist would count on our being able to hold air bases in Western Europe. Spain, however, may be enabled to resist by her Pyrenees barrier. We hope that Britain would offer an unsinkable aircraft base, but again the fortunes of war might deny us its use. We must have flexibility to our plans.

There are excellent potential air base sites in Libya. Possibly these are the closest to Russia which we would be able to hold with small ground forces. Here the water and desert barriers of the Mediterranean and Middle East would prevent Russia from throwing the full weight of the Red army against us. From these bases, which offer unlimited dispersal areas, medium bombers and long-range fighters can strike deep into Russia; from them they can deny Russia the oil of Rumania and Saudia Arabia. When one realizes that 40 percent of the known oil reserves of the world lie in the Middle East, the necessity of being able to deny this oil to Russia becomes imperative.

Today the Middle East has been caught physically and ideologically between the surging, irreconcilable forces of the East and West. Communists tell these nonindependent peoples that European colonial imperialists, backed by America, seek only exploitation. Western propaganda warns them against the Communists who seek to enslave the world. Each of these forces is so overpowering that the people must yield eventually to one or the other.

In view of the strategic importance of the Middle East we can not afford to lose the ideological struggle there.

Africa, also, is part of Stalin's program for world communization. Once in possession of the Middle East, the extension of Red domination over all Africa would be greatly facilitated. Loss of Africa would be a tragedy to the western powers, for this undeveloped continent, rich in natural resources, offers to Europe and America a vast potential market.

The African people number fewer than 200,000,000; they are wretchedly poor. But provide them with better food and medical care, and the population would doubtless double in two generations. The natives, being inclined essentially to agriculture, could help feed Europe in exchange for manufactured goods. Thus abundance could be created readily both in Europe and Africa. The fly in the ointment lies in the fact that free Europe, still stunned from World War II, is unable to devote its energies to Africa, where the Communist threat is real and immediate.

The key to the solution of our problem in the Middle East and Africa lies in Egypt. Egypt exercises a strange mystic control over the Arab and Moslem worlds. If the United States policy toward Egypt were direct from Americans to Egyptians; if our attitude contained warmth—and I do not mean money; if Egypt could count on a close relationship, culturally, economically, and militarily, the Arab and Moslem worlds could be aligned closely with the free peoples of the world. A series of fortunate events in history makes this Egyptian leadership possible.

For centuries, either the Ottoman Empire or Germany—and sometimes both—served to keep the great Russian bear from wandering over Europe and the Middle East. The Ottoman Empire had held together because its people possessed a common culture and a defiant, compelling religious faith. Like Austria-Hungary, it was a binational empire in which the Turk and Arab were united by an indigenous political-religious ideology.

But gradually, as the Ottoman Empire met the impact of western influence, its components became weak. Then World War I collapsed the empire. The Turks and Arabs separated. The Turks became independent and looked to the materialism of the west. The Arabs broke up into tribes which fell under the domination of France, Spain, Great Britain, and Italy.

In 1923 Turkey threw away the Caliph cloak and declared for westernized methods without reservation. She held that Islam and modern civilization were incompatible, and she elected to be modern. To the moslem this act amounted to a renouncement of his faith. It offended his sensitive feelings; it troubled his conscience. He pondered: Is it true that I cannot be modern and progressive and yet keep the faith of my fathers?

On the other hand, when Egypt firmly accepted western materialism and at the same time firmly retained her old faith, it caught the Moslem's imagination. The stand gladdened his conscience. Egypt became his Mecca—a progressive state by eastern standards, with a flavor of western methods, and still a Moslem state to which the same 400,000,000 Moslems of the world could turn with pride. Here was a country tolerant toward religion; free of inquisition, stanch for personal liberty—democratic—yet Moslem. To anyone who dreams of a close union of all Arabic and Moslem peoples, Egypt, especially Cairo, represents his ideal. Here he finds everything he likes from religion to political intrigue, from art to prostitution. Egypt's victory of tolerance was a victory for Moslems everywhere.

Leadership in Egypt may not always be good, but it is accepted by the Arabs and Moslems who follow blindly and who like to commit the same mistakes. Egypt enjoys such an enviable position that the most convincing proof to a Moslem that a thing is correct is—if it is done that way in Egypt.

But Egypt is more than a Moslem state where East meets West. Since the nineteenth century Egypt has been a Mediterranean power. Her population exceeds 20,000,000; her annual imports amount to half a billion dollars. No longer bound by the sterling bloc; Britain repudiated her Egyptian war debt of half a billion pounds; Egypt is free to turn to the United States. Egypt seeks no money from us—only trade, cultural relations, and mutually beneficial defensive measures. She cannot turn to Russia, which has nothing to offer in trade, culture, security, or freedom. Although Egypt realizes the strength of her leadership in the Arab and Moslem worlds, she does not know how best to exercise it.

The hand we extend to her is guided by European colonial powers. Consequently, Egypt is not free to throw her weight with us. Yet the United States sorely needs the support and friendship of the Arab and Moslem worlds to which Egypt is the key. This is essential to the success of our policy of containment. The next move must be ours.

To effect the support we need to contain communism, deter war, and win if war comes, the United States should:

1. Stop underwriting European colonialism. (Communism cannot be defeated by support of colonialism.)
2. Adopt a policy of dealing directly with the Middle East rather than blindly following the British.
3. Endorse the principle of self-government—everywhere.
4. Encourage the formation of a defensive Mediterranean Alliance, to include Spain.
5. Help equip, if requested, local forces for the defense of air bases.
6. Extend the Monroe Doctrine over those members of the Alliance which are vital to our security.

Such a new and better relationship with the Middle East could be achieved merely by a change in our attitude. This would not destroy our firmly established relationships with France and Britain because, in the long run, our stand would benefit them in the furtherance of world peace.

In the final analysis communism, which is an ideology, cannot be destroyed by force and bayonets. It can be destroyed only by another and better ideology. We possess this better ideology, but in the Middle East we have permitted it to become submerged. It is still not too late to correct our mistakes if we decide to fight communism by furthering the cause of freedom.

American Peace Crusade at Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

MARCH 13, 1951.

Dr. JEROME DAVIS,
American Peace Crusade,
West Haven, Conn.:

Concerning your telegram requesting that I reserve time Thursday, March 15, for Connecticut constituents attending the American Peace Crusade at Washington, I wish to inform you that I have not done so nor do I have any intention of doing so.

While all my efforts and all my prayers are dedicated to world peace, I am not convinced that your group and your efforts are so dedicated.

You, Dr. Davis, have been cited personally by the House Un-American Activities Committee as belonging to from 41-50 Communist-front organizations. Your American Peace Crusade has been cited as an organic part of the Communist peace offensive and once again as organized by Communists.

While the door to my office is always open to my constituents, while my time is devoted entirely to fulfilling the responsibilities to my constituents and to my country, I cannot devote any portion of my time to a cause such as you represent. Rather, I prefer to utilize these moments I might spend with your group continuing my endeavors to bring about a real and just peace in the world, the sincerest form of peace whose basic foundation is the antithesis of Communist ideology—a peace based on the dignity of man.

Until such time that I am convinced your aims are constant with the best interests of the Nation, I must refuse to meet with you or any of your group.

ALBERT P. MORANO,
Member of Congress.

Can a Congressman Serve 900,000 People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article I wrote which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, March 11, 1951:

CAN A CONGRESSMAN SERVE 900,000 PEOPLE?—THIS EXTREME POSES PROBLEMS FOR THE HOUSE TACKLING THE DECENNIAL JOB OF REAPPORTIONMENT

(By Hon. EMANUEL CELLER)

WASHINGTON.—Once again the size of the House of Representatives is up for consideration by Congress—as it has been every 10 years since the First Congress met in New York City in 1789. This is because, under our Constitution and the laws made to carry out its provisions, House seats must be reapportioned among the States every 10 years to reflect population shifts shown by the decennial census. Inevitably, unless the House is enlarged, some States stand to lose one or more seats; and, inevitably, those States wage a battle to maintain their representation by providing more seats.

The President, in a special message to Congress on January 8, listed seven States which will gain and nine States which will lose, a total of 16 House seats, as a result of gains or losses in population, actual or relative, between 1940 and the census of 1950. Notice of these changes has now been transmitted to the States affected. They will take effect automatically with the Congress to be elected next year—unless the present Congress takes affirmative action to raise the ceiling on the size of the House that has stood at 435 seats since 1911.

Already States which stand to lose seats are vigorously agitating for a larger House to preserve their present numerical representation, and bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve that end. One proposal would reduce the individual losses and increase the compensating gains by enlarging the House to 450 Members. Another would save the seats of all present Members and reward the faster-growing States by adding 74 new sets to make a total of 509.

Well, how big should the House be?

Any answer entails a choice, or compromise, between conflicting answers to two more basic questions: How many people can a Representative really represent? How large can a National Legislature become before it becomes too unwieldly to get its work done?

For specific suggestions as to the practical range within which a compromise might be worked out we can look to our own history and to the varying choices that have been made by other democracies of the world.

The Constitution set the size of the House temporarily at 65 seats and provided that thereafter the number of Representatives shall not exceed 1 for every 30,000 people. The Second Congress, accepting that figure as an approximate maximum as well as a strict minimum on the population of any congressional district, increased the membership of the House, following the First Census in 1790, to 106: One for every 33,000 of population.

Through 1910, as the country grew and new States were admitted to the Union, the House was enlarged every 10 years (except in 1840, when a mathematical peculiarity resulted in reducing the number of seats despite an increase in population). Even so, the average Member's constituents grew to 210,000.

Since then the country has grown another 60 percent, but the House has remained at the statutory limit of 435 set 40 years ago. With the population now standing at 150,687,361, according to last year's census, the average House Member represents almost 350,000 people, and because of inequities within the States the actual population of single districts ranges up to more than 900,000. At the 1790 ratio, the House today would have some 4,560 Members.

In a dozen other countries with democratic governments and two-house national legislatures, the figures run like this:

	Membership of legislative assembly	Average constituency
Australia	121	66,000
Belgium	202	42,000
Britain	625	81,000
Canada	262	52,000
France	619	66,000
India	500	634,000
Israel	120	11,000
Italy	574	80,000
Mexico	147	166,000
Netherlands	100	100,000
Sweden	230	30,000
Switzerland	194	24,000

Two generalizations stand out: In all but four of those countries the membership of the so-called lower house of the national legislature is smaller than ours. But in all except one—gigantic India—each member represents far fewer people.

The argument for enlarging Congress starts with the obvious fact that the House, which the founding fathers held should be close to the people, has not grown up with the country. A hundred and sixty years ago a Congressman could actually maintain a personal relationship with a good portion of his constituents. Plainly, a Congressman today cannot maintain that same intimate relationship with a constituency that has grown tenfold. The Congressman, according to those who favor enlarging the House, has become less and less accessible to the people

who elected him and less and less responsive to their interests.

Besides having more people to represent, it is argued, the Congressman is further impeded in the opportunity to consult them by the increased burden of his work, which has grown even faster than the number of his constituents. In the First Congress, a century and a half ago, 142 bills were introduced in the House; for an average Congress of the last 10 years the flood of bills has risen to more than 5,000. Laws finally passed in a session have gone up at least 10 times.

Moreover, bills today are frequently technical and extremely complicated in their economic ramifications. More and more time must be spent studying them in committee as well as threshing out complex issues on the floor. The length of annual meetings has more than doubled from 4 or 5 months to almost continuous sessions during the crisis-ridden past decade. The time available for grass-roots refreshment and home-town contacts has steadily lessened almost to the vanishing point.

At the same time, the demands of individuals for special services and of pressure groups for immediate decisions on pending issues have been intensified immeasurably. One Member of the House testified before a congressional reorganization committee a few years ago that his work as Washington errand boy for the folks back home was consuming up to 80 percent of his time. A Congressman's mail may run from 200 letters a day up to 1,000 when some critical issue is being debated. A member who kept track of telephone calls to his office for a week reported an average of 82 a day. Another counted 48 callers who sought interviews with him in a single day—46 of them on matters not even related to legislation.

Several years ago Representative Luther Patrick, of Alabama, made a speech in the House that still stands as only a slightly exaggerated listing of some of a Congressman's extraconstitutional duties:

"A Congressman," said Representative Patrick, "has become an expanded messenger boy, an employment agency, getter-out of the Navy, Army, Marines; ward heeler, wound healer, trouble-shooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, resolution interpreter, controversy oil pourer, glad-hand extender, business promoter, convention goer, civil-ills skirmisher, veterans' affairs adjuster, ex-serviceman's champion, watchdog for the underdog, sympathizer with the upper dog, namer and kisser of babies, recoverer of lost baggage, soberer of delegates, adjuster of traffic violators, voters straying into Washington and into the toils of the law; binder up of broken hearts, financial wet nurse, good Samaritan, contributor to good causes—there are so many good causes—cornerstone layer, public building and bridge dedicator, ship christener. To be sure, he does get in a little flag waving—and a little Constitution hoisting and spread-eagle work, but it is getting harder every day to find time to properly study legislation—the very business we are primarily here to discharge and that must be done above all things."

In an effort to keep in touch with the people of their districts, and to fulfill their reciprocal responsibility for informing public opinion, Congressmen conduct post-card surveys, subscribe to scores of community newspapers, provide letters from Washington free to local editors. They mail out copies of their speeches and Government documents by the bushel. Many maintain offices in their home districts to which constituents who can't get to Washington may bring their complaints, suggestions, and requests for assistance.

Indeed, the cartoon of the old-fashioned Congressman enjoying his leisure in Washington, or on his front porch back home, is today a myth. This I can vouch for on the basis of 26 years in Congress. The average Representative is a hard worker. He puts in long hours under severe tension. His responsibilities—and, more, his chores—weigh upon him. His arduous tasks make him a poor insurance risk.

The argument against enlarging Congress also starts with the obvious: that the House would have to be expanded beyond all reasonable bounds to restore the intimate contact with his constituents which each Member enjoyed in the early years of the Republic.

But even in its present size the House is generally considered by its more experienced members to be too unwieldy, and it has been criticized for lack of orderliness. Those criticisms were cited when the present ceiling was adopted and when a proposal to add 35 seats was defeated following the census of 1920.

If the habit of enlarging the membership with each 10-year increase in population were resumed, where would the trend ever end? Imagine, if you can, the effect on the expedition of important business of 74 more Members—and perhaps another 74 after 1960—making speeches for the RECORD to impress the folks back home. Or, contrariwise, the increased frustration of an individual Member striving to make his voice heard on the determination of a critical issue.

The British and French Parliaments are sometimes cited as horrible examples of what might be in store for us. In the House of Commons, with its 625 members, many on the back benches (when they can get seats at all) must endure enforced silence during the sessions; because of their great number they cannot effectively participate in debate. Similarly, the very size of the French National Assembly (formerly Chamber of Deputies), with its 619 members, diminishes the value and power of each member. The equivalent of our Speaker in the French lower house does not use a gavel to keep order. He has a huge bell. The great number of members makes it difficult to quell disorder. If the continued ringing of the bell fails to stop the tumult, the presiding officer puts on his hat as a warning that, if the turbulence continues, he will leave the chamber. If after these warnings order is not restored, he clamps on his hat, strides out of the chamber in high dudgeon and calls it a day.

Already the House of Representatives must rigidly curb debate, in comparison to the opportunity for full discussion allowed in the Senate, with its 96 Members. Sometimes even members of the House committee handling a bill do not have sufficient time to discuss the issues as thoroughly as might be desirable. Often freshman Congressmen receive no opportunity to speak on bills of great interest.

To the question of the proper size for an efficient legislative assembly, Winston Churchill offered one expert's answer—an arbitrary one, to be sure—in arguing against enlarging the chamber of the bombed-out House of Commons when it was rebuilt after the war. To preserve the intimacy and conversational form of debate conducive to carefully deliberated yet expeditious action, he urged, successfully, that the chamber be held to its prewar accommodations for only 437 of its 625 members. Perhaps it is worth nothing that our lower House comes remarkably close to that figure at its present size of 435.

Is it true, moreover, that increased pressure of work has made the Congressman less accessible to the people who elected him and less responsive to their interests? And, admitting the pressure, does an increase in the number of Members offer the only—or even the best—means of alleviating it?

Few public officials and certainly few private business executives are, in my opinion, more accessible or more responsive to the people than the Members of the House of Representatives. Most Congressmen still manage, somehow, to keep their office doors open to any importunate constituent or visiting fireman who chooses to walk in. No Congressman who wants to stay in office ignores letters from his voters. Few fail to follow the editorial pages of the influential newspapers of their districts.

Faster means of travel and communication make it easier for a Congressman to keep in touch with his district than it was in 1790. Administrative assistants, increased clerical staffs and the resources of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress have made it possible for conscientious Members to avoid becoming engulfed by the detailed demands of their offices.

Additional possibilities for relieving the burden—more practical, it seems to me, than enlarging the membership of the House—have been suggested: Elimination of the private calendar of bills for the payment of small claims against the Government, which could be handled by administrative agencies; home rule for Washington, D. C., which is now governed directly by Congress; electric voting machines in the House, which could tabulate a roll call in a few seconds instead of half an hour; fewer and smaller committees; delegation of minor law-making authority to administrative agencies and regional authorities; delegation of some congressional investigative missions to ad hoc public committees such as the new Nimitz Commission on Security and Civil Liberties.

A more drastic solution was proposed by Representative Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, on the eve of his retirement from Congress in 1946. He suggested splitting the Congressman's job into two parts: the legislative part, to be handled by elected representatives in Congress; the administrative, or errand-running, part by elected representatives before the executive branch of the Government. The House of Representatives, under the Ramspeck plan, would have been reduced to half its present size, and its Members would have been prohibited by law from contacting the executive branch except in regard to legislation.

There was, and is, no realistic possibility of any such plan being adopted—as Mr. Ramspeck himself knew best, after 17 years in Congress. The thought behind it, however, is pertinent today to the decennial discussion of the size of the House of Representatives.

That part of the Congressman's job which has become most burdensome with the increasing size of his constituency, and the only part of it which enlargement of the House might somewhat reduce by distributing it among more Members, is his job as Washington lobbyist for the special political, economic, social, and cultural interests of the individuals in his district. His primary job, which is to participate in the shaping of wise policies and the writing of sound laws for the general welfare of the Nation, could only be impeded by enlarging the House to still more unwieldy proportions.

The question, should the House be enlarged, comes down then to this basic issue: Whether the Congress shall be organized as a lobby serving a diversity of local interests or as an efficient national legislature, placing the good of the whole country above favoritism to any of its parts. If this issue is seen clearly by the American people, and by their representatives in Congress, there can be no doubt of the choice that will be made.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address, recently delivered by Mr. Eugene Lyons, roving editor of Reader's Digest, on the Justice for Poland radio series sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress, together with the introduction by Attorney John P. Zaremba:

INTRODUCTION BY ATTORNEY JOHN P. ZAREMBA TO MR. EUGENE LYONS

Through the appeasement of Stalin at Tehran and Yalta we have, during the last 5 years, lost one-half of Europe and a large part of Asia. We have betrayed our friends, we have sacrificed country after country, depriving them of their freedom and their independence. We have recognized satellite Communist stooges as legitimate governments and degraded Washington by their embassies. But we have not quenched the appetite of the great imperialist aggressor of the Kremlin. Now that our own security is threatened by the rapid growth of Communist-dominated countries and a vital conflict is envisioned, we pour billions of dollars in the industries and military assistance of western democracies but with very disappointing results. In our perilous situation we are placing our highest hopes in the people behind the iron curtain, in Russia proper and more so in the satellite countries suffering under the ruthless oppression of Communist tyranny. We are hoping that more internal unrest, resistance and revolt might initiate the crumbling of the Communist giant.

But how can Poland, for instance, the largest in territory and most numerous in population of all European satellite nations, respond to our appeals sent by the Voice of America or Radio Free Europe, knowing that it was our appeasing diplomats who betrayed her and deprived her of independence? Only by the outright repudiation of the Tehran and Yalta agreements can we restore the confidence of freedom-loving people in American democracy, for deeds speak louder than words. So it is high time to blot out the infamous secret agreement of Yalta that turned out to be the curse of the United States, the curse that produced the cold war; cost thousands of lives in Korea and instigated dangerous inflation with expenditures of untold billions of dollars. It is indeed deplorable that such catastrophic agreements of our highest diplomats are known only to a small percentage of our fellow American citizens. Our speaker today is Mr. Eugene Lyons, foreign correspondent, author and editor, at present roving editor of Reader's Digest, formerly editor of American Mercury. He is the author of Assignment Utopia, The Red Decade, and other works, of which the most recent is Our Unknown Ex-President. So it is with pleasure that I present to you Mr. Eugene Lyons, of New York.

ADDRESS BY EUGENE LYONS, ROVING EDITOR OF READER'S DIGEST

Our country is at this time in the throes of a great debate on foreign policy and military strategy. It rings through the press, the airwaves, the halls of Congress. More important, it [illegible] echoed in millions [illegible]—as ordinary Americans try to understand the grim, fear-ridden world we live in.

It is, I think, a wholesome debate. It means that America at long last is facing up to the life-and-death threat of Red imperialism. It means that the American people are coming to grips with the challenge of the cruel and godless dictatorship enthroned in the Moscow Kremlin. To those who are not familiar with our democratic processes and traditions, the clash of opinions may sound like division and chaos. You and I, however, know that our America is merely hammering out a new unity with which to confront the looming menace.

But in the great flood of oratory and editorial comment, it seems to me, one element has not been given the attention and the emphasis it deserves.

That element was hinted at by Governor Dewey and John Foster Dulles, both of whom referred to the wretchedness and the discontents under the seemingly smooth totalitarian surface of the Soviet empire. It was highlighted also by Governor Harold Stassen. Returning from a world tour, Mr. Stassen reported wide disaffections and a spirit of rebellion in the satellite nations—and in Soviet Russia itself. It was made even more explicit by Senator ROBERT TAFT, who declared—and I quote—"We need to study the methods by which those millions who yearn for liberty in satellite countries may be organized to seize power."

Well, the Ohio Senator would have been closer to the truth if he had not limited his study to satellite areas; if he had realized that the same yearning for liberty exists also inside Russia. All the debaters, indeed, would be closer to the reality if they gave more thought to the hundreds of millions of men and women suffering under the iron heel of Bolshevik tyranny. For those people, in the long run, are destined to be our most valuable allies in the struggle against Red barbarism.

Some of us try to view the world situation also from the vantage point of the populations within the Soviet sphere. And from that point of view we are worried, even alarmed, by the failure of American leaders to deal with this crucial fact. Nowhere do we hear a forthright pledge of the ultimate liberation of the countries already swallowed by the Communist nightmare. Nowhere do we see any genuine concern with that phase of the over-all problem.

All the recent policy speeches—those of President Truman and ex-President Hoover included—seem strangely indifferent to the fate of the teeming peoples behind the iron curtains and in Russia proper. Not one of our top leaders has as yet proclaimed, in ringing words, that the free portion of mankind will never reconcile itself to the permanent enslavement of the populations in the Communist portion; that we shall not consider our job completed until the Soviet dragon has been slain by its victim. Nowhere do we find a solemn promise that those who rise against the Bolshevik despots can count on our moral and material support. In short, there has been no serious and emphatic offer of an alliance to the enemies of communism inside the Communist sphere.

Suppose that Soviet citizens, or Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, could read all sides of the American debate. Would they find anything to encourage them, to raise their hopes? Unfortunately the answer is No. On the contrary, they would more likely feel themselves abandoned, forsaken, written off as expendables. They would have a sense of being callously condemned to eternal servitude—if only the West can somehow save its own skin. The American speeches are filled with fervor about saving the freedom of the free; but they show little if any interest in freeing the unfree.

From the moral standpoint, this indifference to the fate of the captive peoples seems to me utterly shabby and shocking. There was a time in history when the ordeal of any oppressed people was the concern of decent, democratic men everywhere, even if it did not pack a threat to their own survival. Now, we seem willing to wash our hands of the oppressed, provided we can somehow contain or come to terms with their oppressors.

Pause to think how all the talk of stopping Stalin and containing the Soviets must sound to, let us say a Pole living under the whip of Communist tyrants. That talk, after all, implies an acceptance of the status quo, which is to say a permanent division of the globe into free and totalitarian portions. It denies to the enslaved peoples all hope of outside sympathy, let alone assistance. Our calculated silence on the issue of liberating those millions amounts to an attitude of neutrality in relation to the great struggle between the Kremlin and its subjects now under way in Poland and in every nation under the hammer and sickle.

But morals aside, that attitude of neutrality is stupid in terms of the psychological warfare to which more and more American minds are turning. It throws away the powerful, and perhaps decisive, weapon represented by the explosive discontents, by the aspirations for freedom, in the sovietized part of the world.

Psychological warfare makes no sense unless it is geared to a crusading determination to help the subjugated peoples throw off their hateful yoke—unless it is combined with an honest pledge to overthrow the Soviet regime and liberate its victims. We are stepping up our propaganda to the multitudes behind the iron curtains, and that's all to the good. But that propaganda will remain meaningless as long as it rests merely on a desire to safeguard our own freedom—rather than a decision to restore freedom whenever it has been expunged.

Where, in all the recent American pronouncements, can the Kremlin's long-suffering subjects find a ray of hope, a token of comradeship? Where are the expressions of solidarity with the oppressed peoples which we could transmit to them in radio messages or leaflets? Where are the ringing words that could rally fugitives from communism—of whom there are hundreds of thousands—for a finish fight against our common foe?

I submit that even on the level of simple political expediency, our seeming disinterest in the fate of the unfree population is self-defeating. It can only weaken the spirit of resistance where it exists, and deepen the pessimism of those who have renounced hope. It can only serve to rally the Kremlin's captives around Stalin and his puppets in sheer despair.

To the hundreds of millions in the Soviet Empire, our discussions about ground troops, air power, rearmament, are of secondary importance. What interests them is our basic approach to the Communist malignity. They search anxiously, in our words and acts, for portents of our long-range view of the Red cancer. Is the west, and America in particular, committed to bringing about the destruction of Soviet power, and thereby the liberation of its victims? That is the only question that has any direct relevance for those already confined in the prison states.

Had our spokesmen, whatever their political color, added this long-range objective to their programs, they would have laid a foundation for collaboration with the sovietized peoples. They would have brought closer an alliance of freedom-loving populations on both sides of the iron curtain—an alliance of the utmost value today in the propaganda duel, and our strongest single weapon tomorrow in short-cutting a war if it comes.

The great American debate, alas, has as yet done nothing to break down their awful sense of isolation from the democratic world. It has done less than nothing to apprise them honestly that we recognize our share of the guilt for [illegible] plight; that we realize how, through ignorance and through the machinations of traitors in our midst, we helped rivet the Communist chains around their necks.

Our aloofness from their fate, our seeming willingness to barter their freedom in order to save our own, are the products of confusion, political cowardice, and moral weakness. Our task, from this point forward, is to let the enslaved peoples know that we consider them our friends and allies in a common cause. Let us say to them, in a voice that will penetrate the thickest iron curtains, "We shall not rest until Stalin and his system have joined Hitler and Mussolini in the limbo of history. We shall not rest until Soviet barbarism has become an ugly memory."

And words alone will not be enough. They must be backed by deeds—dramatic, forthright, unequivocal. As a beginning, we must repudiate the shameful bargains struck at Teheran, Yalta, and other such conferences. The betrayals compounded in those places were not mistakes. They were crimes against humanity, the American humanity included. Whatever our motives, those crimes must be frankly acknowledged and fully expiated. Only then shall we come to the great conflict of our era with clean hands and clean consciences.

We are aware that the victims of communism despite their tormentors and dream of the hour of liberation. This is the most significant factor in the whole world equation. It is the factor that can serve as a lever to overthrow the Soviet regime and make possible a new world—a world from which the obscene shadows of Kremlin power and Kremlin ambitions will have been lifted by the combined might of freemen on both sides of the iron curtain.

Urge MacArthur's Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hankering for the truth of what is going on in the world. They have been starved of facts by the Truman administration in regard to the world situation. I agree with John S. Knight of the Detroit Free Press that Gen. Douglas MacArthur could clarify many misunderstandings in the minds of the American people, if he were permitted to come home and report to Congress. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by Mr. Knight which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, Sunday, March 11, 1951:

MACARTHUR'S RETURN URGED

(By John S. Knight)

Several times within recent weeks, this newspaper has urged that Gen. Douglas MacArthur be brought home to make a full report on Korea to Congress and the American people.

We reasoned that the Eisenhower report on Europe had been useful and informative, although vague in a number of particulars; that a MacArthur report on Asia would help to clear away many misunderstandings and bare the truth.

Why such a report is so necessary can be gathered from these two dispatches, both published Thursday last on page 1 by the Miami Herald and other newspapers:

"WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department reported Wednesday that American casualties in the Korean War rose to 59,448 last week, the biggest weekly increase since mid-January.

"SUWON, KOREA.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur said Wednesday continued limitations upon our field of counter-offensive action means the Korean War cannot fail to end in a stalemate."

General MacArthur said further that the great casualties suffered by the enemy would shake the Red China regime and dampen its ardor for any other aggressive adventures in Asia.

Yet he offered no hope that his military forces, barred from attacking Communist war production in China, and without reinforcements, could achieve more than a continuing stalemate.

So the "meat grinding" process, as MacArthur calls it, goes on without decisive results, and the American people are unable to understand clearly why their sons are in Korea or what they are fighting for.

They are entitled to a full explanation.

THE STORY OF A POLICE ACTION

Told chronologically, the story of Korea is this:

Last June President Truman suddenly decided to take a firm stand against the North Korean Soviet puppets who had attacked the Republic of Korea, which was that section of Korea lying below the thirty-eighth parallel.

For this action President Truman received widespread commendation. Even men who had bitterly opposed the President said: "This is the first time in years I have been proud to be an American."

The view was taken that while we might be risking a third world war by resisting aggression in Korea, it would be a lesser risk than permitting Russia to proceed unhindered with her plans for world conquest.

However, when the news from Korea turned sour, the very people who had been praising Truman to the skies for moving with dispatch began chanting a different tune.

As our limited American forces withdrew to the tightened Pusan defense perimeter, there were grim days when it seemed almost certain we would be driven into the sea.

What had started as a limited police action found the outnumbered Americans clinging precariously to an area less than one-tenth the size of Florida.

MacArthur could not fight an orthodox war and bomb the North Korean arsenals of supply in Manchuria for fear of involving the United States and the United Nations in a full-scale war with Red China.

UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie's appeal for ground troops to aid the embattled Americans fell upon deaf ears. Our allies in the United Nations either could not, or did not, show the stirring enthusiasm with which they voted for the resolutions committing the United Nations to a full share in the Korean crusade.

At this stage, United States public resentment against the sit-it-out countries was running high.

WHAT IS OUR FUTURE BELOW PARALLEL 38?

Months later, when the tide of battle turned with MacArthur's brilliant strategy at Inchon, brooding pessimism turned to exultation over our successes.

As our forces pushed far north to the borders of Manchuria, even the great MacArthur volunteered the ill-fated prediction that United States troops would be on their way home before Christmas.

Then the Chinese Reds struck in such vast numbers that UN troops were once again driven below the thirty-eighth parallel in a crushing defeat.

There we stand today, with Gen. Matthew Ridgway's defense line strong and firm and showing signs of being able to hold out indefinitely.

The strategy at the moment has taken the course of killing as many Communists as possible and keeping our casualties to a minimum.

But what of the future? What is our long-range policy? What objectives do we have in mind?

These are some of the questions that a MacArthur report would help to resolve. At present, the solutions—if they have been determined—are carefully guarded secrets known only to President Truman, Defense Secretary George Marshall, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The rest of us are expected to make sacrifices, give our sons and be patriotic, but we are told nothing.

WHAT ISN'T TAUGHT AT WEST POINT

These disturbing facts stand out in bold relief:

1. MacArthur has said that he is fighting the Korean War under restrictions "unparalleled in military history."

2. He has ironically described Manchuria as a privileged sanctuary, safe from the devastating blows of his heavy bombers.

3. When questioned recently about the probability of recrossing the thirty-eighth parallel, MacArthur said: "I want to make it quite clear that if and when the issue actually arises, I shall not arbitrarily exercise that authority if cogent political reasons against crossing are then advanced and there is any reasonable possibility that a this-side-of-Korea is to be placed thereon. I repeat that at this time, the question is academic."

Phrased in simpler terms, what MacArthur means is that he does not again intend to be put in the middle.

He is still smarting over British criticism that he was responsible for bringing the Chinese Reds into the war; still insists that his disastrous November offensive in North Korea was approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

4. MacArthur's latest statement that continued "limitations upon our field of counter-offensive action" means the Korean War cannot fail to end in a stalemate, is in effect serving notice upon the American public and the United Nations that he is unable to win a war where military strategy is dictated by political considerations.

This is something they didn't teach at West Point in MacArthur's day.

OUR ORIGINAL POLICY IN KOREA RECALLED

It seems fairly obvious that MacArthur is in the awkward position of neither being able to press the Korean campaign to ultimate victory, nor to give it up as a bad job.

It is no secret that our Allies, including Great Britain, shrink from "antagonizing" Communist China and want no part of a major conflict with Chinese Reds.

It is equally true that a decision to pull out of Korea would mean a terrible loss of face. Such a decision would also serve notice upon the European nations who have been encouraged to stand up to Russia that United States and UN policy is weak, irresolute, and undependable.

The announced purpose of the UN resolution of last October 7 was to establish by arms "a unified, independent, and democratic government in Korea."

This noble objective has long since been discarded, and for the reasons which MacArthur has so clearly expressed.

Where, then, do we go from here?

Should we stay in Korea to prove that Communist aggression can and will be resisted?

Are we staying in Korea to pin down Communist forces who otherwise might be used against Indochina and other threatened areas in the Far East?

Do we hope that a stalemated war in Korea will lead the Communists to seek a negotiated peace?

These questions are being asked daily in millions of American homes where sons of draft age are being called to the colors.

It is easy to understand official reluctance to discuss these subjects honestly with the American people because the answers would require some rather complicated and difficult explanations.

That is why the Detroit Free Press believes a report from General MacArthur would help to crystallize public opinion; to spell out the incontrovertible facts; to tell us, as the British say, "which side is up."

We could then get somewhere near the truth.

Come; We Need You; Throw Away Your Education, Your Home, Your Loved Ones; Fight, Fight to Preserve—We Know Not What

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the following article.

This is an excerpt from an address before the American Legion Child Welfare School in Grand Island in February. The youth who made the address was Governor of Boys' State in 1950, and World-Herald's Teen of the Week last August 21. A Central High Senior, he is son of Mr. and Mrs. L. O. Burke, 1004 South Fifty-first Avenue. The sentences quoted were so designated in the text of the address:

When I was asked to speak today, I was informed that the talk should in some way enlighten you about the way in which the young citizens of today are "taking the bit"—are accepting their responsibilities. Always, adults are worried about the attitudes of young people. Afraid they are not up to par—worried for fear they do not uphold the things which ought to be upheld, and attack the things which ought to be attacked.

To you who wonder what the youth of today think about their future in terms of the citizen's duty to his country, I can only say—the outlook is pretty grim.

Ask them yourself. Ask Jim there—the tall young senior about to graduate from high school. Find out what he thinks of the job he finds on his shoulders. He says:

So, if the Army doesn't get me right away, I'll go to college. If it does, and war breaks out—well, I may not have to worry about what I'm gonna do for an education. A bullet'll take care of that".

Question Jack—the school's top athlete—want to hear a nice outlook for a 17-year-old kid? Listen:

"As far as I'm concerned, I'm gonna have one devil of a good time till I'm 18. I'm gonna do all the things that are wrong, so's I can say at least I lived for a little while. By golly, I'm gonna live for a year. After that—what's the difference."

Talk to the school "brain"—a boy with a brilliant mind, capable of doing innumerable things. How does he regard his duties as a citizen?

"So, what good are my brains—and all the knowledge I've accumulated—and the desire I have to learn, and to do great things? With a uniform on, you don't look much different than the town bum."

Exaggerated? Scattered examples? Suppositions? No.

Before writing this paper, I sat in on a lot of "bull sessions" and heard a lot of opinions expressed. These were only three. They all ran about like that.

WHY THESE ATTITUDES?

Why do they have this outlook? What has happened to the pioneer spirit and determination to keep this country free?

Why have these attitudes pervaded the minds of the young folk whose duty it is to preserve democracy?

Here's my opinion, formed after listening to a lot of friends and acquaintances expound on the subject.

Reason No. 1: The kids of today are tired of wars.

True, they never have fought on the front lines—they may never have seen military service. But consider the fact that the youngsters of 17 and 18 today have never, never, known a year in which there was not war, or rumors of war, or hatred in the air.

This young person is not the innocent that went off to serve with the AEF in World War I. Neither is he the young heroic who marched off to save world peace in World War II. He has seen war, read war, heard war, since he was old enough to understand what it all meant. And because of this vicarious experience understands what war does.

Don't get me wrong. These same kids realize that there are nations in the world where the young people have seen a lot more conflict than right here in the United States. And they also realize that a lot of sacrifices have been made for them by men in the past and that they owe a lot to these people. In addition, they are not cowards.

They merely pose a question. It is one which they deserve to have answered. It is—is this the end?

Must the United States be the police force of the world forever and ever?

Do the other nations of the world really crave peace, or is the world so pent up with hatred and fury that each peace will be just a breathing spell before the next conflict?

SIXTY-FOUR-DOLLAR QUESTION

And above all—now get this one well, for it is important if you are to understand the young problems.

The $64 question is: "Are the officials now in the chief offices of our Federal Government really the high-caliber individuals that they should be, and are they working for the best interests of the American people today, regardless of political ties and ambitions?"

The majority of those young people I know believe that they are not.

Most young folks in my school and my town have even a high disregard for people in public office.

If these young men and women cannot trust and respect the supposedly leading citizens of the nation, then it is fair to expect high standards of citizenship from them?

If bungling in Washington causes and stretches out a war in which nothing is gained in material, in which no moral objective is reached and in which we are virtually betrayed by those supposedly our supporters, then is it fair to call to the stout young men of the Nation:

"Come—we need you. Throw away your education, your home, your loved ones, fight—fight to preserve—we know not what."

This, then, is what the young person must hear from you, the adults he looks up to. Is it wise? Will it get us somewhere?

Will my personal sacrifice—whether it be my life, or a limb, or merely some of my time, be to a good end? Will generations yet to come benefit from what I do, or will my part in history be an embarrassing synapse in the history of America—from which it will escape?

If your answers to these questions can be right, if you—the voting adults of America—can make it right with your sons and daughters—then never fear.

They will show you that they know how to fight as well as the ones that came before them. They will gladly take up their responsibilities and carry them out.

It is not a lack of patriotism that ails our youth. It is a lack of meaning to what they are asked to do. Once this has been cleared up—all will be well.

Opponents of Congressional Participation in Military Policy Are Inconsistent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, both by informal action and through a formal vote of their policy committee, Republican Members of this House have recently called for full participation and approval of both Houses of the Congress in decisions on national military policy.

If there had been any doubt as to the need for such a declaration, it is removed by the response of opponents of this policy of full congressional participation.

Assertion of the right and duty of the Congress to pass on the matter of troops for Europe in particular, has aroused those who want a free hand for the executive and the military. They have launched an all-out campaign to discredit this effort to secure full participation by the Congress and to vilify those responsible for the effort. They have not hesitated to insult a former President of the United States. They have invoked the ghost of the committee on the conduct of the war of Lincoln's day. They have accused the advocates of such congressional participation and control of wanting our country to turn tail and run.

The opponents of congressional participation in these decisions have charged that the purpose of such controls is to betray our partners in Europe and to violate the spirit and intent of the North Atlantic Treaty. They have gone so far, even, as to insist that ratification of this treaty by the Senate, July 21, 1949, gave the administration carte blanche in the matter of furnishing troops to Europe.

These allegations with respect to the North Atlantic Treaty have prompted me to review, in detail, the hearings and debate in the other body which preceded ratification of that treaty.

I want to report some of the high lights of what that analysis reveals. The findings have a direct and urgent bearing on the need to recapture full participation and approval of the Congress. These findings stand, either as a powerful rebuke of those who today seek to deny or limit the participation and approval of the Congress, or as an indictment of the integrity and good faith of those who took the lead in urging ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Here is finding No. 1:

The idea or suggestion that the treaty contemplated—much less obligated—sending troops to Europe prior to an actual outbreak of war was emphatically denied by every supporter of the treaty who commented on, or was queried about, that point prior to ratification.

In some instances the suggestion of that possibility was scornfully dismissed. In one instance, at least, it was scornfully and sarcastically dismissed by a Member of the other body who now turns the same vials of scorn and sarcasm upon those who would have the Congress assert control over the process of committing American troops to Europe.

The question regarding the prospect of American troops being required or expected for Europe, prior to aggression, was raised—when it was raised—in connection with article III of the treaty. This article states that—

> In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

The question of the prospect of American troops for Europe was first raised during the public hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations. On April 27, 1949, the senior Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, addressed the following to Secretary of State Dean Acheson:

> I am interested in getting the answers as to whether or not we are expected to supply substantial numbers—by that I do not mean a thousand or two, or 500, or anything of that kind, but very substantial numbers—of troops and troop organizations, of American troops, to implement the land power of Western Europe prior to aggression.
>
> Is it contemplated under article 3? In other words, are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist?

Secretary Acheson replied:

> The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute "no."

A few minutes later, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] asked Mr. Acheson whether the phrase "effective self-help" in article III contained within it the idea of sufficiency—sufficient self-help.

Mr. Acheson replied:

> No. It cannot mean that, because probably the provision of sufficient forces at the present time is impossible for everybody. Otherwise if you were trying to get sufficient forces you would have to maintain military establishments which would be quite impossible both for Europe and for us.

On April 29, Senator DONNELL asked W. Averill Harriman, special United States Representative in Europe for ECA, another witness for the supporters of the treaty:

> In your study in Europe, have you considered whether or not it would be necessary for American troops to be stationed in Europe in order to prevent Russia from overrunning Europe, should an attack be made by Russia?

This drew the flippant reply:

> All I know is that I do not know any country that wants to have an armed occupation of United States troops.

After rebuking this answer, Senator DONNELL later asked:

> Why haven't you given consideration to the question of whether manpower must also be sent over?

The answer was:

> Because I have never heard anyone in Europe suggest it. * * * It is not in the European mind at the present time as I see it. I have said they do not like armies of occupation.

Pressed further, Mr. Harriman said:

> You should ask that question of our Military Establishment. So far as I am concerned, I have never heard anyone discuss that matter in the discussions I have had regarding the Atlantic Pact and the implementation of article 3.
>
> I might add that there are grounds for reasonable doubt as to Mr. Harriman's insight into the European mind in view of his earlier testimony that day that the European nations "are so keen to get themselves in a stronger position that it does not occur to them that they can rely upon the United States." Would that that were true.

On May 2 the former Under Secretary of State, Robert A. Lovett, was a witness. Senator DONNELL asked Mr. Lovett:

> Do you know whether or not it was considered by the negotiators, and particularly the United States, as to whether, in order to stop Russia in her tracks, if she should come across the borders of the other European countries, it would be necessary or advisable that there be United States troops on hand in addition to the troops of the European countries?

Mr. Lovett replied:

> I have an accurate recollection of the negotiations in which I participated, but I do not recall that question being raised by anyone. No suggestion was made to us that we should have United States troops spotted around Europe.

On May 3 the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] questioned Gen. Omar Bradley, as follows:

> Senator VANDENBERG. In connection with any discussions of implementation of this treaty, is there any thought that we must contribute mass manpower under any circumstances connected with the implementation of the treaty?
>
> General BRADLEY. I do not see how it is implied in the pact itself. In case of war you probably would act in concert with them, and that would of course depend upon the circumstances and eventually would be at the will of the people, expressed through their Congress, after due consideration.
>
> Senator VANDENBERG. I am asking whether our contemplated contribution does not exclude mass manpower at the beginning, before there is any fracas?
>
> General BRADLEY. I do not see that it excludes or includes. I do not see how it is involved at all.
>
> Senator VANDENBERG. Is it involved in your plans on the subject?
>
> General BRADLEY. No, sir. In my opinion it is not involved.

Later this line of questioning was conducted by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]:

> Senator WATKINS. I have noticed from time to time statements by some people who are more or less responsible, that a part of our program contemplates the sending of considerable detachments to members of the Atlantic Pact not only for the purpose of instruction but also to bolster their forces. What can you say about that, General?
>
> General BRADLEY. If any decision has been made as to sending any particular size group and for any purpose to these nations, I do not know about it.
>
> Senator WATKINS. It is not contemplated at the present time?
>
> General BRADLEY. It may be on some levels——
>
> Senator WATKINS. I mean as far as you have been advised.
>
> General BRADLEY. Certainly we have not been in any planning for sending any particular groups.

Does this suggest that General Bradley was a reluctant witness, momentarily lifting the veil of secrecy on already conceived plans for troops for Europe? One wonders, certainly.

By far the most interesting discussion of this subject occurred during the testimony of Mr. James P. Warburg, financial adviser to the American delegation to the World Economic Conference in London in 1933 and Deputy Director of the Office of War Information during the war, who appeared as a private witness to urge certain reservations and clarification of the treaty. He testified on May 10.

Some of the most pressing questions raised in the Congress today regarding troop commitments to Europe and development of a sound security program for the United States were anticipated by Mr. Warburg in his testimony. He said, in part:

> If the Atlantic security program means what our European friends think it means, either Western European recovery will have to be halted in its tracks, or else the United States will have to undertake a vastly greater commitment than the American people realize today. * * *
>
> What good will it do to build half a defense force [in Europe]? Twenty divisions are no better than the 10 or 12 which exist in Western Europe today, if it takes 40 to do the job. Surely it is folly to think that the French or the Dutch, or the Belgians would fight a delaying action for the benefit of Britain and the United States, if they knew in advance that their countries would be overrun and occupied.

Here are some of the questions and answers developed during his testimony:

> Mr. WARBURG. Unless the treaty is clarified, I think it is a highly dangerous instrument.
>
> Chairman CONNALLY. You mean clarified the way you want to clarify it?
>
> Mr. WARBURG. I do not mean it has to be in those particular words. I think it has to be made clear whether we are or are not undertaking to secure the frontiers of Europe against invasion.
>
> Senator VANDENBERG. I certainly agree with you * * * that * * * the great and real operative power of this treaty cannot be forces in being, but must be the potential force of the combined invincible

resources of those who notify prospective aggressors of what they are up against.

Mr. WARBURG. Yes, sir.

Senator VANDENBERG. Well, we are in complete agreement in that thesis.

Senator VANDENBERG added later:

I certainly concur in your thought that we must not permit our friends [in Europe] to be deceived [regarding our intentions as to troops for Europe]. That would be the last possible crime we could commit.

Senator VANDENBERG continued:

If all of our treaty friends sit in together and agree tentatively on a military-aid program of $1,000,000,000, isn't it inevitable that they must understand that they are agreeing to a program which does not contemplate any attempted Maginot line, or something of the sort?

Subsequently, Mr. Warburg observed that—

If we did mean that we were going to attempt to hold the frontiers of Western Europe, then unless we made sure we could hold them we would be embarking on a gigantic Dunkirk. We would be starting off with a guaranteed initial defeat.

There then developed this highly interesting exchange between Chairman CONNALLY and Mr. Warburg:

Chairman CONNALLY. The treaty does not contemplate the sending of an army now to string along the Rhine. It only means that when they are the victims of an armed attack, we act. * * * [Addressing Mr. Warburg]: Do you favor sending an army over there now and keeping it there to protect their borders?

Mr. WARBURG. I would say that would be a very foolish thing to do. * * *

Senator CONNALLY. That is what we are not going to do. We do not plan to do that. But I judge from some of your statements that you thought that was what we ought to do.

Mr. WARBURG. I do not think I made any statement that could be so interpreted.

Senator CONNALLY. I apologize.

So much for the testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs on the subject of troops for Europe. Is it surprising that the report of the committee did not even mention the subject?

There were few references to the subject during consideration of the treaty in the other body. There was absolutely no debate on this point!

Here is the record:

In his opening address on the treaty, the senior Senator from Texas, Mr. CONNALLY, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, did not refer directly to this point. But he did say:

We have not committed ourselves to any particular type of military-assistance program. There were no secret agreements at the negotiation of this pact.

That was on July 5. The next day the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] repeated his earlier remarks at the committee hearing, saying:

Article III builds no illusory Maginot lines.

And he added:

Frankly, I should have much less interest in this treaty if I thought its repressive influence for peace is measured by or dependent on any such [physical] implementation [of the pact]. * * * It is not the military forces in being which measure the impact of this "knock-out" admonition, importance through they are. It is the potential which counts, and any armed aggressor knows that he forthwith faces this potential from the moment he attacks.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who early announced his support of the pact, said on July 8:

I do not hold with those who say that we are committed to building up a military establishment abroad that is sufficiently large to repel any kind of an aggression which might come. That would be an enormous commitment.

We have not any concept of dispatching an expeditionary force here and there.

And Senator LODGE made a particular point of criticizing those who in the past have talked about having 100 divisions in event of another war. He added:

The idea that this country is a bottomless pit, so far as manpower is concerned, should be completely dispelled.

The senior Senator from Florida, Mr. Pepper, admitted that the pact contained "elements of danger," but pointed out that "the United States is separated by 3,000 miles of ocean, and it is not contemplated that we shall establish in Europe military forces of this country other than our occupation forces, so far as I know at the present time." That statement was made on July 15.

A new Member of the other body also spoke on the subject. He was the junior Senator from New York, Mr. Dulles, newly appointed to that office by Governor Dewey. It was Mr. Dewey who the other day demanded defeat of the Wherry resolution "by as large a vote as possible—so that the world will know we do not intend to turn tail and run." And it is Mr. Dewey who now is demanding that the United States immediately mobilize 100 divisions.

Well, Mr. Dewey's appointee spoke on July 12. He was listened to most attentively. He had aided in drafting the North Atlantic Pact. He had testified for it before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Here is what he said:

I have supported the treaty because, in my opinion, it will make it possible to reduce the very heavy burden of military expenditure which our Nation is now carrying. * * *

If I thought the treaty meant that we had to build up on the continent of Europe a Military Establishment sufficient to withstand an all-out assault by the Soviet Union, I certainly would not vote for the treaty.

What does all this establish?

Certainly it establishes that the strongest supporters of the bill believed, or purported to believe, that there was no commitment, implied even, under the treaty, to send American troops to Europe before an act of aggression. Moreover, from the record, they believed, or purported to believe, that such a move was neither contemplated, desirable, nor, in terms of providing sufficient security against aggression, even feasible.

Well, but you say that conditions are now completely changed, especially as a result of the aggression in Korea.

I think that may be questioned. I think it may be questioned whether anything has happened in Europe since July 1949 to warrant doing now what the authors of the pact then avowed was not contemplated or feasible.

In testifying before the Senate committee, Will L. Clayton, vice president of the Atlantic Union committee, said that one of the principal objectives in the cold war is to frighten democratic governments into excessive expenditures for defense. I think that may still be Russia's main strategy despite the hot war in Korea.

But even if changed circumstances do justify a change in our position, the very stand taken by the supporters and authors of the pact emphasizes that such a change involves a new situation, calling for new debate, new decisions and commitments by constitutional processes, that is by the Congress.

Certainly this record rebukes those who charge we are threatening to turn tail and run if we today question what 2 years ago was professedly repudiated.

Certainly the whole record reenforces the proposition that by all means "whatever our future military or political policy is to be, it must be determined with the full participation and approval of the Congress."

And that leads to finding No. 2:

This current insistence upon the "full participation and approval of the Congress" is the self-same principle upon which was placed the very greatest emphasis during the hearings and debate on the North Atlantic Pact.

And let it be noted that this emphasis upon the right of the Congress to make the final decisions as to what it would do to implement Article III was directed, not to the question of furnishing manpower for Europe, but to the question of furnishing arms for Europe.

It is amazing the amount of unctuous insistence upon "the power of Congress to decide" which can be given by the executive branch when it wants the approval of the Congress. Even when the treaty, as in this case, had already been signed by the member nations, including the United States. And even when the debate on the treaty was closed with a bludgeoning telegram from a former Cabinet Member, Secretary Henry L. Stimson, that the adding of any reservations "would be a disastrous repudiation" and that votes for reservations "will weigh in the scales against (the) cause of peace with freedom."

But be that as it may, there were earnest protestations that after adoption of the treaty there would be full right remaining to the Congress to decide how it was to be implemented.

Both Secretary Acheson—at the hearing on April 27—and the committee report stated that—

The pact does not bind the Congress to reach the same conclusion (the same conclusion, that is, as the executive branch, that the arms aid proposal should be adopted), for it—the pact—does not dictate the conclusion of honest judgment. * * * There is [under the treaty] an obligation to help, but the extent, the manner, and the timing is up to the honest judgment of the parties [to the treaty].

And so up to the Congress.

Said the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]:

There is no obligation to furnish arms. How does the United States obligate itself? It obligates itself by a vote of the Senate

on the treaty, or by the passage of a law. There is no man in the Government, not even the President of the United States, who can obligate this Nation on this, that, and the other thing. The Constitution provides the way.

That, it should be observed, was before Korea—before the President of the United States demonstrated that he could, constitutionally or not, obligate the lives of thousands of Americans in an undeclared war.

The junior Senator from New York, Mr. Dulles, said July 12:

I find in the treaty no obligation, legal or moral, to vote for any armament program or for any item of any armament program unless it be meritorious in its own right.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was skeptical and invited the junior Senator from New York to accept a reservation to the treaty putting his sentiments into black and white. The answer was:

No; such a reservation is both unnecessary and untimely.

The senior Senator from Florida, Mr. Pepper, speaking July 15, said he did not regard any reservations as necessary, and continued:

Why? Because we already have a reservation of the most effective character in the pact itself. What is it? It is that whatever is done under article III must be authorized by the Congress of the United States. That is the reservation that is important. * * * Whether we give economic aid or whether we give military assistance, the final arbiter of what we give shall be the Congress of the United States—not the State Department, not the President of the United States, but the Congress of the United States, where we shall have the privilege of debate and consideration, and where public opinion may make itself manifest.

That, too, was before the undeclared war in Korea.

The committee report on the treaty stated that the North Atlantic Council, set up under the treaty to enable it to function, has only "advisory powers," since final decision presumably is left to the member nations "in accordance with the respective constitutional processes."

That reads fine. But it is noteworthy that last December 22 Secretary of State Acheson reported on "matters acted upon" by the Council. These matters "acted upon," mind you, included "structure of the European army, how it should be composed, of what troops, where should the troops come from," and so forth. That does not sound exactly like an advisory role.

But the whole point of this is that there was abundant insistence prior to ratification upon the powers of the Congress, upon the role of the Congress as the "final arbiter." This was in the matter of exportation of arms for Europe. Now it is being contended with no little emphasis and even bitterness that Congress is not the proper "final arbiter" in the matter of the exportation of men for Europe.

What a presumptuous and tragic claim. How terribly important it is that the Congress reassert and recapture its right and duty of "full participation and approval."

Here is the third finding in my review of the hearings and debate on the North Atlantic Pact:

The hearings and debate disclosed—perhaps it would be more accurate to say failed to conceal—the fact that there has been opened, by the provisions of the treaty, a completely new and immensely enlarged area of discretionary power whereby a President may directly and completely involve the Nation in war without authority or consent of the Congress.

A great deal of lip service was paid, during the debate, to the reassuring doctrine that the power to declare war is still vested in the Congress.

Secretary Acheson, in his speech March 19, 1949, announcing the North Atlantic Pact, denied that the treaty means that "the United States would be automatically at war if one of the nations covered by the pact is subjected to armed attack." He said the decision on the "prompt action" the United States would be bound to take in event of aggression—"will rest where the Constitution has placed it," that is, in the Congress.

Senator CONNALLY said—July 5—in the debate:

The full authority of the Congress to declare war, with all the discretion that power implies, remains unimpaired.

But both Secretary Acheson and the committee report frankly declined to "define the authority of the President to use the Armed Forces." More specifically, they evaded the question of whether the President was free to act in the same way—without, and prior to, action by the Congress—if a member nation were attacked as he is free to act if the United States or our nationals are directly attacked.

The treaty provides, in article V, that—

An armed attack against one or more—of the nations—shall be considered an attack against them all.

This plainly opens the door, as several opponents of the Atlantic Pact pointed out during the debate in 1949, to the possibility of the President enlisting this Nation in a war, and of his thereby presenting the Congress with a war "already in being," in event of an attack by any aggressor on some other member of the Atlantic Pact.

This conclusion is reaffirmed not only by the method used to involve the United States in the Korean War—although Korea was not, of course, a member of the Atlantic Pact—but also by a recent pronouncement by the administration. A document issued by the executive branch under date of February 28, 1951, places the administration on record as to how it feels about the role of the Congress in the matter of a declaration of war. It brazenly asserts:

Use of the congressional power to declare war * * * has fallen into abeyance because wars are no longer declared in advance. The constitutional power of the Commander in Chief has been exercised more often because the need for armed international action has grown more acute. The long delays occasioned by the slowness of communications in the eighteenth century have given place to breath-taking rapidity in the tempo of history. Repelling aggression in Korea or Europe cannot wait upon congressional debate.

That amounts to an assertion that through "practical necessities" the power of the Congress to declare war has been "repealed" by its transfer to the President.

This, of course, is vastly more than even President Franklin D. Roosevelt ever openly claimed. As the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] recently pointed out, Mr. Roosevelt sent a message to Prime Minister Churchill, through Ambassador Kennedy early in World War II, stating that his earlier message of encouragement to Premier Reynaud, of France, must not be construed as committing the United States to military action against Germany because "there was no authority under the Constitution except the Congress which could make any commitment of that nature."

The pretense maintained during Senate debate on the Atlantic Pact is now completely abandoned. Instead, it is flatly asserted that "repelling aggression in Korea or Europe cannot wait upon congressional debate." That amounts to a claim that aggression by anyone, anywhere, at any time and under any circumstances, may by presidential discretion alone be regarded in the same light as a direct attack on American territory or nationals so far as the presidential power to commit this Nation to war is concerned.

There is general agreement that the President has a constitutional right to use American armed forces instantly to repel an attack on American territory or nationals, without waiting for congressional approval. It is something vastly different to claim that the President has the right to enlist this Nation in any war, in Europe or Asia, without the prior authority of the Congress, and that modern circumstances make it necessary that this power be vested in the President.

Unless the President is barred from maintaining and hereafter acting on this preposterous claim, unless he is barred from this either by adoption now of a restraining resolution by the Congress or, if necessary, through a constitutional amendment, we will be permitting repeal of a basic constitutional provision by default. And we will be virtually guaranteeing more Koreas.

Certainly in this field, above all, the need for recapturing and firmly establishing the "full participation and approval of the Congress" is a matter of the gravest urgency.

Appropriation for Southeastern Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I

would like to include a statement by Mr. Tom Martin, of Birmingham, Ala., in opposition to the requested appropriation for the Southeastern Power Administration for the fiscal year 1952. Mr. Martin, chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co., and union representatives, agree that such expenditures are unwise and unnecessary. I am glad to call Mr. Martin's statement to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives because it expresses so clearly how duplication of facilities can be eliminated.

STATEMENT OF ALABAMA POWER CO. IN OPPOSITION TO REQUESTED APPROPRIATION FOR SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1952

This statement is filed in opposition to the request of the Southeastern Power Administration which is seeking an appropriation of $4,500,000 for the fiscal year 1952 to be used generally for the purpose of constructing electric transmission lines. The appropriation sought includes funds which must be provided by this company and other American taxpayers, with which to build, among others, electric transmission lines in the State of Georgia. The report of the Southeastern Power Administration to the Congress which seeks to justify the requested appropriation refers to a proposed Clark Hill-Macon, Ga., electric transmission line as follows:

"This feature will initially provide service at 115 kilovolts to the load center at Macon, Ga., and will ultimately provide a 230,000-volt tie between the Clark Hill power plant and power developments in the Alabama-Coosa Basin, three of which, totaling 249,000 kilowatts are authorized at the present time."

Alabama Power Co. is and has been for more than 40 years an operating electric utility in Alabama. It operates an electric generating, transmission, and distribution system which provides the electric power requirements of the public in most of the State, except in the Tennessee Valley area.

As of December 31, 1950, the company, which has more than 4,000 employees, was providing electric service directly at retail to 358,282 customers in 585 communities. The company had in operation 17,600 miles of rural line serving 99,277 rural customers, of which 88,716 are farms. In addition to the rural customers served from its rural lines, the company is also serving approximately 60,000 customers in rural communities. The company is now serving 95 percent of the farms within its service area, and by the end of 1951 will be serving 98 percent of the farms within its service area. It follows that of the 358,282 customers served directly by Alabama Power Co. approximately 150,000 are located in rural areas and rural communities. The company is also providing the power supply to other utilities, municipalities, and cooperatives for distribution and resale to some additional 227,000 customers. Therefore, at the end of 1950 the company was providing most of the power requirements for a total of 582,000 customers throughout the State of Alabama, except within the Tennessee Valley area.

The company has six large hydroelectric plants in middle Alabama and four large steam plants located in different parts of the State to enable it to render the very best service that skill and foresight can produce. Anticipating the growth of load in this area, it is bringing in 140,000 kilowatts of new plant capacity in 1951 and another 156,000 kilowatts in 1952. On completion of these plants it will have in hydroelectric and steam installed capacity a total of 1,135,500 kilowatts.

In addition the company has on order two super steam electric generating units, each with a capacity of from 40,000 to 150,000 kilowatts to be installed for operation in 1953, location of which is now under consideration.

There is no question of the company's ability to meet every load requirement in any part of the territory it serves now and in the foreseeable future.

Alabama Power Co. has constructed and now operates a network of 4,762 miles of electric transmission lines interconnecting with its generating plants and extending throughout the company's entire service area so as to provide an adequate and dependable supply of electric power for its various customers. The company also owns and operates approximately 22,250 miles of electric distribution lines. Alabama Power Co. is associated with three other electric companies in adjoining States, namely, Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., and Mississippi Power Co. The four companies constitute the integrated Southern Co. electric system in Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi.

Attached to this statement is a map showing the interconnected and integrated system of the Southern Co.

These four associated companies have been integrated in respect to their power supply and transmission systems for a great many years. The subject was fully presented to the Securities and Exchange Commission when that Commission had under consideration the dissolution of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., of which this and its associated companies were subsidiaries.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, in its order issued under date of August 1, 1947, found that the electric properties of these four operating companies were retainable under common control as an integrated public-utility system under the standards of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 and that the continued existence of the Southern Co. as a holding company over such retainable properties is appropriate under such standards. In this connection, it was shown that there are substantial savings in operating costs and fixed charges, resulting from coordinated planning and operation; that power supply economies are achieved through sharing of reserve capacity and through joint planning of generating facilities so as to stagger construction; further that power supply economies result from central load dispatching whereby, by the control of reservoirs, run of river and fuel-electric plants, substantial amounts of water which might otherwise be wasted are conserved and thereby the need for additional generating facilities with accompanying fixed changes may be averted or delayed.

Based upon these findings, the Southern Co. was organized; the four companies were taken over by the Southern Co. The method of integrated operation has been carried on as in the past years; and it is estimated that the annual savings to the companies and hence to the public served by them is in the order of at least $6,000,000 a year.

The electric transmission facilities of the company are interconnected with the transmission facilities of the southern system by means of heavy duty high voltage lines in such a manner that in effect power generated at any point on the entire interconnected southern system in Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, may be utilized at any other point. Additional interconnections make power available from the Tennessee Valley Authority, other utilities, and a number of industrial and miscellaneous sources.

The company has electric transmission lines in close proximity to each of the proposed Federal reservoir projects within its service area. This company has jointly with the other three companies of the Southern Co. system submitted a proposed contract to the Southeastern Power Administration. This proposed contract fulfills and carries out the congressional mandate as contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 providing for the distribution of surplus power from the Federal reservoir projects in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and giving preference in the sale of such power to public bodies and cooperatives. The proposed contract submitted by Alabama Power Co. and its associated companies to the Southeastern Power Administration would accomplish these purposes fully and completely. If such proposed contract is accepted by the Southeastern Power Administration, there would be no occasion for the use of Federal funds as is now proposed by the Southeastern Power Administration for the construction of electric transmission lines and facilities which, if built, would not only duplicate existing facilities but would necessitate a waste of critical materials, manpower and Federal funds at the expense of the American taxpayers and at a time when all such materials, manpower and funds should be most zealously safeguarded and conserved for the defense effort.

There are some 10,000 stockholders of Alabama Power Co., of whom approximately 7,000 are residents of Alabama. The company has made an investment of more than $225,000,000 in its electric plants and facilities in Alabama. In 1950 the company accrued from income $10,592,410 for payment of taxes, of which more than $6,000,000 constituted Federal income tax. Taxes by the company also included more than $2,000,000 in real and personal property taxes in 64 of the 67 counties of the State.

Alabama Power Co. has over the years constructed and is now operating an electric generating and transmission system which is providing at reasonable rates an adequate and dependable supply of electric power sufficient to serve the public in its service area. All rates of the company have been approved by the Alabama Public Service Commission, a State regulatory body which, under the laws of the State of Alabama, has general supervision and control over the company's rates and service. The company now has planned or under construction additional facilities to meet the growing requirements for electric service in its area. Unless prevented from so doing by shortages of critical materials or by other things beyond the control of the company, Alabama Power Co. will continue to provide the necessary facilities for transmitting and distributing electric power to meet all future requirements within the company's service area. The company can do this while still functioning as a part of the American free enterprise system.

The proposed appropriation of $4,500,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration for the fiscal year 1952, if made, will be used generally for the purpose of constructing duplicating electric transmission lines which are absolutely unnecessary. Such an appropriation is not only unnecessary but it would result in waste of critical materials, manpower, and Federal funds at a time when such materials, manpower, and funds are so sorely needed for the defense effort. The proposed appropriation is not only inexpedient, unnecessary, and wasteful, but such an appropriation, if made, will lead eventually to a needless duplication of the electric transmission and generating facilities of this company. It will lead also to an effort on the part of the Federal Government, acting through the Southeastern Power Administration, to take from this company and from its employees and its stockholders, the business and the customers which have been built up through the joint efforts of this company and its employees and stockholders over a period of many years. Such effort will of necessity be financed and paid for by this company and by its employees and stockholders and by the other American taxpayers, all at a time when such use of funds, materials, and manpower would be highly prejudicial to the defense program. Could anything be more unnecessary, inequitable, unfair, and unjust?

Respectfully submitted.

ALABAMA POWER CO.,
By THOMAS W. MARTIN,
Chairman of the Board.

The Problems of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a report on the problems of agriculture prepared by Dr. John Lee Coulter, an eminent consulting economist, of Washington, D. C., under the sponsorship of the National Reclamation Association. The report has special reference to conservation, reclamation, and irrigation in the 17 Western States of the United States. The full text of the report will be printed in the hearings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and has been made available to many Members from the Western States. I include with my remarks the following synopsis of the report and commend the full report to all who are interested in this vital problem:

DO WE NEED RECLAMATION?—SYNOPSIS OF A REPORT ON THE PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE BY DR. JOHN LEE COULTER

During the past 35 years the population of the United States has increased 50 percent—from 100,000,000 in 1915 to 150,000,000 in 1950. While during the same period the total available farm land has remained about the same—450,000,000 acres. How, then, were the additional 50,000,000 people fed, clothed, and sheltered? How were we able to meet the demands of this increased population for food and fiber, and at the same time maintain our highest standards of living? Several factors made this possible:

1. A TREMENDOUS REDUCTION IN ACREAGE DEVOTED TO COTTON PRODUCTION

The cotton acreage from 1925 to 1929 averaged 45,000,000 acres, while at the present time it is less than 20,000,000 acres. Thus, 25,000,000 acres have been made available for the production of food and fiber for human requirements.

2. THE SHIFT FROM HORSES AND MULES ON THE FARMS AND ELSEWHERE TO AUTOMOBILES, TRUCKS, AND TRACTORS

Prior to World War I there were more than 30,000,000 horses and mules on farms and elsewhere throughout the country. By 1949 this number had been reduced to less than 10,000,000—a reduction of more than 20,000,000—thus making available for human consumption the food and fiber produced on 60,000,000 additional acres.

3. EXPANSION OF WHEAT PRODUCTION IN THE GREAT PLAINS AREA

It has been estimated that at least 35,000,000 acres of grasslands in the Great Plains area has been plowed up and planted to wheat since World War I. Dr. Bennett, Chief of Soil Conservation Service, has recently stated, "There are probably as high as 8,000,000 acres in these Plains States that should be gotten out of cultivation and put back to grass—and kept in grass."

These shifts and changes in our farming practices have made available the products of more than 100,000,000 additional acres to meet the requirements of our rapidly increasing population during the past 35 years. But what about the future? With our population increasing at the tremendous rate of more than 2,000,000 per year what would be the situation if during the sixties or the seventies we were again confronted with a drought such as we experienced in the thirties?

Our population is not only growing but it is moving westward. By 1975 there will be 50,000,000 or more people in the West. A balanced economy for these people will require the full development of all the resources of that area, particularly agricultural. This, in the arid and semi-arid West, can be accomplished only through reclamation.

But reclamation is a slow process requiring many years to accomplish. Furthermore, the total remaining area to be developed is only about 17,000,000 acres or less than 4 percent of our present area available for farming. These increased irrigated acres, if brought under cultivation by means of reclamation during the next 25 years, would largely be offset by the present wheatlands of the Great Plains that should revert to grasslands and by lands going out of production because of soil erosion, which is an important and critical factor.

Thus, if during the next 25 years we bring under irrigation all of the remaining undeveloped irrigable lands of the West, it is possible that the total farming area of the United States may not be as large as it is today. But during the same period our population will increase by 50,000,000 people—or by 33⅓ percent.

A Soldier Writes From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, considerable interesting correspondence is being received by families who have boys fighting in Korea. As part of my remarks, I am inserting at this point a letter from a boy who writes from the depths of his heart as to conditions in that unhappy land.

DEAR ——: Your letter was most interesting. Am sorry the Powers moved away, but maybe I'll see them again some day.

About this island we're on. This is one of the reasons that the people back in the States are paying some awful figures in taxes. This island could run and do everything expected of it with the manpower of 300. But we have over 1,000 GI's, officers, and other personnel stationed here. When you move a man into a place like this you have to have just about another man some place taking care of him, and also the more men come in here, the more officers and men have to be sent in to run and take care of them.

So you see it can get in a cycle in a way. Food isn't too good, but it won't kill you if you eat it. Shows here are about 6 months to a year old. * * * Seeing a show for the tenth time is nothing new around here.

This doesn't seem to hang too hard on my mind, as we have a lot of personal things to relieve just loafing around. Have a small but widely used library and spend a lot of time there. Reading books like classics, Japan Today, Inside Russia, the Reds and Russia, World Peace, and things like that. Also other books, such as on medicine, Legion, and custom.

I do a lot of writing. Write short stories, also a lot of articles on Japan, Korea, and things I've seen. Just for myself, but it's fun. Right now I'm writing a story for the squadron commanding officer to publish in the newspaper that is sold over the South Pacific.

As far as trying to say, "Why are we fighting in Korea" is a good question but try to answer it when you see your buddies all shot up and some even pretty badly tortured. Well it makes you think a little. There wasn't much use of even going into Korea in the first place as I can see it because the United States couldn't even take Japan. After we get all through, we will be spread all over the world and we will be wide open then. But such is life. Most of the guys out here believe as I do on this subject.

I didn't know that we had exploded A-bombs in Arizona. Nobody tells us guys anything. Hear news at night once in a while short-waved from Los Angeles but not too often.

I thank you for the book and will read it when am feeling sorta out sometime.

If you honestly want to know how I feel about the whole mess we're in now, if I was a millionaire, I'd buy the biggest rocket ship and take off for parts unknown. Right now the guys on this island are living from day to day. There have been unidentified aircraft and underwater craft around here several times, and if ever anything happens, a lot of people are going to cash in on Western Union. It would be a second Wake Island. We have light machine guns here, three to be truthful, and a hundred or so rifles, which is about it. No place to go if anything did happen.

One rifle shot would blow this place wide open, as we have large 100-octane gas tanks all over the island. Me, I'm swimming out to a small coral reef if anything does happen. I may not be a hero but I'm not a fool either. The only aircraft stationed here is a C-47 and a B-17. The former is used for flying protocol to the nearest base.

Well, really can't think too much of anything else to write about so will sign off for now, wishing to hear from you soon.

As ever.

Too Long in Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of my colleagues, and of others who may read it, I am inserting, by unanimous consent, the pertinent and thought-provoking editorial from a recent issue of the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis.:

TOO LONG IN POWER

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY puts the pressure on the RFC to approve a Government loan to the Saxony, a lush Miami Beach hotel. The Senator's son gets a $21,000 fee after the million-dollar loan was made.

Is anyone around here surprised?

He shouldn't be. It's only part, and undoubtedly a very small part, of the pattern

of graft, influence, and cheap politicking running wild in Washington today.

And it's nothing new, either in the RFC or in Washington generally. Even in the days of Jesse Jones, a paragon of statesmanship and integrity when compared to the crowd running the show today, one had to have an "angle" or a "friend" to get an RFC loan. The worthiness of the loan was not enough to get a foot in the door.

It's all part of the atmosphere which surrounds a party—any party—too long in power. The mink coats, the deep freezers, the Donald Dawsons, the Merle Youngs, and the Harry Vaughans are just the window dressings of a deeper political philosophy of smugness, venality, and indifference to the public good.

Too long in power.

The Republican Party blew up in the twenties. The personal honesty and high purpose of Herbert Hoover was not strong enough to live down Tea Pot Dome and Warren Harding.

The country needed a change of party—and it got it.

Does anyone dare to suggest that America does not need a change today?

Isn't it time to start at the top and sweep out the slimy crowd that surrounds the White House? The walls and pillars of that old structure are not all that termites destroyed. When the Pendergast protégé moved in a heap of the spirit of Pendergast moved in with him.

Too long in power.

There's little use in rattling dead bones, but it's important to know where these things start. F. D. R. owed nothing to Tammany Hall, but he used Tammany methods. His revolution—good or bad—safely launched, himself anchored and unbeatable, and there began to appear the same smugness, the same willingness to use influence to achieve personal profit that has reached a climax in Washington today.

His son sold insurance policies that your son and mine could not sell. His son got loans—ones that were never repaid—because papa entertained the right people at dinner, or put in phone calls to the right men.

And the Roosevelt revolution itself, which history may tell us saved this country from economic chaos, nevertheless started the growth of a spirit new to America—something for nothing.

Get out your Mark Twain and read The Man Who Corrupted Hadleyburg if you are interested in prophetic allegories.

We don't like it. We don't believe America likes it.

We don't like Senators whose sons get big fees because pops helped their clients get a loan. Think how honest old Thomas J. Walsh must be rolling in his grave. He was the man who smoked out Teapot Dome. And Senator JIM MURRAY, from the same State of Montana, is sitting in his Senate seat.

We don't like the percentage boys whose White House wives get $6,000 mink coats in trade for influence.

We wish JOE MCCARTHY would stay away from the race tracks, and quit having friends cash checks—and concentrate on the job of smoking out the commies.

We wish * * * but there's no use wishing that Harry Truman will clean house and start playing President instead of king. Anyone who has read about him knows he's a stubborn man. He likes what he has, and even what he has created, and he's going to keep it.

The answer? Clean out this administration while there's still time to save the country. There are honest men and able men who can take over the job and do it right.

If it's done in time, it may be possible to avoid disastrously with integrity. If there's much more delay, we predict the great, honest mass of our people will rise up in their wrath and put their candidates to only one test:

They may be dumb, they may vote wrong, they may stand for stupid things, but, by God, are they honest?

The Late Paul H. Ballard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, last, death came to Paul Ballard, a great and good man. For 14 years he was a member of the Ohio House of Representatives, and for 10 years he was chairman of the powerful finance committee of the Ohio House. He voluntarily retired from the house to become business manager of Ohio University, reputedly the oldest university west of the Alleghenies.

Paul Ballard was a strong yet humble man. He was able, courageous, honest, and sincere. He really believed that public office was a public trust and his every act conformed to his belief.

In these days, when it might appear that strength and character in public office, are at so low an ebb, America, as never before, desperately needs men of his qualities in high positions.

Although Paul Ballard died without great wealth, an editorial in the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer leaves to his wife and family a priceless heritage. The editorial is as follows:

PAUL H. BALLARD

It has never been possible for us to reflect on Paul H. Ballard's distinguished record of service in the Ohio Legislature without wondering why some men think that they have to stoop to cowardly compromise of principles or engage in the shoddy tricks of the demagogue in order to be politically successful.

No man who has served in the legislature in the memory of living Ohioans was any more influential and any more respected than was Paul Ballard. And that it was so because he was a politician who didn't frighten easily, who could be persuaded by reason but never by threat or enticement, and who believed that occupancy of political office should be for public service, not for the advancement of special interest or for personal aggrandizement.

Because of his integrity and because of the intelligent way in which he decided issues that confronted him during his 14 years of service in the house, Ballard enjoyed the confidence of legislators from the urban areas in the same degree that he was given the implicit confidence of those from the rural sections. Fittingly enough, he was chairman of the important house finance committee.

Ballard retired from the legislature in 1948 in order to become business manager of Ohio University, where he served with the same exceptional competence and inflexible probity that characterized his legislative career.

Mr. Ballard's death at Athens is a genuine loss to this State. The public service in Ohio could never have enough men like him, for he imparted strength and character to the government he served.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the very excellent letter of Robert B. Dresser to the editor of the Providence Journal:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

EDITOR, PROVIDENCE JOURNAL,
Providence, R. I.:

The Sunday Journal for February 4 contained a letter to the editor, signed Historicus, quoting from a letter written under date of March 22, 1903, by Henry Adams, the historian. I quote from the Adams letter as follows:

"My statesmanship is still all in China, where the last struggle for power is to come. China is bound to go to pieces, and every year is a long step to the bad. The only country now on the spot is Russia, and if Russia organizes China as an economical power, the little drama of history will end in the overthrow of our clumsy western civilization. We never can compete with Asia, and Chinese coal and labor, organized by a Siberian system. In that event I allow till 1950 to run our race out."

It is remarkable that this view, expressed almost 50 years ago, agrees so closely with the present views of a number of those most familiar with China and its affairs.

In 1923 Lenin wrote, "In the last analysis, the outcome of the world struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, and China, etc., constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe."

On January 6, 1948, former Ambassador William C. Bullitt said in a Town Hall debate on China:

"If we permit the Soviet Government to control the Chinese and the Japanese, we shall finally go down under the assault of hundreds of millions of Communist serfs. If our Government permits Soviet control of China, we can all count our country as doomed and our children as dead."

In July 1950 Dr. Walter H. Judd, one of America's leading authorities on China, said:

"What other task, I ask you, could be so important to the Kremlin's plan for the conquest of Asia, then of Europe and then of ourselves as beguiling America into stopping effective assistance to China?

"Foster [William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in this country] summed it up in this sentence: 'The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front.'

"Not Japan, not Germany, not the Mediterranean, not the Balkans, not the oil of the Middle East, not the North Atlantic or any of the other areas where we have focused our efforts, but China. The Kremlin 5 years ago instructed its followers that the war in China is the key of all—I repeat, all—problems on the international front. While we were seeking to forget China and its troublesome war against Communists, the Kremlin was already working to win that war and the crucial victory which that would represent in its never-ending warfare against us and all the free world."

In this same statement Dr. Judd quoted the following observations by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, made in the fall of 1947:

"Our failure to help the Government of China effectively at the end of the war, with its otherwise insuperable problems, particularly the Communist rebellion, will turn out,

I fear, to be the single greatest blunder in the history of the United States."

The current debate regarding the sending of a land army to Europe raises many serious questions. The debate seems to be centering largely on the question of whether Western Europe is important to us. Its importance seems to be generally conceded. However, the vital question really is not that, but whether it is possible at this time to save Western Europe from Russian domination by the use of land forces. It seems to be admitted on all sides that Russia has such vast superiority in land forces that she could overrun Western Europe at will. If this is true, is it likely that she will delay using this power until it is too late?

Brig. Gen. Brice P. Disque (U. S. Army retired) in an article recently published in the Spotlight Publications of the Committee for Constitutional Government, has this to say on this subject:

"The Politburo sits on Europe's eastern boundary with a fully equipped land army of about 200 divisions. If it is the Politburo's purpose to war in Europe with troops, is there an American so silly as to believe that the Russians will accommodate us by holding back until we create a bigger force in Europe, so as to insure their defeat?

"We may have leaders that silly, but the Politburo is not. Quite likely it will wait, and if events dictate a military advance into Europe, it will overrun the place before we can set up a force to stop it. The chances are 100 to 1 that everything we have sent or may send eventually will become Russian property."

It should be observed that according to reliable reports there are large numbers of Nationalist Chinese who are willing and eager to fight the Communists in China. They need, however, arms, equipment, and training. In the language of General Chennault: "It [China] is the one key area of the world where international communism can still be licked without the involvement of a single American infantry soldier."

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

FEBRUARY 6, 1951.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty Cut-Backs in Mail Service Unjustified, Ex-Official Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post for Sunday, February 25, 1951, relative to postal service cut-backs:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY CUT-BACKS IN MAIL SERVICE UNJUSTIFIED, EX-OFFICIAL SAYS

A former Chief Inspector of the Post Office Department criticized Department management yesterday and said it "is on weak ground in trying to convince anyone" that postal rates should be substantially increased.

James M. Doran, who retired October 1 after 44 years, challenged last April's economy in service. He said the Department could have made major operation changes and thus have done away with any need for service cut-backs.

Doran, Chief Inspector between 1945 and 1949 and then Director of Budget and Planning, expressed his views in the March Postal Record, published by the National Association of Letter Carriers.

The union has criticized Postmaster General Donaldson's cutting residential mail deliveries to one a day, curtailing window hours and pick-ups from mailing boxes and cutting down on nighttime processing of other than first-class mail.

APPROPRIATION REQUEST CUT

Donaldson based his action on a directive from the House Appropriations Committee to effect economies after it had cut his appropriation request. He failed to get through Congress suggested increases in all postal charges except first-class (letter) rates.

Doran said that about 94 percent of the Nation's 41,000 post offices, located in smaller communities and having small receipts, always have and always will require a subsidy. This, he contended, is justified by the essential service they perform.

"Congress can never be expected to hike rates sufficiently to wipe out the deficit in these district [small] offices, and it should not attempt to do so," Doran said.

Donaldson's cuts, he said, fell most heavily on the other 6 percent of the offices in large communities, which regularly return a profit.

WOULD RAISE SOME RATES

"Certain rates should be raised," he said, "particularly those on second (publication) and fourth class (parcel post), but all concerned should be certain of the equity involved in the increases requested."

Doran said the Department's Cost Ascertainment Division last March submitted a report on operating expenses in 20 of the largest post offices which suggested a broad field for saving.

"On one item, the cost of handling first-class mail, one office showed a cost of 133 percent more than the one that operated at the least cost," he said.

"If the report accurately portrays present conditions and costs in the 20 offices in question, a saving of $45,000,000 a year could be made in the handling of first-class mail alone," he added.

Statement of Guy George Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Guy George Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee:

Let Representative HAYS clean up his own party, and his own national committee, before he tries to talk about something which he knows nothing about.

The hearings of the Fulbright subcommittee show that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan to Carthage Hydrocol, Inc., was negotiated before I became president of Carthage, and before I became chairman of the Republican National Committee.

The printed hearings of the subcommittee show, on page 440, that under questioning of Senator FULBRIGHT on July 10, 1950, a former RFC director, Mr. Harvey Gunderson, testified as follows:

"I had never talked to Mr. Gabrielson, and I know of no one in the RFC who had ever talked with him until after the loan was made, at which time he was elected president of the company."

Mr. Gunderson's testimony further makes it clear that the loan was negotiated by Mr. P. C. (Dobie) Keith, an outstanding chemical engineer, through Mr. Jesse Jones, former Federal loan administrator. I have been Mr. Keith's attorney for many years.

Because of its value to national defense and the development of natural resources, the loan was endorsed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior.

The record shows that I have no financial interest in Carthage Hydrocol, and that the only compensation I have received has been for my services as president and counsel.

The last installment of the loan to Carthage Hydrocol was made April 25, 1949. I became chairman of the Republican National Committee August 4, 1949. These facts are all a matter of record, and were available to Congressman HAYS.

I can only conclude that this deliberate smear is an attempt to divert attention from the rascality rampant in Washington under the administration of the political party to which Mr. HAYS is affiliated. And no amount of misrepresentation or mud-throwing will deter me from continuing to urge that we turn these rascals out in 1952.

Records of Applicants for Public Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted by the State Senate of Illinois.

In substance, the resolution is a protest against the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act, which provides that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public assistance programs, and so forth, are not open to public scrutiny and inspection.

I wish to add that the resolution in question is meritorious and is worthy of further study and consideration. In my opinion the members of the State Senate of Illinois are to be commended for their forthright and courageous position which they have taken, evidently in the hope that it ultimately will be the means of unmasking the many frauds and false pretenses that are imposed upon the Government of the United States because of the unreasonable and unconscionable clause contained in the present Social Security Act, and which definitely appertains to the subject matter so ably portrayed in the resolution. A copy of the resolution follows:

Senate Resolution 24

Whereas the Congress of the United States by amendment to the Federal Social Security Act has provided that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public assistance programs operated by the various

States in conjunction with the Federal Government under provisions of the Social Security Act shall be limited to purposes directly connected with the administration of these programs; and

Whereas this injunction of secrecy imposed on the States by said amendment to the Federal Social Security Act is a matter which causes great public concern, and is directly responsible for numerous injustices, abuses, and fraud by permitting many individuals not actually in need to receive assistance and to escape detection because of the stringent regulations guarding the names of recipients of public assistance, thus creating dissatisfaction with the public-welfare program in many communities of the State; and

Whereas said secrecy provision violates the fundamental principle that any expenditure of public funds should be subject to public audit; and

Whereas members of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois repeatedly have expressed themselves as favoring an amendment to the Public Assistance Code of Illinois which would make available to public inspection and sound use a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State, only to be advised that such an action would be in conflict with the Federal Social Security Act and would result in loss of Federal funds for public assistance purposes; and

Whereas the so-called Federal funds were collected from the taxpayers of Illinois to the extent of almost $2,340,000,000 dollars during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, while less than $3 out of every $100 collected from the people of Illinois was returned to the State of Illinois in so-called Federal aid for all purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we go on record as recommending to the Congress of the United States that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible date amending pertinent sections of the Federal Social Security Act in such a manner that State legislative bodies desiring to do so would be permitted to remove restrictions in State laws concealing the identity of public assistance recipients, and to provide that a list of the names of all recipients of assistance be available for public inspection in a proper public office; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eighty-second Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

Adopted by the senate March 7, 1951.

SHERWOOD DIXON,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Filed March 8, 1951.

EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

On Low State of Morals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Terre Haute (Ind.) Star of March 12, 1951. This editorial, touching as it does on the current RFC investigation, is particularly pertinent to today's debate on the floor of the House:

"IS ANYTHING WRONG IN THAT?" QUIZZY SHOWS MORAL DECLINE

From the moment the RFC disclosures began hitting the headlines, the words "illegal" and "improper" have enjoyed the currency of popular songs.

White House attachés, RFC officials, Senators, these and others have time and again defended the exercise of pressure and influence on the ground that what they did was not illegal. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, pursuing the inquiry, has often insisted that while this might be so, their actions were nevertheless improper.

Faced with this moral gage, the principals in the RFC story have then usually gone on to assert that they have done nothing improper, either.

There is no need here to discuss the issue of illegality. If any be demonstrated, it is a matter for the courts and that's that. What is of much graver concern to the Nation is the strange idea so many of our public officials seem to have of what is proper and what is improper.

An examiner for RFC sees no harm in accepting free hospitality from a Florida hotel owner who has won an RFC loan. Senator MURRAY, Montana Democrat, says it's quite "routine" for lawmakers to plug loans for applicants who happen to be constituents, even when a Senator's son is the applicant's lawyer.

White House personnel feel utterly free about accepting favors of all kinds, as well as dispensing them. Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, President Truman's military aide, doesn't have a single qualm whether he's taking in deep freezers or getting a special law pushed through Congress to allow entry from Australia of a woman acquaintance he wants as secretary.

In all these instances, the principals have one standard reply: "Is there anything wrong in that?"

That they even find it necessary to ask the question tells us how insensible many public men have become to any lofty code of propriety in official life. By any reasonable measure, no man who occupies a position of responsibility in Government ought either to accept or grant special favors to anyone.

There was a time when such an elementary ethical standard was universally revered and widely observed. In the Washington of 1951, it appears as outmoded as celluloid collars and knee-length bathing suits.

Nothing unearthed so far has bracketed the Truman administration with the scandalous Harding regime. Yet in some ways the offenses against the moral code today are worse. They have tended to haul the National Government down to the level of petty, tin-horn courthouse politics. They have robbed the White House and the Presidency of dignity. They have made Washington life spineless, boneless—a shambles of competing influences and pressure and friendships in which moral values are buried underfoot.

Only one thing is still lacking. No one has yet put vending machines into the White House, the Capitol, and assorted Government halls to dispense favors easily, mechanically, and for a fixed price. "Is there anything wrong in that?"

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which is one of a series published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—Albert Edward DePalma, the one-time St. Louis waiter who became one of Toronto's most notorious promoters, reigns over his ramshackle empire of moose pasture stock enterprises at 185 Bay Street, in the heart of the financial district.

The legend on the translucent glass of the main office door recites some of DePalma's activities as follows: "Tantalum Refining & Mining Corp. of America, Ltd., Indigo Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., Petromine Exploration & Finance Co., Ltd., Dominion Resources Publications, John W. Hammond Co."

Tantalum, Indigo, and Petromine are branded as stock frauds by the United States Securities and Exchange Commmission and the United States Post Office.

DePalma says he has no connection with Dominion Resources Publications or the John W. Hammond Co. These concerns, he says, are entirely separate.

Hammond writes and prints the literature for DePalma's stock promotions, however, and Dominion Resources Publications produces a tabloid newspaper entitled "The Financial Observer" which is always reporting big developments at DePalma's properties in the Yellowknife.

DePalma said he would receive me and William C. Rosenbaum of the St. Louis Better Business Bureau "in a few minutes." A secretary, who was rushing a bundle of literature from the rear of the establishment to a front office, told us the chief was tied up for the moment.

Since DePalma's business is mail order, there were no chairs for customers. Rosenbaum and I stood in a corridor about the width and length of a bowling alley.

It was broken along its length, however, by doorways leading into cubby-hole offices, from which we could hear the whir of mimeograph machines and the clackety-clack of typewriters.

At the far end, there was a large room lined with filing cabinets, a refrigerator and a gas stove. No one was doing any cooking then, but girls were running back and forth along the corridor with stacks of literature, wrapped up in copies of the Financial Observer. Old copies, we presumed.

It seemed as though you had to be sound of wind and limb to work for DePalma. Everyone we saw moved on the double. The girls brushed past us breathlessly, as though someone was timing them.

The bundles of literature they were rushing into the front room were being folded and stuffed into envelopes by a half dozen women sitting around a table. The printed matter, we learned later, consisted of progress reports on the Indigo mine, sent out monthly to each stockholder.

With all these people running back and forth and the clatter of multigraph equipment, the place had the tempo of a merry-go-round. Photographic murals showed rugged, square-jawed men standing on barren hillsides examining gold-bearing rocks. There was one painting of a square rigger forging ahead in a stormy, dark-blue sea. It symbolized something, we guessed, but we never found out what.

Finally we were summoned into the presence of DePalma by one of the slightly winded runners who said: "The Chief will see you now."

DePalma got up from behind his mahogany desk to greet a couple of fellow St. Louisans. A large-framed man, he has wavy, iron-gray hair, somewhat protruding blue eyes which stare at you with deep sincerity and an easy-going, American manner of speaking.

He was wearing an expensive looking gray suit with big, blue checks, a light blue tie to match the color of the checks, gray suede shoes. He was expansive and friendly.

"I loved St. Louis," said DePalma. "Came, let's see, about 30 years ago. I'm 50 now. So I was about 19 then. Sold knitted ties a while, went broke, had to eat, went out and gotta job slinging hash at Autenrieth's in Clayton, just across from the courthouse.

"Used to talk to Billy DeBeck, you know, who did Barney Google. Wonderful bunch of people there. Wonderful bunch of people in St. Louis. Wonderful people."

In the old days DePalma recalled courthouse employees used to eat at Autenrieth's and many a jury was fed there.

Today, however, DePalma is shy of American juries. It cost him $65,000 by his own reckoning to avoid one in Cleveland, where he was indicted 3 years ago on 14 counts of mail fraud in connection with the tantalum and gold mine promotions.

Unaware of the indictments, DePalma said he flew down from Toronto into New York State in his private airplane, to market some more of his mine stock which he was selling in those days to the public in $10 lots. This was no surreptitious journey since his name was printed all over his airplane as a form of advertising.

Consequently, no one was more amazed than DePalma when Federal agents arrested him in a quiet hotel on Park Avenue, New York City, a few days before Christmas, 1947, and hustled him off to a cell to await extradition to Cleveland.

Although the United States district attorney requested $100,000 bail bond for DePalma, the bond was set at $40,000. This sum the promoter raised through his Toronto bank.

Then he climbed back into his airplane and flew like a homing pigeon back to Toronto. He has never set foot into the United States since.

DePalma told us it cost him a total of $65,000 to liberate himself from the clutches of United States authorities. This included the $40,000 bond he forfeited, the additional cash he had to put up because of the difference in rates of exchange and attorney fees.

"That wasn't all," he said. "I lost a million dollars worth of business, too."

In Toronto, DePalma is safe. The United States can't touch him there because the Canadian Parliament has refused for 8 years to include stock fraud as an extraditable offense.

His misfortune in New York DePalma ascribes to an article written about him in 1946 by Lester Velie of Colliers. Velie described DePalma's boiler-room operations so well that even the Ontario authorities got after the promoter and took away his license as a broker-dealer.

DePalma sued Colliers for $100,000, but ultimately dropped the suit.

"It was a dirty trick," he said. "My whole life for years has been dedicated to Canadian mining."

Like the Broker-Dealer Association and some of the officials of the Ontario Securities Commission, DePalma believes the SEC takes an old-womanish attitude toward the lusty development of Canadian mining, in which the axiom is that to make a dollar, you take a dollar's worth of risk.

While it appears that the risk has been taken by the suckers, not the promoters, DePalma's views on the matter are held here by most of the promoting community.

The attitude of the SEC, DePalma told us, has prevented him from bringing his mines into production. But he'll show them, he said.

"I am devoting my life to Indigo," he said. "Believe me, I've been with these deals 5 years and I'm going to continue to battle for their success to my dying breath."

While the Tantalum is stalled just now, due to the difficulty of separating this rare metal from the earth, Indigo is "going like a house afire," DePalma said.

The market on Indigo stock, he said, was 82 bid and 87 ask. Neither Rosenbaum nor I could find Indigo listed on any market. We asked DePalma about this.

"Oh," he said, "I delisted it from the stock exchange myself."

The promoter was vague about his reasons for this, but it had something to do with his feeling that if people didn't trust him he wasn't going to let the public make a killing on his gold mine.

Throughout our conversation, DePalma tossed a piece of quartz about 2 inches in diameter into the air and caught it with one hand.

"Know what this is?" he said finally.

He handed it to me. The rock was studded with slivers of yellow metal. Gold.

"Picked it up at the mine site," said DePalma casually. "Use this stuff as paper weights around the office."

Because of the bad publicity attending his ventures, DePalma said he was forced to change the name of his Progress Diversified Minerals, Ltd., under which his gold mines promotion operated last year, to Indigo.

The stock transfer was done on a share-for-share basis, so that no stockholder lost anything by the switch, he said. Indigo also absorbed his Palamino gold mine enterprise.

The Indigo promotion is underwritten by Mining Financiers, which is DePalma. His name, however, never appears in the promotional literature.

Promoting a gold mine, DePalma told us, is a difficult and often thankless task.

"We figure to sell a stock issue we have to send out a million pieces of mail," he said. "When I was promoting Palamino at $10 a customer, my replies were so small even I was surprised, and I'm accustomed to the risks in this business.

"I figure that only one-fourth of 1 percent of the send-out responded, that is, sent in the $10. You can see that the promoter doesn't make as much money as you think."

DePalma closed his eyes and sighed. The walls of his office are plastered with mottoes. One says:

"A friend is a person who says nice things about you behind your back."

"I'll tell you something," said the promoter. "I would have had Tantalum and Indigo in production if the SEC hadn't interfered. Let me show you what's happening at Indigo now."

He pressed a buzzer. A young man in shirtsleeves, whom we had seen bending over a desk in a rear office, appeared and said snappily:

"Yes, Chief?"

DePalma told him to bring up the progress reports on Indigo. The clerk raced out of the office and in a moment was back. He unrolled a map of the diggings on DePalma's desk and with enthusiasm began to interpret it.

"The chip sample assays here," he said, "show up to $20.40 a ton. That's an average of $11.88 over 3 feet or so."

He pointed to an extension of the tunnel the map showed.

"They're drilling in here. The crosscut enters here. Now, over here, the ore shoot is 120 feet long and 51 inches and some wide. The average value here is $21.95 a ton."

I couldn't be sure what all of this meant, but it certainly sounded encouraging whatever it was. I asked DePalma when he would start hauling this gold out of the ground.

Well, he said, he has to get power and then buy a mill some place. Then he can start.

Although this mine has been on the verge of making people rich for 5 years, DePalma and his staff are sure production is at hand.

Sometime later, DePalma told me he was a great and good friend of Preston Tucker, the would-be automobile magnate.

"If Tucker had listened to me," said DePalma, "he wouldn't have had that trouble. You know, I bid for a Tucker dealership here. But I couldn't get it."

I asked him if he would have quit the gold mine business if he had managed to get the Tucker distributorship.

"I sure would have," said DePalma. "That distributorship would have been a gold mine."

Manor, Tex., Adopts a Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, a big thing has happened down in Manor, Tex., a really big thing. This small town in central Texas has adopted a hospital. One day the mayor of the town scribbled a message on the blackboard outside his store. "Let's all go to Fort Hood with a cake and entertain the wounded soldiers. They are waiting for us. Let's not disappoint them." The response was volcanic—every man, woman and child in Manor remembered the soldiers whom they had visited the previous December at this same hospital. These soldiers might have been their own fathers, sons, or brothers, but, more significant, these were the boys who had gone out to fight that the people of Manor and all over their great America might have the security of living in a free Nation.

The ladies responded with their cake baking, the men took care of the transportation problem to Fort Hood, and the children added their gay enthusiasm to this new experience of adopting a hospital. And everyone dusted off his talents to see what might be produced in the way of entertainment. Manorites knew they were not glamorous Hollywood stars or notable world figures, but they did know they were home-town folk whose friendly company the boys in the service yearned for more than anything else in the world—for there is nothing so filling to both the heart and soul of an individual than the knowledge that someone really cares about him.

When you, the Members of the Congress, have read the following excerpt about Manor which appeared in the Austin American-Statesman of March 4, 1951, I think that each of you will sit back quietly for a moment and feel quite humble indeed that it is our privilege here in Congress to represent people such as these all over America. May I, therefore, respectfully request that this article be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MANOR MOVES EN MASSE TO FORT HOOD TODAY TO ENTERTAIN HOSPITAL

(By Mark Batterson)

You couldn't find a place in Manor last week where the folks weren't talking about the trip they're going to make Sunday to their adopted hospital at Fort Hood.

Every place you went—the Johnson's grocery store, or across the street to W. C. McCutcheon's Manor Cafe or even at the combination domino hall-barber shop next

door to the post office—they were all talking about it.

Most of the actual planning was going on at the Johnson's store. Mayor Luther Johnson and his wife, two of the town's leaders in the project, had sickness in the family, but they continued to hold court over their counter all week. And helping them out was W. H. Wentland, Manor's Red Cross chairman who has had a lot to do with the project since its start.

The three realized there were a lot of problems still to be solved, and they soon found out that everyone else in town had every intention of getting them out of the way by Sunday.

A couple of weeks ago, Mayor Johnson scrawled a message on the blackboard outside his store.

"Let's all go to Fort Hood with a cake and entertain the wounded soldiers," it read. "They are waiting for us. Let's not disappoint them."

As events revealed, no one had any idea of disappointing them. Every day, people showed up with more problems to prove their intentions.

The biggest difficulty has been transportation. There just isn't enough to go around.

Mrs. J. E. Beeson, who is the wife of Manor's Chamber of Commerce president, put it this way:

"Everyone in town wants to go, but we simply have a lot more people than cars. We've finally decided that some of the ones who got to go last time will have to stay behind and give some of the others a chance to go."

Z. Kemp, Manor's postal carrier who is also the village's leading impresario when it comes to amateur shows, had a lighter problem, but a problem nonetheless. All of the girls, it seemed, were willing to wear evening dresses, but Kemp found a minor rebellion on his hands when it came to deciding on what the uniform of the day would be for the boys.

He finally came up with a sporting proposition.

"If we can hog-tie the boys long enough, they'll wear neckties," he said, straightening his own neckpiece determinedly. "Even if they are already kicking like a steer about it."

At least, Kemp said, the entertainment is shaping up. There will be about 30 entertainers going up this trip, and their director thinks they'll make even a better showing than they did the last time they entertained the wards.

Kemp, who carries himself with the air of another P. T. Barnum, also had some Barnumlike words to say:

"I think the show's going to be bigger and better this time. It's more organized, more of a unit. Anyway, we're having a dress rehearsal at Manor High School for the folks who can't go up. We'll know for sure then."

No one had any real doubts, however.

They remembered the first time they went to the hospital at Fort Hood, in December. The patients didn't know them, and they didn't know the patients, but they felt like old friends in a matter of minutes.

Then they passed out cake and conversation, and the entertainers went through their routines. By the time they left they had adopted the hospital and the patients had adopted them.

Most of the hamlet's citizens see eye to eye with a farmer who gave his opinion of the trip coming up while he was sitting around the Manor Cafe the other day.

"It's bound to be twice as good this time," he explained. "We just had 36 cakes last time—probably have about 75 this trip. Just had 30 people who went up last time—if we can get the cars, we'll have twice as many going up Sunday.

"It's all just a matter of one plus one making two."

The "Big Grab"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following series of articles by Allen Duckworth, from the Dallas Morning News:

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 1, March 4)

(By Allen Duckworth)

Oil is messy stuff—especially when you mix it with politics.

Nasty odors of petroleo-politics have raked the nostrils of American citizens off and on for half a century.

The Teapot Dome scandal, involving a Republican Department of the Interior and assorted political hangers-on who didn't mind a bit of stealing, rocked the Nation during Harding days.

Republican Harding's administration contributed Teapot Dome—"the big steal."

Democrat Truman's administration has given us the Federal tidelands claim—"the big grab."

There are some parallels. Oil riches were involved in both cases. The Department of the Interior was involved in both cases.

Someone was trying to take something from somebody else in both cases.

Outright bribery and lying were factors in the "big steal."

In the "big grab" the factors were double-talk, political influence, and a long-range campaign to build a more powerful central government and strike another blow at local rights and property ownership.

Justice caught up with the boys in the "big steal."

The "big grab" plotters haven't had anything to worry about along the justice line. No less than the Supreme Court of the United States, in a peculiar opinion that astounded the leading legal talent of the world, has given its blessing to the "big grab."

Simply stated, the "big grab" is the story of how the Federal Government confiscated through a well-plotted campaign that led right into the marble halls of the Supreme Court, the submerged coastal lands that belonged to the States of Texas, California, and Louisiana.

In the case of Texas these particular lands had belonged to the State, without dispute, for more than a hundred years. They were retained in the annexation agreement between Texas and the United States. These lands were important to every Texas school child, for all revenues from oil leases went into the school fund.

That revenue for school purposes is important enough. But more important is the new, rather socialistic philosophy the Supreme Court has written. It is a philosophy that makes a mere citizen, "a mere property owner," to use the Court's language, secondary to centralized authority. Under previous philosophy, Americans had thought that the Federal Government existed as a servant of the individual. Now, if this new philosophy is extended, just the opposite will be true.

There is no doubt that the Supreme Court has weakened the titles to all properties.

The late Gov. Beauford H. Jester, of Texas, feared that the new theory, as expressed by the United States Supreme Court, might lead to nationalization of basic industries.

Other Texans fear that even individual property rights no longer are as strong as they were before the Supreme Court dreamed up an opinion so filled with errors that even such a liberal old waddy as Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter gave up in disgust—he couldn't understand what was going on.

Americans who realize the long-range dangers of the new and strange doctrine of the Supreme Court haven't given up. There still is a chance for the Congress to put the brakes on expansion of Federal powers at the expense of local interests. Congress can do this by slapping down the Supreme Court outrage in the tidelands case. Congress has ruled for the States before, but President Truman vetoed the resolution that would have confirmed existing State ownership.

There is a lot of propaganda to overcome, however.

One reason that the "big grab" boys have been successful so far in the submerged-lands seizure is that the entire case is difficult for the average citizen to understand.

The "big grab" campaign has been accompanied by false flag waving and a smoke screen which convinced many citizens that it was only a battle between the Government and the big oil companies.

"Big grab" instigators influenced Federal officials to wage a highly technical legal battle against the States, and the plain citizen got lost in lawyer talk and Latin phrases.

Technicalities of the tidelands controversy between the individual States and the Federal Government have overshadowed some peculiar angles of the case.

Americans could understand the "big steal" of Harding days because anyone can grasp the meaning of outright individual lying and bribery.

This story hasn't anything to do with lying and bribery of the "big steal" nature.

Rather, it will try to show the subtle style of the "big grab" plot—which used double-talk, political influence, misleading statements, injustice at the highest bar of justice in the land.

Such as—

How "Honest Harold" Ickes, as Secretary of the Interior, said flatly that the States had legal title to their submerged lands off their coasts, where oil was being found.

How "Honest Harold" changed his mind later on, after hearing arguments of Federal-lease applicants, and launched a campaign against the States.

How "Honest Harold" encouraged a friend to file an application for a Federal tidelands lease.

How an attorney who drew Federal Government pay under Ickes in the Interior Department later represented a group trying to get Federal leases.

How admitted speculators have offered "shares" in an oil gamble based on the United States Supreme Court decision.

How one of these speculators admitted he hoped to make a killing by selling lease interests to the big oil companies.

How one of the applicants for Federal leases carried his influence with the administration direct to the White House.

How Texas was told prior to the 1948 elections that it had a special case and would never be sued and how the suit was filed within 60 days after President Truman was elected, getting from Texas the biggest majority of any State in the Union.

How Texas was hustled in and out of court and denied a chance to present evidence in her defense.

How the United States Supreme Court, famous throughout its history for majority opinions, was able to defeat the taxpayers and school children of Texas with a minority opinion.

How and why those in favor of getting cheap Federal leases prefer them to State leasing systems that would cost them more money.

This story presents facts in the tidelands controversy which have not been driven home to the American people—whose liberties and property rights under constitutional government are the real stake.

As said by Attorney General Price Daniel of Texas, oil and Texas are merely incidental to the case as compared to principles involved. Daniel believes that the people have been misled by a smoke screen and propaganda from the instigators of the "big grab."

"In our country," said Daniel, "property rights are not automatically attached to the powers of government."

If the Supreme Court's philosophy is allowed to stand in this case, he suggests, then the Federal Government will have a power over every river, farm, home, mine, and factory of the Nation to a degree never dreamed of by the founders of this democracy.

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 2, March 5)

(By Allen Duckworth)

"Honest Harold" Ickes' quick-change act is a curious angle in the "big grab"—the Federal Government's attempt to seize underseas oil lands from the States.

Changing is a part of Ickes' political nature.

He was supposed to be a Republican, but Ickes has worn the Bull Moose coat of Teddy Roosevelt, the Republican coat of Charles Evans Hughes, the Democratic coat of James M. Cox and of Al Smith.

All were losers in Presidential campaigns.

"Honest Harold" finally made a political touchdown in 1932 when Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President. Roosevelt put Ickes in high cotton with a Cabinet appointment to Secretary of Interior.

Now, for the oil angle.

Around the turn of the century, it became known that oil could be found under the ocean bed. California pioneered in this exploration. Later, Texas and Louisiana came into the tidelands drilling picture.

Texas has taken in eight millions of dollars for its State school fund by leasing underwater lands to oil prospectors.

It was considered a matter of settled law that the States owned the land, and could lease it as they saw fit.

Even "Honest Harold" Ickes thought the States had undisputed ownership on December 22, 1933.

A fellow by the name of Olin S. Proctor of Long Beach, Calif., wrote to Secretary Ickes and asked if he could lease some submerged land from the Federal Government.

"Honest Harold" told Proctor he couldn't get Federal leases.

In a letter dated December 22, 1933, "Honest Harold" quoted a Supreme Court of the United States opinion to Mr. Proctor to make it quite clear to Mr. Proctor.

Ickes said it was a matter of "settled law."

"Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California," wrote Ickes. He said the land could "not be appropriated except by authority of California."

This is amazing in light of later events.

Somehow or another "Honest Harold" changed his mind and the "settled law" became unsettled.

Just to refresh your memory, this happened:

The "big grab" plot was taken to Congress. California oil lands, Congress was told, must be declared part of the Federal domain. Only Congress had the power to do that, it was argued. Suggestions that it could be made a court matter without consent of Congress were disputed then by the big-grab crowd.

Congress refused to confiscate the California lands. It refused to grant permission to the Attorney General to sue California.

It was then that the "big grab" plotters decided it was a court matter after all—regardless of what Congress thought.

Later, when Congress decided to take action in favor of the States, President Truman vetoed the resolution on the grounds that the matter was before the Supreme Court and Congress should not interfere.

In other words, it was a congressional matter only if Congress would rule their way.

But let us return to "Honest Harold's" quick-change exhibition.

Ickes admitted at a congressional hearing in 1946 that he had told Mr. Proctor that the Federal Government didn't have control of the undersea lands. Ickes said his mind began to change. He explained that "applicants (for Federal leases) and their lawyers continued to insist that the United States does own the land and oil and that the Department (of Interior) does have the power to grant them oil and gas leases."

It is only natural that one would wonder who were the "applicants and their lawyers" who were able to sway "Honest Harold" from the "settled law."

A search through official records throws a bit of light on the identity of at least two applicants and one lawyer.

The evidence shows that Ickes was friendly to one applicant and took a personal interest in his application.

Robert W. Kenny, at that time attorney general of California, at a congressional hearing, introduced documents to show that:

On May 17, 1944, Fred W. Johnson, Land Commissioner in Ickes' Department of the Interior at the time, wrote to the branch office in Los Angeles, Calif., and said he would like to have quick action on any oil- and gas-lease application presented by W. W. Chapin, of San Francisco, or C. P. Ritter, of Los Angeles.

On June 24, 1944, Commissioner Johnson prodded the Los Angeles office with a telegram and urged that the Chapin-Ritter application be air-mailed to Washington if it had been filed.

When the reply came from Los Angeles the lease application "filed by C. P. Ritter, president of Consolidated Petroleum Co.," for tidelands rights, was enclosed.

With the application was this information:

"Mr. Ritter presented a letter from the Secretary of Interior (Ickes) suggesting that he file an application and stating that he would get to the bottom of this matter pertaining to the tidelands."

Ickes testified at a later hearing that before the Ritter application was filed he had talked several times with Chapin. Ritter also called to see Ickes.

"He [Chapin] frequently came in to see me, usually when he was in Washington," Ickes testified.

Ickes said that Chapin's lawyer, George Bush, of Los Angeles, "was firmly of the opinion that the Federal Government, rather than the State of California, held the title to those tidelands."

Said Ickes: "Mr. Chapin talked to me on two or three occasions about this. And, subsequently, Mr. Ritter came in. He went over the same ground." Chapin sent Ickes some letters written by Bush.

"Then I made up my mind that I thought the courts ought to decide this, since it was a legal matter," Ickes stated.

When Olin S. Proctor wrote "Honest Harold" back in 1933, it was a matter of "settled law." But after conferences with Chapin and with Ritter, the law became unsettled.

Another interesting angle in the various testimony that Ickes gave about changing his mind involves the White House.

In 1946, when Ickes recalled about the beginning of his "doubts," he credited those doubts to lease applicants and their attorneys.

Two years later he added the White House touch.

Ickes told Congressmen that he had luncheon on April 27, 1937, with President Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins and "the President raised the question as to the ownership of oil found under the ocean."

The late Ed Moore, of Oklahoma, then in the United States Senate, was curious. He asked Ickes why he didn't say anything about Roosevelt raising the tidelands question in his former testimony.

Ickes said he had forgotten about the luncheon with the President of the United States and had just recently refreshed his memory by reading his diary.

Regardless of whether Roosevelt was interested, the record will show there was no dash to the Supreme Court by the "big grab" boys until after Roosevelt was dead.

Another item from Ickes' diary was questioned. It was in Ickes' testimony at a hearing in 1948 when he referred to Hatton Sumners, of Dallas, then in Congress and chairman of the powerful House Judiciary Committee. Ickes said he had talked to Sumners back in 1938 about California tidelands and Sumners was of the opinion "that the United States already has title."

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, went out and telegraphed Sumners, who was in New Mexico. Sumners replied by wire:

"I never entertained or expressed an opinion that the United States has title to tidelands and that suit ought to be instigated against California or any other State."

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 3, March 6)

(By Allen Duckworth)

The big oil companies came in for quite a lashing during the "big grab" campaign.

Arguments that the States had a clear and legal title to undersea lands off their shores were drowned out by the howl that the big oil barons must be cornered.

It is true that the big oil companies spent vast sums in trying to protect their titles. They had invested money. And they made no secret of trying to save drilling rights they had purchased, in good faith, from the individual States.

Little emphasis has been placed on the influence exerted on the other side by those supporting the big grab—those who wanted Federal leases and who demanded that those having State permits be treated as trespassers.

We touched a bit on that in yesterday's article, when we related how W. W. Chapin of San Francisco made frequent calls on "Honest Harold" Ickes while Ickes was Secretary of the Interior, and how the Department took more than casual interest in Chapin's attempt to secure oil lands off the California coast.

Now let us turn back to the newspaper files of April 18, 1949, to a column by Drew Pearson, the Washington columnist. To quote:

"Salt Lake City's dignified, white-haired postmaster, L. A. Smoot, called on President Truman the other day to plead for a strong hand in crushing the oil lobby. The lobby is now pushing another bill through Congress to restore the rich tidelands to the States.

"There was no hedging in Truman's reply.

"'As long as I am President,' he declared, 'I will never permit the submerged oil lands to go back to the States.'"

Mr. Pearson didn't tell the whole story. So we will have to look further for information on L. A. Smoot of Salt Lake City, Utah.

The dignified postmaster, Mr. Pearson mentions made his White House visit after the California decision of the Supreme Court saying the State did not own its tidelands. This decision later was applied to Texas and

Louisiana. Then, as now, Congress was considering a resolution to override the Court's far-fetched opinion.

An uninformed reader might get the idea that Postmaster Smoot was up there in Washington on official business, such as getting his mail sacks repaired or suggesting that they put better glue on the back of stamps, and decided he had better drop in and tell President Truman what the big oil companies were up to.

Smoot is a former State land commissioner of Idaho. After going to Utah, he became prominent in politics and served in the legislature. President Roosevelt named Smoot postmaster in 1933.

A District of Columbia suit now on file is trying to force the Department of Interior to issue Federal leaces on tidelands under the noncompetitive system.

A plaintiff listed in the suit is I. A. Smoot, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

And if we look on the records of the Department of the Interior, we find that I. A. Smoot filed application LA-053269 on April 8, 1938, for an 800-acre Federal lease of California tidelands.

J. Stuart Watson, assistant executive officer of the State Lands Commission of California, says the Smoot application covers an area about three-quarters of a mile from where oil is being produced by State-let leases.

A pleasure pier of the city of Long Beach runs out over the tract Smoot wants to lease via Federal permit, Watson reports.

Watson estimated that the land Smoot wants is worth at least a million dollars. He called that a conservative estimate.

Smoot called on Truman in 1949. According to the Associated Press Salt Lake City Bureau, Smoot did not retire from the postmastership until December 1, 1950. So, it appears Smoot was on the Federal payroll when he called at the White House to do some lobbying against the oil lobbyists and in favor of I. A. Smoot.

Incidentally, since retiring from the post office, Smoot has been connected with Consolidated Uranium Mines Co., Inc., the Associated Press reported.

The suit Smoot figures in now involves persons who applied for Federal leases years ago in hopes that the United States Supreme Court eventually would rule in their favor. But they still haven't received those leases, because the Department of the Interior believes a stronger leasing act is needed.

Three attorneys signed the petition in the suit by Smoot and 30 others.

One of those attorneys was Max Barash.

Max Barash was chief counsel for the Department of the Interior's geological survey department when Harold Ickes was Secretary of the Interior.

Later, in private practice, Barash took the suit in behalf of the oil lease applicants against the Department of the Interior, where he once worked. (Barash told the Washington Bureau of the Dallas Morning News that he dropped out of the case some months ago, but declined to say why.)

Ickes, no longer Secretary of the Interior, is plugging for recognition of those leases under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920; even though he once said that act should not apply to tidelands. Main objection to the leasing act is that it provides much less income from oil rentals and royalties than the States have been able to obtain.

Returning to the subject of who was influencing for what, Congress' records contain some letters written by persons who think it would be a terrible mistake not to issue Federal tidelands leases on a noncompetitive bid basis.

Congress is discussing that now. There are two plans in congressional consideration at present. A movement is in progress to override the Supreme Court opinion completely and declare the States have full control over tidelands leasing. Another piece of legislation concerns "temporary" leasing arrangements, so that oil production and exploration can go on while it is being decided once and for all who owns those lands. That's where the issue of competitive bids, a State system, comes in as against Federal noncompetitive bids.

One of those who wrote to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY to say that competitive bidding would be "against the public interest" was Arnold M. Seiler, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

The record shows that an Arnold M. Seiler has filed application for a Federal oil lease on 320 acres of tidelands.

J. H. Morgan, of Salt Lake City wrote to Senator O'MAHONEY along the same line.

The record shows that folks by the name of Morgan in Salt Lake City have filed applications for hundreds of acres of tidelands leases. The list includes John H. Morgan, Merin Morgan, N. G. Morgan, N. G. Morgan, Sr., and John H. Morgan, Jr.

Grace Hull, of Salt Lake City, protests competitive bidding.

The record shows that a Grace Hull has an application for a 780-acre tidelands lease.

Clarence I. Justheim, Salt Lake City oil promoter, has been loud in his protests against State ownership of tidelands.

The record shows that a Clarence I. Justheim has filed application for Federal leases on more than 3,000 acres off the California coast. And there are other applications under the name of Margaret L. Justeheim.

Why all the fuss over what kind of leasing act the Federal Government shall use when and if Uncle Sam takes complete control of the tidelands?

B. L. Krebs, a New Orleans Times-Picayune writer, revealed 2 years ago that the Federal leasing act as now written allows far less income than does the Louisiana system.

Krebs showed that federally owned land, in one case, was leased in Louisiana and brought only $161 for a 3-year period. But if the leasing had been done by the State of Louisiana, the return to the public treasury would have been $27,000 the first year, half that amount each year for the two succeeding years.

One of the reasons the States get more money is that they call for competitive bids. In certain cases, under the Federal Leasing Act, bids are not asked. They just pass out the leases.

So here we go again with "Honest Harold" Ickes.

Back in 1946, "Honest Harold" appeared before a Senate committee and stated that the tidelands should be made a Federal oil reserve. Furthermore, he said, "the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 is not applicable to submerged lands."

Two years after Ickes said that, he appeared before another congressional committee. He had resigned from the Truman Cabinet, was admitted to practice law before the United States Supreme Court, and had become a newspaper columnist.

Representative J. M. COMBS, of Texas, read from Ickes' column of November 3, 1947, in the Washington Evening Star:

"Recently the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, Mastin G. White, also of Texas, and the Attorney General agreed that the Federal Leasing Act did not extend to those California tidelands. I challenge this finding."

Asked Congressman COMBS: 'Did you write that?"

Ickes replied: "I wrote that."

COMBS pressed further: "Now then, under the Federal Leasing Act, I will ask you if it is not true that if that act applies to tidelands then, under the law the Department will have to go and take the applications for leases in there, in the order in which they were filed, and parcel them out to those applicants at 25 cents an acre. Is that not right?"

Ickes: "Whatever the provision is; yes."

And that testimony came from a man who, 2 years before, had said the Leasing Act should not apply to tidelands, and who had said those valuable lands should be set aside as a Federal oil reserve.

Attorney General Price Daniel, of Texas, has told Congressmen the difference between State and Federal control in terms of dollars.

Texas leased 350,000 tidelands acres to oil companies, prior to the Ickes-inspired lawsuit against the State, for more than $7,000,000.

If the Federal Leasing Act that Ickes supports had been applied, instead of competitive State bidding, the income would have been only $87,000, Daniel estimated.

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 4, March 7)

(By Allen Duckworth)

When the "big grab" scheme was hatched, under the generalship of "Honest Harold" Ickes, there was a lot of flag waving.

The Navy must have oil to keep Old Glory on high, said some of the original instigators to the "big grab." So, said they, those underwater oil lands off the coasts must be taken from the States and made a reserve for emergencies.

And "Honest Harold" said so, too.

"These lands should be held as a Federal oil reserve," Ickes told a congressional committee in 1946.

This sounded very nice to those who did not recall what a mess there was during the Harding administration when the Navy put certain oil lands in the hands of the Department of the Interior and the Teapot Dome leasing scandal developed.

This time, Navy-owned lands were not involved in the proposed transfer to the Interior Department. Rather, they were lands that did not, under law at the time, belong to Federal Government at all. The land belongs to the States. At least, the Supreme Court had said so up to then.

In the case of Texas, the lands belonged to the State under the agreement that admitted Texas to the Union, and Texas has dedicated the oil-leasing income from those lands to the school kids.

While the flag was being waved and the public was being told that the influence of the big oil barons must be crushed, some clever moves were being made.

Certain individuals played a long shot. They applied for Federal oil leases on submerged lands off the California coast.

The Department of the Interior was not issuing any Federal leases on tidelands, but these individuals put themselves on record as having filed applications.

These applications were long-range speculations. If things worked out all right in Washington, holders of these applications might be able to eat high on the hog.

This brings us to a letter read into the record last year before a United States Senate hearing.

The letter would indicate that some of those who hope to obtain Federal leases would be willing to sell them to big oil companies at a handsome profit.

In other words, big oil companies have been operating under State leases. They have invested a lot of money. But if Federal leases are approved, in some instances, the oil companies might find Federal permits slapped down on top of their old State permits. They might have to get out or pay those with the new-style leases.

The possibility is stated blandly in the letter the Senators had read to them.

Quoting from the letter in the Senate record:

The letter is addressed to Robert E. George, of Los Angeles, Calif., and is dated February 10, 1950. It is signed by Robert F. Purvis.

"In recent years," the letter reads, "you have doubtless read and heard a great deal about the tidelands-oil controversy between the United States and California, the high light of which was the United States Supreme Court decision in 1947 declaring the United States to have paramount rights to the submerged lands involved."

The letter details the oil riches involved in the lands off the California coast, and then gets down to the real business:

"My friend and client, Joseph Cunningham, anticipated by 13 years the Supreme Court decision of 1947 by filing on, with his nominees, some 10,000 acres of submerged lands. * * *"

Mr. George is then informed that there is a suit pending to force the Department of the Interior to honor those old applications—those applications filed before the Federal Government was given any power over tidelands oil by the Supreme Court.

It was revealed that no less a personage than former Senator Burton K. Wheeler now acting as lawyer and was pressing this legal claim.

The letter leads up to an offer to Mr. George to invest in an enterprise known as the Shore Line Oil Co. This company, it is indicated, had acquired an interest in some of the old applications. Purvis, the letter stated, was in need of a bit of ready cash and was willing to part with some of his shares if Mr. George was interested.

Now for the kicker line:

"In my opinion, it is a most magnificent gamble in that all existing law is on our side and the high stakes involved are out of all proportion to the risk of losing. * * *

"If the permits are granted, oil companies will offer fabulous sums either for the stock or for operating agreements or leases bearing handsome royalties. * * *"

Little wonder that the Department of the Interior, under Secretary Julius A. Krug, and later under the present Secretary, Oscar L. Chapman, balked at being rushed into granting those lease applications under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

Yet, former Senator Wheeler insists that the applications should be granted.

So does "Honest Harold" Ickes, who fathered the "big grab" of lands from the States while he was Secretary of the Interior.

The States are trying to get Congress to override the Supreme Court and declare all of the tidelands the rightful property of individual States. And while that is being considered, Congress also is trying to decide how oil leases shall be made, if the Federal Government retains control.

While Congress considers leasing legislation, holders of the old applications demand in District of Columbia Court that the Interior Department be forced to issue leases to them.

Not so long ago, there were whoops and hollers about the menace of the big oil companies.

Now, the record would indicate, the little fellows would be willing to sell back the lands to the big boys. If and when that is done, the oil operations would be back where they began—in the hands of the big oil companies.

There would be a major difference, however. The Federal Government will be grabbing the leasing cash and royalties that formerly went to the State treasuries.

As for Texas, the big loser will be the school kids, since all from these lands go to the public school fund.

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 5, March 8)

(By Allen Duckworth)

When "Honest Harold" Ickes cast the cloud on the States' ownership of submerged oil lands off their coasts, a wave of highly speculative investing was set off.

Here's what happened:

When it became apparent that Secretary of the Interior Ickes had changed his mind after stating firmly that the tidelands legally belonged to the States and had decided they belonged to the Central Government after all, there was a rush to file for Federal leases on underwater properties.

Some of the applications for Federal leases plopped right on top of valuable State leases issued by California and paid for by the lessees in good faith.

Ickes let the applications cool in the Department of the Interior.

Now that the Supreme Court has spoken, saying that Texas, Louisiana, and California don't own those undersea oil lands, a great clamor has been set up to honor those old lease applications that Ickes allowed to pile up.

Congress isn't so sure it will let the Supreme Court get away with its bizarre opinion.

And even if it does it wants to make sure those leases won't be handed out at bargain rates by the Federal Government.

Impatient holders of the old applications don't want to wait. They are suing in District of Columbia District Court to force the Interior Department to issue them leases under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

Harold Ickes thinks the leasing ought to be granted under the old act, although he once stated that the act should not apply to submerged oil lands. Ickes "changes like a weather vane," former Senator Sheridan Downey once observed.

Under Federal law, you can get oil prospecting (wildcat) leases, without bidding in competition with others, on a first-come, first-serve basis, at a few cents an acre.

Congress is taking another look. Even if the Department of the Interior is to boss the tidelands oil, Congress isn't sure it wants the 1920 mineral leasing law to apply.

Much evidence of speculation on Federal leases has been uncovered.

In yesterday's article, a letter was quoted from the official record to show that a California man had stated that it would be possible, if Federal leases were granted, to sell them to the big oil companies. It is obvious that the big oil companies would be happy to buy off Federal leaseholders to protect their investments under State leases.

The evidence points to some outright speculation on the outcome of the Supreme Court decision against the individual States.

It is to be remembered that the United States Supreme Court did not hand down its decision in the California tidelands case until June 23, 1947.

Long before that, however, Ickes had had his famous change of mind, which he admits came about after applicants and their attorneys pressed the matter upon him.

Among the applicants for Federal leases sent to the Department of the Interior was one on May 5, 1939, in the name of Earl G. Sinclair and Lauren D. Cherry.

Robert W. Kenny, as attorney general of California, gave evidence to Congress of what he called "a traffic throughout the United States whereby people have been led to believe that there is a great get-rich-quick opportunity if State tidelands can be upset."

He used Lauren D. Cherry's unapproved, but undenied, application as an example.

Kenny offered in evidence documents showing that Cherry sold interests in his application on at least four occasions.

A 2-percent interest in the application was sold for $100 to Alma Goettsch of Long Beach, Calif., in 1939—8 years before the Supreme Court spoke.

Andrew Shease of Long Beach paid $75 for a 1-percent interest in May 1941. Alma Goettsch put in $110 for an additional interest of 1 percent June 3, 1941.

Anna H. Krutzfeldt of Long Beach found she could buy an interest on the installment plan. She paid $65 down on a 1-percent interest priced at $175.

It must be remembered that these sales were not in oil leases. They were in mere applications—applications that could not be granted until the Supreme Court ruled the right way.

The Supreme Court number came up as expected.

Payoff hasn't come—yet.

Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler is a lawyer for some of those applicants who want Federal leases right now.

Ickes is taking their part, too.

Texas officials, especially Attorney General Price Daniel, do not believe the tidelands fight has been made in good faith by the Federal Government.

Daniel believes the people have been misled—misled not only on the merits of the controversy over oil between the Federal Government and the States, but have had a Supreme Court opinion slapped on the books that threatens the very theory of resistance to high dictatorial powers in this country.

He urges that Congress undo this injustice of the Supreme Court.

Daniel cites the double talk. First, the American people were told the tidelands should be made a naval reserve for national defense. Now, some of the same folks who talked like that want to hand out Federal oil leases on applications that have been used for speculative purposes.

"This naval reserve and national defense has been put up as a smoke screen," Daniel told Congress.

"I think that I can illustrate that best by recalling former Secretary Ickes' testimony," Daniel said at a hearing.

"He sat right here in this chair and told the committee that it was his idea that this property should be set aside for naval purposes.

"There is your smoke screen to get plenty of popular appeal behind their idea. That is for the purpose of getting it in the hands of the Federal Government.

"Then, before he left the stand, he [Ickes] told the committee what he really thought ought to be done with it after the Federal Government got hold of it under the pretense of naval reserves and national defense. He told the committee he thought the Mineral Leasing Act applies to all of these lands and criticized the solicitor of the Interior Department and Attorney General Clark for holding to the contrary.

"So he thinks the Mineral Leasing Act ought to apply to these lands.

"That would mean all this proposed naval reserve on the California coast would go out at 25 cents an acre to these 1,021 applicants who have their applications on file like Senator Wheeler's clients."

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 6, March 9)

(By Allen Duckworth)

There are those who insist that "Pappy" O'Daniel, of Texas, was able to contribute little during his term in the United States Senate.

That is not true. He coined a classic term:

"Legal looting."

The term was applied to the methods used to put across the "big grab"—the political conspiracy to saw off valuable seaward boundaries of the States of Texas, Louisiana, and California.

This fight is nearing a climax.

Texas is pleading for Congress to override a warped, politically tainted edict of the United States Supreme Court.

Texas has a selfish interest. Those submerged lands off its coasts are leased to oil prospectors. The school kids of Texas have a stake. Oil-lease revenue goes to the public-school fund.

There's more than a selfish interest.

Texas is trying to awaken other States to the menace.

If that strange philosophy spawned in the waters of bureaucracy is allowed to stand, the extension of Federal seizures could wipe out any horizon dividing the title to property. State control of waters, fish, piers, riverbeds, lakes, and all other submerged lands could be transferred to the Federal Government.

Under the Constitution, the Congress is the maker of laws. The Supreme Court interprets them—or is supposed to.

Now the Supreme Court, in the tidelands case, has started making laws. It has started breaking solemn agreements. And the President of the United States has aided and abetted.

Three times did Congress refuse to grant the Justice Department authority to proceed against the States to seize their oil-bearing tidelands. That was back in the thirties.

Texas was in there fighting from the start, although the original attack was against California because California took a lead in tapping undersea oil deposits.

After all, 53 past Supreme Court decisions had favored State control of offshore lands.

And, in the special case of Texas, the United States had agreed that Texas could keep all vacant lands "lying within its limits" when it joined the Union.

There must be a reason for the "big grab" plot. Jimmy Allred, while Governor of Texas, had an explanation. Said Allred:

"When lands become valuable somebody wants to get them."

Allred was a good New Dealer, but he couldn't digest the plot cooked up by the "big grab" chiefs headed by "Honest Harold" Ickes, the Secretary of the Interior.

Failing to get congressional action, the "big grab" crowd ignored Congress and turned to the courts, anyway.

But it is interesting to recall that while Franklin D. Roosevelt was alive, nothing was done about suing the States.

Roosevelt has been criticized severely for favoring super powers for the Federal Government. But he was a piker along that line when compared with President Truman.

Six weeks after President Roosevelt died the big grab really got going good.

The argument had been that oil drillers with California leases were trespassers.

Attorney General Francis Biddle filed a suit against the Pacific Western Oil Co. for trespass on 144 acres of productive tidelands off the coast of Santa Barbara County, Calif.

Now, as every citizen knows, when a suit is filed in Federal district court, each side has a chance to present evidence. The case can be appealed to a circuit court. And, if desired, it can be taken all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States.

While every citizen understands that simple judicial system, every citizen also knows there are cases in which certain parties do not want to hear evidence. Too, every citizen knows that the law isn't perfect and that a smart lawyer who looks close enough and long enough is likely to find a loophole—in his favor.

The States, alarmed by this lawsuit in California, pressed for Congress to clarify ownership of the tidelands; to say flatly that the Federal Government had no claim.

Law and precedent were on the side of the States, but you can cloud any title, no matter how good, with a lawsuit, no matter how weak.

Congressional sentiment leaned toward the States.

This didn't set well in the big grab circles. It became evident to them that they must put new goals in their strategy.

While Congress deliberated on the quitclaim legislation, a new Attorney General came to the Cabinet—Tom C. Clark, of Dallas, Tex.

Obviously, the congressional resolution would blow the district court trespass suit right into the bay.

There must be some way to go right to the Supreme Court, with no dilly-dallying with evidence and testimony.

The "big grab" found a path to the Supreme Court itself under article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which reads:

"In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. * * *"

That was a wonderful idea, as you shall see.

The Attorney General dismissed the district court trespass suit against the oil company.

A suit as an original action was filed in Supreme Court against California itself. Such procedure is rare.

Harold Ickes has taken full credit for the switch of the case from district court in California to the Supreme Court in Washington. Writing in his newspaper column, Man to Man, back in July 1947, Ickes said:

"I decided that the surest and quickest rout was a beeline to the Supreme Court itself."

After Roosevelt died, relates Ickes, Attorney General Biddle, with the blessing of President Harry S. Truman, filed the district court suit. That wasn't good enough for "Honest Harold."

"I had always urged the filing of an original suit in the Supreme Court," the Ickes story goes.

After Tom Clark replaced Biddle as Attorney General:

"I persuaded President Truman to instruct his Attorney General, Mr. Tom Clark, to dismiss the suit in the district court and file an original proceeding in the Supreme Court.

"Thus we were able to get a much quicker final decision than if the case had dragged its weary way from the district court to the circuit court of appeal and then to the Supreme Court."

Mark you well that this Supreme Court suit was filed while Congress had before it the quitclaim resolution in favor of the States.

Congress wasn't in as big a hurry as the "big grab" crowd.

Congress didn't do its job overnight. It held exhaustive hearings. It heard both sides, including Harold Ickes.

Congress passed the quitclaim resolution in 1946.

President Truman slapped a veto on the resolution.

The President's reason for a veto: The case was before the Supreme Court and "the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be interfered with while it is arriving at it decision. * * *"

When the "big grab" boys made the beeline to the Supreme Court while Congress was deliberating, it was all right.

When the Congress acted while the Supreme Court was deliberating, it was all wrong.

Or was it that there was a rather certain feeling that the Supreme Court would deliver the goods as per schedule?

Mr. Justice Black wrote an opinion June 23, 1947, saying that the Federal Government had first say on California's undersea oil lands.

Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter, in his dissent, registered judicial shock. As liberal as is Frankfurter's background, the Roosevelt appointee insisted that the Supreme Court was taking over a function of the Congress.

The "big grab" crowd had won its first round. It then cast hungry eyes at the school-kids' land in Texas.

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 7, March 10)

(By Allen Duckworth)

There was a bit of talk around Texas a few years ago about the actions of Attorney General Price Daniel.

Why, asked some, was the attorney general of Texas spending so much of his time worrying about a California lawsuit?

What difference did it make to Texas if the Federal Government confiscated California offshore oil lands?

After all, wasn't Texas secure? Didn't Texas have a special agreement with the Federal Government that gave it the right to keep all its unsold lands after joining the union?

Attorney General Daniel wasn't so sure the "big grab" crowd would respect that title.

Neither was Gov. Beauford Jester.

As things have panned out, Attorney General Daniel was as right as a fox with a crystal ball.

The "big grab" plotters in Washington were using the strategy of divide and conquer. They weren't going after all the States at once. First, they would pick off California, apparently the weak sister. Then they would use a Supreme Court opinion in the California case to slick Texas and Louisiana. And then, who knows?

Daniel helped California defend its lawsuit, because he was dead sure that the divide-and-conquer scheme would hit Texas eventually. He argued on behalf of the National Association of Attorneys General who appeared as amicus curiae ("friend of the court").

Aided by Governor Jester, Daniel tried to line up Nation-wide sentiment against this obvious creeping paralysis of super-Federal powers. Congress tried to help with a resolution that the States had full ownership, but President Truman slapped it down with a veto. The "big grab" was stretching for the critical gobble and wasn't to be trifled with.

Even while Daniel worked in the California case, efforts were made to lull him and Texans generally.

After arguing for the State attorneys general in the California case, Daniel got a friendly pat on the back from Attorney General Tom Clark, who had presented the Federal side. Said Clark:

"Well, you've had a nice trip up here, but that's all it amounts to. Texas is different from California and will never be sued. I have just handed the press a written statement to that effect."

Many a Texan read with relief that written statement by Texas-born Tom Clark. It was the lawsuit "involves only the area off the coast of California." In that statement prepared for Clark, the Justice Department said:

"When asked regarding his native State of Texas, the Attorney General—Clark—pointed out that Texas had been an independent nation, a Republic, for 10 years before joining the Union. As a Republic it owned all of the lands within its boundaries, including the marginal sea commonly called tidelands. This area similar to that involved in the California case extended into the Gulf of Mexico and was under the sovereignty of Texas all during the Republic and was retained by it under the provisions of the Act of Admission."

The Attorney General, Clark, stated quite plainly that Texas retained those lands.

It was convincing enough for many Texans.

(Months later, in a congressional hearing, Clark told Representative ED GOSSETT that "I still feel that Texas has special rights," but added that Texas could plead those "special defenses" in court.)

After following the "big grab" strategy under the direction of "Honest Harold" Ickes, Daniel knew pretty much what to expect.

When the California opinion by Mr. Justice Black was read, Daniel and Jester were more apprehensive than ever.

Lawyer Daniel and Lawyer Jester read the opinion more carefully than the average layman.

The language did far more than take control of thousands of acres of offshore lands in California.

An entirely new philosophy of government seemed to have been set up—not by revolution, nor by act of Congress, but by ukase of the Supreme Court.

Said Mr. Justice Black:

"The crucial question * * * is not merely who owns the bare legal title to the lands. * * * The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner. * * *"

Many a great lawyer gasped and reread those words.

"Bare legal title * * * mere property owner. * * *"

The opinion went on with talk about how the Federal Government had to protect the coast in time of war as an argument for owning the coastal lands.

It took only a reading of Mr. Justice Reed's dissent to realize how this opinion of the Court might be extended to other property.

Yes, admitted Reed, the United States had certain powers of protection over the coasts, just as it had over every "river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation."

Could Reed have been hinting at the possible projection to other property of this theory expressed by the majority?

Commented Governor Jester in a speech to the National Governors Conference: "It is the first decision within our knowledge holding that exercise of the Federal Government's responsibility to protect the shores and lands of this country can ripen into rights heretofore identified with ownership of such shores and lands."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter criticized the majority opinion in the California case by saying that the right of the Federal Government to regulate commerce and to wage wars and protect the country were being mixed with "rights of ownership."

The legal lightning struck Texas on December 21, 1948.

Note the date. President Truman had been down in Texas on his campaign tour.

"Texas is in a class by itself; it entered the Union by treaty," Truman said in a speech at Austin, September 20, 1948.

Certainly, thought thousands of Texans, the President would not allow a suit against Texas after that statement.

Texas gave Truman the largest majority of any Democratic State.

Sixty days after the election, the Federal suit was filed to confiscate Texas tidelands.

"It is the position of the United States," said Attorney General Clark's motion for leave to file suit against Texas, "that the rule there announced (in the California case) is equally applicable to the sea bed and subsoil of the Gulf of Mexico adjacent to Texas."

How about those special defenses Texas had?

They were brushed aside in a vague manner that even the Supreme Court itself has yet to explain in the quaint opinion that followed.

Texas was hustled in and out of court and stripped of her tidelands in short order—without being allowed to develop testimony in defenses of historic rights she had enjoyed for a hundred years. But that is another chapter in the story of the "big grab."

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 8, March 11)

(By Allen Duckworth)

Old Man Texas was hustled in and out of the Supreme Court of the United States.

When the bum's rush was over Old Man Texas found himself much poorer. The Court said he must give up 2,608,000 acres of land he had owned more than a century.

His experience in the long-range "big grab" scheme that was hatched in Washington is a warning to every State and every citizen of the dangerous possibilities in the Supreme Court's decision.

What happened to Old Man Texas in losing those 2,608,000 acres of off-shore oil lands could happen to inland States, he believes, if the theory of nationalization is extended.

Old Man Texas says to the other States who haven't been sued yet, to industries, and to all property owners:

"Pull up a chair and listen to me, pardner. You may be next."

One has only to look over at once Merry Ol' England, where nationalization of most everything the Government decides it wants "for public welfare" has progressed since the close of the last war to understand what Old Man Texas is talking about.

The submerged oil lands of California were first on the nationalization list over here. Then it was Texas and Louisiana.

What next? The shores of the Great Lakes of the Northern States? Seizure of rivers and creeks and lakes from inland States?

Basic industries from the hands of private owners?

Farfetched?

Old Man Texas merely quotes the exact words of Mr. Justice Hugo Black in the first tidelands-seizure opinion. Black used the phrases "bare title" and "mere property owner" in brushing aside the State's objections and allowing the Government to lay claim to the valuable oil lands just because the Government said it was necessary.

Incidentally no one in the Federal Government has proven yet that it can manage the oil lands better than the States. And the States have shown, up to now, that they can get more out of the big oil companies than can the Federal Government.

Projecting this theory expressed by the Supreme Court, the Federal Government could seize anything by merely saying it was necessary.

A shameful angle is the manner in which Old Man Texas was handled in court. Here is the record:

Old Man Texas was refused a district court trial.

Old Man Texas was refused the right to present evidence.

Old Man Texas wasn't allowed near as much time to prepare his defenses as was Uncle Sam, who had gone on a bureaucratic binge and was suing Old Man Texas.

Old Man Texas didn't even have the benefit of having a majority of the court ruling against him.

The treatment given Old Man Texas was pretty rough in the Supreme Court, from his viewpoint. But in the light of the whole history of the "big grab" it was consistent with the Federal strategy.

We already have shown, in previous stories of this series, how "Honest Harold" Ickes, as Secretary of the Interior, made the first reach of the "big grab." We have shown how he did a complete about face after stating flatly that it was a matter of "settled law" that the States owned their submerged lands. We have shown how President Truman refused to let Congress act in favor of the States.

After winning its Supreme Court lawsuit against California, the Federal prosecutors turned to Texas.

Unlike California, Texas had an iron-clad defense. The United States told Texas to keep its unsold lands when it joined the Union in return for payment of its public debts. Texas was the only State ever to do that. The agreement was in writing.

When the lawsuit was filed, the Texas attorney general, Price Daniel, said only Congress, not the Court, had the authority to act.

"Congress made the agreement and has recognized it for more than 100 years. This court should not permit the Attorney General to sue without permission of Congress," Daniel argued.

But, he added, if there was going to be a lawsuit, why not have a full one, so that evidence might be heard?

Those weren't Daniel's words. He put them in lawyer language for the court. But that's what it amounted to.

Daniel was asking for Texas only what the most humble citizen can demand and get.

Daniel wanted to try the case before a district court or a master assigned to hear evidence. He wanted a chance to present evidence of Texas' ownership and use of those lands. Then, if the Federal Government didn't like the verdict, it could appeal—clear up to the Supreme Court—if it desired.

Nope. Those Federal prosecutors didn't want any testimony—period.

So, the court ordered Texas to the bar. Texas couldn't prepare its brief in reply to Federal claims until it examined the Federal charges.

Daniel was forced to wait 77 days before the Federal brief was delivered to him.

Texas was given only 27 days to prepare, print, and file its brief.

The Federal Government raised points that would require Texas to restudy and revise its entire argument.

"A physically impossible task," the scrappy little Texas attorney general protested to the court, in vain.

Even time was used against Texas in that rush to grab the offshore oil lands—lands Texas had owned since winning its independence at San Jacinto.

Seventy-seven days for the prosecution.

Twenty-seven days for Texas.

Daniel and his assistants holed up in an Austin hotel room and worked days and nights against the deadline. Crews of printers labored overtime. When Daniel entrained last March for Washington, the ink wasn't dry on the hastily prepared and printed-brief copies. His own copy hadn't been found.

Philip B. Perlman, Solicitor General, presented the Federal case.

Perlman admitted that the annexation agreement gave Texas its public lands, but he insisted that the seaward lands were not lands in the same sense.

Asked Mr. Justice Minton, who later voted to uphold the Texas claim:

"Was it not land that was under the water? There was not anything else."

They gave Attorney General Price Daniel 2 hours to argue the Texas case that day in March last year. Defenses for common criminals usually last longer in plain county courtrooms. But that was all—2 hours—that the Supreme Court allowed Texas for argument over 2,500,000 acres of land whose oil lease incomes help educate the kids of Texas.

Three months later—last June—the famous minority opinion came in against Texas. There are nine members of the Court. Two did not participate in the Texas case. That left seven. Four of the seven voted against Texas, three voted for Texas.

The opinion, written by politically conscious Mr. Justice Douglas, admitted that Texas once owned those lands as a republic, but lost them somehow when she entered the Union.

Scoffed Mr. Justice Frankfurter in a classic dissent:

"The Court now decided that when Texas entered the Union she lost what she had and the United States acquired it.

"How that shift came to pass remains for me a puzzle."

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 9, March 12)

(By Allen Duckworth)

Twenty-four percent of all the land in the United States is owned by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government is reaching for more land and power.

Unless Congress stops the trend the individual States are threatened with an eventual draining of their power and wealth.

The new threat is part of the general scheme to whittle away powers of the States and invest the Federal Government with unlimited authority.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States point the way. This country has been nosed onto the road to nationalization.

Already possessing almost a quarter of all the Nation's continental lands, the Federal Government will confiscate an underwater territory as large as the New England States combined if Congress does not slap down the Court reasoning.

The Court has said the Federal Government can claim the submerged oil lands off the coasts of Texas, California, and Louisiana as a matter of national necessity.

Valuable though they are, those tidelands are pittance when compared to the other possibilities of nationalization.

Do the tidelands opinions really point toward a growing nationalization policy in Washington?

Some of the Nation's greatest legal authorities interpret the Supreme Court decisions that way.

They fear that the Court has pointed the way for greater grabs.

Next on the grab list, they fear, will be harbors, river beds, inland lakes and streams, and perhaps basic industries.

Already the States have been rocked by Supreme Court decisions clipping their powers on everything from conduct of elections to running their universities.

Now that the States' political powers have been weakened, the attack shifts to the States' finances.

Strip the States of both power and income, then the Federal Government will emerge supreme in everything.

The "divide and conquer" method has been used.

That was the strategy to prevent a general uproar throughout the country.

Few Americans were especially excited when the Federal Government won Supreme Court approval for confiscation of California's submerged oil lands. But that was only the beginning.

In spite of statements designed to lull Texas into a feeling of security about its own lands, Texas was next on the list. And Louisiana. The Supreme Court again stamped its O. K. for Federal confiscation in an opinion that disregarded both law and precedent. The Court wrote its own law to fit the occasion, thus stepping out of its judicial role and invading the province of Congress.

The Court's reasoning could be extended to ownership of the iron ore deposits under the Great Lakes, kelp (an iodine source) from the coastal States, copper and precious metals of the Western States, coal of the Eastern States.

"It can happen here," warns Robert Lee Bobbitt of San Antonio, former attorney general of Texas and chairman of the Texas State Bar Committee to fight the Supreme Court decision.

"If you have any doubt, then take a look at once proud and powerful old England. That once great empire stands socialized and paralyzed."

Gasped Senator TOM CONNALLY of Texas, after the Supreme Court decision last year:

"Is there no possible end or limit to arbitrary power?"

When the Federal Government extends ownership of lands it does more than acquire property.

The more property the Government owns, the fewer taxes the States can levy on lands and resources.

Reduce the tax dollar income of a State and it becomes less powerful as it becomes poorer. It must look to the central government for financial help. And with that financial help comes greater Federal powers over the States and their citizens.

The stakes in the big-grab scheme are tremendous.

Each year, Pennsylvania scoops from 500,000 to 1,500,000 tons of coal from river beds.

Delaware has 50,000 acres of oyster beds, leased out by the State government for revenues.

While the suits against Texas, California, and Louisiana involved tidelands oil, it must be remembered that the Federal Government claims all tidelands—not merely those containing oil.

Only 15 miles of the California coast is producing oil, but the Federal Government is fighting to obtain control over the other 1,185 miles.

Long Beach, Calif., is a classic example of what other harbor cities, such as Boston, Mass., are threatened with. More than 20 square miles, or 37 percent, of the entire area of Long Beach is tidelands. They include the public harbor, the beach, the amusements zone, the municipal auditorium. Public and private investment on these lands is estimated at more than $200,000,000 by Board of Harbor Commissioners.

Maine has more of its tidelands under kelp leases than Texas has under oil leases.

Florida, with the longest coastline, receives far more money from the use of its tidelands resources of fish, shell sand, hotel and pier sites than Texas does from tidelands oil.

"Government will be further removed from the people, instead of being brought closer to them, if fishing, cultivating oysters, building docks and ports, removing seaweed, oyster and coquina shell, digging oil wells and engaging in all other activities in the marginal sea are controlled by bureaus in Washington," observed the University of Florida Law Review. "Yet the decision leads to precisely this."

Equally alarmed was the Marquette Law Review.

The Supreme Court's tidelands decision language was so broad that "it could be held to apply to other State-owned property, if not to private property," said the Marquette Review.

"Carried to its logical conclusion, this doctrine of national ownership could be applied to almost any kind of property—State or privately owned. * * *

"The steady whittling away of the rights of the States is a cause for concern of everyone."

Aside from certain Federal officials, including President Truman, whose philosophy supports greater powers for the Washington Government, the big grab campaign has been encouraged by those who hope to profit from Federal leases if they can upset State titles.

Resolutions are pending in Congress that would repudiate the Supreme Court decisions against the States.

Such legislation will have to hurdle the White House.

Although Congress, in 1948, passed a resolution by overwhelming vote to give the States undisputed title, President Truman slapped on a veto. His excuse was that the matter was pending in court and Congress should not interfere while the court was deliberating.

Truman probably will veto the new resolution if Congress passes it.

He'll have to think up a new excuse this time.

And there is a good chance that States can muster the votes to veto his veto.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which is one of a series published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—"Beautifully engraved invitations to the poorhouse."

That's how Chairman Harry A. McDonald, of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, describes the gold, silver, uranium, cobalt, and oil stock promotions carried on by mail and telephone from here into the United States.

Although illegal in the United States, these promotions which extract an estimated $52,000,000 a year from American suckers are legalized by the provincial government of Ontario.

Yet, every Toronto mail order promotion which the SEC and the United States Post Office have investigated has been found to be promoted by fraud.

Investigations show, said SEC Chairman McDonald, that the frauds of the mail-order promoters "are particularly vicious in character, that their operations are continuous, and that these operations are conducted more or less exclusively from Toronto."

The buccaneers of Bay Street, Toronto's Wall Street, conduct their raids on American investment capital from suites in downtown office buildings.

From outside appearances, the suites look like staid brokerage offices, but the description of them here is "boiler rooms," because of the high-pressure methods used to sell stock.

I saw them going full blast.

The Bay Street boiler rooms are literally small factories. They mail out millions of pieces of literature, telling United States suckers in glowing terms how to make easy money in mines and wells at the "development stage."

This "development stage" can range anywhere from a lease on a quarter section of moose pasture in the wilds of western Canada to an abandoned mine that hasn't produced for years in northern Ontario.

I saw mimeographed letters and expensively printed and illustrated pamphlets, folders, and brochures filled with glorious promises of wealth, being folded, sealed into envelopes and mailed to potential suckers in St. Louis, Kansas City, Topeka, Des Moines, and other cities by the thousands.

Each form letter advised the addressee—whose name had been copied from sucker lists furnished by a firm in Chicago—that he had been selected to participate in an unparalleled, unusual, or historical opportunity to make money.

The folding, the sealing, and the mailing are done by teams of bored-looking women. They sit at improvised tables in the back room of the boiler-room suite and stuff the come-on literature into envelopes on a production-line basis.

Most of these women are immigrants to Canada from England, Scotland, and Ireland, who have come here in response to this country's drive to expand its 14,000,000 population and build up its industry.

I talked to several of them. They told me they became disgusted with their work as soon as they figured out what the boss was doing. But they are hanging on until they can find productive work that pays as well, or nearly as well, they told me.

The broker-dealers and underwriters pay their employees well, I was told. Salesmen who remote over long-distance telephones for hours at a time to sell the suckers in the States receive from 15 to 20 percent of their gross sales.

After dark the lights keep burning in the promoters' offices. The electric lighting isn't good in most of Toronto because of a Province-wide power shortage, and you are constantly reminded to turn out the lights when you leave.

The lighting flickers at times—so badly you can hardly see well enough to read. But by night fall the mailing operation is finished.

Under the flickering bulbs salesmen with their feet upon their desks and their hats pushed back on their heads like characters out of Hollywood production, squint at the cards listing suckers they are to call and feed the long-distance operators two or three numbers at a time, in case some don't answer.

I saw them working over the telephone in groups of four to six, each talking to a different prospect in an American city, perspiring a little under their hatbands with the effort to sound convincing.

The babble of voices coaxing, declaiming, and even warning would rise and fall, punctuated by sharp, metallic clicks of the receiver as some the salesmen would hang up and dial long distance again for other numbers.

Most of the salesmen seemed to keep their calls to 4 minutes, although they would exceed that limit if an extra minute or two was needed to hook the sucker. With commissions dangling in front of them, they worked hard.

The long-distance telephoning begins at 6 p. m. eastern standard time, which is also Toronto time, when Americans on the eastern seaboard and as far west as Indiana are sitting down to dinner. The salesmen want to be sure to catch them at home.

At 7 p. m. the telephoning begins to swing into the States on central standard time—Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin. Then the calls begin going into Chicago and St. Louis.

I overheard one salesman making his pitch to a woman in Michigan. The victim must have been a housewife, because I heard him saying:

"I'm sure your husband would approve * * * an opportunity to get in at the beginning * * * that's where the money is going to be made * * * in the western Canadian oils."

He babbled on about a pipeline somebody was going to build, how some of the "big boys" were poking around, interested, how the stock was rising on the market, how he could hold a block of stock at the special bargain price until midnight tomorrow night.

At 8 p. m. the telephone barrage descended into the Mountain States. I heard a fat, anxious salesman trying to get through to Denver. He was pleading with the operator as though it were a matter of life or death. As he pleaded and argued, perspiration ran down his beefy, red face in rivulets and he kept wiping it away with his pudgy hands.

At 9 p. m. the Toronto telephone rings the bells on the west coast. In the Los Angeles area, I was told, "prospects" respond more readily than in any other section of the United States.

"They are more speculative minded," a salesman remarked.

There are approximately 55 big boiler rooms in Toronto, and many small ones. Officially, the total is 113.

And there are nearly 300 salesmen. I was told a good stock salesman can make as much as $20,000 a year, working 6 hours a day, 6 days a week. Most of them don't work on Sunday. They figure Americans don't like to gamble on Sunday.

In every instance the stock promoted over the telephone was being peddled illegally in the United States.

In every instance it represented nothing more than the promoters' promise.

In no instance could it be sold or traded by anyone hypnotized into buying it. There is no market for it and there never was.

Yet, this is the type of promotion which is not only tolerated by the Ontario Securities Commission as long as it is fired to persons outside the borders of Ontario, but accepted by the Broker-Dealers' Association, the promoters' official club.

I asked W. M. Wismer, executive secretary of the association and a former counsel for the Commission, why licensed broker-dealers in Ontario are permitted to violate the laws of their good neighbor to the south.

He said the law violations were only technical, the SEC does not understand the speculative nature of Canadian petroleum and mining development, he said.

Neither he nor any official of the Securities Commission was able to show me a single instance of where a current boiler-room stock promotion had paid a dividend, or ever would.

Old Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following. Mr. James Patrick McGovern compiled the Poems of World War II, which was published by the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, Department of Maryland, the American Legion, in April 1945. Included in this publication was the following poem entitled "Valor of the Celt," which is most appropriate in observance of St. Patrick's Day on March 17, and which poem is dedicated to the fighting spirit of the Irish:

VALOR OF THE CELT

What mean the neutral mandates of today
As long as Irish hearts, not laws, hold sway?
Two thousand years ago the Celts were bold
To prove their valor, never since grown cold;
For centuries their sons have heard drums roll
Abroad and home, and won the hero's scroll.

Who can recount each deed, recall each name,
Enrolling Irish warriors in halls of fame?
Their spirit on every front has never ceased
To be among the Allies a buoyant yeast.
The race itself stands now with vision clear
An international and stalwart peer.

No mortal power can cloud fair Ireland's brow;
As her men always fought, so they fight now;
They fill the foremost ranks where danger lies,
Spurred by the valorous will which death defies,
Impelled by native love for soil that's free,
Dauntless wherever they meet with tyranny.

For many flags, by land, in sky, on sea,
The Celtic race fulfills its destiny;
A hundred ships of war slip down the ways,
Each christened in an Irish martyr's praise;
And untold shrines in foreign, distant parts
Will keep Old Erin warm within true hearts.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

You and the $71,600,000,000 Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial entitled "You and the $71,600,000,000 Budget," which appeared in the March 1951 issue of the Virginia Farm Bureau News:

YOU AND THE $71,600,000,000 BUDGET

The chances are that few of us have any very clear conception of just what the President's $71,600,000,000 budget means to us in terms of the actual cash which will be extracted from our pockets through Federal taxation.

To Dr. William H. Stauffer, director of research for the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, we are indebted for some eye-opening figures on this subject.

For example it has been estimated that Virginia's share of the $71,600,000,000 budget will be $1,103,000,000. If this amount were divided equally among all Virginia citizens each would be required to pay $33.36. For a family of four the amount would be $1,339. The share for each employed person would be $861.

Actually, of course, such payments are not made in equal amounts since a large proportion of the Federal budget is collected directly from individuals and corporations. In the final analysis, however, the average individual does pay either directly or indirectly very close to his proportionate share of the tax burden. A few individuals with high incomes are very heavily taxed, of course, but the total take from these is relatively small. Beyond a certain point corporations must necessarily pass on to their customers any increase in taxes levied against them or else face bankruptcy. Thus they merely become tax collection agencies.

All of which means that in one form or another, Mr. John Q. Average will pay very close to $861 each year in Federal taxes whether he realizes it or not, that is, if we are not to continue to inflate the currency with deficit financing.

The only real way to reduce the $861 figure is to squeeze some of the fat out of the $71,600,000,000 budget.

This will not be done, however, unless taxpayers insist that all items not strictly related to national defense be reduced to a minimum if not eliminated altogether.

As we go about this job of reducing and eliminating nondefense expenditures, we should bear in mind that the task will be tough—there are always those who can and will present arguments that every public project is essential to national defense, even though the job involved might be taking the blood pressure of grasshoppers in Timbuctu.

We ourselves must insist that Congress separate the wheat from the chaff, or else be prepared to pay our proportionate share of the bloated $71,600,000,000 budget. If the job isn't done we should blame neither the President nor the Congress but ourselves.

THE PRICE OF MEAT

There's an opinion abroad (and regrettably it has been fostered by some Government agencies) that meat is high. But viewed from the standpoint of the percentage of his disposable income which the average consumer spends for meat, the argument falls completely apart. On the basis of United States Department of Agriculture figures, meat took only 5.5 percent of total disposable consumer income last year as compared with 6.6 percent in 1913.

Stating it another way, the price of meat or any other commodity will maintain about the same ratio to income year in and year out, in good times or bad, as long as the economy is free. It is only when a managed economy comes along that the balance is apt to be upset. A perfect example of this situation is a floating dock on the edge of a lake, which rises and falls with the level of the water. Prices float in much the same way on purchasing power, and while they may bob up and down a little under the influence of temporary fluctuations in supply and demand, they'll neither sink to the bottom nor rise out of the water and fly as long as nature's economic laws remain in effect. If we could ever get that lesson across to our self-appointed would-be managers and caretakers in Washington, we'd all be better off, for the Nation could look forward to a truly balanced and stable economy, and not a rigidly frozen one.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, which is one of a series published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—This Canadian financial capital on the shores of Lake Ontario is headquarters for one of the biggest stock frauds in the world today—perhaps the biggest.

Main target of this gigantic swindle is the United States. Toronto promoters are extracting more than $1,000,000 a week by their own estimate from gullible Americans—more than $52,000,000 a year.

In the St. Louis area alone, according to estimates by the better business bureau, the take by Toronto swindlers is more than $15,000 a month—more than $180,000 a year.

The racket here consists of promoting gigantic stock lotteries which offer Americans chances—in the form of stock at 20 to 30 cents a share—on finding gold, silver, cobalt, tantalum, uranium, and oil in the moose pastures of Canada.

Such stock is sold in St. Louis and other major American cities through millions of pieces of mail and thousands of long-distance telephone calls from coast to coast.

The United States Securities and Exchange Commission has found that all the Toronto mail-order promotions it has examined are promoted by fraud and violate United States securities laws. But they are tolerated by the standards of the Province of Ontario. This makes it impossible to stop them, although both the Canadian and United States post offices have tried.

Years of investigations by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and postal authorities show that Americans who invest in the mail-order gold mine and oil promotions are simply giving their money away.

To explore the operation of these promotions, I went to Toronto with William C. Rosenbaum, of the St. Louis Better Business Bureau.

Rosenbaum, who is head of the bureau's investors' department, is a former United States postal inspector. He was one of the post-office investigators who broke up the notorious Fort Worth oil swindles in the 1920's.

This is what we found:

1. The mail-order stock lotteries are a multi-million-dollar business. They operate on the fringe of legitimate Canadian oil and mineral development. They are powerfully entrenched in Toronto.

2. While the mail order promoters offer Americans "rich opportunities" to make money, investigation here shows that the only one who profits is the promoter. Most of the mining he does is in the sucker's wallet.

3. The promoter sells stock he takes down (buys) from the treasury of the mining or oil enterprise at 5, 10, or 15 cents a share to American suckers, at 20, 30, or 45 cents a share. This permits him to keep two-thirds of the "take" for "promotional expense."

4. The one-third remitted to the treasury of the enterprise is not enough to bring the mine or well into production on the initial capitalization.

5. If the promotion turns out to be a dry hole, the promotor can quit with his 200 to 400 percent profits on stock sales. This leaves the sucker who bought the stock on get-rich-quick promises holding the bag.

6. If the promoter strikes oil or finds gold, he shuffles the sucker out of the deal by recapitalizing. This reduces the value of the stock the sucker has purchased, sometimes to the vanishing point. In one instance, a series of recapitalizations in a gold mine cut shareholders from 1,000 to 15 shares of stock within a few years.

7. The leeway given promoters by securities law enforcement here has made Toronto a haven for confidence men and fugitives from United States justice.

8. One of the big promoters here is Albert Edward DePalma, a one-time St. Louis waiter and necktie salesman, who came here and got rich selling stock in gold and tantalum promotions. DePalma fled New York State 3 years ago to avoid prosecution on mail-fraud indictments in Cleveland. He is still promoting his gold and tantalum mines, and has added an oil well to the list.

9. The only place in Canada or the United States where the Toronto promoters dare not peddle stock by high pressure mail and telephone tactics is within the Province of Ontario—which licenses them. But Ontario rarely interferes with the promoters as long as they sell outside the Province.

10. The mail order promotions are tolerated here officially despite the fact that more than 700 citations have been issued by United States authorities against the promoters for selling securities in the United States against United States laws.

Sixty of them are charged by the United States Post Office with promoting by fraud or under fictitious names. Another 53 have been ordered to cease and desist stock promotions in a dozen States.

But the promotions go on. Ontario securities authorities told Rosenbaum and me they cannot enforce the securities laws of "other jurisdictions." They said also the United States fraud orders were based on "technical violations" and "prejudice."

These fraud orders—designed to prevent sucker mail from reaching the promoters from the United States—are issued by United States Post Office trial examiners in Philadelphia and Washington, on the basis of thorough investigation.

Nevertheless, the Ontario Securities Commission does not recognize them, although it makes little independent investigation of its own into the promoters' get-rich-quick claims.

For this reason, Ontario authorities do not interfere when promoters dodge the postal fraud orders by changing names, addresses, or both, two or three times a year.

Despite the vigilance, the United States Post Office cannot move fast enough to keep up with the evasive tactics of the promoters.

The result is that a good deal of sucker-response mail—some of it containing millions of dollars in payment for phony stock—gets through the postal barrier and cascades onto the promoters' desks.

Mail which is halted at the border is stamped with a fraud notice in big red letters and returned to the sender.

Promoters here complained bitterly about this to Rosenbaum and me. They said it was interfering with "Canadian enterprise." And they are backed up in their complaints by their own securities commissioners.

The United States Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office also attempt to curb the racket by obtaining secret indictments against some promoters. The indictments are held in abeyance until the promoters cross the border into the United States.

Somehow, the promoters either learn or suspect they are under indictment. They stay out of the United States. Instead of taking their customary vacations in Florida, they are going to Europe this year.

United States authorities cannot touch swindlers in Canada because the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Canada does not cover stock fraud.

Efforts to include this as an extraditable offense have been made by Congress since 1942, but the Ottawa Parliament has consistently rejected the amendment, partly because of powerful political pressure exerted by organized promoters from here.

When the Canadian Post Office withdrew the use of the mails from 27 persons and firms on suspicion of stock fraud last spring the howl that went up in Ottawa shook the Government.

After 3 months, mailing privileges were restored—and the promoters went right on with their stock-selling schemes.

In Canada, other provinces are having the same trouble with the Ontario swindlers as the United States, but are powerless to intervene because Canada has no dominion-wide securities law.

Not only the United States Government, but the securities departments of the States have attempted to bar these promotions, without much success. In the last 2 years, such States as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Nebraska, and California have attempted to halt mail order stock sales from here by injunction or cease and desist orders.

The results have been poor. Canadians have found to their intense delight that Americans like to gamble.

"I am the first to admit," said W. M. Wismer, secretary of the Broker-Dealers' Association in which most of the promoters are members, "that Americans are bigger gamblers and speculators than Canadians."

He told Rosenbaum and me that as long as Americans like to wager their money on horse races, Canada might as well take a cut. He and other members of the association admitted that the Toronto stock promotions are in competition for United States sucker money with American bookmakers and gamblers.

Of the approximately 175 promoters here, at least 115 are selling stock in the United States in violation of the United States law.

Even Canadians, like one member of the Ontario legislature, have charged that securities law enforcement here is so lax that a bell hop one day became a broker-dealer the next. Rosenbaum and I ran into an ex-piano salesman who is regarded as one of the "hottest" stock salesmen in town.

We found, too, that this whole noisy racket causes a great deal of anguish to brokers who are members of the Toronto Stock Exchange and to legitimate securities dealers who don't peddle stock through the mails.

But they do not bring much pressure to bear to clean up Bay Street—the Wall Street of Canada—where many of the boiler-room promoters have fancy offices.

We found that Toronto is an oasis of fraud on the North American continent.

For this reason, the Toronto swindlers can sit in their offices, grind out millions of pieces of misleading come-on promotion, raid the United States and other provinces for sucker money and laugh at the laws of the United States.

Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, H. R. 2988, Eighty-second Congress, as reported March 6, 1951:

QUESTION AND ANSWERS

GENERAL

1. Question. What is the purpose of this bill?

Answer. This bill is designed to assure that housing and community facilities and services required to support national defense activities will be provided when and where needed. The bill is directly related to, and represents an essential part of, the defense mobilization program. It derives from the hard experience in the defense and war period of World War II that (a) in many areas, defense production cannot proceed until the additional workers required to run the production lines can be brought in from other areas, and (b) the needed additional defense workers cannot be brought into the defense area and kept there on essential defense production work unless adequate housing and community facilities and services are available for them. The failure to recognize clearly those essential facts and to make adequate provisions for meeting those needs effectively resulted in serious and crippling delays in the production of many defense items during the early part of the defense and war period of World War II.

2. Question. What are community facilities and services under the bill?

Answer. Community facilities are defined in the bill as those facilities necessary for carrying on community living including primarily water works, sewers, sewage, garbage, and refuse disposal facilities, police and fire protection facilities, public sanitary facilities, works for treatment and purification of water, schools, libraries, hospitals, and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, streets and roads, and day-care centers.

"Community services" are services necessary for carrying on community living, including maintenance and operation of community facilities.

These are in general the facilities and services which were furnished under the Lanham Act during World War II as "defense public works."

3. Question. Why are additional housing and community facilities and services needed for national defense?

Answer. The bill contemplates the use of existing facilities, wherever possible, to meet defense needs. However, it is clear that the needs of the defense production program cannot be met solely by converting and reactivating existing plants. There must be recourse to new plant construction and expansion. This is made necessary because our total capacity for the production of certain basic materials falls short of our defense needs, because it is not physically possible to produce certain new types of military equipment and weapons in existing plants, and because no existing plant capacity is adequate to meet such needs as those of the Atomic Energy Commission which must provide new installations in relatively isolated areas. The construction and operation of new plants, as well as the expansion of old plants, normally requires workers to be brought into the area. In order to attract workers to such areas and to avoid labor turnover, it is essential to provide housing for them and their families and to provide the community facilities and services necessary for community living. Of course, utilities and other community facilities are also necessary for the operation of the plant itself.

Because of the continuing housing shortage resulting from general increases in population and other factors, in almost no area will there be sufficient housing to accommodate a sudden influx of defense workers. Similarly, there is generally a shortage of utilities and other facilities necessary to serve even the existing housing and other local needs.

4. Question. What are the major provisions of this bill?

Answer. The bill provides for:

(a) liberalized FHA mortgage insurance to stimulate private production of housing required for in-migrant defense workers;

(b) authority for the Federal Government to provide housing directly in those cases where private enterprise cannot meet defense-caused housing needs;

(c) authority for the Federal Government to assist localities in providing community facilities and services required in connection with defense activities, and, in cases where a local community cannot supply essential facilities even with such assistance, to directly provide such facilities and services;

(d) authority for the Federal Government to acquire land at certain isolated defense installations, to prepare general plans for the development of the land for needed housing and community facilities, to provide site improvements, and to dispose of the land to private purchasers for the development in accordance with such plans, and to local agencies for public use;

(e) authority for the Federal Government to make loans to maintain the existing productive capacity of the prefabricated housing industry needed for defense; and

(f) certain amendments to existing legislation to gear it to defense needs.

5. Question. Why is this additional legislative authority necessary?

Answer. The legislative authority contained in this bill is necessary for the following reasons:

(a) Existing aids to private enterprise for the production of housing in defense areas are not sufficiently liberal to stimulate private enterprise to furnish the maximum amount of housing needed because of the impact of defense activities, and such aids are not designed to best meet the needs of in-migrant defense workers;

(b) There is no existing authority for the Federal Government to provide defense housing in cases where such housing cannot be provided by private enterprise;

(c) There is no existing legislation adequate for assisting local communities in the provision of, or for providing, community facilities and services required because of the impact of defense activities;

(d) There is no existing authority for the Federal Government to purchase land at isolated defense installations for the purpose of disposing of it to private owners for development of housing and commercial facilities in accordance with general plans for the area and to local agencies for public use; and

(e) Existing loan authorizations are insufficient for the purpose of loans to maintain the industrial capacity of prefabricated housing manufacturers in this defense period.

6. Question. Why can't community facilities and services needed in connection with defense be furnished by the localities without Federal assistance?

Answer. In many cases, especially in relatively isolated areas, it would be legally impossible, because of constitutional and statutory debt limitations, for local governments to bear the entire burden of furnishing community facilities and services required by the sudden impact of defense activities in the area. Even if legally possible, it would impose an unfair share of the expense of our mobilization program on a disproportionate number of municipalities and people. The ability of municipalities to furnish additional community facilities and services is especially limited at the present time because of recent heavy increases in municipal expenditures for such facilities and services. The unprecedented increase in urban population and the unprecedented housing boom since the war have placed a corresponding burden on all community facilities and services. To this has been added the backlog of public construction postponed during World War II because of the shortage of materials. The concentration of this construction within the postwar period, as against existing statutory and constitutional debt limitations, has greatly reduced the borrowing authority of many cities. Even existing needs for facilities and services are being met with difficulty.

7. Question. Wouldn't the relaxation of credit controls be sufficient to stimulate the provision of defense housing by private industry?

Answer. Even with the relaxation of credit controls, the existing conventional financing of housing and the existing programs of Federal mortgage insurance would not be liberal enough to stimulate private industry to supply the needs for housing in defense areas. Residential mortgage insurance aids are not geared to defense-area needs and risks. The requirement of economic soundness in the regular mortgage-insurance program cannot be met in many instances in defense areas with respect to location and long-term marketability. Also the existing law is inadequate to assure that the housing will best meet defense needs. The mortgage-insurance program for this housing must be carried out in accordance with programing operations coordinated with the mobilization program as provided in the bill. Unlike existing authority, the provisions of the bill would permit one- and two-family structures, for example, to be programed for rent and required to be held for rental. This is essential to providing the type of house needed by immigrant defense workers and their families.

Existing legislation is also inadequate because it makes no provision for the construction of temporary housing in areas where the need is clearly temporary.

Existing legislation is entirely inadequate for the provision of any housing which private enterprise cannot be encouraged to provide even with liberal mortgage-insurance

assistance. In some areas it will be quite clear that the need will continue only during a short period. It may be necessary to bring workers into other areas on such a large scale and within such a limited time that operative builders, although otherwise able to build, cannot do so within the time required. In such cases it is essential to the mobilization program that the Federal Government provide the housing as authorized in the bill.

8. Question. Why haven't credit controls already been relaxed in areas of defense-housing shortage?

Answer. Credit controls are now in process of being relaxed in such areas. Credit controls have already been relaxed on a selective and controlled basis at the Atomic Energy Commission installations in the Savannah River area and at Paducah, Ky. Similar action will be taken shortly in connection with other defense installations. The extent of the need for housing at most defense installations and the extent of the need for relaxation of credit restrictions is only now becoming sufficient for proper identification and measurement. It is important to avoid indiscriminate and unplanned relaxation of credit controls, as such relaxation must be accomplished in a manner which will best meet the needs of essential in-migrant defense workers.

9. Question. Why can't defense housing needs be met through FHA-insured military (Wherry Act) housing?

Answer. FHA mortgage insurance under the so-called Wherry Act is limited to housing for military and civilian personnel at permanent military installations. It could not be used for housing to serve personnel at temporary military installations or personnel of defense plants or other nonmilitary defense installations.

10. Question. Why is federally owned housing built during World War II inadequate to meet new defense needs?

Answer. Most of this housing is already occupied by veterans, military personnel, and defense workers, and vacancies occurring in defense areas are already being used for defense workers. Monthly turn-over is less than 3 percent and, accordingly, few units can, as a practical matter, be made available for defense workers. Also, the location of this existing housing is based on World War II defense requirements which will obviously differ from the pattern of new defense needs.

11. Question. Does the bill contemplate the establishment of new agencies for its administration?

Answer. No. Existing agencies would be utilized for the program contemplated by the bill.

12. Question. How would defense housing areas be determined and housing programed for those areas?

Answer. Based on defense program information as to production plans, manpower requirements, and available accommodations, the President would decide whether a shortage of housing exists or impends in the area which impedes or threatens to impede defense activities. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator would determine, on the basis of surveys, the number of units to be eligible for the special mortgage insurance authorized under this bill, as well as the types of housing needed, the rent levels to be served, etc. Any federally provided housing would be limited, after consultation with housing industry representatives, to that which could not be built by private enterprise.

13. Question. Would the bill grant any power to the Government not previously granted?

Answer. No; except for the authority in title III to purchase and sell land in isolated areas for the development of needed housing and commercial facilities by private enterprise. The private housing aids are similar to, though less broad and liberal than, the title VI mortgage insurance program of World War II. The authority in title II with respect to the provision of housing and aids for, and the provision of, community facilities and services, where necessary for defense purposes, are similar to those contained in the Lanham Act of World War II.

14. Question. Is this bill socialistic?

Answer. No. The fundamental principle of the bill is that necessary defense housing and community facilities shall be provided by private enterprise and local communities to the fullest extent possible, and the Government is permitted to provide them only as a last resort. The bill undertakes, in fact, to help private enterprise and local governments to do more of the job than they could otherwise do in order to hold Government action or operations to a minimum. Any federally owned housing under the bill would have to be disposed of to private owners, with preference to occupants and veterans, as soon as feasible consistent with defense requirements.

15. Question. Who supported this bill?

Answer. In addition to various Federal agencies, including the Director of Office of Defense Mobilization (Hon. Charles E. Wilson), the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission, those presenting testimony or submitting statements in support of the bill were: Hon. PAUL BROWN, Hon. CLINTON D. MCKINNON, Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, Hon. JOHN J. RILEY, Hon. LEROY JOHNSON, Hon. HUGH MITCHELL, Members of Congress; Mortgage Bankers Association of America; National Savings & Loan League; American Municipal Association; City Manager, Norfolk, Va.; Mayor of Wilmington, N. C.; Mayor of Gary, Ind.; American Federation of Labor; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Americans for Democratic Action; National Association of Housing Officials; National Housing Conference; National Conference of Catholic Charities; American Association of Social Workers; American Institute of Architects; Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

16. Question. Who opposed this bill?

Answer. Three organizations presented testimony or submitted statements contending that—

1. The Congress should postpone action on the bill until specific and immediate needs have been demonstrated.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America: The bill "should be laid aside until a definite need for it develops. * * * legislation could be passed quickly should a clear need for it become apparent."

National Retail Lumber Dealers Association: "Authorization of such a program before any specific need has been demonstrated would be unsound. * * * No supplemental legislation for private defense housing and community facilities is necessary at this time."

2. Defense housing and community facility needs can be met by existing legislation, or with a few simple amendments to existing law.

National Association of Real Estate Boards: "The National Association of Real Estate Boards is not here in opposition to purposes for which the bill is intended. We will prove that this legislation is not needed because most of its provisions are already incorporated in existing law."

TITLE I. MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR DEFENSE HOUSING

1. Question. What is the purpose of this title?

Answer. It is the purpose of the title to encourage private enterprise to furnish as much of the needed defense housing as possible. It stresses assistance to rental housing, since that is the type most needed by workers coming into defense areas.

2. Question. What does this title provide?

Answer. It adds a new title IX to the National Housing Act to make special FHA mortgage insurance aids available to private industry for the production of housing needed in defense areas. The special insurance aids would be available only in areas or localities in which the President finds that a shortage of housing exists or impends which impedes or threatens to impede national defense activities. One- or two-family homes, as well as multifamily rental housing would be eligible for the special FHA mortgage insurance aids and the housing would be required to be made available for persons engaged in defense activities.

3. Question. How would this help to supply defense housing needs?

Answer. The new defense-housing insurance program would be more liberal than the existing permanent peacetime aids supplied through the FHA. Under the proposed new program, mortgages may be insured if the property is an acceptable risk in view of the needs of national defense. This would permit the FHA to underwrite projects in defense areas which might not meet the criteria of economic soundness, especially as to location and long-range continued marketability, which are required by FHA under its regular programs. This departure will permit FHA mortgage insurance on housing where there may be some question as to whether the housing will be marketable when the emergency or defense need is terminated. In addition, the FHA would be authorized to insure mortgage loans on more liberal terms. It would permit mortgage loans having a higher ratio of loan to value and longer maturities, thereby permitting lower down payments and lower monthly financing charges.

4. Question. What means are provided to assure that the housing will be used to best meet defense needs?

Answer. The mortgage insurance provided by the new title would be available only for property located in areas where the President has found that a shortage of housing impedes or threatens to impede national defense activities. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, with the approval of the President, would program the number of houses in such localities which could be financed with the aid of these special insurance provisions. The FHA would have power to require properties covered by mortgages insured under the new title to be held for rental to defense workers or military personnel.

5. Question. Is mortgage insurance under this title consistent with anti-inflationary restrictions already imposed on housing?

Answer. Yes. The purpose of housing-credit controls is to curb inflation and conserve materials for national defense purposes. The use of material for housing provided under this bill would, of course, be used for national defense purposes. The credit controls are designed to reduce the volume of housing construction from the 1,400,000 homes started in 1950 to about 800,000 to 850,000 for 1951. Out of this total of 800,000 to 850,000 housing units to be started in 1951 there will come whatever housing is required to be channeled specifically for military personnel and defense workers. This bill assists the provision of defense housing on a controlled and selective basis, but does not provide for an increase in the total volume of housing.

6. Question. What kind of housing would be built under this title?

Answer. Two general types: one- and two-family units, and multifamily rental housing. The one- and two-family housing would be designed and constructed for ultimate sale but would be required to be held for rent for persons engaged in defense activities for such periods of time as may be necessary.

7. Question. What rental ranges can be expected under this title?

Answer. Except in high-cost areas, it is estimated that maximum rents for one- and two-family houses will range from $75 to $93 a month, for two-, three-, and four-bedroom houses, and from $77 to $89 in the case of multiunit housing. Rents could be lower where construction costs permit.

8. Question. Why does this title stress rental housing?

Answer. Because it is felt that persons coming into communities to work in defense plants initially desire to rent rather than purchase a home, since they are uncertain as to how long they may remain in the locality.

9. Question. What will happen to the housing assisted under this title after defense needs are over?

Answer. Requirements that one- and two-family houses must be held for rental to defense workers will be relaxed as defense needs lessen and the housing will be rented or sold in the regular market. The multiunit housing will continue as privately owned and operated rental housing.

10. Question. Are there cost or mortgage limits on housing under this title? Is any provision made for high-cost areas?

Answer. The mortgage limit on one- and two-family units is $8,100 (but not more than 90 percent of appraised value) for a single-family resident and $15,000 for a two-family residence, except that in a high-cost area the $8,100 may be increased to $9,000 and the $15,000 may be raised to $16,000. In addition, the mortgage limit may be increased by the FHA by $900 for a third bedroom and another $900 for a fourth bedroom. In the case of multiunit residences, the maximum mortgage amount is $8,100 per family unit, or $7,200 if the unit contains less than four bedrooms.

11. Question. Would the proposed new title IX have the same inflationary effect that was attributed to the old title VI during and after World War II?

Answer. While the proposed new title IX (which would be added to the National Housing Act by title I of this act) uses the same general approach as the old title VI, it is deliberately designed to avoid the inflationary tendency of title VI. Under the latter, mortgages were based on "necessary current cost," so that they automatically increased when costs rose, thus tending to contribute to rising costs. The proposed title IX, on the other hand, would base mortgages on appraised value. (FHA, however, could insure mortgages under title IX if they represent "acceptable risk," even though they do not meet certain normal economic soundness criteria, such as those of location and continued marketability.) By using value instead of necessary current cost for computing mortgages, title IX insured loans would tend to curb cost rises rather than support them.

12. Question. How much will this title cost the Government?

Answer. FHA experience thus far would indicate that this program should cost the Government nothing. The costs of the FHA credit-insurance programs are defrayed out of premiums and fees collected from the lending institutions. Income from premiums, fees, and other sources has been sufficient to defray administrative expenses, pay losses, and establish reserves in the insurance funds.

TITLE II. PROVISION OF DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

1. Question. What is the purpose of this title?

Answer. It is the purpose of this title to provide for carrying out the objectives of the bill in areas where private industry cannot furnish the housing needed for defense activities, or local communities would not, without the assistance of the bill, furnish necessary community facilities and services. The title would authorize the President to provide housing and to give assistance for the provision of, or provide, community facilities and services in areas where lack of such housing, facilities, or services would impede the defense effort and they would not otherwise be provided when and where needed.

2. Question. How much money is provided for this title?

Answer. No money is appropriated by the bill and the bill does not authorize appropriation of any specific sum. The funds to be provided will be determined through the regular congressional appropriation process after consideration of evidence of need. The President's budget asks for $125,000,000 for this title for fiscal 1952.

3. Question. How would the housing provided under this title be financed and built?

Answer. The housing would be directly financed by the Federal Government from appropriated funds. It would be built by private firms under contract with the Federal Government.

4. Question. What kinds of housing would be provided?

Answer. To the greatest extent practicable, the housing is required to be one- to four-family structures of permanent construction suitable for sale as individual structures. Multifamily residences would be provided where required by local conditions. In localities where the need for housing appears to be of temporary duration, the housing provided would be temporary, with first consideration being given to mobile or portable housing or housing otherwise constructed so that it could be moved from one area to another for reuse according to need.

5. Question. What rents would be charged? Would the Government subsidize rents for workers?

Answer. The bill requires that the rents charged be fair rents based on value as determined by the President. These rents would not be subsidized.

6. Question. Who could live in federally provided defense housing?

Answer. The housing would be occupied, while the need continues, by military personnel or civilian workers required to be brought into the area for carrying out defense activities. The President would be empowered to prescribe the class or classes of eligible persons and the preferences and priorities in the rental of this housing. When it is determined that any federally provided housing is no longer needed for housing defense workers, preference in occupancy pending disposition would be given to veterans, and among veterans to disabled veterans and dependent parents and unremarried widows of deceased veterans whose death was service-connected. Occupancy could also be permitted by persons displaced from their homes by Government acquisition of land for defense industries or installations.

7. Question. Why not use existing federally owned World War II housing, instead of building new Federal housing?

Answer. The majority of the dwellings provided in the World War II housing program has been disposed of, and of the remaining inventory (about 118,000 permanent and 178,000 temporary units) nearly all are occupied and could not be made available for purposes of the present emergency except as vacancies occur, without displacing the present tenants, most of whom are veterans, many of them engaged, or soon to be engaged, in defense activities. Moreover, in many cases, due to technological and other changes in materials and equipment needed for defense and the consequent shift of defense plants, World War II housing may not be located in areas where housing is required to meet present needs. Despite these draw-backs, however, war housing in the present inventory will be used to the greatest practicable extent in meeting needs as they arise in the defense program. Vacancies will be used for defense workers. The new housing authorized by this bill would be that required in any locality over and above that which could be supplied out of existing federally controlled housing. No new housing would be provided where World War II housing could meet the need.

8. Question. What would become of this housing after the defense need is over?

Answer. Provision is made in the bill to assure ultimate disposition of permanent housing for private use. It is required that all permanent housing be sold as expeditiously as possible and in the public interest, considering the purposes for which it was provided. For all structures suitable for separate sale, preference in sale would be given to occupants and veterans. Pending disposition of housing no longer needed for defense workers, veterans are to be given first preference in rental, thus increasing the chance of ultimate sale to veterans under the preference accorded occupants. Permanent projects consisting of structures not suitable for separate sale would be sold as entities, with first preference to groups of veterans organized on a mutual ownership or cooperative basis. Terms of sale would be full payment to the Government within 25 years, with interest of not less than 4 percent on unpaid balances. These are the same general provisions that Congress last year adopted for disposition of federally owned permanent World War II housing.

Due to present uncertainties, the method and final date of disposition of any temporary housing provided under this title would be left for later determination by Congress. Assurance is given, however, that temporary housing would be disposed of as soon as possible when no longer needed for defense purposes, and would not be allowed to continue in use for housing purposes.

9. Question. What would this housing cost?

Answer. The average cost of two- three- and four-bedroom family dwelling units in any project provided by the Federal Government would be limited to $9,000, $10,000, and $11,000 respectively. These limits would apply to over-all costs, including land and site improvements. In the Territories and possessions of the United States, these cost limits may be increased by the President by up to 50 percent. These limits correspond to the values of housing on which maximum mortgage amounts are based under the proposed aids to private builders in title I for single-family houses, except that no increase for high-cost areas is permitted for Government construction. Mortgage limits for private construction could be increased by $900 in high-cost areas.

10. Question. What assistance would the Federal Government give for community facilities?

Answer. The Federal Government may give assistance for the provision of, or itself provide, community facilities and services only when necessary to meet newly arisen needs directly attributable to defense activities. Such Federal action would be authorized only when additional facilities or services are necessitated by the fact that military personnel or civilian workers required for carrying out national defense activities must be brought into the locality from other areas or other additions to the local labor force are needed for such purposes, or where water, or sewerage extensions or similar facilities must be provided for a defense plant or installation. When these conditions are met, the Federal Government would be authorized to make grants

or loans to public and nonprofit agencies for the provision, operation, and maintenance of the needed facilities and services. Such grants could not be in amounts exceeding that portion of the total cost of the facilities or services, or their operation, estimated to be the result of the impact of the defense activity, less amounts estimated to be recoverable from revenue or other sources by the local agency. The Federal Government itself would provide or operate community facilities and services only where no appropriate State, city, or other local agency having responsibility for such facilities in the area is available, able, and willing, with such assistance as the Government is authorized to give under this bill, to provide or operate the needed facilities and services.

12. Question. Would Federal assistance be available for community facilities in all localities?

Answer. No. Such assistance could be given only upon a finding by the President that community facilities or services are needed in the particular area or locality to support defense activities, and then only when Federal assistance is necessary to meet newly arising community needs which are directly attributable to defense activities and would not otherwise be met.

12. Question. How would aid for schools under this title be related to existing school-aid legislation?

Answer. Assistance for educational facilities and services would be supplementary to, and would conform closely to the principles and procedures established by, the school-aid acts, Public Laws 815 and 874 of the last Congress. Aid under this bill would be given only to the extent that the present aids are inadequate. The existing aids were, of course, not designed to meet the problems of new defense areas.

It may be noted that these provisions of the bill were prepared and recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor on the basis of its extensive studies both prior and subsequent to its reports on the school-aid acts.

13. Question. Why shouldn't local communities provide all community facilities with their own funds?

Answer. Cities are generally unable financially to assume unanticipated large new burdens requiring capital expansion and increased service budgets. This is particularly true now when, as a result of postwar expansion and the housing boom, as well as the backlog of construction of public works postponed during World War II, most communities have already greatly expanded their facilities and services and many have reached their statutory debt limits. Even if legally and practically possible, however, it would be obviously unfair to make certain communities bear the full cost of facilities made necessary by the common effort for the defense of the Nation as a whole.

14. Question. Would the Federal Government operate schools, hospitals, and other facilities?

Answer. Only in cases where the local communities are unwilling or unable to undertake such responsibilities, even with Government aid under the bill, would the Federal Government either provide such facilities directly or operate them with its own personnel. The bill seeks to make direct Federal provision and operation of such facilities unnecessary by providing assistance to local agencies to permit them to assume these responsibilities. Even in those cases where the Federal Government was forced to provide or operate them directly, the bill would require their transfer to the local agencies just as soon as possible. In no event could the Government exercise any control or supervision over curriculum, personnel, or program of instruction in any school.

15. Question. Would housing and community facilities provided under this title conform to State and local laws?

Answer. The bill would require that housing and community facilities constructed by the United States conform to requirements of State and local health and sanitation laws. To the maximum extent practicable, considering limitations on materials and requirements of defense, except for temporary construction, housing and community facilities would be required to conform to requirements of State and local building codes.

16. Question. Won't communities and States suffer from removal of housing sites from tax rolls?

Answer. No. The bill provides for annual payments in lieu of taxes and special assessments approximating full taxes and assessments on residential real property held under this title, less approximate amounts for Federal expenditures for items usually furnished by the taxing authority.

17. Question. What disposition would be made of federally built community facilities?

Answer. The bill requires that any such community facilities be disposed of to the appropriate State or local agencies not later than a date and subject to terms and conditions which Congress will determine. With a few exceptions it would require the outright donation of educational facilities to such agencies within 18 months of completion.

18. Question. Who would administer this title?

Answer. The President could delegate responsibilities under this title and title III to such Federal agency or agencies as he deemed appropriate to best assure the most efficient use of existing Federal agencies and the most expeditious handling of such responsibilities in the interests of national defense.

19. Question. Who would construct community facilities under this title?

Answer. Community facilities would usually be constructed in the normal manner by the local communities or their contractors. Where the Federal Government itself provided such facilities they would be constructed by private construction firms who would contract with the Federal Government for the work.

TITLE III. PROVISION OF SITES FOR NECESSARY DEVELOPMENT IN CONNECTION WITH ISOLATED DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS

1. Question. What is the purpose of this title and why is it needed?

Answer. Title III is designed to meet special problems involved in providing suitable land for necessary housing, commercial services, and community facilities serving large defense installations, such as Atomic Energy installations, in isolated or relatively isolated areas. This title provides for Government acquisition, planning, site improvement, and disposal of land in such areas. It is intended to facilitate the establishment of new communities, or, if necessary, the rapid expansion of existing communities, when large defense installations are located in areas in which communities of adequate size do not exist.

The authority provided in this title is needed to assure that as much as possible of the housing and commercial buildings required for such defense installations shall be provided by private enterprise through private financing and ownership, thereby avoiding the development of Government towns. It is also needed to help avoid land speculation and to assure the development of communities in the most economical and efficient manner so that defense needs will be adequately served. Thus in isolated defense areas, it would be possible to avoid the burden of increased residential and commercial rents caused by land speculation. Such authority could only be used in connection with a defense installation in an isolated area (1) if housing or community facilities for the installation would not otherwise be provided when and where required, or (2) if there would otherwise be speculation or uneconomic use of land resources which would impair the efficiency of defense activities at such a defense installation.

2. Question. Would the Government buy large tracts of land for continued public ownership?

Answer. No. The primary purpose of title III is to encourage and assist private ownership rather than public ownership or the construction of Government towns. It is the intent of the bill that the land acquired by the Government under it shall be disposed of as quickly as practicable to private enterprise for the development of the community and to local agencies for public use. Without the provisions of title III, land speculation at isolated defense installations cannot be avoided. Excessive land costs, due to speculation, inevitably increase the cost of public facilities and could very well make it impossible for private enterprise to provide adequate housing for defense workers receiving moderate wages.

Appropriations authorized for the purposes of the title are limited to a $10,000,000 revolving fund. This would limit the amount of land held at any one time under this title. Any increase in authorization would be reviewed by the Congress on the basis of the evidence of need presented at the time.

3. Question. Could the Federal Government construct housing or other buildings under this title?

Answer. No buildings could be constructed by the Federal Government under the authority of title III. However, necessary housing and community facilities and services could be provided under other provisions of the bill where they cannot otherwise be provided when and where needed to serve the defense installations. Any defense installation constructed on the land would be constructed under other congressional authority.

4. Question. Could the purposes of this title be carried out under the Atomic Energy Act?

Answer. No. The Atomic Energy Act confers no authority to acquire land and dispose of it to private developers for housing or commercial purposes, or to public agencies for public use as is provided in title III of the bill. While the Atomic Energy Commission has authority under its act to acquire land for housing, it can do so only if the Commission is building and financing the housing. This results in Government-owned towns. Neither can the purpose of title III be accomplished by any other existing legislation. Through the provisions of title III, it will be possible to avoid the necessity for the construction of Government-owned towns and at the same time to secure the provision of the types of housing, community facilities, and commercial enterprises which will best serve the needs of the defense installation. This title will also facilitate the assumption by the residents of the responsibilities of local government under State laws, a matter which has proved to be extremely difficult in the case of the Government-owned towns which the Atomic Energy Commission has constructed in the past. This title will afford relief to the Atomic Energy Commission which has expressed its view that it should not be diverted from its major purposes to cope with housing and land planning problems.

5. Question. Wouldn't Federal acquisition of land under this title deprive local and State jurisdictions of essential tax revenues?

Answer. No. The bill would make special provision to compensate State and local governments for loss of tax revenues occasioned by the acquisition of land for the defense installation or the acquisition of land under the provisions of title III. This title would require payments in lieu of taxes and special assessments approximating, but not exceeding, the taxes and special assessments which would be paid to the taxing authorities upon the property acquired and held under the title if they were not exempt from taxation and special assessments, less (1) credit for Federal expenditures for community facilities, and (2) other Federal payments in lieu of taxes or special assessments on the property. In addition, under certain conditions similar payments in lieu of taxes would be paid on the defense installation itself. With respect to the defense installation itself, however (as distinguished from its site), tax payments would be approximately 10 percent of the amount of taxes which would be levied with respect to it if it were subject to taxation. This limitation is included because of the unusually high ratio of the cost of improvements on some defense installations to the cost of services rendered to them by the communities.

Payments under this title for defense installations themselves would not be made where construction of such installations was commenced before June 27, 1950, unless the President found that such payments were necessary to permit local ownership and operation of public facilities and services required in connection with the housing and community facilities serving the installation.

6. Question. How much would this title cost?

Answer. Since the $10,000,000 authorized as a revolving fund for acquisition and site improvement of land is expected to be recovered through its disposition, the only net cost anticipated under this title will be the payments in lieu of taxes and assessments, for which separate appropriations are authorized.

TITLE IV. PREFABRICATED HOUSING

1. Question. What does this title provide?

Answer. It would authorize the HHFA to make $15,000,000 in loans outstanding at any one time to aid the production of prefabricated houses or housing components of producers who have a demonstrated capacity to produce and market their products. These loans would be made in order to enable such producers to maintain their housing production capacity for defense purposes. No loan could be made under this authority unless suitable private financing is unavailable. The program is designed to assure that the existing prefabricated housing industry, which has an estimated capacity of about 100,000 homes annually, will have a necessary source of adequate working capital to maintain its operations so that it can serve defense and emergency needs, instead of being compelled to convert to some other kind of production through lack of suitable credit under defense conditions. Loans could be made for distribution and erection of prefabricated houses, as well as for their production.

2. Question. How does the new loan program under this title differ from the previous prefabricated housing loan programs?

Answer. (a) The funds are specifically directed toward maintaining prefabricated production to serve defense needs.

(b) Unlike earlier programs which had as one of their main purposes the encouragement of new enterprises, this program is limited to the maintenance of present production capacity. Therefore, the financing would aid only housing of prefabricated producers who have demonstrated their capacity to produce and market their houses. It would not be available for new enterprises, nor for the Lustron Corporation if reorganized.

(c) The program makes additional funds available to aid in both production and distribution of prefabricated housing, since previously authorized funds are nearly all committed.

(d) The program includes producers of mobile or portable housing to serve temporary defense housing needs as provided under title II of this bill.

TITLE V. AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAWS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Question. What provisions are made to adjust existing housing laws to help meet defense needs?

Answer. The final or "miscellaneous" title of the bill would amend a number of such laws for this purpose:

(a) The authority for the special FHA military housing mortgage insurance provided under title VIII of the National Housing Act for rental housing for personnel of permanent military installations would be extended for 2 years beyond the present expiration date of July 1, 1951. In addition, this title would be extended to permit insurance of mortgages on housing constructed for personnel at permanent Atomic Energy Commission installations.

(b) Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, now permits Federally assisted low-rent housing projects and related powers to sons engaged in national defense activities. This law would be amended to permit payments in lieu of taxes somewhat higher than are presently authorized and to make it clear that rentals and eligibility for admission and for continued occupancy may be based on defense use rather than low-rent housing use.

(c) Because of the critical international situation and the consequent suspension of disposition of Federally owned war and veterans' housing built during and immediately after World War II, the President would be authorized to extend disposition deadline dates prescribed in the Housing Act of 1950 for this housing.

(d) A new provision would be added to the Lanham Act to permit income limitations to be placed on occupancy of existing federally owned housing constructed during the last war so that this housing may better serve the needs of present defense workers.

(e) An amendment to the National Housing Act would permit the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure mortgages upon homes purchased by persons called into the active military service notwithstanding the requirements of the act that the mortgagor (under certain FHA programs) must occupy the property.

(f) Certain changes would be made in the yield insurance program (title VII of the National Housing Act) to encourage the use of this title for the development of more moderate rental housing for defense workers. (The yield insurance program is designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing with rentals within the capacity of families of moderate income. No mortgage financing is involved. The FHA is authorized to insure a minimum annual amortization of 2 percent of total investment and an annual rate of return of not more than 2¾ percent on outstanding investment.)

2. Question. What special provision is made for veterans who are defense workers?

Answer. The bill would provide that veterans who are defense workers in areas of housing shortage as determined by the President could use their veterans' home loan benefits under the GI bill of rights without restriction of any sort if the cost of the home involved did not exceed $9,000, $10,000 and $11,000 for two-bedroom, three-bedroom and four-bedroom family units, respectively.

3. Question. The bill sometimes has been called a $3,000,000,000 measure. What are the financial authorizations in the bill?

Answer. The $3,000,000,000 referred to is the authorization to FHA to insure up to $3,000,000,000 of additional home mortgage loans under the FHA mortgage insurance provisions. This authorization could only be used as released by the President. It would be used for the existing FHA insurance programs as well as the new special defense housing program and the military housing insurance program. This does not represent expenditures to be made by the Federal Government. It would be insurance only. Past experience over a period of 17 years has been that mortgage insurance premiums and fees more than cover both administrative expenses and losses incurred.

In addition to the increase of mortgage insurance authorizations, the bill would authorize (a) appropriations for the purposes of title II—the provision of housing by the Federal Government and aid to localities for, and the provision of, community facilities and services; (b) the appropriation of $10,000,000 to a revolving fund to be used for the purposes of site acquisition in isolated localities under title III; and (c) borrowing by the Housing Administrator from the Treasury of $15,000,000 for the purposes of prefabricated housing loans under title IV.

Any appropriations for title II would, of course, have to be justified before appropriations committees before being made available for the purposes of that title. No amount for such appropriations can be stipulated in this bill because the extent of the over-all needs cannot presently be estimated with any accuracy. (See question II-2, p. 14.)

4. Question. What provision is made for families forced to move from sites of new defense installations?

Answer. The bill provides that the President may, where he determines that persons have been displaced from their homes as a result of acquisition of sites for defense installations or industries, authorize such persons to occupy or purchase housing assisted under the provisions of this bill or for which credit restrictions have been relaxed.

5. Question. Would there be any time limitation on the exercise of powers to be granted under this bill?

Answer. Yes. Powers to insure mortgages under title I, agreements to extend assistance for community facilities or services under title II, and commencement of construction of housing or community facilities under title II, acquisition of land under title III, and loans under title IV could not be made after June 30, 1953.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, which is one of a series published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—It's possible to get rich in the mine and oil promotions here.

But not for the sucker in the United States.

The stock the American buys makes only one man rich—the Toronto promoter.

Up and down Toronto's Bay Street, you hear stories of mining ventures like Quemont and Noranda which struck gold and made their stockholders lots of money.

You hear how Imperial Oil drilled 119 holes before Leduc No. 1 gushed in and became the starter for the Alberta oil boom.

But I didn't find that any one of these bonanza ventures were promoted by mail

order and telephone solicitation. Neither did William C. Rosenbaum, of the St. Louis Better Business Bureau, who surveyed the Toronto promotions with me.

In our canvass of the Toronto stock lotteries, Rosenbaum and I found no record that any of the mail-order mine enterprises promoted illegally in the United States from here paid anyone a dime—except the promoter.

It isn't hard to see why only the promoter makes money on these deals.

The cost of promotion is so high that it makes the prospect of bringing a moose-pasture mine into production a mathematical miracle.

In Missouri, for example, the cost of promoting a speculative stock venture is restricted to 20 percent of funds from sales.

This means that 80 percent goes into the company treasury to develop the property.

In Ontario, however, promotion costs are 66⅔ percent of funds derived from stock sales. Two-thirds of the take goes into the promoter's pocket. Only one-third goes into the company treasury.

The ratio is official. It is fixed by the Broker-Dealers' Association of Ontario and approved by the Ontario Securities Commission.

Rosenbaum and I were told promotion costs are high because of long-distance selling. Also, we were told, adverse publicity and efforts of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and the United States Post Office to protect Americans from fraud have forced promoters to spend more money for gaudy literature, publicity, and telephone calls.

American buyer resistance to Toronto stocks, officials told us, is increasing.

While it is theoretically possible to bring a mine into production on a two-thirds stock mark-up, we found it is not done on the initial capitalization.

This is one reason the sucker can't win.

Mining and oil venture companies are capitalized at about 3,000,000 shares of stock, at $1 per value. Under securities regulations, the broker-dealer who wants to sell the stock commits himself to marketing a sizable block—about 500,000 shares.

In return for taking this risk, he is given options on other shares at ascending prices.

The broker-dealer buys the first 500,000 shares at 10 cents a share from the company treasury. It costs him $50,000.

He sells it to the suckers for 30 cents a share, grossing $150,000.

This leaves him a $100,000 selling profit, from which he deducts promotion expenses, such as mailings, long-distance telephone calls, and salesmen's commissions.

Even with a lavish promotional campaign, his net is likely to run about $50,000.

The next batch of stock costs him 15 cents a share from the mine treasury. He puts it on the market at 45 cents a share.

At this point, one of the most misleading phases of the whole racket comes into play.

The promoter advises the suckers that "Consolidated Connivance Gold Mines, Ltd.," is going up in price. Instead of 30 cents, it will be offered at 45 cents a share.

"Holding back some of the 30-cent shares for our earlier customers," the promoter wires the sucker. "But you must act before midnight tomorrow night."

St. Louisans who were high-pressured from Toronto said they believed the stock had actually risen on the market 15 cents a share.

That's the way it sounds.

They didn't know the promoter is simply closing out his 10-cent shares and getting ready to move his 15-cent optioned shares into selling position.

The victim doesn't know that the wholesale price of the shares is fixed by the Ontario Securities Commission and the retail markup is fixed by the Broker-Dealers' Association.

He doesn't know there isn't any market for his stock. And the broker-dealers of Toronto make a special point of not telling him.

The deadline of midnight tomorrow night is pure fiction. It is intended to create a feeling of urgency in the mind of the sucker. It often works.

This technique of selling the sucker a second time is called reloading in the racket here. Sometimes it gets so bad the Ontario Securities Commission has to crack down.

For instance, when the Commission canceled the registration of Junior Golds Securities, Ltd., on February 3, 1950, it charged that Sidney C. Davidge, president of the firm, and A. C. Gardiner, a salesman, had reloaded a victim in New York State who was mentally incompetent.

Commission records show the victim started out by purchasing 25 shares of Yukeno Lead & Silver Mines, Ltd., in the spring of 1949.

Then the victim had a dream that gold would be found in the diggings, although the mine Junior Golds was promoting was a lead mine. Anyway, he sent Davidge and Gardiner a map he drew from his vision showing where the gold was.

The promoters kept feeding him more stock. Within a few months the victim had purchased 4,500 shares for $1,250, his life savings.

Davidge told the Commission when this case was heard that he thought the New York sucker was just kidding him about the vision and the map.

"This," observed the Commission, "was an unfortunate example of overreaching."

If the promoter finds that the gold mine or oil well can become commercially profitable, the sucker is speedily shuffled out by a series of recapitalizations.

Since the initial capitalization is not sufficient to bring the mine into production, the promoter reorganizes the company and issues more stock.

Since each share of stock is essentially a chance against potential riches, the more new stock the promoter issues the less the original shareholders get. Recapitalization can continue until the potential value of the original shares approaches zero.

Take the experience of the Casey Summit Mine, in the Kenora mining district of northwestern Ontario. Launched in 1932, it did not achieve production under the initial capitalization.

It was reorganized in 1935 as Argosy Gold Mines. One share of stock in the new company was exchanged for four and a fraction shares in the old. Holders of 1,000 shares of Casey Summit stock wound up with 226 shares of Argosy stock on the first recapitalization.

In 1938 Argosy was recapitalized as Jason Mines, Ltd. One share of Jason stock was given for five shares of Argosy. That left the original holder of 1,000 shares of Casey Summit with 45 shares of Jason.

Jason produced $2,400,000 worth of gold between 1940 and 1947, and paid two dividends of 2 cents per share each. Under the old Casey Summit set-up, the stockholder with 1,000 shares would have received $40. But he had been reduced to 45 shares. All he got was $1.80.

In 1948 New Jason Mines, Ltd., was formed, issuing one share for every three in old Jason.

The original stockholder who had bought 1,000 shares now had 15 left.

This isn't simply what can happen in a Canadian promotion—it is what does happen to bring a mail-order mine into production.

There may be gold or there may be oil, but the sucker doesn't reap any reward from it.

Only the promoter gets rich.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Annual Meeting of the Sunday League at Bridgeton, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the eighteenth anniversary meeting of the Interdenominational Sunday League which was held in Bridgeton, N. J., last night, we of New Jersey had the honor of having as the guest speaker our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. He delivered an outstanding address, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SUNDAY LEAGUE, INC., AT BRIDGETON, N. J., TUESDAY EVENING, MARCH 13, 1951

Meetings such as this are living symbols of faith in God and devotion to the Christian ideals upon which our great land of liberty was established.

In meetings such as this many generations of God-fearing Americans have strengthened the moral and spiritual foundation of our Nation's greatness.

In coming into the great State of New Jersey I recall the historic importance of your State as the principal battleground of the Revolution.

I am mindful also of the proud place New Jersey holds today as a great industrial State, a great agricultural State, and as a center of education, science, culture, and religion.

I welcome this opportunity to praise the splendid service given your State and the Nation by your distinguished United States Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH and ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON. It is an honor to be associated in the United States Senate with these outstanding American statesmen.

It is a privilege also to tell you of my high regard for your distinguished Governor, the Honorable Alfred E. Driscoll. He has made a national reputation as a foremost exponent of economy and efficiency in government.

We have reached a time of great peril in the history of our Republic. The American way of life is threatened by enemies at home and abroad. The precious freedoms we prize so highly are in danger.

The great issue is whether we are to live in a peaceful world or whether we are to be plunged into the most terrible war of all time.

To meet the crisis we are mobilizing all the power of our rich resources to defend our homes and our liberties.

We are calling the youth of our land to the colors. We are preparing to start a system of universal military training.

We are pouring billions upon billions of dollars into the production of weapons and munitions for our Armed Forces.

But, my fellow Americans, if we are to survive as a free nation—if we are to preserve peace, freedom, and justice in the world—we need more than armies, more than weapons, more than wealth.

Above all, we need the strength that comes from God.

We need the strength that can be generated only by obedience to the laws of God and man—by deeper devotion to the teachings of the Holy Bible—by living in accordance with the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount.

We support the American principle that the state and church must be separate. But we know that one cannot live without the other. No government can rise above the moral and spiritual standards of its people. Freedom, good will, and tolerance cannot be maintained without a strong militant church.

In this blessed land of ours we have been so fortunate. Throughout its history there has run a golden thread of deep religious conviction.

The spirit of religion guided the Pilgrim fathers to the New World. They began the Mayflower compact with the words, "In the name of God. Amen."

William Penn, illustrious founder of Pennsylvania, established his holy experiment on the spirit of religious freedom.

"If we are not ruled by God," William Penn asserted, "we will be ruled by tyrants."

Faith in God sustained the pioneers in their lives of struggle and hardship. George Washington, kneeling in prayer in the snow at Valley Forge, has given patriotic inspiration to many generations of Americans.

"Firm reliance upon the protection of divine providence" is set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

Benjamin Franklin suggested that prayers for divine guidance be offered in framing the Constitution.

Abraham Lincoln, in his immortal Gettysburg address, referred to the United States as "this Nation, under God."

With these magnificent examples before us, we are forced to wonder why we have departed from the right course.

We have reason to be alarmed at recent disclosures that indicate such a widespread breakdown of decency and morality.

Can we remain calm while there is revealed evidence of corruption, bribery, and racketeering, not only in the criminal underworld, but in the very seat of the Government itself?

The other day there appeared in the press a statement which should shock every right-thinking American out of his complacency. It was made by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas. He is chairman of the Senate subcommittee investigating charges of political influence, favoritism, and graft in connection with loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Senator FULBRIGHT was quoted as saying the testimony produced before his committee shows the need for a "general investigation of the moral level in government."

Senator FULBRIGHT was further quoted in these words:

"If people lose faith in the honesty of their Government by reason of rather recent development then we will be in greater danger from within than from without. Loss of confidence in our Government is as great a menace to our security as is communism."

Another Senate investigation has brought out into the open criminal activity by organized crime syndicates reaching into many States of the Union.

This disgraceful condition is described as a "record of official corruption." It was submitted 2 weeks ago by the Senate Crime Investigating Committee headed by Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Because of its tremendous importance I should like to read a portion of that report, from which I now quote:

"The most shocking revelation of the testimony before us is the extent of official corruption and connivance in facilitating and promoting organized crime.

"The committee has found evidence of corruption and connivance at all levels of Government—Federal, State, and local.

"Such evidence of the corruption of Federal Government officials as we received, is primarily in connection with the enforcement of the income-tax laws.

"The evidence of corruption and connivance with organized crime in State and local government is present in five different forms:

"1. Direct bribe or protection payments made to law-enforcement officials, so that they will not interfere with specific criminal activities.

"2. Political influence and pressure of important officials or political leaders used to protect criminal activities or further the interests of criminal gangs.

"3. Law-enforcement officials found in the possession of unusual and unexplained wealth.

"4. Law-enforcement officials participating directly in the business of organized crime.

"5. Contributions to the campaign funds of candidates for political office at various levels frequently made by organized criminals without reference to political affiliation. Not infrequently, contributions are made to both major political parties; gangsters operate on both sides of the street."

At another point in the report this statement is made; and again I quote:

"The committee figures conservatively that $20,000,000,000 changes hands every year in the United States as a result of organized illegal gambling."

That $20,000,000,000 figure is just for gambling alone. In order to understand the magnitude of organized crime in the United States it would be necessary to add the income from many other criminal activities—narcotics, the white-slave traffic, illegal loan-shark rackets, swindling schemes, the extortion rackets, and even organized murder.

I have discussed these conditions of crime and corruption because there is a definite relationship between religion and good government.

Our civic duty and our religious duty are interwoven. Both must be honored and observed if we are to measure up to the responsibilities of citizenship.

One hundred and fifty-five years ago George Washington expressed that thought so clearly in his famous Farewell Address.

Washington said, and I quote:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports.

"Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Yes, my fellow Americans, national morality has been weakened because we have allowed our material progress to advance far beyond our gains in spiritual strength.

In the words of the poet, Oliver Goldsmith:

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay."

Every one of us here is shocked by the revelations of corruption, graft, and racketeering to which I have referred.

But the thing that so greatly disturbs me is the indifferent attitude of so many of our people.

In every community thousands of good citizens seem to accept these matters as a necessary evil—something we cannot cope with.

Such citizens, and many of them are church members, have lost their sense of civic duty and civic responsibility. They must be awakened to the importance of the fight for honesty and decency—both in and out of government.

Unless the moral forces of our communities arouse themselves to drive out racketeers and grafters, wherever they exist, there can be no hope of honest, decent government.

We cannot have good government unless we elect to public office courageous men of outstanding ability, upright character, and unquestioned integrity.

We must drive out of office those politicians whose objective is personal gain and personal power, not public service.

Victory over the racketeers and grafters can be won only if every right-thinking, law-abiding citizen takes an interest in government.

Men and women of the church should take an intelligent and militant part in politics, because clean, honest politics is the foundation of good government.

And good government, in our Republic, is the greatest safeguard of individual freedom, including the most precious of all—freedom of religion.

To hold the line in America we must have a strong, courageous, self-reliant, God-fearing people. We must have a strong, militant church and a strong, solvent Government. We must have a total mobilization of all the moral forces. Our churches must be the armories of trained battalions of men and women working for God and country.

The battalions must be formed into armies under courageous and righteous leadership. With flags flying, they must march forward to fight the evils which have brought us to a time of national peril.

We must keep in mind always the historic mission of the United States—to lead the world in progress for justice, freedom, and peace.

Even at this critical time in world affairs we must not yield to the belief that war is inevitable.

We must never abandon hope that we can live in peace, as ordained by the Creator of the Universe.

Let the Voice of America resound throughout the world with a message of peace and good will.

Let us tell the glories of the American way of life. Let us make known to people everywhere that our plan means freedom of the individual—that it gives more of the good things of life to more people than any other system the world has ever known.

But first—and most important—let us put our own house in order.

Let us so live that we can be an example of religion, patriotism, and high moral standards.

The crying need of the hour is for a great spiritual rearmament, not only in America but all over the world.

Not until this is accomplished can we beat our swords into plowshares and live at peace, secure in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Propaganda Is Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Propaganda Is Costly," published in the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Herald of March 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPAGANDA IS COSTLY

Washington is the center of the huge Government propaganda machine which provides an estimated 45,000 Federal employees with full-time work to dispense information, publicity and out-and-out propaganda. This figure, by the way, was supplied by the Budget Bureau on congressional demand 2 years ago. It has hardly decreased since 1949.

Paul R. Leach, chief of the Washington Bureau, Detroit Free Press, dug into this Federal press agent quagmire and found the State Department tops the list with nearly 6,000 assorted press agents here and abroad. Yes, the Economic Cooperation Administration is included in this bracket.

The dough is pretty good—averaging from $3,000 to $10,300, with a few section chiefs drawing $15,000 per annum. (That's better money than the rewrite battery is drawing on New York Local, AP.)

Public Relations for the Department of Defense engages about 1,800 while the Department of Agriculture has a press agent payroll of 400, not including 300 more on research, writing, and editing publications.

We could go on with a lot more figures, but, perhaps, the taxpaying public gets a vague idea that "thought control" is hardly peanuts.

(Note to Herald news room gentry: What's the matter with you guys? Wanna' be reporters all your lives? Why not make a try for "Director, Office of Information" Department of (you-name-it, Pal) and get along in the world?)

Secretary Acheson's Letter to Marine Corporal Moulette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial in regard to Secretary Acheson's letter to Marine Corporal Moulette, which appeared on Saturday, March 10, in the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail. The Daily Mail is one of the leading Republican newspapers in West Virginia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The exchange of letters between Marine Corporal Moulette, his father, who is the assistant to the mayor of Camden, N. J., and Secretary of State Dean Acheson is a revealing and heart-warming correspondence which throws a good deal of light on the American temper.

The corporal's reaction to the Korean police action, the great questions of national policy and the future of the United States is, we imagine, typical enough to be taken seriously. To him the war is, first of all, a great personal inconvenience, an interruption in a planned and promising life. He has no personal enthusiasm for it, and he is resigned to fighting it "only because of the obligation we—the marines—have to each other."

His father is not unsympathetic, which becomes him, but he is concerned over a reaction which, if it is general, is certainly going to make it difficult to implement national policy where disagreement is potentially, at least, a form of division.

Dean Acheson, in the summing up, deals admirably with both. His expressions of sympathy ring true. The corporal's questions are, in fact, much like those which Mr. Acheson confronted with his own son in World War II. But there are other considerations beyond those which touch upon the individual, and Mr. Acheson states them well. "The liberty we enjoy is not won and preserved without unremitting effort, without sacrifice, without eternal vigilance."

This is one of the cliches of patriotic oratory. It is also one of the solemn truths of our national existence. It has been proved time and again that we cannot enjoy what someone else has won for us unless we are willing to keep up the installments.

It may be, in this connection, that the Korean engagement is a tactical mistake, although Mr. Acheson does not think so. But strategically it is a phase of the struggle which the United States must fight and must win. To dwell on the hardships which this may involve is natural, but Mr. Acheson is surely right when he says that "the great thing is not what happens to us but how we bear what happens to us."

To his great credit the corporal sees the Secretary's point and graciously acknowledges that he stands corrected.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me entitled "Happenings in Washington, Program No. 36."

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM NO. 36

(By United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you the first in a new series of broadcasts on Happenings in Washington.

When I inaugurated these talks in June of 1949, I stated that I hoped to bring you a better understanding of developments in your Government.

I said I would endeavor to keep you advised about legislation that is being considered in Congress and how it would affect Pennsylvania.

I now repeat and reemphasize that pledge.

In the present critical situation it is a most important duty of good citizenship to be fully informed on the great problems of the day.

It is equally important to study the proposals that are offered to meet those problems in order to reach decisions that will best contribute to the preservation of freedom and the American way of life.

The grave problems now before Congress are your problems. They reach into your home and your job. They determine your standard of living, the purchasing power of your earnings, and the future of your children.

Under the American system of government the decisions that are reached must reflect the will of the people—expressed through their elected representatives in both Houses of Congress.

Never in the history of the United States have we been called upon to make decisions as important as those now before the Eighty-second Congress.

The problems arising out of international relations will decide whether we are to have war or peace.

The course we take in domestic affairs will determine whether we are to preserve the American plan of individual freedom or whether we are to continue on the road to state socialism.

In the brief time at my disposal I want to outline some of the problems now before Congress.

I am sure that nearly every American will agree that we must keep our country strong.

We must have military strength, financial strength, industrial strength, and spiritual strength if we are to have leadership for peace in the world.

Upon that objective we all agree—but there are many divergent opinions as to how we are to reach that goal.

In recent months there has been a great debate on whether we should send American combat divisions to Europe at this time.

There has been a great deal of discussion as to whether the President has the power to order troops overseas without first consulting Congress.

I believe that even if the President has that power he should seek the advice of Congress—because the Members of Congress are the direct representatives of the people—and the people are still the Government of these United States.

Another important decision that Congress must make has to do with the proposal to drop the selective-service age limit to 18 and the establishment of universal military training.

I believe that no boy should be sent into combat without at least 1 year of intensive training.

For many years I have advocated universal military training as the best system by which every young man can and should be prepared to serve his country in time of crisis.

These military questions are part of building our defense against danger from abroad.

But military strength is only a part of our defense. To safeguard freedom of the individual we must maintain the economic and financial strength of our country.

The Finance Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, is now holding hearings on the Reciprocal Trade Act. The question before us is whether this act should be extended, and if so, should it be amended to provide protection for the American worker against the influx of goods produced in low wage foreign countries.

I have allined myself with those who believe that drastic changes should be made in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.

I believe it should be amended so as to protect the jobs of our workers against unfair competition fostered by the Truman administration and the State Department.

Recently there was submitted to Congress a list of 50 different industries which have been injured or seriously threatened in the normal economic times prior to the outbreak of war in Korea.

I have mentioned only a few of the grave problems with which Congress is struggling.

But the most dangerous threat to American safety and security is the continued reckless disregard for the financial stability of our country.

In these days of peril we sometimes forget that we are now saddled with a national debt in excess of $260,000,000,000.

The worst evils that strike at the foundation of our liberties are public debt, excessive taxation, deficit financing and extravagant spending by all levels of Government.

We can win against foreign enemies and can still be destroyed as a free nation by unsound fiscal policies which must result in financial collapse and national bankruptcy. The inevitable consequence is the loss of all freedom under socialistic dictatorship.

You may recall that the President, in his state of the Union message, said:

"The Government must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

The statement was cheered in Congress. It raised the hopes of the American people. It gave the impression that in the trying days ahead the Truman administration was committed to economy in nondefense expenditures.

But it took only a single week for this pledge to vanish in thin air. When the President submitted his budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, it called for the spending of $71,500,000,000. It provided for revenues of $55,000,000,000, leaving a deficit of sixteen and a half billion to be made up by additional taxation.

Instead of calling for "rigid economy in nondefense activities," the budget proposed the highest nondefense spending in our Nation's history, an increase of $6,000,000,000 over this year's figure.

Members of Congress and the American people were shocked at this utter disregard by the President of his economy pledge.

That stalwart Democrat, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, called the budget message "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

But Mr. Truman dared Congress to cut a single dollar from his spending requests.

He said, and I quote, "The requirements of national security are reflected in every major function of the budget."

When we examine some of the major functions that he advocated, we find the same old socialistic proposals that have been rejected by one Congress after another.

Formerly they were pushed as part of a so-called social-welfare program. Now they are put forward in the guise of measures necessary for national defense.

Included are the Brannan plan, to regiment agriculture at a cost of billions of dollars to the taxpayers, the vicious scheme to socialize the practice of medicine, the dangerous proposal to place education under Federal regulation, and other socialistic schemes.

Now the President talks about a balanced budget, and he has asked for $16,000,000,000 in new or increased taxes. He has recommended to Congress additional tax proposals that would raise $10,000,000,000 and has said he would make further proposals for another $6,000,000,000.

I have always been a strong advocate of a balanced budget. I believe that we should pay the cost of building our defense on a pay-as-you-go basis. But I want to make it clear, however, that I do not propose to support revenue measures that would add $16,000,000,000 to the backbreaking burden now carried by the American taxpayer.

I am convinced that somewhere between $6,000,000,000 and $9,000,000,000 can be chopped out of Mr. Truman's $71,500,000,000 budget. I do not propose to load new taxes on the taxpayers of the United States to pay for the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, socialized education, and the other socialistic programs in the budget.

I refused to do it in peacetime. I certainly will not do it at a time when every possible dollar must be dedicated to the defense of the Republic.

I am convinced that every department of Government could reduce its spending by 20 percent without sacrifice of efficiency and without curtailing any essential service.

Let me cite one example of what can be done where there is the will to economize.

The Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, is the directing head of the General Accounting Office. He is appointed by Congress, not the President, for a 15-year term and cannot be reappointed.

In April 1946 that agency reached a peak of 14,904 employees. This figure was steadily reduced until it was down to 7,063 at the beginning of 1951. That was a reduction of 7,841 persons, representing an annual payroll reduction of $31,377,500.

In other words, Mr. Warren is operating the General Accounting Office with less than half the people he had in 1946 and it is operating in 1951 with greater efficiency than ever before.

In the same period every department and agency under the President was growing, expanding and bursting at the seams. For some time the number of Federal employees has been increasing at the rate of 1,000 a day.

Let me tell you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, that a strong, solvent, economically sound America must be our first line of defense against Communist aggression. It is the only way we can stop the drift toward a socialistic state.

Therefore I shall battle against every scheme for needless spending that would increase the tax burden upon the wage earner and upon productive industry.

With the spirit of American patriotism as our guide, each of us, as individuals, can help strengthen the defense of our country.

The troubled times ahead call for work and sacrifice.

Every American must be prepared to do his share.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. The next talk in this series will be given 2 weeks from today. Thank you so much for your attention.

The New Alger Hiss Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the conviction of Alger Hiss has been confirmed by our highest court through refusal to review his case.

This brings to a close not only a brilliant and potentially promising career, but also one of the most sordid chapters in the history of the administration which controls the executive branch of the Government. The recent attempt to escape responsibility will fool no one. In the beginning, the apologists for the administration defended their erstwhile idol by claiming that he was being picked on and vilified for political hysterical reasons and that a trial would surely result in his vindication.

After a jury had unanimously found him guilty following an eminently fair second trial, the official line changed to the effect that he was shielding his wife or someone else in a commendable spirit of chivalry or martyrdom. It was the story heard on all sides among his admirers and many of his former associates in Government.

Now a new administration apologia appears in the current issue of Harper's magazine, where the author alleges that Mr. Hiss "was never an important figure in the State Department." This newly concocted fantasy is effectively answered in two editorials in the Washington Times-Herald, which, under leave to extend my remarks, are included below. The factual data furnished by former Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane must be accepted, unless refuted by equally powerful evidence:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

THE UNIMPORTANCE OF ALGER HISS

In a magazine article in defense of Secretary of State Acheson, Mr. Elmer Davis, the news analyst and wartime director of the OWI, attempts to slough off Alger Hiss in a way that could surprise no one more than Hiss himself.

The article, The Crusade Against Acheson, appears in the March 1951 issue of Harper's magazine, and contains this bit of beautiful letters:

"Let it be noted, by the way, that Hiss was never an important figure in the State Department. He was a rising young man, a useful technician; but that he ever made policy, at Yalta or anywhere else, is pure (or rather impure) myth."

We take this to be the new line on Hiss soon to be adopted by administration apologists everywhere. The old line, of course, was that poor Hiss was but a "red herring" victim of some nasty Republican politicians playing nasty politics. This won't do any longer, now that Hiss has been convicted, and so we are told that he wasn't really an important fellow to begin with, and let's not fuss about him.

An unimportant fellow, this Hiss? Well, suppose we go back to August 5, 1948, and see what Hiss himself, testifying before the House Un-American Activities Committee, had to say on this point. We give here some key questions and answers as they appear in the official record of that hearing:

"Mr. MUNDT. Did you participate in the Yalta Conference?

"Mr. HISS. I did, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. MUNDT. Did you draft or participate in the drafting of parts of the Yalta agreement?

"Mr. HISS. I think it is accurate and not an immodest statement to say that I did to some extent, yes."

Is this a mere technician speaking? Mr. Davis would have us think so.

A bit later in the hearing, Mr. MUNDT asked Hiss if he had participated in drawing up the veto provisions that later were to appear in the United Nations charter. This colloquy developed:

"Mr. MUNDT. What I was trying to get to is whether you participated in the creation of the draft.

"Mr. HISS. I did participate in the creation of the draft that was sent by President Roosevelt to Churchill and Stalin, which was the draft actually adopted at Yalta and actually adopted at San Francisco.

"Mr. MUNDT. Did you lend your influence in the direction of having the veto provision included in that draft?

"Mr. HISS. I did. That was practically the unanimous position of the American Government, I might add."

Such was the vein in which this allegedly unimportant flunkey testified. That a particular decision may have been taken in the face of his opposition, or that he may not have been consulted in some matters, is quite beside the point. The fact remains that he was there, on the scene of big decisions, participating in them in a major capacity and lending his influence as he saw fit.

Later that August of 1948, in a letter to the House committee, Hiss named all sorts of VIP's as his former associates and superiors and declared, in part:

"This charge (i. e., that Hiss was or had been a Communist) goes beyond the personal. Attempts will be made to use it, and the resulting publicity, to discredit recent great achievements of this country in which I was privileged to participate. * * *

"As an official of the Department of State, I was appointed secretary general, the top administrative officer, of the peace-building international assembly that created the United Nations."

Does that indicate merely "a rising young man, a useful technician?"

That same August, Adolph A. Berle, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State, set for the House committee the first time "when Hiss would have been in a position to do anything effectively"—when Acheson became Assistant Secretary and Hiss his executive assistant.

Mr. Berle also told how, in the fall of 1944, there was a difference of opinion in the State Department:

"I felt that the Russians were not going to be sympathetic and cooperative, * * * I was pressing for a pretty clean-cut showdown then. * * * The opposite group in the State Department was largely the men—Mr. Acheson's group, of course, with Mr. Hiss as his principal assistant in the matter."

The unimportant Alger Hiss, is it? You be the judge. We add only the postscript of Mr. Berle: "I got trimmed in that fight, and, as a result, went to Brazil, and that ended my diplomatic career."

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

SPEAK UP, GENTLEMEN

We have here a challenge to former officials of the State department, to come forward and tell the truth about Alger Hiss. The challenge is put by one of their own, Arthur Bliss Lane, a distinguished career diplomat with an unblemished record of public service.

Mr. Lane has issued his challenge in the form of a letter to the Times-Herald, just as the Supreme Court thumbs Hiss up the river for as light a term in prison as any traitor ever got.

The Supreme Court decision leaves Hiss no way out, unless Truman has the brass to grant him an Executive pardon. That is possible, of course. Truman has pardoned plenty of other criminals with less claim on the administration's own peculiar brand of loyalty.

The other criminals merely gave the administration its gangster friends, gangster money and gangster political support. Hiss, the spy for Russia, gave the whole New Deal the cover post of moral and intellectual snob appeal and so worked in powerful ways in the highest circles of American ignorance. He helped bend the minds of college professors who helped bend the minds of a generation's students, voters, soldiers and wives.

Now he is safely behind the bars. But yet it remains an obligation for all honest men who know what he has done to put the facts on record.

Mr. Lane's challenge reads as follows:

"I have read your splendid editorial of today [Times-Herald, Sunday, March 11] refuting the contention of Mr. Elmer Davis, former head of the Office of War Information, that Alger Hiss was an unimportant personage in the Department of State.

"The Hiss case, with its terrifying international implications, is so serious that, without regard to the legal and judicial considerations, all those who had contact officially or privately with Hiss should make a public record of their recollection so that the American people may determine whether he was or was not an important cog in the formation of our foreign policy culminating in the Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and Korean disasters.

"Shortly after my arrival in Washington in October 1944, en route to my post as Ambassador to the Polish Government in London (later I was appointed to the Government in Warsaw) I was invited by the then Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle, Jr., to attend the biweekly meetings of the policy committee of the Department of State.

"This was during the period of the serious illness of Secretary Hull. The meetings were presided over by the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and the meetings were discontinued when Mr. Stettinius was appointed Secretary of State in the latter part of 1944.

"At these meetings Hiss generally sat on the left hand of Mr. Stettinius and it was to him, as well as to Mr. Leo Pasvolsky (whose reliability is without a blemish) that Mr. Stettinius requested advice in front of the rest of the gathering on such matters as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the future organization of the United Nations.

"I would suggest for the sake of accuracy that other former State Department officials should also testify through your columns as to whether Hiss played an important or unimportant part in the making of decisions of major policy.

"The meetings which I attended at the invitation of Mr. Berle were also attended by 15 or 20 other State Department officials, several of whom were, like myself, astounded at the apparent influence which this at that time relatively unknown official was exercising on matters of the greatest international importance.

"It is evident from his having been one of the insiders at Yalta and by his appointment as Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in April 1945 that Hiss was more than a figurehead during that crucial year.

"By the way, was it not the Office of War Information that broadcast to the world that the Germans; not the Russians, were responsible for the murder of 4,000 Polish officers whose bodies were found in the mass grave at Katyn, near Smolensk, in 1943?

"We know now from medical and diplomatic evidence that the Soviet Government was responsible for this atrocious crime, yet Mr. Elmer Davis' OWI tried to make the world swallow the Soviet propaganda.

"Yours very truly,

"ARTHUR BLISS LANE."

There it is, gentlemen. You have heard from one of your own and one you can't shrug off. Speak right up. Just address your revelations to "Voice of the People, Times-Herald, 1317 H Street NW., Washington 5, D. C."

Stick to the facts, leave off the rhetoric and keep it clean, otherwise call it as you see it. Who'll be the first?

Disorders in Barcelona, Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown relating to disturbances in Barcelona, Spain, published in the Washington Evening Star of March 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAD NEWS FOR THE MILITARY—INDUSTRIAL DISORDERS IN SPAIN COULD HINDER PLANS OF EISENHOWER FOR EUROPEAN DEFENSE

(By Constantine Brown)

Disturbances are reported to have broken out in Barcelona, Spain's most important industrial city.

A strike followed by street riots in that second largest city of Spain were caused by the increasing cost of living and the prospect that about 650,000 persons, most of them employed in cotton mills, will become unemployed in the next few weeks because of the lack of cotton.

While this may be pleasing news for those who oppose the Franco regime, it is highly unwelcome news for General Eisenhower and all other military planners among the Atlantic pact nations. Spain is not a member of that organization and is not likely to be accepted, for political reasons, by western European nations.

But from the military strategic point of view that country is regarded as one of the highly important assets in the general defense plan for Europe. And the military planners know that a country which is not healthy economically is unlikely to be of real assistance in the event of a general conflict with the Russians and their satellites.

This was one of the reasons for building up the free nations economically and also the reason why this country has come to Marshal Tito's assistance in recent months by providing him with millions of dollars for food when the Yugoslav crops failed.

Because it was evident that a serious crisis may break out in Spain, Congress last summer approved a loan of $65,000,000 to Spain through the Export-Import Bank. This legislation did not please the White House and the State Department. President Truman approved it only reluctantly and said so publicly.

Taking the cue, apparently from the feelings which prevailed among the Executive branch's policy-makers, the Export-Import Bank was slow in granting the sums approved by Congress. Of the $65,000,000 only $12,500,000 has been approved so far.

Because of crop failures during the last 3 years, Spain is in great need of food grains. Yet the Export-Import Bank did not provide any portion of the loan to be used for the purchase of wheat or corn in this country.

There is a surplus of wheat in the United States. The administration is anxious for Congress to approve a gift of 2,000,000 tons of food grains to India. Administration spokesmen argue that in spite of the Indian Government's hostile attitude in the United Nations, political considerations must not be permitted to affect humanitarian actions. But it appears to average observers that in applying this golden rule, what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander.

While we do not permit politics to influence our help to Communist Yugoslavia or to pro-Red-China-India, we draw the line when Franco's Spain is concerned.

Because of an alleged expected shortage of cotton, the Agriculture Department has established quotas for the export of that commodity. These quotas have a political tinge. By using the figures for the last 3 years in the establishment of these quotas India can purchase much larger quantities of cotton than can Spain.

The reason is believed to be that prior to 1947 India got the bulk of her cotton from Pakistan. It was only after its political quarrel with that sister republic that the New Delhi government started buying cotton in this country.

During that period Spain has been able to buy little in the United States because of the dollar shortage. Spain's quotas for the 1950–51 period was set at only 51,000 bales. It happens that Spain used to be one of this country's best cotton markets. Her mills are tooled for the American type and not for long-staple Egyptian cotton.

When the Export-Import Bank was directed by law to extend Spain credits for $65,000,000, the Spanish Government hoped that it could purchase the needed cotton in this country. Now it has discovered that money for such a purpose is not available and at the same time it is faced with a quota established by the Agriculture Department limiting its imports drastically.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. John L. McClellan, of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] on the occasion of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Richmond, Va., March 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, RICHMOND, VA., MARCH 9, 1951

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Democrats, and citizens of Virginia, the holding of Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners is now a long-established, popular custom of the Democratic Party. The original was held in Washington, D. C., in 1830. It was given in memory of Thomas Jefferson, and its guest of honor was President Jackson. Although on that occasion President Jackson gave his solemn and now famous toast, "Our Federal Union, it must be preserved," today these dinners are regarded as strictly partisan in character. They might well be characterized as an annual one-night political revival. They serve to revive our enthusiasm, to stimulate greater interest and activity, and to enlist support calculated to insure success of the party in coming campaigns.

On these occasions it is both appropriate and generally expected that the remarks of the speakers shall be directed largely to extolling virtues of the Democratic Party and its leaders, both present and past, and to condemning and damning the opposition party. While taking some advantage of the opportunity for that purpose, out of deference to what I conceive to be of equal or greater importance, and in the spirit of the famous toast of President Jackson, I should like also to refer to some of our problems that, in my judgment, largely transcend partisan considerations.

The grave dangers that now threaten our destruction do not permit the indulgence of politics as usual, anymore than does the mobilization of our military strength and the resulting strain on our economy permit of business as usual. The challenge we face seems to me to be of such magnitude that it can only be met and repelled by the strong resolve, sacrificial courage, and fortitude of a united people.

In the difficult days ahead, I am persuaded that we can reach greater heights of patriotism if we will place the stronger emphasis on achieving that unity and on devotion and service to our country, rather than on gaining the temporary political success of any person or any party. The political party that will exercise the wisdom and courage to adopt and present the highest standard of policies and principles in its platform, in my judgment, will not only meet with popular acclaim and be most likely to succeed in coming elections, but it will be the party best prepared and most competent to guide our Nation through the perilous vicissitudes that now so seriously endanger our priceless heritage of freedom. I want your party and mine, the Democratic Party, to measure up to its opportunities and to those responsibilities of leadership and statesmanship that the exigencies of the present crisis demand.

I am not implying that party affiliations or considerations should be unduly minimized or wholly disregarded. Surely party politics has a proper place in our scheme of government. Our traditional two-party system has for a century and a half contributed mightily to the success and strength of our democracy. It has provided a wholesome and an effective check and balance and the means by which the will of the majority is determined and is made to prevail. Our two-party system generally affords the fullest opportunity for presenting the issues on which the people in the exercise of their franchise register a decision and impress their will upon the Government, and upon their servants whom they choose and entrust with the responsibilities of public office.

We desire not to abandon this system but rather to strengthen and improve it so that public and political issues may be more clearly defined, and more intelligently understood by the people when they make their decision in the marking of their ballots on election day.

It was that great and immortal Virginian, one whom we revere and honor tonight, who 150 years ago so ably formulated and promulgated the philosophy of government upon which the Democratic Party was founded. The great ideals and principles which Thomas Jefferson profoundly espoused, and which for the most part have influenced and guided the deliberations and policies of the Democratic Party since its existence, have been a source of constant inspiration to me throughout my public life, just as they have claimed and sustained the hope and faith of the American people in our free and democratic institutions and in the true concepts of justice and equality under the law.

The superb quality of leadership and statesmanship our party has often provided are in a large measure responsible for the great economic growth and power our Nation has achieved and for the unequaled and unexcelled happiness and prosperity that our people have enjoyed. To perpetuate these ideals and to preserve their benefits and blessings to posterity is the highest aim to which the Democratic Party can aspire, and is the most sacred and inescapable duty and obligation it has assumed.

First of all, you and I are Americans. Our beloved country and its welfare is our first concern. Secondly, we are partisan and Democrats in our politics. I am by heritage, by training, and above all by conscience and choice a Democrat. I yield to no one in my loyalty and devotion to the principles of the real Democratic Party. I have never, however, boasted of being a "yellow-dog Democrat." Such an aphorism has never appealed to me. I like neither the description nor the implication that he who professes to be such is willing to swallow or support any proposal, plank, or platform, however repugnant to his conscience it may be so long as it bears a "Democrat" label.

If in modern times some descriptive or identifying term must be used to emphasize the different kinds of Democrats—such as "New Dealer," "Fair Dealer," or some other—then I prefer to be known and accepted as a Jeffersonian Democrat—a southern Democrat, if you please. I regard those as honorable distinctions, for it is traditionally characteristic of Jeffersonian-southern Democrats to stand firmly for the basic and fundamental principles of liberty. In times of great stress and under oft-repeated pressure, Jeffersonian-southern Democrats in the National Congress have been unwilling to abandon those principles or to barter them away for temporary political expediency or in exchange for political patronage and favors.

I have not and you perhaps have not agreed with all that is contained in recent Democratic national platforms, or with some legislative proposals of the present administration. However, in disagreeing with and opposing some provisions in the national platform and some legislation sponsored by the administration, we have not sought nor have we attempted to find sanctuary for our opposition in the philosophy of the Republican Party.

On most of the issues that are highly controversial among Democrats, we find that a large segment of the Republican Party and its leaders have simply adopted a "me-too'sm" attitude. In many instances, both the Republican Party and its leaders strongly advocate the same proposals to which we Jeffersonian Democrats so vigorously object. This "me-too'sm" attitude is possibly the outstanding weakness today in the Republican Party. Its lack of courage and willingness to accept issues, and its failure to challenge unwise and unsound proposals and to vigorously champion the opposition viewpoint have caused such serious impairment of its vitality that today it borders on bankruptcy in both ideals and leadership. As a result, many American citizens who are largely independent in their political thinking and voting have practically abandoned all hope of any improvement or prospect for better government under a Republican administration.

Such losses as we have sustained and such gains as Republicans have made in recent campaigns are attributable primarily to objectionable policies and programs with which our own party is burdened, rather than to the faith and confidence of the people in the Republican Party. In recent years the Republican Party has weaseled and vacillated so much and "me-too'd" so many things that the people have been unwilling to look to it and to trust it to bring about the progress and reforms in Government that are desirable and needed.

It is not my purpose to cast unwarranted aspersions upon the opposition party. I want always to be charitable and temperate, but in any just and fair comparison of the two major parties, the Republican Party invariably suffers and is found wanting. Therefore, I wish to make it plain that while disagreeing with some parts of the Democratic platform and while opposing some legislative recommendations of the President, I intend to lend neither encouragement nor comfort to the Republican Party, for I have neither interest in nor desire for its success.

However, there are some good Republicans. There are those in the Congress and in the Senate of the United States who sometimes rise above party to principle and vote with us southern Democrats. When they do that, they usually attain their highest mark of statesmanship. With their assistance and support, we are often able to defeat unwholesome legislative proposals, and likewise to prevent some misguided leaders of the Democratic Party and the Congress from

committing tragic errors by the enactment of laws that would be destructive of our liberties and detrimental to the welfare of our people.

The Democratic Party is now in power. For the next 2 years at least it is entrusted with the stewardship of national affairs. Its task is difficult. Its responsibilities are heavy and grave indeed. Possibly there was never a similar period of time in our history that was fraught with greater dangers than those now confronting us and which are indicated in the immediate future.

We are living in a dangerous world—in a time of wars and rumors of war. Free peoples everywhere are gripped with fear and anxiety lest there now be a third world war in the making. Freedom and democracy are being attacked on all fronts by an atheistic ideology of communism under the rule of totalitarian aggressors. Obviously they seek not the establishment of peace or good will among men. They are bent upon destruction and conquest. There is every indication that these abominable forces of evil will resort to any means or measures to achieve their goal, including the instigation of another world war if and when they become convinced they can win. That horrible prospect is neither mythical nor imaginary. Our very existence is challenged. The whole free world is imperiled by this monster that seeks to devour the liberties and freedoms of mankind. That is the danger we face from without. That danger compels us to rearm and get prepared for any eventuality.

We face other dangers from within. The burden of unprecedented expenditures for rearmament will place a strain upon our economy that could well jeopardize if not shatter its very foundations if we neglect or fail to promptly invoke the most rigid economy and pursue sound fiscal policies in the expenditures of the Federal Government. Strong inflationary trends are present everywhere. Unfortunately spending "as usual" seems to be still in order in many quarters. Higher taxes are inevitable. A pay-as-you-go policy cannot and will not succeed unless the Federal Government as such makes sacrifices in spending comparable to those it calls upon the people to make in their way of living.

A wrecked economy and national insolvency resulting from devastating inflation and unbearable indebtedness are the dangers we face from within. If such occurs, our liberties would be greatly impaired and our military fortress so dangerously weakened that it would be vulnerable to any mighty assault that might be made against it. If we are to stay strong, a sound economic and fiscal position must be maintained. Federal spending for normal services and functions must be materially curtailed. Every budgetary item that is not a fixed cost of Government should be reduced to the essential minimum. Expenditures for national defense should also be carefully scrutinized to prevent waste and extravagance. All proposed expenditures that are unnecessary to the indispensable functions of Government and that are not absolutely necessary for our mobilization and war effort must be rejected.

The President's budget should no longer be regarded as sacrosanct. Congress should—and I believe Congress will—accept the challenge of the President and reduce it. Budget requests to initiate and provide for the iniquitous FEPC, for the infamous so-called Brannan plan, and for the socialistic national compulsory health insurance, and other such schemes should be denied. They will be denied. I mention those three specifically only as samples and illustrations. They clearly indicate an attempt on the part of the administration to take advantage of the war emergency to impose these unpopular and undesired proposals and programs on the American people against their will. These items shall not pass. It is along these lines that I have disagreed with party leadership.

Associated with such proposals is another danger to America, as I see it. During the past two decades the false philosophy that Government should provide for and insure the economic security of every citizen has gained dangerous headway in our Nation. Both major parties must share the blame for having indoctrinated many of our people with the illusion that the Federal Government has and must exercise a paternalistic responsibility and attitude toward the individual economic needs of every citizen. Our Government was not founded on such principles. The cry that was heralded throughout the land in 1776 was the cry for "liberty." When your own Patrick Henry exclaimed, "Give me liberty or give me death," his words, their spirit, and their meaning, were heard and understood around the world. Our founding fathers undertook to and did establish a Government that would insure freedom of the individual, and not a Government that guaranteed their economic security. In the past few years both major political parties, motivated no doubt by political expediency, have sought to entice voters by emphasizing the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide economic security for every citizen. The modern cry of our day too often is, "Give me security," without due regard for freedom.

More than 50 years ago when threats of socialism were limited and weak and before paternalism had become entrenched in the National Government as it is today, another great American and a great leader of our party, Grover Cleveland, wisely counseled in these words:

"The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned, and the better lesson taught that while the people should patriotically and cheerfully support their Government, its functions do not include the support of the people."

Thomas Jefferson foresaw that this danger would arise and warned the Democratic Party and the American people against it when he said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements."

And then he gave this warning:

"If we prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

These modern schemes, such as the FEPC, the Brannan farm plan, and the proposal for national compulsory health insurance, all come within the category of the Federal Government wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them.

I strongly urge that our party abandon and repudiate these obnoxious proposals. We are already loaded with an astronomical perpetual debt. We are already taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. Higher and higher taxes are demanded and needed. We are told we must tax "until it hurts." If the leadership of our party insists that we do that, and if it is necessary that we do it, then it is the solemn duty and responsibility of our party and our leaders to see that the Federal Government correspondingly economizes "until it hurts."

This crisis we are in requires and demands the most and best in statesmanship and not greater artifice and cunning in partisanship. I should like to see our party return to the basic ideals and fundamental virtues that were so wisely proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson. It should dare to put the interest and welfare of our Nation and the American people above politics. It should champion economy and pursue sound fiscal policies rather than indulge in wasteful expenditures and extravagant promises of more paternalism in Government.

These are some of the reforms that many of us are fighting for within the party. We are not fighting against the party, but fighting for it and for the survival of America. Sometimes we fight with our backs against the wall and under most unfavorable and adverse conditions. Our labors are not always pleasant. The charge of disloyalty is often hurled at us. We who oppose paternalistic and socialistic schemes and advocate economy and common sense in government are not the ones who are disloyal. We are those who are true and faithful to the party's original ideals and concepts. If any betrayal of party is involved in these issues and conflicts, then the shoe is on the other foot.

I have never assented to or accepted the test of party loyalty that some would attempt to impose. My concept of party loyalty does not require abject subservience to the whim or will of any temporary leader. Nor does it compel me to support platforms, planks, or legislative proposals that are repugnant to and violate the fundamental principles of our liberty.

I am a Democrat. I want the Democratic Party to remain in power. I want it to retain and deserve the confidence and support of the American people. I want it to be worthy of that confidence and of victory in future elections. I want it to be the party best equipped in leadership, in policies, and ideals, and the party most capable and competent to guide our destinies and steer us through the storms and dangers of the present to a happy landing on the distant shores of peace.

The party that will have the courage to be forthright and the wisdom to present a platform of principles and policies that are reassuring to the American people, the party to which they can always come with confident hope that under its leadership America will survive and our liberties and democracy will be preserved—that is the party that will triumph tomorrow.

The people today are considerably confused and greatly distressed. They are no longer complacent or indifferent. They are becoming militant and determined to have better government. They are looking for integrity and character in party standards and leadership. Let us not be under any illusions regarding future party successes. They are not a certainty. We must earn and deserve victory if we are to remain in power. The people will change administrations if we trifle with their confidence.

So, I want to see the Democratic Party clean up, straighten up, and measure up to its opportunities and responsibilities and be worthy of its founder, its traditions and the continued confidence and support of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Senator McCarran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] which appeared in the February 1951 issue of the American Foreign Service Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR PAT McCARRAN

(By Joan David)

"Anyone who enjoys work certainly can have a hell of a good time in this office" is the sign that greets the eye on entering the small suite occupied by Senator PAT McCARRAN, of Nevada, and his staff on Capitol Hill. If anything, that sign is an understatement. Hardest worker in the office is the Senator himself. As one staff member plaintively put it, "By working at top speed all day, you can be even with the Boss when you go home at night. But by the time he gets to his desk at eight the next morning, he's way ahead of you. Not only does he take work home with him at night, but he starts in on it again when he wakes up in the morning, around 4 or 5 a. m."

McCARRAN is the first native-born Nevadan to be elected to the United States Senate. He was born in 1876 and he likes to think of his birthplace as "a century after the Declaration of Independence." An only child, he worked summers during his high school and college years herding sheep, gradually acquiring a flock of his own. At the University of Nevada he attracted notice as a star debater and popularity as a star athlete. On the football team he first played left guard, then right tackle. He claims he's "never been left of center since."

McCARRAN was 26 when he was elected to the Nevada State legislature. While there he introduced (in 1904) the first bill for an 8-hour day. It was for the miners and smelters of Nevada. There, too, he continued the reading of Blackstone he had started in his ranching days (the marks of the saddle thongs still show on the old volumes) and was admitted to the bar when his 3-year legislative term was up. Next he became a District Attorney of Nye County and was later elected Chief Justice of the Nevada Supreme Court. None of his decisions has been overruled. McCARRAN is very proud of the fact that the law firm he established soon after that judicial interlude still exists (McCARRAN and Wedge) although associates have changed and he does not actively practice now. Nevada has no law school of its own and it has become traditional there now for promising young men who want to study law to come to Washington. McCARRAN gets them daytime jobs—there are always five or six of them on his own staff—and they go to school at nights. Thirty-eight such protegés have now graduated and gone back home with the result that there are "city and district attorneys all over the State who are devoted to him."

IN POLITICS FOR 40 YEARS

At 74, PAT McCARRAN has been in politics off and on for 40 years. He is now serving his fourth term in the Senate. Although a Democrat, the political position he can be said to have followed most consistently has been that of Nevada's United States spokesman. Nevada's welfare has even been incorporated into some of the major foreign legislation he has sponsored. Both his proposed China Aid Act of a few years ago and more recently the Spanish Assistance Act contained provisions for loans of silver bullion to those two countries.[1] On non-Nevada issues, it's not his party but his conscience, that is his guide.

[1] Aid to Spain as finally passed by Congress, McCARRAN's fourth try on this pet project, was incorporated into ECA's Marshall plan activities.

ENERGETIC AND CONSCIENTIOUS

McCARRAN takes his congressional obligations with an earnest sense of duty. While others may attend committee hearings when it is convenient, McCARRAN makes sure that nothing else interferes. Keeping up with senatorial committee work is a full-time job in itself. For McCARRAN, chairmanship of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eighty-first Congress meant attending the bulk of the 330 separate hearing sessions held by the committee and its subcommittees (the Judiciary Committee handles over 40 percent of the Senate's business). He usually gets one or two calls before a meeting from Members who just can't make it but say that anything he approves will be all right with them. In addition, McCARRAN is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handles the budget for the Justice, Commerce, and State Departments, and he is a very vocal member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid and played a leading part in the establishment and work of the ECA watchdog committee.

McCARRAN's physical energy leaves his colleagues amazed, his assistants exhausted, and the opposition wondering just what hit them. He never seems to get tense or tired and claims that he is refreshed simply by turning from one problem to another.

McCARRAN believes that the Appropriations Committees are just beginning to realize the full extent of their legislative responsibilities and power. He feels that in the current session this broadened concept will be developed and exercised.

VIEWS ON THE FOREIGN SERVICE

So far as the Foreign Service itself is concerned, McCARRAN declares that while this is bound to be a year in which defense items must have budgetary priority, the Foreign Service is an important civilian element in the safeguarding of our national security. He does protest, though, that certain elements of the Foreign Service have lost touch with the things that make up America. He feels that these elements are prone to apologize for the American way of doing things, rather than holding the American methods and ideals out as firm guides to countries that do not enjoy the benefits of our way of life. For this reason he feels that appointments made from all walks of American life can contribute immeasurably to a speed-up of negotiations and resultant understanding between countries. The so-called "career diplomat," he says, "is brought up from the beginning in the obscurities of diplomacy, rather than the realities of international relations." He singled out the exchange-of-persons program as one that was certainly all to the good. Also he would favor doing everything possible to improve our relations with our southern neighbors.

Uppermost in his mind regarding the Department is to clear the State Department of those who are sympathetic with Communist activities or with the so-called one-world movement. He also feels that the Department has improperly appropriated to itself a share in telling the Defense Department what to do. McCARRAN's aides are quick to point out that this is not an anti-State Department prejudice, but a question of issues. Most recently, McCARRAN has been defending the Department's stand on the interpretation of the Internal Security Act as against that made by the Justice Department.

McCARRAN's legislative record reveals a considerable interest in aviation. He sponsored the first bill for a separate Air Force, in 1936. He was largely responsible for the civilian pilot training program, and he authorized the bill for the establishment of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. His campaign listing of his achievements for Nevada, incidentally, includes along with roads, dams, post offices, etc., some 10 Nevada airports for which he helped secure Federal funds. The Las Vegas airport is known officially as McCarran Field.

McCARRAN led the anti-Court-packing fight during Roosevelt days. In 1946 he sponsored the Administrative Procedure Act which generally tidied up and made uniform the regulations governing cases tried before those agencies (such as the Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Communications Commission, etc.), which act as courts as well as prosecutors. His 1951 contribution, along with these lines is the recently introduced omnibus bill, which is a complete revision and codification of the hundreds of old immigration and naturalization laws which had grown into a hodgepodge over the years.

DP legislation (one of his few notable defeats) and the Internal Security Act have brought McCARRAN as bad public relations on a national scale as almost any one of his colleagues has ever had on any issue. McCARRAN was urged not to stick out his neck on the question of admitting DP's to this country. Friends pointed out that it was an explosive issue and didn't affect Nevada at all. But the Senator felt he must protect the country against being overrun by Communist agents and by cheap foreign labor. McCARRAN makes no attempt to combat his bad publicity. He sends out press releases on particularly important issues, but never on himself. He almost never accepts speaking engagements. While one may disagree with him, it is impossible on going into the debates on these, or any issues on which he takes a stand, to fail to recognize his sincerity. His staff vouches for the fact that he goes into a subject exhaustively before making up his mind. When he does, it is almost impossible to shake his conviction that he is right.

McCARRAN's staff, who treat him with all the reverence due a prophet, feel sad but resigned about his bad press. They wish that when events prove him right there could be some publicity, too. Almost wistfully they point out that during the debates a few years ago when McCARRAN was urging aid for Chiang to combat the Red menace in China he predicted what has happened in Korea.

Hundreds of people come to McCARRAN's office every week. The largest classifiable groups among those who are not Government officials are like the young man in an Air Force uniform who came just as I was leaving to "see about gettin' my wife here from Italy." Next come those who want free legal advice on establishing residence in Nevada with its twin attractions of quick divorce and no State income tax.

Although his staff usually takes care of these as well as many others, McCARRAN personally sees a great many people in his office. The overflow he sees at home where his wife keeps track of business appointments from about 7:30 on for most evenings. He almost never takes the time for any of Washington's social life. As for peace and quiet and time to call his own—that must wait, he ruefully explains, until he gets back into the sagebrush country. But after all, he philosophizes, "It's better to wear out than to rust out."

Benjamin Stolberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Benjamin Stolberg," from the February 12, 1951, issue of the Freeman, and one entitled "He Was a Man," by Charles Yale Harrison, from the Freeman for February 26, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Freeman of February 12, 1951]

BENJAMIN STOLBERG

All through the popular front and wartime periods of "everything for Russia, even our self-respect," a pitifully small handful of prophetic writers in this country kept reiterating that it was dangerous to put any long-term trust in Stalin's dictatorship. The strain of bucking the great delusion for virtually two decades is now apparent in the death notices. A few weeks ago James K. McGuinness, the stanch leader of the anti-Communist fight in Hollywood, died of a heart attack. And just within the fortnight Benjamin Stolberg, irascible, delightful, catankerous and amusing Ben, followed Jim McGuinness at the all-too-young age of 59. In his case, too, it was a heart attack.

Ben Stolberg was one of America's pioneer anti-Communists among the intellectuals. A labor journalist in the twenties, Ben began by admiring the theories of Marx and Lenin. But Ben always believed in letting facts correct his theories, and when he caught the American Communists of the twenties in a red-handed theft of Sacco-Vanzetti defense funds he cried out in righteous anger. This was the beginning of a change of mind and heart that led him quickly back to passionate individualism. In 1937 Ben undertook to do a series of articles on the CIO for the Scripps-Howard papers. He discovered communism at work in some of the CIO unions, and said so. When the articles were expanded into a book, The Story of the CIO, the Communists and fellow-travelers in New York ganged up on Ben's reputation, smearing him in a thousand-and-one snide and utterly despicable ways. The smears had their powerful effect in editorial offices. But when Phil Murray finally got around to kicking the Communist unions out of the CIO a decade later it was on evidence, now fully corroborated by time, that Ben had originally assembled when it was dangerous to assemble it.

Ben paid a high price for being right at the journalistically wrong moment. Like other men of integrity before him, he was forced to live uncomplainingly in very strait circumstances. He developed a writing "block" largely because he felt there was little place for his work in the generally soft-headed American press. But he continued to have a very large influence. The wittiest of conversationalists, Ben poured out his ideas in talk that will be remembered to the day his last friend dies. If Ben had only had a Boswell among his acquaintances he would go down in history as the Dr. Johnson of the social struggle. Maybe his friends, if they tug painfully at their memories, will constitute themselves a sort of collective Boswell in Ben's behalf. Certain it is that Ben never lived a day without fashioning a new and devastating epigram. His epigrams were not merely clever; they were also enduringly wise. Reporters, columnists, editors, politicians, young book writers, trade-union leaders fell into the habit of calling Ben up to consult him on everything from personal problems to world affairs. At the time of his death he had become a sort of one-man general staff for virtually all the good soldiers in the anti-Communist struggle.

A passionately intellectual man (the description is Andrew Overby's), Ben was religious in his own way. "God," he said on one occasion, "is freedom." Since these few paragraphs are all too inadequate a farewell to Ben Stolberg as he goes to meet his God of freedom, we promise our readers a more extended estimate of Ben's significance in an early issue of the Freeman. Meanwhile let us say it right here and now: "Ben Stolberg was a better fighter for truth than any of us."

[From the Freeman of February 26, 1951]

HE WAS A MAN

(By Charles Yale Harrison)

We are adjured, and quite properly, to say nothing but good of the dead. This is an injunction, however, with which compliance is sometimes difficult. But in speaking of Benjamin Stolberg it is, I think, particularly easy, since there was so much that was not only good but distinctive and superb in his life.

There was, for instance, his wholehearted and unalterable devotion to the cause of human freedom in the face of the threat of totalitarian slavery. There was, too, his brilliant intuition, his keen insight, his sensitive awareness, his incisive and sometimes deadly wit, his engaging humor, and his unmistakable, distinguished prose style.

William Hazlitt once remarked that the love of liberty was the love of others and that the love of power was the love of ourselves. If this it true, as indeed it is, then Ben Stolberg's love of others was boundless.

He was among the first of us to recognize, with amazing clarity, the threat to our free institutions inherent in communism. And for this foresight he paid a heavy price. For years he was relentlessly maligned, traduced, and vilified by the agents of Stalin's fifth column both here and abroad. He was boycotted, blacklisted, and frequently denied the opportunity freely to express himself while, at the same time, Communists and fellow-travelers were appointed to high public office and were courted and touted by too many publishing houses, broadcasting companies, and influential magazines. There was no honor in his country, except among a relatively small group, for this prophet who had foretold with clairvoyant accuracy the enormous dangers with which we are now confronted. As a result, for several years he lived in a kind of courageous, genteel poverty, borne with fortitude and a graceful indifference which was sometimes heartbreaking to behold. But always, even to the end, the very end, there was his saving grace of humor. Somehow he managed to be gay and witty; to laugh in circumstances that would have reduced lesser men to despair.

Who of us will ever forget that laugh of his? It started, as many of us now ruefully remember, as a low chuckle coming deep from within, from his heart, as all true laughter should, and finally broke into open, delighted, infectious, boyish hilarity.

And, of course, there was Ben's extraordinary capacity for living. He loved people, ideas, and the clash of honest opinion. But above all he loved conversation, and he was a virtuoso at it. He had been almost everywhere and had known almost everyone worth knowing. He chose his friends and his enemies with a fine discrimination, and he had an enviable collection of both. In short, he lived fully, richly, and with completeness.

Perhaps you may recall a character known as Father Latour in Willa Cather's "Death Comes for the Archbishop." In conversation with a younger man the good father smiled slowly and said: "I shall not die of a cold, my son, I shall die of having lived." And of Ben Stolberg it may be truly said that he died of having lived.

Now he is lost to us. And the tears we shed for him are not the tears of altruism. We weep for ourselves. We weep because we have all been irreparably impoverished by his tragic death.

Manpower of Free China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by a constituent of mine, Mrs. Geraldine Fitch, of Leonia, N. J., who, with her husband, has spent much time in China, and has important sources of information as to what is going on there. The article, entitled "Manpower of Free China," appeared in a recent issue of the magazine called the Freeman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANPOWER OF FREE CHINA

(By Geraldine Fitch)

Whatever the past blunders of China, and whatever the past sins of America against China, the naked truth today is that our one hope of curbing the Chinese Communists is to avail ourselves of all the help Free China can give us. For today Free China is our only potential source of ample manpower.

The help available there divides itself into two parts: the troops on Formosa and the Nationalist guerrillas on the mainland. Had we supplied those guerrillas, the Chinese Communist armies could never have been thrown in such numbers into Korea.

When on June 27 the United Nations called on all member states "to furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary * * *" Chiang Kai-shek offered 33,000 troops on behalf of National China, charter member of the UN. Apart from our own troops, that is more than the combined forces supplied by other UN members. The offer was rejected for the ostensible reason that acceptance might incite Red China to intervene on the side of the North Koreans. And so far as I know, Generalissimo Chiang was not even thanked.

After the fiction of Communist "volunteers" had been dispelled, and Communist Gen. Lin Piao's armies had been identified, the Generalissimo repeated his offer. To date it has not been accepted. Those 33,000 men would be a big help to our battle-weary GIs and to the forces of the Korean Republic. Moreover, Chiang's aid could be expanded, probably up to a quarter of a million men or more.

Last May I was one of a group of 25 news correspondents, radio commentators, and photographers who visited Formosa. Our party saw a new Nationalist army; the oft-defeated and formerly dejected forces had been reorganized, retrained, and revitalized. This near-miracle is largely the work of Gen. Sun Li-jen of Virginia Military Institute, who put the infantry through a complete course of indoctrination along with their military training, and has given the army new blood by recruiting soldiers from among the sturdy Formosans.

Though for security reasons we were not told the exact size of the new National army, we had data on which to base our estimate of about 500,000 on Formosa itself. While we were there the troops were evacuated from Hainan. At Kao-hsiung, where the ships were coming in, we saw trainloads of soldiers, worn and thin but in high spirits, leaving for

dispersal points. We visited emergency hospitals for the wounded and the sick (many with malaria); we talked with the soldiers, both on the pier and in hospitals.

Young officers were still sure that in time they could have won. Reports had been circulated abroad that Hainan was given up without a struggle. It was not true, they said. The decision on top levels 2 months earlier had been to evacuate troops and equipment if the Communists ever succeeded in landing large numbers. Eleven assaults had been repulsed. Then, under cover of darkness, many of Mao's soldiers were put ashore, and soon reinforced by Communist guerrillas infesting the hills. Great piles of equipment, neatly stacked on the pier, were evidence of an orderly withdrawal. No officer and no unit had defected. Only the dead were left behind, and a unit of Nationalist guerrillas whose business it would be to harass the Communists sufficiently to keep Hainan's iron ore from moving.

On Hainan the troops had acquitted themselves well. On Tan Po and Quemoy islands they tasted victory. Today there are seasoned troops as a hard core for the army on Formosa.

Soon after our press party returned to the States, Nationalist troops and supplies were evacuated from the Chu-san Islands. This strategic move with no leak to the enemy was rightly regarded as a victory by the Generalissimo. Concentrating all available troops and equipment on Formosa was necessary because a midsummer invasion was expected, and without military aid from the United States the Nationalists could not possibly defend all the outlying islands.

While on Formosa we visited the air force training center. The Chinese Air Force (CAF) had moved from Chengtu, West China, a year and a half before, to a former Japanese base on Formosa—bombed into a rubble heap and without roads, light or water. Now it was occupied by the signal corps school, communications and mechanics training institutes, and the flying school; and new offices, classrooms, laboratories, library, barracks, mess halls, athletic fields, and a swimming pool had been built—a miracle of achievement. We talked with fine officers who had flown 50 or 100 missions against the Japanese. Many of them wore the wings of the Chinese-American Composite Wing as well as those of the CAF. Some had been with General Chennault in the Fourteenth Air Force. Others had taken their advanced training in Texas or Oklahoma. One, who had flown 160 combat missions and wore the American DFC, was said by his colleagues to have 21 service bars which he was too modest to wear all at one time.

Prevented by fog from flying to the tank corps base, we were briefed on the mechanized troops. We learned that a long-deferred shipment of tanks, purchased under the $125,000,000 military appropriation of Congress (1948) had recently arrived. Surplus tanks, "demilitarized for combat use" at the end of the war, had been imported from Hawaii and "cannibalized" or welded together again. We inspected an arsenal where captured Japanese rifles were being rebored to use standard Chinese ammunition, and where excellent sub-machine guns were coming off the assembly line.

The Chinese Navy, greatly handicapped by want of spare parts and 3-inch shells, had given a good account of itself in the effective blockade of the mainland. It was training technicians, midshipmen, and officers, and repairing its few war vessels. Before the fall of Nanking, the navy was credited with destroying or seriously damaging 3,531 Communist motor-powered and sailing junks, and capturing 325 others. Following the Nationalist withdrawal from Shanghai, the navy held the advanced bases on Tan Po, Quemoy (Kinmen) and the Chusan Islands, and patrolled the coast. Acknowledged by some to be 97 percent effective, the blockade brought forth loud protests from the British shipping companies and the American Isbrantsen Line, which were blockade-running for trade with Red China. Last year the Chinese Navy stopped 32 foreign ships and persuaded them to turn back, forcibly turned back 8 others, and captured 53 Communist craft.

On Formosa is the largest trained anti-Communist force in Asia. From what we saw with our own eyes plus reliable reports of the Chusan withdrawal soon thereafter, some 700,000 effective Nationalist ground troops are there, in addition to the air force, navy, and tank corps. Equipment is needed—more ammunition, spare parts, radar, new planes, and ships. But a UN military mission would find that the aid needed would not include a single American GI.

What is the potential strength of Nationalist guerrillas on the mainland? There are anti-Communist underground forces in every corner of continental China, some operating in small groups which hit and run, while others number tens of thousands. They probably total at least a million and a half—a rough average between what the Communists concede and the exaggerated reports of the overoptimistic. At least a million can be located. Moreover, since large numbers of Nationalist soldiers joined the Communist armies when Chiang was pressured by the Marshall mission into demobilizing more than a million of his troops, most of them could be won back. The division of Lin Piao's Fourth Field Army which was reported to have rebelled and joined the guerrillas may have been part of those demobilized units.

Among the guerrillas are large numbers operating under the Ministry of Defense, i. e., maintaining direct contact with Formosa. There are other groups, actively anti-Communist, but not necessarily pro-Nationalist. An able American who has made a voluntary nonmilitary, nonofficial survey of guerrilla potential says there are 200 splinter groups having their representatives in Hong Kong and hoping to get aid somewhere, somehow. Vice President Li Tsung-jen has lost his guerrilla following because of his failure to return from the United States. Gen. Chang Fa-kwei, known as Old Ironsides, has a considerable following, but no third force can command anything like the strength of the forces still loyal to Chiang Kai-shek. Reliable reports indicate that the Nationalists in general, and Chiang in particular, are daily growing in favor on the mainland and their return is fervently desired.

The greatest concentrated guerrilla strength and the area most favorable for the initiation of an organized counterrevolution is in south China, Fukien, Kwangtung, and Kwangsi provinces. This is partly because the Communist advance in China began to snowball after the disintegration of the Nationalist front on the Yangtze. Political commissars had less time to indoctrinate the people and, as they advanced to the southern provinces, they found a more militant resistance. The Canton area is traditionally the seat of Chinese revolution; its merchants, at home and overseas, are among the world's best. Canton was one place the Chinese Communists had to garrison, not just organize. When Lin Piao's armies moved north from south China and eventually into the Korean War, this area was left poorly defended.

Translated from the Chinese, the names of anti-Communist guerrilla forces are cumbersome—the People's Anti-Communist Self-Protection Army, the Southwest People's National Salvation Army, the Southern Fukien Mobile Column. To give an example of guerrilla organization, that of Fukien Province is divided into four areas. Ten counties in the southern section alone have an aggregate of 90,000 men. In northern Fukien the first guerrilla leader to raise an anti-Communist flag rallied 1,000 picked men. Another has his headquarters in the hills 15 miles from Foochow, the provincial capital, and from time to time raids the city. An old guerrilla leader operates from Matsu Island in the mouth of the Min River (still in Nationalist hands), sending his men on frequent raids inland.

Many of the units of South China are composed of peasants; others are led by college graduates and rally more of the educated youth. A former Nationalist garrison commander of Canton, now called "the general with the black flag," has 50,000 guerrillas in the western hills of Kwangtung, and is well known among Chinese overseas, who would gladly support him with arms and ammunition if United States permission to purchase and export were granted.

Out in Yunnan Province 3 brothers direct 100,000 guerrillas. In Anhwei Province, from whose mountain fastnesses the Communists back in the early thirties harassed Chiang Kai-shek with armed rebellion before their defeat and long march to Yenan, the tables are now turned. Nationalist units today work throughout the hundreds of miles of mountainous country, assailing the occupying Reds. In Szechuan Province—known to Americans as West China—the People's Liberation Army, the Anti-Communist Salvation Army, the People's Revolutionary Army, and similar groups, number 400,000 guerrillas. Manchuria has a smaller force known as the Anti-Communist Iron-Footed Army (cavalry) actively operating against the entrenched Reds. In the desert area of Jehol, Chahar, and Suiykuan Provinces with their grassy plains, two Mongolian princes are in revolt. Chinghai Province is almost wholly Mohammedan, and the Mohammedans are revolting against Red domination. In every province resistance groups and their leaders can be named, and their availability for an organized resistance movement is assured.

The Communist generals and the Peiping radio admit (by understating their troubles or overstating the number of guerrillas they have liquidated) that resistance is growing. General Peng Teh-huai recently conceded that "thousands of guerrillas are operating in the area of Sining (capital of Chinghai) and the mountain areas of Kansu and Ningsia." In recent dispatches to the New York Times Henry Lieberman quotes official Communist papers as declaring that "the Korean war has stimulated resistance activity in East China" and calling upon all security bodies "to rid themselves of complacency and crack down harder on 'bandits,' 'saboteurs,' and 'special agents,'" which in our vocabulary means "guerrillas."

Does this mean that all the Chinese mainland is about to rise and throw off the incubus of Communist control? Not at all. From all available information, that is not yet possible. But there are islands of resistance in every part of China, some large, some small; some armed, some serving as unarmed operators skilled in sabotage. This is the potential, awaiting direction from Formosa, or supplies by airlift, or commando raids along the coast, now prevented by our Seventh Fleet. But to encourage a simultaneous uprising of all guerrilla units without giving it aid and direction would mean only temporary resistance, after which—with the best leaders liquidated, and terrible reprisals on guerrilla families—the resistance movement would be broken. Communist control would be consolidated, and hope would die in millions of disillusioned people.

On the other hand, once the UN or the United States alone decided to use the Free

Chinese to fight Red Chinese, a Chinese-American composite group similar to our wartime OSS could unify, organize and supply this resistance and through it could make Communist China blow up in Stalin's face. It would not be necessary to send American ground troops either to Formosa or to the Chinese mainland. In Red China is the manpower that our mistaken foreign policy allowed to be organized against us. On Formosa, and in the mainland resistance movement, is the manpower still available to the free world. We can save that world by recognizing our past mistakes, and by combining our military and industrial might with the manpower of anti-Communist China.

War Mobilization Is Everyone's Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times in the following editorial sets out a few facts regarding the justified protest of organized labor in the mobilization program.

It is the concern of all important segments of our economy that they be represented and given a part in our home-front war effort.

LABOR'S JUST GRIEVANCES

Organized labor has plenty of reasons to be sore about the present defense mobilization set-up. For instance, we can't see why labor shouldn't be admitted to full partnership in the mobilization high command, on a par with big business. And it seems to us that a fairer wage increase formula can be worked out.

Labor has every right to be alarmed over the rising prices of all cost-of-living items, and food in particular. It's demand that all segments of our economy share equally in mobilization is just and right.

But just grievances are one thing and a boycott of the entire defense mobilization establishment is another. The latter smacks too much of the strike technique. Men who walk out on their responsibilities today raise doubts about the wisdom of giving them responsibility.

It is not fair, however, to ask that only labor exercise the high degree of statesmanship so badly needed at this time. Defense Mobilizer Wilson has done little to make labor feel that it has a vital part to play in rearming the free world. Yet Wilson as well as labor knows no amount of planning can succeed until blueprints are converted into planes, tanks, ships, and guns by workers in the Nation's factories, shipyards, and arsenals.

The trouble is that too many of our leaders, in Government as well as out of it, have tended to go their separate ways.

Too few have tried to view the mobilization program as the single unit that it should be, tying wages, prices, credit policies, manpower, and production into one manageable whole.

Congress is derelict in its failure to pass speedily the tax boosts needed to help lick inflation. President Truman has let the people down by failing to take decisive and corrective action against the disastrous easy-credit policy of his trusted crony, Secretary of Treasury Snyder. That policy is one of the major factors in today's mounting costs of living and rearmament.

The farm bloc, with the connivance of both major political parties, has refused to budge from the price support programs which make it impossible to impose real ceilings on the family grocery bill.

So far as wages are concerned, we feel some of the present inequities could be wiped out if the Government's wage order were broadened. The Government should say that if the cost of living creeps up, wages will be allowed to creep up too.

That would be done by permitting all collective bargaining contracts to include escalator clauses for cost-of-living wage increases or, as it may be, decreases. The Government order now freezes inequities by approving only the few industry-labor contracts which already have escalator clauses.

Resolutions on Broadcasts by Martin Agronsky by American Legion, Post 52, Department of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions by American Legion, Post 52, Department of Texas, regarding broadcasts by Martin Agronsky, together with a letter from John P. Rogge to Martin Agronsky, which appear in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the resolutions and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas Martin Agronsky is making daily appearances on the American 7 a. m. newscast and is misusing that time to scatter his left-wing philosophy, smearing the reputations of patriotic citizens who are champions of the American way of life, and more particularly undermining the cause of the National China Government and furthering the cause of Communist China: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That American Legion Post, 52, Department of Texas, at regular meeting this December 4, 1950, now go on record as expressing its disapproval of the character of the Martin Agronsky newscast and as recommending to the sponsors of the same and to the American network that his services in that capacity be discontinued immediately; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution properly authenticated be sent to American Broadcasting Co., to Martin Agronsky and to the present sponsors of his newscast in the Houston area."

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by unanimous vote at the regular meeting of American Legion Post, 52, Department of Texas, December 4, 1950.

JOHN L. COMPTON,
Post Commander.
ZENOBIA DOLEZOL,
Post Adjutant.

"Whereas our State Department as now constituted and under the leadership of Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, has proven itself to be unworthy of the confidence of the people; and

"Whereas its foreign policy, whether the result of honest mistake or the result of treasonous conduct on the part of the said Dean Acheson or other personnel, has led our military efforts to the brink of disaster and has placed our Armed Forces in Korea in mortal jeopardy; and

"Whereas there has resulted a clamor throughout the country calling for suitable action against the said Acheson, recommending congressional censure or a vote of lack of confidence in the said Acheson; and

"Whereas it appears to this body that any such congressional action would serve only to make official the lack of confidence which already exists but would not serve to correct the complaint itself; and

"Whereas it is the considered opinion of this body that definite action is now required which will at once register the Nation-wide appraisal of the said Acheson and at the same time positively remove him from office: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That American Legion, Post 52, Department of Texas, in regular meeting this 4th day of December 1950, now go on record as favoring prompt impeachment of the said Dean Acheson, as Secretary of State, proceeding under article 2, section 4 of the United States Constitution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, as the urgent demand of this post that he at once offer in Congress a bill calling for the prompt impeachment of the said Dean Acheson by the House of Representatives; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution, properly certified be forwarded to each of the Houston daily papers and to the State Department, Washington, D. C., to the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, chairman Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to the Honorable JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, United States Senate."

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by unanimous vote at the regular meeting of American Legion, Post 52, Department of Texas, December 4, 1950.

JOHN L. COMPTON,
Post Commander.
ZENOBIA DOLEZOL,
Post Adjutant.

HOUSTON, TEX., *December 8, 1950.*

Mr. MARTIN AGRONSKY,
American Broadcasting Co.
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Mr. John L. Compton, commander, Post 52, American Legion (Houston), Department of Texas, has instructed me to forward to you the attached copy of resolution adopted unanimously by that post in its regular meeting last Monday, December 4.

By coincidence this resolution was adopted on a day when your "news" cast was more obnoxious even than usual—contaminating the morning air with your condemnation of Senator MCCARTHY's demand that Nationalist China be allowed to take to the field alongside our boys. Taking your usual left-wing slant you stated that would bring Communist China definitely into the war and that only by calling up more American boys would we be able to stem the Chinese Communist tide—or words to that effect. Intimating that this would all start a real war you came to the main insolence in that broadcast. "If Senator MCCARTHY wants to fight, somebody hold his coat." You should have gone further and told your listeners that in the past war the Senator was actually in the war on the front—making history while you were on the air—reciting it.

Lo! How low a man can go to get a living?

Yours,

JOHN P. ROGGE.

Government by Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the treaty-making powers of the United States Senate have been threatened with relegation to a minor role, in spite of the fact that the Constitution decrees that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

During the administration of the late President Roosevelt, the prerogatives of the President in foreign relations were stretched to the point where in 1944 nearly all foreign arrangements were handled as executive agreements, and in that year there were 74 executive agreements and only 1 treaty.

The present Truman administration has continued to follow the precedent set by President Roosevelt, and recently Secretary of State Acheson, on his own motion and without reference to the advice and consent of the Senate, proposed that the fate of Formosa be decided by Russia, Communist China, Britain, and the United States, if they could get together within a year, otherwise by the United Nations.

It is certainly time for the Senate of the United States to call a halt to this type of unconstitutional negotiations, and to declare that treaties must be ratified by the Senate in accord with our Constitution, or that they will not be valid.

The assumption of the treaty-making power by the Executive is just another step in the New Deal-Fair Deal program to establish law by decree rather than by legislation, and this policy must be stopped now.

The following is a recent editorial which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post by Draper W. Phillips, which analyzes the loss of treaty-making powers by the Senate, and it is a subject that must have immediate attention:

THE SENATE MUST RECOVER ITS LOST POWERS IN TREATY MAKING

(By Draper W. Phillips)

The extent to which President Franklin D. Roosevelt stretched his prerogatives in foreign relations threatened to relegate to a minor role, if not to obliterate altogether, the treaty-making powers of the United States Senate. In view of the great crisis which again threatens our country, it is high time that the Senate repudiated this type of unconstitutional dealing, and proclaimed to the world that treaties must be ratified by the Senate in the traditional manner in order to bind America.

During the war years nearly all foreign arrangements were handled as executive agreements, for which senatorial concurrence was not asked. In 1944 there were 74 executive agreements and only 1 treaty. This compared with 25 treaties and 11 executive agreements in 1930.

The Truman administration, far from repudiating this usurpaion by the New Deal, has done its best to perpetuate these agreements as a proper subject for executive action. Most recently Secretary of State Acheson, on his own motion, and without reference to the advice and consent of the Senate, proposed that the fate of Formosa be decided by Russia, Communist China, Britain, and the United States, if they could get together within a year, otherwise by the United Nations.

Until the advent of the New Deal, the constitutional limitation on presidential treaty-making power was well known and accepted by American officials and foreign powers. William Howard Taft, while acting as envoy for the first Roosevelt, said that it was impossible for the President to enter into even an understanding without the consent of the Senate.

Even as late as 1940, the Attorney General, in an opinion to the President concerning the latter's right to acquire sites for naval and air bases from the British, indicated the limitation on the President in dealing with foreign powers. The Attorney General said that negotiations involving commitments as to the future are customarily submitted for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. He approved the President's power to act alone in this case only because the President was accepting a benefit without express or implied promise by the United States of any obligation to be carried out in the future.

Early in World War II, and before we had entered the conflict, President Roosevelt had frequent meetings with foreign rulers and diplomats who were not thus circumscribed in their diplomacy. Wallace McClure, lawyer and official of the Treaty Division of the State Department, bolstered the President in 1941 with the startling thesis, which he published in a large volume, that anything that could be done by treaty could also be done by executive agreement. Thus was Roosevelt launched on the series of private deals which have exposed us to the evils and dangers of communism.

Prof. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, has been the most outspoken opponent of this new theory of presidential omnipotence. Looking back to the origin of the Constitution, he saw its framers with their fear of powerful executives and secret diplomacy. They were careful that a treaty should reflect the mature sentiment of the people. The overwhelming weight of authority furnishd by decisions of the Supreme Court and by presidential action itself sustains those scholars who have defended the traditional method of treaty making.

Many question the feasibility of open negotiations in foreign affairs, claiming that the pitiless public glare would make compromise difficult, if not impossible. This, of course, is true, but negotiation is entirely a different thing from a secret agreement. If and when secrecy is necessary in concluding a treaty under the American system, the Senate can collaborate in secret as it has done on several occasions in the past.

Wildlife, Fish, and Game Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a measure to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in Military Reservations. This proposal is prompted by the success which has attended the operation of an earlier measure, now Public Law 345 of the Eighty-First Congress. Public Law 345 deals with the same subject but is confined to the Eglin Reservation at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. At this military reservation long prior to the passage of Public Law 345 there was an obvious need for sounder game, fish, and wildlife conservation, but due to the lack of a specific authorization for such a program very little could be accomplished. Since the act has been in force, the half-million-acre Eglin Reservation has shown increasing promise as one of the outstanding wildlife development projects in the Nation. This work is being carried on by trained personnel without interference in any way with the military-training program. Also significantly the work is being carried on without cost to the Government. All costs are borne by small fees collected from hunters and fishermen. Because of the success which is attending the Eglin Reservation program, personnel from a number of other military establishments have contacted me requesting that steps be taken to provide similar legislation applicable to all military reservations. That is the sole purpose of this bill. It will not cost the Government any money. It does offer an opportunity to build up our wildlife resources and provide additional recreational facilities for military personnel and civilians.

Buenos Aires Papers Please Copy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a front page editorial from the Washington Daily News of Monday, March 12. The News is performing a notable journalistic service in making available to La Prensa space for editorial comment by the staff of this distinguished Argentinian newspaper, which has been throttled by Dictator-President Peron:

BUENOS AIRES PAPERS PLEASE COPY

The voice of La Prensa cannot be heard in Buenos Aires.

It can be heard in Washington.

The Washington Daily News today offers La Prensa daily space.

We will make available whatever is needed for editorial comment from the staff of La Prensa.

The News has cabled the editors of La Prensa that this space is available immediately, and for as long as the editors want it.

La Prensa has been shut down by the government of Dictator Peron, acting through its creature, the Central Committee of the General Confederation of Labor. The story of how this was brutally done, and of this newspaper's situation today, is told on page 5.

We hope the editors of La Prensa will find space useful in the Washington Daily News, particularly during the conference of North and South American ministers, which convenes here in 2 weeks. La Prensa will then

be able to address, while they are in Washington, the diplomatic representatives of every nation in this hemisphere.

As the accompanying story on page 5 points out, freedom of the press is not on the agenda of this meeting. But if press freedom is not formally discussed, it can at least be informally discussed by the ministers of free nations.

They may want to consider it in terms of their general problem which the meeting was called to study: that of hemispheric defense. How can that goal best be reached—if it can be reached—when one nation has deliberately turned its back on the liberal ideal and is plunging with ever-increasing speed toward utter totalitarianism?

President Peron takes the view it is nobody's business but his own if he throttles his country's leading independent newspaper.

He may be in for some unpleasant surprises on that score.

Quite a few sister republics of the Americas, including the United States, are getting their backs up over his disregard of the ordinary liberties and decencies accorded to a free people.

Freedom of the press is a measure not only of a people's freedom but of the good faith of a government in their name.

By silencing this great independent newspaper, Peron shows how far he can be trusted to assume a fair and honorable share in the councils of free nations.

Our idea to invite La Prensa to be heard in Washington stems from a proposal of Herbert Moses, president of the Brazilian Press Association.

Senor Moses suggested that all Brazilian newspapers devote a fourth of a column each day to La Prensa's editorial comment.

According to news dispatches he, in turn, apparently was inspired to his proposal by a suggestion made to him by a press association man in Peru—that the newspapers of the Americas give space each day to La Prensa's plight.

We would like to see a column a day, carrying the masthead of La Prensa, or even the fraction of a column a day, printing La Prensa's opinions in newspapers all over North and South America.

The blow against La Prensa already has been called informally to the attention of the United Nations by a Latin-American representative.

We hope that it is also brought up, at least for floor discussion, at the meeting of the American Foreign Ministers here in Washington later this month.

After flirting with the Axis Powers during the war, Argentina restored herself to the good graces of the American community only by promising to adhere to the Chapultepec agreement. That pact contains a freedom-of-the-press declaration. By abrogating it or ignoring it, Peron once more could find himself ostracized by democratic nations.

United States-Argentine relations now have hit a 4-year low as a result of public disgust and sense of outrage in this country.

For this is no little thing.

Once again it is demonstrated that an idea cannot be shot, or bombed out, or hung to a lamppost. Even an evil idea.

The totalitarian Hitler attacked the free peoples and finally was buried under the most fantastic holocaust of bombs; the totalitarian Mussolini came to an obscene and terrible end, brutally destroyed by his own disillusioned people.

But totalitarianism did not die. And many of Hitler's and many of Mussolini's one-time henchmen are doing well in Argentina. There, perhaps, they find the air salubrious.

For totalitarianism does not die when dictators die, and we would be naive to suppose it.

Mankind's struggles for political and economic security and individual safety are unending. Over the centuries, his gains are small and slowly and bitterly won.

It is for all of us to show that good has at least the stubborn vitality of evil, and that men who are dedicated to political decency, who stand for the right to honestly criticize their government, who stand to tell the truth as they sincerely see the truth—these men must stand together, wherever they may be.

Therefore, we gladly and proudly offer to La Prensa the columns of the Washington Daily News, so that, as the ministers of North and South American nations convene here March 26, the voice of this great newspaper need not be silent.

Conscientious Objectors Fully Protected Under Selective Service Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter written by Mr. Frederick J. Libby, executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, and my reply to the same:

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1951.

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: You are perhaps familiar already with the story contained in the enclosed clippings from this afternoon's Washington Daily News, which is covered also in the editorial from the same paper.

As I have just written Senator SCHOEPPEL it is the most shocking abuse of the rights of conscience that has occurred in the present crisis.

I cannot help thinking that you will want to do all you can to clear the fair name of Kansas of this blot on its reputation for justice, and for the maintenance of our great American traditions.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK J. LIBBY,
Executive Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1951.

Mr. FREDERICK J. LIBBY,
Executive Secretary, National Council for Prevention of War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LIBBY: I am in receipt of your letter of the sixth with which you enclosed two tear sheets from the Washington Daily News of yesterday, one of which was a news article concerning the trial and conviction of Robert Michener, the other an editorial commenting on the news story. I appreciate your sending me these articles and I am glad to comment on the same.

May I say in the beginning that this conviction was for violation of Federal laws and in a Federal court. Neither the State of Kansas nor the laws of the State of Kansas were involved. I have no information on the matter except as contained in the two articles which you sent me, both of which are very sympathetic to Mr. Michener and his viewpoint. It would seem to me that the sentences imposed are extremely severe and it may be that they should be modified. I would not want to comment further on that question, however, without knowing more about the facts.

It seems to me, however, that your letter as well as the article and the editorial overlook entirely the fact that there is no reason under the laws of the United States why this young man should be in his present situation except that he deliberately disobeyed and flouted the laws of his country. According to the article which you sent me, Mr. Michener was convicted about a year ago of refusing to register for the draft. He was sentenced to jail and has served that sentence. After getting out of jail, Mr. Michener further showed his contempt for the laws of his country (1) by refusing to fill out a questionnaire, (2) by failing to report for a physical examination, (3) by failing to report for induction. He made no defense to any of these charges and admitted his guilt.

I firmly believe in the right of those whose conscious and religious beliefs impel them to oppose participation in war to be exempted from combat training and service. The present Selective Service Act makes ample provision for such exemption and deferment. Section 6 (j) of the Selective Service Act of 1948 reads as follows:

"Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the Armed Forces under this title, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, be deferred. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the Armed Forces under this title, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, he shall be deferred. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice, together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors."

This section sets up a procedure by which any conscientious objector may present his case and claim his exemption. The articles which you sent me would indicate that Mr. Michener is a genuine conscientious objector. Had he followed the simple procedure outlined in the law, there would, in my opinion, be no question about his exemption and deferment. Thousands of conscientious objectors have followed this procedure and thousands more will do so. In other words, they will abide by the laws of their country. Mr. Michener, for reasons which are unknown to me, chose to disregard, flout, and disobey his country's laws. If we are to be fair to the millions of young men who have obeyed the selective service law and especially those who have been inducted into the service, there is nothing that can be done except to charge Mr. Michener with violating the laws of his country and convict him when he admits such violation as he did in this case. Thousands of men who obeyed the law, which Mr. Michener flouts, have given their lives in Korea. Hundreds of thousands have left their homes and their families to enter the service of their country. Your letter would imply that Mr. Michener is right and that these law-abiding young Americans are wrong. I cannot agree with you.

Had Mr. Michener obeyed the laws of his country and availed himself of the provision which is made for those who have conscientious objection to combat training and service, he would be a freeman today. Had every American boy between the ages of 18 and 26 followed the course of Mr. Michener, it would be the greatest mass law violation in history. It would utterly defeat our defense program.

Are you advocating that others follow the course of Mr. Michener and refuse to register or to carry out their obligations under the Selective Service Act? Are you urging conscientious objectors to follow this course rather than to obey the law and bring themselves within its provisions relating to conscientious objectors and securing exemption and deferment by that lawful method?

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

Letter to Farmers Urging Them to Step Up Production That America May Be Healthy and Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEAR FRIEND: Now is the time to get the old sow out of the pen and you should bring the younger sows with her. Spring is here. If you have a cow that's getting dry, you should breed her, too. We need bacon and beef. The city fellow has the money and is anxious to buy what you produce. Prices are up and you are bound to make some profits. One of the best ways to save money is to raise your own meat and fix it right at home so you can use it the year around. When you send it to market and buy it back you pay a lot of other people for moving it, shipping it, and processing it. Everyone who handles it has to make a profit. Why can't we keep that profit among the home folks?

We can do just that in three ways. First, you can check with your home demonstration agent and she can tell you how to can meat if you don't already know. She might even know a better way than you are now using. Second, in some of our towns and cities meat lockers can be rented for a small fee. Make use of these. Your county agent can tell you where they are located. Third and a modern new way is to buy now or plan to buy a deep freeze for next year. These boxes make money for farmers by keeping fine home grown meat well preserved. You can also use these boxes for your strawberries, beans and other fruits and vegetables to keep them in good shape for a healthy family.

There are many suggestions which could be made, but I am sure you've got the idea. I am counting on you and I am sure you will do your part in helping keep America healthy and strong.

If I can be of any service to you and your neighbors, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Altoona (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce Supports the State of Pennsylvania's Opposition to the Construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the many Pennsylvania communities opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is the city of Altoona. Speaking for the citizens of Altoona the chamber of commerce adopted the following resolution which goes into detail in explaining why the citizens of Pennsylvania oppose construction of such an economic monstrosity as the St. Lawrence project.

The resolution follows:

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States on February 1, 1951, approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada: providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes: Be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Altoona, Pa., is unalterably opposed to this bill because:

1. At the height of the greatest crisis in our Nation's history, when world communism has embroiled us in what may become a series of Koreas or World War III, we are asked to divert from our national defense effort manpower, materials, and financial resources.

On manpower it has been estimated by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, that the international rapids section alone would take 140,235,000 man hours. He said, "If computed on 4 years to finish, the Labor Department estimates the average number of employees at the site as 11,150, varying from 5,400 a month in winter to 23,600 in the summer." This at the very time when our existence depends on an all-out manpower effort to do those things that are genuinely vital to our national defense.

On materials it is clearly evident that this gigantic seaway will take millions of tons of vital and scarce defense materials at a time when they cannot be spared.

On financial resources it has been estimated that the cost will range between $300,000,000 and $1,350,000,000. Yearly operation costs will be approximately $20,000,000 and adequate defenses would probably come to another billion dollars.

2. The project would take at least 4, and probably 7, years to complete. This is too long, when the element of time is on the side of our enemy.

3. The proposal is a particular threat to the economy not only of this immediate vicinity and the vitally important industrial capacity of the State of Pennsylvania but it is also a real threat to the economy of the entire northeastern section of the United States. All our great eastern ports are seriously threatened not only by loss in tonnage but by competition from ship lines whose lower-paid employees pay no income taxes in this country. It would also be a severe blow to our railroads through loss of freight tonnage and the importation of foreign goods. This coupled with the importation of foreign coal and crude oil would severely threaten our great coal-producing industry. Thus Pennsylvania's two great industries would be seriously affected.

4. Our merchant marine, on which we have spent more than $19,000,000,000, finds that because of size only 9 percent of its vessels could use the seaway. Smaller foreign vessels again would have the advantage.

5. The St. Lawrence River is icebound for virtually 5 months out of the year, and during the fall and spring, and even in summer, is blanketed by fog.

6. The seaway would give us 1,677 more miles of coast line to defend and a bomb dropped at any single point would cripple the entire project.

7. The claims of need for more electric power, and that the undertakings are too big for private enterprise to finance are spurious. Private, taxpaying enterprise is already furnishing all electric power presently required and can raise the money for any project if there is sufficient demand for the services; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Pennsylvania Representatives and Senators and that they be urged to uphold this resolution and to defeat the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 27, now before the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

(This resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Altoona Chamber of Commerce Thursday, March 8, 1951.)

The Italian-American World War Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of Mr. Anthony V. Lo Popolo, Pennsylvania department commander of the Italian-American World War Veterans, which Mr. Lo Popolo delivered on Sunday, March 11, 1951, over radio station WJMJ, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Why does the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States exist? The preamble to our national constitution establishes the basis. From what is its name derived? The name is one that acts as a living perpetual memorial for all those Italian-Americans who served and those who died

for their country, the United States of America. There is no more fitting tribute, no better honor to bestow. If the organization grows the memorial becomes more brilliant and refulgent. If the organization wanes and diminishes, the memorial becomes dull and gathers moss. It is for us the living to see, to be ever vigilant that our service will work toward the betterment of mankind.

The Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., believes in brotherhood in action. It teaches and exhorts clean, upright living, tolerance and good will. It symbolizes faith in our country and faith in God. It is a preponderant influence in building good citizens and loyalty to the laws of the Nation, State and municipality.

It believes in the expansion of industry, commerce, agriculture and transportation. It believes in fair, just and adequate rights for labor to insure labor a living and just wage. It believes in the development of our great natural resources for the benefit of all our citizens, the hard-pressed taxpayer and other backwood nations on a business-like basis. It believes in adequate schools, hospitals, universities, centers of art and music, churches of every denomination. It believes in the improvement of the living standard.

It believes in the obliteration of crime, racketeering, federations of law-enforcement officials and public officials with criminals and gamblers. Statistics show that crime syndicates in the United States net approximately $15,000,000,000. This money is taken from families that can least afford it. The money is then diverted by these racketeers and gamblers to purchase political control. It believes that corrupt officials in towns, cities, States and in the Federal Government who succumb to the wishes of these criminals and cast aside their oaths to serve in the public interest should be quickly removed from office and punished severely. It believes that each citizen should become aware of his civic duties. Each citizen has rights. Each citizen has obligations. It believes that every citizen should take part in politics, community affairs, in State, national and international problems.

It believes that each citizen should act freely and without coercion. It believes that each citizen should excite public opinion to a higher standard of ethics, to cultivate an obedient respect for the law and to bring about confidence in the qualifications of our officials and in the integrity of our courts.

It believes that each citizen should exercise his right to vote to see to it that only the best qualified, high caliber men are chosen and delegated to do our work as we want it done, so that the perennial misfits, cheap politicians and gangsters who are always standing ready to slip in and very adroitly take over by our failure to vote will be thwarted. It believes that with strong, qualified, and fearless men on the job, quislings will be ousted as soon as spotted. It believes that the connivance engendered by money and influence is great but that the power of an aroused, demanding electorate is more powerful.

It believes in the American way of life. It believes that law and order must prevail over the rule of men, coteries and pressure groups. It believes in a strong and united America without endangering our priceless freedoms. It believes in aid and assistance to other nations under constitutional process to maintain the checks and balances established by our forefathers. It is when we do nothing that we continue the triumph of evil.

This is the organization that the department presents to all Italian-American veterans who are interested in establishing a local post as a permanent living memorial for those Italian-Americans who served and those who died for their country, the United States of America.

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD 2 more of a series of 22 articles in the series entitled "Medicine in Crisis," which have been written by Mr. Selig Greenberg, and which appeared in the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, newspapers published in the city of Providence, R. I.

This series presents an impartial and objective discussion of conditions faced by our medical schools and the medical profession in general.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 1, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—STRICT RATIONING RULES CAREERS IN UNITED STATES MEDICINE—22,280 SEEK TO ENTER 72 SCHOOLS ABLE TO ACCOMMODATE BUT 7,187

(By Selig Greenberg)

Cornell University Medical College last fall accepted 80 freshmen and turned down 2,870 applicants. This was a ratio of one admission to 37 applicants.

While Cornell had the highest proportion of rejections in the country, much the same thing happened in many of our medical schools.

A FEW FIGURES

Here are just a few figures: Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons accepted 120 out of 2,800 applicants; New York Medical College took 124 out of 3,153; Harvard Medical School, 112 out of 996; Temple University School of Medicine, 125 out of 3,089; Yale School of Medicine, 65 out of 1,401; Western Reserve, 80 out of 1,800; Vanderbilt, 52 out of 1,415; Tulane, 128 out of 2,000; Syracuse, 76 out of 2,600; Rochester, 70 out of 2,100; Northwestern, 128 out of 2,103; Boston University School of Medicine, 72 out of 1,875.

Because of the extreme difficulty of making the grade, most applicants apply to more than one medical school. Some have been known to file applications in the same year with as many as 25 schools without any success.

ONE OUT OF THREE

Last fall 22,280 students filed a total of 31,930 applications in the Nation's 72 medical schools. Of these, 7,187 were enrolled, which was a ratio of nearly one out of three. But an important point to bear in mind is that the proportion of successful applicants in the better schools was much lower.

Youths from 11 States, including Rhode Island, which have no medical schools find it even harder to get a chance. There is an increasing trend among State-supported medical schools to restrict admission to residents of their own States.

According to the American Medical Association's breakdown of the residence of freshmen medical students in the 1949–50 academic year, there were only 30 such freshmen from Rhode Island.

FIFTEEN PERCENT DROP OUT

As a rule, about 15 percent of medical students are flunked or dropped out for other reasons. This means that only about 25 of the Rhode Islanders enrolled in 1940–50 can expect to graduate. Twenty doctors died in this State last year and an unknown number retired. While the supply of physicians entering practice here is not limited to residents of the State, it is significant that depletions in the ranks of doctors in Rhode Island probably exceeded the number of those from this State given an opportunity to become replacements.

All of which points up the fact that there is strict rationing of careers in medicine. Failure of our medical training facilities to expand enough is depriving thousands of young men and women of a chance to enter the profession of their choice at a time when the threat of war faces us with a possible serious shortage of doctors.

WASTED EFFORT

The intense competition for medical school openings has unquestionably contributed to the generally high standard of students by permitting the schools to pick the cream of the crop. But it has also meant a tragic waste of many good candidates. It brings frustration annually to thousands of students. For some of them premedical training has turned out to be a wasted effort.

This situation recently led Dean Simeon E. Leland of the College of Liberal Arts at Northwestern University to remark that "medicine is the only profession where the element of competition comes only at the beginning." While somewhat exaggerated, this observation is not without truth.

The limited opportunities have other disturbing implications. They have to a considerable extent restricted access to medical education to the well-to-do and permitted discrimination against racial and religious minorities.

TUITION RUNS HIGH

Although it covers less than one-fourth of the cost of operating the schools, tuition runs as high as $835 a year. The training schedule is usually so heavy that students find it impossible to support themselves by working after school hours. This automatically rules out many gifted students from low-income families.

Some observers have commented on the fact that medicine frequently tends to become an hereditary affair, with doctors' sons following in their fathers' footsteps. One reason for this may be that doctors often have fatter bankbooks than most other people. Nor is it unreasonable to suspect that sons of medical families find it easier to vault the admission hurdle.

ROOM FOR PREJUDICE

Applicants for admission to medical schools are judged not only on the basis of their scholastic standing in college, which usually has to be very high, but also on their personality and character. These are, obviously, qualifications not subject to precise measurement. As a report of the New York Academy of Medicine put it, "any appraisal of these matters is necessarily so inexact that it leaves room for the operation of prejudice against applicants whose sex, race, or creed differs from that of the examiners." There is undoubtedly discrimination against women, Negroes, Jews and, to a lesser extent, students of Italian extraction.

Some medical educators go so far as to claim that the 7,100-odd places now open annually in the country's medical schools just about cover the available pool of fully qualified applicants and that in the case of substantial expansion it would be difficult to recruit a sufficient number of candidates of the proper intellectual and moral caliber. A statement along this line was actually made in the official 1948 handbook prepared by the Association of American Medical Colleges for premedical advisers.

YALE DEAN DISSENTS

Dr. C. N. Hugh Long, dean of the Yale School of Medicine, recently dissented from this point of view when he declared that

"the country needs more doctors but this deficiency is not due to any lack of material to supply them." Some officials of other medical schools continue to insist that because of grave deficiencies in our educational sytem there is a dearth of good candidates.

Leading educators outside the medical field feel that such a claim is absurd. Our educational system, all the way from grammar school to college, is far from perfect. But with 2,500,000 students enrolled in our colleges, it is inconceivable, they say, that only about 7,100 are fit to be picked for training as doctors.

American medical education is of the highest quality in the world, and it is important to preserve that quality. But the insistence on preserving quality, which is perfectly valid in itself, can also be used as a cover for other motives. There are indications that it has been accompanied by a growing cult of exclusiveness in the medical profession and an almost pathological fear of the possible leveling effect of greater numbers.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 2, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—DOCTOR-POPULATION RATIO FOR UNITED STATES LOWER THAN IN 1909—NUMBER OF GENERAL PRACTITIONERS AND MEDICAL SCHOOLS ALSO DECLINES

(By Selig Greenberg)

There are fewer doctors in the United States today in relation to the population than there were 40 years ago.

It is true that some of the physicians at that time were graduates of low-grade medical schools which have since been closed. But quality in medicine, while crucial now, was far less important in those days, when doctors had few specific remedies for disease.

It is therefore valid to cite the historical record of the supply of physicians in this country. For it shows the extent to which expansion of the profession has lagged behind the increase in population and in demand for medical services.

TWO HUNDRED AND ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVEN DOCTORS IN 1949

In 1909 there were 134,000 physicians, or one for every 671 Americans. The latest count in 1949 showed a total of 201,277 doctors—one for every 750 persons. In the 40-year period the population of the United States increased 65 percent. But the number of doctors rose only 50 percent.

This lag developed despite the tremendous increase in the things that medicine can do for people. It developed in the face of a rise of about five times in our national income. It occurred at a time when there was a steadily rising curve in the proportion of older people who need extra medical care.

The increasing trend toward specilization makes the decline in the ratio of physicians to population even more serious than it looks at first glance.

FEWER GENERAL PRACTITIONERS

Around the turn of the century virtually every doctor was available for general treatment of patients. By 1920 about 15,000 doctors reported that they were confining their practice to a specialty. There are now more than 55,000 physicians who do so and who are thus tacitly excused from carrying cases beyond the chosen limits of their specialty and their chosen hours of work. The number of general practitioners, who are supposed to be always on call, has sharply declined.

Specialization also has contributed to the concentration of physicians in the cities, where the level of income is higher and hospital facilities are available. Further aggravating the situation has been the rise in the number of salaried doctors, many of whom do not furnish direct medical care. The proportion of salaried physicians has nearly doubled during the past 20 years.

In 1905 there were 160 4-year medical schools and 2-year basic science schools in the United States. (Students who take the basic science school course complete the last 2 years of their training in the 4-year schools.) These schools had a total of 26,147 students and graduated 5,606 doctors. General college enrollment in 1905 stood at 138,000.

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS SLASHED

There are now only 72 4-year medical schools and 7 basic science schools. Last year they graduated 5,583 M. D.'s. In the current year there is an enrollment of 26,193, and a graduating class of about 6,000 is expected. While college enrollment has increased 18 times since 1905, the number of medical students has remained static.

The number of medical schools was slashed as the result of a revolution in American medical education launched in 1910.

In that year the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published a study of the country's medical schools made by Abraham Flexner, a noted educational authority. Flexner reported that many of the schools were hopelessly inadequate and some of them were little more than diploma mills. The resulting unfavorable publicity and the efforts of the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals forced many of the schools to close and others to raise their standards.

CLAIM OPPORTUNITIES DOUBLED

Shortly after publication of the Flexner report, the AMA graded 66 of the medical schools, with a total enrollment of 12,530, as class A. It placed 43 schools in class B and 22 in class C. In 1929 the AMA discontinued this method of grading and confined its recognition to 75 medical and basic science schools which it listed as approved. There are now no unapproved medical schools in the United States. Since 1929 four new medical schools have been established and three 2-year schools have been converted into 4-year schools.

AMA spokesmen contend that it is unfair to compare the enrollment of 45 years ago, which included many students in substandard institutions, with the present total of medical students. They maintain that opportunities to study medicine in approved schools have doubled and have thus more than kept pace with the growth in population.

The closing of the inferior schools must, of course, be taken into consideration in viewing the over-all picture. But many authorities argue that the rise in population, in the complexity of medicine and in the health consciousness of the American people and their demand for medical services more than offsets the gain from the higher quality and efficiency of most of our present practitioners.

An important byproduct of the reforms which followed the Flexner report was the emergence of the AMA's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals as the accrediting body for the medical schools.

EXPANSION DISCOURAGED

Since 1910 the AMA council has set standards for the medical colleges. These standards provide a minimum ratio of faculty, laboratory equipment, and other training facilities to students and thereby control enrollment. Legal requirements or the rules of licensing boards in virtually all States specify that only graduates of medical schools approved by the AMA council may take the examination for admission to practice. The council also certifies hospitals where newly graduated physicians may take internship or residency training.

There is no question that the AMA council has made a great and positive contribution to the cause of medical education in this country. Its influence has been good in securing higher standards. It was courageous and public-spirited in the vigorous housecleaning it conducted in the years after 1910 to rid the Nation of poor medical schools.

But there is also some evidence that the council has at times used its influence to discourage expansion of medical training facilities. In at least one instance it has openly advocated that enrollment be cut down on the ground that the profession was overcrowded.

Initially, the drop in enrollment was an unplanned result of the intensive drive for higher standards. There is some reason to doubt that the subsequent failure to provide better opportunities for medical schooling was always unpremeditated.

Bread and Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, of Pontiac, Mich., for March 9, 1951.

The people of this country need not fear "big business." Business is not bad because it is big. Their real fear should be of "big government" which threatens to engulf them and make them the servant of the state.

Our country was founded on the theory that the individual is master and the state is servant.

The editorial which follows indicates the tremendous amount that industry contributes to the expense of the Federal Government. General Motors is the largest corporation in the world. Its contribution to the welfare of this country is well established. This editorial by one of the finest newspapers in the United States, points out that fact:

PONTIAC'S BREAD AND BUTTER

According to the statement just issued by the General Motors Corp., the 1950 tax bill was $1,536,000,000.

For fear someone may misread the total, or think we've gone naught happy, the figure is written in a different way.

Here it is: One billion five hundred and thirty-six million dollars.

The press is speechless.

We're open-mouthed.

Words are inadequate.

Two challenging facts stand out and compel attention. First, this total would have paid all the costs of our Federal Government for any complete year up to the First World War. Perhaps that gives a better picture of the terrific tax bite placed on all those in modern economy.

No one escapes.

The salaried man, the hourly worker, and corporations alike are belted stockholders. This gigantic, gargantuan, and enormous sum taken from one corporation, alone would now run the Federal Government less than a week under President Truman's current proposal.

Even under that very wasteful Mr. Hoover (as the Democrats charged in 1932), the figure quoted above would have paid all the expenses of the Government for 5 months.

The second and equally inescapable fact pertains solely to the size of General Motors.

GM is an industrial colossus.

All rivals are distanced.

It storms ahead alone.

Pontiac is very fortunate to have this sound, brilliantly managed, and well-financed giant as the basis of our living and very existence. Allah has smiled on the civic namesake of the fiery and picturesque red man. Our workers have suffered a minimum of lay-offs. They have benefited by steady and continuous employment beyond the ken of those in most occupations.

Retail circles profit accordingly.

The whole area prospers.

It's nice to be part of the biggest industrial family in all the history of the world.

That's precisely what we are.

Colonel Lindsay Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore placed in the RECORD several guest editorials by Col. C. H. Lindsay, general manager of the Tremont Lumber Co. mills in Louisiana. I have another editorial written by Colonel Lindsay which I desire to place in the RECORD. This outstanding builder and industrialist is doing some good thinking on the question of communism. The editorial is as follows:

TEAMWORK VERSUS COMMUNISM

(By C. H. Lindsay)

It is teamwork that completes a touchdown and makes thousands of fans rise from their seats to cheer. Teamwork is a great factor in everyday life. Without teamwork, a war cannot be won or a world peace crystallized. To bring out the finest and best in mankind's productivity, we must always unite toward that harmonious end.

Nothing short of working in harmony with a square deal plainly in view will suffice. We must meet present-day conditions—communism—by fair play among ourselves and our neighboring countries.

From where I sit, which is closer to general conditions than you may think, I know that we have had too much pulling in opposite direction by two groups of people both striving for the same goal. So let's have a pep talk before the game and let both groups pull in the same direction to attain a lasting cooperation based upon mutual trust, understanding, and appreciation of each other's problems with full respect of rights and responsibilities.

It is fine to have a captain of our team, but he cannot see everything and think for every individual. He cannot win the game alone. Every player must think for himself. So it is today, every individual citizen must think for himself and stop to analyze every single issue that is presented to him; or else he will be caught in the booby trap of a communistic doctrine.

Communists don't just happen; they have had rigid training by the party. A little thing like the truth means nothing to them. They were trained to let nothing stand in their way of world domination.

It takes a great man to make a good listener and a greater man to separate the truth from the untruth. Don't take stock in all you hear, but be able to thresh the wheat from the chaff and show yourself to be a thinking man.

Let us apply our teamwork in our fight to stay free. Let us think right and act accordingly. Let us pray for a better understanding of our fellow man. Let us work together for the good of all.

Song of Susan—A True Story Concerning the Lincoln Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Sue Josties, of 814 East Seventh Street, Hastings, Nebr., has made a real contribution to the field of literature concerning America's great Abraham Lincoln.

This article speaks for itself, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article that was published in the Omaha World-Herald on February 11, 1951:

(By Sue Josties)

The melon bears fruit on the ground, and the apple tree high in its branches. Our rose blossoms red, and our pansies and violets purple. The meadowlark trills one song; the bobwhite and thrush each another.

So must I tell my story, although it differs from others as oak leaf and pine needle differ. Who can say which is more worthy? which is to live? Which be stricken? Each has its place, and my story, too, is worth telling whenever folks talk about Lincoln.

This is my debt to my parents. I must write now, ere the sun of their declining years ease softly below the horizon; lest my own sun, now at its zenith, streak through the western sky, and there be no late afternoon shadows. I must write now, lest the story not ever be written, or they never know that I wrote it. I know they would rather I tell of the home which gave the world Abraham Lincoln than anything else I could think of.

ABE'S "OTHER MOTHER"

Back of Abe's life was another, who, from the time he was 10, had been his "other mother." At their first meeting, she saw that destiny claimed him. Sensed that this child in her keeping had it within him to tower in the hearts of his fellows as his great height towered above them. Sensed that an hour would come when the man would be needed to match it. Knew she was needed to help this gaunt man child get ready.

Not much is written of Sarah Bush, Lincoln's stepmother, but my people knew her. In Illinois they knew her, in Goosenest Prairie, near Charleston. They knew that when Abe utered those words so often requoted, "All that I am I owe to my angel mother," he spoke of Sarah Bush Lincoln, and not of a flesh-and-blood parent.

There is one book, Abraham Lincoln's Other Mother, by Bernadine Bailey, which tells how, unlearned herself, she urged her stepson to keep up his learning; how, although they moved often, she helped him to put down his roots in the eternal, everyday verities; how she held politics out to him, urged him to follow.

Tom Lincoln had been dead 10 years when Abe was elected, and, before leaving the State, came to Goosenest to visit.

They were God-fearing people who settled in Goosenest Prairie. They were glad when a preacher could come, but they needed no preacher. Each taught his children the Scriptures, and each was admonished to "work out his own salvation." Each himself tested the promises, found them sufficient, and each one had his own reason for the faith burning within him.

Isaac Rogers had given the land for the graveyard called Shiloh. (After the Civil War, when the church was erected, tall trees were cut down, and in the foundation the trunks were used without splicing to run the full length of the building.) Abe came to his father's grave, and pausing beside it, solemnly picked up some bark and whittled a marker.

He asked a man, Isaac Rodgers, to care for Tom Lincoln's grave. As he talked he placed both his hands on the head of a child who stood with them. That man was my grandmother's father; the child was his daughter named Susan. She was my father's own mother, and I am named for her.

THE GRIEVING SARAH

The book does not tell of the time that Sarah was sorry for the way she had influenced her stepson. When the word came that Abe had been killed, she would have fallen herself, remorseful and grieving. But there were neighbors—my people—who, grieving with her, helped her to see that he had lived a full measure. The child had finished his task. Her Abe had been ready when needed.

Abe had been dead 4 years when she took to her bed, and a neighbor came in to help her, keeping the cabin warm, nursing her, trying to coax strength into her being. The neighbor sat by her side as she joined the son she still grieved for. Elsie Price was the neighbor, and she was my mother's own mother.

Both of my grandmothers, thus, were family friends of the Lincolns. Elsie lived on the eighty adjoining and Susan a scant mile west of the Price home.

Susan married John Baker. They lived a stone's throw from the churchyard and Susan went often to work there. * * * There she found change from the farm work, her house, and her family. The solitude calmed her, brought peace and fulfillment.

She remembered the hands on her head and the trust Abe Lincoln had given as she cared for the Lincoln graves as well as for those of her loved ones. The bark where Abe Lincoln had whittled his father's initials was long since destroyed, and souvenir hunters had chipped almost completely to bits the marker that Abe's son had placed there.

One late afternoon as she worked she heard someone weeping. An orphan youth slumped by the unmarked mounds. Susan talked to him, told him the graves where he wept were the graves of the people who gave the world Abraham Lincoln. She told him that if he faced hardships, the Lincolns had surely faced greater. She took him home, fed him. He went on his way the next morning, encouraged.

SUSAN'S CAMPAIGN

But Susan kept wondering what might have happened if she had not been in the churchyard. She saw that monuments must be erected, so anyone passing by—not just the people of Shiloh—might take new courage as they were reminded of Lincoln.

Monuments would cost money. She had some, and gladly would give it. However, she felt that this would not be right. Abe was a man of the people and this was a thing, she believed, in which many people should share.

And also, a part of her project was that, in raising the money, she re-tell the story of Lincoln and his paths to greatness so that all who heard her might stand to their own highest stature and set their own feet on those pathways.

She set about making speeches. For years she talked nothing but Lincoln. Into a small stone jar went the money from eggs and from butter. She used it to pay her expenses.

I remember the black alpaca that was new when she went to Chicago. There she met, among others, Bruce Barton. He helped her re-tell her story.

She went, too, to Springfield, asking the legislature to provide the tombstones at Shiloh. Once, when she finished speaking, a man came and told her that he was the orphan whom she had helped with her story.

All through the years while her babies (among them, my father) grew up about her, this was the cause to which she gave her devotion. She seemed to get nowhere. Discouraged she must have been. But, she knew the story of Lincoln and she simply would not know failure. Abe placed his hands on her head, and others must know his story so that they, too, could take courage. Abe placed his hands on her head and others must know—other mothers, so that they guide well the children who came to their keeping.

And when her husband died, she must soon have followed, except for her task, still unfinished.

SUSAN'S SUCCESS

Fate cannot be stubborn forever when great souls have courage. They who work toward the things which they pray for must find their prayers answered. One more speech, this time at Mattoon, and it happened.

There, at the Lions' Club luncheon, the State president dropped in to visit. He heard her. He wanted a project. Here was a thing he might do and be proud of, or not do and always be sorry. In that moment her task was accomplished, her years of endeavor rewarded.

We have her picture, there in the churchyard at Shiloh, beside the stone she had worked for. On the granite are chiseled the names of the Lincolns, and then:

"Their humble, but worthy home gave to the world Abraham Lincoln."

Her picture hangs also in the reception room at the tomb of Abe Lincoln in Springfield.

Paved roads now take you to Goosenest from Charleston, over the trails where wheels of the surrey sank deep in the mud in the springtime. Nearby, on the Lincoln homestead, is a replica of their cabin. Their own was taken away to the world's fair in Chicago and no one knows what happened to it. (My mother's father, a wounded war veteran, watched as the cabin was loaded. A splinter fell off, and we have it.) You see a rail fence on the homestead. A bobwhite calls from the bushes flanking the creek where the deer came to drink in the cool of the evening. Visitors come from all over the world to walk in the lush green grass and stop in the churchyard at Shiloh.

I like to go there. In that one graveyard, under the carpet of green, lies buried someone from my family who fought in each of the wars since the Revolution. From New Orleans to Antietam, through the Argonne, and now the airborne invasion, those silent tombstones at Shiloh shout out their saga of freedom: the story of parents who gave to their children a sense of eternal values, children who grew up to manhood and when they were needed were ready.

ANOTHER SON

In the evening my 12-year-old rests from his romping. Rests with his chin on his hands on the floor in front of the fireplace. And as the flames beckon his fancy to follow, he begs me:

"Tell me, now, mother, how was it we came to know Lincoln?"

I know how the tales of the past may well fashion the call of the future. So I tell it—tell my son over and over how Abe always plowed a straight furrow; how Sarah taught him to tote a full pail without splashing; how she taught him to hold to his faith in the right as God gave him to see it. No need to mention how much these meant in the White House; or how they helped Abe to get there. I tell him, too, how his people knew and loved Sarah Bush Lincoln.

I see my son's soul stir within him. The light in his 12-year-old eyes leaps like the flames of the hearth fire. His comment:

"You know, mom, that's really something."

Then it is bedtime. He stands up, he seems to be taller.

Next morning, I find his bed made and his clothes neatly hung, neatly folded. I see his treasures about me—his Scout things, the sports stuff, his miniature horses. The bookshelves; the blue catchechism; the clippings he keeps on Korea. His bank makes me think of the ways he earns money, of the garden he soon will be planting.

On his desk he has made out a schedule, the week ahead planned to the fullest—well planned, so his load won't splash over. And, at the top, idly scribbled, "We knew Abe Lincoln." I fondle the block of black walnut he picked up in the graveyard at Shiloh and carefully sanded and polished. Humbly I ponder if hands have been laid on my youngest. I ponder where destiny may yet call him.

Dear God, help me help him get ready.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951—Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, to me it is regrettable that the White House did not send the Congress a proposal to reorganize the RFC by abolishing it rather than the present legislation we have before us.

Certainly the RFC did have a useful function at the time it was established in the early 1930's but it has long since outlived its usefulness.

The Hoover task force report made on this organization a year or two ago was excellent and should have been followed by the Congress. They proposed that this agency be abolished and that in the case of necessary national emergency loans that they could be made by private banks and approved and backed by the Federal Reserve Board. That proposal makes sense to me and I hope sincerely that the Congress will undertake as soon as possible to undertake the passage of such legislation. I introduced recently a bill providing for just such action and I commend it to your attention.

Tribute to the Hills of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a well-known writer for the Boston Herald, Bill Cunningham, recently visited my State of West Virginia and wrote a report for his paper. His report appeared in the Boston Herald on March 1, and was reprinted in the Charleston Gazette of March 11. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HILLS OF WEST VIRGINIA

(By Bill Cunningham)

MONTGOMERY, W. Va., February 28.—"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help." This first verse of the one hundred twenty-first Psalm is cast in bronze in the rotunda of Charleston's practically unbelievable airport station. It hits the arriving visitor hard because he's just flown for an hour over rugged hills, no matter what his quarter of approach, because the beautiful sky-high airport, itself, was made by leveling the tops of three mountains, and because, in no matter what direction he looks, he sees nothing but the tops of the Appalachians marching silently into the purpling distance.

This is not only one of the most beautiful airports in America, but it must be one of the most unusual in that it's high above the communities on a valley's floor, it's brought close to the outside world in the last few years. It doesn't, however, take even a stranger long to reach the conclusion that that quotation from the psalter could serve as a secular trade-mark for this entire area, and that it could, and probably would, be sincerely felt, if not actually spoken by the citizens of the rest of these troubled United States, if they could see and meet what is here.

PLANTS FUMING 'ROUND CLOCK

For there's help here, plenty of it. This is the start of the great coal region, the black, billion-dollar empire of John L. Lewis. Along this busy valley of the great Kanawha River, huge plants are fuming 'round the clock making chemicals, rayon, synthetic rubber, electric power, and other things, some of which are industrial, and even military secrets. This is a region, rich in water power, coal enough, apparently, to last forever, and gas. That's convenient fuel making for economical production. That means major help to a Nation forced to stock itself again with the engines of war, and to produce enough, otherwise, to keep itself in something approximating normal operation. First, however, maybe I'd better explain.

In this mountainous State, population can't run to metropoli, because there simply isn't enough level ground. Charleston, the State capital, and leading metropolis, is a city of about 75,000 in actual count of heads, but it serves as general headquarters for possibly a quarter of a million West Virginians who live scattered around in smaller communities.

This little town of Montgomery, which has just been so gracious to your roving correspondent, is about 35 miles farther along the big and busy river, and while it has a very real identity of its own, it seems to have practically a suburban relation to the State capital. Montgomery, itself, however, is a very compact toy metropolis at a bend in the river, with a population of 4,000, and it can't have any more unless it goes in for skyscrapers, because there isn't any more land here on the flat.

It, however, is a self-sufficient place, with its own churches, schools, banks, shopping district, newspaper, radio station, etc. It even boasts a fine college, the West Virginia Institute of Technology, under a very able president, Dr. M. J. Horsch. Like Charleston, it, too, services a surrounding community estimated at about 30,000.

From any evidence to the contrary, the people must do pretty well here. I was invited down to participate in the golden anniversary of the Montgomery National Bank. It's the larger of two banks in this busy place. It has deposits of close to $7,000,000 at present and it has been above the $7,000,000 mark. That's the highest per capita deposit rate in the entire State of West Virginia.

This institution, which pays me the honor of sponsoring me over the Montgomery Mutual radio station WMON, obviously has plenty of faith in the future. In honor of the anniversary, it completely and expensively remodeled its entire interior, installing the most modern equipment and brightening its sizable premises with the most modern decor. Yesterday, with business suspended, was the formal opening with the public invited.

The bank invited the community to hear me speak in the evening, and we all repaired after dinner to the local college gymnasium. That's not the institution's formal auditorium where such affairs generally are held but a larger number can be accommodated there. The audience was big, attractive to look at, and exceedingly quick on the trigger.

Afterward, we walked a few steps to the attractive residence of R. L. Holstein, president of the bank, where the friends and neighbors gathered, complete with wives, and we all swapped yarns, partook of some noble refreshments the ladies prepared, and I even operated on the piano while a considerable choir gathered around and rendered such standard present-day opera as the Tennessee Waltz, My Heart Cries for You, I Had a Dream, Dear, etc.

LOOK LIKE A TEAM

This all was a heartening experience to their visitor, thinking in terms of the trials that face us, because I had just finished doing exactly these same things with comparable representatives of the public in Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. I could have shut my eyes last night, and believed they were the same people. They responded to approximately the same speech in exactly the same way. They asked the same questions, and made the same comments afterward. Many of them offered the same observations of their own.

Banker Holstine, Cashier Bill Buchonan, Raymond Kandel, the Vickers brothers, former president of the State senate, Arnold—who was my official chaperone—and the rest, were exactly like the friends at home. So were their very swell wives.

Proud of their community, proud of their State—they took me through their handsome State capital which cost $10,000,000 in 1932 and looks it, and presented me to their Governor, the Honorable Okey L. Patteson—concerned about the futures of all of us, and well informed on all counts, these citizens of another region proved a matter I've been maintaining.

That's that, thanks to the press, the radio, the automobile, the plane, and two wars, there's no regional isolationism any more. We're all the same folks now, no matter where we live, or, if we're not it's the fault of the individual, not the locality. We Americans are now beginning to look like a team.

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help." There's a mighty reservoir of help, physical and spiritual, in this region I've been visiting these past 2 days. Don't sell America short.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Confusion," published in the New York Times on March 12, 1951. The editorial is a factual statement of some of the problems and enormous expense which would be involved in the construction of a St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE CONFUSION

After 20 years of disputation there is still no agreement on any phase of the St. Lawrence project—not even on engineering policy. The present plan calls for a channel 27 feet deep. One school of thought would increase the depth to 35 feet, so that bigger vessels, especially those that fly the American flag, could make use of the St. Lawrence from its mouth to the Great Lakes; another school maintains that if big ships were lightened to decrease their draft to 27 feet they could still make money. Once upon a time it was argued that the wheat of the West could be transported more cheaply through the seaway to Europe that is possible by way of Atlantic or Gulf ports; now we hear more of our growing need of Labrador's iron ore.

The argument in favor of national security had much in its favor in 1941 when the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, was signed; today Army officers admit that the seaway, though desirable, is no longer vital in national security, that the locks and dams could be bombed in a long-range aircraft attack by way of the Pole, and that a single atom bomb, properly placed, could block all the shipping in the channel. In 1948 it was estimated that a seaway with a 27-foot channel would cost about $785,000,000. The cost of constructing the seaway and hydroelectric power plant would be at least $918,000,000 today for a 27-foot channel. If a 35-foot channel alone will serve us adequately its cost will be at least a billion and a half, with an annual debt charge of $60,000,000 plus $5,000,000 for operation and maintenance.

Estimates of the traffic that will pass through the seaway vary from 20,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons. The busy Panama Canal handles only 25,000,000 tons annually. Pessimists maintain that this Panama figure might be reached in 10 years, but that 10,000,000 of the 25,000,000 will have to be new tons carried in ships of the United States. If this estimate is correct tolls would have to be outrageously high if the project is ever to pay for itself. It must also be borne in mind that the construction of a seaway and a hydroelectric station is not enough. Great Lakes ports will have to be dredged, at a cost of hundreds of millions. Lastly, it is objected that ice will close the seaway for 5 months in the year, and that long-term obligations will burden both this country and Canada for years.

It may be that the possibility of shipping goods to and from Europe through the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes ought to be converted into a reality. But what are the facts? We have a good picture of what may be gained by carrying out the hydroelectric plans of this State's power authority but only rough appraisals and romantic speculations of what may be expected of the seaway. For the resultant confusion special and sectional interests are responsible. A waterway that stretches 2,200 miles to the head of the Great Lakes is clearly of such continental importance that sectionalism should be disregarded. We need a study that objectively considers national exigencies, both economic and military. Until that is before us judgment on the St. Lawrence project must be deferred.

The Menace of Usurpation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth is the need of the hour. Bureaucratic self-serving propaganda paid for out of public funds has been a curse to our people. Once in possession of the facts relating to public problems the citizens of our Republic will find the correct solution. The New Deal has sought to mislead and deceive the people with reference to the real purpose of legislation, but this program of hypocrisy is being unmasked and the perfidy exposed.

Under leave to extend I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, as part of my remarks, which appeared in the Freeman of February 26, 1950, by Edna Lonigan, entitled "The Menace of Usurpation":

THE MENACE OF USURPATION

(By Edna Lonigan)

WASHINGTON.—The momentary hope that the Fair Deal PAC faction, which steers the Democratic administration, would forego political warfare for the duration is now in the discard. The Fair Dealers have been busy working out new political strategems since the morning of November 8. What is news is that Congress, as a body, is no longer willing to bow to their demands.

The great Senate debate on foreign policy is part of Congress' declaration of independence from Executive domination, but equally important—perhaps more important in terms of political power to resist domination—was the contest in the House over the rules to be used by the new Congress.

As recently as last summer able and courageous Members of Congress, who wanted

to stop the march to one-party government, were hopeless, even broken-hearted. They believed that Congress as an institution had lost its last chance to act independently. They knew that the Fair Deal could count on a large bloc of Senators and Representatives whose only hope of reelection lay in obeying the orders of PAC pressure groups. Administration strategists could also defeat independent Members who opposed their wishes by building up mass pressure groups in the recalcitrant Congressmen's districts. This was all done under the surface, and the public had little chance to know what was going on.

It is a fine thing, you will say, for Congressmen to be willing to go down to defeat for a principle. But if the electors do not know what the contest is about, a good Representative will be defeated only to make room for one more congressional errand boy of the Executive power.

When members of a law-making body can be retired by the central government and its party apparatus, rather than by the voters in their constituencies, representative government is lost, and we have in its place the self-steering Executive—responsible to no one, and able to use the legislative body as a sounding board for whatever "law" it wants.

The mortal struggle over representative government, which now centers in this country, has three phases. In the districts individual voters are struggling to win more political strength than the mass voters drilled by the central power. In the relations between Congress and the Executive, Congress is trying to reestablish its primacy in policy making. Within the Congress itself the true representatives of free communities are attempting to take back management of Congress from the pseudo representatives, vassals of the Executive arm.

The shape of the struggle within Congress, between pressure-group democracy and the representative principle, could be clearly seen on the first day of the new session, in the debate over the rules under which the House of Representatives was to carry on its work.

Hardly had the opening words about national unity been spoken before Representative SABATH, of Illinois, introduced the innocent-sounding resolution which was to lay bare the cleavage between two irreconcilable political philosophies. He proposed that the House adopt the same rules they used in the last session.

Here we must digress. Seen in two dimensions the debates in Congress often look like technical minutiae or factional disputes. Only by looking below the surface can we see the struggle between two systems of power as dramatic as in the First Continental Congress, the Estates General, or the Long Parliament of Charles Stuart's reign.

For nearly 30 years the House has had a Rules Committee whose duty it was to regulate the traffic when too many bills awaited the attention of the Members. The Fair Dealers took away its power over this traffic after the victory of 1948. Now they wanted to keep the 1948 procedures in the new Congress.

Administration leaders argued that the old Rules Committee had violated the will of the majority by bottling up bills that a majority of the Members favored. There was no particle of evidence for this charge, though it was repeated fervently by administration supporters in the press. The Rules Committee's control of the traffic in bills originated in the revolt against Speaker Joseph Cannon, led by Representative George W. Norris, of Nebraska, hardly a reactionary. The majority had two simple ways to override the Rules Committee whenever they wanted to do so. On Calendar Wednesdays the chairmen of committees could call up bills the Rules Committee had blocked, or a petition signed by 219 Members could bring about the discharge of any bill.

Obviously the real issue lay elsewhere. The trouble was, as the Washington Star said:

"Pressure-group tactics have been perfected to such an extent that some House Members, for the sake of their own political fortunes, would feel compelled to vote for certain Fair Deal measures which they secretly oppose. But if these measures can be kept from reaching the floor, they will not have to record their vote."

Now we can see more clearly. Under the 1948 rules individual Members could be coerced by the administration; under the earlier rules they could not be coerced. The old Rules Committee had not been opposing the will of the majority. It had been opposing the will of the pressure groups, at the behest of the majority.

In the Eightieth Congress, the Rules Committee had blocked the bills of the Fair Deal-PAC leaders, not against the will of the majority, but to take the Members off a political hot spot in their districts.

Enraged at this unexpected barrier to the passage of their blueprint for Federal domination of all American life, the PAC-ADA-Fair Dealers waged the 1948 Presidential campaign on the issue of the Do-Nothing Eightieth Congress. The Republicans did not oppose their strategy (although Truman's slogans almost paralleled those in the Daily Worker). The combine which rules the Democratic Party swept in, with the Fair Deal-PAC victorious over the rest of the administration and over Congress.

Representative COX, a Democrat, tells us what happened in the 1948 Congress:

"When we assembled here 2 years ago, fresh as we were from a great victory, there was demand for the scalps of people who had stood in the way of reform measures advocated by many prominent figures in this House and the country. The Rules Committee had incurred the displeasure of many because it had, in keeping with what it believed to be the good of the country, refused to stampede under the lash of the whip applied by strong unofficial minority groups."

Relentlessly the winners set to work to change the rules of the House so that the Rules Committee could not bar their way. Under their proposal any bill could be brought out in 21 days by a militant minority, even though the majority wanted it buried. The Fair Dealers put through the 1948 rules, as Representative HERTER said, "under very peculiar circumstances. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] moved that the rules of the previous session be adopted with an amendment; that amendment was not in type, it was not printed, nobody had a chance to read it. Then the gentleman from Illinois moved the previous question so there could be no debate on it." This in the name of democracy.

The difference between the Eightieth Congress, aided by the Rules Committee, and the Eighty-first, with no check rein, is nicely reflected in the budget. Freed from all restraints, the Eighty-first Congress passed every possible spending bill. Only a few civil-rights bills escaped because the administration did not want to count heads on those measures.

Representative ALLEN of Illinois, former chairman of the committee, said:

"During the Eightieth Congress * * * I invited the attention of the members of the Rules Committee in session to the standing committees of the House, which approved bills appropriating at least $20,000,000,000 more than the revenue estimated to be received.

"We felt that something should be done about it, that the budget must be balanced even though it was necessary to hold up several bills with considerable merit. As a result of the rules adopted by the Eightieth Congress that Congress saved the taxpayers considerable money, and for the first time in 18 years the income of the Federal Government was larger than its outgo. In other words, since 1933 it was the first Congress that balanced the budget."

This is the record which was so bitterly denounced in the 1948 Presidential campaign. And defended by no one.

In contrast, the Eighty-first Congress, under Fair Deal-PAC control, voted to spend deficit funds for all the old stand-bys of the welfare state, and new projects like the federalization of science. In 2 years it authorized a total of $135,000,000,000 and raised the debt to the highest point in our history. The Korean war sent the total higher, but even without the war Mr. Truman's Fair Deal outran New Deal welfare spending. With the Korean war, he and his pressure bloc have received $256,000,000,000 in 6 years. It took Roosevelt 12 years to spend $272,000,000,000. With two more war years to go, the Truman administration may well spend more than all our Presidents together since 1789.

It is significant that in the 1950 campaign the Republican Party again studiously refrained from any really unkind words about the record of the Eighty-first Congress in hurrying us down the road to financial chaos, in a world preparing for all-out war.

Obviously the administration wanted to keep the rules under which they could make Congressmen vote for spending they did not believe in. In the new Congress Fair Dealers argued for the 1948 rules because they helped the common people, while the opposition, according to Mr. SABATH, "uses its power to defeat liberal and progressive legislation and * * * it invariably supports and votes for all legislation advocated by the vested interests."

HALLECK, of Indiana, summarized the case for the insurgents:

"Let us get this matter out in the open. Let us quit shadow-boxing about it. * * * The reason the proponents of the 21-day rule are so vigorous and so active is that they think they see in the Committee on Rules something of a balance wheel in the way of unwise, unsound, and ill-timed, spendthrift socialistic measures."

There is some question, however, whether economic ruin and Socialist regimentation are the only issues in this contest between the Fair Dealers and the reactionaries. It is a sad commentary on our political blindness that the Fair Deal, so much more subtle and dangerous than the New Deal, has received so little of the attention it deserves.

President Truman has always hewn closely to the program laid down by the PAC-ADA-Farmers' Union. His legislative messages have always urged socialized medicine, Federal control of education, public housing, federalized civil rights, point-4, and a social security system designed to bring the whole population under a plan meant for proletarian wage earners.

We have heard vigorous debate on the question whether the proposals would bring welfare, but there was another, more serious, problem. The separate "parts" of this program all fitted together to make an oddly definite political pattern. They all led to spending ourselves into bankruptcy with money we did not have. They all helped to condition our people to centralized controls in peacetime, and to federalization of activities like voting, police, and justice which, in Anglo-Saxon tradition, had always been left to private or local direction. It is the subtlety of this program which is most disturbing. The parts seem so precisely fitted to a blueprint for our undoing.

If all the parts of the program, including price control, rent control, and rationing, had been adopted we would now be a thoroughly regimented people, with all power

centered in Washington, with the debt far higher than it is today, and with deep and incurable divisions among our people.

Perhaps this is only socialism, but perhaps it is something more. We know the Communists were present at the birth of the PAC program. We know they supported every part of it in their propaganda. We may well ask what better plan could saboteurs have devised to keep our people divided, to spend us into bankruptcy, and to put restraints on our habit of improvisation, so we could not win a long war?

Looking back, we can be profoundly grateful to the Eightieth Congress that this straitjacket of the permanent war economy was not put into effect just before we had to prepare for a great war.

Obviously the men on opposite sides of such a debate did not hear each others' arguments with their minds. There was no room for conciliation. The issue was settled by the southern Democrats. They voted for the old rules.

The Fair Dealers knew they had met a major defeat. Their existing power over Congress was broken. Representative SABATH bitterly denounced "some of the gentlemen of the Democratic Party, whose responsibility it is to carry out the program of the majority in power, [who] do not work with the leaders, and although we have a so-called majority on the Rules Committee here, it is only a paper majority. * * * In fact only yesterday * * * I am informed that these three Democratic members of the Committee on Rules, elected by the Democrats, were in conference with Republican leaders for the purpose of arranging for the defeat of the resolution I have presented here today."

The southern Democrats recognized that they were faced with a constitutional, not a party, issue. PAC-Fair Deal domination of our congressional districts is not a party issue but the death of representative government. The impending conflict between irresponsible executive power with its own money and its own voting blocs, and representative government, with control of lawmaking and of the purse firmly in the hands of agents of the people, cannot be settled by any compromise.

The southern Democrats have not yet made any decision about coalition, nor have the Republicans. There are deep technical and psychological barriers to coalition for most purposes. But there is reason for rejoicing when on a clear constitutional issue Republicans and southern Democrats join together and fight through to victory.

This is not the last contest over representative government in this session. The Fair Dealers are scared, but they will not quit. The President's message was, on the surface, a compromise between the Fair Deal-PAC faction and the old-line Democrats, who occupy most of the offices but have little share in the inner councils. For the benefit of the real Democrats most of the emphasis was on national security, with a ringing insistence that we cut nondefense spending, and balance new expenditures by taxes. In his 10 recommendations for action, however, the President included every important plank in the Fair Deal-PAC line-up—socialized medicine, subsidized medical education, public housing, a new farm program, Federal aid for education, ECA, point 4, and civil rights. They were all in battle dress, of course, but otherwise unchanged. The administration's bold new program for winning the most intellectually complex of all wars is to ask for everything in the PAC program, about as it stood in 1944, plus Mr. Roosevelt's arsenal of democracy.

Even before the President delivered his message, the Fair Deal members had introduced in the new session bills for health insurance, Federal control of lynching, civil rights, federalization of unemployment insurance, and aid for State and local governments. Their members have been moved to most of the important new vacancies on congressional committees. They obviously plan to make even more skillful use of the committee system for propaganda than they did last year in the Tydings investigation. They plan a spate of new Buchanan committees to harass their opponents, and to prevent the opposition from investigating their war powers. They have new and more subtle means for managing public opinion than those they worked out last year to win public acceptance of point 4.

Standing against the Fair Dealers' new strategies, so far, are only scattered individuals, who do not study the carefully charted designs of their opponents, and do not have any of their own. They have only native good judgment, and true devotion to representative government. But that is all the colonists had to set up representative government in the first place.

A Suggestion About Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Albert B. Colby, of Phoenix, Ariz., writes a very constructive suggestion concerning future surplus property. I think it has much merit so I am submitting it into the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

MARCH 8, 1951.

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CARL: Wasn't it Ben Franklin who said, "A penny saved is a penny earned"? We, as a Nation, in the conduct of our national business, often seem to overlook this sage admonition, particularly has this been true in the conduct of our wars and more particularly their termination.

After World War I we proceeded to give away, abandon, or sell at a ridiculous price millions of dollars of supposedly "surplus property." After World War II we did the same thing, but the amount went up into the billions. All because no comprehensive plan had been made in advance for a conservative disposition of such property. (This of course is not so true in the case of maritime and naval vessels after World War II.)

The newspapers here yesterday carried the story of a surplus dealer selling back to the Government several thousand Army cots for $4.95 which had been purchased from Surplus Property recently for $1.30. This is not an isolated case; it is being repeated daily.

My thought is this: Let us take steps now to conserve the surplus materials which will inevitably develop from our present defense activities.

No. 1: Erect in the Southwest, on Government land, where weather is so mild that in many cases only storage sheds would be needed, warehouses for the storage of all so-called surplus materials that may accrue from now on. Catalog it and make it available to all branches of the Government for present and future use.

No. 2: Establish repair and maintenance shops with personnel to care for these items.

No. 3: Establish a competent board of surveyors on a high policy level whose function it would be to decide on disposal if and when prudent business judgment dictated such a course.

Our Government is now in the market purchasing billions of dollars of automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, desks, chairs, typewriters, filing cabinets, tools, bulldozers, cranes, steam shovels, motors, and hundreds of similar items—most of which could have been on hand, in storage in good and usable condition.

Not only would millions of dollars have been saved but, more important, time as well. Then too the impact of civilian construction would have been lessened and a certain amount of inflationary force eliminated.

As you know, we abandoned millions of dollars of supplies and equipment on foreign shores after World War II. We lost much "face" by doing this in many spots. In others it was picked up and is being used today against us.

In too many cases, favored purchasers bought immense quantities of this surplus material for resale for fantastic profits.

All in all it has been very poor business and this in a Nation that prides itself on its efficiency.

It would not cost too much to establish such a base as I so meagerly outline in the fourth paragraph of this letter. It would be a rather gigantic undertaking, comparable in size to the amounts it would undoubtedly save us. Such a plant should be built in this section of the country because of the mild weather, little rain, no snow or ice or storms. For weather reasons the structures can be built much cheaper than in sections where it has to be considered. Many thousands of acres would be required for storage of motor vehicles and larger pieces of equipment. The Government has the land out here, idle, nonproductive, and lying along railways and highways. (Federal land in this State runs to approximately 22,000,000 acres.)

Such an undertaking belongs properly under the Secretary of Defense with liaison with other departments that may require materials not only in time of war but in peace as well.

We have spent and are spending millions of dollars in the stockpiling of critical materials. Don't you think it would be prudent to similarly stockpile the items already on hand that are manufactured from those critical materials?

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT B. COLBY.

Abolition, Not Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a timely editorial from the Rochester Times-Union on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The editorial follows:

ABOLITION, NOT REFORM

Shocking testimony and even more shocking maneuvers in the past week make clearer

that what the Reconstruction Finance Corporation needs most is not reform but abolition.

Testimony on influence-peddling quickly ran into a conflict that led Senator TOBEY to declare, "One of these two men is a liar." Then it developed that, as Senator FULBRIGHT says, some bright boy at the White House or the RFC attempted to silence the inquiry by having Senators' letters to the RFC about loans sent to the White House.

The squirming done by top men in the RFC when the committee sought to learn who authorized this threat was a complete commentary on the nature of the RFC as now operated. Finally it was determined that President Truman himself and his patronage aid, Donald Dawson, had discussed the procurement of the letters from RFC files with W. Elmer Harber, Chairman of the RFC Board.

Going to such lengths to protect an influence kingdom maintained by public funds inspires wonder whether the Fulbright committee, fine as its work has been, has got to the bottom of the RFC.

The RFC in its early days served a useful purpose. There was a lack of credit then. Today there is no lack of credit. There is, in fact, too much. Any enterprise that wants to borrow money for a sound purpose or on sound security can do so from any of a dozen private sources.

The door ought to be closed on influence peddlers of political loans, by liquidating the whole establishment. So long as there is a place where those who know the right people or can pull the right wires can dip into public funds, there will be scandal. The RFC is such a place.

Worse Than a Murderer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with drug addicts on the increase, particularly among teen-agers, Dr. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, and all associated with him in efforts to rid the Nation of a menace which has even caused alarm among our military leadership, will be pleased to learn of the action of Passaic County Judge Alexander M. Mac Leod, of Paterson, N. J., in his recent sentence of a narcotics peddler to the limit of the law provided in New Jersey—7 years behind the bars.

Recent testimony by Dr. Anslinger before a House subcommittee on appropriations emphasizes that the work of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics in recent months has been set back by light jail sentences, particularly in the so-called Hollywood cases. It is the hope of Dr. Anslinger and his men that the Congress will enact new legislation providing stiffer Federal jail sentences for first, second, and repeating offenders.

The Paterson (N. J.) Evening News, editorializing on Judge Mac Leod's action, writes:

WORSE THAN A MURDERER

Anyone reading the vigorous and forthright statement of County Judge Alex. M. Mac Leod as he sentenced a narcotics peddler to the limit of the law cannot help but feel a sense of pride in the jurist's clear-cut enunciations of a fundamental principle of society.

The News congratulates Judge Mac Leod and bespeaks for him continued strength and determination in helping to uproot this foul evil which destroys men's minds, characters, and souls:

Judge Mac Leod's message as he imposed a sentence on a peddler of marihuana is a sermon in itself:

"A fellow who will go out and sell narcotics, in the opinion of the court, is worse than a murderer, because one who sells or distributes narcotics kills the soul of a person. The narcotic vendor brings slow death and disgrace, for the addict loses pride, honor, and integrity; his usefulness is gone and his veracity destroyed. The illegal dispenser of narcotics is a major criminal. He is a triple threat to the health, safety, and morals of the community. Where people prey upon the weakness of a man, where they sell narcotics to addicts, I think there is no adequate punishment. It is one of the most corrupt rackets in the United States today. From it come mind-, body-, and soul-destroying habits that rob the victim of reason. There is no habit that can more encourage criminality in its worst form. All this can be laid to the viper who puts narcotics into the hands of victims for the gain of money."

All over the country spread of the use of narcotics is developing with alarming speed. Perhaps it's a manifestation of the restiveness of the times. With the world in turmoil, lives uprooted by the demands of universal stress, young folks not knowing whither they are going, morals become loosened, normal restraints abandoned.

In this fertile field the vermin who deal in the traffic of dope bore in among otherwise decent and unsuspecting people. Young folks especially are susceptible to the slippery and slimy wiles of the peddler. It only takes one whiff of a reefer to make some people addicts, and from there on in the story is one of human devastation.

Judge Mac Leod's characterization of the appalling effects of this dread affliction is mild in spite of its powerful impact by comparison with the end result. Youngsters who become victims of the dope are lost forever, finally sinking, as he points out, into the lowest depths of degradation.

The only language these lice understand is the language Judge Mac Leod spoke which puts them safely behind bars for as long as the law will permit. Let's have more sentences of the same type for any similar violators.

The Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call editorialized as follows:

NARCOTIC PEDDLER HAS 7 YEARS TO REPENT

One source of marihuana cigaret supplies in Paterson has been closed by the severe penalty given by County Judge Alexander M. Mac Leod to Charles Ervin, 31, said to be by police one of the most prolific independent vendors, at 50 cents each, of the so-called "reefers" in this area. Ervin will have 7 years, less time off for good behavior, plus enriching the county by a $2,000 fine to repent.

The exposé of racketeers in Brooklyn selling narcotics over the candy-store counters to children of school age aroused the public to the extent vendors were operating in their vile traffic in human lives. There was no evidence that there is any organized traffic in marihuana cigarettes here, but the authorities are checking on independent operators. Their vigilance paid off in the conviction of Ervin.

A month's investigation by City Detective John Broda and County Detective William Walter led them to Ervin, who had 26 "reefers" in his possession when arrested. The officers and Judge Mac Leod, who suggested narcotic peddlers were worse than murderers and imposed the maximum sentence allowed by law rendered the public a very commendable service. Meanwhile Ervin will have several long years to reflect on whether his racket was worth the risk.

Military Aid to Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, every one of us in this great chamber knows that there is a wide difference of opinion throughout the country on the vital issue of what our future policy should be regarding military aid to Western European allies.

Like my colleagues, I have seen newspaper editorials both favoring and opposing my personal stand. I welcome all such judgment on this issue. I feel that debate is healthy in newspaper columns, just as it is healthy on the floor of the Congress.

At this time, I have in my hand an editorial published in the Tuesday, March 6, issue of the Racine Journal-Times. This editorial very kindly commends my stand. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I do not do so because of its personal praise of me, but rather because I feel that it represents a viewpoint widely held regarding the position which many others and I have taken.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY PLAYING VITAL ROLE WELL

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin is the senior Republican on the important Foreign Relations Committee. During the present foreign policy debate, he has an opportunity to help guide this Nation through a grave period of international relations that may determine whether the world can find a road to peace, or be thrown into a maelstrom of conflict.

Since assuming the top GOP spot, because of the extended illness of Senator VANDENBERG of Michigan, WILEY has shown the restraint and foresight that becomes the minority leader on the Senate committee. In the present debate over sending troops to Europe the Wisconsin Senator is placing the welfare of his country above party politics.

In a recent interview in Milwaukee, WILEY showed a clear understanding of the current issue, and enunciated a sound set of principles that should help Congress and the Nation reach an agreement on foreign policy.

Said Senator WILEY:

"There is considerable misunderstanding about the differences of opinion, but the disagreement cannot and must not obscure the fact that our Nation is in danger.

"There is no disagreement on three key questions. Everyone is agreed that the President has power to send occupation troops to Germany, since after all we are still at war with Germany until a peace treaty is drawn. Everyone is agreed that the President can send American troops to Europe, under American control. No one contends that he needs congressional approval for either action. Everyone is also agreed that they are not opposed to sending air and sea support for Europe.

"There is only one disagreement, that is whether the President needs to ask Congress for approval before he sends American troops into an integrated international army of Atlantic Pact nations. Even that point is countered by the common agreement that we must send troops to help any Atlantic Pact ally that is attacked.

"There isn't much ground for disagreement left, and I think that we'll see the end of that soon * * * Especially since the executive branch is ready to discuss the matter with the legislative and there is no threat to our Republic by breaking down the balance of power."

We sincerely hope that the area of agreement is as wide as outlined by Senator WILEY. If it is, the people have been misled by speeches of Hoover, Taft, and Kennedy. Full discussion of the important foreign policy issues is helpful to any democracy, but, as Senator WILEY said, it must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the Nation is in danger.

Senator WILEY is demonstrating that he is fully conscious of the important role that he, and his party, must play in guiding this Nation's foreign policy. It is encouraging to report that he is meeting those responsibilities in a manner that is a credit to himself, his State, the Republican Party and his country.

Entertainment of Servicemen by Loyal Order of Moose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter regarding the activities of the Loyal Order of Moose in entertaining servicemen, as outlined in a letter from Malcolm R. Giles, the director general.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME LODGE OF THE WORLD,
LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE,
Mooseheart, Ill., March 10, 1951.

Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEELY: It occurs to me that you might be extremely interested in knowing what the Loyal Order of Moose is doing in an effort to entertain and lift up the morale of our valiant men in service of our country in the wide-flung outposts of democracy.

On next Friday, March 16, a star-studded theater group, headed by Roy Acuff, of Grand Ole Opry fame, will leave for an extended tour of Europe to entertain our servicemen in United States Army bases and hospitals. The unit, consisting of 25 performers, is being financed by lodges of the Loyal Order of Moose in Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and New Jersey. Everything possible in the way of high-class talent has been included in this show, which is to be called A Night With the Moose. It should do much to give a lift to the boys who are striving so valiantly for the advancement of our way of life.

You will also be happy to learn that this is the third such entertainment unit which has been financed by the Moose. The first played to capacity audiences in United States Air Force bases in Alaska and the Aleutians. The second unit traveled to Labrador, Greenland, Newfoundland, and Bermuda. In order to bring a bit of synthetic warmth to the frozen outposts of our defense perimeter, the first two units were entitled "South Pacific Review." These two units played to more than 50,000 of our United States Air Force servicemen.

The unit leaving next Friday will entertain our servicemen in 18 United States air bases and hospitals in the Azores, Germany, Austria, England, and Newfoundland. They will be on tour of the Continent until April 11, a total of 27 days. It is estimated that they will entertain more than 100,000 servicemen in that time.

We are especially proud of this effort to do our bit in easing the tension which these "ambassadors of freedom" are under during these trying times. Especially so since we believe we are the only organization, fraternal or otherwise, which is engaging in such an enterprise during the present emergency. Due credit must be given to the originator of these shows, Loyal Order of Moose Regional Director J. Jack Stoehr. The shows have been especially produced for the Armed Forces by special arrangement with the headquarters of the United States Air Force, which is furnishing transportation and housing.

I am also enclosing an editorial which appeared today in the Aurora (Ill.) Daily Beacon-News, which lauds the Moose for this venture and gives the itinerary of the show troupe.

With every good wish, I am,
Cordially yours,

MALCOLM R. GILES,
Director General.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an oration on the subject, This Nation Under God, delivered by Oscar J. Schmiegge, Jr., age 16 years, who was the winner in an oratorical contest held in the Appleton High School, Appleton, Wis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS NATION UNDER GOD

(By Oscar J. Schmiegge, Jr., age 16, winner of the Appleton High School, Appleton, Wis., oratorical contest)

On a cold, bleak November day, fourscore and seven years ago, Abraham Lincoln stood before a vast throng assembled at a place called Gettysburg. In that day of national crisis, as America faced the great problem which ensued as a result of the Civil War, he uttered these words, "We are testing whether this Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." Now eight decades have passed since then. America, at present, is facing a far more serious crisis than that. Only six short years after winning the most costly war in our history, we are confronted with the threat of another war, more costly—more devastating—more terrible than the last war. The present situation is vastly different than it was 6 or 7 years ago. We are not facing Germany, Italy, and Japan, three small nations, each fighting for their own goal, disunited, and having inferior forces. We are facing half the world. Russia and her satellites are united and have one goal in mind—to wipe out forever from the face of the earth America, democracy, religion. They have superior forces with which to carry out that objective. We are quite obviously on the defensive.

Today, those words spoken at Gettysburg are truer than when President Lincoln said them: "We are testing whether this Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." We're all quite concerned with that problem, aren't we? What goes on in the world is going to vitally affect your life, and yours, and yours, and everyone in this auditorium. There are times when we reflect upon the world's problems that we become discouraged and wonder whether there is an answer to all the confusion.

President Lincoln sketched it when, in closing his address he made a slight, but very important addition to his original draft. "We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation—" and it was here, as he reflected upon what he was saying, that he added the two words he knew he should never have left out, and so he said "that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that this government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." This Nation "under God"—this is the answer.

The answer to the great personal problems brought on by times such as these and the answer to a troubled world—prayer, faith; the answer 176 years ago when it looked as though the fundamental law of this country might never be formulated. When the fathers of our Nation met to frame the Constitution they labored several hours, rejecting copy after copy, until finally the situation looked hopeless; they were ready to give up in despair. Then wise old Benjamin Franklin spoke forth, "Gentlemen, we have forgotten something, we have forgotten to pray." Every man assembled knelt down to ask divine guidance in framing our Constitution. They arose, the seemingly insoluble deadlock was broken, and the greatest piece of national legislation the world has ever seen was produced. Washington at Valley Forge; Lincoln pacing the streets of our Nation's Capital at 2 o'clock in the morning; MacArthur at Leyte; Americans all, finding hope, strength, and help in prayer. And then there was just plain GI Joe finding God while sitting in a foxhole. A prayer that came forth from World War II very clearly illustrates this:

"Look, God, I have never spoken to You,
But now I want to say, 'How do You do.'
You God, they told me You didn't exist,
And, like a fool, I believed all this.

"Last night from a shell hole I saw Your sky,
I figured right then they'd told me a lie;
Had I taken the time to see what You made,
I'd have known they weren't calling a spade a spade.

"I wonder, God, if You'd shake my hand;
Somehow I feel You will understand.
Funny I had to come to this hellish place
Before I had time to see Your face.

"Well, I guess there isn't much more to say,
But I'm glad, God, I met You today;
I guess the zero hour will soon be here,
But I'm not afraid since I know You're near.

"The signal—well, God, I'll have to go,
I like You lots; this I want You to know.
Look, now, this will be a horrible fight—
Who knows, I may come to Your house tonight.

"Though I wasn't friendly to You before,
I wonder, God, if You'd wait at the door.
Look, I'm crying. Me, shedding tears!
I wish I'd known You these many years."

We do need people of faith today in our America, because you can't win wars with just guns, bombs, and planes. You must have people with an unconquerable spirit. The spirit we need today is the spirit that down through history has confronted fiery furnaces, lion's dens, and crosses, and conquered them all. The spirit that cannot, will not die. What did Washington, Lincoln, MacArthur, and plain GI Joe find? They found a power beyond themselves who would listen to their troubles, who cared for them, and who would give them His help. You too will find what they did when you turn to Him. In devout, humble men of faith like these lies also the solution for the world's perplexities. A little boy once discovered something that we must discover today; his father, wanting to read his newspaper undisturbed, tore out one page upon which was printed a large map of the world; tearing it up into pieces he tossed them on the floor and said, "Alright, son, let's see whether you can put the map together again." Within a very short time the small boy said, "There it is, dad, all fixed"—and it was. The amazed father asked, "How in the world did you do that so fast?" "Oh, it was easy," replied the boy, "you see, there was a picture of a man on the back of it and when I got the man fixed the world was fixed too." You can't change the world until you change the individuals in that world. Your personal responsibility is to get yourself fixed, and when we have enough individuals fixed, like you, with a living, loving faith—then your influence, under the guiding hand of God, will lead us from the night of perplexity and confusion into the day of peace and harmony. We must receive strength, guidance, and aid and then plunge forth as warriors into action—strong in love—strong in courage—strong in faith—to help the world find the better way of life. Then let the storms of hate, confusion, and hopelessness rage and beat against you and the land you love—upon the rock of your faith you shall stand and prevail.

Simple words once spoken by Jesus sum up and express more beautifully than my words ever could begin to, the solution to our modern dilemma, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give ye rest; take my yoke upon you and learn of me for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your soul."

Peter Norbeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate will remember Peter Norbeck, that great, sturdy Senator South Dakota sent to the Capitol some years ago. By action of the legislature, South Dakota has recently accepted and placed in the State capitol a bust of Peter Norbeck created by the famous sculptor, Gutzon Borglum.

Four of Mr. Borglum's figures are to be found here in the Capitol of the United States—the incomparable head of Lincoln in the rotunda, and the figures of Greenway, of Arizona; Stephens, of Georgia; and Vance, of North Carolina, in Statuary Hall.

The widow of Peter Norbeck, Mrs. Lydia Norbeck, also well remembered in Washington, was present for the ceremonies at Pierre, S. Dak.

The principal address was delivered by Hon. John A. Boland, Sr., himself a five-term member of the South Dakota State Senate, and long-time president of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society.

Mr. Boland's address was outstanding and it is appropriate that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, partly because Norbeck was a great United States Senator, partly because Rushmore is a national undertaking, and partly because it is part of the story of the United States admirably told.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Rapid City, (S. Dak.) Journal of March 9, 1951, which incorporates Mr. Boland's address, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETER NORBECK

A bust of the late Peter Norbeck, former governor and United States Senator, now rests in a special niche in the State capitol, reserved for South Dakota's immortals.

The bust was unveiled at impressive ceremonies on the day before the 1951 legislative session adjourned. Because of the press of legislative news, the Norbeck ceremonies did not receive the attention in the newspapers it ordinarily would have commanded.

One of the speakers at the dedication ceremonies was John A. Boland, Sr., Rapid City. His remarks concerning the father of Custer State Park were outstanding.

Said Boland:

"I deem it a distinct honor and a great privilege to take part in this brief ceremony to honor the late Peter Norbeck. He was a great conservationist, owning a national as well as a State reputation, as such. From a meager beginning, through his efforts, both mental and physical, over a period of years, Custer State Park became one of the nation's most attractive and largest State parks. It was by his leadership and personal interest that wild game was secured, facilities were provided, lakes and roads were constructed and the scenic beauty and natural resources were preserved. Surely he was the father of Custer State Park.

"He also was a great student of art. When the late Doane Robinson conceived the idea of a national monument in the Black Hills, he joined with him and others in the organization of the Mount Harney Memorial association that contracted with the sculptor and provided the funds by popular subscription for the installation of equipment and to start the work. The composition of the monument was largely the product of his fertile brain, the heroic figures of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt commemorating the founding, expansion, preservation and unification of the Great American Republic. It was he who gained the profound interest of the late President Coolidge in the project. It was he, who with the able assistance of Congressman Williamson, secured the enactment of the Federal law creating the Mt. Rushmore National Memorial Commission, and providing, in part, the funds to carry on the work. But to me, his greatest contribution to this shrine of democracy was his abiding faith and firm determination—faith in the monument and for what it stood, and determination to see that it was completed.

"Regardless of the perplexing problems that confronted the commission from time to time, he never lost his faith and determination, and until his death he always insisted that this great American memorial must and would be completed. Believe me when I say that if there had been no Peter Norbeck, I greatly doubt if there would have been a Rushmore Memorial. Indeed it is appropriate that the bust to be unveiled should be the creation of a great American sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, who, as Peter Norbeck, was a product of the West, reared under humble and trying conditions, and who, as he, was the son of Scandinavian parents.

"It seems to me that it is proper and fitting that this heroic bronze bust of this great, though humble man should be placed in the halls of the capitol building of the State where he was born, and that he loved so well and served so faithfully. It was in this building that he labored as State senator, lieutenant governor and governor, then rounded out his career by serving his State as United States Senator for 16 years. Truly Peter Norbeck was the prairie statesman."

The above words by Mr. Boland speak for the hundreds of friends of Peter Norbeck throughout the Black Hills. His good deeds for this section of South Dakota will live in the memories of the people as long as they live. And history will record indelibly Norbeck's part in developing the Black Hills and Badlands area.

A beautiful section of the hills between Rushmore Memorial and Custer State Park has been named in Norbeck's honor. The bust of the late Senator, sculptured by Gutzon Borglum, is a proper addition to the halls of the State capitol.

Inside Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "Inside Labor," by Victor Riesel, as it appeared in the New York Daily Mirror on January 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

In Hollywood not too long ago I signed a membership card in a party the FBI has not yet discovered.

I was recruited in a $7-a-steak bistro while the rest of the estery was distracted by Mike Romanoff's princely mixing of Caesar salad. The card I signed appropriately had a transparent middle section—and was evidence of membership in the cellophane wall party.

My movie script writer friend said there were only a few members for there were so few willing to stand up at a cellophane wall and be shot at from both sides for criticizing all sides.

Today I've sent for a new batch of membership cards. For on the morning of February 10, at 10 a. m. to be exact, a nonpartisan group of labor leaders, Congressmen, and columnists will meet in Philadelphia to say in effect that even their friends can be wrong.

This will be the first time any important group inside labor will disclose publicly that there is a sharp split among the men who for 20 years have worked together, first to oust the Communists from strategic Government policy-making posts, then to drive the leftists out of their unions.

Well, virtually all big unions are solidly in anti-Communist hands today. With that common defensive and offensive bond no longer needed, labor leaders are now examining more closely what their friends "think internationally."

Here is bitter disagreement.

At the moment the explosive dispute pivots on the foreign position taken by Walter Reuther. This swiftly moving, cross-country hopping redhead is the dynamo of the Americans for Democratic Action, the organization of old New Dealers who believe they are carrying on from the point at which Franklin D. Roosevelt's personal saga ended.

This organization, now headed by ex-United States Attorney General Francis Biddle, is being accused by important national leaders of a "soft" attitude on the Chinese Communists, of trying to appease Mao Tse-tung.

The critics of the ADA which has considerable influence on many of Mr. Truman's foreign policy makers and is on intimate terms with Dean Acheson, point to a statement made by Reuther at a recent ADA conference in the Henry Hudson Hotel here over the December 8 week-end. The critics' records show that Mr. Reuther said with great intensity:

"I am not interested in fighting world communism. I'm only interested in fighting Communist imperialism. I draw a distinction between world communism and Communist imperialism. I'm willing to leave the fight against world communism to McCARTHY and the Republicans."

Later, referring to the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa, Reuther argued that "Chiang Kai-shek is a company union and you never work with company unions."

Understandably, this aroused considerable resentment in top AFL circles for Mr. Reuther has great influence in the highest Washington war boards, both personally and in the name of CIO.

The AFL disagrees with Mr. Reuther. The AFL maintains a representative, the world-trotting Willis Etter, in Formosa working closely with Generalissimo Chiang's free Chinese labor federation there. Etter is in Washington this week but soon will cross the globe again to Chiang's headquarters.

The reaction to Reuther's position has been quick and bitter. A spokesman for the upholsterers union (AFL) which is lending its facilities to the February 10 conference, retorted the other day with:

"For over 20 years we have been pointing out the link between world communism and Communist imperialism and in one sentence these men would wipe out this highly vital and significant connection."

So a few days ago representatives of the AFL's upholsterers and hatters unions dispatched invitations to 30 representative international union chiefs, 50 Democratic and Republican Congressmen, some 20 professional people, and several newspapermen to meet on February 10.

Purpose will be to hammer out a common approach to Nationalist China which makes sense and doesn't appease the Reds.

And to tell the world that American labor doesn't want to abandon Chiang.

Also, of course, to tell the State Department that it has a disastrous policy * * * and that "those invited are men and women who have never faltered in the belief that communism and aggression should be resisted and counterattacked in any accessible quarter of the globe where we can find an ally to fight by our side in the open or underground."

These men and women will be hit by their friends as well as their enemies. They now are eligible for my Cellophane Wall Party.

Transferring Individuals From Minnesota One Hundred and Third Reserve Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following correspondence which I have had with the Secretary of Defense concerning the transferring of individuals from cadre units of the Minnesota One Hundred and Third Reserve Division.

I believe that this is the first official announcement that has been made by the Department of Defense in connection with preservation of troop program units; therefore, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks the following letters:

FEBRUARY 8, 1951.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to quote below from a letter I have received from one of my constituents for your consideration and comments:

"As you may know, I have been interested in the Reserve program of the Armed Forces for a little over 5 years. Most Reserve units are formed on the basis of "cadre" strength, with the mission of rapid expansion to full strength, and the training of 'fillers.' I happen to belong to the One Hundred and Third Reserve Division, with two regiments in Minnesota and one regiment together with division headquarters in Iowa. The unit is commanded by Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, of Mason City, Iowa, who is a fine leader.

"As long as it was guaranteed that the division would be called, when and if, as a unit, morale was high, enlistments were progressing, and I felt that the whole thing was worthwhile. Certainly, there were some who were postponing their draft calls by being members of the division, but it seemed that the public interest was being served by the unit, no matter what motives some of the people in it had.

"It now develops that we are to have our junior officers and enlisted men taken as individuals, in increments. Our regiment has been ordered to submit rosters of lieutenants already, and the apparent result is that a continuation of this policy will knock the props out from under the unit. If we are to train a cadre, we have to have the people, because 9 to 10 hours of training per month is none too much. The great promise that we could hold out to veterans was that they could count on going 'with the unit,' when called. To people with World War II experience, this is a big item, as the replacement system was not pleasantly regarded by anyone who was subject to it.

"As you know, millions of dollars have been spent in forming and training these cadre units—in fact one-third of a million dollars was just spent in remodeling two reserve armory buildings at Fort Snelling, one of which we occupy. It seems a shame to have this dissipated on units which will apparently never survive to accomplish their basic mission, expansion, and absorption of fillers. We fully recognize that the shortage of infantry officers must be met, but it seems a little rough on Minnesota, where no ROTC infantry officers are being commissioned to keep our ranks up to strength. The university has QM, Air Force, AAA, and other branches of training, but no infantry. Therefore, infantry officers' quotas are being met by tapping organized cadre units.

"If the higher commanders lose patience with the program, as seems possible, according to their utterances off the record, then many hours and dollars are down the drain."

Sincerely yours,

WALTER H. JUDD,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 5, 1951.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JUDD: This letter is in further reference to your communication of February 8, 1951, in which you asked for information with regard to the policy of recalling to active duty as individuals, commissioned and enlisted personnel who are members of Active Reserve units. As you may recall one of your constituents has written you in protest of this policy, with particular emphasis as to its effect on the One Hundred and Third Division, of which he is a member.

Upon inquiry I find that the commanders of the continental armies, who are responsible for the selection of individuals for active military service, have been directed to preserve the integrity of the troop program units by retaining therein sufficient personnel to maintain mobilization potential of these units after all voluntary and involuntary recall orders have been issued. A report received from the commanding general, Fifth Army, who is the responsible Army commander insofar as the One Hundred and Third Division is concerned, reveals that one officer who volunteered, two officers commissioned from a senior ROTC unit and who had had less than 1 year of active Federal service, and two other company-grade officers have been ordered to active duty from this division. Twenty-six others have been selected but have not been ordered to active duty pending a determination as to whether such action will impair the mobilization potential of the division.

Officers and enlisted men who are members of troop program units of the active Reserve have been permitted to volunteer for active military service since it is considered highly desirable to make the maximum use of volunteers in attaining the objectives of the recall programs. On the other hand, officers who have been commissioned from the ROTC program and who have less than 1 year of active military service to their credit are being recalled as a matter of equity to assure that reservists with long prior military service are not ordered into the active military service ahead of those with short prior service.

Please be assured that it is the policy of the Department of the Army not to seriously deplete the Reserve units of personnel by the individual recall of members of these units, and that insofar as possible every effort has been, and will continue to be, exerted to preserve their integrity against the necessity for such future use as may be dictated by the military situation.

Sincerely yours,

C. G. BLAKENEY,
Colonel, GSC,
Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Book of Genesis Tells Story of Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Milt Dean Hill, able and popular Washington correspondent for the Federated Publications, has written a timely and illuminating article which was printed in his newspapers Sunday, March 11, 1951, headed "The Book of Genesis Tells Story of Income Tax." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article and commend it to Members of Congress:

BOOK OF GENESIS TELLS STORY OF ORIGINATOR OF INCOME TAX

(By Milt Dean Hill)

Thursday when you send in your last year's income tax—blame it on a guy named Joe.

Not Joe Stalin, either, though the Russian generalissimo is responsible for the depth to which Uncle Sam is reaching into your pockets for his cut.

Actually, the author of the first income tax law in history—and the world's first commissioner of internal revenue was a biblical character who got his start as a poor shepherd boy.

He never went to college, they didn't have 'em in those days, but he was a psychologist and did reach the highest office open to an immigrant.

DREAMS UP INCOME TAX

He was the man who sold folks on the idea he could tell them what their dreams meant.

He was only 30 when he dreamed up the nightmare that's plagued the world since—income tax.

But nobody remembers him for his nefarious contribution to society. He's known mostly for wearing a coat of many colors that made his brothers so jealous they sold him as a slave in Egypt.

But that was almost 3,500 years ago.

Joseph's first income tax figures out to be only slightly less than the basic rate of today's taxes.

The Tax Foundation, an independent research organization in Washington, dug the story out of the Book of Genesis.

BECOMES TAX COLLECTOR

The Pharaoh, it seems, was addicted to dreaming. Joseph apparently knew something of the 14-year flood cycle of the Nile River, so he gave his boss the good word.

He suggested that the Pharaoh find a discreet citizen, give him a staff of collectors, and sock a 20-percent tax on every Egyptian's income and his grain crop.

The Pharaoh, as kings and presidents and Pharaohs are wont to do, went for the idea. He named Joseph the commissioner of internal revenue—or whatever the local title was at the time—and gave him a handsome young thing for a wife.

The bride was a priest's daughter, that being incidental to the fact that priests were the only ones who got an exemption from income tax.

Joseph, according to the record, was a diligent young tax collector. He stored away so much that when the drought came, he was the man with the answer.

THE BIBLE EXPLAINS

When Joseph unloaded his stored grain, he brought the money into Pharaoh's house—which, by then, must have looked like the United States Treasury.

The Bible tells how it all came out:

"When money failed, Joseph said 'give your cattle.' And they brought their cattle and Joseph gave them bread in exchange.

"When that year was ended they said 'Our money is spent; my lord hath our herds of cattle; there is nought but our bodies and our lands; buy us and our land for bread.'

"And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for the Pharaoh, and the people he moved to the cities from one end of the borders of Egypt to the other end thereof."

Whatever you think of the custom now, Joseph had broken the cycle. He taxed in the good years and fed his people in the bad.

WE'RE STILL PAYING

That, according to the Tax Foundation, makes him the real author of the theory of cycle-neutralization which, in effect, means hit 'em high and hit 'em low.

The point of which is that Joseph did a pretty efficient job—but he got all the money, horses, sheep, and cattle, and almost everything else. Plus that, he got a contract on the services of all the people of Egypt—for life.

After that, he handed out the seed, told them to plant it and declared that from that time forward, one-fifth of everything they raised should belong to Pharaoh.

You're still paying that 20 percent.

Increase of Salaries of Federal Civil Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following resolution adopted by the executive committee of Local No. 575, National Federation of Federal Employees, representing employees of the Veterans' Administration in Huntington, W. Va.:

The executive committee of Local 575, National Federation of Federal Employees, representing employees of the Veterans' Administration in Huntington, W. Va., on February 19, 1951, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas there has been a material increase in the cost of living since Congress last fixed the salaries in the Government civil service, and it is generally conceded by Government economists and others that further substantial increase cannot be prevented; and

"Whereas Federal employees, especially those in the lower salary ranges, by reason of such increased costs, and increased taxes on incomes, are sorely pressed to earn a substantial livelihood for themselves and their dependents, and many have already been driven by these events to accept a lower living standard; and

"Whereas for sundry other reasons all of which are matters of general knowledge;

"Now, therefore, the executive committee of Local 575, National Federation of Federal Employees, representing the employees of the Veterans' Administration in the regional office and the hospital at Huntington, W. Va., respectfully solicit your support of pending legislation providing for a fair and just increase in basic salaries of Federal civil employees: *Provided further*, That the president of local 575 is hereby authorized and instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of the six Congressmen from this State."

Voice of America Penetrates Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I enclose two newspaper articles relating to the Voice of America:

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 15, 1951]

VOICE CRACKS RED BARRIER—80 PERCENT OF PROGRAMS ARE BELIEVED REACHING RUSSIANS

(By Robert W. Ruth)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The Voice of America finally has succeeded in driving a sizable crack in the Iron Curtain.

This achievement, accomplished mainly in the last 6 months, is the most significant development in the entire postwar existence of this country's international broadcasting effort to present American views to the world.

A year ago the Voice as it came into Russia, was largely drowned out by a terrific barrage of noise set up by Soviet jamming transmitters. At best only 15 percent of the programs were getting through, usually much less. State Department officials who operate the Voice spoke of its effectiveness in Russia in the most conservative terms.

THIRTY PERCENT GETTING THROUGH

Now, however, they estimate that 30 percent of the programs are getting through in areas where the Soviets are using more than 1,000 transmitters to jam our broadcasts. The American Embassy in Moscow which monitors the Voice programs, offers evidence of their new effectiveness. In the outlying areas away from the big cities there is almost no jamming.

Reasons for the Voice's new success include the following: More powerful signals are being sent out from European transmitters. The Voice is using a cuddling technique—beaming its programs into Russia on frequency bands adjacent to those the Russians use for their own broadcasts. If the Russians jam the Voice program, they probably also jam their own.

In addition, the western European nations have arranged their broadcasts so they go on the air at the same time. That means that the Soviet jamming facilities are taxed to the full.

NEW AND SECRET METHODS

New and secret methods of piercing the iron curtain are now being devised. Since the facilities needed for jamming are about twice those for broadcasting programs, and since America's manufacturing potential for electronic equipment is vastly greater than Russia's, Voice officials look to the future with optimism.

The Voice is also vigorously pushing its idea of distributing 200,000 small $15 radio

receivers about the vital areas of the world, including 50,000 behind the iron curtain. Manufacturers abroad are already producing the sets, although the ticklish task of distribution has not yet been started. Experiments on cheaper models are progressing.

The State Department's International Broadcasting Division (the official name of the Voice of America) is constantly increasing the number of its programs.

MORE TIME TO CHINA

Next Friday a daily half-hour broadcast will begin in the Amoy dialect of Chinese and Mandarin Chinese programs will be boosted from 2¾ hours a day to 3 hours. A 15-minute program in Lithuanian also will commence. Estonian, Latvian, and Hebrew will be added shortly.

The addition of three new languages this week will bring to 28 the number of Voice broadcasts in more than 70 separate programs for 34 program hours a day. The number of words approximates 200,000.

But even this volume, much of which is beamed toward Communist-dominated countries, falls far short of the Russian output. The Soviets broadcast 547 hours a week, more than double total Voice programs.

CURRENT PROGRAM SCHEDULED

At present, the Voice's daily broadcasts to Europe are divided as follows:

German to Austria, 30 minutes; Bulgarian, 45 minutes; Czech and Slovak, 1 hour; English, 4 hours, 15 minutes; French, 45 minutes; Finnish, 15 minutes; German to Germany, 1 hour; Hungarian, 45 minutes; Italian, 1 hour, 10 minutes; Polish, 1 hour; Rumanian, 45 minutes; Russian, 2 hours; Serbo-Croat, 1 hour; Slovene, 15 minutes; Spanish, 30 minutes; and Ukrainian, 30 minutes.

To the Far East the present schedule is: Cantonese, 1 hour, 30 minutes; English, 3 hours; Indonesian, 30 minutes; Korean, 1 hour, 15 minutes; Mandarin, 2 hours, 45 minutes; Russian, 30 minutes, and Viet Namese, 15 minutes.

To the Near East: Arabic, 1 hour; Greek, 30 minutes; Persian, 45 minutes, and Turkish, 30 minutes. To Latin America: English, 1 hour, 15 minutes; Portuguese, 30 minutes; and Spanish, 2 hours, 30 minutes.

POWER TO 200,000 WATTS

Transmitters sending programs to Europe are located near New York City, Boston, and Cincinnati. Beamed via directional antennas ranging from 50,000 to 200,000 watts power, the transmissions are relayed by stations at Munich, Germany; Tangier, North Africa; Woofferton, England; and Salonika, Greece.

To the Far East the programs are broadcast from transmitters near San Francisco and relayed by stations at Honolulu and Manila. The Latin-American programs go out from stations in this country.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 16, 1951]

VOICE NOW STRESSES WIDENING DEFECTIONS OF REDS IN EUROPE

(By Robert W. Ruth)

WASHINGTON, February 15.—The Voice of America, now that it is speaking up with some chance of being heard in Soviet Russia, is hammering hard on one of the best anti-Marxist themes in years: the widening Communist defections in Europe.

The story of bourgeois nationalist deviations, particularly in Italy, which the Voice is taking behind the iron curtain, comprises a skillful mixture of news and propaganda.

TEST BY STATE DEPARTMENT

This impulse to blend news and propaganda, however, is not always lost when the Voice of America discusses America. As a consequence, the Voice sometimes takes on a tone that has a clear proadministration ring.

What the Voice tells the world is prepared here in the State Department's international broadcasting division. Last week a program entitled "Washington Observer" was teletyped to New York, where it was broadcast abroad in various languages.

Its treatment of the congressional debate about how many troops to send to Europe went as follows:

"The so-called great debate on foreign affairs—that debate has left the fabric of the American foreign policy untorn. In fact, it turns out now that the process of discussion—as usual—is shaping a broader bipartisan platform."

CONTRAST TO GOP VIEWS

"The issue * * * is not whether the President has the right to dispatch troops overseas. It is rather how much of a say Congress ought to be given in that decision. * * * Government and opposition apparently are coming closer together."

Then, in sharp contrast to widespread Republican views, the Voice went on:

"This narrowing of the issues debated tends to clear the political atmosphere. And at the same time defense problems have been clarified by General Eisenhower. His emphasis on the contagious interplay of courage—on Europe's need for equipment more than for troops—this prescription of Eisenhower's puts the defense problem on a new plane. Washington is almost unanimously agreed today that a great segment of public and congressional opinion is rallying on that plane."

Washington Observer told of rapid progress in strategic defense planning—tanks, planes, rifles, bombs, guns, and ships being ordered at a rate of $3,500,000,000 a month and soon to be stepped up to $4,000,000,000, adding:

"From all that, a new feeling—a new sense is spreading in Washington. General Eisenhower is responsible for part, and at the end of the week, President Truman further swung Washington firmly into the lead."

Voice officials, however, contend that the Republican view is not ignored in its programs. They say that Senator TAFT (Republican, Ohio) and former President Hoover get their share of time in State Department broadcasts.

Less open to controversy are the Voice broadcasts on foreign affairs.

Earlier this month the following program went out and much of it must have gotten to Moscow listeners because of the Voice's recent success in outsmarting Soviet jamming transmitters:

"Last week two prominent Italian Communist deputies from Reggio Emilia resigned from the party. Since then there have been further resignations, and yesterday a strike set to take place in the area was called off by the Communists. The reason, according to press dispatches, is that they were afraid it would fail.

"The two men were Valdo Magnani and Aldo Cucchi. * * * Both enjoy great influence in Communist ranks. * * * The immediate cause of the resignations was a speech recently delivered by Magnani. He made it clear he still considers himself a good Communist. * * * What bothered him was the slavish way with which Communists follow the Moscow line. * * *

"The Italian Communist Party hierarchy was quick to sense the heresy of Magnani's remarks. * * * As a result, party circles in northern Italy are in a state of furor."

The Voice then took up another topic designed to salt Moscow wounds.

"Another personality," it said, "is in the news, a prominent former Communist purged from his post on the charge of Titoism. The person is Vladimir Clementis, former Czechoslovak Foreign Minister. According to press dispatches, Mr. Clementis has fled from Prague. His whereabouts are a mystery. * * *

CLEMENTIS WAS PURGED

"Clementis was purged late last spring. The specific sin brought against him was that he had failed to accept the Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939; and that he had instead criticized it. According to his successor, Viliam Siroky, Clementis' crime was that he had lost his faith in Stalin.

"The connection between the purging of Clementis and last week's resignations of Italian Communists Magnani and Cucchi is obvious. All three, in Stalinist eyes, were guilty of the same sin: Of maintaining that a person can be a good Communist without accepting Soviet domination."

Although the Voice of America is rapidly maturing, it has yet to acquire much sex appeal—something which has great influence over Americans and Western Europeans. True, the Voice of America is sometimes the lush voice of Dinah Shore or Stafford, and sometimes Hollywood stars with foreign antecedents are worked into programs.

But the Voice feels compelled to be very proper in what it says to, say, French listeners, and suggestive noises are entirely taboo in programs beamed to the Middle and Far East for fear of offending oriental tastes.

Only disquieting whispers are directed to the ears of Mother Russia. After a long day's work in the fields, the Soviet woman is likely to get word via the Voice of America that the Communists lack the same enthusiasm for producing cosmetics that they do for hammers and sickles. If Mother Russia begins to feel like a drudge, a "gunny sack" (as one State Department official phrased it) and rises up and ousts her Communists oppressors, she can thank the Voice of America.

As for the Russian men the Voice never lets the Communists forget their setbacks in Western Germany—where they have lost elections, in France where their daily paper is losing circulation, in the Soviet zone of Austria where they get only five per cent of the votes, and in the rest of the Western World.

Other favorite topics: Russian slave labor, the Soviet-Chinese treaty, the adulation accorded Stalin in the Soviet press, the virtual banning of the literature of the great Russian writer, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, the Communist hate campaign against America, and the fate of a Chinese Communist basketball team which had been forced to lose to a Russian team.

The American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent edition of the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes:

LET'S NOT MAR THE APPLAUSE

Thirty-two years ago this week there was born in Paris, France, one of the most unique organizations of all time. It was designed to be nonpolitical in its every aspect and was to devote its efforts entirely to a furthering of the great principles upon which this Nation was founded. Its very name designated the high purposes of its being. Because there has been no avoiding of the program it had been organized to undertake, we join with all other veterans of the land in offering our sincere felicitations to the American Legion on its birthday anniversary.

It would be folly if we were to attempt in this space to list the meritorious results of Legion effort over the more than three

decades of its existence, but we do believe it proper to review briefly its history, point up its ideals, make mention of its larger accomplishments and, perhaps, refer respectfully to what we believe to be its shortcomings. That is what birthdays are for, and no matter how big or how strong any organization might become its works are reflected by its leadership, and people, being human, can always make mistakes.

Shortly after the shooting was over in World War I, some 20 servicemen who had gone to France to aid that Republic and its allies in defeating the German war lords, met in Paris. Following each of the other wars in which this country had been engaged, the veterans of those conflicts had organized to form societies through which the memories of comradeship would be perpetuated. This score of men, who had helped greatly to whip Germany, felt that they, too, as veterans of another war should organize "for God and country" and to be of every possible assistance to those who had fought with them and might require their understanding and their care. Led by a son of former fighting President Theodore Roosevelt, they called a caucus for March 15–17, 1919. More than a thousand representatives from military units met on those dates. They named an executive group, hit upon the name "American Legion," and, in April, designated a committee to start the ball rolling back home. In May there was called together in St. Louis, Mo., another caucus with delegates attending from every State of the Union, and from it came the first national convention at Minneapolis that November.

So was created an organization of veterans that has become the numerically strongest of all time. Although originally intended to accept only veterans of 1917–18, new wars have broadened its horizons. From 1,250,000 members who served in the first war, it grew to more than 3,000,000 when its rolls were opened to men who fought in 1941–46, and a further change in its charter last December admits as associates those who are now or will be serving their country in world war III. Its potential is unlimited both as to numbers and service. It boasts now over 17,000 posts in every State and Territory as well as in foreign lands, and it has more than half a million women in its Ladies Auxiliary who are devoting themselves so splendidly to the programs adopted.

Far from being a pressure group given over to selfish matters, the Legion has been selfless from the very beginning of its organization. Although like any similar group it has indulged in internal politics, it is truly democratic in its make-up from the choice of its leaders to the adoption of its mandates. A long succession of excellent national commanders who served in World War I gave way to their younger comrades 2 years ago and the leadership has gone over largely to that element, perhaps never to return. Yet, although time alters the execution of policy, there has been no change in the principles for which the Legion was born. It has, and it continues to dedicate itself to the care of war veterans, its program of rehabilitation being one of its choicest possessions.

In the fields of Americanism, child welfare, youth delinquency, national security, and foreign relations this strictly American society of war veterans has accomplished much of which it and the Nation can be proud, and veterans themselves must be ever grateful for the many laws enacted by the Congress for their relief, many of which could not have been realized if it were not for the valiant effort put forth by their benefactors who met together 32 years ago so that these things could be done. Political thinking has never dominated the Legion; service has been its watchword.

No group with such a background, with so large a membership, and with a variety of personnel could be without its faults, so we would wish to point out a weakness we feel should be corrected. Long ago the need for relief by veterans of World War I became apparent. Legion spokesmen, and men and women who have given the best years of their lives to remedial legislation and other rehabilitation measures, went to work with a will and saw that many beneficial laws were enacted. As World War II came on, they helped to spread upon the statute books a vast system of enactments that have afforded aid to millions who were engulfed in the last war. The organization is now sponsoring numerous other bills whose passage is vitally necessary. The needs of our men now fighting in Korea are receiving major attention.

When new requirements are evident, it is all too easy to forget the past and to think largely in terms of the present. The Congress has a full heart and, when shooting is going on, it is a comparatively simple thing to obtain relief legislation for the boys who have just seen enemy action. However, age and economic conditions bring about new needs. Especially is this true as to the older veterans who assisted with their comrades in the Legion's formation. There is a sad necessity right now for a service pension law, particularly for the forgotten veterans of World War I. Under younger leadership of men who do not understand this problem, aided and abetted by older veterans who have been inclined to judge the circumstances of others by their own well-being, the Legion has fallen down miserably in this particular. Corrective measures must be taken at once, if the support of the older men is to be expected to continue.

Elsewhere in this issue we are paid high and somewhat undeserved compliment for our insistence that organized veterans are not doing their full duty when their leaders fail to recognize the desirability of working in harmony with brother organizations for the good of all. We recognize as do few others that friendly competition spices the desire for membership in any group. It is good to have. It helps the cause no end, but when rivalry and a desire to claim all of the spoils prevents a combined effort to do good, it is essentially wrong. Veterans as a class have powerful enemies who gage their deeds by the cost involved. To fail to unite in combating the enemy is to lose the fight. It is a disservice to the entire list of veterans of all our wars. We have devoted ourselves for years to a dissipation of unhealthy contests as between veterans' organizations. We have done it because we know there is much still to be done for all veterans and we realize full well how easily the gears can be stripped by selfishness. For the past couple of years at least there has been a high-level willingness of national commanders to meet together but the meetings have not diminished the suspicion that self-advantage has been the motive rather than selfless assistance to those who require their help. Down in the lower echelon, in post and departments, there is less of dishonest competition than up at the top. There is enough of credit for honest effort available to all organizations, but a little give-and-take would do wonders for everybody, and we hope that the present leaders and those who follow them in the American Legion and in all other major organizations will permit their hearts to dictate their actions and that they will not let organizational jealousies shape their courses. It is easy to agree upon concerted conduct where there is no disagreement. What is wanting is a willingness to sit at the conference table, iron out honest differences of opinion and move on to the completion of appointed tasks in strength and full unison.

Failure to turn in a completely harmonious performance spoils the show. No one actor can do the whole job without a supporting cast. We must work together in service to the Nation and to those who have preserved it against its foes. The enemies of veterans are on the warpath again. They are out to hurt the halt, the lame, and the blind with sugar-coated economy moves. The veterans are our charges, especially the disabled and the aging. They and their dependents look to the Legion and their associate organizations not to let them down. The American Legion has done a great work in the past. We congratulate it for its achievements. Looking ahead, we hope it will enjoy fine health so that it may live long and do all of those things it has yet to do. It has run a great show, but our veterans want no failure to mar the applause when the final curtain falls.

Education in Rural Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the New York Times of last Monday, March 12, there appeared a most challenging article by Mr. Benjamin Fine on education in rural schools. The headline of the article is "Rural Schools Still Inferior Despite Gains, Study Shows," and the subhead is "In General, Teachers are Poorly Prepared, Buildings Outmoded, Courses Inadequate—Communities Slowly Realizing Needs." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL SCHOOLS STILL INFERIOR DESPITE GAINS, STUDY SHOWS—IN GENERAL, TEACHERS ARE POORLY PREPARED, BUILDINGS OUTMODED, COURSES INADEQUATE—COMMUNITIES SLOWLY REALIZING NEEDS

(By Benjamin Fine)

Despite recent improvements, the Nation's rural schools are providing an inferior education to large numbers of children. The worst school conditions in the United States are found in rural areas. In general, the teachers are poorly prepared, the buildings are outmoded and the course of studies inadequate.

Nearly 3,500,000 boys and girls in the rural schools are receiving an impaired education this year because of inadequate buildings, incompetent teachers, double sessions, and part-time instruction. This means that one out of every four pupils in the rural schools is obtaining only a second-rate schooling. Even the others are getting an education poorer than that of their city cousins.

These conclusions are based on a 6-month Nation-wide survey conducted by the New York Times. In the course of the study, this writer visited rural schools in various parts of the country, interviewed officials at the National Education Association and United States Office of Education, and queried 1,500 rural teachers and superintendents.

The survey disclosed a gradual awakening in school circles to the need for better facilities in rural communities. Many educational

organizations have made a determined effort in recent years to raise the rural school standards. Large numbers of one-room schoolhouses have been closed in favor of modern consolidated buildings. Some communities demand qualified teachers and have floated bond issues to construct adequate classrooms, laboratories, and other facilities.

But the over-all picture is not too bright. Although vast strides have been made in the last half century, the rural schools, by and large, are still the stepchildren of America's huge educational system. Rural school teachers average 2 years of college training, compared with 4 years for the urban teachers. Many rural children attend classes in dilapidated buildings, in converted garages, in cowlike shacks, in church basements, and, in at least one case, an undertaker's parlor.

The rural schools play an important part in the social and educational life of the United States. Of the 26,000,000 children in the Nation's elementary and high schools, nearly half, or approximately 12,500,000, come from rural areas. More than half—500,000 out of 980,000—of the teachers are employed in rural schools. And the outlook is that the heaviest increases in the next 10 years will be found in the rural schools.

Rural schools are lagging behind the city schools, and in many instances little, if anything, is being done about this vital problem. For example, 1,000,000 children (for the most part those of migratory workers) go to school 60 days a year. As a result, the country is producing yearly 200,000 illiterates—persons with less than a fifth-grade education. The Army will not accept such men for service.

The Times survey shows that rural education receives much less support than does the urban program. Even though there are almost as many children in the rural classrooms, and slightly more teachers, the rural schools get a bare 35 percent of the total amount spent for education in this country. The urban schools get the remaining 65 percent. This means that of the estimated $5,000,000,000 expended annually for public elementary and secondary schools, the rural share is $2,000,000,000, the urban, $3,000,000,000.

MORE PUPILS, LESS MONEY

It was found that as a rule those States with the largest number of rural children of school age have the least ability to support their schools, as well as the smallest amount of school funds for each child. On the other hand, they usually make the greatest effort to provide support. New York State has five times as much income per child of school age as does Mississippi—$15,739 against $3,030. The six States with the highest percent of rural school children spend $110 a pupil, while the six States with the smallest number of rural pupils spend an average of $222.

What may be even more significant for the Nation as a whole, using 1947–48 figures (the latest accurate ones available), the current expense per pupil in average daily attendance was $128 for rural schools, $199 for urban.

A great disparity between rural and urban schools exists in the value of the school property. The urban pupils attend schools valued at more than $500 a pupil, while rural children go to schools valued at less than half that amount. In some sections there are four or five times as much wealth back of the urban child as that behind the rural. For example, in the South Atlantic States, the ratio is $5,491 to $986, in the New England States it is $6,302 to $2,079.

Probably the most difficult problem confronting the rural schools is to obtain an adequate supply of competent teachers. More than 70 percent of all the rural county superintendents who replied to the Times' questionnaire said they could not get enough elementary teachers; one-third noted it was impossible to obtain high-school instructors for rural areas. As a result many untrained, badly prepared men and women holding rural teaching certificates should not be allowed to continue in the profession.

These teachers, in the words of Dr. Howard A. Dawson, director of rural service, National Education Association, practice on the rural children, usually without supervision. The teaching is mostly on the basis of trial and error, catch-as-catch-can, by guess and by gosh.

"The good teachers are picked up within a year by the city superintendents," observes Dr. Dawson. "The poor ones get married. Those that stay by choice are missionary minded—and the percentage is small."

The typical elementary rural teacher has a 2-year college education; the urban teacher has a 4-year average. The worst education in the country is found on the rural elementary level. The majority of substandard teachers are in the rural schools; of the 80,000 emergency teaching licenses, 65,000 are found in rural schools.

Sometimes the educational level of rural teachers is unbelievably low. The Times survey brought out these figures: 1,000 rural teachers have less than a high-school education; 30,000 have no more than a high-school training; 45,000 have not completed 1 year of college; 100,000 have not completed 2. Because of the growing school population the shortages will worsen in this decade.

The rate of turn-over is much heavier in rural than in urban schools. Generally, the average rural teacher is a woman with about 2 years of college education, who will stay in teaching 3 to 5 years. Less than 15 percent of the rural teachers are men, compared with 39 percent in 1870. Rural teachers more often than not have no tenure; they are employed from year to year and can be dismissed any time the local school board desires.

Undoubtedly the salaries play an important part in this not-too-happy picture. The average rural teacher receives $2,200 a year, or just about $42 a week. However, many of the 500,000 such teachers get much less. This writer met many teachers who were receiving $65 to $100 a month.

The urban teachers fare considerably better. Their annual average salary is $3,300. Many of the larger cities now pay maximums of $5,000 or more. In New York City the recent fact-finding committee proposed that the salary schedules run from $3,000 to $6,500.

SAMPLING OF ATTITUDES

But salary is not the only reason why teachers stay away from rural schools. They object to large classes, to living conditions, and to overwork. A sampling of 600 rural teachers in the country showed these attitudes toward their problems:

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
	Percent	*Percent*
Large classes	33.5	66.5
Housing facilities	42	58
Salary	51	49
Overwork	51	49
Community respect	77	23

Teachers are more disturbed about large classes than any other factor. Two-thirds of them replied they were dissatisfied with their oversize classes. Some rural classes have 70, 80, or even 90 children crowded into one room. One teacher in a southern school told this writer unhappily:

"Wouldn't it be heaven if I had only 40 pupils instead of 70?"

Living conditions, listed as the second factor of dissatisfaction, are highly unsatisfactory in many sections of the country.

Either the rural teacher has to live in a neighboring house as a boarder, or she has to commute from a nearby larger town. Most rural communities want their teachers to live among them, to become a definite part of the community.

Restrictions in most rural areas are much more severe than in urban centers. Personal freedoms are sharply restricted—to smoke a cigarette, to drink a cocktail, to go to a public dance or on a date, often is frowned upon, frequently forbidden.

A rural school principal making $1,410 a year after 17 years of teaching, sings in the church choir, is treasurer of the community club, and supplies the entertainment at school functions. But he doesn't mind his hard work and low pay, for a teacher feels free in a rural school. He has had 1 year of college training.

Some of the teachers this writer observed in the classroom are hardly worth the $67.50 a month they were receiving. In one Midwest rural school—a three-teacher school with about 100 pupils—the first grade teacher boasted she didn't have to yell or shout at her children.

It was lunch time, and, quite by accident, a blue-eyed, blond-haired child of 6 toppled her container of milk. Pouncing on her angrily, the teacher began to shake her vigorously, shouting at her for her stupidity. Turning to the visitor, she said: "We don't spank them, we just shake 'em."

Another teacher appeared to have difficulty keeping discipline. His 45 fifth and sixth graders didn't respond even when he banged on the desk with a paddle.

He explained he had been a stationary steam engineer, but last year he decided to go into teaching—less money, but the $175 a month kept him off the breadline.

"Do you ever use this paddle?" the writer inquired innocently.

"I sure do," he responded eagerly. "I don't hit them very hard. Fiddlesticks, I just make it sting a little bit, but not enough to injure them."

The steam-engineer-turned-teacher banged on his desk: "Quiet." Turning to a lad of 10 or 11, he threatened: "I'll beat the daylights out of you later."

He turned to the writer again and confided, "Yes, sirree, the paddle keeps 'em from running all over you. You got to use every trick of the trade in this business. Some teachers say they can get discipline without paddling, but I question it. The paddle's the thing. If they don't behave I just have 'em bend over and give 'em a good clip on the bucket."

Of course, not many teachers are as crude or as little suited for teaching. But enough exist to handicap the rural schools in their desire to give the 12,000,000 children in their care a good, democratic education that will help them become better, more responsible citizens.

THE LITTLE RED SCHOOLHOUSE

One of the major problems confronting the rural schools is that of reorganizing the school districts into larger units. Significant advances have been made. In the last 30 years the number of one-room schools has declined from 200,000 to 70,000.

The one-teacher schools still are numerous in many of the North Central Prairie States. They account for nearly three-fourths of all the public schools in those States and for one-fourth of all the teachers employed. The little red schoolhouses teach a total of 1,500,000 pupils in the Nation.

If the rural schools are to do a good job, it will be necessary that they reorganize

into more efficient units. The 70,000 one-room schools could be reduced to about 25,000 and still meet the needs of sparsely populated rural areas. But on the high school level, the situation is more disturbing. Of the 24,000 high schools in the United States, nearly 4,000 have less than 50 pupils. About 9,000 have less than 100 pupils, 18,000 have less than 300.

Most of the small high schools, as well as elementary schools, are found in rural areas. The education of a boy who attends a high school of 50 pupils with a staff of 2 teachers is often inadequate. The National Commission on School District Reorganization has made this recommendation: The enrollment in junior and senior high schools should not be fewer than 300 pupils, with a minimum of 12 full-time teachers. About 10 percent of the rural high schools would qualify.

Many advantages can be found in the school reorganization program. One of the immediate results of the formation of the county unit system in West Virginia was the professionalization of the county superintendency. Today these leaders compare in background and experience with school administrators in larger cities.

The creation of the central school districts in New York State has attracted a high quality of educational leaders—a much higher quality of leadership than is available to the districts that have not been centralized. The newly established community school districts in Illinois likewise are attracting educational leaders of high quality.

Here is a typical illustration of the way reorganization can improve rural schooling: Five years ago Perry County, Pa., operated 75 one-room schools. The 10 high schools enrolled 1,211 pupils. One-third of the pupils received music instruction or were under direction of a supervising principal, none had services of a school nurse, and half the elementary pupils were in graded schools.

Today, Perry County operates 18 one-room schools; 1,535 pupils are enrolled in 7 high schools. Eighty percent of the pupils are under direction of supervising principals, and the same percentage receives instruction from music supervisors. Moreover, 100 percent have the services of school nurses.

RESULTS OF REORGANIZATION

The gains made possible by reorganization are illustrated by the experience in Scott County, Ill. These projects followed the creation of larger, more effective school units; a more closely integrated program between elementary and high schools; adoption of uniform textbooks in all elementary schools; revision of the elementary curriculum; an intensive health program under the supervision of a full-time registered nurse; improved library facilities; single-salary schedule; expanded music program, and closer relationship between the home and the school through a county-wide parent-teacher association.

A large number of antiquated, almost dilapidated schoolhouses dot the countryside. A much higher percentage of outmoded buildings are found in the rural than in the city areas. In some communities the rural schools are little more than abandoned shacks, unfit to house valuable livestock. The pot-bellied stove is still used in many wooden, unsafe buildings. It is not unusual to find 100-year-old schools with the windows boarded up where the panes had been broken a quarter century ago, and an open door as the only means of lighting.

The rural schools recognize their problem. Last year they spent more than $300,000,000 for school buildings—compared with $450,000,000 in urban areas. The rural schools report they need about $2,500,000,000 to provide adequate facilities. And now the building program is virtually stymied. Inflationary costs have shot the prices out of sight. Many communities say that though they have bonds in the bank they cannot build. The amount they thought would be enough 5, 4, or even 2 years ago is now wholly inadequate.

A large number of rural schools lack any modern facilities, such as gymnasiums, lunchrooms, vocational workshops, or other up-to-date services. The high schools frequently offer a minimum of courses, and these are based on the precollege curriculum. Little is done on training for the vocations, or in homemaking, health, music, or the arts.

Yet only a small percentage of the rural high-school students go to college. Modern buildings, together with a revised curriculum and more competent teachers, would help keep the rural youth in school and encourage them to enter college.

In recent months there has been a dramatic awakening on the part of rural school leadership. A number of model rural schools now serve as inspiring examples. A better system of supervision has been introduced in a number of rural communities. Specialists who can meet the needs of the schools have been developed.

CYR LAUDS MOVEMENT

Praising this movement, Prof. Frank W. Cyr, of Teachers' College, Columbia University, one of the leading authorities on rural education, declared the community leadership itself would help the schools overcome their traditional handicaps. He pointed to agricultural leaders, to the farm bureaus, the Grange, and the activities of the Future Farmers of America, as focal points for the rural-school renaissance.

The rural schools want the three R's—reading, writing, and arithmetic—but they want to go beyond that, according to Dr. Cyr, who is in charge of rural education at Teachers. They believe their children should know something about the conservation of natural resources, about individual and community health, about home and family life. The rural schools can play a vital role in the ideological war that has divided the world. A democracy needs a strong, intelligent citizenry, whether it comes from the farms or from the city.

RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED

Based on the results of the Times study, these recommendations are offered as first steps to improve the Nation's rural school program:

1. Establish larger units of school administration.
2. Secure better prepared teachers by raising the salaries, reducing workload, and providing more adequate living conditions.
3. Develop better administrators and supervisors to help raise the rural school educational standards.
4. Adopt Federal financing for many rural communities that are too poor to provide necessary funds without Government help.
5. Adjust the curriculum to meet the needs of the community.
6. Start an immediate building program to construct badly needed elementary and high schools.
7. Provide adequate means of transportation to make possible the creation of effective consolidated elementary and high school.

EDUCATION: RURAL, URBAN

The following table depicting rural education conditions in the academic year 1950–51, is based on the Nation-wide survey of rural schools conducted by the New York Times, together with data obtained from the National Education Association and the United States Office of Education:

	Rural	Urban
Number of teachers employed	500,000	480,000
Number of teachers employed on emergency or substandard certificates	65,000	15,000
Total public school enrollment	12,500,000	13,500,000
Average annual salary for classroom teachers	$2,200	$3,300
Average educational level of teachers	(1)	(2)
Total operating expenditures	$2,000,000,000	$3,000,000,000
Amount spent for school construction	$300,000,000	$450,000,000
States reporting serious shortage of elementary teachers	42	26
States reporting serious shortage of secondary teachers	13	0
Number of additional qualified teachers needed	50,000	
Number of 1- and 2-room schools	71,000	
Number of pupils who will suffer an impairment in schooling because of—		
Inadequate buildings	1,536,900	
Lack of teachers	728,435	
Poorly prepared teachers	1,257,436	
Double sessions or part-time instruction	118,817	
Total	3,440,588	

[1] 2 years' college education.

[2] 4 years' college education.

The Draft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 4, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, director of the Selective Service System, and I participated in a radio and television discussion on the American Forum of the Air, the founder and moderator of which is Mr. Theodore Granik.

The subject assigned us was the Draft Act. The Draft Act is now being considered by the United States Congress. Under leave granted me I extend the following broadcast on this timely and most important piece of legislation:

ANNOUNCER. Here with us today on the American Forum of the Air are Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, and Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, ranking Republican leader of the House Armed Services Committee.

And now, your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. Shall we lower the draft age to 18?

Shall we require all the Nation's young men to undergo a period of universal military training?

These are issues which confront our Congress and our people—issues of great concern to our youth—issues which affect almost every home throughout the Nation.

All of us want to see this Nation strong—on land, sea, and in the air—able to defend itself against any aggressor. We are in the process of building this armed strength. How to meet our goal is the question posed by the American Forum of the Air today.

Congressman SHORT, how do you feel about the proposed legislation which combines, with the Draft Act, a permanent system of universal military training?

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Granik, personally I am seriously opposed to this shotgun wedding of selective service along with universal military training. It seems to me that this clandestine, illicit and unholy marriage is a brazen attempt to achieve by indirection what the Defense Department could not achieve by direction. In a time of hysteria we should not pass laws which in time of calm and cool reflection could not be approved.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. Mr. SHORT makes quite a little point of the shotgun wedding. I have known many of those that have worked out rather successfully. I don't take too seriously how we do a thing. I don't happen to agree with Mr. SHORT. We agree on most things. I don't quite agree with him on the fact that we are getting a universal military training system for the first time. We got one in 1940. We let it die in 1947. We recreated it in 1948. We did not use it as much as we should have. We are now using it. I think we are making some changes in it. But outside of making the present law permanent, I think we have got a universal military training system at the present time if we use it.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Granik, I think that obviously the sponsors of this bill are taking advantage of the emotional pressure in a jittery age when many people have become panicky because of the ceaseless, tireless effort of the brass and braid to create and shoulder upon us a permanent system of universal military training under which they can command large bodies of men.

Now, it is admitted by the authors and sponsors of the legislation that the UMT phase of it is in the future, perhaps the distant future. So why not wait until we come to that bridge before we cross it. Why muddy the waters now by putting on the statute books a piece of legislation that cannot possibly be implemented for several years to come.

General HERSHEY. Mr. SHORT, I take a little issue with you in that. In the first place, the only difference between a universal military training program now and any other time is that at the present time the service, instead of coming at some future time, comes immediately. There are only three fundamentals mentioned, and I think you and I agree on most of them. First of all, you don't like the permanency. You make quite a little point of the fact that we are now in an unusual situation. There are a lot of people who have to get awfully sick before they will take reasonable precautions to maintain their health. It is unfortunate that the doctor has to scare them into doing what they ought to do. It is unfortunate we did not get universal training in 1947. If we had, we would not have to go through some of the things we do. I regret the same as you do that we have got to do something in an emergency, but if the choice is between emergency or not doing it, as long as survival is the thing you are going to get out of it, I think we are just going to have to do what we must.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Much of what the general says is quite plausible, but he knows, as every student of government knows, that no Congress can bind another Congress, and under the Constitution we cannot vote appropriations for military purposes more than 2 years in advance.

Now, the real and immediate need today is for forces in being, and there are not enough young men to provide these forces in being now, along with three and a half million, if that is going to be your goal, combined with a system of universal military training.

General HERSHEY. Mr. SHORT, I know it is just another evidence of how near you and I are together. You say that no Congress can bind another. I agree with you. Therefore, a permanent act is permanent for today. That is, unless they stay in session late this afternoon and repeal it. There is no fuss about a permanent law. Why do we want to set any time limit on something that, of course, is not permanent. Of course, any Congress can repeal what another Congress has done, and any Congress can repeal what it has itself passed. I find myself completely in agreement with you.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Why put a law on the books now? It is much easier to put the law on the books than it is to take it off after it is put on. It is like putting on excess weight. Those who pass 50 know it is much easier to put on fat than it is to take it off, and the same is true with legislation.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. Some of these fellows of 40 are about the age of Dewey and myself. Anyway, I think we are arguing about things that are not too important when we argue whether it is better not to do something that we should have done 4 years ago, because we can't use it as we did 4 years ago, which we can't. There is no question about it. The boys taking universal training now have to have the service immediate and sure; instead, in 1947, they might have had it at some future time, and maybe would not even had to have it.

Chairman GRANIK. We won the last war without a system of universal training. Are we now facing a peril greater than the last war?

General HERSHEY. In the first place, that is not quite accurate. I don't like to hold you to little things. We had the universal military training, although we called it something else in 1940, and we had it to the point where he had 1,000,000 men under arms when World War II broke out—a thing that has never happened in American history, and I am not sure it had anything to do with success. I am getting so old that I don't want to skate as near the hole in the ice as when I was a boy. For that reason, I don't want to take the chances I used to.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. It is an undeniable fact in World War II we raised 12,000,000 men and women in the various branches of the Armed Forces, and we won the greatest war in all history, and we did it without universal military training or peacetime conscription.

General HERSHEY. We had it a year before the war.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. That is all right. Of course we have to have draft in time of war or immediate great peril. I voted for an extension of the Draft Act a year ago, and to give the President the additional authority to call out the National Guard, and the Reserves, if he deemed it necessary, whether Congress was in session or not. But we must not forget that we did raise 12,000,000 men and women in our armed services without universal military training or peacetime conscription, and since VE- and VJ-days, the Navy and the Air Force have succeeded in getting all the volunteers they wanted and, though the draft was in effect 2 years ago last January, January 1949, the Army stopped calling men up under the draft. I am just wondering whether or not the way they have shamefully treated the Guard and the Reserves, letting them almost disintegrate, plus the fact that they refused to invoke the draft 2 years ago, plus the fact that the Navy and Air Force have gotten all the volunteers they needed, they perhaps maneuvered us into a position where now they want to try to convince the people that it is indispensable and necessary to shoulder upon us peacetime military training.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. Let us be sure what we are talking about here. If we are trying the Defense Establishment, you know as well as I do that I can probably help you out on that.

Congressman SHORT. I should say you have.

General HERSHEY. But in the first place, we are not trying the Defense Establishment. We are trying to set up a system that will allow the United States to survive. I am not going to argue today about the rightness or wrongness. If there are some of our agencies that are not operating as they should, let us make them operate as they should. But let us have something that will let us survive. I do not like to take issue with you, because you have been such a good friend of mine through the years.

Congressman SHORT. We still are.

General HERSHEY. When you talk about shotguns, it is not shotgun weddings. A lot of boys joined the Navy and Air Force who were volunteers, and when the doctor at the time commented on how warm the back of their necks were, I know whose breath was on them.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. I don't think that I could argue that point with the general at all. He knows as well as I do that the area of agreement between us is much wider than the area of disagreement.

Chairman GRANIK. General, what about education? Is there any danger of the draft bringing education to a standstill by stripping the colleges and universities?

General HERSHEY. I think that is a loaded question. In the first place, I want to differentiate between institutions and education. Education goes on in this world and many places other than in an institution. But I want to answer this question by saying I believe we can administer this draft so we not only save education, which is very important, but I think we can save the colleges, too, and I am not going to argue how important that is. I think we can save both, and as long as we can save both, I don't want to get into an argument about the difference between education or college and school. There is a difference.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Granik, if the present draft law were properly administered and the different branches of the armed services would carry out the clear intent of Congress so far as the National Guard and Reserves are concerned, we could raise the 3,463,000 men which they have established as the ceiling, without having to draft any 18-year-old boys, and without having to take any veterans of the last war.

Now, the truth of the matter is if we lower the mental and physical standards, not to the low level of January 1945, but to the reasonably low level, and if we take married, childless men between the ages of 19 and 25, and tighten the administration of the act, we can have even a surplus of 460,000 men in addition to the number that we require at this time.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. Mr. Granik, I majored in education instead of mathematics, so Mr. SHORT kind of swamped me with a lot of

figures. I think mostly my own. But even so, I might not draw quite the same conclusion. I agree with everything he has said. The only thing I have to say, as a broken-down soldier who has been attached for 20 or 30 years for pay purposes to the Armed Forces, I have to insist when we set aside the less fit, we are going to have to take them a few at a time. They do not constitute quite as large or immediate supply of manpower as the numbers would indicate. I agree with everything that DEWEY SHORT said. If we get to Mr. SHORT, he sometimes votes the wrong way.

Chairman GRANIK. What are the principal arguments of lowering the draft age to 18?

General HERSHEY. In the first place I believe in a permanent military system of training. While I don't think the most important thing is age, if you are going to have to pay your military tax, the earlier you pay it, the sooner you are available to do the other things that have to be done in this world. I have never seen anything too productive by the boy who graduates from high school at 17 years and 6 months and spends a year and a half waiting to do his military service because I think it leaves him uncertain, and they are unproductive years. He can go to college and take a year or two, or he can be one of those deferred and do his service afterwards. But I can assure you that doing service at 22 or 23 or 24, after you begin to get married and want to do a lot of other things, is not the best time to take the military service. The sooner you get it and get adult— and remember, kids get adult 2 or 3 years before their folks think so, and 2 years after the kids think so.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Granik, if the boy has had 1 or 2 years in college before he goes into the service, the chances are very much greater that he will finish college after he gets out of the service than if he had no college work at all. I think that taking a boy immediately out of high school, particularly at the tender age of 18, with fuzz on his cheeks, is rather robbing the cradle. I know that some boys at 18 are more mature than other boys at 20, but the undeniable fact is that under this proposed legislation we are going to draft men at the younger age, and compel them to serve longer than any other member of the North Atlantic Pact Nations. In France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Portugal, they take young men at the age of 20, and in most of those countries they serve only 12 months, and in none more than 18 months. In Italy they don't take them until they are 21 years of age, and they serve for 18 months.

Now we propose to take the youth of this country at the tender age of 18 and compel them to serve for 27 months. Our draft laws—I want it clearly understood by the public—that under these pending bills it is proposed that we draft men at an earlier age, compel them to serve a longer period than any other member nation of the Atlantic Pact, and the draft laws are milder than the ones we propose to enact. Even in Soviet Russia they are not called up as early as the Defense Department in this country proposes.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. I agree with everything he says. Those are the facts. The inferences I want to reserve some right on. I think that Mr. SHORT is not too happy about our allies and yet he uses them as evidence of what we ought to do, although that is an international field that I obviously know nothing about. Unfortunately, the reason we have to have a Draft Act is not because of allies, but because of enemies. I would not tend to agree that Russia and Soviet China are as careful about the lower ages as Mr. SHORT has indicated.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. I think we should stop requiring men to be Phi Beta Kappas or Ph. D.'s before we take them into the different branches of our service.

General HERSHEY. I agree with that. Unfortunately, you are the Phi Beta Kappa. I am not.

Congressman SHORT. I would rather trust a lot of squirrel shooters in the Ozarks than Ph. D.'s.

General HERSHEY. I agree with you there. You know about the shortcomings of the Phi Beta Kappa, because you are one.

Chairman GRANIK. Before we take questions from our audience, would you care to make a prediction? Will the final bill approved by Congress be settled for an 18½-year-old draft?

Congressman SHORT. Only a fool would dare prognosticate in these uncertain times. To tell you the truth, I have been trying to maintain an open mind and hoping we can work out some kind of legislation which I could support and vote for. I try to keep an open mind. I am inclined to think that the House bill is much better than the Senate bill and the Senate bill is much better than the one sent over by the Pentagon. If we do pass legislation of any sort, it will be to draft boys at the age of 18½ years, requiring them to have 6 months of training—4 months before leaving the continental United States or any of our possessions or Territories, with 2 months more, making them 19 years of age before they enter combat. I am pretty sure that is the best that any proponent of the bill can hope for.

General HERSHEY. I would not want to make any predictions because this is Mr. SHORT's field. In the first place, I want a bill that Mr. SHORT can vote for or support, if we possibly can get one, because I feel so much better administering something that was good enough for him to vote for.

On the other hand, I do think we ought to take 18-year-olds. Whether we will or not I don't know; whether we will take them this year or next I don't know.

Chairman GRANIK. Now for a question from the audience.

QUESTION. My name is Allan A. Carney, and my question is directed to Congressman SHORT.

Since Russia does not want peace except on her own terms, should we not have universal military training at once in order to be permanently prepared?

Congressman SHORT. In answer to that I would say that those of us who oppose peacetime military conscription are certainly not against adequate defense. I think we can reach the goals that have been established by the Defense Department itself if we will carry out the laws that are already on the statute books, and if the different branches of the services cease trying to avoid the clear intent of the Congress.

The thing that disturbs me more than anything, Commodore, is to see us depart from our American tradition. Germany, Italy, and Japan had peacetime military conscription; they had universal military service, and they, along with every other major nation that has ever had it, have inevitably been led into war and down the road to ruin and defeat. I am afraid that the same thing will happen to us.

General HERSHEY. I don't know that I want to say much about it. Of course, every nation that has lived too long has died, whether it had universal training or not. We had 636 laws in our Colonies that compelled service in both peace and war before we had a nation. We have compelled people to serve everytime we needed them, whether it was peace or war.

I can't quite become as disturbed as my good friend DEWEY can over this question about how you survive. I want to survive and I say that you have to survive as best you can.

Congressman SHORT. Many of our best citizens came to this country to avoid this tyranny abroad, and after spilling so much blood and spending so much of our treasure in two World Wars, I do not want us to adopt the techniques, plans, and methods of the enemy dictator countries which we defeated. I still feel that free men can outwork, out-produce and out-fight slaves.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, we have another question from the audience.

QUESTION. My question is directed to General Hershey:

To what do you attribute the present lack of volunteer enlistments?

General HERSHEY. It depends on what you are talking about of course. If you are talking about parts of the Armed Forces, I think that you have always had a little slowness with respect to enlistments.

I could answer the question better by saying that I attribute the enlistments you are getting to the fact that you have a draft law.

I don't like to say this, either, but part of the slowness in enlistments is due to the fact that people have been reading the casualty lists. Enlistments have been particularly good where the casualty list is light, with one exception.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT, have you a comment to make on this point?

Congressman SHORT. I would like to make this point clear, Mr. Granik. If I vote for the bill in its final form—and we don't know what the final form is going to be yet, it is being considered in our Armed Services Committee in the House and no doubt it will be amended greatly on the floor—but if I vote for it, it will be due to the rank injustices and inequities that we have suffered under our present Reserve system that has completely bogged down.

I think that General Hershey will admit that with the outbreak of the Korean war the Government went out with its strong arm and pulled in a lot of men from the inactive Reserves who were in their late twenties or early thirties, now married with dependents, who perhaps had bought a farm, or were building a house, or going into business, and many of them combat veterans with 2 or 3 years' experience in the last war.

It is simply wicked, shameful, and inexcusable the way the inactive Reserves were treated when a lot of men in the Organized Reserve and the National Guard, who have been taking the training and receiving pay, looking forward to the longevity pay and retirement benefits, have not been called up.

That is why we are going to have to do something about this desperate situation.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey?

General HERSHEY. I agree with a lot of the things you say, Mr. SHORT, but I can't settle, like you can, three or four things at the same time. This is a procurement field, and I would like to get this settled, and then I wish that Congress would get at it and settle up the National Guard and Reserve business.

I certainly go along with a lot of the things you say. But we must not mix them all up and not do anything because we can't agree on doing anything at all.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, we have another question from the audience.

QUESTION. My question is directed to Congressman SHORT:

What great difference is there between going into service at 18, 18½, or 19? Since we have to have it, let the military decide.

Congressman SHORT. I think, sir, that civilians and parents and teachers and pastors are as well qualified, if not much better qualified, than the military to make such decisions. It is true that General Marshall

and some of our high military have said that the 18-year-old boys are the best soldiers in the world. If you talk to combat leaders, I think you will find that there is a lot of room for argument.

We know that at 18 years of age they are bold, adventurous, resilient, and quick to come back, but don't tell me that they have the stamina and strength to march under a heavy pack over tough terrain and face all the other hardships. Also, they do not have the mature judgment that boys a year or two older have.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey?

General HERSHEY. I don't want to get on a rather facetious vein, but I will bet you, Dewey, if you were talking to 18-year-old boys to get them to vote for you, that you wouldn't tell them that they are as weak as you are trying to make them.

Congressman SHORT. Of course they don't vote, but you want them to fight and die for us.

General HERSHEY. Unfortunately, this Nation lives because it had its boys between 18 and about 23 or 24 in every war. I don't care if you go back to the Revolutionary War, you will find that the 18-year-old boys are the ones who made this Nation and also saved it.

Congressman SHORT. Of course. I knew more at 18 than I have ever known before or will ever know since. That doesn't change the fact that they do not possess the mature judgment or the endurance or stamina of older men.

Chairman GRANIK. Would you sum up at this point, General?

General HERSHEY. Mr. Granik and Mr. SHORT, I am for this bill: First, because I want to see installed now, because we should have done it years ago, but now is the earliest that we can have a permanent system of training our people—one, so that they can survive individually, and two, by surviving individually that we can have this society of ours survive. Secondly, I want an obligation that will make everybody trained. I don't care if we can get so that we can cut the period to 3 months or 6 months. So much the better. I don't think we are there yet. Third, I want in this bill an obligation that a man either immediately after his training or at whichever time after his training you must have, that he will give the service which he has learned to give in the training. That is what I want in this bill.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. Congressman SHORT, will you give us your summary, please?

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Granik, it is unfortunate that we have combined with the Selective Service Act this plan to shoulder upon the American people permanent peacetime military conscription or universal military training. I do not think we have a sufficient number of men to supply the forces in being that are required now along with this training program. I believe that universal military training on a long-range plan for building a civilian Reserve under civilian control could be more effectively worked out if it were treated in separate legislation. I do not want for us to be compelled to accept the worn-out and discarded European philosophy and foreign ism that has proved a failure wherever it has been tried by any major country. I think that from every point of view, the American people should be fully informed and warned in advance of what is being done to them if this bill becomes law.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. You have been listening to a discussion on the draft act. Our speakers have been General Hershey, director of the Selective Service System, and Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, ranking Republican leader of the House Armed Services Committee.

Armament To Meet Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the headline "Truman urges rapid arming in face of aggression threat," by Anthony Leviero, which appeared recently in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN URGES RAPID ARMING IN FACE OF AGGRESSION THREAT

(By Anthony Leviero)

KEY WEST, FLA., March 14.—President Truman declared today that this country and its allies would rearm to the utmost in the face of continuing threats of aggression, but he left the door wide open for any honest proposal for world disarmament.

The free countries of the world, he said, would press their dual aim of trying to prevent a world war and of building up strength to cope with such a conflict if it is forced upon us.

(The text of the Truman letter is printed below.)

The President warned that the free peoples must not be seduced by the heightening Russian propaganda campaign to confuse and weaken the efforts of the aroused democratic countries that were rapidly unifying themselves.

"We must not be deflected," he asserted. "But as we continue to increase our defenses we must press by every possible means, for a real change in the attitude of the Soviet Union."

This expression of a determination to keep a firm attitude toward insincere Russian proposals was balanced by the following unreserved promise to consider any proposition that was supported by good will and foolproof guaranties.

"Continuing emphasis on disarmament is a necessary and vital part of our foreign policy. We must always be seeking for new approaches to this problem, and we must take advantage of every opportunity that presents itself to work toward genuine disarmament proposals."

Mr. Truman's views on international disarmament were expressed in a letter to a bipartisan group of 13 Senators and 9 Representatives who, on February 26, wrote to him about the disarmament speech he had made before the United Nations General Assembly on October 24. They had urged him to follow it up with definite proposals. He wrote today that his speech last fall essentially did that.

While the President's letter was a reply to the Members of Congress, it cut at the congressional attitude at home and into Russian propaganda and actions abroad. Mr. Truman is deeply concerned over efforts in Congress to put a ceiling of 4,000,000 men on this country's Armed Forces and to restrict what he regards as his constitutional authority to send troops abroad without express approval of Congress.

For Russia it was an invitation to get down to brass tacks on the disarmament issue, which that country has pressed hard of late. In an official note to Great Britain on February 26, the Soviet Union said that the Russian Army had 2,500,000 men, as compared with about 5,000,000 for the western countries.

The Western Allies have countered these figures by saying that Russia does not include the strength of her satellites, estimated at 600,000 men, or of paramilitary organizations, like the MKVD. They estimate Russia's Armed Forces at nearly 5,000,000, organized into 175 to 200 divisions, as compared with allies forces of 4,500,000, of whom 2,600,000 are ground forces.

Some recent official Russian pronouncements as well as propaganda have focused on the deputy foreign ministers' conference now going on in Paris, where some observers believe that Russia will not agree to a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers unless German militarization and international disarmament are included in the agenda. Allied representatives at the conference insisted on February 19 that the existing level of armaments be considered.

Mr. Truman recalled this country's series of efforts since the end of World War II to bring about foolproof disarmament of atomic as well as conventional weapons. He also recalled how the United States had demobilized hastily, along with other democratic countries.

By way of contrast, he accused Russia of persistent obstruction of efforts to attain world peace and of encouraging "a ruthless program of rearmament on the part of the nations which have fallen under its control and influence."

The authors of the letter to the President were as follows:

Senators LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming; WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia; ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; LISTER HILL, of Alabama; A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma; A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia; and JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, Democrats.

Others were Senators RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont; H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey; MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine; ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey; CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire; and EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota, Republicans.

Also, Representatives BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas; LAURIE BATTLE, of Alabama; and A. S. J. CARNAHAN, of Missouri, Democrats; and JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio; WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota; ROBERT HALE, of Maine; and JOHN W. HESELTON, of Massachusetts, Republicans.

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S LETTER

UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION,
Key West, Fla., March 14, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR FLANDERS: I appreciate very much the letter of February 26, 1951, signed by you and a number of other Senators and Representatives, in which you urge that we follow up the plea for peace through disarmament, made in my address before the United Nations General Assembly last October.

This expression of your view will give added strength to the efforts of the free nations to establish a just and lasting peace in the world. While we must continue to build up vigorously our military strength as long as world conditions make such a course essential, we must, at the same time, keep on working toward the control and reduction of armaments and armed forces.

We must work toward the time when material and human resources, rather than being used for armaments, can be used to advance the well-being of mankind. That is and must remain our goal.

We have been working toward this end in the United Nations. As you know, the Charter of the United Nations gives to the General Assembly and the Security Council responsibility to work out principles and plans for disarmament by the member nations.

At the time the Charter was adopted, it was hoped that this great objective of the United Nations would be carried out speedily and without international friction.

This has not proved to be the case. The laborious effort of 5 years has been thwarted by the constant opposition of one of the great powers.

To keep the record straight, I think it would be well to review briefly the history of these events.

At its first meeting in January, 1946, the General Assembly established a United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and gave it the task of developing a plan for the control of atomic energy, under effective safeguards, to insure its use for peaceful purposes only, and to bring about the complete prohibition of atomic weapons.

This commission labored long and diligently. It came up with a comprehensive plan which the General Assembly approved, in November 1948, by an overwhelming majority.

However, the Soviet Union refused to approve the plan adopted by the General Assembly. As a consequence, the plan could not be put into effect, since no agreement for the control of atomic weapons can be effective if any one of the great nations refuses to cooperate.

Meanwhile, the United Nations had set up a second commission to consider the control and reduction of the ordinary weapons and instrumentalities of war. This was the Commission for Conventional Armaments.

In general, it had the task of developing a plan to regulate armed forces and armaments other than those falling within the atomic category. As one of its first projects, this Commission worked out a plan for taking a census or inventory of the nonatomic armaments and of the armed forces of all principal nations, subject to supervision and verification by a body of international inspectors.

The purpose of this plan was to obtain the verified information necessary for the development of an intelligent system of armament reduction and control.

This plan made sense and was swiftly accepted by the majority of the United Nations in December, 1949. But here again a majority was not enough. The Soviet Union, one of the major military powers, refused to accept this proposal. And, as in the case of the plan for controlling atomic energy, this refusal made it impossible to put the program into operation.

At the same time that the Soviet Union has been following a course of obstruction in the United Nations armament proposals, it has been building up its own armaments as a central feature of its expansionist foreign policy.

At the end of World War II, the United States hastily demobilized and reduced the size of its Armed Forces. So did other free nations. But the Soviet Union continued to maintain armed forces at a high level—far higher than necessary for purely defensive purposes. Furthermore, it encouraged a ruthless program of rearmament on the part of the nations which have fallen under its control and influence.

WAY TO DISCOURAGE AGGRESSOR

The great disparity between the armaments of the Soviet Union and its satellites on the one hand and the free nations on the other, is one of the basic reasons for the defensive alliances and defense programs which are now being jointly pursued by the nations of the free world.

Since the Soviet Union has failed to cooperate in any genuine plan for the international limitation of armament, we have been compelled to look to our defenses.

It is essential to our national security that we build up our defenses as quickly and vigorously as possible. We do not know what further aggressive plans may be in the making by the adversaries of the free world. But by rearming the free world may attain benefits above and beyond preparedness against attack.

Our defense program, if carried through, will have the effect of discouraging aggression, and may eventually lead to a change in the tactics of the Soviet Union and of its current satellites, which would ease the present international tension; that is our great hope.

Our present armament program, therefore, has a double purpose. It is, above all, an effort to prevent a world conflict, while at the same time it is an effort to prepare our defenses to meet such a conflict if it is forced upon us. What we are striving for is peace and international order.

In the field of armament the free nations have been unable to make any progress while their own military forces have been inferior to those of the Soviet Union. But, paradoxial as it may seem, when the free nations have built up their forces, they may be able to convince potential aggressors that the control and reduction of armaments is a desirable policy.

In the face of the plans of the free world for increased defense forces, Soviet propaganda is beginning to take notice of the belief of the free nations that Soviet armed strength is excessive.

We can expect great propaganda efforts by the Soviet system to deflect the free nations from their defense plans. We must not be deflected. But as we continue to increase our defenses, we must press, by every possible means, for a real change in the attitude of the Soviet Union.

My address on October 24 suggested a new procedural approach to the question, in the hope that it might offer a way out of the existing deadlock. I suggested the possibility of combining the work of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission on Conventional Armaments in a new and consolidated disarmaments commission.

WORK BEING ADVANCED

The General Assembly, on December 13, 1950, established a committee of 12 to study the proposal. This committee is directed to work on the "ways and means whereby the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission on Conventional Armaments may be coordinated, and on the advisability of their functions being merged and placed under a new and consolidated disarmament commission."

This committee has had two meetings, the second of which was held on March 2. The United States representatives at the United Nations have been actively pushing the work of this committee. We hope that it will be able to make recommendations which will revitalize the efforts of the United Nations for international disarmament.

Before we can enter into any concrete program to reduce armaments, we must be sure that the principles which I outlined in my address of October 24 are adhered to. A program of disarmament must include all kinds of weapons, must have unanimous agreement of all the nations having substantial armaments and armed forces and must be so thoroughly and continuously policed as to be foolproof.

These are the principles on which we stand and which we continue to offer to other nations as the basis for any plan for armaments reduction and control.

Such a program is difficult to achieve even when there is a reasonable degree of trust and confidence between nations. It is almost impossible unless there is free and open interchange of information across national borders. As you indicated in your letter, increased freedom of communications is, therefore, a necessary step in an effective program of disarmament.

The need for authentic information has been pointed up by recent Soviet assertions concerning the size of its own armed forces in relation to those of the free nations. The United States would welcome a thorough exploration of this subject.

On March 2, 1951, our deputy representative on the United Nations Commission on Conventional Armaments reasserted the position of this country and invited a census, under United Nations auspices, of armed forces of the member nations.

Continuing emphasis on disarmament is a necessary and vital part of our foreign policy. We must always be seeking for new approaches to this problem and we must take advantage of every opportunity that presents itself to work toward genuine disarmament proposals.

I am very happy indeed that this major element in our foreign policy has your support and that of your colleagues in both Houses of Congress. I want to have your continued counsel and advice in these matters.

I hope that when I return to Washington I will have an early opportunity to discuss these questions further with you and your colleagues, as you suggested in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Increased Compensation for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter which I have been asked by Mr. Lee F. Kellams, president, local 446, National Federation of Federal Employees, Rock Island, Ill., to place in the RECORD outlining why Federal employees feel it is necessary for them to write Members of Congress:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL NO. 446,
Rock Island, Ill., March 6, 1951.

Hon. R. B. CHIPERFIELD,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been informed that Chairman MURRAY, of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, speaking on the floor of the House on February 28, 1951, made the following statements: "At the present time approximately 200 bills have been referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the great majority of which provide for some kind of increased benefits in the way of additional compensation for all Federal employees * * *. A letter-writing campaign is now being conducted by certain postal-employee organizations in behalf of increased salary legislation * * *. Since fiscal year 1945, the Congress has approved increased salary benefits for postal and other Federal employees amounting to almost $2,000,000,000. In view of the national emergency, the gigantic national debt, the tremendous expenditures for our national defense program, and the heavy tax burdens imposed already and to be imposed further upon our people, I feel that all proposed salary-increase legislation

should receive the careful and deliberate attention of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service before any action is taken."

In behalf of 250 members of Local No. 446, National Federation of Federal Employees, composed of employees of the Rock Island District, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Rock Island, Ill., I wish to call attention to the following pertinent facts:

(a) The great need for additional compensation for Federal employees is evidenced in the total number of bills introduced, since a bill is not usually introduced without a need for some action.

(b) How else can postal employee organizations or other groups secure needed pay increases than by "letter-writing" campaigns? Other labor unions have collective bargaining; signed contracts, many of which contain automatic cost-of-living increases; closed shops; huge lobbying expenditures; and always the threat of strike action. Surely no one could object to the one means left to Government employees—a personal appeal to their representatives in Washington.

(c) It is undoubtedly true that since 1945 Congress has approved increased salary legislation amounting to almost $2,000,000,000, but that action does not have any bearing upon the current need. The last actual salary increase was in the fall of 1948, 2½ years ago, and since then it is no secret that prices have gone up tremendously, not to mention taxes of all sorts. In this period other employees have received salary increases, bonuses, cost-of-living adjustments, and other benefits regularly. Today's newspaper carries the following headlines: "International Harvester Co. workers will be given 5-cent boost," an increase of approximately $100 per year based solely upon increased living costs in the last few months.

(d) While it is true that because of the national emergency, the gigantic national debt, and so forth, the increased expenditures of the Federal Government should be watched with care, it is no less important that those people entrusted with the operation of this same Government should receive salaries at least commensurate with those paid others in private industry. It is only through such equal salaries that competent and experienced employees can be retained in the Government service and other competent employees attracted to meet the increased needs of the present emergency program.

(e) A typical sample of the need for salary-increase legislation is offered by the comparison between salaried employees and those hourly employees whose wages are set by wage-board surveys. In the Rock Island district alone, wage-board employees were granted wage increases averaging 15 cents per hour in both 1949 and again in 1950, for a total increase of approximately $600.00 per year since 1948.

In view of these facts I can only urge, in behalf of the members of Local No. 446, National Federation of Federal Employees, your serious consideration and support of immediate favorable action toward an increase in salary for all Federal employees, and suggest that this information be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information and guidance of your colleagues.

Respectfully yours,

LEE F. KELLAMS,
President, Local No. 446, National Federation of Federal Employees.

Poll of Public Opinion in the Thirtieth Pennsylvania District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during the Seventy-sixth Congress and subsequent terms that I have had the pleasure of serving as a Member of the House of Representatives I have regularly conducted polls of public opinion in my district on current vital issues.

Our method consists of sending out sufficient questionnaires to registered voters to constitute a partial referendum. We send these questionnaires to a percentage of voters in each precinct. An equal number are addressed to Republicans and Democrats and the returns are tabulated according to party affiliation. All returns that are used to secure the percentage results listed below are signed by the voter.

My district, which is the Thirtieth of Pennsylvania, is exceptionally well suited for such a project. It consists of a portion of the city of Pittsburgh, residential suburban boroughs and townships, large industrial and mining concentrations, and a surprisingly large farm area.

For our own purposes we study the answers that come back on the basis of financial and occupational status, but obviously we can only publish the over-all totals. It is our hope and belief, however, that the over-all percentages are a fairly accurate cross section of public opinion in the district. Likewise, by keeping the questions general we feel that we secure a good reading of attitudes rather than a "Yes" or "No" on specific legislative proposals, and thereby eliminate the necessity of the voter having specialized knowledge or detailed information.

I hope that the Members of Congress, and the public generally, will find the percentage totals of this latest poll interesting and informative. The results are here presented without editorial comment:

	Percentage totals			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the voluntary withdrawal of our troops from Korea?	38	62	32	68
2. Do you agree that we should help Gen. Chiang Kai-shek invade China from Formosa?	68	32	56	44
3. Are you in favor of helping rearm Japan?	73	27	69	31
4. Should we rearm Western Germany, if possible?	80	20	78	22
5. Are you in favor of extending military aid to Tito?	46	54	43	57
6. Would you draft 18-year-olds prior to drafting veterans or married men?	69	31	77	23
7. Do you believe that Secretary of State Dean Acheson should be replaced?	89	11	73	27
8. Do you favor sharply increased taxes for the duration of the emergency?	37	63	44	56
9. Do you believe that President Truman is administering our affairs satisfactorily?	7	93	26	74
10. Do you favor an all-out effort by us to protect Western Europe from Russian aggression?	64	36	77	23
11. Do you agree that the United Nations as an instrument for stopping aggression is a failure?	75	25	66	34

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 97—PART 12

MARCH 15, 1951, TO MAY 21, 1951

(PAGES A1449 TO A2870)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1951

3-10-1952

Sup. of Doc

Doc

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Sean MacBride's Address to the National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct honor for me to attend the luncheon given by the National Press Club in honor of Sean MacBride, Minister of External Affairs for Ireland. The speech by Mr. MacBride was interesting, direct, and to the point and was extremely well received by the Cabinet members, the newspapermen, and the Members of the House and Senate in attendance.

In this particular week, preceding the celebration of St. Patrick's Day, Sean MacBride has undertaken a difficult schedule. Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington will be visited by him and in all these cities, he will be at home because he will be among friends.

Ireland is to be complimented for having such an outstanding leader in these troublous times and America is grateful that, out of his busy life, he has found time to visit us and to discuss problems of mutual interest.

To Sean MacBride, we wish the greatest possible success in his efforts to solve his country's problems. We want to assure him that Ireland holds a particularly warm spot in the hearts of Americans and that we look upon him as a true exponent of the ideals which have made Ireland great down through the centuries.

ADDRESS BY SEAN MACBRIDE, MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 14, 1951

The honor you have done me in asking me to be your guest here is one which gives me a very special pleasure. I have been a newspaperman myself, and I have come here today simply as a colleague who happens to be Foreign Minister of a small nation which has very strong and ancient ties with America to tell you something of how that nation stands today.

I am told that Irish names are not unknown in American journalism, and, if so, there must be among you many whose parents and grandparents came from Ireland. The land they left was vastly different from the Ireland we know today. The Ireland of the last century was, in the material sense, one of the poorest countries in Western Europe. Her population was in process of being halved by the results of a famine on a scale that had been unknown in Western Europe since the Middle Ages. Today Ireland is on the road to economic progress and development. Our wealth is reasonably well divided; we have no very great extremes of rich and poor. The rural slums, the ramshackle cabins are nearly a thing of the past, and although there are slums still in certain of our cities we shall, unless a general war or acute shortages wreck our plans with those of the rest of the world, get rid of these within about 10 years. Our population, which had been falling steadily, although at a decreasing rate, since the famine of the last century is now taking an upward turn. Work is progressing on a $120,000,000 land-development scheme, and on drainage, rural electrification, and hospital-building schemes of a similar scale. The number employed in industry, though still small, is rising steadily.

I don't know if any of you, Americans with your history which has been no less prosperous than glorious, can appreciate what that means to an Irishman. It means that a nation which was nearly killed, whose life had almost ebbed away in the course of a long and agonizing struggle, is at last on the turn. The efforts of many Irishmen have gone to make this change, and, not least, those Irishmen who worked and fought to secure for us the independence without which a nation cannot work out its own salvation. Since a measure of independence was obtained, successive governments have played their parts—that of Mr. Cosgrave, that of Mr. De Valera, and now Mr. Costello's government, of which I am a member. None of these governments has been infallible, but under all of them the work has gone ahead and is still going on. While the Ireland of today is no utopia, one finds that atmosphere of hope and confidence which is lacking in many other countries today.

Much of the progress made in the last couple of years is attributable to the Marshall plan, and in particular to the really constructive and helpful cooperation which we received from the ECA. The direct financial aid which we received was valuable but far more important in any view was the economic planning which we had to undertake in conjunction with the ECA. I have always held the view that in the long run the most permanent benefits that will accrue to Europe from the Marshall plan will be technical assistance and the system of economic analysis and cooperation resulting from a policy answered by ECA. I would like to avail of this opportunity of paying a public tribute to the far-sighted and constructive approach initiated by the ECA in Europe under the leadership of men like Paul Hoffman, Averell Harriman, and Bill Foster.

It is often suggested or implied by critics that Ireland is so preoccupied with her own affairs that she cares nothing for what goes on around her. I think it would be hard to put forward a suggestion that was more wholly misleading. It is not a question of whether the Irish people want to be internationally minded or not; they cannot help being internationally minded for they are an international people. An ordinary Kerry family may well have two uncles and an aunt in New Jersey, Chicago, and Springfield, Mass., a cousin in Montreal and another in Melbourne, and probably a son or daughter in England or Scotland as well. With most of these they regularly correspond, and I think that if some of our older people in, say Galway, were asked to draw a map of the world they might, if they were not careful, show New York as being nearer than Dublin.

The people of Irish origin, scattered throughout the world and now playing their parts as citizens of other countries, still retain many of the characteristics of the people of the mother country. They are, for the most part, whether they be Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, religious folk, and they constitute a moral force and go to reinforce the stabilizing elements in the countries in which they are. They are a virile and active force within the community of free nations, the very sort of people, tainted neither with communism nor reaction, of which the west stands most in need. While they remain fondly attached to Ireland and look to Ireland for moral leadership they certainly do not look to Ireland for political leadership. They are loyal Americans, Australians, and Canadians, or citizens of the country in which they have settled. At home our wish is to play our part with them, as well as with the ancient European nations to whose sisterhood Ireland belongs, in the building and preserving of a just and free society.

What part is Ireland, in fact, playing in international affairs? I think that question is best answered by reference to the four international organizations with which we might be directly concerned: the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the OEEC, and the North Atlantic Treaty organization.

As regards the United Nations, the position is that we applied for membership several years ago, being willing to undertake the full responsibilities of such membership. We were, however, kept out by the veto of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—Russia. Ironical as it may sound, Russia says that she cannot regard us as a democratic or peace-loving country.

As regards the Council of Europe and the OEEC, we are members of both these organizations. In both of them our representatives have consistently adopted the progressive policy of favoring developments which tended toward a united Europe. In the OEEC we have favored greater liberalization

of trade, and we are in a position to do so since our own trade policies are among the most liberal in Europe. In the Council of Europe we have supported every measure which tended to strengthen the Assembly as against the Committee of Ministers, that is to say, every measure which represented a step on the road to a Parliament of Europe. This was the attitude which was taken up by a country which has been represented as stubbornly or narrowly nationalistic. In fact no nation has been so prompt as we have been to support the uniting of Europe and the free and voluntary merging of individual sovereignties. We are, however, quite as stubbornly nationalistic as the United States would be when it is suggested that we should surrender our rights or a portion of our sovereignty to another nation.

As regards the last organization, that of the Atlantic Pact powers, the position is this: We were asked to join and we refused. You will want to know why.

I think on this vitally important question I cannot do better than take as my point of departure the cardinal principles of your own foreign policy, as set out in an admirable document, Our Foreign Policy, issued by your State Department.

These are the three points:

"We are an independent nation and we want to keep our independence."

"We attach the highest importance to individual freedom and we mean to keep our freedom."

"We are a peaceful people and we want to get rid of wars and the threat of wars."

We, in Ireland, would subscribe wholeheartedly to every one of these principles but, being historically less fortunate than you, we are forced to state them for ourselves in a somewhat different manner. This is how we have to state them:

"We are not an independent nation because a portion of it is still unfree but we want to achieve our independence.

"We attach the highest importance to individual freedom but many of our people have not got that freedom.

"We are a peaceful people but part of our territory has been taken from us by war and the threat of war."

These points which, as you will surmise, refer to the fact that part of our country, the six northeastern counties, is held under British rule, may seem exaggerated to you. They do not seem exaggerated to us or to the people, the majority in the greater part of the British held territory, who want to be with us. I do not bring this problem before you because I expect that you, with the vast problems which you must debate every day, can concern yourselves with the intricacies of the methods by which this small territory, in defiance of geography, is held as part of Britain. I am not going to discuss, nor, I am sure, do you want to hear of the finesses of boundary drawing. Discrimination, gerrymandering, and political police by which the entity known as Northern Ireland was set up and is maintained, but I do want you to know that that partition is the cause of such feeling in Ireland that no Irish Government could attempt, without immediately being driven from office, to enter into a military alliance with the power which is responsible for it. This is not one of those ancient grievances which we are supposed to hug to our bosoms. It is quite modern and very real and very present. It would be as impossible for an Irish Government to accept the article of the Atlantic Pact which binds each participant to respect the territorial integrity of the others as it would have been for Abraham Lincoln to accept the Mason and Dixon's line as an international frontier. You do not accept the territorial integrity of a neighbor who is encamped in your garden. We are, I need hardly say, fully conscious of the gravity of our decision. Indeed in our reply to the invitation to join the pact we suggested that, in the interests of the greater safety and strength of the chain of Atlantic defense, the members might discuss ways and means of solving the problem which precluded us from membership. Unfortunately, this suggestion was not acted on.

I wish to make it clear that there is no question of bargaining on this matter. It would be unworthy, both of the great issue involved—the future of the Atlantic community—and of the historic tradition of the Irish Nation, were we to attempt to bargain on this. We are seeking our full freedom and independence as of right and we intend to get it.

The position then, in short, is that Ireland is willing and anxious to play her full part in international affairs, that she is already making a certain contribution but is prevented from doing her full share by two outside powers, Russia and Britain. I do not say that the policies or actions of these two powers are the same, or even comparable. All I do say is that they are inclined to look rather alike from where we sit. Both are powers with imperial traditions and to imperial powers the partitioning of small nations has always seemed expedient and, therefore, just. This was, and is, the policy of Russia in Poland. It has been the policy of Russia in Korea. In both cases the Russians found some Poles and some Koreans to support them, but in both cases the partition of a nation, a disaster in itself, leads to other disasters.

A nation is not a vague territory that can be cut up at will. It is a living, breathing thing. It is not easy to dig the grave of a nation, and when you have dug it, it is an unquiet grave. I think that you in this room who do so much to mold the policies of your great Nation, cannot do better than to reflect upon the cases of Poland, of Korea, and of Ireland, and to believe, contrary to the imperialist maxim, that what is unjust can never be expedient, since there is something in humanity which stubbornly rejects, and in the long run overthrows, an unjust solution. I think that the greatest and the most effective political leaders, those whose work has been solid and enduring, are not the showy Machiavellians, or modern totalitarian dictators, with their contempt for people, and especially for people who were militarily weak or numerically insignificant, but the leaders who, like Washington and Lincoln, believed in human freedom as a guiding principle. Those who stand for that freedom have always been reputed damnably awkward people. It is, therefore, with no shame but with pride, that I say the Irish still stand for freedom and democratic rule and, therefore, may still be portrayed to you as "damnably awkward people."

Fallacy of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Teacher Shows Fallacy of Socialism," which appeared in the Arkansas Democrat of Monday, March 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHER SHOWS FALLACY OF SOCIALISM

Socialism is one of the great delusions of our time. It is perilous because it appeals to the weakness in men—to the desire of millions of us to get along as easily as possible.

So while these millions might reject socialism in total, they are voting it into our Government by bits and pieces. They do not see that the end of continued handouts, aids, and regulations will be to bring the full, deadening grasp of socialism onto the Nation.

A New York city teacher, Thomas J. Shelley, reveals to his pupils the fallacy and the danger of socialism with a brilliant illustration. He explains:

"When one of the brighter or harder-working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points, and give them to a student who has made only 55 points. Thus each would contribute 'according to his ability,' and—since both would have a passing mark—each would receive 'according to his need.'"

Then the teacher points out the results of that policy. The higher-grading pupils would take their work easier. Why strive to make a high grade when an authority gives part of it to someone else?

And the pupils who benefited would also let down. Since they were going to get by anyway, why should they study and worry to do their best?

Then, the teacher points out, the authority would have to adopt compulsory methods, with punishments for those who lagged behind.

And that, he sums up, is just what a Socialist government must do sooner or later. It comes eventually to a living death for all except the authorities and a few of their favorite lackeys. And he adds that most of his pupils understand. They see socialism for what it is—a glittering trickery—a flowered road to an economic desert.

We'd all better be thinking hard on this subject. The fine-promising politicians will ignorantly or wilfully deliver us to socialism if we continue to follow false leaders.

Necessity for Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin Forum, held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., last Tuesday evening. The subject of my address was Our Preparedness To Meet Any Threat of War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our people—how prepared? To answer that question it is necessary to ask another. Do we face now the threat of all-out war with Russia, or can we look forward to a long period of cold war without actual fighting? If world war III is just around the corner, then the answer to the question, "Our People—How Prepared?" is simple. We certainly are not adequately prepared. The fact is that if world war III is close upon us we are not prepared in any important phase of the activities in which it is necessary to be prepared if we are to meet Russia on anything like equal terms.

The great danger of our dilemma is that if we do face world war III we dare not be unprepared because our failure may be fatal.

In ordinary living when we face life or death decisions we do not take chances. Surely in the life of a whole nation we dare not be less cautious. This is all the more true because a decision for or against world war III does not rest with the United States; it rests solely with the evil men in the Kremlin. They need appeal to no legislative body; they have no Congress to consult; they can decide in the twinkling of an eye without public discussion or approval or responsibility whether it will be peace or war. That being so, it is clear that the decision that Russia takes may be life or death for the United States, if we are unprepared. As a Nation, we dare not run that risk.

We can only be safe if we are prepared for the worst. Therefore we must be fully prepared; prepared physically, mentally, morally and spiritually. We must be so strong that Russia dare not risk the danger of war with us because of the fear of our power of annihilatory retaliation.

America was aroused to the necessity of military preparation by the sudden and unprovoked outbreak of war in Korea. But strangely enough, the longer that war lasts, the more our fears seem to subside; and this despite the fact that every analysis of the situation shows that the longer the Korean War lasts the more conclusively it proves that Russia is willing to risk world war III rather than reach a peaceful end to the war in Korea.

Surely we must soon all realize that America cannot carry on war in Korea or anywhere else, or undertake a vast preparation program, and at the same time carry on business as usual, politics as usual and ordinary pleasures as usual. The fact that we are taking the situation in Korea so casually proves beyond doubt that as a nation we have temporarily lost contact with the hopes and the fear and the aspirations of our boys in the battle line and with the threat they are there to meet. Certainly the boys who are fighting and dying for us half-way around the world have a different appraisal of how serious it is.

For one, I firmly believe that right now we do face the risk of all-out war. Consequently, the American people are confronted by the greatest crisis in our history. This being true, we are merely fooling around by our preparations to date. What we have done is unequal to the challenge because that challenge is the challenge of survival.

Certainly we must now realize that the Communists are united. They have a common purpose and a common determination. Their intention is to destroy every nation which opposes them. In the final analysis the supreme objective of today's communism is the destruction of the United States of America and everything it stands for, because we alone block the way to world domination by communism.

Our people must understand both the threat and the problem if as a nation we are to be as serious as we must be if we are to face this challenge of survival.

If Russia desides to bring on world war III, such a war will require the maximum of everything that we are and everything that we have. All the industrial, military and economic power of our people must be energized to the very maximum if we are to win through when this real test comes upon us.

Therefore, first of all, if we are to be adequately prepared we must reach a decision upon what we face. Not whether we face a war—because we are right now engaged in a war in Korea where we have already lost 50,000 men but whether we face an all-out war with Russia. That is the supremely important problem to every American.

We in America must understand both the threat and the problem. Clearly, if America is to exercise the leadership of the free people of today's world—and that leadership is ours whether we want it or not—we can only exercise it effectively by uniting the free people outside America, and to do that we must be united inside America. Division at home can only result in division abroad. Consequently, it is clear that the foreign policy of the United States must be on a bipartisan basis. If politics are to determine important matters of foreign policy, that policy cannot conceivably be successful.

A bipartisan foreign policy cannot be determined by one person or one party. It is just as important for the Democratic administration to realise that fact as it is for the Republican Party.

I also feel that at this critical hour it is a tremendous disservice to arouse distrust of our military leaders. Because the conduct of the military strategy of world war III, if it is coming up, or prevention of world war III, if it can be prevented, must in the final analysis be determined by our military leaders. If we are to have no confidence in them, if we are to treat military problems on any other than a military basis, we will not only render a great disservice to the military but we will make it impossible to prepare our people properly for the ordeal that confronts us.

Any mistrust the American people have in the foreign policy of the United States, and any impartial observer must know that many do, can only be changed and fears allayed by a fully accredited bipartisan foreign policy. And it cannot be done in any other way.

In the final analysis, the President should take the Congress more fully into the details of his confidence. When there is time for consultation there should be consultation. There is time now for the national administration to do more than it has done in the way of creating good will and confidence in the Congress. Proper procedures will render an immense service, at this critical juncture, in uniting the American people and creating thereby not only firmer support for our military leaders but also renewed confidence in our leadership of the free people everywhere.

These facts being true, and I am sure they are, it is clear that in the most essential part of our preparation, we are not ready.

The generation to which we belong has already fought the two bloodiest wars in history. In our generation more people have been killed; there has been more hatred, more bigotry, more transplanting of people out of the places where they were born to other places where they were strangers; there have been more changes of national boundary lines, more revolution of ideas, more changes of attitude with respect to world problems than in any generation in history. This is the character of the time in which we live. It is a time when it is the part of wisdom to be prepared for the worst possible contingencies.

The American people want peace. But it isn't a question of what we want. We live in a time when it is a question of what challenges we face. We have already suffered tremendous losses in Korea. We will suffer still more. As a Nation we will groan under the highest taxes we have known. We must pull in our belts and arouse ourselves to the real seriousness of the implications of the facts of the time in which we live. We will be unprepared at the critical time of our lives as a people unless we prepare ourselves now for a period of sparse and bitter living. And as of now we are not so prepared.

We want peace. Every sensible person wants peace. We must have peace because war may destroy victor and vanquished alike.

But the best hope for peace for America is a thorough preparation for war. The dictators start war only against the unprepared. The peril that faces the world today is due to the dismemberment of the armed forces of the free nations when Russia kept her armed power moving toward an increasing maximum. The hope for peace can be sustained only by a preparation that will convince aggressor nations that we are too strong to be attacked. Only if we make ourselves strong enough to discourage the Russians from attack will we avoid world war III. A strong America with strong allies in Western Europe is the one sure guaranty for world peace.

Finally we must remember there is the chance that the Russian threat may continue not for a year or 2 years, or 5 or 10, it may continue for a generation. Therefore it is imperative that we keep our Government in a sound condition financially. That means that we must cut out all fat from the budget. There must be no budgetary set-up except for the very necessities of decent living in addition to our military preparation. We must decide now the full scope of what is necessary to be done to be ready to meet this crisis. Then with no politics, with no log rolling, with no back scratching, and with a bipartisan foreign policy we must unite the American people for a united free world in order to stand united against the greatest threat to modern civilization.

As of now we are not prepared. The question for every American to answer is, What do you intend to do about it?

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more articles in the series entitled "Medicine in Crisis," by Mr. Selig Greenberg, writer for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, published in the city of Providence, R. I.

These articles will be most interesting to the Members of the Senate in their consideration of S. 337, which is a bill to provide an emergency program of grants and scholarships for education in the medical fields.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal of March 8, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—CURBS ON MEDICAL TRAINING ARE LAID TO RESTRICTIONISM—ALTHOUGH AMA DENIES DEVICE OF SETTING EDUCATION STANDARDS TO HOLD DOWN GRADUATES, RESPONSIBLE OBSERVERS BELIEVE MOTIVE NOT DISINTERESTED

(This is the sixth of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within

the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The high cost of medical education is the major reason our facilities for training doctors have failed to keep up with the Nation's needs.

But there is ground for believing that restrictionism has also been a factor.

The American Medical Association denies using the device of setting educational standards or any other means to hold down the number of graduates and restrict competition. It insists that the medical profession's major concern has always been to protect the public.

The disinterestedness of the AMA's motives has been questioned by a number of responsible observers. Some of these have charged that the raising of standards has been used not only to train better doctors but also to curtail their number. Others have said that while restrictionism may not be deliberate, the profession's trade union motivation had certainly contributed toward its lack of vigor in pressing for expansion of medical education.

HARD TO GET AT MOTIVES

One of the loudest bombshells in this controversy was exploded last year at the annual meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans.

A committee named by the deans of the liberal arts colleges reported after a year's investigation that the limited opportunities for training doctors constituted "a most serious threat to the continued health and well-being of the American people" and accused the medical profession of "Petrillo economics." The reference was to James C. Petrillo, high-handed president of the A. F. of L.'s American Federation of Musicians.

It is extremely difficult to get to the bottom of this matter. It would require an exhaustive analysis of the motives, acts, and influence of each group involved in controlling entry into medicine—the AMA and its council on medical education and hospitals, the medical schools and their national association, and the State boards of medical licensure and their national federation. Even then, as one man commented, "you'd have to psychoanalyze these people to get definite proof of their motivation."

While describing the Petrillo economics charge as probably too sweeping, a number of the experts interviewed by this reporter—all of them physicians—said they were convinced that guild economics was a factor in the profession's thinking. They said they knew personally of cases where doctors had made it difficult for new practitioners to come into communities and were fairly certain that the same motivation played a part in keeping down expansion.

TENDENCY TO DISCOURAGE

One educator who had served with an AMA representative on a committee to consider the case of a 2-year basic science school which wanted to convert into a 4-year medical school, recalled that the AMA man was the only one to oppose the move.

"You run quite frequently into this sort of inside opposition," this man said. "The tendency all along has been to discourage expansion of existing schools or establishment of new ones. The same thing has happened with regard to DP doctors. The AMA hasn't made it easy for these foreign physicians to get into practice here."

"Restrictionism is probably a relatively minor factor now that most doctors have more business than they can handle," said another authority I consulted. "But it was pretty clearly in evidence during the depression."

COMMISSION REPORTED SURPLUS

This set me off on a search through the back files of the AMA Journal and the Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges. The story pieced together from those files is instructive.

In 1932 a study made by a commission of the Association of Medical Colleges reported that there was a surplus of doctors. Discussion then began to shape up within both the AMA and the medical school association that it was time to raise educational standards and cut down the number of students.

In 1933 the AMA Council on Medical Education adopted a formal resolution inviting "the active support of the Association of American Medical Colleges in bringing about a substantial reduction of their enrollment."

At the annual meeting of the Association of Medical Colleges later that year, Dr. William D. Cutler, then secretary of the AMA council, spelled this out in greater detail.

"Not everyone who aspires to a professional career," said Dr. Cutler, "has the God-given right to receive a long and highly technical training at public expense. Recently only half, or less than half, of those applying have been accepted, but the number which each school admitted was based on its own determination of the number which it could effectively teach without any regard to the needs of the profession or of the country as a whole. The time has come when we must still further limit the enrollment of our medical schools.

"The achievements of the last three decades in raising the standards of medical education are without parallel in history. But is the process complete? The time is ripe for an advance all along the line. Together we should be able to set up a new and higher standard."

A year later the AMA council reported that "seven schools have definitely stated that their enrollment will be decreased, and others have indicated adherence to the council's principles."

Between 1935 and 1938 the number of freshmen admitted by the medical schools was slashed by 841, or 13 percent. There was a drop of 1,617 in over-all enrollment between 1935 and 1940. It is true that general college enrollment also went down during the depression years. But the decline was neither as drastic nor as prolonged.

"It is certainly more than a coincidence," observed one educator, "that when the sledding got tough the doctors became interested in improving the quality of medical education."

"It was appallingly short-sighted to take the bottom of the depression as a guide for the country's future health needs," commented another prominent physician.

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin of March 5, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—DOCTORS CONTROL CHANNELS LEADING TO MEDICAL CAREER—STANDARDS SUBJECT TO THEIR O. K. DETERMINE ENROLLMENT AT SCHOOLS

(This is the seventh of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The training of doctors in the United States is a monopoly tightly controlled by the medical profession.

This raises the vital question as to where the interest of the public—the 152,000,000 consumers of medical care—comes in.

In the opinion of eminent medical and lay authorities, this is an issue which far transcends in importance the question of whether the profession has misused its control of the output of physicians to limit their number.

"I don't know—and, as far as I can see, there is no means of proving it definitely one way or another—whether there has been deliberate restrictionism in keeping down the supply of doctors," said one of the men consulted by this reporter. "But the mere fact that there is a group having the power to do so points up the danger of the present situation."

"TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC"

Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, dean of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, concedes that "legally the practice of medicine is a monopoly in the sense that the source of supply of physicians is restricted to those institutions which are recognized for the purpose of medical licensure."

"The intent of this monopoly," Dr. Rappleye has said, "is not to create benefits for the medical profession but to protect the public."

The public has undoubtedly been protected by the establishment of high standards in the medical schools. But many observers feel that the public interest has been hurt rather than protected by the profession's lack of vigor in expanding the facilities for training doctors so as to keep up with the country's needs. They feel strongly that the consumers are entitled to have something to say about the matter.

Control of entry into medicine is now vested in three groups, all of them in the hands of the medical profession. These groups are the American Medical Association and its Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, the medical schools and their national association, and the State boards of medical licensure and their national federation.

UNUSUAL DEGREE OF AUTONOMY

Medical school standards, which among other things determine enrollment, are subject to approval by both the AMA Council on Medical Education and the Association of American Medical Colleges. Representatives of the two organizations have for years made joint inspections of the schools. The laws or licensure board regulations of virtually all States permit only graduates of schools accredited by both organizations to take examinations for admission to practice. As a rule, the licensure boards are made up exclusively of doctors appointed with the consent of the State medical societies.

In theory, the public has some representation under this set-up through the Association of Medical Colleges. Theoretically, the medical schools are the creatures of the universities with which they are affiliated and which pay their bills. But, in practice, many of the medical schools have over the years acquired an unusual degree of autonomy.

All but a handful of the medical school deans are doctors and so are members of the faculties. The AMA and the Association of Medical Colleges have been disagreeing lately with increasing frequency and have formally split on the issue of Federal subsidies for medical education. But the AMA has long exercised a powerful influence over the medical school association, particularly with regard to standards and enrollment, through what one prominent educator has described as "a variety of interlocking directorships."

ONE OF PRINCIPAL TARGETS

The influence of trade organizations in medicine and other fields of professional education through the accrediting role they have arrogated to themselves has long worried the heads of many of the universities and they are now trying to do something about it.

The Association of American Universities and several other leading educational groups last year set up the National Commission on Accrediting. This commission is investigating various professional accrediting bodies in an effort to establish whether their activities are in the public interest. The AMA's control over the medical schools and their association is obviously one of the commission's principal targets.

Dr. Cloyd H. Marvin, president of George Washington University and secretary of the commission, has been particularly outspoken in this respect. He recently accused the Association of Medical Colleges of being one of the educational groups which have permitted themselves to become dominated by professional groups for their own purposes. This, he asserted, is tending to turn professional schools into agents of the economic objectives of professional guilds and is increasingly removing these schools from control of the universities.

CAN BE USED TO RESTRICT

Dr. Samuel P. Capen, chancellor of the University of Buffalo and former president of the Association of Urban Universities, has also expressed concern over the AMA's accrediting function.

Conceding the laudability of the AMA's interest in high educational standards, he noted that accrediting can also be used "to restrict entry into a profession." By limiting enrollment, he said, "the number of professional practitioners can be regulated with almost absolute precision."

All of which raises still another important issue. Shouldn't there be some group in this country, representing not only the medical profession but also the public, whose job it would be to reassess periodically the adequacy of our supply of doctors and to regulate that supply? Spokesmen for the AMA and the medical school association deny that they are doing this now. But it is pretty clear that this is exactly what they are doing.

Dr. Thomas Parran, former Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and now dean of the Graduate School of Public Health at the University of Pittsburgh, has complained that "we are producing our annual output of doctors in this country not by plan but by happenstance," under the present set-up, this "happenstance" has not always been governed exclusively by the public interest.

The Late Honorable O. S. Warden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD the news story on the passing of Montana's greatest citizen and also an editorial covering the event. The news story and the editorial are both carried in the Great Falls Tribune, which he nurtured and reared so faithfully.

A great and simple man has gone to his reward.

O. S. WARDEN, 85, PUBLISHER OF TRIBUNE, DIES AT HOME

O. S. Warden, 85, publisher of the Great Falls Tribune, Democratic national committeeman for Montana, and an active figure in the development of this State, died at 2 o'clock this morning at the family home, 500 Fourth Avenue North, following an illness of about 2 months.

The publisher's death ended a career crowded with achievement—a lifetime devoted to public service. He had remained active in his business and in the future development of Great Falls, Montana, and the West until his recent illness.

Warden saw Montana history made—from the Territorial days to the present. He witnessed the final session of the constitutional convention in 1889, and he had a major hand in the State's development for 60 years thereafter, with scarcely a day's interruption.

While he traveled frequently throughout his lifetime, nearly every trip was made in the interest of some phase of Montana development—irrigation, highways, power projects, or aviation.

Although he served from 1934 until his death as Democratic national committeeman for Montana, Warden's services to the State knew no party lines. His willingness to devote his own time and finances to the upbuilding of his adopted State was quickly recognized by leaders of both parties. For years he had been associated with city, State, regional, and national bodies in public work.

This started in 1924 with his appointment by Republican Gov. Joseph M. Dixon to the newly created Montana Highway Commission. He served for a decade, spearheading through the Tribune and by personal effort, enactment of the first referendum bill to provide State finances to match Federal-aid money to get Montana out of the mud.

Because of his interest in highways, he was vice president of the Y-G Bee Line Highway Association, then vice president and later president of the National Association of State Highway Officials.

After retirement from the State commission, Warden retained a continuing interest in the highway program to the last. As chairman of the goods roads committee of the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce, he waged a continuous battle for completion of the central Montana highway, the last main artery of Montana's Federal-aid system. This fight included the bitter struggle over completion of the Rogers Pass link of the road between Great Falls and Missoula. Through his efforts, the Circle-Sidney section was added to the primary system within the last year. The highway, shortest route across the State when finally completed, will be one of many lasting monuments to the memory of O. S. Warden.

In 1936 he was appointed a member of the Montana Water Conservation Board by Gov. W. E. Holt. He later was called upon to act as vice chairman and secretary of the water board by Gov. Sam C. Ford, another Republican. From being Montana director of the National Reclamation Association, he was elected president in 1934 and was reelected nine times.

He was a leader in the construction of a vast system of unrelated and interrelated water storage and irrigation projects, ranging from those which would irrigate only a few acres to the Broadwater-Missouri project in Broadwater County that diverted water near Toston for 5,000 acres and provided a supplemental supply for 10,000 acres additionally.

While he long had been interested in development of the Sun River irrigation project west of Great Falls, and in later years stressed importance of the lower Marias project, his crowning achievement in the field of reclamation was in bringing the Canyon Ferry reclamation project through the dream stage to reality.

Warden, convinced additional storage facilities must be made available on the Missouri if the reclamation possibilities above Fort Benton were to be fully utilized, prevailed with private power interests and State and Federal officials until it finally was authorized as part of the Missouri Basin development program.

In July 1949 the first blast for excavation in connection with construction of Canyon Ferry Dam, 17 miles east of Helena, occurred and Warden was chosen to set it off. Michael Straus, Reclamation Commissioner and principal speaker, declared:

"Men of vision made today possible and Mr. Warden is one. Over the years, wherever men of the West have planned to develop their water resources, I have found they have been guided by the gentle, persuasive wisdom of Mr. Warden."

W. G. Sloan, former regional director and later chairman of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, hailed Warden as the grand old man of reclamation.

Warden's first civic activity was as a member of the Great Falls Board of School Trustees, serving from 1896 to 1910. His service to the local chamber of commerce included perennial directorship and the presidency, 1920–21. He was an active member of the sugar-beet and airways committees. It was partially through his efforts that Inland Air Lines, now the Inland division of Western Air Lines, was extended from Billings to Great Falls, giving this city direct air service to Denver.

From 1933 to 1938 he was a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce, first as director at large and then as representative of the eighth district. In 1944 he served as Montana governor of the National Aeronautics Association, and was active in organizing the Great Falls chapter.

He had been a director of the Associated Press for many years, being the first director to be elected from the Rocky Mountain area for newspapers under 50,000 circulation. He maintained a continuing interest in the school of journalism at Montana State University. Warden was president of the Montana Press Association in 1934, and served as vice president of the Inland Daily Press Association.

Oliver Sherman Warden was born at North Haverhill, N. H., August 19, 1866, the only child of Alexander and Lucy Flint Warden. His middle name was derived from the popular Civil War general, William Tecumseh Sherman.

After attending elementary school at Monroe, N. H., and high school at McIndoes, Vt., Warden was graduated from St. Johnsbury Academy, St. Johnsbury, Vt. He earned his bachelor of arts degree and Phi Beta Kappa key at Dartmouth, graduating with the class of 1889. A few weeks later he arrived in Montana to accept a position on the news staff of the Great Falls Leader.

En route to Great Falls, Warden stopped in Helena, where on August 19, 1889, he watched the constitutional convention that was shaping the government of the soon-to-be born Treasure State. Montana was admitted to statehood several weeks later.

In 1895, in association with William M. Bole, another New Englander, he purchased the Great Falls Tribune and became its business manager. Bole assumed the editorship. In 1900, this newspaper was purchased by the late William A. Clark, when Clark sought election to the United States Senate. Warden remained as business manager, while Bole moved to Bozeman and purchased the Chronicle.

After Clark's election, the Tribune was sold to W. G. Conrad, who resold it to Warden and Bole in 1905. Bole returned to the editorship, a post he held until his retirement in 1927. He died at Bozeman in 1932.

The Tribune, starting with nine employees, including the two owners, developed steadily through the years. Its present building was completed in 1916. Long recognized as the stalwart of independent Montana journalism, the Tribune never has been subsidized by any person or interest. Tribune associate properties include the Great Falls Leader, the Montana Farmer-Stockman, Tribune Printing & Supply Co., and radio station KMON.

Warden's community service over a long period was as director and trustee of the YMCA, member of the North Montana State Fair board since 1931, and chairman of the Great Falls Park Board. He was a charter member of the local Rotary Club, a charter member of the Great Falls Elks Lodge, a member of Euclid Lodge 56 of the Masons, and one of the organizers and corporate members of the Meadow Lark Country Club.

Mr. Warden was married first to Etta A. Scott, of Lawrence, Mass., in 1895, the year he became co-owner of the Tribune. She died in 1919 and four of six children born to this union survive. They are Alexander and Robert D. Warden, business manager and managaging editor, respectively, of the Tribune; Mrs. G. A. Hansen, of Great Falls, and Mrs. Virginia Morrell, of Worcester, Mass.

In 1936, he was married to Eleanor G. McRae, of Helena, who survives. They have a son, Jock Finley. Other survivors include eight grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. Three half-brothers and two half-sisters, residing in the East, also survive.

Funeral arrangements are in charge of the W. H. George Co.

HE LEAVES HIS INDELIBLE MARK

In the waning summer of 62 years ago O. S. Warden, freshly graduated from his New England college of Dartmouth, journeyed from his home State of New Hampshire to the then territory of Montana. As he arrived in Helena the historic 1889 constitutional convention for Montana statehood was in session. Continuing to Great Falls he embarked in what was to be his whole business life, that of a working newspaper man.

When, in association with William M. Bole, he purchased the Great Falls Tribune in 1895, the Tribune's whole crew consisted of nine people, including the two owners. Throughout the years the growth of the newspaper and its related endeavors has been closely allied to the growth of this community and the Treasure State.

Throughout his many years in Great Falls he devoted constant attention and time to the advancement of his adopted community and State in many fields. His accomplishments in Montana welfare will stand as his most fitting memorial. They bear eloquent witness to an untiring zeal and an unflagging effort that bore bountiful fruit through all the years of this century.

Those who worked with him in his own business and those associated with him in wider fields can best appreciate how well he directed this course. They may now gain inspiration from his life and accomplishments, to carry on their efforts.

Use of American Troops in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from my friend, Katharine S. Eakin, superintendent of schools of Jerome County, Idaho.

As Senators will note from her letter, this fine educator is sending to me excerpts from a letter she has received from a friend of hers in France. For obvious reasons I have deleted the name of the French lady who has written to my Idaho friend her observations on our current and proposed foreign policy. I commend this letter to my colleagues for thoughtful reading.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEROME, IDAHO, *February 6, 1951.*

The Honorable HERMAN WELKER,
United States Senator from Idaho,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WELKER: I am writing this separately as this will be a personal letter about an entirely different matter. I am writing now, concerning the sending of our boys as a land army into Central Europe, in my capacity as a citizen and a mother who lost one son in World War II and has but one remaining son, a senior at MIT, age 22 years. I agree wholeheartedly with the stand of ex-President Hoover and Senator TAFT that we will fulfill our obligations to our allies more successfully by using air and naval power coupled with a clear-cut and unmistakable warning that we intend to protect the territorial integrity of Central Europe with any means at our command, rather than by sending troops into Europe to be at the mercy of submarines, planes, and hordes of land soldiers, not to mention the very real danger from Communist soldiers at their sides clad in the uniforms of allies. While I have been deeply concerned over General Eisenhower's report, feeling it far too optimistic a picture of the possibility of large and loyal land forces to be raised there, I probably would not have written you about this had I not received a letter from France just while I was working on these other matters ready to write to you about them.

Before quoting from this letter, may I explain that the author is the widow of a very outstanding Evangelical minister to whom members of our church (the Presbyterian) have been sending gifts since the war. He was a chaplain in the French Army and spent a number of months in a concentration camp, where he taught many of the prisoners geology, as he had studied that in college before deciding upon the ministry. His parish in Paris is among the laboring class and, besides five children of his own, who are now in their late teens, he worked largely with French youth. While my niece and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Merwin, now of Washington, D. C., were in Paris with the United Nations they called on this family and were impressed with their intelligence and culture. The biography lately completed of him, which was sent us here, shows him to have been a man of wide knowledge and deep understanding. Although he passed away last spring, his family has remained in this same neighborhood and is in constant contact with these people. Therefore, when this letter arrived, I felt impelled to send you excerpts from it (omitting personal bits) in order that you may see how one sincere Christian woman of Paris feels concerning this situation.

Excerpts from the letter written January 30 by Mme. ———. (Please do not quote her by name, as I would not cause her any difficulty for the world.)

"We, all of them, are also very troubled by the war noises. In spite of the sayings of our statesmen, I know that there is no enthusiasm in France for another war. We suffered much, twice, for awful occupations which left us weak physically and morally. I read in statistics that the French money power in the working class and amongst industrial workmen is five times smaller than in America; our workmen are not paid enough to live properly; they are also awfully lodged (the number of our hovels is a shame for our Government)—that is why, we understand, the communism of most of them. If our Government and, first of all, the industrial employers, did sacrifices and increased sufficiently the salaries, that would be their best interest and would save France from communism. There are beautiful cases of Christian employers; but, alas, most of the employers in reality are selfish, some are black-market people who did scandalous fortunes during the war, while people hungered—that is why most of our intellectual young men are so anxious, wondering where is the truth in all the sincerity of their souls—all of them are studying social problems—all of them are condemning the church with great severity—and even if the churches are doing great efforts for comprehension and sacrifices, it seems in many ways too late, though we have many apostles.

"All this explains also the small enthusiasm of all our workers for a new war—they have suffered too much. If they fight again, I am afraid there would be first of all a civil war. Most of them would fight for a Communist government, for all of them are upset, and you know, alas, that Moscow profits by these conditions for her propaganda.

"You see how, in these conditions, the part of a pastor is simply to be an apostle, to shake the selfishness, and to help the poor—and that is complicated and how difficult."

The rest of the letter is personal, concerning some packages, etc.

Please protect her name as she has had much suffering, and I would not add one iota to her load, but I could not help but write this part of her letter to you.

Thanks for your patience. Is there any way mothers can persuade the Government to stop giving the boys beer and encouraging their use of stronger liquor while in the Armed Forces? This is a matter of deep concern to many of us. Surely there is something we can do, for it is bad enough for them to take our boys without placing about them temptations, urged on by their superior officers, which undo all that Christian homes have tried to accomplish.

Sincerely and gratefully,

KATHARINE S. EAKIN.

Equality and Equal Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "No Color Line," which appeared in the New York Times on March 4, last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO COLOR LINE

President Truman restated last week his oft-expressed belief in the importance of preserving our individual liberties at the same time that we take steps to assure our national security. His words in this respect are always welcome, and will encourage all who believe in giving greater substance to the American tradition of equality and equal opportunity.

Yet it is impossible to avoid noting the disconcerting contrast between the tone of his statement and that of a commentary, made the same day, on a very vital civil-liberties question as it affects the Army in Korea. A representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, just back from a trip to the Far East, states that a study of Negro court-martial cases for 3 months of last summer indicates that most of them were largely the result of low morale induced by the segregation policies still maintained by General MacArthur. While the NAACP spokesman criticized court-martial procedure as it applied to whites as well as to Negroes, he held that Negroes had been the principal sufferers—and that segregation was at the root of much of the evil. To the extent that segregation is still practiced in the Army it surely is contradicting the principles enunciated time and again by the President of the United States.

As the President has noted, however, there are spheres in which real progress is being made. Among the most notable advances in recent weeks is the action of the Georgia Legislature in tearing masks off the Ku Klux Klan, a very great victory for progressive forces in the South. The mere fact that a stringent antilynch bill has been introduced in the South Carolina Legislature is encouraging; and steps to abolish the poll tax have just been taken in one or two more southern States. The battle for civil rights, particularly in times of stress, has to be waged on many a front.

But surely among the most important and urgent of all these fronts is, in a literal sense, the fighting front. Out there in the lonely hills and valleys of Korea courage knows nothing of segregation, and death has yet to learn a color line.

Russia Seen Waiting for Chaos in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent from the Washington Star:

RUSSIA SEEN WAITING FOR CHAOS IN UNITED STATES—WRITER SAYS OUR BANKRUPTCY WOULD BE SOVIET VICTORY

(By Frank R. Kent)

For a long time now there have been two schools of thought among men in Washington supposedly better informed than the average citizen concerning the international crisis that exists because of Russian behavior in the United Nations and elsewhere in the world.

One school firmly believes a third world war inevitable; that this will be precipitated by a new Soviet aggresison this year against Yugoslavia; that unless we and our allies are able to check this advance of the Red armies all Western Europe will be overrun and the worst conflict in history ensue. The other school contends there will be no war; that Russia has not and does not now plan an all-out war; that her strategy has never included such a thing; that on the contrary, it is exactly the thing she does not want.

It is interesting to note that while recently there have been many converts from the "war is inevitable" group to the other, we are wholeheartedly proceeding on the assumption that the first group is right. The reason is clear—we just cannot afford to take the chance. Our great trouble is utter lack of certainty about Soviet intentions.

On the other hand, Mr. Stalin and his friends do not have to have a spy system or an intelligence service here to know our plans, strength, weaknesses, and problems. All they have to do is read the newspapers and listen to the radio. They have complete certainty as contrasted with our complete uncertainty—and that is a great advantage. Being intelligent men, they know that neither the British nor ourselves will fight unless war is forced upon us.

If, it may be asked, the Soviet rulers are so sure they are in no danger of attack from the free nations of the world, what then is the point of their ceaseless and violent propaganda denouncing us as warmongers and insisting that the United States is determined to bring about a third world war? Those of the second school, who hold that the Russians do not want war, provide the answer—first, that the Russians do not want war with us primarily, as Dr. Vannevar Bush says, because they know our present superiority in atomic weapons would destroy them. This is the great deterrent. If this were not so and they wanted war, it would be idiotic for them not to start the big fight now instead of waiting and watching while our mobilization gets rolling and we get stronger and stronger as the months go by.

From either their standpoint or ours, if the Soviets mean war, this waiting policy makes no sense. It only makes sense if they plan to make the whole world communistic not through military conquest but by promoting economic chaos. That explains everything the Russians do and have done. The argument is based on the axiom that out of economic chaos communism almost inevitably comes. This, it is argued, is why Soviet policy in the last 5 years has been so threatening and provocative as to force us into the expenditure of many billions, the imposition of enormous taxes, and an added strain on the Federal fiscal structure, which no one knows whether we can bear or not. On the assumption that these immense outpourings are the only way to insure peace, we cannot stop to consider the size of the debt or the depth of the deficits. In a year and a half we will be far more powerful than the Russians, but we easily may have spent ourselves into national bankruptcy, which would be a victory for them.

We would then appear to be the most gigantic suckers in all history. Still we have got to become strong enough to conquer even though we never have to fight. But if this idea of Russian strategy is sound, nothing makes sense except the taking of every possible step to guard Federal finances against collapse.

As Freemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Leavenworth (Kans.) Times of March 9, 1951:

AS FREEMEN

One thousand employees of the Kansas Power & Light Co., the northeast Kansas utility which supplies Leavenworth its gas and electricity, have signed a petition proclaiming their belief in God and the American way of life.

The unusual fact about the petition is that it was a spontaneous action by the employees themselves; management of the KPL had nothing to do with it until it was presented to them.

And management felt it was of sufficient significance to be reproduced. A copy of proclamation and the thousand-odd signatures are on display in the window of the local KPL office.

Art Johnson, local office manager, said today the company is not sure where the petition got started. There are many signatures of local employees on the proclamation.

The text follows:

"As freemen we proclaim—

"Our belief in the divinity of God, the dignity of man and the destiny of our country.

"Our belief in a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

"Our belief that a man should live within his income and pay his honest debts, and that our Government should operate on the same sensible basis.

"Our belief that under the American way of life we always have a higher standard of living than any other governmental system has ever offered—let alone delivered.

"Our belief that as freemen, proud of our achievements and jealous of our rights, that there is no place in our midst for Communists, fellow travelers, and other cranks who by wild accusations and empty promises would lead us down the trail of political and economic slavery.

"Our belief that it is our duty as freemen to speak out in defense of our American ways of life and to go on record to that end.

"So we proclaim, with the firm conviction that 99 percent of all Americans subscribe to the above sentiments that we—the undersigned employees of the Kansas Power & Light Co.—herewith and henceforth endorse and pledge our wholehearted support to the same. May God be with us."

This started out to be a routine news story but it soon became obvious that it was more than just a bit of news. It is a concrete manifestation of faith in American Democracy by those who build and keep America strong.

As long as such citizens as these are willing and glad to go on public record as they have done this country cannot be destroyed by enemies from without or within.

Overtaxation on Wine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the economic welfare of the State of California is primarily dependent on agriculture, with 1,515,245 bearing acres of fruit, nuts, and vine products in the State.

One-third of all this acreage consists of vineyards, making grapes the largest single crop in the agricultural economy.

Primary outlet for grapes is the wine industry, operating on a year around basis and providing employment for 111,000 persons.

A proposal by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, now before the Ways and Means Committee, has created turmoil among grape growers, vintners and allied industries throughout the entire State of California.

This proposal would raise Federal excise taxes on dessert wines from the present 60 cents to $1.50 per gallon; and

from the present 15 cents to 50 cents per gallon on table wines.

On a tonnage basis, the proposal would increase the present $24 per ton tax on table wine grapes to $80; and the present $48 tax on grapes for dessert wine to $120 per ton.

Percentagewise, this tax proposal reflects increases of 150 percent and 233⅓ percent, respectively.

Placed in the unfortunate position of being taxed out of business, are the 26,000 grape-growing farm families in California. Of 506,000 acres planted to vineyards, 167,000 acres are planted to varieties of grapes for which the only commercial outlet is wine products.

It takes 5 years to bring a grape vineyard into production and the supply cannot be adjusted to demand, except on a long-term basis. Since the end of World War II, the grape and wine industries have been in a depressed condition.

In normal years of production many varieties of grapes are readily sold for eating purposes in the fresh state and a great quantity are dried and processed for raisins. Culls also find a ready use in the production of brandy.

In 1946 withdrawal of the Government from its fruit-buying program, coupled with an extremely heavy crop, resulted in more grapes going into wine than the market could absorb. During 1947–49 this oversupply of grapes and wine depressed grower returns, they getting $29 per ton, or about 60 percent of parity. Similarly depressed were returns to vintners during those same years. The Bureau of Internal Revenue excess-profits tax listings of depressed industries classifies wine making as the only food or food-products industry that was depressed during that approximate period.

By 1950 supply and demand had been brought more into line, but only as the result of nearly 4 years of moving wine in volume at ruinously low returns to grape growers and vintners. The 1950 crop returned $61 per ton, which is still below parity, bringing the 1947–50 average returns to $37 per ton.

Tax rates become a fixed charge on the operation of converting grapes to wine and moving them to market. This is no time to change the historic tax basis for wine, it being the least stable of agricultural food products.

The wine industry must undergo further development if the grape industry is to move its surplus crops and survive.

It is manifestly impossible for the wineries to carry this new load in regard to overhead and still maintain the customary returns to growers.

In order to do so, the retail price of wine would, of necessity, have to be increased to such a level that it would destroy the retail outlet. Eighty percent of the wine-consuming public are in the low- and middle-income brackets.

This proposed tax increase would make of wine a luxury product instead of keeping it on the present level or near there. Wine is a product for temperate drinking, considered more as a food necessary and common to the everyday diet of the great majority of those who consume it.

By placing the wine products out of the reach of these people, through the imposition of higher retail prices which would be necessary to meet tax demands, the grape growers would be forced into the unfortunate position of being without their outlet.

By taxing wine at this proposed high rate, families who have invested their funds and years of hard work into productive vineyards would find themselves divested of their livelihood.

As a further indication of the harmful effect this excessive tax would have upon the economy of California is the fact that in 1950 grapes had a farm value of $156,772,000. This is more than twice as large as that of the second ranking crop, oranges, which were valued at $74,585,000.

There are 383 wineries in California, dependent upon the grape growers and their ability and incentive to supply the necessary grape varieties.

Capital investment in vineyards and winery property total $500,000,000—a major factor in keeping our economy on a sound basis.

By hindering this huge industry through the medium of overtaxation, the Federal Government stands to lose revenue, rather than gaining. On a Federal basis, the industry now pays taxes at the rate of $61,600,000 annually.

It has been admitted that the imposition of this increased excise tax on wine would cut consumption by 20,000,000 gallons, which represents approximately 16 percent of all wine consumed in the country. That figure in itself represents considerable loss in revenue and it is not out of reason to assume the consumption would decline even further.

As a whole, the grape growers and the wine industry are willing to carry their fair share of the tax load. But they are protesting the Treasury Department's proposal as being ruinous, discriminatory, and completely unjustifiable. Under the present law any citizen can make and have 200 gallons of wine per year for personal use which is nontaxable. Should the proposed unreasonable tax be levied I am fearful that the practice which prevailed during prohibition days will be resorted to and open the possibility of law violations. Grape growing is not strictly a California industry but is common to most States of the Union to a more or less degree.

California's grape industry is making a very determined effort to aid itself through marketing agreements and other self-help, industry-wide devices. It is very probable that imposition of an excessive tax burden would counteract the results obtained thus far.

Being unable to meet and carry the added financial burden this tax would impose, many small businesses would be forced to curtail operations. In California, as in wine-producing sections of the United States, the great majority of vineyards are of the small farm type and most of the wineries are family operations. They would be forced out of existence by the larger concerns with financial backing in sufficient amount to carry the added burden.

Normal consumption of wine is the only way that a sound grape industry can exist. Strangle this outlet and marketing of all varieties of grapes will be damaged, leading to bankruptcy for many.

In addition to the farm families directly dependent upon a stable outlet, there are approximately 200,000 persons engaged in businesses connected with supplying the needs of the grape industry. These include such enterprises as the manufacture of crates, bottles, corks; reproduction of labels by the printing and lithography trades. Any action to curtail normal function of this segment of our agricultural economy would lead into larger problems centering around surpluses, unstable markets, and unemployment.

Being familiar with the problems of grape growers and the wine industry it is my firm belief that if enacted as currently proposed this overexcessive tax recommendation would cause irreparable harm to befall not only those immediately connected with the industry, but would adversely affect areas in which grapes are grown and would be particularly injurious to the agricultural economy as a whole.

Use of Chemicals in Food and Soap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing four bills dealing with several phases of the use of chemicals in food and soap.

I would call your attention to the fact that at present the Food and Drug Administration lacks the proper authority to bring in and question, under oath, individuals or corporations using these chemicals, particularly in the production and processing of food. I am a little scared at the harm that may come to the health of the people because some of these individuals, even though they are good men, after but a few experiments, recommend that certain chemicals be introduced into food that is widely consumed.

I would call your attention further to the fact that there are nearly 842 chemicals knocking at the door of the food industry, demanding a place at the table of the consumer. Of these nearly 428 chemicals are now being used in some part of the production, processing, and handling of food. It is my understanding there are about 70 chemicals, presently being used, which have not had sufficient analysis or experimental work, to determine their effect upon a human being.

The hearings before the Select Committee on Chemicals in Food Production, have produced a great deal of evidence that a few chemicals used in food have recently been found to be harmful to the human being and, in most cases, their use has been discontinued. There are other chemicals whose effect upon the human being, has not been entirely established.

The bills I am introducing today would give the Food and Drug Administration sufficient authority to require individuals who are using chemicals in the production and processing of food to furnish adequate proof that these chemicals are not harmful.

There has been a tremendous development in the field of chemistry since the war. A great many chemicals were developed during the war and are now being used. This may or may not be to the good. It may be just a step in the parade of progress. You can pick up almost any issue of a technical magazine and you will find it calling attention to certain chemicals that can be used to an advantage by the food industry.

There are a great many emulsifying agents of softeners used by the baking industry which may or may not be good for the food that gets into the blood stream. We human beings like to take a pill to relieve our ills; or vitamins, that are supposed to give us some pep. It is a trait of human nature, and we are often misled, to be interested in advertising over the radio and in the press about certain food products being better as a result of the addition of certain chemicals or vitamins. It does seem to me that there are certain loopholes in the Food and Drug Act, which ought to be plugged up in order to protect the health of the people.

Our committee will soon be proceeding with additional hearings. There is a wide field that needs to be investigated. The question of the use of hormones now being used extensively in the poultry and animal industries should be carefully considered. It is quite possible there are many evil effects of these hormones, when they get into the blood stream of the individual.

I know also that the impact upon agriculture is tremendous when we find two baking companies using some 10,000,000 pounds of softener and other substitutes which partially replace the use of eggs, milk, lard, and wheat in baking products.

I trust the committee to which these bills will be assigned will see fit to give them an early hearing. The hearings need to be extensive. These bills are of interest to all of the people who consume food.

House Cleaning Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington News:

HOUSE CLEANING NOW

Time finally came when a man who had been fired in a policy disagreement with the Truman administration was willing to tell his story (see article on p. 6). He is Dr. Alan Valentine, former Economic Stabilization Director, who was let out by President Truman on the ground that he did not move drastically enough.

Too often a man who resigns or is dismissed remains silent. He may feel a loyalty to old associates, or he may hope fortune will return him to office, or he may suspect what he has to say will impair confidence in the Government.

What Dr. Valentine has to say does impair confidence, but it was time somebody was taking the risk. He left as Stabilization Director on January 19 after having served since October 6. Yesterday, after 2 months of silence, he spoke out.

Dr. Valentine soon discovered here that he was relied upon to deliver Democratic patronage, which he wouldn't do. He told of his unpopularity with organized labor, the White House "secretariat" and the Democratic National Committee. In vivid terms he described a second government—the political organization—which functions, he said, with few scruples and little or no sense of public responsibility.

As Dr. Valentine said, only President Truman can demolish this undercover government now. When the President returns from Florida he will find this emergency waiting for him. It worsens daily in its progressive impairment of public confidence.

The people can clean up the mess eventually. But in the face of the greater international emergency the President must act at once. The decay of confidence becomes a genuine peril to the Republic.

Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have read carefully the report submitted to the President by the International Development Advisory Board, which is headed by Nelson A. Rockefeller, entitled "Partners in Progress," and I hope that all the Members of Congress will take the time to read this excellent survey.

It has to do with what is generally known as the point 4 program and by reading this document it can be readily appreciated that a very careful and exhaustive study has been made of this whole proposition. This report will provoke great discussion, not only among legislators but also among men of business, and thoughtful discussion on this subject is greatly needed so the idea may be thoroughly digested and the proposals made as practical as possible. What appeals to me as much as anything in this excellent report is the point that by helping the world help itself toward a better standard of living, the cause of peace, contentment, and appreciation of each other's neighbors' problems is promoted. If this objective can be furthered through the active interest and participation of private capital, the gospel of our American free economy will be preached throughout the world.

The report contains a recommendation in the sum of $2,000,000,000 needed for this program, and the thought of such a large amount of money in times like these makes all of us shudder, but if we really desire to promote good will on earth, we should not let the expense hinder a thorough study and exploration of this constructive plan which must be approached on the basis that Government cannot and should not be entirely responsible for it.

The excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 14 points out one of the important conclusions of this report that "American policy must treat both tasks—defense and economic aid—as important and as interconnected." It is my opinion that that is the cornerstone of the foundation for such a program and it will take great wisdom, unselfish zeal, and tremendous nobility of character to work out the details. It is a challenge to American ingenuity, American good will, and American wisdom. The editorial follows:

DEFENSE AND DEVELOPMENT

The International Development Advisory Board appointed by President Truman last November to reappraise American policy toward the world's underdeveloped areas has finished its labors by facing up directly to our hard problem of combining a very costly and restrictive program of rearmament with one of economic aid to the many friendly countries that are poor in capital and low in living standards. The Board's most important conclusion is that American policy must treat both tasks as important and as interconnected. We must not slacken our effort to increase defensive strength. But we will not be able to advance toward a world that is secure and mutually respecting unless we support now the efforts of underdeveloped countries to overcome the bitter handicap of a late and slow start toward economic self reliance. The danger these countries now face "is that in the pressures of mobilization their need may be forgotten."

Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, whose work in this field has been outstanding, and the other members of his widely representative Board will help us not to forget. Their report amounts to a definition of issues on which important policy decisions ought to be made. Its nature is more that of an agenda, indeed, than of an articulated program such as Congress might consider in one piece of legislation. Congress may very well wish to take up individually many of the major recommendations of the Rockefeller Board. Some of them cannot be implemented without international negotiation and agreements of treaty status. So long as this is all understood, there is little danger that the report will provoke hasty judgment here or raise false hopes abroad.

But deliberate judgment and separate consideration must not be used as excuses for inaction. The Board is perfectly correct in warning that we have underestimated the importance of development aid. The group's recommendations that the forms of aid (investment, loan or grant) should be tailored to the special economic and strategic nature of development projects deserves extended application. Logic supports its call for a unification of American agencies dealing in development work. This emphasis on our need to place major financial reliance on increasing the flow of private investment could appropriately be given expression in revisions in our tax laws. Surely none of its recommendations deserves more early attention than the proposal that the needs of other countries for essential materials and equipment be considered in a systematic, organized way.

St. Lawrence Seaway Is Not a War Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, what we need now is money for our national defense and not heavy expenditures for boondoggling projects such as the St. Lawrence seaway. We won World War I without the St. Lawrence seaway, and likewise World War II, and we can come out of this present emergency in a more solvent manner if we spend our money only for those projects that are vital to our national defense.

The editor of the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, in an editorial in the December 17, 1950, issue, said as follows:

SEAWAY NOT A WAR EMERGENCY

The war outlook and the enormous cost involved, stupendous as these reasons are, do not seem to have slowed up the St. Lawrence waterway proponents. They have come forth with new impetus to urge it as a secure route by which to bring in millions of tons of iron ore from Labrador and Quebec fields.

Regardless of what might be the ultimate usefulness of the proposed seaway, nobody can defend it successfully as an emergency war measure. It is not a must on any present item of war preparedness. In fact it could not possibly be placed in use before many years.

We need things now, in our defense program, not something we might get 5 or 10 years later.

We have only vague guesses at present as to the waterway's cost. A recent estimate of $1,200,000,000 for a 35-foot channel adaptable to modern shipping is based on most favorable conditions. Engineers have no adequate data on how much of the dredging for channels and locks would be through rock and what it would cost. The seaway project, at least, can wait its turn on our national agenda.

American Peace Crusade Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcript of a radio broadcast by Mr. Earl Godwin, made over the facilities of NBC on March 14:

The meanest and bitterest fake now being foisted upon so many millions of people in this whole world shapes up here as the American peace crusade. It is a shame to have to expose a peace movement as a fake and a booby trap into which we might fall. But declare peace on Communist terms and we would find out that we have been disarmed by a nation of cruel bandits who would attack us, ravish us and our country and America would be blacked out into slavery just as Czechoslovakia was and Poland too. That is difficult for us to realize, we who have been so honest and aboveboard about peace, we who have been the only Nation to put forward a practical plan for the reduction of arms and armaments, we who stuck to our program of reducing arms expenditures and were left dangerously far behind by other nations who always promised and laughed at us.

Now comes this American peace crusade which will flood Washington this week with a sugar-flavored poison. I think a striking example of what Americans should do is in the news today of how Representative MORANO of Greenwich, Conn., has rebuffed a group of his own constituents who wanted to see him and probably grease him up with their fake peace ointment.

Dr. Jerome Davis, of West Haven, Conn., had asked to lead in a group of these constituents tomorrow. MORANO said, "Nothing doing," and he pinned Jerome Davis down under the strong light of scrutiny in a reply which is now a part of the records of Congress.

"You, Mr. Davis, have been cited personally by the House Un-American Activities Committee as belonging to from 41 to 50 Communist-front organizations. Your American peace crusade has been cited as 'an organic part of the Communist peace offensive' and once again as 'organized by Communists.' Until such time that I am convinced your aims are constant with the best interests of the Nation, I must refuse to meet with you or any of your group."

The man Jerome Davis is the author of a recent book called Character Assassination in which he painted in brilliant colors the one-time Commerce Department official, William Remington, who was booted out by a loyalty board, then restored by a higher board. That is where Jerome Davis came in with the sob-sister stuff about how someone is always picking on men of a liberal mind.

The book had not been out more than a few days when this same Remington was convicted in New York for perjury in that he had sworn falsely as to his Red connections.

The phony peace crusade is all set for as much of a gigantic swoosh as possible throughout Washington tomorrow. It is time to bring out every possible expression to show that this harbinger of peace is a butcher bird in dove's clothing.

Girding for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, this excellent article written by Mr. Hickerson reveals the great contribution of Texas to the national defense effort:

GIRDING FOR DEFENSE—TEXAS SUPPLIES MORE GAS, OIL, RUBBER, AND PLANES FOR DEFENSE

(By Clayton Hickerson)

DALLAS, March 15.—The mobilization program has Texas humping, with three things most noticeable:

1. More oil, gas, and synthetic rubber are being drawn out of the fabulously rich soil.

2. A growing stream of military planes—from small liaison craft and the world's fastest jets to the giant strategic bomber, the famed B-36—is coming from Texas manufacturing plants.

3. Air Force bases are being reactivated wholesale, to turn out more trained warriors and technicians.

EMPLOYMENT AT ALL-TIME HIGH

With the employment index in Texas at an all-time high, much of the defense employment data is restricted.

But some examples are enlightening.

About 50,000 Texans are engaged in aircraft production in the Dallas-Fort Worth area alone. More than half of these are in the cavernous Consolidated Vultee plant at Forth Worth working on stepped-up B-36 bomber orders.

Two companies at Houston are building small arms. Another is building heavy artillery. Other Houston area firms opened up new tank assembly and repair shops.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANTS

Almost everything in the air line is being built within a 40-mile circle that includes Dallas, Fort Worth, and suburban Garland.

The Federal Government reactivated synthetic rubber plants along the Texas Gulf coast, and also encouraged farmers to plant guayule—a strange plant from which natural rubber can be processed.

Reynolds Aluminum Co. announced plans to build one of the greatest aluminum plants in the Nation near Corpus Christi. It will cost at least $80,000,000. Three or four nearby towns will have great reduction plants.

Plans for Texas' second fully integrated steel processing plant were announced by Lone Star Steel Co., which will erect it at Daingerfield in east Texas. Sheffield's plant at Houston is so far Texas' only plant which produces plate steel from raw ore.

THOUSANDS RECRUITED

Heavy chemical industries recruited several thousand new workers at Beaumont and Port Arthur. Red River ordnance plant at Texarkana added several thousand in its stepped-up ammunition production program.

Texas' great oil industry is putting heavy emphasis on high-octane aviation gasoline.

When World War II started, Texas refinery capacity was 4,956,599 barrels daily. Daily crude runs now are hitting a record of 6,600,000 barrels, compared to 5,000,000 a year ago. Refinery capacities reached a record 6,732,200 barrels daily last year, and oilmen expect to add 100,000 in 1951.

Oil production is barely holding its own at 2,800,000 barrels daily in Texas. But the industry expects the Texas Railroad Commission—which regulates the industry—to allow greater production.

REFINERIES EXPANSIONS PLANNED

Of the many refinery expansions being planned, those announced include Gulf Oil's multi-million-dollar ethylene gas plant at Port Arthur. Ethylene is used in making synthetic rubber and plastics.

Magnolia Petroleum Co., a Standard affiliate, has completed two cracking units to speed up the output of higher-valued chemicals essential to aviation fuel. Continental Oil Co. plans a $10,000,000 catalytic cracking plant (modern refinery) at nearby Lake Charles, La.

West Texas is in on the mobilization efforts as well as the industrial coast and Dallas-Fort Worth areas.

AEC MYSTERY PROJECT

On a 4,000-acre tract east of Amarillo, the Atomic Energy Commission has a mystery project. AEC has been noncommunicative about what is going on except to say it does not involve radioactive materials. The site is 17 miles from Amarillo and was Pantex Ordnance Plant in World War II. About 1,000 persons will work there.

To the south, the Midland-Odessa area has at least one order for 100,000,000 gallons of high-octane aviation gasoline.

Biggest military center is San Antonio, site of Lackland Air Force Base, Fort Sam Houston, and Randolph Air Force Base.

Lackland—where reports of overcrowding and lack of facilities for Air Force recruits drew a senatorial investigation—is handling one of the greatest floods of manpower in Air Force history. Randolph AFB, assigned a new $30,000,000 aeromedical center, will be the top military medical center in the world, according to Representative KILDAY, Democrat, of Texas.

The Air Force wants more than $50,000,000 for work at Amarillo Air Force Base. Sheppard Air Force Base at Wichita Falls is bulging with Air Force recuits rerouted there from San Antonio. Carswell Air Force Base at Fort Worth—home of the B-36—will get new space for its superbomber fleet at a cost of more than $2,000,000.

New barracks will go up at Fort Hood in central Texas. Fort Bliss in far west Texas is assigned a guided-missile center and an antiaircraft firing center. Camp Wolters at Mineral Wells is being reactivated as a training site for Air Force construction engineers.

American Enterprise Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Members of the House received an offer from an organization calling itself the American Enterprise Association, in which such organization offered its services in the digesting of legislation introduced in the Congress. Of course, Congress needs all the information on such matters as it can receive. Helpful organizations with sincere motives are to be complimented in their willingness to give aid.

However, Members of the Congress should be fully advised as to the background and interests of individuals promoting such programs. Accordingly, in order to make available to the Members of Congress such background material on the membership of the American Enterprise Association, I am having the following inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The list of officers has been taken from the stationery used by the Enterprise Association:

AMERICAN ENTERPRISE ASSOCIATION, INC.,

New York, N. Y., March 5, 1951.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,

The House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: This is to advise you and your staff that the American Enterprise Association has reopened its Washington office and has resumed the services heretofore made available to, and utilized by, Members of Congress.

The offices of the association are located at 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. The telephone number of the association is Executive 8205.

The American Enterprise Association will continue to offer to Members of Congress, without charge, its bill analyses of important legislative proposals before the Congress for consideration. The bills which will be analyzed are those which the staff of the association select as most likely to be actively considered by the Congress, as indicated by current public announcements, and by the advice of the leadership and the chairman of the various committees of the Congress.

If you desire these bill analyses, or an analysis of any particular bill of special interest to you not included in our general bill analyses series, the association, within the limits of its staff facilities, will be glad upon request to make an analysis of a special bill for you.

Each bill analysis contains a synopsis, which on quick reading will give the substance of the content of the bill, a detailed analysis of the bill, section by section, and the legislative history of the bill.

The association will also make available upon specific request an interrogatory containing questions, the answers to which it is believed will bring out the fundamental issues and problems involved in the bill.

In addition to the bill analyses, the association also issues, from time to time, on general questions deemed to be of special public interest, studies prepared under the direction of its advisory board. In each instance a recognized and specialized expert in the academic or economic field is carefully selected to prepare the study. These studies are the independent works and opinions of the experts selected, and are available to you upon request.

The association also supplies Members with a spot research service, and on request, prepares for them summaries, digests, and compilations of factual and authoritative data on various subjects of current legislative interest or on any specially requested subject.

In charge of staff and research activities is Dr. Felix E. Sklagen, former Acting Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives, and assistant to the association's first Washington representative, Mr. J. Frederick Richardson.

Mr. James O'Connor Roberts has again been retained as special counsel for the association. His offices are in the Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; telephone, Executive 4822.

We are advising all Members of Congress of this resumption of our service, and of its availability to them. If, therefore, you desire to receive this service, please advise the association, addressing your communication to the association at its Washington office, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Thanking you, I am

Sincerely yours,

N. BAXTER JACKSON.

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN ENTERPRISE ASSOCIATION, INC.

CHAIRMAN

Lewis H. Brown, New York City, N. Y., chairman of the board, member executive committee and director, Johns-Manville Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville Sales Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville International Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Canadian Johns-Manville Corp.; director, Asbestos & Danville Railway; director, Pacific Southwestern Railroad; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville Products Corp.; director, Johns-Manville Boley, Ltd.; director, Johns-Manville Co. of Cuba; director, Johns-Manville Service Corp.; director, Asbestos Wood Co.; director, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; director, Johns-Manville Co., Ltd.; chairman of the board and director, Southern Johns-Manville Products Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville Products Corp. of Massachusetts; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville Products Corp. of Pennsylvania; trustee and chairman of the executive committee, Tax Foundation, Inc.; director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

VICE PRESIDENTS

Christopher J. Abbott, Hyannis, Nebr., cattleman and banker, president, Guardian State Bank of Alliance, Nebr.; president, Bank of Chadron, Nebr.; president, Farmers' State Bank of Winner, S. Dak.; president, Bank of Hyannis, Nebr.; president, Abbott Co.; president, Stanaple-Engel Co.; director, Northwest Bell Telephone Co.; former director and president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

John J. Hopkins, Washington, D. C., president and director, Electric Boat Co.; chairman of the board and director, Canadair, Ltd., of Montreal, Canada; director, Tide Water Associated Oil Co., New York City, N. Y.; director, Delarge Oil Co., Houston, Tex.; director, Lincoln Service Corp., Washington, D. C.; director, Dealers Credit, Ltd., Washington, D. C.; director, Manufacturers Credit Corp., Washington, D. C.

Robert L. Lund, St. Louis, Mo., industrialist, former official of the International Shoe Co.; founder and president of the Lund-Williams Co.; director, Lambert Pharmaceuticals Co.; director, St. Louis Lambert Pharmaceuticals Co.; director, Majestic Manufacturing Co.; past president, National Association of Manufacturers.

Fred A. Poor, Chicago, Ill., chairman of the board and director, Poor & Co.; chairman of the board and director, Ball Joint Reforming Co.; chairman of the board and director, Peerless Equipment Co.; chairman of the board and director, Kensington Steel Co.; director, Combustion Engineering Co., Inc.; director, J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis.

TREASURER

N. Baxter Jackson, New York City, N. Y., chairman of the board and director, Chemical Bank & Trust Co., New York; director, Chemical Safe Deposit Co.; director, North Star Insurance Co.; director, General Reinsurance Corp.; director, McCrory Stores Corp.; director, Home Life Insurance Co.; director, American Chicle Co.; director, United Stores Corp.; director, French-American Banking Corp.

TRUSTEES

C. J. Abbott, Hyannis, Nebr. (see vice presidents, above).

Henry P. Bristol, New York, N. Y., president and director, Bristol-Myers Co.; trustee, East River Savings Bank; trustee, Hamilton College; director, Irving Trust Co., New York City; director, Atlas Underwear Co.; chairman of the board and director, Bristol Laboratories; chairman of the board and director, Sun Tube Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Rubberset Co.

Lewis H. Brown, New York City, N. Y. (see chairman, above).

Fuller E. Callaway, Jr., La Grange, Ga.; president and trustee, Fuller E. Callaway Foundation; director, Cotton Textile Institute; director, American Cotton Manufacturers Association; trustee, Institute of Textile Technology; director, Cotton Manufacturers Association of Georgia; director, Georgia Hereford Association; trustee, Callaway Community Foundation; trustee, Georgia Tech Alumni Association; trustee, Callaway Education Association; trustee, Georgia Tech Research Institute.

Paul S. Clapp, New York, N. Y., former vice president, Columbia Gas & Electric Corp.; vice president, Ohio Fuel Gas Co.; vice president, Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.; vice president, Columbia Engineering Corp.; member, National Association of Manufacturers, member, Edison Electric Institute.

J. D. Stetson Coleman, Delray Beach, Fla.

John S. Coleman, Birmingham, Ala., president and director, Birmingham Trust National Bank; director, Alabama Great Southern Railroad; director, United States Cast Iron Pipe Co.; director, Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Co.

Carl P. Dennett, Boston, Mass., president and director, Capital Management, Inc.; director, Griffin Wheel Co.; director and member executive committee, First National Bank of Boston; director and member finance committee, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.; director, Florence Stove Co.; director, United-Carr Fastener Corp.; director, New

York Central Railroad System; director and member, Industrial Advisory Committee, Federal Reserve Bank (First Federal Reserve District).

Raoul E. Desvernine, Washington, D. C., partner, Pruitt, Desvernine & Coursen law firm; director and member executive committee, Washington Lawyers Trust Co.; director, Samson United Corp.; director, Doyle Manufacturing Corp.; former president, Crucible Steel Co.

Thomas Drever, Chicago, Ill., president and director, American Steel Foundries; chairman of the board and director, Griffin Wheel Co.; director, Griffin Engineering Co.; member executive committee and governing board, Railway Business Association; director, Harris Trust and Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill.; member executive committee and director, Institute of Gas Technology; chairman finance committee and trustee, Illinois Institute of Technology; director, Armour Research Foundation; member of governing body, National Industrial Conference Board, Inc.; director, Miehle Printing Press & Manufacturing Co., Chicago.

Alfred C. Fuller, Hartford, Conn., chairman of the board and director, Fuller Brush Co.

W. Harnischfeger, Milwaukee, Wis., president and director, Harnischfeger Corp.

Richard Harte, Parkersburg, W. Va., president and director, Ames Baldwin Wyoming Co.; director, Chicago, Wilmington & Franklin Coal Co.; director, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad; trustee, Marietta College.

John B. Hollister, Cincinnati, Ohio, partner, Taft, Stettinius & Hollister; member executive committee and director, New York Life Insurance Co.; vice president and director, Little Miami Railroad; director, Stearns & Foster Co.; director, Lima Hamilton Corp.; director, Fifth-Third Union Trust Co.; director, Sandusky Foundry & Machine Co.; director, Virginia Hot Springs Co.; director, Charleston Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.; director, Cincinnati Equitable Insurance Co.; director, Standard Brands, Inc.; director, Union Iron & Steel Co.; director, Chatfield & Woods Co.; director, Cincinnati Realty Corp.; director, Hamilton Corp.; director, Tri-State Ignition Corp.; vice president and director, Covington-Cincinnati Bridge Co.; member executive committee and director, William Powell Co.

Charles R. Hook, Middletown, Ohio, chairman of the board, Armco Steel, Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Armco International Corp.; member of advisory board, National Industrial Conference Board; member executive committee and director, American Iron & Steel Institute; member executive committee and director, National Association of Manufacturers; director, Westinghouse Electric Corp.; director, Equitable Life Assurance Society; director, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis, Louisville & Jeffersonville Bridge and Railroad.

John J. Hopkins, Washington, D. C. (see vice presidents, above).

B. E. Hutchinson, Detroit, Mich., vice president, chairman of finance committee and director of the Chrysler Corp.; director, National Bank of Detroit.

N. Baxter Jackson, New York City, N. Y. (see treasurer, above).

Oswald W. Knauth, New York City, N. Y., director, National Bureau of Economic Research; trustee, Twentieth Century Fund.

Edward H. Little, Jersey City, N. J., president, chairman executive committee and director, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co.

Robert L. Lund, St. Louis, Mo. (see vice president, above).

Hughston M. McBain, Chicago, Ill., president and director, Marshall Field & Co.; president and director, Marshall Field & Co. of New Jersey; director, First National Bank of Chicago; director, Illinois Bell Telephone Co.; trustee, Frederick & Nelson, Inc., Seattle, Wash.

Walter S. McLucas, Detroit, Mich., director, Interstate Securities, Kansas City, Mo.; director, Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., Detroit, Mich.; director, Standard Accident Insurance Co.; director, Planet Insurance Co., of Detroit; director, National Cement Co., Birmingham, Ala.; director, Safe Deposit Co. of Detroit; director, Whittier Corp., Detroit; director, Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co.; director, Detroit Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; director, Detroit Steel Products Co., Detroit; director, Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad; director, Bendix Aviation Corp.

Harry S. Middendorf, Boston, Mass., with Wood Struthers & Co., Boston; secretary treasurer and director, Insuranshares Certificates, Inc.

Nicholas H. Noyes, Indianapolis, Ind., chairman finance committee and director, Eli Lilly & Co.; director, Paper Package Co.; director, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago; director, Indiana Bell Telephone Co.; member executive committee, American Drug Manufacturers Association; member, Business Advisory Council, United States Department of Commerce.

Fred A. Poor, Chicago, Ill. (see vice presidents, above).

Louis Ruthenburg, Evansville, Ind., president and director, Servel, Inc.

Henry D. Sharpe, Providence, R. I., president and director, Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co.; president and director, Puritan Life Insurance Co.; director, Providence Gas Co.; director, Rhode Island Trust Co.; director, Rhode Island Hospital National Bank; director, New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; director, Providence Journal; trustee, Rhode Island School of Design; trustee and chancellor, Brown University; trustee, Providence Institution for Savings.

Wilfred Sykes, Chicago, Ill., president and director, Inland Steel Co.; chairman of the board and director, Inland Steel Products Co.; chairman of the board and director, Inland Steel Container Co.; director, Joseph T. Ryerson & Son, Inc.; director, Inland Lime and Stone Co.; director, Pullman Co.; president and director, Indiana Harbor Homes Co.

Sinclair Weeks, Boston, Mass., chairman of the board, Reed & Barton Corp.; chairman of the board, United-Carr Fastener Corp.; director, First National Bank of Boston; director, West Point Manufacturing Co. of Boston; director, Rand Avery-Gordon Taylor Inc., Boston; director, Pacific Mills, Boston; director, Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston; director, National Association of Manufacturers, New York City; director, Atlas Plywood Co.; director, Pullman Co.; trustee, Wentworth Institute, Boston.

Ernest T. Weir, Pittsburgh, Pa., chairman of the board, member executive committee and director, National Steel Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Weirton Steel Co.; chairman of the board and director, Hanna Furnace Corp., New York; chairman of the board and director, National Steel Products Co.; chairman of the board, president and director, Midwest Steel Corp.; president and director, Bank of Weirton; president and director, Peoples Bank of Hollidays Cove, W. Va.; director, Weirton Steel Co.; director, Edgewater Steel Co.; director, Great Lakes Steel Corp.; director, Hanna Iron Ore Co.; director, Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railroad; director, Fidelity Trust Co.; director, National Association of Manufacturers; director, Weirton Improvement Co.; director, Oak Hill Supply Co.; director, Maurice & Laura Falk Foundation; director, American Iron and Steel Institute.

Charles M. White, Cleveland, Ohio, president and director, Republic Steel Corp.; president and director, Truscon Steel Co., Youngtown, Ohio; president and director, Union Drawn Steel Co., Ltd.; director, Fretz-Moon Tube Co., Inc., Butler, Pa.; director, James Manufacturing Co., Fort Atkinson, Wis.; director, Lake Champlain & Mariah Railroad, Cleveland; director, American Iron and Steel Institute; president and director, Republic Collieries Co., Cleveland; president and director, Susquehanna Ore Co., Cleveland.

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Paul H. Perreten.

"It Is Reported That Mr. Stalin Said, 'If the Peoples Were to Learn the Truth, There Would Be No New World War'—I Certainly Agree With That Statement"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, brings another battle report from Washington to the people of these United States.

Battle Report, Washington, the teledocumentary sent out over the air on the coaxial cables of the National Broadcasting Co., every Sunday afternoon, is now becoming one of the most popular and best known of all televised news programs. I, myself, never fail to tune in on channel four to hear it through to its conclusion without realizing that it is, as its name implies, a true report with respect to the most important incidents happening on the Washington front as of that time—from the Federal Government to the citizen taxpayers of this Nation.

Last Sunday, Dr. John R. Steelman brought to the microphone Mr. Homer M. Byington, Director of the Office of European Affairs of the State Department; Brig. Gen. Donald M. Yates, Director of Research and Development of the United States Air Force; Rear Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Deputy Chief of Staff to the Commander of the United States Naval Forces in the Far East, and Mr. Michael DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization.

Unlike the bombastic ravings done by Soviet officials—

Dr. Steelman said, in his opening statement—

these men will bring you the simple facts. It is fitting and proper and the way of freemen who live under a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, it was certainly heartening to hear Mr. Byington tell of the decline of Communist strength in Western Europe—and only today I read of the sabotage of the electric light plant in Peking—carried out in China by the anti-Communists in that communistic stronghold and capital. Certainly, Europe is witnessing an economic, but a moral, recovery of remarkable proportions—directly due to the fundamental aid and assistance afforded them by the Marshall plan.

Nevertheless, now with spring, comes the traditional rumblings of war talk from out of the Balkans—Marshall Tito

has already told of the hordes of Russian Communist soldiers and other troop movements that are seemingly directed toward Yugoslavia—and so, despite all that has been done, the world still moves toward global warfare.

Our own defenses, viewed in the light of the facts, reported by Brigadier General Yates of the United States Air Force, are particularly heartening. He told of a still newer type of aircraft—the United States Air Force B-52—announced last week by Secretary Finletter—which will provide our country with a strategic weapon of even greater capability and performance than the B-36, or any other plane now in existence. Only last week, Dr. Vannevar Bush stated it to be his opinion that the A-bomb and the ability of our Air Force to deliver it was the sole deterrent that kept the Red army from rolling at the time the Air Force started and successfully carried on the Berlin lift.

The United States Navy has no officer more distinguished, nor one with a more enviable record, than the Deputy Chief of Staff to the Commander of the United States Naval Forces in the Far East—Rear Adm. Arleigh A. Burke—31-knot Burke. Admiral Burke's word picture of the contribution which our Navy is making in the Far East to the Korean war was certainly a first-hand report to the people. His dramatic portrayal of naval action in Korean waters constitute one of the most dramatic highlights so far achieved on Battle Report, Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly do wish that every Member of this House would take time out to read the wonderfully clear and concise statement made by the Nation's Price Stabilizer. I know of no man under heaven that could have undertaken a more difficult task than that of pleasing every segment of this Nation's economy in his efforts to ward off or even control price inflation, than the Honorable Michael DiSalle, one of the Nation's finest public officials.

Mr. Speaker, now hear me well on this—if for no reason other than to make it possible for my colleagues to read of the objectives sought and of the problems confronting our price stabilization activities as expressed by the Price Stabilizer himself, the Honorable Michael DiSalle, I ask the unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and include in the RECORD of proceedings the twenty-eighth Battle Report, Washington.

This telecast reads as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. MCCORMICK. As the attention of this peace-loving Nation is forced by world events upon Operation Killer across the Pacific, NBC television once again brings its cameras into focus on the Nation's Capital for another "Operation Battle Report."

Washington, where the will to see this battle through is now fast being matched by the armament with which to do it, and Korea, where news comes that our arms are helping our troops to write new successes in the mud and mountains above Hoengsong.

Today, Battle Report's cameras greet a top official of our State Department—an Air Force general, a Navy admiral—and the Nation's Price Stabilizer. All this so that you may be better informed on the struggle for freedom, not only on the battle front, but elsewhere throughout the world, and here at home. But first, the man who this week helped bring peace to the Nation's railroads. The assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. This afternoon, I want to announce publicly that I agree wholeheartedly with one of the statements Premier Stalin made in his recent interview with representatives of Pravda. It has been reported that Mr. Stalin said, I quote, "If the peoples were to learn the truth, there would be no new world war."

I certainly agree with that statement. Furthermore, practically everyone in the free world also agrees with it.

Unfortunately, however, there are many millions of persons who are not permitted to learn the truth. They are imprisoned behind the iron curtain. They are spied upon by ruthless secret police. They jeopardize their very lives if they listen to a broadcast or read a newspaper which has not been approved by the tyrants in the Kremlin. And, what sort of information do they get from their own radio stations and newspapers? Men of the free world are called criminal imperialists; we are pictured as warmongers who are planning the destruction of our fellow men, particularly those in the Soviet Union, our people are described as wretched slaves, half-starved, poorly clothed, and scourged by the lash of money-mad tyrants. Day in and day out the cowardly propaganda pours forth, teaching hatred, preying upon every human weakness, and filling the minds of men with falsehoods. Yet, Mr. Stalin is right. If the Russian people were told the truth, there would be no new world war. They would soon learn that the truth shall make them free and there is nothing a tyrant fears more than freemen.

This afternoon, we have four distinguished visitors. First, we will hear from Mr. Homer M. Byington, Director, Office of European Affairs of the Department of State. He has some encouraging news for us from Western Europe, which has just been received. Brig. Gen. Donald N. Yates, of Research and Development for the Air Force, will tell us of the progress being made in building the greatest air defense in the world. Rear Adm. Arleigh A. Burke is known to most of you as 31-knot Burke. He has just returned from the Pacific and will bring us up to date on the Navy's activities in the waters around Korea. Our fourth guest has one of the most difficult jobs in Washington. He is Mr. Michael DiSalle, Director of Office of Price Stabilization. During the past week, Mr. DiSalle has issued some very important orders and he is here to tell us what they mean to us, the consumers.

Unlike the bombastic ravings done by Soviet officials, these men will bring you the simple facts. It is fitting and proper—and the way of freemen who live under a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Continuing the UN offensive that began Wednesday, United States troops on the central front pursue the enemy beyond strategic Hoengsong and run into fierce resistance. On the flanks—the Ninth Corps in the west and the Tenth in the east—more up under fire to keep the UN line straight. The Reds we fight are not all in Korea, however. Throughout Europe in the past months—marching, demonstrating, rioting—they, like the puppets, have been acting up every time Moscow pulled the strings. These scenes are from the rehearsed spontaneous demonstrations that greeted General Eisenhower's survey of Western Europe's strength. But, much like a barking dog, it's beginning to look as if the noise they make is far out of proportion to their bite. And here to testify on that score is the State Department's Director of the Office of European Affairs, Homer M. Byington.

Mr. BYINGTON. Communist strength in Western Europe is declining. I am only able to give you estimates. These are the figures, and they speak for themselves: Belgium, 1946, 100,000—today, 35,000; Denmark, 37 percent of 1946; France, down 30 percent; Western Germany, down 34 percent; Austria, down 34 percent; Italy, the Communists admit a loss of 200,000. A reliable estimate places their loss at over half a million. Defections from the Italian Communist Party are now in the headlines; Luxemburg, down 64 percent; Netherlands, 1946, 50,000—now 33,000; Norway, down 68 percent; Sweden, down 45 percent; United Kingdom, in 1946, only 60,000 members—today, 40,000.

The followers of Stalin are losing ground despite the glitter of their false promises, strong-arm tactics, threats, and pressures of all kinds.

We are witnessing an economic and moral recovery in Western Europe of remarkable proportions. In 1945, international communism seemed ready to take over. Today, we find that the living conditions of the people have greatly improved and that democratic government, where it was once weak, has been strengthened. This is proof of the moral fiber and intelligence of these peoples and their leaders. It justifies our confidence that in the next 5 years the picture will be correspondingly better than it is today.

The part of the American people in this recovery is fundamental. With the aid of the Marshall plan, Western Europe has rebuilt its industry, made its railroads run again, and resumed its important role in the world economy.

We are now joined with them in a great military effort to confront the threat of Communist aggression. Only by achieving united moral and military strength can we hope to prevent aggression and ensure an enduring peace. Korea has shown that small free nations are no longer to be devoured one by one and that aggression does not and will not pay.

International Communists are using every propaganda trick in the book to undermine the free nations. At the same time, they hold out a completely false exaggerated picture of their own aims and way of life. The Department of State has undertaken to counter these lies with a campaign of truth through the Voice of America, overseas press, films, and libraries. Between the United States and these free nations, there is a continuing exchange of teachers, students, leaders of labor, industry, and government. These activities are a very important part of American foreign policy.

The encouraging report I bring you today is a tribute to the peoples of Western Europe who, although directly in the path of Communist aggression, nevertheless are growing stronger and better able to resist the Communist danger. It is also a tribute to you, the American people, who through the Marshall plan and North Atlantic Treaty, have had the courage and foresight to undertake the responsibility of leadership in preserving the free world.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Strafing, rocketing, and dropping their napalm bombs, United States jet planes swarmed over northwest Korea this week end, smashing at enemy supplies moving forward toward the front. All along the battle line they lent close air support to our ground troops, and tangled with Russian MIG's whenever the opportunity presented itself. And they have made the Reds very wary of the famous "Tiny Tim" rocket, which they have learned to use with deadly accuracy. But Tiny Tim is less than a baby brother to this giant rocket, ready for its test somewhere in the Nation. As it zooms into the air with its promise of greater American might to meet any future challenge to our security, Battle Report turns its cameras on the Director of Research and Development for the Air Force. His subject, The Development of New Air Power. His name, Brig. Gen. Donald N. Yates.

Brigadier General YATES. Plans to embrace production of a new aircraft, the B-52, were announced last week by the Secretary

of the Air Force, Mr. Finletter. It is expected that the B-52 will perform an extremely important role by providing us with a strategic weapon of greater capability than any now in existence. How does it happen that such a plane is available? Is it simply the result of chance? Definitely not. Whenever you see a new airplane streaking overhead remember that plane represents about 5 years of hard work by thousands of people—designers, engineers, specialists in every field from fuels to aerodynamics.

The Air Force conducts a vigorous research and development program. This effort is directed in 10 major categories and objectives. The first of these is basic research. Nearly all great inventions have their origin in undirected investigation in the fields of pure science. For example, the atom bomb is a direct result of intensive research in the field of nuclear physics.

The second area is applied research. In working for the Air Force the applied scientist becomes both a military philosopher and strategist. Using the results of basic research, his aim is to obtain, at a minimum cost, the most effective weapons and weapons systems.

Next comes quite an obvious objective—flight at greatly increased speeds coupled with the efficient transport of heavier loads. Here aircraft design and power-plant development are the fundamental problems. We have progressed from supersonic speeds throughout the field of manned and unmanned aircraft. Our ranges are increasing along with our capacity for heavier loads.

A fourth area includes the location, recognition, and hitting of targets. In this field our principal problem involves overcoming the obstacles of bad weather and darkness.

Next come the means of target destruction. Some targets are attacked best by penetrating bombs, others by air bursts, and still others may require lateral dispersion. We are working on new types of war heads and fuses for both our bombs and guided missiles.

Our sixth objective is to be able to operate regardless of weather and darkness. Weather can't be ignored, but means can be devised to fly around, through, or over it with minimum interference. The most serious problem is still taking off and landing. The Berlin airlift stimulated considerable progress in this field. As to the prediction of weather, our geophysical-research program is endeavoring to cut down the ever-present error.

Our seventh problem is the defeat of enemy interference. An efficient retaliatory striking force must incorporate adequate defensive qualities. Fighters, rockets, and missiles can be utilized to overcome enemy interference. Development continues in these fields.

Our eighth problem is the perfection of communications. The required integration of any large-scale air operation demands the refinement of communications systems to be adequate in range, clear in reception, and to offer the opposing force a minimum prospect of successful interception.

Our ninth problem is the defense of home territory. Although a constantly modernized long-range strategic air force-in-being constitutes our hope for peace by deterring aggression, we must continue to develop our radar network, interceptor planes, guided missiles, all integrated into a more efficient air defense system.

Lastly, we are faced with the problem involving efficient utilization of human resources. Efficient use of our manpower must substitute for numerical superiority. Simplicity of operation, coupled with the right man in the job, is our aim.

In these areas I have mentioned, the Air Force, along with the Army and Navy, is working closely with science and industry. This team—science, industry, and the military forces, is concentrating today on the weapons of tomorrow, working to insure the technological superiority so essential to the defense of the Nation.

Mr. McCORMICK. Against this backdrop of destroyer activity in World War II, we bring you our next guest, a man with one of the most enviable records in the United States Navy. Former commander of the destroyer squadron known as "Little Beavers." He covered the landing at Bougainville in 1943 and, subsequently, participated in 22 separate engagements. His decorations testify to the character of service. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, Navy Cross, Legion of Merit, Presidential Unit Citation, Silver Star, Purple Heart, and commended for his "extraordinary heroism." He has just returned from Korea where his ships—as you see them here bombarding the coast—helped make life on shore decidedly unhealthy for the Communist Chinese.

For a report on the Navy in Korean waters, we proudly present the Deputy Chief of Staff to the Commander of the United States Naval Forces in the Far East, Rear Adm. Arleigh A. (31-Knot) Burke.

Real Admiral BURKE. I am glad for this chance to talk to you of the television audience about your Navy in the Far East. In Korea, the time is 5:15 in the morning. As I speak to you, Navy planes are warming up on the flight decks of carriers off Korea, preparing to take off at dawn. Guns of Navy ships offshore are blasting coastal targets.

Tomorrow morning, you will read in your paper, or hear on the radio, that Navy planes loaded with napalm and rockets flew so many sorties and destroyed so many warehouses, or killed so many enemy troops. You will read that Navy guns damaged so many bridges or dispersed so many troop concentrations.

From day to day, that is the picture you get of your Navy in action off Korea. But that is not the complete picture. We are proud of what our planes and guns have done and are doing, but they are, after all, only a part of the total Navy effort.

To control and exploit control of the seas around Korea we have a Navy and Marine force numbering more than 90,000 men. Broadly speaking, the forces afloat consist of the Seventh Fleet, commanded by Vice Admiral Struble and three major task forces—Task Force 77, 90, and 95. Task Force 77 is our main striking force—our Sunday punch. Task Force 90 is our amphibious force. Task Force 95 is our blockade and escort force. The blockade and escort force includes our mine-sweeping fleet and the ships of eight nations. The fleet is able to stay at sea day in and day out without returning to port because of another force—the service force. This is the force that serves as a giant floating supermarket, service station, department store, and ammunition depot. Then, of course, we have our sea- and land-based patrol squadrons—the eyes of the fleet.

Since seven-tenths of the earth's surface is covered by water, control of the seas will always be important. In Korea, it is particularly important because we are fighting over and on a peninsula from an island base. All but a negligible number of men and amount of equipment has been delivered in Korea by sea. The flow is unobstructed because we control the seas and are prepared to deal with any threat to that control. The sea is the main highway over which we project our military power.

From the 3d of July our carriers have roamed at will, carrying the fight to the enemy—destroying his forces and his means of waging war. Our surface forces have completely dominated the coasts of Korea, denying the enemy not only the sea but also the use of his important coastal roads and railroads. We have forced him to fight inland. We have forced him to rely on notoriously inadequate inland roads and railroads to resupply his forces. The enemy may move out of range of our guns, but he cannot move out of range of our carrier-based aircraft, which have been attacking in almost continuous close and deep support of the Ground Forces.

Control of the seas and the air over the sea made Inchon possible. Control of the seas made Hungnam possible. It was at Hungnam that, for the first time in history, an entire army, with all of its equipment, was successfully redeployed by sea in the face of enemy pressure. The Navy and Marine amphibious assault at Inchon is already regarded as a classic in the projection of military power.

The mere presence of our sea power is a threat with which the enemy must contend, and against which he must plan and deploy his forces.

You may be proud of the job the men of the Navy and Marine Corps are doing in Korea. However, I don't think any of them, regardless of how hard he fights or how long he works, feels that he is giving or doing any more than the hour demands. In the fight against communism we will always be at battle stations.

Mr. McCORMICK. Scene: Korea. In the midst of a big push trucks drive up to provide tanks with the supplies they'll need to do business, namely, fuel and ammunition. But as more war goods find their way to the right places in Korea, here at home the supply-and-demand story is just a wee bit different. Here, for example, you see huge supplies of tender cuts of meat cramming New York's meat-packing houses. Reason: Housewives, who'd love to serve some for dinner, are boycotting the butcher because of high prices. Though porterhouse and sirloin steak has fallen a nickel a pound as a consequence, the dealer's "beef" is he can't make a profit, for, while his prices have been frozen, the prices he must pay for livestock have not. Mike DiSalle, the Nation's Price Stabilizer, is here with us today. Just this week he announced new margin-type orders to put prices on a fairer and more equitable basis than the last freeze. As these orders go into effect, from coast to coast, the cash register continues to chime this all-too-familiar story.

Mr. DiSalle, I've heard an awful lot of complaints because you picked February 24 as the date—the model date—by which you judge margins. Now, why didn't you pick a pre-Korean War date? Was February 24 really very fair?

Mr. DISALLE. Well, Bob, first of all, by way of background, you remember that night not quite 5 weeks ago that I dashed into this studio just a few minutes after issuing the general freeze order? At that time, we knew that we were going to have to issue some tailored regulations to fit various segments of business. The regulation issued last week was one of those regulations. These regulations, of a highly technical nature, are very complex. You attempt to cover, in one regulation, the annual volume of business, $30,000,000,000, and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of items—they can't be very simple, and I'd like to compare those regulations with the refrigerator that you might have in your own kitchen. We know that as long as it operates you just plug it in and it works, but how it operates, very few of us know as individuals. If something goes wrong, we get a technician to fix it up. Now, the regulation is a technical regulation. We have our technicians to write them and to fix them up in case something goes wrong. Now, in attempting to achieve a fair and equitable type of regulation, the margin of control regulations for non-food retailers, we had to get an accurate picture of what we were attempting to control. A good many items just leave the market from day to day. And so, in an attempt to fix a fair margin regulation, we couldn't go back to the period prior to Korea because we couldn't get an accurate picture of what the retailer had on his shelves at that time. And so, the only way you can take a photograph of anything is to take the photograph of the things that you have before you. So we picked February 24 in order to get a picture of those items that we were attempting to control. We required the retailer to list each one of those items, his cost, and his mark-up. Then we asked him to file with us his average margin or his initial mark-up on items that existed in the year prior to Korea.

That's from June 1949 to June 1950. Then we asked him to file, alongside of that, his present average margin or initial mark-ups, or whatever records he may have available. Then we have three different techniques that we think are practical in restoring pre-Korea mark-ups. First of all we feel that the retailer, rather than file with us an abnormal mark-up, will restore his mark-up to the pre-Korea period. Secondly, if he doesn't, we have the authority to do so, and we will—either by department or by store. Thirdly, if we find generally that the mark-ups are great, we can reduce by a specified percentage the entire percentage that is now permitted. And so we feel that we have an effective and enforceable means of price controls that will enable us to do a better job than if we had attempted to take some sort of phony picture that was brought in to us and we have no way of checking.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will you actually crack down on some of these people if you find they're completely out of line?

Mr. DISALLE. There isn't any question about it, Bob. We're here to do a job and we're going to do a job.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, I'd like to ask you something else, too. Do you think this is going to mean that there will be more consumer goods and legitimate business houses at legitimate prices? In other words, will there be less black markets?

Mr. DISALLE. We're definitely convinced that this type of regulation will produce that result. Already, since January 25, when we issued our general freeze, retailers were keeping off the shelf those items which they were unable to sell at a reasonable profit. This retail mark-up regulation will bring those items back out on the shelves. It will enable us to do a better enforcement job, better able to restore the ordinary course of business, and it will furnish the consumer much greater protection than some sort of a regulation that we were not able to enforce ourselves, or that would require some unusual or unnecessary work on the part of the retailer.

Mr. McCORMICK. You use that word—reasonable. Are the retailers convinced that this is a reasonable margin that you're giving them?

Mr. DISALLE. Well, we feel that since laborers complained about it and since the retailers complained about it that the public will no doubt be served properly by the regulations.

Mr. McCORMICK. Has the public complained yet?

Mr. DISALLE. Well, we've had complaints, but mostly from people who haven't taken the time to analyze the regulation or to understand its working effect.

Mr. McCORMICK. Could you tell us as a practical matter—will this mean very much in the way of roll-backs, or aren't roll-backs really desirable?

Mr. DISALLE. Well, yes; roll-backs are desirable, and we feel in most cases where there have been abnormal mark-ups, this will mean indefinite roll-backs.

Mr. McCORMICK. In other words, it is only in the places where they have been badly out of line there will be any roll-backs?

Mr. DISALLE. That's right; and that's the only place where there should be roll-backs.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, thank you very much, Mr. DiSalle. I'm sure, whether we agree or not, we now know more than we did.

Migratory Farm Workers Need Real Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted the following statement to the Committee on Agriculture. I understand it has not been included in the record of hearings held by that committee, relative to migratory farm workers. While I have been promised a hearing at a later date on H. R. 2955, I believe that the views expressed in my statement may be of interest to the Members of the House, should the Agriculture Committee report favorably on H. R. 3048 before holding hearings on H. R. 2955.

STATEMENT OF SAMUEL WILLIAM YORTY RELATIVE TO H. R. 2955, THE DEFENSE FARM LABOR ACT OF 1951, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in order to keep the record straight, I am submitting herewith a copy of a letter addressed to me by the distinguished chairman of this committee, dated March 9, and my reply of March 12.

As stated in the correspondence, the notice to me was entirely too short to permit me to bring witnesses from California for the purpose of presenting an analysis of the farm-labor problem as we see it. Although the Governor of California was desirous of cooperating and was willing to send a representative, this could not be arranged on such short notice, and I would need at least 10 days' notice to insure attendance of California witnesses whom I think the committee should hear.

I wish to reiterate the fact that Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, rule XI (I)(g), seems to clearly require that H. R. 2955 be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Said committee has jurisdiction over wages and hours of labor, regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract, child labor, labor statistics, labor standards, and welfare of miners. It seems to me the plain wording of the act leaves no room for doubt concerning the jurisdiction of the Labor Committee over the subject matter of H. R. 2955. Furthermore, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, as set forth in that rule, does not include the subject matter of H. R. 2955. I therefore respectfully request that the committee have the bill rereferred to the Committee on Education and Labor, where it clearly belongs.

The plight of the migratory farm worker, as I have seen it in my own State, is a disgrace to the Nation. These people are treated with far less consideration than farm animals, and it is particularly distressing to see the condition of children who are not receiving proper education, medical attention, or even proper nutrition, although working in the midst of the rich agricultural areas. The whole system of handling migratory labor has created nothing but misery, hostility, and social tensions. It seems unbelievable that we have delayed this long in attempting a real solution of this problem in spite of the fact that the conditions that exist today have been prevalent for many years. To say that we have been un-Christian and calloused in permitting the situation to exist is to put the matter mildly indeed. If we should deliberately set out to drive a group of people into the arms of the subversive forces who exploit class antagonisms, we could not do a more effective job than we are doing in glossing over or ignoring the human equations involved in the migratory farm labor problem.

In California last year, the Governor appointed a committee to survey the agricultural labor resources of the San Joaquin Valley. The executive director of this committee was Dr. Paul Prasow, whom I had hoped to bring here to testify relative to H. R. 2955. Dr. Prasow was very anxious to come but could not arrange to do so because of the shortness of the notice that I was able to give him. The committee, which was representative of all phases of California life, held a number of hearings in the San Joaquin Valley, and if anything was evident, it was the fact that the migratory farm labor problem must be handled on a national level because of the interstate movement of the workers. No single State can control the enticing advertisements placed in the papers of other States, such as those which appeared in some Southern States describing the "gold row" in the San Joaquin Valley of California. These advertisements do not tell the whole story. They omit the fact that the work is highly seasonal. One cannot help feel that some of the advertisements stem from a desire to have an oversupply of farm labor on hand at the farms to suit the selfish purposes of some of the employers. Obviously, this condition requires control at the national level.

The lack of protection for migratory farm workers and their children is too well known to everyone to require detailed reiteration. Farm workers are not protected by the National Labor Relations Act. Most of them are not covered by social security or State unemployment insurance systems. They are buffeted about on the economic tides without any anchor or semblance of security.

California suffers from a lack of enforcement of the immigration laws, both in the matter of the exclusion of illegal aliens and in the enforcement against employers who violate the law by knowingly harboring aliens illegally in this country. Among the so-called "wet-backs" are many who shuttle back and forth across the border as they are repeatedly apprehended and returned to Mexico, only to turn around and reenter the United States. The lax enforcement along this border permits the entry of subversive agents and is a real danger to the security of this Nation.

Among persons who have studied the migratory farm labor problem objectively, there is a growing feeling that the farm laborers desiring to settle in a locality are actually discriminated against and discouraged by employers who prefer migratory laborers not apt to become a political force in a community or to obtain the benefits of collective bargaining and union protection.

Labor contractors who recruit migratory workers must be placed under Federal control in order to correct their activities which are, in many cases, interstate in scope, and therefore partly or wholly beyond the jurisdiction of any one State.

It is my feeling that if farm labor conditions were sufficiently improved along the lines proposed in H. R. 2955, a much greater supply of farm labor could be obtained within the United States. As long as American farm workers are treated as outcasts, it is obvious that they will abandon farm labor as fast as they can possibly do so. As pointed out by Clarence J. McCormick, Undersecretary of Agriculture, in his statement to this committee, "the average cash farm wage in 1950 was about 56 cents per hour. While this was more than 3 times the average wage for the 1935–39 period, it was still only 38 percent of the average factory wage of $1.46 an hour prevailing last year."

The report of our own Joint Committee on the Economic Report filed last month contains the following significant statement on page 19:

"Farm people who go into the migratory labor force do so from lack of better opportunity and then merely change to another and less secure type of underemployment. According to the survey previously mentioned, the average number of days of employment for migratory workers over the country in 1949 was 101, 70 days in farm work, 31 more in nonfarm employment.

"Three factors enter into this underemployment. First, a period of several slack months when there is little seasonal employment to be found. Second, irregular and intermittent employment during the harvest season. Some harvests are oversupplied with workers, others last for such a brief period that the amount of work obtained by a worker is small. The third factor is too large a supply of workers for the amount of work available. Migratory workers compete with local seasonal and year-round workers for employment. The latter, too, then suffer from underemployment; during 1949 they had a total of 120 days employment of which 91 days were in farm work and 29 days in nonfarm jobs.[1]

"The earnings from the 101 days of farm work which the migratory workers obtained in 1949 amounted to an average of $514.[2] The value of housing, transportation, and other perquisites amounts to $36 more.[2] At an average of two workers per family, total family incomes averaged $1,028 cash or $1,000 with perquisites. This amount had to feed, clothe, shelter, and educate a family of four.

"Underemployment and low earnings are not the only problems among migratory farm workers. Poor housing, lack of sanitation and medical care, child labor, and educational retardation of the children, all tend to make them a disadvantaged group. They have little voice either in community, State, or national affairs and are unable to make effective demands to relieve their situation.

"Although they are most essential to meet peak-season demands for gathering in the national food supply, they are explicitly excluded from national legislation which protects and advances the rights of workers. Their position is the most precarious of any in our economy. They have no definable job rights and are so far removed from the employer group that they are unable to obtain redress for grievances.

"Rather than hire seasonal and migratory workers directly and individually, it is a widespread practice among farm employers to hire in crews through labor contractors, crew chiefs, or labor recruiters. In many areas it is virtually impossible for a worker to obtain a job directly from the farm employer. As a consequence of these practices, a farm worker has to pay heavily from his already-too-low earnings for the privilege of getting work to do.

"Under Executive Order No. 10129 of June 3, 1950, the President's Commission on Migratory Labor was created and directed to inquire into problems of migratory labor and to make recommendations for action, both legislative and administrative. The report of this Commission is scheduled to appear at an early date."

The report of the President's Commission referred to above has not yet been made public. I myself was a witness before this committee at its hearing in Los Angeles. The committee showed great patience and diligence in striving to understand the migratory farm-labor problem. I am sure the Congress would be well advised to withhold final action on any migratory farm-labor bills until the Members have had the opportunity to study the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission.

It is the contention of those interested in an efficient, sound national farm-labor program that we have the available means and manpower to produce the food and fabric necessary to our defense effort. It is maintained that if there is a need for foreign farm workers, then this need should be fairly determined at public hearings.

None of the most significant differences between the present situation and that at the beginning of World War II is found in the greater inventory of farm equipment and machinery at present, and the greater potentialities that exist for substitution of machinery for labor. The prospective increase between now and this time next year in the number of the mechanical cotton harvesters may reduce the number of cotton harvesters needed during the season by about 50,000. It is during the harvesting of the greatly expanded cotton acreage that the pinch in available manpower is likely to be felt more sharply in 1951. The increase in mechanization will not be confined to cotton harvests or areas. It will be a most important factor in the farm manpower situation next year.

(NOTE.—See Statement by Lewis J. Ducoff, Labor Economist, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, at the twenty-eighth annual Agricultural Economics Conference, Washington, D. C., November 2, 1950.)

The Sparkman committee report, referred to above, is an important document. In the words of Senator SPARKMAN, this report "points the way toward increasing our national labor force by 2,500,000 man-years. It concretely shows how a practical application can be made of point 4 know-how and show-how right here at home in many rural areas where output, productivity, and living standards are now distressingly low. In view of the critical manpower shortages likely to limit our output for defense in this emergency, I feel that practical suggestions for increasing the productivity of our rural underemployed ought to be given immediate consideration."

I should like to direct the attention of the committee to the following additional paragraphs from the said report: "There are approximately 1,200,000 male hired wage workers whose main activity is farm work. These hired wage workers were employed an average of 218 days at farm work and 14 days at nonfarm work in 1949 and earned an average of $960. Approximately half are married. (These families are in part included in the nonfarm families and are not included as a separate group in the statistical summary.)

"Underemployment among farm wage workers is a special problem. Partly because of days not worked and partly because of inefficient employment, these workers appear to be only about half as productive as workers on medium-sized commercial family farms."

I should also like to call the committee's attention to the fact that Puerto Rico has established a territorial employment service affiliated with the United States Employment Service. This move is intended to make available seventy-five to one hundred thousand surplus workers. I feel that if it is at all possible these American citizens should be utilized before noncitizens are brought into the country for farm work. The Puerto Ricans are loyal Americans, good workers, and because of the seasonal nature of the economy of their island, they are badly in need of additional employment opportunities.

The committee is no doubt familiar with the articles of Agnes Myers, of the Washington Post, printed October 6 to 12, 1947, which articles pointed out that the cost of the foreign farm-labor program to the taxpayers of the United States during the years 1943–47 was $84,000,000. According to the Farm Placement Service, foreign workers usually constitute less than 2 percent of each seasonal agricultural poll. One cannot help but feel that the same amount of money spent improving the conditions of American farm workers would constitute a better investment of taxpayers' money.

I hope the committee will see fit to act favorably on H. R. 2955, but I wish to repeat in closing that it appears from Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, that the bill should be considered by the Committee on Education and Labor.

UNITED STATES HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1951.

Hon. SAMUEL W. YORTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: While your name did not appear on the list of witnesses handed me by the committee staff, and apparently we have not received a request from you to be heard on your bill, H. R. 2955, which you introduced on February 27, the Committee on Agriculture has held hearings yesterday and all day today on proposed legislation dealing with that subject.

Assuming that you would want to appear in behalf of your bill, I announced at the beginning of the hearings that the committee would take up for consideration not only the bill introduced by Congressman POAGE, H. R. 3048, but would also take up and consider your bill and other proposals.

We had hoped to conclude the hearings on Monday, March 12, and that it might be possible for you to be heard on Monday. I understand, however, from Mrs. Clark that it will not be possible for you to appear at that time. Hearings will not be concluded, therefore, and I am scheduling a meeting on Wednesday, March 14, at 10 a. m., at which time the committee will be very glad to hear you and such witnesses as you may desire to present.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY.

MARCH 12, 1951.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Thank you very much for your letter of March 9 and your courtesy in scheduling a 1-day hearing on H. R. 2955 for Wednesday, March 14, at 10 a. m.

There evidently was some misunderstanding in connection with the hearings on this bill. It was my understanding that your committee had scheduled hearings only on the Poage bill, H. R. 3048, and my secretary was so informed by both Mr. POAGE and Mr. Parker when he appeared at your hearings on Thursday, March 8, having received a telephone call from your committee the previous day informing us that your committee would take up H. R. 2955 along with H. R. 3048.

I understand, however, that when you opened the hearing you did include H. R. 2955, although I was unable to be present due to the shortness of the notice and the necessity of my attendance at hearings by my own committee on a bill of vital concern to California.

The day following the opening of your hearings I asked my secretary to place a statement in the RECORD to clarify the situation and make it clear that we did not understand that we were expected to have people from California appear in Washington on only 1 day's notice. My secretary reported back that you informed him that we had notice from the RECORD. We have checked the RECORD and found the only reference to be to H. R. 3048.

I, of course, would need a more adequate notice in order to present effective testimony in support of H. R. 2955. Over the week end I tried to arrange to have at least one representative of California here before Wednesday. The Governor was anxious to cooperate by sending a representative who could discuss the farm-labor problem in California in a manner that I feel would be most helpful to the committee, but the Governor could not arrange to have his representative here before Monday of next week.

Although the Governor may not agree with all of the provisions of H. R. 2955, I believe he is in agreement with the need for interstate control of farm labor migration, and I think his representative would, in a general way, support the basic plan of H. R. 2955. At any rate, I am sure the committee would benefit from the testimony of the Governor's representative.

Pursuant to Public Law 601, rule XI (1)(g), 3, 5, 6, 8, and 13, it appears that H. R. 2955 should have been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and I shall appreciate the courtesy if you will ask that the bill be rereferred to said committee. If, however, you feel that you wish me to present evidence before your committee, I shall do the best I can to obtain statements for filing with the committee, although I cannot on such short notice arrange for the presence of the witnesses I had hoped to make available. The importance of the subject would seem to merit full hearings and more sufficient notice to those interested.

I fully realize the heavy amount of work your committee is called upon to do, and shall try to reciprocate your kindness in scheduling the Wednesday hearing by making the statements as brief as possible.

The President's Commission is due to report soon, and it seems quite likely that the Commission may make some suggestions that will help all of us who are concerned with the farm labor problem. I had hoped that your committee would not take final action before reviewing the recommendation of the President's Commission.

With kindest regards.
Sincerely,

SAM YORTY,
Member of Congress.

---

[1] Migratory Farm Workers in 1949, Louis Ducoff, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1949.

[2] Perquisites Furnished Hired Farm Workers, Barbara B. Reagan, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1945.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of a questionnaire I sent to several thousand citizens in the Seventeenth Ohio District. I am proud to represent this district in the Congress of the United States. The questions were concerned with major national and international problems facing Congress today. I wanted to find out how a cross section of my constituents felt on these issues.

I regret I could not send a questionnaire to every citizen in the district, but I believe the replies I have received are the opinions of the majority of those I represent.

Question sheets were sent to almost every occupational group: Republican and Democratic committeemen and women, laborers, attorneys, barbers, housewives, public office holders and Government employees, salesmen, retired men and women, ministers, college and high school students and their instructors. Also included were those working in business and industry, newspaper, radio, and professional positions.

Approximately 3,000 blanks were mailed to individuals and reproductions of the questionnaire were published in nearly all of the 20 daily and weekly newspapers in my district.

Returns of over 3,000 completed forms, with over a third of these containing comments on the question, proves to me that the average citizen is interested in the vital issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them. I am very pleased so many took the time to write and attach letters and notes to the questionnaire enlarging upon their answers.

The population in my district is composed of about half rural and half urban residents. Nearly all of the labor and farm organizations are represented as well as large and small business. There are also two colleges and two universities.

It is not often that a Congressman can obtain a true picture of such an evenly divided district, but through the questionnaire method, I feel I have gained the majority opinions of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you think Communist China should be given a seat in the United Nations? Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Do you favor the drafting of 18-year-olds into the armed services? Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Do you favor the drafting of veterans? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Do you think the United States should put into effect a system of universal military service training for all men reaching the age of 18? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Do you favor drafting of civilian men and women for jobs in war production in the event of an all-out war? Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Do you advocate immediate "across the board" Government regulation of prices, wages and rents? Yes ☐ No ☐

7. With which one of the following advocated foreign policies do you agree:

(a) The United States should pull out of Europe and build up a Gibraltar of military strength in the Western Hemisphere? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) Europe is our first line of defense and should be defended with American weapons and manpower? Yes ☐ No ☐

(c) We should strike a medium between the above two policies by advocating full cooperation with the European nations by providing men and guns if they show they are willing to fight in their own defense and assume a proportionate share of such endeavors? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Do you favor:

(a) The removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) If the answer to the above question is "Yes," who would you suggest should take his place? _____

9. Do you think the United States should use the atomic bomb in Korea or other possible danger spots? Yes ☐ No ☐

10. Would you be willing to have your taxes increased by 30 percent in order to establish a pay-as-you-go tax plan to compensate for the proposed budget increases? Yes ☐ No ☐

Signature _____
Address _____
Occupation _____

Please write any comments you might have on the above questions and return this sheet to J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, 1434 New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 1: Do you think Communist China should be given a seat in the United Nations?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	13	87
Attorneys	11	89
Barbers	24	76
Business, industry, salesmen	8	92
Farmers	6	94
Groups	16	84
Housewives	10	90
Labor	10	90
Ministers	33	67
Newspaper and radio	10	90
Occupation not given	15	85
Professionals	9	91
Public officeholders	8	92
Retired	4	96
School teachers	3	97

Question 2: Do you favor the drafting of 18-year-olds into the armed services?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	48	52
Attorneys	62	38
Barbers	48	52
Business, industry, salesmen	59	41
Farmers	35	65
Groups	46	54
Housewives	35	65
Labor	53	47
Ministers	50	50
Newspaper and radio	70	30
Occupation not given	45	55
Professionals	59	41
Public officeholders	57	43
Retired	37	63
School teachers	56	44

Question 3: Do you favor the drafting of veterans?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	38	62
Attorneys	54	46
Barbers	23	77
Business, industry, salesmen	38	62
Farmers	38	62
Groups	36	64
Housewives	35	65
Labor	30	70
Ministers	71	29
Newspaper and radio	44	56
Occupation not given	34	66
Professionals	45	55
Public officeholders	30	65
Retired	39	61
School teachers	47	53

Question 4: Do you think the United States should put into effect a system of universal military service training for all men reaching the age of 18?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	67	33
Attorneys	74	26
Barbers	62	38
Business, industry, salesmen	77	23
Farmers	44	56
Groups	69	31
Housewives	60	40
Labor	69	31
Ministers	44	56
Newspaper and radio	70	30
Occupation not given	73	27
Professionals	77	23
Public officeholders	76	24
Retired	56	44
School teachers	70	30

Question 5: Do you favor drafting of civilian men and women for jobs in war production in the event of an all-out war?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 59	*Percent* 41
Attorneys	72	28
Barbers	75	25
Business, industry, salesmen	60	40
Farmers	56	44
Groups	55	45
Housewives	58	42
Labor	54	46
Ministers	50	50
Newspaper and radio	60	40
Occupation not given	65	35
Professionals	78	22
Public office holders	62	38
Retired	79	21
School teachers	65	35

Question 6: Do you advocate immediate across-the-board Government regulation of prices, wages, and rents?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 62	*Percent* 38
Attorneys	70	30
Barbers	80	20
Business, industry, salesmen	63	37
Farmers	36	64
Groups	68	32
Housewives	58	42
Labor	65	35
Ministers	78	22
Newspaper and radio	70	30
Occupation not given	61	39
Professionals	66	34
Public officeholders	58	42
Retired	59	41
School teachers	59	41

Question 7. With which one of the following advocated foreign policies do you agree?

(a) The United States should pull out of Europe and build up a Gibraltar of military strength in the Western Hemisphere?

(b) Europe is our first line of defense and should be defended with American weapons and manpower?

(c) We should strike a medium between the above two policies by advocating full cooperation with the European nations by providing men and guns if they show they are willing to fight in their own defense and assume a proportionate share of such endeavors?

	A	B	C
Total replies	*Percent* 13	*Percent* 10	*Percent* 77
Attorneys	17	15	68
Barbers	24	0	76
Business, industry, salesmen	19	4	77
Farmers	17	3	80
Groups	7	17	76
Housewives	22	3	75
Labor	21	5	74
Ministers	0	0	100
Newspaper and radio	0	10	90
Occupation not given	17	4	79
Professionals	10	3	87
Public officeholders	18	4	78
Retired	24	5	71
School teachers	12	6	82

Question 8-A: Do you favor the removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 79	*Percent* 38
Attorneys	66	34
Barbers	72	28
Business, industry, salesmen	88	12
Farmers	82	18
Groups	48	52
Housewives	84	16
Labor	79	21
Ministers	57	43
Newspaper and radio	80	20
Occupation not given	80	20
Professionals	88	12
Public officeholders	84	16
Retired	84	16
School teachers	73	27

Question 8-B: If the answer to the above question is "Yes," who would you suggest should take his place?

	No choice	Submitted name
Total replies	*Percent* 63	*Percent* 37
Attorneys	68	32
Barbers	69	31
Business, industry, salesmen	55	45
Farmers	61	39
Groups	(1)	(1)
Housewives	53	47
Labor	60	40
Ministers	25	75
Newspaper and radio	25	75
Occupation not given	41	59
Professionals	52	48
Public officeholders	50	50
Retired	52	48
School teachers	42	58

[1] No indication.

Question 9: Do you think the United States should use the atomic bomb in Korea or other possible danger spots?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 45	*Percent* 55
Attorneys	39	61
Barbers	47	53
Business, industry, salesmen	51	49
Farmers	58	42
Groups	37	63
Housewives	47	53
Labor	58	42
Ministers	13	87
Newspaper and radio	56	44
Occupation not given	51	49
Professionals	41	59
Public officeholders	60	40
Retired	57	43
School teachers	44	56

Question 10: Would you be willing to have your taxes increased by 30 percent in order to establish a pay-as-you-go tax plan to compensate for the proposed budget increases?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 36	*Percent* 64
Attorneys	69	31
Barbers	10	90
Business, industry, salesmen	37	63
Farmers	33	67
Groups	34	66
Housewives	23	77
Labor	38	62
Ministers	29	71
Newspaper and radio	44	56
Occupation not given	43	57
Professionals	53	47
Public officeholders	25	75
Retired	35	65
School teachers	54	46

Oil Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks a statement filed by me with the Ways and Means Committee relating to the proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce the 27½-percent rate on oil depletion to 15 percent. Such a reduction would be ruinous to 23,000 stripper oil wells in New York State. The statement filed with the Ways and Means Committee is as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DANIEL A. REED, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, due to the fact that I was necessarily absent on the occasion of the hearing on the oil and gas depletion question, I ask unanimous consent to file with the committee the following remarks on that very important subject:

As a Member of the Congress from New York I represent the Forty-fifth District, which is composed of Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and Allegany Counties. These are among 21 counties of western and central New York in which the oil industry is a vital economic factor. Oil contributes greatly to the welfare of virtually all communities in my district.

I am vitally concerned with the Treasury's recommendation to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowance to 15 percent because the oil industry of New York is fighting great odds for survival even with the present 27½-percent rate. Consider the fact that New York State oil production is 100 percent in the "stripper well" class. New York has some 23,000 such wells which produce less than 12,000 barrels of oil daily. This is approximately one-half barrel per well a day.

It does not require involved mathematics to realize that such wells return a very narrow margin of profit. In our national petroleum supply picture they appear insignificant. But they produce high-grade Pennsylvania type crude from which our best lubricants are extracted. New York fields represent more than 77,000,000 barrels of reserves of this high-quality crude oil. I fear that most of this great oil reserve would never be produced if this committee followed the Treasury's proposal.

It is significant that the industry estimates only 13,000,000 barrels of oil will be recovered from New York fields by primary methods. This leaves more than 63,000,000 barrels of the total reserves to be recovered by expensive secondary recovery processes. These important secondary projects, many of them in the planning stage, would be destined for certain abandonment if producers were denied the historic incentives contained in the present depletion rate. This would not only be a death-dealing blow to hundreds whose livelihoods are dependent on the stripper production in my area but would be certain to deprive us of the use of that oil forever. I say that we are in no position to forfeit any portion of the fuel supply on which we are so vitally dependent for our very security.

New York is only one of 22 States in which stripper and secondary recovery wells would suffer from any reduction in the depletion rate. I am informed that 7,500,000,000 barrels, or nearly 25 percent of our total national petroleum reserves, are in the stripper well class. Stripper fields contain more than 313,000 wells which produced an average of 3.6 barrels a day in 1949. That production averages much less today.

Of primary importance in considering the need for the present depletion rate in operation of these marginal properties is this fact: More than four billion of the present stripper reserves can be recovered only by secondary methods. Secondary recovery actually is in its infancy. To date its results have come from the application of trial and error. It is a coming science to which many of our college engineering students will cast their lot in the future. Its importance cannot be overemphasized because of this point: all oil fields will ultimately be reduced to stripper production. Therefore, any tax legislation which would make secondary recovery an economic fool's play would discourage its application not only now, but in the future when we will be more than ever dependent upon ingenuity for recovery of a vast share of the oil with which our Nation has been so abundantly blessed.

Oil is basic to the economy of my district and throughout western New York. It employs thousands of engineers, researchers, laborers. Our stripper fields are a stimulus to the minds of those who are pioneering in new and improved methods of oil extraction. I do not need to describe to my colleagues on this committee the drastic results of any burdensome new tax legislation which would force these farsighted men to abandon the tasks which challenge their inventiveness. I emphasize again that we have barely scratched the surface in secondary recovery; we cannot afford by short-sighted taxation to dim the prospects of an activity which holds such great promise for full utilization of our great petroluem resources.

I have described to the best of my ability a great activity within the petroleum industry which would be eliminated, or drastically curtailed, by any reduction in the depletion rate. The 27½-percent rate of depletion has become as much a part of petroleum industry operations as the lease form, the drilling rig, the flow pipe. Congress has long since established it and reaffirmed it as such. It can be recognized as nothing short of the backbone of the financial structure of the industry.

Although the small stripper producers, and indeed the entire communities of my district, are vitally concerned with the Treasury's proposal, my concern goes far beyond that. In the last analysis, as I have said, the stripper fields of western New York are of no great significance. It is the discovery and availability of new oil horizons with which our Nation must necessarily concern itself in this grave period. Oil is truly our first line of defense. I have no doubt that the Russian armies would be rolling westward if our advantage over the Kremlin, oilwise, were reversed.

So, I submit to this committee that if the present rate of depletion is the deciding factor in whether or not the oil industry will venture expenses for secondary recovery of known reserves, then certainly it is a dominant factor in persuading our oil men to go out and search for new reserves with one chance in nine of being successful.

Of all the vital industries which deserves more encouragement, not less, I truly believe petroleum should head the list. I do not say this selfishly, but realistically. One of the greatest concerns of this Congress should be the building of a petroleum supply from reliable sources. In the type of conflict in which we would engage in a third world war, certainly no supply outside the United States, and possibly Canada and Mexico, would be reliable.

We are importing and using roughly a million barrels of oil a day at present, largely from South America and the Middle East. What would happen to that supply in case of open warfare is a matter for conjecture, but I dare say it could not be classed reliable. The Secretary of Interior has expressed the need for the oil industry to up its productive capacity by at least 1,000,000 barrels a day. It will require the discovery of billions of barrels of new reserves to insure this additional million barrels. Undiscovered oil cannot fill the bill.

If the Nation is to have adequate oil supplies securely available from within our own borders the domestic industry must have adequate funds with which to finance expanding exploration and development activities. The oil industry is an expanding industry. Year after year our economy requires more oil. And war after war our military machine becomes more dependent on oil which is a unique munition in that it is the sole energy source that provides the mobility of our modern war machine.

In considering Secretary Snyder's proposal to reduce the oil-depletion allowance we must face the fact that we are tampering with an industry that is vital to our way of life and to our security. We must face the fact that if we reduce the depletion allowance we will be reducing the ability of the oil industry to expand so as to meet rising consumer requirements. We must face the fact that the result will be less oil unless the industry secures the necessary financing through increased prices to the consuming public. This would be unfortunate. It would be a forced contribution to the inflationary spiral that we are endeavoring to combat.

Since percentage depletion was initiated in 1926, the price index of crude petroleum has been consistently lower than that of all other commodities. According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, using 1926 as the base period, the price index for crude oil today is 136 whereas the price index for all commodities is 183.

Comparing crude prices today with those existing in 1948 the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports show that crude prices have actually decreased by 0.8 percent, whereas the average of all commodities has increased 8.2 percent. A comparison of today's prices with those existing at the beginning of the Korean war is even more emphatic. Since the Korean war crude prices have increased 0.8 percent whereas textile products have increased 34 percent, chemical products 30 percent, foods 16 percent, building materials 13 percent, and the average of all commodities 17 percent.

At the same time, the retail price of gasoline, excluding taxes, is actually less by about 20 percent than in 1918 and approximately the same as in 1926, the year that percentage depletion was adopted. In addition, although the price of gasoline has not increased, the gasoline of today is far superior to that of 1918 and 1926. It is estimated that 2 gallons of today's gasoline is equivalent to 3 gallons in these former years.

The announced purpose of the Treasury Department's proposal to reduce the depletion allowance for oil is to increase the Federal revenue. It is doubtful, however, that increased revenue would result if the Treasury's recommendations were adopted for the reason that losses of revenue from other sources would be directly caused thereby. There would be reduced activity on the part of many drilling contractors, geological and geophysical companies, and other services and operations necessary to the exploration and development of petroleum reserves. The income of thousands of lease brokers and tens of thousands of farmers and land owners in the form of reduced lease bonuses, royalties, and rentals would also result in reduced revenues from these sources, more than offsetting any probable gain that is estimated to be collected from reduced depletion allowance. The Treasury's proposal would thus be self-defeating.

There is no doubt that the Treasury has been forced to search every possible source for new revenue at this time. However, it is the responsibility of the Ways and Means Committee to examine each of these proposals in the light of their impact upon our national economy and our national security. I cannot believe that this committee, which beyond doubt has the most difficult task that ever faced a committee of the Congress, could give approval to the administration recommendations regarding depletion. To do so would be to follow a course of self-destruction in a time which requires an extremely opposite course.

Walter E. Cosgriff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter I sent today to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. It is a letter in praise of Walter E. Cosgriff, a member of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The letter is self-explanatory, though I would like to reemphasize that Mr. Cosgriff is a man of high reputation, a banker known for his integrity throughout the Nation. I should also like to stress again that Mr. Cosgriff has in no way been connected with the RFC activities prior to last August, around which the current hearings revolve.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 15, 1951.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: I congratulate you for your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, February 26, 1951, dealing with the career of Walter E. Cosgriff, a Republican member of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

It is a fine statement about a remarkable man from your own State of Utah.

Mr. Cosgriff accepted his appointment to the RFC Board in the belief that he could help do a job on reorganization by revamping and improving the RFC. I am persuaded that Mr. Cosgriff only accepted the appointment last August when he was assured that he could throw his energies into such constructive channels. It is a most unhappy fact that his real progress has been obscured by the publicity and hullabalooo surrounding the negative and extremely unfortunate aspects of the current RFC headlines, all of which deal with events which transpired prior to Mr. Cosgriff's appointment.

I agree that a statement such as yours in the RECORD should be made to the Senate and to the people of the United States in order to clear up any possible misunderstanding about the role Mr. Cogrift has played in this work as a member of the RFC Board. I regret that I was not on the floor when you made the statement so that I could have, right then and there, wholeheartedly lent my support to your tribute to a man for whom I have high regard—not only a distinguished banker of Utah but of the Nation.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate.

The Great Soviet Encyclopedia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article about the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, which appears in the March 1 issue of the Daily Express of London.

The Soviet regime undertook early in the twenties to bring out a Soviet encyclopedia. Before the work was finished the Soviet version of political, historical, and scientific truth had undergone so many changes that they decided to start all over again. This new effort, which the Daily Express calls "Stalin's last word on everything" is to be in 50 volumes.

It takes its place in Russian life as the major work of reference, an instrument of education soon to be available in the libraries to hundreds of millions—

Says the Daily Express.

These extracts printed below tell their own story of what can happen when the mind of one great area of the world cuts itself off from the rest of civilization.

The extracts are entirely from the letter "A." The violent anti-Americanism found reflected in these quotations is not, we may be sure, an alphabetical accident; from all that we have seen of Soviet propaganda the chorus of hate will be equally evident in the remaining volumes as they come out.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXPRESS EXAMINES FIRST TWO VOLUMES OF THE GREAT SOVIET ENCYCLOPEDIA

Before you read below the Daily Express presents today a glimpse of Russia which tells a terrifying story, but one which is less surprising perhaps to those who have read George Orwell's famous novel of the future called 1984. In the totalitarian state Orwell describes, even history is rewritten so that all evidence of a world in any way at variance with the "party line" is completely removed. Now, in Russia, the first two volumes have been published of what is to be a vast 50-volume undertaking—the Russian parallel to the encyclopedias of the west. In a sense this publishing enterprise is Stalin's Last Word on Everything. It takes its place in Russian life as the major work of reference, an instrument of education soon to be available in the libraries to hundreds of millions. These extracts printed below tell their own story of what can happen when the "mind" of one great area of the world cuts itself off from the rest of civilization.

"A" IS FOR AGITATION

Quote No. 1 is headed Aghitazya:

The Russian Communist Party's Aghitazya (political agitation) is one of the most powerful means of educating the workers as Communists, and of heightening social consciousness.

Bolshevist propaganda is always just. Only the Communist Party has always openly spoken the truth, and the whole truth, to the people.

Every free hour and day every conscientious working man and woman must engage in political agitation. Speeches must be made at meetings, and with private individuals.

Utilizing the Russian Communist Party's experience, the People's Democracies are now agitating energetically and thus countering the dirty work of foreign agents and warmongers.

Anglo-American imperialism has worked out the ideological preparations for another aggressive world war. With the help of lies and hate of humanity, imperialist propaganda attempts to undermine the people's free will.

Communist agitation in capitalist lands plays a big part in mobilizing, organizing, and educating the international movement for the unification of the working classes.

Posters, pamphlets, and "honor cards," which help to popularize efficient workers when posted on factory walls, are also used.

"A" IS FOR ANGLISKY (ENGLISH)

Since 1750 the English have done nothing to modernize their language. Earlier the language was enriched when the English occupied Ireland and borrowed from fine old Celtic. The English also borrowed "Cayman" from America and "Kangaroo" from Australia.

But since the October revolution some Russian words have been adopted. All English Socialist words are derived from Russian.

For example: Soviet, Bolshevik, Udarnik (the earliest category of shock worker), Stakhanovist, Kolkhoz (collective farm), and abbreviations such as NKVD (secret police), and Narkom (people's commissar).

"A" IS FOR ANTIMILITARISM

The struggle for peace is directly linked with Soviet foreign policy, which has submitted concrete proposals to UNO for disarmament and an atomic ban.

During 1949–50 the Cominform gave explicit instructions to all friends of peace to be more watchful and untrusting than ever, since the final battle for peace is now staged and must continue until socialism is spread all over the world.

The battle for peace is directly connected with the world-wide victory of the proletarian revolution. As Stalin has written, "To abolish war and its causes and to establish a just peace, power must be seized from the imperialistic bourgeoisie."

Since the Soviet Union's historic victory over Hitlerism and salvation of civilization, the American imperialists have started fresh war preparations.

This peace front depends on the Soviet's unconquerable power and on freedom movements in underdeveloped colonies.

The Bolsheviks were never actually pacifists who want peace for the sake of peace.

Bolsheviks favor a decisive battle for peace, which must be waged until power has been taken from the warmongering and belligerent bourgeois class.

"A" IS FOR AMERICA

North American people speak one language but they are not one nation, as Stalin has said. Attempts by bougeois linguistic experts in the United States of America to prove that American is independent of English are just as reactionary as the modern cosmopolitan theory that there is an American language.

Any idea that American has a special quality and is more modern and lively than English is as reactionary as propaganda maintaining that English would be the best world language.

Yet, American and British experts try to prove that the construction of English entitles it to be the universal tongue.

Such reactionary and unscientific theses are symptomatic of the course of Anglo-American imperialism in raping the free peoples of Europe and elsewhere.

Bourgeois experts now hold that American will soon absorb English and that the language spoken in England will become of real American type.

NOTE.—Shakespeare's autograph is included in the encyclopedia as the sole British specimen in the Soviet collection of famous signatures.

The 50 pages devoted to North America give the final Soviet view of the United States of America and Canada pictorially. There are 19 pictures of Indians and Eskimos. The solitary photograph of white Americans depicts them pouring superfluous milk into the street.

Wall Street is contrasted on another page with a picture of washing hanging across slum streets. The only seven pictures of American industry are blurred and no bigger than some postage stamps.

"A" IS FOR AMERICAN LABOR

American Federation of Labor is an organization "for the benefit of the high labor aristocracy. It is led by a clique of reactionaries who are agents of Wall Street commercialism. Its object is to prevent the unity of the working classes.

The AFL directly opposes strike campaigns and strike solidarity. It also assists the bourgeoisie to smash strikes and harbors many blacklegs.

Its leaders actively support the most reactionary bourgeois ideology such as American racial theory.

"A" IS FOR AMERICAN LEGION

The American Legion is one of the greatest militarized Fascist organizations in the United States of America.

The whole country is covered by a network of local Legion posts, which function as secret police and strikebreakers. No trade-unionist can become a member of the Legion unless he is a strikebreaker or a blackleg.

Among the Legion's duties are smashing Communist newspaper offices, lynching Negroes, and agitating for war against the U. S. S. R. President Truman is a member.

"A" IS FOR AVIATION

Red air force men won the war. In 1943 the RAF made limited night raids against German military bases and supply dumps.

In 1941 and 1942 the British had attempted to conduct daylight bombing, but their machines suffered too heavy losses, although the Luftwaffe had most of its planes on the eastern front.

By 1943 the Germans were in no shape to offer any serious resistance to the Anglo-American Air Force, thanks to the German losses on the eastern front. By 1944 the Luftwaffe was no danger at all to Great Britain and much less to the United States.

Only at the end of the war was the creation of complete Anglo-American air superiority in the west established. Not until then did the British resume day bombing regularly.

Thus one can see how reactionary American policy had nothing to do with freeing the people from Hitlerism and had the sole object of destroying German and Japanese industry, which competed with the United States of America in world markets.

"A" IS FOR AIRPLANE

The Russian naval captain, A. F. Mosjaisky, was the first man in the world to fly a motor-driven airplane. He took out a patent in St. Petersburg in 1881 and flew his plane in the summer of 1882 near St. Petersburg.

This Is a Great Day for the Non-Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of the day dedicated to that great patron of Ireland, St. Patrick, I am happy to extend in the RECORD the following article of interest by Hal Boyle, a staff writer for the Associated Press:

THIS IS A GREAT DAY FOR THE NON-IRISH—BUT, IF YOU'VE A SPARK OF DECENCY, FOR ST. PAT'S SAKE, TAKE A BIT OF ADVICE

(By Hal Boyle)

NEW YORK, March 17.—An open letter to all Americans whose mothers didn't come from Ireland:

"My friends, you are non-Irish—and this is a great day for the non-Irish.

"It is a great day for you to buy your groceries the previous night, lock your door, and stay in your homes. That way you won't have to deal with the problem of what to do if you meet an Irishman.

"And that is a good problem to avoid, because no Irishman today is an innocent bystander. Every Irishman is a moon-mad son of the kings of an old and wronged land. He is in no mood to be trifled with."

GREEN ELEPHANTS

"This is the day he honors St. Patrick, that great and learned man, and all America is just one big Irish stew. Yes, it's 'Erin go Bragh' everywhere—from the potato-logged coast of Maine to the colleen-covered shores of Hollywood, where 16 film studios have crowned 16 different unknown starlets as 'Miss Shamrock of 1950.'

"Long ago, my friends, most of the Nation decided it was simpler, on this day, to say they were Irish even if they weren't. It saved long-winded explanations. And arguments that started out, 'Well, why aren't you an Irishman? I am.'

"A survey made this year indicates that today, out of our population of 150,000,000, some 145,000,000 will claim to be Irish—by birth, by ancestry, by perjury, or by default.

"This leaves only 5,000,000 of you non-Irish. And that's why it's a good idea to stay indoors—the odds are 29 to 1 against you.

"But if you must go outside, friends, here are a few simple rules on how to treat any Irishman you encounter:

"1. Remember, he is moved in this hour of glory by a sense of ancient oppression, a pride in his clan too big for his heart to hold, and an old wrath. Therefore he is touchy and quick to anger. Also, he is ridden by leprechauns. Therefore he may do things poetical or foolish.

"For St. Patrick's Day isn't just a holiday to an Irishman. It is Armistice Day, pay day, Fourth of July, a bit of Easter, maybe a touch of April Fool's Day—these and something more. In one day he must himself love anew the mystic, troubled story of the Emerald Isle. He must go from an elf-haunted forest through a peat bog to a small stony farm, suffer long poverty, and cross many lost battlefields to victory, a cathedral—and peace. It is a time when he rededicates himself, worships, rejoices, sorrows over his distant dead, feasts, and asks, 'What next?' In short, it is a time to be an Irishman.

"2. The password, if you meet this Irishman, is a smiling 'begorra.' Say it and go on. But don't make a mistake and say 'Gomorrah.' You won't be able to go on.

"3. Don't greet him with a 'top o' the morning.' That's what he is determined to say to you, and if you say it first all he can say is 'howdy.' Irishmen don't like to say 'howdy' on St. Pat's Day.

"4. If you want to give him a good wish straight from the Ould Sod, say—'May the road rise with you and the wind be always behind you.' Or, 'May the devil fly off with your worries, and forever and ever God bless you.'"

BUY BOTTLE—GO HOME

"5. Should you chance to drop into a bar to purchase your mother-in-law a basin of beer, don't offer to buy an Irishman a drink. Buy him a bottle—and you go home.

"6. If you see two Irishmen discussing a subject with four flying fists, don't stop. They are probably mulling over why the six northern Irish counties stay with the British instead of joining up with Free Ireland? And it's a good quarrel to stay out of if you aren't in the family.

"7. If you see a weeping Irishman, don't pause to find the reason for his tears. It may be because St. Patrick is buried at Downpatrick and Downpatrick is in the northern area of Ireland still garrisoned by British troops. On the other hand, he may not know at all why he is crying, so why make him more miserable trying to think up a reason?

"8. Don't—even as a joke—call an Irishman a Mick. Not unless you've already slipped him three Mickey Finns."

LEAVE OUT THE PRANKS

"9. And above all don't play any pranks on him. There is a legend here that a wiseacre once tried to sell British souvenir flags to St. Patrick's Day parade crowds. Twelve mighty men from Mayo dropped out of the parade, quietly picked up the prankster and took him to the Bowery. There his head was shaved and he was tattooed with Britain's Unionjack from the soles of his feet to his skull. When the tatto artist's arm gave out, is is chronicled, the police commissioner arrived, rolled up his sleeves, took the needle, and put on the last four flags himself—then wrote "Up, Ireland" on the scoundrel's forehead, and let him go.

"10. Just remember that tomorrow the Irishman will be a normal man again. If you bump into him then, give him an aspirin and a kind word, and you'll have a friend. If you meet me, skip the kind word—just give me the aspirin.

"Thanking you in advance for your understanding, dear non-Irish friends, we wish you an Irish toast older than the nine lives of your great grandfather's grandmother's cat:

"'Health and long life to you;
The choice of a wife to you;
A child every year to you;
Land without rent to you,
And may death come in Ireland.'

"Sincerely yours,

"HAL BOYLE.

"P. S.—In Ireland itself the doors of all saloons are closed by law on St. Patrick's Day. The front doors, that is."

Chinese Students in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Chinese Students in Country Stir Fight of United States Agencies," which appeared in the New York Times on March 9. It was written by the distinguished Washington correspondent for that paper, Mr. James Reston.

Mr. Reston points up the difficulties and hardships currently being experienced by Chinese students in this country, and also underscores the complicated legal problems involved in allowing them to remain here.

I feel we should do everything we can to make the lot of these Chinese students easier while they are with us. These estimated 3,600 Chinese students reflect a large credit of good will for our way of life which we may chalk up in our future relations with a friendlier China. I commend this article to the attention of the Congress and to the executive agencies for study and action.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINESE STUDENTS IN COUNTRY STIR FIGHT OF UNITED STATES AGENCIES—STATE DEPARTMENT WANTS LAW USED ALLOWING FULL-TIME JOBS—DEPORTATION IS OPPOSED

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—The Chinese Communist war in Korea has produced a whole series of small interdepartmental wars in Washington, the latest between the State and Justice Departments over the future of Chinese university students in this country.

There are about 3,600 of these students here now, most of them doing graduate work at their own expense in the large State universities. They received temporary permits to remain in the United States, but to do so they had to stay in school, keep their academic work in good order, pay their bills, and go home when their courses ended.

The Chinese civil war and the Chinese Communist aggression in Korea, however, have created a number of problems.

First, most of the students were cut off from papa's monthly remittance, a slight embarrassment, as any freshman knows.

Second, the Communist conquest of the Chinese mainland changed most of the students' plans about returning home.

And now many of them are reaching the end of their student courses—more than 900 last month and about 500 more scheduled to be graduated in June.

RUN INTO DIFFICULTIES

The universities and other private and public organizations bailed a lot of them out of their financial troubles for a while, but some left their studies, or came to the end of their academic courses, and in due course ran into trouble with the Justice Department.

Public Law 555, passed last June, made provision for this situation, but it has never been put into effect by the Justice Department. That law states, among other things,

that "the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate regulations providing that such selected citizens of China who have been admitted for the purpose of study in the United States shall be granted permission to accept employment upon application filed with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization."

The State Department repeatedly has urged that this section of the law be put into force, but while the Justice Department has been reasonable about allowing the Chinese students to work after school hours and during summer vacations, it has not promulgated this section, which would enable the Chinese students to leave school and earn a living, or to take full-time jobs after graduation.

Instead, particularly since the Government was charged with being soft on Communists last year, the regional offices of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, particularly in Chicago, have been adopting what many university officials regard as an obsolete and harsh policy toward many of the Chinese students.

Now a Chinese student who has left school for lack of funds, or taken a job after graduation, is very likely to be served with a warrant of arrest, forced to return to his campus under the custody of some official there, and even served with a warrant of deportation.

MANY JOIN ORGANIZATIONS

This situation is greatly complicated by the fact that a great many of the Chinese students—at many universities the majority of them—have joined one or two organizations whose national leadership has been branded subversive by the Attorney General's office.

These organizations are the Chinese Students Christian Organization and the Scientific Workers Association of Engineering and Chemistry. Even those educators who criticize the Justice Department's handling of this problem agree that there has been some infiltration of these two organizations by Communists. Their complaints, however, are—

1. That the State and Justice Departments have different approaches to the problem, and

2. That all the Chinese students are being indicted as a result of the Communist sympathies of a few, and that the executive branch of the Government has let 9 months go by without putting into force a law that would enable the Chinese students to work here and avoid the consequences of returning to a Communist-controlled country.

PROFESSOR'S CONCLUSIONS

One professor who has watched the two Government departments trying to deal with these problems of employment and subversion summarizes his conclusions as follows:

1. One department tells us that so far as it is concerned no Chinese student who wishes to remain here will be forced to go back to Communist China. But the other Government department has given us the impression that all the Chinese students must prepare to return, even if they do not want to.

2. The simple theory of some of the Government officials in these parts is that since some of the Chinese students may be subversive, it would be better in the present atmosphere of suspicion and investigation to get rid of all of them.

"The answer to that, of course," he adds, "is that it is criminal to send back our friends and idiotic to send back our enemies, since all of them are highly trained. No sensible government would let any of them go near Peiping, whether they wished to go or not—and 90 percent of them definitely wish not to go."

Query

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorial comment from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald.

The editorial follows:

QUERY

Is President Truman's proposed budget as closely trimmed as it might be?

The President thinks it is. He has said so emphatically and caustically; and he has "dared" Congress to try to reduce it further.

It is always risky for a President to "dare" Congress to do anything; for Congress is quite apt to take up the challenge, not only for the merit of the action itself, but also to demonstrate to the Chief Executive that the Congress is the legislative body, and the direct representative of the American pepole.

As to what Congress will do in this particular instance must remain to be seen.

But there is no doubt as to the attitude of the congressional representation from western New York.

The views of Representative DANIEL A. REED of this forty-fifth district already have been quoted by this newspaper.

Mr. REED is convinced that billions of dollars could be lopped from the proposed budget. He has pointed out that all told the President wants $16,000,000,000 of additional revenue for the next fiscal year; and that he, Mr. REED, has not satisfied himself that, if the proper pruning is done, there will be any need to provide more than half of that colossal sum.

The views of other western New York colons may not be so well known to the people of Olean and vicinity; but here, in brief, are some of them:

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, declares that Mr. Truman again has demonstrated his habit of putting his personal feelings ahead of reason.

"The President," he says, "should welcome rather than spurn the efforts of Congress to find ways to reduce nonessential, nondefense spending. In issuing a dare to Congress to cut his budget in any respect, the President demonstrates his impetuous tendency, tragic for the country, to put personal pique ahead of reason."

On its part, added Mr. KEATING, Congress should dare the President "to put to the American people the issue of whether or not they want him to be the absolute dictator of how much shall be deducted from the pay envelopes for taxes without any participation by Congress in that decision."

Here is Representative W. STERLING COLE, of Bath:

"I can think of no dare in all my lifetime that I have accepted with more enthusiasm than this one. There are some parts of the President's budget I shall be especially happy to vote against. The Brannan farm plan, Federal aid to education, and socialized medicine are some of them."

Representative JOHN TABER, of Auburn—the ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee—has this to say:

"We accept his challenge. The administration's every effort has been made to get every last possible dollar out of the Treasury, and to delude the Congress that it was needed.

"We do not intend to be sidetracked by threats from doing our duty, which is to protect the American people against the ridiculous and exorbitant demands of the bureaucrats."

There is every indication, it is gratifying to note, that Congress will trim the Presidential tax proposals to a considerable degree by the relatively simple expedient of cutting down or lopping off altogether appropriations for completely nonessential activities.

And there are many.

Besides the Brannan farm plan, socialized medicine and other schemes whose cost would run into the billions annually, there are requests in the President's budget for an increase in the amount of money devoted to "earthquake investigation," for the construction of a glove factory at Alcatraz Federal Penitentiary "to offset a reduction in convict employment at the laundry," money for five new facilities for sightseers at various national parks, funds to carry on "studies designed to increase production of potatoes in Alaska."

There are many other such requests. Congressional pruners should have quite an interesting time.

New Tool Probes Gravity's Effects for Navy's Fliers—Pilots of Tomorrow May Work Lying Down—Lessens Blackout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Lt. Comdr. Robert J. Boylan and published by the North American Newspaper Alliance on the new Aviation Medical Acceleration Laboratory at Johnsville, Pa. The article follows:

NEW TOOL PROBES GRAVITY'S EFFECTS FOR NAVY'S FLYERS—PILOTS OF TOMORROW MAY WORK LYING DOWN—LESSENS BLACKOUT

(By Lt. Comdr. Robert J. Boylan, USNR)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Sir Isaac Newton found out what he wanted to know about gravity using only an apple and a tree. But he couldn't possibly have conceived the present and increasing need to know more and more about gravity's effect on the human body as it rockets through the air at speeds approaching that of sound.

To try to come up with some of the answers the Navy is spending more than $4,000,000 on a new aviation medical acceleration laboratory at Johnsville, Pa., which will devote a lot of its time to measuring the effects of gravity at high speeds and sharp turns under a wide variety of altitudes and temperatures, artificially produced. Knowledge acquired can be used in planning military and civilian aircraft of the future.

Centerpiece of this new laboratory is the largest and newest centrifuge in the world, which has taken several years to plan, construct, and install in the laboratory. Part of the centrifuge is a long steel horizontal arm with a small enclosed passenger compartment mounted on the end of it.

A huge 180-ton, 4,000-horsepower motor on a stand in the center of the cylindrical steel and concrete building swings this arm at astonishing speeds. It can be accelerated from a dead stop to 174 miles per hour in a little under 7 seconds.

The Navy laboratory will use television and movie cameras and high-speed X-ray equipment in recording the effects on the human passenger as he is whirled around. He will be seated inside an aluminum gondola mounted at the end of a 50-foot tubular steel arm.

Not only will the centrifuge permit the study of the effects of gravity but also of altitude. The gondola, which can carry 600 pounds and can be used for testing effects on men and also equipment, is capable of simulating altitudes up to 60,000 feet and temperatures with a range from 44 to 110 degrees Fahrenheit.

The centrifuge was designed by the special devices center of the office of naval research and the McKiernan-Terry Co. of New Jersey. It is surrounded by subsidiary laboratories for physiological, biophysical, psycho-physiological and biochemical research.

As he is swirled around the edge of this circular room with solid walls, the passenger will be seated in what the Navy engineers call an oblate spheroidal gondola, mounted in a two-gimbal support. To a layman it looks like a huge bomber tire with solid sides, except for a door to permit entry and exit. The gondola is of sandwich construction with spun aluminum inner and outer layers.

Mounted in the counterweight at the center the gimbal control motors drive the gimbal rings through shafts running the length of the arm. In a turret suspended from the ceiling is the control station for the centrifuge. The operator can look out through windows in the side of this control blister and watch the arm as it picks up speed.

Inside the control room are a number of devices to record the effects of the pulls and stresses of the speed and the turns the centrifuge creates. The room has been carefully shielded to protect the delicate physiological instrumentation circuits from magnetic and electrical interference. One-sixteenth inch copper has been used in sheathing the floor, walls, and ceiling.

As head of the laboratory, the Navy has an unusually well qualified team composed of Capt. John R. Poppen, who has been in the service for 33 years, ever since his graduation from the University of Michigan in 1917; and Commander Charles F. Gell, who combines in one man the knowledge and skill of an aviator, a doctor of medicine, and an engineer.

Poppen pioneered some of the earliest research on gravity effects in aviation. In fact, during experiments 15 years ago, he hit on something so revolutionary he didn't even mention it to his colleagues. It was the fact that dogs could withstand far more gravity pull when lying down than they could in standing. Currently the services are deep in experiments on this subject, planning the day when a pilot will fly prone or supine to permit faster pull-outs and sharper turns.

One of the reasons the Navy wants to develop more information about effects of speed on equipment and materials is that at 650 miles per hour a plane can reach 70 degrees above outside temperatures due to frictional heating alone, which can be beyond the melting point of plastics used in aircraft.

It is particularly fitting that Captain Poppen should be the director of the laboratory, since he pioneered the first research in G's and developed the first anti-G blackout device for pilots.

Congress Has No Real Independence, But Is Puppet for the Military—Is This True?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the March 7, 1951, issue of the Christian Century, the leading Protestant religious weekly in America.

The facts and logic in this discussion of the American political scene, and Congress in particular, seem very convincing.

Yet, as a Member of Congress, I still cherish the hope that Congress will establish its independence and constitutional power.

However, it is hard to conceive how Congress can recover its rightful power once it passes General Marshall's demand for universal military service.

Once that instrument of power is in the hands of the military, they will almost certainly be tempted to elect or defeat Congressmen at will—because military spending programs, plus arbitrary power to grab the youth of every home in America, will give them a political weapon that cannot be effectively resisted.

The military will then have a political machine so powerful that those who seek public office will dare not seriously oppose them.

If this analysis is not correct, I challenge the advocates of UMTS to discuss this issue fairly and frankly—and to offer some creditable evidence that it is not correct.

The editorial follows:

FRUSTRATION ON THE POTOMAC

More than ever Congress in these tense days is living up to its reputation as the Nation's "cave of the winds." On and off the floors of the two Houses, Members indulge in wild words on all sorts of matters of Government policy. Little legislation has so far been enacted. An observer unfamiliar with the ways of Washington might, at this stage in the current session, conclude that with partisan passion running verbal riot as it now is doing, not much legislation ever will grind through the congressional mill. But all this violence of debate, formal and informal, really means little. It is, in fact, the way by which Members of the legislative branch of the Government seek to compensate for their sense of frustration. And the noisy proceedings on Capitol Hill will not be understood unless this frustration is taken into account.

Under the Constitution of the United States, ours is supposed to be a government of clearly divided powers, with three coordinated branches providing checks and balances for each other. The founding fathers, steeped in Aristotle, Locke, and Montesquieu, believed that they were thus providing against too great a concentration of powers in the Executive and for the subordination of the military to the civil authority. Congress was granted constitutional duties and powers which it was thought would make it forever the source of all laws and the ultimate arbiter of national policy. Senators and Representatives, important figures in their local communities, go to Washington expecting to fulfill these constitutional functions. But they soon find, after they get there, that their control over the most important measures of state is more theoretical than real. They resent being cast in a rubber-stamp role, but they quickly discover that there is not much they can do to escape it. Hence their sense of frustration, which they try to appease by noisy, though largely empty, threats of a legislative revolt.

The current hullabaloo over sending American troops to Europe is simply one more example. The Senate—and possibly to a lesser degree the House—will rant and rave over the President's assumption of authority in this vital matter. Before the session ends, however, Congress will approve whatever President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and General Eisenhower demand. It will do so because it cannot do anything else. The Senators who are now holding forth on executive invasions of the war-making powers of Congress know this. They know that when the decisive vote comes they will have to go along with the decisions which the Executive, acting on the advice of the military, has already made. In an issue of this sort Congress has no genuine independence. It takes out its sense of helplessness, therefore, in tall talk.

Equally unreal is the debate over the drafting of 18-year-olds. Congress knows the proposal is not popular. Its instinct warns that there must be something wrong about a system of selective service which cannot raise the 700,000 to 1,000,000 men required for the contemplated increase in the Army from the more than 9,000,000 in the present 19–26 draft-age pool. Its suspicions have been aroused by the speed with which the Defense Department discovered, when congressional questioning brought out the adequacy of this pool to supply the Army of 3,200,000 which President Truman said was planned, that an army more than a quarter of a million larger would be needed. Nevertheless, if General Marshall continues to insist that he must have the 18-year-olds—as he will—Congress knows that he will get them. Loud talk for the benefit of the parents back home therefore becomes its only compensation for its puppet role. But the talk will not affect the outcome.

The perfervid wrangling over executive assumptions of the Senate's treaty-making powers is more of the same. Under the Constitution, the Executive negotiates treaties but the Senate must ratify them before they can go into effect. In actuality, however, the growing practice of making executive agreements with other governments has all but emptied of meaning the Senate's participation in foreign relations. President Roosevelt carried this development to previously undreamed-of lengths during the war. The precedents which he established then are being continued in this period of at least theoretical peace. Accordingly, strident demands arise from Congress for reassurance as to what promises the Executive may have made to our allies in the North Atlantic military alliance. Before long we expect to hear as loud demands for reassurance concerning the promises made to France regarding help in Indochina. These assurances are given, but so slippery is diplomatic language that, no matter what Secretary Acheson tells his congressional inquisitors, Congress is not reassured. Yet the Senate knows it can really do nothing. As a result, more loud talk which changes the realities of the situation not at all.

Even the excited exchange over the budget is of much the same nature. True, financial measures must still originate in the House and must pass Congress before any branch of the Government can legally spend

a nickel. But the budget has become a Presidential production, and Congress retains little actual control over it. Mr. Truman almost laughed in the face of Congress the other day when, in defying its Members to cut his current $72,000,000,000 figure, he reminded the Nation that we went through the same performance of an initial outcry and demands for cuts during the previous session and ended by actual additions of a billion to what the Executive had proposed. Now Congress is trying to delay its inevitable accession to the demands of the White House by dragging out action on taxes. But with the sacrosanct military and veterans' items, with the fixed charges on debt and the virtual promises already made to our allies, Congress knows that there is very little it can do. So there is nothing left for it but to get what satisfaction it can from preliminary howling, with Senators and Representatives hoping that at tax-paying and voting times the electorate will remember the howls and forget the actual outcome.

So it goes in all fields of government action. Under the Constitution, Congress remains the lawmaking branch, and therefore might be thought to be the actual governing body in Washington. Thousands of classes in the Nation's schools are still being taught that this is so. Yet in reality it is not so. The real centers of authority in Washington are three—the White House, the Pentagon and the administrative agencies. Not one of the three is to be found in the Capitol.

Aside from the check which remains in the provision that Congress must enact appropriation bills—a check which, as has been said, constantly diminishes in actuality—the White House has almost no limitations left on its exercise of power. The President, appealing to his authority as commander in chief, now claims almost unlimited war-making powers. By executive agreements with foreign governments he continually bypasses limitations over his control of foreign policy. The Vatican embassy has given public demonstration of the way in which he can, and frequently does, ignore the constitutional provisions for Senate participation in the appointment of ambassadors. Two years ago he claimed implied powers to intervene in labor disputes by drafting striking railway workers. Even in financial matters, he now demands and receives secret funds which he disburses without congressional check. The President of the United States thus has accumulated far more power than any other head of a supposedly democratic government on earth. Once in a long while Congress tries to stand up against this current of growing executive power. The last instance came in the revolt against President Roosevelt's Supreme Court-packing plan. But such occasional revolts do not alter the general trend. That is toward investing the President with ever accumulating powers.

The Pentagon has become almost a law unto itself. Each new crisis in our international relations adds to its freedom from civilian control. In this session it is demanding astronomical sums of Congress without giving more than the haziest suggestions as to how it intends to use the money. Every Member of Congress knows, moreover, that after these enormous appropriations have been voted the Pentagon will be back, before the session ends, with demands for many more billions in supplemental appropriations. If any significant body of Congressmen dare to question the Pentagon's demands, it has only to fling out the magic word "security" and the opposition collapses. The prospect of a permanent military establishment of great size at last confronts the Republic with a permanent military caste—the very thing which the founding fathers were most determined to prevent. Not only is the defense department for the first time in our history headed by a professional military man, but the fate of Louis Johnson is a reminder of what will now happen to a civilian who tries to impose his authority on the Pentagon. From now on, civilians in the Pentagon will be tolerated only if they understand that they are there to do as the generals and admirals tell them.

As for the administrative agencies—Washington's "alphabet soup"—they proliferate endlessly and accumulate authority all the time. Whence come the laws which actually rule American life today? Businessmen have long known that they come from the tens of thousands of executive regulations which pour out of the administrative agencies. Now the rank-and-file of our citizens will be taught the same lesson. Wage and price controls will not let them forget this, and these are only a start in the flood of administrative regulations which are to be expected now that we are heading into another war crisis. Does Congress have no control over these agencies? Well, it must appropriate their running expenses, to be sure. But ask any candid Congressman how much control this is in actual practice. Ultimate power, of course, inheres in the President who sets up these agencies. To that extent, the growth of the authority of the regulatory agencies is a growth of White House authority. Working together, White House and alphabetical bodies constitute a government which is virtually independent of Congress.

What all this means is that the theory of the United States Government, as embedded in the Federal Constitution, is one thing; its actual working is something far different. As our drift into the conditions of a militarized state continues, this divergence will become ever more marked. Congress is headed toward becoming as vestigial as was the Roman Senate under the Caesars. Is there anything that can be done about it? Should the Constitution be rewritten to bring it into accord with the facts? Or should the two Houses of Congress be encouraged to stage more frequent uprisings against a White House and Pentagon grasping for power?

The first suggestion is academic; such a general rewriting of the Constitution is not politically possible. Besides, the Constitution as it stands, with its provisions for amendment, is a good constitution—as good as the Republic envisaged by the founding fathers requires. Congressional revolts can yield only sporadic and limited results; the general trend toward concentration of power in the Executive will go right on. It will go right on, we believe, because no genuine democratic control can be established over a militarized state, and that is what this Nation—driven by what we are told are ineluctable historic forces—is becoming. It is this progress toward militarization that the frustrated men on the Potomac are declaiming against on the floors of Congress, even though most of them do not realize it. Until this trend is reversed, Congress will continue to lose power, the White House and the Pentagon to gain it. And power once lost will never be regained without a terrific struggle, even should the tensions which are hastening our militarization be eased or pass away.

Wire Tap Bill Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News.

The editorial follows:

KEATING BILL SHOULD PASS

A teapot tempest is still raging on the question of allowing the FBI to tap telephone conversations of suspected foreign agents.

With thousands of American boys already lying in Korean graves, we think it's high time to start helping instead of hindering the FBI. But many well-meaning persons still raise the bloody shirt of martyred civil liberties at such a suggestion.

Obviously, no sane person wants to start scrapping civil liberties wholesale. From Bunker Hill to Wonju our soldiers have fought to preserve a system of government whose core is the protection of the rights of the individual.

There are inconsistencies in the objections raised to FBI wire-tapping. For example, it's permissible for a FBI man to eavesdrop on a conversation in a restaurant, but he can't eavesdrop on a telephone conversation.

Police of many States can use wiretap evidence on minor crimes, but the FBI can't use it in efforts to guard our Government against enemy espionage.

Representative KEATING has introduced a bill to remedy the situation. By making permission of a Federal judge necessary for such wire-tapping, the bill attempts to protect the public against unwarranted invasion of its rights.

This long-overdue measure should be passed quickly.

The Crusade Against Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Mr. Elmer Davis in the current Harper's entitled "The Crusade Against Acheson."

In line with the customs of the Senate, and the senatorial courtesies around which these customs revolve, I have asked permission of Mr. Davis to make three deletions, a total of perhaps a hundred and fifty words, and these are indicated by asterisks.

Mr. President, America has no more distinguished journalist than Elmer Davis and few in Congress can know his handiwork, particularly his wartime handiwork with the OWI, as well as I. I congratulate him for the penetrating insight of this piece about our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. I congratulate him for taking time from his tense and busy life to do such a piece—involving much travail and little pay—because his conscience drove him to it. Mr. Davis wrote it, I am sure, to help all of us to understand the great domestic fact of the present day, that we Americans are engaged in a cold civil war testing whether our nation, "so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure."

I submit this article for the RECORD not merely as tribute to Mr. Davis, and not merely because I am proud to take the floor of the Senate to endorse his

analysis of Secretary Acheson's character and capacity, but primarily because I feel it is imperative that the Congress and the American people be again alerted—and again and again—to the current attacks upon our character and institutions of which Secretary Acheson has unwittingly become the supreme symbol.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make two and a half pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRUSADE AGAINST ACHESON

(By Elmer Davis)

I

Whatever else Mr. Herbert Hoover may or may not have accomplished by his foreign-policy speech last December, he at least changed the topic of conversation and thereby got the Republicans in Congress off of what was becoming a somewhat uncomfortable hook. Ever since the election they had been talking about nothing but the Secretary of State; and finally their party caucuses in both Houses had formally demanded that Acheson must go. Why must he go? Because, they said, he had lost the confidence of the country. Why had he lost it—if or insofar as he had? Because for months past Republican orators had been denouncing him with a virulence seldom equaled, and a shameless mendacity quite unequaled in my recollection. After the election there was little pretense that there had been any truth in these attacks. Said Senator IVES, in presenting the demand for Acheson's dismissal, "Whether or not he is responsible for the dilemma we are in has nothing to do with it." (All through the campaign the Republicans had been insisting that he was responsible; they disagreed only as to whether he was a traitor or a mere incompetent.) * * *

But Acheson did not go. The resignation he had never written was accepted by several volunteer presidents in their newspaper columns; but the elected President in the White House said that Acheson was going to stay, and the Republicans in Congress were beginning to look rather foolish till Mr. Hoover gave them a chance to talk about something else. By the time you read this the attack on Acheson may have been renewed; but if so, it may be a little less illogical than it was in December; there has been nothing quite like that in American history. Not merely because they were denouncing as a Communist (or a protector of Communists—they could never quite agree on their story) the man who had done more to check the advance of Russian aggression than any other public official we have ever had; not merely because they were demanding the dismissal of the man who, at that time, was clearly the most successful Secretary of State since Seward. (Subsequent events have somewhat tarnished the luster of his greatest achievement, the change in the constitution of the United Nations; but Acheson is not to blame for that, nor could the Republicans then have foreseen it.) But for pure irresponsibility their performance has no equal.

The parallel cited by the President—the demand of the Republican Senators, in December 1862, for the dismissal of Secretary of State Seward—fits only loosely. Those were Senators of the President's own party and they were a majority of the total membership of the Senate. What they proposed was, as the most candid of them admitted, unconstitutional—an attempt to establish something like the parliamentary form of government; with the considerable difference that the President's powers would have been transferred, not to Congress as a whole, but to the Senate. But at least they did propose to transfer the executive authority, not to nullify it; and to transfer it to a group that had a policy, an alternative to the policy of President Lincoln. Their policy would almost certainly have lost the Civil War and disrupted the Republic; still it was a policy, the majority of the Senate was behind it; granted their premises, their behavior made some sense.

No such logic informed the action of the Republicans last December. They were a minority, and would still be a minority when the new Congress came in. The demand for Acheson's removal was overwhelmingly supported in the House caucus; but only 23 of the 42 Republican Senators voted for it. Five voted against it—AIKEN, LANGER, MORSE, and the two SMITHS; 14 others had at least the courage not to vote at all. The President was called on to remove the Secretary of State to satisfy a minority of the House of Representatives and less than a fourth of the Senators, who had no alternative to offer, either of personality or of policy. It was not their business, they insisted, to say who should replace Acheson; and there were almost as many Republican foreign policies as there were Republican Senators. This was not a proposal—not even a revolutionary proposal—for a different kind of action; it was a program for organizing and institutionalizing impotence.

But at this writing (mid-January) Republican policies seem to be beginning to jell. It is not yet clear whether the party will follow Mr. Hoover in his proposal to retreat under the bed and there erect a Gibraltar of Western civilization; or Senator TAFT in any of the various ideas he offers, fresh every morning; or whether—as seems not yet beyond hope—the Dewey-Dulles Republicans may persuade their colleagues to recognize the facts of life. At any rate, if the attack on Acheson should be resumed, his enemies will probably have some alternative to offer, whatever it may be worth.

* * * * * *

But why pick on Acheson? Well, last spring, before McCarthyism had conquered a party (or much of a party, for there were honorable holdouts to the last), John Duncan Miller of the London Times had interpreted it as essentially "a revolt of the primitives against intelligence." Acheson is intelligent; he also has the misfortune of being a gentleman, and what in his case proved to be the greater misfortune of being a Christian.

His origins are appallingly respectable—the son of a bishop, educated at Groton, Yale, and the Harvard Law School; an editor of the Harvard Law Review, followed by a term as secretary to Justice Brandeis before he went into the practice of law in Washington. He has, as one of his old friends remarked to me, "all the virtues that were considered estimable when you and I were boys." Also, he dresses well and speaks correct English; for which he has been sneered at by Mr. Fulton Lewis, who also can speak correct English and dresses well enough to impersonate a man of distinction in whisky advertisements. All this makes Acheson an easy target for the fascistoid elements in American society—the people from whom the Ku Klux Klan and the Christian Front were recruited, the kind of people who gave Hitler his first mass support. But for all that, you would suppose there must be something in his official record to justify the holy crusade that was waged against him.

There is not.

II

Acheson has been damned as a New Dealer by those who believe, or profess to believe, that New Dealers are Communists; yet he first became conspicuous in the news as a man who would not go along with the New Deal. A brilliant and highly successful lawyer, he gave up his practice in the spring of 1933 to become Under Secretary of the Treasury. Since Secretary Woodin was often ill, Acheson ran the department during a good part of that tumultuous year; but in November he resigned by request, because he opposed the devaluation of the dollar. Thereafter he returned to his law office, and would probably have stayed there but for Hitler's successes in 1940. Acheson then became active in the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, and early in 1941 left his practice again to become Assistant Secretary of State.

During his 4½ years in that office his duties consisted largely of liaison with Congress, and in view of his recent troubles it is worth noting that he got along with Congress remarkably well. Aside from that he dealt chiefly with economic problems; he had little to do with political policy until August 1945, when he was promoted to Under Secretary. And here appears the first muted announcement of a theme that has lately been blared on numerous Republican trumpets. He was confirmed with only one dissenting vote—that of Senator WHERRY, who accused him of insulting MacArthur. Acheson had said that MacArthur's occupation command was the instrument, not the determinant, of United States Government policy, and this statement of constitutional fact was evidently news to KENNETH WHERRY.

Acheson remained as Under Secretary till July 1947, often running the Department as Acting Secretary while his chief—first Byrnes and later Marshall—was absent at international conferences. State Department policies are usually the product of many minds, and it is hard to say just who deserves the credit. But Acheson had, as the President has noted, a great deal to do with the Greek-Turkish policy and the Truman doctrine early in 1947; still more to do with the transformation of the Truman doctrine into the Marshall plan, which became the most successful of all our postwar policies. And incidentally he was the first high American official who publicly declared that Russian policy is aggressive—a statement which, made to a Senate committee early in 1947, brought a formal and irate protest from Molotov which General Marshall brushed aside. All in all, Acheson's record as Under Secretary thoroughly justifies his later remark that not even "disinterested malevolence" could call him an appeaser. (But he had underestimated the capabilities of interested malevolence.)

His retirement to private life left him little time for his law practice, for presently he was named vice chairman of the Hoover Commission on Governmental Reorganization. And about the time that group finished its arduous and fruitful labors, General Marshall's health compelled his retirement, and Acheson was called back into the service as Secretary of State. Whether history will ultimately rank him right up at the top, along with John Quincy Adams and William H. Seward, cannot yet be predicted; but neither of those men, in his first 2 years in office, accomplished as much as Acheson has done. More than any other man he has created the organization by which the free nations can make most effective use of their united powers to beat back Communist imperialism.

The first of his great achievements, the North Atlantic Treaty, had been largely prepared by Marshall and Lovett; but Acheson finished the work of concluding it, and led the way in the more difficult task of persuading the Senate to approve it. He was working on long-term policies too—the policy of building up situations of strength from which we could afford to negotiate with the Kremlin with some hope of getting somewhere. And his speech at the University of California last March set forth the conditions on which other nations can safely live in the same world with Russia. They are conditions to which the Russians will

never assent except under great pressure, but unquestionably they are the only conditions that would make the world safe for anybody but Communists; they are the objectives at which American foreign policy must aim if it is to make sense.

He has been damned for omitting Korea from our defense perimeter, in a speech last spring (also Formosa, but more of that later). But the Korean Republic had then been set up by the United Nations; the consequent withdrawal of the occupation troops was approved by American military opinion, which was then thinking in terms of global war and held that Korea could not be defended against massive attack except by the commitment of more troops than Korea was worth, on a global scale. Recent events suggest that this judgment was correct. But a very different situation arose on June 25 last; here was a local aggression of the kind with which we had become familiar in the thirties, and the melancholy history of that decade had taught us that the time to stop it was the first time. Every member of the National Security Council advised the President that we must go to Korea's defense, but Acheson seems to have been the most vigorous of them all. Furthermore Acheson, working through Warren Austin at Lake Success, spurred the United Nations to back us up. Their military aid, though minor, has not been negligible; and in the situation of last June the political and moral effect of their support was immense.

But that support could be given only thanks to the accident that the Russians were then boycotting the Security Council. When they rejoined it, it was obvious that they could stop any similar action in future. The result was the greatest of Acheson's achievements—the persuading of the United Nations Assembly to declare its own competence to act when the Security Council is paralyzed by the veto. As Vishinsky correctly (and furiously) declared, this was a complete change in the character of the United Nations. For the first time it became an organization which could really do something, even if a great power wanted it to do nothing. This was the most brilliant American diplomatic victory of many decades—and the best kind of diplomatic victory, won not by pressure but by persuasion, by convincing other nations that their interest was identical with ours.

The immediate practical value of this is uncertain, at this writing. Acheson gave the Assembly machinery but he could not give it guts; when the small aggression of June was overlaid by the big aggression of November, many members of the United Nations seemed to have no further ambition except to escape notice.

Similarly the value of the Atlantic Treaty is being undermined, at this writing, by our own defeatists; Acheson could not give them guts either. But the machinery is there, if men have the spirit to use it.

III

So McCARTHY calls him the Red Dean of Washington; JENNER accuses him of a pro-Communist betrayal of the American people; and * * * men, who have repeated their story so often that they have come to believe it themselves, demand his dismissal on the ground that they have persuaded the public to lose confidence in him. The attack on Acheson, said John Dewey after the election, was a victory for the Communist cause that the rulers of Russia could not have obtained by any activity of their own. Why should men who presumably want to stop the Russians have tried to destroy the man who has done more to stop the Russians than anybody else?

[illegible] on account of what seems to me Acheson's one serious failure, the mishandling of Korean rearmament. Granted that he was under pressure from the military, it was his business to resist that pressure if it threatened to get us into a situation where the Germans could demand a price for defending themselves instead of clamoring for the privilege. But his enemies have not attacked him on that account; most of them are all out for German rearmament, whether or not either the French or the Germans want it.

China, however, is another matter: American policy, highly successful in Europe, failed to prevent the Communist conquest of China. Whether any American policy, after 1945, could have saved China is open to question; especially if it entailed saving Chiang Kai-shek and the men around him. But a noisy, unscrupulous, and well financed lobby insists not only that it could have been done, but that anybody who doubts that it could have been done their way is a Communist; these people ask, "Can Chiang trust the United States?" And aside from these gentlemen (whose activities deserve a more thorough investigation than they are likely to get, in the present political climate) there are others, more respectable, in Congress and elsewhere, who honestly believe that China is more important to American interest than Europe; that we can afford to let France go but we must save Formosa; that Chiang Kai-shek is more deserving of support than Clement Attlee, and that it is our fault, not his, if he was unable to beat the Communists. The Washington Post observes that Chiang seems to have lost the mandate of heaven which traditionally entitled a Chinese ruler to his people's loyalty, but that he still has his mandate from the Republicans.

To men who feel that way, failure in China naturally outweighs all our successes in Europe. But Acheson's part in making our China policy was very small indeed. The Communist victory was completed after he became Secretary of State but the policy that failed to prevent it was an inheritance from his predecessors. It had begun to take shape in the days of Stettinius; it was formulated, after Byrnes had taken over, by men in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, who passed it on up to their superiors. Acheson as Under Secretary gave it approval which was not indeed perfunctory, but was no more than the judgment of a man who was not an expert on China that so far as he could see it looked all right. Secretary Byrnes did the same; but not till it had been gone over with General Marshall, who was something of an expert on China. They all approved it; but the official responsibility lay with Secretary Byrnes, and he has never tried to evade it.

Acheson, however, is now blamed for it, and for other things for which he was even less responsible. If he had been forced out of office last December it would have been, above all, because he had publicly endorsed the opinions of Jesus Christ, and because the military hero of the opposition party lost a battle. A party has often gained advantage because its favorite general won a battle; but it took political genius—or something—for the Republicans to derive as much profit from MacArthur's defeat on the Chongchon River as the Whigs derived from Zachary Taylor's victory at Buena Vista.

The crusade against Acheson had, of course, long been going on, but many people thought that the accusations of appeasement or communism were only what Thurlow Weed once called "a good enough Morgan till after election."

And they might have died down, despite the persistent proddings of the China lobby, if the situation had remained as it was on November 25, when the Nation was warm with the certainty of victory in Korea. In September MacArthur had turned disaster into triumph; when he started his end-the-war offensive everybody in Washington was still so dazzled by the brilliant success of his Inchon operation that they were sure that he could bring it off again. If he had, if the Army had pushed on to the Yalu, the United Nations would not have dogged it when it came to a Korean settlement; and the most ingenious political malevolence could hardly have longer obscured the facts.

But MacArthur's attempt to repeat the tactics of Chancellorsville, on a grander scale, unfortunately ran into a Chinese general more enterprising than Joe Hooker. Thanks to able leadership and hard fighting (by Turks, British, and Koreans, as well as Americans) the army was extricated without disaster; still we had lost a battle and perhaps a campaign, and there had to be a scapegoat for this incredible peripety. But it is a dogma of the Republican faith that MacArthur cannot lose a battle; since a battle had been lost, it must have been Acheson who lost it; it was his fault that the Chinese Communists were in Korea, or, indeed that they existed at all.

But, of course, the thing that more than anything else laid him open to attack was his famous refusal to turn his back on Alger Hiss. Let it be noted, by the way, that Hiss was never an important figure in the State Department. He was a rising young man, a useful technician; but that he ever made policy, at Yalta or anywhere else, is pure (or rather impure) myth. He was, however, a friend of Acheson, who has said that his friendship is not lightly given, and he had been convicted of a gross breach of public trust. What should a statesman say in such a case? Most men would have followed what Acheson later called "the counsels of discretion and cowardice," and taken the out of declining to comment on a case which had been appealed; but he chose not to have to remember, the rest of his life, that he had run away from "a disagreeable and dangerous decision."

What he did say meant simply that he didn't like to kick a man who was down; and if he had said just that he would have got into little trouble. Not that Acheson's enemies have any objection to kicking a man who is down; it is safer than kicking him when he is standing up; but phrased in those words, it could hardly be made popular. But Acheson made the mistake, natural perhaps to a bishop's son and a practicing Christian, of quoting some apposite but lengthy observations by the Saviour of mankind; and then they had him. He was a protector of Communists (though all the efforts of McCARTHY and his gang have failed to prove that there is a single Communist in the State Department).

IV

The Hiss episode moved James Reston, of the New York Times to write that Acheson "seems to lack the gift, absolutely essential in a Secretary of State, of foreseeing how his remarks will look in tomorrow morning's newspapers." Yet they often look pretty good, if not tomorrow morning at least next week. He was denounced for insulting and misrepresenting Senator TAFT in his comments on reexaminists; yet it presently turned out that what TAFT meant was just about what Acheson thought he meant. (At least, what TAFT means on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays; he seems to spend Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays reexamining and contradicting his own remarks of the day before.)

When Mr. Burt Shotton, who as manager of the Brooklyn Dodgers had won two pennants in 3 years and kept his team in the running till the last game in the third, was rewarded by being fired, Red Smith, of the New York Herald Tribune observed that he had made two major mistakes in public relations: he had neglected to acknowledge the superior wisdom of some inmates of the press box, and when he was asked a stupid question he yielded to the impulse to reply, "That is a stupid question." I have never heard Acheson say that, though he sometimes looks it; and to look it can be more withering—and more unfortunate, if you

happen to look it at a member of a congressional committee. It is not his fault that he looks like, and indeed is, a superior person; but that can be very annoying to Members of Congress.

Nevertheless, in his news conferences he displays more candor, and far more sense of humor, than any other Secretary of State within my recollection (which goes back 30-odd years). Once, I remember, when somebody asked him an embarrassing question, he remarked with a grin, "You wouldn't have known anything about that if I hadn't been silly enough to mention it last week." He seldom if ever takes the advice so lavishly given him by the pundits of the press, which may account for the crocodile tears which not long ago bedewed certain newspaper columns, whose writers sobbed that it was too bad—Acheson was a great statesman and a fine fellow, but he had lost the confidence of the country, so he would have to go.

Well, if you believe Dr. Gallup's not wholly infallible poll, he had lost the confidence of a majority of such citizens as had heard of him (about a third of them, in spite of all the uproar, had not); the big lie, repeated over and over, had done its work. The attack on Acheson was indeed only the major aspect of a campaign which included demands for either the resignation or the impeachment of the President; which included also the attack on General Marshall, disguised as an attack on Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg, who being a woman and a Jew looked like a safe preliminary target. Just possibly, this case marked the turn of the tide. The Senate committee which heard the charges against Mrs. Rosenberg not only unanimously cleared her, but sent the evidence it had heard to the Department of Justice for investigation of the perjury which somebody had obviously committed. Moreover, the Senator who was most irate over this outrageous attack was a conservative Republican, HARRY CAIN, and Mrs. Rosenberg's most energetic and effective defender, during the investigation, was a conservative newspaperman, Frederick Woltman of the Scripps-Howard papers. So maybe the distinction between truth and falsehood is again beginning to mean something.

How much the public cares, however, is still uncertain. Last fall a man named FRANK BOW, operating through a Senator (libel-proof, in a speech on the floor), attacked both the integrity and the loyalty of the Secretary of the Interior. Bow's sworn testimony before a Senate committee was contradicted by the sworn testimony of several other people; somebody was lying, and lying on oath. Secretary Chapman was completely exonerated; Senator O'MAHONEY said that Bow's charges were an infamous libel; Senator MURRAY said that a man like Bow should not be allowed to remain at large. So what happened to FRANK BOW? He was elected to Congress from Ohio, beating a good man.

Tacitus wrote that the civil wars of A. D. 69 had "divulged the secret of the Empire, that an Emperor could be made elsewhere than at Rome." Sometimes it seems that some of the performances of this past year have divulged the secret of the Republic—that while you may not be able to fool all of the people all of the time, you can fool enough of them enough of the time to gain your end. The ethics of this sort of thing require no comment, but I should think that at least some of the men who joined in the crusade against Acheson would be concerned about its intellectual implications. They must at least be smart enough to realize that similar tactics might some day be used against them, even if they are undisturbed over what they have done to the basic principles of American public life.

They were operating on the principle that there can be no such thing as an honest difference of opinion, that whoever disagreed with them must be a traitor. In a time of great international tension they had demanded the dismissal of the Secretary of State, just as he was about to start off for an international conference where important and controversial issues were to be decided; they proposed no alternative to his policy, or to him; they had made allegations against him which were utterly, and often ludicrously false; and but for the firmness of the President they would have got away with it.

This Nation was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the principle (among others) that honest men may honestly disagree on public issues; that if they all say what they think, a majority of the people will be able to distinguish truth from error; that in the competition in the market place of ideas, the sounder ideas will in the long run win out. Lately we have been engaged in a cold civil war—it was nothing less, in the year 1950—testing whether any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

Time will tell.

Some Aspects of the Veterans' Administration Medical Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative and interesting article, Some Aspects of the Veterans' Administration Medical Program, appearing in the November 1950, issue of Harvard Public Health Alumni Bulletin, written by Dr. Francis Brian Carroll, M. D.; D. M. D., Tufts College; M. D., University of Rochester; M. P. H., Harvard University; and since his discharge after World War II, area medical director, New England States, and New York State, Veterans' Administration.

The article follows:

Since 1946 there has been marked improvement in quality of medical care in the hospital program of the Veterans' Administration.

Much has been accomplished by emulating those procedures which have proved successful in civilian medical practice in our large university hospitals.

Veterans' Administration hospitals have become affiliated with medical schools. Residency training programs have been instituted under the sponsorship of deans' committees. Leading physicians in all of the medical and surgical specialties are utilized on a part-time basis as consultants and attending physicians. There has been a resultant elevation of the professional standards in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Prior to World War II, the Veterans' Administration had considerable difficulty recruiting physicians because of the great disparity between salaries established by the Civil Service and the earnings of private practitioners in civilian life. Congress passed Public Law 293, which permitted the Veterans' Administration to hire medical personnel without reference to civil service rules and regulations. This has proved another important factor in enabling the Veterans' Administration to recruit competent medical staffs.

There has been a great increase in the amount of money spent for professional and other services, particularly for the use of diagnostic procedures and techniques requiring a large number of ancillary personnel. This has not only improved the quality of care, but has improved the efficiency of the entire program.

Individuals frequently ask why the Veterans' Administration does not contract for patient care in civilian hospitals. Actually, many veterans with service-connected disabilities are receiving care in civilian hospitals. Such an arrangement is made in emergencies when, because of the distance involved, it might be detrimental to transport the patient to a veterans' hospital.

Veterans' Administration hospitals were originally authorized because a grateful Nation recognized the debt which it owed to those who suffered disabilities in the service of their country.

At the present time there are two additional reasons why we must have so many Veterans' Administration hospitals: (1) Civilian hospitals do not have sufficient beds to handle the patient load, and (2) a large proportion of service-connected cases have disabilities which are chronic in nature and require long-term hospitalization. Private hospitals do not want this type of case.

Many people wonder why it is necessary to continue to build additional Veterans' Administration hospitals. This is readily understandable when one considers the potential load of veterans eligible for hospital benefits within the next 25 years.

A statistical summary released by the Veterans' Administration on January 31, 1950, showed there were 19,035,000 living veterans, of whom 15,213,000 served in World War II, the remainder in World War I and other wars. From this, one can appreciate the great reservoir of eligible veterans who will seek hospitalization within the next 25 years. It must also be realized that as the average age of the veteran increases, his need for hospitalization increases. Therefore, it can be safely estimated that the peak load will not be reached until after 1970. At that time one can envisage a need of 250,000 beds. In considering the demand for increasing hospitalization over the past years. The Veterans' Administration has reported that in 1930, approximately 10 years following World War I, there were 90,511 veterans hospitalized. They report the load in July 1945, just prior to the flow resulting from World War II, as 71,713. As of January 31, 1950, there were 112,332 Veterans' Administration patients in hospitals.

This situation requires long-range planning and does not lend itself to a vacillating policy of adopting each temporary expedient suggested by those well-meaning groups who are not always conversant with the facts.

Taxpayers rightfully wonder why the Veterans' Administration does not utilize Army or Navy hospitals, since they are closed, instead of building new hospitals. In some instances the Veterans' Administration has taken over these hospitals. In most instances, however, it is not feasible to do so. Many armed services hospitals are located in isolated areas where it would be impossible to arrange for an affiliation with a medical school, and it would be difficult to assemble a competent full-time professional staff. Many of these hospitals are of temporary construction, or at best, of semipermanent construction, with a resultant excessive cost for upkeep. Most of these hospitals are of the cantonment type with a horizontal layout. This type of hospital requires much more personnel to operate and, therefore, greatly increases operating expenses. Thus, one can appreciate why the Veterans' Administration should studiously avoid acquiring the average Army or Navy hospital built during World War II.

It is true that the average length of patient stay in a veterans' hospital is greater than in most civilian hospitals. It must be borne

in mind that veterans' hospitals have many more chronic patients which accounts for a greater average length of hospital stay. But the patient stay is also longer in Veterans' Administration hospitals than in civilian hospitals if one compares only the patients who remain less than 30 days. There is a simple explanation for this which is not generally appreciated by the public. In civilian practice a patient usually visits his physician's office where a careful history is taken and a physical examination made. In some instances special examinations such as chest X-rays are taken and gastrointestinal studies are performed on an outpatient basis. In many instances surgical patients have had all except the immediate preoperative studies completed prior to hospitalization for an operation. Also following an operation, the patient is discharged home at an early date for further follow-up at home by the family physician. This is not usually possible with veterans because only those with service-connected disabilities are eligible for outpatient care at Government expense.

Accordingly, when the average veteran enters the hospital, he receives a complete work-up preoperatively and remains at the hospital, in most instances, until he is fully recovered.

There is no denying the fact that a patient who is paying for his own hospitalization is anxious to be discharged as soon as possible. It is claimed that this incentive is not present in the case of the average veteran. This may be true in isolated instances but the Veterans' Administration does not concur in the belief that this is a factor of major importance. The cost of hospitalization is but one of the many factors which affect a patient while he is hospitalized. In many cases he is faced with loss of income, interruption of schooling, and separation from his family. Any one or a combination of these factors would offer an impelling reason why he would want to be discharged from the hospital at the earliest possible date.

Any assumption, based on the length of hospital stay, that it takes longer, for example, to complete a gastrointestinal series or to recover from a major operation in a Veterans' Administration hospital than in a civilian hospital is entirely erroneous.

It is well recognized that the type of medical care afforded in Veterans' Administration hospitals affiliated with medical schools is on a par with that provided in the best civilian hospitals. Veterans' Administration hospitals are not only staffed by eminent physicians, but also by experts in all the allied medical specialties. They are equipped with the finest equipment available to enable these highly specialized individuals to carry out their diversified and complicated techniques.

Once a patient has been admitted to a VA hospital, irrespective of whether the veteran has established service connection, there can be but one standard of medical care—the best possible.

Inasmuch as the greatest demand for beds is for neuropsychiatric patients, coupled with the fact that the VA has a limited number of neuropsychiatric beds available at the present time, it has been necessary to utilize these beds to the greatest advantage. To this end, mental hygiene clinics attempt to handle as many psychoneurotic and mild psychotic patients as possible, thus decreasing need for hospitalization. In VA neuropsychiatric hospitals, intensive therapy is utilized in an effort to treat effectively and discharge incumbents to make room for others needing treatment.

Applications for admission to tuberculosis hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration are far in excess of the number of beds available for tuberculosis patients. To meet this situation, the Veterans' Administration has made arrangements for hospitalization of service-connected veterans at Government expense in practically every State, county, or municipal sanatorium in this country. Building plans call for the construction of more tuberculosis hospitals. In the meantime, the Veterans' Administration is converting some general medical and surgical hospitals to tuberculosis. They are also utilizing sections in their general hospitals for tuberculosis cases. For the past 2 years, in approximately 25 of the Veterans' Administration tuberculosis hospitals throughout the country, one of the largest and best controlled studies in the use of streptomycin in the treatment of tuberculosis cases has been carried out. All tuberculosis-psychotic patients in Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospitals have been isolated and are cared for in separate buildings. Aseptic technique has been established in all of the tuberculosis hospitals. The Veterans' Administration has adopted the procedure of oiling blankets, bed linen, and floors in their tuberculosis hospitals, in order to prevent dust and hence tubercle bacilli, from circulating. The policy of giving B. C. G. vaccine to tuberculin negative doctors, nurses, and food attendants has been considered, but has not been adopted to date. Tuberculosis registers have been established and will be maintained locally in cooperation with State health departments.

Future planning calls for 1,000-bed construction projects predominantly for neuropsychiatric patients but to include separate 250-bed medical and surgical buildings. The general medical and surgical unit will take care of general medical and surgical admissions from the surrounding area, as well as the intercurrent illness of patients in the neuropsychiatric units.

Future 1,000-bed hospitals primarily for general medical and surgical patients will have neuropsychiatric units of approximately 250 beds.

Domiciliary homes are operated to care for those veterans who are able to work for a few hours a day, and who need a minimum amount of professional care. This enables the Veterans' Administration to utilize the limited number of hospital beds in their general hospitals to the greatest advantage.

Any widespread notion that the Veterans' Administration operates independently or arbitrarily without the advice and assistance of the medical profession, as a whole, is grossly erroneous.

A group of national consultants representing all of the medical and surgical specialties, meet approximately every 2 months at the Veterans' Administration central office, Washington, D. C., to review the program and recommend changes for its improvement to the Chief Medical Director and his staff. Dr. James Stevens Simmons, dean, Harvard School of Public Health, is one of the most active members of this group and has contributed a great deal toward its success.

There are six area offices located throughout the country, charged with the responsibility of supervising the operation of the medical program. In addition to a full-time staff, three area offices utilize the services of consultants in all of the medical specialties. The Boston area office has responsibility for supervision of all Veterans' Administration hospitals and out-patient medical clinics in the New England States and in New York State, where there is a total of 29 installations. There are 59 area medical consultants in the various specialties attached to the Boston area, who make periodic surveys of the activities in their respective specialties in the VA installations in this area, and make recommendations for improvement.

At VA hospitals, another group of consultant and attending physicians render direct service in the hospitals, making ward rounds, performing operations, and participating in the training of residents.

Our regional office medical clinics authorize treatment of service-connected cases by private practitioners of medicine on a fee basis. This enables the veteran to have free choice of a physician approved by the State medical society, either as a general practitioner or as a specialist.

It would be difficult to conceive of any medical program with more active participation of specialists and private practitioners in medicine, than that which now exists in the medical program of the Veterans' Administration.

Social Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following Senate resolution passed by the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois recommending amendments to the Social Security Act:

Whereas the Congress of United States by amendment to the Federal Social Security Act has provided that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public-assistance programs operated by the various States in conjunction with the Federal Government under provisions of the Social Security Act shall be limited to purposes directly connected with the administration of these programs; and

Whereas this injunction of secrecy imposed on the States by said amendment to the Federal Social Security Act is a matter which causes great public concern, and is directly responsible for numerous injustices, abuses, and fraud by permitting many individuals not actually in need to receive assistance and to escape detection because of the stringent regulations guarding the names of recipients of public assistance, thus creating dissatisfaction with the public welfare program in many communities of the State; and

Whereas said secrecy provision violates the fundamental principle that any expenditure of public funds should be subject to public audit; and

Whereas members of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois repeatedly have expressed themselves as favoring an amendment to the "Public Assistance Code of Illinois" which would make available to public inspection and sound use a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State, only to be advised that such an action would be in conflict with the Federal Social Security Act and would result in loss of Federal funds for public assistance purposes; and

Whereas the so-called Federal funds were collected from the taxpayers of Illinois to the extent of almost $3,340,000,000 during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, while less than $3 out of every $100 collected from the people of Illinois was returned to the State of Illinois in so-called Federal aid for all purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we go on record as recommending to the Congress of the United States that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible date amending pertinent sections of the Federal Social Security Act in such a manner that State legislative bodies desiring to do so would be permitted to remove restrictions in State laws concealing the identity of public assistance recipients and to provide that a list of the names of all recipients of assistance be available for public inspection in a proper public office: and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eighty-second Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

Adopted by the senate March 7, 1951.

SHERWOOD G. DEGAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

India Can and Should Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, in our natural and commendable impulse to help hungry people in India, we should not, I think, overlook the fact that India is rich in assets and has the ultimate capacity to pay us for the wheat we propose to send her either in money or commodities that we need. I am not concerned with the terms of such payment and would be content if they were most conveniently arranged; but pay they certainly can, and pay they certainly should.

There is grave question of our right as representatives of the people to give away their money. Our own individual and private charities are one thing, but to be charitable with the money of other people is something else.

I am including the following interesting editorial from the Bridgeton (N. J.) Evening News entitled "Let India Pay":

LET INDIA PAY

India wanted this country to give her 200,000,000 tons of wheat because she said she had a crop failure of wheat in that country last year, and there were a lot of people in this country, including Mr. Harry Truman and a lot of Government officials, who immediately jumped up and said, "Why certainly, give India the wheat she needs to keep her people from starving. We have never turned down a humanitarian call. Because India's representative in the United Nations took sides against us and spoke harshly about us is no reason for refusing aid to starving people."

That is all very true, but those people, including the President, himself, did not know all the facts in the case nor did they stop to find out before they raised the humanitarian cry.

Yes, India had a short wheat crop, not because of a wheat failure, but because India had shifted large areas of wheat land to jute and other crops that were more profitable and furnished labor to industrial workers. Neither was India unable to secure wheat because there was none near at hand. Her adjoining little republic has millions of bushels of wheat for sale, which would have filled a large part of India's needs, the transportation on which would be much cheaper than that on wheat shipped from this country. Nor was India unable to pay for at least a part of the wheat shipped from this country, for the Indian Government has money.

India has valuable deposits of minerals which we use in the manufacture of steel and the atomic bomb but of which we have none and must import, which could have been traded for wheat or at least for some of it, but no such offer was ever made, the Indian officials seeming to think that the United States was a sucker and a good subject to bleed for a good lot of wheat by the humanitarian route and perhaps they were unaware that Uncle Sam did not grow this wheat, but paid a big price for it and taxed the people's bread as well as their pocketbook to pay for it.

Be this picture as it may, the House of Representatives has taken a hard-hearted view of the application, opposing passage of the bill as at present constituted and the House Rules Committee has it bottled up refusing to permit it to reach the floor and, even though it was released, it would fall of passage by the House.

If the people of India are shown to be suffering from famine, Congress will aid them but their need must be presented in a different light from that now shown.

This country cannot carry the whole world on its shoulders even though a lot of Washington officials, including Mr. Truman, think it can.

W. E. M.

Time to Ring Down Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter. This editorial, entitled "Time To Ring Down Curtain," is indeed timely and expresses the views of the people in my district regarding the incompetence of many of the administration's appointments. They realize we cannot long survive under the bureaucratic form of Government and want the constitutional rights of Congress returned from the executive branch of the Government. They want their elected representatives to represent them at all times and not be governed by the mandates handed down by men and women appointed by the President.

TIME TO RING DOWN CURTAIN

It seemed fair to hold off conclusive judgment about the RFC until the Senate's inquiry was well advanced. That stage has now been reached. And the findings point to just one sensible course: The abolition of the RFC.

As everyone knows, Herbert Hoover created RFC as a depression emergency device to help keep tottering big business going in the dark days. It was never contemplated that the agency should go permanently into the banking business in competition with our private banking system.

But that is in fact exactly what happened. More than that, the RFC became a sort of court of last resort to which business firms appealed after all regular banks had turned a deaf ear. Many such concerns were granted loans, in defiance of what private bankers considered sound lending practice.

No doubt this greater liberality often had beneficial results, but that cannot be allowed to obscure the essential that the RFC was serving as a vast commercial bank. On several occasions, indeed, the RFC's well known liberality enabled private banks to transfer to that agency outstanding loans the banks rated as poor risks.

The private banking system is perfectly qualified, except perhaps in extreme emergencies, to meet all the credit needs of the expanding United States economy. There is no point in having the Government competing in this field.

But as it has developed in the capital, the issue goes well beyond the economic justifications for keeping or abolishing the RFC. Basically the problem has become a moral one.

What the investigation of Senator Fulbright's subcommittee has disclosed is a supreme example of the folly of government by crony—cronyism, as some have styled it.

Too often President Truman has placed in key Government office not the most fit men, nor even well-qualified men, but simply men he knew and liked. He frequently complains that he cannot attract competent men to many important posts, but the record indicates he at numerous times went out of his way to assure such jobs to his friends.

It is the thoughtful testimony of several seasoned Washington observers that Mr. Truman has thereby permitted a host of Federal commissions and bureaus to deteriorate dangerously. The Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, these are among them.

Worse than this, the President has maintained an almost fanatical loyalty to his cronies holding these jobs. Loyalty is a noble trait, and it isn't the only one the American people admire in Mr. Truman. But loyalty to incompetent men—friends or not—is misplaced. The President would do much better to be loyal to high standards of performance.

Moreover, this attitude has been aggravated by his insistence upon regarding every attack upon a subordinate as fundamentally an assault upon him as President. Thus he has tended to discount the criticisms as always political, never sincere.

Senator FULBRIGHT may not be without political motive, but the facts unearthed by his committee cannot be brushed off as campaign fantasies. The expensive mink coat given to a White House secretary, the free vacations for White House functionaries (and Senators, too, for that matter) at the expense of a Florida hotel manager who won an RFC loan, the innumerable payoffs through awards of high-salaried business jobs to former RFC men, these compound into a sordid, immoral story.

Apparently only the strongest men, administrators like Jesse Jones and Eugene Meyer, can keep a government lending agency from sinking into the morass of loans-by-political-favor. Establish an institution dealing in billions—passed out on fairly easy terms—and you have a set-up ideally suited to political machinations. Flies always collect around the honey pot.

The result is not only a weakening of the RFC itself, but a general lowering of moral behavior in many parts of the Administration, in Congress, and elsewhere.

Mr. Hoover, Jesse Jones, and others have called for RFC's demise. To abolish the agency would be to set an example, to start Government back up the road to sound moral performance.

No Communist Can Halt My Efforts in the Interest of Home-Front Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in their insane zeal to sabotage the efforts of your Congressman, some Communists often shoot beyond their first target and hit their ultimate bullseye, that of wrecking our civilian defense.

This fifth-column operation is best described by the recent action of a floater who went all out to smear a proposal because the man he hates most made it.

I refer to the Hall measure which extends the franking privilege to New York State civilian defense authorities and makes available the use of free mail in the organization of our local defense.

No Communist wants American homes or firesides to be safe. No left-winger wants anything but chaos on the home front.

So it is a clever, if not patriotic, excuse on the part of any punk who might be passing through, yet claiming to be a constituent and thereby seeming to make himself immune, to strike out at your Congressman when he proposes something in the interest of local civilian defense.

For such a troublemaker's information, I will say the proposal was not mine, but that it was made to me by the New York State Commission of Civilian Defense.

The appearance of my name as author of a bill invariably infuriates any Commie and throws him into a double lather when he learns such a bill is in the cause of defending our Nation.

That is why your Congressman has had to bear the most inhuman, unholy, and un-American attacks in his determination to fight for the welfare of the Americans of his district.

No; this was not my idea. But it is a good one and since it will stimulate, increase, and materially assist the work of Broome County's civilian defense, as well as the whole State's, I intend to press for its passage.

I will not be deterred by the smears of any Communist in pushing such a worthy cause.

Wanted: A New Name for Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William I. Nichols, from This Week magazine:

The redefinition of just one word could help change history.

Finding a new term to express a new idea could be a decisive factor in checking the world spread of communism.

This is the report that comes back again and again from men and women who are engaged in the struggle of ideas between the free world and the Soviets.

The word is "capitalism."

It is the term used over and over by the Soviets as a smear word to describe our side; and, so far as that goes, Americans generally use it themselves when they try to describe their economic system. But in fact, and on both sides of the iron curtain, it is a misleading word because, when applied to America, it no longer fits the system it pretends to describe.

What is worse, to many people it carries negative overtones of old errors and old abuses. In no way does it imply the positive, dynamic, expanding system of today, constantly changing, but always moving toward one goal—to create more goods and greater well-being for more people.

Recently, a top official in our overseas information program put it this way: "In all propaganda broadcasts now, the two words which appear most frequently are 'communism' and 'capitalism.' I don't think we have half as much trouble with the word 'communism' as we do with 'capitalism.' It's relatively easy to expose the bad side of communism and make it stick—so much so that when you say 'communism' and 'Red fascism' most people know you're talking about one and the same thing.

"But," he went on, "it's nowhere near as easy to make the good side of our society plain by using the word 'capitalism.' That's important. We need a word to make people realize that the real source of hope, progress, and prosperity rests with us."

The same thought has been expressed again and again by America's business leaders. "We only muddle our own thinking," they say, "when we use old words to describe new ideas."

To understand the problem, let's look back a bit. The word "capitalism" came into being well over 100 years ago in the early days of the industrial revolution. At that time the basis of wealth shifted from land to money (that is, capital) invested in industrial and commercial ventures. Admittedly, during those years there were many abuses, errors, and mistakes.

If you have read the novels of Charles Dickens—written 100 years ago—or the story of America's "Robber Barons" in the 1890's, you know what they were. There is no denying that capitalism's primitive period contains many dark chapters of worker exploitation at home, and colonial expansion abroad.

WE'VE CHANGED

All those memories are contained in the word "capitalism." The Communists are clever enough to seize upon that fact. Hence their use of the word "capitalist" as a dirty name, a smear word, for every aspect of our Western civilization.

But what about us? Are we so stupid as to let them get away with it? In the face of their repressive, regressive slave system, we stand for bold and imaginative society which has changed, developed, and improved with the years. Are we imaginative enough to find a word for it?

Anyone who has eyes and looks around him knows how conditions today differ from those of 50 or 100 years ago. Here, for example, are 10 points based in large part on a listing recently prepared by Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

1. Slavery, which antedates capitalism, has been abolished in all capitalist countries. In fact, and ironically, it is now practiced primarily in Communist countries, and on a wider scale than ever before in history.

2. In its early days capitalism exploited the labor of women and children. This has nearly been abolished.

3. Capitalism once imposed overlong hours. These are now short, and growing shorter.

4. The standard of living under capitalism has steadily risen. This is exactly contrary to Marx's prediction—and to the record on Communist countries.

5. Unemployment has been reduced and controlled and is now a diminishing problem.

6. The adulteration and misbranding of products have almost been eliminated.

7. Early capitalist employers cared little about the health and safety of their workers. Today industrial safety has been carried to such a point that more accidents occur in our homes than in factories, offices, and stores.

8. The slogan of capitalism once was "The public be damned." Today all progressive companies know the importance of public opinion and public relations have become an essential part of management.

9. Capitalism formerly produced crowded, unsanitary slums. Now employers know the value of better living conditions, and work for them.

10. Imperialist wars were once waged by capitalists and colonial rule imposed on foreign peoples. Now country after country has given up its colonies.

That is a pretty impressive list of differences between "then" and "now." And the process is still going on. Up to the time of emergency controls (a result of Communist aggression, by the way) company after company was developing new plans for bonuses, pensions, incentive wages, cost-of-living wage raises, profit-sharing, and other procedures.

In one form or another all these methods are designed to give more and more people an increasing share of production, whether in the form of higher wages, shorter hours, lower prices, or better goods and services.

Most of us in America know all these facts. We know what our "new capitalism" is producing for us and what it can produce anywhere if given a fair chance. But hundreds of millions of people throughout the world don't know this. We must find some way to make clear in their minds the distinction between (1) our system and the capitalism of the past and, (2) between our system and capitalism as it is practiced in some other parts of the world. Unfortunately there are still areas where capitalism operates in the old, primitive way, and a capitalist is regarded as a member of a privileged upper group who dodges taxes, exploits his workers, and overcharges his customers.

EUROPE'S VIEW

As was pointed out recently by French-American writer, Lewis Galantière, the average European "judges our capitalism in the light of what he knows about his own, and we have allowed him to remain in profound ignorance of the differences between the two."

A new name for our system would help make the distinctions clear. It would revive hope among the underprivileged. And at the same time it would be a spur toward more enlightened action by old-fashioned capitalists wherever they may be.

Up to now communism has claimed that it held out the only promise for a better future. But as soon as communism takes over, the promises are forgotten. Then the iron curtain falls, the security police move in, the gates of the slave-labor camps swing open, and another helpless nation is trapped.

In a free world one can make no sweeping promises because people can come and go, and see for themselves. One can never claim that everything is, or will be, perfect for everybody, everywhere, at exactly the same time. But one can see with his own eyes that in most areas where true political and economic democracy is practiced, things are getting better; the direction is up. And it is the direction which counts.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

How shall we describe this system—imperfect, but always improving, and always capable of further improvement—where men move forward freely together, working together, building together, producing always more and more, and sharing together the rewards of their increased production? Capitalism is no longer the right word. In too many minds it stands for the primitive economic system of the nineteenth century when, all too often, employers were greedy and workers were oppressed. We need a new name to describe the new, expanding, and ever-self-renewing system. What shall it be? I have heard various suggestions. Here are a few of the best:

"The new capitalism; democratic capitalism; economic democracy; industrial democracy; distribution; mutualism; productivism."

All have their points. All help catch and express the idea, or parts of it. But might there be something better? Some word which will catch hold and slip automatically into the language, giving that sense of birth, hope, promise, and everlasting pushing forward which is the essence of every society of free men?

If we find the right word it will help things fall into perspective. Gradually, throughout the world, the word "communism" will sink and dwindle to its true level, standing not for progress but reaction, not freedom but slavery, not comfort but miserable and abject poverty and fear.

The fact that no new name has yet been found shows that the problem is not easy. Perhaps we must still go through more years of effort and growth before the right word emerges. But some of This Week's 10,000,000 reader-families may come up with suggestions to push us further along the road. If so, they will have played their part in the battle for the minds of men.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick was a slave in his youth and a bishop when he died, March 17, many, many years ago. St. Patrick was born in Britain around the year 380. The stories of his life state that when St. Patrick was 16, he was taken captive by a band of Irish marauders. For 6 years he worked as a slave for an Irish chieftain. While in Ireland he learned a great deal about the people—their languages, their emotions, and their character. He managed to make his escape and returned to England.

It was there that he decided to enter the church. After 14 years of study and preparation, he was ordained a priest.

In 432, St. Patrick returned to Ireland as a missionary. During his work there he founded over 350 churches, ordained many priests and baptized thousands of people. The flame which he lighted on the Hill of Tara was spread until there is a flame burning in the heart of each Irishman all over the world. When he died, sometime around 460, it is said that there was no night for 12 days.

St. Patrick was a man of very strong will power and considerable executive ability. There is no doubt about his competence as an organizer; he was a man of tireless action and enthusiasm. St. Patrick had great influence on the Irish mind and Celtic imagination—striking examples of these are the picturesque legends about his miraculous deeds which have sprung up in each locality of Ireland. One such story concerns the shamrock; it is esteemed today because St. Patrick purportedly used its three leaves on one stem to illustrate the principle of the Holy Trinity.

St. Patrick taught the Irish that God created man free, that God bestowed on every man a free will and gave each man the responsibility for the proper exercise of this free will. From this teaching, the Irish have developed an emotional trait which makes them more than ready to defend the principles of freedom and tolerance.

In the third stanza of "The Wearing of the Green" there is the following passage:

I've heard a whisper of a country
That lies beyond the sea,
Where rich and poor stand equal
In the light of freedom's day.
O Erin, must we leave you,
Driven by a tyrant's hand?
Must we ask a mother's blessing
From a strange and distant land?

Could that country have been America? At any rate, the Irish came here bringing their crafts and skills; they led in the clamor for freedom of religion, speech, and assembly. America was pleased to welcome its Irish friends and it has profited from their arrival.

The "fighting Irish" fight because they love. And as Monsignor Sheen once stated, "since an Irishman loves more than anyone else, he fights more than anyone else." Many of the Revolutionary troops were Irish—they were determined to see the fight through to its glorious end. There was Gen. Henry Knox, from New Derry, who fought in every battle of the war. He became the Secretary of War in Washington's first cabinet. Then there were Gen. Andrew Lewis, born in Donegal; Gen. Dan Morgan; Gen. Walter Stewart, from Derry; Gen. Ephraim Blaine, Washington's quartermaster; Gen. Andrew Pickens; Gen. Joseph Reid; Gen. William Maxwell; Gen. Richard Montgomery, who captured Fort John, Fort Chambly, and stormed Montreal; and many other gallant Irish fighters. Also one must not forget the "Father of the American Navy," Capt. John Barry.

The Irish helped in peaceful battles also; among the Irish signing our great Declaration of Independence were Robert Paine, Thomas McKean, Matthew Thornton, George Taylor, and Edward Rutledge. Also important in that great signing was Charles Thompson, from Maghera, who was the perpetual secretary of the Continental Congress.

For a good many years, the wandering Irish schoolteachers had most of the responsibility for the education in America.

The War of 1812 brought forth Gen. George Croghan; a monument in his honor was built in Savannah, Ga. Also participating in that war was Gen. Andrew Jackson, who later became President of these United States.

During the late unpleasantness of the 1860's the Irish, too, were often divided in their allegiance. On the Confederate side, there were Postmaster General John H. Reagan, Gen. "Pat" Cleburne, and Gen. Joseph Finnegan. On the Union side were Generals Philip Sheridan, Patrick Francis Meagher, and Philip Kearney. Michael Corcoran also supported the "Blues."

World War II heroes of Irish descent are still familiar names to us all—Capt. Colin Kelly, the hero of Pearl Harbor; the five Sullivan brothers; and Father Duffy, the fighting chaplain. It is even said that among Britain's heroes of the Second World War are two Irishmen, Pat Finucane and Viscount Montgomery.

Many more Irish names can be added to our roll of "Americans of Irish descent who have made valuable contributions to our country," Horace Greeley, the founder of the New York Tribune; the Armours of Chicago; Robert Fulton, inventor of the steamboat; Cyrus Hall McCormick; the second Chief Justice, John Rutledge; John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War, Secretary of State and Vice President in 1825; Alfred E. Smith, Governor of New York; Samuel Morse, the inventor of electric telegraphy; James F. Byrnes, now Governor of South Carolina; Supreme Court Justice Frank Murphy. From the artistic approach, there are Augustus St. Gaudens, the sculptor; William Corcoran, who supplied Washington's Corcoran Art Gallery; James McNeill Whistler, the artist; composers such as Edward McDowell, Victor Herbert, and Stephen Foster; and poets such as James Whitcomb Riley, Joyce Kilmer, Padraic Colum, and Edna St. Vincent Millay.

Is there any wonder why the Irish celebrate so on the 17th of March? They are proud, and rightfully so, of their heritage. And America is proud of their support and contributions. We salute the Irish, not only on this day, but every day of the year.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the world needs Ireland.

March 17 is the day of celebration for the Irish. It is the day they set aside to

honor St. Patrick. They give thanks to God for him, for St. Patrick who brought the faith to Erin.

The conversion of Ireland to the Christian religion was one of the most dramatic and miraculous events in the history of Europe. They have "kept the faith" in the face of diabolical persecution.

Today more than ever the world needs Ireland. As an American of Irish descent I ask the people of the United States and the world to take cognizance of Irish history in the face of world crisis.

As an American I am proud of my country and more devoted to her than to Ireland, but I love and cherish Ireland for her devotion to the truth and to the faith, for her sacrifices to save principle. We Americans all need faith, not only faith in God but faith in our fellowman. We must have hope—hope in the United States. We must be a land of religion, a land of racial harmony, a land of people devoted to family life if we are to survive the aggression of godless Russia.

The United States is the last bulwark of the free world. Her destiny is at stake. She, too, needs prayer—prayer for the will, the leadership, the faith, the hope to uphold the principles of the free world.

To speak of Ireland is to call to mind the kings of Tara's Hill, or Brian Boru and the Battle of Clontarf. Shall we talk of the Book of Kells, the Cells of the Monks, and the learning of the scholars of old? A prayerful tribute could be paid to the memory of Patrick, Bridget, Malachy, and many more. All this could we do. Or shall we dwell upon the sweetness of the land of Ireland, the brilliance of her emerald cloak, the stark beauty of the isles, the sad splendor of the gloaming upon her evening hills, the lilt of her gay little rivers and the peaceful stillness of her lakes, the rugged coasts, and the ever-sounding seas about her? Or listen to her poets, her philosophers, her scholars, her men and women of wit and charm, her bards and her minstrels? Or tell anew the myths and the fancies, the tales and the Come-All-Yes, the annals of olden times, and rhapsodies of the blind walkers of the roads? Or glory in the tenacity which preserved the faith of our fathers, the holiness of martyred priest and nun, or saint, and humble laborer? And might we not join in spirit with the pilgrims wending their way to Mellray and Knock and Croagh Patrick?

What peace of mind to dwell on these thoughts, and how compelling is the desire to ponder upon them. Would that I had the pen of the Irish writers to give them their true and worthiest expression. My safest course is to tell you that I possess these beloved thoughts. They are part of my being, as they are part of yours. How better our lives, how nobler our natures, for cherishing them. Thank God we have them.

Let us not think for a moment that our riches are those of memory only. The treasury of Ireland has been indeed heavily drawn upon for the endowment of western civilization. It will never be forgotten that when darkness engulfed the minds and hearts of men, and the lamps of learning were blown out by the fierce winds of barbarian invasion and shattered by ignorance, the only light, besides the beacon of the Holy Faith, that the eyes of man could see and finally take bearings by was the single, strong flame which was nourished and kept alive on that little green isle set in the vastness of the ocean waters. So powerful was this flame, and zealous its monastic guardians, that no assault could cause it to flicker or sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the western world that is good, and true, and beautiful, and it casts its challenging brilliance even upon the far-flung steppes and tundras of Russia. Its warmth is felt in a body politic shuddering in terror of the cold clammy rigor of spiritual death. And it will burn forever, because it was fed with the oil of truth and kindled with the breath of belief in God, His justice, His wisdom, His mercy, and His love.

We could dwell upon the priceless substantial contributions that the Irish have brought to these shores of our beloved America and the part they have played in every field of endeavor which has been for the development and permanence of this great Nation. Irish names come to mind from every decade of our history and from every quarter of the land—and from every bit of hallowed ground, far-flung throughout the world, wherein rest the bodies of our heroic American dead.

We are Americans—first, last, and always. This is our own, our native land. Our loyalty to it has never been questioned. The nation and the world know where we stand—and we stand here immovable.

As a Member of Congress, my first consideration and my desire is the good of my country, above all other things, having in mind the dictates of my conscience and the wishes of my constituents. As a human being, and preeminently as an American, it is also my desire that truth and justice shall prevail among all men everywhere, that their rights and dignity be respected as a divine imperative; that they have the greatest freedom possible to establish the seeds of good that are within them. These desires, I grant you, struggle for realization in a most complex and disordered world society. Morally and spiritually I will continue true to them to the best of my ability before God. Intellectually and practically I recognize my limitations in the face of the vast array of problems that are thrust before me and every other Member of Congress, problems complicated by the wishes of those who would have us decide in favor of this or that side of a question, often on the basis of an intense ex parte interest or partisan affinity. The internal affairs of the Commonwealth of Australia are not the proper subject of inquiry by our Government in the ordinary course of events. If the people of Portugal want, or will tolerate a corporative form of state, that is their concern. If England favors constitutional monarchy, that is the Englishman's free choice. It is no business of ours, in fact or theory, to foist our notions of self-rule upon any other nation. While we as Americans, Americans with a tradition of freedom fostered and magnified by our Irish ancestors, would like to see all the people of Ireland free and united in one nation indivisible, such as our own, we have no right to prescribe or direct that economy for them. Nor does international law warrant our intruding. But let no one attempt to persuade us not to work and pray for the unification of Ireland, for that is our individual right as free members of a free community. In keeping with my rights, and because of my personal view of the matter, I gave evidence of my stand on the Irish partition situation, by standing up in the House of Representatives on March 29, 1950, on a division vote, and casting my vote in favor of the Fogarty amendment, which was adopted with 99 for, and 66 against; then, on March 31, 1950, again on a division vote, I was one of the 60 for the same amendment—against 220—when it was defeated.

I would like to state that never in the history of the world have men and women of good will so earnestly and so pitifully sought for a sound basis of universal peace. It is a striking fact that in an era of awful physical violence and threats of worse violence to come, the hearts and minds of mankind have leaned with anxiety and hope toward solutions in the moral order, the order of thought and ideas, as opposed to the law of the jungle.

Certainly, there will be no peace of any universality until men advance beyond practical moral considerations into the spiritual order of adjustment. It is only in the spiritual ordering of their affairs and their lives that men can come to acknowledge, in humility and fraternity, the final sanction of their actions, namely, the will of God. With a widespread spiritual awakening, the terrors that beset us all now will perish. Then the whole world, made free to enter upon an era of peace and charity, will do that which will put to shame the glories of the Renaissance from the other great ages of history.

We know that for the accomplishment of His greatest works, God has chosen the weak things of the world. In the great census of humanity, the Irish have been but few; they have been and are numerically weak. But they have, in the historical sum, a moral and a spiritual grandeur and effectiveness that is far out of proportion to their mere numbers. The impression they have made upon western civilization is a major mark. Indeed, they have helped shape the very mold of that civilization. It is devoutly to be hoped and prayed that their moral and spiritual grandeur and effectiveness will continue to be felt in the shaping of the destiny of mankind. The Irish race are a mystical people, and a people of prayer; let us pray for a rule of holiness.

We are a people of action; let us act in the defense of our beliefs. We are a loyal people; let us never lessen our loyalty to the faith of our fathers and to this great country which we love so dearly as to die for it. Let us do all we can to hasten the day when peace once more walks the ways of this world and holds us all close in a bond of understanding and brotherly love.

RFC: Relatives, Friends, and Contributors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, relatives, friends, contributors, we will lend up to our ears. This clumsy paraphrase of the classic Shakespearian quotation attributed to the Honorable Mark Antony, himself no mean politician of the first century B. C., must have been the motto of the RFC in its dealings on private loan applications. Whatever may be the validity of the RFC as a lending agency in connection with such projects as public utility operation by local governments, the fact is that in its operations as a lender to private corporations and individuals, the RFC has become a stench in the public nostrils.

Something more is required of a public agency than the "morals of the market place." To argue that a loan is "proper" because it violates no law, when the fact is that such a loan has been influenced by personal considerations, such as family relationships, free hotel accommodations, mink coats, and maybe other things as well, is to mock at the law and its spirit.

The private lending facilities of RFC ought to be closed down at once. Anyone who wants a loan today for private ventures can obtain a loan through banks or insurance companies, if the proposal is worth a bean. If it is not, he should not be getting it from Uncle Sam either.

Questions and Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on top of the RFC business and the Mississippi job-buying charges directed against the Administration, comes another bit of shenanigans to look into.

Just how did it happen that a chap out in Salt Lake City named Walter V. Pace, a meat-market owner, manage to drop into South Carolina last November to pick up options on land which he shortly sold to our Government for hydrogen-bomb plant development at a near profit of $76,000? Mr. Pace says that it just "happened." The Governor of South Carolina says that he would regard it as somewhat "unusual" if a man in South Carolina got an option on some land in Utah the day before an announcement that an atomic-bomb plant would be built.

Big question is: Did anybody in Washington or anywhere else connected with the atomic-bomb project tip Mr. Pace or some associate off to the pending announcement, and if so, who did and who profited? So far, nobody has done much talking. But you cannot stop us from thinking.

Whose Government Is This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Government in Washington is supposed to be your Government. Is it doing what you want it to do?

Your Government, as Lincoln put it, is supposed to be "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Yet, without any action by you—the people—or by your Representatives in the Congress, your Government is at war in Korea. Your Government is making preparations for war in Europe and elsewhere.

You are told that the military campaign in Korea is a police action by the United Nations. But you know it is war. You know that your sons, husbands, fathers—American boys—are fighting and dying in the frozen jungles of a foreign country halfway around the world. This is world war III. This world war may destroy your Government. It certainly will give you a dictatorship while it lasts and, when over, a depression the like of which this country has never experienced.

You are told that your Government's participation is necessary; that we must fight the world-wide menace of communism. But your Government is not fighting communism. The United Nations is not fighting communism.

General MacArthur, who is leading your sons in battle, is being prevented by the United Nations, and by your State Department, from fighting communism.

General MacArthur is not permitted to attack the Communist enemy wherever he may be. He may not employ intelligence or aerial reconnaissance to protect his soldiers unless the Communist enemy is actually upon him. He is forbidden to bomb Communist supply lines until it is too late. He may not employ an offensive against the Communist enemy on the enemy's territory. He is forbidden to organize for guerrilla warfare in the Communist enemy's rear.

Your Government is sending your boys to their fate blindfolded, and with one arm tied behind their backs. To all intents and purposes, in one way the United Nations is actually protecting the Communist enemy, and your State Department is backing the United Nations.

Your Seventh Fleet is protecting the Communists from attack by the Chinese anti-Communists, and it is keeping the ports of Red China open to receive matériel of war with which the Communists are killing your boys.

Your Government is spending your money to make war matériel available to its so-called friends and allies in the United Nations, who, in turn, are selling it to the Communists—in effect, trading with the enemy—your enemy. Trading with the enemy, under the laws and Constitution of the United States, is treason. We should not permit treason.

It is an outrage to pretend to fight communism in the Far East, or to prepare to fight communism in Europe, when our internal Communist problem is ignored. The place to start fighting communism is in Washington, where, during the past two administrations, Communists have been cultivated and coddled and where, even now, they are still being defended and protected. Actions speak louder than words.

The Government in Washington is supposed to be your Government. But, unless you assert yourself; unless you make your will known by writing the President, the Secretary of State, your Senators and Representatives in Congress who favor spending, sending troops to Europe, and unless you nominate and elect fearless, forthright men to run your Government, you will continue to be misrepresented; your Government may perish from the earth.

State-wide spring elections in Michigan are on Monday, April 2.

American Peace Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on two occasions, February 12, 1951, and February 26, 1951, I called the attention of the House to the current Communist phony peace offensive, under the guise of which, Communist propaganda is being spread throughout the Nation. The American press, as usual, is doing a fine public service by publicizing the fact that these Communist groups are not really interested in peace, but are, rather, interested in seeing the United States weak and Russia strong. For the benefit of the Members, I am including in the RECORD at this point, an excellent article by Mr. Ernest Brashear. The article appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News on March 9, 1951. The article follows:

(By Ernest Brashear)

The comrades are at it again.

Last time it was the Stockholm peace petition that made a phony plea for peace in the same paragraph that said America would be a war criminal if it dropped an atom bomb on Russia, even if Russia was the aggressor.

Now it's America's Peace Poll, which follows the same line—the Moscow line.

We all want peace, and when somebody walks up to us with a slip of paper and says, "Do you want to sign for peace?" you'll probably say "yes," and put down your name.

Then you'll turn in the ballot and go about your business feeling you've done a pretty good deed.

Don't feel too good brother. You will have just signed up in the big new phony peace drive sponsored by some of the Nation's top Communists and Commie-liners.

What's behind all this? Why do American Communists, agents in hiding of a hostile nation with the greatest army and air force in the world, circulate peace petitions?

The answer is easy.

They do it to gain time. They do it to slow our defense effort by representing Russia as a power that never, but never, would go to war unless attacked.

Only America, they lie, could be the aggressor, so Americans must sign peace petitions to show our Government that John Doe does not support the administration's war-mongering, imperialist designs on Russia.

If they can persuade enough people to believe this, our defense program will stall in its tracks.

But do you think for a minute the U. S. S. R. will stop building planes and submarines and tanks once we stop? Don't kid yourself.

It's all part of a carefully drawn national scheme known as the American Peace Crusade, with headquarters in New York.

The big idea is for 3,000 or so crusaders to descend on Washington next March 15, with thousands of votes for peace in the so-called peace poll.

Locally, the campaign kick-off comes tonight at a dinner meeting of the Labor Conference for Peace at the Park View Manor, 2200 West Seventh Street.

Principal speaker will be Judith Boudon, who will relate some of her experiences as a delegate to the Stalinist-controlled Warsaw peace congress.

Her report will be followed by entertainment and dancing.

The serious business will consist of handing out samples of the phony peace ballot and opening a drive for members at $1 a head.

Beginning tomorrow, the Commies and their supporters will get busy talking people into X-ing the ballots in a campaign blueprinted in the New York headquarters.

Here are some of the steps listed in the national memorandum of marching orders:

"As far as possible, see that all possible groupings are represented—women, labor, youth, Negro, clergy, academic circles, nationalities—officially or unofficially.

"Select the busiest corner in town—or the two or three busiest corners—for the public launching of the poll.

"Try to get a combination of World War II vets and mothers or sisters of boys now in the Armed Forces to man these posts.

"Approach the ministers and rabbis in your area.

"Get the people to write letters to the editor.

"Ask each group to consider immediately how the poll issue can be merged with the key concerns of the group—the 18-year-old draft and universal military training for youth groups; the wage freeze and rising prices for trade-unions; the Lieutenant Gilbert case, Army discrimination for anti-discrimination groups.

"Within a few days we hope to have available attractive leaflets which most certainly should be used with the distribution of the polling sheet.

"The leaflets will be designed for distribution to specialized groups, to begin with, labor, Negro, youth."

That blueprint, mailed from New York headquarters February 2, provides a neat lesson in Communist techniques for building up support of the Commie line by tying in with groups who have a legitimate objective.

The original plan called for the big crusade to take place March 1. Several developments, among them strong opposition to the move by AFL and CIO union leaders, caused deferment of the march on the Capitol until March 15.

Why Americans Don't Vote—Americans Will Vote, Inc.'s Successful Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be useful for veterans' organizations, fraternal organizations, civic organizations, States and municipalities, and voluntary groups to study the activities of Americans Will Vote, a group of public-spirited Americans who got together for the purpose of getting out the vote and did a remarkable job in a comparatively short time. The November 1950 election brought out a million more voters in Illinois than in any one presidential year, and it is estimated that as much as 80 percent of the responsibility for this increase is attributable to the efforts of Americans Will Vote, Inc. This organization won a special award in the 1950 Nation-wide get-out-the-vote competition, sponsored by the American Heritage Foundation. Appended is their report of November 24, 1950, which detailed the activities which won for them this award:

THE JOS. W. HICKS ORGANIZATION,
Chicago, Ill., November 24, 1950.

VOTING AWARDS COMMITTEE,
AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION,
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of Americans Will Vote, Inc., a nonpartisan, nonprofit, and nonpolitical organization, I am submitting this report in my capacity as public-relations counsel to the organization, as an application for one of the awards to be made in 1950 by the American Heritage Foundation on the theme Voting Is Everybody's Job.

ORIGIN OF AMERICANS WILL VOTE

Early in September a group of Chicago businessmen at luncheon were discussing a national magazine article, in which it was pointed out that only about 51 percent of America's qualified voters took the trouble to go to the polls in 1948's national election. Unanimous in their opinion that such apathy was distressing, they decided to attempt corrective action by forming an organization incorporated under the name "Americans Will Vote." The name of the organization was suggested by Mr. Charles T. Scott, owner of the Scott Steel Co. and prominent Chicago businessman. The article of incorporation was signed by Mr. Scott; Henry F. Woulfe, vice president of a leading Chicago printing and engraving firm; and Col. Max D. Emmanuel, a retired Army officer.

At the first organization meeting Elmer F. Layden, former Notre Dame football player and coach and now associated with the General American Transportation Corp., was elected president. Henry F. Woulfe, former president of Pepsodent Corp. and now vice president of Manz Corp., was elected vice president. Frederick W. Turner, Jr., prominent Chicago lawyer, was elected secretary, and John C. Wright, president of the La Salle National Bank, was elected treasurer.

Members of the board of directors are: John C. Bowers, Chicago real-estate broker; Harold S. Russell, president of Railroad & Industrial Products Co.; Otto Schnering, president of Curtiss Candy Co.; Charles T. Scott, owner, Scott Steel Co.; and Henry F. Woulfe, vice president of Manz Corp.

Each of the foregoing officers and directors were chosen not only because of their prominence in civic life and their successful business careers, but with consideration of the fact that none of them had ever been prominently identified with any partisan political campaign.

The article of incorporation stated:

"The corporation is organized exclusively for educational purposes, particularly education of Americans to exercise their right and responsibility to vote in all elections and on all questions submitted to vote; no part of its income or property shall inure to the private benefit of its directors or officers or any individual or association of individuals or corporation; the corporation will not attempt in any manner to influence legislation through propaganda or any other effort, or take a partisan position on any issue, or assist any candidate for any office or provide aid to any political party.

"In carrying out its purpose, the corporation may use all means appropriate to the accomplishment of such purpose, including aiding such education activity by any other individual or organization in the United States, provided that such activity must conform to the purpose and limitations of the article of incorporation of this corporation."

It was agreed that the success or failure of the objectives of Americans Will Vote could be determined by any unguarded comment that any officer or director might make which could be construed by any person as being prejudiced toward the interest or promotion of any political candidate or any partisan issue. Each and every person associated with the project therefore dedicated himself to the complete objective of encouraging Americans to vote without any degree of partisanship reflected in any manner. At the outset, inasmuch as the organization was incorporated in the State of Illinois it was decided that its activities preliminary to the recent election campaign would be devoted to the confines of this State. However, the organization promotion became so widely known that cooperation was volunteered from many other States, and to that end, a substantial amount of the organization material was supplied and distributed in other States by members of the clergy, veterans' groups, Boy Scouts, and other organizations and individuals.

PLANNING THE PROGRAM

The services of the Jos. W. Hicks Organization, public relations consulting firm, were obtained to plan and direct the organization's program.

Approach to the clergy: Letters were written to all of the members of the clergy in the State of Illinois, asking them to ring their church bells or play their chimes on election day, offering them material for distribution to their congregations and seeking their cooperation in preaching Americanism and teaching Americans to vote, in their sermons. Attached is a copy of the letter sent to the clergy, together with copy of a check sheet supplied for their convenience in ordering material. The number of clergymen thus contacted totaled 2,840.

Approach to women's clubs: Letters with an appropriate check sheet enclosed for their convenience in ordering material for distribution were sent to some 400 women's clubs in the State.

Approach to civic clubs, chambers of commerce, etc.: Attached is a copy of a letter written to some 980 various civic clubs, chambers of commerce, and other community organizations, with an appropriate check sheet for ordering material for distribution, outlining the purposes of Americans Will Vote and seeking their cooperation on a State-wide basis.

Approach to Boy Scout troops: Copy of a letter written to approximately 500 Boy Scout troops in the State of Illinois is attached, together with check sheet.

Approach to veterans' groups: A letter with appropriate check sheet was sent to approximately 750 American Legion posts, copy of which is attached. The pamphlet containing the statements of Commander George Craig and the resolution passed by the American Legion in its convention in Los Angeles was, of course, of considerable interest to the veterans' groups.

Approach to election commissioners: Attached you will find copy of a letter gotten out to the 98 county election commissioners in the State of Illinois in which we advise them of the many letters and phone calls received from persons about the inadequacy of voting facilities in certain areas in previous elections, and urging their cooperation in providing adequate facilities in order that voters could exercise their franchise at the polling places without loss of time.

Approach to radio stations: We prepared and had transcribed 11 announcements ranging in time from 30 seconds to 2½ minutes, and distributed the transcriptions as well as copies of the written scripts to 80 radio stations in the State of Illinois. Copy of our original letter and check sheet for give-away material are attached.

Approach to news editors and commentators: A special plea was made to news editors and commentators in all Illinois radio stations, a total of 114 persons receiving copy of our letter of October 4, which is attached, reminding their listeners of being properly registered for the November 7 election, and urging them to make sure they go to the polls and vote.

Approach to stars of stage, screen, and radio: Attached you will find copy of a letter given out to a total of 265 stars of stage, screen, and radio, in which we outlined the purposes of Americans Will Vote and asked their cooperation in mentioning Americans Will Vote to their audiences prior to election day.

Approach to oil companies: We are enclosing copy of individually typed letter to executives of 15 oil companies in the United States, outlining the purposes of Americans Will Vote and asking their cooperation in the distribution of material designed to urge Americans to vote.

Approach to companies to use postage-meter slugs: A postage-meter slug was designed and furnished, without charge, to prominent business firms in the city to use on their mail prior to election day. A list of the firms using the 36 postage-meter slugs is given a little later in this report.

DEVELOPMENT OF MATERIAL

Publicity: Three picture stories were syndicated to 2,000 daily and weekly newspapers in the State of Illinois and cities in other adjoining States within a radius of 200 miles of Chicago. Copies of the syndications are attached, which cover: (1) Picture of Elmer Layden, pointing to emblem of Americans Will Vote and outlining the purposes and objectives of the organization; (2) National Commander George Craig, of American Legion, and Frank Moran, president of the Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce pledge their support to Elmer Layden as president of Americans Will Vote; (3) at rally held in Springfield, Ill., Avinere Tolgo, down-State executive director of Americans Will Vote joins hands with Peter F. Rossiter, Sangamon County's Democratic Chairman, and Conrad Noll, Jr., Sangamon County's Republican chairman.

Beginning with the announcement of the organization of Americans Will Vote on September 19, 13 major news releases have been developed and released to the press. The distribution of all of these releases with the exception of release of October 3 which carried an additional mailing to the city editors of all dailies and weeklies in the United States totaling 12,280, and the several releases concerning the rallies which were distributed limited to the local area involved, were distributed as follows:

City editors, Illinois daily newspapers	87
Illinois weeklies	585
Chicago suburban newspapers	95
Chicago neighborhood newspapers	92
News directors, Illinois radio stations	100
Chicago radio commentators	14
Chicago television stations	5
Wall Street Journal	1
Chicago Journal of Commerce	1
Americans Will Vote officers and directors	13
Total	993

Copies of these releases are attached, but briefly are as follows:

September 19: Announcement story of organization of Americans Will Vote.

October 3: Statement of George Craig, national commander of the American Legion, urging Americans to vote.

October 4: Elmer Layden urges election commissioners to provide adequate facilities at the polls.

October 12: Announcement of formation of down-State committee, and plans for down-State rally in Springfield.

October 12: Announcement of American Legion passing resolution of commendation. Text of the resolution was included in give-away pamphlet.

October 13: Details of down-State rally planned for Springfield on October 19.

October 19: Announcement of preelection rally in Chicago, October 31.

October 20: Report of success of down-State rally held at Springfield, Ill.

October 26: Announcement of Irv Kupcinet, well-known newspaper columnist and television star to act as emcee of rally held in Chicago.

October 26: Announcement of final plans for rally in Chicago, with speakers George Craig, past commander of the American Legion, and Frank Moran, president of Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce, with Irv Kupcinet as master of ceremonies.

October 30: Special memo to the press, radio, and television: Announcement of the rally October 31.

October 31: Follow-up news release outlining outstanding comments in addresses made by George Craig and Frank Moran at the rally.

Description of material: Following is a listing of the various pieces of material developed, and the sources through which it was distributed prior to election day.

(a) Leaflet Election Day Is November 7: More than 4,000,000 of the 5,000,000 copies of this leaflet produced, were distributed by Curtiss Candy Co., through the inspiration of its president, Otto Schnering, by their candy salesmen as they made their calls throughout the United States.

Members of the clergy were responsible for the distribution of approximately 300,000 leaflets; American Legion posts approximately 100,000; civic clubs 52,000; Boy Scouts 36,500. Included in the miscellaneous distribution total of approximately 685,000 were such firms and individuals as 36,000 for Quaker Oats Co., 17,000 for the La Salle National Bank, 8,000 for the First National Bank of Harvey, 4,000 to Alden's Mail Order, 2,000 to National Confectioners' Association, 9,000 for First National Bank & Trust Co., Evanston, 9,000 for State Bank & Trust Co., Evanston, 8,000 for Steele-Wedeles Co., 4,500 for Elgin National Watch Co., 5,000 for International Harvester Co., etc.

In addition, cuts were supplied to Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co. who wished to pay for, themselves, and distribute 600,000 copies of the leaflet.

(b) Automobile and window sticker: Over 400,000 of these stickers were produced and distributed through orders received on the check-sheets from civic clubs, American Legion posts, clergy, radio stations, Boy Scouts, and various individuals and companies' telephone calls and letters. There also the Curtiss Candy Co. salesmen distributed approximately 250,000.

(c) Correspondent sticker: 60,000 of these small stickers were distributed and used by various companies and individuals on correspondence and envelopes.

(d) Contribution cards: 11,000 of two types of cards, one for individuals and the other for corporations, were produced and distributed in the various channels solicited by our check-sheets and letters to the groups outlined in our program.

(e) Leaflet, You Can Get 111,111 to the Polls: Over 200,000 copies of this leaflet were produced and distributed. This particular leaflet proved very popular and more copies of it could have been used if time prior to election day would have permitted.

(f) Leaflet, George Craig, Legion Head, Lists Reasons: Close to 40,000 of these leaflets were produced and distributed.

(g) Leaflet, Endorsed by American Legion Resolution: About 150,000 copies of this leaflet were processed and distributed as quickly as we were advised the American Legion had passed the resolution at the Los Angeles convention. The leaflet gives the verbatim wording of the resolution.

(h) Lapel button: Of the 722,500 lapel buttons processed, close to 600,000 were distributed through the various channels represented by the check sheets and telephone calls.

(i) Postage meter slugs: As quickly as the postage meter slugs could be made up, they were put to use by the following firms, 36 firms in all, using a total of 36 postage meter slugs on their outgoing mail until election day: United Air Lines, the Borden Co., National Standard Parts Association, Auto Parts & Gear Co., steed Candy Co., Quaker Oats Co., Rock Island Lines, M. B. Austin Co., Illinois Bell Telephone Co., International Harvester Co., La Salle National Bank, Uhlmann Grain Co., Stevens Candy Co., James E. Bennett Co., General American Transportation Co., Steven Candy Kitchens, Inc., Inland Steel Co., Alden's, Inc., the Quaker Oats Co., Capper & Capper, and the Jos. W. Hicks Organization.

We feel that the distribution of the material, together with the great number of imprints of the Liberty Bell symbol distributed through the use of the postage meter slugs, represents a circulation of approximately 25,000,000.

(j) Door-knob hanger: 250,000 door-knob hangers were processed and distributed prior to electiton day, a large percentage of this figure being accounted for in the door-to-door work done by the Boy Scout troops and the Sunday School children of the various churches responding to our letter.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Three mass meetings or rallys were held prior to election day, one at Springfield, Ill., another at Bloomington, Ill., and the third one in Chicago at the La Salle Hotel. The meetings at Springfield and Bloomington both included remarks by the Democratic and Republican chairmen of the county, and representatives of various religious and civic local groups. In the case of the down-State rally at Springfield, the main address was given by the Honorable George D. Stoddard, president of the University of Illinois, his subject being To Vote or Not To Vote.

As previously mentioned, the Chicago meeting featured addresses by George Craig, past national commander of the American Legion, and Frank Moran, president of the Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce, and Irv Kupcinet, well-known newspaper columnist and television star, was master of ceremonies.

Personal appearances: On October 9 Elmer Layden was interviewed on the Don Mahoney

Breakfast Club, well known radio program on a coast-to-coast network, at which time he outlined the purposes and objectives of Americans Will Vote.

On October 20 Mr. Layden assisted the Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce in painting the first in a series of "get out the vote" signs on the sidewalk at the corner of State and Madison Streets. Representatives of all Chicago newspapers and WGN-TV news reel were present, the ceremonies being televised the next night by WGN.

On October 21 Mr. Layden was interviewed by Dennis James after the television broadcast of the Notre Dame-Michigan State football game, sponsored by Old Gold over the DuMont network. At this time also, Mr. Layden outlined the purposes and objectives of Americans Will Vote and urged all listeners to exercise their privilege at the polls on November 7.

On October 24 Mr. Layden was interviewed by Bill Evans over the latter's television show on WBKB, at which time approximately 12 minutes were devoted to the interview.

On October 24 Mr. Layden was interviewed by Austin Kiplinger during his newscast over WGN-TV at 6:15. Here again Mr. Layden emphasized to the listeners the distressing apathy that has existed by voters in the last previous national election and urged them not to repeat such a disgraceful performance.

Airplane trailer: As a way of adding emphasis to the message of Americans Will Vote to a great number of persons at one time, we arranged for an airplane to circle over Dyche Stadium in Evanston on the Saturday before election day during the time of the football game, and again on Sunday before election day over Comiskey Park during a professional football game, carrying a streamer with the wording "Americans will vote on November 7."

Special telegram: As an additional means of bringing the message of Americans Will Vote to as many persons as possible just prior to election day, a telegram was sent signed by Mr. Layden to 42 prominent newspaper columnists; press services; news editors of all radio networks in Chicago, New York, and Hollywood; the city editors of all newspapers in Los Angeles and San Francisco; and outstanding radio performers, such as Jack Benny, Edgar Bergen, Eddie Cantor, and including radio commentators Walter Winchell, Jim Hurlbut, Clifton Utley, etc. Copy of this telegram and list of recipients is attached.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Americans Will Vote cooperated with the junior chamber of commerce in supplying them with material and speakers for their programs. Americans Will Vote cooperated with the American Legion in distributing the resolution passed by the American Legion at their convention in Los Angeles. Americans Will Vote also cooperated with the Illinois Federation of Retail Associations' get-out-the-vote program, headed by Mr. J. T. Meek, by making known to members of the association the availability of Americans Will Vote material, and the fact that this campaign was being conducted on a publicity promotion level, whereas the other campaign was conducted on a paid-advertising-space level and the sale of promotional material. It was pointed out that in the case of our campaign nothing was to be sold, every piece of material was given away without any charge whatsoever.

METHOD OF FINANCING OF AMERICANS WILL VOTE CAMPAIGN

The entire financial proceeds for the Americans Will Vote campaign were obtained through individual and business firm subscriptions. Contributions ranged in size from $1 to $1,000.

There is attached a clipping from the Chicago Tribune of November 9, indicating the election returns as they had been reported at that time. However, as of this date the official returns for the State of Illinois have not been recorded.

CONTINUING PROGRAM

The Americans Will Vote activity we describe in effect constituted about a 7-week campaign; in fact, the announcement and press conference concerning the organization was exactly 7 weeks prior to election day. All of the material described herein, of which copies are attached, was prepared, produced and released within that space of time.

Much credit has been given Americans Will Vote in news and editorial comment in the newspapers, and by commentators over radio and television, for the organization's part in helping to bring out the vote on election day. We do not believe that any single organization designed to help increase the vote can or should attempt specific credit for its efforts—however, we do believe that this organization, operating as it did and with the cooperation of all of the agencies involved, can rightly share with others the results that were so definitely indicated on election day.

The greatest evidence of the success of the campaign is that interest which has been generated wherein many persons and organizations which cooperated have indicated a desire that the activities be continued. For instance, we have letters from scout masters asking us to send them material now which they may plan to distribute and instruct their troops in distributing on the occasion of the spring elections. Practically all of the business organizations which used postage meter slugs have indicated that they will hold these slugs with the intention of using them in advance of future elections. An inventory of the material that is left over would indicate there is just about enough to use in promoting the future activities of the organization, and the requests for information and material from States across the country from Maine to Oregon will indicate that Americans Will Vote has outgrown its original state of incorporation and in its next step will be a Nation-wide undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,

———,
President.

Where the Money Goes; Some of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, during the month of January, our draft quota was 80,000. During the same month, military agencies hired 58,388 civilians. For every four men inducted, three others were hired to do civilian jobs connected with military service. Our total civilian personnel working for the Federal Government reached 2,245,275 when January ended. Sixteen new agencies have been set up in the last 6 months to deal with the national emergency, with an increase in the number of men and women working for Uncle Sam amounting to 219,000 since July 1, 1950.

This record of mushrooming departments and new divisions within departments helps us to understand what goes on with the taxpayer's hard-earned dollar. In the House of Representatives it was declared that our military authorities are purchasing supplies sufficient to meet the needs of a 10,000,000-man army. Such spending as the buying of Navy desks for $198 each and wooden office chairs at $78 apiece are part of this fantastic orgy of public spending.

It will not end until this administration is removed from control in Congress and the White House. Bear that in mind every time you write a check to the collector of internal revenue.

Defense Against Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, for the information of Senators, a brief resolution adopted at its founding conference by the Council Against Communist Aggression with offices at 1500 North Broad Street, Philadelphia 21, Pa., together with an article by Prof. Karl A. Wittfogel entitled "A New Policy for Asia," printed in the New Leader for February 19, 1951.

The council is a militant anti-Communist group, concentrating particularly on foreign policy in reference to the Far East. It is headed by a provisional executive group, including Marx Lewis, of the Hatters union; Bishop Welch, of the Methodist Church; Sal B. Hoffman, president of the Upholsterers union; Christopher Emmet, of Common Cause; and Arthur G. McDowell, as executive secretary.

While I am not necessarily in full agreement with all parts of the council's resolution, I am glad at its request to make the data available for the information of Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Our security depends on a global system of collective security and calls for defense against Communist aggression in both Europe and Asia.

Therefore, we urge—

1. That the United States sponsor a resolution in the United Nations condemning the government of the U. S. S. R. as the instigator of and accomplice in the aggressions against the Republic of Korea and the United Nations based on evidence presented to the United Nations by Ambassador Austin.

2. That the United States sponsor a resolution calling on the United Nations to impose sanctions, including a blockade, against Communist China so as to effectively prevent the direct or indirect shipment of strategic materials to the aggressors attacking the United Nations forces in Korea.

3. That the United States should offer the National Government of China for the revitalized army on Formosa adequate arms and equipment under the supervision of top military personnel of the United States as in Greece and Turkey so that it can help the people of China to free themselves from the Communist yoke and develop political and economic democracy.

4. That the United States sponsor a resolution in the United Nations serving notice upon the U. S. S. R. that if it directly or through its satellites commits aggression upon any state whether or not it is a member of the North Atlantic Pact that the full force of all the members of the United Nations will be directed against it.

(Adopted February 10, 1951, at the founding conference of the Council Against Communist Aggression, 1500 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.)

———

A NEW POLICY FOR ASIA

(By Karl A. Wittfogel)

[From the New Leader of February 19, 1951]

Recent far-eastern developments have disappointed all those who expected the Chinese Communists to settle down peacefully after the full establishment of their regime and not get too deeply involved in Soviet world strategy. Today, it is clear to even the most well-disposed observer that the problem of the Chinese Communists is nothing but the problem of the Chinese sector of a huge Communist axis which stretches from Canton to the Elbe and which expands wherever opportunity permits. But many who accept this fact are reluctant to accept its consequences. Under new disguises, old illusions again rear their heads, obscuring once more the real issues in our China policy.

In the global array of Communist and non-Communist forces, the highly industrialized countries of Western Europe manifestly constitute the most precious stake. The present American efforts to prevent a Soviet victory in this zone are therefore eminently justified. But the Communist victory in China has heightened rather than lessened the importance of an active American policy in east Asia. The spread of Communist power to Formosa, Japan, and the Philippines would seriously imperil our Pacific defenses; and the fall of southeast and south Asia would catastrophically affect the situation in the Middle and Near East.

In view of this danger, which is bloodily underlined by the Korean war, it becomes difficult to plead for a gentle American policy toward Communist China on the ground of an expected Titoist development. Instead, we increasingly hear references to the intense nationalism of our potential friends, the Chinese intellectuals, whose favor we may gain by yielding Formosa and by recognizing the Peking regime. Besides being inconsistent, this argument completely misunderstands the character of a Communist state, in China or anywhere else. Where public opinion is dictatorially controlled, Nationalist sentiment can be so manipulated that the real issues may be reduced to insignificance (cf. the impact of the Soviet Union on Manchuria) and insignificant issues blown up fantastically (cf. the propaganda against American imperialism in China today).

There certainly are in China national as well as other undercurrents that defy Communist manipulation; but however important these undercurrents may become in an open crisis, at the moment they are woefully ineffective if compared with the strength of government-promoted ideas. Any American policy which disregards essential political (and strategic) considerations in order to appeal to the controlled nationalism of the Chinese intelligentsia will be the victim of an unrealistic concept of Communist power.

The only effective nationalism in Communist China today is the nationalism of its ruling party. No doubt, the Peking Politburo is fully aware that in Sinkiang, Inner Mongolia, Manchuria, and perhaps now also in Korea, Moscow's and Peking's aspirations clash. But some of these areas have already fallen under Soviet influence; and Manchuria is too close to Russian territory and military might to lead to open conflict.

NO TITOS IN CHINA

Such a conflict seems unlikely also for other and even more weighty reasons. The conference of the trade-unions of the countries of Asia and Australasia, held in 1949 in Peking with strong Soviet approval, placed the Chinese Communists in an outstanding position as the models and supporters of the many hoped-for Asian revolutions. The prospect that Mao and his lieutenants may rule as satraps over the majority of the agrarian countries of Asia opens up enormous vistas, not only for the Communist leaders themselves, but also for their subjects. This perspective which, with its imperialistic possibilities, surpasses all traditional Chinese Nationalist dreams, is entirely acceptable to the Moscow Politburo. The master strategists of the Kremlin are accustomed to think in geoeconomical categories. They see their hegemony for any foreseeable future guaranteed by their control over the great industrial centers of the Eurasian heartland, centers which they hope to supplement with the industries of Western Europe, while the remainder of agrarian Asia, under Chinese (and Russian) direction, is being liberated.

Thus the Chinese and Russian Communists are linked not only by similarities in their power structures, ideologies, and the corresponding vested interests of their ruling classes, but also by historical expectancies which logically emerge from their Leninist-Stalinist premises. Faced with enemies who think in global and long-range terms, we can hope to build an effective policy only if we too view the separate issues of the present far-eastern situation in a global and long-range context.

KEEP KOREA FREE

Korea: In line with previously stated intentions, we should try to establish an independent and democratic Korea within whatever limits military and political conditions permit. But neither attacks by ever-increasing masses of Chinese Communist troops, nor pseudo-conciliatory gestures should induce us to make permanent commitments in a strategically absurd position. It is obvious that the Communist Axis wants to tie down the UN forces in as many separate and disadvantageous places as possible. It is equally obvious that we must not become unwilling partners in this game.

Formosa: Our attitude toward Formosa involves military problems which the layman is not competent to solve. But if military judgment recommends the defense of the island—as it apparently does—then it would be foolish to abandon it, and this for political reasons as well. The "nationalism" argument has already been discussed in relation to the Chinese intellectuals. In its official Communist form it is an unpleasant reminder of Nazi arguments for occupying Austria.

Austria has been closely connected with Germany in a long political and cultural history; and the inhabitants of this rump area are practically all German. Nevertheless the consistent enemies of Nazi expansion were unmitigatedly opposed to having Austria added to the Reich when Germany was under the control of a blatantly totalitarian regime. Formosa is far less easily invaded and far more easily defended than Austria was in 1937—or Korea is today. In permitting the island to become the victim of a Communist "Anschluss," we would not only weaken ourselves militarily, but we would also strengthen the impression which Communist propaganda is particularly eager to give—that among other things we are abysmally stupid.

HELP AND REFORM CHIANG

And what of the Nationalist Government and army? Chiang Kai-shek's record as the leader of the defense of his country during the grim years of Japanese occupation is better than most of us today care to remember; the record of his internal policy is bad. Even so well-balanced a document as the Wedemeyer report stresses the many acts of oppression and corruption which helped to undermine Chiang's popular support. But during World War II we had a number of allies whose governments were none too savory and whose internal conditions we could not influence. If a general war breaks out shortly, we should have to accept the Nationalists, like all other allies, "as is," making the best of what we have to defend the east Asian fringe. But if the present uneasy world situation continues for some time then we shall be in a better position than ever to make the Nationalists underwrite certain basic economic and political reforms. Such reforms, if thorough and successful, will also provide new perspectives for a post-Communist China. Most probably they will raise the fighting potential of the Nationalist forces far beyond their present level.

Whatever we may do with regard to developing and equipping the Nationalist army, we should certainly not commit ourselves now to any major invasion of the mainland. Such a step would require comprehensive UN (or United States) support, and it would drag us into precisely that kind of an amorphous Asian land war which we have every reason to avoid. Of course, there are many small military operations that a strengthened Nationalist government or independent anti-Communist resistance centers might undertake. In this respect, the previous blockade of Shanghai and the present guerrilla activities on the Chinese mainland provide invaluable lessons as to what is technically advisable and what is not. But here, as in all other instances, momentary indignation must not make us lose sight of our long-range strategy. Proper balance between our European and Asian commitments remains the paramount test. And certain actions which, in a spreading military conflagration, would be extremely helpful may produce a wholly undesired effect when undertaken impulsively and without regard for the general Asian and global situation.

Diplomatic recognition of Communist China. As a matter of expediency, it seems desirable to recognize diplomatically all de facto governments that persist over time. But this rule, like others, has its exceptions. Communist China may be one of them.

The Peking invasion of Tibet was not officially branded for what it was except by the Lhasa government. The Chinese Communist aggression in Korea was eventually condemned by the UN. These two ventures are direct and, so to speak, neighboring actions. Others, less direct, have more ambitious aims. The top-ranking Peking dignitary, Liu Shao-chi, who promised his party's support for the Communist movements throughout Asia and Australasia, urged the necessity of setting up in these areas "wherever and whenever possible a national army which is led by the Communist Party."

If our Asian friends hope to tame the Chinese tiger by feeding it, we can do nothing to stop them. But we have no right to neglect the lessons gleaned from our own experiences. These lessons controvert many oft-repeated misconceptions. They show that, without recognition, a modest flow of diplomatic messages and proposals is entirely possible. They show that, without recognition, economic relations can be maintained with considerable success. (The bulk of American trade with the U. S. S. R. during certain years before recognition was greater than during any years from 1933 until the beginning of the war.) They also show that a free exchange of persons—students, journalists, businessmen—with a Communist state is a complete fiction. The apparatchik societies refuse to admit any member of the free world who is overtly critical of their

way of life, while, under cover of "exchange," they send us hand-picked and thoroughly indoctrinated Communists.

But apart from the disadvantages involved in unequal diplomatic treaties with Communist countries to which we have agreed without realizing their pitfalls, there is no justification for our recognizing now or in any near future a regime that blackmails us with threats and that openly attacks the UN (and United States) forces. Recognition under these circumstances would indeed be a reward for aggression; and the Communist camp would certainly hail it as such.

VETO REDS IN UN

Admission to the UN: As in the case of recognition, we should maintain our freedom of decision. But also, as in that case, there is no excuse for putting a premium on aggression. On the contrary, conditions being what they are, we should use every means provided by the Charter, including the veto, to prevent the seating of a Chinese Communist delegation in the United Nations.

For the Chinese people—against their Communist dictators: We have never ceased to emphasize our friendliness for the Chinese people; and in view of the present Communist hate campaign it is particularly important to unmask the claim of American imperialism in China as a new version of the big lie. The United States voluntarily dropped all unequal treaties just when the U. S. S. R. was striving to reestablish tsarist prerogatives in Manchuria. We voluntarily withdrew our troops from Korea as well as from China; and our continued pressure for the liquidation of colonialism is well known. The partial success of Communist propaganda in such countries as India in depicting us as imperialist schemers therefore constitutes a particularly serious challenge. The incessant repetition of the big lie requires that we, with equal insistence, restate our friendship for the Chinese people (as juxtaposed to their Communist dictators) and our full acceptance of the country's national independence—which is threatened not by us, but by the new Soviet treaties and the Moscow teachers of the Peking regime. We should make it unmistakably clear that our refusal of recognition is directed, not against the Chinese people, but exclusively against their aggressive and dictatorial rulers. Of course, there is no reason for righteous self-adulation, and the American who fails to see the opportunistic inconsistencies in our proliberation policy oversimplifies a good record which needs no glamorizing. But the American who brazenly denies our basic proliberation policy gives comfort to our enemies by repeating one of their most dishonest slander themes.

WELFARE AND THE PEOPLE

Our attitude toward the non-Communist population of China and the adjacent countries of Asia: Another slogan, which is thoughtless rather than vicious, is the cry for contacts with the non-Communist people of China. We certainly should do everything in our power to reach the urban as well as the rural non-Communist population in China and in other parts of Communist Asia. But besides supporting the resistance movements and spreading whatever propaganda we can, we have only limited opportunities of approaching the subjects of the new apparatchik states. The real issue, thus, lies somewhere else.

In the great majority of all Asian countries, the discontent of large strata of the rural population enables the Communists to pursue their strategy of infiltration, organization, and attack. No military and political measures on our side will prove satisfactory unless they are bulwarked by a genuine concern for the welfare of the villagers. The excellent land reform which, under American direction, was carried out in Japan has resulted in a situation in which the Japanese Communists have lost most of the support which they previously derived from the poor peasants and tenants. The second part of a land reform which was initiated in Korea in 1949 under our pressure and by vote of an assembly that did not see eye to eye with Syngman Rhee might have achieved similar results, if the Korean Government had acted faster and if the North Koreans had not attacked in June 1950. The ECA is now trying to enforce in Korea the second (and more comprehensive) part of the reform.

History will show whether the harm done by the delay can be amended; but it is vital to learn from experience and to apply the principles, which proved so effective in Japan, to other areas of east and southeast Asia immediately threatened by Communist civil war and expansion. Formosa has already been mentioned. The Philippines and Indochina also have a high priority. Any American funds which will facilitate the transfer of the land to the peasants by partially underwriting a reasonable compensation may prove decisive in demonstrating the seriousness of our attempt to show that our democratic policy concerns itself not only with the form of government, but also with the vital needs of the large underprivileged strata of the agrarian population. The implications of such a bold and focused application of our point 4 program for other parts of non-Communist Asia, such as India, Pakistan, and even the Near East, are obvious.

REFORMS AGAINST RED REVOLUTION

Our economic and social policy in Asia should not be based on the principle of me-toolsm, but on entirely different considerations and aims: American policy in all these fields defeats its purpose when it insists that we are aiming at measures similar to those undertaken by the Communists, the difference being only that we proceed in a more civilized and gradual manner. Such an attitude of me-toolsm is decidedly harmful. Today, no sincere political analyst has the right to speak of the Communist land distribution as a measure intended to provide the peasants with full, permanent and secure possession of the assigned land. This policy is nothing but a ruse for temporarily gaining peasant support for the seizure of political power which, once achieved, becomes the lever for destroying not only all large property, but eventually all small rural and urban property as well. Ambivalent statements spread by irresponsible authors and politicians about the first phase of the Communist land policy bulwark a propaganda myth which we have every reason to destroy. It is of the utmost importance for us to contrast the temporary and dishonest Communist revolution with the permanent and honest reforms which we promote. Together with its industrial supplement (the encouragement of a strong and independent trade-union movement) and a general policy of civil liberties and social security, these measures prepare the urban and rural population to participate democratically in the life of their commonwealth.

To be sure, our insistence on the superiority of our policy will be meaningful only to the extent to which it is accompanied by authentic acts. But these acts will become propagandistically effective only if we present them without apology, and not as if the Communists were actually, if pervertedly, doing the job better. It is high time to discard a me-toolst revolutionary phraseology which implicitly gives the Communists credit for something for which they deserve no credit whatsoever.

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more articles in the series entitled "Medicine in Crisis," by Mr. Selig Greenberg, writer for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, published in the city of Providence, R. I.

These articles will be most interesting to the Members of the Senate in their consideration of S. 337, which is a bill to provide an emergency program of grants and scholarships for education in the medical fields.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 6, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—SURVEY SHOWS UNITED STATES FACES SERIOUS DOCTOR SHORTAGE—TOTAL OF PHYSICIANS NOT ENOUGH TO FILL CIVILIAN AND MILITARY NEEDS

(This is the eighth of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The issue of monopoly in medicine has been brought into particularly sharp focus by the grave financial crisis facing the medical schools and the demand for more doctors growing out of the national emergency.

The ominous and undisputed facts in the financial crisis are:

The medical schools cannot enlarge or even maintain their present enrollment unless they get a lot more money.

The same thing holds true of the standards of teaching which will determine the quality of future medical practice. Without additional funds, the schools will not only be unable to improve and expand the scope of their teaching but will be forced to let standards deteriorate.

In other words, instead of getting more and better doctors we are in danger of getting fewer and poorer ones at a time when the need may be greater than ever.

STUDY REVEALS SHORTAGE

The extent to which the national emergency and the threat of war have aggravated the shortage of doctors was recently revealed by the health resources advisory committee of the National Security Resources Board.

The committee, made up of physicians, said latly after a 6-month study that there were not enough doctors in the United States to meet mobilization needs and afford at the same time adequate protection for the civilian population. The Nation would need 22,000 physicians over and above those in sight for 1954, it reported, to maintain the present level of civilian medical services and meet expected requirements for the Armed Forces, civil defense, and public-health services.

The committee urged immediate expansion and acceleration of medical training facilities. It warned that the threatened deficit could be averted only if medical school enrollments were increased at once by 15 percent and the schools adopted again the speed-up program in effect during the last war. Under this program, the 4 years of medical training were squeezed into 3 years by giving up vacations.

All of which underscores the urgency of relieving the financial plight of the medical colleges.

MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ROLE

What has the American Medical Association done about it?

The preponderance of objective opinion is that the AMA has consistently pursued a policy of obstructionism.

The country's top medical educators and the presidents of some of our leading universities agree that the amount of money needed to assure the future of American medical education is so huge that it cannot be met through private philanthropy alone. They are convinced that the job can be done adequately only with Federal aid.

A bill providing for Federal subsidies was introduced in the United States Senate in 1949 under joint Democratic and Republican auspices, with Senator TAFT as one of its sponsors. The Senate passed it by unanimous vote.

The AMA then got busy and killed the measure. The bill was bottled up last year in a House committee by a single vote and never got to the floor. Qualified observers have held up this action as proof of the hollowness of the AMA's claim that it favors the training of more doctors.

THREE MAJOR ARGUMENTS

I will go into the merits of the subsidy controversy in a later article. Right now let's take a final look at the AMA line in the debate over the adequacy of our supply of physicians. The line has been based on these three major arguments:

1. We don't need any more doctors.

2. The medical schools already are expanding their enrollment to take care of additional needs.

3. Those who favor still further expansion want to lower the quality of medical training.

The first argument is no longer pressed with as much vigor as it once was. Aside from the factors cited in previous articles, the contrast with what has happened in other professions is too sharp.

GAIN IN DOCTORS LAGS

Between 1910 and 1940, when the country's population rose 43 percent, there was an increase of only 30 percent in the number of doctors as against a boost of 58 percent for lawyers, 76 percent for dentists, 86 percent for teachers and 212 percent for engineers. Last year the medical schools graduated 5,553 M. D.'s. This compared with 52,240 degrees awarded by engineering schools and 14,312 by law schools.

During the past 10 years the rise in the number of doctors—but not of private practitioners—has kept pace with the growth of population and medical school enrollment has substantially increased. Freshman admissions mounted 22 percent between 1940 and 1950 and the number of graduates rose 9 percent. But in 1940 the schools had barely begun recovering from the low point to which their enrollment had sunk during the depression.

A new medical school is being built in California and plans for new schools are under discussion in three other States. Experts maintain that this is not enough.

POOR TRAINING CHARGED

Much of the increase in the rate of production of doctors in the past decade has been the result of the opening of several new schools and of the wartime accelerated program. The AMA and the Medical School Association have expressed opposition to renewal of this program on the ground that it led to overcrowding, understaffing, and poor training.

Some of the schools affiliated with State universities expanded their intake in the postwar years under the pressure of veterans seeking to get a medical education through the GI bill of rights. But there has been little expansion in the private schools.

Those who maintain that we need more doctors deny emphatically that they are advocating lowering of standards. Dean Victor A. Rapport, of the College of Liberal Arts at Wayne University, chairman of a committee of American Conference of Academic Deans which has made a study of the subject, has described charges to that effect as "sheer twaddle designed solely to obfuscate basic issues."

Proponents of expansion realize that it will take years to turn out more doctors. They know that it will require not only many millions of dollars but careful planning to secure additional laboratory space and equipment, hospital facilities, and qualified teachers. They are, therefore, all the more concerned over the time lost because of AMA hindrance.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 7, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—MEDICAL SCHOOLS IN RED, NEED $40,000,000 A YEAR—OTHER UNIVERSITY FUNDS HAVE TO COVER $10,000,000 ANNUAL DEFICIT

(This is the ninth of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The Nation's medical schools need an additional $40,000,000 a year—a jump of about 75 percent—in operating funds to train adequately their present student body.

This was the recent conclusion of a committee of 12 doctors and medical educators after a 2-year study of medical-school finances undertaken for the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. The committee was headed by Dr. Lowell J. Reed, vice president of Johns Hopkins University, and included Dr. Ernest E. Irons, former president of the American Medical Association.

BIG OPERATING DEFICITS

The 72 medical schools and 7 basic science schools in the United States now have an annual operating deficit of about $10,000,000, which is being met largely by dipping into other university funds. The $40,000,000 covers this deficit and the additional amount which the committee felt was needed to enable the schools to do a proper teaching job.

The proposed boost of 75 percent in operating expenses would take care only of the present enrollment. Enlargement of the student body, which has been urged by many authorities, would require a lot more money.

The magnitude of the financial emergency confronting medical education is indicated by these major findings of the committee:

IMPROVEMENT OF PLANTS

Aside from $40,000,000 a year in operating funds, the schools need about $330,000,000 to improve their physical plants to meet desired standards.

To increase enrollment by 22 percent, the schools would need an additional $18,000,000 a year in operating expenses and $244,000,000 more for construction purposes.

(The Health Resources Advisory Committee of the National Security Resources Board has warned that we will be short 22,000 doctors by 1954 unless enrollments are raised at once by 15 percent and the schools adopt again the speed-up program they ran during the last war. The combination of these two measures would mean an increased enrollment of considerably more than 22 percent.)

While medical school operating costs jumped 94 percent between 1941 and 1946, income from endowment and tuition failed to keep pace.

TUITION COMES

Tuition now averages $530 a year and runs as high as $635. But income from tuition provides only 23 percent of operating expenses. (Brown University, where tuition is $600, gets 56 percent of its total budget from this source. The proportion of income from tuition is even higher in colleges which have no graduate schools.)

Medical school operating expenses average $2,285 a year per student. One school reported spending $6,267 per student. But these figures cover more than the cost of undergraduate training as they include expenditures for research and graduate instruction.

Lack of funds has forced 23 of the schools to limit their programs or defer important advances. Curtailments have been particularly heavy in teaching of public health and preventive medicine, two fields where there has long been a critical lag.

SUBSIDY BILL

The study committee made no direct comment on the revived medical education subsidy bill now pending in Congress. But its findings made it pretty clear that the medical schools could not hope to make up their deficits from increased revenue from private endowment or tuition or bigger grants from their parent universities which already are hard pressed for funds.

There is general agreement among educators that it would be dangerous to go on raising tuition charges and thereby limit still further the study of medicine.

A point stressed by the committee was that even if the required money were made available at once it would take years to improve and expand facilities and recruit faculty. There already is a shortage of teachers, mainly because salaries in many of the schools are too low to attract skilled men who can earn more in private practice.

Far more so than any other field the medical profession cannot be enlarged quickly.

LONG PREPARATION

To become a doctor, a student must have 3 or 4 years of college training, 4 years of medical schooling, 1 or 2 years of internship, and two or more years of hospital residency if he wants to become a specialist. It takes from 10 to 12 years from the time planning starts for a new medical school before its graduates are ready to hang out their shingles.

"Medicine," as one authority has put it, "does not lend itself to the type of expansion that can be accomplished by putting additional chairs in the back of the classroom and asking the instructor to speak a little louder." If they are to do the job properly, the schools must have more teachers and hospital and laboratory facilities before they can accept more students.

TRAINING EXPENSIVE

Medical training is the most expensive of all forms of education because it is an apprenticeship involving a continuous personal relationship between faculty, students, and patients in the teaching hospitals. It requires close personal supervision of students through an unusually high ratio of faculty. At Cornell University Medical College, for instance, there is a faculty of 658, including 123 full-time teachers, for a student body of 394.

Medical education is subdivided into two so-called preclinical years and two clinical years.

The first 2 years are devoted largely to laboratory study of the basic sciences of anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, pathology, bacteriology, and pharmacology. In the last 2 years the student's time is spent mostly in hospital wards and outpatient departments. Here he learns by watching his teachers practice and gradually being allowed to do some of the work himself under supervision. Before he can be permitted to assume responsibility for the life and death of his fellow men the prospective physician requires much training and complicated and costly facilities and equipment.

All of which underscores the fact that if we are to get more doctors it will take not only much money but years. So the time to start doing something about it is now.

The State Versus the Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the following speech made by Mr. Louis Bromfield, noted author and farmer, at the Cleveland freedom dinner held at the Hotel Statler in Cleveland, Ohio, on February 1, 1951:

THE STATE VERSUS THE INDIVIDUAL

(By Louis Bromfield)

I have been requested to keep what I have to say tonight outside the realms of partisan politics and I shall endeavor to do so insofar as this is possible, but in such a time and in such an age when the entire world is engaged in a struggle between two ideologies, I find it extremely difficult to make a nonpolitical speech on the subject of freedom, and the preservation of man's right to his own individuality.

I think it is quite clear by now to almost everyone that what we are witnessing is a battle between two principles—on the one hand the principle that man is and should be subject to a vague but tyrannical, impersonal machine known as the state. On the other the principle that man's most sacred right is his freedom to live, think, and develop his own character and personality within reason and that government should remain forever subject to the combined will of individual citizens and that officers and bureaucrats from President to policeman are inevitably and eternally the servants of the people.

It is only within the past 2 or 3 years that the true nature of this struggle has become apparent to what we might call the average man, the man in the street, John Q. Citizen, or what you will. Until very recently many of the rights of our citizens have been extracted, as you might say, painlessly, as a tooth might be extracted painlessly by employing the very latest in pain killers. In this process, extending over the past generation or longer, the pain killer has always been employed in the form of subsidies or offers of security in one form or other, with the ultimate in doses being Sir Albert Beveridge's "womb to tomb" state in which, by theory, all material worries would be removed from mankind in return for his giving up the right to choose what kind of work he would perform, where he would perform it, how much he would be paid, and so forth. In other words, in return for the security of the "womb to tomb" plan, he would cease to exist as an intelligent, creative, vigorous individual and become merely a kind of robot, sacrificed to an immense bureaucracy, operating with little consideration for him as an individual. In return for a theoretical security he becomes the victim of an impersonal, inhuman machine—and let me add, from the experience of every nation in which bureaucracy has continued to grow—with a waste and inefficiency that becomes an increasing material burden to the very people whom it is supposed to benefit.

This system of using bribes, subsidies, promises, and so forth as a pain killer confused many—indeed most people—for a considerable time, and it is only since we have begun to see the results in operation has it become apparent, even to the simplest fellow, that when the pain killer wears off, the pain, in terms of insecurity and material cost, is much worse than ever. We, as a Nation, have been very fortunate in having placed before us a laboratory example of how the "womb to tomb" pattern works out. With us, the menace of this false and unworkable political philosophy has crept up slowly and gradually, but in the British Isles, owing to a great number of circumstances, it was put into operation rapidly and with a high degree of completeness.

To establish this "womb to tomb" state, capital was liquidated or confiscated, industry was very largely nationalized, and every sort of assumed benefit was established for the so-called little people (incidentally a disgusting phrase invented by the "womb to tombers"). Quickly every sort of weakness in the system became apparent. The rich were wiped out almost entirely and with them the vast tax revenues which they provided. Industries were taken over and in the process another great block of vast tax revenues was destroyed. Worst of all, perhaps, was the virtual destruction of the solid middle class which built the wealth and power of the British Empire in the past and which is inevitably the very backbone, not only of Great Britain, but of any democratic government. The assumed aim of the "womb to tombers" was to level off everything and everybody, leveling up "the little people" and leveling down the rich, the middle classes and those individuals who were formerly rewarded in high earnings for their value to the state, the economy, and the general national welfare.

Essentially the process has proven to be much more one of leveling down rather than of leveling up and as this has occurred, increasing burdens, both material and of the spirit, have fallen upon the "little people" and will continue to do so with a rapidly gaining momentum.

In this process certain inevitable economic flaws developed—flaws which should have been apparent to any man who could add two and two. The "womb to tomb" theory made necessary at once a huge growth in bureaucracy to administer all the benefits of this new paradise, to pay out subsidies and benefits and police the inevitable chiselers, to collect more complicated and more burdensome taxes, to administer the nationalized industries in which the previously great tax revenues were destroyed. The cost of government increased enormously while the revenues from taxes upon capital, industry, and large incomes disappeared almost entirely. Somebody had to pay for this simultaneous increase in expense and decline in revenue. The next step was to try to pass the costs along to the middle class, a process which in an unbelievably short space of time destroyed the middle class itself, together with its revenues. So in the end everyone has to pay for "the womb to tomb" government and the burden of taxes and finances becomes levelled off and the "little people" pay more and more until it becomes apparent presently that in terms of high prices and taxes they pay in the end far more for a free set of false teeth or a dose of calomel than they would have paid under the old system. Moreover, the workingman and the miner found that there was no gain in working overtime to help national production and income because the government promptly took from him in taxes the money he was paid for the overtime. Some workers even have figured so closely the operations of the system that they have begun to practice deliberate absenteeism, because they found that taxwise they kept more money if they worked less.

These factors are, of course, only material and economic ones but they are far less important to the survival and welfare of nations and even of mankind than the other sacrifices which have been made for a bigger bureaucracy, more taxes and greater hardships. These sacrifices concern directly and inevitably the spirit and the dignity and the freedom not only of the individual but eventually of civilization itself. Let's examine some of the noneconomic sacrifices in the case of that once great nation and that once great democracy known as the United Kingdom of Great Britain.

The so-called Labor Government, let us remember, and especially when we are listening to the arguments of Walter Reuther and some of his friends. Let us remember that the Labor Government is almost entirely made up of the leaders of the trades-unions. Once these unions became the Government, the organized workingman lost the right to strike or even indeed to negotiate in a free sense. They could not strike against themselves, and we have already been treated to the spectacle of the British Labor Government ordering out troops to break strikes occurring among its own unionized Labor Party members. In Great Britain today many workers are frozen on the jobs they are doing and have lost the right to take another and better job or to move to another community. Wage raises are entirely determined by the bureaucracy. A man cannot erect a building, from chicken coop to palace, on his own land with the materials coming from his own land without a permit from the bureaucracy. There is even the absurd case of one farmer who started constructing a small building made from rammed earth coming from his own farm and was ordered to stop the construction and destroy what already existed because he did not have the necessary permit. And the farmer * * * today if a farmer does not operate his land according to the ideas and orders of a distant bureaucracy it is sold from under him and he is dispossessed and the land goes into the hands of a man more amenable to the wishes of bureaucrats in far-off London, who, often enough, know little, or nothing, about agriculture.

The average British citizen can no longer even travel freely outside his own country, since he is not allowed to spend more than the equivalent of about $40 outside the islands. The ration of meat, eggs, and other edibles is today actually lower than at the very peak of the war shortages.

But the list is endless. It explains easily enough why a recent poll showed that 37 percent of British young people would leave England today for this country or some part of the Commonwealth if they found the means of getting out. Probably that 37 percent represents the cream of the nation's youth in terms of initiative, energy, and creative ability. But what young person of ability and ambition would want to live under the "womb to tomb" government if it were possible to escape?

All these troubles have been offered to the British in return for security, and security is something that no government and no bureaucracy can either bestow or guarantee. Security comes from the economic prosperity of a nation, from the rewards which go to intelligence, energy, and initiative, from the stability of a national currency and the freedom to develop the resources of a nation. Administrative bureaucrats, let me add, have never been brilliant and creative men and never will be, by the very nature of their calling and by the type of man who seeks a bureaucrat's job. That is mere simple psychology.

As the pain-killer begins to wear off in this country, the aches associated with the Socialist "womb to tomb" Government are beginning to appear. As the bureaucratic costs of our Government have been increased 3 to 500 percent, the tax burden has increased steadily and, under the theory of taxing according to ability to pay has been carried out, the burden has fallen on the big corporation, the big fortunes, the big earning capacity until the point of diminishing returns has been reached and the higher the taxes the less the revenue is the result. Beyond this point lies the crisis where confiscation of capital in one way or another becomes the rule, and when that comes the vast productivity which is the source of our wealth and power as a Nation will evaporate as it has done in Great Britain. We have already reached that point where the burden of increased taxes to operate our bureaucracy will have to be spread largely over the people in the lower-income brackets. This has already begun to occur. It will not benefit this most important element of our society to increase taxes in the higher brackets until these incomes begin to disappear, nor will confiscation of capital or nationalization of industry make their situation easier. Such a process would only mean that the taxes in the lower brackets would be steadily increased as they have been in Great Britain. On the other hand if the able individual and the great efficient corporation is permitted freedom of operation, the tax revenues from both increase steadily and the burden on the smaller income becomes progressively less and less.

The operations of economic laws are fairly exact and much simpler than Lord Keynes and some of his followers would try to make us believe. That this is true, we are beginning to discover the hard way and let us hope that we shall not have to go through all the miseries of Great Britain in order to act in time.

The idea that Government or bureaucracy alone can provide security is at this very moment blowing up in our faces. As a very nearly perfect example, let us take the case of social security. At the time this manifestation of the "womb to tomb" state was set up, a certain rate of in-payments was established and in relation to it a certain pension was established which was regarded as sufficient to provide comfort for the declining years of the average citizen. And so what happens? We have a Government and a system and certain economic conditions which bring about and even encourage inflation, and suddenly the pensioner who gets his social-security payments upon retirement finds that he is being paid off in 50-cent dollars while the money which he paid into the fund for his security was largely paid in 100-cent dollars. In other words, he is getting half as much as he was guaranteed by a Government who took his money, giving him no choice in how he might invest it. And so Congress is forced to increase the amount of the security pensions by 100 percent or more and increase in-payments as well. This process could, of course, go on indefinitely for we have no assurance that inflation will not bring us within a few years to a 30-cent dollar or even a 10-cent dollar. Then where will be the retirement security promised by Government and bureaucracy? I have spent a good part of my life in Europe and I have seen what happened under these conditions in Europe. The process destroyed not only the security of people living on government or industrial pensions but the security of those who had invested in insurance annuities and government bonds. People in old age who believed themselves safe were forced to go back to work by the thousands in order to get enough to eat. The situation was worse and more cruel than anything happening here during the great depression of the thirties.

For a generation the political and social progression in this country has constantly moved toward the abominable fallacy of the "womb to tomb" philosophy. It has been variously called the New Deal, the welfare state, and by other names. That does not matter. What is serious is that the whole movement has been toward greater power in government and the gradual destruction of free will and individual determination for the citizen and the individual community. The very measure which imposes participation in social security by law is in itself a fundamental infringement upon the rights of the individual who should not be ordered where and how he is to invest any portion of his savings, much less so when an acre of land or a small house would provide for him a much greater degree of security than the currency or the bonds of a government engaged in the inflationary process.

If we had no other means of gaging the welfare of peoples and states under the "womb to tomb" philosophy, we have only to check off for comparison the nations of Europe. The greater the degree of state dominion and Socialist "womb to tomb" philosophy, the lower the living standards and the greater the hardships of the people, the lower the state of economic prosperity of the nation and the greater its peril in the world struggle for production and markets. Check off the countries one by one from Belgium or France with the lightest burdens of socialism through to Great Britain with its "womb to tomb" government of Soviet Russia and Hungary where not only are all personal liberties destroyed but the living standards are as low as any in the world. Those nations in which free enterprise was allowed to flourish made the quickest and most solid recovery. In the others, including Great Britain, the prospect of any recovery at all seems dim indeed.

What we are witnessing is the final struggle between the German ideology of the painful nineteenth century on the one hand and the French philosophy of the enlightened eighteenth century on the other, a struggle between the ideas of a disgruntled psychoneurotic called Karl Marx and the civilized and serene philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin. And do not be deceived by those quibblers who insist that there is a difference between communism and socialism. Both have their roots in the brutal and primitive thinking of Marx. Socialism is merely the old Marxian fallacies watered down by the intellectuals and the so-called liberals. Those who believe that one can engage in a little socialism without arriving in the end at the full bureaucratic ruthlessness of communism are merely deceiving themselves. To quote an old chestnut, you cannot be a little Communist any more than you can be a little pregnant. The mere continuing weight of bureaucracy, of taxes, of state domination, forces more and more measures which oppress the people still further until in the end all their liberties are destroyed.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about communism and Communists, and their infiltration into our Government. They are dangerous and subversive and their influence should be stamped out but I doubt that the influence of the direct and avowed Communist is so dangerous to our welfare and our liberties as that of the so-called liberal, the pink thinker and politician, the demi-Socialist, the demivirgin of political life. In this group some advocate the "womb to tomb" state cynically and unscrupulously because so long as the pain killer is working, it gets votes. Some advocate the paternalistic state through plain stupidity and confused thinking. Some promote it because it gives them a warm feeling in the pit of the stomach and makes them feel that they are better and more humanitarian and more sanctified than other citizens, although they are actually destroying slowly the greatest privileges man can know—the privileges of free thought and independence and the right to mold his own life.

The out-and-out Communist is easy to detect and to some extent an easy snake to scotch. Not so the demi-Communist liberal whose ideas are direct from Karl Marx and watered down. He insinuates his poison under the guise of virtue and smugness. He is the one who is used by the Communist as a front behind which the Communist can hide. Recent history goes to prove that the Communist could not have operated at all within our Government save with the cooperation and behind the shelter of the so-called liberal. Of the two I would prefer to fight the Communist. Often enough he is easier to fight because you know him as your enemy. He does not deceive himself or wrap himself in the robes of sanctity and hypocrisy as does the liberal who is often enough too stupid to understand what he is doing or that he is being used. It is through the pinkish reformer that Great Britain has arrived at her disastrous situation. In the case of every nation in Europe taken over by communism and Soviet Russia, it has always been the so-called liberal who prepared the way and held the door ajar. Once the enemy was inside the gates the liberals were liquidated in a wholesale fashion, but it was too late. The tragic damage had already been done.

You may have noticed that I have used the expression "so-called liberal." I do so advisedly because the word "liberal" has become debased both in this country and Europe. It no longer has any real meaning and for some it has even the color of opprobrium. Franklin and Jefferson were very great liberals, indeed, but who would dare suggest that they would support for an instant the freedom-destroying doctrines of many of those half-Mezionas who today call themselves liberals.

I believe that at last, as the pain killers of subsidy, bribery, promises, and humbug are wearing off, all of us are beginning to understand where lie the roots of our freedom, our strength, our prosperity, our human dignity. The recent elections, particularly in this great State of Ohio, pointed in that direction. If we have any doubts let us simply look at the record, let us look at what happens to any nation throughout history which has followed the theory that the state should rule man and not man the state. The record is as clear as the rising sun on a beautiful morning.

Investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The RFC Should Be Abolished," published in the Baltimore Sun, an editorial entitled "Time To Ring Down Curtain on the RFC," from the Jacksonville

Journal, and an editorial entitled "Why Keep the RFC?", from the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of March 16, 1951]

THE RFC SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

No single episode in the shabby RFC story brought out by the Fulbright investigation really justifies the abolition of the RFC. And yet there is a rising demand that the RFC be abolished. Why?

The answer is implicit in the original establishment of the RFC back in the days of the depression. This organization, properly called the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was a creature of the emergency. The credit system of the United States had broken down almost completely. A pinch hitter was needed for doing what the banks and other credit institutions normally do. The RFC was the pinch-hitter, and it did what it was designed to do.

The emergency passed away. But the RFC did not. The crying need for private access to public credit disappeared. But the RFC kept right on providing private access to public credit. Government agencies have a way of lingering, and even of continuing to expand, after the need which brought them into being is gone. That is just what happened in the case of the RFC.

But when a public institution outlives its usefulness it sometimes becomes not merely useless but noxious. That also is what has happened in the case of the RFC.

For one thing, we find that, because banks and private credit institutions stand ready to lend money to sound enterprises, it is the marginal enterprises, the highly dubious credit risks, which tend to flock around the RFC. The RFC has become a "soft touch."

There is another point. When the RFC came into being, this country was in deep depression. Now conditions have been exactly reversed. This country enjoys an unexampled business activity. This country, far from being in depression, is in a period of inflation. One of the recognized methods of combating inflation is to cut down on available supplies of credit, since lending swells the supply of money.

The United States Government at the present time is supposed to be fighting inflation. In various ways it is trying to cut down on credit. And yet, while it struggles with this problem, it continues to maintain the RFC as a "soft touch" credit agency—an agency, in other words, which, by making easy loans to marginal enterprises, actually promotes inflation.

A reorganization such as Mr. Truman now proposes would wash the face, so to speak, of the RFC. But it would not correct the Government's inconsistency in maintaining an easy-credit agency in time of inflation. We do not see any justification for its continuance. There are no useful RFC functions which cannot be dealt with as readily by some other agency of the Federal Government. We believe that the RFC should be abolished, its assets liquidated, and such useful functions as it may still have transferred to other appropriate agencies.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal of March 13, 1951]

TIME TO RING DOWN CURTAIN ON THE RFC

It seemed fair to hold off conclusive judgment about the RFC until the Senate's inquiry was well advanced. That stage has now been reached. And the findings point to just one sensible course: The abolition of the RFC.

As everyone knows, Herbert Hoover created the RFC as a depression emergency device to help keep tottering big business going in the dark days. It was never contemplated that the agency should go permanently into the banking business in competition with our private banking system.

But that is in fact exactly what happened. More than that, the RFC became a sort of court of last resort to which business firms appealed after all regular banks had turned a deaf ear. Many such concerns were granted loans, in defiance of what private bankers considered sound lending practice.

No doubt this greater liberality often had beneficial results, but that cannot be allowed to obscure the essential that the RFC was serving as a vast commercial bank. On several occasions, indeed, the RFC's well-known liberality enabled private banks to transfer to that agency outstanding loans the banks rated as poor risks.

The private banking system is perfectly qualified, except perhaps in extreme emergencies, to meet all the credit needs of the expanding United States economy. There is no point in having the Government competing in this field.

But as it has developed in the Capital, the issue goes well beyond the economic justifications for keeping or abolishing the RFC. Basically, the problem has become a moral one.

What the investigation of Senator FULBRIGHT's subcommittee has disclosed is a supreme example of the folly of Government by crony—"cronyism," as some have styled it.

Too often President Truman has placed in key Government office not the most fit men, nor even well-qualified men, but simply men he knew and liked. He frequently complains that he cannot attract competent men to many important posts, but the record indicates he at numerous times went out of his way to assure such jobs to his friends.

It is the thoughtful testimony of several seasoned Washington observers that Mr. Truman has thereby committed a host of Federal commissions and bureaus to deteriorate dangerously. The Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, these are among them.

Worse than this, the President has maintained an almost fanatical loyalty to the cronies holding these jobs. Loyalty is a noble trait, and it isn't the only one the American people admire in Mr. Truman. But loyalty to incompetent men—friends or not—is misplaced. The President would do much better to be loyal to high standards of performance.

Moreover, this attitude has been aggravated by his insistence upon regarding every attack upon a subordinate as fundamentally an assault upon him as President. Thus he has tended to discount the criticisms as always political, never sincere.

Senator FULBRIGHT may not be without political motive, but the facts unearthed by his committee cannot be brushed off as campaign fantasies. The expensive mink coat given to a White House secretary, the free vacations for White House functionaries (and Senators, too, for that matter) at the expense of a Florida hotel manager who won an RFC loan, the innumerable pay-offs through awards of high-salaried business jobs to former RFC men, these compound into a sordid, immoral story.

Apparently only the strongest men, administrators like Jesse Jones and Eugene Meyer, can keep a Government lending agency from sinking into the morass of loans by political favor. Establish an institution dealing in billions—passed out on fairly easy terms—and you have a set-up ideally suited to political machinations. Flies always collect around the honey pot.

The result is not only a weakening of the RFC itself, but a general lowering of moral behavior in many parts of the administration, in Congress, and elsewhere.

Mr. Hoover, Jesse Jones, and others have called for RFC's demise. To abolish the agency would be to set an example, to start Government back up the road to sound moral performance.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star]

WHY KEEP THE RFC?

If the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to be kept alive, the reorganization plan advocated by the President, and which has survived a Republican attack in the House, is clearly desirable.

Under this plan, the five-man Board of Directors would be abolished and all RFC operations would be placed under a single Administrator. Senator FULBRIGHT, whose subcommittee has been letting a little light into some of the darker RFC corners, favors this change. The single Administrator system, he says, is "the best method of preventing or, at least, minimizing the conditions now being revealed in our hearings."

When this matter comes before the Senate, however, that body should give very careful consideration to the desirability of abolishing the RFC. Certainly this should be done if the reorganization would do no more than minimize the disgraceful practices which have been exposed by the Fulbright committee. And even if the change would prevent such practices, which is doubtful, it is hard to see wherein the public interest would be served by continuing, in a period of inflation, a Federal agency that was created to meet a need born of deep economic depression, and whose economic influence in those changed times probably is definitely harmful.

When Herbert Hoover asked Congress to set up the RFC on December 8, 1931, this country was in the grip of a paralyzing depression. Normal sources of credit had dried up or had been cut off. The need of Federal assistance was self-evident. Still, even so, Mr. Hoover urged that the proposed RFC "should be placed in liquidation at the end of 2 years." But the familiar pattern has been followed. Twenty years later, when cheap, easy, and abundant credit is our greatest source of economic danger, the adminstration wants to maintain as a going concern an agency which has outlived its usefulness, and which has become a kind of happy hunting ground for those who want to finance dubious ventures with public funds.

The Hoover Commission task force which studied the RFC strongly urged that it be abolished. The full Commission did not adopt this recommendation, although it frowned on many of the things the RFC had been doing. Senator BYRD has taken up the task-force proposal, however, and has served notice that he will seek the abolition of the agency, which he regards as being not only useless in these times, but which also serves as a "workshop for get-rich-quick political predators."

The most meritorious argument that can be made for continuing the RFC is that the agency, if kept alive on a stand-by basis, might serve some useful purpose if conditions should change. But experience has shown that Federal agencies, especially agencies with money to lend, do not sit quietly by waiting for a change of economic climate. If the money is there, the smart operators will be after it. And the chances are that they will always be able to get it, by one device or another, regardless of whether any public interest is served in the process. Senator FULBRIGHT's statement indicates that this is true; and, in the Star's judgment, the RFC should be liquidated as quickly as possible, unless better arguments can be made for its continuance than have been heard to this time.

Pensions for Disabled Veterans Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, compensation for totally disabled veterans is lagging so seriously behind the cost of living as to jeopardize families and family life. The Nation owes these veterans the highest obligation. The fact speaks more eloquently than argument. Their case demands correction. Appended are two letters from a constituent of mine, a totally disabled veteran, expressing this plea and the need for correction in such detail as to deserve the study of every Member. It is such testimony as this from those directly affected which should produce the needed legislation promptly:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 20, 1951.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a totally disabled veteran of World War I. I receive compensation of $171 per month for a service-connected disability. Considering the present-day high cost of food and medical care, I assure you that this is entirely insufficient for my wife and myself to live on decently. I don't mention the prohibitive cost of clothing, because those items are in the realm of luxury for us, even though we are sorely in need of new clothing as a sheer necessity. Every time we buy food or medicine, another item has been increased in price. My wife has been ill for several years and, not desirous of accepting charity treatment, she has foregone some necessary medical care, resulting in a detriment to her state of health. Even at this writing, my wife needs a doctor's attention, but we cannot afford to consult one. There are many other disabled veterans and their families who are forced to exist under similar conditions.

The totally disabled war veterans have no other source of income, and we are entirely dependent upon the Congress of the United States for a decent existence. I am therefore appealing to you and the collective heart of our Congress, as a humanitarian gesture, to alleviate this situation with appropriate legislation to reasonably increase the present disability compensation rates. As your views in this respect are well known to and appreciated by disabled veterans, we will be highly honored if you would cosponsor such legislation on the floor of the House. And may I further request that such legislation be favorably consummated at a very early date, so that we may enjoy the luxury of living decently as soon as possible? In the past, such matters have generally been taken up at the close of congressional sessions. But are not disabled veterans entitled to more pressing consideration, after national security?

Are we asking for too much, just to live decently? You have my utmost assurance that, were I able to work, I would not humiliate myself by writing this letter.

I assure you that such a kind act by the Congress, and by you, personally, will be sincerely appreciated by my wife and myself; by the thousands of disabled veterans, like myself, who are unable to work; and by those disabled veterans who further jeopardize their disabilities by working.

Won't you please make the waning years of an old soldier happy with a favorable reply to his appeal, and with your favorable reaction to match the reply? All disabled war veterans will be sincerely grateful to be able to finally live decently.

In these days of world crises, may our Congress and Government be guided by the wisdom of God.

Very respectfully,

PHILIP H. RICHARDS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 19, 1951.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciate very sincerely your kind, sympathetic, and encouraging letter of February 16, in reply to mine of January 20, a copy of which I am enclosing. In these days of the entirely uncalled-for high cost of living, when the disabled veterans depend on the humane understanding of our Congress, and a prayer to God, for a decent existence for our families, it fills me with exhilarating relief to receive such a genuinely sincere and understanding letter from you.

Is there not someone in our Congress who will take the initiative to ease the burden of the disabled war veterans, and follow it thru successfully at a very early date? Since the advent of the Korean war, the cost of living has been increasing regularly every week, especially food and medicine. And even though food prices were supposedly "frozen" on January 25, the prices of these necessities of life are still increasing. And, according to the OPS, the prices of food will continue to increase until midsummer.

The great majority of organized labor has not felt this increased cost of living, having received substantial pay increases. But what about me, with a fixed income of $171 per month, as a totally disabled war veteran? What are my wife and I supposed to eat? And how am I supposed to take care of the medical needs of my sick wife? I don't like to beg all the time—it's humiliating. But, like most disabled war veterans, I am entirely dependent on the Congress for a decent existence. Am I not entitled to live decently, just like organized labor?

There are several bills, calling for increases in disability compensation rates, pending in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. In view of the tense situation in which disabled veterans find themselves in order to live decently, and as you are greatly respected as a sincere friend of disabled veterans, would it be an imposition on my part in urgently requesting that you do something to have one of these measures expedited through this committee, and then acted on favorably and expeditiously by the Rules Committee, so that it can reach the floor of the House for a vote very soon?

My wife and I will be very grateful, like all disabled veterans, for this humanitarian gesture on your part, and all of us will anxiously await early action, in this respect, by the Congress. Please favor me with some good news at your very earliest convenience.

In my humble way, permit me to hope that you may enjoy good health, happiness and Godly wisdom in the future, so that you will continue to serve our country in the same unselfish manner for many years to come.

Very respectfully,

PHILIP H. RICHARDS.

Good Forestry With Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Good Forestry With Competition," by Joe M. Crabane, of Brownsville, Oreg.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD FORESTRY WITH COMPETITION

State and United States foresters, conservationists, the Department of the Interior, together with various other public agencies and local and national organizations, have in the past few years been concerned with the depletion problems of our forests, both publicly and privately owned. There have been, likewise, scores of bills introduced in both our Congress and our State legislatures attempting to provide protection for our natural resources, so that we and future generations may have timber, that the mills may operate steadily and furnish annual employment, which will play a big part in the stabilization of our communities. A constant source of employment is very essential.

Now in view of all that had been said with respect to depleting and denuding our forests, there had been comparatively little done in way of good forestry management up until the last few years. But in the last few years, through the continual rising price of stumpage caused by the shortage and scarcity of timber, it became apparent to many that timber is a profitable crop. They have also concluded that it pays to be careful in logging not to destroy the reproduction. Many are also of the opinion that trees planted now will produce a fair crop in 40 years. Some are so strong in this belief that they are really practicing good forestry and are putting a large portion of their earnings into forestry as an investment. But it took an incentive to bring about this new thinking. It wasn't altogether the thought of the future generation. It wasn't that our public spirited people and conservationists were demanding it. It was the potential profit they could see in good forestry. Yes, if it wasn't a profitable investment no one but the Federal Government could invest in such a long-shot program. But while some are convinced that sustained yield forestry is good business many are doubtful and say the risk is too great. Personally I agree—it is a big risk. But it is worth it.

There are others, however, who will not be convinced that the policy is sound. There are too many things, political and economic, which might cause an investment to be worthless. These very people who preached conservation might help implement some deal whereby it would be a poor investment.

Some operators are definitely of the opinion that only the United States should attempt such long-range planning and they have resolved to take what timber is available and run the mill just as long as they can without attempting to conserve timber, protect the reproduction, or make an effort to restock, as well as have consideration for the economy and general stability of the community.

However, if we are allowed to continue under the new policy adopted by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the

Interior, about 2 years ago I am sure that at least one-half of the operators will fall in line with the few who are now practicing good forestry. They, too, would see that it is the only way they can hope to have a lasting—perhaps perpetual—lumbering operation.

This new policy that I refer to came into existence in 1948 and it had to do with the administration of O. & C. lands in western Oregon. This new regulation is based on the premise that all operators shall have an equal opportunity to purchase Federal timber, and that Federal timber shall be sold on bids to the highest bidder in accordance with some qualifications of the bidder pertaining to State and Federal laws, roads, marketing areas, etc.

The Bureau of Land Management is doing a splendid job of administering the public lands, opening up these timber tracts for the public to buy on auction and sealed bids, giving the mill operators a chance to compete for the purchase of the timber, and in so doing has caused the bidders to pay a good price—as much as 80 percent on an average more than the appraised values. It is true that it required good milling facilities to get the most out of the high-priced stumpage but we are pleased with the results. If the other fellow can outbid us, we are still happy. We will be happy as long as we have an equal opportunity to compete. We hope we can continue to have competition and not allocation as it would obviously be if Federal stumpage price is to remain frozen. For if stumpage is frozen it will be impossible to deal justly with the many bidders. If there are six bidders on one tract, who will have the knowledge to judge which one of the six shall get the timber? Even if there are two bidders or a dozen bidders, who can make such a decision? Shall he allocate the timber to the mill that has some timber of its own or to the operator who has done nothing to perpetuate the industry or who has done a very poor job of forestry or who has given little thought to what effect the denuded lands in his logged-over areas would have on the economic stability of the community? Will the allocator take into consideration the good forester who has been doing the job which has in the past been so strongly recommended by good forestry men and conservationists, as well as put a fair part of his earnings into this program which is so essential to perpetuate good forestry?

The Bureau of Land Management has gone a long way in good forestry in the last 2 years. It is the Bureau of Land Management and the competitive system that has caused many operators to practice better forestry. These operators believe that with the small stands of their own timber, some purchased from ranchers and others, and an opportunity to bid in Federal tracts of timber—maybe two or four million feet a year—they can operate perpetually on a small scale. These small operators will always be a source of revenue for the small towns and their employees will feel they have job security and in turn will build better homes and schools.

We must understand there is not enough Federal timber to go half way around and if we lose out on our bid for it we will have to assume that the other fellow is a better operator and has a better mill and will come to the conclusion that we will have to bring our plant up to date in order to compete with our competitor. But if the timber is allocated to certain mills, good mills as well as poor ones do not have an opportunity to bid. It will destroy the incentive for those who have tried to do the job right. Encourage the good operator by giving him an equal opportunity. Encourage the man who is doing good forestry. All he wants is an equal opportunity. He doesn't necessarily have to buy timber but he does want an equal opportunity, and especially so if he has practiced good forestry.

In order to supply a greater amount of lumber for the military requirements, it is essential that we have competition in the purchase of Federal timber. We cannot have competition with allocation, and allocation is essential with the price ceiling on stumpage. It is not necessary to put a ceiling on stumpage to keep operators from paying too much. Ceilings are created and applied to check hoarding and profiteering and are also a factor in checking inflation but it is not necessary that Uncle Sam place a ceiling on his own commodities.

Don't destroy the good system we now have for fear an operator is going to pay too much for Federal timber. They have taken care of themselves in the past and they will continue to do so. The ceiling on lumber will regulate the price of stumpage. Operators will not bid more than that which they can afford to pay. They have not done so in the past and there is no reason to believe they will in the future. Take the freeze off Federal timber and avoid discrimination. Make timber available with access roads. When timber is available it creates competition. The extra money obtained through access roads will more than pay for the roads and the lumber industry will more than meet both military and civilian requirements.

JOE M. CRAHANE.

BROWNSVILLE, OREG.

Intertie Between Bonneville Power System and Shasta Dam in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "State Master's Comments," published in the Grange News of February 24, 1951; also an editorial entitled "Mr. Chapman Has Spoken," published in the Grange News of March 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Grange News of February 24, 1951]

STATE MASTER'S COMMENTS

CALIFORNIA INTERTIE

Much is being said and written these days about the proposed intertie between the Bonneville power system and Shasta Dam in California. One of the latest arguments advanced is that the intertie would save 5,000,000 barrels of oil which otherwise will be needed to operate steam plants to generate electricity for California.

This seems like a mighty flimsy excuse when we consider the huge cost of the intertie and the heavy load losses that would result from such long-distance transmission of power. This would greatly increase the power costs in this region, which has so ably demonstrated the soundness of the existing Bonneville wholesale rates.

Of the $521,000,000 that the Government has spent on these projects, the Bonneville system has in this short time returned to the Federal Treasury $170,000,000, of which $70,000,000 represented interest. In the fiscal year 1949–50 the surplus of $42,000,000 was increased to $54,000,000. In other words, the system earned more than $12,000,000 above the amount needed to retire the principal and interest due on the entire cost of the system.

Not until we have a surplus of power here will the people of the Pacific Northwest feel justified in permitting any of this power—so essential to carry on the region's industries and production—to be siphoned into other areas.

No amount of statistics and political maneuvering will ever convince the people of this region that they should stand by and submit to being robbed of their great natural heritage, the Columbia River and its power. (H. P. C.)

[From the Grange News of March 3, 1951]

MR. CHAPMAN HAS SPOKEN

Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, has calmly brushed aside Pacific Northwest opposition to the "California intertie" power transmission line which would link the Bonneville system with that of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. near Shasta Dam. Although practically everybody in this region has "kicked like a steer" at the intertie proposed by his Bureau of Reclamation for the past 2 years or more, this sentiment has not ruffled a hair of Mr. Chapman's smoothly combed head. Ordinarily one would think that people living nearest to a problem would be best qualified to analyze it, but Mr. Chapman seems to know more than all of the Pacific northwesterners put together—even at a 3,000-mile distance.

There has been real basis for the fear that this power link would make an irreparable break in the breastworks of space that now protect the Northwest from raids on its Columbia River water and power supplies. Recent events lend more substance to this fear.

Without waiting for a congressional appropriation, Mr. Chapman blandly announces that the Bureau of Reclamation has started surveys of the intertie, and that construction will be completed in November 1952. Ignoring arguments challenging the feasibility of the project, its lack of defense need as compared with steam plants within this region, and the unjustifiable "profits" to be made by the Bureau of Reclamation from selling 2-mill Columbia River in California's 5-mill market, Secretary Chapman blithely reiterates that the intertie will bring 100,000 kilowatts of California power to "firm up" supplies for Northwest aluminum plants, like a dog team firming up a Great Northern freight train. In the same breath he says it would save California 730,000 barrels of oil, which indicates the real one-way nature of the plan.

Last year, on a Grange radio program here, Mr. Chapman denied any intention of permitting construction of the intertie. A verbatim transcription of his remarks shows him trying to reassure the Northwest that the intertie was "just talk." He said there had been "no request" for funds, "no authorization * * * whatsoever for any kind of these projects." "Moreover," he added, "you have got to protect your basic resources, which is cheap power. You would have to be very serious and careful before you would make an interchange of connection which would raise your cost."

But the outbreak of the Korean war 2 months later furnished Mr. Chapman an excuse for labeling the intertie a defense project, and as such it was put through the O. K. mill of the Defense Power Administration which he heads.

Now it seems that the people who opposed a Columbia Valley Administration are getting a taste of what they so lovingly referred to as "efficient existing agencies." Instead of a "three-man dictatorship" we've got a one-man paternalism telling us what's best for us—from 3,000 miles distant.

If the Northwest can't stop construction of a supertransmission line which will tap its main power supply, how can it hope to prevent that line from being used to draw the lion's share of that power to a "market" that's ready, eager and waiting to take it? (B.)

Truman Administration Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The People Say No" published in the Omaha World-Herald of March 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE SAY NO

Dorothy Thompson's column which appears elsewhere on this page was written before yesterday's vote by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

But that vote strongly emphasizes the truth which Miss Thompson cites, namely: That the American people, by overwhelming opinion, have rejected the foreign policies of the Truman administration.

This truth is attested to by virtually every poll that has been taken. It is emphasized by the floods of letters received by newspapers and Members of Congress. It is revealed anew by the vote of the two Senate committees, requiring that the administration gain the assent of both Houses of Congress before committing troops to the North Atlantic Command.

This was a staggering and generally unexpected reversal for the Messrs. Truman, Marshall, Acheson and Connally.

When Nebraska's Senator WHERRY first introduced the resolution which provided virtually the same restrictions as those voted by the committees yesterday, the administration leaders brought out the vitriol. This, they said, was vile isolationism. It would tie the hands of the responsible officials and give Joe Stalin a huge advantage vis-à-vis the democracies.

But yesterday the vote was 14 to 10 in favor of the Wherry stand. Three Democrats joined with the solid Republican block to reject the administration's demand.

What had happened?

Clearly, we think, the Senators had been reading the mail from home.

Since last June 25 the American people have been marched up to the very gates of the garrison state, and they do not like what they see.

They do not relish the prospect that for many years, possibly for the rest of their lives, they will be required to live in accordance with the iron whim of bureaucrats. They see little pleasure in giving a huge share of what they earn, and every year a bigger share, to the tax collector.

This, they sense, is not the way to achieve true security nor is it the end to which a democratic people should aspire. Surely, they reason, there must be better ways to approach the problems of mankind than to plunge blindly down the road toward despotism and, maybe, oblivion.

It is unfortunately true that the Truman administration may be somewhat embarrassed, in its dealings with other nations, by the developments of yesterday.

But that is only an incident of the day. The embarrassment will pass. Of vastly more importance is the fact that the attitudes and convictions of the people finally have been communicated forcibly to the Congress.

At last we, the people, and our representatives are beginning to understand each other. That growing understanding, heralded by yesterday's vote, may prove to be the most significant event of 1951.

Resolutions Adopted at Chicago Conference of American Association for the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions which were adopted at the Chicago Conference of the American Association for the United Nations, held on February 25–27, 1951.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT CHICAGO CONFERENCE FEBRUARY 25–27, 1951, BY AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

PREAMBLE

We the duly appointed delegates of 91 broadly representative national organizations are gathered in Chicago under the auspices of the American Association for the United Nations in an emergency conference to discuss United States responsibility for world leadership. Speaking as individuals with a sense of responsibility to the organizations which appointed us, we express the following as the consensus of our meeting.

We believe that all people are equal and united to one another in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

We are united in our support of the United Nations as the best hope of the peoples of the world to prevent war, to develop collective security, to promote negotiation among governments, to create world law, to aid the self-determination of peoples, to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, and to advance economic welfare among all the peoples of the world.

We are united also in our conviction that war is not inevitable, and that the common efforts of the international community can direct the destinies of mankind.

Already the United Nations in five short years has to its credit the following impressive accomplishments:

1. It has through the Assembly resolution on uniting for peace pledged common action to resist aggression anywhere in the world and created the immediate means to do so not subject to veto.

2. It has moved through the overwhelming majority of nations to resist aggression in Korea and for the first time in history placed at the disposal of the international community the military and other aid of member nations.

3. It has aided in resolving conflicts that threatened the peace in half a dozen areas throughout the world and through its good offices brought about cease-fires, basic principles of self-determination, and peaceful settlements, notably in Indonesia and Israel.

4. It has aided the development into nationhood of subject colonial peoples and promoted the independence of non-self-governing peoples.

5. It has extended technical assistance and economic aid to underdeveloped countries, and through its many specialized agencies all over the world attacked the obstacles to world trade and economic welfare.

6. It has promoted human rights through the adoption for the first time in history of universal standards and is following them up by drafting enforceable covenants for freedom of information internationally and for economic and social rights as well as political and civil liberties. It has advanced the status of millions of women throughout the world and gained recognition for their political, educational, and economic rights. It has outlawed by international treaty the crime of genocide.

These are only the outstanding lines of achievement among a host of activities unprecedented in international action.

The United States, in conformity with the Charter's principles, is championing under its bipartisan foreign policy these aforts. Support of the United Nations Charter is the keystone of American policy. That policy, in and out of the United Nations, has buttressed the purposes of the Charter through economic aid to Europe and other parts of the world, the promotion of freer trade, and regional pacts for defense against aggression.

The United Nations is still in an early stage of development, with the prospect that its machinery will be improved as it may become necessary to make it more fully representative of the peoples of the world and with larger powers to meet their claims and needs. To strengthen it member nations should implement by their domestic action the decisions reached by United Nations organs. The leadership of the United States, for instance, in promoting the convention against genocide, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly in 1948, cannot be convincingly maintained until the United States Senate ratifies the convention, now already in effect by the action of other nations. Nor can the moral position of our country in world councils be maintained unless at home we raise our own standards by eliminating practices of racial and religious discrimination and by observing all the rights which we champion internationally.

The United Nations will grow in influence as it is faithfully used by the member nations as the major instrument of foreign policy. Unilateral action bypassing the United Nations in the fields of its activities tends to weaken the whole structure. Membership should be universally open to all nations who adhere to the principles of the Charter, so that it may as rapidly as possible become both the forum for negotiation and the means for action for all mankind.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

We support the principle of collective security by which we mean the use of common force to protect all nations from aggression, as provided by the Charter. We reject as false the doctrine, from whatever source or spokesman, that the United States should regard certain areas or peoples as expendable in its strategy of security. We reject such a doctrine as an inducement to aggression. We reject it as destructive of the collective strength of free peoples. We reject it as contrary to the Charter. Every member of

the United Nations has an obligation to do what it reasonably can do to promote collective security. No nation has a right to purchase its security at the expense of another.

Intervention in Korea to repel the North Korean armies was the first demonstration of collective security by the use of armed forces under the flag of the United Nations. It was action based upon the law of the Charter, authorized by the United Nations, endorsed by 53 of its members, 26 of whom have furnished or offered practical military assistance.

The principle of collective security is as sound today as when the United Nations took action to repel the aggression against the Republic of Korea on June 25. The nations must profit by experience. The experience in Korea clearly demonstrates the necessity for improvement in collective-security action.

In the first place, troops must be designated in advance for call by the Security Council or the General Assembly; an adequate United Nations military staff must plan in advance for their coordination and command. The absence of such advance designations resulted in one nation sending a disproportionately large number of forces and in the inability of the United Nations to use all national forces that were offered.

The experience in Korea also shows that the United Nations must have appropriate organs to assess the political consequences of proposed military measures. Collective security cannot be achieved by permitting smaller aggressions to grow into universal war. Careful diplomacy by the United Nations and its members should seek to localize policing actions.

The United States should urge the United Nations immediately to implement the uniting-for-peace resolution adopted by the Fifth General Assembly, which provides for the designation of forces to be available to the General Assembly or the Security Council, for a Collective Measures Committee to plan further strategy of collective security, and for a Peace Observation Commission to watch troublesome frontiers.

DISARMAMENT

We fully support President Truman's suggestion in his UN Day speech of October 24, 1950, that there be a merger of the UN Commission on Atomic Energy and the UN Commission for Conventional Armaments, and that the new commission devise a plan whereby an enforceable, general, and universal disarmament might be achieved. Certainly an enforceable plan must provide for effective UN inspection and police forces.

We believe that the United States must under present conditions continue to muster its strength until the defenses of the free world are so strong that they will deter aggression by making its price too high. But no reasonable ground must be left for anyone to regard the measures of defense as designed for any purpose other than the preservation of peace and the protection of freedom against aggression. The gains for defense of any particular measure might otherwise be balanced by its dangers in provoking countermeasures or even aggression by others.

Therefore, in building our military strength we must make clear to the world that the goal of our country is a collective system to make possible the disarmament of all nations. The United States should boldly and forthrightly advocate a UN plan for stopping the arms race through general disarmament, enforceable by the United Nations. The clear vision of this as our goal would win the hearts and minds of war-weary peoples everywhere and inspire our allies and our own people in the common struggle to resist aggression.

CONCILIATION

The United Nations Charter places the processes of negotiation and conciliation first in its program for maintaining international peace and security. The United States and other members of the United Nations should with boldness and imagination seek every practical avenue of conciliation.

We urge that the proven and diverse patterns used in Palestine, Indonesia, Iran, and Greece be applied to new areas of conflict.

We do not accept the inevitability of war. While it is necessary to strengthen regional arrangements and to develop military forces for collective use against aggression, we urge unrelenting negotiation to find areas of agreement. Negotiations involve concessions by both sides. They require of the United States a broad understanding of the views and circumstances of other nations, without appeasement of aggression or any surrender of the basic principles of the Charter.

The work of the United Nations Good Offices Committee to arrange a cease fire in Korea should be encouraged. We recommend that the United States support a resolution in the General Assembly formally recommending to the parties the pattern of the Renville principles which became a basis for the settlement of the Indonesian dispute. Essentially these principles are a cease fire, demilitarized zones, progressive withdrawal of forces, interim government, free elections, a constitutional convention, and economic rehabilitation, all under the supervision of the United Nations. These principles are applicable not only to Korea but to similar conflicts that may arise. They are basic to any fair solution in the spirit of the Charter.

Negotiations in the major world conflicts will have a far greater chance of success as the collective forces of the free world become stronger. But there is danger that in their all-out determination to develop the necessary military forces, the American people may come to assume the inevitability of war and fail to seek all practical avenues of negotiation and conciliation. We Americans must not lose the capacity for a bold initiative for peace.

COEXISTENCE OF DIVERSE SYSTEMS

More important than any specific decision is the growth of a United Nations mind with its developing parliamentary practices and sense of unity of mankind. The Soviet Union, it is true, leads a minority of Communist states in frequent opposition to the majority. We must evidently accept for an indefinite future the coexistence of diverse policies and systems of government. Adjustment to such differences is urged by the basic principle of the Charter—the sovereign equality of states. All states, whatever their forms, must now learn to live and let live under the principles of the Charter. The fact that both the dictatorships and democracies continue to take a vigorous part in United Nations debates keeps the door open for eventual adjustment of the conflicts that now divide the world. That door should never be closed. The ultimate dissolution of police states and tyrannical governments will be measured by the degree democracy succeeds in meeting the insistent demands of the world's peoples for greater freedoms, enduring peace, and rising standards of living.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF ASIA AND AFRICA

A great economic and social revolution is taking place in Asia. Hundreds of millions in that part of the world are throwing off the yoke of colonialism, and at the same time are striving for better economic and social conditions. Communism is not the moving impulse behind the revolutionary upheavals in Asia. Communism is the means by which Soviet imperialism has attempted to take advantage of the vacuum created by the failure of the Western World to understand the forces of nationalism and social revolution in Asia. The liberal policies pursued in freeing India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Indonesia have led to a spirit of cooperation and friendliness in these countries with the Western World. These newly awakened peoples in Asia have taken their place in the United Nations, and from their ranks have come some of the great statesmen of the United Nations.

The same nationalist and revolutionary forces are alive in Africa. Whether we shall see repeated there the tragedies of China and Indochina will depend on the understanding and leadership which the members of the United Nations give to the peoples of that great continent.

In finding peaceful solutions there must be greater understanding of the appalling conditions of poverty, illiteracy, and disease under which millions are living and which prevent them from responding to the appeal of our democratic society. Each people must recognize that its culture and political ideals cannot have a universal application.

HIGHER STANDARDS OF LIVING

One of the basic goals of the United Nations for an orderly world is to assure to the peoples of underdeveloped countries, numbering more than two-thirds of mankind, the opportunity to raise their living standards by developing their resources, food supplies, and industries. Only so can hungry and desperate peoples be saved from the false salvation of totalitarian promises, and participate in international efforts for universal education, human rights, and peace.

Already the United Nations through technical assistance teams is engaged in such a program. Bilateral projects by the United States are also in progress under point 4. The British Commonwealth nations have set up a regional technical assistance and aid program on a vast scale for southeast Asia. The resources of the United States devoted to such purposes should be channeled to the maximum degree practical through the United Nations, or with the advice of its agencies, in order to unify all effort under international direction. Similar aid which may be given to the British Commonwealth plan should be likewise channeled.

The deplorable disparity between arms and welfare is illustrated by the fact that the world's military budgets this year approach $100,000,000,000, but total contributions for technical assistance and aid through the United Nations, from the United States and from the British Commonwealth plan, will not exceed a tiny fraction of the military totals.

Greater boldness and imagination must be aroused in carrying forward this program on a world scale if the false promises of communism and fascism are to be discredited. Food surpluses in some nations should be used for relief in others. Mutually advantageous trade must be greatly increased. Capital investment in underdeveloped areas should be encouraged. Technical assistance to enable these peoples to pool their own capital through their own agencies should be used to expand their facilities, skills, and industries.

While recognizing as we do the immediate necessity of a large rearmament program on all the fronts of the free world, we believe that the fullest development of the United Nations technical assistance program will only become possible as the disarmament goals here stated become effectual. The United States Government should take the lead in declaring its intention that with the gradual reduction of its military appropriations that will be possible with a workable enforcement of disarmament, it will contribute correspondingly increasing sums to the United Nations fund for economic development.

At the same time, however, our Government should now give reassurances that during the present period of necessary heavy military expenditures we will maintain and expand our United States program, both governmental and private, of technical and economic assistance to the greatest extent possible within the limits of our economic capacities. For we must not relax our vigorous pursuit of the constructive task of raising the standards of living of the peoples of the world. This will demand of us all that we sacrifice for this great goal as we are sacrificing for military preparedness.

HUMAN RIGHTS

The United States, with other nations, has assumed great obligations for the advancement of human rights through the diverse efforts of the United Nations.

Despite the political conflicts which so largely mark the United Nations, practical work is steadily progressing to promote one of the major objectives of the charter: the universal protection of human rights for all men and women in the world. The universal declaration adopted at Paris in 1948 is being followed up by the drafting of a covenant, which we urge the United States to support with provisions for the right of private petition and for effective inquiry and conciliation, and for judicial review of legal issues. No reservations should be adopted which concede to state jurisdiction any exemption from the operations of international standards agreed to by the United States.

Simultaneously with the drafting of a covenant, we urge the practical implementation of the universal declaration, already recognized in principle in many situations. The Assembly resolution urging wide popular education in the principles of the declaration should be a concern of all organizations committed to promoting the United Nations.

We support the varied efforts of the United Nations in the promotion of human rights through its agencies on the status of women, freedom of information by press, radio, and newsreels, on the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities, on forced labor, trade-union rights, slavery, and the greater liberties of non-self-governing peoples.

We regard all these efforts as constituting a basis for the growth of world law to promote and defend standards of rights applicable to all peoples everywhere, with increasing resort to the agencies of the international community to assure their practical application. These efforts strike at the tyrannies of the police state, whether Communist or Fascist, and also at the causes of manifold grievances and injustices which arouse strife and endanger peace. As such, they constitute one of the greatest hopes of human progress through the United Nations.

Our commitments under the Charter and the universal declaration are to principles grounded in the traditions of our own Bill of Rights. Both our own heritage and our role of world leadership make it imperative that we maintain at home in these critical days the utmost freedom of opinion, debate and dissent, and that we secure equality of all our people without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

We are running the grave risk of sacrificing the spirit and practice of independent and critical expression through fear and hysterical measures to check subversion. An apparent unity purchased at such a price would be a false front, dangerous in its effects on world estimates of the true sentiments of the American people and on the construction at home of a solid foreign policy.

The soundest defense and security of our country lie not in unity enforced by fear, but in the courageous exercise of those liberties which are both the tradition and the hope of the whole free world.

CALL TO ACTION

Recognizing that the governments of free peoples receive their mandate from their citizens, we urge Americans to accept the responsibility to carry forward into their communities and organizations the practical work of education in the policies and principles we have expressed.

We call upon all citizens to maintain contact with their elected representatives for the furtherance of these principles, so that the will of the people for peace and justice through the United Nations may be realized.

INFLATION

We believe that in the present world emergency inflation threatens to hinder the work of the United Nations.

We therefore call for immediate action by the United States Government for a firm and vigorous stabilization program that will distribute the unavoidable sacrifices with fairness and justice, and will enable the United States to discharge effectively its international responsibilities.

WHEAT FOR INDIA

Whereas the people of India are facing serious famine within the next 6 months;

Whereas there exists a surplus of food grains in the United States;

Whereas the traditional practice of the United States has been to give such emergency humanitarian aid as resources permit to peoples in distress solely on the basis of need: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Emergency Conference of the American Association for the United Nations convened in Chicago urges the Congress of the United States to adopt without delay pending legislation which would make available to India 2,000,000 tons of food grains without regard to any political conditions.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE CHICAGO CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 27, 1951

Never before in the history of our Nation has there been so much need for enlightened understanding on the part of our people—of the role it can and should play in the field of international affairs.

The fact that representatives of 91 national organizations, representing practically every phase of American life, have met together for 2½ days in the city of Chicago to consider in emergency session the problem of our responsibility for world leadership, is indicative of the great desire of our people to help maintain the peace of the world at this critical juncture in history and to help bring about a universal state of affairs which would guarantee the peace for generations to come.

As representatives of a great cross-section of American public opinion, we applaud the high level of participation which brought to this conference a rare blending of representatives of public and private agencies, which together with excellent delegate participation will undoubtedly bring forth a set of findings and resolutions which will hearten and provide a spiritual lift to those forces who are so valiantly striving for peace and world understanding.

For the great service provided in making this conference possible, we take this opportunity to express to the American Association for the United Nations, its director, Clark Eichelberger, and his staff, our deep sense of gratitude and appreciation for the wisdom they have shown in conceiving and planning this conference and for the leadership they have provided in bringing together the representatives of these 91 great national organizations to explore their common interests and problems in this field.

We urge upon the American Association for the United Nations to take the leadership and help establish similar conferences on local and regional levels toward the end that a grass-roots educational program to implement the findings of this conference might go forward at the earliest possible moment. We are confident that our local and State organizations will cooperate in this endeavor in every possible manner. We firmly believe that such a program will have a great and continued impact upon the thinking of our Government and our people and will provide for continuity of the magnificent work begun here.

Confusion Peddlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the New Era, AFL publication in Reading, Pa.:

CONFUSION PEDDLERS

Headline writers, mink coat sellers, influence peddlers, sports fixers, crime commissions, and 5 percenters are having a field day. Almost hourly new revelations or charges in one field or another adds to the spectacle, and before one accusation has died out another has taken its place.

And while the merry-go-round spins wildly, the political undertones grow more and more prominent until they eventually drown out the original complaints.

The Kefauver Crime Commission which recently skyrocketed into No. 1 spot on the TV hit parade, has certainly done much to throw the spotlight on gambling and rackets in the United States. Even though the committee functions as an arm of a democratically controlled Congress, it has struck without regard for political welfare or future. Just last November ex-Senator Scott Lucas, then majority leader of the Senate, bitterly charged the Kefauver group with bringing about his defeat by training its probers on gambling in Illinois.

Right now we are witnessing the revelation of alleged irregularities in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation where mink coats battle $100,000 fees to the Republican national chairman in an effort to win headlines.

A Democratic Congressman charges that GOP National Chairman Guy Gabrielson collected a fee of $100,000 for helping his own corporation to get healthy RFC assistance.

Republicans tried to hush up this charge by calling it old stuff. They are probably correct. If the Republican techniques employed by Pennsylvania State government and State officials can be considered typical of the GOP nationally, then Gabrielson's influence peddling most certainly is old stuff. They have been doing it for years.

Actually, we don't believe the big press and the Republican-Dixiecrat outfit is too concerned about the evils of gambling as such. We believe they are more concerned

with discrediting the present administration so that the basically more important issues are drowned in confusion.

Certainly we want no truck with the goings on inside the RFC. If somebody's guilty, give 'em the right kind of medicine. But do it to both sides.

The people are the losers in this business, no matter how you look at it. In the short-range picture, the workers lose as a result of RFC losses because it's the taxpayers' money. But the workers lose a lot more when the party which stands for liberal social legislation is discredited to the point where it cannot get its bills enacted into law.

One thing's certain. Workers don't stand a chance of getting better social security, a workable health program, a higher minimum wage, a break in the Federal tax program, and other benefits as long as the Republican-Dixiecrat crowd is in control. Crime probers, worthy as they are, are sensational and take the play away from the long-range problems affecting not only a handful of gamblers or five-percenters, but every one of the 150,000,000 people in America.

Some day we'd like to see a slum probe, an old-age probe, and a minimum-wage probe in which groups of Senators and Representatives toured the United States with the same amount of publicity given the Kefauver commission. We'd like to hear the plain people of America talk about the hovels they live in and we'd like to catch their expressions on the TV screen. We'd like to hear the 7,300 families of Reading and Berks County testify as to their substandard housing and then force the owners of those properties to reveal their profits from human misery.

Or perhaps an aged couple could sit before the cameras and give a detailed budget of how they pay their rent, buy their food, buy their clothing on a social-security check of $75 a month. And then maybe a General Motors Corp. executive could tell this old couple never to fear because GM made over $600,000,000 last year and therefore everything must be right with the world.

Yes, kick out the five-percenters, the influence peddlers, and all the rest. And then put the spotlight on the real problems that face the vast majority of Americans.

American Gift Dollars Buy Strategic and Critical Materials for European Countries While American Citizens Are Denied the Right To Buy and Use These Same Items

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers who filed their income-tax returns last Thursday and made their payments as required by law ought to know that many of the dollars they now are compelled to pay into the Federal Treasury are going to pay for strategic and critical materials now in short supply in this country, which are being bought by European countries with gift dollars supplied under the so-called Marshall plan.

So far, Mr. Speaker, we have authorized total expenditures for Marshall plan aid in excess of $11,000,000,000.

It is indeed a sad commentary on the economic situation we now find this Nation to be in when it is learned that within the past 2 weeks, ECA has authorized new procurements in this country of copper, copper products, lead and lead alloys, and nickel and nickel alloys, all of which products are under strict allocation and control for our own consumers. The following are examples of recent procurement authorizations:

Mar. 8, 1951. Tin plate to French North Africa	$800,000
Mar. 7, 1951. Copper and products to United Kingdom	5,880,000
Mar. 12, 1951. Copper and products to United Kingdom	600,000
Mar. 12, 1951. Copper and products to Austria	250,000
Mar. 12, 1951. Lead and lead-base alloys to Austria	90,000
Mar. 12, 1951. Tin plate, terneplate, black plate to Belgium-Luxemburg	200,000
Mar. 14, 1951. Copper and products to Norway	350,000
Mar. 14, 1951. Nickel and nickel-base alloys to France	35,000
Mar. 14, 1951. Copper and products to France	15,000
Total	8,220,000

How Much Longer Before United States Joins Second-Front Movement Against Chinese Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of March 15, 1951:

CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE

For practical purposes, something close to a second front has been opened on the mainland of China against the Chinese Communists.

Reports from Hong Kong yesterday said the revolt against the Communist rule was growing rapidly. Hungry farmers armed with hoes and scythes are staging food riots and storming Red strongholds for arms.

Nationalist sources on Formosa have estimated that 200,000 guerrillas are active in two southern provinces and a total of 1,500,000 throughout China.

The figures may be high, but from the Communists' own admissions the Reds have their hands full with determined rebellious forces in their own backyard.

And fear of Nationalist landings across from Formosa has forced the Communists to halt their flow of southern troops toward Korea, thereby potentially if not actually relieving pressure on American forces.

But our Government is doing nothing about it. We're passing up a momentous opportunity. We're offering no aid to these anti-Communist forces who are fighting on our side, and little or none to the Nationalists on Formosa who are inspiring or directing them.

We won't even let the Nationalists airlift supplies to their own people, or bomb the common enemy. Nor, under the Truman-Acheson neutrality order, will we permit the Nationalists to throw another half million trained troops into the fight.

All we do is sit back and fervently wish the United Nations would think of something to get us off the hook in Korea. And the UN is doing nothing.

An aggressive, straight-thinking United States Government—one not mainly concerned with covering up its own mistakes and bad guesses on China—would pick up the ball at this point, and run with it.

To ignore this virtual second front that has opened in South China is criminal negligence and callous indifference to the sacrifice of American lives in Korea in the last 8½ months.

At the very least, our Government could adopt the suggestion of Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, whose ideas on China run to a high percentage of good sense. In a New York speech Tuesday night, he said:

"If the defeatist and appease bloc in the State Department is still trying more to justify its past than to win the future, let us at least demand that a mission of top-notch leaders be sent to Formosa to survey the situation."

Congress should on its own responsibility dispatch such a mission immediately. Not another Philip Jessup mission, but a group unquestionably unbiased and powerful enough to withstand any suppression of its findings.

Let them report back to us on the feasibility and possible results of unshackling Chiang Kai-shek and aiding his forces on the mainland.

Surely that much is owed to the American public now confused by State Department vacillation and squeamishness over what to do next in our war in Asia.

Northwestern's Tragic Prank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely, significant, and well-written editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Journal of March 13 on a subject that has touched deeply the hearts of our people in Louisiana:

NORTHWESTERN'S TRAGIC PRANK

Like many other shocking happenings, the prank which resulted in the death of a Northwestern State college student should teach an important lesson—stressing the need of suppressing any activity with violent potentialities. It should be taught in all institutions in which youths indulge in hazing and similar programs, which always are expected to be enjoyed without serious results but at times are too dangerous to be immune from fatal consequences.

Naturally, there is widespread sympathy for the family and friends of the victim of the Natchitoches escapade, and also compassion for the college officials, faculty, student body, and citizens of the hospitable community in which originated the tragic experience. But nothing now said can make the outcome of the students' prank any different. Only words of regret, sorrow, and sympathy can be spoken and written. But the terrible incident can and should result in public opinion strong enough to effectively discourage further use of possibly violent stunts, especially the prank now in

question—that of directing a youth to a "blind date" and having a mythical "irate husband" appear with shotgun. The college boy, blessed with promising future, died precipitately in the woods as the gunblast suddenly exploded. Presumably he fell over the high Grand Ecore bluff into Red River, where several days later the body was found.

Obviously fellow students taking part in the prank had in mind only harmless amusement. They expected that the youth chosen as victim of the "irate husband" would return to the campus after his flight from the scene of the "shooting" and become the target of good natured jests. None entertained any thought that the prank would culminate contrary to their friendly wishes. Previous staging of the same "play" had resulted only in such entertainment. But, unfortunately, it ended in tragedy and in consequent sorrow, distress, and regret that can never entirely disappear. The youths who staged the stunt can never be free from the knowledge of their responsibility. That too, is a dreadful result of the fatal incident.

The victim's father, who collapsed upon learning of the death of his son, realizes that nothing can be done punitively, since the tragedy was unintentional, as judged by his comment just before leaving the college for home, including these words:

"I realize that this college prank, even though it resulted in the death of my son, could have happened anywhere. I hold no malice in my heart toward anyone involved."

Dr. H. Lee Prather, president of Northwestern, expressed himself similarly:

"The college officials at present concur with the generous opinion expressed by the distraught father—that no attempt should be made to punish the group of young college students responsible for the prank that had such a tragic result. Obviously any reasonable measures that might be taken to that end would be wholly inadequate to atone for the lamentable affair."

Foreign Policy Must Be Changed—Lippmann Points Out Lessons for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Walter Lippmann admits that a change in foreign policy is necessary, Mr. Truman and the State Department should give serious consideration to doing so. For 2 years this outstanding authority on international questions has warned that this country must not undertake commitments which we cannot fulfill. The record is clear from admissions by the Secretary of State and his policy makers that we have many commitments all over the world that these United States will be short on performance and this means a loss in honor and prestige.

Mr. Speaker, so that all Members may have the benefit of Mr. Lippmann's reasoning on this important question before the American people, I am inserting, at this point, an article of his that appeared in the February Atlantic Monthly:

LESSONS FOR SURVIVAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

As I write we find ourselves wondering whether we are facing the awful dilemma of appeasement or war—of default and surrender and the death of the soul, or of a war that would be as inconclusive as it was irreparably destructive. What, we say to one another, must we do, that the Nation, and the western society to which it belongs, may survive to fulfill their promise and to complete their destiny?

The answer that each of us makes to these questions will be determined by the conclusions he draws from his reading of the history of other societies which have risen and have flourished and have passed away. For myself, I hold with those who, like René Grousset, say that in general no civilization is destroyed from the outside unless it has already decayed from within, that no empire is conquered from abroad unless it has first destroyed itself. And so, I would say that the questions about our survival have no human and practical meaning unless we believe, as I do, that we are still the masters of our destiny and not the mere spectators of our own downfall.

If we believe that we are responsible for our own fate, and that we are still free to choose, then out of the experience of Korea, which is so bitter, we can learn the lessons for survival. The lessons deal with the elemental facts of our situation in the world. When we ignore the elemental facts, as we have done from the proclamation of the Truman doctrine to its application in Korea, we are inviting certain defeat. But if we can learn from experience and will make the truth about ourselves and our friends and our adversaries the foundation of our policies, we shall be able surely—I have no doubt at all—to make ourselves invulnerable, be it in war or in the great struggle which is neither peace nor war.

Let us set down, then, the elemental and unalterable facts of the American situation.

In this century North America has become the citadel, the main arsenal, and the central workshop of the Atlantic community—of the nations that are the bearers of the western civilization.

North America is an island—a continental island, to be sure, but in relation to all the other nations of the world an island nonetheless. Canada, the United States, and Mexico are surrounded by the three oceans and by the air above them in the Pacific and the Atlantic and the Arctic. No enemy can conquer them unless he is master of the sea and air. And unless we in North America are the masters of this sea and air, we cannot support our allies or wage war against our enemies. The first rule of our diplomacy and of our strategical doctrine is therefore that we must never forget the limitations, and that always we must take the utmost advantage of our island character.

On this continental island of ours live fewer than one-tenth of the inhabitants of the globe. We cannot prevail, or even in the end do more than survive ignominiously and miserably, unless, like all the seagoing people before us—unless, like the Athenians, the Venetians, and the English in the days of their greatness—we learn how to make up for our inferiority in numbers. Like David with Goliath, we have to learn to live by our wits and not to engage ourselves in wrestling matches with the Philistines.

We and our neighbors in North America are outnumbered. We must take this truth to heart. We must write it on the walls of our council chambers. We must never forget it. The Communist coalition can raise more soldiers than we or our allies can ever have. These soldiers have weapons which on any battlefield in Eurasia are quite deadly enough to kill. Any policy which compels us to fight them, as we are fighting them in Korea now—across an ocean, within walking distance of their own inexhaustible reserves, on terms of battle in which they are forever incalculably superior—cannot be anything but what it has turned out to be; a bloody entanglement.

Our superiority is in our technology and our productivity and in the science that has flourished and can flourish only in free societies, and in the magic of freedom to arouse the best in men. These are the sources of our strength. If they are drawn upon skillfully, we shall have forms of power, suitable to our island character, in which we excel. With them we can defend the North American citadel and arsenal and workshop. Within it we can create an offensive power that will make the cost of military aggression against the Atlantic community very nearly prohibitive, and in any event most certainly inconclusive.

But that will mean that we have fixed our military frontiers not along rivers or at mountain ranges, and certainly not on demarcation lines in the Eurasian Continent, but in the oceans of sea and air. For the defense and for the offense, for our own security and for our power to protect our friends and to deal with our enemies, we must rely on the speed and the range, on the tactical and the strategical mobility of sea and air power. Where, as the saying goes, the Infantry is the queen of battles, there the American soldier and statesman must avoid the battle.

The recognition of these elementals—though they are not self-evident—truths should lead, I contend, to a clarification of the assumptions and to a revision of the policies on which we have been acting. The cold war has been a struggle over the future of Germany and of the European Continent which Hitler occupied, and over the future of Japan and of all that large part of the Asiatic Continent which the Japanese occupied.

We have believed, rightly I am sure, that it is the purpose of the Soviet Government to become the heir of all of Hitler's and of all of Japan's possessions, including and above all Germany and Japan. We have realized that if this expansion were successful we should be confronted with an overwhelming combination of powers—by the Germans and the Japanese who nearly conquered the world themselves, allied with and not opposed by the Russians.

Our answer to this fearful menace has been an attempt to bring Germany and Japan, and as much as we could of the lands they once occupied, within the orbit of the Atlantic community. Our thesis has been that whatever is not within the military orbit of the west must fall within the orbit of the Soviets, and vice versa. The policy we have founded upon this assumption has always and from the beginning been doomed to fail. For it could be enforced only if we had possessed, and had been able and willing to commit, ground forces capable of defeating the armed and armored hordes of the Soviet Union. We could never have found the Infantry to contain the masses of the Communist orbit in Eurasia.

But if we cannot permit the Soviets to become the heirs of Hitler and of the Japanese war lords, if the Atlantic community cannot, in defiance of the Soviets, bring Germany and Japan within its own military system, then there is only one tolerable course open to us. It is to base our military posture toward Germany and Japan on a decision not to make them our allies, but in all cases to deny them to the Soviets. We cannot, I believe, defend them on the ground while they rearm. We cannot, I believe, defend them at all against Soviet atomic attack. We cannot, I believe, count on their loyalty to the Atlantic community if that were to mean the sacrificing

destruction of their own countries in order that Britain and France and America should survive.

What we can do is make it equally unprofitable and intolerable for the Soviets if they take Germany and Japan into their military system. There can be no question of our military power to neutralize Germany or Japan in case of war. The Russians are as little able to defend them as we are.

Whether the Germans or the Japanese would like to be incorporated within the Soviet rule, I seriously question. But leaving that point aside, it lies within our power—our power to bomb—to make sure that no military cell within them shall swing either country into the Soviet orbit. This initiative we have always held. We hold it still and should hold it in the future.

The best, indeed the only, military course effectively open to us in Germany and Japan is in fact the counterpart of the political course which most Germans and, I imagine, most Japanese believe in. That is a policy of neutrality like that of Sweden and Switzerland, which rests not on pacifism and disarmament, but on the realization that any other course is suicidal.

The Russians must understand beyond doubt that we shall be certain to retaliate if they attempt to conquer Western Europe, and that we shall destroy the material assets which they might seek to gain by conquest.

I believe myself that we should revise our present policy—which is a corollary of the Truman doctrine and is designed to make Germany and Japan our military allies. We should espouse the policy, which corresponds to our own military capacity, and to our own military necessities, and to the real will of the German and the Japanese nations, which is to guarantee their independence, and to deny them to the Soviets.

I do not know whether we shall be at war with the Soviet Union when this paper is published. If we are not at war, the one course most likely to avert war is the acceptance by the Russians, the Germans, the British, the French, and ourselves of the conclusion that no one can now rearm the Germans and the Japanese and make them, and that is use them as, military allies or satellites. Were our diplomacy at all astute, we should make a virtue of what is in fact a necessity.

And if, God forbid, we are at war, there will not be on the Rhine that German Army which some of our military dreamers dream about, and we shall be facing the hideous question of whether we must go back and once again destroy the Ruhr. We shall then be wondering whether it was indeed wise, even sensible, to suspend diplomacy while we sought to conjure up a theoretically desirable but an imaginary German Army.

What Our Young Men Think About the Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly evident that the youths of this land have definite ideas with reference to our foreign policy. I believe that the Congress should give serious consideration to the views expressed by young men who offer their lives and their blood to their country, whether they do so voluntarily or under conscription. The future of our country is in the youths of this land of the free and the home of the brave, except those who are plunged into foreign slaughterhouses to be crippled, blinded, or liquidated.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a letter which I have received from nine servicemen now stationed in one of our military camps. These boys are all from the Forty-fifth Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent. I feel a great responsibility, not only to these boys but also to their fathers and mothers and families.

The letter reads as follows:

As our Representative in the Congress of the United States, we wish in this letter to convey to you our personal convictions on the foreign policies of this Government and the defense of our Nation.

We shall list our opinion below.

1. We believe in accordance with ex-President Herbert Hoover in regard to foreign policy and national defense—in that the dispersal of our Armed Forces about the globe can only lead to defeat, disaster, and economic ruin of our beloved country.

2. We believe that our armed invasion last fall of territory north of parallel 38 in Korea was a definite departure from democratic principles under which this Nation was founded and lived so many years in peace.

3. We believe that this invasion has cost us as a nation a terrific price in human lives—both our soldiers and also helpless South Korean civilians whose land we have devastated for what little we or they (South Korea) could ever hope to gain.

4. We believe that Russia would like nothing better than to lure our forces into scattered conflicts with her satellites throughout the world, thus creating long supply lines and leaving our hemisphere open to concentrated attack by her own untouched military might.

5. We believe that the defense of America lies in building a powerful strategic Air Force.

6. We believe that the futile hope of matching ground forces with the Communist world is not only illogical but tragic.

7. We believe that the conscription of men physically and mentally unfit and the placing of them into combat organizations has undermined the strength, efficiency, and morale of our Army Ground Forces. This to us is an obvious fact.

8. We believe that the inefficiency with which the Army classification system has dealt with draftees has caused much bitterness and loss of respect for those in charge of military administration, and has and will continue to cause needless waste of valuable skilled manpower.

9. We believe that if American blood is to be spilled on foreign soil in an attempt to save the free world from the evils of statism abroad, this blood must not be spilled in vain by allowing these evils to strangulate here in our homeland the very freedoms, economic and political, for which we fight. In short, we, as soldiers, do not wish to come home to another England.

10. We believe that, finally, unless the above-mentioned blunders are corrected as soon as possible, and a coherent, intelligent foreign policy and sound military strategy instituted, America as a free nation might go down to defeat, carrying with it the hope and future of free civilization upon this globe.

In conclusion of this letter, we would endeavor to impress upon you as our Representative in our Government that these are our views as loyal citizens and soldiers. These views are shared by many other soldiers whom we know but who are not in our congressional district.

Gwilym A. Price Analyzes Performance and Prospects of Reorganization of the United States Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Gwilym A. Price, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp., styled "The Hoover Plan: Performance and Prospects," which deals with our progress toward putting the Hoover Commission recommendations for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government into effect.

Mr. Price points out that the Eighty-first Congress put into effect approximately 50 percent of the Hoover plan for reorganization, at a total savings of approximately $2,000,000,000 per year. However, it should be borne in mind that this half is the less controversial half.

I hope Congress will do its full duty by putting into effect such further reorganization plans as are justified during 1951.

Mr. Price's article follows:

THE HOOVER PLAN: PERFORMANCE AND PROSPECTS

(By Gwilym A. Price, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp.)

There is wide agreement on three steps we must take if we are to survive a long war. These do not make up a complete program; they are not a complete solution to our problems. But we cannot control inflation, keep our economy dynamic, and rearm ourselves effectively—which is the same thing as saying we cannot survive—if we do not carry out these steps.

We must improve the efficiency of our civil government. We must achieve the maximum possible efficiency in military procurement. We must reduce nonmilitary expenditures by the Government for the duration of the crisis.

The report of the Hoover Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government is directly concerned with all three of these very vital requirements.

The total Hoover plan includes suggestions for ways to save money in running the Government, but it goes beyond that into the field of creative reorganization. It recommends the consolidation of some services, the elimination of others, and the creation of still others. It calls for the abolition of some jobs and higher pay for others. In short, the Hoover Commission carried out its assignment of drawing up plans for the reorganization of big government into an effective and economical instrument of public service.

Savings possible under the report were unofficially estimated at no less than $3,000,000,000 and possibly as high as $5,000,000,000 annually. The report made some 300 specific recommendations. Every department was examined.

The great majority of the American public was solidly behind the Hoover Commission, what it was trying to do, and what it finally recommended. According to Dr. Gallup that majority was about 25 to 1. More than 12,000 editorials about the Hoover report appeared in 1949, and less than 1 percent were opposed. Some 90 organizations joined in support of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report, a nonpartisan organization

for public education in support of the report which had been formed with the encouragement of Mr. Truman and Mr. Hoover.

THE OPPOSITION

However, there has been strong opposition from some of the two million Federal employees and their friends, particularly from agency heads who felt that their empires were in danger. One Cabinet member approved that part of the plan affecting his department which raised his salary and gave him several assistants; the other recommendations, he said, would require "further study."

Opposition also came from some Congressmen who saw the Hoover plan chiefly as a force for reducing their patronage and the Federal spending in their districts. The plan for military unification brought about a tug-of-war among the three services.

Most regrettable of all, opposition came in many directions from private citizens and organizations. It came in much the same way and for much the same reasons it developed among department heads in Government. They favored the report as a whole, but (in the words of the Citizens Committee) "just wanted an exception made for some agency or bureau with which they happened to have a well-developed working relationship or from which they received some form of patronage, subsidy, or beneficent relation."

THE $5,000,000,000 QUESTION

As the Eighty-first Congress convened at the beginning of 1949, the $5,000,000,000 question was this: What, if anything, will be done about the Hoover Commission recommendations? Here is the record as it stood in December 1950.

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission Report can be put into effect in three different ways.

Administrative action: About 40 percent of the Commission's original 300 recommendations do not need changes in existing laws in order to be adopted, but can be put into effect simply by Presidential directive or administrative action from within the departments and agencies.

In order to work out plans for doing this, the President formed a President's Advisory Committee on Management Improvement, consisting of 10 men who are top executives in government and private organizations. As Chairman he appointed Thomas P. Morgan, president and board chairman of the Sperry Corp.

This committee is concerned particularly with the progress being made in budgeting and accounting, development of executive staffs, reduction of operating costs, and use of supplies and facilities.

Reorganization plans: Under the Reorganization Act of 1949, the President can submit reorganization plans to the Congress. These automatically become effective in 60 days unless disapproved by a constitutional majority of either House of Congress.

The President submitted seven reorganization plans to the Congress in 1949 and 27 more in 1950. Of these 34 plans, 26 have become effective and are in operation.

Public laws: The balance of the Commission's recommendations must be formally approved by Congress as statutory legislation and signed by the President.

To date, 20 public laws based on the Hoover plan have been enacted. There has been considerable criticism of the way the administration proposed and carried out some of the Hoover Commission recommendations. Most of this criticism arose in connection with the 34 reorganization plans submitted to Congress. Some of it is justified.

The first plan submitted by the President in 1949 would have confined the Federal medical, education, and security programs in a department with Cabinet status. This went far beyond the recommendations of the Hoover report, was not certified by the Citizens Committee as conforming to the report, and was rejected by the Senate.

The reorganization plans for 1950 were likewise deficient in some respects. Plan No. 12, an attempt to abolish one of the offices of the National Labor Relations Board, involved a matter of policy and raised issues beyond the authority of the Hoover report. It was not certified by the Citizens Committee, and was defeated in the Senate.

Despite the suspicion cast on the rest of the reorganization plans by these two false moves, however, almost all the other plans were in conformity with the basic principles laid down by the Commission. The Citizens Committee certified all 26 of the plans which passed as conforming to the report. Of the eight which were rejected, only four were so certified.

By these three methods, then—administrative action, reorganization plans, and public laws—almost 50 percent of the Hoover Commission's recommendations are definitely enacted and in operation. Some of these fell short of the original recommendations and some varied in details, but most of them conform to the report.

THE MAIN ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Reorganization Act, under which the 26 plans mentioned above were adopted, permits the President to unsnarl some of the tangle of boards, bureaus, and agencies under him. "On the record," said the Citizens Committee, "this is the best reorganization act given any President of modern times."

A new General Service Agency, combining four previous agencies, has been created to bring a degree of common sense and efficiency to Government purchasing, storage, inventory, records management, and other housekeeping procedures. It is hoped that General Services has ended the kind of confusion whereby one agency stocked a 93-year supply of fluorescent lamps and another laid away a 247-year supply of loose-leaf binders.

By administrative action, a modern budget format was adopted by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal 1950–51. It is a graphic, simple, and clear document and has been praised by the Hoover Commission as the foremost advance in Federal fiscal procedure in many decades.

An Accounting Procedures Act prescribes a new, modern, and uniform system of Federal accounting. It can release several thousand Federal employees from unnecessary work. It can end an accounting system that dates back to the first Secretary of the Treasury and slows down the business operations of the whole Government, with some agencies forced to wait 12 months or more to get the results of their previous year's activities. The act is largely permissive, however, and requires firm execution if it is to do any good.

One bill, nicknamed the "President's time saver," has relieved the President of legal obligation to sign great piles of documents relating to such affairs as Osage Indian oil royalties, whale-hunting licenses, and migratory birds. It saves about 2 weeks of Presidential working time each year.

The Commission found a virtually disintegrated Labor Department, with its logical functions scattered in other agencies throughout the Government. On Commission recommendations, the Department is being rebuilt to true Cabinet stature.

Under Public Law 73, streamlining of the organizational structure of the State Department has begun. Communications have been improved within the Department, transactions have been expedited, and the Secretary's burden of paper work has been cut in two.

The Post Office accounting reform has brought a degree of reorganization to one function of the largest single Government business enterprise. The accounts of the Post Office had previously been kept by the General Accounting Office, an outside agency, under an obsolete and inadequate system. The Department normally waited a year for its official accounting figures and, therefore, it based its operating plans on estimates which it worked up itself with duplicate accounting machinery.

The Military Unification Act of August 1949 has strengthened the authority of the Secretary of Defense, introduced a performance budget system and modernized accounting, and helped to bring about real teamwork among the three military services.

The last of these nine—military unification—has been called the greatest single achievement of the Hoover Commission. Much of the value of unification lies in the field of morale and cannot easily be appraised. Specific, measurable examples of interservice cooperation and economy, however, are beginning to add up to a heartening total.

There is now being developed, for example, a common cataloging system of supplies for all services instead of the 17 different systems previously used, and it has already cut the 5,000,000 items previously listed in half.

All three services are now using unified printing plants, a single Washington telephone switchboard, a single improved method (the Navy's) of issuing uniforms, and a unified code of military justice. They are cooperating for the first time on such matters as wind tunnels, research, purchasing, and construction. More than 10,000 job classifications used by the Military Establishment in World War II have been cut to 3,000.

These, then, are the main accomplishments of reorganization to date. There have been, in addition, many lesser reforms within the framework of these nine major accomplishments. All Government transport services have been consolidated within the Department of Commerce. The management and government of the Panama Canal have been recognized and a modern business-type organization and a new tolls policy installed.

The Federal Executive Pay Act has given some 200 top Federal officials salaries somewhat more in line with those of private industry. The number of military attachés in foreign embassies has been cut 30 percent and their work consolidated. Wandering bureaus have been put where they belong; the Treasury Department no longer operates the Bureau of Federal Supply.

HOW MUCH IS IT WORTH?

How much actual savings can we expect from these reforms already enacted? The Citizens Committee estimates a total savings of around $2,000,000,000 a year, most of it arising from economies worked in military unification. I cannot, of course, judge the accuracy of this estimate. As military expenditures and the total Federal budget rise, the total of savings effected, of course, will also rise.

Some savings are clear and apparent. For example, a year ago General McNarney stopped the unnecessary operation of 30,000 military passenger vehicles and released the services of 3,500 officers and men for better use elsewhere. Last fall enough Government records and dead files were transferred to an abandoned factory outside Washington to allow office space for 10,000 employees—space which otherwise would have to be built or rented.

Other savings, unlike those mentioned, are of a less obvious nature, and still others, I presume, will take months and perhaps years to develop. Three-fifths of the Hoover laws and plans enacted, after all, were passed within the past year, many of them within the past few months.

I am inclined to think that economy is only half the story of the Hoover report, and perhaps the half that has been emphasized at the expense of other things that the report can do for us.

It is from changed policies that the greatest savings can and must come, and with these the Hoover Commission was not directly concerned. Far more than $3,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 can be saved if the Government will simply cancel, postpone, and reduce some of its nonessential, nonmilitary programs in this crisis, withdraw from competition with private industry in a score of fields, and stop handing out subsidies.

THREE WAYS TO SAVE

There is a widespread misconception about how savings in Government—or in private industry, for that matter—are made. Consolidation and reorganization do not save money in themselves. They simply provide the means by which such savings can be made. When you merge two private companies, you have the same number of people working for one firm instead of two, with a new need, probably, for additional supervisory personnel—unless you press the opportunities for savings that come with merger. The same is true of merger in Government.

There are three requirements to effect savings. The first is reorganization. The second is the technical knowledge of how to use that reorganization. The third is the will to use it.

The Hoover Commission Report is simply a plan for reorganization. If it is all put into effect tomorrow, it will save nothing unless the knowledge and the will to make savings are there, too. On the other hand, no administrator, regardless of his knowledge and will, can make appreciable savings in our Federal Government without first having reorganization to build upon.

The other half of the Hoover report story, efficiency, now seems to be growing more important every day. In order to survive the long emergency we face, we must have an efficient and effective Government as well as an economical one.

It seems apparent to me that the Hoover reforms have helped us considerably in this respect in the past 6 months. Washington is still a jungle, to be sure; but it is probably a good deal less of a jungle than it would have been if the Hoover plan had not unsnarled some of those agencies and bureaus.

IMPROVEMENTS FOR DEFENSE

There is impressive testimony from military men, including General MacArthur and Secretary of Defense Marshall, that military unification as wrought by the Hoover plan has worked well in the Korean action, both at the front and in Washington. The new single military sea transport service carried 120,000 troops and a tremendous amount of material to Korea with unparalleled speed. The military air transport service moved 35,000 persons to Korea and saved weeks of time in evacuating wounded to the United States.

It is unfortunate that there has been some confusion among our people on the relationship of the Hoover report to the amount and kind of armament and the number of men we had under arms when the war broke out in Korea.

It must be pointed out that neither the Eberstadt task force of the Hoover Commission, the Hoover Commission itself, nor the Tydings Act based on the Hoover report, ever made any recommendations, one way or the other, for cuts or increases in the amount or nature of military appropriations. That was not their job. They were concerned only with two things: Operating economies and the bringing about of unified military thinking, planning, and organization.

I think we know enough now to say positively that the Hoover plan has rewarded us well both in efficiency and economy to the extent that it has been adopted; that the remainder of the plan surely should be put to work.

A little more than 50 percent of the Hoover Plan remains to be put into effect. That is a statistical figure only. The fact is that not one Commission recommendation has been adopted that offends any major pressure group or that makes possible a major reduction in Government employees. With the exception of Military Unification, no recommendation has yet been adopted that will lead to major economies. The easier, less controversial half, emphasizing efficiency, has been adopted. The harder half, in which the greatest economies can be achieved, still lies before us.

POLITICS VERSUS ECONOMY

The remaining recommendations will certainly be fought more fiercely than anything that has gone before. And yet they must be adopted. Mr. Hoover has stated over and over that his Commission's report should be judged and accepted in its entirety. "The pattern is a unity," he said. "Any major exceptions would damage or destroy the whole." And again: "They stand or fall together. To give in at one spot, whatever the political pressures, means, almost inevitably, the collapse of the whole."

The Veterans' Administration has not yet been touched. The Department of Agriculture has not been touched. Our antique and patched-up Civil Service System has never been overhauled since it was inaugurated 67 years ago.

The Hoover Commission Task Force for Personnel Management, headed by the late John Stevenson, president of the Penn Mutual Insurance Co., made 33 recommendations on this latter subject, only a few of which have been adopted.

There must be drastic reforms in methods of hiring, promoting, firing, and paying Government employees. Such reforms would make Government service more attractive to better and younger people. They would reduce a costly turn-over that now runs to about 25 percent a year. They would increase the efficiency of two million workers by an estimated 10 percent. They would reverse the protective, negative Civil Service philosophy which is based on rights and not on ability. As Mr. Hoover has declared, "We cannot entrust the Government of today to second-rate men and women."

The Post Office Department needs the thorough overhauling slated for it in the Hoover plan. The report made 9 recommendations for this Department, and of the 6 that must be enacted by Congress, only 1 has been passed. The postal service would be decentralized into 15 regions and operated under procedures somewhat similar to those of national chain-store management.

A start was made when the President, for the first time, appointed a career official instead of a political figure as Postmaster General. He has asked the Congress to place the appointment of 22,000 postmasters on a career instead of a patronage basis. These 9 recommendations, if properly carried out, will improve morale and service and cut in half the annual three to five hundred million dollar deficit.

WASTE AND DUPLICATION

The United Medical Administration recommended to take over the Public Health Service and the military and veterans' hospitals has not been created. Five big Federal hospital systems are competing with each other, and with all other hospitals, for nurses, doctors, and technicians. Forty Government agencies are still offering medical services to various groups.

The recommendation that all Federal conservation and construction be consolidated in the Department of the Interior (renamed the National Resources Department) has not been adopted. The rivalry and duplication of work between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are still unresolved. There is no check and balance system on projects, and no review board to prevent duplication of surveys and planning. The agencies themselves are deciding whether or not their projects are economically or socially sound.

Land management functions have not been consolidated within the Department of Agriculture. The Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, and Bureau of Land Management are still competing with each other and duplicating work and services. Rental for grazing land varies according to which agency administers it, and if two agencies administer it, a cattleman must have two leases.

A start, but no more, has been made on the reorganization of Federal business enterprises. Certain enterprises should be incorporated in one agency and uniform budgeting, accounting, and other business procedures installed. There should be uniform corporate requirements. Hidden subsidies should be discontinued. If the Federal Government is going to continue to lend money and buy and sell mortgages, it at least should do it properly and under one roof.

THE HOOVER PLAN OF 1951

The Hoover report has not been tested until all its recommendations have been adopted. The country cannot be considered fully or effectively mobilized until they have been put in force.

To the extent that we believe this and believe in the Hoover report, we must now bear down to see that the rest of the plan is accepted—and accepted in 1951. Some of us may feel a moral obligation to do this. Certainly we will be benefited as citizens if we do so.

We can do this in the usual ways in which we would support any idea we believe in or any piece of legislation we want to see passed. To these ways, however, we can add one more: we can think twice and deeply before we speak or act against any specific Hoover report reform that works to the apparent disadvantage of us as individuals or of some group with which we are associated. We can, in other words, support the Hoover plan when and if it hurts. We can subordinate personal interest, if the occasion arises, to the interest of good government.

There is a grave and real question whether we can survive the perils of the years that lie ahead. As one of the world's great powers, we have the factories and the know-how. Our enemy has immense resources of manpower and raw materials. The factors are increasing against us as time goes on.

We must make the best possible use of everything we have. We must put our house in order and prepare for a long siege. The Hoover Commission report—all of it in effect and working—can help us to do that.

Address by Hon. Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, at Anniversary Dinner of Charitable Irish Society of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an accomplished and interesting address delivered by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] at the two hundred and fourteenth anniversary dinner of the

Charitable Irish Society of Boston, held at Boston, Mass., on Saturday, March 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BRIEN MCMAHON AT THE TWO HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE CHARITABLE IRISH SOCIETY OF BOSTON, COPLEY-PLAZA HOTEL, BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1951

I am sure that St. Patrick must have given a special blessing to the devoted pioneers who joined together so early to plant a little bit of Irish warmth in the heart of America.

The Charitable Irish Society of Boston has more than 2 centuries of splendid traditions behind it and I am sure you will agree with me that it still stands on the very threshold of its growth. The capacity of the Irish race for expansion, especially in deeds of charity, is simply beyond the imagination of those unfortunates who lack a bit of Celtic in their make-up. In fact, growth is synonymous with the Irish character.

Other races have tall men and tall tales to grace the annals of their heroic past; but the Irish have taller men and if we don't have taller tales, we know how to supply them. We simply won't be outdone in such matters, especially on March 17.

The peculiar talent of our people, which some mistake for Celtic boasting, is nothing more than sober fancy, undistorted by fact or fiction. But I think our kindly neighbors appreciate by now that there is nothing in life more real than the delightful exuberance of Irish imagination.

This is the day we love and the saint we love because divine providence fashioned for us a heavenly patron ideally suited to the needs of the Irish temperament. The ancient chronicles tell us that Patrick was like a lion in strength and power; like a dove in gentleness and humility. In short, St. Patrick had those simple, sturdy virtues which we prize above all others.

This is a day of undisguised sentiment because sentiment is that shining power of the soul, a special gift of the Creator, which sustained and kept alive generations of Irish forebears under the harsh exactions of a cold and brutal tyranny. It was the Irishman's secret that a day of laughter and good cheer could banish the bitter misery of a winter of sorrow and heartbreak. And this lesson must never perish from our memory—the lesson that no tyrant will ever crush out the spirit of a people sustained by love and by faith in the God who made them.

We meet on this day to enjoy the present and to win fresh inspiration from the mighty deeds of those who preceded us. The inspiring story of St. Patrick is as fresh today as it was nearly 15 centuries ago when he lighted the fire on Tara's hill which still remains as the eternal symbol of Ireland's faith and Ireland's glory.

St. Patrick was a slave boy who escaped his captors to return half a century later to conquer the people who held him in bondage. But his weapons of conquest were not made of steel and they were not designed for physical destruction.

There is a striking parallel between the age in which St. Patrick lived and our own times. In the fifth century, the mighty Roman Empire was breaking up and the rule of law was fast disappearing under the steady advances of political chaos and social barbarism. The slow growth of civilization was in danger of extinction under the heavy blows of grasping despots, who knew nothing and cared nothing about the sanctity and dignity of human life. It was into this world of darkness and despair that St. Patrick brought the Christian message of hope and faith which spread its light over Ireland and eventually over the cultural and religious centers of Western Europe. I think the lesson for our time is so obvious that its significance will be lost on no one. How much has changed and how little has changed since the shepherd boy Patrick tended his flocks in the verdant pastures of ancient Ireland.

You have graciously asked me to respond to the toast "The United States of America." I think every American with a drop of Irish blood in his arteries can respond to this toast with love and reverence.

We are proud of the fact that men and women of our blood have lived and died for this land of America with fierce devotion. We are proud of the fact that a touch of Irish genius has quickened the soul of America, that Irish hands and brains have helped fashion its buildings and its political institutions. And above all, we are proud of the fact that this United States of ours is the finest symbol of justice and liberty and political fair-dealing which has ever been devised by mortal man.

Yes; this is a day of sentiment and we are a sentimental people. On St. Patrick's name day we are never afraid that emotional excess will blur the intensity of our love for this cherished land of liberty which means so much to all of us. The virtue of understatement has no appeal for the Irish.

But while we celebrate, we know deep down in our hearts that we are rekindling the fires of loyalty and patriotism because today mortal peril threatens the United States of America.

During the past 5 years, many people have charged me with excessive pessimism on the question of war and peace.

After Hiroshima, I repeatedly warned against the consoling notion that the Soviets might not achieve an atomic weapon for decades. When the President announced, in 1949, that the Kremlin had in fact produced an atomic bomb, I said that total power in the hands of total evil would confront our country with dangers such as it had never before known. Last winter, when many of my senatorial colleagues aspired toward the altogether desirable goal of balancing the national budget, I ventured to prophecy that the accelerating armaments race would mock at any such hopes—I predicted that necessary military spending would force our budget up and up and up.

Just a few weeks ago, I cautioned once more against the siren voices which take false comfort in repeating over and over that "war is not inevitable." Pious hopes do not change hard facts; slogans do not refute the lessons of history. History teaches time and again that prolonged armaments races always end in war.

If we refuse to heed this lesson, we do so at our mortal peril.

But history teaches another lesson. It shows that the destiny of men and nations does not proceed in an inevitable path. It demonstrates that intelligent and valiant action—if taken in time—can stave off looming disaster.

Only the philosophy of communism—with its historical determinism and with its denial of free will—asserts that the future is predetermined. We Americans, with our awareness that God has given man free will, know that the future is not already determined. We know that what happens in the future depends on what we do now—it depends on our present wisdom or lack thereof, on our present moral courage or moral cowardice. This is elementary Christian doctrine.

If it is downright dangerous to take unfounded comfort in the phrase "war is not inevitable," it is even more dangerous to think and act as if war is inevitable. The members of this cult of inevitability, even though they do not realize it, bespeak their lack of faith in the vitality of our own free institutions; they give the cause of communism undeserved flattery. In effect, they say that we Americans and our Allies do not have sufficient imagination and staying power to halt the onward march of Soviet power. They suggest that the Kremlin is invincible—that we can never halt Stalin in his tracks. Unwittingly, they subscribe to Stalin's own proud boast—that the Soviet Union represents the wave of the future and that our western society is decadent and slated for extinction.

As a moral people who believe in free will and in an open future, we Americans must reject this false doctrine of inevitable war.

I say that if we formulate—now—a positive peace program of splendid and compelling dimensions, we can—and will—win through to a just and lasting peace. I assert that if we now wage peace with the same fixity of purpose with which we would wage war, we have every reason to believe that a third world war can be averted.

Our program for waging peace need not start from scratch.

Over the past 5 years, let us never forget, we have recorded mighty successes in halting the spread of communism, and in leaving the door open to peace. I do not pretend for a moment that we have acted with perfect wisdom, or that we have not suffered important set-backs. Western Europe, nonetheless, whose economic and military potential is second only to that of the United States, is still in the camp of freedom. The Marshall plan has worked. Month after month, the Communist ranks in France and Italy diminish. Our military-assistance program, coupled with the growing armies of our European friends, holds forth real promise of deterring the Kremlin from all-out aggression. In Greece, communism has suffered a decisive set-back. Fortified with our aid, Turkey now stands resolute in the face of Soviet threats.

And above all, our country has created an imposing and fearsome stockpile of atomic weapons which has kept the Red armies out of Western Europe, and which now shields us and our allies while we go about the urgent task of enlarging our armies. I confess that I take no little pride in the opportunity given me, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to help make our atomic stockpile the defender of our freedoms.

Our foreign policy has properly recognized that the peace can be maintained, and the Kremlin dissuaded from aggression, only through military and economic strength. No matter how noble the principles for which they stand, troops armed with pitchforks will never deter an aggressor. It takes tanks and planes, in vast numbers, to halt modern armies and air fleets. Likewise, disease-ridden and poverty-stricken populations are natural targets for conquest and infiltration. Empty stomachs must be filled if minds are not to be victimized by evil philosophies.

It is obvious that military and economic strength must be countered in their own terms. But perhaps less obvious is this, that military and economic strength are important only when translated into human strength, into the strength of people. Tanks and guns are of no avail in defending liberty unless we have soldiers who are willing to fight, and if necessary, die. By the same token, an aggressor needs the support of vast numbers of people to carry out his designs. If the Red army refused to carry out plans for foreign conquest, Stalin would be powerless.

All military leaders have recognized that military strength must be ultimately defined in terms of human strength. General Eisenhower underlined this truth time and again when he testified on the problem of defending Western Europe; he stated that

morale was all-important. Even the Communists have paid obeisance to this principle, and have perverted it on behalf of their evil purposes. Marx and Lenin and Stalin have all declared that the struggle for the world will ultimately be decided by the morale of the opposing camps.

Now the words "morale" and "morality" sound very much alike. This is no accident of language; they are, in face, very much alike. Morale depends basically, not upon the strength of a man's weapons, but on the strength of his cause. That cause, if it is to command the allegiance of man of good will, must be the cause of justice and freedom and decency. People are incorrigibly moral. They do not really fight for boundaries or raw materials or factories; they fight for things of the spirit—for transcendent principles. Surely this is apparent to all who claim Ireland as their ancestral homeland.

I therefore put before you this simple series of propositions. Military strength ultimately rests upon human strength. Human strength rests on morale. Morale derives from a passionate belief in the justice of one's cause.

If these things are indeed true—and I am sure no one will deny them—it is clear what we must do to avert a third world war.

We must get squarely behind a moral program that will win people over to our side and away from Stalin.

We can do this only by approaching all the world's peoples—and the Russian people as well—with a positive peace program so in harmony with man's natural desires that it cannot fail to win the support of all men of good will.

In 1917, we did this. We told the world that we stood for the fourteen points. In 1940, we again declared ourselves in favor of concrete objectives of peace—the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Suppose that we had come out in favor of the fourteen points not in 1917, but in 1912—before the Kaiser sent his armies marching into Belgium and France. Suppose that the "four freedoms" had been proclaimed—not in 1940, but in 1938—before Hitler invaded Poland. I wonder if, in either case, the First and Second World Wars would have started. I wonder if the German people, whose consent was indispensable to both wars, could have been mobilized behind an aggressive policy.

Such a program, I fully believe, would accomplish what we have failed to do so far—to rally the moral and physical strength of the world's peoples as a mighty force for peace. Such a program, by mobilizing the moral strength latent in all men, would confront the Kremlin with a dynamic force far more powerful than even the free world's guns and tanks and atomic bombs.

The program I envisage would lay stress upon two things. First, that the supreme menace to world peace comes from the iron curtain. Second, that our country does in fact have a practical and realizable program for ridding the world of fear and bringing about a new community of men.

If the free peoples of Europe and Asia are presented with a cause which fulfills man's basic longings, they will be prepared to meet any armed assault. And if the peoples of Russia come not to believe in Stalin's cause, all the vaunted power of the Kremlin will be of no avail.

Our entire foreign policy must therefore be geared to this twin task—exposing Stalin's conspiracy against the truth, and approaching all the world's peoples with a constructive alternative to war.

The Russian people have passed through two dreadful wars, a bloody revolution, and incessant purges—all in a span of a generation. They long to be relieved of their crushing burden of armament expenditures. They long for the dignities which we Americans take for granted. If we can convince the Russian people that we stand for a decent and peaceful world, they will become Stalin's greatest liability and our greatest asset.

Not all the tanks rolling off Red assembly lines will help Stalin if the soldiers of the Red Army are unwilling to fight on behalf of aggression. If we can show the ordinary Russians that the Kremlin alone threatens the peace—if we can demonstrate that we stand for all the liberties and decencies which are now withheld from the Russian people—we will vastly reduce or even eliminate the chance of a third world war.

Stalin will no doubt use the iron curtain—as he has always used it in the past—to keep the Russian people from learning of our true intentions.

But let us draw hope and inspiration from the life of St. Patrick. He was a slave boy held in bondage by his captors—just as the Russian people are held in bondage now. And yet he ended as a conqueror. His only weapons were a flaming faith, an indomitable courage, and a Christian love of his fellow men.

An idea grounded in objective truth is invincible—and will win out whatever the obstacles raised against it. Against the sword of the spirit, no worldly weapon can prevail.

The Fix Pattern

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting into the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "The Fix Pattern." It discusses another tragic scandal coming to light at this time, the scandal of income-tax fixing.

The editorial asks the Attorney General what he is going to do about this. What is he doing about it? What is he going to do about it?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 13, 1951]

THE FIX PATTERN

The Post-Dispatch yesterday reported a pattern of income-tax fixes so successful, so widespread, and so costly to the Government that it should shake the national capital all the way to the top of the Washington Monument. The reverberations should be quick to reach Key West, where the White House party is spending a late winter vacation on the beach.

The first source of information about the fix pattern in income-tax prosecutions is a retired agent of the Intelligence Unit, Robert L. Sharp, who served for 25 years, some three of them in St. Louis.

How did Mr. Sharp express his protest?

He did the highly unusual thing of writing personally to a Federal judge to complain that many important cases recommended for prosecution were fixed along the way.

What form has this fix taken?

The pattern is that political lawyers, with highly placed connections, take up these prosecution cases, with the result that they are removed from prosecution channels.

How high up do these influences go?

In at least one instance, a widely known St. Louis businessman, who is a friend of President Truman and Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, escaped prosecution for income-tax evasion after pressure was exerted in Washington.

Who handles these fixes?

In St. Louis, three lawyers who are highly influential in Democratic Party politics seldom fail in getting prosecutions stopped once they take a case which has been recommended by the Intelligence Unit for action by the Department of Justice.

Why do not more agents protest as Mr. Sharp has done?

Along with the fix pattern goes a pattern of intimidation. As described by Mr. Sharp, agents believe that they have no chance of advancement unless they do the will of the higher-ups.

Is this pattern confined to the lower levels of income-tax administration and prosecution?

In his highly unusual charge to the Federal grand jury now investigating this whole situation, Federal Judge Moore gave the jurors authority to take income-tax cases out of their usual channels to press prosecution. Since then, Attorney General McGrath has phoned United States Attorney Drake Watson several times to get these cases returned to their regular channels.

Officials in both St. Louis and Washington have a lot to explain. These officials include:

Collector of Internal Revenue James P. Finnegan.

United States Attorney Drake Watson.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue George J. Schoeneman.

Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder.

Attorney General J. Howard McGrath.

If no satisfactory accounting is had from any of these officials, then it will be up to President Truman, who is responsible for them all.

We Can't Put a Price Tag on Defense of Our Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "We Can't Put a Price Tag on Defense of Our Freedom," written by Mr. Louis Eckl, editor of the Florence (Ala.) Times, and appearing in that publication on March 13, 1951:

WE CAN'T PUT A PRICE TAG ON DEFENSE OF OUR FREEDOM

The so-called great debate on sending more United States troops to Europe still rages. Every American concern for his own and his country's future must hope it is wisely resolved on its real merits.

With that objective in view, it is possible here and now to eliminate from the argument one element that has been injected by some debaters. That is the issue of cost.

Senator TAFT and some others who oppose leaving the troops-for-Europe question to our military leaders have many reasons. And one of them is that we cannot send too many men abroad because we cannot afford it.

To say that this issue doesn't belong in the debate is not to say that we should be indifferent to the cost of our military ventures, in Europe or anywhere else. On the contrary, we should monitor the expenditure of every dollar spent for defense.

That's not the point. What is the point then? It's that the debate over troops for Europe is basically an argument over how and where we can best commit our strength for the defense of America and the whole free world.

Does a free people shrink from the cost of preserving its liberties? At what stage can you no longer afford to save freedom?

This country spent $350,000,000,000 to win World War II. Is there any American who doubts we would have put out twice that sum if it had been necessary to keep Germany or Japan or both from conquering this country?

The answer is evident to all. You can always afford the cost of guarding freedom. When you decide that you cannot, you have already yielded your liberties and succumbed to tyranny.

As we spent in World War II to snuff out the menace of Hitler and Tojo, so today we will spend to gird the free world to meet the threat of Russian global ambition. The only matter to decide is how we shall spend to do this job.

If the United States Senate, in its considered wisdom, votes to support administration proposals for the dispatch of a greater Armed Force to Europe, then there can be no hesitation about our providing the money needed. Whatever the reasonable cost, we shall have to afford it.

It would be small recompense to know we had balanced our national budget if in the pursuit of this goal we had lost our priceless heritage of freedom.

Morality in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio broadcast over WJR, Detroit, last Friday, March 16:

MORALITY IN GOVERNMENT

It is a pleasure to again appear on this Your Congress program. I am sure we are all most appreciative of WJR's efforts permitting Members of Congress to report directly to the people.

C-bombs have been exploding all over Washington during the past several weeks. The C-bomb is not a new military weapon, but it could be just as dangerous to the people of the United States. The ingredients of this bomb are crime, confusion, and corruption.

The headlines of your daily papers, the news from your radio and television correspondents, daily report new discoveries in the field of crime, confusion, corruption, and communism, implicating personalities in Washington, in our Government. No person can condone officials in public trust who utilize that trust for selfish purposes. It is true you will find your Alger Hisses and your William Remingtons; you will find your Harry Vaughans and Donald Dawsons; you will find your Pendergast machine and your syndicate crime tie-up in politics; but we must not overlook the fact that these people so implicated, who are not deserving of their trust, are a small minority of our Government officials, either appointed or elected. The vast majority of our Government officials are sincere, hard-working, conscientious, loyal Americans. But, in order to protect the vast majority of public officials from being classified as a group as being conniving parasites, we have to expose the small minority who misuse their trust. In other words, we should throw out the few rotten apples of the public will assume that the rotten apples are typical rather than exceptions.

It is disconcerting to us, who believe in good, clean, honest government to note that the President, by being petty and stubborn, refused to aid the Congress in sorting out the rotten apples from the barrel. Loyalty to friends is to be condoned if that loyalty does not harm anyone else but you. But loyalty to friends in public office who have used their friendship to the President and their public office for immoral financial or political gain cannot be condoned.

The citizens of this country are still smarting from the red-herring charges made when Alger Hiss and William Remington were investigated for Communist activities while employed by the Federal Government. These two I have mentioned served in positions of high public trust and the President rather than aiding in their investigation ridiculed the investigation as a "red herring." We are all too familiar with Mr. Truman's stubborn insistence that Major General Vaughan remain his military aide despite the fact that the general used his office in the White House to put pressure to bear upon other Government officials in order to secure benefits based upon favoritism rather than upon merit. We recall that Major General Vaughan helped his friends get perfume, molasses, race-track permits, passports, and military passes and for the use of his influence coming from the White House, Harry Vaughan was paid off with deep-freeze cabinets. Friends of General Vaughan were able to get permits to build race tracks when materials were in short supply. He endeavored to secure a permit to purchase molasses which was in direct violation of war regulations. He is quoted in testimony as interceding with a departmental official to ease the permit through saying—"We Democrats must stick together." But despite all of the unsavory actions on the part of his military aide, the President laughed off the charges and General Vaughan retains his position in the inner White House circle.

Of course, we are all familiar with the most recent investigation conducted by a Senate subcommittee, chairmaned by Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, into so-called influence exerted upon members of the FRC Board. There again the influence was traced into the White House inner circle. It was brought out time and time again that Mr. Donald Dawson, the President's assistant in charge of personnel, consistently used his influence on the RFC to secure loans. Many of these were loans which had been turned down by an examiner. Of course, one of the most flagrant cases was the one where Mr. George Sax—the punchboard king of the country who built the luxurious Saxony Hotel in Miami Beach secured a loan of $1,500,000 from the RFC. Mr. Dawson was a frequent guest at the Saxony Hotel, on a complimentary basis, while the Saxony Hotel was negotiating with RFC to secure the relaxation of certain conditions of the loan agreement. The Fulbright committee wrote Mr. Dawson asking he appear before the committee to give his side of the story. This, however, he has failed to do and the President has given no indication that he either had asked Mr. Dawson or would permit him to appear before the committee. The only assumption we can make is that the implications made by the committee—that it was Dawson who brought pressure to bear upon RFC to make the Saxony Hotel as well as other loans which were not justified—are true.

The most amazing story coming out of the Fulbright committee is of the payoff of a mink coat valued at $9,500 to a White House secretary for the influence she and her husband—who is an influence peddler—had on the RFC to secure approval of a loan to a fur company. Mrs. Young and her husband, Meri Young, came from Missouri. Eleven years ago Meri was a messenger boy receiving $1,800. His wife was Senator Truman's secretary at the time. When Mr. Truman went to the White House, he took Mrs. Young with him and she was able through her connections to get Mr. Young placed with the RFC as an examiner at a salary of $7,100 per year. He aided in securing loans for the infamous Lustron Corp. and the Jacobs Corp. of Detroit. He left RFC and took executive positions with both these companies, which gave him a total income of $46,000 per year. In his spare time he worked for the Democratic National Committee. But still the President has not seen fit to discharge the bribe-taking secretary, Mrs. Young. She is still on the Government payroll in the inner circle of the White House.

Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Mississippi were shocked to find that Federal jobs were being sold in their State of Mississippi for prices ranging from $250 to $1,500 each. These jobs were sold by the Truman Democrats in an effort to build up their organization in the State of Mississippi to undermine the so-called Dixiecrats or States-rights Democrats. Many a veteran who was entitled under law to Federal job preference had to pay a large sum in order to secure placement. It is a strange commentary that President Truman has not denied the charges and has remained completely silent on the whole affair.

Senator KEFAUVER, who is chairman of the Crime Investigating Committee has been severely chastised in private by certain powers that be for his investigations which have exposed the tie-up between syndicated crime and political machines in Missouri, Illinois, New York, and Florida. Many of these political machines in some of our large cities owe their existence to organized crime—and still, there has been no effort made by the President to purge the gangsters, slot-machine kings, and gamblers from these Democratic organizations.

I have cited these examples—which are common knowledge—for the purpose that irrespective of political party, irrespective of our personal philosophy of government neither a forthright Democrat nor Republican citizen will, or does, condone corruption.

Our way of life—our republican form of government—can be lost just as easily by immoral activities in Government as it can by outward aggression. It is my sincere hope that the investigations that have taken place—and are now in progress—will spark the fire of a moral awakening to insure that public officials will be more conscious of their public trust, that the individual voters will insist that the people who represent them are above reproach. We cannot long last as a free nation with representative government if the citizens of this country lose faith in their Government. It is tragedy of the first order for people to assume that this is politics and politics is rotten. Politics is what you make it. Politics will be rotten if we, as individual citizens, become callous and assume that all people in political life are corrupt and if you replace one corrupt man you will get another. You cannot legislate morals. You cannot legislate ethics. Public officials—elected or appointed—should be—and in the main are—responsive to the wishes and desires of the people they represent. I hope that throughout the country there will be a wave of indignation against immorality in Government. We need to live by Christian principles. We must take a greater interest and be more active in governmental affairs whether it be in your local precinct, school district, city, State, or National Government. If all citizens would actively participate in political affairs either within or without their party, we would be assured of a complete house cleaning and the morals and ethics of government in general would be greatly enhanced. But if, as individual citizens, because of apathy, lack of interest and callousness we accept corruption as a byproduct of politics your moral standard in government will sink lower and

lower. So, we as individual citizens have a solemn duty to perform. We must be as conscious of corruption as we are of communism. Either one allowed to go unchecked would mean we would lose the way of life and the form of government so dear to us.

The Roman Empire fell because of internal corruption, which was allowed to grow unchecked as a malignant cancer. Other great governments have fallen when they became arrogant, cocky, and conceited. We cannot allow corrupt practices to go unpunished.

I do not blame the people of our country for being tired and fed up with the headlines they have been reading of late as a result of the several investigations being conducted by congressional committees. Neither party has a monopoly on good government. The vast majority of Democrats and Republicans in Congress are anxious to rid our Government of unsavory practices. As a matter of fact the investigations taking place at the present time are conducted under the chairmanship of Democratic Members who believe as you and I in good government. It is not a question in many cases as to whether an action is legal or illegal. Many practices are legal but they are not moral. It is not enough to judge an action by whether it is legal or illegal. You can misuse your public trust by unethical practices that are within the law.

These are trying days indeed. Not only does the United States need a strong military arm for our defense but we must have strong moral fiber and our Government must reflect the honesty, the integrity, the character of the American people. If the Government so reflects the true character of the American people, we then will have a Government whose feet will be so well entrenched in the respect of the people that unity will exist and our people will be welded together to fight for a common cause.

Education and Agricultural Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, Editor Wheeler McMillen in his column All of Us, in the March 1951 issue of the Farm Journal, makes a statement with respect to the influence of education in agricultural progress. I am in hearty agreement with what Mr. McMillen so well says and, under permission granted me by the House, submit his statement herewith:

[From the March 1951 Farm Journal]

ALL OF US

(By Wheeler McMillen)

Boys and girls get too little attention from county agents, home demonstration agents, and 4-H Club agents. That's a flat statement. I am talking about the total effort by the agricultural extension services. Only about one-third of extension work aims at youngsters; nearly two-thirds aims at adults. Some of the adult farmers will keep on learning new things anyway, and would get along without extension agents. Other adults do not learn, and time spent on them is not very productive. Young people from 10 to 20 will always learn if their interests are aroused. That's the time to pry minds open.

Every oldster can see that farming has progressed enormously these last 30 years. Why? Well, science has shown us many better methods. Invention has given us far better equipment. But do science and invention by themselves explain why one farmer today produces much more than one farmer did 30 years ago? Don't people count? Hasn't something happened to farmers, too? Our top farmers today, in most cases I believe, started differently from the ways their grandfathers started. They had 4-H and FFA experience. Their minds were opened early, and they have ever since eagerly grabbed at new ideas and new equipment.

The time to educate comes when people are young. I am sure that education deserves more credit than it has been given for agricultural progress. I am sure that this progress would continue and advance faster if less time were now spent trying to change those who are too old to learn, and the same effort were expended on the youngsters who are at the right age to learn. Plain arithmetic dictates the lesson that educating youth pays longer dividends. Teach a boy something, and he may use it for 40 years; teach a man the same thing, and he has less time to use it, just because the undertaker will get the man before he gets the boy.

Time for PMA To Face Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial written by Mr. R. Frank Frazier, executive secretary of the Virginia State Poultry Federation, intended for publication in the forthcoming issue of the Virginia Poultrymen and the Southeastern Poultryman. The latter publication circulates in 11 Southeastern States.

I should like to commend this editorial to the consideration of my colleagues from these States and elsewhere who are interested in the future of the poultry industry.

In reading Mr. Frazier's statement, and in talking with a number of prominent poultrymen I have become convinced of the urgent need for reform in the administration of Federal grading and inspection activity in poultry.

It should be abundantly clear that there is no logic in having a poultry grading and inspection program administered by the dairy branch of PMA when PMA has a functioning poultry branch familiar with the particular problems of poultrymen.

Inasmuch as the indicated adjustment has not been brought about administratively, legislative action must be taken toward achieving a more sensible arrangement.

The editorial follows:

TIME FOR PMA TO FACE FACTS

Those unfamiliar with the Washington Production and Marketing Administration set-up are shocked when they learn the dairy branch is still administering grading and inspection programs for the poultry industry. And to justify not having these programs in the poultry branch where they belong, top level PMA administrators claim that in some past years it has been necessary to take tens of thousands of dollars from dairy program fees to subsidize those for poultry. If this be true, then we are amused that our dairy friends haven't already arisen in righteous indignation to demand their money's worth for services they were buying from PMA.

Remembering the exhorbitant fees charged for the so-called "Washington supervision" of poultry grading and inspection work, many industry leaders are at a loss to understand why the operation of these programs hadn't been on the black side of the ledger all along, if they were administered with a reasonable degree of efficiency. But now, at long last, poultry programs are self-supporting, according to John I. Thompson, Deputy Administrator of PMA. He also said, when visited recently in Washington by a delegation from your association, that he favored the transfer of these programs to the poultry branch as was being requested by your representatives. He expressed the view such a transfer should not be made until the opportune time. When pressed for clarification of this statement, his answer was general, vague, and noncommittal.

In the minds of the leaders of your association is the conviction that the opportune time for this transfer has arrived. In fact, it is long overdue, and they can find no justification for some dairy administrators continuing to supervise poultry programs which they apparently do not understand.

The record of their administrative blunders is no longer a secret among informed poultrymen. When industry leaders assist the poultry branch in developing improvements in regulations under which grading and inspection programs operate, these regulations, although approved even by the Secretary of Agriculture, have been either sabotaged or completely ignored in some instances by dairy administrators. But perhaps even more serious from the standpoint of our industry is the fact that certain ill advised dairy branch administrators kill many worth while recommendations for improvements in poultry programs even before they can become a part of the official regulations. Is this not weak administration by those who seem to be shirking their duty? Is this fair to the poultryman?

Admittedly, back in the horse and buggy days when most poultry marketing firms also handled butter, cream, cheese, nuts and hides, there may have been a degree of justification for both dairy and poultry programs being administered by the same people. But this is not true today. An immediate transfer of grading and inspection programs for poultry and poultry products to the poultry branch of PMA must be made for these programs to perform their maximum service to our industry.

Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the boxcar situation in the Middle West is becoming more desperate as time goes on. One of the primary causes of this shortage is the large percentage of western cars which are tied up on eastern lines. In a letter to Dr. W. M. W. Splawn, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. Sam P. Wallingford, an extensive and prominent grain dealer in Kansas, calls attention to this situation. Because the matter is of such great and general interest, I am herewith including a copy of Mr. Wallingford's letter as a part of my remarks:

MARCH 12, 1951.

Mr. W. M. W. SPLAWN,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPLAWN: We operate quite a large group of country elevators, and own and operate a six-million bushel public terminal elevator here in Wichita. I feel that something of a drastic nature is going to have to be done about the present boxcar shortage which we are having in the Southwest, and which threatens to be the worst situation in all of our history by the time of harvest, say from June 1 on.

The writer feels that a most serious situation confronts the southwestern lines, which can only be helped by radical action on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The latest figures I have show that the Boston & Maine Railroad has on its lines today 259.1 percent of its ownership; New York Central, 122.1 percent; New York, New Haven & Hartford, 173.2 percent; the total Allegheny group, including the Pennsylvania Railroad, 107.8 percent; and the Reading Railroad, 121.1 percent. Now we'll take the western lines, with a percentage of 86.5 of ownership, and you can see the serious injustice that is being handed out, not only to the railroads, but to the shippers in the great Southwest.

I have been advised, Mr. Splawn, that if our western lines could be permitted to use 100 percent of their boxcars, that our situation would be materially improved. Cannot something be done to help this situation? I note that insufficient steel is being allotted to freight car builders, so that cars are not being built to the full capacity of these plants. What, may I ask, is more important to the commerce of America, and to the war effort, as well, than the 100 percent efficiency of the railroads. Personally, I feel that the railroads have, through efficient managment, performed an almost superhuman task with the cars that they have.

I, as a shipper, would like to have you advise me what I can do, first, to help correct the improper distribution of boxcars, and, secondly, what can be done to assist in a more adequate new car building program.

I am sending a copy of this letter to our Kansas Senators and Representatives, who are fully cognizant, I am sure, of the drastic need of more cars and of their more adequate distribution.

Very truly yours,

SAM P. WALLINGFORD.

Leadership, Not St. Lawrence Seaway, Vital in Current Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the January 19, 1951, issue of the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Times-Leader, speaks for itself:

LEADERSHIP, NOT SEAWAY, VITAL IN CURRENT CRISIS

An Associated Press dispatch from Detroit yesterday quoted President Truman as saying that the St. Lawrence project has become a matter of very high urgency. He was, of course, referring to the seaway. His message was addressed to a group of Great Lakes labor leaders who will back the seaway for obvious reasons, with or without a Presidential appeal.

Truman lets himself wide open when he implies that all will be lost in the developing struggle without the seaway. It is absolutely untrue that the seaway is vital to our national security as he states. Franklin Roosevelt said the same thing a decade ago and history records we won the Second World War without any seaway. We shall come out on top in the current crisis, too, if we can survive the incompetency in Washington.

What the United States needs at the moment urgently is not the seaway, but leadership. What passes for that in the Nation's Capital today is pathetic. Perhaps never in the country's history have we been so impoverished in the top echelons.

When the President of the United States tells the public the St. Lawrence seaway is essential when it manifestly is not, and when it is generally known he is trying to put across this pet scheme, together with other crackpot ideas, under the guise of national defense, then it is time to call a spade a spade. Truman, the vigilant opportunist and politician, obviously is willing to gamble with American lives as well as dollars, to say nothing of liberty itself, just to advance his program. Such an attitude when Americans are being called on to sacrifice is despicable.

If the St. Lawrence seaway were as essential as Truman pretends, which it isn't, it could not be constructed in time to have any bearing on the outcome of the current controversy.

Home Folks Urged To Write Often to Boys in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of Congress and, indeed, all of the American people will be deeply interested in the attached letter which I have received from an Army sergeant now stationed in San Francisco:

I am a sergeant in the United States Army, recently returned from Korea. I am not writing this in any official capacity (but with knowledge and permission of Sixth Army PIO).

I am trying to keep a personal promise I made to my buddies in Korea and elsewhere.

I am in the Army—I've been in the Navy—I served with the Marines and Air Force. I have spent over 6 years overseas and many months in Army hospitals and I have seen too many servicemen there fighting the unnecessary extra battle against despondency, lonesomeness, and the terrible feeling of being unloved and forgotten by the folks back home.

All the attention and care of the various morale, recreational, athletic, spiritual, and special-service sections of the various components of the Armed Forces, the Red Cross and their unsurpassed Grey Ladies, the superlative entertainment of such top-notch entertainers as Bob Hope, Bing Crosby, and others cannot completely combat this melancholy and misery without the wholehearted support and cooperation of the folks back home themselves.

My request of you will clarify the entire problem and solution.

Will you please join with other radio, TV, stage, movie, magazine, newspaper, lecture, church, club, and other celebrities to urge the folks at home to please write cheery, newsy letters—often—with their latest snapshot—and some small, inexpensive gift once in a while, to their relatives, friends, acquaintances, or home-town boys overseas or in the Armed Forces' hospitals?

This is my own personal campaign for mail from home for my buddies. Will you please let me know what you sincerely and frankly think of it and what you will do to help get mail from home for the boys overseas and in our Armed Forces' hospitals?

Respectfully yours,

Sgt. WILBUR F. H. RADELINE.

P. S.—I have received some specific requests for mail from home from servicemen from many localities, races, and creeds.

Thirty-second Anniversary of the Founding of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert a statement I am making in regard to the thirty-second anniversary of the founding of the American Legion.

Thirty-two years ago there gathered at Paris, France, a caucus of more than a thousand of our fighting men of World War I, led by the son of our former fighting President, a hero of another war, Theodore Roosevelt. The purpose of the meeting was to start the organization of veterans of the just-ended war. They appointed an executive group to make the initial organization in the States and adopted the name, "The American Legion." The preamble of its constitution is:

For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

From the million and a quarter members from World War I, its membership increased to more than 3,000,000 when its charter was amended to admit veterans of World War II. Last December Congress further amended its charter so that veterans of the present fighting will be eligible. It is now the world's largest veterans' organization and no one can estimate what its future membership will become.

Over the years this great organization has continued to serve in peace as it

served in war. This service has not been limited to service to its membership or to veterans. A great part of its time and money has been spent on activities for the welfare of the community, State, and Nation. At its 1922 convention in New Orleans it started upon a program of child welfare. Since that time it has spent over $80,000,000 on the program and is now recognized as one of the Nation's great agencies in this field.

Its other great programs of Americanism—national security, juvenile delinquency, and others—have rendered outstanding service. In my opinion, its programs for Boys' State and Girls' State are outstanding. In my own State for 1 week selected boys from our high schools are brought together at Jacksons Mill for lessons and experience in government at all levels. For another week there is the same program for girls. Here they receive instructions from officials of government. I am proud of the fact that the Legion of West Virginia established the first Negro Boys' State and the second White Boys' State in the Nation.

Ever since its organization the American Legion has fought for adequate national defense, including universal military training. Most of us have seen it assume leadership in times of floods and other local emergencies. Its work for education is well known. It is credited with the origin of American Education Week, which has been observed annually for 30 years. During this week it directs public attention to the accomplishments and needs of our public schools.

Its accomplishments in the fields of unselfish service to all of our people, not just veterans, can hardly be mentioned much less discussed in the short time at my disposal. I congratulate the American Legion on its outstanding record and express my sincere appreciation.

Eloquent Tribute to St. Patrick by Hon. John F. Shelley, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an eloquent speech made by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], at the 1951 St. Patrick's Day banquet given by the Ancient Order of Hibernians in Washington, D. C.:

SPEECH BY HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, OF CALIFORNIA, AT ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS DINNER, ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1951

In the course of my forty-odd years I have attended a great many St. Patrick's Day celebrations—listened to a great many speeches in praise of St. Patrick in particular and the Irish, God love 'em, in general. I have even made a few myself. Looking back on them now—my own included—I think that they may have been bad speeches, although they went over big. They were pretty much the same; they recounted the glorious history of St. Patrick; followed up with accounts of the Irish heroes of history and their heroic deeds; and then the speaker sat down, with his audience emotionally charged, and cheering.

I think now that those speeches may have been bad, not because they were not oratorical masterpieces, nor because they were not true—but because they dwelt too much on the glories of the past and said nothing constructive about the future in which we and our children and their children must live. Now, I do not intend to ignore St. Patrick—he wasn't the kind of man you can ignore. Neither do I intend to forget the countless other Irish heroes, saintly, or warlike, or both. What I want to do is to place those ancestors of ours in the context of our times, and to say what I think they would say about the future of Ireland and the world, and Ireland's place in the present crisis and the future struggle.

The age in which St. Patrick lived was one in which ancient institutions were breaking down and confusion reigning in men's minds. The Roman Empire was disintegrating and with it the political structure of the civilized world. Fear and uncertainty were everywhere in that chaotic time.

Into his part of that world—into Ireland—St. Patrick brought two great and related ideas—faith and freedom. He was first and foremost an apostle of the Catholic faith. There were apparently Christians in Ireland before him, but he made the country dominantly Christian, and so thoroughly that Ireland became for the next several hundred years a center of learning and a center of missionary activity. It remained so, in fact, until the energies of the people were consumed in fighting off the attempts of their neighboring island to conquer them and they had no more left for teaching their arts and ethics to others. Up until that time Irish missionaries had gone to Scotland, to Northern and Central Europe, and Ireland was a kind of headquarters of culture and religion for Western Europe.

As well as being an apostle of faith, and quite as logically, St. Patrick was an apostle of freedom. He had been slave. He endeavored to make people free. He challenged the royal authority of the pagan chieftains, protested and opposed raids by British bands who carried Irish captives off into slavery, and raised money for the ransoming of these captives.

Ladies and gentlemen, the story of St. Patrick has peculiar relevance today, because we also live in a chaotic age when the old structures, political and otherwise, on which humanity rested are breaking down under the force of wars and history. Fear and uncertainty reign in many places and in many minds. Moreover, there is a great and powerful concerted attack on just the things for which St. Patrick stood.

The specter of Soviet communism which is stalking over the world today is the denial of religious faith, and at the same time the denial of human freedom. Communism is Godless. It is also a system of slavery based on contempt for, and oppression of the common man.

But there are weapons which will defeat Stalinism. They are the same weapons as those wielded by St. Patrick in his fight against false gods and inhuman men. On the one hand he held to his faith in God, on the other, to his faith in human freedom, and the human will to be free. These are indestructible, and while we cling to them we are indestructible too. That is the lesson of St. Patrick for this year 1951.

We know how those weapons served the Irish people—helped along, it is true, by other weapons which Irish courage saw fit to use—in the long struggle against British domination; a struggle not yet completely won. From the three O'Neills to the days of Wolfe Tone; from O'Connell and Parnell to De Valera and McSweeney, the Irish have kept their faith, their freedom of spirit, and their hate, alive to fight against religious persecution and foreign control. Though the wall built by the partitioners still casts a shadow over the island, the whole world knows that, essentially, Ireland is one, united, free, and ready to fight to remain so.

The Irish have not fought for freedom in Ireland alone. The United States can count an endless number of heroes of Irish birth or descent. Charles Carroll, founder of Maryland, was one of these, and it was in Maryland that religious freedom was really born in this country. Twelve signers of the Declaration of Independence were Irish. Eleven Irish generals of the Revolutionary armies, including a Sullivan and a Conway; the Navy's Barry and McDonough, and hundreds of other Irishmen helped to set the country free; Andrew Jackson, fighter and great defender of democracy, was of Irish descent. The list goes on through Gen. Phil Sheridan to Al Smith, and the many Irish heroes of World Wars I and II, including General McAuliffe who said "Nuts" to the Germans at Bastogne, Colin Kelly, whose heroic death in the Pacific gave us renewed courage after Pearl Harbor, and the five Sullivan brothers who gave up their lives when the cruiser *Juneau* was sunk by the Japanese in the Pacific.

Our sister republics in South America have likewise benefited from the leadership of men of Irish blood. There was Bernard O'Higgins, whose name is a byword among liberty-loving South Americans, and there were a great many others too numerous to mention. Wherever Irishmen immigrated they gave new life to the nation of their choice.

Now, the achievements of these men were remarkable, but they did not achieve what they did simply by sitting in admiration of St. Patrick. They followed the old precept of "Go thou, and do likewise." The glory of St. Patrick was reflected in their deeds, but they also infused something of their own spirit. They took the good saint's principles and they fitted them to their own hour and their own need.

There is a lesson in that for us Irish, both here in America, in Ireland, and throughout the world. Ireland, and God knows our hearts are with her, is now in what may be hoped are the last stages of the fight to end the pernicious partition and to become what Cardinal O'Donnell referred to as "Ireland, one and indivisible, though the heavens fall."

The opposition to partition—the fight for a United Ireland—are in the very best of Irish tradition. It has been a bitter war marked by British deceit and brutality, and by typical Irish patriotism and courage. It should not be forgotten, nor should it be shelved. The world today has great need for the courage and the faith in God and his principles that St. Patrick gave to the Irish. The whole world is now lined up in a cold war in which the issues are clear. The choice is between western democracy and man's right to his belief in his God on the one hand, and godless communism on the other. A world-wide conflagration may break out at any moment.

In such a situation, I have no doubt as to what St. Patrick would do or say. He would be in the vanguard of the forces of freedom and Christianity leading the drive to rid the world of the serpent of communism. St. Patrick did not do his fighting from the side lines—he led the way.

Ireland is not now a member of the United Nations. She has been kept from full participation by the vote of Soviet Russia and her satellites. Though participating in the activities of some of the associated agencies, her voice has not been heard in the General Assembly or the Security Council. For that reason, Ireland should and will work doubly hard in combating the menace of world

communism at every possible turn. By such action, and only such action, can she live up to the great tradition of St. Patrick and Brian Boru; of Commodore Barry and of General McAuliffe. Ireland is the true heir to the mantle of St. Patrick, to the principles for which he fought, and the leadership he showed. The Western World needs those principles and that leadership now as never before. Ireland must be allowed to take her place in the forefront of the battle and show the world that neither she nor her sons have forgotten how to fight the good fight, and to keep the faith.

It may be bitter for the people of Ireland and for its leaders to realize that while the United Nations, with the United States in the lead, are throwing the weight of the Western World into the battle in Korea in an effort to throw out a foreign power occupying a part of the nation, and to end the partition, if possible; Ireland herself suffers under a no less unjustifiable occupation and partition, and the rest of the world does nothing about it. England is left to work her will in the six counties—against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland.

In spite of this we of Irish blood cannot afford to ignore our obligations to the principle laid down by St. Patrick—the principle that faith and freedom must be fought for if they are to be won and held. Communism has made fewer converts in Eire than anywhere else in the civilized world in proportion to population. It is up to her to show the rest of the world how to beat down the threat which faces it. Eire must not be isolated from the community of nations when her religious faith and her matchless ability to fight for freedom are so sorely needed. Ireland alone cannot keep her freedom if the forces of communism are not destroyed. But Ireland can provide inspired leadership to the democratic peoples of the world in the common fight to preserve freedom everywhere.

Let us take a look at Ireland's recent history—and in doing so, we cannot fail to get a better appreciation of what her present-day leaders could and would do for the cause of western civilization if they were permitted.

It remained for our own day to produce some of the greatest heroes and the brightest victories, as well as the most tragic martyrs of the battle for home rule for Ireland. Most of us know—some of us may have seen for ourselves, others have heard from our brothers, our parents, or our friends and relatives—the story of the Easter rebellion of 1916. We have been thrilled by the details of the battle around Dublin Castle and the heroism of Eamon de Valera and his comrades. We have grieved over those who died in the uprising or were executed afterward. We know that though the uprising failed of its immediate purpose it lit fires in the hearts of Irishmen everywhere which have not yet been extinguished.

For 2 years thereafter the civil conflict continued with the Sinn Fein leading the Irish people in their resistance to British rule. Eventually, in December of 1918, a general election was ordered for the whole of Ireland, supposedly to settle once and for all the question of independence for Ireland. The costly attempt to maintain control by force, and the weight of world opinion as voiced in the proclamation of the right to self-determination by the victorious democracies in World War I, had forced England to this step. Despite the fact that the election was held under British law and was carried out while a British army occupied the whole island, the result was overwhelmingly in favor of national independence. Out of 105 electoral divisions 79 voted for independence and only 26 against. The popular vote was over 80 percent in favor of independence.

In response to this expression of the national will the elected representatives of the people of Ireland assembled in Dublin on January 21, 1919, declared Ireland an independent nation, and established a government and the Dail Eireann the national legislature. The English, going back on their promises, refused to recognize this action, and thus a virtual state of war again broke out between the Irish Republic and Great Britain. The British sent in their Black and Tans, imposed martial law, and tried to force Ireland to give up her independence. Ireland, of course, continued the battle. Finally, as a last resort, the British Parliament on December 23, 1920, without an Irishman voting, passed a Government of Ireland Act—the Act of Partition, whereby the six counties were cut off from the homeland.

The Irish people rightfully refused to accept this settlement. The Sinn Fein again led the war against the occupying Black and Tan army of the British, and the attempt to force acceptance of the partition was wholly unsuccessful in the greater part of Ireland. Despite the fact that a Northern Ireland government was set up in Belfast, even this was the will of England only, and was opposed by the majority in the six counties broken off.

It was during this period that the heroic hunger strikes took place and Terrence McSweeney, in giving up his life, brought world sympathy to the Irish cause.

In the partition election of May 1921, intended to put the Government of Ireland Act into effect, out of a total of 186 seats in both the north and the south Parliaments, 140 were won by the Republicans; thus, Ireland, as a whole, repudiated the act. The British again set up martial law and bitter fighting again took place. Finally, on December 6, 1921, after almost 6 months of negotiations between the leaders of the Sinn Fein and the British, a treaty was signed establishing the Irish Free State, and partition became an accomplished fact. Even with this, the English deceit was not ended, since the treaty called for revising the boundary between Northern Ireland and the free state to free some of the Irish Republicans who form a majority in four of the six counties, and this was never done. England's latest act, intended to cement her position in Northern Ireland, was to pass the so-called Ireland bill in May of 1949. In this bill they presumed to declare that Northern Ireland will never cease to be a part of the United Kingdom without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland. Incidentally, this is a fine time for England to begin to worry about obtaining the consent of her subject Parliament when questions of how they are to be ruled come up.

This Ireland bill has served to keep Ireland out of participation in the North Atlantic Defense Treaty, since one of the purposes of that treaty is to preserve the territorial integrity of the participating nations, and Ireland fears that her adherence to the pact would be interpreted as recognizing England's claim that Northern Ireland is an integral part of the United Kingdom.

That is where the matter stands today. Despite protest after protest, the English have refused to concede that, by any standard, Ireland should be one and united. Irishmen in either North or South consider themselves as Irish, not English or British, or anything but Irish. The population is homogeneous, the island is one geographic unit, her history and traditions are distinctively national, and even her churches, whether Catholic or Protestant, are organized on a national all-Ireland basis. Her learned bodies and her sports organizations are nationwide. Ireland is divided only in the minds of the Government of England and in the measures England has forced upon the island.

What can we here do to end this intolerable situation? It is true that our State Department has said that we should maintain a hands-off attitude; that partition is an internal problem, with which we should not be concerned. But I say that it is no more internal than the invasion of South Korea, and we are certainly involved there. It is no more right that the island of Ireland should be divided than that the Korean peninsula should be.

Fortunately, we Americans of Irish descent or birth, do have a program for putting the great moral weight of the United States behind the fight to end partition in Ireland, and to end English rule there forevermore. In April of last year the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives held hearings on a number of resolutions which had been introduced in the House, and which would have put the United States solidly on record as favoring unification of Ireland. Some of these resolutions provided means for our active participation in action leading to unification. Those resolutions had been introduced by Members of Congress of Irish descent, and received strong support in the hearings on the subject. Unfortunately, the Foreign Affairs Committee did not see fit to report any of them to the floor of the House. You may be sure, however, that this program will not be allowed to die, and eventually, we hope that the Congress will take action placing this country in the fight to end partition—and leading the fight, as it should. Ireland has made great contributions in culture and leadership to the United States, she has given the same strong support to democratic ideals; it is time that the United States do something to help Ireland gain her complete freedom.

We of Irish blood in Congress did something else last year to open the eyes of the English to how strong the feeling in this country in opposition to partition is. On March 29 of last year, when the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 was under consideration by the House, an amendment was introduced by Congressman JOHN FOGARTY and was accepted. This amendment was designed to withhold assistance from the United Kingdom until partition in Ireland was ended. Although the amendment was later stricken out of the bill, it did awaken England to some consciousness of American and world feeling on the matter. As a matter of fact, there was much scurrying about the Capitol and the State Department by worried British diplomats during the period of debate on the bill. These actions have forced England to take a new look at her policy.

You may be sure that I and all the other Congressmen who have engaged in this fight will carry on until England does more than simply take a new look. We want her to take positive action and get out of Ireland, and we will not be satisfied until she does so. If Irish people everywhere get behind this program of pressure on England from the United States, we may be able to write a new page in Irish history for our grandchildren to read—the story of how the English were finally driven out of Ireland.

Knowing this history of persistent courage and remarkable leadership on the part of the Irish people, who can doubt that their full participation in the titanic world struggle now shaping up would provide inspiration for the rest of the democratic world—inspiration which might well spell the difference between victory and defeat?

I realize, however, quoting an official Irish Government memorandum, that although "Ireland is earnestly desirous of playing her full part in protecting Christian civilization and the democratic way of life * * * [she] is faced with grave difficulties from the strategic and political points of view." This is true, both because the "continued partition of Ireland is naturally and bitterly resented by the Irish people" and because without a single integrated authority either the defense or the effective utilization of the island's capacities are impossible.

I therefore, call upon our own Government to recognize that as long as the Western

World countenances the unjust partition we cannot muster our fullest strength to fight the injustice of communism. I call upon the Congress of the United States and the present administration to accept the program sponsored by the friends of Ireland in Congress and to put the full weight of the United States behind unification of Ireland and the end of partition.

To that end, may we of Irish descent or Irish birth go forward, inspired by the holiness of St. Patrick and the legions of Irish heroes through the generations, guided by Christian principles, encouraged by our knowledge of and adherence to the rightcousness of our cause, thankful to Almighty God for His blessings and praying for His strengthening so that the day will come in the near future when Ireland will be one.

May God give to all of us the courage and strength of St. Patrick so that we may fight until that day, and beyond that day, until the time when the whole world is free of tyranny and oppression.

It Is Just Common Sense to Ask Why We Arrived at Our Present Positions

REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the months of hallowed memories of great Americans. February 12 is the birthday of the sublime Lincoln, whose faith in democracy and freedom was expressed in always telling the people the truth, whose noble nature was incapable of betraying free government by resorting to political subterfuge. February 22 is the birthday of George Washington, whose last words of warning to the Nation he loved was to keep away from foreign entanglements. December 29 is the birthday of Andrew Johnson, the able and fearless defender of the Constitution. April 13 is the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, who clearly foresaw disaster to the Republic if the Federal Government developed into an inquisitorial bureaucracy sustained by crushing taxes on the backs of the people.

Today the political wisdom of these great Americans is desperately needed. For many years now the people have lived under a government which has repeatedly deceived them, which has led them blindfolded into global wars that have wasted their resources and drenched the soil of far away lands with the blood of their sons. They have lived under a government which in only 17 years has grown into a bureaucratic Frankenstein which picks their pockets of vast sums to support hordes of spoil seekers. More ominous than all, however, is the fact that all this misrule has now brought the Nation to the verge of another global conflict the prospective burdens of which may be reckoned in the lives of millions of American youths and the economic exhaustion of America.

Within a few weeks Congress will probably have approved of the drafting of 18-year-old youths. A staggering budget has already been requested by the President. Across the waters we still do not know what real effort our hailed allies such as socialist England and radical France are willing to make, or how much trust we can put in foreign divisions reported to be honeycombed with Communist influence, or whether the troops we may commit to Europe will be subjected to the same vacillation and procrastination of a United Nations organization which for 7 months has been unable to take the action necessary for us to save the lives of thousands of American boys in Korea as well as our national honor. While war with Russia is still far from certain, our Socialist planners in Government are moving swiftly to utilize the emergency to clamp down authoritative controls on the life of the people in every direction—a pattern which they hope to make permanent.

Never before in our history is it so necessary for the people to think clearly about the perils which confront us. It is just common sense to ask why we arrived in our present perilous position—where we find ourselves after distributing vast largesses in the form of money and food and materials throughout the globe, comparatively alone and friendless in the world of diplomacy. This just did not happen. It has come about as the result of a series of tragic mistakes—mistakes which must be carefully examined. For it is only in the light of past performance that the Congress and the American people can judge of what they can expect in the future.

Let me go back some 30 years to World War I. That was the start of our troubles today. It was under the aggressive leadership of a Democratic President in 1917 that America first departed from the wisdom of Washington and took sides in a European war. Europe has been the great war factory of the world for centuries. Since the twelfth century there have been very few years when nations of Europe were not warring among themselves. But under President Wilson the farsightedness of Washington was abandoned and America launched on an interventionist role in Old World quarrels which has gained us nothing as a Nation but a staggering load of debt and foreign burial grounds for our youth and gained nothing for the world but the destruction of free government.

How was America lured into World War I? From the beginning international banking houses in the United States took a definitely unneutral attitude, favoring investment in the bonds of the Allied countries and discouraging or refusing investment in the paper of the Central Powers. This immediately gave us a strong financial stake in the cause of the Allies—a stake that grew larger with each year of the war. Likewise American industry became violently pro-Ally. The illegal British blockade of the Central Powers crippled our foreign trade and industry eagerly embraced the opportunity to sell to the Allies. All this made it easy for propagandists of the Allied cause to mold public opinion in America toward our participation in the war. Americans knew little about the history of Europe and they swallowed bait, line, and sinker the most unblushing and vicious propaganda. Allied propagandists shaped public opinion to believe that the Kaiser started the war for the purpose of conquering the world and in consequence the United States had to get into this struggle to "make the world safe for democracy." German militarism was represented as the taproot of European wars. This central thesis was reinforced by a collateral one that the Central Powers were moral degenerates. The American people were deluged with atrocity stories about the Germans, such as cutting off the hands of Belgian children. Little Serbia was pictured as the victim of brutal aggression by Austria, the declaration of war by Austria against Serbia having started the European conflagration. The sinking of the *Lusitania* was branded as a classic case of barbarianism. The unrestricted submarine warfare of the Germans against merchant ships was denounced to the high heavens as a barbaric violation of international law. The lofty moral propaganda of the Allies strongly influenced the American people to feel that they could not possibly keep out of the struggle without becoming unfaithful to all that was good and decent in their own manhood.

Ten years after the end of World War I the most distinguished historians in America, England, France, and Russia had amassed sickening but thoroughly convincing evidence that America had been tragically misled by foreign propaganda. Looked at coldly from the American standpoint it was all too clear we had been fooled into a war that was not worth the life of a single American mule. The facts established showed that—

First. The Kaiser did not start the war. On the contrary, he tried to stop it. The real culprits were Russia and France, the former seeking to gain possession of Constantinople—the dream of Russian foreign policy for many years—and the latter seeking to recapture Alsace-Lorraine which Germany had taken from France in 1870. The immediate cause of the war had been the order of the Russian Czar to mobilize the Russian Army on Germany's borders. This was followed by French mobilization since Russia and France had been working together for years to bring about a showdown with Germany and Austria so that their territorial ambitions could be realized. Germany caught between these two mobilizations had no choice but to strike as quickly as possible.

Second. When the German archives were finally opened to the world there was not the slightest evidence that the Kaiser had been plotting to conquer the world. German militarism was less potent than French and Russian militarism at the outbreak of the war. Germany had an army of 806,000, France, 816,000, while that of Russia was 1,284,000. Pitrim Sorokin's masterful study of the frequency of wars in Europe from the twelfth century to 1925 showed that in terms of percent of years at war Spain registered 67 percent—the highest—and Germany 28 percent—the lowest. England during 56 percent of this time period was at war and France 50 percent of the time. But the defeat of Germany did not free Europe from militarism. France became the big military bully of Europe after World War I—so bad a bully that Woodrow Wilson before he died in the twenties said, "I would like to see France licked and I would like to tell Jusserand so to his face." In World War II the American people again set out to crush German militarism only to find that Russia took over the role of bully on a far bigger scale in European politics.

Third. The facts revealed about Serbia were particularly depressing. Serbian officials had actually organized the plot to assassinate the Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Serajevo in 1914. The Prime Minister of Serbia knew all about the existence of the plot nearly a month before it was executed, but made no effort to warn the Austrian Government. Serbian officials had supplied out of Serbian arsenals the bombs and pistols used in the assassination and had even given the assassins pistol practice in the woods of Belgrade. During the war the Serbian Government fearful that its complicity in this plot might leak out liquidated Dragutin Dimitrijevitch, chief of the Intelligence Division of the Serbian General Staff, who had been the administrative brains in organizing the murder of the archduke. The weapon of assassination failing, Dimitrijevitch was condemned to death on a trumped-up charge of treason and shot at Saloniki in June 1917.

Fourth. The atrocity tales about the Germans had been faked. Belgian authorities denied them after the war. Lloyd George, of England, and Nitti, of Italy, admitted that no one had ever seen a Belgian child with its hands cut off by the Germans. Gen. J. V. Charteris, Chief of the Intelligence Division of the British Army during the war, in a speech before the National Arts Club in New York City on October 19, 1925, cheerfully told how he had faked photographs to arouse both British and American public opinion. The most nauseating evidence was uncovered showing the existence in France of photograph factories which turned out faked atrocity pictures on a mass scale.

Fifth. The *Lusitania* was an armed merchantman and carried contraband on her last voyage. More shocking she was at that time a registered auxiliary cruiser of the British Navy which automatically deprived her of any protection by international law.

Sixth. Unrestricted submarine warfare had been forced upon the Central Powers because of English violations of international law with respect to the rights of neutral shipping. These violations even included using the American flag on British ships carrying war cargo. Through its illegal blockade of Germany the people of the Central Powers were being starved out. Had America effectively protested British violations of international law Germany would not have had to resort desperately to submarine warfare. German submarine warfare was conducted without atrocities. Admiral Sims challenged anyone to produce evidence of more than one German atrocity in the period of submarine activity, and the officers guilty of this were punished by the German Government.

The idealistic professions of allied propagandists about World War I were completely discredited by the discovery of the notorious secret treaties between the Allies—treaties that embodied as sordid a program of territorial pilfering as can be found in the history of diplomacy.

Seventh. America was taken into World War I by a President who concealed his intentions from the people. In January 1916 President Wilson sent Colonel House abroad to inform Lord Grey that the United States would enter the war "as soon as he could bring American opinion to that point." A month after the departure of Colonel House, Wilson emphatically declared in a speech at Milwaukee that the United States would not intervene in the World War. In April 1916 Wilson called to the White House the Democratic leaders of Congress and asked them to aid him in throwing the country into war, but they firmly refused to support him in any such action. Yet Wilson coolly planned the campaign of 1916 to get himself reelected on a platform of that "He kept us out of war." This duplicity of Wilson is shocking enough, but under President Roosevelt political duplicity to force America into another global war was elevated into an all-out weapon against democracy.

What were the results of World War I so far as America was concerned? We took the lead in imposing on Germany a vicious and unjust peace making her solely responsible for the war and in setting up a world organization to enforce it and thereby sowed the seeds of World War II. At a tremendous cost in American lives and economic resources we handed out "freedom" to a number of newly created European states only to find that within a few years these states had gone fascist and freedom had been destroyed from within them by the people themselves. To repair the ravages of war in Europe billions of American investor's dollars were poured down a rat hole and the problem of always-at-war Europe intensified.

In between World Wars I and II public opinion in America, following the revelations of the revisionist historians, soured on America's first crusade. There was a deep national feeling of having been tricked into the First World War, or for reasons which, in retrospect, seemed inadequate to justify the expenditure of blood and treasure. In this change of sentiment a student of public opinion recorded: "American newspapers in 1921 said that the only American book supremely popular in Europe was Uncle Sam's pocketbook; in 1923 we had become a leading member of the league of donations; in 1928 that Europe counted too much on being 'Yank-ed' out of economic difficulties; in 1932 that our being expected to succor Europe suggested too strongly sucker; in 1933 that whenever an international conference met to get at the bottom of things, one of the things is Uncle Sam's pocket."

In 1937, 71 percent of the people who replied to a national public-opinion poll expressed the opinion that our participation in the First World War had been a mistake. This judgment of the people found reflection in legislation designed to remove for any future war emergency in Europe the immediate cause of America's involvement in the First World War. This immediate cause had been Wilson's assertion of America's rights on the high seas against the German submarine blockade. So it was decided to forego those rights in advance, as not worth the cost of war. On May 1, 1937, neutrality legislation, passed overwhelmingly by both Houses of Congress, was enacted. In the event of any war in Europe or elsewhere there was to be an embargo on the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war to all belligerents. American citizens were forbidden to travel on belligerent ships and to buy or sell securities of warring powers.

Now how did we get into World War II after the people had had their eyes opened to the truth about World War I and after the people themselves had brought about the enactment of strong neutrality legislation?

There is no better summary of how this was accomplished than the words of Sir Oliver Lyttleton, British Minister to the American Chamber of Commerce in London June 20, 1944:

> America provoked Japan to such an extent that the Japanese were forced to attack Pearl Harbor. It is a travesty on history to say that America was forced into the war.

To millions of Americans Pearl Harbor was an attack by Japan that spoke for itself. Actually, it was the inevitable end result of a long series of political maneuvers conducted behind an iron curtain of secrecy by President Roosevelt. Behind this iron curtain—which had as much iron in it as its Russian type—Roosevelt was able to do three things:

First. To fool Congress into passing measures on the ground that they were intended to keep the Nation out of war when he intended them to put the Nation into war.

Second. To arouse the war spirit in the people by deliberate misrepresentations of military facts.

Third. To force Japan to fire the first shot which automatically put us into war.

Let me give you some examples. Lend-lease, which repealed in substance the Neutrality Act, was put forward by administrative spokesmen in Congress as a measure intended to keep America out of war. Churchill had said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job," and these spokesmen harped on the theme that in this way the United States could stay out of the war. Yet at the very time when anxious Congressmen were being assured that the lend-lease bill was designed to avoid war, important American and British staff talks were taking place in Washington in an atmosphere of extreme secrecy. Before the bill had even passed these military and naval experts had adopted a report which took for granted American participation in the war. The report read:

> The staff conference assumes that when the United States becomes involved in war with Germany.

Robert Sherwood in his book, Roosevelt and Hopkins, admits that "had the details of these plans—the staff meetings—fallen into the hands of Congress or the press, American preparation for war might have been well-nigh wrecked and ruined." There could scarcely be a more candid admission from a Roosevelt worshiping source that America was stealthily maneuvered into war behind the backs of and without the knowledge of the elected representatives of the people.

Lend-lease contained amendments to prevent the President from using the bill as an authorization for carrying on an undeclared war. Convoying by United States naval ships was forbidden as was the entry of any American vessels into a combat area. From behind his iron curtain Roosevelt announced a patrol policy which he could secretly employ to get around the amendments to lend-lease. To the public this policy meant use of our naval vessels and planes to patrol American waters to prevent any sudden attack by Germany on our shores. Our ships and planes were directed to report the presence of any German raiders or submarines in our waters to the British Navy. The catch in this was that our ships and planes tracked down German ships and subs far beyond the limits of American waters—in fact all the way across the Atlantic—so as to protect British convoys laden with American implements of war.

As a result of his patrol policy Roosevelt did not hesitate to falsify the alleged attack on the *Greer*, an American destroyer bound for Iceland. He told the people that this ship, flying the American flag, had been wantonly attacked by a German submarine. What he concealed was the fact that the *Greer* had followed the German sub for hours reporting its position to the British Navy far beyond American waters. The sub in desperation had finally surfaced and fired at the *Greer* and had then fled.

After reporting similarly distorted incidents to the people, Roosevelt then calmly announced a shooting war in which our ships and planes would supposedly in American waters—but actually all over the North Atlantic—go after German ships and subs without continuing to report their position to the British Navy for the kill.

Thus the United States behind Roosevelt's iron curtain was actually at war with Germany more than a year before Pearl Harbor unbeknown to the American people. But in spite of all this Roosevelt could not push the Nation into war. A number of polls registered the disheartening fact that the people still did not want to get into another European war. So Roosevelt, behind his iron curtain of secret diplomacy, concentrated his efforts on Japan, and there he was successful. He was finally able to maneuver Japan into firing the first shot and to plunge the Nation into the war for which he had been working for a long time. Because of secret diplomacy the American people knew nothing of Prince Konoye's efforts when he was the Japanese Prime Minister to meet with Roosevelt at Honolulu or Alaska or that he was willing even to get Japan out of China if given a little time to save face in the Orient. They knew nothing of the fact that Secretary Hull had actually worked out a reasonable program of compromise with Japan but withdrew it because of opposition of China and England and our own Lattimore to any compromise, or that thereafter there were no terms whatsoever save the impossible ones submitted in the ultimatum to Japan on November 28, a few days before Pearl Harbor. They knew nothing of plan B submitted by the Japanese Government. All they knew was what Roosevelt permitted them to be told and this information was selected to picture the United States as doing its utmost for peace with a war-lustful Japan and getting nowhere. Behind his iron curtain of secret diplomacy Roosevelt finally goaded the Japs into making the attack which put us into the war.

If our policies toward Japan were not calculated to goad her into striking first at the United States, what excuse could be given for them. Japan consists of a group of islands inhabited before the war by some 70,000,000 persons—a population that was increasing yearly at the rate of 650,000. The total arable land surface of Japan is less than the improved farmlands of New York State alone. Since the turn of the century Japan had been forced to find an outlet for the extra people at home, territory which could also supply her teeming domestic population with food. She had found such an outlet in northern Asia, in a part of the world that is very lightly populated, and which had been accustomed to such outrageous forms of government that the inhabitants could not possibly be worse off than they were ever before. Every important nation in history faced with overpopulation has acted just as Japan did, and anyone in America who might deplore this in Japan is politely requested to weep on the shoulders of our own Indians. At any rate Roosevelt suddenly became indignant at Japan's war with China, a war that had practically become a stalemate because of the geographic unconquerability of China.

If Japanese expansion had been toward the United States, toward the Philippines and Hawaii, we would have had something to complain about. But Japanese expansion was away from our interests. So Roosevelt waxed more and more indignant over noble China, the same China that today has embraced communism, and froze Japanese assets in the United States, embargoed vital products from American to Japan, punched away at her from behind his iron curtain and finally had issued an ultimatum which Japan could not accept. We then brought down in ruin the only nation of Asia that had a democratic legislature which controlled the purse strings, the only Asiatic nation that could be counted on to oppose the expansion of Communist Russia in Asia. Today, having handed over food lands in Asia to Mao, the Communist, Japan's economy is now on Uncle Sam's bounty roll.

But even more repulsive in its consequences was Roosevelt's use of his iron curtain to build Russian military strength and to make war settlements with her that reeked of barbarianism and make inevitable her present challenge to civilization.

At Tehran Roosevelt sold Yugoslavia down the river to Tito, and abandoned the heroic Mihailovic, the anti-Communist leader, to the fate of death by a firing squad of Tito's Communists. This was a crime against the people of Yugoslavia. King Peter, head of the Yugoslav government-in-exile, pleaded with Roosevelt in a letter to him that "he could not abandon Mihailovic without betraying the people of Yugoslavia" and said "I would become a traitor to my people and to my army in Yugoslavia." But Peter got the brush-off from the great Franklin who seemed so eager to please Russia.

It was at Yalta that Roosevelt sold both China and Poland down the river to Russia. His gift of China to Stalin was unbelievable in the lights of the facts now known. Two days before Roosevelt left for Yalta he had in his hands a 40-page memorandum from General MacArthur outlining overtures of the Japanese for peace. All the Japs asked for was the preservation of the Emperor, the same terms that the Japanese accepted 4 months later after the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Capt. Ellis M. Zacharias, Navy expert on Japan, asserts that intelligence reports indicating Japanese impending willingness to surrender were also available. American warships were known to be cruising along the shores of Japan bombarding at will.

Yet, at Yalta Roosevelt "bribed" Russia to get into the war against Japan by handing over to Russia Manchuria, the most industrially developed part of China as well as outer Mongolia, Sakhalin, Kuriles, Port Arthur, and North Korea. He did this, although a few weeks earlier at Cairo, Roosevelt had solemnly promised Chiang Kai-shek that Manchuria would be returned to China. During the Soviet occupation of Manchuria industrial equipment of an estimated value of two billions was looted and carried off to Russia. Ironically Russia did not get into the war with Japan until 2 days after our bombing of Hiroshima and her contribution to victory was negligible. But she was on hand in Asia to take over the guns and ammunition of Japanese forces there. These she passed out to Chinese Reds like Mao, trained in Moscow, and with this equipment plus the diversion of military supplies from American to the Red armies due to the efforts of the Red clique in our State Department the Chinese Reds under Mao beat Chiang and drove him to Formosa.

The handing over of Poland to Russia was particularly odious since England had gone to war with Germany over the latter's seizure of Polish territory.

Russia was even befriended by Roosevelt when our armies advanced on Berlin. We could have easily gotten to Berlin first. But our troops were first halted at the Elbe. They were then withdrawn from that river in wide circle—far enough westward to make Stalin a present of the great Zeiss optical and precision instrument works at Jena, the most important V-1 and V-2 rocket laboratory and production plant in Nordhausen, and the vital underground jet plant in Kahla. Everywhere we surrendered to the Soviets intact thousands of German planes, including great masses of jet fighters ready for assembly, as well as research centers, rocket developments, scientific personnel, and other military treasures.

When it was all over, a large part of the formidable Russian militarism of today was clearly marked "Made in America" or "donated by America from Germany." But where Roosevelt left off President Truman resumed.

At Potsdam, Truman maintaining intact Roosevelt's iron curtain of secret diplomacy played fast and loose with American honor and security. He agreed to an enlargement of the boundaries of a Poland already delivered by Roosevelt and Churchill to Russian control through addition of areas that had for centuries been occupied by Germans or people of German origin. Some 14,000,000 persons were brutally expelled from their homes with the confiscation of virtually all their property. Only 10,000,000 finally reached the American, French, and British zones of Germany. Four million mysteriously disappeared though the finger points toward Russian atrocities. Thus Truman approved one of the greatest mass deportations in history which for sheer cruelty is a dark page in the annals of history.

At Potsdam, Truman also sanctioned Russian acquisition of Eastern Germany, the food bin of that nation before the war. It then became impossible for the remaining German economy in British, French, and American hands to feed its people. Germany, like Japan, also went on our bounty rolls.

Like Roosevelt, Truman did not neglect to build up Russian military strength when his opportunity came at Potsdam. He provided her with more factories, machines, and military equipment though at the time he attended Potsdam Truman knew that through lend-lease we had already dangerously expanded Russia's military might and that, in addition, we had given the Soviets some 15,000 planes—many of them of our latest type—and 7,000 tanks.

But at Potsdam Truman gave to Russia the entire zone embracing the Elbe and Oder Rivers, excepting Hamburg which lies within the British zone. Naval experts had known from the early days of World War II that it was along these rivers and their tributaries that the Germans had set up their submarine production line. The menace which the Nazi underwater fleet constituted during World War II is still remembered by residents along the Atlantic coast who saw oil tankers, merchant ships, and even a troop transport sunk within sight of our shores. Convoy losses during the early years of the war were tremendous. And special defensive methods had to be devised by our Navy to get our supplies across the Atlantic.

But in spite of this, the President agreed at Potsdam to deliver to Russia the parts which lay in satellite plants sufficient for her to fabricate hundreds of submarines. In addition to this, he agreed to give to Russia 10 of the latest snorkel-type long-range German submarines for experimental purposes.

That is not all. The Potsdam agreement delivered to Russia the city of Koenigsburg and the adjacent area on the Baltic Sea—thus we provided the Soviets with an all-weather, year-round seaport from which her newly received submarine fleet might operate.

But Truman's generosity to Russia went even further than this. In addition to the reparations already given to Russia in the eastern zone of Germany, including the uranium mines, article 4 of section 3 of the agreement permitted Russia to take "15 percent of such usable and complete industrial capital equipment" out of the western zone in exchange for raw materials.

Then the President went one step further. Section B of the article 4 reads:

> Ten percent of such industrial capital equipment as is unnecessary for the German peace economy and should be removed from the western zones, to be transferred to the Soviet Government on reparations account without payment or exchange of any kind in return.

A time limit of 2 years was set upon this transfer. But even if this section of the agreement had been questioned, the full text was not released by the State Department until 19 months later.

Perhaps it is sufficient to note that conservative estimates place the Russian submarine fleet at more than 300 today. The chances are that it is closer to 500. It was at Potsdam that Truman provided Russia with the materials and facilities sufficient for her to become a first-class underseas naval power.

It was also at Potsdam that the President and his advisers stupidly accepted a zone of control in the city of Berlin without providing any access to it. You all remember well how when the Russians chose to close the roads and railroads to us, we embarked upon a costly airlift in order to supply our zone in Berlin.

This colossal diplomatic blunder cost the American people $265,948,000—more than a quarter of a billion dollars.

The iron curtain of secret diplomacy which Roosevelt erected and which Truman after the war has continued to use is ably commented upon by Dr. Charles Beard, the great American historian, in his book, Roosevelt and the Coming of the War:

> If the precedents set by President Roosevelt in conducting foreign affairs as reported in the records of the congressional committee on Pearl Harbor and other documents are to stand unimpeached and to be accepted henceforth as valid in law and morals then—
>
> The President of the United States in a campaign for reelection may publicly promise the people to keep the country out of war, and after victory at the polls may set out secretly on a course designed practically certain to bring war upon the country.
>
> He may secure legislation in furtherance of his secret designs, misrepresent to Congress and the people its purport and the policy he intends to pursue if and when such legislation is enacted.
>
> He may after securing such legislation publicly announce that he will pursue, as previously proposed, a policy contrary to war and yet at the same time secretly prepare plans for waging an undeclared shooting war that are in flat contradiction to his public professions.
>
> He may hold secret conferences with the premier of a foreign government and publicly declare that no new commitments have been made when, in fact, he had committed the United States to occupy, by the use of American armed forces, the territory of a third country and joining the premier in parallel threats to another government.
>
> He may make secret agreements with a foreign power more fateful in consequences to the United States than any alliance ever incorporated in a treaty to be submitted to the Senate for approval.
>
> He may publicly represent to the Congress and the people that acts of war have been committed against the United States when in reality said acts were secretly invited and even initiated by the Armed Forces of the United States under his secret direction.
>
> He may after publicly announcing one foreign policy secretly pursue the opposite and so conduct foreign and military affairs as to maneuver a designated foreign power into firing the first shot in an attack upon the United States and thus avoid the necessity of calling upon Congress in advance to exercise its constitutional power to deliberate upon a declaration of war.
>
> He may as a crowning act in arrogation of authority to himself without the consent of the Senate make a commitment to the head of a foreign government which binds the United States to police the world at least for a given time—that in the eyes of other governments and people to be policed is to dominate the world; and the American people are thereby in honor bound to provide the military, naval, and economic forces necessary to pursue, with no assurance of success, this exacting business.

As in World War I, the bogy of German world conquest was revived. The numerous deceptions and public immorality of Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy are now defended by his apologists on the ground that he had to "deceive the people into war" so as to crush Hitler before the Nazi blitzkrieg engulfed us. One recalls Mr. Roosevelt's fearsome reference to Hitler's timetable to invade Iowa, the official talk about the ease of invading the United States via Dakar and Brazil, though a movement of troops and supplies over this route would have compelled the Nazis to traverse about three times the distance from Berlin to New York City, and about the frequent discovery of secret Nazi plans for the invasion of the United States, despite the fact that the Nazis were not able to cross the less than 20 miles of the Dover Strait, when Britain was virtually helpless.

Even if Germany had had plans for world conquest that would not excuse a President of the United States from deceiving the people and manipulating them into a war behind an iron curtain of secret diplomacy. But the evidence is convincing that the Nazis had no plans for world conquest—that Hitler did not have even the most remote notion of invading the United States at any predictable period.

Gen. George C. Marshall, in his official report as Chief of Staff at the end of the war clearly stated that the Nazis had no actual plan of world domination. Marshall confirmed this in his deposition for use in the Tokyo trials. Wars in Europe have always been fought over issues that related solely to the interests of Europe, except in the case of Russia today which

does have the intention to subdue the world. But, if when Germany and Russia went to war we had forced them to fight it out there would be no crisis today. These two totalitarian powers would have bled each other white. Even President Truman when a Senator saw this—and urged that we play one off against the other until both were prostrate. Instead Roosevelt elected under cover of secret diplomacy to fight Germany and coddle Stalin—and for that secrecy we are now facing a third world war.

The record is clear that under two Democratic administrations the people were tricked or deceived into wars which from the standpoint of our own interests were fruitless in results and devastating in their sacrifice of our sons and our resources. Under Roosevelt and Truman the Presidency has been fashioned into a ruthless weapon for forcing the people into war and for pledging their resources to foreign governments without consent of the Congress. We are now under a dictatorship in foreign affairs and on the brink of another global struggle. We have been pursuing a fatal policy of "perpetual war for perpetual peace."

Fortunately, today the American people are aroused as never before. They are far ahead of their leaders. They realize at last, that the very leaders who took us into World War II have created a Frankenstein in Russia with which they are totally unable to cope. They ask, how can we depend on these same leaders who have, through blundering, failed to win the peace after the last war, to make a lasting peace now, either with, or without, world war III?

The American people today are belligerent. They are protesting the leadership which blundered us into a war in Korea. They are protesting the leadership which is sure to blunder us into another global war and finally into socialism. They already see that our casualty list, which approaches 60,000, is a needless sacrifice of American lives and with no hope for a decisive military victory. The President on his own motion does not have the constitutional power to send abroad troops in force which could lead to war.

Growing out of their experience with the autocratic European kings, our founding fathers established two fundamental principles in the Constitution: First, individual liberty; second, the right of the people through their elected representatives in the Congress to provide for their own national defense and to declare war. This right of the people and this responsibility of the Congress were never challenged until President Truman sent large forces of our boys into Korea.

They are convinced the administration's spending program will disrupt our economy and carry us over the precipice to disaster. We must provide our people with a military program which will be, first, within the limits of sound economy; second, the most effective war deterrent available; third, enable us to win should war come.

The most ardent supporters of the army for Europe have never maintained it could win a war. At best, this—so far mythical—army is to be an alleged war deterrent. Claim is made that it could delay a Red invasion and absorb the surplus ammunition of the Red army.

What Stalin fears is the atomic bomb and the long-range bombers which can deliver it from bases outside of Europe. He knows what our bombing did to Japan and Germany, and he wants to save Russia from similar destruction. Consequently, we should have an allied air force which can dominate the sky over Russia and act as a shield over all Europe, preventing Stalin from striking with his Red army.

As Winston Churchill said:

> We are still under the shield of the atomic bomb, possessed in formidable quantities by the United States alone. The use of this weapon would shake the foundations of the Soviet regime throughout the vast areas of Russia * * * and constitute an effective deterrent upon Soviet aggression.

Our planners for European aid have strangely avoided mention of enemy air power in this program of ground defense.

How do they intend to gain a final decision over Russia and her satellites? The hearings on the Wherry resolution brought out the fact that all military leaders concede Russia can be destroyed only by air power. Yet our principal expenditure for the Air Force is for combat planes to protect the ground forces in Europe.

We must provide a military program which places the principal reliance in air power supported by an adequate Army and Navy. The main expenditure for the Air Force should be for strategic bombers which can strike anywhere in Russia from bases outside Europe which we know we can hold. The American people are behind such a program. They are unwilling to sacrifice their youth, who would be hopelessly outnumbered, in bayonet fighting against the enslaved millions under Stalin. Republicans must block this ruinous policy of the Truman administration. Time is growing short. The absolute deadline is November 1952. Only a Republican victory can save us.

Beware of false propaganda. Let us not be misled.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter sent by the Reader's Digest urging its representatives to write members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee with respect to legislation increasing postal rates, together with a reply to such letter by one of its representatives:

THE READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N. Y., March 7, 1951.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On March 13, 1951, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will begin hearings on a bill (H. R. 2982) to increase postal rates on magazines.

On behalf of the whole magazine publishing industry, we are bringing this matter to your attention, because it may affect your well-being as a publisher's representative.

The object of H. R. 2982 is to increase postal rates on magazines 100 percent (50 percent this year, 25 percent next year, and another 25 percent the next year).

If such a postal increase should come about, it could directly and seriously affect your income because:

(1) Some publishers might be forced out of business.

(2) Others might be forced to—

(a) Increase subscription prices, and/or

(b) Increase emphasis on newsstand sales.

All of these things might affect the number of subscriptions you would sell in the future, and thus affect your income.

This letter is sent to you so that you may know what is going on, so that you may take whatever action you feel you should.

In the past we have encouraged you to sell all publications, because by so doing you could give more and better service to your community, and earn more money for yourself. We are sending you this letter in the same spirit.

If you feel that an increase in magazine subscription prices caused by increased postal rates would affect your income adversely (and you have first-hand knowledge of how resistant the public now is to increases in prices), you may wish to write to the Congressman who can be most influential on this subject. They are the members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Their names are given on the next page. The address for each is: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Democrats: TOM MURRAY, of Tennessee, chairman; JAMES H. MORRISON, of Louisiana; GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia; JOHN ALBERT WHITAKER, of Kentucky; GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania; FRANK M. KARSTEN, of Missouri; M. G. (BURNIE) BURNSIDE, of West Virginia; JOHN LESINSKI, Jr., of Michigan; JOHN JARMAN, of Oklahoma; VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York; BILL LANTAFF, of Florida; FRAZIER REAMS of Ohio.

Republicans: EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas; HAROLD C. HAGEN, of Minnesota; ROBERT J. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York; ANTONI N. SADLAK, of Connecticut; USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota; GARDNER R. WITHROW, of Wisconsin; H. R. GROSS, of Iowa; JAMES S. GOLDEN, of Kentucky; WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, of New York; O. K. ARMSTRONG, of Missouri.

If you intend to write members of the committee, you should do so today, or within the next few days. Hearings are scheduled to begin on March 13 and will continue for several days.

And if you do want to write, don't feel that your letter may be inconsequential. Last year, when this same subject came up before the Senate committee, it was in large measure letters from representatives like yourself that convinced the committee that postal rates on magazines should not then be increased. This is definitely a place where your letter can have an important effect on the final decision.

Cordially,

ALLAN SCOTT.

MARCH 9, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES,
House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RHODES: On March 9, 1951, my wife received a letter from Allan Scott, director community representatives of the Reader's Digest, informing her that on March 13, 1951, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will begin hearings on a bill (H. R. 2982) to increase postal rates on magazines. He stated that the object of the bill is to increase postal rates on magazines 100 percent (50 percent this year, 25 percent next year, and another 25 percent the following year). He suggested that should this increase come about it would directly and seriously affect your income. He also stated that some publishers might be forced out of business, and that my wife should write to the Congressman now who can be most influential on this subject, even enclosing a list of such men.

Mr. Scott neglected to inform her of the present postal rate for magazines (or even his magazine). He also neglected to call her attention to the fact that the Post Office Department is operating at a deficit, and that no kind of business can operate at a deficit for very long, even the Reader's Digest. Fortunately, for all of us, the Post Office Department is a governmental agency and we all benefit by the low cost of mail handling, even if we do make up the deficit out of taxpayer's contributions. However, neither my wife nor I feel that the Government should subsidize the Reader's Digest or any other publication, directly or indirectly, as we feel it would if it took the burden of meeting the cost of operation away from those who use the mails and place it in bulk upon the taxpayer. If we were to suggest, as Mr. Scott would have us, that the Reader's Digest and all other publications should be mailed by the millions annually at a ridiculously low unit mailing cost to the mailer, and that any deficit in the cost of operating the post office should not be placed on the user but on the general public, we would certainly be selfish, unrealistic, and definitely not a fit citizen or businessman.

Out of curiosity, I called our local branch of the post office and learned that the Reader's Digest paid not less than 1 cent per copy for mailing its magazine in the United States. This is possible because of bulk mailing. To raise the cost 100 percent would be to require 2 cents postage per magazine. I can't see any reason why neither the Reader's Digest nor any other publication should not pay the increase when mailing is a service they require and should pay for.

Both my wife and I were surprised at the inferences contained in Mr. Scott's letter. He implied the proposed postal increase would be prohibitive and would force some publishers out of business. To say that he is not being realistic is to say that the Reader's Digest needs Government funds to continue operating successfully.

My wife and I feel that there are enough lobbyists in Washington bidding for their selfish interests and we do not want to come to the aid of anyone who is selfish. We feel that under the circumstances we should support your committee on seeking an increase of postal rates on magazines.

I am enclosing Mr. Scott's letter for your perusal.

Very truly yours,

_____.

A Footnote for Historians on the Strange Case of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "A Footnote for Historians on the Strange Case of Alger Hiss," together with an article entitled "Links to Field Cited," written by Drew Pearson, and cabled by him from Frankfurt, Germany, on March 17.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FOOTNOTE FOR HISTORIANS ON THE STRANGE CASE OF ALGER HISS

Mr. President, now that the Supreme Court of the United States has denied the appeal of Alger Hiss and it appears that before this week is over the doors of a Federal penitentiary will have clanged shut on Hiss, it is appropriate that there be placed in the permanent files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any additional evidence that comes to light on the activities and associations of this badly misguided former high official of our Department of State.

As chairman of the House subcommittee that handled the investigation which led to the indictment and conviction of Alger Hiss, following our disclosure of the pumpkin papers on the farm of Whittaker Chambers, I have from time to time inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD data which I have felt historians will want to consult as they attempt to chronicle and interpret the trends of our times and the tortuous twistings of American foreign policy since the concluding days of World War II.

Clearly any attempt to record or understand our bizarre contradictions in foreign policy since the last war must take any serious-minded historian to an examination of the part played in them by Alger Hiss not only as a top-ranking policy functionary of the State Department but as a confidential participant in the Yalta Conference, in the San Francisco Conference where the basic format of United Nations procedures was prepared, and in the Bretton Woods Conference. Even more important to historians would be an analysis and report of the very significant activities of Alger Hiss at the unheralded Malta Conference, a preparatory conference for Yalta, at which Alger Hiss and a few associates conferred for many days and made significant advance determinations and studies to be taken by them to Yalta for the guidance and direction of those who represented the United States at the Yalta Conference.

In a lengthy address on the Senate floor on January 25, 1950, I discussed some of these activities under the heading, "What the Hiss trial actually means." Since then additional evidence is continuing to come to light. For example, in his release for Saturday, March 17, 1951, Drew Pearson cabled from Frankfort, Germany, a report conveying some significant information on the relationships of Alger Hiss, Laurence Duggan, and Harry Dexter White—all of whom worked contemporaneously as a clique of trusted Government employees. Drew Pearson also relates the manner in which Noel Field participated in these activities and the mysterious manner in which Field, his brother, and some of his relatives have vanished from the face of the earth. He labels this vanishing act as the No. 1 American mystery of Europe. In this dispatch Drew Pearson to be sure contradicts an earlier report on Duggan which he released on December 27, 1948, but to Pearson's credit let it be said that he is now reporting from Europe the chain of evidence that he has subsequently discovered.

No history of our times which deals with American foreign policy, the Korean War, the public personalities of the Roosevelt-Truman era, or the manner in which communism has become an insidious threat to our way of life both at home and abroad would be either accurate, authentic, or complete without an attempt to interpret and analyze the determining parts played in it by Hiss, Duggan, White, Field, Wadleigh, Marzani, Chambers, Bentley, Remington, and others in and out of Government, and in and out of prison, whose strange attachment for the Soviet cause at one time or another induced them to serve its interests rather than those of the land of their birth.

To help complete the record for the archives of history, Mr. President, I therefore place at the conclusion of these remarks the very significant dispatch which Drew Pearson cabled from Frankfort, Germany, and which appears as his syndicated column for the papers published on March 17, 1951.

[From the Washington Post of March 17, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

LINKS TO FIELD MYSTERY CITED

FRANKFORT.—The No. 1 American mystery of Europe continues to be the sudden and unsolved disappearance of four Americans in the Noel Field case after Field was named by Whittaker Chambers as a member of the Communist cell in the United States State Department. This case is now being linked for the first time with another unsolved mystery in the United States—the strange death of Laurence Duggan, found in a snowbank 16 floors below his New York office. Duggan also was named in the State Department investigation, though cleared by the Justice Department.

The amazing thing is that a total of seven people have now died mysteriously or disappeared even more mysteriously following revelations in the Alger Hiss case.

The four people who have disappeared behind the iron curtain with or in the wake of Noel Field are: Field himself, who disappeared in Czechoslovakia May 10, 1949. His brother Herman vanished August 23 that same year while traveling in an airplane between Warsaw and Prague. A few days later Mrs. Noel Field disappeared while trying to find her husband in Prague. Then, 1 year later, Erica Wallachs, a friend of the Fields, went into the Russian zone of Berlin in search of them and never came back. All these disappearances occurred during about the same period of three mysterious deaths in the Hiss case. They were:

Death No. 1: Harry Dexter White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury who reportedly died of heart failure August 16, 1948, after testifying before the congressional committee at which Elizabeth Bentley had charged White with being a member of the elite Communist group inside the Government. White's death was not announced until 1 day afterward and he was buried hastily. Later it was reported the real cause of his death was an overdose of digitalis, not heart failure.

Death No. 2: Walter Marvin Smith, Justice Department attorney found at the base of the Justice Department staircase where he had fallen or jumped October 20, 1948, shortly after the House Un-American Activities Committee had questioned him on his notarization of the transfer of title of a Ford automobile from Hiss to William Rosen, described in the congressional testimony as a Communist organizer. Hiss, according to Whittaker Chambers, insisted on turning over his car to the Communist organizer. Smith was the only actual witness to the transfer.

Death No. 3, and the most mysterious of all, was that of Laurence Duggan, the former State Department official who, "while putting on his overshoes to go home," fell through a New York skyscraper window. Duggan had been questioned a few days earlier regarding Communist spies in the State Department. Insurance investigators believed it unlikely that a man would commit suicide while putting on his overshoes and paid his widow nonsuicide death benefits.

DUGGAN-FIELD LINK

It now develops there was a personal link between Duggan and Field which may supply one small clue to this international mystery. Duggan and Field not only served in the State Department at the same time but, for one period, they shared the same house together off Judiciary Square in Washington. Duggan informed his superiors during the war that he had once attended Communist meetings in Alexandria, Va., during his early days in the State Department, but he had never joined the party and became unsympathetic with their ideas.

Field, meanwhile, had left the State Department in 1936 and joined the League of Nations secretariat. During the war he served as European director of the Unitarian Service Committee, which took him to Poland and Czechoslovakia, where he established medical centers and children's homes. He had thus become well acquainted with these two countries and, after the war, remained abroad to write a book on Poland and Czechoslovakia.

DISAPPEARANCE UNPLANNED

On May 5, 1949, Field went from Switzerland to Prague and on May 12 he failed to keep an afternoon appointment. He has not been heard of since. Apparently he did not plan to disappear because his room showed no signs of departure. He did not notify the friend with whom he had the appointment nor his wife, Herta, who planned to join him in a few weeks.

Five months later, however, when the Communists tried Hungarian Foreign Minister Laszlo Rajk, the Hungarian press reported that Rajk testified that Field had persuaded him to become "a servant of American imperialism." Later, in the fall of 1950, six East German Communists were charged with dealing with "the American spy, Noel Field."

More recently Czech refugees have reported that Field would testify in the trial of former Czech Foreign Minister Vladimir Clementis, though there has been nothing to substantiate this.

Meanwhile, Field's brother, Herman, in August 1949, decided to go to Prague to find his missing brother. He boarded a plane in Warsaw on August 22. Friends accompanied him to the airport and the American Embassy checking the plane's manifest later, found his name was on it. However, when the plane arrived at Prague, Herman Field was not on it. He has never been heard of since, either, except in one respect.

On February 25, 1950, Vilem Novy, editor of the Czech Communist newspaper, Rude Pravo, was denounced by a member of the Central Communist Committee for having betrayed state secrets to a western espionage agent when Novy was a refugee in Krakow in 1939. Herman Field, who was then doing refugee work among Czech refugees in Krakow, knew Novy, and was apparently that alleged agent.

THEORIES ON UNSOLVED MYSTERY

Meanwhile, Mrs. Noel Field left Switzerland on August 2 to seek her husband in Prague, but she, too, disappeared from sight on August 17. A year later, with the Fields' whereabouts still unsolved, their friend, Erica Wallachs, wife of a Washington attorney, persuaded her husband to let her go to Switzerland to locate them. Mrs. Wallachs went to Berlin alone, reportedly was met by Leo Bauer, editor of the Soviet-controlled Berlin radio whom she knew. She has never been heard of since.

Several theories are given for these disappearances. One is that Field had been working with the Communists and, when the congressional investigations got too hot, he wanted to be taken into protective Communist custody. Another theory is that the Fields had worked with the Communists in their early days, knew their vital secrets, and became too dangerous for them to have on the loose. Another is that they wanted Noel Field as a witness against key figures, such as Hungarian Foreign Minister Rajk. Field not only worked with refugees during and after the war but also with the OSS in Czechoslovakia and Hungary in an effort to unseat Hitler's puppet governments.

Meanwhile, until Field and his family are heard from direct, his whereabouts remain the No. 1 unsolved mystery of Europe.

The National Fiscal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the 20th day of February 1951, the New Jersey Republican State Committee adopted a resolution covering certain aspects of the present national fiscal situation and commenting on the recent budget proposal of the President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll has submitted to the New Jersey Legislature a budget for the 1951–52 fiscal year which, in its demand for spartan economy at all levels of government, set a pattern for the drastic curtailment of all but the most necessary expenditures; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress a budget proposal by the President of the United States for the same period which constitutes an invitation to fiscal disaster for our country and which, unlike our own State budget, utterly fails to recognize the needs of the times: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Republican State Committee does hereby commend the Governor of New Jersey for his practical and realistic approach to the budgetary problems of our State and at the same time condemns the budget proposal of the President of the United States for the following reasons:

1. While purporting to call for expenditures of $71,500,000,000, it actually asks authorization to spend nearly $100,000,000,000.

2. Of this vast amount, the President has seen fit to itemize expenditures totaling only slightly more than $20,000,000,000 and has in effect, asked Congress for a blank check for the remainder.

3. In complete disregard of congressional responsibility, he has refused to state how many billions of dollars will be spent for defense. This committee, while fully aware of the need for high expenditures for the defense of our Nation, nevertheless believes it to be the duty of the President to confide in our elected representatives to the extent that they can make an honest examination of all proposals for defense expenditures before they are called upon to vote vast new taxes on the American people.

4. The President has claimed savings of $5,000,000,000 below last year in nondefense items. Many of these savings are not real. For example, examination shows one of these savings to be the amount expended last year for the 1950 census (a nonrecurring item). He also claims as a saving the more than $500,000,000 which the Congress forced the President to cut from the 1950–51 budget before its adoption. In other words, he is claiming savings below a nonexisting budget.

5. There are but 2 of 130 items submitted by the President in which he has claimed to have effected savings. Examination shows most of them to be based upon transfers which, in many cases, turn out to be increases and not savings.

6. Despite widespread demands for rigid economy in nondefense spending, the President, often under the guise of defense preparation, has continued to foist his Fair Deal, socialistic program on the American people. For example, he has asked:

(a) Three hundred million dollars to equalize education opportunities among the States (as a defense measure, on the grounds that the Armed Forces do not have time to teach draftees how to read and write); plus $106,000,000 for Federal aid to education in certain areas.

(b) A two-hundred-and-seventy-five-million-dollar payroll tax to set up the machinery for socialized medicine.

(c) Direct payments to producers of perishable farm products in lieu of price supports (the Brannan plan).

(d) Seven new waterways projects costing $1,500,000,000, as follows: Hell's Canyon, The Dalles, and Ice Harbor projects in the Columbia Basin; Old Hickory on the Cumberland; a steam plant for TVA; Gavins Point on the Missouri; and $20,000,000 to start the St. Lawrence seaway.

7. Although the President states that his budget totals $71,500,000,000, he has, in fact, asked for contract authorizations and appropriations of $94,500,000,000, plus an additional $4,000,000,000 to pay old bills. Inasmuch as the books of the United States Government are carried on a cash basis, the President's budget should state that he seeks a total of $98,500,000,000—or $27,000,000,000 more than he has admitted; and be it further

Resolved, That the Republican State committee calls on the Republican Members of the Senate and House from New Jersey to continue their efforts to compel the Federal Government to give the American people an honest accounting of their money, and to examine carefully all proposed expenditures, both defense and otherwise, to the end that this Nation may be saved from the fiscal disaster which will surely follow if the Federal Government is permitted to engage in the confused and illogical practices exemplified by the President's budget proposal; and be it further

Resolved, That our Representatives shall bring this resolution to the attention of the Congress in the hope that the Congress shall see fit to follow the pattern established by the Governor of New Jersey in setting an example for prudent management which present circumstances demand at all levels of Government.

The Need for More Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Flu Epidemic Pointed Up Need for More Doctors To Answer House

Calls," which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of March 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLU EPIDEMIC POINTED UP NEED FOR MORE DOCTORS TO ANSWER HOUSE CALLS

The recent epidemic of influenza, now waning, directed attention to the difficulty of obtaining the services of a physician in any circumstances short of an emergency.

When it comes to turning down telephone calls for assistance there is little to choose between specialists and general practitioners.

In both categories there are physicians who are at the beck and call of the sick and ailing, who work long hours without proper rest to relieve suffering, and who sometimes pay in broken health and shortened lives the price of unstinting service.

But it is also true that in both categories there are physicians whose service is determined by monetary standards, whose desire for personal ease and comfort takes precedence over consideration for those who are ill, and who are more interested in fighting socialized medicine than in healing the sick.

EMERGENCY LIST POSTED

Emergency care is easier to obtain than the normal medical care required in less dangerous cases of illness. The Medical Society of Erie County has established an emergency referral list of doctors who will accept calls day or night. This list is posted in all police and fire stations and in all hospitals.

Physicians and attorneys alike agree that medical jurisprudence has established that a physician who has treated, or has promised to treat, a person who is ill has thereafter an obligation to fulfill his promise or to complete the treatment, as the case may be. Even the telephoned promise to come and see the patient is regarded in legal circles as an oral contract between physician and patient.

However, where no such promise has been made, either orally or de facto by the beginning of treatment, the decision on an appeal for medical assistance is an obligation which rests upon the physician in recognition of his responsibility to society, which permits him to practice medicine. The importance attached to this obligation by the physician will be determined almost entirely by his regard for his responsibilities.

ETHICS CLOSELY WATCHED

The medical society has a board of censors, which keeps watch over the ethics of the society's members, but even physicians admit that there are too many loopholes which permit avoidance of censorship.

A Buffalo physician recently told a friend about the death of one of his patients. He told how the patient had called him at 6 o'clock in the morning and had said that he did not feel well. The physician gave him certain instructions, but the patient telephoned again a short time later and said that he felt no better.

"All right," said the physician, "I'll be over about 8 or 9 o'clock."

"When I got there, he was dead," the doctor said, in recounting his experience.

"Why didn't you go when he called?" his friend asked.

"Because I just don't like night calls," was the reply. "I've got used to sleeping in the early morning."

CALL A DOCTOR

Such a case, an expert in medical jurisprudence explained, constitutes a breach of contract, in that the physician did not take all reasonable steps to insure his patient's recovery or, in this particular case, to prevent his death.

Consider the case of the young mother who telephoned a west side physician during the flu epidemic. The young woman, employed in one of the Buffalo hospitals, told the physician that she had a temperature above 103 and explained what treatment she had been taking.

"It is apparent that you need a doctor," the physician said.

"That's why I called you," she told him, and received this reply:

"I do not take patients during the week end and I am just finishing up my paper work for this week. Then I will have finished. I suggest that you call a doctor in your own neighborhood."

SOME REFUSE HOUSE CALLS

In this case, the experts explain, the doctor was entirely within his rights in refusing the case. The problem arises from the fact that too many doctors are refusing too many cases—at least that's the explanation given by some leading physicians.

Specialists have refused for many years to accept "general" cases. Now, however, many specialists are refusing to make house calls under any circumstances.

"They have many more calls than they want," a well-known physician explained, "and they can handle half a dozen office cases in the time required to make a house call."

Even the family which stints itself to provides the best possible medical care for the new baby may find itself in a desperate situation within a few months after the infant's birth. The pediatrist, or baby specialist, may be one of those who refuse house calls.

CHINESE HAD A SYSTEM

Not having established contact with a general practitioner, or family doctor, the frantic mother and father may be compelled to consult the emergency referral list, though they have already spent many dollars on specialist care for their child.

Some persons who have experienced difficulty in obtaining the ministrations of a physician are beginning to wonder if the Chinese system of medical insurance may not have something to recommend it.

Back in the days before China was liberated by the Communist hordes, a Chinese paid his physician only while his health was satisfactory. If he became ill, payments ceased. Thus, it behooved a shrewd physician to keep his patients in good health.

At worst, under such a system, there would be no truth in the assertion of a leading attorney that "only two classes get the best medical attention today—the very rich and the very poor—the former by paying high for it, the latter through the welfare department."

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article by Sydney J. Harris entitled "What Price Education as Defense?" which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of Tuesday, March 13, 1951. This article, in a few brief paragraphs, points out the significance of the legislation now pending in the Senate to provide Federal aid to the States for education.

I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD following the article just mentioned, a very able column written by Ysabel and Robert Rennie, dealing in some detail with the necessity of this program in the interests of national defense and the welfare of our country.

There being no objection the article and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of March 13, 1951]

WHAT PRICE EDUCATION AS DEFENSE?

(By Sydney J. Harris)

For the third time, Senator MURRAY of Montana has introduced a bill to set up a program for $300,000,000 a year in Federal aid to the States for education.

Twice before the Senate has passed this legislation, and twice before it has died in the House—the same House which has rapidly passed appropriations for many billions for armaments.

Yet, what we need more than anything else in America is basic education. If people don't know what to live for, they can't know what to die for. This is why—as the marine wrote to Secretary Acheson—morale is so low among our young people today.

Three hundred million dollars is an insignificant sum compared with the overwhelming cost of our defense program. But communism cannot be fought with weapons; it is an idea, and to be defeated only by another, and stronger, idea.

Education is the most neglected aspect in our society. The States and cities cannot carry the whole burden, especially in the poorer regions, where help is most needed. Teachers are scandalously underpaid, and students are shamefully undertaught.

DEMOCRACY NOT SIMPLE

The idea of democracy is not a simple one, despite the after-dinner orators. Belief in democracy must follow a knowledge of what such words as "liberty" and "justice" and "security" really mean.

A true and full education examines the meaning of these words. It tries to discover what man is, and what society ought to be like. It attempts to discover the best means of accomplishing the end, which is human happiness.

Our young people leave school today without any such firm idea. They are confused and cynical; the war is a painful riddle they do not comprehend; their loyalty is pierced by doubt and despair.

In war, the great danger is always that you may become the thing you are fighting; that the enemy will conquer you in spirit. Only in knowledge resides the strength to resist this spiritual corrosion. Only through education can we find the reason for living and the motive for dying.

[From the Washington Post, March 18, 1951]

OUR POLITICAL ECONOMY—TEACHERS HARD HIT BY INFLATION

(By Ysabel and Robert Rennie)

Now that we have climbed back aboard the escalator of inflation, certain groups are bound to be hurt. Conspicuous among these are the Nation's schoolteachers, whose incomes are slow to respond to a change in prices.

Numerically—and hence politically—they are not a strong group. They number about a million, or 1.6 percent of our labor force; but in the coming decade they may well be among the most important workers in our economy. By 1956, it is estimated, there will be some 27,000,000 young Americans in the school-age group between 5 and 17. This will be 17 percent above 1950.

Because schoolteachers are not organized, they cannot compete with such potent pressure groups as union workers or farmers. Furthermore, in times of inflation they suffer

from the fact that the sources of school revenues are rigid and inflexible.

Public school teachers depend for their salaries on the local property tax, a notably unresponsive form of revenue. Private school and college teachers depend, to a considerable extent, on endowment income, much of it in fixed-interest securities like bonds and mortgages.

The result is that there is a general exodus from the teaching field during inflation. Afterward, teaching salaries tend to catch up again; and in depression the real income of teachers rise very rapidly—when they get paid.

Let us look at the record. We have figures on teachers' salaries which go back to the beginning of the century.

From 1900 to 1949 the average salary of public school teachers rose from $311 to an estimated $2,750 a year. If adjustment is made for changes in the cost of living, real salaries (in 1935–39 dollars) rose from $591 in 1900 to $1,626 in 1949.

The increase, however, was less an upward march than a ride on the roller coaster. Statistics on the salaries of urban teachers show that between 1900 and 1920 real salaries declined by a fourth. Then in just 2 years, from 1920 to 1922, they recovered all the ground they had lost since the beginning of the century and began an upward climb which reached a high mark in 1940.

In terms of purchasing power, teachers' salaries showed a dramatic gain during the early years of the depression. As prices plummeted between 1930 and 1932, real salaries of urban teachers jumped from $1,583 to $1,872.

The trend was exactly reversed by the Second World War. From 1940 to 1944 real salaries for this group declined by nearly 10 percent.

All this tells something of how teachers have been faring in relation to their previous history. But how do they compare with other groups in the economy?

A half century ago the average schoolteacher earned less than half as much as the average factory worker and a third less than even the unskilled laborer of the period.

As late as 1920 he was still making less than half the factory wage. After that, however, he gained ground rapidly. All during the 1930's his average income was higher than that of the factory hand.

The wartime inflation represented a serious setback. Today the schoolteacher again lags well behind the wage earner in the race for a decent living. In June 1950, his disposable income was some 3 percent below that of the average factory hand, more than a sixth lower than the coal miner's or construction worker's and a full quarter below the average earnings in the automobile industry.

Considering the education and training which are expected of a teacher, these figures come as something of a shock. One offsetting factor is that most teachers are single women, with somewhat lighter-than-average family responsibilities. Another is that the school year runs for 9 months; many teachers add to their earnings in the summer

When this has been said, however, the fact remains that teaching is a low-paid profession, and that as living costs rise it is likely to drop even further behind.

The exodus from teaching jobs did not matter so much in the Second World War because school enrollment was actually declining. Today the full flood of war babies is all but overwhelming our school system. Can we continue to toss teachers the crumbs from our economic dinner table and still meet this crisis?

Ours is an increasingly complex civilization. Our teachers must know more than ever before if they are to train our children to cope with it. Yet how good can a profession be which offers fewer rewards than manual labor?

Assignment of Ground Forces To Duty in the European Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial entitled "Senate's Gobbledygook," which appeared this morning in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE'S GOBBLEDYGOOK

The so-called great debate in the Senate has narrowed down to one immediate question—will the Senate say what it means? Unanimous action by the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees had settled the momentous issue of sending four American divisions to Europe before the exchange of words began on the floor. Every opponent of this bipartisan policy now knows that he is wasting his breath. Aside from giving Senators a chance to get their views on record, the debate from this point on is likely to be useful only if it saves the resolution from becoming a monument to obfuscation.

The worst of the legislative gobbledygook is concentrated in section 6. On Friday Chairman CONNALLY of the Foreign Relations Committee refused to speculate on what it means. He referred questions on that point to Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, who wrote this notable specimen of double-talk at the behest of Senators GEORGE and BYRD. Mr. SMITH has promised the Senate an explanation today. But at best he can give only one man's opinion of the resolution's dictum that "congressional approval should be obtained of any policy requiring the assignment of American troops abroad * * * in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty"—excepting the four divisions for the Eisenhower army, which the resolution itself approves. Unless the language itself is clarified, the resolution will rise to plague any reasonable administration of a policy that is vital to our national security.

Mr. SMITH has denied that a formal act of Congress would be required under his proviso to permit the dispatch of five divisions, if needed, instead of four. What, then, would Congress have to do? The Senator spoke of setting up a "moral check" on the President. Where does he find any senatorial power to fix moral standards for the President to obey? Senator WILEY realistically pointed out that in no circumstances can the Senate alter the President's constitutional power by passing a resolution. But at the same time he asked the Senate to accept the resolution as it is—thus creating a presumption in the minds of legislators and citizens that the Senate can prevent the President from using his constitutional power by passing a negative resolution and then refusing to pass a positive one.

Aside from its obscurity section 6 is vicious because it gives the impression of interfering with the powers of the Commander in Chief, whether or not that is its purpose. This appearance of unconstitutional meddling will remain so long as the resolution calls for "congressional approval" of further troop movements. What the Senate ought to ask of the President, in our opinion, is merely consultation with its leaders and appropriate committees if the dispatch of further troops abroad is contemplated under the treaty. This would give the Senate an opportunity to advise the President of its own wishes, and, if no meeting of minds could be obtained, the Senate could then initiate legislation making it impossible for the President to carry out his project successfully. Congress always has a ready weapon against such projects—the denial of appropriations.

Such consultation is provided for in section 3 of the resolution. Up to that point no cloud is cast upon the freedom of the Commander in Chief to move troops in accord which his own concept of our national security and our treaty obligations. It is of the utmost importance that this presidential power remain unfettered even by senatorial expressions of opinion. It is not a question of leaving vital decisions as to peace and security in the hands of one man, as Senator WILEY contends. With a pattern of consultations established, Congress would always be able to check unsound executive decisions while keeping within its own constitutional role. Congress would thus be in a position to control basic policy in case of disagreement with the President, but without crippling the Commander in Chief in making strategic decisions.

It is possible that the very ambiguity of section 6 would prevent it from becoming a grave hazard to our security in time of great emergency. But the Senate ought not to take any such chance. The best course would seem to be to eliminate section 6 and give more emphasis to the consultation requirement of section 3, if the Senate is not satisfied with the present language.

Military Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Moving Toward Strength," published in the New York Times of March 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVING TOWARD STRENGTH

The Senate has taken an important forward step in its approval of the military manpower bill. It is significant that only five votes were cast in opposition on the final balloting. Our senior lawmakers are obviously convinced that we have no alternative but to make ourselves militarily strong, and they have acted accordingly.

This measure as it stands is not, in our judgment, by any means a perfect bill. The 24-month service period actually means about 3 months less than that when time for induction and travel and for authorized leave is deducted. This is short of the most effective period. The universal training features, likewise, remain somewhat indefinite and are placed in the future instead of being incorporated into the existing military program. The concept of universal service has, therefore, been weakened. It is our view that it should be accepted in both the military and civilian spheres as a national necessity.

With these limitations, however, the measure moves some considerable way in the right direction. It makes the required provision for a substantial manpower establishment. More than that, it puts the United States on the record before the world as being in deadly earnest about the defense of its liberties. The overwhelming vote by which it was adopted is a salutary indication that we mean business.

The necessity for this legislation is not of our own choosing. Few persons in this country, if any, like the idea of drafting 18-year-olds, or for that matter of drafting anyone at all. There is nothing pleasant about the idea of sustaining armed forces up to 4,000,000 men. There is no moral satisfaction in the conviction that every young man must undergo a period of training to enable him more skillfully to kill and more securely to avert some of the dangers of sudden and violent death if and when he is placed in the field.

Unhappily, however, we are not living in a world of our own good wishes and pleasant comforts. We have been placed in a situation in which our physical and spiritual survival is dependent upon our ability to make ourselves strong. We face an implacable adversary that knows no respect for honorable intentions unless they are backed up by unquestioned might. Under that condition we have no choice except to take the hard course upon which we have embarked.

We can take that course in honor and in confidence only if we are fully convinced of the permanent worth of the human cause that our liberties represent. We make ourselves physically strong so that we may endure for the sake of something more than physical values. Thus can our actions be justified. Only thus can the grim steps that we are taking, and must continue to take, be made conformable to our individual integrity and our national soul.

The Senate has done the right thing. The House must carry on with that program. But it is all of us, in the end, who must make that program worthy.

Restrictions on American Troop Movements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relating to proposed restrictions on American troop movements, published in the Times-Picayune, of New Orleans, on March 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE ON THE DOLE?

The fight in Congress to establish congressional restrictions on American troop movements confuses millions of Americans—including perhaps some Congressmen. Pictured by proponent as a step to restore some fundamental and arbitrary prerogative of the legislative branch, it may win sentimental support by folks who do not take the trouble to think the proposition through to the actual effect of putting our national defense on the dole, by way of speaking.

In a radio address last Sunday, former War Secretary Patterson reminded his hearers that "Congress never has undertaken to say where the military forces should be stationed. In the days of troubles along the Mexican border, Congress did not pass a law that only so many soldiers should be sent to the Rio Grande. In the First World War Congress did not set a ceiling on the number of troops to be sent to France. In the Second World War Congress did not take the responsibility of deciding what divisions should be assigned to Eisenhower, what divisions to MacArthur, what divisions to Mark Clark. Those decisions were left to the military leaders." And Mr. Patterson followed with this forthright statement:

"The setting of a limit by Congress on the number of troops to be furnished to Eisenhower's army would make it impossible for him to accomplish his mission."

When, and if, the showdown were forced by a Communist attack upon Western Europe, Congress presumably would take the Nation's overseas defense off the dole and vote its buildup to requisite strength. Public opinion at home would force that saving action, in all probability. But the time required for congressional debate and action to correct its error might be costly in lives and treasure both. And that would go double if the instinctive but wholly untrained, inexperienced, and uncommissioned admirals, generals, and other military geniuses in Senate and House insisted upon ordering their own defense plans written into the new legislation.

It is fervently to be hoped, for the national interest and safety, that Congress will refuse to "ration" our defense and make any transfer of needed forces subject to its approval or veto before orders can be issued to meet an urgent need or immediate threat. We don't believe the Congress majority really wants that arbitrary authority—or the awesome responsibilities that would go with it.

The Fulbright Exchange of Persons Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received recently from Prof. J. T. Salter, of the department of political science, University of Wisconsin, at Madison.

Professor Salter, who is one of the leading political scientists in the United States, has written me in detail of his experience in the Philippines as an exchange professor. His story demonstrates the value of the exchange of persons program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., February 13, 1951.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I am happy to write to you about my year in the Orient as a Fulbright professor at the University of the Philippines, for I consider it one of the best years I have lived.

I am strongly in favor of the Fulbright program, just as I am in favor of education, world communication, and travel.

This program is a two-fisted process for peace. It inevitably helps destroy ignorance, disease, and poverty. It does this in two ways. The professor that goes to a foreign land brings facts, ideas, opinions, viewpoints, guidance, and inspiration to the students and other people that attend his classes and public meetings. The professor's own mind is enriched by the questions, attitudes, and experiences he meets in the foreign land.

I learned this at the University of the Philippines and in a dozen or more other colleges and universities that I addressed while I was in the Philippines. Everywhere I found two things—that the Filipinos love the Americans and that they are ardent about getting an education. I think that the words America and United States have a glorious sound in Filipino ears because we brought the Filipinos education, democracy in education, and education in democracy.

The United States Army transport Thomas reached Manila in 1901. This ship carried more than 600 school teachers. They were scattered throughout the provinces and boarded in Filipino houses. According to Mr. Pastor Sioco and other writers these early teachers made friends, because they brought a new and helpful meaning to the old Spanish concept of education, a concept that was narrowing and stifling, limiting education to the very few.

The American soldier, however, was there even before the Thomasite school teachers, and the soldier was a school teacher, too. He had come to fight the insurrectos and stayed to teach reading and writing and arithmetic. Commonwealth President Sergio Osmeña, in his loyalty-day speech in 1940, said that "the Filipinos will never forget the inspiring spectacle of American soldiers leaving their guns and ammunition of peace and good will, with book in hand, repairing to public schools to teach the Filipino children the duties of free citizenship."

From that day until this, American school teachers have taught in the Philippines and Filipinos of both high and low degree are aware of it. The want is still great, however, and more teachers are needed, especially vocational, agricultural, health, taxation, administration, and dietary teachers. (I think that there is an urgent need for persuasive teachers in other countries in the Orient, too.)

Although the want for educational help is great it is no greater than the Filipino's capacity for appreciation. This appreciation is a charming thing to find in anyone. In the Philippines it is present in people of all walks of life. I think it is a national characteristic. I will mention an example or two.

I spoke to the students and other Americans at the American school in Manila on Constitution Day. I briefly referred to the Filipinos in the introduction to my talk. Later I gave a mimeographed copy of it to Dr. Gumersindo Garcia, a regent of the University of the Philippines, an outstanding physician and surgeon, and an outstanding Christian gentleman. He wrote to me October 4, 1949. I quote in part: "I wish to take this opportunity of thanking you for your generous spirit of appreciation of us Filipinos. While I may say with humbleness and sincerity that we do not fully deserve that high commendation because we know our own weaknesses and shortcomings, and yet because of your sincerity in saying those nice things of us, we as a people cannot help but be grateful to you and be more inspired to become fully deserving of your high regard of us.

"But if we have become as you have expressed in a magnificent way in the first page of your address, we can also justly

and truly say that we owe it in a large measure to you, our American friends who for almost half a century have labored with us together and worked out a way of life that is basically Christian and democratic in spirit and practice. For this blessing in life that we now enjoy, we are deeply grateful to you, our friends across the sea and to God who has made America the greatest Nation in the world today—not necessarily in wealth and power but in heart. May God bless America and keep her moral and spiritual leadership ever strong and dynamic in a world that is again being rocked by confusion, chaos, hatred, strifes, and rumors of war.

"With my best personal regards to you and to the other Fulbright professors present at that pleasant fellowship after the meeting of the board of regents last Thursday afternoon."

This letter is characteristic of the Filipino rather than unique. It might stand for several dozen other fine letters that I have received. Near the end of my year in the Philippines the professors in the political science department of my university arranged for a farewell dinner at the Aristocrat Restaurant on Dewey's Boulevard. All of us, there were about 12 in our party, met at the restaurant on time. But when we started to arrange ourselves for a photograph before dinner, we found that the youthful professor, Telesforo Ramos, was absent. We waited for more than half an hour. Ramos had been there, but no one knew where he had gone. Finally he came rushing in with a smile on his face and said that dinner would be served in a few minutes.

Later I was told what had happened. Professor Ramos is my good friend; he knows that I like fish best of all and that the apahap is the fish that I like best. So when Professor Ramos found that our restaurant had no apahap, although they had earlier assured him that they had plenty of them, he set out in search for one. He searched until he found one. It was very excellent.

I mention this simple story because it illustrates the great length to which a person in the Philippines will go to please his friend. There is something charming and wonderful about a people that will pay such a tribute to personal relations. Again this one example can stand for a hundred.

I unexpectedly arrived in Legaspi City in the middle of an afternoon. One of my friends there, Mr. Luis Duka, who is supervisor of vocational education, urged me to stay overnight at his home. The next day I learned that he had slept on the porch in order for me to sleep in his bed.

While I was in Sulu a number of the people in various places and at different times told me about an American teacher and friend who had long lived among them. His name is Edward M. Kuder. He is spoken of in Sulu and in parts of Mindanao as though he were another George Washington. I later met this splendid American in Manila and I found that he feels as kindly toward these people as they do toward him.

Mr. Reyes, an engineer in Luzon at Santa Cruz in Laguna, once told me that I was the innocent ambassador. I believe that every American in a foreign land is an ambassador whether he knows it or not. Mr. Kuder is my idea of the informal or innocent ambassador par excellence.

The Filipinos love music, dancing and dances, ceremony, and good food. Giving an address there has much glory attached to it regardless of the talk itself. There is likely to be a printed program. There may be 10 items listed, music by the orchestra, opening remarks by a member of the faculty, a folk dance or a moro dance by the gifted Santanina Tillah, a song by the glee club or by some other group, the introduction of the guest speaker by Mr. Vijendre, the college president, the speech The Individual and Democracy, then discussion is apt to follow and cause the rest of the program to be modified, because there are apt to be many questions and little time left after the questions have been discussed, or there might be another folk dance, closing remarks by Dean Selina L. Sta. Romana, and finally music.

This is not all. There is most certain to be a banquet with excellent food and more talk. One may think that after having spoken twice during the day, and after having listened to questions and the expressions of a variety of viewpoints, and after having stated his own viewpoints in connection with different questions, he would not be able to talk at the banquet. But when he is at the banquet and he feels the joy and enthusiasm of the people there, and he observes their eagerness to participate in some sort of a roundtable discussion, he finds that he has much to say. He could not remain quiet if he tried.

During the days and weeks that follow the talk there is likely to be one or more interesting letters. Jose Ramirez, the principal of the Albay high school and the editor of a magazine for teachers, the Albay Educator, wrote to me following one of my talks. I quote the first two paragraphs of his communication:

"I thank you very much for your letter of December 11 in which you enclosed Hayden's essay on democracy. I have read the essay three times already and I have learned a lot. I fully subscribe to the ideas embodied therein.

"Your address during the provincial meet will come out in the December issue of the Albay Educator. In this connection I wish to inform you that your address has been the talk of the teachers and the people who heard it. I have told them that it will come out in the magazine. This will give those who have had no chance to get a copy of your address an opportunity to read it in full. I hope more men like you will come to Albay. Your address was very instructive and educational."

I think that the letter is the man and the man is the people. I therefore quote another letter. This one from Mindanao. Its author is Mr. Deogracias L. Cajigas, principal of the Misamis Academy in the city of Ozamiz. It was written to Colonel Meader of the American Education Foundation in Manila, under the date of March 15, 1950. I quote: "With joy I wish to inform you that Prof. John T. Salter visited this school yesterday and at 11 a. m. gave an informative and inspiring talk on education and democracy, in which he stressed the responsibility of every individual to a democratic government. He also expressed his strong belief in the possibility of bringing the whole world into a brotherhood for the common cause.

"The teachers and students of this school were impressed by the speech and by the man. Today the speech is going to be discussed in all classes in history and government in this school. The teachers and students of this school like Prof. Salter for his simplicity, sincerity, and humor."

I had a bad head cold while I was at the University of the Philippines. I called at the office of Dr. Josefina Ayuayo in the student infirmary. This doctor gave me the most effective and satisfactory treatment for a cold that I have ever had anywhere. In fact if I had a cold now, and if I had my choice of doctors in the world, I would call on this Filipina doctor. Dr. Ayuayo would never accept one centavo in payment although she greatly helped me. Other Fulbright professors told me that Dr. Ayuayo would never accept payment from them either.

Dr. Rodriguez is a professor of dentistry in the university dental school. He took care of my teeth for 12 months. He would never send a bill; he would never accept a peso.

These two doctors are straws in the wind; they show something of the gratitude of the Filipinos for the presence of the Fulbright professors in the Philippines.

I have written about the students and faculty at the University of the Philippines in a report I gave to the Fulbright Committee secretary, Dr. Jack Bryan, in Manila. I stated there that everyone at the university from President Gonzales and Dr. Francisco Benitez on down and around, both faculty and students, gave me the happy impression that I was welcome, that their best was never too good for me, and that I was doing necessary work. They are people of imagination; they were willing to have me accept speaking engagements beyond the limits of the university campus.

I felt very much at home in the Philippines, and never more so than when I was in the university classroom.

The university is second to none in the Philippines. It is not large, there are fewer than 6,000 students, but its standards are jealously guarded. The students that are there, a handful out of about 20,000,000 people, are invariably proud of their presence in the University of the Philippines. Those that were enrolled in my classes made me feel that they were happy to be there.

These students were interested in my lectures and discussions. They were attentive, invariably eager and responsive. I taught government and politics; we devoted part of our time to the current scene. The students had questions and they had opinions; they were articulate. More than 90 percent of them spoke English well and many speak it better than do many university students in the United States. I enjoyed nearly every hour with them.

One day I asked my American government class what they thought of Americans. I asked the students not to sign their name. They liked the assignment, wrote freely, and in more than nine-tenths of the cases, in fact, in nearly every instance, the student expressed both liking and admiration for the Americans. One said that he felt toward America as a son feels toward his mother. This simple figure expressed the thought of many students.

The next term I repeated the experiment on the first day that the class met. Again I found almost every student enthusistically in favor of the Americans. In order to give you some concrete idea of these student expressions of opinion, I shall quote a representative one exactly as it was written by the student.

"Whenever I come across the word 'American,' I come to think also of the word 'democracy.' For me, the word 'American' has a big sense of meaning. Just to hear this word, my body trembles with joy and excitement. Wherever this word can be heard, four freedoms always go with it. I have a high regard for this people of the world. I began to think of this people consciously as bearers of freedom and democracy when after the end of the Spanish-American War, President McKinley instructed the American Military Governor in the Philippines with such never dying words. Such words are as follows: We are not messengers of a conquering nation but, the bearer of the blessings of liberty. They are the people who was responsible for the growth of democracy in the world, especially in the Philippines; they are the greatest of all humans."

I must bring this communication to a close. My justification for writing at even this length, if I can have any justification, is the belief that I have written about something that I never see in print. One of the great things about being a Fulbright professor in the Orient is to find out that the Oriental is a human being of charm and dignity. The Filipinos seem like Americans living in a tropical land. They are living in an underdeveloped country, just as the United States was an underdeveloped country in the eighteenth century. Many of the people in the Philippines, however, are the most highly and beautifully developed human beings that exist anywhere on the earth's surface.

Even though this is true you may wonder about the other side of the picture, the publicized side. You may ask, for example, about the Huks and peace and order; the problem of economic development; the education of the farmer and the modernization of agricultural processes, materials and equipment; or the need for more education—vocational, health, dietary, and grade school—in a country where half the people cannot read or write; or you may inquire about the unprotected position of labor; and finally the general feeling of insecurity.

I agree that these subjects are important. The Bell report is one approach to them. This valuable report has great possibilities for the improvement of life and conditions in the Philippines. I hope that these possibilities are realized. The Filipinos are making a courageous fight to maintain self-government in their beloved country. They have the most difficult problem: the problem of an agricultural country that has been occupied by a cruel foe, bombed by both friend and foe, largely destroyed and impoverished, and then a few months after peace with the Japanese was achieved, and because of an earlier agreement with the United States, the Filipinos became politically independent. But, of course, they could not be so quickly independent of the ruins all about them. Their late hero, President Manuel Quezon, said that it would be better to be governed like hell by the Filipinos than run like heaven by the Americans. Yet a number of Filipinos have told me that it was most unfortunate for them to become independent right at the time that all the problems of reconstruction confronted them.

Sometimes at the end of a long discussion I have got the impression that the problems of life and government are more than an individual can bear. Just now Filipinos are faced with an uphill fight. The Fulbright professor that works with these people is going to feel doubly rewarded because their appreciation is as great as their need—and their need is great.

"I shall not try to tell that in a letter, but it is a story—the Philippines' story. The Philippine story has never been told. It has not even been hinted at in American newspapers. It is so easy to write an editorial and a news story about a disaster, but how can one write good news so that it is interesting?

For instance how can one celebrate and extoll the Filipinos for their great human qualities, for the richness of their personalities? As gracious human beings they have a charm that is not often found in this world. They love music, ceremonial, and they dance with rare grace, but they fight and die like heroes in war. They have an outflowing generosity that even now months after I have gone from the Philippines, causes me to ponder on how I can do something to repay them for their many kindnesses to me.

I know that all life is not sunshine; I have been in some unpleasant experiences, but I have had some unpleasant experiences in the United States, too. The thing that impresses me most is that the impressions that live with me are happy ones. They are the ones that most need telling, too. Especially in the case of the Philippines for it is far away. The printed word has done little in presenting a rounded picture of the land and the people.

Mine is not a rounded picture either, but there is much in it that is characteristic. I write of the thing that impressed me most—the rare fascination of a brave people earning their daily bread through hard work, and never failing to look up and smile and offer the American more than half of what they have; and if they have nothing, they are likely to get something and give it away.

I think that the Philippines will in the long future, as well as in the present and immediate future, illustrate the Biblical saying that if you cast your bread on the waters it will return sevenfold unto you. I know after my 1 year in the Philippines I would like to return and work with these people again.

Faithfully yours,

J. T. SALTER.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Opposition Not Quite Unanimous," by Lowell Mellett, published in the Washington Star of last Saturday, March 17. In the article Mr. Mellett comments upon the foreign policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSITION NOT QUITE UNANIMOUS—CHAIRMAN GABRIELSON'S ONE DEFINITE FOREIGN POLICY TURNS OUT TO BE MANY MORE THAN ONE

(By Lowell Mellett)

What this country needs today, according to Republican Chairman Guy Gabrielson, is a definite foreign policy and, he says, his party has got it. The chairman doesn't do his party justice. It not only has one definite foreign policy; it has several. The idea seems to be that, if one definite foreign policy is good, several definite foreign policies are better.

Former President Hoover says we should send no divisions to Europe. Former candidates Dewey and Stassen say we should send as many as General Eisenhower requires. Senator SALTONSTALL goes along with that. Senators TAFT, KEM, and WHERRY say we should send no more than six divisions or 20 percent of our total or 10 percent of the European total.

Senator TAFT says the line against communism can be held without the six divisions. Mr. Hoover says it cannot be held even with the six divisions.

Senator DUFF says there should be no political interference with the military judgment. Senator TAFT says the sending of troops without congressional approval would put a dent in the Constitution. Governor Warren says Stalin would be happy to know we wouldn't send any without first debating the matter in Congress.

Senator TAFT finds General Eisenhower's first report hazy and indefinite. Senator SALTONSTALL finds it crystal clear.

Sending four more divisions over would lead to a land war with Russia and the massacre of American boys, Mr. Hoover thinks. Failing to do so (with congressional approval) would be a blow to European morale, in Senator TAFT's opinion.

Senator TAFT says a 3,000,000-man Army is big enough. Should have 100 divisions, says Governor Dewey. That's 3,000,000 men, says Speaker MARTIN.

Name calling has no place in foreign policy debate, says Senator PIKOR. The crimson clique in our Government engineered the Communist victory in China and signed the death warrants of every young man who dies in Korea, says Senator MCCARTHY.

Senator TAFT says President Truman is trying to force us into a war with Russia. He also says Mr. Truman is guilty of abject appeasement of Russia. The self-selected successor to Senator VANDENBERG says on one day that he wishes we could pull out of Korea and on the next day that we should capture Pyongyang.

Senator WHERRY argues we should prepare to pulverize Russia from the air without fighting on the ground. Mr. Hoover likes the idea of a western Gibraltar protected by air and sea power. Utmost folly, says Governor Dewey, to depend solely on air and sea power.

Senator KNOWLAND says Western Europe and maybe even Great Britain would have gone Communist had it not been for our economic aid. Senator KEM condemns the Marshall plan, and Senator TAFT would abolish ECA.

We can never subscribe to a backyard defense of our country and our homes, says Senator SALTONSTALL. We can defend the United States more effectively on Cape Cod than in Europe, says Senator TAFT. Cape Cod is right in Senator SALTONSTALL's personal backyard.

So we find the loyal opposition performing its proper function, furnishing sound, constructive criticism of the administration in office and prepared, if called on, to give the country any one of a number of definite foreign policies. President Truman and the country, should be grateful.

Mike Masaoka, Loyal Japanese-American, Lobbies Without Votes, Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article about my friend, Mike Masaoka, who is lobbying in Washington for the loyal Japanese-Americans. In this day and age when almost everyone picks on lobbyists, it is refreshing to note one at least who is doing an excellent job for his people, without money.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIKE MASAOKA, LOYAL JAPANESE-AMERICAN, LOBBIES WITHOUT VOTES, MONEY

(By Arthur Edson)

WASHINGTON.—It isn't a headline-making congressional hearing. No mink coats. No deep freezes. No dancing girls. But to energetic, 35-year-old Mike Masaoka, the hearing on changes in our immigration and naturalization laws is of topflight importance. He hasn't missed a meeting of a subcommittee of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees and he doesn't intend to.

I thought you might be interested in Mike because he doesn't fit in the picture that usually is painted of lobbyists. Like many another person working here to influence legislation, Mike has no money to throw around—and he doesn't control enough votes to swing a single congressional election.

All Mike has is his own seemingly boundless energy, a cheerful friendliness, and, he quickly points out, "a cause that is just." That may be enough.

Mike's cause may be better understood by looking first at Mike.

The Masaoka family moved from Fresno to Utah. Mike went to school there, was graduated from the University of Utah. Everything was going along nicely until December 7, 1941.

Japanese were put in detention camps. Japanese-Americans, though citizens, were suspected of treachery. Mike was jailed nine times.

He decided the best way Japanese-Americans could prove their loyalty would be to have a fighting force of their own. The Four Hundred and Forty-second Japanese American Regimental Combat Team was the result.

The first volunteer, Mike Masaoka. The second, third, fourth, and fifth volunteers: Mike's brothers.

The combat team had a terrific record. "We helped rescue the Texans," he says proudly, "and I am now a honorary citizen of Texas."

The Four Hundred and Forty-second won medals by the bucketfull.

The cost was high. Its casualties ran higher than 300 percent, counting replacements.

The Masaokas won 30 medals. But one brother was killed, another suffered wounds that left him 100 percent disabled, another was 40 percent disabled.

Mike came home to work for the Japanese-American Citizens League and its 10,000 members.

The league has two objectives that are under consideration at the present hearing. In the order of their importance, these are:

Full naturalization rights for Japanese. No Japanese ever has been allowed to become a citizen, although, of course, his children who are born here are citizens. There are around 76,000 Japanese aliens in the United States and Hawaii.

"This means that my mother, who has been here since 1907 and who had five sons in the Army, can't become a citizen," Mike says. "I don't think that's fair."

The league wants the old Oriental Exclusion Act repealed so that Japanese can immigrate. Even if this is done, only 185 would be allowed to come in each year under the quota system.

"It isn't many," Mike says. "But it's the principle that counts. We think this law, which made the Japanese feel inferior, played a part in bringing on the last war."

Mike thinks he had one real break. He was named Masaru Masaoka, but the members of his Boy Scout troop couldn't pronounce it. So they all put names in a hat, and he drew out the one that would be his.

Mike has had the name legalized, and he feels he nailed the right to it down further when he was wounded during the war.

"I'm part Irish now," he says. "I needed a transfusion, and the blood was supplied by an Irishman."

Defense of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Diplomats and Legislators at Odds on Allied Lineup," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Sunday Star yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIPLOMATS AND LEGISLATORS AT ODDS ON ALLIED LINEUP—STATE DEPARTMENT WOULD LIMIT DEFENDERS TO PACT NATIONS, BRUSHING OFF OUTSIDERS

(By Constantine Brown)

The conflict between the State Department and Congress over how to defend Europe is likely to be intensified in weeks to come. So long as the cold war continues across the Atlantic, diplomatic considerations will prevail over military realities.

This was brought out sharply during the "great debate," when all military witnesses testified that they wanted badly, if political considerations can be overcome—to have the armies of Spain, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey made a part of the common defense against communism.

General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, put the idea picturesquely: "In a barroom brawl you want as many chairs at hand as possible."

In spite of public and private advice to the State Department by Members of Congress to do something to increase the defense potential of Europe, these pleas have brought no results. The State Department has given the most sympathetic consideration to this problem, but our foreign policymakers must take into account the feeling and political conditions of our Atlantic Pact allies.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

The position of the executive and legislative branches of the Government can be summed up as follows:

The State Department is intent on keeping the North Atlantic Pact as it is at present. It wants Congress to appropriate billions of dollars for strengthening that organization and pays little attention to the nations which are not members of the exclusive club. And exclusive it is, indeed.

According to the charter of that organization, the acceptance of new members must be voted unanimously. This means that each of the 12 members has a veto. If Iceland, for instance, with no military strength whatever, does not want Turkey with her 20 divisions as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, its negative vote annuls all the affirmative votes of the other member nations.

Confronted with the testimony of the outstanding military men of the United States, who will have to bear the brunt of the fighting if the cold war becomes a shooting war, the State Department hides behind this provision for unanimity in NATO.

It says to the irate Senators that there is nothing it would like better than to have there Mediterranean nations, with their large organized manpower, on our side. But what can Americans do when Britain and France oppose so sternly the inclusion of Spain and Turkey in the defense setup? What more can the United States do than it has done in the last 3 months for the inclusion of Germany? France has put up a road block against the effective alinement of Western Germany with NATO and it is not customary for our diplomats to use a blackjack on our good allies.

It will take time and infinite patience, our Congressmen are told, to iron out these difficulties which are inherent in the psychological makeup of Europe, where neighbors have been fighting each other for so many centuries. It is a miracle, which shows the persuasive skill of our diplomats, that we have been able to organize even the Western European powers into a bloc. France and Italy, for instance, have been antagonists for many years, but are honeymooning now under our benevolent eye.

But the Senate and House, where more than $7,000,000,000 will have to be voted to organize "solidly" the defense of Western Europe, are not likely to be patient. This was shown strongly recently when the mildly amended Wherry resolution concerning the dispatch of American troops to Europe was approved over the violent protests of the State Department's spokesman in the Senate, Chairman CONNALLY, of the Foreign Relations Committee.

CONGRESS IMPATIENT

The legislators' patience is growing thin. They accept the thesis that America's security will be adversely affected if Western Europe collapses under the blows of the Russian hordes. And for this reason they are willing to put no hurdles in the way of the administration, provided our foreign-policymakers follow a realistic course.

In keeping with what the representatives of the Nation have been told at open and executive sessions, they are convinced that partial defense of Europe cannot be successful. They do not believe that Europe can avoid catastrophe if her defenses are concentrated only in the west.

Moreover, they do not see any indication that the members of the North Atlantic Pact, with the possible exception of Britain, are doing anything positive to increase their defense potential. It is true that there has been a spurt of energy since former President Hoover made his first speech last December and the foreign ambassadors reported that it had been well received by the American people.

Our allies realized then that, unless they activated their military preparations in some tangible way, there was a grave risk of their being cut off from the vast sums the American taxpayer is pouring into their countries. But when assurances came from Washington that, in spite of Mr. Hoover and his henchmen in the Senate and House, the needed appropriations would be rammed through anyway, the enthusiasm to prepare cooled.

Despite all the optimism of our foreign-policy architects in the State Department and other Government agencies about the remarkable changes in western Europe, there is nothing so far to confirm the reports of such changes. Political conditions in France and other continental European countries tend to slow down any quick rearmament move, for the time being at least.

None of these western European governments actually has tapped its manpower for military service. According to factual reports from Paris, the 15 divisions which former Premier Plevin promised to have ready by 1953 will not be ready by then.

LOOPHOLE IN TREATY

Nothing concrete is expected in French armed preparations, except possibly some slow-motion rearmament, before the French elections some time this summer. Short of actual aggression by the U. S. S. R., no French politician will dare put hundreds of thousands of men into uniform until they have seen the results of the election. And when France moves slowly the smaller countries follow her lead.

Under these conditions, and because there is some danger that Moscow may decide to strike sooner than the western European political optimists expect, Congress wishes to marshal for the defense of Europe—and thereby the defense of the United States—some nations which have an organized manpower of more than 1,000,000 men, but which do not have the equipment necessary to make them a truly efficient force.

The legislators admit that the veto power of the members of NATO cannot be changed without scrapping the whole treaty. But there is nothing in that treaty to prevent the United States from extending help to other nonmember nations. There is nothing in the Atlantic Pact to prevent this country from making mutual defense agreements with other nations.

In the past, when we stuck to the idea that this country should not enter into any entangling alliances in peacetime, such mutual-defense pacts were inadmissible. But we broke away from that American tradition when the Senate approved the Atlantic Pact, in which we became full-fledged allies of the 11 Western European countries.

There is no reason, our legislators say, why we should not help and be helped in turn by nations which do not belong to NATO, if such help is necessary to further the security of the free nations. We cannot force the British and French to accept the Spaniards as allies. But neither can our western European friends take offense if we wish to strengthen the walls against a Russian invasion.

The case of Turkey is remarkable. The Turks are receiving some assistance from us under the Truman doctrine.

TURKS SEEK ALLIANCE

According to every official and unofficial American who has visited Turkey, she has not squandered a nickel of the money given her. The Turks have today unquestionably the best army in Europe. They have made repeated requests that they be included in the North Atlantic Pact. This request, mildly supported by our Government, was turned down by the other members.

Recently the Turkish Government has suggested to Washington that a mutual-defense alliance be concluded. This proposal is receiving the usual treatment: Sympathetic consideration.

The situation of Turkey, however, is totally different from that of Spain. Turkey has had for more than a decade a mutual-assistance treaty with the French and British. They want a similar treaty with us, because they believe that in this manner the confidence of their people will be further bolstered.

Since the treaties with Britain and France are in force today, there is no reason why this country should not conclude a similar pact. Yet the State Department is reluctant to do more than give Ankara's plea sympathetic consideration. Our policy makers know that they need not expect any opposition from the Senate, which would welcome such an agreement with pleasure.

This attitude of the State Department is likely to bring a head-on clash with Congress in the near future. Our diplomats are wedded to the idea that we must do nothing to irk our allies. Being perennial optimists they still believe that something might be done to soften the men in the Kremlin, if we avoid doing anything rash. They know that our defense plans in Western Europe, as they stand today, are less irksome to Moscow than if this country entered into definite mutual-defense agreements with countries like Spain and Turkey.

The Senators take a "Missouri approach" to diplomacy. They accept the fact that we are at war with the Communists in one part of the world and almost at war in another section. They believe that only a strong defense, not limited to the atomic bomb but including all the nations which want to preserve their liberties, can be a deterrent to the power-hungry Muscovites. Hence, they say, what is the good of dilly-dallying with diplomatic formulas and approaches which have failed completely in the last 6 years? Let's arm, they say, since this is necessary, but also put our chips in other places where they will bring the best results.

Whether our Western European Allies like it or not, we should provide other nations with the means to fight. A couple of billion dollars spent on the Mediterranean nations conceivably might save us many other billions in cash and tens of thousands of lives in the future.

Reforming RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reforming RFC," from the March 12, 1951, edition of the Tampa Morning Tribune, of Tampa, Fla.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFORMING RFC

Demands for reorganizing or completely liquidating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation naturally follow the Senate subcommittee's probe of the operation of that far-reaching agency of the Federal Government. The disclosures of the exercise of undue influence, of private profit, of political chicanery, brought out in the committee hearings, has provoked Nation-wide criticism.

First definite move comes from Senator KEM, of Missouri, who introduced a joint resolution for "termination of the powers and succession" of the RFC. He termed the agency "this Royal Fruit Cake," and said that a fundamental principle of American constitutional government is that "control of the Federal purse strings should remain firmly in the hands of the elected representatives of the people in Congress."

President Truman last year proposed to transfer the RFC to the Commerce Department, but the Senate vetoed that plan. At the same time Congress allowed a second Presidential plan, to shift the Federal Mortgage Association away from RFC to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to go into effect. A new Presidential reorganization proposal, now awaiting action in Congress, would put the RFC under a single administrator.

The lending authority of RFC was extended to June 30, 1954, with two additional years for liquidation, by a bill approved May 25, 1948. Congress at that time placed a top limit of $1,500,000,000 on outstanding RFC loans and investments at any one time.

Under earlier statutes the RFC would have expired June 30, 1947. On that day, President Truman signed a bill giving the agency a 1-year extension of life, but ordering the rapid liquidation of its outstanding loans and security holdings and limiting new business to a total of two billion. The legislation provided also that no new loans could be made to foreign governments, to States, or on real estate.

What was the origin of RFC? It was originally established by Congress in 1932 to meet financial emergencies of that period.

President Hoover was mainly responsible for the birth of the agency. He intended it to function to shore up banks, railroads, other institutions which needed new capital to weather the economic collapse of 1929-33. Even advances to States for relief purposes were made as loans. In 1933 an article in the Washington Post said: "Through pouring funds into the economic organization at any legal available point, it has become a positive inflationary force."

The RFC claims that during the course of its operations 90 percent of its loans have been to small business, loans of less than $100,000, and about 51 percent to companies wanting to borrow less than $25,000. Yet, in the last 6 months of 1950, of the total of $140,967,000 lent to business, only $40,011,000 was in amounts of $100,000 or less.

The record of RFC has been spotted with questionable loans and political manipulations. In reviewing recent transactions a few days ago we contended that Congress ought to abolish it. The more we hear of it the more convinced we become on that point.

Unification of Eire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very fine and appropriate article which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Friday, March 16, 1951, by Mr. William James Conlon, of Lynn, Mass.:

LYNN MAN WRITES ON UNIFICATION OF EIRE

(With St. Patrick's Day on Saturday, William James Conlon, of 23 Broad Street, wrote the following letter to the editor of the Telegram-News, which he deemed appropriate to the season. The letter tells of the struggle of Ireland for its unification. Three bills have been filed before the Congress of the United States by sponsors, Congressmen FOGARTY, of Rhode Island; LANE, of Massachusetts, and House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Boston.)

End of the World War. France repaid for her aid to the struggling colonies. America's contributions to the Allied cause. What will be England's response? Self-determination by all nations, great and small. The only means by which permanent peace can be secured. Ireland's claims to nationhood and to the gratitude of America.

Now that the terrible struggle in Europe has drawn to a close, and America has triumphantly vindicated the justice of the cause which impelled her to war on German autocracy, it is pertinent to recall the situation at present existing in Ireland. Much has been said and properly said since the outbreak of the war, of the debt of gratitude which we owed to France because of the services rendered by that nation in the struggle for American liberty. America has well disproved the assertion that "republics are ungrateful"; the American people have not forgotten the favors that were done for them by the gallant French Nation; and in this, her hour of strength, America has well repaid the debt at the outset of the Revolution. America appealed to Ireland; and not in vain, for Ireland's sons answered the call with the same cheerful readiness that they have responded to all similar appeals in the wars in which America has been engaged, and the words of Lord Chatham in the House of Commons in 1775, that "the Irish are with the Americans to a man," are just as applicable today.

Irishmen and their descendants in every land under the sun rejoice that the light of liberty is to shine once again for the oppressed nations of Europe, and especially that this happy result has been achieved through America's participation in the war. But what of Ireland itself, one of the small nations of Europe? She contributed more fighting men to the American Revolution than even the gallant French, and America owes more to Ireland for the success of that revolution than to any other European country, for in the day when it was most dangerous and dangerous to speak of American independence the Irish immigrants and their

sons were planting the seeds of liberty on this continent. Ireland has waged the longest and most bitter struggle for human liberty and complete freedom and her people still cry out to their American friends. Will the call be heard in America as the call of the Americans was heard in Ireland 168 years ago? There is every reason to hope that it will; that the great-hearted American people will pay the debt their country owes to Ireland for the part played by her sons in the achievement of their liberties and that the American doctrine of human freedom will be consistently applied to all, including the Ireland of Sorrows, and how may that debt be paid? Our great President has solemnly declared that after this war (namely, World War I) "the small nationalities shall have the right to self-determination," and that this conference shall be settled at the peace conference and Ireland has every reason to expect that her inalienable right to self-determination shall not be excluded from this peace conference. A well-known American jurist, a serious student of this question, thus expresses himself on the present relations between England and Ireland, especially as they apply to the forthcoming peace conference, and the timeliness of his views justifies their citation here.

Surely every American and every lover of liberty and humanity throughout the world is anxious that this should be the last great war and that peace and good will among the various races of mankind shall permanently take the place of the rule of force and of the horrors of war. How can this end be attained until and unless all peoples and all nations are permitted to enjoy the right of self-determination and to select for themselves the form of government under which they are to live. We entered World War I to put an end to autocracy and to bring into existence the rule of democracy. That does not merely mean the end of German autocracy, or British autocracy, or Russian autocracy, but of all autocracy. It does not mean to bring freedom to the Poles alone, but to bring freedom to all oppressed peoples and to all downtrodden nations. And what people deserve such consideration at our hands as do the Irish?

What other land has sent us sons, who have been so numerous and so constant in our behalf, in every hour of our existence, and in every battle for our honor and our flag. Not alone were they in great numbers in our Revolutonary Armies. Not alone did they make certain the success of the Revolution, and since then render decisive aid in every war in which we have engaged, but their services in times of peace in every walk of life, in the development of our great country have been well nigh priceless to us.

And this not alone in the material things, the building of our railroads and bridges, and roads and cities, and the clearing of our forests, but even more, in the development of our ideals and of the spiritual side of our nature—that side which made us enter this gigantic war in order to bring to others that liberty which we value above all other riches. Think of their contribution to our national character; their indomitable perseverance; their indestructible optimism, the charm and vivacity of their manner; even in dark hours of gloom and storm; their inexhaustible humor and their brilliant wit; and above all, their belief in the invisible world around us in every great contest among men. We have shown the world that we are not ungrateful to France, that great country whose service to us we have now many times repaid. Can we afford to let history record that it was only to the strong that we were grateful, and that in our hour of victory and triumph, when the whole world acclaimed our power and our strength we turned a deaf ear to the call of the people whose blood has helped us so greatly to make us what we are today, and refuse to pay Ireland the debt so long owed?

Let it not be so; for in that direction, not alone, lies ingratitude—(basest of vices) but danger for the future of all mankind. While Ireland in her present mutilated and partitioned condition, stands festering like a great cancer in the side of England, there can be no security or peace for England or for Europe.

English statesmen have tried through the centuries, every method suggested by ingenuity or force or craft, to settle this question—except the method of leaving Ireland to the Irish; and the Premier of England was forced to confess recently that the people of Ireland are now as dissatisfied with England and her rule as they were in the days of Cromwell. "It is entirely within the bounds of propriety for America to remind England of the situation as it existed in the spring of 1917 with England with her back to the wall, according to the admissions of her own generals and statesmen found herself beaten and practically at the end of her resources in which crucial moment America entered the war and brought victory and triumph to the allied cause. The former enemies became the cobelligerents of the great World War. The despised and derided colonies became through liberty and opportunity to develop their resources, the saviors in the great hour of fate.

Had Washington failed, who can say that America today would have been much more powerful than Canada or Australia, and under such conditions that would have been the fate of the Allies?

Justice demands that Ireland should have the same right accorded to her as that which is to be given to the other small nations of Europe. Experience, dearly bought by England, suggests the wisdom of turning an age-long enemy into a friendly neighbor. Gratitude and consistency call on America to help Ireland to liberty now that we have it in our power to do so.

The history of mankind and the cry of humanity which calls out for permanent peace to end all wars, both urge that only by self-determination can tyranny and war be banished from the face of the earth. A thousand selfish interests probably will cry out in England, now that her hour of peril has passed, to make no concessions to America on this question. But that extraordinary genius which has watched over England's destinies for the last three centuries and which has made her outlive trials and survive storms that seemed certain to engulf her may raise up among her sons, one who will remind her that it would be well to listen to that great country, but for which she would have gone to inevitable destruction, and to do now in her hour of triumph that act of justice which she has so long deferred.

And that act may result in building up another great and prosperous country near her shores, whose commerce would be with all mankind instead of with her alone, but the portion of state commerce which she would secure would be greater than the whole of that which she now monopolizes. It may result in bringing into existence a government in Ireland which would mean the creation of a hundred ties that would make for friendliness and neighborly kindness and of contributions to mankind in the benefits of which England would necessarily share, that would outweigh many times any losses she would sustain. It may indeed result in loosening her control of the seas, but it would remove the enmity and hostility of England's governing classes that have gone wherever the Irish or their descendants are to be found on earth—and where is it they are not to be found? And such an act will do more to remove the differences that have existed between America and England than all the other things that she can do in that it will satisfy the vast body of Americans of the sincerity of England in talking of self-determination of small nations.

Possibly England may be told by her zealous friends here that America has been won so completely from her old ideas that to all intents and purposes the separation of the two countries is a thing of the past.

But let her make no such a mistake. Never underneath the surface was the spirit of American nationality so vibrant and so strong; never was there so much pride in what our country has been able to do and is determined to do for the cause of liberty and mankind. Never so certain the reaction which will come against any failure, unselfishly to keep promises and professions, made in the hour of danger and distress. America has awakened for the first time to a realization of her wonderful strength. Not merely in resources, but in the moral leadership of the progressiveness of the world which will remain with her so long, and only so long as she is faithful to the eternal truths in that immortal document—in the common language it is well to remember of America and England—the Declaration of Independence, which startled the tyrants of mankind and started the procession of peoples toward liberty which should not and will not end until all governments on earth derive their powers from the consent of those whom they govern.

In that path lie safety and security for mankind, peace and good will among men and freedom from war with its attendant horrors, an end to the colossal armaments and preparations for war which bring in their train the overtaxation which breeds anarchy and hatred of all authority.

The United Nations and the rule of justice of which idealists all over the world are dreaming, and the permanent peace which will secure to England, as to all the rest of the world the exemption which she needs from another test of her strength in arms. May her statesmen have the courage to rise to the occasion and by their devotion to justice and the fulfillment of their pledges, help our great President at this peace conference to heal this cancerous ulcer in the side of England because a just peace will be a blessing to all mankind.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM JAMES CONLON.

LYNN, MASS.

Morano a Peace Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post of March 17, 1951:

MORANO A PEACE OFFICER

When any delegation goes to Washington in the future to try to put pressure on Congressman MORANO, of our district, they'd better think twice, especially if that delegation should represent an outfit already branded by the House Un-American Activities Committee and the State Department as subversive, or a Communist-front.

A so-called peace crusade was put on in Washington and a group of these people who seem to have nothing else to do but waste their own time and annoy other people, called on Congressman MORANO. The Daily Worker had previously announced

that the delegates were to proceed straight to appointments with their Congressman.

This gang had no appointment with Mr. MORANO. He wouldn't make one because he said, they are not a legitimate group, and Mr. MORANO does not hold conferences with groups which are—not legitimate.

So when they stormed his office, he promptly ordered the demonstrators out, and when they refused to get out, he called the cops. Great. There is absolutely no sense in trying to reason with these people, or to give them the consideration that legitimate delegations deserve. Congressman MORANO is busy, too busy to be wasting the people's time on malcontents who are devoted to Moscow.

The demonstrators belong to that same gang who circulated the alleged peace appeal which insulted the good name of Stockholm. They say they're not Communists, but we'll take the word of the State Department and a committee of Congress in place of their's any day.

The delegates got a brush-off everywhere they went in Washington. The days when people of such minds could strut around the Nation's Capital as if they were getting ready to take it over are gone. Everyone understands the Moscow interpretation of the word "peace" and this crusade, like all their other attempts to cause trouble in this country, flopped.

Mr. MORANO may not be the biggest man in Washington, physically, but he proved to be big enough to handle a gang that was trying to disturb his peace and his work as a Member of Congress. Good for him.

Farm Bureau Chief Punctures Belief Farmers Getting Rich on Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the Greensburg (Ind.) Daily News of March 14, 1951:

FARM BUREAU CHIEF PUNCTURES BELIEF FARMERS GETTING RICH ON FOOD PRICES

(By Hazell E. Schenck)

Food prices are sensitive during inflationary times, just as are the prices of other items that make up our standard of living. Food comes from the farm. So, when food prices increase and everyone must have food, it is natural for consumers to assume that farmers are getting rich. It is understandable why consumers do not know about farming and farm business and reach such misleading conclusions.

Mr. and Mrs. Average Farmer got a terrific jolt when they closed 1950 accounts and began figuring their Federal income-tax reports. Latest Government figures show that Indiana farmers had a total cash gross income of 10 percent less in 1950 than in 1949, but the prices farmers paid for the many, many farm expense items jumped during the year of 1950 an average of 10 percentage points.

Government computations show that the farmer's total income is derived from only about 53 or 54 cents of the consumer's food dollar. The other 47 to 46 cents go to processors, jobbers, wholesalers, handlers, and retailers—persons operating between the farm and the grocery.

NET INCOME

Here is the way the farm business shaped up for Mr. and Mrs. Forrest M. Alexander, who rent farm land near Indianapolis. Alexander, while preparing his income-tax return not long ago, noted with satisfaction that his gross income in 1950 was $19,261—or nearly $6,000 more than the $13,891 taken in during 1949.

But imagine Alexander's depressed feeling when he learned that his net income or profit, after deducting his 1950 farm expenses, amounted to only $3,366 last year, compared to $5,891.23 in 1949—or a 40-percent reduction in net income.

This happened on a general livestock and dairy farm at the very time when the average city consumer was paying higher food prices and blaming the farmer for the rise.

What about those farm expenses? Well, here is how prices of things farmers buy for food production compared for February of 1951 with February of 1950.

A ton of 3-12-12 fertiliser is now 12.4 percent higher in price than a year ago; a bushel of alfalfa seed, 19 percent higher; a new tractor, 7 to 10 percent higher; motor oil for the tractor 12.8 percent higher; dairy feed, 23 percent higher; aluminum roofing for barns, 8 percent higher; livestock fencing, 11 percent higher; and barbed wire, 13 percent higher; and poultry feed, 15 percent higher.

Few city people know that the net income of farmers has been steadily dropping since 1947 when it was eighteen billions. The guess are $16,500,000,000 in 1948, $14,000,000,000 in 1949, and $13,000,000,000 last year.

Meanwhile, Government figures on corporate profits, after taxes, for the Nation showed: $18,500,000,000 in 1947, $20,000,000,000 in 1948, $17,000,000,000 in 1949, and $21,000,000,000 in 1950. And remember that was after taxes, too.

The national average hourly factory wage rates increased from $1.24 in 1947 to $1.46 in 1950, with the December 1950 average reaching $1.54 per hour.

When you compare or contrast income with the average of 1935 to 1939, we find: Agriculture getting two and one-half times as much as last year, labor receiving three and one-half times as much, and corporate profits amounting to more than six times as much.

Farmers have no control over the price of food. Farmers do not set the price on their farm products. But, if consumers think meat prices are unreasonable, they could correct the situation overnight simply by refusing to buy meat and turning, instead, to cheaper and equally nutritious and palatable proteins which are in abundance, such as eggs.

Consumers always have many alternatives when their favorite foods seem too high in price. That is not so with farm supplies. There is no alternative to tractors, tires for farm tools, fertilizer, and seeds and feeding. If these items appear too high in price, his only alternative as a farmer is not to buy them—and thereby reduce food production.

Forest Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following testimony which I delivered before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, Friday, March 9, on the subject of forest conservation:

FOREST CONSERVATION

Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure and privilege to appear before this distinguished committee a number of times in recent years in support of appropriations for forest conservation. That is my purpose again today.

STATE AND PRIVATE FOREST COOPERATION

In the past two Congresses I have cosponsored legislation that strengthened the cooperative Federal-State forestry programs. Iowa does not boast the extensive forested areas that some of the Southern and Western States enjoy, but we do have more than 2,000,000 acres of productive timberland, largely owned by farmers and other small landholders. And we in Iowa have become increasingly aware that proper management, selective tree planting, forestry education, and fire protection are essential in maintaining the productivity of our woodlands.

We now have five farm foresters employed in my State. I have followed their progress closely, and I may report that they are rendering a real service to the small woodland owners. I urge this committee to give full consideration to the splendid work of the farm foresters. By increasing the flow of forest products, they are making a significant contribution to the defense effort.

Because of the national emergency, Mr. Chairman, the protection of our timber resources against destruction by fire is especially important. The Clarke-McNary Act, as amended, contains a $15,000,000 authorization for the Federal-State cooperative fire program in the next fiscal year. In view of the steadily rising costs of fire-fighting equipment and materials, I believe the committee should give serious consideration to appropriating the full amount of the existing authorization. An adequately financed fire-control program will benefit the Nation as a whole; and certainly the State forestry departments are cooperating wholeheartedly in the program. Last year, for example, the State of Iowa spent $12,000 as compared to a Federal contribution of $9,500 in protecting State-owned and private forest lands against fire.

NATIONAL FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Of course, fire control is just as important in our national forests as on State and private lands. Consequently, I strongly recommend an adequate appropriation to protect our national forests; and I want to direct the committee's attention to the fact that forest-fire protection is especially important in time of war because of the very serious threat of sabotage. Every time we save an acre of public timber from destruction by fire we are saving a resource that not only contributes to the defense effort but is a source of income to the Federal Treasury.

NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER USE

In this connection, I should like to point out that the Federal Treasury is already benefiting to the extent of some $60,000,000 annually by the sale of timber from our national forests. And bearing in mind the urgent need for a steady flow of forest products in defense industries, it is my considered judgment that timber sales from our national forests should be maintained at the highest possible level consistent with good forest management.

FOREST-DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

As a matter of fact, lumber experts have informed me that the yearly income to the Federal Treasury from sales of public timber could be increased by $50,000,000 if roads were constructed into national forest areas now inaccessible. The expenditure would do

well to explore the feasibility of providing funds for building such access roads. Money so appropriated would be an investment in America's future, and a profitable investment at that from the standpoint of the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, on other occasions I have come before the committee in support of various forestry programs. This year, in particular, I urge special attention to the budget items for farm forestry, fire control, and access roads. These are vital conservation programs in my opinion, and the wise conservation of our natural resources was never of more urgent importance to the welfare of the Nation.

Thank you for this opportunity of appearing before your committee.

Address of Gov. James F. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of James F. Byrnes, Governor of South Carolina, to the North Carolina Citizens Association at Raleigh, N. C., on March 14, 1951:

The people of the two Carolinas have somewhat the same ancestry and history. Throughout their history they have shown their devotion to the spirit of independence. It was the love of liberty that inspired them to fight at Kings Mountain and Fort Sumter. It is the love of liberty that today inspires their sons to deeds of heroism in Korea.

Their ancestors, the men and women who came to settle the province of Carolina, came not to establish a government. Their real motive was to escape government. Many of them had suffered from the exercise of concentrated power. In that day power was concentrated in a king. Power centered in a bureaucracy can be equally as despotic as power centered in a king.

As those early settlers increased in number, they realized some government was necessary and with great caution they distilled the experiences of mankind and adopted the Constitution with its Bill of Rights.

North Carolina did not ratify the Constitution until it included that Bill of Rights. They wanted to make certain that the liberty they sought in this New World should not be surrendered to any government.

Those early settlers did not teach their children to seek security; they taught them to look for opportunity.

They believed that liberty must be exercised by all individuals; that men cannot safely transfer their liberties to a few individuals to be held in trust for them.

They were right. In this world of ours men must assume responsibility for their own welfare or they will have only such degree of welfare as may be bestowed upon them by those temporarily in power.

Some people may be impatient with these views. They may regard them as old-fashioned. They may argue that conditions have changed. That is true, but human behavior has not changed in its fundamentals.

The failure of a man to stand on his own feet, to assume the responsibilities of a man, and to discharge the duties of a man, will weaken him now just as it did in the scorned horse and buggy days and in the early days of the Republic.

If the age of our Constitution is to be held against the soundness of its fundamental principles, then what about the age of our religion? If time invalidates truth in one field, will it not do so in other fields?

Carolinians—North and South—have believed in the fundamentals of the Christian religion and have believed, too, in the fundamentals of the Constitution of the United States. Of course, there are people in other sections who scornfully refer to the South as the backward South and the Bible Belt. As long as they couple the two, I do not seriously object, for I do not believe, after all, that a people who read the Bible and humbly try to follow in the footsteps of the Master are such a backward people.

It was only a few years ago that a Commission reported to the President of the United States that the South was economic problem No. 1. Some of the writers and politicians who then bemoaned our economic and politic plight, today are seeking legislation in their States to prevent the removal of industries to the Carolinas and other Southern States.

We have reason to be proud of our progress in the Carolinas. Less than a century ago, because we believed in the preservation of the rights and powers of the States under the Constitution, we were at war with other States of the Union. We suffered disastrous defeat.

At the end of 4 years the soldiers of the Confederacy returned to their homes having lost all save honor and spirit. They had no equipment to operate factories or to cultivate farms. They had no labor. The slaves who had previously worked our farms had been freed.

Unlike the Germans, Italians and Japanese, the defeated South received no Marshall aid. The United States Government, however, did send an occupation army, guarding the right of the carpetbagger and the freed slave to administer government. Our cry of cruelty and corruption was regarded by some in the North as the cry of poor losers, and by the other, as a fate we deserved.

But, as in all history, out of adversity there came strength. By our own efforts, we made progress even in the reconstruction period. And, to the glory of Southern women, be it said, we preserved the racial integrity of the white race.

The history of the Carolinas since the period of reconstruction is the story "From Rags to Riches." It is a Cinderella story. It is a true story.

Years ago North Carolina achieved a balanced economy. You are still progressing in industry and in agriculture. In the last 10 years the number of your manufacturing establishments increased approximately 70 percent. It is amazing to learn that last year your farmers received in cash for their crops the sum of $750,000,000.

Now what of the future? No business man can answer that question because the answer is dependent upon what Government will do. What the Government will do necessarily is dependent in great degree upon what the Soviet Government will do. But it does not depend entirely upon that.

In time of war or of great business depression, it is necessary that unusual powers be granted to the Federal Government. When there is an end to war or depression, if we are to have the form of government under which we have lived and prospered for a century and a half, those powers must be returned to the States and the people.

Experience has proved that is difficult to accomplish. Human beings love power. Seldom will they voluntarily relinquish it. A man can get drunk on alcohol and recover without suffering more than remorse and a headache but the man who gets drunk on power never recovers.

Now because of war in the Pacific and the threat of war, we are conferring extraordinary powers upon the National Government. We must do so. But every such grant should have a specified date for its termination. If at that time the necessity exists for its continuance, the Representatives of the people in the Congress can be relied upon to extend such powers.

If, however, there is no specified date of termination, I care not what political party is in power, legislation, returning such powers to the States is apt to be vetoed and would require a two-thirds vote for enactment.

I heartily favor the administration's program to increase our military power in the air and on land and sea.

In October 1945, at the very first meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, I learned to my great disappointment, that the Soviets seemed more interested in expansion of their territory and power than in peace on earth.

When I moved to adjourn that meeting in London without accomplishing anything, I stated that no agreement was better than a bad agreement. I realized how my statement would disillusion the peace-loving people of the United States. I realized, too, that demobilization by the point system had already taken from our Army the men of experience so essential to a mechanized army.

From that day to this, I have urged an increase in our appropriations for military purposes and a decrease in our nonmilitary expenditures. However, others equally patriotic, but grossly mistaken, believed in spending more money for nonmilitary purposes and little money for the defense of the Nation. It took Korea to waken us to a true realization of our defenseless position.

As we read the casualty lists, we know we are not engaged in a police action in Korea. We are engaged in a war. We know, too, that we are threatened with war in Europe. We must not refuse to confer with the Soviet Republic with a view to avoiding a world war, but as we confer, we must always remember that peace depends not upon what is written in an agreement but upon what is in the minds and hearts of men. The Soviets will live up to an agreement only so long as it is to their advantage to do so. And it will be to their advantage only so long as the United States is strong militarily and economically.

From my experience with the Soviet representatives at many international conferences, I know they respect only force. Therefore, we must be strong in the air and on land and sea. Our rearmament will not provoke a war but our failure to rearm might well do so.

It is my conviction that the only reason the Soviets have not started a war in Europe is because of our supply of atomic weapons.

On one of my trips to Russia I saw the damage done by German artillery and air power to Russian cities. I saw the effect that destruction had upon the minds of Soviet leaders. They realize the much greater destruction that would be wrought by our atomic weapons. They realize, too, that if we have in Western Europe an army sufficiently strong to hold their foot soldiers in check for a time, we will have available the air bases from which to fly planes that would destroy, not only their supply bases, but their production facilities.

Of course, the Soviets might likewise destroy some of our communities where are located plants producing weapons of war. Fortunately, however, our production is being decentralized. And with the protection afforded us by our air power and our Navy, it will be a long time before the Soviets, with the air bases they presently have, could do any great damage to American production.

It is the productive power of the United States upon which the free nations of the

world rely for defense of their liberties. It is our productive power, as well as our atomic power, that will cause the Kremlin to hesitate to start a war in Europe. That is why we must remain economically strong.

We must not allow misguided or selfish people in our midst to do what Stalin cannot do—destroy our productive power. And the people of America must support those officials who are willing to tell the representatives of business and of labor that they cannot use this war situation to promote their selfish interests.

The Congress has freely granted the appropriations recommended in the President's budget for military purposes. I hope that with equal enthusiasm they will reduce the amount requested for nonmilitary programs.

In his budget message the President recommended the enactment of legislation embarking upon new activities such as socialized medicine, the Brannan plan, Federal aid for education, and the civil-rights program, including the FEPC. I hope the Congress will just forget these recommendations.

These proposals will divide the people of the country at a time when unity is essential. Some of them would involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. Others threaten local self-government and threaten also the liberties of the individual.

The people of America are willing to sacrifice even life itself to defend our liberties against communistic governments. But while making such sacrifices they do not want to have their government start on the road toward socialism.

I hope, too, that the Congress will forget the administration's point 4, the objective of which is to elevate the standard of living of all the peoples of the world. It is appealing to think of helping all mankind. Our people will always respond to an appeal for help to any pepole in an emergency. But common sense tells us there is a limit to what we can do.

The taxpayers of this Nation cannot adequately provide for the defense of this country, furnish military equipment to all governments that will resist the aggression of the Soviets; discharge our obligations to our veterans, the poor and the aged, and at the same time elevate the standard of living of the peoples of all the rest of the world.

The freedom-loving people of the world must remember that we fight and sacrifice to preserve their freedom as well as ours. They must remember, and we must remember, that if we fall or stumble there is no other government to which we can turn for financial help. There is no Marshal aid for us.

We will be like Coleridge's Ancient Mariner,

"Alone, alone, all, all alone,
Alone on a wide, wide sea!
And never a saint took pity
On my soul in agony."

Our people must remember, too, that government has no money except that which comes from the pockets of the people or is borrowed, if borrowed it must be repaid either by our taxpayers or by their children, who then would be made to suffer for the folly of their fathers.

There is a vast difference between local governments borrowing to invest in schools or other improvements of permanent character and the National Government borrowing to improve the standards of living of the people of the world.

The United States Government now owes approximately $260,000,000,000. During the fiscal year beginning next July first, if we do not have full scale war, our debt will increase an additional $13,000,000,000, unless additional taxes are levied. If we have full scale war, of course, the increase will be greater.

The market price of our bonds has been preserved by the Federal Reserve Board through its control of the issuance of currency. That is inflationary. It presents a terrible problem because if the price of our bonds ever should begin to drop, the holders will start to sell and accelerate depreciation.

Facing this situation, the people who urge that we embark upon new activities costing billions of dollars should be willing to withhold their demands until we have first made secure their liberties.

Because of the Korean War and the defense program, it is essential that the Government enforce wartime controls. Last July when it became apparent that we were engaged in a war in Korea, a ceiling should have been placed on prices and wages. It was not done. Now it is a difficult task.

It was not done at the beginning of World War II. When I became Director of Economic Stabilization, 11 months after we entered the war, I had the same difficult task that today confronts Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston. Businessmen and farmers demanded increased prices. Labor demanded increased wages. Each group claimed their demands were necessary because of the increases received by the others. At my request, President Roosevelt signed the order known as the hold-the-line order.

Of course, every group complained. They howled—they threatened. All of the leaders came to see me. I had more acquaintances and fewer friends than I ever had in my life. But then, as now, if we were to halt inflation, there was but one course. That was to hold the line.

Today the Government must say what it means and mean what it says. Exceptions cannot be made. Of course, there will be inequities. Inequities are a part of war. One boy is called to fight and die in Korea while another boy may live at home and make money. In time of war, if the Nation is to endure, there must be a spirit of sacrifice instead of a spirit of selfishness.

The people who are called upon to make sacrifices are not made happy by the disclosure of disloyalty of an employee of the Atomic Energy Commission and by the shocking disclosures before the Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Worse than the loss of money is the loss of confidence in the honesty of men who have occupied responsible positions in Government.

There is no excuse for the existence of the organization. Why should your Government lend public funds to manufacture automobiles and fabricated houses to build tourist hotels in Florida?

A man can borrow money from the banks and private investors provided he has character and collateral. If he does not possess them, he should not be loaned your money.

In March 1945 I expressed this view to President Roosevelt. In his administration the RFC had been wisely administered by Jesse Jones. But President Roosevelt realized the danger. He said it had served its purpose and when peace was restored it should be liquidated. He did not live to liquidate it.

Because of the war situation, it may be necessary to make loans to a few manufacturers producing weapons of war. But these can be made by Charles E. Wilson, defense mobilizer, who has the confidence of the people. The Congress should promptly enact legislation to liquidate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I want to make clear that while I disagree with the administration about some domestic policies, I am not criticising its foreign policies. I heartily favor the defense programs. I heartily favor the administration's policy of sending troops to Europe. I think we should accept the judgment of General Eisenhower as to the number of troops we should contribute to the army of freedom. I am willing also to accept his judgment that the governments of Western Europe are showing a willingness to fight for their freedom.

I would make even further overtures to Yugoslavia and to Spain. They have armies on the field, not merely on paper. I would also accept in that army of freedom troops from Western Germany. If Stalin should determine to make war on Western Europe, that great industrial people could not remain neutral even if they wished to do so. Western Germany will be with us or with the Soviets. I want them with us.

Upon the cessation of hostilities we promptly returned the German prisoners of war. Later France and Britain returned theirs. The Soviets failed to return approximately a million German prisoners of war to their homes. Those German soldiers are working as slaves in Russia or have died while working as slaves. They constitute a million reasons why the Germans would prefer to serve in Eisenhower's army of freedom.

We must say to our friends in Western Europe that if American boys are going to risk their lives in defense of Western Europe, we want them to have the help of every soldier who is willing to fight against the Godless Communists of Russia.

I do not believe that a world war is inevitable. On the contrary, if we remain strong, militarily and economically, I believe there will be no war, certainly not for a long time to come.

We must remain strong, not only militarily and economically, but spiritually. "In God we trust" must be engraved in our hearts as well as on our coins. We must pray that the war in Korea shall come to an end. We must pray that we shall never have another world war. But, if notwithstanding our prayers and our efforts, that misfortune should come to the world, the people of the Carolinas will be found sacrificing, fighting and dying for America, the land we love.

Rewards of Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there was brought to my attention the following folder; it clearly brings out the close attention paid by our local officials to the needs of the American public. Alderman Thomas J. Corcoran was elected in 1947 receiving a vote of 2 to 1 over his opponent. Here in 1951 after attention to the duties of his office he has been returned with the same plurality.

Mr. Corcoran represents the finest type of public servant. It is by attracting men of this caliber to public office that the great strides are made in urban development and administration. His record is a standard of performance which is recognized by his community. His devotion to duty is indicative also of good work being done by so many of our local officials. Public notice should be taken in order to encourage them as well as the public.

The above-mentioned follows:

CITY COUNCIL OF THE EIGHTEENTH WARD

Shortly after being elected in 1948, I organized what is known as the City Council of the Eighteenth Ward, a representative group of practically all the improvement associations throughout the eighteenth

ward. We meet at intervals once a month and take up matters most pertinent to the interest of our community. This organization has been most cooperative and has been of fine assistance to me.

The members of the civic council are as follows: Highland Improvement Association, Englefield Improvement Association, Ashburn Civic Association, Auburn Park Improvement Association, Eighty-third and Campbell Improvement Association, Foster Park Council, North Beverly Improvement Association, Park View Civic Association, West Hamilton Park Improvement Association, Wrightwood Improvement Association; also, Highland Businessmen's Association, Gresham Businessmen's Association, Auburn Park Chamber of Commerce.

Listed below are a number of services and improvements that have taken place during my term of office:

TRANSPORTATION

Bus service extension on Eighty-seventh Street, from Western to Hamlin Avenues, to take care of the fast-developing residential district in that area.

SEVENTY-NINTH STREET

After several conferences with members of the Chicago Transit Authority and their staff, I have been promised that by July 1, 1951, the one-man streetcars on Seventy-ninth Street will be replaced by propane motorbusses. The one-man cars have been a hazard and have slowed up and delayed transportation on this busy thoroughfare. It is the tendency of the riders to stay close to the front entrance on the one-man streetcars, which is also the exit. This will be eliminated, as the new motorbusses have an entrance in front and an exit either at the center or the rear of the bus.

STREET LIGHTS

Removal of 56 gas and gasoline lamps, or lights, and have been installed 486 new street lights. This is in the area west of Western Avenue where single-family dwellings are rapidly being constructed by numerous private contractors.

TRAFFIC-CONTROL LIGHTS

To eliminate traffic hazards we have installed traffic-control lights at eight dangerous intersections, viz: Sixty-sixth and Halsted, Seventy-eighth and Halsted, Sixty-fourth and Morgan, Eighty-seventh and Racine, Seventy-sixth and Loomis, Seventy-sixth and Damen, and Seventy-ninth and Damen.

Approval also has been made to install traffic-control lights at Eighty-first Street and South Halsted Street.

SEWERS

The completion of the Wood Street sewer eliminated the flooding condition in a large area west of Ashland Avenue.

The present main sewers in the entire area south of Sixty-third Street and east of Ashland Avenue will be tied into the sanitary sewer now completed in Sangamon Street and Seventy-second Street, and numerous laterals are to be constructed which will also empty into this sanitary sewer. I have been informed by the city sewer department this work is to begin early this year and to be completed within a reasonable time.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH STREET

The construction of a median strip and new lighting system on Eighty-seventh Street from Vincennes Avenue to Damen Avenue is now nearing completion.

FOSTER PARK FIELD HOUSE

Through constant contact with the Chicago Park District construction was started some 6 months back on a field house for Foster Park, which, when completed, will service some 40,000 residents of the area, and will cost $527,945. Work is approximately 50 percent completed.

A small field house and shelter has also been erected in O'Hallaren Park at Eighty-third Street and South Wood Street.

SAFETY GATES

There have been installed within the past few months safety gates at the grade crossings of both the Grand Trunk Railroad and the Wabash Railroad west of Central Park Avenue and east of the Southwest Highway on Eighty-third Place.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

In the newly developed area west of Western Avenue I have been successful in having erected two new-type portable school buildings at Eightieth and South Talman Avenue, which services children from sixth grade down, who prior to that time had to travel a great distance and cross two main arterial streets to attend Clara Barton School at Seventy-seventh Street and South Wolcott Avenue.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Over a period of the past 2 years I have successfully opposed several tentative public-housing projects which were to be located in the eighteenth ward. In my opinion, public housing is an added burden on the taxpayers, because this type of building does not pay real-estate taxes, but the occupants receive all the services rendered by the city government.

I will continue to oppose this type of tax-free housing, not only in the eighteenth ward, but in the entire city.

REFUSE AND GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Refuse and garbage disposal as well as street maintenance has received very close attention from our ward superintendent, and he has assured me of his continued cooperation along these lines.

THOMAS J. CORCORAN.

Trans-Isthmian Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, in the February issue of Marine Progress an article on the Trans-Isthmian Canal appeared which was called to my attention by a former colleague, the Honorable Willis W. Bradley, of California. The subject is one which it is appropriate to keep alive particularly when we have in mind that the carrier recently proposed to be built by the Navy would not be able to traverse the Panama Canal and that larger ships of every category seem to be in prospect in the immediate future.

The article to which I refer reads as follows:

The reorganization of the Panama Canal Zone Government, providing for the separation of certain functions and also the establishment of a new base for computing tolls, has served to drop from the current shipping picture the still present problem of adequacy of the waterway in the light of future defense and economic developments.

It has been estimated that at a time no more distant than 20 years, the present Panama Canal will not be adequate, in its present form, to accommodate the shipping that is expected to use it. There need only be a brief survey of the ships that have been built since the end of the war to realize that the trend, in both tankers and dry-cargo ships is toward larger and deeper vessels, as well as ships with considerably more power and speed than has heretofore graced our merchant marine.

The new supertankers will draw up to 34 feet of water and the new 20-knot cargo ships, on which bids have just been taken, will also be deep draft vessels. These ships while providing transportation for larger amounts of cargo at higher speeds also offer their own navigational problems, particularly in narrow channels. Those that will transit the Panama Canal will have in addition, other hazards inherent in the present canal structure that will make the transiting of these large, powerful vessels a task where the closest attention to navigation must be paid. There is, of course, the dangers that the navigator finds in the relatively narrow channel of the Gaillard Cut, aggravated by the prevalence of lock surges from the Pedro Miguel Locks that sweep back through the Canal until they are dissipated in Gatun Lake. There will also be the hazards of holding these vessels in anchorage or mooring areas in case of fog and with their greater length the number of ships so moored or berthed will be less than at present, all leading to delay, if not confusion.

CONGRESSIONAL STUDIES

During the session of the Eighty-first Congress a House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee subgroup was charged with looking into the adequacy of the present canal, to determine the feasibility of changing its level and its axis to increase its capacity or whether it would be better to construct a canal at some other Isthmian location.

This subcommittee spent some time in the Canal Zone meeting with Canal officials and making a study of the actual operation of the waterway. The subcommittee, after its Canal Zone work was completed and the data evaluated, reported to the chairman of the whole committee who said:

"An evaluation of the information reported by the subcommittee makes it apparent that authorities familiar with the Panama Canal are of the opinion that the existing operation will be unable to accommodate commercial traffic by 1970. At this point it should be borne in mind that the above estimate is for normal peacetime flow. Some of our biggest naval and commercial vessels cannot now transit the Canal. The Canal at this time would be most difficult to defend against a concerted attack of enemy aircraft using the conventional type bombs. A dislocation of the lock system could render the Canal unusable for 2 years."

The committee chairman did not consider the defense of the Canal because this was not his responsibility, but his subcommittee did consider the adequacy of the waterway from a commercial viewpoint, and from its studies Chairman EDWARD J. HART made these remarks in his report, "It is granted that any Canal facility must perform the requirements of peacetime commerce in order to meet its responsibility as an important adjunct to our national defense. Because of this fact, it is the sense of the committee that the Congress, with the assistance of appropriate agencies of the Government, should give thorough consideration to our national need for a transisthmian canal and should take such steps as are prerequisite to that end. The committee further believes that the Congress should appropriate a sufficient sum which would provide for the appointment of some of the best engineering minds of our country to a committee for the purpose of studying this situation."

The question under consideration requires the minds of highly trained specialists in the engineering field if the proper answer is to be given. The committee can only approach the problem with the minds of laymen, and we feel that our duty to the Nation and to posterity necessitates the recommendation

that the study be undertaken by those with greater knowledge, skill, and training than the committee possesses. The committee further desires to impress upon the Congress the extreme value of the Canal to the defense of our country and to remind the Congress at the same time that if steps are to be taken to either build a companion waterway in the Canal Zone or to construct a new waterway in some other spot that it will be a long, tortuous process. We believe this to be one of the most important questions confronting the American people, and hope that speedy action will be taken to formulate a definite program.

With a full appreciation for the effort in formulating a program necessary for such achievement, and the knowledge that legislation authorizing any further study or construction must be followed by a minimum 3 years' work to build new locks at the present site, and a maximum of 10 years to build a sea-level route, it is strongly urged that action be taken on this question without delay.

THE POSSIBLE ROUTES

Aside from the Panama route there are two major locations where a canal could be dug. One is across Nicaragua, utilizing Lake Nicaragua for a considerable portion of the distance, and the other is at Tehuantepec, Mexico, where a break in the range of mountains provides a site for a canal.

The House subcommittee reported that after concluding its studies at the Tehuantepec site and its discussions with Mexican officials it was of the opinion that it would be difficult at this time to get permission to construct the waterway at that location.

The situation in Nicaragua is far different, however. The subcommittee was assured that there is great willingness on the part of the President of Nicaragua to grant the United States whatever is necessary to make the canal possible. The committee members made an extensive exploration of the proposed route by foot, motor, and air. They were told that such a canal would save from 1½ to 2 days on the intercoastal voyage over the Panama route.

The Nicaragua route has been an active idea for some hundreds of years. The diplomatic overtures and negotiations that have transpired since the idea was first broached have been extensive. Capt. Miles DuVal, USN, retired, has covered these thoroughly in his books on the Panama Canal, from Cadiz to Cathay and also the second volume, And the Mountains Will Move. In these works he shows the strong efforts that have been made to bring about a Nicaraguan canal and how the decisions on the ultimate location of the transisthmian waterway wavered between Panama and Nicaragua and finally settled on the present location.

In respect to current opinion on the waterway across the isthmus there is a two-faction camp in existence, inhabited by proponents of a sea-level waterway in the Canal Zone and by the proponents of the terminal lake plan which has received so much attention in recent years. This last plan is the work of Captain DuVal who proposes that a terminal lake be created between the Miraflores Locks and the entrance to Gaillard Cut and the elimination of the bottle-necking Pedro Miguel Locks as part of the plan.

This plan is seen as having distinct marine benefits since it would eliminate a number of conditions affecting the transit of ships that have been set up through the location of the locks at Pedro Miguel.

The studies made by the House Merchant Marine Subcommittee have served to keep alive the question of an adequate waterway from ocean to ocean and the recommendation that a group of experts make a full study of the problem is one that will meet with the approval of the users of the canal. What they will probably look for is adequate representation on any such commission so that the merchant marine requirements of the canal can be discussed with the engineering talent to the end that a practical waterway be built to handle the waterborne commerce which, after all is said and done, will be the major users of the canal.

The Delivered Pricing Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, for half a century it has been the practice of heavy industry in America—cement, steel, building materials, lumber, newsprint—to quote delivered prices to the buyers of their products. When the Federal Trade Commission issued an order forbidding this practice, and the Supreme Court in the well-known Cement case partially sustained the Commission's order, the result was chaos and uncertainty in all lines of American heavy industry. It threatens to dislocate and wreck our economic system.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission has been crusading for many years against these long-established pricing practices, practices in which the producer absorbs the freight. The Commission proposes to substitute f. o. b. plant prices for the delivered prices. Twice the Commission has attempted to persuade Congress to pass legislation to bring about this change, but Congress has refused to do so because the Commission has failed to prove that such a change in pricing practices would be an over-all benefit to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Congress will act promptly to clear away the fog that the Federal Trade Commission edict and the court ruling have thrown around the clear intent of Congress concerning the delivered pricing system. Congress should at least make clear its policy concerning this long-established method of selling.

The following factual and logical discussion of this subject taken from the 1950 annual report of the Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co. is so concise and clear that I include it as a part of my remarks for the enlightenment of my colleagues:

THE QUESTION OF HOW TO PRICE

Current world events have tended to obscure the fact that an important piece of work in the economic field on the home front remains to be done. This job is to require the Federal Trade Commission to administer the laws as written and as clearly intended by Congress.

Under present laws anyone has the right to sell at delivered prices and to meet lower prices of competitors wherever or whenever he considers it good business to do so. But this does not accord with the economic ideas of the Federal Trade Commission; so it has set about to change the laws—not by seeking amendments, but by administrative circumvention. To make matters worse, some courts have given their approval to such conduct, and, as a consequence, the meaning and intent of the basic laws have been lost sight of by the public.

There is no consistency in the rulings of the Federal Trade Commission. In one breath it condemns the lowering of a price to secure business as unfair competition. In another breath it charges that any meeting of competitive prices establishes a conspiracy in restraint of trade. Then it indulges in meaningless press releases to the effect that not every meeting of a competitive price is unlawful, but never specifying when that condition exists.

Under such circumstances it is easy for the average businessman to lose track of the basic laws and his rights thereunder, and to follow, sheeplike, whatever seems to be least frowned upon at the moment by the FTC.

But such procedure often produces harmful effects upon the public. That is precisely what happened when a large segment of the heavy-goods industries adopted f. o. b. plant pricing following the Supreme Court opinion in the Cement case. Statistics on file with the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee show that the f. o. b. plant pricing induced by this attitude has cost the public many millions of dollars.

It should be obvious in view of all this that Congress must clarify existing laws, if for no other reason than to encourage a return to competitive pricing and thus a reduction in the cost of goods to buyers. The right to meet competitive prices has been recently reaffirmed by the Supreme Court, but there is no reason to believe that the Federal Trade Commission will respect this decision any more than it has respected the laws as written. The only way to insure correct administration is to enact new legislation making the intent of Congress so manifest that even the Trade Commission will not dare to circumvent it.

For our own part we continue to price on a delivered basis, believing that the lawfulness of independent, competitive delivered pricing has never been in doubt. By lowering our price to meet a price of a competitor in a particular market, our customer in that market is assured that he has no cost disadvantage to overcome in his competitive efforts. Thus our policies tend to benefit the ultimate consumer.

Harry Goes Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, not very many of our country editors in Iowa are being fooled by the Truman administration's insipid policies at home and abroad.

Illustrative of that is the following bit of poetry written by Charlie Gebhard for his column Nowadaze and printed in last week's issue of the Bremer County Independent, published at Waverly, Iowa.

It is a pleasure to reproduce it herewith:

The atom race is really hot;
The Commies worry us a lot;
We've lost the peace for which we fought;
In foreign intrigue we've been caught;
But Harry just goes fishing!

Inflation's storming through the door,
As billion's down the drain we pour;
Our dollars just can't shrink much more,
While taxes jump and prices soar;
But Harry just goes fishing!

The RFC is in a stew,
As graft disclosures come anew;
A mink coat brought an I O U
And many more the same way too;
But Harry just goes fishing!

The State Department's full of pinks,
Who crossed us up on Mao's Chinks,
While Dean was taking 40 winks;
We need a change there too, methinks;
But Harry just goes fishing!

The cost of beef for us each noon,
Proves that the cow jumped o'er the moon;
Our whole price structure's out of tune;
We need some roll-backs mighty soon;
But Harry just goes fishing!

In Waverly we hope and pray,
We'll get a change election day;
But that's still two full years away;
There's so much to be done today;
But Harry just goes fishing!

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., Sunday, March 18, 1951:

ACCEPTANCE OF UMT WILL INDICATE WE ARE WILLING TO BREAK DOWN OUR SYSTEM—IT WOULD BE MOST RADICAL DEPARTURE FROM OUR WAY OF LIFE SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE REPUBLIC

(By John Griffin)

Nobody knows what the next few years will bring, but apparently the advocates of compulsory military training, or universal military training, as they now call it, don't want to take any chances of universal military training being considered on its own merits, if any. They want to rush it through now, to take effect some years in the future.

And it looks very much as if they are going to succeed. The Armed Services Committees in both House and Senate have approved a bill which ties universal military training up with the draft and other matters, although they insist no actual move be made under universal military training for several years.

Why are they so anxious to rush universal military training through now when it won't become effective for several years? Obviously, they are afraid that under more normal conditions and a substantial peace situation, they wouldn't be able to put it over on an American people who have always loathed the idea.

Universal military training is the most radical departure from our way of life since the start of the Republic. It will disrupt the education of millions of American youths. It will put them under the Army training and the philosophy of the top sergeant during some of the most important years of their lives, years when the formation of character and the basis of a career are most effectively achieved.

WHERE'S RECORD OFFERED

It is a system that was responsible for the emigration to America of some of the best European peoples. A good many ancestors of present Americans came to this country to avoid compulsory service.

Some of the weirdest excuses ever devised have been offered in favor of universal military training. It has been said by some people of important standing that universal military training would be good for American boys because of its educational, moral, and spiritual values in addition to the physical training it would afford.

No person devoted to the American concept and the traditional American way of life would pay any attention to such arguments if he stopped to think for a minute. The idea of turning boys over to the military for such training is abhorrent to the American idea. It always has been.

Some of the organizations that have been consistently plugging the cause of universal military training have apparently forgotten that it is a system used by European monarchies and other governments that were designed to hold the people in subjection in both body and mind.

Some of these organizations might have served the country better if they had devoted their efforts to cleaning up politics. Then the morals of the politicians would be a credit to democracy instead of a public scandal.

PROVED SOUND CITIZENSHIP

For several years, during and after World War II, some leading American figures were insisting upon universal military training for its citizenship values. One of these was Mrs. Roosevelt, whose public statements were in reality an insult to the veterans of World War II. She insisted that the youth of America needed training in civic responsibilities and the requirements of citizenship.

While she was sounding off on that subject, she was also using her influence to see that the notorious Communist, Gerhard Eisler, was admitted to this country. She was also entertaining puerile pinks at the White House.

The youth of America had just demonstrated, at the cost of several hundred thousand lives and millions of wounds, that their idea of citizenship was sounder than hers. Yet she kept right on with the proposal of UMT for citizenship training, and even went so far as to favor similar training for girls.

The worst argument of all for UMT was served up by those who insisted upon pointing to Switzerland and Sweden as examples of countries which, through UMT, had avoided war. The inference was that other nations were afraid to attack them because of their use of the UMT system.

Some people have accepted that argument without stopping to think of the absurdity involved in the suggestion that Germany, for example, was afraid of Switzerland. The facts, as far as Sweden is concerned, are that the Germans could have taken it any time they wanted, but didn't need it so long as they could use it for their own purposes.

The bulk of the iron ore that was necessary for the Hitler war machine came from Sweden, and it was to Germany's advantage to keep Sweden out of the war. It wasn't fear of the Swedish system of universal military training.

ONLY POSSIBLE REASON

A noted educator, President Charles F. Phillips, of Bates College, said the other day that if a universal military training bill is passed, it should have a definite time limit to its existence. His suggestion was 5 or 7 years, after which if the situation has improved, it could be allowed to lapse.

It is a good suggestion, but a better one is to continue the draft for a year or two and see what the situation is then. Perhaps at that time UMT would not be permitted by the people through Congress because of its breakdown of the American way of life.

The only possible excuse for UMT in a democracy is military urgency. All other arguments, the stuff about moral and spiritual and education values, about citizenship responsibilities is the bunk. And there is no military necessity for it now, and there won't be under present conditions.

The manner in which proposals that violently clash with the American way are calmly accepted nowadays makes one wonder whether the system of government and the system of living that we know, aren't being imperiled. The acceptance of UMT will indicate that we are willing to break down our own system.

The Overton Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Americans must not become entirely dependent upon colonies and other countries for their existence. A kind Providence has bestowed upon us bountiful natural wealth, which, under proper stewardship, should assure us a strong place among the great powers of the world for centuries to come. If we fail in the careful handling of these natural resources, this Nation may sink into a second or third place among the peoples of the earth, as have other nations which have risen and later fallen into obscurity. We must, therefore, so handle these resources which a benevolent Providence has placed at our disposal that they may sustain and support the economy of this Nation for many years to come.

It so happens that we now find ourselves in the wake of the most terrible military conflict of history, and we are at this hour grappling with problems which may usher in another world war. With this in mind, we must so handle the assets of our Nation that they will strengthen and renew the institutions that we may be in a proper economic and military posture when the great crisis should come.

One of the critical materials which is giving great concern at the present time is steel. Upon survey, we find that more and more our steel industry is being forced to look further and further for iron ore from which to fashion steel for use in this steel age. Since almost the birth of this Republic our heavy industry has depended upon iron ore from the Mesabi Range of mountains; but now, under the tremendous withdrawal from this area, we find that our supply of high-grade iron ore is being rapidly depleted. Industry is looking southward to South America—Brazil, Colombia, and Venezuela—for rich ore; and this must be brought into the United States from remote areas. The proposal now comes to us that we open up the St. Lawrence River from the Great Lakes to the ocean, at a tremendous public expense, so that rich ore may be brought into this country from Labrador and Newfoundland to our smelting plants in the Pittsburgh area of this country. This proposal

seems to be gaining some favor, in spite of the fact that to accomplish this gigantic development we must industrially invade our neighbor on the north—the Dominion of Canada—and there construct great locks and dams so as to make navigation possible along the St. Lawrence River to the ocean. Such a program will provide water transportation by which this heavy ore may be slowly moved to the mills and factories for processing.

While the Nation is looking abroad for accessible deposits of iron ore for use in our manufacturing we are overlooking great possibilities within our own midst. In east Texas, adjacent to my own congressional district of Louisiana, are located vast quantities of rich iron ore. Already careful surveys have indicated that at least 200,000,000 tons of high-grade brown ore have been located in northeast Texas suitable for manufacturing purposes. This ore has been surveyed and tested and found available and suitable to our use. Our country badly needs this supply of iron ore, and we naturally exclaim in pleasure over the new find in east Texas. Why then is it not being used as a means of supplying our furnaces in the Pittsburgh and the Birmingham areas?

The answer is the same here as it is in the case of the Labrador and Newfoundland areas—transportation. The Texas ore is located miles from water transportation. It is about 15 miles west of Jefferson, Tex., and close to Shreveport, La. There is rail, but no water, transportation to the ore fields.

During the course of the thirties the Army engineers made surveys of this area for navigation purposes. They came up with the recommendation that a canal be built on the west side of the Red River, beginning about 5 miles south of Shreveport and roughly paralleling the Red River to its mouth far below Alexandria, La. This canal would follow Bayou Pierre from Shreveport southeasterly; then Cane River and other available streams until it opens into Red River some 30 miles above its mouth. Such a canal, they stated at that time, could be built for the sum of $42,000,000. It would, I am sure, in these inflation times cost considerably more.

Such a canal, to be called the Overton waterway, will provide canal navigation by means of a system of locks and dams. It will provide a slack water route from the region of the east Texas iron ore to the inland water routes of the Nation. Iron ore produced within a few miles of this canal would be trucked to the turnaround basin south of Shreveport, loaded upon barges, and moved to points throughout the country where needed. The Mississippi River, the Intercoastal Canal, the Tennessee, Cumberland, Ohio, Missouri, and, in fact, all of the mid-continent navigable streams will do their part in moving Texas iron ore to the markets.

Some persons there may be who may label this statement to be a "pipe dream" and nonrealistic. Such a charge should be immediately dismissed as untrue and incorrect. Already at least one large steel mill is operating in this area at the present time and is doing an excellent job. Other mills may soon become available. But real progress in the development of the ore field will occur when the Overton waterway is built. Low-priced water transportation will give the incentive to make this whole area blossom into activity, and the peoples of this country will benefit from the heavy movement of iron ore to the mills and the furnaces.

Of course, we want to utilize foreign ore within limits when it is available and thereby save our own resources for the day of real trouble when we will not be able to bring outside metals in huge quantities into this country for use in mobilizing to fight the enemy. The day may come when our merchant marine will not be able to move South American ore across the long sea lane and to our factories in the steel sections of the United States. Enemy submarines may be on the prowl and the cost in loss of tonnage and manpower may make such an operation prohibitive.

When such conditions arise, we must have readily available ore which can be moved to the steel mills along waterways far removed from the sharp swish of the enemy torpedo and along the sheltered routes which belong exclusively to our own people. Inland water development is certainly a wise and far-sighted policy for our young and vigorous Nation to pursue.

I saw some of the submarine warfare of the last war. I saw ships sunk along the Florida coast by hostile submarines—ships afire, crews jumping into the water to save their lives, and cargoes jettisoned to salvage the ship, if possible. Such scenes are not pleasant. They represent loss and waste—waste of material and of manpower. They represent waste at a time when waste could least be afforded.

A very few of such losses will more than pay the entire cost of the construction of the Overton Canal, and then, for all time, we will have an inland slack-water canal route from the rich iron-ore fields of east Texas to all parts of the Nation. Then will our people rejoice in the further development of our Nation and feel confidence in the knowledge that we are building, not only for development of the domestic front but also for the safety and security of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the construction of the Overton waterway will become a matter for the immediate attention of our Army engineers and the Budget Bureau, and before another great war shall claim our energies and efforts we may have it available for our use and our security.

American Selling Price Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a letter received with reference to H. R. 1535 on which no action has been taken by the Ways and Means Committee. This committee is presently considering a tax revenue raising measure pending the receipt of further reports on H. R. 1535 from interested departments. The letter, dated March 13, 1951, follows:

UNITED STATES RUBBER CO.,
Naugatuck, Conn., March 13, 1951.

Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SADLAK: Both labor and management involved in the manufacture and distribution of rubber footwear devoted much study last year to H. R. 8304 (81st Cong., 2d sess.), the proposed Customs Simplification Act of 1950. It was our feeling the bill proposed in general many constructive and long overdue changes in customs procedure.

We did, however, take vigorous exception to one provision in the measure. That was section 14 which, if it had been enacted, would have jettisoned the American selling price principle as a basis for computing import duties on rubber and canvas footwear. The bill would have substituted a foreign export value as the basis for computing duty. It was our contention that this involved a substantive change in the law and was not for that reason germane to a measure pointed otherwise at streamlining customs procedure.

This bill has now been reintroduced in the Eighty-second Congress, H. R. 1535. It contains the same objectionable provision (sec. 14) eliminating the American selling price principle. This section of the bill provides that the Tariff Commission shall certify to the President a rate of duty for each classification of articles "which the Commission estimates to be reasonably equivalent."

It is our contention that even if the authors of the bill sincerely intended to provide the same level of relief under the proposed revisions, they could not make good. Experts in customs matters support us in this view. The proposed bill does not outline a detailed procedure for converting the tariff protection to the same level under the proposed revision. The Tariff Commission, as far as we can learn, has not agreed on a procedure of any kind to meet the new proposed provisions, much less one that will guarantee our industry the same protection as it now has under the American selling price. We have had no information from Tariff Commission or State Department to persuade us from our opinion that no workable scheme can be devised under the new law to give us this same protection.

If we are to have the same protection as under American selling price, how would the Tariff Commission set up a schedule of tariffs which would take account of the fluctuations in the price of imported goods and the price of like or similar American goods?

When it is realized that there are hundreds of different rubber footwear items, each with its own price level, it becomes clear that there is no workable substitute for the American selling price method which will give the industry the same level of protection.

Some of the letters last year from the State Department indicated a misunderstanding of the American selling price principle and the conditions under which it was enacted into law by Congress about 25 years ago. It was implied that the United States Government, apparently upon the urging of American industry, adopted the American selling price as a "device to conceal the real amount of protection actually enjoyed by this and the other industries concerned."

Congress set the American selling price as a basis for duty valuation because other methods of valuation were not adequate; and one of the inadequacies was the inability of American officials to obtain accurate information on foreign costs. This was particularly true with reference to rubber footwear. In this respect the situation is even worse today.

The American rubber footwear industry's most serious competitor for the domestic market is Czechoslovakia. Can the Tariff Commission or the State Department get trustworthy data on costs of production in Czechoslovakia today? Does any one in our Government have accurate figures on the labor and material costs represented in a pair of rubber gaiters from a Czech factory landed in New York today?

Instead of concealing the facts about the amount of duty, the American selling price makes it easy for a foreign competitor to determine the amount of duty he has to pay in relation to his costs of production.

From whom are the facts as to the real amount of protection concealed? Not from the Czech manufacturer. Under the American selling price he is the only person who knows the actual rate of duty based on his export value or any other value. And under the American selling price usually he can determine what his duty will be even before he begins to manufacture. The only thing that would change his estimate would be a change in the selling price of the American article like or similar to the one he is producing, and the adjustment in any event would be negligible.

The American rubber footwear industry can stand no further cuts. In fact competitive footwear made in low-wage countries abroad is seriously threatening the industry under the existing duties. Labor constitutes approximately 47 percent of the factory cost of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear. This is the labor of American workmen and wages paid in this industry in this country are far higher than those in any other country. The materials used by American manufacturers of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear are, with the exception of natural rubber, American made and here again this industry is at a disadvantage as against the use of materials produced in foreign low-labor-cost countries.

The manufacture of rubber footwear is an essential part of our national economy. It is vital to our national defense. During the last war this industry furnished our Armed Forces with more than 45,000,000 pairs of rubber footwear. In the same facilities, it also made life rafts, fuel cells, raincoats, life vests and other similar war products. Without a going rubber footwear industry our national defense program would be seriously impaired.

Thirteen companies are engaged in the manufacture of rubber and canvas footwear and employ more than 30,000 men and women with sales of approximately $100,000,000.

It is one of the truly American industries—foreign manufacturers having copied its styles and methods. The low-labor rates and cheaper materials costs of foreign manufacturers, particularly Czechoslovakian and Japanese, combined with lower tariffs, would mean the loss of jobs to thousands not alone in this industry but in the factories of its suppliers and in the stores and shops in the communities which serve its workers.

It is clear that the elimination of the American selling price, through H. R. 1535 or any other measure would adversely affect the American rubber footwear industry, its stockholders, and its employees, and eventually the American public who look to this industry to supply it with essential waterproof rubber and rubber-soled canvas shoes.

We earnestly solicit your support for the elimination of this Section 14 from the bill which is now under consideration in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Very truly yours,

T. B. BURNHAM,
Industrial Relations Manager, Naugatuck Footwear Plant.

GEORGE T. FROMHOLZ,
President, Local 45, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, Plastic Workers of America, CIO.

Relief for Our Manpower Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, a suggestion has been made by an outstanding and able member of the Texas Prison Board, Mr. French Robertson, of Abilene, which might give considerable relief to our manpower shortage.

Mr. Robertson states that there are at least 1,500 able-bodied young men in Texas prisons, convicted of minor offenses, who would make good soldiers if a national clemency policy was set up permitting them to join the Army.

As he points out, if there are 1,500 such prisons in Texas, then there must be 30,000 to 40,000 prisoners in the country who are potential soldier material.

In an interview with Elizabeth Carpenter, Washington correspondent for a number of papers in the Southwest, Mr. Robertson elaborates on this idea which he has since carried to top officials at the Pentagon and I understand they are now fully exploring its possibilities.

I call to the attention of Congress this interview with French Robertson which appears in the Abilene Reporter-News of March 9, and ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, March. 9.—Behind Texas prison walls, there are 1,500 able-bodied young men, convicted of minor offenses, who, in the opinion of a member of the Texas Prison Board, would make good soldiers.

Not content with the "no" which he has already received from the Fourth Army Headquarters, French M. Robertson, of Abilene, a member of the board, will take his suggestion to the Pentagon Building and to Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, whose preparedness subcommittee has been seeking answers to the big manpower shortage.

"A world of these boys should never have been sent to prison in the first place," said Robertson, who, as a former Air Force lieutenant colonel in World War II, adds: "I think they could serve their country well and rehabilitate themselves in uniform."

Robertson will point out to officials here if, using rough mathematics, there are 1,500 such possible draftees in Texas prisons, there must be some 30,000 throughout the United States. He will have no difficulty impressing his listeners on Capitol Hill with the significance of 30,000 more men. The past few weeks has kept more than one congressional committee busily seeking new manpower resources which might have been overlooked in the past.

The prison manpower which Robertson believes could be put to use first came to his attention last July when the Korean situation created patriotic fervor among some of the inmates. They swamped him with applications for clemency, saying they would be of much more use to their country on the front line in Korea than locked up in Huntsville.

Robertson and Prison Manager O. B. Ellis looked over the prison population of Texas—which has swelled from 3,600 in 1946 to nearly 7,000 this year—and found that there are some 1,500 young men whom they would consider good material for the Army.

Robertson called on Gov. Allan Shivers who encouraged him to take it up with the Army. But Army officers at Fort Sam Houston informed him that military regulations prevent anyone convicted of a felony from joining the Armed Forces.

Army regulations are, of course, subject to change to meet new emergencies and it is Robertson's thought that the manpower crisis might warrant exploration of prison material by the military.

By careful screening of the men permitted to join the Army, Robertson sees no difficulty in letting convicts take up a gun for Uncle Sam.

"We would set up a screening committee to check the history and record of the prisoner who was released to the Army," Robertson explained. "There would be many applicants, of course, that we would not release."

It is Robertson's belief that the young men whom he considers good soldier material could best fit into the "service end" of the Army—driving trucks, cooking, or doing the day labor in the Ordnance and Quartermaster Corps.

"Most of the 1,500 boys in Texas got into trouble because of their environment," Robertson explained. "They really never had a chance. They'd see Willie Jones taking his girl out on a date with a new suit of clothes and they'd want one. So, they'd forge a check."

Texas laws are much too strict on many offenses, according to Robertson who recalls one case he handled as a young attorney in which a 17-year-old boy was sent to prison for 3 years for forging a check for $5.

"The kid was selling magazines and he needed some money so he forged a check for $5 using the name of someone who had taken out a magazine subscription," Robertson said. "It was a forgery so the court sent him to the pen for 3 years."

It is this type of offender which Robertson believes could safely be rehabilitated into the Army and finally become a decent, useful citizen in civilian life.

"Being in the Army would restore self-confidence and self-respect," Robertson says, "the two big factors in setting a man back on the right path."

1951 Budget Made Understandable for Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New Brunswick (N. J.) Sunday Times of February 18, 1951, there appeared an article reporting on a brief analysis by Dr. Audley H. F. Stephan, chairman of the department of economics of Rutgers University, of the President's Federal Budget. The article is entitled "1951 Budget of Billions of Dollars Made Understandable for Public." I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Stephan's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-ONE BUDGET OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS MADE UNDERSTANDABLE FOR PUBLIC

The President's demand for a new Federal budget of $71,600,000,000 to keep the United States in business in 1951 probably gives most citizens no more than a baffling headache. Even his request to Congress for $16,500,000,000 in new 1951 taxes probably staggers more than it penetrates the minds of most people.

For billion-dollar amounts are totally beyond the comprehension of most ordinary citizens.

This $71,600,000,000 is to be spent on a business which belongs to each and every citizen in the United States, and they are going to be asked to pay the $16,500,000,000 in anticipated new taxes, reminds Dr. Audley H. F. Stephan, budget expert at Rutgers University. He believes, therefore, that average citizens should be offered the opportunity to understand their Federal budget.

MADE UNDERSTANDABLE

Dr. Stephan, who is chairman of the finance and economics department of Rutgers University College and former New Jersey budget commissioner, has translated this staggering Federal budget into layman's language as a service to his fellow citizens.

Here is his popularized presentation of the national budget, the only changes being the removal of a few ciphers to make the sums more understandable and a more simply worded explanation of the reasons for the expenditures. Characters of this dialogue are the bank loan officer, representing Congress as the representatives of the American public, and the bank customer, representing the President as the Nation's chief executive officer.

A bank customer, already owing the bank $25,700 (the national debt) on prior borrowings, goes in to the bank's loan officer and asks to borrow $1,650 (requested 1951 additional taxes). The following conversation ensues:

Loan officer: "What is the amount of your present income?"

Customer: "I was granted a substantial increase in pay 3 months ago, so my take-home pay is now $5,510 a year (anticipated receipts or earnings of United States in 1951 Federal budget)."

Loan officer: "Fine, how much of your salary do you think you can save this year?"

WON'T SAVE THIS YEAR

Customer: "Oh, I won't save any this year. You see my necessary living expenses this year will amount to $7,160 (Federal budget estimate of total operating costs of United States in 1951)."

Loan officer (amazed and gasping for breath): "Do you mean that already owing the bank about five times your new salary, you still want to spend more than you earn?"

Customer: "Oh, yes. But I'll gladly tell you what I must spend."

"First, you see I have been named defendant in a law suit which I must fight or lose everything, and the court costs and lawyers' fees will cost me $4,142. Then, since this is not my first law case, I am still paying $491 a year on past cases.

"Next, I have some neighbors who have been rather hard hit in the past to make ends meet, and they find it difficult to reduce their standard of living. So I must help them to get along and this will cost me $746 during the year.

"While I hate to mention it, the interest alone on my present debt, without any reduction of the principal, will cost me $590 this year.

"Fourth, I have a number of poor relations and old folks that I'd like to help, and so must give them $263 because they don't earn enough themselves."

RELATIONS AND FARMERS

"Also, some of my relatives are farmers and I don't think the prices they receive for their potatoes and other crops are fair. So, I'm going to give them $143 additional.

"Then, I have some ideas on brand new contraptions that, if they succeed, will be helpful to everybody and they will cost me $250 to develop.

"Upkeep of my car will amount to $160 and other living expenses, including hiring a bookkeeper to keep my accounts straight, will be $142.

"Oh, yes, I forgot I have some friends I'd like to set up in business and some others that need some financial help to keep out of the red, which will cost me $152.

"Finally, some of my children are still in school and I give them $4 a month allowance which costs me $48, and some of my working children get out of work at times and I give them $22.

"That's my story. Do I get a loan?"

The answer to the question is to be decided by the Congress in passing the appropriation bill or bills. Should Congress decide not to permit the Federal Government to go further into debt, it will be necessary to raise taxes. The taxing side of the budget might be presented in the form of an employee (the President) going in to his employer (the people of the United States represented by the Congress) and asking for a raise in his pay (sufficient to meet his added expenses).

In this case the employee's situation is that prior to World War I he made less than $100 a year (total taxes collected by the Federal Government prior to the First World War). During World War I his pay was raised to $330 a year, and following that war during the 1920's his pay went to $440 a year. The depression of the 1930's reduced his pay somewhat to $400 a year. The Second World War provided the spurt which raised his take-home pay to $2,850 a year. During the first four postwar years another increase raised his pay to $3,940 a year. Late in 1950 his employer increased his pay by 40 percent to $5,510 and now if his pay is to meet his expense he must be given a further 42-percent raise to $7,160, or in other words a total of 82 percent in take-home pay in less than a year.

The alternatives facing Congress is whether as loan officer it will grant an additional loan, or as an employer, can it give another raise. The Congress might solve its problem partly by a loan and partly by a raise in pay, but the pay-as-you-go policy will permit of no loan at all. If the raise in pay is too great, somewhere the proposed expense must be reduced.

Dr. Stephan concludes, "The little story above is not fiction. If each figure used is multiplied by 10,000,000 the result will be the federal fiscal policy for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, as set forth in the Federal budget.

It Is About Time Millions of Americans Wake Up to Communist Actions and Objectives in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, during the postwar years when the Communists in China were seeking to undermine and discredit its government and seize control themselves, they were portrayed by the leftists, and most liberals in our country as spontaneous democratic uprising which was endeavoring to give China true freedom, and its people wider civil rights and genuine self-government.

At the same time Chiang Kai-shek and the legitimate government were denounced as Fascist aggressors, even butchers, because they apprehended some professors, students, and a few labor leaders who it has since been demonstrated were in almost every case Communist traitors seeking to overthrow the government by violence and make China a colony of the Soviet Union.

Events have proved that Chiang's error was in not being strict enough rather than in being too harsh against enemies of the state. Now the latter are in control. Their record of ruthless oppression and cruel tyranny makes any recent previous regime in China seem mild by comparison.

The American Federation of Labor is to be commended for its forthright reporting of the facts about what was to be such a benevolent Utopia in China. One can hardly blame many Chinese for being taken in by the glowing promises of the Reds. But there never was any excuse for Americans to be fooled—especially so-called intellectuals. It is a sad commentary on where the greater realism resides in America to note that many labor leaders were among the first and most courageous exposers of the Communist lies, while thousands of professors, ministers, scientists, artists, and—least excusably of all—columnists, commentators, and editors were vigorously promoting the Communist line, in most cases not knowing what they were doing.

The record needs to be compiled, because the reeducation of many is still far from finished. Under leave to extend my remarks I include two articles from the American Federationist for February 1951—one by Richard Deverall, A. F. of L. representative in Asia, and the other by Victor Riesel, well-known columnist specializing in labor matters.

THE MOSCOW-PEIPING PLOT AGAINST ASIA'S FREEDOM

(By Richard Deverall, A. F. of L. representative in Asia)

Many of us remember well the raving pages of Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf, with its blueprint for the conquest of the West. Some of us found in Mein Kampf a clear warning of Nazi intentions. Others regarded it as the work of a madman, a wild dog, a screwball. But, as we know today, Mein Kampf was a document that clearly outlined the tactics and strategy of the Nazis.

So, too, today many who have read the Collected Works of V. I. Lenin and such books as Joseph Stalin's Problems of Leninism have been plainly forewarned by the Soviet slave-masters that their objective is world domination and nothing less, that they plan to achieve conquest of the world by first conquering Asia and then using the men and raw materials of Asia to destroy the remaining portions of the free world.

Thus in one of the last articles penned by Lenin, found on page 654 of volume II of his Selected Works (Moscow, 1947), we read:

"In the last analysis, the upshot of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, and so forth, account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And it is precisely this majority that, during the past few years, has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of socialism (Stalinism) is fully and absolutely assured."

There is no secret in all this. It is not Anglo-American or anti-Soviet propaganda.

Following Lenin, Stalin has himself written on countless occasions of the intentions of the Soviet geopoliticians to conquer China first, then through China conquer Asia and, with control of the land mass of Eurasia, complete the conquest of the entire world. This follows the classic formulation of Lenin:

"The road to Paris is through Peiping."

Some persons profess to see in the Communist drive a glorious and epic crusade to free the world from imperialism and colonialism. They view the literacy, electric power, and collective-farming schemes of Communist Russia as achievements of the Soviet regime. Such persons overlook the tens of millions of Soviet citizens who languish in slave-labor camps because they dare to assert their God-given humanity and their human rights. Such naive persons overlook a Yugoslavia which, if it is Communist, is not under the heel of Stalin and which therefore, in Stalin's view, must be destroyed by a Communist Russia whose concept of democracy is utter surrender to the will of the Kremlin.

The Communist geopoliticians at Yalta in 1945 wrung from President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill amazing concessions which made straight the path for the advance of Soviet imperialism in Asia. Yalta guaranteed Russian control of Manchuria, guaranteed the encirclement of a disarmed and defeated Japan by Soviet military and naval power, and guaranteed the fall of democratic Korea under the weight of Soviet pressure.

When the war ended, the honest attempt made by the West to find the road to world peace was terminated, as ever, by the Soviet butchers. They created the Cominform, pushed guerrilla activities through stooge Asian Communist parties, and most cynically used Japanese arms and the vacuum created by Japan's defeat to launch full-scale guerrilla warfare in China, in Indochina, and other Asian areas.

It must never be forgotten that so-called British imperialism has drastically retreated in Asia. British power has left India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, and other areas. The Dutch have been forced to relinquish political control of rich Indonesia. Throughout Asia the greatest phenomenon of the postwar era is the end of European power in Asia.

And in the Asian countries which have found freedom and national independence, indigenous regimes have struggled with the terrible social and economic problems which resulted from the brutal and wasteful occupations of the Japanese Army. These new regimes have struggled to emancipate their people and to resurrect and refurbish their century-old cultures and century-old civilizations. Yet Moscow has attacked each and every national regime in Asia—except those subservient to Moscow—as bourgeois, antinational, rotten regimes.

In essence the Soviet aim in Asia since the end of the Pacific war has been to wreck the new-found national independence of Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Indochina, Indonesia, Burma, Korea, and the Philippines. Stalin's actions clearly warn that Red China is the Asian base which the Kremlin is using to extend Communist domination across the map of ancient Asia. Where the British and Dutch and French have withdrawn, Moscow and its Asian stooges plan to march in. Nothing less than complete domination of Asia is the objective of the Kremlin and its Chinese Communist colony.

The Stalinist butchers use two tactics in the achievement of their aggressive strategy and warmongering.

One is the exploitation of overseas Chinese minorities in the Philippines, Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma to aid in the financing of Chinese Communist propaganda, penetration, and espionage. Anyone who listens to Radio Peiping broadcasts made daily to the overseas Chinese knows that the Chinese Communists are banking on use of overseas Chinese as a fifth column in free Asia.

The second tactic is use of the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions and its stooge unions to foment civil disorder, violence, sabotage, and juncture with Communist guerrillas in the final all-out push to liquidate the Governments of Indochina, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, Thailand, and the Philippines.

All this is a matter of the Communist record.

Early in September of 1949, Asian and Australasian Communist leaders and WFTU affiliates received invitations to attend a conference to be held in Peiping, capital of Communist China. The invitation requested "complete reports on the situation in your respective countries, progress of your organizations, your problems and the means of solving them, and the assistance you wish to obtain from the WFTU." The WFTU conference met in Peiping on the 13th of November 1949, with some 177 delegates on hand, representing 13 countries, including Communist Russia, Communist China, Communist Mongolia, North Korea, Indochina, India, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, Ceylon, Malaya, Iran, and the Philippines.

The conference was formally opened by Liu Shao-chi, a vice president of the WFTU, trusted adviser to Mao Tse-tung and honorary president of the All-China Federation of Labor. With the geopolitical ambitions of world communism well in mind, Lui told the assembled delegates that over one-half of the world's population lives in the vast territories of Asia and Australasia; these territories have rich resources, industrious working peoples.

As even a blind man can see by reading Liu's speech, this was no conference of bonafide trade-union leaders promoting free trade-unionism but rather a top policy conference of military men, guerrilla tactician and quasi-trade unionists plotting the military destruction of the hemisphere of Asia not yet under Soviet domination. Thus Liu said:

"The path which led the Chinese people [i. e., the Communists—Ed.] to victory is expressed in the following formula:

"1. The working class must unite to form a broad, nation-wide united front.

"2. This nation-wide united front must be led by the Communist Party.

"3. It is necessary to build up through patient struggle a Communist Party equipped with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

"4. It is necessary to set up wherever and whenever possible a People's Liberation Army led by the Communist Party, an army which is powerful and skillful in fighting enemies, as well as strong points for the operations of these armies, and also to coordinate the mass struggles in the enemy-controlled areas with the armed struggle. Morever, armed struggle is the main form of struggle in the national liberation struggle in many colonies and semicolonies."

And in case anyone doubted the intent of Liu, he added:

"This is the main path followed in China by the Chinese people—i. e., the Communists—in winning their victory. This path is the path of Mao Tse-tung. It can also become the main path of the peoples of other colonial and semicolonial countries for winning emancipation where similar conditions prevail."

On November 16 the executive board members of the WFTU were tendered a banquet by Chou En-lai, premier of the Chinese Communist regime. With Chou En-lai were Gen. Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Chinese Soviet Red Army, and other top Chinese Communists and military officials. On November 21, Mao gave a huge banquet honoring the WFTU delegates.

And, as reported by the Indian Communist weekly, Crossroads:

"The delegates repeatedly toasted to the health of Stalin, leader of world working people, and Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Chinese working people."

As the smokescreen of public meetings, huge rallies and banquets proceeded, super-secret military sessions were held by the top leaders with well-known Russian agents. These secret sessions pointed up the essentially military nature of the WFTU's Peiping conference. The Russian Communist warmongers, L. Soloviev and S. Kostovsky, were present at the secret meetings. The participants in the top-level meetings discussed the 1950–51 strategy of world communism, including the planned tactical struggle in Korea to secure that geopolitical bastion for the Kremlin.

The report of Louis Saillant, general secretary of the WFTU, clearly outlined the key role of the WFTU in undermining the freedom and national independence of the Asian nations. Comrade Saillant listed the several Cominform stooge organizations which would work with the WFTU in overthrowing popular governments throughout Asia—the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation, and the International Committee of Intellectuals. Saillant proclaimed the world aims of the Communist imperialist warmongers when he declared:

"We are forming the grand new coalition of peoples fighting for a new world, living in peace, making socialism a living reality and laying the foundations of a new civilization on a world-wide scale."

Following Saillant, Comrade Soloviev of Russia warmly supported the recommendation of Saillant that an oriental bureau of the WFTU be set up in Peiping. He outlined the antinational and espionage role of this agency when he said it would be "responsible for the consolidation of contacts between the countries of Asia and the WFTU for the provision of mutual exchange of information, implementation of the decisions of the leading bodies of the WFTU for rendering assistance to national trade union centers of countries of Asia."

And, as Saillant noted in his closing speech, the WFTU described a three-tiered category of Asian countries:

Tier 1. China, Mongolia, and North Korea.

Tier 2. South Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines.

Tier 3. India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran, and Japan.

Obviously the tier 1 countries are those dominated by the Soviets and presently behind the Kremlin's oriental iron curtain. And if the Peiping conference considered the tier 3 countries as still difficult, the implication is clear that Moscow's plan of aggression in Asia comprehends guerrilla warfare and the overthrow of democratic regimes in the tier 2 countries—South Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines.

Another proof of the tactics and strategy can be found in the speech of Li Li-san. He pointed out that the Chinese Communists had learned that they had to stir up agrarian unrest and promote revolutionary land reform programs, that they had to unite with the bourgeoisie in the urban areas and thus build a united front. Second, Li La-san said, guerrilla struggles, over a period of years would form the base for the people's liberation armies. Third and most fundamental, the Chinese Communist movement has always been under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, which has always accepted the theoretical guidance of of Marxism-Leninism.

Clearly Li Li-san was hammering home the warmongering, death-to-liberty theme expounded at the conference by Comrade Liu.

Significantly, Ban Se-yang of South Korea led off in presenting reports. He noted that since October of 1946 the WFTU forces had led mounting guerrilla warfare against the Republic of Korea (South Korea). He called upon other Asian nations to boycott the United Nations. And after him came Choi Ho-min, of North Korea, who demanded that UN advisers in Korea and American troops in Japan leave at once. Each speaker underlined the activities needed to pave the way for the coming Communist aggression against South Korea.

As Indochina is the next on Stalin's timetable in Asia, it was not surprising to find that Luu Doc Pho reported in turn. Representing the Vietnam trade union movement, he emphasized guerrilla struggles and the war for emancipation. Luu Doc Pho said that such emancipation would be brought to a successful issue only if the working class of every country follows the example of China.

Next came the report of Vas Sunderachamara of Thailand who reported on the progress of the labor movement in that country. After describing the wartime role of the Anti-Japanese Volunteer Corps (the Communist wartime front) and their struggle against Japanese militarism and the Phibul Songgram clique, this Communist then told of the emergence of the Bangkok Federation of Labor and pointed out how the wartime struggle brought unification of Siamese, Chinese and workers of other nationalities. After attacking the government of Thailand, Vas ended thus:

"Long live the new democratic republic of China. Long live Mao Tse-tung. Long live Stalin."

The report of Lu Cheng of Malaya emphasized the role of the Communists in building guerrilla forces under the Japanese occupation. He told how after the war the Communists formed the Pan-Malayan Federation of Labor to launch revolutionary general strikes. Then he told the story of how after June of 1948 the Communists and their trade union allies went underground to mount the present civil war in British Malaya.

Comrade Ali Marjono reported for Indonesia. He told how the Communists formed the SOBSI in November of 1946, attacked Hatta as an "imperialist tool" and described Premier Nehru of India as leader of the "reactionaries" in southeast Asia. This Indonesian Communist let the cat out of the bag when he declared:

"The great victory of the Chinese people and its working class, guided by the Chinese Communist Party and the leader, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, is a victory for our people."

Comrade Aun-Win reported for Burma. This Communist denounced the Thakin Nu government. The Communist-led unions of Burma, he said, would fight for "complete destruction of the fascist system of the Thakin Nu government."

The report from India was unsigned, but it was given in the name of the Communist-led All-India Trade Union Congress. It denounced the "bourgeois Congress government." It denounced Prime Minister Nehru. It denounced both the Hind Mazdoor Sabha and the Indian National Trade Union Congress. It also denounced the American Federation of Labor "who have spent many months (and dollars) in India training up their Indian prototypes." But for Stalin, Mao, and the WFTU it had sweet words. Them it hailed as "saviors" of Gandhi's India.

The program of the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions and its Russian and Chinese Communist backers is crystal clear. The record speaks plainly. There can be no doubt that the criminal Communist aggression against South Korea is but the first move in the conquest of the Tier 2 countries—Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines. And once they are conquered and transformed into Kremlin colonies, then will come India's turn and the turns of Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran, and Japan.

No sane person can talk of "neutrality" in the face of this clear Communist-WFTU blueprint for the conquest of Asia, which has already given evidence of its authenticity through the brutal Communist aggression against Korea.

As the Communist record shows, the Communist Party in every country mentioned is committed to the service of Stalin in the subversion of the now independent and free nations of Asia.

And in Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, the Philippines, India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran and Japan the WFTU-affiliated unions, by their own pronouncement, are traitorous, subversive agencies seeking to used armed guerrilla forces, pledged to serve as espionage agents for their Kremlin-Peiping masters and acting as the running dogs of world Communist imperialism—the highest stage of international Stalinist communism.

In these countries the Communist Party is not a political party but the advance military base of Soviet imperialism and the coordinator of armed terror, arson, bloodshed and unremitting guerrilla warfare. The Communist Party in every country is not a political party but, by its own frank admissions, an armed military group. So, too, the agents of the WFTU and their affiliated members throughout the world are not trade unionists but the running dogs of the Kremlin, the espionage agents for Soviet Russian imperialism, the paid puppet fomentors of bloody revolution, the precursors of totalitarian coups d'état aimed at throwing into the ashcan of history the hard-won freedom and independence of the Asian countries which have struggled, in the face of all difficulties, to extend freedom and raise living standards throughout Asia.

The blueprint for Communist aggression against all Asia outlined at the Peiping conference of November-December, 1949, is proof positive of the vast plot now unfolding throughout Asia. Asia has been warned. Let him who has ears hear.

Asia has indeed been warned. Courageous action today may secure freedom, peace and national independence tomorrow.

But action tomorrow or the day after tomorrow may be too late.

MAO, LIKE STALIN, MURDERS HONEST TRADE-UNIONISTS

(By Victor Riesel)

A nonconformist labor chief in the land where the spirit of Sun Yat-sen has sunk disappears fast. Then comes the bullet. This has happened to 800 since the Soviet took over China. I have their names, where they were killed and why.

On the night of April 30, 1950, the lights went up in the Kumsin theater, largest movie house in West Canton. Leaflets were spread calling for the celebration of a non-Communist May Day. The throwaways were found in every street, even in the mansion of Mayor Yeh Chien-yin.

Communist Kanpo arrested 400 labor men. They were never seen again.

Yo Cheng-chi, a labor man, was killed by the secret police in Tzepo, Shantung, in February 1949; Wu Cho-ting was murdered in Tsinan, Shantung, the same day.

Hwang Ta-chung and 22 of his colleagues, men and women, were assassinated in Shanghai in July 1949. Ching Kwang-shi and 50 of his union people were slain at the Sungsin cotton mill because they stood on their human rights and in August 1949, refused to move factory machinery to go to the Soviet Union. Late in 1950, 400 were shot in Tsingtao on sabotage charges.

Wei Yung-lai, Mao Teh-kang and Shuntao were killed for calling a strike in the Wing-on cotton mill, No. 2 factory. One thousand key unionists were arrested in Shanghai, 600 in Canton, 300 in Chungking, and 200 in Hankow recently. Loh Kwan was wounded in Portuguese Macao by Red agents after escaping from glorious new China.

The August 19, 1949, labor regulations, just made available in this country by the anti-Communist underground, say that during a labor-management dispute:

"* * * employees shall not strike or engage in other activities tending to obstruct production or produce deterioration in labor discipline. Even after an arbitration decision has been made by the Bureau (of Social Affairs) * * * the right of interpretation and revision of these regulations rests with the Military Control Commission."

A let's-be-frank meeting was run by the Chinese military in every factory in every city they hold on the mainland. The workers were told: Tell your grievances.

The workers talked. The secret police took notes.

Those workers talk no more.

Small Business in the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Small Business in the Defense Program by former Senator James M. Mead, now Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, which was broadcast from radio station WBNY, Buffalo, N. Y., on March 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this grave international crisis with our liberties at stake, Americans are united in accepting a few basic ideas: First, that our essential freedoms, spiritual, political, and economic, are in jeopardy; second, that the preservation of these freedoms will demand the utmost use of our national skills and resources; and, third, that personal and group interests must be temporarily passed over wherever such interests are inconsistent with our maximum national effort.

As one who shares this common ground with you, I want to talk to you about the substantial contribution which small and independent business can make to the Nation's industrial mobilization program and about the danger—the avoidable danger—that small business may not be given the fullest opportunity to make this substantial contribution.

My experience in the Senate with the War Investigating and Small Business Committees tells me that our industrial mobilization for military purposes has a strong tendency to rely upon big companies more than upon small companies.

The situation does not spring from anyone's plan to bring about such results. It is the cumulative effect of many detailed decisions born from hurry and haste, and sometimes from the ill-considered self-interest shown by strategically placed large enterprises. It shows itself in a tendency toward greater concentration of economic power, in the accelerated growth of the Nation's largest corporations.

Industrial concentration is often promoted by the scarcities that accompany mobilization. Sellers are likely to serve

their own larger customers first. Vertically integrated concerns are likely to serve themselves and their subsidiaries before serving their independent customers.

Such concentration may likewise be promoted by the Government's emergency procurement because some Government officials turn readily to large enterprises with established reputations, and because such large enterprises are much more familiar with Government specifications and with the procedures for awarding Government contracts.

It is again promoted by the need for secrecy in handling strategic knowledge, since secrecy is easiest to maintain if the knowledge is available only to a few persons in a few large key enterprises.

It is further promoted by the channeling of Government funds for research purposes into a few large research organizations.

It is finally promoted by the channeling of Government loans to a few large producers who can get materials and who have Government contracts.

I should also like it to be clearly understood that I am not criticizing large companies, nor their executives, for putting themselves at the service of the Government during an emergency. Their facilities and their know-how are indispensable. I am saying that because they are important, and because they are well-known, and because the use of them offers obvious advantages to a Government that is necessarily in a hurry and does not want to take unnecessary risks, they tend to be used disproportionately. This disproportionate use ultimately weakens the country during the progress of emergency and creates a concentration which weakens the country's institutions after the emergency is over.

The other side of the picture is that small business tends to be underused. Such small business concerns are likely to be cut off first when goods are scarce. They are least likely to be able to accumulate inventories in anticipation of a shortage or to find alternative sources of supply. They experience unusual difficulty in adapting their operations to the use of substitute materials, since their research facilities are typically limited. Their financial resources are often unequal to the risk of rapidly expanding their capacity, and finally they find it hard to attract new investment capital or to secure adequate credit, either private or governmental. Unable to keep close watch over the development of defense orders and unable to bid on the larger contracts, they are handicapped in obtaining Government business. They find it difficult to obtain subcontracts because they cannot offer reciprocal subcontracts. In selling to the civilian market, they encounter difficulties when goods are scarce and consumer incomes are high. Buyers who are uncertain if they can get replacements are likely to prefer known brands of large concerns to the unknown brands of small concerns. Price controls are likely to eliminate the price differentials which have offset the relative lack of prestige of the small company's products. The drafting of personnel for military service is an inconvenience to the large company, it may be a disaster to the small one.

All of us have a common interest in counteracting these tendencies. Even the large business enterprise which, at first glance, obtains a differential advantage from its size has such a common interest. When small business is not adequately utilized, a large proportion of the country's total productive capacity is prevented from contributing to the country's economic strength. This was true in the last war. In 1943, for example, a survey of unused capacity among small plants was made by the Department of Commerce. It concluded that only 13 percent of the concerns studied were using their existing facilities fully; that half of the companies could increase their output if they obtained men and materials to do so; and that a third of them could increase their output even without additional men and materials.

This underuse of the small establishment was a corollary of an excessive concentration of Government contracts. From June 1940 to September 1944 51 percent of the prime contracts went to 28 corporations and more than 67 percent to 100 corporations. Even subcontracts went mostly to the larger concerns. A study of 252 of the Nation's largest corporations made by the Smaller War-plants Corporation in 1943 showed that these large firms sublet about 34 percent of the value of their prime contracts but that only a quarter of this amount went to subcontractors with less than 500 workers.

When we overload the industrial machine at one end and underload it at the other, the inevitable result is failure to produce as much and as fast as can be produced. That is what happened in World War II. This fact appeared clearly in the unfilled order backlogs that prevailed during the latter part of the recent World War. In March 1944, the unfilled orders of large plants in the metal products industries averaged nearly a year's full production, whereas those of small plants averaged barely more than 5 months full production. While it is true that only the large company and the large plant can produce certain types of heavy military equipment, this pattern of overuse of large business and underuse of small business was not limited to such cases. Relatively simple types of metal products showed the same pattern. For metal pails, small plants had backlogs of between 4 and 5 months and large plants between 9 and 10 months. There were many other similar instances in which either the Government or the civilian market or both went unduly short or waited an unduly long time because orders had been unduly concentrated in the large companies.

The easy way of organizing industrial mobilization so that it depends chiefly upon large enterprises is not at all the efficient way of getting full production. The small companies are an important part of our national capacity. Their output is a vital part of our national strength. An equal opportunity for small business to produce is essential if we are to use all our muscle.

Thus there is harmony rather than conflict between the immediate needs of industrial mobilization and the longer run needs of a free-enterprise economy. Competitive private enterprise is regarded by all of us as one of the fundamental expressions of our freedom and one of the fundamental supports as well. While we may differ among ourselves from time to time about whether a large company has acquired monopoly power that needs to be curbed, I think most of us agree that to keep private competitive enterprise we must preserve small business along with large business. We must avoid a long run trend toward even greater concentration of economic power.

We can mobilize the maximum resources of small business if we want to do it and if we take the necessary steps soon enough. I shall not attempt to offer a complete program for this purpose. I shall merely mention a few of the more obvious means by which it can be accomplished.

We should make, and keep up to date, a study of the idle capacity available in the United States, particularly that in the hands of small business. We should also study the idle manpower that is available, particularly in the smaller communities. In the light of these studies, we should review the distribution of Government procurement, of industrial subcontracts, and of order backlogs for the sake of shifting orders from the overused to the underused facilities and from localities where labor is short to localities where it is more plentiful. We should examine the size of inventories and revise allocations of scarce materials to avoid tying up such materials in congested establishments where their turn-over will be slow. We should avoid withholding such materials from small plants which could use idle facilities and idle labor if the materials were available.

We should set up special machinery for placing Government contracts directly with small enterprises. We should use that machinery also to assure so far as possible that the subcontracts placed by large concerns shall go to small enterprises. The Smaller War Plants Corporation performed such functions fairly well during the last world war.

We should make every effort to simplify Government purchasing specifications so that they correspond as nearly as possible to ordinary commercial specifications for similar goods.

We should encourage plant expansion by small enterprises as well as by large ones. We should take steps to make available to small concerns loans and tax amortization privileges comparable to those that are extended to large companies that undertake strategically desirable plant expansion. Wherever practical we should encourage plant expansion in dispersed small units capable of being built and operated by small companies.

We should make production methods and new techniques available to small companies as fully as possible. We should consider a policy of making research grants to small companies that have appropriate research facilities. We should consider requiring that new technology that has strategic value and has been financed by the Government be made available on reasonable terms without undue restrictions to small concerns that will use it for mobilization purposes.

Steps such as these require exercise of judgment day by day in many varying situations. The first essential is a policy determination that the facilities of small business shall be fully used. But such a policy is not automatic nor self-executing. The second essential, therefore, is a specific assignment to one or more appropriate agencies to see to it that the policy is carried out.

De Seversky Calls Bigger United States Force for Europe a Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith the following brief significant article from the New York Journal-American of Sunday, March 11, by the eminent authority on air power, Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky:

DE SEVERSKY CALLS BIGGER UNITED STATES FORCE FOR EUROPE A TRAP

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, internationally famous airplane designer and aviation authority)

The great military debate in Congress has been steered into a blind alley of confusion. Somehow the false impression has been created that the problem is simply whether or not to send four additional American divisions to Europe.

The average American may be forgiven if he now thinks that this is the heart of the dispute. With two divisions already in Europe, he wonders, why all the quibbling about raising this contingent to six.

Unfortunately, this is a misleading statement of the issue. If it were merely a question of a few more divisions, even the congressional witnesses opposing the scheme, the writer included, would readily go along. There are no overwhelming objections to such a trifling expansion of the American ground quota.

But the real issue is far removed from this. The four divisions are only the beginning of a process that must ultimately suck millions of our young men into a European slaughterhouse, under conditions made to order for the Kremlin.

BASIC STRATEGY

What is at stake in the debate is the nature of basic American strategy. The decision to be made is whether our industrial potentials and limited manpower shall be channeled into old-style ground warfare, in which the enemy enjoys all the advantages—or invested in air strategy, in which we can attain clean-cut supremacy both in numbers and quality.

The arguments advanced in favor of more American troops for Europe have little relation to the real problem. Indeed, they have raised a smoke screen of irrelevancies behind which the strategic core of the issue has been hidden from public view.

BOOSTING MORALE

We are told, for instance, that four more divisions will boost European morale by demonstrating America's will to fight for freedom. But in the light of our sacrifices in Korea, the American declaration of a national emergency, our vastly expanded military budgets, why should our will to oppose aggression be in doubt?

I submit that any European who still doubts it will not be convinced by the arrival of a few more divisions. Stalin has, and for years must continue to have, overwhelming superiority on the ground. To suppose that America would not fight if he slaughtered two divisions, but only if he slaughtered six, makes no sense.

Behind the beguiling talk of "only a few more divisions" is the plan—already adopted by our high command without consulting Congress and the people—which is bound to degenerate into a showdown on the ground against the Soviet and satellite armies. Though billed as "balanced forces," that plan still looks upon air power as an auxiliary to soften the enemy at home and to provide "air artillery" support for our foot soldiers.

The tragic reality is that America is being committed to an outmoded and fallacious strategy, because it is the only kind our military mentors understand. Like the French generals who staked their country on the Maginot line after 1918, our generals are making the commitment in a spirit of patriotic devotion.

We have been assured that 3,500,000 men would be enough unless the world situation deteriorated sharply. Almost at once, however, Gen. J. Lawton Collins took the stand to announce that the figure would have to be expanded within 6 months. That's the tipoff. We are preparing to fight a new war with the methods of the last, although history proves that such "frozen thinking" is fatal. More and more millions will be funneled into the hopeless attempt to match Moscow's teeming manpower on the ground.

GROUND GENERAL

The very make-up of our high command makes such strategy inevitable. Secretary of Defense Marshall is a ground general. On June 21, 1943, he declared: "Your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing, but he will recover unless the knockout blow is delivered by the Army." The fact that Japan, having been knocked from the skies, surrendered with an army of 6,000,000 well-equipped men still intact, apparently made little impression on General Marshall. Only last week in his speech at Columbia University, before the Institute of Arts and Sciences, he said, "The experience of battle * * * points to the continued and decisive role of ground forces."

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, wrote last year that he is "convinced beyond any reasonable doubt" that "we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground." And the Chief of Staff of the Army, naturally, is no less sold on bayonet warfare. All of General Collins' statements revolve around his certainty that "the doughboy is the final answer."

OTHERS GO ALONG

The other two members of the high command, representing the Navy and the Air Force, are in a minority and, in the nature of a military body, bound to go along with the majority concepts. Thus while the dispute rages around irrelevant matters like those four divisions, the life-and-death issue of a correct strategy is shoved out of sight.

I am not accusing our leadership of some mischievous conspiracy. The conspiracy is of another kind—like that of a fond mother who believes that castor oil is a cure-all, and administers it to her child in ever larger doses, thinly disguised with orange juice. Her intentions are the best, but her child will die all the same if his abdominal pains are due to acute appendicitis.

We are being coaxed and threatened and argued into putting more and more of our resources and manhood into surface force, for the kind of war in which we cannot hope to win under modern conditions. Our leaders do not grasp the possibilities of air power geared to take control of the air clear around the globe, by passing the surface strength of the Soviets.

POPULATION FACTOR

The optimistic references to a population of 200 or 300 millions in the western bloc are meaningless. This represents potential troops—but the Soviet Union has huge and superbly equipped armies already in being, supported by tactical aviation as good as ours and much larger in quantity. It is childish to suppose that Moscow will allow us to create West European forces capable of crossing out her dominance of the continent, when it has the power to nip the enterprise in the bud. How an additional four divisions put into the inextricable trap will deter Soviet aggression defies explanation.

After the war, we threw away our gun. Soviet Russia held on to hers. Now we propose to stoop down and pick up the discarded weapon. Why should the Kremlin let us do this—unless we have a powerful deterrent force elsewhere to stop them from putting a bullet through our forehead?

DETERRENT FORCE

That deterrent force can only be American strategic air power, operating directly from our continent—from bases, that is to say, inaccessible to the Kremlin's land might and tactical air force. Only under this protection can European capacity for defense be revived.

But today our strategic air force does not have the magnitude to serve as a real deterrent. Though properly conceived, and armed with atom bombs, it is no more than a token force. It will remain only a token force as long as we persist in dividing our potential three ways for so-called balanced forces—instead of applying the major portion to air power on the common-sense basis that first things must come first. Only when such an American Air Force is in existence will European rearmament be at all possible.

Public Assistance Provisions of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

DEAR ———: No doubt you have been informed of the recent action of the New York State Legislature, which adopted a resolution concerning the application of certain parts of the Social Security Act to the public assistance program in the State of New York. Since copies of the resolution may have been forwarded to you, I think you will be interested in the enclosed comments, which are taken from a statement I issued to the press the day the resolution was adopted in Albany. If you would like to have any additional information on this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

With warm good wishes, I am,

Cordially and sincerely,

OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator.

STATEMENT BY FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, MARCH 9, 1951

The resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature claims that the Federal Security Agency has threatened to withhold funds from New York for aid to dependent children, old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled, unless the State acquiesced in two "arbitrary conditions."

The resolution alleges that one of these conditions "would mandate an inflexible State-wide standard of assistance requiring all persons receiving assistance under a welfare program to receive mechanically the same benefits in total disregard of individualized needs." The second condition, according to the resolution, would require the State "to depart from its long-established civil-service system and compel the adoption of special civil-service standards and procedures for employees dealing with Federal welfare programs or a general revision of our civil-service system."

The 1935 Social Security Act provided for Federal contributions to the States for needy people—under certain conditions. It provided that each State submit a State plan which had to be approved, originally by the Social Security Board and now by the Federal Security Administrator, as meeting the requirements of the Social Security Act. This State plan, the act says, "shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and if administered by them, be mandatory upon them." Furthermore, since 1940, the act requires that all such plans include "methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis."

These are not arbitrary conditions dreamed up by me or anyone else in the Federal Security Agency. They are part of the law of the land. Congress wrote these essential provisions into the Social Security Act because it wanted to protect helpless needy persons from arbitrary and capricious action, and to make sure that they would receive humane and individual consideration wherever they live within a State.

Failure to adhere to these provisions has resulted in serious differences in the treatment of needy people throughout New York

State. People in various parts of the State receive shockingly disparate amounts of assistance in relation to their need. The law clearly calls for equitable treatment for persons in need; and persons in New York State have not been getting equitable treatment.

There has been failure on the part of local welfare districts to include basic items in the budgets of needy persons. There has been an alarming variation in the tests applied in determining who is entitled to assistance and who is not. Thus, in some welfare districts a person may be denied assistance if he has as much as $100 worth of personal property, while in a neighboring district a person may be granted assistance even though he has $1,500 or more of personal property. In my opinion, the Congress that passed the Social Security Act was out to prevent precisely this kind of discrimination.

We have not insisted on an "inflexible" standard that would require all persons to receive mechanically the same benefit without regard to individual need. Quite the contrary. What we have asked the State Department of Social Welfare to do is to establish a Statewide policy that would be simple, objective, and consistent, so that a person in need would know what he is entitled to and would not have to depend on the whim of a local official.

The Federal Government asks for equality of treatment, not necessarily equality of dollar assistance. The Federal Government asks that New York see to it that people in equal need receive the money to secure the same standard of living. Obviously, the rent costs in a small town upstate will not be the same as in Manhattan. The equal standard requires that a needy person receive the money to purchase equivalent food, clothing, and shelter, wherever he lives within the State.

All of this is well known to the State Board of Social Welfare. As a matter of fact, since 1944 the board has paid lip service to the requirements of Federal law. In that year it issued an instruction to local districts calling for equitable treatment of persons in equal need; but this instruction was never enforced. On January 22, 1951, this board ratified an agreement which the chairman of the board and I had reached on December 29, 1950, relating to aid to the permanently and totally disabled. That agreement provides for inclusion in the State plan of assistance standards to assure equitable treatment for all needy persons.

Thus the State Board of Social Welfare recognizes that there is no basis for the accusations contained in the legislature's resolution and accordingly agrees to abide by the law of the land.

As to requirements for an adequate merit system in the administration of public assistance in New York, the Federal law is perfectly clear. Its intent is to have administration of public assistance in all States free from political pressures. The fact is that New York has some 900 welfare positions exempted from civil service—more than the number of such exempted positions in all other States put together. New York is the only State in the Union where county welfare directors are not under the merit system. Moreover, 55 deputy directors are also exempt, along with a large number of other miscellaneous jobs. This contradicts the express requirements of the Federal Security Act. The State Board of Social Welfare has now assured us that it will take any steps which may be necessary to correct any deficiencies in the carrying out of personnel standards on a merit basis in accordance with the Federal Social Security Act.

These facts reveal the inaccuracies and distortions of the resolutions better than any argumentation.

The Prince of Peace, by William Jennings Bryan

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the ninety-first anniversary of the birth of William Jennings Bryan, one of the greatest Christian leaders our country has ever produced. His lecture on the Prince of Peace is the greatest argument of its kind I have ever read or ever heard.

In this day and time when the enemies of Christianity are trying to wreck our civilization, I think it is a good time to bring to the attention of the American people the argument of this masterful man, who probably did more to promote Christianity throughout the world than any other lay leader of modern times.

Mr. Bryan's lecture reads as follows:

THE PRINCE OF PEACE

Mr. BRYAN. I offer no apology for speaking upon a religious theme, for it is the most universal of all themes. If I addressed you upon the subject of law I might interest the lawyers; if I discussed the science of medicine I might interest the physicians; in like manner merchants might be interested in a talk on commerce, and farmers in a discussion on agriculture; but none of these subjects appeals to all. Even the science of government, though broader than any profession or occupation, does not embrace the whole sum of life, and those who think upon it differ so among themselves that I could not speak upon the subject so as to please a part without offending others. While to me the science of government is intensely absorbing, I recognize that the most important things in life lie outside of the realm of government and that more depends upon what the individual does for himself than upon what the government does or can do for him. Men can be miserable under the best government and they can be happy under the worst government.

Government affects but a part of the life which we live here and does not touch at all the life beyond, while religion touches the infinite circle of existence as well as the small arc of that circle which we spend on earth. No greater theme, therefore, can engage our attention.

Man is a religious being; the heart instinctively seeks for a God. Whether he worships on the banks of the Ganges, prays with his face upturned to the sun, kneels toward Mecca, or, regarding all space as a temple, communes with the Heavenly Father according to the Christian creed, man is essentially devout.

There are honest doubters whose sincerity we recognize and respect, but occasionally I find young men who think it smart to be skeptical; they talk as if it were an evidence of larger intelligence to scoff at creeds and refuse to connect themselves with churches. They call themselves "liberal," as if a Christian were narrow-minded. To these young men I desire to address myself.

Even some older people profess to regard religion as a superstition, pardonable in the ignorant, but unworthy of the educated—a mental state which one can and should outgrow. Those who hold this view look down with mild contempt upon such as give to religion a definite place in their thoughts and lives. They assume an intellectual superiority and often take little pains to conceal the assumption. Tolstoy administers to the "cultured crowd" (the words quoted are his) a severe rebuke when he declares that the religious sentiment rests not upon a superstitious fear of the invisible forces of nature, but upon man's consciousness of his finiteness amid an infinite universe and of his sinfulness; and this consciousness, the great philosopher adds, man can never outgrow. Tolstoy is right; man recognizes how limited are his own powers and how vast is the universe, and he leans upon the arm that is stronger than his. Man feels the weight of his sins and looks for One who is sinless.

Religion has been defined as the relation which man fixes between himself and his God, and morality as the outward manifestation of this relation. Every one, by the time he reaches maturity, has fixed some relation between himself and God, and no material change in this relation can take place without a revolution in the man, for this relation is the most potent influence that acts upon a human life.

Religion is the basis of morality in the individual and in the group of individuals. Materialists have attempted to build up a system of morality upon the basis of enlightened self-interest. They would have man figure out by mathematics that it pays him to abstain from wrongdoing; they would even inject an element of selfishness into altruism; but the moral system elaborated by the materialists has several defects. First, its virtues are borrowed from moral systems based upon religion; second, as it rests upon argument rather than upon authority, it does not appeal to the young, and by the time the young are able to follow their reason they have already become set in their ways. Our laws do not permit a young man to dispose of real estate until he is 21. Why this restraint? Because his reason is not mature; and yet a man's life is largely molded by the environment of his youth. Third, one never knows just how much of his decision is due to reason and how much is due to passion or to selfish interest. We recognize the bias of self-interest when we exclude from the jury every man, no matter how reasonable or upright he may be, who has a pecuniary interest in the result of the trial. And, fourth, one whose morality is based upon a nice calculation of benefits to be secured spends time figuring that he should spend in action. Those who keep a book account of their good deeds seldom do enough good to justify keeping books.

Morality is the power of endurance in man; and a religion which teaches personal responsibility to God gives strength to morality. There is a powerful restraining influence in the belief that an all-seeing eye scrutinizes every thought and word and act of the individual.

There is a wide difference between the man who is trying to conform to a standard of morality about him and the man who is endeavoring to make his life approximate to a divine standard. The former attempts to live up to the standard if it is above him and down to it if it is below him—and if he is doing right only when others are looking he is sure to find a time when he thinks he is unobserved, and then he takes a vacation and falls. One needs the inner strength which comes with the conscious presence of a personal God. If those who are thus fortified sometimes yield to temptation, how helpless and hopeless must those be who rely upon their own strength alone!

There are difficulties to be encountered in religion, but there are difficulties to be encountered everywhere. I passed through a period of skepticism when I was in college and I have been glad ever since that I became a member of the church before I left home for college, for it helped me during those trying days. The college days cover

the dangerous period in the young man's life; it is when he is just coming into possession of his powers—when he feels stronger than he ever feels afterward and thinks he knows more than he ever does know.

It was at this period that I was confused by the different theories of creation. But I examined these theories and found that they all assumed something to begin with. The nebular hypothesis, for instance, assumes that matter and force existed—matter in particles infinitely fine and each particle separated from every other particle by space infinitely great. Beginning with this assumption, force working on matter—according to this hypothesis—creates a universe. Well, I have a right to assume, and I prefer to assume a Designer back of the design—a Creator back of creation; and no matter how long you draw out the process of creation, so long as God stands back of it, you cannot shake my faith in Jehovah. In Genesis it is written that, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, and I can stand on that proposition until I find some theory of creation that goes further back than "the beginning."

I do not carry the doctrine of evolution as far as some do; I have not yet been able to convince myself that man is a lineal descendant of the lower animals. I do not mean to find fault with you if you want to accept it; all I mean to say is that while you may trace your ancestry back to the monkey if you find pleasure or pride in doing so, you shall not connect me with your family tree without more evidence than has yet been produced. It is true that man, in some physical qualities, resembles the beast, but man has a mind as well as a body and a soul as well as a mind. The mind is greater than the body and the soul is greater than the mind, and I object to having man's pedigree traced on one-third of him only—and that the lowest third. Fairbairn lays down a sound proposition when he says that it is not sufficient to explain man as an animal; it is necessary to explain man in history—and the Darwinian theory does not do this. The ape, according to this theory, is older than man, and yet he is still an ape, while man is the author of the marvelous civilization which we see about us.

One does not escape from mystery, however, by accepting this theory, for it does not explain the origin of life. When the follower of Darwin has traced the germ of life back to the lowest form in which it appears—and to follow him one must exercise more faith than religion calls for—he finds that scientists differ. Some believe that the first germ of life came from another planet and others hold that it was the result of spontaneous generation.

If I were compelled to accept one of these theories I would prefer the first, for if we can chase the germ of life off this planet and get it out into space we can guess the rest of the way and no one can contradict us; but if we accept the doctrine of spontaneous generation we cannot explain why spontaneous generation ceased to act after the first germ was created.

Go back as far as we may, we cannot escape from the creative act, and it is just as easy for me to believe that God created man as he is as to believe that, millions of years ago, He created a germ of life and endowed it with power to develop into all that we see today. But I object to the Darwinian theory until more conclusive proof is produced, because I fear we shall lose the consciousness of God's presence in our daily life, if we must assume that through all the ages no spiritual force has touched the life of man or shaped the destiny of nations. But there is another objection. The Darwinian theory represents man as reaching his present perfection by the operation of the law of hate—the merciless law by which the strong crowd out and kill off the weak. If this is the law of our development, then, if there is any logic that can bind the human mind, we shall turn backward toward the beast in proportion as we substitute the law of love. How can hatred be the law of development when nations have advanced in proportion as they have departed from that law and adopted the law of love?

But while I do not accept the Darwinian theory, I shall not quarrel with you about it; I only refer to it to remind you that it does not solve the mystery of life or explain human progress. I fear that some have accepted it in the hope of escaping from the miracle, but why should the miracle frighten us? It bothered me once, and I am inclined to think that it is one of the test questions with the Christian.

Christ cannot be separated from the miraculous; His birth, His ministrations and His resurrection, all involve the miraculous, and the change which His religion works in the human heart is a continuing miracle. Eliminate the miracles and Christ becomes merely a human being and His gospel is stripped of divine authority.

The miracle raises two questions: "Can God perform a miracle?" and, "Would He want to?" The first is easy to answer. A God who can make a world can do anything He wants to do with it. The power to perform miracles is necessarily implied in the power to create. But would God want to perform a miracle?—this is the question which has given most of the trouble. The more I have considered it the less inclined I am to answer in the negative. To say that God would not perform a miracle is to assume a more intimate knowledge of God's plans and purposes than I can claim to have. I will not deny that God does perform a miracle or may perform one merely because I do not know how or why He does it. The fact that we are constantly learning of the existence of new forces suggests the possibility that God may operate through forces yet unknown to us, and the mysteries with which we deal every day warn me that faith is as necessary as sight. Who would have credited a century ago the stories that are now told of the wonder-working electricity? For ages man had known the lightning, but only to fear it; now this invisible current is generated by a man-made machine, imprisoned in a man-made wire and made to do the bidding of man. We are even able to dispense with the wire and hurl words through space, and the X-ray has enabled us to look through substances which were supposed, until recently, to exclude all light. The miracle is not more mysterious than many of the things with which man now deals—it is simply different. The Immaculate Conception is not more mysterious than any other conception—it is simply unlike; nor is the resurrection of Christ more mysterious than the myriad resurrections which mark each annual seed-time.

It is sometimes said that God could not suspend one of His laws without stopping the universe, but do we not suspend or overcome the law of gravitation every day? Every time we move a foot or lift a weight, we temporarily interfere with the operation of the most universal of natural laws, and yet the world is not disturbed.

Science has taught us so many things that we are tempted to conclude that we know everything, but there is really a great unknown which is still unexplored, and that which we have learned ought to increase our reverence rather than our egotism. Science has disclosed some of the machinery of the universe, but science has not yet revealed to us the great secret—the secret of life. It is to be found in every blade of grass, in every insect, in every bird and in every animal, as well as in man. Six thousand years of recorded history, and yet we know no more about the secret of life than they knew in the beginning. We live, we plan; we have our hopes, our fears; and yet in a moment a change may come over any one of us and this body will become a mass of lifeless clay. What is it that, having, we live and, having not, we are as the clod? We know not; and yet the progress of the race and the civilization which we now behold are the work of men and women who have not solved the mystery of their own lives.

And our food, must we understand it before we eat it? If we refused to eat anything until we could understand the mystery of its growth, we should die of starvation. But mystery does not bother us in the dining room; it is only in the church that it is an obstacle.

I was eating a piece of watermelon some months ago and was struck with its beauty. I took some of the seeds and dried them and weighed them, and found that it would require some 5,000 seed to weigh a pound. And then I applied mathematics to that 40-pound melon. One of these seeds, put into the ground, when warmed by the sun and moistened by the rain, goes to work; it gathers from somewhere 200,000 times its own weight and, forcing this raw material through a tiny stem, constructs a watermelon. It covers the outside with a coating of green; inside of the green it puts a layer of white, and within the white a core of red, and all through the red it scatters seeds, each one capable of continuing the work of reproduction. Where did that little seed get its tremendous power? Where did it find its coloring matter? How did it collect its flavoring extract? How did it build a watermelon? Until you can explain a watermelon, do not be too sure that you can set limits to the power of the Almighty or say just what He would do or how He would do it. I cannot explain the watermelon, but I eat it and enjoy it.

Everything that grows tells a like story of infinite power. Why should I deny that a divine hand fed a multitude with a few loaves and fishes when I see hundreds of millions fed every year by a hand which converts the seeds scattered over the field into an abundant harvest? We know that food can be multiplied in a few months' time; shall we deny the power of the Creator to eliminate the element of time, when we have gone so far in eliminating the element of space?

But there is something even more wonderful still—the mysterious change that takes place in the human heart when the man begins to hate the things he loved and to love the things he hated—the marvelous transformation that takes place in the man who, before the change, would have sacrificed the world for his own advancement, but who, after the change, would give his life for a principle and esteem it a privilege to make sacrifice for his convictions. What greater miracle than this, that converts a selfish, self-centered human being into a center from which good influences flow out in every direction? And yet this miracle has been wrought in the heart of each one of us—or may be wrought—and we have seen it wrought in the hearts of those about us. No, living in the midst of mystery and miracles, I shall not allow either to deprive me of the benefits of the Christian religion.

Some of those who question the miracle also question the theory of atonement; they assert that it does not accord with their idea of justice for one to die for others. Let each one bear his own sins and the punishments due for them, they say. The doctrine of vicarious suffering is not a new one; it is as old as the race. That one should suffer for others is one of the most familiar principles, and we see the principle illustrated every day of our lives. Take the family, for instance; from the day the mother's first child is born, for twenty-five or thirty years they are scarcely out of her waking thoughts.

She sacrifices for them, she surrenders herself to them. Is it because she expects them to pay her back? Fortunate for the parent and fortunate for the child if the latter has an opportunity to repay in part the debt it owes. But no child can compensate a parent for a parent's care. In the course of nature the debt is paid, not to the parent, but to the next generation, each generation suffering and sacrificing for the one following.

Nor is this confined to the family. Every step in advance has been made possible by those who have been willing to sacrifice for posterity. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience and free government have all been won for the world by those who were willing to make sacrifices for their fellows. So well established is this doctrine that we do not regard any one as great unless he recognizes how unimportant his life is in comparison with the problems with which he deals.

I find proof that man was made in the image of his Creator in the fact that, throughout the centuries, man has been willing to die that blessings denied to him might be enjoyed by his children, his children's children and the world.

The seeming paradox: "He that saveth his life shall lose it and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it," has an application wider than that usually given to it; it is an epitome of history. Those who live only for themselves live little lives, but those who give themselves for the advancement of things greater than themselves find a larger life than the one surrendered. Wendell Phillips gave expression to the same idea when he said: "How prudently most men sink into nameless graves, while now and then a few forget themselves into immortality."

Instead of being an unnatural plan, the plan of salvation is in perfect harmony with human nature as we understand it. Sacrifice is the language of love, and Christ, in suffering for the world, adopted the only means of reaching the heart, and this can be demonstrated not only by theory, but by experience, for the story of His life, His teachings, His sufferings, and His death has been translated into every language and everywhere it has touched the heart.

But if I were going to present an argument in favor of the divinity of Christ, I would not begin with miracles or mystery or theory of atonement. I would begin as Carnegie Simpson begins in his book entitled "The Fact of Christ." Commencing with the fact that Christ lived, he points out that one cannot contemplate this undisputed fact without feeling that in some way this fact is related to those now living. He says that one can read of Alexander, of Caesar, or of Napoleon, and not feel that it is a matter of personal concern; but that when one reads how Christ lived and how He died he feels that somehow there is a chord that stretches from that life to his. As he studies the character of Christ he becomes conscious of certain virtues which stand out in bold relief—purity, humility, a forgiving spirit, and an unfathomable love. The author is correct. Christ presents an example of purity in thought and life, and man, conscious of his own imperfections and grieved over his shortcomings, finds inspiration in One who was tempted in all points like as we are, and yet without sin. I am not sure but that we can find just here a way of determining whether one possesses the true spirit of a Christian. If he finds in the sinlessness of Christ an inspiration and a stimulus to greater effort and higher living, he is indeed a follower; if, on the other hand, he resents the reproof which the purity of Christ offers, he is likely to question the divinity of Christ in order to excuse himself for not being a follower.

Humility is a rare virtue. If one is rich he is apt to be proud of his riches; if he has distinguished ancestry, he is apt to be proud of his lineage; if he is well educated, he is apt to be proud of his learning. Some one has suggested that if one becomes humble he soon becomes proud of his humility. Christ, however, possessed of all power, was the very personification of humility.

The most difficult of all the virtues to cultivate is the forgiving spirit. Revenge seems to be natural to the human heart; to want to get even with an enemy is a common sin. It has even been popular to boast of vindictiveness; it was once inscribed on a monument to a hero that he had repaid both friends and enemies more than he had received. This was not the spirit of Christ. He taught forgiveness; and in that incomparable prayer which He left as a model for our petitions He made our willingness to forgive the measure by which we may claim forgiveness. He not only taught forgiveness, but He exemplified His teachings in His life. When those who persecuted Him brought Him to the most disgraceful of all deaths, His spirit of forgiveness rose above His suffering and He prayed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

But love is the foundation of Christ's creed. The world had known love before; parents had loved children, and children parents; husband had loved wife, and wife husband; and friend had loved friend; but Jesus gave a new definition of love. His love was as boundless as the sea; its limits were so far-flung that even an enemy could not travel beyond it. Other teachers sought to regulate the lives of their followers by rule and formula, but Christ's plans was, first to purify the heart and then to leave love to direct the footsteps.

What conclusion is to be drawn from the life, the teachings and the depth of this historic figure? Reared in a carpenter shop; with no knowledge of literature, save Bible literature; with no acquaintance with philosophers living or with the writings of sages dead, this young man gathered disciples about him, promulgated a higher code of morals than the world had ever known before, and proclaimed Himself the Messiah. He taught and performed miracles for a few brief months and then was crucified; His disciples were scattered and many of them put to death; His claims were disputed, His resurrection denied and His followers persecuted, and yet from this beginning His religion has spread until millions take His name with reverence upon their lips and thousands have been willing to die rather than surrender the faith which he put into their hearts. How shall we account for Him? "What think ye of Christ?" It is easier to believe Him divine than to explain in any other way what He said and did and was. And I have greater faith even than before since I have visited the Orient and witnessed the successful contest which Christianity is waging against the religions and philosophers of the East.

I was thinking a few years ago of the Christmas which was then approaching and of Him in whose honor the day is celebrated. I recalled the message, Peace on earth, good will to men, and then my thoughts ran back to the prophecy uttered centuries before His birth, in which He was described as the Prince of Peace. To reinforce my memory I reread the prophecy and found immediately following a verse which I had forgotten—a verse which declares that of the increase of His peace and government there shall be no end, for, adds Isaiah, "He shall judge His people with justice and with judgment." Thinking of the prophecy, I have selected this theme that I may present some of the reasons which lead me to believe that Christ has fully earned the title, the Prince of Peace, and that in the years to come it will be more and more applied to Him. Faith in Him brings peace to the heart and His teachings, when applied, will bring peace between man and man. And if He can bring peace to each heart, and if His creed will bring peace throughout the earth, who will deny His right to be called the Prince of Peace?

All the world is in search of peace; every heart that ever beat has sought for peace, and many have been the methods employed to secure it. Some have thought to purchase it with riches, and they have labored to secure wealth, hoping to find peace when they were able to go where they pleased and buy what they liked. Of those who have endeavored to purchase peace with money, the large majority have failed to secure the money. But what has been the experience of those who have been successful in accumulating money? They all tell the same story—viz., that they spent the first half of their lives trying to get money from others and the last half trying to keep others from getting their money, and that they found peace in neither half. Some have even reached the point where they find difficulty in getting people to accept their money; and I know of no better indication of the ethical awakening in this country than the increasing tendency to scrutinize the methods of money making. A long step in advance will have been taken when religious, educational, and charitable institutions refuse to condone immoral methods in business and leave the possessor of ill-gotten gains to learn the loneliness of life when one prefers money to morals.

Some have sought peace in social distinction, but whether they have been within the charmed circle and fearful lest they might fall out, or outside and hopeful that they might get in, they have not found peace.

Some have thought—vain thought—to find peace in political prominence; but whether office comes by birth, as in monarchies, or by election, as in republics, it does not bring peace. An office is conspicuous only when few can occupy it. Only when few in a generation can hope to enjoy an honor do we call it a great honor. I am glad that our Heavenly Father did not make the peace of the human heart depend upon the accumulation of wealth, or upon the securing of social or political distinction, for in either case but few could have enjoyed it, but when He made peace the reward of a conscience void of offense toward God and man, He put it within reach of all. The poor can secure it as easily as the rich, the social outcast as freely as the leader of society, and the humblest citizen equally with those who wield political power.

To those who have grown gray in the faith I need not speak of the peace to be found in the belief in an overruling providence. Christ taught that our lives are precious in the sight of God, and poets have taken up the theme and woven it into immortal verse. No uninspired writer has expressed the idea more beautifully than William Cullen Bryant in the Ode to a Waterfowl. After following the wanderings of the bird of passage as it seeks first its northern and then its southern home, he concludes:

"Thou'rt gone; the abyss of heaven
Hath swallowed up thy form, but on my heart
Deeply hath sunk the lesson thou hast given,
And shall not soon depart.

"He who, from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright."

Christ promoted peace by giving us assurance that a line of communication can be established between the Father above and the child below. And who will measure the consolation that has been brought to troubled hearts by the hour of prayer?

And immortality. Who will estimate the peace which a belief in a future life has brought to the sorrowing? You may talk to the young about death ending all, for life is full and hope is strong, but preach not this doctrine to the mother who stands by the deathbed of her babe or to one who is within the shadow of a great affliction. When I was a young man I wrote to Colonel Ingersoll and asked him for his views on God and immortality. His secretary answered that the great infidel was not at home, but enclosed a copy of a speech which covered my question. I scanned it with eagerness and found that he had expressed himself about as follows: "I do not say that there is no God, I simply say I do not know. I do not say that there is no life beyond the grave, I simply say I do not know." And from that day to this I have not been able to understand how anyone could find pleasure in taking from any human heart a living faith and substituting therefor the cold and cheerless doctrine, "I do not know."

Christ gave us proof of immortality, and yet it would hardly seem necessary that one should rise from the dead to convince us that the grave is not the end. To every created thing God has given a tongue that proclaims a resurrection.

If the Father deigns to touch with divine power the cold and pulseless heart of the buried acorn and to make it burst forth from its prison walls, will He leave neglected in the earth the soul of man, made in the image of his Creator? If He stoops to give to the rosebush, whose withered blossoms float upon the autumn breeze, the sweet assurance of another springtime, will He refuse the words of hope to the sons of men when the frosts of winter come? If matter, mute and inanimate, though changed by the forces of nature into a multitude of forms, can never die, will the spirit of man suffer annihilation when it has paid a brief visit like a royal guest to this tenement of clay? No, I am as sure that there is another life as I am that I live today.

In Cairo I secured a few grains of wheat that had slumbered for more than 3,000 year in an Egyptian tomb. As I looked at them this thought came into my mind: If one of those grains had been planted on the banks of the Nile the year after it grew, and all its lineal descendants planted and replanted from that time until now, its progeny would today be sufficiently numerous to feed the teeming millions of the world. There is in the grain of wheat an invisible something which has power to discard the body that we see, and from earth and air fashion a new body so much like the old one that we cannot tell the one from the other. If this invisible germ of life in the grain of wheat can thus pass unimpaired through 3,000 resurrections, I shall not doubt that my soul has power to clothe itself with a body suited to its new existence when this earthly frame has crumbled into dust.

A belief in immortality not only consoles the individual, but it exerts a powerful influence in bringing peace between individuals. If one really thinks that man dies as the brute dies, he may yield to the temptation to do injustice to his neighbor when the circumstances are such as to promise security from detection. But if one really expects to meet again and live eternally with those whom he knows today, he is restrained from evil deeds by the fear of endless remorse. We do not know what rewards are in store for us or what punishments may be reserved, but if there were no other punishment it would be enough for one who deliberately and consciously wrongs another to have to live forever in the company of the person wronged and have his littleness and selfishness laid bare. I repeat, a belief in immortality must exert a powerful influence in establishing justice between men and thus laying the foundation for peace.

Again, Christ deserves to be called the Prince of Peace because He has given us a measure of greatness which promotes peace. When His disciples disputed among themselves as to which should be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven, he rebuked them and said: "Let him who would be chiefest among you be the servant of all." Service is the measure of greatness; it always has been true; it is true today, and it always will be true, that he is greatest who does the most of good. And yet, what a revolution it will work in this old world when this standard becomes the standard of life. Nearly all of our controversies and combats arise from the fact that we are trying to get something from each other—there will be peace when our aim is to do something for each other. Our enmities and animosities arise from our efforts to get as much as possible out of the world—there will be peace when our endeavor is to put as much as possible into the world. Society will take an immeasurable step toward peace when it estimates a citizen by his output rather than by his income and gives the crown of its approval to the one who makes the largest contribution to the welfare of all. It is the glory of the Christian ideal that, while it is within sight of the weakest and the lowliest, it is yet so high that the best and the noblest are kept with their faces turned ever upward.

Christ has also led the way to peace by giving us a formula for the propagation of good. Not all of those who have really desired to do good have employed the Christian method—not all Christians even. In all the history of the human race but two methods have been employed. The first is the forcible method. A man has an idea which he thinks is good; he tells his neighbors about it and they do not like it. This makes him angry, and seizing a club, he attempts to make them like it. One trouble about this rule is that it works both ways; when a man starts out to compel his neighbors to think as he does, he generally finds them willing to accept the challenge, and they spend so much time in trying to coerce each other that they have no time left to be of service to each other.

The other is the Bible plan—be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. And there is no other way of overcoming evil. I am not much of a farmer—I get more credit for my farming than I deserve, and my little farm receives more advertising than it is entitled to. But I am former enough to know that if I cut down weeds they will spring up again, and I know that if I plant something there which has more vitality than the weeds I shall not only get rid of the constant cutting, but have the benefit of the crop besides.

In order that there might be no mistake about His plan of propagating good, Christ went into detail and laid emphasis upon the value of example—"so live that others seeing your good works may be constrained to glorify your Father which is in heaven." There is no human influence so potent for good as that which goes out from an upright life. A sermon may be answered; the arguments presented in a speech may be disputed, but no one can answer a Christian life—it is the unanswerable argument in favor of our religion.

It may be a slow process—this conversion of the world by the silent influence of a noble example, but it is the only sure one, and the doctrine applies to nations as well as to individuals. The Gospel of the Prince of Peace gives us the only hope that the world has—and it is an increasing hope—of the substitution of reason for the arbitrament of force in the settlement of international disputes.

But Christ has given us a platform more fundamental than any political party has ever written. We are interested in platforms; we attend conventions, sometimes traveling long distances; we have wordy wars over the phraseology of various planks, and then we wage earnest campaigns to secure the endorsement of these platform at the polls. But the platform given to the world by the Nazarene is more far-reaching and more comprehensive than any platform ever written by the convention of any party in any country. When He condensed into 1 commandment those of the 10 which relate to man's duty toward his fellows and enjoined upon us the rule, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," He presented a plan for the solution of all the problems that now vex society or may hereafter arise. Other remedies may palliate or postpone the day of settlement, but this is all-sufficient and the reconciliation which it effects is a permanent one.

If I were to attempt to apply this thought to various questions which are at issue I might be accused of entering the domain of partisan politics; but I may safely apply it to two great problems. First, let us consider the question of capital and labor. This is not a transient issue or a local one. It engages the attention of the people of all countries and has appeared in every age. The immediate need in this country is arbitration, for neither side of a controversy can be trusted to deal with absolute justice, if allowed undisputed control; but arbitration, like a court, is a last resort. It would be better if the relations between employer and employee were such as to make arbitration unnecessary. Just in proportion as men recognize their kinship to each other and deal with each other in the spirit of brotherhood will friendship and harmony be secured. Both employer and employee need to cultivate the spirit which follows from obedience to the great commandment.

The second problem to which I would apply this platform of peace is that which relates to the accumulation of wealth. We cannot much longer delay consideration of the ethics of money making. That many of the enormous fortunes which have been accumulated in the last quarter of a century are now held by men who have given to society no adequate service in return for the money secured is now generally recognized. While legislation can and should protect the public from predatory wealth, a more effective remedy will be found in the cultivation of a public opinion which will substitute a higher ideal than the one which tolerates the enjoyment of unearned gains. No man who really knows what brotherly love is will desire to take advantage of his neighbor, and the conscience when not seared will admonish against injustice. My faith in the future rests upon the belief that Christ's teachings are being more studied today than ever before, and that with this larger study will come an application of those teachings to the everyday life of the world. In former times men read that Christ came to bring life and immortality to light and placed the emphasis upon immortality; now they are studying Christ's relation to human life. In former years many thought to prepare themselves for future bliss by a life of seclusion here; now they are learning that they cannot follow in the footsteps of the Master unless they go about doing good. Christ declared that He came that we might have life and have it more abundantly. The world is learning that Christ came not to narrow life but to enlarge it—to fill it with purpose, earnestness, and happiness.

But this Prince of Peace promises not only peace, but strength. Some have thought His teachings fit only for the weak and the timid and unsuited to men of vigor, energy, and ambition. Nothing could be further from the truth. Only the man of faith can be courageous. Confident that he fights on the side of Jehovah, he doubts not the success of his cause. What matters it whether he shares in the shouts of triumph? If every word spoken in behalf of truth has its influence and every deed done for the right weighs in the final account, it is immaterial to the Christian whether his eyes behold victory or whether he dies in the midst of the conflict.

"Yea, though thou lie upon the dust,
When they who helped thee flee in fear,
Die full of hope and manly trust,
Like those who fell in battle here.

"Another hand thy sword shall wield,
Another hand the standard wave,
Till from the trumpet's mouth is pealed
The blast of triumph o'er thy grave."

Only those who believe attempt the seemingly impossible, and, by attempting, prove that one with God can chase a thousand and two can put ten thousand to flight. I can imagine that the early Christians who were carried into the arena to make a spectacle for those more savage than the beasts, were entreated by their doubting companions not to endanger their lives. But, kneeling in the center of the arena, they prayed and sang until they were devoured. How helpless they seemed and, measured by every human rule, how hopeless was their cause. And yet within a few decades the power which they invoked proved mightier than the legions of the emperor, and the faith in which they died was triumphant o'er all that land. It is said that those who went to mock at their sufferings returned asking themselves, "What is it that can enter into the heart of man and make him die as these die?" They were greater conquerors in their death than they could have been had they purchased life by a surrender of their faith.

What would have been the fate of the church if the early Christians had had as little faith as many of our Christians now have? And, on the other hand, if the Christians of today had the faith of the martyrs, how long would it be before the fulfillment of the prophecy that every knee shall bow and every tongue confess?

Our faith should be even stronger than the faith of those who lived 2,000 years ago, for we see our religion spreading and supplanting the philosophies and creeds of the Orient.

As the Christian grows older, he appreciates more and more the completeness with which Christ fills the requirements of the heart and, grateful for the peace which he enjoys and for the strength which he has received, he repeats the words of the great scholar, Sir William Jones:

"Before thy mystic altar, heavenly truth,
I kneel in manhood, as I knelt in youth,
Thus let me kneel, till this dull form decay,
And life's last shade be brightened by thy ray."

Snide Sniping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of March 15, 1951. This editorial discusses the ridiculous lengths to which some people in our country are willing to go today to place partisan politics above the unity which we need in this critical period in our Nation's history.

The editorial follows:

SNIDE SNIPING

Time must hang heavy on the hands of the Republican National Committee. That august body recently issued, as a formal press release, a compilation of President Truman's travels and absences from Washington during the past year, prepared by its research division at the request of Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah. Its evident intent is to suggest to feebleminded or incorrigibly crotchety readers that Mr. Truman has been leading a carefree, gadabout existence, oblivious of his responsibilities to the American people.

A study of this remarkable piece of research reveals that the President did, indeed, take numerous week-end cruises on the Potomac, leaving Washington as a rule at noon on Saturday and returning late Sunday afternoon—he even took off Memorial Day, which happened to fall on a Tuesday last year—and that he made several short visits to Independence, Mo., to see members of his family and to rest. Most Americans, we have no doubt, will feel unreservedly glad that the President of the United States has the simple mother wit to take an occasional respite from his enormously taxing job. Many may criticize the way Mr. Truman does the job, at least in some respects, but very few, we are sure, will consider him guilty of neglecting it.

The Presidency has become, especially in recent years, a grueling test of physical endurance. Its demands are so heavy that a mere mortal can bear them only if his physician and his family make him take reasonable care of his health and indulge in a reasonable amount of relaxation. In point of fact, he owes it to the people to do this, and the people ought to require it of him. Too often a foolish fear of popular criticism has led Presidents to drive themselves irrationally—and to the detriment of their duties. Consider, for instance, this illuminating entry in Colonel House's diary for January 31, 1917:

"Mrs. Wilson spoke of golf and asked whether I thought it would look badly if the President went on the links. I thought the American people would feel that he should not do anything at such a time. The President at last suggested that we play a game of pool—at which we elderly men were absurdly inadept."

We are glad that Mr. Truman seems to have a better opinion of the common sense of the American people. The Republican National Committee appears to take it for granted that this is a Nation of fools.

Labor Is Entitled to an Equal Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article from the March 10,1951, issue of the Illinois State Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter, entitled "Backs United Labor Rights":

BACKS UNITED LABOR RIGHTS

The Reverend George G. Higgins, assistant director, social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, said that the United Labor Policy Committee "is doing all of us great service in insisting upon the 'right to an equal voice'" in the administration of Defense Mobilization Czar Charles E. Wilson.

Commenting on united labor's position that big business is running the national defense mobilization to the detriment of all the people, the Reverend Higgins said in his weekly column:

"In terms of the present controversy in Washington it—labor—is merely asking for the right to have a say—the right to an equal voice—in the mobilization program which is being administered at the top level by Charles E. Wilson, former president of General Electric.

"'So far,' said the official spokesman for American labor on February 16, 'virtually the entire defense mobilization program has been entrusted to the hands of a few men recruited from big business who believe they have a monopoly on experience, good ideas, and patriotism.' The Wall Street Journal replied, in effect, that labor is trying to run the show and shouldn't be allowed to get away with it.

"More moderate observers have concluded, however, that labor is perfectly justified in asking for the right to have a say. We ourselves would go so far as to maintain that American labor, far from being out of order in making such a reasonable demand, is doing all of us a great service in insisting upon the right to an equal voice in Mr. Wilson's administration.

"It is doing us the inestimable service of safeguarding certain basic democratic values in a far-reaching governmental program which otherwise could very easily—and even innocently—become a top-heavy and rather arbitrary bureaucracy.

"Mr. Wilson and his top assistants—chosen for the most part from the ranks of big business—are undoubtedly very competent and very honest. But not even the Archangel Gabriel ought to be delegated to administer the defense mobilization program on his own, as it were, without the fullest possible assistance—and surveillance—of organized labor, management, and agriculture.

"Philip Murray and William Green, as the Wall Street Journal will most certainly agree, wouldn't be qualified to administer the program on their own without the cooperation of business and agriculture. By the same token, therefore, Mr. Wilson is not qualified to go it alone without the participation of labor, on a basis of full equality with big business, in the administration of the program."

The Tragedy of Seoul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, during World War II capital cities were destroyed, ruined, and devastated like they never had been in previous history. Heading this list, and there is a question as to the order in which they should be listed, are the capital cities of Warsaw, Poland; Berlin, Germany; and Manila in the Philippines. Another capital city is now in this category; and as the Korean war continues, this capital will, no doubt, head the list of total destruction as far as capital cities are concerned. My reference, of course, is to the city of Seoul; and in this connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, March 17, headed "The Tragedy of Seoul:"

THE TRAGEDY OF SEOUL

It is hard for Americans, in the security and comfort of their homes, to imagine what life in far away Seoul is like today. It is hard for war correspondents to put in words the tragedy of a city which twice has been captured by Communist armies and twice has been liberated by United Nations troops.

One might think that the failure twice in the past to hold the South Korean capital against Red hordes would have left the miserable people of desolate Seoul resentful and sullen. Surely their faith in the defenders of their families, their homes, and their city has been put to cruel test during the past terrible months. Death, pestilence, and destruction have besieged them in frightening forms by day and by night. Their dwellings and business houses have been destroyed by blast and flame, their loved ones slaughtered or maimed, their food supplies confiscated. Only 200,000 of the once-thriving population of 1,500,000 persons remain in the rubble of what is virtually a dead city.

Yet there was no bitterness evident when American troops once more entered Seoul yesterday. On the contrary, the welcome which the GI's received was pathetically emotional. Ragged urchins cheered and tagged along beside the soldiers. Tears coursed down the cheeks of emaciated women. Men eagerly questioned the troops about the size of the liberating force. One resident voiced the question in the minds of all when he asked: "Will you stay this time?"

The demonstration left no doubt as to which type of occupation the citizens of Seoul prefer. The siege and seizure of a city by any army constitute a dreadful ordeal for the inhabitants. But if there is to be any liberating done by anyone, Seoul has made it plain that she wants it done by MacArthur's men, not Mao's. As for the question raised about the duration of this liberation, Seoul may look to the future with more confidence than at any time in recent months. At least the American troops which marched into the ravaged city were confident that this time they had come to stay. There is a good chance that they are right.

Rice Can Be a War Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the Southwest Citizen, of Lake Charles, La., as follows:

RICE CAN BE A WAR WEAPON

Rice is important to more people than any food in the world. It is particularly vital in some of the world's worst trouble spots.

Ninety-five percent of the world's supply of rice is grown in the Asiatic countries. Some produce more than they need, others less. When every Asiatic rice farmer is producing and distribution channels are open, there is enough to go around.

But take Communist China. It is a deficit nation. There is not nearly enough rice to feed its people. If the conquest of Korea had been complete and quick, there is a possibility they might have received supplies from there, since Korea was a surplus producer of rice. As matters now stand, Korea will not have enough rice to supply its own needs.

General Mao thus faces more perils than the bullets of the United Nations troops. If he is not able to obtain the needed rice from some source, he will have a hungry people on his hands and hungry people are inclined to take desperate chances and to do desperate things.

Though the Communists may win occasional victories with arms while following orders of alien masters in Moscow, what will the Chinese people gain? They may come to ask this question and, as they do, the attractions of communism will grow fewer and their enthusiasm for foreign adventures in Korea, in Indochina, in Tibet, and India will grow proportionately less.

All because there is less rice, to us an ordinary item of diet.

Growers in the United States cannot of course hope to produce a sufficient amount to feed the hungry people of Asia. But if our farmers do succeed in producing another bumper crop, there may be enough surplus on hand to weigh heavily in a diplomatic trade. This is one reason why the 1951 crop, here, in Arkansas, Texas, and California may well have considerable significance in the current war we are fighting against communism.

Bradley: Big Man, Big Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article on Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which appeared in Parade in the Washington Post of March 18, 1951:

BRADLEY: BIG MAN, BIG HEART

WASHINGTON.—There's one 18-year-old secretary tucked away in a remote cubicle of the Pentagon here who'll never forget the day she met General Bradley.

She was just a little late for work—a minute or two after 8:30. She scooted up the steps at the impressive river entrance and was about to go in one of the big oaken doors when a tall man in uniform stepped up and held it open for her. She slipped through, and suddenly realized who the tall man was.

"Golly," she told her friends later, "it was General Bradley himself."

That's a typical story about Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and boss of bosses in the Nation's Armed Forces. Bradley is a forceful, determined and proven leader, but at the same time he's a warm, unassuming man who looks more like the family doctor than a top military strategist. Says a friend of the General's: "He has a humility approaching that of the late Will Rogers."

MAN WITH THREE HATS

Bradley, 58 and balding, retains these qualities even though today he bears the responsibility for the Nation's entire Military Establishment—Navy and Air Force as well as his old alma mater, the Army. Right now, he wears these three "hats" which make him one of the half-dozen most influential military men in the world.

But Bradley's high station has not changed his feeling toward the GI.

"I give you my pledge," he says, "that no weapon can ever be so sensational and no situation so critical as to receive more consideration than the welfare of our fighting men."

Chances are that when his term expires next August as head of the Joint Chiefs, President Truman will refuse to let him step down.

He's a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Military Committee, a top group which lays down broad policy for General Eisenhower. He also belongs to the Committee's "Standing Group" of three which receives reports from and issues orders directly to General Ike.

Bradley has the plain spoken quality common to many Midwesterners. A tense Congressman asked him recently whether an invasion of Norway by 500,000 Russians would mean we'd have to send an expeditionary force to Norway. Bradley said laconically: "You would if you wanted to get those fellows out."

He takes the same basically reasonable view of the troubled world situation.

AMERICA IN A SMALLER WORLD

"The world has shrunk to such an extent," he says, "that we must be ready to defend ourselves on very short notice.

"This is a condition familiar to the nations of Europe, but it's new to us. Yet they have existed for centuries under it—and there's no reason why we shouldn't be able to do the same."

Interestingly, Bradley has turned writer, and his A Soldier's Story will be published in June (Henry Holt & Co.). In it will be Bradley's own estimate of the men he fought with in World War II, from United States private to British field marshal.

Ireland Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over radio-television station WXEL at Cleveland, Ohio, March 17:

It is customary on an occasion like this to extol the past glories of Ireland. A St. Patrick's Day speaker is traditionally expected to recall the times when Ireland was the sole light of learning and culture shining in the Europe of the Dark Ages, to tell once again how her far-reaching missionaries brought Christianity and civilization back to people crushed by the barbarian invasions.

Or he may review the history of our own country and show how, from its very beginnings, men of Irish birth or descent have contributed to the military, political, cultural, and industrial life of the American Republic.

Tonight I propose to break with tradition and to take a look at the Ireland of our own times. This will not be a waste of time, for most people seem to know very little about modern Ireland. Indeed, to judge from stories that appear from time to time in the newspapers, any story about Ireland will be accepted at face value, provided it is queer enough or unfavorable enough. Let me give you one instance. Around Christmas of 1942, an American publisher returned from a trip to England and Ireland. In an interview he spoke of the "enormous German Legation in Dublin," implying that it was a hotbed of spies, tolerated by the Irish Government. In the first place this publisher did something that no one with any journalistic experience should ever have done; he fell for a trumped-up story that was 2½

years old. In the spring of 1940 the London Times had its Dublin correspondent look into the matter. He reported that there were about six or seven people in the German legation in Dublin. Secondly, this publisher did not ask himself how the enormous numbers could have gotten there. It would be possible, of course, to land spies from a submarine. But diplomatic personnel are a different matter. They have to come openly and to be known by the government admitting them. Now, from the beginning of the war, Ireland was cut off from direct contact with Europe. Diplomats could not have come except through Great Britain. This is just one example of the way some people will swallow any story about Ireland.

We are told, for instance, that Ireland sat out the war comfortably while other people were beating Hitler. This is not the place to go into a long discussion on Irish neutrality. Ireland, no doubt, was as fully entitled to be neutral as was Sweden or Switzerland. But Mr. Churchill himself, in a speech at the end of the war, paid tribute to the Irish who had served in the British armed forces and manned the British factories during the war. From Ireland came almost a quarter of a million people to the British munition factories and to her army, navy, and air force. Mr. Churchill's personal airplane pilot was an Irishman, Paddy Finucane. If we realize that the population of the Irish Republic is not quite 3,000,000, you will see that almost one-twelfth of its people served Britain during the war—not bad for a neutral country. If we apply the same proportions to the United States, we should have seen from ten to twelve million Americans streaming across the border into Canada to work or fight in the war effort.

But let us take a look at Ireland today. One of the big controversies in this country at the present moment revolves around private denominational schools. How does Ireland handle its school question? Ireland handles its primary schools by a combination of private initiative and state aid. It has some 5,000 primary schools attended by 450,000 children, of whom 97 percent are Catholics. The state gives grants toward the construction and maintenance of primary schools. The school manager is usually the local Catholic pastor or Protestant minister. No school may refuse a pupil entrance on grounds of religion.

No great trouble arises with the Catholic population. Since Protestants are few and scattered, they may have difficulty in founding and maintaining schools. But the state, in cases of proved hardship, stands ready to defray the whole cost of such schools; even to the extent of providing a school where an average of 10 pupils can be assured. If a particular Protestant group cannot show enough children to justify a school for them, the state will pay half the cost of transportation to the nearest Protestant school, if the number of pupils does not fall below five. All the non-Catholic denominations in the Irish Republic have repeatedly testified to the generosity with which this overwhelmingly Catholic state treats them. It is worth noting that while catholicism is the religion of the vast majority of the Irish, there is no state religion there.

It used to be said, before Ireland became independent, that the Irish were incapable of governing themselves. Let me point out that the present Irish Government, that of Mr. John Costello, is only the third since 1921. France, on the contrary, has had 10 governments since 1945, and now needs another new one. The allegedly stable-minded British have had nine prime ministers during the 30 years during which Ireland has had three. This was not due to any dictatorship in Ireland. On the contrary, there have been numerous fair and hard-fought elections.

The present Irish Government is a coalition, or as the Irish prefer to call it, an interparty government. When Mr. Costello took office in February of 1948, the wise ones said that he would never succeed in holding his cabinet together, since it represented very different parties. He is now 3 years in office, and his government shows no signs of disintegrating.

One of Ireland's biggest problems today is building up after the war. Ireland, of course, did not suffer any war destruction. But it was cut off from many sources of supply. Its industrial plant ran down. Its land needed fertilizers. Today the Irish Government is engaged on a land reconstruction project greater than any ever undertaken by a previous Irish Government. It is investing some £40,000,000 in the scheme, helped by Marshall plan aid. The ECA Administrator in Ireland has complimented the Irish Government on the constructive uses to which it has put its Marshall plan funds.

There is nothing paternalistic about the land scheme. The government offers help to the various farming communities in the way of machinery, fertilizer, seeds, and so forth. It is up to the communities themselves to take up the government's offer; millions of acres of farm land are being improved; millions of acres of submarginal land are being brought up to cultivation standards. A nation-wide scheme of reforestation is under way. Replacing on the Irish hills the extensive forests that once clothed them will prevent the flooding of lowlands by the runoff rain water—no small consideration in a country with a rainy climate like Ireland's.

Ireland has very little coal, but the Irish have under their feet, more than 3 centuries' supply of fuel in the form of peat, or turf. During the war, when coal supplies were almost completely cut off, the importance of turf became appreciated. In fact, some 5,000,000 tons of this fuel are used every year. Most of it, 80 percent or more, is dug by individual farmers. But the government maintains the turf board, which keeps up research in modern methods of winning turf, drying it, compressing it, and using the byproducts. Moreover, it is building three electric power stations adapted to be fired by turf. One of them is already in operation. There are also two hydroelectric stations—one on the river Shannon, built some 25 years ago, and a new one being built on the Erne. There will be a nice balance between water power and turf-fired power. In wet years the water-power will be abundant. In dry years, the water-power may run low, but the turf will be easier to dig and process.

The power from the electric stations is being spread as rapidly as possible into all parts of Ireland. Villages where once the only light was the oil lamp or candle and the only power the muscle power of the farmer and his wife and family are now lighted by electricity, and the farm work is done by electric motors.

Here again, the Irish Government encourages private initiative. A rural community must estimate its own needs, roughly, of course, and make application to the electricity supply board to have the power lines brought in. The local officer of the board makes a more accurate survey. He can point out to overconservative farmers the advantages of electric power and its small cost. Then, if enough people want it to justify the cost and to show a reasonable income from the power used, the power lines come in.

In this, as in other things, the aim of the Irish Government is to help the people to help themselves.

It is well known, of course, that the Soviet veto has kept Ireland out the United Nations—that is to say out of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The United Nations is the poorer by that, for it could well profit by the high moral principles that Irish statesmen have shown in international relations. People may not remember that Mr. De Valera, when the Fascists invaded Abyssinia in 1935, warned the old League of Nations that this was its crucial test. If it allowed aggression against a small and defenseless country to go unpunished, its days were numbered. Mr. De Valera was not heeded. We had the Second World War, and the League is ingloriously gone.

But while excluded from United Nations membership, Ireland is cooperating with the United Nations in the ways that are open to it. Ireland is a member of many of the specialized agencies of the United Nations: For instance, the International Labor Office, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the Universal Postal Union, and the International Telecommunications Union.

Ireland is also an active member of the Council of Europe. In fact Ireland's Foreign Minister, Mr. Sean MacBride is the liaison officer between the Council of Ministers and the Assembly of the Council of Europe.

One may ask, perhaps, why Ireland did not accept membership in the Atlantic Pact. Here one must step warily to avoid treading on some sensitive toes. But there are certain facts which should be known. Since the British Government holds part of northeastern Ireland, claiming it as British territory, the Irish Government says that to join the Atlantic Pact would mean that it was ratifying this forcible partition of Ireland, which it has never recognized. The pact pledges each member to guarantee the territorial integrity of all the others. And since Britain claims northeastern Ireland as British territory, the Irish Government would be put in the position of guaranteeing what it has always regarded as an unjust usurpation of Irish territory.

Now there is here much more than a mere boundary dispute. If the United States, for instance, had a boundary dispute with Canada, one might say that it was mainly a question of territory. On whichever side of the disputed boundary a man lived, he would find himself under a fair and democratic government. But in 1921 the British set up a northern government to govern the territory they claim in Ireland. Shortly after coming into existence, the northern government declared a state of emergency and passed a special powers act, suspending all the civil guarantees.

The emergency has now lasted 29 years. Let me quote you a couple of opinions from fairly unbiased sources on the northern government. In 1935 the British National Council for Civil Liberties—which included people like Lady Astor and the late Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells—had an investigation made of the northern government. It reported:

"Through the use of the special powers, individual liberty is no longer protected by law, but is at the arbitrary disposition of the executive. This abrogation of law has been so practiced as to bring the freedoms of the subject into contempt."

Writing in the New York liberal weekly, the Nation, in August 1949, a former correspondent of the London Daily Herald, Griffin Barry, described the operation of the special powers:

"A person detained under these regulations is deprived of protections that have hedged the liberty of the subject in Britain for ages. He may be held indefinitely without being charged and without trial. He is allowed no visitors and no messages. He has no access to legal advice. A curious statute deals with the examination of witnesses by a resident magistrate. * * * A witness may not be accompanied to court by a legal adviser or friend and is specifically not excused from answering questions on the grounds that 'an answer may incriminate or tend to incriminate himself.' Refusal to answer is punishable by penal servitude up to 14 years."

These are no extracts from the code of laws in a Communist so-called Peoples Democracy. They are regulations made for Irishmen in Northern Island, by a government set up and supported from London. The Irish Government recognizes that one of the objects of the Atlantic Pact is to prevent the further spread of that kind of police state over Western Europe. It could not logically sign the Atlantic Pact, which would mean ratifying the existence of a police state in Northern Ireland.

The objection may be raised that in view of the great threats of communism the Irish should waive their quarrel with England over the northern territory. To be logical, one should also urge the British Government to abolish, or at least to reform, the northern government. But the British will not even discuss the northern government. One can understand that; the northern government simply cannot stand discussion. It would seem only reasonable to urge the British to be just, before urging the Irish to be generous. For the ultimate redress of this injustice, Ireland looks not to arms, for it is a nation dedicated to peaceful settlement of international questions, but to the pressure of enlightened world opinion, especially of American opinion. God speed the day when Ireland's hopes will be realized.

In our own country the Irish have shown themselves most appreciative of the character of our American democracy. While on a night like this they foregather to revive the memories of the old country, to recall its glories and its sorrows, its perennial smile and tear, yet they have given to this Republic their unstinted loyalty and devotion. Many thousands of them in the late war gave the last supreme unanswerable testimony of loyalty—their lives. The Irish in America never forget the land of their birth or of their ancestors. But theirs is no divided allegiance; their love of Ireland has never conflicted with their loyalty to the country that has become for them a second homeland. And Americans of all creeds and classes, from all nations of the world, join with them tonight in honoring their ancestral Emerald Isle and the saint who has won and held for 1,500 years every Irish heart.

Armed Forces Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian on the subject of an Armed Forces ceiling:

ARMED FORCES CEILING

If the Nation is to have universal military training, or its immediate equivalent, selective service for 18-year-olds, we are thoroughly in accord with the Senate's determination to establish a ceiling on military manpower. The 3,500,000-man limit proposed by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, would have been adequate. The Senate compromised on 4,000,000.

Military greed in the matter of building a huge standing army, navy and air force is insatiable. But a principal argument used in bringing universal military training in by the back door of the 18-year-old draft was that creation of a large reserve pool of young men with around 2 years of military training would make it unnecessary for the Nation to support a permanent, back-breaking load of millions of men in the regular forces.

The high command pleaded for an open end on military manpower on the basis of preparedness for a national emergency. Should such an emergency—which could only be war with Russia—occur, Congress would be ready to remove the limitation without argument. There is no greater danger of war with Russia today than there has been for several years—perhaps less. The 18-draft and its possible successor, UMT, will build up a vast reserve of trained soldiers, sailors, and airmen for employment in such an emergency.

Nothing would suit the Soviet purposes better than to have the United States plunge itself into an economic collapse because of an unbearable burden of taxes, restrictions on production, and inflation. This would end more quickly than anything else our power to help free nations and our leadership in resisting Communist aggression. An unnecessarily great military force in being would contribute to such a debacle.

In voting a limitation on military manpower, Congress will be taking the Truman administration at its word in the matter of limited contribution of troops to defend Western Europe and in not attempting to garrison the entire world. It will be recognizing the validity of the concept that American strength is geared to the technical superiority of our weapons, and not to mass movement of troops. It will impress on the generals and admirals the economic necessity of making the most of their manpower—and womanpower.

Congressional surrender to the brass on this point would be a mistake which in the course of time could change American life so drastically that we would have lost a war without fighting it. If the United States cannot make its case for freedom in the world with a military force of 4,000,000 men, it might as well, as ex-President Hoover proposed, withdraw to Fortress America and await the assault of its enemies.

Workers of America Contributed Most to Its Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article appearing in the February 1951 issue of the International Chemical Worker, written by H. A. Bradley, international president of the International Chemical Workers Union, entitled "Let's Face It":

LET'S FACE IT

(By H. A. Bradley, International president, International Chemical Workers Union)

Mussolini, acting on the theory that the workers of Italy possessed only muscle and no capacity for thinking, deliberately created a program of confusion and distrust in government; and when the confusion was at its height, he seized the power of government and enslaved the Italian people, not just the workers but all of the Italian people.

Hitler was a copycat. He noted well the maneuvers of Il Duce and improved on his technique of confusing the people and even wrote a book on the subject in which he brazenly stated that if you tell a lie often enough, the lie eventually becomes accepted as a fact—and how he lied and how often. By adding a little arson and murder to his lies, he was able to create enough confusion so that he, too, became the slavemaster of not just the German workers but of all the German people.

We must retrace history briefly and again consider Mussolini. Where did he get his ideas? Well, he had been gazing with envy at the modern masters of slavery, the heads of the World Communist Party in Russia, who proclaimed that only the working people had the ability to use their brains and govern themselves, but these leaders acted always exactly the opposite way. More confusion. They were able to take advantage of the people by fully exploiting the greed and persecutions of stupid dictators who had preceded them.

Today here in the United States, we as a people and as a Nation face grave responsibilities. Our way of life and our freedom is at stake. Our resources are being destroyed and our sons are being killed; and in Washington are men who are doing their utmost to create confusion in the minds of the people and distrust in our Government—men who even now by their actions, if not their words, seem to feel that the workers of this country are incapable of exercising good judgment.

In the current crisis the workers have not been permitted one single spokesman in any capacity where the views, ability, and experience of the worker might be utilized for the full benefit of all the people. Why is this so? Why do some political leaders insist on bypassing the viewpoint and assistance of the largest segment of our population? Why do they insist that they and only they have any mental capacity? Why do they continually try to hamstring every effort of our Government to function normally and properly? Why do they always insist that only they, and no one else, know how things should be done? Why this continual attempt to confuse a nation and discredit its government? Why are they against everything they do not control?

Let's face it. Is an attempt under way to force history to repeat itself and add other names to the dictator's roster?

It seems high time that the people—all the people of this Nation, take a look under the covers and see what some of this is all about. Let us not become victims of confusion, let us not become unjust critics of our governmental processes and let us not forget that it was workers who made America great, not professional opportunists. And it was the town meeting that consolidated our views and our actions, not the secret huddle of a few grasping, professional politicians bent on having their way even at the price of American security and freedom.

Tom Dewey Gets on an Expensive Bandwagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Frank C. Hanighen, in his supplement to Human Events entitled "Not Merely Gossip," calls attention to the testimony given by the New York Governor before the joint Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate a few weeks ago. At that time

he said that we should send 100 divisions to Europe. He did not say what the cost would be. I think Tom Dewey is on the wrong bandwagon. Mr. Hannigan points out in his issue of March 14 just what 100 divisions in Europe would cost the American taxpayer. Apparently Dewey does not care what the cost will be. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the item on Governor Dewey at this point in the RECORD:

The New York Governor's demand—reiterated in his Lincoln Day address—for 100 divisions for Europe had a round-number impressiveness for the newspaper headlines. But GOP Members of Congress wonder if Dewey really understood the budgetary implications of what he was talking about. Would he have ventured to propose that over six and a half million American soldiers should be raised to defend Europe? Yet, that is the substance of his talk, whether he knew it or not.

According to military observers, this is how it is figured. On the basis of World War II experience—and obviously our command is planning to fight the next war on the basis of the last one—the military manpower necessary for 100 divisions would come to at least 6,700,000 men. It is true that we begin with a figure of 18,000 men to a division; but that is only combat troops. All the auxiliary services must be figured and the divisional slice is always far greater than the actual front-line soldiers, since it must include the demands of logistics. Next, the cost of one soldier per year, including pay, allowances, shelter, food, clothing, transport, etc., comes to an estimated $10,000. On the reasonable assumption that the Dewey 100-division army would be composed of 5 airborne, 25 armored and 70 infantry divisions, the cost of equipment alone is estimated at $25,000,000,000. In short, the Dewey program would cost $67,000,000,000 a year for the Armed Forces, plus an initial cost of $25,000,000,000 for equipment. It may be that these figures give the New York Governor no pause, but they do impress Members of Congress who participate in the great debate and who seek to raise the money for such military plans.

Democrats Clean Their Own House—Republicans Not So Zealous in Harding Administration—Maryland GOP Should Be Embarrassed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal, of Thursday, March 15, 1951. It follows:

WHO DIGS IT UP

Two Senate investigating committees are writing into the record some unpleasant history of our times.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's subcommittee is looking into the operations of syndicate crime and is finding evidence of a partnership between crime and some public officials sworn to uphold and enforce the law.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT's subcommittee is digging out the details of the manner in which influence has been exerted in the granting of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The findings of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees have been embarrassing to the Truman administration. The Kefauver committee findings have implicated various Democratic Party organizations.

The RFC investigation has reached into the White House "palace guard," the close advisers of the President.

Senators KEFAUVER and FULBRIGHT are Democrats. Neither has betrayed the least inclination to relax in investigative zeal, no matter if the chips fall for the most part on the Democratic side.

In that particular respect the Republicans, while enjoying the embarrassment of the Democrats, must remember that the scandals of the Harding administration were not unearthed by Republicans. The scandals were made known during a Republican administration, but the Senate committee chairmen and prosecutors were Senators Thomas J. Walsh and Burton K. Wheeler, both Democrats.

While Democrats may be embarrassed by the findings of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees, they do not mind at all the revelations being made by another Senate committee, an elections subcommittee headed by Senator MIKE MONRONEY. The matter in which Senator Millard Tydings, of Maryland, was defeated last fall deserves an airing, and if Republicans in and out of Maryland are embarrassed, they deserve to be.

Iranian Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the most alarming developments is now underway which could very likely result in a most serious problem to this country and other free nations of the world. I am fearful these happenings in the Middle East are little noticed and I call to the attention of the House the implications so evident in this explosive Middle East area.

For 50 years or more, the British have controlled the Iranian oil fields. The greatest known reserves of oil in the world are in the Middle East. The richest single pool is undoubtedly in the oil fields of Iran. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. has the largest reserves in this huge outlay. It is principally British in which the British Government owns the controlling interest, approximately 52 percent.

Great Britain has nationalized its most important industry and embarked upon national socialism. Now they are faced with the proposition that threatens their fuel pipeline.

I have been watching recently the developments of the Iranian Government repudiating their long years of control over these oil fields and following the same policies to nationalize this operation in their country. This means, of course, the Government of Iran will take over this largest of oil companies operating in that country.

The implications would, of course, be immediate. From these fields tons of fuel go to the armies, navies, and air forces of this country, Great Britain, and other western powers. For years Russia has no doubt been striving to bring about this dissension and expropriation of these rich reserves. In any war between the West and Russia this certainly would be the grand prize.

Should this action stand, it is very likely the next move would be to take over the American companies and any other operating in that area under firm agreements.

This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, would be far more serious than the expropriation by Mexico in 1938.

Today there appears an editorial in the Washington Post. It is a sad commentary but yet points up some of the views and circumstances surrounding this problem and emphasizes how far reaching it might be. Under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks in the RECORD:

IRANIAN OIL

The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. is a British concern in which the British Government owns a controlling interest. It is not only the largest industrial enterprise in Iran, but also the only successfully operating oil company in the country, providing about 15 percent of the Government's income in the form of royalties and taxes and more than 60 percent of its foreign-exchange receipts. More than a third of Britain's oil imports are shipped from Iran, and the company is the chief source of supply for the Royal Navy. Nevertheless, the company's relations with the Iranian Government have been unsatisfactory for a long time. The Iranians claim that their Government's income from company operations is too low; that information about its activities is inadequate; that too much foreign labor is employed; that oil distribution in Iran is not efficient; and that the educational, health, and housing needs of employees are neglected.

Efforts to revise the terms of the 60-year concession under which the company operates were started in 1948, but the Iranian Parliament—the Majlis—failed to ratify this supplementary agreement, and it was withdrawn at the end of 1950. Thereafter agitation for cancellation of the concession was intensified, and the Parliament recently voted to nationalize Anglo-Iranian. The British are largely to blame for the growing opposition that led to this crisis. For, although the supplementary agreement went part way toward meeting Iranian demands, it did not go far enough. Belatedly the British have notified the Premier of Iran that the company is prepared to discuss a proposal for an equal division of profits—a concession that should satisfy critics whose chief complaint has been that the profit-sharing arrangement is unduly favorable to the British.

Whether this tardy overture will repair the damage already done is an open question. Much depends on whether nationalist sentiment, reflected in Communist-inspired desires to emancipate Iran from dependence on foreign capital, is strong enough to outweigh the economic arguments against expropriation of British oil properties. Thinking Iranians surely know that without the aid of foreign capital and foreign know-how the income from the oil industry would dwindle and the government would be deprived of funds needed to finance developmental projects in this backward area. Obviously it is to the interest of both countries to extend the agreement.

The free world has a tremendous political stake in the outcome of this controversy. For if the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. were nationalized, oil now sold to the western powers

would no doubt eventually be diverted to Russia. Directly or indirectly, Russia would be able to gain access to one of the world's richest oil fields. As Philip Toynbee points out in an article in the New York Times magazine, Iran is a tempting prize for economic reasons but its "real and compelling attraction is its strategic position."

Even if the Senate passes the nationalization bill, as expected, and it is approved by the Shah, 2 months are allowed for study of proposals for taking over the properties. So there is still hope that a solution of the controversy can be found that will protect the interests of both the British and the Iranians and keep oil moving in the same channels as at present. If this hope should be frustrated Great Britain might feel compelled to move troops into Iran to protect her oil properties, which, she protests, the Iranian Government has no legal right to nationalize. In that case Russia would have an excuse for moving her troops across the northern frontier and a third world war might be touched off.

The Story of Wright Bryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the latest issue of the magazine, Dixie Business, Col. Hubert F. Lee, the editor, has written an article entitled "The Story of Wright Bryan." Mr. Bryan, the editor of the Atlanta Journal, is one of the youngest editors of any metropolitan newspaper in the Nation.

Colonel Lee's story describes the interesting career of this outstanding Atlantian, and, under leave previously granted, I insert this article herewith:

THE STORY OF WRIGHT BRYAN

(By Hubert F. Lee)

Wright Bryan, one of the South's foremost leaders, is at 46, one of the youngest editors of any metropolitan newspaper in the Nation. He is a native Atlantian who not only has spent his entire life in the South but who has achieved a distinguished record of contributions to this region.

Mr. Bryan's philosophy is that no newspaper executive is worth a darn unless he likes to be a reporter. Even though he is now editor of the Atlanta Journal—a post in which he has served since August 1945—he constantly practices what he preaches by getting into action as a reporter whenever he has a chance. He is known to his associates on the Journal as an editor who would never assign a reporter to do a job he wouldn't be willing to undertake himself.

Wright Bryan was born in Atlanta on August 6, 1905, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. B. Bryan. He graduated from Clemson College, where his distinguished father was editor of extension publications, with a B. S. degree and then attended the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

His first newspaper experience was as a reporter and sports editor on the Greenville (S. C.) Piedmont. He joined the staff of the Atlanta Journal in 1927 as a reporter, in which capacity he served until he was named city editor in 1935. In 1940, he was named managing editor, and 3 years later he had so ably demonstrated his talents that the title of associate editor was added to that of managing editor.

Mr. Bryan left his executive position in September 1942 to represent the Journal as war correspondent on the scene of action in England. Although slated to return to his post at the Journal at the end of 6 months, he asked permission to remain in the European theater of operations until D-day. And it was on D-day—June 6, 1944—that he scooped the world. And what a scoop.

He flew across the English Channel in a C-47 with the first group of planes to take American parachutists to French shores.

En route back to England, he wrote his account of the invasion, and at 3:15 a. m., Atlanta time, NBC headquarters in New York notified radio station WSB in Atlanta that Mr. Bryan would shortly be on the air—"the first man to come back from the invasion and report to the Nation by air." Wright Bryan was also an accredited correspondent for NBC.

High acclaim greeted the calm, though stirring account of the momentous events. Atlanta newspapermen, active and (like this writer, has been) inactive, were thrilled by both the big news but most because Wright Bryan was making newspaper and radio history.

President Roosevelt wired Wright Bryan his appreciation of the broadcast.

Secretary of War Stimson said the broadcast was his first news of the invasion. Mothers and fathers and sons and brothers and sisters of the men in uniform and all the Nation heard it with all the mixed emotions of wartime anxiety, hope, and prayer. It was truly a distinguished journalistic achievement.

Later on the same day, Mr. Bryan flew back across the Channel and filed an additional dispatch replete with details of the fighting.

Then, almost before he himself realized it, he was in Normandy, assigned at first to Canadian troops and a little later with the American First Army at the St. Lo breakthrough.

On September 12, 1944, he was captured by the German Army near Chaumont, France, and was sent to Oflig 64, a prisoner-of-war camp at Szubin, Poland, from which he was liberated by the Russians on January 21, 1945. He had been wounded in the leg, an injury that did not fully heal until some time after he had returned to Atlanta.

Under his editorship, the Atlanta Journal has maintained a consistently courageous editorial policy. It has never hesitated to speak out boldly for what it believed was right nor to condemn what it felt was evil. Its editorial columns are known throughout the country for the intellectual honesty of their content. The paper has long been a leader in fighting to better the economic condition of the South and its people and the awakening of a greater civic consciousness so essential to progress.

Editor Bryan has been active for years in both newspaper projects and civic work. He has served as chairman of the Georgia Press Institute and as secretary and, currently, vice president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

He has been particularly active in the American Red Cross and served as one of the three general chairmen in the Atlanta Red Cross drive in 1946. He was president of the Atlanta Social Service Index in 1948. Meanwhile, he has also found time to devote his energies to numerous other programs designed for community betterment.

When Dixie Business resumed after marking time during the war years, its fall 1945 issue reprinted what Wright Bryan wrote about the great need for Atlanta putting over the annual community and war fund drive. Our editorial note at that time said: "Our selection of the outstanding column published in a southern newspaper appeared in the September 7, 1945, issue of the Atlanta Journal. Wright Bryan, famed war correspondent and now editor of the Atlanta Journal, is an internationally famous writer. He knows from personal observation the good work done by the war agencies."

Mr. Bryan is a member of the Capital City Club, Piedmont Driving Club, Atlanta Rotary Club, and the Overseas Press Club of America. He is steward of the First Methodist Church.

On October 12, 1932, he was married to Ellen Hillyer Newell, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred C. Newell, of Atlanta. He and Mrs. Bryan have three children, Ellen Newell, Mary Lane, and William Wright Bryan, Jr.

In addition to Mr. Bryan's duties as editor of a great metropolitan daily, he somehow manages to find time for frequent radio broadcasts, sometimes interpreting the news and sometimes interviewing important personalities over WSB's Views of the News program. He also is in constant demand as a speaker for a wide variety of functions.

Collective Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an informative article by Mr. Felix Morley, an outstanding writer, which appeared in Barron's a few weeks ago. This is a thought-provoking article and I commend it to the attention of all Members of this body:

COLLECTIVE SECURITY—ACTION TO THAT END IS FAVORED BY AMERICANS IF APPLIED CONSISTENTLY

(By Felix Morley)

Condemnation of Communist China as an aggressor, by the Assembly of the United Nations, is much more than a belated international recognition of an obvious fact. It is also an endorsement of what has long been a distinctively American principle.

For over 40 years American statesmen, regardless of party, have argued that the most effective way to prevent war is to make aggression unprofitable. Theodore Roosevelt advocated this as early as 1910. After the outbreak of World War I, the principle of collective action was pressed energetically by William H. Taft, father of the present Republican leader.

In a speech at Cleveland, on May 12, 1915, former President Taft laid down four fundamental provisions for a "league of peace." The last of these four points was that in the event of aggression by one government against another, following a refusal to arbitrate the dispute, "then the remaining members of the league agree to join in the formidable defense of the member thus prematurely attacked."

The origin of the quest for security by collective action is much older, and really early American. It was first voiced by William Penn, in his Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe, written shortly after the founding of Pennsylvania.

In this essay, Penn, although a Quaker, argued persuasively for the use of force against aggression. He suggested an annual general assembly of governmental delegates, empowered to consider all international disputes "that cannot be made up by private embassies before the assembly begins." If arbitration were refused or rejected then, in Penn's own words:

"All the other sovereignties, united as one strength, shall compel the submission and

performance of the sentence, with damages to the suffering party, and charges to the sovereignties that obliged their submission."

What American leadership is now trying to accomplish through the United Nations in Korea is precisely what William Penn advocated in 1693, and what William Howard Taft again advised in 1915.

It should also be recalled that even before President Taft publicly urged collective action, President Woodrow Wilson was thinking about it privately. Soon after the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914, Mr. Wilson wrote that, at the end of those hostilities, "all nations must be absorbed into some great association of nations whereby all shall guarantee the integrity of each, so that any one nation violating the agreement between all of them shall bring punishment on itself automatically."

From this reasoning the League of Nations evolved. In the upshot, though membership was strongly urged by many Americans, including the then youthful ROBERT A. TAFT, the United States did not join the League. But hostility to the theory of collective security was not the prevailing reason for that refusal.

The fundamental and logical American objection was to the joining of the League Covenant and the Versailles Treaty in a single document, so that the League was at the outset made an organization of victorious powers empowered to maintain a punitive status quo in their own behalf. Many people thought it a false start to apply the doctrine of collective action to secure a peace regarded as unjust.

The story of the failure of the League of Nations, handicapped from the beginning by United States abstention, needs no retelling. Its greatest procedural blunder, undoubtedly, was the effort to secure disarmament ahead of the preparation of machinery to enforce peace. Nevertheless, for all its mistakes and weakness, the League kept the idea of collective action alive. Indeed its final gesture, on Dec. 14, 1939, was to expel Russia from membership for refusing to accept mediation of the dispute leading to the Soviet war of aggression against Finland.

The United Nations, like the League of Nations before it, developed from a wartime alliance. Its actual origin was the declaration, signed in Washington on January 1, 1942, whereby 26 governments subscribed to the now forgotten Atlantic Charter and pledged themselves "not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies."

In a simultanous public statement, Secretary of State Cordell Hull emphasized the collective action aspect of the alliance. He called its declaration "a living proof that law-abiding and peacful nations can unite in using the sword when necessary to preserve liberty and justice and the fundamental values of mankind."

When the time came for writing the Charter of UN as a permanent organization, two major mistakes made in respect to the old League were avoided. The United Nations was set up without reference to any postwar settlements and without any special responsibility for enforcing such settlements when made. Furthermore, in 10 separate articles (41-50) the San Francisco Charter sought to set up definite enforcement machinery for use against aggression, which the Covenant of the League of Nations failed to do.

On the other hand, the Charter of UN made two wholly new mistakes, the less excusable because they were both identified by constructive critics before the San Francisco Conference, but were committed by the Department of State in defiance of the "more haste, less speed" adage.

One of these disastrous mistakes was the assumption, bitterly upset by events, that the five permanent members of the Council would always see eye to eye on everything. On this assumption each was given the veto power that Russia has used so lavishly. Furthermore, no provision whatever was made for the probability that a permanent member of the Council would itself sometime commit aggression. This blunder had been avoided by the League covenant, which successively defined Japan, Italy, and Russia as aggressors, even though not strong enough to take effective action.

The second major blunder of the present Charter was to put preeminent authority in the Security Council, where the veto operates, instead of in the Assembly, where action may be decided by a two-thirds vote. This stupidity contributed greatly to the delay in defining Communist China as an aggressor, and could indeed have prevented any United Nations action in Korea, except that last June Russia happened to be boycotting all UN meetings.

Moscow is not likely to be unrepresented on the Security Council at critical moments in future. And it is ironic to realize now that Russia cannot be expelled from the United Nations except on the recommendation of the Security Council—where Russia has unlimited veto privilege.

The United States still has faith in collective action against aggression. That is demonstrated both by the unending casualty lists from Korea and by the pertinacity with which, after long weeks of unhealthy recrimination, the administration has finally pushed through the UN Assembly a rather futile condemnation of the Chinese Communists.

But the history of both the League and the UN demonstrate that collective action cannot be made effective through an international parliament at its present stage of development. And for that reason the effort, as General Eisenhower is making plain, must be channeled through limited military alliances rather than through UN.

What is beyond the power of General Eisenhower to explain is why the State Department has throughout been disposed to throw potential allies to the wolves in Asia, while pouring out billions to sustain other allies in Europe. That is a strange and futile way to implement the popular will to resist aggression as such. It has created that debilitating confusion in public thinking for which the President and Secretary Acheson must take responsibility.

A Refugee From Nazi Persecution Gives His Views on Being Called Into Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, because I want my colleagues in the House to have the benefit of the clear thinking of a foreign-born youth who is about to be called into military service for the United States, I herewith insert in the RECORD one of the most splendid articles I have yet read on why it is necessary for America to rebuild her Armed Forces.

Charles L. Klotzer, author of this article, has been in the United States only 2 years. Of the Jewish faith, this young man was forced from his native Germany by Nazi persecution, his father having served in a concentration camp. Opposed as he is to force and violence of any nature, he quite naturally opposes war.

It is a refreshing thing to read young Klotzer's reasoning on his desire to answer his adopted country's call to military service despite his adversion to army life and his conscientious opposition to war.

Our country owes its greatness to the kind of stock Charles L. Klotzer comes from. Since the beginning of our Republic, from many nations of the world, strong, sincere, honest young men like this one have come to our shores seeking the peace and the freedom all men cherish and in return giving to our country a high type of citizenship that has made us the great Nation we are. These were the people who built our country—these were our forefathers.

I am glad that Charles Klotzer took the time to put into writing his thoughts as he leaves his position on the Troy (Ill.) Tribune, and his new-found home in that typical American community, to enter the service of his new country.

The article to which I have referred follows:

WHY I DO NOT REFUSE TO BE DRAFTED

(By Charles L. Klotzer)

Although I am neither a conscientious objector nor a pacifist, I am opposed to war. As I am opposed to war, and as the army is an instrument of war, I am consequently opposed to the army. Nevertheless, I will report for duty next Monday morning.

My principal objection to army life is that it cancels various personal freedoms. In general, it interrupts the healthy life of a nation; in particular, it retards the normal development of youth. In its ultimate sense the purpose of an army is destructive, leading toward actual combat. Combat itself does not achieve any elimination of international conflicts, it only forces physical solutions. One country will have to obey the other, not that it wants to. More probably, future wars cannot be won at all, they will end because of mutual exhaustion.

In spite of these reasons I will obey the induction order. Am I simply afraid? Am I giving up my high-sounding principles?

When I say I oppose war, I may be misunderstood. A truly defensive war, a war to check aggression, a war to uphold the foundation of our way of life, is a war which one has to support. World War II, which temporarily reestablished the four freedoms in Europe, created something. It destroyed what was evil, nazism; it created what was good, freedom.

The defensive side of a war is the one which counts. We have no right to invade others and change their way of living. We would be as guilty as those who want to reshape our society by force. As long as our country does not become the aggressor and employs its forces maintaining what is morally right, it is my moral and legal obligation to support an army.

It is a legal obligation because the institution of the Armed Forces is a matter of law. When I refuse to obey these laws, I also cannot call upon them to protect me when I need them. American laws cover every phase of life and provide for security and progress. Only by upholding them ourselves can one ask others to abide by them as well.

A military force, especially the American Army, need not necessarily cause evil.

Armies can be a powerful factor for peace. I say that somewhat hesitantly, as history has yet to prove that increased armed force secures peace. So far the existence of armies led to their use—and the slaughtering of human beings. Due to my lack of knowledge of present international moves and motives I extend to my country the benefit of a doubt, hoping that force will restrain force.

The American Army has a very high standard of ethics. Its leadership has not thrown us into battle for spoils or for more territory. They are a positive force which has stood for what was considered right in the past.

With this background in mind and hoping for a continuation of such a policy, I cannot help but acknowledge that it reflects on everyone clothed in a soldier's outfit. Those in the service must learn a feeling of belongingness to something which under the right leadership will secure liberty and justice.

At the same time those at home must assure a wise leadership for these forces, so that their feeling of identification and pride will not be betrayed.

So far I have been talking about generalities in regard to war and the Army. At the present time, however, there are additional considerations. There is the international tension, the threat of a new war, and the need to strengthen defenses.

Pressure Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Congress-at-work section of Senior Scholastic Magazine, February 14, 1951, written by Mr. Herbert L. Marx, Jr., under the title "Pressure Groups":

PRESSURE GROUPS—THOUSANDS OF LOBBYISTS TRY TO INFLUENCE OUR LEGISLATION

One of the major industries in the United States—oddly enough—is lobbying. According to one who should know (Chairman FRANK BUCHANAN, of the House Special Committee on Lobbying Activities), lobbying today is a billion-dollar business in this country.

In American political slang, a lobby has come to mean persons (or an organization) hired by private interests to exert pressure on Congress for the passage or defeat of certain legislation.

Originally the lobbies in the Capitol building were the places where people with special causes to plead would buttonhole their Congressmen. Most lobbying today no longer takes place in the Capitol lobbies. But the name has stuck, and the people who engage in lobbying are known as lobbyists.

It should be pointed out at the very outset that there is nothing illegal about lobbying. The first amendment to the Constitution guarantees to all citizens the right "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." A petition may be a written statement with many signatures affixed to it. Or it may be expressed through an organized movement.

Many lobbies serve a useful civic purpose in bringing out facts not generally known to the public or to the legislators. The information supplied by lobbyists at times helps Congress decide what corrective legislation is needed. The danger, however, lies in the tendency of some lobbyists to assume that the public welfare coincides with their own interests.

Lobbying has become such a powerful national institution that it is sometimes referred to, jestingly, as the third House of Congress. It takes 13 columns of the Washington, D. C., telephone directory to list the names of lobbyists. Representative BUCHANAN asserts that there are no fewer than 1,500 lobbying groups and 10,000 individual lobbyists. Many lobbyists work for large national organizations representing special groups such as business, labor, farmers, real-estate owners, veterans, doctors. And there are, of course, a multitude of reformers who organize drives to champion their pet reforms.

Most lobbies make no secret of their identity and what they stand for. They appeal directly to the public through radio, newspapers, magazines, advertising, pamphlets, and movies. They present their case before congressional committees. They work for the election of candidates friendly to their cause.

Some lobbies, however, operate under cover. They keep secret who they are and what they stand for. They privately organize campaigns to send letters and telegrams to Congressmen—to give the impression that large numbers of voters support their program. They try to spread their propaganda without indicating its source.

What are some of the better-known lobbies? One of the largest lobbies represents the American Medical Association. The AMA announced that it had spent $1,225,028 in the first 9 months of 1949 to fight President Truman's national health program. Other big spenders during 1949 were the United World Federalists ($230,500), the Townsend plan backers ($205,371), the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons ($186,271), National Association of Manufacturers ($86,000). Labor unions spent a combined total of more than $100,000.

In order to keep lobbies under control and to regulate their activities, Congress passed in 1946 a special Lobbying Act. It requires the registration with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate of organized groups and their representatives who seek to influence legislation. The agent is also required to file a quarterly report of his lobbying activities and expenditures. All contributions of more than $500 must be noted. Statements are made under oath, and maximum penalties of a $5,000 fine, a year in prison, or both, are provided for violation of the act.

Three lobbyists who refused to supply the required information were cited last year for contempt of Congress. They are Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government; Joseph P. Kamp, executive vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League; and William L. Patterson, national executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress.

The House also set up its special Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. On October 21, the committee submitted its report. It revealed that 152 corporations had spent $32,124,800 between January 1, 1947, and June 1, 1950, on "activities relating to attempts to influence legislation."

The report was based on replies to questionnaires sent by the committee to 173 corporations. Of this number, 65 reported spending more than $2,000,000 in printing and distributing publications dealing with public issues; 31 reported spending $3,000,000 for advertising dealing with public issues; 21 firms refused to tell what they spent.

Chairman BUCHANAN did not, however, criticize the right of business firms to engage in lobbying. "I do not believe in curbing lobbying activity in any way," he said. "But I do believe in full disclosure. Influencing legislation is an activity that should be carried on in a goldfish bowl."

Commenting on the committee report, the New York Times declared in an editorial, "The nature of the pressure and who is paying for it ought always to be public knowledge. * * * If this can be done, lobbying can be part of the democratic process; if it can't, some new legislation may be required."

Mexican War Hide-Out for F. D. R. Rumors Persist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, here is a very interesting article by Mr. Ed Ainsworth of the Los Angeles Times about one of the mysteries of F. D. R.:

MEXICAN VILLAGE WAR HIDE-OUT BUILT FOR F. D. R., RUMORS INSIST—$6,000,000 FACILITIES IN REMOTE SPOT

(By Ed Ainsworth)

PUNTA PENASCO, SONORA, MEXICO, March 13.—Did the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, suppress the story of a multimillion-dollar war hideout for him in this remote Mexican fishing village?

The rumors are flying thick and fast here today.

They have been started anew by news dispatches from Washington speculating about possible hide-outs for President Truman and other top Government officials in the event of bombing of the capital.

IMPOSING PALACE

An imposing palace and an extensive airport and a handy harbor and a paved highway all figure in the conjectures here about the Roosevelt hiding place.

Estimates run in the neighborhood of $6,000,000 (American money) for the combined facilities built here about 1943.

The accepted version in Punta Penasco is that the "palacio" was built for a proposed meeting of President Roosevelt and President Avila Camacho of Mexico to discuss the projected Pan-American military highway down the west coast of Mexico.

READILY ACCESSIBLE

Persistent stories are circulating, however, that the real purpose of the extensive construction projects was to provide a hide-away accessible by all means of transportation—motor vehicle, warship, and airplane—for the personal safety of President Roosevelt.

The palacio which is the central structure in the fabric of rumors, is being operated now under lease by Americans as a tourist hotel. It is owned, according to information given out here, by the Mexican Government.

The fine, paved highway to this port runs about 60 miles from Sonoyta at the Mexican border. Sonoyta, a mere sleepy hamlet, is approximately 96 miles south of Gila Bend, Ariz.

SPORT-FISHING MECCA

Punta Penasco, last becoming a sport-fishing mecca for southern Californians as well as an important shrimp center, is 500 miles from Los Angeles. The port—named

Rocky Point for the sheer headland that rises from its long, curving, white sand beaches—is on the northernmost portion of the Gulf of California, southeast of the delta of the Colorado River.

It does not even appear on many maps.

This isolation is reported to have been the determining factor in its selection for the hide-out.

It was on April 20, 1943, that President Roosevelt and President Avila Camacho met in a historic conference in Monterrey to discuss the war situation and Pan-American unity and defense.

OFFICIAL DISCLAIMERS

The presumption is that, later on, when the gravity of the war situation was even greater, the Punta Penasco hide-away was prepared as a sequel to the Monterrey meeting.

In Washington today, official disclaimers of any knowledge of the project came from various sources.

Steve Early, White House secretary under the Roosevelt administration, declared that the only precautions taken for spiriting President Roosevelt out of Washington were the construction of a tunnel out of the White House and the creation of the well-known Shangri-La retreat in Maryland.

The Mexican Embassy denied any knowledge of the project involving President Roosevelt.

NOTHING IN FILES

"It's not a fancy palacio, it's just a decent hotel, and now they wish they had built it bigger," one Embassy spokesman said.

The State Department couldn't locate anything in its files concerning the affair, according to the press section.

Comptroller General Warren's staff reviewed old accounts without coming up with anything tangible in the General Accounting Office.

Despite these blind alleys in Washington, the circumstantial evidence piled up here to bolster the account that is current throughout both Mexico and the United States—that the palacio was a hide-out.

INTERIOR ELABORATE

The palacio is an extremely well-constructed hewn stone and wood building, with many modernistic features.

It is known as the Hotel Cortez.

The interior is elaborately finished, with much paneling and fancy woodwork. A significant feature is that there is no transparent window in the main lounge on the side toward the sea—an obvious precaution for the President's safety, according to observers here.

The main apartment and kitchen are on a grand scale.

Operators of the hotel are Mr. and Mrs. Richard Hussong of southern California. They are reported to be subleasing from Senora Olodia Manriquez, a reputed kinswoman of former President Plutarco Elias Calles who in turn is said to lease from a Mr. Bermudas.

The builders are listed as Petroleos Mexicanos.

Visitors who have come to this port over the new road during the last few years have been enthusiastic over the sport fishing and the fine sandy beaches covered with beautiful sea shells.

The big airport on the edge of town is said to be capable of handling the largest planes. The airport is managed by Felipe Ulloa, who welcomes an occasional small plane and some commercial ones, but who has not reported any presidents dropping in so far.

Some people say that a deep-water passage was dredged in deepest secrecy right up to the huge breakwater near the mysterious palacio, presumably to provide a channel for a warship in case the President needed to be brought in or evacuated in that manner. Nobody seems to be able to pin down this story, however.

Perhaps the puzzle will never be solved.

Washington officials say the financial accounts of the transaction might be buried forever in some obscure bookkeeping or Mexican loan item.

So Punta Penasco drowses here beside the blue water of the gulf, and sometimes the cries of the gulls circling the harbor are the only sounds heard.

The Hotel Cortez—otherwise known as the Roosevelt palacio—does a good business with tourists.

Who knows the full answer?

Perhaps we will learn manana.

Termination Dates for Education and Training Under Servicemen's Readjustment Act and Public Law 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting information contained in a fact sheet issued by the Veterans' Administration concerning termination dates for education and training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and Public Law 16. The information given in this sheet will be helpful to Members in answering inquiries from their constituents on this subject.

The material referred to follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
INFORMATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1951.

FACT SHEET—CUT-OFF DATE FOR GI BILL EDUCATION AND TRAINING AND TERMINATION DATES FOR GI BILL AND PUBLIC LAW 16 TRAINING

Ex-service men and women have been asking the Veterans' Administration questions about the approaching July 25, 1951, cut-off date for GI bill education and training. Many others have been asking about the termination dates of the GI bill and Public Law 16 programs.

This fact sheet provides the answers to questions most frequently asked.

WHEN IS THE CUT-OFF DATE?

The GI bill states that a veteran's course of education or training "shall be initiated not later than 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later." Termination of the war for GI bill purposes was fixed at July 25, 1947, by Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress. Therefore:

1. Veterans discharged on or before July 25, 1947 (and this includes most World War II veterans), must begin GI bill training by July 25, 1951.

2. Veterans discharged after July 25, 1947, must start within 4 years from their date of discharge.

3. Veterans who enlisted or reenlisted under the Voluntary Recruitment Act (between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946) may count the entire period of their enlistment or reenlistment as war service for GI bill purposes. They must start training within 4 years from the end of their enlistment or reenlistment period.

IS THERE A CUT-OFF DATE FOR PUBLIC LAW 16 TRAINEES?

There is no cut-off date for starting courses under Public Law 16, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for disabled veterans.

Disabled veterans may begin Public Law 16 training at any time after discharge, but in time to complete it by the wind-up of the program. The wind-up, for World War II veterans, is July 25, 1956. For veterans disabled after fighting started in Korea, the termination is 9 years from the end of the current emergency, a date yet to be established.

WHAT IS MEANT BY "INITIATING" TRAINING?

To initiate GI bill training by the cut-off date means actually to begin. It does not mean merely to make an application for training before the deadline, with the training itself to begin sometime afterward.

Veterans actually in training by cut-off time will be allowed to continue afterward. Veterans not in training by that date may not start afterward—though there are some exceptions.

A veteran who has started his course in time, and who has continued in it, will be considered to be in training, even though he has temporarily interrupted the course for the summer vacation or for other reasons beyond his control.

Example: A veteran enrolled in the fall of 1950 for a 2-year GI bill business course. His first school year ends in June 1951, at which time summer vacation begins. The July 25 cut-off date comes during his vacation. Yet, he will be permitted to resume his training for his second year starting in the fall of 1951.

POST-CUT-OFF DATE TRAINING

A veteran continuing a GI bill course after the cut-off date will be expected to pursue his training continuously until completion, except for conditions which normally would cause interruption by any student.

Once he completes or discontinues his GI bill course after the deadline, he may not start another course.

What is a course? VA has defined a course as a "curriculum, program of study or training or combination of subjects as are prescribed by the institution as constituting a course."

For a veteran studying engineering, for example, VA would consider his over-all program of engineering as his course. A single subject within his program, such as drafting, would not be a course in itself.

Changes of course after the cut-off date: Public Law 610, which permits a veteran to make a first change of general fields of study merely by applying for it, will not be in effect after the cut-off date.

Instead, a veteran will be permitted to change his educational objective only while in training and then for reasons satisfactory to VA.

Satisfactory reasons for change are these:

1. When a veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present course and the failure is not due to his own misconduct, neglect, or lack of application.

2. When the course to which he desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude, previous education, training, or other such pertinent facts.

3. When the course to which he wants to change is a normal progression from his current course, and will help him attain his educational or vocational objective.

No additional changes of course will be approved, except for the most cogent reasons.

By change of course, VA means a change in the over-all program of study.

The following do not constitute a change of course:

A change of one or more subjects within an elected curriculum or program; the dropping of a subject without replacing it with another; the adding of a subject; change in the sequence in which subjects are taken, or advancement from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase of a course.

ARE THERE ANY SPECIAL RULINGS THAT APPLY IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES?

In several instances VA has made special rulings with respect to the GI bill cut-off date. The rulings have been necessary to apply the cut-off date to special circumstances.

All of VA's special rulings are consistent with the law and with VA's basic regulations on the training deadline.

Following are descriptions of the special instances:

RETURN TO ACTIVE MILITARY DUTY

Veterans who have started GI bill training and interrupt it to go back into active military or naval service will not be bound by the cut-off date.

Instead, they will be permitted to resume their training within a reasonable period following their release from active service, even though they get out after the cut-off date.

They will be subject to three requirements:

The conduct and progress in their GI bill courses must have been satisfactory; the period of training obtainable after they are released from service will be limited to their remaining GI bill entitlement, and they may not train beyond the termination of the GI bill program (July 25, 1956, for most veterans).

This cut-off date extension applies only to veterans who already had started training, and are prevented from continuing with their training by reason of their return to uniform.

Reason for the extension: VA's regulations state that a veteran actually must be in training on the cut-off date, except for an interruption for reasons beyond his control. Return to active duty, VA ruled, is such an interruption.

SERVICEMEN IN TRAINING

Many World War II veterans, now in active military service, have been taking GI bill training during their spare time.

If they are forced to interrupt their studies because of military duties or transfers, the GI bill cut-off date will not apply to them. Instead, they may resume their education within a reasonable period after their release from active duty.

In fact, when they do reenter GI bill training, they may change from the parttime courses they were taking while in uniform to fulltime studies in the same field.

These veteran-trainees also will be bound by the three requirements of satisfactory conduct and progress, training limited to remaining entitlement, and no training after the program's termination.

Reason for the extension: Here, too, VA has ruled that the interruption because of military duties or transfers is beyond the veterans' control.

CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

Veterans taking GI bill correspondence courses will not be permitted to switch to classroom courses after the cut-off date—even though the classroom training would be in the same field as the correspondence training.

They may, however, take more advanced work by correspondence if the advanced training is considered a normal progression toward their educational goal.

In some cases, correspondence courses are offered as supplements to residence training in schools or on-the-job. A college, for example, might make available a home-study course to supplement classroom studies. Or a course by mail might be offered as a supplement to apprenticeship or on-the-job training.

In cases like these, the basic course itself must have been initiated before the cut-off date, rather than the supplementary correspondence phase of the course.

A veteran planning to take GI bill job training, for instance, could not enroll in supplementary correspondence training now with the intention of beginning his basic job training after the cut-off date.

Reason for the ruling: VA deadline regulations state that once a veteran completes or discontinues a course after the cut-off date, he may not start another. Correspondence courses have been universally accepted as independent courses within themselves, and not as stepping-stones to resident study. Therefore, a veteran who finishes a correspondence course after the cut-off date could not, under VA's regulations, start a classroom course.

The regulations also state that a veteran may advance from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase of a course. Hence, a veteran may take more advanced work by correspondence after the cut-off date.

MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND OSTEOPATH TRAINING

Veterans who complete premedical, predental, or preosteopath training under the GI bill but haven't yet gained admittance to medical, dental, or osteopath schools, will be permitted to start their advanced training in such schools whenever an accredited school, wherever located, has room for them—even if it is after the cut-off date.

The veterans must establish the fact that they applied for admission each year after completing their GI bill preliminary training.

This special provision applies regardless of whether a veteran's preliminary training ended before or after the cut-off date.

Reason for the extension: Under VA regulations, a veteran must be in training on the cut-off date, except for reasons beyond his control.

The period between completion of premedical, predental, or preosteopath training and the date of acceptance by an accredited medical, dental, or osteopath school will be considered by VA as a period of interruption for a reason beyond the veteran's control.

TEACHERS IN TRAINING

Veteran-teachers who take GI bill courses during succeeding summer vacations may continue to do so after the cut-off date.

They will have to meet certain qualifications. Their study must lead toward a degree; they must be continuously employed as a school teacher the rest of the year, and they may not skip any GI bill summer sessions.

Reason for the ruling: VA regulations require that a veteran be in continuous training after the cut-off date, except for reasons which normally would cause interruptions by any student.

Summer training by teachers for the purpose of obtaining a degree is a long-recognized practice of the profession. Because of the veteran-teacher's unique position, VA will consider him to be in continuous pursuit of his course—within the meaning of the regulations—so long as he takes courses each summer with the objective of getting a degree, and continues to be employed as a teacher each succeeding year.

UNDERGRADUATE TO GRADUATE TRAINING

Veterans who finish GI bill undergraduate courses and intend to go ahead with graduate training which would start after the cut-off date may do so, if they file an application for their advanced training sometime before they complete their undergraduate work.

They must meet these two requirements:

They must start their additional training at the end of their summer vacation period, and the graduate course must be a normal progression of previous studies.

A veteran who receive his bachelor of arts degree in languages in June 1951, for example, could start work on his master's degree—also in languages—in September 1951, if he applied to VA in time.

This ruling also applies to those who finish undergraduate studies after the cut-off date, and wish to continue advanced studies at the end of the vacation period.

Reason for the ruling: VA regulations state that a veteran must be in training on the cut-off date, except for reasons beyond his control such as summer vacations. They also state that a veteran may progress from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase of a course.

A veteran who completes undergraduate studies and applies for graduate work in time is considered to have met both provisions of the regulations.

WHEN DOES THE GI BILL PROGRAM END?

The law states that no GI bill education or training shall be afforded beyond 9 years after the termination of the present war.

Termination date of the war, for GI bill purposes, was July 25, 1947. Hence, the GI bill program comes to an end on July 25, 1956.

There is one exception. Veterans who enlisted or reenlisted under the Voluntary Recruitment Act (between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946) have 9 years from the end of that enlistment or reenlistment period in which to wind up GI bill training.

WHEN DOES THE PUBLIC LAW 16 PROGRAM END?

There are two termination dates for disabled veterans training under Public Law 16.

World War II veterans with disabilities incurred in or aggravated by service between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947, have until July 25, 1956, to complete Public Law 16 training.

Veterans disabled while on active duty on or after June 27, 1950, have 9 years from the end of the current emergency in which to finish training under Public Law 16.

To be eligible for the training, veterans in the second category must have disabilities resulting from conditions under which VA pays compensation at full wartime rates.

Assistance for Wives of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the increasing number of young men being called in the Armed Forces there is developing a situation calling for the attention of the Congress.

Many of the prospective mothers—wives of members of the Armed Forces—find it impossible to meet the increasing costs of prenatal and postnatal care and the expenses connected with childbirth.

Everything reasonable and possible should be done by the Congress to relieve these young mothers of this worry and unnecessary hardship.

For this reason, I am introducing today the following bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That the wife of any member of the Armed Forces of the United States who on or after the date of the enactment of this act incurs expenses in connection with childbirth (including expenses of prenatal and postnatal care), and for whom the payment of such expenses is found to constitute undue financial hardship, shall upon application be entitled to receive, in payment or reimbursement of such expenses, such amount not exceeding $100 as may be necessary to alleviate such financial hardship.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall, in accordance with regulations jointly prescribed by them, make payment or reimbursement of such expenses to each person who is entitled thereto under the first section of this act.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith one of a series of articles now being published in the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times exposing a group of stock promoters in Canada who transact a mail-order solicitation of American investors.

The article follows:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—When Cardigan Securities, Ltd., solicited stock sales in St. Louis last fall by mail and telephone, it told prospects it was offering them stock in Mensilvo Mines, Ltd., as a special favor to win confidence.

It did not tell them that Cardigan and its president, Horace Nelson Switzer, made 400 percent profit on every share of stock purchased, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission investigation showed.

The SEC found that the price charged by Cardigan Securities is an arbitrarily established public offering price made to hundreds of persons whose names were selected at random for mass mailing.

Mensilvo is a cobalt-silver promotion and its property is located in the cobalt area of northern Ontario. The SEC found that the promoter's statement the mine represented a safe and sound investment, sure to make money for the investor, had no basis. Instead, the promotion was—and is—highly speculative

Cardigan also represented that money from the sale of stock would go into the Mensilvo treasury to develop the property. Actually, the SEC reported, only a small amount reaches the treasury.

"The 400 percent mark-up is divided among the promoters, vendors, optionees, underwriters, dealers, and salesmen," the SEC said.

The SEC also labeled as false Cardigan's representation that arrangements had been made to list Mensilvo stock on the Toronto Stock Exchange and that dividends would soon be declared. There was no basis for dividends, the SEC said.

Cardigan and its president, Switzer, "are conducting a scheme for obtaining money through the mails by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations and promises," said United States Trial Examiner James C. Haynes, Jr.

Fraud order No. 42671 was accordingly issued against this company's promoter, Cardigan Securities and Switzer, March 10, 1950.

Also, the irrepressible Switzer has been promoting Crangold Mines, Ltd., in St. Louis and vicinity. Not long ago, a St. Louis grocer bought 1,000 shares at 18 cents a share, paying Switzer $180.

According to the authoritative Canadian Mines Handbook of 1950, Crangold Mines, Ltd., has been inactive since a geophysical survey was made of the property in Senneville township, northwestern Quebec, in 1949.

Not long after he purchased the Crangold stock, the grocer was contacted by the broker-dealer and asked if he wanted to buy some more. The stock had gone up to 36 cents a share, doubled in value, he was told.

Like Mensilvo, the history of Crangold goes back about five years, during which neither property showed any particular promise.

In the case of Crangold, the records of the Ontario Securities Commission show that the stock Cardigan sold to the St. Louis grocer for 18 cents actually cost 5 cents and that the shares offered for 36 cents actually cost the promoter 7 and 7½ cents.

The promotion of Crangold and Mensilvo in St. Louis was attended not only by the usual flurry of promotional pamphlets and dodgers, but also by an impressive array of tabloid-sized newspapers pretending to be objective journals of the mining industry.

For example, the grocer received a publication entitled "East-West Commentary—Pulse of Canadian Markets," issued by John F. Burgess & Co., another licensed broker-dealer, listed at the same address as Cardigan, but in a different room.

This was shortly before last Christmas and Burgess got into the spirit of the season with the message: "Only 15 full trading days till Xmas."

Another publication which arrived at the grocer's store was Harold A. Prescott's "Mining Broadcaster."

"Our motto," said Prescott lightly, "is investigate before investing." Elsewhere in the Broadcaster Prescott's prints another motto: "Mighty oaks from little acorns Grow."

The little acorns are then described in a publication which the grocer also received called The Canadian Mining Reporter and Investment Counsellor.

Its headline was: "Make magnetic survey on Crangold" in big black type. This news seemed to be a bit old. The survey had been made in 1949 and nothing had come of it.

This publication also exploited a promotion called Marwood Mining Corp., Ltd., which it found to be a red-hot possibility.

Marwood attracted the attention of the SEC and United States Post Office, who called it a fraud.

United States Trial Examiner Hayaes issued fraud order 42720 on March 17, 1950, against Cambridge Securities, Ltd. (a licensed broker-dealer) for promoting Marwood.

Cambridge's propaganda was so worded, the post office found, as to give suckers the impression that everyone should feel fortunate indeed to play a part in the development of Marwood.

The literature failed to mention, however, the fact that some of the properties Marwood intends to develop were actually producing ore in 1941–42, but not at a profitable rate and were abandoned.

Marwood is a triple threat deal. It has gold prospects in the Lightning River area of Northern Ontario and on Outpost Island of the Great Slave Lake in Northwestern Ontario. It has uranium prospects in northwestern Ontario, too, and interest in oil lands in the Maidstone area of the Lloydminster field of western Canada.

"Your opportunity," cries the Marwood promotion letters, "With three chances • • • Gold! uranium! oil!"

Marwood's claims that each of its properties is located near established gold, uranium and oil producers are so much hokum, the SEC investigation found.

"The vicious nature of this illegal promotion," said the SEC report, "can best be shown by the fact that shares of Marwood Mining Corp., Ltd., are being taken down (purchased wholesale) by the underwriter on a 'best effort' basis—that is, by option without a firm commitment, at from 10 to 15 cents per share and are being sold by the above fraudulent misrepresentations by mail into the United States at 60 cents per share."

A Chicago sucker told the SEC he bought 500 shares of Marwood at 60 cents a throw. The shares cost Cambridge 10 cents. The promoter made $250 net on one $300 stock sale.

Another promoter of Marwood, the United States Post Office found, was one W. A. Smith operating under a fictitious name as National Securities.

The postal fictitious name order No. 41077, issued July 25, 1949, also covered C. H. Corolis, operating under the name of Wellington Securities and promoting Canarose Gold & Metals, Ltd.; E. A. Manning, as Union Securities, soliciting in Delo Oil Co., Ltd., Palermo Gold Mines, Ltd., and Karraka Gold Mines, Ltd.

George Edgar Mallen, operating as Gordon-Daly Co., selling Minoil Exploration, Ltd., and Meg Petroleum Dealers, Ltd.; and Harold George Graham and Steven Bolesiav Roman, operating as Mitchell & Mitchell, selling Concord Mines, Ltd.

Trial Examiner Haynes described these enterprises as "unlawful businesses which are being conducted under fictitious names through the United States mails" despite the fact that the promoters were warned to stop selling in the United States.

But with 400-percent profits on sales of stock alone, irrespective of whether gold, silver, cobalt, uranium or what not is found, the promoters are not likely to let the United States SEC or Post Office blow them down.

Here in Toronto, the promoters can get away with it, too.

Hammond, Ind., and Rent Decontrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives extended the rent-control legislation for 3 months.

A number of cities that have decontrolled are now clamoring for recontrol, but are helpless under the present law. When I spoke on rent extension yesterday I mentioned about the housing and rental crisis in the Calumet industrial region of Indiana.

The following telegram which I received this morning from Councilman John E. O'Donnell, of Hammond, Ind., reveals the unfortunate position the tenants of Hammond, Ind., are in today. I am receiving numerous protests from Hammond every day.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RAY: At a meeting of the Hammond City Council held February 19 an ordinance was passed calling on Tighe Woods to decontrol rent in the city of Hammond. The mayor signed the ordinance on February 24 and it was transmitted to Washington same as approved by the Housing Expediter under date of March 2. Since that time I have received numerous complaints that rentals have been increased from 15 percent to as much as 100 percent. In a 42-apartment building at 48 Waltham Street the tenants have all been notified that the rent will be increased from 40 to 63 percent. Please advise what action can be taken by the city to reestablish rent controls in Hammond.

P. S.—I did not vote for decontrol. Wire return reply via Western Union collect.

Councilman JOHN E. O'DONNELL.

The Hammond City Council, with the approval of its mayor, voted to decontrol on February 24, 1951.

I am including the telegrams which I have received this morning from citizens of Hammond, protesting the rent gouging which has been brought about by reason of decontrol:

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Congressman RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Rent decontrolled. Landlords hog wild. We are at their mercy. Can anything be done? Please help us if possible.

CARROLL SUMMNER.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana,
Washington, D. C.:

Since rent controls were removed in Hammond our rent, 1½-room apartment, has been increased 50 percent. Unfair.

Mr. and Mrs. BERNARD HOPPE.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol in Hammond I have had my rent increased 56½ percent. This is certainly unjust. I demand Federal action on rent control.

MARGARET MAXWELL.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Decontrol of rent in Hammond has raised my rent from $47.50 to $75, which I consider exorbitant.

ESTHER DUSKIN.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana,
Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol our rent for 1½ rooms has increased from $50 to $75. My salary has increased 10 percent. What is to be done?

CHANDOS T. BASON.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana,
Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol in Hammond our rent has been increased 50 percent for one and a half room apartment. Something should be done immediately.

JOSEPHINE MARKEY.
LAVON BUSH.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

My rent has increased 60 percent since Hammond decontrol. Federal action for rent control urgently requested.

MAX MASON.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Congressman RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Rents increased 40 percent since rents have been decontrolled. Landlords hungry and going hog wild. Give us your immediate assistance.

Mr. WILLIAM BRUCK.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana,
Washington, D. C.:

Wish to protest rent raise of 40 percent since recent decontrol of rent in Hammond, Ind. Believe raise absolutely unreasonable and request new Federal controls.

ARTHUR C. SMITH.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

My rent has been increased 56 percent since decontrol in Hammond. Federal action to reestablish rent control is urgent.

ADDIE FAY DUGG.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

My basement apartment rent has been increased 75 percent since Hammond decontrolled rent. Federal action requested.

MAX WHITE.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Congress from Indiana,
Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol has gone into effect in Hammond, Ind., my rent has been increased from $55 to $77.50. Seems unfair. Please investigate.

Respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. HOWARD RIPLEY.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana,
Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol has gone into effect in Hammond, Ind., my rent has been increased from $42.50 for basement apartment to $70. Please check if legal.

Respectfully,
Mrs. JENNIE L. NEELAND,
Widow.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. Congressman RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I beseech you to act at once regarding unfair rentals. My rent is to jump 65 percent first of next month. Now I ask you in God's name, is that fair? Look to you for urgent help.

LUTHER DUBE.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*

Hon. R. J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Although agreeable to reasonable rent increases, have been subject to 40-percent increase as result of Hammond decontrol. Justly demand immediate action against such unfair practice.

Mr. and Mrs. T. R. BLOCKER.

Hon. Robert Lee Doughton, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday evening, March 14, in the Virginia Dare room of the Sir Walter Hotel, in the city of Raleigh, the North Carolina Citizens Association conferred its distinguished service award upon our beloved colleague, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON. The parchment, upon which appropriate language was written, was presented by North Carolina's very able and distinguished Lieutenant Governor, Hon. Hoyt Patrick Taylor. In presenting the award, Governor Taylor said:

In 1903, almost half a century ago, a successful farmer and stock raiser from one of the mountain counties in what was then North Carolina's lost province was appointed a member of the State board of agriculture. His sound counsel and hard work for agriculture, at a time when the State's farm resources were comparatively small, merited successive appointment to the board until his election to the State senate in 1908 removed him from the eligible list. The following year the State government authorities asked him to take over the direction of the State prison, a position held until 1911, when the people of this mountain district first sent ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON to Congress.

Since that date, 40 years ago, "Farmer Bob" DOUGHTON, as he is affectionately known by the people of his congressional district, has been returned to Washington regularly every 2 years. Most of the time his opposition has not been serious.

Forty years ago ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON, as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, began his preparation for national leadership during two World Wars, the intervening peace, and the present global crisis, when the free world this Nation represents is fighting the encroaching enslavement of the world to communistic dictatorship.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of this committee for a longer period of time than any other man in the Nation's history, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON has carried the burden of initiating the tax legislation that financed the United States during years when every ideal for which our colonial forefathers fought was at stake. How ably this man from Alleghany County's mountains has borne this heavy responsibility is recognized by everyone who knows anything about American history of the past half century. The name of this Alleghany County farmer is known all over America. Though not a lawyer he is an authority in the most complex field of legal practice—taxation. Though never an active banker, save as director of the system of county banks, he helped to establish to serve northwestern North Carolina, his advice is sought and respected by Treasury officials and financiers whose contacts are world-wide. Though a lover of the peaceful pursuits of a farmer and stock raiser, he has helped finance the Nation's two world wars, and now, at a time of life when most men think they have run their race, he is so

busy in formulating the Nation's fiscal policies for our defense against threatened dangers, that he came to Raleigh tonight on borrowed time. Though his independent nature and unbounded energy have never given him time to think of old-age security or retirement, he piloted through the National Congress the laws that make old age somewhat more secure for millions of Americans.

In all of those varied activities ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON has ben guided by those rock-ribbed principles of diligence, honesty, and a steadfast belief in the American ideal of individual initiative and responsibility he learned from his mountain ancestors.

When officials of the North Carolina Citizens Association asked me to perform this very pleasant task tonight, they said they were going to honor a distinguished citizen. I believe I am going to be bold enough to disagree with that version of this happy event. The Citizens Association is not honoring you, Congressman DOUGHTON. You are honoring the association. This State-wide organization of representative citizens from all over North Carolina is merely giving public recognition to honors you have earned through 50 years of public service. Personally, I consider it a great privilege and a high honor to be the instrument through which the North Carolina Citizens Association tonight awards ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON this parchment in recognition of his distinguished public service to his community, his State, his Nation, and the world. May you continue to live and serve for many more fruitful years and never get old enough to retire.

Mr. Speaker, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON is not only a beloved citizen, but he is a statesman in the truest sense and meaning of that word. He is never influenced by petty prejudices nor blinded by fond partialities. With courage and fidelity he performs all of the duties of his high position in a manner compatible with all of the fine traditions of American statesmanship. BOB DOUGHTON understands the problems of our day and generation, and he appreciates the importance of the strength of our Nation in the world in which we live. He has seen other nations go down the primrose path of paternalism, and he wants no part of such a program. He has seen the currencies of other countries collapse and the high principles of people perish under the onslaughts of inflation. He understands, perhaps better than any other man in public life today, the great importance of protecting and preserving the financial stability of this, the greatest nation in all the earth.

In the golden hour of his great life, yet with the spirit of youth, he is carrying a burden which is greater than he has ever carried before, but in magnificent fashion he is bearing the great load. BOB DOUGHTON is the most distinguished living North Carolinian and one of the greatest Americans living today. There are no inconsistencies in his life; his character is constant. By the eloquence of his actions, the exalted nobility of his soul, and the simplicity of his life he has endeared himself to all who know him. As a colleague and as one who has enjoyed his friendship, I am glad to join with other North Carolinians in doing honor to one who by his life has exemplified all of the fine virtues and tender sensibilities of true American statesmanship.

Mr. Charles A. Reap, editor of the Albemarle Enterprise, wrote a very appropriate editorial about our colleague, the text of which follows:

CONGRESSMAN ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Few men in American history have ever served our Nation so long or ably as Congressman DOUGHTON from this district. As a lad in teens we recall going with father and others to hear him speak when he first ran for Congress in 1910. He was introduced as "Farmer BOB," and has ever carried that friendly name for the farmers. He has always been a farmer at heart and a true friend to the farmers. We recall his efforts in behalf of the farmers in the depths of the depression when he said it was almost necessary for farmers in his mountain counties to hire a lawyer to help them give away cattle.

As a public official Mr. DOUGHTON has acquired and merited the fullest confidence of the American people in all walks of life from the small farmer to the biggest business. During the early part of the war when we were assigned to make an economic study of household appliances we were sent to a number of the largest offices in New York City. While on this mission we were in the manager's office of Macy's in New York, the largest store in the world. There on the wall of the manager's office hung the picture of our own Congressman, R. L. DOUGHTON. The manager spoke very highly of Mr. DOUGHTON's ability and efforts in working out America's tax problems.

Possibly no man in American history has ever given so much time, effort and study to our never ending tax problems as has Mr. DOUGHTON. As long-time member and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee the burden has been on his massive shoulders, and he has worked early and late as he did on his farm toward an equitable tax policy. He has often stated that he was not satisfied with his own efforts in this problematic field, but has ever striven to do the best he could. He has been in Congress since 1910 and this has been his chief burden, hence no man in public office has ever carried such tax burdens for forty years.

Congressman DOUGHTON has labored diligently in Congress to aid America through two World Wars. He is now laboring again in an emergency that the world fears will lead to another world war. This is why so many people urge him to enter the race again this year when he wanted to retire to his Allegheny farms. It is fortunate that his age is little handicap to his health and vigor for he can doubtless still do more work by force of habit than the average younger man will do in a shorter workweek. From a nonpartisan viewpoint people have high regard for Mr. DOUGHTON's ability, honesty and integrity. We hope to see him returned to Congress from this district with the largest vote of confidence from each county he has ever received.

Issues of the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

OUR HOPES FOR PEACE

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, during this Easter season it is natural for our thoughts to turn to peace.

A few days ago I received a letter which expresses very well the longing for peace which is uppermost in all our minds today. The lady who wrote me said she felt that we, as a Christian people, must exert greater efforts of love and compassion for our neighbors, our friends and other nations—and she asked me if there was not something I could give her to do, to help bring peace. To quote, she said:

> I stand ready from this day forward to give every minute of time I can find to work for peace and true democracy.

I have many letters expressing a similar longing for peace. They express concern that we are losing sight of what should be our principal objective—a world at peace.

Their fears are not hard to understand. The news of the Korean War is constantly in our thoughts. There are constant reports of preparation for war in other parts of the world, and there is a great deal more speculation on where the Communists may strike next than on peaceful methods of settling the world's problems.

COSTLY MISTAKES

Here in the United States we find that we, as a nation, have made some costly mistakes in our efforts to build peace on the foundation of victory in the last world war. Some of the mistakes date from the period when the war still was in progress.

We must not again blind our eyes to the true nature of international communism. We must not be guilty again of duplicity toward our friends, selling them out to their enemies as we did Nationalist China. We must not aid and abet unfriendly forces as we did with the notorious loans to Poland. We must not alienate potentially helpful forces as we have done in the case of Spain and certain nations of South America. All of these things have contributed to our present dilemma—war and the threat of war only 5 years after our great victory.

International communism is the principal threat to peace. With a ruthless determination and a total disregard for moral or human values it has, in five short years, brought most of Asia and some 600,000,000 people under its dictatorship. Because some of our leaders thought they could deal with the Communist dictators—or that they could outguess them—we made promises and followed programs which led to the downfall of the Chinese National Government. Because we were not sufficiently zealous in our championship of freedom elsewhere, we contributed to the Communist overthrow of democratic governments in a half dozen central European nations.

POSITIVE PROGRAMS FOR PEACE

Recognizing the mistakes of the past, what can we do to bring peace to this troubled world.

First of all, we must build our military strength. There is good reason to believe that it is the threat of atomic bombing that has kept us from a third war in Europe. We must supplement our strength in atomic weapons with similar strength in our Armed Forces. Most of us accept the principle that military weakness invites attack. We have proved it three times in our own history, in 1812, in 1917, and in 1941. The recent boldness of the Chinese Reds is a further example.

But this is only a temporary expedient—not a permanent foundation for peace. Just because we are undertaking these military measures to avoid war through a balance of power, does not mean that we should or can afford to give second place to the positive measures that may build real peace. We have by no means exhausted the possibilities.

There is still room for diplomatic negotiations with Russia concerning the world's troubled areas. These are slim possibilities, to be sure, but they exist and they must be explored, first, because they may be helpful to a degree, and, second, because our moral position before the world demands that we continually explore every honorable means of avoiding war.

Another positive step lies in concluding peace treaties with our former enemies. A fair and equitable treaty should be signed with Japan. It should contain terms that will win for us the support of the Japanese people and the approval of others throughout Asia. Similar arrangements should be made in Germany. The mistakes of our occupation must be erased by a new policy in West Germany.

SETTLEMENT IN KOREA

The time has come when our Government should announce its terms for peace, or at least a truce, in Korea. To date we have done nothing to stop the killing. Are we justified in continuing this killing without clearly stating our military and political objectives? It is true our long-term objective is to stop communism, but winning a few more miles in North Korea will not resolve that world-wide issue. At the present time there is no basis for peace in Korea and therefore no possibility that war will end.

President Wilson's Fourteen Points in the First World War did much to shorten that struggle. Let us show our disposition toward a peaceful solution of our Korean conflict by announcing, through the United Nations if you will, the terms under which we would consider a cease-fire.

The United Nations is a possible instrument of peace. It is true that the veto in the United Nations has hampered desirable action, and it is true that the organization has not proved effective in the Korean War. But both of these are in part our fault. We agreed to the veto in the first place, although many people expressed misgivings, and in Korea our policies in large measure were responsible for encouraging the Communist attack. Certainly we are responsible for trying to make a military force out of the UN before it had the moral authority to command such force.

I realize that many Americans are enraged by the spectacle of the United Nations debating at length while Americans die in Korea. I feel the same way. But it remains a vehicle which may help bring peace. We must use it as wisely as we can, hopeful that it will fulfill in some measure the high hopes we had at the time of its creation.

THE BEST HOPE

Beyond all these things lies an even greater force for peace.

We are a great Christian nation. Most of us believe the Christian precepts of honesty, fair dealing, kindness, and love for other men. The same things may be said of the great masses of the people in other lands, whether they be Christian or Jew or members of one of the great religions of the east. Nowhere in the world, not even in Russia, do the people want war.

A group of Senators had this in mind recently when they introduced a resolution stating that the goal of the American people is, and ever has been, a just and lasting peace; that we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote all our energies to peace; and that we reaffirm our deep and abiding friendship for all other peoples, including the people of Russia. The Senators felt that such a resolution, especially if it could be communicated to the people of Russia, would be a positive force for peace. Certainly it states our true feelings.

If war can be avoided for a time, we may by words and deeds convey this message to people throughout the world, encourage them by our example, and trust that the fears and ambitions which separate nations will be overcome by the love of peace which unites all mankind. Each of us by his own example and his active interest in our Government can contribute to this end.

In this way we may fulfill the mission of the Prince of Peace whose resurrection all Christians celebrate at this season.

The Congressional Secretaries Club Had a Gala Night February 27, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to point out the pride we take in, and the appreciation we have for, the splendid work which is being done by secretaries and others, both in our congressional offices and on our committee staffs.

The Congressional Secretaries Club, as you know, is the organization made up of secretaries and clerks employed in the offices and on the committees, by the Members of both Houses of Congress.

At each of the meetings of the club, there is usually an informative address made by some top-flight public official—either a Cabinet member or other departmental head, talking on some current problem of great congressional and national interest.

On Tuesday evening, February 27, the regular meeting of the club was held in the Departmental Auditorium on Constitution Avenue. The regular business being quickly dispensed with, there was a kind of open-house meeting to which the club members had invited their immediate as well as their official families. The entertainment for the evening was provided by the Air Force Symphonic Band, accompanied by the voices of the Air Force Singing Sergeants. In addition to the musical program, all in attendance were given a preview of two films. One was actual footage of war in the air as it is being carried on in Korea as of this very hour, and disclosed the actual destruction not alone of Chinese planes but of some of the hundreds of bridges, industries, tanks, trucks, supply trains, and other war accoutrements and supports, as well as vivid candid camera account of the magnificent support accorded to the ground troops by our Air Force. The other picture depicted practically all types of aircraft in simulated battle action. This included, among others, a most realistic exhibition, done in color, of the almost indescribable damage that can be meted by a single United States Air Force intercontinental bomber B-36.

A short talk was given by Brig. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton, Director of Legislation and Liaison, who, in part, stated:

> We of the Air Force are firm in the knowledge and belief that the Congress of the United States is the policy-making body of this great union of States, and, moreover, that the Congress is the true voice of the American people.

General Eaton went on to say:

> From its very date of establishment, the United States Air Force has had but two purposes in mind: (1) To afford our country the greatest possible measure of defense; (2) to accomplish this defense by the most prudent and effective means and with the least expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar.

The address of the evening was by Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, speaking in behalf of Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary, due to Mr. Finletter's absence on official business in the Far East.

Because of the earnestness and the utter frankness of these gentlemen in their dealings with our secretaries and others of our official families, I am asking the unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the statements of Brig. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton and Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert:

ADDRESS OF BRIG. GEN. ROBERT E. L. EATON

Mr. Johnson, may I express my thanks for the generous words spoken with respect to the Air Force Directorate of Legislation and Liaison.

We of the Air Force are firm in the knowledge and belief that the Congress of the United States is the policy-making body of this great union of States—and, moreover, the Congress is the true voice of the American people.

We believe that when Congress speaks, the American people themselves speak.

From its very date of establishment, the United States Air Force has had but two purposes in mind:

1. To afford our country the greatest possible measure of defense.

2. To accomplish this defense by the most prudent and effective means, and with the least expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar.

Recognizing that the power to fulfill these purposes comes from the Congress that the Congress is the arm of the Government which decides the number of weapons, and all other matériel woven into the warp and the woof of the fabric that goes to make up the United States Air Force, and, acting under the Commander in Chief, we regard ourselves as servants of the people.

For this reason, we are particularly happy this evening to be permitted to address an organization made up of the official staffs and families of our Senators and Representatives of the Nation's Congress.

In a more personal way, the responsibilities which are assigned to me constitute the direct point of contact between the Congress and the Air Force. I have thoroughly enjoyed my opportunities to be of service to the Members of the Congress—but I am even more pleased to present here tonight a distinguished gentleman whose work has long since marked him as one of the great figures associated with the establishment of the United States Air Force.

I know of no other who could have brought to that task greater skill, ability, wisdom, prudence, or a more thorough training, to do the job as it should be done.

An experienced Government administrator—an attorney by profession—he served 4 years as professor in the relations of Government and business at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

It might well be said that his scope of responsibility within the Air Force includes all human as well as physical resources. His principal contributions have been in the field of management—the application of sound business administration of the military organization, including statistical controls, the development of organizational policies, civilian and military personnel control policies, budgetary policies, and educational and training policies.

Under his direction was developed the first performance-type budget in use by a military service. This performance-type of budget has been acclaimed by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization in Government as the pattern that should be followed in all Government budgeting.

He is here tonight as the personal representative of the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force, to speak to you on matters of interest, both to yourselves and to the United States Air Force.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is now my distinct privilege and pleasure to present to you the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

ADDRESS OF MR. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT

Mr. Johnson, members of the Secretaries' Club, and honored guests, I bring greetings to all from Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force, whose trip into the Middle East precluded his being here personally to discuss with you the problems which we in the Air Force share with the office and committee staffs of the Members of the Congress.

When it was first proposed that I do this pinch-hitting for Mr. Finletter I was told that, inasmuch as we pretty much all know one another, I could speak right off-the-cuff and without preparation. It is because of this fact that I made no effort whatever to prepare an address. In fact, I am glad that it happened just that way, and that I didn't have to make any type of address. Rather, I wish I could stand here and make answer to such questions as you would like to put to me, and perhaps, in that manner, get closer together on an even greater team made up of the legislation and liaison directorate personnel of the Air Force and all you secretaries on Capitol Hill.

I want to stress the fact that we are desirous of assisting all possible—not alone in informing you, and through you, the Members of Congress, with respect to the things with which they are concerned, but, in addition thereto, in rendering all possible assistance in doing the things your respective constituents desire in behalf of themselves and the Nation's interest.

As General Eaton so aptly pointed out, it is the fixed resolve of the Air Force to cooperate with the Congress, recognizing that they are the policy-making body.

We have made mistakes—and we realize that we will probably continue to make even more. You can be assured, however, that all possible is being done to abate these errors, if not altogether to eliminate them.

That some error will creep into such a huge organization as the Air Force is inevitable when one thinks of the tremendous turnover in personnel—the vast number of new persons to be brought into service—the numerous bases to be opened, and the never-ending planning attended by the letting of an almost endless variety of contracts in dollar values that can only be expressed in astronomical figures.

Determined not to fail, we are in no manner adverse to seeing our errors pointed out. Constructive criticism, we recognize, can only result in giving added impetus to measures that will further improve our methods and thus enable us to do the same and all other things even better.

My friends, may I take this occasion to tell you how happy we are with the results of the good work that is being done by our directorate of legislation and liaison and the equally splendid gentlemen and officers that we have in the personalities of Brig. Gen. Robert (Bob) E. L. Eaton, Col. James W. Wilson, Col. James W. Chapman, and Maj. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., who are representing us in our direct congressional liaison work.

It stirred my heart to hear the tribute paid by your gracious chairman to that self-effacing great American ace, gentlemen, and officer, Lt. Col. Johnny C. Meyer, of whom, we in the Air Force, as well as Americans everywhere, are justifiably proud. It has often been asked of me why it was that, as the greatest living Air Force ace, and after having shot down 37½ German planes in World War II, Johnny Meyer was not relieved from future combat duty. Such, however, is not the reward of airmen in your Air Force. His specialty is that of pilot in a fighter group. His experience in the Liaison Division was a routine tour of duty. It is solely because of his unique and peculiar training and experience as a fighter pilot that Johnny Meyer is now back in Korea with his fighting command. There we find him carrying on in the same tradition of the Air Force that has made him the beloved, respected officer in the field that he proved himself to be in his tour of liaison duty among you here on Capitol Hill.

It is well to remember that, on the eve of the Korean conflict, we had an Air Force of but 48 groups, with a total strength of 400,000 officers and airmen. Immediately upon entering Korea, legislation which supplemented the Air Force budget enabled us to rapidly expand the Air Force and to greatly increase its number of personnel, planes, weapons, and bases. Security precludes my telling just how large our Air Force is of this hour, but I can assure you that we are well on the way to almost doubling the number of personnel which we had last fall.

Authorization has been granted to attain a 68-wing level—and the 84-group level by January 1953. But, my friends, even these are not set goals—they may be raised once, or even several times. This altogether depends upon the critical world situation, which, I need not tell you, is changing almost daily.

Might I take this opportunity of pointing out to all that the tempo of your Air Force preparedness cannot be gaged with any accuracy upon results as they manifest themselves in Korea—nor do we make plans, day by day, based on the successes which we have achieved or the reverses met in the over-all picture as seen in Korea.

Ours is a program based upon long-range planning, and with two main considerations. The first is that we must immediately double our strength while, at the same time, we organize that expansion in such manner that we could again double and redouble the industrial and personnel mobilization should the requirement for full-scale Air Force development confront this Nation. Second only to that, and always in the forefront, is our desire to achieve the maximum of efficiency and of national defense, with the minimum expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars.

It seems inevitable that we convert some portion of the Nation's industrial production, now devoted largely to peacetime consumers' goods, to the increased production of planes, weapons, electronic equipment, and thousands of complex technical items required to meet the demands of a modern Air Force with engines and jets geared to supersonic speeds. Moreover, these things must be accomplished during the period that your Air Force is developing an over-all expansion of existing aircraft production capacity.

In maintaining the national economic health, great care must be exercised to prevent either the unemployment or displacement of labor from their homes or families, while, at the same time, achieving the maximum result from the most efficient use of the skilled labor resources available.

As of this very hour, automobile craftsmen are producing aircraft for jet planes, working at their own lathes and benches. One plant, which had previously been devoted solely to the production of flying boxcars, will now undertake to make the B-47 stratojet bombers, while, at the same time, it gears itself to an increased production of its own specialized end product.

It could easily mean that the little manufacturing plant just down the street, in addition to maintaining some certain percentage of its regular production, will, in the near future, produce any one of more than the 100,000 component parts that enter into the construction and development of but a single one of our great international B-36 long-range bombers.

At the same time that these things are being accomplished on the production line, the training camps of the Air Force are undertaking to absorb scores of thousands of the raw youth of our Nation and build them, by the use of the present limited housing and other facilities, and with the greatest dispatch, into well-trained and equipped members of the greatest Air Force in the world.

We must train a large percent of these young men—who, prior to their induction into the Air Force, never had been in an airplane—to fly precision jet bombers with a maximum of personal safety and military efficiency—or else cement them into effectively organized combat crews, trained to man and operate the complex equipments built into our long-range, international bombers of the latest models and supersonic speeds.

As you all well know, next to the Strategic Bombing Command, the principle mission of the Air Force is to secure the defenses of these United States. Top on all priority lists is to train these youths—young women, as well as young men—to carry out vital supporting roles, not alone in combat forces, but in a veritable catalog of administrative, aeronautic, scientific, and technical fields. As one great team, we do all in order that our peoples can continue the American traditional mode of existence and the American way of life.

The Battle Against Chronic Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the battle against chronic diseases, which has been advanced by sizable congressional appropriations to the National Institutes of Health in recent years, is handicapped at the present time by a lack of precise data on the extent of these crippling illnesses. Federal, State, and local governmental agencies and nongovernmental organizations have been similarly handicapped in their attempts to properly plan facilities, rehabilitation programs and research projects applicable to particular diseases. Information to the extent of chronic and disabling diseases in the United States today is so inadequate that the Congress has to rely upon data 15 years old and of doubtful accuracy in making appropriations for research in these diseases. The last survey of national health was made in 1935. Its scope was restricted to the cities and did not cover a broad enough segment of the population.

Recent military and mobilization manpower demands point up the need for a more accurate picture of the extent to which chronic illnesses have handicapped our defense effort. In terms of production today, more than one and one-half billion man-days are lost annually because of sickness and disability. Nearly 3,000,000 workers annually are prevented from working by total disability. The financial loss to the Nation is staggering—$27,000,000,000 a year. In appropriating moneys for research to cut down this enormous toll, the Congress should have, for guidance, a factual up-to-date survey of the incidence of each particular disease. It is for these reasons that I am today submitting a bill to the Congress to provide for a survey of sickness in the United States. I am convinced that the considerable advances made in the science of sampling since 1935, plus other improvements to give more diagnostic medical accuracy, would result in a more accurate and less costly survey.

I am certain that the doctors of the country will cooperate fully in this vital survey. They have supported wholeheartedly the work of the Commission on Chronic Illness, established in 1949 to spearhead a joint attack on the serious national problems raised by chronic illness. The American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Public Welfare Association, the insurance companies, labor unions, the Grange, industry, as well as State and city health and welfare departments are all represented on this commission. We can count on the assistance of the Commission on Chronic Illness in connection with the planning and operation of the survey program.

I can envision, as the result of this proposed legislation, provision for periodic estimates of the amount of chronic disease and handicapping conditions in the population. These periodic estimates will be needed by all types of public and private health agencies and organizations in the planning of programs. Many cities and rural counties which cannot afford to conduct a canvass of this sort will benefit tremendously from a periodic inventory which includes accurate, up-to-date data.

This Great Farming Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following significant editorial which summarizes the great agricultural progress being made in Madison County and the Tennessee Valley. This fine editorial was written by Mr. Reese T. Amis, editor of the Huntsville (Ala.) Times and appeared in that paper on March 12, 1951. I am glad to call this splendid article to the attention of the Members:

THIS GREAT FARMING AREA

The annual farm edition of the Times is published today. It is the largest ever published in the State of Alabama. It contains 64 pages, tabloid size, and has 75 local pictures and some 125 local news stories.

The purpose of these annual editions is to chronicle the varied agricultural progress of Madison County and the Tennessee Valley.

Up until 15 years ago, cotton and corn were the mainstays of this rich agricultural area. That is no longer so. Beginning with the soil-conservation program set up by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and aided and abetted by the extension services of the agricultural colleges, especially Auburn, the type of farming was changed.

Instead of talking about crop diversification, farmers did something about it, increasingly, each year.

If you will look carefully through this farm edition, it will be found that there is not only a cotton and corn industry in this and adjoining counties, but a cattle industry, a hog industry, a sheep industry, a grain and seed industry, a dairy industry, and a poultry industry, not to speak of some others on a smaller scale.

This is one of the premier farming sections, not only of Alabama, but of the entire Southeast. It can produce bountifully, and profitably, almost any and every kind of farm crop. Intensive cultivation gives yields that are comparable in quality and quantity to the highest raised in any State.

Best of all, the farmers of this and adjoining counties are increasing the productivity of their soil annually. There are no exact figures, but many have estimated this growth in productivity as much as 50 percent in the past 15 years.

No longer does a farmer blithely allow his soil to wash away. He has become an apostle of soil conservation, and of enlightened soil practices. He enlists the help and advice of the agents of the Soil Conservation Service.

Where little more than a decade ago, a quarter or half bale of cotton was grown to the acre, the good lands are making a bale or more, with staple an inch or better in length.

We once made 15 or 20 bushels of corn to the acre. Yields of 100 to 150 bushels to the acre now are common. On one entire farm last year, the average was more than 100 bushels to the acre.

Up until a few years ago, the livestock industry was almost nonexistent in this county. Truck peddlers bought a cow, or sheep, or hog by the head, not the pound. Some few livestock were trucked off to Nashville or Birmingham for sale at stockyards. Today, there is a stockyard at almost every county seat.

It has now been demonstrated that as good cattle, hogs, or sheep can be raised and grown here as any that the Middle West produces—and more cheaply, because the grazing season is longer.

The end of our farming progress is not yet. In fact, it is perhaps just really getting under way. These past few years have made it clear to even the most uninformed that the new way of farming is more profitable. Nearly every farmer, big or little, is joining the parade, in more or less degree.

Farming in Madison County, and its neighboring counties, is becoming an increasingly attractive way of life.

Highways, electricity, better homes and buildings, better schools—all these, and others—more and more make rural life rank with, if not exceed, the pleasure of city life.

Senator Williams Attacks Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star, a newspaper of Wilmington, Del., on Sunday, March 18, 1951, carried a news story of vital importance in these times. This news story was based upon a statement by the distinguished and able senior United States Senator from the State of Delaware, the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS. The news account listed Senator WILLIAMS' suggestions to beat inflation and stabilize our economy.

This 10-point program to stabilize our economy and meet the greatest danger confronting our country, that of uncontrolled inflation, is most timely and merits the consideration of everyone interested in attacking the problem of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, which was carried in the Sunday Star of Wilmington, Del., on March 18, 1951:

TEXT OF SENATOR WILLIAMS' STATEMENT ON INFLATION

The greatest danger confronting our country today is not the menace of attack by communistic forces beyond our borders or the destructive influences of these same forces within our own country, but it is the ever rising spiral of uncontrolled inflation which now envelops our country and seriously threatens our entire economy and American way of life.

There are those who feel that the control of inflation is simply a matter of enacting a price and wage control law. Unfortunately it is not that simple.

In order to intelligently approach the solution of this problem, we must first recognize the No. 1 cause of inflation, which is large governmental expenditures accompanied by a long series of unbalanced budgets. So long as our expenditures exceed our income, just so long will our deficit spending dilute our monetary blood stream by decreasing the purchasing value of our dollar and increase the spiral of inflation. This diabolical practice has reduced the purchasing value of the 100-cent dollar of 1900 to the 31-cent dollar of today. The further continuance of this practice will further decrease the purchasing value of our dollar and entirely destroy our economy.

The diversion of our productive capacity to wartime materials reduces the amount of civilian goods available for purchase, and unless this additional money is siphoned off by increased taxes the result is higher prices.

Upon the outbreak of war in Korea last June, Congress was confronted with a prospective increased expenditure of 30 to 40 billion dollars annually. Recognizing that all these additional expenditures would not be covered by increased taxes, Congress enacted the Defense Production Act, commonly designated as a price and wage control law.

This price and wage control law has been on the statute books since August of last year, and yet during this 7-month period our country has witnessed one of its most rapid inflationary spirals. The cost of living today has advanced 6 percent above the July 1950 level.

Why has the enactment of this so-called price- and wage-control law not deterred the upward trend of this spiral of inflation but in fact has increased the upward trend? Is it because (1) Congress has failed to take adequate steps to minimize the causes of inflation? (2) Is there something wrong with the law? (3) Is there something wrong with the administration of the law? (4) Or is it a combination of all three?

Suppose we discuss first the question, "Has Congress taken the proper steps to minimize the causes of inflation by reducing all nonessential Government expenditures to the fullest extent possible?"

Unfortunately the answer is "No." Notwithstanding all the orations which have been made on the floor of the Senate advocating economy, the net result is that we are currently spending more money on domestic programs than ever before in our history. Nor is there any program to reduce these expenditures during the next fiscal year. For instance, note the following tabulation of the budgetary requests of those nondefense agencies handling domestic programs for the next fiscal year as compared with their expenditures for the current year as compared with the preceding 10 years.

According to this chart it is apparent that no effort has been made to curtail the public works and welfare programs of our domestic departments.

[In thousands]

Year	Department of Commerce	Department of State	Department of Labor	Department of the Interior	Department of Justice
1941	$147,827	$23,955	$23,013	$169,537	$57,125
1942	445,437	31,434	24,145	298,490	84,215
1943	622,846	37,922	26,112	281,205	107,985
1944	136,209	53,190	55,024	255,474	114,940
1945	98,313	66,240	71,489	214,338	117,885
1946	198,469	102,345	82,289	248,817	106,650
1947	[illegible],112	135,269	148,490	296,408	112,085
1948	198,372	315,594	86,520	320,608	116,024
1949	642,999	259,862	15,469	516,401	126,789
1950	[illegible],299	303,872	58,985	646,431	138,970
1951	713,542	271,383	208,573	631,628	147,732

The next two questions raised were: Is there something wrong with the law? and Does the fault lie with its administration?

At the time the Defense Production Act was passed by the Congress I made the statement that the law could not possibly serve as a measure to control inflation if the Senate insisted upon adopting amendments providing for special exemptions to every pressure group in the country.

An exemption was provided for wage earners.

An exemption was provided for farmers.

An exemption was provided for the press, including newspapers, magazines, and periodicals.

An exemption was provided for the fees of lawyers, doctors, and all other members of the professions.

And exemptions were provided for many other groups too numerous to mention.

It is only natural that each of these groups, while having no objection to rigid controls over other groups, would want their own special group to be exempt. However, what Congress overlooked, as they did in World War II, was that there is no such thing as partial controls. You cannot expect the wage earners to accept controls over wages unless the cost of living is stabilized. You cannot expect the farmer to accept controls over his products unless labor costs are controlled, because without the stabilization of labor, his production and equipment costs inevitably soar. You cannot expect any of these groups to accept controls unless all other groups accept the same restrictions. At the same time, through increased tax rates, industry would be operating on a lower net-earning basis.

Now the question is: What can we do today to stabilize our economy and eliminate the destructive threat of uncontrolled inflation? It is later than we think; however, I believe that it is not too late if the Congress and the administration will pursue the proper course and display the necessary courage to do the job.

These are the necessary steps which I think must be taken, namely:

1. The economies recommended by the Hoover Commission should become effective immediately, thereby saving millions which are currently being lost through overlapping bureaus and through unnecessary waste. According to the best authorities our domestic, nondefense expenditures could easily be reduced by $7,000,000,000.

2. An immediate overhauling of all Government employment records and eliminating therefrom all nonessential Government employees.

3. An immediate stopping of all construction work on all Government buildings and public-works projects which are not declared essential to our national defense program.

4. An immediate ban upon the expansion of any existing or upon the enactment of any new welfare programs.

5. Increase production by increasing the numbers of working hours and the efficiency and productivity of the workers. Full production is the mortal enemy of inflation.

6. Repeal all subsidy programs including those on agriculture, labor, and industry. Practically every segment of our society is being subsidized in some manner at the expense of the taxpayer.

7. Our existing tax laws should be revised so as to eliminate many of the loopholes now existing and thereby spreading the tax load on a more equitable basis.

8. Stop the absurd policy of spending millions buying agricultural products and destroying them for the avowed purpose of creating a scarcity and then spending added millions to sustain another agency to hold prices down.

9. Adopt the Federal Reserve Board formula of more realistic interest rates, thereby discouraging loose credit. Credit should be made readily available only for those purposes which contribute to the strengthening of our national economy and our national defense.

10. After the above recommendations have become effective, we should immediately adopt a fair and equitable tax law which will balance our budget and place our economy on a pay-as-you-go basis. To charge our present-day expenditures to future generations means that we are not only shirking the responsibilities of this generation but jeopardizing the future as well.

We should at all times recognize the importance of maintaining our economic and financial strength, which is so necessary to our national security and the preservation of our form of government. We should also recognize that our greatest enemy is inflation, which, if uncontrolled, means certain economic collapse, hardships upon people living on a fixed income, a devaluation in our monetary standards, and a loss of savings to people who have labored all their lives to assure themselves of a competency in their later years.

I am thoroughly convinced that if the above 10 recommendations are put into practice we shall be able to abandon dependency on price and wage controls, which at best can only be regarded as a stopgap remedy and which should be put into effect only after all other remedies have failed.

Lenin knew the destructive force of inflation when he said in substance, "Inflation is the spark of revolution. I will print so many bonds and so much money that the capitalists will choke on them."

I agree with CIO President Murray that "inflation must be stopped. Inflation can be stopped if we meet this major problem of the home front with the same boldness, intelligence, and courage that our Armed Forces are showing in Korea."

Broadcast by Raymond Swing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Raymond Swing over Station WOL, Washington, D. C.:

One of the proposals the Soviet Union wants at Paris to get on the agenda of a four-power conference is a reduction of armaments. Nothing promotes Soviet interests more effectively than its ability to convince people that the Soviet Union wants to reduce armaments, and that the western world—well, look at it—is building up its arms. That is supposed to identify who it is wants peace. What the Russians mean by a reduction in armaments is a percentage reduction of standard arms after an abolition of atomic weapons. They want atomic warfare banned by international agreement first of all. Then they want other arms scaled down on the basis of existing ratios. Thus in 1948 the Soviet Union proposed to the United Nations Assembly a reduction of one-third in existing armaments. The western powers rejected this plan, so did the United Nations.

It is clear that any Russian offer will not be like the one made in the first disarmament talks of the League of Nations. At that time Mr. Litvinov proposed genuine, total disarmament. It may be doubted if he would have offered it then had there been any chance of its being accepted. But he did offer it, and it startled the world, which was not ready then to forego the unlimited sovereign right to wage a national war. The present Soviet regime is not repeating the Litvinov offer. All it offers is something that, if accepted, would leave the Soviet Union relatively stronger than its rivals. For if the atomic bomb were banned, the Soviet Union would be unchallenged in its supremacy as a land power. And if armaments were to be reduced percentagewise, the Soviet Union with its huge ground forces, still would remain on top. It is easy enough to convince Americans of the spuriousness of the Russia disarmament proposals. But it is not so easy to convince those who hear only the Russian side of the story. Nor is it easy to convince the world that the western powers are, as they say, arming for peace, since on its face this is a paradox. It happens to be a truthful paradox. Put it is not persuasive.

The Western World has ideas about disarmament of its own. But they are not worked out in detail, not carefully thought through, and not the result of consultation between the western governments. One gets it by glimpses, as when President Truman proposed to the United Nations on its anniversary in October a program of unusual disarmament under foolproof international control. At that time he asked that the study of atomic control and disarmament be merged, a step that now is being taken by the United Nations.

One gets another glimpse of it in the proposal now being discussed by the United Nations to set up an international police force. This, however, is quite meaningless in the UN as it is, for the Soviet Union sits on the Council with its veto power, and the police force would be under the control of the Security Council. So this proposal now is being supplanted by the Acheson plan for setting aside armed forces by all UN members for duty at the call, not of the Security Council but the Assembly, where the veto does not operate. This is now up for action at Lake Success, but somehow its bearing on disarmament is in the shadows. It looks much more like an effort to prepare for another Korea, by assuring the United Nations a force with which to head off an aggression.

The idea of a UN legion which can fight anywhere at any time would be a necessary part of a genuine, world-wide, total disarmament. For if nations give up their national armaments, there would have to be police to enforce the laws by which the disarmament has been effected. But a UN legion would be powerless against the Red Army and any talk about it in a world of unlimited national armaments is not realistic. So one sees in this western thinking no coherent program. It does not come to the root of the problem of war. Suppose the west gets what it now asks. Suppose the UN merges the study of atomic control with the reduction of armaments and also creates a UN force, there still is no concerted western program with the ultimate objective of a world without war. The arms race would not be stopped. No headway would be made against the Soviet campaign for its spurious kind of peace and disarmament.

The need for a genuine disarmament offer by the west is daily more apparent, for it seems to be the only way to meet the Soviet case before the world this summer. For if the four power conference is held and does not end the cold war and the arms race the west will be at a distinct disadvantage in not having a positive and genuine aim with which to match the Soviet pretense.

Just now the United States is engrossed with the job of enlarging its Armed Forces and inspiring the Western Europe countries to enlarge theirs. Probably it is against human nature to do this and talk about peace at the same time. But it is essential to know what this force we are building is for and it is important to know what it is not for.

Walter Lippmann in his column today brings this out skillfully in a recognition of the difference betwen two verbs, to deter and to compel. Our military force has only the purpose of deterring, he points out, and if we try to use it to compel it may cease to deter. "We have the power," he writes, "to cause great destruction within the Soviet Union and the satellites. Were we to allow the Russians to think that this power of ours would be used to support a policy of ultimatum and unconditional surrender in the cold war, almost certainly our whole vast military effort would cease to be a deterrent against military aggression. For the power to deter can only be effective if the nation at which it is directed has been convinced that it will not be struck if it refrains from striking." He goes on to point out that if the Russians believe we will strike them, not because of what they do, but because of what they are, they will not be influenced in what they do. In other words, the power to deter only works if there is a clear alternative to war. It works only if there can be a negotiated settlement. The power to deter, Mr. Lippmann, says, is the military complement of the doctrine that the Soviet Union and the United States can coexist, and that their coexistence can be made tolerable. This is an unanswerable way of saying that the objective of western policy must be peace. But it can only be said convincingly in terms of concrete policy. And it is not yet being said in that way. A UN legion, or a UN police force, against aggression, or a merger of the study of atomic energy control and arms reduction are not a program to offset the Russians. The western program must lead to peace, must lead if possible to the end of modern war. While it is both desirable and imperative that the west be strong enough to deter—to prevent an aggression, that is only half a program. The other half is to build peace, and to end the arms race. This is said in the knowledge that it is what President Truman wants, and what a substantial number of the ablest men in Congress want. The knowledge that sooner or later the United States must take the lead to negotiate a genuine settlement, a true peace, a real disarmament, is shared by many American and western leaders. What they differ about is timing. Thus Secretary Acheson wants no basic negotiations until the west is stronger. But without a peace objective the Soviet world may not believe the western power is intended only to deter. They may fear it is being created to compel and a constructive solution may come too late.

Senator McMAHON today suggested that Congress, on agreeing to send troops to Europe and enlarge its armed forces, should pass a resolution disavowing the desire for war with the Russian people. That is good as far as it goes. Still more persuasive would be a formula with the backing of all the western governments stating it to be the ultimate objective to end the very possibility of national wars. That is, to meet the Russian formula of arms reduction by a formula of arms elimination, under the sovereignty of the UN. I am not saying the Russians would or would not repudiate such a formula. But if the west adopted it, whatever the Russians did would decide before the whole world what chance there is to realize peace.

Address of Hon. Sean MacBride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by His Excellency Sean MacBride, S. C., T. D., Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, to the Overseas Press Club, New York, on Monday, March 19, 1951:

The advance of democracy coupled with the development of transport and communications places an ever-increasing burden on the shoulders of our statesmen and governments. The ever-increasing tempo of international conferences, as well as the vast amount of administrative work that falls on the shoulders of ministers and governments, leaves little time for considered objective thinking.

At the beginning of our century international conferences were big and rare events. Preparations were made for them long in advance and they were held in a leisurely atmosphere. Nowadays our statesmen are snowed under by mass documentation from government agencies and from the international organizations to which they belong; they have, too, to attend international conferences with increasing frequency. As a result of this high pressure insufficient thought has so far been given by the leaders of the democratic world to the fundamental issues that are involved and to the necessary remedies. Many decisions have to be taken in the agony of a crisis and are, therefore, based on the expediency of the moment. It is difficult for the statesmen of today to look ahead and to take the long view based on objective planning.

The struggle which divides the world into two main camps reaches deeply into the foundations of our civilisation; it is a conflict of ideologies which must consequently be fought out in the conscience of mankind. In the struggle against communism our attitude must be not merely a negative one of piling up defensive equipment but must also be constructive. To oppose the Communist ideology the western democracies have the fundamental beliefs which form part of their tradition and outlook, a belief in the democratic way of life and a belief in fundamental human and political rights. One of the greatest needs of the western nations is a clear enunciation of what they guarantee to their peoples. Counter materialism and physical force do not provide the necessary ideals around which the human conscience can rally. We in the democratic world must evolve a clear-cut political and economic philosophy which will enunciate clearly the principles for which we stand. These should be based upon the liberty and dignity of the human being, justice, and equality of opportunity. In the economic sphere, they must include the right to work for an adequate family wage, and the utilization of productive capacity for the welfare of the people. In the national sphere, they should include a clear enunciation of democratic principles and assert the right of nations to determine their own affairs freely, by democratic means, without outside interference.

The provision of such a banner is, in my view, a matter of urgency and of the utmost importance. It should resolve from world statesmen at least as much consideration and thought as the military and economic problems that confront the world. It is essential, I believe, if democracy is to be the

force we would like it to be, that its cardinal principles should be defined, accepted, and applied by all democratic powers.

The considerations with which I have just dealt are applicable to both America and Europe and should be dealt with jointly by the democratic nations of both continents.

Even if the progress made in Europe has been agonizingly slow and subject to constant diversionary and delaying tactics, the fact that a start has been made towards a greater degree of coordination is important. Europe has hitherto been the starting point and the storm center of most wars, hence the importance of seeking to establish a system of organization that will at least reduce the likelihood of political and economic conflicts between the free nations of Europe. The creation of OEEC and the Council of Europe have been steps in the right direction and I sincerely hope that nothing will happen as a result of the present world tension to minimize or divert the efforts of these two organizations. I hope that at all stages the United States foreign policy makers will appreciate the long-term importance of the concept that underlies this attempt at European organization and not allow the United States to be made the excuse for procrastination on grounds of diplomatic or military expediency. For the first time a real effort is being made to secure active cooperation between the European democracies for purposes other than war or military defense. This in itself is of far-reaching importance and represents a new concept in European affairs. It is through the two organizations that I have just mentioned, the Council of Europe and the OEEC, that these efforts are being carried out.

The OEEC was originally set up to administer the European end of the Marshall plan; to be quite frank, it was regarded at first, in many European capitals, as a piece of "window dressing" to satisfy American congressional and public opinion. In the last 18 months, however, the value of the OEEC as a real instrument of economic cooperation and planning is coming to be more generally recognized. This position was not achieved without a considerable amount of energizing on the part of some of its members; great credit is due to the help such men as Paul Hoffman, Averill Harriman, Bill Foster, and Milton Katz gave in seeking to infuse the OEEC with a concept of integration. The rule of unanimity rendered the progress slow, as the pace was set by the slowest members of the convoy. That any progress was made is in no small measure due to the insistence on frequent meetings of the Ministers; this compelled the Ministers concerned, and their government, to take a greater degree of interest in the work of the OEEC. However, it is really in the years ahead, when Marshall aid will have ceased, that a true test of the OEEC's worth can be determined.

As I have often advocated at its Council meetings, the OEEC should be the economic nerve center of Europe, and its Council of Ministers should constitute an economic cabinet for Europe. Any attempt by a major European power to bypass the OEEC in economic matters, as has happened on a number of occasions, should be eternly frowned upon, both in Europe and in America. As far as possible all matters relating to economic affairs and trade should be canalized through the OEEC.

If the 2½ years of its life the OEEC has done much to justify its existence, and, as I have indicated, it has in the last 18 months gone beyond being merely an agency for the division of United States aid. Industrial production in the OEEC countries is now about 30 percent higher than in 1938. Agricultural production has also been on the increase and in almost all fields it is higher than prewar. The organization has done much valuable work in tackling the problem of currency restrictions and shortages which have so much bedeviled European trade since the end of the war. The two Intra-European Payments and Compensation Agreements, culminating in the establishment of the European Payments Union, have gone far to establish the smooth and efficiently operating mechanism of international payments which is essential for trading among the European nations. The liberalization of trade from quantitative restrictions has been another step; not all difficulties have been resolved here but progress has been made. In addition there has been a great deal of solid and useful work done in relation to the exchange of technical and scientific information between countries, the coordination of investment, the cooperative examination of problems arising in agriculture and in many other sectors.

OEEC, then, has by its many activities shown itself to be an organization within which the many and varied economic problems confronting all nations in Europe today can be tackled realistically. I hope that it will be regarded more and more by the United States as the medium for economic action with Europe. We have learned the lesson that by cooperation we can hope to overcome many of our problems. Unilateral and isolated action is hurtful not only to the European community as a whole but ultimately to the country responsible for such action.

We must, of course, not overlook the fact that the interests of the different member countries must be carefully attended to. Not all of the countries of Europe are equally well developed economically. Some are highly industrialized while others have had their development retarded and cannot so easily expose themselves to courses of action which highly industrialized countries may take in their stride. That is why, in particular, such arrangements as the Schuman plan and Benelux are to be commended, because, while lacking nothing of the energy and determination which must characterize our actions in this field, they pay attention to the realities of the situation and form sound bases on which more large-scale actions may be founded.

However, the OEEC is purely an intergovernmental organization and suffers from all the defects inherent in this type of organization. Such organizations are of their nature slow, cautious, ponderous, and inevitably subject to the arts of secret diplomacy. By opposition and delaying tactics governments who are not wholeheartedly in favor of closer integration can successfully block progress. Because the discussions are for the most part held in secret and are of a technical nature, public opinion has little opportunity of asserting itself. These defects have, to a certain extent, been overcome in the Council of Europe.

Unlike the League of Nations, UNO and the OEEC, the Council of Europe is not a purely intergovernmental organization. The Assembly of the Council of Europe is, in effect, the first real attempt to constitute a European parliament. True, the seat of power rests in the Committee of Foreign Ministers and not in the Assembly. Nevertheless, obstruction, secret diplomacy and power politics will lose much of their effectiveness under the searchlight of an active European Parliamentary Assembly. The Assembly has already asserted itself and will, I hope, continue to show that the Committee of Ministers and Governments must take cognizance of its views. There will also be a better informed opinion in the different European parliaments on international problems and a greater degree of mutual understanding between the members of the different parliaments. It will not, therefore, be so easy for certain governments to maintain an evasive and obstructionist attitude on questions affecting European cooperation.

There is, however, a serious danger that the conservative attitude which has been forced upon the Committee of Ministers by certain governments will further dishearten and disillusion that section of European opinion which saw in the Council of Europe a real hope of concrete progress. I hope that the Assembly and those of my colleagues in the Committee of Foreign Ministers who support the viewpoint of the Assembly will persevere with patience and determination in their attempt to give reality to the concept of a European Assembly.

One of the problems which will have to be faced in the near future is the integration of the OEEC with the Council of Europe. This will present some difficulties, as certain countries are not members of the Council of Europe while they are members of the OEEC; it is also likely that proposals in this direction will be opposed by certain governments who prefer the secrecy and unprogressive attitude of intergovernmental organizations. In any scheme for integration care will have to be taken to preserve intact the Secretariat and economic organization of the OEEC, which is highly competent.

I have tried briefly to give you a picture of the European scene. The work of these two main instruments of European cooperation does not, however, fill the lacuna for a clear statement enunciating the moral and political philosophy of the free democratic world on the lines which I indicated at the beginning of this talk. This is a task which might well be undertaken by the Council of Europe in conjunction with America. It is, I believe, a matter of urgency.

I would like before concluding to refer briefly to the only territorial dispute which exists in the North Atlantic area, namely, the infringement of the sovereignty of the Irish people by the enforced partition of Ireland by Britain. No nation in the world can claim to have more clearly defined natural boundaries than Ireland. The basis of democratic rule depends upon the right of the people of a nation to determine their own affairs freely by democratic means and without outside interference. What right, therefore, has Britain to partition our country or claim sovereignty in any portion of it against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people? This violation of the democratic principles for which the democratic world stands injures not merely Ireland but also the cause of the free world.

The Constitution, Our Palace of Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very timely address on the Constitution of the United States by Miss Ann West, of Antlers, Okla. The address follows:

THE CONSTITUTION, OUR PALACE OF LIBERTIES

Let us go back in time to the month of May, the year 1776, and to stately Independence Hall, Philadelphia. Here we see gathered together a very distinguished group of men. Their minds are keen, and their personalities as varied as you will find in any group. All of this intellect and all of these personalities are intent upon one purpose. That purpose, my friends, was to formulate a document which would proclaim the independence of these young colonies from the tyranny and exploitation of an oppressive monarchy.

The way was not to be smooth in attaining their goals, nor were they always to see eye to eye on the means of achieving the end toward which they worked. There were clashes of temper, conflicting sectional interests, jealousies, problems of finance and organization—all set against a lurid backdrop of a devastating war and its desolation. The result of their consecrated efforts was the Declaration of Independence, the foundation stone of constitutional government.

However, it was one thing to declare that we meant to be free and quite another to draw up a set of rules and regulations governing and guarding that freedom. Following that meeting in Independence Hall, there were other meetings of august and purposeful leaders, each with his own idea of what the charter of the new nation should contain. In Independence Hall in 1787, the ideals and beliefs of freedom-loving men were incorporated into the Constitution of the United States, which stands today, 164 years later, a guardian to our palace of liberties.

The architects of this palace were many and varied and each has left the imprint of his hopes and plans on the structure. Let us examine for a bit three of the master framers or builders of the Constitution and their contributions.

First, let us consider Alexander Hamilton, nicknamed the Little Lion, probably because of his perseverance in overcoming obstacles that would have thwarted a lesser man. After the Revolutionary War, Hamilton was elected to the New York Assembly from which he was appointed as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention. He was the moving force of this assembly, composed of some of the most brilliant thinkers the world has ever seen. Hamilton, according to Chancelor Kent, "surpassed all of his contemporaries in his exertion to create, recommend, adopt and defend the Constitution of the United States of America." Hamilton had great visions of what this young nation could and should be, and when others were less ambitious than he, he felt the bitter pangs of disgust, but grasped hopefully at each semblance of progress. He believed fervently in a strong, centralized government with the States subordinate to the Nation. This basic principle of Hamilton's is found throughout the Constitution. It forbids several powers to the States and proclaims with authority that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. ARTHUR VANDENBERG, the venerable statesman of our own day, had this to say of Hamilton: "He was the brains in the pilot house when the ship of state set out into the perilous seas of history. The Republic is his monument."

Now let us consider James Madison, sometimes called "The father of the Constitution." At 36, he was one of the youngest members attending the Convention. Maj. William Pierce, a delegate from Georgia, describes Madison thus: "Mr. Madison is a character who has long been in public life; and what is very remarkable every person seems to acknowledge his greatness. He blends together the profound politician with the scholar. He perhaps has the most correct knowledge of the affairs of the United States of any man in the Union." Night after night, during the months that the Assembly was in session, Madison made a complete record of the proceedings of the day. From these notes, published after his death, we derive a picture of the hopes and fears of the delegates, of their attempts and successes to lead the Nation wandering blind and helpless into the light of freedom. Madison once stated that if men were angels, a government would not be needed. If angels governed men, controls on the government would not be necessary. As neither is the case, a government that controls the people but is also obliged to control itself, is the ideal form of government. Madison believed firmly in giving every free man the right to vote, and he led the fight for popular suffrage in electing our representatives. I believe Madison's chief contribution to the Constitution was his firm conviction that the will of the majority could not be far from right.

The last man whom we shall consider is Benjamin Franklin, then the most widely known man in the Colonies. Ben Franklin was old, past 80, but he still had the most farsighted vision of any delegate attending the Convention. He was physically feeble at his fourscore years, but his brilliant intellect was unimpaired. He was content to let the younger men plan the structure of the palace, giving them the benefit of his elder wisdom. His common sense turned disagreeable men into cooperative ones, helped make the Constitution a reality. Franklin was firmly convinced that the people should have the controlling voice in the Government, and today the sound sense of the common people finds expression through him. His last earnest address to the delegates so influenced the assembly that, according to Francis Thorpe, the noted author and historian, "it gave us the Constitution." In this speech Franklin said that he had noticed on the back of Washington's chair a carving of the sun and its rays. He had often wondered if this portrayed the rising or setting sun, but that now, at the conclusion of their arduous labors, he was sure that it was the rising sun of a great new country. What prophetic words Ben Franklin spoke. Franklin needs no memorial of stone, for he has a living one in our Constitution.

Alexander Hamilton's idea that the Constitution must be the supreme law of the land and that in union there is strength—Madison's great democratic principle that the will of the majority is nearly always right—and Ben Franklin's conviction that the controls of the Government must remain in the hands of the governed, are all great supporting beams in the structure of the constitutional Government of today.

One cannot pick three men out of this assembly of brilliant personages and state that, beyond all doubt, they were the leaders. George Washington, the brilliant general and statesman; Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, the sagacious Yankee lawyer; Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania, the financial backbone of the Colonies; Thomas Jefferson, absent from this assembly yet making his influence count for a minimum of government and a maximum of freedom—all these men and many others, were architects of the palace. When the document was completed, some hesitated to sign the charter because it didn't meet their views in every particular, and was, as Hamilton once said, "a bundle of compromises." However, most of the men realized that this step, if not perfect, led the right way toward attaining a government that would improve with years. These men little thought that from these Colonies would come forth the greatest nation in the world, a nation dedicated to the cherished belief that all men are created equal. How much we of today owe to those stalwart men who masterminded the building of our palace of liberties.

Once a structure is built, it must be maintained carefully and must sometimes be remodeled. The Constitution provides for the remodeling of itself through amendments, but it is up to us, the American citizens of today, to maintain and defend our Constitution against any nation or theory of government which attempts to force its will on free people. It is especially up to us, the youth of this Nation, to be on guard against any encroachment on our personal liberties by a foreign ideology. It is up to all of us—regardless of race, creed, or color, to band together in a common effort to defend the great fundamentals of democracy bequeathed to us as a sacred heritage by our gallant forefathers. Even now, the Communists are battering without and working as termites within, to undermine the strength of our palace. We dare not let them succeed.

Back in 1775 that eloquent statesman, Patrick Henry, flung the challenge that we of today must accept when he asked, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased by the price of chains or slavery?" We must answer with him, "Forbid it, Almighty God." May we, too, be willing to defend to death, if need be, the Constitution, our palace of liberties.

St. Lawrence Seaway Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the old economic monstrosity, the St. Lawrence seaway, is back with us again. It may be of interest to Members of Congress to read the following article that appeared in the January 3, 1951, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

ST. LAWRENCE AGAIN

A new attempt will be made to put over on this country the discredited St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Members of the new Congress may expect a propaganda barrage urging approval of the project as a war measure. The New England States, so the propaganda line runs, need more electric power for war industries. The seaway is needed, we are told, to provide a submarine-safe passage for iron ore from Labrador to the Great Lakes.

The catch in this reasoning is that this country will have won or lost its security long before the project could be completed. In the meantime, money, material, and manpower urgently needed for mobilization would be diverted to a scheme which would ultimately benefit Canada far more than the United States.

There is nothing new about the hysteria for a St. Lawrence seaway, except the propaganda. The project has been before Congress since early in the twenties. It has been studied by congressional committees time and again—and each time has been decisively rejected. Its value as a transportation artery has been vastly overrated. Because it would be closed to navigation for at least 5 months out of the year, it has been called the world's greatest part-time transportation agency. The 27-foot channel proposed would be too shallow for 91 percent of the American merchant marine—a fact generally overlooked by those who urge its construction.

Governor Dewey, of New York, is for it—at least the power project—although it obviously would have an adverse effect upon the port of New York City. New York and the other New England States naturally would like to have the Federal Government—which includes Missouri taxpayers—finance cheap hydroelectric power for the industries of those States.

Every Congress in the last three decades has seen through the flimsy arguments for the seaway and power project. It is to be hoped the next Congress will be as wise. Certainly, it is against the national interest, as well as military security, to embark on so costly a scheme at this time.

Lenten Guideposts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following fine statement by Mr. Charles Spaulding, proving that men of good will, who truly believe in God's goodness and are obedient to His will, can succeed in the United States regardless of race, creed, or color in any locality North or South:

LENTEN GUIDEPOSTS—THE LAND OF THE FREE

(By Charles Spaulding, president of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co., Durham, N. C.)

My father was a slave, and I was born one of 14 children on a small cotton farm 75 years ago.

I have been president of a life insurance company that has about $140,000,000 worth of insurance in force, a bank that has $5,000,000 in resources; I have been a director of a bonding company, a building and loan association, and a fire insurance company, I have been a trustee of several universities, chairman of the board of a large hospital, and have been invited to conferences to the White House.

I recite these statistics, not to boast, but to show what can happen to a supposedly underprivileged Negro, not in Russia, but right here in America in the heart of the Southland where members of my race allegedly have the least chance to become successful.

Nothing grieves me more than to have a young man approach me with this sad attitude: "I'm nothing but a Negro. How can I ever amount to anything?"

I simply point to the successful careers of Booker T. Washington, Ralph Bunche, Jackie Robinson, Gen Benjamin O. Davis, Miss Marian Anderson, George Washington Carver, and Judge William H. Hastie.

My father, Benjamin Spaulding, taught me the most important lessons I ever learned about getting ahead in this country. He believed in the promise of America, which promise could be realized only by years of sweat, thrift, and enterprise. He never expected something for nothing.

In my youth we learned as much about living from the Bible as we did from schoolbooks. In fact, the Bible was taught in school, and I have always felt education took a great backward step when this practice was stopped. God could get along without me, I was told, but I would never amount to much without God.

I left the farm at 21 and came to Durham, N. C. where I could continue my education through the eighth grade. A full-grown man among kids, I studied my English and arithmetic while washing dishes for $10 a month in a hotel.

Soon after my graduation two men of my race—John Merrick (a barber) and A. M. Moore (a doctor)—asked me to manage an insurance company which they planned to start. They would provide the backing and policy; I the full-time hustle.

It was a bold idea, since an insurance company run by Negroes had never succeeded before, doubtless because of the inferiority complex our own people had about the executive ability of members of our race. Sales resistance was great.

We had 29 cents in assets when a make-or-break crisis occurred. One of the first men who signed up for a policy died. His widow promptly appeared and demanded the $40 due.

Mr. Merrick and Dr. Moore dug down in their pockets for the payment, determined that every claim be met instantly. It was a major moment for our firm, and the news spread like wildfire. Our credit rating soared. From then on our worst obstacles often turned out to be blessings in disguise.

In the years that followed we grew and expanded despite depressions and setbacks of every conceivable type. Mr. Merrick and Dr. Moore have long since died, but their integrity will always be a part of the organization.

Out of the growth of the business and my own growth as a man came many conclusions. One was: That for a business to realize its maximum potentialities, a combination of business and faith was needed. Every business reflects the integrity of its employees. And without faith that integrity is too often assaulted to hold up forever.

Some of my people blame the white man in the South for all their difficulties. There are always two sides to everything. In our earliest, darkest days, Washington Duke, the famed tobacco man, spent many hours giving pointers to our business; Judge W. R. Winston, the noted Carolina jurist, aided us with legal advice.

Then there was the incident in 1933 during the bank crisis. The State banking commissioner called several of Durham's leading bankers and said:

"Spaulding said he wants to open Monday morning. But what if they stage a real knockout run on him?"

Without exception the bankers replied: "Tell Spaulding that as long as we have money he will have it."

No prejudice there.

Faith helps me in my relationships with people, just as the Bible helps me in working out tough problems. My wife has always been able to say proudly: "There are no dusty Bibles in our house."

The first thing I do at work in the morning is to close the office door and open the Bible to the ninety-first Psalm. I believe in this Psalm as I believe in getting up in the morning.

Before each board meeting I stop outside the board room to ask myself this question: "Am I fit to be an executive?" This repeated check on humility always reminds me that I am an instrument of God. His ideas direct our company policy.

It doesn't make any difference where you are, God is there and can hear your prayers. I pray in what many would consider very odd places. For example, at home every time I finish taking a bath, while cleaning the tub, I say: "Lord, as I clean this tub, clean my heart." I want both to be as spotless as possible.

During the rest of my years I plan to spend time with young people in an effort to give them a vision—a conviction that the color of their skin has nothing to do with whether they are successful or not. Changing deeply planted ideas is hard, but not impossible.

It grieves me to see so many Negroes pull out of the South for the promised riches of the large northern cities. For that matter, there is often complete disillusionment and frustration for many people of all races who leave small community situations where they are doing well for the promised big-city gold.

There was the situation of the Negro farmer who lived outside of Durham. I'll call him Jeff Thomas. Jeff began to receive letters from his daughters in New York's Harlem, pleading that he sell his farm and move up with them. Jeff worked all his life for his farm; he loved every bit of it, yet finally the salesmanship of his daughters was too much.

Jeff sold his 20-acre farm for $2,000, much less than the farm was worth. Then he pulled up stakes and moved to Harlem.

What he found shocked and numbed him. His daughters, instead of living in a comfortable house, as he had been led to believe, had two rooms in a large run-down tenement. His home amounted to a small bed and bureau.

Within a year all his money was gone, and Jeff was a lonely, helpless figure amid a teeming multitude. He was a farmer in New York with not only no land to till, but hardly a tree or blade of grass within sight. It was a pitiful situation. And his case is multiplied many times today.

My credo is summed up in this prayer: "God, give me the serenity to accept what cannot be changed. * * * Give me the courage to change what can be changed. * * * And the wisdom to know one from the other."

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, in the Monday morning, March 19 issue of the oldest newspaper of continuous publication in America, the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, there appeared an editorial commenting upon two public-housing situations which are causing the taxpayers to ask questions. Though these two instances may be isolated cases, it may be the forerunner of surveys and perhaps investigation amoung housing projects that may reveal other facts which have not been brought to light in connection with housing authorities. The editorial follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING REQUIRES CLOSE SCRUTINY

It becomes more evident every day that before a lot more of public money is sunk into public housing in Connecticut, somebody ought to give the whole situation a thorough going-over. In Danbury the five members of the Town Housing Authority resigned the other day. They were completely fed up with the families who, with plenty of money for television sets, were unable to keep up their rent payments. Thirty-one of the 40 families in the project were delinquent in their rent payments.

The other side of the coin is the long existing situation in Hartford. Neglect of Bellevue Square by the Hartford Housing Authority is now followed up by charges of tenants that their inquiries of local officials are met with insolence and sarcasm. The fact that Bellevue Square is now being given a thorough clean-up does not in the least change the complexion of things. Why was it permitted to get into such a state of disrepair?

Certainly it was not due to any lack of money. Figures indicate that more than $73,000 was charged off against maintenance of Bellevue Square last year. Tenants who live there might be interested to know that it is claimed that $1,400 a week has been spent there on maintaining the project. Of this more than $8,000 was spent for painting and decorating. Another $10,880 was allegedly spent on maintenance of grounds. More than $14,000 was spent for janitorial services and another $7,290 for heating labor.

The question certainly arises as to how it is possible to spend money at the rate of $1,400 a week and still, at the end of the year, to have a project that looks like an adjunct to the city dump. There is even an

item of $2,331 for the operation of motor vehicles, gas, and oil. Coming on top of the charges of responsible State officials that the Hartford Housing Authority is greatly overstaffed, it seems obvious that investigation by some responsible public authority is long overdue. Or is this a completely autonomous little empire?

The Thirty-ninth Parallel Should Be the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the UN forces advance toward the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea, the question arises as to whether or not we should stop at that imaginary line.

Last November I urged that a buffer area be created along the Manchurian-Korean frontier; that the UN troops stop short of it and that the buffer area be occupied by South Korean troops. Since that time, conditions have changed markedly. I now wish to urge that the UN forces advance as far as the thirty-eighth parallel and stop there so that the original Republic of South Korea can once again be established in its own right. I further recommend that South Korean forces be sent into the area north of the thirty-eighth parallel up to the thirty-ninth parallel so a defense line can be established which will increase the defensive strength of South Korea and establish a status quo which can be maintained. Furthermore, if and when this is done, a warning should be issued against any further attempts to disturb the situation as thereby created. A move to the thirty-ninth parallel by South Korean forces and a declaration of maintainance of the status quo will, in my opinion, be a long step toward stopping Stalin's plans to involve us in an all-out war in Asia; it will allow the UN to start rebuilding South Korea and will have served notice to the world that aggression does not pay.

It might be well to point out that recent remarks by both Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway indicate that in their minds there is no longer any serious thought of attempting to liberate all of Korea. General Ridgway has stated "if the Korean war ends at the parallel, it would still be a tremendous victory for the United Nations."

Mr. Speaker, the most important result of the Korean war to date is that not since it began have the Russians or any of their satellites launched any other act of territorial aggression. This does not mean that they will not do so but the fact remains that they have not done so. Perhaps one of the reasons for this is because not one but a number of nations have stood up and insisted that aggression be resisted. Russia, with her Communist Chinese and North Korean allies, has not been allowed to win a cheap and swift victory. It is too soon, perhaps, to say that the war in Korea has prevented a world war but it seems safe to assume that our resistance in Korea has put off a general war and has won for us time to build up our strength and to continue to work to prevent a world war. We have had to pay a high price to put down aggression in Korea but we have pointed out to the Russians that a satellite cannot commit an act of aggression with immunity. The North Koreans and the Communist Chinese have gained nothing except a frightful loss of life and prestige. While the unification of all Korea is the ultimate possibility in that part of the Far East, yet, it is of greater importance to us that we discourage the Russian bloc from further adventures which would sooner or later launch an atomic war.

Oil and Gas Tax Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to the reduction of the 27½-percent oil and gas tax depletion allowance, March 19, 1951:

Mr. Chairman, to satisfy the appetite of this administration for more taxes, the President is again asking for a reduction of the oil and gas depletion tax allowance which has worked successfully and to the benefit of this Nation for many years.

If the administration is successful, less oil and gasoline will be produced, which will cause the price to rise, and every citizen will pay more for every gallon of oil or gasoline he buys, whether it is for his car, his tractor, or fuel oil to heat his home. It will not only affect the oil producer and farmer who may have oil, it will nick the pocketbook of all of our citizens. It will weaken our national defense and will cause everyone to pay more taxes, rather than less.

The President has referred to the oil and gas depletion allowance as a tax loophole that should be plugged. I submit if there is no loophole, there is nothing to plug.

This committee and the Congress in 1926 after a thorough study of the entire problem found this percentage method was more practical to administer, was fair and just, placed all taxpayers on an equal basis, and wrote the 27½-percent depletion allowance into the law.

In the subsequent Revenue Act of 1934, this committee and the Congress reviewed carefully the experience under the percentage depletion provisions. It had proved satisfactory during the 8 years and was continued in the act unchanged.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in 1936, when the revenue act was again reviewed, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, that the Treasury Department, with regard to the depletion provisions, "would not want to see any change." Congress made no change in these provisions.

Then again in considering the Revenue Act of 1942, the depletion provisions received a most comprehensive and detailed review by your committee and the Congress. The success of these provisions in assuring adequate oil supplies for World War II was demonstrated conclusively and the provisions were continued.

Again, only a year ago the President and the Secretary of the Treasury recommended a reduction of the 27½-percent depletion allowance. Your committee held full and complete hearings which brought out all of the facts and voted to maintain the 27½-percent depletion.

Throughout the past 25 years of trial and experience this depletion allowance has proven, beyond question, to be a necessary and effective means of assuring an increasing oil supply essential to the Nation's economic progress, industrial expansion, and for our national defense.

It has proven there is no loophole to plug—no one is cheating the Government out of a dollar in taxes because of this depletion allowance.

The Congress knew it was not a tax loophole when they wrote it into the law. Their review of this provision in several subsequent tax bills has confirmed the wisdom of the members of this committee and the Congress.

The Congress, in writing this provision into the law, sought to protect the oil owner or producer from being compelled to pay an income tax on his capital investment.

The Congress also realized that this depletion allowance was necessary as an incentive for further exploration and production of oil in an expanding economy.

The question was raised before the Ways and Means Committee in the hearings last year as to whether the oil industry was spending the 27½ percent for exploration and drilling of new wells.

In response to that question Mr. R. B. Anderson, president of the Texas division of the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 14, 1950, and I quote excerpts from his testimony.

Mr. Anderson said, "a detailed survey has just been completed of a group of large oil companies including all of the so-called major companies in the industry for a 12-year period from 1936 to 1947 inclusive. The survey shows that this group of companies spent more in their effort to find new oil reserves than the total percentage depletion allowed for the same period, or $1,833,000,000 more in their efforts to find new oil than the total additional taxes they would have paid without the depletion percentage.

"The total sum expended by this group of companies during the period, including both expiration and development, was $5,541,829,000; or more than twice the percentage depletion allowed."

Continuing Mr. Anderson said: "It is the necessary incentive to the oil and gas producer whether large or small to plow back his funds in the search for new and essential reserves.

"It is also the incentive for new and risk capital from outside sources to be expended in the search for new and additional oil reserves.

"The facts shown by the survey are conclusive evidence that these provisions have done what they were intended to do and that the larger producers are as dependent upon the percentage depletion provision as are the smaller operators in their continuous search for oil."

I submit, that the foregoing statement by such an eminent authority as Mr. Anderson proves that the depletion allowance is justified, necessary, and is being used as the Congress intended, for the expansion of exploration and oil development.

OIL PAYS FULL SHARE OF TAXES

It is utterly fallacious to consider the present 27½-percent rate of depletion on oil production as unjustified or excessive. The petroleum industry has always paid its fair

share of taxes, and in my opinion is now paying more than its proportionate share.

Mr. Chairman, if this depletion allowance is reduced, it will ultimately close down hundreds of thousands of stripper wells which are at present producing over a million barrels of oil a day. Industry and national defense will lose this oil now so much needed.

More seriously than this, all of these millions of barrels of oil will be left in the ground never to be recovered.

I do not believe this committee or the Congress will allow this to happen. It will almost completely stop what is known as wildcat drilling throughout the Nation. By this I refer to the little oilmen who cannot continue to finance their drilling without this depletion allowance.

EIGHTY-TWO PERCENT DRY HOLES

It is these small producers on whom this Nation is dependent for increasing supplies of oil. They drill 75 percent of the so-called wildcat wells, which are those drilled in unexplored areas for new reserves. Eighty-two percent of the wildcat wells drilled in the United States last year were nonproductive.

ILLINOIS, SEVEN OUT OF EIGHT DRY

In Illinois alone last year the industry drilled 810 exploratory wells, of which 700, or approximately 7 out of every 8, were dry and abandoned.

A DANGEROUS GAMBLE

On a gamble to obtain $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 in taxes the administration proposal would strike a blow which would kill the incentive to explore for new oil reserves in our country. This is no time to take such a dangerous gamble.

Demand for petroleum has risen 750,000 barrels a day in the past year. Due to the present war emergency the oil industry is right now facing a gigantic task. The Petroleum Administration for Defense is asking the oil industry to further increase its production by 1,000,000 barrels daily.

WE NEED GREATER PRODUCTION

What we need is more exploring for oil, more new oil wells brought in and greater production. If this depletion allowance is reduced, we will have less oil. Then oil will join the ranks of inflation with higher prices per gallon for gasoline and oil and will cost the American taxpayers more than the $300,000,000 in taxes sought in increased prices of oil and gasoline. It will weaken the industrial power of our country, weaken the power of our military machine, and endanger the defense of all of the people.

Let us look at the remarkable record of the oil industry in World War II. It achieved miracles in supplying our Armed Forces. It did so on its own. At the same time, it was necessary that the Government subsidize many other basic and essential industries to achieve the desired production. If we tamper with the time-tested tax base as applied to petroleum, within the year we may find it necessary to subsidize the drilling of oil wells.

I should like to pose this question: Which is more important—assurance of a continued oil exploration program sufficient to meet our military and essential civilian demand in any event, or the return of a relatively few additional dollars in the public Treasury? That is the choice which now faces the Congress.

This ill-considered attack on the rate of depletion is a direct blow at our very security. But it goes beyond that. We must consider that the economic and governmental structures in some 30 States are vitally affected. The health of the oil industry influences the economic well-being in at least 12 of our major producing States.

PRICES OF OIL LOWER THAN 30 YEARS AGO

The average price of gasoline in 1949 was 20.47 cents per gallon as compared to 20.74 cents in 1920—an actual reduction of 9.27 cents while during this period the quality of petroleum products has improved manyfold. Also during this period, gasoline taxes were increased more than 10 times.

ILLINOIS OIL PRODUCTION

I have lived close to the oil industry in Illinois. In my district are thousands of independent oil producers, among whom are many operators of stripper or marginal wells. In Illinois there are thousands of such wells with a daily average production of 2½ barrels of oil a day. All will be closed down without the depletion allowance and the oil will be lost forever.

THOUSANDS OF DRY HOLES

Many people are led to believe all is profit and riches for those engaged in the oil business. The facts show a different picture. Out of 6,785 exploratory or wildcat wells drilled in Illinois from 1937 to 1950, inclusive, 6,389 were dry and only 306 produced oil.

The loss or cost in drilling the 6,389 dry wells was $95,835,000. No one gives publicity to these staggering losses of these men who are willing to risk their money, these free enterprisers who might well be referred to as the last of the vanishing rugged pioneers who are willing to struggle and sacrifice to win success by their own efforts.

Members of the committee, I would like to point out that the oil industry paid in State and Federal taxes last year $3,551,370,000. This does not include many of the taxes below the State level and does not include income taxes paid by the great body of men employed in the oil industry or probably $500,000,000 in addition.

In addition many States, through their legislatures are raising the taxes on the oil industry, and the President and the Secretary of the Treasury are asking this committee of the Congress now to increase Federal gasoline tax from 1½ cents to 3 cents which would add an additional tax burden of over $500,000,000 a year.

I am informed that the average gasoline State tax is 6 cents a gallon. Federal and State taxes on gasoline now produce a total revenue of about $2,500,000,000. This reaches an approximate grand total of over $4,500,000,000 resulting from the oil industry. This does not include many further millions the oil and gas industry will have to pay because of the increased corporate and excess-profits taxes.

If we continue to heap unbearable taxes on the oil and gas industry, we will destroy one of the most powerful branches of our economy, slow down the industry of the Nation at a time when it is necessary to expand it, and weaken our national defense on which we are now spending countless billions of dollars to build up.

If the administration is successful in reducing this depletion allowance, it will so reduce oil production in this Nation that instead of scraping the bottom of the barrel and getting $300,000,000 more in taxes, they will probably lose $500,000,000 in taxes that would normally flow into the Treasury if the oil business is allowed to continue to expand in the future as it has in the past.

Mr. Chairman, the oil industry has made a remarkable contribution to all of the people in the Nation. It is a splendid example of competitive enterprise. Millions of people have invested billions of dollars in the oil and gas industry, making it possible to carry its services to every citizen of the Nation.

Those in directing the management of these organizations continue to spend billions of dollars each year in the further expansion of this great industry which expands our national economy and which renders the people a better service and brings employment to countless millions of them in addition to helping furnish the finest transportation in the world to our people.

Few people realize that gasoline, oil products, and natural gas and oil to power the industries of our country are being furnished to all of the people at a lesser price than they were 25 years ago.

Let me point out again that the average price of a gallon of gasoline in 1920 was 29.7 cents a gallon without any tax. Leaving off present taxes the average price of a gallon of regular gasoline on July 1, 1950, was 20.4 cents. In other words, because of the great exploration, production, and supply of oil, gasoline, and gas during the past number of years, your gasoline is delivered to you by the oil industry at about 9 cents a gallon less than 30 years ago.

It is the Government, both State and National, that adds the extra average of about 6 cents in taxes a gallon and not the oil industry.

Think what it would mean to the people if all other industries would have held the prices of their products down to the people, as the oil and gas industry has done. If they had, we would not have the ruinous inflation that is upon us today. By comparison, the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the general cost of living has gone up in this same period 44½ percent. Again, let's make a comparison. Oil produced and delivered to the filling stations of the Nation today is 9 cents a gallon less than 30 years ago, while all other commodities are up a general average of 44½ percent.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND MILES OF PIPELINE

Few people realize that throughout the days and nights, the weeks and months, that billions of barrels of oil due to the foresight and good management of those directing the oil and gasoline industry, flow underground to distribution points all over the United States through 120,000 miles of great oil pipelines—yes, delivering it at lower prices to the distributor than it cost 30 years ago.

NINETY-EIGHT THOUSAND MILES OF GAS PIPELINES

That likewise the oil and gas industry through the same business foresight has 98,000 miles of big gas pipelines which carry the gas underground to power thousands of great industries throughout the United States and to furnish heat for millions of homes. Yes, and at a lower price than was charged for gas many years ago.

WHO BENEFITS?

All the people are benefited by an adequate supply of oil and gas which keeps the price of these products at the lowest possible level. It is not a few oil men who benefit. They only get their legitimate tax rights under the Constitution. It is the 150,000 people who reap the benefits, and it is the United States Treasury that benefits in billions of dollars in taxes collected from this great industry.

CHICAGO AREA BENEFITS

All cities, industrial and farm areas benefit. By illustration, may I refer to Chicago and its trade territory. What an adequate supply means to that vast trade area.

The people of the city of Chicago use more fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline than any other city in the world.

The farm trade territory of the city of Chicago embracing seven States constitutes the largest rural market for petroleum products in the world.

The greatest saturation of automobiles, tractors, and motorized farm equipment in the world is found in this area.

The largest per capita use of petroleum products in the world is in the area of these seven States of Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Indiana, Iowa, and Nebraska.

The petroleum and natural-gas industry has furnished these products in this great productive locality in such abundance that the price of natural gas today is cheaper than it was 10 years ago, and the price of gasoline before Government taxes are added is 9 cents a gallon less than it was 30 years ago, and gives the consumer, through its refinement and improvement, 50 percent more power than it did 30 years ago.

Certainly, the Government should not be permitted to slow down the service to our people, and the march of progress of the great oil and gas industry.

The oil and gas industry which employs millions of men as a rule pays the highest standard wages and seldom do you ever hear of a strike in the oil and gas fields that amounts to anything worthy of mention.

It is a mistake for the Federal Government to bog down and slow down this great essential industry by tampering with the 27½-percent depletion allowance which would reduce supply of these essential products and drive them on the escalator of inflation by governmental interference.

It would be a tragic blunder if this depletion were reduced, which would weaken and endanger the national defense of our country. I feel certain that the Ways and Means Committee in its wisdom will again refuse to reduce this depletion allowance, and I feel certain the Members of the Congress will applaud such action on the part of the Ways and Means Committee.

Let us not kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Let us not temporize with or endanger the security and defense of our Nation in these perilous times.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, American investors owe a debt of gratitude to the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times for the warning given in a series of articles now being published in that great newspaper.

Mr. Richard S. Lewis, Star-Times staff writer, has performed a fine public service as author of the articles which describe in detail the operations of a group who seek to funnel American capital into gold-brick promotions. Working with mailing lists of potential American investors, these promoters undoubtedly have many victims for their nefarious schemes. Thanks to the investigations of Mr. Lewis for the Star-Times, they are now being exposed and thousands of investors are being saved from loss of investment capital.

This series of articles should have the widest circulation throughout the country. I am hopeful that other newspapers will call attention to this stock-promotion racket as a result of the Star-Times exposure. The St. Louis newspaper is to be congratulated for this unusual public service. I am sure this series of articles will be listed high among the outstanding newspaper contributions for 1951.

With my remarks I include the following article which is one of the series which I have mentioned:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—This is the story of how an American fugitive from justice who jumped $40,000 bond in New York City 3 years ago masterminds gold mine and oil promotions here today.

He is Albert Edward DePalma, age 50. Thirty years ago, he sold knitted ties in St. Louis. When this venture failed, he became a waiter at Autenrieth's restaurant in Clayton. It used to be across the street from the courthouse.

From St. Louis, he went East. He sold used cars for a while in Brooklyn.

Born in Capetown, South Africa, DePalma was brought to the United States at the age of 2 by his parents and reared in Savannah, Ga. He never made much money in the United States.

Then he went to Toronto and got into the mail order stock racket. Today he is regarded as one of the wealthiest men in this city.

Like a number of other promoters here, DePalma cannot set foot in the United States without risking arrest. He jumped bail after he was indicted in Cleveland in 1947 on 14 counts of mail fraud in connection with his promotion of Novell Porcupine Gold Mines, Ltd, and Peg Tantalum Mines.

DePalma ranks high on the United States Securities and Exchange Commission's list of most wanted swindlers. The Canadian Government protects him from United States authorities by refusing extradition. Although DePalma has been denied a broker-dealer license here, his stock promotions are peddled by fronts who are licensed broker-dealers.

These broker-dealers are peddling stocks in the same gold and tantalum mine promotions which were the basis of the Cleveland mail fraud indictments in 1947, and in addition, they are handling an oil issue which the United States SEC also finds to be a phony.

They are Victor H. Waddell, suite 26, of 29 Melinda Street; Frank Shea, 221 Victoria Street, and William A. Deering, 71 King Street West, all of Toronto.

These three are currently licensed broker-dealers in good standing with the Ontario Securities Commission. They are also members of the Broker-Dealer Association, the outfit which does not like the laws of the United States.

In addition to these fronts, DePalma has been represented in the past by J. F. Wright, who was licensed as a broker-dealer in April 1949, at suite 110, 221 Victoria Street, but who is no longer a licensed broker-dealer.

Another DePalma stooge was Robert C. H. Mitchell whose license as a broker-dealer was cancelled by the Ontario Securities Commission on January 13, 1948. The Commission declared Mitchell to be a front for DePalma.

The mining ventures which led to the Cleveland indictments—Peg Tantalum Mines and Novell Porcupine Gold Mines, Ltd.—are still current. The SEC investigation shows that Novell Porcupine Gold Mines, Ltd., permitted its claims to lapse after DePalma's indictment. In May 1949 the claims were restaked on behalf of J. F. Wright and on September 23, 1949, Palamino Gold Mines, Ltd., was formed and took over Wright's claims.

Wright became the president of Palamino, according to the 1950 Canadian Mines Handbook, at the same time he was promoting its stock as a broker-dealer.

All through 1949–50 Palamino circulars were pouring into the Midwest, offering 25 shares of stock per person (no more) at $1 a share.

This is a typical DePalma promotion technique. In 1946, when DePalma was promoting Novell Porcupine by flying around the United States in his private airplane with his name printed all over it, he permitted each sucker to purchase only $10 worth of stock.

Palamino promotional circulars kept referring to the fact that a big company called Progress Diversified Minerals, Ltd., was sinking $1,000,000 in some property adjacent to the Palamino site in the Yellowknife mining district.

Progress Diversified, according to the promotion, had been working a property which Wright, himself, had purchased from an old prospector in 1944 on the basis of "striking samples" of ore.

The fact that Progress Diversified and Palamino were two angles of the same promotion is not stated in the literature, but it happens to be the case. DePalma admitted that much to me.

Not long after United States postal fraud orders began flying at Wright and Palamino, DePalma ended its career and formed a new company called Indigo Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., in which both Palamino and Progress Diversified were merged.

From Novell Porcupine to Palamino and Progress Diversified to Indigo, the SEC and the United States Post Office have kept up with DePalma all the way.

Indigo, in the opinion of SEC and postal investigators, was a device to evade the fraud order issued against Palamino, since both Shea and Waddell were asking suckers to send their remittances to Indigo.

Shea and Waddell told the suckers that stock shares, selling to the public at 70 cents, would soon sell for $5. They did not mention the fact, however, that DePalma was purchasing these shares from the mine treasury for 25 cents.

The broker-dealers also advised mailing lists that Indigo was in production and making money and that the mine adjoined the famous Noranda mine, whose vein runs into Indigo property.

Mining Engineer Benjamin Adelstein, of the SEC, reported that Indigo's mine is 1,700 miles away from Noranda, that insufficient ore has been encountered at Indigo to show a feasible commercial operation, and that there is no present reasonable basis for assuming the venture will be profitable.

Indigo appeared on the scene last year, however, as a brand-new promotion as far as St. Louisans knew. DePalma's name was not connected with it.

Indeed, this was the reason he changed the name, he told me.

The stock promotion was handled by Waddell and Shea. Both advised prospective clients that for each share of stock outstanding there was $4 of ore indicated at a depth of only 500 feet on a mere one-sixth of the company's vein structure. The SEC found these claims untrue.

Broker-Dealer William A. Deering also got into the act. His advertising literature last month represented that work on Indigo's properties had reached the stage where the ore zone would be reached last September.

According to the SEC investigation, Deering told suckers that arrangements had been made to list Indigo on the Toronto Stock Exchange at $2 a share.

In reviewing the Indigo case prior to issuing a fraud order against it November 24, 1950, Trial Examiner Daniel J. Kelly asserted that no application has ever been made to list Indigo on the Toronto Stock Exchange.

DePalma swore it was listed, but he delisted it himself. He was vague about the reason.

Examiner Kelly also made the point that Indigo's property is in an inaccessible area of the Yellowknife district, served only by airplane and tractor train in the winter.

This would create unusually high costs for operations and mill installation, he commented.

In addition to Indigo, DePalma's broker-dealer fronts were active in promoting his oil stocks in the Petromine Exploration & Finance Co., Ltd.

In Post Office fraud order No. 42707, issued March 16, 1950, Trial Examiner James C. Haynes, Jr., said the broker-dealer concern of Waddell & Co. "is engaged in conducting a scheme for obtainng money through the United States mails by means of pretenses, representations, and promises that are knowingly false and fraudulent."

The SEC report stated that Petromine shares were peddled by long-distance telephone and mail in the United States by Waddell on such representations as—

It was the largest independent oil producer in western Canada.

It owns the richest quarter section of the Lloydminster field.

That seven Petromine wells are the finest commercial producing wells in the area.

That Petromine wells flow fairly well on their own, but to control the wells they are pumped.

The SEC reported that in truth and fact Petromine was not the largest independent producer in western Canada; that it did not own the richest quarter section in the Lloydminster field; that its seven wells are not even good commercial producing wells and that the oil has to be pumped in order to squeeze it out of the ground.

The SEC found untrue the claim that application had been made to list Petromine shares on the stock exchange here. It found untrue the claim that all funds derived from stock sales went into the company treasury to develop the well.

Instead, the SEC found the company treasury received 20 cents out of each share sold to the public for 50 to 75 cents. "This mark-up of 150 to 300 percent a share was distributed among the promoter, underwriter, dealers, and salesmen," the SEC report said.

"Waddell's representation that Petromine was a safe and sound investment is absolutely false," the SEC said.

Because of bank loans outstanding and limited production from its well, Petromine assets are likely to be taken over by creditors.

"The resultant loss to investors will be 100 percent of the purchase price of their shares," the SEC report said.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent of mine:

SUFFERN, N. Y., *March 15, 1951.*

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: Recently the House Public Works Committee has been conducting hearings on the various resolutions proposing the completion of the perennial boondoggling St. Lawrence seaway and power project, now garbed in the cloak of a defense measure.

I am opposed to several phases of the bill, particularly that part covering the St. Lawrence seaway, as I am convinced, contrary to the blandishments of the sponsors of the bill, that the project is for defense purposes, that it will not add one iota to national defense, Governor Dewey and all the proponents to the contrary notwithstanding. It is not in reality a defense measure at all, and I am deeply concerned by this insistence to spend vast sums of money, great quantities of materials and millions of man-hours, which will have to be diverted from our defense requirements and be dissipated on projects which will be detrimental rather than beneficial.

How much this part of the subject bill will cost to complete no one seems to know, even approximately. Reliable engineers 10 years ago—when the matter was under consideration and when costs were considerably lower—estimated the cost at from $800,000,000 to $1,350,000,000. If then, as is usually the case with public projects of this type, the cost of building the St. Lawrence seaway runs true to form, and in this day when the "squanderbund" is in the saddle, the final costs will reach staggering proportions. In support of this contention, I point to the final cost of the Panama Canal, the highest cost estimate of which was placed at $160,000,000 by a well-known and reliable engineer, but which actually cost the Nation $375,000,000 before it was completed, or 134 percent more than the highest estimated cost.

I am, however, in perfect accord with the building and cost of the Panama Canal, since it was actually built for and has proven to be one of the most important links in our chain of national defense.

Besides being opposed to this bill on the grounds that this is not the time for nondefense expenditures, particularly at a time when it is apparent that real defense requirements are seriously straining the economy of the people, I oppose this scheme on the grounds of being directly detrimental to the living standards of a great part of the American people, especially those living in the North Atlantic States.

That this letter may not assume too large proportions, I am attaching hereto for handy reference a list of 17 reasons why I oppose the passage of this nefarious bill and pray that you, in the interest of every American, will vote against this insidious measure when it comes before the House.

Very respectfully yours,

G. J. GARDNER.

SEVENTEEN REASONS WHY THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY SHOULD NOT BE BUILT

1. It will slow up our war efforts in Korea by directing to the project enormous quantities of steel, lumber, cement, machinery, explosives, and other materials now so urgently needed.

2. It will slow up our defense efforts by diverting manpower so vitally needed for essential industry at this time, and may prove to be disastrous.

3. In the event of invasion, and the best authorities say it is possible, it will be difficult to defend.

4. Only 5 percent of American ships of 2,000 tons or over could be operated through the seaway.

5. Only 30 percent of foreign ships of 2,000 tons or over could use the seaway.

6. Only smaller ships of our Navy could use the seaway.

7. In this time of strain upon our national finances, it will require many millions of dollars to prepare our lake ports for this type of navigation service.

8. Weather conditions will permit the use of the seaway for only 8 months or less each year.

9. Out of the money spent of our tax dollars only 6 percent would be for the benefit of American workmen and shipping.

10. It will reduce employment in many of the major industries of the United States.

11. It will tend to reduce the earnings of American marine workmen millions of dollars annually.

12. It will skyrocket the already high cost of living.

13. It will increase our taxes by untold millions of dollars each year.

14. It will subsidize foreign workmen, shipping and factories at the expense of American workmen and industries.

15. It will place American workmen in competition with cheap foreign labor.

16. It will place an intolerable burden on American workmen and industry for all time to come and without hope of benefit.

17. It will do irreparable harm to all of the North Atlantic ports established at such great cost, especially that of New York City in our own State, and make for unemployment on a huge scale, not to mention destroying the railroads within our State borders, now struggling for survival.

West Point Appointment System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a clipping from a newspaper which complains about the system of appointing candidates to the United States Military Academy at West Point.

WEST POINT APPOINTMENT SYSTEM HIT

BUFFALO, March 17.—The West Point Society of Western New York wants more enlisted men—and fewer friends of politicians—given a chance to attend the United States Military Academy.

"The number of (cadet) appointments available for enlisted men of the Armed Forces should be very materially increased," said a statement in connection with local observance today of the academy's one hundred forty-ninth anniversary.

"This increase could be immediately brought about by transferring at least 1,062, or half of the appointments now available to Senators and Representatives, to the Armed Forces."

The statement was approved by the society's board of governors. The society is an alumni group.

Having Congressmen appoint most of the West Point cadets, as at present, is "to a great extent just another form of political patronage," the statement said.

The West Point Society of Western New York believes in the appointment of more enlisted men and fewer friends of politicians. They believe the number of appointments available for enlisted men of the Armed Forces should be materially increased. I believe so, too. But I wish the West Point Society of Western New York would advise me as to the number of their members who were appointed to the Academy by their several Congressmen. It would make interesting reading, I am sure, in view of their resolution concerning appointments. But you see, my colleagues, they are out of the service, either by resignation, retirement or otherwise.

But to have this group, or any other similar group, complain that "having Congressmen appoint most of the West Point cadets, as at present, is to a great extent just another form of political patronage" is interesting, to say the least.

The resolution of the West Point alumni could, in my humble opinion go still further with further provision that the academy be more interested in obtaining lads who desire to make the Army their life's career instead of looking for prominent football and other qualified athletes.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith one of a series of articles which have been appearing in the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times, exposing the operations of a stock promotion group in Canada which has been preying upon unsuspecting American investors. The Star-Times is performing a great public service in exposing these operations.

The article follows:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—The letter we received last November 13 from Leader Securities, Ltd., of 88 Richmond Street West, fairly glowed with promise.

"We are pleased to have you with us as a participant in the promising future of Treasure Rouyn Mines, Ltd.," it said. "The response to our offering of these shares has been overwhelmingly enthusiastic. Judging by the number of reservations received, there is every indication that a substantial oversubscription will result."

Approximately 15,000 persons in the Middle Western States received the same letter we did. It was followed by a second letter urging us to immediate action in sending in our check for 500 shares of Treasure Rouyn stock at 30 cents a share.

"Substantial wealth has accrued in many fortunate individuals by the tremendous growth of Canada's mining industry," the second letter said. "We believe these profits will be more than surpassed in the future."

This, in turn, was followed by expensively prepared literature indicating how our fortune would be made by investing in an aggressive mining company exploiting the wealth of the Noranda mining district of Quebec.

Included was a small publication called Mining News and Market Digest, which featured an article on the front page headlined: "Treasure Rouyn plans completed for early start on new program."

Underneath was a picture of a gold miner drilling in a tunnel. There were other pictures, one entitled "Winter in a Mining Camp," which showed a group of miners standing around outside snow-covered log cabins.

Another showed a mining head frame under construction. None of these had anything to do with the Treasure Rouyn mine, but they were instructive.

We also received a little booklet entitled "Mine Making Portrayed." This, like the four-page Mining News and Market Digest, was sent to us with the compliments of our broker, Leader Securities, Ltd. It showed how mines are dug and gave us a brief history of the Canadian mining industry.

When we did not send in our check, we received another letter from Leader on December 11. The tone was a little different.

"Due, no doubt, to pressure of other business," it said, "you have omitted to forward your check in the amount of $150 Canadian funds, or $142.50 American funds, covering our statement of your account relative to the purchase of 500 shares of Treasure Rouyn Mines, Ltd."

It went on to say that the company was anxious to adjust our stock position, and our immediate remittance was to our own advantage.

All this we got from Leader Securities for a penny post card we sent in asking for information. We haven't received any more dunning letters asking for $150 we never agreed to put up in the first place, but we do continue to receive more propaganda. Leader is trying to sell us some cobalt now.

This is somewhat typical of the way the moose pasture promoters here beslege you with literature and attempt to make you believe you actually owe them money. We got the long-distance-telephone treatment, too. Everybody does.

Let's examine this proposition.

In the first place, Leader Securities Ltd., of which one Lionel Richmond is president, became the subject of United States postal fraud order No. 42687 on March 13, 1950—8 months before we were solicited.

The fraud order was written because of misrepresentation made in regard to the possibility of making profits out of Treasure Rouyn Mines.

The purpose of the postal fraud order is to prevent mail from the United States reaching its Toronto destination. But our postal card asking more information got through this barrier.

Maybe that's because it was addressed to "Accounts Department," suite 101 at 88 Richmond Street, west. The postal fraud order lists Leader's address as suite 305 at 88 Richmond Street, west. Leader simply switched offices in the same building to confuse and confound the United States postal authorities.

But the Post Office caught up with this maneuver on Sept. 12, 1950. It issued a supplemental fraud order covering suite 101 as well as suite 305.

Then Leader dodged again. They sent us a self-addressed envelope in feminine handwriting in which they wanted us to send our "cheque."

The address was: "Cashiers Department, suite 101, 90 Richmond Street, west."

Dodging the United States postal fraud orders here is as easy as rolling off a mail sack. There was no indication on the return envelope to indicate the address was Leader Securities.

This is not the legal address of Leader Securities. But that's where this outfit picks up much of its mail from the United States.

Having seen how Leader bamboozles the United States Post Office, let's see how they are trying to take us for a ride with their gold mine.

Without the permission of the Ontario Securities Commission, it would not be possible for Leader or any of the other broker-dealers here to pull these shenanigans.

According to the official bulletin of the Ontario Commission, an organization calling itself Baylord Securities, Ltd., agreed to purchase 250,000 of Treasure-Rouyn stock at 5 cents a share on June 27, 1949.

In February, 1950, the record shows that Baylord and the mining company agreed to cancel this agreement in favor of a new agreement. Under it, Baylord entered into the purchase of 10,000 shares at 10 cents a share and was granted options on 1,240,000 shares, of which the first 490,000 shares were to sell also at 10 cents and the rest as ascending prices ranging from 12, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 to 50 cents a share.

What Baylord agreed to do, in brief, was to sell 500,000 shares to the public and pay the mine treasury 10 cents for each share. Only the first 10,000 shares required cash on the barrelhead.

Now Baylord Securities is not a licensed broker-dealer in Ontario. It operates as an underwriter and it had to find a licensed broker-dealer to promote the stock to the public.

Accordingly in July of 1950, Baylord was granted permission by the Ontario Commission to give Leader Securities a suboption on the shares at a half-cent mark-up per share.

This agreement was modified on August 29 when Leader took options on 1,115,000 shares. It was to purchase these from the treasury at 12 cents a share for 450,000 shares and the remainder at ascending prices up to 50 cents.

What all this adds up to is that Leader was offering to sell us 500 shares at 30 cents a share—for which it paid a wholesale price of 10½ to 12 cents per share. This was a bargain, according to the promotion ethics here.

Under the broker-dealer association code Leader could have charged 34 to 36 cents a share, and indeed advertised in the Mining News and Market Digest it was asking 34 cents.

At this point it should be explained that the Mining News and Market Digest is not an independent publication, but one of the myriad propaganda devices published by the promoters themselves to create an illusion of publicity which they cannot get in any respectable newspaper either in the United States or Canada, except through articles exposing their operations.

How is this price of 30 cents a share set?

Treasure Rouyn stock is not listed on any market. There is no trading in it. There is no bid price.

It started out at 5 cents a share wholesale when it was first promoted by Baylord. It went up to 10 cents under a new agreement alleged to have been made between Baylord and the mining company.

Then Leader got into the act and decided to see if it could get 30 cents for the stock.

The value of Treasure Rouyn today appears to exist in the minds of the promoters—and the suckers if the promoters can make them believe it.

That the promoters and the broker-dealer are the same people is evident by the fact that the executive office of the mining company is in the same suite in the same building as Leader Securities, Ltd.

The Canadian Mines Handbook, an authoritative listing of current and abandoned mining properties in Canada, lists the concern as having 32 claims in Rouyn and Beauchastel Townships, northwestern Quebec.

Development of the property, the Handbook shows, up to March 1950, consisted of a geophysical survey which was in progress at that time. This was to be followed by diamond drilling to determine if any gold is to be found in the property.

The fact that the stock-selling deal was all set up nearly a year before the geophysical survey was made or any diamond drilling got under way is made clear by the records.

The fact that the SEC and the Post Office have found this promotion to be based on fraud also is a matter of record.

But the Ontario Securities Commission makes such promotions as this legal. The result is that in defiance of United States postal fraud orders, Lionel Richmond, of Richmond St., West, Toronto, is not only promoting fraudulent stock in St. Louis through the mail, but trying to dun suckers who even indicate some curiosity in his promotion.

Government Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Western Hills Press, Cheviot, Ohio, of March 16, 1951:

GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE—COUPLE OF EXAMPLES THAT ARE NOT HEARSAY

Many stories of profligate extravagance on the part of the Federal Government are told, some so fantastic that the average housewife who diligently shops from store to store to save a few pennies to stay within an inflation-riddled budget or that the average small businessman who turns out a light in an effort to keep expenses inside of income find them hard to believe.

But occasionally, each of us comes across personal examples that cannot be denied. Thus, to the editor's desk came this week, a release from the local Navy Recruiting station. Not one copy, not two copies, not three—but 10 copies of the same release were included in the mailing. Accustomed to receive three copies of releases from military agencies (no Army or Navy form is official in less than triplicate), this set a new high.

Knowing from daily experience how increasingly difficult it has become to secure paper needed for the ordinary operations of a printing and publishing business and being familiar with the recent directive setting aside 5 percent of all mill production of certain papers for Government use, it is needless to say that this wholesale news release did not improve Navy press relations insofar as we are concerned.

Nor is this an isolated instance. The Treasury Department, in its campaign to stimulate the sale of Savings Bonds, is also generous to a fault. For instance, it has not been long since that one of our periodic shipment of mats for Savings Bond advertisements arrived with four duplications of each ad, none of which we had specifically ordered. The fact that one mat will provide casts for a half dozen plates, if that number of duplicate ads would be required by a single publication for any conceivable reason, is a matter of elementary knowledge to anyone familiar with graphic arts processes. It would doubtless be presuming too much to expect that the Treasury Department "expert" publicists would know as much.

The value of these mats on the Cincinnati market we ascertained to be $2.24; the packing and handling charge a minimum of 35 cents, and parcel post from Chicago, the point of origin, to Cincinnati, 19 cents. (Of course, these mats came under Government frank, adding to the postal deficit for which the second-class mailing rates granted to newspapers get principal credit.)

Thus, this single mailing cost the Treasury Department (which of course, is you and I) an estimated $2.78, or considerably more than twice of what it should have been had single mats been sent. Had proof sheets for editor's selection been sent, the general trade practice, the cost would have been even a smaller fraction of the actual cost. And there are over 10,000 weekly newspapers in the United States, the majority of which are doubtless on the Treasury Department's mailing list.

We also find in our mail a news release (one copy) from the Ohio Public Expenditure Council stating, Ohio's share of President Truman's proposed $71,600,000,000 budget, as submitted to Congress, amounts to $3,752,028,016.40. Hamilton County's share, alone, amounts to $341,509,129.20 or an average of $475.12 for every man, woman, and child in the county.

So what, it's only money. Your money, that is.

A. H. H.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith one of a series of articles now appearing in the St. Louis, Mo., Star-Times, exposing the operations of a stock-promotion group in Canada which has been systematically defrauding American investors. The article follows:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—There is no question about the oil boom in Alberta. It is real. Some of the greatest oil pools in North America have been discovered there.

But not by the mail-order stock promoters of Toronto's Bay Street. Tying their promotions to the legitimate boom, the Bay Street buccaneers have leased lands on the fringes of the oil areas and drilled wildcat wells as a basis for selling schemes.

According to them, they hold open the door for United States participation in Canadian western oils.

Alberta authorities have vainly warned Americans to beware of the flamboyant promotions emanating from Toronto. But their warnings have been drowned out in the torrents of promotional literature from Bay Street promising big profits overnight to investors in Canada's black gold.

The oil promotions seem to be the easiest to sell in the United States, possibly because the Horatio Alger oil millionaire is a familiar figure to Americans.

This is the kind of propaganda oil promoters are feeding St. Louisans:

"Once upon a time, only a few months ago, a farmer named Bill Mulligan and his wife and 11 children lived in a tumble-down shack with a dirt floor near Bon Accord, Alberta.

"The family was very poor. If it hadn't been for the milk from their four cows, the Mulligans would have been hungry at times.

"Then along came an oil company and drilled a hole in their cow lot. Oil gushed out of it and, lo, the Mulligans aren't on a milk diet any more.

"They are eating beefsteaks now and have just bought a new home, two new tractors, and a $4,000 sedan in which they are touring the States. All of them are riding high."

Now this rags-to-riches documentary was not invented by the promoters. It was published by the American magazine last August, in an enthusiastic article entitled "It's Easier To Get Rich in Canada," by Clarence Woodbury.

No criticism of Woodbury's article nor the facts he has assembled to show why it is easier to get rich in Canada is intended.

But reprints of this article are being mailed by Toronto's broker-dealers to St. Louisans in support of fraudulent oil stocks.

As early as November 1949 C. O. Nickle, a recognized oil authority of Calgary, Alberta, issued a public warning to beware of the wildcatters. He criticized the high-pressure selling methods used by the Bay Street buccaneers to sell western oil stocks.

At that time, most of the promotions were based on drillings in the Lloydminster area. This field is favorable at best only for efficient operators, he said, who can keep costs to a minimum, but not to operators who put two-thirds of the investors' dollar in their pockets and use one-third to look for oil.

"Chances for an investor to get his capital back, let alone realize a profit, are about comparable to a snowball in Hades," he said.

The most prevalent western Canadian oil promotions circulating in the St. Louis area are Cordasun Petroleums, Ltd., and Maidstone Oils, Ltd. Both of these have been found fraudulent by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office.

Probably the most aggressive promoter in the group of licensed broker-dealers pushing these stocks is J. D. Cullingham, of J. D. Cullingham & Co., 185 Bay Street.

Cullingham, who occupies office space on the floor below the headquarters of the notorious bail jumper, Albert E. DePalma, is the subject of postal fraud order No. 43124, issued May 5, 1950.

Also, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, Michigan, Minnesota, California, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Virginia have issued cease and desist orders against Cullingham. But in spite of these efforts, he is still spreading the old oil throughout the Middle West.

By mail and over the telephone, Cullingham promised St. Louisans that he could sell them stock below the market price, when there wasn't any market to begin with; that they were sure to make money; that the stock was safe and sound, and that Cordasun Petroleums was an investment, not a speculation.

Not many of the broker-dealers go this far. Most of them admit their promotions are speculative, but, they add, nobody makes money in Canada unless he speculates.

Cullingham's pitch is rather distinctive. He tells you that Cordasun's 35-cent shares have been oversubscribed and that the offering price to the public has now risen to 50 cents. But—

"As principals we have allotted a special bloc at a preferential price of 45 cents per share—a price 5 cents under the prevailing public offering quotation of 50 cents a share."

How can anyone resist such an offer which enables you to make a nickel a share before you buy the stock at all?

It's not hard to resist when you look behind this deal. The SEC and the postal inspectors did.

They found that Cullingham received 300,000 treasury shares from Cordasun at 7½ cents, 300,000 at 10 cents, and 15,000 at 12½ cents, with options to purchase more stock at ascending prices.

This is the stock Cullingham has been offering at 35, 45, and 50 cents. What he offers it for, the SEC found, has no relation to any market value.

The postal investigation found that glowing representations were made about a Cordasun well known as Bailey-Nisku well No. 1, which was promoted as a prolific producer.

United States Trial Examiner James C. Haynes, Jr., reported in his findings that this well had been drilled to 6,000 feet and abandoned as a nonproducer.

Analysis of the amended prospectus filed by Cordasun with the Ontario Securities Commission shows that Cordasun's holdings in seven areas are not substantial enough to warrant the promises of profit made by the promoter, according to Haynes.

In the area called Pouce Coupe (which means "Flea Bite") the prospectus shows Cordasun has only a one-eighth interest in certain acreage. In addition to this and the well which was abandoned, the prospectus shows two gas wells on the holdings of other companies were drilled and sealed for lack of a market.

In the whole area, there has been no production as of Feb. 3, 1950, according to the examiner's report.

In the East Leduc or Nisku area, where the prospectus shows Cordasun has a 5 percent interest in certain properties, an $80,000 drilling which went down to 6,000 feet was abandoned, according to the prospectus.

In the Speedon area, where Cordasun has only a one-fifth interest in a 50 percent of a co-participant, the prospectus shows there has been little drilling near Cordasun's property, according to the trial examiner's finding.

In fact, the closest well which was drilled 5 miles away was abandoned. In the Campbell area, Cordasun has only a percent interest in the net oil produced after all expenses for drilling have been paid.

The trial examiner commented that in some areas where Cordasun has an interest there are producing wells, but they have not been pumped steadily because there is no market for the oil produced.

In a letter to the SEC dated May 27, 1949, the chairman of the Alberta Province Board of Public Utility Commissioners wrote:

"This company (Cordasun) is not registered in this province and is not entitled to sell its shares in this province.

"The whole literature is completely objectionable and would never be authorized by us for publication. It is not so much what is said but what is unsaid that makes the literature misleading.

"Perhaps I should mention that all these Ontario companies carefully avoid coming to Alberta for registration.

"The whole literature can be described as misleading, high-pressure sucker bait."

Trial Examiner Haynes concluded:

"The evidence before me in this case shows, and I find that the business conducted by J. D. Cullingham & Co., through the United States mails, is a scheme for obtaining money by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations and promises."

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Brass Industry in Naugatuck Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the year 1802 marked the founding of the brass industry, as we know it, in the United States. In this year the manufacture of buttons from sheet brass was undertaken by the firm of Abel Porter & Co. in Waterbury, Conn. Here was the first American use of the direct fusion of copper and zinc to make brass as invented by James Emerson in England in 1781. This also involved the first rolling of brass in this country.

To mark the occasion of this great event, I propose that a postage stamp commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the brass industry be issued, and am introducing today legislation to that effect. Provision is made for the sale of the postage stamp at the post office in Waterbury, Conn., 1 day preceding the general sale of these stamps.

The brass industry provides employment for an untold number of our citizens. Its production makes life more inviting for all our people. Our defense effort would shudder to a halt without the full participation of the brass industry. Throughout its 150-year history the contribution of pioneer workmen and manufacturers in the Naugatuck Valley have made possible its tremendous expansion to the industrial giant of today.

I hope that the anniversary celebration will not be marred through congressional neglect to suspend the present import tax on copper which is tying the hands of the industry in these critical times. An unprecedented effort is being made by the brass industry to cooperate in defense mobilization plans, but success is not readily attained when obstructions such as this tax are placed in the path.

It would be most appropriate for the Federal Government to acknowledge the sesquicentennial of the brass industry through the issuance of a special commemorative stamp next year.

Statement Prepared by Hon. Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, for the American Hungarian Federation in New York City, Sunday, March 11, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement prepared by me for the American Hungarian Federation which met in New York City on Sunday, March 11, 1951:

MY DEAR MR. FALUSSY: I had hoped very much to be able to speak to you in person this evening, but unfortunately unforeseen exigencies prevent me from doing so. I am extremely glad to have at least the opportunity of sending to you and the members of your organization these few words of friendly greeting and of encouragement in your useful work and purposes. I regard this occasion as especially felicitous in view of the approaching Ides of March—a truly inspiring date in Hungarian history, which marks the anniversary of the beginning in 1848 of the Hungarian war for independence under the leadership of that remarkable apostle of democracy, Louis Kossuth, against the foreign oppressors of the Hungarian people at that period.

It is a notable fact that, over the past century, hundreds of thousands of persons of Hungarian origin have come to this great land, and while not forsaking their splendid Hungarian cultural heritage, have become loyal American citizens. These good people, together with their descendants, have creatively and productively enriched American life and added to its achievements. Now, in the critical period in which we live today, I find it most satisfying and reassuring to observe that this patriotic community, as an integral segment of our people, continues with exemplary alertness and a clear sense of civic responsibility to contribute effectively to the preservation of those principles and institutions which have made this country both great and free.

I believe we are all quite aware at this juncture that in preserving our American way of life against the threat of Communist totalitarianism, we cannot remain unconcerned at the suppression of human rights and freedoms and the extinction of democratic principles elsewhere in the world. This fact has a direct application to Hungary because of the tragic situation which has befallen the liberty-loving people of that country. Theirs is a culture and a national history which extends back into the first millennium of the Christian era. Through a thousand years, amidst a sea of peoples of unrelated tongues, they have maintained their language and culture, and, while sharing fully in a common Western European civilization, have yet preserved their own essential qualities and their entity. This is a significant achievement and provides a sound historical basis for confidence—indeed, assurance—that the Hungarian people, possessed of this spirit, will never accept the domination of foreign tyrants but will continue successfully, whatever may be their temporary difficulties, to assert their independence.

The aspirations for independence, freedom, and democratic institutions, which have found clear expression in both Hungarian and American history and traditions, are lasting elements in the ties which exist between the peoples of Hungary and the United States. These firm bonds cannot be broken by the present Soviet-dominated Communist regime in Hungary despite its practice of systematic repression and its efforts to isolate the Hungarian people from friendly intercourse with the American and other western peoples. I submit that this is a fact which no amount of false Communist propaganda and forced "re-education" can alter or expunge from the hearts and minds of the Hungarian people. I also suggest to those of you whom, happily, I can address on this occasion, that you and those whom you represent are in a peculiarly advantageous position as loyal American citizens of Hungarian descent to maintain an intelligent and sympathetic interest in the plight of the Hungarian people, to give them encouragement in their spiritual and moral resistance to Communism, and to assist them, despite their present subjection to a foreign control which is exercised through a subservient Communist minority, to look and work with perseverance toward ultimate liberation and the fulfillment of their democratic aspirations within the organized community of free peoples. In these endeavors, the Hungarian people will assuredly have the greatest sympathy and support from all of the American people and from other free peoples throughout the world.

A Proposed Blueprint for Victory in 1952—Extracts From Address by Senator Mundt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address on the subject A Proposed Blueprint for Victory in 1952, delivered by our colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], before a meeting of the executive committee of the National Federation of Young Republican Clubs, as contained in a release dated February 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Extracts from address of Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, before meeting of executive committee, National Federation of Young Republican Clubs]

A PROPOSED BLUEPRINT FOR VICTORY IN 1952

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 25.—Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, a conventional Republican from one of the strongest Republican strongholds in the country, today proposed an unconventional blueprint for victory in the Presidential elections of 1952 to a national meeting of Young Republican leaders assembling in Washington from approximately 40 States of the Union, last night. Senator MUNDT suggested, "the way to save freedom and protect individual and property rights in this country is to develop an election formula whereby the people of both political parties on each side of the Mason-Dixon line can join their forces and their votes in a great national effort to elect a President and a Congress dedicated to restoring the Federal Government to its proper sphere of activity and thus putting a permanent end to today's direful drift toward the shoals of national socialism under the banners of fair dealism."

Tracing the process by which individual freedom and private ownership has been losing ground all over the world, Senator MUNDT said, "For 20 years the areas of human freedom and the functions of freemen have been growing sickeningly smaller all around the globe. Even Britain has succumbed to national socialism. In the United States we have been moving steadily and sadly in the same direction although not to the same degree as many of the European powers. Unless we can stop this drift—unless we change this direction in America, it is only a matter of time before we, too, shall be added to the casualty list of free peoples who have surrendered their individual rights, their property rights, their States' rights, and their rights of decision to the all-powerful state. Here, too, we are finding Federal politicians today pushing around more private citizens by executive action than in any era of our history. Only an informal, inadequate, and intermittent coalition of southern Democrats and northern Republicans in the Congress has protected our precious individualized and community rights from being destroyed in America. Such an unorganized and leaderless defense line cannot permanently protect this country against those whou would magnify the Central Government and minimize the rights of individual citizens and their respective State governments in this Republic."

MUNDT urged the National Federation of Young Republican leaders to "give serious study to the fruitful possibilities of saving our freedom formula in America by developing a blueprint for victory in the presidential elections of 1952 so that those who think and act alike in America—whose Senators and Congressmen vote alike—can vote victoriously for the same presidential candidate be he from the North or the South."

Reducing his theories to practical proposals for procedure, MUNDT outlined a six-step program for "harnessing together in a victorious presidential campaign those in America who place principle above partisanship and those who hold fast to the Constitutional principles which have for so long so well protected our community and individual rights."

1. The Republicans should for the first time since the turn of the century hold their National nominating convention after the Democrats rather than before them. The melancholy record of five successive Republican defeats should indicate that such a change in procedure does not represent a very dangerous Republican gamble.

2. In all likelihood, the Democratic National Convention will nominate President Truman for another term "or somebody to the left of Truman—somebody who actually believes in the programs of nationalization and socialism (medicine, health, housing, education, farming, power, banking, insurance) that Truman has rendered lip service to support." The Democratic Convention will also most certainly include planks and programs moving toward the socialization of the foregoing services—and perhaps others. This seems inevitable because in the 1936 convention when the southern Democrats lost the two-thirds rule which enabled them to direct the destinies of their party they fell off the back of the Democratic donkey and under its heels and there seems no likelihood that they can ever again wrest control of the party away from its left-wing elements, its city machine bosses, and the leaders of various pressure and propaganda groups.

3. Let the study southern Democrats who approve States' rights and abhor State socialism then "walk out and go home" as they did 4 years ago. Let them send emissaries to the Republican Convention to "talk turkey" about the desirability of nominating candidates and writing a platform acceptable to the South and consistent with its historic concepts.

4. If the Republicans will nominate such candidates (for example, TAFT, of Ohio; BYRD, of Virginia; Eisenhower, of New York; or RUSSELL, of Georgia; and others who could be suggested), our Jeffersonian democratic friends could then hold State or regional conventions to place these same candidates on the ballot as the regular democratic nominees where that is possible and as "coalition Democrats" or "States' rights Democrats" in other southern States. At the electoral college "these votes could all be merged together to elect the candidates supported by many Republican States in the North and by the Southern States delivering their votes to them as Democrats or as dissenting partisans."

5. Once such a team of candidates is elected by coalition efforts of the North and the South, the Senators and Representatives from the cooperating areas would be pooled in the Senate and the House, their seniority rights would be interwoven with each other, and committee chairmen selected from whichever group had the ranking legislator. Federal patronage could temporarily be handled on the same basis.

6. A few months after such coalition candidates had assumed office in the White House and the Congress, a National convention could be called to select a name, a symbol, and a set of principles for the coalition forces. Suppose they chose the name of Freedom Party and the Statue of Liberty as a symbol with a careful definition of the appropriate scope and function of the Federal Government as basic party doctrine. Those out of power would then be forced to form an opposition party and with two new political parties, each with a definite set of principles, we would have an honest, meaningful, party realignment in this country. Party labels would mean something again; individual voters would know what they were voting for in supporting public officials; county and State officials would change their allegiance from Republican or Democrat to one or the other of the two new parties.

MUNDT called attention to the fact, "In this country we have changed party designations several times. Each time it has been a good tonic for America and we have moved forward into a new era of progress. People have renewed their interest in Government. With such a new alignment of parties, now, it is a safe assumption that the discouragingly small number of voters now going to the polling places would sharply and continuously increase. Voters could then vote for a principle rather than a party label."

Drawing upon the experiences of Great Britain as an example, MUNDT said, "I have made a careful study of the manner in which inadequate and unworkable political alignments in Great Britain have contributed to its collapse into the pitfalls of National Socialism. Both the Conservative and the Liberal party members oppose Socialism as indicated by the vote of a fortnight ago when all Liberal and Conservative Members of Parliament voted unanimously against the nationalization of steel. What would have happened if in the last general election in Britain those voting for losing Liberal Members of Parliament had voted for the Conservative candidates? The results show their own parallel with our American predicament. Had there been no Liberal Members of Parliament candidates and had the voters voting for losing Liberal Members of Parliament voted Conservative, the Conservative Party would have gained 71 seats in the House of Commons. Added to the 272 they actually won, this would have given the Conservative Party a majority of 343 or 29 more than needed to control the House of Commons. Thus, Socialism prevails in Britain because in the last election the British people were divided by artificial barriers and unworkable political alignments just as today those in the South and North who oppose "'Big Government' are divided by historic, semantic, and artificial party labels. We can most surely avoid the fate of Britain where private ownership and individual initiative have been taken over by the palace politicians by meeting the issue head-on in America and placing behind one Presidential candidate the voters of both political parties whose legislators in Congress have joined together repeatedly to prevent Socialistic programs from being adopted here."

Using the 1948 presidential election as an example, MUNDT said, "Had we been able to merge the votes behind the men who have fought together in Congress into a great national effort to elect a President in 1948, the Fair Deal would have been routed in our last election. Add to the four States where Dixiecrat candidates won the electoral votes of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia where voters have steadfastly and emphatically supported anti-New Deal, anti-Fair Deal Senators, and Harry Truman would have received 93 less electoral votes than he did in 1948. Deduct 93 from the 303 which he received and you have 210 votes or 56 less votes than needed for election. Thus it can be seen that if those whose votes in this country have clearly demonstrated they do not want reckless extravagance, a breakdown of States' rights, complete domination by the Federal Government and a whole catalog of socialistic experiments in America had an available political formula whereby they could merge their strength and marry their votes in the electoral college a conservative, business-minded, constitutional adherent can be elected in 1952."

"Who better than our Young Republicans have the progressive spirit and the energetic vision required to breath new hope and life and strength into the cause of freedom in America?" asked Senator MUNDT in conclusion. "After all it is the youth of our land who will lose most if the present trends toward top-heavy, arrogant, socialistic government continue. It might well be the youth of America who should take the lead in breaking with past formulas for political defeat. For too long our Republican Party has been a sectional party operating effectively in less than three-quarters of our States. Let it become the vehicle for conducting a great national drive to unite its force with those in the South who share our affinity for freedom, private enterprise, individual initiative, the dignity of the individual citizen, the protection of States' rights and the necessity to stop socialism from making further inroads in the world's last citadel of liberty, independence, and opportunity. Let it never be said that false political labels, a problem in partisan semantics, and an imaginary boundary line between the freedom-loving people of the North and South were successful in combining to bring catastrophe and collectivism to this Republic."

The Tidelands Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

House Resolution 137

Whereas the Dallas Morning News on yesterday, March 14, 1951, carried a front-page editorial straight to the point on what the tidelands fight really is; and

Whereas said editorial reads as follows:

"The tidelands fight has been defined as many things which it is not. It is high time to start describing what it really is.

"It is a fight for property rights that have existed since this Government was born.

"It is a fight for the honesty and integrity of the pledged word of the National Government against specious phrase twisting to cover legalized chicanery.

"It is a fight for the honest returns of investment in risk and commercial venture against the sure-thing speculators who would reap where others have sown.

"So far as Texas is concerned, it is a fight for the school funds and school future of the children of a State that voluntarily ceased to be an independent Nation and cast its lot with a government whose word it believed it could trust. So far as Texas is concerned it is a fight to see that no false reasoning or time-serving pretense by an inept Federal Supreme Court shall set that word aside.

"In the striking series of nine articles by Allen Duckworth concluded in the Dallas Morning News on Monday, the case of Texas and the other tideland States has been made crystal clear. You have seen official conspiracy to seize these lands for the Federal Government in defiance of a concept of ownership that was born before the Constitution and endured with it. You have seen the evidence that this is a national grab to benefit private spoilsmen.

"What the tidelands issue has never been is either an effort to assure the naval oil reserve or to benefit the people of the United States.

"It has made no difference to those responsible that they have written on the books a Supreme Court opinion that places in jeopardy every square foot of privately owned or State-owned property in this country. For the Court in its labored effort to justify its grossly unfair decision has asserted that the United States has the right in its own interest and regardless of its pledges to seize the tidelands without compensation.

"The tidelands today—your home, your business, your person tomorrow.

"An act of Congress can stay the progress of that unhallowed theory, fundamentally identical with the concepts of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

"Get Congress to act": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Dallas Morning News, be commended for its outstanding public service in publishing the plain truth about the Federal grab of Texas' tidelands under color of legalized authority delivered up by a willing United States Supreme Court; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk be directed to forward copies of this resolution to each Member of the Texas delegation in Congress, House and Senate.

REUBEN K. SENTERFITT,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that house resolution 137 was adopted by the house on March 15, 1951.

[SEAL] CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the St. Louis Star-Times for the splendid series of articles it has been publishing exposing a stock-promotion group in Canada which has been systematically defrauding American investors for several years. Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include one of the series which merits the gratitude of investors:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—"Sheer, undiluted nonsense" was the way United States Trial Examiner James C. Haynes, Jr., characterized the promotion of Bison Petroleums, Ltd., when he issued the first of four fraud orders against its promoter, A. Garfield Heyes.

Bison was literally promoted in reverse. It told suckers it was going to set up a refinery before it had struck oil. It prepared to drill for oil before making a geophysical survey to see if any oil was there, according to the investigation of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and the United States Post Office.

The trial examiner issued the first of four fraud orders against Heyes August 2, 1950. But Heyes turned out to be a slippery customer, changing his address three times. Each time, though, the Post Office nailed him.

The firm of A. Garfield Heyes, Ltd., is still doing business here. It is currently listed by the Ontario Securities Commission as a broker-dealer and it is in good standing with the Broker-Dealer Association.

Heyes, the United States probe showed, sold Bison as another get-rich-quick opportunity in the western Canada oil boom. His literature told the suckers the boom had hardly scratched the surface.

Not only did Bison Petroleum propose to give the United States citizen a chance to participate in oil product, but in refining as well. The deal simply couldn't miss, according to Heyes.

But it could when SEC investigators took a close look at it.

Canadian postal authorities advised American postal authorities that Heyes' literature was "a very obvious attempt to sell shares on the strength of Saskatchewan properties which are in novice related to the Alberta light-crude discoveries."

"Bison Petroleums," the Canada Post Office added, "is designed to offer the investor an opportunity to participate in two profitable phases. The two can be profitable, but not with the properties and the suggested refining facilities of the company."

The Canada postal authorities said that Bison's claim it held favorably located leases and participation in the Redwater, Lac La Biche, and White Mud areas is completely deceptive.

Literature issued by Heyes speaks enthusiastically of drilling contracts signed by Bison, "with work scheduled to commence immediately.

Characteristic of this literature is the persistent word picture that the promoters use to convey the idea they are toeing the mark and ready to go. They are always "commencing" or "ready to commence" some operation which shows "favorable indications" of "rich rewards" or "interesting possibilities" of "remarkable profits."

The Bison prospectus, on file with the Ontario Securities Commission, shows that Bison closed contracts for drilling, or said it closed them, ignoring the advice of its own geologist, who recommended that a geophysical survey be made before trying to drill the wells, according to the United States trial examiner.

Bison got this advice on March 9, 1950, and executed the drilling contracts shortly afterward, according to the trial examiner.

"The evidence before me also shows that the refining plant which is to contribute so substantially to the value of Bison stock will most certainly not produce anything in the way of profit," said the trial examiner.

"The plant is to be a skimming plant. The margin of profit which can be secured from such an operation is quite narrow. To talk of building a refinery until you have an assured supply of at least 1,000 barrels a day is sheer, undiluted nonsense, and can only be deceptive."

Postal fraud order 43739, issued August 2 against A. Garfield Heyes, Ltd., did not deter the promoter from sending his literature to United States suckers. In order to bypass it, Heyes enclosed a self-addressed return envelope with the address, A. G. Heyes, 9 Adelaide East, Toronto 1, Canada.

Since the first fraud order did not cover this designation, another was issued to cover it on October 2. But this still did not stop the resourceful Heyes.

He sent a return envelope self-addressed to Heyes, Ltd., Suite 1, Bank of Toronto Building, Laird Drive and Eglinton Avenue, Leaside, Ontario.

In his letters was an explanatory postcript: "P. S.—Use the stamped, return envelope, addressed to our branch accounting office for extra prompt attention, which is enclosed for your convenience."

On November 17, a third fraud order was issued covering this dodge. But Heyes continued to operate.

His latest return envelope is inscribed with this address: A. G. Heyes, president, 7 Adelaide Street East, Toronto 1, Canada.

A fourth fraud order, covering this designation, was issued December 6. But Heyes is still operating here under other aliases and he is getting his mail delivered.

Another promotion of the same caliber of fraud is Maidstone Oils, Ltd., promoted principally by Donald F. Bryans & Co., a concern connected with another swindle called Lashburn Petroleums, Ltd.

Bryans and a colleague, William G. Chice, sold Maidstone stock in the United States

by advertising through the mails that Maidstone holds a total of 128 well sites in the Lloydminster area, where successful wells are frequent.

Examination of Maidstone's holdings by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission geologist showed that Maidstone had only 32 well sites within 3 miles of area, and that the remaining acreage is 12 miles away.

The SEC geologist also found that Maidstone's claim its acreage was located in "proven and semiproven sectors and/or sectors deemed to offer oil- or gas-bearing possibilities" was false.

None of this acreage could reasonably be considered proven and semiproven oil land, the geologist found.

The promotion circulars also asserted that all doubt had vanished regarding the profitability of Lloydminster wells. But the evidence showed that even better wells in this area were not particularly profitable, according to the findings of United States Trial Examiner Daniel J. Kelly.

Kelly said there was no reasonable possibility that the wells in the area would produce enough oil to enable investors to secure a return of the purchase price of the stock.

Another promoter of Maidstone, Cordasun Petroleums, Ltd., and a third enterprise called Docana Oils and Mines, Ltd., is J. B. Dow & Co. of 9 Richmond Street East, Toronto. This concern is listed currently as a licensed broker-dealer and a member in good standing of the Broker-Dealer Association.

Dow represented to suckers in Minnesota that he had discovered a junior oil company with holdings in 10 areas of western Canada, but could not disclose the identity of the company lest premature publicity might result in a sudden upsurge in the market price for the shares.

The mysterious company turned out to be the old swindle, Cordasun, which has been promoted by more Bay Street pirates than almost any other oil stock in the moose pastures.

Dow, according to the United States postal investigation, represented there was an established market for Cordasun, Maidstone and Docana. There is no market, the post office reported.

Dow is subject to cease and desist orders in Missouri, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, and California, while New York and New Jersey have obtained injunctions against sale of Maidstone stock.

Still another promoter riding the crest of the Alberta boom is L. B. Scott & Co., a licensed broker-dealer here and member of the Broker-Dealer Association. Scott sold Capitol Petroleums, Ltd., and a mining promotion, Eastwebb Mines, Ltd.

Scott became the subject of a postal fraud order last April. A second fraud order was issued against this concern in December when it tried to dodge the first order by using Terminal A, Box 296, as its address here.

In his oily brochure, Scott told suckers that 87.5 percent of all wells drilled in Lloydminster field were successful. The SEC found no such percentage of success had ever been heard of in the area.

An employee of the SEC talked over the telephone with L. B. Scott & Co. and was told:

"A situation has come up that prompted telephone calls to our customers. This stock became very active owing to some news that came in on the property. They are down 1,500 feet. There is an adjoining well causing quite a lot of activity. They are drilling a deep test well now, down 1,500 feet."

The SEC man, whom the promoter took to be a sucker, asked what size was the adjoining well.

"A $5,000,000 well," was the response. "The original investment was $80,000. It is considered a $5,000,000 well right now."

SEC said such statements were "inexcusably vicious, highly fraudulent and have no factual basis."

Imposition of Controls—Address by Alan H. Valentine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Controls: By Whom and for What? delivered by Alan H. Valentine at the thirty-first annual luncheon of the Associated Industries of Cleveland, at the Statler Hotel, Cleveland, Ohio, on March 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROLS: BY WHOM AND FOR WHAT?

When in January your officers invited me to speak today, they thought they were going to get the Economic Stabilizer. So did I. But instead you get only a private citizen, only another Republican fired by a Democratic President. If you feel short-changed, how do you think I feel?

Actually I feel relieved. It is nice to know I have no responsibility whatever for the words and actions of the officers of Price Stabilization and of the members of the Wage Stabilization Board, if any. They have my good wishes, though not my envy. May they succeed, or at least survive.

Though relieved at my freedom, I did not seek it. I took on the job of Economic Stabilizer aware of its difficulties and dangers, and was prepared to see it through. But any man not supported by organized labor, or by the White House secretariat, or by the Democratic National Committee needs to watch his step, and I was unpopular with all three. The President gave me support for some weeks against heavy odds, and finally gave me the distinction of being Washington's finest example of what inventory accountants call "Last in, first out." My personal regard for him remains.

There is nothing more unstable than the job of an Economic Stabilizer. It is easy to talk stabilization but not to stabilize, and it is possible to appear to stabilize our economy but actually to impair it. But if one tries to act the economist and the statesman, he is moving against the crowd. Perhaps it is wiser to be like the demagog of the French Revolution, who, hearing in the small hours the noise of a riot in the street below, leapt from his bed and announced to his lady: "There go my people. I am their leader; I must follow them."

Paris has no monopoly of such leaders. In its milder form that kind of leadership is now called rolling with the punches. I am glad that some of our business leaders now serving in Washington have learned how to roll with the punches, for we need badly their continuance in the top councils of our Government. I do not know where our defense program would be without men like Charlie Wilson, Bob Lovett, and Bill Harrison. Hoping that my praise is not the kiss of death, I want you to know that in my observation one of the finest jobs of production ever done anywhere, and against heavy odds, is being done by General Harrison.

But there are issues too important to compromise; sometimes one must refuse to roll with the punches. One cannot compromise one's basic economic judgment especially when it is supported by the wisest advisers one can assemble. I have always believed that free enterprise produces best when it is most free and that its mechanism is delicate and should be adjusted only after the most careful consideration. I knew we could not in any case, for want of staff, arrest inflation for a month or two, and believed that during that period it was better to endure inflation and not risk impairing production, than to impose a regimentation which would not, in any case, hold down prices of most consumer goods about which the complaints centered. Therefore I would not impose general controls until Government took certain other deflationary steps—mostly still not taken—to help make controls workable. My judgment may have been wrong, but events since February 1 have not changed it. My judgment was not shared by most of the powers in Washington. As prices rose it became increasingly difficult for me, and for the President who supported me, to resist the pressures of those whose opinions were seldom tempered by any knowledge of the complications of price regimentation and wage regulation—to resist the sincere and vocal people who had all the popular arguments on their side—to resist those who cared more about placating the public than helping the public.

That was an economic issue, though it became a political one. But there was another. It was one I had been promised would not be allowed to impede my work, I was forced to choose between being a participant in large-scale partisan patronage or of being a victim of it. I chose the latter; forced the issue; and do not regret my choice. Perhaps it would have happened in any administration; it did happen in this one.

There are few men more boring than he who wants to tell you about his recent operation and how much it hurt. There are few figures more pathetic than the defeated football coach who spends all winter explaining how all he needed was more good material. I shall try not to be an Ancient Mariner either. What happened to me is unimportant—except to me—unless it brings some clarification to matters of greater importance. The times are too crucial to permit any of us the luxury of destructive criticism or personal tirades. Our Government needs our support. We owe support, with all the largeness of spirit and generosity of judgment we can muster, to that Government and to a President whose honesty and devotion, whose difficulties and problems, we never can belittle. Any further references to my own misadventures will be purely illustrative. I come to bury Valentine, not to praise him.

I want to give my remaining time to two considerations.

First, are Government efforts toward stabilization succeeding, and if not why not?

Second, what does that tell us about the future of our democratic Government?

If in 15 minutes I can answer either of those I shall not have died politically in vain.

Can our economy be stabilized? That depends on what we mean by stabilization.

If we mean bringing our national economy wholly under the control of Government; if we mean arresting and freezing our productive organization within some predetermined framework; then our economy cannot be stabilized, at least short of complete dictatorial socialism. Such regimentation

would reduce personal incentive and impair production; it would strait-jacket initiative and destroy free enterprise. If that be stabilization I am against it, for the essence of our economy is its flexibility; the merit of our system is its relative freedom.

But if by stabilization we mean eliminating the extremes of booms and busts; ameliorating the worst effects of inflation and deflation; and spreading more fairly the profit and the pain of our defense program—if that be stabilization it is desirable and possible. Are we on our way to it? I think we are on our way, but with more noise than efficiency, more disagreement than unity, more cooks than consistency, more contumely than courage, more politics than progress.

Whose fault is that? The fault lies in many places and has a long history. I can suggest a few factors, but I shall try to name no names.

One trouble has been an overemphasis in Government circles, in press circles, and in the public mind, upon the price-control aspects of economic stabilization. This was natural and perhaps inevitable. Prices are of immediate concern to the public; prices are news to the press, price control can provide legislators with an excuse for not voting unpopular taxes or troublesome government economies. This over-emphasis has led to too little emphasis—and too little action—upon other and more basic deflationary measures absolutely essential to stabilization.

Allied with this error was the widespread fallacy that to control prices one had only to issue a few orders. Actually price control is one of the most complicated, delicate, and difficult aspects of economic endeavor—a field really understood as a whole only by a few professional experts, and really understood in detail only by a few specialists in Government and business. Last week Walter Lippmann wrote that even Mr. Charles Wilson "seemed to accept the notion that prices could be frozen by decree without taking any serious measures to stop the inflation." If Mr. Wilson did accept that notion it was despite several hours of conversation, right up to the eve of my resignation, in which I endeavored to convince him to the contrary. Perhaps he did recognize the difficulties and dangers of the course which he then approved, but did not feel he could afford to take the risk of supporting a policy and a man so politically unacceptable. He had and has my sympathy and support.

Another fault lies in the terms of the Defense Production Act, which by various conditions makes it difficult and perhaps impossible to achieve effective price and wage control. Parity protection of agriculture is one of these hurdles, but there are others.

Then there are many areas of our economy in which controls of prices and wages are for practical reasons extremely difficult. How can one enforce price controls in many unorganized small-unit trades; how can one enforce a wage freeze among thousands of tiny groups of unorganized workers? In industries like motorcars or steel, when the units of management are large in size, few in number, law-abiding, socially responsible, and very much in the public eye, the problem of enforcement is a minor one. But there are many other industries, each with thousands of small operators, where that description does not apply, and where there is no medium for internal leadership or external control. Mr. DiSalle has yet to demonstrate that he can do—without rationing and without a Pearl Harbor psychology—what Messrs. Henderson, Bowles, and Porter could not do; control the retail price and quality of meat and men's clothing. Yet they were two of the items which both Congress and the public apparently expected any understaffed stabilizer could roll back in price by the simple issuance of an order.

But the greatest weakness in our stabilizing effort has been the failure of Government to take strong, prompt, and fundamental steps toward deflation—including Government economy, a wise and fair plan of increased tax revenue that would draw off excessive spending power, greater credit restrictions, more intelligent policies on interest rates, increased personal savings and purchase of Government bonds. Most of these remain undone, and meanwhile the ship of state drifts with the vagrant pressure-tides and stabilizers flounder.

If war becomes so near or inflation so devastating that we Americans are lifted by patriotism or by fear out of our normal selfishness and inertia—if that happens then the difficulties described will be promptly overcome. But even then we will still lack a major essential to effective stabilization—an efficient Federal Government.

That essential we do not now have. It cannot be quickly created or recruited for it is a matter of spirit and purpose as well as talent and experience.

Some 50 years ago Henry and Brooks Adams warned that American democracy might descend from mediocrity to mediocrity until it became too mediocre to survive. If they feared that in 1900, what would they think of the quality of American politics and society today? The problems which currently face our Government are more complicated and difficult than ever in our history. More than ever before we need many men of fine mind and character in Government, and an atmosphere in Government in which they can work happily and effectively. As the task of our Government has enlarged so has its size. It has multiplied in numbers, cost, and power. Has it increased proportionately in the wisdom and character of its leaders? Were our social gains of the 1930's, for example, accompanied by comparable improvements in standards of public propriety? Has the power, for example, which leaders of organized labor have gained since 1932 been balanced by an added sense of responsibility on their part for the welfare of all Americans? Indeed, do the American people any longer even expect to see Washington set an example of high-mindedness? Is our public now so inured to improprieties of public conduct that it is no longer offended by them? Are we, also, satisfied so long as our Congressmen or Federal officers do nothing actually illegal?

This brings me to my final question:

What does the current state of affairs in Washington tell us about the future of democratic government? I do not even suggest the possibility of any political corruption. I do not even suggest that many of the reported improprieties have seemed improper to the men who so acted, though that makes them doubly frightening. After all, let us gladly recognize that Washington does contain many men exceptional in ability, vision, and political integrity with whom any man should be proud to associate.

A government in which even men of Cabinet rank are advised to ingratiate themselves at regular intervals with certain members of the White House staff is an inefficient government.

A government in which thousands of Federal employees are strongly influenced by fear they will lose their jobs or their promotions if they offend the party political watchdogs in their department or agency is an inefficient government.

A government in which, in a declared emergency, top officials pursue various courses in matters of crucial financial, economic, labor, and manpower policy is an inefficient government.

A government which leaders of business and professions hesitate to join, even in a national emergency, because of the frustrations, defeats, compromises, and personal lacerations they know they must endure is an inefficient government.

A government in which leading Senators and other public servants are obliged to spend much time, in a crucial year, investigating the propriety and even the integrity of other public servants is an inefficient government.

A government in which thousands of Federal employees have forgotten that the function of government is to serve the people is an inefficient government.

It is said that democratic government must be in some respects inefficient; that that is the price of democracy. But the inefficiencies I have described do not derive from democracy; are not inherent in its working or essential to its welfare.

So I conclude that a government so inefficient is inadequate to our times.

Too mediocre to survive. Are we approaching that stage? There have always been some men of third-rate ability in our Government, and our Nation has survived them. But never, I suggest, have such third-rate standards and objectives flourished so openly or been more generally accepted and more loyally defended. This tolerance of the mediocre began long before the present administration, and Mr. Truman thus inherited a downward trend in political morality. That trend would have been difficult to reverse. It was not reversed but augmented. The moral ground on which contemporary Washington now rests is so low that mists of contagion can rise quickly and spread far.

Surely our President fails to realize how many and how large are the spots on the fabric of his Federal mantle. If he did realize, surely he would act.

The heart of this contagion is patronage whenever and wherever it can be got away with. We cannot, of course, have democratic government without political parties, and political parties cannot live without patronage. But patronage has become not a means to life but an end in itself to a political machine which has been too long at the trough. That patronage has become an excuse for the creation of a government within a government.

Our official Government is headed by an honest, well-intentioned, industrious, and likable President.

But there is a second government, nominally headed by the President but with activities of which he can be only vaguely aware. That government is largely unofficial in its standing, anonymous in its membership, undercover in its operations, undefined in its functions, and nebulous in its actual leadership, with few records, few scruples, and little or no sense of public responsibility.

Nominally a creature of the Democratic National Committee, in practice it appears to include men not officially connected with that committee, who are primarily in pursuit of personal power or personal wealth. Perhaps no single person knows all that is said and done in the name of this nameless government, but let there be no doubt of its influence. There is perhaps no complete record of its membership or of its plans, its promises, and its proscribed victims, but some of us soon learn to feel its power. I do not even hint at any illegality, for these are all, all honorable men. I merely suggest that this obscure and irresponsible power is a danger to the defense effort, and if long endured could become a menace to free government. The Fulbright commission has come upon some revealing traces and some familiar names.

Such a situation could not exist unless the leaders of our Government had become a little too tolerant of mediocre political ethics and a little too complacent about their own. How else can one explain an apparent willingness to be satisfied with public servants so long as their actions are not clearly

illegal, and to be unconcerned about actions which, though legal, are highly improper?

These factors are not remote from my discussion of stabilizing our economy, for they are major hazards which our stabilizers must overcome. Sound economics and partisan politics simply do not mix. Even a Charles Wilson cannot successfully organize our production and oversee our stabilization if he must also cope with an undercover government as well as a legally constituted one.

Only one man can repudiate and demolish this second and unofficial government. Only one man can raise the level of our political morality; only one man can drive the money lenders from his own temple. That man is the President of the United States. If I do not misjudge the American people, they know the time has come for the President to undertake a major house cleaning. They admire his loyalty to his supporters; they like his good nature. But he, who has himself declared a national emergency, must recognize this situation as one aspect of that national emergency. He must not let loyalty or good nature blind him to the fact that his loyalty is being imposed upon, his faith is being misplaced, his friendship is being betrayed by some whom he has thought to be his friends. They are no friends of his or of the Nation. In their own ways they are saboteurs of our defense program.

Only the President can act now, and by his action lift his administration from moral mediocrity. Only the President can act now. If he does not; the people can act later, if it is not too late.

Results of a Poll on Public Questions—Editorial From the Sacramento Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "So Congress Can Know," which appeared in the Sacramento Union on Sunday, March 11, 1951. This newspaper has conducted a poll on a number of questions of interest to the people of the United States, and the editorial deals with the answers received. I call this to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento Union of March 11, 1951]

SO CONGRESS CAN KNOW

Last week we invited readers, in the interest of good citizenship, to express their opinions on 10 important questions before the Nation. More than 800 responded, with the following result:

1. Are you for or against our representatives taking action right now to eliminate the waste, the unnecessary jobs, inefficiency, and extravagance within each major department of our Government? For, 584; against, 10; don't know, 6.

2. Do you think our Government should stop giving and lending money and materials, other than military matériel, to foreign countries, until we can do so with a reasonable tax load, and a diminishing national deficit? For, 501; against, 52; don't know, 52.

3. Do you think our representatives should take action to correct legislation that requires our Government to buy farm products and other commodities in huge, unusable, and unsalable quantities, with taxpayers' money? For, 461; against, 31; don't know, 14.

4. Are you for or against admitting Red China to the United Nations? For, 59; against, 502; don't know, 41.

5. Are you for or against legislation that will prevent the President from ever again committing our Nation to undeclared war, or to any other unusual foreign duty, without consent of Congress or congressional committee? For, 517; against, 57; don't know, 31.

6. Do you think the UN should impose an embargo and blockade against the Chinese mainland, and encourage Chiang Kai-shek with moral and material support against Communists? For, 451; against, 51; don't know, 59.

7. Do you think our State Department needs a good overhauling, beginning at the top? For, 551; against, 30; don't know, 28.

8. Are you for or against legislation to stop all trade, direct or indirect, with Russia, and forbid entry to people, ships, and goods from Communist-dominated countries into this country? For, 517; against, 54; don't know, 33.

9. Are you for or against an immediate and all-inclusive clean-out of Communists and fellow travelers from every department of the Government, and airtight steps taken to keep them out? For, 567; against, 21; don't know, 16.

10. Are you for or against sending a large standing army to Europe? For, 81; against, 416; don't know, 115.

The information has been carefully compiled and sent not only to the two United States Senators from California, but to every Member of Congress from this State. In addition, an account of the balloting has been placed upon press association wires, so that all Members of Congress and the administration will have an idea how at least 841 northern Californians feel about important questions of the day.

Air Power Indivisible for National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine—a friend who is a military man, which I am not—has called to my attention an old Training Manual of the War Department, dated December 23, 1921, in which the principles of war are listed. These principles are the principles of objective, offensive, concentration or mass, economy of force, movement, surprise, security, simplicity, and cooperation. They are the ancient principles of warfare, from the time of Alexander, and earlier; and they are the principles on which every successful general has based his campaign, right up to the present.

The same friend has called to my attention an article in the latest issue of the Air University Quarterly Review, called Air Power Indivisible. In this article two experienced Air Force officers, Col. Dale O. Smith and Maj. Gen. John DeF. Barker, apply these ancient principles of warfare to the newest form of military power—air power. Their conclusion is that the principles are still sound, and that air power, if it is to be effectively applied, must be applied with reference to them.

Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter has truly stated:

> Tactical air and strategic air are merely handles which have been developed to identify different functions, each of which is indispensable and each of which fits into the over-all integrated structure of air power.

The authors of Air Force Indivisible conclude:

> There should be no rigid adherence to the predetermined priorities ascribed to certain elements of air power when a crucial issue is at stake affecting the whole of national security. Then, without regard to theoretical priorities, total air power must be thrown into the gap which threatens the very structure of our civilization. This will always be the first priority.
>
> The air organization must be designed to advance the national objectives with indivisible air power.

Using the ancient traditional principles of war as guides to strategic and tactical conduct more firmly based than conclusions drawn from incidents of the Korean struggle, General Barker and Colonel Smith have presented their case for the employment of air power in a clear, readable, and convincing fashion.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article entitled "Air Power Indivisible" from the fall 1950 issue of the Air University Quarterly Review:

AIR POWER INDIVISIBLE

(By Col. Dale O. Smith in collaboration with Maj. Gen. John DeF. Barker)

Professional magazines have recently published several articles arguing the employment of air power in support of troops. One school of thought holds that more control of air should be vested in the ground commander who is directly affected by the kind of close air support he receives. The other school maintains that the current mode of air control, developed in World War II, permits more effective all-round air employment and, in the final analysis, better ground support.

The intellectual controversy thus stimulated is usually documented with authoritative statements from both sides and often supported by one-time incidents gleaned from the Korean struggle. Certainly there must be a firmer base upon which military thought may establish greater agreement.

The substantial acceptance of the traditional principles of war by all people wearing uniform might be one such starting base. These ancient guides to strategic and tactical conduct present a ground of basic harmony from which shoots of further military agreement might grow.

One of these principles is referred to as economy of force. It is, of course, self-explanatory. We want the most military return possible for any military force expended. When we go duck hunting we don't want to carry along a rifle in case we should run into a moose, or if we should hunt moose a shotgun would simply be a burden. On the rare occasion, however, when we want to hunt both duck and moose on the same trip, we'd like to have both types of guns along. But at other times it would be most uneconomical to buy and carry the extra firearm. Wouldn't it be better to borrow the extra gun from a trusted friend rather than to buy it and lug it around for years with slight occasion to use it? For those who hesitate to borrow, it might be pointed out that the borrower is just as often lending his gun to help out the other fellow.

That seems to be a fair exchange. It is simply cooperation—another principle of war. Cooperation also can be considered one of the fundamental tenets of the American system and a secret of our great material and moral success. We trust our fellow man; we rely on his help. We abhor waste of any kind—even waste of time. By working together we make the most of our resources and never let them stand idle when they can be put to work in someone else's hands.

In war isolated situations or campaigns may make us forget or brush aside accepted principles which may not seem to apply at the moment. Yet a broad perspective of the whole history of warfare shows these principles standing up, again and again, under the acid test of combat. Why do we see more meaning in retrospect than in the heat of today's battle? Can it be because more of the relevant facts of the past are known than are the facts of the immediate situation? And cannot those more numerous facts be weighed and analyzed more dispassionately without our being swayed by personal involvement?

We are presently engaged in the Korean campaign, and we have yet to benefit from a comprehensive analysis of it. Our professional observers and correspondents provide separate accounts of one individual, viewing a limited number of isolated actions. Such reports often provide conflicting observations and we are prone to be emotionally affected by those we read. All these valuable experiences must be put together, with many more, and soberly evaluated for safe conclusions.

As a volume of evidence builds up, for example, the first somewhat hysterical accounts of jets being too lightly armored to be effective have been to a large extent disproved. True, jets can't be employed as well on some support missions as F-51's, but on other tasks jets have been found superior. Furthermore, had there been air opposition and accurate antiaircraft artillery, perhaps F-51's would have been knocked out of the skies.

The Air Force has maintained that a warplane must be fundamentally designed to live in the air. No matter how effective it might be under unopposed conditions, a warplane is of slight value if it fails to show up when needed. Recent engagements of our jets have discouraged enemy air attacks and have made it more possible to continue ground support. Economy of force would hardly be attained should we construct a Stuka or a Stormovik purely as airborne artillery, yet so vulnerable to air attack that another aircraft would be required to protect it. (A German and Russian experience that can hardly be ignored.) If we can, on the other hand, build an airplane which not only can protect itself but can perform adequate ground support, we have then what is tantamount to twice the force we might have had with a Stuka-escort combination. It might even be desirable to accept some slight reduction of our "air artillery" capabilities to gain this twice as large force. Fortunately this is not necessary, however, for as more reports pile up we find that jets, employing tactics to suit their unique capabilities, tend to provide an air support comparable to that of the propeller aircraft.

Had we fully accepted the first despairing and fragmentary reports regarding jets we might have gone all out for piston-driven fighters. Could that policy not have encouraged the enemy to employ his jets more vigorously? Would we now have control of the air? Surely we must consider the situation anomalous when the enemy concedes us air superiority. We cannot assume he will always react in that unusual manner. And his current reaction might have been somewhat due to the mere presence of our jets. It is possible that we are getting an economic return from our jets not readily apparent.

Whether we talk of aircraft or tanks or warships, pistols or rifles or artillery, no weapon can be considered of full value unless we employ it with economy of force. Each weapon possesses certain characteristics, singular strengths and weaknesses. We use each weapon so as to take advantage of its capabilities and allay the effects of its limitations. One of the greatest strengths of an airplane is in its flexibility (still another principle of war). The airplane can be used for many military purposes, and it has a mobility that surpasses any other man-carrying weapon. To tie this versatile instrument of war down to a few specific tasks and thus deny it other objectives which at times might be far more productive toward eventual victory would seem to be a profligate waste of force. Would it not be better to organize our forces for optimum flexibility and hence be more able to practice economy of force?

If an air force is organized to take advantage of the great material versatility inherent in the airplane, the commander can be in a position to skillfully apply all the principles of war. He can launch his force from a carrier at sea, from an airfield 20 miles behind the lines, or from a different continent, thus employing it with extreme flexibility. He can take the offensive and concentrate his force against the most critical objective with maximum economy. He can do so even though today's objective is a thousand miles from tomorrow's objective. Rapid movement of large forces over vast distances will permit surprise. Should he be attacked at home, most of his force can be quickly diverted for defense and the security of his and other military bases. Simplicity is the essence of such concentrated air actions, since the very speed of aircraft prohibits operations of excessive complication. But unless his air force is so organized and habitually trained to perform these varied functions, he will not likely be as able to follow the principles. Specific local tasks may deter a more fruitful employment.

The overwhelming advantage of flexibility provided by air power has sometimes been mitigated by an unfunctional organization which seems to divide available air strength into small parcels, each parcel tightly wrapped and labeled "For tactical (or other) use only." Paradoxically, such a piecemeal commitment of air strength is not now, nor has it ever been, a true doctrine of the Air Force.

With some justification, however, the Air Force has been accused of packaging its aviation into such mutually exclusive bundles of "strategic," "tactical," and "air defense" forces. Many airmen have too literally accepted these terms by regarding the over-all strategic picture in too narrow a light. Yet the actual employment of air forces in World War II and in the present Korean conflict should dispel any fears that Air Force policy tends toward compartmentation. Repeated evidence of the use of all air weapons against every kind of target, depending upon the immediate crucial objectives, should amply indicate the fundamental doctrine of air employment.

So-called strategic heavy bombers were employed in Europe before D-day, and after, to attack coastal gun emplacements and other front-line objectives. A quarter of a million tons of bombs were dropped on transportation targets by every type of Eighth Air Force craft, which was nearly one-third of the grand total expended. For the breakthrough at St. Lo a veritable carpet of bombs was laid in front of our lines by waves of big bombers. The tactical efficacy of this operation is attested to by comments from German commanders who asserted that it was this type of air action which was most detrimental to defending a position.

In the Pacific all kinds of aircraft were concentrated on critical objectives regardless of the terminology covering their organizational assignments. Cape Gloucester, for example, was so effectively pounded by every available aircraft that our surface invaders walked in standing up. Bombers and fighters from all sorts of air organizations were later set to interdict the water approaches to Rabaul and with cooperative surface action completed Rabaul's isolation.

Japanese air units had been built up in New Guinea at Wewak where massed Allied air struck them in August 1943. The enemy recoiled to Hollandia, but the sustained bombardment and strafing there by all types of craft wrote the ultimate end to Japanese air strength as an effective force. No piecemeal efforts were attempted in these great air offensives, but rather concentrated, massed operations were undertaken with every available airplane deployed by the theater commander. Air superiority was achieved, and from Hollandia on the possibility of our continued advance was assured.

Later, when the insane "diving wind" flyers streamed down on our invasion forces off Okinawa, B-29's were diverted from their attacks on industrial centers. Destruction of Kyusku airfields and kamikaze forces on the ground became an immediate primary objective. For 24 days kamikaze bases were bombarded, and vicious enemy reactions claimed 22 B-29's. But most kamikaze establishments were knocked out, and attacks on our invasion forces started falling off.

Recently, in Korea, the B-29's not only attacked factories, ports, depots and marshaling yards but bridges, troop concentrations, and strong points. This carpet bombing effort near Taegu was another example of the extreme flexibility of air power. Fighter-bombers and mediums poured fire on many of the selfsame targets. The objectives for the day were those felt to be most urgent at that time by the theater commander, and he was able through his flexible organization to launch his entire force, directing every available air weapon at the sensitive spots.

It has long been held as Air Force doctrine that air superiority should be the primary mission of air power. This premise has gained quick support from Army leaders who have suffered air attacks. Most Army leaders who have been harassed by enemy air would far rather have the enemy air kept off their necks than have integrally assigned aircraft for use as extended artillery. These leaders have no misconceptions about retaining, say, divisional, corps, or army aviation, in the face of superior enemy air. The fate of the German Stuka, which was ruthlessly swept from the skies when the Allies achieved air superiority, is too fresh in the memory of the experienced ground commanders.

Students of warfare are apprised, as well, of the relativeness of air superiority. It is never gained in finality, but only by degrees. The enemy may husband some air power, even though he is driven from the skies, and mount this saved force at a critical time, as the Germans did during the Ardennes offensive and the Japanese did with their kamikaze. Under such conditions we must always be prepared to concentrate and strike with overwhelming energy, even though at any one period our air superiority seems well assured.

Moreover, to achieve air superiority, we cannot hope to indulge exclusively in air combat over the front lines. If we defeat the enemy in this narrow area, we may achieve a local superiority as long as our aircraft are present. The enemy will then merely refuse to commit his air while ours stooge around, but he will strike when we leave. Since a constant air umbrella is wasteful of force, the obvious necessity is to wear down the enemy air force through attrition of every nature. Pilots, crews, planes, fuel, training establishments, aircraft manufacturing and storage center, and communications facilities which interconnect the many elements of his air power—all should be our targets. Seldom can any one element be fully destroyed. Some elements are more exposed to attack than others, and our emphasis should be influenced by those sore toes sticking out, inviting us to step on them.

Before we engage in air battle, however, we must be assured of a certain security for our own air bases, for our own communications, and for all the other elements of national strength present in our territory. Air defense is an impelling responsibility, and because it is seen at first hand by the law-making populace, air defense may be given inordinate stress.

As General Lee, through his threatening advances toward Washington, succeeded in immobilizing tens of thousands of Union troops in the nonproductive defense of the Capital, so did the Doolittle mission freeze much of Japan's aviation to the defense of its homeland. The battle of Britain put a premium upon air defense, and it was sometime after our fighters extended their range with drop tanks that the RAF fighters began to follow our lead and not sit at home waiting for air attacks that seldom came. In using nearly all of our aviation every flyable day, the AAF suffered some surprises and many local defeats, but the aggregate of our efforts compared with those of the enemy turned the tide of air victory. Enemy aviation was then largely pinned down to defend the homeland.

A striking example of Germany's failure to exploit the versatility of aircraft is illustrated by her air policies. Because Britain did not fall after a few months of aerial bombardment during 1940, Hitler lost faith in offensive air power. Specialized aviation, essentially under Wehrmacht domination, became the order of the day. The close-support Stuka had paid good dividends when air superiority had been easily attained. But pitted against Allied fighter bombers in Africa and elsewhere, Stukas were knocked down like tenpins. RAF bombardment put a priority on German air defense, and Stukas were left without an escort. As the AAF added its strength, home defense became Germany's No. 1 strategic consideration.

Fighter production was stepped up repeatedly at the expense of other classes of aviation, and over 70 percent of Germany's air force was earmarked exclusively for home defense. At no time was this huge force concentrated to strike offensively at Russia or to back up the retreating Wehrmacht on the eastern front. Nor did the crystal-pure mission of air defense permit the Luftwaffe to be assembled for tactical cooperation with hard-pressed Panzers at Normandy or to make concentrated strikes at overloaded Allied supply points and lines of communications. They were organized to perform but one mission and no more.

The glaring errors made by Germany in her failure to exploit the versatility of air power are apparent to all. Overstrict interpretations of specific roles and missions, particularly those of close-support and air defense, left Germany not with a true air force capable of strategic employment but with a restricted and specialized weapon of doubtful value.

On the other hand, United States Air Force doctrine from its inception has stressed the use of air as a national force capable of performing innumerable strategic missions. Air power has been organized with some specialization, but the long-range objectives have not been prostituted by the need for this specialization. For example, Tactical Air Command was organized to develop ground-support tactics, but included also in its directive was a mission for gaining and maintaining air superiority, while a third specified function of Tactical Air Command was interdiction of the battlefield.

Interdiction—the squeezing off of communication arteries to the battle zones—is merely a phase of the strategic bombing mission. In the latter, not only the battle zone is interdicted, but the whole enemy war-making potential is attacked. It is interdiction of all enemy strength. Hence the interdiction mission of tactical aviation is essentially a part of the long-range mission of strategic employment.

Keeping in mind the three primary objectives of tactical aviation (air superiority, interdiction, and front-line support) let us examine their fulfillment in the Korean War during November 1950. Our forces had driven past the thirty-eighth parallel to within a few miles of the northern border of Korea. Down from Manchuria streamed a vast army to oppose our advance. But, contrary to the concepts of orthodox warfare, we were denied the opportunity to stem this advance. The territory north of the border was declared inviolate, and our aviation could not fly across that artificial barrier. What, then, happened to our air superiority? The air superiority, for example, that we had (by default) over the Pusan pocket?

North of the border, which was just a few minutes by air in front of our ground troops, we generously granted the enemy absolute air superiority. We refused to venture beyond that arbitrary boundary, and the enemy marshalled and directed his divisions with impunity in that sanctuary. The only air superiority we retained was in that thin strip of space between our forces and the Manchurian frontier together with the area behind our lines. Our superiority thus became essentially defensive in nature, since we could not exploit it offensively. Unwarlike restrictions caused us to cede to the enemy the most fruitful harvests of air superiority.

How did these restrictions effect the interdiction mission? Hundreds of communications bottlenecks behind the frontier could not be touched. The stores, warehouses, supply dumps, and depots were safer than if they had been thousands of miles in the interior during a more orthodox war. Railroads, marshalling yards, bridges, and rolling stock were immune from our attack. Roads could be filled bumper to bumper with enemy vehicles of war, and we were even denied air reconnaissance of these myriad movements. We could block the advance only in a pitifully narrow strip of land where a finite number of supply bottlenecks could be repaired by concentrated enemy construction units, permitting his forces to sweep into the battle zones at night, relatively unhandicapped. Interdiction of the battlefield became a vain hope for our air forces under such gross limitations.

The final aim of tactical air, that of front-line support, was unhampered by the anomalous character of the Korean War. Only this last objective remained. Air could be used, like artillery, to blast enemy strong points directly in front of our troops. The decisiveness of this single employment of air was learned to be non-existent when the enemy overwhelmed our positions during the latter days of November.

The use of air strength for direct front-line support of ground forces, although necessary and valuable, can hardly be considered decisive, nor can exclusive employment in this fashion be regarded as economy of force. The most lucrative targets for air appear farther from the front, where the enemy is not holed-up, dispersed along a battlefield many miles wide, and well hidden in natural cover. The best return from air fire is gained when the enemy can be caught jammed-up, behind the line, with his guard down, and when the bottlenecks over which his concentrations must move are destroyed and kept destroyed. The striking flexibility of air strength is only exploited to its fullest when its speed, range, and firepower are employed to surprise the enemy where he is most vulnerable.

It is undoubtedly true that slower propeller fighter-bombers can supply a more constant front-line cover than jets, and that their longer orbiting of front-line positions inspires the fighting troops with greater confidence. But by the same token, a battery of corps artillery would also be a comforting addition to an infantry regiment. Hard-hitting, long-range weapons like the 155-mm. guns, 8-inch guns, and 240-mm. howitzers are assigned to higher echelons, however, in order to allow them greater mobility and to permit their concentrations where most needed. The announced mission of corps and Army artillery is to reinforce division artillery and to lend depth to the battle. Only incidentally is its purpose to raise the morale of front-line troops.

Some experts would have tactical aviation assigned to the same army headquarters as is heavy artillery, for employment in a similar manner. This concept makes good sense from a restricted point of view, but a broader analysis may cast doubt upon it.

The capabilities of heavy artillery are obviously not the same as are the capabilities of tactical air. The essential role played by artillery is to further the clear objective of defeating the opposing army, and the range and mobility of artillery does not permit many other objectives. Hence it is logically assigned, in the main, to Army, corps, and division headquarters. Because it may take days to move heavy guns from one sector to another, it is logical for units as small as divisions to have some organic artillery. But the range and mobility of air force far exceeds that of artillery. Each single fighter-bomber can cruise far beyond the vital Army and corps areas in a matter of minutes and can support divisions at opposite ends of the battle line in a matter of hours. All operational fighter-bombers can be concentrated at one sector of the front in a period of time which would be unthinkable as the time required to mobilize artillery at that sector. With such physical flexibility would it not seem reasonable to assign such forces organically to the headquarters most able to exploit the advantages of the weapons? And would not this headquarters logically be the theater command?

A still further argument for assignment of aviation to the highest echelon is presented when considering the air-superiority objective. It is possible, as at Dunkirk, to achieve a local air superiority for a limited time. But such a condition is tenuous and not likely to be much more than an emergency measure to permit an isolated operation. Little hope can be held for a general offensive without a general air superiority in the theater of operations.[1] This theory is widely held by both ground and air specialists. How, then, must aviation be employed to achieve superiority?

The principles of war would be nullified by parceling out aviation to armies, corps, or divisions for their exclusive use when the air is controlled by the enemy. In the Napoleonic tradition the enemy would then defeat our aviation in detail. We would not be organized in such a way as to quickly assemble our air forces at the decisive time and place or to range far beyond the surface battle zones to strike enemy aviation where it would hurt most. By the same logic, if command of air were relinquished to those having paramount interest in a mere phase of air operations, such as close support, the more decisive roles of air power would doubtless be jeopardized.

[1] When this principle appears not to hold as in Korea, it can be accounted for by the fact that air superiority is not fully exploited.

For the purpose of securing air superiority, "tactical" and "strategic" aviation are employed in an identical manner. It is all one air force with one major objective. The same fighters used to support front lines are used to escort bombers which stimulate enemy air opposition. Precisely the same F-47's that escorted B-17's to Berlin were strafing the beaches at Normandy. And the next day the self-same craft were defending the communication zone by chasing buzz-bombs approaching London, or sweeping far into France and Germany to keep enemy air subdued and immobile.

Innumerable examples in World War II can be cited where "tactical," "strategic," and "defense" aircraft performed in the same struggle for air superiority. The heavy, medium, and light bombers struck at hostile air forces on the ground, inflicting severe damage to manufacturing plants, fuel production, and transportation. Our fighters caused enemy attrition in the air. Finally the air campaign won the degree of superiority which permitted our aircraft to roam over all of Europe and make possible the Normandy invasion.

For the most part our air forces were based in England, where fighters were available for air defense in periods of emergency. It would have been a gross violation of economy of force to have attempted setting up restrictive missions for separate air forces, one packaged to defend Great Britain and another to obtain control of the air over the Continent.

Combined use of all available air strength was earlier demonstrated in northwest Africa. We needed to halt the flow of German supplies to Tunisia. Heavy night bombers based in England struck at the port of Genoa, where enemy supplies were loaded. Bombers from the Middle East attacked the ports of Naples and Palermo. Others based in northwest Africa hit the same targets and added Bizerte and Tunis to the list. Fighters blasted trains and trucks en route from the ports to the front lines. All were concentrated against that objective deemed most important by the supreme commander.

It became apparent that the more sensitive the supply point we hit, the greater was the air opposition encountered, and hence the more enemy aircraft we could destroy. Thus our attacks fulfilled a twofold purpose: air superiority and interdiction. Later when Montgomery's and Eisenhower's armies began to press the Wehrmacht between its pincers, the identical aircraft used on interdiction and air superiority missions provided close ground support.

It was not possible for us to concentrate against any one objective until that job was wholly completed, then forget it and proceed to the next. In World War II it was necessary to organize so that we were able to mass our air against one objective or another as the need arose. The ability to do this was actually contingent upon the kind of organization we employed. It permitted us from time to time to concentrate on getting air superiority, to concentrate on the destruction of the means with which the Germans were carrying on the war, to concentrate maximum air strength in direct support of ground forces in periods of emergency, as at Salerno or at Leyte.

Which air operations were purely strategic? Which were tactical operations? Which were air defense operations? It becomes apparent that all such operations are conducted concurrently by all air forces. The operations have a broader scope and a more varied application than the traditional terms imply.

When a nation finds itself at war, its objective is to enforce its will on the other. This is the ultimate end product of war. To do this, a nation must force the other to quit fighting. This may be done by destroying his will to fight or by depriving him of his means to fight. Those are the significant goals of all national power, whether it is deployed on land, at sea, or in the air.

The military is essentially concerned with carrying out the shooting phase of the conflict. Always confronted with insufficient means to insure success, a Nation must rigidly compel economy of force. The United States can never afford the luxury of compartmented military services, or branches within a service, each sufficient within its own framework to carry out certain over-all roles and missions.

Without in any sense denying the need for unity of command at the top, it must be admitted that a misconceived application of the idea of unity of command has sometimes worked to the detriment of economy of force. If unity of command be carried to an extreme, the Navy would have its ground force and air force; the Army would have its own surface fleets and air force; and the Air Force would have its own navy and ground force. Each service might justify its requirements on the grounds that these additional forces would be essential to executing assigned roles and missions. Unity of command would be extolled in a general way as a necessary factor in military operations. But the need to rigidly apply economy of force prevents this. The principle of cooperation must be substituted. Fortunately the National Defense Act of 1947 and its subsequent amendments have provided the framework around which to build an effective military force with that economy which is indispensable for a Nation with finite resources.

It must be obvious that the large naval air forces operating in support of the naval mission in the Pacific during World War II would have been idle for weeks on end if used only for naval roles. As it was, they were effectively used to hit at the Philippines and Japan to supplement the tactical and strategic air force operations and to erase from the skies a large proportion of Japanese air power. It must be equally obvious that to have set up sufficient air forces to support the landing operations in Normandy would have been just as wasteful if used solely for that purpose. Nor is it possible to separate and identify all the air operations mounted exclusively for the Normandy invasion. Similarly the provision within the United States Air Force of sufficient aviation to do the long-distance job only, or the short-range Army support job only, or the air defense job only, would again violate the principle of economy of force.

Maximum air power seems possible only when air weapons are organized as one force, thus permitting air power's potential flexibility to be utilized more in accordance with the other principles of war. To those unfamiliar with the extensive communications, logistical, and other requirements for the employment of large air forces, another solution may seem simple and appropriate: Give to each army, air force, or fleet that amount of aviation needed to carry out normal missions. Then when the need arises to concentrate all forces against certain objectives, take these air forces away from their parent unit, attach them to the appropriate headquarters, and send them on their way. This solution is an oversimplification of a complex problem. The hard facts of experience have shown that it seldom works out as pat as the logic would imply.

The coordination demanded by any air operation requires an integrated, closely knit organization for communications, logistics, intelligence, and command. It must be well oiled and not allowed to get rusty during normal operations. Training in concentration, in flexibility, and in surprise types of offensive operation must be a continuing process even during combat. These massed activities of air power cannot be achieved by quickly forming a one-task organization. The degree of teamwork that permits rapid concentrations requires routine functioning with a resultant broad base of knowledge and skill. Thus can simplicity and swift movement be assured.

It can be concluded that, if the principles of war are to be most effectively applied, air power should habitually be organized as one unified force. In the words of General Vandenberg, "Tactical and strategic air power is part of the same ball of wax * * * you can't separate [it] and put [it] in neat compartments."

A recent speech by Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter epitomizes this point and leaves slight doubt about Air Force policy in this regard. "Tactical air and strategic air are merely handles," he said, "which have been developed to identify different functions, each of which is indispensable and each of which fits into the over-all integrated structure of air power."

Furthermore there should be no rigid adherence to the predetermined priorities ascribed to certain elements of air power when a crucial issue is at stake affecting the whole of national security. Then, without regard to theoretical priorities, total air power must be thrown into the gap which threatens the very structure of our civilization. This will always be the first priority.

Air power must act promptly, not in terms of weeks, but hours. Surprise demands speed and makes mandatory the tactical control by skilled air leaders of supporting operations. The air organization must be designed to advance the national objectives with indivisible air power.

Complaints About Conditions of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by a Missourian to the editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a leading newspaper in Missouri.

This letter was printed in the issue of March 8, 1951, and was clipped from the newspaper and sent to me by Mrs. Paul Kippenberger, of St. Louis, Mo., with the remark that "this letter expresses the opinions of many." I am sure it does.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEM OF MANY THEMS

To the EDITOR:

As an average American citizen, I am sick of a number of things in the American picture today.

1. I'm sick of being told we must be taxed and taxed until we're broke, when our highest officials are tax-free.

2. I'm sick of picking up the newspaper day after day and reading about the scandalous dishonesty and misuse of public funds in so many Government offices and agencies. I'm for impeaching any public official found dishonest in his duties—that is, if there are enough honest men left in Government to start an impeachment.

3. I'm sick of reading about namby-pambies who are trying to establish price controls and are having a hot-foot dance to keep from stepping on any influential group's toes. By the time they get any decent controls, high prices will long since have depleted people's pocketbooks and bankbooks, so it won't matter.

4. And I'm sick and tired of the President's tenacious loyalty in his attitude of "my friends, right or wrong before our country." If my husband, for the second time in his 30 years, is expected to put his wife and children second and his country first by leaving for the service, it seems little enough to ask of our country's highest official to put his country before his friends.

More power to you and your sentiments expressed in your editorial, Immorality in Government. A crusade for a return to God, the Golden Rule, and the Biblical laws of right and wrong is sadly needed today.

The St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Delusion," published in the Philadelphia Daily News of Thursday, March 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE DELUSION—PROJECT'S COST WOULD RUN INTO ASTRONOMICAL TOTALS, WITH VIRTUALLY NO BENEFITS

Public hearings now in progress before the House of Representatives' Public Works Committee on the feasibility of the proposed construction of a seaway along the St. Lawrence River from the Great Lakes to the sea are bringing a mass of new data to light that only accentuates the folly of this proposal. For 30 years the proponents of the seaway have been hammering periodically at Congress to enter an agreement with Canada to assist in the building of this project.

But it is now revealed that the original estimate of cost, ranging between $1,048,000,000 and $1,750,000,000, provides for only a 27-foot channel, whereas oceangoing traffic would require at least a 35-foot channel (a 40-foot channel always has been the goal of Army engineers for the Delaware River). To dredge the St. Lawrence to that depth would require at least another $1,000,000,000, competent authorities declare.

The project usually is broached in times of stress. In the early 1930's the argument was that it would provide work for many men. Now when labor is scarce, its proponents want to draw manpower from vital plants and projects to construct an improvement, the value of which is questionable in the national defense program.

Certainly, concentration of shipping in one spot, as it is proposed for this seaway, would make it particularly vulnerable in time of war to enemy bombers or submarines. During the last war, a German U-boat managed to get far up the St. Lawrence River, sink a ship and then escape.

Dispersing shipping to the Atlantic coast ports, as is done now, is a much safer method. It is hardly believable that any foe would immobilize every one of these ports at the same time, either through direct attack or sabotage. Transport by railroads, as it was shown in England and Germany during the last war, is more desirable in that railroads can be repaired quickly, or bypasses can be utilized and supplies kept moving.

But a well-placed bombing attack could knock out a project such as the St. Lawrence seaway, put its 18 locks out of commission, and make its entire 1,700 mile route a nightmare, impossible of repair for a number of years.

Diversion of freight traffic to such a seaway not only would injure the economy of the coast port cities, it would strike a heavy blow at the railroads, cost thousands of persons their jobs and generally disrupt the business in a hundred other cities that are dependent on this business.

And as far as the increased power output promised from it is concerned, the only State in the Union to benefit would be New York. In addition, the production of electricity from any hydroelectric plant along the river would be only a drop in the bucket compared with the current total produced in the United States now.

On the whole, the project is a waste of time. The money it would require could be put to far more effective use in developing concrete defensive measures and the sooner this proposal is put on the shelf again, the better it will be for the United States.

Racial Discrimination in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Complaint Against the Army," appearing in the March 9, 1951, issue of the New York Herald Tribune, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPLAINT AGAINST THE ARMY

Against a background of rapidly dwindling racial discrimination in the Armed Forces, the charges just made against the Army by investigators for the Minneapolis branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People come as disturbing news. The NAACP group says that of 15 men shipped out of Fort Dix, N. J., recently, one was classified on his overseas movement orders as a Puerto Rican and one as an American Indian, and that on induction orders issued in several States Negroes are denoted by asterisks on the notation "col."

It is not yet clear whether these manifestations are to be regarded as typical of Army policy, or as representing individual evasions of President Truman's Executive order of July 26, 1948, which forbids discrimination in the Armed Forces. But it is striking that the charges are leveled only against the Army, while the Navy and Air Force are regarded by the investigators as pursuing satisfactorily the integration policies supposed to be practiced by all service branches.

Conceivably, there may be valid reasons for including all of a soldier's characteristics, physical and mental, on his basic record. But the Army has an obligation to explain why racial and similar information should be included on other documents, if this is actually being done. Segregation and discrimination die stubbornly, in the Armed Forces as elsewhere, but the task of eliminating them has progressed so far that we must be on guard against attempts to back-track. It is important that we deprive Communists throughout the world of the opportunity to manufacture propaganda ammunition by magnifying our lapses into bad practices. It is still more important that we keep faith with our own ideals.

Addresses by Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, Hon. Dennis Chavez of New Mexico, and Hon. Jennings Randolph Before the American Road Builders Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the American Road Builders Association held its annual meeting at Milwaukee, Wis., last week. The Attorney General of the United States, Hon. J. Howard McGrath, former Representative Jennings Randolph, and I addressed the gathering. I ask unanimous consent that these three addresses be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. J. HOWARD MCGRATH, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman, gentleman, I am grateful to the American Road Builders' Association for your invitation to take part in this annual convention.

My very good friend, Jennings Randolph, insisted on my coming here in spite of my great protestations of complete lack of knowledge concerning the immediate problems of your great industry. Nonetheless, I have ventured to come and speak to you about some of the common interests we have as citizens of this great Republic in whose immediate service I happen to be engaged.

We do live in the greatest country on earth. Our physical needs of food, clothing, housing, highways, and transportation are better taken care of than in any other country in the world. But, more than that, the individualism which is the cornerstone of our democratic edifice has made us great; our precious heritage of freedom has been an inspiration to the peoples of the world.

As our President pointed out in his state of the Union message delivered to a joint session of the Congress, we can be assured that our country at this critical time is in a healthy condition. We have by far the greatest productive capacity ever attained by any nation of people. Our people are

skilled and vigorous. We are a people of great technical skills and knowledge that are constantly expanding our control over the natural resources of the ground, sea, and air that God has placed in our hands.

After the most devastating of wars we have continued to maintain standards of living approximating, in many ways excelling, our prewar levels. Since World War II we have had no such unemployment as followed World War I; in fact, we have more men and women at work than ever before. Strong heads and practical minds have been behind advances in production which have made it possible to report, for the year 1950, the production of the greatest abundance of goods in our history. In the year just past, our industries have created gigantic new standards with which to measure our industrial might.

Much of the know-how which has made this record possible was learned during World War II. Consequently we are prepared to meet the most recent challenge to modern democracy—the third in the lifetime of most of us—with greater resources, more armed might, and more inflexible determination than ever before. Against the challenge of the Kremlin, the people of the United States, together with all free peoples, will be prepared to pit formidable military strength, if necessary. I join with the President and all our people in a prayer that it will not be necessary. But, if it becomes necessary, we are pledged to produce all the weapons and equipment that our increased Armed Forces will need, no matter what their ultimate active strength. That strength must be measured by the demands of our security. We must all make great personal sacrifices to achieve this goal.

I do not minimize the present serious state of world affairs, or the enormous problems which confront our United States in this latest crisis. To do so would be foolish and dangerous.

We Americans are not fools. We recognize the nature of the challenge. Earlier challenges have been answered by us with a showing that we were prepared and able to defend our country's honor and its freedoms. Let there be no mistake. Any new challenge will be met equally well.

We Americans are no fair-weather friends of liberty and democracy. We have practiced democracy, we have lived it through the decades, we have a deep awareness of its intrinsic values. No slanders, no bullying threats from Kremlin propagandists will change our faith in the future of our American promise, or of our American democratic ideal or our belief in the future of the free nations of the world.

Nor will the American people need to be goaded into the sacrifices necessary to accomplish the great tasks which are imposed by our responsibility to ourselves and to our position of world leadership. We have vast objectives which cannot be gained by Government alone. The task must be shared by the whole American people, 151,000,000 strong. We know that all-out effort and all-out measures are required. Preparedness means careful planning and careful control over essentials which will prevent the nonessential use of vital goods. We don't like controls, yet we know we must endure them.

We will have need for substantial controls to divert goods from civilian to military use. That is the reason that credit has already been tightened on many items of trade and commerce. Other restrictions are daily being found necessary. We will have to convert plants. Materials in short supply will have to be allocated. There will be shortages in certain consumer goods. The burden of the enlarged defense program must be borne by all of us, and for that we must also expect heavy tax increases.

These are sacrifices, but they are a part of the price we are willing to pay for liberty and democracy. The quality of the zeal with which we defend our freedoms is a measure of the sacrifices we are willing to endure. I know that the American people will welcome the sacrifices made necessary by our defense effort.

With foresight born of his intimate experience as a Senator, and chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate National Defense Activities during World War II, President Truman is gathering in Washington a defense mobilization organization that will be fully able to meet the difficult problems that lie ahead. The lines of authority in this organization must be clear and straight. It must be an organization that merits the full confidence and cooperation of every American. With such confidence and cooperation, I am sure that the mission of the defense mobilization organization will be successfully accomplished. At the top of his organization, the President has placed, in the post of Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, formerly the president of General Electric Co., and Vice Chairman of the War Production Board during World War II.

During World War II our role was emphasized as the arsenal of weapons to defend freedom in the world. Today, however, we are the arsenal of democracy in a much greater sense. We are not only an arsenal of material weapons; also we are an arsenal of the moral and spiritual values which are the basic elements of true democracy. By our way of life, we shall show the world that we do not give up our democracy in our mobilization effort to defend it.

In our defense effort it is important that we bear clearly in mind that there is no need for us to abandon the aspirations around which our lives center. In periods of emergency it is natural that some of the rights and privileges of peacetime must be temporarily abridged or restricted in the interest of national survival. But the restrictions should be, must be, limited to the minimum. We cannot afford, by any yardstick of wisdom, to plan a wholesale discarding of the democratic processes and institutions which this Nation has developed during its decades of experience. The maintenance of both the structure and the spirit of our civil liberties is essential to the country's well-being.

In a period of emergency such as this, the undivided loyalty of all our people to the Nation and its institutions is essential. President Truman, early in his administration, foresaw the need of assuring that no disloyal persons should be employed in the Government, and, to that end, in 1947 instituted the Government employees loyalty program. Under that program the records of well over 3,000,000 employees have been checked by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These investigations have been conducted in a manner consistent with our principles of fair play and in accordance with the provisions of the President's Executive order establishing the loyalty program; and they give us the assurance that your Government is making every effort, and successfully, to see that no disloyal person is working for it.

But many sins have been and may be committed in the name of loyalty. There are men in this country—in both private and public life—who have indicated a dangerous willingness to use this emergency as an occasion for discarding much of our carefully constructed edifice of human rights. I am frankly concerned about those who would smear every opposition sentiment with the label of communism—men who would penalize the thinking of unorthodox thoughts, or the writing of nonconformist words. Those who pose as the saviors of our Nation by seeking to abridge beyond reason our tradition of democratic freedoms are as dangerous to American liberties as the Communists themselves. For, in destroying that fabric of democracy and reason, they play directly into the hands of the Kremlin's agents. In the struggle against our enemy we must be aware of the danger of losing our freedoms for the sake of victory.

In his state of the Union message to the Congress, President Truman asked the Congress for unity. But he made clear what he meant by unity. He said:

"Make no mistake about my meaning. I do not ask, or expect, unanimity. I do not ask for an end to debate. Only by debate can we arrive at decisions which are wise and which reflect the desires of the American people. We do not have dictatorship in this country, and we will never have it.

"When I request unity, what I am really asking for is a sense of responsibility on the part of every Member of this Congress. Let us debate the issues, but let every man among us weigh his words and deeds. There is a sharp difference between harmful criticism and constructive criticism. If we are truly responsible as individuals, I am sure that we will be unified as a government."

What the President requested of the Congress is just as applicable to all of the people of the country. Unity we must have. But unanimity is not expected. Responsible constructive criticism is healthy; it is not subversion or disloyalty. We must be ever alert and on guard to protect the rights of the constructive critic. We must be careful to use the words "disloyal" and "subversive" with caution. They should not be used as synonyms for "critical" and "unorthodox."

There is not any magic formula yet discovered upon which we may rely for the sure preservation of our freedoms. To the contrary, danger lurks in the recourse to catchy name calling and the easy methods of those advocates of extra-legal conduct who would justify their actions in glib phrases such as "putting down the Reds." Our best resort is to the application of common sense standards.

We have the Communist fifth column under control. We have an efficient Federal Bureau of Investigation to prevent sabotage and to keep track of Communist espionage, maneuverings, and conspiracies. But Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and I are determined that there will be no Gestapo witch hunts—that the basic civil rights of the individual will be securely protected and defended as guaranteed by the fundamental law of the land. The free America that we have inherited must be handed down in like manner to the future generations. It is, indeed, for this very reason that we are mobilizing our resources.

There is no more precious possession today than that of United States citizenship. The enslaved peoples of the world look upon our citizens as the guardians and the possessors of those moral, spiritual, political, economic, and social values which alone can bring to them the peace and freedom they so sorely need and pray for.

In the world today, where there is much chaos and confusion, we in this country have demonstrated that the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens can be respected and protected regardless of nationality, or racial or religious affiliations. It is our responsibility to recognize and meet the challenge that the free world is faced with today, for it is a real challenge.

I have never found it wise, nor will the American people find it wise, to take advice which counsels abandonment of our friends in Europe. To quote again from the President's state of the Union message: "All free nations are exposed and all are in peril. Their only security lies in banding together. No one nation can find protection in a selfish search for a safe haven from the storm * * *. If (the free nations) * * * should fall apart, the results would be fatal to human freedom

* * *. We are the most powerful single member of * * * (the community of free nations) * * * and we have a special responsibility. We must take the leadership in meeting the challenge to freedom and in helping to protect the rights of independent nations."

I have faith, our great President has faith, and the overwhelming majority of the American people have faith in their own strength, in their intelligence, and in their ideals.

As I travel about this country I gain constant faith in our people and in our institutions. I have faith particularly that we will keep our heads out of the sands of isolationism and hysteria. Alert to our problems, cherishing our great traditions, secure in the knowledge of our material and spiritual strength, Americans can face the future with quiet determination to fight the challenge of the hated dictatorships. The spectacle of our twentieth-century America is an object of pride and inspiration, and the source of spiritual strength.

To be sure, the Soviet Union has machines, and men, and mountains, and rivers; its assets, real and potential, are sizable. But no one who seeks to appraise the limits of Soviet strength can for a moment ignore what the Russian people lack, and what we have in abundance—the power of the democratic way of life, the tradition of free institutions, the respect for the individual.

We must never underestimate the power of our liberty. In the final analysis, it is the bulwark of our defense against the imperialism and brutality of communism. It is our democratic way of life that gives America the power and the inspiration of a free people. And, in this contracting world of ours, it is the example of our freedom rather than the example of our wealth which gives us a measure of spiritual and moral leadership among the people of other lands.

My friends, today our way of life is put to the test—the supreme test of whether our free country can endure—whether our people can remain free. We have met and survived other such tests—from the very first one of which our country was born—when we were only a scattered handful, but we resisted and we survived—a nation of freemen.

In the days that lie ahead we will gather our strength and mobilize our resources under the leadership of our great President. United with the community of free nations we shall be prepared to meet the challenge of any enemy, and we shall emerge once again with our heritage preserved—secure in our dignity as individual human beings.

I have tried to state briefly what I deem to be our faith and our strength, and in conclusion I wish to quote from a recent editorial comment in one of our national magazines. I believe this more clearly states the message I deliver tonight than anything I have read since the beginning of the present crisis.

"It is the aim of everyone these days to speak very distinctly. And it should be the duty of speakers and writers, at any rate, to put things in their proper place in relation to the natural world and to avoid preoccupation with sudden, dark events that are only a small part of a very great picture. A man can search his morning paper in vain for a crumb of comfort, yet no man should forget that most of the strongest assets are on our side, many of the heaviest liabilities are on the Soviet Union's. The burden Russia carries is the simple burden of wishing to conquer and rule the world by guile and by strength. This is an ancient dream that has in every instance thrown the dreamer. Our own dream is not to rule the world, but to save and fortify the free men in an atmosphere of freedom. This, too, is an ancient dream, and although it has been a very costly one, it has never let anybody down yet. Even if it should now prove costly beyond all ability to pay, it is still worth following and there can never be a valid reason to deviate, to hesitate, or to compromise."

ADDRESS BY HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ, UNITED STATES SENATOR, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Good afternoon, friends in the American Road Builders. I am getting to be a regular at your meetings. This is the fourth time I have attended. I have enjoyed each and every one of them.

I have a feeling that most people don't go to the convention to listen to speeches. But a Senator or a Congressman always has a few remarks to deliver. I am no exception. But the few things I have to say this afternoon do not represent a speech. I only want to talk with you, and give you some ideas of mine about public works in this accelerating defense period.

You are principally interested in roads. But construction of any kind draws your interest, too. I'll start out on roads.

I think there is one thing that must be unmistakably clear to all of us in the Government and to those charged with the highway program in the States. This is—the maintenance of the highway plant of the United States should not be confused with new construction at any time.

Roads and the contributing industries and services represent about one-seventh of the total national economy. It's big business.

When the Nation began its modern road-building program following World War I, there was continued expansion of activity. Each year, with the exception of 1923, the accomplishment was greater than in the year before. This continued through 1930. Thereafter the depression produced some slight recessions, but peak performance was reached in 1938 and a high level of performance was maintained in every year through 1941. In this period a network of main highways covering the entire country was created.

In the same period the passenger car was converted from the model T to the powerful, smooth-running car of today. The truck was developed from a light vehicle of uncertain utility to the dependable vehicle now used in every form of production. The economic and social life of the Nation was expanded and rearranged in a manner made possible only by highway transport.

By 1940 it was evident that the road building that had preceded was only a pioneer effort, that the types of road built for the volume and kind of traffic of the 1920's and early 1930's would not be adequate for the kind of highway service the Nation must have. The main highways needed strengthening, widening, and straightening to accommodate the large movement of people and goods. Conditions on the main arteries through cities had become intolerable. Accidents, congestion, and delay were resulting in costs far greater than that of providing the needed expressways and arterial routes. At the same time there was need to courtruct a large mileage of secondary or farm-to-market roads to give us a completely balanced system of highways in both rural and urban areas.

A highway program on a scale much larger than any that had preceded was an urgent requirement. It was recognized that the cost would be great but it was well within our means. It did not loom as an insuperable obstacle as did the cost of the Federal-aid system when it was first designated.

There was general agreement as to the character of improvements needed and that they should be built but attempts to carry out the plan have met many vicissitudes.

World War II began almost immediately and general highway construction was stopped. In the aggregate a large amount of work was done in building highways to serve war installations and to reach raw materials. A few improvements were made on main highways to keep traffic moving but the condition of the system declined. Thousands of miles of highway surface reached the end of economic life and were not replaced. At the end of the war there was the greatest accumulation in history of old surfaces that could not be maintained in use with any reasonable expenditure.

It was expected that highway construction would start in a big way at the end of the war. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 had been enacted providing $500,000,000 for each of the first three postwar fiscal years. The States were in excellent financial positions with motor vehicle revenues accumulated during the war. It was expected that men and equipment released from war operations would find employment on highway work.

Things did not work out as expected. High prices and shortages of men, equipment, and materials slowed action. Many readjustments were necessary before we could return to normal peacetime conditions.

Highway work did begin in 1946 but it gained momentum slowly. Progress was better in 1947 but nowhere near the desired pace. We have had good years in 1948, 1949, and 1950. In 1950 the State highway departments awarded contracts for 55,467 miles at a cost of $1,500,000,000. Federal-aid projects accounted for 23,429 miles at a cost of $820,000,000. Work actually completed during the year was not far below the rate at which contracts were awarded. Since the end of the war 82,000 miles of highway have been completed in the Federal-aid program.

Highway improvement has reached a high level but it has not yet grown to the size necessary to produce an adequate system within a reasonable period of years. Estimates of the cost of making all needed improvements range from $42,000,000,000 to $47,000,000,000.

If we decide to eliminate these deficiencies within a period of 15 years and also replace those highways that wear out or become obsolete within the 15 years, we shall have to make an expenditure of $3,800,000,000 each year for the 15 years. Of this amount, $1,443,000,000 would go on the Federal-aid system in rural areas, and $755,000,000 on the Federal-aid system in urban areas. An additional $732,000,000 would go on the Federal-aid secondary system, and $480,000,000 on rural highways not on the present Federal-aid systems.

The annual expenditure actually being made for highway construction is approximately $2,400,000,000, including expenditures for toll roads. Our expenditure falls short of what may be considered a minimum desired figure by $1,400,000,000.

For at least 10 years the gap between existing highways and the kind of improvements needed has continually widened. At this juncture when it appears that we may prevent further widening of the gap and possibly make some progress in closing it, a disturbed international situation brings on the prospect of checking or stopping the program through controls over equipment, materials, and manpower.

I have had close contact with highway matters for a number of years and I can see serious danger in the thought that our highway system can be kept in its present condition by what are ordinarily called maintenance methods alone.

Highway interests are likely to suffer because of the narrow scope of the work that is commonly included under the heading of maintenance. Light work of the kind that can be done by patrol crews with hand tools and small machines is all that is commonly included. If an entire surface is to be relaid or if a 2-inch layer of bituminous mixture is to be placed, it is called construction mainly because such work is done by contractors rather than by State or county-employed maintenance gangs.

Each year a large mileage of highway reaches the end of its economic life and can no longer be kept in use by a reasonable expenditure of funds. Often a badly worn surface is associated with narrow width, sharp curves and steep grades wholly unsuited for the present volume and speed of traffic. Replacement of such surfaces is just as much maintenance as is the replacement of ballast, ties, and rails on a railroad. Also it is just as important to the country in accomplishing its main objective—war production.

The motor vehicle almost overnight changed the utility of highways from local to Nation-wide scope. The boundaries between counties and States for travel purposes disappeared. It became necessary to think of the highway system as a national problem.

Congress, when it framed the basic legislation, recognized the nature of road improvements. The following is quoted from the original Federal-Aid Road Act of July 1916:

"The term 'construction' shall be construed to include reconstruction and improvement of roads; 'properly maintained' as used herein shall be construed to mean the making of needed repairs and the preservation of a reasonably smooth surface considering the type of road, but shall not be held to include extraordinary repairs, nor reconstruction."

In 1949 our State highway departments completed 22,425 miles on primary State systems outside of cities, including the work done on the Federal-aid highway system. Of this mileage 17,288 miles was resurfacing of existing pavements. It was maintenance of such character that it had to be done by contractors. Of the remaining 5,137 miles a very large portion consisted of construction to replace worn surface where the location was so poor that it was best to abandon it and build on new location.

In reconstructing an old highway it is almost always necessary to do something more than replace the worn facility in kind. Most often a greater width of surface is required to make the highway safe. When an old bridge is about to fall down it is almost always necessary to replace it with a bridge having a wider roadway and greater strength. It would be a great mistake not to modernize as facilities are rebuilt. Our construction program for several years has been almost entirely a maintenance operation if we consider the term "maintenance" to mean the keeping of existing highways in a condition satisfactory for use.

The gravity of the international situation has increased constantly since the end of the war. No one can say with assurance what the future holds in store. The only safe assumption to make is that the necessity for a build-up of strength for defense may continue for a number of years. The degree of the build-up is unknown and unstable.

I do not consider it intelligent preparation for defense to permit highway transportation to deteriorate in any degree. The main highways are the assembly lines of a large portion of our defense plants. Raw materials move over the highways to plants. Parts for weapons and machines move from one plant to another for processing. Plants assembling airplanes, tanks, trucks, and electronic devices receive a daily flow of parts from a great number of smaller plants making parts. The highways are links in the assembly line that may extend for hundreds of miles. Speedy conversion from raw material to finished product would not be possible without these links.

We must feed, clothe, and house our war workers and all the rest of our population. Usage of highways must continue for these purposes. Recent studies show that highway usage follows very closely the trend in national income when corrected so that each dollar represents the same purchasing power. Omitting the period of war restrictions it has been found that for nearly 20 years there has been 1 mile of vehicle travel to every three and one-half to four dollars of national income expressed in dollars having the purchasing power of the dollar during the period 1935–39.

There is no question that national income will continue to be large throughout the period of defense activity however long it may last. It will be possible to check recreational travel if that becomes necessary but transport for defense production, movement of workers to and from their jobs, and supplying workers with the necessities of life must continue. It will be a serious blow to preparedness if highways are permitted to decline so that transport can be accomplished only with increasing effort.

We should not permit our highways to decline in any degree below their present condition. This will require a substantial replacement program as well as continuation of normal maintenance operations. Men, machines, and materials should be provided in sufficient quantity for this purpose.

Ordinarily, I would lean heavily toward State authority and responsibility in programs. I am a firm believer in the Federal Government being cooperative, but not dictatorial. Bureaucracy at the helm is a slow and devious path. But side by side, it is a dandy team. These are not ordinary times, however.

In the fields of roads and rivers and harbors and flood control, these activities must go on unless our struggle for freedom reaches such a pitch that it is a deadly matter of life. A third major activity of the Committee on Public Works—that of public buildings—is more in direct conflict with the war effort than roads and the activities of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Into public buildings such as office buildings, post offices, and United States courthouses or custom houses, we have to put structural steel, copper, a lot of aluminum, and we reach into the brass field. There is also the manpower situation. This is also true of any private construction of buildings. Any program of new post offices or office buildings can well be postponed. The Government can put off its work. The less we do, the more essential private industry can do. Public buildings are out for the time being.

Right now we are feeling a severe pinch in construction materials. Big slices are being diverted into defense work. I don't believe there is a good program involving the diversion. We create brand-new agencies to take over materials and work handled previously by established agencies, and it doesn't make for an orderly program.

Right now, our production of aluminum and steel and other essentials is being stepped up greatly. In the meantime, national defense production is grabbing a big cut of present output. I firmly believe that in another 12 months we will reach a balance on steel and several other items. That means more will be available for civilian needs than now.

In 2 years, at the present stage of defense preparedness, and in view of the ceilings placed on military personnel and equipment, our increased production will not only carry the defense equipment but also come back to near present-day levels on materials.

In the meantime, there is some question of whether the military ought to have blanket authority to take over material output wholesale. The military effort has needs, and these needs can be arrived at. What is left can be distributed to carry on civilian work in nearly every field. I am not arguing against cutting back what the military needs. I am saying let the military arrive at efficient needs, and then what is left we will parcel out in an orderly and sensible program.

We have criteria established by which we judge whether or not irrigation and river and harbor and flood-control work can go on. What the Congress and the President ask on each project of the Corps of Army Engineers is:

Will it develop hydroelectric power for a needed area? Will it provide a water supply in critical areas? Would stopping work on the dam or reservoir projects make them useless? Is it an important harbor or waterway? Is it to protect important industries or major food-producing areas? Can it be finished economically during the present working season? Does it involve almost entirely earth movement, and will it use critical materials? Then, of course, we always ask if it helps in the national defense directly?

There is no doubt in my mind but what Gen. Lewis Pick, of the Army Engineers, and Commissioner Thomas MacDonald of the Bureau of Public Roads know what they are doing and they know what can be done and what shouldn't be done on a national scale. General Pick has a voice through the Army and the defense needs.

I would like to see Commissioner MacDonald have a powerful voice in this materials picture and regulation. I think, after defense and certain civilian needs in other fields are determined in Washington, that share which might be used in roads should be under the direction of Mr. MacDonald. Knowing what he has, he could set up criteria, and the States could then plan and build with a solid program and a real knowledge and certain definite thinking.

The Bureau of Public Roads, looking at all States, could allot strategic materials which it has on a priority-order basis. Certain roads and certain bridges would be built. On others, the roadway would be repaired or built, but bridges might be omitted, in a stage construction program. Unless we have something like this, we are going to have costly bidding, confused authority and contractors, and a darned good mess in just a short time. I think we could avoid black markets of any kind in the construction picture, insofar as public works is concerned.

There must be some clear thinking and programing at the top level in Washington, or no one will know what he is doing in the States. If we have a sensible program, then we can go along in the States in public works as materials and manpower will allow, and we can keep going forward. As the materials picture changed, so could the program on roads and rivers and harbors. It would make sense to everyone concerned, and there would be a clear explanation. Unless we get something modeled like this, I am afraid a lot of your activity is going to stop. It would be short-sighted, and dangerous, to stop.

Some of you out there are perhaps wondering whether I am advocating Government control. Well, the Selective Service controls your young sons. There are wage freezes and price freezes, and this and that. That is controls, and they are for your benefit—our mutual benefit. I am advocating some Government controlled planning in Washington, for the defense needs and stimulated production. What is left after defense needs should be allocated. Such controls—if you want to call them controls—would be to your benefit.

Let me give you a very graphic example. During World War II, the Public Buildings Administration was engaged in erecting some office space for defense workers in Washington. One early afternoon a certain group of the military swooped down on the job waving a priority order and whisked away the cement. The carpenters and skilled workmen

were left standing there and the confusion was terrific. The military used the cement to build some sidewalks at a military installation very near Washington. A return to something like that is not only ridiculous, but intolerable.

Thanks for listening to a few ideas. It was a pleasure to talk with you. When I step down from here, I am not going away. Mrs. Chavez and I will still be around, and we will see you at the banquet tomorrow night. Thank you all.

ADDRESS BY HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, TREASURER, AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, CAPITAL AIRLINES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Americans, regardless of religious creed or political party, must be awakened to the terrible truth that communism threatens Christianity and democracy in practically every part of the world.

Time for compromise is over, if that course was ever the one to pursue, with the Red rulership of Russia. The Kremlin's orders demanded, and direct today, the aggression into South Korea. We now know that Stalin plotted the control of all of that strategic peninsula of the Pacific, even though a pretense of cooperation was being pledged within the United Nations.

With perverted propaganda and the power of armed might, the Communists have set forth on a conquest which is aimed at control of all the earth. That statement is not too drastic a one to make, for the facts prove that Red Russian leaders are determined to achieve, by whatever means necessary, the domination of the peoples of the world.

Let us look at the record, not through the eyes of partisanship, but as men and women who believe in personal freedom and the practice of Christian citizenship. The sooner all of us realize what is happening, the better for mankind. Let us devoutly resolve to end our confusion here at home, and replace appeasement policies of the past with courage and power—as we use the righteous sword to turn back the evil force bent on making slaves of men and women.

Communism, directed from Moscow, today controls 40 percent of the world's population. This tragic truth must be faced. In a little more than 11 years the bluff and the bloodshed, caused by the Red aggression, has given to communism country after country. In 1939 Russian dictatorship embraced 171,000,000 persons while today it controls at least 850,000,000 men and women across more than 11,000,000 square miles of the earth's surface.

In every direction—north, east, south, west—the Reds have been on the march. In 1939 Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania were caught in the web of communism. A year later Bessarabia and Bukovina were being absorbed. For a few years (during World War II) Russia fought to protect its own homeland and people, but in 1945 its tentacles were reaching out again. Finland fell, as did Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Prussia and the Kuriles. Into the dragnet in 1948 went Rumania and Bulgaria. Soon it was Albania and parts of Germany. Then Yugoslavia and North Korea followed, and Manchuria and China collapsed within the Red circle of communism.

Red Russia is not concerned with its own security. A carefully calculated conspiracy and conquest is under way. Americans, and free people everywhere, abhor war. But we believe that the souls of men and women are more precious than mere physical bodies. Now, not later, is the time of testing. The United States, and other free nations that stand with us, must be ready for any emergency.

In our Nation we resolutely manufacture equipment and mobilize manpower and resources in a determined drive to prevent a possible all-out world war III.

In the highway and airport fields, we can and will make an important contribution. We are here in convention assembled to merge all our efforts to the end that they will materially aid the common cause of freedom.

Postal Workers' Pay—They Receive Less Than Day Laborers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article published by the Redford Record on March 16, 1951, at Redford, a part of Detroit, Mich.

This paper has as its editor and publisher Mr. Floyd McGriff, one of the most prominent newspapermen in the entire metropolitan area of Detroit:

POSTAL WORKERS PAID LESS THAN DETROIT DAY LABORERS

With very few exceptions, there is no large group of public servants who have evidenced more loyalty to the service they represent than the postal workers. This loyalty has been maintained in the face of continually mounting adverse conditions which currently are decidedly prevalent.

The working conditions of the postal employee are continually worsening because of economy cut-backs by Executive orders, and because of failure to expand and equip post offices proportionately to the expansion of business.

His compensation has lagged far behind that provided in private industry for many years; so much so, in fact, that he is unable to live on a plane with his fellow men. If he chooses to house, clothe, feed, medicate, and insure himself and his family at a standard currently existing, he must seek outside employment, thus reducing, by long working hours, his efficiency for both employers. Inefficiency brands him as one unqualified for advancement, and his lot, and that of his family, is fixed at a standard far below par.

DON'T GET DAY-LABOR RATE

Loyalty has repeatedly been exemplified as honorable, but the loyalty of the postal worker, to the service he represents, appears to be an act of dishonorableness to his wife and kiddies.

His salary status is summed up briefly by the following: In 1944 he started at a salary of $1,700 per annum and graduated to $2,100 per annum—$40 a week—after 5 years of service. By gradual upgrading since 1944 his entrance salary is now $2,670 per annum or $51 a week (about $1.31 per hour), in 7 years. He may upgrade himself $100, or 4.9 cents per hour, each year for 10 years by diligently applying himself to his work and becoming skilled in several of the many operations connected with mail handling. This is less than common day labor wages in Detroit. These postal salaries have been, and still are, far below Detroit salaries provided in private industry, and far too low to cope with present living costs. Day labor in the building trades—helpful but unskilled—is $1.90 an hour in Detroit today.

POSTAL WORKER MUST STUDY

In but few trades or professions is it more difficult to gain perfection for advancement than in postal operation. The postal worker must qualify on two or three, and sometimes four, of the several operations of mail handling. These operations involve schemes of separation, necessitating months of study and qualifying by examination. The schemes involve separation of mail to all cities served by certain railroads and all other railroads connected therewith; separation of mail for an entire city to respective delivery stations; separation of mail for all carrier routes out of a given delivery station; and many other complicated separations. His qualifications for advancement also require a knowledge of classification of mail matter, rates of postage, amounts of fees, courteously serving the public, and assuming responsibilities of finances. The letter carrier, in addition to knowing his route thoroughly, must start his day at an early hour, and in any kind of good or miserable weather serve his patrons faithfully.

The present plight of postal workers is, and always has been, in the lap of Congress. Adjustments can only be made through legislation by our Senators and Congressmen in Washington.

UNITED STATES EXAMPLE UNWORTHY

As legislators for the greatest and wealthiest country in the world, Congress advocates and sets standards for the rest of the world to follow. When strikes occur, and when differences of opinion arise between management and labor, Government with mediation and conciliation officers often steps in and effects adjustments at standards far in excess of that provided for postal and other Government employees.

Adjustments in private industry usually result from deliberations by representatives numbering 3, 4, or 5, from each faction, with possibly some one or two representatives of Government. Postal and other Government employees have no similar bargaining rights, nor are they privileged to enter into deliberations in equal strength with Congress. They must appeal to and gain favorable support of a 24-man Post Office Civil Service Committee in the House and a 13-man committee in the Senate, in connection with legislative bills. Following this, the bills must be presented to the whole Congress, and appeals for a favorable majority vote must be made to 435 Congressmen and 96 Senators. If legislation is successful up to this point it must be signed by the President.

Many pitfalls occur in this procedure, and even though a favorable majority sentiment is manifested; parliamentary procedure, failure of committees to meet, filibusters, and many other stumbling blocks result in no action. When no action is taken and Congress adjourns, the employees concerned can only sit back for another year and wait until the next session of Congress. If Congress adjourns sine die, the proposed legislation dies with it, and the procedure must be started over again.

This has occurred over and over again, and is the principle reason why salaries of postal and other Government employees are always lagging behind that provided in private industry.

The United States mails is a service intended for business, social, and general economic purposes. Its efficient existence is an absolute necessity for the betterment of every single activity from coast to coast, and border to border. Its efficiency, however, is rapidly diminishing because of low salaries being paid to employees engaged in handling the mails.

People qualified to perform the necessary work are unobtainable because of the low salaries and lack of other inducements, and steer clear of working in the service which is the very bloodstream of our country.

Women and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on the evening of March 17 the distinguished Representative from Utah, Mrs. REVA BECK BOSONE, delivered an able and informative address to a joint meeting of five women's civic clubs in Washington, D. C. In my opinion, this address, which is entitled "Women and Civil Defense," has national significance. I therefore ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN AND CIVIL DEFENSE

I have been asked to speak to you tonight on the place of the American women in our civil defense.

I have not given my talk a title but if I did, maybe I would adopt the newspaper style and call it "The Bomber Brings the War to the Woman." For today the front line is closer to the clothesline than at any time in our history.

Let me begin my talk by repeating a statement made at a recent meeting of a congressional committee. The witness, discussing some of the terrors of Bataan and elsewhere, said, "Among the first of our troops to cave in under the hardships and the cruelties were those who had nothing to come home to".

Now, ladies, I ask you to take that thought home with you and ponder over it. "Nothing to come home to"—"Something to come home to." There is a challenge. There is a responsibility. There is a duty. You will have other challenges, other responsibilities, other duties but you will never have a more important one than keeping America something worth "coming home to".

We on the home front are facing many situations we have never had to face before—situations which a few years ago we would have thought impossible.

But we are beset by a myriad of things which will demand answers. They cover every field of life.

There are the many problems of our organized civil defense—and those of you who take an active part in that will learn just how many.

There are the problems which are vital to civil defense but which are not listed as such.

There are the many things you patriotic women can do and will do—in addition to whatever regular duties you have.

There are so many things to do that I shall not presume to lay out any program for club women and will not attempt to set up any target at which you can aim.

Rather I will give you some of my ideas on women's responsibilities in times like these and try to point out a few of the many things which must be done.

I ask myself, "What is civil defense?"

To me "civil defense" means many things.

It is that vast program now taking form in our Federal, State, and local civil defense administration.

It is that vast program of the production line with women turning out the materials needed for peace and war.

It is that vast program of keeping our moral fiber strong and healthy under adverse conditions.

It is that vast program of nurturing our youth and preparing them for tomorrow.

It is that vast program of keeping a home a home in spite of "Hades and high water."

Yes, and even those women who go forth with their market baskets on their arms and stubbornly refuse to buy meat and thereby do more to make an effective price control than Congress has done are engaged in an important phase of civil defense.

So, with civil defense meaning all that, just where do you fit in?

Bombers might make you homeless—but you are still a woman.

The factory might call you from your kitchen or from your office—but you are still a woman.

Events may make you the top hand in the office, or might move you into the executive spot in the firm—but you are still a woman.

You might be clerk or carpenter, artist or author, laborer or legislator—but you will still be a woman. And being a woman you will have responsibilities which you could not shirk even if you would.

For that same Creator who decreed that woman would carry the child from embryo to birth also decreed that it was woman's responsibility to protect the human race and the family home against the ravages of war and pestilence—and that same Creator who heaped all that responsibility on the female of the species also gave her the strength and courage and fortitude to carry all those burdens and still have something left for times of greater emergency.

I shall touch only lightly on the part women will play in our organized civil defense program for the doors are being opened wide for you to get your knowledge along that line from experts. But I urge all of you who do ally yourself in any civil defense group to learn well the fundamentals of your job, for when crises come they come with unexpected suddenness and from unexpected angles and the good civil defense worker is the one who can quickly adapt himself to any shift in a situation.

In World War I we had no civil defense as we know it today. We did not have the problems. There was some sabotage, but that was the Army's headaches. Rolling bandages, passing out candy and cigarettes, keeping up the morale of the soldiers and sailors—those were the chief aspects of civil defense at that time. Then, too, the value of or the need for women in heavy industry was hardly even considered.

World War II saw women come to the fore in industry. And World War II saw America getting uneasy for the first time about the possibility of an enemy striking our cities and towns. Yes, World War II saw the birth of civil defense and, believe me, that baby has grown in the past 5 years.

Developments during the closing year of the war and in the years since the war indicate that America can be hit from the air. Developments of undersea craft call to mind that even with the subs of World War I, a daring German pig-boat crew crept into New York harbor and the men took turns at looking through the periscope at the harbor lights of our greatest city.

The adroitness of the present day saboteur and the many weapons with which he has to work—poison for drinking and ventilating systems, germs, plant infestations, explosives—in fact, chemical and biological material of many types and descriptions—make us aware that eternal vigilance is necessary.

The success of enemy attack, no matter what kind, will be in the inverse ratio to the efficiency of our civil and military defense.

Rather than catalog the many, many things for which the organized civil defense is responsible, let me give you a rough example. Because I am more familiar with the activity in the West, I shall use my home city of Salt Lake City and its neighbor, Los Angeles, as an illustration.

Should there be an attack on our west coast, Los Angeles and the cities in the vicinity would have, among other things, problems of exodus. Salt Lake City and Utah, on the other hand, would probably have problems of influx. Goodness knows how many people in southern California—I know several myself—who each have 20 and 30 gallons of gasoline buried in their backyards. They fear that if there is an attack, there will be a big traffic jam around filling stations and they plan on getting on their way early.

Utah believes that in case of an attack on the coast there will be literally thousands of persons who will make a hurried departure from the target area and head for high mountains. Accordingly, Utah is preparing one camp in the southwest corner of the State which will accommodate 10,000 refugees for a night or two. Then there will be at least two more camps of 10,000 capacity not far away. In the center and eastern portion of the State will be some more camps. Not only must there be plans and a considerable amount of actual material for these camps but arrangements must be made to keep the expected heavy traffic off the roads which would probably be jammed with either war or relief material. Obviously camps to house thousands of refugees who might never come cannot be fully constructed but such fundamental things as potential water supply, sanitary facilities, streets, roads, shopping centers must be far beyond the planning stage and there must be enough personnel and readily available equipment to handle such a load when and if it hits.

Should storms or road failures or some other things stop the refugees short of the regular camps, there must be preparations for field kitchens, field hospitals, field repair shops, and so on. And these things will not be of any value unless there is a communication system over which to order the proper things to the proper place and unless there is a transportation system to get them there. The age groups of the refugees, their physical and mental health, and the amount of their physical belongings will vary those problems of civil defense and woman's part in it.

Thus, while Los Angeles civil defense would be busy fighting fire, protecting health, preventing looting, guarding against sabotage, housing the homeless, allaying panic, fighting traffic jams, Utah would have a different type of problem. And if Salt Lake City and its military installations, its big copper and steel mills were to be the target, its civil defense would have to handle the problems of catastrophe and some other area would have to handle the problems of flight.

One could go on and on, thinking up not only possibilities, but probabilities. Each situation would be different and would call for a different approach. That is why I urge you who get into civil defense to learn well your task, for problems will be thrown at you from all sides.

But let us not in our discussion forget the fundamental thought of this talk—that no matter if a woman is filling a man's job, she is still a woman and has responsibilities which she will not shun.

It may be the school in your neighborhood; it may be your church; it may be the girl at the next desk, or the young fellow who is sick because he has to go to service, or the boy who is sick because he can't go; it may be the father who fears that he will lose a son, or it may be the mother who has, or it may be a girl whose hope for a home of her own and a family is out there somewhere facing only God knows what—but all around you, you will find small but important areas

of civil defense—things which are not in the book and things which you don't know just how to handle. But you'll handle them. You'll handle them because that's the woman in you.

In the years ahead you are certain to have new challenges from such things as juvenile delinquency, and I consider the successful meetings of those challenges a very definite part of civil defense, not only for our times but for our children's times.

Defects of one period have a habit of slapping us in the face in a later period. I am especially interested in the report of Senator LISTER HILL on draft rejectees. According to Senator HILL, 46 percent of the young men who have been drafted since 1948 were declared unfit for military service. These young men were in the age bracket of 19 to 25 years. Whether the malnutrition of the big depression—these boys were just babies then, many of them underfed and poorly clothed—whether their deficiencies today are traceable to their difficulties of 20 years ago, I cannot say, but I certainly believe that it might be the case.

Figures also indicate that in areas where there are good schools the number of boys found unfit for military service is much smaller than in those areas which have poor schools. That, to me, is another angle of civil defense which might be explored, for it seems to follow that those who fail in their duties during peacetime fail in their duties during war, and to me civil defense requires the best there is in all of us all of the time.

High taxes inspire demands for reduced expenditures, and it is surprising how often the suggestion is to reduce the expenditures for the most important but less tangible things we are doing for ourselves and our future. One of the places usually hit, or at least hit at, is our educational system. To me our educational system is even more important in war than in peace. For as war takes the man away from the home, and as economics force the woman to go to work, the school and the school teacher must fill some of the void in the life of the growing youngster. Maintaining our school systems at a high standard is a matter of civil defense at all times, for if we weaken our educational institutions 1 year, we shall pay for it dearly 20 years later. Today in our schools are the youngsters of the boys who fought in Asia and Europe for us, and unless we provide the best possible education for them we do a double wrong—we fail the soldier parent and the girl who makes America something to come home to and we do irreparable damage to the America of the next generation. Then there are the diseases of tension—a whole category of nervous conditions which show up in times of stress—and there is alcoholism which still defies solution and which could add to the problems of civil defense.

One of the big problems is going to be filling the jobs in the armed services that women can best perform and filling the jobs in industry that women will have to perform.

During the last war women did a magnificent job in the services and in industry. They may be called upon to duplicate that effort. But whether the job be in the armed services or in industry, the first consideration should be given to the women between 45 and 60 years old. Youth will still demand and get its own consideration. These older women have already reared their children and usually have a lot of time on their hands. My court experience has shown me that the woman between those ages is lost without her children and is hungry for something to do but exceedingly timid about going out of the home for training or to fill the position. There are many places which these women could fill admirably and I see no reason why the first call should not be for them. I am quite sure that the recognition would give them a great deal of satisfaction and happiness and would rebuild the ego of an age group that is apt to lose it.

There are seven or eight million women in this age group who are engaged in housework, and I am certain that from this reservoir a great number of capable persons could be brought into the services of industry.

The Department of Labor, which will have the responsibility of recruiting labor for industry, is already giving considerable thought to ways and means of getting women back into industry should the need arise.

Ten years ago there was a big pool of unemployed—more than 7,000,000 able-bodied men—who were ready and eager to get to work. In addition to that group was another huge pool of women workers who had not then given serious thought to getting into a job away from home. But things have changed. We have more persons employed now than ever before; our pool of unemployed labor is practically nil and the women who 10 years ago came to the rescue so to speak are either listed among the 60,000,000 who have jobs, or have passed into an older age group or have started raising a family of their own.

The problem of recruitment is going to be more serious as we get into the job of producing both guns and butter. According to reports the people in the public employment offices are already making plans to have the clubwomen of the Nation help them in some of their recruitment problems—sometimes actually filling some of the jobs, sometimes helping others fill the jobs.

But there is still another approach to job-filling which I shall pass on to you.

During World War II industry was on a 48-hour week a good bit of the time. Actually, however, the average workweek for that period was 45 hours. Just think of that! With millions and millions working in industry, an average of 3 hours a week per man was lost through absenteeism. Millions of days of production lost! This absenteeism was due to illness, accident, faulty transportation, crowding of nursery schools, time to catch up with home duties, and often just too much partying the night before.

Some of you women who want to make a real contribution to the war effort, look into that matter of absenteeism. Many of those millions of days lost might have been saved.

The problem can be approached from any number of angles. True, you can't just overnight stop accidents in industry, but you can see that you and your associates observe all the rules and regulations aimed at preventing accidents—not only on the job but in your home and in your automobile. You perhaps can't help someone from getting sick, but perhaps you can help them get better more quickly. You cannot take over the household duties for your neighbor, but maybe you can do some shopping for her or otherwise do things which will permit her to stay on that job that extra day. There are so many things, not part of your daily task, which you can do to help in the defense effort.

As I look at the educational films showing how to survive an atomic attack, I cannot believe that anything can be so fantastic and yet so real. It does not seem possible that atomic disaster—or even the disaster of a full-sized air blitz—can hit any city in this great country.

But fantastic as it might appear, such a catastrophe is entirely possible—cruelly and absolutely possible.

Somehow, awful though an attack would be, I do not fear for America. The American man has always done his job well, and the American woman will be standing right by his side sharing his tragedies, if there be any.

There is no difference between the modern American woman and her pioneer grandmother. The present-day woman may have finer clothes and softer hands but she has that same intangible thing called courage—the same urge to carry on and do her part to make America a home.

If a bomb spreads ruin, the American woman will be there to help remove the debris.

If there be sickness or accident, she will be there to nurse.

If the hand that guides the machine falls, she will step into the driver's seat and carry on.

Everywhere I look I see a task to be done and a woman moving quietly to do it. She knows a job need not seem important to be important. It need not be far away, it can be right at hand; it need not be heralded by a trumpet—it might be murmured by a heartbreak.

In this talk tonight I am not sure that I have told you anything you did not already know. I only hope that I have touched upon the things you feel. I know that each of you has already— nd in your own way—probed the field to see just where you could best fit into the task ahead. I know each of you will fill your niche and fill it well.

But if I were to presume to give you executive women advice, I would merely ask that you let your mother instinct—and what woman does not have that instinct—set your course for you. It will not steer you wrong. Let's keep America something to come home to.

Hospitals for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial, published in the February 22, 1951, issue of the Dodge County Independent, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This newspaper is published by Mr. Philip S. Duff, Jr., a very energetic and able young man in our State who has just recently been elected to the State legislature.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOSPITALS FOR DEFENSE

A nurse in St. Paul's Ancker Hospital was quoted as follows after the recent tragic explosion at the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company plant:

"Look at the terrible confusion which this blast has caused here. What would we do in case of an air raid?"

This exclamation dramatized the need for adding to Minnesota's total of 10,000 general hospital beds, not only to better meet the peacetime needs of our people, but also to provide facilities which will be urgently needed in case of war.

The particular need, it appears to us, is for more small hospital facilities in communities throughout the rural areas of Minnesota.

Should atomic bombs fall upon Minneapolis, St. Paul, or Duluth, most hospital facilities there will almost certainly be put out of action, for city hospitals tend to be located in or near the industrial areas which make prime targets for bombers. Then first-aid workers would have to fall back upon Minnesota's rural hospitals.

The Federal Hospital Construction Act is already a going concern. Several Minnesota communities have already received up to 50-percent aid under this program in the construction of small hospitals.

But appropriations for this hospital program are now awaiting congressional action, and there is some danger that these funds may be caught in the general rush to cut out nonessential domestic spending during this emergency period.

We heartily endorse this domestic economy—indeed, we believe that those governmental programs which merely allow us civilians to enjoy life a little more should be slashed to the bone—but we would think it a tragic mistake if something so essential to defense as rural hospitals should be included in this pruning operation. We commend Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and others who are endeavoring to obtain adequate grants for rural hospital construction.

Lax Security at Argonne Atomic Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the radio broadcast of Mr. Paul Harvey over the American Broadcasting System on Sunday evening, March 18, 1951, respecting the lack of security at the Argonne National Laboratory at Lemont, Ill.:

Good evening, Americans, last night I talked to a banquet of Legionnaires. Afterward, during the parade past the speaker's table, one said, "Thank God, Mr. Harvey, for your fearless defense of Americanism." For a moment I was taken aback.

For a long moment I wondered what Tom Jefferson or Dan Webster or Patrick Henry would say if they knew that in 1951 a man had to defend Americanism. And that he would be called fearless for doing it. But I know what the gentleman meant. It's not easy. But I'll tell you something, the credit is not rightly due me. The praise is not due the Harveys because it happens we have a secret weapon.

I've been attacked, smeared, and threatened by experts. They'd have silenced these broadcasts a long time ago except for one thing. It's the Harveys' secret weapon. You see, I come from a prayin' family. So we've got Stalin outmaneuvered. And, counting all my wife's prayin' relatives, we've doggone near got him outnumbered, too.

Now once before in history a lone little individual named David was underestimated, because his enemies judged his strength by the caliber of his slingshot. And a chap named Goliath ended up with a hole in the head.

I have only one voice.

But I have a rock called the truth in my slingshot. So look out, here it comes.

I have heard, unofficially, that a grand jury has been summoned for tomorrow in Chicago to weigh the evidence regarding Paul Harvey's recent midnight visit to the supersecret Argonne National Laboratory near Lemont, Ill., on last February 7.

There has never been any mystery about the purpose of my mission. But a congressional committee hearing which my friends and I have repeatedly requested has been put off and put off week after week.

I want the facts known. I was willing to do this quietly. But I want the facts made known. I'm tired of sitting on one of the biggest stories of my life and getting smeared in the process, just to keep from revealing the negligence with which our security regulations are administered.

But I can tell you this much:

Whoever gets the facts is going to learn, not just from me, but from many—I said many—witnesses—I said witnesses—how absurdly lax is the administration of those vital regulations in the hands of civilian scientists.

They're going to learn—now sit down for this—they're going to learn that one man entered the highly secret tech area, an area where not even guards are permitted without special credentials, was inside buildings in that vital area, telephoned his identity to the central switchboard to establish his presence, then after an hour left undetected.

And believe me this is just the beginning. There are those persons just waiting for me publicly to reveal secrets so they could pin my ears back and draw attention away from their own red faces. I am well aware that there are those persons who would like to see a grand-jury indictment hung over my head, then postpone indefinitely bringing the matter to trial.

They figure they can intimidate and frighten away my sponsors and my friends.

Well, let's understand each other.

It just happens that I have some of the finest sponsors you'll ever come across.

And they figure if this country is already totalitarian, then we might as well find it out now.

But we don't think so.

And another thing, this happens to be the American Broadcasting Co., where a man is innocent of wrongdoing until you prove differently.

I am satisfied that no grand jury properly apprised of all the facts will even bring an indictment in this matter, because my purpose, established with authorities in advance, was to protect our security.

Congressmen and others were apprised months ago of my plan and purpose.

But I want a congressional hearing now.

And if there is no congressional committee hearing even on the basis of what I have to say tonight, then I'm going to place this entire file in the hands of the Americanism committee of the American Legion and somebody's going to get mad.

You fellows should have learned by now that the American people can do anything, if they get mad enough.

If nothing else ever proved that, Pearl Harbor did.

It is unfortunate that in 1951 we've become so accustomed to a namby-pamby approach to everything and everybody, including our worst enemies, that when somebody comes along with a healthy circulation folks think he has a fever. Well, I think being an American is worth working at.

I didn't initiate this investigation, but I helped carry the ball, and for now I can take care of the tacklers.

And another thing—the investigator of the Office of Naval Intelligence and the guard who participated in this demonstration—when this investigation is over I want you businessmen across America who have been telling me for years that we stand for the same kind of an America to stand up and be counted, and offer these men the really good jobs they deserve.

This is not intended as a carte blanche indictment of Chicago University. I have made cash gifts to that university's school of medicine. There are many fine individuals on its faculty. But this Argonne installation operated by Chicago University scientists already has been the subject of congressional investigation when priceless uranium was misplaced out there. But that investigation got no place. Now, I have conducted an investigation of this same Argonne installation to prove security is lax and I have proved it lax.

The results of my investigation were intended only for official ears. With patriotic Members of Congress aware of my purpose, my plan, and my objective.

But if the scientists who run this laboratory want to explain this laxity in enforcing security regulations, they are welcome to use this microphone at a mutually convenient date. Here, gentlemen, you can talk to the "grandest" jury in the world—the American people. Either what you're doing in that area is secret or it is not. If it is not, then let us quit wasting taxpayers' money even going through the motions of guarding it.

But you know better. So, for now, I respectfully recommend that a military guard be placed around Argonne until we are sure this situation has been remedied and this can't happen again. Next time your midnight visitor might not be a friend.

Yes, Americans, my motive was and is to protect our security. I did enter the Argonne Laboratory. A loyal employee of that installation has been suspended because he put patriotism above his job. An investigator of the Office of Naval Intelligence has been fired because somebody's sensitive jurisdictional toes have been stepped on. Well, I risked getting shot purposely to focus attention on our insecurity. And I want something done about it. As Merlin Griffith, business agent of the guard's union, said: "If Harvey and his friends had been saboteurs, there would be no Argonne Laboratory left. Harvey should get a medal for what he did."

I neither expect nor want that. But I do want somebody to quit whitewashing and I want a congressional committee to get to the bottom of this maladministration of security regulations before we lose what few atomic secrets we have left.

I have pleaded for and waited for an investigation, by Marquis of Queensberry rules. Now let's get out into the middle of the ring where everybody can see and slug this out.

The public may have had the impression that my mission was not successful. Well, now you know differently. Now you know that one of the men with me, one of three unarmed men, spent a midnight hour inside buildings, inside the top-secret tech area—he could have carried a bomb in or secret papers out, because he left as he entered undetected.

Now you know this.

Now I'd like to give the rest of the facts, and the facts will be startling.

I want a subcommittee of the joint Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee to come to Chicago.

I recommend this procedure rather than a Washington hearing, because at a recent meeting of the Argonne Guards Union every guard—now get this—every single guard present voted yes, he wants to testify before a congressional committee as to laxity of security at the project.

And let's stop trying to do it quietly. Let's just do it.

Bring the whole committee if you want. Bring the whole Congress if you like.

Because, I'll tell you something: It isn't going to make any difference how many troops we send to Europe or how much budget we vote or how many more men die in Korea if our big secrets continue to slip though our fingers or our big weapons go off in our own back yard.

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more articles in the series entitled "Medicine in Crisis," by Mr. Selig Greenberg, writer for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, published in the city of Providence, R. I.

While these articles do not conclude the series, I feel that these, coupled with those previously published in the RECORD, present the high lights of the survey made by Mr. Greenberg that will be helpful to the Members of the Senate in their consideration of S. 337, which bill provides an emergency program of grants and scholarships for education in the medical fields.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin of March 8, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—PHILANTHROPISTS MADE POSSIBLE 1910–30 ADVANCES—GOLDEN AGE'S PASSING POSES PROBLEM OF FINANCING RESEARCH, EDUCATION

(This is the tenth of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

If you should mention the late John D. Rockefeller to an average group of Americans, what idea would the name evoke in their minds?

The chances are they would think of a wizened, crochety old gentleman giving away shiny new dimes to people. Probably not one of them would associate the name with the unparalleled achievements of medicine during the past few decades, with the conquest of many deadly diseases, with the remarkable application of hormones, vitamins and antibiotics to the control and treatment of illness.

And yet, many of these dramatic advances would not have been scored if it had not been for the generosity of Rockefeller and, to a lesser extent, other philanthropists. If it were not for the vision of these men of great wealth, American medical education—with all that it involves in top-notch research and practice—would not be what it is today.

UNPRECEDENTED PHILANTHROPY

A combination of unprecedented philanthropy and fundamental discoveries in the medical sciences, of money and ideas, between 1910 and 1930 gave American medicine what might be called its golden age. We are still reaping the harvest of the seeds planted during those years.

That era is now over, and its passing confronts us with a problem of the first magnitude, namely: How are we going to pay for the kind of first-rate medical education and research without which it is impossible to have high-quality medical care?

In 1910 the education of doctors was a largely self-supporting enterprise. Tuition collected from students was the main source of support of medical schools, investment in faculty and plant was small and teaching standards were low.

Then came the study of medical education by Abraham Flexner which exposed the inadequacy of most schools. Out of it emerged new patterns of medical training and of its financing through large philanthropic foundations. The succeeding 20 years constituted, as one authority has described it, "a unique and sheltered period, a kind of hiatus during which dependence upon the community dollar was reduced to practically zero."

It was lucky that realization of the need for a new level of medicine came at a time when holders of great wealth began to become conscious of their responsibility toward society. These men sought competent guidance in their philanthropy which made for selective giving.

Between 1910 and 1930, about $200,000,000—which is the equivalent of half a billion in terms of today's purchasing power—was poured into the Nation's medical schools by philanthropic foundations in endowment and gifts for construction and maintenance of plant.

USUALLY OVERSUBSCRIBED

Eighty million dollars of this was Rockefeller money. This money was given on a matching basis. The only string attached to it was that at least an equivalent amount be raised from other donors. The resulting drives for funds were usually oversubscribed. Johns Hopkins, for instance, got $8,000,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation and raised $12,000,000 more.

Much of the money was given to the better schools to develop them as pace setters. This gave tremendous impetus to medical research and education. Medicine is now taught in an entirely different way than it was before John D. Rockefeller had his vision. If your sick child recovers quickly because of a dose of aureomycin, if you can be fairly sure of excellent medical care when you call a doctor, it is because Rockefeller and a few other men paid a large part of the bill.

But now we have to start thinking about paying much of the bill ourselves.

The age of fabulous wealth is over. High income, inheritance, and corporation taxes arising out of a changed economic and social philosophy now preclude the accumulation of individual wealth on a large scale. The medical schools can no longer expect many large gifts and additions to their endowment. The philanthropic foundations remain an important source of support. But they are no longer contributing toward endowment and are confining themselves instead to the financing of specialized research and of experimental teaching projects.

This development has reached its peak at a time of inflation and increasing medical school costs resulting from ever-expanding functions. It has come just when the lower interest rate on invested funds has reduced income from endowment. It has coincided with increasing obsolescence of plant and equipment.

NO SUCH GIFTS IN SIGHT

According to an exhaustive study of medical finances whose findings were reported yesterday, the schools need an additional $40,000,000 a year in operating funds and a great deal more if they increase enrollment. Forty million dollars is the annual return on an endowment of a billion dollars at an optimistic interest rate of 4 percent. There are no such private gifts in sight.

This leads to the conclusion, in the opinion of experts, that we will have to turn to the tax dollar for a large part of the bill.

What concerns many authorities are not so much the political implications of such a step as these questions:

Are the American people prepared to pay the cost of educating doctors and supporting research of the caliber which philanthropy has shown to be possible? Is it possible to finance top-flight medical education and research on a broad base requiring popular consent? Or will the transition from private to public support lead to a lowering of standards?

What many of us have failed to realize is that neither the doctors themselves nor the patients have paid the full cost of medical training. For years this function was subsidized by the largesse of multimillionaires. But now Santa Claus is gone.

American society faces a fateful decision at a time when new horizons are beckoning in medical science. We are on the threshold of great new discoveries. Major advances in chemistry, physics, biology and psychology remain to be translated into terms of medical progress. Heart disease, cancer, polio and other enemies of mankind are still to be conquered. Preventive medicine is in process of changing the whole concept of health care. Are we to go forward or backward? We will be answerable for our decision to our children and grandchildren.

[From the Providence Journal of March 10, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—UNITED STATES MEDICAL SCHOOLS LOOK TO TWO SOURCES FOR HELP—HOPE CONGRESS WILL ENACT SUBSIDY LEGISLATION DESPITE AMA OPPOSITION; EXPECT TO PRESS CAMPAIGN FOR CORPORATION GIFTS ALREADY UNDER WAY

(This is the eleventh of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The Nation's hard-pressed medical schools are looking forward to possible financial relief from two sources.

First of all, they hope Congress will enact subsidy legislation this year, despite the opposition of the American Medical Association.

Secondly, they expect the wraps may soon be taken off a campaign for corporation gifts for medical education which has been quietly under way for nearly 2 years. This drive, sparked by President James B. Conant, of Harvard, and headed by former President Herbert Hoover as honorary chairman, aims to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually.

Top medical educators are aware of the danger of becoming overdependent on Government funds and are eager to develop untapped private sources of support. But they have reached the conclusion that philanthropy alone cannot do the job.

FIRST FORMAL SPLIT

This conclusion has led the Association of American Medical Colleges to its first formal split with the AMA, whose opposition killed the Federal aid bill last year. The measure was reintroduced early this year, and medical school deans are working vigorously for its passage.

The new bill, which recently won unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, calls for a 5-year aid program for medical, dental, and nursing schools at an annual cost of $50,000,000. Of this, $40,000,000 would be spent to help the schools maintain their present enrollment and admit additional students and $10,000,000 would go to toward the cost of construction and equipment.

The medical schools would get a subsidy of $500 a year for each student they now have and of $1,000 for every new student. Scholarships for needy students also would be provided.

ORIGINAL BILL IN 1949

The original bill was introduced in the Senate in 1949 under bipartisan auspices. Its early draft set a ceiling of 50 percent on the proportion of the budget of any school that might be met by Federal grants. AMA representatives held out for a ceiling of 30 percent, and the figure was finally reduced to 40 percent. Other changes also were made in the measure at AMA insistence before the Senate passed it by a unanimous vote.

When the legislation went to the House, its passage was generally considered assured. In December 1949, the AMA house of delegates approved a report by its council on medical education and hospitals which said that while the council was "not entirely satisfied" with the bill, it contained "safeguards that should protect the medical schools from unwarranted interference in their affairs by the Federal Government."

But several months later the AMA suddenly changed its tune and announced its opposition to the measure. Proponents of the legislation compromised further and gave in on the AMA's demand for a 30-percent ceiling. But this failed to mollify the AMA. As a result of its lobbying, the bill was finally tabled by a House committee by a one-vote margin and never reached the floor of the House.

SUMS UP OPPOSITION

Dr. Donald G. Anderson, secretary of the AMA Council on Medical Education, sums up AMA opposition to Federal subsidies as follows: "We do not believe the possibilities of securing adequate support from voluntary sources have been thoroughly explored. Nor are we convinced that any of the legislation so far proposed insures the freedom and independence of the schools."

Among those who strongly dispute this assertion are Dr. Alan Gregg, director of the medical sciences division of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Dr. George Packer Berry, dean of Harvard Medical School and president-elect of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Dr. Gregg told this reporter that he could see no alternative to large-scale Federal aid. "The medical schools," he said, "are on the danger list and in desperate need of a transfusion, much of which can come only from public funds."

"We now spend more than a million dollars a year in Federal funds at Harvard Medical School," said Dr. Berry, "and it has come to us without any strings attached or any effort to control us. I see no ground for apprehension if the schools maintain a proper balance between their own funds and Federal grants."

DISPUTE IS ACADEMIC

Dr. Dean F. Smiley, secretary of the Association of Medical Colleges, commented that "this whole subsidy dispute is academic, as the medical schools already are getting millions of dollars a year in Federal grants for research and teaching in certain specialized subjects which have been neglected."

Qualified observers believe that, aside from its distaste for too much competition, the AMA dreads Federal subsidies because they would establish the principle of Government responsibility in medicine and might be a stepping stone to compulsory health insurance. These observers nevertheless feel that the AMA, in view of the threatened serious shortage of doctors as a result of the national emergency, may reverse itself again and abandon its opposition.

The AMA voted last December to contribute $500,000 to help bail out the medical schools and is now urging its members to donate $100 annually for this purpose. In view of the fact that the schools have a deficit of $10,000,000 a year and would need millions more to expand, this action was described by the dean of one leading medical college as "a fancy but futile and utterly inadequate gesture."

BANKER IS DIRECTOR

Leaders of the drive for corporate gifts for medical education have withheld public announcement of the campaign because they want to satisfy themselves first that substantial amounts can be raised. It is reliably reported that many of the country's biggest corporations already have pledged sizable contributions. The list of sponsors of the appeal is studded with some of the top names in American industry and finance and also includes the presidents of the A. F. of L. and CIO.

The campaign is under the active direction of S. Sloan Colt, president of the Bankers Trust Co. of New York. Among the men on its board of trustees are Owen J. Roberts, Robert P. Patterson, Winthrop W. Aldrich, Albert P. Sloan, Jr., Ernest T. Weir, Thomas J. Watson, and Winthrop Rockefeller. Its prospectus, which has been sent to leading corporations throughout the country concedes the need for Federal aid and asks for private gifts to create "a balance between two great sources of support."

Pointers on Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that an editorial entitled "Pointers on Point 4," published in the Washington Post of March 13, 1951, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This is a discussion of the point 4 program as presently developed, and with emphasis upon the Rockefeller report, recognizing and pointing out the need for greater expansion of our economic assistance to underdeveloped and underprivileged areas.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINTERS ON POINT 4

Since the President launched his concept of point 4, the times have changed and the free world is now engrossed in an emergency calling for speedy and ramified rearmament. This of necessity governs the average man's approach to point 4. The Rockefeller report, recognizing the intervening event, would enlarge, not contract the over-all program so as to handle certain defense requirements. The defense needs scheduled to be so absorbed are highly significant. One is the encouragement of raw material exploitation for the service of our defense effort, another is the kind of preclusive buying that was done in the last war by the Board of Economic Warfare.

Some doubts will arise over this organizational plan that the Rockefeller board suggests under the aegis of an Overseas Economic Administration. We don't see how defense development could be dovetailed into the comprehensive job which the Rockefeller committee has outlined. There are several reasons for keeping apart defense and nondefense operations; for instance, the idea of point 4 might get adulterated in foreign particularly nonwestern, minds if they were lumped together. Surely defense enterprises should fall within the domain of the ECA and the military working together.

The idea of an over-all agency may have some merit in respect of nondefense work. Those who have watched with respect the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, for instance, will doubtless put up a case for separate existence. However, the central agency would have a sort of federation-like framework, providing for regional work and making provision for autonomy of the institute. Indeed, the set-up of the institute would be copied elsewhere. Another problem in respect of organization: Authority in foreign parts would doubtless come from centralization, but it would be at the expense of the good name that has been won by ECA.

On our part we would like to see criteria set up ahead of organization. With criteria fully accepted by Congress and Executive, the organization problem could easily be solved. Yet there is little attention to criteria in the Rockefeller report beyond the twin need of combating subversion and doing away with hunger, poverty, disease, and illiteracy. This is a millennial task, not a criterion.

First among the criteria in lifting the lot of "the 1,075,000,000 inhabitants of the so-called underdeveloped areas" should be that any specific project must be viewed in the light of what it will do to relieve population pressure. Puerto Rico is a hideous example of what "meddling with death" has done to make the inhabitants more rather than less miserable. Many of the areas put within the orbit of point 4 operations have a similar population problem. All Asia, except the Philippines, is, indeed, pullulating with breeding, and our occupation policy in Japan has accentuated the population problem in respect of Japan. Health experts have been welcome in Japan, but Mrs. Sanger, though free to visit in pre-MacArthur days, is barred. It would be the height of folly to make Asia a gigantic Puerto Rico.

On this point the emphasis on the eradication of human disease has other limits. An example will suffice. India is said to have the highest incidence of tuberculosis, but if you go to India and set up an anti-tuberculosis station in, say, Travancore, the station would be relatively worthless. For there are not the doctors in Travancore to man it.

Perhaps the second criterion may involve something of the chicken and the egg attitude. But projects of the nature outlined in this report require as a sine qua non to be politically integrated in the recipient country. It is simply making matters worse to saddle a country still in the dirt-road stage of development with the industrial equipment of modern America. All nations, to be sure, want that equipment; no country any longer thinks of itself as fit to hold its head up unless it has a steel mill. Is this, however, the way to build up a spirit of interdependence? Another consideration is the need for awareness that the burden of repayment is not crushing, as in the case of development works in being in Afghanistan and in the case of those in prospect in Iran.

Nor is there any point in making a showcase out of part of a country which is torn in civil strife. There are those, for instance, who think that the North Koreans were encouraged to fall on South Korea by the spectacle of economic improvement that the United States had introduced. By political integration, too, we mean receptive administration. In India a deadweight of superstition is basically responsible for the food deficit, and, till this is relieved, no effort of the outside world can solve the Indian problem. Elsewhere it is imprudent to put up works in a country where the administrators have been habituated to pocket the petty cash.

The attitude of mind of the affected country is all-important in this great economic

offensive. It will make the difference between success or failure—whether or not a venture will be "operation rathole" to the American taxpayer and the people aimed at. To put a premium on peculation, on reliance, on making the rich richer and the poor poorer, on economic top-heaviness, or on political strife is no business to indulge in. To be sure, the Rockefeller board recognizes this, but we should like to see some insurance by way of criteria.

Now a fine and noble idea is enshrined in point 4. It is the idea of spreading our know-how, and tendering our show-how, to other countries that want it. This country has grown rich in part upon the plants and other things that our agricultural and commercial explorers, beginning with Jefferson and his rice, have brought back to America. A reciprocal service is due now that we have grown into a great world creditor. There are a hundred ways in which our technology can benefit the world, including ourselves. Much of it lies in the files of the Department of Agriculture. The world should be encouraged to come and get it; a roster of experts should be compiled whose services the underdeveloped countries could draw upon. The central idea should be to enable underdeveloped countries to do better what they already do, and to shake themselves out of the toils of the planter economy associated with colonial development.

Enough has been done already in this respect to be impressive. We have seen what ECA has accomplished in Greece, as, for instance, in converting swamps into rice paddies, in preventing spoilage of olive oil. Technical assistance this is called, and it is technical assistance that lay at the root of the President's bold new program. It is untrue to suggest, as could be deduced from the Rockefeller report, that you need roads and medical service to install badly needed tube wells in India.

On top of defense work and point 4, the report, which almost defies absorption in a single gulp, recommends that the Overseas Economic Administration should be empowered to encourage public works and private enterprise. Here a link with the World Bank is proposed. For public works an International Development Authority would be established in a management contractual relation with the World Bank. A finance corporation is also provided for, also relation to the World Bank, and tax and other incentives to American investors are mentioned as part of this scheme to use American dollars for development. It is to be hoped that Congress will not be affrighted by this ambitious report, but will set to work and hammer out criteria and the machinery for the realization of the idea back of it.

Who, Other Than General MacArthur, Is Capable of Giving Us a Complete and Authentic Story on Asia Equal in Fullness and Authenticity With the European Story of General Eisenhower?

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, months ago I called to the attention of Congress and the American people the necessity of Gen. Douglas MacArthur returning immediately to the United States for the purpose of reporting to the Congress and the American people of our true situation in Asia. But no action has been taken in recalling the general.

In the meantime, what has happened? General MacArthur in a recent interview with American newspapermen flatly stated that in his opinion we are destined to be tied down indefinitely to a stalemate in Korea, while we continue to spend men, money, and munitions against puppet troops of the Kremlin thrown at us by Mao Tse-tung, Chinese Red leader. General MacArthur issued this warning when he said:

> This situation can wear us down and weaken us by costing Communist Russia very little.

The general pleaded in his interview for the right to fight a winning war, which is denied him by a United Nations debating society in which so-called allies who place their Asiatic trade interests above the fight against communism, outvote us, road-block us, and circumvent our diplomats.

We all know that during the next few weeks this Congress will be asked to implement national defense spending to the extent of $40,000,000,000 or more, and some say this is just the beginning. This is a huge sum of money which must come from the hard-pressed taxpayers of America. To continue to spend this money with the knowledge that we face an indefinite military stalemate in Korea would certainly indicate the imperative need of appraising the military situation in the Far East, in the same manner that we surveyed the military situation in Europe through the eyes of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower.

We are told that the military needs of Europe will require many American divisions, and billions of American dollars will be necessary to provide arms for the defense that Europe finally decides to establish for herself.

At the same time we read repeatedly of British, French, and other North Atlantic Pact nations letting steel, jet engines, rubber, and other vital war materials and fabricated products go behind the iron curtain.

While all this goes on in Europe, the major military strength of the United States is now tied down in Korean areas on what the President calls a police action, but which General MacArthur tells us is rapidly developing into a military stalemate which has to date cost us more than 52,000 casualties and a merely estimated cost in money and military supplies.

In other words, we are so far committed in Korea that we cannot withdraw and at the same time maintain our prestige in the Orient.

General MacArthur in his interview with representatives of the American press stated flatly that our forces cannot win a decisive victory in Korea unless they are permitted to fight an all-out war north of the Yalu River or wherever military necessity demands. At the moment General MacArthur and our forces have been refused that right and are literally fighting the Korean war with one hand tied behind their backs.

Why should not Congress and the American people be given the story of the Asiatic situation from the lips of General MacArthur just as the administration with a lot of fanfare gave us the European story through General Eisenhower.

Who, I ask, other than General MacArthur, is capable of giving us a complete and authentic story on Asia, equal in fullness and authenticity with the European story by General Eisenhower.

If General MacArthur could leave Tokyo to confer mysteriously with President Truman at Wake Island, why is he denied the opportunity to come to Washington temporarily for the purpose of telling the Congress and the American people what they are entitled to know.

How can the Congress intelligently appropriate tax-raised dollars to finance military strength or discuss the allocation of American military power without knowing the truth about what is needed in Asia as well as in Europe?

In all fairness, I ask, why does General MacArthur get only lip service from the White House whether it be in Washington or Key West, instead of the military divisions and solid effort by United States representatives in the United Nations to untie the General's hands and let him fight?

In my opinion, the administration is afraid to let General MacArthur come back because he would tell Congress under questioning what the American people want to know and what they are entitled to know.

Yes; if General MacArthur were to come back to the United States and tell Congress and the American people the true story on Asia, he would neutralize the Truman administration's concept that world war III can only be won in Europe even though it is the belief of many top-ranking military men that Russia will never attack in Europe until Asia is secure. What concept is right?

There is no doubt from General MacArthur's statement that we are being blocked and bled white in Korea.

Therefore, let General MacArthur come back here and give us a first-hand report of what our job is in Asia and what it is going to cost us in manpower and money to break this military stalemate and win a decisive victory.

Where Are Our Ships?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the March 1951 issue of the American magazine, written by Mr. Theodore Brent, president of the Delta Line. Mr. Brent has very ably reviewed the status of our merchant marine and has called

attention to the necessity of Congress taking immediate action to put it in shape for service in the event of a national emergency.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE ARE OUR SHIPS?

(By Theodore Brent, president, the Delta Line)

In recent months we Americans have watched the threat of another war grow daily more ominous. At this writing the world seems about to fall around our shoulders. Our taxes have been increased. Our credit has been curbed. Our use of certain materials has been limited. Grudgingly, but necessarily approvingly, we have watched Congress appropriate billion after billion for a war which may never come but which might strike us tomorrow.

Our billions—all from our new taxes—are going into the training of armies, the building of planes, the buying of guns, the manufacture of bombs and bullets and supplies. Belatedly, but at last, we are trying hard to catch up.

But ever since we began this new build-up one unanswered question has been nagging me: If we get our men and our planes, our guns and bombs and supplies in time, how are we going to transport them over the thousands of miles of seas to wherever our next theater of war may be?

The only answer I can come up with is this: We aren't. The Navy hasn't enough ships of the type necessary to do it. Certainly our woefully inadequate merchant marine can't do the job, although in every war in our history we have depended on our civilian ships to do it. But our Government is doing next to nothing about rebuilding our merchant marine as an essential arm of national defense. It is passing the buck and ducking its responsibilities.

Even if war were not a threat, this bumbling, unbusinesslike attitude on the part of the biggest business in the world may lead us to further tragedy, one which could tumble us from our present eminence as a world economic power, and consequently affect millions of us individually through a decrease in employment, a lowering of wages, a necessary cut-back in production because of our inability to market our surplus products at prices guaranteeing reasonable profits to those who operate under our free-enterprise economy.

America's shipping industry today is inadequate—in contrast with that of several foreign nations—for five reasons: (1) The majority of the merchant vessels operating under the American flag are too slow to outrun submarines of our potential enemies in time of war; (2) the number of ships which can compete with foreign vessels and which can serve efficiently as troop and supply transports in time of war is too small; (3) at least one-third of the life of our good merchant ships is already spent and before long they will become obsolete together; (4) the huge fleet of World War II cargo vessels now in mothballs comprises ships uneconomical to operate and therefore virtually worthless to commercial shipping companies in peacetime; and (5) any suggestion of development or expansion with the assistance of Government funds—in the manner of virtually every other nation in the world—is pooh-poohed by Government authorities as "unrealistic and unnecessary."

Twice within the past 33 years we have plunged into war without sufficient ships to transport our men and arms and supplies to the areas where they were needed. Frantically we built huge fleets of uneconomical emergency-type ships. In World War I, few, if any, were completed before the Armistice. In World War II, hundreds of them were used, but few of them were worth more than their sale price in scrap when the war was over.

Today we are following the pattern drawn after World War I. Then we depended for years solely on our war-built ships to service our merchant marine. Few new ships were constructed. Consequently, when all of them began to fall apart at once—in the early 1930's—we were caught without sufficient ships to carry our exportable goods. We're approaching again that same situation.

Every attempt to improve this situation by shipping operators has been stymied by a vacillating foreign policy, by congressional confusion, by complacency and ineptness in Federal bureaus and departments, by a lack of understanding of maritime problems, and by the lack of a well-founded and publicly stated maritime policy that would help us drag ourselves out of the minor role in foreign trade into which we may soon sink.

There are two reasons why we must have a powerful merchant marine: national defense and internal economy. The need of a fleet of transports capable of carrying our armies and their weapons and supplies is obvious. Without such ships we might just as well sit back and wait for some other power to attack us. But the effect of an inadequate merchant marine on you and me individually is a much more obscure, complex problem.

America is a power in any association or agreement of nations into which it enters, primarily because of the abundance of everything that it possesses—our abundance of manpower, of materials, of skills. America bears the greater load of the Korean War and of the occupation of Japan and Germany because we have an abundance of money, men, and machines. America's voice is powerful and respected in all international conferences on any subject or situation because of the abundance with which we can back up our diplomats. In the eyes of other nations America is affluent, fertile, generous, but—vulnerable.

Many of us, I think, don't realize that America's export and import industry is dependent not only on America's abundance, but on the respect which other countries accord us in certain international shipping conferences which set the rates for the haulage of every type of commodity from one area of the world to another. Every country engaged in carrying certain goods has a voice in the rates, but, naturally, those nations which haul the most carry the heaviest voice when it comes to a vote. If you want a voice you have to carry the goods. You can't carry the goods without ships.

If our merchant marine is permitted to deteriorate—as it seems to be now—our stake in all these conferences will be thrown overboard automatically, as it was during the First World War, when our foreign competitors increased rates on our exports as much as 1,000 percent, and those nations which can continue to operate vessels in strength will once more gain control of the shipping rates. Their votes will strike first and foremost at shipping rates on commodities exported from America, in which they are in competition with American lines and American products.

If Great Britain, for example, can sell her automobiles in South America at a price greatly under that of American machines, she has a good chance of cornering the market. If Great Britain—through superiority in ships—can control the rates on the shipping of American-made cars to South America she can increase those rates to the point where an American manufacturer will be unable to make a profit on a sale. British-made cars—shipped cheaply—could be sold at a profit for prices less than ours.

Production at Detroit factories, let us say, would have to be cut, because the market for American-made cars would be sharply reduced. The British could refuse to carry American-made cars even at prohibitive rates and could take only their own makes into South America. Employment in Detroit—in a dozen other cities which supply that city with parts and assemblies—would be cut. Wages, too, would drop. A man in Indiana who runs a lathe that makes a part that is used in a certain sedan could be laid off because there would not be enough demand for that part.

It's complicated. But it's logical. A dwindling, inadequate merchant marine could hurt us individually and on a national scale as much as a strike in major industry affects a single city.

As an example of Government interference in industry's attempt to rebuild an adequate merchant fleet let me tell you about a ship which the company that I represent—the Delta Line—wanted to build in 1947. Delta operates cruise-cargo ships between New Orleans and South American east coast ports, runs on routes which the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 designated as "essential" and, therefore, to be served at regular intervals in the best interests of the United States.

Our ship, as we planned her, would carry plenty of cargo along with about 250 passengers and would make 16 or 17 knots. We asked the Federal Maritime Commission for approval of the plans—necessary because she would be built and operated under Government subsidy. The Commission approved these plans. In fact, we were ordered by contract to build the ship because she would provide an essential service as determined by law.

Then the Navy stepped in. Twenty knots, said the Navy. Two feet wider to improve damage stability. Two more bulkheads. Increased size of auxiliary machinery. With these and a few other alterations the Navy could convert our ship into a fast attack-transport capable of carrying 4,000 troops, their munitions and supplies, anywhere in the world, and sustain them for 30 days. The Navy was looking ahead.

We didn't object. In fact, the whole idea was great. The new ship would fill a gap in our service and provide a superb weapon of offense and supply if the threat of war should materialize.

We went ahead and spent $250,000 for plans, secured construction bids, quietly cheered when Congress appropriated $16,000,000 for her. It looked as if the American merchant marine might finally come back into its own, that we would play an active part in the renaissance.

The keel of our ship has never been laid. She is still only a dream. The $16,000,000 has been allowed to lapse, and there is little prospect that we or the Navy will soon get the ship which could mean so much to our national economy and to our national defense in these critical days.

The fact that this ship isn't available today can largely be attributed to the General Accounting Office and its penchant for assuming the right to make policy decisions. While we were going through the always prolonged preliminary throes of trying to start building our ship, the GAO questioned the amount of construction subsidy authorized for two other ships already being built by another line. GAO demanded an investigation. GAO got it, both of subsidies and of the Maritime Commission. The almost immediate result was the complete cessation of new construction of any ships under Federal subsidy, including ours.

These subsidies, controversial and misunderstood as most subsidies are, are necessary to the life of our merchant marine.

Only once, in time of peace, has any attempt been made to assure the American people that they would be served by an adequate merchant marine on a par with the needs of the Nation. That was following

1936, when the Merchant Marine Act was passed.

Two of its important provisions involved subsidies—one for construction, one for the operation, of ships. It was logical and, as I see it, necessary. For many, many years it has been possible to build a ship in Europe, for example, much more cheaply than in the United States, due primarily to lower labor costs. Under the 1936 act the Federal Government would pay the shipyard the difference between the cost of construction of a similar vessel in a foreign yard and the actual cost in an American yard. The buyer of the ship received none of the subsidy, simply contracted to buy the ship at the price based on foreign costs and operate it on an essential line for at least 20 years under the American flag. At the end of that time he would have repaid his mortgage to the Government.

American seamen live in the finest crew's quarters afloat. They are fed the best food. They are the best paid. In contrast, those of other countries are little better off than their predecessors of a half-century ago. So the 1936 act also provided that an operating subsidy be paid to ship operators who would run their ships on government-declared essential routes on predetermined schedules. The subsidy would amount to the difference between American and foreign costs in wages, subsistence, cost of stores, equipment, insurance, and repairs not compensated for by insurance.

No profit was guaranteed the operating line. In fact, any amount earned annually by the line over 10 percent was placed in a fund which, at the end of 10 years, was divided equally between the Government and the company, with the object of repaying, so far as possible, the subsidy to the Government. During the first 10 years, after 1936, of the operation of these essential routes, over 75 percent of the entire operating subsidy was paid back to the Government. Not a penny of the millions of dollars paid out annually in agriculture and other production subsidies is ever returned to the Government.

Another shipping line just recently rebid to charter three Government-owned vessels which it has been operating on a specific run. In accepting, the Maritime Commission said, "Fine, that's acceptable. But if you operate those three ships you must build two more 23-knot cargo-liners carrying 700 passengers each for the same route. Otherwise, no deal."

These new ships will have to receive both kinds of subsidy—construction and operation. But, in the present state of confusion, it is unlikely that any subsidy will be approved for some time.

The current mess, started by the General Accounting Office, was accentuated when Congress, at the urging of the administration and a report by the Hoover Commission, abolished last year the Maritime Commission, which had operated since 1936 and was under congressional rather than administration control, and replaced it with a three-man Federal Maritime Board reporting to the Secretary of Commerce. A 90-day temporary board was appointed. The appointees, not knowing if they would remain as such, did nothing. After their tenure, a new board of able men was gradually named. So far it has done nothing but batter its head against varied opposition from every other Federal department concerned.

As this article is concluded, the new Congress has made a beginning by reintroducing the enabling bills for the long-range program and has authorized a start on the construction of part of the proposed defense cargo-ship program.

Boiled down, the situation amounts to this: Every attempt since World War II by the shipping operators to expand, replace, or improve their fleets through new construction has been stymied by a vacillating foreign policy and by a lack of respect for the law which in 1936 authorized a shipbuilding and operating subsidy program, and by the lack of a well-founded and publicly stated maritime policy.

This, despite a law passed 15 years ago which definitely states:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

That's the law. But our operating merchant marine is no more capable of handling the requirements of a major war than it was in 1917 or 1941. At the time of Pearl Harbor we had little more than 1,100 cargo, tanker, and passenger vessels. Today we have about 1,150—plus 150 or so uneconomical Victory ships which were hauled out of mothballs for the Korean action. With few exceptions they are incapable of outrunning the fast submarines reportedly being built today by our potential enemies. (A recent survey estimated Russia's undersea fleet will number more than 1,000 by the end of 1951.)

I maintain that this course—our present governmental attitude toward our merchant marine—can lead only to disaster. If we are to consider the great number of vessels which we have tied up in mothballs, plus 80 Liberty ships which we loaned to Russia, we possess numerically the greatest merchant fleet in the world. But in actual fact the United States operates only 8 percent of the 13,000 merchant vessels in the world. England has in operation many more than double what we have. Norway, Sweden, France, the Netherlands, Russia, and Panama all operate fleets which may soon outstrip us in size and regularity of service and which eventually can take from us the relatively small percentage of our own export and import business which we now handle.

Since World War II the United States Government has sold 1,113 ships to foreign nations. Only 700 have been sold to companies operating under the American flag. Yet we spent something like $15,000,000,000 to build all our wartime merchant fleet and we have received or been promised less than $3,000,000,000 in return.

Most of our wartime merchant fleet of vessels probably will remain tied up, beam-to-beam—more than 2,000 ships—in the rivers and harbors of New York, Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Texas, California, Oregon, and Washington. There they have been coated with preservatives, are inspected frequently by maintenance crews, and are running up an annual bill of $8,000,000 to no purpose. Most of these vessels are slow, uneconomical Liberty ships built in the rush and confusion of the last war, ships that could more profitably be sold for scrap than stored as costly reminders of our last unreadiness. Yet this is the fleet on which we must depend in war.

Unless we begin immediately to build up our merchant fleet, by the end of the present decade all of our ships will be approaching obsolescence. They will be too slow to compete with foreign vessels. They will need increasingly more costly repairs. They will be impossible to operate at a reasonable profit. Then we shall be forced to turn over the transportation of our exports and imports to foreign ships.

Today the United States has the greatest export-import business in the world. We export huge quantities of raw materials and manufactured goods resulting from the excellence of our industrial system. Fifteen to 25 percent of all goods manufactured in the United States are exported.

Several ship operators, including my own company, would like to keep this business and, consequently, our merchant marine alive by acquiring many new ships for use on essential routes as the nucleus of a fast, efficient transport fleet in time of war. But, as I have already outlined, we are being thwarted by the fumbling of our Federal Government.

If it were within my power to implement a workable program for the reestablishment of our merchant marine as a world power essential to both our national defense and our national economy I would recommend the following steps:

The executive branch of the Government—preferably through the President—should definitely state that we need a strong merchant fleet capable of fulfilling our needs in peace and war as contemplated by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and that its construction and operation should be subsidized with Federal funds where necessary.

We should embark on a 10-year construction program of defense cargo ships costing approximately $8,000,000 each. At least 50 of these vessels should be started each year under a Government subsidy program. This program would cost approximately $400,000,000 a year—a mere nothing compared with our other defense expenditures—and from past experience there is an almost certain guaranty that half of that amount—$200,000,000 annually—will be returned by the operators through purchase.

We should immediately start the construction of at least 15 cargo-passenger ships which would incorporate features recommended by the Navy for their conversion into attack transports. At present, when a shipping line takes over a vessel built under Federal subsidy the 20-year mortgage applies to every ship owned by the company. In the case of passenger-transport ships—because of their high cost—the mortgage should apply only to that individual ship, so that if the operator lost money on it, he could return it to the Government with the loss of only his 25 percent down payment, plus any interim payments he had made, and the Government would get back a virtually new and valuable ship.

An American, whether he operates under a Government subsidy or not, should be permitted to build a Government-approved ship with a construction subsidy, provided he agrees to operate it under the American flag for 20 years. At present, only those lines which contract to serve essential routes are permitted construction subsidies.

Today any vessel must be operated by the shipping company for a minimum of 17 years before it can be turned in on a new subsidized ship. To reduce the danger of multiple obsolescence of many ships at once, the period should be reduced to 12 years.

The Maritime Board, at an appropriate time, should be returned to its status as a separate agency operating under the Congress from the Department of Commerce. Thus it would be less subject to political and department interference at or below Cabinet levels.

Once before—from 1932 to 1936—American maritime authority was vested in a board under the Commerce Department. It failed, hampered and harassed by politics and external argument. Little or nothing was done to improve the merchant marine.

We should scrap the Liberty-ship fleet tied up in our rivers and use the money from the sale of the steel as the partial basis of a new ship-construction program.

We should urge our Senators and Representatives to a greater understanding of the vital import of a strong merchant marine, and should demand from Congress a constructive program if the executive branch of the Government continues it uninterested policy.

We should reestablish, without delay, a program of fair and adequate construction and operating subsidies, so that we may compete on an equal footing with foreign shipyards and foreign operators.

We should, in other words, build up a merchant marine that will serve us as effectively as is necessary to our continuing advancement as the greatest and strongest Nation truly representative of democracy on the face of the earth.

Address of Hon. Sean MacBride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. In the midst of world-wide worry and tension, Mr. Speaker, many of us were privileged yesterday to enjoy a genuinely thrilling few hours. The foreign minister of a sovereign nation of Europe discussed the state of the nation he represents—both on domestic matters and international relations. Later in the afternoon he presented to the Library of Congress a reproduction of the world's most beautiful manuscript, the Book of Kells.

This manuscript is to go on display today. I hope all my colleagues will take advantage of the opportunity to examine it. When they do I hope they will have in mind the fact that the proud little Republic of Ireland took occasion to present this great work, which is the story of the life and death of Christ as told in the four gospels, at an hour in the world's history when all men need the inspiration—the renewed faith and confidence—which can come only from Divine Providence. We can be proud of this wonderful gesture of friendship. The world will have wiped out the cause of 95 percent of its woes when all nations can enjoy the kind of foreign relations which were exemplified here yesterday.

I include in the RECORD the address of Hon. Sean MacBride, Minister of External Affairs of the Republic of Ireland, delivered at the National Press Club luncheon, and his remarks at the Library of Congress when he presented the reproduction of the Book of Kells.

I include, also, the Washington Post account of the Irish Foreign Minister's address.

ADDRESS BY SEAN MACBRIDE, MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 14, 1951

The honor you have done me in asking me to be your guest here is one which gives me a very special pleasure. I have been a newspaperman myself and I have come here today simply as a colleague who happens to be Foreign Minister of a small nation which has very strong and ancient ties with America, to tell you something of how that nation stands today.

I am told that Irish names are not unknown in American journalism and, if so, there must be among you many whose parents and grandparents came from Ireland. The land they left was vastly different from the Ireland we know today. The Ireland of the last century was, in the material sense, one of the poorest countries in Western Europe. Her population was in process of being halved by the results of a famine on a scale that had been unknown to Western Europe since the Middle Ages. Today, Ireland is on the road to economic progress and development. Our wealth is reasonably well divided: we have no very great extremes of rich and poor. The rural slums, the ramshackle cabins, are nearly a thing of the past, and although there are slums still in certain of our cities, we shall, unless a general war or acute shortages wreck our plans with those of the rest of the world, get rid of these within about 10 years. Our population, which had been falling steadily, although at a decreasing rate, since the famine of the last century, is now taking an upward turn. Work is progressing on a $120,000,000 land development scheme and on drainage, rural electrification and hospital building schemes of a similar scale. The number employed in industry, though still small, is rising steadily.

I don't know if any of you, Americans with your history which has been no less prosperous than glorious, can appreciate what that means to an Irishman. It means that a nation which was nearly killed, whose life had almost ebbed away in the course of a long and agonizing struggle, is at last on the turn. The efforts of many Irishmen have gone to make this change and, not least, those Irishmen who worked and fought to secure for us the independence without which a nation cannot work out its own salvation. Since a measure of independence was obtained, successive governments have played their parts—that of Mr. Cosgrave, that of Mr. de Valera, and now Mr. Costello's government, of which I am a member. None of these governments has been infallible, but under all of them the work has gone ahead and is still going on. While the Ireland of today is no Utopia, one finds that atmosphere of hope and confidence which is lacking in many other countries today.

Much of the progress made in the last couple of years is attributable to the Marshall plan and in particular to the really constructive and helpful cooperation which we received from the ECA. The direct financial aid which we received was valuable but far more important in any view was the economic planning which we had to undertake in conjunction with the ECA. I have always held the view that in the long run the most permanent benefits that will accrue to Europe from the Marshall plan will be technical assistance and the system of economic analysis and cooperation resulting from a policy answered by ECA. I would like to avail of this opportunity of paying a public tribute to the far-sighted and constructive approach initiated by the ECA in Europe under the leadership of men like Paul Hoffman, Averell Harriman, and Bill Foster.

It is often suggested or implied by critics that Ireland is so preoccupied with her own affairs that she cares nothing for what goes on around her. I think it would be hard to put forward a suggestion that was more wholly misleading. It is not a question of whether the Irish people want to be internationally-minded or not; they cannot help being internationally-minded for they are an international people. An ordinary Kerry family may well have two uncles and an aunt in New Jersey, Chicago, and Springfield, Mass., a cousin in Montreal and another in Melbourne and probably a son or daughter in England or Scotland as well. With most of these they regularly correspond and I think that if some of our older people in, say Galway, were asked to draw a map of the world they might if they were not careful, show New York as being nearer than Dublin.

The people of Irish origin, scattered throughout the world and now playing their parts as citizens of other countries, still retain many of the characteristics of the people of the mother country. They are, for the most part, whether they be Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, religious folk, and they constitute a moral force and go to reinforce the stabilizing elements in the countries in which they are. They are a virile and active force within the community of free nations—the very sort of people, tainted neither with communism nor reaction, of which the west stands most in need. While they remain fondly attached to Ireland and look to Ireland for moral leadership they certainly do not look to Ireland for political leadership. They are loyal Americans, Australians, and Canadians, or citizens of the country in which they have settled. At home our wish is to play our part with them, as well as with the ancient European nations to whose sisterhood Ireland belongs, in the building and preserving of a just and free society.

What part is Ireland, in fact, playing in international affairs? I think that question is best answered by reference to the four international organizations with which we might be directly concerned: The United Nations, the Council of Europe, the OEEC, and the North Atlantic Treaty organization.

As regards the United Nations the position is that we applied for the membership several years ago, being willing to undertake the full responsibilities of such membership. We were, however, kept out by the veto of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—Russia. Ironical as it may sound, Russia says that she cannot regard us as a democratic or peace-loving country.

As regards the Council of Europe and the OEEC, we are members of both these organizations. In both of them our representatives have consistently adopted the progressive policy of favoring developments which tended toward a united Europe. In the OEEC we have favored greater liberalization of trade, and we are in a position to do so since our own trade policies are among the most liberal in Europe. In the Council of Europe we have supported every measure which tended to strengthen the Assembly as against the Committee of Ministers, that is to say, every measure which represented a step on the road to a parliament of Europe. This was the attitude which was taken up by a country which has been represented as stubbornly or narrowly nationalistic. In fact no nation has been so prompt as we have been to support the uniting of Europe and the free and voluntary merging of individual sovereignties. We are however quite as stubbornly nationalistic as the United States would be when it is suggested that we should surrender our rights or a portion of our sovereignty to another nation.

As regards the last organization, that of the Atlantic Pact powers, the position is

this: We were asked to join and we refused. You will want to know why.

I think on this vitally important question I cannot do better than take as my point of departure the cardinal principles of your own foreign policy, as set out in an admirable document, Our Foreign Policy, issued by your State Department.

These are the three points:

"We are an independent nation and we want to keep our independence;

"We attach the highest importance to individual freedom and we mean to keep our freedom;

"We are a peaceful people and we want to get rid of wars and the threat of wars."

We, in Ireland, would subscribe wholeheartedly to every one of these principles but, being historically less fortunate than you, we are forced to state them for ourselves in a somewhat different manner. This is how we have to state them:

"We are not an independent nation because a portion of it is still unfree but we want to achieve our independence;

"We attach the highest importance to individual freedom but many of our people have not got that freedom;

"We are a peaceful people but part of our territory has been taken from us by war and the threat of war."

These points which, as you will surmise, refer to the fact that part of our country, the six northeastern counties, is held under British rule, may seem exaggerated to you. They do not seem exaggerated to us or to the people, the majority in the greatest part of the British held territory, who want to be with us. I do not bring this problem before you because I expect that you, with the vast problems which you must debate every day, can concern yourselves with the intricacies of the methods by which this small territory, in defiance of geography, is held as part of Britain. I am not going to discuss, nor, I am sure, do you want to hear of the finesses of boundary drawing. Discrimination, gerrymandering and political police by which the entity known as Northern Ireland was set up and is maintained, but I do want you to know that that partition is the cause of such feeling in Ireland that no Irish Government could attempt, without immediately being driven from office, to enter into a military alliance with the power which is responsible for it. This is not one of those ancient grievances which we are supposed to hug to our bosoms. It is quite modern and very real and very present. It would be as impossible for an Irish Government to accept the article of the Atlantic Pact which binds each participant to respect the territorial integrity of the others as it would have been for Abraham Lincoln to accept the Mason and Dixon line as an international frontier. You do not accept the territorial integrity of a neighbor who is encamped in your garden. We are, I need hardly say, fully conscious of the gravity of our decision. Indeed, in our reply to the invitation to join the pact we suggested that, in the interests of the greater safety and strength of the chain of Atlantic defense, the members might discuss ways and means of solving the problem which precluded us from membership. Unfortunately, this suggestion was not acted on.

I wish to make it clear that there is no question of bargaining on this matter. It would be unworthy, both of the great issue involved—the future of the Atlantic community—and of the historic tradition of the Irish nation, were we to attempt to bargain on this. We are seeking our full freedom and independence as of right and we intend to get it.

The position then, in short, is that Ireland is willing and anxious to play her full part in international affairs, that she is already making a certain contribution but is prevented from doing her full share by two outside powers: Russia and Britain. I do not say that the policies or actions of these two powers are the same, or even comparable. All I do say is that they are inclined to look rather alike from where we sit. Both are powers with imperial traditions and to imperial powers the partitioning of small nations has always seemed expedient and, therefore, just. This was, and is, the policy of Russia in Poland. It has been the policy of Russia in Korea. In both cases the Russians found some Poles and some Koreans to support them, but in both cases the partition of a nation, a disaster in itself, leads to other disasters.

A nation is not a vague territory that can be cut up at will. It is a living, breathing thing. It is not easy to dig the grave of a nation, and when you have dug it, it is an unquiet grave. I think that you in this room who do so much to mold the policies of your great Nation, cannot do better than to reflect upon the cases of Poland, of Korea, and of Ireland, and to believe, contrary to the imperialistic maxim, that what is unjust can never be expedient, since there is something in humanity which stubbornly rejects, and in the long run overthrows, an unjust solution. I think that the greatest and the most effective political leaders, those whose work has been solid and enduring, are not the showy Machiavellians, or modern totalitarian dictators, with their contempt for people, and especially for people who were militarily weak or numerically insignificant, but the leaders who, like Washington and Lincoln, believed in human freedom as a guiding principle. Those who stand for that freedom have always been reputed damnably awkward people. It is, therefore, with no shame, but with pride, that I say that the Irish, still, stand for freedom and democratic rule and therefore may still be portrayed to you as damnably awkward people.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE SEAN MACBRIDE, MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND, AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, MARCH 14, 1951

Whether the Book of Kells—known of old as "the Gospel of Columcille"—was inscribed and illuminated in the ancient town of Kells is a question which has not yet been solved. The last few pages of the manuscript, which might have enlightened us on this point, have been missing for many centuries. But it is now generally accepted that the book was produced at the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century.

We know from an entry in the Annals of Ulster that the book was preserved in Kells in 1006. In that year the Annals record that "the great Gospel of Columcille was wickedly stolen by night out of the western sacristy of the large stone church of Kells. The Gospel was found after two months and twenty nights its gold having been taken off, and a sod over it".

For the next three centuries the famous manuscript continued to survive in the Monastery of Kells, now threatened by the violence and destruction of the Anglo-Norman invaders. Its association with Kells was finally broken in 1539, the year in which all surviving Irish monasteries were dissolved by order of Henry VIII. The manuscript was handed over to the care of one Henry Plunkett, probably a relative of the last abbot of Kells. A marginal note by Plunkett shows that some of the pages were missing in his day.

In 1661 the book became the property of Trinity College, Dublin, where it has remained ever since. Three hundred and thirty-nine pages long, it contains the Four Gospels in Latin, illustrated by pictures of the Evangelists and scenes from the life of our Lord. It is remarkable for the beauty of the writing, for the great variety of the capital letters, for the size of the initials on the monogram pages. It is the most elaborate Irish manuscript extant and the delicacy and beauty of the design are such that in the words of one observer "they might have been drawn in Paradise." Not without reason has the Book of Kells become known as one of the world's most beautiful books.

Now, after the lapse of 1200 years Swiss experts and Irish scholars, aided by modern color photography, have combined to produce this copy of the Book of Kells. It was, I understand, a slow and difficult task. There were more than 650 distinct shades in the book. Each page was photographed in Dublin, the photograph taken to Berne for technical treatment and printing then the proof returned to Dublin to be compared color by color, line by line with the original. Some pages went through more than 25 printings before the experts were satisfied.

One day, I understand, someone suggested that this was a needlessly complicated arrangement. Wouldn't it be better if the Book of Kells was flown to Switzerland? The Swiss expert scrutinizing print and original looked up from his task. "You can always replace an airplane," he remarked laconically—and that was that. The Book of Kells stayed in Dublin.

It is not without significance that this presentation takes place in the United States of America the greatest free federation of states which the world has ever known. The skilled reproduction which we see before us is largely the work of Swiss experts, men from the confederation of freedom-loving self-governing cantons which the outside world has grown to love and respect as Switzerland. The original Book of Kells was produced some 1200 years ago in an Ireland in which the individual tuatha, grouped into five kingdoms, presided over by one High King while sharing the same language, the same Brehon code of laws, the same rich folklore and literature, the same social life and customs, yet possessed a large measure of local autonomy and in fact formed a United States of Ireland.

On behalf of the people and Government of Ireland I am honored to have the privilege of presenting this copy to the Library of the Congress of the United States which has always given us its sympathy in our struggle to regain our liberty and to maintain the civilization and culture of which this book is an example.

REMARKS OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS, LUTHER HARRIS EVANS, ON THE PRESENTATION OF THE BOOK OF KELLS, COOLIDGE AUDITORIUM, MARCH 14, 1951

You Irish have a saying: "Glory be to God; it's the fine day that's in it." I use it now (employing a Texas accent) for you have made a fine day in this. But my pleasure in this afternoon is more than pleasure in a gift. The Library of Congress has—or had until a few minutes ago when last I looked—a book. No such book, to be sure as that of Kells, which, legend holds, was penned by Columba himself almost a millenium before Columbus provided the possibility of this repository for that magnificent reproduction you have entrusted to my care. No, our gratitude for your generosity is not confined to tangibles, but spreads beyond an obvious cupidity and a lamentable sense of proprietorship to the very race which makes it. Specifically, our gratitude goes out to the island people and their government, who have so lavishly enriched our collections. In sharing with us the greatest of your cultural monuments you continue a great tradition.

You have delighted the American audience with the luminous loveliness of Synge and the wit and daring of a vegetarian-musicologist who once called himself by a foreign name, Corno di Bassetto, and then emerged as George Bernard Shaw. Miss Horniman and the Abbey Theater players have brought delight to thousands in our stalls. Our poets have sought beauty by frank, unblushing trespass on the realms which Yeats made his. From James Stephens we have taken up the chase of leprechauns. A generation of my fellow citizens learned political science and political suspicion from the works of a great philosopher, Mr. Dooley. Don Byrne has interpreted for us the magic that is in your soil and on your tongues and of your hearts.

But there are modern instances. The Book of Kells stands for something else. In sharp contrast, its antiquity stands for ancient, rooted, friendships, its presence here, for the commonality of freedom seeking and freedom winning, its text for those ideals and energies and high resolves which hold the fairest promise of survival and a future. Itself a blend of supreme art and consummate craftsmanship it has neither counterpart nor counterfeit among the medieval manuscripts which destructive time has spared to us. Curiously, it inspires no argument but only firm agreement. It is by consent and honor the finest product of that unparalleled efflorescence of Irish achievement which set the fine example for Western Europe in the centuries following the fall of Rome. In the Middle Ages it was at once model and goad and challenge for the perfection of calligraphy, the eloquence of illumination, and the nobility of striving. It is a testament worthy of the testaments it contains. Today, after a millenium and more, it evokes the same wonder and enlists the same devotion that brought it into being.

And so, Mr. Minister, please say to them who dwell in County Meath, and to the officers and fellows of Trinity, and to all the men and women of your green land, that your magnificent message of many meanings has reached one who is, at least by marriage, Irish. That may be their comforting assurance that the Book of Kells is inalienable and safe and somehow still at home. And for the people of these States, in whose name I am allowed to speak, convey to your constituency a profound and sturdy gratitude.

[From the Washington Post of March 15, 1951]

IRISH FOREIGN MINISTER COMPARES BRITAIN TO RUSSIA

Sean MacBride, Ireland's 47-year-old Minister for External Affairs, said yesterday that his country wanted to play a full part in international affairs, but was prevented from doing so by two powers—Russia and Britain.

"I do not say that the policies or actions of these two powers are the same, or even comparable," MacBride said. "All I do say is that they are inclined to look rather alike from where we sit.

"Both are powers with imperial traditions and to imperial powers the partitioning of small nations has always seemed expedient, and, therefore, just."

Minister MacBride spoke at a luncheon of the National Press Club, and evoked a good deal of applause and laughter with his eloquence and wit. The main dish at the luncheon was Irish stew.

The Irish cabinet officer said that Ireland had been kept out of the United Nations by the veto of Russia.

"Ironical as it may sound," he said, "Russia says she cannot regard us as a democratic or peace-loving country."

He said that Ireland was asked to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but refused because the six northeastern counties of Ireland are held under British rule. He pointed out that any Irish Government would be driven from office if it attempted to enter into a military alliance with a power that is responsible for the partitioning of Ireland.

"This is not one of those ancient grievances which we are supposed to hug to our bosoms," MacBride said. "It is quite modern and very real and very present. It would be as impossible for an Irish Government to accept the article of the Atlantic Treaty which binds each participant to respect the territorial integrity of the others as it would have been for Abraham Lincoln to accept the Mason and Dixon's line as an international frontier.

"You do not accept the territorial integrity of a neighbor who is encamped in your garden."

Minister MacBride, in answering questions at the conclusion of his prepared talk, said there was no question that Ireland ought to be in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"Whatever else you may say about Ireland," he said, amidst laughter, "she is plump in the middle of the North Atlantic Treaty territory."

He said that the time Ireland was invited to join the Atlantic Pact, in the interests of greater safety and strength, she suggested that the members discuss ways and means of solving the problem which precluded membership. This suggestion, he said, was not acted on.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I shall deliver over radio station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, March 26, 1951:

These days we hear a lot of talk about inflation, price control, wage freeze, communism, hidden taxes, and "where do we go from here."

Now most of the problems are very real, but in a strange way that we cannot see and come to grips with. They bother us because we fear the unknown.

For a change, suppose we take a subject that is familiar to every American. And its name will be the Average City in the United States. In colonial times, most people lived in the country. In 1951 most of them live in communities. New York City alone has a population greater than forty-odd individual States. Each city has a transient number of people who work here or visit it frequently. Therefore, it may be said that all Americans are city folk either on a full- or part-time basis.

With the vast network of railroads and highways and airlines and with tens of millions of cars and trucks one would expect to find us getting away from urban concentrations. But these vast transportation facilities lead from city to city to city. We have seen the growth of suburban areas, but they are so close to the major cities that it is hard to tell the difference.

The average American community is the nerve center of our civilization.

Each is the focus of trade or industry.

The organization of city life is a big job.

To protect the life and health and property of its cliff dwellers is an elemental problem. There are others more complex and difficult.

So much so that we have had to create a new profession called city management to save our municipalities from a breakdown.

The traffic war alone in Boston or Los Angeles is a nightmare in itself. And a new one that didn't exist 30 years ago. Pollution of air and water is another modern plague that endangers our overcrowded centers of population.

Add to these physical troubles the old moral sores of crime and corruption, and we can understand how hard it is to control our mushrooming cities.

It is a major domestic challenge in time of peace.

And one that would be magnified a thousand times if we had to contend with sabotage, germ warfare, or death from the skies.

Imaginary?

Look back 1 year.

Whoever dreamed on February 26, 1950, that we would have been deeply committed in Korea and would have suffered more than 50,000 casualties 1 year later?

No one, at least not in the United States.

With hindsight it is easy to say now that we could have avoided some of this cost if we had been prepared.

The grim truth is that we were not prepared then.

From that lesson we are learning to have a little foresight and to protect ourselves against further shocks by taking out a little insurance in advance.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, has testified that even with the best of interception a majority of enemy bombers would be able to get through and press home the attack on our industrial cities.

This is not a pleasant fact.

It is a realistic one.

What do we do then?

If we are organized and prepared to meet such a threat, the loss of life and the damage can be held to a minimum. The enemy will have lost his greatest opportunity, for our strategic bombers will be able to retaliate in force, sustained by our productive capacity that has been hurt but not destroyed.

If we fail to take these precautions, we shall be victims of the last Pearl Harbor, the last because we will never have a chance to recover from our defenseless, shattered, and defeated cities.

Our people's will to resist would be numbed by an overwhelming disaster.

Under the present circumstances, I cannot understand how anyone either in the United States or abroad can object if we set up defenses for our own cities.

Even the Communist propaganda machine, clever as it is in twisting the facts, could never call preparations for the civilian defense of Detroit or St. Louis as an aggression against the people of Budapest or Leningrad.

In normal times, it is our duty as citizens to pay out some money and not enough responsibility to protect our cities from germs, fire, crime, and ignorance.

In the present national emergency, declared because we are under pressure from an enemy who might blast our cities with fearful weapons, the ordinary safeguards would provide us with no defense.

Evidently we need something more.

I believe that volunteer service for civilian defense is both necessary and good. It will help to save our families, our homes, and our standard of living. And it will give us a greater knowledge of and respect for our communities and our fellow citizens that will improve the life of every city after we have survived these anxious years.

On Friday, January 21, 1951, the President signed H. R. 9796, which provides for a 3-year, three billion, one hundred million civil defense program. It extends Federal aid for the construction of air-raid shelters, for the stockpiling of blood plasma, and other special equipment, and sets up a Civil Defense Agency with authority—

1. To mobilize all Federal agencies for the aid of a stricken or threatened area.

2. To spend unlimited funds to aid stricken area.

3. To requisition equipment and property from any source.

The States and cities would have to match the Federal contributions.

Last June there were less than six full-time State directors of civilian defense. Now there is one for every State and Territory.

Detailed plans have been worked out on local, State, and regional levels, but these blueprints mean little unless we have the supplies and the trained volunteers to give us some measure of real protection within a matter of minutes.

The people working on the problem at Chicago have figured that we couldn't expect more than 8 minutes warning before an atomic-bomb attack.

But how many Americans know what they should do in the next 8 minutes?

What would you do now—sitting in the easy chair before your radio or washing the dishes in the kitchen? Has anyone told you? Have you read up anything about it? The children in your home would look to you for emergency protection because the civilian-defense people at their posts or on their way to them would have their hands full battling fire and confusion and ministering to the wounded.

It is a question for sober thought and answer in terms of immediate and personal responsibility.

The average American city is a structure of many buildings, laced together by streets, in which thousands of human beings move and function with a minimum of friction. Your civilian defense agency has to protect the city first and you secondarily. It is a group effort.

Red Russia has a stockpile of 50 or more A-bombs.

Perhaps your city is designated to receive one of these, or you live within 100 miles of a major target city and must be prepared to offer refuge to its evacuees.

How much progress has your community made in preparing for such an emergency?

Luckily, most cities have done something on their own initiative without waiting for the State and Federal Governments to catch up with the realities of 1951.

Norfolk, Va., and San Mateo, Calif., report that they are almost completely ready to handle any disaster. Uniontown, Pa., has lined up its beauty shops as first-aid stations, and San Antonio, Tex., has given its taxicab drivers and its bus systems a basic training in the technique of moving the population from a hard-hit area.

Schenectady, N. Y., has figured out bridge loads and clearances in case of a mass emergency exit and is recruiting volunteer stretcher bearers; Revere, Mass., is using television to explain civilian defense to the people at home.

A disaster manual, written in plain words and with pictures to show what each individual should do to protect himself and others, ought to be in the possession of every school child and every grown-up in this Nation. A few cities and States are putting out their own manuals, but this isn't enough. The source of such vital information—the Federal Government—is so bogged down with red tape that it can't seem to get out these prescriptions for safety to the people it is supposed to serve. Maybe if the first Russian A-bomb is dropped on Washington and burns up the suffocating mass of bureaucratic waste paper, the way will be cleared for direct communication and effective teamwork between the Government and the public.

Our present stockpile of A-bombs won't do us much good as long as we are wide open to attack. And the Soviet Union is far ahead of us in protective measures. Much of its industrial power has been dispersed, and its citizens have been well trained in civil defense. Sooner than we think, the Soviet Union will be able to direct simultaneous A-bomb attacks against many of our harbors and industrial centers. To absorb this without crippling damage we must scatter our industries and decentralize our Federal Government, and set up an effective warning and interception system.

The only power in the world that the Soviet planners fear is the power of American production. In fact, a complete civilian-defense program that actually protects our industries, our people and their ability to work, will discourage a Soviet attack. They will not strike if they know that we are ready to take it and strike back in turn.

And our readiness will be based upon our ability to keep American cities going as producers of military supplies.

We can defend ourselves against atomic attack, but we cannot buy absolute protection. England survived because it was able to take and rally from the fury of repeated enemy air attacks. And make note of the fact that England started to prepare its civilian defense in 1936, 3 years before the outbreak of war.

In the light of all this, what shall we do?

Sign up as volunteers for local defense.

Help in the work of planning dispersal and for the setting up of decontamination facilities. Each city needs emergency hospitals, mobile first-aid units, fire-fighting units, emergency feeding and housing accommodations, and other programs for the relief of target areas.

I feel that the American people should know of the dangers that face them. I do not hold with those who say "Don't tell them the truth for they will give way to fear and hysteria."

Rich or poor, great or humble, we're all in the same house as far as this threat to our security is concerned. Given the details, we can accept them and learn to live with danger and not try to shield ourselves with helpless and pathetic innocence.

Only preparedness can possibly ward off an attack.

There is no other way.

As one of your public servants, I consider it my duty to give you a few of the facts in the time at my disposal. I do this so that you will demand a genuine program for your community, that you will become a part of it, so that our combined efforts will build an alert and strong America that will warn the aggressor not to attack, because he will fall against the strength of our civilian defense.

Price Stabilization—An Economic View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is an analysis of the price stabilization situation from the March monthly letter on economic conditions and Government finance of the National City Bank of New York. It emphasizes that the welfare of the whole country must stand ahead of group interests and calls attention to the hard decisions which must be made in the public interest when the Defense Production Act of 1950 is extended this year:

PRESENT RELATION OF WAGES AND LIVING COSTS

The accompanying chart [not printed] sets forth as of latest available dates the relation of wage rates in the manufacturing industries to the cost of living calculated on the base period January 1950, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics data. It shows that in November average straight time wage rates (excluding overtime premiums) were almost exactly in line with the cost of living. Later figures unfortunately are not available. To reach the allowable 10 percent increase, a rise of nearly 5 percent above the average November rates could take place, even without the good-sized loopholes asked by Mr. Johnston.

The chart also shows that the straight time rate understates factory workers' income, because earnings are made up not only of straight time rates but of overtime and other premiums. Another line in the chart shows actual hourly earnings, averaging overtime premiums over the workweek. This line rose above the cost of living line in September and has maintained a good lead since. Finally, average weekly earnings are given. Reflecting the influence of longer hours, they show a steady gain in real purchasing power.

The margin between contractual straight time rates and actual hourly earnings is almost certain to widen as the familiar "upgrading" and shifting of jobs, which inevitably develop in tight labor markets, makes its appearance. Thus the rise in hourly earnings under the formula can obviously exceed 10 percent, and by a substantial margin if all the loopholes asked by Mr. JOHNSTON are provided. What the cost of living may be by June 30—the date when revision is promised—remains to be seen. But the probability indicated by the respective lines on the chart is that factory workers under the formula will enjoy a rise of real income on an hourly basis—in other words in real earnings per unit of work—even without the further increase in working hours which in many industries is desirable.

INFLATIONARY EFFECTS

If this is the outcome the influence of the wage formula will not be to establish equity, but to create inequity. The purchasing power of factory workers will keep ahead of the cost of living increase, and the added buying power (unless nullified by greater taxes and savings) will come into the markets as enlarged demand for goods. In a time of declining supplies of consumer goods an increase in the real purchasing power of any group must be at the expense of other elements of the population. This is the pertinent point as to the equity of the formula. As to its inflationary effect, further wage increases unless offset by greater productivity will raise industrial costs, and the increased money income also will exert its upward push on the price level.

The position of the farmer under the stabilization program is equally privileged, by reason of the statutory exemptions already referred to. As higher wages force up industrial costs, and the increases work their way into the prices farmers pay, the farm parity price—the level at which ceilings are permitted—will rise. This in turn will interact on the cost of living, and so around the circle. The farm parity price computation itself includes a substantial percentage of farm commodities such as foods and purchased feed; this permits the parity index in effect to spiral within itself when farm prices are rising, even though manufactured goods prices remain unchanged.

On behalf of increases in compensation for special groups, it will be argued that incentives to work and production must be preserved. But if the decision of the stabilization agencies is that preservation of incentives makes it necessary to accept inflationary mechanisms, the need to adopt offsetting counter-inflationary policies becomes all the more urgent. This brings the discussion back to the point at which it inevitably arrives, namely, the need for taxes of the kind and magnitude that will drain off excess spending power, and of coordinated fiscal and monetary policies to restrain inflationary pressures, as discussed in the subsequent articles in this letter.

ESSENTIALS OF INFLATION CONTROL

In this brief record of 1 month's developments can be seen the basic reasons why the program to curb inflation is working badly. With respect to price and wage controls, the weaknesses in part are inherent. A freeze in either prices or wages destroys the flexibility which in normal times is relied upon to keep the economy in balance. It freezes inequities and impracticable relationships and for that reason checks production and trade, unless relief is given. But relief or exceptions in any direction raise demands for compensating relief or exceptions elsewhere. Meanwhile powerful political groups use their power to protect themselves against sacrifice, at the expense of requiring greater sacrifice from others. To exert pressure for this purpose, labor union leaders walked out of the Wage Stabilization Board, resigned from all positions in the defense effort, and denounced Mr. C. E. Wilson, whose offense seems to be that as Defense Mobilization Administrator he is determined to get his job done effectively and with regard to the general interest above special interests. Fortunately Mr. Wilson continues to enjoy the confidence of the country.

The United States Treasury seeks exemption from any increase in borrowing costs that might be caused by desirable anti-inflationary policies. The Congressional hearings on taxation become a cockpit of conflicting representations by groups intent on protecting themselves, culminating in the proposal of a labor union economist that exemptions from the personal income tax be raised to $2,500 for a married couple; this of course would free more billions of dollars of income from taxation and leave it to exert its inflationary powers in the markets. While this goes on the rise in incomes and spending power continues, and well designed anti-inflationary measures such as Regulations W and X, limiting consumer and housing credit respectively, fail to have the anticipated effects because people can pay cash or meet larger down payments without the expected difficulty.

This list could be extended. The evil is that if the politically powerful groups obtain exceptions the inflationary pressures will not be contained, and all will suffer. The problem of leadership, if the objective of establishing an effective price and wage stabilization in the next few months is to be reached, is to get people to think and act in terms of the general interest, and resolutely to place the welfare of the whole country ahead of group interests in the hard decisions now in the making.

The National Health Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address I made before the Midwood Jewish Center in Brooklyn on the subject of the national health insurance program:

THE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Before I begin the discussion of a national health insurance program I believe it is high time that it was made clear what we are talking about. The misleading tag that has been placed on this program, namely, socialized medicine, has done more to confuse the issue than any other factor. You will forgive my bluntness, I am sure, when I say that this was and still is a deliberate campaign to becloud the real meaning and benefits of such a program.

This must be made absolutely clear: The national health insurance program is not socialized medicine. I have yet to see any bit of propaganda against this program making any attempts to analyze the bills. What I have seen is vague ill-denied use of such words as "socialism," "bureaucracy," "Government controlled," and so on. If the opponents of a national health insurance program have read the administration bills they certainly take the greatest pains to conceal that fact; and if they have not read the administration bills, then most certainly the public trust and confidence have been clearly abused.

The national health insurance program is exactly what it says it is—it is insurance. The purpose is to enable the American people to pay for good medical and hospital care by requiring them to put a small percentage of their income into a national insurance fund which would be used to provide such services. It is based on the exact same principle as unemployment insurance, and social security. It is based on the exact same principle as private insurance. In other words, periodic payments are made at a time when ability to pay is present to provide for future needs. As in social-security payments, unemployment compensation, and private insurance, moneys are paid into a common fund out of which fund, benefits will be derived when conditions demand it. If this be socialism, then make the most of it.

It has been charged that the right of the citizen to pick his own doctor will be wiped out. I would like to quote a section—a direct quote, if you please—from my bill, H. R. 27, section 203: "Every individual eligible for personal health services available under this title may freely select the physician, dentist, nurse, medical group, hospital, or other person of his choice to render such services, and may change such selection."

It has been charged that such a program makes mere political pawns of doctors, dentists, and nurses. Nonsense. The bill assures professional freedom to doctors. Their medical work is not to be subject to lay direction. Doctors are represented on all commissions and advisory councils. All purely medical matters are to be settled only by doctors.

Doctors and other health personnel are free to participate full-time, part-time, or not at all as they choose. Let me read from section 220 headed "Professional rights and responsibilities":

"(b) Every physician, dentist, or nurse agreeing to render services as benefits under this title shall be free to practice his profession in the locality of his own choosing, consistent with the requirements of the laws of the States.

"(c) Every physician, dentist, nurse, hospital, or other person entering into an agreement under this part shall be free to the extent consistent with applicable State law and customary professional ethics to accept or reject as a patient any individual requesting his services."

Now let me read subsection (d) to you:

"No supervision or control over the details of administration or operation, or over the selection, tenure, or compensation of personnel, shall be exercised under the authority of this title over any hospital which has agreed to furnish personal health services as benefits."

Now let's look a little bit at the pay. A national health insurance fund would be set up in the United States Treasury and would consist of an annual sum equal to 3 percent of earnings up to $3,600. Workers would contribute a small regular sum, amounting to 1½ percent of their earnings up to $3,600 a year (a maximum of $54 a year). This would be matched by equal contributions from their employers.

Physicians and dentists could choose any of the following methods by which to be paid: on a fee-for-service basis, as is now the most common method; so much per year per person; on a salary basis; or by a combination of methods. The bill provides that the payment must adequately remunerate for the services rendered and that is determined by the advice of the professional people participating in the administration of the program.

Now let it be noted that major administrative responsibility would be placed in the hands of the people where the services are rendered and received. Each State government would be able to administer the program in its area. Each State would name its own agency to administer the program and its own advisory council. The Federal Board would administer the program within a State only if a State did not accept the responsibility.

In addition to health insurance, the bill grants to nonprofit institutions and agencies aid for medical education and medical research up to $10,000,000 in the first year and $15,000,000 the second year; thereafter up to 2 percent of the amount spent for benefits in the preceding year.

Grants to States are authorized for a comprehensive program of basic State and local health services, for maternal and child health, crippled children, chronic disease, industrial hygiene and related services, and for training of personnel.

It provides Federal funds for the construction of needed hospitals, clinics, and health centers.

Perhaps you are asking yourself why this program is necessary at all. Why can't we continue the way we have continued heretofore—a man is sick, a man, woman, or child is ill; he goes to the doctor; gets his treatment; pays his money? But is it really of question of "leave well enough alone"?

Four fears attend the average person through his life—the fear of unemployment, the fear of accident, the fear of old age, and the fear of sickness. It is a common enough, though tragic, story of life savings being wiped out by an illness. Doctor bills, hospital bills, and dental bills have, in many instances, mortgaged many lives. Is it not logical that unavoidable illnesses be paid for when the ability to pay is still with us? Or shall we wait until the dread attacks us and then draw upon our limited savings?

That is what all insurance is—a compulsory savings to meet a need when it arises. The whole program, to my mind, is a prudent, practical, American way to insure the very best for its people, self-paid for by the people out of their earnings. It is confined to people who make no more than $3,600 a year, thereby covering those people whose savings at best barely cover when the tragedy of illness overcomes them either as breadwinners or as heads of families. Lost wages and lost production come to $27,000,000,000 a year.

Over 40 percent of America's young men were not able to pass wartime draft standards. One out of every six rejectees had remedial or preventive diseases or defects.

Twenty-seven million have doctors' services in a hospital plus hospitalization. Twenty-seven million more have hospitalization insurance only. Three and one-half million have comprehensive protection including preventive medicine. Eighty-six million Americans have no health protection at all.

True, voluntary plans such as the Blue Cross and the Blue Shield are all right as far as they go, but very few of these approved plans offer any preventive medicine or accept patients with chronic diseases. Very often in maternity cases extra fees are justifiably asked for. Under the national health program adequate medical care would be a right, not a charity.

Now I do not for a moment pretend that the administration bills covering the national health insurance program are letter perfect, but I do know that the resistors to any national insurance program have made no effort to cooperate so that a fully acceptable bill could be worked out. As I pointed out before the only cry that they put up is that of "socialism," disregarding the hopes and the futures of millions of Americans. The AMA—the American Medical Association—has disseminated a good bit of material about the national health insurance program full of hazy writing and half-truth.

I would like to quote a bit from Mr. Bernard DeVoto, who in a recent issue of Harper's magazine wrote a Letter to a Family Doctor. He bluntly states: "I will not help pay for the $25 assessment you sent to the AMA to run these ads and print these pamphlets. I will not help you finance distortion and demagoguery. In an envelope that has your name and degree on it you tell me by way of Dr. Henderson that 'all infectious diseases have been brought under effective methods of prevention, control, and treatment.' I am to have no more colds, then, and my friend's daughter need not have died of poliomyelitis last summer. Cure guaranteed, Dr. Henderson's ad says in effect, and it was only through inadvertence that he did not mention the great increase in chronic diseases, especially among the elderly, and that he did not point out how our increased longevity makes more medical service necessary, not less."

Several proposals, as you know, have been made. The administration bill outlines a compulsory health-insurance system based on a contributory payroll tax. Other bills have called for grants-in-aid to States to underwrite and expand existing State and local programs for the "medically indigent." The Flanders-Ives bill proposes Federal subsidies, furnished through the States, to help develop a national system of private voluntary prepayment group-insurance plans. In the first and third plans mentioned here, there is considerable merit. It may well be that a system of private voluntary prepayment group-insurance plans may be a partial answer. The legislation is continually under examination. What I ask mainly is that there be an intelligent approach to the subject, taking into consideration both our needs and our facilities. What I object so strenuously to is this attitude of what was good enough for grandfather is good enough for me.

There was a time when the American Medical Association bitterly attacked voluntary-group plans, going even to the extent of dismissing able physicians from the society because of their participation in such groups. Now experiencing a change of heart, it embraces these groups, trying to show how noble and how public-minded the AMA really is.

If there is a basic evil in a national health insurance program, its opponents have yet failed to point it out. Enough of this double-talk. Let's have straight talk. Yet the AMA has offered no adequate substitute for this tested insurance plan of pooling resources to meet a common risk. If they fear reduction in earnings, let them say so, though nobody has yet proved how the doctors will suffer financially because of such a program. Nor has yet anybody proved how medical services therein will be decreased in quality.

What I object to is not the objections to the program—for honest men may disagree among themselves—but I object to the manner and methods of objection.

If there is a better way of improving the Nation's health—and it cannot be denied that the Nation's health needs improving—then let's face the issue squarely in earnest cooperation and not in a spirit of tantrums and the manufacturing of ghosts.

Enlisted Reservists in Korea Score Congress for Indecision

EXTENSION OF REMARK

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have just clipped an article from the March 8, 1951, edition of the Shreveport Journal, a daily newspaper published in Shreveport, La., which article contains a joint letter signed by 33 members of the Armed Forces Reserves who are now on active service in Korea. This letter sets forth strongly the position of these Reserves who are now fighting in the Far East and who are serving the Nation there and elsewhere. It is obvious that these Reserves feel that they have not been treated fairly.

For the information of the Congress I set forth this article in full below:

CLAIM UNFAIR BURDEN—ENLISTED RESERVISTS IN KOREA SCORE CONGRESS FOR INDECISION

Shreveport enlisted Reserve servicemen now on duty with the Eighth Army in Korea blame congressional indecision for what they consider an unfair burden on veteran reservists.

"It seems that the Armed Forces reason * * * that they had better milk us dry while we are still under thumb, for once the Reserves are released, they will never again allow themselves in position for another rape," the Shreveport Journal was told today, in a letter signed by 34 enlisted reservists in Korea.

THIRTY-FOUR SIGN LETTER

The letter, signed by Corp. Clarence D. Ellington and 33 other men, was written February 25.

"Congress would have heard little complaint even this time," the men wrote, "if a just recall system had been effected."

An investigation of reported inequities in the reverse recall program was launched by the House Armed Services Committee several months ago, shortly after the Journal printed a complaint from Ellington and other reservists prior to their shipment overseas.

The letter received today from Korea follows:

"Enlisted Reserve personnel in this theater have received word through letters from home—we get little first-hand news—that an attempt is being made by the Defense Department to extend our present compulsory tour of active duty beyond 21 months.

"Are the Armed Forces trying to cope with the present crisis by the exclusive use of veteran reservists? Such would seem to be the case.

"Reservists in Korea had already given 3 years or more of their lives even before the present police action. Congress would have heard little complaint even this time if a just recall system had been effected.

"Be that as it may, these reservists are now filling manpower gaps in Korea, fighting with the Regulars, and awaiting congressional consideration on mistakes which have been made.

"Our civilian lives have been interrupted for a second time. How are we later to compete with men who have seen little or no service?

"We have heard of endless talk and hesitation on the draft of 18-year-olds and married nonveterans.

"Why have these men acquired the privilege of living their lives with impunity when, during the last war, they would have long since been overseas? Experience, not age, determines the efficiency of a soldier in or out of battle.

"It appears that someone at home is suffering from delusions of grandeur if they believe a large military force can be built without this sizable segment of available manpower. Volunteer 17-year-olds were permitted to fight in 1941 and are fighting now, yet there is still doubt over the ability of 18-year-olds to do likewise.

"The reservists await completion of present debate over rotation plans, but, judging from treatment afforded us thus far, precious little in our favor is expected. It seems that the Armed Forces reason, and with accuracy, that they had better milk us dry while we are still under thumb, for once the reserves are released, they will never again allow themselves in position for another rape.

"The following signatures indicate agreement with this letter and request publication of same." Names and serial numbers on the signature list:

Clarence D. Ellington, 18231041; Russell Wieser, 18332820; Selby E. Copeland, 36557769; Carl Nolon, 44008472; Salvatore Polizzi, 12027024; Clifton H. Matthews, 36540238; Robert F. Ingraham, 57308138; Leroy J. Gelhausen, 35727939; Lendon Turpen, 35715812; Albert M. Stocks, 16229246; Guy W. Owens, 38343964.

C. R. Rogers, 16267538; S. R. Lombardo, 57209510; W. G. Wilson, 37721832; Carl E. Rawls, 34926006; Carvel L. Knafe, 38549136; William D. Towler, 18286663; Roy M. Ogoto, 46043812; Richard N. Robey, 36786778; M. L. Hall, 18139843; John A. Essner, 55006083.

Arthur A. Laiselle, 57109126; Frank R. Hanson, 16250005; Clarence F. Bryans, 16204547; Myron M. Bokski, 16300287; Lucien C. Latulippe, 57109168; Earl J. Vickers, 16284695; Joe R. Reeder, 18100027; William A. Boyd, 34599298; Clyde W. Abea, Jr., 14332242; Roy G. Lee, 34509823; Frank S. Danca, 37804707; Carl E. Peterson, 57143757; Kieth Mizell, 38236479.

Mr. Speaker, the inactive reservist in a large percentage of the cases is a veteran with a long period of service in the Second World War. It is true that he entered the Reserves voluntarily, but after electing to go into the Reserves, he was placed in an inactive status as an inactive reservist. As such, he was denied position in an organized unit. He was given no equipment, no drill, and no drill pay. He received no training and no instruction; and in most instances, no effort was made whatsoever to keep in contact with him. In many instances he changed his civilian occupation and certainly changed his marital status and the Armed Forces knew nothing about his efforts to improve himself and his position in life. When an inactive reservist was denied a position in an organized unit, he obtained the impression, if not the information direct, that he would be needed only after the organized units were called into active service. The call, therefore, which resulted in bringing almost a million of these men, together with the National Guard, into active service found the inactive Reserve unprepared both mentally and by virtue of his environment for such a call.

As I understand the feeling of these men, it is that they feel that organized units with equipment, uniforms, training, drill pay and a definite rating as to efficiency would be called before the inactive Reserve would be called into service. He was prepared to go in the event of an all-out world-wide war; but he did expect, and felt like the armed services had led him to believe, that he would not be called upon to shoulder the burden of national defense as a first-line reservist. This, I think, presents strongly the views of the men whose letter is set forth above.

The bill which has just been approved by the House Armed Services Committee contains a provision which will release inactive and volunteer reservists after 12 months of active duty, provided it is in the interest of national security. Considering all the circumstances, I feel that this man with veteran status should be treated as a veteran and should be released as soon as practicable, regardless of the 12-month period, in the event it can be done without jeopardizing our national safety.

I strongly believe in rotation. It is a great morale builder. The fact that the Marine Corps has already put into active operation rotation from the Far East theater of operations is a further argument showing the wisdom of this program. I hope that the other branches of the armed services will immediately put into effect a very liberal rotation policy and that those men who have long periods of service in Korea and in the Far East will be given a reasonable opportunity to come home and stay for a while in the United States of America with their friends and family. The sooner this program is put into operation the better will be the morale effect on our troops overseas.

We have tremendous problems in providing this country with an adequate national defense. These problems must be met; but in meeting them we should not overlook equity and fair dealing in our attitude and our program to those who faithfully served the military needs of this country in critical times.

Budget Cuts Hurt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it was encouraging to observe the action of the House today in passing by comfortable margins amendments to effect substantial reductions in the first three items of the first appropriation bill to come before us. Yet the total of these cuts is less than $1,000,000.

Commendable as this action was, therefore, it also demonstrates that the only way we will accomplish large economies is by eliminating entirely services, activities, and functions of government which cannot properly be termed essential.

In the accomplishment of this objective, it is my considered judgment that the re-creation of the Hoover Commission would be a great step forward. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester Times-Union backing such a proposal.

The editorial follows:

BUDGET CUTS HURT

President Truman has described his $71,600,000,000 budget as "tight." If this year is like others the budget will rock along that way until the congressional committees get all wadded up in figures and confusion. Then out of sheer discouragement at the magnitude of the task, somebody will pipe up and demand to know how budget cutting can be done.

Senator BYRD has shown how $9,000,000,000 can be cut. Now comes the Roswell Magill committee on Federal tax policy with proposals of $10,000,000,000 cuts outside defense expenditures.

Of course these cuts hurt. But so will the new taxes hurt. Magill and his associates would make deep cuts in public works, drastic reductions in grants and subsidies, and an end to Federal buying of farm commodities and business loans.

The budget can be cut but it can't be cut painlessly. That is why Representative KENNETH KEATING's proposal to call back the Hoover Commission to designate unnecessary or postponable drains on the public till is a practical approach.

KEATING has now been joined by Senator DIRKSEN (Republican, Illinois), who will press the proposition in the Senate. Until this is done, any claim that the budget can't be cut is pure defeatism.

Asleep at the Switch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks, excerpts from Paul Harvey's news broadcast of American Broadcasting Co., of January 21, 1951. I believe that Mr. Harvey has correctly called attention to the situation as it exists in this country for the last decade. The American people have been asleep at the switch.

The above-mentioned excerpts follow:

Now something to slumber on.

The Pilgrim Fathers of the United States were Communists.

The self-government which they established in Massachusetts was communistic.

All that they owned and all the crops which they grew became the common property of all. A man's task was assigned him by central authority. Food was rationed. At first a quarter-pound of bread a day to each person.

But some of the Pilgrims complained that they were too weak from want of food to tend the crops as they should.

There was increasing absenteeism.

"So," writes Governor Bradford, "the colonists began to think how they might raise as much corn as they could and obtain a better crop than they had done."

And at last, in 1623, after much debate of things, the governor, with the advice of the chiefest of the colonists, decided upon a new system whereby each man should plant his own corn. Each would therefore have to trust himself for the food for his family.

So each family was assigned a parcel of land. And I quote Governor Bradford, "This had a very good success, for it made all hands very industrious so as much more corn was planted."

They now went willingly into the field and took their little ones with them to set corn. Before, they would have alleged weakness and inability to work. To have compelled them to work would have been tyranny. But now they worked willingly. By the time the next harvest had come, instead of famine there was plenty. The effect of the private planting was apparent to all. Some of the more industrious had to spare, and to sell to others. "So," writes Governor Bradford, "any general want or famine has not been amongst them to this day."

The Communist experiment in America—as with all Communist experiments past, present, and future—was foredoomed to failure, because it considered man to be an economic rather than a human being. And so was conceived here a new system of government. It was based on I Corinthians 3: 8: "Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." And in but a few years freemen raised themselves and their society to a pinnacle of progress unapproached in all the ages.

Then in 1916 something happened. And the people of the United States became the first in the history of the world ever voluntarily to surrender their rights of property. It was done in an hour of foreign entanglement, with a carelessly worded constitutional amendment. It said, "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes on income from whatever source. * * *" It placed no limit on the amount of those taxes. Conceivably the people could be taxed out of all private property. Income taxes were not new. The first income tax was written on a rock by the hand of Divinity and given to Moses at the top of Mount Sinai. It was at the flat rate of 10 percent. And, remember this, it promised the wrath of God on anyone who violated that law.

At Runnymede the Magna Carta was handed to King John on the end of a sword * * * denying to royalty the right of unlimited taxation. But, as I say, it was for the American people to become the first ever voluntarily to return that tyrannical power to government.

Then, in 1932, the next big step backward. What had been a government of, by, and for the people * * * became instead a government of executive directors and bureaus; by appointees having the power to make rules with the force of law. The power to construe those rules and to enforce them. All the powers any king in history ever had * * * were handed to men not even duly elected. Such was called a "new deal." Though Emperor Diocletian long before had tried to rescue the Roman Empire by destroying the power of the senate and delegating that power to many government bureaus. The result was the Dark Ages, lasting a thousand years.

Finally, in January 1951, the United States prepared once more in the pattern of the first confused, frightened Pilgrims to ration food, to allocate farm crops by decree, to regulate what could be sold and to whom and for how much; to regulate where a man

should work and at what wage; and to remove further limitless amounts from his wage in taxes.

Let them not alter the label on the poison bottle. Let them call it "necessary," but let them not call it "new." Let them call it "expedient," but let them not call it "progress." Let them say we no longer deserve the right to think and act for ourselves, but let them not say this is to preserve our "freedom."

Could it be?

Is it yet possible that history might be altered?

That the American people will awaken in their comfortable parlor-car seats, look out the window, and realize in time that somewhere back there the Freedom Train got off the track.

That we switched off the main line and turned left.

And kept turning left until we're headed back to where we came from.

Could it be that we may yet shake off the leg iron someone locked on while we slept, and seek out the engineer?

And demand—with the courage of bare-handed men—that he get us back on the high road. Now.

That if any bandits think they can stop this train, they can come shootin', but we're not going to be wrecked or returned to serfdom by our own frock-coated crew.

And I'll tell you something.

If we all left the parlor car and got back to competing to see who could shovel the most coal—nobody could even catch, much less wreck—this train.

Then the American historians of some distant tomorrow might write, as Governor Bradford wrote, "Any general want or famine has not been amongst them to this day."

Could it be?

No.

Free men—free to do anything—are also free to do nothing.

And apparently that is our choice.

We said we no longer wanted opportunity.

We wanted security.

And they gave us chains.

And we were secure.

So, when some future Gibbon writes, "The Decline and Fall of the American Empire," let him be honest.

Let him say the great new system of government called free competitive American capitalism brought forth such bountiful harvest of all good things, that the people, grown fat—grew lazy.

And their leaders, instead of destroying their enemies, copied them.

And history's shining hour came to an end.

The Book of Kells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the Sunday Star, March 18, 1951:

THE BOOK OF KELLS

One of the most beautiful things in the world made by human hands is the ancient Book of Kells. Created by the brothers of an Irish monastery about the eighth century after Christ, it now is the principal treasure of Trinity College in Dublin. Thousands of pilgrims have gone there to gaze upon its delicately illuminated pages. The text is the four Gospels of the Vulgate. It was lettered and decorated with a precision unexcelled in any similar work at any place or any time. The geometrical symmetry of the entire volume has been compared to a single breath of celestial song. Examining its loveliness, one takes pride in sharing the devoted humanity of the unrecorded artists. Their names are lost, but they were men to make all men glad to be men.

Kells was called Ceanannus a thousand years ago. The retreat where the book was put together was pledged to Saint Columba. It was founded in 550, and it drew scholars like the proverbial magnet through 30 generations. How great was the wisdom of the friars is proved by the variety of their subject material. Their learning embraced everything—all classes and conditions of people, a vast menagerie of animals and birds, flowers, inanimate forms of reality, and much that simply was imagined with rare poetic artistry. The 678 pages the monks compiled are an encyclopaedia of the universe. Their faith was an ardent force, reaching from the dust to the stars, conceding no barrier to the power of their love for the Master Artist.

The brothers were deliberately all-inclusive. Their work shuts nothing out. Within it all forms are interlaced. The book assembled at Kells is as closely knit as a good tapestry or a good carpet. Some hint of distant Byzantium may be discovered in the designs, yet they are as Irish as Ireland. Their colors are as brilliant as the rainbow even now after a whole millenium. Perhaps it was because of the challenge of this circumstance that all early attempts to copy the volume fell short. The version produced by the Urs Graf-Verlag in Berne, Switzerland, in recent months represents the best skill available in Europe in our day. An example of this edition is the gift of the Government of Eire to the Library of Congress. Sean MacBride, Irish Minister of External Affairs, made the presentation. Dr. Luther H. Evans, Librarian, received the precious offering and expressed the gratitude of the American community for it. The book is a tie of a sort between three as yet free nations—Ireland, Switzerland, and the United States.

Address of the Honorable John L. Sullivan, Former Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, February 27, 1951, to be exact, the Honorable John L. Sullivan, former Secretary of the Navy, delivered an address in Shreveport, La., at a luncheon held under the auspices of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Mr. Sullivan said so many things in that address that should command the approval of all of us that I have asked leave to include his remarks in the RECORD.

John Sullivan was known to Members of Congress as one of the most capable, efficient, and patriotic Secretaries who ever directed the Department of the Navy. He was a strong man and commanded universal respect in that position as well as in other Government positions which he held in many years of public service.

His endeavors outside the Government add to the high respect we have for him. He has been intensely active with the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He has been outstanding among Americans because of his contribution to the most worthy movement to implement the principles of brotherhood.

I hope my colleagues in the House will read carefully the message on brotherhood which John Sullivan left with those who attended the luncheon in Shreveport. His address follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN L. SULLIVAN AT THE LUNCHEON UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS AT THE WASHINGTON-YOUREE HOTEL, SHREVEPORT, LA.

I want to tell you how delighted I am to have this opportunity to visit your dynamic, growing city of Shreveport and to meet with so many outstanding citizens of this great city.

The work you have done in the advancement of intergroup relations is known far outside the confines of this State. For your progress in this mission, I extend my congratulations not only to you but to Centenary College and its president, Joe Mickle, who have rendered such valuable assistance in this endeavor.

Here in Shreveport with your oil and gas, your agriculture, your cattle, and your lumber, you have a sound and diversified basis for a continuing prosperity. Together with the fine Barksdale Air Base at Bossier all contribute to the stability and zest of living in this most pleasant city.

The only thing about my visit here today which I regret is the absence of my good friend, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS. I have known Congressman BROOKS ever since 1939, and during my years in the Treasury and Navy Departments I have had a first-hand opportunity to watch him work and to evaluate the contribution he is making to the affairs of our Federal Government. I know that all of you know him and like him. I can assure you that if you had had my opportunity to work with him closely in Washington, you would be even prouder of him than you are now.

I talked with Congressman BROOKS just before leaving Washington, and I am very happy to extend to you, as he requested me to do, his very warm and cordial greetings to all of you here today.

We meet here under the auspices of a truly great organization, an organization which last year afforded me the opportunity of engaging in the most rewarding work I have ever known. I am convinced that there is no peacetime work in which civilians can engaged that contributes so much to the present welfare and future security of our country as the implementation of the principles of brotherhood.

My activity in this work started at a luncheon in Washington on Armistice Day, 1949. That day we heard a stirring address by the President of the United States. He started by saying, "I have just come from the National Cemetery at Arlington where I have laid a wreath on the grave of an American hero, the unknown soldier. I do not know, and no real American cares, whether that man was a Protestant, a Jew, or a Catholic, whether he was black or red, yellow, or white." Later in this address the President warned us that the issue of our times would lie between those who believe in a Divine Being and who look upward for guidance, and those who—denying God—worship materialism, and look downward to the earth for the things which it produces rather than toward the heavens for that help all mankind needs.

How tragically true the events of the past year have proved the President's prediction. More and more evident it becomes that the current separation of mankind into differing camps is essentially a moral cleavage involving two irreconcilable concepts of the importance of the human being. In the Communist view the individual—like a cow or a horse—is a chattel of the state, just that and nothing more. In the eyes of the democratic world the individual is recognized as the most important thing on the face of the globe because that individual possesses an immortal soul. You and I are truly free, because you and I have certain inherent, natural rights—rights derived from our creation by God—from our equal creation by God.

Few generations have lived in such uncertain, confused and dangerous conditions as those in which we will probably spend the rest of our lives. On all hands people cry out "What can we do to help?" One clear and obvious answer to that question is for all Americans to strive in their daily lives to fulfill in our blessed America that perfection of the democratic processes, that real equality that was envisaged for all Americans by our founding fathers. Much remains to be done by all of us before that is accomplished, and it cannot be accomplished merely by a 7-day observance of Brotherhood Week.

Believing in a spiritual interpretation of the universe, and deriving its inspiration therefrom, the national conference exists to promote justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation among Protestants, Jews, and Catholics. We seek to analyze, moderate, and ultimately eliminate intergroup prejudices which disfigure and distort religious, business, social, and political relations. We strive to establish a social order in which the religious ideals of brotherhood and justice shall become the standards of human relationships, and we work at it 365 days in the year.

Goethe once observed that it is easier to perceive error than to find truth, for the former lies on the surface and is easily seen, while the latter lies in the depths where few are willing to search for it. From day to day and from week to week we must augment our forces with men and women who are willing to make some sacrifice to seek out the causes of intolerance and bigotry and to root them out of our system.

In the 22 years since this conference was organized, very great progress has been made. Encouraged by that progress thousands of American men and women who realize that the job is far from done and who appreciate the tremendous importance of this work are devoting a great deal of their time and their efforts in this cause.

Why is this so important? That I shall attempt to answer this evening.

Whether or not we like it, America has been invested with the leadership of the free world and the task of defending western civilization. The success of that defense will determine the survival of our way of life and the maintenance of the dignity of man. Until and unless bigotry, prejudice and intolerance among intercreedal and interracial groups have disappeared from the American scene, the success of that leadership and of that defense will be in jeopardy.

Until we have achieved a practical day-to-day implementation of the principles of brotherhood, we cannot be sure that our American democracy is secure, and we cannot have too great confidence in our efforts to bring democracy to other parts of the world. But once we have attained throughout this fair land a unity which comes from an understanding of group by group; an appreciation of culture, group by group; and respect of racial, religious differences, group by group, American democracy will have a much firmer foundation.

The times in which we have lived have seen fantastic progress in most fields of human endeavor. Within our lifetime science has contributed more to medicine, to communication, to transportation, to agriculture, and to many of the other things that affect our daily lives than it has contributed in many centuries. In giving us the radio and the airplane it furnished the peoples of the world with those devices they needed to draw closer together, to understand and respect each other. It is the tragedy of our age, that these two inventions were aborted from their proper purposes. In the hands of power-crazed egoists in the late 1930's one was diverted to the purposes of hate-fostering and war-breeding propaganda, and the other into a lethal weapon of international blackmail. These two inventions which had given such promise of forestalling future wars contributed to the events that produced the most costly war in world history.

Since the end of World War II, science has made further great strides—in every field of human endeavor except the one in which we most need progress. That is the field of human relationships. It is to this objective that the National Conference of Christians and Jews addresses its entire efforts.

In this country, differences in background and culture are sometimes overemphasized, and the broad areas of common purposes and objectives that unite all of the people of the United States are too frequently forgotten. So it is that throughout the length and breadth of our land we ask Americans to reexamine from time to time the community of purpose of all Americans, and to explore various new approaches for devising formulas that will lead to even greater trust, confidence, and respect among our different groups. We hope that there will be no lessening of anyone's loyalty to one's own faith or race. We seek a strong, purposeful movement toward the realization of unity in diversity. Our objective is not to abolish differences but to learn to respect them. The pride and the strength of America are to be found in the amazing diversity of its people drawn from every race and culture on this globe. That diversity of talents and skills and personalities—urged of the toxin of misunderstanding and distrust—can constitute a greatness and a strength that no other nation can ever achieve.

We know that today the biggest question for the entire world is whether the human spirit is to remain free, or is to be swallowed up by totalitarianism. We agree with the late Justice Wiley Rutledge that if we are to be free we must deserve to be free; if we are to survive we must deserve to survive.

There is no doubt in the mind of any real American that here on this continent our forefathers established a system of government and a way of life which has proved to be the world's greatest contribution to human freedom and the dignity of man. No thoughtful person can question that our system of government and our way of life is in greater jeopardy today from outside influences than it has been since the birth of the Republic.

We Americans have come to regard democracy as an established, dominant fact in this world. Yet, neither in terms of duration (as judged by the perspective of history) nor in numbers of adherents, has democracy permanently or universally established itself, although we know it is the best form of government yet devised.

There are in the world some 2,400,000,000 humans. Of this number only 600,000,000 derive their culture and their philosophy, their religious ideals, and their way of life from the same sources that gave us our civilization—Western Europe. These peoples of Europe, the British Isles, Australia, North and South America, parts of Africa, and those in the Southwest Pacific who have embraced democracy, together with ourselves, constitute the bulk of those who believe in democracy or who have been able to give it stable life in their native lands. Two hundred and fifty million of these people exist today in Western Europe under the guns of a colossus that says that communism and democracy cannot live in the same world.

It has never been the policy of our Government to attempt to drive the Soviet system from its birthplace. Our Government has never taken the position that it cannot live in a world where communism exists. However, the Communists view with alarm every manifestation of freedom, and repeatedly proclaim that communism and what we call democracy cannot exist together. Particularly do they proclaim the impossibility of the coexistence of communism and religious principles of any sort or type. They reject such virtues as meekness, humility, charity, love of neighbor, and the Golden Rule. The trials of Cardinal Mindszenty and the Protestant clergy of Bulgaria and the present antireligious activity in Czechoslovakia are among the most brazen and ruthless attacks upon God and upon religion that have been witnessed in many centuries.

Now all thinking Americans know deep in their hearts that the surest and most effective countermeasures we can take in this country to combat the godless propaganda of the Communists is to create here upon our shores the fullest and finest flowering of true democracy and real equality. We know that if people are free they are equal, but that without equality there can be no true freedom. That applies to all—Protestants, Jews, and Catholics; Nordics and Latins; Negroes and Orientals.

The members of this conference are not unduly alarmed about interracial and intercreedal conditions in the United States today. We recognize the very great progress that is being made toward understanding and mutual respect. We believe, however, that through public diligence and public awareness of its importance the progress now being made can be accelerated.

There is a new attitude on the American scene about which I would like to speak for a few moments—one that truly disturbs me. And that is the attitude of defeatism about America's military and economic posture, an attitude that must give very great solace and comfort to the men in the Kremlin.

In government, self-criticism, and I mean public self-criticism, is the mark of a dynamic, progressive democracy, the real antidote for political dry rot or inefficiency. Today in Washington, a great deal is being done to question, examine, and perhaps to improve our public affairs. Such an examination is welcomed by every public servant worth his salt. However, I call to your attention the very great difference between self-criticism that seeks for improvement and blind pessimism that looks at only one side of the ledger.

There is some talk and feeling in this country today that seems almost foreign.

What is the faith of an American? It varies from man to man, and from woman to woman, and with each man and every woman, it varies from time to time.

With some, it is faith in our manhood. With some, it is faith in our moral or political leadership. With some, it is faith in our industrial potential. With some, it is a faith in God coupled with a belief in free democratic institutions and actions.

But whatever that faith is, wherever it comes from, whatever its basis, it is the hallmark of every real American. An American is the one person in the world who is distinctly out of character when he dons the black robes of defeatism and hastens civilization on its rush to ruin.

Of course, we face a formidable challenge from a power that holds in thrall the largest organized group of manpower in the world. Yet, the entire history of the development of the freedom of the individual and the creation of what is now the Western World has

been achieved against seemingly overwhelmingly powerful tyrannies. If the odds against the free world are today greater than ever, you must remember that so, too, are our means of resisting and our will to resist.

Why, then, do so many of our fellow citizens adopt the helpless and hopeless point of view?

The focal point of the world's troubles today is Korea. But it is merely a happenstance that it is Korea and not any one of a half dozen other places. Realizing what Korea is costing us in the lives of fine young men and the disruption of our economy, some people are today questioning the wisdom of our decision to resist aggression in Korea. Regardless of the outcome of the Korean campaign, there will never be any question in my mind but what the United States made the only decision it could have made under those circumstances.

It so happened that I was in Europe at the time of the crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel by the North Koreans. Within a period of 6 days I was in Rome, Paris, Frankfort and London. You will recall that following the invasion there was a hiatus of 48 hours during which our Government very properly went through the procedures of the last-resort provision of the United Nations Charter. During those 2 days you could see the confidence of Western Europeans in America melt like butter in the noonday sun. On all sides they said: "Here we go again. After World War I your President Wilson conceived the League of Nations. We all joined it in an effort to secure a just and enduring peace. Then, after we had gotten in, America turned her back on us and left us holding the bag. It is only 5 years since you started the United Nations, and here, when the first real test comes, when there is a clear and cruel case of aggression, you don't fight, you don't even make a statement." I can tell you that things looked pretty grim, and I am sure that had that continued for another week or 10 days Western Europe would be lost to America for generations and that the cooperation we are now receiving from the Atlantic Pact Nations could never have been achieved.

However, 2 days after the invasion of Korea the President of the United States announced our resistance to aggression in such clear and unmistakable terms that the peoples all over Western Europe were lifted from the depths of despondency. Never have I seen such a change come over large numbers of people. You could see it in the face of every man and woman you passed on the street.

It must be remembered that at no time since the death of Napoleon has there been a catalyst to unite all peoples of Europe in a common front against a common foe. I am not at all sure that the Communist action in Korea is not serving as that catalyst. I believe that there exists today a greater potential opportunity to weld the peoples and governments of Western Europe into a stanch bloc of defenders of democracy and freedom than has existed in the last 175 years.

We started to fight in Korea as we had to. Our forces were greatly outnumbered and in fact there were few combat troops in that area. But once we became organized and landed at Inchon, things took on an entirely different aspect. Then came the disastrous defeat and retreat of late November. That is when the second guessers went to work. That is when a great many Americans forgot that the United States of America is at the peak of its power, the strongest country in the world. They began to exalt our enemies as superdemons and to discount and downgrade the finest fighting men in the world—the American soldiers. What a spectacle this must have been for the United Nations representatives of the other countries of the world. Just think of what it must have done to their confidence in America when they saw that Americans were forgetting their own potential power and the majesty of our mission, and thinking only of the price it was costing us.

I would like to go on record here and now as affirming my complete confidence in the professional soldiers and sailors who are today guiding the destinies of our Army, our Air Force, and our Navy.

Throughout my life I have been particularly fortunate in my associations with my fellow men, in college and law school, in the practice of law, in business, and in the Government. However, for 4 years I had the opportunity of working very closely with the officers of the Army, Air Force, and Navy, and I want to tell you I never met a better group of men in my life.

We have heard a great deal of criticism since VJ-day about the graduates of West Point and Annapolis. I tell you that, in my opinion, if the alumni of West Point and Annapolis as a group were compared with all of the alumni of any college or university in this land, the comparison would be far from favorable to us civilian alumni. In like manner, I believe that if we were to compare all of the regular officers of the Army, Air Force, and Navy with all of the civilians in any given profession or line of endeavor, the results would be equally startling.

With the sole exception of those who have consecrated their lives to spiritual leadership, I know of no group of men who lead such dedicated lives or make such sacrifices in their profession as the regular officers of the armed services. I think we should all thank God that the future security of our country is in the hands of these men. They are the best I have ever met.

Fighting under their command and backed by the production of the greatest industrial power in the world is the youth of the Nation, young men who know the value of that for which they fight. Victor Hugo once said: "Nothing in this world is so powerful as an idea whose time has come." The youth of America know the full value of democracy and freedom, and they know that now our hour has come, and that we must stop every effort to spread communism further by forceful means, or we will be isolated and left to fight, and perhaps lose, alone.

Science has made great contributions to American armies and military proficiency. Yet, neither radar nor the proximity fuse, the atomic bomb or the guided missile is America's secret weapon. I know that every commander in the armed services agrees with me that the secret weapon with which America won World Wars I and II and the greatest weapon we have today is millions of the finest young men this world has ever known.

They are the best because they have seen democracy at work and they know that after enjoying the freedoms and the equality of America, life for them under any other system would not be worth the living. Those men on the battle lines in Korea have seen democracy and brotherhood at work, and they know it is worth fighting and dying for. In these crucial times when men as well as nations are being tried for size, the least we civilians can do is to acquire a faith to match that of our men in combat.

In no way do I try to minimize the seriousness of the situation. But America has survived a great many crises in the last 176 years. I think we will survive this one.

In the words of the poet, Stephen Vincent Benet:

"We made this thing, this dream,
This land unsatisfied by little ways,
Open to every man who brought good will,
This peaceless vision, groping for the stars,
Not as a huge devouring machine
Rolling and clanking with remorseless force
Over submitted bodies and the dead,
But as live earth where anything could grow
We made it and it's ours.
We shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

Not Illegal, but Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President does not reflect the thinking of the vast majority of the American people when he intimates that legality should be the sole test in determining the faithfulness or faithlessness of a public servant. He should clean house at once in his official family in the light of the shocking disclosures which have been made in congressional hearings. If he does not act promptly, Congress should move without any regard to the question as to whose toes are stepped on.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two editorials from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and one from the Rochester Times-Union.

The editorials follow:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle]

NOT ILLEGAL, BUT WRONG

"Why," asks a correspondent of this newspaper, "is it up to Congress to ferret out the crooks, parasites, and subversives in the executive branch of the Government? Have you noticed that most of the sensational proceedings against such offenders have resulted from congressional action? Congress uncovered the Garsson brothers, Andy May, Benny Meyers, John Maragon, Alger (Red Herring) Hiss, and William Remington."

It is a good question, given more point by the current interest in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation investigation. The revelation of misused influence, of mink coats and luxury room hotels speaks loudly of a Government owning an easy morality and a great complaisance toward wrongdoing that stops short of violating a law. It is easy to believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a Government agency, knows of many such violations of moral codes. Yet, operating under the Department of Justice, it is not a prosecuting agency. The Department of Justice, headed by a political appointee, has shown little concern over much wrongdoing which is just short of illegality.

Here lies the harm: It is the official contentment with behavior which is improper, but cannot be branded specifically as illegal. It is behavior which any man, unless utterly devoid of conscience, would recognize as wrong. It is the sort of behavior which would end quickly any employee's usefulness to a business concern. It is the sort of behavior which would make a man a neighbor to be avoided. It is the sort of behavior which cannot be tolerated in a government, supposedly acting for the good of all citizens.

If the Presidency will not act to rid itself of bad characters, if the Department of Justice is prevented from clearing them out, then we hope Congress, much maligned Congress, will continue to rout the unfit in

its own slow, expensive way. Let it keep on the trail of the RFC, and then let it go after some other agencies which offer promises of easy money for the unmoral.

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle]

VALENTINE DISCLOSURES SHOULD STIR COUNTRY

The usually mild-mannered Dr. Alan Valentine let loose in Cleveland with some blunt truths about affairs at Washington that must have relieved his own soul and ought to have a tonic effect on the conscience of the country. What he said ought to be published across the Nation, studied in every home. For he pictured, more plainly and bluntly than anyone else has yet, a steadily deteriorating moral climate in Washington that is spreading contagion and actually creating a threat to free government.

In an adjoining column we print excerpts from this notable address.

As economic stabilizer in the early days of the defense mobilization program, during which he butted his head against walls of confusion and recklessness, Dr. Valentine got a close view of the whole stewing mess. He reports now on the patronage, favoritism, pushing and jostling that have created "a government within a government," and as such is almost beyond the control of President Truman and other top men. "Patronage," he said, "has become not a means of life but an end in itself to a political machine which has been too long at the trough."

Never in the Nation's history, said Dr. Valentine, "have such third-rate standards and objectives flourished so openly or been more generally accepted and more loyally defended."

This tolerance of the mediocre "began long before the present administration, and Mr. Truman has inherited a downward trend in political morality."

There are signs that the public is awakening to the seriousness of a state of affairs that has been likened by one Senator to the Teapot Dome scandals. The disclosures about the Reconstruction Finance Corporation alone are enough to disgust any ordinary conscience. Among the sheen of mink coats and of White House favorites controlling millions of dollars in loans, of lawyers getting $21,000 fees for having the inside track with the RFC, of the unbelievable favors granted to individuals with the right contacts, and so on and so on, the level of morality has sunk to the gutter level. It is no better because most of the deals were technically legal.

Never before did influence-peddling flourish so openly and with such complete tolerance by high Government officials. President Truman, personally honest and well-intentioned has scarcely lifted a finger to stop a downward cycle that is slowly but surely dragging his administration to disgrace. Except to discount the reports of those who know what is going on, he has shown almost no interest. Yet, says Dr. Valentine, "only President Truman can demolish this second and unofficial government * * * and drive the money lenders from his own temple."

This government within a government, made up of patronage and favoritism and plain graft, is playing fast and loose with the people's money. It is nullifying the efforts of Chief Stabilizer Charles Wilson and Director of Controls Eric Johnston to stop the dangerous inflation that is making the dollar smaller and smaller. It is sticking a knife into the heart of our whole defense program.

If Alan Valentine's warning is heeded, if the message can be spread, he will have performed a greater service to the country than he could have done in his recent public office. By this speech he has gained stature.

[From the Rochester Times-Union]

PRESIDENT CAN CLEAN UP MESS

It was only 16 months ago that the Nation was being regaled by tales of deep freezers distributed among the elect, including the President's wife, by Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, the President's blustering military aide.

There has been scarcely enough time to get a minor character in that influence-peddling cast into jail for his perjuries. John Maragon, the Kansas City bootblack who rose to influence and wealth as a hanger-on in Vaughan's entourage, has finally lost his appeal and will serve 8 to 20 months.

Now the Fulbright committee has found a bigger swarm of flies gathered around a larger barrel of spilled sugar.

Senator FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas), didn't start out to send anybody to jail. His committee, composed of Senators of extraordinary competence, had looked into the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years and decided it needed drastic shake-up and overhauling. The President remarked that the committee's report was asinine. All the reconvened committee hoped to do was to show that it wasn't.

What started out to be merely a demonstration that an influence web wove back and forth from the White House to the RFC and thence to marginal characters in need of Government money, turned into a sickening revelation of the deterioration of moral standards in public service.

The details need not be repeated here. But they involve directors of the RFC, men whose nod can dispense public funds, and at least two employees of the White House, one, Donald Dawson, the personnel adviser to the President, whose wife is custodian of RFC files.

After a week of this, Senator FULBRIGHT is beginning to want some fresh air. "I never heard," he says, "so much lying in my life."

But a few more sentences for perjury aren't enough. What deeply moves Senator FULBRIGHT are the doubts his investigation have raised about the general moral level of government. He proposes a broader inquiry of the whole executive branch.

It may come to this, but it need not. The President can clean up this mess himself. He could have done so 18 months ago when the preposterous Vaughan was explaining his Missouri morals to a congressional committee.

The standards demanded in public service and the moral tone of any administration are set by the President himself. You don't get higher standards by riding along with a favorite poker companion no matter what he does outside poker hours.

We are entering a period when larger sacrifices will be asked of everybody and when more and more people will be going to Washington to ask exceptions to general rules. The people have a right to expect that these decisions be made on their merits, without favoritism, influence rings or payoffs.

The President can give them that assurance by acting on his own—now. He is still the boss. He should know what to do.

What Americanism Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the junior chamber of commerce at Itasca, Tex., has sponsored a very praiseworthy contest for the high-school students of their city which has resulted in these young people thinking and writing about Americanism. The JayCees, the teachers as well as the parents who encouraged the students to participate in the contest, and the newspapers in the area who publicized the contest are to be commended for their efforts.

Miss Pat Brown, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. G. C. Brown, wrote the winning essay entitled "What Americanism Means to me," and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this essay as I sincerely believe that this young lady has experienced what Americanism really is:

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME

(By Pat Brown)

Just what does Americanism mean to me? It means the American way of life. What is the American way of life? It is the Sunday funnies, hot dogs, and cokes at a ball game, a democratic government, our own desires, and our own ways of expressing them, the hills, plains, crops, farms, lakes, rivers, oceans, the blue of the heavens that seem a little bluer because it is America, the cars and the intricate web of our highways, the flag and what it means to me, our homes, parents, and our God.

In the words of the song, "America," we get a clear picture of what America meant to its author.

"My country 'tis of Thee"—even in those five small words we detect the real reason America was founded. The yearning for real freedom of worship brought the Pilgrim fathers to the shores of our paramount nation. Religion or their beliefs in the Almighty God enabled them to withstand the horrors of hunger, pain, fear, homesickness, and countless other disastrous events that mapped out that first, history-writing winter. As always the magnetism of God's almighty love brought them through. It was part of this life-giving love that encouraged them to make friends with the Indians, who in turn taught them the first principles of agriculture. All of these supreme sacrifices were made and met with the supreme love of our Almighty God in their hearts. His love for them brought them through this so-called "valley of the shadow of death." So, first of all, our country was founded on a firm, stable belief in God. Thus, Americanism means Christianity, love, faith, hope, all of these being achieved through God's love for us and our love for Him.

"Sweet land of liberty"—how many times do we think of the sweet, poignant liberty that our country provides? Where else can you get the things that our gigantic way of life provides? Yes, the serenity of the gently rolling foothills of our own community reflect a sweet, peaceful feeling. It is here for us to enjoy, here to appreciate, here for food for thought. It is a part of our own land, a land surrounded by countless advantages and pleasures if we would only heed them. Even here in Texas, only a part of our vast Nation, the land and liberties are endless, ever rolling in ceaseless splendor. Yes, Americanism exemplifies a "sweet land of liberty."

"Land where my fathers died." Why have so many gallant American men, and yes, women, too, given their lives so unreliably for the United States of America? A life is not something easily gained, but it is easily lost. I never have been called on to sacrifice my life for anyone or anything, yet, but if I had my choice as to why I should give my life, I would choose the portrayal of Americanism as have so many countless others. I would gladly die to preserve the American way of life or to even impress its immense qualities on the mind of some unfortunate person, who has not enjoyed its advantage as I have. Yes, Americanism must

be something pretty big to affect countless millions of men and women like that.

"Land of the pilgrims' pride." Pride, it is a small word to have such a very great meaning. Our pilgrim forefathers had a never-wavering pride for this, then unborn Nation. So, why should not we, as present-day Americans, not fairly burst with pride for America, Americanism, our way of life?

"From every mountain side, let freedom ring." That has been the cry for many centuries, and upon end. Here in America, ever since the first group of colonists came over and settled on the shores of our Nation, the cry has been "freedom." It was heard at Lexington, Concord, Valley Forge, San Jacinto, the Alamo, and in countless countries of the world where the Americans raised their flag in liberty for the embonded, maltreated people of the world. On the beachheads of both World Wars I and II the cries of our gallant soldiers were heard and some of them were stifled; but still the intense burning in the breasts of people everywhere echo the cry of "freedom."

What does Americanism mean to me? It means the right to worship my God; the origin of our country and how that reflects on us, even today; liberty, the right to sing praises of whomever or whatever I see fit; a land that would merit the sacrificing of one's life for it; my pride and the pride of countless millions; and most of all my freedom. Freedom from want, from fear, religious beliefs, press, and many other freedoms compromise the long, practically endless line of freedoms enjoyed and provided by all Americans, regardless of color, race religious beliefs, or station in life.

This to me equals Americanism.

Economies Before Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Ed Coman in the Woodburn (Oreg.) Independent of March 8, 1951:

ECONOMIES BEFORE TAXES

The recent request of President Truman that Congress increase postal rates by $287,000,000 in the next fiscal year appears to be another evidence of the peculiar reasoning of the administration. He continues to ignore the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to save some $140,000,000 a year by taking the Post Office Department out of politics, modernizing its organization, methods and equipment and providing greater freedom and flexibility of management. Instead he makes a considerable issue of the second-class mailing rates charged newspapers and other publications—a policy established long ago as a public service to encourage the dissemination of news and knowledge—a policy that has resulted in the American people being the best informed in the world concerning their National, State, city, and other government bodies.

Some adjustment of the second-class mailing rates are justified, but President Truman's suggestion of doubling the rates appears unreasonable. This is particularly true in the light of his recent budget and tax messages to Congress in which he seeks to continue further expansion of his experimental Fair Deal program of extending unemployment insurance, establishing socialized medicine, extension of Federal power projects, governmental housing and nonessential public works, and a substantial increase in Federal aid to public schools. This in almost the same breath with his call to the public to practice the most rigid economies in personal and family affairs to meet the huge increase in taxation required for the military budget.

We believe it is high time that the administration begin studying the economies that can be applied to governmental operations before it looks for more ways to spend the public's money. Before it approves any of the President's recommended tax and postal increases, it would be well for Congress to dust off the Hoover report and put the more important of its recommendations into practice. Then Congress should call a halt to the "spending binge" of the administration, appropriating not one single dollar that is not absolutely necessary for defense and essential services.

We face a grim era in our history and we cannot continue to supinely accept politics and governmental business as usual. We must insist that the opportunity of the American citizen to be fully informed must not be curtailed by short-sighted policies. We must demand efficiency and frugality of all governmental activities, appropriating funds on the basis of necessity rather than desirability. The time to call a halt to the "spending binge" is now.

Elimination of Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF POLLUTION FROM THE RIVERS, STREAMS, INLAND AND TIDAL WATERS OF THE COMMONWEALTH

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to enact forthwith legislation appropriating money to be spent in conjunction with funds of the Commonwealth or any of its political subdivisions for the elimination of pollution from the rivers, streams, inland and tidal waters of the Commonwealth; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

In house of representatives, adopted March 7, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 13, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, representatives of the shipping and other industries of the port of Baltimore were privileged last week to hear an able discourse from the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], relative to the United States merchant marine.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington has made a most valuable contribution to the future security and progress of our country by his consistent and able efforts on behalf of United States shipping and shipbuilding.

It has been most gratifying to me to have had the opportunity to work with the distinguished Senator and I can assert most emphatically that the people of Maryland, as well as those in the great States of the west coast, are aware of and are deeply appreciative of the splendid fight which the Senator from Washington has led in the Senate to acquaint the country with the problems facing American shipping and the need for constructive action looking toward the rehabilitation of this industry which has ever meant so much to the economy of this great Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the Senator from Washington, to which I have referred, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last fall your national organization held its annual convention in Baltimore. Because of the press of other business—a reelection campaign—I was unable to attend. So when your distinguished Senator and neighbor, HERBERT O'CONOR, invited me to address your club, I was happy to accept.

We in Congress are fortunate you send HERB O'CONOR to the Senate. In addition to ably representing you, he has a keen regard for the national welfare. This is particularly true on maritime matters. His outstanding service as a member of the subcommittee on merchant marine and maritime matters of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee gives an excellent example of his fine work. I am certain his expert knowledge of maritime affairs was learned along your waterfront in rubbing elbows with shipping men, both labor and management. He could not have picked a better home port for his schooling. Your city is one of the world's outstanding shipping and shipbuilding centers. Many of you contributed time and energy in developing such a fine port. You have every right to be proud of the excellent results.

Last year our maritime subcommittee investigated and studied the problems of the American merchant marine. I believe I

can state that we were objective in our approach. We wanted facts that would help in solving the many complex problems. We were not interested only in destructive criticism. Thanks to the cooperation of labor, management, Government, and the representatives of industry and civic organizations interested in a strong American merchant marine, such as your group, I am able to report progress in both the administrative and legislative fields.

Under Reorganization Plan 21, 1950, the old Maritime Commission was abolished. Conforming to the recommendations of the Hoover Report, the President's reorganization has brought a new spirit to the administration of our maritime laws. Admiral Cochrane, as Maritime Administrator and Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, Albert Gatov, and your fellow Baltimorean, A. J. Williams, have made fine progress in their new work. Given a reasonable opportunity to work out the problems, I believe they can succeed in erasing many of the mistakes of the past.

Perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation is the provision requiring that 50 percent of Government aid cargoes be transported in American-flag bottoms. During the doldrums in shipping, the requirement was invaluable in assuring cargoes for vessels. Needless to say the adoption of the provision was vigorously opposed by foreign shipping interests supported by certain Government agencies. That opposition still exists. We must be vigilant if we are to retain the principle in future legislation. With the pattern of world trade changing from day to day, we cannot afford to relax. Less than 9 months ago cargoes were short. Today they are abundant. No one knows what tomorrow will bring. You may be assured that I will do everything within my power to have the provision included in the India aid bill and any other similar type of legislation I know that Senator O'CONOR agrees with me.

We were also able to pass legislation establishing a permanent policy for the charter of vessels in the reserve fleet. In prohibiting the charter of Government ships except at times when American flag vessels are not available at reasonable rate and under reasonable conditions, the act assures the shipowner and labor of the maximum employment of the privately owned fleet and fully protects the public interest.

The bill also terminated the authority of the Government to sell ships under the Ship Sales Act of 1946. In the 2 weeks preceding the January 15, 1951, termination date, private operators purchased 131 ships. It is gratifying to realize the purchasers had sufficient confidence in the future of the privately owned American merchant marine to invest their funds in ships. If a further extension of the sales authority were to again result in such substantial additions to the American privately owned fleet, it might be advisable to reopen it for a very limited time. This is a matter it might be well to seriously consider.

The long fight for a more equitable formula in the tolls structure of the Panama Canal also came to a conclusion during the last Congress. The amendments to the Panama Canal Act provide a more realistic and businesslike formula for computing tolls. While the full effect of the formula on the toll structure has not been determined, there is no doubt that the legislation removes many of the discriminatory administrative and accounting procedures which forced shipping to pay an inordinate share of the costs of the canal.

On the west coast certain labor contracts contained provisions for seamen's welfare and pension plans. They could not be put in force because the Federal law prohibited deductions from seamen's pay for that purpose. We are successful in passing a bill to validate the plans.

The greatest deficiency in the Government's handling of maritime affairs is the lack of long-range planning. In an effort to correct the condition, Senator O'CONOR and I introduced and succeeded in having the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee favorably report to the Senate, the long-range shipping bill. The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee also reported the bill with a do-pass recommendation. Unfortunately, because of the time factor and preoccupation with problems arising out of the Korean conflict, we were unable to get a vote in either body.

Senator O'CONOR and I are still convinced of the merits of the legislation. We have reintroduced the bill as reported to the Senate.

Further hearings appear to be unnecessary. The subject was exhaustively covered in the last session. Many of the Treasury Department's objections to certain of the taxing provisions were met. This time, in the interest of resolving remaining objections, I have asked Treasury for a bill of particulars detailing the points at issue. It is due to be received any day. I am hopeful that as a result of this procedure, we can resolve any differences, at the same time retaining the principal objectives of the act. If this can be done positive action during this session is possible.

In the last two World Wars the intrinsic value of a privately owned American merchant marine was conclusively demonstrated. The facts show that in World War II, 95.7 percent of the arms, ammunition, and supplies for our Armed Forces moved in ships operated by private shipping companies acting as agents for the Government. The other 4.3 percent was carried by the military. The cargoes were delivered directly to the beachheads and supply ports and in many instances transferred at sea. The privately operated civilian-manned ships did everything the military-controlled and manned ships were able to do. They did it with substantially less manpower per ship and at a lower cost. The comparative manning scales for a Liberty ship amply illustrate my point.

The scale on a commercial Liberty including the gun crew was 70, on a civilian-manned Army Transport Liberty 79, while on a Navy military-manned Liberty the crew was 167. The comparative wage costs on a monthly basis were: commercial, $18,471; Army, civilian-manned, $22,097; and Navy, $25,516. The picture has not changed under Military Sea Transport Service operations. For example, a privately owned T-2 tanker operates with a crew of 43, an MSTS tanker, civilian-manned has 48, and a military manned 129, or 300 percent above the commercial vessel. Our subcommittee files reflect other comparable examples.

The World War II pattern continues to hold true in the present conflict. Figures released by MSTS show that for a 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1950, 5,500,000 measurement tons of cargo were carried trans-Pacific. Of this tonnage, 3,250,000 tons were carried to Korea and Japan; 2,250,000 tons moved to the South Pacific and interisland. Eighty-six percent of the cargoes were carried in privately operated, American-flag vessels, 14 percent in MSTS, other naval vessels, and a small number of foreign-flag ships. Again, the privately operated ships stood off the beaches at Inchon and Hungnam alongside their military counterparts, doing the same work.

Our greatest problem is scarcity of manpower. We cannot afford to waste it. The people rightfully demand that our military planners do everything to conserve this valuable asset. Necessity dictates the closest integration of civilian skills with military operations. Where, as in the case of shipping, the record conclusively evidences that civilian agencies can efficiently fulfill military logistic requirements at a saving in manpower and cost, the course we must follow is clear.

My position as to the operation by the military of a merchant fleet in peacetime should be well known. I am opposed. Such operations are a definite threat to the basic principle of private enterprise. We must plan now to prevent the occurrence of such an event. We cannot wait until the end of the present emergency. Entrenched power is difficult to displace. If a solution to the question indicates the necessity for legislative action to remove this type of Government competition, I will introduce the required legislation. With realistic planning this should not be necessary. I hope the military will cooperate with me in a program to insure a strong peacetime, privately operated, merchant marine. Knowing many of them as I do, I believe they will.

Our present active merchant fleet plus the mothball ships in reserve are considered by some to be sufficient for defense. This conclusion is not supported by the facts. We have a total active and inactive fleet of approximately 2,700 ships. In World War II we had 5,000 and could have used more. Also the greater percentage of the fleet has an effective speed of not more than 10 knots. Considering the speed of a modern submarine, this is much too slow. All informed persons admit that speed is an important factor.

Of equal importance is the alarming shortage of passenger ships available as troop carriers. In this category we have less than one-half of the tonnage we had prior to the last war. The deficiency has all been well documented. In 1947 the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine recognized it. More recently the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the several congressional committees considering the problem reached the same conclusion. Here again we have been deficient in long-range planning. But in spite of the uncertainties inherent in passenger ship operations, some companies have had the courage to build new passenger ships. They are to be congratulated for their optimism. That passenger vessels are highly important to our military potential is clearly pointed out by the fact that three out of six new passenger ships have already been requisitioned.

A short time ago I had a very instructive and interesting conversation with a leading British authority on shipping. He pointed out the need for more ships in the event of war with imperialist Russia. He made the point that if the Suez Canal were "knocked out," and this is well within the realm of probability, our situation would be desperate. Access to the Middle and Far East would be extremely difficult. The longer routes around Africa would require more ships. Until enough ships were built India and neighboring countries would be effectively cut off from contact with the West. The present fleets could not supply the tonnage to move equipment and troops to those vital areas. Nor are there enough ships to bring the necessary strategic materials so urgently needed for our industries or those of our allies.

No review, however brief, would be complete without mentioning shipbuilding. The status of shipbuilding has improved in the last 6 months. With the building of the 30 class mariner-type ships by the Maritime Administration and increased activity in naval building, many of the yards on the East and Gulf coasts will be able to maintain a reasonable nucleus of skilled workmen. This is not

true of the Pacific coast. If we are to have a well-balanced program on a sound national basis, we cannot afford to overlook the importance of shipbuilding in the West. The nature of modern warfare dictates that industries be dispersed throughout the country. Nor can we close our eyes to the lessons of World War II when our country was the prime supplier of merchant shipping to all our allies. This came about through an agreement between those two wartime leaders, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. The conditions motivating the agreement are set forth in a letter from the Administrator of War Shipping Administration to the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee on July 27, 1943. I quote:

"After Pearl Harbor, one of the general arrangements made by the President with the Prime Minister was that we, the United States, would be the merchant shipbuilder for our cause, while the British yards would be devoted largely to the construction of naval vessels. In accordance with this scheme, the British merchant-ship program was very substantially reduced. A number of persuasive and compelling considerations dictated this arrangement: First, we had the raw materials; second, we had the manpower; third, we had developed a technique which enabled us to produce in mass and with unbelievable speed a vast tonnage of merchant ships; fourth, the cargo was here in the United States to be moved to the various theaters of war."

The same economic and military factors exist today with greater force. We cannot dissipate any of our shipbuilding potential.

Just a few months ago there was a surplus of world tonnage. Due in large part to the Korean situation, the extension of our military and civilian aid programs and stockpiling of strategic materials, a shortage of tonnage has developed. It has become necessary to use the ships of the reserve fleet. The shortages are most acutely reflected in the skyrocketing rates for the transportation of full cargoes of bulk commodities. Liner rates have remained fairly constant. Considering rising costs, the liner rates may even be at a point where they are no longer compensatory.

To alleviate the shortage of ships available to transport the increased movements of Government cargoes, the Maritime Administration, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, is seriously considering operating ships on a general agency plan. To do this a National Shipping Authority has been set up. It is contemplated that the new agency will break out vessels of the reserve fleet and allocate them to private steamship companies for operation as agents for the Government. The program will be similar to that followed during World War II.

The facts which I have called to your attention appear to warrant a general agency operation provided that the operation is limited to Government-owned vessels. I am in accord with the thinking of those charged with administering our maritime laws, there is no necessity to include the privately owned fleet under general agency operations. Such a step would require requisitioning of the ships for charter or for hire. In my opinion it would be justified only in the event of a world conflagration. In the light of our past and present experience, I believe we can all agree that the Maritime Administration is the logical department to operate Government owned or controlled merchant type ships under a limited or unlimited general agency plan.

A Government general agency operation, even though limited in scope, will inevitably interfere with normal shipping operations. If it is not equitably administered there is grave danger the entire industry will be disrupted.

The policies governing agency operations in World War II worked well. Conditions then and today are materially similar. I am advised the Maritime Administrator contemplates adopting similar policies. In any event I am convinced that in allocating vessels or cargoes priority must be given to those companies which are engaged in operating only American flag vessels. Most of the responsible shipping representatives and unions will agree with me that such companies should take precedence over those which also operate vessels under foreign flags. This is particularly applicable under limited agency operations. Further, the integrity of existing services must be protected, particularly the subsidized and unsubsidized berth operators serving the essential trade routes. It would be ruinous to the future of the American merchant marine, if as the result of Government operations, regular berth line services were destroyed. Most informed persons agree with me that as soon as the privately owned American fleet is able to transport the emergency cargoes the Government's operation of merchant vessels must end. I have full confidence the administration will follow this course.

With the rapidly expanding need for shipping, a shortage of skilled seamen is developing. Some ships destined for Korea have been delayed because of the nonavailability of seamen in a particular area. The availability of manpower is generally considered as a local problem. Prior war experiences have conclusively proved that this reasoning cannot be applied to the maritime industry. Skilled seamen comprise a national pool. A national policy for deferment of skilled men is necessary if our defense needs are to be met. It is highly important that uniform procedures be set up and that local boards be informed of the facts.

In developing a long-range maritime policy consideration must be given to technological advances. One that may have a revolutionary import is rapidly shaping up in the atomic field. Our scientists report that a submarine engine using atomic energy will be completed within the year. The speed of a submarine with atomic propulsion is theoretically limited only by its construction features. This being so, ship speed as a defense factor is greatly minimized. We may have to convoy every ship if Russian scientists keep pace with ours. Of greater import will be the ultimate effect on the design of ships following the adaptation of atomic propulsion to surface ships. The step from subs to ships is short. I do not wish to hold out the hope the development is just around the corner. But good sense dictates we keep in mind all possibilities. A merchant fleet is costly and expensive. It lasts a long time. Planning ahead is necessary.

On the whole the outlook in maritime matters is brighter. The Federal Maritime Board and Administrator report progress in formulating methods and procedures for calculating construction and operating subsidies. A new spirit of cooperation with the GAO and other interested Government agencies is developing. The new keynote of constructive criticism augurs well for the future of shipping. But a lot of work remains to be done. A well-planned long-range program is a must. We are a great commercial Nation. Shipping is one of the principal cornerstones of our greatness. We must protect it. The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, recognizes the precept this can be best accomplished by a privately owned and operated merchant fleet. It expresses the sound national policy in keeping with our concept of life as a free people. We must strongly resist the encroachment of Government competition in shipping be it civilian or military.

You know the outstanding job the privately owned American merchant marine has done and can do in peacetime or in any emergency that may arise. It is incumbent on you as an individual, as a member of this club and as a patriotic citizen to tell the story. With your help and assistance we can build up a strong merchant marine—the fourth arm of defense.

Father Prudell, Chaplain in Korea, Fights for Men's Souls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in bringing to the attention of the House of Representatives and the American people the outstanding record of a fighting man in Korea, a fellow Milwaukeean of mine, who fights not with guns against a material enemy on the battle fronts but rather against the enemies of the soul.

I am speaking of Chaplain Harold O. Prudell, recently promoted to lieutenant colonel, chaplain, United States Army. Under unanimous consent, I include an account of Father Prudell's outstanding work in the RECORD.

Father Prudell, the son of Capt. and Mrs. J. A. Prudell, Veterans' Administration, Wood, Wis., was born in Manila, Philippine Islands, August 1, 1912. Upon his return to this country in 1915, his father was given a post at the Soldier's Home and he has lived there ever since.

He attended St. Florian's grade school and was graduated from St. John's Cathedral School. He attended Marquette University High School, graduating in 1931. After graduation he entered St. Francis Seminary and was awarded the bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees. He was ordained to the holy priesthood by Archbishop Stritch on June 3, 1939, in St. Anne's Church. His first solemn mass was celebrated at the Soldier's Home chapel on June 11, 1939.

During his vacation periods, while attending Marquette University High School and St. Francis Seminary, he attended the citizen's military training camp at Fort Sheridan—red, white, and blue course—from which he was graduated with high honors and was commissioned a second lieutenant of infantry in 1937. This rank he carried until his ordination to the holy priesthood.

In 1940, at the age of 28, he was the youngest chaplain in the United States Army, and the first Catholic priest of the Milwaukee archdiocese to enter the service with the rank of first lieutenant. He was promoted to the rank of captain on August 12, 1943, and later promoted to the rank of major in 1944.

His tour of service in the United States Army began at Camp McCoy, Wis. He

was transferred to Fort Knox, Ky., then transferred to Camp Custer, Mich. The same year he left for Iceland where he served for 23 months. He was then transferred to England for a short period and then to Northern Ireland where he remained until the invasion at Normandy, France, on June 6, 1944. During the invasion he was cited for the Bronze Star for meritorious service. He was assistant divisional chaplain of the Third Army, Fifth Infantry. He took part in all the engagements of that division in the liberation of France, Luxemburg, and so forth. After the liberation of Metz he took part in the ceremonials of the return of the Bishop of Metz in which he spoke to the liberated people in French and English; also took part in many outstanding activities in Luxemburg and in other cities of Germany.

At the capitulation of Germany on VE-day, May 8, he was stationed in Vienna, Austria, where he and many of his fellow officers and enlisted men received their orders to return to the United States, arriving on May 29, 1945.

Father Prudell has been awarded the Croix de Guerre and possesses the Purple Heart, European Theater Ribbon with five battle stars, the Bronze Star for meritorious service, and several other ribbons for similar bravery.

Upon his return from the European theater Father Prudell was assigned to the Chief of Chaplains' Office at Washington, D. C., after which he was assigned to the Army staff job at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., to prepare the new weekly Army publication entitled "The Chaplains' Hour." This publication was for the purpose of supplying lecture material for the Army's weekly nonsectarian lectures to all troops on morality and citizenship.

Father Prudell's approach to the problem of combating an alarming increase in the venereal-disease rate differed radically from the conventional attack used heretofore by the armed services.

An excerpt from a letter to his father, dated January 9, 1948, states:

A medical doctor and I rewrote the Army's policy and attitude which was signed by Secretary of War Robert Patterson. This directive on discipline and venereal disease became the accepted policy of the Army. In this directive I inserted the clause that chaplains would deliver citizenship-morality lectures as prepared by the Office of Chief of Chaplains. As this policy was implemented throughout the Army, venereal-disease rates went down and attitudes and morale improved.

My contention all along has been that it is not the duty of the Army to change a man after he has received the majority of his training in civil life, but it does have the responsibility not to lower his ideals, and, if possible, to give him continued inducements for better conduct as a good citizen.

Since the unification of the Armed Forces, it is of interest to know that the above program is being rewritten so as to become a policy, not only for the Army but the Navy and Air Forces as well.

After this work was completed, Father Prudell was assigned with a group of 10 Army officers on an Army mission to the far north, which included a tour of Alaskan military installations, Fort Churchill, Canada, Newfoundland, Greenland, and Labrador. This mission was under the leadership of Lt. Col. Hallett D. Edson, of Fort Monroe, Va. The mission was by plane and covered approximately 17,000 miles. Chaplain Prudell was instrumental in bringing about the revision of the Army health program. Emphasis was placed on morality instead of the old scare system. This new system was adopted by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff of the Army, after it had been given a thorough work-out at Fort Knox.

Chaplain Prudell is also a graduate of the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth. He served with the Planning and Training Division Office, Chief of Chaplains, Washington, D. C., and also was post chaplain at Fort Eustis, Va., where he received orders to proceed to Korea.

He was first stationed in Tokyo, Japan, and was titled "The Flying Chaplain of Japan." He said mass at Camp Drake, flew 80 miles to Camp McNair and said mass and then returned to Camp Drake for the rosary, and so forth.

Chaplain Prudell was recently appointed as chaplain of the First Cavalry Division near Tokyo, which was recently announced by Maj. Gen. Robert Gay.

On December 23, 1950, Father Prudell received the announcement that he had been promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel as of December 5, 1950.

Father Prudell's work on the Korean battle fronts continues to be over and above the call of duty as is evidenced by the excerpts from letters of commendation:

In rendering services so faithfully to our wounded and our dying you have not only brought comfort to those who need it, but have brought credit upon yourself and to the division and have been in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service.

HOBART R. GAY,
Major General, United States Army, Commanding Officer, First Cavalry Division.

During the dark days of Taegu, the chaplain was present at the hospital until late into the night, covering both this hospital and the Fifteenth Clearing Company, again at Kaesong he was present when the wounded arrived from the front. Whenever he had a few spare moments he held services for the Catholic personnel of the hospital.

Chaplain Prudell has accomplished his duties faithfully, a job well done, for which the officers and men of this organization humbly thank him.

ISSAC J. TENDER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Marine Corps.

Address of Robert E. Sherwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday afternoon, March 6, in New York, representatives of the publishers, booksellers, book manufacturers, book reviewers, and others associated with the book trade met for the presentation of the second annual national book awards. The national book award, sponsored by the American Book Publishers Council, the American Booksellers Association, and the Book Manufacturers Institute, is the first award to have the sponsorship of the entire book industry. It was established in 1950 to honor the most distinguished books of fiction, nonfiction, and poetry written by American authors.

Gold medals were presented to the winning authors at a ceremony attended by over 500 authors, critics, librarians, and members of the book industry from all over the country. Edward A. Weeks, editor of the Atlantic Monthly, presided over the award ceremony. The speaker for the event was Robert E. Sherwood, four-time Pulitzer prize winner.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to be able to place in the RECORD the following excerpts from Mr. Sherwood's address:

Last summer I made a speech at the opening of the PEN Congress in Edinburgh, and my remarks provoked quite a bit of controversy at the time and subsequently. I was frequently interrupted. One gentleman jumped to his feet and shouted that he had come there to listen to a discussion of the drama and not a lot of dirty American propaganda against the Soviet Union.

Among those present was the distinguished Scottish dramatist, the late and lamented James Bridie. I am afraid that Mr. Bridie—distracted perhaps by the heckling—did not pay very strict attention to what I said, for he later quoted me as having stated that all writers should write nothing but propaganda.

Now, I can say stupid things as well as the next one, but I could not possibly have said anything quite as stupid as that.

What I did say is that no sensitive writer of today can be unaware of the dreadful circumstances of the surrounding world. It is only natural for writers, like other people, to yearn for escape. But now we can find no ivory tower that is sufficiently strong and sufficiently remote to provide a safe refuge.

In this connection I should like to quote from one of the finest speeches I have ever read—the speech delivered by Bill Faulkner in Stockholm 2 months ago when he received the award of the Nobel prize. Mr. Faulkner said:

"Our tragedy today is a general and universal physical fear so long sustained by now that we can even bear it. There are no longer problems of the spirit. There is only the question: When will I be blown up? Because of this, the young man or woman writing today has forgotten the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself which alone can make good writing because only that is worth writing about, worth the agony and the sweat."

Incidentally, if there is anyone here who has not read all of Mr. Faulkner's short speech, I urge you to do so. It is required reading for anyone who is interested in writing or the publication thereof. The speech was printed in the New York Herald Tribune book review section of January 14 and in Bennett Cerf's department in the Saturday Review of Literature, the February 3 issue.

I do not agree with Mr. Faulkner that "the young man or woman writing today has forgotten the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself."

The dilemma of all writers, young or old, is in reconciling those problems of the human heart with a world state of mind that appears to become increasingly inhuman.

Some of the brutal, barbaric censorship which is imposed on writers and artists of all kinds in the Soviet Union is imposed on writers everywhere. There is certainly plenty of it in this country. It is imposed not by law, not by any arbitrary theoreticians in the White House or the Pentagon Building or even by Senator McCarthy; it is imposed by inward fear.

It is not necessarily fear that at any moment we may all be fascioned.

It is fear that all of our highest hopes and our deepest convictions may be subject to change without notice.

I believe it is no exaggeration to say that those of us who have lived through the first half of the twentieth century have seen more violent changes on the face of this earth than there were in all of the preceding 50 centuries of recorded history. The only pattern that we have known is a pattern of unmitigated and unpredictable instability and turbulence.

The writer who is old enough has distant memories of tranquillity, of the calm afterglow of the Victorian era, the calm that was forever shattered by the shots fired at Sarajevo.

The young writer may have memories of the apparent tranquillity of the 1920's, but he now knows how utterly phony and deceptive and ultimately disillusioning that was.

As Mr. Faulkner has said, we have known this fear—this instability, this awful uncertainty as to what the morrow may bring—we have known it so long that we can bear it.

Mr. Faulkner's career, and the high honors that he has won and earned, prove that we can do more than bear it, we can eventually conquer it and end it.

Just as we have been sorely tried in this age, we have been greatly tested. I think that the way in which the human race has met that test is sufficient proof of its durability.

In a play that I wrote 11 years ago, at the outbreak of the Second World War, I quoted some words from the Epistles of St. Paul, and I should like to quote those words now: "We glory in tribulation; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope."

I think that is sufficient text for any writer in the free world today.

The Perpetual Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proposing in a bill that I have introduced today the adoption on New Year's Day, 1956, of The Perpetual Calendar devised by Willard E. Edwards, an electrical engineer of Honolulu.

Mr. Edwards has devoted many years to the study of calendar reform. He was born at Chatham, Mass., in 1903. He attended the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Oklahoma where he received his degree in engineering. He later was a graduate student at the University of Southern California. He was called into the service of the Navy during World War II and attained the rank of lieutenant commander. He has had extensive flying and aeronautical experience, and is an expert in radio and telephone communications. He now makes his home in Honolulu.

The Perpetual Calendar of 12 months and equal quarters is regarded by Mr. Edwards as the logical successor to the 13-month calendar proposed 20 years ago by George Eastman of the Eastman Kodak Co. At that time Mr. Eastman was actively engaged in furthering the adoption of a 13-month calendar to replace our present irrational one. He regarded this movement as a natural evolution in modern life and succeeded in getting more than 100 corporations to adopt the 13-period calendar for their internal accounting purposes.

But auditing, inventories, production, dividends, taxes, etc., are largely and increasingly being accounted for on a quarterly basis, and most of these concerns have now returned to the customary calendar system. Thirteen cannot be split into quarters, and a double system of bookkeeping proved too costly and inconvenient in most cases.

Moreover, to the average individual, 13 identical months of 4 weeks each is exceedingly monotonous, and the fact that there are 13 Fridays-the-13th in the 13-month calendar is very unattractive from a popular viewpoint. Also, with the 1st and 15th always on Sundays, this would cause many monthly and semimonthly payments to be postponed or advanced and would often cause needless expense, confusion, and embarrassment.

The Edwards Perpetual Calendar is described by its supporters as the simplest, the most practical, the easiest to use and to remember of any equal-quarter calendar yet offered for adoption.

The Perpetual Calendar has regularity without monotony, contains 26 working days (plus Sundays) in each month, and allows holidays and anniversaries to fall always on the same day of the week, year after year. This is accomplished by the simple operation of removing 1 day out of 365 from the regular count of the week after its adoption.

To begin with, New Year's Day, an already well-known and internationally celebrated holiday, is proposed not as January 1 but as a "day apart." This is like the "extra day" we now have on crossing the date line from west to east, where two succeeding days of the week occur with the same name. This system has been successfully employed at the one hundred and eightieth meridian, for our convenience in reckoning days, ever since 1884 without any apparent hardship occurring to anyone.

This "day apart" in The Perpetual Calendar is thus taken care of painlessly at the beginning of each year, allowing the remaining 364 days to be divided exactly into 52 weeks and into 4 quarters of 91 days each. It also becomes the 3d day of a 3-day week end, since it follows a Saturday and Sunday (December 30 and 31), and it will not interfere with church attendance. This is more practical than having the "day apart" at the end of the year, since such an arrangement would interfere with Sunday observance and cause a 4-day holiday which would be too disruptive to business.

The second day of the new year, a Monday in The Perpetual Calendar, thus becomes January 1 and will always be the first business or working day of the new year.

In fact, Monday is shown in this calendar as the first day of every week, with Saturday and Sunday at the end, where a "week end" belongs. Three arguments for this are that it is a real and natural need of human nature to rest after a period of work, the seventh day was the Biblical day of rest, and in actual business practice the week is already considered as beginning on Monday. However, for those who prefer it that way, The Perpetual Calendar may be readily printed with Sunday as the first day.

In this up-to-date calendar, the month lengths fall into the easily remembered pattern of 30–30–31, and the starting days into the well-known sequence of Monday-Wednesday-Friday, days on which many weekly events regularly occur. The day of the week for any day in the year can be easily figured in a few seconds by remembering "30, 30, 31; Monday, Wednesday, Friday." No other rhyme or "jingle" is necessary to compute any future date.

The first and the fifteenth, important monthly and semimonthly payroll, bill-paying and accounting days, always fall on weekdays in The Perpetual Calendar. This plan thus becomes the most practical one for a new fixed up-to-date international civil calendar.

There is no unlucky Friday the 13th, or Black Friday, in The Perpetual Calendar to worry the superstitious or to deter them from business sales and the signing of contracts. The elimination of this ancient bugaboo will actually help in many businesses. Executives know that a great many people are not willing to sign contracts, buy insurance or transact business on a Friday the 13th. The elimination of all Fridays the 13th on this calendar has been favorably noted and commented on by thousands of people. This is important to businessmen. Even though they themselves are not superstitious, their customers often are.

Leap-Year Day in leap years comes between June 31 and July 1, and is a second day apart, the first day of the second half-year. It is proposed as a new international summer holiday but may also be considered as a second Sunday. This is a great advantage, for if 2 days apart are to occur in any fixed calendar, it is better for them to be rest days than to be working days, both for workers and for business accounting purposes.

The Perpetual Calendar is offered to the United Nations for international adoption as the simplest and the most practical of any 12-month fixed calendar yet proposed. It is an up-to-date civil calendar, entirely suitable for everyday business, social, judicial, governmental, and school use. It has the main advantages of other proposals, but not their inherent disadvantages.

If Congress and the United Nations will definitely recommend that The Perpetual Calendar be universally adopted beginning with 1956, there should be plenty of time between now and then to prepare the American Ephemeris and other advance publications.

There is no valid objection to the adoption of The Perpetual Calendar, and nothing is accomplished by defending or cherishing our present irrational calendar. We make progress through adopting better methods, and if human inertia and natural resistance to change can be overcome, we may all be able to enjoy the time- and money-saving convenience of having a more useful calendar.

Reprinting The Perpetual Calendar itself creates reader interest and provides a clearer understanding of it. People always like to look at it to see on what day of the week their birthdays and other anniversaries will always fall. It is freely offered for the use of all nations and races, and no permission is necessary in order to reproduce it.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that The Perpetual Calendar be reproduced at this point in the RECORD.

The Perpetual Calendar is as follows:

THE PERPETUAL CALENDAR

*New Year's Day (a day apart from any week or month) is the first day of each year, a holiday, followed by the 364-day fixed calendar shown below:

January							February							March						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

April							May							June						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

*Leap-Year Day (a second day apart) is observed only during leap years between June 31 and July 1 as the first day of the second half-year, a holiday.

July							August							September						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

October							November							December						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

*These two year-days are definitely named and have a definite purpose. When considered apart from any week, they allow the calendar to become fixed and perpetual.

The Democracies Must Unite to Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include herewith the following text of an address delivered recently before the Washington Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee by the well-known motion-picture actor, Douglas Fairbanks, Jr.:

THE DEMOCRACIES MUST UNITE TO SURVIVE

Today the free world in general, and the United States in particular, are indulging themselves in the luxury of a great debate, a vast discussion involving the very survival of those privileges upon which the life of our society depends. These privileges are so fundamental in our philosophy that we call them rights, but as such a large part of humanity either denies them as rights or has never heard of them, it is perhaps more realistic to call them privileges. The arguments stem from a common agreement on the need to preserve—and even enlarge upon—these privileges. One of our biggest current handicaps in deciding what and how is of having to advertise in advance every possible line of national action to our potential enemies. When, say, we decide to resist at one point but give way at another, when we decide how many we will requisition for our defense forces and where and how we will deploy them, when we decide what the limits of our economy are, these and other vital military and political statistics are publicly analyzed down to the last decimal point and presented to the rest of the world on a platter. So-called secret conferences and off-the-record briefings of officials, presumably concerned with the Nation's welfare, find their way, all or in part, to someone's favorite column. To make matters worse, divergencies between friendly powers on matters of emphasis and procedure provide our enemies with a good hint as to where allied weaknesses can be exploited. We will certainly agree that these charges against the privileges we enjoy can be written off. They are deductible. We would not, if we could, curtail any one of our freedoms. Decisions arrived at via responsible public and parliamentary argument is still the soundest method of providing an intelligent community with the means of determining, and then supporting, its policy.

Though taking our own habits for granted it must be confusing to less blessed lands, immovably placed in the shadow of a militant tyranny; yet listening to our great debate from afar, to know whose voice means business, on whom to depend, on which side of them lies consistency and purpose. This confusion is, of course, abetted by our enemies. We have seen how the Soviets sneer at our achievements and seek to disillusion the well-founded hopes of friends. Our Puritan conscience obliges us to pause from time to time, take stock of ourselves, and, as at a public confessional, openly acknowledge our own weaknesses and assume a defensive stance.

Surely, we can sympathize with those of our friends who during the great debate hear of proposals to assign what is left of their bodies to a loose fraternity of nations whose strongest member speaks with many mouths, first proposing to stand with them, then behind them, then to withdraw (in the hope of being a "last fortress"), then (the other extreme) to disperse its forces on any front where trouble may start. Promises of eventual success are apt to sound ephemeral and less immediately tempting than peace and a loaf of bread.

If a modern Rip van Winkle were to awake from a 20-year sleep on the banks of the Hudson today, he would undoubtedly be as shocked as was the old Van Winkle of a century and a half ago. He would not, I think, be so shocked by the screaming headlines, the blaring radio, or the publicity seekers. "These," he would say nostalgically, "are but the old methods with new trimmings." What would disturb him is the apparent substitution of American faith and purpose with self-queries of whether democracy's destiny is indeed manifest. He would ask: "What happened? Was a great war lost? Has the productivity of the free world lessened? Are the masses of people restive and worse off? Have the hopes for a fear-free world been dashed for a lack of a champion, for lack of incentive? Whence comes this apprehension at home, this trepidation abroad? Where has the great revolutionary vigor of Magna Carta days, of Puritan days, or the eighteenth century, gone? What has become of the great sense of mission which united the people of the world in the idea of freedom? Why do so many either embrace an old, reactionary idea like Russian communism or are paralyzed by the fear of it?"

Surely our reply to old Rip would be plain: First, we could assure him that insofar as America's resistance is concerned the people are not divided on anything but method, that they are fearful because they know that no one nation or system can stand alone for long and survive, that the American community is more a system than a nation, and that until we are more seriously articulate about our objectives we cannot rekindle that flame in men's hearts which makes for greatness and without which our survival is questionable. Second, we could point out the poignant dilemma faced by other friendly communities, severely bled and weakened by war, which see their homes as prospective battlegrounds for giants—one giant, disciplined and dedicated, forcefully imposing regimented order in dynamic terms, while the other giant, prosperous, content, fearful of discipline and unsure of its goal, proposes more obligations and sacrifices as the road to an unspelled-out freedom. Third, we could remind him that each community, understandably, views threats to its accustomed, or desired, ways of life primarily from the vantage-point of its own interests. These interests are rarely appreciated by its neighbors and friends. On an international scale, the British, for example, look to the security of their home islands and commonwealth; Hong Kong and the Mid-East are as important to them as Panama and Hawaii are to us. The French, for their part, are rightfully concerned about internal insecurity, about welcoming an ancient enemy as an ally against a new one and about their tremendous military investments halfway around the world. The numerically weak but gallant Dutch have global problems vital to their very existence. Each one of us has problems peculiar to his own life and tends to put these first things first, considering his friend's problems only afterward.

These, then, are some of the reasons for our doubts and fears. To understand them is at least a step toward coping with them. We are obliged to recognize the frailties and humanisms of the world of independent nations which are attempting to meet the challenge of a great and ambitious power whose objectives and philosophy are well known. This power and its bonded associates receive direction from a single source and no means are too sinister, too pitiless, to distract its attention from its ends. The forces resisting it are, (a) the United States—also a great power, but whose potential strength is weakened by a deficiency of clearly stated objectives, and (b) the rest of the free world—some strong, some weak, though, as a whole, rich in manpower and resources and culture, but uncoordinated and uninspired. Both (a) and (b) are together far stronger than the combination which threatens them. But our modern Van Winkle would never believe it by the way all these people are kept separated and disunited, internally and externally. He would remember Thomas Jefferson's admonition that a civilization's real greatness depend not on statistics but on the

quality of human being it produces. Yet even this commodity is vouchsafed the Western World in overwhelming abundance.

The United States has done a great deal to promote the general welfare—its own and others—and to throw light onto dark corners. To help heal the wounds of two wars and to reinvigorate ourselves and our friends, the American people wholeheartedly supported vast international economic projects, and, in large part, they have succeeded in their purpose. The Marshall plan halted and, in places, hurled back the rapid epidemic spread of the Soviet virus. An increase in material welfare and moral self-respect were pitted against Marxist dialectic. Also, after years of hampering world trade by selling a lot but buying only a little, we made a wise though tentative beginning sometime back toward a lowering of tariffs. We have spurred postwar foreign reconstruction and rehabilitation, encouraged a military alliance, in the form of the Atlantic Pact and put ourselves in the vanguard of those who, despite all, will fight for a principle. But, as the potency of today's threat to our survival is unprecedented, as the power and will alined against the things we are pledged to is relentless and as the test to our nerves and patience is wracking, what we have done so far is clearly not enough. Somehow, our program needs greater and more positive definition.

This deadly germ of the Soviet ideology works its way into the blood stream of the free world's body politic. Like crime, it is not enough to punish or suppress it. We must do more than merely contain the Marxist disease. We must eliminate its causes. Only by a positive policy of set objectives, executed by concerted community action, can we hope to succeed. But how can we and our friends take any initiative unless we know, within limits, what we want?

Obviously, everyone prefers a life of opportunity to one of resignation to direction—to be independent and not dependent. Less obviously, do we realize that successful independence requires the cooperation of the other fellow. It is by mutual indulgence and consideration that individual independence can peacefully be practiced. Independence is a proud and heady brew and is difficult to achieve and maintain. It must be based on common interests, exercised by a common authority, commonly supported. Only in that way can the potential of any free fraternity be realized.

Full and comprehensive agreement appears to be a long way off. We have not yet agreed even between ourselves on where or how or how much to resist; nor do we know quite where we are heading for should our resistance prove successful. What are our long-range, future plans? Are we to recreate the past, withdraw to our arbitrary, man-made borders, let dog eat dog? Are the nations of the world again to vie for trade privileges and jockey for economic advantages?

I wonder if we could, perhaps, hope to ease world problems in a way similar to the method we have evolved on this continent, where, for instance, a Texas cattleman has a stake in the prosperity of a Michigan car manufacturer who is, in turn, dependent on the Pennsylvania coal miner who helps support the Ohio farmer? Would it be too farfetched to dream of a time when a Lancashire cotton spinner will share his vote with a steel worker in the Saar, whose efforts somehow relieve an Italian farmer's bad ha vest? As the Californian and Arizonian resolve their local differences on, say, water supply when voting on purely Federal matters, would not the free world's welfare be enhanced if Parisians, Romans, and New Yorkers were also to pool their hopes and interests? Could not, to bring the conjecture down to earth, General Eisenhower's burden be considerably eased if he were able to report to one body capable of issuing precise directives with the speed which the situation will require? Could not western diplomats speak and act for one group, with one set of objectives, or is unity of interest and purpose only for members of the Soviet Empire?

Of course, no proud community wishes to be absorbed by any alien one. Our own Colonies, after uniting in revolution, were some time deciding that their interests lay in federation. Though I venture to say that most men now believe in union—at least in theory—they hesitate today when even wider union is proposed. It is less surprising that this should be so abroad than it is here, in the United States.

There is a curious apprehension of exploring and exploiting a basic element of our own greatness, the greatness inherent in our national motto: "E Pluribus Unum." We know our strength lies in unity—our kind of unity, a voluntary, self-imposed and supported unity. Furthermore, circumstances oblige us, however reluctantly, to recognize that only by unity with Western Europe can we achieve the necesary balance of power to restrain the Soviet combination.

Who, then, argues against binding ourselves in all necessary respects to each other? The American? The European? Americans do not ask for empire. We do not seek to impose the American or any other form of government on anyone. It is proposed to create some compatible form of union—a union of basic and common interests. Better yet, it is proposed that, within the Charter of the United Nations, a convention of democratic and like-minded associates investigate the feasibility of setting up an authority which can speak for its peoples with one voice. It need not and it should not, at this time, dot every "i" and cross every "t." It could, as I see it, begin on a purely provisional and limited basis. It would concern itself for a moment merely with exploring the potential advantage and efficiency which such an authority could achieve. Without something of the sort, we can be sure that no amount of national military power or economic sustenance can or will avail us. Without the double-edged weapon of basic common interests and a spiritual urge, we cannot hope to sustain ourselves.

We have seen how the Soviets identify themselves and their cause with the international workingman. Taking the world at large, this has been a fertile field, because when the international workingman's concern is to exist, he sometimes finds it hard to enthuse over a promise of free votes and free speech. We know, by instinct and experience, that there is at once both a subtler and a more dynamic key to the mutual identification of mankind's fate. We must somehow identify our fate with the fate of others, theirs with ours. It is our own lack of emphasis on such motives for policy that affords the Marxist sloganeers such a widely receptive audience.

When we are asked what America is for, let us say that our first concern is for all peoples to live according to their own needs and desires, not as mere numbers in a soulless, totalitarian state. Let us say that we are for a standard of moral decency and behavior for and between all men and nations, not for a life of spying on our families and the distortion of truths in order that the unholy holy state shall survive. Though famously abjuring the use of violence or the threat of it to obtain our ends, we should make it unmistakably clear that should we or our friends be threatened by violence, in any form, we will reciprocate in kind. Let us say that we are for the further extension of economic freedom and opportunity, and for the system by which every man's right to live his life, enjoy his liberties and, armed with basic security, to pursue happiness as he sees it, protected and encouraged by laws of his consent. Let us then trumpet those ideas around the world till they echo and reecho. Then let us expose the great lie which makes slavery and terror appear to be the only hope, the only security and salvation. Let others from far places assert the same theme in their own tongue and take up the cry in a spirit of fanaticism and revolt against the great conspiracy against mankind. After all, this theme is not an American idea. It is as old as humanity itself. It is as old as sin. Man has always fought for one and against the other.

Having well and truly stated what we are for, we should indicate the way permanently to establish it. My own view is that we need a roof under which all men can find shelter. Once having taken into account ancient prides and prejudices, we should take the first step in proposing to the free world the creed of union by which we live. Let us by all means move cautiously. Everyone else will, you may be sure, do likewise. We must first explore what should be done and then what could be done—then do it.

As I see it, members of an international democratic union would, in the common interest, surrender only those facets of national decision required to make the union a recognizable and effective force. To spell it out, the proposers for Atlantic Union ask now only for a convention of the sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact (and any other free countries that the group wishes to invite) to explore together the extent to which they might apply among themselves the principles of a limited federation, all within the framework of the United Nations Organization. The convention would then report back its findings and recommendations to the governments and peoples represented. The union could be established only after those recommendations had been accepted, which, in our country, would require an amendment of the Constitution.

It is important to point out that this convention would not interfere with the efforts we are already making to meet the present emergency. In no wise do I see it is a substitute for existing diplomatic machinery, be it that of the Atlantic Pact, the United Nations, or any other. It would merely investigate the possibility of finding a stronger "situation of strength" in federation by law than in alliance by treaty.

It is true that many deeply ingrained national interests appear at variance. Britain hesitates to commit her precious resources to a continental plan, because she fears an association from which, if it doesn't succeed, she might not be able to extricate herself. France finds it difficult to lead a movement toward European commonality without Britain. America treads gently on the feelings of Latin-America, yet scolds wounded Europe for not seeing all international problems through our eyes. Union is difficult to achieve, but once established it would provide the tangible machinery of pooling these problems on the basis of common interests. The convention I speak of would study the means by which the differences on procedure and emphasis could be reconciled; it would recommend the method by which the democratic peoples can integrate their strength; it would provide the spiritual inspiration for which the mind and soul of the world hunger. We, in the United States, can give the lead. We shall require patience, wisdom, imagination, and courage. We shall have to persevere without hatred or malice. What are we afraid of? Ourselves? The Soviet Empire? Our friends? No, of course not. Then let us take the initiative on all fronts; not only in armaments and economic aid, not only in military leadership, but in concrete proposals

for a better life for ourselves and for mankind than any which the Comintern can supply. Let us propose the revolution of all individuals against tyranny of some, let us propose the oneness of mankind, the spirit and the fact of a real and workable association of peoples. The time has come when we must provide these peoples of the world with a vested interest in freedom.

If we are for international decency, let us state it. If we are for the dignity of man, let us profess it. If we are for honest and direct dealings, let us proclaim it. If we are for strength and an ever fuller life through unity, let us build it. If we are for our faith, faith in our God and our fellow men, let us fight for it.

An Attempt To Come to Agreement With the Masters of the Kremlin Abandons Their Victims, the Peoples of the Soviet Union and of Satellite Nations, Who Want To Get Rid of Those Masters Who Now Enslave Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit a series of articles which were published in the Milwaukee Sentinel February 26, 27, and 28 on the Russian underground movement aimed at the overthrow of Soviet tyranny. These articles show how the Russian underground could be developed to the extent that it may be possible for the Russians to overthrow their Communist oppressors:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 26, 1951]

TRIDENT SPREADS WORD TO RUSS OF REBELLION AGAINST RULERS—KERSTEN SEEKS UNITED STATES AID IN MOVE TO OVERTHROW REDS

(By Edward P. Halline)

The Communist land of the hammer and sickle is now seeing the sign of the trident in public places everywhere.

The trident is the sign with which the growing underground resistance in Soviet Russia is showing an oppressed people that there is a revolt in the making, that there is hope they can be rid of the bloody tyranny that has ruled them for 30 years.

An American policy which would take advantage of that revolutionary movement and encourage the Russian people to fight to regain their liberties is being urged by Representative CHARLES J. KERSTEN, Republican, of Milwaukee's Fifth District.

KERSTEN has been in communication with anti Communist Russians in this country and has in his possession samples of anti-Communist underground literature which has been circulated behind the iron curtain by every kind of trick and wile.

The desperate efforts of the secret police have not availed to keep these bitter attacks on Stalin and his tyrannical regime from getting into the hands of the people of Russia.

KERSTEN said:

"In the past 30 years the Communist regime has murdered 40,000,000 Russians. It has put another 15,000,000 in slave-labor camps. There is hardly a family that has not felt the whip or the club of this police state."

REVOLT LOGICAL

To KERSTEN, to many other Congressmen, to the Russians here in touch with the revolutionary movement, the only policy that makes sense is the policy that will help the Russian people overthrow their oppressors.

The vast potential of hatred built among the Russian people by 30 years of suffering hasn't yet been tapped. It must be if America and the Western World are going to win the cold war, say Kersten, Constantine W. Boldyreff, professor of Russian at Georgetown University, Washington, and Prof. Vladimir N. Petrov, Yale.

SEEKS CONGRESS ACTION

So KERSTEN is going to propose that Congress go on record to express its sympathy with the oppressed people of Russia and satellite countries, to say that the governments that rule them are not legitimate governments and to offer every possible assistance to the movement for freedom.

Congress currently has before it a resolution, on Russian relations, introduced by Senator MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut, and other Senators of both parties, including Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin.

REAFFIRMS FRIENDSHIP

This reaffirms the friendship of the American people for all other peoples including the people of the Soviet Union, regrets the artificial barrier that separates them from those peoples and says America desires "neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war."

But then comes a declaration which KERSTEN says will antagonize the great mass of Russians who long for freedom. Here is the wording of the McMahon resolution:

"Although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences between them and the Soviet government."

SEEN AS VAIN HOPE

To the Russians yearning to be rid of the Red tyranny, that is nothing more than an expression of a vain hope for friendship with a regime relentlessly determined to extend its tyranny over the whole world.

Would KERSTEN's substitute for the McMahon resolution provoke the Communist government into a full-scale war?

"No," says KERSTEN. "Russia would march today if the Communists thought they could win a war."

In last November's Reader's Digest, Professor Boldyreff wrote:

"World war III can be prevented by an immediate and vigorous psychological attack aimed at the enemy's weakest spot—smoldering opposition of the Russian people against their oppressors in the Kremlin. The masters of the Kremlin dread most a movement that will show their victims how to shake off Communist control."

(Future articles will tell how the underground functions behind the iron curtain, how hope is being instilled into the victims of the Red tyranny, how the fighters for freedom are strengthening their cause while waiting for the strategic day to strike off their chains.)

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 27, 1951]

HOW ANTI-RED RUSS UNDERGROUND OUTWEARS SOVIET OFFICIALS—KERSTEN REVEALS REVOLT TRICKS

(By Edward P. Halline)

In Leningrad a few weeks ago a slightly tipsy worker boarded a streetcar in the central part of the city. He started talking to the guard stationed on board and gave him a drink from a bottle of vodka.

The guard quickly warmed up and a friendly conversation was proceeding when the worker suddenly handed him a package of cookies to have with the drinks. Then the worker got off the car as fast as he could.

The guard, immediately suspicious, shouted an order for his new acquaintance to stop. But the man vanished in the crowd on the street.

Then the guard opened the package. The contents exploded all over the car and out into the street. They were anti-Red, anti-Stalin leaflets put out by NTS (initials of the Russian name, variously translated as National Toilers' Society and National Alliance of Russian Solidarists).

The worker was an NTS agent, and this was just one of the tricks by which the underground makes Soviet officials themselves the unwitting allies in the distribution of anti-Communist literature, said Representative KERSTEN in telling of the revolutionary movement behind the iron curtain.

Most of the literature is printed outside the iron curtain. It is smuggled into Russia and the satellite countries and distributed by every means that will avoid detection.

Copies of the Posev, the Russian anti-Communist paper printed in West Berlin, have been circulated all through Russia, sometimes by use of balloons and rockets. (Posev translates to "sowing" or "seeding time.")

Rockets can be fired about 2 miles. When they land leaflets are scattered. Balloons, too, are loaded with anti-Communist literature and usually they land where the literature will be found.

Plenty of Russians are naturally afraid to pick up or read the underground leaflets, especially in public places, said KERSTEN.

But the fact that such literature gets through shows the people the secret police are far from invincible. This raises hopes of even the most fearful and, at the same time, helps undermine the morale of the police and the Communist officials.

That is the reason for marking the sign of the trident in public places. It is the way a Russian publicly shows his allegiance to the cause without exposing himself to the vengeance of the Communists.

Other Russians may not know who put the sign there, but they know there is another patriot pledged to join the uprising when the time comes to act.

As the sign of the trident spreads over Russia and the satellite countries the psychological effect increases in intensity, KERSTEN has been told by Russian leaders in the movement.

Behind the iron curtain KERSTEN said, the underground is not yet organized in cells or groups. NTS leaders are waiting until the time is ripe for concerted action.

It still is too dangerous to act in groups or even meet in secret. One member, if arrested, can be tortured by the secret police into revealing names and plans. So even the fighters in the underground are not told the names. Their instructions come from the anti-Communist paper printed in Berlin and from the leaflets scattered everywhere.

LEAFLET MESSAGE TRANSLATED

Here is the translation of the instructions to prospective workers in the anti-Communist underground:

"Comrade, friends, if you will read everything written here, and read it again, honestly and sincerely, will think it over, and will decide to take part in the struggle for truth among the people, you are already halfway to victory. The main thing: you will decide to cross the line of lies and hypnotism of Stalin propaganda. If you succeed in doing it, you are already a freeman. Free at this moment within yourself, free in heart and soul. You will see the world about you

in an entirely different light—as it is, and not as presented to you by that incessant and agonizing 'toothache'—government: propaganda.

"If in your soul you surmount that propaganda, you are no longer a slave of Stalin's, but a free fighter in the cause of liberation for your motherland.

"If you decide to take a personal oath to your conscience, when alone think and feel each word of this:

" THE OATH

" 'As a true and honest son of Russia, I give my word, and swear truly and truthfully to serve the cause of freedom for my people in the National Toilers Society. I swear in all my actions to be guided by the honor and welfare of my country, sparing no effort during the revolutionary struggle to fulfill the instructions of the revolutionary staff of the Pitchfork (Trident) NTS (The Sign).'

"Then, if you are a believer, make the sign of the cross. If not, go into the field and kiss the earth that gave you life, the earth that is drenched with the blood of our martyrs and our heroes, the earth which you must free. From this moment you are a charter member of this association of the free.

"What are you to do when you set out on the road to fight for liberty?

"The revolutionary staff is sending throughout the country these first battle instructions:

"1. With all means available to you, spread the word of the fight for liberation. Multiply our pamphlets and articles from our news-sheets; compose revolutionary tracts yourself; copy them by hand—using printed letters so that your handiwork will not be recognized; and carefully, so as not to be discovered, leave them where they are sure to attract someone's attention later—in the cars of the trains, in the streetcars and metros (subways); on the tables of eating houses; in offices; and on the work benches in factories. Pin or paste them on the walls of houses and on fences. If you are abroad in the army of occupation, send pamphlets to your motherland. Already thousands of fighters spread our word of liberation in these ways.

"2. Whenever you can, without risk of discovery, draw with chalk, pencil, or lime—or paint—the recognized sign of our association, the sign of our unity—the Pitchfork (Trident) of the people's anger; or draw the letters NTS (which also mean: 'We bring death to tyrants; and: we carry freedom to the toilers).' Do one, or the other, or both. Repeat it. Be not disturbed if at first results are not immediately apparent; sooner or later you will find at the same place, beside your sign or letter, additional signs or letters drawn by other hands. They are your unknown confederates letting you know of their presence. If walking in the street, you see our fighting sign, look to see if no passersby are close, and extend your greetings to your friends by drawing a sign yourself. In order to appraise the significance of this step, remember how such acknowledgment will encourage him, knowing that he is not alone.

"In our motherland, even now in many cities our friends signal, one to another. The 'power,' while it can, conceals all information about the fight against it; but soon it will be able to conceal no longer. Soon throughout the entire land will blink and twinkle the lights of our cause, our struggle for liberation. Soon the fighters will force the 'power' to reckon with us, and then to retreat before the revolutionary force. That day will be the beginning of the end of Bolshevik tyranny. Limit your action, for the time, to limited deeds; but know that from millions of limited actions, great deeds spring."

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 26, 1951]

ANTI-RED UNDERGROUND SPREADS TO RUSS ARMY

(By Edward P. Halline)

Copies of the Russian anti-Communist paper, Possev, printed in the western zone of Berlin, get to millions of Soviet officers and soldiers in Russia, and in Russian-occupied countries.

The Russian secret police, more than anyone else, would like to know how it's done.

The underground edition of Possev has the same format as the Red army newspaper, Sovietskaya Armiya. So once the contraband sheet got into the distribution channels, it wasn't too hard for countless copies to slip through to the soldiers.

STILL BEING DONE

That was first reported last summer and it is still being done in the face of the most desperate efforts by the Reds to stop it, said Representative KERSTEN.

When Soviet officials ordered a Government stamp on all copies of the Army newspaper, the underground issues carried the stamp, too. This certainly is an indication that plenty of Russian Army officers and men are agents of NTS, the Russian underground organization, or at least are sympathizers.

Leaflets going to Russian officers and soldiers in the Soviet-occupied zones of Austria and Germany stress the questions those men must be forever asking themselves.

Why do the conquered peoples live better than the Russians at home? Why are the Russian soldiers not allowed out of their barracks? Why are they forbidden to fraternize with the Austrians and Germans?

LEAFLET SHOWS MAP

An Austrian leaflet in Representative KERSTEN's possession has a map for the benefit of sympathizers in danger of discovery and arrest. It shows the Soviet and western zones of Vienna, the Danube River, and also portions of Czechoslovakia and Austria.

But it tells the anti-Communist Russians not to escape unless it is necessary to save themselves.

"The fighters for freedom in the army and in the motherland are needed more there than abroad," the leaflet says.

That is the type of propaganda the underground is carrying on and with little money or technical facilities, Representative KERSTEN said.

With such a revolutionary group at work, with the great majority of Russians opposed to the red regime, the American Government cannot afford not to profess its friendship for the Russian people and give them every assistance possible, he declared.

WILL UPSET STALIN PLAN

The increasing strength of the underground will upset Stalin's military plans and prevent world war III, KERSTEN said.

A letter from Russian-born Vladimir N. Petrov, Yale professor, told KERSTEN that Stalin probably fears his own people more than the A-bomb. Another Russian, Prof. Constantine W. Boldyreff, who helped organize the underground in 1930, said in the Reader's Digest last November that Stalin fears a revolt more than American rearmament.

Revolt is brewing in Red China, where the peasants who were promised land are facing collectivization, KERSTEN said. And in Russia a new collectivization drive is planned that will uproot 12,000,000 peasant families. Now is the time, he said, for the Western World to take advantage of rising tide of hatred for communism in Communist lands.

The Late Honorable Virgil M. Chapman, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some statements made relative to my good friend and deceased colleague, Virgil M. Chapman. The first is an editorial by Mr. Charles Finnell, writing for the Cynthiana Democrat, published at Cynthiana, Ky. Second is a resolution of the Paris Chamber of Commerce, Paris, Ky., and the third an introduction to a radio program sponsored by the Associated Industries of Kentucky, given on March 11, 1951, shortly after the funeral services at Paris, Ky.

There being no objection, the editorial, resolution, and introduction were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

(By Charles Fennell)

The death of Senator Virgil M. Chapman was tragic and untimely. He had entered upon a career in the Senate which gave fuller scope to his powers and in which he was fast winning the admiration, respect, and confidence of his colleagues and the country. Had his services continued he would have added his name to the top five or six greatest men that Kentucky has contributed to the public life of America.

He had the finest mind of any man we have known. The scope of his intellectual interests was wide and scholarly. His knowledge of history and of literature was amazing. He could quote from the classics by the hour.

The basic political principal of his life can be summed up in one word—balance. To him the general welfare and happiness of our country depends upon achieving and maintaining a practical balance among the great segments of our economy—agriculture, labor, industry, commerce, and finance. When viewed in this light his political career has the unity and singleness of purpose of a drama. At its beginning in 1924 the industrial, commercial, and financial interest had achieved a domination of the national economy. This had destroyed its balance and had left agriculture a sick economy as President Coolidge called it. Among the victims of this imbalance none were harder hit than the tobacco growers of his district and State whose champion he became.

A life-long friend of labor as another victim of the imbalance, he refused to go along with the dictatorship of the labor bosses when they sought domination of the economy as he had previously fought other such attempts by industry and finance. He knew that their success would be ruinous to all including our laborers. In this he was a truer friend of the laborer than these power crazy bosses. He would have opposed any similar attempt at domination by agriculture for the same reason.

His long-time advocacy of military and naval preparedness sprang from the same principle. He knew that a balance of power among nations is necessary to international peace and recognized the hard fact that power can be matched only with power, and that only a strong nation can speak with authority. At the council table as well as in the field "God is on the side of the big battalions." He had no patience with those idealists who closed their eyes to realities and whose rhetorical ecstasies would have and, in part did, strip us of our armed strength. He did not associate weakness with righteousness and saw no reason why the strong cannot entertain and defend high ideals as well as the weak.

Great as were his mental endowments they were fully matched by his political and moral courage. It is doubtful if any Member of either Chamber in Congress during the last 20 years has stood up for his convictions at the peril of his political life as often as has Virgil Chapman. It can be truthfully said of him that he never betrayed a conviction or a friend for the sake of expediency or gain. This firmness and courage attracted and held the thousands of devoted friends who loyally followed him to the end. He had justified their faith in him. This was expressed by one of them on hearing of his death in an old expression of the mountains: "You can swim the river and ride the mountain with old Virgil," the ultimate tribute to his dependability.

A great Kentuckian, a great American, a great human being sleeps in that newly made grave at Paris. May his slumbers be as sweet as the memories he leaves behind him.

PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Paris, Ky.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Virgil M. Chapman was, up until the time of his death, a valued and esteemed Senator of the United States Senate and a tenacious defender of the political principles in which we all believe; and

Whereas for many years Virgil M. Chapman contributed freely of his time and energy for the betterment of Kentucky farmers as well as farmers in other parts of the Nation, and contributed freely of his time in the interest of all of his constituents; and

Whereas although Virgil M. Chapman was serving his first term in the United States Senate, he had gained a reputation among his fellow colleagues as a man of rugged honesty, high integrity, and intense loyalty; and

Whereas Virgil M. Chapman's associates on the Senate Armed Services Committee and Public Service Committee have lost a man of great intellect and a strong advocate of sound legislation; and

Whereas the city of Paris and Bourbon County have benefited greatly by his lofty purpose and sterling character; and

Whereas the people of the city of Paris and Bourbon County have received an irreparable loss to their community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Paris Chamber of Commerce does hereby in this manner take official notice of the important facts hereinbefore set forth; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the faithful wife and family of Virgil M. Chapman; and that a copy hereof be published in each of the newspapers of general circulation in this city; and that a copy be transmitted to the United States Senate.

This resolution passed this 10th day of March 1951.

MILES M. DAVIS,
President.

Attest:

LOUIS ELMORE,
Secretary.

Committee on resolutions: Miles M. Davis, Clay H. Sutherland, Sam Milner.

[From the radio program Americans, Speak Up, March 11, 1951]

Each Sunday afternoon at this time, Associated Industries of Kentucky brings you these interviews by Bill Slater with prominent and loyal Americans in the interest of defending and strengthening our American heritage of freedom.

Death came Thursday to the senior Senator from Kentucky, Virgil Chapman, of Paris. All of us may not have agreed with Senator Chapman's views and opinions on the pressing problems of our time. But Senator Chapman was a loyal American and Kentuckian who had the courage of his convictions. He was a man who would stand up and be counted for the things he thought were right. And he did not hesitate to put the good of his country before his political party.

Associated Industries regrets deeply the tragic and untimely death of a man of this kind. Perhaps as never before, America needs men who stand for principle, men who believe that the welfare of our Nation must not be substituted for political expediency; men who believe that our Constitution and our Bill of Rights are sacred to the American heritage of freedom and liberty.

Jewish Persecution Increasing Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Jewish persecution is increasing under the Communist rule behind the iron curtain, according to many reports in the press recently. This is in accord with what might be expected under the Communist creed which demands that there be no other gods but communism. Communism is determined to crush all expression of religious and national feelings.

Lenin, in the gobbledygook of Communist phraseology, expressed his hatred of the Jews as follows:

The idea of a Jewish nationality is contrary to the interests of the Jewish workers and engenders in them a feeling of hostility toward assimilation.

And in 1937 Stalin expressed his hatred more plainly when he remarked to the German writer, Feuchtwanger:

You Jews have created one eternally true legend—that of Judas.

I wish to include herewith recent news items which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor and the New York Times:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 3, 1951]

ANTI-SEMITISM REPORTED MOUNTING INSIDE RUSSIA

(By J. L. Teller)

For the first time in Soviet history persons of Jewish faith are apparently in physical danger from anti-Semitic violence.

According to reports from inside the Soviet Union and reaching Jewish leaders in both Israel and the United States, anti-Semitic outbreaks have assumed the size of minor riots in some of the smaller towns in the Ukraine.

Even more disturbing, there have been assaults on individual Jews in such large cities as Moscow, with its 300,000 Jews, and Odessa, with its 100,000 Jews.

COMPLAINTS DISREGARDED

Soviet officials are reported reliably to have shown indifference to the complaints of the Jewish victims and to have taken no steps to curb the mounting frequency of these incidents, notwithstanding the formal ban on anti-Semitism in the Soviet Constitution.

Benjamin West, writing in Israel's best-informed newspaper, Davar, says there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of reports that Jews have been deported from Russian frontier areas. Since, however, figures on these deportations are not available, reports of mass deportations may be exaggerated.

There also have been new round-ups of Zionists and since Zionism has been illegal in the Soviet Union for more than three decades, the arrested men are not youngsters.

They are judged to be mainly veterans of penal servitude, who were released after 10 to 20 years at hard labor in Siberia, but were rearrested when the Moscow radio and the newspaper Pravda began their attacks, just about a year ago, on Ben-Gurion's Marshall plan government.

KIN TOLD NOT TO WRITE

Israeli residents have received letters from their kin in the Soviet Union advising that they no longer wished to receive correspondence from overseas. The Kremlin had encouraged correspondence with overseas relatives during the war years and immediately following the Soviet delegation's support of the United Nation's General Assembly's Palestine partition resolution, under which the State of Israel came into being.

Israeli newspapers report also that Jewish lay representatives and rabbis are no longer to be seen at official Soviet functions, although it is government practice to invite representatives of all ethnic groups residing in the Soviet Union, and to encourage all clergy, both Christian and Moslem, to attend in clerical garb.

Jewish leaders disagree, however, in defining these phenomena of Soviet behavior toward Jews. Some charge that the Soviet authorities have embarked on an outright anti-Semitic policy, tacitly encouraging every form of persecution against persons of the Jewish faith.

Others are somewhat less drastic in their appraisal. One Jewish leader, sharing the second view, asserted this week in an open letter to the Soviet Ambassador to the United States that while the individual Jew still may be physically secure in Russia, the Soviet Union is apparently determined on spiritual genocide of the Jewish group.

SPIRITUAL GENOCIDE CHARGED

The genocide charge has been leveled by Hayim Greenberg in an open-letter article in Der Yiddisher Kemfer, official organ of the Labor Zionist Organization of America, of which he is editor. Mr. Greenberg is also a member of the executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and head of its culture department, and his opinion is highly valued by Israel's top government leaders.

Asserting that he was writing only in his own name, as an American Jew with Russian background, and not in the name of any organization, Mr. Greenberg listed the following evidence of spiritual genocide against Soviet Jewry:

There is not a single Yiddish publication left in the Soviet Union (the former Israel Ambassador to Russia, Mordecai Namir, said there was a Yiddish publication in Birobidjan).

Nothing has been heard, in nearly 2 years, from any of the Yiddish writers in the Soviet Union. Assuming there is no longer an audience for Yiddish publications, surely there must be sufficient interest among Soviet Jews to warrant publication of at least one Russian-language magazine dealing with Jewish affairs for the nearly 2,000,000 Jews in the Soviet Union.

SILENCE IMPLIES GUILT

Mr. Greenberg notes that the Yiddish theater has received no mention recently in the columns of the Soviet press. He asks, furthermore, what has happened to the Jewish schools in Russia, and notes that these questions have been addressed many times in the past to the Soviet ambassadors in various countries, but no answer has been received to date. Their silence must be regarded as implied confession of the charge of spiritual genocide.

The American Jewish Committee has prepared a memorandum on the persecution of religious Jews in Russia. According to this memorandum and testimony from other sources, the few synagogues functioning in Moscow are administered by persons of dubious rabbinical status and by sextons that are party agents. Performance of certain religious rites brands individuals as suspect in the eyes of the party, and instruction in Hebrew is given clandestinely because use of the language is illegal.

The amazing thing is that these clandestine schools, where instruction is largely from memory rather than books, which are unavailable, have produced some brilliant Talmudic scholars, according to wartime orthodox Jewish refugees from Poland who have come out of Russia since the end of the war. Because Soviet workers are granted days off on a rotating basis, orothodox Jews find it impossible to observe the Sabbath.

[From the New York Times of January 11 1951]

HUNGARY TO DEPORT JEWS—COUNCIL MEMBER HERE SAYS ANTI-SEMITIC DRIVE IS STEPPED UP

Dr. Bela Fabian, member of the Hungarian National Council, disclosed yesterday that he had received news from the Hungarian underground that the anti-Semitic campaign had been stepped up in Hungary and that preparations were being made by the Communist dictatorship to deport 20,000 persons, many of them Jews, to Soviet forced-labor camps.

Dr. Fabian also made public an article that he will publish in the current issue of the New Leader, liberal weekly, in which he gives details on the ground for fears by members of the council that the anti-Semitic campaign is the prelude to wholesale deportation of Hungarian Jews.

The Hungarian underground reported that it had received news of wholesale deportations to eastern Siberia of "almost the entire Jewish population of the Ukraine, White Russia, and the Crimea," Dr. Fabian said.

[From the New York Times of February 17, 1951]

PURGING OF JEWS IN SOVIET LANDS DECRIED IN PLEA FOR ACTION BY UN

ATLANTIC CITY, February 16.—The national executive board of the Jewish Labor Committee called here tonight for a thorough inquiry by the United Nations of the cultural and spiritual destruction of Jewish life in Russia and other Soviet-dominated countries behind the iron curtain.

The action was taken by 250 members of the board at their annual conference here after they had heard a detailed report showing that no sign of Jewish life remains in the Soviet Union today and that the spiritual liquidation of the Jewish people in the satellite countries goes on at a rapid pace.

The board, representing half a million persons, adopted a resolution authorizing the administrative committee to the Jewish Lab Committee to present before the Commission of Human Rights of the United Nations all known facts concerning the situation.

Adolph Held, national chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee; Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, CIO; and David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, A. F. of L., were appointed to present the matter to the United Nations.

The report on Jewish life behind the iron curtain and in Western Europe, made by Nathan Chanin, of the labor committee's administrative committee and educational director of the Workmen's Circle, contained the following findings:

Russia: No trace is left of Jewish culture. All Jewish schools have been closed; Yiddish newspapers and periodicals silenced; Yiddish writers have been liquidated; Biro-Bidjan, proclaimed an autonomous Jewish republic in 1926, no longer exists in a true sense.

Rumania: The Rumanian Communist Party is almost completely purged of its Jewish members—68,000 being expelled when the party was consolidated early in 1950. A stop has been put to the emigration of Jews to Israel. Antisemitism has not died in Rumania, nor has the Communist government considered it necessary to conduct a fight against it. In the past 2 years all Jewish schools, synagogues, and newspapers have been closed down.

Poland: There are no more than 50,000 Jews left in Poland. Emigration to Israel has been banned. Zionism is regarded as a crime and treason, and Israel is a hated country, regarded as ideologically bound with the United States and Great Britain. The Jewish community, its cultural institutions, and its religious activities have been placed under the supervision of Jewish Communists.

Hungary and Czechoslovakia: Life is no better for the Jews in these countries than it is in Rumania or Poland.

In contrast, it was reported that the conditions of the Jews in Western Europe were more secure and that there were great expectations that of all the Western European Jewish communities, France would remain the largest. Nearly 250,000 Jews are now in France.

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1951]

UNDERGROUND BUSY BEHIND CURTAIN—MACHINERY THAT AIDED JEWS IN ESCAPING HITLER AGAIN HELPS OPPRESSED TO ESCAPE

ATLANTIC CITY, February 17.—More than 1,000 endangered Jews, including former labor and governmental officials, have been rescued from countries behind the iron curtain by members of an underground operated by the Jewish Labor Committee, it was reported here today.

Jacob Pat, of New York, executive secretary, told members of the committee's national executive board at their annual conference here that its agents both in the United States and Europe were arranging the escape of many thousands more—all under the noses of the Soviet-dominated secret police.

He emphasized that Jewish agents are risking their lives to rescue victims of Polish, Rumanian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, and Czechoslovak communism and help them to freedom.

"Outstanding among the activities of the Jewish Labor Committee during 1950 were the efforts to rescue endangered persons from countries behind the iron curtain," Mr. Pat said. "Once again we have been forced to set up our underground machinery in Europe."

1940 WORK REPORTED

"In 1940, just 10 years ago, we set up an underground operation that rescued thousands of important fighters for freedom from Hitler's slave Europe, and today we are again working and saving the lives of democratic opponents of Stalin's tyranny.

Mr. Pat said, "The underground agents rescue those Jews who are refused clearance by the Soviet-dominated Government to emigrate to Israel.

"Many of these people, and there are thousands of them, have been active in the free labor movement, in civil groups and social welfare work," he noted. "For these Jews a hopeless future existence in Soviet land is the price demanded by the Communists."

Mr. Pat emphasized that tightened lines and Soviet-commanded reinforced border patrols make it virtually impossible to successfully find a rear exit to the dungeon-like bleakness of Sovietland.

"The emphasis in escaping Stalin's inferno as of November 1950, had turned to extensive use of misleading identification papers to smuggle these Jews, and their families in many cases, to a friendly neighboring European country and then to Israel and permanent freedom," he declared.

COST OF CREDENTIALS

Illegal credentials sell for approximately $100 each on the black market and elsewhere in certain Soviet-controlled states, it was explained, but as agents work inward toward the Soviet itself, the price for such credentials becomes even costlier, the existence of such escape papers more scarce.

Mr. Pat said that in Russia itself the Jewish underground is not operating its rescue network because, among other reasons, it is felt that there would be very few trustworthy agents to help with the work.

Head of the Jewish underground is an unidentified man in his late fifties who handled the underground operations against Hitler, Mr. Pat said. He works out of the committee headquarters in New York City.

Several of the European agents of the underground have been imprisoned or simply disappeared, it was revealed.

The executive board adopted a resolution calling upon the United States Government and other democratic nations joined by the Atlantic Pact not to rearm Germany and to hold firmly to the oath they took at the end of the war to liquidate all of Germany's armed forces.

[From the New York Times of February 19, 1951]

VOICE IS INVOKED IN ABUSE OF JEWS—LABOR COMMITTEE ASKS STRESS ON THE PLIGHT OF MINORITIES IN THE SOVIET'S DOMAINS

ATLANTIC CITY, February 18.—The Jewish Labor Committee, representing 500,000 persons, urged here today that Voice of America broadcasts give greater emphasis to the mistreatment of Jews and other minorities within the Soviet sphere.

The action was taken in a resolution approved unanimously by the 250 members of the committee's national executive board at the final session of a 3-day annual conference.

Observing that the thousands of refugees who have sought asylum in the West agree that the Voice of America is doing an essential and increasingly effective job, the resolution continued:

"The policies, attitude toward and treatment of minorities—racial, cultural and political—by any government is the acid test of whether it is genuinely democratic and civilized.

"Just as the conscience of the civilized world was aroused by the Hitlerite policy of genocide, so also the conscience of everyone who believes in decency, justice and the dignity of man must be aroused against the genocide now being practiced by Communist dictatorship in its drive to destroy physically, culturally and spiritually the Jewish people, who internationally constitute the most active anti-Communist racial minority.

"This Communist drive to exterminate Jews as a people within the U. S. S. R. and its satellites foreshadows an effort to liquidate other political, racial and cultural minorities."

Harry N. Rosenfield, a member of the Displaced Persons Commission, reported that under the Displaced Persons Act, 226,000 DP's had arrived in this country since October 30, 1948, or were on the way, and that thousands of others were departing daily.

He gave the following distribution on the basis of religious affiliations: Catholics, 98,400, or 45 percent of the total; Protestants, 74,500, or 34 percent; Jews, 44,300, or 20 percent; others, 2,800, or 1 percent.

"In American foreign policy," he said, "the displaced persons program is the symbol of American determination to stand by fighters for freedom; in domestic affairs, the displaced persons program adds to our sinews of strength for arming ourselves and our allies to protect and preserve the peace."

Adolph Held of New York was re-elected national chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee, a post he has had since 1938. Also renamed were Joseph Baskin, secretary; David Dubinsky, treasurer; Jacob Pat, executive secretary; Nathan Chanin, chairman of the administrative committee, and Benjamin Tabachinsky, national campaign director. All are from New York.

The Death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Calvary of the Great," by N. E. Nicoladies, printed in the June issue of the Voice of KEPA, commenting on the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE DEATH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT—THE CALVARY OF THE GREAT

It is the fate of the great to ascend their Calvary wearing a crown of thorns.

It is the fate of the great, who were born to lead humanity forward, never to enjoy the fruit of their labors. The same fate was destined for our great friend, the helper of those who suffer, the man who loved humanity more than himself, our great and beloved of the people, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He worked and toiled; blood was the sweat of his brow, his only compensation having been that he did his duty. He ascended calmly his Calvary, the place destined for all those who work and suffer for us, for our liberties, for the morrow, for the future generations.

The whole of humanity, all right-thinking people, those who suffer from pain and privations, who are struggling and distressed, turn their eyes toward the fresh grave of the great humanitarian.

No tears, sobs, or words are adequate to express our pain for the loss of this great man.

The extinct personality of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the paragon of all virtue and goodness, kindness and love, of every healthy thought. Since the day he became conscious of life, his concern was how to secure a better life for the future generations of humanity. His whole life was expended in all directions in the struggle for the success of this idea. And, fatally wounded in this struggle, he fell on the eve of the day that the crown of laurel, the only crown that was fit for him, was ready to adorn his work.

His teaching, the beautiful teaching of love and peaceful coexistence of all peoples under one great, homogenous democracy, springing from the people, existing for the people, and working for the people, shall predominate throughout the ages as the most radiant ray of light on earth and as an eternal memorial of the man who taught it. His teaching shall become the axis around which shall move from now on the nations and the communities of the earth which is inhabited by us, whom he aspired to lead to the safest haven of life, the haven of equality and justice.

This lucid intellect, endowed with an enormous strength of tolerance, foresight, perspicacity, and absolute and unblemished justice, was the intellect for which the masses of mortals were waiting for thousands of years.

Rest in peace, our great President. Rest not only from your labors and toil for us, but rest also in the thought that it is no longer possible for those who rule today, and those who will come tomorrow, to overlook the righteousness, the goodness, and the divinity of the direction toward which you guided us, holding us by the hand like a great father of the whole humanity.

You were the greatest warrior of the ages and you fell more than heroically on the eve of the day when the great battle for true civilization, in which you were the protagonist, was to be crowned with the eternal crown of victory and glory.

But the crown of thorns on your brow has deeply wounded you during these years and you succumbed, but not before you laid down the unshaken foundations of the edifice you wished to build. The first cornerstones of the edifice, in which humanity will dwell in the future, shall bear your traces—the traces and the seal of your great personality as a guaranty that this edifice of yours will last forever.

You have been the great statesman, the best head of family, the great philanthropist, our friend, and greatest fellowman. You have been the father of all humanity—of the poor, the suffering, the workers, the orphans, the weak and the meek in spirit—and for them you lived and worked and toiled and gave your life.

Your sermons are destined to live throughout the ages—engraved in gold letters on the metope of the earth.

No words in poetry or prose, in speech or writing, can adequately praise your deeds.

No voice can express precisely what you have done for us. Only the combined voice of humanity—only this united voice—is able to express in two words to you, Oh, great and unforgettable President, something fitting: We thank, we thank you for everything you have done for us, for the peoples of this earth, for those who hunger and thirst for liberty, for the fatigued and the unfortunate, the distressed and the oppressed.

Rest in peace forever, our great President. Your spirit will be our guide from now on. Rest, our great President. A grateful humanity is supporting the load of earth that covers you for everything you have done for it. Hail, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. You have not died. You live and will live as long as the earth on which you were born.

It is your deeds that have carved your immortality.

Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in recent times there has been a considerable amount of unfair criticism in the press as to alleged profiteering on the part of the farmer. In some instances we know that there has been considerable income in the case of large scale farming by a few very wealthy individuals in agriculture. However, that refers to only a very small minority. In the case of the small family type farm which still comprises the great bulk of farms throughout the Nation and in my own State, there is certainly no justification for any allegation that the farmer is profiteering or is gouging the consumer or is getting a disproportionate share of income. On the contrary, the same milk that sells on my farm, for example, for around 7 cents per quart has tripled in price by the time it reaches the consumer. So, obviously the farmer is hardly benefiting from that tremendous price spread; middlemen all along the line are getting the lion's share.

I have in my hands a very illuminating editorial published in the March 15 issue of the Glenwood City Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that its text be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRY REPORT—CRITICS CONTINUE TO BLAME FARMERS FOR INFLATION

Anyone who reads the large metropolitan dailies and many of the nationally circulated magazines cannot help but gain the impression that farmers are the root of the inflation evil. Every boost in food prices is played up big, and the consumers gain the impression that farmers are waxing rich at the expense of further inflation.

No one can deny that the farmers are receiving slightly higher prices for their products, but who is responsible? Meat prices are high because consumers are eating more meat than ever before and are bidding the price up high. The unfortunate thing is that farmers seldom receive anywhere near as large a part of food price increases as do the processors and the people who work for the processors.

Unless agriculture is to suffer some pretty bad black eyes, there must be started very soon a program to educate consumers. Agriculture is merely beginning to catch up with the boom that never ended for other branches of the economy. Since 1948, the peak year for agriculture, net farm income has dropped, but profits of industry and wages of industrial workers have continued to climb to new peaks in that period.

In other words, farmers' prices have been dropping while the cost of goods farmers must buy has been increasing as a result of higher wages and higher profits in industry. Now that consumer demand, again affected by higher wages is putting upward pressure on farm prices, farmers are being blamed for the inflationary spiral. Labor and industry want to freeze food prices just as those prices are beginning to bring agriculture near other branches of the economy in buying power.

The temptation to bring back wartime subsidies is great for the politicians who think they can go on forever fooling the people into believing that when you pay part of the bill in taxes you pay nothing. Somebody must tell the consumer that subsidies are more expensive than paying their bills in the market place, for the simple reason that you cannot dish out subsidies without a huge administrative cost.

There is a big job to be done, too, in waking up Mrs. America to the fact that eating must remain as the primary expense in any family budget. That food costs have not been out of line is proved by the figures: In 1950 American families spent only 19 percent of the family income for food, as compared with an average of 23 percent in the 1935-39 period.

Farmers are being made the scapegoats in the present inflationary spiral. Farm prices have increased in recent months, but they have increased from a previous drop during which industrial prices and wages were constantly going up. Farmers are the only major economic group who suffered a decline in income since the end of World War II. The public, however, is not being told the entire story, and farmers are suffering very adverse criticism as a result.

The Late Honorable Virgil M. Chapman, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Paris, Ky., newspaper, the Paris Kentuckian-Citizen, and also one from the Oldham Era, of La Grange, Ky., relative to my good friend and deceased colleague Virgil M. Chapman.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Paris Kentuckian-Citizen]

WE SHALL NEVER SEE HIS LIKE AGAIN

The sad news of the death of Senator Virgil Chapman in Washington Thursday morning was received in his home community of Bourbon County a short while later as a shock which has been, perhaps, without parallel in the history of the county.

The impact of the almost unbelievable loss has been such that depression is still difficult under the stunning realization that his eloquent voice has been finally stilled, that his stout heart no longer beats and that his strong hand has been removed from the shoulders of his beloved people.

Through the untimely death of Virgil Chapman, we are sure that a great statesman has been lost to the Nation in a trying hour. We know that the people of Kentucky have lost a great advocate. The people of his home community have lost, indeed, a great friend.

The Kentuckian-Citizen, his home-town newspaper, leaves the larger tributes the hour seems to demand to other associates of Senator Chapman, hoping to remain, rather, on the plane of simplicity reserved for his old-time friends and neighbors. We who knew him best here at home knew him for traits of sterling character which will be the truest measure of his worth—for his rugged honesty, for his high integrity, for his intense loyalty, and for his lofty purpose. We remember him through many years since first he enlisted his services under the banner of exalted principle—a banner which fluttered to the ground Thursday on what seems to us to have been the very threshold of an even greater stewardship, unsullied still by the sacrifice of a single conviction.

His fine virtues far transcended his faults, to a degree only recording of the scroll will reveal eventually. He was our friend, tried and true. Our hearts are heavy today here in Bourbon County because of his death.

[From the Oldham (Ky.) Era of March 16, 1951]

A NOBLEMAN STRICKEN FROM THE SENATE ROLLS

The untimely death of Senator Virgil M. Chapman is not only a loss to Kentucky but to the United States Senate and to the Nation. After a long and distinguished service in the House of Representatives he brought to the Senate that wealth of legislative experience, sound judgment, and wise counsel so necessary to fulfill prudently the obligations of a Senator and he was daily growing in political stature.

One had to know him to appreciate what he really was and to appraise his true character. The people have had few servants more honest, more conscientious, more loyal and dependable. It is difficult to find a deeper student of the history of our colonial ancestors who were responsible for the birth of this Nation.

His first visits to Oldham County were in the days of the organization of the Burley Tobacco Cooperative Association. He made friends among the farmers and businessmen of this country and they were his friends forever. When Oldham County was a part of the district he so ably represented his visits were frequent and he continued to add friends.

Virgil Chapman was an experienced, illustrious statesman, a peerless orator, and a great patriot who knew no dictator but his conscience, no guide but his judgment and no purpose but to serve his country. While on the mountaintop of success, in the very heyday of manhood, while all the tides of life and joy and hope were flowing full and fair, from an environment of prosperity, comfort, love and peace he was abruptly summoned to take his journey to that mysterious country from which no traveler ever returns. With courage and hope he went from the restless land of the living into the silent land of the dead.

He was a man who thought clearly, who considered questions logically, and who possessed the virtue of thinking straight. He arrived at decisions quickly, and once having arrived at a decision as to what was right, he could not be changed. He would not tolerate what he believed to be wrong.

During his legislative experience his fine character, intellectual integrity, far-seeing statesmanship, and wise counsel were outstanding. He loved his country and realized its great power and influence in world affairs.

There was nothing narrow about his vision. He saw with uncanny accuracy the likely unfolding of world events and threw his great vision and statesmanship into the struggle to bring his countrymen and men and women everywhere a chance for peace and prosperity on a world-wide scale.

His convictions were founded on deep thought. Compromises were not a part of his nature. He began and ended his career with the same basic philosophy of government. The illustrious son of a great State, beloved by all who knew him, he left footprints that will endure for all time. The legislative annals of the Nation have been enriched by the eloquence, the persuasion, and the logic of his oratory.

"And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

Confirmation of Nomination of Thomas Fairchild To Be United States Attorney for Western District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the confirmation of the nomination of Hon. Thomas Fairchild to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, together with certain correspondence on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night the Senate confirmed the nomination of the Honorable Thomas E. Fairchild to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

This nomination was of interest to the people of Wisconsin because last November, our people rejected the political philosophy of Mr. Fairchild when they returned me, as his opponent, to another term in the United States Senate.

This is the fourth such occasion in which I have entered no objection to those who were either candidates against me in an election or were previously active participants in such opposition. The first such occasion was the nomination of the Honorable F. Ryan Duffy to a United States district judgeship. Judge Duffy had, as the Senatorial incumbent, opposed me in the November 1938 elections and was defeated. Later he was elevated to the appellate judgeship without any objection on my part.

The third such occasion was the nomination to a Federal judgeship of the Honorable Robert Tehan, Democratic national committeeman for the State of Wisconsin.

The fourth was the nomination of Thomas E. Fairchild for this United States attorneyship.

Some folks in the State of Wisconsin have wondered at what might seem to them the peculiar sight of a Republican Senator not objecting to the nomination to important posts of his former opponents. I, however, feel that no Senator, including this Senator, should hold a man personally obnoxious to him, merely because in good faith he happens to have opposed the Senator in a political campaign.

When I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee during the Republican Eightieth Congress, I set up three standards—ability, integrity, and Americanism—for screening all nominees. I insisted, moreover, that no nomination be considered by our committee until the nomination had been taken up prior to submittal to us with the State Bar Association and the American Bar Association for clearance. We thus succeeded in securing the nomination, after several alternatives had been submitted to and rejected by the New York State bar, of a great Federal judge, the Honorable Harold Medina.

Prior to the Judiciary Committee's consideration of Mr. Fairchild, I corresponded with him, asking if he would faithfully apply the laws of the United States, even a law such as the Taft-Hartley statute which was a crucial issue in the 1950 campaign in that he had urged its repeal whereas I had supported its continuation. Mr. Fairchild wrote back, stating that as a faithful public servant, he would fully carry out his legal responsibilities.

I felt that on that basis there was no substantial basis for me to seek rejection of his nomination. To be sure, I would have hoped that the President might have seen fit to nominate a man of more conservative viewpoint. I have pointed out on a number of occasions on the floor of the Senate that the Federal bench is literally packed with individuals of one particular political belief, namely, the left wing of the Democratic Party. If the President feels that he has to appoint practically exclusively Democrats, let him at least appoint some members within that sizable branch of his own party who are conservative in their approach.

Back in 1947 and 1948, if we Republicans had been of a mind to do so during the Eightieth Congress, we could have voted down every single Democratic nomination sent to us. But we did not take the partisan approach then, and I, for one, do not propose that we take the partisan approach now.

The American Bar Association has in the past enthusiastically endorsed the viewpoint which I have expressed on the imperative necessity of security a greater balance in the Federal courts; a balance between parties, a balance within the Democratic Party. I, for one, pledge my continued efforts along this line. It is my judgment that there would be a tremendous shot in the arm to American unity if President Truman, during this national emergency, were to abandon his purely partisan approach to this matter of judicial and quasi-judicial nominations.

I want the people of the United States to have complete and unreserved faith in the Federal courts and in United States attorneys. I want them to feel that when they go before a United States attorney or a judge, they are going to be assured complete justice, regardless of their own particular political background. I do not see how individuals can have such complete faith and confidence so long as the courts continue to be packed with such a complete unbalance in personnel.

There follows now the complete text of my correspondence exchange with Mr. Fairchild. As will be noted, I have commended him for his very constructive answer to my inquiry. It was an answer worthy of the name Fairchild which through previous generations has come to denote integrity and sound leadership in our State.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
March 1, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS FAIRCHILD,
Verona, Wis.

DEAR MR. FAIRCHILD: I have seen a number of the endorsements sent by your friends to the Judiciary Committee in connection with your nomination. On the other hand, I have a number of letters from very distinguished attorneys in the State and others, who have personally talked to me on one particular issue about which they and I are in doubt and which they and I think is very important.

You will remember that during the campaign you were very outspoken for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I was wondering therefore, if your nomination for United States attorney should be confirmed, whether in view of your expressed attitude and in view of your affiliation with those who have made the Taft-Hartley law a political issue—whether you believe you could faithfully prosecute any and all violations of the Taft-Hartley statute.

The letters in your favor on file generally speak of your good character and your ability, but do not cover the answer to this question. I should appreciate hearing from you on it.

Sincerely yours,
ALEXANDER WILEY.

VERONA, WIS., *March 6, 1951.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your letter of March 1. You refer to the fact that during my campaign for election to the Senate I said I would vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and you ask whether I believe that as United States attorney I could faithfully prosecute violations of that law.

I can assure you that I will faithfully perform the duties of United States attorney arising under any law of the United States, without exception. When I take my oath to do so, it will be without reservation of any kind. If circumstances should occur under which it is my duty to take some action under the Taft-Hartley law, I would perform that duty just as I would if it arose under the Criminal Code, the Internal Revenue Code, the Defense Production Act, or any other statute of the United States.

You have served as district attorney. I am sure you will agree that the prosecutor's personal opinion that a law is a bad law would not justify his failure to enforce it. Under our American system of separation of powers, it often happens that a judge decides a case in a certain way solely because that result is required by a statute with which he disagrees. He would vote to repeal or change the law if he were a legislator, but as a judge he is bound to give effect to it. An officer in the executive department often performs a duty required by a law he would vote to repeal or amend if he had the chance.

When a Senator casts a vote, he necessarily decides whether a law is wise and desirable. But a United States attorney who withholds action under a particular law because of his belief that the law is unwise would be trespassing on the legislative function.

You note in your letter that I am affiliated with those who have advocated repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. Had I been elected a Senator, I would have voted for repeal. No affiliation, however, could influence me to attempt, as United States attorney, to nullify a law by failure to perform a duty.

I hope that I have satisfactorily answered your question. I very much appreciate your giving me the opportunity to do so.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS E. FAIRCHILD.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
March 8, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS FAIRCHILD,
Verona, Wis.

MY DEAR MR. FAIRCHILD: Thank you for your letter of March 6 responding to my inquiry.

I think that your reply is very reasonable and commendable. While I obviously do not share your basic political thinking, I do believe that you have approached the problem of fulfilling the duties of your future office in a very judicious way.

I shall, therefore, not offer any objection in the Senate Judiciary Committee to your nomination, and I shall seek to expedite it to the greatest extent possible.

I am sure that you share my feeling of gratitude that you and I live in a blessed country where former political foes, however wide they are apart in their basic thinking, can agree as to essentials of what constitutes the duty of a public official.

There is one basic fact that, as you know, concerns me and that is the practical monopoly of appointments to United States attorneyships, to the office of United States Marshall, and most important, to the position of Federal judge, which have gone to one wing of one political party in the last 17 years.

I think that such a situation is most regrettable and that it would be infinitely preferable: (a) to secure a balance in such appointments among both parties—getting men of ability, integrity and Americanism, and, (b) getting a balance of appointments within the Democratic Party so that faithful members of conservative philosophy are represented.

While I shall continue to point out the necessity for such dual balance in appointments, I do not feel that it would justify opposition to your confirmation. In this respect, therefore, I shall continue the policy that I have laid down previously in voting for confirmation of the nominations of Judge Duffy and Judge Tehan, as well as of other members of the Wisconsin Democratic Party.

The President makes the nominations, we in the Senate can only confirm or reject, but I trust that some day, the President will see the wisdom in a more equitable basis for those nominations.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,
ALEXANDER WILEY.

VERONA, WIS., *March 12, 1951.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your letter of March 8.

Needless to say, I am happy to learn that you see fit to make no objection to my nomination as United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

I look forward to this new work with a great deal of interest.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS E. FAIRCHILD.

The Record of the Second Division in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a private in the Army from the State of Maine who is now serving in Korea, regarding the record of the Second Division.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHUNGJU, KOREA, *January 23, 1951*.

DEAR MR. BREWSTER: I sure hope that this letter gets to you.

My name is William N. Young, Jr., and I was born in Mexico, Maine, and I have lived in Rumford all my life.

I am writing to you because you are a Representative from the State I am from.

I would like to call to your attention a recent column by Drew Pearson. I don't have the date of the column but the heading was "Calculated Retreat" taken from Drew Pearson's Washington Merry Go Round. With reference to the above-mentioned article, Mr. Pearson referred to the "Panic Stricken Second Infantry Division" which I am a member of.

My buddies and I are in the Twenty-third Infantry Regiment, a member of the Second Division.

Now, Mr. BREWSTER, I am primarily concerned with the exploits of the Twenty-third Infantry Regiment, a part of the Second Infantry Division as referred to in Mr. Pearson's column pertaining to the withdrawal from Kunuri.

The records will show that the Twenty-third Infantry fought a delaying action for 4 days after the other UN elements had withdrawn. Does that look like a panic-stricken rout?

During the battle of Kunuri the Second Division suffered between four and six thousand casualties.

It doesn't seem probable that those men were injured by falling off trucks whenever they saw the enemy.

Korea is a very miserable place and it doesn't boost the morale of the fighting troops to read articles as written by Mr. Pearson which we who were there know that the report is erroneous.

Very truly yours,

Private First Class YOUNG.

Resolutions Adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Glen Rock, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I present for printing the resolutions adopted on March 13 by the Chamber of Commerce of Glen Rock, N. J.:

First. Resolution having to do with the recent Supreme Court decision declaring the State of Wisconsin anti-strike law unconstitutional.

Second. Resolution opposing levying of taxes by the State of New York on income earned in New York by New Jersey residents.

Earlier in the day, in the course of the proceedings of the Senate, the resolutions were submitted and were ordered to be printed in the Appendix.

The resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in a 6-3 decision has declared that a utility antistrike law in the State of Wisconsin conflicts with the Taft-Hartley Law and, therefore, the Wisconsin law may not be used in disputes affecting interstate commerce; and

Whereas the National Labor Relations Board in October 1950, arbitrarily decided, as a matter of general policy, to assume jurisdiction over all public utility and transit systems; and

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, N. J., senses an immediate danger to the citizens of the State of New Jersey should existing legislation prohibiting strikes in public utilities in the State of New Jersey be voided or otherwise limited in effectiveness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the considered opinion of the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, N. J., that the right to work and to enjoy the fruits of one's labor is paramount to the right to strike; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the considered opinion of the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, N. J., that the best public interest would be served by the prohibition of strikes in industries which are essential to the public health, safety or convenience, under penalty of immediate and permanent dismissal from employment in any and all such industries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the attorney general of the State of New Jersey, to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, to our Representatives in Congress, to the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Department of Taxation and Finance of the State of New York imposes an income tax upon that portion of the earnings of residents of the State of New Jersey derived from employment within the State of New York; and

Whereas the said residents of the State of New Jersey who pay taxes to the State of New York are denied the right of franchise in elections held in the State of New York; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, that such taxation and denial of the right of franchise constitutes taxation without representation, which is the identical principle upon which our revolutionary forefathers sought and gained our freedom from a tyrannical monarch: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, declares it is in opposition to the practice of the State of New York in imposing income taxes upon the residents of the State of New Jersey; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the attorney general of the State of New Jersey, to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, to our Representatives in Congress, to the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Tennessee Pays Tribute to Native Son, Gen. Clifton B. Cates, Commandant of United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of Tennessee in a joint resolution recently paid fitting and deserved tribute and homage to that distinguished general—now serving as Commandant of the United States Marine Corps—Clifton Bledsoe Cates.

The entire State of Tennessee, which so proudly has given to the Nation many another great and distinguished personage, joins with our representatives in the general assembly in this act of tribute.

General Cates is a native son of Tennessee. He ascended through the ranks of the Marine Corps to the rank of full general and his service to his country includes World War I, in which he was twice wounded, through the grueling campaigns of the Pacific in World War II. He commanded the gallant and intrepid first Marine Regiment at Guadalcanal, Solomons Islands, in that harrowing and unparalleled campaign which will never be forgotten in the annals of our country. He led in the Saipan and Tinian invasions; and also Iwo Jima. Truly he is one of our distinguished and valorous Americans to whom we owe a great measure of gratitude.

As a Tennessean, I proudly salute General Cates—a military genius and a great man.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks an editorial from the March 14, 1951, issue of the Nashville Banner entitled "Tennessee's General Cates."

The editorial is as follows:

TENNESSEE'S GENERAL CATES

That joint resolution by the general assembly in praise and recognition of Gen. Clifton B. Cates expresses the esteem of all Tennessee for this distinguished native son. Through it, an honor is accorded one richly deserving it; and to him we would convey, as well, his State's regard for the United States Marine Corps, which he commands.

Our compliments to a great general—stalwart defender of his country in two world wars, whose career embodies the proud motto of his service unit, "Semper Fidelis."

We could not overlook, in a discussion of the Marine Corps or its commanding officer, the propriety of that urgent demand—still before Congress—that the Marine Commandant be made a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thus giving this unit direct representation there; and that the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be rotated on a fixed schedule to alternate that key office between the services.

In reality, Tennessee's esteem is expressive of the Nation's esteem; and Senate bill 677, providing this Joint Chiefs of Staff representation, has the popular support to demand enactment if Congress will heed it.

Why Americans Don't Vote—A Helpful Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the whole country is being aroused about the fact that 40 percent of our country's eligible voters failed to vote in 1950, particularly at this time of crises for democracy. In

connection with my sponsorship of House Resolution 89 seeking the establishment of a special House committee to investigate why Americans do not vote, I have received a considerable number of suggestions about what the Federal Government can do to help with the problem. I found one of these suggestions as part of a radio broadcast script—radio talk by Alfred Nilson, Station WOR, New York City—and considered it so highly that I am today introducing a bill to carry it out.

The bill requires each postmaster to make available in his post office equal facilites for equal-sized pictures, biographical and other descriptive information regarding the State Governor, each Senator, each Representative in Congress, each representative in the several houses of the State legislature and each mayor or equivalent municipal chief executive from the area within which such post office is located together with maps and descriptions of the areas which they represent respectively. It provides also that each postmaster shall maintain and post on the bulletin board information on the laws regarding voting and the places for registration and voting within such area. These regulations are entirely practical and are designed to bring the voter and prospective voter in closer touch with public officials and to establish a central and convenient place where voting information can be available.

The bill seeks to reach the two reasons assigned by a majority—62 percent—of nonvoters for their failure to vote in the surveys which I have made on this subject. These reasons are the alleged lack of reliable information on candidates—37 percent—and the fact that nonvoters feel they have little choice in selecting the candidates—25 percent. These disadvantages are, it is true, entirely within the power of any voter to correct today for reliable information can be secured from the press and the radio and the voter in the great majority of the States can freely participate in primary elections, but measures must be taken to deal with these problems just the same as they are so widely considered a reason or excuse for not voting.

The President has been much interested in the situation as shown by his letter to me of February 14 on this subject and his request to the American Political Science Association of December 25 last to investigate the question.

Priesthood of Believers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a sermon delivered by the United States Ambassador to Uruguay, Christian M. Ravndal, at the Emmanuel Methodist Church, Montevideo, July 23, 1950. The sermon is entitled "Priesthood of Believers." I hope that especially the membership of the House will take time to read this most excellent sermon. It is gratifying to know that we have men like Ambassador Ravndal representing our Government in international relationships:

PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS

Some 2,000 years ago Christ Jesus brought into being the most adventurous, the most dynamic, the most enlightened idea ever to seize the mind of man—the idea of man's inherent dignity and importance as an individual. From it sprang the ideas of freedom, individuality and tolerance. Freedom—freedom to achieve a larger and fuller life through government of the people, by the people, for the people. Individuality—the right to be different as we inevitably will be if we may think and act as our conscience, reason, and circumstances dictate. And, finally, a feeling of tolerance—tolerance of faith, of color, of race—and tolerance of the fact that many people simply do not think and act the way we do. These three great concepts—freedom, individuality and tolerance have been the dynamic force in our whole development. They, together with the basic concept underlying them, the Golden Rule (the doctrine of love, of brotherhood, of the good neighbor) have given us the way of life we believe in as fundamentally as we believe anything in this world.

Today we are celebrating a laymen's Sunday for the purpose of bringing to the forefront the fact of the priesthood of all believers. What does priesthood mean? It means the office of a priest, his function, his mission. How does that concern us? In the New Testament all Christians are designated priests.

Today, also, the way of life which is our heritage and our responsibility to protect is in desperate danger. It is threatened by the cancerous evil of totalitarianism—something which now is clothed as Soviet communism—something which denies every premise we hold valid—something which turns the face of man away from God—something which is unremitting terror against religion, and ethics, and morality.

Let us not fool ourselves. Let us not pretend that the situation is not critical. Let us not be lulled into thinking the danger is not to us and that we have no responsibility in this struggle.

We are in fact in the midst of a crucial struggle for the continued existence of our way of life. And we are in this condition because we have been indifferent. We have not cared to understand the signs—we have been a tepid people, negligent in our priesthood. The time has come when we may well ask ourselves whether we are losing our heritage by default—whether we are in fact Christians. For clearly we are not utilizing our total resources toward winning this struggle. And our responsibility, the obligation inherent in the priesthood of Christian believers, is to do everything we possibly can to further the way of our Lord, God Almighty.

What can we do that we are not doing? Let us see first what we are up against.

We are up against a deadly serious adversary, one who is playing for keeps. We are up against an enemy whose mechanism of threats, lies, infiltration, planned chaos, despair, and confusion is terrible beyond belief, and one, further, whose use of informers, secret police, thugs, and gunmen represents the deadliest weapon ever brought against freedom.

This adversary (Soviet communism) holds in it the denial of every premise we hold valid. It denies the sovereignty of God. It denies freedom, individuality, tolerance—the Golden Rule. Freedom, the Communists say, is an evil thing. And as for individuality—all people must be alike. The state is supreme—the lot of the people, servility.

Soviet spokesmen claim a monopoly of the knowledge of what is right and what is wrong for human beings. They maintain the pretense that they are the interpreters of the aspirations of all peoples. They would speak for great masses of human beings whose opinions they have never solicited—and who have never selected them as their spokesmen. They arrogate to themselves powers and pretenses which you and I are willing to concede only to the infinite wisdom and compassion of Almighty God. They use the great resources of modern science (particularly those that have to do with an understanding of the human mind) to pervert the human mind. They resort to every trick, to every insidious and brutal device to destroy what we think is essential—the self-respect of the individual, the integrity of his mind and of his spirit. And if someone should exercise freedom of thought, should dare to depart from the doctrine laid down in the Kremlin, he is a criminal—and must be placed behind bars or put to death.

Let us not forget that the objective of Soviet communism—a force which controls a great world power and many satellites—which wields authority over hundreds of millions of people—a major industrial empire, the greatest armed strength in the world today, and a force which has the fanatical devotion of fifth columnists in every country not yet within its terrible orbit, let us not forget that the objective of Soviet communism is to make all the world's people subservient to the Soviet regime. Soviet communism has devoted a major portion of its energies and resources to the attempt to impose its system on other people. And since under its thesis the end justifies the means, we are fighting an unbelievably evil force to which all methods of achieving its objectives are permissible.

What can we do about it? As President Truman said recently, there are many things we can do and two things we cannot do. We cannot compromise our principles and we cannot withdraw from the world.

We can, together with other nations of the free world, clearly demonstrate the superiority of the ideals of freedom over the iron hand of tyranny. We can make clear that democracy and freedom, which have evolved from the teachings of Christ, bring to each individual each day more of what he wants than any other system. The free world has the resources to demonstrate both moral and material superiority. It has the tremendous advantage that always adheres to the cause of justice, liberty and respect for human dignity. With leadership, with unity, with steadfastness, that demonstration of moral and material superiority can be made. And as the strength and effectiveness of the system of freedom are made clear over the globe—as the people who now stand in doubt turn to our way of life—the danger of Communist domination will dwindle and finally disappear. The struggle for peace, security and stability in world affairs can be won. But only if each Christian is productive in his priesthood.

The threat is to our kind of civilization. Each one of us is an ambassador of that civilization. And therefore each of us has a part to play in what our Secretary of State Dean Acheson has called total diplomacy. There is no longer any difference between foreign questions and domestic questions. They are all parts of the same question. When we consider any matter, whether it is the size of the budget or the amount of taxes we pay, or the regulation of our commerce—or the regulation of immigration—or military policy—or foreign aid—it is all part of the same thing. Each one of these things is a part of the problem of our safety—and every part of the problem is serious.

We need to take a greater personal interest in government. In the past, except in national emergencies, we have never taken governmental activities as seriously as we should. We have regarded them as someone else's responsibility and have shrugged our shoulders over their shortcomings and faults, saying, "Well, politics is politics." As a result, our representation has not always been as clean, as wise, and as efficient as it might have been. If each one of us will take a genuine, abiding, intelligent interest in how and by whom we are represented, we shall strengthen our defenses against Soviet Communist encroachment. And if we have the dynamic faith, the strong convictions, the sense of mission envisaged by Lincoln, we will give reality to his dream of government of the people, by the people, for the people.

I know that you and I want to do something constructive about the basic wants of man. There is a tremendous and spontaneous pressure within us to help men everywhere in the world satisfy basic social and economic needs. The urge is there. All of us are conscious of the fact that one of the most pleasant feelings we are privileged to enjoy is to meet a person (whether friend, acquaintance, or stranger), knowing that we have done him no wrong and that we wish him well. We feel so good we want to be helpful, if possible. We want to share his troubles and to better the situation, if he will let us. As I have said, the urge is there. The challenge of Soviet communism merely increases that urge. And the feeling of the individual becomes that of the family; that of the family, the community; and that of the community—the State.

Actually the basic wants are about the same for every individual. For one thing, we want a sense of security—we don't want to live in a society where the fear of bandits (local or international), has to be uppermost in our minds. Secondly, we want a sense of productive achievement, for man must feel that he is performing somewhere near the top of the range of his capabilities. Thirdly, we want a sense of equity or justice, particularly as regards our standard of living. Fourthly, we want a sense of participation, some degree of control over the decisions that directly affect our own living and our own destiny. And I should add what Gen. George Marshall has described as the most important need for the world today—"a spiritual regeneration which would restore a feeling of good faith and good will among men generally."

Discouraged people are sorely in need of the inspiration of great principles. Such inspiration, such leadership can be the rallying point against intolerance, against distrust, and against that fatal insecurity that leads to war. I hope that you and I may participate in providing that leadership. But we shall have to get back to first principles if we are to speak with a voice that will kindle the imagination and rouse the spirit. We must present our way of life as a force holding within itself the seeds of unlimited progress for the human race. We must make clear that it is a means to a beter way of life within nations and to a better understanding among nations.

However, it is not enough that one should have faith and should make that faith articulate. It is also essential that we, and those who think like us, should have the power to make safe the area in which we carry that faith into action. And beyond faith and preachment and defense there lies the necessity of translating all of these into terms of the daily lives of hundreds of millions of people who live in this free world of ours.

We must create those economic, political, social, and psychological conditions that strengthen and create confidence in our way of life. One obstacle to the realization of the kind of world in which we can live in peace, is that great areas of the world are breeding grounds of conflict simply because their people lack the means of a tolerable existence. It is hard for us to realize just how bad economic conditions are for many peoples of the world. Famine, disease, and poverty are the scourge of vast areas. Hundreds of millions of people have a life expectancy of 30 years or less and many of these people live on inadequate diets, unable to perform the tasks necessary to earn even their daily bread. Animal plagues and plant pests carry away their livestock and their crops. Misuse of natural resources exposes their land to flood and drought. Conditions such as these are the seedbeds of political unrest and instability. And it is in areas where these conditions exist that Soviet communism makes its greatest inroads. In such areas, Soviet Communists are attempting to turn people's honest dissatisfaction with their present conditions into support for Communist efforts to dominate their nations. Because of their hopelessness, people turn to the false promises of dictators—anything promises better than the miserable existence they endure. Let us not fool ourselves, democratic principles do not flourish easily on empty stomachs.

And so we must work to bring about better living conditions in the free nations. We must help them to help themselves. We must help them to make progress in agriculture, in industry, in health, and in the education of their children. Our missionary groups—our philanthropic and charitable agencies must continue the efforts they have been making over the years for the improvement of conditions. Our young people can find careers in the pioneering work of bringing technical assistance to needy countries. Trade-unions and business organizations might profitably enlarge their contacts and bring the benefits of their experience to others.

If we fail to give material help now we run the risk of losing to Soviet communism by default hundreds of millions of people who look to us for help in their struggle against hunger and despair. The so-called point 4 program could demonstrate that capitalism is energetic, intelligent, and humane.

Summing up, there are several things we can do to meet the threat of Soviet communism. No one of them will be the answer, because there is no answer. There is no quick or easy way to subdue an evil force. It will be with us until Christ comes again. But we can and must contain it. And here our individual, our personal responsibility, the priesthood of the Christian believer comes into play.

Let us dedicate ourselves to the business of total diplomacy. Let us see to it that we get the right people to represent us in government. Let us jealously guard the implementation of the great concepts that underlie the whole development of our civilization: freedom, individuality, tolerance, the Golden Rule. Let us help people to help themselves. Let us build a world society that possesses the richness of individuality. That concept will attract a following great enough to put to rout those who seek a world of servility. Let us not forget that if the free world is to be big enough and strong enough to survive the inevitable thrusts of those who believe in a totalitarian world, the free world must be built upon a foundation of tolerance of difference rather than imposition of conformity. Let us make our free world a safe area in which to practice our faith. Let us thus be prepared for any eventuality. Let us be ready at all times for war, if necessary. War is better than appeasement of aggression—because appeasing encourages the very aggression it seeks to prevent. And it is far better than submission to tyranny, because without freedom and respect for human dignity life would not be worth living. Let us be constructively productive in our Christian priesthood.

We want a peaceful world, but our conception of peace is not the kind of condition one finds in the still and terrifying center of a hurricane. We do not want peace at any price, for we know that peace cannot be bought at the price of freedom.

Let us work for an evermore effective United Nations. That organization symbolizes one of mankind's highest aspirations—an international house of democracy, a true brotherhood of the nations.

Let us preach the inherent dignity and importance of the individual—the dynamic idea we have from Christ Jesus. Our strength will be invincible with the voluntary adherence of free men and free minds to the great concepts of our civilization. And in the end, tyranny must fall back before the tremendous moral strength of the gospel of freedom and self-respect, the gospel we have from Christ Jesus, our Lord.

Let us pray. O Lord in Thine infinite wisdom Thou has determined that good and evil shall exist concurrently in the whole reach of human life; that they shall exist within every individual, within every nation and within every human group; that the struggle between them cannot be confined to governments, but must go on, as it always has, in the wider theater of the human spirit itself.

Enable us to understand that this is so and that we who want to qualify as Christians must accept and discharge the responsibilities inherent in the priesthood of Christianity.

Forgive us O Lord that because of our indifference, our negligence, our hypocrisy many people less fortunate than we have strayed from Thy way. Give us a passionate desire to serve. Give us a burning, dynamic feeling of our mission. Give us the strength to withstand and defeat the onslaught of evil, the force that is constantly probing our resistance. Let us at all times, like Thy Son's parable of the talents, be careful about multiplying the good of our heritage. Make the meaning of our priesthood a clear and living thing. O Lord, in the name of Jesus Christ we pray. Amen.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Project Is as Unsound as Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, from the State of Alabama comes the following editorial taken from the December 26, 1950, issue of the Mobile Register in which it points out that proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway are trying to sell America something that does not have the merit to justify the investment.

The editorial follows:

MORE TALK FOR ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY BUT PROJECT IS AS UNSOUND AS EVER

Lately, United States Senator EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota, and United States Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, have invited attention to renewed arguments for construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, the route which would extend from the Great Lakes region to the Atlantic Ocean via Canada.

We take it for granted that the active manner in which the St. Lawrence project is being talked up again is the forerunner of another congressional move to commit the United States to the expenditure of untold millions of dollars for its construction.

The important point, and the point which should be borne in mind in Congress, is that arguments offered today for the St. Lawrence seaway are just as unconvincing as the arguments which have been offered heretofore.

We observe that one article on the subject says the project first came before Congress about a half century ago. It has been brought before Congress time after time since then. In fact it has become sort of a perennial question.

Yet never once has a convincing case been made for the project during the long and persistent fight which has been carried on for it.

There is good reason why no convincing case has ever been made for the St. Lawrence seaway project. The good reason is that no convincing case can be made for it.

Plain irrefutable fact is that the project was unsound when first thought up, has remained unsound ever since and will still be unsound the next time it is placed before Congress. Proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway simply are trying to sell something which does not have the merit to justify the investment.

It would seem that eventually the proponents of the project would wake up to the lack of market for the costly white elephant they have to offer. But apparently not. Apparently the St. Lawrence seaway project is on the way to another session of Congress, and will return to still other sessions.

It is unfortunate that so much congressional time must be spent on this unsound St. Lawrence seaway project when much that is worthy needs more congressional attention than is given.

Thoughts by the Printer's Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Isanti (Minn.) News:

THOUGHTS BY THE PRINTER'S WIFE

ISANTI, MINN., *March 12, 1951.*

Hon. ROY W. WIER,
Third Congressional District of Minnesota, Washington, D. C.:

During my limited experience in correspondence I have written letters to Sears, Roebuck & Co., my Aunt Florence, the Minneapolis Tribune, and the county attorney, all of which were promptly answered to my satisfaction. This is my first letter to a Congressman and I am writing it in the faith that all Congressmen take seriously the matters brought to their notice through the mail.

Our society reporter has called it to my attention that there is a movement in Congress to abolish the penny post card. Now, whether she got this information from the women on her calling list (who also are your constituents) or if she read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I did not take time to ask. I was so thoroughly alarmed I made straight for the typewriter to take up this matter with someone who could do something about it. If the letter is not ready by mail time I will flag the train so as to get it off this evening.

Mr. WIER, as far as I can estimate, there are only two bargains left; one is the penny post card and the other is a subscription to this newspaper. The way things are going it looks like we might have to raise the price of the subscription so let's keep the penny post card privilege for present and future economy.

The penny postcard is so necessary to my personal activities. I have a chair about whom I feel like a mother hen feels about her chicks. Sometimes during the week I must send messages to the members. Take for instance that as I ponder over the anthem for Sunday, I suddenly reconsider the second movement and decide it should be done pianissimo instead of fortissimo. I couldn't afford to spend 3 cents for mailing out the one-line messages but somehow 1 cent seems entirely within my circumstances. As publicity chairman for the PTA, I may want to send notices to all the members, "Please come to the next meeting to hear Mr. Morgenthau speak on the Penny Postcard Must Live Forever. The activities I promote do not allow me an expense account—this makes the penny postcard an absolute necessity.

I honestly feel that it is perfectly all right for Congress to receive suggestions on budgets and appropriations from women because through money management on a small scale, housewives have learned foresightedness. A quick example of this comes to my mind. When Dr. and Mrs. Hedenstrom were a young couple and the children were tots, every time the doctor set out to buy a new business suit, Mrs. Hedenstrom would remind him, "Be sure, dear, to choose a pattern that can be suitably made over for Phil after you are through wearing it."

Of course I wouldn't be able to offer any suggestions as to making money go farther in the military department but if you need my ideas, Mr. Hoover has lots of them written down in his reports. However, I will come right out and say a couple of things about the Government printing department.

For instance, in direct competition to my husband's business, the Government Office prints stamped envelopes with a return card in the upper left-hand corner. I have seen printing so crooked on these envelopes which have been ordered locally that I have been embarrassed lest people might think they came from our shop. I believe that some good printing authority has figured that these are printed at a ridiculous loss per order. If I am wrong, be sure to correct me, because I find this envelope business particularly interesting.

Oh yes, far be it from me to make suggestions but I thought maybe a few of the bulletins and leaflets printed for free distribution might be eliminated from your list which I have read very carefully. For instance, leaflet 1852 on Lespedeza Culture and Utilization, I wouldn't imagine would be too popular inasmuch as neither my dictionaries nor encyclopedia columns list lespedezias. Oh, I do assume they are important inasmuch as there are publications about them. I find listed some booklets which sound extremely useful but I do think the "ABC's of mending" is sort of silly. If a woman can't patch instinctively, she isn't going to bother to learn from a book.

Of course, as I said, I am entirely unable to offer any suggestions in big-time finances because I am so busy with my household budget but it is just on account of this budget that I can't get along without a 1-cent postcard.

I know a war is very expensive—it must take a mint of money. But, if our fighting men need more supplies and equipment, go ahead and raise our taxes but please, let us keep the penny postcard!

Yours respectfully,

THE PRINTER'S WIFE.

Labor Should Be Given Real Voice in Formulation of Defense Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following statement issued by the United Labor Policy Committee on February 28, 1951, which appeared in the March issue of the American Federationist:

THE PLAIN PEOPLE GET A RAW DEAL

The United Labor Policy Committee decided unanimously today that all labor representatives of our respective organizations serving on existing defense mobilization agencies shall resign immediately.

We fully realize the gravity of this decision. It was arrived at only after exhaustive exploration of all the facts and after almost continuous conferences with the leaders of our Government and of the defense program during the past 2 weeks.

We have come to the conclusion that in no other way can we effectively impress upon the American people the great wrongs being perpetrated against them.

On February 16 we announced that we had become thoroughly disillusioned with the conduct of the defense mobilization program. We made the deliberate charge that big business was dominating the program, that the interests of the plain people of this country were being ignored and that the basic principles of equality of sacrifice in the national effort to protect freedom against Communist aggression had been abandoned.

Since then we have spelled out our indictment in detail to the President of the United States and to the heads of agencies under him. We have talked and we have listened. After full and complete exchanges of information, our original convictions have been more than confirmed.

We are today confronted with a price order which amounts to legalized robbery of every American consumer, together with a wage order which denies justice and fair play to every American who works for wages. The door has been slammed in our faces on the vital problem of manpower, which directly affects the workers we represent. We are offered the lame excuse that on other important policies the decisions must be made by a Congress which is not cooperating with the administration. There has been no affirmative action to meet our basic position—that equality of sacrifice must be the guiding and indispensable principle in the defense program in order to obtain full cooperation and maximum results.

We have also arrived at the inescapable conclusion that such representation which already has been accorded to labor in defense agencies and such further representation as is now offered are merely for the purpose of window dressing. There is absolutely no desire on the part of Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson to give labor a real voice in the formulation of defense policy.

Under these circumstances, we have decided that to continue to serve on defense agencies would bring about no constructive results and would merely delude the public and the wage earners we represent into believing that labor acquiesced in what is being done.

In the interests of our country and the cause of international peace and freedom to which it is committed, we stand ready to meet with responsible representatives of our

Government to continue to seek a remedy for the insupportable conditions facing us.

WAGES

The Director of Economic Stabilization has signed a wage order which we know to be unfair, unworkable, and unjust. Wages and salaries of all Americans are now bound under the most rigid controls in the history of our country.

Wage Order No. 6 has been given the force of law by Mr. Eric Johnston's signature. Yet, even as he did so, he admitted that this order requires fundamental revision and improvement to correct some of the grave inequities apparent on its face.

Mr. Johnston's suggestions for correcting these grave injustices are inadequate. They do not meet the needs of American workers. Mr. Johnston's recommendations freeze injustice by denying less privileged workers the right to obtain through collective bargaining the benefits enjoyed in substantial segments of industry.

Labor's representatives cannot in good conscience return to the Wage Stabilization Board which voted Order No. 6, nor can we acquiesce in the unfair wage policy enunciated by Mr. Johnston.

We have, however, publicly stated, and we now reiterate, that we are prepared to participate in a reconstituted tripartite wage stabilization and disputes board which would administer a fair and equitable wage policy.

PRICES

While wages and salaries are being brought under strict control, the price freeze has been revoked. The Price Stabilization Administrator, with the full approval of the Director of Economic Stabilization, has issued a price order under which 200,000 stores will establish their own price ceilings on the basis of their own bookkeeping and on the basis of their past margin of profit on each item sold.

By officially validating the margin of profit in effect on February 24, the order legalizes every illegal price mark-up since the January 25 freeze order. Higher and higher prices are built into the price formula by its reliance on margin of profit for computing the legal price.

For example, the wholesale cost of a workshirt to the retailer was $2 and has now gone to $2.50. The retailer's price to the consumer was $3. Under the price order, the new ceiling price will be $3.75. In other words, an extra 25 cents of profit not reflected by cost has been added by the retailer with official sanction.

No customer will be able to check whether the retailer is selling his product at a price based on the regulation. There will be no such thing as a dollar-and-cent price ceiling for any commodity, except the price which the retailer sets. There will be no posting of ceiling prices. Enforcement is obviously impossible, even if it were intended.

At a time when fixed formulas are being applied to wages, business is being allowed to write its own ceiling prices. Wages are frozen. Nothing else in the economy has been frozen.

MANPOWER

During the past 2 weeks we have been unable to achieve an iota of progress toward the establishment of administrative machinery and policies on manpower that would most effectively help the Nation's defense effort.

Control of manpower was seized several weeks ago by Mr. Charles E. Wilson and centralized in his already-powerful Office of Defense Mobilization, without ever discussing the matter with his labor advisory committee. Both by correspondence and by several hours of discussion, we have sought to show Mr. Wilson that manpower policies would best be formulated in the Department of Labor. We pointed out that a labor-management committee in the Department of Labor had been functioning harmoniously and satisfactorily on manpower problems until its effectiveness was arbitrarily and suddenly ended by Mr. Wilson's action.

Speaking for millions of wage earners who will be most directly affected as our manpower problems increase, we asked Mr. Wilson to reconsider that decision. He refused flatly and finally, and without atempting to offer any logical reasons for his refusal.

The United Labor Policy Committee is deeply concerned at Mr. Wilson's arrogant seizure of control over manpower and by his equally arrogant refusal to give more than the most superficial consideration to our plea for reversal of his action. So long as the control of manpower rests in the Office of Defense Mobilization, no American wage or salary earner may feel safe that the big business clique in control of that agency may not suddenly seek to achieve a compulsory draft of the Nation's workers. Such an action, under big business control and supervision, would endanger our traditional concepts of free labor and voluntary cooperation. We do not believe that free Americans want civilian labor to be conscripted.

LABOR PARTICIPATION AT ODM

Our conferences and correspondence with Charles E. Wilson have demonstrated that he has little understanding of the needs of the plain folks throughout America. Mr. Wilson has clearly failed to recognize that voluntary cooperation among the various groups in our population has always been attainable in times of national emergency, and that such cooperation has been a foundation of our national strength. To the contrary, Mr. Wilson has demonstrated time and again that he considers the mobilization program his private preserve, in which he may order directives and ukases without consideration of the public need or the public wishes.

But our America is not a private corporation. Authority in our America does not flow down from the front office. It rises from the great common sense and deep patriotism of all the people. The Office of Defense Mobilization, however, is staffed at its top level exclusively with men from the executive offices of big business.

To give voice to the needs of the public, including all workers—on whom our defense production depends—we have asked Mr. Wilson for an opportunity for labor to participate at the top policy level of the ODM. That request was not voiced merely in order to provide a job for a leader of labor; it was advanced in the hope that labor's experience, skill, and viewpoint could help to advance the interests of the total defense effort.

Mr. Wilson has made it clear by his actions that he wants no such broadening of the ODM structure. He does not want suggestions or advice from outside the ranks of big business. It is amply clear to the United Labor Policy Committee that Mr. Wilson does not want labor participation in the mobilization program; he now would accept window dressing, supplied by labor, to cover the backroom activities of the leaders of industry who staff the ODM. He will get no such window dressing from the men and women of American labor. Under these circumstances, his belated offer to appoint a man from labor on his staff is meaningless.

CONCLUSION

Two weeks ago the United Labor Policy Committee voiced alarm over the crisis in our defense program. The crisis has not lessened; it has become more acute.

The road is greased for higher prices. The present wage formula will act like a vise on the aspirations of Americans for decent living standards and equality of sacrifice in the defense effort. Rents are climbing steadily upward, while effective rent-control legislation lags in Congress. An unbalanced tax program, which would place its heaviest burdens on the lower income groups, is in the process of enactment.

Nowhere in the defense mobilization program is there evidence of enlightened and militant leadership to meet these problems, act upon them and help the country develop the strength necessary to met the threat of Communist aggression.

We of the United Labor Policy Committee have voiced these criticisms not to impair our defense program but to improve it. We seek, actively and earnestly, an effective mobilization program which is imperatively required for the defense of our free institutions and of our great democratic traditions.

We shall continue, with all the strength and persuasion at our command, to work toward our goal—the preservation of human liberty throughout the democratic world. We believe that in that American effort the aims and aspirations of free labor—which has never faltered in its opposition to Communist aggression—can play a major, constructive part.

A Veterans' Administration Domiciliary Facility Is Needed in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1951, I introduced H. R. 3147, to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There is a very definite and pressing need for such a facility in Massachusetts. Our veteran population in New England is greater than many other sections of the country and suffers from the lack of a domiciliary home of this nature. Veterans who are eligible for such care are obliged to enter facilities far from their families and friends, with the resultant breaking of home ties and the usual feeling of loneliness occasioned thereby.

I have received a letter from the commandant of the Soldiers' Home, at Chelsea, which is maintained by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It gives pertinent information concerning the need for such a facility, and I include it herein:

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: It was with considerable pleasure that I read of your having introduced a bill to the House calling for the construction of a domiciliary home here in Massachusetts.

I feel that there is no question but what the New England area, and Massachusetts particularly, is far worse off than any other section in the entire country with reference to domiciliary units.

For your information, there are 26 States which operate soldiers' homes in this country, or an average of almost one soldiers' home for every two States. Here in New England, we have every State, with the exception of Maine, operating a soldiers' home, so that our average is five out of six States; and I think the Veterans' Administration has not aided this problem by the construction of even one Federal domiciliary home here in New England. The nearst domiciliary facility, as you know, is at Bath, N. Y.

The waiting list for admission is approximately 18 months.

The States here in New England were forced into the maintaining of soldiers' homes for the care of their veterans since the Federal Government failed in this respect. It would, indeed, be a pleasure for me to appear in support of this very worthwhile measure which you have introduced. Once again, you have taken the leadership in seeking a practical solution to one of the more vexing problems of our veterans, particularly those of World War I and the Spanish-American War.

With very best regards to you, I remain,

Yours very truly,

JOHN L. QUIGLEY,

Commandant, Commonwealth of Massachusetts Soldiers' Home, Chelsea.

Martin College, Pulaski, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Nashville Tennessean Sunday magazine there appeared a most excellent article written by Mrs. Helen P. Abernathy, outstanding writer and journalist, of Pulaski, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent. Mrs. Abernathy's fine article was on the history of Martin College, in Pulaski, one of the finest of our educational institutions and a source of inspiration to thousands of students over the course of 5 generations.

Because of the excellence of this article and because of the widespread interest in Martin College of Pulaski, I desire to have the text of this article included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

THOMAS MARTIN'S COLLEGE

(By Helen P. Abernathy)

Pulaski, Tenn., is a town of 6,500 inhabitants, but there is not one of its native-born citizens who considers it strange that there should once have lived there a man who flatly rejected the offer of President James K. Polk to make him Secretary of the Treasury, and became town mayor instead.

The gentleman, they will tell you, was only exhibiting his extremely good sense in preferring to handle the hearthstone politics of a purring municipality instead of the purse-strings of a Nation, especially in a period plagued with the expansive notions of the aggressive Polk administration.

Whether or not Thomas Martin forfeited national fame for himself, his name has continued to be a familiar one throughout Tennessee, and, at least in Pulaski, no one has challenged his leadership as a financial power, cotton merchant, banker, railroad president, church worker and founder of Martin College.

It was to carry out the wish of his daughter, Virginia, who died at the age of 20 that he bequeathed $30,000 in State bonds for the establishment of a school for girls. Although at the time of its debut, the school was indeed "the answer to a maiden's prayer," it has perhaps become even more so in later years, for since 1937 young men have been admitted also, and Faith chapel has become the scene of many a wedding planned on proper strolls about the campus.

Since the advent of coeducation, male students, too, have learned to appreciate the independent ability of Thomas Martin. It is not recorded, however, that any student, male or female, with present-day campus financial worries, has ever been deterred from writing home for money by having read of the college founder that: "He never cost his father a cent after he reached the age of 15, clerked in a store until he was 18, and at 25, had accumulated $150,000. He died worth more than a million—his unusual success the result of fine judgment, foresight and splendid integrity."

The first high school for girls in Giles County began its existence under the name of "The Martin Female College" in the basement of the Methodist Church, one block north of the public square in a building now occupied by the Church of Christ. The first president, according to the records, was a teacher of wide experience and a Christian gentleman, Prof. William E. Jones. When he left to head a school in Texas, Dr. R. H. Rivers of Louisville, Ky., became president for a five-year period, until Professor Jones resumed the presidency of Martin for several more years. However, in 1884, Professor Jones again was prevailed upon to go to Dallas, Tex., as head of a school there, and the college records of this incident are notably doleful as the board members gave their consent to his leaving.

The purchase of the Gov. John C. Brown property, an ornate colonial-style residence on a seven-acre plot, was accomplished in 1874, and under the beautiful magnolias shading the box-bordered flowerbeds, girls of all ages were taught the importance of being gentle ladies as well as intelligent scholars.

In 1876 uniforms for all boarding students were adopted. The board, whose president at that time was Governor Brown, voted the measure in order to prevent extravagance and promote economy, and recommended that "exercises of this school shall hereafter be conducted in uniform, calico or lawn for summer, and some cheap worsted goods for winter, or something equally inexpensive, the uniform to be adopted by Mrs. Menefee and Mrs. Nathan Adams subject to the ratification of this board. This rule may be modified so as to permit the graduating class to dress otherwise by the consent of parents."

Mrs. Adams, one of the eminent educators of her day, had operated a private school of her own in her home, and when she became associated with Martin College as a teacher, brought with her 20 young women who were her patrons. In good weather, all boarding pupils went for long walks, and the uniformed line, two by two, was chaperoned by a member of the faculty.

In 1885 the Misses Ida E. Hood and Susan L. Heron, of Philadelphia and Boston, later of Belmont and Ward-Belmont College fame, took over the principalship of Martin College. According to the contract, they were to pay as rental for said college building, grounds, and furniture, the sum of $500 per annum.

When the Misses Hood and Heron, in 1887, asked for and received a renewal of their lease for another term, the church, through her presiding elder, brought suit to invalidate the contract between the trustees and these copresidents. Their contention was that the board had no right to elect anyone but Methodists as head of the school, and that the right of choice was implicit in the official board of the Methodist church. (Miss Hood was a Quaker, and Miss Heron a Presbyterian.)

The board minutes reveal the members as being pleased with the management of said principals, feel satisfied it would be to the best interests of the school that it be released to them. John S. Wilkes, then president of the trustees, a skilled lawyer, and afterward member of the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, defended the case. The chancelor in Pulaski ruled in favor of the trustees, that Martin College is not a denominational school, as did the Supreme Court when the church appealed the case.

To this day Martin opens her doors to all denominations, and while her students and faculty are predominantly Methodist, many visit and worship in eight other churches.

In 1888 Martin received a threat to her continuance when Mrs. Spofford, daughter of Thomas Martin, sought to recover to her father's estate the 30 State bonds, claiming it was his purpose to do this when they matured, with only the interest to go to Martin. That suit also was successfully fought by the college in the lower courts and the Supreme Court, and to the present time, the corpus of the bonds has been kept intact, with only the interest, as stipulated in the donor's will, being used for expenses of the school.

Ten years later, Judge John S. Wilkes voiced the courage of Martin's trustees at the cornerstone laying of the $25,000 new pressed-brick building. "Many have said to me, 'You are building too much; you can never fill it up. This is the same song I have heard ever since Prof. William Jones moved from the basement of the Methodist church to this location. The same doubters have been predicting disaster with every change in principals and faculty. No. Martin College will never die."

The new building boasted broad stairways, wide corridors, fire escapes, freight elevator, covered galleries, city water, water closets, bathrooms, and floral-patterned carpeting in the huge, ornately furnished parlors. According to the catalog of 1900, the climate is mild, free from the rigors of northern winters and the debilitating influences of southern summers. The dormitories are amply supplied with ventiducts, transoms, and windows; there is an abundance of pure, fresh air, so essential to healthy growth and action; the building is comfortably heated, the bedrooms having open grates with wire protectors. The place is entirely free from all malarial influences.

Disaster visited the school the first in January 1900, when a slight case of smallpox caused the closing of the school for several months. A second catastrophe came when fire destroyed the building on October 16, 1904.

Martin became a junior college when one of the best dormitories in the State was ready for occupancy in 1914, and Prof. W. T. Wynn was the school's president. Five years before the Tennessee Conference of the Methodist Church had taken over the college, and it remains today under that organization's leadership.

Today, the college is headed by the Reverend Joseph D. Quillan, Jr., who assumed his duties September 1, succeeding E. H. Ham, who was its president for 5 years.

It has an enrollment of approximately 180 students.

The campus is alive presently with crew haircuts, checkered shirts, abbreviated tennis shorts, bobbed curls and socks. Such activities as big-, little-sister-and-brother parties, Sadie Hawkins days, and recreational gymnasium parties vie with the cultural offerings of the art, music, and dramatics departments.

Contrasted with these interests are the restrictions of another day at Martin, when the college catalog stated: "Parents are requested to furnish the president with a list of correspondents of their daughter. Excessive letter writing should be discouraged. Each boarding pupil must provide herself with rubbers, and an umbrella or gossamer, and in winter with a black wrap. Friday afternoon and night, the lace-curtained parlors are open for teachers and pupils to receive their friends, but at no other time. No one, teachers, family, or pupils entertains company on the Sabbath. Boarding pupils are expected to wear a plain black uniform

when they go out from the college in winter and plain white for summer. This discourages extravagant dressing."

Tiny Faith Chapel is the spiritual hub of Martin College. Concerning the chapel, a bulletin board in the college hall states, "Someone prays in Faith Chapel every night at 10 o'clock." The shrine was effected through the late Dr. Franklin H. Clapp and Mrs. Clapp, former teachers at the school.

Of the college, Pedro Sota of Cuba, a student, remarked: "After being at Martin for 1 month, my first month in the United States, I am finding this college, though small, a wonderful place. In its homelike, friendly, and Christian atmosphere, I know, indeed, there is something here."

It is doubtful if Thomas Martin, founder of "a school for girls," could have wished his bequest to accomplish more.

Why Labor Resigned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, appearing in the March issue of the American Federationist entitled "Why Labor Resigned." The editorial follows:

WHY LABOR RESIGNED

In our present emergency, which is the result of Stalin's refusal to respect the rights of other peoples, and when our whole Nation is called upon to make sacrifices to maintain human freedom against the military and psychological moves of the Kremlin for world domination, it is fitting and natural that national groups whose functions are essential to national life should want to participate equally with other groups.

Labor was one of the first groups in this country to realize the ruthless nature of the organization that seized power in Russia in 1917 and to realize the menace it presented to free people everywhere.

When the President of the United States asked for authority to meet open defiance of law and order in world relations, the American Federation of Labor supported his proposal wholeheartedly and stood ready to cooperate.

Organization for the defense of the Nation and our national institutions means the temporary subordination of the goals of individual progress to the national program. Labor, with the experience of all-out cooperation in two World Wars, wants to put that experience at the service of the Nation. Conscious of the fact that divisions in the ranks of workers had resulted in unwieldy organization in World War II, representatives of the principal groups organized a committee through which to handle the collective interests of trade-union organizations.

Labor realizes the menace which inflation holds. Workers have watched the dwindling purchasing value of dollars earned and have had only one way by which they could protect standards of living in their homes—increased wage rates to compensate for increased prices. Wage rate increases, however, only reflected inflation and were not a primary cause.

We knew that the expansion of our economy, as manifested in increased national production and national income, increases in exports, increased employment, and greater stability of employment, were inflationary in nature, stimulating price rises and larger profits. Sustained high-level production, with high levels of employment, provided the funds for Government expenditure unparalleled during peace. High national indebtedness due to World War II in the form of bonds at low interest rates became a ready source of credit expansion, adding to the flood of volume of money. Taxes, already at peak with only wartime precedents, were increased to meet defense needs and to serve as an inflation brake.

Taxation alone cannot check inflation or restore normal relationships within our economy. Only the coordinated, sustained, and purposeful cooperation of all whose acts affect the economy can check the flood of inflation and restore the value of our dollars.

We were moving toward organized cooperation until the President reorganized the defense administration under the Office of Defense Mobilization. The President selected a Director of Defense Mobilization and delegated to him powers second only to his own, along with responsibility for the weapons of defense. Big business, with its peak profits, was in a position to send its experts to Washington on a loan basis to put their management experience at the service of the Government as it took over duties and responsibilities formerly performed by competitive enterprise and other private agencies. Labor logically expected an opportunity to supply representatives of experience to aid in developing the policies and regulations for defense production and to contribute its experience in mobilizing and assuring the cooperation of workers who transform work orders into needed products. Power, tools, materials, blueprints, and work orders get into operation through hands skilled by work experience and directed by judgment evolved in production.

When labor saw defense manpower shifted from administration by an agency whose basic function is the promotion of the welfare of human beings to an agency where manpower is subordinated to production, and policies conditioning our standard of living entrusted to an agency in which we had but a minority voice, our first responsibility was to secure adequate and competent representation and to assure justice in defense production.

Without waiting to determine all problems of functions and operation, the Economic Stabilization Agency initiated its program with a price and wage freeze. The wage freeze was to be succeeded on March 15 by a permanent wage formula. The public and the employer members of the Wage Stabilization Board agreed together upon a wage formula as follows: To limit wage increases to 10 percent of the wage of January 15, 1950. It included within this permitted wage range pensions, health and welfare funds, vacations with pay, paid holidays, etc.

Welfare and pension plans are clearly noninflationary. Their current value cannot be estimated. Therefore they should not be blanketed into the 10 percent.

The old formula had provided an adjustment on the basis of the April 1951 consumers' price index, while the new regulation merely provides a review in the light of a rising index. There is no provision for time inequities or for those due to industrial change and growth. Neither was there provision for determining disputes over interpretation or application of the formula.

This formula was proposed as a substitute for collective bargaining which deals with all phases of work relationships in changing and developing industries. It would result in freezing workers' compensation for work done. This proposal to penalize labor, while the prices of articles included in workers' living costs continued to soar and while agricultural prices were uncurbed, was so flagrantly unjust that labor representatives refused to stay on the Board and be a party to it. Their resignation was a protest against injustice which they were powerless to correct.

Labor expects to do its share for national defense and to bear its share of the burden of controlling inflation. Everyone knows increases in wages are not a primary cause of inflation. Until the Government attacks primary causes and gives equitable and effective machinery to compensate for the loss of effective freedom of contract, it may expect our protests against arbitrary determination of workers' pay. Freedom of contract is the instrumentality that maintains that delicate balance within our intricate and interrelated production system. Outside tampering with that freedom creates injustices which destroy balance and injure individuals.

As the representatives of organized labor told the Director of Defense Mobilization in the beginning:

No wage stabilization should be imposed or can succeed unless an over-all system of anti-inflation controls is simultaneously imposed—on the basis of the principle of equality of sacrifice.

Wage stabilization must be a supplement to, not a substitute for, collective bargaining.

Practically continuous conferences failed to result in proposals to assure workers rights necessary for equality of sacrifice and for wholehearted participation in defense of the Nation and our American way of life. We then withdrew the few representatives labor did have from the defense mobilization agencies.

The American Federation of Labor will continue to work for the preservation of human liberty and democratic institutions throughout the world.

LABOR REPRESENTATION

American wage-earners have learned the lesson that the price of liberty, opportunity and justice is "eternal vigilance." The master key is the right and the fact of representation in decisions on matters affecting the welfare of persons concerned. Wage-earners have given their tears, blood, and even lives to secure recognition in work relationships of their right to representation through agents of their own choosing. Congress finally stripped employers of the power to use injunctions against workers seeking better standards of life and work, and employers were told they must not interfere with workers' right to representation.

Under the emergency situation the government has set up administrative bureaus to perform some of the functions normally performed by private individuals or agencies. Since the emergency takes from workers not only freedom of contract but also of decision on policies to promote their future welfare, labor naturally expected representation of its own choosing at the top level to keep the Office of Defense Mobilization mindful of the working people's interests and welfare as over-all policies were determined. Such representation at the top level, to supplement representation in specialized agencies, would assure wage-earners a degree of justice in the defense emergency.

The emergency itself is a changing situation of unknown duration, subject to modification by changes in world diplomacy and international strategy. It commits our Nation to a way of life necessary for preparedness for national defense in a possible atomic war.

Workers as well as citizens in other walks of life realize that national interests and welfare must take precedence over individual

welfare. However, those principles and institutions necessary for individual integrity must remain operative. The most fundamental of these principles is representation. Upon this principle our Nation set up a government charged with assuring every person inalienable and equal rights which give dignity and purpose to human life. Under such a government, tyranny has no place.

THE CONSPIRATORS

Because the international conspiratorial organization which the Kremlin has built up is a military body controlled from Moscow, it represents a threat which no country can safely disregard. It operates in the economic, social and political fields. It employs the methods of organized violence.

Regardless of the place of operation, the Kremlin's method is always the same: centralized authority with orders to constituent bodies with detailed procedures for enforcing them. Plans are developed at the GHQ and carried by agents to the groups selected to execute them. Plans are based on central intelligence built up by Communist agents all over the world.

The Kremlin plans to seize control over all peoples who do not "peacefully" yield. In all fields these plans follow the strategy of armed forces and are directed at gaining control over strategic industries, strategic groups of people, strategic powers of government, and strategic informational and cultural agencies.

With such termites following over-all orders busily battling their way into so many institutions and with the warning of the growing list of nations that have succumbed to termite traitors, the United States has been trying to develop greater legal protection against the treachery of United States Communists as well as the Soviet agents who direct them to carry out Stalin's purposes.

In the economic field our trade-unions were battling the philosophy of communism when it was advocating national socialism as developed by Karl Marx. Our democratic unions knew that labor alone did not create all wealth and that our most constructive policy was to concentrate on getting a fairer share of the returns from the production to which we contributed. We fought and defeated the Marxian advocates, so that we could have American trade-unions to serve us in getting higher standards of living in our democratic society.

When Lenin, the heir of Marxian socialism, molded it into a military organization to battle competitive enterprise, we recognized a deadly enemy in this International Communist Party called the Comintern. We turned against Communists who had infiltrated some strategic unions and drove them out. We insistently and repeatedly urged our Government not to establish diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R., pointing out that the Communist Party, although posing as a political organization, was in reality not a political party at all but an organization seeking conquest by treachery, subversion, and force, that it was not an honest institution but an agency of the Kremlin rulers seeking to delude our citizens into substituting dictatorship for freedom.

The position of the American Federation of Labor has been justified by events of the past two decades. All efforts of the free nations to cooperate with the Communist Government of Russia, in World War II and in the United Nations, have been regarded by the Kremlin as merely opportunities to advance Communist control in order to establish the reactionary despotism of past ages. It is difficult to legislate against communism without impairing our own freedoms. We can, however, deal with it as an illegal conspiracy and outlaw the tactics of conspirators. We shall have to develop the machinery for necessary security and see to it that our judges learn the facts of the Communist way of life.

The shock of finding Communists in the executive branch of our own Government and the trial of a confidential assistant to a President of the United States have resulted in checks on civil-service employees to establish their loyalty, and in some agencies to establish that employees are not security risks. The President in 1947, by Executive order, set up a Loyalty Board of Review to assure Government employees protection against arbitrary action.

Last year Congress enacted the Internal Security Act of 1950, which sought to outlaw subversive activities. This law requires Communist organizations and fronts to register as agents of a foreign government and to make regular reports on their activities. The names of party members must also be registered. Registered organizations can use the mails only by labeling their documents as disseminated by a Communist organization. The President was directed to appoint a Subversive Activities Control Board of five members to enforce this law against conspiratorial acts.

This law also denies passports to Communists and denies admission to Communist immigrants. There are other provisions in the act which have aroused controversy.

The President, by Executive order, has recently established a Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights to study the problem of providing for internal security while conserving individual rights and freedoms, to examine present loyalty and security programs, and to report its findings and conclusions.

More protection and security should result from these various efforts so that our national defense may proceed more effectively both in cold and in hot wars.

Report of Tariff Committee of the New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I present for printing the report of the tariff committee of the New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association, which during the course of the Senate proceedings today was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Appendix.

The report is as follows:

REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE TARIFF COMMITTEE OF THE NEW JERSEY BLUEBERRY FARMERS ASSOCIATION

(The following report is submitted by the tariff committee on the New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association, the policy organization for the New Jersey cultivated blueberry industry, for the purpose of expressing its opposition to the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. A careful reading of this report will convey to you and your distinguished colleagues the extreme hardship that threatens our welfare because of the existing low tariffs on our products.)

With the mounting stress of mobilization, it seems mandatory to both Government and citizens to maintain every branch of American business enterprise at the peak of health and vigor so that the national effort shall not want for needed revenue. In this respect the cultivated blueberry farming enterprise of my State is one of the hundreds of small consumer industries which our Government hopes will prosper greatly so that it will be able to assume more of the sharply increased tax burden.

As we know, steel, aircraft, and related war industries working on a cost-plus basis will have to be fed colossal rations of tax dollars to arm the Western World. It is up to industries like this one from my State which will have to contribute more dollars to the tax purse in order to pay these munitions industries as well as maintain normal cost of Government. Unfortunately, industries like this will be unable to share directly in any Government expenditures, yet it will be expected to increase its production and revenue in the steadily restricted buying sphere of the American consumer. There is no doubt but that is going to be a mighty strenuous schedule—more dollar revenue without sharing in the Government largess.

Another thing to be considered is the fact that the blueberry industry has built up its unique and valuable contribution to our farm economy without any Government assistance such as farm subsidies and stabilized parity prices. It is totally dependent upon the whims of the greatly fluctuating produce market. Here, I might point out, the blueberry grower is one of a category of several million farmers in this Nation who have never cashed a fat subsidy check in one shape or another to swell his normal farm earnings. These are the people who produce the perishable crops of fruits and vegetables. Since the completion of World War II, these farmers, with unsupported prices, have frequently suffered a very rough time. Speaking of the blueberry industry, I am able to say that in recent years the margin of profit has been so narrow that there now exists a state of alarm among its growers. As if domestic problems were not enough, this industry is now threatened by a sizable invasion of their markets from several foreign quarters at prices which they are unable to meet without courting bankruptcy. Gentlemen, if this condition is allowed to continue unabated, do not count on the blueberry industry to supply any fat to the sinews of war. We think it is relevant to give you a brief history of this industry in order to impress upon you its modest value in the American economy.

Twenty-five years ago this food did not exist in American commerce. In the wooded pine barrens of New Jersey it has converted thousands of acres of land, long considered unworthy of dollar valuation, into profitable farm ground valued at more than $5,000,000 at present and recently producing an annual crop worth $2,500,000. To emphasize this accomplishment in a short quarter century, I give you the recent report of the New Jersey Department of Agriculture: The cultivated blueberry has replaced the cranberry as New Jersey's first-ranking small fruit. In fact, the value of the State's cultivated blueberry crop exceeded the value of all other berry crops in New Jersey in 1950.

Where once nothing but deer and rabbits roamed, prosperous communities are growing and thousands earn good wages harvesting and maintaining the plantations. More hundreds profit through the processing of this new fruit in canneries and freezers. From this enterprise in three counties of south Jersey has sprung rapidly growing industries in the States of Michigan, North Carolina, Maryland, Washington, and Oregon—offsprings that are bringing greatly appreciated revenue of additional millions to the former waste lands of those States. It has been a promising effort until now.

These people have created something that is new and valuable to American farming, and we in New Jersey are proud of their efforts. But as they stand at this moment they do not have much more reward than pride. Theirs is a costly industry. It defies

partial mechanization. To maintain quality nearly every operation demands human labor. The bulk of the plantations are small family enterprises. This is necessitated by the heavy capitalization and the need for constant personal supervision to maintain the crop at peak efficiency. The day when this fruit was considered a rich man's luxury is past. They now have to supply the increasing demand of the average man for this fruit at a price he can afford to pay. The fixed costs which amount to two-thirds of their sales revenue have relentlessly mounted while competition has forced them to lower their prices. The end result is that few in this industry last year earned enough after a year's work to pay Uncle Sam more than a token income tax. The average blueberry farmer made less on his investment of thousands of dollars per farm than an ordinary worker in a munitions plant. Yet today he has to pay farm labor $1 per hour, and his pickers won't come to the field unless they are assured of from $8 to $10 per day for harvesting, plus their transportation. Every item of production needed to market one pint of blueberries has sharply increased in cost.

There is, however, a note of brightness. There is no optimist quite like the farmer. When a workman finds his job is unprofitable, he quits; when a businessman finds his business is unprofitable, he liquidates; when a farmer finds the crop unprofitable, he goes right back and takes another swat at it.

The blueberry farmers, I can assure you, are not afraid of their domestic problems. They figure that they will have to organize more cooperatively, build up wider markets, strive to control their distribution and improve their already fine product. That is a man-sized job, but they figure that they can do it; eat and still pay those taxes. What has them worried is a threat from a different quarter and they are powerless to meet that one on equal terms. But the United States Government can. Their problem is this:

One of the reasons they have been able to expand has been the development of what is called "bulk" sales as a companion to the sales of fresh fruit, limited to two short months of the summer season. Gradually they have encouraged the processors to can the product, freeze it for the family table and also freeze it in larger quantities for the bakery and allied industries. This represents several millions of pounds of business each year that formerly did not exist. The public likes it and is going more for this high-quality product each season. For this market, growers of cultivated blueberries have had competition from the harvesters of huckleberries, a similar wild fruit abundant in a few sections of the United States where this enterprise is carried on commercially. But there has always been room for both of them. Unfortunately, the wild huckleberry grows prolifically in Canada and nearly every country of North Europe.

We have been informed that the Government of Norway has assisted one of the Norwegian import companies to process its abundant harvest of wild huckleberries with the idea of entering the American market. Norwegian agronomists came to America to study our markets and industry. They obtained the most modern blast freezing equipment, installing it in a modern plant and are now set up in business to go for our markets. According to our information, they planned last year to start with a modest 500 long tons of frozen fruit, packed in tin, to be made available to the American consumer at the rate of 21 cents per pound delivered. This first plant has a maximum capacity of 2,000 long tons, or 4,500,000 pounds, which they anticipate shipping to us by 1952. That about equals the amount of the present bulk sales from Jersey. Recently we learned that the Swedish canning industry is now making available for the American market canned Swedish huckleberries at a price of $2.50 per dozen to the retailer.

These are only the most recent invasions of our markets. For some time now the Canadians have shipped several millions of pounds of fresh fruit annually across the border to compete against the native product at a delivered price below that which the American farmer can profitably produce the cultivated variety.

In this uneven contest some of the elements the American grower has had to fight are these: It costs a thousand dollars to bring an acre of cultivated blueberries into production; the foreign competitor gets his free from nature. We pay high American wages to gather, process, maintain insect control, package and transport our product; the foreign competition does this at labor costs far below ours.

This is tough enough competition but the straw that breaks the camel's back is the fact that the tariff established some years ago to protect the blueberry and huckleberry industries has been slashed from a sound 35 percent to 10 percent since 1930. There is a move on now by our foreign competitors to whittle it to 8¾ percent.

Since the completion of World War II the blueberry grower, like many of his fellows in the perishable-foods line, has been fighting a losing battle with the processor who insists each year that he must have the product cheaper. In 1945 they were paid 28 cents per pound for cultivated "blues." Last year they were paid 20 cents and were warned to expect a farm price of 18 cents for the coming year. The club which the processor sometimes uses is something called competitive price—meaning that he must buy the article cheap enough to assure himself ample profit, plus mark-ups of the wholesaler and retailer, and then deliver it to the consumer at an attractive price. There has been hope up to now that the blueberry farmer could meet with the processor and convince him that there is still room for a few cents more per pound to the farmer without jeopardizing the attractive price for the consumer. Inflationary prices in food, the realization that our costs will jump at least 2 cents more per pound for the coming season, the reasonable assumption that the spread between the farmer and the consumer can be reduced—these have been factors which encouraged the farmers to believe that they might obtain a better break from the processing industry.

These hopes seem pretty dim now with sizable importations of Norwegian blueberries available at 21 cents per pound and canned Swedish berries at $2.50 per dozen. On a 20-cent per pound basis, the processing trade has made bulk frozen berries available to the retail trade at 28 cents per pound. The canning trade has made available its product to the retail trade at from $2.65 per dozen to $3.00 per dozen. The blueberry farmer fears that processors and jobbers are going to be mighty tough when they are faced with competition that undersells the frozen product by 7 cents per pound and the canned product by at least 15 percent per dozen below what is considered an irreducible minimum.

With this situation the blueberry farmers feel they are with their backs to the wall. They cannot afford to give any more ground on price and stay in business. I am informed that an accurate cost accounting of one of the big plantations—a small group of about 25 of these producing 200,000 or more pounds annually—revealed that it had cost the grower 19.2 cents per pound to get the fruit off the bush and to the buyer. This was done on a 20-cent sales price. You can see that margin of profit if you look closely on a very clear day. Several smaller growers toted up their bush-to-market costs and they came out with a 16-cent cost per pound. The 4-cent per pound profit does not add up to much when one considers that the small-type plantations produced only from 50,000 to 75,000 pounds last year. Remember, these figures do not include capitalization costs such as new plantings, new machinery and new buildings.

In the face of the Norwegian importations being introduced last year they lost and expect to lose a lot more business. The importers and jobbers report they plan to increase sharply their use of Norwegian fruit this coming year, while active canvassing is under way for the Swedish product expected for the coming season.

Canada, which has already established itself in the American market, has been reported as expecting to ship a bumper crop across the border. I might add that growing of the cultivated American blueberry is going apace in northern Germany and Holland, and that there are several hundred acres under cultivation already. We understand that this endeavor is also aimed eventually at the attractive low-tariff American market.

In the coming years we gather you want this industry to grow in the United States, expand and produce more revenue so that the blueberry farmers can provide for and pay the taxes necessary for the increased mobilization. To do this they will have to have more than a line-holding operation by the Government on tariffs. It is essential that the tariff be raised back to its original level of 35 percent.

There is no desire by this industry to totally exclude competition, either foreign or domestic. The American, I think, is adult enough now to realize that such aims in the long run produce more harm than good. However, the blueberry grower—knowing that science, nature and good farming techniques have endowed him with a superior product—merely wants to fight for his own markets under the Marquis of Queensberry rules. The 35 percent tariff will enable him to meet the foreign frozen fruit on the basis of 26½ cents as compared to 21 cents. The canned fruit entering the country would have to be sold at a comparative price which would bring it within range of the lowest production price of the processors. This does not improve the meager profits of 20-cent fruit but it does allow us to tackle our domestic problems without being sandbagged from abroad.

In presenting their plea, I have shown you a rendering rather than a blueprint—a picture with over-all color and perspective that graphically shows how important it is to protect a struggling, average American farm industry in these trying times. Further statistics are available from the more detailed documents which we presented with sympathetic reception before the Reciprocity Commission some months ago.

JOHN GOODMAN,
Secretary, New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association.

Amalgamation of the State Department and Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable THURMOND CHATHAM, chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs for the State Department, made a reply to my speeches in the House of Representatives on Wednesday and Thursday of last week. I regret that I was not present at the time he made his remarks, but that was entirely my fault. He had taken the trouble to notify my office that he intended to make such a reply. We had under discussion the appropriation bill for the Post Office and Treasury Departments and I had to return to my office to meet with some people. His time for special orders came 2 hours sooner than either of us anticipated, in view of the fact that the committee rose and the members having the time which would consume 1 hour of special orders prior to Mr. CHATHAM did not use it.

I do not propose to make a complete comment on Mr. CHATHAM's remarks at this time as I am about to catch a plane for Chicago to keep an appointment with the district attorney in the hope that I may be permitted to appear before the grand jury tomorrow afternoon in connection with a situation in which I am intensely interested. I shall ask for permission for a special order to make a detailed analysis of Mr. CHATHAM's remarks immediately following the Easter recess.

Briefly, I would like to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina for a very good summary of my fears. I wish everyone in the country could read and digest it because, in my opinion, it substantiates exactly what I was fearful would happen. The important thing accomplished by my speeches is that the State Department agreed to withhold the effective date of the amalgamation of the State Department and the Foreign Service until such time as appropriate committees of Congress can thoroughly study its effects.

I am making a formal request today of Mr. CHATHAM, chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs for the Department of State, for permission to appear before his committee as a witness. I am also directing a request to Chairman DAWSON, of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to appear as a witness if the reorganization comes before his committee for consideration.

The American Selling-Price Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress is being asked to consider legislation which would overhaul customs procedures to conform more nearly to standard practices. This is a worthy objective and should result in the lessening of injustices and confusion.

However, section 14 of H. R. 1535 eliminates the American selling-price principle, which has afforded some measure of protection to domestic rubber-footwear producers. Should this provision remain in the bill, it will grant to slave-labor employees in Czechoslovakia concessions which will allow the unrestrained importation of foreign-made rubber footwear.

If this repealer section should become the law of the land, the State Department will have accomplished what they failed to do in the Torquay Conference last September. The rubber-footwear industry will be injured through congressional enactment, after public outcry staved off tariff concessions at Torquay.

I warned against the evils of this legislative language in the Eighty-first Congress, and now forewarn those who are interested in the maintenance of a strong, virile, American rubber-footwear industry.

There follows a letter on this subject voicing the concern of industry and labor officials intimately associated with the problem:

UNITED STATES RUBBER CO.,
Naugatuck, Conn., March 13, 1951.
The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: Both labor and management involved in the manufacture and distribution of rubber footwear devoted much study last year to H. R. 8304 (81st Cong., 2d sess.), the proposed Customs Simplification Act of 1950. It was our feeling the bill proposed in general many constructive and long overdue changes in customs procedures.

We did, however, take vigorous exception to one provision in the measure. That was section 14 which, if it had been enacted, would have jettisoned the American selling price principle as a basis for computing import duties on rubber and canvas footwear. The bill would have substituted a foreign export value as the basis for computing duty. It was our contention that this involved a substantive change in the law and was not for that reason germane to a measure pointed otherwise at streamlining customs procedure.

This bill has now been reintroduced in the Eighty-second Congress, H. R. 1535. It contains the same objectionable provision (sec. 14), eliminating the American selling price principle. This section of the bill provides that the Tariff Commission shall certify to the President a rate of duty for each classification of articles "which the Commission estimates to be reasonably equivalent."

It is our contention that even if the authors of the bill sincerely intended to provide the same level of relief under the proposed revisions, they could not make good. Experts in customs matters support us in this view. The proposed bill does not outline a detailed procedure for converting the tariff protection to the same level under the proposed revision. The Tariff Commission, as far as we can learn, has not agreed on a procedure of any kind to meet the new proposed provisions, much less one that will guarantee our industry the same protection as it now has under the American selling price. We have had no information from Tariff Commission or State Department to persuade us from our opinion that no workable scheme can be devised under the new law to give us this same protection.

If we are to have the same protection as under American selling price, how would the Tariff Commission set up a schedule of tariffs which would take account of the fluctuations in the price of imported goods and the price of like or similar American goods?

When it is realized that there are hundreds of different rubber footwear items, each with its own price level, it becomes clear that there is no workable substitute for the American selling-price method which will give the industry the same level of protection.

Some of the letters last year from the State Department indicated a misunderstanding of the American selling price principle and the conditions under which it was enacted into law by Congress about 25 years ago. It was implied that the United States Government, apparently upon the urging of American industry, adopted the American selling price as a "device to conceal the real amount of protection actually enjoyed by this and the other industries concerned."

Congress set the American selling price as a basis for duty valuation because other methods of valuation were not adequate; and one of the inadequacies was the inability of American officials to obtain accurate information on foreign costs. This was particularly true with reference to rubber footwear. In this respect the situation is even worse today.

The American rubber footwear industry's most serious competitor for the domestic market is Czechoslovakia. Can the Tariff Commission or the State Department get trustworthy data on costs of production in Czechoslovakia today? Does any one in our Government have accurate figures on the labor and material costs represented in a pair of rubber galters from a Czech factory landed in New York today?

Instead of "concealing" the facts about the amount of duty, the American selling price makes it easy for a foreign competitor to determine the amount of duty he has to pay in relation to his costs of production.

From whom are the facts as to the "real amount of protection" concealed? Not from the Czech manufacturer. Under the American selling price he is the only person who knows the actual rate of duty based on his export value or any other value. And under the American selling price usually he can determine what his duty will be even before he begins to manufacture. The only thing that would change his estimate would be a change in the selling price of the American article like or similar to the one he is producing, and the adjustment in any event would be negligible.

The American rubber footwear industry can stand no further cuts. In fact competitive footwear made in low-wage countries abroad is seriously threatening the industry under the existing duties. Labor constitutes approximately 47 percent of the factory cost of canvas and waterproof footwear. This is the labor of American workmen and wages paid in this industry in this country are far higher than those in any other country. The materials used by American manufacturers of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear are, with the exception of natural rubber, American made and here again this industry is at a disadvantage as against the use of materials produced in foreign low-labor-cost countries.

The manufacture of rubber footwear is an essential part of our national economy. It is vital to our national defense. During the last war this industry furnished our Armed Forces with more than 45,000,000 pairs of rubber footwear. In the same facilities, it also made life rafts, fuel cells, raincoats, life vests, and other similar war products. Without a going rubber-footwear industry our national defense program would be seriously impaired.

Thirteen companies are engaged in the manufacture of rubber and canvas footwear and employ more than 20,000 men and women with sales of approximately $100,000,000.

It is one of the truly American industries, foreign manufacturers having copied its styles and methods. The low-labor rates

and cheaper materials costs of foreign manufacturers, particularly Czechoslovakian and Japanese, combined with lower tariffs, would mean the loss of jobs to thousands, not alone in this industry, but in the factories of its suppliers and in the stores and shops in the communities which serve its workers.

It is clear that the elimination of the American selling price, through H. R. 1535 or any other measure, would adversely affect the American rubber footwear industry, its stockholders and its employees, and eventually the American public who look to this industry to supply it with essential waterproof rubber and rubber-soled canvas shoes.

We earnestly solicit your support for the elimination of this section 14 from the bill which is now under consideration in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Very truly yours,

T. R. BEHRMAN,
Industrial Relations Manager, Naugatuck Footwear Plant.

GEORGE T. FROEHLICH,
President, Local 45, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, Plastic Workers of America, CIO.

Pennsylvania's Governors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on a very personal matter, because as a Pennsylvanian I am, naturally, tremendously proud of Pennsylvania's long and honored history.

What I consider to be a lamentable understatement in our Commonwealth's history has been corrected by a new book which was published on Monday entitled "Shelter for His Excellency" and written by Le Roy Greene, veteran Philadelphia newspaperman, author, and historian.

The book makes the point that Pennsylvania, which had its beginnings of colonization in 1624, has had in the line of historic sequence a total of one hundred governors.

Among other colonial States there may well be others which have had one hundred chief executives since their history began, but I believe Pennsylvania is the first State to have had them recorded and accounted for in a single book.

It has been the unfortunate tendency, as we inaugurate each Governor to the State Capitol at Harrisburg every 4 years, as we did with Governor John S. Fine this year, to refer to the Governor as the such-and-such number since the constitution of 1750.

This habit has grown upon us, for reasons which are apocryphal, with the result, for example, that our incumbent Governor Fine was described as Pennsylvania's thirty-fifth Governor since the constitution. The fact of the matter is that Governor Fine is the one hundredth Governor since the beginnings of our Commonwealth.

As a result, this unhappy custom of referring to governors only since the second constitution, almost wipes out in a stroke the long line of great men, among them the founders of our Nation, who were the chief executives of Pennsylvania long before there was such an instrument as a constitution.

Under such reasoning we have ignored such intellectual giants as Benjamin Franklin, David Rittenhouse, and William Penn, who were the Governors of Pennsylvania during the provincial and Revolutionary times.

So, too, we have ignored such established historical colonial figures as Peter Minuit, Peter Stuyvesant, and Johan Printz who were also Governors of Pennsylvania.

This new book, which has already become a best seller, sets all this straight and starts at the very beginning of Pennsylvania. That is where the start should be made, and that is why this book makes such an important contribution and why I want to spread it upon the record of this session.

It has also been a tendency in the past to number persons and dates in Pennsylvania, in addition to using the constitution of 1790 as a milestone, from the Revolution, or from the proprietorship of William Penn, or from the rule of Sweden.

The beginnings of Pennsylvania history are with the Dutch colonization which preceded them all. The colonies on the Delaware River and the Hudson River were encompassed in the area then known as the New Netherlands. Hence, the early history of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Delaware are naturally tied in together. The early Dutch Governors ruled the land of all of these future States together, with some of them even appointing resident governors in each of the areas while they themselves assumed a master control from wherever they established their own capital in the new land. Every school child knows of Peter Minuit's purchase of the island of Manhattan for $24. Now, as a result of this new book our Pennsylvania school children will have an opportunity to learn also that Peter Minuit made an equally sensational purchase when he bought all of the land along the west bank of the Delaware from Delaware clear up to Trenton, N. J., for an almost equally ridiculous sum. Minuit's fame is well established as a foremost New Yorker when he was also Pennsylvania's third Governor. We see again reestablished the fact that for a time the capital of all New Netherlands, well known to have been in New York, was also for a time in Pennsylvania.

I, for one, am delighted that all of this history has been brought together in a single book. I am especially happy that the job was not intended to be a dry, dull history reference book, which it is not, but is what it was intended to be—a fascinating, colorful, exciting story for general reader interest and aimed at the average citizen who has neither the time nor the inclination to pull out reference books to learn the history of our State. It is the usual thing for books like this to be reference books, which keeps them out of the hands of all those except scholars, but fortunately that is not the case here.

How this book came to be written is almost as interesting as the book itself. The author, Le Roy Greene, was a young but already veteran newspaperman on the Philadelphia Public Ledger and Evening Public Ledger when he was summoned to Harrisburg by Governor Arthur H. James to be press secretary to the Governor. Greene accepted the summons and took a 4-year leave of absence from his newspaper where he had been a reporter, rewriteman, and editor on assignments which took him over a good part of the world.

He had been with Governor James but a short time in 1939, when Governor James asked him about the history of the executive mansion on Harrisburg's Front Street, at the bend of the Susquehanna, which had been the home of the State's chief executives since the great Civil War governor, Andrew Curtin.

Greene went looking for the history and found that nothing had ever been written except in newspaper stories reporting the day-by-day activities. Nothing had ever been compiled. Shortly thereafter Governor James inquired of Greene as to what number governor he was in the line of historic sequence and Greene found that nothing had been done on that subject since the mid-1800's and that even so, the line of succession had never been established. Greene expressed the thought at the time that if anyone was entitled to know how many governors there had been, that person should certainly be the Governor of Pennsylvania.

With the insatiable curiosity for ferreting out facts which is typical of qualified and trained newspapermen, Greene undertook the job which he was to finish some 12 years later. During those years, however, he was in the Army for more than four, serving in the Philippines as a lieutenant colonel in the infantry.

I quote from a recent review of his book, published in newspapers, in which the reviewer said: "It is the story of a great State told by the State's best storyteller in his finest reportorial style."

I could go on at some length about the stories of our great governors and their altogether human idiosyncrasies, including the one who kicked a Supreme Court Justice in the seat of the pants, the one who inadvertently drank a jug of water which had been sent to the State Capitol to be tested for typhoid fever; the one who was only 21 years of age; the one who was one of America's great baseball players; the one who drove a committee of the General Assembly from his door; or even the one who kept a pet skunk named Charlie in the executive mansion at Harrisburg; but those are the human touches which make this book so fascinating. But what I want to do before closing these remarks is to point out two more historical inaccuracies which have been corrected in this book. The eighth Governor of Pennsylvania has gone down in history as Peter Hollender, whereas actually his name is Peter Hollender Ridder. One governor has been overlooked entirely in history but Greene puts him in his rightful place. He was Derck Smidt, of Holland, who ruled Pennsylvania during the year 1655.

Letter From Rev. Lawrence L. Lacour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Lawrence L. Lacour, of Oskaloosa, Iowa, in the district which I have the honor to represent, and a man who served with distinction as a chaplain in the Navy during the late war, had an opportunity to observe at close hand the moral conditions in Japan, and recently has written me a very enlightening letter.

Members may recall that our colleague, Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, the gentleman from Minnesota, in 1945, inserted in the RECORD a letter from the Reverend Lawrence L. Lacour, written from Japan in which he described an unspeakable moral breakdown, and the letter commanded attention in all parts of the United States. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the letter from the Reverend Lawrence L. Lacour setting forth his conclusions after careful study and close observation.

The letter is as follows:

MOUNT PLEASANT, IOWA,
February 26, 1951.

The Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: It was most thoughtful of you to send your favor of February 2. Many times I have wanted to thank you for the support you gave our moral crusade project when I was a chaplain in the Navy. The action in Washington brought immediate response in Japan with a personal order from the Secretary of the Navy making all houses of prostitution out of bounds. After that order of November 1 the incidence of venereal disease began to decline.

It was also most gracious of you to recommend that I be honored by the Legion of Merit. It is most understandable why such a recommendation was never passed since I would have been decorated for attacking a situation that had been accepted as a part of the Navy policy.

As you may know, our group recently concluded a 5½-month tour of Japan. This tour took us to every prefecture of Japan where we appeared before over a half million people in 130 different cities. In many of these cities we were entertained by both the mayors and governors of the prefectures. All of these contacts gave us some feel of the pulse in Japan. Some of these observations may be of help to you.

First, there is a deep-seated resentment among the intellectuals toward our talk of rearming Japan. According to the new constitution the Japanese people accepted the terms that they would never again return to military power as a means of settling international disputes, or even for the cause of self-defense. It is a feeling of many of these people that either the original terms of the surrender must be changed, or we must allow the people to make this decision for themselves. Otherwise, they see no consistency in our theories of democracy.

Although General MacArthur has been criticized severely by some sources, his overall policy is commendable. Yet the Japanese feel they cannot openly criticise administrative policies administered by GHQ. This inability of General MacArthur to accept criticism has caused him again and again to be betrayed on administrative matters, and has made it impossible for him to get the total picture. We conducted services for a number of encampments of Japanese police reserves. Among many of these men there was the feeling that they had been recruited under false pretenses. They had agreed to become police reserves but are now undergoing basic infantry training. Such inconsistencies do not help the cause of democracy.

Naturally, no occupation, or any other government for that matter, can be completely void of corruption and abuses. However, there were two phases of the local administrative policies that have not created good will. First, the Army has taken over the finest buildings in the cities where our men are billeting. We have enlisted men over there who enjoy a standard of living beyond anything they could know in America. With servants often more highly educated than themselves, they have found it easy to take a very superior attitude to the Japanese. More recently the Army established more equitable rents for these dwellings, but considerable local resentment has been created by these policies.

The second factor concerns morality. There is no particular problem concerning prostitution any longer in Japan. The Army has solved it in its own way. Many of the men (of course it is impossible to produce statistics for this observation) have taken over Japanese girls and are living with them. These girls are examined to determine freedom from venereal disease and then the men proceed to live with them. Before the Korean incident the situation was so common as to have become accepted as regular occupation routine. This has not created good will with the Japanese people. Nor are all of the girls who have cooperated in this project prostitutes. Many of them are girls from good families, and in some cases exceptionally high-type girls who, being void of any standard of Christian ethics, are attracted by the possibilities of American citizenship and a general good time in the company of the American fellows, who most certainly excel the Japanese men in their treatment of women. So common was this practice among our young men that I strongly oppose the drafting of our 18-year-olds, or the use of our younger men in an army of occupation. If this must be the conduct of the career soldier, we can only plug along through the processes of education and religion for a reform; but in the cases of our younger men who eventually expect to return to civilian status, we have a responsibility at the point of those factors which determine their fitness to be good husbands and substantial citizens.

Kindest personal regards and success to you in your great work.

Yours truly,

LAWRENCE L. LACOUR.

Ninety-seventh Birthday Anniversary of Andrew Furuseth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an address delivered at the celebration of the ninety-seventh birthday anniversary of Andrew Furuseth, on March 12, 1951. The speech was delivered by Mr. Einar Johansen, representative of the Norwegian Seamen's Unions in the United States and was broadcast by courtesy of WNYS, the municipal broadcasting system of the city of New York.

In addition to this address, there was also broadcast a tribute to Mr. Furuseth, written by Mr. George W. Blakeley, a licensed marine engineer and intimate friend of Mr. Furuseth, which was read by Mr. Peter Gravina, a station announcer. The speech and the tribute follow:

On the occasion of Andrew Furuseth's ninety-seventh birthday, I feel greatly honored to be chosen to pay tribute to the grand old man of the sea, and one of the foremost in American labor movement. The memory of "Andy" as he affectionately was called by all who knew him, will remain forever among all seamen, regardless of nationality.

Andrew Furuseth has been called the Abraham Lincoln of the sea, and greater truth has never been spoken. Andrew was born on a small farm at Romedal, Telemark in Norway, the fourth of eight children. Due to poverty in the family, he had to work for his keep from the age of eight. Coming from a seafaring nation, he went to sea at an early age in 1873. At that time the seaman's lot, at the best, could be called a hard one. For years Andrew Furuseth was trained in the hard school of the sea, sailing in ships belonging to five different nations, until he arrived at the Pacific coast on an English ship from Calcutta in 1881. Like thousands of other seamen at that time, he came to America to find freedom, but unlike other men, he dedicated his life to the task of freeing others.

His achievements and what he accomplished in Congress is an old story and should be known to all of you. Before and after the year of 1887, when he was elected secretary of the Pacific Coast Seamen's Union, later the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, he fought a long hard fight to make all men sailing the seven seas, equal to any man ashore. Fighting relentlessly throughout the years, he was the victor in many amendments to the Seamen's Act of 1872. His long uphill fight for freedom, integrity, and better living conditions for the seamen was rewarded on March 4, 1915, when the Seamen's Act of the same date was signed by President Woodrow Wilson. Signature of the bill was witnessed by Andrew Furuseth, on bent knees and with hands lifted in prayers. Thus were destroyed conditions, which at many times were worse than slavery.

It is because of men like Andrew Furuseth and the seafarers trade-unions, that the shackles were removed from men who go down to sea in ships.

It was not due to birth or heritage, Andrew Furuseth succeeded, but by using his long experience at sea, and above all by self-education. He was a student of maritime laws, both ancient and those existing in his time. He was eager to learn from reading history, classics, and other books, helping him to understand people and relationship between them. His life was in itself an example for others.

Whenever he lost a fight, and you could always be sure he made it a good one, he used to say: "Tomorrow is also a day." He was a lonely man, but may be greater because of it. He never asked anything for himself, and often declared that a labor leader to be successful, useful, and efficient should have nothing of his own, and want nothing for himself. He never accepted more in wages than to cover necessities and when traveling, mostly shipped before the mast.

Due to these characteristics, his keen sense of duty and devotion to the seamen's cause, he could not fail. He was truly a great man. He lived only to benefit others. His sincerity and motives could never be questioned, even by those who did not agree with his line of thought.

When Andrew Furuseth passed away in Washington on January 22, 1938, he was laid in state in the Department of Labor Building, an honor never accorded any other labor leader in the United States. According to his wish his ashes were scattered on the ocean as far from land as possible. He came from a seafaring nation, suffered and fought, as freemen always will when necessary.

I have a feeling that wherever ships float old Andy is still with his beloved seamen in their fight for peace, security, and freedom.

Since Andrew Furuseth's time, material achievements have brought changes in international relations and have created new and wonderful opportunities for further progress and welfare of humanity. The seafarers, having gained freedom through him, are well fitted to promote universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all human beings without distinction of race, language, or religion. They contact all kinds of people and for the seamen, this world of ours is really one.

In their opinion material achievements should be followed by better international understanding and cooperation.

Mankind's capacity for creative work, should be more displayed in the organization of international life, so that freedom and peace may prevail. This must be done, because today, as in Andrew Furuseth's time, the longing for freedom and security is still the predominant desire of all people.

Many years of war and strife between nations has taught us how precious freedom really is and how easy it can be lost. We have realized that life cannot be lived without freedom. That is why the seafarers and their trade-unions always have been partisans of world progress and emancipation, and why they cannot tolerate concentration camp regimes. There is something greater than peace, and we must be ready to fight for it as men like Furuseth did before us.

We have seen destruction of free trade-unions behind the iron curtain, where freedom is nothing more than a memory. Existing conditions impose strict duties on all free labor. A choice must be made between freedom and servitude. Free labor all around the world has made that choice. The Norwegian Seamen's union together with all other affiliations of the International Transportworkers Federation have taken measures to ensure safe delivery of arms under the Atlantic Treaty, without delay and sabotage. The action of the United Nations in Korea has full support. The ideals and principles for which the United Nations are fighting will not be surrendered. The International Transportworkers Federation and all its affiliates are determined to fight all plans to misuse the seafarers for political ends, and are prepared to take counteraction against all subversive activities and all attempts to destroy free trade-unions.

Andrew Furuseth recognized that background knowledge was essential for those who wished to build wisely for the future. Much can be learned from reading the history of great men, their achievements and what they fought and often died for. The memory of men like Andrew Furuseth will inspire to give greater and better services to mankind. If he had lived today I am quite certain that he would have been a leader among freedom loving people, because of all men that have dedicated themselves to the welfare of humanity, the name of Andrew Furuseth will always be among the first. He would no doubt be as confident in victory today as he was before, because he would know that he was on the right side and fighting a just cause.

I like to think about Furuseth as a teacher and great humanitarian. His teaching has shown that peace, together with economic and social freedom and security can be won, as long as men are willing to fight for it. I don't say this can be done overnight, but it can and will be done through cooperation between all freedom loving nations and through unity of labor, national as well as international.

Andrew Furuseth has in many ways shown us how to fight and what to fight for. He has given us great hopes and great claims, but we have also inherited his fight for freedom and prosperity. It is because of Andrew Furuseth and men like him that we believe in ourselves, in the future and the cause we are fighting for.

Mr. GRAVINA. In conclusion, I have been asked to read a tribute to Mr. Andrew Furuseth by Mr. George W. Blakeley, licensed marine engineer and intimate friend of Mr. Furuseth:

"It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to say a few words in honor of Mr. Andrew Furuseth, one of the world's greatest men. He was a giant in crusading for human rights through a social justice that would be void of communistic or of other dictatorial elements, whether of the red, the brown, or the black variety.

"I first met Mr. Furuseth in 1919, during the seamen's strike in New Orleans, and as the years rolled by I came to realize his greatness. He gave of himself without thought of self-gain or egotism, so that his fellow men could enjoy some of the blessings of life that I am sure our good Lord so intended.

"He was indeed a rare jewel in unionism, and in explaining a union to me, he once said, and I quote, 'A union has three important duties to fulfill:

"'1. It must be fair to the employer,

"'2. It must be fair to the employee,

"'3. It must be fair to the employer's customers, the consumers of either merchandise or services.'

"A union must stand for cooperation and fairness, and for the greatest good of all concerned. For this kind of union, Andrew Furuseth devoted his life.

"Today, in a world that is worshiping materialism, in a world of mass murder, and in a world that is forgetting God, our country and the entire world are in dire need of men like Andrew Furuseth who could lead men back to justice for their fellow man through God. Even as I speak, the world seems bent on a complete catastrophe by atheists who will exert every effort to enslave all people, or to bring the world around them down in chaos.

"Andrew Furuseth began a crusade against human enslavers back in 1887, and never once relented his energies in that crusade.

"We are very unfortunate that we did not heed his advice many years ago in guarding against human enslavers."

A Tribute to the Soil of the State of Iowa by Arthur Orr, One of Its Native Sons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my notice a very fervent tribute to the soil of my State which I believe is worthy to be permanently inscrolled in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is the work of one who has been an employee of this House of Representatives for more than 30 years. I refer to Arthur Orr, who, in point of length of service, is the senior clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations. He is well known by a very large number of the Members because for upward of 25 years he was assigned to the subcommittee in charge of the Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

His tribute to the soil of the great State of Iowa is contained in a letter written more than 15 years ago to his niece, then Miss Margaret Holler, of Van Horne, Iowa. It is my privilege to insert a copy of that letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

Mr. Orr was born in Woodbury County, Iowa, but spent much of his boyhood in my district on a farm near the town of Thurman in Fremont County, where he attended the Thurman public school. He grew up "between the Iowa corn rows," and he knows whereof he speaks of the soil of his native State. Mr. Orr has performed his very responsible duties here as a servant of the people with honor and distinction. He is a fine example of a true Iowan. I am sure his old friends and schoolmates of Thurman, Iowa, will be happy to know that Arthur Orr is in good health and has not forgotten Iowa, his native State. The letter to his niece follows:

ARLINGTON, VA., *January 16, 1934.*

Miss MARGARET HOLLER,

Van Horne, Iowa.

DEAR NIECE: Several months ago I received from you a small package which you had sent me through the mail. Upon opening the package, I discovered a toy truck, the body of which was occupied by a small burlap bag filled with soil.

I then recalled that during your visit with us the winter before I had told you about the poor qualities of the soil here in Arlington County, Va., and of the difficulties and bitter disappointment experienced by one who had grown up between the Iowa corn rows, and who later in life took up his residence in the Old Dominion State and undertook to do a bit of gardening in the back yard or innocently planted a shrub in the front yard with the expectation that, without other measures, the plants would flourish. I think I told you how often I have longed for a truckload of good, old Iowa soil, which requires no amendment or improvement, and which was endowed by Providence at the time the world was created with all the qualities necessary to produce plant life in boundless abundance.

It is not my purpose to cast any aspersions upon the State of Virgina because, perchance, it is not blessed with soil of the unsurpassing degree of fertility which characterizes that of the States in the Mississippi Valley. Aside from being the Mother of States and the Mother of Presidents, Virginia enjoys a still greater distinction in my esteem because it is the birthplace of my father. That fact alone is sufficient to endear it to me forever.

When I opened the package and discovered its contents, I recalled what I had said to you on this subject during your visit and I realized that my eyes were beholding once more the soil of my native State. I cannot adequately describe the emotions stirred within my breast by your thoughtful act. It was but a small amount of earth, less than a teacupful, and yet the very sight of it recalled the happiest days of my life. In fancy, I lived again the joyous days of childhood and the romantic and glamorous years of youth and early manhood.

It was on that soil my mother gave me birth. It was that soil, untouched as yet by plowshare or other implement of civilized man, which my father, in the bright morning of his early manhood, tilled and sowed and reaped in the providence of God. On that soil he laid the foundations of the humble home, the memory of which is dearer to me than all else besides. In that home, at the knees of a God-fearing mother and a devout father, neither schooled in the learning of man-made institutions, but both richly endowed by providence with the inherent wisdom of the ages, I learned the fundamental precepts which are the essentials of an abundant life.

In that home, and on the soil upon which it rested, they labored and toiled and sacrificed to the end that their children might have better advantages in life than had been theirs. In that home I was blessed with the companionship of brothers and sisters as dear and sweet as has ever been vouchsafed to any human being.

On that soil, stood the little red school house where we spent the happiest days of our childhood, learned to sit at the feet of wisdom. On that soil, I came to manhood's full estate and consummated the rendezvous with life. On that soil, I found the dear, sweet girl who has made the past quarter century the sweetest period of my whole existence and without whom life would be a barren and dreary waste.

From that soil, the vicissitudes of fate decreed, almost two decades ago, I should depart; and, although I dearly love my present abiding place, the State of my birth shall ever remain the Mecca of my fancy and affections.

I am deeply indebted to you for the priceless souvenir of my genesis which came that day in the little toy truck. The truck has enriched the life of my young son whose vivid imagination wields a sorcery whereby it is translated into a real, 10-ton juggernaut of the public highway. But that little bit of soil which came in the truck now reposes in an urn and graces the mantelpiece. It is the most precious item in the lares et penates of the Orr domicile.

How often do I gaze upon it, as upon a crystal, wherein I can see the billowing fields of corn, the cattle on a thousand hills, and the myriad cities and towns where dwell the favorites of a beneficent providence. How often does its pleasing contemplation bring vividly to mind the inspired words of the poet:

Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
"This is my own, my native land!"

With eternal gratitude to my dear niece for the little act which has so enriched my life and so measurably enhanced its felicity, I remain, with great affection,

Your uncle,

ARTHUR ORR.

Taxation of Alcoholic Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I append herewith an address recently delivered by Mr. Edwin B. Hock, director, Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control, State of New Jersey, and president of the National Conference of State Liquor Administrators, to the annual dinner of the Hudson-Bergen County Retail Liquor Stores Association, at the Hotel Astor, New York City.

The address follows:

The last time I had the pleasure of addressing your association was at the annual banquet a year ago at the Waldorf-Astoria. Most of those in attendance tonight will recall that your yearbook on that occasion was devoted to the theme of sincerity on fair trade and mark-up. At that time liquor administrators and the liquor industry were deeply concerned with the problem of the orderly distribution of an abundance of merchandise in the face of an increasingly competitive market and a trend toward deflationary price adjustment in commodities other than alcoholic beverages. It was feared that the heavy impost of taxes on alcoholic beverages might well place your industry in a most disadvantageous position.

Many events have occurred during the last year, however, and tonight our Nation is again faced with a national emergency. In effect, the field has been reversed. Whereas a year ago we were concerned with a trend toward deflationary economy, today we are witnessing one of the most inflationary periods in our Nation's history and are faced with a proposed across-the-board increase in alcoholic beverage taxes.

It is of this problem of an increase in taxes that I will speak briefly tonight. It is to be clearly understood that what I say here reflects only my own personal views and does not purport to represent the opinion or attitude of the National Conference of State Liquor Administrators, of which I am president, or its members.

Alcoholic-beverage laws are both permissive and prohibitive. Licensing laws are permissive in that certain persons are permitted to manufacture, distribute, and sell alcoholic beverages at designated places and are prohibitive in that they deny all others the right to traffic in liquor. Prohibition laws are, of course, supposed to prohibit. In the face of these laws, however, Licensed Beverage Industries released, only a week ago, a special study of illegal distilling in the United States high-lighting two very startling conclusions: (1) That the producing capacity of illegal stills seized by Federal, State, and local enforcement officials during 1949 amounted to almost 120,000 gallons more per day than the daily new whisky produced in that year by the legal, taxpaying, distilled-spirits industry; and (2) that illegal distilling is becoming an increasingly big business in this country.

Why does the illicit manufacture of liquor persist 17 years after repeal, and why are we now threatened with an even greater increase in this illegal activity. The answer has to do with the heavy taxes upon alcoholic beverages. In this connection, it is interesting to review the Federal tax picture on distilled spirits since December 6, 1933. On that date the Federal tax on a proof gallon of distilled spirits was $1.10. Thereafter the tax was increased to amounts as follows: January 12, 1934, $2; January 1, 1938, $2.25; January 1, 1940, $3; October 1, 1941; $4; November 1, 1942, $6; and April 1, 1944, $9. When taking into consideration other levies such as Federal occupational and rectification taxes and State and local taxes and license fees, the burden totals today nearly $12 per gallon and, if the proposed $3 increase were to be adopted, the tax burden would become almost $15 per gallon. And, of course, this does not include the costs of production, aging, bottling, blending, rectifying, and of distributing to wholesaler, retailer, and consumer.

It is generally accepted that illegal liquor can be produced and distributed to the consumer under current conditions for $1 a gallon or even less. Obviously this wide differential presents an open invitation to violation and evasion of the law. In this connection it is reported that Governor Driscoll, our former State commissioner of alcoholic beverage control, told the Association of Chosen Freeholders at its annual dinner on February 5 that a sharp increase in alcoholic beverage taxes would certainly result in more bootlegging with a resultant tax loss to the States and an increase in the cost of law enforcement.

It is interesting to note that as early as February 1935 the late Commissioner Burnett recommended, in his annual report to the Governor and Legislature of the State of New Jersey, that Congress be memorialized to reduce radically the Federal tax. In making such recommendation the Commissioner said:

"As it stands, it is a protective tariff for the bootlegger * * * As was said in the inaugural message: 'The constant demand will therefore be automatically diverted into legitimate channels, and will prove again the time-tested truth that a lower tax, widely distributed, produces more revenue than a high tax the incidence of which falls solely upon a special class.'"

This recommendation was made at a time when the Federal tax was a mere $2 per proof gallon. It may be wondered what Commissioner Burnett would think today about a proposed Federal tax of $12 per proof gallon.

In the light of our past and present experiences it is reasonable to assume that any further increase would encourage a greater increase in the illegal manufacture of distilled spirits. Obviously, both Federal and State governments would be harassed by illegal manufacturing and distribution of alcoholic beverages on an even wider scale. A natural result would be an increase in the costs of law enforcement which could bring about a need for greater tax revenues to the Federal Government and the States.

It is heartening to note that Federal officials are showing an awareness to the dangers of further increase in alcoholic beverage taxes. An Associated Press release from Washington, published in the Newark Evening News on February 19, reports Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee as stating, "Heavier liquor taxes may very likely make collections much more difficult to enforce. I think it will depend on how closely we can keep after the moonshiners. It may be that we will have to have a great many more enforcement officers."

Mr. DOUGHTON's observation is well taken. A further increase in taxes would necessarily result in higher prices to the consumer. With more and more consumers resorting to illegal sources for their alcoholic beverages the Government's revenue would not expand; it would shrink. Enactment of the proposed tax increase would not repeal the law of diminishing returns.

I believe that serious consideration should be given to the financial burden placed upon the liquor industry, particularly the small retailer. An additional increase of $3 on distilled spirits would mean that every licensee would need approximately 25 percent more money to finance his business. Obviously this would place an onerous load upon thousands of small licensees throughout the Nation and would probably force many of them to go out of business.

Substantially every State where the sale of alcoholic beverages is legalized has in its law a provision that one of the primary duties of its liquor administration is the "promotion of temperance." I am convinced that liquor administration can best carry out this duty where there is an orderly distribution of alcoholic beverages to members of the public who wish to purchase this commodity and where the licit beverages are made available at a reasonable cost. Our years under prohibition were the most intemperate in our history. Inordinately high taxes do not have the sound of prohibition but I feel

sure that a further increase in Federal taxes would not result in greater temperance.

I do not believe that members of the liquor industry are lacking in patriotism. We all realize that an emergency such as our country faces today requires increased revenue to meet military needs. It does not follow, however, that a lion's share of increased revenue must fall upon an industry which already carries so heavy a tax burden. In my opinion, even greater revenue than is anticipated by the presently proposed increase could be obtained by providing greater facilities for the enforcement of collection of present taxes and by imposing more severe penalties against violators. The problem will not be solved by merely increasing the tax on a commodity when more than 50 percent of the available supply escapes without tax.

Stalin's Slave System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an article entitled "Stalin's Slave System" appearing in the March issue of the American Federationist, written by Johannes Mihkelson, taken from the International Free Trade Union News. Johannes Mihkelson was a leading figure in the trade-union and political movements of Estonia. He went into exile when his country was grabbed by the Kremlin.

The article follows:

STALIN'S SLAVE SYSTEM

(By Johannes Mihkelson)

The truth about the Soviet system of forced labor is gradually spreading throughout the world. No longer is it possible to conceal the fact that, among the many millions of Soviet slave laborers, over 10,000,000 persons at Kolouna, Verkuta, and other educational establishments in the Soviet Arctic are slowly but surely being starved and worked to death. The absence of medical attention is only hastening that process.

All this is part of the Soviet system, which could not exist without slave labor. Communist state capitalism ends in the one-way street of terrorism which seeks its victims even among persons in leading positions.

The tempo of work in the Soviet Union is stepped up through Stakhanovite methods and incessant Socialist competitions. There is always some reason for such competitions—celebrating the October revolution, marking Red army or Red navy day, hailing the Stalinist railroad workers. But whatever the reason, the purpose is always the same—to increase per capita output at any cost.

Of late a new slogan has been forced on the Soviet people—the Stockholm "peace appeal." Over and over again, all Soviet speakers and papers refer to this appeal and call upon the whole nation to safeguard "peace."

What all this emphasis actually represents is nothing more than a summons for one and all to work still harder in increasing their production. Propaganda meetings throughout the country underscore the Soviet people's obligation to build enormous power stations at such places as Stalingrad and Kuibishev.

All Estonian metal works have received strict orders to have material for the construction of these Russian power stations. The metal works of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania must provide the new stations with technical equipment, and other plants must contribute to the goal by fulfilling their production targets 2 months ahead of schedule. Under this program, fishermen must catch more fish, collective-farm peasants must produce more fodder for livestock, workers in stocking factories must turn out more hosiery.

Moscow is being transformed into a port connected with five seas. The Kuibishev project is making the upper reaches of the Volga navigable, while at Stalingrad dikes are under construction to do the same thing for the Volga's central portions. The schedule for these undertakings calls for their completion in 1955–56. The Volga-Don Canal must be finished in 1952.

The power stations at Stalingrad, Turkmenia and Kuibishev—with the latter aimed to be the largest in the world—are intended to solve the problem of transportation and of power supply at the same time. It should be borne in mind that, because of the shortage of electric power, the Soviet Union cannot produce the most highly modernized weapons. It is therefore pertinent to ask whether the new giant construction projects will be devoted exclusively to "peaceful ends."

The Soviet actions for safeguarding peace have assumed some strange forms. At Karula in Estonia, for instance, 40 brooms and 3 wooden spades were produced, according to their makers, "in honor of peace." In another town a Russian officer of the last war proclaimed that his answer to "the imperialist warmongers" would be to finish the whitewashing of the school building "before the day of the October revolution."

The Russian-language Sovyetskaya Estonya has castigated the Estonian workers for laziness harmful to the Russian economy and rebuked the Estonian-language Communist papers for being remiss in "safeguarding peace" and in unmasking the secret plans of "the American imperialists." It has demanded that the Communist Party tighten its controls over all Estonian publications.

The Soviet "love of peace" is exemplified in Estonia by establishment of the army's voluntary auxiliary corps, a country-wide body which has been assigned the task of organization and training Estonian youth in marksmanship, motor maintenance and transportation, radio and telephone mechanics, and other auxiliary services.

In addition to labor exacted for "safeguarding peace," the Soviet workers are confronted with another vast job—that of clearing up the ruins of the war-devastated cities. This work is without remuneration and is done on Sundays or holidays and after regular working hours during the week.

As a rule, such efforts are voluntary, but it is unnecessary to explain that no workers would dare to stay at home when the personnel of his plant or enterprise is collectively ordered out for clearance work.

In Estonia alone last year 4,700,000 unremunerated hours of this kind were worked, resulting in the clearance of 76,700 cubic meters of ruins and 525,400 square meters of surface.

Another form of unremunerated work among Soviet workers is that of the "chiefdom." This is an "honor" conferred on each major factory enterprise, making it the head of a kolkhoz (collective farm), thus imposing on its employees the obligation of assisting that particular kolkhoz. Usually the workers are taken out to their kolkhoz on Sundays or holidays by trucks to help in harvesting or other types of agricultural labor. Since all this work is "voluntary," there is, of course, no compensation for the workers so "honored."

It need not be pointed out that in democratic countries collective bargaining agreements contain detailed provisions concerning payment of workers for overtime, shift work and night work. It would be unthinkable for a worker in a democracy to be ordered out for unpaid labor at any time. In the Soviet Union, however, such proceedings take place in quite a normal way since Soviet trade unions have no influence in protecting the interests of Russian workers.

The Soviet trade unions can only help in propagandizing those actions which are ordered and organized by the Communist Party leadership. Collective agreements in Russia stipulate more duties than rights for the workers.

The Stockholm "peace appeal" is essentially a propaganda campaign to accelerate the tempo of work and to improve the output of the Soviet heavy armament industries. The fine slogans and public declarations to the Russian masses are only a disguise for the completely different purposes harbored by the Soviet dictators.

The American Merchant Marine, Life Line of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD the following very illuminating address delivered at the San Francisco Bay Area Ports and Transportation Conference, recently held in San Francisco, by Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane, United States Navy, retired, Federal Wartime Administrator:

Gentlemen, it is well known that only a poor mechanic quarrels with his tools; and that it is only a poor speaker who refuses to face up to his assigned subject. There are, of course, two lines of escape for these poor speakers. One course is to change the subject to suit one's own fancy, but the second avenue is more effective, if less artistic; namely, to ignore it entirely.

To be doubly sure I plan to use both methods.

As you see by the program, I am scheduled to speak on The American Merchant Marine—Life Line of American Port Commerce.

I'll stand on the American Merchant Marine part of that title, but I want to shorten the second half from Lifeline of American Port Commerce by scratching the final n on American and scratching the last words completely, thus, the American Merchant Marine, Life Line of America.

I know that I am speaking at a Bay Area Ports and Transportation Conference, and I am all for better ports and better port facilities, and more business for San Francisco. As a matter of fact, I saw on Monday afternoon two of the finest pier developments I have seen in this country. But, gentlemen, if the debate today is on the subject Resolved That the Merchant Marine Is for the Benefit of Ports, I am on deck to take the negative side.

The merchant marine is for the benefit not only of our own great Nation but for western civilization, and I will grant that the ports are an indispensable link between the ships and the nations which they serve.

It is inspiring to see so many organizations and so many people here today devoting themselves to the development of the ports of the bay area. I regret that it has not been possible for me to attend all of these sessions for yours is a subject of critical

and increasing importance if we are to get the most from our ships. Days in port are lost days in the earning year of a ship. As ship speed increases, turn-around times should be shortened if the real benefit of sea speed is to accrue.

Our ports for several reasons are not as efficient as they might be—but it is not my intention to dwell on that score today. You are far better qualified in that field than I.

It is always pleasant for me to return to California, my native heath. It is doubly pleasant to come here to look at ships and shipyards and to talk to shipping men and to shipbuilders, for my whole life has been spent in that association.

I had retired from active duty in the Navy in 1947, to be sure, but not because of loss of interest in ships. I admit very frankly, too, that I resisted with full earnestness being drawn back to Washington to become Maritime Administrator. I came finally only after I became fully convinced that our country faces a threat more serious than any it has faced before in its history.

I am not one who holds the situation to be hopeless by any means. It is crystal clear to me, however, that unless we establish ourselves in such strength that the Commies will not risk an attack and unless we make it so clear to them that we are taking no more nonsense on the fringes, they will continue to whittle at the edges of western strength until it is exhausted.

It must, also, be held continuously in mind that it is not enough merely to fend off military attack from outside our borders. We must so husband our economy that our way of doing business outlasts theirs; for clearly, if our economy breaks down, they could win the war without firing a shot.

But what has this to do with ships and ports? Ships are truly the life line not only of America but of democracy. We are not sufficient unto ourselves. Nothing could be more dangerous to us than an attempt to withdraw into a shell like a giant hermit crab.

We need the raw materials of the world. We need markets for our products and outlets for the talents, ingenuity, and enterprise of the generations of young Americans who are coming behind us. Those seem like trite truisms, but I am confronted today with the possibility of having to see that bulk cargoes to the volume of over 15,000,000 tons are moved at sea.

This over-all job of development of America must be better done than the British did their job over the last 100 years. It is shocking to contemplate that in winning two world wars, with help, to be sure—but still winning them—Great Britain has lost an empire. They relied upon the hypotheses that history repeats itself—that they could continue to muddle through, that they could continue to knock off for tea each afternoon at 4. We are breaking ships out of the Reserve Fleets today to move shiploads of coal to England. They awakened during the war to discover that their technology had not kept pace—to find our ships out-steaming, out-shooting, out-maneuvering theirs—to find their factories not adequate to handle the war demands. They still have courage and ingenuity and I agree with Winnie Churchill that we cannot discard them. My point is solely that complacency has even less place in a nation in 1951. No more in the United States than anywhere else.

Our position in the world—a position forced upon us, to be sure, by circumstances, demands courage. It requires progress. We have staggering world responsibilities. We cannot desert the Western European nations from whence the American family has sprung. No more could we survive without ocean transport to the outposts of the world than we could survive were all the means of land traffic between the States and cities obliterated. The recent "sickness" of the switchmen on eastern railroads has given us a clear picture of the mess which would result.

The more progress is made in developing the resources of the backward areas of the world, the better off both they and we are—but only if the development is wisely done. Exploitation will react adversely. Wise assistance will bring untold dividends.

Ships are the backbone of this traffic of development. Air lanes are essential, too. We learned how essential the ships are in 1914–18 (World War I). We taught this lesson to South America during World War II. They are today demanding support for their ships in various schemes. One had difficulty in quarreling with their desires when we ourselves were forced into building so heavily in 1914 to 1918, and again in 1939 to 1945. Surely, in all of this, we must be convinced, even if a few of our countrymen are not, that America must continue to own and operate its lifeline of ships.

Since this is my first visit here since the establishment of the two new maritime agencies to replace the Maritime Commission, I want to give you a brief report on what's been done during that 6-month period.

You will recall that the President's Reorganization Plan No. 21 did away with the five-man Maritime Commission and transferred its duties to the Secretary of Commerce. Under him two new agencies have been established, the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration, to which the maritime functions have been delegated.

This arrangement is working exceedingly well. The jobs of these two agencies are those of the old Maritime Commission—the administration of the basic shipping laws. The new set-up is, however, better geared for action.

You must remember that the Maritime Commission had a chance to function under favorable conditions. Administration by committee has been tried many times. It has, so far as I can recall, never continued to run when the first blush of enthusiasm has faded.

After the honeymoon period of scarcely 2 years in 1937–38, during which action was being taken to lay down a modern merchant fleet, along came the war in Europe, abruptly changing the emphasis. From that time on through VJ-day the old commission's job under "Jerry" Land was to help win a war. Joining hands with the shipbuilding and ship-operating industries, that mission was accomplished with typical Jerry Land-Howard Vickery success.

Then the Maritime Commission settled down to face the painful postwar complexities of cutting back a major arm of warfare to peacetime size through a period of postwar uncertainties from which you gentlemen have in many cases not yet been freed.

Even a well-thought-out organization would have its hands full. Gentlemen, the old Maritime Commission had my sympathy, and I speak from an intimate knowledge of both its achievements and its shortcomings. To a member of the President's Advisory Committee, appointed to look into the Nation's merchant marine problems in 1947, it was very apparent that such an organization could have no assurance of continued success.

The Chairman of the old Commission had responsibility without authority, and even the simplest administrative problems were pitched on the table for discussion when action was the need. On matters of review, the clear-headed deliberations of a quasi-judicial board are vital. But in the day-to-day operations of a big business corporation, the board of directors cannot usurp the duties of its president. The wonder is that the Maritime Commission accomplished as much as it did—and I should like to take off my hat (my two hats) to many of its accomplishments.

On the Federal Maritime Board we now have three members. Under the new rules, we are able to have men who know something about ships and shipping.

Right here let me say that one of the great contributions the west coast has made to the American Merchant Marine was in providing the Government with Al Gatov, so well known to all of you here as the recent president of the Pacific American Steamship Association.

His very practical and thorough knowledge of shipping has supplied a sound base for many important decisions made by the Federal Maritime Board, and on the theory that if I could wear two hats, he could too, he has agreed to serve also as a special assistant to the Maritime Administrator. His advice and counsel have gone into every phase of our planning for a National Shipping Authority, of which more later.

The second member of the Board also contributes greatly toward a balanced team. He is Mr. Robert W. Williams, of Baltimore. Bob Williams is a widely known and highly respected admiralty lawyer. You can well imagine the value of such a gentleman to the Board.

The third member can at least speak in a vocabulary understandable to shipbuilders, in strength as well as in technical phraseology.

While the Federal Maritime Board is charged with the regulatory powers of the old Maritime Commission, plus the sensitive and debated responsibility of determining the subsidies under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Maritime Administration inherited the administrative tasks, the housekeeping chores of its predecessor.

We have had a thorough reorganization. But we have retained the valuable men of the old Maritime Commission staff, and are striving to provide them a better environment in which to work. Some new faces have been added, and I am happy to say that the whole staff is responding. They have made great progress.

I am proud of our accomplishments in 6 months' time.

I came to Washington under no great desire of my own. The academic life at MIT, watching the development of these youngsters who are the very future of this country, was completely satisfying to me. But the call to duty was too much for an old fire horse to resist.

My immediate and temporary predecessor, John Koehler, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, had been putting the new machinery together, and even before I arrived in Washington we had to use it, not for the long-haul peacetime program, but for breaking out ships for the Korean emergency.

As you know, we have maintained the pattern of private operation to handle this job, and have added to the privately operated fleet a total now of 130 Victory ships under bareboat charter to the industry for use by the MSTS.

I am proud of the fact that never, since the show started, has MSTS been delayed by the lack of a ship on berth which they had requested from us. As a matter of fact, we have them ready in advance of their needs many times, and are in that situation today.

Over the last 6 months we have added to our troopship capacity. The construction of new passenger ships has eased somewhat the immediate need for troopships. Other troopers are already in service under the MSTS; still others are in the reserve fleets. There is a bank of passenger ships now in operation under the American flag and under the flags of the other nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Right at this point, I imagine no San Francisco audience could fail to mumble, "What about the Mariposa and Monterey leaning up against the docks in Alameda?"

I looked over those ships yesterday, and may say at this moment that we are well aware of their value as troopships. The Navy has requested us to requisition them, but there are several matters—each with a dollar sign in front of it—that must be resolved before they can return to sea again.

Now we come to the third, and a most important, activity in which we have been engaged during the past 6 months; new ships.

With the rapid break-out of vessels for the Korean campaign, it became crystal clear to me that we needed more and faster ships behind the reserve supply of Libertys in the laid-up fleets.

I had the privilege of serving, while at MIT, in company with a number of scientists, at the request of the Navy, on research work dealing with the effect of new weapons upon seapower. I break no confidence when I say that atom missiles, modern subs, new torpedoes and new bomber planes force a reevaluation of the chances of survival of the slow-moving convoys used in the last wars.

Some Americans—those who look at numbers and not at facts—believe that we have plenty of ships. But even a cursory analysis of these ships shows that they are today entirely inadequate to carry critical cargoes of men and munitions into the forward areas in time of war because they are too slow and too vulnerable.

Even the Victory's are not fast enough, and we have been reactivating them at such a pace that we can see the last of them going into service very shortly. This will leave us with only the 10-knot Liberty's, and that just will not do. Out of this the new Mariner class grew, and just 6 months to the day after I took the oath of office contracts to build the first 26 of them were awarded. They will be fine ships and will put us in the lead in the dry-cargo type.

Twenty-five is not a large number—but the interest of our congressional leaders and those within the administration has been heartening indeed. We are on our way.

No; the west coast yards did not get any of this first block. For this I make no apologies, for I know that with a little reflection, you will understand why none were allocated to the west coast yards. In the first place, we are not yet allocating ships for construction. In the second place, prospective west coast bidders were not sharpening pencils quite enough to meet the competition.

I can understand the disappointment of your municipalities, your labor organizations, your shipbuilders—but if you are disheartened, you are not the kind of people I am sure you are.

The west coast can, and did, build good ships and plenty of them, and they can, and will, I hope, build them again. But it must, in the last analysis, be you, out here, who will find the way. We will help to the best of our ability, but in the end it will be capital and labor working together out here who will decide to get into this pilot program leading the way to a real shipbuilding effort in this country.

We want west coast shipbuilding; I am confident that we shall have it.

More has been happening. We are well advanced in our mobilization planning of the American merchant marine to ready it for possible war service.

In spite of the fact that American boys are dying in Korea by enemy bullets, the Nation has not had the psychological kick—the Pearl Harbor attack—to jolt us out of a peacetime economy into a wartime operation. We don't know our own strength. We have been conducting this affair overseas, and at the same time maintaining the greatest peacetime production the world has ever seen. This fact is recognized and we have very able men led by Charles Wilson steering our enormous industrial potential into a new area. In the merchant marine, we are meeting the demands of the Defense Department for shipping, but at the same time handling an expanding commercial activity.

But much of that expansion is in a category not entirely disconnected from our national defense, for it is concerned with the welfare of friendly countries, with partners in a free community of nations which must battle the common enemy. This, plus the obvious probability of increased military demands, calls for the organization of the United States merchant marine to fill its proper role in our security effort.

In other words, we had to put together the over-all organization that would enable the merchant marine to function as the fourth arm of national defense, in company with the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In World War II, this was called the War Shipping Administration, which after its duties were discharged, was disbanded. The agency now being readied is the NSA—the National Shipping Authority.

The merchant marine, unlike the Armed Forces, does not have an organized reserve. For its manpower we must rely upon the maritime industry—management and labor. We met with both groups, and based upon the nucleus of manpower within the Maritime Administration, have put together the names of many of those qualified men who will serve when needed. I have selected a highly qualified member of our own staff, Charles H. McGuire, to head the NSA when it goes into active operation.

Already, one vital segment of the merchant marine is organized and operating during this transition period to provide essential service to the Armed Forces. A voluntary tanker group composed of practically every tanker operator in the industry has pooled its qualified tonnage. This group, headed by an able tankerman, Mr. William Dunning, can and will easily gear into the NSA operation when needed.

One big task in particular is just over the horizon which may start typical NSA-type operations in a matter of days—that of carrying grain to India, and returning with cargoes of essential ores. All the programs will apparently call for activating 30 to 40 ships a month for a considerable period. For this purpose we intend to use the Liberty ships in the reserve fleets. This, I do not need to remind you, will bring more activity to the ship repair yards. The chances are that we will operate these ships on general agency agreements, utilizing American shipping companies as Government agents.

The National Production Authority has listened very attentively to our needs, and has approved the provision of approximately 9,000 tons of steel products monthly during the second quarter of this year to shipyards for the repair and conversion of seagoing vessels.

I am tempted to go further with a list of the activity now taking place back in Washington, but we must be running out of time. I do want to say that we haven't forgotten in the rush of mobilization needs the all-important job of administering the subsidy laws and regulatory responsibilities with which we of the Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Board are charged.

This is the type of work, gentlemen, which those of us in Washington know all too well makes no headlines, but generates headaches. Nevertheless, it is the unhappy foundation for building a merchant marine under the American flag in many routes. I don't have to remind you of the troubled waters in which the old Maritime Commission found itself. We have got to pilot the new agencies through those waters, and I can report that our charts show increasingly improved navigation.

The new world situation, our manifest leadership in world affairs, combine to make evident the need for wise and sound administration of existing laws, and some deep and constructive thought on the need for modification of these laws. I believe that I can report progress in making more realistic our calculations of both steamship-operating subsidies and construction subsidies, and in overcoming the criticisms leveled in the past at the methods of administering these all-important subsidies.

Gentlemen, I want to wind up this talk with a very simple message. The times in which we live are very complex; but their complexity is based upon the grave responsibilities thrust upon us as a nation—the responsibility of leadership. We must not—and with God's help we will not—lose confidence in ourselves to meet them. We have production potentials greater than we can imagine. We have the climate of freedom and of great conviction in which that production can flourish.

In terms we of the American merchant marine can understand, we have the ships, and the means of producing more ships, and we have the men to sail these ships. We are better prepared than our enemies may suppose. With courage and confidence we can point today to a maritime strength which, I believe, need yield nothing to the readiness in any other field.

I am proud to be associated with it, to be even a single fiber in the life line of America.

Veterans' Administration Payments of Benefits to Recipients in Satellite Countries Frozen Pending Proof Payees Will Receive Full Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is of interest to know that the Secretary of the Treasury is now withholding in the Treasury proceeds of United States Government checks payable to claimants who live in the satellite countries behind the iron curtain. The Treasury Department is to be commended for taking this step.

During a trip to Europe last fall a congressional group, of which I was a member, found evidence indicating that through exchange manipulations and certain actions by Communist regimes, recipients of benefit payments from the Veterans' Administration were actually getting but a portion of the actual value of their checks. On February 20, 1951, I called this to the attention of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. A week later, on February 27, the Secretary of the Treasury ordered all such checks to be withheld pending a determination of "a reasonable assurance that the payees will actually receive such check or warrant and be able to negotiate the same for full value."

The letter from Hon. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, giving information on this subject, follows:

MARCH 2, 1951.

Hon. O. C. FISHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. FISHER: In response to your inquiry of February 20, 1951, I have had prepared the attached tables showing in some detail the number and amount of check certifications by the Veterans' Administration for payment to beneficiaries residing in Russia and the satellite countries during the calendar years 1948, 1949, and 1950. Certain observations on the information included may be helpful to you.

In the first place, the countries included in the list are those commonly regarded as satellite countries, except that the Russian zone of Germany, including the Russian sector of Berlin, has been omitted. Our records do not differentiate between addresses in Germany, but it may be assumed that any payments in the Russian zone would be negligible, since they may not be made to German citizens or nationals residing there. No attempt has been made to determine when the individual countries became, or ceased to be, satellite countries. Accordingly, China and Yugoslavia are included in the summary for the entire 3-year period.

Our information is derived from records of check certifications, which do not always reflect actual payments. You will recall that Public Law 828, Seventy-sixth Congress, authorizes the withholding in the Treasury of proceeds of United States Government checks "in any case in which the Secretary of the Treasury determines that postal, transportation, or banking facilities in general, or local conditions in the country to which such check or warrant is to be delivered, are such that there is not a reasonable assurance that the payee will actually receive such check or warrant and be able to negotiate the same for full value." In such cases, payments continue to be certified by the Veterans' Administration, but the proceeds of the checks issued are deposited in a special account in the Treasury. At different times during the past 3 years, some check proceeds have been so withheld, as indicated in the summary at the end of this letter.

I am sure that you will also be interested to note that the Secretary of the Treasury has just made such a determination for prospective application to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Russian zone of occupation of Germany, and the Russian sector of occupation of Berlin, Germany. This determination is incorporated in supplement 7 to Treasury Department Circular 655, and may be found on pages 1818 and 1819 of the Federal Register, volume 16, No. 39, dated February 27, 1951.

In answer to your question about the procedure followed in the payment of such benefits, the Treasury checks are delivered to the Department of State, where they are dispatched by pouch to the United States Embassy, Legation, or consulate serving the area in which the payee resides. Our consular officials in turn forward the checks to the individual payees, or, if circumstances warrant, and the request is a reasonable one, they may ask the individual payee to come to our consular office to receive the check in person. This entire procedure has, however, been varied in some cases. Reports that beneficiaries were forced to convert dollar checks to foreign currencies at artificial rates of exchange in some countries, have led the Treasury occasionally to follow a different disbursement procedure. I am advised that disbursement vouchers certified by the Veterans' Administration for payment to beneficiaries in some satellite countries, have been forwarded to our Embassy disbursing officers abroad where checks have been drawn in the currency of the country for the equivalent of the dollars due, computed at the official rate of exchange. Full information on the extent to which this procedure has been utilized should, of course, come from the Treasury Department whose responsibility it is to make disbursements upon proper certification.

In your perusal of the attached tables, you will note that the average payments in 1948 were in general much larger than in 1950. This is due primarily to the settlement of accrued amounts due many beneficiaries in the earlier year, following the withholding of check proceeds during World War II under Public Law 828. (In the case of Russia, such settlements were still being made in 1949 and 1950 in sufficient numbers to keep the average payments relatively high.)

An important factor in the decline of the total number of payments in 1950 was an action necessarily taken by the Veterans' Administration. As you know, it is required that we obtain information from time to time bearing on the continued eligibility of the beneficiary to receive payments (e. g., reports of physical examination, reports of income, etc.). As might be expected, it has become increasingly difficult for the United States Foreign Service to conduct investigations and obtain such necessary information in Russia and the satellite countries. It has therefore been made a matter of established policy that in any case where the Department of State has been prevented from obtaining information requested by the Veterans' Administration, the award is terminated.

The data you requested are set forth in detail in the attached tables. You may find convenient, however, this simple summary of the information for the 3-year period 1948 through 1950:

Total certifications all foreign countries:

Number	2,593,095
Amount	$191,812,261.11

Total certifications U. S. S. R. and satellites:

Number	30,949
Amount	$3,265,116.54

The amount actually paid to beneficiaries in Russia and the satellite countries is less than the total certifications would indicate, since the proceeds of checks to Albania have been withheld in the Treasury since October 7, 1948 and of checks to Bulgaria since March 1, 1950. Furthermore, the difficulties leading to the finding of the Secretary of the Treasury published on February 27 have resulted in a considerable number of checks being now on file in the Treasury. I am advised that the total actually paid during the 3-year period in these countries is probably nearer to $3,000,000 than to the $3,265,116.54 shown by our certifications.

I hope that you will find this information adequate. It comes to you with my personal best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, JR.,
Administrator.

Soviet Officials in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and tabulations:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 20, 1951.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: Reference is made to your letter of March 1, 1951, acknowledged by telephone on March 9, 1951, forwarding for the Department's comment a copy of the remarks which you made in the House of Representatives on March 1. In these remarks you recommend that the official personnel which the Soviet Government sends to the United States and the travel of this personnel in the United States be placed on a reciprocal basis with regard to the number of official personnel of the United States in the Soviet Union and the travel privileges of American official personnel in that country.

Your remarks refer to two important questions concerning United States-Soviet relations which are under continual consideration in the Department. The comments of the Department with regard to these matters are presented in the following paragraphs.

The exchange of official representatives between two governments is rarely susceptible to treatment on a numerical parity basis. In almost every instance one country or the other will require a larger official establishment. Actually the variety of functions which the American Foreign Service is expected to perform, including complex visa and passport services and a wide range of reporting on political and economic subjects, is so great that the diplomatic and consular offices of the United States in any foreign country tend to be larger than that country's official representation in the United States.

An analysis of the number of Soviet officials in the United States reported to the Department of State by the Soviet Embassy up to March 5, 1951, and comparable American personnel in the Soviet Union as of the same date indicate that Soviet and United States official representation is practically on a parity basis. This analysis includes Embassy officials, correspondents, and commercial representatives of the two countries. It excludes Soviet representation to international organizations in the United States which have no counterpart in the Soviet Union.

There are enclosed two sheets which present United States official personnel in the Soviet Union and Soviet personnel in the United States as of March 5, 1951. You will note that the Soviet list carries a comparative list of Soviet personnel in the United States as of July 1, 1950. While on the face of these lists there appears to be a numerical disparity in representation in favor of the Soviet Union, an analysis of the figures gives a different picture. On March 5 the United States Government had official personnel numbering 101 with 16 dependents assigned to the American Embassy in Moscow. The Soviet counterpart of this figure is official Soviet personnel numbering 88, with 125 dependents (70 wives and 55 children) assigned to the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Thus, the United States has 13 more official employees in the American Embassy in Moscow than the Soviet Government has in the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Since no international organization of which the United States is a member has its headquarters in the Soviet Union, there can be no United States personnel in the Soviet Union comparable to the Soviet personnel assigned to the United Nations; namely, 121 (52 official employees, 38 wives, 31 children). If from the 391 total Soviet official personnel in the United States, there is subtracted 121, which is the Soviet representation, including dependents, to the United Nations, and 153 which represents Soviet dependents in the United States other than dependents of Soviet United Nations employees, the total Soviet official employees in the United States would amount to 107, 6 more than the 101 United States official employees in the Soviet Union, minus dependents.

With regard to Soviet restrictions on the travel of foreigners, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is divided into "free" and prohibited areas for diplomatic and consular personnel of foreign nations in the Soviet Union. Foreign officials on duty in Moscow may not travel more than 50 kilometers from the city limits with the exception of three points of historic interest to which foreigners may travel after appropriate notification to the foreign office. In general, all border areas and all of the central

Asian republics, the Caucausus with the exception of Tbilisi, the Baltic States, and the western areas of the Ukraine and Belorussia including the capital cities of Kiev and Minsk are within the zones prohibited to foreign officials. Although most of the Siberian areas is technically "free," in practice it is greatly restricted owing to the fact that the important cities are forbidden areas. In order to travel to "free" areas foreign missions must notify the foreign office in advance of the name and the itinerary of the traveler. Under this procedure, members of the Embassy's staff in Moscow have been able to make frequent trips to "free" areas during the past 2 years.

The question of applying travel control measures to Soviet official personnel in the United States is under constant review by the United States Government agencies concerned. Restrictions upon the travel of Soviet officials will be imposed whenever it is evident that such action is in the over-all interest of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosures: (1) Total United States official personnel in the Soviet Union as of March 5, 1951; (2) total Soviet officials in the United States as of March 5, 1951.)

Total United States official personnel in the Soviet Union, Mar. 5, 1951

Embassy:	
State Department	64
Navy attaché staff	13
Army attaché staff	18
Air Force attaché staff	6
Dependents	16
Total	117
UNITED STATES NONOFFICIAL PERSONNEL IN THE SOVIET UNION	
Clergymen	1
Newspaper correspondents	6
Businessmen (composed at present of fur buyers—an approximation)	2
Total	9
Grand total	126

Breakdown of figures used in the compilation "Total United States official personnel in the Soviet Union March 5, 1951," attached hereto:

State Department:	
Male employees including Ambassador:	
Foreign Service officer	15
Foreign Service Reserve officer	1
Foreign service staff personnel	25
Female employees, unmarried (Foreign Service staff)	8
Working wives (Foreign Service staff)	15
Total working personnel	64
Dependents (nonworking—includes 2 wives and 9 children)	11
Total State Department	75
Navy Department:	
Naval officers	5
Enlisted men	8
Total	13
Dependents (2 wives included in "working wives" above and 1 daughter included in "female employees, unmarried" above—1 dependent child)	1
Total Navy Department	14
Department of the Army:	
Officers	5
Warrant officers	1
Enlisted men	12
Total	18
Dependents (2 wives included in "working wives" above; 2 dependent wives)	4
Total Army	20
Air Force:	
Officers	3
Enlisted men	3
Total	6
Dependents (1 wife included in "working wives" above; 1 wife and 1 dependent child)	3
Total for Air Force	8
Grand total	117

Soviet officials in United States[1]

	Comparative figures	
	Mar. 5, 1951[2]	July 1, 1950
SUMMARY		
Embassy personnel	88	[3] 86
International organizations	52	59
Purchasing Commission	2	2
Tass	7	7
Pravda correspondents	2	2
Amtorg	7	17
Correspondents of All-Union Radio Committee of U. S. S. R.	1	1
Wives	124	132
Children	98	103
Dependent relative	0	1
Grand total[3]	381	410
BREAKDOWN		
Embassy of the U. S. S. R.:		
Accredited officers of Embassy	40	39
Employees of Embassy	48	47
Subtotal	88	86
Wives of Embassy officers	32	31
Wives of Embassy employees	38	38
Subtotal	70	69
Children of Embassy officers	23	24
Children of Embassy employees	32	28
Subtotal	55	52
Dependent relative of Embassy personnel	0	1
Total Embassy	213	208
United Nations:		
U. S. S. R. representation to UN	49	55
Wives of U. S. S. R. representatives	35	39
Children	30	37
Subtotal	114	131
U. S. S. R. members Military Staff Committee	3	4
Wives of members of Military Staff Committee	3	4
Children	1	2
Subtotal	7	10
Total United Nations	121	141

[1] Figures based on note 8 of Jan. 27, 1951, from Soviet Embassy reporting Soviet citizens, employees of Soviet State institutions, Soviet missions, and other organizations to be found in the United States as of Jan. 1, 1951, and note 7 of Jan. 24, 1951, and note 11 of Feb. 7, 1951, which showed further personnel changes.

[2] Soviet officials in United States as of July 1, 1950. Figures based on note No. 113 of July 12, 1950. Soviet Embassy reporting Soviet citizens, employees, and other organizations in the United States as of July 1, 1950.

[3] In addition to this total, there are 12 Soviet citizens employed by the Secretariat of the United Nations who are accompanied by 12 wives and 6 children (total 30).

Soviet officials in United States—Continued

	Comparative figures	
	Mar. 5, 1951	July 1, 1950
Government organizations:		
Purchasing Commission	2	2
Wives of members	2	2
Children	2	2
Subtotal	6	6
Tass employees	7	7
Wives	6	6
Children	5	3
Subtotal	18	16
Pravda correspondents	2	2
Wives	2	1
Children	1	0
Subtotal	5	3
All-Union Radio Committee Correspondents	1	1
Wives	1	1
Children	2	1
Subtotal	4	3
Amtorg employees	7	17
Wives	5	10
Children	2	6
Subtotal	14	33
Total governmental organizations	47	61
Grand total	[3] 381	410

American Aid to Yugoslavia Is Achieving Its Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a letter I recently received from an American official in Yugoslavia relative to the distribution of American food under the Yugoslav aid program. It will be recalled that during the debate on the bill some Members were apprehensive that there would be faulty distribution and that many recipients would not be informed where the aid came from. The information contained in this letter should, therefore, be welcome:

As I see it, the Tito government is the only government Yugoslavia has got and under present conditions if that government were permitted to fall, the most likely alternative would be a government set up by the Kremlin. * * *

By way of informal information, I can tell you up to this point that the American observers-supervisors operating in the country are receiving every facility and cooperation from the Yugoslav Government. These men are spotting around in key centers throughout the country from which they radiate by jeep to outlying areas. Their individual and independent reports to date indicate without exception that the Yugoslav officials at all levels are fully cooperative, that the receipt and distribution of American food stuffs is being carried out with a high degree of expedition and efficiency with no apparent evidences of discrimination. Favorable publicity continues to flow in substantial volume. I am confident that every Yugoslav knows that they are receiving American food through the generosity of the American people, and that they understand, at the same time, that this donation of food is not intended to saddle more firmly a Communist regime on their backs. * * *

A quick check this morning shows that something over 138,000 tons of American-supplied foodstuffs have entered Yugoslavia up to February 1. The bulk of this, 91,000 tons, is flour from Italy and Germany, with the balance of 19,000 of this item to arrive within the next week or 10 days. Other items that have arrived are: Beans, 16,800; Mexican canned meat, 900; powdered eggs, 3,300; corn, 8,500; barley, 9,000; lard, 8,500. We anticipate that the remaining 110,000 tons of stop-gap aid will arrive during February, with the congressional part of the program filling in closely behind.

All in all, it appears that the relief program is accomplishing its purpose up to this time. As recognized from the outset, however, the critical period will likely be the spring months when they begin to scrape the bottom of the barrel of domestically produced foodstuffs and before new crop food becomes available in any substantial quantity. One essential factor that we must bear in mind is that roughly one-third of the entire crop area of Yugoslavia is customarily planted to corn which is not harvested until late September and early October. Moreover, two-thirds of the potato crop is late planted, and like cabbage and onions, is usually not available for consumption until August and later. It is quite clear, therefore, that while our food supply program will likely have been completed by early May, the Yugoslavs will not be out of the woods until autumn, assuming a good crop year.

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed in recent days that Yugoslavia has been blessed with normal rainfall during recent weeks and that the prospects for a return to normal crop yields over there appear good for this year. Normally, Yugoslavia is an exporter of food and other agricultural products. The American aid from our surpluses appears to be accomplishing what was intended, stopgap assistance to help tide those people over during the worst crop failure and drought that has occurred there in 50 years.

Location of Defense Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 19, 1951, an article appeared in the Cumberland Evening Times, Cumberland, Md., by the columnist Peter Edson, in which he stated:

Plant location. There is today no area in which a new defense plant can be put to draw on surplus labor. Every new site selected in the future will have to be determined by a shift of labor from nonessential industry, as well as by availability of power, transportation, raw material, and housing. Projections. So far there have been no tables prepared on how many men will be needed for defense production, when and where. Projecting the employment and draft curves to show total manpower requirements is a first job of Government agencies operating under Dr. Flemming's directives.

If the Department of Defense is considering areas where there is surplus unemployment, I would like to call their attention to the present situation in Cumberland and Allegany County, Md., where there are approximately 5,000 unemployed persons at this time. In this total there are skilled, semiskilled and unskilled workers such as machinists, carpenters, chemists and chemical laboratory technicians. When these people apply to the Unemployment Compensation Division they are advised to go to other areas to seek employment. This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is not good either for the community or for the worker himself because 90 percent of these unemployed own their homes and naturally when they leave the local community their homes will be unoccupied and they will create a housing problem in industrial areas.

Cumberland and Allegany County are ideally situated for the establishment of a defense plant. Not only do we have ample labor but we are located on the main line of the Baltimore and Ohio and the Western Maryland Railroads with an adequate water supply from the Potomac River and the North Branch of the Potomac River and many ideal factory sites are available.

I think it would be well for the Department of Defense and the Real Estate Divisions of the Army and Navy to look into the availability of this community which is approximately 150 miles from the Nation's Capital and close to the Atlantic Seaboard.

Ethics of Public Life Seem To Be Lacking in RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of March 14, 1951:

ETHICS OF PUBLIC LIFE SEEM TO BE LACKING IN RFC

One thing in all walks of public life is above the law. That is ethics, the ability to tell the good from the bad, right from wrong. Nothing exactly illegal, it is said, has yet been proved in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation investigation. Maybe not, but there is abundant evidence that men—and women—used positions of public service to which they had been appointed for the sake of personal profit.

Private advantage has no place at all in the handling of the people's business. Those who find themselves so placed as to see in their responsibility for governmental operations incidental opportunity for self-enrichment have only two alternatives. The first is to lean over backward not to avail themselves of such opportunity, however innocent it seems on the surface, and to pursue the sole purpose for which they were entrusted with power—the greatest good of the greatest number.

The second alternative is to resign, recognizing that self-seeking motives may be overpowering and that their interests may be properly pursued in private life. In the latter alternative, the incumbents must forego the honor and confidence implied by acceptance of public service.

There is no law to control the inner recesses of the human conscience. There is no law that says, in so many words, the right hand should know what the left is doing. But where the law in its methodical and sometimes slow process of following society's interests leaves off, something higher which we are wont to call ethics carries on.

Personal profit is not, according to our code of ethics, consistent with governmental obligation. Do we want to see a blunting of democratic standards on which the country was founded until we expose it to the nicking and hacking of every private, selfish gain? Integrity that is rock-ribbed to the point of self-denial is the cornerstone of American political life.

Enthusiastic Milwaukee Girl Scout Leaders Doing a Great Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last Monday was the thirty-ninth anniversary of the founding of the Girl Scouts. It is well known what a worth-while work the Girl Scouts are engaged in. Today the total Girl Scout membership of the United States totals about 1,500,000 girls, ages ranging from 7 to 17.

The Girl Scouts of Milwaukee County are a particularly active council and this year again, as in the past, their entire membership of 14,000 girls—4,459 brownies, 5,911 intermediates, and 517 seniors—is busy selling Girl Scout cookies from March 10 to March 16. This year's funds will be used to equip a camp site located at Saukville, Wis., and to help finance 9 days of primitive camping for 80 senior Scouts at a site near Escanaba, Mich. Adult membership of the Milwaukee County Girl Scouts is well over 3,500 and includes leaders, assistant leaders, troop committee members, council members, district and functional members, associate scouts, and the professional staff. That so many women take part in this work indicates the excellent value of Girl Scout activities is well recognized in Milwaukee. I should like to include here an article from the Milwaukee Journal of March 1, 1951, telling of the experiences of some of the Milwaukee Girl Scout leaders:

GIRL SCOUT LEADERS FIND RESULTS WORTH THE TIME—UNDERSTANDING FAMILY BEGINS TO BE AMONG PREREQUISITES FOR A GOOD TROOP CHIEF

Daughters and an understanding husband are among prerequisites for a Girl Scout

troop leader, the example of six volunteers seems to indicate.

They are among the 1,200 leaders and assistants who organize and direct troop activity for some 10,000 Girl Scouts in Milwaukee County. On the average, the little-known planners give 4 to 10 hours a week to the job.

Mrs Weikko Leppanen, 1921 North Thirty-second Street, says she owes her start in scouting to one of her three daughters. About 3 years ago Patricia, now 17, was ready to "fly up" from Brownie to intermediate status. Patricia discovered, however, that there was no intermediate troop in the neighborhood in which she could enroll.

TWO ORGANIZE TROOP

Long interested in scouting, Mrs. Leppanen decided it was time she "got in the swim" herself. She and another woman took the 16-hour course in group leadership necessary for Girl Scout leaders. Then they organized an intermediate troop.

Since that time Mrs. Leppanen has had another daughter, Jean, 15, in her intermediate and senior troops. She now has Susan, 9, in the Brownie troop, No. 141, that she supervises at St. Thomas Aquinas' church.

Mrs. Leppanen says that each age level offers a particular challenge. "I miss my big girls now because they're so full of the dickens," she relates. "But I love the Brownies. They are so loyal and you don't have to give them 50 good reasons for one move."

The charm of intermediates is that they are beginning to assume responsibilities, according to Mrs. Leppanen. "They learn to think for themselves and work toward a self-realization."

Scout leadership has been her college education, Mrs. Leppanen said. "I've taken so many courses that I could paper a room with my qualifying cards. It's been a satisfying job."

CALLS IT RECREATION

In addition to leading the Brownie troop, Mrs. Leppanen is neighborhood scout chairman and serves as a counselor at a summer Girl Scout day camp.

How many hours does she give to all her scout duties? "My husband would say every hour," she retorts. She believes that the scout organization should initiate a "husband appreciation night."

For Mrs. George Graetz, 618 Hawthorne Avenue, South Milwaukee, who grew up in scouting, leadership of an intermediate troop in South Milwaukee is recreation. Her oldest daughter, Susan, 10, is in her troop.

Her other daughters are Mary, 8, who is a Brownie, and Sally, 4. "Even Sally has had some scouting experience," Mrs. Graetz tells. "With the rest of the family she went to Girl Scout day camp last summer. But she stayed in the nursery."

TAUGHT PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Before she was married, Mrs. Graetz was an instructor of physical education. She entered scouting when she was 12 and became a leader in 1930 in Duluth, Minn. She droped out to raise a family after her marriage in 1938. She resumed troop leadership in 1944.

Mrs. Graetz feels that Girl Scouting has drawn her closer to her daughters. "It's a deep common love," she said. Her husband declares he has decided that she will be in scouting the rest of her life.

DEVOTES 8 HOURS WEEKLY

Five daughters, a seven-room house and an ambitious schedule of community volunteer work have not discouraged Mrs. Charles Rupp, 2376 South Seventy-sixth Street, West Allis, from troop leadership. She has an intermediate troop at Jefferson school.

Her family includes Darlene, 13; Renee, 11; Bonnie and Vicki, 8-year-old twins, and Janee, 4. All except the youngest are in scouting. Mrs. Rupp says that her daughters got her interested in the movement.

"Scouting has taught me to organize my own family," she says. "We all have duties and work on a kind of alarm-clock system."

She spends at least 8 hours a week on leadership duties. Also, she does volunteer work for the West Allis health department, is a neighborhood chairman for the Girl Scouts and solicits funds for the March of Dimes.

"I couldn't do any of it without a cooperative husband," she said.

For Mrs. Melvin Petrie, Girl Scout leadership filled a lonely hollow caused by moving from Minneapolis 10 months ago. She had lived there for 25 years. She now is at 1040 South Thirtieth Street.

"My youngsters and I felt right at home when we heard the familiar scout songs," she declares. "It was like coming home."

LIKES LITTLE FOLKS

Her youngsters are Marie, 8, a Brownie, and Maja Lisa, 11, an intermediate scout. Mrs. Petrie has been working with a Brownie troop at Doerfler school and now is helping to organize an intermediate group.

In Minneapolis she worked with a Brownie troop for 2½ years. She likes the little folks because "I can give attention to children who don't get enough of it at home."

She says her husband is a tremendous help. "He does carpentry work when we need it for a play or a troop investiture," Mrs. Petrie said. "And best of all, he doesn't complain about late meals."

Troop leadership is the hobby of Mrs. Smith N. Brickhouse, Jr., 2608 South Shore Drive. She got into the work because her children seemed to enjoy Scouting so much.

ORGANIZED MARINER TROOP

Her daughters, Beth, 12, and Barbara, 11, are both intermediates, and a son, Smith, is a Cub Scout. She never has had her daughters in a troop because, she says, "They get enough of my ideas at home."

Mrs. Brickhouse has charge of Brownie Troop, No. 245, at the Trowbridge Street School. She also is a neighborhood chairman in the South Shore district.

She spends about 10 hours a week on Scouting duties. "My husband enjoys having me do it," she says.

Living smack on the ocean at Marblehead, Mass., gave Mrs. Kenneth Johnston, 3265 North Summit Avenue, an early love for the sea and sailing. She put this love and scouting together by becoming a Mariner Scout.

Last year Mrs. Johnston organized the second mariner Girl Scout troop in Milwaukee. The group now is busy learning to tie knots, chart sea courses, identify parts of a boat, and pass required swimming badges.

Mrs. Johnston, 24, is one of the younger adult leaders. She has a daughter, Deborah, 16 months old. She was graduated in 1948 from the University of Wisconsin, where she majored in political science.

She believes that all women should have some activity outside the home. And her husband agrees. In addition to her scout leadership, Mrs. Johnston does volunteer work at the junior league blood center.

Jewish Youth Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, March 23-30, 1951, has been designated as Jewish Youth Week in the United States by the National Jewish Youth Conference. The conference is a permanent Nation-wide body which represents over 300 local Jewish and young adult councils, regional youth and young adult councils and national Jewish youth organizations. The conference is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board. The purpose of Jewish Youth Week is to focus the attention of the entire community on the activities of its young people.

"Learning through Jewish living," the theme of this year's Jewish Youth Week, reveals significantly the fact that American Jewish youth has learned the art of working together around areas of common interest for a healthier, happier, more positive community. Through youth and young adult councils—which in most cases are representative of all organized Jewish youth in the community—they have been able to develop constructive programs.

Clearly reflected in the theme is the recognition by Jewish youth of its role in the growth and development of the American Jewish community. Across the Nation, young people have taken their seats on boards of Jewish community centers, Jewish community councils, and Jewish welfare organizations such as the National Jewish Welfare Board.

During Jewish Youth Week the searchlight of the communities will be focused on the major advances which Jewish young men and women have been able to make by working together. Through such events as cultural festivals, youth Sabbath services, exhibits, rallies, conferences, forums, institutes, pageants, athletic and social events, radio and television programs, Jewish youth will demonstrate its abilities, accomplishments, role and responsibilities and needs. They will demonstrate during this week the fruitful results of concentrated efforts to build a better community and Nation.

Our Jewish young men and women have willingly accepted their responsibility of citizenship and service and have given generously of their time and efforts in working for deserving projects. On a national level, for example, the National Jewish Youth Conference served as an active member of the advisory council on youth participation of the recent Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth. The conference played an important role in stimulating the participation of youth and young adult councils in the work of the State and local White House Conference committees throughout the United States.

Youths of all faiths are needed for the future leadership of America. The splendid achievements of our Jewish youth in the past warrants a hopeful prediction that they will more than measure up to the responsibilities that will face them in the crucial days ahead.

The theme of Jewish Youth Week is described in an article written by Mr. Arnulf M. Pins:

WE LEARN THROUGH JEWISH LIVING

(By Arnulf M. Pins)

The theme of Jewish Youth Week, March 23-30, 1951, is Learning Through Jewish Living. Jewish Youth Week, conducted annually by the National Jewish Youth conference, aims to focus attention on the activities, hopes, abilities, and plans of Jewish young people today.

The National Jewish Youth Conference, which is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board, can serve as an excellent example of "learning through Jewish living." It reflects the aspirations, hopes, and plans of American Jewish youth in the critical days through which we are living.

The National Jewish Youth Conference was set up as a permanent body in 1948, "to provide a self-governing representative body of organized Jewish youth which can develop a service for meeting the needs of American Jewish young people." Local and regional Jewish youth and young adult councils, some 300 in number, and most of the national Jewish youth organizations are members of the NJYC.

The purposes of the National Jewish Youth Conference are: To exchange experiences and program ideas on the youth and young adult levels; to initiate programs nationally which could aid local communities; to act as a sounding board of youth needs; to stimulate and aid in the development of youth and young adult councils; to facilitate relationships with other cultural and ethnic groups; to serve as an instrument for cooperation between Jewish youth in America and youth all over the world; to stimulate means of cooperation and exchange among American youth and Israel; to provide opportunity for development of leadership through actual experience; to provide a medium for democratic representation from youth and young adult councils on a national and international youth serving bodies and to develop a medium of cooperation between national Jewish youth organizations and the local youth and young adult councils.

In the 2 years the NJYC has done much to carry out these objectives. Through its annual assemblies, quarterly meetings of the executive committee and work of its standing committees, the NJYC has begun to meet the needs of local youth councils and national organizations and has begun to be a unifying force in American Jewish youth life. It has been an experience of youth accepting its responsibilities and working for a better, more meaningful, and creative American Jewish community. It has been an example of youth serving youth.

In order to acquaint more people with the purposes and activities of the various national Jewish youth organizations, the conference published a directory of these organizations, as well as a listing of nonfee organizational speakers who are available for talks, forums, and lecture programs. The NJYC is also preparing a radio script which will explain in dramatic form the objectives of the various Jewish youth organizations in this country.

The National Jewish Youth Conference has been in close contact with youth in Israel. It has distributed magazines, articles, and other publications published by the Jewish Agency, Jewish National Fund, and the Keren Hayesod. The NJYC published and distributed widely a complete listing of all the different youth "Tours to Israel" which were held during this past year. A "reciprocal adoption project" between local youth councils and settlements in Israel has been undertaken for the current year.

In order to enhance the exchange between youth councils, a directory of Jewish youth and young adult councils has been published; a directory of Jewish youth-council newspapers is now in preparation. Special bulletins of program suggestions for youth councils are sent periodically to the councils throughout the country. They have covered such subjects as Youth Conferences on Israel, Social Action, and others.

A Jewish-youth lecture service has recently been established by the conference. It lists youth speakers throughout the country who are able to speak before youth and adult audiences on specific topics. The conference also publishes a paper called the National Jewish Youth Review. The conference also publishes a news service, which gives items about and of interest to Jewish youth for use by local and national youth and community newspapers.

The conference cooperates with other agencies to encourage the celebration and to prepare and distribute materials for Jewish Book Month, Jewish Music Festival, Jewish History Week, Hebrew Month, and United Nations Day. The National Jewish Youth Conference has also stimulated special programs such as career conferences, youth sabbaths, join a jewish youth group campaigns, and others.

The conference's week-long annual assemblies held during each summer provide a setting where young people get together to consider matters of concern to Jewish youth, learn new skills, and get new ideas for their local programs, and have the opportunity to participate, in a democratic fashion, in deciding the future services and activities of the National Jewish Youth Conference.

The National Jewish Youth Conference represents Jewish youth in the Young Adult Council of the National Social Welfare Assembly, a national coordinating body of all the major youth organizations in this country, and through it has actively participated in the work of the World Assembly of Youth, UNESCO, and other international agencies. The conference also took an active part in the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth recently held in Washington, D. C.

These are but a few of the concrete and visible things the National Jewish Youth Conference has accomplished during the first 2 years of its existence. However, some of the accomplishments of the conference, of equal importance, are of a different nature. For example, the National Jewish Youth Conference has given many individuals an invaluable experience in working with people of different backgrounds and varying interests as well as getting new insights into the needs of the American Jewish community. Through their participation in the work of the conference young people have gained a community outlook, they have learned that there can be unity without uniformity. In other words they have begun to prepare themselves, through actual experience, for their future responsibilities as adults.

The efforts of the National Jewish Youth Conference in the past 2 years are more than mere activities, projects, meetings, or publications. There is deep underlying purpose and direction to all the work of the National Jewish Youth Conference. The National Jewish Youth Conference is working toward an American Jewish community which will be positive in attitude, democratic in structure and creative in its program, by preparing young people for their future responsibilities in Jewish life in America and Israel. To achieve this goal, youth must gain the knowledge, understanding, and experience in Jewish affairs, and must learn to work together, to share views and develop necessary skills.

In reality, the National Jewish Youth Conference has been and will continue to be training for community leadership. Jewish youth is learning through doing; the conference is a good example, of learning through Jewish living.

Post Office Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to find in the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee items which will permit the extension of the research and development program which was inaugurated by the Post Office Department pursuant to Public Law 231, Eighty-first Congress. I introduced the bill which became Public Law 231 following a visit to one of the large post offices in the United States in connection with a study made by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in 1948.

It was clear that the postal service was being impaired by a lack of funds and a lack of a coordinated program for research and development in items that are peculiar to the postal service.

It is virtually impossible to get private organizations to conduct research of this type for the postal service because in the event they might develop some item which would be of benefit, the Department must then ask for bids in which all manufacturing organizations can participate without regard to whether they participated in the development period or not.

I note that this bill carries an item of $250,000 for original research and development on new machines, procedures, and methods. There is also an additional item of $500,000 for improvements on existing equipment that has already passed through the initial experimental stage.

The Post Office Department has reported with regard to the research and development program, and I believe the Members of this House would like to know that a wide field for improvement in the postal service is being developed. Already under the authority of the research and development law the Department has made many advances. The work incident to the establishment of the new money-order system which is expected to go into effect on July 1, 1951, is well advanced. This new money-order system proposes to replace the present postal note and money order by a machine record card prepunched to expedite the accounting procedures. The Postmaster General testified before our committee that he expected the savings in this new system to virtually eliminate the deficit the Department is now experiencing in handling money orders which amounts to approximately $30,000,000 annually.

The Department has installed improved garage equipment and experimented with highway post-office vehicles. These latter vehicles, incidentally, are proving a good substitute for the hundreds of branch lines that the railroads have found necessary to discontinue because of reduced revenues.

The Department is negotiating for research into parcel-post packaging. This will be of benefit not only to the postal service but to all of those using the facilities of the post office. I might mention that during our study of the postal service it was developed that in San Francisco alone 20 full-time employees were required for rewrapping packages that were broken in handling on the parcel-post conveyor equipment. You see, it is not only a question of adding mechanical equipment to handle parcel post, but the addition of mechanical equipment creates new problems such as the packaging problem I have just mentioned.

The Department is improving the unit-cost system and proposes to institute a unit-factor system which will have a material effect on the management of such offices taking into consideration the units of work produced.

Much has been accomplished under this program in research into sorting equipment for letter mail. The Department is also experimenting with and intends to install in some of the larger post offices a simplified sorting system similar to the one developed in the Dallas, Tex., post office.

Mail distributing machines have been constructed and a study has been initiated into the development of a machine for facing mail prior to cancellation.

The Department is also conducting research in payroll machines, postmarking machines, stackers, improved hand-postmarking devices, portable conveyors, electric tractors, small motor vehicles for city carriers, city carrier carts, magnesium hand trucks for parcel-post carriers, plastic carrier satchels, microfilm, labels for packages and sacks of mail, check signers, magnetic counting devices, twine, and coin-handling machines.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, is currently holding hearings on postal rates. These hearings have developed the very serious need for a more constructive approach to the manner in which postal rates are set. The postal rate structure is one of the most complicated sets of rates, and has a more far-reaching effect than virtually any other single transportation rate structure. Yet the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is expected to examine into the rate structure and come up with recommendations to the Congress which will be fair in all respects. This is a most difficult task and the net result in revisions are seldom accomplished.

Under the research and development program, a Division of Rates is being set up. This Division will conduct continuous studies into the postal rate problem and will be able to provide more complete data with regard to the necessary postal rate revisions, and possibly will result in recommendations with regard to revised rate-making procedures that will be workable and acceptable to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I say I am gratified that the research and development program is recognized and is being continued by means of appropriations contained in this bill.

Proposed Increases in Federal Automotive Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include by request at this point in the RECORD the following resolution on proposed increases in Federal automotive excise taxes:

RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED INCREASES IN FEDERAL AUTOMOTIVE EXCISE TAXES

Whereas Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has proposed that the 7 percent manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles be jumped to 20 percent, and the Federal gasoline tax from 1½ cents to 3 cents, in addition to the nearly $1,500,000,000 which highway users are now paying annually in Federal automotive excise taxes; and

Whereas this doubling of the Federal gasoline tax and tripling of the tax on new automobiles will add, according to the Secretary's estimate, about $1,265,000,000 in additional Federal automotive excise taxes which would result in highway users paying almost 42 percent of the total revenue expected from all new excise tax increases; and

Whereas Federal automotive excises are discriminatory and unfair because, (1) they select one type of transportation for general tax purposes (only highway transportation is singled out for such taxes); (2) they are imposed upon products essential to modern transportation; (3) they bear heavily on the small income groups; and (4) they result in multiple taxation; and

Whereas in addition to these Federal automotive excise taxes, motor-vehicle owners contribute their fair share of all general taxes in the support of Government and pay special imposts to the States and localities for use of the highways at an annual rate in excess of $2,500,000,000, thereby building and maintaining the road network which is indispensable to the Nation's defense; and

Whereas passenger cars are no longer a luxury to be taxed as such but instead are used daily by farmers, workers, professional, and business men in the pursuits of their livelihood which are essential to a strong supporting civilian economy for our defense effort; and

Whereas the proposed increase in gasoline tax excises alone would not only increase the cost of operating passenger cars and privately owned commercial vehicles essential to the defense effort, but would add so much to the cost of bus and truck operation that higher fares and rates would result in ultimate higher prices to the consumer; and

Whereas there is pending in the Congress a bill known as H. R. 1652 to impose Federal registration fees on motor vehicles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That while the undersigned organizations, members of the Massachusetts Highway Users Conference, stand ready to make the contributions and sacrifices necessary in the defense effort as demonstrated by the withdrawal of our demands for repeal of present Federal automotive excise taxes when the first shot in Korea was fired, we are nevertheless unalterably opposed to any proposals to further increase or add to these taxes for the forestated reasons; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to our congressional delegation.

American Automobile Association, Robert S. Kretschmar, Executive Secretary; Automobile Legal Association, Sidney S. von Loesecke, Assistant Manager; The Asphalt Institute, E. M. Howard, District Engineer; Automotive Booster Club, E. E. Graves, Legislative Committee; Bancroft Automobile Club, John H. Brooks, Sr., President; Independent Oil Men's Association of New England, J. B. Wells, Executive Director; Lawrence Automobile Club, James N. Keefe, Manager; Mack Motor Truck Co., Walter E. McLean, New England Manager; Massachusetts Farm Bureau, Walter E. Brigham, Director; Massachusetts Highway Users Conference, Richard P. Paul, Secretary; Massachusetts Motor Truck Association, Myles W. Illingworth, General Manager; Massachusetts Rural Letter Carriers Association, Woodworth J. Rice, Legislative Committee; Massachusetts State Automobile Dealers Association, William A. Plunkett, Executive Vice President; Massachusetts State Grange, Charles H. Brown, Master; New England Bakers Association, James W. Mackey, Assistant Executive Secretary; R. S. Robie-U-Dryvit Auto Rental Co., Charles A. Higgins, Jr., Sales Manager.

Amendment of Internal Revenue Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today similar to H. R. 3168, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

During this period of high taxes and with the possibility of even higher taxes in the offing, it is of the utmost importance that the Congress be alert to correct inequities which arise under our complicated tax laws.

The bill which I am introducing is one of a number of corrections which should be made in our tax laws.

In 1932 the Treasury Department requested an amendment to the internal revenue laws to provide that the basis of property should be reduced not only by any depreciation properly allowable but also by any depreciation allowed if it exceeded the amount allowable. The sole purpose was to prevent injustice to the revenue by the restoration to bases of excessive depreciation claimed where taxes had been reduced by the excessive deductions and the statute of limitations had run against the collection of the taxes properly due.

Instead of using the section only to protect the revenue against injustice the Commissioner with the sanction of a 5-to-4 decision of the Supreme Court, has used the statute to inflict the grossest injustice upon innocent taxpayers. This should not be permitted. Nowhere else in the tax laws is a taxpayer bound, in computing income in future years, by an error in a prior return which did not affect tax liability. It is only simple justice that an innocent and harmless error should not increase tax liability.

Congress, in amending the basis provisions in 1932, intended no exception.

My bill does not open any statute of limitations. Closed years are left closed. But it does in all open years permit computation of basis by the deduction only of depreciation allowable, except where depreciation in excess of that allowable has reduced tax liability and the statute of limitations has barred collection of the taxes properly due.

Altoona, Pa., Local of the American Federation of Labor Opposes the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of Labor representing the shopmen employed by the Pennsylvania Railroad at Altoona, Pa., are against the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project.

There is no community in the United States that depends more upon coal and railroading for its economy than does the city of Altoona. Destroy this economy as the St. Lawrence seaway will and you will destroy the jobs of the many thousands of good Americans employed in Altoona by the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The resolution recently adopted by the local federation of the American Federation of Labor, Altoona, Pa., follows:

Be it resolved, That the local federation of the American Federation of Labor, Altoona, is opposed to the bill approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada, providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating, and for other purposes.

1. That this proposal at the present time is a threat to the economy of the entire northeastern part of the United States and would reduce the tonnage of both the merchant marine and the railroads.

2. That the project would cover 2,687 miles of which 345 miles would be in this country and 2,342 in Canada.

3. The proposal would cost between $800,000,000 and $1,350,000,000 and yearly operation would cost approximately $20,000,000 and adequate defense would probably come to another billion.

4. Vital materials for the war effort would be used and could not be spared at the present time.

5. The project would take at least 4 to 7 years to complete and could be crippled by one bomb, rendering it useless.

6. The St. Lawrence River is icebound for virtually 5 months out of the year and during the spring and fall, and even in summer is blanketed by fog.

7. Only 9 percent of the merchant marine vessels could use the seaway, and smaller vessels would have the advantage.

8. It is estimated that the international section alone would take 140,235,000 man-hours when manpower is so vital to the national defense.

Italian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday March 15, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the existing Italian Peace Treaty is today completely outmoded and sadly in need of revision. The conditions which existed at the time the treaty was written no longer hold true and the situation has so changed that immediate action appears to be called for. Today, while we in the Congress, are debating the various proposals and methods by which a real and lasting peace can be secured, and while we are attempting to best implement the Atlantic Pact, we are overlooking a decided and impelling force toward such a peace by continuing in effect the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947.

This treaty imposed drastic limitations on the Italian army, navy, and air force and greatly curtailed military training in that country. Because of these restrictions Italy is now prohibited from fulfilling her obligation under the Atlantic Pact. She is denied the right to contribute to the full extent of her capability to the defense of Western Europe. At the same time it forces the United States to carry an undue burden in supplying additional combat manpower to make up for that loss.

It seems evident to me that for our own best interests, we here in America should immediately negotiate a new treaty of peace with Italy and permit her to assume her responsibilities among the free nations of the world. For these reasons I have today submitted a bill to the Congress which would authorize the negotiation of such a new treaty.

Conservation and Development of Forest Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to submit for the consideration of the Congress the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Forest Farmers Association, with headquarters at Valdosta, Ga., during their tenth annual meeting recently completed:

RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO FEDERAL PROGRAMS CONCERNING THE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF FOREST RESOURCES

Whereas forest farming is dependent on the same biological sciences as other agricultural crops; and

Whereas the biological scientists, concentrated in the Department of Agriculture and working on problems in the growing of cultivated crops, grasses, and trees, have associations and facilities there that are mutually helpful and advantageous to the country; and

Whereas a large proportion of the forest land of the South and of the Nation is in farm woodlands; and

Whereas the United States Forest Service, as the Federal agency responsible for the forest program, has for many years worked successfully with the other agencies in the Department of Agriculture in developing the science and art of forest farming, and in disseminating information to forest farmers and other woodland owners: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Forest Farmers Association go on record as recommending to the President of the United States and to Congress that the Federal programs concerning the conservation and development of the forest resources be concentrated in the United States Department of Agriculture; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress.

Address of Hon. Sean MacBride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the stirring address made by His Excellency Sean MacBride, S. C., T. D., Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, to the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick of the City of Philadelphia on Saturday, March 17, 1951, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Mr. President and gentlemen, you will know how honored and happy I was to receive the invitation sent to me some months ago to be the guest on this occasion of the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick of the City of Philadelphia. In the midst of heavy duties I considered that this was an invitation I must accept. All the more so because your society is celebrating this year an anniversary which recalls, in a very special way, the closeness of its association with the historic origin and the political development of this great Republic. It happened, Mr. President, that the Society of the Friendly Sons was founded in this city in the year in which the last monarch to rule in this part of North America ascended the British throne. The American frontier was still ablaze. Mason and Dixon had not yet been employed to fix the boundary between the Colonies which were to become the States of Pennsylvania and Maryland. From that early time, members of your society have been closely associated with the history of your country. They stood sponsors at the birth of the Republic; they financed the War of Independence; they sat amongst the founding fathers; they marched with Washington from Philadelphia down to victory at Yorktown. They signed the Declaration; they framed the Constitution of the United States. They were the first to proclaim and promulgate the sacred documents of the new predestined Nation which, in an interval almost precisely coterminous with the life of this society itself, was to become the leader of the world. And through all the years between, they have been the stanchest supporters of the principles and ideals which have motivated the

peoples of the United States and of Ireland in their struggle for unity and liberty.

Therefore on this one hundred and eightieth foundation anniversary I heartily congratulate you on the story which is so closely woven into the history of America. And I congratulate you also because it was here in Pennsylvania that the first attempt was made in North America to frame an instrument of practical government under which the human rights of religious liberty and of equal citizenship were safeguarded, and made basic in its law. It was the spirit of that daring and seemingly futile experiment which, when freedom finally came, gave its character, its directives and, to some extent its form, to the Constitution of the United States. At the outbreak of the Revolution there was nowhere in America a legislative body more democratic and more firmly opposed to the tyrannical exercise of royal prerogatives than the Assembly of Pennsylvania. No other part of this great country can claim so fully as this to have been the inspiration of the events through which your emancipation was achieved. But there is yet one other feature which is of vital import. I am referring, Mr. President, to the part played by the State of Pennsylvania when the unity of this Nation was imperiled and the integrity of its territory sought to be destroyed by Civil War. Six days after the bombardment of Fort Sumter two regiments of Pennsylvanian troops marched into Washington—the very first to arrive—in defense of the national capital and of national unity. Only twice during the Civil War was your State raided. But, nonetheless, it was the high tide of the Confederacy which rolled into the Cumberland Valley in that July of 1863, the second famous July in your calendar, to be stopped and turned back at Gettysburg.

I wish here to pay my tribute to the members of your Society who played so great a part in providing the most striking proof in all modern history that freedom and unity are essential to the life and ordered progress of Nations, new or old. In this connection the history of the United States shows two other things very clearly. It shows that national freedom, however powerfully challenged, can always be won and secured by an enlightened and determined people. At one stage in American history there was a proposal that an actual union should be formed between Ireland and America. If the plan of Benjamin Franklin had been followed Ireland would have become a partner in the confederation. In July 1775 Benjamin Franklin proposed to the Continental Congress draft Articles of Confederation by which Ireland could join. Of the hundred members of the Annual Congress which was to govern this confederation, forty were to be assigned to the representatives of Ireland. The proposal was not acted upon but it is an indication of the closeness of the ties which existed between our two nations.

In those early days when the people of Ireland and the people of America first began their struggles for the establishment of democracy and liberty in their respective countries, Republics were few and far between; democratic principles as we know them today were then practically unknown. Our respective peoples were not only fighting for the freedom of their countries but they were struggling also for the establishment of democracy and the assertion of fundamental human rights. The ebb and flow of this battle has not been an even one. You in the United States won your battle long before us. Indeed we have not yet won ours fully, for a portion of Ireland still remains cut away from the rest of the country against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people.

As on St. Patrick's Day our thoughts naturally turn towards Ireland you will probably expect to hear from me on account of how Ireland is faring. It is nearly 30 years ago since we obtained control of three-quarters of our country. The task which faced the successive Irish Governments was a tremendous one because it involved, in effect, the complete reconstruction of our economy. Under favorable circumstances and in normal times this would have been a difficult task, but circumstances were very far from normal.

In the first place, the industrial area in the country, the northeast, was retained by Britain; this created an unbalance in our economy. In the second place the civil war retarded progress; apart from the material damage which resulted, the divisions set up prevented, for a long period of time, the objective planning which was so necessary. Following upon the civil war we had to fight an economic war with our neighboring island which lasted practically until the outbreak of World War II.

Despite these difficulties considerable progress has been made in every field of economic activity, particularly in recent years, and I would like to pay tribute to the work of the Government that preceded the present one for the part it played in the task of national reconstruction. The task of reconstruction involved three different fields of activity:

Firstly, the utilization and development of our land resources. This involved: land division of big estates that had been owned by the absentee landlords, improved farming and agricultural methods, and better organization of marketing facilities. Apart from farming and agriculture proper, vast schemes for land drainage, for afforestation and for turf utilization have been undertaken. Vast areas that hitherto were unproductive will thus be utilized for production of food, timber, or fuel. Generating stations are being built in the center of the large bog areas for conversion of turf into electricity, so as to reduce our dependence on imported fuel; when the peat has been cut away and utilized, the land that lies beneath it is being reclaimed and will become available for agricultural purposes.

The second field of activity concerned the creation of industries. While agriculture is the basic industry of the country, it is essential to develop industries to provide employment for our people at home, to supply the needs of our population and, if possible, to produce an exportable surplus. The number of new industries created is increasing daily and industrial employment and production are rising steadily. The year 1950 has been a record year of progress in our economy. This improvement in our economic position has been reflected by the fall in unemployment and emigration and the increase in our national income.

The third main task which had to be undertaken was that of reorganizing the practically nonexistent Sicis services which we took over. New hospitals, sanitation schemes, houses had to be constructed. Within the next 5 years we are confident that these tasks will have been practically completed. At present, measures for a comprehensive social-security scheme and health service are being considered by our Parliament.

From this brief account you will realize that considerable progress has been made. Equally important is the atmosphere of hope and confidence which exists in our population.

In the political field, too, much progress has been made. There is now, since passage of the Republic of Ireland Act, complete unity regarding all questions affecting our national sovereignty and concerning the unification of our national territory. We may differ on many matters of internal policy and administration but where the question of Ireland's sovereignty or unity is involved the leaders and members of all parties stand shoulder to shoulder together.

In the field of international affairs Ireland has been playing an active part. In the Council of Europe and in the OEEC (the European Economic Organization) our policy has been to further the concept of closer cooperation and unity among European states. We have approached these questions not from any narrow, nationalistic, or insular viewpoint but, on the contrary, we have been prepared, far more readily than many other nations to make our contribution toward the unification of Europe which we believe to be essential for the economic and political revival of our civilization. While we are prepared to surrender portions of our sovereignty on a basis of reciprocity with other European nations we are not prepared to submit to the domination or exploitation of one nation.

As regards international organizations we have been precluded by Russia from becoming a member of the United Nations on the grounds, if you please, that we are not a democratic and peace-loving nation. [Laughter.]

As regards the North Atlantic Pact organization we indicated clearly our agreement with its objectives but could not enter into a military alliance with the power which, in effect, was claiming and enforcing jurisdiction within our shores. Furthermore, we pointed out that the defense of a small island such as Ireland can be undertaken effectively only by a single central authority having at its back the firm support of a decisive majority of the people. There is, of course, a natural resentment among our people against the continued denial of the application of the democratic principles in the case of Ireland. In our view the continued partition of Ireland against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people is an example of the very type of evil which it is the object of the Atlantic Pact to oppose and prevent.

Our attitude in this matter is in no way activated by feelings of hostility toward Britain based on past wrongs. On the contrary we are most anxious to develop genuinely friendly relations with Britain. Such friendly relations would be in the interest of both countries and once partition is removed it is inconceivable that Ireland should ever constitute a source of embarrassment to Britain in time of war. Indeed the very contrary would be the case. A friendly and united Ireland on Britain's western approaches is in the interest not merely of Britain and Ireland but of all the countries concerned with the security of the North Atlantic area. Constructive and sincere statesmanship would point to the necessity of the withdrawal of Britain's territorial claims in our island. By so doing Britain would be making a contribution toward strengthening the internal harmony and cohesion of the nations concerned with the security of the North Atlantic area. She would, too, relieve herself of the charge of violating the principles upon which democracy rests.

If we are proud of the part our people have played in the building of your great Nation, we are also very grateful for the sympathy and help which you have given us in the course of our struggle. Not least are we grateful for the message which George Washington sent to us in 1786 which it seems only proper that I should quote in this historic city:

"Patriots of Ireland. Champions of liberty in all lands. Your cause is identical with mine. You are calumniated in your day. I was misrepresented by the loyalists of my day. Had I failed the scaffold would have been my doom. But now my enemies pay me honor. Had I failed I would have deserved the same honor. I stood true to my cause even when victory had fled. In that I merited success. You must act likewise."

We have acted likewise and will continue to so act until Ireland is free from shore to shore.

Admiral Morton D. Willcutts

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time out of order to call to the attention of the House a news report which appeared in the newspapers this morning announcing that on April 1 Admiral Morton D. Willcutts, the head of the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md., will retire from active duty, after having served his country and all humanity ably and well for 34 long years.

Many of the Members of the House know Admiral Willcutts and appreciate his fine qualities and his great ability as a surgeon and as a physician, and the exceptionally remarkable services he has rendered this Nation as an officer in the Navy of the United States. I believe all Members of the House will join me in paying tribute to this great American and outstanding naval officer. I am sure we all wish Admiral Willcutts well upon his retirement to private life. It is our hope he may enjoy many years of good health and pleasant days in the future. Of him we can well say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

We've Missed the Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under consent given me by the House, I am including an editorial from the Wichita Eagle, of Wichita, Kans., entitled "We've Missed the Goal." The editorial is one that contains a considerable amount of food for thought. It is worthy of the consideration of not only the Members of the House but of the American people as well:

WE'VE MISSED THE GOAL

As an average citizen you must be concerned over the state of the world, and just how your own country will emerge from the present situation which is often referred to as a crisis. As the average citizen you can see only one solution of the problem. Without world peace there can be no security for the United States or any other nation. Continued rumors of war, while not as costly perhaps as actual conflict, will prevent this Nation from achieving its destiny, and continue as the citadel of freedom. If our thoughts and efforts are to be centered on war it will mean neglect of the better things which can come only with peace.

Peace, then, is the prime necessity. That admission alone seems to have done little to bring it about. There is no general agreement among our own leaders on how to attain peace. On one hand we are being urged to make the United States so strong in a military way that none will attack. Others hold to the theory that we should do just the opposite, withdraw to our own shores, and forget the other free peoples, leaving them to their own fate.

Before becoming too critical of either method ask yourself this question: Do you have a solution of your own? If the job of solving the situation was left to your own devices would you tackle it with any assurance that your way would be effective? The point, then, is that no one seems to know what to do. The state of concern over the future is no greater than the doubt that is in every heart. That mankind in general has somewhere along the way missed the goal which could have been his ultimate destiny—peace on earth, good will to all men.

The Case for Western Democracy Against Russian Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Virgil M. Hancher, president of the State University of Iowa, before the American Association of Junior Colleges, Des Moines, Iowa, March 6, 1951:

THE CASE FOR WESTERN DEMOCRACY AGAINST RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

(By Virgil M. Hancher)

I trust that you will forgive me if I invite you on this occasion to participate in the most unpleasant task that one citizen can invite another to share. I invite you to think.

Someone has observed that when we believe ourselves to be engaged in thinking, more often than not we are merely engaged in rearranging our prejudices. I can illustrate that point. We are met in the Middle West. During two World Wars this part of the United States was remote from the scenes of conflict. Therefore, many people residing here believe that we shall be remote from the scenes of conflict if there is a third world war. Is this true? If we fight Russia, must the attack come through Germany and Europe and across the Atlantic, or through Korea and Japan and across the Pacific? If Russia decides to fight, it will be because she believes she can destroy our strategic areas and defenses just as we can destroy hers. If she attacks us, where will the attack be made? Detroit, Chicago, Pittsburgh, New York, Washington seem obvious possibilities. Are they the only ones? I doubt it. The men in the Kremlin can be incredibly stupid and incredibly wise, but it is never safe for us to count on stupidity; and unless they are incredibly stupid, the possibility that they will make other strategic attacks is obvious. Such attacks might call for the destruction of the bridges across the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, and the immobilization of transcontinental and local rail and truck transportation which would result.

Notwithstanding the ominous silence about it, or perhaps because of that very silence, other attacks might call for biological warfare to be waged against humans, animals, and crops in this, the richest and most highly concentrated agricultural area in the world. If Detroit invites attack because of its automotive industry, surely Iowa invites attack because of its agricultural production. The rise of air power has put the northern United States on the new frontier, but this is an exceedingly unpleasant prospect, and, therefore, instead of thinking about it and planning for it, we tend to rearrange our prejudices and ignore it as much as possible.

So it has been in our consideration of communism. For more than 30 years we have avoided thinking communism and have merely rearranged our prejudices. We have assumed that because we did not like communism, it must necessarily fail. Perhaps it will, but no longer can we afford the luxury of error. If western democracy has a case against communism, we should know what it is. I invite you to think about this subject during the remainder of my remarks.

No task could be more congenial to me than that of presenting the case for western democracy against communism in response to the invitation extended to me by your executive director some months ago. I do this with the greater willingness because I believe that we are often in error; first, in our estimates of the strengths and weaknesses of communism; and next, in our understanding of our own civilization and way of life.

Perhaps the most significant feature of the attitude of the western nations toward communism since the Russian revolution of November 1917 has been their sincere and utter belief that it could not endure. Yet a movement which has lasted for 32 years is no passing fancy, especially when it appears to be stronger at the close of that period than at any other time during the period.

What have been the factors contributing to our disbelief in the capacity of communism to endure? The first and most obvious was pointed out by John Maynard Keynes more than a quarter of a century ago. It is that we mistook the Russian revolution for an economic movement, and because we deemed its economic basis fallacious we thought that the movement must fail. This was an error. To evaluate communism, especially the communism of the U. S. S. R. in terms of economics alone, is to misjudge it fundamentally. As Keynes pointed out with insight and clarity, the bad economics of primitive Christianity did not cause that movement to fail. On the contrary, the zeal and faith of its adherents permitted it to exist and grow despite its bad economics. So it has been with communism. The zeal of its devotees has enabled it to exist and grow in defiance of its economic doctrines. Those who looked for its early collapse on this ground were doomed to disappointment. Unless we are prepared to see in it more resemblances to a religious than to an economic movement, we are in error of misjudging communism as completely and as tragically today as we have misjudged it every year since 1917.

Up to this time we have misjudged the staying power of Russian communism. In part we have done so because we have gaged its acceptance in the U. S. S. R. by western

rather than by Russian standards. If anything is demonstrably clear, it is that Russian communism has not produced as high a standard of material well-being for the people of the U. S. S. R. as is enjoyed by the people of the United States or even by the people of Western Europe. Because of this, we have expected the Russian people to be dissatisfied and to revolt. But here again we have deceived ourselves. By the devices of the iron curtain and of internal propaganda, the party has been able to control the information received by the Russian people concerning conditions outside the Soviet orbit, and to a very considerable degree to control their thinking on the information they have received.

But in another respect we have overlooked the fact that for the masses in Russia, communism probably represents an advance from the economic conditions prevailing under the Czars. The Russian standard of living may be grossly inferior to that of Western Europe and America, but the better-informed opinion seems to be that it has improved in relation to the only standards which the Russian people have ever known. The whole propaganda technique of the Kremlin is directed to this fact, to the fact that communism is the wave of the future, and that, once the enemies of communism have been destroyed, the proletariat will come into his own. I once asked an English friend of mine, who had lived through the revolution in St. Petersburg, why the Russian people accepted the revolutionary regime. His answer was, "Why not? What did they have to lose?" Is it not clear, then, that in considering the acceptability of the Russian regime to the Russian people, we must not think of the problem in our own terms and according to our own standards, but rather in terms of the background, experience, and expectations of the Russian people? The more we divorce ourselves from our own peculiar outlook on life and on the world, the less we shall expect an early dissolution of Russian power from within.

One of the major handicaps to international understanding is the assumption on the part of almost every nation, people, or race that its particular religion, philosophy, culture, or way of life is superior to that of every other. This lay at the bottom of the Chinese dislike for foreigners, the seclusion of the Japanese, the racial theories of German extremists, the alleged or real arrogance of the British, and our own conviction that we live in God's country and somehow are under a special dispensation. This common national shortcoming is a barrier to true international understanding. In this respect we are no more guilty than many other nations, and perhaps we are no less guilty. There is nothing about it that should make us desire to give up Coca-Cola, automobiles, television, our standard of living, or any other part of the material basis of our culture. At the same time, we stand in a peculiar relation to the non-Communist world, and that relation places upon us a fearful responsibility to assess correctly the power and the durability of the Russians and their satellites and allies. In that assessment we must not assume that, because we loathe the tyrannical practices of communism, other peoples will necessarily share the loathing.

We should remember that the Russian people, in common with all the peoples of Asia, lack the traditions of freedom and justice and democracy that we possess. In his book, I Write as I Please, Walter Duranty tells a story to illustrate the difference between the psychology of the Russians (many of whom are basically oriental) and of Western Europeans and Americans. During one of the periods of food shortage in Russia in the 1920's, there was a surplus of wheat in one part of Russia and many people starving in another part. Although orders had been given for the surplus wheat to be shipped, it somehow failed to pass through a bottleneck in a certain junction town, and shipments were held up interminably at that point. A high Soviet official from Moscow went to a nearby city to investigate. Telegrams to the junction were sent out. There were no replies. Others were sent and still there were no replies. Finally the official himself went to the junction town. Finding the minor official who, in obedience to a stupid rule, had filed the telegrams without reply, he caused the man and his two superior officers to be taken forthwith to the courtyard of the railway office and shot. There was no trial, but the procedure was effective. The railway employees knew what was wanted. They knew that the shipments of wheat were to be expedited and that there was to be no more delay. To a Western European or an American, nothing could have been more unjust than the shooting of those men. But to the Russians, it was an action that they understood. They knew that Moscow meant business. Thereafter the wheat came through without delay and without fail.

But, perhaps our gravest error in evaluating the strength of communism has been our failure to realize that the Marxist philosophy undertakes to give a complete account of the origin of the universe and of the development and destiny of human society and of man. Marx, Engels, and Lenin all sought an ultimate reality, something on which to base a philosophy that would account for everything in the universe. In seeking this goal, they developed the theory of a universe springing from ceaseless motion and chance, first quantitative, then qualitative, until the earth and finally man himself was created. Marxist acknowledged that in olden times men had to use the hypothesis of God in order to understand the universe, but today they reject this attitude and regard religion merely as the persistence of a prescientific attitude in the minds of the people. They regard belief in God as a kind of cultural lag, characteristic of backward and unscientific persons.

Paul B. Anderson, a member of the International Committee of the YMCA, and a long-time student of Russian ideology and tactics, has pointed out that:

"There are four cornerstones in the Marxist structure: First, a philosophy of reality in which motion, change, is the central idea; second, a body of men integrated into and directing this process of change; third, the relegation of God and religion to the status of an anachronism; and fourth, the view that man becomes a real man only after he has consciously identified himself with the Communist interpretation of the creative process."[1]

On these four cornerstones rests the Communist ideology, a kind of godless theology (contradictory as that may seem which presents to the satisfaction of the Communists a complete account of the origin and existence of the universe and of man and of all past and contemporary phenomena. It even has its counterpart of those who are "saved"—that is, workers and others related to the creative process—and those who are "damned"—that is, capitalists and functionaries of capitalism who are outside the creative process. Apparently it also had its organizational counterpart of those who are nominal members of the church, that is, the rank and file of the party, and of those who are "the elect," that is, those who regulate the stream of motion which is our universe and have it within their power to dominate the creative process. These elect are the Politburo, the political bureau of the party.

Now we may deplore the vicious aspects of the class struggle and the emasculation of religion which restricts it exclusively to the experience of man's relationship to his God; we may deplore the oppression, the tyranny, and the slavery practiced by the dominant political group; but the fact remains that the most striking feature of the Marxist ideology is its resemblance to a religion without God. It has its dogmas; it has its organization and its hierarchy; it has its devotees and its communicants; it has its martyrs and its saints; it has its missionaries. It, too, has obeyed an injunction to go into all the world and preach the gospel—to preach, as some say, sacrilegiously perhaps, the gospel according to "St. Marx."

Unless one accepts Marxism in these terms, as in effect a religion without God, how does one account for Fuchs and Gold and many other self-confessed believers in and tools of communism whose conduct seems as eccentric and inexplicable to us as the conduct of the Christian martyrs must have seemed to the solid citizenry of imperial Rome? The faith of the Marxists that their ideology presents a world view, that it is the wave of the future, that ultimately it must and will prevail, constitutes the gravest threat that communism has to offer to our way of life, a threat more grave than atom bombs or hydrogen bombs or dark and treacherous conspiracy, because it is a threat in the realm of the spirit, and in the realm of the spirit ideas can be dangerous to the established order, as Christianity has proved in more than one of the last 20 centuries.

Finally, it must be remembered that to millions, even hundred of millions, of people who have never known the standard of living enjoyed by the poorest 10 percent of the population of the United States, communism offers hope. In Russia, in China, in southeast Asia, its appeal is one of hope for the future, for a more abundant life under the dictatorship of the proletariat, for a part in that world revolution which, according to Marxist dogma, will inevitably overthrow the kingdoms of this capitalistic world and usher in the utopia of the classless society. To those who have lived without hope, the appeal of the Marxist dogma must be enormous. What have we offered, what can we offer, to the hungry millions of distant lands to offset the appeal of the Communists?

II

As I take up the affirmative task of presenting the challenge of western democracy to imperialistic communism, it seems appropriate to delimit the task by a definition of terms. I take it that the term "western democracy," as it is used in the title of these remarks, refers not so much to politics and political organization as to the total political, economic, social, and cultural organization and way of life of the people of the United States; for, notwithstanding the great traditions of freedom and justice and the dignity of man, which are common to the cultures of Western Europe and America, there are other differences which are broad and deep. I need cite only two. In an article in the Atlantic Monthly for March 1951, Dr. Perry Miller points out fundamental differences in the academic traditions of Western Europe and America that grow out of the concept of education for a cultural elite on the one hand and the concept of education for a free and open society on the other. Moreover, European capitalism, like capitalism in all parts of the world outside the United States, is dominated by the concept of a closed market wherein the capitalistic enterprise, through monopoly or cartels, seeks to eliminate competition in order to increase profits without recognizing any corresponding obligation to increase the wages of labor and hereby enlarge the

[1] Anderson, Paul B., Can Marxism Make Room for Religion? The Living Church, January 29, 1950, p. 10. See also, Communism and Christian Education, World Christian Education, vol. V, No. 2, p. 36 (1950).

market and create a greater number of potential buyers of goods. In these and other respects, the differences between European and American thought and practice are so fundamental that they cannot be treated within the limits of this address; and, therefore, the points which I shall make should be tested for their truth or falsity by consideration of the American scene, with a full awareness on my part that they may not be equally applicable, or that they may not be applicable at all, to the nations of Western Europe.

Now in presenting affirmatively the challenge of western democracy against imperialistic communism, I am impressed by the fact that far too often we have failed to understand our own society and way of life. As we stand in this time of testing and trial, we must be clear about our own society and way of life. Without clarity of understanding in ourselves, we cannot communicate its distinctive features to others. The writings of Henry Steel Commager, of Gerald W. Johnson and of many others are clear evidence of our struggle toward such an understanding. Perhaps one of the most significant efforts—because it came from a quarter in which it might not have been anticipated—appears in the February 1951 issue of Fortune magazine, whose entire contents are given over to an interpretation of our way of life under the heading "U. S. A.—The Permanent Elevolution." This spokesman for the rich and powerful, for the leaders of finance and industry, reminds us of what is often forgotten by the foundering sons of the founding fathers—that our independence was won as the result of a revolution, that we are the descendants of revolutionaries, and that our progress and development have depended upon revolutionary departures from traditional modes of thought and action, from the establishment of a republic rather than a monarchy in our earliest days to the adoption of the techniques of mass production and high wages for labor in our later days. This freshness of outlook, this creativeness of mind, this unwillingness to accept any problem as insoluble, this indomitableness of spirit, in short the American Revolution itself, constitutes our first, and one of our very greatest, challenges to communism.

In the field of politics and political institutions, not only are we the heirs of the great tradition of freedom and justice and the dignity of man, but we have translated those great concepts into the practical realities of representative government, of the federal principle in governmental organization, and of the right of judicial review as a protection against the tyranny of man over man and the tyranny of government itself over the liberties of the citizen. In our enthusiasm over these great accomplishments, we must not claim perfection for ourselves. We, too, have sinned and fallen short of our goals. Does anyone suppose that the democracy of Chicago in the Capone era, of Kansas City under Pendergast, of Pennsylvania under Penrose and Vare, and of New York under Tammany offers a challenge to communism that would appeal to the peoples of India, China, or Russia? Would the nullification of representative government, by the disregard of constitutional provisions for reapportionment, from Connecticut to Oregon, constitute an appeal? Will the introduction into government of those old-fashioned principles of industrial organization that call for the centralization of power and authority constitute such an appeal? We must remember that freedom and justice and the dignity of man are not the product of the centralization of power and authority. On the contrary, they are nourished and protected by a kind of "pluralism" unique to our society—a kind of pluralism which makes it possible to have clubs and associations, charities and foundations, churches and schools, colleges and universities, manufacturers' associations and labor unions existing under every form of organization and sponsored by every kind of group interest. Some are wise. Some are foolish. Some are pernicious. But, on balance, the contribution which they make to the understanding, the variety, and the stability of our way of life is beyond price. And, likewise, on balance the weakness as well as the strength, the alleged inefficiency as well as the efficiency of our political institutions are not only safeguards of freedom and justice and the dignity of man; they are as well a challenge to the tyranny of communism.

Another revolutionary departure from traditional modes of thought and action occurs in one of the least understood features of our way of life—the unique nature of our industrial order. There is no apt word to describe it. More often than not it is referred to as capitalism, but every student of capitalism knows that our industrial order has features that distinguish it from capitalism elsewhere in the world. As I have pointed out above, capitalism in Europe means monopoly and cartels and a closed and limited market. In Asia it means exploitation. In Asia it means the exploitation of labor, the exploitation of natural resources, and the siphoning off of wealth so that the native populations remain poor and enslaved in order that the few may live in luxury.

Throughout the nations of Asia, capitalism shares the stigma of the "white man's burden." Both suggest the dominance of the foreigner and the subservience of the native. The revolt of native Asian populations against foreign political domination carries with it a revolt against foreign exploitive capitalism as well. This explains the strong movement of many Asiatic nations toward socialism or even communism. It is a reaction, a revulsion, from the exploitative capitalism to which the Asiatics have been subjected for many decades. Thus the description of our system as capitalistic plays directly into the propaganda schemes of the Communists and adds fuel to the flames of hatred against America so carefully fanned in Asia by Communist propaganda. To be sure our system is capitalistic, and in my judgment should remain so, but to describe it as capitalistic is to miss the point that it is unlike the capitalism of Asia and even unlike the capitalism of Europe. It is to miss the point that our system has certain unique characteristics that distinguish it from capitalism elsewhere in the world. It is to miss the point that the distinctive characteristics of our economy are the mass production of goods and services in industry and agriculture and high wages and high living standards for the people as a whole.

Obviously one of the great appeals of communism has been the purely materialistic promise of a higher standard of living. It is an appeal to the exploited and downtrodden. "Arise ye slaves who know starvation. Shake off the curse that binds the earth," says the "Internationale," the international anthem of the Communists. It is an appeal to the hungry, the homeless, and the forsaken. The promise of communism is the promise that the proletariat shall come into its own, that the hungry shall have food, that the homeless shall have shelter, and that the downtrodden shall be raised up.

So far this promise of communism has not been fulfilled in any part of the world. Only in the countries of Western Europe and America has it been demonstrated that the elimination of hunger and poverty is not a fanciful dream of the philosophers. We have come close enough to the fact to know that, for us at least it can be done. And we have come to that point by mass production and by the distribution of the results of that mass production into a high standard of living. What more powerful appeal could we make to the hungry, the sick, and the homeless all over the world than the promise that what we have done may be adapted to help in the solution of their problems? If ever their hunger and poverty and distress are to be relieved, here are instruments to their need. But too much of the time this powerful challenge to communism is kept carefully wrapped in silence, while we invite the resistance and ill-will of Asiatic peoples by praise of a capitalism which to them means exploitation or slavery.

The continuance of our material well-being is impossible without mass production and high wages. It is impossible without gigantic aggregations of capital and labor. We cannot have the one without the other. Yet in peace our people seek to fetter the genius of our industrial organization, and in war or danger beg it to bring its knowledge and resources to our defense. How can we present our way of life to our allies, to the non-Communist world, or to the peoples behind the iron curtain, unless we understand it and believe in it ourselves? Here we have at hand a powerful weapon in the war against communism, but it will never serve us unless we ourselves comprehend its unique characteristics and learn to use it as a weapon.

Another revolutionary departure from traditional modes of thought and action, another challenge which our western democracy offers to Russian communism, lies in the challenge of a free and open society. True enough, this is a goal that we have never completely achieved. True enough, discriminatory practices and race segregation are flatly contradictory to our goals. But who would dare to say that our intolerances, however great, are to be compared with the intolerances of the Russian regime in its mass trials, its purges, and its enslavement of millions of people in prison camps and Siberian wastes? What shall it profit a man to escape a penalty for the color of his skin, only to incur a penalty for the color of his views? Each is wrong, but who shall say that the first wrong is greater than the second?

Only a free and open society can be tolerant. Its frontiers are open to the free interchange of ideas. Its occupations are so diversified and complex that everyone, whatever the nature or the limitation of his talent, can find a useful and satisfying calling. As W. H. Auden has said:

"Such a community would be tolerant because it found every kind of person useful, and its members socially responsible because conscious of being needed."[2]

Thus everyone who functions effectively at the level of his capacity will be needed and respected. He will be deemed a worthy member of society whether he be street sweeper or president.

Implicit in the concept of such a society is the idea of universal education. Again this must be at the level of the capacity of the individual. Not equality, but equality of opportunity is the goal; and there can be no equality of opportunity unless the doors and windows of the mind are thrown open to the light of knowledge. Universal education has not been achieved. Admittedly it is a goal. But it is an indispensable goal if we, with inferior numbers, are to stand firm and secure against the hosts of communism. In his Farewell Address upon leaving the presidency, Washington said: "Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened." Universal education is an indispensable goal if we are to present a free and open society as a challenge to the closed and stratified society of the Communists, if each individual is to

[2] Auden, W. H., "Criticism in a Mass Society," in the Intent of the Critic, p. 131.

develop in response to his desires and capacities rather than in response to the needs and the politics of the state. Never in our history has it been so important that our schools and colleges and universities be dedicated to freedom—in order that truth may be discovered and may prevail, to justice—in order that it may be our "set and constant purpose to render to every man his due,"[8] and to the dignity of man—in order that man made in the image of God may tread the earth without fear.

Another revolutionary departure from traditional modes of thought and action, another challenge to imperialistic communism, lies in the incorporation and commingling of the spiritual values of the Jewish and Christian tradition into the very fabric of our daily lives. The Jews have been called a "God-intoxicated people." The Old Testament is the record of their long, long search for the one true God and for a knowledge of His law. Both Jews and Christians among us cry out in their hearts for righteousness. Nevertheless, we have been called a materialistic people. Our civilization has been called a materialistic civilization. To the extent that the accumulation of money has become the sole or even the predominant goal of individual members of our society, to that extent we are a materialistic people. To conclude from this point, however, that our civilization is devoid of spiritual values is a superficial judgment. It is true that we talk about money and material values, oftentimes to the distress of our friends in other parts of the world, but to assert that we place greater value on them than do Europeans or Asians is to close our eyes to obvious facts. Nowhere in the world can one see a more fixed determination of the poor to become rich or of the rich to stay rich than can be seen throughout the Orient. And it is often suspected that the privileges of party leaders in Russia are the equivalent of great wealth.

To call our civilization materialistic and money-minded is to leave unaccounted for the endowment of great hospitals and foundations, of schools and colleges and universities, of churches and charities, and of a hundred and one other things that bring to our common life a kindly and humanitarian spirit unprecedented in the long history of mankind. If our people are not visibly moved in their daily lives by a burning religious zeal, at least they live in an afterglow of a religious faith, that commands them to love their neighbors as themselves. Both Jews and Christians among us hearken to the commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Much that we do falls short of the perfection called for by these commandments, but no one can understand us who does not know that the spiritual values implicit in these commandments are woven into the very texture of our being and permeate both the form and the direction of our society.

Perhaps in this respect we do not even understand ourselves. Perhaps we do not understand the forces of our own American Revolution. Our actions are permeated with wisdom and goodness, but we may have lost sight of the fact that wisdom and goodness are the goals of living. If that be true, we must seek once more to know what wisdom and goodness are. Contrary to our accepted beliefs, the most deadly challenge of communism lies in the fact that it presents a philosophy. Life has a goal. Life makes sense. To its adherents, the Marxist philosophy gives meaning to life. We can meet this only with a greater challenge. We can meet this with a world view which gives a meaning to life transcending the materialism that stands at the heart of communism. We are the heirs of a tradition possessing such a meaning. We must seek to apprehend that tradition anew, because our political, economic, and social structures and actions, permeated, enlightened, and strengthened by the highest spiritual values of western man constitute our last and mightiest challenge to the theories and forces of communism.

Shall we stand in terror before the challenges of communism or shall we, possessing a giant's strength and conscious of that strength, be strong and of good courage?

The choice is ours. The challenge is before us. Upon our wisdom and faith and courage may depend the course of civilization for a thousand years. In this crucial hour we must not fail.

[8] The Institutes of Justinian.

Economy in Military Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, the following letter:

We all are cognizant of the great importance of the defense effort and the necessity of building up an adequate military organization. However, in doing this it is necessary that the economy of our country be maintained on a strong level because it is just as important that we remain economically strong as it is that we become militarily strong and remain so. Both must be correlated if we are to accomplish the purpose of the program that we believe will serve to maintain the peace in the world today.

In these trying times, and especially in view of the tax burden already on our people as well as the huge additional tax burden contemplated to be added shortly, it seems to me that now as never before it is necessary that we have economy in the use of our military manpower as well as financial economy.

The general feeling among those people whom I have contacted appears to be that the several branches of the Armed Forces are more or less in a race to build up their strength without due and adequate consideration being given to proper utilization of this strength in the so-called housekeeping or office work of the various branches. We all realize that a certain amount of office work must be done by the personnel of the several branches of the service. It would appear, however, that a great amount of this type of work could be done by civilians at considerable savings in military manpower as well as monetary.

It seems to me that a searching survey should be made by the Defense Department, going into all phases of this important matter so that wherever possible those members of the Armed Forces who are physically fit and trained may be utilized as such rather than to have them doing work that civilians or limited-service personnel could do just as well.

Recently the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, of which committee I am a member, went fully into the manpower situation as it affects agriculture and related industries. Apparently this vital phase of our economy is or will be shortly facing a serious manpower shortage for several reasons. Many workers are being drawn into high-paying defense projects and, of course, many of these workers are being taken into the Armed Forces. Other industries apparently also will be facing critical shortages in the near future.

Necessarily, potential military manpower is relatively scarce due to the high standards set by the Armed Forces and the comparatively small group which they have to choose from. With this in mind, it seems to me that a reevaluation of the situation should be made by the Defense Department. Lower standards wherever possible should be adopted as to mental capacity, and certainly some of our manpower in the approved group with minor deficiencies could be used in the so-called housekeeping work of the Department, thus allowing able-bodied, physically fit, and well-trained personnel of the Armed Forces to be counted among the field forces.

I have heard it said, unofficially, of course, and not from an authoritative source, that the military has more personnel in the Pentagon today than it had at the height of World War II. If it will not give aid and comfort to the enemy or adversely affect the defense effort, I would like very much to have a comparison between the present military strength at the Pentagon and as it was at the height of World War II. I would also like to know the exact number of officers and men who are members of the Armed Forces now on duty at the Pentagon, by rank. I am wondering if there aren't a number of physically fit and trained personnel being used there and elsewhere as chauffeurs, office workers, and handy men, more or less, and if these positions could not be filled by the women of our country or men who are not physically fit for full military duties.

I would appreciate hearing from you in regard to these matters.

Since writing this letter my investigation, which, of course, was very cursory, convinces me that the armed services, in many instances, are operating in utter disregard of proper utilization of manpower, as well as financial economy. I believe it is going to be necessary to have a searching inquiry on the part of Congress into this matter before adequate relief can be expected. After the Easter recess it is my present intention to initiate such a proposal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter that I have recently received from a young man who is a member of the armed services and whom I have known all of his life. He is a splendid young man, well educated and entirely reliable. The letter is as follows:

As this diatribe progresses, I hope you will not think I've taken the term "servant of the people" too seriously. My many letters to you are a result of my confidence in your ability and personal integrity.

Today I went back to work for the Army and worked about 4 hours for which I was paid a little over $7, plus quarters for my family, my food, and clothing, and a form of security. Now I realize that some of us are paid for experience and ability and that higher pay is an inducement to greater effort and, in fact, the pay would be well earned, if our time were well used. What I am trying to say is: Why curbs, shortages, and restrictions in civilian life while we waste time, material, and manpower? Today the Army cries for all of these, yet I would estimate that considerably less than a majority of these is put to a good use.

Sometime ago there was a great clamor to economize—brought to a halt by the Korean incident, but why not save while economy is a greater virtue than ever? Why not make the Armed Forces and other Government services live within their budgets instead of letting them spend more and more per unit, even in time of comparative peace?

Since the channel is being put to more uses and more fantastic results are being accomplished, why not budget small units on the channel plan? Small units cause the expense; and here is a typical example: This morning five trucks took about 50 of us about 8 miles for a class in wire installation. Equipment needed consisted of wire, pliers, and tape. Any locale that contains trees, which abound 20 feet from the barracks is suitable, but we went to a special location, consuming 50 man-hours per hour for 3 hours, the equipment and the wear and tear on vehicles. This venture, I estimate, cost the taxpayer about $80.83, while the same could have been accomplished for about $33 and would have released 50 men for the 2 hours consumed in travel.

Well, now you have an idea of what I mean and why I wonder when I hear talk of another billion or so here and there.

As I mentioned, an individual is a voice in the wilderness, but since free speech prevails and since the combined voices of the citizens of our country determine our actions—let us hope.

Venereal Disease Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article by Dr. E. Gurney Clark, of Columbia University, reporting the present status of venereal disease control in our country:

IS VENEREAL DISEASE NO LONGER A PROBLEM?[1]

(By E. Gurney Clark, M. D.[2])

A wave of optimism pervades medical and public health circles in respect to the status of venereal disease control. "Penicillin, the panacea, is at hand. Venereal disease control is imminent." In accordance with one of our objectives, "to disseminate authoritative information," this hypothesis should be critically examined by the American Venereal Disease Association to determine if the optimism is warranted, or is possibly premature.

To this end the following questions are raised:

(1) Is venereal disease now a problem? If so, why, to whom, and to what extent is it a problem?

(2) Is venereal disease control imminent?

(3) If so, how can control be maintained?

1. Is venereal disease now a problem? Yes, syphilis is a problem because of the character of the causative agent, because of certain human characteristics, the nature of the disease, and the character of the environment in which people live. The organism is one that requires moisture to live and is thus associated with the moisture of intimate contact and thus is linked with sex and sex attitudes, with the result that infected persons hide their infections. It is a problem because of certain human characteristics: lack of interest in health, lack of knowledge, and willingness to take chances with mild, painless lesions. It is a problem because of the nature of the disease itself: the interaction between the host and the parasitic agent, symptomless infection, evanescence of early signs. It is a problem because of environment, particularly the social and biologic environment, differences in educational attainment, standards of living, cost and availability of medical services. Gonorrhea is a problem because it is caused by an organism with similar biologic requirements and is thus related to sex. It is a problem because in women the disease frequently goes symptomless for many years. Yes, venereal disease is now a problem.

To whom is venereal disease a problem?

(a) To the patient? No, provided there is early discovery and adequate treatment. However, according to estimates, syphilis is a problem to more than half of the people who acquire it, since more than half the cases are undiscovered during the primary and secondary stages.

(b) Is it a problem to the physician in practice? Not from the standpoint of treatment, despite the fact that we cannot define "adequate" treatment for each individual case. There is no problem provided the patient remains under observation. Yet, until the many unknowns about this disease are solved, it will be a scientific problem as long as a case remains. The causative organism of syphilis has not yet been cultivated. We have no vaccine. We know very little about the natural history of the untreated infection; the duration of infectiousness; the mechanism of immunity; the mechanism of infection in utero; the selectivity of the disease for certain tissues; the nature of reagin upon which our nonspecific serologic tests are based. These gaps in our medical knowledge make syphilis a definite problem to the physician.

(c) Is it a problem to the health officer and the community? This can be answered by quoting from remarks made by Dr. W. H. Aufranc, of the Venereal Disease Division, United States Public Health Service, at a recent meeting devoted to the subject: Are Venereal Diseases Disappearing? He pointed out that in 1949 syphilis: (1) infected 150,000 persons in the United States, 80,000 of which cases went undiscovered; (2) sent 6,000 persons to mental institutions; (3) infected prenatally 14,000 innocent children; (4) killed 13,000 people. He also stated that it has been estimated that if the population of the United States were tested today, 3,000,000 people would be found to have positive serologic tests for syphilis. It is, then, a definite problem to the health officer and the community.

2. Is venereal disease control imminent? Eighteen years ago Parran said, "Syphilis can never be controlled while more than one-half of the cases are not recognized for more than a year after onset." What is the situation now? There has been an encouraging decline in the numbers of cases of primary and secondary syphilis reported by States and Territories from 1946 to the present. More recently, a slight decline has been noted in reported cases of early latent, but none in late and late latent and congenital syphilis. These latter facts are discouraging and disturbing. The diagnosis of early latent, late, and late latent syphilis means the diagnosis of cases which were not recognized during the first year, or indeed the first several years, of infection. These represent our failures in case finding at a most critical time in the course of the disease. A rough estimate of the extent of the failure may be made by allocating a portion of reported cases of early latent syphilis in any one year to previous years when, as primary and secondary, they were not discovered. This approximation reveals that in only 1 year, 1947, did the discovered cases of primary and secondary syphilis exceed those not discovered. Furthermore, approximately 120,000 late and late latent and 16,000 cases of congenital syphilis are reported each year. These must be added to our failures. It is an old epidemiologic principle that successful control of communicable disease depends upon the recognition and the elimination of sources of infection. We are still missing more than we recognize. It can be stated without question that at the present, 18 years after Parran's statement, still more than one-half of the cases are not recognized for more than a year after onset.

3. If control is at hand, how can it be maintained? There are and have been areas of so-called low prevalence in the United States and in other parts of the world. By critical analysis of the maintenance methods used in these areas, we should be able to apply immediately the most effective ones so as to insure safety from the venereal diseases forever. Have we studied critically these methods? Do we know what to do? The first step should be to test the assumption of low prevalence by thorough use of all case-finding methods, reaching as many people as possible in the population in question. If the low-prevalence assumption is correct, then we can test certain hypotheses as to maintenance programs. If not, a careful analysis of the data will yield information to assist in defining areas of true low prevalence.

There is additional information needed to plan an effective maintenance program. What to include in such a program will depend upon the effectiveness of measures previously used. What do we know about these measures individually? Have we evaluated them sufficiently to know which measures are responsible for our present accomplishment?

Any program of syphilis control or maintenance must take into account the biologic characteristics of this particular agent-host relationship. These characteristics make it impossible: (1) to eliminate the organism in the physical environment; (2) to eliminate contact; (3) to immunize; and (4) to practice mass quarantine except by treatment. Therefore, maintenance efforts must be directed toward methods which continue the reduction of effective exposures to the treponema pallidum such as: (1) a continued reduction of total exposures by decreasing promiscuity; (2) prophylaxis; (3) maintenance of adequate treatment and follow-up requirements; and (4) a further reduction of periods of infectiousness by early recognition of infection. This latter means case finding. Those methods of case finding which will best serve a maintenance program remain to be found.

SUMMARY

1. The venereal diseases, particularly syphilis and gonorrhea, are still public health problems of the first magnitude.

2. Considerable progress has been made in their control, but from present criteria control is not imminent.

3. Information relating to adequate low-level maintenance measures is lacking.

CONCLUSION

The present optimism in respect to the immediate control of the venereal diseases in the United States as a whole cannot be substantiated in fact.

[1] Presidential address, twelfth annual meeting, American Venereal Disease Association, Washington, D. C., April 28, 1950.

[2] Professor of epidemiology, School of Public Health of the Faculty of Medicine, Columbia University.

Civil-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association:

CHAPTER CONTACT

One of the greatest services members of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association remaining at home can render to the Nation at the present time is active participation in the civil-defense effort of the community in which we reside.

The training experience you have gained as officers in the Marine Corps has qualified you to render excellent service to the Nation in the Civil Defense Corps.

Civil defense can no longer be looked upon as a fad, hobby, or as a social gathering. America for the first time in her history faces the probability of attack, by an enemy nation, of her industrial areas and population centers.

It is no longer sufficient to build up the Nation's military strength and war production. Attacks by the enemy with modern weapons will be aimed not only at destroying our war production but also designed to break the morale of the American public.

We must organize to protect our home front, to minimize destruction and casualties, to learn all about the effects of atomic weapons in order to dispel the fear that breeds from the unknown and the resultant panic and hysteria which may cause as many casualties as the enemy attack itself. We must all learn the safety measures that can be taken to insure our own personal safety and we must pass these on to others.

This organizing and training must of necessity be voluntary. There is neither money or manpower to organize a paid civil-defense effort. The very principles of civil defense are self-help, both individual and community; mutual aid or help from others when disaster is so great that the community cannot cope with it.

Teaching this "self-help" and organizing the civil-defense program will require considerable sacrifice. It is comparatively simple to go out and enroll volunteers—that is, to get the names. Providing the organization which will direct the efforts of these volunteers and establishing a training program to make their services more effective will require considerably more effort and sacrifice of time.

This is where the men and women of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association can be utilized to the best effect. Your previous training has emphasized the need for instruction and leadership. Your experience has provided you with these qualifications.

You say "Nothing will ever happen to my community." Perhaps you do not live in a critical target area—that does not mean that your community has no part in the civil defense effort. It merely indicates the type of planning and organization you must undertake to assist other communities which are in critical target areas in furnishing mobile civil defense support and mutual aid. We all hope and pray that there never may be any occasion for using the civil defense organization but we can't afford to take the chance of being unprepared.

A trained organization ready to meet emergencies will save thousands of American lives and may spell the difference between victory and defeat should war come. The word "survival" has become almost synonymous with civil defense. Whether we survive may actually depend upon the efficiency of the home front preparations and our readiness in the event of disaster.

Considerable study has been made of all phases of civil defense. A number of official pamphlets and books have been published. Among these are United States Civil Defense, which outlines the problems which must be met and serves as a guide for organization to meet these problems; Survival Under Atomic Attack, which outlines what everyone should know relative to safety measures; Health Services and Special Weapons Defense; The Medical Aspects of Atomic Weapons, and many others. These booklets all give authentic information on the subject of civil defense and are available either through your local civil-defense authorities or from the Government Printing Office.

Civil-defense organization will differ with the requirements of the community. It may be that your community can use your entire chapter in one activity—your community plan on the other hand may be such that it can only employ the individuals within your chapter in several activities. Whatever the requirements are you owe it to yourself and your community to render whatever service you can.

Remember that an attack if it comes is directed against the people of the United States and the people must be prepared to meet it. It cannot be met if we "let George do it."

We hear much about lack of funds for this and that. It is true that civil-defense operations will eventually require considerable money. However there is a great deal of work to be done in organizing and training prior to the actual need for money. Marines have always known how to operate on a shoestring so this will be no new problem to conquer for you.

Every chapter is urged to immediately contact the civil-defense authority in your own community and offer the services of the membership in whatever phase of the civil-defense effort they can be most effectively employed, or in the event no civil-defense organization has been established, to take the necessary steps to organize one under the constituted authorities.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

JACKSON CITY BANK & TRUST CO.,
Jackson, Mich., March 14, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: I have read in the press in the past few days that there is a movement to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I, for one, should very much dislike seeing this brought about. Notwithstanding the fact that a lot of unfavorable publicity has come out during the current investigation, I feel that the RFC, over-all, has done a very good job and should be continued.

This bank has handled more RFC loans, I understand, than any other bank in Michigan, and there has never been a loss.

The banks in the large cities have been prime movers for abolishing the RFC, saying that there is no longer a need for it and that they are capable of handling all applications. However, if we take an application to a large city bank and ask them to participate with us in a loan which would run for a term of years and wherein there is real estate and other collateral involved, they quickly step aside and say that they are not interested. If we take to them an application from a company which shows a wonderful financial statement and perhaps wants to borrow money for from 3 to 6 months, they will, of course, be very glad to handle all or any part of such a loan.

I feel that there is a distinct need for the RFC, especially for the small business which needs term money for fixed assets.

Very truly yours,

C. F. SPAETH,
President.

MARCH 19, 1951.

CARL F. SPAETH,
President, Jackson City Bank & Trust Co., Jackson, Mich.

DEAR CARL: Thank you very much for your letter of March 14, expressing your views on the present need for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The work I did with the Fulbright Committee—before resigning last August to run for Congress—led me to the tentative conclusion that long-term loans on fixed assets for small businesses did not seem to be available from private credit sources, except at extremely high interest rates. It was my hope that the study of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would lead to the development of sound practices for processing applications for loans of this type and servicing them, which might lead the way to the development of an attractive field in private financing which now seems to be neglected. I am somewhat familiar with the benefits to small enterprises, arising from Reconstruction Finance Corporation financing, wholly aside from the financial relief granted.

Frequently small-business men neglect to give attention to accounting and planning, to the extent they ought to for their own good. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through its processing of applications and subsequent servicing of loans, frequently helps such small concerns to establish more businesslike procedures. Banking institutions, generally, cannot afford to maintain the staff of engineers, examiners, etc., through which consulting and advisory functions are performed, and through which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in my judgment, has been able to modify and reconstruct the business operations of an applicant so that a loan to him is a safe business risk.

Therefore, it is my feeling, which is contrary to the position of the Republican policy committee of both the House and the Senate, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation ought not to be abolished until the problem of providing financial assistance to small-business enterprises has been dealt with more effectively than it has up to the present time. I appreciate that the relief afforded through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation falls far short of equalizing opportunities for expansion as between small and large concerns. However, what little relief there is to the small concern ought not to be taken away until something has been found to substitute for it. Furthermore, a period of conversion to defense production, on which we are now entering, will inevitably cause dislocation intensifying the need for financial aid. This will be most difficult for the small concerns. Our procurement program seems to be founded upon huge prime contracts with large business. Small business gets only the defense crumbs that fall from the table of large business, as an overflow, before any appreciable volume of defense work is subcontracted to small business. Therefore, there will inevitably be a time lag of several months. If no financial aid is available to small business during this period of conversion to defense production, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is able to provide, the business failures and the impact on our economy through unemployment will be far more serious than it needs to be.

I was very glad to have your letter for another reason. I had been shown letters from banks all over the country which were answers to a questionnaire supplied by the American Banking Association, in which all

but a very few expressed the opinion that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was wholly unnecessary, since any loan applicant entitled to credit could obtain all the money it needed from private banks, and that larger loans could be handled through participation with correspondent banks.

I am convinced that Congress needs to go much more deeply into this problem before taking drastic action.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

The Real Victim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the loose morals of the New Deal administration are now coming to a head. The American people who have been taken in by the New Deal propaganda can now see the price which they have to pay when they become indifferent to the affairs of their Government.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial which appears in the Wall Street Journal of March 22, 1951, with reference to a few, and only a few, of the high-handed rackets within the Government and without the Government:

THE REAL VICTIM

In dark days of March 1933 the leaders of the Federal Government were in a bustling hurry. The slogan was, "Act now and worry about the legality later." Out of that attitude came the bank holiday and after a while the NRA, the old AAA, and a host of other acts that skirted the law for expediency.

In the same days there crept in another philosophy, that the Public Treasury belongs to him who gets there first. Probably at no time in our history was there such a wild scramble to get up projects to be paid for out of the public till. Out of that attitude toward the public moneys came finally another slogan, "Spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

This March the days of 1933 seem dark again in retrospect, although for a different reason. This March beholds the spectacle of wholesale investigations into the conduct of people who also believe, in a different way, in acting first and considering the legality later and of people who believe that the Public Treasury is there for them to tap.

The progress from March 1933 to March 1951 has been a slow one. In 1933 there was no lack of personal probity among trusted public officials. They did not skirt the law for personal gain nor did they dip into the Treasury to put money in their own or in their friends' pockets.

But it was there that there was sown, subtle and insidious, the general disregard for the statute books and the orderly processes of law that have brought public morality to its present state. It was there that was sown the philosophy that since the Treasury is being touched anyway "we might as well get ours."

If this seems to be too heavy an indictment of public morality, consider for a moment who it is that is really being exposed in this parade of investigations.

In Washington one investigation is making considerable scandal of five-percenters, lobbyists, negotiators, and fixers who have taken the RFC for millions not yet counted. But however evil their machinations, the larceny—if that is the word for it—would have been impossible if the morality of the officials had been such that they were unapproachable.

The interesting fact is that whole investigation is that so far no criminal act has been disclosed. What has outraged the public sense of propriety has been nothing more than the acceptance of deep-freezes and the doing of favors for cronies—it only seems more startling here, and less comic, because bigger sums are involved.

It seemed funny when one official got a deep-freeze and offered only friendly favors in return. It isn't funny when another official accepts a luxurious week-end in Florida and the quid pro quo is a million-dollar loan. But one grows from another. If the first is viewed jovially in high places, why should there not be hurt surprise at the indignation over the second?

In Chicago, in Kansas City, in New York there proceeds another investigation, this time into the activities of the underworld. To no one's great surprise this investigation discloses that there is an underworld. There are gangsters, gamblers, racketeers, and murderers in the world after all.

What has caused the surprise, and the indignation, is the disclosure of the size and organization of their operations and the clear suggestion that they could not operate so without at least the tacit consent of those holding public office.

The gangsters—the intended victims—have hardly been touched by the probe except for side malfeasances, such as concealment and lying. The real victim is public morality.

The spotlight of this investigation has touched sheriffs in Louisiana, political bosses in Missouri, police officials in Illinois, a mayor in New York, a dead governor, and a live diplomat. They in their turn have raised suspicion that the lines of connection go farther and higher.

The progression seems to us not a surprising one. A President skirts the law from the noblest of motives, but once the idea of skirting is morally accepted the evil grows too familiar. Who should expect more scrupulous regard for it from ward leaders and policemen than from Presidents?

Public moneys are used for the noblest of purposes. Since they are to be spent anyway it seems a small matter to weigh their spending so as incidentally to help and get votes from large pressure groups. Soon it is a little matter also to spread it through friends and in return for favors.

Favors are accepted from shady characters, shadows between the world and the underworld, for the noblest of objectives. After all, a politician must be elected before he can do good. You do not inquire too closely into your city machine supporters, and soon they are not inquiring at all into the little favors done for the cop on the beat. You begin with the virtue of loyalty to your friends and pretty soon friendship becomes the greatest of virtues.

Between the beginning and the end there is, of course, a wide difference. But once there is a loosening of the attitude toward the public treasury and the public laws, no one should be surprised when a rot sets in. If public officials dissuade with a wave of the hand so grave a charge as treason to one's country, who should be surprised that lesser officials go unmoved by slot machines and $2 bets on the horses?

The beginning of all this is the thought that one need not be too scrupulous in the protection of the public moneys or in the observance of the law so long as the purpose is to do good. The progression is disregard for the law and no regard for money. The end, if it goes that far, is the end of public morality.

Brooklyn's Man of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jeanne Toomey, from the Brooklyn Eagle of March 18, 1951:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—BOSS OF ARMY BASE HERE CALLS BOROUGH "TOPS FOR LIVING"

(By Jeanne Toomey)

Brig. Gen. Edward H. Lastayo, commander of the New York port of embarkation, including the Brooklyn Army Base, has seen the world, but he still ranks Brooklyn tops as a place to live.

Ask why he was selected for West Point from the New Jersey National Guard in July of 1918, he will answer mildly, "On the basis of service."

"Hard work, not romance," is the way he sums up 34 years of military life.

A handsome, quiet-spoken man of 58, General Lastayo lives at Fort Hamilton with his wife, the former Virginia H. Dillard of Chattanooga, Tenn. He has two married daughters—Ann, whose husband, Lt. John D. Howard, is serving with the Third Division in Korea, and Virginia, wife of Bruce Reagan of Dobbs Ferry, a former infantry sergeant.

BOSSES ETC'S BIGGEST BASE

Head of the largest United States installation of the Army's Transportation Corps, General Lastayo describes himself as "not a combat soldier," and has no recollection of any "exciting moments" in his career.

Tracing his life, however, shows this statement to be dictated by reserve rather than accuracy.

He transferred from the Field Artillery in 1942 after 22 years with that branch and left with an invasion convoy for his Transportation Corps assignment in England. From May to October of that year he commanded the third port at the Bristol channel ports, England. In November he left for North Africa.

"We took over the port of Oran and operated it until March 1943," he said in his office at the Army base the other day. General Lastayo commanded the port during that period. Later he was transportation officer for both the Mediterranean and Peninsula Base Sections. Charged with the loading of invasion forces and the landing and transporting of men, equipment and supplies as Chief of Transportation of the Mediterranean Theater of Operations, the Army chief had an unparalleled opportunity to study and appraise American youth.

His conclusion? "I think that, on an average, the boys of today are the same as the boys I was with in 1917 and 1918."

With this attitude, the general is understandably popular with his subordinates at the Army base.

LOADED ANZIO INVADERS

While in Italy he supervised the loading of forces, both American and British, who made the Anzio landing. In September 1944, he was charged with the responsibility of loading the Seventh Army for the invasion of southern France from Naples. In June 1945, he returned to the United States.

In the field of transportation, the port of embarkation head believes that the LST and LCT may be the greatest contributions made during World War II because they enable

troops with equipment to debark directly from the vessel to the beach.

Prior to World War II, while with the Field Artillery, he served in Kentucky, the Philippines, Virginia, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Florida, Maryland, and Texas.

"I saw so much heat I got used to it," he commented.

In all his Army career he spent only a few months in his native New Jersey while with the Sixth Field Artillery at Camp Dix, from August 1921 to January 1922.

He was born in West Hoboken, October 4, 1897.

TAUGHT ROTC AT CORNELL

From 1925 to 1929 he taught physics and astronomy at West Point and in 1939 and 1940, as a major, was an instructor in ROTC at Cornell.

Of his own career as a student at the Point he is characteristically modest.

Asked whether he had any favorite subjects, he replied, "Like most boys I took the course of study because I had to."

He was not an athlete and did not participate in sports. Among his classmates were Gen. Ewart Gladstone Plank, who commanded the New York port of embarkation from June 1946 to May 1949, and Maj. Gen. Clovis E. Byers, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1, who was wounded in New Guinea in 1942 carrying a tommygun in the attack on Buna Village.

General Lastayo has great affection for the Point and plans to attend the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary ceremonies there July 4, 1952.

After his return to this country the transportation officer was Chief of the Highway Division, Office of Chief of Transportation, in Washington. From February 1946 to June 1949, as deputy port commander and chief of staff of the New York port of embarkation, he first fell in love with Brooklyn.

PRO-BROOKLYN JERSEY MAN

"I like Brooklyn," he declared. "I was a Jersey boy, and you never hear any good about Brooklyn in Jersey. I disagree with the Jersey view. I like Brooklyn extremely well and think it is a fine place to live."

His younger daughter, Ann, was graduated from Fort Hamilton High School in 1948 while her father was stationed here.

A year intervened between that hitch in Brooklyn and his present assignment here. From June 1949 to August 1950 he was Assistant Chief of Transportation in Washington.

As boss of the largest American installation, he looks out his window from the administration building of the Brooklyn Army base at a scene of bustling activity, but security prevents his discussing his present task and responsibilities.

However, he will talk about his two granddaughters like any proud grandpa. One was born only a few Sundays ago.

His own father was not in the Army and the family "seems to run to girls," but General Lastayo still has hopes for a future general.

Patriot Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there is no finer group of patriots in our country than the devoted Americans who are today serving in the thankless role of membership on their local draft boards.

Without compensation, and too often with no sign of public appreciation, they perform a vital task in the mobilization of our defense. The United States owes an everlasting debt of gratitude to these fine citizens.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

PATRIOT WANTED

We are indebted to one of our readers for an interesting advertisement clipped from the Dickson County (Tenn.) Herald. "Wanted," says the ad, "one draft board member." Then it lists the requirements for the job. Among them are these: "He must sign two or more waivers of pay or compensation; he must be prepared to take plenty of cussing with a smile, both publicly and privately; he must not have too much sense, because, if he does, he will not take the job." The salary offered is set forth as follows: "All compensation paid for duties in this position is exempt from income taxes for the reason this position pays no salary, wages or compensation." "Reasons for taking job," the ad goes on: "Somebody has to do it under the present law and whoever does it has the satisfaction of knowing that he is doing his patriotic duty, and the further satisfaction of knowing that all registrants registered with his board will be treated alike under like conditions."

We have no doubt that the Dickson County Draft Board will fill its vacancy. It will find some devoted American who, like the 39,340 other volunteers now working without compensation in the Selective Service System all over the country, will find satisfaction in the knowledge that "he is doing his patriotic duty." The response that free men make to a call of this kind is a measure of their sense of responsibility and of the vitality of their society. The United States has always been able to count on a full and generous response.

Membership on a draft board is an onerous and exacting assignment. It is not easy to make the decision that requires the son of a friend or a neighbor or a business associate to go into military service. It requires often the judgment of a Solomon and the patience of a Job to weigh the claims of conscience, the considerations of family hardship, the pleas for deferment to finish a course of education that are presented in an infinite variety of forms by the young men called up for induction. The work demands long hours, and it imposes on the men who perform it a sternness—in the national interest—that necessarily sets them apart, in some degree, from their fellow men. Some draft board members have been doing the job steadily for a decade. They have won small acclaim. But they deserve the warm gratitude of all Americans for an indispensable public service well and faithfully and selflessly performed.

Peanut Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, last fall the House passed and sent to the other body a bill dealing with peanut marketing quotas and acreage allotments. This was a good bill. It sought to do equity and to alleviate a situation that exists in Alabama and Texas, and to a lesser degree in several other States. The Eighty-first Congress adjourned without any action being taken by the Senate. I am not here to censure any group or any individual for failure to take action, although I know some action should have been taken. By reason of this failure the House several weeks ago again passed similar legislation. Monday of this week the Senate amended the House bill by striking out everything in our bill and inserting a new amendment. This amendment reduced the 79,000 acreage increase to 34,900 acres. Senator HOEY, who was handling the bill, had this to say, and I quote:

In the House bill there was a provision for 79,000 acres increase for Texas and Alabama to correct an injustice heretofore existing. The Senate bill reduces to 34,900.

The Senator also said, and I quote:

Furthermore, I may say that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided that this was as far as they wish to go, and therefore it is not desired or intended to ask for the appointment of conferees but to let the matter rest on the bill as reported to the Senate by the committee.

I do not censure the Senator for his action. He did this in good faith in an effort to bring out some legislation. He approved of the legislation as enacted by the House. However, on handling it on the Senate floor, he was necessarily bound by the action of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

This is an unprecedented action to think of one body of this Congress saying to the other: "We refuse to sit down with any conferees that the House might name and work out a bill. Yes; we know that an inequity and injustice does exist, and we will make a half correction."

It is a tragedy that we who know the justice of our case are barred from even being allowed to talk the matter over with representatives of the other body. This is not conducive to good legislation. It is a departure from the good relations that have heretofore existed between the Senate and the House, and especially between the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is setting a bad precedent.

As much as I regret to admit it, it is a fact that we are caught between the "devil and the deep blue sea." The Senate by its action has refused to do anything further and has passed the ball back to the House.

I am convinced that if objection is made to agree to the Senate amendment that the farmers of my State will be further penalized. Certainly a half loaf is better than none at all, and I am, therefore, withholding my objection to the passage of this bill with the hope that a more equitable bill can be worked out at a later date.

The farmers of my section are about ready to plant. Action on this bill has already been too long delayed. We cannot afford to wait any longer. I know that Senator HOEY and the Senators of my State have done everything that they could to have their body adopt the House bill. I am sure that they will continue their efforts toward securing the enactment of just and equitable legislation.

Tribute to Coach of Indian Basketball Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the papers have been filled with stories of bribery and poor sportsmanship in basketball. It is most heartening to look at the other side of the ledger and to praise those who follow the game in a spirit of honesty and clean play.

One of the finest examples of how fine the game may be is offered by a high-school team in my district. The Red Lake team, coached by Russ Smith, is composed of Indian boys from the Red Lake Indian Reservation. I think the following article, written by Charles Johnson of the Minneapolis Star in its issue of March 6, is well worth the attention of all the Members of the House:

CHARLES JOHNSON'S LOW-DOWN ON SPORTS

By the end of this week when the eight participants in the Minnesota State high-school basketball tournament are known, we'll hear this statement not once but many times:

"I can pick eight teams that aren't coming to Minneapolis that could beat the eight that will participate."

This cry goes up every year when strong combinations that have played brilliantly all season are edged out of the tournament because of off nights or bad breaks.

There undoubtedly is some justification for such claims, but there isn't any way to change the situation.

We agree that the teams that are playing the best basketball at tournament time—district or regional—usually earn the right to battle for State honors.

Up in the north country unprejudiced basketball fans are singing the praises of the Red Lake team, coached by Russ Smith. This fine aggregation was nosed out in the district meet 59–54, by Bemidji which has won that event for the last 14 years for some sort of a record.

Red Lake is a tiny spot with a limited high-school enrollment and many Indian students.

Everyone in that district, even those in Bemidji, are talking about the Red Lake team and its coach.

"If Red Lake had been able to nose out Bemidji, which also has a well-coached team under Bun Fortie, it would have been the sweetheart outfit of this or any other tournament," one admirer writes.

"I think coach Smith has done the greatest coaching job at Red Lake this season I have seen in this area in a long time.

"First, Smith has a well-coached, smart, and clean-cut group of Indian boys. They are outstanding young men who show it by their dress, conduct, and appearance on and off the floor. They are good students, too.

"On a recent visit to the reservation I saw basketball backboards everywhere. They are all talking the sport. The townsfolks are backing the team to the limit.

"Coach Smith has gone into the homes of the boys, talked to the parents and dined with them to create a new spirit and interest which has been lacking in the past.

"They used to blame the Red Lake Indians for fights, brawls, and arguments at games that drove spectators away. No longer do you hear them accused of damaging cars or responsibility for other pranks that don't set too well with the residents and certainly don't help sports.

"Russ Smith has made the community so proud of its high-school athletes that women arrange dinners for them after the games. They have increased interest of the public in their activities, and Smith has made them better boys and that means better citizens when they grow up.

"Smith has taught the Indians good sportsmanship. That goes for the players as well as the spectators. He had a clever little Indian princess, dressed in beaded buckskin outfit with tribal headdress as the cheer leader," our Bemidji informant went on.

That's the kind of a story we love to hear about our amateur athletics. Coach Smith apparently is a man who is using our fine competitive sports to make better citizens, a stronger community and sound leaders for the future.

That should be the No. 1 aim of every coach. Accomplishments of this type are much more important than championships or victories of any kind.

VA Backdown on Regional Office for Brooklyn Recognizes Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of March 16, 1951:

VA BACKDOWN ON REGIONAL OFFICE FOR BROOKLYN RECOGNIZES INJUSTICE

Only 3 days after the Veterans' Administration announced that parts of the Brooklyn regional office would be transferred to Manhattan mounting criticism here has brought a change of opinion on the part of Administrator Carl R. Gray. This followed his receipt of information that sufficient space is available in Brooklyn to house the complete regional activity. Orders have been issued to secure that space at once.

This comes as welcome news throughout the borough, but particularly to the major veterans' organizations, which with the members of the Brooklyn congressional delegation and the Brooklyn Eagle, have been fighting to block this move which would have caused such great inconvenience to large numbers of veterans seeking information and guidance.

Despite the fact that three of the nine floors in the building would have remained available for the veterans office, the removal of the records to Manhattan would have seriously impaired service here.

In a wire sent to Administrator Gray just before he changed his mind the local congressional delegation stated that "we refuse to let Brooklyn become the stepchild of the VA."

We are glad to see that our Representatives did not hesitate to use the very descriptive word "stepchild." If Washington, Albany, and City Hall were to have their way on some occasions, that is just what Brooklyn would become. We have used the word recently in describing the effect of the treatment accorded some of our local projects by the city administration—and City Hall didn't like it. But it is a word that tells a story and we intend to use it, as our Congressman did, whenever it fits a situation.

We are informed that there are 437,000 veterans in this borough. A large proportion of them find it necessary to go to the regional office on Ryerson Street occasionally. Some of them have been wounded or otherwise disabled. It seems to us thoughtless and inexcusable on the part of the Veterans' Administration that it was willing to force these men to take a long trip to Manhattan when there was no compelling reason for them to suffer such inconvenience.

But favorable action has now been taken and Brooklyn's regional VA office will be retained here. We trust that there will be no further change of mind at Washington.

Inflation and Government Rubber Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to Mr. Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator, from Mr. John L. Collyer, president, the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio:

THE B. F. GOODRICH CO.,
Akron, Ohio, March 3, 1951.

Subject: Inflation and Government rubber policies.

Mr. ERIC JOHNSTON,
Administrator, Economic Stabilization Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: Following is an extract from the Economic Stabilization Agency's General Ceiling Price Regulation dated January 28, 1951, which was signed by you and with which I am in complete accord:

"Since June 1950 the country has been in the throes of a mounting inflation. What is most alarming is the violence and rapidity with which prices are rising throughout the economy. Since the outbreak in Korea, basic commodity prices have risen almost 50 percent, farm prices about 15 percent, wholesale food prices 12 percent, and industrial prices about 14 percent. Wholesale textile prices have advanced over 30 percent, chemicals over 25 percent, building materials and metals and metal products about 10 percent.

"The cost of living is now at an all-time high and is rising sharply.

"These increases in prices have added billions to the cost of the defense program and many more billions to the cost of living of the general public."

The inflation in prices of raw materials used by the rubber industry has been far greater than the percentages quoted above. And the inflation will continue indefinitely if our Government should enter into a rubber price cartel with the crude rubber growing areas or into fixed-price contracts with private crude rubber producers.

Rubbers are by far the major item of cost in the rubber manufacturing industry. Today, the Government bears almost total responsibility for the price of rubbers—both for the American rubbers produced in Government-owned facilities and for the crude rubber imported into this country. The future price of all of these rubbers is dependent almost entirely upon governmental policies.

By May 1, when all plants are operating at capacity, over 90 percent of the American rubbers will be produced in Government-owned plants retained by Government under the Rubber Act of 1950. On December 7, 1950, the Government increased the selling price to industry of its general purpose American rubber 32½ percent, or from 18½ cents a pound to 24½ cents a pound.

The greatest price increase has been in crude rubber. The delivered price in New York for No. 1 ribbed smoke sheets advanced from 18¼ cents a pound at the beginning of 1950 to a high of 90 cents a pound during the year. The present world market price is about 80 cents, an increase since January 1, 1950, of almost 340 percent.

Our Government became the sole importer of crude rubber for this country on December 29, 1950, at which time the price was 70 cents a pound. The stated purpose was to obtain a materially lower price by eliminating competitive buying between private companies for consumption and our Government for stockpiling. There has been no decrease in the world price of crude rubber since then; instead, the price has increased about 15 percent.

The total cost of crude rubber produced by reasonably efficient growers is about 10 cents a pound delivered in the United States. The average total cost of all producers of crude rubber is probably not in excess of 16 cents a pound.

The rubber position of the United States at present reflects the serious supply problems which we have faced in both the crude rubber and American rubbers, resulting from the unprecedented levels of demand for rubber for current consumption, the scare buying following Korea, the acceleration of buying for strategic stockpiling purposes, both by our Government and by other nations, failure of the Government to maintain the output of American rubbers at the levels recommended in 1948, and the Government's delay in reopening the American rubber facilities which had been placed in mothballs.

During the last year the American people as consumers and as taxpayers for the defense program have paids tens of millions of dollars more for rubber products than would have been the case if our Government had followed the recommendations of the B. F. Goodrich Co. and the rubber industry for sound policies in rubber.

In a letter addressed to Mr. C. E. Wilson, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, dated December 30, 1950, we said:

"Proper perspective on the problem of supply requires that we go back to October 1948 when the rubber industry made a report to Government recommending steps that should be taken to safeguard the rubber security interests of the Nation. The industry report, completely documented statistically, recommended a crude rubber stockpiling program by Government which could have resulted in a combined Government and industry stockpile of almost 900,000 long tons by June 1950, when the Korean War broke out. It further recommended that production of general purpose synthetic rubber by Government should not be permitted to fall below 34,000 long tons a month, and that any excess of production over current synthetic rubber consumption be stockpiled by Government in order to conserve crude rubber in the early stages of any national emergency that might arise.

"None of these recommendations was followed. Crude rubber stockpiling took place at a considerably lower rate than that recommended. No stockpiling of general purpose synthetic rubber was attempted. The production rate of general purpose synthetic rubber was allowed to decline to a postwar low of only 18,100 long tons in January 1950, and working inventories were kept low.

"Alarmed over this precarious supply position, the B. F. Goodrich Co. and the rubber industry early in 1950 urged a rapid step-up in the rate of synthetic rubber production and in the rate of crude rubber stockpile accumulation. Later, on May 8, 1950, the B. F. Goodrich Co. recommended the immediate reopening of one additional GR-S plant, and shortly thereafter, the reopening of all stand-by GR-S plants. It was not until after the outbreak of the Korean War—in July, actually—that reactivation of one synthetic plant was authorized, and not until September that the remaining stand-by plants were directed to be reopened. To the present time, little substantial relief has resulted from the reactivation of these facilities and it is now estimated that full scale production cannot be attained before April 1951."

It is our conviction that if our Government had carried out the recommendations made in 1948 and those made early in 1950 by the B. F. Goodrich C.., the rubber-supply position of the United States and of the world would now be such that the price of crude rubber would be far more realistic in relation to production costs than the prices prevailing during the last 9 months.

Our company has frequently commented on the exorbitant cost to the American taxpayer of previous cartels in crude rubber organized by foreign governments, which have always resulted in extortionate prices to the consuming countries, of which the United States is by far the largest. Long-time experience dictates that our Government should not participate in any rubber price cartel or fixed-price arrangement.

It is our conviction that the world rubber-supply situation is not nearly so serious as has been publicized and is improving so rapidly that a much lower price for crude rubber will result within the next few months, provided that—

(a) Our country is not involved in a war with Russia;

(b) Our Government does not enter into price cartels with crude-producing nations or into fixed-price arrangements with private producers; and that—

(c) The adequacy of the crude-rubber stockpile already accumulated is realized.

Great progress toward the solution of the rubber-supply situation has already been made. American rubber policy must give full weight to this progress and to its future effects.

Proper evaluation of the facts and estimates stated below will bring policy changes that are needed.

1. THE SUPPLY-DEMAND OUTLOOK FOR 1951

Here are our estimates of world supply and demand for rubbers in 1951. (See table.) These estimates show a world surplus of over 600,000 long tons of rubber this year, after all consumptive needs for both military and civilian products have been filled. Because the United States stocks are already adequate, the indicated surplus should be more than sufficient to supply the possible stockpile requirements of foreign countries.

Estimated world new-rubber supply and consumption, January to December 1951

[Long tons]

	Supply			Consumption [1]			Available for stocks and stockpiling
	Crude	Man-made	Total	United States	Rest of world	Total	
1951							
January	150,000	63,000	213,000	100,000	82,500	182,500	30,500
February	140,000	61,000	201,000	92,000	82,500	174,500	26,500
March	151,000	69,000	220,000	93,500	82,500	176,000	44,000
First quarter	441,000	193,000	634,000	285,500	247,500	533,000	101,000
April	155,000	72,000	227,000	94,500	82,500	177,000	50,000
May	155,000	79,000	234,000	98,000	82,500	180,500	53,500
June	158,000	76,000	234,000	99,000	82,500	181,500	52,500
Second quarter	468,000	227,000	695,000	291,500	247,500	539,000	156,000
July	158,000	80,000	238,000	100,000	80,000	180,000	58,000
August	167,000	80,000	247,000	101,500	80,000	181,500	65,500
September	167,000	80,000	247,000	103,000	80,000	183,000	64,000
Third quarter	492,000	240,000	732,000	304,500	240,000	544,500	187,500
October	167,000	80,000	247,000	104,500	80,000	184,500	62,500
November	165,000	80,000	246,000	106,000	80,000	186,000	60,000
December	166,000	80,000	246,000	108,000	80,000	188,000	58,000
Fourth quarter	499,000	240,000	739,000	318,500	240,000	558,500	180,500
Year 1951	1,900,000	900,000	2,800,000	1,200,000	975,000	2,175,000	625,000

[1] Includes rubber estimated to be consumed in 1951 in the manufacture of military as well as civilian products.

NOTE.—The final disposition of the 625,000 tons apparent excess of world supply over world consumption requirements will depend upon the stockpiling policies pursued by individuals and governments.

These estimates are made on the assumption that war or other events will not interfere with crude rubber production in 1951.

2. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CRUDE RUBBER STOCKPILE OBJECTIVE

The stockpile objective is the keystone of United States of America rubber policy. This objective should now be materially reduced in the light of changed conditions, which differ greatly from the conditions existing when the present objective was established.

These factors are constantly working to make us less dependent on crude rubber.

(a) The present objective includes a provision for sufficient crude rubber to meet consumption requirements during the period when the American rubber plants were being taken out of mothballs. Now that the American rubber facilities are achieving capacity production, this provision is no longer necessary.

(b) Rubber now being converted into finished military products is not being withdrawn from the stockpile but is being supplied from current imports. We estimate that in 1951 there will be 150,000 tons of all types of rubbers used in military products for the defense effort, most of which will not be put into service. That matériel represents a stockpile in being and its rubber content should be included in stockpile totals.

(c) The performance of products made from American-made rubbers is constantly being improved. New types have been developed. "Cold rubber" is now in mass production and usage. New compounding materials have been discovered. New components are available. New techniques have been tested. The result is that American-made rubbers can now replace crude rubber much more effectively than during World War II. This statement can readily be confirmed by a review of industry and Government test results.

3. INCREASE IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICAN-MADE RUBBER CAPACITY

Our company has already recommended that our American-made rubber capacity be increased by 200,000 tons a year. This increase might be obtainable from existing facilities more quickly and with less expense than if new plants were built. This desirable safety factor would give us protection against bombing and could, during a war, give us capacity to supply the needs of our allies, many of whom have been stockpiling crude rubber.

In summary, the 1951 world supply of new rubber will be by far the largest in history—2,800,000 tons. World consumption needs for both military and essential civilian rubber products in 1951 of 2,175,000 long tons are well within the limits of supply. The great current inflationary force in the crude-rubber market is that of fear-buying of stocks, mainly for strategic purposes, as nations bid against each other for the 625,000 tons surplus. So far as the United States is concerned, such strategic stock accumulation above present stockpile levels is largely based on outdated premises. A realistic current appraisal of strategic stockpile needs, and the provision of a 200-000-ton safety factor in American rubber capacity, would permit natural market forces to eliminate much of the costly inflation now present in the crude-rubber market.

It is for these reasons that the United States should by all means avoid entanglement in a rubber price cartel with the crude-rubber-growing areas or in fixed-price arrangements with private crude-rubber producers. Such arrangements would simply legalize and perpetuate much of the gross inflation now present in the crude-rubber market structure to the continuing detriment of consumers, manufacturers, and defense production, not only in the United States, but throughout the free world.

This problem is of such immediate importance to our entire defense mobilization and economic stabilization programs that prompt understanding and action are essential. We suggest that a meeting be called by you before March 14 in which informed Government and business people may join to consider the facts, to appraise them realistically, and to stimulate action along the lines indicated herein. Copies of this letter are being sent to other interested persons.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN L. COLLYER.

Legislative Program of Regular Veterans Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to the legislative program of the Regular Veterans Association of the United States. This program was adopted by the annual convention of the association last September. There are many points in this program which deserve careful consideration as their enactment would react to the greater benefit of the people of this Nation.

The program follows:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE REGULAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ADOPTED BY ITS 1950 NATIONAL CONVENTION, SEPTEMBER 23, 1950

NATIONAL DEFENSE

1. The immediate enactment of a universal military training law.

2. Mobilization of all material resources for war.

3. Legislation to effectively curb war inflation during the present emergency.

4. An effective national organization for civil defense.

5. Creation of a national committee for the conservation of natural resources.

6. Issuance, by the United States, of an appropriate medal for service in the present Korean campaign.

7. Issuance, by the United Nations of an appropriate medal for service in the present Korean campaign.

8. Appropriate United Nations rank for the present commandant of the United Nations forces in Korea.

9. Relentless war on Communist aggression.

10. Extension of all provisions of the GI bill of rights to all veterans of the Korean campaign.

11. Federal income-tax exemptions, the same as was extended to Armed Forces personnel during World War II, for all personnel engaged in the present Korean campaign—said exemptions to be retroactive to the beginning of hostilities and to continue for 1 year after they shall have ended.

12. Free postage for all service personnel during the present Korean campaign

13. Immediate restoration of the World War II allotment system for the dependents of all service personnel.

14. Legislation prohibiting strikes, or mass work stoppages, in time of war or during military campaigns such as the Korean campaign.

15. Extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance coverage to all members of the Armed Forces, drafted for service, with the Federal Government paying the contributions.

16. All commissaries, exchanges, and ship's service stores to be operated strictly on a nonprofit basis and all merchandise sold in them to be exempt from Federal and State tax.

17. National service life insurance to be supplanted with a flat $10,000 death gratuity.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. Continued support of the United Nations.

2. Vigorous fulfillment of our international commitments and agreements.

3. Restricted and screened immigration.

4. Continued cooperation with all nations for the promotion of international peace and the development of backward areas.

AMERICANISM

1. Legislation outlawing the Communist Party, and all other groups who advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

2. Unequivocal denial of the right to vote and to hold public office, or to enjoy public employment, to those who are known to oppose our form of government.

3. A stronger Voice of America program and greater efforts to penetrate the iron curtain by educational means.

4. Deportation of all known alien and foreign-born Communists.

5. Praise and continued support of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its effective war on communism and subversive groups.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

1. Parity in pensions and disability compensation for all persons who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States at any time and parity in all widows pensions—and in all pension payments to the dependents of deceased disabled veterans. (S. 727 and H. R. 303.)

2. Service pensions for all veterans who were engaged in hostilities against the hostile natives in the Moro Province and in the islands of Leyte and Samar from July 4, 1902, to January 1, 1914. (S. 422 and H. R. 303.)

3. Vocational rehabilitation for all honorably discharged disabled veterans of the Armed Forces regardless of when the service was performed.

4. Civil service preference, United States Employment Service preference, and preference on relief projects—when they exist—for all honorably discharged veterans of the Regular Establishment.

5. A uniform law and uniform regulations applicable to all disabled tubercular veterans regardless of the date of service. (H. R. 1038, 77th Cong.)

6. Legislation to reduce to 10 percent the disability requirement for entitlement to additional compensation for dependents of veterans.

7. Service pensions for veterans of World War I, and World War II at age 55, in the amount of $66 a month with an increase of $2 a month for each year thereafter.

8. Legislation to increase pension income limitation to $2,000 for veterans, or widow without dependents, and to $3,000 for veteran or widow with dependents.

9. Legislation to exclude commercial insurance payments from consideration as income in determining eligibility for nonservice-connected death pensions.

10. Legislation, or an executive directive by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, requiring the Veterans' Administration to accept as evidence, for rating purposes, examinations made at any hospital approved by the American Hospital Association.

11. A substantial raise in pay to VA hospital attendants, especially to those in mental hospitals and contagious disease wards in VA hospitals.

12. Opposing any plan to take from the Veterans' Administration, or its immediate jurisdiction and control, any function of government having to do with veterans.

13. Continued hospitalization, in VA hospitals, for non-service-connected disabilities when facilities are available.

14. Out-patient treatment and medication for veterans receiving part III benefits at VA hospitals.

15. An identification card and lapel button to be furnished all service-connected disabled veterans by the Veterans' Administration.

16. Rescission of VA Circular 26, March 7, 1947, prohibiting VA employees from taking part in veterans' organizations.

17. Legislation requiring the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue explicit instructions that each and every decision of the VA in its agencies of original and appellate jurisdiction be supported by an adequately detailed recitation of the basis of finding of fact and to contain a statement that the policy of resolution of reasonable doubt has been considered.

18. A rating of permanent and total disability for all veterans who have a lung removed.

19. Amendment of R. & P. R. 2676 (b) 4 to permit acceptance of lay testimony in determining service connection for malaria.

20. The establishment of a VA hospital, for Negro veterans in Franklin County, Va., the birthplace of Booker T. Washington.

21. A minimum of 2 prosthetic appliances a year to eligible veterans.

22. A national cemetery in each of the 48 States.

23. Adapted housing for helpless disabled veterans of the Regular Establishment.

24. Adjusted service compensation for veterans of World War II, and the present Korean campaign, in the amount of $6 a day for foreign service and $3 a day for home service.

25. Legislation authorizing official representatives of veterans' organizations, accredited by the Veterans Administration, to appear before any unit of the Federal Government on behalf of any veteran when properly empowered by the veteran to do so.

26. Maintenance of the United States soldier's and naval homes in their present locations.

27. First priority for Philippine veterans and their dependents in the settlement of all World War II claims.

28. Compensation and pension for service-connected disabilities are rights and not gratuities. The Regular Veterans' Association of the United States, therefore, urges the immediate enactment of legislation to subject all decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to Federal court review.

FRANK E. MCCLERNAN,
National Commander.

Postal Workers Find Themselves in Economic Strait-Jacket: Pay Adjustments and Service Restoration Should Have Immediate Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter I received from Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and an article appearing in the March edition of the Postal Record, the official publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers, written by Mr. James J. Doran, former chief post office inspector, who calls for restoration of postal service curtailed last year.

The letter and article follow:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1951.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Offic Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: There is herewith attached a reprint of an article appearing in the March edition of the Postal Record, the official publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers. You will note that it is written by Mr. James J. Doran, the recently retired postal executive who succeeded the present Postmaster General in the office of the chief post office inspector. In the light of existing conditions, Mr. Doran's article is both thought-provoking and timely. He clearly indicates in the article that the postal-curtailment orders issued under date of April 17, 1950, were unnecessary and that a report in the hands of the Postmaster General 1 month prior to that date (March 15, 1950) "contradicts the assertions that savings could only be made through curtailments."

On March 6 and 7, 1951, Postmaster General Donaldson appeared before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of the pending rate bill, H. R. 2982, which is designed to increase postal revenues by $163,000,000 annually. When interrogated by committee members as to whether the increase in rates would permit the restoration of postal services to the high standard which prevailed on April 17, 1950, the Postmaster General answered in the negative. He was also queried at considerable length as to whether the rate increases contemplated granting much-needed upward wage revision to the 500,000 postal workers in the field service. Once again his answer was in the negative. In fact, he made the positive statement that neither the requested increase in postage rates nor his budgetary estimates included any provisions for service restoration or pay increases to postal workers.

In view of the foregoing, it is quite apparent that the only hope for restoring the postal service rests with Congress. Accordingly, this association firmly believes that H. R. 2982 and S. 1046 should be amended so as to provide specific instruction to the Postmaster General which would give to the American people the type of postal service to which they have been accustomed over the years.

It is a well-known fact that on December 4, 1950, the Interstate Commerce Commission approved a compromise agreement between the rail carriers and the Post Office Department which amounted to $312,000,000 (ICC Docket No. 9200), covering the period February 19, 1947, through December 31, 1950. That huge sum of money must come from postal revenues which presently fall short of equaling postal expenditures by approximately $500,000,000 each year. We have been reliably informed that public hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission have just been concluded and that additional rate increases will undoubtedly be granted covering the period subsequent to January 1, 1951. Additionally, the Nation's airlines have pending requests before the Civil Aeronautics Board which aggregate in excess of $2,250,000 for transporting United States mails by air. This item, too, if approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, will be charged against the revenue of the Post Office Department and will greatly increase the alleged operating deficit.

Meanwhile, postal workers everywhere find themselves in an economic strait-jacket because of the fact that those in authority, particularly in the Post Office Department, have made no provisions for upward wage adjustments to meet the ever-expanding cost of living. This association firmly believes that both service restoration and pay adjustments must be given immediate consideration. Reports reaching this office almost daily clearly indicate that the personnel turn-over in the field postal service is higher than at any time in history. In Detroit, Mich., alone, 732 employees, or 12 percent of the total personnel, have left the postal service since July 1, 1950. This does not include 104 Detroit postal workers who have entered the military service. Similar conditions prevail in practically all parts of the country.

We implore you to give serious consideration to taking whatever action deemed necessary to provide a complete service restoration and an upward wage adjustment for letter carriers and other postal people. Favorable action on your part will be deeply appreciated.

With every good wish, we are,
Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.
D. R. SULLIVAN,
Vice President.
JEROME J. KEATING,
Secretary.
R. B. KREMERS,
Assistant Secretary.

OUR PRESENT POSTAL SERVICE
(By James J. Doran)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
January 18, 1951.

Mr. JAMES J. DORAN,
Chevy Chase, Md.

DEAR MR. DORAN: You are undoubtedly familiar with the present postal curtailment program and the existing controversy resulting from the orders contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18, 1950. As one who has spent a lifetime in the United States Postal Service, I am convinced beyond words that a statement from you would be of great importance at this particular time.

I am in a position to publish whatever statement you care to make in the monthly organ of this association, the Postal Record. It goes without saying that whatever your approach to the postal problem, this association will publish your views verbatim.

It is my firm conviction that you will be rendering a great public service by making known your views on the present-day postal system.

With kind regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.

CHEVY CHASE, MD., *February 11, 1951.*

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOHERTY: I have given a great deal of consideration to your letter of January 18, 1951, in which you invite me to make a statement on our present-day postal service to be published in your official organ, the Postal Record. I note that you have agreed that anything I might offer in the way of an article will be published verbatim.

I have decided to accept your offer and I do so in the hope that some part of the article which I will submit may in a small measure lead to a settlement of the present-day postal controversy. Some of my friends will perhaps think that it was unwise on my part to become involved in this controversy, but to those who would form such an opinion, I call their attention to the possibility that any dispute, disagreement, or controversy stands a better chance of being adjusted and settled equitably if all of the truth is known and understood and not just a part of the truth. I believe that I have in my possession and I am setting forth, in the article certain features of the rate situation and the postal curtailment matter that have not been given very much publicity in the past.

I thank you for your offer.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DORAN.

Until shortly after World War II the average American, and in fact all Americans, took our Postal Service for granted. It was looked upon with confidence and faith in its honesty and efficiency. Its rank and file could, if they so desired, boast of a fidelity not easily equalled and never surpassed. If its laws were broken or violated its inspection service went into action and stayed at it until the law breakers were in custody and punished. It could match its performance with any of its fellows in the National Government and do so without apology or explanation.

It was generally credited with doing a fine job during the war and was praised highly for contributing a great deal to our fighting men's morale by its prompt and efficient handling of the military mail. It did all this in spite of the absence of thousands of its best employees who were in the war. After the war rising costs of operation brought on staggering deficits which aroused Congress and brought considerable criticism from a variety of sources. This made a strange and not easily understood picture—with a less experienced force during the war we were praised; with our experienced and efficient men and women back at work, we were being charged with waste and inefficiency.

There had to be a reason for this change and the reason was not hard to find. The Department wanted a raise in postal rates and the publishers and heavy mail users said, "No. It was not justified. Cut your costs. Put in up-to-date methods. Avoid your duplication. Dispose of useless records," and on and on. The deficit had grown steadily until in each of the fiscal years of 1949 and 1950 it exceeded $550,000,000. All concerned became postal deficit conscious.

The Department and other parts of the Federal Government had been investigated by the Hoover Commission. After the task force that spent the greater part of a year in its work on the Postal Service made its report a claim arose that a yearly savings of more than 200,000,000 was possible if up-to-date methods were used and modern mechanical equipment bought for the field service. This was just the kind of charge the opponents of the increased postal rate bill wanted and they used it to the best of their ability and capacity.

Just about the time it seemed nothing more could happen to or be said about the Postal Service that would add to its worries and troubles, the Post Office Department, yes the Department itself, decided otherwise. The Department reached the conclusion it had to curtail and eliminate Postal Service throughout the country.

Accordingly on April 18, 1950, there appeared in the Postal Bulletin one of the most drastic orders ever written by a Postmaster General. You are familiar with the order which has been properly labeled the curtailment order.

Now for the reasons for the order. The Postmaster General said Congress and the Bureau of Budget have reduced his requests for appropriation by such amounts as to compel a curtailment in postal service all over the Nation. He explained there was no other way in which to meet the situation and the order was placed in effect despite the opposition of Congress, the public, business and the labor unions of postal employees. There had been substantial reduction in the amounts asked by the Department by the House of Representatives, and the Postmaster General took the viewpoint the Department would not be allowed to proceed on a deficit spending basis. The Senate had not yet acted on the appropriation bill.

If I or any other person were to say the order was a mistake, that there were other means of reducing the over-all costs of operating the postal service, and failed to produce evidence to support and substantiate such a contention, you the reader would promptly and properly proceed to the conclusion my views and opinions were worthless. In place of setting my views and opinions on whether the order was a mistake, I am going to place before you facts, clear undisputed facts, all of which have been published by the Department at one time or another. All that is contained in this article is public property and a matter of public record. If perchance some of these public documents conflict with or contradict the efforts and representations of the Department in its fight for higher postal rates, then the Department must truly accept the responsibility so created. And if these public papers or some of them cast an element of doubt on the validity of the Department's case before Congress and the people, then the Department can blame itself for a not too carefully prepared and presented line of evidence to establish the proof that higher rates and service curtailment were absolutely necessary.

Your organization contends the postal establishment is a public service and the need for a balanced postal budget is not as vital as the Department claims. You have called attention to other departments of the National Government that produce little or no revenue and yet obtain their appropriations without apparently too much trouble. All Americans use the postal service. Therefore it is a public service. As to the value of the contention that it should be supported by congressional appropriation regardless of the disparity between income and expense, that at first glance seems a wide departure from what might be considered the good old-fashioned "earn your own keep" American methods. But if we look into the history of the postal service right down to the present moment we find considerable support for that very theory. Yes; the records of the Department will show that more than 39,000 of the more than 41,000 post offices of the country could not operate without what is truly a postal subsidy.

These 39,000 offices are of the second, third, and fourth class and are called district offices. At none of them are the receipts more than $40,000 a year and many have annual revenue of only a few hundred dollars. But they are necessary and perform good service, a service that our people could not and would not be expected to give up. Far from being self-supporting they cause an annual deficit of about $130,000,000 and this does not include the cost of mail transportation to and from these offices. The Department says its mail transportation costs amount to over $420,000,000 a year. It would be difficult to apportion the exact amount of the total transportation charges to these district offices but recalling they are located in 39,000 different places in all 48 States and our possessions, an estimate of $50,000,000, which is slightly over 10 percent of the whole cost, would certainly not seem too high. At any rate a very substantial deficit is to be expected year after year and it can only be met by congressional appropriation.

Suppose the Department got a 20-percent increase in rates, the added revenue at these district offices would amount to probably not more than $10,000,000 unless the rate on first-class matter were raised. All the efforts of the Department up to the recent curtailment order were for increases on everything except first-class mail. Congress can never be expected to hike postal rates sufficiently to wipe out the deficit in these district offices and it should not attempt to do so.

The Postmaster General and other officials of the Department have stated on many occasions that the cost of free postal services to other Government departments and agencies, free-in-county newspaper handling, etc., amounts to $150,000,000 a year. Add this to the annual deficit at the district offices and you have $280,000,000, or more than one-half of the entire postal deficit. And if we add the $50,000,000 (estimated) for mail transportation to these 39,000 offices we have a total of $330,000,000. This amount we will agree takes quite a slice out of the total postal deficit of $570,000,000. And if you add to that the subsidies given the air lines and other carriers of mail, you have accounted for at least four hundred million of the deficit. Subsidies should be recognized and labeled as such, and there is no justification for the postal service being saddled with them. If Congress decides to reduce the amount of postal subsidies given, it can do so by increasing postal rates, but it cannot wipe out either now or in the future the subsidy it is giving to support the district offices.

The 39,000 represents 94 percent of all the offices in our postal service. The other 6 percent make a profit, and they, the 6 percent, were the ones most affected by the curtailment order. If a postal-rate increase is granted it is their profits which will be increased. But it is a fair arrangement to expect the larger offices to produce enough revenue to wipe out the deficit, excluding the $130,000,000, which is the cost of the free services? Any increase in postal rates will be effective at all offices, but unless the Department changes its stand and asks for an increase on letter-mail postage—on which it claims to make a profit—the added revenue at the district offices will be slight compared to that of the 6 percent now more than earning their expenses. Until this subsidy to the postal service is recognized and treated as such and not placed on the mail users at the profit-making offices, there can be little or no hope of proceeding in a fair and equitable manner in this matter of rates. Certain rates should be raised, particularly those on second and fourth class, but all concerned should be certain of the equity involved in the increases requested.

The Department's basis for asking for increase in postal rates is to be found in its cost ascertainment figures and statistics. Cost ascertainment is a time, weight, and count study on all the mail handling and special service operations made at more than 500 offices of all 4 classes located in various parts of the country. From this study the Department puts forth the information that certain specified losses are incurred in handling second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, and all the special services excepting Postal Savings. The opposition to the rate increases, and this opposition is numerous and forceful, says the cost figures are not accurate; that the Department does not know what its costs are, and furthermore it cannot be expected to find out what it costs with relation to each operation are under its present system of cost ascertainment.

Congress has a real interest in the postal service. True it has not passed the rate bill; probably because the Department said we lose so much on each operation and each class of mail except first, but it apparently did not produce enough proof to satisfy Congress on that issue.

The postal service should pay its personnel good wages, better than at present, and improve working conditions where possible; and the personnel owes it to itself, the Department and the people to do the best job possible. Postal employees have a great investment in the service. The best and greatest investment possible. It is themselves as people and their future, and it is upon them that the country must depend for an efficient service. The employes, like the Department must be realistic and recognize conditions and facts as they exist. If they can be changed for the better, well and good. If not, they must be faced. And one of the important facts to face is the cost of operation in the largest offices.

Cost ascertainment figures show there is a difference in cost, a great difference; and, until it is wiped out or plainly explained and accounted for the entire service is on weak

ground in trying to convince anyone, especially Congress and the publishers, that an appreciable boost in rates is justified.

The Department has accepted cost ascertainment figures and bases its efforts for increased rates on these figures. The Department claimed it could not continue to give the country the postal service that was in existence on April 17, 1950, and for some time prior thereto, because it was not getting the money needed for that service and curtailment was the answer to the problem created by reduced appropriations. The head of the Department said he disliked to curtail the service but as the entire postal service was operated economically there was nothing else to do. Savings were not possible in any other way. Sounds reasonable, doesn't it? A frank statement made about a frank and drastic order.

Now, no one who knows the officials and those holding high places in the Cost Ascertainment Division as I do, would charge these officials and employees with a desire to work against the Postmaster General. On the contrary, they are loyal honest people. Their responsibility is to put the data and statistics together in the form of reports of costs on different postal activities. These figures are gathered in the field. Under date of March 15, 1950, such a report was prepared and it was issued about the time of the April 18 bulletin—perhaps a few days later. This particular report contradicts the assertions that savings could only be made through curtailment. Yes (if the report is accurate, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary it should be accepted as accurate), this particular report dealt with the cost of operation in the 20 largest offices of the country. On one item, the cost of handling first-class mail, one office showed a cost of 133 percent more than the one that operated at the least cost. The average cost for the 20 offices was almost double that of the best office. Just imagine spending $5 for a piece of work in one office and getting that same piece of work done in another for $2.75.

Would it seem that savings could be made with such conditions existing? Yes, if the report accurately portrays present conditions and costs in the 20 offices in question, a savings of over $45,000,000 a year could be made in the handling of first-class mail alone. There was no explanation why such difference in operations cost should exist. There are bound to be some differences in costs of many postal activities but any report which showed such glaring disparity costs should be most carefully examined and analyzed before being made public. There were other differences of costs in other operations at these same 20 offices, but I might be considered as trying to build up a case if I offered additional detail. The report in question is not a secret. I am quite sure the congressional committee got copies of it and your organization may also have one.

The question will naturally arise in the minds of men of good sense—was this condition known to the officials of the Department, and, if known, what, if any, action was taken? Let us again look at the record. The report of March 15, 1950, was not the first of its kind to be printed and issued. Others in years and months passed had been distributed and showed similar conditions existing at the time specified on each report. The Department officials were aware of this disparagement in costs for the same kinds of work, and in some of the reports discussions were had on what was termed variables. Variables were introduced to offer some reasons why a difference might justifiably exist. But what kind of a variable it is that permits one office to spend the $5 for the same amount and kind of work and another only $2.75.

Could it be that the over-all management was satisfied to obtain and print cost figures and their related data and then go on to something else? Is it possible that the present postal management considered it had adequately and competently discharged its duties and responsibilities by gathering and publishing these very detailed reports on the operation costs in the 20 largest offices and then ignored the very conditions its own reports brought to light? If so, the conclusion is and must be there is something wrong in that kind of management.

Each and every matter I have discussed in this article I brought to the attention (in writing) of the present postal management at one time or another. Only two of my memoranda were acknowledged. I felt I owed it to the postal officials to call to their attention the conditions, some of which at least, were in strong contrast to the representations that savings could only be made through curtailment of service. I have always considered it disloyal to keep from my superiors any information which had a bearing on any of their policies or programs. It was a duty to call attention to the unpleasant and contradictory conditions—and one I tried to carry out under all conditions. There may be some who disagree with such procedure.

Don't Send Your Daughter to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 19 I introduced in the House H. R. 2766, a bill to create a Federal corporation for organized recreation of Government employees, with special attention to the metropolitan areas. The same or similar bills were introduced at the same time by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], and in another House by Senators LANGER, MURRAY, DOUGLAS, and MORSE.

Mr. Speaker, it took little persuasion to convince us of the merit—nay, the necessity—of such legislation.

Not even the busy day of a Member of Congress is impervious to the parade of human tragedies running through the daily newspapers of Washington, and of other large cities with heavy concentrations of Federal employees, such as my own city of New York.

CRITICISMS OUTWEIGHED

So far as I am concerned, I believe I am fully aware of the valid criticisms of such a program, and in the balance I find the arguments in its favor far, far outweigh those against.

To my amusement and amazement, I have received some torrid mail, however, opposing the proposal with a violence hardly justified by the earnest good will of the bill's sponsors.

It seems to me fitting that some of the evidence on the side of an authorized, organized, self-sustaining recreation program should be set forth in the RECORD, and I am, accordingly, inserting a straightforward, factual piece of reporting from Liberty magazine, written by Sam Stavisky, veterans' affairs editor of the Washington Post, with whom many of us are personally acquainted:

Two youthful sailors strolling through a downtown Washington park spotted a couple of good-looking girls, exchanged glances, and quickly made a pickup.

In the ensuing conversational byplay, it developed that the girls were fresh out of high school, had come to Washington only a few weeks before from a small town in the Midwest, and had been recruited by the Federal Government to work in Washington as typists. The sailors had been in the Navy for nearly a year, and, so they said, were due to be shipped overseas in a couple of days.

The girls said they had to get back to work, but promised to meet the sailors that night.

"Don't forget," said one of the boys, "This may be your last chance to do something nice for a couple of sailors going off to war, so don't stand us up."

Both girls giggled, and one of them answered: "Don't worry. We'll be here. We'd like some fun too."

This casual incident, which occurred some weeks after the outbreak of the Korean war, was witnessed by a tall, distinguished man who was snatching a few minutes' midday sun on a nearby park bench. He shrugged sorrowfully, then slowly walked to his office across the park.

The pickup incident was related to me several days later by that man, Ray H. Everett, executive secretary of the Washington Social Hygiene Society.

"Maybe nothing more than an evening's innocent fun came out of that pickup," Everett said. "I have no way of knowing.

"I do know that pickup dates are becoming more and more common here as Uncle Sam once again starts to bring thousands of young girls into Washington to work for the mushrooming emergency agencies. And that means more trouble."

Everett knows a little something about trouble. He has devoted half of his 63 years to crusading for intelligent sex education. He has helped more than 20,000 young men and women who have gotten into trouble over sex and marriage. Hundreds of unmarried mothers have come to him in despair to find kindly help and wise guidance.

"During World War II Washington attained the unsavory reputation of being a paradise for pickups, especially for the 40,000 to 50,000 servicemen who poured into the Nation's Capital on week-end leave," Everett said.

"As a result Washington became something of a boomtown for unwed mothers. It still is—with every indication that the tragic situation will get worse."

Ray Everett is an outspoken fellow. But a check-up with officials dealing with maternity and child-welfare problems in the Federal agencies, municipal departments, and private helping-hand organizations leaves no doubt that they also are worried about the shape of things to come.

Why?

Because right now it appears that Uncle Sam has already started to repeat the mistakes of World War II. Already eager-beaver agents from the Department of Defense and the State Department are racing around the countryside pell-mell recruiting a new civilian army of Government girls. Already the young recruits, many enlisted from the high schools, are marching into Washington—and trouble.

It's an ugly fact that the tremendous influx of "G-girls" into Washington during World War II, together with wartime conditions and tensions there, combined to make Washington the Nation's No. 1 boomtown for unwed mothers in 1944.

The records of the National Office of Vital Statistics give evidence that the Nation's

Capital has held on to that unenviable record ever since.

In 1945 Washington's illegitimate babies numbered 105 out of every 1,000 live births; in 1946 there were 98 out of 1,000; in 1947 there were 94 out of 1,000. In every one of those years Washington's illegitimacy ratio has been more than double the national average. The Federal statistics don't go beyond 1947, but the local statistics for the first half of 1950, as collected by the District of Columbia Health Department, indicate that the unmarried mother boom is hitting an all-time high.

Even as the boom expands, approximately 100,000 more G-girls will be herded into Washington—as the mobilization effort intensifies through 1951—to pound the endless rows of typewriters and to cultivate the endless columns of files in ever-burgeoning defense agencies.

These recruits are trooping into a city short of decent housing and short of adequate recreational facilities. They are crowding into a city in which—according to a 1947 Census Bureau survey of Metropolitan Washington—there are five women for every four men 14 to 44 years of age, four women to three men in the 20-to-24 age bracket. The combined shortages—housing, recreational facilities, eligible men—provide a fertile ground for giving another spurt to the boom in unwed mothers.

The same combination of shortages was discovered in Washington by G-girls of World War II, who flocked to the Nation's Capital to do their part. Poor, sometimes vile housing, insufficient recreational outlets, and desperate competition for the available men broke down the unstable girls, mentally and emotionally. Some got in trouble through unwed pregnancy; some with venereal disease. (Oh, yes, the Nation's Capital also has a thriving boom in VD.)

What's in store for Washington—unless corrective measures are taken—can be glimpsed in the report of the Committee on Unmarried Parenthood, D. C. Council of Social Agencies, made late in 1944. It read in part:

"Individual agencies all reported an increase in the number of unmarried mothers coming to them, particularly the young pregnant girl. One agency which had in 1938 accepted for care 16 unmarried mothers and pregnant girls, in 1943 accepted 128. * * * This increase does not allow for those cases which might have been accepted if there had been adequate staff and facilities to meet all requests.

"Most agencies have been experiencing an increase in applications among unmarried mothers who are new settlers in the community, many of these being young Government employees who plan to resume work in the District of Columbia after the birth of their babies and prefer not to return to the place of their legal residence."

The report pointed out that the local agencies, already overburdened with the requests for help from legally resident unwed mothers, were generally unable to assume responsibility for the newcomers. As a result, some of the unwed mothers had to be thrust, along with their illegitimate offspring, back into the community from which they came—and into social ostracism. Because of the legal red tape, lack of funds by the municipal government, indifference and apathy of the Federal Government, the nonresident unmarried mother—the report observed—"is frequently cut adrift from all normal human relationships through which she might receive help."

The situation hasn't changed much since that report was read. The municipal and local Community Chest agencies are still understaffed, overworked, and lacking in funds. And Uncle Sam is still pretty much indifferent to the problem.

Along with illegitimacy, the venereal disease rate also boomed during the war and postwar years in Washington. By 1948, VD was claiming six times as many victims in the District of Columbia as in 1941, with 13,000 cases reported, and 26,000 more cases unreported but suspected by health officials. By 1948, Washington's gonorrhea rate was five and one-half times the national average, with three to four times the number of cases than in cities of comparable population—such as Baltimore, Cleveland, and St. Louis.

Back in 1941 the local Health Department reported that 93 percent of the VD-infected soldiers at Fort Belvoir, Va., and 43 percent of the infected draftees at Fort Meade, Md., blamed Washington girls for their trouble.

Two years later—in 1943—Washington was accused by the Army of infecting twice as many soldiers with VD as any other city.

Now, who do you suppose was blamed for this situation? Street-walkers? Camp-followers? Prostitutes? Not at all. Washington police did a commendable job in cleaning up and eliminating the Capital's bawdy houses.

But the police found themselves helpless in attempting to cope with the "victory-girls," with the "cuddle-bunnies."

Efforts at controlling the amateur boom in illicit sexual relations made little headway. In 1945, the last year of the war, more than 65 percent of GI's infected with VD could blame their disease on amateur carriers. Twenty-four cases of GI gonorrhea were traced to one nice girl, whose promiscuity made her as dangerous to our troops as a full battalion of enemy soldiers on the front line.

The Washington Federation of Churches investigated the problem during the war and came up with the conclusion that 80 percent of infections among GI's were attributable to the young innocent-type of girl. The local Criminal Justice Association found that the sharp increase in juvenile delinquency was due to the uniform-happy girls who feel they can't say "No" to a soldier.

Several times during the Second World War, congressional committees took a hurried glance into the shameful conditions, but did little or nothing about it. Testimony before these committees, however, demonstrated that Uncle Sam was largely to blame.

There's no question but that Uncle Sam needed woman-power to run the vast network of records-and-red-tape mills in Washington during the war. But in its rush to bring the girls into the Nation's capital, Uncle Sam took a callous attitude toward his employees. The Federal agencies and their recruiters made no attempt to screen the girls, but instead hired anyone who could distinguish a filing cabinet from a typewriter.

In at least two cases, according to the Women's Bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, female inmates of mental institutions, who had written war agencies for jobs, were wired to report for work in Washington.

Testimony before congressional committees, presented by Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of famed St. Elizabeths mental hospital, made it clear that Uncle Sam's indiscriminate hiring program during World War II brought hundreds of mentally and emotionally unstable girls into Washington at a time when the economic and social tensions were at their worst.

"Too many of the girls brought here were young adolescents not very well adjusted, who found the excitement of wartime Washington conducive to recklessness," observes Miss Patricia Morse, license officer of the District Public Welfare Department.

Instead of glamour, the girls discovered Washington was a place where the abnormally high cost of living nullified what looked to them like high salaries. Decent quarters were hard to obtain, and even poor quarters were expensive. The files of the Community Chest agencies and municipal welfare units abound with instances of a half dozen or more Government girls being jammed into a single cellar or attic room at $25 or more a month for each girl.

When the situation got desperate, the Federal Government was panicked into throwing up dormitories for the girls. By the end of the war, some 11,000 girls were living in the dorms. Some of the units, like Arlington Farms, with a capacity of 4,300 residents, also provided excellent, if isolated, recreational facilities for the girls.

Now, however, Uncle Sam is back where he started on the housing problem. Housing facilities for G-girls have been sold to private interests, converted into office space for blossoming "cold war" agencies, or given over to the rapidly expanding Armed Forces. Along with the housing went some of the best recreational facilities. So, with the new crop of G-girls streaming in, the housing situation is just about where it was before World War II broke out.

Dorothea Andrews, social welfare writer for the Washington Post, in a 1949 study of unmarried parenthood in the Nation's Capital, points up the fact that Washington adds its own factor to unwed motherhood—loneliness.

"In a town where there is a preponderance of women over men, a woman is in heavier competition for a social life," commented Miss Andrews. "If the newcomer doesn't get the opportunity to meet single men, she may become involved with a married man."

The Andrews study disclosed that of those girls in trouble who came to local agencies for help, 50 percent were Government girls. Social workers agree, Miss Andrews said, that the girls seeking help were coming from an increasingly higher intelligence-level group, and that in most cases, promiscuity was the exception rather than the rule.

Of course, it is true that good housing, adequate recreational facilities, and the opportunity to meet single men won't stop girls from getting into trouble. But as Capt. Rhoda Milliken, of the Women's Bureau, point out, these three things will help prevent a number of individual tragedies.

Miss Milliken, who has spent a good part of her life dealing with so-called bad girls, urged the Federal Government in the pre-World War II days to screen G-girl recruits in order to weed out many of these mentally and emotionally unstable. The reply from the war agencies then was that the suggestion was "impractical."

Recently, Ray Everett, of the Social Hygiene Society, issued a strong statement warning the Federal agencies that their recruiting drives were duplicating the ballyhoo and repeating the take-one, take-all mistakes of World War II. "There were too many needless home-front casualties," he said.

Reaction of the Federal agencies to the renewed suggestions for screening girl recruits ranged from indifference to apathy. I asked the personnel chief of a major agency what he thought of the screening suggestion. The personnel director laughed at the idea.

"Look," he said, "our recruiters are given 2 or 3 weeks training before they're sent into the field. They're supposed to evaluate the girls when they interview them. * * * You certainly don't expect each girl to be examined by a psychiatrist, do you? * * * Why, we don't know which of the girls will crack up until they get here. Besides, how do we know she didn't get into trouble back at home. * * * Social hygiene education? That's a waste of time. Most of the girls know where babies come from."

Proponents of screening argue that the idea is not at all impractical. They point

out that draftees are given quickie mental-stability tests prior to induction, and that only the borderline cases have to be sent to a psychiatrist. They point out, too, that checks on mental and emotional stability for the girl recruits can be made—if the recruiters will put in the time—through the girls' teachers and ministers, through the social-service agencies in her community.

A check with the Civil Service Commission and the agencies which do their own hiring indicates that, arguments or not, screening of the G-girls is not planned. A check of the Federal housing agencies indicates that provision for good, inexpensive housing for the G-girls is not planned. Ditto on recreation. At this writing, there's nothing in the works to prevent the extra troubles most everybody expects.

Right now it's a sure bet that Washington will not only retain its scandalous title as the Nation's No. 1 boom town for unwed mothers, but will even establish a more disgraceful record in the war-scare months to come.

Fair Employment Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject Fair Employment Practices, the Essential Ingredient of Democracy, delivered at Indianapolis, Ind., by Mrs. Mahala Ashley Dickerson, an attorney of Montgomery, Ala.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES, THE ESSENTIAL INGREDIENTS OF DEMOCRACY

The founding fathers of this country entered upon a way of life with unbounded frontiers. There was always a new wide open space in which one could sow his seeds and watch his plants grow; set his traps and lift from them their game. The prior inhabitants of this land were pushed further and further back if their presence proved, in any way, thwarting to the pattern of the pioneers.

The framers of the Constitution of this country framed it for a civilization with much wide open space—space where the individual could do much as he pleased as long as he regarded the rights of others to do almost the same thing. That was freedom.

This very latitude in the early development of this country permitted the gradual crystallization of much injustice; for example, almost the extinction of a race once holding it completely, and the enslaving of another brought to it in chains, to help to build its dynasties, which were considered a part of that individual freedom, inherent in the rights of the pioneer.

This country, allegedly founded to perpetuate and enlarge Christendom, in the process of its maturity, has, bit by bit, revised its laws and constitutions to make for "a more perfect union * * * insure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity."

Yes; by constitutional enactments and judicial decisions, many inequities in the eyes of the law have been removed. Our shores have become havens of refuge for the oppressed of all lands. Fundamentally, there survives much of the early American sprit of "America, the land of opportunity." However, one fundamental ingredient, which held a place of equal dignity, with "the right to worship God as we please," is missing, that is: "the right to work."

Unfortunately, the days of homesteading on the physical frontiers are over. This country is controlled by an intricate economic system—a system which hums to the tune of corporations, stock, bonds, debentures, mines, minerals, farms, and the like. In addition, we recognize the fact that the Federal Government conducts a momentous business and that each State has a full force of employees, as had each municipality.

Unfortunately, the geographical location of the corporations, mines, minerals, farms, yes, even the State, Federal, or municipal agency, is largely determinative of whether or not all United States citizens are allowed to work there, or, if allowed, in what capacity. Yet, all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States, and of the State in which they reside. If a citizen, though competent to perform a task, is deprived of the opportunity because of race, religion, or parental origin, this fundamental ingredient of democracy has been suppressed.

The victims of willful rejection and deprivation, this disinherited group, may be followed into the various frustrated channels of all society. Many are in the prisons; many are in the sanitariums; yes, many are in our Armed Forces, not because they liked army life or were drafted, but because they could not find a job at home. Many, after the particular crisis, which prompted the enlistment ended, never returned home, or for that matter, to this country. They preferred anonymity in a strange land to the embarrassing experience of job seeking, and the endless shakes of the head which they knew were prompted solely because of race, religion, or parental origin.

Yet, these same citizens are expected to pledge and maintain the same allegiance to this country's flag, contribute to its same organized charities, which often do not permit a member of the rejected group to hold a job on their staffs, pay State and Federal taxes to help support the offices from which they are excluded. A loyalty built on such an uncertain basis would appear easily shaken. The more men suffer the more they think. Perhaps the failure of mass rebellion of the disinherited groups has resulted from only slight suffering here and there or an inability to think in a logical manner because of not having once had a spark or hint of anything different or better.

Today, the world is in a turmoil. The world will decide before too many years have passed whether or not the two major forms of government battling each other can survive side by side or will have one engulfed by the other. Whether integrity, loyalty, patriotism, and the like can survive rejection and discrimination becomes a problem. Yet, more pressing is the problem of whether these concepts can survive hunger, perpetual want, and other vital deprivations arising naturally from the denial of the right to work. Whether this denial comes from a Federal agency, a State agency, a municipal agency, or private enterprise, operating by virtue of a franchise emitting from one of the afore-mentioned, it is nevertheless an un-American act, destructive of a democratic way of life.

The mills of the gods grind slowly and our own country is now playing a crucial role in the upward or downward trend of the infiltration of various sentiments into the hearts and minds of its citizens. Never before has the United States had such an opportunity through its citizens to win so completely a world-wide victory; by making democracy work at home, by insuring one fundamental right to all of its very own—a right which they could all, despite inability to comprehend a nebulous foreign policy, understand—the right to work.

Ability knows no color line, as was recently demonstrated by the Crispus Attucks Tigers. At this time they are the standard bearers for all the high schools of this great city. The American spirit of fair play, so aptly asserting itself in the world of sports, should not be suppressed in our economic system. Here, too, the basis should be merit, and merit alone.

Plight of Small-Business Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the plight of many small-business men is very serious today. Inability to obtain highly needed materials is bringing many of them to the verge of ruin. One of them has written to me as follows:

It is difficult to preserve any faith in the present administrators of government in the face of the shameful publicity coming out of Washington and the utter lack of evidence that a unified, realistic, well-organized approach is being made toward solving the internal affairs of our country.

This gentleman has sent me two articles by Denny Allen which relate to the question of material shortages as it affects the small-business men. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAPE STRANGULATION, STEEL STARVATION KILL QUINCY MAN'S BOILER BUSINESS

(By Denny Allen)

The squeeze is on—and getting tighter—for the small-business man.

He's being swamped, his business imperiled, by a wave of Government controls, red tape and scarcity of raw materials, all created by the defense economy. He's a victim of the Nation's transition from civilian to war production.

FALLING BY WAYSIDE

At a time when business could be thriving in an expanding market, small-scale manufacturers along the South Shore are finding themselves up to their necks in a struggle to keep going. Some are beginning to succumb to the undertow.

Especially hard hit are the small companies which use steel and other metals as a basic production item. They can't get raw materials for civilian production and are caught in a time lag in which they can only hope for future subcontracts or defense projects.

One such case—and it's a drastic one—is that of the Arc-Way Steel Boiler Co., owned by F. Ray Robinson, of 128 Spring Street, Quincy. The squeeze is driving him right out of the business which he spent years in developing.

Robinson's plant is at 20 Ericsson Street in Neponset, a building he purchased from the old Lawley shipyard when it closed down after the war. He manufactures (when he can get materials) some 40 types of oil-fed and gas-fed steel boilers and a comparatively new product, a poultry cremator for which there is a national demand.

TO BE SOLD AT AUCTION

But he's going out of business. His plant and machinery are to be sold at public auction next week in a complete liquidation of the company.

Robinson's problem is the same as all small manufacturers. Production has been reduced to a trickle because metals aren't available. What's more, defense subcontracts are still several months off. Anticipating them in a highly competitive field is a risky proposition.

For 5 months, the company has been at work, filling out forms and making contacts in hopes of getting some defense work, but there hasn't been any given out in the steel prefabricating line. It probably will be June or after before the situation breaks.

Even if defense orders were available, the present system of allocation carries no guaranty that a manufacturer could get raw materials. True, he would have a defense order (DO), but mills and warehouses are selling available materials to the first fellow who comes with a DO. Later arrivals are out of luck.

By summer, the Government hopes to set up a controlled materials plan which would establish necessary priorities, but that will be too late for Robinson and others like him.

MILLS WON'T TAKE ORDERS

Big business, with its resources, connections and wherewithal, may be able to hang on, but the sag in civilian production is killing the Arc-Way Steel Boiler Co.

"We can't get the materials. The mills won't even take our orders," he said.

"The black market? Yes, we can get all the steel we want at black market prices, but then we couldn't sell our product because the cost to the consumer would be too high."

For example, he explained, the maximum price his company can pay for steel boiler plate is 7.5 cents a pound. The black market boys are asking from 10 to 20 cents a pound.

Robinson is proud of his products—the steel boilers which he says are about half the size, yet close to three times as efficient as the old-type cast-iron boilers. He could build them at the rate of one every 20 minutes if he had the materials.

ORDERS FOR 200

The poultry cremator, invented by a New Hampshire man with Robinson aiding the development, is something new with great promise. It is for use around poultry farms and hatcheries where the disposal of dead poultry and refuse has always been a health problem.

"We've sold 50 already and have orders for 200 more. The orders would go on indefinitely but we can't get the steel," said Robinson. Of the 200 on order, he hopes to complete 20. The plant, even at present, could turn out 10 a day—again if materials were obtainable.

But they're not, so the Arc-Way Steel Boiler Co. is going on the auction block on February 28 at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. The building, land, machinery, and everything else will be offered for sale.

"It would be an excellent opportunity for someone," said Robinson. "The right people with the right connections could have a fine business."

But for Robinson, the end of his career as a manufacturer is at hand. How many more small businesses will follow suit in the "big squeeze" remains to be seen.

DEFENSE MUDDLE HITS BRAINTREE TOOL PLANT

(By Denny Allen)

"Us little fellows are really getting booted around. Those people in Washington do not care what happens to us."

TOUGH SITUATION

Thus spoke today another of the small-scale manufacturers along the South Shore who are facing extinction in the Nation's jerky jump from civilian to defense production.

"It is a tough and nasty situation," mourned Frank Albertassi, an official of the Corey Tool & Machine Co., of 21 Granite Street, Braintree.

"I have got 17 men I do not know what to do with when we finish the work now on hand. We cannot get the materials or the machines to do our own work and there is not too much defense work around yet."

Pessimistic about the future, Albertassi voiced a lament that is common with little-business men today, especially those who need a steady flow of steel and other materials to stay in business.

Since the Government began cutbacks in civilian production to bolster the defense program, a time lag before defense contracts appear has pushed many manufacturers into an enforced business slump.

Production has dropped off because materials are not available and the jobs of employees are being either wiped out or seriously jeopardized.

NATIONAL CONCERN

The situation is one of national concern. Manufacturers by the thousands are facing an uncertain future that may bring idle plants and a serious unemployment problem.

As a result, Washington officials are under heavy pressure to reduce the stockpiling of materials and lessen the severity of the time lag until defense contracts are placed in sufficient volume.

"Even at that we have been luckier than some," said Albertassi, whose company makes special tools for such customers as the Pneumatic Scale Corp. in North Quincy and the Armstrong Cork Co. plant in South Braintree. Albertassi is a partner in the Corey concern with his son James and William Bemis, also of Braintree.

"We saw it coming 4 or 5 months ago and stocked up, but it is all gone now," he said. "It is really getting bad."

Getting materials today, he explained, amounts to a scramble, picking up 100 pounds or so wherever it can be found.

"It is a funny thing," he said. "Three months ago we used to have salesmen coming in here trying to sell us stainless steel. Now we cannot buy it, yet there are not many defense contracts around, so where is the steel going?"

GREY MARKET

One of the answers, he agreed, is the so-called grey market where a manufacturer can buy just about any type of metal he wants at double the normal price.

How about the prospect of defense work?

"We really do not know because we have not been out looking," said Albertassi. "We have been very busy with our own work for 2 or 3 years. But from what I can see, there is not too much defense work around for companies like ours."

During World War II, the Corey Co. did much work for the Army and Navy on the manufacture of special tools. But the prospects of returning to that work are not very bright.

"Practically all of the skilled personnel we had in those days are gone now," Albertassi decalred. "Only one of them is still with us.

"You can quote me. It is a tough and nasty situation."

Underemployment of Rural Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Farm Unemployment," published in the Washington Post, March 19, 1951. This editorial discusses materials prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the committee's staff and published as a committee print February 2, 1951, under the title "Underemployment of Rural Families." I understand that the committee still has available a few copies, which will be distributed on an individual basis as long as the supply lasts.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the findings of this staff study. I wish to state that this report grew out of the recommendations for further study of the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families, under my chairmanship. This study is not to be considered a report of the committee. It does not represent the conclusions of the committee or any of its members, but simply attempts to present a factual review of available material on the important economic problem of rural low-income families. The study was prepared by Dr. Walter W. Wilcox, on loan from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and Dr. W. E. Hendrix, on leave from the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station. Other members of the committee's staff have subjected it to close scrutiny.

There being no objection, the editorial and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 19, 1951]

FARM UNDEREMPLOYMENT

A report prepared for the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report states that 2,000,000 small-farm families, or more than a third of all farm families, are underemployed. Workers on these small farms produce less than half as much as those operating medium-sized family farms. Another million and a half nonfarm workers living in the country or in small towns are only 60 percent as productive as workers in the average rural nonfarm family. If all these underemployed workers had jobs enabling them to produce as much as the average worker on medium-sized family farms or the average rural nonfarm worker, the investigators conclude that the increase in output would in effect add 2,500,000 workers to the country's labor force.

This rural underemployment is Nationwide. Evidence gathered by the committee from all parts of the country is a military reminder that we need a point 4 program of our own to make more efficient use of our manpower resources. Although Federal educational and credit programs aid some of these low-income underemployed farm families, the report points out that there is "no clearly defined (national) policy for dealing

specifically with rural underemployment and the low-income problem in agriculture on a comprehensive basis including both farm and nonfarm adjustments."

The investigators stress in particular the need for a vigorous farm enlargement program. That is of major importance since inadequate acreage accounts for a great deal of the prevailing underemployment. However, the job is considered too large an undertaking for the Government alone. The report advocates integration of educational programs carried on by the Government with a farm-enlargement loan program carried on by private agencies.

Loans are needed, too, to improve farm practices and help underemployed farmers to obtain employment elsewhere. Of course, these proposals would entail considerable outlays by lending agencies, but expenditures would be spread over a long period of time and would yield dividends through an increase in the earning capacity of several million Americans. A country that has spent billions of dollars to further recovery (i. e., increase the productivity) of Western European workers has no excuse for ignoring the exigent needs of the underprivileged at home.

SUMMARY OF UNDEREMPLOYMENT OF RURAL FAMILIES

(Prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the committee staff)

Two million of nearly six million farm operator families are now producing less than $1,800 each per year in farm products, including products used in the home. In addition to these farm families, there are 3,531,000 rural nonfarm families, 1,500,000 of whom had annual incomes of less than $2,000 in 1948. The staff study, which is an outgrowth of studies conducted by the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families last year, shows how the welfare of these 3,500,000 rural families may be improved while at the same time adding the equivalent of nearly 2,500,000 workers to our national labor force.

The report presents new information on the extent of underemployment among rural families, what existing governmental programs are now doing to improve the lot of the underemployed farm family, and lists the results of questions directed to technicians in various States as to the extent, causes and remedies for underemployment of farm families in their areas. The Nationwide character of the problem of rural underemployment is demonstrated by the fact that the subcommittee received replies from respondents in 37 States.

The report points out that there are four general areas for improvement of the underemployed rural worker:

1. Increase the productivity per worker on existing farms: On small, inadequate farming units crop yields are lower and milk production per cow and egg production per hen are lower than on the nearby larger farms. Families on these farming units are usually hard-pressed for money to spend for seeds, fertilizers, foundation livestock, and supplies for disease and insect control. Lacking alternative means for employment these families, instead of moving, adjust themselves to the limited resources at hand.

2. Increase the size of the farm: Even with the adoption of improved practices, if existing units are not enlarged workers can only increase their productivity by 50 to 100 percent. These small-scale units would have to increase their output by an average of 300 percent to equal the modest level of output on medium-sized commercial family farms. To reach that level fully 60 percent of the present small farm units must be increased in size or consolidated with other farms.

3. Assist families who desire farm or nonfarm employment outside their home communities: In spite of substantial outward migration the reduction in population pressure in communities of low-income underemployed rural families has been only about 10 percent in the last decade. Although in some instances new industries have been established nearby, opportunities for off-farm employment are only a small fraction of the number needed to provide full employment for the available able-bodied manpower of working age.

4. Increase employment opportunities for low-income part-time farmers, rural nonfarm families, and hired farm workers: The 1,900,000 part-time farm and rural nonfarm families where the head of the family is able-bodied and of working age, either underemployed or employed on low-productivity jobs, exceeds the number of full-time farm families who are underemployed.

The study goes on to give a number of specific suggestions to carry out the recommendations listed above, including:

(a) A cooperative State and Federal program of substantial assistance to counties having high proportions of underemployed rural families to provide: (1) Special technical assistance on more efficient farming practices; (2) Technical assistance to help people in these communities determine alternative employment opportunities and to provide them with skills to take advantage of these opportunities.

(b) Plans for stimulating increased private credit for improved farming practices, including farm enlargement.

(c) Proposals, in the light of current manpower shortages, to provide substantial defense credit and grants to supplement private credit for improved farming practices, for farm enlargement, and for moving costs of families desiring employment in other communities.

Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atlantic Union," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, March 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC UNION

When the friends and supporters of a Federal union of the Atlantic Pact nations gathered last week to promote their cause, they could point to a general tide moving in their direction. The Atlantic Pact contains many hints of an ultimate union; and Russia's continued intransigence has given these a new emphasis. General Eisenhower represents a unified military policy, while a federation of Western European states continues to develop on functional lines. The Schuman plan is the boldest initiative of this kind; and the efforts of American officials to secure its adoption indicate the extent to which we are bound up in a wide community of interests.

Ex-Secretary of War Patterson, Senators Kefauver and Gillette, and other speakers at the impressive annual dinner could draw upon recent events to fortify their case. The successes and the set-backs in Korea, the immense efforts and the considerable difficulties of General Eisenhower's mission, all can be taken to illustrate the need for some form of closer political ties. A resolution calling for an international convention to discuss implementation of this need has received substantial support in both Houses of Congress. For the moment, however, there undoubtedly is a desire among many world-minded statesmen to focus attention on reinforcing General Eisenhower's command rather than to raise other far-reaching and controversial questions. The immediate task is to prove that there exists among the people a widespread and profound desire for a larger union; and this the Atlantic Union Committee is prepared to undertake. It is a great task worthy of the efforts of the best men.

Back to the Day of the Serf and Peasant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Americans, we are told, have fought two wars to preserve civilization, prevent a return to the Dark Ages.

As your sons, husbands, and fathers, some who have served before, are marching off to world war III, should we not be told where they will be required to fight, for what purpose, what battles they must win before the war is over?

Are we back in the days when the feudal lords decided when a war—either for gain or just for the pleasure of fighting—should be fought by their serfs?

Those serfs neither knew why they were fighting, where they were to fight, nor when the war would end. They were a little worse off than are our conscripted men of today, for they were required, to some extent, to equip themselves for the fighting. Our conscripted men are a little better off, for munitions of war, their food, clothing, and transportation, are provided by the taxpayers. But they have little, if any, more knowledge of where they are going or why—or when the war will be over for those who survive—than did those who fought 600 years ago.

The men of those days did, however, at least know that they were fighting for and under the command of their feudal lord. The soldiers of old followed their lord and master and his flag into battle. Our men, as they leave their home shores, sail out under the Stars and Stripes, the flag which for more than 160 years has, to the people of all the world, been the symbol of liberty, identifying the land of freedom and opportunity.

But, under the present procedure, when they leave the homeland and become a part of world war III they will find themselves serving under the flag of United Nations, in a force whose commander is a general or an admiral who takes his orders either from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or United Nations. The soldier of 600 years ago was subject to the orders of his lord. The American boy of today, when he reaches the battleground where he must fight—perhaps die—will go forward, will withdraw—on the orders of United Nations.

United Nations is a group made up of representatives of 59 nations, with a Security Council of 11 members—a Security Council which dictates when and where our men shall fight and for what purpose.

Do you realize that there is a plan which will authorize the drafting of every physically and mentally fit American male, as he reaches the age of 18½ years, for a period of 26 months, with a further obligation to serve in the active or reserve forces for an additional 6 years—a total of 8 years and 2 months in military service?

Do you realize that Mr. Truman proposes to create an army of at least 4,000,000 men? That he contemplates sending as many million of our men to Korea and to Europe as the Security Council—not Congress—thinks may be necessary to accomplish its purpose—whatever that may be? That they will serve under the command and flag of the United Nations?

When our forefathers were fighting for their liberty George III of England, who wished to prevent the establishment of our Republic, hired the Hessians—trained mercenary soldiers—to fight for him in the Revolutionary War. King George paid the landgraves, princes, and dukes of the German states for the services of those Hessians in an effort to throttle liberty.

Today, Mr. Truman, Mr. Acheson are sending American men to fight for United Nations. The administration is not paid for the services of these men who fight and die abroad—they fight, suffer, and some die, not for home, fireside, or country, but for United Nations. The administration has the effrontery to tell us that these wars are necessary for our own protection.

But never yet has Mr. Truman, Mr. Acheson, nor anyone else told those who are paying the cost, doing the fighting, just what it is that these men, sent abroad to fight under the orders of United Nations, must do, which, having done, the war will end, peace will be established and those who survive may come home—live their own lives in their own way.

Are not the American people entitled to an answer to that question before more of their men are conscripted, march off to fight in world war III?

State Legislative Program of Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the New York State legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats, adopted December 20, 1950:

STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., OF NEW YORK, FOR 1951

1. Rent control: Every housewife and every tenant knows that our people are the victims of inflation at home. The two enemies that must be defeated are inflation and communism. The rising cost of living must be held in check, and a major factor in the cost of living is rents. A first order of business of the new legislature should be the enactment of a fair rent-control law to prohibit the imposition of unfair rent increases by landlords.

We have repeatedly pointed out that residents of the city of New York have been the subject of fantastic increases in garage rentals, in some cases amounting to 315 percent. The legislature has repeatedly refused to plug this hole in the rent control laws. We urge again that the rent control laws be amended so as to control specifically garage rentals, and thus put an end to this abuse on automobile owners.

2. Increased aid to municipalities: The legislature should enact laws giving a fair share of the taxes collected by the State paid by the residents of the city of New York and other cities to those municipalities.

3. Public schools: In terms of per capita expenditure, and facilities available to the total population, New York State ranks far below its proper place. Our cities lack adequate and modern public schools, and existing schools are overcrowded. The salaries paid to public school teachers are far below what is needed by them to maintain a fair standard of living. A broad program of legislation should be adopted to give all communities in the State adequate and modern schools and to insure a decent standard of living for our teachers. The incoming legislature should remain in session until such a program has been adopted.

4. Primaries: Under existing law candidates for nomination to offices filled by a State-wide election are nominated by State conventions. It is notorious that such conventions are controlled conventions and that the candidates for election to such offices as Governor, United States Senator, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, and Comptroller are selected by a handful of party bosses. Few of the candidates nominated at such conventions in recent years would have been nominated by party primaries of either party. To us such a system is not in accord with our concept of the democratic way of life. We urge that, as in many other States, a direct primary law be enacted so that the candidates for offices to be filled by a State-wide election will be selected by State-wide primaries. Only this way can the right of the people to select their officers be insured.

5. Boards of election: The election law at the present time provides that the board of elections in the city of New York shall be selected by the Democratic and Republican County Committees of New York County and Kings County. For years the people of the counties of Bronx, Richmond, and Queens have been thus deprived of representation in the board of elections, and appointments to that board have become party plums to be distributed by political bosses. The board of elections, charged with maintaining the integrity of our elective processes, is truly the watchdog of our liberties. We urge that the election law be amended so as to provide for the election of members of the board of elections by city-wide primary elections of the two major parties.

6. Eighteen-year-old ballot: With the drafting of 18-year-old boys to fight in Korea, emphasis is again laid upon the inequity of our present law which says that citizens who are old enough to fight are not old enough to vote. New York should follow the lead of other States and enact legislation conferring the ballot at the age of 18.

7. Divorce law revision: We have for many years called attention to the scandal of our present divorce laws which breed perjury and rampant fraud. The so-called strict divorce law of New York has actually resulted in New York becoming one of the easiest of divorce States, and has seriously weakened the integrity of our system of justice. New York needs new laws relating to the family, marriage, and divorce under which our courts will be given adequate staffs to permit them to ascertain the causes of family difficulties and to work out solutions which will permit the court to effect reconciliations and save marriages. We again urge the creation by the legislature of a commission composed of representatives of the three principal faiths of the State, of doctors, sociologists, women, bench and bar to evolve for New York State a model family law including divorce, separation, annulment, marriage, and related matters. We urge the enactment by New York of the Uniform Divorce Recognition Act to put an end to fraudulent out-of-State divorces.

8. Family court: Today there is confusion in the courts as to family matters. The supreme court has jurisdiction in divorce, separation, and annulment matters, and is not equipped with the staff to permit it to discharge its responsibilities adequately. The surrogates have jurisdiction in adoption matters. The so-called domestic relations court handles primarily support cases, and juvenile problems. Still other family matters are handled elsewhere. Paternity cases are handled in the court of special sessions, and other matters in the magistrates courts. All of these matters should be handled and centered in a single family court, and we urge the enactment of laws to that end.

9. Court unification and simplification: In other matters too we are afflicted with an ancient and unwieldy court structure. The Supreme Court of the State is congested with many more cases than can possibly be handled by its judges, and justice is frustrated by delays of years in between the commencement of an action and the time that it comes to trial. Other courts such as the city court, the municipal court, and the court of general sessions do not today have a sufficient volume of business to keep their judges busy, and those judges are not now permitted to serve in other courts where they are needed. Our entire court structure should be overhauled so as to provide for a better utilization of our judge power, and to furnish the people with a more efficient administration of justice.

10. Judges and political office: The State constitution today effectively prohibits judges of the court of appeals and justices of the supreme court from running for political office without resigning from the bench. Such a rule is consistent with the canons of judicial ethics which are aimed at preventing judges from using their judicial office for political purposes. Yet judges of other courts of the State are, under existing law, free to run for political office without resigning from the bench and many have returned to judicial duties after active political campaigns and defeats at the polls. To keep politics out of our courts, the constitutional prohibitions should be extended to all judges of all courts of record in the State.

11. Unemployment insurance: The benefits of the unemployment insurance law should be extended to classes not now covered by it, and should also be made available to the sick.

12. Reapportionment: The incoming legislature is charged with responsibility for a reapportionment of the State's congressional districts. This becomes a heavy responsibility since New York's representation in the Eighty-third Congress is to be reduced. Congressional reapportionment should be done

on a nonpartisan basis and with the purpose of insuring that each of the State's 43 congressional districts will contain an equal population. Gerrymandering should be avoided.

Reapportionment of the State legislature is also a pressing problem. For many years restrictive laws have prevented the people of the cities of the State, including the city of New York, from having fair and equal representation in the legislature. A new law should be enacted to provide that all sections of the State will be represented in the legislature on the basis of population in accord with the basic principles of democratic government.

13. Motor vehicles: We are opposed to the use of revenues obtained from gasoline taxes and automobile license fees for purposes other than the development and maintenance of an adequate system of highways. We advocate the abolition of toll roads and the issuance of permanent automobile license plates. We urge that the discriminatory gasoline tax in favor of nonautomotive users of gasoline be abolished, and that industrial users of gasoline be subjected to the same tax as motorists. We oppose a use tax on automobiles.

14. Recognition of women voters: Although they constitute more than half of the electorate, there are few major State, city, or county offices which are held by women. We advocate the nomination, appointment, and election of qualified women to a fair share of city, State, and county offices, and we call upon Democratic leaders in the State to give such representation to women wherever possible.

15. Narcotics: We favor the enactment of a law providing for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts by State agencies, and the taking of all necessary steps by the State to eliminate the traffic in narcotics.

16. Little Hoover Commission: Enactment of a bill for a little Hoover Commission, to be patterned after the Federal Hoover Commission, is recommended.

17. Permanent personal registration: It is urgent that legislation be enacted to provide for permanent personal registration throughout the State.

18. Refusal to waive immunity: We urge that the present laws which provide that a Government official or employee who refuses to testify in any proceeding on the ground that his testimony will incriminate him shall thereafter be barred from public employment, shall be extended to retired Government officials or employees, and that the pension rights of all such retired Government officials or employees shall terminate upon such refusal to testify.

19. Communism: We abhor communism in all its manifestations, and we urge that all steps be taken by the legislature necessary to root it out and expell it from our State. We are opposed to the employment of Communists in our National, State, or local Governments. The danger to our democratic way of life does not come only from abroad. There are some misguided citizens and resident aliens who call themselves Americans who have lent themselves and their energies to foreign doctrine and to foreign aggressors who seek to stamp out democracy in our country. We cannot afford to have an American Gottwald or an American Quisling, and we must take all steps that our Constitution permits to make sure that we do not have one. At the same time, we must apply traditional American methods in ferreting out and removing such persons. It is clear to us that the members, both open and concealed, of the American Communist Party are, in fact, the willing agents of a foreign government committed to interfere with and disrupt our domestic affairs. We must deal with them as such.

20. United Nations: We again support to the fullest extent the United Nations, and advocate strengthening it so that it may make and enforce wise judgments and keep the peace of the world. We endorse the flying on the public buildings of our States the United Nations flag, to the left of our own American flag, as a symbol of our Nation's support of the United Nations and its objectives. We urge that our teachers training colleges give courses qualifying their graduates to impart to their students in our public schools the principles of sound Americanism and of the United Nations Charter.

21. St. Lawrence seaway: Once again we endorse the program for a St. Lawrence seaway, and full development by New York State under public ownership of the waterpower facilities thereby provided. Too long has this important project been neglected. In connection therewith, we favor the preservation and development of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls.

22. Public health: The inadequacies of our State public health system should be speedily removed, and new public hospitals throughout the State should be completed and constructed. The intolerable conditions in some of our State hospitals, whereby children are forced to sleep on the floor, should be corrected at once.

23. Public housing: Our program of public housing should be accelerated and projects brought to completion so that the existing shortage of homes can be remedied. Our goal should be to have provided homes for all veterans of World War II before the veterans of Korea come home.

24. Regents: The present method of electing regents of the University of the State of New York is unfair and should be changed. Those in charge of the educational system of the State should be selected on a nonpolitical basis, and with a view to giving representation to all sections of the State.

25. Securities dealers: It is ironical that although our laws provide that barbers, plumbers, lawyers, doctors, teachers, real estate brokers, and insurance brokers must take examinations and demonstrate their qualifications before they can commence their profession, no similar laws apply to persons handling other people's money as securities dealers and brokers. We do not believe that merely the possession of funds necessary to purchase a seat on the New York Stock Exchange or the New York Curb Exchange should qualify a person to engage in the securities business. We support the enactment of a State law providing for the licensing, by a system of examination, of all persons engaging in the securities business in this State.

26. Civilian defense: We support full appropriations for the development of a civilian defense system in this State.

27. Practice of electrolysis: To amend the general business law in relation to providing for the examination, licensing, and regulations of persons engaged in the practice of electrolysis.

Expenditure Control and Defense Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a copy of a policy recommendation adopted by the national affairs committee of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce on February 8 on the subject of control of nonessential expenditures. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, indicating, I believe, reactions which are shared by countless people of my State on the vital subject of conserving funds, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPENDITURE CONTROL AND DEFENSE LEGISLATION

Recommended a minimum reduction of $4,500,000,000 in the budget for fiscal 1952. In the light of present conditions this reduction can be effected without hampering the defense effort. Even with such a reduction, Federal civilian expenditures would still be $2,000,000,000 more than they were in 1945, and nearly $3,000,000,000 more than in 1946.

The President's new budget of $71,600,000,000 for fiscal 1952 leaves much to be desired if the Federal Government is to do a real belt-tightening job in nondefense spending. This is by far the largest peacetime budget that has ever been submitted to the American people. The previous all-time high of $44,000,000,000 was collected by the Federal Government in 1945. It will cost the taxpayers of Milwaukee County $587,919,000, and those of the State $1,489,155,000 as their share of the budget.

In his state of the Union message the President said, "The Government must practice rigid economy in nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed." A close look at this budget message, however, shows that 1952 expenditures will be higher than 1951 in almost every major spending item. The budget message proposes an enactment of virtually all of the Fair Deal legislative program. For many of these items the budget does not include expenditure estimates. He did, however, specifically add $290,000,000 in Federal aid to education and $35,000,000 for his proposed health-insurance program. In the time of sharply rising taxes these proposals seem remarkable, to say the least.

While some cuts have been made (totaling $3,800,000,000), they are somewhat misleading, since many of them are balanced by increases in nondefense spending under other headings such as health insurance and Federal aid to education.

In general, the budget appears to be extremely liberal toward nonmilitary expenditures which, in one way or another, can be tied in with defense. In the strictly nondefense areas some relative small cuts have been made, but by and large, the policy seems to be hold the line of 1951 expenditures in these areas rather than to make cuts in them.

The President expressed every intention of restoring, when possible, cuts he did make, and in many cases recommendations were made that these nondefense activities be greatly expanded when possible.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD (Democrat, Virginia), on December 22, 1950, in a letter to the President suggested reductions in nonessential spending totaling $7,600,000,000, based largely on estimated expenditures during the present fiscal year. When the President submitted his budget on January 15 for the next fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, recommending domestic civilian expenditures totaling more than $1,000,000,000 in excess of the estimates for this fiscal year, Senator BYRD revised his proposal to reduce nonessential Federal expenditures by $9,100,000,000 in comparison with the President's budget requests for next year.

Reductions in less essential spending will not only make it easier for the Nation to bear the enlarged burden of military preparation, but will also be a powerful force in the fight against inflation.

The Present Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very good letter on the present situation, written by the Honorable G. Albert Stewart, a most outstanding newspaperman.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEARFIELD, PA., *March 20, 1951.*

EDITOR, THE INQUIRER:

Monday's Inquirer tells us of an Easter program beamed to Eastern Europe by our multi-million-dollar propaganda outfit, the Voice, wherein Joe Stalin was likened to a cuckoo.

How nauseating to think that the voice of a great Christian nation could do no better than produce a cheap vaudevillian skit as a means of combating communism and portraying the American way of life.

How much better and more appropriate would it have been to beam the story of the risen Christ which communism seeks to put down but which millions of middle age and aged Russians surely remember and would like to hear again.

How much better to have beamed some glorious and soul-lifting Easter music which surely would have fallen on receptive ears no longer treated to anything but the militaristic music exalting statism.

How much better to have told of the millions of free Americans singing praises to God rather than to dictators and political philosophies, and of all the millions of free Americans who gathered in their chosen places of worship in accordance with the dictates of their own conscience.

Aside from the ridiculousness of such a broadcast our multi-million-dollar Voice is supposed to be staffed by experts in human relations, among them psychologists who should know that the surest way to encourage support of a man by his friends and associates is to ridicule him. These experts must know that Stalin has his friends in Eastern Europe, that there is a generous streak of nationalism in every man and that such silly ridicule is resented.

Many of us Americans are not admirers of our President, Mr. Truman. We cuss him aplenty. But all of us would resent ridicule and caricature of him by Russia or by the propaganda machine of any other nation, and, motivated by our nationalistic impulses, basic American unity and, yes, patriotism if you like, would rush to his support.

Finally, if Joe Stalin is what our President and our State Department says he is, his name should be referred to with disdain and he described as something unspeakable, not likened to a cuckoo or any other member of the feathered kingdom.

And, above all, our Voice should realize the seriousness of the job it has to do and not be playing around with such juvenilian ideas as skits in gay mood as reported by the United Press, especially on a day affording the finest opportunity to portray our joyous American way of life.

The Voice has given ample evidence of its unfitness on this and other occasions. Why do we continue to spend millions on such cuckoo business?

G. ALBERT STEWART,
Ex-editor, Clearfield (Pa.) Progress.

Claims of Jewish People for Nazi Murder, Spoliation, and Robbery—Shall the Murderers Become the Heirs of Their Victims?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the Ambassador of Israel to the Secretary of State on the question of Israel's claim against Germany:

The Ambassador of Israel presents his compliments to the honorable the Secretary of State and, under instructions from the Government of Israel, has the honor to submit the following communication on the question of Israel's claim against Germany.

2. In the note which the Ambassador of Israel had the honor to address to the Secretary of State on January 16, 1951, he stated that the Government of Israel reserved to itself the right to deal in a separate note with such claims in respect of Jewish losses for which Germany must be held accountable as did not fall within the scope of the existing laws providing for individual restitution and indemnification. It is proposed in the present note to state the basis and nature of these claims and submit proposals for their satisfaction.

3. The case of the Jewish people against Germany is without precedent. There is no record in history of such gigantic slaughter and rapine as that perpetrated by the German people against the Jews of Europe. In the course of a few years entire communities, whose history went back over a millennium, were wiped out by a process of systematic extermination. Over 6,000,000 Jews were done to death by torture, starvation, mass execution, and asphyxiation; many of them were burned and buried alive. Neither old nor young were spared. Children were torn from the arms of their mothers and flung into the furnaces. Old men and women were hunted down and sent to the death camps. In Poland and the occupied zone of Russia alone, over 4,000,000 Jews perished. From Germany itself and from every part of Europe which fell under German domination—from Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, Greece, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria—trainloads of Jews were sent month after month to the extermination centers. Their destruction forms one of the most harrowing stories in the annals of the human race.

4. Murder was accompanied by robbery on a vast scale. According to conservative estimates,[1] Jewish property to the value of over $6,000,000,000 was seized by the Nazis in Germany and the other European countries that fell under their sway. This includes a collective fine of 1,000,000,000 marks imposed on the Jews in Germany in the wake of the Government-organized pogrom of November 1938, as well as other fines, seizures, and discriminatory taxes imposed by the Nazi authorities on German Jews in regard to which the Government of the German Federal Republic appears to have assumed a liability by acknowledging itself recently a successor power to the Third Reich.

[1] Indemnification and Reparations, by N. Robinson (published by the Institute of Jewish Affairs, New York, 1944), p. 83.

5. This colossal campaign of genocide and spoliation represented the climax of a process of persecution which began on the day when the National-Socialist Government came into power. The judgment in the Nuremberg trial of German major war criminals described it as "a record of consistent and systematic inhumanity on the greatest scale." The following extracts from the judgment may serve to illustrate the progress of Jewish persecution from the establishment of the Nazi regime until the end of World War II:

"With the seizure of power, the persecution of the Jews was intensified. A series of discriminatory laws were passed, which limited the offices and professions permitted to Jews; and restrictions were placed on their family life and their rights of citizenship. By the autumn of 1938, the Nazi policy toward the Jews had reached the stage where it was directed toward the complete exclusion of Jews from German life. Pogroms were organized, which included the burning and demolishing of synagogues, the looting of Jewish businesses, and the arrest of prominent Jewish businessmen. A collective fine of 1,000,000,000 marks was imposed on the Jews, the seizure of Jewish assets was authorized, and the movement of Jews was restricted by regulations to certain specified districts and hours. The creation of ghettoes was carried out on an extensive scale, and by an order of the security police Jews were compelled to wear a yellow star to be worn on the breast and back. * * * The imposition of a fine of 1,000,000,000 marks was made, and the confiscation of the financial holdings of the Jews was decreed, at a time when German armament expenditure had put the German treasury in difficulties, and when the reduction of expenditure on armaments was being considered. * * *

"The Nazi persecution of Jews in Germany before the war, severe and repressive as it was, cannot compare, however, with the policy pursued during the war in the occupied territories. Originally the policy was similar to that which had been in force inside Germany. Jews were required to register, were forced to live in ghettoes, to wear the yellow star, and were used as slave laborers. In the summer of 1941, however, plans were made for the final solution of the Jewish question in all of Europe. The final solution meant the extermination of the Jews, which early in 1939 Hitler had threatened would be one of the consequences of an outbreak of war, and a special section in the Gestapo under Adolf Eichmann, as head of section B4 of the Gestapo, was formed to carry out the policy.

"The plan for exterminating the Jews was developed shortly after the attack on the Soviet Union. Einsatzgruppen of the security police and SD, formed for the purpose of breaking the resistance of the population of the areas lying behind the German armies in the East, were given the duty of exterminating the Jews in these areas. The effectiveness of the work of the Einsatzgruppen is shown by the fact that in February 1942, Heydrich was able to report that Estonia had already been cleared of Jews and that in Riga the number of Jews had been reduced from 29,500 to 2,500. Altogether the Einsatzgruppen operating in the occupied Baltic States killed over 135,000 Jews in 3 months. Nor did these special units operate completely independently of the German armed forces. There is clear evidence that leaders of the Einsatzgruppen obtained the cooperation of army commanders. * * *

"These atrocities were all part and parcel of the policy inaugurated in 1941. Part of the 'final solution' was the gathering of Jews from all German-occupied Europe in concentration camps. * * * All who were fit to work were used as slave laborers in the concentration camps; all who were not fit to work were destroyed in gas chambers

and their bodies burned. Certain concentration camps such as Treblinka and Auschwitz were set aside for this main purpose. With regard to Auschwitz, the tribunal heard the evidence of Hoess, the commandant of the camp from May 1, 1940, to December 1, 1943. He estimated that in the camp of Auschwitz alone in that time 2,500,000 persons were exterminated, and that a further 500,000 died from disease and starvation. Hoess described the screening for extermination by stating in evidence:

"'Those who were fit for work were sent into the camp. Others were sent immediately to the extermination plants. Children of tender years were invariably exterminated. * * * Very frequently women would hide their children under their clothes, but of course when we found them we would send the children to be exterminated.'

"He described the actual killing by stating:

"'It took from 3 to 15 minutes to kill the people in the death chamber, depending upon climatic conditions. We knew when the people were dead because their screaming stopped. We usually waited about one-half hour before we opened the doors and removed the bodies. After the bodies were removed our special commando took off the rings and extracted the gold from the teeth of the corpses.'

"Beating, starvation, torture, and killing were general. The inmates were subjected to cruel experiments at Dachau in August 1942; victims were immersed in cold water until their body temperatures were reduced to 26 degrees centigrade, when they died immediately. Other experiments included high-altitude experiments in pressure chambers, experiments to determine how long human beings could survive in freezing water, experiments with poison bullets, experiments with contagious diseases, and experiments dealing with sterilization of men and women by X-rays and other methods.

"Evidence was given of the treatment of the inmates before and after their extermination. There was testimony that the hair of women victims was cut off before they were killed, and shipped to Germany, there to be used in the manufacture of mattresses. The clothes, money and valuables of the inmates were also salvaged and sent to the appropriate agencies for disposition. After the extermination the gold teeth and fillings were taken from the heads of the corpses and sent to the Reichsbank.

"After cremation the ashes were used for fertilizer, and in some instances attempts were made to utilize the fat from the bodies of the victims in the commercial manufacture of soap. Special groups traveled through Europe to find Jews and subject them to the 'final solution.' German missions were sent to such satellite countries as Hungary and Bulgaria, to arrange for the shipment of Jews to extermination camps and it is known that by the end of 1944, 400,000 Jews from Hungary had been murdered at Auschwitz. Evidence has also been given of the evacuation of 110,000 Jews from part of Rumania for 'liquidation.' Adolph Eichmann, who had been put in charge of this program by Hitler, has estimated that the policy pursued resulted in the killing of 6,000,000 Jews, of which 4,000,000 were killed in the extermination institutions."

6. A crime of such vast and fearful dimensions cannot be expiated by any measure of material reparation. The Jewish people has lost a third of its numbers. The bulk of European Jewry has been annihilated; out of every four Jews in Europe three were killed. No indemnity, however large, can make good the loss of human life and cultural values or atone for the suffering and agonies of the men, women and children put to death by every inhuman device. As Frank, one of the principal defendants in the Nuremberg Trial, admitted: "A thousand years will pass and this guilt of Germany will still not be erased." All that can be done is to secure the indemnification of the heirs of the victims and the rehabilitation of the survivors. The Jews have been killed, but the German people continue to enjoy the fruits of the carnage and plunder perpetrated by their erstwhile leaders. In the Biblical phrase, they have "killed and also taken possession." The dead cannot be revived. Their torment cannot be undone. This much, however, can be demanded: that the German people be required to restore the stolen Jewish property and to pay for the rehabilitation of those who have survived.

7. In the absorption and rehabilitation of these survivors Israel has from the start played a major part. When the Nazi persecution began in Germany in the spring of 1933, the Jews of Palestine, as it then was, immediately came to the rescue. An ever increasing stream of German Jews—swollen after the rape of Austria and Czechoslovakia by Jews from these countries—found its way to Palestine. During the period between the establishment of the Nazi regime in Germany and the outbreak of the Second World War, over 75,000 refugees from the Nazi-controlled countries of Central Europe settled in Palestine. Even during the war years, despite the limitations imposed, Jewish immigration from Europe never ceased. Tireless efforts were made to bring out Jews from the countries threatened or engulfed by the Nazi invasion. When the war ended, the Jews of Palestine risked their all to bring to safety those who had survived the great slaughter. When in the end the State of Israel was established, its first step was to open its gates to the Jewish Displaced Persons from the areas of the former concentration camps. Between the years 1939 and 1950, nearly 380,000 Jews were brought over in this way from the Nazi-conquered territories. If to these are added the Jews who immigrated from Central Europe during the prewar years of the Nazi persecution, the total amounts to over 450,000.

8. Most of the newcomers brought with them little more than their weakened bodies. Their belongings had long been taken from them. Many of them were hard-core cases, men and women whose health was broken beyond repair, and whom no country but Israel was prepared to accept. Unlike other immigration countries where new arrivals can easily be absorbed into a fully developed economic system, Israel has had to make special efforts by large-scale allocation of public funds for investment and maintenance to create openings for the newcomers. The whole economic regime of the new state was from its first hour made to serve this overriding task. Though substantial financial support has come from Jews abroad, the bulk of the expenditure involved in the reception and rehabilitation of the immigrants has been borne by the people of Israel. Heavy taxation and a strict regime of economic austerity have had to be imposed and have been willingly accepted by the people of the country in order to provide homes and a livelihood for these immigrants. It is surely no exaggerated claim to demand that the German people, who were responsible for all this misery and who continue in possession of the economic assets taken from the Jews, dead and alive, should be required to make reparation for the benefit of the survivors.

9. When the victorious Allies at the end of the war allocated the reparations due from Germany, the Jewish people had as yet no locus standi in the community of sovereign nations. As a result, its claims, though morally perhaps stronger than those of any other people that had suffered at the hands of the Nazis, went by default. The time has come to rectify this omission. Israel is the only state which can speak on behalf of the Jewish people—the people, membership of which was the cause of the death of the 6,000,000. Israel has been built up for the specific purpose of providing a refuge for all persecuted and homeless Jews. That responsibility has throughout been conceived in active terms; in the war against Nazi Germany, Israel's sons and daughters fought in national formations among the Allied forces. A Jewish brigade group took part in the final overthrow of the enemy and played an active role in the rescue and relief of Jewish survivors in various parts of Europe. The recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Jewish people to the reestablishment of its commonwealth was seen as an act of reparation for the wrongs endured by them throughout history, culminating in the Nazi campaign of extermination. Having thus arisen, Israel has made itself responsible for the absorption and rehabilitation of the survivors of that catastrophe. For all these reasons, the state of Israel regards itself as entitled to claim reparations from Germany by way of indemnity to the Jewish people.

10. The amount to be claimed must be related, on the one hand, to the losses suffered by the Jewish people at the hands of the Germans, and on the other, to the financial cost involved in the rehabilitation in Israel of those who escaped or survived the Nazi regime. The Government of Israel is not in a position to procure and submit full data of the Jewish property confiscated and plundered by the Germans, which, as previously stated, is authoritatively estimated to aggregate over $6,000,000,000. It can base its claim only on the expenditure incurred and anticipated in connection with the resettlement of the Jewish immigrants from the countries formerly under Nazi control. Their number is estimated at about 500,000 which would involve an over-all expenditure of $1,500,000,000. This figure corresponds approximately to the value of exports from Western Germany alone in 1950, which, in view of Germany's economic recovery, is likely to increase considerably during 1951. If spread over a period of years and transferred partly in the form of goods, a reparation payment of this total would not be beyond the capacity of the German people. No settlement of German reparations can be regarded as equitable on moral or legal grounds which would not meet this minimum claim on behalf of the major sufferers of the Nazi regime. Nor can there be any approach to the rehabilitation of Germany among the community of nations until this basic measure of reparation has been effected.

11. The Government of Israel trusts that the Government of the United States will accept the justice of its claim. It would urgently request that the occupying powers should not hand over full powers to any German government without express reservations having been made for the payment of reparations to Israel. It would welcome an early expression of the views of the Government of the United States concerning the practical steps which might most effectively be taken toward implementing the proposals outlined in this note.

MARCH 12, 1951.

Resolution Adopted by the American Legion of Freemont, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I include a resolution adopted by unanimous vote of the American Legion, of Freemont, Ohio, and request that the House

Committee on Ways and Means consider the matter:

RESOLUTION

Whereas it was the custom during World War II that members of the Armed Forces should not have to pay income tax on service pay because of the sacrifices they were making for the good of their country; and

Whereas the members of our Armed Forces are now paying the regular income tax on their income received as members of the Armed Forces; and

Whereas it is felt by the members of Thurston-Zwir Post, No. 121, Inc., the American Legion, of Ohio, that members of the Armed Forces are being taxed sufficiently by virtue of their service to their country: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That all regulations governing the collection of withholding tax and income tax on service pay from members of our Armed Forces be rescinded until such time as the present emergency is declared officially at an end; and be it further

Resolved, That, effective January 1, 1951, all withholding tax on service pay be returned to the members of our Armed Forces who have paid same; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Representatives of Ohio, to the commander of the fifth district, the American Legion of Ohio, and to the commander of the American Legion of Ohio for action by their respective committees to put this into effect.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the post at its regular meeting on Monday, February 19, 1951.

HARRY A. BRUNTHAVER,
Adjutant.

What Do They Teach at Roosevelt College?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of March 17, 1951:

WHAT DO THEY TEACH AT ROOSEVELT COLLEGE?

Hearings on the Broyles-Young antisubversive bill continued this week in the State senate. It was a similar bill which brought rioting Communist students to Springfield 2 years ago from Roosevelt College and the University of Chicago.

One of the witnesses appearing to testify against the bill Wednesday was a student of Roosevelt College of Chicago. Her name was Mrs. Violet Finney. She testified that it was her belief that the Broyles-Young bill constituted an infringement upon personal freedom.

"What rights are you denied in the bill?" asked Senator Clyde Trager, of Peoria.

"The right to belong to a subversive organization," replied Mrs. Finney. (She was forthright to say the least.)

"Do you want to belong to a subversive organization?" asked Senator Trager.

"No," answered Mrs. Finney, "but I do not like to be denied the right."

If the witness had carefully read the Broyles-Young bill—and we doubt if she had—she would have found that it contained the following definition of "subversive organization."

"Subversive organization means any organization which engages in or advocates, abets, advises, or teaches, or a purpose of which is to engage in or advocate, abet, advise, or teach activities intended to overthrow, destroy, or alter, or to assist in the overthrow, destruction, or alteration of, the constitutional form of government of the United States, or of the State of Illinois, or of any political subdivision of either of them, by revolution, force, violence, or other unlawful means."

Subversion, as defined in the Broyles-Young bill, is already a felony and will continue to be so whether this bill becomes a law or not. Purpose of the Broyles-Young bill is to give the State of Illinois a better legal weapon to deal with persons who are engaged in subversive activities.

What the Roosevelt College student confessed was that she wanted the privilege of joining others in unlawful means of attempting to overthrow the constitutional Government of the United States. She might as well have said that she did not want to commit murder, but she did not like to be denied the right to do it; or that she had no intention of robbing a bank, but that she didn't like the Government to tell her that she couldn't do so if she chose.

Roosevelt College is only a name to us. We have no reason to believe that Mrs. Finney's thoughts reflect those of the faculty or the student body. But the student riot of 1949 and this testimony of a student raises the question, What influence at Roosevelt College fosters or permits such irresponsible action and such distorted thinking among some of the students?

Mr. Speaker, we believe the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been asked to look into some midwestern universities for evidence of subversive teaching. Perhaps the House committee could learn what they teach at Roosevelt College.

A Tale of Two Valleys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is so easy to find articles about what is wrong with America and to hear constant criticism of all phases of our national life, that it is refreshing to read a report which calls attention to Americanism and what it really is. I am proud to call attention to a book written by a former Member of this House, the Honorable Conrad G. Selvig, who represented a district in the great State of Minnesota. Mr. Selvig is now enjoying a well earned rest and has taken advantage of the time to put into a book his thoughts on good old-fashioned Americanism.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a review of the book taken from the Los Angeles Mirror, a review which is also a stirring tribute to our former colleague. The review was reprinted by the Crookston (Minn.) Daily Times. It follows:

SELVIG'S BOOK BEARS TRIBUTE

From far-off California comes a stirring tribute to Conrad G. Selvig and incidentally our Red River Valley with which Mr. Selvig had so much to do in developing.

The tribute is a clipping from the Los Angeles Mirror and mailed to the Times office by Harry J. Crompe, a former Crookston man and himself a valley booster.

In the Mirror's Florabel Muir Reporting column the columnist reviews Mr. Selvig's book, a Tale of Two Valleys, which she uses as the basis for an editorial on the American way of life.

But read the Los Angeles paper's comments in full:

"Perhaps at this time a small sermon setting forth the solidity and strength of good old-fashioned Americanism may be in order.

"I found this sermon in a plain, unadorned book, the autobiography of Conrad G. Selvig, once a Congressman from Minnesota, now rounding out a full and useful life in Santa Monica.

"He shows how the real wealth of our great country is created and developed. He shows what makes us great—and it isn't Wall Street manipulations, stock issues, skinny undressed chits in magazine ads, Hollywood starlets, or television.

"Before Selvig went to Congress he was head of the Minnesota Agricultural College at Northwest Station, Crookston, Minn.

"In 1924, experimenting, they planted a 28-acre field to sweet clover, intending to pasture 32 cows on it. They figured they would require about one acre per head.

"The clover kept growing and they kept cutting down the proportion. By midsummer they had cut the pasturage for those 32 cattle down to 7 acres and had fenced off the remaining 21 for a hay crop.

"Does that sound like small potatoes? I say that what Selvig accomplished, multiplied 10,000-fold and more through the Nation, represents the basis impregnable potency of America.

"Selvig saw the Minnesota farmers taking the short end, due largely to slipshod and unfair farm marketing methods. He got himself elected to Congress and battled like a steer at bay to right those wrongs.

"Today we all know about the farm bloc. Nobody gets far fighting it. In fact the farmers is the Nation's legislative pet, too much pampered.

"I like Selvig's book, the plain record of a plain American, the son of Norwegian immigrant parents. Under our American Republic he won distinction, gave sons and daughters to the Nation in war. Now in his seventies, he has earned the boon of a rich contentment.

"Don't look for literary brilliance in A Tale of Two Valleys. It's a simple narrative as earthy as Gray's Elegy, not too far removed from that classic in theme—the conquest of the 'stubborn glebe.'

"But if our America is great today and is to be greater tomorrow, we can thank the plodders like Conrad Selvig who learned early that there is richer wealth both for the spirit and for the pocketbook in a clod of fertile black soil than in a shining nugget of gold."

The President's Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial, appearing in the Detroit News of March 12, 1951, might well be interpreted as a gentle but well-deserved rebuke to the sadists and perverted partisans and some well-intentioned but

grossly ignorant critics who just cannot understand the tremendous problems of state which rest upon our American Presidents generally, and upon those who, like Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, have been called upon to carry an emergency load during a most critical time in our national existence. Ignorance even in this enlightened day, although it is inexcusable, can be forgiven. But a line must be drawn somewhere and men must be held responsible for their slanderous abuse of a man simply because he is the President of the United States and therefore considered a fair political target for anyone in disagreement with his policies or who belongs to the opposition party.

HE NEEDS A REST

The President's first Key West holiday in a year invites the usual criticism that he has ducked out in a time of crisis. Yet, if one reads the current Saturday Evening Post series on how he puts in his Washington day, the wonder is that he or any President can stand up with so little relief.

From 5:30 a. m. until 8 at night, Mr. Truman's time is as rigidly scheduled as that of a limited train. In the working day he must regularly meet aides and advisers, the Cabinet, the press, carry on a voluminous correspondence, and sit through 100 15-minute appointments a week with visitors.

From 8 p. m. until an early bedtime he is busy drawing up memoranda, making notes on working papers, often consulting with others on public statements.

No doubt many readers of the Post articles, like ourselves, are appalled anew at the lack in such a program of any time for that reflection out of which great decisions could be expected to issue.

Hardly an hour in the 24 is Mr. Truman's own. Nor can he delegate any considerable part of his burden to others. He has tried this, and the performances of these aide and confidants constitute some of the sorrier episodes in his administration.

Other Presidents in other times have supported the burden, but it was a different burden. In Coolidge's day, for example, the country scarcely owned a foreign policy as we now understand it. The Executive could consider a course for months, where in the present day of multiple agencies he must improvise policy, often in a matter of days, and make or subscribe to decisions out of hand.

Woodrow Wilson brought to the White House the fruit of years of study of government, and many convictions born of long ruminating on its principles and practices.

As preparation for the same post, Mr. Truman brought little of this; only courage, intelligence rather than intellectual capacity, and endurance. These and such counsel as he feels he can rely on have seen him through an ordeal which few Americans could have survived.

We believe he needs more, not fewer holidays, if his own and the country's welfare are to be at all considered.

Europe Cuts Its National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Walter W. R. May in the Oregon City (Oreg.) Enterprise-Courier:

EUROPE CUTS ITS NATIONAL DEBT

The European nations which have been receiving Marshall-plan aid from the United States have cut their national debts a total of $1,202,000,000, while the United States national debt has steadily gone up to $255,902,000,000 in 19 years, with only one reduction, a $6,000,000,000 cut made by the Republican Eightieth Congress the President so shamefully misrepresented in the 1948 campaign.

From the Economic Cooperation Agency which dispenses Marshall-plan aid provided by the United States taxpayers, we learn the following European nations have reduced their debts as follows:

Norway, $73,500,000; Denmark, $88,300,000; Austria, $85,000,000; France, $171,400,000; and Great Britain, $784,100,000.

This all adds up to $1,202,300,000 with no good signs that the United States will do anything but increase its debt.

Can the Communists Conquer Religion?—Beran, Powerless in Banishment, Has Greater Influence on the Minds of Men Than Powerful Stalin in the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, someday Stalin may realize that he cannot conquer God. Archbishop Beran, prior to his persecution by Stalin, was little known outside of his native Czechoslovakia. Now he has become a world figure. So also, have the Protestant and Jewish representatives of religion who have been martyrs to Stalin.

Before his persecution, Archbishop Beran, as the duly constituted moral authority of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia, was an inspiration to the people of his diocese. Now, after his persecution by the Communists, stripped of all power to exercise control of the religious affairs of his diocese and banished from his native land, Archbishop Beran is an even greater inspiration to his fellow countrymen in Czechoslovakia. Not only that but Archbishop Beran's influence has so grown that he is now an inspiration to people all over the world. What chagrin this must cause the master plotters of the Kremlin.

I include here an excellent editorial in tribute to Archbishop Beran which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 13, 1951:

MOSCOW VERSUS ROME

In waging war on the Vatican the puppet Communist regime of Czechoslovakia apparently is trying to be less crude and more cautious than its counterpart in Hungary. At any rate, the indications are that Archbishop Beran, the Roman Catholic primate of the country, is not going to be tried and imprisoned on trumped-up charges of treason, as in the case of Cardinal Mindszenty. Instead, it seems that he is merely to be banished from Prague—and fined—for taking a negative attitude toward the church laws that the Kremlin's stooges have decreed to make clear to the devout that Stalin is next to godliness and that one had better pay attention to him, not to the Pope, on matters of faith and morals.

Archbishop Beran's offense, of course, is that he has refused to sell his soul to the Communists and let them profane and defile his church by making it a tool of the atheistic Kremlin. He has sought to keep them from interfering with the worship of God and from contaminating the hallowed precincts of religion with their peculiarly unholy brand of irreligion. So they have "banished" him and named in his place a "patriotic and democratic" parish priest who seems willing to play their game—an obscure Catholic clergyman who presumably can be counted upon not to upset efforts to undermine the Vatican in Czechoslovakia for the greater honor and glory of the Soviet Union.

Thus the war between Moscow and Rome goes on, with Moscow resorting to any and every means to destroy the one thing that must be obliterated if totalitarian materialism is to survive and if the Kremlin is to win mastery of the world. That one thing is man's belief in God—the religious force of the ages, the spirit that exalts the individual over the state, the spark and fire of faith in the proposition that people do not begin or end here but are creatures with immortal souls and with a high eternal destiny that is governed not by bipeds like Stalin but by an all-wise, all-just, all-powerful, all-infinite Supreme Being beyond the comprehension of our finite minds. The Soviet Communists cannot live with such a doctrine, and hence the effort to wipe it out.

Archbishop Beran—like Cardinal Mindszenty, and like a number of Protestant and Jewish leaders as well—has come to grief behind the iron curtain not because of himself but because he represents in his person a faith that is absolutely irreconcilable with, and repugnant to, what the Soviet tryanny stands for. The war on the Vatican, the war on religion in general, is an inevitable and basic part of the Soviet war on the free world. For man, as long as he believes in God, cannot be conquered or enslaved by the godless. The battle has just begun, and the Kremlin—which is waging it cautiously in Czechoslovakia because Catholicism is predominant there—is as doomed to failure in it as was Lucifer when he stormed the gates of heaven against Michael the Archangel.

Reminiscences by Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the University of Missouri Alumni Association of Washington, at its monthly meeting at the Congressional Hotel March 16, had as its principal speaker a worthy and distinguished alumnus of our great university, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. The junior Senator from Missouri was privileged to introduce his colleague to the alumni.

The Honorable John T. Barker, a former attorney general of the State of Missouri, and now a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, presided at the meeting. Senator KEM's interesting reminiscences of his student days, and his fine tribute to the university, were so eloquently presented that I ask unanimous consent to have this fine address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the opening day of the present session of the Congress my distinguished colleague told me that we had this in common: his mother went to school to my mother. And since that time I have discovered that we have many other things in common. Now that we have got our hands on Tom Hennings, I think we should proceed to initiate him. I would like to have the privilege of proposing him as an honorary member of the University of Missouri Alumni Association of Washington.

When I first went to the university, the able and genial president of our society was the speaker of the house of representatives of the general assembly. In my freshman year, the Federal Government turned over to the State of Missouri a considerable sum of money in settlement of certain Civil War claims. The university asked that this money be appropriated to build a memorial library. It was suggested to the students that they see their representatives in the legislature (of course, no one here understands what it means to approach a legislator for anything he wants)—and so I went to see John Barker as the representative from my home county of Macon. He treated me with great consideration—with the courtesy that I now know is instinctive and characteristic. He heard my story out although he had probably heard the story 25 times before. A friendship was begun that has been the source of pleasure and satisfaction to me in the many years that have followed.

When I entered the university in 1906, the white campus existed only on the drawing boards. When we spoke of the campus, we meant the quadrangle set off by its fabulous jewel, the columns of ever-cherished memory. The old brick buildings may not be exactly cathedrals of learning, but as James Russell Lowell said, "They have many crevices for the tentacles of affection." It was a small college but there were those who loved it.

When I first went to the university, Richard Henry Jesse was the president. We called him "Uncle Dick" with no little affection. Soon he was succeeded as president by Dr. A. Ross Hill. Dr. Hill was an able and accomplished administrator. I always liked him—while he was president and after he became a resident of Kansas City, where I came to know him quite well.

Along about 1908, the school of journalism as founded by Walter Williams. The late Charlie Ross—familiarly known as "Doodles" Ross—was a leading member of the faculty of the school of journalism. He remained genial and delightful to the end.

There was Dr. Max Meyer, German-born professor of psychology, who was slanderously described as a man who could tell you what everybody knew in language that nobody could understand.

There was Dr. Isadore Loeb, whom the university funny paper, the Oven, insisted on referring to as "Was-a-Dore" after he ceased to be a member of the athletic committee, showing the extent to which his stock had fallen in undergraduate opinion.

In football the Tigers suffered a long and dispiriting series of defeats at the hands of Kansas. Then came the fall of 1909 when William W. Roper, who had been a star at Princeton and was a practicing lawyer in Philadelphia, came as head football coach. From the day of his arrival there was a new spirit on Rollins Field, and he gave us a glorious victory over Kansas.

At the first mass meeting Roper attended he was introduced as "Big Bill." He said he didn't mind being called "Big Bill" in Missouri, but as a practicing lawyer in Philadelphia he didn't like it very much. Being called "Big Bill" Roper didn't help his budding law practice one bit. I would like to talk about other faculty members whose names crowd into my mind for recognition.

It is often said that at college we learn more from our fellow students than from members of the faculty.

One of the first organizations that I joined when I reached the university was the Athenaean Debating Society. The presiding genius in those days was Mac Anderson—B. M. Anderson, Jr. The brilliance of his mind and his amazing accumulation of accurate information made a lasting impression on all who knew him. He became one of the leading economists of the United States. For years he was the head economist for the Chase National Bank in New York and the editor of their bulletin. Afterward he was professor of economics at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Merrill Otis, who was to be a distinguished Federal Judge at Kansas City, was in his heyday. What a grand person he was—truly one of nature's noblemen. How he used to thrill us at the mass meetings with his sonorous voice and rounded periods. Not infrequently a student speaker was heckled by someone calling out "louder and funnier." But never Merrill Otis. He held us speechless. There was one exception to the usual order that I remember well. At one of the mass meetings some prominent speaker failed to appear on time. The chairman of the meeting (it was either Ozark Wright or Raymond Lee) scribbled a little note to Otis asking him to come up to the rostrum to speak until the VIP arrived. Merrill started out by saying "I have just received a message asking me to come up and say something funny." Someone in the back of the auditorium called out: "You'll tell us when you say it, won't you?" To which Merrill gave an instant reply—"I'll tell you, the rest will know."

The year I entered as a freshman, Forrest Donnell left the university in a blaze of glory. He had graduated at the head of his class both in the college and the law school. Forrest with his passion for the truth and nothing but the truth has always insisted he didn't know me at the university. But I knew him. When I came to Washington our unilateral friendship became mutual. I love him dearly.

Then there was Lee Miller who had the unusual distinction of being captain of the football team 2 years in succession. Big, generous, and awkward—we always called him, "Cow." After he found a sweetheart at the Kappa House, he didn't like the name cow. He became a leading surgeon in Kansas City until his untimely death a few years ago.

The pioneers who founded the university in 1839 were a strong and self reliant breed. The chief among them, James S. Rollins, had ridden his horse back and forth from central Missouri to Kentucky to get a college education. His grandson and namesake, James Sidney Rollins, whom most of us know as "Sid" is now a prominent lawyer in Columbia. Back in the days when Frederick D. Gardner was Governor of Missouri the governor came to Columbia to deliver an address. Sid, who had just launched himself in the practice of law at the Columbia bar, was the presiding officer at the meeting. He started out by paying a glowing tribute to the governor and then wound up with this peroration: "My friends, I have the honor and privilege to present to you Missouri's great Gardner, the honorable Frederick D. Governor."

In the days when the university came into being, people put their faith in education. The famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787 had declared: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." From the very first settlement in Missouri, schools, colleges, and universities have been the subject of public largess and private benefaction. The people were tremendously interested in the public school system, of which the university was the crowning apex. In their dreams it was to be more than its finest flower—it was to be the nourishing mother. I think the founders of the university must have had in mind certain definite purposes and objectives.

I am sure the founders of the University of Missouri had very keenly in mind that Americans were then and meant to continue to be, for all time to come, a self-governing people. They established an institution of higher learning in order to help make self government work. James S. Rollins and those of his generation were sons of fathers who had marched and suffered and triumphed with Washington and Lafayette. The Revolution was close to their generation in point of time—it was even closer in their thinking. To them independence had a very real meaning. It was something that had been bought and paid for by blood and tears. With independence the problem of self government became urgent. They and Americans of their generation realized that in order to make this experiment in self government a success, there must be developed an enlightened citizenship with the knowledge and the will to carry on. They pledged their faith to education as the best means to this cherished end.

In the second place, I think the founders of the university were very much interested in creating in the State a spirit of national unity. The State of Missouri came into the Union as a result of the Missouri Compromise of 1820. A deep cleavage existed between the North and the South. The first settlers of Missouri came up the great rivers from Virginia and Kentucky. They settled in the rich alluvial lands along the Missouri and Mississippi. Many of them brought with them their "peculiar institution." But there were other important streams of immigration. People from Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois settled in counties of the northwestern part of the State. And then into the Ozark country came a steady stream from the hill country of western North Carolina and east Tennessee, who knew nothing about the institution of slavery, and cared nothing, except to despise it.

The third task which the founders imposed upon the university was what we call Americanization.

"God sifted the whole world that He might send choice grain over to the wilderness." Before the Louisiana purchase the French came into Missouri—Ste. Genevieve was the first settlement by white men west of the Mississippi. In 1803, at the time of the Louisiana purchase, St. Louis was the largest town in what was then the West. In the decade following the founding of the university the Germans came in large numbers, and continued to do so for several decades thereafter. Then the Irish, the Scotch, the Welsh, and others in smaller numbers added a leaven to the melting pot.

No other people absorbed more racial stocks so rapidly and completely. This was the job of the public-school system from the university down. In the classrooms the sons and daughters of every racial stock were subjected to the same educational processes and the same disciplines.

The roster of foreign names on our football teams shows what I mean. Who can

doubt that the cause of unity is served when it is Glorioso, Fuchs, Marusic, Christman, Orf, Keller, Ackermann, Klein, Ghnouly, Cone, Kadlec, Carras, Stuber, that the cheering stands applaud.

Our early Missourians knew a lot about authoritarian governments. Across the seas in the old countries their close ancestors, and in many cases they themselves, had lived under such government. They knew about it—and they didn't like it.

They knew nothing of the modern form of totalitarianism, socialism, or communism. In 1839, when the university was founded, Karl Marx had not yet met Frederick Engels, so Marx had not yet become a Socialist.

The early Missourians were devoted to the idea of maintaining Missouri as part and parcel of a great liberal republic. They wanted none of either monarchy or collectivism. They were individualists to the core. They believed that individuality was the aim of political liberty. They wished to leave to the citizen as much freedom of action as was consistent with order and the rights of others. The idea was that so far as possible the citizen should be left to pursue his means of happiness in his way and according to his own lights. In the best sense the University of Missouri has always been a center of liberalism. Harlow Shapley and Thorstein Veblen came, but they also went. They never set the pattern. The founders believed that work and thrift would bring a just reward. They believed in free enterprise to the soul of their beings.

The State of Missouri was a bud just opening its petals. It offered a field of fruitful activity for millions of busy bees.

To make the most of this great opportunity the State needed individuals trained to be specialists. It needed trained agriculturists, trained teachers, lawyers, doctors, civil, electrical, mechanical, chemical, and mining engineers to develop and to conserve its resources. With the exception of the field of medicine (where the failure can perhaps be explained), the university has fulfilled this function in an abundant measure. It has given the State a steady stream of specialists adequately trained for their respective tasks. As an example, four out of the seven judges presently sitting on the highest court of our State are University of Missouri men. For over a century the University of Missouri has served and strengthened the Commonwealth. It has made a substantial contribution toward providing a citizenry as enlightened as any on earth. It has justified and vindicated the faith of its founders. It has met the challenge.

And what about the future? We can have every assurance that the university will meet the changing problems of our time. An optimist in the atomic age has been defined as one who believes the future is uncertain. The typical Missourian of 1839 had no qualms about the future. He knew what he wanted, and he had an unabashed confidence in his ability to get it. He didn't know about sanitary plumbing, or airplanes, or motorcars, or nylon stockings, but he believed Missouri was the center of the bread basket of the world. He thought it was the best place in all the world to live and have his being.

Shall we of this generation be of little faith? Shall we worry too much about whether we shall reinforce nationalism or inspire internationalism?

Our answer is: Let us carry on in the faith of our fathers. Let us take comfort in the old Scotch ballad:

"I am hurt, Sir Barton said.
I am hurt, but I am not slain,
I'll lie me down and bleed awhile
And then I'll fight again."

America and the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, on the twentieth anniversary of Chicago Round Table, a special pamphlet was published consisting of selections from round-table discussions in which Mr. Hutchins has participated. Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins, after 21 years at the university, has recently resigned to become associate director of the Ford Foundation.

I concede I speak with some prejudice, out of my friendship with Chancellor Hutchins which dates back to our days as Yale classmates, and out of my association with the University of Chicago, first as a part-time vice president and now as a trustee.

Increasingly, with each passing year, there are fewer and fewer to deny that Chancellor Hutchins has been the leading voice in the field of higher education in this country. But his influence is far wider than merely that of an educator. Only this week, growing out of the Kefauver hearings in New York, I recalled to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] Chancellor Hutchins' speeches over the last two decades about the great issues of our times, in which he has repeatedly called for a moral, spiritual, and intellectual revolution. Dr. Hutchins' talent for leadership, as well as his great insight into the crucial issues facing the peoples of the world, are again pointed up by these selections from extemporaneous broadcasts in which he has participated. I ask the readers of these selections to note particularly the dates of the broadcasts.

Mr. President, this opportunity to insert these selections into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD provides me with the chance to tell my colleagues of the Senate that in my judgment the Ford Foundation promises to be the greatest private undertaking of all time. The reason why this is true is not merely because of the fabulous potential extent of its philanthropic gifts, which can be anticipated over the next decade, but more particularly because of the talented and inspired leadership which can be expected from Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, the Ford Foundation's director, and from Chancellor Hutchins and Mr. Chester Davis, his two associate directors.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make six and one-half pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $533. However, there is no more important subject engaging our attention than that covered by the discussions reproduced in the pamphlet, and that is why I feel warranted in asking unanimous consent that this remarkable group of selections be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the selections were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AND THE ATOMIC AGE

THE CRISIS OF OUR TIME

(Broadcast December 24, 1944, with William E. Hocking, professor of philosophy, Harvard University; Reinhold Niebuhr, professor of Christian ethics, Union Theological Seminary; Robert Redfield, professor of anthropology, University of Chicago; Robert M. Hutchins)

Statement by Mr. Hutchins

A theologian, a philosopher, and a scientist have shown that the crisis of our time is a moral crisis. They have shown that, unless we can surmount this crisis, such civilization as we have will fall apart, for civilization is a moral fabric. They have shown that the defeat of our enemies in this war, though it may be an indispensable means to the preservation of our civilization, in no sense guarantees its preservation. Peace without good will cannot be durable, because it cannot be just. And technology is not a substitute for justice. Our machines seem, in fact, on the point of wiping us off the face of the earth. They are, moreover, so expensive that we cannot afford to let them stand idle. We must fight for the oil to feed them. We must die that our machines may live. So a distinguished educator said before Pearl Harbor that we should have to go to war with Japan to get rubber for our tires.

The speakers who have preceded me on this program have emphasized that the underlying problem is one of ends, goals, and ideals. With the tremendous resources which science has placed in our hands we should be able to reach almost any conceivable human goal. But if we have the wrong ideals, or if we fail to live up to good ones, the great scientific accomplishments of modern man will end in suicide.

The testimony of the educator is the same as that of the theologian, the philosopher, and the scientist. The educational system of a country is a reflection of what the country thinks it wants. What is honored in a country will be cultivated there. If we look at the educational system of the United States, we get the same impression we got from the speeches in the last campaign—what the American people want is not peace and good will, but peace and a good job. The ideal of the full dinner pail and a chicken in every pot and two cars in every garage has been attenuated to the mere possession of a job, any kind of job that will sustain life. It is not surprising, therefore, that although it has never been possible to obtain Federal appropriations for education for citizenship, a representative of the United States Office of Education has lately advocated a Federal appropriation of $300,000,000 for vocational training. It is not surprising that every suggestion affecting our youth is considered in terms of the labor market. It has been proposed in high quarters that men ought to be kept in the Army if jobs cannot be found for them after the war. One of the current arguments for universal military training is that it would give at least a million young men a year something to do.

Now certainly there is no use talking about the aims of life to those who are starving to death. Mass unemployment is a menace to any society. But are we to work merely to exist? Is a job a good thing just because it is a job, no matter how trivial and degrading the occupation? Jobs are means, not ends; and our problem is: What are we working for and what are we living for? If the answer is that we are living merely to live, the whole process loses its meaning. We are in search of values, and there are no values here.

Insofar as we have a definite goal, then, it appears to be a goal of success interpreted in material terms. Though material goods are goods, there are other goods beyond them;

for, in the order of goods, materials goods do not stand high. The passionate pursuit of material goods disrupts human relations—as when a prominent labor leader was asked whether, now that China was our ally, we should not repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, and he replied, "A Chinaman is still a Chinaman."

The passionate pursuit of material goods disrupts the common good, for our Government is now the sport of pressure groups—each seeking its material advantage. The passionate pursuit of material goods impairs the hope of world organization and necessarily substitutes security for good will. For each country, even if it does not want territory for itself, must grab territory in order to keep other nations from grabbing it.

America is the strongest and richest Nation on earth. Since we are not under the material pressure to which other nations are subject, since we are not in danger of starvation or invasion, we have no excuse for failing to offer the world what it needs most—moral leadership and a moral example. For the sake of suffering humanity everywhere the people of this country must rediscover the ends of human life and of organized society; they must base their own lives and their own society upon these foundations. As Santayana said of the United States long ago: "This soil is propitious to every seed, and tares must needs grow in it. But why should it not also breed clear thinking, honest judgment, and rational happiness? These things are indeed not necessary to existence, and without them America might long remain rich and populous, like many a barbarous land in the past. But in that case its existence will be hounded, like theirs, by falsity and remorse. May heaven avert the omen, and make the new world a better world than the old."

There is a slight trace of selfishness in Santayana's prayer. Let us change it to read, "May the new world help to make the whole world new."

ATOMIC FORCE: ITS MEANING FOR MANKIND

(Broadcast August 12, 1945 (5 days after Hiroshima), with Reuben Gustavson, chancelor, University of Nebraska; William F. Ogburn, professor of sociology, University of Chicago; Robert M. Hutchins)

Discussion by Mr. Gustavson, Mr. Ogburn, and Mr. Hutchins

Mr. HUTCHINS. Gentlemen, is the atomic bomb good or bad for the world?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. On the day that the first atomic bomb was dropped, I met the director of the university laboratory which helped to develop it. His first words to me were: "This is a very sad day for us. Let us hope that we've not placed dynamite in the hands of children."

Mr. HUTCHINS. Was it wise to use this bomb against Japan?

Mr. OGBURN. By ending the war, it saved more lives than were lost at Hiroshima.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Was the war not going to end anyway?

Mr. OGBURN. But when? The Japanese Minister to Sweden has said that the atomic bomb brought the plea for peace. We cannot have peace or progress without paying the costs, as Charles Darwin showed.

Mr. HUTCHINS. This is the kind of weapon, I believe, which should be used, if at all, only as a last resort in self-defense. At the time that this bomb was dropped the American authorities knew that Russia was going to enter the war. It was said that Japan was blockaded and that its cities were burned out. All the evidence points to the fact that the use of this bomb was unnecessary. Therefore, the United States has lost its moral prestige.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. At the very least we might have used another method. We might have demonstrated the effectiveness of the bomb by calling our shot in advance and by giving the Japanese an opportunity to watch us drop a bomb on an uninhabited part of Japan and then calling upon Japan to surrender.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Perhaps the future is more important than the past. Ogburn, as a social forecaster, what seems most important to you about the atomic bomb?

Mr. OGBURN. This may well be one of the most important inventions of all time. The explosive energy in the atomic bomb, in my opinion, undoubtedly brightens the prospect for abolishing war, but, if, in addition, atomic energy is harnessed, we will usher in the "atomic age" and may produce sweeping changes comparable to those of the industrial revolution, which was brought in by steam. The industrial revolution, we all know, created our cities, made nations bigger, shifted world power, weakened the family, revolutionized agriculture, built an enormous industry, and led to the creation of powerful central government—more powerful than the world had ever known.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Gustavson, you are a scientist. What do you say?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. I would say that the bomb teaches us the value of fundamental research. The work done by Professor Fermi and others on the effect of the neutron on the uranium atom was research carried on out of curiosity and for the general purpose of increasing human understanding. There was no specific purpose of producing atomic energy—certainly no intention of producing world-shattering bombs. The basic work was an attempt to find out about the universe in which we live. To me that is the important lesson; and that is the way all really important discoveries are made.

Mr. HUTCHINS. My own conviction is that the moral burden which this discovery places upon the peoples of the earth and the necessity of a world organization to control this force are most important. Let us take up in order the social and industrial consequences, the implications for research, and the impact of this discovery upon war, peace, and world organization.

Mr. OGBURN. Let us first see what we are talking about. If we are talking about the explosive capacities of uranium—which is the only thing that is known definitely and publicly now—that is one thing; if we are talking about harnessing power from uranium and regulating its flow through machines—which is something I have not yet heard whether we can do—then the social consequences, of course, will be much greater; but if we are talking about releasing atomic energy not from uranium alone but from other and more abundant materials—such as for instance, clay or water—and of this I am skeptical as well as uninformed—then, in my judgment, no human imagination can encompass the consequences.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. This is the most important discovery that has been made since the discovery of fire. It is more important than all the inventions since the industrial revolution combined. This discovery is the answer to the dream of the alchemist. We are dealing here with the transmutation of elements, the destruction of matter, and the liberation of tremendous quantities of energy—energy the intensity of which defies description. For example, when dynamite explodes, there is an intensity represented by about 4 volts. We are now talking about something of the order of 200,000,000 volts.

Mr. OGBURN. This is very impressive, but inventions are nearly always overpromised. Ninety-five percent of them never materialize at all. Take, for instance, the singing wire or the talking book, which were invented in the 1890's. They have not been put to public use yet. Or take another invention—that of gas warfare—which put fear in our hearts and which was certainly overpromised 25 years ago at the end of the First World War. It has never materialized up to its promises. My calculations show that it takes, on the average, about 35 years for an invention to materialize, and sometimes it takes 200 or 300 years or longer. All inventions of the past which I have studied have been resisted. Let us look at the example of prefabricated housing, for instance. We could have had it 50 years ago, but instead it has been resisted by the building trades, certain real estate interests, and, of course, the mortgage companies. They do not want it.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. It seems to me that the trend today, however, is away from resistance and toward too-ready acceptance of new things. As a people, we are credulous and volatile rather than skeptical and slow to change. Take vitamins and nylon, for example.

Mr. OGBURN. We must not allow ourselves to begin talking like Jules Verne.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Maybe this time Jules is justified.

Mr. OGBURN. If Jules Verne were sitting around the round table this morning, he would be using the atomic bomb for organizing a war on Mars.

But there are many, many forces which slow up change. Civilization is merely a complicated mass of interrelationships, like a huge piece of machinery. We cannot change one part without changing many parts. To bring in a regulated atomic power means, for instance, changing railroads, electric-power systems, banks, factories, and many other types of social organizations. All this takes time. We do not get inventions adopted overnight.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. We may not get inventions adopted overnight, but we do know certain things about this discovery. We do know that we get out of it incredible heat, incredible power, incredible radioactivity, and new elements.

Mr. OGBURN. But there is a third factor, it seems to me, which slows up the use of inventions. An invention will not be used if it costs too much. President Truman told us that atomic energy cannot compete, in terms of costs, with coal or electricity at this stage. The first two atomic bombs cost, it is reported, $1,000,000,000 apiece. One cannot pick up a piece of U-235 as cheaply as one can pick up a piece of coal and put it in the furnace. The question still is whether it will be brought down cheap enough, and this we certainly do not know yet.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Then let us assume that we have a fundamental discovery, but that it is in a very early stage. What are the social consequences, Ogburn, that you as a social scientist can reasonably foresee, even at this stage?

Mr. OGBURN. I have been trying to argue that we need not get a case of the jitters and that inventions, though they disturb our sense of security, have a way of developing slowly. They develop against social inertia and in the face of resistances arising from the complicated nature of our society, and they come with the handicap of high costs. But to answer your question. If we cannot abolish war, we can pretty well count on a considerable effect on the layout of our cities and on city planning. The cities have already been dispersed by the automobile and more recently by the bomber. If explosives of this kind can reach them, our cities will be further dispersed and spread outward. Thus, this is a tendency which is already under way.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Can we look forward to more leisure

Mr. OGBURN. Any great new use of energy has the potentialities of reducing and, I may say, even abolishing physical toil. We might, if we look forward into the future,

even have factories without any laborers in them at all, but, of course, this will all come slowly.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Could we not have technological unemployment on a scale of which we have never dreamed?

Mr. OGBURN. We could, if the inventions came quickly enough, but most inventions produce technological unemployment only temporarily. Unemployment, in the main, is really caused by the business cycle, fluctuations, and by population changes. I have calculated, for instance, that during the depressions of the 1930's only 15 percent of it was technological.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Remember, this is a fundamental discovery of very fundamental character. It could affect our whole industrial civilization.

Mr. HUTCHINS. What about the effect on the standard of living?

Mr. OGBURN. It will make the atomic age an age of abundance. I am particularly excited, though, about the possibilities for transportation, which I have been studying recently. If atomic energy could be put in a rocket—and that does not seem to be very difficult—and if these rockets could be kept cool and slowed near their destination, it would be perfectly possible, I think, to travel 3,000 miles an hour. This would mean that we could leave New York one day and arrive in China the day before.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Who is talking like Jules Verne now?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Let us not forget that the bomb is the end product of a series of discoveries. In all probability the liberation of atomic power, in a fashion that can be controlled for industry, will likely be much simpler than the making of the bomb.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I am interested in the suggestion that this discovery will favor the big industries—at least in its present stage where we have relatively rare materials and a relatively expensive process. How do you gentlemen feel about public versus private control of this material and this process?

Mr. OGBURN. Let me give some illustrations on this point. Most of our power inventions which we have now have developed big industries of the public utility type—electricity, railroads, aviation. These are certainly not the industries for small businesses. I suspect that the development of atomic energy will be in this class. It will tend to strengthen the big industries. It is very likely, by the way, to speed us further on the "road to serfdom," as the term is now used. It will tend to reinforce movements toward monopoly and toward cartels if, of course, we do not do something about it. But if it can be used in very small packages, then it may, of course, not accentuate this tendency. Most probably, however, it will put tremendous power in the hands of large industrial units. That brings us to the question of what we are going to do about it.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. It seems to me that it will go about the way the development of power in general has gone. We have seen the Government step into the power problem to control the great water resources for the development of electrical power. We are increasingly coming to the conclusion, I believe, that anything so fundamental to our economic structure as electricity, or power in general, has to be something that is Government controlled. The Government would logically have a lot to say about the development and distribution of atomic power.

Mr. OGBURN. I agree. Military reasons, of course, are added to the economic reasons in this case.

Mr. HUTCHINS. You both thus feel that on the military side there is no question but that the Government will have to continue in control of this process and the materials used in it. But if large industries are the only ones which are in a position to develop the process or exploit the material at the present time, then we shall have to have governmental regulation of those industries.

What are the implications of this discovery for medicine and for health and for biology?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. They are tremendous, of course. The radioactivity associated with all this work has great possibilities for good and for harm—industrial hazards, for example, in the new industries—the exposure of workingmen to dangers which we never suspected before. We are going to use these radioactive materials, too, in the study of disease processes. We are going to use them in attempting to follow the fundamental researches in biology. The implications for public health, as I said, probably cannot be overstated.

Mr. HUTCHINS. You think that we may have as great a revolution in medical treatment and in biological investigation as we can see ahead of us in the physical sciences and in technology, is that correct?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. There is no question about it.

Mr. HUTCHINS. We have now come to the second main point of discussion on this round table. If the Government has succeeded in creating a notable curse with $2,000,000,000 and the concentrated effort of thousands of scientists over 4 or 5 years, why could we not ask that the Government devote the same money and effort to the elimination of some of the already existing curses such as cancer, influenza, venereal disease, unemployment at home, or starvation abroad?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. The important point here is that while it is relatively easy to get large sums of money to study the cancer problem which you have suggested, it is by no means easy to get large sums of money to study the fundamental properties of living matter. In the last analysis, solution of the cancer problem will be a byproduct of fundamental research on how the cell divides, why it divides, and so forth. We should remember that the nucleus of the cell is just as important in biology as the nucleus of the atom is to nuclear physics. We should remember, as I said before, that, when Professor Fermi did some of the fundamental work leading to the atomic bomb, bombs were the furthest thing away from his thinking. Similarly, the cure for cancer will come indirectly. It will probably come out of fundamental research and not out of the study of cancer.

Mr. HUTCHINS. But does this not mean that such researches would have to be centered in universities rather than in industry or under the auspices of Government?

Mr. OGBURN. The history of research has shown that industry is interested in applied research and that Government is interested, in the main, in contemporary applications. The only fundamental research of any significance has been done at the universities. Take, for instance, radio broadcasting and radar. They were dependent upon the discovery through pure research and science of Hertzian waves.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. After all, where did the Government turn in its hour of great fear? It did not turn to industry, and it did not turn to itself; it turned to the universities.

Mr. OGBURN. The atomic bomb has now put to the universities the biggest challenge which they ever faced, in my judgment. We have to know what to do with the dangerous weapon which we have created. Without liberal education and spiritual education it may become our master and our destroyer. What the natural scientists do is to unloose these new inventions which cause a reorganization of society, a reorganization of our economic institutions and of our social institutions, and always, what should not be forgotten, a revaluation of our ideologies. But here we are, sitting around trying to give the answers in a half hour on this round table, when it canont be done. It took $2,000,000,000 and 3 years, so we are told, to produce an atomic bomb. If the various social scientists had $2,000,000,000 and 3 years of research, maybe we could give better answers, but I think maybe that we ought to consider declaring a moratorium on all pure-science and natural-science development until we social scientists can catch up.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I understand that you are not seriously suggesting a moratorium. You are suggesting that Gustavson and I should get out and raise $2,000,000,000 for the support of social science research. We will be glad to do that.

Mr. OGBURN. That is chicken feed, Hutchins, mere chicken feed. We need much more than that.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I would like to consider whether, even if we had $2,000,000,000 for social-science research, we could have any effect upon society if society were not educated enough to accept the results.

Mr. OGBURN. That, of course, is the basic problem.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I want to ask whether it is not necessary, therefore—and whether this is not another of the responsibilities of the university—to develop liberal education for all.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Quite right. Even Harvard and Yale and the University of Colorado, my former institution, have at last decided to devote themselves to general education as a preliminary to specialization. It would seem to me that this must be the trend and that it must be tremendously accelerated.

Mr. HUTCHINS. If we are going to have a society which knows what to do with these constant surprises from the physical scientists, we are going to have an entirely different level of general intelligence in the community from the one which we have been used to in the past.

Mr. OGBURN. That, Hutchins, is really the challenge of the atomic bomb. The bomb produced a sort of paralysis in Japan, but also, we would like to note that the first week in the atomic-bomb age has given the rest of the world a very bad state of jitters, to say the least. What we really fear, I think, is not the bomb so much as the unknown. But we need not fear it if we can control the development and control the knowledge and use it consciously and confidently for good and not for evil.

Mr. HUTCHINS. That brings us, does it not, to our last point, which is the military and political significance of atomic force?

Mr. OGBURN. It is an interesting fact that nations in the past, throughout the long history of mankind, have risen and fallen pretty much on the basis of inventions. England dominated the world during the nineteenth century. She did it, because the harnessing of the first mechanical power—steam—brought the Industrial Revolution to England 50 years before it did to any country on the Continent. Prior to that, France and other West European countries displaced the Mediterranean countries, because agricultural inventions made the river valleys of France such powerful forces. Before that, the Mediterranean powers rose because of another invention—the boat. Now, along comes a still more important development—atomic energy. Will there be a realinement of international powers?

Mr. HUTCHINS. What I get out of what you have been saying is that the United States is going to dominate the world, because the United States is sitting on this secret.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. If the United States tries to sit on this secret, it will make itself the most hated power on earth. But we cannot sit on this secret. If the history of science shows anything, it shows that discoveries are made practically simultaneously in several parts of the world and that no single nation develops an idea of this kind. As you well know, Hutchins, the men who are going to work on nuclear physics at the University of Chicago, come from Italy, from Hungary, from England, from Canada, from the United States. This bomb was a composite that grew out of the efforts of many people. If any one nation attempted to isolate itself scientifically, it would soon be outstripped by the others which would not be parties to the secrecy.

Mr. OGBURN. Brains, in a hereditary sense, as the biologists know, are pretty well generally distributed over the world. The thing which we have to look out for, though, is what the distribution of the natural resources is, for this new source of power. Where do we find uranium? In Colorado, Utah, and Canada, but it also exists in Czechoslovakia, in Africa, and in Russia. That puts it in the hands of what we call the "peace-loving nations." May I say that I hope that they will continue to love peace.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Your implication that the release of atomic energy is limited to uranium is open to question. In all probability we shall learn to apply the process to other more abundant elements. It seems to me that this discovery really equalizes the nations by placing atomic power, with all its potentialities, into the hands of all small nations. What we have done is the equivalent of placing a slingshot in the hands of a David.

Mr. OGBURN. Not yet; not yet. The chances are strong that the difference between the big nations and the small nations will be increased rather than diminished. That is what happened with the tank and the bomber. They practically killed off the small nations as effective factors in the distribution of power. The atomic bomb will very likely strengthen the big nation, because, whatever the little one can do, the big can do better and quicker.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. But your assumption is that it takes tremendous industry and a lot of airplanes to do this sort of job. It is altogether possible that relatively small numbers of workers in a small country, such as Denmark, could develop all the facilities which are necessary without a single bomber. With only a runway, a rocket, and an atomic bomb a man in Copenhagen might be able to destroy Berlin.

Mr. OGBURN. The big nation could still produce bigger, better, and quicker results. What do you think, Hutchins?

Mr. HUTCHINS. The first thing that I think is that peacetime military training in the United States now becomes an irrelevant issue. We do not need a big Army to operate an atomic bomb; we do not need much of an Air Force. Peacetime conscription is a soporific. We should not rely upon large masses of half-trained men; we should pin our faith upon scientific research.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. At the present stage uranium is known to be distributed only in certain places. Manpower and industrial strength related to its use are important. The issue is whether, as scientific research proceeds, it will not result in a further redistribution of power which might bring the smaller nations back on the same level. But the upshot in any case is that the atomic bomb cannot be suppressed. Ogburn, by talking about the abolition of war, did you mean that something like the United Nations Organization might abolish war by agreement now that the atomic bomb has fallen?

Mr. OGBURN. It is the best chance to banish war which we have had since the League of Nations—at least to banish it for a time—a very long time.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I do not follow you at all. After the last war it was said that the airplane and the TNT bomb were going to be so horrible that nobody would ever fight again. And Hitler began to fight as soon as he saw that he had industrial resources and a political position adequate to give him a good chance of success. Is that not always going to be the case? We are not going to abolish war merely by making it horrible.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. People are going to fight for whatever they think that they can win. They always have, and they always will.

Mr. OGBURN. The Japanese apparently thought that it was too horrible. But do not misunderstand me, I am not saying that we can banish war forever. All that we can foresee is about 20 or 25 years ahead. The problem is practically, to make war much more difficult. If the atomic bomb has all these destructive capacities, it may be our golden opportunity.

Mr. HUTCHINS. We have always had this chance.

Mr. OGBURN. But we did not have the atomic bomb.

Mr. HUTCHINS. The whole question is: What is at stake and what are our chances? If a man has a chance to dominate the world through the control of atomic energy, that is a very large stake. And if he has, through the advances made by the scientists in his country, an opportunity to use this atomic force in such a way as to justify him in thinking that he has the edge on his enemies, he will take advantage of his situation and start another international conflagration. How are we going to prevent this? Did I understand you to say that you thought that we could have an international agreement which would either stop scientific progress in weapons or make every nation feel that it should never take advantage of such progress?

Mr. OGBURN. Such an agreement is not impossible, certainly.

Mr. HUTCHINS. The question is not whether it is impossible but whether it would be effective. Up to last Monday I must confess that I did not have much hope for a world state. I have believed that no moral basis for it existed and that we had no world conscience and no sense of world community sufficient to keep a world state together. But the alternatives now seem clear. One is world suicide; another is agreement among sovereign states to abstain from using the bomb. This will not be effective. The only hope, therefore, of abolishing war is through the monopoly of atomic force by a world organization.

Mr. OGBURN. But that is a thousand years off.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Remember that Leon Bloy, the French philosopher, referred to the good news of damnation, doubtless on the theory that none of us would be Christians if we were not afraid of perpetual hell-fire. It may be that the atomic bomb is the good news of damnation, that it may frighten us into that Christian character and those righteous actions and those positive political steps necessary to the creation of a world society, not a thousand or 500 years hence, but now.

PEACE AND THE ATOM BOMB

(Broadcast November 11, 1945, with Reuben Gustavson, chancellor, University of Nebraska; Robert Redfield, professor of anthropology, University of Chicago; Robert M. Hutchins)

Discussion by Mr. Gustavson, Mr. Redfield, and Mr. Hutchins

Mr. HUTCHINS. This Armistice Day the world is blessed with peace, except in China, Java, Palestine, and a few other places. We are also blessed with the atomic bomb. This is a good time to ask whether America, which gave the world the atomic bomb, has a foreign policy which makes for peace.

It seems to me that the American people now realize that the United States, for the first time, is vulnerable from every quarter of the globe. Americans are striking out in all directions under the impact of the discovery of atomic energy, striving, first of all, for what they think is national security.

Mr. REDFIELD. I agree that this is a new and a terrible fear and that we are acting under the influence of that fear. Many of the actions which we are taking are therefore unreasonable actions. It is not surprising, I believe, that we turn first to the new military strength which has just won us victory. But we hide behind it blindly. The question for us to consider here is whether this military strength is really the protection which we like to think it is.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. In addition, we are also reorganizing our whole domestic life in the light of this fear which has come over us. We are now talking about putting scientific research in atomic energy in the United States under the cloak of secrecy. This will hamper and delay the developments in the field of biology, in the field of medicine, and in the field of atomic power for industry. The end result of this policy is that we deny ourselves the very things which will make future wars less likely.

Mr. HUTCHINS. In short, the official policy of the United States is a policy of force. We find it manifested in all kinds of different ways, in almost everything that comes out of Washington. We hear that we are going to keep the so-called secret of the atomic bomb; that we are going to have the largest navy in the world. At the moment when we are the most powerful nation on earth, we are going to introduce the innovation of universal military training. We are going to put atomic energy under a dictatorship. We are going to get island bases to protect us. We are going to have the largest espionage service in the world.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Even when we go about fostering science through a proposed National Research Foundation, we do it in the name of military strength.

Mr. HUTCHINS. One of the most distressing aspects of this policy is the air of moral superiority with which we state it. Mr. Truman hints that we are entitled to world domination because we are devoted to the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule. But it is a little difficult to see how dropping atomic bombs, without warning, upon the men, women, and children of Hiroshima and Nagasaki could have been suggested to us by either the Ten Commandments or the Golden Rule.

But perhaps we have not time to discuss our alleged moral superiority. Let us ask, instead, whether the policy of force which our Government is following makes sense.

Mr. REDFIELD. It must make only one kind of sense to people in other countries. To them it must seem that we are preparing to dominate the world by force. The policy would at least be one which could be carried out if America were, in fact, determined to dominate the world, but I do not believe that 130,000,000 Americans are. So the first thing to be said about the Government policy is that it is confused. It threatens while we do not really mean the threat.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Our policy is complete confusion. Let us take, for example, the policy of keeping the secret of the atomic bomb. Every scientist who has said anything about this problem has said that in terms of fundamental principles there is no secret; that our secrets (such as they are) consist in industrial know-how. We should remember that Germany, even though she was bombed almost continuously, made great progress toward the liberation of atomic energy. This simply means that any country which is capable of making a great industrial effort can have atomic bombs, just as any country which wants automobiles can have them.

Mr. HUTCHINS. In addition to England and Canada, scientists at least in France and Denmark are familiar with this whole development.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. That is true. We simply have to contemplate a world in which every nation which is capable of making the effort can have atomic bombs in 5 years; and there

are a number of them—some are small, and some are large—who are capable of making that effort.

Mr. HUTCHINS. But do I not understand Einstein to say that this atomic bomb is not a very serious weapon after all?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Yes, when asked if all the people would be killed in the next atomic-power war, he said, "No, only two-thirds of them," if that is any consolation.

Mr. REDFIELD. In other words as a friend of mine put it, there is nothing to worry about. We have nothing to lose but our lives and our property.

J. R. Oppenheimer, an atom-bomb scientist, who should know something about this, was a little more conservative. He gave his opinion that 40,000,000 Americans might be killed in one night.

Mr. HUTCHINS. What you gentlemen are saying, I take it, is that the atomic bomb is a new threat to civilization—a threat which will be fatal unless something is done to control it. You are also saying that our effort to control it by preserving the secret is absurd. That policy will fail.

Mr. REDFIELD. The evidence of confusion in this policy is also present in other matters. I do not think that the question as to armament, in terms of the ordinary army and navy, has been frankly faced in terms of the atom bomb.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. If we are to have a large army, we should know what we are to do with it—if we destroy the cities of our enemy or if the enemy destroys our cities.

Mr. REDFIELD. The Secretary of War said last week that universal military training is needed so that trained men will be available to restore public utilities after our cities have been atom-bombed. Perhaps the Army will teach them to connect the sewers and the electric-light wires. The Japanese certainly had universal military training, but did they connect the plumbing after Hiroshima? They did not; they gave up. Moreover, I ask, what is to support the Army after all the cities have been destroyed?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. In spite of all which has been written, the American people still fail to realize the tremendous power, even at its present state of development, in one atomic bomb, to say nothing of what the future might bring.

For comparison, let us look at the Fifth and Eighth Air Forces. They dropped a million tons of bombs on Europe during the war, and we have some faint notion of the terrible destruction which was accomplished. One atomic bomb is equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT, which to carry requires five freight trains of 80 cars each. Fifty atomic bombs carried by 50 planes could carry the equivalent of all the TNT bombs dropped on Europe. Obviously, if this is the case, for what do we want a large Navy?

Mr. REDFIELD. Similar difficulty can be found with the suggestion that naval bases must be maintained and defended. As General Arnold tells us, these bombs can today be carried by nonstop airplanes to any part of the world. We know that even if some of the planes were intercepted, enough are sure to get through to destroy the industrial base of an enemy or of ourselves. Why, then, do you need naval bases? What kind of a navy do you need if one can destroy an enemy's industrial foundations in a few hours from one's own home country?

Mr. HUTCHINS. What kind of air force do we need if we are going to fire atomic bombs by rockets, or if we are going to send agents into potential enemy countries who will plant bombs which will be detonated when war is decided upon?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. The answer which the professional military people make is that we must have a large army to occupy a defeated country.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Yes; we may need a relatively small army of occupation if we insist upon occupying a defeated country after its cities have been devastated. In order to get this small army of occupation to the defeated country, we may need an air force and a navy, not for combat but for transport. But this means a much smaller number of ships and airplanes and an entirely different kind of ship and airplane than is being proposed.

But this policy of force, which is exemplified by a policy of secrecy in regard to the atomic bomb, is not merely confused, is it, gentlemen? It is dangerous, also, because if we claim to have a secret when there is no secret and if we keep telling the people that we are going to protect them by keeping a secret that does not exist, then we lull them into a false sense of security.

Mr. REDFIELD. The pretense that we are protected, then, works us a double injury. In the first place, relying upon a protection which is really not a protection in the long run, we fail to take the steps to build international confidence which might save us. In the second place, it greatly enhances the fear and suspicion which are directed against us, and so brings war nearer.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. That is very obvious in the recent attitude which Russia has expressed in her failure to attend conferences and in her maintaining an attitude of almost complete silence on the whole problem of the military bomb.

The Russians, for example, recently celebrated the two hundred and twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Russian Academy of Science. As a part of that celebration, they invited scientists from all over the world to join them, including the outstanding scientists in America. Pressure was brought to bear upon our scientists to prevent them from attending, presumably for fear that they might give up some of our so-called secrets. In other words, we have gotten to the place where we do not even trust our own people. We seem headed in the same general direction as Germany was headed when she tried to build a Nazi science. We are trying to build a highly nationalistic American science.

Mr. REDFIELD. When scientists want to talk things over with other scientists, they are not traitors. Scientists have to be internationalists, for no nation can go it alone in science and not lag behind in scientific progress.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Let us put ourselves wholeheartedly to the task of feeding the world: to clothing the world; to housing it. Let us pool our resources against disease. We have the know-how; let us go to work. Let us get our mind off the military problem and put it back on the fundamental problem of making a decent world.

Mr. HUTCHINS. But all the discussions in the American Congress about atomic energy have been conducted on the assumption that what we are dealing with here is a weapon.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. It is interesting, of course, to contrast the attitude of our own Government, as reflected in our press, with what we can read in papers such as the London Times. In England, industrialists are gathering a fund of something like a half a billion dollars—that is a fourth of the money we spent on the atomic bomb—for the investigation of the peacetime uses of atomic energy. In our own country there has been practically no discussion along that line. In fact, all our legislation is headed in the direction of using this entirely as a military weapon.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Take the May-Johnson bill, for example. The May-Johnson bill attempts to control all atomic research. It maintains that secrecy is necessary in order that the research may succeed. This can be true only if one is thinking in military terms. The bill places the administration of atomic research in the hands of an independent, practically irresponsible agency, exercising a kind of control which can be justified—if it can be justified at all—only on military grounds. In fact, there is reason to believe that the bill contemplates placing a military officer in charge of atomic research in this country.

Mr. REDFIELD. Again in contrast with our own obsession with the control of the discovery for warfare is the tenor of Molotov's speech made last week. You will remember that he promised the Russians an early development of atomic energy in their own country. But all his emphasis was upon the development of that energy in the building-up of the country.

On the other hand, in our own country, the Army has tried to hurry through Congress a strait-jacket for scientific research—the May-Johnson bill, which Hutchins just mentioned. If the bill should pass, the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes will be hampered. Indeed, under such a law, research for military purposes would be hampered.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. As I recall it, Molotov scarcely referred to the military use of atomic energy in Russia. It is the United States which seems to be beginning an armament race in atomic armaments. History suggests that any armament race ends in very serious consequences; and an atomic-bomb armament race, as we have learned from the statements of Einstein and Oppenheimer, is something too frightening to contemplate.

Mr. HUTCHINS. If we go into an atomic-bomb armament race, can we hope to win it?

Mr. REDFIELD. I say that this is a kind of race which nobody can really win. Such an arms race would end in an explosion which would be a catastrophe. A victory would mean only that more Americans would be left than citizens of the enemy country. This is a race toward just one goal—world suicide.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Suppose that Mr. Truman suddenly decides to reveal the so-called secrets of the atomic bomb to all the nations of the world. What kind of policy have we then?

Mr. REDFIELD. We have considerable improvement, but essentially we still have the same policy; have we not? We have a policy which emphasizes military domination by our country. If everybody had bombs, nevertheless, the various measures which you have listed, Hutchins, would add up to the same desperate and ultimately suicidal armaments race.

Mr. HUTCHINS. In this discussion it becomes clear that the policy of the United States is based on force. It is a policy which will seem to other countries a policy directed toward world domination. The policy is confused, contradictory, and incoherent. It is a bad means to a bad end. The general tendency of the policy, moreover, is to increase enormously the difficulty of developing confidence among peoples; to exaggerate the tensions leading to war; and to create a world which must live in perpetual fear.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. In other words, here we are with all the technical skills to produce all the food we need, all the clothing we need, and, what is more wonderful, new tools which grow out of atomic-energy research for fighting disease, all the necessary skills for housing the world. Yet we are chained to the psychology of war.

Mr. HUTCHINS. We take the substance of the people and devote it to a fruitless armament race.

Mr. REDFIELD. We take the substance, and we corrupt the spirit. The current policy would make exaggerated military power a main basis of national life. This is to make the people accept force as a principle of living. The hope lies in extending common understandings to make a world community, but we now frustrate that hope by accepting force as our principle.

Mr. HUTCHINS. This is the doctrine of power politics.

Mr. REDFIELD. That doctrine may now become not merely a public policy but also a mode of life.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. And it is a question whether any of us want to live under it. I am reminded of Lord Acton, when he said, "Power always corrupts; and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Mr. HUTCHINS. That is, we would say that this policy is suicidal; but, what is much more important, it is degrading. Even if we survive, we ought not to want to.

The situation is all the more menacing because the world which is emerging seems to be a world of two major powers—Russia and the United States. By constantly building up our military strength, we are daily threatening the other major power in the world—namely, Russia.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Suppose that Russia had the atomic bomb and suppose that Russia were building the largest navy in the world and suppose she were keeping her army at its present great strength and suppose she were legislating for her science so that everything would go down a military channel, would we look upon that as a threat to world peace?

Mr. REDFIELD. Of course we would. I would answer that argument by saying that I think that we would be seriously mistaken if we should attempt to justify the present policy in this country on the ground that the Russians, if they were in our shoes, would do the same things. Maybe they would; but if they would make the mistake we are making, that is no reason why we should make it.

Here the atom bomb comes in again. Before its advent, people had a chance to dominate the world without destroying themselves. The Nazis had that chance. But, today, although through fear or desperation men may nevertheless make the attempt, the ruin of all will be the result.

Mr. HUTCHINS. The Russians are human, and conceivably they might be as stupid if they were in our position. But there is no reason why we should be stupid just because we think somebody else might be under the same circumstances.

But I understand that Mr. Truman has telegraphed congratulations to Russia on the anniversary of the revolution and has expressed hopes for lasting cooperation. So, perhaps, we do not have to worry about the problem of Russian relations.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. I know all about that. But when someone holds out his right hand to shake hands with somebody and, at the same time, puts his left hand on his gun, there results a situation where mutual confidence is impossible.

Mr. HUTCHINS. What you are saying is that if these policies are calculated to convince the Russians that we are proposing to attack them, what is needed now is not fair words but a repudiation of the policy.

That leads to the next question for our consideration. What specific steps can be taken now, independently of other nations, which will turn our foreign policy into a policy which makes for peace?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. First, we can disclose the so-called secrets of the atomic bomb. There is no scientific secret. There are no mechanical secrets which cannot be worked out by foreign engineers just as our engineers worked them out. We are not giving away anything when we give away these so-called secrets. But what we are doing, and this is most important, is making a friendly gesture.

Mr. REDFIELD. We agree here that there is no long-run security in a policy of military force, but would not the revelation of the know-how of the atomic bomb endanger the short-run, immediate security of the United States?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. No, because the time which it will take other nations to make atomic bombs will not be materially shortened. The difference would probably be only a matter of months, or perhaps a year at most. What takes time is the mobilization of industrial power, the men and the machines, to make the bombs. Even if other nations knew today all that we know about the manufacturing process, they would have a hard pull ahead of them before they could come out with a finished product.

Mr. HUTCHINS. A second specific step toward peace to be taken independently by the United States, without endangering the security of the country, would be to withdraw the May-Johnson bill for the control of atomic energy. This proposed act, which treats atomic energy chiefly as a weapon, gives other countries the impression that we propose to develop atomic energy chiefly for hostile purposes. What we need now is a bill which looks upon atomic power as a potential benefit to mankind and which frees industrial and scientific development. That would do much to reassure the world.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. A third specific step which can be taken independently by the United States without endangering its security is the abandonment of the proposal for universal military training. We have seen that this proposal is a military absurdity in an atomic age. We actually strengthen ourselves by abandoning it, for we avoid the waste of our resources and the self-deception which it involves.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Then, these three steps—the disclosure of the secrets of the atomic bomb, the passage of a bill on atomic energy which would emphasize the peaceful possibilities of this discovery for mankind, and the abandonment of universal military training—can all be safely taken by us alone and taken now; and all of them will make for peace. Other steps may require the collaboration of other nations and may take longer.

Mr. REDFIELD. But these other steps are even more important. And in one of them we can take the initiative now. We can call a conference of the United Nations, at which the United States would offer to disclose all its military secrets of every kind and to reduce all its armaments of every kind, provided every nation would do the same. The same invitation, I submit, should propose that the conference exchange all scientific information which might be useful in the cooperative reconstruction of the world. If other nations refused, the United States would at least have made it clear that it had no desire to dominate the world by force. If other nations accepted, we might again have some hope for the survival of civilization.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. But the ultimate hope for civilization in the atomic age cannot rest on interim measures like these, important as they are. The important hope lies in world unity, in a world state, in a world government.

Mr. HUTCHINS. But that is a long way off. If a world state and a world government are to last and not to be disrupted by an atomic civil war, a world state and a world government must be supported by and must reflect a world community. This world community requires world communication; world understanding; a common tradition; a common stock of ideas and ideals which are shared by the peoples of the earth. People can be frightened into a world government, but they cannot develop communication, understanding, tradition, ideas, and ideals overnight. And if they do not develop them, the world government into which they have been frightened cannot last.

Mr. REDFIELD. I agree that they cannot develop them overnight, but they can do something to bring them about. The mere discussion of a world constitution and, still more, of course, the adoption of one would do more than any other single thing to promote the formation of a true world community, just as our own Constitution, which reflects the principles which unite us, helps to make the United States a community.

We should therefore call a world constitutional convention to consider how the world may be held together during the atomic age. If it failed, we should call another. Every interchange among the nations must be encouraged, and discussions of the possible constitution of a world state should be the most fruitful of all.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. After all, an atomic civil war, if it should take place in a world state, would be no worse for us or for the world than the atomic international war toward which we are speeding.

Mr. HUTCHINS. In the meantime, the possibilities of the United Nations Organization should not be overlooked.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. That organization is far from perfect. In its present form it cannot prevent war, for example. It is an organization of independent sovereign states, dominated by a few great powers.

Mr. REDFIELD. But the important point is that it is an international organization and the only one which we have. It must be used. The more it is used, the more useful it will become. Meanwhile, we can consider whether it should be supplanted by a stronger organization or whether it may not itself, drastically revised, grow into world government.

Mr. HUTCHINS. The next war will be, in a very gruesome sense, a war to end war. When the next war is over, there will be nobody left to fight another. If we are to avert the next war, we must immediately change the direction of American foreign policy.

On this round-table discussion we have listed five measures which might avert the next war: (1) The disclosure of the so-called "secrets" of the atomic bomb; (2) a law governing atomic energy, which would release science and industry to give the world the goods and leisure which atomic energy promises; (3) the abandonment of universal military training; (4) an international conference in which we propose to disclose all military secrets and reduce all armaments if other nations will do the same; and (5) the calling of a world constitutional convention.

Simultaneously, we must develop the United Nations Organization to the maximum by using it to the maximum. If the American people want peace, they must recognize the folly of trying to build it on force. That policy is immoral and suicidal. It is a policy adequately described by the historian Tacitus. He said, when force was the policy of the Romans, "They make a desolation, and they call it peace."

THE THIRD YEAR OF THE ATOMIC AGE: WHAT SHOULD WE DO NOW?

(Broadcast August 24, 1947, with G. A. Borgese, secretary of the Committee To Frame a World Constitution; Richard J. Finnegan, editor, Chicago Sun-Times; Carl A. Hatch, United States district judge, New Mexico; Harold C. Urey, atomic scientist, University of Chicago; Robert M. Hutchins)

Statement by Mr. Hutchins

Two years ago, the Sunday after the bomb dropped, the University of Chicago Round Table discussed Atomic Force—Its Meaning for Mankind.

The University of Chicago had been one of the principal centers of research on the bomb. The first chain reaction took place on its campus on December 2, 1942.

The university, even before the round table of 2 years ago, had determined to do what it could to maintain the leadership of the United States in atomic studies and to hold together some of the members of the group which had produced the bomb.

For this purpose it had already created three new research institutes. The university representatives on the round table had therefore some qualifications to speak on the subject, and the institution they represented was deeply involved in whatever atomic energy might mean for mankind.

The fundamental facts about the atomic bomb today are those which the round table emphasized 2 years ago. There is no secret. There is no defense. Since there is no secret, other nations will have the bomb almost any day. Since there is no defense, military preparations to defend ourselves against the bomb are a waste of time.

In another war the atomic bomb will be used. International agreements for the control of atomic energy will simply mean that the next war will end with atomic bombs instead of beginning with them. The minute that war breaks out, every nation that knows how will start making atomic bombs.

It is generally thought that another nation will be able to make atomic bombs within 5 years from the day on which we dropped the first bomb on Japan. If this is so, we have already frittered away 40 percent of the time we had to organize ourselves to preserve mankind.

The New York Times, in its editorial on the second anniversary of the bomb, says that the ultimate protection against it can only be the abolition of war itself. The Times suggests that the final success of efforts to abolish war can be realised only in an ultimate world government.

I do not understand the use of the word "ultimate" in this connection. We have now arrived at the ultimate stage in history. We cannot do something intermediate now and ultimately do something ultimate. What is ultimately required of us is required of us now. If what is ultimately required of us is the abolition of war through a world government, then we had better set about trying to get war abolished through world government now.

Any proposal for a world atomic authority is a proposal for world government. Such an authority must have a monopoly of atomic bombs, which means that every nation would be at its mercy, and it must have the right to enter, inspect, and destroy atomic installations anywhere in the world. No nation could call itself sovereign in any usual sense under such conditions.

The major premise of all discussions looking toward agreements for the control of atomic energy has been that the nations retain their sovereignty. Hence, these discussions have not succeeded and cannot succeed. Either we have world federal government and real atomic control, or we have no agreements, or agreements that are meaningless, and eventually atomic war.

It will be said, of course, that if nations will not collaborate in an alliance or debating society like the United Nations, they cannot be expected to come together or stay together in a world state. The American States could not or would not collaborate under the Articles of Confederation before 1787, but they did come together, and with the exception of one period, they stayed together under the Constitution.

It may be admitted that there were ties which united them which do not unite the nations today. On the other hand, we should not forget that many differences deeply divided the American States, so much so that, 3 months before the Constitutional Convention, Madison wrote that "he trembled for the issue."

Mr. Hooker has lately shown in the magazine Common Cause how serious the divisions among the States in the Confederation were. Virginia had twelve times as many people as Delaware. Georgia claimed a hundred times as many square miles as Rhode Island. There were so many Germans in Pennsylvania that Franklin feared they might make German the language of the State. It was impossible to get along in some sections in New York without knowing Dutch. The trip from Boston to New York, which now takes less than an hour, took four days to a week along the finest road, or longer than it takes now to go around the world.

Gouverneur Morris thought that a Federal tax was impossible because of the extent of the country; and one member of the Convention asked, How can it be supposed that this vast country, including the western territory, will, 150 years hence, remain one Nation?

When Washington took charge of the armies surrounding Boston, he wrote that the New Englanders were an exceedingly dirty and nasty people. On the other hand, Ephraim Paine, of Vermont, complained that the southern members of Congress regarded themselves as a superior order of animals. Tithes were levied by New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland on the goods of other States; and New Jersey taxed the New York lighthouse on Sandy Hook. New York, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts quarreled about Vermont, and Pennsylvanians battled Virginians on the Upper Ohio. It is no wonder that, when the Constitution was completed by the Convention, the principal attack upon it was that it was utopian—a visionary project, an indigestible panacea.

And it barely was accepted. In the convention in the critical States it just squeaked through. In Massachusetts it carried by 29 votes; in Virginia, by 10; and in New York by only three.

To borrow a phrase from Mr. Borgese, world government is necessary and therefore possible. Of course, the world government can mean much, little, or nothing. An effort to find out what a free and federal world constitution would be like is now proceeding in the Committee To Frame a World Constitution. Whether this effort succeeds or fails, it will at least serve to clarify the issues and to focus the thought of the world on the method of forming a federal union which shall embrace all men.

It is very late. Perhaps nothing can save us. But the handwriting on the wall is plain enough. It says to the peoples of the earth, "Unite or die."

THE PROBLEM OF WORLD GOVERNMENT

(Broadcast April 4, 1948, with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India; V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador from China in the United States; Robert M. Hutchins)

Statement by Mr. Hutchins

We come now to the practical and immediate bearing upon American foreign policy of the two eloquent statements which you have heard.

The official American policy is to frighten Russia out of her alleged intention to establish world government, on the Russian plan, by force and fraud. According to present indications, the American elections next autumn can make little change in this policy; for each candidate for the Republican nomination is seeking favor on the ground that his principles and personality will frighten the Russians more than those of any of his rivals. Many Americans want to go farther still. They see that a policy of frightening Russia will merely postpone the war which is to decide whether we have world government on the Russian plan or world government on the American plan. Therefore, they want to fight Russia now while we are overwhelmingly stronger than she. They are calling for a preventive war.

Talk of a preventive war is vicious and perverted. If we seriously entertain the idea of a preventive war, we ought first to make our apologies to the Nazis we hanged at Nuremberg. Talk of any war, now or later, is not much better. The best that can be said for it is that it is recklessly frivolous. This is, we often hear, a Christian country; and the message of Christ calls us to good will, to the love of our neighbor, to the renunciation of the goods of this world, to humility, and to the forgiveness, not the slaughter, of our enemies. To say that we must kill Communists because they are atheists and we are Christians is a strange distortion of Christianity.

Those who believe in preventive war have one point on their side. They are correct in holding that a policy of frightening Russia cannot permanently succeed. Some day Russia will have the atomic bomb. Some day Russia will feel strong enough to prefer fighting to being frightened. Then the next war will come, and after it will come world government for such world as we have left. World government will come by conquest, instead of by orderly constitutional procedure.

Have we forgotten what the scientists have told us about the next war? If it comes when both sides have the atomic bomb, the cities of both sides will be destroyed. I do not care about architecture. The men, women, and children in our cities will be blown to bits. The atomic bomb is a weapon directed against civilians. If we go to war before the Russians have the atomic bomb, we may expect the horrors of bacteriological warfare. We may expect the death of millions of innocent people. We may expect the disruption of our own economy and of our own form of government. We shall lay Europe waste—Europe, our ancestral homeland; Europe, for the sake of which we are now preparing for war. And when the war is over, if it ever is, we shall have the task of imposing our will by force for centuries on the peoples we have defeated. World government by the conquest of the world means perpetual war.

That we can lightheartedly discuss such a program not 3 years after the death of Hitler suggests that Hitler has triumphed after all. He was the symbol of brute force in our time. He was defeated, but we, his conquerors, are now preparing to bow down before the idol which he worshiped.

There is a good deal of hypocrisy about our attitude toward Russia. We do not believe that Russia is ready to attack us. We cannot seriously think that all Russians are bloodthirsty villains and that all the actions of the American Government through history have the pure, angelic quality which we ascribe to them. Have we forgotten how we got the Panama Canal? Have we forgotten our continual interference, often for no better reason than the protection of our investments, in the internal affairs of Latin America? The Russians have behaved stupidly. Our own consciences cannot be altogether clear. We might ask ourselves how we should feel if the Russian Secretary for Air were to say of us what our Secretary for Air said of Russia a week or so ago, when he stated publicly that our planes could now drop bombs on Russian cities and return to their bases in America.

The peoples of the earth want freedom and justice. They do not want to be individuals without duties or automatons without rights. Communism denies them freedom. The critical spirit of man works against communism. Differences among individuals work against communism, for it holds that all men are identical. The European tradition of free expression, a free press, and political parties works against communism. Invention in the arts, discovery in the sciences, carelessness, restlessness, humor, rational skepticism, and religious faith work against it.

What works for it? Nothing but injustice, which appears to millions today in the prospect of endless starvation and exploitation. The people of Europe do not want and will not long tolerate Communist justice at the expense of freedom. But the people of Europe cannot be permanently intimidated, and they cannot be permanently bought. They must have before their eyes some positive idea, some positive program which offers them both freedom and justice.

The stop-Russia program does not meet these requirements. The time is one for imagination, invention, for the effort to raise ourselves by our own bootstraps into a different spiritual world. This effort is harder than a policy of vast military preparations and resounding threats. But it has the merit of relieving us from condemnation by our own moral code. It has the merit of offering hope to mankind. Another war will mean the end of all hopes whatever.

We should strain our minds and imaginations to invent a political structure which may unite the world in freedom and justice. The aim is unity, which comes by agreement, not unification, which is imposed by force. The aim is a world state which rests not on the uneasy, impermanent, and unjust foundation of conquest but on the durable basis of the consent of the governed.

Such a world state must be a federal government, for only a federal government can create peace and safeguard liberty while preserving order. Such a world government must be a government, and not, like the United Nations, a league of independent, sovereign states, perpetuating the malady of nationalism. Such a world government must protect freedom; and it must be founded on justice, for men will fight until they get their rights.

Can such a world constitution be invented? I think so, for the Committee To Frame a World Constitution, established at Chicago 2½ years ago at the initiative of G. A. Borgese, has just published a draft of a possible world constitution which contains these elements.

Can such a world constitution be adopted? Nobody knows. But such a world constitution offers a positive idea. Hence it has a chance of gaining the adherence of mankind.

Can such a constitution guarantee that there will never be another war? Of course not. But it offers a hope that there will not be another war—and the only hope which we have. If a constitution proposing freedom and justice is accepted by most of the world, with the exception of Russia and her satellites, then there may be war. But it will be a war in which we cannot be accused of seeking our own aggrandizement, the subjugation of others to our will, or the domination of the world. A war, if it comes then, will be one in which the issues will be far plainer, in which our allies will be far more numerous and more loyal, and in which our sense of righteousness and high purpose will be far stronger than they can be today.

But the main point of contrast is this: the foreign policy of the United States means that war is inevitable. World government founded on freedom and justice means that war, though still possible, is no longer inevitable. If war is inevitable, civilization has no future.

All Americans who hope for a future for their children, all Americans who want one good world, all Americans who believe in the brotherhood of man, should call upon the President and upon Congress to initiate a world constitutional convention.

The mission of America is not to dominate the world but to transform it.

A National Policy for Timberlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in the present emergency we realize more and more the importance of our natural resources, especially those represented in the forest lands of the United States. In times when there is no stress we ruthlessly exploit our timberlands and dispoil our forests without thought of the future, without regard to the huge loss of construction material and the waste of our land.

Some interesting information is contained in a speech on a national policy for timber lands, which was recently delivered by Mr. E. L. Demmon, director, Lake States Forest Experiment Station at St. Paul, Minn. The speech was made before the North American Wildlife Conference at Milwaukee, Wis. I recommend careful consideration of Mr. Demmon's remarks:

A NATIONAL POLICY FOR TIMBERLANDS[1]

(By E. L. Demmon, director, Lake States Forest Experiment Station[2])

Today forest resources are more important than ever to the security and prosperity of the United States. We have been blessed with an abundance of forest land, which has contributed immeasurably to building up this country and helping us to world leadership. But, until recent years, most of our forests were exploited with little or no thought to the future. We cannot afford this luxury again. Faced with the possibilities of a continuing emergency, common sense demands that we care for and use wisely this great resource so essential not only to a high standard of living but to our national defense. Under such a policy of wise use present timber growth could be increased, and our requirements for a multitude of essential commodities could be met without detriment to the watershed, wildlife, range, or recreational values of the forest.

With population on the increase and an expanded national defense effort now under way, emergency requirements for construction material, crating and boxing, paper, and many other products of the forest can be expected to mount. It is timely, therefore, that we take a fresh look at our position with regard to our forests and work toward a realistic and coordinated policy, easily understood and generally acceptable.

In World War II we cut deeply into our forest resources; it was part of the price of victory. For example, we put 25,000,000,000 board feet of lumber per year, or over half of the total national production, into military uses, compared to only about 300,000,000 board feet, or less than 2 percent as much, in normal times. In the days ahead when undoubtedly we shall again have to expand the use of forest resources to help defend our way of life, let us do so as efficiently as possible, and with a look to the future.

In the past half century we have learned much about reproducing and growing crops of trees and forage, and how to use their products more economically and efficiently. We have also learned much about managing watersheds, the range, and wildlife habitat. How to get this knowledge more generally applied is a real challenge. Certainly a strong and prosperous nation will require an abundance of forest products. Conversely, waste and inefficiency in the handling of these forest resources can invite disaster. It takes many years to grow a forest, but only a few minutes to destroy one.

What is our forest situation today? We need to know this to plan intelligently. Originally covering about half of the land surface of the United States, forests now occupy only about one-third of the total land area. Although we can anticipate minor shifts of some forest to cropland, it probably will be about offset by abandonment of cropland, so we need expect no great change in total forest area. Only about two-thirds of these forest lands can produce commercial crops of timber; the balance consists of areas which are too remote to be utilized, are chiefly valuable for soil and watershed protection, hunting, fishing, and other recreational use, and are inherently unproductive of timber, or are devoted exclusively to park purposes. We will concern ourselves here only with the commercial forests which cover 460,000,000 acres of land.

What do these forests mean to us? Foremost, they provide us with cellulose or wood—a material with thousands of uses—so essential to everyday life. Recent estimates show that about 55 percent of the timber harvested each year goes into lumber, 18 percent into fuel wood, 11 percent into pulpwood, and the balance into veneer logs, hewn railroad ties, round mine timbers, fence posts, cooperage, shingles, poles, and a multitude of other items. The value of these wood products—their harvesting, manufacture, transportation, and sale—puts several billions of dollars annually into the channels of commerce and provides a source of livelihood for more than 3,000,000 people. Many a community receives its major support from forest enterprises. In addition, the livestock products from the forest ranges, the enormous wildlife and recreational values, and the priceless protection which forests afford soils and watersheds represent an asset almost beyond computation.

Who owns the forests? Three-fourths of all commercial forest land belongs to more than 4,000,000 private owners, many of them farmers. In general, these are the more productive lands. Presently about 60 percent of the Nation's forest production comes from these private lands. The Nation, therefore, must look to private forests for most of its present and future supplies of forest products. The remaining one-fourth of the commercial forest is in National, State, county, municipal, and school forests, on Indian lands, or on the public domain.

There is a growing realization nowadays that ownership of a national resource carries with it a responsibility as well as a privilege. Forest owners have a major responsibility in properly caring for their forests. On the other hand, every American shares the responsibility for making possible the continued productiveness of these vitally important resources which are basic to our well-being. Thus, the general public should encourage and assist private owners to keep their timberlands productive. The Forest Service believes in building up our forest resources through individual initiative and cooperative endeavor under reasonable rules adopted through democratic processes. It believes that such rules are as necessary to resource management as they are to transportation, communication, and other enterprises that affect the public welfare.

What is the condition of the forests? A Forest Service appraisal made a few years ago showed the American forests are growing at a rate far below their productive capacity. This is due mainly to past treatment—as a rule, forests were overcut, burned, and generally uncared for. As a matter of fact, for many years it was believed that most of the cut-over land would be suited to and needed for farming—often, however, this did not prove to be the case. After the original old-growth forest was harvested, mostly during the last century, nature reclothed some of the land with a new timber stand, although many tracts were entirely denuded. However, unaided, natural restocking could not keep pace with cutting

[1] Paper delivered at the Sixteenth North American Wildlife Conference at Milwaukee, Wis., March 6, 1951.

[2] Maintained by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, in cooperation with the University of Minnesota, university farm, St. Paul, Minn.

and fires. At present, less than 50 percent of our commercial forest land bears sawtimber stands.

Foresters tell us that we are still cutting saw timber faster than it is being replaced through growth, although the over-all cubic volume of annual forest growth and drain is almost in balance. Our softwood stands in particular are continuing to shrink, whereas the amount of lesser used and lesser valued hardwoods is on the increase. It is estimated that we have at least 50,000,000 acres of understocked or deforested but potentially productive lands that can be rehabilitated only by planting. (At present rates, it would take more than 100 years to complete this task.) About 70,000,000 acres of forest and watershed lands do not yet have organized fire protection, although a first principle of good forestry demands such protection. An urgent reason for 100-percent fire protection now is its importance to the country's defense activities. Protection from harmful diseases and insects is often more important than protection from fire and gives a continuing battle to forestry agencies. Many miles of new roads are needed to make possible the orderly harvesting of inaccessible old-growth timber on public lands in the West before it becomes decadent. Many western forest ranges have deteriorated due to overgrazing, and many woodland areas in the East need protection from livestock for maximum productiveness. Locally, deer and other wildlife species have become overabundant and destroyed tree reproduction. Evidence of excessive soil erosion on forest lands is commonplace. All this should dispel any complacency we might have as to the adequacy of present forestry practices. Also, let us not forget that forestry is a long-time undertaking—a tree planted today may not be harvested for 40 to 100 years?

Not until the early part of this century was a real start made toward the practice of forestry in this country. During the last 50 years, through trial and research, much has been learned about how best to care for forests to make them renewable and productive, and how to get maximum utilization from each tree harvested. The national forests, which make up 16 percent of the nation's commercial forest area, have been organized and placed under management. Last fiscal year (ending June 30, 1950) they yielded a total revenue of almost $34,000,000 (timber—3,500,000,000 board feet worth $29,379,217; grazing—1,100,000 cattle and horses, and 3,100,000 sheep and goats, $3,385,004; and miscellaneous receipts, $380,393); and this year the total promises to go much higher. (During the last 6 months of 1950, national forest receipts totaled $27,000,000.) A good share of this (25 percent) is returned to the States to be expended for the benefit of public schools and public roads within the counties where the national forests are located.

This group is, of course, interested primarily in wildlife. It is probably superfluous to mention to you, then, that the national forests constitute a hunting and fishing ground equivalent to about one-tenth of the total land area of the United States. As you know, the States make and enforce the laws necessary to protect and utilize these wildlife resources; the Forest Service gives primary attention to maintaining a habitat suited to wildlife. (It is estimated that 2,440,000 head of big game animals find shelter and food within the national forests.) Close cooperative relations between the States and the Forest Service have helped promote good hunting and fishing consistent with the protection and development of all the resources. Although wildlife in the national forests is often one of the major resource values, the Forest Service has in recent years been handicapped in habitat management work because of curtailment in regular funds for this purpose.

State forestry work, including the organized protection of State and private forests from fire, has made good progress in the last quarter century. A program of public aid in providing technical forestry assistance to small owners is now well under way. In the last 10 years industry has sponsored campaigns for better forestry, such as the tree farm and keep green programs. Here in Wisconsin there is an excellent example of industry leadership for better forestry in the work of Trees for Tomorrow, an organization sponsored by several pulp and paper companies to stimulate tree planting and better forestry on private lands. Management of privately owned forests to keep them continuously productive has increased greatly, particularly during the last decade. These private owners have a wonderful incentive to forestry practice—they have found that it pays good dividends and that it lessens transportation and other costs. Above all, however, it assures a future supply of raw materials, without which this industry cannot exist. Many private operators are actively buying land in the vicinity of their plants.

Although many notable gains have been made in both public and private forestry, we are still a long way from a satisfactory forest economy in this country. As an example of the timber situation in a single region, let us take a look at the Lake States (Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota), where we are meeting today. From 1875 to 1900, this region led the Nation in lumber production, turning out from one-fourth to one-third of all the lumber cut, and much of it was shipped throughout the country. Today, Lake States mills account for only 3 to 4 percent of national lumber production, which does not begin to take care of the region's own needs; almost two-thirds of the lumber used here has to be imported, much of it from the Pacific coast, at a very high cost in freight alone.

The decline in lumbering has been offset in recent years by the growth of the pulp and paper industry. The Lake States region now produces more than 3,000,000 tons of paper and board annually, or about one-sixth of the output of the Nation. With good forestry practices and over a period of time, this trend can be reversed—not only can the Lake States region grow all the forest raw materials it needs, it can also have a balance for export.

There is little to be gained in placing the blame for mistakes of the past, although we do want to be assured that the same thing will not happen again. It is of more value now to take stock of our situation and decide how we can work together constructively for the future. This requires a broad plan or policy on which the majority can agree and within the framework of which we can strive toward an improved forest situation commensurate with our national needs. To build up the nation's forest resources so as to meet anticipated future demands and to place forestry on a sound business basis, a 3-point program has often been recommended by the Forest Service. This includes (1) an expanded program of public aid and service to private forest owners, including (a) more technical assistance to improve tree growth and obtain better use of wood, (b) additional help for nurseries and planting, (c) setting up a forest credit and insurance system, (d) improving tax laws where needed, (e) providing all State and private forest land with an adequate cooperative program of protection from fire, insects, and diseases, and (f) a strengthening of forest research; (2) a system of public regulation of cutting and other forest practices that will keep forest lands reasonably productive, recognizing that such legislation or Government direction will fail without full understanding and backing of the public at large (States that have made notable headway in this direction include Washington, Oregon, California, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, and Virginia among others); and (3) expansion and intensified protection and management of all public forests, many of which are at present inaccessible or too thinly manned to yield their potential forestry values.

The present strength and future security of our Nation depend in part on the abundance and productiveness of its forests. The values at stake concern industry, labor, the tax base, and the perpetuation of our free institutions. They must, therefore, be of concern to every citizen. To build these forests to full strength, to keep them abundantly productive, and to utilize them in full measure for human progress will require real partnership of effort, with public agencies, landowners, forest industries, labor, and the public at large all working together. Here is an opportunity to show the world an example of progress under the democratic way of life. Let's make this a better forested country for future generations in which to live and work.

Jurisdiction Over the Airspace Above Federal Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of an editorial from the Washington Post stressing the need for early passage of corrective legislation to confer jurisdiction on Federal courts to punish those who commit crimes in aircraft over Federal territory. We should not wait to take action on this important matter until some shocking crime has been perpetrated which goes unpunished on a technicality. The Post editorial follows:

Mr. Truman may be a bit chagrined to discover that the officer who forbade him to jump at Fort Bragg might have been assuming an authority that he really did not possess. The embarrassing truth seems to be that when an airplane is aloft over Federal territory or over the high seas, nobody posseses any authority over anybody. Each occupant of the plane is a law unto himself, as the saying goes, since something like the pure anarchic state of nature, as described by Tom Hobbes, appears to prevail. We confess we did not realize this ourselves until the point was brought up by Representative KEATING, of New York. According to Mr. KEATING, you can get away with almost anything, including murder and sabotage, in an airplane once it is off the ground, simply because the Federal authority has now no legal power to punish any crimes committed up there; so that if you feel like beating your wife, for example, all you need do is to charter a plane and entice her aboard; and if the pilot intervenes, you can beat him too—if you think you are strong enough. Mr. KEATING thinks that this inadequacy in the Federal statutes needs to be corrected at once and we heartily agree.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a speech delivered by me through the facilities of radio station WJR, Detroit, on Friday, March 9, in support of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The atmosphere of world conditions forces a reorientation of our thinking on the St. Lawrence seaway. Now, more than ever before, the principal value of the seaway lies in its importance to the national defense, because industrial production is by far the most important single aspect of the strength we must have to preserve the peace of the world or to defend ourselves in case of attack.

In this speech, which was made a part of the Your Congress series of programs by station WJR, I have pointed out the reasons why the St. Lawrence seaway affects every American citizen in every corner of the Nation.

The speech is as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I deeply appreciate the invitation of radio station WJR to participate in the series of programs entitled "Your Congress." WJR performs a distinct public service through these programs and deserves the commendation of all its listeners.

If you have been following the developments in Washington for the past few weeks you know that there is once again before the Congress the proposal for approving the agreement between this country and Canada relating to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. To most Midwesterners, this subject has become a familiar one in the 24 years since it was first proposed, and most of us are well acquainted with the arguments that have been advanced in support of the seaway. We have a deep personal interest in the project because our lives are deeply involved in the manufacturing activity of this region. We know that if our industries move elsewhere in conformity with the hard and fast rules of economic life, the Midwest will be transformed into one huge ghost town. The decline of Lake Superior iron ore foretells the disappearance of large-scale industrial activity in the Midwest, unless the St. Lawrence seaway is constructed to provide easy access to the one most promising new source of ore in Labrador.

There are reams of arguments, surveys, reports, analyses, charts, maps, and so forth that bear out these facts. The law of nature is inexorable, "either grow or die" and we know that the seaway is the key to our growth in the years ahead.

As important as it is that the people of the Midwest avoid this economic nightmare, there is yet one overreaching consideration which should win the approval of every American citizen in every corner of the Nation—namely—the intimate relation of the seaway to our national defense. The seaway is vital to Americans—as Americans—and sectional interests are narrow and short-sighted in comparison.

Let us put the case in one-two order.

Using Labrador ore, a new industrial pattern will be built around the east coast ports of Philadelphia and Baltimore as the unloading and transshipment depots. The National Security Resources Board estimates that the cost of this route to the steel industry centered in and around Pittsburgh, will not differ materially from the cost of shipping from Labrador to Pittsburgh via the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

It is quite a different story, however, with regard to the steel manufacturing centers with ports on Lake Erie. Shipping costs via the seaway to Lorain, Ohio, and east, including Cleveland and Buffalo, would approximate $2.15, assuming a 50-cent toll per ton. The cost via any ocean and rail transportation route would be about 75 cents higher, so that the seaway represents a saving of about 26 percent on every ton of ore brought into the country.

This consideration of savings in the cost of ore, steel, and products made from steel is vital to America at this time. Soaring defense costs since the outbreak of the Korean War are startling evidence of the staggering burden any full-scale military production effort would place upon the economy. Viewed in this light, the seaway is actually a cost-reducing investment.

Top defense officials—the Joint Chiefs of Staff included—endorse the seaway for more than mere economic reasons. The St. Lawrence seaway has a prominent place in the strategy of those entrusted with the defense of the Nation.

The ocean route from Labrador to Philadelphia covers 1,300 miles of open sea—sea lanes which in wartime would be infested with long-range, snorkel-type submarines, forcing a constant patrol by our naval forces at an added expense in money, ships, and men. Ore carriers are prime targets for enemy submarines as was proved by our experience in World War II. Bethlehem Steel lost five of the seven ships it had in service transporting ore from Chile to Sparrows Point, Md. For understandable reasons, the company withdrew the other two ships from service and we thus lost an important source of ore for emergency steel production.

The seaway, while vulnerable to some extent from sabotage, could be defended and patrolled at a much lower cost to the military than could this route over some of the worst water in the Atlantic ocean, and with a much lower risk of loss.

No military commander ever knowingly exposes or over-extends his lines of supply so as to make them vulnerable to enemy attack. No military commander establishes his supply dumps within the range of enemy artillery. Yet this is precisely the set-up when the terminal points for iron ore imports are the east-coast ports and the industries have moved closer to these points, driven there by inexorable economic reasons.

In other words, the military axiom, protect your lines of supply, is an imperative rule of action for the United States, dictating the construction of the seaway.

There is yet another factor which begs our consideration. We all know that our industrial activity is in a period of technological development. Nuclear fission is in the process of revolutionizing the art of manufacturing. But behind the glittering success story of atomic energy development there is the modern commonplace of hydroelectric power. We built the Oak Ridge atomic development plant close to the source of TVA electrical energy, and this same electric power figures strongly in other phases of the production side of modern warfare. Aluminum is a prime example in this regard.

The St. Lawrence power project will develop more of this vitally needed power than the TVA plants, and its enormous output will allow for expanding industrial development and rehabilitation in the New York-New England region where manufacturers now pay the highest power rates in the country.

It is significant to note at this point what is going on in the rest of the world with regard to inland waterways and power-development projects.

Throughout the Communist world the Soviet publicity organs are beating the drums in the approved Bolshevik style, announcing the expected completion in 1952, 2 years ahead of schedule, of a vast canal system linking the Black, Caspian, Baltic, and White Seas. The great inland plains of Russia will then be served by five oceans, according to the Red press agents. This will facilitate the transfer of ships from one major area to another. It gives them transportation routes for coal and construction materials which cannot be reached by any other naval power.

Perhaps more ominous than this far-flung canal system are the two enormous hydroelectric projects, one at Kuibyshev, the other at Stalingrad, lower down the Volga River. Between them they will generate 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, and the plant at Kuibyshev will be the most powerful hydroelectric plant in the world.

Despite the peaceful purposes for the power described by the Russians, it is significant that the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union has directed the transmission of 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually to a single point 800 to 625 miles distant from the source. Within that radius lie the Ural Mountains with their large deposits of uranium ore and the industrial center of Magnitogorsk, the arsenal of the Red army.

Tying all these ideas together, I believe we see with startling clarity the advantages of a secure and economical traffic artery for our iron ore and the development of powerful new sources of electric energy. And if we face the facts of international life we realize that these advantages may mean our survival as a free Nation.

The masters of the Kremlin, of course, do not have to put up with powerful lobbyists; they do not have to pacify selfish local interests and the costs of slave labor are never prohibitive. In the United States, however, we are hampered, in a sense, by the demands of the democratic process.

We have had nothing but foot-dragging on the part of Congress in getting ahead with the job. Endorsement by every President since Coolidge has been ineffective and meanwhile the American people wait.

Despite this, ladies and gentlemen, it is a blunt, hard, and obvious fact that we can no longer afford to drag our feet. We must begin at once, through the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to serve and safeguard our national interest.

We must begin at once a job that too long has been pushed aside, a job that has taken on life and death significance for every American citizen.

Personal Appearance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on March 20, 1951:

PERSONAL APPEARANCE?

Senator HARRY CAIN selects a poor time to suggest that Gen. Douglas MacArthur be

ordered before Congress to tell it just what is needed to win victory and peace in Korea.

CAIN claims MacArthur is as tragic a figure as is to be found in all history, because he is required to send his men out to die in Korea without being able to offer them the prospect of eventual victory.

Thus the Washington State Republican relegates himself to the ranks of other Americans who have from time to time attempted to have MacArthur brought back to the United States. Most of us would welcome his homecoming in order to accord him the ovation he earned during World War II, and has enhanced in Korea. Others, such as Senator CAIN, have less wholesome reasons.

General MacArthur has not been home since 1937. He did come as far as Hawaii in August 1944, when he conferred with the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. And last year, he met with President Truman in similar conference on a Pacific island.

He had planned a visit to the United States in 1948, but after learning the proposed return was being seized upon for political purposes, he deferred that visit. In peacetime, he reiterated that duty held him to his post in Japan. With the commencement of hostilities in Korea, the reason for his stay is obvious.

Senator CAIN, then, wants a MacArthur report to Congress, but it would appear he is skipping a few channels of command in his thoughtless suggestion. General MacArthur is a soldier; responsible only to the President, the Commander in Chief; and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He has no obligation of Congress. If his military superiors feel Congress needs more information, it is their privilege to appear before its Members. These superiors get frequent reports from MacArthur—how many and what they contain we cannot know for security reasons—and MacArthur himself is liberal with statements to the American press in Tokyo.

A MacArthur appearance before Congress would be an exciting show, one Senator CAIN and his colleagues could enjoy, but it is doubtful whether the general would get any sound advice from the Members nor whether he could tell them anything they could not now learn. General MacArthur is in the middle of a job, and we can reserve the festivities for later.

Vast Possibilities Before Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling attention to an editorial written by Mr. Sanford Martin in the Journal and Sentinel of Winston-Salem, N. C., on March 19, 1951, in which reference is made to our distinguished colleague, Congressman THURMOND CHATHAM:

VAST POSSIBILITIES BEFORE US

(From editorial columns of the High Point Enterprise, March 19, 1951)

Representative THURMOND CHATHAM has strong faith in the possibilities and the future of northwest North Carolina. He has manifested this faith in many ways which have included action as well as words. Therefore, the 1,200 farmers and businessmen who heard him speak at the ninth annual Farmers' Day observance in Elkin this week were convinced of his complete sincerity when he said:

"Either for agriculture or industry, I do not believe there is a better location in the world today than our area, from the mountains to the coastal plains. We have the climate. We have the soil. We are close to markets. We have transportation and communications—and, most important of all, we have the right kind of people."

In this statement Mr. CHATHAM listed five assets, which if exploited to the fullest should make the economy of this section among the most prosperous in the Nation. By exploiting our climate, soil, marketing possibilities and transportation and communications advantages intelligently and going forward with the program of educating and training our people both in the academic and vocational sense, we can expand our agriculture, our tourist business, our mechanical industry, make the most of our dairying, fruit growing and mining possibilities, and develop the type of agrarian and urban leadership essential to an ever forward movement of progress.

In recent decades the northwest section of North Carolina has made remarkable progress in almost all these fields. But any competent observer is cognizant that up to now the surface has merely been scratched. In the light of the truly amazing natural resources and potentialities of our section of the State and Nation, our progress thus far indeed seems very slight.

As we enter the new era which has been opened up by great advance in the development of electric power and the discovery of atomic energy, northwest North Carolina faces the most inviting opportunity of its history to apply its native energy, its growing vision, and its increasing knowledge and skills to the upbuilding of the most promising section of the South's "most progressive State." (Winston-Salem Journal.)

A Loophole To Be Plugged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, there can be no justification for continuing the tax-free allowance to the President, Vice President, Speaker, and Members of Congress. They should be required to itemize and justify the expenses connected with the conduct of their offices in just the same way any other taxpayer has to do.

The working man or woman quite properly wonders what there is fair about a deal whereby he cannot even deduct his bus or streetcar fare to work as a necessary expense when the President of the United States on top of his salary is given $50,000 tax-free to spend as he sees fit without any accounting.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials on this subject from the Portland (Maine) Evening Express and Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union:

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express of February 7, 1951]

TAX-FREE FAIR DEALERS

Taxpayers may possibly derive some joy, in these gray days, from the recollection that the Fair Deal Seventy-ninth Congress voted to each of its Members a $2,500 tax-free expense account, not subject to any accounting.

Taxpayers may further cheer themselves by remembering that Harry S. Truman's salary as President was increased from $75,000 to $100,000 a year by the Fair Deal Eighty-first Congress, and that, at the same time, that Democratic Congress gave the President a $50,000 tax-free expense account for which he is not required to make any accounting.

The Democrats in the Eighty-first Congress also thought it well to increase Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY's salary to $30,000 and to favor him with a $10,000 tax-free expense account. And they very thoughtfully also awarded a $10,000 allowance to Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, for which no accounting is required.

New York's Republican Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, who observes pointedly that "everyone incurs such expenses in connection with his work, for which he is denied any tax exemption," now proposes that the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives be held accountable for tax purposes—just as all other Americans are held accountable—for those items in the income of each described under the heading, "Expenses."

All of us have to pay bus fare, or have to pay the bills for owning, licensing, insuring, and maintaining some kind of an automobile, in order to get from home to work and from work to home; but our expenditures for such necessary expense are not tax free. Had you noticed? Mr. KEATING thinks the expenses of the President and Congressmen likewise should be taxed.

Accordingly, this New York Republican has introduced a bill to amend the pertinent statutes relating to compensation, to provide that those expense accounts which the Democrats have made tax-free in recent congressional sessions shall be added, henceforth, to the salaries of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House, and Members of Congress, "so that the total compensation will be subject to income tax."

This being the Fair Deal, and all of its adherents—from the President down—being devoted to the principle of sharing the wealth, we lowly taxpayers may of course assume that all of these, "our leaders," will now heap gladsome praises upon Representative KEATING for having thus brought to their attention a method whereby each may share more fully with us in the matter of paying taxes.

We "little people," who cannot deduct bus fare as a legitimate expense when figuring our income-tax returns can, of course, expect Mr. Truman to leap at the opportunity to have his $50,000-a-year expense account lumped with his $100,000 salary for tax purposes.

Actually, to be sure, the President's expense account—for which he has not been held accountable—amounts to $90,000 over and above his salary. He had a $40,000 expense allowance before the Democrats voted him the additional $50,000 in 1949.

Moreover, in addition to the $100,000 salary and the $90,000 tax-free expense allowance which, in our crude way, we shall call his take-home pay, our leader is granted the use—at the expense of all taxpayers—of various luxurious airplanes, 35 White House automobiles, the yacht Williamsburg (even the millionaire Roosevelt got along nicely with a relatively tiny minesweeper, for his week-end seafaring), a private pullman car, a vacation retreat at Key West, Fla., and another "Shangri-La" in Maryland. The estimated annual cost of the staff and upkeep for these items, Representative KEATING finds, is about $1,500,000. That's all over and above the actual take-home pay.

"I know of no group of our people who need more to be reminded that their compensation is subject to tax," says Representative KEATING, "than do the President and Members of Congress."

KENNETH B. KEATING, we love you. Carry on.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union]

KEATING BILL SHOULD PASS

Special tax privileges for officeholders do not sit well with ordinary taxpaying citizens at any time. When ordinary taxes go to the height they will—and should—this year, special privileges become causes for downright complaint.

Congress was unwise some years ago when it voted itself and top members of the executive branch a tax-free raise in salary disguised as an expense account. The President pays no tax on $50,000 he receives in addition to his $100,000 salary. Nor do the Vice President and Speaker of the House pay on $10,000 expense receipts. Congressmen get $2,500 which is untaxed.

Representative KENNETH KEATING has introduced a bill to remove the tax exemptions on these items. This is the honest thing to do. It eliminates subterfuge and special privilege. It may be, as some Congressmen argue, that the bill will not add to revenues because the money goes for expenses that are deductible. But the ordinary taxpayer, struggling with his own tax bill, will thank KEATING for this bill. It ought to pass in the interest of taxpayer morale.

We Should Speed Up the Construction of Rural Hospitals Under the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it will soon be time to again appropriate money for hospital and health-center construction under the Hill-Burton hospital program.

This program was, in my judgment, unnecessarily delayed during this fiscal year when the Bureau of the Budget last year arbitrarily cut the appropriation for Federal contributions to hospital and health-center construction projects by 50 percent, reducing the amount available from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000, to which $13,000,000 was later added by a supplemental appropriation.

The Korean War has created an emergency in our way of life, and we as a nation are faced with the possibility of seeing our cities and industrial centers, and their hospitals, destroyed by enemy bombs.

Therefore, the rural hospital assumes a new significance, over and above its peacetime importance, as an evacuation facility to care for those who might be injured by enemy bombing of our cities.

Latest figures show that we need an additional 1,000,000 hospital beds to fulfill peacetime requirements. A large proportion of these beds are needed in rural America.

As a part of my remarks, I include an address by Dr. John W. Cronin, Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, United States Public Health Service, delivered at the American Hospital Association convention in Atlantic City, N. J., September 20, 1950, and entitled "Are We Building Too Many Small Hospitals?":

ARE WE BUILDING TOO MANY SMALL HOSPITALS?

Exactly 3 years ago (in September 1947) the first project was initially approved for Federal aid under the Hill-Burton program. This was for a new 30-bed general hospital to be located in a southern town of under 2,000 people. The nearest general hospital—a 40-bed facility—was 30 miles away; the nearest sizable hospital—one with 235 beds—was twice that far. The new hospital project was sponsored by the county, a fairly poor county compared with most others in the State.

My reason for mentioning this bit of history is to show that, from the very beginning, the program has done its best to carry out its aim of building hospitals where they are needed the most—in places where hospital care has not been within easy reach, where the area is rural, and where income is low.

In the 3 years which have passed since approval of this project, nearly 1,500 others have been initially approved. Through these, more than 65,000 hospital beds are to be provided. Total construction costs for all projects have now reached the one billion mark with the Federal Government contributing about one-third of this amount. Final approval has now been given to more than 1,000 projects, that is, blueprints and specifications have been approved, sites have been acquired and building preparations begun. But more important, as of today 200 projects have been completed and are now providing community hospital or public health services.

WHAT ARE WE BUILDING?

Of all projects approved so far, more than three-fourths are for general hospital construction. When we talk of hospital construction projects we mean not only the building of an entirely new facility, but also the building of an addition or the remodeling of an already existing hospital. Next in order of number are public health centers—about 16 percent of all projects. Then follow mental hospital projects—about 5 percent of the total; tuberculosis projects—3 percent; and chronic-disease projects—less than 1 percent.

As for construction costs, general hospitals again account for the major share—85 percent—of the total, and for a like percentage of the Federal share of the costs. Public health centers, while holding second place in number of projects, take last place in the share of construction costs, largely because of their relatively low cost per project.

So far, then, most of the emphasis in the program has been on general hospital facilities. How, exactly what do we know about these projects? Just what are they, where are they, and how large are they?

First of all, about one-half of the general hospital projects are for completely new hospitals. The balance is made up of projects for the replacement of old buildings or for additions or alterations to existing ones. Most of the new hospitals are being built in small towns and in the smaller cities; at least 70 percent of the new general projects are located in places with populations below 5,000. Only 12 percent are in communities of more than 10,000.

As we might expect, the projects for replacing, altering, or adding to already-existing hospitals are generally from the larger cities; only one-fourth are from towns with less than 5,000 population.

Now, as to the size of new general hospitals being built under this program, two-thirds will have less than 50 beds. Only 1 out of 10 will have 100 beds or more. On the other hand, most of the hospitals which are being replaced, or are having additions or alterations to their present buildings, are medium-sized or larger hospitals.

We can now see the evolving general pattern of this program. General hospital projects predominate; half of these are for completely new facilities which, for the most part, are located in small towns. As a rule, the new facilities will have less than 50 beds.

For the moment, let us define these hospitals of less than 50 beds as the small hospitals. This is quite usual, I believe, if we limit our thinking to the number of beds a facility contains. Some of the details about these so-called small hospital projects, I feel sure, will interest you.

Nearly two-thirds of the new small facilities will have from 20 to 25 beds. Some of the even smaller projects with 10 to 15 beds, probably should be called community clinics rather than general hospitals. Nevertheless, they do meet specifications for a hospital in that they will provide 24-hour service.

Practically none of these new small hospitals are being built in the large population centers. Two-thirds of the new projects calling for less than 50 beds are in towns of less than 2,000 people. Nearly all are in towns of less than 5,000.

While the small hospital predominates among all new general hospital projects, we find a somewhat different story when we look at the distribution of Federal construction funds. Here we see that little more than one-third of the Federal money being used for all new general hospital projects is for small facilities, that is, for those with less than 50 beds. Actually, this is to be expected since we are well aware that the larger institution, because of its more elaborate and more complete facilities, costs more per bed than the small institution.

In this brief review one fact stands out—the small general hospital (small, that is, in number of beds) is occupying a prominent place in the hospital construction program. Is this right, or are we building too many of these small facilities?

WHY BUILD SMALL HOSPITALS?

In answering this question, let us first find out why we spend any time and money in building 25-, 30-, or 40-bed hospitals. It is true that they are not utilized as fully as larger facilities, because the small hospital does not have the flexibility of use that is found in the larger hospital. It is also true that they do not provide the variety of service that can be given in the larger hospitals. What, then, makes them necessary?

In every State there are some communities, in fact whole areas, where no hospital facilities of any kind exist. Most of these are small towns and rural areas. The nearest hospital may be from 20 to 30 miles away. Yet the people in these communities are just as likely to need hospital care as the people in a larger city where the hospital may be only a few blocks away. Don't forget that last year, 1 out of every 6 persons in the United States was hospitalized. During every hour that we are sitting in these meetings, 600 people are being admitted to hospitals throughout the country. These are people of all kinds, from every occupation, with high and with low incomes. They come from cities, and they also come from small towns and rural communities. Many are traveling an hour—probably longer—to the nearest hospital because their home town has no facility available.

Under the Hill-Burton program, each of the States has investigated its hospital-facilities situation. Each has outlined hospital-service areas where general-hospital facilities should be available to the areas' residents.

Each has given high-construction priority to those areas where facilities are needed but are completely inadequate or entirely lacking. The majority of these are small rural localities. As a result of the incentive given under the Hill-Burton program, communities in many of these service-needy areas have raised funds and submitted approved plans for local hospitals. Generally speaking, the hospitals planned are small; usually because the expected immediate demand for hospital care does not warrant a larger facility. In some instances community funds have placed a limit on the size of the facility that can be built.

Here are some facts that will interest you. So far, a total of 350 small general hospital projects (that is, projects calling for hospitals with less than 50 beds) have been approved. Well over one-fourth of these are being located in service areas which heretofore had no general hospital; another one-fourth are being located in areas that have no facilities which meet the State standards for an acceptable hospital. The remainder are in areas where some facilities exist but where they are completely inadequate to meet the need for hospital care. Nearly all of these are in rural areas, according to the States' classification.

You will also be interested in a recent study of the distance of these new small general hospitals from the nearest other facility. The study included new hospitals with 25 beds or less and covered about 20 States. As a rule, the next nearest facility was about 25 miles distant. Frequently, this was found to be a nonacceptable institution, according to State standards. The range in distance, as we would expect, was wide. Some of the new hospitals are being built in communities where another facility already exists, but others were found to be anywhere from 100 to 150 miles from another general hospital, regardless of its size or its acceptability. When distance was measured to the nearest facility of 50 beds or larger, the average distance was found to be about 45 miles. Again, of course, the range in distance was wide.

Many small hospitals are being built, that is true. But they are bringing or will soon bring some hospital service to areas where the need has been critical. These small hospitals have the potentiality of growing into more effective-sized institutions when demand for service increases or when additional funds for expansion become available. Our data from the State plans and from the project applications show that, in general, this is the case. On the average, the approved new hospitals of less than 50 beds will meet only about half the number of beds needed in their areas.

For many years we have been talking about the shortage of physicians in our smaller towns and rural areas. We all know why this shortage exists. Physicians naturally locate in communities where they can make the best use of their medical training. Modern medical training puts heavy emphasis on the use of instruments of precision in diagnostic and treatment facilities. What chance has a small community, without any type of hospital or clinical facility, to attract and keep a doctor? Few physicians willingly settle in small towns, away from the hospital equipment they need and depend upon and cut off from other medical connection. Few are willing to accept medical isolation. Recently, however, we have been given a good demonstration of how doctors can be attracted to practice in a rural State. Perhaps all of you are familiar with the Kansas program. Under the leadership of Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, dean of the University of Kansas medical center, the State has embarked on a three-point campaign: First, the provision of clinics and hospitals in rural communities; second, expansion of medical training facilities in the State; and third, the development of intensive training and refresher courses for the rural physician. This plan and similar ones in other States have been meeting with great success. In Kansas, rural communities have launched fund drives for the building of clinics and hospitals. With the prospect of up-to-date working facilities at hand, young physicians are being encouraged to take up practice in previously doctorless areas. The medical center is being expanded with grants approved by the State legislature. Traveling lecture teams are keeping the country doctor up-to-date on medical and surgical topics. The citizens of the community derive the benefits of this type of modern medical care. Health maintenance is becoming more possible day by day.

There is a psychological factor in the building of a small local hospital that we must not overlook. Sick people want to be near their own homes, their families and friends. When hospitalization becomes necessary, but local facilities are lacking, the sick person has no choice but to seek hospital care in another community where the needed service is available. As I have pointed out before, this other community may be 30, 40, or 50 miles distant—often too far for frequent visits from friends and relatives. Experience has shown that loneliness and worry over families can delay recovery for many patients.

PROBLEMS OF THE SMALL HOSPITAL

The small local hospitals, while filling definite needs in many communities, are nevertheless faced with serious problems.

The small hospital, obviously, cannot afford to provide many of the services needed by the people in the community. Consequently, it loses many patients to the larger city hospitals where more complete services are available. The result has been that the average small general hospital can count on being used to a lesser percent of its capacity than the larger hospital because of its lack of flexibility of use.

Low occupancy rates in small hospitals can also be traced to the economic resources of the community. In general, small communities have a greater concentration of low-than of high-income families. Experience has shown a definite relationship between the demand for hospital care and the ability to pay for it; the lower the financial resources of a community, the lower the use of hospital beds.

Because of the relatively low income in small towns and rural communities, charges for hospital care must be kept comparatively low. As a result, the small hospital in the small community has found it difficult to hold aside sufficient funds for the purchase and maintenance of modern equipment, or for the employment of specialized personnel.

This leads us to an additional problem—the temptation given to the small-hospital staff to perform services beyond their skills. The less common surgical problems may be undertaken by the local physician who lacks the special skill required. X-ray and other specialized apparatus may be used by physicians or other hospital personnel who are inadequately trained in their use. The results, too frequently, may bring harm to the patient.

These are a few of the problems which the small hospital faces. We know that there is a real need for the small facility in many small communities and rural areas. Let me make clear, at this point, that we do not believe in the indiscriminate building of small hospitals in all rural areas. There are many rural sections where sparsity of population, low income, transportation, and geographical factors make the provision of any type of hospital facility impractical. We do believe in providing such facilities where they can effectively serve their purpose of bringing needed medical service to the population. To make certain that a facility is needed—that it can be used effectively—requires careful study and sound community planning.

Where the situation clearly demonstrates the need for the small hospital we believe necessary aid should be given for its provision. But our efforts must not stop there. If so, we would merely be encouraging the growth of additional facilities which face the prospect of low efficiency, high operating costs, inadequate support, and the provision of a low quality of care.

COORDINATION IS THE ANSWER

Under the Hill-Burton program our goal is the provision of better hospital care for all people. One step toward this goal is the construction of the necessary physical facilities. This we are now doing. But of greater importance is assuring that these facilities provide efficient and effective service. This can best be accomplished, we believe, by bringing about greater coordination and cooperation among hospitals. We have good evidence that the small hospital cannot hope, by itself, to provide many of the services needed by the people it serves. The solution is to develop relationships among hospitals whereby the larger and more completely equipped and staffed facilities can provide smaller hospitals with the needed services. Our concept of a regional coordination system includes many lines of affiliation among hospitals. For example, we envision the exchange of knowledge related to modern hospital practices and services; provision of interm or resident service on a rotating basis to hospitals which otherwise would not have the advantage of such services; the provision of consultation and part-time specialist services, including radiology and pathology, to small institutions; clinical conferences in small community hospitals; continuation courses for all classes of hospital personnel; postgraduate training of physicians from small communities; stimulation and exchange of information on improved hospital administrative methods; joint planning of hospital and public-health programs; and the formation of regional hospital councils.

Such cooperation can be without loss to the hospital of its individuality, initiative, and local responsibility. Rather, it would act as a stimulus to enlarged responsibility, toward retention of professional personnel in rural areas; and to improved patient care. Participation in the program should be completely voluntary. Any group of hospitals should be free to form a council or not as they wished, and any hospital within a region should be free to join or not join the council, as it saw fit.

The experience of a few regionalization programs has given good evidence of the benefits that result. We can look to the program of the Bingham Associates, in New England, to see the great advantages which have accrued to the small rural communities served. Regional programs in Michigan, Virginia, and in the Rochester region in New York likewise demonstrate the benefits which are gained through coordination of hospital services.

Under the Hill-Burton program, each State has outlined a proposed program of coordination among hospitals within hospital service regions. However, in all except a very few places, these plans exist on paper only. Encouragement for the real development of such programs came with the passage of an amendment to the Hospital Construction Act which provides for grants for experiments in regional coordination. When funds provided by this amendment become available, these paper plans can develop into reality.

Let me emphasize that we are not building small hospitals with the intent that they should stand alone. We are thinking of these hospitals as a necessary link in a coordinated system. The small hospital has a real and distinct place in the provision of medical service in its own community, for it is ultimately the community hospital which will be a determining factor whether good or poor medicine is to be practiced in the community. In the future, the smallness of a hospital will no longer be determined by its size, but rather in terms of the service which it makes available to its patients. Under a system which coordinates and integrates the services of its affiliated hospitals, the services which the 50-bed facility can provide are as broad as those of the largest medical center.

It would be a serious omission to conclude this address without a look at the future. The international situation is disturbing to all of us. Our cultural pattern, our way of life, definitely changed on June 25, 1950, with the Korean incident. Our international, national, and personal tranquility has been thrown out of balance.

Those of us who deal with services to our fellow men in time of illness during peace have an even greater responsibility during the preparations for defense of our country against an aggressor. No one can dispute the fact that we need at present more, better, and serviceable health facilities—hospitals, health centers, and community clinics. The State plans show a minimum need of 900,000 additional beds in all categories. We must achieve that goal for even a peacetime existence.

Those State plans in arriving at that minimum did not take into consideration atomic warfare, bacteriological warfare, or radiological warfare. Today we are face to face with those factors as part of our everyday life.

In preparing to meet such a way of life, we must consider industrial mobilization, agricultural mobilization and in fact the mobilization of all our resources directed at supporting our combat forces and also supporting our civil defense plans against an aggressor approaching our Nation by air, by land, by sea, or from within our borders.

The hospital survey and construction program must be attuned to the cultural pattern of today, not the one that existed before Korea became the percussion cap in the explosion of our struggle for democracy versus communism. The Federal Government and the States, through the machinery of the Hill-Burton program, can work together in defining the need for and methods of acquiring hospitals and related health facilities in and on the periphery of the critical areas of possible attack and of industrial mobilization. This may mean, at the proper time, new factors in the formula of establishing priorities for construction and even, in some instances, types of hospital construction. The degree of population shifts incident to the fracture of our society brought about by war with its various economic, social, and financial aspects all must and will be considered. Adequate plans must be made not in the months and years to come but now. The development of these plans is already under way. Coordination and cooperation are the keys to its success. I feel certain that we in the hospital and health field in Government and in all our States will make our contribution at the proper time, in an adequate proportion, and supported by the conviction that a nation with good health resources, properly organized, is a strong and prepared nation for any eventuality.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during these hectic days when everybody seems under fire for one reason or another, we are prone to overlook the great good accomplished by some of our governmental agencies while we exaggerate their faults and weaknesses. Of course, we should strive for perfection in all things in and out of Government. But let us proceed cautiously when we contemplate the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation because it has served well the purpose for which it was established. This despite the outcropping of human weakness which comes to the surface from time to time but which on the whole is rare. Reconstruction Finance Corporation was scarcely launched when the first big scandal broke and almost wrecked its reputation and effectiveness. I recall the Charley Dawes move when he as head of this very agency now under fire used the credit of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to bail out his foundering banks in Chicago, then resigned leaving the portfolio of the agency stuffed with worthless insull paper, which to this day, so far as I am able to learn, has never been revitalized or made to be worth anything. Just from memory I recall that the worthless loan amounted to $92,000,000 and was never repaid. It was a total loss. Despite this early jolt the Reconstruction Finance Corporation survived and served for the most part thereafter the interests of small business, and as I want to point out, has shown an over-all profit to the Government of the United States.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation needs no defense at my hands, a fur coat or a 5 percent commission in evidence to the contrary notwithstanding. I submit that an agency which in 19 years of its existence made and serviced 631,351 business loans totaling $16,000,000,000 with losses of only $134,000,000 and withal had shown a net profit of $600,000,000 is not a corrupt or loosely run enterprise. The record of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is doubly commendable when we take into consideration the fact that for the most part, if not altogether, the loans were made during depressed or emergency times upon such applications as were rejected by the local banks throughout the Nation. Under the law the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is compelled to examine applications of clients and consider loans that have been rejected by banks because of a potential risk. Many loans made by RFC are rejected by commercial banks for reasons of their own or are prohibited by banking laws. If it were not so these applications for loans would be be grabbed up by the local banks. Thus Reconstruction Finance Corporation gets the milk after the cream has been skimmed.

I am confronted with a bit of favorable evidence in the news article by the well known and able Martin S. Hayden of the Detroit News staff and syndicated through the North American Newspapers Alliance which appeared in the Sunday Star of March 18, 1951, which cannot be refuted. Mr. Hayden merely reports upon the facts as a newspaperman, he does not editorialize or color his interview with Walter E. Cosgriff, director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, who properly indicts the privately owned national banking system for failing in its job and the proof is in the article which I submit herewith. More such bold counterattacks should be delivered by the directors and other officials of the agency whenever they have the facts and the performance on their side.

The unfortunately sordid and seamy side of Reconstruction Finance Corporation's operations has been exaggerated and overemphasized out of all proportion while the wholesome and productive story in its favor has been suppressed or ignored.

DIRECTOR CONGRIFF DEFENDS RFC AS ESSENTIAL TO UNITED STATES ECONOMY—ASSAILS PRIVATE BANKS AS UNWILLING TO MEET NATIONAL CREDIT NEEDS

(By Martin S. Hayden)

Assailing the privately owned national banking system for failing in its job, Reconstruction Finance Corporation Director Walter E. Cosgriff yesterday called for a housecleaning of those who have abused authority. He urged the continuance of RFC as an essential to American economy.

The former president of a 16-unit western banking chain and the only RFC director so far untouched by Fulbright committee criticism, Mr. Cosgriff answered in an interview those calling for abolition of the loan agency.

"No one called for abolition of the Army when Maj. Gen. Benny Meyers went to jail," Mr. Cosgriff protested.

The 19-year-old RFC must continue, he contends, because the Nation's private banking system is either unable or unwilling to meet national credit needs.

SAYS AGENCY MUST CONTINUE

"If both long-term loans and the financing of such large new enterprises as the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. were available in the regular credit market, I would favor abolishing RFC even if Abraham Lincoln were for single administrator," Mr. Cosgriff said. "But private banks are not doing the job and, for that reason, I as a Republican, believe the abusers of authority—including myself, if I'm guilty—should be turned out and the agency continued."

To document his charge of banking failure, the 37-year-old Salt Lake City banker who became an RFC director last August, cited key RFC statistics: 631,351 business loans totaling $16,000,000,000 made over 19 years with only $134,000,000 of bad loans and a $600,000,000 net profit to the Federal Government.

"With all the scandal, the influence and the favoritism," he said, "the RFC has a loss record of about 1 percent on more than 600,000 loans. Each of these loans was made after the applicant produced certificates from the bank with which he does business.

and from one other, that credit was unavailable. That our bank 'reject loans' pay out 99 percent seems sufficient evidence that banks are not servicing legitimate credit needs."

PRIVATE BANKS SHUN RISK

Mr. Cosgriff says American bankers fail in today's obligations because Government-backed bonds and guaranteed home loans lead them to shun business risks.

"Businesses that could have got private credit in 1910 are today denied it," he said. "Kaiser-Frazer is an example. Kaiser came to the RFC for $66,000,000, first because big banks that could have made the loan listened to his competitors who did not want it made and secondly, because it was simpler and safer for them to put their cash in Government sure things.

"This typifies a fundamental change in a banking system which, until the 1930s lived off the interest from business loans. In the last 20 years bank deposits have multiplied and, simultaneously, Government bond issues and guaranteed mortgages have offered profitable and sure investments.

"The result," said Mr. Cosgriff, "is that American bankers have turned their backs on the business loans with which America was built.

"I am against wild banking," he insisted, "but the pendulum has now swung too far to the conservative side."

The RFC director agrees with the Hoover Commission that Government guaranties of business loans, similar to FHA insurance of home loans, would be better than direct Federal advances to private borrowers. But he added:

BANKERS' GROUPS KILL PLAN

"Every time a definite business-loan-guaranty plan is advanced," he said, "the American Bankers Association and other powerful groups kill it in congressional committee."

Since its 1932 birthday, the average RFC loan has been for $35,000, and 19 out of every 20 loans made have been for less than $100,000, he said.

"The Commerce Department counts 3,000,000 so-called small businesses. Our record of 500,000 small loans means we have helped one out of every six of them at some time or other."

Why Penalize Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H. R. 2757 on February 19, 1951, I did so with the understanding that it would help the manpower problem during this period of emergency and at the same time assist in destroying the fallacy that retired persons have outlived their usefulness.

I also had in mind that those retired under social security today were being asked to live on fixed income while the cost of living skyrockets to unheard of heights.

The March 21, 1951, issue of the Washington Daily News carried the following editorial in support of my bill, H. R. 2757:

WHY PENALIZE WORK?

The Social Security System's average old-age insurance payment is now less than $44 a month.

It was far less than that until last year, when Congress adjusted payments upward to compensate those who get them for the increased cost of living since the system was adopted.

But the cost of living has continued to rise sharply, and the buying power of the larger old-age insurance payments is again falling behind.

Under the law, a person aged 65 or more can get no payment at all for any month in which, by continuing to work, he earns as much as $50.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT (Republican, Pennsylvania) has introduced a bill which would change the law so as to permit persons aged 65 or more to earn as much as $100 a month without forfeiting old-age insurance benefits.

Why not? In fact, if a person has been otherwise qualified for such benefits by deductions from his pay and contributions from his employer during the years before he reached 65, why should he be compelled to accept any limit on his continued earning power in order to get those benefits?

The notion that he should was a product of the depression and unemployment psychology prevalent when the Social Security System was set up almost 15 years ago.

Many people then thought there would never be enough jobs for younger workers unless elderly ones were forced to retire.

But now conditions are altogether different. This country urgently needs the continued productive efforts of elderly persons who are able and willing to work—needs those efforts to support the national defense program and keep the national standard of living from falling too low.

It seems foolish and unfair to penalize such persons, by depriving them of old-age insurance checks, if they do work productively enough to earn $50 a month, $100 a month, or any larger amount.

Suppose all limits on permissible monthly earnings were removed. The Social Security System then might have to pay more money than it otherwise would to persons thus encouraged to keep on working and at the same time to get old-age insurance benefits.

However, most of those persons would pay from their earnings into Social Security, and so would their employers. Many of them also would pay income taxes into the Treasury. It appears unlikely that there would be any large net loss to the Government, and highly probable that there would be a very important net gain to the country.

Words to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of distinct pride that I call attention to the achievements of a young man from Cincinnati, Ohio—Mr. Jimmie Dodd—who has been signally honored this week, for his prize winning song, Washington.

I feel that Mr. Dodd is a fine example of American youth who is proud of his country and proud of his Government. He started his career in radio, television, and musical composition in Cincinnati, and went on to win, this week, over thousands of entrants, from every State in the Union and many foreign countries, first prize in a Nation-wide contest to select a song for our Nation's Capital, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been given unanimous consent to enter in the RECORD the words of that patriotic song, Washington, and a proclamation by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia honoring Mr. Dodd:

WORDS TO WASHINGTON

(First prize winner Motorola song for Washington contest, by Jimmie Dodd)

Washington, the fairest city in the greatest land of all.
Named for one, our country's Father, who first answered freedom's call.
God bless our White House, our Capitol, too,
And keep ever flying the Red, White, and Blue,
Grandest spot beneath the sun is Washington.

(Patter)

Cherry blossoms bring a lot of joy each spring;
And the statue of Abe Lincoln greets your eye.
When parades pass in revue down Pennsylvania Avenue
All the people lift their voices to the sky.

(Second chorus)

Washington—the land of mem'ries,
Of the great men of the past;
Jefferson and Patrick Henry,
Who for liberty stood fast.
Ole Stonewall Jackson, and Franklin and Clay
All march side by side through mem'ries today.
Give us strength to carry on for Washington.

(Third chorus)

Washington—the good Lord keep you
With your banner high, unfurled;
Washington—the light of freedom,
Let it shine throughout the world.
May all we people be able to see
How grand is our life in the land of the free.
Freedom's hope beneath the sun is Washington.

PROCLAMATION

MARCH 16, 1951.

Whereas the District of Columbia heretofore has not had a song which could be considered the song of the District of Columbia;

Whereas in order to select a song which could be considered the song of the District of Columbia a committee of distinguished musicians consisting of Howard Mitchell, Sigmund Romberg, Maj. William F. Santelmann, Dr. Sigmund Spaeth, and Gordon Jenkins has considered a great number of songs submitted in connection with a recent song for Washington contest; and

Whereas the committee aforesaid has selected the song Washington by James W. Dodd as the most worthy of all the songs so submitted:

Now, therefore, we, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in order to encourage the adoption by the citizens of the District of Columbia of a song they may call their own, and in order to inculcate a spirit of civic pride among the citizens of the District of Columbia, do hereby proclaim Monday, March 19, 1951, as Song for Washington Day, and do urge and recommend to the citizens of the District of Columbia that they adopt the prize-winning song Washington as the song of the District of Columbia.

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG,
F. JOSEPH DONOHUE,
GORDON R. YOUNG,
Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Televising Proceedings of Committees of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been a tremendous interest throughout the country on the subject of the televising of congressional committee hearings. Last night two witnesses before the crime committee refused to testify before TV and thus started what is certain to be a historic test of this issue in the courts.

Last Wednesday I issued a release on this over-all TV subject, pointing out the need for a voluntary committee code of self-regulation, so as to prevent abuses of this great medium insofar as Congress is concerned and so as to explore some of the legal ramifications insofar as that is possible at this stage.

On Sunday I issued another statement on this subject, pointing out that it was my intention to prepare a bill so that the Senate Rules Committee would make a complete study of the implications of television to the Congress.

I referred, for example, to the fact that television might some day be utilized in the event of an atomic emergency for decentralizing functions of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, the text of the initial Associated Press news story written on my approach by Mr. Richard Powers on Wednesday, March 21, to be followed thereafter by the text of my release to the press of last Sunday.

There being no objection, the news story and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette of March 22, 1951]

WILEY URGES CODE TO HANDLE TELEVISING OF WITNESSES

WASHINGTON.—Congressional committees should adopt a voluntary code to handle the touchy problem of whether or not to permit televising of witnesses, Senator WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, said Wednesday.

WILEY is a member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee which has had that question tossed in its face.

In its current quiz in New York, the committee agreed to the plea by Frank Costello, the kingpin gambler, that his face be excluded from the range of the television cameras.

However, in a previous session in Missouri, the same committee insisted that James Carroll, a betting commissioner, testify in front of a TV camera. Carroll declined to do so. The committee has voted to cite him for contempt. Chairman KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee, said he would press for Senate approval of the citation.

USES FLEXIBILITY

WILEY said in an interview that any such code as he suggested must be flexible to meet different situations.

"I have no criticism whatsoever against the rulings made by Chairman KEFAUVER or the crime investigating staff," WILEY said. "They have been models of fairness.

"The point I make is that television of congressional hearings is a relatively new problem thrust upon the committees to handle.

"Television can be the greatest constructive force for public education that has been achieved in this century. It can bring Congress closer to the American people than any other medium.

"However, television of live congressional committee hearings can also become a monster which can destroy innocent individuals, whole corporations, political parties, and entire administrations."

PROPAGANDA MEDIUM

"Think of the possibility of a witness in front of a TV camera unleashing a barrage of unfounded accusations against an individual, business corporation, a political opponent, or someone else he wants to 'get.'

"Or they can make those hearings degenerate into a three-ring carnival of horse play, ham acting and everything but constructive seeking of truth."

As an example, WILEY said, an avowed Communist at a televised hearing "could in a few minutes time reach 10,000,000, 20,000,000 or 30,000,000 viewers with propaganda, sabotage instructions or for some other Red purpose which he could not possibly achieve in any other way."

SUGGESTS CODE

WILEY said a voluntary code by congressional committees might include procedure such as:

(1) Preceding all open hearings by an intensive closed session to explore as many of the issues as possible, which will come up in the public hearings.

(2) Advise wherever possible all individuals, corporations and others whose names will be mentioned that charges or adverse testimony may be presented and they will be given full opportunity to reply.

(3) Careful advice to witnesses beforehand of their tremendous responsibility for fairness and for documentation of their charges rather than talking loosely on the basis of hearsay or other unfounded basis.

(4) A careful check to see that televising of the proceedings would not impair the health or clear reasoning of any individual by subjecting him or her to TV spotlights if they cannot testify properly under such difficult circumstances.

(5) Be particularly careful to assure fair bipartisan representation so that both parties may serve as a check and balance on one another.

WILEY said television of committee hearings "merely accentuates the need of fairness on the part of the committee members."

WILEY SUBMITS A RESOLUTION FOR SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF TELEVISING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

I am introducing a resolution to have the Senate Rules Committee make a thorough study of the various problems which have arisen, or which might arise, in connection with past or proposed televising or radio broadcasting or motion picture or other photographing, of proceedings of the Congress and its respective Houses and committees. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its study, together with its recommendations.

Such a study should be made so that we carefully think out how the great medium of television can most constructively serve the interests of the Congress and of our people in this technological age.

I hope the Senate Rules Committee will act on this resolution rather than have the Congress just allow this new development to grow up like Topsy in every which direction.

VOLUNTARY SELF-REGULATION NEEDED TO PREVENT ABUSES

I think that the committee could come up with helpful suggestions—not laws—which could serve as a basis for voluntary self-regulation by congressional committees of their TV and related processes. Congress' committees would be put on notice that televising of hearings should not be allowed to degenerate into a three-ring circus, a fourth-rate stage production with hamming and phony theatrics, an unjust inquisition of people under klieg lights, particularly people who might not be able to testify properly under such conditions because of health reasons.

What is needed are common-sense standards of good taste and restraint. Such standards would in no way be prejudicial to the great television industry.

I trust that the Rules Committee will secure the best judgment of Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and of the finest minds in the television industry, because it is quite clear that we are going to have to reckon with television in the future work of the Congress.

As a matter of fact, it is obvious to every American that television is going to assume an ever-larger role in the entire political, economic, and social life of our Nation. It may become the most powerful single medium during the 1952 presidential and congressional elections.

IN AN EMERGENCY WE MAY LEGISLATE BY TELEVISION

In the past, I have suggested that television may prove a vital instrument in future national emergencies. If our country were under attack, it might be necessary for Members of the Senate and House at widely dispersed points to legislate by television. They could not possibly assemble at any one single point because they would become subject to enemy sabotage and attack. Yet the Congress as such would have to continue functioning, even though atomic bombs and guided missiles, were raining down on our country.

I approach television, therefore, with a great admiration and respect for its tremendous potentialities, but I also recognize some of the intrinsic dangers in Congress' use of it.

The televising of the crime committee hearings, particularly in New York, have shown TV's tremendous wallop. A vast audience saw real-life prototypes of what Hollywood has been portraying for years in gangster pictures. Moreover, the average man in the street who by and large doesn't get much of a view of his public officials except usually from a distance, was seeing them at close hand and often seeing them squirm. There was conflict; there was drama; there was tremendous human interest in that New York television spectacle.

GREAT DANGERS IN TELEVISING

But any thoughtful individual could shudder at the harm that could have been wrought by such televising to the innocent, not just to the guilty—to innocent persons, political parties, companies, and to governmental administrations.

With a fair committee chairman like ESTES KEFAUVER, with a conscientious committee membership and staff like that of the crime committee, I have less concern than if this powerful medium were in other hands.

A MAN COULD BE "MURDERED" ON TELEVISION

But it is obvious that when a committee calls men who are reported to be murderers, racketeers, goons, etc., it is giving those witnesses a tremendous power for evil. If a man can assassinate another with bullets, how much easier it is for him to assassinate another man with words. He can call his enemy every name in the books; he could attribute all sorts of sins and evils to him; he could smear him, ruin his reputation.

Of course, later on, the accused could come back and try to answer the charges, but he might be doing so probably at a different time of the day, before a different viewing audience. He might not be as good a performer as his accuser; and although his facts might amply refute the charges, he might never escape the cloud that was placed over him. Which man in politics does not have at least one enemy who would be happy to crucify him on television before 20,000,000 viewers?

Let me point out, too, the possibilities for lewd gestures being screened, for profanity, and for other undesirable demonstrations suddenly occurring.

I want us to recognize that there is a point beyond which the exchange of conflicting opinion could become a mere exchange of unfounded smears.

There is a point beyond which the search for corruption could conceivably become an unnecessary dwelling in sordidness and peddling in filth, which is hardly fit subject for televising before a public audience.

SOME HEARINGS ARE ON ISSUES, OTHERS ON PERSONALITIES

We should differentiate between a congressional committee which hears expert individuals testifying on issues, and a hearing in which questionable individuals testify mainly on personalities and alleged misdeeds. Of course, issues and personalities often become intertwined. But our people will understand the point I am making when they consider, for example, how constructive it is for the Nation's television audiences to view someone like former President Herbert Hoover, testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee as compared with someone like Frank Costello.

Now obviously there is usually not the conflict, there is not the dramatic bitterness in a foreign-relations type hearing as in a crime-busting session. The former may make for comparatively duller television presentation. But whereas there are very few people who will doubt the constructive nature of the one type of hearing being televised, there are many of us who have serious doubts about the other type of hearing being continually televised. I say "continually," because I feel that many sessions should be executive, that is, closed, and some sessions should be open. Wherever possible, executive sessions should go over the ground before hearings are thrown open to the public.

THREE STANDARDS FOR CONSIDERING OPEN HEARINGS

We must never forget that the primary aim of congressional committees in making investigations is basically to find the facts on the basis of which to prepare constructive legislation.

Another aim is to enlighten Members of Congress as to their approach on forthcoming issues and votes and reflect by word and deed sound public opinion.

A third aim is to inform the American citizenry of the problems facing the Congress so that they in turn can come to sound decisions on issues and individuals.

It seems to me that all hearings, before being televised, should be evaluated as to whether or not they actually fulfill one of those functions.

PRACTICE OF TELEVISING HEARINGS COULD DEVELOP WILDLY

Now, the usual history of some such development as this TV baby is that the medium becomes more and more used, more and more wildly, with less and less restraint until some dramatic instance comes up in which, say, an innocent man's reputation is completely ruined. Then, the people strike back at the monster they have created by passing repressive rules. I want us to anticipate this danger and prevent it from occurring in the first place. I want us to put on our best thinking caps right now.

I don't want Congress to usurp the powers of courts and of grand juries. Our function is legislative, not judicial. Nor do I want us to ever forget that a television camera is a two-edged sword which can wound the innocent as well as the guilty. Every performer at a congressional hearing—be he Congressman, staff aide or witness—has a terrific responsibility.

TV HEARING COULD BE FULL OF PUBLICITY PLUGS

Lastly, think of the fact that a witness at a TV hearing has a tremendous power to reap commercial publicity for some product or person, to put in a plug which might otherwise cost thousands of dollars if commercial time were bought.

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the News-Press of Nebraska City, Nebr., on February 21, 1951. It reflects the high esteem Mid-Westerners hold for the thinking of the very able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. It is an honor to have the privilege of asking that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY CHATTER

The other day Senator JAMES P. KEM of our neighboring Missouri came home to talk to Republican editors. Of course, he talked politics, tearing into the Truman administration.

A lot of what he said makes sense.

For example: "Since the end of World War II more than $45,000,000,000 has been sent by the administration to some 80 countries. Practically every country on the globe has received aid in some form from the United States."

KEM figured that 18 percent of all the taxes collected from the American people has been sent abroad.

KEM said the Truman doctrine is this: "The United States must resist aggression wherever it appears in the world. The United States will strike down aggression wherever it raises its head."

An expensive and bloody assignment.

Korea is just one tiny spot on the map.

The Marshall plan, said KEM, was to be insurance against war. "Our foreign gifts have not brought us any friends," he declared. "We have fewer friends than we had at the end of World War II."

Even Britain has recognized Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Red dictator who is killing Americans in Korea.

Have our friends helped us in Korea?

Said KEM: "Our fair-weather friends on the bench talk a good game and like to coach. They want us to provide the uniforms, do all the blocking, carry the ball, and collect all the headaches and almost all the bloody noses. We need friends with cool heads, not cold feet."

The Senator recalled that Wilson was elected to keep us out of war, Roosevelt promised in 1940 not to send American boys into a foreign war, and Truman ran on this slogan: "Peace and prosperity—vote Democrat."

"Three wars in 33 years," said KEM. "What have we to show for our foreign adventures carried out under the auspices of the Democratic Party? Some of the best manhood killed or wounded; a public debt of astronomical proportions; the danger of uncontrolled inflation; the threatened ruin of our economic system, and a world in turmoil."

Continuance of Kefauver and Fulbright Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Committees Must Not Die," referring to the Kefauver and Fulbright committees, published in this morning's issue of the Ohio State Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMITTEES MUST NOT DIE

Unless the Senate acts this week, the life of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime, better known as the Kefauver committee, will expire on Saturday. Senator TOBEY, Republican of New Hampshire, a member of the committee, has said that the Senate will be asked to continue the investigation for another 60 days. Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, the chairman, has taken the stand that the committee has turned up enough evidence to show the Senate what needs to be done in the way of new or strengthened laws.

Woodrow Wilson once wrote that the chief use of the power of Congress to make investigations is the enlightenment of the people. Very few men are unequal to a danger when they see and understand. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function.

More people have seen (thanks to television) and read about the conditions of organized crime in the United States as a result of the Kefauver committee's hearings than ever before. We believe the people are beginning to understand the menace of organized gambling and its ramifications which include corruption of public officials, participation in political campaigns, and the whole gamut of crimes, including murder, as they have never understood it before. The informing function of Congress is therefore operating potently. It must not be allowed to languish.

The end of March also is the time originally marked for conclusion of the work of the Fulbright committee which has been investigating influence peddling in Washington, with particular emphasis on the chicanery, recklessness, and immorality of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Senator FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas) has been willing to drop the inquiry. The other committee members have overridden him and have said the investigation will go on. Those committee members, backed by the Senate and the American people, must see to it that it really does go on.

The facts revealed and publicized by these two committees are symptomatic of the decline of moral standards in our country and particularly in its officialdom in Washington, in some of the large cities, and in some of the States. Congressman at Large BROWN (Republican, Ohio) stated the case succinctly when he said: "The facts brought out by the committee make it evident that too many people are looking for a 'fast buck' and they don't care how they get it, just as long as they don't have to work for it. We have created a good many conditions which encourage this attitude, and it's high time we reversed the trend. We don't reverse it by pulling an iron curtain over the whole mess in an effort to pretend that it doesn't smell."

While the public is aroused the job must be carried to its conclusion—new laws, strengthened laws, grand jury investigations as to whether existing laws have been violated, trials for perjury and other crimes if it is believed they have been committed.

The Kefauver and Fulbright committees must not be permitted to die. If they perish, the criminal and immoral elements will have the green light to proceed with greater speed and to the greater endangerment of the Nation.

The Investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last Sunday, March 25, there appeared in the Washington Star an extremely wise and well-written editorial about the congressional investigations which have been in progress recently. Because I believe my colleagues and the country should have an opportunity to read the editorial, and since it expresses so well my own thoughts on the subject, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO STUDY THE NEXT MOVE

The skillful conduct and the genuine productiveness of both the RFC and the organized crime investigations have produced a strong demand that they be continued. There is a general feeling in the public mind that only the surface has been scratched and that the digging should go deeper.

But partly for personal reasons, the able chairmen of these two investigating committees—Senators KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas—want to quit. Neither wishes to confine promising Senate careers to a single specialty, especially when the time consumed by that specialty excludes almost everything else.

There are other considerations, however, outside the personal desires of the two Senators most involved. One is that the only valid justification for such investigations is to determine the need for corrective legislation and the form it should take. In the case of the RFC, the form of the legislation for its reorganization has been approved by the House and is now under study in the Senate, with a possibility that instead of reorganizing it Congress may vote to abolish it. As a result of its investigation, the Kefauver committee has uncovered a pattern of organized crime in this country which is to be made the basis for a series of legislative proposals, as yet unrevealed. Both committee chairmen, therefore, believe that their committee missions have been accomplished.

There is another very practical consideration that the public may overlook. One of the reasons that these two investigations have been productive is the careful work of preparation, extending over many months, by excellent investigating staffs. In the case of the Fulbright committee, the public hearings have now covered and extended beyond the ground explored in advance by the investigating staff. If the committee keeps going, its investigations could deteriorate into a hopeful fishing expedition without real objective. Something of the same condition applies in the case of the Kefauver investigation, which was to wind up by the end of this month. If it is to continue its work indefinitely, and beyond the tying up of some loose ends remaining, the staff of investigators must be given the opportunity to explore in advance.

This would be a logical time to conclude the investigations for the time being and to begin the serious consideration of the legislation, for which the investigations were designed in the first place. For the discussion of that legislation in Congress would provide the most appropriate opportunity to decide whether further investigation is desirable, the direction it should take and how it is to be conducted.

Both Senators KEFAUVER and FULBRIGHT favor creation of commissions, to continue what they have begun. Mr. KEFAUVER would entrust to his commission a continuing study of the ramifications of organized crime, with continuing emphasis upon the responsibility of elected officials at the local level. Mr. FULBRIGHT would like to see a commission of eminent men assigned to a study of the level of morality in Government and desirable ethical standards for men in public life.

Such commissions, under the direction and control of Congress, might accomplish something of value. But no commission has the standing, in public estimation, possessed by a carefully directed congressional investigating committee. Perhaps the sensible thing to do is to consider the work of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees as the end of the beginning, but to pause now and give careful study to the next move, which is to consider legislation to deal with conditions exposed by investigation.

It would be unfortunate to see the excellent work so far of the two committees undermined by a disposition to plunge ahead with further investigation, merely because the incidental glamor of public hearings and colorful testimony are temporarily popular.

Tribute to the Late Senator Virgil M. Chapman by John W. Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was so impressed by the remarks made by Mr. John W. Jones, president of the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association, and intimate and long-time friend of the late Senator Chapman, at a gathering in Lexington, Ky., on the sad occasion of the funeral of Senator Chapman, that I asked Mr. Jones to reduce his impromptu eulogy to writing in order that it might be inserted in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the afore-mentioned remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

There are so many distinguished gentlemen around this table, Senators, Governors, Members of the National House of Representatives, judges, lawyers, and others of outstanding success in their chosen occupations, that in beginning I will simply say: Gentlemen, you are guests this evening of the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association, and though the occasion that brings many of you to Kentucky is a sad one, we are pleased to have you as our guests, and we personally appreciate and desire to thank the colleagues of Senator Chapman for the deserved honor they pay our dear friend in escorting his remains to Paris, Ky. Kentucky mourns the tragic and untimely death of Senator Chapman; as yet we have not recovered from the shock. Kentucky loves him, the farm folk of Kentucky love him dearly, and I love him far beyond the love usual for one man to bear another.

He was a true patriot, an outstanding statesman, a loyal friend, great of mind, warm of heart, honest personally, and honest intellectually, always modest and humble. He was a great historian, and I will never cease to wonder at the great amount of exact information he carried in his mind.

His office in Washington was my home when in that city, and how rich the experience when I would sit with him in his office, and also in Kentucky and listen as he talked of international and national affairs, and of constitutional government. Frequently the conversation would turn to outstanding leaders of other days—Jefferson, and the sage of Monticello would come alive and would be in our company, as Virgil spoke of him as familiarly and intimately as if he were present. And then Jackson and the courageous soul of the Hermitage would stand out in all the rugged strength of his unusual character. If still in the mood it would be that matchless Southerner, General Lee. Virgil's voice would be loving and gentle as he described the distinguished service of this Christian gentleman to his people not only in war, but in peace, as he sought to bind up the wound and hurt of war and unite a divided Nation in peace. How blessed to me was such an experience, and how rich such a fellowship. I believe in immortality, personal immortality, and perhaps already there has been a meeting of these great souls. Virgil would need no introduction for he has known them through the years.

Virgil and I started together in making schoolhouse speeches in our effort to form the organization that is your host this evening. Virgil went on to greatness. The Burley organization serves directly one-third of the population of Kentucky, and indirectly every man, woman, and child within its boundary. Virgil Chapman has advocated, and urged, and with the votes of many of you present, has passed the farm legislation that has blessed our people. Better farms, better homes, better living conditions for the farmer's family have been the result of better prices. The farm folk of Kentucky will not forget. A granite shaft will, perhaps, be erected at Paris, Ky., to mark his resting

place, but the things that he has done to bless so many of the people of Kentucky, whom he loved, will be his real memorial as children and the children of children hear from the lips of fathers and mothers of his untiring and successful efforts in bringing to them the better things of life. An automobile accident took his life, yet the wear, tear, and exhaustion of an unselfish service for his people had gone far to weaken a strong constitution. I personally know this.

We join in sorrow with you gentlemen from Washington. I am sure Virgil's spirit is near us this evening. We meet with you here because we love him. When my earthly pilgrimage is over, I will find Virgil and there in some sequestered spot in that eternal country I will sit in his company, and listen in as he talks with those who have been the great of all the earth.

Speakers at Temple Ohabei Shalom, Brookline, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Army Secretary Pace at Brookline Temple," written by Bill Schofield, and published in the Boston Traveler of March 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE YOU HEARD

(By Bill Schofield)

ARMY SECRETARY PACE AT BROOKLINE TEMPLE

Ever since the drive shaft of the Berlin-Tokyo-Axis broke down, this land of ours has heard a lot of talk about service unification. It even has seen certain good theories along that line converted into action.

And now, for a fresh example of unity, let's turn for a bow toward the banquet hall of Temple Ohabei Shalom in Brookline.

There, when the gavel hits the table next Tuesday night, Army Secretary Frank Pace, Jr., will rise on his toes to deliver a speech of national significance.

When he returns to his seat, acknowledging the applause of the crowd, the temple group will have completed the unique feat of entertaining within three successive years the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Army.

Not a word has been relayed about it yet, but this alinement suggests that on a March night next year the master of ceremonies will be saying "Ladies and gentlemen, your principal speaker of the evening, Secretary of Defense * * *."

That would round out the cycle, and would be typical of the way Temple Ohabei Shalom has been doing things with its annual Armed Forces and veterans' night dinner.

This unusual sequence of speakers began on March 1, 1949, when W. Stuart Symington returned to his home State as Secretary of the Air Force and spoke to the temple brotherhood. Nobody would have been too greatly surprised if the Amherst-born Cabinet officer had failed to reach Boston that night.

For one thing, it was blowing a gale of snow and his chances of getting here by plane were as dark and confused as the clouds that blackened the city. For another thing, it was his twenty-fifth wedding anniversary and any man could be excused for wishing to stay home with a few close friends on such a night.

Nevertheless, Symington arrived with Mrs. Symington at his side, and graciously accepted a Paul Revere silver bowl as a gift from his friends of the temple.

Last year, it was Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews' turn to take the stage. He came at a time when the subject of unification was touchy and delicate. Admiral Louis E. Denfeld had left office as Chief of Naval Operations just a few months earlier, and a coast-to-coast audience was bending a critical ear toward any word of departmental policy.

Matthews that night assured the Nation that Navy discipline and Navy order were taut and shipshape. He characterized the leadership of Admiral Forrest Sherman as brilliant. He left a good feeling in the hearts of 1,000 listeners in the dining hall, and millions on the radio.

And now on Tuesday night, when President Frank Brooks calls the meeting to order, the temple hosts and their guests will rise to greet the third member of the Nation's triangular defense team.

The 38-year-old Pace is not of this part of the country, but neither is he a stranger here. He came originally from Little Rock, Ark., but he grew well acquainted with Boston during his days as a student at Harvard Law School. He'll have words of immediate interest to offer, not only on Korea but also on potential military volcanoes in other parts of the planet.

Col. Elliott A. Niles, in charge of arranging the dinner, has lined up a guest list containing names that would be labeled box office in the parlance of show business. Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Director of Selective Service, will be guest of honor. Speakers will include Omer W. Clark, Deputy National Administrator of Veterans' Administration; Harold Russell, national commander of AMVETS; and Roy E. Johnson, coordinator, military and veterans' liaison, American National Red Cross.

Also attending will be Rear Adm. Hewlett Thebaud, commandant of the First Naval District; Maj. Gen. C. G. Helmick, commanding general New England subarea; Maj. Gen. James W. Spry, of the Air Force; Rear Adm. Harold G. Bradbury, of the Coast Guard; Brig. Gen. William J. Blake, of the Veterans' Administration—and the list runs on through the dozens.

Most of these guests will be honored before dinner at a reception in the Niles home in Brookline. And if the conversation gets around to American unification—as it's bound to do in time—the name of Temple Ohabei Shalom is sure to win applause.

Three services with one goal—it's a program worthy of praise.

Assistance for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention of the Senate to the column Sounding Off, by J. M. Hazlitt, of the Pauls Valley Democrat, Pauls Valley, Okla., adjudged by the Disabled American Veterans' organization as being the best article in their newspaper column contest aiding the cause of the disabled veterans.

Out of the 3 years the DAV has conducted this contest, this is the second consecutive year Mr. Hazlitt, of Pauls Valley, has been adjudged the winner. At a time when additional thousands of disabled veterans are being discharged from service hospitals to seek gainful employment and resume their civilian pursuits, Mr. Hazlitt's column was deemed by the judges to be particularly significant.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUNDING OFF

(By J. M. Hazlitt, Pauls Valley (Okla.) Daily Democrat)

The great factory is in production again. After a lull in manufacturing its own special product, the process is going again, and the products are being scattered across the land.

For a scant 5 years the wheels and spikes of war ceased the output of broken bodies, torn flesh, and scarred minds. But now the pipelines are full again, and the stream of wrecked lives swells daily.

The process from healthy civilian to trained fighter is a relatively short one. The actual creation of a disabled veteran takes only a second or two of time. A machine gun burst, an angry grenade, a sudden and sickening eruption of a land mine, the rending and tearing of a torpedo, a quick flash of fire, a crashed plane, or the longer and slower process of numbing the mind with horror, are all the tools of the factory which makes the individuals of the long parade of disabled veterans.

When life hangs on by a slender thread, when consciousness returns, if it does, then begins the longest travel, the most endless journey, the steepest trail ever traveled by men. That is the road back to recovery of what is left of life and after that the rough and bumpy road back into the life of the community and Nation.

Only those who travel that road—only those who are products of that hellish manufacturing process—can know what it means to look at our complex economy from the depths of the pit of incapacity.

Of course there is that time of quick and ready sympathy, sometimes developing into sweetly sickening pity. For a time there is an honest desire on the part of most people to be helpful. Then comes the realization that the world moves on and hasn't time for the man who can't keep up in the race.

Of course there is an attempt on the part of Government to bridge the gap between what a man was and that to which he is reduced. But even that comes into question quickly. Pensions and compensation soon become easy money in the eyes of the public and the disabled veteran cashes his checks in a surreptitious manner, bordering on apology.

Of course time brings its compensations and adaptations. The man survives and learns better to overcome and minimize the handicap under which he must labor to carry his own load in the economy of the most complex Nation on earth.

All these matters are part of the pattern. All these things come about in an orderly manner and each takes its toll. Through it all the veteran is glad that he isn't confined in a hospital and his sympathy runs to those

whose bodies and minds won't heal and who face days and years in the halls of the forgotten, in the backwash of war, in the storage rooms of the factory of death and near death.

If people could just understand—if the general public could just be aware—that all the veteran asks, all he wants, and all he hopes for, is a chance to care for himself in dignity and decency.

The records of a thousand employers prove that the disabled have discarded the prefix to disability and meet the world on the basis of ability itself. The record proves that disabled men with all degrees of disability can and do hold jobs with greater fidelity and skill than their whole compatriots.

It may require some minor adjustments in routine, some special arrangements of various kinds, to accommodate the handicap of the man coming back along that trail, but the truth is, that he will pay it all back and return a profit.

They come from new places now, strange, oriental names designate the points on the map where the trail starts, Tarawa, Iwo, the Bulge, Kasserine, Sicily, Salerno, Anzio, Guadalcanal, now have such names as Pusan, Taejon, Seoul, Kaesong, and Inchon added to them, but the story and the problem are the same.

You can help, it is up to you to help. Your attitude can make or break the disabled veteran. Don't cry over him, give him a chance.

That's all for today. No color will cheer up a hospital room as much as the color in your face.

Democracy in Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Democracy in Turkey," by Mr. Farnsworth Fowle. Mr. Fowle is at the present time a correspondent for the New York Times in Frankfort, Germany. His article is based largely upon his experience as correspondent for the same paper in Istanbul from 1949 until recently.

It gives me great pleasure to see the recognition, so well deserved, which our friends the Turkish people are receiving. I wish to congratulate them for the wisdom and dignity with which they conduct their public affairs. I have had occasion in the past to refer to their outstanding contribution to the fighting in Korea.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Ozonian of April 1951]

DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY

(By Farnsworth Fowle)

This timely article, showing that the cold war has stimulated democracy in one of Russia's neighbors, comes from a foreign correspondent of the New York Times. Fowle has served as war correspondent to Great Britain and to the United States Armed Forces; as a correspondent for the New York Times in Istanbul, 1949–51; and now represents the same newspaper in Frankfurt.

The Turks are an exceptional people. Generalizations about them have a way of breaking down. Attempts to classify them with their Balkan neighbors or their Moslem coreligionists, or with other familiar types of Asian or European nationalities, are more often wrong than right.

In his early days as president of the Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal (as he then was, before he decided that Turks should have surnames and took for himself the style of Ancestral-Turk or Ataturk) was once asked if the new regime was like the Fascists or the Communists. His answer, "We resemble ourselves!" may have seemed a proud man's denial of obvious similarities at the time. Turkey's evolution in the past 20 years suggests that he was right; the more they change, the more they resemble themselves.

The Turks have maintained their political independence in their Anatolian heartland for just under 5½ centuries—ever since Tamerlane's Central Asiatic empire turned out to be a flash in the pan. Behind borrowed plumes of various colors and ages, the Turkish national character can best be described in terms of a pragmatic genius for survival. A record of this sort in one of the most strategic corners of Eurasia can scarcely be ascribed to luck. The Turks have shown not only the will to survive but the skill.

It is all the more flattering to the democracies that in the present world crisis, in spite of their exposed position, the Turks have chosen—with the same courage as the Greeks but with greater unanimity—to throw in their lot with us, in their internal policy no less than in diplomacy, which, after all, has always produced strange bed fellows.

There is nothing new and nothing imposed about the westernization of Turkey. Characteristically, it was in military matters that the Ottoman sultans first decided to learn from the patently superior techniques of the European powers. In 1826, a generation after the first attempt to introduce army reform ended in the assassination of his ruling uncle Selim by the Janissary Corps Mahmoud II abruptly liquidated this obsolete Prastorian Guard and started rebuilding his army from scratch on western models under French and Prussian advisers. As the nineteenth century progressed, more of these western techniques in engineering, medicine, and administration were introduced along with the new military organization. They took root wherever their practical superiority was proved—and where they did not present an outright challenge to the obsolescent Islamic structure of state and society.

The harsh surgery of the First World War and its aftermath virtually eliminated the non-Turkish lands and peoples from Ottoman rule. The further partition of Turkey, prescribed by the Allied Powers at the Paris Peace Conference, was prevented by a 3-year war of national resistance led by Mustafa Kemal.

As an authentic national hero he always had the great majority of the Turkish people behind him, sometimes enthusiastically, sometimes—as in the case of his determined campaign against the conservative power of the Moslem clergy—grudgingly. During the 16 years from his military victory in 1922 to his death in 1938, he used his extraordinary prestige to eliminate the sultanate and the caliphate and to complete the westernization of the state structure, the educational system, and—as much as he could—the modes of social behavior.

Kemal Ataturk's methods were dictatorial: the National Assembly, which had represented many shades of opinion during the unifying war of independence, became after 1925 a rubber stamp for his dynamic person. In 1930 he ordered several of his most trusted friends to organize a Liberal Party in opposition to the monopolistic People's Party. The experiment lasted only 100 days; long before the election stage was reached, Ataturk permitted the Liberals to drop the whole matter. They believed that Prime Minister Ismet Inonu was terrified by the popular response to the opposition group, and convinced his chief that the foundations of the Republic were threatened.

As time went on, the People's Party was dressed up to look more and more like a dynamic totalitarian movement. Dubious theories of race, language, and history, designed to reassure the Turkish people as to their central position in human civilization, received official sponsorship. In foreign policy, paradoxically, the growing Axis threat to the status quo had impelled Turkey, like the Soviet Union, to join the League of Nations in a belated effort to achieve collective security. Even before Ataturk's death and Inonu's succession to the presidency in 1938, the foundations were laid for a supplementary defensive alliance with Britain and France, which was concluded just after the outbreak of war in 1939.

The war years, with every country on Turkey's frontiers sooner or later involved in the struggle, were scarce a time for liberal experiment. In 1945, the emergence of an expansionist Soviet Union as the only surviving great power in Eastern Europe brought about a reexamination of policy at home and abroad.

Inonu's achievement in staying out of the war while maintaining alliance and friendship with the western wing of the victorious coalition was almost universally applauded in Turkey. On both counts it was a conspicuous improvement over Turkey's status at the end of the First World War. Internally, there was no compelling reason for a change.

In view of Moscow's territorial claims advanced in June 1945, the urgent need for obtaining the support of the West cast a different light on the matter. Britain and France, Turkey's two formal allies, were no longer in a position to force a rapprochement to Russian interest in the Straits, Kars, Artvin, and Ardahan. As viewed by the classical school of Turkish diplomacy, Ataturk's policy was not committed to back Turkey and was even more subject than Britain and France to the moods of popular opinion. Turkey's wartime neutrality might be regarded as both correct and useful by western diplomatists, but it did not inspire anything like the popular sympathy won by the Russians as fighting allies.

It was at this stage in the fall of 1945 that a former Prime Minister, Celal Bayar, a mere back-bencher in the National Assembly ever since Inonu became president, issued a call for reform within the ranks of the People's Party. Instead, he was expelled along with three other dissidents—Fuat Korelkel, a veteran public prosecutor; Fuad Sirgeray, Turkey's best-known historian, and a prosperous landowner, Adnan Menderes, who takes his name from the silt-overburdening river of his house in the rich Aegean coastal region. The four rebels proclaimed the foundations of the Democrat Partisi.

In spite of the precedent of Ataturk and the Liberals of 1930, the Democrats certainly did not begin as a gleam in the eye of fascism. If the President had decided to appoint an opposition leader, he would have selected a more congenial figure. The experiment having been thrust upon him, he chosen to accept it; suppression would have been doubly embarrassing to Turkey's prestige in the west. Preparations were made for the republic's first direct elections to the National Assembly in July 1946.

Bayar's plea for more political and economic freedom was taken up by most of the big metropolitan newspapers of Istanbul, weary after years of heavy-handed control and suppression. The patriotic character of the opposition was assured when Turkey's only field marshal, Fevzi Cakmak, agreed to emerge from retirement and run as an "independent" on the Democrats' list.

The election was marred by intimidation of the voters and administrative perversion of the results in many cases: the Democrats should have received many more seats than the one in six they were awarded after much embarrassing delay in declaring the results. A new bitterness entered the relations between government and opposition.

In the People's Party, nervous politicians of the old school wanted to go back to the good old days when nobody crossed the government. President Inonu, however, looked instead to younger men like Nihat Erim and Kasim Gulek to give a more democratic tone to the party.

The Democrats were always in danger of becoming a mere voice of uninhibited denunciation, rather than an organization preparing to offer the people an alternative government. One wing, finding Bayar's policy of patiently building a nation-wide organization too tame, split off to form a third, or Nation, party, led or at least fronted by the august Marshal Cakmak. In the long run, this probably helped the Democrats by drawing off the hotheads, and, with them, the attention of the government, always tempted to strike in anger.

In the years that followed the 1946 election, Russia remained just as unfriendly and America showed increasingly active sympathy and support for Turkey's stand. Truman aid in 1947 and Marshall aid the next year opened new perspectives for Turkey's military and economic strength. Most Turks saw that it would be inexpedient to abandon the democratic experiment on the one hand, or for party rivalries to boil over and create internal weakness on the other. This peculiar international situation produced a hothouse atmosphere favorable to the growth of transplanted western democracy.

A year before the 1950 election its prospects were far from brilliant. Both opposition parties were still boycotting local elections and byelections because the Government had not yet met their demand for a fair election law. Political debate was frequently centered on hair-splitting questions that were significant only because they seemed to show that the Government might be looking for grounds to suppress the opposition. The press, however, was increasingly free and increasingly independent of all three parties, to the considerable disgust of the Democrats. This fact helped to raise the tone of the debate.

Finally the Government incorporated most of the Democrats' suggestions in the new election law, and the Democrats agreed to run. Grave doubts remained as to whether the parties, the administrative machine, and the general public could make it work. In a land where the literacy rate is still extremely low, where bipartisan poll management was unprecedented, and where the law's complicated appeal mechanism could hold up the results almost indefiniately, many things could go wrong.

The consensus was that at least in the cities of Ankara, Istanbul, and Izmir an honest election was possible and even likely. Here the Democrats were well organized, literacy and political interest were both relatively high, and a repetition of the 1946 scandal would have been a conspicuous national disgrace.

As for the smaller towns and the 35,000 villages of Anatolia, many doubted whether the peasant, even if he dared to trust the secrecy of the poll, would care very much which politicians ruled in Ankara. Above all, in the eastern provinces between the Euphrates and the Caucasus frontier, so much more backward than the rest of the country and so tightly under the administrative and military thumb of the Government, it was easy to believe that the People's Party would pick up enough seats to produce a comfortable national majority. A solid east seemed in prospect. If the peasants were somehow persuaded to vote for the Government, this would mean a clean sweep for the People's Party in every election district except the province of Istanbul, the only one in which city dwellers outnumbered country folk. The most generous prelection nonparty estimate I heard was two seats out of five for the Democrats.

To my surprise, a swing through central and eastern Turkey a month before the election showed a picture scarcely distinguishable from that in the cities. In spite of alleged campaign outrages played up in the metropolitan and provincial press, the temper of the country was nowhere near the boiling point. People were interested in what the parties were saying but not demonstratively enthusiastic. A common remark was: "I don't know how the province will go, but this village will probably vote for the Demirkirat Party." Slightly twisted, democrat means iron-breaker in Turkish. Even more significant, the rural and provincial Democrats had few complaints to make about administrative obstruction. Not at all like 1946, they said.

Celal Bayar went east for the final week of the campaign. In Elazig he proclaimed: "If you are satisfied with your present condition, vote for the People's Party. If not, vote for us."

On a rainy election Sunday, May 14, every polling station I visited inside and outside Ankara presented the same sceen of decorum, approaching solemnity. The police and gendarmes kept their distance, and there were no disorders anyway. Silently men and women waited their turn to complete the complicated paper work and make their private choice. They sensed the historic responsibility before them, and some inner discipline told them to accept it with calmness and dignity.

That night at the Democrats' modest national headquarters on Inonu Boulevard they kept their excitement under firm control as the returns began coming in. Bayar read us a list of telegrams from many provincial centers reporting an orderly poll and a lead in the count. He cautioned us against jumping at conclusions: there was still no word at all from the east. While he was talking, another blue telegram was brought in and he opened it. It was from Mus, one of the most remote districts of the doubtful area. There was no change in his voice as he read to us: "We are ahead."

Next morning, when the outlines of an overwhelming Democratic landslide became clear, it only remained for the People's Party to scotch rumors of an army coup d'état by announcing that they were preparing to turn over the reins of government in an orderly way. On a Monday afternoon a week later, the new National Assembly met to elect Bayar president of the republic, with Menderes as Prime Minister and Koprulu as Foreign Minister.

The election was an expression of dissatisfaction, but it was more than that. For the first time the Turkish people were given a chance to show that they were the master of the government—so they quietly but firmly asserted themselves. The article in the constitution of the republic which reads, "Sovereignty belongs to the people, without limitation or restriction," had come to life.

The new government made few sweeping changes. They listened to business interests more sympathetically, and brought a more critical eye to bear on the entrenched military bureaucracy. In foreign affairs, however, the Democrats showed more energy and initiative than Inonu's cautious waiting game. They were the first United Nations government to offer unconditionally ground reinforcements for the American troops in Korea last summer. The Turkish brigade has since distinguished itself in the stubborn defensive bayonet warfare of their tradition.

Turkey has even offered to throw away its loophole to neutrality by assuming the obligations of membership in the Atlantic Pact. This comes from a reasoned calculation that they do not want to be space to be sold against time in the event of all-out war; they want to be assured of a place within the main line of defense of the West. The Pentagon apparently was not ready to extend its commitments, and consultative machinery was as far as the Atlantic Powers accordingly agreed to go at this stage.

The cold war continues to provide a hothouse atmosphere favorable to the growth of Turkish democracy. Already it is clear that the plant is putting out genuine roots of its own in Turkish soil. If democracy is not discredited by its eccentricities in the United States and its timidities in Western Europe, if its Turkish practitioners prove reasonably effective, it stands a good chance of surviving and flourishing at the very frontier of Soviet absolutism.

Comments by Walter Winchell On Responsibility for Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have before me this morning's column by Mr. Walter Winchell on the subject of the real source of responsibility for interstate gambling. Mr. Winchell, who fought communism, cancer, and crime long before it became fashionable to do so, has written another of his hard-hitting columns—punching straight from the shoulder.

His remarks will, I believe, raise blood pressures, lift eyebrows, but most important, elevate the sights of a lot of people so that they can see exactly what one very keen observer feels is really involved in the multi-billion-dollar gambling syndicate. Whether or not one agrees entirely with Mr. Winchell—and there will be some heated differences—I doubt very much that there will be many folks who do not respect his frank approach on this subject of hypocrisy and gambling. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

MR. AND MRS. UNITED STATES: The Kefauver committee has done a good job of showing up the American underworld with its political tie-ups. But never in history has the sinful life been given the effective—and misleading—advertising it got from the Senate hearings in the last few weeks. When the average hard-working, debt-ridden citizen heard that a Frank Costello can swing elections and keep $50,000 in cash around the house for spending money—his first reaction was not apt to be indignation as much as envy.

But that's one of the limitations of this modern world. Television can give a picture, but only the mind can give a view. For every so-called successful Costello there are 5,000 misled kids in reform schools and 10,000 men behind prison bars. Frank Costello, on the surface, was a winner. But the losers in the criminal game—the prisoners in the penitentiary—could have testified that all of Costello's money isn't worth the right of a freeman to take a walk in the spring.

When the chic Virginia Hill unfolded her amazing life story (contributing nothing to the committee's knowledge of crime—after her tardy arrival was excused by Senator KEFAUVER with the explanation "ladies from my part of the country are traditionally late") many a young girl must have wondered: Who really knows best? Mother or Virginia Hill? After doing all the things called wrong, there she was on top of the world, with a beautiful home in Miami Beach and a handsome husband and baby.

But it is a very hard life for any women to receive more attention than affection—and even harder to receive more affection than respect. The life of Virginia Hill sounds glamorous to the uninitiated. But as Damon Runyon said: "It reads a whole lot better than it lives." Most women would gladly trade every fur coat or Miami mansion they might own to avoid having the man they love shot between the eyes with a rifle—or the thousand tortured hours spent waiting for it. And, of course, for every girl like Virginia Hill who hit the highlights of the shadow circuit, there are 10,000 pitifully dependent upon the whim of a criminal's twisted mind for their next meal. Television could not tell anyone of their stories—not only because it is too gruesome—but because there is nothing more boring than repeated sordidness.

The Senators have proven that the underworld is based on one principal source of revenue: Gambling, and 90 percent of that horse gambling. But some eminent psychologists would tell you the reason public interest and indignation are so high was not because the spotlight was on Frank Costello—but because America was holding the mirror up to itself. Frank Costello, sitting in the witness chair, was not the average citizen's $2 bet come home to win—but come home to roost.

Whether or not the average citizen likes to believe it, it is just as immoral for him to place an illegal bet with the gamblers as it is for the gamblers to bribe public officials. The gamblers do not use their own money to bribe public officials; they haven't enough. They must use the public's. Anyone born before noon today knows that part of his $2 bet goes to the crooked combine between criminals and politicians. Under the common law, knowing that makes him an accessory before the fact—and an accessory before the fact is a principal to the crime. Accordingly, Mr. and Mrs. Betting America, take a good look at Frank Costello, because more than he was your enemy—he was your agent.

What the television pictures lacked was a "montage." They should have had plenty of background shots; in fact, they left out the main character, which was Mr. and Mrs. Millions of Betting Public. They should have shown background shots of the crowds swarming up to the betting windows; the busy horse rooms around the country serviced by the eminently respectable A. T. & T., and the conservative newspapers with the racing results. And, of course, the delegation of happy United States Senators being received by the Governor of Kentucky at last year's Kentucky Derby. Or, to make it more timely, the horde of Washington politicians skipping the Kefauver hearings to swarm out to the opening of Laurel last Good Friday.

This is no defense of gambling or official bribing, but it is an attack on hypocrisy. Under his constitutional rights, Frank Costello need not confess to anything on the witness stand. On the other hand, Costello is perfectly satisfied with the gambling situation. Mr. and Mrs. America and the United States Senate are not. They want to do something about it. But, unfortunately, it is a first rule of the law they say they seek to uphold that the applicant come in with clean hands. Well, Mr. and Mrs. America, at least half of you haven't got them. The hands of half the adult population are soiled by the billions of dollars they have paid out in $2 bets—the tiny little raindrops out of which comes the torrent of corruption. Mr. and Mrs. Two Dollar Bettor, you can stop speculating on who is the man higher up. Not very surprisingly—to those who know how the system works—Mr. and Mrs. Two Dollar Bettor—it is you.

Vice alone does not make a hypocrite. A hypocrite is a man who denies his own vices while he seeks to punish his own failings in others. Whatever the betting laws may say, betting on horse races is an ancient American tradition, a long-fixed habit, and a time-honored institution. Once this is admitted, the public won't need the underworld as its broker any more than it now needs a rum runner to deliver its $6,000,000,000 annual intake of alcoholic liquors. Sure gambling is bad for you, but overeating kills 1,000 times more breadwinners yearly than all the roulette wheels combined.

Gambling is as broad as the Nation and not as narrow as the televised pictures of the witness stand. What people are—and what people should be—is as old a story as the Garden of Eden. As Lincoln Steffens said of that: "It wasn't Adam's fault and it wasn't Eve's fault. It wasn't the serpent's fault, either. It was the fault of the apple they wanted."

Again this is no defense of gambling. But it does charge that the aristocratic blue-bloods of the Jockey Club, who stage the races, and Frank Costello, the common gambler, are more than brothers under the skin. They are brothers under the table.

Why Americans Do Not Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, pursuing further the inquiry represented by my House Resolution 89 for a special committee to investigate why Americans do not vote there is appended an interesting article on British experience in the same field entitled "Why the British Vote" contrasting the 84 percent who voted in Britain in the 1950 general election with the 43 percent of the Americans of voting age who voted in our 1950 election. The article is reprinted from the Progressive, a magazine founded by Robert M. La Follette, Sr., in 1909, and not to be confused with the political party which bore this name in the 1948 and 1950 election campaigns:

WHY THE BRITISH VOTE

LONDON.—Some British people did not like the results of the 1950 American elections, others did. But all agreed in deploring the low vote in a contest which could so greatly affect the future of the free world. Only 43 percent of Americans of voting age took the trouble to cast their ballots, as compared with 84 percent in Britain in the 1950 general election.

The British envy Americans their know-how in industrial productivity, and have sent many worker-management teams to the United States in recent years to learn what they can about the most up-to-date techniques. Perhaps Americans should return the compliment, and see what can be done to remedy the distressing political apathy of many United States citizens.

Such a team would have to begin by observing that political alertness, like high productivity, is not a matter of techniques alone. Millions of Americans have somehow acquired the conviction that high productivity is good in itself, while viewing politics as a rather shabby affair, and not something in which the best people willingly take part. The businessman has never had the prestige in Britain that he enjoys in the United States; this is one big reason why he is less alert and enterprising. Politics, on the other hand, is held in very high esteem, and attracts some of the ablest and most public-spirited young people in each generation.

On the negative side, British politics is almost entirely free of the aura of petty corruption which hangs about so much of the American political scene. In part, this is due to the fact that Britain is a more homogeneous and self-disciplined community. The law is greatly respected, and firmly—even harshly—enforced. Nothing arouses so much indignation as an attack upon a policeman.

But in part it is because Britain imposes less of a strain on the morality of politicians. Reading the accounts of the Kefauver committee, the British have been puzzled to learn that one of the main activities of the political underworld is the protection of gambling; most forms of it are perfectly legal in Britain, widely popular, and a source of considerable tax income for the state. Americans pay a high price for pretending to be more strait-laced than they are.

The result is that the British voter usually has honest and reasonably able candidates for whom to vote. Even if he is unlucky in this respect, he knows at least that the strictness of party discipline is such that one weak member of Parliament cannot cause the nation any great harm. There is little excuse for being too proud or too self-righteous to vote. On the contrary, the parties generally vie with one another in putting forward the best candidates they can.

They are also interested in getting out the highest possible vote. One cannot have industrial productivity without wanting it. Americans dislike a manufacturer who wants to keep his output low and his prices high. Yet they find little shocking in politicians speculating upon, or even seeking to insure, a low vote. It must be many years since any British politician has done so. From beginning to end, the whole election apparatus is geared to get out the fullest possible vote.

It begins with registration. Application forms are delivered by local government officials at every doorstep in Britain once each year (it used to be twice a year, and will be again when Britain can afford it). The only effort required of the citizen is to fill out the form for himself and his family and drop it, free of postage, in the nearest mailbox.

Since it is a matter of pride with each local government unit to achieve maximum

registration, the officials often go further than this. They check the returns against the last registration, and where people have dropped off they send canvassers to check up on them. Here again the shortage of money and manpower is something of an obstacle, and the party machines may have to do more of this work in the future.

Every opportunity is given them to do so. The lists of registered voters are posted in each precinct some time before they are closed. Party workers check them against their records, and send people around to bring in the missing names. This, in fact, used to be the main responsibility of the party "election agent," called in earlier years the "registration agent."

II

These election agents are the top sergeants of the British political battle. Each party tries to have one or more of them in as many constituencies as it can afford. It has become a recognized profession. People qualify for it by taking courses in election law and practices given by the party of their choice, and passing a thorough examination. For full-time agents it is a year-round, lifetime job; each party has established a system of retirement pensions for its agents. Precautions are taken to insure that they do not employ their strategic positions to become candidates for Parliament themselves.

Registration nowadays is only the beginning of the agent's job. The more important work comes after the registration lists are completed and closed. They are then arranged by streets and numbers and printed by local governments. Several bound copies are distributed to each party agent. He and his voluntary helpers cut out the pages and paste them on stout cardboard. They provide the basis for the thorough house-to-house canvass which then begins. Each voter is visited, and rated by the canvasser as "Labor," "Conservative," "Liberal," or "Doubtful." The "Doubtful" people are canvassed a second and even a third time, to win their definite support.

Since he cannot know the date of a Parliamentary election very far in advance (that is decided by the Prime Minister), the agent must maintain a constant state of preparedness. Local elections come at regular dates, as in America, and provide trial runs. But Parliamentary campaigning never comes to a full stop. The sitting Member of Parliament is constantly visiting his constituency; many of them have "clinics" every week, when their constituents, whatever their politics, may come to them for advice and help.

The opposition candidate is usually chosen well in advance, and is also constantly active "nursing" the constituency. Incidentally, it is not required in Britain that a candidate reside in the constituency, and many, in fact, are chosen from outside.

When the date of a general election is announced, the agents and candidates simply shift their smooth-running machines into high gear. Each candidate has the right to have his "election address" delivered to every voter at public expense. From then on, he pays his own way, and his expenditures are limited by law.

He spends the day meeting as many people at their doorsteps as possible, and crowds three or four public meetings into every evening. If the contest is an important one, national leaders, from the Prime Minister and Mr. Churchill down, come to the constituency to speak for him and for their party. Headquarters are set up in each voting district, and manned by volunteers, many of them with experience of several previous elections. They see every voter, not once but several times, in the course of the campaign. So thorough is the canvass that an experienced agent can predict the vote within 1 percent well before election day.

III

It is on that day that the most strenuous action takes place. By then, the agent knows where every one of his party's supporters is to be found. His watchers at the polls note down every person who has voted. Runners bring the names to the neighborhood headquarters, and they are checked off on the printed registration pages. In midafternoon the work of checking up on the laggards commences. This is done street by street, and no possible supporter is left unsummoned. Only those who are determined not to vote, or are utterly indifferent, succeed in evading their civic duty.

Until recent years, the Labor Party election machine, with its many volunteer workers, had an edge on the Conservatives in effectiveness. By last year Lord Woolton, head of the Conservative Party organization, had turned the tables. He had large funds, and was able to hire many energetic people, particularly ex-World War II officers, to do the work. No political machine in British history has ever functioned so effectively as his did last year.

Had the Republicans done half so good a job, Governor Dewey would be President today. The way in which the Tories took advantage of the provisions for voting by mail was particularly impressive. At one constituency after another they turned up a postal vote over the thousand mark, while Labor stuck low in the hundreds. As the party machines square off for the next round, this is a point to which Labor agents are giving earnest attention.

Obviously, even in Britain it is easier to get out a high vote in constituencies where the contest is reasonably close. But all parties do their best even in safe Labor or Conservative seats. They emphasize the importance of the total national vote for each party, as well as the place it wins in Parliament. The candidate who is certain of victory takes pride in exceeding any previous majority. The candidate whose cause is hopeless works hard to improve his party's position. It is a matter of direct personal interest to him, as well.

Many ambitious people begin their pilgrimage to Parliament by taking on a constituency they cannot win. They hope and strive to make good enough showings so that their case for a better constituency at the next election will be improved. Here the British system, by which candidates can shop around for constituencies rather than be restricted to the one in which they live, serves to keep up the minority party's interest even in rock-ribbed Labor or Conservative strongholds.

All these traditions and practices contribute to the large-scale turn-out of British voters. It could, of course, be made even greater. Although the polling hours, from seven in the morning until nine in the evening, are generous, there might be an advantage in holding elections on a Sunday or a holiday, as in places on the Continent. Or voting might be made compulsory, as it is in Australia and Belgium. But most party officials feel that they have done very well as it is, and can do even better in the future.

After looking at the American election results, more than one observer has asked: "If the voice of the people is the voice of God, whose voice is the silence of the people?"

American politicians must sometimes wonder what sort of a nation the 57 percent of the United States electorate who did not vote last November really wanted. British political leaders derive pride and confidence from the fact that they have been put in power by the verdict, freely recorded, of the overwhelming majority of adult Britishers. Some British traditions and techniques may not be suited to America. But they are worth considering.

It is a poor advertisement of American democracy if more than half the people are not enough interested in it to take the trouble to vote.

Gorgas, Ala., Coal Mine Leads the Way to Greater Coal Production, Lowered Costs, and Increased Safety by Adopting Additional Progressive and Efficient Mining Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Dr. Milton H. Fies, styled "Greater Coal Production at Gorgas Mine by Roof Bolting and Continuous Miner." This article was originally published in the December 1950 issue of Mining Engineering, a publication of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.

This article shows how the Gorgas, Ala., coal mine is leading the way to greater coal production, lowered costs, and increased safety by adopting additional progressive and efficient mining methods.

The article follows:

GREATER COAL PRODUCTION AT GORGAS MINE BY ROOF BOLTING AND CONTINUOUS MINER

(By Milton H. Fies, manager, coal operations, Alabama Power Co., and consulting engineer)

The Alabama Power Co. operates its Gorgas mine in Walker County, Ala., immediately adjacent to its steam plant. The coal mine property consists of some 19,000 acres of fee and mineral ownership lands, and all of the production from the mine—approximately 2,500 tons per day—is utilized at the company's adjoining steam plant. The company is presently considering the purchase of additional acreage adjoining its present holdings which acquisition will almost double its reserves. The coal is transported from the mine over a short railroad spur in the company's own equipment, either directly to one of the large plants at Gorgas or to a storage pile. The longest haul is about 1¼ miles.

The mine produces 2,500 tons of washed coal per day of two shifts. The preparation of the coal, resulting in a uniform 3 by 0 inch size product, is obtained by passing the coal through a Bradford breaker, thence to two Jeffrey diaphragm jigs, thence over dewatering screens to a 1,000-ton capacity coal bin for further dewatering and transshipment to the power plants. Flow sheet A indicates the travel of the coal from mine car to railroad bin.

The coal property has been thoroughly drilled and otherwise prospected and contains some 85,000,000 tons of proven recoverable coal in three coal beds. These coal beds, beginning at the surface, are the Pratt, and at an interval of 40 to 70 feet below, the American, and then at an interval of 400 feet, the Mary Lee. Coal is being mined only from the American bed, but resumption of mining from the Pratt bed is planned for 1952.

The data presented relate to the operation of one Joy continuous miner, which began to produce coal regularly in March 1950, and to the application of roof bolting throughout the entire mine, which began at the same time.

The American seam at Gorgas averages about 54 inches in thickness.

The rooms are 25 feet wide, driven 250 feet deep, and the pillars between rooms are 20 feet across. Since the American workings are in advance of the Pratt, no pillars are pulled. The width of the rooms compared to that of pillars is increased with the continuous miner and the percentage of recovery appreciably improved.

The larger portion of the production of the mine other than that obtained with the continuous miner is procured with mobile loading machines, Joy 12 BU, loading onto conveyors. These conveyors load either onto belts in the cross entries, or directly into Sanford-Day 6-ton drop-bottom mine cars. The main line track is laid with 70-pound rail, a part of which is thermite welded, with plans for eventually welding the entire track. This track is slag ballasted, and treated ties are used. Main line locomotives are 15 tons, gathering locomotives 6 to 10 tons.

The bottom below the coal is fire clay, which is fairly soft in its consistency. Directly above the coal in varying degrees of hardness and thickness there are two draw rocks. The first draw rock, which is the most difficult to hold, is from 2 to 6 inches thick, and, above, the other draw rock varies from 10 to 20 inches in thickness. In most sections of the mine only the first draw commonly falls with the coal as it is undercut and shot. Occasionally the second draw comes down, but it is only in rare instances that both draw rocks, which might total 30 inches, cannot be supported. The rock above these draw rocks is a hard, sandy shale, ideal for anchoring roof bolts.

During a period of from 6 to 8 months in 1949 roof bolting was applied to a set of three places where a Joy mobile loading unit was in operation. Then the practice was extended to some three or four additional units. The adaptability of the system to the conditions as they exist at Gorgas was definitely proved before the bolting was applied to the entire mine. Before any definite decision was reached, many tests were made in various sections of the mine and in other operations in the district. The results obtained were helpful in the final decision to adopt the system throughout the entire mine.

Experience demonstrated that one of the most important factors in securing satisfactory roof bolting was to obtain a fixed anchorage for the bolts in the roof stratum. Where the wedge-type bolt is used, the nature of the rock stratum in which the anchor is located, the design of the wedge, the method employed in slitting the bolt end, and the hardness of the bolt steel itself are all factors affecting the holding power or strength of the anchor.

It is recommended that each individual mine using the wedge-type anchor do a certain amount of experimenting and testing in order to determine that the anchorage is sufficient to support the amount of rock required.

Tests made in pulling roof bolts at Gorgas and other mines, using a Continental Gin roof-bolt tester, with gage calibrated to register tension pull directly in tons, gave some interesting results. For example, at Gorgas a 1-inch cut thread, burned-slot bolt was originally used with a ¾ by ¾ by 5½-inch wedge in a 1⅜-inch drill hole. This bolt installation provided anchorage (at 8-ton ram pressure) sufficient to break bolts in all tests. Later, in an effort to reduce the cost of the roof bolts (approximately 13,000 were installed per month at this mine) it was decided to use a 1-inch rolled-thread bolt with a sheared slot. The shank diameter of this sheared-slot bolt is approximately 29/32 inch, and its cost is 12½ cents less than the cut thread with burned slot.

When this latter type bolt was first installed on a trial installation, a ¾ by ¾ by 5½-inch burned wedge was used in a 1⅜-inch drill hole, the same as has been used with the 1-inch cut thread with burned slot. These bolts, however, would pull out at around 5-ton tension, irrespective of the method used in driving the bolt into the roof hole (hydraulic ram, stoper, and hand driving was tried). It was found that by anchoring them in a 1¼-inch hole and using a larger wedge, ¾ by ¾ by 6-inch burned wedge, and 8-ton ram pressure, the bolt would break before pulling out. It was further found that by using a wedge designed so that the bolt could be rammed to the extreme depth of the hole at approximately 8 to 9 tons pressure, maximum holding was obtained.

At a second mine a number of tests were made with various types of wedges, and the only wedge-type bolt that could be made to hold over 10 tons was a high-grade carbon steel bolt.

In some cases better anchorage can be obtained by increasing the length of the bolt and anchoring it in more suitable stratum. Experience indicates that the expanding shell-type anchor is not affected by the variations in rock strata as much as are the wedge type; and where it is difficult to secure anchorage with the wedge-type bolt, the expanding wedge shell may offer the best solution even though the installation time and expense may be greater.

The roof bolt pull-test data presented herein, table 1, were compiled from a test made at the Gorgas mine to determine the holding strength of various type bolts under varying methods of installation—wedge design and ram pressure. The roof holes were drilled with a rotary electric drill, and the bolts installed with a hydraulic ram.

It soon became obvious that this method of roof suspension offered so many decided advantages over the older system of room props with cross collars that, after all possible checks had been made as to the safety for the men, the system was adopted. It was found, for example, that because of the added maneuverability of machines (such as the boom on the loading machine or the cutting machines working across the face) the efficiency of loading units was increased from 20 to 25 percent. The contrast in the two systems of roof support is emphasized by the pictures heading this article. One shows the method of supporting the roof with props the cross collars, and the other by roof bolting.

It is extremely difficult to support the second draw in most of the working places in the mine by means of props and cross collars because of the consistency of the underlying fire clay. When the timbering in the mine was done by cross collars and props, the props would sink into the bottom as weight came on, and there was continuous trouble. Idle periods, at times only from Friday night to Monday morning, often resulted in reduced production on Monday due to falls in the working places, which required time to clean up before loading could begin. During longer idle periods it was always necessary to send crews into the mine to remove the falls of rock, and often to reset cross collars. Entries and air courses driven in advance of rooms required additional cleaning when the equipment was moved forward. Experience demonstrated that it was particularly troublesome for the face crews to carry props and 3- by 8- by 16-inch cross collars for timbering to the face in such medium thickness coal, and the time lost was appreciable. This work was made much less laborious with the new system where it is required to carry only the lighter materials consisting of bolts, nuts, and small size T-boards.

Roof support by means of bolts has no dependence on the nature of the floor of a mine, and that gain is important where the bottom is soft.

It has been demonstrated that the ability of bolts to support the roof is greater than the strength of props and cross collars, but it has been decided to place the bolts on the same centers as the props, that is 4-foot squares. The maximum draw rock encountered had reached 30 inches, and bolts were fixed at a 40-inch length, which would give an 8-inch penetration into the permanent stratum when the maximum thickness of draw rock was encountered.

While expansion bolts and other types have been tried, the bolt adopted thus far has been the split bolt with a wedge. Table 1 indicates the resistance of these bolts to pull, which emphasizes the supporting strength of the bolt. The factor of safety of the roof bolting, assuming that the rock to be supported is 4 by 4 feet by a maximum of 2½ feet thick, is much greater than that attained in the use of timbers. And since both draw rocks in the mine average less than 18 inches, the factor of safety is high.

Since in the advanced workings of this mine the supporting rock is shaly sandstone, which has become so hard that it is difficult to drill, and since the draw rock in this area has not exceeded 18 inches, the length of the roof bolt has been reduced to 30 inches. When the bolts were first installed in rooms it was decided to use wooden T-boards against the roof just inside of the washer and nut of the bolt. These were originally 3 by 8 inches by 3 feet, and were used only in rooms. Experience has justified the reduction in the size of the T-boards to 3 by 6 inches by 2 feet. In the entries or haulageways where roof bolts are used, timber is not employed directly under the roof, but only the metal plate washers, 6 by 6 by one-quarter inches thick.

Prior to the adoption of roof bolting throughout the entire mine and during the preliminary stages of the work, it was felt that if an effective, flexible method of drilling the roof could be devised, one that would not involve such costly initial expenditure as is required for portable air compressor, jack hammer, and impact wrench and piping, approval to adopt the system throughout the entire mine could be more readily obtained. Each loading unit would require the air equipment mentioned, and at Gorgas there were a maximum of nine such units. It was believed also that a rotary electric drill would release less fine rock dust in the drilling operation and that vibration caused by pneumatic stopers, which have a tendency to loosen the roof, would be eliminated by the use of the drill ram.

A light, compact, self-propelling drill rig was designed by Paul E. Glass, assistant superintendent and chief electrician at the Gorgas operation. These machines have proved very effective. The number of holes per day has averaged 50, and at times the total has reached as high as 80. The men who drill the holes and insert the bolts also perform other duties.

Also included is the new type self-propelled unit for roof drilling. At present these drill rigs are being built by the Continental Gin Co. under the trade name of Drillram. The rotary drill is so mounted on a hydraulic cylinder that upon completion of the drilling operation this drill can be swung out of position, the roof bolt inserted in the hole just drilled, and the hydraulic ram swung into position to set the split bolt with wedge, without relocating the machine itself.

The contribution which the roof bolting has made in the safe operation of the mine has been significant. Roof bolting, when used in conjunction with the continuous

miner type of machine, where no explosives are required, will greatly minimize roof falls, the greatest hazard in coal mining. The United States Bureau of Mines during the years has been outstanding in its contribution to coal mining, but it may well be that in its long history no single accomplishment exceeds that of roof bolting in mines.

The cost of roof bolting at Gorgas mine is greater by approximately 10 cents per ton than that by the use of wooden supports, but this difference is small as compared to the added efficiency of the machines, the increased tonnage obtained, and the increased safety of the men.

TABLE 1.—*Roof bolt pull test data Gorgas Mine—American seam, June 2, 1950*

Item No.	Hole No.	3, 1 inch diameter	4, 1 inch diameter	5, 1 inch diameter	6, ¾ inch diameter	7, 29/32 inch diameter	8, 29/32 inch diameter	9, 29/32 inch diameter	10, 29/32 inch diameter	11, 1 inch diameter	12, 1 inch diameter	13, ¾ inch diameter
1	Rod type	BS-CT	BS-CT	BS-CT	ES-CT	SS-RT	SS-RT	SS-RT (1)	SS-RT	BS-CT (1)	BS-CT	ES-CT
2	Length ...inches	40	40	39 3/16	40 3/16	40 3/16	40¼	40	40⅜	39⅞	40 1/16	40 15/16
3	Thread length ...do	4½	4½	4 9/16	4 5/16 2 9/16	4 9/16	4 9/16	4 15/16	5 1/16	4⅝	4¼	4 7/16 2¼
4	Foot length ...do	6	6	6¼		9 3/16	9⅛	9 1/16	9 7/16	6 1/16	6⅛	
5	Bolt diameter	1.003	1.007	0.992	0.756	0.914	0.907	0.912	0.912	0.986	0.963	0.760
6	Projection at initial anchorage ...inches	3¾	4¾	4 13/16	2¾	5⅛	6 3/16	4⅞	5 3/16	4⅛	4 3/16	2 1/16
7	Projection after pull ...do	4 1/16	3 9/16	4		4¼	4 5/16	4¼	8⅜	2⅝	3¼	
8	Push pressure ...pounds	16,000	12,000	8,000	None	12,000	16,000	16,000	19,000	12,000	16,000	None
9	Pull pressure ...maximum	19T	19T	9T	14T	4T	14T	1T	14T	19T	19T	14T
10	Result	Broke in thread	Broke in thread	Slipped at 9T	Broke in bottom threads	Slipped at 4T [2]	Bolt bent [3]	Slipped [4]	Bolt stretched or slipped	Broke in threads in hole	Broke in threads	Broke in lower threads
11	Diameter after pull	0.993	0.991	0.982	0.744		0.880		0.883	Not available	0.963	0.743
12	Thread length after pull	5⅛	5 9/16	4 9/16	4 13/16		4 13/16		5 1/16	5 1/16	5⅛	5⅛
13	Projection after pull	6⅛	5⅛		6½		5½		7 11/16	5½	6¼	6½

Explanation of symbols: BS, barred slot; SS, sheared slot; CT, cut thread; RT, rolled thread; ES, expansion shell; (1), special notch. Holes 1 and 2 not used for pull test.
Remarks: [1] Driven in with sledge to 3¼ inches projection after slip. Broke at 14T. [2] Roof irregularity at hole caused bolt to be pulled out of line, causing bend at a point 3¼ inches above threads. Bolt diameter immediately above threads. [3] Driven up with sledge to 3¼ inches projection, no additional data available.

The continuous miner, purchased from the Joy Manufacturing Co., of the type 3-JCM, maximum height 39 inches, produced some coal during a few shifts in the month of January 1950. It was not, however, until after the mines resumed operation on March 6, following a period of idleness due to a Nation-wide strike, that the work of the miner became regular. Only one continuous miner is employed in the mine at Gorgas at the present time. It operates on two shifts and largely in rooms 17 feet wide, which have a 10-foot pillar between. It will be noted in this connection that this compares with the 25-foot rooms and 20-foot pillars employed in the conventional method of mining, and that the percentage of recovery is markedly increased.

When the machine was first installed, an attempt was made to operate it with one operator, one helper, one car trimmer, and one shuttle car operator, using the intermediate shuttle car, operated by push button on the miner, as a surge. This is not practical in coal 52 to 54 inches thick, for the reason that the operator of the miner does not have sufficient height over the surge shuttle car to properly gage its loading. After the first few shifts a second shuttle car operator was added. The crew then consisted of the machine operator, the helper, two shuttle car operators, and a car trimmer, who loaded the mine car.

Coal was mined at the face, conveyed by the shuttle car to a belt on the cross entry, and from the belt the coal was loaded into a 5½-ton mine car on the main entry. This method of operation was continued through March 1950. Time studies were made on each shift, and it was soon definitely determined that the idle period when the machine was standing was due entirely to the inability of the two shuttle cars to effectively serve it. It was then that one of the assistant superintendents of the mine, John Davis, conceived the idea of utilizing an additional mobile loader, a small 12 BU, between the continuous miner and the intermediate shuttle car. The bottom of the mine acts as the surge. The continuous miner, as it produces the coal, deposits it on the floor and the 12 BU picks it up and loads it into the intermediate shuttle car. It has been the experience at Gorgas that the miner is thus made continuous.

Table 2 shows the cost per ton, separated as to day and night shifts, of coal produced by the continuous miner from January 1, 1950, through August 1950, delivered in the mine car on the main haulage entry. The intermediate Joy mobile loader began operation during April 1950. It will be noted how the tons per man-day have increased with the proportionate decrease in the cost per ton. The figures indicated are raw coal, but tests reveal that the tons of washed coal per ton of raw coal with the continuous miner is 85 percent; whereas, in the conventional method of mining, using undercutting machines, explosives, and mobile loaders, the washed coal is only 72 percent of the raw coal produced on the same basis.

It has been estimated that on a washed coal basis the cost of producing coal with a continuous miner in the mine car on the main entry is about one-third of the cost of producing washed coal with the conventional mobile loaders.

The crew now consists of one continuous miner operator, one helper, one Joy operator, two shuttle car operators, one car trimmer, and one foreman. The average number of tons produced since March per shift has been 297.5 of raw coal, with an average 85 percent wash coal recovery. The greatest advance in solid coal in one shift has been 156 feet, and the largest tonnage per shift has been 443 tons of raw coal.

The savings in explosives cost amounted to about 8 cents per ton.

The noticeable improvement in the condition of the roof in the places where the continuous miner has operated has been most marked. Ribs of pillars are not shattered and accordingly are capable of supporting more weight. Likewise, the hazard of falling rib coal is greatly minimized. Draw rock which formerly came down as the coal was shot, now stands up in places after the supports are withdrawn for as long as 3 months. The 17-foot rooms are timbered with cross collars with 6-foot centers supported by light jacks. These rooms are timbered by the operator and helper as the places advance. After each room is driven to its boundary, which is on an average of every two shifts, the cross collars and jacks are withdrawn to the nearest crosscut and are there available as the adjoining inby rooms intersect these crosscuts. In the entries and air course the roof is supported by bolts.

The use of the continuous miner at Gorgas has convincingly demonstrated that: (1) This method of winning coal from the face is dependable; (2) the use of the machine greatly reduces the hazard of mining (a) by the elimination of explosives, (b) by reducing roof exposure, (c) by reducing man-hours of exposure per ton of coal mined, (d) by concentration of rock dust, (e) by removing the worker from the face (the operator of the machine performs his task at a minimum of 10 feet from the face), (f) by eliminating the shattering of ribs of pillars and thus avoiding falls of pillar coal; (3) the cost of producing coal is greatly reduced.

The matter of the size of the coal produced is of no moment at a mine like Gorgas where the coal is produced for steam purposes only, and this likewise would be true at mines producing metallurgical coal. Sizing tests shown in tables 3 and 4 over a period of a week indicate the difference between sizes of the coal with a conventional mobile loader and undercutting machine as compared to the continuous miner. No noticeable effect has been observed in the quality of the washed coal due to the use of this machine, producing about one-quarter of the total production.

The results thus obtained in the use of this one continuous miner warranted the recent purchase by the Alabama Power Co. of two additional miners. If such results continue, the mine should be completely equipped with these machines.

The writer feels a deep sense of obligation to the following members of the mining staff of Alabama Power Co. for their criticism and suggestions in the preparation of this paper: Harry M. Johnstone, manager of Gorgas Mine; J. W. Shealy, senior engineer; W. O. Hodgkin, mining engineer; and E. W. Booker, superintendent.

TABLE 2.—*Cost per ton of coal produced at face with continuous miner, Jan. 1, 1950, to Aug. 31, 1950*

Date	Number of man-shifts	Number of shifts	Total tons	Tons per man	Amount	Cost per ton
January	88	11	1,714	20.6	$805.52	0.47
February [1]						
March	250	36	7,360	29.6	3,857.62	.48
April	301	40	11,352	37.7	4,313.61	.38
May	335	46	12,629	37.7	4,869.66	.39
June	304	44	14,089	46.3	4,806.44	.31
July	216	32	9,413	43.6	3,147.65	.33
August	323	45	14,190	43.8	4,614.55	.32
Total	1,767	264	70,777	[2] 39.6	26,706.37	[3] .36

[1] Mine idle this month due to strike.
[2] Deduct 15 percent to obtain tons of washed coal per man-day.
[3] Divide by 0.85 to obtain cost per ton of washed coal.

TABLE 3.—*Sample screen analysis of coal taken from continuous miner*

Date	+6 in.	−6 in. +3 in.	−3 in. +1½ in.	−1½ in. +¾ in.	−¾ in. +½ in.	−½ in. +⅜ in.	−⅜ in. +8M	−8M +0	Total
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
June 12, 1950	0	4.2	7.3	19.75	10.2	17.88	17.6	23.1	100.03
June 13, 1950	3.98	6.28	10.26	19.29	9.80	15.93	15.64	18.3	99.5
June 14, 1950	6.71	6.54	10.91	19.80	9.89	13.93	14.76	17.4	99.94
June 15, 1950	3.6	4.3	10.8	20.9	11.3	14.4	16.4	18.3	100.0
June 16, 1950	4.2	5.5	11.7	20.7	10.1	14.1	15.0	18.6	99.9
Average	4.6	5.4	10.2	20.09	10.26	15.25	15.9	19.1	100.8

TABLE 4.—*Sample screen analysis of coal from joy loaders*

Date	−6 in.	−6 in. +3 in.	−3 in. +1½ in.	−1½ in. +¾ in.	−¾ in. +½ in.	−½ in. +⅜ in.	−⅜ in. +8M	−8M +0 in.	Total
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
June 12, 1950	4.4	7.7	11.8	21.6	10.1	12.7	15.5	16.0	99.9
June 13, 1950	11.2	11.5	17.8	23.9	7.0	9.8	9.6	9.1	99.9
June 14, 1950	8.28	10.51	15.44	21.48	7.83	10.96	12.37	13.1	100.0
June 15, 1950	3.3	8.6	18.0	24.1	8.8	11.1	12.0	14.0	99.9
June 16, 1950	5.3	12.0	21.1	25.5	6.7	9.1	9.8	9.8	99.9
Average	6.5	10.2	16.8	23.3	8.1	10.7	11.9	12.4	99.9

Address of Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio, at Memorial Program for Thomas G. Masaryk, First President of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I made at a special memorial program for Thomas G. Masaryk, first President of Czechoslovakia. This address was made under the auspices of the American Committee To Fight Communism:

Millions of people throughout the world—the millions who are shackled in their own homes—cannot celebrate, cannot talk or even breathe the name "Masaryk." Red tyrants cannot tolerate the name of this great liberator, but I know that these freedom-loving people abroad are offering a silent prayer in memory of this great statesman and humanitarian.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk will be remembered for centuries. History will place him as a leader who was born on the threshold of the nineteenth-twentieth century, and who, at the ripe age of 65 years, went in exile to forge and found a new republic which for 20 years was a model of democracy in central Europe.

Thomas Masaryk was more than a liberator to his own people. He is remembered as a world statesman and world leader in the finest sense of Christianity. Born in Moravia, of humble origin, Masaryk married into an old American family. During their entire married life, his wife was a constant co-worker and a great spiritual guidance in his long struggle as a professor and congressman in the old Austro-Hungary Parliament. Their family union was complete.

In the words of Masaryk himself, "When I came back to Prague in 1918, I could hardly wait to be beside her."

Masaryk was a great scholar. He stressed the importance of Christianity in education. I shall quote his own words:

"I cannot picture a human being in our world growing up without knowing of Christ and His teaching; and of course the Old Testament is part of the fundamental cultural background of every European. Anyone not knowing what Christianity stands for would really be a stranger in our cultural domain; and how could anyone understand European history and the system running through it, if he had not been taught about the reality and development of the church? But the difficulty is how to teach it, from what standpoint to appraise the historical facts—a hard problem for the schools.

"I myself am always repeating and emphasizing the fact that religion is the essential element of spiritual life and culture, and for that reason not only religious instruction and instruction about religion in general, but also religious practice is for me a great and unsolved question of school policy."

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk believed in true democracy founded on love and respect for one's neighbor, and toward all neighbors, as the realization of the rule of God on earth. Let me quote him again:

"Democracy is not only a form of government, it is not only what is written in constitutions; democracy is a view of life, rests on faith in men, in humanity, and in human nature, and there is no love without faith. I said once that democracy is a discussion. But real discussion is only possible where men trust one another, and honestly seek the truth. Democracy is a conversation among equals, the thinking of free people open to complete publicity—the word 'parliament' has a fine meaning, if only we could give it body.

"I said among equals. I know that men are not equal; nowhere on the earth or in nature is there equality—there is variety; only as immortal souls are we really equivalent. Liberé, egalité fraternité—even the French Revolution de facto accepted Jesus' commandment, the commandment of love toward one's neighbor. It sounds like a paradox, but it is true: the French revolutionaries were theocrats, even if they had God merely as a highest being.

"The democratic ideal is not only political, it is social and economic. Communism I vigorously reject. Without individualism, without gifted and inventive individuals, without capable leaders, without geniuses society cannot be reasonably and justly organized.

"Democracy on its social side means the abolition of degrading misery; in a republic, in a democracy, it must not be possible for individuals or ranks to exploit their cocitizens—in a democracy man to man must not be merely a means. No organization of men is possible without superiors and subordinates, but it must just be an organization, and not a privilege, not aristocratic coercion but mutual service. Democracy needs leaders, not masters."

Masaryk defended his concept of democracy against protagonists of totalitarian systems of any color.

"I defend democracy, moreover, against dictatorial absolutism, whether the right to dictate be claimed by the proletariate, the state, or the church. I know the argument that dictatorship is justified, since conscience and right, reason and science, are absolute; and I am not unfamiliar with talk about the dictatorship 'of the heart.' Logic, mathematics, and some moral maxims may be absolute, that is to say, not relative as they would be if all countries, parties, and individuals had a special morality, mathematics, and logic of their own; but there is a difference between absolutism of theory, and practical, political absolutism. The most scientific policy depends upon experience and induction. It can claim no infallibility. It offers no eternal truths and can form no warrant for absolutism."

Masaryk, even in his years after World War I, didn't trust, didn't believe in communism. It was he who coined the phrase that "Russian bolshevism is a pathological scum."

Today Masaryk's ideas of democracy, of humanitarianism, and of liberalism and those associated before the name of "Thomas Masaryk" are brutally suppressed in his native land. Even his works are banned, but the remaining free world bows deeply in memory of a statesman who left the greatest impression on his people and free people everywhere.

I know that Czechoslovakia will arise again. I know that the Red plague will be removed. And after victory of democracy, which must come with spiritual weapons, the Red plague will be forgotten, but, the name of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk will live forever.

In conclusion, I want to say on this broadcast, which will be heard not only in our United States but also behind the iron curtain, that my country, the great United States of America, is and will be always the torch and bastion for all who are surpressed, abused, and enslaved. Thank you.

Public Assistance Provisions of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable confusion and misunderstanding created by some sources as to the administration in New York State of the Social Security Act. It is my opinion that there is a deliberate effort being made by the Republican officeholders of New York State to hide their own wrongdoing by an unwarranted attack upon the Federal administration.

The following statement, issued March 9, 1951, by the Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, is an unanswerable refutation of the

misstatements emanating from New York:

STATEMENT BY FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature claims that the Federal Security Agency has threatened to withhold funds from New York for aid to dependent children, old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled, unless the State acquiesced in two arbitrary conditions.

The resolution alleges that one of these conditions "would mandate an inflexible State-wide standard of assistance requiring all persons receiving assistance under a welfare program to receive mechanically the same benefits in total disregard of individualized needs." The second condition, according to the resolution, would require the State "to depart from its long-established civil-service system and compel the adoption of special civil-service standards and procedures for employees dealing with Federal welfare programs or a general revision of our civil-service system."

The 1935 Social Security Act provided for Federal contributions to the States for needy people—under certain conditions. It provided that each State submit a State plan which had to be approved, originally by the Social Security Board and now by the Federal Security Administrator, as meeting the requirements of the Social Security Act. This State plan, the act says, "shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and if administered by them, be mandatory upon them." Furthermore, since 1940, the act requires that all such plans include "methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis."

These are not arbitrary conditions dreamed up by me or anyone else in the Federal Security Agency. They are part of the law of the land. Congress wrote these essential provisions into the Social Security Act because it wanted to protect helpless needy persons from arbitrary and capricious action, and to make sure that they would receive humane and individual consideration wherever they live within a State.

Failure to adhere to these provisions has resulted in serious differences in the treatment of needy people throughout New York State. People in various parts of the State receive shockingly disparate amounts of assistance in relation to their need. The law clearly calls for equitable treatment for persons in need; and persons in New York State have not been getting equitable treatment.

There has been failure on the part of local welfare districts to include basic items in the budgets of needy persons. There has been an alarming variation in the tests applied in determining who is entitled to assistance and who is not. Thus, in some welfare districts a person may be denied assistance if he has as much as $100 worth of personal property, while in a neighboring district a person may be granted assistance even though he has $1,500 or more of personal property. In my opinion, the Congress that passed the Social Security Act was out to prevent precisely this kind of discrimination.

We have not insisted on an inflexible standard that would require all persons to receive mechanically the same benefit without regard to individual need. Quite the contrary. What we have asked the State department of social welfare to do is to establish a State-wide policy that would be simple, objective, and consistent, so that a person in need would know what he is entitled to, and would not have to depend on the whim of a local official.

The Federal Government asks for equality of treatment, not necessarily equality of dollar assistance. The Federal Government asks that New York see to it that people in equal need receive the money to secure the same standard of living. Obviously, the rent costs in a small town upstate will not be the same as in Manhattan. The equal standard requires that a needy person receive the money to purchase equivalent food, clothing, and shelter, wherever he lives within the State.

All of this is well known to the State board of social welfare. As a matter of fact, since 1944 the board has paid lip service to the requirements of Federal law. In that year it issued an instruction to local districts calling for equitable treatment of persons in equal need; but this instruction was never enforced. On January 22, 1951, this board ratified an agreement which the chairman of the board and I had reached on December 29, 1950, relating to aid to the permanently and totally disabled. That agreement provides for inclusion in the State plan of assistance standards to assure equitable treatment for all needy persons.

Thus the State board of social welfare recognizes that there is no basis for the accusations contained in the legislature's resolution and accordingly agrees to abide by the law of the land.

As to requirements for an adequate merit system in the administration of public assistance in New York, the Federal law is perfectly clear. Its intent is to have administration of public assistance in all States free from political pressures. The fact is that New York has some 900 welfare positions exempted from civil service—more than the number of such exempted positions in all other States put together. New York is the only State in the Union where county welfare directors are not under the merit system. Moreover, 55 deputy directors are also exempt, along with a large number of other miscellaneous jobs. This contradicts the express requirements of the Federal Social Security Act. The State board of social welfare has now assured us that it will take the necessary steps to correct any deficiencies which may be necessary in the carrying out of personnel standards on a merit basis in accordance with the Federal Social Security Act."

These facts reveal the inaccuracies and distortions of the resolutions better than any argumentation.

Connections Between Criminals and Law-Enforcement Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent statement made by former Ambassador Spruille Braden, chairman, New York City Anticrime Committee, at the session of the United States Senate Crime Investigating Committee in the United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York City, on Tuesday, March 20, 1951.

This anticrime committee has been recently created upon recommendation of the King's County grand jury. Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz and District Attorney Miles McDonald especially deserve recognition and credit for this effective movement for better law enforcement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY FORMER AMBASSADOR SPRUILLE BRADEN, CHAIRMAN, NEW YORK CITY ANTICRIME COMMITTEE, AT TUESDAY'S (MARCH 20, 1951) SESSION OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE CRIME INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE IN THE UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, FOLEY SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY

Both as chairman of the New York City Anticrime Committee and as a citizen, I appreciate the honor of being invited last week to sit with this distinguished committee and to make this statement today.

Your committee, Senator KEFAUVER, merits the gratitude of all decent Americans for exposing to the light of public opinion the shameful connections between criminals and the law-enforcement officers throughout this country.

Your committee has helped the average man in the street to realize that the apparently innocent placing of a $2 bet with a bookmaker, when multiplied by the thousands who do it daily, is in fact supplying organized crime with huge additional revenues wherewith to corrupt law-enforcement officers, to buy immunity from punishment for all manner of offenses, to make drug addicts of our children and generally to pollute society.

I have watched this committee bit by bit extract from witnesses sordid stories of corruption in this city. My emotions have been mixed, but I am confident that they are typical of all those who by television, radio, and the press have followed events in this courtroom. We plain citizens have resented the arrogance and impertinence shown before this committee. We have been shocked to hear a city commissioner admit to hobnobbing with gangsters and receiving in his office such loathsome creatures as the so-called policy king. We have drawn the only implications that can be drawn from these evil associations between the hoodlums and high officials of this great city. Momentarily we have, perhaps, felt a certain measure of frustration that swift and severe punishment is not meted out both to the gangsters and to the venal officials. We are increasingly angered—in a cold reasoning rage—because self-evidently these racketeers could not have grown rich and powerful, as they have, if they had not been in complicity with law-enforcement officers. Were it not for this complicity, we realize that these criminals never could have accumulated wealth and influence to a point where they must be consulted on the reorganization of Tammany Hall or as to who should or should not be a supreme court justice or even a candidate for mayor of New York City. We know that crime cannot exist on a major scale or on organized or syndicated bases unless there is something rotten in city hall. Finally, we plain citizens are determined to put an end to these outrageous conditions. We are awake at last.

This Senate committee has contributed to this awakening. Its activities should be continued. I voice the ardent wish of thousands of citizens in New York City that it be continued after March 31.

Also I wish to pass on to this committee and to the television companies the desire expressed in many messages I have received, that the more important scenes in these hearings be repeated extensively at night over television, for the benefit of those whose

occupations prevented their watching during the working hours of the last week.

I have said that the citizens of New York are determined to eradicate corruption. More, we are already under way. On January 31, 1951, the December 1949 grand jury in Kings County handed up a presentment stating that—

"The history of past investigations reveals a sudden relaxation of the public temper, when the headlined activities of the malefactor have been filed away in forgetfulness. That public apathy is the fertilizer that nurtures the soil for unbridled graft and corruption."

The grand jury, with the vigorous support of Judge Samuel Leibowitz and District Attorney Miles McDonald therefore "urged the immediate establishment of an entirely new and permanent city-wide crime commission to be supported by public contributions. * * * This body under no circumstances to undertake the business of law enforcement itself. Rather it must concentrate on purposeful systematic observation of those who are duly entrusted with the conduct of our law enforcement, and on keeping the community informed of the results of this observation."

To these ends, within a few hours on that same day, the New York City Anticrime Committee was formed by a group of prominent citizens from Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond Counties. On the committee are men and women of different creeds, color, and racial origins. They are leaders of industry, labor, education, social organizations, banking, and other callings. Our membership is absolutely nonpolitical and contains no one ambitious for public office.

Our group, as a watchdog committee, will give every support to those law-enforcement officers who are performing honestly and efficiently. If through the meticulous observation by our staff of investigators we find proven cases of ineptitude or worse in the courts, the district attorneys' offices, or parole boards, the police, or elsewhere, the facts will be presented to the appropriate authorities in order for them to take prompt remedial action. Should they fail to do so, the committee will then go to the public with these facts. In short, the purposes of the New York City Anticrime Committee, as expressed in its certificate of incorporation, are as follows:

(a) To keep continually before all the people of the city of New York the principle that no lasting happiness or prosperity can be established without due respect for law and order, and that crime and vice can be suppressed only by the firm determination of the people and consistent action by law-enforcement officers and their superiors.

(b) To give aid to law-enforcement agencies in the proper discharge of their duties.

(c) To keep the public continually informed as to conditions showing criminal activities and to promote vigilance in the suppression thereof.

(d) To receive private voluntary contributions to be used solely to effectuate the foregoing purposes.

The New York City Anticrime Committee has established offices at 270 Park Avenue, where information respecting crime conditions in this city will be welcomed, treated confidentially, and investigated by an expert staff.

The New York City Anticrime Committee in zeal and effectiveness will outmatch the crooks and conniving law-enforcement officers. We are in this fight to the finish. We demand and will see to it that there are honest and competent law-enforcement officers throughout the five boroughs.

Senator TOBEY, like everyone else who heard you, I was profoundly moved last Wednesday by your eloquent and impassioned plea for a spiritual and religious revival in this country if crime and corruption are to be exterminated.

So much do I agree with you that for many years I have at every opportunity in public addresses and otherwise declared that the greatest single problem confronting humanity today is the breakdown in morality everywhere, but especially in government. Basically it is precisely this lack of morality which is responsible for communism, aggression, and Russian expansionism along with all the many other political ills that afflict us in domestic as well as in world affairs. Unless our citizenry, and in particular every one of those who govern and who are charged with law enforcement, get back to morality and common honesty, our other efforts and struggles will be sterile. We will be attacking symptoms rather than the disease itself.

This leads me to another aspect of the crime and corruption situation on which heretofore—so far as I know—there has been little or no comment. I refer to its repercussions on our foreign relations.

Irrespective of whether we want it or not, the mantle of world leadership rests on our shoulders. On how well we wear it depends not merely the fate of these United States but of civilization itself.

We can only exercise that leadership successfully if we have self-respect and are respected by and enjoy the confidence of other peoples. For respect there must be complete integrity and confidence in that integrity by the authorities and peoples on both sides.

I regret to say that we have been losing that respect and confidence of other nations which we formerly held.

Through the years I have been proud when repeatedly my foreign friends have remarked, "Of course, you have some crime and corruption in the United States, but you keep it at a minimum because you have sanctions; the punishment is swift and sure."

In contrast to these statements, of late years these same friends, pointing to the revolting conditions disclosed by this committee, the Brooklyn grand jury, and other investigations, have commented sadly on our moral deterioration.

One of the outstanding statesmen of this hemisphere, a former Ambassador and President of his country, in effect, told me only a few weeks ago:

"The scandalous connivance of the police disclosed by the Brooklyn grand jury is known throughout Latin America. It destroys overnight your efforts to win the minds and hearts of our people. If dishonesty amongst your officials continues, you might as well forget about the Voice of America and other efforts to keep us on your side. The millions of dollars you are spending for these purposes will go down the drain unless you get back to your old system of integrity in public life."

Just as the people, and particularly the youth, of a country are prone to imitate their leaders, so a great and powerful country such as ours sets the tempo for others. Thus, the bad example set by some of our public officials will be followed elsewhere. In any event, we cannot rationally protest against corruption abroad ruining our investments when there is such blatant corruption right at home.

This means that as corruption spreads, capital will not dare venture into other lands, and the point 4 program, which in large part must depend upon private investment, will fail.

Just as Caesar's wife must be above suspicion, so any official directly or indirectly having to do with law enforcement, must not only be good but must appear good. This is imperative from the aspect of our foreign relations. Here, at home, we may judge the corrupt or indiscreet official as an individual, but to foreigners he represents and typifies the United States, and so this Nation's reputation for integrity may stand or fall by what he does or seems to do.

The loss of moral prestige by the United States and its repercussions on others was vividly demonstrated last October, when a report issued by an official of a friendly government stated that the "bankruptcy and corruption" existing in his country, "have an intimate relation to the American example in racketeering."

One of the phenomena accompanying the breakdown in morality, to which I referred, may be stated practically as a law of nature: just as dictatorships almost always become corrupt, so conversely corruption often leads to dictatorship. This happens because either the crooks and dishonest officials become dictators in order to continue stealing, or there is an armed revolution to throw them out. In the latter case the resultant chaos and exercise of force in turn lead to dictatorship. This vicious circle has destroyed the Roman and other civilizations and could do the same to ours, if we do not take preventive measures.

In other words, either we must wipe out these mobsters and their political partners or we will lose our way of life.

Joe Stalin, if he had planned it that way, could not find a speedier and surer way to defeat the democracies than by subsidizing these gangsters and foul politicians. Actually, as I have seen in other countries how closely the gangsters and Communists work together, I sometimes wonder if the Soviet is not, at least in some measure, inciting these vermin to defile our system of law and order.

But whether or not this be so, of one thing we can be sure, the Costellos, Adonises, and the rest of this scum and still more the miserably corrupted law-enforcement officers, are among the Kremlin's best allies. Perhaps, in a sense, they are even more dangerous than the spies convicted of stealing our atomic and military secrets. After all, by ingenuity and hard work we can compensate for and replace these thefts, but the loss of morality in government will cause us to lose our self-respect and the respect and confidence of other peoples. From such a catastrophe no nation has ever recovered.

A most important result of the Senate investigating committee's work is that it is demonstrating to the entire world that our democracy is essentially sound and honest, because a bipartisan group of legislators without fear or hesitation, free from political bias, letting the chips fall where they may, are exposing to the purifying light of public opinion the crime, graft, and bribery which has existed in this and other communities.

The importance of your work, Senator KEFAUVER, from a purely domestic viewpoint, cannot be exaggerated, but I dare to say that in restoring and fortifying our country's position of respected leadership in the world you and your associates, and such bodies as the Brooklyn grand jury, can strike one of the most vital blows required for our defense and the preservation of the confidence in and friendship for us of other nations.

Our citizens are aroused, and an aroused citizenry is irresistible. They will relentlessly demand honest and competent officials, who will drive the criminals into prison, out of the country, or into the electric chair.

The New York City Anticrime Committee was formed to help in this work. You may be assured it is at your service at all times, and we hope to join with other crime commissions throughout the country to make this a great national campaign, an unremitting crusade.

H. R. 1 Provides $10,000 of Free Insurance for Every Member of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1951, the United States House of Representatives passed a free insurance bill for members of the Armed Forces by a vote of 390 to 0.

This bill, when and if it becomes law, will have the great advantage of providing every member of the Armed Forces with $10,000 of insurance during the period of his military service and for at least 90 days after his discharge, without cost to the serviceman.

Thus, we can be assured of universal insurance coverage of all members of the Armed Forces, a result which we were never able to attain in World War I or World War II.

Experience has heretofore been that the dependents of deceased servicemen who did not have either national service life insurance or Government life insurance, were generally among those who needed the benefits of insurance most. Universal coverage of all who serve in our military forces is a much-to-be-desired ideal. The bill, H. R. 1, will, for the first time in the military history of this country, enable us to attain that ideal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by James Marlow entitled "Free Insurance Bill Covers Servicemen Killed Since June 27" from the Wednesday, February 21, 1951, edition of the Evening Star:

FREE INSURANCE BILL COVERS SERVICEMEN KILLED SINCE JUNE 27

(By James Marlow)

Veterans with national service life insurance may be puzzled about a move in Congress to set up a new kind of GI insurance.

Up to now, men in service could get this national service life insurance, insuring themselves up to $10,000. They had to pay for it, but no one had to buy it. Roughly 20 percent of the men now in service, with dependents, don't have the insurance.

If a serviceman bought it, he could drop it when he was discharged, and that would end it. But if he wanted to, he could keep it to cover him in civilian life.

If he kept it, he could have the cheapest kind, called term insurance, or convert it to a more expensive permanent policy. In either case, he'd have to keep on paying for it. Only about 4,000,000 World War II veterans have kept the national service life insurance they had while in service.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

That's the way the story has been and is now. But a week ago the House Veterans Committee approved a new kind of GI insurance.

If it goes through as approved, this is the way it will work:

Every serviceman will be insured for $10,000 by the Government for as long as he's in service and for 90 days afterward. He won't have to pay for it. At the end of those 90 days, the insurance stops.

If he comes out of the service disabled he can keep the insurance—it is called "H" policy—but he'll have to pay for it then. The maximum "H" policy is $10,000.

If he comes out of the service totally disabled, then he gets this same "H" policy free for the whole period of his total disability. The "H" policy in that case is a flat $10,000.

RETROACTIVE IN DEATHS

And this new law would take care of the survivors of men who died in service since June 27, 1950, if they were not protected at the time of their death by the present national service life insurance.

For example: John Jones was killed in Korea in July but had no national service life insurance. Still, he had dependents. The new law would provide $10,000 for them.

Or, Tom Smith was killed in Korea. He had dependents, too, but only $5,000 national service life insurance. Under the new law those dependents would get an additional $5,000, to make the total insurance payment to them $10,000.

But what of those 4,000,000 World War II veterans who kept national service life insurance after being discharged and have been paying on it ever since? The new law wouldn't affect them or their policy in any way. They'd continue to pay on their national service life insurance policy.

BACK-IN-SERVICE CASE

But suppose a veteran with this old national service life insurance is called back into service now and this House committee bill becomes a law. He'd get a break.

Once back in service, he'd be covered free with the new $10,000 policy. He could give up his old national service life insurance policy.

If he had a permanent national service life insurance policy, he'd get back from the Government, when he gave it up, the policy's cash surrender value.

If he had the cheaper national service life insurance term policy, he'd get nothing back when he gave it up after returning to the service.

But what happens when this veteran—who went back into service and gave up his national service life insurance policy—is discharged later on? As noted above, the protection of the $10,000-for-free policy under the new law would end 90 days after his discharge. Is he then left without any insurance?

COULD GET IT BACK

No. Once discharged, he could get back his old national service life insurance policy:

1. If he had the permanent kind, he can get it back by returning all the money he had received when he gave it up, plus a sum slightly less than what he would have paid on it from the time he gave it up until he wanted it back again. And he could get this back without a physical examination.

2. If he had the national service life insurance term insurance, he could get it back simply by paying a sum equal to two monthly premiums. But he'd have to take a physical examination.

If he was disabled and couldn't pass the term insurance examination he'd get the "H" insurance mentioned before, up to $10,000 and pay for it month by month.

If he was totally disabled, he'd get a full $10,000 "H" policy for free for the whole period of his total disability.

Posthumous Award of Congressional Medal of Honor to Sgt. William Russell Jecelin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the Congressional Medal of Honor is the supreme tribute which our Nation can pay to the valor of one of its fighting men. Its recipients have always been held, and rightly so, in a specially exalted classification among all the heroes of our Armed Forces.

It is with a sense of pride, therefore, that I bring to the attention of the Senate the posthumous award of this decoration to Sgt. William Russell Jecelin, of Baltimore, for incredible courage in saving the members of his platoon by covering with his body an exploding hand grenade after he had led and rallied his men to storm and capture an enemy ridge in Korea.

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." The account of the award and the reasons therefor will be, I am sure, an inspiration to all the countrymen of this gallant young man, and I ask unanimous consent that the story of the award and of the heroism which merited it, as published in the Baltimore Sun of March 27, together with an editorial from the same paper this morning, be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 27, 1951]

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR ANNOUNCED FOR BALTIMORE HERO—SERGEANT JECELIN THREW HIMSELF ON GRENADE IN KOREAN FIGHT TO SAVE MEN

The Congressional Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest military decoration, has been awarded posthumously to a young Baltimore soldier who threw himself on an exploding hand grenade in Korea and saved his comrades from almost certain death.

"This incredible courage" of Sgt. William Russell Jecelin, who lived at 228 Henneman Avenue before entering the Army, climaxed his company's direct frontal attack on a strongly defended enemy ridge which was blocking the advance of United Nations troops.

BRADLEY TO GIVE MEDAL

The action took place September 19 near Saga during the first United Nations advance up the Korean peninsula.

The blue-ribboned medal, the sixth to be awarded in the present conflict, will be presented to the sergeant's father, John Jecelin, Jr., at 2:30 p. m. next Tuesday by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The ceremony will be held in the Pentagon in Washington.

TEXT OF CITATION

The citation reads as follows:

"Sgt. William R. Jecelin, Company C, Thirty-fifth Infantry Regiment, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Saga, Korea, on September 19, 1950. His company was ordered to secure a prominent, saw-toothed ridge from a well entrenched and heavily armed enemy force.

"Unable to capture the objective in the first attempt, a frontal and flanking assault was launched. He led his platoon through heavy enemy fire and bursting shells, across rice fields and rocky terrain, in direct frontal attack on the ridge in order to draw fire away from the flanks.

"The unit advanced to the base of the cliff, where intense, accurate hostile fire stopped the attack.

"Realizing that an assault was the only solution, Sergeant Jecelin rose from his position firing his rifle and throwing grenades as he called on his men to follow him. Despite the intense enemy fire this attack carried to the crest of the ridge, where the men were forced to take cover.

"Again he rallied his men and stormed the enemy strongpoint. With fixed bayonets they charged into the face of antitank fire and engaged the enemy in hand-to-hand combat. After clubbing and clashing this force into submission the platoon was forced to take cover from indirect frontal fire of a self-propelled gun.

SAVE THOSE AROUND HIM

"Refusing to be stopped he leaped to his feet and through sheer personal courage and fierce determination led his men in a new attack. At this instance a well-camouflaged enemy soldier threw a grenade at the remaining members of the platoon. He immediately lunged and covered the grenade with his body, absorbing the full force of the explosion to save those around him.

"This incredible courage and willingness to sacrifice himself for his comrades so imbued them with fury that they completely eliminated the enemy force. Sergeant Jecelin's heroic leadership and outstanding gallantry reflect the highest credit upon himself and uphold the esteemed traditions of the military service."

General MacArthur has sent a letter to Sergeant Jecelin's sister, Mrs. Marie De Vaux, expressing his regret at the "untimely and tragic loss of your brother." Sergeant Jecelin had named Mrs. De Vaux as the relative to be notified should he be killed or injured.

"I am confident," wrote the commander of the United Nations armies, "that his devotion to duty, at the cost of all he held dear, will hasten the day when ruthless aggression shall disappear from the face of the earth and freemen everywhere will live together in peace and harmony."

SINGING ALL THE TIME

Mrs. De Vaux, who lives at 8106 Walnut Avenue, Rosedale, described her brother yesterday as a quiet, soft-spoken boy "who seemed to be singing all the time."

"He was real lively," she said, "and liked to listen to jazz music and go to football games.

"One thing about him, though, he couldn't stand an argument. In fact, if some people were arguing in the room, he would walk out till it was over. He always did that."

Sergeant Jecelin lived with his sister several years before enlisting.

PARACHUTE DIDN'T OPEN

His father, who lives at 2107 East Chase Street, has been a trackman for the Baltimore Transit Co. for the past 21 years. His mother, Mrs. Bertha Killmeyer Jecelin, died a few years after he was born.

Mrs. De Vaux recalled yesterday that her brother wanted to be a paratrooper when he first entered the Army. He trained at Camp Breckinridge, Ky., when an incident occurred which led to the heroic Korean episode.

"He had already made one jump in a parachute," Mrs. De Vaux said, "when, the next time up, he saw a friend of his jump out of the plane, but the parachute didn't open.

"RIGHT IN THE THICK OF IT"

"He told them, after that, that he didn't want to jump any more. They said he would have to finish the training or else go overseas. He told them he would rather go overseas."

Sergeant Jecelin left for Japan March 11, 1949. He had enlisted November 21, 1948. He entered Korea with the Twenty-fourth Division soon after the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel.

"He was right in the thick of it" until the day he was killed, Mrs. De Vaux said.

THIRD OF FOUR CHILDREN

Sergeant Jecelin was born May 24, 1930, at 1002 North Chester Street. He was the third of four children of the Jecelins, all born at that address. He has an older brother, George, 31, now ill in the Maryland General Hospital, and two sisters, Mrs. De Vaux, 28, and Miss Agnes Novena Jecelin, 17.

The family moved later to 1514 North Chapel Street and were there about a year when Mrs. Jecelin died after a fall down their cellar steps.

Mr. Jecelin married again and with his children moved to 2107 East Chase Street, Sergeant Jecelin attended Elementary School No. 2, Chase and McDonald Streets. He left school after the sixth grade.

SAVED $2,000

"He never was one for school," Mrs. De Vaux said. "He got a job with a dairy and drove a milk truck for them. He worked at that for three years and then enlisted.

"He really seemed to enjoy his work. He worked the night shift, from 12 to 8, and when he came home he usually would sit around and listen to the radio or else go out and meet some of his friends.

"He worked hard, though, and saved his money. When he went in the service he had $2,000 saved up."

His family said he was a baseball fan.

SENT MONEY FOR NEW HOME

Mrs. De Vaux said that he sent regular allotments home and had invested most of his money in a new house in Rosedale. Most of the family live there now and Mr. Jecelin usually visits them on week ends, she said.

Sergeant Jecelin's last letter home, written to his brother, George, was dated August 29, 1950. After describing a hand-to-hand fight with a North Korean unit, he ended by writing:

"Well, George, that's about all for now so drop me a few lines soon. There go some B-29's over to raise some hell further up the line. Well, George, I think I will catch a couple hours' sleep while there is nothing doing.

"P. S.—Tell Dad to take it easy and not to worry too much, because I will be home soon.

"BROTHER BILL."

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 28, 1951]

A NEW AMERICAN HERO, SGT. WILLIAM R. JECELIN

Bill Jecelin was not the kind of boy who believes the world owes him a living. He left school at 15 and went to work for a milk company, in Baltimore, from midnight until 8 a. m. By the time he enlisted in the Army at the age of 18 he had saved $2,000, which he invested in a house for his brother and sisters. He hated arguments, liked jazz music and football games, and seemed to be singing all the time.

By the time Bill Jecelin was 20 years 3 months and 26 days old, he was dead. He was dead on top of a saw-toothed ridge in Korea which he, a platoon sergeant, was responsible for capturing in repeated charges against seemingly overwhelming enemy fire. He was dead on top of a grenadate which he had covered with his body in a successful effort to shield his men from the ensuing blast. He was dead, but his complete and devastating devotion to duty continued to lead his men to further victories.

Nobody has ever successfully answered the question: What makes a hero? Certainly Bill Jecelin, the youngster behind the wheel of a milk truck, could not have been singled out as likely to become the sixth American among many thousands of Americans in Korea to win the highest military award this country has to offer. Certainly the boy who always left the room to avoid a family argument and who balked at making a second jump as a paratrooper was not likely to become the man who rose up again and again in the fury of concentrated enemy fire and led his platoon into hand-to-hand combat.

All we know is that when the military situation called for heroic action, it was Bill Jecelin who stood up and met the challenge. In losing his life he truly saved it, because the name of Baltimore's Bill Jecelin will surely live long on the American roll of honor.

America's No. 1 Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "America's No. 1 Farm Problem," written by Lauren Soth and published in the current March issue of Successful Farming. This article, in popular language, discusses the problem of underemployment of rural families, and is based upon a staff report to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report prepared at the request of this committee's Subcommittee on Low-Income Families, of which I am chairman. At my request there was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD of March 22, 1951, at page A1656, a summary of the staff report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S NO. 1 FARM PROBLEM

(By Lauren Soth)

America's No. 1 farm problem today is not fair prices for farmers. Neither is it adjustment of production, soil conservation, nor any of the other perplexing questions which have bothered farmers and the Government in recent years.

It is manpower.

We are beginning a vast expansion in our military strength, to meet the threat of world communism. For the indefinite future, we shall have to maintain a high degree of

armed readiness. This takes men for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. More important, it takes men away from producing civilian goods, and puts them to work on military airplanes, tanks, cannon, ammunition, and so forth. National defense comes first.

In certain industries, manpower already is scarce. By the end of 1951, when defense production gets into full swing, nearly all factory managers will be pleading for more workmen. By that time, also, many farmers in the commercial agriculture regions will be short of help.

This will mean a drastic reduction in the output of many civilian goods, including some farm products, unless we can find ways to add new workers to the labor force—or use our present labor force more efficiently. The degree to which we maintain our present high living standards will depend in large part on our success in this manpower job.

Where can we get additional manpower?

Several sources come to mind quickly:

We can reduce the number of unemployed. But of a labor force of 65,000,000, only a little over 2,000,000 are out of work at present. This is about normal for a full employment period. In a free economy—where people are changing jobs often—some slack must be maintained. Even in the stress of World War II the unemployed figure never dropped below one million.

Factory workers can work longer hours. Already, the average number of hours per week has gone up; it will increase further.

More women, young people, and older people ready for retirement will go to work.

These things will help. But the biggest source of new manpower is the underemployed. These people are working full time, but are so inefficient they add little to the Nation's output. A large block of these underemployed persons are in farming.

So the manpower problem is a farm problem from two angles: Commercial agriculture needs more labor, and another section of agriculture has a surplus of usable labor.

A committee of Congress, under Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, has just completed a searching inquiry into the facts about underemployment in farming. Some of the figures will surprise you. They show that our vaunted efficiency in American farming has some holes in it.

They show that while most of United States' agriculture has been moving forward—using more machinery, better seed, better fertilizer, and so on—a very large group of farm people has been standing still. These farmers still are using the methods of their grandfathers. They have not caught up with the industrial age.

Here are the Sparkman committee findings:

1. About 1,600,000 farm families produce less than $2,500 worth of products a year, based on 1945 prices. At present prices, this figure might be $3,000. That's total, gross value—including all products sold and used at home.

Of these 1,600,000 families, 1,000,000 produced less than $1,500 worth of crops and livestock in 1945.

You can estimate for yourself how much net income was left after paying expenses—and how dire is the poverty in which these people live.

2. The Sparkman committee found another 400,000 part-time farm families, who had total earnings of $3,000 or less in 1945.

It is estimated that of the Nation's total of 5,700,000 farm families, 2,000,000 (1,600,000 full-time farmers and 400,000 part-time) produced less than half as much as the families on medium-sized, commercial family farms. (In computing these figures, the Sparkman committee eliminated all families where the head of the family was under 25 or over 65. Thus, these are farmers of working age.)

In other words, more than one-third of the farm families of this country are less than half as productive as the average family on a commercial farm.

3. In addition, says the Sparkman report, there are about 1,500,000 nonfarm families, living in rural areas, who had family incomes of $2,000 or less in 1945. Here again, these are able-bodied people of working age—not the very young or very old.

And, finally, there are about 1,000,000 hired wage workers, who work part time or full time on farms, who earned an average of only $530 in cash in 1945. They worked an average of only 158 days in that year. To a large extent, these wage workers are included in the nonfarm families mentioned above.

"If the workers in these three groups," says the Sparkman committee, "could be employed at jobs where they would produce as much as the average worker on the medium-sized commercial family farm it would be the equivalent of adding 2,500,000 workers to the labor force."

Where do these people live? The greater share of them are in the South. But some are in the cut-over lands of the Great Lakes States and the far Northwest, and in some of the isolated mountain areas of the West. Some are in the southern, hilly fringe of the rich Corn Belt States.

Are these farmers mostly tenants and sharecroppers? No; about 57 percent of those who had a gross of less than $1,500 in 1945 owned the small acreages they farmed.

What are their farms like? Well, here's a typical Piedmont region farm in North Carolina: It is a 45-acre place run by an owner-operator. The farmer has 19 acres of woodland and wasteland, 2 acres of pasture land, and 24 acres of crops. He has small fields of cotton, tobacco, corn, wheat, oats, and lespedeza; 2 cows, 2 hogs, and 40 chickens. The farm takes only 180 man-days of labor per year.

Here's a typical southern Appalachian farm: The farmer-owner has 24 acres to work with, of which 10½ acres are cropland. He grows a little tobacco, has 4 acres in corn, and about 6 acres in other crops. He has 1 cow, 2 hogs, and 20 chickens. The business takes 120 days of man labor.

A southern Illinois owner-operator of 120 acres has 23 acres in crops. The farmer raises 7 acres of cotton and 16 of lespedeza. He handles 2 dairy cows, has 6 beef animals, 7 hogs, and 60 chickens. The farm is operated with 120 days of man labor.

The net cash income in all three of these cases, which were selected as representative of their areas by the Department of Agriculture, was less than $500 at the 1945 level of prices (or about $550 at 1950 prices). The farm families got about as much income in the form of food consumed at home as in cash.

This is real poverty. It is tragedy. But the effects of this poverty on the farm families themselves—the lack of education for the children, the poor nutrition, the ill health—need not concern us here. In this article let's look at the problem from the standpoint of the rest of us, from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole.

Clearly, the goods we all have to consume, including the goods we need to be militarily strong, come from what we all produce. The failure of 2,000,000 farm families to produce more than one-half their share is a heavy burden on the Nation. It seriously cuts down on our ability to maintain the national standard of living during a time of great military expense.

The underemployed farm families are a burden on the rest of us in other ways. Their health is poorer on the average. So more of them require public aid for health services and fewer of the young men are eligible for military duty. Many of these people have to go on relief when they are too old to work.

Their children aren't as well educated because local schools are poorly financed. So we are seriously considering a Federal aid program which would improve educational standards in the poor farm areas. We cannot afford to have a large group of young people so poorly educated that they are a liability instead of an asset to democratic government.

But all this welfare and relief, which costs lots of money, doesn't get at the root of the problem: underemployment or lack of productivity. How much wiser it would be to undertake a national program to raise these people up to the American standard of productivity. Then they could take care of themselves in good, old-fashioned, independent American style.

It is an easy "out" for us to say that these poor farmers are shiftless, lazy, and incapable of doing more. It is easy to say, "Well, this is a free country. Why don't they move to bigger farms or move to the cities?"

But that simply bypasses the issue. The facts are that most of the poor people on poor farms stay there. In spite of the great wave of prosperity in the last 10 years, we still have 2,000,000 families, according to the Sparkman study, who seem anchored to their pitifully unproductive farms.

Ordinary price and wage incentives do not seem to be enough to pull many of the underemployed farm people out of their ruts. In the current emergency, we cannot count on this problem solving itself—at least not fast enough to help the defense effort.

What can be done, then?

The first step is to improve practices and methods on present small farms. You would think that with all the extra labor time they have, the operators of these small farms would have high crop yields per acre and high production per unit of livestock. But they do not. They need to learn how to farm by modern methods—to use fertilizer, improved varieties of seeds, and more productive livestock.

Can they, or will they, learn? Experiences of the extension services in the Southern States, and of the Farmers Home Administration are encouraging. Once they are given the chance, plus financial help to get started, many of these so-called backward farmers prove to be very good producers. We need to place much greater emphasis on FHA and extension educational programs for the poorest farmers.

The next step is to provide larger farming units for those who demonstrate capacity to handle them. This means more credit facilities for this group of farmers. It may require a land-purchase and recombination program by the Federal Government. FHA needs additional authority from Congress to do this.

Hand in hand with this program to improve methods and expand the size of farms goes the need for machinery. During the next several years, it would pay the country to give high priority to southern agriculture on farm machinery.

If we are to make full use of manpower from southern farms, we must make machinery available to replace it.

A set-up of efficiency in the poor farming areas will not by itself solve the manpower problem. Displaced labor from these areas must be helped to find work elsewhere—in factories and in commercial farming areas. The Federal-State employment services need to expand their informational and guidance activities in the poor-farm areas. At present they have few offices, and no special information programs in such places.

Probably the most important single action that could improve the productivity of southern people would be more industrial development. Private business already has done much to encourage new factories in the South. But it is obviously impossible to locate enough factories close to surplus labor areas to give everybody a job without moving from home.

During the last war one of the chief obstacles to getting jobs for southern farm people was the difficulty of moving. Maybe we need to give some thought to providing Government funds for buying up farms of people who want to move to other farms or nonfarm work. These pieces of land could be resold to other families in the neighborhood who need bigger units.

Clearly, this problem of making fuller use of manpower on farms is many-sided. No one cure-all is possible. At several different points, however, we can make our system of free choice work better. We can remove some of the obstacles that prevent the exercise of free choice.

The heavy pressure of work which the world crisis has placed upon us demands that we make every ounce of manpower as effective as possible. Making fuller use of manpower now available on farms is the most important task for the Department of Agriculture in the immediate future.

The United States Department of Agriculture might well shift some emphasis away from price supports and other programs for commercial farmers in order to concentrate on manpower. These other programs are not needed now, anyway, because prices and incomes of commercial agriculture are certain to remain high during the defense period.

An effort to overcome the stagnation in our poor farming areas will not only help the defense effort, but it will give us a better balanced and more profitable agriculture for the long-run future.

CARE Completes 5 Years of Significant Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have just read the fifth annual report of that great American organization known as CARE, under the splendid leadership of Paul Comly French, the executive director. In the 5 years in which this private organization has been active in relief and rehabilitation, it has assembled and distributed to needy people throughout the world 10,000,000 packages of food and textiles. As the report suggests, here are 10,000,000 ambassadors of good will. Mr. French, his able staff members, and the rank and file workers throughout America, utilizing our church and benevolent institutions, have given the most tangible evidence of our concern for the victims of war and other disasters. The report carries words of appreciation from the heads of government in Europe and Asia whose peoples have been helped by this activity. Included also is a fine appraisal of its significance by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The American people can be proud of CARE's magnificent record.

Walter P. Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two excerpts from the magazine Newsweek. The first is from the magazine's issue of February 26, 1951, and is a telegram from the Honorable Francis Biddle, distinguished former Attorney General of the United States and now national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action. The second excerpt is from the magazine's March 5, 1951, issue and is a letter from Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, CIO. These items are pertinent for the RECORD in order to be read together with an insertion made on Wednesday, March 14, by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The three insertions read together will, I am confident, leave no doubt in the minds of reasonable people as to what the facts are. Mr. Reuther's opposition to communism is irrefutable. His record of militant, practical, and successful opposition to communism is well known.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek of February 26, 1951]

IN BEHALF OF REUTHER

As national chairman and presiding officer at last ADA national board meeting, statement attributed to Walter Reuther in Moley article February 12 issue of Newsweek totally inaccurate. Reuther's positive program of attack on communism within trade-union movement and at national and world level is outstanding and has long spoken for itself. Public distortion of his vigorous and effective stand against Communist doctrine as well as Communist military aggression serves only totalitarian propaganda ends.

FRANCIS BIDDLE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

(The questioned statement was picked up from Victor Riesel, labor columnist, who is standing by what he was told by his source.)

[From Newsweek of March 5, 1951]

REUTHER'S REBUTTAL

My fight against communism of all varieties, including world communism, is sufficiently on record as to need no defense or explanation. However, I would like to keep the record straight.

I was supposed to have said, according to a quotation used by Raymond Moley in his column (Newsweek, February 12): "I am not interested in fighting world communism. I am only interested in fighting Communist imperialism. I draw a distinction between world communism and Communist imperialism. I'm willing to leave the fight against world communism to MCCARTHY and the Republicans."

I believe I have clearly demonstrated in work and action (a) I am against world communism (b) I regard imperialism as only one of the many ugly sides of communism, (c) I do not draw any distinction between world communism and Communist imperialism, and that (d) I most certainly am not willing to leave the fight against world communism to the McCarthys because McCarthyism cannot win the fight against communism.

What I actually said at the ADA meeting to which Moley referred was this: "I am not interested in a purely negative fight against communism, because a negative fight will not succeed. I will leave that kind of fighting to the McCarthys. I am for a positive fight against communism, because that is the only way to win.

"We must build military strength to resist aggression on the battle front, and at the same time, fight against poverty and hunger on the economic and social front because poverty and hunger are the sources of Communist power."

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, UAW-CIO.

DETROIT, MICH.

Use of Television by Congress and Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains an interesting editorial on the subject of a proposed voluntary code to be worked out so as to make sure that television is constructively used by Congress and its committees. This was the substance of the suggestion I made in my public statements on this subject which were reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD on Tuesday, March 27, 1951.

The Washington Post suggests that the Subcommittee on Congr ssional Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be the group to handle this issue. I personally feel that it might better come within the purview of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which might concentrate on this particular subject rather than become involved in a great mass of other congressional reorganization details. Whoever does the job, however, I trust that it will be done promptly and in the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Post editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Prior to the Washington Post editorial, however, I should like to have included in the RECORD a copy of a Tuesday, March 27, editorial that appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on this same issue. I think that this is one of the most stimulating editorials which has been published to date regarding the new TV "baby." This editorial very kindly commends my suggestion to the effect that we should not allow TV to be used recklessly and without careful thought. The editorial points out in a

very sensible fashion the fact that in other hands the televising of congressional hearings could become a very dangerous instrument. The fact that our subcommittee has been conscientious in its handling of the hearings does not detract from the fact that some other committee might not exercise such high standards.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun]

THE TV "BABY"

Many thoughtful citizens are uneasy about television's spectacular role in the hearings of Senator KEFAUVER's crime investigating committee.

They concede the tremendous popularity of the fascinating show provided for millions of people throughout the country.

They aren't concerned for the tender sensibilities of underworld big shots who complain of "fear psychology" when required to testify under the glaring lights, even though not in direct range of the TV cameras.

And they agreed that Senator KEFAUVER and his colleagues have sought commendably to conduct the hearings with dignity and restraint.

But they are apprehensive about what could develop now that the precedent has been established.

All congressional investigations, unfortunately, are not inspired by motives as good as those of the Kefauver committee. Some have been—as some may be hereafter—conducted by men ruthlessly bent on smearing honorable persons whose political or economic views differed from their own.

There is nothing fanciful in the fear that innocent witnesses, subjected to ordeal by television before future Senate or House committees, may suffer ruin of their reputations if their rights are not carefully protected.

Senator WILEY, a Wisconsin Republican and a member of the Kefauver committee, is one who sees this danger plainly.

He has proposed a thorough study of television's part in hearings and other congressional proceedings, with a view to establishing definite standards and preventing abuses. He says:

"The usual history of developments such as this TV 'baby' is that the medium becomes more and more used, more and more wildly, with less and less restraint, until in some dramatic instance, say, an innocent man's reputation, is destroyed. Then the people strike back at the 'monster' they have created by passing restrictive rules."

The Kefauver committee's hearings have made such a hit on TV that public demand for more like them is sure to be strong. And congressional desire to meet that demand also is certain.

Now, therefore, is the time for Congress to act on Senator WILEY's excellent suggestion. Unless its committees are required to observe common-sense standards of good taste and restraint, he says, correctly:

"Televised hearings will degenerate into three-ring circuses, fourth-rate stage productions with hamming and phony theatrics or unjust inquisitions under klieg lights."

Other mediums of public information—the press, the news cameramen, the radio, the newsreels—also should not object to fair and sensible standards for their coverage of congressional hearings and proceedings.

[From the Washington Post of March 29, 1951]

COSTS OF USE OF TV

The grinding of television and motion picture cameras and the flashing of newspaper photographers' bulbs were probably only a convenient excuse seized upon by Morris Kleinman and Louis Rothkopf to cover up their unwillingness to testify before the Kefauver committee. Both had been dodging subpenas for 3½ months. They were brought before the committee under arrest. If no cameramen had been present, the pair would probably have sought some other excuse for not testifying. Nevertheless, their refusal to talk with the television audience looking on will furnish an interesting test of whether Congress may compel testimony under these circumstances. We hope the case will be ably and thoroughly presented to the courts.

At the outset it should be understood, however, that the courts cannot settle the larger issue that has been raised. Presumably the decision of the courts in this case will tell Congress only whether or not it may compel a witness to talk directly to the country as well as to itself. Beyond this question of legal rights lie momentous questions of policy: To what extent should television and motion pictures be utilized in congressional investigations when witnesses do not object? To what extent should their objections be overridden if the courts decided to sustain contempt convictions for refusal to talk for TV? Decision of the legal issues will not relieve Congress of the necessity of adopting a policy of its own.

It is a timely moment for Congress to be thinking about a code for the guidance of its investigators—a code that would include other rules of fair investigative practice aside from the use of television. With expert assistance, the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is currently studying ways and means of improving the performance of Congress and its committees. One of its primary tasks might well be the writing of a code of fair procedure for congressional investigators, with special emphasis on this new problem that Congress has not yet had time to think about.

Congressional Probers Again Prove Their Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congressional Probers Again Prove Their Value," by Leslie Gould. The article appeared in the March 22, 1951, issue of the New York Journal-American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL PROBERS AGAIN PROVE THEIR VALUE

(By Leslie Gould)

The value of congressional committee investigations has again been proved.

Eighteen years ago, a congressional committee showed up the racketeering in finance and some lines of business. The things exposed were known, but had never been gathered together in one shocking package.

More recently, a congressional committee turned up the Communist infiltration into Government and caught in the net Alger Hiss.

If it hadn't been for the congressional committee, Hiss would never have been exposed. He was one of the darlings of the New Deal and part of the conspiracy that sold the country out to the Russians and killed the peace won by the blood, sweat and tears of World War II.

A congressional committee turned up Andy May—the double dealing Congressman who had headed the powerful Military Affairs Committee—and the Garnson brothers.

Currently the racketeering in Government is being exposed, with the RFC bowing to influence in making unsound, political loans. The influence trail to the RFC leads right into the White House.

The links between the most vicious gambling and criminal elements in the country, going back to the dark days of prohibition, to important figures in local, State and National Government are being revealed in all their disgusting detail.

The investigations of 18 years ago brought a long overdue clean-up of the financial markets, but they also have brought along powerful Government interference with private business and some of this influence is crooked.

The pendulum has swung now far to the left. Criminal elements are political powers. They control many of the unions, particularly those along the water fronts.

If the shocking revelations of the Kefauver committee and the Fulbright committee bring the long overdue clean-up, the public will be the gainer. But if just one or two figures are sacrificed and the matter ends there, with the same thing continuing only under new names, the investigations will mean nothing.

The investigations have hardly more than scratched the surface. This is particularly true of the Fulbright inquiry into the RFC. This is only one agency. Many of the other agencies in Washington are similarly operated.

Behind the whole stinking mess are lawyers peddling influence, hiding behind their cloak of immunity of lawyer-client privilege. A real housecleaning is needed in the legal profession.

Politics and the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Stockton Legionnaire, which I wish every American could read. The American Legion has often been charged with politics and with inordinate selfishness.

From its inception the Legion determined to keep out of partisan politics and as far as the American Legion in California is concerned, which is the only one of which I have intimate knowledge, they have done exactly that. This has been one of the strong characteristics of the American Legion. The Legion supports principles, community activities and institutions but, very wisely, it does not support candidates for political office.

Also, the Legion has consistently and persistently taken a strong stand against

subversive activities against our Government. There has been no deviation in its course in this regard. Furthermore, it has consistently taken a strong and vigorous stand on national defense. From the beginning it has many times affirmed that it believes universal military training is the one way to make and keep America strong. It has been my privilege to hear some of the men who represent the Legion speak before the House Armed Services Committee. Some of the best presentations of the need for and the utility of universal military training have been made by Legionnaires. The one that I remember more vividly than all others is the presentation made by Perry Brown, of Texas, who is one of the Legion's past national commanders.

This article referred to was printed in the Stockton Legionnaire, the Post paper of Karl Ross Post No. 16, my Post in my home town of Stockton, Calif.

I believe I can truthfully say that Karl Ross Post is one of the great legion posts in the entire United States. The main reason it has been such a constructive force in our city is that there has been practically complete harmony among the post members. No matter what the members' political differences might be—or differences on other matters—when they come into the legion meeting they pull and work together. The post has done a great many fine things for the city of Stockton and for its people and has contributed many thousands of dollars toward public improvements. It has carried on a vigorous program in support of our public schools and in disseminating wholesome information regarding the benefits of the American political and social system. There is a comradeship in Karl Ross Post that I have never found in any other group and I can truthfully say that, of all the other organizations that I belong to, I cherish my membership in Karl Ross Post more than my membership in any other group. I am very proud of the fact that I once served as the commander of this post.

Following is the article:

POLITICS AND THE AMERICAN LEGION

The formation of war veterans into peacetime organizations seems to be one of the invariable results of modern demobilization. These organizations have been many, and varied in general plan and purpose. Some seek only to promote the selfish interests of their members, while others seek to render public service in peace as well as in war. It is perhaps natural that the American Legion, originally formed by veterans of a war to make the world safe for democracy, should fall into the latter class. The preamble of our Constitution, one of the greatest dedications to high patriotism ever written, discloses a determination to be ever militant in the defense of the ideas our comrades died to save.

Recognizing that the military struggles of the last decade are but a renewal of the battle for democracy—a battle that will continue until the people learn to turn from their pacifists and demagogs long enough to make good, in peacetime, the victories for democracy won by the blood of their sons in war—membership in the Legion was opened to the veterans of later wars.

To keep the organization on as high a level as possible, for as long as possible, the constitution provided that it should be nonpolitical, in the sense that it would not be used to promote the candidacy for public office of any person, or to advance the cause of any political party. Our determination, as previously suggested, was to be militant in defending the Constitution of the United States of America, a 100-percent Americanism, combating the autocracy of the classes and the masses, making right the master of might, promoting peace and good will on earth, and perpetuating the principles of justice, freedom, democracy. It was never suspected at that time that such a program would conflict with the programs of persons in public office. But the people forgot that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and hundreds of those who would destroy what we fought to save wormed their way into high places in our National Government. For a while the Legion was practically alone in warning the American people that termites had invaded the foundations of our national structure, and were becoming ever more effective in their program of destruction.

Our work was, of course, very obnoxious to certain groups, and they set out to destroy us. The rumor of a meeting on perhaps the most prominent lawn in Washington, D. C., one hot summer afternoon during World War II, for the purpose of planning the formation of an organization to put the American Legion out of business, is well founded. The plan failed, and the organization that was to wipe us out has fallen into disrepute.

But the battle continues, and as usual in such cases, one of the weapons is to try to shake the confidence of its members in the organization. So they began asserting and repeating that the American Legion is too much in politics. Some of the more or less gullible members began repeating it, and some even went so far as to assert that eligibles were declining to join because of the activity of the organization in party politics. Of course no one ever actually refused to join because of that false statement, but it is not to be denied that many who have other reasons may find satisfaction in advancing that excuse for declining. It sounds pure and holy, and we ourselves have often not been too skillful in calling attention to the Stalin philosophy that a lie, repeated often enough, is bound ultimately to be believed by someone.

It is natural, therefore, that many of the founders of the organization viewed with alarm the introduction, some months ago, of a resolution which, if adopted on a national scale, would completely disarm the organization, and subject us to just criticism of having shrunk into a simple treasury-raiding outfit. The backers of the resolution were of undoubted sincerety and loyalty. But they lost sight of our main objectives. Fortunately the proposal for this self-emasculation was caught in time, and the resolution amended so as to call for no weakening of our past policy or practice.

Tell me that the American Legion has failed to sign up 2,000,000 members because we are not sufficiently active in the support of our high purposes, and I will believe you. I frequently hear the criticism, "You talk about these things, but you don't do anything about them." For instance, it is not easy to explain why when surveys showed 80 percent of the people of the United States behind our military training program, we did not actively engage in the defeat of two Congressmen, one Republican, one Democratic, which refused to do anything about it.

But look well into the background of someone who repeats, parrotlike, the assertion that the American Legion is too much in politics, as an excuse for not joining. Read him the preamble, and ask him if he believes in the same things we do. Maybe he is not going our way.

If we are to remain true to our principles, it is our duty to do all in our power to combat the infiltration of communism and communistic influence in our Government, as well as to combat the childish stupidity that gave Stalin half of the world on a platter, a situation that will cost millions of lives to correct, if indeed it can ever be corrected. The American Legion is a truly democratic organization, and as such it has not always been free from the faults of democracy. But to our everlasting credit it must be said that, while often blundering in our methods and inconsistent in our acts, we gave the Nation the only leadership it had, for a long period of time, in the battle against the fifth column. If we force ourselves to withdraw from the fight now, on the ground that we are treading on some politician's toes, then next time we meet, let's not forget to bring along our knitting. We won't be good for anything else.

CHAS. H. EVERSMON,
Chairman Americanism.

The Final Chapter of the Alger Hiss Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in one place, under the title "The Final Chapter of the Alger Hiss Case," three newspaper clippings, being editorials or articles. The first one is an editorial entitled "Final Chapter in Alger Hiss Case," from the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; the second is an editorial entitled "Hiss Is Lucky," taken from the South Bend Tribune, of South Bend, Ind.; and the third is a news article entitled "Alger Hiss Is Taken to Lewisburg Prison," from the front page of the Washington Times-Herald for March 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader]

FINAL CHAPTER IN ALGER HISS CASE

The United States Supreme Court this week wrote what is perhaps the final chapter in the case of Alger Hiss when it refused to review his conviction on a perjury charge.

Thus goes into the archives one of the most extraordinary episodes in American history—not extraordinary solely because Hiss betrayed his Government but also because he rallied to his support so many men in high places.

TRUSTED BY MANY

Hiss was one of the top aides in the Department of State at the time of his violation of public trust. He was a trusted adviser of President Roosevelt—one of his primary helpers at Yalta. He helped frame the basic set-up of the United Nations at San Francisco, acting as a chief agent of the United States.

When charges were first voiced against him, an angry outcry was heard in Washington. It was, his friends and supporters said, a horrible case of "character assassination." It was tragic, indeed, they contended, that such a fine and noble man as Hiss should be subjected to such shocking abuse.

President Truman joined in the chorus. Two Justices of the United States Supreme

Court appeared as character witnesses at his trial. Even after he had been convicted, Secretary Dean Acheson of the Department of State made the almost incredible statement that he wouldn't turn his back on him.

YOUNG GOING

We recall the early developments in this case. At that time Senator KARL MUNDT was a Member of the United States House of Representatives and an active leader in the House Un-American Activities Committee. As events unfolded he became more and more convinced, he told us, that Hiss was not the innocent character depicted by his associates. But his committee encountered difficulty in getting the proper assistance to ferret out the facts. President Truman virtually commanded the Department of Justice, including the FBI, to leave the case alone. So the committee had to function as best it could without benefit of the Government's established agencies. Because Hiss had so many friends of unusual influence, the going was tough. Not only was there opposition from the President, but various columnists and others sought to belittle the committee at every opportunity. In consequence a considerable degree of public sympathy was lost.

But the committee was so certain that it was proceeding along a good trail that it didn't desist. MUNDT took the leadership in the probe and it was his adroit and vigorous questioning that eventually played a prominent part in the developments resulting in the arrest and subsequent conviction of Hiss.

HOW MANY OTHERS?

Now this episode is over. But it is tremendously disturbing to realize that a man who was virtually a spy for another country could work himself into such a high position and command the respect of so many important officials.

The worrisome question today concerns how many others like Hiss are in the Government. The matter is particularly aggravating in view of the apparent unwillingness of President Truman as well as Secretary Acheson to promote a really thorough investigation.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of March 23, 1951]

HISS IS LUCKY

What many, perhaps most, Americans had not expected to come to pass became a reality Thursday when Alger Hiss surrendered to begin serving a prison term for perjury. Two trials in Federal court and much litigation in the appellate area were necessary to bring this about. Even when he was found guilty by a jury in New York City on January 21, 1950, many observers were skeptical about his ultimate imprisonment.

Hiss, the "one-time bright young star of President Roosevelt's New Deal," actually is lucky as he becomes a convict. The perjury conviction means that he has been found guilty, in not effect, of betraying the United States for the benefit of the Communist conspirators in the Kremlin. As Russia was not officially an enemy of the United States when Hiss thus degraded himself he was not subject to indictment and trial as a traitor. So he is under a 5-year sentence ostensibly for perjury, but actually for what was essentially a crime that has spelled death for so many other wrongdoers in the history of the human race.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of March 29, 1951]

ALGER HISS IS TAKEN TO LEWISBURG PRISON

Alger Hiss, former high State Department official convicted of perjury, was taken yesterday from New York to the Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., to serve his 5-year term.

Letters From GI Who Has Recently Returned From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there has come to me a request from one of our recently returned GI's from Korea. He has asked me to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a plea he is making in the interest of his buddies who are still fighting and suffering and dying and winning far from home and kin. He tells of the meaning to these brave fellows of mail from home, and his plea is that we give them more and more of this comfort and joy. It is a fine, straight-forward appeal, and I ask that Sgt. Wilbur F. H. Radeline's letter to me and his appeal to the people of this country be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FELLOW AMERICANS: I am Sgt. Wilbur F. H. Radeline, of the United States Army, recently returned from Korea and now stationed at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.

I am not writing this in any official capacity.

I do not expect, nor do I think I merit any special consideration, commendation, or privileges for what I am doing. I am simply trying to keep a promise I made to my buddies in Korea.

Some time ago my good friend, Don Blanding, wrote a dramatic, true poem about a certain Private Willie who, when the ever-welcome mail call came, and after the names of the Zylowskies, the Perkins, Van de Veers, and others had been called, would linger awhile, outside the circle, his name uncalled. Then, with a look of deep, hurt loneliness in his eyes, would turn away, forgotten, heartsick, and forlorn.

Today, over in Korea, in Japan, Okinawa, and, yes, even right here in the United States, especially in our Armed Forces hospitals, Private Willie is present and disappointed at too many mail calls.

Oh, his name isn't always Willie. It might be John, Rastus, Richard, Max, or even your own boy's name, but he is there, his name uncalled, forgotten.

I, myself, have spent over 6 years overseas, and months in Army hospitals, and I know the worth and value of mail from home. I also know the heartache and misery when you are forgotten.

I have seen many men and boys, of all races, creeds, and ages, in Korea and elsewhere, who receive little or no mail from home, and no matter what their position in life was before they entered the service this failure to write on the part of the folks back home makes these men believe and feel as though they were forgotten and their efforts unappreciated. I promised to them that I would prove to them that this was not so, but only you can make this promise come true. How? By writing a cheery, newsy letter, with your latest snapshot, to some relative, friend, or acquaintance overseas. Or, better still, why not send him a small package containing some inexpensive gift?

If you do not have anyone of your own overseas and still want to help bring cheer and happiness to our men overseas, you can do so by sending your mail to me, with forwarding postage if possible, and I will forward it for you. I have the names of many men in our Armed Forces overseas who receive little or no mail, as well as promises from chaplains and the Pacific Stars and Stripes—the servicemen's newspaper—to help me pass on your mail to where it will do the most good.

Now I've told you my story, and it's up to you.

Are you going to sit still and do nothing and let those fellows over there continue to believe that their suffering, their struggle, and their pain is unappreciated and in vain? Are you going to make these men wage an additional battle against lonesomeness as well as against the enemy? Or are you going to prove to them with your letters and packages that you do appreciate what they are doing for you and not let them down?

I assure you they will not let you down. I thank you.

Sgt. WILBUR F. H. RADELINE.

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Hon. Mr. MILLER: I really haven't any legitimate excuse for not thanking you before for everything you have done for my wife and myself, but I am humbly saying "thank you" now. But at the same time I am also saying "please" again.

Since I have returned I have taken a furlough and on my own time and at my own expense I have gone to Hollywood and talked to executives, producers, writers, and actors at both independent radio stations and networks about a campaign for mail from home for men overseas. Their cooperation has been wonderful and not only have they had me appear on programs but many other programs are "plugging" my campaign. Magazine editors have also promised me their help.

Then the Pacific Stars and Stripes has given my campaign write-ups, and when the men found out about it they started writing me, begging me for mail from home. They believe in what I am doing and are asking for mail from their home States and towns. I honestly and sincerely believe that I can do much to build up morale and happiness if I can do what they want. And I also am convinced that as long as I continue to do this personally and without any official tie-ins the real concrete belief in and response will be better. Oh, I hasten to tell you that although I am doing this personally and unofficially, I have cleared with and received the permission to do so from the Sixth Army PIO (Public Information Office), as long as I do not obligate or embarrass the Government or the Defense Department or do not bring discredit upon the military service.

So this brings me to my request for help from you. Could or would you, after you are convinced yourself that you would be doing the most good for the most people, read the inclosed copy into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No; wait a minute, sir; it is not for the purpose of self aggrandizement or for desire of publicity for myself. It is for the purpose of getting as many people in the United States as possible to read and cooperate in my appeal and thus help the many thousands of men in the service by writing to them. I feel sure that if you could do this, and then call the press gallery's attention to it, their papers might pick up our appeal and reprint it in their columns. Then you and I could honestly feel that we had done something worth while for those GIs over there in a really unselfish manner. I'll forward the mail.

The reason I am appealing to you to do this is this: In the past as soon as I would receive a request from a serviceman overseas for mail from any particular section of the country I would write out the copy I am enclosing in this letter and mail it to the newspaper in his home town (but not mention his name, in order to avoid embarrassment to himself or his family), and then when or if mail from there came in I'd restamp it and forward it overseas. This has gotten to be too big and too expensive a procedure and thus I am appealing to you. And I honestly feel as though this concerns everyone, not just any one section or faction, in our country, and maybe they will wake up and stop forgetting the boys overseas and send them that all-important mail from home. Thank you and God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

SGT. WILBUR F. H. RADELINE.

How Good Is the Voice of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of a recent broadcast in which I participated on the subject of How Good Is the Voice of America?

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTER'S ROUND-UP: HOW GOOD IS THE VOICE OF AMERICA?

(Mutual Broadcasting System, March 15, 1951)

Guest speaker: Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota.

Moderator: Everett Holles.

Reporters: Frank R. Kent, Jr., Robert E. Burns, and Earl H. Richard.

Mr. RICHARD. Do you agree with the sentiment expressed by some Senators that control of the Voice of America should be taken from the State Department?

Senator MUNDT. No, I do not, Mr. Richard. What is meant—and I presume it is—that we should make that change at this time; but it seems to me, actually, this is about the poorest time that could be selected for taking the Voice of America program away from the State Department because that would necessitate the establishment of a new agency at once, the staffing of it, the manning and training of it and leave this country without any effective foreign information program for a hiatus of perhaps 90 or 120 days. What I have suggested in S. 731, now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is that we establish a sort of Hoover Commission to study the entire foreign information program, a commission of 12 outstanding Americans, 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats, to make findings and, on the basis of those recommendations, we would then make some changes in the Voice of America programs.

Mr. RICHARD. You would leave the Voice in the State Department until your commission would report.

Senator MUNDT. That's correct, and then I would be governed in large part by the findings of these 12 American experts.

Mr. RICHARD. Do you think the State Department's doing a good job with the Voice now?

Senator MUNDT. I think it is doing a good job. I don't think it's doing the best job that's possible. I think it's doing a considerably better job than it was 12 months ago, and an infinitely better job than it was 24 months ago.

Mr. RICHARD. To whom do you attribute that?

Senator MUNDT. I think largely to the fact that—and this is a point a great many of the public fail to understand—that it's not being run now simply as a sort of an adjunct of the State Department, but is actually run by a general manager, Charley Hulten, who, operating under the general authority of the Assistant Secretary of State, Ed Barrett, runs the thing administratively as a general manager precisely as it would have to be run if it were in any other department of the Government or handled by some private agency.

Mr. KENT. Senator, I've heard the argument made that if the Voice were taken out of the State Department much higher type, higher caliber men, could be attracted to the Voice as an independent agency than as would be within the State Department, where opportunities are much more limited.

Senator MUNDT. I've heard that argument, too, Mr. Kent, but I think it presupposes that if we take it away from the State Department you're going to turn it over to some private radio company, where, of course, in private industry salaries are higher than they are in Government. But no matter what agency you were going to give it to within the Government, the salary schedule would be precisely the same as that in the State Department, so I don't see how it could attract men of any higher caliber than they can attract them now under the guidance of the Department of State.

Mr. KENT. I've heard the ECA—the European—Economic Cooperation Administration—cited as an example of the men of high ability in business who have been attracted because of its independence as an agency.

Senator MUNDT. I think they have been attracted, not so much because of its independence but because of the hope that it's a temporary program, and you can get, as you know, fine people down here at a dollar a year for 1 or 2 or 3 years, but when it becomes a career proposition I don't think there would be any difference, regardless of which division of Government happened to manage the Voice of America program.

Mr. BURNS. Senator, you said the Voice of America is doing a better job than it did a few months ago. How do we know that? What evidence of it?

Senator MUNDT. We have some pretty concrete evidence, and let me quote you just one excerpt which I think is rather interesting, and that's no later than February 15, 1951. You know we monitor the programs of foreign radio stations, and that's one way we get some idea of the reaction foreign countries have to the Voice of America program. So, speaking over the Czechoslovakian radio on February 15, President Clement Gottwald said this—and I quote him—he said: "It is grievous that there are sons and daughters of Czech mothers who have staked their fortune on United States cards. Let me now warn all those who rather than listen to the voice of their hearts listen to the Voice of America."

Mr. BURNS. But, Senator, not many American taxpayers listen to the Czech radio. Isn't it on the part of the Voice of America that the American taxpayer doesn't know that?

Senator MUNDT. Well, you would never get from this particular Republican Senator a complaint that a Government agency has failed to have enough public relations officials to keep the taxpayers acquainted with what they're doing. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURNS. Isn't this rather a bipartisanship?

Senator MUNDT. Yes; it should be, but I rather congratulate the Department of State, at least the Voice of America section of the Department of State, on the fact that it is not spending a lot of money to tell Americans what they're doing overseas.

REPORTER. Do you know whether the Voice of America is effective in our allied friendly countries? What we see in the newspapers is mostly the stories of anti-American feeling. In Britain, for example, the last week or so.

Senator MUNDT. Well, I might suggest the fact that I talked to a traveler who had just come back from Turkey last week, and he said that all over Turkey the name of Marshall was much better known that the name of either Truman or Acheson. I said, How does that happen? Well, he said, they keep on hearing the Voice of America program about the Marshall plan, so apparently they are doing a pretty good job of telling the Turks, at least, and, I think, the people of other countries the fact that this Marshall plan aid does come from the United States, and that's part of the deal that we have in connection with the publicity program of this country—to make the foreign nations aware of the fact that when we contribute something to them for free, that it actually comes from the United States.

REPORTER. Wouldn't it be easier for you, as a Senator, and for the other Members of Congress, though, if the ordinary taxpayer got some concrete evidence along with his breakfast coffee that this program did have some effect?

Senator MUNDT. Yes; I think so, and I believe that, by and large, the newspaper and radio fraternity of this country—on their own, good private enterprise activities—have been telling the country what's been done by the Voice of America program. Certainly it's getting a much better press, and radio commentators are treating it more kindly than was true either 1 or 2 years ago. I would just hate to see the Department of State spending any of the taxpayers' money telling the taxpayers what a good job they think they're doing with the Voice of America program.

Mr. HOLLES. Senator MUNDT, I would like to get down to one of the real fundamentals of this thing. Just what are we trying to do with the Voice of America? Are we primarily trying to stir the Russian people to revolt?

Senator MUNDT. No, I think not, Mr. Holles. I think that insofar as we've broadcast behind the iron curtain, especially into Russia, we do it with the intent in mind of making the Russian people realize that our quarrel is with their leaders, and not with the people of Russia; that we recognize that many of the people of Russia are not Communists; that many of the people of Russia would like to own their own farms instead of work on collectivized farms; and that here, in America, when they listen to the Russian broadcasts talking about how we are constantly quarreling with Russia, that that quarrel is with a group of 14 men in the Kremlin in Moscow—the high command of the Communist Party—and not with the people of Russia.

Mr. HOLLES. Well what do we expect those Russian listeners to do about that situation though?

Senator MUNDT. We expect them to do a great many things which they can do. One of them very definitely is not to revolt at this time, but we do expect them to sort of soldier on the job, to slow down in the defense activities, to fail to respond to 5-year programs which would step up production on the farm and in the factories. We expect them, on occasion, as they have, to pull out of Russia and to escape to a free country and to come here so that we can learn from Russians who know what kind of defense establishments they're building behind the Urals and in the defense centers of Russia.

Mr. HOLLES. You say, Senator, that we're not asking them to revolt. But are we coming right out and asking them in plain and simple language to—well, that is, loaf on the job—to slow down.

Senator MUNDT. No, I think what our job primarily, Mr. Holles, is to drive a wedge of suspicion between the ordinary Russian mujik, the peasant, the workman, the shopkeeper, and the government gauleiter who goes around as one of the Communist high command, and if we can constantly keep in the minds of—say—a hundred and ninety of the hundred and ninety-five million Russians, a big suspicion that their politicians over there are not doing right by them—they'll think of their own ways of trying to get even with the Kremlin and the Communist command.

Mr. HOLLES. How are we going to impart that suspicion, though? Isn't it reasonable to believe that the Russians will have the same attitude toward our propaganda broadcast that we would have—say—in this country toward Russian propaganda?

Senator MUNDT. Not if we continue our present policy, which is to keep the broadcasts factual. What we try to do is to tell the truth about America in the conviction that the truth about America is better than any fiction that a Communist storybook writer could write about Russia, and if we establish credibility in the minds of the Russians, I think we have achieved a great deal. Now the reason it's easier to develop this suspicion on the part of the ordinary Russian against his government than it woud be for the Russians to develop that kind of suspicion in our country is that here, after all, the people elect the Government, they elect the President, they elect the Senators and the Representatives; but over there every Russian knows in his heart that when the Voice of America broadcast says to him, Look Ivan, you didn't have a chance to elect your officials and explain that to them, they'll say, "We were given a ballot with just one name on it. You had to either vote for that fellow or no one." They know we're telling them the truth, and that creates a suspicion in their minds.

Mr. RICHARD. Well, Senator, we're not telling them that in the broadcasts, are we?

Senator MUNDT. I don't know as to that particular statement, but we are talking directly to Ivan, we're talking directly to Tara, we're talking directly to the Russian people, and that kind of convinced the Communist leaders, of course, to change their particular political propaganda line.

Mr. RICHARD. Well, what concrete evidence, Senator, do we have that the program's getting through to the heart of the iron curtain, Russia, itself; do we have any?

Senator MUNDT. Yes; we have evidence just like I gave you from Czechoslovakia. We have, for example, the tangible evidence which comes from our monitoring stations, where we have discovered that the Russians are today devoting twice the number of man-hours toward jamming our programs and keeping them out of Russia as compared to the amount of man-hours we're devoting to put the programs into Russia, and the Russians wouldn't be doing that if it were not for the fact that without trying to jam them, too many Russians would be hearing too many Voice of America programs.

Mr. BURNS. Senator, Gen. Bedell Smith, the former Ambassador to Moscow, testified last summer before a subcommittee here that he thought the best way to approach the Russians was through the satellite countries and through the Russians who were stationed there. As I understood his testimony, he did not think the broadcast to Russia, itself, was the most effective way of reaching the Russian people.

Senator MUNDT. Well, I think we should all keep in mind, Mr. Burns, that when we're talking about the State Department foreign information program the Voice of America is just one litle segment of the program. As you know, I was the author of the so-called Voice of America Act, and I quite agree that radio is not necessarily the most important part. I think that if you can make contacts through information libraries, if you can make contacts by sending friendly people behind the iron curtain, and all of those contribute considerably to the goal which we have in mind, and all of those are part of this whole State Department information program—I am not trying to point out that radio alone is solely the best way to proceed. For that very reason I put all these other devices in my original legislation. They are there today.

Mr. BURNS. As I understood General Smith's testimony, though, it related entirely to radio in that respect. He did not, as I recall it, mention movies or information libraries or the other things.

Senator MUNDT. If his testimony is to the effect that it's easier to convince people in the satellite countries that the Politburo in Moscow is a bunch of rascals, I think that probably is true.

Mr. BURNS. That was one of his points. As I remember, he said, 50 percent of them knew about freedom.

Senator MUNDT. That's right. They've had some experience with freedom, whereas the people of Russia, generally, have had no experience in freedom at any time in their lives.

Mr. KENT. Senator, there has been some talk about a so-called Marshall plan of ideas in the propaganda field. What do you think about that?

Senator MUNDT. I think we have it. I think in the Voice of America program you have what is equivalent to a Marshall plan of ideas because we have good cooperative working conditions with BBC in Great Britain. We get splendid cooperation from Radio Luxemburg in Luxemburg. We have some cooperation, in varying degrees, from Italy and France. The Republic of Turkey is actually sending messages behind the iron curtain, which are much more to the point, and, I think, doing a better job than the Voice of America.

REPORTER. How?

Senator MUNDT. The Republic of Turkey has constant access to people who are freshly across the border, and frequently, they put them on the microphone. They broadcast in the Russian language to their Russian neighbors, but there is always quite a time lag, of course, between the time a Russian leaves Russia and gets over to this country so he can broadcast.

REPORTER. Is that financed by Turkey, itself, or by the Marshall plan?

Senator MUNDT. Well, like most European expenditures it's financed by the Government after they get the money from us! [Laughter.]

REPORTER. Isn't it true that we are largely on the defensive on the Voice of America? Russia makes the big lie, and then we come through and deny it and say its the big lie, and then we try to put the facts straight; but we are really on the defensive, aren't we, all the time?

Senator MUNDT. I think there is a lot of validity to that criticism, and it's one of the things I mentioned in my speech on the Senate floor when I suggested we establish a Hoover Commission to study the product of the Voice of America. Certainly, I would like to have them become much more positive and get off the defensive. I quote a few words here from the editorial in the New York Times of today, for example, which says—its heading is "Strengthening the Voice"—and the concluding paragraph is this: "But reputation by itself is not enough. The Voice of America must be an enthusiastic spokesman for the traditionally American way of life." I agree completely; we should get over on the positive to the greatest extent possible. On the other hand, we must never stop answering the slanderous falsehoods that the propagandists of Moscow continuously drill into the unsuspecting ears of the people of Europe.

REPORTER. Well, that's all very well, Senator. You speak of taking the offensive and getting off the defensive; but just how do you take the offensive? What do you tell them?

Senator MUNDT. You tell them the truth about America. You tell them what it means to have trial by jury. You tell them what it means to have freedom of religion and freedom of speech. You tell them what it means when you go to a polling place to have a choice between two or three or four candidates. You tell them what private ownership means, and the thrill that you get from farming your own piece of soil instead of the state's piece of soil. That's what I mean about getting on the affirmative.

REPORTER. Ah, that seems to me like that's still defensive. You're not a part of the Russian system, which, after all they're living under, when you're doing that.

Senator MUNDT. Well, that's what I would say instead of being positive would be a program of offense, and certainly I don't object to doing that. I think that you do that, however, more successfully if there's some subtlety in connection with it. I think if it becomes too obviously propaganda that you're not nearly as successful as if you plant these seeds of doubt and suspicion in the hearts of the people behind the iron curtain as against their government, giving them a sort of a feeling of homesickness for the days when they did have a chance to go to church, when they did have a chance for private ownership, when they did have a chance for freedom of speech. I think those in the long run are more effective than to simply engage in a cantankerous argument against the philosophical and theoretical practice of communism.

Mr. BURNS. Senator, this survey commission you're proposing, does that look to making the State Department information services a permanent agency?

Senator MUNDT. It is a completely objective study. I would select the 12 best Americans available to make that study—6 of them Democrats, 6 of them Republicans; 6 of them selected from public life in the executive and legislative branch of Government, 6 from private life in the field of radio and education and newspapers. And then I would tell them to make a complete analysis of what has been done, of the needs that we must supply, and to bring back recommendations as to where they think this instrumentality should best be housed, in the State Department or some place else.

REPORTER. You spoke a moment ago disparagingly of propaganda. How would you make an agency like this—or how would you keep an agency like this from becoming—a propaganda bureau?

Senator MUNDT. Simply by making it a showcase through which the rest of the world can look and see what's happening in America, without trying to color the truth or to gild the lily; simply letting them see us as we are.

Mr. RICHARD. Senator, before this program gets over I wanted to ask you, How do the people back in your home State of South Dakota regard the Voice of America program and your interest in it?

Senator MUNDT. Well, as you know, I was the author of the Voice of America bill when it passed the House—and it was during the Eightieth Congress—and cochairman of the committee along with Senator SMITH of New Jersey that took a group of Senators and Congressmen to Europe to study the needs for it over there, so that the legislation bears the name the Smith-Mundt Act. People back home certainly know of my interest in it, and I would say that, by and large, regardless of party affiliation, the people of South Dakota, and the Midwest generally, are supporters of the whole Voice of America and the conviction that the best way to attain peace is to cultivate and capture the minds of men in the countries of the world who might otherwise become our enemies.

REPORTER. Now, is your thinking on this typical of Republican thinking, particularly Midwest Republican thinking?

Senator MUNDT. I think so. I think it's typical of Midwest Republican thinking and pretty much typical of Midwest Democratic thinking, too; that midwesterners are generally inclined to believe that the spoken word is mightier than the sword, and that if we engage in an intelligent foreign policy, if we engage in the fine art of trying to win friends abroad, we're not as likely going to have a war and to kill each other off in a conflict.

Mr. KENT. Senator, a moment ago you spoke of propaganda. I gather that you would not like to see the Voice of America become an agency such as the British Broadcasting Co. that is in liaison with the Foreign Office but acts independently of them and I think is acknowledged to be one of the better propaganda instruments in the Western World.

Senator MUNDT. That's right. In the first place I don't want to see radio in this country run by the Government. I don't like the idea of the BBC situation because the whole radio network over there is a socialistic enterprise. In the second place, I believe that the State Department has acted wisely in bringing in as many private enterprises as they have who work in liaison with the State Department, preparing programs and writing scripts and helping to set up different kinds of programs. I think, from the standpoint of propaganda, that so long as we're not in a shooting war against a country we should continue to tell the truth. Once you're involved in a war, then you get into the field of psychological warfare, where anything goes that helps to win the conflict.

Mr. HOLLES. Senator MUNDT, you spoke a moment ago of the fact that our Voice of America broadcasts should be rather subtle. Russia has been rather successful in her propaganda around the world, particularly in the Far East, has she not?

Senator MUNDT. On the contrary, Russia has failed to take over a single country of the world by the volition of the people in that country——

REPORTER'S VOICE. That's not by any means subtle, is it?

Senator MUNDT. No; she has made her conquest by conspiracy, by intrigue, and by aggression. What we're trying to do is appeal to the minds of men, and I don't want it [Voice program] to develop a degree of subtlety so that the fellow of average intelligence can't understand it; but neither do I want it to become so blunt that anybody up and down the highway will recognize that as obviously being western propaganda.

MODERATOR. Thank you, gentlemen. Three prize-winning questions from the listening audience are to be selected. Senator MUNDT will answer the three questions.

Question from Oliver V. Kessler, of Stroudsburg, Va.: The Voice of America recently devoted a 15-minute program to dog cemeteries in the United States, telling of $500 funerals and $1,000 tombstones for dogs. Is that the way to sell democracy?

Senator MUNDT. I wouldn't think that would be the best way to sell democracy, Mr. Holles, but I don't see anything particularly wrong with letting the rest of the world know that over here we do consider that a man's best friend is his dog, and that we are willing to pay some tribute to the dog. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLES. From Joseph K. Kidder, of La Crosse, Wis.: If the Voice of America used Senator MCCARTHY's charges against the State Department on its broadcasts, would it raise or lower this country's prestige with the people whom we're trying to influence?

Senator MUNDT. I think that would depend in part, of course, upon the auditors in the country that we're trying to influence. I am confident, however, that it would raise the prestige of the Voice of America programs from the standpoint of their credibility because they would recognize that the State Department was willing to broadcast information which obviously was unpleasant to the members of the State Department.

Mr. HOLLES. From David E. Ferrin, of Johnstown, R. I.: It's been said that one of the Voice of America's main faults is that it overemphasizes the material wealth of America. Is this true?

Senator MUNDT. I think that that is a pretty valid criticism, and that frequently in the past we have tended to place too much emphasis upon the fact that every American can be riding in an automobile at the same time, and that a great many Americans have electrical refrigeration in their kitchens and have central heat in their homes, and there's constantly the necessity of analyzing and appraising these programs to gear them down to the type of civilization in which our listeners are living—talking about conveniences and comforts which they may some day hope to have right in their own locality and in their own foreign cities.

Tribute to the Late Edgar Rickard by Belgian American Educational Foundation, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the 21st day of January last, there died in San Francisco one of America's leading citizens. Mr. Edgar Rickard, who was closely identified with former President Hoover during Mr. Hoover's entire life and public career, and was a symbol of cooperative action that meant much to the United States at the time of World War I and the periods between World War I and World War II.

As one of the originators, with Mr. Hoover, of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, which saved the Belgian people in World War I, Mr. Rickard continued to be the rallying voice for all the important educational and relief work that followed World War I in Belgium and other countries of Europe. During his entire life Mr. Rickard had a devoted group of friends, many of whom have been active since World War I in public life.

As Edgar Rickard's principal activity was the Belgian American Educational Foundation, which was set up after the close of World War I, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the minutes of that Foundation on the occasion of Mr. Rickard's death, and the resolution adopted at a special meeting held in New York City on January 23.

There being no objection, the minutes and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Belgian American Educational Foundation announced the death of its chairman, Edgar Rickard, in San Francisco on January 21, 1951. Mr. Rickard had been an original incorporator in 1920, and successively secretary, vice president, president, and chairman of the foundation.

Mr. Rickard was a retired mining engineer who had practiced his profession in the United States, Alaska, Tasmania, and Mexico from 1896 to 1905, when he became a publisher of mining journals in San Francisco and in London.

With the outbreak of World War I he joined with his fellow Californian, Herbert Hoover, in the organization and management of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, which continued until the end of active operations in 1919. This Commission was the first large-scale relief effort in wartime, and its operations set a standard for later relief work in subsequent years and in many countries.

With the entry of the United States into the war in 1917 Mr. Rickard joined the newly organized United States Food Administration, serving as Assistant Administrator in 1918 and Acting Food Administrator in 1918–19. He was active in the work of the American Relief Administration during the armistice and postwar periods and was a member of the Purchasing Commission for Russian Relief in 1921–22 by appointment of the President. This Commission purchased wheat, corn, and other grains valued at over $18,000,000 in this country for use in the Russian famine areas where the distribution was supervised by the American Relief Administration.

Mr. Rickard was active in a number of postwar relief and welfare organizations in association with Mr. Hoover, but he held no official Government office during Mr. Hoover's years of public service other than that mentioned above.

A special meeting of the Belgian American Educational Foundation was called on January 23, 1951, to take appropriate action. At the meeting were Herbert Hoover, honorary chairman; Perrin C. Galpin, president; Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission; John L. Simpson, financier; W. Hallam Tuck, formerly Director of International Refugee Organization; Maurice Pate, Director of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund; Sidney A. Mitchell, former associate in the Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government; Scott Turner, mining engineer; Edwin P. Shattuck, attorney; and Clark Stillman, secretary of the foundation. Absent due to official duties was United States Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

The resolution adopted at that special meeting was as follows:

"RESOLUTION ON EDGAR RICKARD

"*Resolved*, That the members of the executive and finance committees of the Belgian American Educational Foundation, assembled in a special joint meeting in New York City on January 23, 1951, hereby record their deep sense of loss at the death of Edgar Rickard, chairman of the board of directors, on January 21, 1951, in San Francisco, Calif.

"At this meeting the following minute was approved and entered on the permanent records of the foundation:

"A member of the Commission for Relief in Belgium from its inception in October

1914, our friend and associate, Edgar Rickard, gave continuous devoted and loyal service to the work of the Commission and its successor organization, the Belgian American Educational Foundation, during more than 36 years until his death. In addition Mr. Rickard served as Mr. Hoover's chief aide and assistant in the United States Food Administration and the American Relief Administration during World War I and all the overseas and war service organizations and their successor associations that followed. No one gave greater fullness of devotion to his chief and to the operations of these service organizations—no one gave more of himself to aid his friends and to help young men and women advance to positions of trust and responsibility. He gave such inspiration to men and women that his associates responded with their best efforts to further any undertaking with which they were concerned. His sound practical judgment and his true modesty combined with his personal charm made him a delightful companion and a valued friend.

"Devoted to his country, to his profession, to his friends, he lived a full life and his passing will be mourned by all whose paths crossed him during his active and rewarding life."

Overloading of Commercial Trucks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Interstate Commerce Commissioner James K. Knudson, the head of the Defense Transportation Administration, shocked the Nation 2 weeks ago when he invited State officials to approve the overloading of commercial trucks in the name of national defense. Just how many crimes are to be committed in the sacred name of national defense?

Every schoolboy knows that overloaded trucks traveling at high speeds are destroying American highways faster than we can build them. The State highway departments are bleeding the passenger-car motorists white to get money to build good highways. The motorists do not object to these high taxes, because they know that building good highways is directly in the interest of national defense in a very important degree. But it is pretty discouraging to them to build good highways for Mr. Knudson to destroy by arbitrary and unwarranted bureaucratic orders from his Ivory Dome Room in Washington.

I hope the States will resist this selfish conspiracy to destroy our greatest national defense asset. Surely truck lines do not want to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs for them. No one should be more active in protecting the highways than they.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by James Daniel which appeared in the Washington Daily News today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO LET'S CHANGE THE RULES—DTA CONSULTANT'S FIRM VIOLATED LAW 665 TIMES

(By James Daniel)

John L. Fraley, adviser to James K. Knudson, head of the Defense Transportation Administration (DTA), is on leave from a trucking firm which has been caught in 665 violations of Virginia's truck weight laws.

Mr. Fraley was assistant to the president of the Carolina Freight Carriers Corp. of Cherryville, N. C. Now he is "consultant on street and highway maintenance" to Mr. Knudson.

And Mr. Knudson, as head of the DTA, recently wrote to all State governors urging, for the sake of national defense, that they ease up on their truck weight laws in order to speed up the movement of truck cargo.

Mr. Fraley was one of three DTA officials present when the letter was discussed. The others were Mr. Knudson and Joseph E. Keller, an attorney who is advising Mr. Knudson on removal of "trade barriers."

DISCUSSED LETTER

Mr. Keller said that he wrote the letter and discussed it in his home with Mr. Knudson and Mr. Fraley.

J. A. Anderson, chief of the Virginia highway department, said Mr. Fraley's company had been caught 665 times since 1940 with trucks loaded above the legal limits.

Violations since the war accounted for 496 of the offenses.

ONLY A FRACTION

Mr. Anderson said since only a fraction of the trucks passing through Virginia in that period were stopped and weighed, so the total of 665 overloads may not have been all.

Mr. Fraley came to work in Washington in January.

He said his title as consultant on street and highway maintenance had been misunderstood. "I just deal with the maintenance of vehicles using the streets and highways," he said. "I advise Mr. Knudson on things he wants to be advised on."

Mr. Fraley said he met his Government boss last September while serving as his host at a North Carolina truckers convention. About that time Mr. Knudson, an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, was appointed to perform the transportation duties arising from the Defense Production Act. By his own decree, Mr. Knudson then created the Defense Transportation Administration, with himself as head.

KEPT HIM COMFORTABLE

The head of the company for which Mr. Fraley worked was also president of the North Carolina Truckers Association.

"Four or five of us were assigned to kind of keep Mr. Knudson comfortable," Mr. Fraley recalled.

Mr. Fraley said the next thing he knew, he was invited to come join Mr. Knudson's staff. "I didn't ask for the job," he said.

Mr. Fraley, who is 30, rose from a private to captain in World War II and later started a knitwear business in North Carolina. He gave that up and went to Germany to manage a hotel for the occupation forces. In 1949 he joined the trucking firm as a salesman and traffic generator.

BASED IN STATE

Many big east coast trucking firms are headquartered in North Carolina, which has milder truck laws than some other States. Recently a move in the North Carolina Legislature to bring the State's code into line with Virginia's and the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway Officials was stalled by a telegram from Mr. Knudson.

Virginia Highway Director Anderson is currently head of the American Association of State Highway Officials, which is leading a fight against the DTA. The highway officials say the DTA is trying to break down the enforcement of State truck laws. Mr. Anderson said he now has round-the-clock weighing stations on four of the five main north-south routes and occasional weighing stations at 40 other Virginia points.

PRIVATE CARS WATCH

He said the truckers have private cars traveling the State highways at all times spotting the weighing points and warning truck drivers up and down the line. Many filling stations and roadside restaurant operators also warn truckers of weighing operations. Not long ago a State highway employee was suspected of being bribed to give out weighing schedules a week in advance. He was dismissed.

Mr. Anderson said individual truck drivers now are assisting the enforcement program. He said his department recently was telephoned by a driver for a Carolina concern that he was coming in with a 72,000-pound load (Virginia maximum for a four-axle truck is 50,000) and was tired of being told to travel back roads at night. The driver spilled the employing company's entire plan of operations, producing a fresh haul of violators.

Common Sense Versus Legalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that most of my colleagues are familiar with the excellent work performed by the Washington staff of the Christian Science Monitor, a great international daily newspaper. Day after day this bureau, like its counterparts elsewhere, reports clearly and quite objectively on the great events of our Nation's Capital.

There may be times when we disagree with specific editorial views of the Monitor, but I doubt that there is any Senator who questions the refreshing, constructive approach which this newspaper takes in both domestic and foreign affairs.

At times the Monitor has disagreed with me personally, at times it has agreed, but throughout my entire period in the Congress I have always read it with respect and with tremendous interest.

I have a copy of an article entitled "Common Sense Versus Legalism," written in the Tuesday, March 20, issue, by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch, chief of the Washington bureau. This article endorses my interpretation of the basic questions at stake in the present foreign-policy debate.

I am grateful for that endorsement, not so much because it relates to me personally, but rather because I think it helps focus attention, as many of us have sought to do, on the actual points at issue.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Harsch's article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

COMMON SENSE VERSUS LEGALISM

WASHINGTON.—One of our quieter and less talkative Senators, ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, deserves credit, I think, for listening to others present their dialectical points through long weeks of debate over the troops-to-Europe issue and coming out finally with a reduction of the problem to common sense.

The legal issue, he points out, is not over whether the President has power to send troops to Europe. It is, rather, over whether the President has the power under the North Atlantic Treaty to put American forces into an international army under an international commander without the consent of the Congress.

The issue goes back to article 3 of the treaty. The article pledges that the United States and other signatories "separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack."

Under the Constitution, Senator WILEY points out, a treaty is binding on the United States as law. It takes precedence over domestic laws. The North Atlantic Treaty has been ratified by the Senate. It is, therefore, the law of the land.

If article 3 had obligated the United States specifically to commit its troops to an international army to be set up under the treaty, then the President would have not only the right but the obligation to send American troops to such an army. However, the treaty was not explicit as to details of implementation. The furthest it goes is to "require" the signatories to "develop" their "collective capacity to resist armed attack."

Some supporters of the President contend that this requirement to develop "collective capacity to resist armed attack" is in itself sufficient not only to permit but even to require the President to send more troops to Europe. However, this is a matter of interpretation.

And it is a fact that in the debates over the treaty spokesmen for the administration declared that the sending of United States ground troops to Europe was not contemplated. Therefore, the decision to increase the number of United States troops in Europe and to put them under an international command goes beyond what Congress contemplated at the time it ratified the treaty.

There is no doubt about the constitutional power of the President to send United States Armed Forces outside the United States. Senator WILEY pointed out that not once in the entire debate has anyone criticized the President for sending United States naval and Air Forces to many places outside the United States. He makes the point also that if the President ordered American ground troops to Germany to implement the occupation there could not be the slightest basis for legal protests.

As Commander in Chief, the President can send American Armed Forces anywhere he chooses. However, Congress also has the power to strangulate such a policy by withholding appropriations.

The nub of the question, therefore, is untouched either by the constitutional power of the President to send troops where he deems it necessary, or of the Congress to check the President by withholding appropriations if it disagrees with the President's action. It is touched by the question of duties under the Atlantic treaty.

Without that treaty there could be no legal or valid North Atlantic army under General Eisenhower's command. The only valid legal question is over the President's right to commit American forces to that command. Doubt about that question will be removed if the Senate approves the pending resolutions. Those resolutions will not have the force of law. But they will express congressional approval of what the President intends to do.

What emerges from the debate, therefore, will not be an agreement between President and Congress on respective authority. It rather will be Congress challenging the right of the President to act alone, but approving what he is doing; while the President will be denying the right of Congress to interfere, but happily accepting a resolution approving what he is doing.

There will be no resolution of the irresolvable constitutional issue. There will be agreement, in effect, on the course to be taken.

Regulation of Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent statement submitted by the American Jewish Congress to the Joint Committee on Immigration in regard to two pending omnibus bills under consideration by the joint committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS ON THE MCCARRAN-WALTER OMNIBUS IMMIGRATION BILLS (S. 716 AND H. R. 2379) SUBMITTED TO JOINT SENATE-HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The American Jewish Congress is an association of American Jews committed to the preservation and extension of the democratic way of life and to the assurance of the fundamental freedoms of man through the elimination of all forms of political, social, and economic discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin. Our concern with the nature of the immigration laws of this country is rooted both in our general concern with the quality of American democracy and the nature of our organization.

The immigration laws of any society both reflect and shape its fundamental character. Freedom of movement, both of emigration and immigration, have long been recognized as among the most fundamental of human freedoms; it is the hallmark of totalitarianism that it seeks rigidly to limit the free movement of people. It seeks to deny its own subjects the freedom to live elsewhere. It seeks to deny to others access to its soil or any contact with its peoples. Conversely, it is the very essence of democracy that people should be free to choose where they wish to live or those with whom they prefer to associate.

Immigration laws crystallize and express a society's basic human values, for they deal with our relationship to people other than our immediate neighbors. Such laws affirm the degree of our acceptance or rejection of the essential equality of all human beings. They codify our prejudices or our freedom from prejudice. They reveal the measure of correspondence between our professed ideals and our actual practices. Because the American Jewish Congress is profoundly concerned with the maintenance and reaffirmation of our democratic heritage, we are inevitably concerned with the character of our immigration legislation.

Our concern, however, is rooted as well in the particular character of our organization. The American Jewish Congress was founded more than 30 years ago by men who, like the late Stephen Wise, were born in lands other than the United States or who, like the late Justice Louis Brandeis were the descendants of immigrants to these shores. We take deep pride in the contributions which such men have made to the enrichment of American life and freedom; we are gratified that our movement has steadfastly and, we believe, significantly, served and helped to fashion America's highest ideals. That unique and intimate experience has strengthened our adherence to, and enables us to testify to the validity of, the most fundamental of American tenets: that a person's loyalty and service to America and its principles are measured by his character and ideals rather than determined by his biological or geographic origin.

The American Jewish Congress regards it as highly desirable that the proposed codification of our basic immigration laws set forth in the McCarran-Walter bills should be made the occasion for a comprehensive revaluation of our immigration laws. Indeed, such revaluation is long overdue. There has been no systematic consideration of our basic immigration policies since 1911 when the Immigration Commission created by Congress concluded its 4-year study (S. Doc. 758, 61st Cong., 3d sess.). A great deal has happened in America and the world since that time. We have learned that democracy cannot remain static and maintain its vitality. We have come to understand the subtle and devious methods through which democracy can be corrupted and undermined, even unwittingly. We have acquired new responsibilities in a world of nations. It is therefore mandatory that we examine the concepts at the heart of our immigration policies for the past quarter of a century to see whether they adequately express the democratic principles it is the duty of this country to affirm and to practice and to ascertain whether the proposed legislation conforms to such principles.

What has been our basic immigration policy? That policy, enacted in 1924, has become known as the national origins quota system. Under its provisions, a total of about 150,000 people was to be admitted to this country each year, with a maximum quota fixed for each country. Exceptions were made of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, to which no numerical limitations were attached and most Asiatic countries whose inhabitants were in effect completely barred from admission. Quotas were to range from 100 to 65,000 (the latter the quota for Great Britain) and each country's quota was based on the percentage of persons of that national origin resident in the United States in 1920.

That formula was no legislative accident. It was deliberately designed to limit the number of immigrants from South and East Europe and to encourage the immigration of Englishmen, Irishmen, and Germans. The theory on which it rested was compounded of bigotry and ignorance—that people from certain lands, particularly Great Britain and Germany, possessed hereditary qualities which made them highly desirable additions to our population, while others were less desirable because they were likely because of their national origin to prove less assimilable.

There was thus enacted into American law a racist concept based on what the minority report of the Immigration Commission at that time correctly termed "an unfounded anthropological concept."

No scientific evidence worthy of consideration was introduced at the time to support that racist theory. It was clear then, and men like Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes and Rabbi Stephen Wise emphasized the fact, that the racist concept which was elevated to the status of law, flagrantly violated the fundamental principles of American democracy. America's most distinctive and creative contribution to the world has not been the automobile or the radio, the atom bomb, or even the television screen. It has been the affirmation of the basic equality of all human beings, an affirmation whose increasing translation into law and public practice has constituted America's greatness. The eloquent affirmation of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" was never intended to be translated as "all Americans" or "all Anglo-Saxons." It expressed the cardinal democratic belief that all persons were to be regarded as equally capable of intelligence, freedom, and social usefulness, that every individual could claim the right to be judged on his own merits. The immigration policy enacted in 1924 was a repudiation of that doctrine, for it asserted that persons in quest of the opportunity to live in this land were to be judged according to breed like cattle at a country fair and not on the basis of their character, fitness, or capacity.

Scientific study and social experience have surely withered those racist fictions with the finality of an atomic blast. The findings of science must force even the most prejudiced among us to accept as unqualifiedly as we do the law of gravity that intelligence, morality, and character bear no relationship whatever to geography or place of birth. Mental or moral characteristics cannot be associated with race, however broadly or narrowly that dubious concept is interpreted, or with national origin. It is highly paradoxical, to say the least, that America, which prides itself on its loyalty to the dictates of scientific knowledge and discovery, should continue to base so significant a portion of its legal and legislative structure on foundations thoroughly and irrevocably corroded by scientific finding.

Social experience, no less than scientific study, reinforces that conclusion. The experience of two wars has amply demonstrated that no national group can claim a monopoly on loyalty to America and to its ideals; people of all national origins have contributed inspiringly to its defense and to its enrichment. Indeed, time has made nonsense out of that 1924 policy, even in its own terms. It may not be without interest to remind ourselves that a land whose inhabitants were in 1924 regarded as among the most desirable acquisitions to America ushered in the most devastating war in human history, murdered millions of people in fulfillment of its own racist doctrine, and sought to wipe democracy and human freedom off the face of the globe.

The laboratory which is this Nation itself has offered the most persuasive rebuttal of the 1924 doctrine. America's richness has not been merely our material resources, amply endowed though we are. It has been, even more, our diversity of peoples and cultures and our unique ability to fashion a creative national unity out of that diversity. That has proved to be our strength as well as our richness. Totalitarianism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction through the mechanical uniformity it seeks to impose, for imposed uniformity must ultimately result in social and human degeneration. Uniformity can emerge not only from legal or physical coercion, but as a result of rigidly limiting the human resources on which we should be free to draw. The "American type" has not been nourished at a single fount; it has drawn from many springs, and it must continue to draw from many springs if it is to be enriched—indeed, if it is to remain healthy.

Our knowledge and experience, as well as our historic traditions, therefore should have long made mandatory the abrogation of the national origins system as the basis of our immigration policy. Both the moral imperative and the practical necessity of bringing our national practices into conformity with our democratic professions should have required the formulation of an alternative approach such as we shall later suggest.

Unfortunately, neither the McCarran bill (S. 716) nor the Walter bill (H. R. 2379) make any such effort. Both measures merely tinker with the application of the 1924 doctrine. But they accept that doctrine wholly and unreservedly and would leave untouched in our law a racial anachronism that blemishes our national record. They would, in effect, reaffirm the 1924 repudiation of our fundamental democratic concept. They would reveal that we have learned nothing in a quarter of a century, that our prejudices have remained untarnished by the light of knowledge. They would retain the qualifications which the act of 1924 introduced into the Declaration of Independence.

Such action, under any circumstances, would scarcely do this country credit. Under present conditions, the enactment of such measures will gravely impair the national effort we are putting forth. For we are engaged in a war for the minds and hearts of men. The free nations of the world look to us not only for material aid and armed might. They turn to us for moral and spiritual reinforcement at a time when the faith which moves men is as important as the force they wield. Our responsibilities of world leadership require us not to reassert our moral errors but to expunge them. We seek to embrace the world in a companionship of free peoples, demanding as a qualification nothing more than a common abhorrence of authoritarianism. We cannot expect such companionship to be freely and eagerly given if we announce that we continue to repudiate more than half the human race, as we repudiated it in 1924, on no grounds other than geography and national origin.

These bills, however, go beyond even the retention of the national origins system. They continue to base the national quotas on the 1920 census, ignoring any changes since that date in the composition of the American population. They thus affirm, with emphasis, the spurious anthropology and the genuine prejudice of the 1924 act.

Even within these limitations, they would more rigorously limit entry to this country by the provisions they embody. Both propose a restrictive system of priorities for the distribution of visas to prospective immigrants. The McCarran bill provides that 50 percent of the visas under any national quota be allocated to persons whose technological proficiency or special skills are urgently needed in the United States, while the Walter bill suggests an allocation of 30 percent to such persons. Thus, for a very substantial number of persons who might enter this country, there is added to the existing qualification of national origin, a new qualification, that of exceptional skill. The basic motivation of our immigration system is thus transformed from its life-giving and life-saving quality into a device for extracting maximum industrial benefit from our immigrant potential. It is, of course, unchallengeable that such skilled persons will constitute a valuable addition to our population. But it is difficult to escape the conviction that restriction of entry rather than the entry of skilled persons is the dominant purpose, certainly of the McCarran bill. For, if the 50-percent quota allocated to skilled personnel is not used, those visas cannot be used for other immigrants, even of the same national origin.

While there are other restrictive provisions in these measures, we do not intend to dwell on them in detail. We do, however, wish emphatically to point out that certain sections of S. 716 and H. R. 2379 embody, in addition to the quota provisions, racist features repugnant to our traditions of equality. Under section 202 (a) of both bills, an alien born within the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle and an alien born outside that triangle but attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle is chargeable to the quota of the country of his ancestry or, if no such quota exists, to the special Asia-Pacific quota of 100 whose establishment is proposed. This section represents a slight measure of advance in that it extends quota visas, however limited in number, to Asiatic countries for the first time. The advance is more than cancelled out, however, by the fact that the section applies a far harsher test to those who originate from the triangle. Here eligibility is required to be determined not by place of birth but by blood and ancestry. We are thus in effect announcing to the millions of inhabitants of that area that we are continuing arbitrarily to attach an onus to their racial identity and that, as far as this country is concerned, they will never escape that onus, no matter to what ends of the earth they or their children may migrate. That section canonizes a primitive and irrational belief that character and capacity are functions of blood and ancestry. At a time when Asia has become the battleground on which democracy and communism vie for the loyalties of millions of men, the enactment of such a discriminatory and primitivist measure would represent for us a defeat more calamitous than a reversal on the field of battle. That defeat would not be rendered more endurable or less catastrophic because it would have been self-invited and self-inflicted.

In addition to these racist provisions, both measures reflect a hostility, unconscious or otherwise, toward immigrants and naturalized citizens, a grudging reluctance to accept the alien as a full-fledged member of the American community and an inclination to interpose barriers in the path of his total and ultimate acceptance. That attitude is clearly revealed in section 312 of the proposed bills which, unlike earlier immigration laws, provides that petitioners for naturalization must be able to read and write as well as to speak the English language. In the light of the successful naturalization of hundreds of thousands of immigrants who were admitted to citizenship on showing that they understood English without being required to demonstrate their ability to read or write it, this section becomes an arbitrary and unnecessary withholding of the privilege of citizenship from deserving residents. For many, if not the majority of, immigrants are adults, relatively advanced in years, and it has long been acknowledged that writing, particularly, is a skill difficult to acquire in adulthood. Nor can such a provision be defended as serving the best interests of this country. The media of mass communication, the multilanguage press of this country make it fully possible for anyone to familiarize himself with our political and social problems without requiring the ability to write. The provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 requiring as qualifications for naturalization only the ability to understand and to speak English are fully adequate.

Sections 103 and 104 of the McCarran bill, requiring that the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Administrator of the Bureau of Passports, Visas, Security, and Consular Affairs shall be native-born citizens of the United States are gratuitously insulting and offensive not only to all naturalized citizens, but to all Americans who recognize no gradations in citizenship or any automatic category of unreliables. This provision introduces a concept of second-class citizenship abhorrent to American tradition and principle. H. R. 2379 contains no comparable provision.

One other provision of both bills similiarly attempts to relegate naturalized citizens to an inferior status by depriving them of rights accorded native citizens. Section 352 (a) (2) continues the discriminatory expatriation clause of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 which makes mandatory loss of nationality by a naturalized citizen who resides continuously for 5 years in any foreign state, although native-born citizens may reside anywhere for any length of time without penalty. This section, as the American Jewish Congress pointed out in a brief in the case of *Lapides v. Clark*, submitted to the United States Supreme Court, derives directly from a bureaucratic antagonism to American Jews supporting the Zionist ideal of the rebuilding of a Jewish homeland. Testimony by Government officials at the hearings on the section which ultimately became section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act made it clear that the provision stemmed from a desire to dissuade naturalized American Jews from subscribing to a deeply held ideal which some officials in contravention of American policy regarded as undesirable rather than from an effort to deter or punish the commission of fraudulent or illegal acts. To the extent that this statute is directed at narrowing freedoms belonging to American citizens, it constitutes an unwarranted invasion of those rights which indisputably belong to all citizens, whether native born or naturalized. It should be repealed.

The American Jewish Congress, therefore, urges the rejection of the omnibus bills under consideration because they retain the national origins system of 1924, based then on prejudice and ignorance and based today, in defiance of all scientific knowledge, on prejudice alone. We further urge their rejection because they incorporate provisions restrictive even within the national-origins system, because they introduce new concepts of racism and because they seek, in certain respects, to deny to naturalized Americans the full rights and privileges of citizenship.

This public reexamination of our immigration policies will render useful service to America if it prevents the enactment of the two measures now being considered. But we should regard it as an error, possibly less serious than the enactment of these measures but scarcely less lamentable, if this reexamination failed to result in the formulation of a new immigration policy superseding the national origins quota system.

It has long been our view that such a system can be formulated which is in full conformity with our democratic principles and which is politically and administratively practicable. Nor are we advocating, whatever our views on present numerical limitations on entry into this country, the reestablishment of the earlier American practice of free and unrestricted admission. A system consonant with democratic traditions can be established within the framework of whatever numerical limits may at any time govern the rate of entry. Thus, for example, existing laws provide for an annual issuance of slightly more than 150,000 visas per year. Assuming the maintenance of that limitation for the present time, full and adequate safeguards exist to prevent the kind of abuse which it is sometimes suggested would follow the abolition of the national origins system. The laws provide minimum conditions for admission with regard to the health, financial support, loyalty, and moral qualifications of the prospective immigrants. These laws provide ample assurance that persons mentally, politically, or morally unfit would not be permitted to enter.

We can therefore find no substantial reason for refusal to adopt a plan which would make the total number of visas apportionable to all quota countries available to immigrants in order of their applications without distinction as to place of birth, subject to their ability to satisfy all other eligibility requirements. Such a plan would constitute the most direct and effective method of expunging from our immigration laws the inequities, implied prejudices, and racial connotations of the national origins system. Individual character, need, and merit, rather than geography or biology, would once again become the factors governing admission to this country. The result, as we have indicated, need not necessarily be a greater volume of immigration, but it would certainly produce more equitable immigration.

Nor would this system present any insuperable administrative difficulties. The present British quota, for example, is 65,000 per year. Within that quota, nonpreference visas are issued on the basis of priority in filing, and there have obviously been no insurmountable difficulties in the administration of that quota. There is no reason why it should not be equally feasible to administer a system based on priority of application for a total number of visas slightly more than twice the size of the British quota.

Within such a system, it is equally feasible to establish certain limited preferences and priorities for such categories as near relatives of citizens or legal residents of the United States and victims of racial, religious, or political persecution, preferences whose purpose and effect would not be restrictive but, on the contrary, would constitute a fulfillment of the humanitarian character of immigration. To give even greater flexibility to the program, emergency situations could be handled by Executive order creating special priorities within the nonpreference classes.

We are not naive enough to believe that abolition of the national origins system will prove an easy task. Its acceptance as an integral part of our national pattern is reflected by the fact that none of the legislation under consideration suggests its modification, let alone its elimination. On the contrary, these measures seek to impose further rigidities and inequities in its operation. Thus, vital legislation rooted deeply in antidemocratic concepts and prejudice can become deeply embedded in our national consciousness, affecting not only the areas of social concern it is intended to regulate but corrupting thought and practice over widening areas of our national life.

During the course of these hearings, certain suggestions will be made by spokesmen for major national Jewish organizations for the amelioration of some of the harshest consequences of the national origins system. While, in our view, these suggestions leave the heart of the problem untouched, we fully associate ourselves with them. One of the most unfortunate aspects of the existing system is that visas assigned to a particular country which are unused by the end of the year cannot be utilized for any other persons. Thus, a staggering number of quota places theoretically available for immigrants have been unused and lost each year. While only 856,085 quota immigrants were admitted to this country between 1930-49, it is estimated that 2,940,160 quota members supposedly available during that period were lost. (S. Rept. No. 1515, p. 690.) That has occurred not because of a dearth of qualified immigrant applicants throughout the world but because the national origins plan, through its own system of gerrymandering, provided the largest quotas for countries with the least pressure for migration.

We therefore fully endorse the proposal that a pooling system be established whereby unused quota numbers will be distributed on a nonnational basis, either in accordance with priority of filing or some secondary system of priorities. While this pooling system would fail to erase the racist overtones of the national origins plan, it would help relax some of its most objectionable effects and introduce, in somewhat limited form, the allocation of visas without reference to national origin or place of birth.

Under a pooling arrangement, preferred status might be granted, as we have suggested earlier, to victims of persecution, close relatives of citizens or residents or persons with special occupational qualifications. A bill incorporating these suggestions was introduced in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress (S. 2550). That measure provided for the pooling of unused national quota visas and the allocation of 25 percent to skilled specialists, 25 percent for the purpose of reuniting families, 25 percent for persecutees, and 25 percent for a nonpreference class in order of the registration of applicants. Enactment of such a measure is surely the least which any body reexamining our immigration policies and procedures may reasonably be expected to recommend.

The growth of the American ideal has been the record of the triumph of great ideas over small men. At various times in our history, men of limited vision have sought to interpose barriers in the path of the fulfillment of the promise of American democracy. Occasionally, they have had momentary victories. But they have proved unable to withstand, for any appreciable period of time, the dynamic of the idea that is America. Probably no success they have achieved, however, has been more fateful or long-lived than the enactment of the national origins quota system in 1924 when bigotry replaced knowledge and the justice of humanitarianism gave way to the expediency of prejudice in a significant area of American life and law.

The acceptance of American leadership throughout the world during the past few decades has been a tribute not to the growth of American might; other powerful nations have failed to win such leadership. It has been, rather, a tribute to the strength of the American idea. Impairment of that idea will inevitably mean impairment of our capacity, if not limitation of our right, to give such moral leadership. Such impairment is serious enough when it occurs in any aspect of our national life. But it becomes critical when, as in the present instance, it affects our relationship and expresses our attitude to our fellow human beings throughout the world. The national origins system of 1924 was such an impairment. Its continuance for a quarter of a century has sharpened, rather than dulled, its impact. Its reaffirmation today would be more than an impairment; it would constitute a political and moral catastrophe.

Today, we seek to rally nations of the world to the cause of democracy and freedom through the Voice of America. We firmly believe that the soul of America would serve to rally the peoples of the world more spontaneously and effectively. And nothing could more dramatically reveal the genuine soul of America than the abrogation of the national origins quota system of 1924, so offensive to millions of the people whose partnership and cooperation we are seeking in order to maintain inviolate the ideals on which this country has been built.

Boss of Army Base Here Calls Borough Tops for Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Brooklyn has proudly proclaimed the accomplishments of many of its native sons. We are just as proud when we can proclaim the accomplishments of men who have come to Brooklyn from other places.

On March 18, 1951, the Brooklyn Eagle chose Brig. Gen. Edward H. Lastayo as "Brooklyn's man of the week." It was an excellent choice. General Lastayo has done a remarkable job at the New York Port of Embarkation in Brooklyn. He is highly respected by all who have come in contact with him.

As he says, he likes Brooklyn; on behalf of Brooklyn, I am glad to say that Brooklyn likes him.

The following is the article about him as it appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle.

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—BOSS OF ARMY BASE HERE CALLS BOROUGH TOPS FOR LIVING

(By Jeanne Toomey)

Brig. Gen. Edward H. Lastayo, commander of the New York Port of Embarkation, including the Brooklyn Army Base, has seen the world, but he still ranks Brooklyn tops as a place to live.

Ask why he was selected for West Point from the New Jersey National Guard in July of 1918, he will answer mildly, "On the basis of service."

"Hard work, not romance," is the way he sums up 34 years of military duty.

A handsome, quiet-spoken man of 53, General Lastayo lives at Fort Hamilton with his wife, the former Virginia H. Dillard, of Chattanooga, Tenn. He has two married daughters—Ann, whose husband, Lt. John D. Howard, is serving with the Third Division in Korea, and Virginia, wife of Shane Riordan, of Dobbs Ferry, a former infantry sergeant.

BOSSES ATC'S BIGGEST BASE

Head of the largest United States installation of the Army's Transportation Corps, General Lastayo describes himself as "not a combat soldier," and has no recollection of any "exciting moments" in his career.

Tracing his life, however, shows this statement to be dictated by reserve rather accuracy.

He transferred from the Field Artillery in 1942 after 22 years with that branch and left with an invasion convoy for his Transportation Corps assignment in England. From May to October of that year he commanded the Third Port at the Bristol Channel Ports, England. In November he left for north Africa.

"We took over the port of Oran and operated it until March 1943," he said in his office at the Army base the other day. General Lastayo commanded the port during that period. Later he was transportation officer for both the Mediterranean and Peninsula base sections. Charged with the loading of invasion forces and the landing and transporting of men, equipment and supplies as chief of transportation of the Mediterranean theater of operations, the Army chief had an unparalleled opportunity to study and appraise American youth.

His conclusion? "I think that, on an average, the boys of today are the same as the boys I was with in 1917 and 1918."

With this attitude, the General is understandably popular with his subordinates at the Army base.

LOADED ANZIO INVADERS

While in Italy he supervised the loading of forces, both American and British, who made the Anzio landing. In September 1944 he was charged with the responsibility of loading the Seventh Army for the invasion of southern France from Naples. In June 1945 he returned to the United States.

In the field of transportation, the port of embarkation head believes that the LST and LCT may be the greatest contributions made during World War II because "they enable troops with equipment to debark directly from the vessel to the beach."

Prior to World War II, while with the Field Artillery, he served in Kentucky, the Philippines, Virginia, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Florida, Maryland, and Texas.

"I saw so much heat I got used to it," he commented.

In all his Army career he spent only a few months in his native New Jersey while with the Sixth Field Artillery at Camp Dix, from August 1921 to January 1922.

He was born in West Hoboken on October 4, 1897.

TAUGHT ROTC AT CORNELL

From 1925 to 1929 he taught physics and astronomy at West Point and in 1939 and 1940, as a major, was an instructor in ROTC at Cornell.

Of his own career as a student at the Point he is characteristically modest.

Asked whether he had any favorite subjects, he replied, "Like most boys I took the course of study because I had to."

He was not an athlete and did not participate in sports. Among his classmates were Gen. Ewart Gladstone Plank, who commanded the New York port of embarkation from June 1946 to May 1949, and Maj. Gen. Clovis E. Byers, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1, who was wounded in New Guinea in 1942 carrying a tommygun in the attack on Buna Village.

General Lastayo has great affection for the Point and plans to attend the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary ceremonies there July 4, 1952.

After his return to this country, the transportation officer was Chief of the Highway Division, Office of Chief of Transportation, in Washington. From February 1946 to June 1949, as deputy port commander and chief of staff of the New York Port of embarkation, he first fell in love with Brooklyn.

PRO-BROOKLYN JERSEY MAN

"I like Brooklyn," he declared. "I was a Jersey boy, and you never heard any good about Brooklyn in Jersey. I disagree with the Jersey view. I like Brooklyn extremely well and think it is a fine place to live."

His younger daughter, Ann, was graduated from Fort Hamilton High School in 1948 while her father was stationed here.

A year intervened between that hitch in Brooklyn and his present assignment here. From June 1949 to August 1950 he was Assistant Chief of Transportation in Washington.

As boss of the largest American installation, he looks out his window from the administration building of the Brooklyn Army Base at a scene of bustling activity, but security prevents his discussing his present task and responsibilities.

However, he will talk about his two granddaughters like any proud grandpa. One was born only a few Sundays ago.

His own father was not in the Army and the family "seems to run to girls," but General Lastayo still has hopes for a future general.

Medical Policies of the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the March 25 issue of the New York Times relative to the investigation of medical policies of the Veterans' Administration being conducted under the able chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. This article by Dr. Howard Rusk analyzes the hearings that have been held, and comments upon them.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVED PROSPECTS SEEN FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL SERVICES—LAY ADMINISTRATOR'S PROMISED RELIANCE UPON DOCTOR'S DIRECTION IS HAILED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

A special Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, recently completed hearings on the medical policies of the Veterans' Administration. As the investigations were prompted by the summary dismissal of Dr. Paul Magnuson, former VA medical director, by Veterans' Administrator Carl R. Gray, this investigation, like other current congressional hearings, could have become highly sensational. Fortunately, it did not, and the hearings were confined to the issue of medical versus lay direction of the administration's huge medical service rather than personalities.

Second in size only to that of the Soviet Union, the VA medical service prior to 1945 frequently was termed "the backwash of American medicine." Within a remarkably short time after Gen. Omar N. Bradley became Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and Dr. Paul R. Hawley his medical director, the situation reversed itself, and the VA medical service became second to none.

This great improvement resulted primarily from the close relationship of veterans' hospitals to civilian teaching hospitals and medical schools, and the utilization of outstanding civilian physicians as consultants, both clinically and in determining VA medical policies and procedures.

Equally important and essential to this tie-in with civilian medicine was the fact that General Bradley, an able administrator, gave the full responsibility for the VA medical program to Dr. Hawley. When General Bradley returned to military service and Dr. Hawley resigned, the outlook for continued high-quality medical care remained high, for Dr. Hawley's successor, Dr. Magnuson, is a capable medical leader. As Dr. Hawley's assistant, he had largely been responsible for the development of the dean's committee system under which the VA program is integrally related to the teaching programs of 71 hospitals and 59 medical schools.

The close relationship based on confidence rather than directive that existed between Bradley and Hawley was lacking, however, between Gray and Magnuson. This resulted in a progressive tightening of the administrative reins on the medical director. Under this restrictive action, he and many physicians associated with him felt that the medical service could not operate adequately. The result was continuing and increasing friction, which culminated with Dr. Magnuson's dismissal.

Although most of the veterans' organizations sided with General Gray in their testimony before Senator HUMPHREY's committee, other witnesses insisted that the determination of medical policies must remain under direct medical supervision.

Both the committee hearings and in later statements to medical advisory groups of the VA and the American Legion, Administrator Gray has said emphatically that he would give full support to Dr. Joel T. Boone, Dr. Magnuson's successor, and has agreed to administrative changes in the VA that would make hospital managers responsible to him through Dr. Boone.

Although influenced by the personalities, the Gray-Magnuson clash was based on a fundamental difference of opinion on where administrative authority for the VA medical services should rest. It was this difference that jeopardized the continued relationship of civilian medical schools, hospitals, and physicians with the VA program.

If the medical services rendered to the individual veteran are to be more than routine and are to include an interest in his emotional and social problems, his rehabilitation and finally his return to the community as a useful, self-respecting citizen, it is imperative that these relationships be kept intact. This cannot be done by administrative fiat alone; they must embody a spirit based on mutual confidence and an encompassing philosophy of medical responsibility.

Senator HUMPHREY and his colleagues are to be commended that their hearings have dealt with issues and policies rather than personalities. Administrator Gray has promised to give Dr. Boone the authority necessary to carry out his mission. It is to be hoped that this basic policy is scrupulously observed, for upon it lies the basis for continued high standards of medical care for our veterans.

Universal Military Training and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Fred I. Cairns on the subject UMT and Freedom, broadcast by him from station WIBA in Madison, Wis., on March 18, 1951. A copy of this address was sent to me by the First Unitarian Society, of Madison, Wis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UMT AND FREEDOM

The Unitarian religious philosophy is related to the need for progress, and the techniques through which it may be achieved. We have said frequently that progress cannot come without change. This morning, I want to clarify this idea and point out that progress does not necessarily follow every change. There are two kinds of change possible. One is advance, where the people move toward their goals. This is progress. The other is retreat, where the people move away from their goals. This is not progress.

Freedom has been the goal of our democracy during the entire history of this Nation. We have cherished it, fought for it, tried over and again to arrange our laws consistently with it. We have been happiest when we were surest that we were moving in the direction of freedom; we have been concerned most when it seemed that our trends were away from it. When we fight wars which we say are to secure freedom, we apologise profusely because certain liberties have to be denied our citizens. When we imposed discriminatory restrictions upon American citizens of Japanese origin during the last war, we argued that the imposition to which they submitted was in fact a contribution by them to the larger picture of freedom. But the human mind is more logical than it is honest, and when we say, for selfish reasons, that occasions arise when freedom must be denied for the sake of freedom, our logical thoughts rebel against such an inconsistency.

Today I am worried about freedom in America. It is difficult to reconcile our traditions with loyalty boards and thought control, and un-American activity investigations and turn-coat testimony to convict citizens. These practices strike deep fear in our hearts, for while we want America to move, to change, we want her to change for the better. We are not convinced that the present mood of America is progressive. We are disheartened because those who have been so long reactionary are today in positions of power, and many who, but a short time ago were supporters of the most progressive administration this Nation has ever had, are today being investigated and otherwise suspected of disloyalty.

Beneath all that disquiets us is the constant expansion of military influence over the life of our land. This, I believe, can hardly be defended in terms of progress. Militarism is as old as organized society. The hope of every new social technique for the past millenium has been that somehow the influence and the need for militarism would be reduced. Men have never been quite sure they could dispense entirely with military power, but they have always hoped, and only the worst governments have oppressed those who insistently demanded the implementation of such ideals as disarmament. Pacifism has never been a popular theory, but neither have civilized peoples ever been willing to abandon the idea entirely. And each time war becomes a reality, we face again the question of what we shall do with those who refuse to participate because of their adverse convictions. Never have we answered the question to anyone's satisfaction, for the pacifists frequently prefer jail to the alternative offered, and military minds are sure that pacifists are pampered and should be dealt with more forcefully. Sincere citizens, of neither pacifist nor military persuasion are invariably troubled.

The one fact which all but the blindest military prejudice have observed is that there could be no greater tragedy than the complete elimination of the pacifist hope. Let the time come when every pacifist and every portion of his philosophy shall have been destroyed, and the darkness will be complete. When war clouds are blackest, honest people, knowing they must live in the dark for a season, are still cheered by the single star which breaks the complete night; that star is the hope that one day men will learn to live without violence. The brighter the star, the more hopeful men become, and the surer that they are moving toward their noblest goals.

Universal military training, should it become actually univeral as far as this country is concerned, is the final removal of that star from the blackest cloud of our darkest night. Universal military training is the antitheses of all that this Nation has sought throughout its existence. It is the opposite of that which has for so long attracted the best minds of the world to our shores, and many other minds which, if not of the genius variety, were yet clear enough to believe in peace, and a nonmilitary society, and to desire a country where the life and energy of the people are devoted to constructive living instead of military preparation. We need go back but a short distance in our history to observe the determination that this land should never come under military control. Our fathers established a government which provided that the Commander in Chief of all the Armed Forces should be a civilian—the President. This was never intended to make the President a soldier—it was felt that the President's position was large enough to overshadow the false glamor of military authority, and it was made clear that he should be in control of the military as a safeguard for civilian life, and not in order to permit him or any portion of his Cabinet to think of themselves as soldiers. It is hard to believe that these founding fathers could have foreseen the time when the President would himself advocate universal military training.

For some time now efforts have been made to get a bill through Congress that would bring about the domination of all life by military discipline, a bill which decrees that every male citizen of this land, before he shall have reached the voting age, shall be conditioned to the program of the armed services. I wonder if we understand this clearly—all young men, before they are permitted to take any responsibility in our national life, before they cast their first vote, must submit to a training period which will give most of them, forever, a sense of the propriety of violence. A school for death, we might call this program, and with compulsory attendance. Before our children can complete their civil education they will be inducted into army training, and this, we may be sure, will alter the educational emphasis of many of them. It is not a hopeful thought and it is not like Americans to sit by idly while the Government completes this plan under the questionable proclamement of necessity. But we have been so frightened by war scares, by the fact that good citizens are convicted of treason, by investigations and accusations, that we will now give our sons to march by compulsion in the military parade and not lift a finger to prevent it. And the worst is that those who have most enthusiastically and successfully raised the war cry, and most wantonly hurled the accusations, have slandered decent citizens without regard for truth, defied the rules of honesty in government and have shown themselves over and again to be enemies of progress and untrustworthy in public responsibility. These are not the men who should give leadership to our land.

I want to read a portion of a news report covering the passage of the UMT bill in the Senate. It comes from the New York Times, not a newspaper usually flippant in its attitude, and not one most widely known for its radical or false reporting. The New York Times, whether rightly or not, is considered to be the newspaper of America. It tells us that before the vote on the military bill was taken, Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, proposed an amendment. But let me quote, "By this time it was apparent that the Armed Services Committee had enough voting strength behind it to beat down all amendments, and the members merely laughed when Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, offered amendments to fix a surtax of 100 percent on all incomes in excess of $25,000 a year, and to impose an excess-profits tax of 100 percent." Do you understand what this means? It is the same story of willingness on the part of comfortable people to remain comfortable at the

cost of everything democracy stands for. It is the old story of protecting wealth with human life. How can we keep down indignation when the military purposes are so clearly put, and interest in human life is shown to be secondary to the well-being of particular groups. If a young man must serve in the Armed Forces before he is allowed to vote, why should any man be allowed to profit by it, or any corporation? This proposal was not original with Senator LANGER—it was offered by President Roosevelt when he began to prepare for the last war, but it was turned down as contemptuously then as now.

I'm afraid I take life too seriously. I can see little reason to laugh at such a proposal, and I can find little comfort when it is reported that Senators laughed because they were so sure it would have no chance of acceptance. I have little hope for a society that consents to military planning simply because those who plan insist that there is something worse in store if we do not accept what they propose. I don't see how anything can be worse than the total loss of freedom, and if I must lose mine, I'd prefer that it be taken from me by an enemy than that I should release it willingly to those who are supposed to help me keep it. Universal military training is as near as anything I can imagine to the total loss of freedom for the average citizen.

Let me tell you of what is happening in Madison. On the university campus here, there is a group known as the Student Committee for Conscientious Objectors to War. This committee has posted notices on campus bulletin boards to inform others of their existence and purpose. Their notice reads, "A group of persons having deep convictions against participation in war have formed a committee for the purpose of giving information, legal assistance, and opportunities for sympathetic discussion and fellowship to students who are weighing the problems of personal participation in war. The committee can be contacted through F. D. Hole, J. E. Olsen, or A. L. Christensen." Telephone numbers are given with the names. The notices are legal within the life of the campus. The committee is a registered student organization, recognized by the student life and interests committee and the student board.

Of the three whose names appear on the notices, one is a professor and a Quaker, another a Methodist minister, and the third, a student, is a Unitarian. This diversity of faith suggests at least a sincerity of purpose. A significant fact about the notices is that while ordinarily about 30 or 40 posters will cover the campus, for this particular notice some six hundred have been needed. This is not because the student committee has been careless, but because, as fast as they put up their notices, someone tears them off the boards.

In addition to tearing down the notices, they who would destroy the efforts of the Committee for Conscientious Objectors have made anonymous telephone calls to those whose names appear on the notices. Not just ordinary phone calls, but calls at 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning. Those who make the calls, in spite of their determination to support the military program against any pacifist intrusion, have not yet found sufficient courage to identify themselves. Perhaps they imagine that their acts must conform to standards of military secrecy, but what is more likely is that they are victims of the mood of America today, victims of a psychosis that is eating away our freedom. Perhaps they believe that what they are doing is courageous, and what the objectors to war are doing is contemptuous. They may honestly hope that a universal military program will provide the freedoms that America has sought so long. Or perhaps they are just confused, as most of America is confused about this whole subject, and lacking understanding because of the hysterical mood which has come over us all, they are not aware of their inconsistency, just as most of us are not aware of ours.

The supposition that peace can be won through violence is a false one. Religion is not alone in declaring this; every reasonable psychological premise asserts its falsity, and every observation of both individual and international life proclaims its folly. The hope of democracy rests with the alertness of its citizens, and their refusal to permit any group of leaders, regardless of party or purpose, to impose upon our free land a military code that is a compulsory conditioning for coming generations.

Relations Between the United States and India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I had prepared for delivery today regarding an article by Robert Trumbull entitled "India Parley Links Food and Freedom," published in the New York Times on March 29, 1951, together with a dispatch from Calcutta relating to the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Yesterday's newspapers printed some very disturbing reports with regard to our Nation's reception in India and our country's reputation with the people of India. I refer to an article by Mr. Robert Trumbull in the New York Times of March 29 reporting on the Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom, a meeting representing anti-Communist cultural leaders from all over the world. The proof is again clear, Mr. President, that all of our statements for democracy and liberty will fall on closed ears in Asia unless we act in accordance with the principles of human dignity and brotherhood. It is indeed true that the world cannot hear what we say because what we do keeps dinning in their ears.

The people of Asia face starvation. Freedom loses its meaning if it is without bread. Our Nation, if it is to be effective in the struggle against communism, must respond to the appeal for food from the underprivileged masses of Asia, Africa, and other undeveloped areas. The most effective way to oppose communism and fascism is to eliminate the causes of those malignant diseases. We must attack poverty in the world.

I bring attention to Mr. Trumbull's article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks. I also bring attention to a telegram which was sent to the American Congress by the American delegation to the Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom. The telegram reads:

"While American Congress delays legislation famine threatens millions in Bihar. Prompt dispatch of wheat imperative for America's good name in Asia."

That telegram is signed by Mr. James Burnham, Mr. Harry Goldberg, Mr. W. H. Auden, Mr. J. J. Miller (the Nobel-prize-winning American geneticist), Mr. Max Yergen, and Mr. Norman Thomas.

An ominous note to me is another dispatch in the same day's issue of the New York Times headed "Left gains in Calcutta," indicating the Communist movement is gaining in strength at the expense of the Congress Party. The time for us to assist the democratic forces in India is now. Every humanitarian consideration, every political consideration, every religious consideration, and every consideration of our national self-interest calls for the Congress to act immediately in support of legislation for an immediate grant of 2,000,000 tons of food grain for the people of India.

[From the New York Times of March 29, 1951]

INDIA PARLEY LINKS FOOD AND FREEDOM—CULTURAL CONGRESS SPEAKERS SAY DEMOCRACIES LAG IN FIGHT ON COMMUNISM IN ASIA

(By Robert Trumbull)

BOMBAY, INDIA, March 28.—The Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom opened here today on an unexpected undertone of dissatisfaction with the practical job that the free democracies are doing to combat communism where it has its most potent appeal, that is, among the underprivileged masses of Asia, Africa, and other underdeveloped areas.

About 30 Indian intellectuals, political leaders and business men, and 9 foreign delegates are attending the 4-day session. After several eloquent and loudly applauded attacks upon the Stalinist iron curtain, two delegates of notable standing wanted to know what meaning "cultural freedom" had to men without bread.

Stephen Spender, British poet, summed up this divergent train of thought with his remark that the intellectuals congregated here "should not study so much why we are opposed to communism as the just reasons that make those people Communists who should be on our side."

Jai Prakash Narain, Wisconsin-educated leader of the Indian Socialist Party, who acted as chairman, said that to talk of cultural freedom among India's hungry villagers "seems" comic. He suggested that if the anti-Communist crusade was to succeed with the masses of Asia it must be accompanied by an effective attack upon poverty.

The delegates here made it clear that they were unanimously opposed to communism or totalitarianism in any form and it seemed safe to assume that the audience was mainly of the same mind.

Among other speakers Denis de Rougemont, Swiss writer, characterized the Communist suppression of culture as the avenue to human slavery.

Dr. Max Yergan, an American Negro educator, spoke of the advance of the Negro's status in the United States as evidence of that country's depth of soul and innate spirituality.

Salvador de Madariaga, exiled Spanish writer, delivered a subtle and witty attack upon another Indian tendency, which is to equate the political freedom that the Indians have with the economic independence that they do not have.

The Indian Government caused the Congress of Cultural Freedom to be shifted from New Delhi to Bombay, apparently through some sort of idea of neutrality. Nevertheless India's Food and Agricultural Minister, K. M. Munshi, delivered the inaugural address and gave at least a semiofficial tone to the opening meeting.

Mr. Munshi remarked upon the appropriateness of holding this congress in Bombay where Indian communism was born. He spoke of the devious record of the Indian Communist Party from personal experience as one-time Home Minister of the Bombay Presidency.

M. de Rougemont, in an apparent oblique attack upon India's neutral foreign policy, contrasted neutrality, which he said, might be defensible, with the neutralism, which he declared was not. He told a fable that by implication compared the present Indian neutrality with that of the lamb that is neutral between the wolf and the shepherd.

Mr. Narain, in his later speech, took the same fable and turned it to account in his argument that the democracies had been lacking in their consideration for underprivileged peoples. He pointed out that the shepherd, having saved the lamb from the wolf, then shears the lamb and possibly eats it.

LEFT GAINS IN CALCUTTA—CONGRESS PARTY SUFFERS FIRST MAJOR LOCAL DEFEAT

CALCUTTA, INDIA, March 28.—The governing Congress Party, which had hitherto dominated the municipal administration in Calcutta, suffered its first major defeat in the municipal elections that concluded yesterday.

Formerly the Congress Party held all 30 seats in the local administration. Only 14 Congress Party candidates were returned. Fifteen seats went to a new leftist combination called the United Progressive Bloc, which is a loose coalition of the Revolutionary Communist Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, the Forward Bloc, and the Communist Party.

This is the first time that the leftists, including the Communists, have combined against the Congress Party in West Bengal and have entered the municipal administration in large numbers through constitutional means.

A Report From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent issues of the Minneapolis Star, there appeared a series of articles entitled "A Report From Europe," which were prepared by Mr. John Cowles, publisher of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. Mr. Cowles is intimately acquainted with the economic and political problems of Europe, having visited the European countries on many occasions and for extended periods of time. His observations are particularly pertinent at this period in our history. It is interesting to observe that Mr. Cowles agrees with the position recently taken by our Secretary of Defense, the Honorable George Marshall. He, too, advises after touring Europe that the year 1951 is still a year of danger.

Mr. Cowles also seems to be in agreement with the attitude expressed by General Eisenhower as to the West European will to resist a Russian attack.

I think it is particularly important to note the observations of Mr. Cowles on the spirit and morale to be found in western Berlin, a fortress of freedom behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles entitled "War Peril Fades, But 1951 Still Is Year of Danger," "Will To Resist a Russ Attack Found Mounting," and "Morale Higher in West Berlin Than in Paris."

There being no objection, the three articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR PERIL FADES, BUT 1951 STILL IS YEAR OF DANGER

War with Russia in the near future now seems less likely than it appeared a few months ago.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one is, however, still a year of danger.

Despite our present enormous superiority in atomic bombs and our ability to deliver them with devastating effects upon Russia, Stalin may decide to attack this year for four reasons:

1. Stalin may conclude that he can no longer continue to tolerate Tito's open defiance of the Kremlin. The Yugoslav dictator's independence is stimulating the idea of "nationalist deviation" among Communist Party members in Italy, France, and Germany, as well as in the satellite states.

2. Stalin may conclude that the likelihood of our bringing the western Germans into the North Atlantic Pact organization and of effectively rearming them during the coming year is a risk he cannot afford to run. The Russians' fear of the Germans as fighters is deep.

3. Stalin may conclude that in another 18 months the forces which General Eisenhower is putting together may be sufficient to prevent any quick and easy Russian occupation of Western Europe and seizure of the Ruhr. The huge war-making potential of the Ruhr industries is, of course, the top military prize in Europe.

4. Stalin, who is approaching 72, may feel that his time is running short. Like other dictators, he may have an irresistible ambition to try to add more laurels to his fame as a conqueror before history turns his page.

If Stalin should conclude to attack Western Europe in 1951 it would probably come in late August or September, after most of the crops are in. Those months are certain, in any event, to be full of tension.

The Russians are planning to bring a total of 2,000,000 German Communist youths to East Berlin during the first week of August—a maximum of 800,000 a day—for demonstrations. Things then might get out of hand.

Of course, Stalin may calculate that he can attack Tito, destroy his regime, and occupy most of Yugoslavia this spring without precipitating a general world war. The Kremlin recently instructed the Bulgarian Government to promulgate a new law under which Russians could acquire Bulgarian citizenship after only 24 hours' residence. Stalin could thus claim to the United Nations that the Russian divisions invading Yugoslavia were simply "Bulgarian volunteers."

The Yugoslavs are desperately short of food and supplies. They lack almost everything except an indomitable will to resist invasion and maintain their country's independence. Although some United States aid has been promised them, only a trickle has yet arrived.

No observer thinks that satellite armies, without Russian support, could conquer Yugoslavia. Many of the Rumanian troops, and possibly some of the Hungarians, would presumably desert if they were ordered to attack.

If the Russians strike at Yugoslavia, Tito's forces, tough but badly equipped, will probably be compelled to retreat to the mountains for semiguerrilla fighting. If the Russians are able to occupy most of Yugoslavia they will be on the shores of the Mediterranean, and both Italy and Greece will be outflanked.

The most effective way of deterring the Russians from attacking Yugoslavia would be for the United States and Great Britain to make it crystal clear that we would immediately go to Tito's aid. The sooner we get food, gasoline, and explosives, as well as aircraft and weapons, to Yugoslavia, the better. Every week counts.

Probably Stalin will conclude (or he may have already concluded) not to make all-out war in Europe in 1951. Diplomats report that in those areas adjacent to Moscow which they are permitted to visit there are no outward signs that war in the near future is expected. There is no visible evidence that the Russians are building underground shelters, radar warning nets, antiaircraft emplacements, etc., which presumably they would be doing in Moscow if war were imminent.

Unless Stalin is more badly informed than most experts believe, he must realize that any Soviet aggression in Europe will result in prompt retaliatory atomic bomb attacks on Moscow along with a dozen other Russian targets.

Perhaps Stalin will move in Europe this year, but the preponderance of competent opinion abroad is that he won't. A basic tenet of the Lenin-Communist creed is to do nothing that might jeopardize the party's continuance as the ruling regime in Russia. Even though the Soviet armies could occupy Western Europe relatively easily this year, our present enormous superiority in atomic bombs will probably continue to deter them.

Perhaps a temporary new Russian "peace" offensive is more likely in 1951 than war, even though Russia's ultimate ambitions for world domination remain unchanged.

WILL TO RESIST A RUSS ATTACK FOUND MOUNTING

If the Russians, because of our great superiority in A-bombs and the planes to deliver them, do not start armed aggression in Europe this year, what will be the west's chance of stopping them if they do try it in 1952 or 1953?

First of all, many qualified observers in Europe believe that the American public has an exaggerated idea of Russia's military power.

Soviet divisions are much smaller numerically than full strength American divisions and have only 50 to 60 percent of their fire power. The Russians also have far less mobility.

American and British military experts, moreover, heavily discount the value to Russia of the Soviet satellite forces. They say that the Rumanians, for example, are of negligible worth.

In the event of war between Russia and the west, many of our top officers question both the effectiveness and the reliability of the Soviet satellite forces.

One high-ranking military man expressed the view that of the 60 divisions (excluding satellites) that he said Russia now has in the west, 20 would be required for occupation purposes in her own and satellite areas, leaving 40 available for a possible attack on Western Europe.

Of these, 27 Russian divisions now are in Germany and 8 more just over the Polish border adjacent to Germany. The Russians have stored gasoline and munitions throughout the Soviet zone of Germany. Once they start on spring field maneuvers, they could invade Western Germany with no advance notice.

If Stalin decides to move this year, no one contends that the Russians could be stopped before they had occupied all of Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark.

But if Stalin, because of fear that if he moves this year we can and will obliterate

Russian cities with A-bombs, postpones any move in Western Europe until late 1952 or 1953, the story may be quite different. Some American observers feel sure that the Russians won't go to war until they are much further along with atomic development than they are believed to be now, and until they have installed many more radar defenses against raids by our Air Force.

Western Europe's morale and will to resist are higher than they were even a few months ago and appear to be growing.

General Eisenhower's appointment as commander of the international army, and the way he has started out on his enormously difficult military and political and diplomatic task, have had a profound effect throughout Europe.

Even in France, much the weakest and most defeatist of the important western nations, public sentiment seems to be changing. A year ago many influential Frenchmen held the view that occupation, while terribly bad, would be at least bearable while war would be intolerable. Many of them have lost that defeatism. The chances now appear at least even that France will have a reasonable number of effective divisions in Eisenhower's army within 18 months.

If Russia moves in Western Europe, there is not the slightest doubt that Great Britain would instantly join the United States in going to war. There would be no enthusiasm for it in Britain, just quiet resignation, but an almost unanimous determination.

Holland and Belgium will provide relatively little in the way of armed forces for Western Europe's defense until they are convinced that Germany also is to be rearmed.

Both Norway and Denmark are cooperating with General Eisenhower within the limits of their capacity.

Dr. Adenauer, the Chancelor of Western Germany, last month declared that the neutralization of Germany would be a disaster for Europe and a disaster for the German people. There is no doubt that the sympathies of the overwhelming majority of the German people lie with the west. The Germans are, however, tired of war, just as are the British and French.

The Communist propaganda for German peace, unity, and neutrality has had and is having considerable success in Germany. The persuasiveness of that appeal should not be underestimated.

Probably it was a mistake for the United States to announce when it did that Germany was to be rearmed. Probably it would have been wiser to wait until after Western Germany had been given a wider measure of self-government. Perhaps it would have been better to have postponed any discussion of arming the Germans until a relatively sovereign Western German Government applied for admission into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and requested that military equipment be provided so that Western Germany could play its part in defending itself against a possible Russian attack.

Americans sometimes forget how terrifically beaten the Germans were in the last war. To see the ruins even now in any German industrial city is to understand why pacifism is widespread.

Even though most Germans hate the Russians and look forward to economic and political integration with Western Europe, they naturally have no desire to rearm and then be slaughtered by the Russians if the western powers are going to "retreat behind the Pyrenees" if war comes.

Western Europe is, I am increasingly convinced, a cornerstone of America's own freedom. Were we voluntarily to abandon it to the Russians it would be a momentous military, political, and economic disaster. It might, I fear, be the beginning of the end for the American Republic.

If we handle the problem firmly but diplomatically, I believe that the majority of the western Germans, after they have been given a larger measure of self-government and sovereignty a few months from now, will come to agree with the statement by Chancellor Adenauer quoted above.

That would mean there would be a good chance that Western Europe would build fairly quickly its own defenses to a point where Stalin, unless he attacks within the next year, would not think it profitable to launch war.

No one, either American or European, with whom I talked expressed the view that it would require more than the four additional American divisions which General Marshall has announced will be sent to supplement the two United States divisions now in Germany, provided European morale continues to improve the way it has in recent months.

If the western Europeans organize the forces which most American observers abroad now think that there is a better than 50–50 chance that they will, we might then even be able safely to reduce the number of United States divisions in Europe.

And if our development of atomic artillery shells as a tactical weapon progresses rapidly, that might prove decisive, and enable even a relatively small defense force to hold Western Europe against an attempted Russian invasion.

MORALE HIGHER IN WEST BERLIN THAN IN PARIS

Berlin today is one of the most inspiring and at the same time depressing cities in the world.

Square miles of rubble. Ghost buildings whose walls look as if they would collapse under a high wind. Although it is nearly 6 years since the fighting stopped, the human and material wreckage of war is visible everywhere.

In the western sectors of Berlin, under American, British, and French control, live nearly 2,250,000 Germans, many of them existing with five or six persons to a room.

Although the Russians occupy not only the eastern sector of Berlin but all the surrounding area of East Germany, there is higher morale and less defeatism in West Berlin than there is in Paris.

The Berliners have seen Russian occupation at close range. Most of them are determined to fight to the death, if necessary, against being engulfed by the Soviet terrorism.

No visible iron curtain separates East, or Soviet Berlin from the western sectors—simply a city street. People can pass from one sector to the other at will. Some prominent West Germans and most foreigners go into the Russian sector only warily, and rarely after dark.

A number have disappeared there, perhaps to become the recipients of a one-way ticket to the uranium mines.

As one drives through the Russian sector, which has a population of 1,200,000, many differences from West Berlin are apparent. There's much less rebuilding. The shops are drab, the people poorly dressed. Except for essential food, which is rationed in the Russian sector, the East German (Soviet) mark will buy only about one-fifth as much as a Western German mark. An East Berlin worker has about the same standard of living as an unemployed person on relief in West Berlin.

Communist propaganda is evident everywhere in the Soviet sector of Berlin and in the Soviet zone outside.

Russian war memorials express "sympathy" for the German people who, they say, had been enslaved by the Nazi. The Russians "liberated" them.

Fresh flowers are placed by the Russians on ruined buildings with sympathetic signs saying that here on some specific date in 1944 or 1945 the American fascist air force dropped bombs that murdered so many hundred peace-loving Germans.

Signs everywhere promote "Communist democracy and peace."

While Communist propaganda is making almost no progress in Berlin, where the contrast between the Russian occupation and that of the western powers is apparent to everyone, the Russians are making headway in Eastern Germany.

Boys are required to attend school for 6 days a week, instead of 5, unless they join the Communist youth organization. Boys cannot get fishing licenses unless they are members.

Consequently a substantial portion of the East German youths has enrolled, and participate in frequent Communist parades and athletic spectacles as they did under Hitler's national socialism.

Partially offsetting the Russian Communist propaganda in East Germany is an extraordinary effective Berlin radio station RIAS, controlled by the United States but using Germans exclusively as announcers, commentators and actors.

That RIAS is influencing a big listening audience is proved by the violent and constant vituperation which is heaped on it by the Soviet German newspapers and Soviet radio stations.

With 100,000 watts of power, RIAS is on the air 20 hours a day, warning its listeners that Herr Schmidt, a butcher in a certain German town, or Herr Wagner, a baker in another, is now a secret Soviet agent and to be wary of him.

RIAS won a great following by tipping off the Germans that the Russians intended to confiscate all the wheat above a small minimum amount in a certain area the following day, so that the listeners were able to hide their supplies.

Polls show that 98 percent of the West Berlin radio audience tunes to RIAS, and there is widespread evidence that RIAS, despite constant efforts by the Russians to prevent listening, has an enormous following throughout the entire Russian zone.

Some of the most popular RIAS programs are those kidding the Russians, with a moronic comedian spouting the Soviet propaganda line.

RIAS deliberately avoids using any unusual sound effects or loud broadcasts which could enable an eavesdropper to identify the station to which his neighbor was listening as the forbidden RIAS.

In Berlin the central telephone exchange is in the western sector. Any Berliner can dial the RIAS telephone number at any hour and hear 3 minutes of late news over the phone. The Russians have no way of stopping this or of ascertaining who may be phoning RIAS to get the news. As many as 18,000 phone calls have been received in a day, half from the Russian sector.

Both in Berlin and throughout our zone in Germany there are, in addition to our Armed Forces, hundreds of American civilians working in all phases of military government and economic rehabilitation. Many are doing excellent jobs.

Few persons in the United States appreciate the enormous complexities and difficulties of the task which our American High Commissioner, John J. McCloy, has faced for nearly 2 years. Probably the High Commission set-up will be terminated this fall and Western Germany be given pretty complete self-government powers, except as to Allied military occupation and security.

That will be a welcome day for Commissioner McCloy and his wife, who, by visiting hospitals and schools and explaining to German women how American democracy actually functions, is working as hard as her husband.

It will mean an end to the constant stream of abuse, from both Americans and Germans, which comes in a torrent whenever the High Commissioner, after reviewing all the evidence, pardons or commutes the sentence of some German war criminal or, equally, refuses to do so.

And it also will mean an end to living in a home whose grounds must constantly be patrolled by soldiers, all floodlighted at night, because of threats against the High Commissioner, his wife, and their children.

Veterans' Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the provisions and effects of the gratuitous indemnity bill, H. R. 1, which I introduced and which passed the House in early January by a roll call vote of 390 to 0, and has been sent to conference, drastically amended, in the Senate.

Perhaps it is well to point out here, in regard to the present insurance program, that the Veterans' Administration has presented to the Bureau of the Budget a claim for $117,000,000 to pay for approximately 13,600 deaths resulting from the fighting in Korea—claims which are being paid entirely by the Government, regardless of the amount of premiums paid by the policyholder, or the length of time which the policy was held. It can readily be seen from this that H. R. 1 would constitute no new departure from the present program, as far as payment for service-connected deaths are concerned. The financial savings resulting from the elimination of administrative expenses would be great, and most desirable.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a very excellent article written on the subject of H. R. 1 which appeared in the April 1951 issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, and which was prepared by Hon. Omar B. Ketchum, the national legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This article states the issue very clearly, and I am sure the Members will find it most informative.

The article referred to follows:

THE INSURANCE ISSUE—HOUSE AND SENATE DIVIDED ON TWO BILLS DEALING WITH INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR VETERANS IN THE FUTURE

(By Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative director, VFW)

Shall national service life insurance for members of the Armed Forces, with its inequities, excessive costs, and administrative red tape be continued or shall the Congress adopt a new insurance approach through a gratuitous indemnity of $10,000 which would automatically cover all active service personnel with a minimum of red tape and no premium payments?

This question has developed into a major controversy between the United States Senate and House of Representatives with a division of opinion between veteran organizations and some outsiders taking out a stack of chips one way or another.

In the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress the House of Representatives, after months of study and investigation, approved a bill identified as H. R. 9011 which would set up a gratuitous indemnity insurance program as a future substitute for national service life insurance. The Senate failed to take action and the House bill died with the close of the Eighty-first Congress.

When the Eighty-second Congress convened the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs immediately took up reconsideration of the gratuitous indemnity insurance in a bill identified as H. R. 1. After making some changes the new bill was reported unanimously by the Veterans' Committee. On January 24 the House of Representatives, by a unanimous vote of 390 to 0, approved H. R. 1. The following day the Senate Committee on Finance under the leadership of Senator WALTER GEORGE, Georgia, opened hearings on several insurance bills, including H. R. 1, which had just come over with the approval of the House.

Among the insurance bills considered by the Senate Finance Committee was a bill by Senator GEORGE identified as Senate bill 84. This bill is an amendment to the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide a gratuitous insurance payment of $10,000 to the immediate families or estates of those servicemen who had been killed or who had died, without insurance coverage, subsequent to June 27, 1950, and would provide gratuitous insurance protection for all active service personnel, not covered by insurance, up to 120 days after final passage of the bill. H. R. 1, approved by the House, also provided gratuitous payments of $10,000 for servicemen who had died, without insurance protection, subsequent to June 27, 1950.

After 2 days of open hearings and a few executive committee sessions, the Senate Finance Committee on February 14 reported H. R. 1 favorably with some amendments. The first paragraph of the report of the Senate Finance Committee on February 14, 1951, reads as follows:

"The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the bill as amended do pass."

On Monday, February 26, H. R. 1, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, came up for consideration on the floor of the Senate. Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Finance Committee, which reported H. R. 1 and recommended its passage, moved to substitute S. 84 in lieu of H. R. 1. Only a handful of Senators were present on the Senate floor and after a limited discussion an aye-and-nay vote was taken. Witnesses in the Senate gallery reported there were three ayes and two nays and Senator GEORGE's motion was declared adopted. The Senate was officially on record as bypassing H. R. 1 and adopting instead, as a substitute, S. 84.

Senator BYRD, Virginia, and Senator JOHNSON, Colorado, both members of the Senate Finance Committee, were the two Senators who voted in the negative against Senator GEORGE's motion. Senator BYRD submitted a spirited but brief argument in support of H. R. 1 and pointed out that the Senate Finance Committee had favorably reported H. R. 1 and recommended its passage on February 14. BYRD also read into the RECORD the history of the lengthy hearings held by the House on the gratuitous indemnity proposal and many of the reasons why H. R. 1 was a sound approach to insurance coverage for members of the Armed Forces. Senator GEORGE was supported by Senator TAFT, Ohio, who said he favored GEORGE's motion because the American Legion was opposed to H. R. 1.

As this article is written the two insurance bills, one by the House and one by the Senate, have been sent to conference. Seven Members of the Senate, headed by Senator GEORGE, and seven Members of the House, headed by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, will attempt to resolve the differences between the House and Senate. A long and bitter struggle between the conferees is predicted, and unless two or more of the House conferees surrender it is not likely the House will accept the Senate version. It is predicted that Senators BYRD and JOHNSON, of the Senate conferees, will support the House bill, H. R. 1, while opponents of the House bill will endeavor to win over two or three of the House conferees in support of the Senate bill.

H. R. 1, as approved by the House of Representatives and reported by the Senate Finance Committee, had the support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President. It is opposed by the American Legion and a radio commentator, Frank Edwards. Edwards, although not a veteran, has been vigorously denouncing H. R. 1 in his broadcasts.

What is the real issue before the Congress on insurance coverage for members of the Armed Forces? Why has a new approach to insurance coverage been proposed, and is it designed to take something away from our veterans? Here are the facts as viewed by the VFW and based on a long and exhaustive investigation of the entire insurance problem:

In December 1948 an Advisory Commission on Service Pay, commonly referred to as the Hook Commission, after a long and exhaustive study, filed a report on career compensation for uniformed forces with the Secretary of Defense. Included in that report was a recommendation, with justification, to discontinue national service life insurance and substitute an automatic gratuitous indemnity coverage of $10,000 for all members of the Armed Forces.

The Hook Commission report went into detail, pointing out that national service life insurance was inequitable, excessive in costs, and a "white elephant" in administration. The report further pointed out that gratuitous indemnity coverage would be equitable in its coverage and effect savings in paper work, manpower, and costs.

In May 1950 a subcommittee of the House Committee on Executive Expenditures, headed by Representative FORTEE HARDY, of Virginia, conducted a long and intensive study and hearings on the question of life-insurance coverage for members of the Armed Forces. Government officials, insurance experts, representatives of veteran organizations, and representatives of the Armed Forces were invited to express their views on insurance before this committee. Following the study and hearings, the committee submitted a lengthy report, commonly referred to as the Hardy committee report, in which it pointed out the inequities, excessive costs, and administrative red tape of the national service life insurance program and proposed as a substitute a gratuitous indemnity insurance coverage for all members of the Armed Forces. Insurance representatives of the VFW sat in and followed closely the study and hearings by the Hardy committee.

Following the Hardy committee report the staff of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs was directed to continue the insurance study and several bills incorporating suggestions of the Hook Commission and the Hardy committee were introduced. The Veterans' Committee staff invited persons interested in service insurance to consult with it in relation to the various bills which had been introduced. At the conclusion of the staff study a subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs opened hearings on a series of insurance bills, including national service life insurance, a mutual insurance program, a group insurance program and a gratuitous indemnity program. When the hearing was completed the subcommittee recommended to the full committee a bill which would establish a uniform gratuitous indemnity coverage of $10,000 for each person on active duty in the Armed Forces.

The full House committee adopted the recommendation of the subcommittee and a bill identified as H. R. 9911 was reported favorably to the House with a recommendation that it be passed. The bill had the support of the VFW, the DAV, and the AMVETS. It was later approved by the House and sent to the Senate where no action was taken and the bill died. When the Eighty-second Congress convened, Chairman JOHN E. RANKIN reintroduced the insurance bill as H. R. 1 with a few improving changes. The bill, again with the support of the VFW, the DAV, and the AMVETS, was unanimously approved by the House on January 24, 1951. That is the history of the gratuitous indemnity proposal up to the time it ran into trouble in the United States Senate.

H. R. 1 would:

1. Provide automatic, uniform coverage of $10,000 gratuitous indemnity on the lives of all active service personnel, with no solicitation, no premium payment, and a minimum of administration, retroactive to June 27, 1950.

2. Provide the free insurance coverage for 120 days after discharge or release from active duty.

3. Provide continuing free insurance coverage for those who become totally and permanently disabled during service.

4. Provide privilege of purchasing Government insurance after release from active duty for those who become uninsurable by reason of their service.

5. Preserves the World Wars I and II insurance rights of those who had insurance contracts or previously eligible for said insurance.

6. End sale of subsidized Government insurance in the future, except to those mentioned in items 4 and 5, and would eventually get the Government out of the insurance business.

7. Save millions of man-hours in administrative work and millions of dollars in cost to Federal taxpayers. The United States General Accounting Office estimates that a savings of approximately $600,000,000 would have been made had this program been in effect during World War II.

Senate 84, which was substituted for House Resolution 1 in the Senate, would:

1. Provide free insurance protection from June 27, 1950, up until 120 days from the passage of the act to all service men who are not covered by national life insurance.

2. Require all servicemen to buy national service life insurance after the 120 days' grace period or have no insurance protection for their families.

3. Give no consideration to the serviceman who becomes disabled by reason of service.

4. Discriminate between servicemen who are paying premiums on policies and those who are not paying premiums on policies.

5. Perpetuate national service life insurance with its inequities, excessive costs and administrative red tape.

The principal arguments advanced against House Resolution 1 are (a) would deny Korean veterans the privilege of carrying subsidized Government insurance after discharge, and (b) would take from future veterans the privilege of carrying low-cost Government insurance after discharge.

The answer to those arguments are (a) approximately 84 percent of all servicemen involved in the Korean campaign and elsewhere are already covered with national service life insurance contracts and would be privileged under House Resolution 1 to continue their insurance after discharge if desired; and (b) out of the millions of policies issued during World Wars I and II approximately 75 percent have dropped their policies.

The benefits under House Resolution 1 far outweigh any theoretical loss of the privilege of carrying subsidized Government insurance after discharge or release from active service. It's up to Congress to make the decision.

Inciting Racial Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in Il Progresso Italo-Americano on March 28, 1951:

INCITING RACIAL HATRED

Last Saturday, at the Kefauver committee hearing held in Washington, Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, with a touch of cutting satisfaction, read a telegram from an aged self-styled Italian who had long ago become an American citizen, in which he insinuated that Americans of Italian origin are more inclined to be criminals and crooks than those of any other racial segment of the United States population.

The gratuitous self-defamation is completely extraneous to the investigation which the Senate committee is conducting. This was not a specific accusation against particular individuals who might have violated the law or participated in the spreading corruption or promoted alliances of crime and politics. It was a ridiculous statement designed to inflict the stigma of an imaginary criminality on an ethnic segment of our population whose worthiness is beyond reproach.

It should not be necessary to dwell in detail on this subject to prove how much iniquity and slander there is in this vulgar message. All right thinking people are convinced, as we are, that this is a deliberate lie and an arbitrary falsification of the truth which should never have been brought up in an official inquiry. After all, the purpose of the investigation is to ascertain facts and fix specific responsibilities and not to go afield in absurd generalities which contribute solely to accentuate prejudices and foment discrimination and race hatred.

By reading the message Senator TOBEY voluntarily made himself a party to an unworthy action which was all the more deplorable because the unjust accusation was made by an alleged member of the racial group against which an attempt is being made to hold it up to public scorn.

Senator TOBEY well knows that the millions of Italo-Americans, naturalized or not, who live in the United States, have no reason to envy the other ethnic elements of our population for honesty, loyalty, and respect for our laws.

If the Senator, with ill-advised haste, seized upon the sadistic self-defamation of a despicable slanderer of his own blood, he did so with the malicious intention of giving a greater semblance of reliability to the insult.

THE INEXISTENCE OF AN INFAMOUS LEGEND

Criminal statistics fortunately belie the libelous statement. The presumed criminal inclination of the Italian element in our society is an infamous legend. Instincts of degeneracy are not in the nature of the race, which for thousands of years has been in the forefront in its contributions to civilization and progress.

Wherever Italians have migrated they have brought the fruitfulness of their genius and their labor. No people, as much as the Italian, has furnished greater numbers to the army of immigrants and no immigrant has contributed more than the Italian of his blood and sweat to the welfare of the countries in which he settled.

The history of Italian immigration to the United States is replete with glorious pages which sing the praises of its achievements. There is not an industry, a field of endeavor, private or public, in which Italians have not distinguished themselves for loyalty, tirelessness, and spirit of initiative. Their names are closely linked with all the great accomplishments which have made our great Republic the foremost nation in the world. Their honor roll cannot be contaminated by the defamatory drivel of scoundrels who resort to self-degradation in order to stir up nonexistent prejudices. Unfortunately there are among Italian immigrants and their children some degenerate elements who have sunk into the dregs of vice. Their misdeeds, however, should not in any way cast a sinister light on the entire group of upright people. Crime has no nationality or country of origin. It is an evil plant which grows in every clime. It is a social disease which afflicts all countries. Any attempt to attribute the instinct of degeneracy to a particular nationality is a deplorable evasion of the responsibility to suppress crime which is incumbent on legislators and law enforcement agencies.

AN EXAMPLE WHICH HAS NOT BEEN FOLLOWED

Il Progresso Italo-Americano has repeatedly launched courageous campaigns to combat discrimination and racial prejudice in the interest of all the racial groups which comprise the American people. We have frequently appealed to legislators and public officials to promote social rehabilitation with wise legislation aimed at removing the causes which encourage delinquency. We have no knowledge that Senator TOBEY—who seems so eager to popularize insults against Americans of Italian origin—has ever harkened to our appeals. He evidently seems more interested in persecution rather than in the prevention of crime. The fact that he played on sensationalism publicized by television and radio is a clear indication that there is something mysterious and personal which guides his actions in the committee of which he is a member.

The public assiduously follows the investigation conducted by the committee in the hope that the inquiry will bring about the desired results. Unfortunately, if the fatal germ of prejudice and personal rancor is injected in the investigation—as Senator TOBEY is doing—the objective will never be reached. Only a disastrous disintegration of national unity will result, a unity which America needs more urgently and imperatively today.

Representative Believes RFC Should Be Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview given by Representative PHIL J. WELCH to the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press under date of March 23, 1951:

WELCH FEELS RFC SHOULD BE ABOLISHED—DIVERTED FROM ORIGINAL PURPOSE, HE SAYS

Congressman PHIL J. WELCH said today he would vote to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an agency in which he once served as an assistant area manager.

"The RFC was a good thing when organized," the Third District Congressman said. "Its purpose was to help the small-business man. But somewhere along the line it was diverted into a set-up that gave its aid to big business."

The Democratic Congressman, home for the Easter vacation, served the RFC for about a year and a half as assistant manager for the area that included western Missouri and all of Kansas. He resigned when he became a candidate for Congress in 1948.

FAVORS DISASTER RELIEF

He emphatically declared himself as favoring the retaining of one section of the RFC under some other administrative set-up, however.

That is the disaster-relief loan section with which Mr. WELCH was closely associated during his tenure with the RFC.

"Many persons hard hit by flood and other disaster were aided by that section of the RFC," he said. "I recall particularly the victims of the Worth, Mo., tornado and many who suffered heavy losses when the Missouri River overflowed. These loans, the RFC figures will show, are repaid almost 100 percent.

"By all means a disaster relief set-up should be retained under some other agency if the RFC is abolished."

TO SPEAK AT ST. LOUIS

Mr. WELCH, who was accompanied home by his wife, will remain here about 2 weeks. On his way back to Washington he will stop at St. Louis, where on April 7 he will give the keynote address at the State convention of Young Democrats.

He said that as far as he knows the Office of Price Stabilization does not intend to have an office in St. Joseph; that it will operate for the entire territory out of its Kansas City office. James P. Hull, St. Joseph lawyer named as OPS enforcement attorney yesterday, will work out of the Kansas City office, the Congressman said.

Congressman WELCH said he did not believe President Harry S. Truman is "being given a fair break by some people."

SAW VIVIAN TRUMAN

"Much of the criticism he has received is unjustified," Mr. WELCH said. "Some of it is far more bitter and derisive than should ever be directed at the Chief Executive of our Nation.

"Remember this: Harry Truman has the toughest job in the world. The man would be superhuman if he didn't make mistakes. He is doing his best and will accomplish the objective sought, although, like everyone else, he may make some errors while proceeding."

The Congressman was at Kansas City yesterday. Among those with whom he conferred there was Vivian Truman, brother of the President.

Student Impressions of Congress of Industry—Bucknell Student Cites Educational Value of Sessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the January edition of the monthly bulletin of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association there appeared the following article written by Harvey H. Bush, a resident of New Castle, Pa., and a member of the senior class of Bucknell University, at Lewisburg, Pa.

College students from every State in the Union attended the fifty-fifth annual congress of American industry at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York.

Pennsylvania had three representatives. Mr. Bush was sponsored by the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association and gives his impressions of his visit to New York in this article.

STUDENT IMPRESSIONS OF CONGRESS OF INDUSTRY—BUCKNELL STUDENT CITES EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF SESSIONS

(By Harvey Bush)

Our American way of life—the free-enterprise system—industrial mobilization—national emergency—these were the phrases that dominated sessions of the fifty-fifth annual congress of American industry. It was my privilege to be a guest of Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association at the congress and thus take part in the program established by the education department of NAM. As a student delegate it is difficult for me to convey with precise enthusiasm how valuable this experience was to me. It would not be an exaggeration to say that I learned more about the field of industry and its relations to management, labor, and government in that 1 week than I could have learned in one semester of economics, history, or political science.

WARM-UP SESSION HELD

Prior to the opening of the congress the education department of NAM put its guests through a program of orientation. Organization of NAM was explained. Representatives from various departments outlined the functions of their group. We were given the opportunity to ask questions. Soon we had an excellent picture of the structure of NAM. Those of us who had known very little about NAM were ready to sit in on the sessions of the congress with clearer understanding of the organization.

Sessions began Wednesday morning and continued until Friday evening. There were four sessions each day—morning, luncheon, afternoon and evening. Our hosts had not required us to attend every session, but they had hoped that we would attend as many as possible. However, no urging was necessary. From the inspiring opening session to the banquet Friday night, interest in the congress seemed to increase. We heard discussions of such topics as America and World Crisis, Production for Freedom, Conservation of Our Resources, Inflation and Security, and America Tomorrow. We were privileged to hear such excellent speakers as Gen. George Marshall, Senator Wallace Bennett, Cyrus Ching, Claude Putnam, Earl Bunting, and Robert Montgomery, just to name a few. It was from such men that we received the picture of American industry today and the problems it faces.

When I first heard that NAM was going to bring college students to their Congress of American Industry as guest delegates, I was a bit skeptical. It looked like a free week at the Waldorf for some lucky group of students. At the very beginning of the week, however, we realized we had been invited to see this typically American voluntary association in action and to observe at first hand industry's thinking and philosophy. It was a week of education in which I learned what the NAM is doing now and hopes to do in the future.

The week, however, was not only informative and educational, but enjoyable also. It was not a week devoted entirely to speeches. We saw dramatic skits, heard excellent musical programs of soloists and choral groups, and saw interesting films. We also had the opportunity to meet and talk with some of the speakers and other men and women who were attending the congress. The students were assigned different tables at the luncheons, thus making it possible for us to meet many of the delegates. I was amazed at the genuine hospitality extended. We learned that NAM is definitely not composed of stuffed-shirted industrialists. It was a wonderful experience to be able to sit down and talk informally with these men and women. The student delegates also had opportunity to visit the United Nations. This was the first trip to Flushing for many of us who will always remember it.

As the convention adjourned Friday night it was hard to believe that the week was over. As we left New York Saturday for our college campuses throughout the Nation, we each knew that we had experienced a most enjoyable week. I think that the education department of NAM has a wonderful program which brings to the congress students, educators, and apprentices. As was stated at the convention, it would be nice to take a postgraduate course in their program. It was a week I shall never forget.

Issues Involved in Assignment of Troops to an International Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I desire to place in the RECORD certain statements which I have prepared this afternoon, in preparation for a pro and con program for the National Broadcasting Co. tonight, on the issues involved in the pending resolutions.

The statements are in the form of answers to questions to be asked by Mr. Frank Burkholser, of the National Broadcasting Co.

So Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD, so as to include the statements I shall make tonight over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the Senator's request that the statements shall appear in the RECORD as a speech or simply as a statement by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE. Whichever way is more agreeable to the Senator and the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it is to appear as a statement, I have no objection; but I shall object to having speeches placed in the RECORD under such circumstances, because we have never done so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that if his request is to have his own speech printed in the Appendix, he should ask consent that it be printed as a statement by him.

Mr. CASE. That is entirely agreeable to me. I asked that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator requesting to have his own remarks or a separate matter printed?

Mr. CASE. They are my own remarks. I have no objection to having them appear in the RECORD as a statement. I asked that they appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, and that in the Appendix of the RECORD they may appear as my own words.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall have no objection to having that done, if the statement bears a heading which shows that it is a statement by the Senator.

Mr. CASE. I shall present it in that form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE GREAT DEBATE RE TROOPS ABROAD BY FRANK BURKHOLSER, OF NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY, AND FRANCIS CASE, UNITED STATES SENATOR, SOUTH DAKOTA, MARCH 30, 1951

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Senator CASE, what exactly is the question involved in the foreign-policy matter now before the Senate?

Senator CASE. Mr. Burkholser, the question is whether the Senate, and possibly the Congress, shall approve President Truman's announced plan to send four additional divisions of ground troops to Europe to be part of an international army but say that we want a voice in deciding whether any additional troops shall be sent.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. How did the matter come up?

Senator CASE. The question arises out of our membership in the North Atlantic Treaty organization under a treaty ratified by the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress. Article 3 of that treaty provided for mutual aid in maintaining the security of the North Atlantic area.

At the time the treaty was considered in the Senate, assurances were given that Congress would be consulted and have a voice in determining how the treaty would be carried out. That is, that Congress would have a right to say in what way and to what extent the United States would contribute to implementing the pact.

Shortly afterward, Congress considered and passed a bill to provide military equipment to other countries in the North Atlantic Treaty organization. At the time, no provision was made for creating an international army. Each member nation was setting up its own army or its own navy if it had one. The United States, by the military aid law, authorized help to these other countries in arming and equipping their forces.

Now, however, the President has said that he intended to send some United States troops to Europe to be part of an international army under an international command.

In January, Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, made a motion that the Senate express itself as opposed to such action until the Congress had considered and formulated a policy with respect to sending troops into an international army. That motion was referred to a joint committee of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services. After hearings, they reported the resolutions now before the Senate.

In brief, these resolutions say that the Senate or Congress, as the case may be, approves the President's plan to send four divisions of ground troops to the international army but that we think we, or at least certain committees, should be consulted before any more troops are sent, beyond these four divisions and their supporting troops.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. By the way, Senator CASE, you were not a Member of the Senate when the North Atlantic Treaty was ratified but you were a Member of the House of Representatives when the military-aid law was passed, under which, as you say, military equipment for these other member nations was provided. What was your position on that bill?

Senator CASE. I am glad you asked that question, Mr. Burkholser, for it will help to clarify the issues in this matter as I see them.

I voted for that military aid bill.

I did it on this ground: the Senate had already ratified the North Atlantic Treaty. Rightly or wrongly, we were committed to a pledge of assistance by that body of the Congress which, under the Constitution ratifies treaties. If it meant anything, it meant that we would help them to arm so as to restore a balance of power in Europe and the North Atlantic area. We had persuaded these nations to say they would oppose aggression in that area; we had said we would help them in some way; we could hardly expect them to stand against aggression with their naked fists.

That was the phrase I used in the debate in the House. We could not expect them to stand up against an aggressor with their naked fists.

So, I voted for the measure to provide them with some arms for their own troops. Now, however, the question is whether we shall say it is all right with us that the President has promised land troops of the United States to an international army under an international command, but that hereafter we would please like to have him ask us about it.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Will the resolution now pending require the President to consult Congress hereafter?

Senator CASE. No; it says in effect that we hope he will. That is one of the questions to be decided.

The pending resolutions are simple expressions of the Senate or of the Congress if the concurrent resolution is adopted.

Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, however proposes to make a motion that the matter be sent back to the committees with an instruction to report the subject matter back in the form of a regular bill which would have to be passed by both House and Senate and either signed or vetoed by the President. If signed, of course, it would have the effect of law.

Many Senators—Senator CAIN, of Washington, and Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, for example—oppose the pending resolutions principally because they are only resolutions and they think would only hoodwink the people since they would be merely a pious hope and not have the force of law.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Well, Senator CASE, do you think Congress should have a voice in sending troops to be part of an international army under an international command?

Senator CASE. Indeed, I do, Mr. Burkholser. The Constitution gave Congress the power to declare war.

The Constitution also says that Congress "shall have the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, to raise and support armies and to provide for the organizing of the Militia—which is the National Guard—and for governing them when employed in the service of the United States."

So, I certainly think Congress should say whether it is raising armies for an international command and whether the National Guard when called into Federal service shall be made part of an international army in peacetime, and without either a declaration of war or an attack upon territory of the United States.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. But Senator CASE, does not the Constitution also say that the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and of the Militia when it is called into service of the United States?

Senator CASE. That is true, Mr. Burkholser. He is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. It may be questioned, however, whether the fathers of the country and the Constitution ever contemplated that any President would delegate that power to an international commander in time of peace.

Certainly George Washington never expected any successor to do so. But, regardless of whether the President technically can order our troops into an international army in time of peace, without getting prior approval of the Congress, certainly it is poor policy for him to do so.

A lot of precedents have been cited where Presidents have sent troops into foreign countries to protect American lives or property without first getting approval of Congress, and generally with the consent or by the invitation of the host country—but never before in time of peace have they been put under an international command. I have not heard of one such instance.

I strongly question whether the laws under which the National Guard of the several States can be called into the Federal service authorize the President to send them out of this country in time of peace and to place them under the command of officers who are not officers of the United States.

If they permit it technically, at least I can say that I believe such an act was far beyond the intent of any Congress that ever authorized federalizing the militias of the several States.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Senator CASE, have you considered offering an amendment to prevent the militia units from being sent into an international army?

Senator CASE. Not exactly, Mr. Burkholser, because I do not think such an amendment should be needed.

I doubt if there is authority in law for the State militias to be made part of an international army simply by an order of the President.

And I have been amazed that Senators from certain States who say they are strong for States' rights should claim that the President, as Commander in Chief, can take the State militias out of the country in time of peace and turn them over to an international army and place them under the command of officers who are not even officers of the United States.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. But you have proposed an amendment to the pending resolutions, two of them in fact, I understand.

Senator CASE. That is correct, Mr. Burkholser.

The first amendment I have proposed would say that soldiers sent to this international army should be at least 20 years of age. This would prevent sending 18- and 19-year-olds into the international army.

We had a children's crusade back in the thirteenth century. It was one of the last of the crusades for the rescue of the Holy Land. The graves and the bones of the children were scattered all the way from France to Jerusalem.

General Eisenhower, you will recall, has written his memoirs of World War II under the title "Crusade in Europe"; well, I don't want this new crusade to be a "children's crusade."

Boys of 18 and 19 are not used for policemen even at home—they should not be used for an international police under the command of officers we do not and cannot control and under environments and conditions we cannot influence.

If any one thing was learned in our occupation of Germany and Japan, it was, I thought, that young boys should not be used for occupation troops, even when under the command of our own officers and under camp conditions and leave regulations that we could determine. But now, unless a restriction such as I have proposed is adopted, 18- and 19-year-old boys can be drafted and sent into an international army where the duties, conditions, and influences will be those of foreign officers whose ideals and standards, whether better or worse, will be beyond our control.

I simply do not think this new crusade should be a children's crusade.

Therefore, I have offered my amendment, and unless it is adopted, on that score alone, I would vote against endorsing the President's plan.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Well, Senator CASE, I see you feel very strongly on that point.

Senator CASE. I do.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. And I was wanting to ask you about your other proposed amendment, the one on enlisting volunteers in Germany. I understand that has attracted considerable interest in England and in Europe generally.

Senator CASE. It has attracted considerable interest over there. Several foreign newspapers have sent queries about it. I think the people of England and Europe, generally, have a better realization than we do of the tremendous capacity for production that exists in Germany. They also know by experience that the Germans are good fighters.

And, instinctively, the people of the North Atlantic area, on that side of the Atlantic, would like to have the production of German industry and the manpower of Germany on our side if war should come. And they know, too, that the German people are naturally on the side of religion and of private property against the tenets of communism.

My amendment seeks to make possible the recruitment of matériel and manpower from the capacity that is Germany's. I have tried to draw the amendment in such a way as to open the door to the Germans without compelling them and, at the same time, to avoid the fears that a remilitarized Germany might create in France, or in Russia, too, for that matter. It reads:

"It is the sense of the Senate that the people of Germany should be permitted to share in their own defense and the collective security of the North Atlantic area by contributing such supplies and equipment as the several states of Germany may agree to furnish; and that a special corps shall be created for the voluntary enlistment of German nationals: Provided, that the training and command of such soldiers shall be under the direction of the Commander in Chief, NATO."

As you will see, that opens the door to voluntary contributions of supplies and equipment by the German states; it opens the door for the voluntary enlistment of German soldiers in the international army to be under the NATO commander in chief and does not create a German army as such.

It is designed to permit the people with the largest industrial capacity of Europe, which we once destroyed and have now largely built back, to help in its own defense. It lets German youth and trained veterans enlist in the defense of their own homes.

Unless we are willing to let these people help defend themselves, why should we put up the money and men to do it? That is my position.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Thank you, Senator CASE.

Idaho Adopts a Webfoot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of our outstanding citizens who has made a name for himself in our State of Oregon has moved on to fields in our neighboring State of Idaho and has recently been elected to the highest office of that State.

I am including as part of these remarks an article which appeared in the Old Oregon magazine for February 1951 by Anita Holmes, entitled "Idaho Adopts a Webfoot," which tells of the rise of Oregon-born Len Jordan to the governorship of Idaho. The article follows:

IDAHO ADOPTS A WEBFOOT—LEN JORDAN, UNIVERSITY GRADUATE OF 1923 AND GRANGEVILLE COUNTY RANCHER, BECOMES THE NEW GOVERNOR OF IDAHO

(By Anita Holmes)

When an Idahoan talks of his State's new Governor, he may say something like, "Len Jordan—auto dealer and rancher from the Grangeville country—never heard much of him in politics before—Republican."

But an Oregonian identifies Governor Jordan as "University of Oregon graduate in the class of '23—played varsity football and made Phi Beta at the same time—married Grace Edgington, class of '16."

The economics and business studied by Jordan at Oregon will be indispensable during his 4 years in the Idaho statehouse. His first legislature is now underway. It should be a productive one with the governor and the majorities in the two houses of the same party.

A soon as the ballot boxes were put away in November, Jordan announced some of his plans for this and the next three legislatures:

"Action toward a long-range highway program in the State, personal supervision over the purse strings of the State to cut down unnecessary expenses.

"Something's got to be done about the driver's license law, and we need a motor pool to cut down duplication of traveling in State vehicles.

"We'll follow the same principles we use in business to conduct State affairs."

And if Jordan can pin his business principles to State government, Idaho should become a national leader. Every business he has touched has succeeded. All, that is, but one.

This single failure came in the early days of the depression, when countless good managers saw their profits eclipsed by a broken bank.

After Jordan had been graduated from Oregon he headed back to the sheep country in central Oregon. As the son of county judge in Enterprise he had grown up with the currents of the Snake River and had no desire for a desk job in the city.

Only Grace Edgington could bring him to the city of Portland, and she did. But after a few years of marriage and two children, the Jordans turned to new horizons in Wallowa County. To go in this direction the young accountant had to make a bank loan, lease a farm, and buy a band of sheep.

They lost all but $600 in the depression.

However, this loss didn't send Jordan to the Government for security. He believes today that the only place where there is security is in a Federal penitentiary where you have lost all your freedoms.

Idahoans who elected Governor Jordan have often heard him say, "I cannot see why the Government owes anybody a living except in rare instances, such as the destitute, the blind, the crippled, the child of the broken home.

"No one would deny that modern society must consider such obligations. But under the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the welfare state, thrift on a national scale and at the family level has been made to seem stupid, old-fashioned.

"We must go back to the day when people could save for their old age and know their savings would still buy what they would need; to the day when young people felt a responsibility to the parents who bore them."

There was never a chance in the Jordan background for him or his family to become soft. After losing everything in the depression he rode into the sheep country looking for a job. It was then that he entered Idaho, where he eventually became owner of a sheep ranch in Hells Canyon, about 90 miles from Lewiston.

Life in Hells Canyon was rugged, especially for a woman, but Grace Jordan was equal to it. At one stretch she didn't see another woman for 4 months. She became the "best barber along the Snake," and during 1 month entertained some 70 wayfarers. She also gave the younger Jordan generation their basic education.

In the early 1940's the family moved from the canyon ranch to Grangeville; in 1944 they sold the ranch and put the money into a 320-acre farm and an insurance and real-estate business.

The business subsequently was sold and the Oregon graduate began operating a farmer-owned string of warehouses and a pea-processing plant besides running his own farm. Success with this led to an additional 400 acres of farm land, a farm-implement business, and the Ford-Mercury dealership in Grangeville.

When Len Jordan first announced that he was running for the nomination, at least one would-be political expert in Idaho just smiled and remarked that "some car dealer in Grangeville is running on a ticket of highway improvement."

At that, probably no man in the State was more qualified to run on a platform including such a plank. Jordan had been more than auto dealer and rancher for the 2 years before his election as Governor. He had been representative from Idaho County to the State legislature and in turn had been chairman of the committee appointed to study highway-user taxation.

As chairman of this committee, he helped Idaho move into its present sound financial status. The inland State is high among the few solvent States in the Nation.

The governor at that time, who also helped bring that solvency, didn't face a full Republican legislature as Jordan is doing. Last session C. A. Robins worked with both houses under Democratic control.

Robins was Idaho's twelfth, and Jordan the thirteenth Republican governor. All but one man, the secretary of state, in the statehouse with Jordan is a Republican.

One Idahoan who was a State official but won't be returning this session is Cal Wright—Democratic candidate who was defeated by Jordan. A popular man throughout Idaho, Wright was justly feared by Republican Party leaders, but he early conceded the election to the man from Grangeville.

After the election was over and the governorship won, Jordan was uneasy over the difficult job of pulling together Idaho's divergent interests. He feared that 50 percent of the people would hate him at the end of 4 years—and he might be correct. It's not easy to win strong support from both the leading religious factions and the gambling interests in a State like Idaho.

But if Jordan history repeats—his years at Oregon, then ranching and other business ventures—this political newcomer from the Oregon side of the Snake will soon be a success as Governor of Idaho.

A New Birth of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A New Birth of Freedom." This address was delivered by Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., on Friday, July 28, 1950, at Lake Success, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM

All progress in the world comes slowly, and at a price. It is well to keep this in mind when the turn of events seems to make us unhappy with the United Nations. We would be realists if we think of the United Nations today as a gawky boy in the most awkward, most difficult period of life.

You and I have seen plenty of such boys. Looking at one of them, in his years of frustration and self doubt, even his parents are sometimes worried about his future. No relative or friend is wise enough to predict how that lad will turn out.

He may turn out to be a total failure. All of us have seen boys who did fail in spite of all that well wishers could offer in the way of counsel and support.

On the other hand, he may develop talents and power so vast, and aptitudes which have been unknown as to make him an influence for good not merely in his own community but in the whole country and even the whole world.

One such unpromising youngster was born in the humblest sort of home in Kentucky 141 years ago. His father was a failure, judged by the world's standards; his mother had been a servant. Neither they nor he had more than a few months' formal schooling.

The boy was tall, homely, and most unimpressive. He showed no special talent. He had few successes. He served for a few weeks as a volunteer in the Black Hawk War, but without distinction. He worked for farmers in Indiana and Illinois. He split rails for a few cents an hour. He was for a little while a partner in a crossroads grocery store which went bankrupt. He got himself admitted to the bar and elected to the Illinois Legislature. His youthful speeches did not attract much attention. Nobody—not even his best friends and well wishers—could think of him as anything more than just another small-town lawyer-politician.

Yet, all the time something deep and strong and powerful was going on inside him. Something that was one day to make his name known in the farthest corners of the world; something that still lives in the heart of every man and woman who seeks—as he did—to make sure that "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." The United Nations may be as futile and as little known in the years to come as some of the boys who grew up with Abraham Lincoln. That is a possibility, though I do not believe a likely one. Or the United Nations may go on to write in even broader terms the goal proclaimed almost a century ago by the backwoods lawyer who became our President when he said: "* * * that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom." It can well be, through the United Nations organization, that this world under God shall have a new birth of freedom.

Yes, the United Nations can be, with God's help and our own faith and devotion, the greatest agency for good that has come into the world in 1900 years.

Toward that goal of international good, and peace and well-being, let us work, and believe, and hope.

We—the people of America—have been elected by fate to occupy an important position in the United Nations. For the moment we have to carry more than our share. We may not like it. We cannot expect to be thanked. We will often be criticized. But we are elected. We cannot resign. We cannot duck. We cannot run. It is a great chance for the people if their strength of purpose, their tolerance, and their bigness hold out. I am one of those who believe we will hold out and win.

Increased Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial carries some very constructive views regarding increased postal rates. While I have always felt that this great Government service should in a large way be self-sustaining, we must not overlook the fact that the service serves all of the people and therefore the Hoover Commission reports should be studied extensively and their recommendations put into effect at once before any large increases are made in these rates at this time. The following editorial appeared in the West Bend News, of West Bend, Wis.:

INCREASED POSTAL RATES

Strenuous effort is now being made by the Post Office Department of the Federal Government and by President Truman to rush legislation through Congress that will double second-class postal rates. Companion bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress, and both bills call for a 100-percent increase in second-class rates in 3 years—50 percent the first year, 25 the second, and 25 the third year.

In urging an increase in his message to Congress in February, President Truman made certain statements which we believe do not present the situation fairly to either the Congress or the public. The figures used by the President are based upon post office cost-accounting figures. We believe those figures to be erroneous because the fundamental realities of proper cost accounting methods are ignored.

Post-office cost accounting is determined on a weight and per-piece basis, without consideration of public-service factors or priorities. However, these factors are basic and paramount in the operation of the post office, because the post office is not a business, but is a service to all the American people, and hence cost figures determined as they would be in competitive business are of little value for setting rates.

For example, according to the post office's own records, there are some 39,000 of the present 41,000 post offices in this country which do not take in sufficient money to pay their own expenses. Some 94 percent of all post offices are in this category. We believe that this only serves to prove that the Post Office Department is created primarily for service to American citizens and not as a business proposition. How many chain stores, we ask, could continue to exist if 94 percent of their stores did not take in sufficient funds to pay their expenses?

The idea that the post office should serve all the American public on a business basis is not in agreement with the handling of other governmental departments. For in 1950, there were differences between income and outgo in the Interior Department, which operated with a deficit of about $460,000,000; in the Commerce Department, with a deficit of about $668,000,000, and in the Department of Agriculture, which showed a deficit of about $475,000,000. Each of these serves mere segments of the population. The post office serves everyone. The President, in his message of February, gives the estimated net postal deficit for 1952 as $361,000,000, which is less than any of those just mentioned.

The President mentions that publications made a contribution to the spread of information and education among all citizens. He does not mention, however, the very valuable effect of these publications, particularly in times like this, in carrying information concerning the national defense effort both to the people of this country and also to the millions of readers throughout the world. Nor does he mention the great contribution of advertising to defense bond sales, to the maintenance of steady employment, to Red Cross recruiting, and a host of other services.

The President points out that the matter of postal rates should be subject to very thorough study. We can agree with him wholeheartedly. We believe that such a study will prove conclusively that the post office is a service agency of the Government; that cost accounting charges should fundamentally be divided into two groups, "Government service" and "business handling"; that the first class should be paid for wholly by the Government, as are the deficits in the Interior, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments, and that the costs in the second group should be reflected in the rate structure of the postal service.

For the reasons indicated, it is urged that the enactment of the rate increases at this time either be deferred, or kept at a very low level, and that the survey which the President suggests should be completed before any substantial rate increases are attempted. It is urged very strongly that this thorough survey of the whole subject of postal rates be undertaken by an independent body similar in type to the Hoover Commission or the committees who in the past have made studies and recommendations in connection with social security.

Postal Rate Problem Needs Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Cadis Republican, Cadiz, Ohio. The thinking of Mr. Milton Ronsheim, the editor of this outstanding eastern Ohio weekly, closely coincides with my own on the matter of postal rates:

POSTAL RATE PROBLEM NEEDS STUDY

Once again the Post Office Department, with the backing of President Truman, is making its bid in Congress to substantially increase rates on various classes of postage. We believe the post-office deficit has not been properly presented and that the proposed rate increase would be another unnecessary expense upon a harassed public.

In the first place, the Post Office Department, in spite of its reluctance to adopt many economy measures except to give poorer mail delivery to its patrons, comes nearer to making itself pay than any other governmental agency.

It is not a business but a service to the public. Rural routes were never expected to pay their own way; they were instituted as a "free delivery" to persons unable to go to a post office daily. The service is one of "delivery" and not of "sending" mail and should be so considered in counting its cost.

The post office is likewise one of the Government's own service organization. A huge quantity of mail sent by Government agents and agencies is handled free and given no place on the credit side of the ledger. Here, for example, the mail of such agencies as the county extension agents, Production and Marketing Administration, draft board, conservation office, Weather Bureau, FBI, health department, the post office, and others pay no postage. Incoming free mail is also very heavy. It is estimated that half of the post-office deficit comes from franked mail.

Additional postage on newspapers would be another added cost of production to a large number of increased expenses. By their very nature, newspapers give a constant, free public service, both to government and community. The current issue of the Republican, for example, carries the following: A long explanation of new social-security benefits and what applicants should do; the weekly news of extension agents; draft board news; civilian defense news and a plea for first-aid instructors; about a church fund drive and efforts to secure a doctor for Cadis; an editorial on fire safety; announcement of a civil-service examination for the post office itself for a rural route carrier, and so on. These services are of considerable value to good government—and are given free as a routine job.

We believe Congress should go into the entire post-office problem before changing its postal rates. The issue is broader than just raising rates to meet a deficit. Certainly an over-all survey will show where many economies may be effected, that millions of dollars listed as deficits should be listed as free services and that the post office is a service organization, after all.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier Journal:

GRAIN FOR INDIA HAS NOW BECOME AN UGLY EASTER

If your neighbor was hungry, would you give him a piece of bread? Of course you would, and whatever else your refrigerator could afford. India is our neighbor in this world grown strangely small. And if for no other reason than that of human compassion we should be touched by India's plight. Droughts, floods, and earthquakes have ravaged that teeming land. It faces a famine catastrophic even in a country where pain and privation are familiar visitors. For grain is the factor between life and death for India, and the season's crops are ruined.

India asked the United States to sell 2,000,000 tons of wheat on long-term credit. After talks in which Herbert Hoover, Senator TAFT, and other Republicans agreed with President Truman, the President asked Congress in February to give the grain to India. Congress has not yet acted, and what should have been a simple act of decency has become a haggle over human lives and souls.

Why this delay? The Indian Government refused to join the United Nations' condemnation of Red China as the aggressor in Korea. India has tried, even though with ineffectual good will, to find some means to end the conflict in Korea. And there are still men in Congress who cannot see that in this fateful time free men must keep their brothers if they themselves stay free.

Instead of a plain act of kindness, the wheat transaction has become a cynical contest between Soviet Communist and western freedom. Red China has offered India 1,000,000 tons of rice and corn in barter, and the Soviet Union is ready to supply 50,000 more tons. This, you may say, should not influence us in a matter which morality should decide alone. Just the same, it must. The United States cannot buy Indian understanding of our loyalties and our independence with 2,000,000 tons of grain. But here is a nation just emerging from colonialism. If, faced with disaster, it finds strength in the blandishments of communism and deadly inaction in us who boast of the world's most vital resources, then what may we expect? Millions more Indians will hurry toward the mirage of Soviet totalitarianism. We will have failed to lead them to the journey's end of freedom and self-respect. And this wide domain of all we cherish will one day become a refuge and a lonely land.

Taxes on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, all Americans realize that it takes taxes to support Government and to supply necessary Government services. They also know that taxes assessed at the local level return more in Government services than Federal assessments. That is why I am opposed to the taxing of municipal securities. The following editorial in the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter expresses the sincere opinions of taxpayers in my district:

TAXES ON TAXES

The Federal Government, at the suggestion of Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, proposes to tax the interest which municipalities pay on the general obligation bonds which they issue.

Municipalities the Nation over are having a tough time finding sources of taxation through which to raise funds to meet general service obligations which have been saddled on them by law. Larger and larger portions of the taxes to which the local communities rightfully should be entitled are now going into State and national treasuries.

The irony of the whole thing is that at the same time State and National governments continue to boast about the huge sums they are returning to the local communities as aids.

Aids? That's just another word to confuse and make the local taxpayer feel good and to give the politicians an opportunity to brag about all the money they are getting out of Washington and Madison for their constituents. Actually it's much like someone blackjacking an individual, taking $50 out of his wallet, giving him $5 back and pretending to be a good fellow.

The bill to tax interest on municipal indebtedness, the bright idea of Secretary Snyder, is now pending in the House Ways and Means Committee. It is hoped that the members will have enough sense either to recommend its rejection or forget all about reporting it out.

If the Snyder proposal is enacted into law it will be a tough blow for Fond du Lac and all other cities who in the future try to float bond issues to finance necessary municipal improvement. If the interest rates on municipal bonds are taxed by the Federal Government, it is certain that prospective buyers will be reluctant to purchase them without a compensatory increase in the rate of interest. Increase the interest rate and the cost of municipal government will increase substantially.

Let's take Berlin in a neighboring county because most everyone is acquainted with this up and coming community. If Berlin wanted to build a new sewage plant the cost probably would be increased by more than $200,000 because the tax would probably double the interest rate paid on the bonds. And who would pay that extra $200,000 in interest charges over the years? Certainly not the people who buy them. Certainly not the Federal Government. Well, there's always the poor taxpayer.

But let's bring it closer to home. In the Fond du Lac budget for this year there are $18,368 set aside for bond interest. If the tax were enacted by the Federal Government actually that interest would mount to

nearly $37,000. The interest, without the tax, is going to be more in future years. Over a period of years the increase by reason of a Federal tax would mount into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It is quite evident that Fond du Lac, as well as many other communities, could not absorb that additional burden and many municipal improvements, necessary as they might be, would have to left undone.

If you are opposed to unwarranted increases in local taxes write or wire your Representatives in Congress—Representative WILLIAM K. VAN PELT and Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY.

Rustle of Spring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bernie Yudain from the Greenwich Time, of Greenwich, Conn.:

THE RAMBLER

(By Bernie Yudain)

RUSTLE OF SPRING

As long as I've lived in the country, I can't tell you what kind of bird I heard whistling a sweet madrigal the other morning as I left for work. It was a strong voice, and a melodic one. My unseen diva seemed happy.

Nights now, you hear the peepers, too. Their incessant sing-song cheeping is the familiar pizzicato in the Spring Song. The squirrels are darting to and fro and up and down the elms and poplars and I suppose out in the fields where, alas, I am not wont to trod these busy days, there is considerable bustling.

The first red flush of budlets can be seen on the branches and some proud golden splashes of the hearty forsythia brighten the suburban streets.

The winter-jaded observer, submerged in routine, occupied with the headlines, concerned over the future, pauses and realizes that spring is here. Soon the pale green puffs will adorn the trees, and winter-weary lawns will take on a green freshness—a new lease on life.

This, then, is the season of hope, and these natural stirrings are its myriad heralds.

Whether Easter comes early or late, the spring is God's promise to His children—to all the harried, disillusioned people who have lost their shiny dreams in a miasma of war, threats of war, scandal, violence, corruption, deceit, chicanery, and nearly universal callousness.

Now comes the reminder—right outside our window, along the neighborhood streets, in the meadows and woods—that nothing really has changed, except us.

There's a sweetness and a soothing balm in the air and the bright sun lights up the darkened corners of our lives, its warm rays melting some of the tenseness and rudeness of our ways.

Here nature seems to be offering us the Grail—not even demanding we go forth and find it. But we're a busy people in this frenetic age of speed and atoms and electronics. Perhaps one day or another during the vernal season we'll stop to take a deep breath of the clear air and observe that spring is wonderful, but then we'll get right back on the treadmill for another interminable race with whatever it is we're racing.

The chipmunks and the larks, alas, seem to give forth better music when "heaven tries the earth if it be in tune."

Living a Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, many people talk about religion and what to do about it, but not enough of us really live it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a column from the New York Times of Sunday, April 1, which in eloquently simple prose retells a story known to every Ohioan. This oft-told tale shines like a beacon light in these troubled times:

TOPICS OF THE TIMES

MAN NAMED CHAPMAN

A hundred and fifty years ago this April a stranger turned up in Licking Spring, Ohio. Strangers were scarce in Licking Spring. The only white man living there looked closely at this one. He was 26, tall, thin, black-eyed. He wore homemade frontier-style clothing. His name, he said, was Jonathan Chapman and he had come West from Massachusetts by way of Pittsburgh. What he did at Licking Spring must have baffled its only resident. Instead of staking off a piece of land for himself, Chapman hunted until he found a small clearing. He took apple seeds from a loaded burlap bag and planted them. He put a rough fence around the plot and left Licking Spring as noiselessly as he had come.

That was the first appearance in American history of Johnny Appleseed, a man more tenderly remembered in the years to follow then any river-boat load of assorted politicians, generals, and statesmen.

MUSKINGUM WHITE WOMAN KOKOSING

A few years later Johnny was seen on the Ohio with two boats filled with apple seeds from the cider presses in Pittsburgh. Thereafter his trail is not easy to follow. He paddled his boat up White Woman Creek, up the Licking River, the Muskingum, the Mohican and the Kokosing. He set out his orchards at Steubenville and a half hundred other places in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan. Wherever apples bloomed fresh in the wilderness a man could say for sure that Johnny had been there. Sometimes he returned to his planting for seedlings to set elsewhere; as often, he did not. He left his nurseries behind in the hope that the settlers might realize what beauty and riches he had planted for them and care for them as he did.

LIVING A RELIGION

A hundred small towns knew him, but they knew as little of his coming and going as of the birds of spring and autumn. They knew him as a religious zealot but one who lived his religion far more than he talked it. The main drive of his life was selflessness; he had set out to plant apples because, back East, he had heard that Ohio apples were dying and he felt called to replant them, that the settlers might eat the fruit and be spared the scurvy. His way of life and his work made him a legend among the simple people of his day and long before he died. In a land that was hard and where life was hard, his disinterest in the things that concerned most men brought him the great love that outlasted his life. He died in 1845, near Fort Wayne, Ind., after catching cold while inspecting one of his nurseries.

THE LEGENDS GROW

After his death the legends about him grew like one of his own trees. Men told of his ways with the Indians, of their friendship for him and their trust and of the times Johnny had dealt with them alone and unafraid. Another man told how he had seen Johnny playing with bear cubs while the mother bear watched without concern; few humans have walked this earth who could do that. Others told how Johnny would eat no meat, carry no gun, how he would give the clothes from his back to any man who needed them, how he would walk the winter woods barefoot, how he would ask a simple meal at a cabin door and pay for it with apple trees, how he asked to sleep the night on a cabin floor and was gone long before his hosts awoke.

THE HARDER AIM

The men of his day who sought and gained wealth, power, and prestige are long forgotten. Still remembered, as fresh as Ohio apple blossoms, is the simple man who took no care for the things of the morrow as he walked through early American history and brushed close to people's hearts. Perhaps it was because, after all, wealth and power and prestige may not be so hard to achieve; many a man gets them. Johnny Appleseed aimed at something much tougher: to leave the world a more neighborly place than he found it.

Congress Itself Gives Away Its Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have seen so many articles and heard so many speeches deploring the fact that the bureaus and the President are fast taking away the powers of Congress. Some Congressmen have made similar statements. The public, through radio addresses and letters, have generally importuned Congress to make an effort to reclaim its powers under the Constitution. I think this should be done, but it is so easy to accomplish that few will accept my recipe for doing it.

Under the Constitution, the House of Representatives and the Senate can, by joint resolution, reduce the powers which have been delegated to any executive bureau, and prevent further delegation. The reason why executive bureaus today make rules and regulations with the force of law is not because these bureaus have usurped the power of Congress, but because Congress has, by law, delegated these powers to the various executive agencies. Congress could have withheld such powers from the bureaus, but it declined to do so and through poor and inattentive legislation has passed on to these bureaus the power that Congress itself should be exercising.

A fair example of this wholesale delegation of powers of Congress is found in the Treasury Department. This department makes rules and regulations

sometimes not only daily but hourly and these regulations have the force of law. The only way for an individual citizen to know what the law is, is to read the Federal Register which comes out every day. What was lawful yesterday is unlawful today. As soon as these regulations are published and they are published every night in the Government Printing Office, they become the law of the land. Who gave the Treasury Department any such complete and arrogant legislative powers? It was Congress and no one else. The Treasury Department has not in any way usurped this power but merely exercises its right under the authority of Congress. The authority, in many cases, is a positive command to exercise this power and to stay within the duties and obligations of its office, the Treasury is officially enjoined to make these laws.

Congress itself cannot complain because the various executive departments are actively engaged in making laws and doing what Congress itself should do. There is a grave question, too, whether Congress has the right to delegate general legislative powers.

Further delegation of these powers could be stopped at once if Congress would do so. The public should not condemn these autocratic bureaus—they should condemn Congress for creating such a situation.

The next complaint which is generally heard is that the Executive has assumed dictatorial powers. There is nothing about this situation that Congress cannot control any time it wants to. Bills are constantly coming before Congress to enlarge the powers of the President, and if Congress is not in accord, it can say "No." Suppose the President assumed powers he does not have, such as the engaging in war without the consent of Congress. What can be done to prevent it? How can the Chief Executive be stopped in this matter?

The framers of the Government had had a very sad experience with arbitrary power in Great Britain and threw off the yoke of this autocratic power so that when they themselves came to organize their own government, after a bloody revolution, they made sure that the people would never find themselves under the rule of autocracy.

The framers of our Government placed the great responsibility of preserving the people's government in the hands of those Members of the lower House of Congress by giving that body the complete control of the purse strings of the Nation. The framers put this trust in this body because they were nearest to the people and had to go before the people every 2 years to give an account of their stewardship. On this matter the Constitution reads:

Section 7, article I: All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Section 9, article I provides: No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement of accounts and receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

The primary responsibility of checking the Executive or any other division of the executive branch rests, therefore, on the House of Representatives. Suppose the President, for example, should disobey constitutional limitations and engage in an activity which never had the approval of Congress, directly or indirectly? Even in that case, the President would be powerless to engage in the undertaking unless Congress appropriated the money, and if the House refused to pass such an appropriation, the Executive could be checked and stopped. This power the House of Representatives has and it is the strongest power belonging to any department of government. The responsibility for the maintenance of a free government is lodged in the lower House nearest to the people.

All the complaints written and heard about the powers that the President has taken away from Congress cannot be maintained. If that situation has developed whose fault is it? It is not the fault of the executive department. It is the fault of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. As Members of Congress we cannot with good grace join in this public clamor against the usurpation of powers by the President. We are at fault and no other body. If this lower House would stand up on its own feet and exercise the power which the Constitution gives it, no such charge of Executive usurpation could or would be made. We represent the people and the people expect us to protect them with this great power which has come down to us since the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787.

Too much fault cannot, however, be found with the Members of the House of Representatives if extra powers are granted almost every day—especially those powers asked by the President. In a state of war or a condition bordering on all-out war the President, as Commander in Chief of the Nation, must have reasonable authority to act in the interest of the country and when war is actually here, democracy does not function in a normal manner. What we have a right to do in peacetime we have no right to do in time of war. We can do nothing that in any way interferes with the war effort, and the judge of that situation is the Commander in Chief. Members of the House, as a usual rule, vote just about the way that suits the people who elected them and if the real cause of stripping Congress of its constitutional powers is finally run down it will be found that the voters themselves are to blame. It is very infrequent that a Member of Congress will defy the will of the voters back home.

Applying this doctrine to the present situation, I can show how the powers of Congress are taken over. At the present moment, the President insists that we put an army into Western Europe without the consent of Congress. When that is done and a war actually starts, we are engaged in war which the Constitution says cannot be engaged in without the authority of Congress.

If I make a stand against the President's action and say we must obey the Constitution, what happens? Thousands of letters and telegrams come pouring in from North Dakota to support the President in anything he wants. These communications say, in substance, "No matter if the President is overriding the powers of Congress, the situation is grave and therefore support the President." What am I to do as a Representative of the people? If I follow my own judgment, I will not be a party to giving away those powers. I vote "No," and then the fur flies. I am branded in the papers as a misrepresentative of the people and the chances are good that I would be kicked out of Congress body and breeches at the next election. The average Congressman likes to stay in Congress, for what particular reason I do not know, and to stay in he follows the wishes of the people who bombard him with letters and messages. The powers are therefore taken away from Congress and turned over to the President, and who did it? The people did it. That is the reason why so many Congressmen vote away the powers of Congress—they are afraid not to—they are afraid of what the voters will do to them.

Those Members who do not feel that being in Congress is the most important thing in life, and that in some way they can eke out a meager existence outside Congress, stand up and vote their convictions. They refuse to turn over the powers of Congress to the Executive or anyone else. They defend the Constitution which they are sworn to do. They are not swerved by war hysteria or any other hysteria. These men may be censured, may be removed from office, and shunned as a citizen, but it is men of this stamp who have preserved our Government. These men can retire to private life with the full consciousness that they have done the right thing while in office and, after all, peace of mind and a clear conscience are more to be desired than anything the voters can offer.

Election of Governor of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a collection of editorials from Alaska newspapers endorsing the proposal I have made that Alaska be granted the right to elect its own Governor. They include an editorial from the Ketchikan Daily News of December 19, 1950, entitled "Why Not Election of Governor?"; an editorial from the Daily Alaska Empire of January 4, 1951, entitled "Elected Alaska Governor"; a column of comment from the Petersburg Press of January 5, 1951; and an editorial from the Sitka Sentinel of December 5,

1950. All of these newspapers are dailies except the Petersburg Press.

I call attention to the fact that all the daily newspapers in the Territory, with the exception of two, have endorsed this proposal.

Along the same line, the Territorial House of Alaska has just adopted a memorial calling for enactment of my bill or similiar legislation. I do not yet have the text of this legislative memorial, but I have here a newspaper clipping from the Daily Alaska Empire, of Juneau, Alaska, for March 21, 1951, entitled "Elective Governor Approved," which announces final approval of this memorial.

In view of this wide-spread support within the Territory for the principle embodied in my bill, S. 105, I strongly believe that this Congress should take speedy action on it.

I might say that I understand that the Alaska House also feels that the Governor's successor, the Lieutenant Governor, or secretary, should likewise be made elective, and I would personally be glad to incorporate that change in my bill.

It is noteworthy, Mr. President, that the Alaska House while strongly endorsing this proposal for an elected Governor, specifically declined some weeks ago to go on record in favor of immediate approval of Alaska statehood.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ketchikan Daily News of December 19, 1950]

WHY NOT ELECTION OF GOVERNOR?

We understand that Delegate E. L. BARTLETT has announced his intention of opposing any bill which would give Alaskans the right to elect their own Governor on the grounds that it would interfere with Alaska's chances for immediate statehood.

Try as we will we cannot go along with this line of reasoning. In the first place our Delegate over 2 years ago pledged his unqualified support to such a bill only to pull strings to have it shelved at the first opportunity. If that bill had been acted on at that time Alaska today would have been working with a Governor elected by the people of the Territory and one who had their absolute trust and support. We do not believe that Delegate BARTLETT was working for the best interests of the people who elected him when he sabotaged the bill.

Now with the proposed statehood bill failing by its own weight and the bungling of those who claimed to be all out for it we find our duly elected Delegate again going all out to attempt to scuttle a bill giving us a chance to elect our own Governor on the grounds that such a measure would hurt our chances for statehood. We feel that Delegate BARTLETT is deliberately abandoning his obligation to the people of the Territory in order to keep Federal Appointee Ernest Gruening on the job. The results of the last election bear out the fact that Republicans and Democrats alike repudiated Governor Gruening for working against the best interests of Alaska and we predict that they will eventually repudiate BARTLETT for the same reasons if he continues on his present course.

In the first place the bill giving us the right to elect our Governor would not conflict or interfere with the statehood bill in any manner. Even if the 1951 Senate had a change of heart and voted approval of the statehood bill in January it would still require 2 or 3 or 4 years before the people of Alaska could elect a constitutional convention, draft and approve a state constitution, and receive favorable action from Congress on the work accomplished.

In the meantime, if the chance were given us to elect our own Governor, this work could be carried on under a man in whom the people have faith and trust. There would be nothing about the bill to prevent Ernest Gruening from filing as a candidate and giving the voters an opportunity to express an opinion about him, but we feel that they would reject him by a larger majority than any man has ever been rejected in Alaska's history. This is probably the reason why BOB BARTLETT is attempting to sabotage the bill.

Federally appointed Gov. Ernest Gruening in his long tenure in office has failed to lead Alaska forward to the position she should hold today. He has proven himself an adept politician and has created a powerful political machine at the expense of the taxpayers, but his attitudes and actions have strangled the industrial development of the Territory and divided its people.

There are men here in Alaska who have been here many years and who understand the problems of the country and have the ability to meet them in a forthright manner. Such men have the faith and confidence of the people, and voters should have the absolute right to choose one of them as governor.

BOB BARTLETT is aware of this fact, for he has told us so. We sympathize with his present position, for he is at the crossroads where he must choose between his loyalty to Gruening or his obligations to the people who voted him into office. We are sure that Alaskans will be watching his choice with interest, for they have a great deal at stake.

This much is certain: If BOB BARTLETT has legitimate reasons for opposing a bill granting Alaska the right to elect its own governor, the people will give him a close and a fair hearing. On the other hand they are not in the mood to accept the weak-kneed reasoning which was shown in the professional lobbying deal. We sincerely hope that Mr. BARTLETT continues to place the welfare of the people of Alaska above all other interests.

[From the Daily Alaska Empire of January 4, 1951]

ELECTED ALASKA GOVERNOR

United States Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, will reintroduce his bill in Congress amending the organic act to permit the election of the Governor in Alaska. A bill was introduced in the last Congress, but there was no opportunity for its being heard before the wind-up of the Eighty-first congressional session. Already there is heard in Alaska reports that this bill, the election of an Alaska Governor, will be fought by statehood supporters.

In regard to this important legislation Sid D. Charles, editor and publisher of the Ketchikan Daily News, editorially said, under the caption of "Why not election of governor," the following:

"We understand that Delegate E. L. BARTLETT has announced his intention of opposing any bill which would give Alaskans the right to elect their own Governor on the grounds that it would interfere with Alaska's chances for immediate statehood.

"Try as we will, we cannot go along with this line of reasoning. In the first place, our Delegate over 2 years ago pledged his unqualified support to such a bill only to pull strings to have it shelved at the first opportunity. If that bill had been acted on at that time, Alaska today would have been working with a Governor elected by the people of the Territory and one who had their absolute trust and support. We do not believe that Delegate BARTLETT was working for the best interests of the people who elected him when he sabotaged the bill.

"Now with the proposed statehood bill failing by its own weight and the bungling of those who claimed to be all out for it, we find our duly elected Delegate again going all out to attempt to scuttle a bill giving us a chance to elect our own Governor on the grounds that such a measure would "hurt" our chances for statehood. We feel that Delegate BARTLETT is deliberately abandoning his obligation to the people of the Territory in order to keep Federal Appointee Ernest Gruening on the job. The results of the last election bear out the fact that Republicans and Democrats alike repudiated Governor Gruening for working against the best interests of Alaska and we predict that they will eventually repudiate BARTLETT for the same reasons if he continues on his present course.

"In the meantime, if the chance were given us to elect our Governor, it would not conflict or interfere with the statehood bill in any manner. Even if the 1951 Senate had a change of heart and voted approval of the statehood bill in January, it would still require 2 or 3 or 4 years before the people of Alaska could elect a constitutional convention, draft and approve a State constitution, and receive favorable action from Congress on the work accomplished.

"In the meantime, if the chance were given us to elect our own Governor, this work could be carried on under a man in whom the people have faith and trust. There would be nothing about the bill to prevent Ernest Gruening from filing as a candidate and giving the voters an opportunity to express an opinion about him—but we feel that they would reject him by a larger majority than any man has ever been rejected in Alaska's history. This is probably the reason why BOB BARTLETT is attempting to sabotage the bill.

"Federally appointed Gov. Ernest Gruening in his long tenure in office has failed to lead Alaska forward to the position she should hold today. He has proven himself an adept politician and has created a powerful political machine at the expense of the taxpayers, but his attitudes and actions have strangled the industrial development of the Territory and divided its people.

"There are men here in Alaska who have been here many years and who understand the problems of the country and have the ability to meet them in a forthright manner. Such men have the faith and confidence of the people, and the voters should have the absolute right to choose one of them as Governor.

"BOB BARTLETT is aware of this fact, for he has told us so. We sympathize with his present position, for he is at the cross roads where he must choose between his loyalty to Gruening or his obligations to the people who voted him into office. We are sure that Alaskans will be watching his choice with interest, for they have a great deal at stake.

"This much is certain: If BOB BARTLETT has legitimate reasons for opposing a bill granting Alaska the right to elect its own Governor, the people will give him a close and a fair hearing. On the other hand, they are not in the mood to accept the weak-kneed reasoning which was shown in the professional lobbying deal. We sincerely hope that Mr. BARTLETT continues to place the welfare of the people of Alaska above all other interests."

[From the Petersburg Press of January 5, 1951]

With the new Eighty-second Congress now in session, the question of statehood for Alaska is again a live issue.

Much has been said about the advantages of statehood, some of it true, some of it distinctly untrue and still more conjecture. The most ridiculous statements have been made up from the latter two categories. There have been slightly veiled threats made that if Alaskans are not given statehood they will "secede" from the United States. This is so obviously silly that no one up here even gives it a second thought. It is possible, however, that it might give concern to those Senators who are sincere in thinking it is dangerous to give statehood to "furriners" like us Alaskans. Incidentally, we've just been reading some early American history and find a remarkable parallel in the thinking of eighteenth century New England statesmen who believed honestly that the Union would be destroyed by the admission of the ignorant and illiterate outlanders from Kentucky and Tennessee.

In the category of conjecture is some of the argument we have heard that Alaska would contribute more to the defense of our country if it were a State. Some pretty silly propositions are being tied onto the tail of national defense kite. But we believe it is unjust to the loyal Alaskans who make up 99.44 percent of our population to claim they would love their country one bit more or defend it one whit more willingly if we were a State than if we are a Territory. Nor do we believe, despite a recent editorial we read to the contrary, that our country will toss us off the sleigh to the pursuing Russian wolves if the going gets bad. The North American continent is in this thing together and self-preservation of us all depends on mutual defense.

Statehood as an ideal is good. We hope it comes at such a time and in such a manner that we can afford it.

Meanwhile, we suggest that Congress get busy and give to us the right which even Puerto Rico has, to elect our own Governor. That would be a good beginning.

[From the Sitka Sentinel of December 5, 1950]

With the withdrawal yesterday of Senator Lucas' motion that the statehood bill for Alaska be considered by the Senate it would almost be a miracle if this question comes up again at this short session of Congress. Groundwork has been laid in both the House and Senate for its introduction when the next Congress convenes but after seeing its treatment by the Dixie Democrats there is little likelihood of either Alaska or Hawaii becoming states in the immediate future.

Puerto Rico was granted the right several years ago to elect its own Governor and more or less conducted its affair without interference from the Department of the Interior. Two years ago, Delegate E. L. BARTLETT promised to introduce a similar bill along with statehood, so that in the event statehood was defeated, Alaskans might have a chance at a greater measure of self-government.

Nothing has been heard concerning the fate of this measure but it appears certain it would receive support in the Territory both from those who favor statehood and those who oppose it. We believe such a measure should be introduced in the short session and pushed vigorously so that irrespective of what happens to any statehood bills in the future, Alaskans may have the privilege of selecting their own governor.

As many Alaskans felt the present statehood bill was deficient in a number of respects, retaining control of too large a portion of land and natural resources to the Government, the bypassing of the measure by the present Congress is something of a blessing. To those ardent adherents of statehood at any price, it is a serious blow.

If the Territory is granted the right to elect its own governor it would appear we might then have a chance to prove to the Doubting Thomases in Congress that Alaska is ready, politically, to assume its place in the Union.

[From the Daily Alaska Empire of March 21, 1951]

ELECTIVE GOVERNOR APPROVED—HOUSE MEMORIAL SEEKING ACTION BY CONGRESS, PASSED 14 TO 10

(By Bob De Armond)

Hotly contested House Memorial 36, seeking action by Congress to allow Alaskans to elect their governor, won final approval last evening. The vote on passage of the memorial was 14 to 10.

When the memorial goes to Congress it will, at the request of Representative McCutcheon, carry a letter giving the vote on its passage. And at the request of other members of the house, the letter will give also the name, party affiliation, and the division represented, as well as the vote on the memorial of each member of the house.

Only one of many amendments offered from the floor was adopted. The amendment deleted from the memorial a reference to an elective governor bill now before Congress. Opponents of the memorial objected to the reference because a bill was introduced by Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, whom they had labeled the greatest foe of statehood.

Democratic members of the house who had said earlier that they would probably vote for the memorial changed their position when Representative McCutcheon read a letter from Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, addressed to Curtis Shattuck, of Juneau.

"This memorial would be a mortal blow to statehood," the Bartlett letter said.

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT

In the final vote, the memorial was approved by all 10 Republican members of the house—Representatives Barnes, Johnson, Locken, Hendrickson, and MacKinnon from the first division; Laws from the second division; and Gasser, Miscovich, Stepovich, and Wilbur from the fourth division; and by all of the Democrats from the second and fourth divisions—Representatives Degnan, Franklin, Madsen, and Wells.

Voting against the memorial were the third division members of the house—Representatives Carlson, Conright, Egan, Kay, McCutcheon, Pollard, and Scavenius; and three members from the first division—Representatives Gundersen, Hope, and Metcalfe. All are Democrats.

VETO SUSTAINED

After hearing from Attorney General J. Gerald Williams, former Attorney General Henry Roden, and Attorney William L. Paul, Jr., in support of the Governor's veto of house bill 63, and Attorney Robert Boochever, and Banker Marshall Crutcher in support of the bill, the house sustained the veto.

The vote on passage of the bill notwithstanding the Governor's veto was 9 to 13, 7 short of the required two-thirds. Representative Stanley McCutcheon led the opposition to the veto in the house, as did his brother, Senator Steve McCutcheon, in the senate.

"I am sorry to find myself on the other side from the Governor," said Representative McCutcheon. "I very seldom get over on that side of the fence, but I fear the Governor has been misled by a letter written to him by William L. Paul, Jr. I find that much of the language of the veto message is similar to the language of the letter."

OTHER VETOES

Two other veto messages were received by the house during the evening, both on bills having to do with banking matters. Although the senate had voted to override both vetoes, house action on them was postponed until today.

The house voted 13 to 11 to table a senate bill providing for a salary increase for the commissioner of veterans' affairs. It also tabled by a 14-to-9 vote a senate bill setting up a Territorial department of lands under the department of taxation. Tax Commissioner M. P. Mullaney appeared before the house regarding the bill but was unable to convince a majority of the members that the department would be worth the $150,000 to $200,000 he estimated it would cost to operate it during the biennium.

SCHOOL CLOSURE

Passed by unanimous vote was senate bill 99, authorizing the board of education to close certain rural schools that the board feels could be partly supported locally. Dr. James Ryan, commissioner of education, told the house that several schools, including those at Homer, Dillingham, Bethel, and Wasilla, are larger than many schools in places that have incorporated and so assumed a part of the financial burden.

Another school bill, providing for the automatic creation of an independent school district when a municipality is incorporated within an incorporated school district was also passed unanimously.

Other senate bills approved by the house provide that the Alaska income tax will not be computed on Federal excess-profits taxes, enable the department of public welfare to extend its program to include aid to the blind and amend the law relating to suits brought by minority stockholders.

Also approved was a new senate bill making it mandatory that employees of the Territory, municipalities, and other subdivisions be covered by social security.

The house completed its work at midnight, having cleared its calendar of all except memorials and revenue and appropriation measures, which can be considered today and tomorrow.

Thomas B. McCabe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes to express appreciation of the public service of Thomas B. McCabe, whose resignation as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System became effective at the end of March. He now again leaves the service of this Government with the respect and affection of all those who have been associated with him, and particularly those who have worked with him from day to day. He has made a significant contribution to the economic well-being of the Nation. I think it is well summed up in an editorial tribute which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on March 17. The editorial said:

Because of its highly technical nature, Mr. McCabe's service to the Nation has been of a sort that could hardly be expected to attract wide public notice. Nevertheless,

all of us will benefit from his contributions to a stable economy.

My personal regard and affection for Tom McCabe was nurtured nearly a decade ago when a small group of businessmen became convinced of the need for careful and intelligent planning to meet the economic problems which would arise after World War II. Some way had to be found to tap the vast storehouse of vitality, foresight, and experience of the business leaders of this country, and to weld together a constructive force to work cooperatively with the Government. Out of the discussions evolved the formation of the Committee for Economic Development. I was privileged to serve as vice chairman of the original Board of Trustees, of which Mr. McCabe was a member. With the exception of Paul Hoffman, Committee for Economic Development's great chairman whose distinguished record with the Economic Cooperation Administration has contributed so much to the moral and economic strength of our allies, no man contributed more to the formation and success of the Committee for Economic Development than Thomas B. McCabe.

Now Mr. McCabe joins Mr. Hoffman in returning to private life. The contribution of these two men, who worked with complete disregard for their personal interest, and who have devoted their energies to the national welfare during this postwar period, is deserving of the gratitude of the American public. Mr. McCabe served here in Washington during the war, as well, in varying roles. He administered the difficult lend-lease program, among other assignments. When I served in the State Department at the end of the war he patriotically assumed the responsibility of the disposal of surplus property, and surely there has been no more thankless job during the war or since.

After nearly 10 years as chairman of the board of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 3 years or so ago, Tom McCabe answered the call of the President to serve as chairman of the board here in Washington. He brought to a difficult task a fresh approach to the problems and operations of the Federal Reserve System. His broad background of successful business experience—and he is one of the most respected men of the business community—and his previous experiences in responsible governmental positions enabled him to have an exceptional perspective both in national and international affairs. He had developed also his innate talents as a conciliator and peacemaker—a role that is difficult to play in public service. It was particularly fortunate that he possessed these attributes and skill in negotiation in dealing with the particular problems of relationships between the Federal Reserve, with its responsibility for monetary and credit policy, and the Treasury, with its equally great responsibilities in the field of debt management. Tom McCabe's approach is to appraise objectively every problem in its true perspective and then to seek common and widespread agreement on the need for finding a satisfactory solution. He has that range of perspective which encompasses the horizons of the community as a whole, and not merely the immediate implications of the problem at hand.

Once having agreed on an ultimate objective, Tom McCabe has worked diligently and earnestly day in and day out, week after week, with a measure of patience and fortitude with which only few are endowed, to seek fair and reasonable compromise and agreement, to seek unity and harmony, and to find grounds for mutual accord, respecting the principles and objectives of each side.

The accord which was recently reached between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve exemplifies the success of this patient search for common ground in solving difficult problems. This was not a victory of one side over the other. It was a triumph of good sense on both sides—of statesmanship in its best meaning. Of this accord the March 10 issue of Business Week said:

> The announcement that the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have reached a full accord in their long-standing disagreement over how to reconcile a tighter credit policy with management of the public debt is exceedingly good news. Secretary Snyder and Federal Reserve Board Chairman McCabe are to be congratulated for their patience and persistence in trying to work out a reasonable solution of this difficult problem.

After pointing out that this accord obviated in large part, and perhaps entirely, the need for more drastic types of credit controls, the editorial added:

> Secretary Snyder and Chairman McCabe have had the statesmanship and good sense to save the financial system from that. It will remain for the financial community in general and the banking community in particular to give every encouragement to the working out of this new Treasury-Federal Reserve accord.

Under his direction and leadership, the Federal Reserve System, with its network of banks and branches reaching into every commercial area in the country, has continued to fulfill the mission and to serve the national interest as envisioned by Woodrow Wilson and Carter Glass who more than all others were responsible for the creation of this institution.

His role in the fight against inflation has been recognized throughout the country. He has emphasized again and again the dangers that threatened to engulf the Nation on the economic front. Time after time he warned that "you cannot maintain a defense program without a sound dollar." Conscious as he was of the way in which inflation destroys the value of the savings of the people, he has done all in his power to protect the integrity of the people's dollar at a time when its value was in peril. He is entitled to the gratitude of every man who has a savings account, a savings bond, a life insurance policy, or a stake in some retirement program. Yes; the American people. The American people are once more deeply in his debt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a series of editorials which recognize the great work accomplished by Tom McCabe in this, the most recent chapter in his great and continuing career as one of America's most eminent public servants. When tough and difficult jobs are again to be done, I predict that Tom McCabe will once more be found in the saddle.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of March 18, 1951]

MR. MCCABE AND SUCCESSOR

The resignation of Thomas B. McCabe as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has come as something of a surprise. This probably is not justified, since Mr. McCabe has wanted for some time to return to private life. However, this resignation and the announcement that Assistant Secretary of the Treasury William McChesney Martin has been chosen to succeed him follow closely upon the compromise settlement of the dispute between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. It is natural, therefore, that some people should wonder whether the Treasury point of view is to be imposed on the Federal Reserve through a change of Chairmen.

It is the Star's belief that there is no basis for such an apprehension. The Treasury-Reserve dispute, centering around the question of the extent to which the price (and interest rate) of Government bonds should be supported through the operations of the Open Market Committee, has been resolved on a reasonably satisfactory basis. The Federal Reserve view, in the main, has prevailed. It is true that Mr. Martin represented the Treasury in the negotiations, and presumably he was at least in general sympathy with the position that had been taken by Secretary Snyder. But there is no reason to suppose that he will attempt to reverse what has been accomplished if and when he assumes the chairmanship of the Board.

One reason for this belief is that Mr. Martin was wholeheartedly supported for the chairmanship by Mr. McCabe, and the latter certainly would not have given that support had he entertained any misgivings. Another reason lies in Mr. Martin's own integrity and competency. He will, of course, have to satisfy the Senate as to his philosophy with respect to credit policy. But if experience means anything, Mr. Martin is the right man for the job.

He has been president of the New York Stock Exchange, head of the Export-Import Bank and executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. More importantly, he would bring to his new post both an extensive background of experience in the Treasury and a thorough understanding of the operations of the Federal Reserve. It is very doubtful that the President could have picked any man who is better equipped to carry on the fine work than Mr. McCabe has been doing.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March 16, 1951]

RESIGNATION WITH HONORS

The resignation of Thomas B. McCabe as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at this time carries far more significance than it normally might.

For months he had been engaged in a tug of war with Secretary of the Treasury Snyder over Government fiscal policies. Mr. McCabe insistently upheld the independence of the Reserve Board and the responsibility with which it is charged by Congress to regulate the country's credit. In this he was fighting a desperate battle against inflation. An agreement finally was reached only 2 weeks ago on terms that were a victory for the chairman.

The agreement was widely interpreted as meaning that the administration belatedly realized that inflation must be stopped.

Heretofore it has dallied, and at times taken action which accelerated rather than put the brakes on inflationary pressures.

The extent of Mr. McCabe's victory is all the more apparent through the choice of his successor. Mr. Martin was recommended to the President by Mr. McCabe himself, and though he has been an assistant Secretary of the Treasury, has supported the Reserve Board's independence of Treasury domination.

Mr. McCabe has wanted for months to leave the exacting duties of Chairman and return to Chester as head of Scott Paper Co. But every time he made up his mind, a new crisis popped up. Now, with his position vindicated, he feels free to leave.

The country is deeply indebted to him for his services.

[From the Herald Tribune of March 17, 1951]

PEACE BY APPOINTMENT?

The contest between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury for undisputed leadership in national credit policy enters a fascinating new phase with the resignation of Mr. Thomas B. McCabe from the Board's chairmanship and the appointment in his place of Mr. William McChesney Martin Jr., brought over by Mr. Truman from a position as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The fact that Mr. McCabe has been replaced by a Treasury official naturally raises as many questions about the implications of the change for the Nation's credit policy as it does about Mr. McCabe's stewardship or Mr. Martin's qualifications for his new post. But credit policy cannot be considered apart from the men who make it, so interpretations of the policy implications of the present change must be based upon impressions of Mr. McCabe's record and Mr. Martin's qualifications.

It seems to us that the country has reason to be very grateful to Mr. McCabe for the meritorious service he has rendered as Board chairman and that it may take strong assurance in the appointment of Mr. Martin as his successor. Mr. McCabe deserves a large measure of personal credit for the fact that during the last long inflationary months of his tenure, the Federal Reserve Board has stood virtually alone among Federal agencies as one that understood the need for a consistent anti-inflation policy and was willing to take the initiative in attempting to enforce it. Again, Mr. McCabe can take satisfaction in having eased the conflict with the Treasury over interest-rate policy through his devotion to the methods of conciliation and rejection of tests of strength.

Mr. Martin is highly qualified for his new and difficult post. His intensive experience on both the private and public sides of financial operations is a matter of familiar record. In these matters he has acted as close student, operating participant, and administrator. He is credited with having played the leading role in the forging of the recent agreement under which the Treasury and the Reserve are now working. Under his chairmanship the Board should not only consolidate its authority in the field of credit control but should also, leading from this position of strength, be able to work constructively with the Treasury in the fulfillment of debt management needs. Such a prediction would appear to be much more reasonable than any more pessimistic one based simply on the fact of the new Board chairman's having come from the Treasury.

[From the Washington Post of March 17, 1951]

MR. MCCABE RESIGNS

In tendering his resignation to the President Chairman McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board made it very clear that his resignation was not due to the feud between the Board and the Treasury. On the contrary, it is known that he has long wanted to return to his post as president of the Scott Paper Co., but was unwilling to quit until an agreement had been reached with the Treasury. Mr. McCabe has consistently emphasized the close relationship between monetary policy and debt management and the necessity of harmonizing those policies through constant cooperation between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. His advocacy of consultation on a voluntary basis to settle, or rather prevent, disputes has undoubtedly been largely responsible for the recently announced accord. To be sure, many of the problems confronting the two agencies remain to be solved, but, given the will to cooperate, the differences can be settled through compromise.

The President says that Mr. McCabe may feel "justly proud" of his successful efforts to settle the dispute with the Treasury. He may. It should be added that Mr. McCabe will return to business with the good wishes of the host of friends he has made in Washington. He is a public-spirited citizen, selfless and dedicated, and he has the respect of all who have come in contact with him. To many who knew him well affection is united to respect.

William McChesney Martin, Jr., a former president of the New York Stock Exchange and the Export-Import Bank, now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, has been nominated by the President to succeed Mr. McCabe. He is a worthy successor, admirably qualified for this important post because of his experience as an officeholder in close contact with financial groups and his reputation as a keen student of monetary and financial problems. The fact that he was one of the Treasury's principal representatives in the negotiation of the recent Federal Reserve-Treasury accord, and that his nomination was suggested by Mr. McCabe indicates that Mr. Martin can be relied upon to recognize the Board's responsibility for controlling an inflationary expansion of credit as well as its obligation to assist the Government in financing the defense effort. Assuming his nomination is confirmed, there is good reason to believe that the satisfactory relationships between the Board and the Treasury will continue to prevail.

[From the New York Times of March 17, 1951]

MR. MARTIN'S APPOINTMENT

Ever since 1949, but especially since the first of this year, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System have been locked in controversy over the basic question of whether fiscal convenience should be the overriding consideration in the determination of credit policy, or whether it should be subordinated to the general requirements of the Nation's monetary and economic stability. A fortnight ago, faced with the possibility of a congressional directive providing that all such disputes be resolved in favor of the Federal Reserve, the Treasury agreed to a truce on terms which represented at least a 75 percent victory for its adversary. Now comes the unexpected announcement that Thomas B. McCabe, chairman of the Reserve Board, is resigning and that President Truman has named as his successor an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, William McChesney Martin.

In view of the fact that in the recent past Mr. Truman had mistakenly, if perhaps understandably, identified himself with the cause of the Treasury in this dispute, it would be easy to construe the present move as an overt act on the part of the White House and as a violation of the 2-week-old truce. But such an interpretation would, in our opinion, be decidedly superficial. The nomination may have represented a mischievous thrust at those congressional leaders who had thrown their support behind the Reserve Board, but hardly a malicious one. For, while Mr. Martin would go to the Reserve Board as a graduate of the Treasury Department, his background in the field of finance is a broad one and, for the man of 44, a deep one. As a matter of fact, long before he earned the title of "boy wonder" of finance by ascending to the presidency of the New York Stock Exchange at the tender age of 31, young Martin had already been steeped in the lore of central banking, for his father had been one of the original governors of the Nation's 12 Regional Reserve banks when the System began operations. Since leaving New York's financial district, and an excellent record as head of the Nation's largest securities market, Mr. Martin has continued to serve out a successful career in Washington in such key posts as head of the Export-Import Bank and, more recently, executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Moreover, his present nomination has the complete approval of Mr. McCabe, outgoing chairman of the Reserve Board.

Needless to say, Mr. Martin's qualifications do not exempt him from the obligation to satisfy Congress as to his philosophy regarding Federal Reserve-Treasury relationships. Moreover, assuming—as we do—that he will more than adequately meet this test, we wish to repeat what we have said before. Neither that fact nor anything else that has occurred to date lessens the desirability or importance of congressional action to the Douglas resolution clearly defining the powers of the Reserve and the Treasury.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of March 17, 1951]

MR. MCCABE'S OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE COUNTRY

The country owes a great debt to Thomas B. McCabe, who has resigned as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, effective at the end of this month.

Mr. McCabe has been a leader of those on the Board who have insisted, despite contrary pressure from the President and the Treasury, that the interest rate on Government securities be increased as a means of reducing credit inflation. Most economists have supported this position.

The dispute, which has persisted for months, finally has been resolved in a compromise which Mr. McCabe believes satisfactory. Having accomplished that, he has decided to fulfill a long-standing desire to return to private business.

Because of its highly technical nature, Mr. McCabe's service to the Nation has been of a sort that could hardly be expected to attract wide public notice. Nevertheless, all of us will benefit from his contributions to a stable economy. We join in wishing him well on his well-earned retirement from public life.

A Code for Conduct of Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a thoughtful article by Walter Lippmann, as it appeared in the Washington Post of April 2, 1951. Mr. Lippmann discusses the need of a code for the conduct of congressional investigating committees, especially in view of the emergence of television as a new and

remarkable medium of public information.

The code should not only contain rules with reference to the use of television, radio, and news reels, but should contain provisions relative to appearance of counsel with witnesses, cross-examination of witnesses, and allowing anyone whose name has been brought out in a hearing to refute, explain, or enlarge upon the testimony referring to him.

I do not agree with Mr. Lippmann's view that television should be ruled out until it has proven itself. I think it has done this already. But in any event, many problems relative to its use need to be considered.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has submitted a resolution for such a study. This resolution should have our early consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ON THE TELEVISION PROBLEM

Senator KEFAUVER is, no doubt, well aware that the work of his committee is likely to be remembered the longest because the hearings were broadcast by television.

Suddenly many questions about television and public affairs, which before that had been regarded as theoretical, have become practical and urgent. These questions will now be threshed out in the courts, in Congress, and in other legislatures. They will be studied in the universities. They will be reported and discussed in the press and on the radio and the television networks themselves.

Long after only the oldest reporters can still remember who Frank Costello was, or even Virginia Hill, Senator KEFAUVER's name may remain connected, like Lord Sandwich's and a quick lunch, with the grandeur and the miseries of conducting public affairs in front of the television audience. The Senator can, however, avert this dreadful fate.

He has only to recognize publicly and thoroughly what I cannot but assume he feels—that the passionate interest of such an immense audience is not in itself the answer to any problem, like lawbreaking, and that in fact it poses problems which may be just as dangerous in a free society as the lawbreaking which his committee has exposed. Mr. KEFAUVER can do what few other men in Congress are so well qualified to do. He can take the leading part in getting Congress to adopt Senator WILEY's resolution and then in defining and debating the great issues of public policy which television is raising.

These questions are subtle, complex, and elusive. Our whole experience with television is limited. The development of television is difficult to forecast. Nothing can and nothing will be decided finally now. Nonetheless decisions, however provisional, have to be taken now. They are unavoidable. If Congress, for example, let matters drift, allowing each committee to decide for itself whether it wished its hearings televised, and when and by what company and under what commercial sponsor, that would in effect be a decision of policy which could easily have, and would tend to invite, the gravest abuses. If the television company were reluctant, perhaps because it did not think that 20,000,000 people would be interested in that particular hearing, the temptation would be strong to make the hearing interesting to an audience of 20,000,000.

Since only so small a part of the whole work of any committee, and only an infinitesimal part of the work of all of the committees, can be broadcast, the selection of what is to be televised invites the exercise of a power over what the people shall know that no editor of a free newspaper could, or would dream of, exercising.

In a newspaper there is of course a selection of the news by the editor and of what importance is to be given to different kinds of news. But much is printed each day that not every reader reads. Because this can be done, it is a violation of the professional standards of journalism not to publish at all, even obscurely, the news which is necessary to a fair judgment. But with television an event is broadcast or it is ignored: either it is in enormous headlines or it is nowhere at all. This power to choose what the great mass of the people shall see and what they shall not see of public affairs is altogether too great to be left to the judgment of a few television companies and to private arrangements made by committees and commercial sponsors and the companies.

It will be said, and I would agree, that Congress and the rest of us do not yet know enough to formulate a policy and to lay down a code of rules. What then ought we to wish to see done now, in this interim, when television is technically and economically prepared to do much broadcasting of public affairs but when on all the questions of law and policy and morals we are quite unprepared?

We must make up our minds. We can let her rip and see what comes of the enterprise of the broadcasting of politicians who like to be televised and the reaction of the audiences. Or we can take a position which, I admit, is at the other extreme—though I believe it to be the wisest. That is to prohibit for the time being the broadcasting of any of the hearings of Congress which have to do with investigation, and should therefore be judicial in character, or with the making of policy, and should therefore be deliberative in character.

No one, presumably, is going to ask that the proceedings of courts or the sessions of Congress be opened now to television, that is to say, to being broadcast when and only when they provide a good show. Is there any good reason why the same rule should not apply to committees when they are debating grave issues of national policy and when they should be thinking of their responsibility and not acting to an audience? And should not the rule apply to committees even more obviously when they are acting as a tribunal, and exercising the power to make or break men, as in a grand jury, or in a trial court or an appellate court?

I would not argue that this rule is the last word on the subject but only that it is better than the anarchy which is now ahead of us if we take no position at all. We shall have to work out a public policy. In the meantime the best thing to do is to put the burden of proof on the newcomer, and to make him do what all useful innovators have always had to do, that is to say, to prove that he has earned his rights because he has defined and established his duties.

A Report From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently Mr. John Cowles, publisher of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, made an extended tour of Europe, and has prepared a series of articles entitled "A Report From Europe." These articles appeared in recent March issues of the Minneapolis Star. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the articles entitled "Red Imperialism, Not Communism, Is Basic Threat"; "Aid to Franco? Yes; If Needed To Resist Reds"; and "'Unified' Set-up in Our Foreign Affairs Urged."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED IMPERIALISM, NOT COMMUNISM, IS BASIC THREAT

American security is threatened, it seems to me, not by communism as such but by Russian Communist imperialism. That is, I believe, a distinction of importance.

The present Russian aggression is the bastard child of traditional, expansionist Pan Slavism, aired by a dynamic revolutionary movement.

The basic threat is Russian imperialism. It uses foreign Communist dupes as a fifth column for subversion. Communism as a political philosophy or religion has been so appealing to many of its converts that they have been willing to act as traitors. They have deluded themselves that they were thereby helping bring about an eventual social utopia.

Actually by betraying their country they were simply aiding Russia in its imperialistic attempt to conquer the world. But it is Russia, not communism as such, that is the real menace.

If we will come to accept and recognize this distinction, the course that we should follow in dealing both with Russian imperialism and with communism elsewhere will be much clearer. Our foreign policy will be more effective.

The chance that we can win the struggle without having to fight world war III will be infinitely greater.

Of paramount importance in Europe today is the fact that Tito, who insists that he is as good a Communist as, or even a better one, than Stalin, has recognized that the Kremlin has been using world communism as a mask to conceal Russian imperialism. Tito, as a nationalistic Yugoslav, has defiantly revolted against the concept that Russian imperialism should rule the globe.

Tito's precepts and example are opening the eyes of the Communists in other countries. "Deviationism"—the refusal to let the Kremlin lay down the line which every Communist must unquestioningly accept—is spreading everywhere.

The recent revolt of the two Italian Communist intellectual leaders may prove to be worth more to the free world in its fight to save Western Europe than the two additional American divisions for General Eisenhower's army would be.

There are many signs that Communist deviation is developing in France and Germany. That means that the Communist parties in those countries may gradually cease to serve blindly as a fifth column for Russian imperialism.

The current purge in Czechoslovakia demonstrates that even behind the iron curtain there is serious deviationism. Intelligence reports also indicate that the Kremlin is having similar trouble in other satellite countries.

Since Russian imperialism—not communism as a political philosophy—is the immediate threat to the free world, it seems clear to me that our foreign policy should be directed toward actively strengthening those, whether Communist or not, who are resisting the Kremlin.

That should mean prompt and liberal aid, food and gasoline, military supplies and planes for Tito's Yugoslavia.

Although Yugoslavia is a ruthless dictatorship, Tito and his Cabinet have recently, however, done various things that are at least gestures in the general direction of constitutional parliamentarism and civil liberties.

A few months ago the British Ambassador gave each member of Tito's cabinet a copy of George Orwell's novel, 1984. Several, after reading it, but without referring to similar conditions that existed in Yugoslavia, commented that it was like Russia.

Shortly thereafter the Yugoslav Government issued edicts reducing the length of time that a prisoner could be held without a formal trial, and expunging from the list of crimes that of having treasonable thoughts.

The British are currently serializing Orwell's novel, 1984, in their newspaper in Vienna. The book has already been reprinted in various other middle European papers and is said to have had a wide effect on public opinion toward Russia.

As Americans come to realize that it is Russian imperialism that is the immediate threat to the Western World, and that communism as such is a grave danger to our way of life here in America only to the extent that its disciples are used by the Kremlin as Russian agents or as a subversive fifth column, the answer to the question as to how we should deal with communism in Asia also becomes clearer.

In Europe, no country has gone Communist except Russia, until after it had first been occupied by the Russian Army.

In southeast Asia, although Communist agents have played a part, most of the uprisings and revolutions have sprung from the grass roots. They have been largely indigenous. The rule of the white man had broken down in Asia.

Over the past generation the Asiatics, through increased education, have come to realize that the people of the Western World have a far higher standard of living than theirs.

They have also come to believe that European colonialism—foreign exploitation—was largely responsible for the poverty and misery in which they existed. They have learned from us the idea of national self-determination and the concept of social justice.

Hundreds of millions of Asiatics aspired to a better life and felt they could get it only by revolution. Communist agents exploited these Asiatic grass roots revolts and told the people that what they wanted was communism.

Instead of assuming that we must use armed force everywhere in southeast Asia to try to suppress genuine grass roots revolutions regardless of whether or not they are nominally called Communist, we should rather, it seems to me, through ECA and point 4 aid attempt to lead the southeast Asiatics away from the Kremlin's control and to increase their friendship for America.

AID TO FRANCO?—YES; IF NEEDED TO RESIST REDS

Last month both the United States and Britain sent Ambassadors to Spain, their first in nearly 5 years.

Although General Franco's regime is not quite as harsh as it was when we originally withdrew our Ambassadors, Spain remains as totalitarian a state as ever. The change in American and British policy stems solely from the fact that in the supreme struggle with Russian Communist imperialism, we want such help as Spain may be able and willing to give.

A glance at the map of Europe and North Africa shows that Spain's geographic position is of extraordinary strategic importance.

If the Russians should overrun Western Germany, the Low Countries, and France, it might be possible to stop them at the Pyrenees, the high mountain range which constitutes Spain's northern border.

That possibility cannot be officially discussed, however, without its doing serious harm to our efforts to instill self-confidence and a determination to resist in the French, Belgians, Dutch, and even the West Germans.

If they should get the idea that American strategy was based on, or contemplated, a retreat behind the Pyrenees, it would be impossible to inspire them to make the military effort that is necessary for the successful defense of Western Europe.

So far our negotiations with General Franco have been tentative and exploratory. No one questions that the Spaniards would fight with intense bravery if the Russians should overrun France and attempt to invade Spain.

But it is more than doubtful that Franco would join the North Atlantic Pact if an invitation were conditioned on Spain's sending some troops to Western Germany, for example, as a contingent in the international defense force General Eisenhower is organizing.

Today Spain, with a population of 29,000,000, has the largest standing army in Western Europe. Estimates as to its size range from 15 to 22 divisions. It is tough and well-trained but extremely badly equipped. If weapons could be provided, the Spanish Army could be doubled or tripled in size.

But unless Franco should prove willing to send some divisions out of Spain, common sense would seem to dictate that most of whatever military equipment the United States can give others in the next year or two had better be devoted to arming those forces that would be in immediate battle if the Russians started west.

Spain is extremely poor. The Economic Commission for Europe recently estimated that it takes almost 50 percent more hours of work for the average Spaniard to earn food for his family than is the case even in impoverished Italy. The average Spaniard's standard of living is about half what it was before the Spanish civil war.

While the Spaniards would welcome economic aid from the United States, they are an extraordinarily proud and stubborn and isolated people and might even reject gifts to which any conditions whatsoever were attached.

Recently the Export-Import Bank advanced Spain $12,500,000 to build a large fertilizer plant, but according to reports in Madrid an additional credit of $50,000,000 has not been made available because Franco has declined to agree that he will spend it in ways which the Washington authorities think would prove of permanent benefit to Spain's economy. (On March 16, the Export-Import Bank announced a $5,000,000 credit to Spain for the purchase of wheat because of a temporary shortage prior to the Spanish harvest.)

Now that Stanton Griffis has been sent to Madrid as American Ambassador, perhaps the two countries will become mutually more understanding.

Spain is still a complete dictatorship, but that fact alone should not prevent us from furnishing the Spaniards aid if it seems militarily advisable, any more than should the fact that Yugoslavia is a Communist dictatorship deter us from helping Tito resist Russia.

At the end of the Spanish civil war, Franco shot thousands of the Republican troops and sentenced to long prison terms most of the others, including some boys aged 12, who could not prove that they had been forced to join the Republican armed forces. Almost all of them, some 250,000, have now been conditionally released, but with a few exceptions they cannot vote, hold office, practice a profession, or hold most jobs above that of common labor.

For any offense they can be reimprisoned without trial to serve the remainder of their original military sentences.

Although there is undoubtedly widespread hostility and bitterness toward the Franco regime throughout Spain, there is no way of determining its extent. Several thousand labor leaders are in jail, and no opposition of any kind to Franco is permitted. Some observers think that there is a sizable underground Communist organization, but most say that the great majority of the people—even though they may detest Franco's regime—much prefer it to a new civil war.

The Spanish peseta has been steadily declining in value. Just as the French are doing in Morocco, rich Spaniards are investing in new office buildings and apartment houses in Madrid as a hedge against inflation.

Spanish railroads are in bad shape, both as to road bed and equipment. Many of the highways would have to be improved and bridges strengthened before heavy military equipment could be moved across Spain.

Perhaps it would be wise for the United States to give Spain some military equipment of the type that would be most valuable in stopping a Russian land invasion if worst came to worse and the Soviets should overrun Western Germany and France. Presumably the only places where any ground forces could hope successfully to invade Spain would be at the two ends of the Pyrenees, near the sea. They are limited in area and with modern weapons would appear to be relatively easy to defend.

It may be advisable to give Spain artillery and equipment for that purpose, and funds for the construction of additional, and the lengthening of present, air strips in Spain, so that part of our Air Force could, on short notice, if necessary, be based in Spain. That would also involve constructing port installations and making transportation improvements, so that gasoline and supplies could be got to our fliers without delay.

But at this stage of the cold war, the United States has neither the billions of dollars that would be required to rehabilitate Spain's whole economy nor the spare military equipment with which to modernize the entire Spanish Army, if it is to be kept permanently in Spain, nearly 1,900 miles from where the Russians would presumably first attack.

"UNIFIED" SET-UP IN OUR FOREIGN AFFAIRS URGED

The United States has a real chance of winning the struggle with Communist Russia without an all-out war, but doing it will for many years require perseverance and wisdom as well as courage.

In addition to maintaining our own armed defenses in a state of alert and adequate preparedness, and helping see to it that the rest of the free world does the same, we will have to spend billions of dollars in the next decade in backward parts of the globe to reduce the likelihood of their falling under the Kremlin's control.

Our Government is not now properly set up to deal with international problems of the kind we must face. Our foreign economic affairs are being dealt with by a dozen uncoordinated separate governmental departments and agencies. Sometimes they even work at cross purposes.

Our operations in the foreign field consequently are far less effective and much more expensive than they need to be.

Even with an efficient Government set-up, we are going to have to spend such large amounts abroad that at best we will have difficulty in avoiding income-tax rates so high that incentives are stifled.

One big improvement would be relatively simple. Congress should reorganize the State Department set-up so that a new division of it would have full responsibility for all

governmental foreign economic operations. There should be three separate divisions in the State Department with the Secretary of State, the Undersecretary, and several Assistant Secretaries having jurisdiction over all three.

These three subdivisions should be, first, a Department of Foreign Political Affairs; second, a Department of Foreign Economic Operations; and, third, a Department of Foreign Information.

The first subdivision, or Department of Foreign Political Affairs, should have the same function as the present Department of State has traditionally performed.

The second subdivision, or Department of Foreign Economic Operations, should have direct responsibility for and full authority over all of the Government's international economic negotiations and over all economic operations abroad.

We now have a dozen different departments or agencies dealing with foreign governments, with little or no coordination. As a result, hundreds of millions of dollars are being wasted. We are accomplishing much less than would be possible were all our foreign economic programs unified.

Even though all State Department cables sent abroad go out under the signature of the Secretary of State and all incoming cables bear the signature of the American Ambassador, no Secretary or Ambassador can personally read even a small fraction of them.

An aggressive underling representing, say, the Department of Agriculture or Interior or Treasury may now frequently be able to persuade the State Department to transmit to an Embassy abroad a message written by him, but bearing the Secretary of State's name, even though it may put far more emphasis on some minor point than the subject conceivably merits, while far more vital matters may receive little attention.

Representatives of various other Government departments also themselves go abroad, negotiate with foreign governments, and carry on economic operations without the State Department controlling their activities.

The range of economic matters which our current international activities cover is enormous. ECA in South Asia. Oil in the Middle East. Arms and supplies for the North Atlantic Pact countries. Tin in Malaya. Economic aid for Yugoslavia. Food for India. Point 4 development of backward areas. Wool purchases in Australia. Air bases. Broadcasting stations. Import-Export Bank loans. Shipping and aviation. Preclusive buying. Purchase of critical materials. International allocations of things in short supply.

These and hundreds of operations like them should all be coordinated through one division of the State Department, that of Foreign Economic Operations, where the relative importance of each could be ascertained and relative priorities as to attention and degree of pressure be given.

The information and advice of the specialists and experts in the other Government departments and agencies should, of course, continue to be used, but operations should be coordinated and funneled through a new State Department subdivision.

There may be, for example, 200 different things that we want Great Britain or its colonies to do for us. They may have 200 other things that they would like us to do for them. All our requests and theirs should be coordinated, where they could be handled more quickly and their relative importance weighed.

The third subdivision of the reorganized State Department should be the Department of Foreign Information, combining the Voice of America and all our many different foreign informational and propaganda activities.

Billions of dollars will be saved because of the enactment by Congress a couple of years ago of the law unifying the armed services. Instead of a completely separate Army, Navy, and Air Force, we now have one coordinated Defense Establishment. In addition to the monetary savings, our present new national Defense Establishment set-up has increased the effectiveness of our over-all security.

We need a similar reorganization of the Department of State, so that it, through a new Department of Foreign Economic Operations, will have direct responsibility for and control of all of the Government's international economic operations.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on January 30, 1951, at Cleveland, Ohio, at the annual convention of the National Rural Electrification Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, President Clark, my good friend Walter Harrison, Clyde Ellis, distinguished officers, directors, and friends, our good friend Claude Wickard, and my fellow Americans. It is a privilege to be presented to you by my fellow Oklahoman, Clark McWhorter. There is no one here any more aware than I of my unworthiness of the wonderful things that he said about me, but, Clark, I want to assure you that there is no one here that would have been any worse disappointed than I, had you not said them.

It is a pleasure to be here with this fireball, Clyde Ellis. It is not a great deal of credit to a man in the Congress from the southwestern part of the United States to be for rural electrification. If he wasn't, Clyde Ellis would make the place where he sits down so warm that he'd soon get so tired that he'd be willing to go along with Clyde and do what he wanted to do just to get a little rest once in a while.

I certainly was thrilled at the sight of those lovely young ladies that were queens and near queens, and I understand now, Clark, why it was you told me that you were making arrangements to serve another year. Of course, I am not surprised that you have increased the number of your queens.

I remember the story of the American soldier in England who fell in love with and asked a lovely English girl to marry him. And he did such a splendid job of it, she was trying to express her appreciation at the same time she was telling him "Yes," and finally she said to him, "I wish you'd explain to me how it is you American boys are so courteous and so considerate of women, seeing that in America you have no queens."

"Ah," he said, "You don't understand." He said, "Here in England, you have one queen—but in my country every woman is a queen."

I did notice this though, Clyde, those young ladies probably are not old enough to vote for me—but I guess I will still be running when they are.

I ought to pay my tribute to the women who are here and say like these other men, "I, too, am on your side." They do have a vote in your convention, don't they, Clark? I have never seen a convention yet but what they were the majority whether they had a legal vote or not. You know, I learned a long time ago what some fellows don't learn until they are too old to do them any good.

An old fellow went to see his grandson, a kid about 8 years old, and the kid, who hadn't seen him in a long time, didn't recognize him; and it nearly broke the old fellow's heart.

"Why," he said, "But, don't you know me?"

The kid said, "No, I don't."

"Why," he said "I'm your granddad."

"Now," said the boy, "That's funny. There has been a fellow around here all my life that I have called 'Granddad'," he said, "but it wasn't you." And he said, "They never told me that granddads come in pairs."

"Well," said the old fellow, "But, it's this way. You see, I am your granddad on your father's side."

"Oh," the boy said, "it's that way. But if you aim to stay here and do well, you'll have to get on the other side."

He was like the old fellow that had the experience of marrying and losing his wife and then falling in love with another fine woman. He proposed to her, and she accepted him, and he said, "Now, I want to make a request of you." He said, "You know I was married before."

She said, "Yes."

He said, "That is over and gone, but I have a very sentimental heart." And he said, "I can never fail to remember with some affection the one who is gone, and with your permission I have her hat that I loved the best, and I'd like to put it up here on the shelf in this closet in our room and just keep it as a memento of other days."

And she said that was all right and they got along fine, but in a few years she, too, passed away, and before too long he went through the same experience with another lovely lady and after she had responded with an affirmative reply to his request that she marry him, he told her the same thing.

He said, "You know, I'd like to keep here on this shelf as a memento of that second wonderful woman who blessed me by being my wife this lovely hat'of hers, and as I look upon it, it will freshen my memory and restore my sentiments."

And so that fine lady agreed, but in due course of time she, too, passed away, and he went through the same identical experience and the same identical speech with number three. But I'll tell you right now she had learned more than the others.

She said, "All right, big boy, you can put that hat up there with the other two if you want to. But I want to tell you right now that the next hat that goes on that shelf will be a derby."

You know I was thinking, Clark, as I was sitting here at this great convention of rural electrification, what a magnificent crowd this is, what a fine looking bunch of men and women are here in this great assembly that has seen so many wonderful assemblages. I want to tell you, though, it is something, as you think about other assemblages that have been here. I understand in this very hall Republican national conventions have chosen their nominees for President. But as you look out over this crowd tonight, Claude, can you see that they look any less prosperous or any less handsome even than a Republican national convention? And I want to assure you that they are a dog-gone sight smarter, and it just proves that in this wonderful age of rural electrification that folks are as good as people, or anybody else.

And I want to say this, as I think about this great setting here: The only thing that I know of that would improve it, Clark, would be if we could just fix it so that the electricity were furnished by the Southwestern Electric Cooperative, of Tipton, Okla., or maybe the Kiamichi Electric Cooperative,

from over in eastern Oklahoma. I believe the lights would be a little brighter.

And I want to say that I am grateful to my fellow Oklahomans who are here and who have been so very, very wonderfully kind, and as I think about this great convention I wonder if there is anybody here who ever had an experience similar to the good woman down at Nevada, Mo. The rural-electrification program was completed, the houses were wired, the equipment purchased, and the current was turned on late one afternoon. Then after a while some of the good women got together and they were talking about their experience and what it was that impressed them the most about the coming of electricity to their homes.

One of the women said, "I'll tell you right now, when I cooked on my new electric stove it was the most wonderful experience that I had ever had."

Another one said, "Now, I'll just tell you right now, it was the washing machine that I enjoyed the most." She said, "It was the first time the clothes were ever cleaned at my house that I didn't do it with that old up-and-down motion on the washboard."

Another one said, "Well, the thing I love about it is the electric ice box. Imagine keeping the food so fresh and so fine for so many days."

Finally, one good lady, a little old lady, who hadn't said a word, spoke up and she said, "Well, I'll tell you I liked the ice box and the washing machine and all that. But," she said, "the greatest thrill I had was just sitting there that evening and looking at pa." She said, "I hadn't seen him after dark for years."

You know, as we think about the progress of our country, it is not difficult to find the secret. Our country belongs to the people. The country's progress is the people's progress, and the people's progress is the country's progress. As we think about the things that we do—as we think about the effort that is required—we are thankful that we live in an age when there is power, when there are agencies, when there are elements available to us that do work in addition to what we can do with our hands. One man plus electricity may do the work of 10 men, or a hundred, or a thousand, and I say this to you—that one of the great differences between this magnificent country of ours and others is that we have available the means of accomplishing and working with other than just the hands and the physical power of our people.

I say to you that many things contributed to this Nation's emerging victorious from World War I and World War II, but I know of nothing that made a greater contribution than the abundant power—electric power—available in our country. Yes; power in the factories and the mills; but just as important, and maybe more so, was the power on the farm. We have seen the amazing transformation of a mighty nation, where once 7 of 10 families lived on the farm, until today less than 2 out of 10 of the families live on the farms. And yet the production is greater because of the progress, the scientific development, and the increase in the amount that each unit of manpower can produce.

And one of the great contributing factors to that amazing development is electric power—electric power—and it is so marvelous when we think about how short a period of time has seen so much of this development. I don't see any women here old enough to remember when there wasn't power available on the farms, but I see a lot of men who are, and if you want to know the difference, you talk to these men and they'll tell you how it was. Why, it has been but short time ago that public power was unknown in this land. When you think about it—development of public power in so brief a time, and the contribution it had made to the peacetime development and the wartime strength of a mighty nation, truly we pause in awe and wonder and also to give our silent thanks that such a great blessing has come to our people.

I say this to you, that rural electrification has been more of an emancipation proclamation for the farm women of America than Lincoln's proclamation back yonder more than 80 years ago was to the slave population of the South. And America will not have come into her own until electrification has been taken to every farm home in the land, not only the poles and the lines up to the doors of the farm homes, but an abundance of cheap power available through those lines.

I could not go further without pausing a moment. I was impressed by the tribute paid here a little while ago to the great man whose picture we see there. I am aware of the contribution made by so many of you, here tonight, and by the countless thousands across the length and breadth of our land in this great program. But I am reminded that today at noon a new record was established by the man serving as Speaker of the House of Representatives. As the noon hour passed, SAM RAYBURN had served as Speaker of the House of Representatives for a longer period of time than any other man in the history of the Nation, and I know of no man who has made a greater contribution to rural electrification. And so far as I am concerned he can continue to serve there the rest of a very long and useful life.

Man versus the forces that he has had to fight has brought into dramatic picturization the value of the utilization of power—the value of the team of man plus power. Man plus power has played a great part in building the richest, the most powerful nation on the earth. Man plus power has had a vital role in bringing this mighty Nation victorious through two World Wars.

And I want to say this to you tonight, my fellow Americans, man plus power, plus the unquenchable, unconquerable spirit of America, is winning the present world-wide struggle against the powers of darkness. As you and I think about the history of our Nation—as we think of that day back yonder nearly 200 years ago when a little group of 3,000,000 people banded themselves together under the provisions of a document that says, "We the people of the United States of America"—when that limited number had the courage to look the world in the face and declare themselves a free and independent government—when they had the courage to look their own sons and daughters in the face and say, "We are launching here an experiment to the success of which we are dedicating our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." When we think of what they did—with their limited resources—we are impressed by the fact that they had a vast abundance of faith, of undying courage.

Well, if those 3,000,000 with their limited means, with their meager resources, with the wilderness beyond the mountains to their backs and with almost an unknown sea to their front, could lift the flag of freedom and set their feet on the pathway that led to liberty and justice, I want to ask you tonight of what should 153,000,000 Americans be afraid?

When we think of the vast material wealth and power—when we realize tonight that ours is the greatest, the strongest, the richest, the most highly productive Nation on the earth, when we know that here in our land man has reached his greatest zenith of production and progress, scientific development and knowledge, freedom, liberty, and justice, of what should this mighty Nation be afraid?

Ah, there are many things that gird us with undying courage—but high on the rank is the knowledge of the vast and abundant quantity of electric power, and the knowledge that as the decades come, we will add to it manyfold. We are grateful for vast deposits of coal; we are grateful for the great abundance of oil and gas, those amazing fuels and sources of power; but I would remind you that when the last ton of coal shall have been mined and burned—when the last barrel of oil shall have been pumped and consumed—when the last cubic foot of gas shall have been produced and used—this Nation may still have a never-ceasing source of heat and light and power from the development of its hydroelectric possibilities.

When your forebears and mine started westward across this Nation, they were looking, yes, for a home, for security, for the opportunity to develop themselves and their families. The means with which they accomplished those results, they referred to as "Land and wood and water." Well, when this young lad right here is an old man, his grandchildren will be looking for land and wood and water. We have the land in vast abundance, in the most productive quantities, and the finest climate on the earth if we will conserve and rebuild and utilize it. We have the water in blessed abundance if we will conserve and use it. As we do we produce that which serves the function that our forebears wanted the wood for most—the heat and the light. Yes, we have been abundantly blessed. We have seen the proper use of the great development of our blessings. We have seen our country grow; become stronger and prosper.

You here tonight know better than any other group the blessings of public power. I believe I see the dawn of a day in which all producers of power have a higher respect and regard for all other producers. I am grateful for the fact that yonder in the Southwest, representatives of public power—the Southwestern Power Administration, guided by Douglas Wright, one of the greatest of the men who have developed this program—the Oklahoma power producing authority—and private utilities have joined hands in a cooperative contract that has produced the finest grid of electric power available in this Nation outside only of the great Northwest with its unlimited hydroelectric power.

They have seen that whatever estimate is made for the consumption of power is inadequate. They have seen that no matter how much the utilities produce or the State produces or the Government produces, that there cannot be too much electric power. And so they have joined hands in what I believe will be a model contract for others in like positions across the land. They guarantee power that is not only cheap, but available and abundant, for our cities and towns and our farms.

As we look ahead, we are aware of the grave danger which our country is confronted with, but, as we know the danger and analyze it, the great knowledge comes to us that we can meet it and we can overcome it. I say this to you tonight—and I don't know when the darkest hour has been, or is, or will be—but it will be the hour before the dawn. There is no nation on this earth, or available group of nations, that can defeat or subjugate or conquer free, united America.

You know, our enemies in this world-wide struggle have spent a lot of money and gone to a lot of trouble in an effort to find out how strong America is. They have their subversive agents. They have their accredited experts studying what they can find of our productive capacity and power of our military machines, of our military equipment. Ah, they are trying to find out what the latest guided missile may be. They are trying to find out what the latest improvement in our air power might be. Yes, we know that their submarines have come to the surface in close proximity to our shores in many places, seeking to find out what the power and strength of our fortifications are.

We know they have shot down our airplanes yonder, seeking to find the secret of America's military might. Well, I want to say this to them in defiance and to you in reassurance—they are looking in the wrong place to find how strong America is.

Nearly a year ago, I was invited to a little community in Oklahoma called Limestone Gap. It was a rural school, with an eighth grade graduating class of five members. I accepted that invitation, along with a number of others in Oklahoma, to go and visit those young people in their hours of graduation. The great press in Oklahoma chided me a little bit that I had come from Washington to Limestone Gap to make a graduation speech. I told them that I was honored to go to Limestone Gap—that, in the first place, I was invited, and that politicians are like business, they go where invited and stay where well treated.

In the second place, Limestone Gap was very near to the farm where I was born. It was just such a school as I had attended. I was happy to meet friends there and make new acquaintances. But over and above all that, I went to Limestone Gap to find at first hand what was in the hearts and minds of the people at Limestone Gap—because there is the secret of how strong America is. Oh, we are proud of our planes and our ships and our tanks and our guns, but they are not the accurate measure of the strength of the Nation, as are the will power and the dedication and the spirit to strengthen the moral fiber in the hearts of the people.

And I want to say this to you, when you go to the Limestone Gaps or to the great conventions—when you go to the crossroads of the great cities—you stand in amazement at the rugged devotion and strength of the people of this mighty Nation—and that is the secret which a totalitarian nation can never know; that is a spirit which no despot can ever conquer; that is a strength which no arrogant aggressor can ever analyze or overcome.

I sat this morning with a group of Future Farmers of America yonder in Washington, a group of United States Senators and a group of farm boys. We gave the boys the floor. We asked them to talk to us and tell us of their projects and their work, and I want to say to you that our hearts were lifted as we heard these young men recite the stories of their accomplishments. We heard them tell the reasons why they arrived at the conclusion that they love the land and all over this blessed country the people love their land.

Yes, whether it is on the farm or in the cities—what a country—when the people are so dedicated to it and when their hearts are so filled with love and affection for it—and what a country, with its whole source of opportunities to its youth.

One of my associates and I a little while ago went to one of the great engineering schools in this country to interview some of the graduates in a certain phase of scientific education. We asked for the opportunity to interview the members of the graduating class. We did—and we found some that we liked especially and who were interested in our work, and we made arrangements to employ some two or three. We then went to the dean of this great engineering school and we said we would like to have one man a little further along in scientific research than any of these. "Do you have some that have gone even farther in the field in which we are interested?"

"Why," he said, "yes, we have three men here who are finishing their doctorate degrees, but," he said, "they'll come pretty high."

Well, we asked him if it would be expensive to interview them, and he told us no. So we visited with them and we found one that we liked especially and who seemed to kind of harmonize with us, and we told him we'd like to have him, and he said he'd like to come. And we sat with him and I said, "I'd like for you to tell me a little bit about your family, and about your background and where you come from."

He said, "My father was an immigrant from a country now behind the iron curtain. My mother was a nurse. They saw me through high school. I received a fellowship to a great university and that, together with the work I was able to do, saw me through that school. Then I received a scholarship here and that, together with the meager help my father and mother could do for me, has seen me through here."

He said, "I want to go to work for you, but first I want to go yonder to a State far away from here to visit my father and mother. My mother is no longer able to work. My father is still a waiter yonder in a great hotel."

I said, "What a country that the son of an immigrant could work his way through schools and come to the point where he could graduate from the toughest engineering school on the earth with the highest honors in his class. What a country—and what a strength—and what a power—in a united America."

The people in the cities and towns, the people at the crossroads, the people on the farms, have had the opportunity to develop their resources and their opportunity and their security. All over the world, men and women envy you and me. They watch us as we go to work unhampered by any fears—as we come home to a happy family meal, as we go to our schools and our churches, as we drive our cars down any road, or play the radio, watch the television, or go to the movies. But to these people all over the world, there comes from the Kremlin the constant warning to them that our way of life—the American way of life—won't work. It can't last, they say. It will either be destroyed or destroy itself.

You know, some actually think that what we have in this blessed land is too good to be true. I say to you that it is good enough to be true. The Russian war dogs shout forebodings of doom for our American way of life. They do this, trying to build confidence among their own people. They do it, trying to undermine the confidence that others have in us or that we have in ourselves. From that whited sepulcher of men's hopes wherein their evil designs are incubated and from whence they are spewed out to curse and blight the free world, the war lords in the Kremlin shout that western civilization will destroy itself.

I say that western civilization is stronger today than it has ever been. It is becoming more powerful each day. It will become strong enough, and very soon, to either prevent world war III or win such a war if a stupid and cruel foe provokes it.

Western civilization, our civilization, will also be wise enough and strong enough to safeguard our freedom and our liberty while we are safeguarding the security of our country. This power is physical, yes—but this power is also moral and spiritual. Thus while we either prevent the starting of world war by Russia's mad rulers or while we defeat them, if they force war upon us, we will at the same time seek to persuade people around the world—yes, even those behind the iron curtain—to find and claim human freedom and spiritual liberty for themselves.

To accomplish these ends, which are the minimum, we must match and surpass Russia's military power.

We must then compel those monsters in the Kremlin to come before the bar of world opinion and human justice. They must be held accountable for their terrible sins. They must be compelled to accept peace—real peace—with adequate guaranties that freedom and liberty and justice will not perish, but will prosper and flourish in the earth.

The rural electric co-ops march in the front ranks of a united and determined America. Through cooperation and unity you have come thus far, and you have found it good. Through cooperation and unity among yourselves you will continue to go forward toward your goal of abundant power for abundant living for every farm home. Through cooperation and unity 155,000,000 Americans are marching with irresistible tread toward their most cherished goals of freedom, prosperity, and security at home and peace around the world.

The Democratic Party, a Progressive Party That Has Never Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, last Saturday evening the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] delivered an eloquent and powerful address at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner, in Detroit, Mich. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, A PROGRESSIVE PARTY THAT HAS NEVER DIED

(Address of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY)

No member of the United States Senate could come to Michigan to make a political speech and, at the same time, refrain from paying his tribute of highly deserved honor, respect, and admiration to the great statesman who has represented this State in the Senate of the United States since early in 1928. By curious coincidence, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG took the oath of office as a Senator of the United States on March 31, 1928, exactly 23 years ago today.

As a Democrat and as an American I honor both my party and myself when, on this notable anniversary, I say that ARTHUR VANDENBERG ranks among the greatest statesmen of this country. His character, his courage, his ability, and, above all, his loyal Americanism have won for him a secure position in the history of this Government and in the history of the world. He is the type of ideal statesman who places country above party. The people of Michigan have recognized these great qualities in him, and, as one who has served with him for more than 17 years, I thank the people of Michigan who have made all of the people of the United States their debtors by returning him to the Senate in election after election regardless of the temporary trend of the political tides.

It is appropriate that I should make this reference to the services and the character of Senator VANDENBERG on this occasion because there never was a time when it should be more clearly understood by all of the people and particularly by those of us who occupy positions of leadership in the public affairs of the Nation that a political party has no reason for existence except to serve the best interests of all the people. Partisanship which becomes only factionalism and which is motivated only by the aspiration to hold political office performs no public service, and the party which operates on that basis is doomed to failure as the political history of this country amply proves. Good government in the interest of all is always the best politics.

We have assembled at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner to honor two of the outstanding statesmen of this country from whom Democrats have always drawn their heritage of political principle. It should never be forgotten that we who gather as Democrats year after year throughout the Nation to draw renewed devotion to the principles for which these men stood, are the members of the only party the life of which is coequal with the life of the Nation itself. Jefferson was the founder of the Democratic Party, but more important than that, he was one of the principal founders of our Nation and no man in all history more clearly outlined than did he the obligation of political organization to serve the welfare of all the people.

THE UNDYING VITALITY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

We are members of a party which has never died because it has drawn undying vitality from the fact that its members and its leaders have recognized that its primary function is to promote popular government and to advocate policies best calculated to preserve the opportunity of the masses to enjoy the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which Jefferson so eloquently defended in writing the Declaration of Independence.

It is no mere chance that from Jefferson to Truman the Democratic Party has preserved throughout the history of this country an unbroken record of devotion to progressive principles save only for a brief time in the last century when its leaders yielded temporarily to defend the vested interests of the slave power. Let no Democrat forget, however:

First, that Jefferson himself advocated the abolition of slavery;

Second, that Martin Van Buren, beloved friend, lieutenant, and successor of Andrew Jackson as President, became, in 1848, the first Presidential candidate to advocate free soil;

Third, that when Abraham Lincoln and his colleagues joined, in the middle of the last century, with supporters of Van Buren to form a new party to oppose the extension of slavery, they went back to Jefferson for a name; and

Finally, that when in the middle of the Civil War Lincoln ran for reelection his running mate was the military governor of Tennessee, the former Democratic United States Senator from that State, Andrew Johnson, whose administration as the successor of Lincoln after the latter's martyrdom was ruined by Republican leadership in Congress because he sought to carry out the liberal program of Abraham Lincoln.

The party Thomas Jefferson founded was called the Democratic-Republican Party. Under Jackson it became known as the Democratic Party and in the middle of the nineteenth century it was only natural that the new advocates of human rights should have chosen to be known as Republicans just as Jefferson was known as a Republican, though sneeringly called a "Jacobin" by the reactionaries of that time, just as we are now called Socialists and Communists by the reactionaries of our time.

LINCOLN ON THE LEGITIMATE OBJECT OF GOVERNMENT

It is not surprising, therefore, that when the Lincoln papers were opened in the Library of Congress on July 1947, there was found among them a fragment of writing in Lincoln's own hand which ought to be committed to memory by every American citizen and particularly by those who, in the current political scene, are constantly denouncing the Democratic Party on the charge that it has given too much power to government. These are the words of Abraham Lincoln, follower of Jefferson, advocate of freedom, defender of government of the people, by the people, for the people. Listen:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves the Government not to interfere."

In our time we have seen private central economic power establish arbitrary control over the lives of the people. It was the failure of the Republican Party to put an end to private economic exploitation of the masses that made possible the victories of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. They were advocating the principles of the welfare state so well defined by Lincoln, when he said that it is the legitimate object of government to do for the people what they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves.

Contrast the history of this democratic vitality from the days of Jefferson to the days of Truman with the history of the parties which have opposed us. Washington, the first President, was the choice of all the people. He was the unanimous choice of the Presidential electors, both in 1788 and in 1792, but in his Cabinet Jefferson became the leader of the party of the people and Hamilton the leader of the party of the vested interests. Hamilton became the leader of the Federalists, a political party which in 1796 gave the United States one and only one President, John Adams. Jefferson followed in 1800 and not until 24 years had elapsed was the Jeffersonian succession broken. In 1824, though Andrew Jackson had the largest vote, he lacked a majority in the electoral college and John Quincy Adams, under whom the Whigs came into existence, was elected President by the House of Representatives. He served only a single term and was succeeded by Andrew Jackson. There followed under Jackson and Van Buren 12 years of progressive government in defense of the people against the vested interests.

HOW THE WHIGS DIED OF A STRADDLE

In 1840 the Whigs came back to power for a single term. It is significant that they campaigned without a political platform of well-defined principle, just as it is significant that in 1848 the Whig Party achieved its last national success when instead of meeting the issue of the time, the slavery issue, it nominated Zachary Taylor, a candidate satisfactory to the proslavery interests, for President and Millard Fillmore, an antislavery man, for Vice President. That straddle, that failure to meet the issue, killed the Whig Party. It died 100 years ago for lack of political principle, a disease which no party can survive.

Now, the Republican Party of our time, which, curiously enough, has been distinguished like the Whigs before it for the preponderance of single-term Presidents it has elected, is quite obviously making ready to wage the campaign of 1952 without a clear-cut platform of political principle. It is preparing in 1952 to die of a straddle just as the Whigs in 1852 vanished forever from the political stage.

Let us not forget that the election of 1948 was won by Harry Truman when most political observers were of the opinion that he was doomed to defeat. His success was based upon the simple fact that he had a platform and the courage to maintain it whereas he was opposed by a party which was trying, like the Whigs before it, to pussyfoot into power.

The Democrats of Michigan are making their campaign now to the people of this State, to the independents and to the Republicans who believe in straightforward, courageous, and positive government for the benefit of the people. You have a Democratic Governor, the only Democrat in 28 years to have been reelected chief executive, a triumph which came to Governor Williams because he is a leader with a program as well as a leader of personality and of principle.

You can go into this campaign in every county and in every city of this State and successfully challenge your opponents to say precisely where the Republican Party, as a party, stands upon the great issues of our time.

You may invite the voters of Michigan to join you because you have a party with a positive program and a positive record. And if any opposing political leader should cherish the hope that a Presidential campaign in 1952 can be won by name-calling or finger pointing, just tell them that KEFAUVER and FULBRIGHT are Democrats. If the cry of socialism and communism should be raised, just tell them that the Truman program has contained communism at the borders of Greece and Turkey while the Marshall plan has turned communism back in Italy and in France and has rehabilitated all Western Europe and made it once again the forum of freemen.

WHERE DOES THE GOP STAND ON MODERN ISSUES?

This is the record that no one can deny, but where does the Republican Party stand as a party on either domestic or international issues?

Does it still adhere to the claims of Landon and Willkie and Dewey that it should be given power because it possesses a better capacity than the Democratic Party to make effective the political reforms conceived and enacted by the Democrats?

Does the Republican Party pledge itself to continue the present policy of our Government to win international peace by collective security through the United Nations, or does it propose, by returning to a bankrupt isolationism, to invite a third world war and thereby risk the destruction of human freedom everywhere—freedom to the preservation of which this Nation has been dedicated since its very inception?

No man tonight can tell where the Republican Party stands upon these issues, domestic or international. No man can doubt where the Democratic Party stands.

When, at the beginning of this century, the Republican leadership failed to meet the domestic policies of that time, the people turned to Woodrow Wilson. The reforms of his two administrations enacted in the face of persistent and desperate Republican opposition have never been repealed.

When Republican leadership in the twenties again failed to meet the domestic issues, the people again turned to the Democratic Party. The reforms which have been enacted since 1933 under Democratic leadership in the White House and in the Congress still stand unchallenged except for the indirect attack which is made upon them by reactionary Republican leaders who indulge themselves in general charges of socialism and communism, but who do not dare to advocate the repeal of the progressive legislation enacted under Roosevelt and Truman.

The independent voter knows these things. The independent voter knows that your party gave agricultural relief where the opposition failed. The independent voter knows that the Democratic Party stands for social justice, that it is opposed to the economic exploitation of the masses, that it is the advocate of opportunity for the individual and that it has been so successful in carrying out these purposes that in the 5 years since the war America has enjoyed the most prosperous era in all history.

EXTRAORDINARY PROSPERITY OF LAST 5 YEARS

A Democratic Congress passed and President Truman signed the Employment Act of

1946 which brought to the people of this country, instead of a depression following the end of World War II, the greatest prosperity that any people have enjoyed anywhere on the face of the globe. Some 20,000,000 motor vehicles have been built and purchased in the United States in the last 5 years. More petroleum has been produced, refined, and consumed during these 5 years than during the war itself with all the staggering military consumption of the conflict. New homes have been built all over the United States. Slums have been abolished, rural electrification has made markets out of the most distant farms and ranches. Corporate profits have reached new highs never before experienced. Every daily paper in the United States, day after day and week after week during the past 5 years has been recording the development of this prosperity. From 1945 to 1951 the people of the United States in every county and in every community from coast to coast and from north to south has achieved new records of progress and plenty. Wages are higher than ever before and salaries are higher than ever before. More than 60,000,000 people are employed and no one can deny the record. It stands for all to see.

Tell the independent citizen of Michigan, tell the new voter who has never lived under a Republican administration what happened when Herbert Hoover was President. Ask them if they are willing to trust the future of this country to the reactionary leaders who fought all these progressive steps while they were being enacted and who denounce us now as Socialists because we enacted them. Ask the Republican leaders whether they propose to abandon the me-too platforms of their past four Presidential campaigns or whether they have the courage to demand the repeal of this legislation.

You know what the answer will be. The reforms brought about by the Democrats were so long overdue that they cannot be abandoned, but if the direction of this Government were to be handed back to the opponents of progress, the fruits of Democratic success would be rapidly dissipated and the whole struggle for the reestablishment of social justice would have to begin again. So much for the domestic scene.

How about the international program? Modern science has made isolationism an impossibility. Nay, more than that, American inventive skill, American scientific progress has so improved the means of transportation and communication in the modern world that we have no choice but to march courageously down the path the great Senator VANDENBERG so firmly treads.

TIMID STATESMEN CANNOT LEAD AMERICANS

American long-range airplanes have triumphed over mountains and oceans. There is no geographical barrier behind which a timid people could be safely led by a timid statesman. We cannot follow Mr. Hoover with any hope of salvation to retire behind imagined barriers while abandoning the natural resources and industrial potentialities of Europe and Asia and Africa to the Communists. To turn our backs upon the free people of Western Europe would be to surrender the resources and the skills of the whole Eastern Hemisphere to communism. To condemn the people through whom we received the religious doctrines of Christianity and the political doctrines of freedom to totalitarian slavery would be a surrender of principle that would dishonor the memory of all the great founders of this Republic. It would profit us nothing. We would surrender two-thirds of the world's resources. We would surrender the aspirations of hundreds of millions of people who want peace and freedom and we would condemn ourselves to the loss of our own essential liberties by years of fearful waiting for the atomic attack the Soviets would be bound to launch.

We have no alternative but to remain loyal and steadfast and courageous in defense of the principles of freedom. The whole genius of our people has been that of courageous and confident self-government. Our political creed is that of popular government. It faces its greatest threat now at the hands of the Communist dictators who are waiting for us to yield to timidity and defeatism.

That is not the spirit of America. Americans are free. They know that there is no materialistic force capable of matching strength with the power of a free soul. We know that the people of the world do not want war, that they are driven to war only through the folly or the stupidity of leaders without faith in God or man.

THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA IS THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM AND PEACE

We know that war settles nothing, that every successive war is more appalling than its predecessor. Surely we know that a third world war would plunge all the world into a new era of darkness and tyranny, but we know that if we have the courage to live as our predecessors on this continent have lived, freely, courageously, and devotedly in the knowledge that the spiritual power of man can never be permanently overthrown by the evil of materialism, then it will be our glory to have been the Nation that shall have led the world to permanent peace.

The Democratic Party is the party that has never died because it has been a progressive party. It served the people in the time of Jefferson and Jackson. It served the people under Wilson and under Roosevelt. It's serving the people now under President Truman. It has a program, a progressive program which Republican leaders resist but dare not attack.

The Republican Party on the other hand is a party without a nationally recognized program on either the home front or the international front. Not until the Republican Convention is held in 1952 will it be possible for the people to know to what extent it will try to lead the country into the past, but all the signs of the times indicate that in 1952 it will turn back into the same paths of indecision and futility in which its predecessors, the Federalists and the Whigs, perished.

Opportunity in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 1, 1951:

OPPORTUNITY IN INDIA

The famine in India has shown no signs of abating; the bill to provide American wheat for the hungry has been stalled in Congress. A quick decision is imperative, both from the standpoint of humanity and as a matter of practical politics. The primary purpose of dispatching wheat to India is to alleviate distress, a step which is in accord with a great American tradition. But against the background of the differences between the United States and India on matters of foreign policy, there are some in this country who would make the wheat shipments conditional on some change in India's attitude, and there are many Indians who suspect that the grain, whether given as a gift or a loan would have political strings attached. Delay only fosters this unhappy condition and creates an atmosphere of asperity around the whole project.

The House Rules Committee has been brooding over the bill, chiefly because the Indian Government had originally asked to be allowed to purchase 2,000,000 tons of wheat on a long-term loan, and some committeemen believe that the whole project should be considered on this basis. Mr. Truman suggests that 1,000,000 tons be sent immediately as a gift and the disposition of the rest be discussed later. There is good sense in this proposal; it would meet the most urgent needs of India without further parley, while allowing debate on terms of payment for the remainder of the wheat. But in any case, some decision should be reached speedily. The United States has an opportunity to prove to the Indian people that their welfare is a matter of concern to this country; that Americans do not always think, as some of the more excitable Indian publicists like to charge, in terms of weapons and power politics. The wheat would be a very eloquent ambassador to India, and the less haggling and obstructionism that accompany it the better.

The Struggle Between Russia and the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege for me to bring to the attention of the Senate a series of three articles by Prof. Herbert McClosky which appeared in the Minneapolis Star for February 27 and 28 and March 1, dealing with the conflict which exists today between the free and democratic countries of the world and the Soviet Union and her satellites. Not only is Professor McCloskey a personal friend of mine, but he is a respected member of the University of Minnesota teaching staff, and one of the leading young political scientists in the country. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star of February 27, 1951]

WHAT HAS BROUGHT US TO THE BRINK OF WAR?

(By Herbert McCloskey)

No conflict faced by modern man has been more important for the future of freedom and culture than the present struggle between the Soviet world and the West.

What is the meaning of this conflict? Is it merely a struggle between hostile economic systems? Is it a struggle for territory? Is it, as Soviet leaders claim, caused by Wall Street or by American foreign policy?

The conflict before us is so fundamental that if the Soviets win, we shall lose not only our freedom but many other qualities upon which civilization rests. It is, therefore, vital that we understand what it is about, that

we do not indulge in fanciful myths about the nature of the enemy that confronts us.

The very scope of the present conflict and our profound hope that it will not need to be resolved by war sometimes leads us into confusion concerning its nature and causes.

This belief is advanced mainly by Soviet Communists. Yet Soviet leaders consider Britain no less an enemy than the United States, despite the fact that Britain has partly abandoned capitalism in favor of socialism. Still we have no serious conflict with Britain. And the number of Americans who would be willing to risk war with Russia over differences in the economies is ridiculously small.

Related to this is the Communist charge that the present conflict results from the manipulations of a rather vague demon known as Wall Street.

But Wall Street (or more accurately, American businessmen) is not always more influential than other power groups in determining our foreign policy.

Following World War II, many businessmen were friendly toward the Soviet Union and eager to enlarge their trade relations with the U. S. S. R. Even today business-minded leaders are by no means always in the forefront of the struggle against Soviet power. Men like Taft, Hoover, and Joseph B. Kennedy, for example, are the champions of the least provocative policies toward the U. S. S. R.

Furthermore, businessmen differ among themselves in many of their attitudes and opinions. To assume that they form a single segment of opinion and influence is to torture the facts.

It is sometimes thought the conflict is essentially about competing territorial aspirations. It is manifestly clear, however, that the Western Powers now possess few such aspirations.

The Soviet Union, for its part, protests its innocence on this score, and while, in the light of the enormous territorial expansion of the U. S. S. R. since 1945, we may reasonably question this innocence, it does not appear that the mere addition of territory is what the Soviet Union most needs or wants.

The struggle to influence territories, especially in central Europe and the Far East, has, of course, sharpened the conflict, but this appears to be a derivative rather than a primary factor.

It is also thought by some that the fault lies mainly with American politics and foreign policy. Are we blameless? Have we contributed in no way to the present world difficulties? It would be rash indeed to assume so.

We have failed in a most vital internal area—race relations—and this has reflected itself in world affairs. We are known throughout Europe and, more important, throughout Asia, as a nation that treats Negroes shabbily, confines them to second-class citizenship, and holds peculiar notions about white supremacy.

It is more difficult than we usually imagine to present ourselves and be accepted as the friends of the non-Caucasian peoples of the world when we are so obviously vulnerable on this score.

Another shortcoming is our inexperience in international politics. We often lack finesse and refinement in our international dealings. We are sometimes wanting in the patience and subtle wisdom that a more experienced people might have developed.

We have sometimes been rash, and have antagonized sensitive Europeans and Asiatics. We have exhibited sometimes an excess of pride, and even arrogance, in our attitudes toward other nations.

We have committed sins in the past by joining with other Western Powers in imperialist ventures. We grow increasingly more free from this, but our past sins nevertheless continue to plague us.

Factors of this sort have contributed to the present conflict, but none of them is decisive, and none of them compares in significance with the behavior of the Soviet Union in provoking the conflict.

It may be said, of course, that we contribute now by our policy of resistance and rearmament, and there is a sense in which this may be true. For it is possible that these policies will have a provocative effect on the Soviet regime.

[From the Minneapolis Star of February 28, 1951]

COMMUNIST RELIGION SOWS SEEDS OF WAR

(By Herbert McClosky)

The major responsibility for the present world conflict belongs to the Communist regime of Russia. At least four characteristics of Soviet communism must be examined to understand why this is so: (1) Its ideology; (2) its dictatorial government; (3) its distorted sense of reality; and (4) its irrational anxieties and fears.

Soviet communism is no ordinary political movement. It is a political religion, dogmatic, consecrated, fanatical, and with a view of history that regards the ultimate victory of communism as a certainty.

The driving force which, according to Bolshevik ideology, motivates history to this end is the class struggle. The doctrine of class struggle is a central myth of Communist theology. This struggle, say Soviet Communists, has now been transferred to the international realm where it will some day produce a final Armageddon in favor of communism.

Soviet leaders apparently believe, therefore, that a world conflict is inevitable, and have, in fact, said so on numerous occasions. Capitalism in crisis, they argue, will seek to start a war in order to survive. So long as there is a division of the classes in the world, the struggle will remain.

So the U. S. S. R. prepares for war. It did so even when other nations were preparing for peace. It maintains the largest army, the most continuous flood of military preparations, the most aggressive foreign policy, the most persistent tendency to expand, the most uncooperative policy of all nations in its international dealings.

There is, however, more to the story. Nothing is plainer about the Soviet system than that it is a dictatorship of the most extreme and concentrated sort.

As a doctrinaire dictatorship, it tends always to read the motives of others in conspiratorial terms. It cannot be persuaded of the good will of those it has marked as enemies. It is essentially irrational and beyond the reaches of reason. Neither logic nor facts can readily prevail against it. It is a closed system, ideologically and politically, and it cannot easily be appealed to.

In a society that cannot conceive of honest intellectual disagreements and that places no reliance on the free play of ideas, distortions crowd out reality and ultimately forbid it. The Soviet regime has forbidden itself from learning the truth, for it has not only closed its mind, but has also closed the channels by which the truth might emerge.

Where the price of error is arrest or death, do even its agents dare to report the truth when it contradicts the dogma?

To deal with a regime of this sort, is to deal with a phenomenon so fundamentalist that it will have the world only on its own terms; a phenomenon in whose given word no faith can be placed; that refuses to understand the simplest and plainest language; and that twists and perverts whatever argument it touches.

It knows little or nothing of compromise, though it respects power, and will on occasion yield to it.

Soviet leaders respect no other man's opinions and values, because they hold themselves to have divined the final truth about man and the universe. They regard tolerance as a sign of weakness, and disagreement as a sign of depravity. They regard all means as permissible to them, for they believe and have said that there is no morality except revolutionary, class morality.

The Soviet dictatorship is, furthermore, like all dictatorships, psychologically insecure, for its sense of reality is so distorted that it is subject to exaggerated fears and anxieties of its own making. It is partly this and partly its messianic ideology that drives the regime to expand and to extend its rule over others.

This expansion, in turn, deepens the conflict, for it is then thought by others, and with justification, that the Soviet dictatorship will never be satisfied until it controls the entire world.

[From the Minneapolis Star of March 1, 1951]

WE HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO RESIST

(By Herbert McClosky)

Facing a growing conflict with the Soviet Union, what choices do we have? Four possible courses seem open to us: (1) The policy of the third camp; (2) pacifism; (3) submission; (4) resistance even at the risk of war.

The third camp idea expressed by a number of European intellectuals holds that Soviet communism and capitalist America are two giant ogres, both bad. It regards the choice between them as imperfect, and therefore chooses neither.

The basic assumption of this view is erroneous, and the view itself is perfectionist and utopian. It bewails the imperfect choice that faces it, and wants to have the struggle on its own terms or not at all.

Most of us cannot hold with this view. We have no right to assume that because the struggle is imperfect, we have no responsibility toward it. The life that has been built out of the democratic tradition may be less than perfect, but it is nevertheless worth choosing, worth preserving, and worth defending.

Nor, for most of us, is pacifism a realistic alternative. The motivations of pacifism are extraordinarily noble. It demands of us, however, that we be more than human, or perhaps less than human.

For the pacifist sake of us that for the sake of the pure principle we must be prepared, if necessary, to sacrifice friendship, love, loyalties, liberties, and perhaps our lives. This is more than most of us who are merely human are willing or able to pay.

If Soviet leaders were the sort of people who might respect pacifism, this alternative might be meaningful. But Soviet pacifists are in concentration camps or dead.

We come now to the alternatives of submission or resistance.

It is hard to believe that men who value freedom could hold with submission. For to submit is to give ourselves up to a way of life that could destroy the vitalities of civilization.

The Soviet regime has imposed on its own people and would impose on others, if it could, a ruthless dictatorship, unlimited in power and largely lacking in moral sensibility. It exercises on its own people and those it has conquered the methods of deceit, violence, and terror. It persecutes its scientists, its scholars, its artists for even the most modest deviations from dogma, and it imposes upon the great mass of men a despotism as great as any the world has ever known.

Against this, there exists in the west and in America, a democratic conviction that is still, despite shortcomings, of considerable vitality.

Let no one tell us that political freedom is of no consequence, that it means only the freedom to starve or to suffer. Among many other things, our freedom makes possible the correction of our shortcomings, a searching out of our deficiencies.

It gives to all of us some opportunity to initiate the course of our own lives. We have the hope of realizing, through freedom, our best qualities, and we can correct error.

This is no trivial matter. Where there is no possibility of correcting error, the entire culture becomes warped and distorted. It is regulated and ground down by those who assume their own infallibility.

If the present conflict should unfortunately come to final issue, let us at least be clear-headed concerning its meaning. For no matter what causes it, it will be a conflict over the survival of the humanistic tradition. We will have to choose between freedom and despotism.

Is the RFC Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert in the appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial, brought to my attention by Mr. W. C. Erkert, director of purchases, Keystone Steel & Wire Co., of Peoria, Ill., entitled "Is the RFC Necessary," and appearing in the March 26 issue of the American Metal Market:

IS THE RFC NECESSARY?

The scandals that have been exposed in the investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the Senate Banking Subcommittee headed by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT have captured the newspaper headlines and have become the butt of jokes on radio and television, obscuring to some extent a basic issue: Is the RFC really necessary?

Questions of public morality and political influence as brought to light recently in the nearly 15 months' old probing of RFC affairs are serious enough, but the question of the economic justification for Government lending on a large scale in present circumstances of excessive availability of credit is one that should have the closest scrutiny by the Congress of the United States.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has introduced a bill (S. 1116) in the Senate to abolish the lending activities of the RFC, to liquidate its holdings and use the proceeds for a reduction of the Federal debt. So enthusiastic was the response to Senator BYRD's proposal that fellow members immediately wanted to climb on the bandwagon and appear as cosponsors of the measure.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was a depression-born instrument created in the Hoover administration and as such it has in the past served a useful purpose. In its early days it saved some distressed banks, kept some railroads out of receivership, and extended agricultural credit in worthy cases. Today many in Congress of both parties favor its abolition as a political grab bag.

Jesse Jones, its former able administrator, is among those who would do away with it entirely. Former President Herbert Hoover, whose Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended more than 2 years ago the liquidation of RFC and the taking over of its duties of guaranteeing loans by the Treasury Department, has recently emphasized his earlier findings in a letter to a Member of Congress. "That agency," says Mr. Hoover, "was created as a result of my recommendations to the Congress in 1931 to meet the credit collapse at that time. It was set up as a purely emergency agency, with stringent restrictions on the type of loans and their security. These restrictions were subsequently relaxed and the agency continued in nonemergency periods."

In its report to Congress the Hoover Commission stated its objections to the manner in which RFC has been conducted in recent years in the following paragraph, which of course was written long before the current investigation was begun:

"Direct lending by the Government to persons or enterprises opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals or enterprises. It invites political and private pressure, or even corruption. Emergencies may arise in depression, war, national defense, or disaster which must be met in this way. But direct lending should be absolutely avoided except for emergencies."

In submitting his bill for liquidation of the RFC and the transfer of some of its most useful functions to the Office of Defense Mobilization, Senator BYRD said:

"The history of the RFC shows that it has done a good job when it was really needed but, as might have been expected, its access to the financial resources of the United States has been too great a temptation for political camp followers in periods when it did not have a job to do."

During its nearly 20 years of existence, the RFC has made more than 30,000 direct business loans totaling approximately a billion dollars and more than 5,000 business loans with banks participating of nearly $200,000,000. These are exclusive of defense loans, bank loans, railroad loans, exclusive of loans to political subdivisions and the mortgage-loan program. Many of these loans have been written off as uncollectible, according to Senator BYRD, though claims have been made that the RFC has operated at a profit. Of the uncollectible loans, a majority were made, it is charged, in periods when there was neither war nor depression in sight.

Many of the RFC loans have been subject to criticism other than those given the spotlight during the Fulbright committee hearings. Besides the Textmas, Lustron, Gunther, Jaeckel and Miami Beach hotel cases, there have been such loans as $34,000,000 to the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. to build automobiles and another $10,000,000 for the establishment of a selling organization, the $1,500,000 granted to the Hal Roach movie studios when the RFC itself found turmoil in the moving-picture industry, and $2,705,000 granted to a gold-mining company in Alaska which was in trouble largely because of Government restrictions on equipment and supplies.

"Such loans," declared Senator BYRD, "do not promote the public welfare. They provide easy credit which is not needed in inflationary periods. At this time they may provide employment, but in competition with vital defense requirements. Under current circumstances, it is competition by the Federal Government with private banking enterprise and a step toward the nationalization of banking."

The Government's investment in Federal lending corporations is $20,000,000,000, according to the Federal Reserve Bulletin, or nearly 10 percent of the Federal debt. But beyond this, the credit that is available to Government lending agencies totals $55,000,000,000, of which there are charges in the form of loans and guaranties of nearly $45,000,000,000. Those who favor the liquidation of the RFC charge that this is one of the primary causes of inflation. New commitments for Federal credit listed in the 1952 budget total $19,900,000,000, of which more than $10,000,000,000 is for housing and agriculture. These are exclusive of short-term loans such as the commodity credit program.

There are 73 Federal corporations which are concerned in one way or another with loans. Among the more important are the Public Housing Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Export-Import Bank, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration.

But despite the adherents that Senator BYRD's bill for abolition of the RFC will attract, there is by no means anything like unanimity in Congress that the RFC should be completely done away with. Senator FULBRIGHT, whose committee has brought to light sordid stories of its dealings, does not believe this course is either feasible or desirable, declaring that the RFC has a number of important duties in the present emergency. Only last year, he has stated, Congress provided additional duties for the RFC in connection with the Defense Production Act. His remedy for the conditions which have prevailed in the administration of the RFC is embodied in Senate bill S. 514 which he has introduced and which would provide for a single Administrator or Governor and a loan policy board.

"To defeat the reorganization plan, on the grounds that the RFC should be abolished, would merely prolong the present conditions," he declares, "without any assurance either that the RFC would be abolished, or that it would be restored to a position of independence and integrity."

Another sponsor of the plan to continue RFC is Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, who has become known as the friend of small business. Declaring that there is very little risk capital available from banking and private sources, Representative PATMAN says that "a vote against RFC is a vote against independent business in this country."

So the battle for and against the RFC may emerge as one of the outstanding issues of the Eighty-second Congress in both Houses and on both sides of the aisle. It is an issue in which party lines will be split and which may carry over into the political campaign of 1952.

United States World Aims and Hopes for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written for the Foreign Policy Bulletin by my colleague from Connecticut in the House, Representative A. A. RIBICOFF, of Hartford. The article appeared in the March 9, 1951, issue of the Bulletin. It deals with the need for this Nation to clarify its world aims and its hopes for world peace.

Representative RIBICOFF's article is the second time in as many months that he has issued an important statement on foreign policy which has contributed to the current "great debate." Earlier, on March 21, 1951, he delivered one of the main talks at the Hollins College, Virginia, convocation exercises. Titled "We Shall Prevail," the speech by this distinguished member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee stressed the need for moral leadership in today's crisis.

Mr. President, those who know Representative RIBICOFF admire him for the wholehearted manner in which, during his service in the House, he has brought his great ability and intelligence to bear on his work as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. His article in the Foreign Policy Bulletin, and his recent talk at Hollins College which already has been inserted in a previous edition of the RECORD, should be studied by all the Members of Congress and by the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIBICOFF URGES RECAPTURE OF POLITICAL INITIATIVE

For the first time in history one nation has strayed into a position of leadership without wanting it. Yet nevertheless the whole free world, economically and militarily, depends on the United States. It is this brutal fact that increases our frustration and our soul searching. "Why, oh God," we cry, "just we?" If we do not lead, no other free nation can take our place. If we do not lead, Soviet Russia will rush into the vacuum created by our abdication.

OUR NEW WORLD ROLE

The implications of our changed international status have been slow to sink into the national consciousness. Yet we do not sufficiently realize that everything we do affects other nations. Nor have we learned that we ourselves can now be subjected to new pressure and new kinds of attacks that cou'd never have touched us before. It is our country's task to determine whether freedom or slavery is the principle to survive for the next centuries.

Although the United States is the nucleus of the non-Communist world, there is no central control, no compelling unifying idea. Korea dramatically opened our eyes to the dangers that confront us and revealed the weakness of ourselves and our allies. Consequently, one fact overshadows all others. Our present policy is bigger than our present means. We should multiply our means to cope with our commitments.

We no longer live in the carefree times when we could ignore the rest of the planet. What we announce we will not defend, the other side automatically takes. Moreover, no portion of the non-Communist world is without importance to the defense of the whole. Because of our geographic position and interests, we must keep in balance our policies as to Europe, Asia, and the Americas. We cannot separate our world relations and responsibilities and treat them separately from one another. Our commitments in one area must not be permitted to endanger our capacity to act in others.

CORRECTIONS OF POLICY NEEDED

There must be some corrections in our short-term foreign policy.

1. Outside the United States we must try to create a single automatic military alliance, embracing all countries willing to join, concentrating on Western Europe as the most valuable, but not overlooking other areas. Although we might be forced out of one area or another, if war comes, we must not voluntarily renounce any important region of the world.

2. We should create local centers of strength able to deal with second-degree aggression, beginning with a far eastern pact—not unlike the North Atlantic Pact—and a Mediterranean pact, for if this second-degree aggression cannot be handled chiefly by local forces, we must either have to submit to it or else fritter away our strength. An example of local defense is the Greek-Yugoslav-Turkish combined force, which could probably handle aggression from the captive countries of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

3. We cannot unilaterally promise each nation and each segment of the globe that we will defend it without getting in return its promise to help us when necessary. Since defense, moreover, is global in scale, we must have commitments from those with whom we are allied to help us in other areas of the world.

4. We need allies as much as they need us. We have interests in common. We must find a common policy with our friends and then follow it together.

5. By appropriate organs we should try to weld our camp into an effective instrument to make it as solid as that of our opponents. For example, we may point to the pooling of military components under General Eisenhower in Europe and the proposal to pool European economic interests under the Schuman plan.

Although terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to rearm, we must never forget that war is the last push that topples civilization. We must press the campaign on the front of peace making, and not only on the front of armed opposition. We must recapture from the Communists the political, social, economic, and spiritual factors without which military strength usually fails. Spiritual power is the ultimate key to the world's ills. We must contribute ideas as well as dollars and soldiers.

LONG-RANGE POLICY GOALS

The following should be the basis for our long-range foreign policy:

1. We must proclaim that our goals for the world are similar to the goals of this Nation from its founding. Paraphrasing the Constitution of the United States, they are: A more perfect world, common security, the establishment of justice, universal tranquility, the securing of peace in our own land and throughout the world, general welfare of all peoples, the securing of the blessings of liberty for all peoples and for posterity.

2. We must proclaim that we are for universal disarmament and international control of weapons.

3. We must proclaim that American wealth, American resources, America itself, are not the ends but the means to an end. The Creator did not endow this Nation with all its vast potential merely that Americans might luxuriate in the midst of a depleted, dismayed, and disheartened world. We should tell the world that once we eliminate the scourge of war we are willing to adopt a peace budget instead of a military budget. Under an international program similar to point 4 we shall help to raise the underdeveloped peoples of this world out of ignorance, poverty, and disease.

4. The McMahon-Ribicoff resolution, recently introduced in Congress, has its place in this program. This resolution is a declaration of friendship of the American people for all other peoples of the world. It emphasizes the desire of the American people for peace, friendship, and brotherhood with all men throughout the world, including those of the Soviet Union.

5. We must take the lead in transforming the United Nations into a world organization able to enact, administer, and enforce world law. This will require fundamental revisions in the United Nations Charter. These changes can be limited and confined to matters relating to the prevention of war.

For our generation and all mankind one question overshadows all others. Are we going to be able to work out the problems that arose out of World War II, or will world war III follow?

All this is a tremendous task. But it is not beyond our capacity. If we have the will to lead, we shall prevail.

A. A. RIBICOFF.

(This article was specially prepared for the Foreign Policy Bulletin by Representative RIBICOFF, Democrat of Connecticut, who is a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.)

The Bitter Wheat of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 1, 1951:

THE BITTER WHEAT OF INDIA—UNITED STATES, IN DELAYING GRAIN, IS RISKING THE LOSS OF A FRIEND

(By Margaret Parton)

NEW DELHI.—Recent news that India will exchange raw jute for 50,000 tons of Russian wheat as she recently exchanged jute goods for 50,000 tons of Chinese rice is considered here further indication of India's determination to keep food imports free of political implications and obtain food for her undernourished people wherever it may be found.

American observers here also regard the news of the Russian deal as another signal to Washington that in Indian eyes the time for discussion of merits of the 2,000,000-ton wheat gift is fast running out.

A month ago, when it appeared India would receive the grain without undue delay, most Indians were already half convinced that the gift was a spontaneous humanitarian gesture, as they had so often been told in preliminary publicity. Now they are beginning to change their minds, and the new mood is a bitter one.

A recent cartoon in a normally pro-American newspaper hero showed a large blood labeled "United States" leaning possessively on a pie marked "Food for India." To an emaciated Indian at the other end of the table she was murmuring: "First tell me you love me, honey."

The view represented in this cartoon is spreading fast. If the offer of wheat to India is really a humanitarian gesture, Indians ask, why then must it be debated at such length? A recent spate of touring American private citizens who flatly tell Indians in public and private that they must sign up with America or else has aggravated opinion. Such an attempt at a straight-from-the-shoulder approach never does any good in India and in this case it merely confirms growing Indian suspicion of American motives.

American observers in India are also uneasy at the way this matter is being delayed in Washington. Many Americans here feel that in Indian eyes the wheat gift has come to symbolize the potential goodness of America, just as the atom bomb symbolizes evil. Since symbols are all-powerful in India, the possibility is that denial of the wheat will have a disastrous effect on Indian public opinion of America and on India's reaction to American policy in general. While America may not win India with wheat, America may well lose India without the wheat.

Proposals that a loan rather than a gift should be made seem here to be equally unfortunate. While such proposals might have been justified before, Indians were so generally led to believe that the gift would be

forthcoming that they now appear in Indian eyes to turn Uncle Sam into Shylock. Economic experts also point out that a long-term loan would tie up India's economy for years and might prevent her from getting loans elsewhere for nation-building projects.

Meanwhile, India's struggle to avert widespread famine continues, and although the Government is importing shiploads of grain every day (against payment) from America, Canada, and elsewhere, many thousands of peasants are facing semistarvation this summer.

In North Bihar, for instance, such limited foodstocks as are available are sufficient to feed the population on a meager scale for only 2 or 3 weeks more. After that the Government will probably be forced to declare North Bihar a famine-stricken area and divert to it dwindling supplies of grain which are already desperately needed in other provinces.

From this distance it appears that the time for questions and debate in Washington is now past, both in regard to acute human hunger and also to America's relations with India. While it is true the grain will certainly help in relieving starvation in a hard-pressed country, even this consideration may count for less in the long run than restoring India's fast-vanishing faith in the sincerity of America's humanitarianism.

Assignment of Ground Forces to Duty in the European Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have expressed the conviction, with regard to sending American troops to fight on foreign soil in times of peace, that this is a matter of policy on which the Congress should be consulted in advance and not merely asked to approve decisions already made.

In this connection, I call to the attention of the Senate a statement by the Committee on the Present Danger, a national group comprised of distinguished representatives of the professions, the educational world, and of business, in which there is set forth the considered conviction that such action as is proposed must be the joint responsibility of the Congress and the Chief Executive, and asking that it be expressed as the sense of the Senate that the Congress be consulted in advance, through its appropriate committees, as to any new long-range policy requiring the stationing of large numbers of additional United States forces in Europe in support of the North Atlantic Treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Committee on the Present Danger be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

The Senate is about to vote on a resolution concerning sending troops to Europe in support of the North Atlantic Treaty. The importance of this subject to the safety of our country can hardly be overstated.

In the hope that it may serve to clarify the issues, this committee ventures its comment.

The real question is how best to defend the United States. This is a military problem. We must look to our responsible military leaders, who must conduct our defense if war comes, to plan the strategy they will employ. It is their unanimous, professional judgment that the defense of the United States should be laid in Europe jointly with our allies under the North Atlantic Treaty; that we must contribute our fair share of the ground forces of the joint army being created under General Eisenhower; that supply of munitions and contributions of sea and air power are not enough; that flexibility as to future decisions for deployment of our troops is an imperative necessity in a future no man can predict.

There is danger that these real issues may be obscured by an unnecessary question as to the respective constitutional powers of the President and the Congress. The Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This carries with it the powers implicit in command as to deployment of existing forces. But the Constitution also provides that it shall be the function of the Congress "to raise and support armies." In addition, of course, Congress has the power over the purse.

Stationing a relatively large United States force in Europe to support the North Atlantic Treaty will involve the functions of command, of raising and supporting armies, and of making appropriations. It must be the joint responsibility of the Congress and the Chief Executive to continue to provide the requisite forces, to pass the laws to create them and the funds to pay for them.

The press recently attributed to General Eisenhower the statement that he might as well be sent to the middle of the Atlantic Ocean unless he is to have in this task the support of the President, of the Congress, and of the public.

The true issues then are not constitutional questions, but whether this country is ready with unity to carry out the spirit as well as the letter of the North Atlantic Treaty; whether it will give its wholehearted support to General Eisenhower's mission; whether it will abide by the considered judgment of its responsible military leaders as to how best to defend the United States.

Secretary Marshall has just stated that the danger is greater now even than last November.

Accordingly this committee urges with deep conviction—

A renewed spirit of national urgency, and of unity of action in this matter between the President and the Congress.

To this end, that the Senate express—as is proposed in section 2 of the joint committees' resolution now pending before it—"that the threat to the security of the United States and our North Atlantic Treaty partners makes it necessary for the United States to station abroad such units of our Armed Forces as may be necessary and appropriate to contribute our fair share of the forces needed for the joint defense of the North Atlantic area."

That it be expressed as the sense of the Senate that the Congress be consulted in advance, through its appropriate committees, as to any new long range policy requiring the stationing of any large number of additional United States forces in Europe in support of the North Atlantic Treaty.

That assurance of such consultation be given by the President.

That the above not be done in a way which might tend to cast any uncertainty or cloud upon the power of the Commander in Chief to take instant action wherever necessary, as emergencies may arise or threaten, to deploy existing forces—a power more urgently requisite for the safety of all of us in today's world of sudden mass-destruction weapons than it has ever been before.

Committee on the Present Danger: Julius Ochs Adler, Raymond B. Allen, Frank Altschul, Dillon Anderson, William Douglas Arant, James Phinney Baxter III, Laird Bell, Barry Bingham, Harry A. Bullis, Vannevar Bush, Will L. Clayton, James B. Conant, Robert Cutler, R. Ammi Cutter, Mrs. Dwight Davis, Harold W. Dodds, E. L. Degolyer, Charles Dollard, William J. Donovan, Goldthwaite H. Dorr, David Dubinsky, Leonard K. Firestone, Truman K. Gibson, Jr., Miss Meta Glass, Arthur J. Goldberg, Samuel Goldwyn, Edward S. Greenbaum, Paul G. Hoffman, Monte M. Lemann, William L. Marbury, Stanley Marcus, William C. Menninger, Frederick A. Middlebush, James L. Morrill, Edward R. Murrow, John Lord O'Brien, Floyd B. Odlum, Robert P. Patterson, Howard C. Petersen, Daniel A. Poling, Stanley Rosen, Samuel I. Rosenman, Theodore W. Schultz, Robert E. Sherwood, Edgar W. Smith, Robert G. Sproul, Robert L. Stearns, Tracy S. Voorhees, Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., W. W. Waymack, Henry M. Wriston, J. D. Zellerbach.

Come Clean, Mr. Welles; Name Those Who Confused President Roosevelt on China Policy and at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, hardly a day goes by that some former Democratic policy maker does not publish a book in an effort to protect himself or his benefactor against historical judgment that is certain to follow. Today we have the sorry spectacle of Sumner Welles offering his excuses for the dismissal foreign policies of the New Deal when he was a high spokesman for the State Department from 1933 to 1943. His confessions appear in his book, Seven Decisions That Shaped History.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely article by Mr. George Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald today. This outstanding writer puts Mr. Welles on the spot. Congress will await an answer to the Sokolsky demand that he "come clean" and name those who "confused" the late President Roosevelt in our foreign affairs.

The article follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Sumner Welles returns to public controversy after a prolonged illness attending the curious circumstances of his departure from the State Department. His resurrection is ushered in by a book, "Seven Decisions That Shaped History," and by the chairmanship of a letterhead organization "Freedom International."

The book is extraordinarily controversal, attacking Cordell Hull, Herbert Hoover, Gen. George Marshall and about everything else, except Franklin D. Roosevelt and Sumner Welles, who were never wrong.

But as I read the book, I could not help recalling that Sumner Welles was in the State Department in extremely important positions from 1933 to 1943 and that he did not speak up at the time to alert the American people. He has waited until 1951 to tell us what we should have known when the mistakes were being made by his own State Department.

For instance, he says:

"In China the Nationalist Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek remained in power. There was good reason to assume that with the pledged support of the Soviet Union and of the United States it would gradually overcome the opposition of the Chinese Communists and consolidate its authority over a united nation."

That, of course, is absolute nonsense and is written only to defend, by implication, the shameless conduct of Roosevelt at Tehran and Yalta. Welles knows that Chiang broke with the Communists in 1927 in such a manner that no peace between them could ever be possible.

Writing of Roosevelt's troubles with Chiang Kai-shek, Sumner Welles says:

"The repeated—and, it must be admitted, bungling—efforts of several of President Roosevelt's representatives in China to persuade Chiang Kai-shek to comply with the demands of the Chinese Communists were productive of misunderstanding, and damaged the prestige and authority of the Nationalist Government.

"Likewise, the profund ignorance of China, and the lack of Far Eastern experience, of certain of the President's representatives there served him in ill stead. These envoys spent much of their time quarreling with each other, or with their subordinates; and, while I know of no instance where they did not try to carry out the President's instructions to further the establishment of a strong postwar China, their erroneous judgment and the wide diversity of their recommendations made it impossible for him to obtain any accurate over-all estimate of the situation."

This is important evidence and has often appeared, in one form or another, in this column, but from Sumner Welles, it is of greater value because he was running the State Department when many of the mistakes were made. And he gives no names, no facts, no details.

Wo are these advisers? Is one of them, perchance, Owen Lattimore or Lauchlin Currie?

Roosevelt, according to Welles, was not only confused by his advisers concerning his China policy, but by Gen. George Marshall concerning the over-all war strategy, Marshall being, according to Welles, incorrect in his information and his decisions.

Welles does not give details as to who it is that made these mistakes. Are we still being governed by the men who were, in his opinion, all wrong? They have, to [illegible] cost us 60,000 casualties. Are they still determining our policy.

If you look at the dates, Gen. George Marshall and Dean Acheson made the worst mistakes, but Sumner Welles does not say who advised them regarding Far Eastern affairs.

Again Sumner Welles, defending Roosevelt, says:

"At the Cairo conferences with the Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek, the President had at his side no expert adviser on Far Eastern affairs. At Yalta also such advice was lacking.

"If the President had had with him at those two conferences so authoritative and keen-minded an expert on Far Eastern affairs, for example, as Dr. Stanley Hornbeck, who had for many years been the State Department's political adviser on the Far East, a number of defects in the Cairo and Yalta agreements on Asia might well have been avoided."

This is a correct view but incomplete. Roosevelt did have advisers at Cairo and certainly at Yalta. Gen. George Marshall was at Cairo as was General Wedemeyer.

At Yalta, President Roosevelt's expert on Far Eastern affairs was Alger Hiss.

What we need to know from Sumner Welles is, who confused President Roosevelt, who appointed the quarrelsome, contending people who gave him, as Welles says, bad advice?

We want names, we want responsibility. Who appointed Hiss? Now that Sumner Welles has written this confession, let him come clean.

Ukrainians a Potent Ally Against the Stalin Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people can be a potent ally of the United States in the fight against the Stalin Communist regime. These people who have been so oppressed by Stalin have been yearning for their freedom. Not only are they subject to the usual Soviet terrorism, but in addition they suffer as a minority group trod upon by the aggressive and imperialistic policies of Soviet Russia. With more than 40,000,000 Ukrainian people living in the Soviet Union, this group constitutes no small prickly thorn in the side of Stalin, but rather a tremendous national group which if properly led and supported may well prove the downfall of the Stalinist regime. I believe that the American people should support the Ukrainian resistance to Communist tyranny.

I include herewith two articles—one from the March 1951 issue of the Sign, and the other from the March 24, 1951, issue of the Brooklyn Tablet. These articles tell in greater detail the possibilities for revolution existing among the Ukrainian people. They follow:

(From the Sign for March 1951)

WEAPON AGAINST RUSSIA—NOT A SUPER ATOM BOMB NOR A POWERFUL JET PLANE, BUT THE PRINCIPLE OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR MISCALLED RUSSIANS IS THE WEAPON TO BEAT THE KREMLIN

(By Leonard J. Snow)

The United States has available today a weapon which can beat the evil men in the Kremlin to their knees, save the world from the menace of Red imperialism, and bring political and spiritual freedom to the slave population of the Soviet Empire itself. Best of all, use of this weapon may very well bring all these blessings without precipitating the horrors of a third world war.

For this weapon is neither a super atom bomb nor a powerful jet plane of new design. In fact, it is not a weapon of mass destruction at all but a long overlooked principle of simple justice which, properly applied, can be of immense benefit, not alone to this country and its allies, but also to the inhabitants of the Soviet Union.

The weapon is the principle of national self-determination which gives each distinctive people in the world the right to live as a free nation, under a government of its own choice, and within the territory it inhabits. If self-determination were applied to the crazy-quilt pattern of different races and nations which make up the population of the Soviet Union, at least two dozen, perhaps more, independent states would replace the single giant Communist slave empire that exists today.

The "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" and "Russia" are neither synonyms nor equivalent terms, although most Americans use them interchangeably. Actually, of course, the Soviet Union, as the name indicates, is a federation of many nations and peoples, of which the group known as the Russians is the largest. But one basic fact that the name does not indicate is that the federation is an involuntary one, produced by Russian conquest over a period of hundreds of years, and not by the free choice of the federated peoples. As a matter of fact about half of the present population of the Soviet Union—that half of the 200,000,000 inhabitants who are ethnologically non-Russian—is anxious to cast off its connection with Moscow.

Among these non-Russians are from thirty-five to forty million Ukrainians and about 10,000,000 Byelorussians, who are related to the Russians to about the same degree that the Dutch or the Swedes are related to the Germans. There are fifty or more million other people in Stalin's empire—among them Tartars, Buryat Mongols, Armenians, Turkestanians, and Finns—who differ from the Russians as greatly as the Chinese do from the French.

If the United States, which has always firmly refused to recognize territorial changes produced by aggression and conquest, comes out bluntly as an advocate of self-determination for these minorities in the Soviet Union, it will gain their sympathy in the cold war. If the cold war becomes a shooting war, this country will gain the active cooperation of hundreds of thousands of desperate representatives of these minorities who will regard war between the Soviet Union and the West as a golden opportunity to launch their own fight for freedom from Moscow's chains.

These statements are neither speculation nor wishful thinking. They are based on the studies of hardheaded policy-making officials in Washington who have the benefit of access to our intelligence files.

These men are convinced that the minorities incorporated into the Soviet Union's huge population are straining at the bonds which tie them to the ruthless Communist dictatorship. Knowledge that the United States recognizes their right to independence and a national existence of their own will cause these people to hamstring Moscow's war plans by sabotage, large-scale desertions from the Red army, and even open revolt against the Communists. It is possible that by these actions alone Stalin's empire can be broken up from within. But, even if Stalin is foolish enough to resort to war in the face of these domestic difficulties, sponsorship and active encouragement of self-determination will give the United States and its allies the assurance that they will have an easier war to fight and win.

The immediate consequence of a breakup of the Communist empire will be to lift the shadow of fear from this planet because most of the new states which would emerge will desire nothing better than to live in complete friendship and harmony with the rest of the world. Even if the Communists retain control of one of the new states, their power to do harm through conquest and aggression, which today comes from the extent of the empire they have and the enormous human and industrial resources, will

be eliminated. Under self-determination, the most the Communists may manage to keep for themselves—and that is doubtful—is a Russian state of about 90,000,000 people centering around Moscow.

There is a tendency to forget that Soviet expansion and conquest is not a new phenomenon but a continuation of the savage Russian imperialism which was the order of the day under the Czarist empire. For instance, the Caucasus region has belonged to Moscow for less than 100 years. Bringing the Caucasus into the Russian fold was not a peaceful process of bringing civilization to a savage area. It was a deliberately planned policy of conquest in which the preponderant military strength of semibarbaric Moscow crushed the ancient Christian kingdom of Georgia and in so doing left behind wounds which have never healed.

Just after the end of World War II, one of the Soviet attaches on duty at the Red Embassy in Washington was an admiral of Georgian extraction. He must remain anonymous because he has since returned to the Soviet Union. This man told his American friends that the spirit of nationalism and the desire for independence from Moscow have never disappeared in his homeland of Georgia. The people of Georgia, he said, were biding their time and waiting for their chance to achieve freedom. They will welcome, with undying gratitude, the knowledge that their aspirations were looked on with sympathy by the West and they will co-operate fully in any feasible plan to bring the Red slave empire to an end.

The Communists have been slightly more subtle in following the Czarist Russian policy of imperialism. Ostensibly they have encouraged minority cultures but, by placing Muscovite gauleiters at the helm in each minority area, they have attained the same net effect as the Czarists: The minorities have been allowed autonomy in unimportant affairs but are tied to Moscow's apron strings in matters that count. Like the Czarists, the Communists bleed the minority areas white of their produce and raw materials for the benefit of the majority Russians.

The attitude of the minorities toward their Russian masters is best illustrated by their immediate response to the fall of the Russian Czar in March 1917. When that happened, most of the minority peoples, living on the periphery of the Czarist Empire, in the west, the east, and to the south, declared their independence and established free and usually republican governments. In other words, the minorities took advantage without delay of the collapse of Moscow's power to free themselves from any connection with the Russians although the democratic successors to the Czarist state promised them sympathetic treatment and a large measure of autonomy under locally chosen governments.

In November 1917, when Lenin and his Bolsheviks overthrew the provisional Kerensky government, despite the difficulties caused by the German occupation of considerable Russian territory, literally dozens of independent states had replaced the old empire. In Eastern Europe there was a free Ukrain and a free White Russia. In the Caucasus, and along the shores of the Caspian Sea, the Georgians, the Armenians, and half a dozen other races, declared their independence. In the Crimea, a Tartar state was formed. Siberia was the location of no less than five free states. The far-off Asiatic possessions of the Czar reverted to their former independent status. The Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—joined Finland in asserting their independence.

Nothing was left of the despotically ruled empire but those territories inhabited by the Russians themselves.

The Communist masters of Russia, although they gave lip service to the principle of self-determination, were then, as now, shrewd men who realized that reconquest of the old Czarist empire would give them a fine start on their plan to conquer the world for Marxism. They also realized that world opinion would not give much support to the new states because the West, not having learned to differentiate between the various distinctive ethnological groups living in the former territories of the Czar, lumped them together as Russian and looked on their wars as so many domestic quarrels.

So Lenin and his Bolsheviks sent their armies against one new state after another and reannexed their territory, this time as part of a Communist empire.

By 1925 the last of the independent states was crushed and the capitals of Europe were crowded with political refugees from the ruthless vengeance of the new Communist empire.

It is these political refugees—and those who joined them in exile during and after the Second World War—who have kept alive the idea that the way to root out Bolshevism is to offer the hope of freedom to the minorities of the Soviet Union. Between the wars, these exiles learned to recognize that it was their own weakness, caused by their inability to work together against the Communists, rather than the Bolshevik power which destroyed their opportunity for freedom. Many of the exiles decided that only through the close cooperation of all the minorities could they hope to regain their precious independence. They organized political associations which cut across national lines, included representatives from all or nearly all minorities, and set as their goal the restoration of freedom to all.

In Warsaw, for instance, Prof. Roman Smal Stocki, a famous Ukrainian scholar who now teaches at Marquette University, organized the Promethean League with delegates from a baker's dozen of the minorities. Between the wars, the Promethean League disseminated independence propaganda from outside the Soviet Union and fostered a secret underground movement within the Communist empire. The league was shattered by the Second World War, but Prof. Smal Stocki has now reorganized it in this country.

Similar in purpose to the Promethean League is the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, organized in the Ukraine in 1943 by underground representatives of the minorities who were then fighting against both the Nazi invaders and the Soviet partisan bands. The ABN now maintains its headquarters in Edinburgh.

The existence of such organizations among the thousands of exiles from the Soviet Union, plus information brought to Washington from inside the Soviet Union by agents of our various official intelligence services, has convinced many American Government officials that a strong demand for freedom exists among the Soviet minorities. There are available on-the-spot reports which reveal that Soviet treatment of its Central Asian minorities, for example, is extremely brutal, and that, as a result, a major part of the population of this area is especially anxious to cast off the Soviet yoke.

Although the constitution of the Soviet Union, the so-called Stalin constitution of 1936, provides for self-government in minority areas of the country, our officials know that in every case the majority of highly placed administrators are Russian carpetbaggers. Only the lowest posts in the administrative echelons are open to the minority representatives.

In the western areas of the Soviet Union, particularly in the Ukraine and in the former Baltic States, Soviet brutality has caused the extermination of a large part of the population and the wholesale transference of other millions to the slave labor camps. These facts are well known to newspaper readers from the charges brought against the Bolsheviks before the United Nations by exiles from these regions. Secret information in the possession of the United States Government confirms these charges in every respect.

If there is further doubt that the minorities of the Soviet Union are eager for freedom, two postwar acts of Stalin's government should serve to dispel the notion. When the United Nations was organized, Stalin thought it necessary to make concessions to minority feelings by insisting that the Soviet Ukraine and the Soviet White Russian Republic should have their own representatives in the General Assembly as well as their own foreign ministers and separate armies. Of course, by placing Communists in charge of these important posts, Stalin has assured himself that whatever autonomy these states have gained has been on paper only.

In its second action, the Soviet Government deliberately destroyed several of the minorities which had enjoyed a slight degree of autonomy under the watchful eyes of Russian overseers. Among these victims were three autonomous republics—two Tatar and one German—located in the Crimea. The population of these regions was shipped to the slave labor camps of the Arctic and their territory was transferred to other minorities on the pretext that these people had cooperated with the Nazis during the war.

Doubtless this was partly true. Most of the minority peoples in the areas occupied by the Germans early in the war did cooperate with the invaders. But they did this not because they favored Hitler's cause, but because they looked upon the war as a God-given opportunity for them to gain their freedom from the men in the Kremlin. Students of Eastern European affairs agree that if the Nazis had properly and decently treated the people of the Soviet Union in the areas occupied by the German Army, Stalin would have lost the war. When the Germans first came in they were welcomed because anything seemed better to these slaves of the Communists than the system under which they had been living. But when the minorities understood that the Germans were coming in as masters rather than as liberators, they turned against them.

Knowing these facts, many responsible Washington officials are convinced that it would be a strategically wise move for this country to announce to the minorities that we look with approval on their aspirations for freedom and will do all in our power to help them achieve it. Such a proclamation, which would pay back the Communists in their own coin because they are constantly urging the people of the West to revolt against their governments, would cause so much strife and dissension within the Soviet Union, as the minorities regained their hope of freedom, that Stalin would be kept too busy to think of foreign adventures.

The Red army would be needed to strengthen local garrisons and quell domestic insurrections instead of for foreign conquest. But since the proportion of minority troops in the Red army is the same as in the general population, it would not be long before Stalin's troops began to join the civilian population in the quest for freedom. When that happens, the break-up of the Soviet state, founded as it is on military power and not the will of the people, will follow inevitably.

Thus there is a good chance that if this country comes out for self-determination and proclaims it by every propaganda means we possess—by radio, leaflet, and word of mouth—we will never have to fight a war with the Communists, who bear within them the seeds of their own destruction. The minority exiles in this country and in Western Europe are the means by which we can carry these propaganda messages to the enslaved people of the Soviet Union. They understand the aspirations of their fellow countrymen at home. Their very presence in the West is proof that the minorities

enthralled to the Russian Communists are anxious for the opportunity to throw off the Soviet yoke. Certainly we will pay a cheaper price in blood and treasure for the destruction of Red Russia's imperialism if we give these men the chance they seek to sow the seeds of liberty in the heart of the Soviet Union.

If we decide to use this plan, there is always the possibility that war with the Communists will come before it can be put into effect and bear its fruit. If that is the case, we will find that advocacy of self-determination will create a pro-United States climate of opinion in the minority areas of the Soviet Union. We will be fighting the Soviets with one will and one determination; they will be fighting us with a divided and unhappy people.

Washington knows these facts but hesitates to take the necessary steps because it is not sure the American people are sufficiently acquainted with Russian history to understand that the break-up of the Soviet Empire would be an act of historical justice. If the people of this country show that they understand and support self-determination for Soviet minorities, Washington will fall in line.

[From the Brooklyn Tablet of March 24, 1951]

UKRAINIANS URGE MORE "VOICE" AID—SESSIONS HERE ALSO ASK HELP TO UNDERGROUND FORCES IN EUROPE

The all-out and unqualified support to the United States Government in its ever-increasing efforts to oppose the aggressive and imperialistic policies of Soviet Russia, whose ultimate and decisive aim is the imposition of slavery upon this country, was pledged by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America at the conclusion of its 2-day annual meeting at the Hotel Statler, Manhattan, Sunday.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, representing over a million citizens of Ukrainian birth or origin and having branches in three quarters of the United States, has been vigorously campaigning against Soviet Russia's enslavement of Ukrainia and other non-Russian countries of Eastern Europe, and advocating the application of the principles of self-determination to all peoples subjugated by the Kremlin.

The main feature of the meeting was the report of the president of the organization, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Dobriansky stated that one of the most gratifying effects of the work of the committee was the growing realization in both governmental and congressional circles, of the urgent need of relying on the subjugated peoples, such as the Ukrainians who, fighting for the liberation of their country from Soviet Russia, are in a true sense allies of western freedom.

URGE JOINING ARMED FORCES

A series of resolutions was voted by the meeting. One of them called for the intensification of efforts in disseminating vital data on developments inside the Soviet Union, which data the committee is receiving from various Ukrainian organizations both inside and outside the iron curtain and imparting as invaluable advance information to our Government, while another called upon similar organizations to unite for an over-all coordination of anti-Communist efforts.

Another resolution deplored the inefficacy of the Voice of America in making genuine appeals to the peoples of the Soviet Union, whose predominant aspirations for liberation from the Russian imperialistic yoke is potentially the most powerful and effective weapon against the Soviet aggressor.

It was emphasized that the Ukrainian Congress Committee, guided by a sense of Christian charity and compassion, observes a well grounded distinction between a historically undemocratic Russian leadership, now in the form of Soviet communism, and the perennially victimized common Russian people; another part of the same resolution castigated those irresponsible anti-Communist Russian political leaders for whom the conservation of the Russian territorial empire is more important than the defeat of Soviet communism.

Finally, the committee called for American aid of every description for the underground Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which is the vanguard of the anti-Communist forces behind the iron curtain, and which collaborates intimately with the known Slovak, Lithuanian, and Polish underground resistance systems, thus creating a vast reservoir of anti-Soviet and anti-Communist forces behind the iron curtain.

The committee also called for the application of the basic American principle in foreign policy, namely, the principle of national self-determination, to be applied to all peoples, large and small, as consistent with our democratic beliefs and the principles of international justice, and endorsed the recent policy proposed by Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, who advocated the complete and true sovereignty and independence of nine eastern European countries, now in Soviet slavery, among which in the first place was Ukraine, the longest and most fiercely oppressed victim of Soviet Russia.

"Washington in a State of Unparalleled Confusion" Says Mr. Felix Morley

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Felix Morley is an outstanding journalist and author. Writing in Barron's for March 19, he calls attention to Washington scandals and says they are the country's peril. And indeed they are, Mr. Speaker, for the people are alarmed about present conditions which President Truman ignores. Recently he was bold enough to say that he is surrounded by "honorable men."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including Mr. Morley's article:

"ALL HONORABLE MEN"—THE WASHINGTON SCANDALS ARE THE COUNTRY'S PERIL

(By Felix Morley)

Under the English system, a vote like that in the House last week on the RFC would probably have brought on a general election.

By the narrow margin of 200 to 197, with 36 absentees, the Representatives favored a Republican resolution to reject President Truman's plan for reorganizing this now unsavory lending agency. It was a clear vote of no confidence. The resolution said, in effect, that reorganization of the RFC should be tabled because the national interest demands its complete abolition; the sooner, the better.

Because the Reorganization Act, under which the vote was taken, requires a majority of the entire House membership, the resolution failed. But that was only because 19 Republicans were absent when the vote was taken. If the fate of the administration had actually been at stake, the GOP whips would have had those absentees in line. Then, with the defections from the Democratic side, the RFC would have been on the way out. It may be, anyway, if the Senate approves the Byrd resolution condemning this agency's "sordid record of fiscal vandalism."

The failure of last week's congressional attack on the RFC is important because it emphasizes that Congress is relatively powerless against entrenched corruption. The inflexible term of executive office is a weakness, as well as a strength, in our governmental system. Short of the process of impeachment, there is no way in which the Truman administration can be ousted prior to November 1952. It is close to 2 years before another President can take office. Until then the Nation must put up with what it has.

When Mr. Truman returns, next week, from his March vacation at Key West he will find Washington in a state of unparalleled confusion. On every sector of the mobilization front matters are definitely getting out of control.

The problems of the Economic Stabilization Agency, boycotted by organized labor, increase daily. Its able publicity director sadly admits that he is too busy releasing the kaleidoscopic regulations to know whether or not they are observed, or even understood, by those on whom they are so prolifically showered.

The issue of military assistance to our European allies is still far from settled. At best it will be some weeks before General Eisenhower has any more American troops under his command, unless they are sent without congressional approval. In spite of protracted hearings, neither House has as yet approved the administration request for a free hand in this matter. And indications are strong that the free hand will not be granted.

The Senate has acted to extend the draft and inaugurate UMT. But the House is only now completing committee consideration of this legislation, rendered urgent by the fact that the present draft law has less than 3 months to run.

Although Seoul is again happily in our hands, the Department of State has revealed no plan for ending the Korean war. In a military sense this has been going as well as could be hoped, but General MacArthur has given public warning that stalemate is the best he can achieve within the present policy setup. Meantime, the UN seems to have washed its hands of its Korean problem child. The only current news from UN is that the windows in the new Secretariat building will have to be weatherstripped to keep out New York's soot and grime.

Weatherstripping, however, will not avail to exclude the dirt that has been sifting into so many Government agencies here in Washington. The current revelations of official connivance in racketeering of many kinds are appalling to honorable leaders in both political parties.

It is a Democratic Senator, FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, who seriously suggests "a general investigation of the moral level" of the Federal Government. And since this suggestion we have had, inter alia, the testimony of the official who said last week that nothing but friendship prompted him to support a highly dubious RFC loan; "Maybe I'm naive or something but that doesn't seem wrong to me."

The revelations brought out by the RFC and crime investigations, and in both there is much still to come, are highly disturbing because, in the words of Senator BYRD, they "show a complete lack of understanding of what is morally right and proper for a Government employee."

From the domestic viewpoint the scandals are causing a mistrust of government which,

while perhaps fundamentally healthy, is materially hampering the conduct of emergency business.

The Fulbright committee reports that its "hearings have not been successful in establishing the real reasons why RFC loans were made." And the suspicion thus engendered carries over into other fields. It has already led to the charge that the administration wants four more divisions for Europe just as a first installment. The feeling grows that all the administration policies are devious and that Congress should therefore block rather than cooperate.

The results is obstruction of policies that are wise as well as those that have been demonstrably shameful.

Obstruction means delay—in matters that demand action as well as in those where inaction is desirable. Tax legislation is a case in point. Clearly the defense effort demands fundamental reexamination of the tax structure and it had been expected that the Congress would have come to grips with this problem before Easter. The present state of the calendar indicates that it will be May, or even later, before any new tax legislation can be cleared by the House.

The picture is equally unhealthy from the viewpoint of American prestige abroad. President Truman says that his foreign policy aims to insure that people everywhere have the things that are necessary to make life worth while and that they live by the moral code in which they believe.

In the light of the mink coat and other revelations these words have an ambiguous ring, and lead to cynical interpretation. Yet the defense effort depends, before anything else, on vital faith and conviction in regard to the values we mobilize to defend.

After 19 years of uninterrupted power the Democratic administration has not merely lost its spiritual elan, but is more and more giving evidence of clinging to power primarily for its fruits, corrupt or otherwise. That would be serious if we had not assumed a position of world leadership. It is doubly serious when the future of civilization depends on a consistency between what we say and what we do.

Fortunately, the real Voice of America does not emanate from Washington. It speaks most clearly in the countless communities where men and women meet their daily tasks with no thought other than doing the job at hand as well as possible. The symbolic significance of Easter was never more important to the American people than this year, when the prospects of an improvement in direction from the center of political power are distinctly dim.

Proposed Virgin Islands Organic Act—Address By Gov. Morris de Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, while in the Virgin Islands on official business for the Committee on Appropriations on March 27, 1951, I heard Gov. Morris F. de Castro, of the Virgin Islands, deliver an address on the radio. He expressed his views on the subject of a proposed new organic act dealing with the governing and financing of the Virgin Islands. I believe the views he expressed may be of interest to Members and others. I wish to make it clear that my inclusion here of the Governor's speech is not to be construed as endorsement or approval by me of his views, but under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith as a matter of public interest a copy of Governor de Castro's radio address:

Fellow citizens of the Virgin Islands, tonight I am going to discuss the proposed organic act for the Virgin Islands, as introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman MURDOCK on February 14 this year, and give you my views, simply and clearly, on the essential provisions which I believe should be given consideration in any change which may be made in our basic law. In accordance with my determination to declare my position on any public question, I shall face the issues here squarely and factually. I sincerely hope that those who may not agree with me will recognize that it is my right and duty to state my views, however controversial they may be.

Let me preface my remarks by saying that the Congress of the United States will decide finally what form of constitution will be provided for the people of the Virgin Islands. This is so because Congress has the supreme right of legislation and of government for the insular possessions of the United States. This is so, also, because whatever form of government we get will directly affect the relationships between these islands and their sovereign, the United States of America. Members of Congress will listen respectfully to the proposals which will be submittted by our legislative assembly, by the Governor, and by various citizens of the islands but, in the final analysis, the decision will be theirs, not ours. We shall hope that the final decisions of Congress will embody our desires and our aspirations.

It is necessary, therefore, that the people of the islands should think these problems through calmly, carefully, and deliberately. We should make every effort to present a united front at the congressional hearings which will undoubtedly be held here in the islands later this year. We should not let such disturbing or vexing questions as to who might lose office in the executive or legislative branches of the government by a new organic act color our thinking or confuse our facts. We must deal with principles, not with personalities. We should bear in mind that the fewer problems we indicate, the fewer differences we present, the better will be the opportunity to convince Members of Congress of what our real needs are and just what are our true aspirations.

Let us begin then with the premise that the people of the Virgin Islands, under the Organic Act of 1936, have enjoyed and are still enjoying a good measure of autonomy. With the exception of the right to elect our own Governor and to vote in national elections, our people have all the benefits and the privileges of American citizens. We have a bill of rights roughly equivalent to that of the Federal Constitution, including freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of worship. We have universal franchise through which our own legislatures, with very broad legislative powers, are elected. A generous National Government has helped us provide a reasonable degree of freedom from want.

What, then, shall we seek in our new organic act? In answering this question, it is important to observe that what we seek is not the ultimate answer. The new organic act will undoubtedly be a composite of the things we seek in order to grant us greater autonomy and the things which the National Government will require in order to make us more self-supporting, more economical of operation, and more responsible and effective in our relationships with the United States. There are a great many details which go into the preparation of a new organic act which need not concern us here. These are the details of draftsmanship which must be left to legal technicians. We need concern ourselves only with a few basic considerations. After these shall have been determined, the rest is easy. I should now like to compare these basic points contained in the proposed organic act now before Congress with our present organic act, analyze them, and give you my own views upon each of them.

Here they are: The Murdock bill proposed:

1. An elected governor in 1953. We have an appointed governor now.

2. A single legislature in 1951. We have three legislatures now. Legislative sessions of 60 days in each year with compensation to be paid during sessions only. We have continuous sessions with annual salaries for our legislators now. Election of members of the single legislature from each island constituting a district with five members at large from all islands. We have now specified numbers of members from town and country districts and specified members at large in each municipality.

3. Abolition of the President's prerogative to act upon local legislation after it has been passed over the Governor's veto. At the present time, the President decides when a bill is passed over the Governor's veto, and the Governor still refuses to approve it.

4. Confirmation of department heads only by the legislature. At present the councils have to confirm all appointees.

5. Return of the internal revenue taxes and no more Federal appropriations. We now receive annual appropriations but not the internal revenue taxes.

6. A single treasury. We have two separate treasuries now, and finally

7. A resident commissioner in 1953. We have none now.

These seven basic principles require serious consideration so that our people may be made fully aware of their many complications and ramifications without which awareness we cannot intelligently make up our minds. Let me now discuss each of these issues.

First and foremost, there is the question of an elective or an appointive governor. I realize that this is perhaps the issue which is the most difficult for me to discuss because I am an appointed governor. It is difficult, also, for the reason that my motives may be so easily impugned. Nevertheless, these times call for honest and courageous leadership and for expressions of honest convictions. I shall, therefore, not hesitate to state my opinion. I am in favor of the ultimate objective of an elective governor. An elective governor is the highest political benefit which the people of these islands may ever hope or expect to achieve. Certainly we cannot hope for statehood or commonwealth status. When Puerto Rico was granted the right to elect its own governor, nearly 50 years after its annexation by the United States, the party system had been well established. Here in the Virgin Islands, 33 years after the purchase of the islands by the United States, only 14 years after universal suffrage was extended here, we have not yet developed the party system of government. In St. Croix last year 30 candidates ran independently for 9 seats in the Council. In a situation such as this an elected governor under present conditions might well not have any party representation in the legislature, resulting in a stalemate in government. I am strongly of the opinion that, before we elect our governor, we need first to develop the party system fully. We need to be more nearly self-supporting. We need to shoulder greater responsibilities in government. In my opinion, our new organic act should provide for an elective governor in a few years when we shall have developed more political maturity and better statesmanship, which we shall need to carry out our responsibilities under a more liberal constitution.

Second, there is the question of a single legislature or of three legislatures, how they shall be elected, and how its members shall be compensated. Here, too, I face a difficult issue because it is so closely connected with incumbents who may question my sincerity of purpose. Yet I must state my opinion candidly. I am in favor of a single legislature, meeting for a stated period each year, and compensated on a per diem basis while in session. I am in favor of election of members to represent each of the three islands, rather than districts within each island. I am in favor of a small board of island commissioners, on an honorary basis, elected from each island, to meet once a month to handle purely local problems. No one can gainsay the fact that three separate legislative bodies, such as we now have, all with full legislative powers, provide a top-heavy, burdensome, and most expensive legislative machinery for 26,000 people. This system has resulted in a per capita legislative cost which is far greater than in any other American community. There is absolutely no need for our legislatures to be in continuous sessions throughout the year. Many States with populations far greater than these islands have legislative sessions every 2 years, with extraordinary sessions at the call of the governor. With due respect to the members of our legislative bodies, I respectfully submit that legislation for 26,000 people can well be enacted during a regular session each year, with such special sessions as emergencies may dictate. We would need to project our budget better. We would need to have a program for the islands. But the legislative participation in such program and in the budget need not provide for active participation in administrative affairs. There must be a clear line of demarcation between the powers of the executive and the powers of the legislature. I am in favor of an adequate per diem for legislators during sessions. This is the method of compensation provided in the new organic act for Guam, just passed by Congress. And we will be deceiving ourselves if we think that we are going to get different treatment. The salaries we pay to our legislators far exceed what is paid in many States. Alabama, with 3,000,000 people, pays its legislators $10 per day during sessions. Arizona pays $8 per day for 60 days, and Arizona's population is 745,000. Connecticut pays $600 every 2 years. Florida pays $10 per day during sessions. Missouri, with a population of 4,000,000, pays $125 per month. Alaska pays $15 per day, and Alaska's population is 105,000. West Virginia pays $500 annually.

I believe that it is unnecessary to continue the system of electing representatives for the town and country districts separately and members at large in each island. These Virgin Islands should constitute a strong and unified political entity. It is fallacious to hold that any responsible citizen of St. Croix, for example, may not adequately represent Christiansted and Frederiksted and the country districts as well. It is fallacious to hold that any responsible leader in St. Thomas may not represent adequately the town and the country districts of the island of St. Thomas. Let us get away from the horse-and-buggy days. Let us advance our thinking as the times have advanced. In my opinion, nothing would solidify our islands more than election of members of the legislature on an island-wide basis. We should have proportional representation in our legislature, namely, one member for so many thousand population. However, to give St. Croix the same number of members as St. Thomas, we might for the present compromise with four members to be elected from St. Croix, four from St. Thomas, one from St. John, and six members at large, with the provision that not more than three of the members at large shall be from any one island.

Third is the issue of full legislative right to override executive vetoes. At present there is the provision that if any bill is passed over the Governor's veto, the Governor may send it to the President for final action. Incidentally, this still remains in Puerto Rico's constitution. I am in favor of allowing bills passed over the Governor's veto to become law by reason of the overriding of the veto. When members of the legislature have this power, which they do not have now, they will have to exercise more mature judgment and greater political skill. This is a step to provide political maturity which should be taken now.

Fourth is confirmation of officials and employees by the legislature. I am in favor of limiting legislative confirmation to policy-making officials. The present system whereby all executive appointments, from custodial to policy-making employees, must be confirmed by the legislature is a vicious one. It must be changed, for it defeats the very objectives of a true merit system. It exists in no other American community. It is an effective bar to good government. It brings politics into our civil service. I agree that all department heads, when we pay their salaries, and all policy-making officials should be confirmed, but certainly not the members of the custodial, clerical, and professional services.

Fifth is the return of the internal revenue taxes. I am in favor of the return of these taxes to the Virgin Islands treasury. I am also in favor of a reduced central administration to be paid from annual Federal appropriations. I am certain that the only way we will get this great benefit, and I believe we can get it this year, is for us all to agree that the Congress should for the time being provide reasonable limitations as to the broad use of the funds so returned to the Virgin Islands. I agree with the provisions of the Murdock bill that the internal revenue taxes may be expended under the supervision of the legislature after the broad purposes and objects of expenditure shall have been approved annually by the President. In other words, the President would say that so much of these funds would be spent each year for operating expenses of the government of the Virgin Islands, so much of the funds for capital improvements, and so much for reserve funds. Thereafter, the legislature would budget the funds and provide for the details of their expenditure but circumscribed by the broad purposes fixed by the President.

Sixth is the question of a single treasury. I am in favor of a single treasury. In a new form of government, this would be academic. It is elementary that in a government for the islands as a whole, funds raised in one island may be expended for the benefit and government of the entire group of islands. This change requires no further justification or explanation. It is bound to come.

And, finally, is the provision for a Resident Commissioner. I am, of course, in favor of the creation of a Resident Commissioner for the islands. We urgently need such representation in Washington. However, we also know that in the recently enacted Organic Act for Guam, Congress deleted the provision for a Resident Commissioner. We should ask for this great benefit, and justify it as strongly as possible.

I have given you my views on the most important provisions of a new constitution. Let me conclude by stating that I believe we have the best opportunity we have ever had of getting the internal-revenue taxes—millions of dollars annually returned to us for the benefit and government of our islands if we can agree on the main provisions of a new organic act which will satisfy Congress and at the same time give us a better governmental structure. And these main provisions, I repeat, should be a single legislature, with specified annual sessions, to be elected in 1952; representation by islands instead of by districts within islands; an honorary board of commissioners sitting once a month to pass on purely local matters; confirmation of policy-making employees only; a single treasury effective immediately; and ultimately the election of the Governor, when we shall have developed a responsive and responsible elective system and achieved the necessary political maturity to provide for a fully autonomous government.

I most earnestly urge that we set aside all sectional and provincial differences and present a united and intelligent as well as forward-looking approach to the Congressmen who will preside over the organic act hearings. This is a year, my fellow citizens, of possible great achievements for the people of the Virgin Islands. My considered judgment is that if we unite on a program such as I have outlined, we shall have an excellent opportunity of making a significant political and economic gain before the close of the year. May I leave with you this thought: "Wisdom in self-government develops slowly, with exercise." I thank you.

Sheer Wastage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including herein a letter from William R. Spear, editor of the Fort Myers News-Press, a daily paper printed in my district. I also include an editorial entitled "Sheer Wastage" which points out very forcefully the waste of the taxpayers' money in addition to the unnecessary waste of newspaper print which is causing a paper shortage. Certainly the committee of the Congress having jurisdiction over this subject matter should look carefully into the complaint made by Editor Spear, and perhaps the newsprint and paper situation could be relieved so as to permit the newspapers of this Nation to obtain the newsprint they need. I desire to recommend this editorial to your careful reading and to commend Editor Spear for this constructive criticism:

FORT MYERS NEWS-PRESS,
Fort Myers, Fla., March 9, 1951.

Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DWIGHT: I wish you'd take a look at the enclosed material and the envelope it was mailed in.

Every few days I get one of these releases in one of these expensive manila envelopes which, of course, go into the wastebasket. While you may not be a newspaperman, you can readily see that it is of no news value whatever. Since it comes to the News-Press,

I assume it is sent to all the other papers of the United States too, and I will guarantee you that no paper, not even the New York Times, prints it.

Today, in one single mail, I received these three separate envelopes, containing the releases I enclose, and I just couldn't refrain from squawking to my Congressman about it.

In these times when newspapers are desperately hard up for enough newsprint to print their papers on, and some have even had to curtail their service to their readers because of the shortage, it seems outrageous to me for the Government to waste expensive paper in this manner—and pure waste is what it is—not to mention the expense.

Sincerely yours,

BILL SPEAR.

SHEER WASTAGE

Would you like to read a speech on forced labor that runs 14 legal-size pages of single-spaced typing which some man named Walter Kotschnig delivered before the United Nations Economic and Social Council in Santiago, Chile, March 15? Would you like the paper to leave out the news about the school board and the city council, the society personals, and some of the sports to make room for printing this 14-page speech for you?

You wouldn't? Why, that's amazing—to the Government, that is. The Government apparently thought you would, for it has mimeographed this speech and mailed it to the News-Press and also, presumably, to the 1,771 other daily papers in the United States. It was mailed, moreover, in a heavy kraft envelope of the finest quality made, a big envelope 10 by 15 inches (1 foot 3 inches long). These envelopes, even when bought in lots of 10,000, are listed in the printing catalog at about 1½ cents apiece, not counting the cost of the printing on it. It would cost a private individual 9 cents for the postage alone, but the Government, of course, mails it "free"—meaning at the taxpayers' expense. Counting in the cost of mimeographing and handling, it cost considerable for the Government to send this to the News-Press, where it wound up in the wastebasket, and to all the other papers which, you can be certain, treated it similarly.

This material was mailed out by the United States mission to the United Nations, and, if you think that's wasteful, read on. This was but one such mailing from this outfit. Every few days others arrived—all equally worthless. In one single mail the other day three separate releases of this nature were received—all separately mailed in three of those huge, expensive kraft envelopes.

This is just from the United States mission to the United Nations—one single Government agency. There are scores of other Government agencies and most of them bombard the newspapers of the country with propaganda and press releases that have no value whatever. The flood is so heavy that actually it takes a good deal of time by somebody on the staff of the paper just to open all this mail and see what it is.

Aside from the sheer waste of the taxpayers' money which this involves, there are two other aspects of the matter that make it outrageous. One is the postal deficit. If all this worthless postage-free material with which the Government bureaus flood the mails were eliminated, it seems quite likely that the Post Office Department could operate in the black without the new increase in postage rates which President Truman has now proposed. The second is the paper shortage. Newspapers are desperately hard up for newsprint. Some have had to ration circulation and advertising. Every paper, including the News-Press, feels the pinch. Yet the Government finds plenty of paper to waste in this manner.

Not Just a Bunch of Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Robert Letts Jones in the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, which further expresses the viewpoint of that community in the pending CAB-West Coast Airlines case:

NOT JUST A BUNCH OF FIGURES

For a company that wants to serve Salem, West Coast Airlines shows a peculiar attitude.

In the case before the Civil Aeronautics Board that has been going on for almost 2 years, West Coast Airlines goes along with the CAB suggestion that the feeder-line service quit serving McMinnville and move operations to Salem instead. But in putting Oregon's capital on its route West Coast would push United Air Lines out.

In summing up its position West Coast admits that passenger traffic into and out of McMinnville for last year "obviously would not begin" to cover costs of maintaining a station. There is no written consideration given the people of the city as far as expenses of McMinnville in providing an airport. The feeder line assumes that if passengers of that city want air service those passengers can travel either to Portland or to Salem, if West Coast is permitted here.

When it comes to the advantages of coming to Salem, West Coast Airline considers the 1948 figures of United Air Lines serving the capital. Instead of the 1948 figures, those of 1950 in relation to 4 or 5 years ago should be considered if the city's welfare and future are to be given any consideration at all. For instance, air cargo or air freight originated on United Air Lines out of or into Salem in 1946 was 6,621 pounds. In contrast to this, poundage figures for the year 1950 were over 420,000 pounds. The total revenue for United service in Salem shows the same growth. In 1945 the airline took in $37,000. By 1950 the revenue figure was $300,000.

West Coast's position is that it, as a feeder line, should be permitted to be the only service for the capital because it has other stations in Oregon. But so does United. Futhermore, West Coast claims the traffic potential of Salem is not very substantial. If Salem doesn't look attractive to West Coast, why does that feeder line want to come into Oregon's capital and second city in size as the only air transport service? West Coast should have asked to come in as a supplementary service, not as the only one.

Salem's position is the same as it has repeatedly been: This city needs United Air Lines main-line service. The figures of passengers, revenue, and air cargo and freight show how this city has used United. Is the fact that the Salem station rates as seventh of all cities, regardless of size, served by United west of the Rockies in handling of air freight to be ignored, for instance?

It is hoped the Civil Aeronautics Board will give consideration to the people of this community who would be affected adversely if United sevice were suspended here. The airport with its new developments has been based economically on United service.

It is unfortunate that West Coast treats a city it would like to have on its route as a bunch of outdated figures—with no feeling for wishes in this case.

The Rubber Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, inquiries have been coming from my constituents regarding the acute shortage of rubber. Rubber is essential in many of our industrial plants, to say nothing of its more general use in the manufacture of automobile tires and accessories. We are, from all accounts, approaching further restrictions on the use of rubber, as evidenced by the announcement that new automobiles will be equipped with only four tires, whereas, in the past, they were equipped with five tires. There is considerable controversy and confusion among our people regarding the statement recently made by President William O'Neil of the General Tire and Rubber Co. that he had perfected a system whereby the synthetic rubber output could be greatly increased. It was said that this system would almost immediately increase the synthetic rubber supply by 22 percent and that presently the increase in the supply could be easily raised to some 40 percent. By reason of the confusion, red tape, and apparently unnecessary delays on the part of the Government, this producer is now operating in Canada. Surely there is some intelligent, logical approach to this problem, and I urge that immediate action be taken.

Relief for Meat Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. LIND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following letter which was sent to me by Mr. Ross L. Bell, chairman of the York County Meat Dealers' Association's board of governors, and which concerns relief for meat dealers now caught in the price squeeze:

YORK, PA., *March 31, 1951.*

The Honorable JAMES F. LIND,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LIND: While I was in Washington this week on March 27 and 28 I was amazed to find that meetings were still being held with cattlemen and livestock growers discussing the future program on controls. In other words the action and discussions were still in the formative stage.

Even the retail meat advisory committee release dated March 20 was the first meeting of that particular group to discuss dollar and cents prices to be established on beef, veal, lamb, pork, etc.

We had been led to believe that some of these prices were to be released March 16 and 23. This will hardly take place soon while plans for action are still in discussion.

Why then was it necessary to freeze one group on prices so far ahead unless it was done to quiet the clamor of the housewife, or general public at the expense of the retailer, even more so the independent slaughterer, or even the packer.

We were all led to believe that within a month or so something would be forthcoming that would regulate prices at the retail level and also some kind of control this time on the sale of the live animal and its fair distribution.

After it was found to be a much larger task than expected, Mr. DiSalle ignored all requests to unfreeze prices until his program was ready. At all costs he would hold the line and get out prices as soon as possible.

I had a personal interview with Mr. Arval Erickson, Assistant Director, Food Division, Office of Price Stabilization, on Tuesday, March 27, just 25 days after he had written to me promising action. The letter was an answer to a telegram sent to Mr. DiSalle on February 19 stating that we were then feeling the effects of a price squeeze. Pressure was put on packers and wholesalers to roll back increased prices. This did not eliminate the chief headache, namely, the ever-increasing cost of cattle.

Up to the present time nothing has been done about the cattle situation and Mr. Erickson said another 15 days or even another month could pass before this picture could be changed.

I am sorry to say at that rate of slow motion activity, the very law that was enacted to protect the licensed, legitimate meat man will have succeeded in forcing him to the wall. If we continue to operate under freeze prices we are bound to lose more money. In a recent check with some of the men the losses run from $500 to $5,000 over a period of about 30 to 60 days. The only other alternative we have to remain honorable is to close our doors completely. This will be our second experience in doing this. The last time we did this when we found ourselves out of compliance with the second OPA law, we were forced to close down for 30 days before we could get any action from the Government.

At that time we merely asked for a reasonable law so that we might operate with a fair profit. We did not insist upon abolishment of the law, but those in power evidently realized what a messy business the whole thing was and threw it out completely.

With regards to the losses, I can substantiate my claims along this line and they will stand up under investigation. These figures will be taken directly from the book records of some of our members during the past 60 days.

To quote Mr. Charles Bauer, our worthy president of the Retail Meat and Food Dealers, a statement made at Chicago, January 23: "The meat dealer has been and is in a real squeeze, and is tired of being the whipping boy of the entire livestock and meat industry, when the truth is that he is making less money then he did before the inflationary factions took effect."

Several factors enter into this picture to change the volume of business and consequently the over-all profits. I will merely mention some of these and can go into detail later if necessary:

Increased prices on wrapping paper and paper bags.

Increased prices on hog and sheep casings, etc.

Increased rates on all mechanical repair work, etc.

Increased costs on equipment for replacement, new or second-hand.

Increased taxes, social security, unemployment, etc.

We have already taken a 2-cent decrease in fats and oils.

We have already taken a cut of $3.50 on hides.

Wages have been increased in many instances to keep the trained employees from leaving to go into defense work at much higher rates.

Last but not least, as I mentioned before the ever-increasing prices of cattle.

The membership has been very patient and in spite of noticeable increases by others who either in ignorance of the law or in direct disobedience continue to pass on to the customer increased costs. The group have been striving despite losses to abide by the ceiling but they cannot be expected to continue to do this indefinitely. In fact they have now reached the breaking point.

As hard as it would have been for regional office to thoroughly check into violations on price it does seem that at least some measure of protection at this late date could have been given the sincere merchant. However, a release dated March 26 shows the power of enforcement now to be through Washington. For further details read the release on this matter of the above date.

Valuable information was secured back in September and November of 1950. The title known as Utilization of Farm Crops-Meat Products—the Subcommittee on Senate Resolution 36 headed by the Honorable Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, chairman.

The witnesses gave some very valuable information, opinions, and advice based on years of experience in the meat industry or other industry closely related and allied with the meat industry.

In my contacts and through conversation with various members of OPS, I am convinced this valuable information was hardly if ever used to formulate a system of fair and equitable control of meats.

I would like it known here and now I personally am in no position to point a finger at any person or group and judge them responsible for existing conditions either through sins of omission or sins of commission. Rather would I take the position of humility and ask of God's guidance through prayer and humble thought to point the way to lead us out of the ungodly mess.

With a Nation as blessed as ours we should hang our heads in shame that we cannot live together and produce God's gifts in abundance and share them with our fellow men, having no other controls than the law of nature, supply, and demand and the will of God to protect us from unseen dangers.

May God help you to help us.

Very sincerely,

ROSS L. BELL.

House Joint Resolution 180

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a report contained in the New York Times of Sunday, March 4. This relates to House Joint Resolution 180, which provides a method for removal of the President and the compelling of a general election in great emergencies. I submit it for the thoughtful consideration of Members of Congress and the public:

COUDERT PROPOSES RULE ON PRESIDENT—SEVEN AMENDMENT TO COMPEL HIS RESIGNATION IF CONGRESS VOTES "NO CONFIDENCE"

WASHINGTON, March 3.—A resolution for a constitutional amendment that would require the resignation of the President upon a two-thirds vote of lack of confidence will be introduced next week by Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., Republican, of New York, his office announced today.

Mr. COUDERT's bill would authorize the Congress, by a concurrent resolution and on a two-thirds vote of lack of confidence to the President, to compel either the resignation of the President or force a national election for President, Vice President, and Senators and Representatives within 40 days.

Congress would be authorized in a joint session to elect a successor to the President upon his resignation or upon his failure either to resign or call for a national election, according to the terms of Mr. COUDERT's resolution. For this purpose, three-fourths of the Members of both Houses would constitute a quorum, and a majority of the quorum would elect.

In the event of a general election, the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives in office when the concurrent resolution was adopted would continue to serve until 14 days after the election. Their successors would then take office. The amendment would not apply to the person holding the office of President at the time of the proposed Coudert amendment.

Thus, if a President, following a no-confidence vote, refused either to resign or call an election, Congress would elect a successor who would serve out his unexpired term. Should he call an election, however, he, the Vice President, and Members of Congress would remain in office until 14 days after the election of their successors, unless reelected.

Under Mr. COUDERT's plan the President would have 10 days from the time of the passing of the concurrent resolution in which to decide on a course of action. Should he call for the new election, it would be held on the seventh Tuesday following the passage of the resolution.

Mr. COUDERT's resolution would have to be approved by a two-thirds vote of each Chamber of Congress. It would then go before the States, and if passed by three-fourths of the State legislatures it would become part of the Constitution.

Speaking of the proposed amendment, Mr. COUDERT said: "I offer this drastic revision of our constitutional system only with the greatest reluctance and in response to the existence of conditions which the founding fathers certainly could not have contemplated.

"Some such action as this is made necessary by the enormous growth of the power of the Presidency over recent years and the corresponding decline of the Congress. This has resulted in a dangerous distortion in our constitutional structure that threatens the security of the United States and the continued existence of free representative government."

HIGH PRESIDENT'S ROLE CHANGED

He pointed out that at the beginning of the Korean fighting he had first voiced the need of such legislation. In a speech from the floor, he had charged that if we had had a parliamentary system resembling Great Britain's, the administration "would be out of office overnight."

The British system was discussed at length during the writing of our Constitution, Mr. COUDERT said, but was rejected.

"The situation has changed drastically since that time," he asserted. "At that time

the central figure in our governmental set-up was the legislature. The President was to have been an honest-to-goodness executive.

"Now, however, the power of the President has become so strong that Congress cannot do a good job of legislating."

The proposed amendment would be based on the British system "as far as applicable," Mr. COUDERT said. "The principle would be the same. It would give the elected legislature an opportunity to effect a change of government in a great emergency without having to resort to the hopelessly fumbling method of impeachment."

Mr. COUDERT pointed out that under his plan the legislature itself would act as its own control in the use of its "recall" machinery, as Parliament did in England.

"Not many Congressmen would like to face the task of going out to campaign for office again before their terms expired," he explained. "The legislation would not be used much: only in a very great emergency. It would be a weapon we should have in our governmental closet."

Donaldson Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the attached official notice that the air base in my home town, formerly known as the Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C., has been redesignated as Donaldson Air Force Base. The naming of this splendid air base for Capt. John O. Donaldson was suggested by local citizens. Attached hereto are certain records regarding young Captain Donaldson's distinguished service:

[From the Department of Defense, Office of Public Information, Washington, D. C., April 3, 1951]

AIR FORCE RENAMES GREENVILLE, S. C., BASE

The redesignation of Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C., as Donaldson Air Force Base in honor of a World War I ace, has been approved by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

At present the base is being used as a basic pilot training school for USAF pilots.

Capt. John O. Donaldson was credited with bringing down eight enemy airplanes in the First World War. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Flying Cross (British), and World War I Victory Medal with the Aisne-Marne, Somme Offensive, Ypres-Lys, and Defensive Sector Battle Clasps.

Captain Donaldson was born on May 14, 1897, at Fort Yates, N. Dak. He received his primary- and high-school education in Greenville. He also attended Furman University in Greenville before taking his ground-school training at Cornell University.

He was selected as one of the winners of the Mackay trophy for 1919 for a round-trip transcontinental flight. Lt. Belvin N. Maynard was cowinner of the trophy.

Following his discharge in 1920, Captain Donaldson spent the next 10 years in commercial aviation. He met his death while stunt flying at an air show held at Philadelphia, Pa., on September 7, 1930.

Dedication ceremonies will be held in the near future. His widow, Mrs. John O. Donaldson, of Atlanta, Ga., is expected to participate in those ceremonies.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of September 8, 1930]

JOHN O. DONALDSON, NOTED ACE, DIES AS HIS PLANE CRASHES

PHILADELPHIA, PA., September 7.—Capt. John O. Donaldson, one of the most distinguished and skillful aviators in the World War fell with his plane from an altitude of 1,800 feet late today over municipal airport and suffered injuries which resulted in his death in Mercy Hospital an hour and a half later. Donaldson shot down nine enemy planes and two balloons during the war. Forty thousand persons, gathered for the American Legion air races, saw Captain Donaldson's plane go out of commission and crash.

Captain Donaldson was officially credited with nine planes and two balloons during the World War and his heroism was recognized by the decorations he received from five nations. These included the Distinguished Service Cross, the Belgian Croix de Guerre, the British Flying Cross from the Prince of Wales.

WELL KNOWN HERE

Captain Donaldson who was fatally injured in a plane accident yesterday in Philadelphia was a member of a prominent Greenville family. He spent most of his boyhood days here with an aunt, Mrs. N. D. Furman, attending Greenville High School and later Furman University. After leaving Furman he entered Cornell University, quitting his studies to join the Air Forces during the World War. Twice during the war he was shot down behind enemy lines and taken prisoner. Both times he managed to escape and return to his fighting unit. He was said to be the fourth ranking American ace.

Captain Donaldson was associated with the aviation industry most of the time since the war. In 1919 he won first place in the SE-5 class, Transcontinental Air Races. He served as commanding officer of several United States Army training schools in this country and abroad.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) Piedmont of September 8, 1930]

JOHN O. DONALDSON

John O. Donaldson died as he lived in an airplane. Countless flying hours and one of the Nation's most distinguished aviation records were behind this Greenville native when he met his death so tragically Sunday in Philadelphia.

As a youth he left Cornell to answer his country's call to arms, choosing aviation and making a name for himself in that field scarcely equaled by any other airman in any army. He was officially credited with bringing down nine German planes and two balloons, and five Allied nations decorated him. Friends said he accomplished more than he was credited with.

John Donaldson died young which added to the tragedy of his death, but into his 34 years was crowded a great deal of achievement, both in military service and in civilian life. He will long be remembered.

[Introduction by editors of Harpers magazine to article in Harpers magazine for July 1919]

MY CAPTURE AND ESCAPE

(By John O. Donaldson)

The following account of the capture by the Germans of a young American aviator, his escape from prison, his recapture and second escape, constitutes one of those extraordinary narratives in which luck, misfortune, and persistent daring have been so artfully ordered by fate as to seem almost increditable. The author, who is the son of Gen. T. Q. Donaldson, of the Inspector General Department at Tours, France, received his instruction in flying at the Ground School, Cornell University, then with the Royal Flying Corps at Toronto, with subsequent gunnery practice in Texas. In June 1918 as a member of the Thirty-second Royal Flying Corps he was sent to France. During the following 2 months he brought down nine German planes, of which he was officially credited with five (i. e., witnessed by four observers). Then Lieutenant Donaldson was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross by Field Marshal Haig and has received two citations by General Pershing. He has been recommended for the Distinguished Service Cross. The following, given in Lieutenant Donaldson's own words without attempt at embellishment describes his last flight and capture and the extraordinary sequence of subsequent adventures and misadventures culminating in his escape through the electric-wire barrier into Holland.

[Excerpts from the New York Times of October 22, 1919]

MAYNARD'S RECORD BEATEN 11 MINUTES—REVIEW OF ACTUAL FLYING TIME MAY GIVE FIRST PLACE TO CAPTAIN DONALDSON

Although 2 days behind Lt. Belvin Maynard in finishing his second transcontinental flight at Mineola, Captain Donaldson may be the winner of the Army's 5,400-mile airplane reliability contest on the technical point of actual flying time.

The performace of these two men, who are far ahead of their 60 competitors on all points of competition, represent superiority in two methods of flying that differ radically. Maynard flies entirely by compass and pays little attention to any but the important landmarks. Donaldson flies near the ground and finds his path entirely by reference to his map and the landmarks.

Captain Donaldson also set a record for a single day's flight with a little scout plane by flying 823 miles from Rock Island to Binghamton.

Captain Donaldson and Lieutenant Maynard will be the guests of the Flying Club today and they, with other winners in the competition, will receive their trophies at an armistice dinner of the Flying Club in the Hotel Commodore on November 11.

JOHN O. DONALDSON

Father: Maj. Gen. T. Q. Donaldson (deceased), 42 years active service, United States Army.

Brothers: Col. T. Q. Donaldson, 30 years' service, United States Army, active; Commander A. H. Donaldson, United States Navy, retired.

Brother-in-law: Brig. Gen. Casper B. Rucker (deceased), 40 years' active service, United States Army.

Nephews: Capt. T. Q. Donaldson, Jr., now in active service, United States Army abroad; Capt. John Donaldson, now in active service, United States Army abroad; Lt. David Donaldson, killed VJ-day in service in Pacific.

Nieces: Wife of Maj. Albert Shulz, now in active service abroad, United States Army; wife of Lt. David Mallett, now in active service abroad, United States Army.

Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following fine editorial that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., April 1, 1951, concerning our colleague, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House majority leader:

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

Once again House majority leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, proves conclusively that he is one of our great national leaders. In a statesmanlike address delivered this week to the Boston University Law School Alumni Association, Congressman MCCORMACK said that the United States should enter at once into a military alliance with Spain, and that Spain should then become a member of the North Atlantic Pact.

Leader MCCORMACK hinted very strongly that negotiations to that end are already in progress. His position was unequivocal on the point that "differences in form of government should not be permitted to interfere with those steps being taken which are in the national interest of such countries."

With Congressman MCCORMACK's position, we are in hearty accord. All logic, common sense, history, economics, and military strategy dictate that Spain is a natural ally of the United States.

The United States is a member of the United Nations. Spain is not, because of the veto power exercised by Soviet Russia. A communistic, atheistic, totalitarian government such as Soviet Russia can be in the United Nations. A monarchy such as Great Britain with its hereditary line of Kings and Queens can also belong. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, and other members of the British Commonwealth of Nations can become members of the U. N., but Spain is outside because the Communists do not like her form of government. Isn't that just too bad? We should placate our enemies and dump our friends.

It couldn't be that this hostility to Spain stems from the fact that Spain is a great Catholic country where communism has made no headway and where communism suffered such a sharp defeat in the Spanish Civil War? The lunatic fringe, the so-called Loyalist Front, has never forgiven Spain for driving out Communist doctrines.

In any European war with Soviet Russia the United States must have Spain as an ally if it is to be in a position to knock out Russia. Anti-Communist Spain lies athwart the gateway to the Mediterranean at Gibraltar. A friendly and stable Spain is necessary to any war operations in that area.

Spain has vital and essential minerals, such as manganese, nickel, beryllium, etc., and it also possesses the Pyrenees, which General Franco and his well-trained troops can hold against any Soviet attack. Behind the Pyrenees lie most vital airfields from which American-based planes and bombers can operate at will.

Spain is the mother country of most of the Latin-American countries. In Latin America there are 158,000,000 persons with whom we do a great business. American investments in Latin America total $4,800,000,000, as compared with $2,100,000,000 in all Europe. Each year the United States buys from Latin America a total of $2,777,000,000 worth of goods, which include $219,000,000 worth of copper and many millions of lead and other vital strategic minerals.

Yes; Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK is again talking directly to the American people, and in his characteristic, forceful manner he is showing the logical way for America to move in this critical period. We most heartily agree with the concluding remarks of Congressman MCCORMACK's Boston University address:

"With the Communist threat the road to security and peace is through strength. It is by America using its great strength affirmatively and effectively, with the moral forces of the world leading the way, that the probability of another world war in our lifetime might be averted.

"If this is accomplished, the chances for peace for a long period of time faces the world of today and tomorrow."

Address of Mr. Charles K. Finch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD portions of a speech delivered by the president of the Queens County Bar Association, Charles K. Finch, at the association's annual dinner in New York in February:

The men who wrote the Declaration of Independence were the founders of our country; and just as you or your client, in founding a new corporation, would have the privilege of selecting and decreeing the purposes of your new corporation, so too, did the founders of this country have those same privileges; and it is very interesting today, when most people have forgotten the Declaration of Independence, and when most people in this, and other countries are wandering about aimlessly, not knowing where we are going and not even knowing where we are supposed to go, for us to reflect upon it.

To be brief, those who are partially well informed, and all who desire to admit the truth, know, despite all the camouflage and flowery and disputatious speeches rendered daily at the U. N., at Washington, and other similar places, that the struggle, which exists throughout the world today, is between materialistic atheism, more commonly known to some as communism, and the believers in a God. Where did the founders of this country stand on this question of a deity? They, who had the right to tell us our position in said regard—since they drew our Charter and named our purposes—made four significant references to it in the Declaration of Independence, in order not only to teach us their creed, but to set the course which they expected us to follow. In order to underline fundamental truths, which they feared others might discard, they wove into the Declaration of Independence four significant sentences, two at the beginning and two at the end. Each specifically affirms the dependence of every human being on God:

1. The first reads: "When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to assume the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitled them." Here, our forefathers emphasized that the natural law itself depends on God.

2. The second is equally positive: "We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

3. Toward the end of the document the authors appeal "to the Supreme Judge of the World" for the rectitude of their intentions.

4. The Declaration closes "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Thereafter, a very good American by the name of George Washington said, referring to freedom of religion, "Every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Diety according to the dictates of his own conscience."

Another great American by the name of Abraham Lincoln said in one of his famous speeches, "I am responsible to the American people, to the Christian world, to history, and on my final account to God." In his immortal Gettysburg address, he said: "That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth." He also stated: "We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these things were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us."

Lest it be thought that similar statements are not made by men of our day, I would ask your further indulgence, while I quote from Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, who, on November 22, 1945, the first postwar Thanksgiving, said: "Oh, God, our Father, today we give Thee thanks for the things which we take for granted, for freedom, for security of life, for food and shelter and the presence of loved ones. * * * In gratitude for all those who paid the price of victory, we now ask: Thy guidance and we dedicate ourselves to that cause for which they gave their last whole measure of devotion—Lord of Hosts be with us yet, lest we forget."

On Armistice Day in Boston, the distinguished Gen. Omar Bradley warned: "With the monstrous weapons man already has, humanity is in danger of being trapped in this world by its moral adolescents. Our knowledge of science has clearly outstripped our capacity to control it. We have many men of science, but too few men of God. We have grasped the mystery of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount. Men is stumbling blindly through a spiritual darkness while toying with the prerogative powers of life and death. The world has knowledge without wisdom, power without compassion. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace, more about killing than we know about living. This is our twentieth century's claim to distinction and to progress."

I would ask, in conclusion, that, if you ever have occasion to remember me, you do so by recalling that Lincoln, in his famous Gettysburg address, said, "This Nation, under God."

Let us, as sworn defenders of these United States of America, read and reread the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Let us listen to and follow the mandate of the founders of this country. Gentlemen, let us celebrate the return, and let us return to God.

CHARLES K. FINCH,
President.

Why Are We Staying in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

by Hon. Alf M. Landon at the FFA banquet, Washburn Rural High School, Thursday evening, March 29, 1951:

WHY ARE WE STAYING IN KOREA?

Why are we staying in Korea? What's the shooting all about? I don't know of any question that is of more interest to you and your parents than our foreign situation.

Incidents these days in little, far-off Iran or Albania may affect the life of every American.

Right now, the daily news from Iran is of great significance because it is in Iran that the Dictator Stalin must seek the oil he desperately needs for war. But even if he does get control of the Iranian crude petroleum—that is a long, long way from having the refined product where he must have it for war.

By staying in Korea, every American will have a much different future. That does not mean that we can ease down in our military operations. However, if we had left Korea—part of the free world would not have survived the shock. Free people's governments would have been unbalanced. Some would have been overthrown. By staying in Korea we gave the free governments of the world a needed shot in the arm.

In Korea, we are fighting what may well be another of civilization's decisive battles—because of its effect in the rest of the world.

In modern total warfare, there are no more single decisive battles like Hastings or Tours where the French stopped the Moslem's invasion of Europe.

If Islam had won, there would be no Christian civilization as we know it today—with its conscience to bother us about its defects.

Tours was a battle between the Moslem and Christian ideologies.

Hastings was a battle of one gang of feudal tyrants against another gang. It was nothing but gang war although called one of the decisive battles because it blended the Norman blood with the Saxon.

Probably the most apt historical comparison with Korea is Lignica—the battle where the Poles stopped the army of Genghis Khan and his Mongols invasion of Western Europe. It was a battle of pure brute force on the one side—without any ideologies—against western civilization.

There is no Communist ideologies involved in the Korean War because there is no communism in Russia. There is nothing in Marx and Engels that justifies the brutal slave state of the Soviet.

The warm humanity of Marx and Engels would have revolted at a communism based on the concentration camp—assassination—and wholesale murder.

They would have flayed Stalin the Terrible as one of cruelest tyrants of all time.

No; the Korean War is not between the Communist and Christian ideologies—there is nothing left in Russia of the real communism of Trotsky. There is only a typical tyranny of a few Mongols and Asiatics, masquerading as Communists. They seek to grind the free peoples of the world under their bloody heel—just as they have ground the Russian masses. They use communism for propaganda purposes just as they use foreign minister conferences and the United Nations. It's the dictator of all Russia's biggest lie. It was remarkably successful for a long time in blinding some people to the plain overwhelming evidence of the basic contradiction between the true cooperative society that Marx and the murdered Trotsky envisaged and the barbaric brutality and cruelty of the Kremlin.

Therefore, we are not battling in Korea so much for our social and economic beliefs as we are for political and religious freedoms of all peoples—including the Russians themselves.

The issue is government based on just consent of the governed and government based on sheer naked power—on terror of torture and the sword. It is barbarism versus civilization.

It is ironical that the battle for freedom of conscience and the Bill of Rights is being fought in Korea that has known so little of both.

It is being fought in that country—so poor in natural resources and manpower—and without any great strategic value—because it is there the Soviet first chose to tackle in open war the armies of the free peoples of the world.

In Korea, Dictator Stalin sent up a trial balloon to find out what America really would do if he challenged the cold war into a shooting war.

He got a swift and probably surprising answer—in view of previous statements by our President and Secretary of State that Korea lay outside our defense perimeter.

If we had ducked Stalin's challenge, Asiatic terrorism today would be on the march throughout the world under the fake label of communism. Instead, the Korean War is turning out bad for the tyrants of the Kremlin. Resistance to their cruel and oppressive rule is increasing. Purges are taking place among all their satellites. But worst of all for the Kremlin rulers was the disillusionment among so many of their followers in other countries. The Korean aggression was the final blow to many who in spite of everything still clung to their faith in the peaceful intentions of the Kremlin.

Our dramatic change of policy on Korea overnight spurred our own country—and other countries—to prepare their military establishments to fight for survival.

Stalin the Cruel reached his high point the day President Truman announced his Turko-Grecian policy. Of course, that policy also was a complete reversal of our previous policies favoring Soviet expansion everywhere.

Taking advantage of the weakness of the military defenses of the free governments—the lack of unity both at home and between each other—the intense desire for peace—the tyrants of the Kremlin have been running the most colossal bluff in all history.

Just as they have used the fake label of communism for propaganda purposes, they have been clever in creating a false impression of Russia's might and a corresponding disbelief among the free people's governments in their own strength.

We have been too much inclined to see only Russia's strength—and overlook her great weaknesses. We have been seeing only the hole in the doughnut. Stalin might have the manpower, but he certainly lacks the fire power to be another Genghis Khan.

Russia lacks natural resources vital to a successful war—the productive capacity vital to a successful war—and the Kremlin rulers also lack the vital confidence and faith of their own people. Millions of Russians greeted the German Army as a liberator.

The record shows: (1) Actually the Communists did not win by themselves a single major battle against the Germans. The defense of Moscow was won by old man weather and the stupid brutality of the Nazis that alienated the Russians; (2) several hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers enlisted in the German Army. Germany was able to form about 25 divisions from deserters and residents of occupied territories.

Fear feeds on fear. The most fearful man in all history is the one who reached his goal through terror and violence, murder and assassination.

Only a little more than a hundred years ago, ships of the British Navy did not dare to give their crews shore leave in foreign countries because those crews would desert wholesale.

The tyrants of Russia are now in the same situation as the tyrants of England were then.

The tyrants of Russia fear to send their own troops into battles outside their country. They have not been able to successfully indoctrinate the youth of their satellite countries—except in North Korea.

Of all Russia's satellite countries, North Korea had the lowest level of existence.

Therefore, it was easy to take some three or four hundred thousand Korean boys—by feeding and clothing them better than they had ever known—indoctrinate them in the Soviet's army.

If the Soviet challenge in Korea had worked—then several million Chinese boys would have been indoctrinated the same way—and the dictator of all Russia at that time would have had an army he could depend upon for conquest of the world.

Sounds fantastic you say. Well, no more fantastic than America betraying our own allies to the Kremlin after World War II. We handed the dictator, Stalin, control from the Far East to almost the center of Europe, before we reversed our policy with the Turkish-Grecian loan. By our foreign policy at Yalta we encouraged Stalin's dream of world conquest.

World conditions are ripe for seizure of power by force.

In many countries of the world there is a loss of confidence in government and loss of faith in the religion of our fathers. As a result of two World Wars in rapid succession, explosive forces are at work in all countries.

American civic consciousness is reaching a new low level. Topeka may not have its pastel mink coat but it is a matter of common knowledge that slot machines are operating all over our State in violation of the laws of Kansas. Where that condition exists, public corruption exists. In the legislative session just ended, our State administration evaded its duty to strengthen the arm of our law-enforcement officers.

Just before the collapse of the golden age of Greece, it was possible for an Athenian citizen to eke out an existence without working—through government aid. That same situation exists in America today. Yet more and more Government aid is being adopted in one way or another by both parties not only in Washington but in State capitals as well.

What is the difference between the members of a country club, or some other social organization, who favors slot machines because they mean cheaper food and lower dues and the man who is willing to eke out an existence without any effort of his own on the public dole? Both are living off the other fellow.

Fortunately, the old American spirit of push ahead has not been entirely corroded yet.

Today we face either the climax of civilization as we have heretofore known it or one of those interludes by which humanity is compelled to pause and gain breath for a new push onward and upward.

Vice President BARKLEY said on his recent visit that America has a responsibility to European countries.

I emphatically disagree. The only responsibility we have is to save our own hides. It is my belief we are doing just that in Korea. If ever an army stood at the gate and battled for a free and peaceful world, it is the United Nations forces in Korea.

In the meantime we are strengthening our own forces and bolstering the defenses of Western Europe. We are preparing to meet Asiatic force with force—if necessary. Or we are prepared to live and let live.

If other nations in the world are not willing to join us in a fight to maintain their own democratic processes and their own individual freedom we are the one nation that can retire to an impregnable armed camp on the Western Hemisphere.

I believe, and said so at the time, that the talk of a German expeditionary force based on the port of Dakar in Africa invading South America at the point of the Brazilian bulge as a reason for us entering World War II was a lot of hog wash.

But I believe our own republican form of government would be bound to suffer if we retired to life in our own armed camp.

By the same token, it will suffer if we take in too much territory. In fact, victory in the end for a free world depends on America keeping our financial base strong and equal to the job. So far Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Spain, and Italy have not been able to cooperate in an adequate collective organization for either mutual defense or trade agreements for a better economic system.

Our foreign commitments must be determined by what our foreign allies are doing—in the way of starting to repair their tragically weak defenses—and what our own economic system can stand. For many years I have been stressing the dangers inherent in our unsound fiscal policy and the state of our national defense.

America is rapidly mobilizing our military strength. But we are lagging dangerously in a constructive, affirmative foreign policy.

1. The United Nations should implement its resolution branding Red China as the aggressor by imposing economic sanctions. Two courses of action were adopted at that time. One called for continued efforts to attain a peaceful settlement—the other for study of possible sanctions against the Reds. Sufficient time has passed to make it plain that the Chinese Communists do not intend to seek a settlement on any reasonable terms. Therefore, it is timely to raise the alternative issue of economic sanctions.

Our allies continue to sell too much strategic material to our mutual enemies.

2. The treaty of peace with Italy must be immediately revised.

3. A peace treaty with Japan is long overdue.

4. Both Germany and Spain have much to contribute and should have been incorporated a long time ago in the defense of a free world.

5. We need friends wherever we can find them. The failure to use the forces of the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek demands a better explanation than has yet been given to the American people.

6. We must strengthen our relations with our neighbors to the south.

Therefore, with faith in the righteousness of our cause—the courage, the devotion, and efficiency of our fighting forces—and backed by the greatest productive capacity of any nation in the world—we face with confidence the battles to preserve our life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Undoubtedly all of you boys will be called by your country to arms. Possibly some of you boys here tonight may make the supreme sacrifice in that holy cause.

You have a right to demand that there be no relaxation on the part of every civilian in doing everything he can to back you up.

You have the right to demand that your public officials fulfill their responsibilities and duties in the same lofty spirit of patriotism that you will fulfill yours in the armed services of your country.

And let Mr. Truman be ever conscious that as our leader, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?"

Third Anniversary of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago today the United States embarked on one of the most far-seeing, and at the same time most controversial programs in its history—the European recovery program, or as it has been more popularly known, the Marshall plan.

In those 3 years, the Marshall plan has recorded remarkable accomplishments in helping war-torn Europe regain her economic stability and productiveness. A continent that was suffering actual physical hunger 3 years ago now has brought its agricultural production back to prewar levels. A continent whose factories had been smashed by the bombs and shells of a major war, and whose economic organization had been completely disrupted by a conqueror's occupation, now sees its industrial production not only back to prewar levels, but some 40 percent above them.

The physical accomplishments in relieving hunger and reviving production and trade are significant, but they pale beside the importance of the Marshall plan's accomplishments in the field of international politics.

Three years ago Europe appeared to be a potentially easy victim for expanding Communist imperialism. Today, the possibility that communism could take over by default has disappeared, as the misery and disorganization on which it feeds have given way to prosperity and order.

Now, entering its fourth year, ECA is embarking on a new phase of operations—designed to help Western Europe provide itself not only with bread, but with the means for its self-defense as well.

The United States can be justly proud of the part it has played in helping Western Europe. In aiding our free neighbors overseas, we also have helped ourselves—by creating new sources of strength for use in the world-wide fight against Communist expansion.

The results of 3 years operation of the Marshall plan are at once a rebuke to those who fought its creation and functioning so bitterly—and glowing evidence that this great Nation is, in a mature manner, accepting its leadership in the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

On this third anniversary, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate you who have carried out so well the aims of the European recovery program.

When General Marshall first made his proposal, the shadow of economic collapse, with its attendant evils of unemployment, of hunger, and political unrest, hung over the countries of Western Europe. The great question in 1947 was whether free institutions could survive.

Today, thanks primarily to their own efforts, the people of Western Europe, together with our help, have rebuilt the economies of their countries and have developed a new spirit of confidence in themselves and in their free institutions. To my mind, this spirit, this rising confidence in the hearts of the people, is one of the greatest sources of strength in the free world.

By working together, economic recovery has been substantially achieved. However, with the present threat to world peace, new tasks have been imposed upon us. The free nations are now combining to convert their resources into military strength to preserve the peace and defend our freedoms.

The splendid organization which has been developed under the Economic Cooperation Administration can make an important contribution in helping develop this strength. Accordingly, I intend to recommend to the Congress that ECA be maintained on a continuing basis to help carry out the programs essential to the security of the free world.

There is much to be done in Europe, in Asia, and in other parts of the world, to help the free countries build their military, economic, and spiritual defenses against aggression from without and subversion from within. One of our essential objectives is to develop, in cooperation with other free nations, an expanding world economy, the benefits of which can be shared by us all.

On this anniversary I extend to all of you my sincere thanks for what you have done. I am confident that in its new tasks the ECA will continue to make a vital contribution in helping to build the strength of the free world upon which security and freedom rest.

REMARKS BY MR. HARRIMAN

It is a great satisfaction for me to be here today with my old colleagues of the ECA. You men and women and your associates abroad have contributed so greatly to the success of the Marshall plan.

It is good to have with us Paul Hoffman, who gave us all such inspired leadership. And we are especially fortunate in the presence of the Foreign Minister of France, M. Robert Schuman. With his broad vision and human understanding, he has given effective leadership to the cause of European unity.

The Marshall plan will go down in history as a great accomplishment in cooperation among free nations and free men. On the material side, there have been outstanding achievements. But of even greater importance has been the development of the sense that men of many nations can work together for common purpose—for common welfare. I think it is no exaggeration to say that the strong bonds which today unite the nations of the North Atlantic community, would not exist had it not been for the successful experience of working together during these last 3 years under the European recovery program. This unity, this sense of interdependence in the North Atlantic community, is one of the greatest assets of the free world as a whole in its present struggle.

You men and women can take great satisfaction in the part that you have played in these events.

Suppression of the Newspaper La Prensa in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch sent a member of its staff, Mr. Donald Grant, to Buenos Aires 2 weeks ago for the purpose of getting at first hand the story of the ruthless suppression of the great newspaper La Prensa. In a most notable instance of journalistic endeavor and high purpose, Mr. Grant went on to Montevideo and obtained an exclusive interview with Alberto Gainza Paz, editor of La Prensa. The interview was published in the Post-Dispatch on Sunday, April 1, and in the same issue there was an editorial which eloquently points up

this breach of the freedom of the press as a test of freedom for everyone throughout our hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, in today's Washington Post, there is an editorial taking note of this work by the Post-Dispatch as a champion of freedom, and because of its parallel interest, I ask unanimous consent that it also be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 1, 1951]

A TEST FOR EVERYONE

A free press versus a gagged press.

The free way of life versus the slave way.

Freemen under their own consciences versus fear-stricken serfs under a tyrant's rule.

Editor Alberto Gainza Paz and the brave "little people" of Argentina versus Dictator Juan Domingo Perón and his ruthless police, thugs, and Fascist henchmen.

These are the issues in the struggle over the great Argentine newspaper, La Prensa, which the Post-Dispatch tells in full detail today in a report from Donald Grant at Montevideo.

They are issues of deep concern for everyone—whether he lives in Buenos Aires or in Washington or in St. Louis; issues for the United States Congress as well as for the Argentine Congress, for our State Department and for the conference of hemispheric foreign ministers now assembled in Washington.

Why does the suppression of a newspaper 5,000 miles to the south make all this difference in Washington and in St. Louis?

Because what happens to freedom in one nation among the Americas happens inevitably also to freedom in some measure in all American nations.

Because when liberty of the press is killed in Buenos Aires it is threatened in a hundred other places.

Because when the lights are extinguished in Argentina, it grows darker where those lights no longer spread their rays.

That is why the suppression of La Prensa makes a difference to us all.

The suppression of Argentina's great newspaper did not occur overnight. It has been coming on ever since Perón took power. Indeed, in 1945, when he was still Minister of War, he said: "The Government will not permit the opposition of the Argentine press."

And now a statement, which Peron is reliably reported to have written says: "The preparation of public opinion of a sovereign country is a part of the sovereignty that government exercises."

That is Peronism, naked and unashamed. It is one with Hitler's nazism, Mussolini's fascism, Franco's falangism, Stalin's communism.

Opposed to Peronism now stands little more than Gainza Paz's brave conviction that Argentineans will never give up their rights and that La Prensa must reappear, strengthened by the support of a people who love liberty and condemn injustice.

The United States is a land whose people remember John Peter Zenger's triumph over attempted suppression of the press in 1735, whose people count Elijah P. Lovejoy's assassination in 1837 a sacrifice on the altar of a free press.

A land with these historic traditions of a free press can no longer be content with the undue deference shown Peron by the State Department.

It is time to be as plain with Peron as he is ruthless with freedom. The executioner of La Prensa should have not another red cent of help from Washington so long as he continues his regime of dictatorial suppression. He should be cut off, and he should be told why.

As for the Conference of American Foreign Ministers in Washington—from Mexico and Brazil and Peru, from Cuba and Honduras and Chile and some 15 other nations—the issue of La Prensa is on their agenda whether they formally list it or not. They may try to ignore the issue, but they cannot strike it off. For it is written in first place and with ink that will not erase.

If the conferees from the Americas go home without coming to grips with this struggle between freedom and slavery, then it would have been better had they not come at all.

La Prensa, bound and gagged, its voice stopped, its editor in exile, raises high throughout the hemisphere a test of freedom for everyone.

The world is watching to see what we do.

[From the Washington Post of April 3, 1951]

LA PRENSA'S FUTURE

It was in the best traditions of a free press that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a exemplar of freedom in North America, sent a reporter, Donald Grant, to interview Alberto Gainza Paz, editor of La Prensa, a now beleaguered exemplar of the same freedom in South America. They talked of the ordeal through which Señor Gainza Paz and his great newspaper have passed under the ruthless dictatorship of Juan Peron. La Prensa is temporarily in eclipse. It defied the dictator in a land where now, as Mr. Crant reports, there is no law save that dictator's will.

But they talked also of La Prensa's future. "The Argentine people," said Gainza Paz, "are fully conscious of their rights to have truthful and complete information about events inside or outside the country, and to read the newspaper of their choice. * * * I have the conviction that Argentineans will never give up those rights or relinquish those principles and that La Prensa must reappear, strengthened by the support of a people who love liberty and condemn injustice."

This is, of course, the real meaning of freedom of the press—that it involves not a publisher's privilege but the right of the people to read. It is a right which may be overridden; but it can never be extinguished. All men who have faith in human freedom must share Gainza Paz's conviction that La Prensa will have a future as free and as devoted to the rights of Argentineans as its past has been.

Rabbi Henry A. Landes and Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent editorial from a recent issue of the Revere Journal, Revere, Mass.:

HONOR TO RABBI AND WIFE

In a testimonial reception, Revere Jewry very properly and rightfully honors this Sunday its venerable spiritual leader, Rabbi Henry A. Landes, and his devoted wife, upon the completion of 30 years in the rabbinate. They unquestionably deserve the position of respect and affection they have in the hearts of their coreligionists here.

This tall, straight, and dignified figure, Rabbi Landes, familiar to everyone in the city for three decades, whose favorite recreation is taking long walks from his home to Lynn and back, can be seen daily talking to young or old in a democratic fashion on the highways, or he can always be relied upon to deliver the invocation or benediction at a public function in an impressive and significant manner. He is truly an integral part of this community, a builder of good will every day of the year.

Sacred Jewish writings relate that the Torah or Holy Law, is like a golden vessel, the more you scour and polish, the more it will glisten and reflect the face of him who looks at it. So with the words of the Torah, whenever you repeat them, they glisten and illumine one's face.

Rabbi Landes, eminent scholar and Talmudist, is so steeped in the knowledge of Jewish theology that he has won recognition in this field. His brilliant and enlightening Sabbath and holiday discourses are but a reflection of the many arduous years he has devoted to learning and mastering Hebrew sacred scripture. To him, the altar is not a pulpit to devote talks on plays or to give book reviews, it is a holy tabernacle where reverence to God is paid and from where truth about His goodness and mercy emanates.

There are thousands who have known this kindly gentleman as the minister who officiated at their wedding, who consoled them in the dark hour of bereavement, who led them in prayer at the synagogue, who taught them the Talmud or who interpreted Jewish canon law for them. They have watched him spend thirty fruitful years in Revere, commanding their respect and winning their affection because of his wisdom, learning and humaneness. He has always taken an interest in civic affairs and the entire city, regardless of race or religion, admires and respects him as a good and useful citizen. He has consistently maintained a fine relationship with the Catholic and Protestant clergy of Revere, and whenever cooperation was required of him on any civic or patriotic matter, he unhesitatingly gave it gladly.

His has always been the life of a holy man, since Rabbi Landes never had high ambitions of material gain and never sought the compensation of worldly aspirations. He consecrated his life to the service of God and to do His work among his people—the good shepherd tending to his faithful flock. A pleasant reward too is to see his son following in his footsteps as a rabbi.

Therefore, congratulations are extended to Rabbi Henry A. Landes and his good wife. As the Book of Proverbs states and is repeated in Jewish homes on the Sabbath eve, "A woman of valor, who can find? For her price is far above rubies." The good rabbi is fortunate indeed that his wife is the ideal helpmate, a gracious and charming lady, active in various local auxiliaries and a true mother and daughter in Israel.

May both of them enjoy future happiness and good health and continue their service to God, their congregation, their family of splendid children and country. May the messages of felicitation inspire Rabbi Landes to go on in his spiritual labors and receive God's blessings, praise and grace for divine work well done as a teacher and preacher in Israel. "Mazel Tov," Rabbi and Mrs. Landes.

Extracts From Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Convention, Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, at York, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD extracts from an address delivered by me at the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor at York, Pa., on Wednesday, March 28, 1951.

There being no objection, the extracts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America today is sitting on a volcano. No one knows when the eruption will come or if it will come, but with the international situation as it is today, certainly we face possible disaster unless as a nation there is an immediate realization of the dangers ahead. Surely this is no time for complacence and disinterest either in high places in Washington or anywhere among our citizens. We are confronted by a challenge for our survival as a Nation. To accept that challenge and to win the fight that that challenge implies we must have unity of purpose in America, the cooperation of labor and industry, the help of the farmer, the businessman and the workingman.

This struggle we are engaged in today on a world-wide basis is not the fight of big business, of labor, of small business, of the farmer, or of any individual or group. It is America's fight and we are all part of America. And to be effective against a relentless, godless foe we must be united instead of pulling in every conceivable direction.

We have to be prepared and we have to be prepared immediately and if we don't get prepared immediately we may be destroyed before we make up our minds that we are even willing to get ready. With the situation as it is, everyone of us ought to ask ourselves—what do we propose to do about it? This is a question that should be asked by every American, not on the basis of what is good for any part of American life, but on the basis of what is necessary to be done by every part of American life in order to preserve the way of life that we know as the American way and the way that is challenged today as it has never been challenged before.

With our country facing the most serious crisis in its history, many of our people are approaching the problem as if it could be debated leisurely and without urgency as to time. If Russia decides to attack, all this time will be lost that could have been used in preparation. Meanwhile, growing daily are the fears and apprehensions of our friends and allies abroad.

To meet the threat that faces us, nothing less than the best we all have to give, will be necessary. This means that every segment of America must make a contribution to the struggle against domination by communism.

Do we dare be lulled into the dangerous assumption that Russia won't attack? Can we afford to guess about Russia's plans? Do we want to be gobbled up by the black bear while we sleep?

Communism's ultimate goal is domination of the world. Not just Korea, not just Indochina, not just other peril points, but the whole world—the United States included.

For what purpose has Russia week by week, month by month, and year by year, since the end of World War II, regularly and systematically built up her army and navy and air force? And, at whom is this immensely great and vastly growing armed might of Russia aimed?

Russia, in her military preparedness, and without any further increase of her armed power, is already enormously ahead of all the free people of the world put together. That takes in the United States too.

Despite the tremendous disparity between Russian power on the one hand and the power of all the free people on the other hand, Russia still continues to build and build and build. The Russian budget for military expenditures for this year, 1951, has again reached another new high.

Certainly this mighty Russian military machine was not created as a result of fear by Russia of any of her immediate neighbors. Russia has already destroyed the governments of her close neighbors and dragged them back of the iron curtain. Surely this immense build-up of military power does not arise from fear of the immense hordes of Chinese to Russia's east. Red China has already joined the aims of Red Russia and is acting as the stooge and puppet of Russia right now against the United Nations in Korea.

This tremendous military might of Russia could not have been built from fear of her ancient foe, Germany. Because Eastern Germany has been completely sovietized by Russia since World War II and Western Germany is weak and divided. Furthermore, the Red Russian Army right now stands poised ready to strike in the very middle of Europe.

As for the rest of Western Europe, France, Italy, and England are mere pygmies compared with the giant size of Russian arms.

Thus in the 6 years intervening since World War II, Russia has brought all Asia to her side and has completely dominated more than half of Europe.

As the result of this tremendous realinement of forces by Russia, the United States stands today as the last great barrier against the domination of the whole world by Russian communism and Russian aims for world empire.

Therefore, it must be clear to everyone willing to stop, look, and listen that the express-train advance of the vast Russian military juggernaut is aimed right at the United States. No other conclusion makes sense.

All this being so, what will we do about it? It seems clear that it is imperative that we realize that we will have to go through a period of sparse and bitter living here in America. That to me is far better than another world holocaust, another war with its horrible destruction of life and property.

On the home front, no longer can there be the question of whether capital and labor can get together for the common good. They must get together. Every segment of our life must make its contribution.

If materials are to be allocated, if wages are to be fixed, if prices are to be frozen, the same thing must happen to profits. In other words, there is no part of our life that possibly can be freed from the necessity of making the contribution that is vitally necessary to build up our production and our preparation to the place where Russia will not dare attack us.

Then the administration must come to its senses on the Federal budget. This is no time to monkey around with costly experiments, with nonsensical expenditures, and with waste and boondoggling.

If we don't cut items of expenditures, other than defense, to the bone, the expenses are going to paralyze our whole productive mechanism. The Government now is taking a terrific wallop out of all income for taxes. The time has come to call a halt to wild, unnecessary spending. The time is here to eliminate all tax loopholes in the tax laws before new and heavier taxes are imposed.

The time has come for America to tighten its belt and to decide right now where we go from here.

If it is the purpose of Russia to attack us immediately, then we can forget about the argument for drafting 18-year-olds and for universal military training because everybody will be in the fight, since every able-bodied person will be necessary.

On the other hand, it may be the purpose of Russia to continue further the cold war which she has been carrying on for the past 5 years. It may be her purpose to put America to the enormous expense of getting ready for a fight which may not come for years. But whatever Russia's purpose is, the United States must be ready because Russia right now has a gun pointed at our head.

If the purpose of Russia is to carry on this cold war over a period of years, it is clear that America must protect herself by tightening up her economic policy and by a preparation program that is realistic for a long-term cold war on the part of Russia. The only possible solution to a cold war by Russia over a period of years is for universal military training.

The figures show that it cost Russia only $7 a year for the pay for a private in the Russian Army. The lowest grade pay in the American Army is $1,080 per year and it costs the United States $10,000 a year for every man that is fully equipped and actually in service in the field. Thus this tremendous difference between what it costs Russia and what it costs America, it is clear that this country cannot afford a standing army over a 5-, 10-, or 15-year period at $10,000 per soldier per year. Universal military training, and the reserve that such training makes possible, is the only answer, on an economic basis, for survival by America against the continuing cold war threat that Russia may continue over the next 20 years or even for a generation.

The problem is not whether America is to be a military nation, but whether we are to be prepared and to be prepared by a method that the economy of this country can sustain over a period of years.

This is a problem to which we must have the right answer. There can be no quibbling and no misunderstanding. We must be prepared and we must be prepared by methods that will not destroy our economy at the same time that it provides a preparation against attack.

Let us not forget that the productive capacity of America was as essential as our armed might in winning World War II. Our productive capacity as well as our armed might well be necessary to prevent world war III. I am sure that Stalin fears the productive capacity of this country more than he fears our atomic bombs. But to have that productive capacity we must have a sound economy. And we cannot have that sound economy by continuing preparation for war over a long number of years without we have universal military training. That is something about which there is no doubt and there is no alternative. It isn't a question of whether or not we want universal military training. It is a matter that universal military training is an imperative necessity that confronts us.

The time is gone when we can pussyfoot or fool about the things that must be done. It is up to us to get down to brass tacks in all these problems. There are certain necessary and vital things that have to be done for the survival of this Nation. Everybody must understand what they are and everybody must make a contribution to the result. Communism is united. America must be united if we are to unite the free peoples elsewhere. And unless the free peoples of the world stand together, they will fall together, because it will take everything that we all have to defeat the tremendous power that communism has built in the endeavor to destroy the free peoples of today's world. That is how plain it is. No one has any excuse for failing to understand the seriousness of the challenge that faces us.

Oregon Senate Joint Memorial 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks Senate Joint Memorial 1 recently adopted by the Oregon Legislature memorializing the President and the Secretary of State, in any negotiations with reference to a peace treaty between the United States and Japan, to make adequate provision positively to insure that no Japanese fishermen or fishing vessels be permitted to enter or interfere with the fisheries of this Pacific coast which have been fished and developed by the fishermen of the United States.

Senate Joint Memorial 1

To the HONORABLE HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas grave disaster to the coastal fisheries of the State of Oregon as well as to the coastal fisheries of the entire Pacific coast of the United States and Canada would result if the Department of State of the United States should again allow Japanese nationals to enter North American fisheries as they had begun to do before World War II, and to permit the Japanese to do this would constitute one of the greatest threats to peaceful relations between Japan and the United States; and

Whereas fisheries constitute one of the basic industries of this State, and not only give employment to many thousands of fishermen and workers in shore plants but also contribute to other industries such as shipyards, supply houses, banks, insurance companies, and many other concerns; and

Whereas fisheries furnish to the people of the Northwest, as well as to millions of other people, great quantities of wholesome and palatable food and constitute an immense food resource which, by proper management, can be made to yield a constant supply of food in the future; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the President of the United States be memorialized to direct the Secretary of State, in any negotiations with reference to a peace treaty between the United States and Japan, to make adequate provision positively to insure that no Japanese fishermen or fishing vessels be permitted to enter or interfere with the fisheries of this Pacific coast which have been fished and developed by the fishermen of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to send this joint memorial to the President of the United States, and to send copies thereof to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the President and the clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress elected or appointed from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the senate January 18, 1951.

ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

P. L. PATTERSON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house March 9, 1951.

JOHN F. STEELHAMMER,
Speaker of the House.

The Forest of the Six Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the annals of history have recorded few parallels to the savagery practiced by the Nazi government on the defenseless and innocent Jewish men, women, and children of Europe. When the Second World War broke out in the fall of 1939, there were 9,000,000 Jews on the continent of Europe; when the war ended in 1945, there were 3,000,000 left. Six million Jews were tortured and done to death in the Nazi concentration camps and crematoria. No greater cruelty has been heaped on any people on the face of the earth within the memory of civilized men.

The world has recently shown a tendency to forget the German atrocities perpetrated upon the peoples of Europe and the 6,000,000 martyred Jews. Instead, the slogan has been given currency: "Let bygones be bygones." We have even forgotten what the Krupps and others did to convert Europe into a shambles. The Jewish people alone have not forgotten.

Out of Jerusalem comes a news story, so packed with drama as to thrill us all. It proves that there are still people on God's green earth who are determined to make sure that the memory of the 6,000,000 and what they fought for shall not perish from the land. To this end, they have established a living memorial which in its grandeur and eternity, may be said to approach closely the vastness of the world's and the Jewish people's tragedy in the loss of the 6,000,000. Here is the news item:

JERUSALEM, March 8.—An extraordinary ceremony, accompanied by tears and punctuated by lamentations, took place yesterday on the mountains overlooking Jerusalem, when the Jewish National Fund, in the presence of 10,000 men and women from the Jewish capital and of representatives of the Israel Government, the Jewish Agency, and 14 Jewish communities of Europe, Morocco and Yemen, planted the first trees of the Forest of Six Million which will occupy both sides of the 40-mile stretch of the Jerusalem-Tel Aviv corridor. The forest, when completed, will have 6,000,000 trees and will be known as the Forest of the Six Million, in commemoration of the 6,000,000 Jews who were done to death by Hitler.

The vast crowd that assembled on the mountain slopes at Kisarom in the Jerusalem corridor, broke into a loud lamentation when Joseph Weitz, representative of the Jewish National Fund, planted the first cypress saplings while the cantor intoned the El Mole Rachamim, invoking the mercy of God on the souls of the departed martyrs. Thousands of men, women and children, many of them close relatives of the martyred six million, wept hysterically as Chief Rabbi Isaac Halevi Herzog, following the cantor, pronounced the Kadish, the prayer for the dead, and David Ramaz, speaking in behalf of the Israel Government, raised his right hand, swearing that the State of Israel will never forget the six million and what was done to them and the whole Jewish people during the last World War. Berl Locker, in the name of the World Zionist Organization, took a similar oath. Isaac Gruenbaum, who for many years was Polish Jewry's outstanding Zionist leader and chief spokesman in the Polish Parliament, delivered the eulogy. He was forced to interrupt his address several times because his throat and voice were choked with tears.

Throughout the whole ceremony Israel airplanes circled high over the mountains and the Israel flag hung at half mast in front of the specially constructed speakers platform on the mountain slope.

The forest will be divided into 14 sections, each commemorating a Jewish community that was wiped out in the great mass murder that cost the lives of 6,000,000 Jews in Europe. The forest will be specially guarded by chosen representatives of the Yemenite Jewish community which is regarded as the oldest Jewish community in the world.

Dr. Harris J. Levine, president of the Jewish National Fund of America, in a message to the memorial assembly, expressed the deep feeling of solidarity with world Jewry, which animates the 5,000,000 Jews of the United States, and pledged that a special effort will be made to help in the establishment of the living memorial in Israel that will forever keep green the memory of our martyred six million.

Mr. Speaker, the Jewish National Fund of America, with offices at 41 East Forty-second Street, New York City, in response to the call from Jerusalem, has undertaken to have 5,000,000 trees planted by the 5,000,000 Jews of the United States in the Forest of the Six Million. It will endeavor to have each Jew in America plant at least one tree in the Forest of Six Million. The motto will be: "Plant a living tree for each martyred dead" and "We build as we mourn." Thus, through the forest, there will be built a living memorial to the 6,000,000—a green mansion in which shall dwell forever the spirits of the departed, giving life, health, and inspiration to all succeeding generations who will be building the land while gratefully and reverently remembering those who lived and worked and died for it.

The roots of the trees we plant will hold back rushing waters and will help erect land terraces. Its timbers will go into building of homes, barns, and factories; into making of chairs, sills, furniture, ships, railroad cars, vehicles, plows, boxes, and tools. The wood pulp will make newsprint and paper for books and fiber for textiles. In other words, they will revere the departed and the past and enrich the present and the future.

Extracts From Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Dinner of the Amen Corner, Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD extracts from an address delivered by me at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner at the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., on Saturday evening, March 31, 1951.

There being no objection, the extracts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The events of this new year, 1951, and particularly of the month of March ending today, have a startling significance for every American.

During the current week three American citizens have been found guilty of being traitors to the United States. Their treason was in exposing the secrets of atomic energy to Russia. Their treasonable act put the women and children of America on the firing line in the event of world war III, and in that event, undoubtedly meant the loss of the lives of millions of their fellow American citizens.

Earlier this month a British jet bomber flew nonstop from an airfield in Ireland to an airfield in Canada in only 4 hours and 37 minutes. That flight was almost as meaningful to America as the discovery of this land by Columbus. It opened up America to contact with Europe in only half the time required for a fast express train to cross from one end of Pennsylvania to the other. However little we may relish the idea, it meant that whatever happens in Western Europe affects us here in the United States almost as if it happened in one of our adjoining States. Had we been at war with a nation controlling Western Europe, that jet bomber could have carried an atomic bomb to blast any of the cities on the eastern seaboard of the United States.

It is, therefore, clear that unless Western Europe is denied to the Russians the whole of the eastern United States is open to atomic bombing whenever world war III comes up. It also seems clear that it is not possible for the United States to abandon Western Europe and to retire within an impregnable fortress here in America, because that fortress would no longer be free from atomic bombing which is the most dangerous and devastating invention of human ingenuity.

The further significance to us here in America of these tremendous events is that the overwhelming proportion of the productive enterprise of the United States is located in a group of Eastern States immediately vulnerable to atomic attack from Western Europe. A Western Europe less than 5 hours away makes Western Europe our next door neighbor so far as concerns vast contact and liability to attack by atomic weapons.

During the past week the doors of a Federal prison closed upon Alger Hiss—an American who had acted as one of the chief advisers of the President of the United States at a conference with Russia and other diplomats at Yalta. It therefore appears that at a momentous conference with Russia, our own President had as one of his confidential advisers a prominent American who in fact at that very time was in league with the most vicious enemy this country ever had, because Alger Hiss was imprisoned after conviction of perjury for having denied under oath that he had ever been a Communist whereas it was proved that he was.

It is also clear therefore that Russia has penetrated successfully into the very highest secret circle of confidence in our Government and has carried away for her own use the secret of atomic energy—thereby not only shattering confidence and assurance of peace in the world, but also giving Russia the secret of the means of conquering the whole world unless we here in America arouse ourselves to the seriousness of our present danger.

The unparalleled productive capacity of the United States has largely developed as a result of the concentration of our industry in large units where production and assembly lines have completely revolutionized and fabulously increased all previous ideas of quantity and quality of production. Our ability to produce has made the United States the leader of the world of today. So long as our great concentration of industry were not open to attack by our enemies we were indeed invulnerable. But as the result of traitors making known to Russia our secrets of atomic energy, they have thereby sown the seeds of our own destruction. Atomic bombing can destroy our industry unless as a Nation we become fully and adequately prepared to defend ourselves.

Many Americans are saying frankly or indicating by their action that there is no need of urgency in our plans. They seem to mean: What is the use of being too serious until war actually starts? Of them it may be asked: What do they call what goes on in Korea? Latest official figures show that our losses in Korea now exceed 57,000. That is greater by more than 10,000 than all the losses of both the Northern and Southern armies in the Gettysburg campaign in the Civil War, which was the bloodiest campaign in American history on this continent.

General MacArthur this week called upon the Communist leader in Korea for a meeting to arrange for ending that war.

The reply dictated from Moscow was a scornful refusal. So that bloody fight goes on with no prospect of its termination. Everyone knows that the whole communistic campaign in Korea is directed by and through Russia. The fact is that Russia shows daily by her activities in Korea that she is willing to risk world war III right now.

Communism is united world-wide. The free nations of the world are not united either in aims or preparation.

The accumulation of events, particularly such as we have witnessed so far this week make it increasingly evident that communism as led by Russian imperialism means to dominate the whole world.

Only determined and united effort, with a common purpose and a common determination by the free people of today's world, can possibly stop this vast expansion of Russian power. It is up to all who believe in freedom to stand together. Unless we do and until we do there is no reason to believe that separately the free people of the world can successfully resist the constantly growing might of Russian military power.

The Stabilization Program Is Not Working for Wage Earners and White-Collar Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting a resolution on the failure of the stabilization program, under the inadequate National Production Act which we passed last year, to work for the benefit of the Americans who already are carrying the chief burden of the defense effort, as adopted by the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York.

Text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL POLICY ADOPTED BY THE DELEGATED CONFERENCE OF THE TRADE UNION COUNCIL OF THE LIBERAL PARTY, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1951

In the present world crisis, the United States must forge a national unity to give strength and leadership to the free world.

This unity must be based on equality of sacrifice and an equal voice for all sections of the national economy who are called upon to make these sacrifices.

The use of our present national crisis to depress labor's standard of living while stepping up profits, to place the heaviest burdens of taxation on labor's shoulders, to deprive labor of an active voice in our economic affairs, is to weaken the entire fabric of our national unity.

So far, our national policy has failed to map a program that will protect labor's standards of work and living, that will tax those best able to pay, that will recognize labor's contributions by giving labor a proper voice.

Since the onset of fighting in Korea, the cost of living has gone up 8 percent to retail prices, according to BLS figures. Wholesale prices have gone up twice as much. Each day, these higher wholesale rates are translated into retail costs.

Wages, lagging behind prices even before the outbreak of the Korean fighting, have lagged even further in the subsequent months.

The stabilization program has, so far, stabilized wages only.

The most decisive item in the worker's budget, food, has escaped control. Those items selling below parity continue to rise because they are exempt by law. Those items selling above parity are controlled at the store but not at the farm, thereby making inevitable future price rises. This free item, food, constitutes 40 percent of the wage earning family budget.

In the over-all ceilings, the point where the freeze was established was the highest point in American history.

This conference of labor delegates believes that the present stabilization program is viciously discriminatory against all wage and salaried groups. It is not really a stabilization program at all. It is a wage freeze and a price rise.

This conference calls upon our National Government to take immediate steps:

1. To roll back prices to June 1950.

2. To place a tight ceiling on the prices of all items of popular consumption, including food.

3. To establish strong, effective rent control which will fully protect the tenants in our Nation.

4. To guide its policies by an effort to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar prior to Korea.

In the light of the foregoing, a tax program that falls most heavily on the wage-earning groups is adding insult to injury. At present, families earning $5,000 a year or less are paying the same taxes as they paid during World War II, while families earning $500,000 a year are paying $40,000 less in taxes.

This conference goes on record for a more equitable tax program.

We oppose any proposals for a national sales tax since it falls most heavily upon the lower income groups whose earnings are spent almost entirely on consumer goods.

We favor a program of taxation that will plug the present loopholes in the tax program, including measures to raise the excess-profits tax and to cover railroads, utilities, natural gas companies; to tighten the estate and gift tax; to tighten the tax on interest and dividends.

To speed our national production, to prevent new inequities in the distribution of our national income, to protect labor's rights in the allocation of manpower, to block black-marketing practices, to keep down the cost of living, this conference calls upon our national administration to give labor a voice in the top councils of our planning and administrative agencies. The present policy of manning such top agencies almost solely with representatives of big business not only threatens the living standards of millions of American families, but weakens the confidence of these same millions whose maximum efforts are required for our great national effort.

Labor's voice at the policy level is the first and greatest stem toward a multiplication of labor's power at the productive level.

RESOLUTION ON STATE RENT CONTROL ADOPTED AT THE SAME CONFERENCE

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party go on record to the following effect:

1. We insist that the State legislature immediately pass legislation amending the State rent-control law (a) to eliminate all provisions for rent increase on any ground except actual, proven out-of-pocket losses; (b) to grant no certificate of eviction except on the ground of a life or health hazard declared by a local government agency, or for the purpose of occupancy by the landlord himself, and then only after livable accommodations at a similar rental have been provided for the tenant; (c) to place under control all rental housing regardless of when built or converted.

2. Since the Liberal Party rent-control bill, introduced in this session of the legislature by Senator Mahoney and Assemblyman Roman anticipated the present situation with respect to the rent-control plan and provided in advance for making the objectionable features of the plan inoperative, we recommend passage of the Liberal Party bill.

3. We pledge ourselves to fight from tonight on until adjournment of this legislature to have the State rent-control law amended to give it teeth on behalf of tenant protection.

4. Unless the State rent-control law is amended by the current legislature to make it a completely effective rent-control statute, which will fully protect the tenants of this State, we deem it necessary, as soon as Federal legislation has been passed establishing effective rent control for the Nation, that the Federal Government reassume control of rents in this State.

Inciting Racial Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much disturbed to learn that a distinguished Member of the Senate inserted a telegram containing disparaging insinuations against Americans of Italian origin, in the record of a hearing. I think this was a grave error. The wire in question visited the sins of the few upon the many.

Italian-Americans need no defense from me or from anybody else. In my book one race is as good as another. We have no creed of superior or inferior races in America. Hitler tried to spread the doctrine of Herrenvolk—superior—and Slavenvolk—inferror or slave—and it took much sacrifice of blood and tragedy to nullify it. Unfortunately, there lingers in the minds of some that some races are superior to others, and in our immigration statutes, we do find a national-origin theory whereby preference is given to immigrants who are Aryan, thereby causing discrimination against the Latins and the Slavic peoples. This prejudice which makes it difficult for Italians seeking entry into this country, is the same kind of prejudice which animated the telegram in question.

I feel certain that when the matter is brought to the attention of the distinguished Senator, he will rectify his mistake. I have great respect for the Senator in question. I am sure he did not mean to imply any immoral conduct to the Italian people as a whole or to the Italian-Americans as a whole. However, I think it was most ill-advised to have inserted such remarks into the record of the hearings, and I take this opportunity to say so.

I should like to compliment the newspaper, Il Progresso Italo-Americano, for its stirring editorial which appeared in its March 28, 1951, issue. My esteemed colleague, Representative JOHN ROONEY, inserted this editorial in the April 2 issue of the RECORD.

Oregon Senate Joint Memorial 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks Senate Joint Memorial 4 recently adopted by the Oregon Legislature providing for memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States of America for the construction of timber access roads to and in public forests:

Senate Joint Memorial 4

To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Forty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the United States, acting through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, manages 58 percent of the total forest land of the State of Oregon, which carries 70 percent of the currently merchantable timber; and

Whereas the allowable cut under sustained yield forest management on the public forests has by no means been reached; and

Whereas 87,000 citizens of Oregon are directly employed in the forest industries; and

Whereas the State of Oregon currently furnishes the people of the United States with more than a quarter of their annual lumber requirements, as well as important quantities of wood pulp, plywood, doors, shingles, and other forest products; and

Whereas if the present national emergency demands a high production of essential timber products for military use, the public forests in many instances are the only ones which can supply these needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to consider the merits of the proposal for the authorization of the construction of timber access roads to and in the public forests of the United States as outlined in House Joint Resolution 88 which has been introduced in the Eighty-second Congress, first session; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the senate be and she hereby is directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Oregon in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the senate February 28, 1951.

ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

P. L. PATTERSON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house March 5, 1951.

JOHN F. STEELHAMMER,
Speaker of the House.

Let's Stop Playing Into the Hands of Russia by Delaying Our Wheat to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD two editorials from the New York Post and a signed column by Dr. Frank Kingdon from the same great newspaper.

All of these insertions say, in effect, that our delay in acting favorably on the authorization to furnish wheat to the starving millions of India is helpful to the propaganda war of the Soviet nations; and it is a brutal death sentence on thousands of helpless human beings whose only sin is in living in a country incapable of feeding all its people.

I hope sincerely that the administration will soon be able to send food to India out of our own wonderful bounty.

Text of the editorials follows:

[From the New York Post of March 12, 1951]

DEATH SENTENCE

Each day that the House Rules Committee delays action on emergency aid to famine-stricken India means the death of more helpless people whom our help could have saved.

[From the New York Post of March 22, 1951]

DANGER: MEN STARVING

A farmer's almanac of global crop conditions would provide ironic contrasts. Starving India reports that hurricanes have followed droughts in razing the subcontinent's maize and wheat fields. At the same moment the already overflowing wheat bowl of the American southwest offers predictions of a bumper crop. In the midst of this almost embarrassing United States plenty, Congress is indulging in sterile filibusters against the proposed $190,000,000 gift of grain to India. The House Rules Committee has shelved the emergency measure with a perverse conviction that starving stomachs can wait. The harrowing truth is that our legislators are talking both the grain measures and Indians to death. J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, flatly denounces that at least one million of his countrymen will die from disease or starvation unless Congress swiftly approves the grant. Emergency help will do more than all the diplomatic maneuvers on record to win friends and influence nations in the Far East. Reports that United States inaction has driven a desperate New Delhi to ask Russia for grain emphasizes the folly of further delay. Are we actually waiting for the Kremlin to lead the way?

[From the New York Post of March 18, 1951]

TO BE FRANK

(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

No more decisive test of our genuine faith in democracy has recently come to us than the question of sending food to India. The only argument against it is that Nehru does not slavishly follow our international policy. To starve a people for its government's independence is a denial of democratic principle. Every time we indulge in this kind of undemocratic arrogance we hand Russia and communism a diplomatic victory.

Our policy in Asia, apart from humanitarian considerations, should have one objective—to separate Asia from Moscow. Nobody would recognize this from our actions. We seem determined to drive the Asians into the arms of the Kremlin.

A few years ago some of us were advocating a $5,000,000,000 world-rehabilitation fund to feed and revive China, India, and other lands then suffering from want and ripe for development. We were lampooned as fabulous visionaries with the lunatic touch. Those $5,000,000,000 could have kept China away from Russia. The price we are now paying for not spending them is $40,000,000,000 as the minor item and the lives of American men as the major one.

We still seem to be in the hands of men determined to drive China more and more to Moscow. Nobody seems to be working at driving a wedge between the Chinese and Soviet Governments, which seems to me the obvious point at which to breach the Communist bloc. Maybe this is because officially we have written China off, or perhaps have decided the time is not ripe.

The one thing on which we can all agree is that we do not want to reproduce in India what occurred in China. Yet here we are on the verge of setting the same forces in motion. We are as good as saying that we are indifferent to India's need except as we can turn it into an instrument to dominate Indian policy. In the light of past experience and India's present mood this can result only in alienating India.

What I am now advocating has nothing to do with approval of Nehru's policies. I am not declaiming them. I am merely saying that we should go out of the business of recruiting Asians for Russia, and turn to the happier business of winning them to our side. It is not a difficult business. It simply requires that we sell democracy by practicing it.

As is always the case with democracy, the more hard-headed we are about serving it, the more humanitarian our action turns out to be. It is pleasantly humane to send aid to India; it is equally sound policy. The audience that will tensely watch and ardently judge our action will be not only India but all the Asian peoples recently freed from the servitude of colonies and now deciding with which half of the world their true interests lie. Insofar as we discover to them a way of life so rooted in human dignity that policy and ethics are naturally united, we shall appeal to both their practical sense and their unique spiritual genius.

It is unfortunate that mankind reserves for courage in military planning an admiration it does not accord boldness in pursuit of peace, but we have here an opportunity to demonstrate that a mature, free people dares to trust its own belief in the freedom of all peoples.

Barbarous Iraqi Action Against Jews Calls for State Department and United Nations Intervention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter sent by me to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State:

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On March 10 in secret session, the Iraqi Majlis (Chamber of Deputies) passed a decree with the approval of the Regency Council providing that all Jews who left Iraq for any reason whatsoever since 1948 must return within 60 days under penalty of confiscation of all their property. This decree applies equally to any and all Jews who left Iraq, temporarily or permanently, with or without passports. There are American citizens who are drastically affected by this decree. Property of American citizens who were nationals of Iraq will be forfeited to the state unless the owners return to Iraq by May 10. A custodian general has been appointed to be in control of all property of Jews who left Iraq. The new decree calls upon all officials in banks and other institutions to furnish the custodian general with information concerning the assets of all Jews affected.

This decree is a culmination of many others. An earlier decree provided that all Jews registered for immigration to Israel be denationalized. That decree was followed by another which froze the property of Jews scheduled for entrance into Israel. The latter decree, however, was made applicable to any Jew outside of Iraq and even Jews resident in the United States. In other words, it was applied to the property of Jews whether or not they went to Israel, United States, or any other country.

In the meanwhile, there are great disturbances in Bagdad and other cities in which Jews live, threatening their lives and property. Anti-Jewish feeling is again being whipped up to a fever point. The position of Jews in Iraq today is not unlike that of the Jews in Germany during the early days of Nazi control. The Government of Israel has protested, but to no avail.

A total of 104,000 Iraqi Jews had registered for transfer to Israel. Forty thousand have already been transferred, leaving 64,000 Iraqi Jews in a precarious state in Iraq. Those Jews who have managed to leave Iraq have been allowed to take with them just 90 cents. Many Iraqi Jews en route to Israel are consequently faced with starvation.

The decree of March 10 has placed the Jews who have left Iraq, some of them, as I have stated before, are in the United States, in a most precarious position. If they go back to Iraq within 60 days they face persecution or worse. If they do not go back they face absolute confiscation of their property.

Iraq is the recipient of United States aid. The Export-Import Bank allotted credits to her in the amount of $12,000,000 for agriculture and irrigation purposes. If this credit has not been completely drawn upon, I ask that any balances be canceled. Any country guilty of such barbarism should not be recipient of either our credit or our confidence. All point 4 aid should likewise be immediately withdrawn. The annulment of these harsh decrees should be the condition precedent for the reinstatement of these benefits from the United States.

The example set by Iraq might be followed by other Arab countries. The precedent is dangerous because the Jews are a religious minority. They are that much more easily victimized. They cannot fight back. Hence the need for vigorous and summary action.

Moreover, the situation in Iraq concerning the treatment of Jews directly relates to articles 55 and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Article 56 states: "All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

Article 55 states that "United Nations shall promote (c) universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

The situation in Iraq with respect to Jews is likewise violative of the convention on genocide and a denial of the resolution adopted by the United Nations on its universal declaration of human rights.

Thus, I believe, it is imperative that this information be imparted to our representatives to the United Nations so that they in turn set this crucial matter before the entire United Nations.

These developments in Iraq must not be permitted to be dismissed as an internal affair only.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

A First-Hand Report About "The Men Russia Fears Most" and "The Greatest Single Deterrent to the Reds Starting a World War"—By Corey Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday supplement to the Washington Star of last week carried an article, datelined "London," written by the internationally known writer on a veritable catalog of miscellaneous subjects, and aviator in World War II—Mr. Corey Ford.

This Week magazine, a Washington Star supplement, has the largest circulation of any Sunday supplement published. The editors of that magazine presented this article by Mr. Ford as a first-hand report on what they declared to be "The greatest single deterrent to the Reds starting another world war."

Mr. Ford's observations are both illuminating and thought-provoking. They have largely to do with the wonderful achievements of the United States Strategic Air Command. He quotes General Johnson as saying:

I wish the families could know the job that these men are doing, and I wish someone would tell them back home just how important it is.

Well, General Johnson, I want you to know that I and every other Member of the House of Representatives are alive to and thrill at the thought of the marvelous works that the Air Force Strategic Command is accomplishing in confining the Russian Bear to his lair. God bless you, General Johnson, and every member of your command, as well as all others who, in following our flag, are preserving—not alone the peace and security of our own country, but the peace and security of the world.

These few words are to tell you and your men that every true American is with them in spirit at each moment of every night and day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to tell the folks back home the wonderful works that our Air Force is doing abroad—by way of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a copy of which daily finds its way into the smallest hamlets of this land, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to insert Corey Ford's article entitled "The Men That Russia Fears Most," into the RECORD.

That article is as follows:

THE MEN RUSSIA FEARS MOST—A FIRST-HAND REPORT ON OUR A-BOMB AIR CREWS—"THE GREATEST SINGLE DETERRENT" TO THE REDS' STARTING A WORLD WAR

(By Corey Ford)

LONDON.—I've recently come back from a visit to the men who hold the world in equilibrium today. The threat of their loaded bomb bays—so Winston Churchill has said—is the greatest single deterrent to a Russian advance over Europe.

They are the pilots who fly the big long-range bombers which are capable of delivering the atomic weapon against the enemy. Their picked unit of the United States Strategic Air Command, sent to Britain on what has been announced as a routine training mission, is maintaining the balance between a cold and a hot war.

You haven't heard much about them. Their planes are parked at isolated RAF fields in East Anglia, gassed and ready. While the great debate goes on at home, while some of our leaders demand that we withdraw to our own shores, and others insist that we fight everywhere at once, the pilots sit at the controls of their bombers, aware that the powerful retaliatory blow they could deliver is what keeps Stalin in check.

MOST POTENT THREAT OF ALL

That word "retaliatory" is important, basic to our strategy. The enemy knows that if he hits us, the Air Force will return the blow with interest; and thus he hesitates because he fears that most potent of all threats, an atomic counterattack by air.

You can spot the huge metal tails a mile away, as you drive north through the pleasant East Anglia countryside. They tower above the hawthorn hedges, above the distant barns and thatched cottages. Their curving silhouettes, against the English sky, are disturbingly reminiscent of a decade ago.

Things haven't changed much in Britain since you were here before. Our men still live in RAF billets, which are no more luxurious than they were back in 1943 and 1944. Austerity, plus an innate British distrust of modern heating, combine to keep the buildings icy cold. A lump of coal smoulders sullenly in the grate of the reading room, and airmen shiver in overcoats as they try to translate the English newspapers into English.

GAME OF DARTS AND A MOVIE

Winters are as miserable as ever. Snow and sleet glaze the runaways, and it's worth your life to ride a bicycle down to the line. There isn't much to do for recreation; a game of darts; a movie, maybe; an occasional train ride into London.

England hasn't changed, but the men have. Today's air force is older, for one thing. These are experienced veterans, with battle stars from Europe, Africa, the Pacific. They are sober, serious, disciplined, highly competent. Flying is their job; they've been doing it for years, and they are professionals now. Their conversation is as technical as a seminar at MIT. You guess that the people of this advance unit—hand-picked from Lt. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay's crack Strategic Air Command—are as effecient a group of trained airmen as exists in the world. "We're the cream of the crop," one of them told me. It's a good feeling for Americans to have about themselves, in times like these.

Week-ends in London are few and far between. Most of the pilots are married; family men. The pin-up girls that used to decorate their walls have been replaced by photographs of Junior. They save their money and send it home to their wives, still living at the group base back in California. "It's tough being a SAC wife," they reflect. "The gals never knew when we'll take off and be away for months." When the men were told, at the last moment, that they would not be home for Christmas, there was no time to mail their presents. Maj. Gen. Leon W. Johnson, hero of Ploesti and Congressional Medal of Honor winner, who is boss of the bombers in England, set up a special airplane to fly their gifts back to the States.

They are frankly homesick, but they are just as glad their families are not over here right now. They don't talk much about the war—a habit of men in combat theaters everywhere—but they all believe that it is coming. They have their own ideas of how it should be fought, of course. "We can't lick them on the ground. We'll have to rely on airpower—where the United States is strongest—rather than on manpower, where the enemy is sure to outnumber us."

They believe in airpower; they wouldn't be pilots if they didn't. Many of them personally saw Japan and Germany crumble under air attack, and they know the effectiveness of aerial bombardment. "We'll lose if we meet them on their own terms. We'll win if we use the technical skill in which America is unbeatable."

The toughest thing over here is the waiting, waiting for the somber English weather to clear. "I missed summer last year," is a sardonic crack, "I went to a double-feature that afternoon." Waiting to run another routine training flight, a prescribed 10-hour course that is as familiar by now as the way to bed. Waiting to get a letter from someone at home. Waiting to learn how much longer they're going to have to wait.

FIRST FLIGHT

There was a little excitement down around the maintainence hangar the day that we arrived. A group of pilots were sweating out an airplane that was making its first flight; their shouts of advice rose above the angry whine of the engine as it climbed. "Ease her back." "Hold that right rudder." "More back pressure, Joe."

We stepped into the hangar. A foot-long model plane was darting erratically right and left overhead, guided by the long wire control lines held in its owner's hand. Its nose rose higher, its air speed fell off until it seemed to hang on the prop, the snarl of the toy motor reached fever-pitch. Then the left wing stalled out, and the tiny ship dropped into a sharp turn.

"Forward, Joe." "Chop the gun and pull up." A mighty groan, as the airplane plunged toward the concrete floor. "Oh, no-o-o-o!"

MOCK SYMPATHY

The owner ran forward to pick up the wreck, ruefully examining the shattered prop and the split plastic wing. "Clobbered." The group shook their heads in mock sympathy. "Wonder what's the penalty for Class Twenty-Sixing an aircraft?" "I'm going to recommend to the Evaluation Board that they consider this one a case of pilot error."

"Ah, I can fix this thing up in an hour with a little Scotch tape," the owner shrugged. "You guys wait here."

"After all," he added as he headed for the ready room, "you got nothing else to do around here but wait."

And wait and wait. Morale is high, but waiting can eat into morale. Waiting is just as hard back home; the letters from their wives show that. General Johnson appreciates the problem. "I wish their families could know the job these men are doing," he said. "I wish somebody could tell them back there how important it is."

Well, this is to tell them. These bomber crews who wait in England are keeping the enemy waiting in Russia. At this moment in history, the threat of the terrible counterpunch they could throw from these East Anglia bases is what holds this teetering globe of ours in balance.

Famine (in India) Will Not Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, attached is an editorial from the New York Times of March 22, 1951, forcefully drawing attention to the fact that although the Foreign Affairs Committee favorably reported out the bill for food aid to India on March 5, it has not yet received the rule or been scheduled for consideration. The vital national interests of the United States which are involved in the enactment of this bill demand that it be debated and considered immediately after the House is through with the pending Selective Service Act. The above-mentioned editorial follows:

FAMINE WILL NOT WAIT

The danger of famine in India is approaching its critical stage. The most serious situation is in Bihar state, where winter crops have failed, but other areas are also threatened. The Indian Government is doing what it can, but is seriously limited by the basic food deficit in the country. It must look abroad for aid if the problem is to be met.

It is against this background that our own reaction to India's need for grain must be appraised. More than 5 weeks ago President Truman sent a specific message to Congress asking for immediate action on legislation to provide part of the food required if widespread famine is to be averted. Though bills to this effect were introduced, both in the House of Representatives and the Senate, little legislative progress has been made to date and only the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has taken action. With Congress now about to begin its Easter recess, passage of the needed legislation cannot be expected before early April, if then.

Here surely is a record of procrastination in the face of great need. Whether the matter is viewed from the humanitarian point of view or from the need of India's friendship in the present great world struggle, the record to date is not one of which we can be proud. In view of the steady worsening of the situation, it may well be that American aid, if it is ever forthcoming, will be too late to avoid great suffering and substantial loss of life. The Indian Government has asked the Soviet Union for aid, too, but, so far, no reply has been received. It is not inconceivable that the Kremlin, ever sensitive to propaganda opportunities, will take the initiative and provide some grain before we ourselves get around to acting. In any case, the need for the prompt action is indisputable. Famine will not wait.

"Just as Sure as the Sun Rises in the East, Some Day the Poor Wretches Behind the Iron Curtain Will Demand Freedom, and They Will Find Freemen Everywhere Extending Them the Right Hand of Good Fellowship"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, once again Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President of the United States, has presented to the Nation's television audience several high Government officials in order to have them make report to the people of the United States on matters of deep concern and which are subject, to a greater or lesser degree, to the control of those appearing on the National Broadcasting Co.'s Sunday afternoon television program Battle Report, Washington.

Chief among these on this program were Maj. Gen. Ward H. Maris, Chief of Research and Development for the United States Army; the Honorable John Sherman Cooper, consultant to the Secretary of State; Mr. C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., officer in charge of Iranian affairs; Capt. Thomas U. Sisson, commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Leyte*; and Under Secretary of the Navy the Honorable Dan A. Kimball.

Mr. Speaker, each Sunday for more than 6 months past, Dr. Steelman has appeared in person, acting as a sort of monitor in selecting and presenting individuals whose current activities as Government officials make their individual reports of public interest.

On Sunday last, however, Dr. Steelman was not in the studio in person. He was with the President's party at Key West, Fla., assisting the President in the discharge of the many tasks that follow our Chief Executive wherever in the world he might go and for whatever reason that brought him there.

In this week's talk—by the use of audio and motion picture film—Dr. Steelman told briefly of what the Soviet radio has been recently saying about us. "Among the lies," he observes, "the Kremlin is spreading about our country, is one about our streets being filled with starving people, while a small group of so-called rulers live in luxury. The power-drunk despots in the Kremlin," Mr. Steelman went on to say, "are afraid to tell the truth—afraid to let their subject enjoy the freedom to live their own lives and think their own thoughts."

In his report to the people, General Maris told of the work of research and development of the United States Army, and spoke briefly of the tremendous improvements that have recently been wrought in the production of tanks, of antitank weapons, of defenses against hostile attacks from the air, and of the work that is being done in the development of guided missiles. "While," General Maris explained, "there is no guaranty of pushbutton warfare being just around the corner, it can be said that gratifying progress is being made in providing powerful and practical atomic weapons for tactical use by the ground forces."

Mr. Cooper, State Department adviser and consultant to the Secretary of State, talked briefly of the benefits that would accrue to our Nation if Congress were to enact legislation which would enable the dispatch of more troops to Europe, while C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., painted a graphic picture of the fantastic murder of the Premier of Iran, long distinguished by his friendship with the United States.

Mr. Ferguson detailed the importance of the friendship of Iran to the people of the United States, as well as the strategic value of that country to our own Armed Forces in the event of global warfare. He graphically pointed out our good fortune in having such freedom-loving people, as are the Iranians, on the front line of those who are battling against communistic forces of the world.

Capt. Thomas Sisson, of the United States Navy, told of the work of the United States Carrier *Leyte* and of the splendid record of its performance in Korean waters, while Under Secretary Dan C. Kimball high-lighted the story of the exploits of the *Leyte*, and spoke of the forthcoming documentary presentation of combat films now being made of naval operations during the second war period.

Mr. Speaker, the receipt in my office of more than 1,000 letters evidence the public interest in the splendid television program, Battle Report, Washington, as produced by Ted Ayers, one of NBC's ace producers, and carried out over the air on the coaxials each Sunday afternoon. It is because of that interest that I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include this program in the records of this day's proceedings.

What follows is the audio portion of Battle Report, Washington, delivered on the network of the National Broadcasting Co., on March 11, under the auspices of Dr. John R. Steelman.

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. BRINKLEY. As the enemy—losing 24,000 men in 3 days—reels before the new onslaught of our allied troops, NBC television again turns its cameras on the Nation's Capital for another film-documented battle report.

Washington, where the Senate this week—its eyes on the struggle between East and West—voted the 18-year-old draft and universal military training, while in Korea, where the struggle is hot, American jets spark an aerial offensive that sweeps the front as our troops surge across the Han River.

This is Dave Brinkley, filling in for your narrator, Bob McCormick, who yesterday left for a first-hand examination of the trouble zones of Europe in behalf of Battle Report—standing by to report to you today. Maj. Gen. Ward H. Maris, Chief of Research and Development for the Army; Adviser to the Secretary of State, John Sherman Cooper, just back from Western Europe; C. Vaughan Ferguson, the State's Department officer in charge of Iranian affairs; Capt. Thomas U. Sisson, commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Leyte*, and the Under Secretary of the Navy, Dan Kimball. Usually on Battle Report in person, but this week with President Truman at Key West, Fla., is Dr. John R. Steelman, helping the President with the work he must carry with him. Today, he reaches you by way of sound-on-film. The Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. During the past few days I have been getting reports upon what the Soviet radio is saying about us and about themselves. It is the same old story every day. The Soviet Union is pictured as a land of plenty, filled with happy, laughing people. The men in the Kremlin have appointed themselves as champions of peace. We, on the other hand, are called warmongers. Our streets are supposed to be filled with starving people, while a small group of so-called rulers live in luxury.

Obviously, the broadcasters make no effort to tell the truth. It cannot be because they do not know the facts, because they are available to all. Free nations do not operate behind an iron curtain.

There can be but one reason why these falsehoods are preached to the gullible people who have been ensnared in the tyrants'

web. It is cowardice. The power-drunk despots in the Kremlin are afraid to tell the truth—they are afraid to let their subjects enjoy the freedom to live their own lives and think their own thoughts.

But history teaches us that men cannot be enslaved forever. In the mind of every man is the desire to seek happiness in his own way. Without freedom he cannot do it. Propaganda is no substitute. Just as sure as the sun rises in the east, some day the poor wretches behind the iron curtain will demand freedom—and they will find freemen everywhere extending them the right hand of good fellowship.

Mr. BRINKLEY. An army may move on its stomach, as someone once said, but how fast and how successfully it moves depends a great deal upon the equipment with which it fights. Guns, tanks, trucks, jeeps, bombs, bazookas, mortars—these and other fighting stuff like them, go a long way toward fixing an army's pace, its fire-power and Sunday punch. Thus, not only in men, but in machines—war machines—must the strength of a nation be measured. Behind the steadily increasing variety of war equipment with which our soldiers are armed—equipment ranked the best in the world—is a story of constant research and the testing of new weapons. To tell us how it looks from the inside, we bring you now the Chief of Research and Development for the Army, Maj. Gen. Ward H. Maris.

Major General MARIS. History abounds with magic and simple recipes for insuring national security or victory in warfare. To one Civil War general, it was just a matter of "gittin' thar fustest with the mostest men." A dozen years ago, it was the Maginot line. Nineteen hundred and forty-five produced "atom-bomb-itis"—the assured conviction that the atom bomb, supplemented by a vast complex of mysterious pushbutton devices, is all that would be needed.

Failure to achieve a quick and easy victory over the Communist armies in Korea has been a severe shock to the adherents of this sublime faith in a single key to victory.

Also, questions have been raised: What is wrong with American weapons and equipment? Has the Army made any improvements?

When World War II ended, there existed a vast supply of the then current weapons and equipment. We know that this material was of proven effectiveness; but we also knew that improvements and revolutionary developments could, and indeed must, be accomplished.

On the recommendation of our scientific advisers, the limited funds available to the Army for research and development were devoted to a balanced plan which included: First, basic research over a period of years to replenish the reservoir of good ideas which had been used up by our wartime agencies, such as the Office of Scientific Research and Development; second, correction of known deficiencies in existing equipment and improvement of its design; third, development of components for completely new facilities of weapons and equipment; and finally, development of unconventional items of warfare, the majority of which were necessarily on a long-term basis because of their complexity and high cost.

From this research and development program, came a steady stream of advances. In many cases models of new items have existed for months. Placing these models into mass production, however, could not be started until money became available with which to pay for them.

Only during the last few months, under the impetus of a shooting war, have we been given funds to start mass production. It is primarily for this reason—rather than lack of research and development—that the Army has been forced to rely largely on World War II material.

I would like nothing better than to be able to give you the details of the hundreds of active research and development projects, but I know you will understand why I can mention only a few.

Antitank weapons: The key here is ammunition, for it is ammunition that kills the tank. With many outstanding developments in this field already or soon to be available, the infantryman, the tanker, and the artilleryman, will have the means to stop and kill any known enemy tank.

Tanks: Here we have developed a family of tanks for all possible missions. After World War II, because of limited funds, development in this costly field was devoted to component parts, such as engines, transmissions, and fire control. The valuable fruits of this decision are now being realized in the greatly superior characteristics and performance of our new tanks. The Walker Bulldog, our new light-gun tank now in production, mounts a gun with greater armor penetration than the 85-millimeter gun of the Russian T34 medium tank. Our new heavy-gun tank incorporates radical innovations in design and will mount a weapon which will destroy any known enemy tank at combat ranges. The first models of our Patton medium-gun tank family have creditably undergone their baptism of fire in Korea. Later models will be much improved.

Here is another payoff in our postwar research program: Now in production for distribution to our combat divisions is a complete new signal communications system, embodying all of the latest advances in the electronics field.

For defense against hostile air, great improvements have been made in fire control which will enable our antiaircraft to engage modern high-speed airplanes.

Further means of increasing our effectiveness against hostile air will be provided by guided missiles, which are being pushed on an all-out basis.

Other guided missiles are also being developed for tactical use by front-line commanders against ground targets.

With no guarantee of pushbutton warfare being around the corner it can be said that gratifying progress is being made in providing powerful and practical atomic weapons for tactical use by the ground forces.

All this effort, of which I have mentioned only a small part, is pointed to just one thing—the best possible support for the combat soldier—the man who finally wins the war.

Mr. BRINKLEY. To remind those of us who need reminding that the defense of freedom in Korea is a joint enterprise which we carry on with our UN allies, here are scenes of a British brigade in action somewhere along the Korean front. Fighting side by side with Turk mountain fighters, Greek Evizones, Aussies and Anzacs from Australia and New Zealand, they are daily throwing themselves into battle with the same courage that marked their victories in World War II.

Far from the sound of battle, however—though very much related to it—are the talks of the Big Four deputies that continue in Paris. It is from the Europe with which they are primarily concerned—Western Europe—that our next guest has but recently returned. Here to report to you on what he saw and heard there is the former Senator from Kentucky and former United States delegate to the U. N., John Sherman Cooper, consultant to the Secretary of State.

Mr. COOPER. A great debate is now taking place in the Nation and in Congress upon the question of sending additional troops to Europe. It may be a debate much larger than that single issue—it may decide how important we think the defense of Western Europe is to the defense of the United States.

I am sure that the opposition to sending troops to Europe is based upon the fear that our partners in the North Atlantic Treaty organization will not do their full share in the defense of Western Europe, or, as it has been bluntly said, they do not possess the will to fight. It is to these ends that I want to talk briefly, basing my remarks and conclusions upon my observations and conversations with many people upon a recent trip to Western Europe. Twice last year upon returning from Europe I had to report that, in my opinion, the efforts that were being made by our partners were inadequate and timorous and led to the conclusion that they did not have confidence that Western Europe could be defended.

At the conclusion of this trip I was happy to report that you could see there a growing determination and effort, which could lead into adequate defense for Europe. You may ask me for my facts upon which I base that conclusion. First, I am certain that the governments of Europe have made a decision that Europe can be defended and that their countries must participate fully in that defense. A year ago that was not true—they still believed then that it was possible to carry on their domestic programs without diminutions. Today, as our country has made the decision, their governments have made the decision that defense is prior.

Second, they are taking action to carry that decision into effect in terms of money, men, and production. In the United Kingdom the defense budget has been increased three times since Korea; in France by 50 percent, and in Italy by 50 percent. In all of those countries and in all the countries in Europe forces are being increased, are being trained, and are being equipped. Production is not yet enough, but at least in the United Kingdom an adequate program is under way. Most important, it is easy to note there the growing confidence of the people of Europe that Europe must be defended, that it can be defended, and that they must support the efforts of their government.

I would like to say this—that the indispensable element in the building of a defense in Western Europe is the confidence of the people that it can be built, and the requisite of that confidence, the most important requisite, is their belief that the United States will participate fully in that defense, not only in the air or on the sea but also upon the ground. Unless that effort is made, it is possible that this movement which is now taking place and growing in Europe could and would fail.

Mr. BRINKLEY. In Iran—so recently jubilant over the wedding of their Shah Mohammed Pahlevi—this has been a week of sorry bloodshed. Premier Ali Razamara, friend of the west, was brutally assassinated, and only the day before yesterday, leaflets threatening the life of the Shah himself were distributed throughout Teheran, as crowds of leftist peace-partisans—apparently Communist inspired—demonstrated before the United States Embassy with cries of "Death to MacArthur."

As a tanker refuels a naval vessel on the Mediterranean with Iranian oil, facts now begin to reveal that behind the trouble lies the question of the nationalization of the British-owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which controls oil resources vital to the west and coveted by Russia. For a full report on this situation, we turn now to the State Department's officer in charge of Iranian affairs, C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr.

Mr. FERGUSON. One morning last week the Premier of Iran or Persia entered the courtyard of a mosque in Tehran to attend a funeral service. According to the Koran—

the Mohammedan Bible—a mosque is a sacred ground and sanctuary from all acts of violence. But as the crowd closed in behind the Premier, a young man rushed forward, whipped a pistol from his coat, and fired point blank at Premier Ali Razmara. The Premier, a friend of the United States, was killed instantly. The murderer was a fanatic, with no Communist connections. There have been some demonstrations and signs of unrest. The situation is serious, but the Persians have been in trouble before.

A glance at the map shows why Iran is always in the thick of trouble. The country is a triangular area wedged in between the Arabian peninsula, southern Asia, and Russia on the north. It is almost two and a half times the size of the State of Texas. It has a thousand-mile border along the iron curtain. It lies across the ancient land and sea routes from Europe to the Far East. It possesses some of the world's richest oil fields.

During the last war Iran was occupied by Russia, British and American supply troops came in later. Billions of dollars of war equipment were shipped into Russia via Iran. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin held an important conference in Tehran, the capital of Iran, in 1943.

After the war the Russians refused to live up to their agreements and leave the country. They established an independent regime in Azerbaijan, the rich northwestern province along the Russian border. Iranian officials were arrested. Landowners were killed. Banks were nationalized. However, Iranians do not scare easily. They have been fighting the Russians off and on for 200 years. They appealed for help to the United Nations. World opinion rallied behind the UN. Iran ordered her troops into the northern provinces. Russia backed down. Since then Iran has turned more and more to the United States for help.

In 1949 the Shah paid a formal visit to the United States. Recently most of our newspapers carried pictures and stories of the Shah's wedding. On Wednesday the Premier was assassinated. The Shah immediately appointed one of his elder advisers as Acting Premier. He and the Shah face many problems. First, of course, are the Russians. In recent months the Russians have changed their policy toward Iran. They have ceased their efforts at intimidation. They profess to be friendly to the Iranians.

Second, Iran is trying to raise the living standards of its people. The country is potentially rich but underdeveloped. The United States is helping with this development program. The first point 4 program in the world was signed with Iran. We have extended loans for agricultural development and road building. We have sent military aid. We have offered to provide technicians and to train Iranian students in our own schools and colleges. We will continue to support the Shah and his Government in every practical way.

Much depends on the people of Iran. They are hard working; they are individuals; they abhor the Communist doctrine; they have been invaded many times since the days of Cyrus the Great. But they have never been subjugated. We are fortunate in having such freedom-loving people on the front line of the non-Communist world.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Norfolk, Va., where the Navy takes out of mothballs and puts into service again another 45,000 tons of sea power—the U. S. S. *Wisconsin*. In retirement since 1948 and the third battleship of its class now in operation, the *Wisconsin* will soon stand ready to add its weight to the enviable record the Navy is blasting almost daily off the Korean shore. Here, as seen by our cameramen, is the Navy in thundering action there.

First carrier back from Korean waters is the famed U. S. S. *Leyte*, shown arriving at San Diego. To tell you of her dramatic dash from the Mediterranean in time for the battle of the Yalu River—as well as something of her other engagements—we focus our cameras now on the *Leyte's* commander, Capt. Thomas U. Sisson.

Captain SISSON. In April of last year it was my privilege to be ordered as commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Leyte*. Shortly afterward we sailed for the Mediterranean. Our air group of over 80 planes consisted of Grumman Panther jet fighters, Vought Corsair fighters, and Douglas Skyraider dive bombers.

We continued intensive training to bring ourselves to maximum combat readiness.

We were in Italy when the Korean War began. We then visited France, Greece, and Turkey and saw first-hand the depressing effect the early Korean reverses had upon the morale of those countries.

Another carrier relieved us while at Beirut, Lebanon, and we received dispatch orders to proceed at best speed to Korea. The 18,500 miles from the eastern end of the Mediterranean through the Panama Canal to Korea were covered at an average speed of 23 knots. This is a record sustained high-speed run for any ship. We arrived in Korea shortly after the Inchon landing. Our air group then aided in covering the advance to the Yalu, bombed the Yalu River bridges, covered the marines in their magnificent fighting from Chosin Reservoir to the sea at Hungnam and continued to cover the Army in their resistance to the Chinese invaders through the beginning of the present skillful offensive.

Although we in the *Leyte* are glad that it is our turn to come home, we feel the important thing is to win the war in Korea, as everything we hold sacred is at stake there. We feel that we are winning that bitter war by the spirit and determination of the men in the fighting, and we know their spirit will be matched by equal determination at home not to yield. We must give them the moral and material support they need to finish the war quickly. It can be done. We do not want the sacrifice of the four fine officers that our Air Group lost to have been made in vain, and I want to pay tribute to them now. Lt. Cmdr. Ralph M. Bagwell, of South Carolina, shot down and captured; Lt. (Junior grade) Ronald R. Batson, of New Jersey, shot down and missing; Ensign Jesse L. Brown, of Mississippi; and Ensign George W. Wagner, of Indiana, both killed in action. I am happy to state that we lost no enlisted men in the Korean operation.

The military lesson in Korea is a reemphasis on the importance of balanced forces working together, the kind of unity that is provided only by the will to work together to a common worthy end. The *Leyte* is proud to have been able to come from the Mediterranean on the other side of the world and contribute her share in that effort.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Here with some more pertinent facts on the *Leyte*, as well as an announcement of importance concerning a new and exciting series on the Navy you'll be seeing on NBC television in the future, is the Under Secretary of the Navy, Dan A. Kimball.

Mr. KIMBALL. I'm glad to have the opportunity to add a line or two to the *Leyte* story. Captain Sisson has spoken with the usual modesty which I have come to regard as the characteristic of the professional naval officer. There are some additional facts which I think you all should know.

During 4 months in Korean waters, the *Leyte* was in port only 2 weeks. Of the time she spent at sea, there were only 4 days when the *Leyte* did not conduct combat operations. During the combat period, there were more than 4,000 operational take-offs from her flight deck. These figures, and the pictures you have just seen, speak for themselves.

Leyte was but one of the vessels flying the flags of United Nations members in Korean waters. These ships are engaged in a great combined naval operation in support of the free world's resistance to Communist aggression and expansion. On the sea, just as on the land, the United Nations defense is a united effort.

Daily in Korea, just as they did during the Second World War, combat photographers risk their lives to bring to the American public action pictures such as you have seen this afternoon. In the months to come, the television audience is going to have an unparalleled chance to see a great documentary presentation of combat films made of naval operations during the second-war period.

The Navy is happy to cooperate with NBC in the preparation of this naval history. Navy and NBC technicians are preparing to screen literally hundreds of thousands of feet of Navy and Marine Corps combat film to pick out the very best for incorporation into this series. Much of our film for various reasons, including security, has never before been shown.

I want to commend the National Broadcasting Co., on behalf of the Navy, for the enterprise they have shown in planning this series.

Peace in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have before me one of the major addresses of recent times made by a distinguished spokesman on American foreign policy. I refer to an address delivered by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, in Los Angeles, Calif., last Saturday, March 31, at the fiftieth anniversary dinner of Whittier College.

Mr. Dulles addressed himself to one of the major issues coming up in the near future—the peace treaty with the Japanese Government. No man who has reviewed the tremendous economic, political, and social problems tied up with that treaty, for example, the single issue of reparations alone, can fail to appreciate the tremendous primary job which has been done by our former colleague in the Senate, Mr. Dulles. I believe that the features which he indicated he feels should be in the treaty will be of interest to my colleagues, and so I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to Whittier College for giving me this opportunity to make a progress report on Peace in the Pacific. That subject is, I suppose, of particular interest to

Americans who live on our west coast. Actually, peace in the Pacific is equally important to all of us, for danger and effort can no longer be localized.

Two principal postwar goals of the Soviet Communists are Japan and Germany. If Russia's rulers could exploit the industrial and human potential of either Japan or Germany, it would be a sad day for peace. That would involve such a shift in the balance of world power that these new imperialists might calculate that they could start a general war with good prospect of success. They know that Japan, even alone, was able seriously to menace the free world in the Pacific and they imagine vast possibilities out of a combination, under their direction, of the Asiatic power of Russia, China, and Japan.

Fortunately, the Japanese people do not want that combination, which would make them the front line of a new aggression which in the end would mean disaster far greater than that which they have already suffered. They are in a mood to reject militarism in all of its aspects, and they want fellowship with the nations which genuinely seek peace through collective security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations. Thus there is the opportunity to make a Japanese peace which will not only end the old war, but give new strength and hope to those who strive to prevent another war.

To achieve that kind of peace is the President's mandate to the Mission which I have the honor to head and President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Secretary Marshall are each of them giving this effort their close personal attention, to the end that this great goal shall be achieved.

Since our mission was established last January we have had a busy time. All or some of us have been to Japan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and England. We have consulted in Washington with ambassadors of other nations and also with the many in the executive and legislative branches of our Government whose wisdom, judgment, and special knowledge can be helpful. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, its Far Eastern Subcommittee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House have extended the utmost cooperation. As a result of all this we have seen the possibility of formulating peace terms which should command general support here at home, which should involve no insoluble differences with our allies, and which should be acceptable to Japan, which we consider has now earned the right to be consulted.

So, this week, we have begun to discuss, with our allies principally concerned in the Pacific war, actual texts which might be incorporated in an eventual treaty. These texts are still working papers, tentative and suggestive only.

We contemplate a simple document, limited to the essentials of peace.

PREAMBLE

Our present thought is to have a preamble to the treaty which would afford the Japanese people the opportunity to express their intentions as to matters which are important, but which for one reason or another do not lend themselves to absolute contractual undertakings.

For example, Japan might indicate its intention to apply for membership in the United Nations. There is no doubt about the reality of that intention, but we think that Japan's application for membership, when it comes, should bear the unmistakable imprint of Japan's own desire, without the slightest taint of external compulsion. Similarly, the Japanese may want to express their intention to carry forward the new ideals as to human rights and like matters which are largely embodied in Japanese legislation under the occupation and which are the subject of the United Nationals Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They may want to declare their intention, in public and private trade and commerce, to conform to internationally accepted fair practices.

Japan's intentions in these respects are vitally important and go to the heart of our future relations. But except as these matters have already been spelled out in international conventions which Japan could and would adopt, they do not lend themselves to peace treaty obligations, which should only be such as can be precisely formulated so that the parties wil clearly know just what are their right and duties.

TERRITORY

The treaty proper would prescribe the territory over which the Japanese will hereafter be sovereign. It is contemplated, generally speaking, that Japan's sovereignty should be limited in accordance with the agreed surrender terms. That would mean sovereignty over the 4 home islands and minor adjacent islands. There would be a renunciation by Japan of all rights, titles, and claims to Korea, Formosa, the Pescadores and the Antarctic area. Also the treaty might contemplate that in the Ryukyu and Bonin Islands there could be United Nations trusteeship and continuing United States administrative responsibility.

The South Sakhalin and Kurile Islands were allotted to Russia at Yalta and are actually in Russian possession. Any peace treaty validation of Russia's title should, we suggest, be dependent upon Russia's becoming a party to that treaty.

SECURITY

The security of Japan itself should, we think, be worked out through individual and collective self-defense arrangements authorized by the United Nations Charter. Thus the peace treaty itself need only affirm that, upon the coming into force of the peace, Japan would in fact possess what the Charter of the United Nations refers to as the inherent right of sovereign nations in these respects.

COMMERCIAL

As regards commercial arrangements, we do not think that the treaty of peace should itself attempt to define what should be the future permanent relations between the Allies and Japan. These might better be left for subsequent negotiation between a free Japan and other friendly nations. However, to prevent confusion and to minimize discrimination immediately following the coming into force of the treaty, Japan might, for such a period as 3 years, agree to accord most-favored-nation treatment to the Allied Powers, except that Japan would not, in any matter, be required to extend more favorable treatment than is accorded it. Similarly, as regards civil air-traffic rights, Japan might for 3 years, and pending the conclusion of civil air-transport agreements, grant the Allied Powers not less favorable conditions than those prevailing at the time of the coming into force of the treaty.

PROPERTY AND CLAIMS

With respect to property and claims, the treaty of peace might give the Allied Powers the right generally to vest, retain, and dispose of Japanese property within their territory, while Japan should return prewar allied property in Japan and validate prewar claims belonging to Allied Powers and their nationals.

The foregoing matters can, we believe, now be dealt with with considerable precision. There are others which are still subject to exploration and development.

JAPAN'S SECURITY

Since Japan is now thoroughly disarmed and materially and legally unable now to maintain armed forces, there is need for provisional security measures. Accordingly, with the authority of the President, and following conversations with committees of Congress, I stated publicly in Japan that, if the Japanese wanted it, the United States would sympathetically consider the retention of United States Armed Forces in and about Japan, so that the coming into force of a treaty of peace would not leave Japan a vacuum of power and, as such, an easy prey to such aggression as has already shown itself in nearby Korea. This suggestion of mine was warmly welcomed by the Japanese Government and the people generally, so that it is now in order to study the implementation of such an arrangement.

Since Japan is an island, its security is strongly influenced by sea and air power, power which the United States is in a position to exercise in the Pacific. The defense of Japan need not require, either now from the United States or ultimately from Japan, as large ground forces as might be thought to be necessary if Japan had common land boundaries with militaristic powers.

PACIFIC SECURITY

Bound up with the problem of Japan's security is the broader problem of security in the Pacific. Japan should hereafter make some contribution of its own to security, but this should never be the pretext for militarism that could be an aggressive threat. Thus, the problem has a dual aspect.

No nation able to make a dependable contribution to security should get a free ride. In our Senate the Vandenberg resolution has laid down, for the United States, the basic proposition that collective security arrangements should be based upon "continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid." The United Nations Charter also establishes that all peace-loving states should stand ready to contribute armed forces, assistance, and facilities for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. That is one aspect of the problem. The other side of the problem is that Japan should never again develop armament which could be an offensive threat or serve other than to promote peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The peace we seek is one which will for all time liberate Japan's neighbors and indeed the Japanese people from the nightmare of militarism.

When we were in Canberra, Australia, our mission had significant discussions on this subject with the Governments of Australia and New Zealand. They made convincingly clear the attitude of their peoples on this subject. Now we are working actively to find the ways to secure the desired results.

We believe that out of our discussions, which are now well advanced, there will emerge a series of arrangements which on the one hand will enable the Japanese to make their own indispensable contribution to preventing their nation's being forced into the service of the new imperialism that ominously threatens from the mainland, and which on the other hand will effectively assure that there will be no unbridled rearmament which could become an offensive threat.

The United States is able, and daily growing more able, to exert a mighty influence for peace and to make peace in the Pacific more secure than it has ever been before. We can see the way to remove the pall of fear which results from Japan's past conduct and from the present Communist menace. But that is not a task which we would or should undertake single-handed and alone. In the Pacific, as elsewhere, security is a cooperative enterprise. Those who wish to cooperate for security can share the protection of immense deterrent power which, in the words of the United Nations Charter, "shall not be used; save in the common interest."

Since the arrangements for peace and security in the Pacific will in part be outside of the peace treaty and since the whole problem is not yet fully explored, we consider that any presently suggested treaty provisions are to be supplemented in the light of the outcome of the promising exchanges of views which are now taking place, and to which we attach the utmost importance. No one should assume that the United States takes this problem lightly or that we shall accept a solution that will be illusory.

REPARATIONS

As regards reparations, the United States does not question the inherent justice of the proposition that Japan should make good the damage done to others by its aggression. Reparation is, however, not merely a matter of what is just, but of what is economically practicable, without disastrous consequences. We have closely examined this problem. Considerable industrial machinery has already been removed from Japan and given to countries having reparation claims. Also, there is substantial Japanese property within allied countries which, as indicated, should be applicable to the satisfaction of claims. It is, however, not easy to see the possibility of Japan's providing future reparation out of her remaining capital assets or as a surplus from her current economic activity over coming years.

One of the gravest problems which confronts Japan, and it equally concerns the reparation creditors, is whether Japan, deprived of its formerly-owned sources of raw material and with a population of eighty-five million on four relatively small and barren islands, can maintain the standard of living and employment necessary to prevent widespread social unrest. This, if it occurred, would inevitably give rise to dangerous expansionist and explosive tendencies, which Japan's Communist neighbors would joyously exploit.

The United States, to prevent social and economic unrest within Japan since the occupation began, has advanced about $2,000,000,000 for relief and economic assistance. That is a realistic measure of how seriously the United States views this problem and its responsibility as principal occupying power. However, the United States is not prepared, after the occupation ends, to continue indefinitely such economic relief. Neither is it willing in effect to pay Japanese reparations by putting into Japan what reparation creditors would take out. The United States considers indeed that its postwar advances have a certain priority status.

We doubt that it is practicable to get the essential over-all and long-range results which are sought if the treaty also seeks to extract reparation payments other than in terms of the Japanese assets already received from Japan or within the territory of the Allied Powers. However, the United States has not closed its mind on this subject, and it is, with an open mind, actively exchanging views with countries which were most grievously damaged by Japanese aggression.

ECONOMIC DISABILITIES

Some suggestions have been made as to imposing upon the Japanese economic disabilities, as, for example, requiring a dismantling of a part of Japan's industrial plant, particularly her shipbuilding capacity. As experience in Germany has shown, such provisions cannot be carried out without arousing great public bitterness. If the peace treaty required the first postwar Japanese Government physically to decimate Japan's industrial equipment, it would impose an almost inhuman burden, and the consequences would almost surely be against the best interests of the Allied Powers.

FISHERIES

It has been suggested, particularly along the Pacific coast, that the treaty of peace might itself attempt permanently to regulate the problem of Japanese participation in high-seas fisheries. To attempt that would almost surely postpone indefinitely both the conclusion of peace and the obtaining of the results which are desired.

There is, I believe, a considerable possibility of agreement between the United States and Japanese fishing interests. However, the treaty of peace is not a treaty merely between the United States and Japan; it is a treaty which we hope will be signed by all of the 53 Allies. Most of these nations have their own fishing problems and their own theories of solution, which differ widely. No quick results can be won by attempting to make the peace treaty into a universal convention on high-seas fishing.

When I was in Japan, the Prime Minister advised me that the Japanese Government stood ready to negotiate fisheries agreements as soon as peace restores to Japan the possibility of independent sovereign action. He said that in the meantime the Japanese Government would prohibit Japanese nationals and Japanese vessels from going into conserved fisheries in all waters, and he mentioned specifically those off the coasts of the United States, Canada, and Alaska.

The Japanese now see the importance of avoiding practices which in the past brought Japan much ill will, and if we can hold to our tentative timetable, there can, I believe, be an early and equitable settlement of this thorny problem.

A PEACE OF RECONCILIATION

From the foregoing it can be seen that the Japanese peace settlement we seek, while it would confirm the cut-back of Japan's territory to her home islands, would contemplate that Japan would be a sovereign and sustaining member of the free world. She would contribute in due course to collective security in accordance with her means, but without developing armament which could be an offensive threat. Also, from an economic standpoint, Japan would be expected to get along without such subsidies as the United States has been providing during the occupation. On the other hand, Japan would be restored to a position of equality, free of burdensome and discriminatory conditions. In essence, the peace would be one of reconciliation.

That is not the kind of a peace which victors usually grant to a vanquished nation which has committed armed aggression on a vast scale. It is not surprising that some, made bitter and distrusting by Japan's past conduct, would like to impose upon Japan continuing burdens and restrictions. Some of these, taken separately, seem to have justification and perhaps no one of them alone would be of decisive historical significance. In the aggregate, however, they would fundamentally change the character of the peace settlement.

The major objective of any Japanese peace treaty is to bring the Japanese people hereafter to live with others as good neighbors. That does not require that the Japanese people should be pampered. It does mean that the victors should not take advantage of Japan's present helpless state to impose, for the future, unequal condition. It means that the peace settlement should restore the vanquished to a position of dignity and equality among the nations.

The peace would be a peace of trust, not because the past justifies trust, but because the act of extending trust usually evokes an effort to merit trust. It would be a peace of opportunity, in that it would afford the Japanese people the same opportunity to develop peacefully their domestic economy and their international relations as are enjoyed by most of the other free nations of the world.

UNITED STATES RESPONSIBILITY

In proposing that kind of a peace, the United States assumes a serious responsibility, for the results cannot be guaranteed. We have, however, a duty to exercise our best judgment as to the kind of peace which will endure. Circumstances have made our duty inescapable.

In the great war in the Pacific, we had valiant allies who, through long, hard years, poured out life and treasure according to their means. But the United States possessed most of the means required for victory in the Pacific. The United States has carried the responsibility of occupation, and the accomplishments of General MacArthur as Supreme Commander represent a moral investment to which his countrymen cannot honorably be indifferent. The United States has contributed the economic aid which has prevented the post-war misery which would have exposed Japan to capture by communism. The United States is the member of the free world which possesses large present and prospective military power in the western Pacific, and today we are the principal contributor to the United Nations effort in Korea, which fends off danger to Japan, to our Pacific allies, as well as to ourselves.

These are some of the circumstances which require the United States to exercise an initiative for peace; to do so while there is still time, and to shape that initiative with all of the wisdom and all of the vision that is available. For a misjudgment as to timing or as to substance, can bring incalculable disaster to all mankind.

The United States does not consider that it has any monopoly of responsibility, nor any monopoly of experience, wisdom and enlightenment that are required. We have no desire to "go it alone" nor have we the slightest thought of dictating. We continuously have sought and shall seek the views of others and, indeed, our present suggestions are a composite, not deriving from any single source. They reflect the ideas of many, and the United Kingdom and Australia are two important sources of mutual language that we accept. However, in the last analysis, the United States cannot, in justice to our own people, or indeed to others, become cosponsor of a peace settlement which in our judgment, made after ample consideration without arrogance and in humbleness of spirit, would throw unnecessary and intolerable burdens of a military or economic character upon the United States, and jeopardize the lasting peace that the war was fought to win.

NO VETO

Happily, the exchange of views which have taken place have, with one exception, been altogether cordial and no basic disagreements have developed. The Government of the Soviet Union is, perhaps, an exception. For three months its representative joined with us in full and frank discussions. But now that a peace treaty with Japan seems actually to be in the offing, the Soviet leaders seem to have taken fright. The Soviet government has publicly announced that it will not resume discussions with us.

When peace is far off, the Russian leaders speak lovingly of peace. But when peace comes near, they shun peace like the plague.

We continue to hope that the Soviet leaders will join in a treaty of peace which would cost them nothing and which would start a relaxing of tensions which would be felt all around the globe. We are ready to give scrupulously fair consideration to any views they may express. We shall gladly urge that they join in the Japanese peace.

Fortunately, however, Soviet participation is not indispensable. The Soviet Union has no legal power to veto. It has no moral due-bills, for its vast takings in Manchuria, Port Arthur, Dairen, Sakhalin, and the

Kuriles repay it a thousandfold for its 6 days of nominal belligerency. Japan, unlike Germany and Austria, is not divided by zones of occupation.

In relation to Japan there is the opportunity to show which of the Allies of World War II now have the genuine will for peace. There is the opportunity for them to make a peace so righteous that the example will hearten and uplift men everywhere. That is the opportunity; and to its challenge we are determined worthily to respond.

Memorandum on Acceleration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the memorandum on acceleration prepared by President A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale University; also President Griswold's lead article in the current Atlantic Monthly, dealing with the same subject.

I should like to point out the special emphasis which Dr. Griswold puts on the need for political and cultural leaders, as well as military leaders, engineers, doctors and other scientifically trained personnel. He is wholly right in stressing that the defense effort is as much political and cultural as it is military, and I am pleased that he has seen fit to quote General Bradley in this area, an area in which I have personally been greatly interested over a long period of years. Dr. Griswold sounds an important warning when he stresses that "high standards and fundamental values should not be sacrificed, but invoked and applied more vigorously than ever in all fields of learning".

Mr. President, I commend these important papers to the Congress and to the administrative officers in the Defense Department and elsewhere who are now responsible for the development of policies on our manpower and its most productive utilization for the long term as well as the short term interests of the American people.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately three pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $246.

There being no objection, the memorandum and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON ACCELERATION

(By A. Whitney Griswold, president, Yale University)

I. BASIC ASSUMPTION

A prolonged period of warfare with ever-present danger of global war, creating exceptional demands for trained manpower of all kinds and requiring a sustained effort to meet those demands.

II. OBJECTIVES

1. Engineers, doctors, and other scientifically trained personnel sufficient in number and quality to satisfy both our civilian and our military needs.

2. Political, cultural, and military leaders sufficient in number and quality to ensure the success of our defense effort and the continued progress of our civilization.

3. This twofold objective is implicit in a defense effort which is as much political and cultural as it is military, and of which General Bradley recently said, "Fundamentally, the United States is competing at this time for the hearts and minds of men in Europe and Asia." If this effort is to succeed we must give the fullest possible scope and the most effective possible representation to our free culture and our free society.

III. MEANS

1. The principal means of accomplishing these objectives is higher education; hence our colleges and universities have an essential mission to perform in the national interest—

(a) They must carry on the scientific research that may hold our security and our lives in the balance.

(b) They must maintain the flow of doctors, engineers, scientists, and officers essential to the Armed Forces.

(c) They must plant the seeds of higher education for a free society in the minds of young men at whatever time and in whatever circumstances the colleges may have them in their charge.[1]

2. These considerations call for the most effective possible utilization of our higher educational resources. High standards and fundamental values should not be sacrificed but invoked and applied more vigorously than ever in all fields of learning.

IV. METHODS

1. To accommodate both groups of students, that is, (a) those who elect to take a year of college before military service, then return to college; and, (b) those who prefer to render their military service before entering college, some form of acceleration is indicated. Young men having to budget 4 years for college plus 2 or 3 to military service before entering upon (or, in the case of professional candidates, even beginning to prepare for) their chosen careers, should be given the opportunity to shorten the duration of their studies and apprenticeship commensurately (a) with the educational standards cited above, and (b) with their own ability.

2. Acceleration in the form of a continuous cycle of 48-week academic years consisting of three 16-week terms each (permitting four normal academic years to be crammed into 28 months) is not consistent with the above standards and does not serve the essential purposes set forth in this memorandum. We tried this scheme in the last war and found it a failure. It exhausted the faculty and fed the students knowledge faster than they could absorb it. It resulted in an all around lowering of standards and cheapening of products. Education, particularly at the college level, is as much a process of maturing as it is of learning. Centuries of experience have proved that this process, applied to the basic arts and sciences of our liberal-arts curriculum, cannot be hurried. A bachelor of arts awarded for four normal academic years crammed into 28 months is a bachelor of arts awarded for quantitative achievement or servitude. It is like awarding a prize to the artist who paints the most pictures instead of the artist who paints the best.

Periodic breaks in the routine of teaching and learning are absolutely essential to both teacher and student. The teacher needs freedom from the classroom to carry on the research and writing that sustain his teaching. The student needs the same freedom to digest what he has absorbed in lectures and discussions; to do the independent work essential to the learning process; to perform the outside labors that—in an ever increasing majority of cases—help pay his way through college; to recruit his intellectual energies. These breaks in routine are as vital to the educational process as any other integral part of it.

3. The only kind of acceleration consistent with the standards, purposes, and conception of the national interest herein set forth is acceleration in the sense of economy, discipline, and qualitative improvements. Both the example of British and European secondary schools and the experience of our own colleges and universities indicate the 8 years consumed in secondary school and college might be reduced to 7 without impairing standards. Acceleration in this form calls for—

(1) Elimination of waste motion all along the line.

(2) Strengthening the secondary-school curricula in both substance and discipline.

(3) Eliminating redundancy, jargon, "gut courses," and excessive extra-curricular activities from the colleges.

V. CONCLUSION

1. As things stand a college student normally spends 44 months (from October of his freshman year to June of his senior year) in acquiring a bachelor of arts or equivalent degree.

2. If the above procedures were set in motion this period could be reduced to 32 months, as follows:

(a) three normal academic years of two 16-week (approximate) semesters each plus.

(b) 2 summer terms (at the end of freshman and sophomore years, respectively) of 8 weeks each, with the possible addition of an optional 8-week summer term for entering freshmen.[2]

3. The 8-week summer terms should be used for intensive work in such subjects (e. g. foreign languages, elementary mathematics[3]) as—

(a) Lend themselves to intensive treatment; and

(b) Afford a contrast with the regular term's work.

4. Acceleration of this type would result in educational improvements of immediate benefits to our defense effort and of lasting value to our society.

[From the Atlantic Monthly]

SURVIVAL IS NOT ENOUGH

(By Whitney Griswold)

I

Communist aggression in Asia has scored one tactical success not commonly recognized as such. It has struck a body blow at American higher education. Barely recovered from the disruptions of the Second World War, our colleges and universities are once more called upon to sacrifice their students, faculties, and curricula to military necessity. No one knows how great these sacrifices may be: The colleges may be confronted with the worst financial crisis in their history. If the lives of many private institutions be threatened, our public institutions will suffer and our whole educational system will be the poorer. If the long-run objective of communism is to destroy our free society at its source, the farther we go toward stripping our colleges of students, dismissing their teachers, and accelerating their curricula, the nearer the Communists will have got to achieving that objective.

Such desperate measures can be justified in the name of national survival. We will fight to survive, and we will fight before our backs are to the wall, for our security and our principles. All this is clear in our history, our character, and our present actions. Our college students and professors share this destiny with their countrymen in every walk of life. They could not escape it if they wished to, and they do not wish to. But they have a mission in society, and the question is how much of that mission they can sacrifice without again losing the peace and perhaps even losing the war.

In the emergency, we talk of college education as a nonessential and an expendable. While we lavish our ingenuity and resources on the weapons of war, we neglect and even handicap the men who will use them. This is a high price to pay for survival. And what price survival if we become a headless monster?

Our colleges and universities are not ivory towers. They are wellsprings of humanistic and scientific learning and of the spirit that puts that learning to use in the cause of freedom. Their long-run value to our arts and sciences, to our whole ideal of a free society and a free culture, is hardly open to question.

And in the emergency? Never in the whole history of warfare has the strength of armies depended to such on their soldiers—especially their officers—articles of faith as it does today. What else has transformed the sleeping peasantry of Russia and China into great military machines? What has muffled the Voice of America and inhibited our efforts to preserve world peace, but the impression we have given other people that, for all our wealth, generosity, and efficiency, we are "light half-believers in our casual creeds"? Cromwell's maxim, in obedience to which he made himself one of the world's great military geniuses, should be engraved on the walls of the Pentagon: "I had rather have a plain russet-coated captain who knows what he fights for and loves what he knows than what you call 'a gentleman' and is nothing else." The greatest source—greater than any other in our society and greater than all others put together—of American captains who know what they fight for and love what they know is our colleges and universities. The greatest, indeed, the exclusive, source of scientific learning and personnel necessary to sustain those captains in modern warfare is our colleges and universities. We tamper with that source at our peril. There is more identity between our long-run cultural interests and our short-run military interest than there is conflict.

II

How short will the run be? Local Korean wars may continue indefinitely. The first frightful spasm of global war may resolve itself into an interminable war of the worlds. This is not a situation we can dispose of by dropping everything for the duration and picking up where we left off, as though we were knocking off for lunch. The only safe assumption is a long pull, and the only proper goal at the end of it is victory, not survival. We seek neither triumph nor conquest but a fulfillment of the moral purposes that moved us to make the effort in the first place. This must be a sustained effort. It cannot even begin if it counts the days and gambles on the duration. The very nature of the effort places the highest premium we have ever placed on our educational system. It rules out education as usual, not for the reasons usually given, but because education as usual is not good enough. It calls on us to educate not fewer citizens but more, not less well but better.

This is the greatest irony of all: That the circumstances calling for the greatest educational effort in our history should be so hostile to that effort. Just 3 years ago, President Truman's Commission on Higher Education, declaring that "the future of our civilization depends on the direction education takes, not just in the distant future, but in the days immediately ahead," fixed our goal at a college population of 4,600,000 by 1960. This would have meant 2,500,000 men and women enrolled in the thirteenth and fourteenth grades, 1,500,000 in the fifteenth and sixteenth, and 600,000 above the sixteenth. Based on an inventory of our needs, resources, and native ability as reflected in Army general classification tests, this figure was given as the minimum necessary to fulfill our social ideals and maintain our economic and cultural progress. In addition to this quantitative responsibility, the commission charged our colleges and universities with qualitative improvements of all kinds, particularly those which will make clear the ethical values and the concept of human relations upon which our political system rests.

The report of the commission makes wistful reading today. Out of a total college population of around 2,300,000, we now have about 1,600,000 men in our colleges and universities—grades 13 through 16. Of these we expect to graduate approximately 380,000 this June. As these words are written, we are debating a military service law that would reduce the total male enrollment to 950,000 next year, 665,000 the year after, and 643,000 in 1954–55. If the law should be enacted, our graduating classes would drop proportionately from 380,000 this year to 81,000 in 1955. If the ratio of college men to women that obtained in 1940 be applied to the Truman Commission's goal, it would give us a total male enrollment (grades 13 through 16) in 1960 of 2,400,000. The total predicted for 1960 if the present bill is passed is 732,000. The needs of our society are to this measure as 24 is to 7.

In the long run, if this ratio is maintained, it means a staggering setback to our cultural development—to our arts, our sciences, and our polity. Among the tables published by the Truman Commission there is a column of figures entitled "Lost Leadership." The figures represent the men and women who have the capacity for higher education, and from whom our society urgently needs the benefits of higher education, yet who, for one reason or another, do not receive it. In 1947 the commission put our wastage of these precious human resources at 2,283,000, a figure it expected to decline to 1,296,000 by 1960 if prevailing trends continued, and to zero, or thereabouts, if the commission's recommendations were put into practice.

Think of the wastage if we pursue our present plans. And think of the consequences. We are not, at the moment, producing enough doctors for the Armed Forces or enough engineers for industry. Yet in Russia, if we can credit the evidence offered by the director of the office of scientific personnel of the National Research Council in his recent testimony to the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness, medical, scientific, and technological institutes are full and their enrollment is increasing. The same is true of the Russian pedagogical institutions, where the Soviet version of knowledge is propounded. From 1943 to 1946 Russia is said to have graduated 150,000 engineers and 350,000 engineering assistants of the technical institute grade, and these numbers are on the increase; while our own estimated total for the next 5 years is only 118,000. Numbers deceive, and Russian statistics are unreliable. We have Allied engineers to swell our total, while Russia must provide for her satellites. Russia's pedagogical institutes can be outmatched by an honest—and a thriving—program of the liberal arts. An army which knows that its leaders dare to trust it with the truth holds an advantage for which no dialectical substitute has yet been found. But this is not the point. The point is that the Communist dictatorship, the military colossus now threatening to bestride the world, appears to be making use of higher education as a strategic asset, while the democratic leader of the free world does not.

III

What can be done to redress the balance in our favor? So many plans, involving such complicated arithmetic, have been proposed to Congress that it is impossible to predict which one, or which combination, will prevail. All fall and most of the winter these plans have kept our colleges in confusion and students in suspense. At the moment of writing, the debate between the advocates of an 18-year and a 19-year draft seems to be heading for the compromise of an 18½-year draft, a compromise that makes little sense save as a compromise.

As indicated by other nations' military service laws, it seems universally accepted that the best fighting years of a man's life come between the ages of 18 and 26; and, as indicated by the ages of our outstanding amateur and professional athletes, splitting the difference by 6 months one way or the other is specious. One thing seems certain. Before these words appear in print we shall have adopted a policy—whether universal military service and training, or a new application of selective service, or both—that will require some form of military duty of all young men; that will cause serious reductions in our college population for the next few years; and that will interrupt the normal process of higher education for an indefinite time to come. This is the prospect we must bank on and try to make the best of in the light of the emergency and in the light of the world we hope to live in when the emergency is over.

As to the first point, that all young men be held responsible for some form of military duty, there can be little argument. A policy that spells out this biological fact means no more than make specific and regular what has always been implicit. The Yale News has spoken forcefully on the subject. In a recent editorial it pointed out that just about everybody had testified at the universal military service and training hearings "except the very people whose futures are being decided." As for the latter:

We would submit that the vast majority of 18-year-olds would answer more or less as follows:

1. They are prepared to serve their country in the Armed Forces.

2. They can see no major importance in the age differential between men 18 and those 19.

3. They bitterly resent their mothers' pleas that they are to young to serve.

4. They would prefer to have it definite that they serve right after high school rather than go to college uncertain of their stay there.

The obligation of military service is accepted. The overwhelming desire of the men who will do the fighting is not deferment but a uniform policy on which they can all count and make plans.

But how and when shall that obligation be discharged? It is here that we run into the debate that has occupied so much of our educators' and military experts' time during the past few months. The debate has been at least temporarily resolved by the new

---

[1] It is assumed here that even with an 18-year draft, many younger men will enter college before being called up; that this will remain a matter of individual choice; and that the colleges will therefore find themselves responsible for a preinduction as well as a postservice undergraduate program.

[2] Colleges operating on the quarter system could accomplish approximately the same results in three full-length and one short quarters.

[3] They might also be used by ROTC units for intensive work, especially outdoor training, which they have to conduct at reduced pace during the regular academic terms.

law. But as long as our young men retain any freedom of choice as to when they will enter the armed forces whether immediately upon completion of high school or later, after a year or two of college—and until we have repaired the deficits of educated manpower previously cited, we shall still face unfinished business and unanswered questions. We must answer these questions scrupulously from the standpoint of the national interest. What would be the purely educational consequences—to the students themselves and to their teachers—if everyone signed up for military service before entering college?

I can think of at least three good ones. First, it would promise us more mature students when they eventually entered college; and as every teacher knows, and our returning veterans proved, education is as much a process of maturation as it is of learning and instruction. Second, it would send us students free of indentures, able to lay their plans and choose their courses without the distraction of military or specialized training requirements. Third, after the initial two or 3 year gap had been closed, it would restore our student enrollment to its normal level. This last argument is the weakest because it assumes that as many men would enter college after military service as would have done so directly from high school. This assumption rests on two others: namely, that military circumstances will permit them to return, and that their desire to do so will not have diminished. Given a favorable military situation, a liberal plan of tuition scholarships, and our experience with the veterans of the last war, this whole set of assumptions is tenable.

Opposing precollege service are two serious considerations. The first is the interruption in the flow of doctors, engineers, and other scientific personnel, which many experts in these fields believe would be disastrous. This can be prevented by selecting students and assigning them to specialized college training after 3 or 4 months of basic military training. A more serious consideration is the maturity of high-school graduates as compared with men who have completed at least 1 year of college. If the Cromwellian maxim is sound, the odds are in favor of the college men as against an army of schoolboys. The former should be a more stable, more resourceful, and more purposeful fighting force both in action and in training.

If the American high school took its students as far as its British or European counterparts, we might dismiss this consideration. But it does not. On the contrary, the graduate of a British public school or a French lycée is ready to enter our college sophomore year, and I have known some to enter our junior year. It may be that the intellectual apparatus of these young men—particularly the Europeans—has been developed beyond their years. Nevertheless, they have had better discipline and, by definition, more higher education than our high-school graduates. The Russian military service law now in force defers high-school students until they graduate or reach the age of 20—the level of our college sophomores. The basic assumption underlying this whole discussion is that we are in for a long pull, in which we stand to win or lose, not only as soldiers but as representatives of a particular civilization. To send our young men abroad in either capacity before they fully comprehend that mission is to neglect one of the most essential phases of their training.

IV

On the whole, with more than a million men becoming 18 each year, I think we can leave the choice of military service before or after entering college with those whose ages permit them to exercise it. Some will prefer to get it over with at once, others to take a year of college. The more freedom of choice we can preserve in these Spartan times the better. But we have no choice whatsoever in what we must do for these young men. Whether they are called at 18 or 18½ or 19, as high-school graduates or as college freshmen, we must give them the richest educational experience of which we are capable before they go, and the greatest educational opportunities of which we are capable when they come back. Only thus can we put in the field an army that knows what it fights for and loves what it knows, the present soldiers and the future scholars.

This is the prime responsibility of American higher education in the emergency. Apart from preserving the higher learning that for 2,000 years has instructed and illuminated western civilization, apart from the scientific research that may hold our lives and our national security in the balance, alone and distinct and urgent, is the intellectual and spiritual fate of the men of fighting age today who will be tomorrow's philosophers and statesmen. They are our best hope of survival. What do we propose to do for them?

One of the first answers on everyone's lips is "acceleration." In the terms in which it is generally understood, I think this is a poor answer. These terms contemplate a round-the-clock, three-term cycle that crowds four normal academic years into less than three calendar years and keeps on revolving until the faculty collapses, the students revolt, or the emergency ends, with the odds favoring the demise of the faculty. Here we have another expression of our naiveté as to the nature and purpose of education. Our colleges and universities may be driven to accelerate by financial necessity, by the terms of our military service law, by ROTC contracts, or some other force majeure. I do not know a single member of the teaching profession who has anything good to say for it on its merits. Our purpose is not to save our students from the draft or salvage their tuitions or get them as far as we can up the 4-year ladder before they are called to duty. Our purpose is to give them a sense of what they are fighting for, a mature introduction to the higher learning of their civilization in the fullness of its humanistic wisdom and scientific genius, and a desire that will survive the drudgery of military service to come back and carry that civilization forward.

We cannot accomplish this purpose by accelerating. I think we would come nearer to it if we gave our students fewer courses and let them take their time with their studies. When I described acceleration recently to a distinguished French colleague, a member of the Collège de France whose ancestors have been teachers since the eighteenth century, he shook his head sadly and said: "Knowledge without culture. Knowledge without pleasure. Absorption without digestion." "Followed by regurgitation," I prompted. "I hope so," he replied; "that at least would show that the students were healthy." To keep our fields fertile we practice crop rotation. Shall we do less for our minds? To speed up our basic courses in the arts and sciences for this long-drawn time of trouble promises nothing but intellectual erosion and academic dust bowls. No one suggests that we take our summers off to loaf. Our faculties need them for the research and writing that sustains their teaching through the academic year. To our self-supporting students (a great majority in the Nation) they are an economic necessity. Our ROTC units might use them to intensify both the course work and outdoor training which they have to conduct at a minimum during the academic year. Students deferred for specialized nonmilitary training could make similar use of them. For these two groups, for students not yet called up, and ultimately for those returning from service, I would be willing to compromise on an 8-week summer term of intensive work in such subjects (for example, foreign languages or elementary mathematics) as lend themselves to intensive treatment and afford a contrast with the regular term's work. But as a matter of principle, I would far rather award a BA degree for three rich, unhurried years than for four lean ones run off against a stop watch.

In the long run it may be necessary to shorten the time consumed in the eight grades of high school and college. If students have to budget 2 or more years to military service they may very well become impatient with the 4-year college curriculum. I do not see why we should not make it possible for them to earn their B. A. degrees in 3 years, whether consecutive or interrupted by military service. But there is one fundamental condition precedent. To accomplish this purpose, without cheapening the B. A., means jacking up our standards of secondary education. We cannot give a 3-year B. A. to students who are inadequately prepared for it. Even with the 4-year degree, as every college admissions office knows, our secondary-school performance is very uneven in this respect. At the best our secondary schools are as good as any in the world, and with a few curricular extensions and revisions could easily carry their students as far as any. At the worst their students are ill-prepared for a 4-year B. A., and the worst greatly depresses the average. The result is that the best-trained students mark time as college freshmen while their less-favored classmates catch up, and they all enter sophomore year from scratch. To "accelerate" by eliminating this redundancy and waste motion would accomplish an educational reform long overdue in the United States. The emergency gives us a powerful incentive to attempt it.

The only reason why the worst American secondary schools should not be as good as the best is our indifference, our failure to comprehend the purpose of education. This is what tolerates the politics, incompetence, and miserably inadequate teachers' salaries that prolong the adolescence of the American youth and send him off to college with a child's mind in a man's body. Here is an area of war effort in which our colleges and universities could cooperate with our secondary schools to the mutual advantage of both and the incalculable advantage of the Nation. Here, conceivably, is a mission for our college teachers temporarily unemployed by military service legislation. Matching grants of public and private funds in support of this mission, properly defined and administered, would be a direct investment in the future of our political institutions and our culture.

V

There are many things our colleges and universities might do to improve the educational advantages of the men going off to war and the opportunities awaiting them on their return. They could run pilot plants to test and perfect the curricula of our twelfth and thirteenth grades, an experiment that might offer immediate benefits to the students and colleges concerned and have far-reaching consequences for our entire educational system. It would almost surely reveal more effective methods of accelerating—that is, by eliminating waste and treating boys like men instead of men like boys—than trying to pour 4 quarts into a 3-quart bottle. They, the colleges and universities—both on their own and in cooperation with the United States Armed Forces Institute—might offer extension courses for men on military service. This might have many advantages. It would keep track of students who had left after a year of college. It would help sustain their momentum. It might enable them to anticipate a course or two. At the very least it would offer an improvement on the Army's educational comics. Both projects—the pilot plants and the extension courses—would have the practical advantages of providing employment for the faculty and income for the college.

This is a time for self-inspection and self-improvement, for which opportunities exist on every campus. Far be it from me to say what others should do: I am too busy with the mote in my own eye. But I seem to see a country which wants better of its educational system, and deserves better of it, than it gets. Wherefore the discrepancy? Because, and here I return to my theme, we do not understand its purpose. We still think of it as a luxury and a privilege, when in reality it is a necessity and an obligation. We still (too often and too many of us) confuse it with other things, with politics, with business, with athletic sports. Once we see it clearly, how it all hangs together, from the primary school to the graduate school, and serves its purpose, in Jefferson's phrase, as "the most legitimate engine of government," I am convinced that we will speedily find ways for higher education to serve us in the emergency. We will find ways to rescue our colleges and universities from their financial difficulties and enlist them in the common cause. To doubt our ability to afford this is to doubt our reason. In 1947, the year of the Truman Commission's Report, we spent $1,005,000,000 on higher education in the United States. Last year we spent slightly over $1,000,000,000 on television sets. Five years ago nobody owned a television set. This is brand-new money, spent on a new toy, having nothing to do with the emergency, our security, or our survival, but only with our pleasure. It tends to prove—does it not?—that we can always find the money for what we want if we want it badly enough.

I would argue from this that we can easily afford to finance our mixed system of public and private higher education as an essential industry in the emergency and an essential key to the survival and progress of our civilization. But the will must precede the plans. That is why I would say to the planners and accelerators what Thoreau urged his preacher to say to his well-intentioned, nervous, action-starved, news-hungry neighbors: "Pause! Avast! Why so seeming fast, but deadly slow?"

Saving Taxpayers' Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union in editorial comment has hit the nail squarely on the head as to what we must do in Congress in order to effect really extensive budget reductions and increase the take-home pay for wage earners. We can make cuts here and there in appropriation bills and, of course, should do so where extravagances stick out like a sore thumb. But the only way a sufficient reduction will be brought about which will really hit pay dirt is through the elimination of services, activities, and functions which cannot measure up to the test of essentiality in these times of necessarily increased defense expenditures.

We have endeavored to point the way to at least one method by which this problem can be approached systematically and courageously. Those of us who have sponsored the bill to breathe life into the Hoover Commission have no particular pride of authorship. But we do urge, I believe justifiably, that if anyone has a better plan to meet this extremely urgent problem, they should come up with it. The important thing is not how the job is done, but that it be done.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two editorials from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union. The editorials follow:

SAVING TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer at a recent meeting of the Ohio Newspaper Association asked the help of newspaper publishers on what he called a troublesome problem—"the problem of saving money, specifically the taxpayers' money."

He pointed out that trimming here and there is not enough, that real economy must rest on dropping functions and services that the Federal Government now performs. This is certainly true.

Then the Secretary suggests that instead of making general statements about Government economy, the publishers might draw up a list of specific activities which they think could be eliminated.

"The President," he said, "on several occasions has asked for specific recommendations of activities which can be eliminated."

We cannot believe that Secretary Sawyer has kept very close to the problem of economy in Government or has watched very closely the President's attitude toward cutting Government down to size. The problem hasn't been troublesome enough in the right quarters.

The fact is that any number of carefully considered lists of nonessential activities of Government have been made.

A year ago the Committee for Economic Development, of which Marion Folsom, of Rochester, is chairman, carried out a thorough research project and came up with a list of specific proposals for balancing the budget. Nothing happened.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, also prepared a list.

Senator BYRD, who as head of the joint committee on executive expenditures has watched Federal spending more closely than any other man, had a list last year and has a new one this year.

Representative KENNETH KEATING and 10 other Members of the House have bills to recall the Hoover Commission to point out what activities, in view of our new world situation and the gigantic increase in defense spending, are nonessential.

Instead of going around the country asking for suggestions, it would seem more appropriate to get to work on the sound suggestions that have already been made.

CUTTING AGAIN

The House is back at a familiar point. It is tweaking the noses of "those bureaucrats downtown" by slicing a bit here and there off appropriation bills.

The first three items in the Treasury and Post Office bill each took cuts totaling $500,000, with deeper cuts pending.

Readers of this newspaper will know that these and even deeper cuts will be applauded here.

But the fact is that they don't mean a thing.

So long as the Treasury and Post Office—or other departments—are required by Congress to perform certain functions and services, they will be performed no matter what cost Congress sets in the appropriation bills. If the cost is greater than the allowance in the bill, the department will come back for a deficiency appropriation—and get it.

Congress can make real cuts in appropriations only by trimming the functions and services. It cannot win a reputation for economy by merely whittling appropriations now and passing deficiency appropriations later.

Representatives KENNETH KEATING and 10 other Representatives have a bill before the House to recall the Hoover Commission to guide Congress in listing the functions and services that in this emergency are nonessential.

This is the way to wipe the slate clean. Support of this bill and compliance with the Commission's recommendations will separate the sheep from the goats on the economy issue. Until then, shaving a little here and there is sound and fury, signifying practically nothing.

Senate Concurrent Resolution, General Assembly, State of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach herewith Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, as adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa on March 16, 1951:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States has by arbitrary abuse of authority forced on the potato growers of northern Iowa unwanted marketing agreements by the use of an illegal if not fraudulent referendum reminiscent of the methods of dictator governments; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan in the administration of the notorious and infamous potato program is seeking to act as a potato czar in 12 Iowa counties and to govern the marketing practices of northern Iowa farmers without their consent or approval; and

"Whereas this purpose has been shown specifically in the case of Harold McKinley, of St. Ansgar, Iowa, and is threatened in relation to the other potato growers of 12 Iowa counties; and

"Whereas Brannan is trying to force these Iowa growers to market only those potatoes which meet his approval under regulations against which the Iowa growers voted overwhelmingly, 24 to 1; and

"Whereas Brannan then overcame this overwhelming and disapproving majority by blanketing the Iowa counties into a voting area which contained four other States and part of a fifth; and

"Whereas the resulting district was a political sham and a shameless example of gerrymandering which destroyed the right of Iowa farmers to determine how they shall be governed and how they shall market their own produce; and

"Whereas they were forced into an area where they were subjected to the domination of the would-be potato czar and must accept his choices as their representatives and must observe his regulations over their business; and

"Whereas he has created discrimination between these growers and their neighbors outside the artificial boundaries which he set; and

"Whereas he will cause them severe business losses as well as the sacrifice of their liberties unless corrective action is taken; and

"Whereas the methods of coercion employed by the United States Secretary of Agriculture in the above instance can be applied to the growers of other agricultural products and can also be used to curb free competition in industry; and

"Whereas the practice of government by administrative directives if unchecked can result in loss of opportunity and the basic freedoms on which this country was founded; and

"Whereas just government derives its powers from the consent of the governed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the house concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States give serious consideration to the passage of appropriate legislation specifically limiting the Secretary of Agriculture in the use of directives; be it further

"*Resolved*, That Congress give earnest consideration to the proposition that the lawmaking power is constitutionally an exclusive prerogative of legislative bodies and Congress should take immediate steps to thwart every encroachment on that power; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House in Congress, and to each Member of the Iowa delegations in the Congress of the United States, under seal of his office.

"X. T. PRENTIS."

We, W. H. Nicholas, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa, and Carroll A. Lane, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa.

W. H. NICHOLAS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
CARROLL A. LANE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Rebuke Should Hit Higher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York World Telegram. The editorial follows:

REBUKE SHOULD HIT HIGHER

Natural and proper aftermath of the Hiss trial and conviction, which the United States Supreme Court refused to review, is the bill introduced again by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING of this State which would forbid the appearance of Supreme Court Justices as character witnesses.

The public was shocked by seeing Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley Reed take the stand for Alger Hiss at his first trial. It also became more evident than ever that judges who let themselves act as character witnesses in a given case risk impairing their judicial dignity.

Congress would do well to extend the prohibition to cover all Federal judges. States could and should follow the example in their own courts.

However, in the case of Hiss who stands convicted as a conspicuous liar, not to say spy, it's a pity prohibition or rebuke can't rise even higher than mere judges to reach President Truman, who pooh-poohed the Hiss affair as only a "red herring," also to reach Secretary of State Acheson who still says he will "never turn his back on Hiss."

National and International Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a letter from a very dear friend whose comments refer to a questionnaire which she filled out with intelligence and foresight. Her letter expresses deep concern about our national and international problems which is shared by thinking people in Jefferson County and all over our country. The completed questionnaire illustrates how constructive and helpful housewives can be in world affairs today.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *March 21, 1951.*

DEAR LAURIE: Far be it from me to know all the answers to the world's problems. These questions are certainly "scorchers." I can understand now why it takes so long for our Government to decide on a problem, with so many in it and for all of them to make up their minds, and arrive at one definite solution.

I will bet I have worried over these questions and given them more serious thought and consideration than the President himself, and the paper has not been stuck back in a drawer somewhere either. I have had it out in plain view; so, every time I passed by it, I would give the subjects more thought.

We have talked and argued them among ourselves, and when we had company we would discuss them. When I go out I discuss them with friends, but this poor, feeble mind of mine gets more puzzled and complicated to arrive at definite answers or put my opinions down in the form of yes or no.

I realize we think we know all the answers about how to run a government, in bickering back and forth at home among ourselves, but when it comes to the test of our opinion being used in the final decision of such strategic values as you are required to make, my over-all knowledge is quite limited and I have only a meager conception of all the issues involved.

For example, who am I to say whether 18-year olds should be drafted, or veterans, or fathers, with a flat yes or no and no "if's" or "and's" or "but's"?

Laurie, we leave it up to you. Paul and I feel you can properly handle the situation. No matter what the question, we have full confidence in you and much sympathy for you. We feel that you are doing a fine job.

That was a wonderful speech. Best regards to the family and office personnel.

Sincerely,

LULU SMITH.
Mrs. Paul V. Smith.

Minks and Winks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, an editorial writer from the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press has offered an explanation, reasonable though perhaps inaccurate, why the Secretary of Agriculture was recently disturbed by the insertion in a Washington newspaper of an advertisement announcing the recovery of a natural pastel mink coat.

If the lady in the pink mink has been the cause of sounding the death knell of the Brannan plan for regimenting the farmers and socializing agriculture, perhaps her $9,500 mink coat has not been as expensive for the taxpayers as was originally assumed when the shocking revelation about her adornment was made before a Senate committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include below the comments of the editorial writer in question:

MINKS AND WINKS

Everything is confusion between Washington and Key West. New York Congressman KEATING says on the radio that the President has fired the now famous Lady in the Pink Mink (a swell title for a musical). The President, at Key West, angrily denies it. KEATING answers that she was, too, fired but the President got mad because it became known and reestablished her as the confidential secretary of his confidential secretary, which makes it very confidential indeed.

Dropping the gal with the royal pastel mink ($8,450) has never been considered, Key West says. The charge is that this coat was paid for by Joe Rosenbaum, fast moving lobbyist and lawyer, along with commissions, to obtain White House influence on questionable RFC loans.

It is easy to understand Mr. Truman's embarrassing position. If he fires her he confesses to error; and others must follow, like the toppling of a row of dominoes. If he makes no such move to clean house (White House) the stench continues.

Worst of all, practical jokers are moving in on the affair. In Saturday's Washington Star a liner ad advertised as found—Natural pastel mink coat, recovered at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.—the White House. The telephone number of Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan was used. He denounces it as the work of a cruel, sadistic, damned fool.

But you can never tell about these things. Maybe the liner was inserted by a disgusted taxpayer who thinks all wasteful spending comes under some Brannan plan.

Letter From J. D. Garrard, of Birmingham, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a letter from Mr. J. D. Garrard, of Birmingham, Ala. As Mr. Garrard points out, he is one of the many taxpayers who are carrying the load which is getting heavier and heavier. I am calling his letter to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives at this time, as he has requested me to do.

The letter follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *March 12, 1951.*

Congressman LAURIE BATTLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAURIE: I've written you many times, but I get so mad before I finish the letters that I burn them.

The utter disregard that the Congress as well as the White House has for the taxpayers' money, the pampering of labor leaders, the planned high cost of living by the so-called wise men in the White House, the potato, butter, and eggs mess, higher and higher taxes to be spent more and more freely are a few of the things that make me mad.

In yesterday's paper I saw a little item that said the refurnishing of the House of Representatives cost $2,667,000. I paid more tax this year than I ever have before, but it would take me more than 3,000 years to pay the refurnishing bill for a place for you to sit in. Are the halls paved in gold? How could that much money be honestly spent just for refurnishing this building? How much of it bought mink coats or deep freezers, etc.? You know somebody got filthy rich on that deal. Why don't you investigate before instead of after the money is wasted? I can't have anything to compare with this House of Representatives' furnishings and there are millions of taxpayers in the same fix, and although they may not write and tell you, I bet they don't like it any more than I do.

I think the elected Representatives of the people should be more careful how they spend the taxpayers' money than they are of their own, and I am darn tired of the Congress giving billions of dollars to every nation that asks for it. You know it's my money that you are giving away, and my vote for you doesn't give you the right to give Britain billions of dollars to become a Socialist form of government or to keep Franco in power in Spain. I am not an isolationist. I am a taxpayer and I'm getting tired of being pushed around by Mr. Atlee or some other foreigner with his hand out.

If you don't get this, you can say "Well he burned that one, too."

Sincerely,

J. D. GARRARD.

P. S.—Please read this on the House floor.

Letter From a GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from a grateful GI who is thanking our Government for helping him. His constructive approach to the solution of our difficult problems is commendable.

The letter follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *February 28, 1951.*

Congressman LAURIE C. BATTLE,
Federal Building,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MR. BATTLE: I want to first thank the Government through you for my education on the GI bill. I think that this benefit was the best that could have been given a veteran.

As a very scared but uninformed citizen I would like to add my opinions to the many you undoubtedly already received.

It seems to me that we stand to lose to Russia by either of two ways, military invasion or economic disorder.

The present draft laws should take care of the next couple of years, but I've heard the experts are worrying about the next 10 years. It is my understanding that the present draftee is released to the Reserves when he finishes his duty. Maybe this would be a good time to set up a system similar to that of the Swiss. They stayed out of two world wars. I have heard that all physically qualified men are required to serve in a form of active reserve without pay. Of course, any such system for this country would require a lot of modification but the basic idea ought to be sound. Think of all the available manpower and brains that would be on tap for such occasions as the present. Also the interest of the general public would tend to keep the military in better shape during peacetime. Yes, I'm in the active Reserves (Navy) and I still think it's a good idea.

As for economics I know very little about it. We spend a powerful lot of money both at home and abroad and have little to show for it. The national debt can hardly be written on one sheet of paper. We pay the farmers to keep prices up and have price control to keep them down. Advocate competition and pay the airlines and others to keep them in business. Try to regulate or "antitrust" large firms out of business. Something is wrong but I don't know the answer, either.

Looks like we might do with more and better publicity for the United States in Europe and also on this side of the world. We need all the friends we can get.

I'm also against any Firearms Registration Act and for the statehood of Alaska and Hawaii.

Yours very truly,

MARVIN R. BEAN.

Radio Network Monopoly Suppresses Broadcasting of Kefauver Crime Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on several previous occasions I have pointed out to this Congress the monopolistic and restraint of trade practices which the four major broadcasting networks—the National Broadcasting Co., the American Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the Mutual Broadcasting System—are conducting in the important field of radio broadcasting and the serious effect of these practices on the economy of the radio industry and, most of all, the serious effect on the radio listening public.

Last week the American Broadcasting Co. saw fit to prevent hundreds of thousands of listeners from hearing the most important public service broadcast in some time, that of the Kefauver crime committee hearings.

I believe the best way to explain this situation is to read an announcement made over radio station WSAY in Rochester, N. Y., relative to this station's effort to bring to the thousands of Rochester radio listeners the broadcast of these crime hearings, and the refusal of the American Broadcasting Co. to allow this station to broadcast them.

In addition to this announcement, I wish to submit, as reported to me, the telephone conversations between Gordon P. Brown, the owner of WSAY in Rochester, N. Y., and the officials of the American Broadcasting Co., telephone conversations of Mr. Brown and his sales manager, Mr. Kelley, with the local ABC radio station outlet, copy of a complaint filed by Mr. Brown with the Federal Communications Commission regarding this serious situation, and copy of rebroadcast permission as requested of these networks by Mr. Brown's radio station WSAY:

WSAY ANNOUNCEMENT

WSAY wishes to bring you, the Rochester radio listeners, this important message. On March 21 the only available broadcast of the Kefauver crime committee hearings which Rochesterians could hear were those which were broadcast on television. WSAY on this date requested permission of the ABC network to rebroadcast these important hearings so that the hundreds of thousands of radio listeners in the city could hear these vital broadcasts. On this date the ABC network refused WSAY permission to rebroadcast these hearings and promptly arranged with the local ABC outlet to broadcast them by delayed recording. Yet, in spite of this, some of the most important portions of these hearings were lost to the Rochester listeners, particularly all of that portion of the hearings broadcast in New York City. Because of ABC's refusal to allow WSAY to rebroadcast important radio programs and

to rebroadcast the Kefauver crime committee hearings, the Rochester radio listeners have been deprived of many vital portions of these hearings, as well as other important radio programs. WSAY for years has made it a point to attempt to bring to its listeners many of the important radio programs broadcast but has been thwarted throughout these years by the refusal of the networks to allow this station to do so. WSAY believes that it is high time that such restraint of broadcasting be stopped and is making formal complaint to the FCC regarding this practice of the networks, which has gone on over a period of years. WSAY suggests that you, the listeners, immediately send a postal card or letter to Senator TOBEY, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. I am sure that when the Senators are informed of this situation they will take immediate steps to correct the further restraint of radio programing, by the radio networks, to the Rochester listeners. Don't forget, write Senator TOBEY today, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. Tell him you want him to look into the withholding of important radio programs from the Rochester listeners by the various networks.

Remember, WSAY is exclusively Rochester owned and operated, and is not in any way controlled by the networks or owned by interests outside of Rochester.

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION BETWEEN GORDON P. BROWN, OF RADIO STATION WSAY, AND DON SHAW, OF ABC, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1951

Mr. BROWN. This is Mr. Brown at radio station WSAY. We have been checking on television broadcasts of hearings in New York and find no AM station is broadcasting it.

Mr. SHAW. I know just what you are going to ask me, and before you ask me I am going to say that the answer is "No!"

We have had this come up in several cases. [Mr. Shaw stated that in all these cases the requests could not be granted as it could not be granted to WSAY because "our own station in Rochester would be in our hair in 5 minutes. This would be violating the territorial rights of our own stations."]

Mr. BROWN. How come you're not putting it on your AM network?

Mr. SHAW. We have had so many problems. [Mr. Shaw continued to explain the problems arising during the broadcasting by TV of the Senate hearing.] Our TV station in Columbus had requests from two stations. [Mr. Shaw continued to explain that carrying the audio portion of these hearings by the AM stations on their network "would lose too much commercial time. In television we did not have this problem."]

(Mr. Brown asked if this was then the complete situation.) I will ask our director of AM stations and get a final answer.

(Mr. Brown asked if he could hold on while Mr. Shaw got a definite answer.)

(Mr. Shaw replied that yes, the AM station's relation man was with him.)

(There was a pause of 3 minutes while they apparently discussed the situation together in New York before answering us on the phone.)

Mr. WELLEY. This is Mr. Welley. We are limited in offering you the audio feed of the Senate investigations primarily for two reasons; our own stations would have priority rights on it; second, we might run into A. T. & T. trouble over franchises, and that would involve legal complications. It is a very interesting subject and one which should be delved into more thoroughly.

(At this point the conversation was concluded.)

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION BETWEEN FRED RIPLEY, OF WARC, AND ROBERT KELLEY, OF WSAY, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1951

Mr. KELLEY. Bob Kelley speaking. I want to find out are you duplicating any of this Kefauver committee thing on AM?

Mr. RIPLEY. No.

Mr. KELLEY. You're not, huh?

Mr. RIPLEY. No.

Mr. KELLEY. I was just wondering if it was going out on AM.

Mr. RIPLEY. I think if it were we would carry it. However, we haven't been offered any yet. We would certainly carry it. They have got an awful ride on TV. We haven't been offered any, but if we are, I think we will carry it.

Mr. KELLEY. Have you asked for it at all?

Mr. RIPLEY. The network has been trying to line up something, but they haven't been successful as yet.

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION BETWEEN FRED RIPLEY, OF WARC, AND GORDON P. BROWN, OF WSAY, MARCH 22, 1951

Mr. BROWN. Are you people going to carry the Kefauver committee hearings?

Mr. RIPLEY. There is no doubt we will if it comes through.

Mr. BROWN. Naturally you have first choice on them. You can broadcast them off of WHAM-TV. If you are going to do this, naturally we won't.

Mr. RIPLEY. We haven't even considered rebroadcasting them off WHAM-TV.

Mr. BROWN. There is a chance that the network itself would do something. As I understand, they aren't going to offer it because their commercial schedule is rather high. We want to give you first opportunity, but if you don't want it——

Mr. RIPLEY. Give me a chance to talk to Sam.

Mr. BROWN. I talked to them and they said the first chance was up to you.

Mr. RIPLEY. We have been trying to get an O. K. on the network. I think we are going to get permission, and if we can, we are going to carry it. I expect clearances by tomorrow. Going right to headquarters, they haven't given anybody in the country permission for doing it yet.

Mr. BROWN. If you can get permission, you are going to do it? We wanted to check; how can they refuse you permission?

Mr. RIPLEY. I think they will O. K. it.

SUPPLEMENT TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND SETTING ASIDE OF FCC ACTION

Re license renewal of ABC owned and operated Stations WENR, WENR-TV, Chicago; KA-4442, KA-4443, area, Chicago; KGO, KGO FM, San Francisco; KA-441, area, San Francisco; WJZ and Auk, New York; KA-4444, KA-4445, area, New York, N. Y.; KA-4160, KA-4440, area, Los Angeles; WXYZ-TV, Detroit, KA-4865, KA-3136, area, Detroit. FCC Public Release No. 60781, March 27, 1951.)

As supplement to my request for reconsideration in setting aside the F. C. C. action regarding the renewal of the ABC owned and operated stations, I submit the following additional objection herewith:

Rochester, N. Y., has four network affiliated AM stations, my independent station WSAY, and one daytime independent station, also one television station WHAM-TV. A great deal of interest has developed in the broadcast of the Kefauver committee crime hearings in New York City. We desired to broadcast the audio portion of these hearings so that people without television sets in the Rochester area could hear them. We requested permission of ABC to rebroadcast the audio portion of the TV broadcast of these hearings, and we telephoned Mr. Donald Shaw of TV station relations of ABC in New York City. He referred me to Mr. Welley of AM station relations of ABC in New York City. I learned from Mr. Shaw that several other requests have been made throughout the United States to rebroadcast these hearings on AM stations, but all were refused.

Mr. Shaw stated that the AM ABC network and affiliated stations could not carry these broadcasts because of their large amount of commercial programs. Mr. Shaw turned me over to Mr. Welley who gave the following excuses for being unable to allow me permission to rebroadcast the Government hearings. We quote Mr. Welley: "This is Mr. Welley. We are limited in offering you the audio feed of the Senate investigations primarily for two reasons; our own stations would have priority rights on it; second we might run into A. T. & T. trouble over franchises, and that would involve legal complications. It is a very interesting subject and one which should be delved into more thoroughly."

Because the local ABC AM outlet was not broadcasting the audio portion of the TV broadcast of these hearings, the majority of the people of Rochester who own only AM sets were unable to hear this most important broadcast of Mr. Kefauver and Mr. Tobey's investigating committee, particularly the part most interesting to Rochester listeners, that portion conducted in New York City.

After being refused permission to rebroadcast these programs by ABC in New York City, I telephoned the local ABC outlet, WARC, in Rochester, N. Y., who advised me according to the enclosed transcript of my conversation with WARC's manager, Mr. Fred Ripley. It is quite apparent from this conversation that WARC had not intended to rebroadcast the audio portion of the TV broadcast of these programs, but they were waiting for the ABC audio network to place it on the regular AM lines.

If WSAY had had blanket permission to rebroadcast these Government hearings, the listeners of Rochester, N. Y., would not have been deprived of the most important part of the testimony that which was conducted in New York City. There is no doubt that the fact that WSAY, in an aggressive effort to bring this Kefauver program to the Rochester listeners on AM radio, finally forced ABC to feed the program to its affiliate, WARC, in Rochester. The rebroadcast of the audio portion of the TV program of the Kefauver committee crime hearings would have been picked up from WHAM-TV.

WSAY has consistently requested permission (per attached mimeographed request) of the ABC owned and operated stations whose licenses are involved in this proceeding. Attached hereto in addition to the copies of my conversation with WARC's manager Mr. Fred Ripley, are copies of my telephone conversation with the officials of the ABC network.

It is imperative that the ABC license renewals involved herein not be granted until such time as the ABC network realizes that blanket permission to rebroadcast must be given in instances where they do not own the property rights of the programs to be rebroadcast.

I am confident that further investigation by the FCC in this matter will disclose the fact that many communities throughout the United States were deprived of this important broadcast because of the undue restrictions and misinterpretations of the rebroadcast rule by the ABC network. This is quite apparent from the conversation which I had with the ABC officials.

I urgently request that your Commission consider this as a supplement to my request for reconsideration in setting aside of FCC action, filed with you on March 13 regarding

the license renewal of ABC owned and operated stations; and that your Commission give careful study to the problems involved and request that the ABC network cease such misinterpretation of the rebroadcast rule, as well as such restraint of rebroadcasting, and that your Commission not renew the licenses of the ABC owned and operated stations until such a time as they discontinue the practices mentioned above.

GORDON P. BROWN,
Radio Station WSAY, Rochester, N. Y.
MARCH 29, 1951.

REBROADCAST PERMISSION AS IT PERTAINS TO FCC RULE 3.191 (d)

We hereby grant blanket permission to Station WSAY to rebroadcast the programs of those sponsors desiring them so rebroadcast by WSAY; and which sponsors are using Station ——— as the originating station for their programs. It is expressly understood that the above blanket permission for rebroadcasting is only for the purpose as it may apply to section 3.191 (d) of the FCC rules and regulations as quoted below; and that nothing in this blanket permission to rebroadcast shall give permission to radio station WSAY for such rebroadcasting as it shall pertain to any program, talent, or any other rights of the program which ——— does not control; nor shall WSAY rebroadcast the program without the express authority and permission of the sponsors, which originate their programs over Station ———.

SECTION 3.191 (D) OF THE FCC RULES AND REGULATIONS

"No licensee of a standard or high-frequency broadcast station shall rebroadcast the program of any other class of United States radio station without written authority having first been obtained from the Commission upon application accompanied by written consent or certification of consent of the licensee of the station originating the program."

Mr. Speaker, it is irony personified that the Senate of these United States entrusted the proceedings of its chambers and gave permission to the American Broadcasting Co. to broadcast these most important crime committee hearings only to find that this radio chain violated this trust of free speech given it by the Senate by suppressing the free broacasting of the public Senate hearings in many communities of this country; and not only this, but the American Broacasting Co. proceeded to make a commercial radio program out of the public hearings of the Senate investigators and their witnesses.

Mind you, my fellow Congressmen, not only did the American Broadcasting Co. withhold the free broacast of this hearing to radio listeners, but this network made a commercial program of these hearings and sold the proceedings of these Government public hearings to Time magazine for its sponsorship. I quote a paragraph from an article titled "Kefauvercasts Prove a Real Tele Bargain," from page 15 of the March 31 issue of the trade paper Billboard, carrying a date line New York, March 24:

ABC-TV PANS OUT

The one outfit to come out ahead on the hearings was ABC-TV which sold the proceedings to Time magazine. The only cancellations suffered by ABC-TV were spot announcements, since the one night the hearings were carried by ABC-TV fell into open time. ABC-TV isn't revealing the deal it made with Time, but it's known that the magazine bought the event at bargain rates.

The American Broadcasting Co. has violated the confidence and trust of the Senate. As licensee of numerous radio broadcasting and TV stations, it has violated its public trust and service obligations and, further, this radio chain has violated the requirement under the licenses which it holds to be "a public interest, convenience, and necessity."

It is high time that the practices of restraint of trade, the restriction of broadcasting and rebroadcasting of radio programs be stopped by these radio chains; and I wish to ask that the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission take immediate action against these radio chains to protect the free radio of this country, and, also, that this Congress favorably consider H. R. 73 and H. R. 10, bills designed to prevent such suppression of radio broadcasting.

A New Direction to World Peace—Help the Russians Get Rid of Stalin

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks a resolution introduced by me yesterday, the purpose of which is to give a new direction to our foreign policy: an alliance between the American people and the Russian people and other peoples of the Russian Union to help their liberation from their present Communist enslavement. The resolution recently introduced in the Senate and in the House known as the McMahon resolution, in my opinion, is defective, faulty, and dangerous inasmuch as it seeks to have us enter into an agreement with Stalin. Agreements with Stalin abandons the peoples he has enslaved. Herewith is the text of the resolution introduced by me yesterday:

Whereas the American people have long accepted the basic principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 in the following words: " * * * that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men,—deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."; and

Whereas the American people believe these principles are universal and apply to all men, everywhere, at all times and under all forms of government; and

Whereas these principles flow from certain essential truths, among which are—

That the Creator is the Author of every human being and the Source of his rights and that neither the state nor any other human agency has jurisdiction to exploit any human being or violate his rights;

That the state is a servant to mankind and not its master and may not pervert its administrative and police powers so as to make of them a weapon to violate human rights or to terrorize the people;

That there is a brotherhood of all men but only under the Fatherhood of God; and

Whereas communism wears a humanitarian cloak and poses as the messiah of social justice but in reality has given rise to the most reactionary regime of our time based on barbarism and slavery as a result of its immoral doctrine founded on malice setting man against man, class against class, and all men against God; and

Whereas communism thrusts itself beyond civil government and political philosophy, claiming the whole man, denying all spiritual values, denying his inalienable rights, and seeking to transform all human beings created by God in His Image into soulless biological units, to be fitted into a military and economic machine designed for world revolution; and

Whereas communism, although not native to Russia, was adopted by a small, ruthless Bolshevik minority which by treachery, deceit, brutal force, and terror subverted and destroyed the freedom gained by the Russian people and other peoples within the former Russian Empire in their democratic revolution of February 1917; and

Whereas communism after coming to power in Russia succeeded until recently by means of false propaganda, deceit, police-state methods, and hermetically sealed frontiers, in keeping the non-Soviet world largely ignorant of the plight of the peoples within the Soviet Union and, in turn, keeping the peoples within the Soviet Union in ignorance of the true nature of conditions existing outside its borders and particularly of conditions in the democratic world; and

Whereas communism has taken the lives of tens of millions of human beings in the Soviet Union, including a vast number of the members of its own armed forces (other than in the late war), and has enslaved the peoples by robbing peasants of their farms and transforming them into landless agricultural robots; by chaining workers to their factories and transforming them into homeless industrial robots; by depriving intellectuals of freedom of creative work and thought and transforming them into voiceless ideological robots; by submitting vast numbers from all classes, both men and women, old and young, workers (industrial and white collar), peasants, and intellectuals, to the subhuman conditions of concentration camps to uninhabitable areas and transforming them into a nameless host of more than 15,000,000 state slaves; by the uprooting and dispersal of minority groups; by practicing genocide upon national groups within the Soviet Union and making of the Soviet Union a burial ground of nations; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying the institution of the family in the Soviet Union by an enforced collective way of life, by inordinate control and indoctrination of the children, and by setting members of the same family against one another through fear and terror; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying religion in the Soviet Union by fostering atheism, by ridiculing and persecuting the sincere religious aspirations of the people, by perverting religious instincts in the hearts of the young, by murdering the

representatives of religion, by destruction of places of worship and the abolition of religious institutions, by tolerating only religious services subservient to the state, and by deifying the leader of the Red regime; and

Whereas communism by force and deceit has transformed into a tool of international aggression, the Soviet Army, conscripted of peace-loving peasants, workers, and intellectuals whose true anti-Communist sentiment has been demonstrated by numerous revolts (such as: 1921—the revolt of the Baltic Fleet at Kronstadt led by Petritchenko; 1937—the plan to overthrow the Communist regime led by Marshal Tukhachevsky, head of all the Soviet armed forces, resulting in the "purge" of four of the five Soviet Army marshals, 399 generals, and over 30,000 other Soviet Army officers; 1942-45—movement involving an anti-Communist army of liberation of over 800,000 soldiers led by General Vlasov), the same army whose patriotic spirit was manifested in the victorious march from Stalingrad to Berlin in the gallant defense of their homeland; and

Whereas communism by making false and appealing promises, in an atmosphere of ideological black-out in the Soviet Union, perverts the patriotic fervor of a certain number of young idealists, who have a genuine desire to serve their people, and exploits it for an antihuman conspiracy; and

Whereas communism in order to extend still further its tyranny concentrates its efforts on promoting artificial hostile feelings between the friendly and peace-loving peoples within the Soviet Union and the people of the United States and of other free nations whose basic aspirations as human beings are identical, and who have no real conflicting interests; and

Whereas communism not satisfied with the exploitation of millions of people in the Soviet Union has already forced Marxist-Stalinist tyranny on the once free and independent nations of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and also parts of Germany and Austria, and initially on Yugoslavia which still follows the Communist ideology, and in the words of the United States Supreme Court Justice Jackson in the recent case of *American Communication Association v. Douds* (339 U. S. at p. 429), "The international police state has crept over Eastern Europe by deception, coercion, coup d'état, and terrorism and assassination."; and communism has conquered China and is in the process of attempting to subjugate Korea, Tibet, Indochina, and Malaya, and seeks eventually to enslave freemen everywhere; and

Whereas agreements made by any one or more of the free nations with the Communist regime that now enslaves the peoples within the Soviet Union strengthen materially and morally the position of said regime, weaken the resistance to Communist tyranny, and dim the hopes of the people for liberation; such agreements with said regime being used by it only to its advantage for the purposes of accumulating additional strength and to the disadvantage of every other country seeking honorably to compose differences with it; it being one of the prime techniques of communism to disregard truth and honor and to ignore agreements whenever opportune; and

Whereas, in contrast to the treacherous fifth column that operate in the free countries of the world to enslave them to international communism, there exists in Russia a potential force for freedom composed of the great majority of the peoples of Russia who yearn for liberty, which force, if activated by the encouragement and positive aid of the free peoples of the world, will enable them to liberate themselves and overthrow the Comununist tyranny and help place mankind on the path of peace instead of plunging it into the holocaust of a third world war; and

Whereas past tragic mistakes in the policies of certain of the free nations, including that of the United States, toward the Communist regime in the Soviet Union and a failure fully to understand the true nature, extent, and the enormity of its aggressive designs have substantially contributed toward placing said Communist regime in a position where it now is a clear and present danger to world peace and the free progress of mankind compelling the United States and other free nations again to undertake a vast program of armament expenditures; and

Whereas, while we rearm with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peace, we are determined to defend our freedom; and

Whereas rearmament alone coupled with an attempt to compose differences with the Communist regime by treaties and agreements leaving undisturbed said regime and its present enormous conquests of aggression will over a period of years, place a crushing burden of armaments upon the free world that eventually could well, of itself, destroy freedom; and such agreements and treaties would tend to stabilize said regime in its conquests and give a benediction to a way of life that has declared war on all human nature under its control; and

Whereas the world cannot long continue to exist half slave and half free: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby reaffirms the historic friendship of the American people with the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union between whom there are innumerable ties of kinship and concerning whose mutual aspirations for democracy, liberty, and justice there has always been an alliance. That alliance was symbolized in 1917, when the Russian people and other peoples of the Russian Empire had freed themselves from the autocracy of the czars but before they were enslaved by the Bolsheviks, by the words of President Wilson in behalf of the American people to the peoples of Russia: "Here is a fit partner for a league of honor."

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States, on behalf of the American people, solemnly pledges that the common struggle against communism in which this Nation, together with other free nations, is now engaged, is not directed against those who have been misled by communism through no fault of their own but against those who have misled them; that those who have unwittingly served the small clique in control of the Communist regime or in countries captive to it should not fear vengeance, provided they break off with communism; and that the American people recognize the right of the peoples of Russia and of the countries now held captive by said Communist regime to bring to justice their oppressors who are leading them into another world war that will mean the destruction of many more millions of lives and of many cities, homes, and the countryside within the Soviet Union.

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress of the United States hereby expresses the firm conviction of the American people that the peoples within the Soviet Union have the right of self-determination (including the right of any of the nations within the Soviet Union to choose its own form of government and also the right to form a free federation) based on the free expression of popular will, namely, that no nation can be deprived of territory by force and that no nation can keep territory by force, and, by free election, to be governed by their own consent.

(b) It is further expressed to be the firm conviction of the American people that the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union have the right to the basic freedoms for which they have long struggled and for which in World War II they together with other people, shed their blood, among which freedoms are—

(1) the right of peasants to their own land, to work it as they see fit, and to dispose of the fruits of their labor as they see fit;

(2) the right of workers to select freely the type and place of their employment, and to obtain equitable wages and decent working hours and conditions through the organization of their own truly independent trade-unions;

(3) the right of intellectuals to freedom of scientific and artistic creation, to freedom of cultural intercourse with the whole world, and to establishment of educational, scientific, and cultural institutions, independent of State control;

(4) the right of political prisoners of all classes to immediate liberation and aid in rehabilitation;

(5) the freedom of religion, of speech, of thought, and of the press, and freedom of each national group to use its own language;

(6) the right of the people peaceably to assemble, to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures;

(7) the right of the people to life, liberty, and private ownership of property; the right of an accused to a speedy and public trial in accordance with principles of law and justice;

(8) the freedom of movement within the country and of travel abroad and upon the high seas, together with the freedom to engage in commerce and pursuits of private enterprise and in all peaceful activities;

(9) the freedom of families from the Communist way of life and from undue state interference and control, and of parents to the education of their own children;

(10) the freedom of the Armed Forces to defend the legitimate interests of the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union, the right and obligation of the Armed Forces to protect the people from the Communist tyranny, and the freedom of the Armed Forces from being used and augmented by the Communist tyranny into an aggressive force both against its own people and against peaceful nations.

SEC. 4. To give meaning to their historic friendship for the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union, the Congress of the United States hereby expresses the strong hope of the American people for an early liberation of the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union from their 33-year-long Communist enslavement. To assist in bringing about that liberation at the earliest possible date, the President of the United States is hereby requested—

(1) to make no further agreement and no commitments to the present Soviet regime that would tend in any way to maintain, stabilize, or further extend its power over the enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union;

(2) to formulate a new and stronger foreign policy which, among other things, recognizes the essentially evil nature of the Communist regime bent on the destruction of the United States and of the free world and distinguished between said regime and the Russian people and other peoples of the Soviet Union;

(3) to explore the methods whereby our representatives in the United Nations may urge that body to assist the Russian people and other peoples within the Soviet Union to obtain liberation from their present enslavement and exchange for their present representation in the United Nations a true representation that can work for, rather than obstruct and undermine the efforts of all peoples of the world, for the first time in human history, effectively to lay down a true foundation for lasting peace and the undisturbed permanent coexistence of peoples;

(4) to explore the methods whereby the American people through their Government, and by private means with Government assistance and otherwise may offer material aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of the Russian people and other peoples within the Soviet Union and people in other Communist-dominated countries.

Anniversary of the North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Pact here in Washington by the ministers of the 12 original members.

The signing of this pact was a high light in the struggle of the free nations against the forces of slavery.

It is appropriate that we should be discussing here on this floor the question of the draft and universal military training while we celebrate this important anniversary.

The United States is a key nation in the pact. Our strength or weakness may well make or break the pact. An integral part of our strength will be the provisions for a strong draft bill accompanied by a program to provide universal military training.

The free nations took heart when the North Atlantic Pact was brought into being. They saw our Nation take its place on the battle line against possible Communist aggression.

They are now celebrating this anniversary in the free capitals in Europe. During their celebration they will have their eyes on our capital. They will be watching the outcome of our debate on strengthening our Nation.

Will we turn our back on the free nations on this anniversary? Will we make this anniversary a period of rejoicing, a period in which to reflect on the meaning of the strength and solidarity of the free nations, or will we leave the celebration to the masters of the Kremlin and turn our backs on our friends and allies? The answer is ours to make by writing a strong draft and universal military training program.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by the President on the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

On the second birthday of the North Atlantic Treaty it is appropriate that we take stock of our progress.

The most encouraging fact which stands out today is that Europe is stronger and in a better position to defend itself than it was a year ago.

This stems from the determination of the free peoples of Europe to help themselves. Their determination as well as their strength has been increased by the assistance which we have been able to give them. Even more important, our joint efforts have acquired greater effectiveness through the establishment of General Eisenhower's unified command. For the first time in history there exists in peace an integrated international force whose object is to maintain peace through strength. Six years ago General Eisenhower led such a force to victory, but we devoutly pray that our present course of action will succeed and maintain peace without war.

The armed forces of the North Atlantic Treaty countries will grow more rapidly in the future as stepped-up training and production programs begin to bear fruit. An enormous military production program is under way in the United States, and our allies, despite limited facilities and resources, have already more than doubled their rate of military production.

Just as important as the forces which we are building together is the spirit of cooperation and joint effort which has been greatly strengthened. This is a solid achievement which will bring rewards of happiness and prosperity to our peoples long after the passing of the present emergency.

The events of the past 2 years have proved beyond question the wisdom of the course we adopted in signing the North Atlantic Treaty. Developments since the war have made it more clear than ever before that no nation can find safety behind its own frontiers—that the only security lies in collective security.

While we have reason to take pride in our accomplishments, we cannot forget that the road ahead is still long and hard. The people of the United States and the people of Europe must accept heavy burdens, with both determination and patience. I am confident that we will march forward together, with speed and vigor. Above all, I feel certain that we will not relax the great effort which is now under way.

Hon. Adolph J. Sabath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH, has today attained the venerable age of four score and five. Few mortal men are privileged to reach this advanced age, and fewer still have attained such an incomparable record of achievement and service to our Nation as did our colleague whom we are honoring today.

His long and distinguished service in Congress, his inspiring leadership, and his courageous efforts to serve the best interests of our country and the American people have unquestionably earned for him the recognition as an elder statesman in the best and most noble tradition. He is a man of deep convictions and a great believer in human rights and humanitarian principles. Throughout his long service in this House, which extends over a period of nearly four and a half decades, he has constantly championed and supported all liberal and constructive legislation.

On this occasion, it is worth while recalling that Judge SABATH came to this country as an immigrant boy from Bohemia—present-day Czechoslovakia—and that largely by hard work and his own ability reached great heights as a national figure and an outstanding American. Today, he is almost an institution in himself, well-beloved by the people and revered by his colleagues in Congress.

It is my fervent wish, as we extend our congratulations and affection to ADOLPH SABATH on this day, that the good Lord will continue to spare him and to give him many long years so that our country may have the benefit of his wisdom and leadership.

Hon. John A. O'Donnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

I am pleased to have an opportunity to place into this permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a simple statement of praise for my friend, neighbor, and able Commissioner, the Honorable John A. O'Donnell, just retiring as Commissioner of the Philippine War Damage Commission by reason of the termination of the Commission according to law and upon the completion of its functions.

John A. O'Donnell, formerly of Scranton, Pa., and now of Washington, D. C., has served this particular Commission with distinction, and it is my privilege to so note the same in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to add that his work has not in any manner deviated from his background of work as a young man, as that career throughout his life to this point had every indication of ability and clean success.

I am happy to note that this Commission concluded its affairs most successfully and returned to the Treasury over $1,600,000 out of its administrative funds. This respect for Federal funds and careful use of the same indicates a serious regard for his trust and speaks more than words for his ability as an administrator.

For a man in his middle forties, educated at the University of Scranton, Harvard, and Georgetown, John O'Donnell has had progressively important assignments. Labor adviser at NRA, extensive responsibility at ICC in the Division of Motor Carriers, private in the army to

the rank of major in World War II. Important work with General Erskine in the reemployment agency after the war and in the function responsible for the return of our men to their work after the victory of War II. Then his assignment to the Philippine Commission.

Handling $400,000,000 for claims with but two other associates and in a far-away country, and doing the same with the complete praise of all concerned is an accomplishment. Receiving claims and making awards is difficult work, and when it is done in the aftermath of war and in a foreign country, and done with praise, seem to call for reiteration of the praise.

I am pleased to learn and note that in the presentation of the materials for appropriations before our appropriate Committee on Appropriations during the past year that the same committee was expressive in its commendations of the work of the Commission and its high regard for the purposes for which this Congress allotted taxpayers' money.

That the Commission completed its work a month earlier than its allotted terms seems to but accumulate praise for this Commission and this Commissioner.

The people from my district, the Tenth District of Pennsylvania, I am certain, join with me in wishing John A. O'Donnell Godspeed along the path of his fine career.

Much Distortion in Look Article

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Peter Molyneaux from the Dallas Morning News:

MUCH DISTORTION IN LOOK ARTICLE

(By Peter Molyneaux)

In the current issue of Look magazine, there is a deliberately slanted distortion of the truth about Mexican-Americans in Texas. It occupies eight of the magazine's large pages and is illustrated with 26 photographs, many of which obviously were specially posed. It is headed "Texas' forgotten people: A million and a half Mexican-Americans live on little more than hope." And it opens with the following paragraphs:

"Texas tub thumpers enjoy shouting about the State's bumper crop of millionaires. But there is an awkward silence where conversation veers to the subject of the million and a half Texans of Mexican descent who comprise the Mexican problem. The silence becomes eloquent when the facts of the Mexican problem are known. The truth is simply this: Nowhere else in America is a group of people so downtrodden and defenseless, and nowhere are human dignity and life held in such low regard.

"This charge carries the crushing authority of Texas' own health statistics:

"Each year, 31 out of every 100,000 Anglo-American Texans die of tuberculosis; during the same year, 209 out of every 100,000 Latins (the Texan name for Mexican-Americans) die of the disease."

This lead gives a fair idea of the whole article, of its viciously biased tone, its bogus holier-than-thou indignation, and its facts.

The first fact it cites, the crushing authority of which is supposed to support its sensational charges, simply isn't a fact at all.

It just isn't true that 209 out of every 100,000 Mexican-Americans in Texas die of tuberculosis every year.

If it were true it would mean that every year 3,135 Mexican-Americans in Texas die of tuberculosis. If there are a million and a half Mexican-Americans in the State, that's 15 units of 100,000, and 15 times 209 is 3,135.

There are not 3,135 deaths from tuberculosis among Mexican-Americans in Texas in a year.

There are not 3,135 deaths from tuberculosis in a year among all of the 7,700,000 people in Texas, Anglo-Americans, and Negroes included.

If the figures of the Look article were correct, and if we assumed that the rate of 31 in 100,000 applied to Negroes as well as Anglo-Americans, the total of deaths from tuberculosis in Texas in a year would be more than 5,000. The actual annual average is about 2,700.

If Look's figures were correct, the death rate from tuberculosis in Texas would be about 65.6 to the 100,000. The 1948 report of the United States Public Health Service shows that the real rate was 35.7 per 100,000.

This isn't something to brag about, but the actual rate is much lower than in many other States and lower than the rate in New York, where Look's editorial offices are located.

In this connection, it is pertinent to point out that Texans do not have to apologize for either the State's present death rate generally or the progress they have made in lowering it. The magazine Look is published in Des Moines, Iowa, and a comparison of the death rates of Iowa and Texas has some point here.

In 1937, for example, the death rate from all causes in Iowa was 10.4 per 1,000 population, while that of Texas was 10.6 per 1,000. There were then 12 States in the Union having lower death rates than Iowa and 16 States with lower rates than Texas.

In 1947 the death rate in Iowa was 10.2 per 1,000, but that of Texas had been reduced to 8.8 per 1,000. The number of States with lower death rates than Iowa increased from 12 in 1937 to 27 in 1948, whereas the number of States with lower death rates than Texas had declined from 16 in 1937 to only 3 in 1947.

But the point to all this is that the first fact on which the sensational charges of the Look article is based is such a groundless and outrageous exaggeration and such a deliberate distortion of the truth that it completely discredits the whole article.

The very title of the article is untrue. Far from the Mexican-Americans in Texas being a forgotten people, they are a people very much on the mind of the State's leaders, and for some time they have been the concern of the State government itself. The good-neighbor commission, created by the Texas Legislature several years ago, and of which Neville G. Penrose, Fort Worth oilman, is chairman, is making genuine progress in improving their lot and opportunities and in bringing about better relations between them and the Anglo-American population. And last year, under the forthright leadership of Gov. Allan Shivers, a council for the study of human relations was established for the express purpose of determining ways and means of improving the relationship between the English-speaking and Spanish-speaking peoples of Texas."

Chairman Penrose puts it this way: "The people of Texas, working hand in hand with our closest neighbors, south of the Rio Grande, are rapidly curing a series of conditions which none of us in this generation had a hand in creating. We inherited them. Intelligent leadership and an enlightened people are determined that posterity will live in a cordial, hospitable atmosphere as neighbors and friends."

End of a Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of April 2, 1951:

END OF A DEBATE

After weeks of debate the Senate gets down to cases today on the issue of troops to Europe. Under a unanimous-consent agreement, entered into March 21, the Chamber will remain in continuous session until it has disposed of Senate Resolution 99 and all the complicated amendments and counter proposals that go with it.

This action comes none too soon. What began as the great debate has degenerated into a rather pointless family squabble. The public has become bored and our allies in Europe have become restless and confused.

It is considered a foregone conclusion that the Senate will end by giving its approval both to General Eisenhower's appointment as NATO supreme commander and to the assignment of American troops which has already been made to that command. The great question mark is whether it will insist on including some language implying the obligation of the President to consult Congress on future troop commitments.

We sincerely hope that the resolution which finally emerges will be the minimum one affirming Senate backing for the commitments already made. That will have the optimum effect abroad. And it is seriously to be doubted whether any action the Senate takes now will sway domestic thinking on the constitutional questions involved.

The vital thing at the moment is to demonstrate that, whatever our differences at home, we are united in our determination to oppose Communist aggression wherever it may threaten.

With all due respect to the advocates of a tough resolution, it has sometimes looked as if they had forgotten that fact. They have seemed to hold the cold war between Russia and the west as of less importance than the cold war between the White House and Capitol Hill.

In their embittered attacks on the President they have accused him of usurping congressional functions through an enlargement of his constitutional duties as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. To the outside observer, however, it has been no less apparent that they were attempting to read into their own constitutional powers of providing for the common defense and of declaring war most of the command functions of the President.

The Constitution deliberately provided for a division of the defense function between the Executive and the legislature. And the function can be effectively carried out only as a collaboration. We believe the President is exercising his proper authority in allo-

cating troops to Europe under the Atlantic Treaty and that Congress would make a fatal error if it attempted by law to claim the function.

This is by no means to say that the President has acted intelligently in antagonizing Congress and failing to keep it informed. Indeed, one of the important goods the great debate can still achieve is to convince both Congress and the President of the need for a better working partnership on all defense matters.

But no resolution the Senate passes today can compel this cooperation. The need is to show a united front abroad—and then quietly build on it at home.

Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, President of Mount Mary College, Speaks Eloquently of the Firm Basis for Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the political philosophy set forth in the American Declaration of Independence and our constitutional Bill of Rights that is based on that philosophy together with the whole Constitution of the United States itself should not be changed or altered by means other than those provided in the Constitution. Particularly, they should not be altered or changed in any way because of treaties or by virtue of our association with other nations in the UN or by Senate action upon the proposed UN Covenant for Human Rights.

Human rights have a divine origin and they therefore are unassailable by human agency. They have not a governmental or treaty origin. If they did have a governmental or treaty origin they would be subject to change with change in government or treaty. I wish to include in my remarks the very eloquent speech on human rights recently given by Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, president of Mount Mary College of Milwaukee before the National Catholic Educational Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on March 30 last:

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EDUCATION

(By Edward A. Fitzpatrick)

I

Human rights are words to conjure with. It is a term heard everywhere. It has too often the magic of unthinking acceptance and wide circulation. It has become a shibboleth, a kind of password among some of the vocal and articulate persons in public discussion, which somehow sheds a beneficence over everything else they say. It is used to sharpen tensions as well as to point the way to better human relations. In the contemporary discussion it is chameleon in character serving the evil purposes of many who pharisaically enough invoke it in destroying human rights and at times to the accompaniment of noisy tom-toms, it becomes a kind of political incantation.

The constitution of the U. S. S. R.

To take only one example: The constitution of the United Soviet Socialist Republics promises to its people many rights, including a right to rest and leisure. It guarantees in article 125 the rights of free speech, of a free press, freedom of assembly, including the holding of mass meetings, and freedom of street processions and demonstrations, and then the remarkable provision is added:

"These civil rights are ensured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organizations printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, communication facilities, and other material requisites for the exercise of these rights."

One did not know that the paradisal highway to Siberia was so broad. Nor will we fail to find similar chameleon double talk in our own country in respectable educational association. The real repository of human rights is not the constitution of the state but the daily life of the people.

II

Human rights in the Declaration of Independence

An American discussion will naturally start from the statement of the Declaration of Independence and we should never tire of repeating the memorable phrases of the Declaration:

"We declare these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Nor should we overlook the right declared immediately after this:

"Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government laying its foundation on such principle and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall most likely effect their safety and happiness."

The Constitution of the United States was submitted to the people for ratification without a Bill of Rights. The argument that the document was an over-all protection was not acceptable, hence the insistence in many States for a specific statement of rights, constitute the Bill of Rights of the first 10 amendments.

The French declaration of human rights

During the French Revolution the words of our Declaration resounded and were studied. The French, too, wanted to formulate the rights of man, so in the early 1790's there were two formulations by the National Assembly and one by Robespierre that are similar on some points in our own Declaration. The 1791 National Assembly made a declaration of rights of man and citizen:

"Considering that ignorance, forgetfulness, or contempt of the rights of man are the sole causes of the public miseries and of the corruption of governments, have resolved to set forth in a solemn declaration the natural, inalienable, and sacred rights of man, in order that this declaration, being ever present to all the members of the social body, may unceasingly remind them of their rights and their duties." (Great Expressions of Human Rights, R. M. MacIver, p. 265.)

The first two declarations made as all of them were, as the document states, "in the presence and under the auspices of the Supreme Being," are:

"1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions can be based only upon public utility.

"2. The aim of every political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible (note the word) rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression" (p. 265).

In the constitution of 1793 this is repeated. We shall add here an interesting definition of liberty:

"Liberty is the power that belongs to man to do whatever is not injurious to the rights of others; it has nature for its principle, justice for its rule, law for its defense; its moral limit is in this maxim: 'Do not do to another that which you do not wish should be done to you'" (p. 269).

The nature of human rights

As stated in our own Declaration these rights are part of the very nature of man—they are his nature, stamped as it were in his mind and heart and [illegible]. They are not man-made, nor conferred by governments, but from the Great Lawgiver, the Maker of the universe and all that is in it, the Creator of man, God Himself. This is the meaning of the Declaration that these human rights are endowed by the Creator. The French very properly call them sacred.

Eternal vigilance needed

The French definition of these rights as imprescriptible as well as inalienable gives special emphasis to another idea that these rights are "independent of law or custom" and cannot be "justly taken away." This is in addition to the fact that the individual cannot give up these rights. And they cannot be surrendered or lost so as to deny them to posterity. But governments which are so often made the guarantors and protectors of these natural, sacred, imprescriptible, and inalienable rights of man are often the instrument of their restriction, their denial, even their destruction. Eternal vigilance is always the price of liberty.

One of the things we ought to be on our guard against is a confusion of these broad human rights—inherent, imprescriptible, inalienable—belonging to man because of his existence, his dignity, his place in the Creation, whatever sanction confirms them; and political and civil, and even social and economic rights which grow out of the particular human conventions, social contracts, constitutions which give form to a political or economic society. The former are rights which are inviolable by absolute monarch, fuehrer, or other dictator or democratic majority. The latter are matters of agreement among men—deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

III

Definition of rights and duties

Unfortunately the whole discussion is a strange confusion of rights and obligations, without any clear distinction between rights and correlative obligations, nor is there any clear conception of duty or duties. A right, as Cahill says, is defined as a "moral power which a person has and which other persons are bound to respect, to do something to retain something, or exact something from another."

A duty is "a moral obligation of doing or not doing something."

Surely there should be no confusion as to rights and duties, but there is, and a good deal of the contemporary moral topsy-turviness and the spiritual chaos is due to that confusion.

Education as right and duty

Education is not in the area of rights, it is in the area of duty. It is in the area of the will which man may or may not do to achieve his purpose, ultimate and immediate. It is in the area of compulsion which the state says the individual must have in the interest of the common welfare; and beyond it an area of social opportunities. There is a minimum, too, of knowledge which the church says is necessary for salvation. Education is in the area of parental obligation and decision both in the natural law, in the civil law, and in the canon law to determine

what education the child shall receive and what use will be made of the social opportunities, including those of the church and state, to help the child secure an education. There is an education that is regimentation and indoctrination, but the only genuine education is self-education utilizing self-activity by means of self direction for the supreme end of life in Heaven and of life on the earth.

United States Senate should reject covenant of human rights

May I digress to say that declarations or covenants of human rights should always remain as statements of aspiration and not presented as treaties. While the proposed covenant to be considered by the United States Senate does not include all the universal declaration of rights, omitting the social and economic, it should nevertheless be rejected by the Senate even if it be, in large part, a statement of rights that are protected in the United States now. This is not the method of making laws or constitutional changes for the American people. If there is any possibility of its passage a rider such as this should be attached:

"No provision of this agreement (not a treaty) shall in any way affect or change the laws of the United States or of any State or the Constitution of the United States or of any State unless each specific proposal has followed the regular procedure for making laws or amending the Constitution of the United States or of the States. Such declaration shall have no force or effect in any court of law or equity in the United States in any suit whatever."[1]

IV

The foundation of human rights

But many people even in our own Nation do not accept the religious and metaphysical basis and sanction of human rights and we know that the belief in the natural law has fluctuated during the centuries. In the history of man's struggle for liberty, we have a common basis of agreement. Those who do not accept the religious sanction must substitute a sanction of social expediency—a not too secure basis, or it becomes as in Russia, a right conferred by the state, not proclaimed or declared by the people, and consequently as insecure and fluctuating as governments themselves—with its not infrequent usurping executive, subservient legislature, and spineless judiciary. This while the human rights may be defined in the same language their foundation may be as in one case, the rock, and in the other case, sand. Though the protection of such rights in constitutions of states as well is a little more secure than statutory provisions; they may be denied or destroyed and are not inalienable, imprescriptible, or sacred. But they will be determined for individuals in a particular social order, however, by some combination of the constitution, the laws, the police powers and equity as interpreted by judicial opinion.

Human rights and the nature of man

Closely related to these rights will be the process of making them real, the process of not merely having them, but enjoying them. Consequently education, not public education, not private education, but education of the individual, helping him to realize the source, sanction, and content of these rights is essential if these rights are to be enjoyed. In other words, the opportunity and the means for the development of the whole man—physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual—for a fullness and abundance of life worthy of his higher potentialities, the individual there must have education. But education is not a right; it is useful, if the right kind, to enable man to save these rights and to achieve their purpose in helping man achieve his humanity.

V

Education as a right (U. S. S. R.)

Education as a right is discussed in the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; in chapter 10 we read:

"Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to education.

"This right is insured by universal, compulsory elementary education; by education, including higher education, being free of charge; by the system of state stipends for the overwhelming majority of students in the universities and colleges; by instruction in schools being conducted in the native language, and by the organization in the factories, state farms, machine and tractor stations and collective farms of free vocational, technical, and agronomic training for the working people." (Article 121, Constitution of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, p. 103.)

Education in universal declaration of human rights

A somewhat similar statement on the relation of education and human rights is contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations. In article 26, we read:

"(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

"(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

"(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children."

A Catholic declaration of human rights

The NCWC submitted a draft of a declaration of human rights to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations. These included many rights. Those relating to education included among the rights of human persons the right to religious formation through education and association; the right to education suitable for the maintenance and development of man's dignity as a human person.

Under the rights of the family was the right to educate the children.

And under the domestic rights of states the right to require that its people receive an education suitable for citizenship.

The rights listed above are in no sense human rights in the basic sense, nor are they rights that can be made secure by government except the parental right stated. Besides this confusion as to the meaning of the word rights, the so-called rights themselves are too vague—unenforceable in law or binding on others because of this vagueness. The rights of parents (rather than of the family) should have been more broadly stated in view of the incompetence, unwillingness, impracticability of parents to carry on the actual education of their children, or their readiness to delegate it.

VI

Learning about human rights

Educational facilities at every level within the capacity of the student must provide opportunity to learn the truths about human rights.

The widest diffusion of the knowledge of the existence of such rights, a fuller meaning of them than the repetition of the phrases of the declaration should be a part of all education in the United States whether publicly or privately supported.

The character of the Government

A clear inference from this point is that we must teach the essential character of government rather than the numerous inert facts about it so often taught in schools. The basic truths we should teach about government will be indicated shortly. We must emphasize it as a means, not an end in itself. The social aims of the preamble to the Constitution must be emphasized. They are the direct objectives of our political life and they are phases of man's effort to achieve the conditions of the fulfillment and enrichment of man's nature and his destiny. This is the purpose of all social machinery including government, and of all social structures as well.

We do not need to go abroad to see government become a Frankenstein. We have only to look at our own country in the last quarter of a century. And if we see, or want to see, how easy it is done we should note in World War II the nonchalance with which the Congress of the United States voted extraordinary war powers to the President. This was practically an abdication of legislative power. We have not learned certain basic lessons of political life.

1. Government exists for the welfare of the governed.

A government of laws rather than a government of men.

3. A really independent judiciary (no packed supreme courts) with a high sense of their function as protectors of individual rights.

4. The greater safeguards are in decentralization rather than in centralization, with control of power kept near the point where it is exercised.

5. Greater emphasis on legislatures rather than executive branch of the Government which on the national level would make Tehrans, Yaltas, and Potsdams impossible without legislative approval.

6. Maintenance of greater independence and sharper separation of governmental powers: executive, judicial, and legislative.

7. Public administration devoted exclusively to a faithful execution of the laws.

8. That governmental power is in its nature, limited—not totalitarian—not despotic—not tyrannical.

9. The revolutionary right when government becomes destructive of its proper ends, to alter or abolish it and institute a new government, laying its new foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

10. Public officials are public servants.

This statement emphasizes the importance of the eternal vigilance needed if human rights are not only to be possessed but to be enjoyed and it points to our first relation of human rights to education. They are a continual challenge and opportunity to education.

If a right, what kind of education?

The grave problem that exists where education is declared to be a right is what education? In the United States as defined by the United States Supreme Court, basing its decision on the natural law, this education is not necessarily an education taught by public teachers, an education which standardizes the children. The high duty of defining this education is in those who nurture him and direct his destiny. The language of the Oregon decision is as follows:

"As often heretofore pointed out, rights guaranteed by the Constitution may not be abridged by legislation which has no reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the State. The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

The kind of education implied in human rights

Education itself is not a right. It cannot be conferred, nor can it be taken away from an individual, nor can it be claimed. All that society or government can do is to provide the opportunities for education, create what Lester Ward called an educational environment. Then the spirit listing where it will may get an education. There is in the old meaning of the word a mystery of education. Different people in the same situation react in widely different ways. For some a situation may be a matter of indifference, for others it may cataclysmically affect their whole life by giving it new direction. Regimentation and uniformity are no parts of effective education. Education for totalitarian regimes, even if some were beneficent would be an evil; only in the freedom of the human spirit can there be real education. Therefore in our schools if education recognizing the existence of human right will conform to certain conditions:

1. It will emphasize learning instead of teaching.

2. It will provide the opportunity for self-activity, self-direction, and self-control.

3. It will provide for diversity of talent, interest, and experience.

4. It will recognize a moral order of the universe of which the school is a part.

5. In Catholic schools it will recognize the giver of human rights, Creator, Father, and the providence of God. In other schools they will give expression to the faith that is in them regarding the universe.

6. It will recognize the dignity of each person without any adjective and make available all educational facilities to each person according to his capacity, his preparation, and training.

Human rights and a liberal education

In the conception of human rights of man, independent of government—inherent, inalienable, imprescriptible, and sacred, we have a basis for a liberal education which has only been rarely averted to, if at all. It is this dignity of man, maker of governments and of school systems, that a liberal education takes account of as its central object and to the fulfillment of whose purposes it is principally concerned. It is the human being achieving his humanity in the community with other human beings by self-mastery, self-direction and self-control that makes education liberal. This is anterior and superior to all his vocations and activities in which he participates in the community. Even these are judged by the degrees to which they enrich human personality by this self activity.

VII

Political and civil rights

There are certain other rights—called political and civil rights—which grow out of the nature of our society and Government, both man-made. They are reinforcements of the basic human rights and grow out of a recognition of the dignity of man. They differ in their scope and their protection in different societies and basing their just powers on the consent of the governed. In our contemporary education three issues are closely related to these political and civic rights. They relate to so-called student rights, to discrimination and to academic freedom.

The school and social responsibility

One of the most significant characteristics of education, particularly in colleges, is a new self-consciousness on the part of students, a new assertion of their rights or what they conceive to be their rights, and a desire to participate in administration, helping to decide the condition of their educational destiny.

There is increasing recognition on the part of education administrators and of teachers of the central place of students in the educational process, and a consequent new emphasis on learning in place of the old emphasis on teaching.

Students on the college level have proposed a student bill of rights. Intrinsically this is a good thing, but instead of being merely imitative of the great documents of political liberty and repeating loudly the weasel words of contemporary discussion they should study the purposes of the institution of which they are a part, and relate these rights to the purposes of the organization. Some will be intrinsic, others will be granted as experience shows the students ready for them. I have elsewhere given my conception of a student bill of rights so will not say more at this time.

Discrimination in schools

I fear a good deal of the discussion of discrimination in education was evilly inspired and was designed to promote tension rather than to alleviate it. There is no justification for discrimination against human beings on any of the grounds so prevalent in our society. The remedy must come as an educative process rather than by social mandate or legislative act. We must learn to live together by living together—as the thoughts of men are widened with the processes of the sun. We know, however, that the inevitable progress of nineteenth century social science was self-deception. A secure progress will be secured only by positive teaching based on the great doctrine of religion, the fatherhood of God, the communion of saints, and the mystical body of Christ, as living faith in the actual social community.

Academic freedom

The other problem is academic freedom. A full discussion would take us too far afield so we state the problem briefly. Academic freedom is as essential in the school as freedom of speech and press is in the general social life. It is interesting to note in the French statements on this subject that the right is stated with the limitation subject to responsibility for the abuse of this freedom.

"The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious of the rights of man; every citizen then can freely speak, write, and print, subject to responsibility for the abuse of this freedom in the cases determined by law" (p. 256).

In university research it is of the essence. In teaching it is weighted with certain responsibilities to the student, the responsibility of conforming to the standards of scholarship and to avoid merely idiosyncratic teaching taking advantage of the immaturity of the student. The ideal, particularly in the research area, was stated in the famous 1910 statement of Wisconsin which was made to encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found.

The teacher and academic freedom

And dealing with a current problem the President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has put the case well regarding a fact often overlooked—the factor of competent teachers.

"The institute also wishes to make it clear that it believes that the teacher, as a teacher, must be free of doctrinaire control originating outside of his own mind. He must be free to be critical and objective in his own way, and above all he must work in the clear daylight without hidden allegiances or obligations which require him to distort his research or teaching in accord with dictates from without. If a teacher were found to be subject to improper outside control in his teaching, the institute would regard him as incompetent" (p. 4, Primer of Intellectual Freedom, Howard Mumford Jones).

And the statement regarding teaching is thus put by the Pope:

A norm of a just freedom

"This norm of a just freedom in things scientific, serves also as an inviolable norm of a just freedom in things didactic, or for rightly understood liberty in teaching; it should be observed therefore in whatever instruction is imparted to others. The obligation is all the more binding in justice when there is question of instructing youth. For in this work the teacher, whether public or private, has no absolute right of his own, but only such as has been communicated to him by others. Besides every Christian child or youth has a strict right to instruction in harmony with the teaching of the church, the pillar and ground of truth. And whoever disturbs the pupil's faith in any way, does him grave wrong, inasmuch as he abuses the trust which children place in their teachers, and takes unfair advantage of their inexperience and of their natural craving for uncontrolled liberty, at once illusory and false (Rudiger in the Philosophy of Education, p. 427).

Conflicts of science and religion

And a word must be said about the conflict between science and religion in this connection. Following the summary fashion we are using, we quote Cardinal Newman's solution:

"(The Catholic) is sure, and nothing shall make him doubt, that if anything seems to be proved by astronomer, or geologist, or chronologist, or antiquarian, or ethnologist, in contradiction to the dogmas of faith, that point will eventually turn out, first, not to be proved, or secondly, not contradictory, or thirdly, not contradictory to anything really revealed, but to something which has been confused with revelation" (Idea of a University, pp. 466–7).

EPILOGUE

There is, in short, vital meaning for education in human rights, but it is not found in the ballyhoo for human rights hampling it with democracy, peace, justice, and every worthy abstract noun. It is more than a catch phrase but it requires thought and reflection. Its real meaning goes down to the very nature of man and to a destiny worthy of his origin, and it has high suggestion. It is the man with human rights, inalienable, imprescriptible, sacred, as well as rights growing out of the social order, that through self activity and self direction will be revealed to himself in education fulfilling the potential dynamism of his nature in full measure—to the measure of the fullness of the stature of Christ.

[1] Inspired by the approval of the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution of the United States another amendment should be formulated embodying the substance of this statement. It should also delete in article VI of the Constitution of the United States the phrase, "and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States."

World Defense in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "World Defense in the Pacific," delivered by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] at Brown University, Providence, R. I., on March 30, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD DEFENSE IN THE PACIFIC

(Address by United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN)

Fellow Brown men, most of last December I spent on a hurried trip which took me around the globe. The purpose of my trip was to take part, along with Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, as representatives of the American Senate in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting in Canberra, Australia. The subject was one of especial present interest to all the nations represented, namely, International Relations and Defense.

In speaking to you today on the problems which American foreign policy must face in the vast and troubled areas of southeast Asia and the southwest Pacific, I refer to this trip because it made it possible for us not only to learn the views of the eight nations representing the British Commonwealth, but also to make brief stop-overs in most of the nations within that region and discuss this subject with them also.

After crossing the Pacific by air, we stopped first in New Zealand, then at several places in Australia. From Australia we flew north to Djakartac, capital of the newly founded Indonesian Republic, from there to Singapore, in British Malaya, and thence on to Bangkok, in Thailand. In the new republic of India, we visited Calcutta and New Delhi and our last stop in that area was at Karachi in the new Republic of Pakistan.

It was possible for us, in practically every instance, to talk at length with the leading officials of the governments we visited. We conferred also with the top American diplomats in the area, with members of the press, and many nationals of the various countries.

Let me make it clear that I do not regard this experience as making me an expert on the affairs of the Far East. On the other hand, I did feel able to capture the pervading sense of urgency which surrounds many of the problems in that region. To a large extent, I could see at first hand, and hear from the words of the leaders best informed, the documentation underlying the many reports which as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations I have studied over the past years.

I assure you that if you have the kind of mind which responds to the challenge of a difficult problem, you would return from a visit to those countries tremendously stimulated with a determination to act in solving the problems existing there. To the pessimist, I am certain that the difficulties appear almost insurmountable. Even to the optimist they seem very difficult, indeed, and time will be needed to devise any successful solution and much more time to carry into effect a program of action. But for us, as free people, the stakes involved are so great that we cannot afford to take the pessimist's view.

Let me paint for you, in outline at least, a picture of this region. With the exception of the predominantly white populations of New Zealand and Australia, most of the brown, black, and yellow people of the region live under conditions which are almost impossible for an American to comprehend. In terms of food supplies, the diet standards are 20 percent below the levels required to meet minimum subsistence, and much of what food there is is badly distributed. India, as a result of a serious drought and trade and political difficulties with Pakistan which have cut off the surplus produced by that Moslem state, is faced with a food shortage of great proportions. There and elsewhere throughout the region the diet standards are so low that the people lack the energy and will to work. Agricultural methods are most primitive, and tilled land produces much smaller yields than it might be made capable of turning out. Other land, which, with irrigation, could be turned to food production lies unused.

Most of the people who farm the land do so as peasants on vast estates. For them there are few incentives to produce more. They lack what might otherwise be a pride of ownership in the land, and they lack a will to produce for profit because any profit will flow into hands other than their own.

Other multitudes live out short lives as unproductive beggars, many packed in cities of indescribable squalor. Still others work for what food they get as laborers on rubber plantations, mining tin or manganese, or otherwise in the production of raw materials for export which produce what revenues these countries get for purchase of manufactured goods from the developed areas of Europe and America.

Moreover, in country after country, the peoples are divided along deep religious or racial cleavages. For example, the Chinese minorities scattered through Indochina, Thailand, Burma, and the Malay States feel the oppression of native majorities and turn toward a China now Communist for support and protection.

Then, too, the long-established practices of colonial powers have made them bitter against the white populations, who lived under democracy at home but refused to adopt it in their colonies. These have left a residual fear, distrust, and even hatred, of white men. The most moving force there is the determination to achieve independence, and the next most moving force is to attain a domestic government which will achieve economic reforms, especially land reforms.

In differing degrees these conditions exert tremendous pressures which cause unrest and instability throughout the region. It can truly be said that the non-Communist governments both colonial and native of these areas are today on trial. And it must be added that the Communists are everywhere actively at work exploiting this dissension and unrest.

This internal Communist activity manifests itself in countless ways. It plays upon the failure of local leaders to overcome starvation. It tries to shout down efforts to enlarge defense forces with cries that the governments must fear the all-powerful Mao of China. It seeks to intimidate people into joining the Communist movement now in order to avoid turning their countries into battlefields of destruction such as—to use their phrase—the American imperialists have done to Korea. Efforts by the United States and other members of the U. N. to furnish military and economic assistance to the countries are condemned as thinly disguised moves to reestablish imperialism. And when last year the Congress cut the funds for technical assistance under the point 4 program to a level below that recommended, this was heralded by the Communists as proof that the United States did not really intend to help the underdeveloped areas.

Black as much of this picture appears to be, there are some bright spots which light the way to effective, affirmative solutions for bringing these people into full partnership in the community of free nations.

But before going into the steps we can take, let me first digress for a moment to answer any of you who may be wondering why we should undertake any responsibility for what happens in far-away areas confronted with so many grave problems.

Firstly, we have a selfish and very important interest in the huge quantities of critical raw materials upon which we primarily depend upon this area to furnish. Assured of a steady and increasing supply of these materials we can maintain and expand the production we so vitally need for the critical period ahead. If these raw materials are lost to us, it will be impossible to develop other supplies or substitutes without first experiencing a serious, perhaps fatal, decline in our own productive output.

Secondly, a matter of fundamental principle is involved. It is the principle of creating a collective strength in the free world. Few people seriously contend that we Americans can best assure our own freedom by facing a hostile world alone. Almost unanimously, we are convinced that with allies beside us, and with unity among these allies, we possess substantial assurance of enduring peace in a free world.

When the democracies of Europe backed down at Munich, fear and despair sapped the morale of free people the world over. And we must not forget that lesson today. Aggression, regardless of where it occurs, affects the whole world. And the loss of a nation to communism by the internal overthrow of its government is nonetheless a loss to the entire community of free nations. Either event strengthens the Kremlin's hand and correspondingly weakens the morale and determination of the non-Communist world.

For us as freemen, there is no acceptable alternative to action, responsible action, on our part to work cooperatively with those who seek to resist the forces of despotism and tyranny. We must reject appeasement in all its forms.

In turning now to the course of action required to bring stability to the Far East, I think we should at the outset recognize the principle that we should work through the United Nations to the maximum degree possible. For one thing, the participation of many nations—large and small—will largely do away with the argument that the white democracies are cooperating for the purpose of fostering imperialism. Particularly with smaller nations in the picture, their participation in, and guidance of, the programs will make it difficult indeed for the Communists to exploit distrust of this motive.

We must also recognize that it is far simpler to chart in theory what should be done than it is to carry this out in actuality. For one thing, the present leadership in some of these countries has shown little real regard for improving the lot of the people. In some cases the anti-Communist attitude of the governments is dictated by little more than the selfish desire to retain their own despotic control over the people. Popular support and loyalty of the people in these instances is slim indeed.

Thus, any assistance going into these countries will have to be conditioned by the insistence that certain basic reforms are expected of the governments in return for the help given them. On the other hand, any

attempt to tell a country what it must do arouses sensitivities and is open to the charge of meddling in purely national matters. Obviously, for any program to succeed, it will be necessary to steer a delicately balanced course between hurt feelings on the one side, and demands for improvement on the other.

With these qualifications in mind, let us examine some of the things which can be done. Take the all-important question of starvation. In the short run, we can, and must, see to it that certain countries need immediate help in meeting their famine conditions. But such help is little more than first-aid to tide them over and does not solve the problem of a food shortage. Agricultural scientists know what is needed to improve farming methods. Putting the methods to work is, however, another question. We can furnish agricultural technicians who in turn can train native farm agents to work with the people and show them and encourage them to adopt new methods. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs has enjoyed considerable success with a similar program in Latin America for more than 8 years.

Adoption of land reforms which will give the people an opportunity to own, and retain their tenure, on the land will be of unparalleled value in giving the farmers real incentive to produce. The United Nations has already done a great deal through its studies to develop workable systems of land reform, and throughout Asia this is a crying need.

Similarly, the eradication of disease, improved public health services, greatly expanded educational facilities, present problems which can be solved by assistance, coupled with more readily available long-term loans and direct money grants.

The governments of these countries must get assistance in making plans for such needed public works as highways, irrigation and power projects, schools, hospitals—and they will undoubtedly need material help in obtaining funds for the construction of these projects.

Let me make it clear, however, that I do not regard such economic-aid programs as I have suggested as hand-out programs which we are called upon to finance. All such projects must be authorized only after they are shown to be part of a planned program for the sound development of a country and a region. It would indeed be pouring money down a rat hole to finance projects which were not realistically related to need and properly designed to improve the economic, social, and political stability of the country.

There is also a great need for technical assistance to enable each country to determine which of its resources are best suited for encouraging the expansion of private industry. What I have in mind here is not the development of productive capacity through some socialistic plan which we are asked to finance. Quite the contrary. You have, I am sure, seen the advertisements in magazines and newspapers extolling the virtues of New England or Pennsylvania or Texas or California as fine places to locate new industries. While I take no position on the effectiveness of this as a method for attracting new capital for industrial expansion, I merely wish to point out that the underdeveloped countries have a similar but much more urgent problem of the same kind. The backward regions are, for the most part, rich in natural resources and poor, indeed, in industrial capacity. By surveying and planning for private industrial development, these countries can do a great deal to attract private capital.

The recent report of the Rockefeller board suggests that Congress can double the rate of private investment in the backward areas for industrial development by establishing a program of loan insurance comparable to the FHA home-loan insurance, and by modification of tax laws which will provide added incentive to invest abroad. On the other hand, we should be most careful to see that we do not give the private investors a license to exploit the countries in which they choose to invest. Any such program underwriting private investment should necessarily be limited to projects which fit in with a sound program for the development of the country involved.

By contrast with the costs of any military program, enormous results can be obtained for relatively small expenditures through foreign economic assistance programs. The Rockefeller report, for example, recommended that the United States spend half a billion dollars a year for foreign economic development over the next few years. The report pointed out that this amount, coupled with proper inducements to private investors and more liberal lending policies by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, could produce a total of $4,500,000,000 annually which would flow into the backward countries for economic development purposes.

Not only could such a program result in greatly strengthening the individual countries, making them more secure against the internal threat of communism by providing better living standards and hope for the people, but in addition, it would provide us with 50 percent more critically needed raw materials, and could furnish the basis for a much larger volume of world trade in the future.

In promoting political, economic, and social stability in the backward areas, we would be meeting communism at its first line of attack, which is the use of internal means to stir up disunity and strife leading to overthrow of the existing non-Communist governments.

But important as economic aid is, we must also now work toward a real build-up of military strength in order to ward off actual aggression itself. Certainly a minimum requirement here is the creation of much stronger national forces in the underdeveloped areas. At the moment, many of them are scarcely capable of maintaining civil order in their own countries. We can scarcely expect these countries to build forces sufficient to meet and repel the combined might of Soviet Russia and all the Soviet satellites too. But we can assist them in creating a combined strength which will be adequate to meet an attack upon any one of them by any such satellite.

Everywhere I went in southeast Asia last December, I heard the Korean war discussed. There were almost as many views as there were people to discuss it. While I can say there is no real unanimity as to what is the best course of action to be taken in a military sense, it is also true to say that the leaders of every country I visited made it clear that they would defend their own countries if attacked. Deep-seated national jealousies and religious differences qualified the view many of them took as to giving military assistance to a neighboring country in the event it was set upon.

However, I am firmly convinced that these national, religious, and racial differences are steadily being submerged as a result of the growing realization that the Kremlin is simply using the people of its satellites to do its work of gradual world conquest. They have all become acutely aware of the Chinese Communist government and the forces at its command. In the minds of some—perhaps it is more accurate to say many—that I talked with—the Communist Mao was little if any worse than Chiang Kai-shek. The belief is widespread that Chiang was not beaten by the Communists whose armies his own greatly outnumbered in men and equipment. The belief is, instead, that the Chinese people had simply rejected the Nationalist Government after 20 years of mismanagement and corruption, because it had failed to advance the interests of the people. Mao's more recent actions—such as his decision to enter the Korean war, and later to launch aggression against Tibet—have, I believe, changed in Asia a great many of the earlier estimates of the Chinese Communists. The fear that Communist China will not be content to keep its forces within its own borders is awakening the realization that the free nations of Asia must stand together, or fall seperately.

The leaders of non-Communist Asia are watching developments under the North Atlantic Pact with greatly increased interest. I heard talk in many places of a corresponding Pacific pact. There is not yet the full willingness to smother the long-smoldering antagonisms between brown men and yellow men and white men and black men to the extent that will be necessary for the kind of close cooperation and mutual support required to make a defense effort like that General Eisenhower is now undertaking a success.

But the necessity for such a collective security system is daily becoming apparent to more of the leaders of non-Communist Asia and the oceanic nations of the southwest Pacific. The initiative for such a plan must necessarily come from them. We cannot compel them to work together; we cannot compel them to cooperate if they continue their distrust of one another. But the exigencies of the present situation are bringing them together.

While war has brought terrific destruction and hardship to the people of Korea, and this is not lost upon the other people of the Far East, the decision by the United Nations not only to condemn aggression as the League of Nations did, but also to implement that condemnation by acts, as the League of Nations failed to do, is a long step forward in the establishment of world peace. Whatever the final outcome may be this action has given encouragement to those nations who long for peace. The fact that the United Nations has undertaken to defend the integrity of a free nation when its independence is at stake, has had a telling effect upon all of the Far East.

Every non-Communist country has the perfectly understandable desire to avoid involvement in all-out war. To each country of the Far East was in Korea the sickening possibility that its turn may come day picks. The people of the Far East want, above all, the assurance that the governments under which they live will lead them to peace and to the kind of life in which disease, starvation, poverty, and despair will be minimized. Such assurance is now difficult to find in most of those countries.

We here in the United States have the grave responsibility to assist these people in gaining the assurance they so desperately need. Many of them are taught daily to distrust us and hate us and fear us. Many of them are too sick, too hungry, too uneducated to care what happens. But despite all this, I am convinced that in most of them there is a latent will to rally to leadership which can bring them freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom to live in the dignity to which man's spirit entitles him.

We Americans know in our own hearts that it is peace, but war, which we seek. That we are being lied about, our motives are being attacked, and our counterpoints are being today in Korea because a horde bent upon the conquest of the world is at large. We must

make no deals with that force; we must accept no appeasement of it; and we will ultimately succeed in turning it back to die of its own internal evil.

But we can do this only through resolute acceptance of the great duties ahead of us, with a willingness to sacrifice if necessary everything but principle. I have no doubt as to our success in the long pull.

Is the St. Lawrence Seaway Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project are again making a desperate effort to revive it despite the fact that for over 50 years frenzied attempts have been made to sell such a discredited scheme to the American people.

Fortunately for the taxpayers of America, Congress has consistently refused to sanction construction of such an economic monstrosity, yet proponents of such a perennial legislative proposal persist in their specious arguments hoping that the American people will be lulled to sleep with their persuasive efforts, and succumb from sheer exhaustion.

It was my pleasure to accept the invitation of the Mutual Broadcasting System to make a Nation-wide broadcast on March 29, 1951, regarding the St. Lawrence project. My address follows:

IS THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY NECESSARY?

Ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply grateful to the Mutual Broadcasting System for the privilege of talking to you on the subject Is the St. Lawrence Seaway Necessary?

As a matter of information, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project which has been before the American people since 1895 should be considered in two parts—first, as a seaway which contemplates the establishment of a 27-foot channel from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to Duluth, Minn., a distance of 1,677 miles. To complete the proposed seaway it will be necessary to construct a series of channels, canals and large dams.

The second part of the St. Lawrence project involves the construction of a large hydroelectric-power dam estimated to produce for the American side 570,000 kilowatt hours of firm electric current.

The project which is commonly known as the St. Lawrence project has been before the Congress of the United States time and time again and not once have its advocates been able to justify the investment because it is as unsound today as it has been in the past.

At the moment there is pending, before both branches of Congress, legislation on the subject and it is interesting to note that there is nothing new to the age-old arguments advanced by its advocates, except that we are told now that the seaway is needed to provide a water route from Seven Islands, Quebec, for the transportation of iron ore from Labrador to Great Lakes ports. It is said that this Labrador ore is vitally needed because of the dwindling supply of ore in the Mesabi Range in Minnesota. We are told also that there is a shortage of electric power in the northeastern section of the United States and particularly in New York State and that this shortage of power is a threat to our national defense. In other words, the advocates of the St. Lawrence project have again tried to label it as necessary to our national security.

The truth of the matter is that this Nation will have won or lost its security long before this project could be completed because it is the opinion of expert engineers that it will require from 5 to 7 years to complete its construction. Meanwhile, money, materials, and manpower, urgently needed for mobilization to meet the emergency we are now confronted with, would be diverted to a scheme that will ultimately benefit Canada more than the United States where only 15 percent of our population would receive any benefits.

If you will read the congressional hearings spread over a period of years containing the arguments for and against the project you will find that Congress rejected the proposal based on the following reasons:

1. The St. Lawrence seaway's value as a transportation artery has been vastly overrated mostly because it would be closed to navigation for at least 5 months or more each year when the St. Lawrence River is ice-bound. In addition, one must consider that the proposed St. Lawrence route will include tortuous, rock-bottomed channels that will be blanketed in fog not only during the fall and spring, but frequently during the summer.

2. The proposed 27-foot channel would be too shallow for 90 percent of the vessels of our own merchant marine, in which the American people have invested $19,000,000,000. Our merchant vessels require channels with a depth of at least 30 feet. On the other hand, vessels of foreign countries, which are smaller in size and manned by cheap labor, would enjoy a field day in dumping cheaply manufactured foreign products on the American market, such as coal, ore, foreign steel and steel products. Nor can we forget that it will bring the Midwest farmer face to face with competition from the agricultural production of foreign countries.

In short, the St. Lawrence seaway will not be a one-way street for the exportation of American goods but in fact will open the way for foreign competition at the expense of the American wage earner.

3. The Nation would lose by spending huge sums of money to establish a costly form of transportation which could exist only because the already overburdened taxpayer would provide and support it. It would disrupt long-established and satisfactory methods of transportation such as trucks and busses on our highways, railroads, airlines, as well as water carriers. The St. Lawrence seaway would compete unfairly with the present-day methods of transportation since it would be Government subsidized and tax free.

For example, at the present time American railroads employ millions of American citizens and long trains carry millions of tons of freight to and from seaboard ports. Should the St. Lawrence seaway become a reality foreign steamers, manned by cheaply paid crews, will deprive the railroads of this freight traffic to such a degree that American railroads will suffer annually a loss in freight revenue of from one hundred to two hundred and fifty million dollars. For every thousand tons of freight taken from the railroads by these foreign steamers, one freight train is eliminated, and when you remove freight trains you destroy the jobs of railroaders and others.

Furthermore, the freight diverted from the American railroads to foreign ships would adversely affect all ports, especially those in New York, Boston, Buffalo, and New Orleans. The effect would also extend to public and private investments in docks, warehouses, terminals, and grain elevators with a consequent reduction in employment. Thus you have foreign seamen on these tramp steamers benefiting at the expense of American workmen. In simple language, the St. Lawrence seaway which has been labeled as a method of cheap transportation would cost the American taxpayers many more dollars than it would save them.

These are only a few of the many reasons why Congress has rejected the flimsy arguments for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

As already mentioned the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway now come forth with the proposal that its construction is necessary to provide a water route from Seven Islands, Quebec for the transportation of iron ore from the Labrador-Quebec area to Great Lakes ports. The amount to be brought in annually over this proposed route is only 10,000,000 tons as compared with our annual need of over 100,000,000 tons.

Mind you, this argument is presented during this critical period in world affairs when our country is on the brink of world war III and at a time when the American taxpayer is paying for tax purposes about 35 cents out of every dollar he earns.

The need for Labrador ores is based on the argument that such ores are indispensable to our own national security because of an impending shortage of high-grade ore principally from the Mesabi Range in Minnesota.

While there have been conflicting statements regarding the remaining deposits of ore in the Mesabi Range, the fact remains that from 1917 to 1949 new ore reserves have been located. It is true that the ore shipped to date is in excess of the reserves, yet we cannot ignore this fact that huge deposits of taconite—a lower grade of ore—have been located in Minnesota and that a process is being perfected that will permit taconite concentrate to compete favorably with the high grade of ore of the Mesabi Range. This fact is confirmed by experts.

In addition to the high- and low-grade ore reserves of the Mesabi Range, there exists on the north shore of Lake Superior at a site known as Steep Rock Lake in Ontario, a source of high-grade ore that, according to the United States Bureau of Mines, may amount to no less than a billion tons. Transportation for this ore deposit is already available by utilizing existing railroad facilities from Steep Rock Lake to Port Arthur where iron-ore vessels now plying the Great Lakes can carry it to its destination.

In addition to iron-ore deposits in Minnesota and Ontario we cannot ignore the huge deposits of iron ore in Venezuela and Chile, that recently started to arrive in this country.

Just a few days ago the Bethlehem Steel Corp. announced that large iron-ore deposits have been located in western Pennsylvania and that already $34,000,000 have been allocated to develop the project. Thus, today we have five principal sources of iron ore, namely, Minnesota, Ontario, Venezuela, Chile, and western Pennsylvania, all of which have been or are being developed in the spirit of free enterprise with adequate transportation facilities available to transport the ore to the mills.

Back of the argument that the St. Lawrence seaway is necessary to transport ore from the Labrador-Quebec area is the fact that a half dozen small Midwest steel companies are promoting the Labrador-Quebec project and they see in the St. Lawrence seaway the opportunity to subsidize the cost of bringing the ore to their mills. Such a subsidy would affect favorably the price of the Labrador-Quebec ore and put it in competition with the ores from Minnesota, Ontario, Venezuela, Chile, and western Pennsylvania which is being mined in the spirit of free enterprise.

In other words, six small Midwest steel companies have invested in the Labrador-Quebec project and they are asking the American people, now burdened by high taxes, to finance the St. Lawrence seaway so that they can get cheaper transportation rates for every ton of ore they transport to their mills, an advantage they would enjoy over their competitors.

While these Midwest steel companies are feathering their own nests at the expense of the American taxpayers, very little is being said about the over-all cost of the St. Lawrence seaway project. We are being told today that the seaway project will only cost the American taxpayers a half a billion dollars—but let me leave this thought with you—should the steam shovels start digging the St. Lawrence seaway there will be American tax dollars in every bucketful of earth—for this project, plus the necessary deepening of lake harbors, together with defending and maintaining it—is expected to cost better than a billion dollars before it is completed with two-thirds of this amount to be sweated out of American taxpayers when in the same breath we are being asked to tighten our belts.

Worse still, a billion dollars is only the estimate of what the project will cost. As a rule estimates are usually way out of line, especially in projects of this nature. For example, the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River cost nearly twice as much as estimated; the Suez Canal cost two and one-half times, and the Chicago drainage canal three and one-half times as much as the engineers estimated. The original cost of the Panama Canal at the time construction started was estimated to be $140,000,000 with the notation that in no case would it exceed $160,000,000. Yet the total cost of the Panama Canal was $375,000,000.

We are hearing a lot today about the cost of the St. Lawrence project being liquidated over a period of 50 years as the result of collecting toll charges. In the first place, the pending legislation contains only suggestions about self-liquidating tolls. It provides only for further negotiations about tolls after construction is under way. As we all know, any negotiations between the United States and Canada regarding the collection of tolls should be definitely settled before construction is begun, and not left to wrangling discussions after the project is completed.

In responsible Canadian quarters the conviction is expressed that Canada will never agree to tolls, because it would be a radical departure from traditional policy. This is further evidence that Uncle Sam and the American people would be left holding the bag.

Turning to the hydroelectric plant, which is the second part and the power phase of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, we are told that it is necessary to erect in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, this hydroelectric project in order to overcome a general power shortage in New England and New York State.

There is no general power shortage in New England or New York State in the accepted sense. I will admit that there have been some postwar difficulties of a very local or temporary character, but new construction of more quickly built types of steam generating plants is the means of solving the problem.

If the people in the northeastern section of the United States are waiting for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, they are going to have to wait at least from 5 to 7 years for its completion.

What is to be done in the meantime regarding the alleged power shortage if it is related in any manner to the needs of our national defense? It is obvious that the speedy construction by free enterprise of steam-generating plants in various locations, which can be erected within a period of 2 years, is the sane and sensible approach to the problem. It is not difficult to recognize that the hydroelectric phase of the St. Lawrence project is being promoted with enthusiasm by the public-power group, composed of Socialist-minded bureaucrats.

Nothing has been mentioned by the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway concerning the mammoth task of defending it against enemy air attack. During the extensive congressional hearings held over a period of years, Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley, United States Army (retired) was asked this question: Can the project with its 40 locks more or less and its proposed dams and powerhouses be defended against enemy air attack? He answered, "Categorically no," and continued by saying an enemy with access to the polar route could and definitely would destroy the project's locks, dams, and powerhouses, and sink ships in the narrow canals in the St. Lawrence seaway.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway have again tried to label the project as necessary to our national security, despite the fact that we have won two World Wars without it, and that it will require from 5 to 7 years to complete its construction. Meanwhile, money, materials, and manpower urgently needed for the present defense effort would be diverted to a scheme that would ultimately benefit Canada more than the United States.

Finally, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will cost the American people millions of dollars to build, millions of dollars to defend, and millions of dollars to maintain. In addition thousands of Americans would lose their jobs and the rest of us would face lifelong taxes that would reduce our already dwindling purchasing power due to high living costs.

The average American citizen, in my opinion, is tired of being fooled with subsidy schemes and with the resultant high taxes that follow them. The American people will certainly be fooled if the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should ever become a reality.

Selective Universality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald:

SELECTIVE UNIVERSALITY

If the President's new Executive order on student draft deferment is intended to carry over into the universal military service and training program currently under consideration by Congress, it should be viewed with grave misgiving by all friends of the legislation.

For the exceptions therein granted and implied would make the universal program infinitely more selective than selective service has been to date and would seem to open the way for a complete breakdown of the equality of sacrifice principle.

America's strength, as General Hershey pointed out in announcing the new deferment plan, lies not in raw manpower but in scientific and technical know how. We must therefore continue to cultivate specialists as we build up our Armed Forces. Even the strongest advocates of universal military service and training do not suggest now that the educational pipelines be allowed to dry up completely while the military training program is being put into effect.

But there are specialists and specialists. In time of emergency we cannot spare nuclear physicists, perhaps, for basic military training, but it is safe to argue that we cannot spare specialists in English literature or household arts. And the new deferment plan selects, not by specialty, but by marks and aptitude regardless of field.

The President's plan, despite its obvious constructive intent, goes far toward creating that aristocracy of education and wealth which the Defense Department has set itself to prevent in manpower procurement. Congress should continue to emphasize the universal in universal military service and training and seek for a less discriminatory way to protect our colleges and their specialist products.

"Mr. Red Cross"—A Name Justly Earned After Years of Service by Alf Carter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, A. B. Carter, county court clerk of Crittenden County, Ark., is an affable, able, and courteous public official. He is a tireless worker. He is happiest when he is serving his fellow man. I know of no man who excels "Alf" Carter in accommodating the people he serves.

The Crittenden County Times carried an excellent article about the services performed by Mr. Carter to his community, county, and State. I include the full text of this editorial, which reflects the esteem and admiration of a grateful people for a job well done:

"MR. RED CROSS"—A NAME JUSTLY EARNED AFTER YEARS OF SERVICE BY ALF CARTER—COUNTY COURT CLERK HAS TRIPLE DUTIES—SERVICE CHAIRMAN SO LONG HE CANNOT REMEMBER WHEN HE STARTED

In Crittenden County the names Alf Carter and Red Cross are synonymous.

Mr. Carter, who makes a living by being county court clerk, has worked with the Red Cross for so long that he can't remember when he got started or how it happened that the major burden of work for that organization fell on his shoulders.

He thinks it was several years prior to World War II.

Officially, Mr. Carter is home service chairman for the county organization, but to the majority who come looking for aid of various kinds he is "Mr. Red Cross" or the "Red Cross man."

Under normal set-ups, the home service chairman acts as a sort of go-between man for servicemen and their families. In this capacity, the Crittenden chairman has successfully obtained emergency leaves and furloughs for many a Crittenden soldier, sailor, or airman.

The families of these men require a lot of attention too for sometimes the serviceman doesn't want to do his duty by those back home. It's up to the Red Cross home service chairman to see that some aid is given to deserted families or try to get the serviceman to help.

Mr. Carter tells this story about one of his clients. There was a fellow in service who suddenly came home and told his wife he had been discharged. They moved out on a farm, made a crop and then military police came for him. He wasn't discharged, he deserted. The Red Cross helped his wife and

three children to get along until help was available elsewhere.

Although he isn't emergency chairman, Mr. Carter does most of the processing of requests for emergency aid. He's got his own collection of clothing in the basement of the courthouse for distribution to burned-out families and others who might need something to wear. And incidentally, he says he could use a few more donations for that supply.

Last year through his efforts, Red Cross workers came into the county and set up headquarters at West Memphis to provide aid for flood victims—the job being just too big for one man.

Despite all the free service he gives to help others, Mr. Carter gives financially to help boost the annual Red Cross funds.

And that's the reason for this story—to give credit to a man who gives unselfishly of his time to help others and impress upon you the need for you to give unselfishly of your money to help provide the money needed to make this humanitarian program possible.

Import Tax on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, long-awaited action by Congress to suspend the import tax on copper now seems to be a reality.

Realism demands that we augment the domestic supply of copper with that mined in Chile. The burden of mobilizing industry cannot be carried without additional copper supplies free of this onerous tax.

I am extremely pleased to note that the news letter of the Mining Association of Montana, in its current issue, carries the text of a resolution adopted by the Utah Mining Association and a statement calling for repeal of the import tax on copper. Their patriotic recognition will aid immeasurably in the smooth passage by Congress of suspension legislation.

The news letter follows:

COPPER TARIFF

Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, Massachusetts, on March 1 introduced into Congress Senate Joint Resolution 41, providing that the import tax of 2 cents per pound now imposed on foreign imported copper be eliminated during the period beginning January 1, 1951, and ending June 30, 1952.

The Utah Mining Association, in a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting in Salt Lake City on March 5, urged the suspension of the present import tax on copper. Full text of the resolution is:

"Whereas the supply of copper now available in the United States from all sources is so short of essential demands that fabricators of metal, for civilian and military uses, have been seriously curtailed and restricted in their efforts to supply requirements; and

"Whereas it is clear that our requirements of copper for essential uses are increasing so rapidly that domestic production of the metal is grossly inadequate to maintain our standard of living; in fact, for the first 10 months of 1950, adding all primary domestic copper production to secondary and import copper available, we were approximately 176,000 tons short of our domestic requirements; and

"Whereas it is essential to the success of our mobilization program and to our domestic economy that an adequate supply of copper be obtained by supplementing our domestic production from accessible foreign sources; and

"Whereas unless supplies of available copper are supplemented from foreign sources, inferior substitutes which are more costly and less efficient will have to be used, thus adding to the cost of our emergency program and our cost of living, and ultimately seriously damaging our domestic industry; and

"Whereas although we generally favor protection of our domestic metal industry from foreign competition, it is obvious, and has been well demonstrated, that the import tax imposed on copper is a hindrance and an obstacle to obtaining our essential requirements of this metal and that said tax serves no useful purpose under the present circumstances whatsoever: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That for our national defense and well-being, to maintain our economy and way of life and to preserve and maintain a healthy, adequate domestic copper industry from mine to consumer, the Utah Mining Association, representing the mining industry in this State, earnestly urges that the present import tax on copper be suspended forthwith and that such tax or any tax on imported copper not be imposed unless and until it is demonstrated that our domestic copper industry is injured or is in jeopardy from foreign competition: provided further, however, that if the domestic price of copper falls to a point where our domestic copper industry is injured or is in jeopardy, that the copper import tax shall automatically be reinstituted on a sliding scale basis commensurate with the maintenance of a healthy domestic copper industry."

We understand that the Nevada Mine Operators' Association and some of the local unions of the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers have taken action similar to the action of the Utah Mining Association. During the summer of 1949 (when there was no duty on copper) the executive committee of the Mining Association of Montana adopted a resolution that "the copper tariff be not reimposed", and since the tariff was reimposed, our Association has been very active in urging that the tariff be suspended or abolished; the basis of this request being somewhat the same as outlined in the Utah resolution.

Southerners in Congress Might Save World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a magnificent editorial by Dr. Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, in which he discusses the possibilities of southerners in Congress being able to save world peace. I especially commend the reading of this editorial to all of the Members of Congress, but more especially to the Senators and Representatives from the Southern States, since it is directed primarily to them.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERNERS IN CONGRESS MIGHT SAVE WORLD PEACE

To Our Southern Senators and Representatives in Congress:

DEAR FRIENDS: First of all, let me pay a deserved tribute to you gentlemen who now represent our Southern States in Washington. As a careful student of both Houses of Congress for many years I can sincerely say this:

Beginning with the distinguished and veteran Kentuckian who presides over the Senate, the distinguished Texan who presides over the House, the equally distinguished Texan who so largely directs American foreign policy, and on down through our newest Members of Congress, I believe the South has never had an abler, worthier, or more distinguished representation than in 1950–51—or one more fully commanding the respect and confidence not only of our own people but of our whole Nation.

And because this is true I know that you can have all the greater influence in shaping the destinies of America—and the world—at this critical time. It is a time, indeed, when the scales between world peace and world war are so evenly balanced that a relatively few highly placed men in a country so powerful as the United States may tip the balance either one way or the other.

In fact, it is my belief that not improbably you 28 southerners now in the United States Senate and you 128 now in our National House of Representatives have enough ability, enough power, and enough prestige to swing the future destiny of mankind to the side of peace, progress, and human brotherhood—if you but have two things: (1) The faith and vision to realize your own possibilities and responsibilities in this hour, and (2) the wisdom to band yourselves together in one continuing determination to render this service to mankind. Whether you will it or not, and however much you might wish to avoid it, you now have a "rendezvous with destiny."

Why do I thus single out you 156 Representatives of our southern people in Congress? Do not all Senators and Representatives in Congress have equally great opportunities and equally great responsibility? No; they do not—and for some very obvious reasons.

First, I have already referred to the fact that southern prestige and position in Congress—as represented by the Speakership of both Houses and the chairmanship of powerful committees—have never been higher than now. But this is not all. You southerners in Congress also have a tremendous advantage in that you are not split into two violently opposing political parties, nor even (in spite of your many proper differences of viewpoint) into two bitterly opposing factions. No other great section of America—North, East, or West—has half such solidarity or half so great an opportunity for working together like brothers in a supreme effort to save our Nation and our world in the present crisis.

Furthermore, no part of America has a greater economic stake in world peace or will suffer so seriously from world impoverishment by war as the South. For our South is still a predominantly agricultural section, and our two greatest money crops—cotton and tobacco—are incomparably the greatest export products of American farms. Every man who cultivates an acre of southern land has a stake in the peace and prosperity of Europe and Asia.

Furthermore—and this may be most important of all—our section, the South, is the only section of America—North, South, East, and West—that knows from experience what a tragic, devastating, and long-enduring disaster any people may suffer by plunging into any war that patience and diplomacy and statesmanship might somehow have avoided. The South knows. The rest of America does not. And because the South knows, do not our southern Senators and Representatives owe a high duty not only to the South but to all America to save us from such a possible disaster? As General Marshall says, "There are no victors in modern warfare." Or as Gen. Omar Bradley says:

"The victorious power in another war will stand amidst its own ruins * * * in a shattered and impoverished world."

What can you do to save world peace? I certainly don't know all the answers. No one of us knows. But I do know this—that if you should resolve singly and as a group (1) to seek all possible truth and (2) to use all possible wisdom that you might win, then I have no doubt but that your final policy and action will be wise. Benjamin Franklin was certainly never an overly religious man. Yet in an hour of national peril and darkness he saw no safe light for the path ahead except that which comes from asking a Higher Power for a wisdom and courage greater than man can find in any other way. On a recent trip to Washington nothing encouraged me more than my accidental discovery that one morning each week during these trying times a group of Senators meets in a quiet prayer service all by themselves to seek a wisdom greater than their own.

HOW TO USE YOUR KINGLY POWERS

In the foregoing paragraphs I have not said much about the specific policies that you southerners in Congress should follow to save humanity from the disaster and devastation of war. On this page last month I discussed that question at some length. But my supreme purpose will have been achieved if I have only succeeded in helping you Senators and Representatives in Congress realize these facts:

1. Our southerners in Congress now have greater prestige, power, and responsibility for service to all America and the world than they have ever had before. It is indeed a power and a responsibility greater than most kings ever exercised in preceding centuries.

2. The South's economic conditions give it a greater stake in world peace and progress than any other section has. Southern farm people especially depend on you to safeguard our future welfare and happiness.

3. The history of the South enables us to realize, as other sections can never realize, how tragic may be the consequences of any war which patience, wisdom, statesmanship, and diplomacy might have avoided.

4. We are in a time when, in my considered opinion, no solution is possible if it does not go beyond America's own safety, self-interest, or future economic or military advantage. Whether we wish it or not, the only plain common-sense thing to do is to "try Christianity—now." I favor all the military preparedness Generals Eisenhower and Marshall ask to meet the menace of enemy governments—but all this may be worthless unless we also have a truly Christian world program to win the hearts of men and women in all lands.

5. Two things at least I believe we must do: First, we must take a patient and a not-too-arrogant, not-too-dictatorial position in the United Nations and try to work out solutions with weaker and more endangered peoples. Second, because of the far greater riches, power, and property we in America have—not by our own effort but by our gifts from the Almighty, the rich natural resources of a virgin continent—we must make a greater contribution than any other nation to a world program of reconstruction and development. We need some such program not of charity, but a program of stimulated and encouraged self-help. We need not merely to live and let live but "live and help live"—such a program as is embodied in the point 4 and International Development Advisory Board proposals. And perhaps the soundest of all such programs is that advocated by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON and his cosponsors substantially as follows:

1. That all nations reduce armaments and spend two-thirds of their most recent war budgets for a world program of reconstruction, irrigation, education, health, industrial progress, and human welfare.

2. That if other nations agree to do this, the United States would itself give ten billion a year for 5 years for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

CLARENCE POE,

President and Editor, The Progressive Farmer.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "St. Lawrence Waterway Gains Support," by Richard L. Strout, published in the Christian Science Monitor on March 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY GAINS SUPPORT—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The proposal to build the St. Lawrence waterway is being taken very seriously in Washington, and after 50 years of delay it may now be approved by Congress. The irony is that if done now it will be at a time of major shortages in steel and cement. If it had been done when first proposed it might have been of inestimable value in World Wars I and II. Also, of course, such an undertaking as this would have put many of the unemployed men to work in the thirties who finally ended up on made-work projects like raking leaves.

Nobody knows the acute shortage of present-day steel better than Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization. Yet he appeared before the House Committee on Public Works the other day to recommend immediate construction of the St. Lawrence project, even though it would add to the demand for steel. Secretary of Defense George Marshall appeared likewise, though he wants precious iron and steel for munitions and tanks. Both admitted that starting now would complicate the economic and raw-material problem. Both nevertheless backed the seaway, and they are joined by other men of like prominence.

What has made the difference? Primarily the fact that the supply of iron ore from the fabulous Mesabi Range is nearing depletion. We have exhausted what seemed once to be an inexhaustible supply. To replace the Mesabi Range, the prospectors have found huge new supplies of iron ore in Labrador and in Venezuela. If there is a through-water highway to the center of the United States industrial life, these new supplies of ore can be brought in cheaply. They will feed the steel mills in the Great Lakes area.

The need for such a highway is urgent, advocates say. The seaway, it is estimated, can be finished in 9 years if started now. By 1960, Mr. Wilson explained, the prospective 130,000,000 ton annual steel industry will annually need 160,000,000 gross tons of high-grade ore. If we are really going to have an expansion like that, we can't start building the ore highway for it too quickly. Mr. Wilson has weighed the pros and cons and gives the verdict, "Go ahead."

The waterway will produce enormous amounts of electric power. This will be available all over eastern Canada, New York, and New England. The amount likely for the American side is estimated at [illegible]-000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. Americans Presidents have vainly appealed for the waterway since the time of Woodrow Wilson. The pressure against the program has heretofore been strong, but now the switch of the big inland steel industry to support of the waterway may well swing the balance of power.

It is curious to note that in the current issue of John L. Lewis' Mine Workers' Journal there is a bitter attack on the St. Lawrence waterway. Why? So far as the detached observer can see, it is because the miners identify themselves with coal rather than hydroelectric power and with railroads using coal rather than with waterways.

Some of the other groups that have objected to the waterway are spokesmen for seaports of the east coast and representatives of power combinations that saw their position compromised by possible new competition. Of course, the Congressmen from Lakes ports favored the scheme which involves deepening present inadequate channels to 27 feet. This would make a submarine-free inland waterway available for most of the world's cargo commerce. One stock phrase is that it would bring Duluth "[illegible] miles nearer to London."

The world seems just on the point of beginning to get power from a new source, uranium. It may be that 10 years from now the first big atomic power plant will be available as the St. Lawrence nexus of dams begins liberating electric current throughout eastern North America. It is comfortable to feel that as one source of supply in nature tends to be exhausted others generally come in sight. But what the United States is going to do for cheap iron ore to replace the Mesabi Range unless the waterway is built is difficult to say.

The Danger Point in Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been called to my attention by Rudolph C. Larson, of Hartford, Conn., a most interesting article on the effect of taxation upon inflation.

Vivid examples of the disaster which engulfed other nations where taxes became too great in proportion to the national income are contained in this reprint from Harper's magazine.

I commend it to the attention of all Members, and with particular emphasis to those serving on the Committee on Ways and Means, who are currently

considering sources of increased revenue:

THE DANGER POINT IN TAXES

(By Colin Clark)

I

How high can taxes rise without economic trouble? The question is timely. People have always grumbled about taxes, but during the past three or four decades—as a result of two hot wars and the high defense costs of the cold war, to say nothing of the gradually rising expense of Government services of many sorts—most of us have watched our taxes climb to such unprecedented heights that we must have sincerely wondered what the effective limit was; and in the United States today, with new war costs mounting and new tax increases being debated, the question presses with special urgency. Is there a discoverable point where the burden of taxes becomes insupportable—or supportable only by such dubious means as inflation?

We have learned, from the experience of many countries, what happens when taxes mount too high. Many people don't find it worth their while to work hard and efficiently. Production doesn't expand as fast as it should. There is a shortage of goods, followed by an inflationary rise in prices. The government then usually makes a countermove—attempting by price controls, wage controls, and rationing to suppress the inflation that is developing, hoping that in due course production and the real national income will grow enough to carry the burden without controls. But this, experience shows, usually takes too long; and there is then a quick escape into uncontrolled inflation—which benefits some people, but does great harm to the great majority, including especially those lower-paid wage-earners who generally keep their savings in the form of money rather than real property.

All this is familiar to us as a sequence of events that has been repeated over and over again in the experience of many countries. Yet the part that excessively high taxes play in causing inflation is still not fully appreciated. It is very widely understood that if a government incurs very heavy expenditures, and these are not covered by taxation, and the government runs at a deficit, the automatic result will be an inflationary trend. It is not so generally understood that if a government incurs very heavy expenditures, and these are covered by taxation, so that the budget is balanced, the trend—while it may be deflationary for a time—will in the long run be toward inflation if the rate of taxation is too high to be borne. The long run, in this case, is probably a period of 2 or 3 years, though this may depend on the nature of the emergency; in wartime it may be longer.

The question I am raising is, how high is too high? What is the danger point? How much of the national income can be taken in taxes before this uncomfortable sequence of events gets under way? Can we, by reviewing the experience of various nations during the past quarter century, fix the point where the danger signals begin to fly? I believe we can.

The foundations of our knowledge on this subject were laid by Lord Keynes in a flash of brilliant insight in 1922. In that year, it may be remembered, inflation was proceeding apace in France and the exchange rate of the franc was falling rapidly. French official opinion hoped to bring it back to its 1914 parity by restoring the balance of trade, and the first step toward this objective was to have been the military occupation of the Ruhr coal field. Meanwhile the French press was claiming that British and American speculation was the cause of the falling exchange rate. Keynes' insight, however, told him that the French inflation would continue. In attempting to pay a high rate of interest on a huge mass of national debt (rentes), the Finance Minister was imposing an intolerable burden of public expenditure, amounting to 34 percent of the current national income.

Keynes remarked: "The level of the franc is going to be settled in the long run, not by speculation or the balance of trade, or even the outcome of the Ruhr adventure, but by the proportion of his earned income which the French taxpayer will permit to be taken from him to pay the claims of the French rentier [bondholder]."

In other words, inflation was the only way out of the financial impasse, and the inflation continued rapidly. Prices increased much faster than government expenditure and by 1926 the latter was only a little over 20 percent of the national income. Then the inflation was checked and a measure of deflation followed. From 1927 onward prices were stabilized. But the interesting thing is that this period of economic and political stability was reached with the level of government expenditure almost exactly 25 percent of the national income. (Lord Keynes commented in 1928: "The French budget balances with the burden of the rentes on the taxpayer bearable at the present level.")

A second relevant prophecy in the period between World War I and World War II also concerned French finances. It was made in 1934 by the Swedish economist, Prof. Bertil Ohlin. He pointed out that French public expenditure by that date had again become such an excessive proportion of the national income (nearly 34 percent) that further devaluation of the franc was unavoidable. The devaluation which he predicted actually occurred in 1936 and French prices went on rising until 1938, by which time the proportion of government expenditure to national income had again been reduced almost exactly to 25 percent.

During the 1920's there were moderate deflations in Britain and Italy and a severe deflation in Norway. Each was carried to the point where it raised the proportion of taxation to national income somewhere between 23 and 25 percent, beyond which it was not carried further. This demonstrates my point in reverse, so to speak.

During the period 1934–35 I prepared a Fabian pamphlet which examined in detail all the taxes then in force in the United Kingdom, estimating by rough commonsense methods the maximum additional revenue which could be obtained from them. (In making this study, I assumed that the British economy was brought to full employment, out of the heavy unemployment then prevailing.) The interesting thing is that the conclusion reached by this method was also that the maximum feasible taxation was almost exactly 25 percent of the national income.

Although this evidence is far from conclusive it certainly suggests that the critical level of taxation beyond which inflationary forces come into play (and deflationary forces suffer a political check) is around 25 percent of the national income.

II

In 1944 I wrote for the Economic Journal an article—eventually published in December 1945—in which I put forward the figure of 25 percent as the measure of taxable capacity. Lord Keynes, who was editing the Journal, wrote me in May 1944 that "in Great Britain after the war I should guess that your figure of 25 percent as the maximum tolerable proportion of taxation may be exceedingly near to the truth," and added that he would not be at all surprised if postwar experience confirmed it.

Now what has been the actual history of the matter since the end of World War II? In the United States, taxation did not pass the critical limit until 1943, and even in the worst years of the war it rose no higher than 29 percent of the national income. Suppressed inflation (rationing and price controls) ended in 1946; whereupon open inflation continued at a moderate rate until 1948, bringing taxes down to almost exactly the 25-percent level.

In a number of countries open inflation was in full swing before the war actually ended. Belgium avoided excessive debt and other burdens on the budget and was fortunate in escaping serious damage to her productive capacity. Her price level by 1946 had risen threefold or fourfold above prewar and this rise sufficed to reduce the burden of Government expenditure to 22 percent of the national income. At this point price stabilization became possible. In France at the same time, however, Government expenditure was one-third of the national income and inflation continued rapidly. It went on to the end of 1948, when a price level 20 times prewar was reached. At that point the budget could be balanced at some 25 percent of the national income.

In Italy inflation proceeded more rapidly, to over 50 times the prewar price level in 1947, when it was suddenly checked. The budget is now balanced with public expenditure at 22 percent of national income, plus 7 percent of national income in social insurance charges (the incidence of which is uncertain).

In Japan there was a hundredfold inflation up to 1949, when prices were stabilized. Taxation is now 30 percent of the national income; but our rule is not violated, for some measure of rationing and price control has continued to be necessary. No doubt the authorities expect that in the next year or so a rapid rise in production, without any further rise in prices being necessary, will raise the national income and thereby lower the tax ratio considerably.

Countries suffering severe suppressed inflation are Britain, Norway, and perhaps the Netherlands. Sweden has moderate suppressed inflation. Australia and New Zealand have suppressed inflation now in the process of becoming open. What are the significant facts about them?

Britain started the war with a figure of 26 percent (including social insurance) of national income going to taxes. The figure rose to 42 percent in 1945. There was a slight reduction in the next 2 years and then the figure started rising again to the appalling level of 43.7 percent for 1949, well above the highest wartime ratio. Although Britain has made a great show of decontrolling a certain number of minor items, the main mass of controls is as rigid as ever, particularly over housing and most articles of food. Last year's devaluation is unlikely to make much difference because it has not been allowed to raise British wages and prices except to a minor degree. It seems inevitable that Britain's suppressed inflation, after a longer or shorter interval, will break out into open inflation, probably on a catastrophic scale. (Incidentally, Hugh Dalton who, when Chancelor of the Exchequer, had a lot to do with boosting British tax rates up to current levels, thought my proposed tax rate of 25 percent of the national income was far too high when I put it forward in the prewar Fabian pamphlet mentioned above. It seemed to him a dangerously radical proposal. After the war he set a 40-percent figure. When I criticized it, he accused me of being a dangerous reactionary.)

The Netherlands figure is now 30 percent. In Norway, which also suffers severe suppressed inflation, a ratio of some 40 percent prevails. Sweden, which has a mild form of suppressed inflation, has a ratio of just over 25 percent. Australia and New Zealand are also at about the 25-percent level and are today emerging from suppressed into open inflation.

All these facts seem to support the conclusion—which is further reinforced by the recent experience of Finland, Switzerland, and Denmark—that the safe political and economic limit of taxation is somewhere near 25 percent of the national income. In this figure all forms of taxation are included: direct and indirect, Federal, State, and local. The figure doesn't tell what proportion of your individual income can legitimately be taken in taxation; it simply indicates how large a proportion of the national income can safely be taken. If the experience of the 1940's, on top of that of the twenties and thirties, doesn't convince you that the 25-percent figure is pretty nearly correct, then I don't know what will.

Proposed Deferment of Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the analysis by Hanson W. Baldwin, in the New York Times of April 4, 1951, of the President's very dangerous plan for the Government to choose our college students, and set up an intellectual elite, while the American Armed Forces are deprived of men with first-rate intelligence.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFERMENT IDEA FAULTY—ORDER TO KEEP BEST STUDENTS FROM DRAFT IGNORES CHARACTER AND LEADERSHIP VALUE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The President's Executive order authorizing a new category of draft deferment—"deferment by brains"—is likely to be one of the subjects of debate in the House of Representatives' discussion of the military manpower bill, which that Chamber took up yesterday.

The arguments for such a deferment procedure, which, will, in effect, keep those college students with the highest marks out of military service, are strong and persuasive. Yet the procedure and the principle have some grave disadvantages that are certain to be exposed by Congress.

The deferments are dictated by the obvious need of the Nation for engineers, scientists, doctors, dentists, trained technicians, and well-educated men. The interruption and damage to the educational system of the Nation during the last war was a serious one. The United States, unlike some of the other warring powers, allowed the immediate emergency of military demands to imperil the future welfare of the Nation not only by reducing greatly the college population but by eliminating or reducing the flow of highly trained scientists and engineers into national life.

SHORTAGE OF SCIENTISTS SERIOUS

Partially as a result of mistaken draft policies in World War II, there is a serious shortage today of scientists, engineers, and technically trained personnel. Government statistics indicated that there are only about 575,000 engineers and scientists in the Nation, and less than 10 percent of these hold doctorate degrees. Yet the present shortage will become worse if our defense program expands. The new deferment procedures are intended to remedy the present shortage and prepare an adequate flow of students for future needs.

Yet, cogent as this reasoning is, an "oligarchy of brains" does not fit well into the democratic concept. The deferment procedures mean that students with the best marks (supplemented by aptitude tests) will be allowed to continue college careers, while those with marks not quite so good will go into the services.

But there are two sides to this coin. In the first place, this procedure means that, except for those few who volunteer, the "brightest" students (judged by marks and tests) will be denied to the services. In the second place, it means that marks and "book learning"—not character or leadership qualifications—are to be the principal criteria by which a student is to be assessed worthy or unworthy of further educational opportunity. Yet certainly the services need brains and certainly the home front needs leaders and men of character.

This is not to say that brains, character, and leadership are incompatible. They are not; sometimes they are all found in one man and he is what might be called the optimum man. But the difficulty with the new deferment procedure is that it is based solely, or largely, on only one of these three important criteria.

Yet the Fuchs case and other spy trials, and the revelations of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees demonstrated that men of brains, in or out of Government, can be traitors and parasites unless they are also men of character and men who will assume the grave responsibility of leadership for the national good.

Indeed, the new deferment procedures illustrate perhaps more graphically than many words what has been wrong with our educational system—it stresses the mind but not the man. There has been too little emphasis on character and leadership development. Yet these two elements of the optimum man are of fundamental importance, not alone to the military service but to the Nation. They are just as likely to be found in the bottom half of a class as in the top half. And they are just as much needed in the services as they are on the home front. Brains, alone, are not enough.

Controversy Between Organized Labor and Defense Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement published as an advertisement entitled "These Are the Issues," relating to the general subject of collective bargaining, signed by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, by Herschel C. Adkinson, president, and printed in the Washington Star of April 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE ARE THE ISSUES

It is necessary that an attempt be made to present to the American people the issues involved in the quarrel between the representatives of organized labor and the defense agencies in Washington and what the position of business is on those matters. From the time that the labor representatives walked out of the advisory committees to the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Economic Stabilization Agency, the Office of Defense Manpower, Department of Labor, the Defense Production Administration, and lost their posts as special assistants to Eric Johnston, Anna Rosenberg, and William H. Harrison, numerous statements have been issued and many speeches have been made.

It is doubtful that the public has been enlightened by this debate. Yet, on the correct determination of the issues in dispute depend not only the success of the country's defense program, but the future welfare of our economic and political system. The debate is not and should not be a private dispute, for basic policies are at stake which will affect this country for many years to come. It is because we recognize the gravity of the situation and the urgent need for understanding and cooperation among all elements of the population that we undertake to state our views concerning the few underlying questions as we see them.

THE CRUX OF THE ISSUE

There is, first, the matter of wage stabilization. On this we have a wealth of experience the world over and for almost any period of recorded history. This record shows many things. But one thing it shows is undeniable. If costs of production are raised and if income is increased in the face of a reduced and declining volume of goods and services, it is impossible to hold prices in check. This is the condition this country and other countries faced in World War I and II, and the condition it faces now and in the next years as our industry is required to turn out an increasing volume of military products and a shrinking volume of civilian products. This is the crux of the wage issue in times like these. It is a problem that cannot be evaded or argued away. Nor can it be blamed on anybody. The blame, if any, can only be put on a public policy which calls for military mobilization on a large and increasing scale. This policy the American people are committed to.

Under these conditions, wages must assume a part of the burden of restraint, partly because wages are by all odds the largest part of the costs of business. They run consistently at more than 60 percent of the national income and currently at more than $125,000,000,000 a year. Raising this wage bill will inevitably raise costs and incomes at a time when the stern necessities of an anti-inflationary policy require that they be stopped from going up. This, too, is nobody's fault. It is an accounting fact. Any reasonable person would expect that 60,000,000 wage and salary employees would take the lion's share of the country's income. This being so, it is futile to look for price stability without wage stability.

IT'S YOUR PAY

The second issue has to do with how wage stabilization, if that is what we want, is to be administered. This sounds like a technical question and has been made to seem so in much of the discussion about it. But it is far from that. It goes to the heart of labor relations. Stated as simply as possible, the question is whether the jurisdiction of a Federal board should be restricted to fixing the principles, rules, and regulations of wage stabilization or should be expanded to include, also, the settlement of labor disputes and strikes. In a communication dated March 13 to Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator, the representatives of several business organizations agreed to granting the Board jurisdiction over decisions of a monetary or economic character, directly related to and affecting stabilization, involving all forms of remuneration to employees. There they drew the line. There, to our

reasoned judgment, the line should be drawn in the interest of sound and workable labor relations in American industry.

A REACTIONARY STEP

On this question, the representatives of organized labor take an opposite position. They want a board to be granted jurisdiction over all disputes of whatever nature, including all wages, even those that don't conflict with the regulations, and such issues as seniority, discipline, union security, management functions, operating procedures and the like. To accede to this demand would be a long reactionary step in the policies and practices of collective bargaining and would set back labor relations many decades.

Everybody knows how much this country went through since the middle thirties in efforts to establish collective bargaining in this country. Today organized labor claims 15,000,000 members and continues daily to grow. Our major industries are unionized and negotiate constantly with the representatives of organized employees. Once a Federal board is granted jurisdiction over all labor disputes, the incentive to bargain and settle things locally would be progressively weakened. Washington and its policies would become the center of labor relations.

An increasing number of labor representatives would hope to get more from a busy Government board than through their own negotiations. Instead of settling disputes promptly and on the spot, they would soon acquire the habit of submitting them to Washington or to a regional board. This is not speculation; it is experience. No sure and more effective means of shirking the responsibility, which is so essential to the successful practice of collective bargaining, could be found.

LOOK AT THE RAILROADS

Long experience in the United States and in other countries demonstrates how fatal to free collective bargaining the entry of Government into labor relations becomes. We have had a succession of examples of such unfortunate consequences in what has happened on the railroads since 1840. The Railway Labor Act, once considered a model Federal labor statute, has become a dead letter. Direct negotiations between the roads and the unions are steadily declining in importance. Increasing numbers of the decisions by statutory emergency boards are disregarded. More and more disputes are brought to Washington. Strikes have increased. It has become a frequent occurrence for the Federal Government to seize the railroads in order to assure or restore the vital transportation services of the Nation.

EXISTING MACHINERY AVAILABLE

This experience is a bad precedent for the balance of American industry and labor. It is clear to us, as we think it should be to all employees, that there are grave risks in making the problems of labor relations the football of politics. As matters now stand there is ample established machinery in this country, Federal and local, to assist employers and labor in adjusting their differences. To add a new superboard will promote and not discourage trouble and will consequently harm and not serve the national interest in these difficult times.

COOPERATION BY ALL, EXPLOITATION BY NONE

Behind these particular issues lies the gravest threat of all. This is the use of an international and domestic emergency as the occasion for acquiring power over Government and over industry. The task before American business from now on is an arduous and exacting one. As the results of the performance during World War II plainly show, a task of heroic proportions was then accomplished. If industry is to discharge its responsibilities now, as it did then, it can only do so with the wholehearted cooperation of Government and labor. In our society all citizens have the right—indeed, the duty—to protect and advance their legitimate interests, but this does not mean that any group is under a mandate to turn a critical situation to its own selfish advantage, to violate the spirit of our political institutions, and to seek to take over the management and functions of business and industry.

COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE,
HERSCHEL C. ATKINSON, *President*.

Will Red China's Hate of United States Mean Stalemate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Will Red China's Hate of United States Mean Stalemate?" written by Carroll Binder, and published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of April 1, 1951. This is a very splendid, thought-provoking article, and for that reason I have asked that it appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL RED CHINA'S HATE OF UNITED STATES MEAN STALEMATE?

(By Carroll Binder)

Does Red China's scornful rejection of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's bid for battlefield negotiations foreshadow renewed Communist attempts to drive United Nations forces out of Korea? Or may more tactful approaches bring an end to hostilities which neither the Chinese Communists nor the 14 nations with troops fighting under the UN banner have anything to gain by prolonging at this stage?

Very little light on these questions trickles through the bamboo curtain which separates the Red Chinese from the free world. There are no free journalists reporting from Red China. The few free diplomats in China have only limited access to the top Chinese leadership. Their reports are kept relatively secret.

If one takes Red Chinese propaganda literally one could hardly help feeling extremely gloomy about the future of the struggle on the Asiatic mainland.

The Red Chinese radio distorted MacArthur's unfortunately phrased remarks about UN ability to hit Red China hard into a declaration that "the United States and Britain are preparing to directly invade China."

This gave great impetus to Red Chinese propaganda efforts to persuade the soldiers and people of China that they must support the war in Korea in order to defend the Chinese homeland from "American imperialists."

For many months Communist propaganda has represented the UN effort in Korea as the first phase of a United States effort to conquer China. The war in Korea is presented to the Chinese people as a "sacred campaign to resist America, aid Korea, protect our homes, safeguard our country and world peace."

This thesis is being stressed in radio broadcasts, by public speakers, "current affairs discussion groups," posters, shop window displays, and letter-writing projects. It is reinforced by witch hunts against Chinese suspected of entertaining friendly thoughts for Americans because of religious, educational or business associations in the past.

These latter are characterized as "counterrevolutionary elements" or "those who work with imperialism against the fatherland." "Imperialism" in the Communist vocabulary applies to United States relations with China but not to Russia's.

A century of American medical, educational, and other philanthropic aid to the Chinese people is counteracted with this sort of propaganda:

"Through their economic exploitation the United States sucked the blood and sweat of the Chinese people and then hoped to buy them off with a small portion of what the United States imperialists had squeezed from their toil. They made big investments to subsidize religious, cultural, and relief bodies in China. But the United States imperialists are completely mistaken in thinking that they can really buy the hearts of the Chinese people with a few of their dirty, blood-stained dollars."

The Reds announce discoveries of "American underground organizations" as a prelude to terroristic arrests, show trials and mass executions. Shih Liang, Red China's woman minister of justice, has ordered Communist courts to refuse mercy to anyone even suspected of opposing the Peiping regime and "to let heads roll." Courts now can order a prisoner shot for "intentions," with the courts deciding what the intentions may have been.

Mayor Peng Chen, of Peiping (who also is deputy chairman of Red China's highest administrative body) has instituted a new technique for "suppressing the wolves of America and Chiang Kai-shek." He arraigned 25 persons accused of being "arch counterrevolutionary criminals" before 5,500 people's representatives on March 24.

"What are you going to do with these important special agents, bandit leaders, despots, and leaders of secret religious societies?" Mayor Peng asked his mob of judges, according to the Communist news agency.

Shoot them, the audience replied, according to the agency. Peng promised execution sentences tomorrow since all of you demand suppression. And the next day, Easter Sunday, thousands of people turned out to watch the firing squad dispose of the condemned, according to a subsequent dispatch.

Thousands are estimated to have been executed in the current purges, not all for being pro-American. Some just stood in the way of the "new China." And some, as in all such blood baths, just had the misfortune to have their intentions misconstrued by the purgers.

Such purges should not be construed as evidence that the Red regime is faced with serious threat of overthrow by would-be revolters. They are rather a means of making sure that the regime meets with no serious opposition when it calls up new contingents for the armed forces, collects heavier levies from the peasants, or confiscates what it desires from urbanites.

The purges are accompanied by systematic campaigns to speed up industrial and agricultural production to help the war effort in Korea. The rejection of MacArthur's proposal was accompanied by fresh references to Formosa, which the Reds vow to take this year. They also vowed to take it last year.

The best time for an operation against Formosa would be between April and midsummer. Vice Admiral Struble, on the eve of relinquishing command of the United States Seventh Fleet, said it is now strong enough to prevent any Chinese Communist invasion of Formosa. He also said the fleet is strong enough to blockade the long coastline of Red China.

Struble's successor, Vice Admiral Martin, added that any attempt by Chinese Nationalists on Formosa to invade the mainland of China will be blocked by the United States Navy. That is in accordance with President Truman's directive of last summer which aimed at localizing the war in Korea.

United States and United Nations policy still aims at localizing hostilities and bringing them to the earliest possible acceptable conclusion.

Unless Russia gives Red China a large amount of air support (which up to now it has shown no disposition to give) there is no possibility of Red China driving U. N. forces out of Korea, as it repeated its intention of doing on March 29. The U. N. forces are sufficiently strong to withstand whatever ground forces Red China may throw against them in a fresh attempt to preserve world peace by fighting the Americans.

United Nations forces are not strong enough, however, to defeat Red China if its leaders choose to sacrifice all prospects for rural reconstruction and industrial development in a desperate attempt to vindicate their theories about the United States.

The efforts to reach an honorable settlement mentioned here last week are based on the hope that the Red Chinese will not subject their low-grade economy and their far from war-minded nation to the hazards of a long drawn out major war. Peiping unfortunately shows no inclination to such realistic thinking.

Investigation of Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Is the Place," relating to the recent investigation of crime in the United States, published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of Saturday, March 31, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE PLACE

The story is told of Brigham Young, after he had led his Mormon followers across hundreds of miles of desert, a trip which took courage and fortitude, coming at last to a certain pass in a mountain range and, after looking out over a broad valley which contained Great Salt Lake, turning to his ragged and worn followers and saying, "This is the place."

And now, many years after, and in another era, may we not also say this is the place.

Shown the way by the Senate Crime Investigation Committee, should not we all make up our minds that this is indeed the place and the time to see to it that these sleazy, working-in-the-hours-of-darkness racketeers and gangsters be once and for all put in their places. That applies to every village and hamlet in the country, as well as to the largest cities, and should serve as notice to any politician, selling his country down the river for a few dirty dollars, that an aroused public will be riding herd on him to see that he carries out his oath of office and works for the people who elected him, rather than for the mobster who backed his candidacy.

We are entitled to good government and we, if we make up our minds to it, can get it—and what a welcome change it will be—if we recognize the danger that is in the course we are pursuing today.

We are entitled to ask our officeholders why these leeches on the body politic are allowed to exist and grow fat and insolent, while those who fall under their spell grow poor because of the money they have thrown away.

We are entitled to ask and to get the answer as to why the vast majority of us living honestly and trying to deal fairly with our fellowman and, above all, making correct returns on our income-tax statements, are hounded if we make what appears to be an error, while these overlords of the underworld are allowed to get away with millions of dollars without fear of being punished.

We are entitled to ask and get an answer to the question as to why these shady characters were not hauled up short many years ago and kept in durance vile, when we have seen how comparatively easy it has been for an investigating committee to haul them before the public gaze and show them in their true colors—colors predominantly yellow.

We are entitled to ask and certainly an answer should be forthcoming as to why men who hold responsible posts, who should be above reproach, suddenly accept bribes and close their eyes to what is going on and shut their hearts to the welfare of their fellow citizens.

We are entitled to all these things and we have the power to get them.

Today the Nation is forced along on a death march, led and guarded by a small group of men not reared in and caring nothing about the American tradition. In that direction lies final ruin, because millions of people will find themselves governed by a small but vicious and yet spineless gang and nowhere in the great tradition of this country has there been room for such a situation.

So now, today, not tomorrow or the day after, is the place and the time to correct these evils which have been weakening our moral structure and making us vulnerable from all sides.

We have been shown the way and have been brought to the pass in the mountain where we may look on the wide valley that can be made fertile by hard work. It is up to us to make the most of it and in the process to be true to ourselves.

Yes; this is the place—and the time.

Marble Plaques of Great Lawgivers of the Past and Lawmakers Who Had Had the Greatest Influence on the American Legal System, Adorning the Walls of the Hall of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in the beautifully reconstructed and redecorated Hall of the House of Representatives, no feature has attracted more attention and inquiry than the marble plaques of great lawgivers and lawmakers of the past adorning its walls.

The historical background and the accomplishments of the individuals who are represented by these marble plaques constitute the basis of an extremely interesting and informative article written by Roy L. Whitman, of Washington, D. C., an Official Reporter of Debates in the House of Representatives. The article, as published in the March 1951 issue of the National Shorthand Reporter, and, by unanimous consent of the House, made a part of my remarks is entitled "Marble Plaques of Destiny." The article gives unmistakable evidence of widespread reading and study upon the part of the author, and, reflects the culture and ability that characterizes him in many activities. Mr. Whitman has performed a worth-while service in preparing this authentic and interesting account of the great lawgivers of the past and lawmakers who had had the greatest influence on the American legal system.

I am certain that there is a keen sense of indebtedness felt by the membership of the House for the splendid cultural contribution that has been made by Mr. Whitman in his article, reading as follows:

MARBLE PLAQUES OF DESTINY

(Roy L. Whitman)

"The God of nature has written His testimonies on all His works, and He has inscribed in the heart of man. To restore the knowledge of the one and the practice of the other has been the real or pretended aim of the prophets of every age" (Gibbon).

"All implements of civilization are spiritual in origin; when conceived they are called ideas; when materially embodied they are called implements; when instituted for general use they are called patterns; when wrought into the everyday life of all the people they marvel at them and call them the work of the gods" (Confucius).

"Our presentations, medieval scholars had a larger concept of history than we. For them history did not mean the history of one's own parochial community; it meant the history of Arabia, Greece, Rome. Even if they were mistaken in believing that the world began some 4,000 years before Christ, it is better to look that far back than only to the Declaration of Independence or the voyage of the *Mayflower*" (Trevelyan).

When the Hall of the House of Representatives was redecorated this year, instructions were given to a committee of learned and eminently qualified men to engrave great lawgivers of the past and lawmakers who had had the greatest influence on the American legal system. From this list 23 were to be chosen as subjects of marble plaques, 1 to be placed above each gallery door, the twenty-fourth space to contain an inscription from Daniel Webster. Twenty-two of the plaques were to carry profile heads carved in bas relief; nine were to be full face. The 22 were divided into 11 right profiles and 11 left profiles, the starting point being at the full-face figure in the center of the north wall, the ending point at the Webster inscription at the center of the south wall.

The subjects of the plaques were jointly chosen by a group from the University of Pennsylvania and the Columbia Historical Society of Washington, D. C. The committee list was submitted to and approved by members of the staff of the Library of Congress, final choice resting with the Architect of the Capitol and his associates. Of the 23 subjects chosen 18 appear on the University of Pennsylvania list and 16 on the Columbia Historical Society list, 9 on both lists, 9 (Pepinian and Justinian) do not appear on either.

The sculptured heads in right profile beginning with the full-face plaque of Moses, and on the north, west, and south walls are: Moses, Hammurabi, Lycurgus, Tribonian, Justinian, St. Louis (Louis X of France), Gregory, Alphonso, Edward the First, Colbert, Pothier, and Mason, then the Webster inscription.

The left profile heads beginning with Moses, and on the north, east, and south walls are: Solon, Papinian, Gaius, Maimonides, Suleiman, Innocent 3d, De Montfort, Grotius, Blackstone, Napoleon, Jefferson, and the Webster inscription.

The Webster inscription reads:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Thus we see that the plaques have two bases: great lawgivers of history, and those who influenced the American legal system, omitting those who came after its establishment, with the exception of Blackstone.

America inherited from England a developed legal system. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1722 laid it down as a rule of English law:

"That if there be a new and uninhabited country found out by English subjects as the law is the birthright of every subject, so wherever they go they carry that law with them, and hence such new-found country is to be governed by the laws of England." (Law; Origin and Development, Huston.)

The first Continental Congress in its fifth and sixth resolves declared:

"That the respective colonies are entitled to the common law of England * * * and to the benefit of such of the English statutes as existed at the time of the colonization. * * *"

The American legal system is a dual system of laws with the jurisdiction of each sovereignty clearly defined, the laws of each sovereignty enacted by a bicameral legislative assembly of representatives elected by the people, and a veto power lying in the Executive. The system includes inferior and superior courts, trial and appellate; a careful system of reports of all decided cases, all designed to elevate the dignity of man, protect his property rights, preserve the sanctity of contract, encourage personal responsibility; and, in the criminal law, to fit the punishment to the crime.

To appreciate the significance of the plaques and understand their import, let us briefly establish a few points of reference, for to weigh justly the merits of a man one must know his position in world history and something of the time and country in which he lived. This is a very large order to fill within the confines of a short article.

The time and historical elements involved cover almost 5,000 years and may be divided into certain very definite epochs: Ancient history, covering Arabia and Egypt; the epoch of the Grecian and Roman civilizations, extending over a period of a thousand years, equally divided by the birth of Christ; the Middle Ages, also called the Dark Ages, from the fall of the Roman Empire in A. D. 476 until the Renaissance in 1453; and the modern Anglo-Saxon world.

The philosophy behind the plaques is that these men are those who influenced the American legal system. As we shall see later, however, three men absolutely dominate the group: Moses, Hammurabi, and Justinian; in fact, the law student could well dispose of the group of 23 by voting that Hammurabi and Justinian represent them all, for the codes established by these two men have influenced all mankind, the former for nearly, 5,000 years and the latter for 1,500. Each of them set up a complete legal system, a body of laws and courts to administer them. But when the average man sees all these heads he is not satisfied with thinking just that they represent a system, but he wants to know the part they played in influencing the system and the times in which they lived. The average citizen thinks not of the cold structure of the system but of its content: He thinks of union on a basis of equality and how his own country survived a tragic war through this principle; he thinks of freedom of the seas and our suppression of the Barbary pirates to establish that principle firmly; he thinks of the four freedoms: of the intellect, of the press, of speech, of the person; of the right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience; and he wonders how these principles are squared with the heads on the plaques, heads that do not speak, yet, embedded in the wall in enduring whiteness, influence American statesmen by the memories they evoke. The mere presence of these plaques is an invitation to look into the lives of the men they portray. Let us now proceed to do just this.

The onward march of civilization is thus recorded in these plaques:

Arabia, Hammurabi.
Egypt and Israel: Moses and Maimonides.
Greece: Solon, Lycurgus.
Rome: Gaius, Justinian, Tribonian, and Papinian.
Turkey: Suleiman.
Italy, Innocent III and Gregory IX.
France, St. Louis, Pothier, Colbert, and Napoleon.
Holland: Grotius.
Spain: Alfonso X.
England: de Montfort, Edward I, and Blackstone.
America: Jefferson and Mason.

Let us consider the men and their times as related to the landmarks of popular government found in the American system.

Union on a basis of equality—Rome.

"One of the most potent influences in the growth of Rome was the habit of association engendered by her peculiar location. The settlements on neighboring hills, originally separate towns and cities, were too near together to permit independence except at the cost of perpetual war and mutually destructive warfare. The only alternative, that of union on a basis of equality of rights was adopted. That at an early day broke down the political and religious exclusiveness characteristic of the Italian cantons and of all primitive communities and gave to the Romans a liberality of mind and an adaptability which was one of the chief elements of their success in dealing with other peoples. Rome thus absorbed other communities instead of destroying them." (Theodore Mommsen.)

The mighty empire of law of government and of things practical—and it still exerts its influence—was born on the seven hills where Rome rose from the banks of the Tiber: The forum, the senate, the popular assemblies of Rome. These were adequate for city government but not for empire.

The late Senator James Hamilton Lewis in his Two Great Republics, Rome and the United States says: "The invention and development of such representative assemblies has been the greatest contribution which the Anglo-Saxon race has made to the political progress of the world."

Let us pursue this matter of individual liberty and representative government a little further. Prof. Charles A. Huston, supra, says:

"In its main body the Anglo-American law is almost purely Germanic. Of any direct influence of the aboriginal Celtic stock, or of even the Roman occupation of Britain, no perceptible trace remains. Our law begins with the English, the Teutonic conquerors of England from the Britons."

It may be mentioned in passing that the Romans withdrew from Britain in A. D. 410, and in 449 the Anglo-Saxons began to take possession of the island.

It was the rude barbarians of Germany, says Guizot in his History of Civilization in Europe, who introduced into European civilization the sentiment of personal independence, the love of liberty. It was unknown among the Romans; it was unknown in the Christian church; it was unknown in nearly all the civilizations of antiquity. The liberty which we meet in ancient civilizations is political liberty; it is the liberty of the citizen. It was not about his personal liberty that man troubled himself; it was his liberty as a citizen. He formed part of an association, and to this alone he was devoted. The case was the same in the Christian church. This feeling of personal liberty and independence was unknown to the Romans and to the Christians. It has played so considerable a part and has produced such lasting and beneficial results that Guizot feels it must be regarded as one of the fundamental principles of European civilization.

Stubbs in his Constitutional History of England states:

"The influence of at least two of the political ideas or institutions of the Germans has been especially marked in our later civilization. These two are the elective monarchy based on the right exercised by the freemen of the German tribes to elect their ruler or king, and the public or popular assembly, in which the freemen met for legislative and judicial purposes."

The problem of the Middle Ages was to settle whether all former civilization should be overturned by the German or the German people should be Romanized and Christianized. Modern civilization is the result of the interplay of these forces.

By the eighth century all remains of Roman civilization had disappeared, even its very language.

Freedom of the Mind, and Democracy—Athens.

The antithesis of union occurred in ancient Greece. There we see Athens, the seat and mother city of one of the world's greatest cultures, defeated, humiliated, and practically destroyed by her neighbor to the south, Sparta. There we find also the most enlightened of the early democracies destroyed by the ruthless uncultured people of the most absolute police state that ever existed, Sparta. Athens, fertile field of mental developments; Sparta, peopled by poor, rude, rough inhabitants, where men sought the camp on the battlefield to escape the horrors of peace, so severe was the regimented life of the people (Professor Oman of Oxford)—whence comes the phrase, Spartan severity, Spartan discipline.

But it was in the Greek commonwealth that the political and intellectual life of the world began.

When we think of Greece we think of Athens.

The empire of Greece was that of the intellect, of art, philosophy, of literature, love of the beautiful, and love of freedom.

Solon of Athens (600 B. C.)
Lycurgus of Sparta (900 B. C.)

Solon, the law giver, who wrought so great a reform in the constitution of Athens, so improved the lot of the poor, so balanced the power of the various classes of Athenian society, so regulated her coinage, that he saved the state from collapse and civil war, rebuilt her commerce. Solon, whose new constitution for Athens was so successful that when the first code of laws was drawn up for Rome, the famous Twelve Tables, a commission was sent from Rome to study them and a number of the provisions of Solon's laws were incorporated in the Twelve Tables.

Lycurgus: So modern an historian as Toynbee states the consensus of latter-day research to be that Lycurgus was a god and not a human being, a purely mythical character. So ancient an historian as Herodotus

states that there is so much doubt about Lycurgus that the place of his birth is unknown, and the date of his birth cannot be fixed within 300 years. Even the thumbnail biography assigned to him by the Architect of the Capitol reads only: "Legendary lawgiver of Sparta." Some historians ascribe to him the constitution of Sparta under which the people, the comitia, had a voice in government. But what kind of voice? When the king wanted approval of a proposal the comitia would be assembled and allowed to vote yes or no; a judge was hidden whose duty it was to weigh the volume of the vote.

Athens rose phoenix-like from the ashes of her defeat by Sparta to establish the wonderful Hellenic culture, and Sparta takes an inferior position in history. Democracy triumphed over the police state. Why not let Solon represent Greece and replace Lycurgus with another law giver or a good American?

EARLY CODIFIED LAW, THE CODES OF ANTIQUITY

When we think of the legal system and the courts we think of that inscription over the entrance to the Supreme Court: "Equal Justice Under Law"; and we think of the United States Code, of codified law. Throughout the ages the cry of the common people has been "Make known unto us the laws by which we are judged, engrave them where all may see."

For the two famous codes of antiquity we go to Arabia and Egypt, referred by the plaques to the Code of Hammurabi and the Decalog of Moses. Though Moses occupies the central position with his majestic face in full relief let us keep the chronology in proper sequence, for the Code of Hammurabi precedes the Decalog by a thousand years.

Who was Hammurabi? (Circa 2800 B. C.) What was his code? He was the man who rebuilt Babylon from the ruin of the empire of Sargon, rebuilt Babylon to rule as the undisputed queen city of the world for 2,000 years, the man who—whether he responded to the plea of the multitude or from his own innate ability as a great administrator—had engraved in imperishable stone in cuneiform characters the laws of the Sumerians and Akkadians, a thousand years before the Code of Moses, the laws governing his people. Three thousand lines of these laws of Hammurabi have been recovered and of this quantity more than the half have been deciphered. They deal with divorce and alimony; with master and servant; with profit on sales transactions, establishing twice the value as the proper asking price in beginning a transaction; establishing public right in irrigation ditches and canals as paramount to those of the owner whose lands they traversed; they dealt with crime and punishment and incorporated the principle that education, wealth, and knowledge carried with them greater responsibility of obedience to the law.

One of the most important items of the code was that of personal responsibility. The builder of a home was responsible for its soundness.

It placed emphasis on reducing contracts and agreements to writing and having them signed and witnessed.

Rightly then is Hammurabi placed side by side with Moses.

Further back than this in history the plaques do not go, although the cuneiform inscriptions of that Eden where meet the four rivers of Paradise affirm that the history of the land extends 422,000 years before the Flood.

Moses: (Circa 1800? 1400? B. C.) Great hero of Israel, first of the great prophets, whose name implies "He who was saved from the water" frequently likened to and coupled with Solon and Lycurgus. What does he appear to be in the outward events of history? What did he become in the beliefs of his people? He stands at the very beginning of the united life of Israel and established its fundamental principles. His distinctive characteristic, surmounting all intellectual qualities, was his realization that only through obedience to spiritual and moral laws could the new people accomplish a national task and achieve a world destiny (Funk & Wagnalls Bible Dictionary). He is credited with the creation of the religion of Israel.

No other people of the ancient world ever exerted upon our civilization influences comparable to that of the Hebrews through a literature containing the highest idealism the world has ever known.

We come next to the Roman law and the Roman codes, but we must remember that the legal system of the empire (not the Holy Roman Empire of Frederick Barbarosa) did not include representative government.

From the time of Diocletian onward the making of law was exclusively in the hands of the emperors. The Senate still existed, but shorn of all its old functions, alike of government and legisletion.

The first three centuries of the Roman Empire contain the perfection of Roman jurisprudence and the commencement of its decline.

Before taking up the codifiers let us pay our respects to Papinian.

It is said that under Papinian (211 A. D.) Roman law reached the highest point in its development. Papinian was a noted lawyer who carried on the government of Rome while the Emperor Severus waged his wars.

But now to consider the Roman codes.

Gaius (130–180 A. D.) stands as the pioneer in this field. His Institutes were received as text books of the law before the general revision of the Roman law.

Justinian (483–565 A. D.): There were others who made codes of Roman law besides Gaius, Tribonian and Justinian—there were, for instance, the Gregorian, Homogenian, and Theodosian codes—but they are all made obsolete by the code which bears Justinian's name.

In his Code, Pandects, and Institutes, we find condensed the legal wisdom of the Romans.

The able and learned Tribonian headed the commission which carried out this work. All obsolete, erroneous, or superfluous laws were eliminated from existing codes; they preserved only the wise and salutary laws. In the Pandects they set out the true spirit of the decisions of the judges. The Institutes contain the essential elements of Roman law.

"The code was signed by Justinian, and the Code, the Pandects, and the Institutes were declared by him to be the only legitimate system of legal jurisprudence. This the last will and testament of Roman jurisprudence was preserved through the Dark Ages and forms the basis of the systems of jurisprudence in most of the continental European states of today. It is one of the most important contributions of Rome to modern civilization." (Guizot, History of Civilization in Europe.)

The code is the facet of Justinian's reign that touches our legal system, but his plaque brings the memory, as Freeman tells us, that "during his reign calamities which human prudence is unable to resist seemed to combine against the Romans as if to compel them to expiate their ancient glory, so that the period which gave birth to so many moments of greatness may be looked back upon with horror as that of the widest dissolution and mortality."

Hodgkins in his Italy and Her Invaders tells us that Justinian projected an expedition against the Goths, but in retaliation Rome was so despoiled by Totila the Goth that the city remained an unpeopled solitude for 40 days.

Law in the Middle Ages: Innocent III and Gregory IX

Separation of temporal from spiritual power in the Christian church occurred in the sixth century, when the church not being able to restore the absolute power of the Roman Empire, in self-defense against the barbarians adopted the principle. "The spiritual order is completely separated from the physical, you have no right to interfere with it" (Guizot, History of Civilization in Europe).

By the eighth century, as we have noted, all remains of Roman civilization had disappeared, even its very language.

"Belief was in the Middle Ages not a matter of choice or of conviction, but of duty. The individual had no rights in the matter, but must submit himself without question to the dictates of the church" (Emerton, Medieval Europe).

The church of the Middle Ages was the only organized force of its period. It was the repository of the knowledge and learning of the time. In the spiritual field the church led the individual from the cradle to the grave, and the spiritual realm had none of its modern limitations. It fulfilled many functions now partly or wholly secular. The church in those centuries buttressed its faith with the most complete and adequate philosophical system the world has ever known. Also it achieved a social system in which the efforts of the individual were subjected to the greater good of the whole.

Innocent III (1198–1226) and Gregory IX (1227–41) were contemporaries of Edward I and de Montfort of England—the fathers of the parliamentary system; of St. Louis (Louis X of France), and Frederick II of Germany, both men of great strength of will and both ardent supporters of the independence of the crown from the church; of Alphonso X; of Maimonides—the great Jewish philosopher who exercised a world-wide influence on Jewry through his beautiful writings and teachings; of John of England, against whom Innocent won a signal victory.

It was a turbulent epoch when the little man did not know individual liberty as we know it, when he had no representative body to make his laws, when he found himself caught in a swirling cauldron that stopped boiling only with the dawn of Renaissance two centuries later.

These two great popes lived in rugged days. Gregory was past 80 when elevated to the papacy and lived to be almost a hundred. It was an age of constant struggle for supremacy between temporal and spiritual power, between emperors and kings and popes. Kings challenged popes and popes hurled the thunderbolts of excommunication and anathemas at will; an age when a king walked barefoot in the snow to the Pope's palace to seek removal of the ban of excommunication (motivated, however, by political necessity); an age of secret intrigues and of promises broken as expediency demanded; an age when Gregory IX called Frederick II "this pestilential king * * * that beast of Revelations which came out of the sea"; and the king addressed the Pope in equally virulent and sulfurous language.

But both of these popes were men of great intelligence, of fearless courage, devoted to their principles, acknowledged authorities in the field of canon and ecclesiastical law, which in that epoch of the Middle Ages was the great body of law.

The Encyclopedia Britannica has this to say of them:

"Innocent III was an eminent jurist and canonist and never ceased using his great power in the service of the law. A great part of his life was passed in hearing pleadings and pronouncing judgments. Few sovereigns have ever worked so industriously or shown such solicitude for the impartial exercise of their judicial functions.

"Gregory was famed for his learning and eloquence, his blameless life and strength of character."

Freedom of the Seas: Hugo Grotius.

Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) brought order out of chaos in Dutch law, established the doctrine of freedom of the seas. He was the first to attempt to establish a principle of right and a basis for society and government outside of church or Bible, to draw a distinction between religion on the one hand and law and morality on the other.

Parliamentary government is traced to Simon de Montfort, of England (1200–65), and Edward I (1239–1307). The former was one of the godfathers of the latter, and both were contemporaneous figures in the struggle to limit the powers and prerogatives of the sovereign, the one instigating, the other yielding.

De Montfort (1200–1265) established parliamentary control over the executive. To this parliament must be traced the germ of the modern governing system, although the constitution he promulgated was premature and failed.

It was Edward the First who convoked the Model Parliament in 1295 to meet a crisis in the kingdom. His writ of summons to the three estates contained this memorable sentence: "What touches all should be approved by all. * * * Common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common." The parliamentary constitution of England was established as the result of Edward's action. Edward is called the Justinian of the English.

The following are good men, 'tis true, but to me, a layman, their influence on the American legal system seems remote and collateral at best: St. Louis, Alphonso, Suleiman, Maimonides.

St. Louis stands in history as the ideal king of the Middle Ages. An accomplished knight, physically strong, fearless in battle, heroic in adversity, of imperious temperament, unyielding when sure of the justness of his cause, energetic and firm, he was every inch a king.

He built hospitals between the two crusades he led. He visited and tended the sick and himself gave charity to many people daily.

He was strenuous and vigorous in upholding the independence of the king in temporal affairs and in the right to supervise ecclesiastical matters in France.

Alphonso X of Spain (1252–84) known as Alphonso, El Sabio (the Wise). The short architect's sketch assigns as reason for his inclusion the authorship of two codes, the Fuero Real and the Siete Partidas.

The Encyclopedia Britannica states that the Fuero Real was formed by combining the best parts of existing charters and was accepted only by towns and districts not already chartered. The three parts of Spain, Castile, Leon, and Aragon were not united and did not have a common court until long after Alphonso's death.

This authority states:

"The famous Siete Partidas (the seven divisions), drawn up about 1260, is often spoken of as a code of laws. It was never so treated till it was promulgated at the Cortes of Alcala in 1338 in the reign of his great grandson Alphonso XI. Even then it was provided that it was not to prevail against any fuero or the Fuero Real."

To further his personal ambitions he debased the coinage and then endeavored to prevent a rise in prices by the application of an arbitrary tariff. The trade of his dominions was ruined. He died leaving his country a legacy of civil war.

Suleiman the Magnificent of Turkey (1494–1566). In his own country distinguished as The Law Giver, but known in European history as The Magnificent. His claim to renown as a legislator rests mainly on his organization of the clerical class, his reform and improvement of the administration of the country, both civil and military, and his inauguration of a new and improved system of feudal tenure. His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame.

Maimonides (Moses Ben Maimon) (1135–1204). Jewish philosopher, born in Cordova, Spain, driven from Spain by the Inquisition, and likewise from Fez, Morocco; finally established himself in Egypt where by his eminent writings and dominant personality he exercised almost worldwide influence over Jewry. He was a great exponent of reason in faith, and toleration of theology.

The exception, Blackstone:

Blackstone (1723–80), jurist and annotator of English law. His lasting fame is founded on his commentaries of the laws of England. He did for English law what Gaius and Tribonian did for Roman law. Blackstone distilled out the technical treaties, clear and readable expositions of the doctrine of English law. For a century his Commentaries were the foundation of all legal education in this country.

The only Americans included: Jefferson and Mason.

Jefferson, Thomas (1743–1826): Third President of the United States. American statesman, great democratic champion of the rights of the common people; had a large part in drafting the Declaration of Independence. His career of public service lasted 40 years. He was the moving spirit behind the abolition in Virginia of the laws of entail and primogeniture; he secured the separation of church and state in Virginia, established religious freedom. He was largely responsible for a revision of the code that modified a great many of the severe penalties for minor offenses. From an early age he was against the principle that aristocracy only should be privileged and saw that the success of America would depend on the education that the average man possessed.

Macon, George (1725–92): American statesman, author of the Declaration of Rights and the Constitution of Virginia; member of the Constitutional Convention of the United States.

Pothier, Robert Joseph (1699–1772) of France, was an authority on Roman law and wrote a famous digest of the Pandects of Justinian. He also wrote many articles on French law. When the Code Civil of France was ordered drafted by the Convention, much of Pothier's work was embodied textually in the code.

And lastly, what of Napoleon, a Frenchman of a later day (1769–1821)?

The Architect says: "In choosing the subjects, they (the committee) limited the choice to makers of law, rather than judges or writers on the law, and to those who influenced the American legal system—omitting those who came after its establishment."

When the American Constitution was ratified in 1788, Napoleon was but a junior lieutenant in Corsica. When the Code Civil of 1804 was again promulgated as the Code Napoleon in 1807, our legal system had been established for 20 years.

The Code of course is inseperably linked with Napoleon's name and is why his profile is included. He had actually very little to do with the preparation of the Code. Other incidents flood the mind that overshadow a code coming so long after our own legal system was established.

Modern European history begins not with Napoleon but 14 years after the Little Corporal began his career during which he so badly scrambled European affairs that the Congress of Vienna of 1815 had to be called, as Toynbee says: "To piece together the broken fragments of the mosaic of city states which strewed the face of Europe." We cannot forget that he overthrew the First Republic of France, established himself emperor and sought to name his successor—the antithesis of democracy.

While Mignet says of Napoleon:

"Of his government it is said that the country annexed to France or even merely brought under the influence of France found its gain in being better governed."

Larned says of him:

"As a heartless warrior, which was the level of his character and genius, Napoleon was unrivaled. * * * A prodigy such as Napoleon is rarely permitted to be born for the affliction of mankind."

Why not replace the Corsican with a good American of the colonial period who helped frame our legal system at Philadelphia?

"Because my people hath forgotten me, they have burned incense to vanity." (Jeremiah 18:15.)

Address by President Truman at Church Cornerstone Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 4, 1951:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS TODAY AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF THE NEW YORK AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THIS CITY

It is a great privilege for me to be able to take part in this service. The New York Avenue Presbyterian Church has played an important part in the history of Washington. For almost 150 years a Presbyterian congregation has worshiped on or near this spot. During all that period this church has preached the Christian message to this busy Capital City.

This new building demonstrates that you are still going forward in the same spirit which moved those early worshipers who first came to the swamps and woodland of this National Capital a century and a half ago. May you long continue in that same missionary spirit.

The essential mission of the church is to teach the moral law. We look to our churches, above all other agencies, to teach us the highest moral standards of right and wrong. We rely on the churches particularly to instill into our young people those moral ideals which are the basis of our free institutions.

Religion is not an easy thing. It is not simply a comfort to those in trouble or a means of escaping from present difficulties, as some people today would have us believe.

Moreover, religion is not a negative thing. It is not merely a series of prohibitions against certain actions because they are wicked.

RELIGION HAS A BROAD VISTA

Our religion includes these elements. But it also includes much more. It is a positive force that impels us to affirmative action. We are under divine orders, not only to refrain from doing evil, but also to do good and to make this world a better place to live in.

Everyone of us should measure the actions of his daily life against this moral code which our religion gives to us. Everyone of us, according to the strength and wisdom God gives to him, should try his best every day to live up to these religious teachings.

More than this, religion should establish moral standards for the conduct of our whole Nation, at home and abroad. We should judge our achievements, as a nation, in the scales of right and wrong.

The democracy we cherish, and our free institutions, depend upon the observance of the moral code, in private and in public life. Selfishness and greed can tear this Nation apart, just as they have torn apart other great nations in the past. Our only defense against them is to follow those moral principles which have been handed down to us by our forefathers and which are enshrined today in churches such as this one.

We talk a lot these days about freedom, freedom for the individual and freedom among nations. Freedom for the human soul is, indeed, the most important principle of our civilization. We must always remember, however, that the freedom we are talking about is freedom based upon moral principles. Without a firm moral foundation, freedom degenerates quickly into selfishness and license.

FREEDOM SETS OBLIGATIONS

Unless men exercise their freedom in a just and honest way, within moral restraints, a free society can degenerate into anarchy. Then there will be freedom only for the rapacious and those who are stronger and more unscrupulous than the rank and file of the people.

If we neglect these truths, our whole society suffers.

This is readily apparent in the case of some of the evils that continually confront us. For example, when organized crime and vice run loose and are accepted and patronized by the people, they threaten our free institutions and debase our national life. These evils are clearly moral issues and our religious beliefs command us to fight against them.

It is not so readily apparent that moral issues are involved in some of the other evils we have been fighting against in this country. But it is nevertheless true that the evils of the sweatshop and the slum, the evils of needless disease and poverty, and the evils of social injustice are, at bottom, moral issues. Such conditions arise because men have neglected the moral law. They arise because men do not actually live up to the religious principles they profess to believe in.

When we move to correct these evils, through our personal conduct, through community action, or through the Government, we are responding to the Divine command—to the Golden Rule—which requires us to do good to others.

Of course, this is a struggle that is never finally won. There are many injustices in our country that need correction today, and need them badly. We must continue to weigh our national life in the scales of justice, and keep on striving to improve it.

In the world at large, as well as in our domestic affairs, we must apply moral standards to our national conduct. At the present time our Nation is engaged in a great effort to maintain justice and peace in the world. An essential feature of this effort is our program to build up the defenses of our country.

There has never been a greater cause. There has never been a cause which had a stronger moral claim on all of us.

MORAL BASIS OF LIFE AT STAKE

We are defending the religious principles upon which our Nation and our whole way of life are founded. We are defending the right to worship God, each as he sees fit according to his own conscience. We are defending the right to follow the precepts and the example which God has set for us. We are defending the right of people to gather together, all across our land, in churches such as this one.

For the danger that threatens us in the world today is utterly and totally opposed to all these things. The international Communist movement is based on a fierce and terrible fanaticism. It denies the existence of God, and, wherever it can, it stamps out the worship of God.

Our religious faith gives us the answer to the false beliefs of communism. Our faith shows us the way to create a society where man can find his greatest happiness under God. Surely we can follow that faith with the same devotion and determination the Communists give to their godless creed.

This is what we must do. Our religion must live in our hearts, not as a set of dull rules learned by rote, but as a burning faith. Only such a faith—only a living allegiance to such a faith—can carry this country through the trials which are ahead of it.

This is a matter that comes home to everyone of us. We have many different jobs to do and different parts to play in our country's defense of its freedom and its beliefs.

If each of us, wherever he may be—in a factory or a mine, on a farm or in an office, or in the home—if each of us does his best to help—we need have no fear of the outcome.

We should continually ask ourselves whether we are responding to this cause with the moral conviction and the faith which it demands.

DAILY SACRIFICES RECORDED

Every day our newspapers tell us about the fighting in Korea. Our men there are making heroic sacrifices. They are fighting and suffering in an effort to prevent the tide of aggression from sweeping across the world. They are fighting to prevent the much greater sacrifice and suffering which all of us would endure if another world war comes.

Although we read about these sacrifices in our newspapers every day, we have a tendency to think of the defense effort only in selfish terms—in terms of avoiding personal inconvenience or making some personal gain. Our young men are offering their lives for us in the hills of Korea—and yet too many of us are chiefly concerned over whether or not we can buy a television set next week, or make the profit we expect to make this year, or how we can turn the situation to our advantage.

This is a failure to understand the moral principles upon which our own Nation is founded. This is a faltering in our allegiance to the moral faith we have inherited from our fathers.

If we truly believe in God, we ought to ask ourselves what He may be thinking of our present attitude and our present conduct. Considering all the advantages that God has given us as a nation and all the mercies that He has shown to us from our very beginnings, we ought to ask ourselves whether we today are worthy of all that He has done for us. We ought to ask ourselves whether we, as a people, are doing our part; whether we are carrying out our moral obligations.

I do not think that anyone can study the history of this Nation of ours—study it deeply and earnestly—without becoming convinced that divine providence has played a great part in it. I have the feeling that God has created us and brought us to our present position of power and strength for some great purpose.

THE TASK IS NOT AN EASY ONE

It is not given to us now to know fully what that purpose is. But I think we may be sure of one thing. And that is that our country is intended to do all it can, in cooperation with other nations, to help create peace and preserve peace in the world. It is given to us to defend the spiritual values—the moral code—against the vast forces of evil that seek to destroy them.

This is a hard task. It is not one that we have asked for. At times, we would like to lay it down. And, as we go on with it, we see that it is full of uncertainties and sacrifices.

But we need not be afraid, if we have faith.

There is a lesson for us in the passage from the Bible which has just been read here. That part of the Book of Ezra describes the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem after the long captivity in Babylon. You remember how the writer describes the people shouting with a great shout when the foundation of the new temple was laid. And then the author goes on to point out that some of those in the crowd, particularly the old men, did not shout. They wept when they saw the foundation stones set in place.

These were the men who remembered all the sacrifices—all the suffering—their people had undergone during the captivity. They knew that these sacrifices had not been in vain. They realized that, in spite of all their troubles, and in the face of overwhelming odds, their faith had prevailed. And so they were too deeply moved to shout; they wept for joy.

They gave thanks to God "because He is good, for His mercy endureth forever."

If we hold true to our faith, as they did, I am sure that we will be able to offer, on some future day, the same heartfelt prayer of thanksgiving and joy. We, too, will be able to give God the glory for the victory of freedom and justice and peace for which we are striving today.

We, too, shall say: "He is good, for His mercy endureth forever."

Opposition to Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful statement published in the Freeman for November 13, 1950, relating to the fundamental American opposition to compulsory military or civilian service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MANIA FOR COMPULSION

Good citizens ought to defend their country. Good citizens ought to vote. But should they be compelled by law to do either?

In the Anglo-Saxon world, at least, the answer to such a question used to be no. It was part and parcel of the traditional English feeling about liberty that free men could always be counted on to volunteer in sufficient numbers both to serve the state and to see to it that rascals would be thrown out of office. Since 1914, however, the traditional English conception of liberty has had a hard time of it. To meet the levée en masse imposed by the authoritarian and dictatorial states of continental Europe in two world wars, the Anglo-Saxon world has felt itself compelled to resort to conscription to raise its armies. And now there is more and more talk about the necessity of making voting compulsory by law.

The mania for compulsion seizes people of all political persuasions. For example, the

eminently conservative Representative WADSWORTH of New York joins with President Harry Truman in advocating, not merely a temporary draft for the Armed Forces, but universal military training virtually in perpetuity. The New York Times is properly appalled when the Left advocates seizure of a person's property, but it looks with approval upon universal military training, which is seizure of a man's body for a term of involuntary servitude. (The fact that universal military training and slavery can be described functionally in the same terms ought to give anyone pause.)

In opposing UMT, we realize that we are treading on boggy ground, at least from the narrowly pragmatic point of view. With Soviet Russia herding millions of its slave citizens into a gigantic mass army, and into a gigantic industry designed solely to support that army, just how is the West to meet the threat without resorting to compulsion on its own? Given a modicum of sense in our diplomacy over the past decade, the job of checking Russia could have been done without resort to the spending of billions and the compulsory uprooting of thousands of young men from schools, homes, jobs and careers. But our diplomacy has let us down. We have lost millions of allies in China, and in eastern and central Europe, because of the frivolities (and worse) of our State Department. So we are faced with the necessity of the draft.

Or are we? There is a school of military thought which says that we can still beat Russia without violating basic libertarian principles. A Major de Seversky, a General Bonner Fellers, even (perhaps) a Douglas MacArthur, would argue that the United States should concentrate on air power, on the industrial production of fast mobile weapons, and on guided missiles and the super-explosives. Properly handled, these might be the equivalent to us of the nineteenth-century British Navy, which was successfully manned by volunteers. Not being military experts, we hesitate to give unqualified endorsement to the Seversky idea. But at least it is worth more talk than it is getting.

Talk or not, however, the draft is with us for the time being. It will probably be with us for some time to come. Since it is rooted in a history of diplomatic mistakes that can not be conjured away, we accept it as an inevitable concomitant of the next 5 years. But acceptance of the draft as a temporary measure and acceptance of universal military training as a permanent warp in the fabric of American life are quite different things.

The proponents of universal military training claim that it will do wonders for the young. It will make them healthy, increase their self-reliance, and so on. Having visited Army camps during World War II, and having listened to the GI tell stories that have never yet appeared in Kinsey, we doubt that a baptism in venereal disease or in spree drinking does much to improve a young man's health. As for the self-reliance, when did force applied to those over the age of 15 ever contribute to such? To use contemporary psychiatric jargon, nobody ever becomes "inner-directed" by living an "other-directed" life. Jumping to the bark of the drill sergeant does not constitute a self-disciplined regimen.

From 1870 on, the countries of Europe went in for universal military training. They also went in for romantic youth movements aimed at substituting a barrack-room life for the blandishments of bourgeois society. The end result was fascism—or the triumph of the principle that a man's body can be seized at any time by the state for the state's uses. Nobody, to our knowledge, has ever bothered to explore the nature of the all-togetherness of events in Europe from 1870 to 1950. But we do not doubt the connection between universal military training and the triumph of the idea that the human being has no right to a life apart from the aims and needs of the state.

The United States has won two great wars within the span of a couple of generations. It has done so without interim universal military training. Is it not reasonable to assume that it has been able to win precisely because it has had a society that left the individual free to experiment, to learn, to produce, on his own? Particularly in the individual's plastic years, from 17 to 21?

The assumption is not only reasonable, it is incontrovertible. A boy of 16 or 17 has just reached the stage of adolescence which poses the internal necessity of getting along on his own. He is ready to cut loose from strict parental supervision. At 18 and 17, the self-reliant youth looks for a summer job away from home. He begins to thumb the college catalogs to see what courses most appeal to him. He is beginning to mature. When a war comes, the properly matured youth is ready to use his ingenuity, his genuine self-reliance, in battle. He may need basic training in the elements of fighting (a training which can be provided in the period when the economy is tooling up to produce military supplies), but he will be a more resourceful aviator, a cannier tank-driver, if he has been left alone in his formative years to tinker with auto engines, or to run a tractor in summer months on a farm. And he will have a better conception of military tactics and strategy if he has quarterbacked a college football team or learned to execute the hit-and-run in baseball.

Under a system of compulsory universal military training, the state rudely interferes with the natural processes of late adolescence. It jerks a boy from the area of experiment, of self-exploration and a fledgling approach to inner-directedness, and plunks him down into an atmosphere of coercion. The sergeant-image replaces the father-image in his mind. He may be physically active in executing a thousand orders, he may even reach a point in the hierarchical army set-up where he gives commands in addition to receiving them. But for all the activity of the military life, the boy is forced into psychological passivity. Things are done to him, or for him; he does not do things out of free choice for himself.

When the inductee goes back to civilian life, where he must learn to get along on his own, he is necessarily bewildered. The bewilderment disappears in time, but only because the atmosphere of civilian life in America is still incredibly free. A generation of UMT would change that atmosphere beyond recognition.

As we have said, a temporary draft may be necessary. But at best it is an acceptance of a lesser evil, something which should be watched carefully and rejected as soon as is possible. Keep the draft for the time being if no better way of opposing Russia can be found. But don't let us make the mistake of thinking that the values of Athens can be maintained by changing our society into a Sparta for all time.

To return to the matter of compulsory voting. Sometimes, when the two parties, Democratic and Republican, are both recreant to their trust, and there is no respectable third party in the field, the only honorable thing a citizen can do is to boycott the polls. By refraining from voting, he serves notice on the old-line politicians that he is a menace to be reckoned with when he returns to voting in the future. He is ready to follow a new leader, to vote for an entirely different program than any the old-line politician has seen fit to propose. Simply because the abstaining voter is an incalculable element in the political picture, the old-line politician must tread warily in his presence.

Not voting, then, can be as positive an act of citizenship as voting. And political freedom implies, of course, the freedom to refrain.

We do not advocate political indifference. We hope that more and more American citizens will choose voluntarily to vote when there is something to vote about. But a compulsory vote is a distasteful thing. It is almost as bad as a compulsory one-party state.

Let's have done with the mania for compulsion. In a free society it doesn't solve a thing.

We Must Have an Over-All Natural Resources Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a challenging speech by Mr. E. H. Taylor, associate editor of the Country Gentleman, on the subject of our lack of a sound national policy for the conservation of our renewable natural resources:

Mr. Chairman, members of the conference, a newspaper cartoon that must have caused some wry laughs appeared not long back. It depicted a man in a toy store showing a puzzle to a mother and her young hopeful with the remark: "This will help to adjust him to the conditions of modern life. No matter how he tries to put it together, it will always come out wrong."

The cartoon, with its frustrating puzzle, unhappily fits many of the distractions of the time. It has no bearing, however, on our mistakes in the management of the renewable natural resources of the Nation. We are failing to insure the conservation, sustained use, and potential values of these basic resources for other reasons than the want of any possible solution.

The failure is due mainly to a disregard of two realities. One is the critical importance of these renewable resources to the life of the Nation. The other is the unity, the indivisible relationship of these resources to one another. We have many policies dealing with them separately, but we have no national policy which comprehends and meets the whole requirements.

There is grave danger that this attitude will continue to prevail. The attention and energies of the Nation are centered upon the struggle for survival in the present world conflict. Other interests are being subordinated or set aside until this struggle is resolved.

But we cannot afford to defer the proper care of our renewable natural resources to some indefinite future. They, too, are requisites of survival. Food is one of the three essentials of war. Our food-producing resources suffered a severe drain during and after the recent conflict. The further pressure now being put upon them may last 5, 10, or 15 years, perhaps a generation.

Only a foresighted and resolute conservation of these basic resources will enable them to stand up under such a prolonged strain.

But there is another compelling reason why we must safeguard our capital stock of renewable resources through this emergency. We want to emerge from it with the same kind of America—an America of widespread opportunity, of an advancing standard of living and a vigorous national economy. This will be possible only if our food-producing resources are capable of supporting these advantages.

Food is the primary necessity of life. People spend their money for it first. What is left over is the total fund available for other economic and social uses. Because we have always had plenty of food at a moderate cost a large balance of personal income has been left over for the other satisfactions of life. It is this broad margin of spendable income that has made possible our flourishing industrial system, large-scale employment at high wage levels, and all the variety of professions and services found in this country.

This wealth of food-producing resources has had a reciprocal effect. It has released more and more people for the production of other goods and the amenities of life. These in turn have supplied the improved machines and tools and scientific research which have multiplied the capacity of those remaining on the land. Thus we have the paradox of an increasing food production at the same time that our soil and water resources are deteriorating. It can lead us into one of the most dangerous illusions in our history.

We will, of course, win the struggle with world communism. But while winning it will we neglect and permanently weaken the resources which nourish the American form of society? The answer depends on the public and official understanding of this danger on the home front, and their will to do something about it.

When I stress the necessity of conserving our food-producing resources it is with no thought of singling them out for attention. This would be but to perpetuate the error that has been pursued in the past and present. Soil and water are but parts of what Morris L. Cooke has described as the great complex we call nature. Indivisibly included in it also are forests, grass, fish, and wildlife. All of these elements are interdependent. They are every one members one of another as truly as that other body of which St. Paul spoke.

The uses of land in accord with its needs and capabilities, uses that hold moisture where it falls or slow down its runoff, are necessary to conserve the tilth, the topsoil, and the organic materials that make land fertile and productive. But also, without such conservation of our land resources, we cannot clean up, control, and develop the potential values of our rivers and other water resources. The forest areas are of critical importance to the protection of our watersheds and the water supplies of thousands of communities. Grass is the great healer of land that has been abused. And finally, though I have no need to tell you, fish require healthy stream beds and wildlife the food, cover, and natural habitat that only a provident use of land will afford.

All of these resources are indispensable to our economy, our social structure, and to a full and satisfactory life for the American people. All of them are inextricably bound up together. Any policy that preserves and builds upon the heritage of resources must be an integrated policy, fully recognizing their fixed association and interaction upon one another.

We have nothing resembling such a policy now. Instead we have numerous separate, fragmented and sometimes conflicting policies and programs. These disconnected efforts are being carried on by various agencies, each naturally intent upon its own specialty. It is as though the Air Force, the infantry, the artillery, and the armored units were each to follow its own plan of battle with only accidental coordination with the others. The results are the same in either case. As the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission said in this understatement:

"Our Federal programs have not brought the situation under control. In fact, there are no current programs adequate to meet our urgent need for the preservation of these renewable resources. All targets fall far short of that mark."

It is time to end this haphazard and losing course. The public interest requires that we now come to grips with the task in an intelligent and effective way. This requirement can be met only by a policy that views these resources as an entirety, and not as separate problems. In short, we must have a national policy for our renewable natural resources which comprehends both their involved relationship and their vital importance to the welfare of the Nation.

Such a policy should establish the conservation, sound use, and development of our renewable natural resources as a basic purpose of the Government and require all other present and future policies and programs to be adjusted to it.

This policy should be long-range in perspective, with an emphasis on permanency in results. It should clearly define the objectives to be sought with each of our renewable natural resources. In brief, these objectives should represent the maximum public benefits that can be achieved by their proper use and management. In conformity with their interrelated nature, the policy should require that all resource programs and projects shall be correlated to produce the fullest possible multipurpose effects.

A national policy, shaped along some such lines, must precede any orderly and successful management of the renewable natural resources of the Nation.

Its long-time importance is equaled by its urgency. Unless such a policy is enacted soon there is a distinct danger that these resources will be neglected and allowed to deteriorate further during the defense emergency. A natural resources policy would be the most effective, perhaps the only effective check to this danger. It would direct public and official attention to the immediate need of using and conserving these resources in a manner to insure their permanency and it would add efficiency to the present resource activities.

The failure to provide a natural resources policy is an omission in the security program that Congress should repair at the earliest possible time.

Even at best, we cannot expect quick action. For not only must a resource policy be well thought out but it must be geared to do the job. This involves decisions as to how it will operate and be administered. I shall offer my own ideas.

For practical purposes most of our future resource programs should be organized on a watershed basis. Except for a few of the outsize rivers, such as the Mississippi and the Missouri, the watershed or river basin is a natural operational unit. It presents a workable aggregate of renewable resources as well as the problems they involve. This fact adapts it to an integrated program, in which the efforts of the various resourse agencies can be marshaled most efficiently.

The great number of small watersheds in this country makes such a plan of operation all the more practicable. Unless they are well managed the problems of the big streams they feed will remain beyond solution. Their resource development offers a large measure of public benefits, as the Muskingum Conservancy District so well demonstrates. Moreover, what has happily been called the community watershed is the unit in which can best be enlisted the initiative and active participation of local people, for they can see its connection with their own interests. This is an asset not to be disregarded.

The democratic principle of local and regional planning should be one of the fundamentals of a national resources policy. In the administration of that policy a middle way between the present irresponsibility and some kind of centralized control is both possible and preferable. It will remain possible, however, only if action is taken before the condition of these resources reaches a critical stage.

The paramount need is for the American people and their elected officials to see the issue in its real terms. It is not simply a matter of saving soil fertility, of controlling wasted waters, of growing enough timber or of producing more game to hunt and fish to catch. These are highly desirable in themselves. But the issue is larger than any of them.

It is a question of whether we shall have at our command the basic natural resources required for continuing growth, for the satisfactions of living and for the security of the American experiment in human freedom. This is the proposition in its real dimensions. Surely it is reason enough for a national policy that will conserve and increase the renewable natural resources of the Nation.

Lawyers and the Present-Day Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on the occasion of the annual banquet of the Boston University Law School Alumni Association, held in Boston the evening of March 27, 1951:

LAWYERS AND THE PRESENT-DAY CRISIS

In appraising the position of the lawyer of today in the present crisis it is well, I think, to recall the days when our Nation faced its first and greatest of crises.

In the stirring days between 1775 and 1789, the predominant question and the great concern was the preservation of what the liberty-loving colonists conceived as the only form of government consistent with the dignity of free men.

Today, the strengthening and perpetuation of that same form of government against a more insidious enemy is again the principal problem of free Americans who have inherited the spirit of the founding fathers.

In the days of the birth-pains of the Republic, it was not without reason that the people of a fledgling Nation looked to the men of law to lay the foundations upon which the structure of liberty should be built.

At the end of the eighteenth century, the ancient Judaic-Christian conception of the natural law linked western civilization with the infant Republic.

It was natural, therefore, that the only technically qualified moulders of the American constitutional system were recruited from the profession whose members were schooled in the philosophy that all man-made laws must conform to the law of God.

Thus it was that 34 of the 55 members who comprised the Constitutional Convention were practicing members of the legal profession or had been indoctrinated in the current jurisprudence of their day.

With the adoption of the Constitution, the lawyers became its interpreters and defenders. As the practical political scientists of their day, they espoused and advanced the case of federalism until it became the model and the wonder of government throughout the world.

Today, after a century and a half, the structure which they devised and built still stands. It has survived because of steadfast adherence to the principles of the philosophy from which its architecture was derived.

The danger today is a tendency to overlook the fact that the enemy of democracy—atheistic, materialistic, imperialistic, international communism—is in reality an expression of a vicious creed which is the antithesis of the natural-law philosophy embodied in our Declaration and our Bill of Rights. As in the days of the founding fathers, then, the battle is cast in the realm of ideas.

It is our task as Americans and as lawyers to help mightily in order that the truth shall prevail.

Wielded in the hands of Bracton, Coke, Fortescue, Blackstone, and Pollock, this natural law which is our heritage broke the power of the "divine right of kings."

Thundered forth in the preachments of Otis, Henry, Wilson, Adams, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison, it received immortal enshrinement in our own charters of liberty and established representative government as the protector, and not the creator, of inalienable rights in man.

The lawyers and judges of today are the spiritual descendants of the Coke who defied the King and of Jefferson who penned the Declaration.

Their tasks and duty are no less noble and no more burdensome.

The task is to pit their knowledge, their skill, and all their energies against the philosophy of force which would enslave the world in the paralyzing grip of modern totalitarianism.

As in the times of crisis in the past, the lawyers of today must become the practical political scientists.

The traditions of our law must be reinvigorated and modernized for use—practical use—in the battle of ideologies which rages about us today.

Our principles and precedents are the raw materials—a veritable arsenal of ideas—out of which we can fashion the weapons to capture the minds of men and wean them away from the delusive hope and the false faith which blind them to the baseness of all totalitarian "isms."

The members of our profession must go into the market place of ideas and there preach the basic elements of the doctrine of human freedom.

This means constant reiteration of the principles upon which this Nation was founded, the same principles without which liberty and justice are impossible.

In order to preserve freedom and to secure justice, the nature of man as the repository of those virtues must be evaluated in the light of the natural law.

The medieval teaching which came down to us in the process of the development of the common law must be rediscovered and emphasis again given to the fact that natural law is antecedent to the law of the state.

Believing this and preaching it, we have the answer to the false prophets of today, and their fallacious doctrines shall wither in the wind of truth if we but have the courage to preach and act and live by what we believe.

One of the most significant expressions of my thought is found in a quotation from an address by Chief Judge Lehman, of the New York Court of Appeals in 1941:

"Statesman, prelate and judge, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, are united in the conviction that the inalienable rights of the individual, formulated and assured by our law, rest upon a foundation eternal and immutable because it is Divine. There lies America's unity."

The lawyer of the present day can do much to spread that conviction.

Today as in the past the spirit of the legal profession generates unquenchable patriotism. Some of the younger members of the bar are now engaged in active combat in Korea. Many others are serving in the various branches of the armed services. Still others, are holding important civil posts in the Federal, State, and local governments.

The very environment surrounding the training of a young man for admission to the bar reflects a respect for law and order. He has been made to believe that juridical order is the essential element of a peaceful society. He can easily understand that this juridical order and good government go hand in hand; that no government can long exist except upon the consent of the governed; that there must be a peaceful adjustment of political affairs and the settlement of disputes by rule of law rather than strength of arms. For "when law ceases, tyranny starts."

But no matter how much he believes in all these things, history teaches him that wars are recurring. No actual solution toward an enduring peace has yet been found.

Yet when war does come, as was the case in World War II and our previous wars, we find the legal profession well trained and experienced to render great public service.

This manifests itself in many ways; adjustment of management-labor disputes so essential to our productive capacity; in the making of Government contracts for defense production; in the field of administrative law; in the forming and enforcement of policies to control inflation; in case of shortages to assure equitable allocation; in the administration of the Selective Service System; in the field of military justice; and many other activities too numerous to mention.

We find the lawyer in time of emergency or of war always responding to the call for active service.

With his training, his ability, his experience, his well schooled mind, particularly in fundamentals, as a leader in his community the lawyer helps mold sound public opinion on important issues of the day.

By virtue of his education, training and experience, he is uniquely qualified and does to a marked extent form and interpret our Government's position on foreign and domestic fields.

Giving full credit to the contributions made by those engaged in other fields of human activity, the influence of the lawyer in the sphere of government is tremendous, and properly so. His education and training equips him to make a marked contribution in the science and operation of government. He has, he is, he will continue to do so.

Because of our changed economic conditions, the large volume of legislation, the necessity and pressure for action, the real work in the Congress is done in committee. It therefore follows on the national legislative level, for all practical purposes, congressional government has essentially turned into committee government.

This means that greater importance must be and is attached to the legislative drafting office of the Senate and House in the Congress, composed of lawyers, who also invariably sit in when committees are considering a bill. Therefore the staffs of committees with the prominence of the lawyer thereon, are all-important. In the executive branch of government, the lawyer as adviser, renders valuable assistance to the President, and department heads.

In the field of preserving the constitutional guaranties relating to the liberties of our people and the American way of life, and at the same time preventing or controlling subversive efforts aimed at the destruction of our Government the lawyer, either as a legislator, as an active practitioner, as a prosecuting attorney, or as a judge, plays the primary part.

Our country—as all of you know—is engaged today in the largest program of military expansion we have ever undertaken short of involvement in full-scale war.

This build-up of military strength is far more than the bald proposition that might makes right. We seek the establishment of a firmly grounded system of international law and order among the family of nations. And to this end, the creation now of powerful military forces within the community of free nations is essential.

We look to the creation of a common policy, directed to a common purpose, and guided by a common body of law among nations. It is the logical end-point of this view that all nations of the world work out together, and ultimately accept, the same policy with respect to dealings among themselves.

Certainly, within the framework of western society we have managed largely to abate the conditions in which the individual takes the law in his own hands. The individual who breaches the law of the community today does so at the peril of sanctions which the community may impose upon him.

But this has not always been the case. The story of civilization is the story of man's continuing battle to enlarge liberty and security of the community at large—always at the expense of the unrestrained activities of the individual. And it is equally the story of resistance by the powerful individual to any new restraints upon his ability to plunder.

With such a heritage, it is indeed difficult for me to understand why any American would challenge the general principle that the collective liberty of all stands above any license that would permit one individual to deprive others of their liberty.

Just as law and order based upon morality have been slow to develop within nations themselves, they have been slower still in emerging among nations. The earlier development of order and stability within nations has evidently received great assistance where there has been a common racial, religious, and environmental background, and achievement of national unity has almost invariably been retarded under conditions in which racial, religious, or environmental differences have divided the people.

While we are a people, not a nation, fortunately we have had no such intense or long-disturbing differences among our people.

The revolution in communications, largely within the past century, has for perhaps the first time in history made unity among nations a practicable—and, I hope, foreseeable—possibility.

We cannot close our eyes to the magnitude of the job. Traditional national jealousies gravely aggravate the task. Great differences in living standards, cultural heritage, political experience, and a thousand other factors give rise to misunderstandings and keep suspicions alive.

The difficulties are great. Yet I firmly believe most Americans accept the fact that it is in our national interest to overcome the difficulties. We can expect no miracle overnight that will bring about the brotherhood of man and world-wide understanding. But with equal truth we can say that only by trying can the job be done. One thing seems to me to be certain; we cannot expect success by default.

The first task of our foreign policy has been—and to a large extent still is—to weld the free nations into a unified community simply as a matter of self-preservation. Division and disunity among the free nations can only result in having them picked off one at a time. The dangers of such division and disunity are at once evident. Every loss to us is a gain to the forces of world communism—a long-term increase in their resources at the expense of ours.

Now if we could assume that world communism would expand no further than it has today, the United States could, perhaps, confine its attention to building up its own defenses without any regard for what happens elsewhere in the world. But there is no basis whatever for believing that the Kremlin is content with what it has already

taken. Indeed, the ceaseless activity of world communism belies any intention to be satisfied with what it already has. And when we look out upon the terrible internal weakness within so many of the non-Communist nations, it is perfectly clear that they do not possess the strength individually to protect themselves. Only by uniting their efforts can there be any realistic hope that their freedom can be maintained, and this directly concerns our own country.

If the Kremlin is to be denied world conquest, the answer is to be found in creating situations of strength to replace the areas of weakness which now threaten to many of the nations outside the Red orbit. And it has been toward the creation of these situations of strength that our foreign policy has been directed.

We have sought to accomplish this through policies mutually adopted by ourselves and other nations. The programs have been designed with the realization that their success is measured by the degree of cooperation, mutual trust and common purpose which they generate among the nations participating in them. The more nearly they succeed in breaking down suspicions and national jealousies, the more closely they approach the kind of unity upon which a lasting system of law and order can be built.

I should like now to examine our major foreign policy programs of the postwar years with an eye to testing their contribution to our ultimate goal of peace and stability throughout the family of nations.

Our participation in the United Nations was—and is—predicated upon the assumption that an international institution, participated in by all nations, is a fundamental requirement of a system of law and order. This, in particular, is a challenge to the legal mind. The United Nations furnished a great meeting place of nations in which international questions could be presented, discussed, and understanding of them broadened. The United Nations Charter incorporated more areas of agreement between nations than had ever before been put on paper. But it was not a perfect instrument, and from the first it was recognized that the mainspring of its initial success would be provided by national good faith, rather than legally foolproof sanctions. It was, nonetheless, a tremendous step forward when you consider that it did succeed in bringing together all but a small handful of nations.

Obstruction and bad faith by the Kremlin and its satellites has served to hamper what direct enforcement powers the United Nations did possess. On the other hand, the United Nations has done a fine job of promoting greater understanding among nations. Nations of the free world have sat in ringside seats as evidences of Soviet bad faith have continued to pile up. Without question this factor has been of primary importance in uniting the free world.

I should also like to point out that last fall the General Assembly enacted a provision which now permits it to impose sanctions free of the veto. Back in October, Secretary of State Acheson proposed the uniting-for-peace resolution, giving the Assembly power to act when the Security Council was hamstrung by the veto. And the Assembly accepted the resolution, with only the Soviets and their satellites voting against it. This adds a significant new strength to the UN, and is a real victory for forces seeking an effective system of law and order.

But the United Nations is young, and it is just now beginning to cut its teeth. It still lacks the strength necessary to assure world peace under all circumstances. And thus it is that American foreign policy has directed its attention in part to regional programs designed to strengthen the security of the non-Communist world.

Along in 1946, guerrilla warfare, directed and supplied from the Kremlin, broke out in Greece. The weak and economically wrecked Government of Greece had too recently emerged from Nazi occupation to possess sufficient strength to beat down the threat. And about the same time, the Soviet Union was making exploratory moves in the direction of Turkey.

It was evident that these countries were too weak to save themselves without help. America's answer to this threat was the Truman doctrine, under which we furnished arms and economic assistance. With this aid, both Greece and Turkey were able to strengthen themselves sufficiently that the threat to their security was overcome. And out of the Truman doctrine has grown a new friendship and a greatly stronger desire by both these countries to work in close cooperation with other nations. Both the Greeks and Turks have forces fighting now in Korea, despite the fact that each country borders the Soviet empire, and is fully aware of the opposing military forces across their borders.

Furthermore, both the Greeks and Turks have won the growing respect of the western European nations, and the prospects for their ultimate participation in the Atlantic Pact are now quite encouraging.

As the Soviets took over the countries of Eastern Europe, the rest of Europe was terribly threatened. Chaotic economic conditions produced an almost mushroomlike growth of internal Communist activity and the overthrow of many non-Communist governments seemed imminent. American Marshall-plan aid cut off that threat, and enabled the countries of Western Europe to re-create a situation of economic stability by restoring industrial and agricultural production to points well above prewar levels.

A major feature of the Marshall plan was the emphasis placed upon carrying out the economic recovery program as part of an over-all plan for Western Europe, rather than attempting it piecemeal, country by country. Thus, the governments of the Marshall plan countries sat down together to work out their problems. Considerable headway was made in cutting down the age-old tariff barriers, and in eliminating uneconomic competition. And efforts to further this are still being made.

As an adventure in international cooperation, the Marshall plan has been a striking success. Without it, the defense of Western Europe today would be impossible.

The situation of economic strength created in Europe by the Marshall plan eradicated the internal threat of communism there. Militarily, however, the threat of possible aggression was very real, and any realistic thinking necessarily had to consider that the Kremlin might seek the conquest of Western Europe by force if efforts at internal subversion and economic collapse failed.

It was to meet this threat of aggression that the North Atlantic Pact was adopted in 1949.

The North Atlantic Pact, born of necessity, consists of 12 nations, including our own country, to stand together for common defense. It is in our national interest. It is in the national interest of the other pact member nations.

Its purpose is twofold:

1. To build collective military strength within the Atlantic community with the will not only to prepare but to fight, if necessary, and powerful enough to prevent any attack from coming.

2. In case of attack, to stand together in common defense and resistance against the aggressor.

It is recognized the only factor the Kremlin respects is that which it fears, and that is strength and power greater than that possessed by the Soviet Union.

The Atlantic Pact, created by voluntary entry of its member nations, is based upon a mutuality and trust for a common purpose—unity and strength to prevent aggression, preserve independence and liberty, and as an instrument of peace.

By the Mutual Defense Act of 1949, we implement the North Atlantic Pact to build up military forces in Europe, speed military equipment to our treaty allies, recognizing, as Congress did, that only by an integrated defense force could maximum benefits be obtained by a minimum cost.

In rendering assistance to other treaty nations we are not disregarding our own national defenses.

The policy of the Kremlin prior to Korea was for Communist forces within a country, with the assistance of the Soviet Union, through any means possible, to take over country after country, and as this resulted, to become satellites of the Soviet Union.

The Greek-Turk assistance, and the Marshall plan in other free European countries, has stopped that policy of internal subversion, the overthrow of the existing government, and thereafter Communist domination.

Stalin and his associates had to turn to a policy of open aggression through satellites.

The attack on South Korea by the North Korean Communists, and the follow-up by Red China was the first act of open aggression.

We had witnessed the act of open aggression by the Japs in Manchuria in 1930; by Mussolini in Ethiopia in 1937; and later by Hitler in the Ruhr, followed by Czechoslavakia, Austria, Hungary, with Great Britain following the policy of appeasement, and with the attack on Poland, the Second World War followed.

It is the first open act of aggression that does the damage, and based on our own experiences, its natural and probably consequences, when appeased or permitted, has been war.

Successful open aggression in Korea would have been rapidly followed elsewhere by further aggression against other nations.

For our country to sit back and protest diplomatically, in other words to follow the dangerous policy of appeasement, would have lost for us the confidence and respect of all countries of the world outside the Red orbit, and countless of millions of persons behind the iron curtain who are looking for their day of deliverance.

We would have destroyed respect for our word and our solemn obligations, we would have failed in our trust.

In all probabilities, we would have compelled every non-Communist country to turn through necessity, but with fear to make the best deal possible with the Kremlin, and that would be but the beginning of the end.

Western Europe, with its know-how, with its productive capacity and its 200,000,000 inhabitants, would sooner or later be lost to us. Frankly, this is too great a risk to place our country in. I shall do everything within my power to prevent it.

In order to prevent that happening we might in our own defense and our national interest be compelled to resort to armed conflict with the Soviet Union.

President Truman saw the danger, made his decision and acted quickly with courage.

The aggression in Korea has awakened our people to the danger that exists. Our Navy, our Air Forces, and our land forces have been greatly increased and strengthened. Our Armed Forces now exceed 2,900,000 men and women, having doubled since the outbreak of the Korean aggression on June 25. Our production for defense has greatly increased, with our productive capacity geared to total production, if necessary.

Our resistance to the Korean aggression has increased the morale, the military strength, and production of non-Communist countries.

If another world conflict is averted, it is my firm opinion that Korea, with the armed

resistance to the first open act of aggression that took place in that country, will be a main factor in this desired result.

The next step for peace by stopping open aggression was the formation of the defense forces of the North Atlantic Pact nations through the recent appointment of General Eisenhower as the over-all military commander in chief.

The success of the Atlantic Pact is in the national interest of the United States. It is also in the national interest of the other 11 member nations.

I expect that Greece and Turkey will soon be members of the pact.

I hope that Spain will be a member in the near future.

The directing of policies concerning the national interest of a nation calls for cool, calm, rational thinking, with emotional thoughts, impulses, or reactions eliminated as far as is humanly possible.

It is my opinion, which I have advocated for a long time, that it would be for our interest and in the interest of a future period of peace for our country to enter into a military agreement or a military alliance with the Government of Spain; also, that as soon as possible thereafter Spain should become a member of the North Atlantic Pact.

Where the national interest of two or more countries are involved, differences in form of government should not be permitted to interfere with those steps being taken which are in the national interest of such countries.

I would be greatly surprised if some such talks or negotiations with Spain are not now under way.

From our outlook, and I include the non-Communist world, conditions are decidedly better than they were 1, 2, or 3 years ago.

In case of sudden attack or war, we are now in a much better position than we were when Pearl Harbor took place. We are growing stronger.

With the Communist threat, the road to security and peace is through strength.

If I am to err, I intend to err on the side of strength and security rather than on the side of weakness and insecurity.

This is not the time when we can take any calculated risks on the side of weakness. Such risks must be on the side of strength.

I introduced on December 8, 1941, one resolution declaring war. I do not want to introduce another one. But I shall if necessary.

It is by America using its great strength affirmatively and effectively, with the moral forces of the world leading the way that the probability of another world war in our lifetime might be averted.

If this is accomplished, the chances for peace for a long period of time faces the world of today and tomorrow.

The lawyers of past generations were leaders in the onward march of mankind toward the establishment of representative government, and of personal liberty.

The lawyers of yesterday were leaders in the establishment and building of the American Republic. A great challenge for leadership presents itself to the lawyers of today.

It is a challenge for leadership which particularly addresses itself to the legal mind, and which will require ability, vision, patience, and courage to meet.

I have every confidence that the lawyers of today will meet the test, and particularly if war is averted, they will make their marked contributions toward the establishment of an international law and order and machinery which will extend justice to all nations and assure world peace for countless of generations to come.

With the direct responsibility that rests upon me, recognizing as I do the gravity and sensitivity of the world situation as it exists, the moral values and strength of men and women who want to be free, and the material strength of our country and our allies whose objective is peace and international law and order, I view the outcome with optimism and with confidence.

We Now Have a Poor Man's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the recent Executive order deferring super-duper college students from call under selective service, in my mind, is ill-advised and poorly timed. It comes while the House of Representatives is considering legislation in which this matter is being dealt with. The President should withdraw this order pending the outcome of the congressional debate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Robert C. Ruark which appeared today in leading newspapers of the country. I agree with Mr. Ruark's observations regarding the deferment of the "bright young men" in college from the draft. The article follows:

WE NOW HAVE A POOR MAN'S WAR

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK.—It seems we have now seen everything. Lo, behold, and forsooth, we now have a poor man's war, a draft in which the college man is mainly exempt from exposure to the military, and a brand-new caste system in the country.

Our President, in his wisdom, has ordered deferment from military service for young men who are passing their work in college, and shortly will subject other young men to special aptitude tests with an eye to deferment if they are smart enough to make a certain grade, as yet unannounced.

Of course, if a man is too poor to entertain the idea of college, or not spiritually attuned to higher education, he is still draft meat. Fall in, bum, you're in the Army now. We draft the Al Smiths, in other words, and exempt the Alger Hisses.

This, finally, seems to be as gross a violation of individual rights as has come down the pike lately. To choose a soldier on a basis of educational opportunity is almost, if not quite, as unfair a proposition as drafting only red-headed, blue-eyed boys with a strawberry mark on their right shoulders, while everybody else goes free.

It is admitted that education is important, but a great many successful people never went to college, and a great many bums did attend the better seminaries. But this is really beside the point.

The point is that the draft, like death and taxes, should be democratic in its administration. If there is a war stirring, and if a draft is necessary, then the obligation belongs to everybody. The load is shareable by all—not just a few.

It would, per se, be foolish to make a foot soldier out of a budding doctor, or throw a carbine at a brilliant physicist or engineer who is winding up his studies. But most of the men affected by the new draft order are not special cases. They are just youngsters taking general courses.

It is a human oddity that nobody cares to be drafted, and very few sane folks are eager to die. When a man is ordered by his government to conform to one or both penalties against personal freedom, he sort of likes to think that everybody is getting the same deal. A man without a college education is just as dear to his family and friends as a double dome with a triple degree in botany. And it is hard to tell, by looking at a dead GI, whether or not he was fortunate enough to get the full dose of schoolhousing.

To make a privileged class of any massive group of healthy young men is a downright insult to every candidate for the press gang. It would be of small comfort to a young man unfreezing his feet in Korea to reflect that his friend Bill, who could afford to go to college, was at the moment chasing a coed around the drinking room in a fraternity house at dear old Bless U.

The other angle is that your college man is highly usable in the Armed Forces, because if he can pass his courses the chances are he can think. Thinkers make great noncoms and officers. What do we seek here, a military composed strictly of fools, disgruntled poor boys, and morons?

If the great brains in Washington wish to really louse up the morale of their handcuff volunteers, this is a gorgeous way to do it. I still say the thing is to draft everybody within the limits of age, physical qualifications, and dependency, and then sort 'em out according to their best use from a military standpoint. This block deferment of students and smart guys is an insult to every cross at Anzio and to every civilian who presently wears the uniform of his country.

The Senate Kefauver Crime Investigation Committee Should Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to insert into the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram that I have received from Mr. J. C. Phillips, editor and manager, Borger News-Herald, of Borger, Tex. This telegram is most timely and most pertinent. It is a concise expression of what should be in the minds of all American citizens at this time. Character is the foundation of a sound government and a sound civilization, and for which there is no substitute.

BORGER, TEX., *March 28, 1951.*

Representative WALTER ROGERS,

House of Representatives:

Cities controlled by organized crime have no more chance of escape from this evil control than anti-Communist Russians have of escaping slavery to the Kremlin. The Senate Kefauver crime investigation committee should be continued until an aroused and indignant public starts effective local cleanups. It seems that corruption in public office has become quite honorable just so long as it is not exposed. The ability to get rich quick, honestly or otherwise, has become too much a part of the American character. Unless we place more emphasis on individual character, in the home, in the school, in civil life, and in public offices, all of the decent and good things of civilization are apt to be lost to us. Dishonest government leads to dictatorship. It is a sorry thing that we sometimes hear, good men will not run for public office because of corruption inherent in politics. Obviously we have good men and courageous men in public office and these are the men who must lead us back to a higher standard of individual and national character. Even in small cities organized crime in public office is hard to eliminate and we know that when gambling and prostitution are flagrant in any city, regardless of size, some public official is getting a payoff. To eliminate this evil, the good people throughout the land must have the continuation of the newly organized Kefauver crime investigation.

J. C. PHILLIPS.

Soldiers and Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by the well-known and highly regarded writer, Hamilton Butler, which appeared in the Detroit Free-Press Sunday, April 1. I commend it to all Members of Congress:

SOLDIERS AND POLITICIANS

(By Hamilton Butler)

Among General MacArthur's many abilities is that of putting his foot in the mouths of double-talking diplomatists to their great annoyance.

The latest exhibition of this feat was his offer to meet the Chinese Communist commander in the field and discuss a military truce.

What was wrong with that?

As commander in chief of the UN forces fighting a war forced upon them by the Chinese Communists, General MacArthur was clearly within his rights in employing this tactical device.

The State Department, though, and the nervous Nellies at Lake Success shrieked that he had made a political decision and endangered their negotiations with Peiping for a cease-fire.

The arrant nonsense of this charge appears from the text of his March 24 statement:

"Apart from the military area of the problem, where the issues are resolved in the course of combat, the fundamental questions continue to be political in nature and must find their answer in the diplomatic sphere.

"Within the area of my authority as military commander, however, it should be needless to say I stand ready at any time to confer in the field with the commander in chief of the enemy forces in an earnest effort to find any military means whereby the realization of the political objectives of the United Nations in Korea, to which no nation may justly take exceptions, might be accomplished without further bloodshed."

As will be noted, General MacArthur emphasized the line dividing the sphere of military authority from that of political authority and carefully kept on his own side of it.

The unpardonable sin General MacArthur committed was in suggesting the possibility that he might obtain by a conference with the Chinese Communist commander the cease-fire that the diplomats have vainly sought for 4 months to win by appeasement.

The politicians will never forgive him for that.

While General MacArthur has sedulously avoided the area of political decisions, the politicians have invaded the area of military decisions and hamstrung him with limitations unparalleled in the history of warfare.

The interdict they imposed on carrying the war beyond the Yalu even after the Chinese Red hordes had crossed that river and attacked the UN forces in full strength created an inviolable sanctuary for the enemy.

The inability of the UN air arm to strike at their communications and bases in Manchuria was worth a dozen divisions to the Communists.

Also it has cost thousands of American lives.

The politicians told General MacArthur to clear Korea of Communist forces in order that it might become a free and united country.

Then they tied his hands.

As a soldier, and an American, General MacArthur wants to get this wretched business over with before the Korean people are further crucified and his troops suffer more senseless casualties.

The effect of his cease-fire statement was to expose what has been going on at Lake Success, where UN committees have been trying since December to interest Peiping in a truce, without any success at all. They have gotten a brushoff. The Commie foreign office won't even talk to them.

The air has been cleared.

Navy Research Promotes Safer Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Navy's Aviation Matériel Center's Research Promotes Safer Aviation; Jet Speeds Bringing Many Problems," by Lt. Comdr. Robert J. Boylan, United States Naval Reserve, which was published by the North American Newspaper Alliance. It describes some of the activities of the Naval Aviation Matériel Center at Philadelphia, Pa.:

NAVY'S AVIATION MATÉRIEL CENTER'S RESEARCH PROMOTES SAFER AVIATION; JET SPEEDS BRINGING MANY PROBLEMS

(By Robert J. Boylan)

PHILADELPHIA, March 24.—A flat-chested Mae West? Sounds incredible, unlikely, and maybe heretical. But that's what the Navy is developing to replace the life preserver that proudly wore the name of Mae throughout World War II.

The 1951 Mae's flatter surfaces make for less bulk and easier movement and should be a handier preserver that does a better job of saving lives, particularly of wounded airmen. Its nylon netting not only reduces weight but produces a correct floating posture.

The new life preserver is only one of many developments coming out of the Navy's aviation matériel center here which devotes thousands of man hours a week to making aviation safer.

One of the problems the center's engineers are licking is crash helmets for pilots using the seat ejector. First the center did a lot of work on the ejector itself, which shoots a pilot out of a plane when the craft runs into trouble serious enough to make this necessary. Then they designed a crash helmet that could withstand the pressure that develops when a pilot is suddenly fired out of a plane skimming along at 500 or more miles per hour.

For this problem the Navy called on the United Carr Fastener Co. for help. The company, after extensive research with the center, came up with a special pull the dot fastener. Not only does this fastener keep a helmet on securely but under pressure it locks even tighter, thus saving many a pilot's head from being snapped off.

Many NAMC problems arose with the coming of near-sonic jet speeds. For instance, cockpit lighting and the exterior lighting of aircraft. In a jet plane booming along at speeds of 8 or 9 miles a minute a pilot has to be able to read his instruments fast and accurately. And when he sees an approaching plane in the night sky the closing speed is about a mile in 3 seconds, which doesn't give any chance for second guessing on an instrument reading or in sighting wing-tip lights.

For this huge and complex lighting problem the Navy has built its own stellarium in a corner of one of the large NAMC buildings. There a pilot is put into a cockpit, all other lights are turned out, leaving only the man, his instrument lights, simulated approaching aircraft, and a starlit sky.

He is shown a total of 15 aircraft approaching and leaving from various angles. It is up to the pilot to take proper moves to avoid a collision course. Pressing one lever records his recognition of the aircraft and a second lever records his actions, if any, to avoid collision.

So far NAMC has tested more than 300 pilots. As part of the test they are given an elaborate questionnaire designed to produce a pattern of answers rather than a subjective "yes" or "no." What the Navy wants to find out from the pilots is how difficult it is to read instruments at night and how hard it is to spot approaching aircraft.

One of the experiments works like this: A pilot is put into a darkened cockpit. A series of four instruments, located at 12, 3, 6, and 9 o'clock on a panel, flash on and off in a clockwise movement. After a few revolutions a pilot cannot tell which of the four instruments is lighted or which will be next to flash on. This proved to the NAMC engineers that a point of reference was necessary and that supplementary floodlighting should be installed in cockpits.

Many of the problems tossed to NAMC develop because of the constant feud between fuel and rubber—two items that always go together on aircraft. The center maintains a laboratory that devotes all its time to research and development of plastic and rubber products.

One of the products, usable where fuel and rubber come together, is a rubber diaphragm built up like a Dagwood sandwich: a layer of special synthetic rubber with excellent resistance to fuel; a nylon center and a nylon barrier to prevent seepage of fuel; and another layer of a synthetic rubber with a good resistance to low temperatures. Fuel has a tendency to extract from rubber the materials that make it resistant to it.

Also on the long list of successful NAMC accomplishments is a simple tab that may save many a pilot's life. Now part of a new oxygen mask, it prevents air from seeping in as a pilot's head is thrown back in using the ejection seat or in making a parachute jump. Old type masks without the tab slipped open just enough to cause death or serious injury from breathing rarefied air at high altitudes.

Waterproof clothing that "breathes" is another NAMC success. Pressure suits made

of a rubber-coated cloth achieve this improvement. On a project such as this, engineers have as their ideal developing a cloth that simulates human skin and its ability to "breathe" through the pores.

The NAMC experts believe that in orlon they have found the most nearly perfect cloth for the suits. It seems to be best because it resists both mildew and sunlight. Nylon is stronger, they say, but doesn't have orlon's other qualities.

Many of the products mentioned were developed in the aeronautical medical equipment laboratory of the Naval Air Matériel Center, which was dedicated only 2 years ago. The laboratory has two divisions: Human engineering, which deals with the physiological phases of aeronautical medicine, and the development division, dealing with the study of scientific engineering problems relating to safety devices and protective equipment.

But the goal of both divisions and of the entire center can be summed up in two words: safer aviation.

Rudolph Halley, Chief Counsel of the Kefauver Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my sincerest wishes for a speedy recovery to my good friend Rudolph Halley, the chief counsel for the Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime. Halley has done a wonderful job in connection with the work of the Kefauver committee in helping to uncover the crime and gambling evils in this country. Millions of people have had the opportunity to watch him over television during the recent hearings in New York and Washington, and have come to respect and admire him for his ability and the manner in which he interrogated witnesses.

Hard-working, energetic Rudolph Halley is only 37 years old. He was born in Harrison, N. Y., on June 19, 1913, and received his preparatory education at Columbia University in New York, where he obtained a bachelor of arts degree in 1932 and a bachelor of laws degree in 1934. He was editor of the Columbia Law Review from 1932 to 1934, which denotes a significant honor and achievement. In 1935 he was admitted to the bar in New York and in 1946 he became a member of the District of Columbia bar.

Halley began his legal career as law secretary to the Honorable William Bondy, United States district judge for the southern district of New York, with whom he was associated from 1934 to 1937. He then became assistant United States attorney for the southern district of New York, in which capacity he served until 1942. When the Truman war investigating committee was established, he was named assistant counsel and in 1944 became the committee's chief counsel. In recent years he was associated with the law firm of Fulton, Walter & Halley in New York.

When the Kefauver committee undertook its crime investigations in the spring of 1950, Mr. Halley was appointed chief counsel, heading an investigative staff of 25 men. His working day often extended until 2 in the morning, he got along on 6 hours sleep, and was back on the job the next day full of his usual vitality. Men like Rudolph Halley are sorely needed now in Government service. I hope he will soon return, well and strengthened, to complete the task he has undertaken and in which he distinguished himself so much.

In conclusion, I want to insert in the RECORD a brief item on Rudolph Halley published in the April 2 issue of Life magazine. It is as follows:

HALLEY WAS A COMET ACROSS TV NETWORKS

As its main interrogator, the chief counsel for the Kefauver committee often had to draw unwilling testimony from men who, as policemen or prosecutors (O'Dwyer had been both), were themselves skilled at tenacious examination and verbal entrapment. Rudolph Halley's success at this was due to extraordinarily hard work, to his prodigious memory (he used no notes during the hearings), and to his ability—which showed brilliantly on television—to press question after relentless question in his flat, metallic voice.

Halley is a stocky, good-humored, 37-year-old New York lawyer, who has enormous energy and a respect for law and order as ingrained, if not as flamboyant, as Senator TOBEY's. Born in Harrison, N. Y., he graduated from Columbia Law School at the age of 20, has since divided his time between Government work and a lucrative civil practice. During the 10 months of the Kefauver hearings he usually worked 16-hour days, 7-day weeks, compiled some 2,000,000 words of testimony and bested most of the major underworld figures in the United States. For this he would receive less than $7,000.

This week he could start writing his report. His boss wanted to end the hearings and begin drafting remedial legislation to curb some of the evils the committee had uncovered.

Sixteenth Annual Patriotic Award Dinner of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two addresses delivered at the sixteenth annual patriotic award dinner given by the Decalogue Society of Lawyers of Chicago, Ill., on March 3, 1951. The society's Award of Merit for 1950 on that date was conferred upon Dr. Percy L. Julian.

The thought-provoking speeches reprinted below were given by Mr. Carl B. Sussman, president of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, and Mr. Roy I. Levinson, past president:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME DELIVERED BY CARL B. SUSSMAN, PRESIDENT, THE DECALOGUE SOCIETY OF LAWYERS

Distinguished guests of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, ladies, and gentlemen, in welcoming you on this festive occasion I do so in a solemn spirit. We live in uneasy times, when values we hold dear and precious are threatened from without in a measure civilization has not known before. It is good, however, that we, a free people, give constant testimony of our confidence and strength to defend a way of life and a system of government that made us, American citizens, outstanding among all nations on earth. And it is to celebrate the right to project our unity with the noble institutions of our country that the Decalogue Society of Lawyers rededicates itself tonight to a restatement of its principles and completeness with the American way of life.

It would seem that, today, secure in its achievements, its ever-growing abundance, this great land of ours would continue to persist unmolested, its moral leadership unchallenged and supreme.

Yet, such is not the case. The world is in a turmoil. Dark forces are at work to nullify our tremendous gains in the orderly forms of government and there is an endeavor abroad to repeal in substance concepts of civilization we cherish in our own land. Science has made tremendous strides; its accomplishments have added dignity and stature to the human being, and it has lifted crushing burdens from the brows of mankind. But that almost to no avail, for no permanent peace or security is yet in sight for the millions on all continents in the world. Is this, the atomic age, to go down in history as the beginning of another Dark Age? The challenge is urgent; the issues are clear.

We lawyers, members of a bar association, all descendants of immigrants who came here a generation or two ago, Americans all, are beneficiaries of a heritage left us by the founders of this country. Violence and deadly strife, untold sacrifices in blood and tears were conditions precedent that had to be met and overcome to establish at last in all its glories this great Republic, this model democracy. We pledge that this sacred legacy shall be inviolate in our keeping and no unclean hands shall trifle with our trust.

Jews are no longer a homeless people. After 20 centuries of wandering and exile our coreligionists are the proud citizens of the youngest Republic in the world. Yet the scars of yesterday are too fresh and deep to forget that prejudice and ignorance needs the vigilant ministrations of the decent people of the world.

Mankind shares the shame for the unspeakable decade that saw incinerators reduce human beings to dust and ashes and the excesses of that era have placed a lien upon the conscience of humanity to guarantee that the outrage never reoccur. We believe that this assurance and covenant extend and unconditionally include all those with sorrow laden, black or white, all minority groups whom the lash of prejudice and discrimination reduce to second-class citizenship.

We hold it vital to reiterate the truth that all men are created equal. That security from the enemy beyond our border is unsure if there lurks in our midst a contempt for a just application of the blessings of our Constitution. We believe that as lawyers we need exercise our special skills, talents, and learnings to defend the weak and to enlighten the confused. We hold that as a society we need be missionary in practicing what we preach. We need living demonstrations of the sincerity and the integrity of our profession of faith that democracy works.

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, in the spirit of true democracy, is giving you such a demonstration.

Conscious of the truth that the struggle for human liberty is ceaseless and exacting and that only in a just world will all peoples find justice for themselves, we seek to support such ideals which promote progress for all.

So this day, as in former years, we bestow an award of merit upon a citizen for distinguished service to humanity, believing that our award serves as an inspiration for the common good.

We are proud to salute in the person of our choice for the decalog award not only recognized achievement and proved merit but also a fellow American the son of a people who have yet to wrest their complete recognition from our laws and institutions. In this we pledge them and all minorities our unstinted aid in our march toward the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

ADDRESS OF ROY I. LEVINSON, PAST PRESIDENT OF THE DECALOGUE SOCIETY OF LAWYERS

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, with warmth and sincerity, the Decalogue Society of Lawyers tonight honors itself in presenting our award of merit to Dr. Percy L. Julian, as a recognition of his own preeminent talent and achievements and his invaluable service to our beloved country, and to humanity.

It is also a tribute of our admiration, gratitude, and respect for more than 15,000,000 Americans, whom Dr. Percy Julian so worthily represents. Their emancipation, humility, loyalty, and patriotism have profoundly influenced us. Their dignity and industry have served as an inspiration to free men everywhere.

In the world's history, never before was the future of so many nations, of so many continents, of so many individuals at home and abroad, so closely shrouded in dark clouds of uncertainty, pregnant with storm. As one looks around there is little light, save when dazzling flashes write a great interrogation on the murky background.

Whither are we drifting? Everywhere civilization is at the crossroads. Can this change and disaster which impends, be harnessed for the welfare of man, as the great soybean chemist has harnessed the forces of nature?

In the life and works of Dr. Julian will we not find answer to the eternal question: What of the future? Bright or dark? From his resistless philosophy why not look at the duty of us all, to one another, from the first stirring of civilization? What of the other man?

Look into your own mind.

As the wrought iron must be melted and tortured in the crucible of fire and flame and then pounded into its beautiful and useful shape, are not those people who have been tortured by the fires of hate and bigotry, and tempered by the process, the worthiest of consideration and admiration?

Dr. Percy Julian graduated at the head of his class at the Alabama State Normal College. He was a classmate of David E. Lilienthal at DePauw University, in Green Castle, Ind., where Dr. Julian slept in the attic of a fraternity house and waited on tables for his meals. At the end of the 4-year course he was Phi Beta Kappa orator and valedictorian of his class in 1920. The winner of several succeeding fellowships carried him through his courses at Harvard University.

His memorable research of the soybean began at the University of Vienna, where he won his doctor of science degree and returned to head the chemistry department at Howard University, where he had previously been a chemistry teacher. Then he gladly accepted the invitation of his old friend, Dean William M. Blanchard, to teach at his old alma mater—DePauw—where a laboratory was built for him. It was here at the DePauw laboratory, in 1933, that Dr. Julian launched the first original creative work in pure chemistry ever published by a Negro in the history of America.

An official of Glidden, a leading Chicago chemical company, heard of his discoveries and offered Dr. Julian a position as research director of their soybean division.

His first job there was to improve a sizing for paper and cold water. This he did, turning a $35,000 a year loss into a $135,000 annual profit.

The same soybean product is used in his Aero-Foam, the fire extinguisher. In the desperate days of our naval war in the Pacific Dr. Julian's soy protein has done and is doing its work against the enemy. They found it put a blanket—impenetrable to oxygen—over gasoline and oil fire, dousing them like magic. It was Aero-Foam, affectionately called bean soup in the Navy, that saved the lives of thousands of our sailors and airmen and many of our warships.

With long-talked-about wars, and rumors of wars, a grim reality and occurring with such frequency and mounting fury that they kill off the youth of each generation, the world has been forced to look to older men for more energy and manpower.

Dr. Julian's experiments with the soybean has produced unlimited quantities of synthetic testosterones (male hormones) which give old men the mental verve, the muscular vigor, and the virility to carry on in industry and at home.

Dr. Julian has a staff of 65 brilliant research chemists now under his direction, a melting pot of the genius of many races and creeds. He has patented over 40 important discoveries.

Most prominent of his synthetic bean products are: Physostigmine, used in curing the eye disease, glaucoma; prostigmine, used as a postoperative and also in the treatment of paralysis; synthetic ephedrine, an element used in cold medicine; synthetic male and female hormones credited with saving the lives of countless unborn babies by protecting expectant mothers from miscarriage, and cortisone, a hormone compound which is making cure possible for thousands of arthritic sufferers.

Dr. Julian is now working hard on pregneen-olone to combat fatigue and amino acids for the treatment of infection and starvation, two new life-giving chemicals.

Dr. Percy L. Julian was selected Chicagoan of the year in 1950 by a city-wide poll conducted by Irv Kupcinet, columnist of the Chicago Sun-Times. In 1947 he received from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People its Spingarn Medal award, and an honorary doctor of science from his alma mater, DePauw University. His accomplished and delightful wife is a research sociologist with a doctor of philosophy and Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Pennsylvania.

Does not the inspiring life of Doctor Julian confirm this old Hebrew Talmud philosophy? "As the grapes which are pressed the hardest, yield the sweetest wine, so this grandson of a slave we honor tonight is one of the most brilliant minds, one of the most compassionate hearts on the world's scene."

At the very time some scientists evolved the atom bomb, Dr. Julian, tranquil and calm, in the midst of life's frustrations and turmoil, worked realistically and sympathetically to save human lives and prolong them.

He has become an apostle of construction, rather than of destruction. We feel keenly his strength and high purpose, the integrity and ability with which he grapples with a succession of difficult problems. He never spares himself, whatever the issue. We know the depth of character and sincerity which motivate his every thought and word. But whither goes the world?

He has asked himself that question all his conscious years. He has read many books, some that men would call sacred. He has tried to understand anatomy, embryology, and chemistry, in the widest meanings of those terms. He has studied comparative religion and found comfort in his own and good in all the others.

I believe there is a great purpose running through all his strivings, which is more than of him. It is above him. The end to which his purpose moves may be hidden at times from mortal eyes, but the direction in which he has moved is not hidden, but clear.

His brain has been demonstrated a thing of marvel. The high thoughts and promptings of his, beam from spiritual lighthouses for the guidance of his earthly voyage.

He finds, in delving into books, and in his work in the research laboratories, that the one book and the one laboratory that contains the resistless truth is the human heart.

In the warm, palpitating book of the heart he has read that each of us had a desire inborn and instinct for beauty, a yearning to serve his fellows and to know the truth.

We honor one who has dug deep into the hidden meanings and implications of the spiritual longings for light.

Prejudice and truth are enemies. Truth, in life as in the laboratory, has no finer task than that which it duly performs: of destroying prejudice. Were I to distill Dr. Julian's philosophy from his life and works in one sentence, he has proved in the laboratory of life that, where prejudice is, truth is excluded, for no judgment where given in advance of known truth is either sound or safe.

So he has not only devoted long hours to his science but also has given unselfishly of himself and his funds to numerous civic and welfare organizations, for the betterment of human relations.

Currently he is a member of the advisory board of Mandel Clinic of Michael Reese Hospital, of Roosevelt College board of trustees, of the board of world service of the First Congregational Church of Oak Park, of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination, of the Phoenix (Ariz.) Council for Civic Unity, where there is a public school named in his honor, and other organizations. Until his health demanded curtailment, Dr. Julian also was very active on the board of trustees of Provident Hospital, the Round Table of Christians and Jews, the Chicago Urban League, and the Chicago Welfare.

With this background the Decalogue Society of Lawyers is honored to present to you, Dr. Julian, its award of merit for the year 1950 for your distinguished service to your country as patriot and scientist; for your outstanding creative achievements in the interest of the common good; for the boon and blessings your scientific learning and discoveries have bestowed upon man; for your unparalleled devotion to the needs of humanity, the cause of decency, and the progress of free America.

Freewheeling Down Inflation Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 22, 1951, entitled "Freewheeling Down Inflation Hill."

Personally, I am alarmed at the present situation and the failure of the

efforts of the administration to halt, or even slow to any great extent, the progress of inflation. It is just as dangerous to our American way of life and our freedom as the Russian threat. In fact, it is Stalin's belief that we cannot prevent a continuation of the present inflation and the disastrous depression that will follow if it is not soon controlled.

I urge that more drastic steps be taken immediately to halt the vicious spiral of wage and price increases. If the law is not at present strong enough to halt it, then by all means we should at once take steps to strengthen the law.

The present situation makes it clearer day by day, how right we were who urged that prices, wages, and rents be frozen at the pre-Korean level before inflation had had time to begin its fatal work. Again I warn the House of the danger and express my displeasure at the apparent apathy of its Members toward this menace that grows greater day by day.

The editorial follows:

FREEWHEELING DOWN INFLATION HILL

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—Charles Wilson, Eric Johnston, and Mike DiSalle, the three men entrusted with the gigantic task of keeping the American economy on an even keel, have been reading the riot act through the corridors of Washington.

They have told every top member of the Truman administration from the President down that inflation pressures to date are nothing compared to those to come; that unless Congress will vote tougher controls and the administration will use those controls far more sternly than it has used the present temporary powers, we are in for a day of reckoning. If that day comes, they say, we will be jolted out of our present complacency so hard out teeth will rattle.

Here is their line of reasoning:

We have had inflation already. Today the Army pays $7.85 for a pair of shoes which cost $4.15 before the war. The rise in costs of things the Government buys already has consumed the whole of the income from last year's new taxes. These are just two illustrations of where the inflation stands at the moment. Any housewife can add yards of examples to the list.

But there is little justification for this present degree of inflation. The Federal budget still is on a pay-as-we-go basis. There is a $3,000,000,000 cash surplus in this year's budget. Merchants' shelves are loaded with consumer goods. There are no shortages of consumer goods sufficient to justify such price increases.

The only important causes of our present inflation are: (a) speculation, (b) fear buying, and (c) purchasing practices of the armed services. Since Korea, commercial bank credits have gone up by $9,000,000,000. Most of this has gone into inventories—that is, speculation. The public has done a lot of fear buying. Defense contracts are awarded on a negotiated basis which amounts in effect to a cost plus 6 percent formula. The rise in wages and prices has been strongest in the defense industries.

Thus, in a period when reasons for inflation were relatively slight we have had massive inflation.

We are headed for a period when there will be real justification for inflation. Even if Congress votes stiff new taxes, there will be some deficit financing.

The time has been reached when the volume of defense contracts is expanding swiftly. The value of contracts awarded by the Army during the first 20 days of January exceeded the total of awards during the previous 6 months. The rate of contract awards by all armed services now has reached $5,000,000,000 a month. The rate is climbing. During the next year, the defense program will involve spending some $50,000,000,000 on capital goods.

The great question is how we are going to hold a line against those powerful inflation influences when we have done such a puny and ineffective job against minor inflation factors.

The problem facing the trio of our economy stabilizers is how to rouse both Congress and the administration to a realization of the dangers.

Right now the politicians seem more eager to please special interests than to protect the economy. The Department of Agriculture sympathizes with farmers who want the lid off farm products. The Department of Commerce sympathizes with the big profits for corporations. The Federal Reserve Board protects the freedom of banks to make commercial loans. The Department of Defense beats against every price or wage ceiling which tends to slow up defense orders.

A remark heard here more and more frequently these days is: "Bernie Baruch was right. We should have gone in for hard controls and a real wage and price freeze. We should have done it long ago."

But Congress has not been roused to any sense of urgency about economic matters. The departments of Government still tend to protect their special interests. The lobbies increase their pressures. The war contracts roll out. Rising prices make labor increasingly restive. There is no effective machinery to prevent angry disputes between labor and management.

We are freewheeling downhill. Messrs. Wilson, Johnston, and DiSalle see a blind corner ahead and shout for brakes.

The three who must carry the load hope we can avoid trouble, but suspect that it may take a jolt of sad experience. They have given their warning. Now it's up to Congress and the administration.

Send a Food Ship to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following very compelling editorial which appeared in the April 2, 1951, issue of the New Leader magazine:

SEND INDIA A FOOD SHIP

The stark hand of a famine worse than India's has gripped the heart of Congress, a famine of pity and mercy. For the bill to send 1,000,000 tons of grain to India has been choked to death—even as countless Indians are daily dying of starvation—by a House Rules Committee clique.

The situation would have been deplorable enough had the bill come to the floor of Congress and been passed—it had been subjected to so much needless scrutiny that procrastination was beginning to produce a bad taste in the mouth of its proud beneficiary. Already, in fact, Peiping has agreed to barter 50,000 tons of rice in exchange for Indian products, and Moscow is almost certain to conclude a similar transaction. The propaganda value of these arrangements will far outweigh, of course, whatever expense Moscow and Peiping might incur, as anyone but a Dixiecrat or a midwestern Republican can see. The United States, to which has been transferred much of Asia's old resentment against British imperialism, will henceforth be all the more realistically caricatured as the conventional bloated and top-hatted Mr. Moneybags smugly contemplating a mountain of withered brown bodies. The expense to us for helping perpetuate this caricature will, in the end, vastly exceed the $190,000,000 it would have cost to send food grains to India.

This is so serious an issue that other means must be found to resolve it at once. It is useless to talk, as so many of us are, of making huge appropriations for "truth" campaigns when the truth is that we constantly undermine our prestige—even as we are seeking, by artificial means, to increase it—by substituting words for deeds, or by permitting deeds to contradict words. It may still be possible to recover a tithe of the standing we lost when the aid-to-India bill was lost in committee, but to do so will require action of an unusual sort, posthaste, on the part of the people themselves.

Since a congressional minority has succeeded in frustrating the will of Congress by a parliamentary maneuver, it is now up to the American people to demonstrate that this minority in no way represents their feeling toward the Indian people and that we are still a humanitarian Nation. This can be done, in a symbolic way at least, by raising through popular subscription sufficient funds to send to India as many shiploads of grain as can be managed. We fully realize that the quantity of grain which may thus reach India can scarcely alleviate the mass suffering there; but if one or more shiploads can be sent promptly, in the name of the American people, that may possibly undo some of the psychological damage that has been done.

We propose, concretely, that a committee of citizens representing all faiths, classes, parties, races, etc., be formed at once; that it be headed by a man of unquestioned humanitarianism and organizing ability; and that it launch a Nation-wide appeal for subscriptions to send a food ship to India. The New Leader hereby offers its own modest resources to the furtherance of this project. Are there any takers?

Filippo Mazzei, the Obstetrician of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, Dr. Leopold S. Vaccaro, a consulting surgeon in Philadelphia, has written an article entitled "Filippo Mazzei, the Obstetrician of the American Revolution and the Defender of the Colonies Here and Abroad," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILIPPO MAZZEI, THE OBSTETRICIAN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND THE DEFENDER OF THE COLONIES HERE AND ABROAD

(By Leopold S. Vaccaro [1])

Filippo Mazzei is not so well known as his compatriots, Christopher Coumbus, John and Sebastian Cabot, Americus Vespucci, Verrazzano, and other illustrious sons of Italy who, working under foreign potentates, have given the world a new world. Our interest in this roving Florentine physician was stimulated following a recent visit to Monticello, the home of the pen of the Revolution, and Ash Lawn, the humble residence of James Monroe.

Our great admiration for Virginia has been well founded by such illustrious sons as Washington, the sword of the Revolution; Patrick Henry, the tongue of that stupendous historical event; James Madison, the father of the Constitution; James Monroe, who kept the foreign aggressors from our shores; and John Marshall, who, by his learning and understanding, raised the prestige of the Supreme Court to the highest peak in his 32 years of service on that high tribunal. However, we were very slightly familiar with Dr. Filippo Mazzei.

Between Monticello and Ash Lawn there is a hill named "colle," which is the Italian translation for hill. On this hill, Mazzei built a home, which, modernized, is now occupied by Stanley Woodward, our American Ambassador to Canada. When we decided to visit this shrine, four domestics tried to chase us from this private property, but we soon gained their confidence and were shown the place without further opposition. In his Memoirs, Dr. Mazzei states: [2] "Mr. Jefferson took me to the home of a man who owned a cabin and about 400 acres of land boarding on his own. * * * I decided to purchase this 'colle.' Mr. Jefferson's estate was adjacent to this property. He said he would give me a tract of 2,000 acres." Jefferson was then 32 years of age, Mazzei 43, and Monroe the junior of Jefferson. These three great personages in the history of the world signaled to one another from their respective hills when they did not visit each other. A bond of sincere and lasting friendship and affection existed among the three of them. In these critical days, when democracy, liberty, and the dignity of man are seriously menaced by militant communism, we are determined that these principles shall not perish from the face of the earth. Filippo Mazzei assisted at their birth in Virginia.

It is very strange indeed that Providence brought this great man to America. Again in his memoirs he states: [3] "I struck up a friendship with Franklin and through him with various other persons from the Colonies. One of these persons was Thomas Adams, who, being a close friend of Jefferson, made it possible for Mr. Jefferson and me to know a great deal about each other some years before we actually met."

While in London, Dr. Mazzei, in company with Franklin, ransacked the whole city looking for, of all things, the famous stove that Franklin had invented. It was in that metropolis that he formed some hopeful ideas about the North American Colonies. Once, in Virginia, he said: ' "We lived in Jefferson's house pending the construction of my house. Jefferson understood the Italian language (Tuscan) very well, but had never heard it spoken. Nevertheless, he could converse with my men in their native tongue, and they were so pleased that I was deeply touched."

At Williamsburg, soon after his arrival, Mazzei had lunch with Jefferson. Washington dropped in during the afternoon. Although he never passed beyond a formal acquaintance with the father of what Mazzei came to call his adopted country, he enjoyed a lifelong friendship with Jefferson and was closely associated with two other young Virginians, James Madison and James Monroe. He gave John Adams, to his face, some rather needed lessons in the theory and practice of democracy.[4]

Before Mazzei had been in this country 8 months, he had become an active pamphleteer and was elected to a local office. He was proud to be called "after Jefferson, the best leader in the country." The following observations, published by Mazzei under the pseudonym "Furioso" in John Pinckney's Virginia Gazette during 1774–75,[5] illustrate his ideas:

"To attain our goal, it is necessary, my dear fellow-citizens, to discuss the natural rights of man, and the foundations of a free government. * * * All men are by nature equally free and independent. This equality is essential to the establishment of a free government. Every individual must be equal to every other in his natural rights. The division of society into the ranks has always been and will always continue to be a serious obstacle to the attainment of this end. I repeat that a truly republican form of government cannot exist except where all men, from the very rich to the very poor, are perfectly equal in their natural rights. Fortunately, we are free on this continent. * * * Now when certain privileges are exercised by a portion of the inhabitants and denied to others, it is vain to hope for the establishment of a liberal and permanent government, unless the favored citizens are willing to relinquish their privileges and stand on a footing of perfect equality with the rest of the inhabitants. Discrimination inevitably arouses envy and ill feeling. * * * Therefore, liberty will always be insecure and finally doomed to collapse. * * * Democracy, I mean representative democracy, which embraces all individuals in one simple body, without any distinction whatsoever, is certainly the only form of government under which a true and enduring liberty may be enjoyed. Unfortunately for mankind, this form of government has never existed. The sacred name of democracy has been abused by tumultuous governments built on false and unstable principles."

The reflective mind will discover, in these ideas expressed by Mazzei, the impact on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. He was the true obstetrician of the American Revolution.

Mazzei refers to one of the many conversations and disputations with Jefferson, which they must have carried on very frequently. He says: [6] "Jefferson was amazed at the defects of the English form of government when I pointed them out to him, saying that they had not even occurred to him. 'There are several reasons for that,' I said, 'Ever since childhood you have heard that it was the best possible type of government; you could see that it was such in comparison with other governments in Europe; you must have read English authors who proved that it is far better than that of the Roman Republic; finally, never dreaming of having to change it, you lacked the incentive to examine it in detail, except when provoked by the insolent way the English express themselves about other nations. They are 400 years behind the times. I have examined it carefully and have noted the essential defects I described to you.' It was agreed that I should write another article, bringing these defects to the attention of everyone."

These exchanges of ideas must have profoundly impressed Jefferson who later in his letters quoted England as a "harlot." [7] Dr. Mazzei, as a continental European and Italian, was always suspicious of England and her schemes. He was really responsible for the formation of volunteers in all counties to fight England. In defense of the Colonies, he states: [8]

"The most cunning policy adopted by the Cabinet of St. James to subjugate the Colonies was well known as one of divide et impera and to attack each separately. * * * To protect his position, the Governor of Virginia enforced the views of the Cabinet. * * * On my return to Monticello I communicated to Jefferson the information I had obtained from the Governor and expressed my opinion as to the probable cause of events. We agreed to announce through the newspapers the publication of a periodical by which we aimed to show the people the true state of affairs, and the necessity of preparing ourselves so as not to be caught unaware in case of attack. As I know the views of the Cabinet of the Court of St. James, and particularly of the persons involved, I was to write the articles in my native tongue, and he would translate them into English.

"Our warnings gave rise to the formation of companies of volunteers in all the counties which call themselves companies. Later, a meeting of the people's representatives was held under the name of conventions."

Filippo Mazzei was not only engaged in economics, history, and finance, but also in agriculture. As a matter of fact he introduced vines and crops in Virginia with his friend Bellini. A special corn called maize is an abbreviation of Mazzei. A lot could be written of Mazzei's contribution to agriculture in this country.

For a period he turned over his agricultural enterprise to his assistant, Bellini, and installed the first chair of modern languages at William and Mary College in Williamsburg, Va. He was eminently successful on the farm, in the shop, in the Council Chamber, in local politics, in newspaper writing and as a historian, which we will see later. He was one of the first to predict the coming struggle between England and the Colonies on the belief that each would not fight the other, and that each would therefore advance to positions from which there would be no escape but to fight, having learned the dangers of monetary inflation and of excessive radicalism.

While he was a sharp observer in 1788, during the French Revolution, he strove to keep that revolution close to the American model. Ciampini says: "Dr. Mazzei has assisted at two of the greatest revolutions of modern times." R. C. Garlick [9] writes of Mazzei as follows: "Mazzei has understood from the beginning the character and the importance of the French Revolution. * * *

---

[1] Dr. Leopold S. Vaccaro, '16 M. C., a consulting surgeon in Philadelphia, make a hobby of his interest in American history and in the contributions of Italians. He studied medicine in Rome, and has been decorated by the King for his services in the cause of international understanding.

[2] Memoria della Vita e delle peregrinazioni del Fiorentino Filippo Mazzei—Tipografia della Svizzera Italiana, 1845–46, p. 192.

[3] Ibid., p. 165.

[4] Ibid., p. 194.

[5] Memoirs of the Life of M., introductory remarks—Marraro, H. R., Columbia University Press, 1942.

[6] Ibid., Preface.

[7] Memoria, p. 204.

[8] R. C. Garlick, F. M., His Life and Letters.

[9] Memoria, p. 198.

[10] R. C. Garlick, F. M., Friend of Jefferson, His Life and Letters.

During 3 years, two and three times a week he writes a lengthy letter to the King of Poland. Nothing escapes his sagacity, his attention, or his curiosity. He is not an inactive agent to register only what comes to him directly or indirectly. He chases after news, swift, and indefatigable, neglecting nothing. He searches above all for the cause and demonstrates more than the vivacity of a chronicle the dignity and conscience of a historian. Since the first days he has understood the enormous importance for the present and for the future of what was happening before his eyes and had the sudden intuition of possible developments. And it was natural because he has assisted in another Revolution. He had known well Jefferson and Franklin. He had seen Washington in action. He had engaged in history, economics, finances, commerce, and agriculture. He had seen people and countries. He had been a politician and a planter—a man of the first order."

Who was this great Italian genius who assisted at the birth of the American Democracy and about whom so little has been written? The historic books on America are systematically numb regarding him. The following are some of the authentic data:[11]

Filippo Mazzei was born on a familiar day, one on which another immortal physician was born, Jesus Christ. It was on Christmas Day in 1730 when Mazzei was born at Poggio a Caiano, Florence. He studied medicine at the hospital of Santa Maria Nuova in Florence and from youth practiced his profession successfully.

In 1752 he visited Asia Minor with Dr. Salinas, and remained there until 1755. On March 3, 1756, he went to London, where he relinquished surgery and taught Italian. He was engaged in commerce and imported Italian products. It was in this city that he made the acquaintance of Benjamin Franklin and other prominent representatives of the North American Colonies, who induced him to form a company for the introduction in America of the silk worm, vines, and olives.

On September 2, 1773, Dr. Mazzei sailed from Leghorn and landed in Virginia toward the end of November. We have already mentioned how he was a guest at Jefferson's home for a certain period of time and how Jefferson was instrumental in the acquisition of land and the building of a residence for Mazzei on "Colle." We have mentioned how before the Revolution, under the pseudonym "Furioso" he was laying the foundation for that memorable explosion. Later on, with his good friend Jefferson, he joined a company of the militia in Albemarle County.

In 1779 Mazzei was sent by the State of Virginia as an agent to Europe to obtain a loan in gold and silver and to procure supplies in Italy for the Revolutionary soldiers. However, the ship whereon he was traveling was captured by English pirates. Mazzei knew he had been betrayed by his own captain, a Scotchman. Therefore he threw the portfolio which contains his credentials and instructions from the State of Virginia into the sea. After many vicissitudes he reached La Rochelle in France, but lacking credentials and money, he was unable to deal with the Government or private firms officially. He finally went to Italy, where he remained 2 years (1781 and 1782), residing in Tuscany. During this period, with articles and lectures, he advocated commercial relationships between Tuscany and America, but the Grand Duke of Tuscany, who ardently believed in the final victory of England, was irrevocably diffident to Mazzei.

Mazzei next returned to Paris where he became the champion of the American cause. Here he engaged in debates with the enemies of the American Colonies. In his Memoirs we find these excerpts: [12]

"Before I had been given my commission by the State of Virginia I heard there of a book by Abbot Raynal, which was creating great furore. * * * I deemed it proper to expose him * * * decided to publish in a single volume the refutation of both Abbot Raynal and Mably. * * *

"I consulted Jefferson on this project and he agreed. * * *

"In 4 weeks I had sketched about one-fourth of my Recherches Historiques et Politiques. As soon as I landed in Virginia in 1773, I began to learn about the history of my new country, beginning with the first European settlements. At that time my memory was very good. * * *

"Once back in Europe I refuted Mably's observations in all seriousness. * * * I added some notes which were intended to inform Europeans of things which I thought might not have come to their attention.

"After the establishment of the American Republic, many wished to see a complete and impartial description of that interesting country—and yet no one had written of it deserving to be taken seriously."

He again returned to Virginia in 1783, giving Jefferson a minute account of what had happened. Again in 1785 he went to Europe and brilliantly defended the Colonies. He ably refuted the censure of the French writers against the American Constitution.[13] In this he was strongly backed by Jefferson who had succeeded Franklin as American Ambassador to France. He held many private conferences and exchanged ideas, and planned a very effective counteroffensive.

In 1788 he was commissioned by the King of Poland to deal with his affairs in the French capital. It was during this period that he deserved the fine tribute of R. C. Garlick in his book, Philip Mazzei, Friend of Jefferson, His Life and Letters, already alluded to.

Although in the service of the King of Poland, while in Paris he was active in spreading the knowledge of the American Revolution and the American ideals of his adopted country, as he states in his Memoirs. He was very well known to the French public men, having been presented to the French Court previously by Franklin.

With du Pont de Nemours he founded the famous Club of 1789 [14] made up of 32 persons, half of them members of the National Assembly, in opposition to the Club Jacobins. The Jacobins attempted to reduce everything to confusion. Each club had a foreign correspondent, and Mazzei was chosen as the foreign correspondent of the Club of 1789. The letters that Mazzei wrote to the King of Poland have been compiled by Raffaele Ciampini.[15]

In December 1791, Mazzei went to Warsaw and stayed until July 1792, returning to Italy and settling in Pisa. While in his retirement in Pisa his old friend Thomas Jefferson, who had by now become President of the United States, gave him another commission for the planning of Government buildings and the beautification of the Capital. Mazzei has this to say:

"I received a letter from the United States Superintendent of public buildings, in which, by order of President Jefferson, he requested me to find one or two sculptors to serve the United States in the erection of public buildings in the Capital, and especially the Capitol itself * * * to ask Canova whether he would undertake to make a statue of liberty in white marble, 7 feet high, in a sitting position; what the cost would be and when he would agree to deliver it." [16]

"I saw two Carrara sculptors, one named Andrei, 36 years of age; the other Franzoni, 28, highly skilled. * * *

"I remembered that a good marble quarry had been discovered not far from the Capital, and was convinced that Franzoni would be well able to make the statue in America.

"I wrote all of this to Jefferson. * * * I gave the letter to the sculptor and 2 years later Jefferson wrote me: 'The sculptors are here, well in health, well employed and greatly esteemed.' "

Having completed his work for his adopted country, Filippo Mazzei died in Pisa, Italy, on March 19, 1816. He requested that the date of his death be inserted at the end of his memoirs.

Jefferson never forgot his old friend, and on April 24, 1796 [17] he wrote the famous letter to Mazzei wherein Jefferson attacked the leading Federalists as having monarchist tendencies. Mazzei translated this letter and published it in an Italian paper. It was translated into French and then again retranslated into English by the French from the French text, reaching America where it was printed in May 1797, soon after the induction of Jefferson as Vice President of the United States.

It is worthy of note that during that political campaign, in which animosities reigned supreme, the spirit of Jefferson's original letter had been greatly changed to suit the purposes of the Federalists.

Dr. Mazzei was a most prolific writer of articles and pamphlets. He was a very eloquent public speaker and spoke all the Romance languages. He also mastered the English language. His monumental works are: Récherches Historiques e Politiques sur les Etats Unis de l'Amérique Septentrionale (four volumes, Paris, 1788) and Le Memorie della Vita e delle Peregrinazioni del fiorention Filippo Mazzei (Lugano, 1845–46, two volumes).

Mazzei was a profound student of the French prerevolutionary writers and thinkers, such as Molière, Boileau, La Fontine, and, particularly, Voltaire. During my visit at Monticello I saw the bust of Voltaire (Jean Francois Marie Arouett) and I have no doubt that the philosophic novels Zadis, Candide, L'Ingénue, Siècle de Louis XIV, Historie de Charles XII, and A. Sermon de Cinquante must have formed the library of Thomas Jefferson. I have no doubt that when these two intellectual giants, Mazzei and Jefferson, met either at Colle or at Monticello, that their discussions revolved on the ideas and the interpretation of the ideals significant of the Revolution: [18] That all men are born equal and are endowed with certain inalienable rights, such as life, and the pursuit of liberty and happiness; that the governments have been instituted so that men may reach these ends and that those who govern derive their power from the consent of the governed; and that when the government does not accomplish these ends, the people have a right to destroy it and replace it with another government. All discussions must have revolved on this doctrinal background. It was the thought of these two great men that the American Revolution was not only a reaction against the abusers of the English Government, not even a secession from it, but a revindication of the rights of men; an affirmation of the popular sovereignty—a regime of the people.

[11] Inciclopedia Treccani.

[12] Memoria, pp. 295–297.

[13] Recherches Historiques et Politiques sur Etats Unis de L'Amerique Septentrionale—1788. Library of Congress, Rare Books Division.

[14] Memoria, p. 277.

[15] Un Osservatore Italiano della Rivoluziona Francese. Firenze, Rinascimento del Libro, 1934.

[16] Memoria, pp. 409–413.

[17] The Four Letters of Jefferson to Mazzei, Marraro, H. R., Columbia University Press.

[18] Philosophy expressed in debates as recorded in Recherches Historiques, etc.

Hamilton and Adams did not have in mind such a democratic interpretation of the Revolution, and Mazzei did not hesitate to express his views freely to Adams to his face. From the ideas of the Revolution the United States was bound to lay the foundation of a new social political order of democracy.

These two sages had arrived at these conclusions, not only on theoretical grounds, but on profound historical reasons. They had a profound conviction of the capacity of the masses to govern themselves and the conviction that in the United States the historical conditions should be crystallized wherein a government by the people could be definitely established. It is quoted that Mazzei had said:

"Unfortunately for mankind, this form of government has never existed. The sacred name of democracy has been abused by the tumultuous governments built on false and unstable principles." [19]

This government was finally to be realized in the United States of America. We hope and pray that the principles established by the founding fathers after untold sacrifices and struggles, may become the torch of mankind for the establishment of free people and good will toward all men.

[19] John Pinckney's Virginia Gazette, 1774–75.

A Quiet, but Fruitful Easter Recess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes lucky to be considered unimportant by newspapermen because you have a much wider latitude of activity than some goldfish they keep track of by watching him swim in a crystal bowl.

They long ago relegated me to the anonymous brigade when it came to embellishing one with unduly favorable comment.

Thus, during the Easter recess, I was at considerable advantage in my roving center strategy of visiting unnoticed through outlying counties which threaten to be part of the new congressional district now being fashioned for me by the boys from Knickerbocker.

My tour took me to places adjacent to but not included in my present bailiwick. I went to the east and the west of the great Hall fortress of Broome.

Thanks to my former secretary, Merlin Casterlin, I found the groundwork well laid. I paid calls on dozens of Americans in every walk of life but the political.

I was well received. It will be fun to go back, especially since a couple of large meetings are now being organized in my behalf at key centers, and there will be new opportunities to make friends.

Our people need help today more than ever before. The growing weight of top-heavy bureaucracy in Washington falls heavily on them because they must foot the bills which high-salaried, do-nothing Government appointees cost the taxpayers.

The folks back home are expected to pay the shot for every new batch of fifteen to twenty thousand dollar executives added to the swivel chair corps. This long list of fakers can be found among the pages of the Federal Register, an imposing volume because of its great length. The five-figure salary of each little giant appears opposite his name. Such a book affords laborious but interesting reading.

Of course, I told the truth and did not step out of cast, when I mentioned to the home folks my objections to the presence of so many well-paid fatcats on the Federal payroll. I insisted they do not earn their money, and the people I talked to agreed with me.

They added that it is futile to fight the handful of Commies who rule the Kremlin, if we are going to permit the building of the same type of Commissariat to supersede Congress they have in Moscow to grind down their millions of subjects. I should hate to see the American people meet any such fate.

But an equally noteworthy fight for freedom ought to be waged on the home front. Citizens of New York State should have the right to know what congressional districts they will vote in next year.

For instance, one loyal albeit newly made friend in the counties I visited demanded that I give him the green signal to start work in my behalf for the 1952 primary. The answer I made was unsatisfactory for I had to tell him I just did not know whether I would be running in his section or a hundred miles away.

My friend's enthusiasm did not die with that, however. He threatened to move into my home territory so he will be able to vote for me in 1952.

"That is most kind of you," I answered him, "but I can hold my own in Broome County because the Americans there far outnumber the Communists."

I suggested to him that he stay where he is, do what many others are offering to do, and organize "Keep HALL in Congress" clubs so we can fight off attacks of the fifth column no matter from whence they come.

Today's Challenge to Our Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting address on the subject Today's Challenge to Our Freedoms, delivered by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] before the Amen Corner Club of Pittsburgh last Saturday evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE TO OUR FREEDOMS

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to address the business and professional leaders of the great American city of Pittsburgh. I have frequently, on past occasions, been privileged to address groups of your citizens, but tonight this great aggregation of civic leaders brings across me the greatest opportunity I have ever had in Pittsburgh to discuss the mutual problems which confront us all.

For nearly 20 years the areas of human freedom and the functions of free men throughout the world—with the sole exception of the Republic of Turkey—have been growing steadily and startlingly smaller. We in America are threatened by these same trends toward totalitarianism.

Tonight, I come before you to challenge you business, professional, and political leaders of western Pennsylvania to dedicate yourselves to the active defense of our free way of life with as much courage, as much conviction, and as much cash-on-the-barrelhead as the Communist conspirators within our midst are devoting to the defeat and betrayal of our peerless way of life and our free institutions.

In my capacity as acting chairman of the House committee that discovered the so-called pumpkin papers on the Maryland farm of Whittaker Chambers that led to the disclosure, indictment, conviction, and imprisonment of Alger Hiss, and in my long years of service on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I have learned that the Communists in this country count upon the apathy and indifference of the good people of America to protect the treachery and indecency in which the Communists conspire. Were it not for the indifference and the actual, although usually inadvertent, cooperation and support of the American colony of private businessmen—especially in our larger corporate structures—communism in this country would have long ago been smashed and we would not today be reading of its successful conspiratorial operations through its combination with big-city criminal syndicates, through its infiltration of high Government positions, through its network of atomic and other espionage agents, and through its great band of front organizations, fellow travelers, breast-beating liberals, and just plain, ordinary, garden-variety intellectual suckers.

I have had many an actual and former Communist tell me that were it not for the financial and moral support—direct and indirect—that the Communists receive from sleepy-minded and careless capitalists, college presidents, religious leaders, and other patriotic "push-overs," who enjoy the benefits of private enterprise but never do anything effective to defend it, the American Communist conspiracy would today be inoperative and impotent. Instead, as all who dare to look can see, American communism is injecting its dupes and its advocates, today in this tragic era of history, into virtually every respectable activity in the field of education, religion, business, labor, and Government.

The Communists rely upon the easy-to-fool, the slow-to-alarm, and the it-can't-happen-here daydreamers who comprise their targets in our respectable society to supply the protection, the indirect financial support, the respectable facades, and the active power with which they operate to manipulate the numerous cells of disloyal agents that they have in every State for the purpose of eventual sabotage and treachery and with immediate assignments to carry on attacks against religion, human decency, law enforcement, private enterprise, Boy's clubs,

and any educational or legislative program to expose and condemn the treacherous tyranny imbedded in the practices and purposes of every Communist. So successful has been their strategy and propaganda that you can count on the fingers of your hands the public-supported educational institutions in America today demonstrating the necessary courage to train their students specifically in the values and virtues of our economic and political system and exposing directly the consummate evil and wickedness in all that smacks of communism.

Communism is a Godless way of life that holds that the entire economic fabric of the country plus all of its social, political, educational, religious, fraternal, labor, and other organizations together with all media of information shall be controlled by a selected group of politicians in the Capital City of the land. These political overlords in turn permit no organized opposition and they associate themselves with like-minded people in other countries to operate a continuing international conspiracy aimed at the establishment of a world-wide Communist dictatorship operated out of Moscow, Russia.

Any on-the-ground study of communism today will find the Communists following the rule of controlling everything from what they term the "center" and every American Communist can be depended upon to support every conceivable move to concentrate additional power in Washington and to support every nondefense spending project by the Federal Government. Communists know from their world-wide experience that when non-Communist stage hands have set the stage sufficiently well with concentrated power and excessive tax demands in the hands of a small group of politicians in any country, they then have only to change the actors on the stage to actual Communists put there either by deception, infiltration, or a coups de tas of force or happen-chance to take over even so great a country as ours before 90 percent of the citizens know that the hour of decision is upon them. Thus it was done in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and thus it can be done here unless a courageous and effective counterattack against communism and all its teachings and supporters can be developed out of the individual towns and cities of America. Our Republic is desperately crying for that type of leadership today in more than 2,500 important communities. Unless it comes to the colors of freedom, all of the agents of the FBI and all of the investigating committees of a dozen Congresses cannot save freedom for those who fail to rise to the defense of their own liberties.

In the United States, we have two great defense lines against communism which many European countries lacked, but they will not give us security against political tyranny unless we man them with courageous contenders and maintain them sufficiently strong so they can operate effectively. These defenses are provided by our American opportunity system of private ownership and by our unique political conception and tradition of State's rights which gives the Federal Government ("the center") only those authorities which are specifically delegated to it. I believe if we lose either of these defense positions, we shall inevitably also lose the other. Neither is strong enough alone to protect us in our cherished and matchless way of life. Both are under constant pitiless, and vicious attack by every Communist in the land and by every dupe or fellow traveler the Communists are able to confuse or to control. In recent years, both defense positions have frequently been deserted by fair-weather friends, or by ambitious politicians seeking temporary political preferment for themselves.

Courageous local leadership rising up from among our private citizens safeguard our freedoms against the Communist attack and the kindred creeds of centralized political power, State socialism, and pilot-plant nationalization which it supports.

In conclusion, let me suggest three possible courses of action which enlightened business and political leadership such as we have here tonight might well undertake right here in western Pennsylvania as a counterattack against the forces of collectivism which are threatening your homes, your businesses and your very way of life.

1. Those who support States rights and decry unnecessary encroachments of the Federal Government are today divided by completely artificial political lines. Thus many times southern Democrats and northern Republicans vote in concert more frequently and freely than do combinations made up of either southern and northern Democrats or urban and rural Republicans. Voters who either favor or oppose the all-powerful State should have an opportunity to join their forces in a presidential election. In my opinion, any political formula or realinement for achieving this would find the vast majority of Americans voting to strengthen rather than weaken both States' rights and private ownership. I commend to you your serious consideration of the tremendous barrier against collectivism in America which can be created if we demonstrate enough intelligence in the field of political engineering to bring about a working alliance between like-minded Americans so that they can vote for the same candidate for President regardless of the State or the area in which they live.

2. Local citizens in and out of patriotic and veterans' organizations should undertake a study of the basic needs of an educational system geared to meet the challenges of communism. In cooperation with patriotic and progressive educational leaders, educational programs should be developed which would (a) positively bar all Communists and their "kept companions" from teaching in a public institution—either grade school, secondary school, college or university; (b) provide factual courses to praise and perpetuate those things "Which are right with America" in the field of economics and politics and thus provide students with an understanding of what must be saved to stay free so they can withstand the lures of the Socialist and the Communist state; (c) provide equally factual courses showing specifically how communism and socialism operate to glorify and magnify the privileged politician and to minimize and degrade the importance of the common citizen.

3. Business and professional leaders—and their wives—should make certain that corporations in which they hold an ownership interest and that institutions which they endow or help to finance are neither directly or indirectly giving aid and comfort to the cause of communism. This is an individual, patriotic responsibility which every right-minded American citizen must assume. For a corporation to employ radio, television, motion picture, or advertising talent which is disloyal and which uses the money thus earned to advance the cause of communism is to help betray America as effectively as though a remittance order were being mailed directly to Stalin in the Kremlin. To endow a college or a cause without making sure that no part of that gift is being used—or can be used—to pay the salaries of those who would destroy the way of life that made possible the accumulated wealth making your gift possible is to imperil the freedom of us all in the same manner as a sentry who falls asleep at a post of duty.

Gentlemen, we have heard many times freedom is everybody's job. It is. And freedom is not free. Let us also remember, however, that security is also everybody's job in America in 1951 and unless we make the effort and pay the price, we in this Republic can quickly lose both our cherished freedoms and our security against the foreign forces of collectivism.

Disclosures of the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee Should Provide Every American Citizen With Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the recent hearings on organized crime conducted by the Kefauver committee were eagerly followed by the American people through the facilities of the press, radio, and television. It is conceded that no other public hearings were given such widespread coverage nor elicited such intense interest on the part of millions of American citizens. Radio and television programs were changed to permit carrying into American homes the shocking disclosures revealed through the testimony of witnesses as to the extent organized gambling has become a daily routine on the part of many citizens.

There have been millions of words printed in describing the testimony and newspapers and magazines have joined in exposing the workings of various forms of gambling enterprises that take an annual toll of millions of dollars from the gambling public.

The following thought-provoking editorial appeared in the March 31, 1951, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, and since it is a timely discussion of the efforts of the Kefauver committee to awaken the American people I am inserting it at this point so that it may be read by my colleagues and all other citizens interested in curbing organized crime:

KEFAUVER LESSON

The really important disclosures of the Kefauver committee investigation should attract the attention of the average voter. The committee has shown a very definite connection between organized crime and corrupt political organizations which exert a great deal of power in our local, State, and National life.

We are asking our boys to stand fast in Korea. We have disrupted millions of lives and imposed a number of hardships on the youth of the land to protect our way of life, our Government. We have a duty to perform and that is to see to it that our Government on every level is worthy of the sacrifices we are asking them to make.

The committee investigations should make it clear to every thinking man and woman that big crime has its grass roots in almost every sizable American community. The only way to destroy objectionable plants effectively is to destroy the roots that feed them. That is where the average man can play a great part in helping rid America of this objectionable system of semigovernment that has had the effrontery to shove its way into the high places.

To stamp out this evil is going to require a great deal of courage and a great deal of thoughtful effort.

It is doubtful if some of the lesser lights in the vast organization that has spread its slimy tentacles across America and penetrated into the sacred places of American life have realized before now the part they were taking in helping to destroy our beloved Republic. It is extremely doubtful if the man who sells a numbers ticket thinks of himself as one who ranks with a Communist in helping to destroy America. The man who buys the ticket certainly would protest vehemently such an indictment. The greatest weapons the Communists have is not the atom bomb. It is capable of destroying cities and men, but it cannot destroy a people's faith in the fundamental principles of democracy. This slimy monster that has been exposed to full public view by the Kefauver committee can destroy that faith that is so essential to a government "of the people, by the people, for the people."

This power of aliens who have obtained their citizenship by fraud must be destroyed. The simple way to destroy it is to root it out in every local community where it has obtained a sinister foothold.

You and I probably have never given this much thought. Perhaps we, too, have been guilty of buying the tickets that are part and parcel of this great crime racket. If we are normally alert citizens, we probably know the names of those in each village and town where tickets are sold, of those who sell them, and of those who are supposed to head up the organization in the district. We also are aware of the fact that our local public officials who are charged with the responsibility of enforcing the law are not dumb, or deaf or blind, and it is reasonable to suppose that they, too, have heard of these things.

Knowing something by rumor and proving it in a court of law are, of course, two different shades of horse. However, we do believe that with the effort and vigilance something could be done to suppress the racket in every local community across the face of the land. It can be stopped and it must be stopped or how are we to face those whose blood has been shed, whose bodies have been crippled, and the parents, widows, and orphans of those who will not return?

It may be a little rough, as the youth of today express it, to make public examples of men who have given liberally to community efforts and who have been liberal with other worth-while enterprises.

It must be remembered, however, that they are being liberal with other people's money, just as some of their political brethren are liberal. The money they donate is but part of the take they get through their illegal enterprises. A larger part goes to the bosses in outside communities and is part of the fund they use to buy influence and, with that influence, jeopardize our American system of government.

We have a right as citizens to demand that our law-enforcement officers break up these gambling rings right here in Altoona and in Blair County. Yes, we have more than a right; we have a sacred duty to see that it is done. Maybe it would be but fair to give a little warning to those engaged in this type of business to tell them to get out of it and to go to work at some productive type of labor or to go to jail and work on the rock pile.

We must not put all the blame on our public officials, however, as each of us has an individual responsibility in good government. We can break up this vicious circle without outside help if we all refrain from buying the wares of the racketeers. What harm is there in the purchase of a 50-cent treasury ticket? What heartbreak is there for the widow of the slain policeman, murdered by a mobster in the hire of Murder, Inc.?

What harm is there in a bet on a horse? Who is being harmed except the bettor? What about the crooked wire, and the man who fixed it, the fixed race and the doped horse? What harm is there in a murder along a lonely stretch of road as three holdup men flee with ill-gotten gains? What power or powers confined that punishment to a term in prison for one man? Why have murder charges never been brought? What harm is there in gambling? Is it not one of the feeder roots on which these murderers have been drawing for nourishment?

The racket men say gambling is instinctive. They say it cannot be legislated out of existence. They do not say that gambling as it has been organized is no longer a simple game of chance and wits. They do not point with pride to the back rooms where the fix is made. They run like rats when the heat is on. Their racket is holding America and the American way of life up to public scorn. They are harming our standing with the other nations of the world at the time when we need the respect of the rest of our world.

Let us resolve now to tear up this evil vine that is strangling the Nation. Let us tear it out by the roots. Those that grow in Altoona and Blair County are our responsibility. Let them be destroyed.

What the Constitution Means to Me—Winning Essay in Illinois American Legion Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the winning oration written by Miss Barbara Miller, a resident of my congressional district at 1116 North Fifteenth Street, East St. Louis, Ill., in the Department of Illinois American Legion oratorical contest. Miss Miller, 17 years old and a student at St. Theresa's Academy in East St. Louis, was awarded a 4-year scholarship to the University of Illinois.

I feel that Miss Miller's oration, entitled "The Preamble and What the Constitution Means to Me," will be enthusiastically received. The oration follows:

THE PREAMBLE AND WHAT THE CONSTITUTION MEANS TO ME

I speak for my Constitution. I am only 16 and yet I can speak for my Constitution. I can speak of that heritage that my forefathers won for me by signing that memorable document on September 17, 1789. It was written on that day but it was fought and hoped for through years of struggle and strife.

Have you ever taken anything for granted? Like coming home to read your evening paper, or going to church on Sundays with your family. Everyone has at sometime or another. And yet there is one thing that is taken for granted above all else: Our freedom and the document that gives it to us, the Constitution of the United States of America.

Before I started to write this speech, the Constitution was just something I had studied in grade school. I had never really thought about it, perhaps, never really understood it. But now I realize it to be the foundation upon which the founding fathers built all the ideals that they so clearly set forth in the Preamble of the Constitution.

"We the people of the United States"—That's how it begins with the words that have included several billions of people. Little did these men who drew up my Constitution ever dream of how much freedom they have given so many people by so few words: "We the people of the United States."

And yet they were thinking of many others than themselves when they were doing all these things. They were thinking of the Pilgrims who started the whole affair. If they hadn't wanted a better place for their children to worship, they would never have left merry England. If they hadn't had this idea in mind they would never have made their perilous journey over the rough water of the mighty Atlantic. If they had not been thinking of others they would never have stayed on this completely unknown and unexplored continent. If it had not been for such brave men as Daniel Boone, Father Marquette, Lewis and Clark, Isaac Jogue, we would probably not be where we are today. You see, they were the men who went out deeper and deeper into this wilderness of ours, to search, to explore, to civilize, to convert.

"We the people of the United States"—But these are only the opening words of our Constitution. What of all the other phrases of our preamble?

"In order to form a more perfect union"—Men fought and died for this part of our Constitution. Yes; men fought and died at the Battle of Bunker Hill, Princeton, Brandywine. Other men fought during the Civil War at Bull Run, Gettysburg, and Richmond. Men are fighting now in Korea. Many men have had to sacrifice their lives to keep this statement true and alive, but because of their efforts, it still stands as a part of my Constitution.

"To establish justice"— Justice and peace was established by this document. It gave no taxation without representation, abolition of the slave market, and provided for amendment to this Constitution, some of which are known as our Bill of Rights. These 10 amendments are almost as important as the whole document itself, for they safeguard the rights of the people by securing the freedom of religion, of speech, of the person and of property. It also secured trial by jury, the right of petition, and the right of assembly. It reserved to the States all powers not delegated to the United States itself.

"To insure domestic tranquility"—

This new Government by the people, of the people, and for the people, formerly into the States that there was needed something to keep its peoples at peace with themselves. This was done in article I, section 2, of our Constitution, which states that "All legislative powers shall be vested in a Congress, which shall be composed of a Senate and a House of Representatives." The people now had the power to elect their representatives, and through them pass all bills that would be for the common good of all the people. Also in the second article of our Bill of Rights, these words are phrased: "A well-regulated militia, being for the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and to bear arms, shall not be infringed."

"To provide for the common defense"—Our safety and well-being was taken care of in article 1, section 8, in the powers granted to Congress. Some of these powers are: To raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to provide for calling forth of a militia, and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining this said militia.

"To promote the general welfare"— Have you stopped to think just what our country did for us when they signed this part of our document? They promised to promote our general welfare. How have they done this? They placed a tariff on all foreign trade to protect our own home manufacturing, they opened the Erie Canal to revolutionize the carrying trade by reducing the price of transportation of a ton of goods between Albany and New York, from $120 to $14. Then to prevent New York from securing all the traffic to the West, Pennsylvania built a system of canals from Philadelphia westward. Yes, our welfare

was greatly taken care of by this document. It also states that the majority of the people do not rule. The minority have a voice in everything. This was apparent and made clear in the Civil War. The majority of the people thought that slavery was all right. But the minority came forth and the minority won the Civil War, thus proving that if the majority had won our welfare would have suffered.

"And to secure the blessings of liberty"—God looked down on our land, on our freedom, and our liberty and He must have repeated the words that seem to sum up all of this. The words of the book of Genesis: "And God looked down on all that He had created, and saw that it was good."

"To ourselves and our posterity"— This document promulgates the fact that it pertains to you. John Doe, a reporter who writes the news as he sees it; to you Reverend Dulin, as you preach a sermon that makes your whole congregation sit up and take notice; to you Mrs. Smith, as you put your daughter to sleep without fear or worry; to myself, for I know I shall never want for love or affection.

"Do ordain and establish"— We have now christened and proclaimed our heritage to be known and to be held in the hearts of men forever as the Constitution of the United States of America.

The preamble was finished. It was not only finished but my freedom, my heritage, now had its firm footing not only in the hearts of these few men, but in the hearts of all who call themselves free.

Yes; I speak for my Constitution. Even as such great men as George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, and all the others who put their expression of their democracy down into this document, I, too, have the power to express my deep feeling of pride and affection. I have a feeling of sharing, sharing in the greatest government this world has ever known.

And now when I stop and think of my Constitution, many things come to my mind. I can see Valley Forge, the ride of Paul Revere, the leadership of the great man, Washington, the solemn signing of this paper that begins—

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Yes; I speak for my Constitution. No, not I, it is my ideals that speak for me.

The Judge and His God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hands excerpts from a very fine address delivered by a very great jurist. These excerpts are from the talk given by Judge Harold R. Medina before the Church Club of New York, as reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor.

During the Eightieth Congress, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, it was my privilege to be instrumental in the nomination and confirmation of Judge Medina, after the names of other less-qualified attorneys had been submitted. I had always insisted that the Senate committee should not confirm any proposed judge unless he fulfilled the highest standards of ability, integrity, and devotion to the American system, and unless he had received prior clearance from the State Bar Association and the American bar. Other names were first submitted to us, but by insisting on the highest possible standards and by insisting on bar clearance—incidentally for the first time in such confirmation procedure—we finally secured the nomination of Judge Medina.

The judge's address, entitled "The Judge and His God," will, I believe, be of interest to all church-going Americans. I should like to read a few excerpts from the address, because in this critical period in the world's history it is well to know that men of his stature sit on the Federal bench of this great Nation.

We all remember the picture which was drawn in the press, of him presiding over the Communist trial. He says:

I found myself to be a small, indeed a very small and insignificant particle in the scheme of things. It has been an extraordinary experience.

Fortunately for me, I was taught to pray from so early a time that I cannot remember going to bed at night without saying my prayers.

* * * * *

I suddenly found myself in the midst of that trial of the Communists. It took me a long time to realize what they were trying to do to me. But as I got weaker and weaker and found the burden difficult to bear, I sought strength from the One Source that never fails.

Then he tells about the trial. Among other things, he says:

And I tell you, as I stand here, that my unguided will alone and such self-control as I possess were unequal to this test. If ever a man felt the presence of Someone beside him, strengthening his will and giving him aid and comfort, it was I on that day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts referred to be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JUDGE AND HIS GOD

(By Judge Harold R. Medina)

While there is much in the Bible about judges, I do not recall any occasion on which a judge has been called upon to discuss the impact of religion upon the performance of the judicial function. Perhaps this is because this is an intimate matter—thoughts about which one is likely to keep to one's self. In any event, I have chosen as my subject here tonight, "The Judge and His God."

I suppose I am a more or less typical American. From boyhood I have had an implicit and unquestioning faith, which I got when I attended the classes in the Episcopal Church at Cassing, N. Y., in preparation for my confirmation when I was a boy at preparatory school. Like most other people I know, I wanted to be a better Christian but, as I look back over the years, I find that I did comparatively little to put this wishful thinking into effect.

As a law student and as a lawyer, I fought hard for what I thought was right, and I had a deep and almost passionate interest in the rules of law and the history of their development. They were the tools of my trade and I worked hard with them.

It was not long after I became a judge that I began to feel a new sense of responsibility. It is something very difficult to explain. It was not simply that I wanted to be right and that I took my duties seriously. There came a feeling that everything I did, even the decision of nice questions of interpretation of mere rules of procedure, was in some way becoming a part of a huge fabric which on the whole was part and parcel of the moral law governing mankind and which must of necessity be divine origin.

As I passed upon the credibility of witnesses and as I wrote my opinions and formulated my judgments, I gradually came to realize that I was weaving my small part of this huge fabric; and I knew that I would not perform my task aright unless I was constantly mindful of the fact that all these matters, large and small, would be mere futility unless I tried to make each one fit into its proper place in the moral law which governed all.

Right here is the part that is difficult to explain. I was still reasoning as a lawyer. The fundamental principles of law were the same. I was still manipulating the techniques of my profession as before. But there was some subtle force, the impact of which was new to me, which was spiritual in quality. It was as though someone were always watching me and telling me to make very sure that my rulings and my decisions were fundamentally right and just.

You know we judges are the servants of the people, as are all Government officials in our particular type of democracy. But I think it will not be difficult for you to see from the things I have been telling you about that it didn't take me very long to perceive that we judges are the servants of someone else too.

Years ago I often heard Chief Judge Benjamin N. Cardozo, before he became an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and while he was still chief judge of our New York State Court of Appeals speak about humility. He was, indeed, a humble man. One could not fail to observe that. But the full effect of what he had to say about humility was not felt by me until I was myself a judge, and found myself struggling with forces too great and too complicated for me to fathom. I saw in a new light the difficulties which beset one in the search for truth and justice.

This was particularly true when I suddenly found myself in the vortex of the trial of the Communists, in the midst of the play of great forces upon which, for all I know, the destiny of the human race may hang. Later it suddenly dawned upon me that some queer turn in the wheel of fate had singled me out, for the moment, to feel the impact of America's love of justice. And the result was what must be inevitable under the circumstances, that I found myself to be a small, indeed a very small, and insignificant particle in the scheme of things. It has been an extraordinary experience.

Fortunately for me, I was taught to pray from so early a time that I cannot remember going to bed at night without saying my prayers. * * *

As I mentioned, * * * I suddenly found myself in the midst of that trial of the Communists. It took me a long time to realize what they were trying to do to me. But as I got weaker and weaker, and found the burden difficult to bear, I sought strength from the one source that never fails.

Let me be specific. There came a time when, doubtless due to previous planning,

one of the defendants was on the stand and he refused to answer a question, pleading a supposed constitutional privilege which obviously had no application. I gave him time to consult with his counsel about it; I held the matter in abeyance overnight to make sure that I was making no misapplication of the law, and then the next day, Friday, June 8, of the year 1949, I sentenced him to prison for 30 days, unless he should sooner purge himself of contempt by answering the question.

Pandemonium broke loose. The other 10 defendants and their lawyers, and many of the spectators, rose to their feet; there was a great shouting and hullabaloo, and several of the defendants started toward the bench.

In all that excitement I felt just as calm as I do now when I speak to you; I did not raise my voice over the tone which you hear me use now; and I singled out several of those men, identified the language they were using, got it on the record, and sentenced each of them to imprisonment for the balance of the trial.

And I tell you, as I stand here, that my unguided will alone and such self-control as I possess were unequal to this test. If ever a man felt the presence of Someone beside him, strengthening his will and giving him aid and comfort, it was I on that day.

And so it was later and toward the end of August, when I finally left the courtroom one day and went to lie down, thinking that perhaps I should never go back. But, after 10 or 15 minutes, I was refreshed and I did go back; and I gained in strength from that moment on to the end.

Perhaps someone will think it wrong for me to tell you these things. But I could not come to this gathering prepared to discuss the ordinary platitudes, or to hold forth on philosophy or international affairs, about which I know nothing. It seemed better, particularly in these trying, difficult times, when each of us is worried, and each of us is troubled over this great country of ours that we love so well, to sound a note of comfort.

After all is said and done, it is not we who pull the strings; we are not the masters, but the servants of our Master's will; and it is well that we should know it to be so.

Gift by Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut, to the University of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS SMITH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] has recently made a gift to the University of North Carolina which is referred to in a letter of appreciation from the President of the university, Gordon Gray, former Secretary of the Army, to Mr. Earle Gluck, of radio station WSCC, in Charlotte, N. C., dated March 31, 1951. A copy of the letter has come to my attention, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSOLIDATED UNIVERSITY
OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Chapel Hill, March 31, 1951.

Mr. EARLE GLUCK,
Radio Station WSOC,
Charlotte, N. C.

DEAR MR. GLUCK: Recently the University of North Carolina has received a gift from Senator WILLIAM BENTON, which I feel that all North Carolina broadcasters should know about. I am writing to you as president of the North Carolina Association of Broadcasters with the request that you inform your membership about Senator BENTON's generosity, which will, I think, mean a great deal to broadcasting in the State, as well as to the University of North Carolina.

Senator BENTON's gift to the university consists of a complete associated program service, which includes:

(a) Two thousand two hundred musical selections in the fields of popular light concert, concert, band, sacred music, and opera, and in the minor categories of Latin-American, Hawaiian, and hillbilly.

(b) Cabinets and other physical aids for efficient use of the service.

(c) A card index of all selections cataloged according to title and composer.

(d) Monthly releases of new recorded selections and continuity for 12 hours of programing each week.

(e) A special promotion and sales service.

For the service the university is paying a token amount of $15 monthly to the associated program service.

I know that the broadcasters of the State will be aware of the great value of this gift and, along with the university, would want me to express their collective gratitude to Senator BENTON.

Would you be good enough, through whatever means may be at your disposal, to communicate this information to the broadcasting community of our State.

Sincerely,

GORDON GRAY, *President.*

Famine in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "While Human Beings Starve," by Anne O'Hare McCormick, which appeared in the New York Times and was reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp. in the Washington Post on April 5, 1951.

This article points out that the human problem of India's need for food must not be treated as a mere political issue if we are to save lives and gain friends in our moral battle with communism. In reprinting this article, the International Latex Corp. has again called to the attention of the American public some clear thinking on an issue of major importance to our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHILE HUMAN BEINGS STARVE

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

When Congress reconvenes today it will be under great pressure to get the India food bill out of cold storage, where it has been shelved for many weeks while famine draws nearer to millions of people in the drought-stricken provinces. It will soon be too late to save the population of the State of Bihar, where the ration is far below the reduced Indian norm of 9 ounces a day. This is not enough to sustain life for long; unless relief comes quickly, there will be widespread chaos, disease, and death.

The bill has been held up in the House Rules Committee on the issue of whether the 2,000,000 tons of grain India asks for shall be a gift or paid for in strategic raw materials. Actually India plans to buy for cash 4,000,000 tons this year, nearly half in the United States, but does not have dollars to pay for the additional supplies. Meantime, Communist China has offered to provide rice and corn for India, and Soviet Russia proposes to exchange wheat for jute. These are effective political gestures, designed to point the contrast between Communist governments and the niggardly attitude of the United States, but they will not feed the starving; the hard fact is that only this country has grain enough to do that.

MAKING THE SAME MISTAKE

President Truman made a second plea last week for immediate action. David E. Lilienthal, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, who has recently returned from India, warned yesterday that the United States is beginning to make in India the same mistakes which paved the way for the Communist victory in China. "If a good many millions of Indians starve to death while our storehouses are bulging with grain," he said, "I don't believe that is going to lay the foundation for making us feel better about ourselves or making the Indians believe what we say we are."

India's policy on China has undoubtedly had much to do with congressional failure to report the relief bill out of committee. The President asked for authorization for the grant February 12. Bills were introduced into Congress with strong bipartisan support and were passed by the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees by March 5. Since then nothing has been done. Congress will not take the responsibility of voting against the bill because such a vote is tantamount to a vote against the American tradition. The measure has wide popular backing, besides, despite the irritation Americans feel over India's refusal to support the UN and the United States fight in Korea by labeling Communist China an aggressor. But a good many Congressmen are like the four Republican Senators who opposed the bill in the Foreign Relations Committee. They are willing to leave India on the anxious seat while the lesson of the present crisis sinks in.

The Kashmir dispute also plays its part in hardening sentiment against India. On Saturday the UN Security Council adopted the latest of many formulas for solving the deadlock on this issue. Of all the knotty problems that disturb the peace in Asia, none has roused more passion than the conflict between India and Pakistan for possession of the fertile valleys and green forests of the beautiful land that lies between Afghanistan and Tibet. The UN has been trying for a peaceful settlement since 1948, and the present plan, sponsored by Britain and the United States, provides for another

study on the scene and another effort to demilitarize the Province in preparation for a free and impartial plebiscite. But Prime Minister Nehru is not expected to be more receptive to the new proposals than to previous plans. He has a special feeling for the Vale of Kashmir, the homeland of his family, and has repeatedly declared that he will never surrender to Pakistan. His uncompromising attitude, together with Pakistan's campaign on this issue, has had considerable effect in Washington. It is not true, however, as has been charged, that if the two countries were on good terms Pakistan could supply India with the grain she needs. Floods have so damaged Pakistan's crops that the Government at Karachi announced last October that it was unable to export wheat anywhere.

A WAY TO LOSE A BATTLE

The point is that India's policy toward China or her feud with Pakistan over Kashmir is completely irrelevant to her desperate need of food or our obligation to use our surplus to save people from famine. India is a young and harassed nation learning that national independence is not merely a matter of throwing off foreign rule. The conflict over Kashmir adds to her dangers, but in her position next door to two pushing Communist empires she has to steer a dangerous course in any event, and if her ideas of how to save Asia were 10 times more opposed to ours than they are this divergence should not for a moment influence our action as a great power with the means and responsibility to deal with a great human emergency.

We have already deliberately lost a lot of time the Indian people will pay for—and the American people, too, if the hungry millions of Asia who have not yet succumbed to Communist promises are driven to choose bread instead of freedom. We have lost half the value of our aid in delay and questions and haggling over terms when we might have dramatized it in a swift and generous gesture. More, if we do not move so that the grain reaches India this spring, before it is too late to save lives, we shall have lost a great battle in a war that will be decided in the end on the moral front.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter addressed by Mayor John J. Tyrell, of Plattsburg, N. Y., to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and an official notification of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of Plattsburg, urging the favorable consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Plattsburg, N. Y., March 26, 1951.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: At the last regular meeting of our common council held March 22, 1951, a resolution was adopted wherein I was requested to write your committee, expressing the sentiments of the members of the council, and myself, concerning legislation now before Congress in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway project. This matter, we understand, will shortly come before your committee for hearings.

This is to inform you that not only at this time, but for some years previous, at the time of my former administration in 1946 and 1947, and even during the administration of my predecessor in office, we have strongly and consistently endorsed any and all legislation pertaining to the development of this most important project.

Knowing as I do that your committee has all the material facts before you for consideration, it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to inform you on any phase thereof. However, realizing the genuine interest the members of your committee have in assisting in any way you can to develop for the benefit of the greatest number of our citizens the wonderful natural resources of our great country, I am sure you will give most serious consideration to this all-important matter.

Assuring you of our appreciation of what we hope will be your favorable reaction to the evidence to be submitted by the proponents of this measure, I remain

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. TYRELL,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Plattsburg, N. Y., March 27, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. TYRELL,
Mayor of Plattsburg,
Plattsburg, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of the Common Council of the City of Plattsburg, N. Y., held March 22, 1951, the following resolution was adopted:

By Alderman Slattery; seconded by Alderman Holland:

"*Resolved*, That the mayor be and he is hereby requested to write to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee informing him of the full support and endorsement of the common council of the St. Lawrence seaway project and urging the approval of legislation for its early development not only as a defense measure, but for the return in increased prosperity in industry and agriculture, as well as benefits to be received from lower rates for power and transportation."

On roll call, Aldermen Holland, LeClair, Villoni, Slattery, and Cardi voted in the affirmative; no one in the negative; carried.

Certified a true copy.

GEORGE E. MILLER,
City Clerk.

Christ's Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate four or more years ago I found an institution of which I had not heard, and which I have come to value very highly. It is the Wednesday morning breakfast of Senators who profess the Christian religion and wish to apply it to their duties in the Senate. A similar breakfast is held every Tuesday morning in the House. The two breakfasts have been stimulated by the International Council for Christian Leadership, which recently held its annual meeting. To that meeting the dowager Queen of the Netherlands, who styles herself Princess Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, sent a message. I ask unanimous consent that the message may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, whenever our thoughts dwell upon the near future, it seems of vital importance to explore what lies at the bottom of all troubles. In this message I would like to express to you my thoughts about this future, which after all depends to a certain extent on ourselves in as far as we place ourselves under Christ's leadership.

When we read about Christ's teaching in the Gospel of St. John, not in a superficial and traditional way, but with our whole heart and soul, keen on solving this problem and in unconditional surrender to the living Christ and His teaching, we cannot but be deeply impressed by the sequence of His instructions therein, and its actuality so strikingly befitting these times of increasing danger for mankind. Because in the Gospel of St. John we find His program for this moment, setting the rules for the abolishment of discord and for the regeneration of man.

Christ first emphasizes love and brotherhood of a very high order and unbounded intensity; then He teaches unity between Him and God and us, and harmony amongst ourselves. And should this be fulfilled, He promises peace; not a peace ruled by man alone, not a peace standing by itself and with no other background than man made treaties and conditions, but a peace ruled by Christ through men reunited and renewed in Christ.

In the midst of an overpowering crisis in which the world finds itself today, this teaching stands out as an undeniable and inevitable truth; because at the very roots of this crisis we find primarily weakening of the spirit.

Every other reasoning, doctrine, or ideology, when faced with the truth of Christ's teaching, proves itself false; so let this truth dominate the world.

For it is clear that we are on the eve of a new era, a new world order, and if this is to be the better world we are all longing for, it never can be realized without Jesus Christ; on no other foundation as on His teaching can it rest.

A better world is not thinkable and cannot be built, before this spiritual foundation has been laid, before brotherhood and unison under Christ's leadership work effectively.

Only then His peace will flourish.

Now is the time for inspired men and women of all races, all classes, and all continents to start a world-wide effort in daring and unflinching faith for this purpose.

Surely all who are of good will can join and be ready to cooperate with us, as the better world under His leadership is a thing we can, we must, we shall make true.

Few as yet realize the magnitude of power which Christ bestowes on us in this very moment of supreme crisis, His rescuing power which He focusses on our present world, and is available to all who thirst for this living water.

An indication of this, one may find in the same inspired spiritual language used nowadays all over the world in speeches and publications dealing with the problems of mankind. This undoubtedly may be taken as proof of a renewed inspiration of the Holy Ghost, preparing the way for the oncoming unity amongst men.

That power to strive and work for a better world, Christ makes attainable to all who open themselves to Him. This need not only be in hours of prayer or meditation, but can just as well be carried out in daily life, by anyone who wants to stand for the undeniable truth of Christ and His teaching.

Those who have experienced something of this rescuing power, know the elevating joy and comforting bliss of participating in it; for those no obstacle exists any more, nor can anything stop their indomitable impetus, as they know that to strive for a better world, is the example set to mankind by Jesus Christ.

And, as we read in the Lord's Prayer: "Thy will be done," we know Christ's victory to be near. Now, and in this world.

Letter From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Al Spiers, editor of the Michigan City (Ind.) News-Dispatch, under date of March 27, 1951:

YOU SEE, IT'S LIKE THIS

(By Al Spiers)

A letter came this morning from far-off Pusan, Korea. It's blunt and sometimes bitter. You may not like it.

But Corp. Walter R. Case, who wrote it, certainly intended the letter to be published. There are some things he wants the folks at home to know.

This is what he wrote:

"Myself and a few thousand other GI's would like to know the answers to several questions.

"The biggest question at present is just why we are over here. The Army has tried to answer that for some time now, but I have yet to hear anyone say he is convinced we ought to be fighting.

"The Korean people certainly are not glad to have us. I've seen that with my own eyes.

"You'll notice that I said the people, and not the politicians. After all, it's the people of the world who we are trying to satisfy, even though the scales show otherwise.

"Another good question is where will it all end, and to what advantage? Also, do the people back home realize how disgusted the reservists are at the quick shuffle they've gotten? I've never seen morale of troops so low before."

Why? Just read on:

"When we signed up after the last war we were led to believe we wouldn't be called until a national emergency existed. Most of us were called before the emergency was declared. To us, it was a kind of low blow, dealt by what we once called a democratic nation. It's rough to be lied to by your own Government.

"This may sound harsh, but it's not half as harsh as most of us feel."

There are other things piled atop this original bitterness that fan its flames. Like this:

"Why is it that our PX shelves are bare when the black market thrives to such an extent that the streets are lined with shops selling American cigarettes, candy, toilet articles, stationery, and every item of GI clothing—not used but brand new?

"Why is it that our engineer battalions have to drive trucks and equipment made in Japan when the Koreans use United States equipment and tear it up in a month?

"Why is it that British soldiers, from the nation which claims to have the best tailors in the world, are seen wearing GI field coats and carrying M-1 rifles as they stroll through the PX buying up our scarce items?

"Why, too, are Korean police, civilians, and soldiers wearing our GI uniform? How is an American soldier supposed to respect his uniform when it's being worn by everyone in the world?

"Why is it that British, Dutch, and other European legations are housed in imposing edifices when the nation that foots the bill for the whole show is in a dump by comparison?"

It just about all boils down to this: How is a man going to fight or give his all when he can't see anything worth while behind it? You try and answer these questions. We, the expendible GI's, can't.

"Should this be published, it would give the folks back home the true questions which are in every GI's mind who is over here in Korea."

I think we can answer Corporal Case's grim questions, but it will take courageous soul-searching and confession to find and speak the true answers.

Isn't practically everything that has embittered this soldier the product of nincompoops in Government and the military?

And aren't nincompoops in Government and the military the inevitable products of citizen neglect of the responsibilities that go hand-in-hand with the treasured privileges of our system?

Cozy, comfortable neglect of these deep responsibilities is a luxury that can scarcely be afforded in calm prosperous times. It is a deadly luxury when carried in today's grim, desperate era.

Let's write to Corporal Case. Let's honestly confess our guilt, but simultaneously tell him that a new spirit is beginning to flame at home in America today. It is a spirit that will not rest until we have driven the peanut politicians and nincompoops from places that produce the snafus which such grave, sacrificing men as Corporal Case must endure.

Let's tell him—and let's do it.

His address: Corp. Walter R. Case, ER, 45016051, Three Hundred and Seventy-eighth EUD, APO 59, care of postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.

A Student's View of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to a prize-winning editorial having significant value in these days of ever-increasing tensions and world crisis. I recommend the reading of this editorial not because it was written in some marble hall of a great newspaper of our time, but rather because it was written by a high-school student of today, a member of the generation which will take over control tomorrow. It is this future generation which must bear much of the impact of decisions which have been and are being made today. The Denver Post, of Denver, Colo., recently conducted a scholastic writing awards contest for Colorado students and this, a first-prize-winning editorial, was written for it by Miss Sally White, of the Palisade High School, in Palisade, Colo.

Miss White shows a mature evaluating ability as she writes down her thinking on the world in which she lives and the world in which her generation must find its place. For her and those of her age there has been little of normalcy, all too little time to see how the world might look if peace were a reality instead of an idealistic institution being used by an evil and expansionistic power as a propaganda weapon. I recommend the reading of her editorial, A Student's View of War, to the Members as a fine example of a fresh and inquiring mind undulled by years of battering against the indifferent wall of human opinion—an opinion far too often dedicated to the preservation of the status quo in which peoples have all too much of a material interest, and are all too often unimpressed by the need to move forward as new means arise for the solution of human problems.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

A STUDENT'S VIEW OF WAR

We've just come in from telling them goodbye—my girl friend and I—her brother and his friend have left to join the paratroopers. It's strangely quiet in the house now, more quiet than I have ever known this house to be. But outside the world goes on about its business just as though a piece of peoples lives hadn't been lost. All over the United States, all over the world, families are kissing their loved ones goodbye. Sons, sweethearts, brothers, are leaving some to come back, some to stay to fight for freedom again.

We've lost quite a few even in our small town, and it doesn't seem right to us that the boys who only yesterday laughed with us, who danced with us at the last dance, so carefree and full of fun, still just kids, should be going away to learn how to use weapons which destroy mankind, to learn what it means to kill or be killed.

And it isn't right but there is more to it than losing a friend, a sweetheart, a companion or even a brother. We're losing a piece of dream, which I think is experienced by all the so-called little people all over the world. That 's the dream of peace and prosperity for everyone. I wasn't very old when the last war broke out, not old enough to realize just what it meant beyond the rationing of certain things I wanted and the fact that many of my relatives left for a long period of time. But I did truly believe the things they told us—that when the war was over there would be no more suffering and strife; that everyone would lead a happy normal life again. I know now this wasn't so.

Maybe I don't know much about war except the fact that it destroys the things that God put up on this earth. Maybe I don't know what starts wars but I do know this: It wasn't us, the youth of the world that got us into this new mess. (And I can't believe that the youth of Russia, of Korea, or of any other country relish the thought of sending their loved ones off to war any more than we do.) It was the political set-ups, the heads of the countries. But it won't be those men who will pick up guns and go to

the front lines; no, they will have to stay home and run rationing boards and decide what prices should go up and what must remain the same. No, it will be the youth of the world. We'll go, reluctantly some of us, but we won't admit it. Some of us only sit and wait till we're old enough to try to do our part. We'll go, we'll fight someone else's war and we'll do a good job; some of us won't come home, some that do will be maimed and crippled, but we will do a good job. Then I wonder, will the world settle down to try and live together peacefully, happily, or will we again see how many atom bombs and hydrogen bombs we can perfect to destroy more of humanity? Will our children's children and their children, too, have to fight the wars that a few start and millions pay for? Will this be their heritage? I can only pray to God that our generation will see a way out of this vicious, never-ending cycle? No normal couple would want to bring children into such a world as that for we would know then that the Bible adage that man will some day destroy himself is true.

Outside the water runs on and the world goes on about its business.

SALLY WHITE.

Setback for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 18, 1951:

SETBACK FOR HOUSING

With the rejection by the House of Representatives of consideration of the Administration's defense housing bill this week the nation defense program is set back in its effort to assure decent housing and community facilities in areas affected by the development of defense production facilities and military installations. As Charles E. Wilson pointed out, "our production program can suffer serious and crippling delays" due to the lack of housing and community facilities.

To get any defense program under way it is necessary to act with dispatch to eliminate the known pitfalls that can mar its progress. The greatest of these is the lack of adequate housing and facilities such as streets, sewers, waterworks, schools and libraries. People who wish to make the sacrifice of moving to new areas in the interest of national defense are loath to do so unless decent housing and facilities are available to make their lives and the lives of their families livable in an alien area. As a prominent New York builder pointed out recently, there is no necessity to build potential slums to house defense workers when decently planned, livable communities can be built at much the same cost.

It is unrealistic to charge the bill with being a form of "creeping socialism" when experiences during the Second World War showed that in certain areas it will be necessary for the Federal Government to provide housing and community facilities if defense projects are to get under way in time to be of use to the national defense effort. It may be true that there are some "bugs" in the bill, but in the light of the country's present needs and the speed with which the bill was reported out of committee, H. R. 2968 was entitled to consideration and acceptance.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed to Citizens of First Congressional District of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 24, I mailed 32,000 questionnaires to my congressional district. There were 56 questions based upon the President's four messages to the Eighty-second Congress on the State of the Union, economic report, budget, and taxation. I distributed the questionnaires to every fifth householder—both town and country—using rural directories for each county, and city directories for each city having them available. I sent the questionnaire also to all who have ordered farm bulletins the past 4 years and to the parents of all babies born in the First Congressional District during the past 4 years. No other names were added and none of the names on the above list was deleted. I wrote no letter to accompany the questionnaire except the statement printed on the questionnaire itself. After delivery of the questionnaire in the district we received special requests for approximately 50 questionnaires and we mailed these additional copies when requested. The post offices returned about 2,200 questionnaires that could not be delivered to the addressees.

In response to the 29,800 questionnaires delivered we have received up to and including April 2, 1951, a total of 3,465 replies. Replies are still coming in at a fair rate, but inasmuch as the ratio between yes and no answers has remained constant from the time we passed the 2,000 mark I have decided to present the summary of returns without waiting for the complete response. The return of 11.6 percent to date is very gratifying as the percentage of returns is already considerably higher than Dr. George Gallup's estimate of total expected returns from such a mailing.

I placed a space on the questionnaire for the person answering it to indicate his occupation, and I am gratified with the listing of occupations by 3,312 of the 3,465 who answered the questionnaire. The occupations listed were as follows:

Farmer	962
Business	592
Professional	661
Labor	798
Housewife	223
Student	56

We have received more than 2,000 special letters with the answered questionnaires and the discussions in these letters are very interesting and informative.

The replies have been rather evenly spread throughout the past 5 weeks, and in my opinion they reflect rather accurately the thinking of the people of the First Congressional District during the month of March 1951. On some of these questions changes in world-wide or domestic events can and will, of course, affect the opinions of those who have replied, but the true grass roots opinions as reflected in the following report are of special value just now when the first session of the Eighty-second Congress is entering the period of final consideration of many of these issues:

Questionnaire

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor:		
(a) Withdrawal of American troops from Korea?	1,180	2,115
(b) Occupation of South Korea?	1,732	1,157
(c) Occupation of all Korea?	1,690	1,900
(d) Bombing of bases and supply lines in Manchuria?	1,889	1,148
(e) Use of atomic bomb against Chinese Red forces and supply bases?	1,094	1,952
(f) Support of invasion of China by Chinese Nationalist forces?	1,099	1,080
(g) Sending American armed forces to Europe?	1,999	1,155
(h) Use of atomic bomb against Russia if Russian war develops?	2,990	349
(i) Continued arms aid to foreign countries?	2,321	800
(j) Rearming Japan?	2,166	995
(k) Rearming Germany?	2,069	987
2. Do you approve the Truman administration foreign policy?	607	2,381
3. Do you favor all-out mobilization by the United States at this time?	1,457	1,839
4. Do you favor universal military training?	2,353	982
5. Do you favor the drafting of 18-year-olds into the armed services?	1,896	1,432
6. Do you favor the drafting of World War II veterans?	869	2,197
7. Do you favor congressional control of sending armed forces to Europe through restrictions placed in appropriation bills?	2,172	994
8. Assuming President Truman has constitutional power to send American armed forces to Europe unless Congress forbids, do you favor his doing so without congressional approval?	636	2,693
9. Do you advocate immediate "across the board" Government regulation of prices, wages, and rents?	1,928	1,298
10. Do you favor heavy Federal taxes as an anti-inflation device?	1,228	1,977
11. Would you be willing to have your taxes increased by 30 percent in order to establish a "pay-as-you-go" tax plan to meet the proposed budget increases?	1,209	1,943
12. Do you favor:		
(a) Increasing corporate income taxes?	2,366	794
(b) Increasing personal income taxes?	1,256	1,866
(c) Increasing excise taxes?	2,100	1,060
(d) Adding a Federal sales tax?	1,294	1,923
(e) Increasing postal rates?	2,304	973
13. Do you favor the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?	617	2,525
14. Do you favor socialized medicine?	344	3,019
15. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	1,874	1,334
16. Are you in favor of the Brannan plan for agriculture?	445	2,629
17. Do you favor development of the St. Lawrence waterway?	1,639	1,109
18. Do you favor cutting down Federal spending?	3,237	73
If so, on which of the following items:		
(a) Veterans' benefits	1,160	.....
(b) National defense	310	.....
(c) Foreign aid to civilians	1,946	.....
(d) Foreign arms aid	1,064	.....
(e) Farm subsidies	2,475	.....
(f) Social welfare, health, and social security	1,153	.....
(g) Grants to States for health services	1,253	.....
(h) Federal housing	1,673	.....
(i) Dams	1,620	.....
(j) Airports	1,083	.....
(k) Roads	599	.....
(l) Federal buildings	2,340	.....
(m) Other public works	1,816	.....
(n) General expense of government	3,059	.....

Questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No
19. Regardless of your approval or disapproval of the policies of the Truman administration, please check the five issues you think most important today:		
(a) Government spending and higher taxes	(1)	2,346
(b) American foreign policy	(2)	2,292
(c) Government controls on prices, wages, and rents		1,552
(d) Government welfare programs of the New Deal and Fair Deal		868
(e) The threat of socialism in this country		1,544
(f) Korean War policy		1,304
(g) American Armed Forces to Europe		1,098
(h) Defense and war preparedness	(3)	2,269
(i) Communists in America	(5)	1,747
(j) Labor policies and strikes	(4)	1,884

Famine in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the Appendix of the RECORD, a very excellent and timely editorial entitled "While Famine Stalks," which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHILE FAMINE STALKS

It is not pretty to watch Congress dawdle while the specter of famine hovers over India. Even if legislators act with all possible speed to approve the bill giving India 2,000,000 tons of grain, it will be a close race. The grain must be sent to ports, and ships must be broken out of storage; it has been impossible to keep them ready on a standby basis. Yet, unless grain is in Indian hands by June, a breakdown in the rationing system is likely; already the people are on a 9-ounce minimum ration, and even this is not available in some areas. President Truman, in his request to Congress in February, put April 1 as the deadline for delivery of the first million tons.

The depressing part of the affair is that it has become confused with all sorts of side issues. First, objections were cited to Prime Minister Nehru's attitude on Korea; then there was talk of making the grain a loan, although India is in no shape to repay it; then India's embargo on certain strategic materials—monazite and beryl—became a stumbling block. This newspaper believes, as respects the latter point, that the American position on access to strategic materials ought to be made quite plain. But none of these factors is reason to deny or delay the grain. It is not in the American tradition, when a stricken person asks for food, to demand to know first how he voted in the last election.

As the Washington Federation of Churches has pointed out in a letter to Speaker RAYBURN, indifference to starvation is "an evil not to be tolerated by Christian conscience." Help now would be "a merciful weapon in our struggle against communism" and would "do much to heal the widening rift between this country and India." Yet while Congress dallies, Russia has made propaganda by offering to sell India 50,000 tons of wheat, and Communist China—itself faced with starvation in many areas—has capitalized on the American delay by offering a million tons of rice. They are doubtless phony offers, both of them; but they make good propaganda, and are pathetic illustrations of India's desperation.

There is reason to believe that the House Rules Committee, which has been sitting on the bill, will report it out when Speaker RAYBURN believes he has the votes to pass it. The test cannot be put off longer, and we cannot believe that if the issue is placed squarely before House Members, they will turn it down. This country would be harmed as much as India if Congress should turn its back on both a moral obligation to humanity and the opportunity to strike a blow in behalf of stability in India.

"Crum-Bums"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March issue of the bulletin of the St. Louis Medical Society:

"CRUM-BUMS"

The daily press is reporting, with increasing frequency, the incidence of narcotic addiction among mere children. To find a name for a character so contemptible that he would peddle dope to kids we must turn to the lexicon of the kids. To them, the lowest form of human life is a "crum-bum." Much worse than an ordinary bum, more despicable than any other type of crook, much more dangerous than the small-time hoodlum—the narcotic peddler who trafficks with the teen-ager is the worst "crum-bum" of the lot. His rank in the genus homo is comparable only to that of the slimy, crawling things that inhabit the undersurface of rocks in the remainder of the animal world. A creature so completely bankrupt of moral principles that he would encourage narcotic addiction in children, to the end that they must steal, lie, cheat, and prostitute themselves in order to purchase the stuff, has sacrificed his right to live among decent people.

What place does this diatribe have in a medical publication, you ask? Simply this: Only the doctor knows, better than anyone, the mental and physical agony that the addict endures. The doctor has seen, more than anyone else, the abject misery and the stripping-away of conscience, virtue, morality, and standards of human relationships engendered by the craving for narcotics. It is fitting and proper, therefore, that the physician—who bears the same responsibility to community health that the lawyer does to community law and order—raise his voice in protest against this horrible and revolting development in our modern society.

We quote a headline from a recent newspaper story: "Couple gets 5 years for dope peddling." Five years. And they may be free in 2, or 2½, or 3 years. Free to go back to where they cached the $270,000 they made in 6 months selling heroin. What "crum-bum"—or for that matter, a higher order of bum—would not be willing to spend 3 or even 5 years in the pokey for that kind of money? The same edition stated that Al Capone's brother faced 16 years for tax evasion; a writer of rubber checks was sentenced to 6 years in another story in the same edition. But for a couple who had murdered the souls and minds and futures of kids; who had helped rob them of the opportunity to grow into healthy, happy, ambitious citizens of a community where they could walk proudly with their fellows—5 years.

This is in no sense an indictment of the judge who pronounced sentence, for—again we quote—this was "the maximum time the court could impose." If 5 years constitute the maximum time that a judge is permitted to put away these termites of our social structure, then it is high time that the lawmakers reexamine relative values. If spies, saboteurs, and other traitors to our country can be given life sentences, then those who would sabotage the children upon whom the Nation's future depends should be given life sentences. If a murderer can be given the electric chair, then those who would create thieves, murderers, and prostitutes deserve no less. Something drastic should be done to protect these kids.

Let Them Find Sites Less Sacred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks, I include the significant editorial written by Arthur L. Crookham, which appeared in the Oregon Journal on March 18, 1951, entitled "Let Them Find Sites Less Sacred," on the proposal in carrying out the dispersal program to select as one of the sites the Civil War battlefield, Bull Run:

LET THEM FIND SITES LESS SACRED

Looks to us as if the third battle of Bull Run is shaping up.

What do you mean, third battle?

Well, in Washington, a committee of Congress is considering erecting one of the proposed dispersed Government office buildings on the magnificent Civil War battlefield, where not one, but two bitter engagements were fought at the outskirts of the National Capital.

Of course, the land is owned by the Government—which means a saving in costs. To this beautifully landscaped area tens of thousands of visitors go each year to see the first great battlefield of the Civil War, where Thomas Jonathan Jackson won the name of Stonewall and where a few months later the braggart Union General Pope was defeated by Longstreet and the self-same Stonewall. It seems that the 1,600-acre tract has caught the congressional eye since it is 26 miles from the White House, nicely outside the range of any A-bomb that might demolish the White House.

What do we mean by third battle of Bull Run? Well, before this national shrine is torn up by bull dozers for some unsightly office building, a lot of fireworks will be shot off by students of the Civil War, historians, and antiquarians. There must be plenty of land in other directions from Washington available for such a building.

Once we start digging up long-preserved national parks for man-made structures, who will say when to stop? We're a-getting out our musket and we'll be tenting tonight at Bull Run. Look out, you Congressmen. history tells us a lot of your fellow Members ran away from their sightseeing at first Bull Run. History can repeat.

The Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by George Rothwell Brown, which could well be entitled "When You Cannot Justify Your Position in an Argument, Walk Out On It":

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The great debate, involving the integrity of the Constitution from Presidential encroachment, and the defense of the country in possible war with Communist Russia, was brought to a tragic conclusion before packed galleries, and row upon row of empty Senate seats.

In view of the basic fundamental issues involved, the attempted usurpation by President Truman of congressional control of the armed services of the Union, and the hazardous adventure in sending inadequate ground forces to Western Europe, this discussion in the Senate took place in the face of a shameful Democratic absenteeism.

The debate was boycotted by virtually the whole Democratic side of the Senate.

On the afternoon upon which Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, made an analysis of remarkable forcefulness of the constitutional power of Congress to determine how and when an Army of the United States might be employed, for several hours the entire Democratic side of the Senate was empty.

Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose mind was already made up, for a little while sat alone amidst a sea of vacant Democratic seats.

There was a look of contemptuous boredom on his face.

The speeches that were being made on the Republican side, the cross-fire of interrogations which brought out the facts, went in one CONNALLY ear and out the other.

He made no attempt to participate in the argument, but as silent as a clam in its shell scorned to answer any of the statements by the opposition, which completely riddled President Truman's impudent assumption of dictatorial powers, as Commander in Chief, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding.

Presently even Chairman CONNALLY got up and walked out of the Chamber, leaving a committee clerk at the adjacent desk.

For quite some time this lone individual was the only person on the Democratic side of the Senate.

Why was this great debate—in view of the consequences for weal or woe of the headstrong Truman-Acheson-Marshall policies perhaps the most important to have been heard in the Senate since the Civil War—deliberately boycotted by the Democratic leadership?

It was apparent as Republican crossfire ruthlessly exposed Truman's attempt to seize a power denied him by the Constitution of the United States, that the Democrats could not answer the constitutional arguments of the opposition.

They could not deny. They would not listen.

The Truman Democrats had no facts—all they had was the votes to jam through a couple of resolutions, having no force in law, and merely begging the President to consult Congress in any future use of troops in Europe, beyond the four extra divisions which are to be sent with the virtual unanimous consent of Congress.

But the votes the majority leaders calculated upon having were admittedly barely enough to win a victory for the Presidency at the expense of Congress and the Constitution.

In the voting to take place this week, the margin would almost certainly be slim, one way or another.

The outcome would depend in part upon how many independent conservative Democrats would vote to send the pending resolutions back to committee to be redrafted in the form of a "joint resolution," which would require action by the House of Representatives.

It would depend in part also upon how many New Deal Republicans would desert their party, and sacrifice on the altar of Roosevelt-Truman internationalism, the constitutional safeguards against Executive usurpation bequeathed to the American people by the founders of the Republic.

It was Easter time. Day after day the Senate galleries were packed with American men and women.

How disillusioned they must have been.

On one side of the magnificent new Senate Chamber WHERRY, TAFT, BRICKER, KEM, WATKINS, DIRKSEN, valiantly defending the ancient rights of Congress.

On the other a vast expanse of empty seats, expressive of the utter contempt in which the Democrats, with a few splendid exceptions, like BYRD, of Virginia, and MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, held the whole great debate.

Dispersion Boys Seek a Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks, I include an interesting editorial written by Royce Brier entitled "Dispersion Boys Seek a Site," which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, March 8, 1951:

DISPERSION BOYS SEEK A SITE

(By Royce Brier)

At the various important battlefields of the Civil War national parks have long been established. They are strewn with bronze markers set up by a historical society, naming formations and describing the action, and with monuments erected by States and patriotic organizations, North and South.

Cemeteries are also situated in the parks (it was a cemetery dedication which occasioned the Gettysburg Address). Millions of Americans visit these battlefields annually, studying the battles or seeking their family names, which are often to be found, a granite immortality for some boy of eighteen. Among the favorites are, of course, Gettysburg and Bull Run, scene of the small first battle, July 21, 1861, and a big battle a year later. It is but 25 miles from Washington.

There is a plan to disperse Government buildings due to the atom-bomb hazard. The planners are looking around for sites not too far from Washington, and have their eyes on some of the battlefield parks. They might save a few million bucks that way.

The Washington Post last week described one of these exploration trips. A House Public Works Subcommittee went out to Bull Run, and members indicated they were impressed with its possibilities as a building site. As you shall see, it isn't the first time Congressmen have sashayed out to Bull Run, and if you'll tolerate a prejudice, this second visit is as dubious as the first.

Efficiency is splendid and Government thrift is admirable, but it is possible to go overboard. One of the tendencies of our day is to wonder if the national shrines and parks cannot be put to some more utilitarian use. No doubt there are gents in crowded Washington who would set up a clerical section in Mount Vernon if they could get away with it.

The weeks of July were hot and nerve wracking in the rolling land of Virginia. Beauregard, the elegant and learned fellow who had fired on Sumter, was sent to command a rag-tag army of fire-eaters assembling north of Richmond to protect that new capital of the Confederacy.

Lincoln was trying to get together a rag-tag army of greenhorns (excepting a small nucleus of Regulars) to protect Washington from seizure, which would be almost fatal to the Union at that juncture—the Europeans had their tongues hanging out for it. A Brig. Gen. Irvin McDowell commanded this force under Fuss and Feathers Scott, who was too old and fat to get into the field. Good man in his day, though.

Beauregard showed some of the traits later displayed by McClellan, one overestimating his enemy. He insisted McDowell had a magnificent fifty thousand, whereas McDowell had thirty thousand, and thousands had never heard a musket go bang.

So McDowell moved out from Arlington. It was the biggest army ever seen in America; its ubiquity awed Congressmen and other Washington red-hots, who drove out in carriages of a Sunday morning to see the rebels trounced and brought back tied up with ropes. Boy, it was a day.

So the battle began about 10 a. m. Some of the best generalship and some of the worst was displayed in the next few hours of dust and heat. The Confederate General Bee said: "There stands Jackson like a stone wall." Colonel Sherman was there, but not Colonel Grant. Neither McDowell nor Beauregard knew what went on or what to do. Each got but 18,000 of their roughly 30,000 troops into combat.

Late in the afternoon Beauregard and the rest of them thought they were licked. Their luck was McDowell and his men also decided they'd had it, and did something about it. They disengaged, brigade by brigade, and it went from retreat, to rout, to panic. The Congressmen and other sightseers got mixed in this fantastic melee, and pushed into the ditches. Beauregard didn't pursue. He and Jeff Davis had a big row about it afterward. Jeff Davis never captured Washington, and he might have Monday.

One cannot describe this first disaster to the northern arms in such stunning terms as it has been described:

"The defeated troops commenced pouring into Washington over the Long Bridge * * * The sun rises, but shines not * * * The men appear, they come in disorderly mobs, queer looking objects, strange eyes and faces, drenched and fearfully worn, hungry, haggard, blistered in the feet * * * Amid the deep excitement, crowds and motion, and desperate eagerness, it seems strange to see many, very many, of the soldiers sleeping—in the midst of all sleeping. They drop down anywhere, on the steps of houses, on the sidewalk, and deeply sleep * * * some in squads, comrades, brothers, close together—and on them as they lay, sullkily drips the rain * * * The hour, the day, the night passed, and whatever returns, an hour, a day, a night like that can never return again."

Those are the words of Walt Whitman, who was there, and to air a prejudice a little further, it would seem that when an hour, a day, a night can never return to America it would be well to leave the field where that travail began as it is, for quiet and memory, and not plaster it with neo-Greek architecture and octopi motor-parks.

Pacific Coast Shipbuilding, a Low Ebb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on two occasions during the past 30 years the Pacific coast shipyards have been called upon to contribute to the bridge of ships which have supplied our forces in foreign wars. During World War II the San Francisco Bay area was one of our largest shipbuilding centers and many thousands of men were employed in this activity.

It should be remembered however that prior to 1939 the shipbuilding skills and organizations had been practically lost on the west coast through long disuse. A start was made in 1939 with the building of two ships in an Oakland yard. It required 4 years to build up the industry to the full capacity required. It did not reach its maximum production until 1943. Ultimately, the west coast produced about half of the wartime tonnage even though the war was half over before its full ability could be brought into use.

Once more history is repeating itself. On the San Francisco Bay shores there are three major shipyards operated by private industry. The Todd shipyard in Alameda, on March 26, 1951, was employing only 128 skilled men. The Bethlehem yard in San Francisco was employing only 200 men, the lowest number in its history. The Moore drydock yard in Oakland was employing approximately 350 men, but all on repair work, most of which has probably already been completed.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of these remarks the letter, dated March 26, 1951, from Mr. Mario Grossetti, business manager of Local 9, Shipfitters and Helpers of the International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers. Similar information has reached me from other sources. Mr. Grossetti's letter is as follows:

I am writing to give you a report of the conditions in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry in the San Francisco Bay area.

At present, you, like anyone else, are hearing the cry that there is a labor shortage of skilled mechanics in the private shipyards and navy yards. This talk is all false, as there are plenty of unemployed journeymen in the metal trades unions.

As of this writing, I will quote you some figures of some of the shipyards:

Todd Shipyard, Alameda, is now at its lowest, with 128 men. Very bad.

Bethlehem, San Francisco, lowest it has ever been—200 men.

Then there is Moore Drydock, which is employing a little more than the above figure, but it is only repair work, and the men will probably be off by the time you receive this letter.

The reason for it being so slow is that the Government has not seen fit to supply the west-coast shipyards with any ship construction or any amount of repair work.

The navy yards are doing all the Navy work and trying to use up the manpower in the area. There is a demand for skilled mechanics at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard, also the Mare Island Navy Yard, Vallejo. But why is there a shortage in the navy yards?

1. They do not pay the prevailing rate in the area, which is $1.93 per hour. The navy yards will not hire you for this rate, but will at $1.81 per hour. It is true they have two other rates of $1.89 and $1.97, but they tell us you must hire in at the minimum rate, which is $1.81 per hour.

At present there is an order for 100 shipfitters at the San Francisco naval shipyard. I could fill that order and still have men available, if something could be done about getting at least the union scale in the navy yards. I have been trying to get my people to go into the navy yards, but they are refusing to go in at the minimum rate, especially when they have 10 or 20 years experience behind them. They figure they are mechanics, and should be entitled to more than the minimum rate.

2. When you hire in at the navy yards, they give you a strict physical examination, which is eliminating many good mechanics. I say this is unjust because the people they are hiring in are only temporary employees, and anyone who worked around the shipyards is bound to have a little high blood pressure, or some other minor ailment.

3. President Truman and the administration a few months back told private industry they should try to place as many handicapped people to work as possible. The Government should practice what they preach, and employ handicapped workers in the navy yards.

4. After you are O.K.'d for work, it takes you from 3 to 4 weeks to go through a security test. By that time you are disgusted or broke; so you pick a job some other place.

Now, I have outlined some of the difficulties which one has to go through in order to work in the navy yards. I hope that something can be done to make it easier to get employment in navy yards. I know that the navy yards come under the civil service, and that there is procedure that one must follow, but on temporary employees I say if it is possible, something should be done to eliminate all this for temporary employees.

One other thing, while I am writing, which I would like to call to your attention, is that I have seen a news release stating that the Japanese Finance Ministry agreed today to lease the shipbuilding facilities at the former Japanese naval yard at Kure to the American National Bulk Carrier Co. The firm was understood planning to build tankers in Kure. I think a little investigation should be made to find out why so many American companies are going foreign to perform their work. If it keeps up, it would seem to me that the Americans may have to migrate to foreign countries for employment.

Penalties for Violation of the Narcotics Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the most frightening social problem facing this country at the present time is the rising incidents of narcotic-drug habits among the young school children of both sexes as reported in so many large cities. As a rule, both school officials and the police find themselves without means to check the growth of this evil and face an impossibility in their attempts to eradicate it. There is reason to believe that the spread of this most horrible of vices, believed by some medical authorities to be incurable, is being deliberately fostered for purposes of profit.

The Federal Narcotics Bureau has reported that illegal traffic in narcotics has advanced at such a stepped-up rate that peddlers have even stooped to giving teen-agers free shots to start them on the road to addiction. The United States Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky., reported last November that in the first 10 months of 1950 it had received 203 addicts under the age of 20 years as compared to 13 in 1948. The Lexington Hospital is the only public one convenient to the larger centers of drug addiction and is indicative of the trend now existing.

One of the worst aspects of the problem is that the drug habit leads very quickly and almost inevitably into crime. The craving for the drug soon surpasses the possibility of satisfying it, and thus the girls resort to prostitution and the boys to various forms of crime, including robbery and hold-ups, in order to secure money with which to procure additional supplies. Or of equal gravity they become purveyors of the drug and are used as the means of recruiting new victims.

A perusal of newspapers from most cities in this country shows that the problem is just about universal in scope. Attempts have been made and are continuing to be made to combat this vicious evil but with little permanent effect. A major enforcement hitch is that narcotics laws carry light sentences. Persons convicted of narcotics offenses are fined relatively small amounts of money and if imprisoned are sentenced for short periods of time. In this respect the penalty for conviction is certainly not a deterrent to continuing violation and court records indicate that probation is often granted the violator which permits him to carry on his filthy operations.

It has been proved that in those areas where a realistic approach to the problem has been made through heavy fines and long terms of imprisonment, violations have amazingly decreased. Apparently the only language which these villainous and foul traders in human misery understand is fear of actual, effective punishment.

With this thought in mind, I have today submitted a bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating the narcotic laws. This bill would provide heavy mandatory fines and compulsory minimum sentences greatly in excess of those authorized in the present law. A mandatory life imprisonment is called for upon conclusive evidence that the offense is the third conviction of the offender.

While this may seem to be quite drastic it still does not actually make the punishment fit the crime. Those of us who have had the misfortune to have seen, at first hand, the ravages of dope addiction well realize this. There could be no punishment which would adequately compensate for the human suffering and misery caused by this affliction worse than death itself.

I am convinced that if this bill should be enacted into law it will check and greatly reduce the present widespread violations of the narcotics laws. It will certainly give our enforcement officials an effective and much-needed weapon with which to combat that vicious and fiendish industry.

Importance and Responsibility—Bureau of Ordnance, Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. HARRIS. I had the very special privilege of being present and hearing an interesting, forthright, and outstanding speech of Rear Adm. M. F. Shoeffel, United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, United States Navy, before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce at Camden, Ark., on Tuesday evening, March 27, 1951.

There were some 800 people who attended this annual dinner meeting and heard Admiral Schoeffel discuss the duties, responsibilities, and the importance of the Bureau of Ordnance of the Navy Department. On this occasion the Navy was honored with special emphasis on the naval ammunition depot at Shumaker, which is near Camden, Ark.

I was very much impressed as were those who had the privilege of hearing the Chief of the Naval Ordnance, in that the reactivation of this depot as a vital part of our ordnance program is of such great importance to our national defense and mobilization program, our future security, and our efforts toward a real and lasting peace.

I am sure the admiral's discussion would be of real interest to every Member of this Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD:

The reason for being of the Bureau of Ordnance is to furnish the firepower which enables our Navy to be a potent member of the team dedicated to the preservation of a free world.

The responsibility of the Bureau includes research and development, manufacture, procurement, maintenance, storage, and issue of all offensive and defensive arms and armament of the Navy—air, surface, and submarine—plus a considerable responsibility for the arms of the Marine Corps.

In discharging these responsibilities the Bureau depends partly upon its own stations, partly upon our friends in khaki or in Air Force blue, partly upon universities, and partly upon industry. The facilities outside the Navy have always played an important part in the program of the Bureau in connection with our requirements for certain types of ordnance—and when we must go to mass production in times of emergency. But to discharge every phase of its responsibility effectively, the Bureau must maintain the hard core of its own ordnance shore establishment, including its research laboratories, ordnance plants, and ammunition depots.

The Bureau's own part of its research program is conducted principally at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md., and the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif. Our center for research, development, and design of rockets is at Inyokern, Calif., which covers over 1,000 square miles in the Mojave Desert, and is actually a town in itself. As I develop my subject you will see why rockets are of particular interest to you here in Camden. The Naval Gun Factory in Washington, D. C., is our principal manufacturing plant for hardware. Aviation fire-control equipment and bombsights are made at Naval Ordnance Plant, Indianapolis, Ind.; torpedoes at Naval Ordnance Plant, Forest Park, Ill.; and the Naval Powder Factory at Indian Head, Md., produces the most advanced types of explosives. Much of this equipment is tested and proved at the Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.

Naval ammunition depots, located at strategic points throughout the United States, comprise the largest part of the ordnance shore establishment. The principal functions of these depots are to load, store, repair and issue all types of ammunition. The importance of the repair and storage functions cannot be overemphasized. Our experience during World War I and in the initial phases of World War II, when this country had serious deficiencies in both armament and ammunition, has illustrated most forcefully the mistake of throwing away prematurely any ammunition that can be salvaged.

VJ-day came while most of our Navy was in the far western Pacific area preparing for what might have been the greatest campaign of the entire war. As a result of preparing for that operation, very large stocks of ammunition remained on hand in September 1945. It is to the everlasting credit of the responsible people in the Bureau and at its ammunition depots that a large part of these stocks was available for use within a few hours after President Truman ordered United States forces to meet the Communist threat in Korea. In spite of budget limitations, in spite of higher priorities for research and development of new weapons and ammunition, and in spite of the necessity for expenditures of new types of ammunition for training, the Bureau was able to keep reserve stocks, totaling approximately $2,500,000,000 in value, in serviceable condition. The genuine saving to the taxpayers has afforded all of us justifiable satisfaction. Since 1945, nearly 500,000 tons of rockets, bombs, projectiles, and related items which make up the fire power of your Navy, have been reconditioned annually, at a cost of approximately 3 percent of the replacement value.

The Naval Ammunition Depot, Shumaker, Ark., participated significantly in that far-reaching reconditioning and storage program until 1949, when national economy measures necessitated a severe cutback in all of our ordnance stations. Many of our depots, including Shumaker, were placed in maintenance or inactive status at that time.

The outbreak of hostilities in Korea last June changed the picture overnight. "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition" became more than just a forgotten melody. Coastal ammunition depots and overseas bases worked practically around the clock loading the ammunition for our fighting forces. To keep pace with the tremendous expansion in expenditures and replacement requirements, reactivation and expansion of the ordnance shore establishment was given No. 1 priority. After a survey made in August 1950, it was decided to reactivate the Naval Ammunition Depot, Shumaker, as the Nation's primary facility for the production of rockets.

As you know, one of the most effective and spectacular weapons in the Korean fighting to date has been the rocket. Carrier-based Navy and Marine planes have been blasting away with rockets at enemy installations, including railroad bridges, ammunition dumps, trains, trucks, and the like, and in close support of the troops. The "Tiny Tim," the Navy's largest and most powerful rocket, which was developed toward the end of World War II and produced at Shumaker, for use against enemy shipping, is being used with telling effects against land targets in the Korean War. The Navy is also supplying rockets to the Air Force for its vital role in beating down the Communist threat. In the surprise Inchon landing rockets loaded at the Shumaker depot contributed materially to the success of the operation. These included both aircraft rockets and rockets launched from amphibious fire support ships.

As you are undoubtedly aware, the plant at Shumaker came into being during the latter part of World War II, to meet the lack of production facilities for all types of rockets. It was named after the late Capt. Samuel Robert Shumaker, United States Navy, who, as head of the Research Division of the Bureau of Ordnance, had contributed in a great measure to the development of the modern Navy rocket. The site for the plant, near Camden, Ark., was selected by a special board appointed for the purpose as the most favorable of a number under consideration and investigation.

The original plans for the Shumaker plant called for an expenditure of approximately $200,000,000. A little over $100,000,000 had been expended by the time VJ-day arrived, and construction was suspended. The first rockets were produced on April 25, 1945, just 5 months and 4 days after work on the plant was initiated. The shooting phases of that war ended before the full benefit of the plant's productive capacity could be realized, and operations were necessarily drastically curtailed in the fall of 1945.

Upon the reactivation of your naval ammunition depot here last September, $33,000,000 was made available mainly for the construction of the following additional facilities:

1. Completion of three production lines.
2. Expanded electric battery charging buildings.
3. Construction of 120 magazines.
4. Construction of 23 storehouses.
5. Completion of cafeteria of 1,000 capacity.
6. Construction of bachelor civilian quarters.

In addition to the bachelor civilian quarters, the Bureau is now seeking approval for the construction of a number of family housing units.

In order to test rockets at greater distances—a distinct advantage in the utilization of these weapons—we are extending the test range approximately 7 miles beyond its present limits. There are obvious advantages and economies in having test ranges located at the loading plant.

When the construction here is completed a thumbnail sketch of the situation will be that rockets developed at Inyokern will be assembled here. From every lot produced here a number will be tested on the ranges across the river. Employment for the current construction work will probably reach a peak of about 3,000 employees very shortly, and should hold that figure for several months. Additional funds are being requested for the purpose of continuing the necessary expansion of the facilities to keep pace with our planned requirements.

The deactivation of Shumaker in 1949, brought about by sharp national economy measures, necessarily entailed a corresponding large-scale cut-back in the Navy payroll of this community. The low point was reached on June 30, 1950, when only 141 people were employed. This employment represented an approximate monthly payroll of $36,000. Employment increased rapidly upon the reactivation of the station and by March 1, 1951, the number of workers had increased to 1,155, with a monthly payroll of about $300,000. The estimated employment figure for June 30 of this year is 2,250, with a corresponding approximate increase in payroll to $625,000. The tentative plans of the Bureau include even more expansion in the following year and a payroll that may exceed a million dollars a month. We have studied the labor market in this area and are confident that with the help and cooperation of all concerned we will be able to reach the higher employment level. It has been particularly interesting to me to learn recently that your retail sales in Camden for the entire year of 1950 amounted to about a million and a half dollars. You can see that in a few months the Navy payroll alone should equal that figure every 6 or 8 weeks.

The personnel figures that I have just outlined are based on the requirements necessary for the depot to accomplish its assigned mission. I repeat that the mission most importantly includes: The preparation, loading, storage, and issuing of rocket-type ammunition and the reconditioning and preservation of rockets and related ammunition parts.

I am sure that all of you have a sympathetic understanding of the tremendous problems which are bound to arise when facilities and production must be increased at such a rapid pace. I know that I speak for Captain Cullen and his staff, as well as for the Bureau of Ordnance, when I assure you that everything possible will be done to accomplish the objectives necessary to discharge our obligations, with the least possible disruption to the community. After all, the plant is an integral part of your community. Many of the employees are relatives and neighbors of yours. I feel confident that all of you, together with the many other loyal citizens which make up this fine community, will bear with us in our growing pains in the creation of this great American arsenal.

Even when the present emergency shall have passed, the naval ammunition depot, Shumaker, will occupy an important place in the permanent ordnance establishment of the Navy as its principal rocket-assembly facility.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1951.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request by cable from Rome to forward following message from National Commander Eric Cocke, Jr., to you:

"Recent tour of Korean battle front and American installations elsewhere in Asia and Europe confirms belief universal military training would have prevented untold casualties, saved many American lives, and will strengthen our future defense against communism. The American Legion urges support for universal military training and is strongly opposed to any amendment that would defer it or separate it from present bill."

Granville S. Ridley, Edward A. Hayes, Perry Brown, Warren H. Atherton, B. W. Gearhart, Fred Alger, George N. Craig, Ray O. Garber, Bruce Henderson, American Legion Security Training Committee.

Address of Edward T. T. Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an address delivered by Edward T. T. Williams before the meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, November 29, 1950:

I am sure all of you are somewhat sober as the result of the news that has come from Korea. I know I am. We are somewhat like the man who carried a case of chronic appendicitis around with him for 6 or 7 months, and then because of acute pain was forced to consult a surgeon. The surgeon, after examination, said in effect: "Yes, you're going to have to go into the hospital immediately for an appendectomy; and while you're there and so long as you will be under a general anesthetic anway, perhaps I'd better remove those two growths that you have—one on each eye. They seem to be at least 5 years old each."

As we look at the international scene, we can readily see that Russia has a purpose, a single-minded purpose. We know that Russia is growing stronger, that Russia is ruthless and that Russia is realistic, and when I say Russia, I mean international communism.

It must be equally apparent to you, as you have watched the domestic scene, that we lack purpose, unless you want to call self-defense a purpose. We have engaged in a curiously inconsistent form of idealism. Certainly we have lacked reality.

Our people talk about the fact that western civilization is threatened by communism. Most Americans don't know what is meant by western civilization. Try it on some of your friends. Ask them what they mean when they say western civilization. You'll get all sorts of answers.

Some will tell you it started with the Greeks. Some will tell you it is Christianity, which is absurd because there are many Jews in western civilization. Some will tell you it is a standard of living. Some will say it is democracy. To me western civilization as we live it and practice it today is less than 400 years old.

The line of demarcation between medievalism and western civilization occurred with the establishment of the Dutch Republic. Garet Garrett selected the significant date as being February 15, 1568. On that day Philip II of Spain condemned the Dutch to die as a nation of Bible readers and heretics. For 10 years there had been religious conflict in the Netherlands. Philip was determined to convert the Dutch to Catholicism. The stubborn Dutch were equally determined not to be converted. And the Dutch fought with a bitter resistance. They fought as individuals, they were not effectively organized. It was a very personal thing and they fought personally.

Philip sent Alva to the Netherlands to enforce his edict. The Dutch were tortured. They were put to the rack. They were condemned to die. They were executed. And as the condemned were carted through the streets in the early morning, they would scream at the men and women who would come out in the early morning to watch them going to be killed. They would exhort the watchers not to succumb to the Spaniards. And when men talk under those circumstances what they have to say carries weight.

As a matter of fact, what they said carried so much weight in the Dutch resistance and it became so bitter that the Spaniards put steel rings over the tongues of the men and women who were being led to be executed, and they had the foresight to heat those steel rings first so they would sear the tongues of the men and women in the carts and they could not talk.

When Alva notified Philip that right after holy week in 1568 he was going to execute 800 Dutchmen, it was quite apparent that mass murder was being practiced. That condition went on for approximately 40 years. Forty-nine years is a lifetime, and it was a long lifetime in those days. It wasn't a question of who was right and who was wrong; it was a question of survival.

When the Prince of Orange finally put into words and phrases some of the theories of natural law, that men do have inalienable rights with respect to religion and the opportunity to pursue both their economic and religious ends, and when Queen Elizabeth sent over 4,000 soldiers the Dutch became free. The Dutch Republic rose on the ashes of its martyrs and became in a short period of time the economic schoolmaster of Europe, because for the first time the great liberals of the day had achieved their purpose. They had freed the individual from a bureaucratic system of administrative control and law as practiced at that time by crown and church.

Well, when the British looked across the channel at this sudden rise of the Dutch, this dynamic upsurge, they were a bit puzzled, because even though Elizabeth had helped the Dutch, she didn't do it because she liked the Dutch; she did it because she hated Philip. Philip was trying to put Mary Stuart on the throne of England and Elizabeth didn't like that.

In England at the time, curiously enough, the prevailing religious philosophy had it that an English gentleman could not work and go to heaven—less than 400 years ago. He could pawn his wife's jewels and go to heaven, but he couldn't lend money. The Jews became the moneylenders of England because of that. It wasn't until the Puritans incorporated in their religious philosophy the fact that a man's work was his calling and that a man could have a moral tone in his business which paralleled the moral tone of his personal life that it was accepted practice in England that a gentleman could work and go to heaven.

When the Puritans threw out the hereditary rulers of England and ended the feudal system in England, they drew the line of demarcation between medievalism and western civilization as we know it, because they, too, freed the individual from a bureaucratic system of administrative control under

which he was helpless to pursue his religious and economic ends.

Well, it was only natural, when the Colonists came to this country—and, as you may recall, many of them went from England to Holland and then came here—that they should carry along that philosophy, the philosophy of western civilization in which the individual was to be free to pursue his religious and economic ends and in which he and his fellows, collectively, were in control of the economic stability of the state through the control of taxation and through the control of the monetary system.

Now, all through the upward surge of western civilization as we know it in these last 400 years, as the French Revolution made its contribution, as France and England and Holland and the United States made their contribution to what I am describing, the hammer in the forge of western civilization was made up of the men and women who worked and saved and put their substance to work, to productive use; the men and the women who worked harder or studied harder or strove harder to make a larger-than-usual contribution in order to receive a larger-than-usual reward.

Well, here we are in the United States today facing a crisis. Five years ago we were the most powerful Nation on earth. We were so strong that we were stronger than any possible coalition of two or three nations. We were so efficient that we could turn out more and better goods than any two or three nations on earth. We were so patriotic that our sons, almost barehanded, fought the Japanese until they received material support. And here we are, looking at Russia, and we are a bit apprehensive. What has happened?

A Swiss historical philosopher by the name of Burckhardt once said a very profound thing. He said, in effect "National civilizations persist not in relation to their power or their patriotism or their efficiency, but in direct relationship to the extent to which they learn and apply the lessons of their own history."

If power 5 years ago hasn't sufficed to make us strong today and if efficiency doesn't leave us too confident and if patriotism may not be enough, where along the line have we failed? Why is it that we are a bit apprehensive? What has happened to change the pattern? Where did we fail to learn and apply the lessons of our own history?

Well, we broke the pattern in England and the United States when we introduced the theory of direct taxation. When William Howard Taft signed the Federal income-tax law, it is reported that he said something like this: "I feel this is unconstitutional, but I am going to sign it because I don't think it will ever exceed 4 percent."

Lenin once wrote a note to the Communist organizers in Switzerland. He said, in effect, "If you can persuade the Swiss to adopt a federal system of direct taxation, that will be the shortest road to socialism and communism." Lenin knew what he was talking about.

We might have gotten by with a system of direct taxation if limits had been established, but when, on September 20, 1930, the British went off the gold standard and when, 3 years later, we followed, we separated, you might say, the other half of this broken pattern. We broke it twice.

Let us see what happened. Let us assume now that in New York or Chicago or your home town, whatever it may be, the city council were to meet tomorrow and pass a resolution and submit that resolution to the voters for approval. A resolution which read to the effect that all of the voters of that city, all of the citizens of that city, would relinquish to the city council the unlimited right to take any or all of the income of the citizens of that town. Do you think that resolution would be adopted? You know as well as I do that if that were presented to any group of citizens by any city council in the United States it would be voted down, possibly 100 to 1. And yet, the citizens of the United States have given that power to another group of men who might just as well be called a city council, because they are no different. They just happen to be called Congressmen and Senators. They have that power, and when they have that power in an unredeemable currency, as has been the case now for almost 20 years, they can abuse the power without penalty.

In other words, prior to that combination, if a government made fiscal mistakes it had to pay penalties. It had to pay higher interest rates on borrowed money. Perhaps it could not borrow money. Everyone, including the taxpayers and the citizens, became aware of the fiscal failures of the party in power. But since we put that combination together, the prevailing British Government or our Government can waste $1,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 without penalty. They can hide $1,000,000,000 and we can hardly find it.

When there was given to succeeding groups of legislators in England and the United States this right of direct taxation in a nonredeemable currency, we made it possible for them, through unlimited control of the financial substance of the people, to establish bureaucratic systems of administrative law. Operating under the popular and painless analgesic of social reform, so dear to the heart of politicians hoping to perpetuate themselves in office, it was a simple matter to mask the symptoms of economic and political rot which grew insidiously under the surface. The unlimited power to collect money from the people brought with it the unlimited power to distribute money. Control over the economic life of the individual was the result.

And so, as we look at this picture, we discover that the wheel has turned. At the time of the Dutch Republic, the great liberals were the men who wanted to separate and free the individual from a system of bureaucratic control. They wanted to free him from the state, to pursue his religious and economic ends. The great reactionaries were those who wanted to impose bureaucratic controls upon him through the state or the church. Through the cleverness of words, the meaning has changed, and today the great liberals are those who argue for state control, for bureaucratic controls. They argue in opposition to the freedom of the individual, and the great reactionaries are those who are talking as I am talking today to you.

As that wheel has turned, the Catholic Church has turned with it. The Catholic Church, philosophically wise in the ways of history, has made the complete turn of the wheel and is today the arch opponent of international communism. It understands the deep, underlying problem.

Many intelligent people have made the turn of the wheel, too, but not too fortunately for them. You remember that I told you that the hammer in the forge of western civilization was the group of people who worked harder, who saved and who put their substance to productive use; also the people who tried to excel in the profession, sciences and arts, and in business, because out of it might come a greater reward. They were the hammer. But in the last 20 years, during which period the taxes in England went to 40 percent and England was broke, and the taxes in this country went to 30 percent and we were struggling against inflation, during that period these same men and women who were the hammer of western civilization became the anvil. They were hammered from below by pressure groups and they were hammered from above by political manipulators.

There is a political economist in England by the name of M. J. Bonn. He teaches. He made a statement last winter, I believe, and he phrased it in the form of a question. He answered his question by the manner of his asking it. He said, "Is what we have in England today socialism, really, or is it a return to medievalism?" He knew what he was talking about.

He knew that by these combinations of circumstances, changing groups of politicians, conservative, liberal, or labor, were given power over the economic life of the citizenry, which was dangerous, bureaucratic controls through administrative law. And what do we find in this country? Oh, yes; we have a few Democrats and we have a few Republicans who have moral integrity and courage, but by and large the words, "Democrat" and "Republican," give only lip service to this broad, deep concept that we are discussing.

In other words, what have they narrowed it down to? They have narrowed it down to the fact that the great goal of democratic government is to provide economic security for the individual. Under the guise of social reform, under the guise of the beneficent state caring for its people, they have narrowed the philosophy down to that single thought, and we have been talking about pensions, social security, and the protection of the individual personally. Economic security—that is what is has narrowed down to.

Meanwhile, time has proved that the security of the individual is not of paramount importance at all, because, through a combination of ignorance and political greed, political inepitude and group selfishness, we have created such a hodge-podge of economic confusion, mixing the good with the bad, mixing social reforms (some of which were good) with many other things that were bad, that we have threatened the economic security of the state itself. No longer is the security of the individual our paramount problem.

Our paramount problem is to consider what needs to be done to strengthen this country. Just as depositors in a bank cannot regard their five or ten thousand dollars as part of their economic security if the bank collapses, so must the citizens of a republic relinquish their personal security if the State collapses. Today, the principal question that we have to face is the political and economic stability of this country.

You see, what we are facing is an odd test. The test is not whether our civilization is better than communism. The test is not whether our people have a higher standard of living or whether, under our philosophy, people have a better opportunity to fulfill their aspirations. That is not the test at all. It is a much more startling, realistic test than that. The test for the immediate future is simply this: Which civilization is going to survive?

Oh, yes; over long periods of time, the good always wins out. But the Dark Ages lasted for hundreds of years. The Dutch suffered for 49 years. I am sure none of us wants to have the good win out after a 10-, 20-, 30-, or 40-year interlude.

We are therefore facing a test of survival, and when you examine the civilizations of history—and 20 of them have already failed—you become conscious of the fact that one civilization does not conquer another. That never happens. The old civilization collapses. It breaks down from within, because it has lost its political and economic stability.

Now, let's look at the Russian picture quickly. The Russians are dealing in hard labor and hard money. They work on a piecework system. If you want to get more pay and more food, you make more goods. Often they deal in gold because they have to, or they deal in barter because they have to. It is a rugged economic school in which they are operating.

And what are we doing? We are dealing in soft labor and soft money. We have created a soft Government which tries to provide a soft future for all of our citizens. And in the process of doing it, through subsidy and through direct employment, we have created literally millions of economic parasites.

There was once an Englishman by the name of Lord Melbourne who said: "What the wise men promised has not come to pass, but what all the damn fools said would happen has happened." Our so-called wise men have promised much for a long time. They have become professional promisers. Meanwhile, we and others like us throughout this country of ours are the damn fools that Melbourne was talking about. We saw the things that were wrong. We disagreed with many of the things that were done. Often, we went along for superficial reasons. We knew the truth. We talked about it. We watched the moral and economic tone of this country go down, as expenditures and ambitions for social reform went up.

Social reform is good when it can be digested in the political and economic scheme. Social reform is bad when it cannot be digested.

Now, our business happens to be closely related to the sciences and the professions. Often scientific men and professional men and men who follow the arts think that they are apart from the economic scheme. But we know that the scientific, professional, and cultural horizon is completely circumscribed by the political and economic horizon.

Witness what happened in this country. How much science and culture and art did we have here until we achieved political and economic stability? And so, among scientists and professional men and those who follow the arts, these same apprehensive conversations took place.

Woodrow Wilson once said, "Some men grow up and some men swell up." We have watched our country in the last few years swell up and we have watched some of our politicians swell up. It takes a salary of $19,800 today to give a man essentially the same as a salary of $10,000 in 1940. We have heard politicians talk, sometimes boastingly talk, of the increase in our national product in terms of dollars. When we discuss these gains in terms of dollars, you know and I know that much of what we claim as gain is just economic bloat. That is all that it is—economic bloat.

Why is this subject of significance to a group like this on a day like this, at the end of a meeting? Well, in my book it is important because one of the greatest defaults that has occurred in history has been the default of the intelligent American citizen—his default from his own responsibilities as a citizen. We, Melbourne's damn fools, who knew what was going on, stood off to one side. We weren't organized the way the unions were. We weren't in politics the way the politicians were. And, by and large, we were too lazy, too complacent, too self-satisfied and, in all, too gutless to take this issue and make a personal issue out of it and do something about it.

Whom else would you expect to follow this pattern, examine the facts and be helpful? Certainly, you couldn't expect the first or second generation of immigrants or labor unions to come up with it. You couldn't expect self-indulgent politicians to come up with it. You know as well as I do that with but few exceptions most of our politicians are not leaders. They follow a sort of Gallup-poll technique. They use investigators to find out what the people want and then try to beat them to the punch by giving it to them.

We, representing the intelligent segment of the American population, many millions of us, defaulted, because, unlike the Dutch who were willing to fight personally and unlike the colonists who did the same thing, we left often to lesser men in politics the responsibilities for what was going to happen to this country.

Now, as we look at the present situation, we say, "Well, after all, it looks as though we may be going into another war and, you know, all the rules are off in a war." Yes, that is quite true; many of the rules are all off. But, if another war comes, who will many of the great patriots be? Won't they come from this same group that I am talking about? Haven't they come from this same group for 150 years? Isn't it in our blood to be patriotic? Won't we all go to Washington? Won't our sons fight? Won't our daughters get into it? Hasn't it always happened and won't it happen again?

Of course it will, but I am here to say to you that if we do get into heavy preparations for a war and if we do have to go through the travail and misery of it, if we do have to go through this fight once again, let's learn a lesson from the past. Today all classes of our people—labor, farmers, professional men and businessmen—are confused and anxious. They know something has happened and is happening to our economic stability and they don't like it. Soon they will learn that our entire defense program is dependent upon our civilian economic stability. Soon they will learn that the continuous subsidy of voters of many classes with public money tends inevitably to higher costs, greater subsidies and more inflation. Even the pressure groups who benefit are beginning to worry.

If, during this difficult, trying period, the intelligent thoughtful citizen of the United States isn't willing, savagely and bitterly, if necessary, to make a personal fight out of the issue of protecting our country from the political and economic self-indulgence that has arisen because of the breaking of the historically successful economic pattern, he will make another default. He will default on his own account, as he has done for the last 10 or 20 years, and he will also default on account of his children and his children's children, because they will not live as free men and women.

The Real Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the well-known economist, James P. Warburg, on March 10, 1951, entitled "Let Us Debate the Real Issue."

While Mr. Warburg's views are obviously controversial and will not necessarily meet with general agreement, they are thoughful and very interesting. I believe they merit the consideration of the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S TALK ABOUT THE REAL ISSUE

(By James P. Warburg)

The great debate, which has been filling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the front pages, and the airwaves, seems to me almost wholly irrelevant. The question of sending troops to Europe prior to the outbreak of war should have been debated 2 years ago when the Atlantic security program was proposed to Congress and to the people in a regrettably misleading manner. This program actually involved two commitments, only one of which was frankly disclosed when the treaty was placed before the Senate.

It was made clear that the treaty committed us to go to war with an aggressor against the European signatories. It was not made clear that the administration intended to go beyond the treaty and commit the United States to fight the aggressor along the line of the Elbe River in central Germany.

In urging the Senate to make clear, when it ratified the treaty, that we were not undertaking to defend our allies by necessarily holding any particular line or frontier, I ventured to point out the dangers which seemed to me inherent in any such additional commitment. These were: first, that we should thereby commit ourselves to a preannounced strategy in a possible war with Russia; second, that a commitment to hold up a Russian invasion in central Germany involved building up a force, which as yet did not exist, precisely where it would be most likely to provoke rather than to deter attack; and, third, that to build up such a force we should either have to double our then existing combat strength and send most of it to Germany, or else rearm the Germans themselves.

Senators CONNALLY, VANDENBERG, and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee replied that the suggested clarification was not necessary, since no such second commitment was contemplated. They relied upon the unequivocal assurances of the administration witnesses that no substantial American forces would be sent abroad in advance of war and that the United States would in no circumstances permit the rearming of Germany.

Shortly after the treaty had been ratified, the administration sent up its military aid bill and, in urging this measure, stated that its purpose was to prevent Europe from being overrun, in the event that an invasion should be undertaken. To accomplish this purpose, the bill provided merely a paltry $1,000,000,000.

This was the time when the great debate should have taken place. This was the time to make up our minds whether or not we could and should undertake the commitment, and, if so, to recognize clearly that it meant raising and equipping a powerful new combat force for European garrison duty. This was the time to vanquish the misgivings which are now belatedly expressed after we have committed ourselves to the military defense of Western Europe's frontiers. The issue of sending troops to Europe is no longer debatable except in terms of whether or not the United States shall go back on a solemnly given promise. That is why I say that the current great debate is irrelevant.

There is, however, a much more important issue before us which, so far, has not been debated at all. There is an opportunity before us—perhaps our last—to extricate ourselves with honor from the stultifying position in which we now find ourselves. This opportunity will arise at the meeting of the

Council of Foreign Ministers, for which the deputies are even now preparing the agenda.

The issue we shall face at that meeting—the issue we should be debating now—is whether we want a peace settlement in Europe or the continuation of the arms race and the cold war.

Unless I misread the signs, this impending meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers will either signal the beginning of a process which leads to the reunification of Germany, the healing of the great scar across the face of Europe, and the ultimate making of a European peace settlement, or else it will finalize the partition of Germany, the partition of Europe, and the probability of eventual conflict.

The outcome lies very largely in our hands. It will be decided at least as much by the President and the Secretary of State, before Mr. Acheson goes to the conference, as by what happens at the conference itself.

* * * * *

The Council of Foreign Ministers is not about to resume its function because we desired a meeting. Quite the contrary is the case. The Council is about to meet because the Russians stated last October that they would not tolerate the contemplated rearming of Western Germany and demanded a meeting of the Council to discuss a renewal of the Potsdam pledge against remilitarization and the carrying out of the Potsdam Agreement for the creation of a peaceful and united German nation. Our first inclination was to rebuff this proposal as a piece of effrontery. The French inclination was to welcome a meeting. The official British reaction was indecisive. Since October there has been a voluminous exchange of diplomatic notes, in which the western powers have tried to broaden the agenda for the meeting so as to include all the various existing causes of tension, while the Russians have sought to confine the discussions as closely as possible to Germany. The Russian notes have been couched in the now familiar language of distortion, vilification, and assumed Kremlin infallibility. The western replies, particularly those drafted in Washington, have borne the equally familiar hallmark of weary patience maintained with increasing difficulty. They have breathed an atmosphere of "We'll go through it all again, if we must, but, of course, no good will come of it."

This atmosphere must be changed before our Secretary of State goes to a meeting which may well open or close for good the door that leads to a peaceful settlement. Certainly nothing can be expected of the conference, if we go to it without an affirmative plan of our own. If we go simply in order to defeat the Russian plan, whatever it may be, we shall continue along the present road to disaster.

As a matter of fact, we know what the Russian plan is. The Russians told us all about it last October. Strangely enough, the Russian plan looks very much like our own plan for a German settlement before we abandoned hope of reaching a settlement, in 1947.

The Russians have proposed the unification of Germany. This was our aim from 1945 to 1947. At that time two obstacles stood in the way: Reparations and disagreement as to the terms of unification.

But, last October, the Russians proposed—and I quote their language—"the removal of all hindrances to the development of a peaceful German economy." Now, if this phrase means anything at all, it means that the Russians are willing to forego further reparations, probably because they think they have extracted about everything they can extract from their puppet state. If true, this removes one of the two barriers that stopped us at Moscow 4 years ago.

The Russians have also indicated—less clearly, because this is obviously a bargaining point—that they may be ready to permit free elections and the maintenance of the political freedoms in the whole of a unified Germany. This could be true if, from the Russian point of view, a democratic Germany (in the western sense) appears as less of an evil than a rearmed Western Germany. The hypothesis makes sense to me because the Politburo, while perhaps not too sincerely alarmed over the inclusion of 250,000 Germans in a western defense force, may in fact be very much alarmed over the possibility that, once rearmed, the Germans might slip out from under NATO control and go off on military adventures of their own. In this respect Russian fear of Germany is rather similar to French apprehension. Neither is, in my judgment, unfounded.

Be this as it may, it is, to say the least, possible that the second great obstacle encountered at Moscow may also now be removed.

Why, then, has our Government been so reluctant?

It has been reluctant because the attainment of its own aims in Germany now runs counter to its program of pursuing the cold war until it has built the much-discussed situations of strength from which it wishes to negotiate. The truth is that our Government is caught between two contradictory policies, one of which it must give up or change. It wants to make Western Europe defensible against Russian invasion before it negotiates a peace settlement. To do this, our Government thinks it must rearm Western Germany. On the other hand, our Government wants to arrive at a peace settlement based upon a unified, peaceful, and democratic Germany. This is irreconcilable with seeking to integrate the rearmed half of Germany—two-thirds would be more accurate—in an anti-Soviet coalition.

The solution seems to me quite simple. More by accident than design, we have now maneuvered the Russians into a position where they are apparently willing to unify Germany on our political terms, to give up reparations, to sign a peace treaty, to end the occupation and withdraw occupation forces. In other words, the threat of German rearmament has apparently given us the very situation of strength we needed to attain our ends. Then why not negotiate and find out whether this is true? And, if it is true, why not give up German rearmament in order to obtain the kind of peace settlement we have vainly sought for 5 years?

As I see it, by foregoing German rearmament, we should not be giving up anything of real value to us in any case. Rearming Western Germany would not add to the strength of a West European defense, because the conditions on which West Germany might fight for the west would be precisely those conditions which would make France unwilling to fight. This has become abundantly clear in recent months. Furthermore, rearming Germany would actually add to Russian military strength, because it would make willing allies out of such presently unenthusiastic satellites as Poland and Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, rearming Germany would almost certainly eliminate what hope remains of helping the Germans to become a peace-loving people; it would utterly destroy what little value there may have been in our democratic teaching. And, finally, rearming Germany and building up a huge army along the Elbe River would be the most provocative thing we could do—the one course most likely to bring on a Russian invasion before we were ready to meet it. It did not take General Eisenhower long to come to these conclusions.

Because our proposal to rearm Germany was, in itself, a foolish proposal—for the reasons just stated—I said, a moment ago, that we have attained our ends more by luck than good management. Shall we now be so unwise, so stubborn, so concerned with saving face as not to take advantage of this stroke of good fortune?

Shall we now pursue the cold war as an end in itself, forgetting that we reluctantly embarked upon it only as a means toward reaching a peaceful settlement?

I submit that the No. 1 item of the President's instructions to Mr. Acheson, when he goes to the conference, should read:

"You are authorized to make it clear that, if a settlement of the German question can be reached under which a freely elected all-German Government will be enabled to guarantee the political freedoms to all German citizens, under which a just and honorable peace treaty may be negotiated, demilitarization assured, and occupation forces gradually withdrawn, then the United States will gladly withdraw its suggestion for the inclusion of German forces in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

If our Secretary of State were to begin the discussions with a statement of that sort, defining precisely what we mean by political freedoms, the Council would at once buckle down to the problem which lies at the heart of its assignment. If real progress were made toward reaching agreement on Germany, the Council would then find it infinitely easier to move forward on the question of the long-delayed Austrian Treaty. This, in turn, would open the way to a discussion of the withdrawal of Russian troops from Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria; and, finally, to a general discussion of the gradual reduction of all armed establishments.

If, on the other hand, Mr. Acheson follows the past pattern of the peripheral approach—seeking to begin with a discussion of the Austrian Treaty or the troops maintained by or in the Soviet satellites, and leaving the initiative, so far as Germany is concerned, to Mr. Vyshinsky—then I should say that the chances of a constructive outcome will be slim. We shall then, in all probability, witness merely another sorry spectacle of procedural wrangling and propaganda speeches, in which the relatively polite rebuttals of the west will be no less indicative of moral and intellectual bankruptcy than the slanderous vituperations of Andrei Vyshinsky.

The objection may be raised that a German peace settlement at this time, which would in effect "neutralize" Germany in the cold war, would "lay the great workshop of Europe wide open to Soviet aggression or subversion."

So far as military aggression is concerned, I am not suggesting that we abandon our commitment to defend Western Europe. As an alternative to German rearmament, I proposed some months ago that we and the British agree to maintain—not in Germany, but in France and the Low Countries—an Anglo-American garrison of at least 20 divisions, provided that this force would be at least matched by our Continental Allies. This army would be no further from the Rhine than the Russian Army would be from the Oder. It would be a far more reliable force than one which included Germans. It would be far less provocative because it would not include Germans, and because it would not be built up, as is now contemplated, right up against a Russian Army across the Elbe River.

As for political subversion of a neutralized Germany, why should we fear that Russian influence would be stronger than that of the west? Wendell Willkie once remarked that he could not understand why so many Americans made the assumption that, where democracy and communism come into contact, communism is likely to win. Why should we assume that a truly free German people—by which I mean a people freed not only from foreign coercion but from renascent native reaction—should be susceptible to Communist conspiracy? This danger will be real only if a free Germany becomes a land in which the masses are discontented, which means, if the Government pursues policies that allow the rich to become richer while the poor grow poorer. If western influence is directed toward true democracy, why should we fear that the German people will fall for the false promises of the east?

The assumption that a "neutral" Germany will necessarily fall prey to the Kremlin is defeatism of the most dangerous variety.

Let me make certain that I have made my major point unequivocally clear.

No matter what the Russians have done or failed to do in the past—no matter how untruthful their often-repeated allegations as to our motives and actions—no matter how churlish the behavior of their negotiators—there is now apparently—and I repeat, apparently—a real chance that a German peace settlement can be achieved.

A German peace settlement is fundamental to a peace settlement in Europe. A European peace settlement is a prerequisite for the establishment of enduring peace throughout the world.

Even if a kindly history should absolve us of all blame for what has happened up to this moment, history will not forgive us if we fail—through stubbornness, or pride, or stupidity—to make the most of this opportunity.

May it be given to those harassed and overburdened men, in whose hands rests not only our future but the future of all mankind, to seize upon this moment and to make it the turning point toward peace.

The Puyallup Valley Daffodil Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday the House and Senate restaurants, abloom with bright yellow daffodils, brought to the Nation's Capitol a bit of spring from my home State, the great and beautiful evergreen State of Washington. This came about through the generosity of the Puyallup Valley Daffodil Festival, Inc., of my own Pierce County, to Representative THOR TOLLEFSON, from Tacoma, and to the junior Senator from the State of Washington. This corporation, each year, stages a colorful flower festival, the highlight of which is a parade of beautiful floats, for which over a million daffodil blooms are used each year. Festivities during the 3 days of the daffodil festival take place in Puyallup and Sumner, in the fertile Puyallup River Valley near Tacoma, and in Tacoma itself.

This year the festival will be held on April 6, 7, and 8. Out home we have come to regard this annual festival, of which this is to be the eighteenth, as a sort of official recognition of the coming of spring.

The April issue of Nation's Business carries a well-illustrated article They're Daffy Over Daffodils on this now nationally famous festival and industry. The author is Mr. William L. Worden, a close friend of mine, who, when he isn't traveling over the world pursuing his profession as a writer, lives in Tacoma. Many of my colleagues, I am sure, have read and enjoyed his articles written from Korea and Japan, which have been recently appearing in the Saturday Evening Post.

Because Mr. Worden's article in Nation's Business tells the story of the daffodil bulb industry of the Puyallup Valley so colorfully, I am sure that the Senators will enjoy reading it, especially after having seen the blooms in the Senate restaurant, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY'RE DAFFY OVER DAFFODILS

(By William L. Worden)

The road was narrow and the ruts were deep. Cumbersome Marmon sedans risked muddy shoulders to let model-T Fords and four-cylinder Chevrolets get by. Ladies with cloches down over their ears snapped pictures with box cameras, and transplanted Dutch farmers patrolled fences to keep small boys from trampling all over rows of yellow daffodils. The farmers did not care about the daffodil blooms but perspired for the bulbs below them. Tempers and radiators boiled over.

It was a mess, and also a very typical April week-end scene on the byroads of Washington State's Puyallup Valley in 1927.

On an early Saturday in April 1951, the highways of the Puyallup Valley—wider now, and paved—will be lined with 30,000 or 40,000 people, and the streets of Tacoma, Puyallup, and Sumner will hold another 100,000, while floats, bands, and marching organizations pass in a parade featuring 1,000,000 daffodil blossoms. At the same time a field house will be filled with thousands of flowers—rare varieties and floral arrangements by professionals and amateurs. The following day ski races in the nearby mountains and a yacht parade on Puget Sound will also feature daffodils, as prizes and decorations, respectively.

This is an eye-filling show and has a mouth-filling name—the eighteenth annual Puyallup Valley Daffodil Festival. A visitor may wonder at the spectacle of four communities going into a week-end business paralysis over flowers; but he is not likely to suspect either that this celebration grew out of a rural traffic jam, or that it has been thriving for 18 years just because people like yellow flowers.

Daffodils don't sound like much of an industry, but they are. The valley is a 15-mile-long, 3-mile-wide strip of rich soil along the banks of the Puyallup River between Mount Rainier's glaciers and Puget Sound. It had been a hop-growing center since settlement days in the 1850's, but was reeling in the early 1920's under the twin blows of prohibition and a hop-killing insect pest. A United States Department of Agriculture expert happened on the scene during a search for an area in which an American bulb industry could be started to compete with the centuries-old Dutch monopoly on daffodils, tulips, irises, and lilies. Here he found suitable soil and landowners who were looking for a new crop.

It was a happy marriage, from the start. Bulbs grew disease-free, larger than the Holland imports and, most important, a full 2 weeks ahead of the Dutch season. Dutch immigrants supplied knowledge of bulb culture and their Yankee neighbors built machinery—bulb planters, diggers, and sorters—to get away from the tedious handwork which always had been part of the industry. Almost immediately bulb growing provided a profitable side line for a farmer with an acre or two to spare. Later, it proved even more practical as a large-scale, industrialized farm operation.

In the Puyallup Valley and half a dozen similar areas in Washington, Oregon, and Michigan, growers specialized from the first in supplying big, fat bulbs to florists and greenhouses. These were forced by the buyers—hence the importance of the 2-week seasonal advantage—and the blooms sold in January or February at high winter prices. A bulb with the unlovely name of the Double-nosed King Alfred became the premium product because it would produce two big and spectacular blooms.

The bulbs were good enough to capture a share of the American market immediately; and with World War II, the capture became complete. Machine methods, accurate grading, disease-free guaranties, and competitive prices have kept the American bulbs abreast of imports in the postwar years.

As an industry, daffodil growing is firmly established on nearly a thousand Puyallup acres, producing 8,000,000 bulbs for sale annually. Washington State as a whole sells 15,000,000. Bulb fields and sorting sheds provide jobs for laborers, school youngsters, and housewives during the season; and the industry maintains skilled farm labor the year around—including men who can look down a row of thousands of daffodils in bloom, pick out two or three of the wrong variety and transplant them, still keeping their eyesight.

Forty acres of daffodils in full bloom, with a snow-capped mountain in the background, form a beautiful picture; but the blossoms have only about the same connection with the final product as tassels do to a field of corn. Careful bulb growers leave blossoms in the field until they begin to wither, then send crews in to top them, collecting the withered flowers as insurance against providing havens for pests but throwing them away once they are out of the field. To cut blooms before they start to wither reduces bulb size as much as 15 percent.

Growers never had any commercial interest in the crowds who drove out to see the fields in the twenties. The market was in New York, Chicago, or St. Louis, but not in the western Washington area where daffodils grow so readily that everybody has them in his own garden. The few flowers the grower might permit his children to sell from a roadside stand did not begin to equal losses caused by careless amateur photographers and sightseers who ruined the back roads and trampled the bulbs.

However, it's hard to stop somebody who really wants to look at flowers. After a few abortive attempts, the growers decided it was easier to bring the flowers to the lookers.

The town of Sumner started with a budget of $25 and a small parade at the height of the blossoming season. Trucks and wagons were decorated with a few thousand discarded daffodil heads. Simultaneously, a few of the major growers displayed a collection of their choice daffodils in a corner of the town's high school gymnasium.

Some Tacoma and Seattle newspaper photographers showed up to take pictures—and the festival was launched. The town of Puyallup joined the celebration on another spring, and then Tacoma followed. The parade acquired bands, more floats, and the inevitable festival queen.

Today, the festival includes the tiny town of Orting among the celebrants. A board of

directors representing chambers of commerce, business and growers works throughout the year without pay. Ski and yacht clubs cooperate by arranging their specialties in conjunction with the main show; and professional growers team with women's garden club members to stage the flower exhibition.

The daffodil festival is a big show—but you'd never guess it from the budget.

Five thousand dollars is the most the directors ever have had—obtained through the sale of 50-cent daffodil buttons and through contributions.

Daffodil growers actually make the largest contribution. Since the war, the industry has begun shipping thousands of cut flowers by air freight direct to city markets, thus short-cutting part of the old bulb-forcing system. But at the height of the cut-flower season, they deliver 1,000,000 flowers to the parade—selling them last year for $3.50 a thousand at a time when the going price was $14.

In the Puyallup Valley, a festival means that a couple of hundred businesses and businessmen, a farm industry, a majority of the area's feminine gardeners, and the representatives of one city and three country towns do a lot of work together. They brave uncertain weather, blister themselves arranging flowers and bang their fingers building floats, putting together one of the country's most beautiful shows.

There really isn't any reason—except that they all like daffodils.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 2, 1951, by Gilbert A. Robinson, 48-13 One Hundred and Eighty-eighth Street, Flushing, N. Y. The writer is a young man, now 23 years of age, who left college at the age of 18 to voluntarily serve in the Armed Forces. He believed in universal military training.

I commend this to the reading of my colleagues because it gives a different and a refreshing point of view from much we have heard here on the floor in recent days:

YOUTH CONSIDERS UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

(By Gilbert A. Robinson)

(Our author, having entered the armed services at the age of 18, spent some time in the Aleutians. He evaluates the defense effort from the points of view of many young men in the services, high-school and university students, as well as his own, and has based his article on these observations.)

There is strife in the American home today. The shoes have switched feet. Youth is attempting to educate its parents. But parents seem harder to educate than they claim their youngsters once were. Paradoxical? Yes, but true.

In many homes we have the strange situation of youth trying to reorient their parents' thinking along lines which will be most conducive to the over-all good of the Nation—namely, legislation for universal military training and the 18-year-old draft.

The pros and cons of these issues seem to strike right at the home itself. Many homes are finding that there is a rift in the thinking of the parents and their children. Many mothers, either from maternal or other views, do not wish their sons to go. On the other hand, the sons desire to do what they deem is in the best interest for the country as a whole.

Parents, as voters, are exercising their constitutional prerogative of writing to their Congressmen about the 18-year-old draft and UMT legislation now pending in Congress. The elder statesmen, military men, educators, and organized groups have all voiced their opinions, but, up to now, youth has been reticent.

From my conversation with students, veterans, servicemen, and those who are working, I feel that youth seems forcefully to recognize that the United States must be strong; to be strong we must maintain a well-trained military force; and that, last but not least, they constitute this force.

We agree, youth says, that we need an army; we agree it is youth's responsibility. Why, then, all the complications and debate? youth is asking today. All we ask is that the system be a fair one, with equitable distribution in length of service.

Many of those in the high schools and colleges in the 18-to-20 age bracket, looking ahead, feel that they are capable of taking on the responsibilities that military service incurs. Those to whom I have spoken who have already served look back and, speaking with more authority, generally agree that no undue hardships were sustained by virtue of service alone. They clearly recognize that there are temptations to which young men entering military service must remain alert, but that mere watchful consideration of these principles should not deter us from using those who can serve best.

Some feel that life in an army camp is not at all conducive to the higher things in life. On the other side, there are sentiments expressed by one college graduate, considered an adept student of history, who pointed to another line of thinking. He thought that we should have had universal military training 30 years ago, and that perhaps we would have spared ourselves much.

He pointed out that all other major powers by 1938, except Great Britain and the United States, had UMT. In 1938 the British adopted it, and now we stand alone. He believes we should not adopt it solely because we stand alone but by its proved merits. In view of the fact that we want a North Atlantic agreement with teeth in it, he poses this question: Why should not we as leaders catch up to our allies in this one field, so we could keep astride of our leadership?

Youth appears not only to be thinking of direct military service but also to be tying together the lessons they are learning, or have learned, about the world's past mistakes. Many students speak in ordinary conversational terms of the mistakes in not deterring aggression in Manchuria in 1931, in Ethiopia in 1936, and in Poland in 1939, and they point to the lesson of the man with the umbrella.

The majority seem to recognize the signs and see a direct approach to stopping aggression wherever it may occur by being prepared. Therefore youth, I feel, is agreeing with the UMT provisions. Not only do many graduates, veterans, and students consider it an essential step to maintain peace and cooperate with the UN, but think it is an essential part of the draft. They reason that any selective service system without UMT to keep a growing trained reserve would naturally increase the length of time each draftee would have to serve.

Congressman HILLINGS, of California, himself only 28 years of age, the youngest Representative in Congress, reflected the opinion of youth when he said: "UMT is an essential realistic approach to peace. Military service alone is not detrimental, but in effect gives an individual a more balanced perspective of and tolerance for the beliefs of people with whom he associates."

The second youngest Representative, Congressman BENTSEN, of Texas, substantiated the views of youth by reference to his own experience as an enlisted man. It was his observation that men in the service matured more rapidly but were not altered in their moral standards.

Both Congressmen were of the opinion that their colleagues feel substantially that UMT and the 18-year-old draft are very advisable under the circumstances. It is quite significant to note that over 50 percent of the Members of both Houses of Congress (59 out of 96 Senators and 224 out of 435 Representatives) have seen military service.

These same Congressmen feel that the preponderance of mail against UMT and the 18-year-old draft is coming from mothers who have sons who would be directly affected by the pending legislation. And these adult views, constituting votes, count quite heavily with Congressmen. They also feel that hearing directly from youth itself could produce a wholesome effect on Congress.

It could be that while youth is trying to educate their elders they might very well take a lesson from them in forcefully making their views part of public opinion.

As a Defense Project the St. Lawrence Seaway Is Substantially Worthless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the January 15, 1951, issue of the Springfield (Mass.) Union reveals that as a defense instrument the St. Lawrence project is substantially worthless from the point of view of both power and navigation.

The editorial follows:

THE DEFENSE LABEL

Among other things, the President advocates an immediate start on construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. He says the navigation features and the power capacity of the St. Lawrence project are necessary for the national defense.

It seems that all one has to do to justify increased taxes, swollen national debt, and usurpation of enterprise by bureaucracy is to talk of the necessity for national defense. As a defense instrument the St. Lawrence development is substantially worthless, from the point of view of both power and navigation.

The 570,000 kilowatts of firm power which could be developed on the American side of the river would be scarcely a drop in the bucket; certainly not the indispensable thing for national defense that has been pictured by the more ardent of the advocates. Again, there's no need to point out that, small though the St. Lawrence development would be in the total picture, it would, nevertheless, represent an ideal objective of aerial warfare, particularly when combined with the bottleneck features of transportation to and from the Great Lakes Basin.

The St. Lawrence proponents cheerfully pass up the hundreds of millions of dollars and the many thousands of defense personnel necessary to guard this concentrated facility against attack from the air and from the Gulf of St. Lawrence. It may be trite to note that one well-placed bomb would wreck the entire project. Army engineers have stated that one bomb could destroy the Panama Canal. The St. Lawrence is a more accessible target.

There is only one way to provide power capacity for national defense, beyond what would be created by the natural operation of economic process. That way is to create the capacity and hold it idle against the day when more power may be needed than can be dug up by conversion of industry and by operation on a three-shift basis.

As a hard-headed, practical matter, if we must have idle capacity in preparation for war, the best way to have it is as extra reserve capacity in the diversified power plants scattered throughout the country, reasonably close to the munition industries. Even the advocates of the St. Lawrence seem to recognize the fact that the project would not create idle power capacity, since, in their enthusiasm for a really good story, they envisage a managed economy whereunder industry would be brought to the region from less subsidized parts of the country, and all the capacity utilized right up to the hilt under a preferential process of definitely socialistic character; and this quite regardless of defense needs.

We have then an interesting device whereby, in the guise of equipping us to fight a war for freedom, an additional collectivist undertaking is advanced.

No nation, not even ours, has a fund of resources beyond its needs. What we squander must come out of what we should usefully employ. What we waste on a fictitious defense must be at the expense of our real ability to take care of ourselves or must mean adoption of a lower standard of living. Every capital expenditure put into the hands of Government is, with the personnel related to it, just so much of our strength frozen into the rigidity of superorganization.

It is regrettable that the President has lent his ear to the public power gang. They are bent on complete collectivization of electric power supply and they are confident they can get it. Only the votes of the citizens of this country can stop them. Only public respect for enterprises that are competent, only public appreciation of the superior services private companies render, self-supporting taxpayers, and public disfavors for agencies that waste public resources in unjustifiable projects can produce those votes.

Saving Money for the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared in the press a news article dealing with the suggestion of an 8-year-old boy of Mobile, Ala., which has enabled the Post Office Department to effect a considerable saving.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, together with a brief editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington News, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEA OF MOBILE YOUNGSTER TO SAVE POST OFFICE SOME MONEY

WASHINGTON, March 28.—An 8-year-old down in Mobile, Ala., has brought about a money-saving change in the stamping of air mail.

He is Gregg Buckalaw, post office box 1378, Mobile.

He recently wrote to Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson suggesting that the "via" be dropped from the phrase "via air mail" which post offices everywhere rubber-stamp on items for plane delivery. "Via" is Latin for "by way of."

Donaldson has advised Gregg that his suggestion is good and is being promptly adopted.

The youngster wrote, with an accompanying illustration:

"You can save a lot of money by doing this. You can save by taking the via off the air-mail letters. You can save almost a third of rubber and it is a critical war material besides.

"Yours truly,

"GREGG BUCKALAW."

The Postmaster General replied:

"The postal service belongs to all the people and serves all the people, and one of the reasons why the Post Office Department can give so much service for so little is that people like you are interested and take time to write letters to me, suggesting ways for improving the service and reducing expenses.

"I am issuing instructions that hereafter all rubber stamps purchased by the Post Office Department for endorsing letters and parcels to be sent by air will read "air mail," omitting the word "via," which after all is entirely unnecessary.

"Sincerely yours,

"JESSE M. DONALDSON."

SAVING NOT ESTIMATED

Donaldson made no estimate of how much money will be saved.

At Mobile, Gregg told reporters he came across the idea by curiosity.

A few weeks ago he received an air-mail letter from his brother Vardy, a student at the University of North Carolina.

His attention centered on the marking "via air mail."

"What does the 'via' mean?" he asked his father, who is an accountant.

Buckalaw explained the Latin meaning.

"Why don't they just say 'air mail'?" young Gregg wanted to know.

The father explained that the stamp was a standard procedure set up by the Post Office Department.

"Can't they change it? They could save a lot of money by leaving off one word," Gregg continued.

It wasn't such a bad idea at that, his father decided. He suggested Gregg write Donaldson.

Two days later he presented his penciled letter for his parent's approval.

It began: "Let me tell you how the post office can save a lot of money and help the war effort * * *."

Gregg, a third-grader, said he was proud his suggestion had been approved and he was exceptionally happy over his personal letter from the Postmaster General.

[From the Washington Daily News]

IT'S THAT EASY

Sometimes, saving the people's money is so simple that an 8-year-old boy can grasp it.

In fact, one did. Gregg Buckalaw, of Mobile, Ala., wrote United States Postmaster General Donaldson suggesting that the "via" be dropped from "via air mail" stamped on items for plane delivery.

"You can save almost a third of the rubber," Gregg pointed out, "and rubber is a critical war material besides." Gregg's right. Lord knows how many thousands of hand stamps were to be bought for the country's post offices next year with that wholly needless word.

The Post Office Department is going to adopt the idea, and Gregg got a nice letter. He ought to be fetched to Washington and turned loose with a nice, shiny new Boy Scout ax.

Assignment of Troops to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Troops to Europe," which appeared in the Boston Post on April 4, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TROOPS TO EUROPE

In expressing a belief that President Truman should consult the Congress before sending more than four divisions of troops to Europe the Senate did not expressly set that limit, but served notice on the President that appropriations for a larger force would be difficult to get if as Commander in Chief the President flouted the wishes of the Senate.

This somewhat cautious action effectively ties the President's hands in dealing with any sudden emergency which may arise in Europe, and is characteristic of the thinking which prevails in the Senate when it is obsessed with an approaching national election.

A coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats put over the handcuffed measure even as the President of France, Vincent Auriol, warned a joint session of Congress that right without might is powerless and that isolation is death. Neutralism, the Frenchman declared, is a moral absurdity and geographical and historical nonsense.

President Auriol spoke from a full heart and bitter experience as the Senate was ready to vote on the handcuff measure that would limit our contribution to article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty to four divisions.

Votes, however, are not found in the exposed marches of Western Europe where the full fury of the Red hordes may one day burst upon the Western World with the fury of barbarism. Votes are here in the United States, in the caucus rooms of the Congress and in the delusive yearnings for peace without present risk.

The Soviet Union has existed in a state of total mobilization through all its existence. Readiness for war is the foundation of its whole economy. In two more years the United States will be in a position to stand forth as a mighty nation fearless of the threat of war constantly brandished by the Soviet Union.

The handcuff resolution in the Senate is a tragic example of expediency. At the moment we haven't got four divisions to send to Europe, nor will such a force be available

for many months. Yet, to serve public notice on the Soviet Union, that four divisions is the limit of our contribution to the common defense is like presenting them with a prefabricated plan of operation on how many divisions they will need to overwhelm the forces in Western Europe.

It is the case of Guam all over again. Back in the days when Guam was the anchor of our strategic position in the Pacific the Congress refused to fortify the island and strengthen it as a Gibraltar of the western Pacific. After Pearl Harbor the monstrous mistake was conveniently forgotten, smothered under the rush of war plans. It can be the same sort of ghastly error of judgment on troops to Europe.

Why and What Are We Fighting For in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared in the Huntsville (Ala.) Times-Sun a full page advertisement inserted by the local post of the American Legion. It is entitled "Why and What Are We Fighting For in Korea?" I think it is a very fine statement. In it is included an article written by Hal Boyle, of the Associated Press, dealing with the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have the advertisement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAL BOYLE, OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, GIVES THE ANSWER, IN OUR OPINION, AS TO WHY AND WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR IN KOREA?

We believe these truths to be self-evident:

1. That communism seeks the overthrow of all democratic governments.

2. That the Kremlin seeks world domination.

3. That Kremlin communism is and has been actively working within our own borders for the destruction of our form of government.

4. That Kremlin communism is and has been waging an all-out underground war cleverly designed to achieve world domination without a shooting war.

5. That the Kremlin Communists are preparing, as rapidly as possible, for an all-out shooting war with the objective of world domination.

6. That the time for all freedom-loving people to take a stand against the Kremlin is now.

7. That the place where this stand is to be taken must be determined by the United Nations to which we must remain loyal.

8. That our forefathers purchased and paid for their freedom with their own personal sacrifices and efforts.

9. That the freedom we inherited from our forefathers can be maintained only by our own personal sacrifices and efforts.

Our young men of this great Tennessee Valley are again being called upon to devote their efforts and make personal sacrifices in order that we may continue to enjoy our cherished freedom. As many of them had done before, and, as the young men of many generations before them, they have responded willingly and have done and are doing a fine job of upholding the high standards which the world has come to recognize as "made in America." We are always justly proud of our young men, but we are especially proud of our young men now serving under the United Nations colors against the most vicious enemy and under the most difficult circumstances known to our history.

Comrades, we of Post 37, American Legion, salute you, and we salute your families you have left behind—for the truly American spirit and courage they have shown in recognizing and resisting the efforts of local propagandists to spread dissatisfaction and dissension among them with false and misleading statements in regard to the Korean war. We appreciate that "they also serve who sit and wait."

HAL BOYLE SAYS

(Reprinted from Huntsville Times of Friday, March 23)

"NEW YORK.—Somewhere in Korea 3 weeks ago an American soldier picked up an enemy propaganda leaflet.

"Even since then the questions it raised have haunted him and members of his infantry squad.

"The faded leaflet—it is on my desk now—is a greeting from 'The Chinese People's Army Volunteer Forces' to the American troops. It wished them a merry Christmas and a peaceful New Year and asked:

"'Why are you slaughtering the Korean people and burning their homes down—freezing and dying 5,000 miles from home where you belong with your families? Why aren't you enjoying a turkey dinner like the Wall Street financiers who sent you here to fight for their profits?

"'We do not want to fight you, and we bear you no ill-will, knowing that you, like us, are ordinary laboring people and that you have been duped by American warmongers and their Wall Street bosses.

"'We only want you to go home, so that we Korean and Chinese people can build the lives we want and live in peace.'

"Somewhere in Korea Sgt. Donald Caine of the Eighth Cavalry Regiment sat down and wrote a letter in pencil. He put the leaflet in the envelope and mailed it to me.

"'We realize that enemy propaganda is one of their greatest weapons,' he wrote. 'But in our position how can we help but believe parts of this? So we'd like for you to help us get an answer to some of these questions.'

"I don't feel I'm the one to give the answers. But here is my reply to Sergeant Caine and the boys in the Fourth Squad of the First Platoon of the First Battalion of the Eighth Regiment of the First United States Cavalry Division, fighting somewhere in Korea since last July.

"That leaflet would trouble any honest man if it were true. But it isn't true. And it isn't simply an earnest plea for peace, written by one soldier to a soldier on the other side.

"It is the effort of a skilled propagandist. He wants to confuse you, to make you homesick, to make you doubt your cause and feel your sacrifices are useless and unnecessary.

"If he should succeed in making a majority of American soldiers feel this way, we will have to pull out of Korea entirely. And, in time, I think that means we will have to fight a third world war in our own homeland—and our own families will become the refugees.

"'You aren't fighting for the profits of Wall Street financiers—or just to save Seoul or Taegu. You're fighting for a chance to keep war forever away from your own town—Main Street, United States of America.

"'Of course, it is true the average Chinese soldier doesn't in his heart bear you any real ill will. You probably don't bear him individually any ill will either. Soldiers in any war rarely hate each other on a personal basis.'

"'I know the word "freedom" may sound ponderous and hollow in ears filled with the noise of crunching mortars. But it is a basic word—basic as hunger and fear. And freedom is your goal. Eventual freedom in the world from war and fear and hunger.

"'You came into Korea under a blue and white flag of the United Nations, pledged to bring unity and freedom to that country. Why is the Chinese so-called volunteer there? He came under the Red flag of real slaughter—the slaughter of the long dream of Korean independence.

"'And if he wins there, it won't be just Korean independence that will disappear. Step by step the Red armies of China and Russia will march across other countries unable to defend themselves alone, and gradually swallow the world piecemeal.

"'That would be quite all right, too, if it meant a better life finally for us all. But communism hasn't been able to do that anywhere. Freedom has always brought more happiness than has slavery. And it is better to fight for a free world than a slave one.

"'It is a lie that the Korean people want you to go home. They want you to stay and help them win a real peace. They dread the Chinese, and you know it.

"'The truth is you are a military pioneer, fighting for the first time on a barricade defending all mankind's yearning for a final world peace. It's always lonely on a barricade, but no soldiers ever fought to hold a higher wall of hope.

"'And if you hold it, the race of man will honor you forever.'"

AMERICANISM COMMITTEE, MADISON COUNTY POST, NO. 37, AMERICAN LEGION, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Toledo Blade of March 19, 1951, on the subject, Wheat for India:

WHEAT FOR INDIA

Both President Truman and former President Herbert Hoover have urged that Congress lay aside all question of the international politics involved and sanction the gift of some 2,000,000 bushels of wheat to relieve famine in India. Yet Congress continues to put off action, and in so doing lends substance to suspicion abroad that America's vaunted humanitarianism applies only to countries whose governments dance to the political tune we call. In this instance congressional indifference to the India wheat bill will be attributed to pique caused by the Nehru government's opposition to our Korean policy in the United Nations.

India first made overtures in January, suggesting proudly—but unrealistically considering the state of its pocketbook—that a wheat shipment be financed by a long-term loan. The President placed his recommendations before Congress in early February. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not even scheduled a hearing yet. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has approved the shipment, but its bill is bottled up in the Rules Committee.

America has always prided itself on its generosity in relieving the distress caused by natural disasters—earthquake, flood, and famine—in other lands. These actions, prompted by no thought of gain, political or otherwise, have been responsible for storing up a vast reservoir of good will toward the United States which the most violent propaganda of our enemies has been unable to exhaust.

The longer Congress delays favorable action on wheat for India the more it gives the appearance of putting a price tag on American benevolence. The longer it delays the less will be the gratitude with which seemingly reluctant help is received. If it delays much longer, it will perhaps be necessary to label our gift "Not to be opened until the next famine."

Friendship for Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Friendship for Russians," which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIENDSHIP FOR RUSSIANS

A number of distinguished Americans—distinguished, among other things, for their realism about the Soviet Union and their unrelenting opposition to American Communists—have formed an organization to promote friendship with the Russian people "over the heads of the Kremlin regime." Calling themselves "Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom," they set forth two objectives—to mobilize American support for anti-Communist elements inside Russia and to provide material aid for refugees from that land and for Red army deserters. Behind these purposes lies the same sound impulse that led Senator BRIEN MCMAHON recently to propose a Senate resolution (which Secretary Acheson the other day commended most heartily) expressing the friendship of this country for the Russian people as distinct from their despotic and aggressive government.

There is need for expressions of this sort both for the clarification of American thinking on the subject and for a rectification of America's position as interpreted by the rest of the free world. The notion has become current abroad—fanned energetically by Soviet propaganda—that we are implacable foes of everything Russian and likely to embark upon a war as a result of our unreasoning hatred. We have no doubt that this is very far from the feeling of most Americans. As a people we have an abhorrence of all forms of tyranny—in part because we know that dictatorship, whether of the so-called right or the so-called left, degrades the human spirit; in part because we know, too, that dictatorships are made inevitably dangerous to free peoples by reason of the inner tensions that compel them to seek expansion.

But love of liberty is a universal human attribute. The fatal weakness of dictatorships is that, however rigid their rule, men living under them will always seek an opportunity to escape or to revolt. Many are doubtless seeking such an opportunity behind the iron curtain today. There is ample evidence of it from those who have been able to cross the line and seek asylum among freemen. (You find few men going the other way.) They deserve asylum when their good faith can be established; they deserve the friendship of the free; they deserve a helping hand and a word of hope—not alone for their sake but for our own as well. The enmity of America is toward oppression—not toward the victims of oppression.

Farmers Will Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful and informative article entitled "Farmers Will Stop Communism," by Charles Morrow Wilson, which appeared in the April issue of the Progressive Farmer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS WILL STOP COMMUNISM

(By Charles Morrow Wilson)

My acquaintance with Soviet Russia began on a September morning in 1923 down in Conway, Ark. I was a junior at the State university, and I had been working that summer for a south Arkansas cotton planter who was also a cotton buyer. On this particular morning the boss sent me to meet the early train at Conway and a stranger who would be on the train, a foreign cotton buyer.

When the train pulled in, one passenger got off. He was a blocky little man who wore a black derby hat and a blue serge suit several sizes too big for him, and walked with a noticeable limp. When I introduced myself, he lifted his derby and waved it at me, then shoved a leather duffelbag at me, meanwhile holding his briefcase.

I asked him where he wanted to go first. "To luck at de gotten." He replaced his hat and added, "And tuck vid gotten farmers." It was easy to translate this. He wanted to see the cotton and talk with cotton farmers.

I began learning something about my unusual guest. His name was Alex Gumberg. He was then head of the original Soviet Russian trading organization, Amtorg. He had come to buy American cotton for supplying the first set-up of Soviet state textile mills. As of that time, he was the No. 1 cotton buyer of all creation; in 1 year he had bought 27,000,000 bales in five countries. Interestingly he had accepted no commission.

By very gradual degrees the Russian told me he had been one of the original 1917 Revolutionaries. He had been first an assistant to Kerensky, the great liberal who tried unsuccessfully to make Russia a democracy, and then of Lenin, one of the fathers of statism. But Gumberg believed in democracy and for that reason had already set out to become an American citizen.

HE SAW COMMUNISM'S WEAK SPOT

He was born in the wheat-growing Ukraine, the son of a country school teacher. Thereafter his family moved to Georgia, Russia's far south province. I asked him why Russia could not produce its own cotton in this great and fertile south province. He answered very frankly that the revolutionaries were unable to control the farmers; that they had already shot or liquidated too many of the good farmers of the potential Soviet cotton belt and couldn't get the limited acreages already grown to the state mills. He confided another opinion I have never forgotten—he believed the Soviets' inability to get along with the capable farmers would turn out to be the downfall of the whole Soviet experiment.

My friendship with Alex lasted for 16 years, or until his death in 1939. After this onetime revolutionary had made a world-respected agency of Amtorg, he helped found the Russian-American Chamber of Commerce. Next the Chase National Bank made Gumberg head of its pioneering department in Russian trade. After that, Alex became one of the principal brain trusters and executive employees of the Atlas Corp., the renowned investment corporation which during the 1930's owned and operated virtually every namable type of property from turkey or apricot farms to sugar-beet mills, plane factories, city hotels, and Madison Square Garden. Alex Gumberg became an American citizen and a very loyal one. Franklin D. Roosevelt mentioned him as one of the "most enlightened minds of the century."

GUMBERG A GOOD AND JUST BOSS

When I went to work for the Atlas Corp. Alex was my boss, and he was a good and just boss. We used to talk over his earlier cotton-buying adventures in Dixie, and Alex kept hoping that Soviet Russia would eventually find and prove its place as a principal farming nation.

Meanwhile his relations with the high moguls of Sovietdom remained friendly. He was an honor guest at the social shindigs which marked America's formal recognition of Soviet Russia and Stalin sent him special Christmas greetings and occasionally a keg of caviar.

One Christmas Eve Alex inveigled me into serving as a Russian-style Santa Claus, because at the time I was the only one momentarily available and thin enough to slip into the gold furred elaborately bemedaled costume and the high shiny boots of the Russian St. Nicholas. After the toasts and vodkas that night, Gumberg joined me for a glass of water. He remarked that every high-ranking U. S. S. R. man at the party was "a city slicker"; that the great danger and the ruinous weakness of the Soviet still lay in the Kremlin's failure to understand and get along with the three-fourths of Russians who are country folks. He predicted flatly that farmers would trip Stalin and stop communism, since the best Russian farmers still saw the Kremlin gangs as "just another wave of imperialism."

This comment impressed me. At the time, 1936, the most brilliant Soviet employee in the United States was Jean Ahrens, the U. S. S. R.'s consul general to New York. Ahrens, a handsome Paris-educated son of a former Moscow banker, had already made a brilliant record as a Stalin industrialist. He had established and managed one of the earlier Soviet show factories. For this he had won promotion to consul general to our greatest city where he was seeking to build trade for the U. S. S. R. in the United States.

DEVOTED TO STALIN CAUSE

Unlike Alex Gumberg, who had never really approved Stalin and the red czars of the Kremlin, Ahrens was a devoted Stalin man. One day Ahrens asked me to his palatial New York office for tea and set out to convert me. Under cross questioning he admitted, like Alex Gumberg, that lack of know-how in getting along with the farmers was the most serious danger to Kremlin futures. "For that reason," Ahrens continued, "and as a friend, I want you to show me something about farmers in the United States—how and why they click."

Plainly that was a big assignment. But my boss in the Atlas Corp. approved, and in the spring of 1936 Ahrens and I made an

extensive auto junket together, beginning in upstate New York. The first day we visited a gathering of county agricultural agents. Ahrens liked and admired the group immensely. "We need men like that back in Russia," he explained. "We need them here, too," I answered.

Next day we visited some nearby seed farms. Ahrens admired the work and the accomplishments but insisted that improving plants and distributing them is a job for the Government. A seed farm proprietor explained that as an American businessman he produces and sells superior seeds at a fair profit, thereby placing them in the line of public good.

Ahrens seemed confused. The seed farmer added that the United States nursery and seed industries, respected and relied on throughout the world, have grown great and endure by private enterprise and competitive marketing; this while respecting science and respecting governments. Ahrens scratched his head and began jotting notes on the back of a pocket calendar.

Later that day we visited a prominent vegetable farm near Utica. The farmer was a highly vocal anti-New Dealer. He spoke precisely what he thought. Ahrens commented that in Russia farmers are liquidated for saying less than that about their government.

"Maybe that's another reason why the Kremlin can't get along with farmers," I suggested.

Ahrens was thoughtful. We went back to a village hotel and as we ate supper the Kremlin man began writing a report to his superiors. Maybe he wrote too much. Three days later a "secretary" who looked more like a paid gunman, overtook us in western Ohio and hauled Ahrens back to New York and Washington. The following week the consul general war returned to the U. S. S. R.

RUSSIAN FARMERS DESPAIRING

Early the following year I went into Soviet Russia's Ukraine on a business trip and was permitted to get a quick glimpse of the "collective farms." The latter were doing badly. Soviet food, even in the favored "political" restaurants, was deplorable. Party workers were permitted to speak of "faulty distribution." But even a tourist could see what the real reason was—it was obviously bad farming and worse leadership of farmers.

At that time (1936) the Kremlin reported that in all the U. S. S. R. there were about 11,000 major state farms which employed about 2,400,000 men and women. Far greater in total were the 240,000 artels or collective farms on which lived about 18,000,000 farm families. As of 1936, the Kremlin boasted that 90 percent of all Russian agriculture had been sovietized.

NINE MAJOR FAMINES

Then as now the U. S. S. R. was trumpeting that supplying food is an obligation of the state. But the state had not fulfilled that obligation. The Kremlin had officially admitted nine major famines during the 1930's. We know that the founding of collective farms at gun's point brought vast blood purges and tragic declines in food production.

Only recently one of Stalin's least censored spokesmen, Dr. H. E. Sigerist, gave me this information:

"During the 1930's and again after World War II, the U. S. S. R. was obliged to employ force in founding or reorganizing the collective farms. Even after the terrific effort of the first 5-year plan, the country still faced a very serious food emergency. Party members sent out over the entire countryside employed every known medium of propaganda to educate the peasant and convince him of the superiority of the new agricultural system. Yet, then as before and since, a regular war had to be fought with these peasants who openly sabotaged the state's farm program. They preferred to feed their grain to the animals and to slaughter the cattle and hogs rather than deliver them to the collectives."

FIVE MILLION "KRASNO"

There is no way of finding out exactly how many Russian farmers have been executed, murdered or otherwise erased for failing to toe all the furrows laid out by the Kremlin Party planners. One respected Associated Press correspondent has estimated the total as 5,000,000 prior to 1950. The Kremlin has officially reported at least seven mass purges of Russian farming people during the past 15 years and has boasted that the soukhozes, one time champion farmers of the Russians, are now wiped out.

Kremlin propagandists still bellow the praises of the bewhiskered little German college professor named Karl Marx, though they change or "reinterpret" what the latter wrote—more or less at will.

Even so, Kremlin pundits cannot get around the fact that Marx neither knew nor cared about farming. He played on industrialism as the major revolution of his times and its many errors and injustices in a profit-greedy, amateur era of new factories and newly rich people before labor gained any of the rights it enjoys today. Marx preached revolution against an industrial revolution. But the little man with long whiskers failed to consider the agricultural backgrounds of industrialism.

The Soviet revolution was distinctly a city man's brain storm which grew in and spread from the three principal cities of that huge, disjointed nation called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But the Kremlin has kept on holding gun butts and leveled sights over its great rural provinces.

COMMANDS IN 117 TONGUES

The Kremlin still publishes or broadcasts its commands and propagandas in 117 different languages and dialects, in order to be understood by all or most of the Russians. Meanwhile Russian farmers have never had any real voice in government.

In the latening 1930's, while United States tourists, I among them, were being permitted to catch brief and carefully supervised glimpses inside Soviet Russia, the Kremlin, while admitting that the collective farms were having serious trouble feeding their own people and villages, much less exporting foods, were flooding the propaganda mills with stories about perennial wheat, rubber-bearing dandelions, air transport of breeding livestock, and other great attainments of Soviet agriculture. No doubt some of those stories were reliable. But on the whole the U. S. S. R. bread baskets were not.

COULDN'T WIN OWN PEOPLE

Ironically Kremlin propagandists were working hard, expensively, and in some part brilliantly to win friends among other farmers when they couldn't win their own. Actually they never really succeeded in winning farm friends or influencing farm people beyond U. S. S. R. boundaries.

Too Much Interference and Help From the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Kemper County Messenger, a weekly newspaper, is edited and published in my home town of DeKalb, Kemper County, Miss., by Mr. Lamar Sledge, who is ably assisted by his wife, Mrs. Frances Sledge. In the March 22, 1951, issue of this grass-roots rural newspaper, Mrs. Sledge has a column of special value which I think most aptly and clearly states some of the cardinal virtues of sound Americanism, whose practice made our Nation great, and without which we cannot continue on a sound basis. I should like to have the entire membership of the Congress read her column, and should also like to have it shared by all the people of the Nation. I therefore ask that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am interested in some old-fashioned Americanism because for some time I have been alarmed to see our people and our free enterprise hampered by too much interference and help from the Government. I am like an old hen. I don't believe in helping chicks out of their shell. I want an opportunity for my boy and girls to attain a place in this world of ours by their own industry and ability, and not on a subsidy from a Government that can tell them what to teach in school, how to conduct their business or what church to belong to, as long as they respect the God-given code of moral conduct.

Too much help from anyone: parents, friends, government, is a curse to the recipient.

Our people seem to pride themselves on an illusion of poverty, afraid to admit to having material possessions earned by their honest labor, for fear a new tax might take it away. * * *

That is what has happened to us since WPA, etc. made it profitable to be too poor or too trifling to support your family. I'm sick of it. I'm glad I have never seen my children hungry or cold, and would be ashamed to have to have help to support them as long as I have health and average intelligence.

Thirty-third Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held in the auditorium of the South Boston High School on February 18, 1951, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council, Boston chapter, approximately 2,000 American Lithuanians of Boston and vicinity being present to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania and to protest against the despotism, tyranny, and genocide being practiced in and upon Lithuania and its people by barbarous Soviet Russia:

Whereas the Soviet Union, by deception, fraud, and Machiavellian politics, desecrated and profaned as well as crushed Lithuania as a government and as a nation, perfidiously undermining its right to existence and to be free and independent in the family of nations; and

Whereas the Soviet Union, in its bloodthirsty zeal to subject the entire world to the dictates of international communism, is extirpating the Lithuanian nation by heretofore unheard of atrocities; and

Whereas these bolshevik acts of abnominable and outrageous cruelty have not been curbed up to now, nor cognizance taken thereof in international fora, and the concomitant genocide goes unchallenged; and

Whereas about 1,000,000 Lithuanians have been taken from their homes and have been either annihilated or cast into the wild wastes of Siberia to perish;

Now, therefore, we here assembled to rededicate ourselves in espousal of a free and independent Lithuania, certify our recognition of the benefits unbounded of the liberty which we enjoy in this great bulwark of freedom, the United States of America, and hereby resolve:

1. That our emphatic and unmitigated protest be recorded in connection with the unwarranted subjugation of Lithuania and unjustified enslavement of its people and progressive extermination of its race.

2. That the President of the United States and its Congress be entreated to induce all international comity and authority to terminate as soon as possible the awful transgressions being engaged in by the Bolsheviks against the sovereignty and people of Lithuania and to compel the withdrawal of the Communist hordes from the territory of Lithuania, simultaneously reestablishing Lithuania as an independent nation with Vilna as its capital.

3. That the prevailing lethargy concerning the genocide going on in Lithuania be rent asunder and that the United Nations and the civilized world as a whole intercede to lend support for the eradication of this barbarity and toward reestablishment of an independent Lithuania.

4. That the American people as well as all other freedom-loving peoples be enlisted in the ranks against the Asiatic barbarians and their savage bolshevism wherever they establish their ramparts, to the end that all nations, including Lithuania, be free and rid of Bolshevik enslavement.

5. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to all Members of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the United Nations, to the Papal Delegate, and to the representatives in the United States of the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Belgium, Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and to the American press.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
BOSTON CHAPTER,
JOHN L. KAS, *Chairman.*
ALEXANDER IVASKA, *Secretary.*

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, there have been statements made on this floor regarding the position of the American Legion on selective service and universal military training.

To make that organization perfectly clear, I include the following telegram in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1951.*

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House Office Building, Washington D. C.:

Request by cable from Rome to forward following message from National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., to you: "Recent tour of Korean battlefront and American installations elsewhere in Asia and Europe confirms belief universal military training would have prevented untold casualties, saved many American lives, and will strengthen our future defense against communism. The American Legion urges support for universal military training and is strongly opposed to any amendment that would defer it or separate it from present bill."

Granville S. Ridley, Edward A. Hayes, Perry Brown, Warren H. Atherton, B. W. Gearhart, Fred Alger, George N. Craig, Ray O. Garber, Bruce Henderson, American Legion Security Training Committee.

Elements of Soviet Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part 1 of an article on elements of Soviet labor law, which appeared in the Monthly Labor Review for March 1951. This analysis well describes the iron rule of the Communist state which lies behind the facade of union organization and collective agreements in Russia. It is a helpful study of the wide differences between Soviet labor laws and industrial procedure, and those of our own free society. I ask for its insertion in order that the facts therein set forth may be available to all those who carry on the war of ideas and truth against the outlandish claims of apologists for Communist tyranny.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make 2½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELEMENTS OF SOVIET LABOR LAW—PART I

"Soviet Russia does not know of any 'free' contract of employment, nor of any legal relations usually connected with the concept of the employment contract * * * In Soviet Russia labor duty is the basis of labor relations."[1]

Thus did a contemporary Soviet authority on labor law characterize the situation in 1920. He was not referring to forced labor, so widely used in Soviet Russia, especially after 1930, but to the Soviet equivalent of "free" labor, the subject of the present article.

Generally speaking the concept put forward in the quotation is largely held today by the Soviet state; it governs to a great extent the functions of the trade unions and reflects the attitude of the Communist Party. Over the years it resulted in separate labor laws which are punitive rather than protective.

True, in 1920, private enterprise had been effectively barred under the policy known as militant communism. This was superseded in 1922 by the so-called new economic policy (NEP),[2] under which private enterprise, within certain limits, was readmitted and freedom of the employment contract was accorded some recognition. But this policy came to an end about 1929 with the inauguration of the first 5-year plan, which, according to Stalin, had been framed and executed to eliminate capitalist elements and to create an economic basis for a Socialist society.[3] Since then private enterprise has been banned.

THE NATURE OF SOVIET ENTERPRISE

When private enterprise finally disappeared in Russia the great majority of persons engaged in industry and commerce—from top executives to manual laborers—became employees of a single owner—the government.[4] In that sense there is no contrast between capital and labor in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government claims that there is a "unity between the interests of the toilers of the Soviet Union and those of the Soviet Socialist State," as an official textbook on labor law stated in 1946.[5] However, such unity can hardly be demonstrated in reality. Soviet industrial organization shows that the fixed relationship between labor and state management took the place of the free relationships between labor and capital in capitalist countries.

Government-owned industry and commerce now operate on a different basis from that of the first years of the Soviet regime (1918–21). At that time, private enterprise and profit-making were outlawed without offering a substitute for satisfaction of personal ambition or an opportunity for extra earning.

In contrast, the policy adopted after the drive began for total socialization was popularly called "whips and cookies." On the one hand, concessions are made to the ever emerging personal ambition; but on the other, criminal law is put into operation in an effort to check the inefficiency of the entire economic system.

Government agencies engaged in business operate on a "commercial" basis (Khozialstvenny raschet) and enjoy a degree of formal independence and enter into contracts with each other and with private persons. Although they are government agencies they are supposed to act with the competitive vigor of a private enterprise (the principle of "Socialist competition"). This "independence" should not be overrated. As a Soviet text puts it: "The commercial basis is merely a special method of management of the national economy."[6] Planned assignments of higher bureaus set definite limits to their independence, to say nothing of continuous supervisory control by various government agencies and political control by the secret police and Communist Party.

---

[1] Z. Tettenborn, Soviet Legislation on Labor (in Russian, 1920) p. 16.

[2] For description and analysis of major stages of the Soviet policies and their expression in law see Gsovski, Soviet Civil Law, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, vol. 1 (1948) pp. 10 et seq., 791, et seq., vol. 2 (1949) p. 537 et seq.

[3] Stalin, Problems of Leninism, English edition, Moscow (1940) p. 409.

[4] Members of the so-called productive cooperatives are in fact paid for their work and not according to their shares. See Gsovski op. cit. vol. 1, p. 411, et seq.

[5] Aleksandrov and Genkin, Soviet Labor Law (in Russian, 1946), p. 312.

[6] Evtikhiev and Vlasov, Administrative Law (in Russian, 1946), p. 36. See also Gsovski op. cit, supra note 2, vol. 1 at 362 et seq.

Nevertheless, the management of a Soviet quasi corporation is as interested in obtaining the lowest unit labor cost as its capitalist prototype. A single executive is appointed by the head of the bureau under whose authority the enterprise (called "trust" in industry and "long" in commerce) operates. He hires and fires, allocates wages, imposes penalties, and grants bonuses. Bonuses are paid from a special director's fund based on a percentage of the profits or savings. His own bonus also depends upon the efficiency of the enterprise. In case the output falls below standard quantity or quality, he is liable to imprisonment up to 8 years.

THE SOVIET WAGE PRACTICE

Private profit making is barred and the earnings of the bulk of the population are practically limited to wages and salaries. But the governmental scale of compensation for work, whether in money or comfort, aims to offer a substitute for profit making to stimulate efficiency. A system of wages and salaries is designed to allow wide latitude for differentials in wage, salary, and bonus payments. To this end the principles of piecework and bonuses for efficiency, without any guaranteed minimum wage, constitute the basis of compensation for work in Government industry, in collective farming, and in cooperatives.

Regardless of whether the employee is paid by time or by piece, he must attain a standard of output established by the management. If he fails to do so through his fault he is paid according to the quality and quantity of his output.[1] Progressive scales of piecework and bonuses for extra efficiency are issued by the government for individual industries and industry groups.

Numerous honorary titles—"Hero of Labor," and others—and medals carry with them distinct material benefit, such as tax exemption, right to extra housing space, etc. There are also personal salaries and personal pensions awarded without reference to any scale, and Stalin prizes amounting to as much as 300,000 rubles in a lump sum.

All this affords professional, managerial, and skilled labor remuneration in money and comfort greatly exceeding that given to the ordinary laborer. For example, a scale of salaries and wages for electrical-power plants, established in 1942 and still in force as late as 1946, ranged from 115 to 175 rubles monthly for janitorial services, to 1,000 to 3,000 rubles for a director.[2]

In 1934, Stalin frankly declared the underlying philosophy of his policy as follows: "Equalization in the sphere of demands and personal life is reactionary, petty bourgeois nonsense, worthy of a primitive ascetic sect and not of a socialist society organized in a Marxian way."[3]

However, material benefits thus promised evidently proved to be insufficient stimuli for good work.

Heavy responsibility is imposed upon both workers and management. Inefficiency involves not only loss of material benefits and possible loss of job, but prosecution in court as well. Workers are subject to penalties imposed by managers for loafing on the job and to court action for absenteeism and unauthorized quitting of the job. From 10 to 25 years in a forced labor camp,[4] with or without confiscation of property, can be imposed for "misappropriation, embezzlement, or any kind of theft" of the property of the principal employers, the government, or public bodies. Prior to 1946 the death penalty could be invoked.[5] In case of damage to or loss of property of the employer—tools, raw materials, fuel, even work clothes—if due to employee negligence can result in deductions from wages, in some instances in an amount 10 times the value of the property.[6]

MANAGERIAL PRESSURES

A series of laws penalize inefficient management for such things as poor quality or small volume of output, failure to penalize workers for absenteeism, and other violations of labor discipline.[7]

A potent incentive to the efficiency of the individual establishment is the principle that earnings depend in part upon the efficiency of the whole enterprise (principle of check by ruble). Business success brings definite individual profit; business failure incurs heavy punishment for those holding administrative posts. Although the total amount of regular wages to be paid in an individual enterprise is established by central government bureaus (wages funds), bonuses are dependent upon the profits or savings of an individual enterprise.

THE ROLE OF TRADE-UNIONS

Under such an arrangement there is no less reason for the rise of labor conflicts than under capitalism. But under the Soviet system labor is deprived of the main effective devices by which it may protect itself in a labor dispute in the capitalist world. Neither the constitution nor any law or decree mentions the right to strike and the strike is tacitly outlawed.

In general, all the channels through which labor can pursue its objectives in the capitalist world—legislation, courts, administrative agencies, the press, and trade unions—are in Soviet Russia agencies of the principal employer of industrial labor—the state.

For a time when private enterprise was tolerated under NEP (1922–28) the Soviet leaders visualized the protection of the interests of labor in this conflict through trade-unions. But the unions were regarded as an arm of government and of the Communist Party rather than as an independent force. Still they were to be an arm specialized in protection of labor. As the drive for socialization progressed, this special protective quality of the unions was pushed to the background. Instead, the notion of the identity of interests of the workers and the Soviet state was put forward and the primary function of Soviet labor unions is to serve the interests of the State.

THE PROMISE OF 1932

The eleventh congress of the Communist Party in 1922, when the NEP was inaugurated, recognized that if government enterprise operates on a commercial basis "inevitably certain conflicts of interests on the issue of labor conditions in the enterprises, are created between the working masses and the directors, managers of the government enterprises, or the government bureaus to which the enterprises are subordinated." Consequently the resolution "imposed upon the trade-unions the duty to protect the interests of the working people."[14]

Thus, the labor code of 1922, then enacted, relegated to the collective agreements between management and trade-unions the settlement of all the basic working conditions, including wage rates, standard of output, shop rules, etc.

Nevertheless, even then, both before and after this period, the trade-unions were not considered as a force independent from the Communist Party or the Soviet Government. The ninth congress of the party (1920) had stated that the tasks of trade-unions lie primarily in the province of economic organization and education. The trade-unions must perform these tasks not in the capacity of an independent, separately organized force but in the capacity of one of the principal branches of the Government machinery guided by the Communist Party.[15] The tenth congress went further and in 1921 passed the resolution, drafted by Lenin, and stressing the role of the trade-unions in Soviet Russia as a school of communism.[16] The fifteenth congress in 1925 stressed that trade-unions were created and built up by our [Communist] Party.[17]

"The most important task of the trade-unions," says the official textbook on civil law of 1944, "is the political education of the toiling masses, their mobilization for building up socialism, and the defense of their economic interests and cultural needs."[18]

"Formally," says the official textbook on administrative law of 1940, "the trade-unions are not a party organization but, in fact, they are carrying out the directives of the party. All leading organs of the trade-unions consist primarily of Communists who execute the party line in the entire work of the trade-unions."[19]

THE REALITY AFTER 30 YEARS

Thus the trade-unions were transformed from a labor-protecting arm into an arm for execution of government policy, and achievement of production goals. According to Soviet jurists, "the Socialist industrialization of the country required that labor law * * * serve the successful struggle for productivity of labor and strengthening of labor discipline."[20]

Such transformation of the trade-unions into a government arm, enforcing official economic policy, began soon after the onset of the first 5-year plan. Accordingly, the sixteenth congress of the Communist Party directed in 1930 that the trade-unions, striving in collective agreements for improvement of the standard of living of the workers, must take into account the financial status of the enterprise with which the agreement was made and the interests of the national economy. In making the agreement, the resolution insisted, each party must undertake definite obligations in carrying out the financial and production plan of the enterprise. The unions in particular were obligated to guarantee, on behalf of the workers, the productivity of labor contemplated by the plan.[21]

---

[1] Soviet Labor Code, sec. 57 as amended in 1944. "If an employee at a governmental, public, or cooperative enterprise, institution, or business fails through his own fault to attain the standard of output prescribed for him, he shall be paid according to the quantity and quality of his output but shall not be guaranteed any minimum wage. In other enterprises and businesses (private enterprises including those under a concession) each an employee shall be paid not less than two-thirds of his scheduled rate."

[2] Handbook of Wages in Electrical Power Plants (in Russian, 1946), pp. 5–12, 26.

[3] Stalin, speech at the 17th Congress of the Communist Party (1934, quoted from his Problems of Leninism (10th Russian edition, 1947), p. 563.

[4] Statute of June 4, 1947, concerning the crimes against government and public property, Vedomosti 1947, No. 19.

[5] Law of August 7, 1932. For its translation and discussion see Gsovski op. cit. supra note 2, vol. 1, pp. 542, 726.

[6] Soviet Labor Code, secs. 823–834 (as amended), act of June 20, 1943, sec. 12; Instruction of the People's Commissar for Labor of June 1, 1932, secs. 1–3. For further citations see Gsovski op. cit. vol. 1, pp. 823–825.

[7] Act of December 28, 1938; edict of July 10, 1940, id. p. 821.

[14] All-Union Communist Party on Trade-Unions, Collection of Resolutions (in Russian, 1930), p. 55.

[15] Ibid., p. 35.

[16] Ibid., p. 36.

[17] Ibid., p. 87.

[18] Agarkov and others, Civil Law (in Russian, 1944), vol. I, p. 190; Civil Law Textbook (in Russian, 1938), vol. I, pp. 108–109.

[19] Denisov, Soviet Administrative Law (in Russian, 1940), p. 60.

[20] Op. cit., supra, note 5, p. 90.

[21] Ibid, p. 28.

The central agency of all the Soviet trade-unions—their central council—was granted the status of a government department in 1933. It officially took the place of the People's Commissariat for Labor, which was then abolished, and the Council was also charged with administration of social insurance. But then the Central Council of Trade Unions lost the character of a representative body of trade-unions even in terms of the Soviet democracy. Under law this council must be elected by the Congress of Trade Unions which is designated as "the supreme authority of the trade-unions of the Soviet Union." Nevertheless, since the ninth congress in 1932 no such congresses were convoked for 17 years, during which the whole Soviet social order and the position of labor were radically changed.

When the tenth congress convened in 1949, no explanation was asked or offered for the delay. The congress adopted a new statute which reaffirmed the total control of the Communist Party over the trade-unions:

"The Soviet trade-unions conduct their entire work under the direction of the Communist Party—the organizing and directing force of the Soviet society. The trade-unions of the U. S. S. R. rally the working masses behind the party of Lenin-Stalin."[22]

Among numerous tasks assigned by the new statute to the trade-unions the generalized political objectives are described in the first place at great length. For example, the trade-unions "strive to enhance in every way the Socialist order in society and State, the moral-political unity of the Soviet people, the brotherly cooperation and friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union. They actively participate in the election of the agencies of governmentl power. They organize workers and clerical employees for the struggle for the steady development of the national economy."

In contrast, "the duty to protect the interests of the working people" which had been emphasized by the party congress in 1922 is not expressly stated. It may have been considered unnecessary because the statute assumes that "in the conditions of the Soviet Socialist order the state protects the rights of the working people." But in any event the labor-protection tasks of the unions are couched in cautious language.

At the very end of the above quoted passage it is mentioned that the unions "look after (zabotiatsia) the further rise of the material well-being and the full satisfaction of the cultural needs of the toilers." At another place the unions' monopoly to represent the workers is stated with a hardly accidental lack of specificity: "[Unions should] act on behalf of workers and clerical employees before the governmental and social bodies in matters concerning labor, culture, and workers' everyday life."

Collective bargaining, provided for in the labor code of 1922, was discontinued in 1933. As the official soviet text on labor law explained in 1946: "The collective agreements as a special form of legal regulation of labor relations of manual and clerical employees has outlived itself. Detailed regulation of all sides of these relations by mandatory acts of governmental power does not leave any room for any contractual agreement concerning one labor condition or another."[23]

In plain English, this means that the Soviet leaders chose to abandon the last vestige of contract in relations between labor, even as represented by party-controlled trade-unions on the one hand and State management on the other, for the sake of outright government regimentation. Capitalist free collective bargaining was frankly declared unfit in the Socialist surroundings of the Soviet Union.

However, in 1947 a campaign for making new collective agreements suddenly was ordered after a lapse of 14 years.

AGREEMENTS WITHOUT BARGAINING

Collective agreements were declared the most important measure "to achieve and exceed the production plan, to secure further growth of the productivity of labor, improvement of the organization of labor, and the increase of responsibility of management and trade organizations for the material condition of living of the employees and cultural services rendered to them."[24] Nevertheless, the new policy is far from introducing free collective bargaining. Certain matters are definitely excluded from any negotiation and agreement and are reserved for government regulation.

The new rules positively require that "the rates of wages, of piecework, progressive piecework, and bonuses as approved by the government must be indicated" in the agreement. It is expressly forbidden to include any rates not approved by the government. In other words, wage rates are excluded from bargaining, but if included in the agreement are no more than applications of the governmental schedule to the establishment for which the collective agreement is drawn. This is true, to a large measure, of other points covered, particularly standards of output. The official act and the jurisprudential writings insist that the primary purpose of such agreements is to translate the abstract terms of the general plan for economic development into specific assignments and obligations within each particular establishment. They appear to be merely a form in which the orders of the government are made more precise.

A Soviet writer of authority comments:

"It is understood that the present-day collective agreements could not but be different by content from collective agreements which were made at the time when the rates of wages and some other conditions of labor were not established by the law and government decrees.

"The purpose of the present-day collective agreement is to make concrete the duties of the management, shop committees, workers, technical, engineering, and clerical personnel toward the fulfillment of the production plans and production over and above the plan as well as to raise the responsibility of business agencies and trade unions for improvement of material living conditions of workers and cultural services rendered to them."[25]

As before, the new regulations are based on the assumption that the interest of the workers are the same as the interests of production in a Socialist state and that the collective agreements are designed to be the juridical form of expression of this unity.[26] Accordingly, a model agreement is drafted by each ministry upon consultation with the central offices of the appropriate trade-unions. Then the model agreement is sent as a fait accompli to the establishments concerned.

While such collective agreements are not the result of collective bargaining, it may be observed that when the Soviet Government faced the task of postwar rehabilitation of its economy, it preferred to give decreed labor conditions the appearance of an agreement.

THE DOCTRINE OF NORMATIVE ACTS

Negotiation and mutual agreement are in fact proscribed in the Soviet Union in many important respects. Government regulation of wages and other basic conditions of labor took their place. However, it does not mean that labor is thus protected by law as we understand it. True, a Code of Labor Laws still exists on the statute books of the republics of the Soviet Union. But it was enacted in 1922 when private enterprise was within some limits tolerated and the Government was not the sole employer in industry and commerce. At that time the code sought to regulate labor relations on the basis of free contract and protect labor by methods resembling advanced democratic labor legislation.

However, these provisions of the code were either repealed or for the most part became inoperative being superseded without a formal repeal by various laws and decrees.

Under the totalitarian concept of government power, the accepted relationships of the administrative and legislative branches of the government do not apply. Although the terms "constitution," "legislative act," and "administrative decree" are used in Soviet law, the authority attached to each of these sources of law in the Soviet Union is different from that associated with these terms in the democratic countries. A constitutional provision may be set aside by an administrative decree and the newly enacted rule is incorporated into the constitution only at a later date. For example, the 7-hour working day was provided for in the 1936 constitution (sec. 119).

However, on June 26, 1940, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, an executive body in terms of the constitution, decreed the 8-hour normal working day. This edict became operative immediately. It was ratified by the Supreme Soviet in August 1940, but without following the procedure prescribed for constitutional amendment. Not until 7 years later was section 119 constitutionally amended.

The Soviet jurists are fully aware of such practices. In discussing the sources of Soviet labor law in the treatises on this subject, they seek to blur the distinction between the authority of a constitutional provision, a legislative enactment, and an administrative decree or directive. In a recent (1949) standard treatise,[27] designed for use in university law schools, a doctrine of "normative acts" (rule making) as the source of Soviet labor law is promulgated. Normative acts are in general terms defined as "acts by which the will of the ruling class is 'elevated to law.'" This not too clear definition is fortunately followed by an enumeration of the specific acts issued by Soviet authorities which, according to the author fall under the definition. These are "laws" enacted by the Supreme Soviet (Soviet equivalent to legislature), "edicts" by its presidium (a body of 47 members constituting the Soviet collective President), "normative resolutions" (i. e., rule-making resolutions) of the Council of Ministers (cabinet), joint resolutions of the Council of Ministers and the Central Committee of the Communist Party, regulations issued by individual ministers and by the Central Council of the Trade-Unions.

In other words, any decree or order by any of the central governmental authorities is law. No matter what it is called and by what body it is issued, it prevails until the action of another authority supersedes it.

---

[22] Trud (in Russian), May 11, 1949. See Bureau of Labor Statistics, Notes on Labor Abroad, No. 11, May 1949, pp. 39–40.

[23] Op. cit., supra, note 5, p. 106. Italics in the original.

[24] Resolution of the Presidium of the Central Council of the Trade-Union, approved by the Council of Ministers, Preamble, Trud (in Russian), April 18, 1947. See Bureau of Labor Statistics, Notes on Labor Abroad, No. 2, June 1947, p. 28, and No. 13, December 1949, p. 36.

[25] Aleksandrov and other compilers, Goliakov, editor, Legislation Concerning Labor (in Russian, 1947), p. 15.

[26] Moskalenko, "Legal Problems Involved in Collective Agreements" in Trade-Unions (in Russian, 1947), No. 8, p. 16 et seq.; Trud (in Russian), April 18, 1947, editorial.

[27] Aleksandrov, editor, Soviet Labor Law (in Russian, 1949), p. 53.

The survey of recent trends in the Soviet legislation thus far made suggests the conclusion that the disappearance of private enterprise from the Soviet economy has not been followed by the increase of rights of labor in labor law. If compared with the time when private enterprise was tolerated, the legal status of labor has worsened. Another striking feature of the Soviet regulations on labor are the numerous penal provisions.

VLADIMIR GSOVSKI,
Chief, Foreign Law Section,
Law Library, Library of Congress.

Congress Fails the Youth of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, given the authority to direct the destiny of our Nation, concededly the most prosperous and, from a productive and military standpoint, the most powerful in all the world, Congress has permitted the executive department to impose upon the people policies which have resulted in three world wars, none of which has contributed either to our happiness, prosperity, or security.

The youth of the land in ever-increasing numbers are thinking along the lines of a letter received this morning, which reads as follows:

MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASH.,
March 29, 1951.

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In June 1941 I was drafted for a year's training in the military forces of the United States. That year ended in January 1946. Those of my friends who did not serve in the Armed Forces made good money, got themselves a home, good positions in life, and are getting along well.

After getting out of the service I remained in the Reserves with the thought in mind that in case of an all-out war I would be called back in the branch of service I had received training in. Meanwhile, I tried to get a job and get a much-delayed start in life at the age of 27.

In September 1950, I enrolled in a correspondence course to better myself in my job. The day after my first lesson came my orders calling me to active duty for 1 year were received. Naturally I was a bit put out, but figured I would study while I was in the service and then go to work when I got out.

Now the majority of the reserves have it we are to be extended for another year's duty. I am now 32. If I get another year's delay it is going to put me seriously behind. This also applies to practically every 12-month recall reservist, I've talked to. We can't understand why we are being held in the service contrary to orders which evidently don't amount to anything more than to get one in the service. Getting out is different. Yet there are several thousand involuntary reservists who were not called up. If we are extended, it is going to reduce our faith in the word of the President as well as our desire to get the job done. I don't mind telling you, if I am forced to spend another year on active duty the Government won't get its money's worth out of me. It's not that I dislike work, it's the principle of the thing.

If I had wanted to make the service my career, then I would be in the Regulars. Since I would like to live my life as a civilian, I feel that I ought to be able to, barring an all-out war, which we certainly aren't engaged in at the present. If we were, then all Reserves ought to be called in as well as veterans, not in the Reserve category.

Speaking for the 4,000 airmen on 12-month recalls, which I am sure the service could get along without by September, anything you can see clear to do toward assisting legislation in our favor would be most gratefully appreciated.

Your past record of achievements and fairness is of the highest, and I am confident you will do what is just.

Sincerely yours.

New Plan May Tap Oil Field in Ocean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, before the Federal Government saw fit to expropriate the submerged oil-bearing lands lying within the seaward boundaries of the State of California, our State had fostered orderly and scientific development of the oil resources beneath these lands. Since the attempted grab by the Federal Government of this area, which the Federal Government conceded that we owned from the time of our admission into the Union until a few years ago, development has been hindered by legal confusion.

The Federal Government's suit in the Federal Government's Supreme Court against the State of California is still pending because, even though it has authorized the Federal grab, the Supreme Court has been unable to determine the boundary lines of the expropriated area. If our State leasing agency were permitted to proceed in the public interest without Federal interference, it could foster additional development likely to add to our known petroleum reserves.

The attached article, which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on April 2, 1951, demonstrates the type of development that is being hindered by the Federal Government's stubborn persistence in defying the will of Congress in an attempt to hang onto the expropriated area. The article will, I am sure, prove of interest to the Members, and I am asking that it be included in our RECORD:

NEW PLAN MAY TAP OIL FIELD IN OCEAN—SHAFT-TUNNEL-CAISSON SYSTEM PROPOSED FOR RICH RESERVOIR

A revolutionary method of extracting petroleum from bay and tideland areas may be used in developing the giant oil field which geologists say is located directly off the Long Beach shoreline.

The vast petroleum deposit lies roughly between the beach city's strand and the outer harbor breakwater which parallels the shoreline at a distance of 3 miles.

Geological data indicate the oil-field reserve to be in the neighborhood of 500,000,000 barrels.

VAST STOREHOUSE

Geologists say the great storehouse of black gold is, in truth, an easterly extension of the rich Wilmington-Long Beach Harbor field which currently is tapped by some 2,000 producing wells, all drilled from dry land and harbor fills.

The unprecedented method of developing oil fields which lie beneath water involves use of a technique familiar to mining engineers. It has been worked out by Hillman A. Hansen, 52, Long Beach engineer-geologist.

The plan envisions sinking of a vertical shaft into the earth to a depth of 400 feet below the bottom of the bay. From this depth a network of tunnels would be driven laterally. These tunnels would conform to a predetermined pattern.

SUBTERRANEAN NETWORK

When completed the subterranean network would, in effect, be a subway system which engineers would put to good use.

Drifting out from each side of the subway tunnels would be short-access tunnels leading into caissons of steel and concrete.

The caissons, 34 feet in diameter and 120 feet high, would provide room for installation of standard oil-well drilling equipment.

It would be within these cylindrical caissons that the oil wells would be drilled.

Each caisson, according to plans, would accommodate the drilling of 20 wells in an adjacent 100 acres of "field," as projected downward from the surface of the Harbor waters.

WELLS WHIPSTOCKED

The wells would be whipstocked (an oil-field term for directional drilling) so that each would draw upon 5 acres of the projected producing area.

The master plan envisages construction of 50 or more of the subterranean caissons.

The underground network of tunnels and caissons would be air-conditioned. Electric power would motivate the drilling equipment.

Technological developments, such as the modern shut-off valves and sparkproof electric motors like those used on seagoing tankers, make the tunnel-and-caisson method of oil-field development both safe and practical, engineers claim.

ECONOMICAL METHOD

"It would be economical, too," Hansen said, "the cost actually figuring out to be less than any other method which has been advanced for developing this oil field."

The recently announced intention of the Iranian Government to nationalize its oil fields and petroleum reserves has been cause for concern among the United States, British, and Dutch interests which have led the way in developing the petroleum storehouse of the Middle East.

Some have interpreted the Iranian move with an eye to Russia and its known thirst for oil. The Iranian repercussions echo loudly in this country and etch sharply the question of United States domestic oil reserves.

Addressing a gathering of geologists here a week ago, Dr. Kenneth O. Emery, of southern California, estimated that 40,000,000,000 barrels of oil lie beneath waters adjacent to the southern California coast line. He pointed up the urgent need for a method to extract this oil.

OTHER METHODS ADVANCED

The tunnel-and-caisson method has awakened great interest in engineering circles and is considered possibly the best approach to the problem yet devised.

Two other suggested methods of drilling the Long Beach offshore field have been advanced. These are (1) constructing a series of concrete islands which would dot the bay with drill sites, and (2) attaching so-called blisters (drill sites) to the existing offshore breakwater.

In 1947 the city of Long Beach investigated the island-platform proposal thoroughly. A report to the city council at that time outlined need for 70 concrete islands, each costing an estimated $1,000,000.

OBJECTIONS CITED

While the proposed island-platform plan would meet the engineering needs of the drilling problem, it was pointed out that the plan would be prohibited by State law on the grounds that it would constitute obstructions to commerce and navigation within the port.

Experts agree that the outer harbor breakwater would be a suitable base for anchoring drill sites, but point out that it would permit too limited development of the oil field and result in the loss of millions of barrels of oil.

"All you could do by drilling from the breakwater," an engineer explained, "would be to effect development of a narrow band along the southerly flank of the field. Geologically speaking, it is axiomatic that drilling an oil field along one side or flank alone throws the entire pressure system of the field out of balance.

"In this instance it would result in the loss of millions of barrels of oil through salt-water encroachment."

AREA EXTENDS TO SEA

The bulk of the oil produced in the Wilmington-Long Beach field comes from sands at an average depth of 3,100 feet. Geologists say they have every reason to believe that this same oil-rich level extends throughout the field directly off Long Beach.

Military experts have studied Hansen's tunnel-and-caisson method and have expressed pleasure with its bombproof aspects.

Conversely, the same military men consider the island-platform and breakwater drill sites as highly vulnerable to attack and see them as being capable of converting the entire Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area into a sea of flaming oil and contaminating the air with billions of cubic feet of noxious gas.

Meanwhile, Hansen continues his 10-year study into the problem of drilling bay and tideland oil fields. He firmly believes that he has come up with the logical answer in tunnels and caissons.

The legal and political barriers obstructing development of this great offshore field will be resolved shortly, he believes, by the urgency of national defense.

Resurrection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in these times when peace must be the prayer of all of us, we should recognize the vital need to live according to our highest standards. The future of the country will depend ultimately more upon the virtues of our citizens than upon the sins of our enemies. For our aspiration, Easter day brings home to us the ideals of character such as I have tried to convey in the accompanying poem, which I am glad to submit to you for inclusion in the RECORD, composed by James Patrick McGovern, a long-time member of the District of Columbia bar and a captain of the American Expeditionary Forces in the First World War:

RESURRECTION

Deep in the currents of the heart there flows
A fervent, dauntless quest of all mankind,
Like life in death when conquering Christ arose—
The mortal and immortal intertwined.
Today, however dark and dull the spring
Of hope and faith through thoughts and deeds impure,
Masking sins with words of hollow ring,
Corrupting men by bribe and sinecure,
New seasons flower and warm hearts aspire,
The true and beautiful glow by their worth,
And virtue's self is such a cleansing fire
These powers shall create our land's rebirth
Of brotherhood, with peace eternal given
By Him to come to us on earth from heaven.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Resolution Against Compulsory Health Insurance Adopted by the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN T. WOOD
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I want to present for the earnest consideration of my colleagues the following resolution adopted by the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., at their regular meeting on March 19, 1951:

RESOLUTION AGAINST COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

At a regular meeting, March 19, 1951, the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., adopted the following resolution proposed by Mr. Dean P. Kimball, as chairman of a special committee on the subject:

"*Resolved*, That this association oppose the enactment of H. R. 54, the so-called national health insurance bill, for the following reasons:

"1. It will destroy the close personal relationship between patient and doctor. In this connection it should be pointed out that in time it will practically destroy the private practice of medicine. All doctors will, in practical effect, if not technically, become mere employees of the Federal Government.

"2. It will result in poor medical service as compared to that we now have. The compensation of the doctor may depend on the number of treatments or visits for which a set fee will be charged or the number of patients on his list. Treatment on a mass-production basis with too little time for each patient will be the result.

"3. It will cost the average family far more than it pays for medical service now and will add thousands of employees to the Federal Government and millions of dollars to the cost of Government. While the present bill calls for 3 percent of salaries to $4,800, some have estimated that it will eventually cost 12 percent of the first $4,800 of a person's earnings, or $576 a year to meet the costs of the plan. It may go even higher.

"4. It is not limited, as has been claimed by its supporters, to caring for cases requiring costly and extended medical or hospital treatment, but purports to take care of every minor illness. It is socialism at its worst, concerning as it does one of the most intimate and personal aspects of life, that of doctor and patient.

"5. There is now available insurance and other forms of mutual or group aid at moderate cost to cover costly hospital and medical service.

"6. It removes one of the spurs or incentives to sober, careful, and prudent living by offering medical care for every type of ailment whether willfully brought on by misconduct or a disregard of the rules of health."

I hereby certify that the undersigned is the secretary of the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., and as such verify and attest to the above resolution having been adopted by the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., at its regular meeting held in the Chevy Chase Community Center, March 19, 1951, and having been included in the minutes of said meeting.

Attest:

HENRY HALLAM,
Secretary, the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1951.*

Home Folks Are Not Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that the people who elected us are becoming aware of what has been happening here in Washington during the past few years is apparent from a letter from a housewife which reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: After reading your paper, The People's Opportunity, I have decided to put a few of the things down on paper that we in our family have been thinking about and discussing in recent years.

1. Mr. Truman said recently that we are in an emergency. I agree, but think that we were thrown into it at the time the idea was advanced that the world owes everyone a living—without first earning it. The CCC, PWA, WPA, and all the other jobs that were created, as well as the relief set-up that was used, really wrecked our economy. It spoiled a lot of workers who had been willing to earn their living before. We personally have not been able to hire farm labor that was worth their board, let alone wages, since then. People on relief would not let their children pick beans or cucumbers, even when we offered 25 cents a bushel for pickers. They could afford to increase their families, while people who earned their living and paid taxes to keep them could not afford larger families. It takes some people 15 or 20 years to wake up, apparently.

2. Old-age benefits: It used to be that people started saving for their old age when they were young. The ones who did not went to the county farm when they could no longer keep themselves. I notice we still have county farms, but people do not try to save; they plan on being kept after they are 65. I don't mean all of them—there are still some who refuse to become parasites—but in increasing numbers we have watched it happen. Many of those people would be a lot better off if they were working. All they have to do is sit around and try to figure out how they can get more for less. Also, at one time we knew of eight in one county who were getting paid to pass out the checks. One person who was alive could do that for a county.

3. The AAA or PMA or whatever it is now called is another big laugh. The fertilizer they furnished for farmers wouldn't go through the drills. It took three times as long to spread it as it would decent fertilizer. The marl they got was so bad it looked like gravel. They brought a load here; we refused it. We would rather get our own gravel. Their office force gets in each other's way, too. Last fall the township worker told us they now tested soil, for 20 cents a sample. The conservation group has been doing it free for years. Why can't they hire an efficiency expert and stop having four or five agencies trying to do the same thing and getting in each other's way? Judging from the waste in our county, it certainly must be monumental when it gets to Washington.

The people who suffered and started this country certainly would be sick and disgusted to see it now. Where has government, for the people, of the people, and by the people gone? I have heard many farmers say they want no subsidies or price supports. Supply and demand have worked before, certainly one man, or group of men, cannot order Old Mother Nature, or human nature, either. During the last war several string butchers, who raised no stock themselves, but spread several stock diseases all over got subsidies enough to buy three or four farms, while the farmers who did the work took the risks and had large amounts of money invested got no subsidies.

4. Their basketball scandal is another thing. Everyone has known for years that schools and colleges have paid athletes to go to their schools. One that we know of was later hired to coach and teach in a high school. He admitted himself, that the students knew more than he did. What can we expect of our children, when such things go on all the time? What has happened to our schools? When my mother started teaching, she had gone through the eighth grade, then took teachers' examinations. Now when children get through the eighth grade, how much do they really know? We should have trade schools to find and develop their talents, so that they will be self-supporting and self-respecting as they grow older. We certainly have people enough that we won't have to import workers if we can get back to the idea that we owe ourselves and our country an honest day's work for a day's pay.

5. We are getting tired of taxes, too, when it is just thrown away. We, in our household, work, plan, and save for things we really need. All the money that has been used to build roads in the jungle, given to England when she is still trading with Russia and Communist China is worse than wasted. It is working against us and our boys in Korea. Both of our sons, 20 and 21, enlisted more than a year ago. They are both in Korea, wondering, with all the other boys there, why they are there. What can our young people have respect for, believe in, or build their lives on?

All we have to do is go back in history. Why did the Pilgrims come over here? Who paid the Indians bounties on American scalps? Who hired Hessians to fight us? Who sent arms, money, and ships to the South during the Civil War? They boast that their policy never changes—apparently it has not, and will not as long as we are spineless, jellyfish, and turn our pockets inside out for them. They have it over on us—they can change their government and policy by a "vote of confidence." What would happen here, if we had the same set-up?

I think we have had weak Presidents ever since Teddy Roosevelt. If we had had his "Speak softly and carry a big stick" we wouldn't be in the mess we are in now.

Personally, I wouldn't hire anyone to work for me who had been a failure before. I doubt if any good businessman would, either. Let's get an efficiency expert, open all the doors and windows, have a good job of spring housecleaning, and then start over.

6. The Communists have been turned free. I am enclosing 25 cents to start a fund to buy gasoline to load them on a plane (after they have paid back to the Government what their trials cost) and unload them in North Korea. Since that is the kind of government they want, it is cruel to keep them here in this country. I am sure there are enough people who feel as I do. They will gladly contribute to such a cause.

7. I am enclosing some material which we have collected from recent papers and magazines. People really are waking up to the dangers we have been harboring for quite some time. I think Congress and the other elected Members would do well to think a little farther ahead than the ends of their noses.

Mrs. W. R. Rowe.

Mr. Speaker, in my reply to the foregoing, among other things the following was written:

Am sending back the 25 cents, as I know of no practical way of putting it to use. If it was $25,000,000, it is just possible we might counteract the propaganda paid for by British money.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Christian Science Monitor:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 14, 1951]

HUNGER DOESN'T WAIT

Three months ago Madame Pandit, Ambassador of India to the United States, presented to the State Department a request by her Government to buy 2,000,000 tons of grain in the United States on long-term credit in order to relieve imminent famine.

This was transmitted to Congress, and 1 month ago, after endorsement of the idea by former President Hoover, President Truman supported the request with a special message. He recommended, however, since there was doubt of the ability of India to assume such a debt and since it clearly could not pay in cash, that an immediate grant be made of the first 1,000,000 tons and terms then be studied for meeting the remainder of the need.

The House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee reported a bill about 10 days ago to authorize appropriations up to $100,000,000 for the full amount of grain if need be. But apparently there is serious question whether the House will get an opportunity to act on this measure with the promptness that a subject involving human survival deserves.

Placing of the bill on the House calendar rests with the House Rules Committee, which early this session was given renewed power of blocking legislation it did not favor. Some persons then were doubtful of the desirability of concentrating that authority in a few members. If the Rules Committee now should prove willing to "play politics with human misery," even misery on the opposite side of the globe, the effects on international friendship for the United States in a crucial area could become very, very injurious and costly.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 20, 1951]

THAT GRAIN FOR INDIA

Question quite naturally has been raised, "If India was willing to buy the 2,000,000 tons of wheat it has requested from the United States, why does the administration propose instead to make an outright gift of the grain?"

India is buying 4,000,000 tons of grain from the United States, Canada, Australia, Argentina, and other countries at market prices. In doing this and paying the ocean freight the Indian Government is using up all the foreign exchange it can safely spare. Its balances are not in dollars but in sterling, which Britain cannot convert. And India still is importing slightly more goods than it finds it possible to pay for by exports.

In these circumstances would it be hard-headed to bind that country to a schedule of payments for grain it cannot buy with cash? President Truman has recommended that 1,000,000 tons of wheat be authorized immediately as a grant to India, after which Congress could look into whether the entire second 1,000,000 tons is needed, whether it can be obtained elsewhere, whether it or part of it could be paid for, and whether stipulations should be attached to that part of the deal.

There are questions legitimately to be asked of the Indian Government. One is whether trade jealousy toward neighboring Pakistan is partly responsible for India's food plight. In 1949–50 India could have obtained 600,000 tons of surplus wheat from Pakistan. This year, though, Pakistan has none to spare and only a small surplus in prospect this spring. India also is criticized for devoting land to jute or cotton which might raise grain.

If study should show that India eventually can pay for part of the presently needed grain, then by all means the second half of the wheat program from the United States should be made partly or all on a loan basis. Stipulations might be added that India should obtain all available grain from nearby sources and should direct its agricultural program toward food rather than nonfood crops.

But the need of many million Indians for food this month and next is urgent. The initial grant from America's great surplus of wheat should be voted by Congress with all possible dispatch.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 24, 1951]

TIME IS NO ALLY HERE

Recently this page mentioned that action on the bill for authorization of aid to India in the form of grain waits on the willingness of the Rules Committee to place that bill on the calendar of the House of Representatives.

The proposal, with some details left to further legislation, has been approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It is backed by the administration, by former President Hoover, by bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress, and by most editorial opinion expressed on the subject.

It takes about 6 weeks to load a ship, sail to India, and unload. And some of the ships to be used are coming out of "moth balls." Meanwhile India has had to cut its ration for 125,000,000 people from 12 ounces to 9 ounces a day, and can fill the ration quotas only as ships arrive. Approximately 45,000,000 persons depend solely on the grain ration. How much hunger do the gentlemen of the House Rules Committee want to take the responsibility for?

Aid to Blind Person in Securing Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Government Employees' Exchange of March 24, 1951, and which gives a graphic account of the progress made by the Civil Service Commission in its efforts to aid blind persons in securing Government employment. I commend this article to my colleagues for their information:

TRANSCRIBERS, REPORTERS EXAMS FOR BLIND MARK PROGRESS FOR CSC

A dictating machine transcriber exam for the blind only and a shorthand reporter exam for which the blind may apply are two of the latest steps in the two-pronged handicap program of Dr. Verne K. Harvey, noted Medical Director of the Civil Service Commission.

Dr. Harvey's program, based on a realistic evaluation of physical requirements, is keyed to give the handicapped person a chance to do a job and at the same time help ease the Government personnel shortage.

The dictating machine transcribers will transcribe on a typewriter. The exam opened February 7 and closed March 2. As of February 27, with still a few days to go, 74 persons had applied for the exams, Dr. Harvey told a Government employees' exchange reporter.

Dr. Harvey explained that the exam has two parts: a performance test and a general abilities. For the performance test the applicant will transcribe from a record dictated by the Civil Service Commission and will be rated on accuracy and speed. The applicant must type at least 40 words a minute with a maximum of nine mistakes. Requirements are flexible so that if greater speed is attained more errors will be allowed.

On the general abilities test questions will be read to the applicant and recorded by a sighted person. The entire examination will take about 2 hours.

Some vacancies are open in these jobs, Dr. Harvey told the Exchange, and as the typist shortage becomes critical, agencies are expected to use up the register. A dictating machine is actually a time-saving device for the administrator, Dr. Harvey noted.

BLIND REPORTER

For the shorthand-reporter examination, for which a sighted person ordinarily uses shorthand or a stenograph machine, any machine that noiselessly records the voice of the shorthand reporter is acceptable. The blind use a machine with a cover that goes over the nose and mouth and a strap that goes around the head. A flexible tube leads to the recording device. The facepiece fits snug so no sound gets in but the reporter's voice. The reporter must take 5 minutes' dictation at 175 words a minute for the test. One hour is allowed for transcribing. The jobs are from grade 6 to 9, paying from $3,450 to $4,600 annually.

The blind reporter speaks in natural English, records the name of the speaker and everything said. Simply recording a meeting is not feasible, Dr. Harvey said, since people forget to state their name, and at important moments all talk at once and the recording becomes a babble.

Dr. Harvey emphasized that on these tests the blind have the same standard of accuracy as a sighted person. Much of the philosophy behind his widely praised handicap program came out in his statement: "To have a sound handicap program you must expect the same performance out of the handicapped as the nonhandicapped. The alternate is an aid program which is a type of welfare work. I don't believe these handicapped people are looking for that in working for the Government. They want to prove that they can do the job."

Blind employees gainfully employed were first used on a large scale by the Government in World War II, Dr. Harvey said. Before that the only openings were special jobs at FSA set aside by law for the blind. When Dr. Harvey first introduced the use of blind employees, some personnel chiefs were skeptical. Personnel men came by the dozens to see the work of the blind girl, Miss Caroline Hastings (now Mrs. McNichols), working as a transcriber at CSC. They went away convinced that the blind could do the job.

There are at least 30 to 35 blind people employed by the Government in Washington at present. Fifteen of these are in the special blind service section at the Library of Congress. VA employs eight in its central office and four in its regional office. Others are: Bureau of the Budget, one; CSC, fourth regional office, one; ICC, one; Immigration and Naturalization Service, one; Agriculture, one; and FSA, one or two. Most of these are typists, the Bureau of the Budget has a blind analyst.

United States Must First Win the Subversive War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, we all know that this Congress has a tendency to reflect the immediate moods of the people. We therefore find ourselves rushing defense legislation during each crisis, and relaxing into complacency whenever the immediate threat to our security seems slightly lessened. That this tendency is not new is demonstrated by the excellent editorial by Mr. Manchester Boddy, of Los Angeles, which I should like to call to the attention of the House:

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of March 30, 1951]

UNITED STATES MUST FIRST WIN THE SUBVERSIVE WAR

Recently over a national radio network Gen. William J. Donovan, former Director of the Office of Strategic Services, and now a working member of the Committee on the Present Danger, went back 2,000 years to wise old Demosthenes, the Greek orator, who thus delivered himself to the people of fourth century B. C., Athens:

"Shame on you Athenians * * * for not wishing to understand that in war one must not allow oneself to be at the command of events, but to forestall them. You Athenians are the strongest of all the Greeks, in ships, cavalry, infantry, and revenue, and you do not make the best of them.

"You make war against Philip like a barbarian when he wrestles—if he suffers a blow, he immediately puts his hand to it. If he is struck again, he puts his hand there too; but he has not the skill or does not think of parrying the blow aimed at him or of evading his antagonist. You, likewise, if you hear tell that Philip has attacked the Chaeronea, you send help there; if he is at Thermopylae, you run there; and if he turns aside, you follow him, to right or left, as if you were acting on his orders. Never a fixed plan, never any precautions: you wait for bad news before you act."

IRAN IS PERFECT EXAMPLE

General Donovan points to recent developments in Iran as a perfect example of how communism is waging its war of aggression.

"A news article of March 15," he says, "states that the Soviet Union has been courting Iranian officials for 6 months with presents, such as release of captured Iranian border guards and the signing of a $20,000,000 barter treaty.

"Iran produces 6 percent of the world's oil. It is the most valuable of the non-American supply sources which serve the western nations. It is a vital strategic area and therefore a sought-after military prize. There has been open speculation on the possibility of a Stalin invasion and what we should do in that event.

"But why should Stalin run the risk of a shooting war? Instead he called up Tudeh, the Soviet-controlled political party, to lead a movement in the Iranian lower house to nationalize the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., despite the fact that it is 58 percent British owned and is operated under a concession that does not expire until 1993.

"Watch the succeeding steps. Moscow has already paved the way to obtain a trade agreement, an agreement which could give her use and control of these British wells and refineries. If this cold war tactic proves successful, Stalin will have out-maneuvered us again, without the necessity of taking over the Government, let alone a military invasion. * * *

"We have only just begun to grasp the special nature of Communist organization and methods," continues General Donovan. "The real strength of the Soviets lies in their world-wide organization, highly developed techniques and communications, and in the discipline of leaders especially trained in the Lenin school in Moscow."

CANNOT LOWER OUR GUARD

"All of this should teach us that we are faced by an enemy against whom we cannot lower our guard—a foe that is always alert—and ruthless—and tenacious. Against such a foe we must exercise rustained effort, perhaps for many years. Soviet tactics may change even to the point of temporary retreat, but the objective is always the same—a world empire.

"Only by our understanding of the manner in which the fight will be carried to us will we be able to deal with it. We can't sit back and hope to be let alone. There is no place for complacency, or indifference, or fear—we can't buy our way out or dream our way out, nor should we be misled by seeming successes until we have totaled the score on a global scale.

"We must win this subversive war. It is necessary to win it because in winning it we would have the edge in the shooting war, if that war should ever come. It is essential to win it because in the winning we may make a shooting war impossible. Therefore, we must be strong enough to compel the peace."

For a long time General Donovan has been urging a "fight fire with fire" policy. Instead of waiting for the Reds to start new trouble in Indochina or Iran or Berlin or

Malaya to keep the Western Powers off balance and in a state of continuous confusion, he thinks our side should do a little "behind the curtain" work and keep the Kremlin guessing.

Well—that's the kind of global war we are in, and even though we are prepared to fight an old-fashioned shooting war, we may very well find that the "new" technique—about which old Demosthenes orated 2,000 years ago—will continue to be the main characteristic of continuing warfare.

Cut the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, after President Truman presented us with a staggering $71,000,000,000 budget and then had the effrontery to dare Congress to cut it, I called upon my colleagues to join me in accepting this challenge by voting for rigid economy in nondefense spending. I pointed out that Mr. Truman was asking the American people to make sacrifices in their daily living, through increased taxes, but that he himself was refusing to make political sacrifices by suspending his give-away schemes for socializing America. I called attention to the estimate of Senator BYRD, of Virginia, that at least $7,000,000,000 could be trimmed from the budget without impairing the defense effort in any way. And I promised the taxpayers of the Third Indiana District that I, for one, would not vote to increase taxes a single penny until every bit of fat had been trimmed from the President's budget.

My remarks on this subject were subsequently printed in several newspapers in northern Indiana, including the Michigan City News-Dispatch. A few days later I was pleasantly surprised to see an article in that newspaper which I quote in full herewith:

HIGH TAXES ARE YOU?—HE DOES SOMETHING ABOUT IT, WILL YOU?

Everyone talks about high taxes but few do anything about it. Few, except William Welk, that is.

Welk, a prison guard who lives at 219 East Eleventh, read with approval in his February 28 News-Dispatch that third district Congressman SHEP CRUMPACKER was urging his colleagues to accept President Truman's dare and cut the $71,000,000,000 budget. The story gave Welk an idea.

Carefully he typed the story neatly on several sheets of paper and beneath it a note to the Congressman telling him that the persons whose names and addresses appear on subsequent sheets agree with his stand. Then Welk began getting signatures in his free time.

In 1 week, more than 700 persons signed the sheets with their names and addresses.

"There are Democrats and Republicans alike on these lists of names," he said.

Now he has received some help to add at least that many more signatures before sending the lists to Washington. Blank lists for signing have been placed at the News-Dispatch and chamber of commerce offices for anyone who feels the same way to sign.

Mr. Speaker, the document referred to in the above article is now in my possession. It is beautifully bound and is inscribed as a "testimonial of confidence and appreciation" extended to me for my stand in support of Government economy. It bears the signatures of more than 1,500 citizens of Michigan City, including many leaders in civic affairs.

My purpose in calling this incident to the attention of Congress is to emphasize a simple fact that many of us here may be inclined to overlook. That fact is that there is a tremendous ground swell of feeling in this country against the spendthrift policies of the Truman administration. There is a great popular demand for a program of rigid Government economy of the kind proposed by Senator BYRD in the Senate and by Republican leaders in the House. The people are aware that the distinguished Senator from Virginia spoke the truth when he said recently:

> The 5 years that have passed since World War II ended may well go down in history as the most irresponsible 5 years of the great American Republic. • • •
>
> In those 5 years has been squandered the greatest prosperity ever to come to any nation; the Federal Government has collected far more taxes than ever before; it has spent far more money on purely domestic-civilian programs than ever before; it has spent far more money abroad than ever before; it has spent far more money for defense than ever before without achieving preparedness; and it has failed to curtail the greatest public debt any nation has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, it is futile to look to President Truman for leadership in this fight to restore a sound American economy. Mr. Truman is committed to a program of more and more spending, and higher and higher taxes. The leadership must come from Congress. The people are looking to us to do more than pay mere lip service to economy. They are expecting us to work for it and to vote for it.

At the time Mr. Truman presented his record budget to Congress I pointed out that there were vast opportunities for savings in nearly every civilian-domestic item. Several of the President's proposals were designed to initiate pet projects of the administration and fulfill political, vote-buying promises made to various pressure groups. Good illustrations of this type are proposed appropriations to socialize farming and medicine. These appropriations, in my opinion, should be rejected outright.

A second step we must take is to serve notice on our military leaders that unnecessary waste, duplication, and inefficiency in the defense program will not be tolerated. Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force are not sacred. They must be carefully scrutinized. Their actual expenditures, reaching astronomical figures, must be the subject of continuing and constructively critical review.

No one for a moment wants to deny our fighting men the best in training, equipment and care. No one wants to scrimp on weapons or ammunition or on any of the essential items which comprise the framework of a sound defense structure. But anyone who has ever served in the Armed Forces knows that military supply officials are not noted for their financial prudence. They need to have applied to them the firm hand of those whose responsibility it is to total up the bill which is to be submitted to the people.

Without intending to imply any criticism of our Nation's military leaders, I am convinced that substantial savings could be effected in the defense effort without in any way impairing the soundness of our defense effort.

For example, with millions of pounds of Government-owned butter and eggs stored in caves around the country, it recently was disclosed that the Quartermaster General has been contracting to buy butter and eggs on the open market at current high prices. There was no effort at cooperation between the Army and the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has been selling these same foodstuffs at a nominal sum or, in some cases, giving them away. Proper liaison between Government agencies would have prevented this inexcusable waste of public funds.

I appreciate the fact that mistakes are bound to occur when mobilization preparations are hurried as they are at this time. My only point is that the constant vigilance of Congress could do much in this field to protect the public purse.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat that Congress should have as its goal a reduction of at least $7,000,000,000 in Federal spending. This reduction, in my opinion, should have priority over any new or additional taxes in our effort to obtain a balanced budget.

As further evidence that demands for Government economy are widespread, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point, a petition from another county in my district, Elkhart County, which I believe eloquently expresses the majority viewpoint of the American people:

ELKHART, IND.

Hon. SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRUMPACKER: The undersigned, all residents and voters of Elkhart County, Ind., desire that you be advised of our reactions to the recent proposed Federal tax increases.

No one of us desires to evade or avoid our just share of the tax burden. That is a price we must all pay for the privilege of citizenship in this wonderful country. However, we cannot, and we will not, tolerate any increase in taxes at the present time for any other reason than to rearm this country and our allies to meet aggression.

The proposed budget of the President contains, as you know, many provisions for increases in the allotments for the President's social reforms, or shall we say, socialistic program. We are definitely opposed to the expenditure of any more funds to increase the scope of Federal control in this country.

The economic stability of this country has been shaken and disturbed and is in danger of being completely disrupted. You appreciate, better than we, that such a result would throw us to our knees before Russia without even having had an opportunity to defend ourselves.

We appeal to you, and we advise you as our elected representative, to do all in your power to curb these foolhardy proposals, and to guard every dollar that must be expended. The future of our country is at

stake. We will need every dollar our economy can raise to succeed in the conflict ahead. We expect you to do all you can to conserve the tax dollars we must all sacrifice.

Forget the Dams and Give the Triple Cities Flood Walls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, probably the most disgraceful exhibition of cheap politics on record has been displayed for the past 4 or 5 years in the valleys of Chenango and Susquehanna in New York's Southern Tier.

A continuous, deliberate campaign of misinformation and deceit against the wishes of the people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and Vestal in regard to adequate flood control has been and is still being waged by undercover agents of sabotage.

It all started as an attempt in certain high places back home and in Washington to discredit the Hall proposal of flood-wall protection for the greater Endicott-Vestal area of the Susquehanna River.

No sooner would I make a public utterance of what everybody in Broome County knows to be true, namely, that these walls are the first line of defense against floods, than a hue and cry would be raised by sundry experts that the only possible solution was the building of dams miles up the Susquehanna and Chenango above Binghamton.

This campaign of rule or ruin has accomplished the blocking of my proposal and has already caused damage to a billion dollars' worth of public and private and industrial properties in our neighborhood in the 1948 flood.

It is apparent that the saboteurs of the Hall plan preferred the satisfaction of defeating this logical flood-wall project rather than saving the triple cities from floods.

These same smart alecks are now gleefully jubiliant over the prospect of local flood works being shelved with preference directed to our national defense program.

They grin and grimace at my suggestion to call our flood walls a defense priority when I demand that the Army engineers build them anyway.

Not content in wrecking proper safeguards in the interest of our Triple Cities population, they have extended their campaign of harassment to the rural folk of Chenango, Delaware, Otsego Counties.

The tremendous torrent of protesting letters I am now receiving from committees and people in the areas of Mount Upton, South New Berlin, Rockdale, Afton, Unadilla, and other nearby communities, tells me the enemies of proper flood control are on the march.

There is no reason why the rural areas of Unadilla, Butternuts, or any other point in the Susquehanna and Chenango watersheds should be destroyed by a massive dam-construction program in place of the erection of our Triple Cities flood walls.

You can put me down as standing solidly on the side of the citizens of both the metropolitan and rural areas in this fight against the hypocrites and monekywrench throwers trying to build these mighty dams ahead of the Hall floodwall projects.

I say to these finaglers, leave the rural people alone, do not ruin their lands, their homes, their properties just because you are determined to deprive the Triple Cities of flood walls.

Is there more gravy in juicy contracts for building dams than for the flood walls? You know there is, and so do I.

Be patriotic Americans for a change. Forget the profits, the dollars you will line your pockets with if the dams are built.

Forget the dams and get busy on our flood walls, which ought to reach solidly clear from Conklin and Kirkwood away down past West Endicott and Vestal, nearly to the Tioga County line.

You people up there in Chenango, Otsego, and Delaware Counties can rest assured I will fight these birds to the finish. I will not take this dam building lying down. My preference is floodwall construction down where the trouble is in the Triple Cities, and I do not believe in wrecking your houses either.

Korean Policy and Our Diplomatic Relations in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, John C. Caldwell, former Embassy attaché at Seoul, Korea, gave an address Tuesday afternoon in Derby, Conn., to the Sarah Riggs Humphreys Chapter, DAR, an account of which was carried in Wednesday's edition of the Ansonia Sentinel.

His remarks, which were confined to Korean policy as promulgated by the State Department and our diplomatic relations in the Far East, merit far greater circulation than given by their printing in a local newspaper.

Mr. Caldwell, a first-hand observer, related astonishing tales of our failure to recognize the basic differences in oriental and occidental behavior. One portion of his address relates to the obvious incompetency of embassy personnel and to the tragic failure of State Department intelligence in foreseeing the invasion of South Korea.

This is the most forthright account I have yet encountered of the complete inability of the State Department to represent the people of the Unitd States in its foreign policy.

The story is one of shame—it cries out for corrective action.

The news account follows:

CALDWELL SAYS SNOBS, INCOMPETENTS, ALCOHOLICS REPRESENTED UNITED STATES AT SEOUL; TELLS OF GRAVE MISTAKE MADE AT YALTA

Diplomatic mistakes caused us to fail in spreading the principles of democracy in Korea, John C. Caldwell, former United States Embassy Attaché at Seoul, Korea, told a large gathering of members of Sarah Riggs Humphreys Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the meeting held Tuesday afternoon in Library Hall.

"We had a wonderful opportunity to teach the people what democracy was," he said, "but we left the people confused. Part of our failure is a matter of personnel," the speaker declared. "I don't believe there are many Communists in the State Department despite what Senator MCCARTHY says, but there are people who are not doing a good job of selling America to the people of the world," averred the former United States Embassy attaché.

"Today people are of tremendous importance, especially the people who represent us abroad. The Voice of America employs 10,650 people, and the President wants to raise this to 13,000."

WRONG PERSONNEL

"Unfortunately, alcoholics, incompetent people, and people who believe in the Gook philosophy are representing us. A person who has a Gook philosophy is a person who believes that people who live differently or not as well as he does are a low-class people. Our representatives in Seoul showed in their everyday actions that they disliked the people with whom they worked. Half of our people detested the Koreans and showed it. They knew nothing of the people, their habits or customs. The Communists in their propaganda say we are snobs and we live up to their propaganda."

NO TRAINING

Mr. Caldwell went on to say that the United States Government gives no training to the people attached to the State Department.

"There is no way of testing aptitudes. We send them to Washington, D. C., for 3 weeks to learn State Department protocol. They learn how to correctly address the Ambassador and how to drop their calling cards in order of importance. We teach them nothing about the country to which they are going, the customs or the people. A salesman is not a good salesman unless he is interested in his prospect. Incalculable damage has been done by sending incompetent personnel as America's representatives in foreign lands."

CHRONIC ALCOHOLIC

He told of a man in the State Department at Seoul who was third in importance. This man was a chronic alcoholic, the speaker averred, who was treated for alcoholism and released, readmitted for treatment and again released. He attempted suicide, was again treated and released and is still on duty representing you in Korea.

Mr. Caldwell, born in China of missionary parents, said he came to this country for the first time when he entered college. He declared that Korea was the big story of 1950 and the side show of 1951. Korea will continue to be of great interest to America and Russia. The latter, he said, thought it could win a large part of the geography of the world with America doing nothing to stop her. He continued that he was afraid that Korea will continue as a danger spot for a good many years.

He wondered if we would learn a lesson from our mistakes in Korea—diplomatic mistakes which cost the Americans 60,000 in casualties and a total of 1,000,000 casualties of all nations.

AN OLD COUNTRY

Korea is an old country, the speaker said, with a history that goes back 4,235 years. It has been fought over and grasped at by neighboring countries for a long time. In the nineteenth century, Japan, China, and Russia fought for its control, with the Japanese winning out early in the twentieth century. Russia has always been interested in Korea, with both Stalin and Lenin expounding the theory that if the billion and a half people of the Far East could be indoctrinated in communism these people could provide the raw manpower to completely control the western capitalistic nations.

YALTA MISTAKE

The greatest mistake America made was made when we gave entry to the Far East to Russia at Yalta. We were anxious for Russia to get into the Asiatic war, he declared. Our Intelligence Department was not operating very well at the time. Japan was near defeat. We did not need Russia, Mr. Caldwell pointed out.

The idea at Yalta was that we would enter South Korea to disarm the Japanese and Russia would do the same in North Korea, so the thirty-eighth parallel came into being simply because it was a line which more or less divided Korea in half. But no thought was given to the fact that two-thirds of the population lives in the south, which is almost completely agricultural, and one-third the population resides in the north, which is where all the industries are located.

DISARM JAPAN

The thirty-eighth parallel was to be in existence only until the Japanese had been disarmed. A United States-U. S. S. R. commission was set up to agree on a government for Korea, but Russia would not agree to anything proposed. Finally, in 1948, the United Nations sent a commission which tried to work with Russia, but was denied the right to go north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

GOVERNMENT

Finally it was decided to elect a government in the American zone, and in May 1948 an election was held, Mr. Caldwell informed his listeners which was a free election, more democratic than in my home State, Tennessee. Dr. Syngman Rhee became President. The South Koreans had more freedom in 1948-50 than ever before. More than 2,000,000 refugees came in from North Korea, over mountain passes at night, under great risk, to get into South Korea.

The military government, established in 1945 and continuing until 1948, left as soon as the South Korean Government was established despite the interest and demands of the Korean people. Our Department of State took over all operations in South Korea, and it is the Department of State which can keep us out of war, or, by a bad job, get us into war, the speaker emphasized.

LARGE ESTABLISHMENT

"As soon as our troops left in the summer of 1948 we built a very large diplomatic establishment, the largest ever maintained overseas. Larger than in great capitals of the world. In Seoul we had an establishment of 1,600 Americans. There were 11 hotels, 10 bars, a beauty parlor, barber shop, taxis, and liquor store. The United States Government owned 375 homes. Good salaries were paid, with 100 employees getting $10,000 per year, plus a house, rent free, plus two servants paid for by the State Department, plus free utilities and fuel. Still, Seoul was considered a hardship post, and we were paid 25 percent extra for having to live in a hardship post."

Mr. Caldwell said that he believed State Department employees should be comfortable, but I think when we have luxury then we create a chasm between ourselves and the people we are supposed to serve. The Koreans have a very low standard of living, and the Communist tries to capitalize on the needs of the people. The Communists always point to America as rich, imperialistic America, and how we lived created a wonderful Communist line. And how they used it. They told the people we were only interested in making money and more money. There should be some lessons we should learn on how to develop diplomatic relations in the future.

FAULTY INTELLIGENCE

"On June 25 we heard that the invasion had started. We had joked about the time when the Communists would invade, take us all prisoners, and send us to Siberia. State Department intelligence had reported that the Communist morale was low, that there was no connection between the Korean Communists and Moscow, that the North Koreans had not good military equipment, and that the South Korean Army was so strong it could stop any invasion." He pointed out that this information was received through our intelligence despite the fact that Seoul was only 25 air miles from the thirty-eighth parallel and that the North Koreans had evacuated whole villages, widened highways so that tanks could get by, strengthened buildings."

INCREDULOUS AMBASSADOR

"Our Ambassador at Seoul refused to believe the story of the invasion for hour after hour and refused to allow the evacuation of our women and children. He would not allow American planes to evacuate our women and children because he feared it might provoke an incident. Finally he ordered the evacuation and there was only one boat in the harbor at Inchon, a boat with a capacity for 12 people and it carried 682 women and children to Japan. Many had to be taken off the boat on stretchers—all the result of faulty intelligence. In this battle against communism we must have honest intelligence in State Department operations," the speaker declared.

SIX KNEW

He continued that although we had not believed the invasion rumors, the British, with a staff of only six people, had sent out evacuation orders 3 weeks before. The South Korean Government had warned us of the coming invasion as had the government of Chiang Kai-shek. "We were so full of wishful thinking, so hopeful that the North Koreans would believe we were their friends instead of the Russians being their friends, that we believed that there would be no trouble.

"I was in the State Department for 8 years and have heard top officials declaim on the merits of Chinese Communists, declaring that we would find no real tie between the Chinese Communists and Russia. The North Korean or Chinese Communist in the Far East is part of international communism. This trouble in Korea started at Russia's direction. Our whole history for the last 5 years in dealing with communism has failed miserably."

ONE LOCATION

Mr. Caldwell told of the Voice of America, whose purpose it is through radio, newspapers, motion pictures, and information centers to sell our point of view. He said that 33 persons were engaged in Korea simply selling our point of view, to teach the Koreans about democracy and American aims. Our first mistake was that the 33 engaged in various phases of selling America to the Koreans all were located in Seoul. The Koreans are largely agrarian. They live on farms and very few get to Seoul. Yet no real effort was made to reach the millions of people on the farms.

The people are illiterate but intelligent, Mr. Caldwell said. He told of the library of 16,000 volumes maintained at Seoul and of the 200 periodicals received every month, among which were Vogue and Harper's Bazaar. He said we were trying to teach democracy to a people who couldn't read English.

One of the unfortunate things is, the speaker said, that the State Department operates the same no matter where it is, in Norway, England, Iran, or Korea. So inflexible is the list of reading material that the list for London, England, is the same as it is for Seoul, Korea.

EXHIBIT

He told of a group of students who asked him if he could get an exhibit of public housing to show in Korea because of the desperate housing shortage. A "magnificent exhibit" of Peter Stuyvesant Village in New York City was flown to Korea, all fine brick buildings. The people become frustrated, he said, when they see this sort of exhibit when they have only straw and mud to work with. The students came to Mr. Caldwell and told him that the exhibit was fine, and that, perhaps, in a hundred years something like that might be built in Korea, but could something be brought in which would be of help today.

He told of asking for a motion picture on college life, expecting a film on a small college. Instead a documentary film on the University of California was sent to be shown to students who have no textbooks and who must study in frame buildings without heat.

COMMUNISTS WORK FOR US

Mr. Caldwell said that we failed in our intelligence and we failed to sell the people our aims and what democracy really means but, he continued, "I don't think all is lost. Where we have failed the Communists have won it for us." The occupation of southern Korea by the Communists has caused the Koreans to be violently against communism. He said that in letters from friends in China he is informed that the anti-Communist feeling is greater than ever before. They know that the economic and farm reforms do not work.

EVANGELICAL ZEAL

In conclusion Mr. Caldwell said that he hoped that from our mistakes we can learn how to reach the people and that now is the time to win or lose the people of the Far East. He said what is needed is the evangelical zeal which marked the work of the missionaries. He told of his father who 51 years ago went to China as a missionary and of his wife's father who went to Korea as a missionary 40 years ago, when conditions were bad and living arrangements poor. He declared that those missionaries had succeeded because they believed in what they were selling, Christianity. They learned to like the people. Mr. Caldwell emphasized that if we could get the State Department to believe in what we are attempting to sell and to use the evangelical zeal that marked the missionaries "then we can win this great fight against communism."

Safe Alternative to a Big Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the House to the following thoughtful statement relative to universal military training which appeared as an editorial in the Evening Star yesterday:

SAFE ALTERNATIVE TO A BIG ARMY

Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, is right. This country cannot afford either the economic or military consequence of being without universal military training in the threatening era which stretches ahead into the indefinite future. A military training system is a necessary adjunct of a strong and ready Reserve program to back up the standing army. With such a system we can run the calculated risk of maintaining a small Regular Defense Establishment, knowing that in an emergency there will be trained manpower instantly available to augment the standing Armed Forces.

Without an adequate trained Reserve the only safe plan would be to build up a much larger Regular Army than is currently planned. There is a limit, however, to the defense burden which our economy can support.

The bill before the House differs from the Senate-approved bill in several minor respects and one major one. The House version would reduce the present draft age of 19 to 18½, while the Senate bill would lower it to 18. Draft service is lengthened from 21 to 26 months, as compared with the Senate requirement for 24 months' service. The House bill has no limit on the number of men who could be inducted, whereas the Senate placed a 4,000,000 limit on military manpower. A major difference between the bills is that the House measure places a definite 3-year limit on the drafting of men for actual service. The Senate defeated a somewhat similar limitation proposed by Senator TAFT.

While the 3-year time limit would be restricted by the language of the House bill to only that part of selective service which channeled men into the Regular Armed Forces, leaving UMT unaffected. The Star believes it would be a mistake to raise any legal barrier to further induction of men in this unsettled period. Since the program contemplated under the legislation would involve a tapering off of inductions for active service, it is not clear what is to be gained by setting a deadline on further inductions. If, as is hoped, conditions grow no worse than they are today, or if they improve, inductions for actual service will have reached a minimum by 1954 or before, making statutory restrictions more or less academic. If, on the other hand, the world situation worsens before 1954, it would be foolhardy to place the induction system under the handicap of a deadline.

In any event, the House should take care to see that any time limit which may be adopted does not apply to universal military training. UMT is a long-view security program that should be set up on a permanent basis. It should continue to supply a reservoir of trained manpower in time of peace as well as during emergency periods. The very existence of such a reservoir would help to keep the peace.

In the True Tradition of the Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a statement from Senator CHARLES TOBEY, of New Hampshire, elicited by Mr. Fortune Pope, editor of the Il Progresso, national newspaper serving the Italian-American population of the Nation.

To me, unity among the various minority groups that form our population is a cherished and desired state. Therefore, I was pleased at the action of Mr. Pope in clearing up a serious misunderstanding concerning Italo-Americans, which arose from the Senate crime investigation hearings in New York. I say serious because at this time, while the Nation is girded to stepping up preparations for full mobilization, unity is of the utmost necessity.

Fortune Pope, as a spokesman for the Americans of Italian origin, performed a public service in keeping with the best traditions of the great free press, in traveling to Washington to meet with Senator TOBEY to clarify certain points made by the Senator on radio and television, regarding Italian immigrants to this country.

In eliciting the following statement from Senator TOBEY, Mr. Pope has done a distinct service to Americans of Italian origin whose exemplary citizenship has contributed greatly to America's growth, and to the American people as a whole:

RADIO STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES TOBEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the light of certain misunderstandings which have arisen from the recent crime investigation hearings in New York, I am grateful to WHOM and the Progresso for this opportunity to clarify those misunderstandings.

Issue has been made about a letter which I read into the record at one of the recent television sessions of the crime committee hearings.

I read that letter to convey the thought that the overwhelming majority of the Italian-American citizens are good men, such as the writer of that letter, and just because a small percentage of these people have done wrong, it casts no reflection on the many honest, hard-working, patriotic Americans of Italian extraction who have contributed their talent and industry to make our country strong and great. My sole purpose in reading this letter was to pay tribute to those fine Americans who—in contrast to a small minority—have given their best to the arts and industries and civic life of these United States.

I felt the spirit of that letter conveyed these thoughts and that it did not need to be clarified by any statement from me. However, if it was misunderstood, I am glad to clarify the point that I was trying to make. I count many Americans of Italian extraction among my close and intimate friends.

The last thing I would have in mind or do would be to cast aspersions on any racial group. I would consider that entirely un-American.

The strength of our country lies in the fact that here are woven into the fabric of American citizenship the blood of all nations, blended into our national life, making for strength and unity.

Good Italian-American citizens, as well as the good citizens of other minority segments of our population, have not had their good record damaged by the handful of evildoers who were called to testify before our committee. I know that I speak for all the members of the committee in assuring you of the heartfelt sincerity with which I say this.

Topics of Concern to the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the current draft extension and universal military training measure, there have been occasional references to the United States Marine Corps. Things which I have heard have been uniformly complimentary. Of particular and timely interest has been the comment on the excellent job done by the civilian component—the Reserve of the United States Marines.

In this, I take particular pride because of my long association with the Reserve and because during the closing phase of World War II and for some months thereafter I was director of the Reserve. As such I had a part in the planning of the organization which has functioned so magnificently and with such telling effect during the Korean troubles.

Every since I became a marine in 1917 I have asked myself the question which so many others have asked and are still asking: Why do marines fight they way they do? I have just read a letter sent by the Commandant of the Marine Corps under date of February 7, 1951, to all general and commanding officers in the corps. It is an exceptional document and should be read by everyone in any way connected with the armed services. It would also be of value to everyone who is in a position of authority or leadership over others.

In this letter of the Commandant to his officers, we may have found an important key to the question: Why do marines fight the way they do?

The Commandant's letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
HEADQUARTERS,
UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1951.

From: Commandant of the Marine Corps.
To: Distribution List.
Subject: Topics of concern to the Marine Corps.

1. Since it is obviously impracticable to hold the Commandant's annual conference of general officers under the current circumstances, the medium of this letter is employed to acquaint all Marine Corps general officers and other commanding officers with the Commandant's views on a number of matters of concern to the entire Marine Corps.

2. This, unquestionably, is one of the most critical periods in the history of the Marine Corps. Following demobilization and further progressive administrative reduction from 1945 to June 1950, we have again embarked on a program of expansion in a new period of national emergency. The First Marine Division and the First Marine Aircraft Wing have already demonstrated in Korea that marines of today can equal the outstanding performance of their predecessors. The actions of the Marine Corps in the months and years ahead may very possibly have some measure of influence on the destiny of the country. These actions, beyond question, will determine the future of the Marine Corps.

3. The reputation of the Corps—the manner in which it is looked upon by the American people whom it serves—is a priceless asset. It was established by faithful and unswerving service rendered with a high order of professional competency at all times. A great part of it was due to success of marines in battle. A significant fraction comes, however, from the fact that habitually marines discharge any job assigned in a satisfactory manner. The public has come to associate competence and efficiency with the Marine Corps and it is a responsibility of every marine to uphold this reputation. The Marine Corps will never become so large or impersonal as to be indifferent to the activities of the individual marine. The success of the Corps in the past has been the result of the collective efforts of many individuals. Success in the future will be attained by the same type of effort.

4. Attitude: In any period of expansion, it is difficult to retain a personal, individual approach to the men. To do so requires extraordinary effort on the part of every officer and noncommissioned officer. It is expected that whatever effort is necessary will be made; whatever measures are required will be taken. Should the time ever arrive when the individual marine becomes—or is permitted to believe that he has become—only a number of an MOS, then the Marine Corps will, in fact, have commenced to decline. In the 6 months from July 1950 to January 1951, the Marine Corps doubled its strength. With expansion of that order, it is far from simple to instill in every marine the proper sense of responsibility and pride in the Corps. Nevertheless, it is a job that must be done.

5. Interservice relations: As a military service of this Nation, the Marine Corps has certain clearly defined functions. The Marine Corps' justification is dependent entirely on the manner in which these functions are carried out. An implied responsibility is that of complete and wholehearted cooperation with the other services. The American people definitely, and quite properly, expect this to be done. Neither that nor any other worthwhile purpose is served by interservice controversy. Accordingly, it is expected that every possible measure will be taken to work in harmony with the other services. The emergency facing this country will require work and sacrifice on the part of every American. The immediate task of the Marine Corps in this emergency is to develop and maintain combat forces in being. This requires the complete and undivided effort of every marine. Perfecting and maintaining the proficiency of the Marine Corps is our full-time job. Relations with other services can and will be conducted on a basis of mutual cooperation and without sacrifice or compromise of Marine Corps principles. Marine participation in interservice controversy in any form acts to the detriment of the Marine Corps and to the entire national defense structure, and is a disservice to both.

6. Economy: The extensive program of expansion on which the services have embarked is by no means to be interpreted as indicating that previous measures of economy can be relaxed. While it is true that there will be more money, more men, and more matériel in the coming months, it is also true that the need to do the most with the least is far greater than it has ever been before. In order to realize the greatest possible return, it will be necessary to adhere to the most rigid measures of economy. Assignment of personnel to noncombatant units will continue to be on a basis of strict austerity. Every allocation of funds, personnel, and matériel to supporting functions must be carefully and continually screened to insure that it is made on the basis of minimum needs. The past efforts of the Marine Corps to make the most of its available means have been uniformly successful. The need for these efforts is even more pressing today than it was in the past. The immediate goal is to develop, in the shortest possible time, formations within the Fleet Marine Forces with the personnel, matériel, and training required to permit them to carry out Marine Corps combat missions. The urgency is such as to prohibit diversion of any of our limited resources to less essential tasks. Every noncombat activity must carry its full share of the burden required to place our maximum effort in the Fleet Marine Forces. Adherence to this policy is a command responsibility.

7. Success in combat can be attributed in great measure to leadership, training, and discipline. In its efforts to produce and maintain combat forces in being, the Marine Corps must direct its attention to these important factors.

(a) Leadership: The development of troop leaders is a continuing process. In a period of expansion such as this, there must be continual screening for men who can be trained to make good leaders. They must be trained with meticulous care. There is no better training device than that of constant demonstration of good leadership practices. There are indications that at least some junior officers and noncommissioned officers are either unaware of or completely indifferent to many of their fundamental responsibilities.

One of the most significant of these is the binding obligation to employ the authority of their rank solely for its intended purpose. There have been instances in which this authority has been so perverted as to result in the physical mistreatment of individual marines. Abuse of authority can undermine and eventually destroy a military organization. In such circumstances, the fault is not alone with the officer or noncommissioned officer concerned. It is clearly indicative of failure on the part of more senior officers, particularly in the matters of leadership and supervision.

(b) Training: Training is, of course, preparation for battle. Thus, it is the most important function of troops not engaged in combat. It is important that the men understand that the training is designed not only to improve their individual performance in combat but also to enable them to function effectively as members of teams in combat wherein malperformance by one individual may endanger all others. While training in the Fleet Marine Forces obviously provides the most direct benefits, nevertheless training conducted at posts and stations is vitally important. It must be properly planned, energetically pursued, and carefully supervised. It must not be considered merely as a perfunctory duty. Every marine is available for assignment to the Fleet Marine Forces and he must be trained continually to permit him to carry out such an assignment. General Order No. 10 (shortly to be superseded by General Order No. 28) outlines a sound course of training to accomplish this purpose.

(c) Discipline: The validity of the Marine Corps standards of discipline has been repeatedly demonstrated. These standards are not to be relaxed or qualified during this period of expansion.

(d) Appearance: In the circumstances such as those currently existing, there is often a tendency to relax normal standards in the personal appearance of individual marines. This same tendency is noted in the appearance of equipment (particularly motor transport) and in the general maintenance of buildings, grounds, and facilities. This deterioration of standards must be avoided. The remedy lies in additional effort on the part of every officer and noncommissioned officer.

8. Recruiting: The Marine Corps expansion to date has been accomplished by using Reserves and voluntary enlistments. The great majority of the Reserves have now been mobilized. It is to the best interest of the Marine Corps to continue to make maximum use of voluntary enlistments as long as it is possible to do so. Every Marine Corps activity can assist the recruiting program by encouraging voluntary enlistment by every practicable means.

9. Inquiries addressed to the Commandant from Members of Congress and from parents and interested friends of marines have, of course, increased tremendously since July. The general pattern established by these inquiries is, in a measure, indicative of the manner in which various command responsibilities are being discharged. Some of the most often mentioned topics are listed below in order that all commanders may insure that the conditions referred to do not exist in their commands.

(a) Food: The fact that at least some complaints about food are received under almost all circumstances does not justify complacency. In spite of the high cost of food there is no reason why entirely adequate messes cannot be maintained. The problem of units in the combat area is, of course, a special circumstance. In other situations, an adequate mess can be provided if the commander gives to it a sufficient amount of his personal attention and supervision. The manner in which food is prepared and served usually determines whether the mess is good or bad. This is the area which requires the greatest attention and supervision and which shows the greatest results of such effort. It is worth noting that at least one complaint was received which stated that one mess was preparing far too much food with a resulting extravagant waste.

(b) Mail: In the question of mail, the problems faced by units in the combat area are of a special nature and not within the purview of these remarks. The morale value of mail is readily recognizable. For all units within the continental United States there is no apparent reason why mail should not be distributed rapidly and regularly though reports to the contrary have been received.

(c) Reserves:

(1) There have been many reports that some reserves are dissatisfied and disgruntled. This seems to be due to a lack of understanding of why they were mobilized and due also to the confusion incident to the large-scale mobilization last fall. There are repeated reports that the reservists, even now, are not receiving proper training. There are other reports which clearly indicate that the reservists do not understand their rights and privileges regarding insurance, family allotments, and other administrative procedures.

(2) While it was reasonable to expect that at least some of these problems would exist during the first few weeks of mobilization, their existence at this date would appear to be inexcusable. Measures should be taken immediately to clarify problems of this kind. Commands which have already carried out orientation courses should institute an immediate recheck to insure that there is no misunderstanding. It must be recognized that these men left their civilian pursuits, their families, and their homes on very short notice. If they are to serve properly as marines, it is necessary that they have an understanding of why they were called to active duty. The importance of their work as marines must be made clear.

(3) The authority under which the reserves were mobilized provided that they would serve for a period of 21 months. Under the terms of the Naval Reserve Act and the National Security Act, the Secretary of the Navy has the authority to extend this period of duty for the duration of the emergency. If the international situation should worsen, this authority would probably be invoked. It most certainly would be in the event of a declaration of war. At the present time, Marine Corps personnel plans are predicated on the assumption that all reservists who so desire, will be released at the end of their 21-months tour. As indicated above, this is, of course, subject to change. As soon as it is practicable to establish a definite program for the return of reservists to inactive duty, all commands will be informed.

(4) It would seem quite obvious that a reservist could scarcely be expected to believe that he is providing an important service to his country on active duty unless he is actually receiving thorough training, and unless, after he is trained, he receives an assignment commensurate with his rank.

(5) It is a basic responsibility of commanders to insure that every marine is fully conversant with his rights, privileges, and responsibilities relating to pay, insurance, and family allotments.

(d) Commercial enterprises: Several reports have been received regarding the improper activities of commercial enterprises on posts and stations. Regulations covering this matter are quite explicit. The presence of large groups of men presents a possible sales opportunity which energetic representatives of commercial enterprises are not likely to overlook. Every possible precaution must be taken to insure that the Marine Corps is not, even by inference, a party to commercial enterprises except through the medium of post exchanges, and that no such enterprise operate on a Marine Corps post or station except as provided by current regulations.

10. The Marine Corps has an important job to do in the future. We can well be proud of our past accomplishments, but that record, no matter how bright, will not serve as future justification for the Marine Corps. By our actions now and in the future we must demonstrate that we are worthy of our status as a military service in this Nation's defense structure.

C. B. CATES.

The National Grange Believes Selective Service Is Meeting Fully Emergency Defense Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Grange believes that the selective service is meeting fully and to spare the emergency defense needs of the Nation; and the military concedes this. We have faith in our people, in democracy, and in Congress to support selective service to the fullest necessary extent as long as danger threatens; and we wish the armed services had this faith and would not try to pass peacetime UMT under the cloak of the present grave danger.

House bill 3364 meets our officially declared stand on this profoundly vital problem in that—

1. It discards universal military training and calls for the fullest necessary use of selective service, with lowered physical and mental tests if needed;

2. Calls for induction at age 19 instead of 18, and for maximum of 24 months' service, or of not over 2 years of a boy's school life, and for release to reserve status if national safety requires it;

3. Provides that Congress by concurrent resolution can change service requirements or suspend the draft when the danger is passed, and for a preservation of selective service machinery but a definite termination date for the draft which automatically gives you as an individual Congressman the right to review your present stand;

4. And provides for a democratically and economically sound occupational deferment based on obtaining maximum national service in the field in which each man is best fitted to serve his country.

The National Grange has no official stand on the provision of House bill 3364 for service in racially segregated units.

We sincerely hope, for the sake of adequate provision for the present emergency, and for the preservation of democracy and the right of Congress to reflect that democracy, that you will support a bill carrying the four numbered items mentioned above.

We sincerely hope and pray also that every Member of the Congress will put forth all possible efforts to bring about a safe and sound reduction of armaments for all nations alike, for a strengthening of law and order and a Christian peace for the world.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. SAUNDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

Proposed Luxury Tax on Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a plan to place a luxury tax on meat in order to force the low-income group to eat grain instead of meat was quietly launched through the professional staff—not the committee members—of the Joint Committee on the January 1951 Economic Report of the President.

Such a plan is un-American and demonstrates how callous a bureaucracy can become toward the wage earners of our country. This report bases the feasibility of this plan principally on the studies and testimony of J. Kenneth Galbraith, professor at Harvard University, who has also held many high positions with various Government commissions and agencies having to do with the control of American living, and the testimony of Harold B. Rowe, of Brookings Institute, also a prominent figure in the Washington control bureaucracy for many years.

In order that there can be no misunderstanding as to the intent of this group, I will quote briefly from the report and the hearings before the committee. On page 365 of the hearings, Mr. Rowe, mentioning Mr. Galbraith's statement, said:

> A justification could be made for the use of a sales tax upon meat to restrain the competitive demand that moves toward that product as incomes increase, particularly among the lower-income groups.

The report itself, on page 52, says:

> This means that taxes on certain luxury foods might not be amiss. * * * Meat, it has often been pointed out, is in reality a luxury food.

This plan to prevent the wage-earning group in America from having meat, points out that they can get their calories by eating the grains. The low-income groups are specifically mentioned. The meat then can be consumed by those who can afford to pay the tax.

This clearly demonstrates the depth to which a regimented bureaucracy will go. Yes; the low-income group can eat much and live, but that is not the diet or philosophy of living that has made America great. In the late days of the last war bureaucratic muddling made meat almost unobtainable in a land of plenty. Production in industries where great physical stamina was needed, such as mining, suffered sharply because workmen could not get the meat needed for a wholesome diet.

In England the socialized regimentation of business and labor has by devious means kept the wage earner from having a wholesome, balanced diet, including meat, so that now they have not the strength and will to resent the regimentation of their lives by the bureaucrats.

The British socialized government now pays their butchers not to sell meat. The Attlee government has cut the British meat ration down to about 1 pound a month.

The butchers under this program cannot make a living, so the Socialist government has put them on the payroll to be supported by public taxes.

It is quite possible that America might some day find itself in a similar condition. If this plan to put a luxury tax on meat is put into effect, fewer and fewer people can buy meat. Less and less meat will be produced and we will enter into an era of economic scarcity where only the wealthy can eat meat. That may be the goal of those who would regiment our lives. An economy of abundance has made America the greatest country on earth. We must keep it that way. To do otherwise will destroy our high standard of living.

If communism comes to America, it will because of economic, social, and moral decay from within, not by conquest from abroad.

Iron Ore and the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been given in recent years to the dwindling deposit of high-grade iron ore in Minnesota's Mesabi Range.

The Troy (N. Y.) Record on December 18, 1950, answers the propaganda

of advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway in the following editorial:

IRON ORE AND THE SEAWAY

Much attention has been given in recent years to the dwindling deposit of high-grade iron ore in Minnesota's Mesabi Range. The situation has caused concern because the Minnesota deposit, one of the greatest in the world, has been the country's principal supply for iron ore.

The last few years have brought a widespread hunt for new iron-ore deposits, a hunt which has taken representatives of our steel companies to many foreign countries. Relatively early explorations brought the developments of big mining operations in Chile. More recently have been the still bigger operations in Venezuela.

Recently there has been considerable comment on the big Labrador deposits. Since then public attention has been drawn to a comparable project—Steep Rock—in the Province of Ontario above Lake Superior. Each of these operations involves the extraction of high-grade ore in huge quantities.

The Labrador and Steep Rock projects could be competitive. The ore from Steep Rock could readily reach our inland steel mills by ship through the Great Lakes and the Welland Canal. The ore from Labrador could do likewise, if the St. Lawrence waterway were ever built.

The ore from Chile had been brought to the east coast. The ore from Venezuela will also come to the east coast.

Despite all this activity the Mesabi Range must not be ruled out of the picture prematurely. The Mesabi Range people have known for years that their high-grade ore would give out eventually. They have known, too, that they have "uncounted billions of tons" of taconite which has a low iron-bearing content. They have been devoting much time and effort in trying to find an economical method of extracting iron ore from taconite.

A news story from Duluth indicates that a method has been found. Details are not disclosed. But the dispatch says that the outlook "staggers the imagination of even a people accustomed to miracles in mining." All of this is doubly good news at this time. Stiff competition among iron ore producers could bring a downward trend in steel prices. The possibility of continuing to meet most, if not all, of this country's iron ore demands from continental sources in these unsettled times is reassuring. Also, it should bring to an end the dispute over the St. Lawrence seaway for which the Labrador deposit was the only legitimate argument.

Point 4 Without the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of March 20, 1951:

POINT 4 WITHOUT THE TAXPAYERS

Point 4 never dies. President Truman proposed this switch on the give-away program in his inaugural address in 1949, and since that time all the global planners have been conning the atlases, finding far places where the American taxpayers' money may be spent for the greater glory of one thing and another.

Of course, all this spending of public funds is supposed to help the United States; the appeal is always to our enlightened self-interest. The more we spend abroad, the stronger our position. The seventeenth century barber-surgeon operated on the same principle; he bled his patients nearly white to cure them of all their ills, from pox to flux.

BLEEDING THE PATIENTS

The latest program for activating point 4 was produced under official auspices. The President has received it from Nelson D. Rockefeller, who headed the board that drew it up. It is big, both in outlook and in money. Without looking very deep one can find $950,000,000 in proposed appropriations.

The Rockefeller board first of all would consolidate our international charities, following the logic of a local Community Chest, in an organization called the Overseas Economic Administration. This OEC would absorb the Marshall plan (ECA) and a score of other give-away programs administered by various United States agencies. The OEC would spend $500,000,000 on railroads, harbors, irrigation projects, and on health and training programs. The board also proposes a United States contribution of $200,000,000 (to a fund of $500,000,000) for the construction of public works by an international development authority.

GUARANTY ON LOSSES

The board wants private enterprise to join it in building a better world, and to get American businessmen interested it proposed to guarantee them against losses in countries whose currencies are even shakier than our own. As a hedge against the vagaries of foreign currencies it would establish a $100,000,000 authority in the Import-Export Bank to take the risk out of foreign investment, and would toss another $150,000,000 into a $400,000,000 international finance corporation, which would be a department of the bank, to make loans to private enterprise for businesses abroad.

Other guaranties would be made to induce American business to go abroad in larger amount—largely against the predatory tax policies of the "friendly" countries which our tax money and our private enterprisers would be aiding.

The first question that occurs is how long would private, more or less free, enterprise remain so under this Government protection? The scheme might increase American investment abroad; indeed, it ought to, for the American investor would be shielded from almost all losses. His would not be risk capital, which is what keeps private enterprise progressing. He would take no more risk than he would in buying a United States Government bond; the American taxpayers would assume all the risk.

The second question is, How much private enterprise or initiative or imagination would adhere to such a scheme? The Government, taking all the risks, would tend to direct the foreign investment. Private businesses would be Government concessions, which Government would give or refuse. Who would want to take a chance with a strictly private enterprise abroad when he could get into something which the Government would guarantee—if, of course, the Government had planned it?

All this global planning would seem more reasonable if there were no alternative which did not depend on the American taxpayer. But there is one, and it works.

EXAMPLE OF ARAMCO

Lorania K. Francis has been reporting in the Times from Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, about the operations of Aramco, the great American oil-producing corporation. Aramco is doing in Saudi Arabia all the things that can be dreamed of under point 4 except to make the Saudi Arabians clients of the American taxpayers. As a result of Aramco's self-interested ministrations Arabs are healthier, wealthier, and wiser, the last in the sense that they are learning American technology by working at jobs where it is applied.

Aramco's guaranty is that oil can always be sold at a profit. It needs no point 4 subsidy. Its risk lies in its relationship with the Government of Saudi Arabia. It was willing to take that risk. It has established better relations with the Arabs, officially and unofficially, than our army of bureaucrats has been able to do with any of the peoples on whom they pour ECA money.

In Arabia point 4 is operating without the American taxpayers. Why not give some thought to creating the political climate which will allow more of the same to develop?

Statement of Motion Picture Industry Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

MARCH 27, 1951.

Hon. JOHN S. WOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Motion Picture Industry Council has instructed me to convey to you the enclosed resolution expressing support of the hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee, confident that the hearings will be distinguished by their fairness and objective inquiry.

The council, as can be noted from this letterhead, is composed of the key management, guild, and union groups in the production branch of the motion-picture industry.

We hope that this expression of support will contribute to the work undertaken by the committee and the objective which we all share—the exposure and destruction of the international Communist conspiracy.

Respectfully,

ART ARTHUR,
Executive Secretary.

OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY COUNCIL REGARDING HEARINGS OF THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE, MARCH 21, 1951

The Motion Picture Industry Council reaffirms its consistent opposition to communism, its works, its members, its methods. It wants to emphasize that, with the overwhelming majority of the American people, it believes that a clear and present danger to our Nation exists. The MPIC offers its strength and support to any legally constituted body that has as its object the exposure and destruction of the International Communist Party conspiracy.

Today, in Washington, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has begun hearings to determine the extent and effect of Communist infiltration in the motion-picture business. The MPIC supports this investigation.

But MPIC would be derelict in its duty if it did not point out that the public has been given an exaggerated and distorted impression of the degree of this Communist infiltration.

The MPIC hopes that all members of this industry who have been subpenaed will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It deplores those who stand on constitutional privileges to hide that truth, or those who refuse to recognize the authority of the Congress.

To those men and women of this industry who are former members of the Communist Party or of any other subversive or Communist-controlled organization, and who openly admit such membership or association, and who conclusively prove that they have repudiated utterly and forever that relationship, the MPIC offers its commendation and encouragement.

When the whole history of the Communist movement in this country is written, it will establish beyond doubt that in every walk of life and in many sections of America there were otherwise honorable and well-intentioned persons who were taken in and used by the Communist Party.

It is not enough for such persons to repudiate their previous actions or associations. They best can prove the sincerity of their repudiation by joining their fellow Americans in the fight for freedom, secure in the knowledge that it is in the historical American tradition to judge a man by his acts—and his acts alone.

The Motion Picture Industry Council for Association of Motion Picture Producers, Hollywood AFL Film Council, Independent Motion Picture Producers Association, Independent Office Workers, Screen Actors' Guild, Screen Directors' Guild, Screen Producers' Guild, Screen Writers' Guild, Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers, Society of Motion Picture Art Directors.

Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times:

MAN ON THE DOORSTEP

President Truman has asked Congress to move quickly on India's urgent plea for wheat to avoid famine. He has suggested that the House and Senate immediately approve the grant of 1,000,000 tons of wheat to India. After that grant the legislators can, if they insist, settle down to debate or delay over the second 1,000,000-ton grant that is needed.

But the men in Congress seem completely unmoved by the appeal.

It is difficult to understand the congressional reasoning.

In the realms of high policy and of intricate ideology the problem is complicated, of course. One must carefully weigh the fact that Prime Minister Nehru has been an outspoken critic of the United States policy toward Communist-ridden China. One must consider at length the fact that the United States cannot afford to subsidize the whole world by grain grants; at the end of such a path of open-handedness lies bankruptcy, for not even this Nation's resources are inexhaustible.

But on the level of the thing called humaneness the problem seems essentially simple. There's a man at the door, asking for a bit of food. It's possible to argue with oneself that the man is perhaps a Socialist and should not be encouraged in his political convictions. It's possible to argue that, if he gets a meal here, he will take the next 50 cents he happens upon to buy whisky. It's possible to suggest that the family can't be handing out food to every panhandling passerby, or the family will soon be down to an empty refrigerator. And still the man will be standing there, hungry, asking for just a little food.

The man at the door is India. India's food supply has been depleted by drought. Never mind the political consequences of that depletion; never mind the probability that Nehru's government, if it fell because of famine, would be replaced by a Communist regime. The simple fact, the important fact is that people are starving in India—starving while this Nation sits tight on a surplus of wheat available to avoid starvation.

Shall we turn the starving man away from the door? Shall we stand pat on the statement that we have given quite enough through organized charity and can't be contributing to every supplicant on the stoop? Shall we condemn thousands of fellow human beings to the horrible death that comes with starvation and content ourselves with counting over the millions of bushels of grain we have in storage?

India is the man on the doorstep.

Iowan Analyzes Commercial Rentals in Connection With Proposed Rent-Control Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am herewith inserting in the RECORD a letter written to me by Mr. Russell C. Cowin, owner and operator of several commercial properties in Waterloo, Iowa.

I believe Members of Congress will find Mr. Cowin's detailed analysis of the problems of those owning rental properties most informative, especially in view of the fact that rent-control legislation will likely be presented within the next few weeks.

The letter follows:

WATERLOO, IOWA, *March 30, 1951.*

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Representative, Third District of Iowa,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I feel that if the Congress is called upon to contemplate provisions for the control of rentals on commercial properties, any bill offered for their consideration by Tighe Woods or his legal or advisory department should be subjected to the severest scrutiny. We understand that Mr. Woods claims an increase of 78 percent in rentals in the last decade. Let me assure you that the taxes and maintenance costs have far exceeded that figure. Enclosed you will find a comparative tax assessment on some local commercial property, which figures can be verified by tax receipts in our possession.

The inequities and the injustices of the residential rent-control laws have been most enlightening and, to my mind, can be summed up very briefly and pointedly. Had the same rules, procedures, and controls been applied to the renting of a horse instead of a house, every humane society in the United States would have caused the lessee to be thrown in jail. Very briefly, you cannot give another party control of your property under rules which force you into the courts to prove the obvious abuse of that property and still make it worth owning.

This feature, however, would become of secondary importance in the case of commercial property.

In the first place, it has been many years since any enterprise was forced into bankruptcy because of the rent they paid. As our retailing system is now conducted, the major portion of commercial rentals are based directly on the volume of sales secured by the tenant. For many years there has been no other basis to negotiate a lease. We have been faced with rising costs and rising taxes and anticipated further rising costs and taxes from year to year for over a decade, and no owner could be advised as to any other way of writing a lease that was fair also to the tenant, except to base it on sales. With only one exception that I know of, every major lessee in the country has been willing to enter into and negotiate leases on this basis. That exception is the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., who do negotiate on 1 percent per month on investment. In that connection, let me call your attention to the fact that the maximum percentage lease on supermarket locations, at least in your congressional district, is based on 1 percent of gross sales. Now follow this closely: The building, the parking lot, the local taxes, the structural and owner's liability insurance, the special assessments, and the structural maintenance on what is considered to be a satisfactory leasing agreement from the owner's point of view in this particular line of enterprise all come out of 1 cent on $1 in sales. Could Mr. Woods save the housewife anything on her grocery bill with that. Other lines of endeavor require a larger portion up to 2½ percent, 5 percent, and even in some types of enterprise, 10 percent; but in every case, the distribution is based on our retail experience and recovery needs.

If Mr. Woods is willing to investigate the history of office building returns, the information is available to him to show that the cross-section of office buildings in the country in the last 50 years have not netted 4 percent on the investment. As far as warehousing goes, let me say that the history is fairly good on it, but here, too, unless the owner were tied in with the operation, the history of profit from this enterprise does not indicate a favorable return. As far as factory or production-type structures is concerned, the history is indeed depressing.

In my experience, the most generous, careless, easily outmaneuvered tenant for any type of space has been various departments of the United States Government, and that only in recent years.

Now the major question at hand in most of the 48 States in relation to the control of commercial rentals is the problem of the taxing bodies up to and including the State level. In Waterloo, Iowa, 50 percent of the property tax is drained off by the local school board. An interesting sidelight on this particular matter is that they anticipate a 2½-mill increase in their levy under a special legislative provision. As every Congressman should know, the city administrations throughout the country are bankrupt because of the inadequacy of their share of the tax slice to provide for their obligations to the community. The point I am making is that, like the policy of our local assessor, who is of exceptional caliber, most tax assessments are based on the return of the property. The worth of the ground and the structure, of course, enter in, but his final assessments are, in every case, made on the return from the property. I am inclined to think, in all fairness, that this is entirely proper, although it is not at this time provided for in the statutes, but I sincerely believe that if the Federal Government jeopardized this last source of local taxing sources, our last hope of avoiding a breakdown will disappear.

Conceivably, the large chains would be behind Mr. Woods in his hope of expanding his bureaucratic powers, and from these sources

may come the pressure on the Congress. Frankly, I haven't analyzed the position that large banking and insurance institutions might take, but, offhand, it would appear that they would be much opposed to jeopardizing their financial positions where the safety of a major portion of their investments was involved.

In summarizing, there are two simple, essential facts: The first is the interference with the final hope of the local taxing bodies, and the second is the fact that the gentleman from the rent control bureau would not save the eventual purchaser a penny on his grocery bill or his fair-traded clothing item or hardware item, but he would very probably concentrate the difference in the hands of the big businesses and the big-volume organizations located beyond the reach of the government of the State in which they sell their merchandise.

The undersigned is in the commercial and industrial rent field and, as far as your congressional district is concerned, feels adequately qualified to discuss and analyze the commercial rental situation as it now exists and has existed, at least in that district.

Respectfully submitted.

RUSSELL C. COWIN.

What Aims in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the questions propounded in the Freeman of April 9, 1951, for Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson to answer are timely, and the American people should have a forthright answer to each question.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the article, which contains the questions from the Freeman of April 9, 1951, as a part of my remarks:

WHAT AIMS IN KOREA?

In our last issue we commented on a long letter which Dean Acheson had written for publication in answer to a young marine's suggestion that our foreign policy was a bit fouled up. Since what the young man chiefly objected to was our involvement in Korea, his letter provided the Secretary of State with an excellent opportunity to define the specific objectives—if any—which Mr. Acheson and the President hope to attain through the fighting in that area. It was high time, indeed; for neither the President nor Mr. Acheson had as yet taken the country into his confidence on that question.

Mr. Acheson ignored this opportunity, and contented himself merely with repeating a few high-sounding generalities. The major questions in the minds of the American people, of our men in Korea, and of their families, remain unanswered. Because both Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson act as if they were completely unaware of what these questions are, we list some of them here. The people who are doing the fighting, and those who are paying for it by their sacrifices, are entitled to prompt, precise, and forthright answers.

1. Are we fighting to push the Chinese Communist forces in Korea back to the thirty-eighth parallel, and to stop there regardless of whether or not that is an advantageous strategic line?

If so, why did we sacrifice thousands of our troops in driving the North Koreans to the Manchurian border? And why should we seek to hold an arbitrary geographical line which from a military standpoint may or may not be defensible?

2. Are we fighting to establish whatever line in Korea, short of the Manchurian border, is in the opinion of the competent military authorities strategically most defensible?

3. Are we fighting to drive the Chinese Communist forces out of Korea and across the Manchurian border, in order that the whole of Korea may be placed under United Nations authority?

If that is the objective, how can it be attained so long as our forces, on instructions from the Department of State, may not pursue the enemy into Manchuria, but must wait inactive at the border while he regroups, reequips and reinforces his armies, without fear of attack or observation, until he is strong enough for another offensive?

That is precisely what happened when our troops chased the fleeing North Koreans to the Manchurian border. The enemy was permitted to regroup, rearm and obtain reenforcements from Communist China; preparations which our Army was not even allowed to find out about because, under State Department instructions, it was not permitted to send reconnaissance planes over the border to observe enemy troop concentrations. Nor were our fighter planes flying along the Manchurian border, under fire from Chinese Communist antiaircraft batteries on the other side of the river, even permitted to attack those batteries.

Thus rendered immune by State Department orders from molestation or observation by our forces, the enemy built up a formidable army which erupted into Korea and nearly drove our troops into the sea, with heavy casualties.

4. Are we fighting merely to maintain a military stalemate in Korea?

The maintenance of a military stalemate would mean that we should attain no military objective. We should merely maintain a tenuous and dangerous hold in Korea, which would continue to cost several thousand lives each month. The only conceivable advantage of maintaining a military stalemate in Korea would be to preserve the remaining shreds of our diplomatic and military prestige in the Far East and to provide time for negotiations with the declared aggressor, Red China, with a view to some compromise—probably involving admittance of Red China to the UN, and in any case probably involving a betrayal of our troops who have fought and died in Korea.

5. Are we fighting to destroy the enemy forces?

Communist China has openly admitted intervention on a large scale—estimated at 300,000 to 500,000 troops—in support of North Korean Communist forces. The bulk of the Communist armies which nearly drove our troops into the sea consisted of Chinese Communist soldiers equipped by Soviet Russia.

Red China's armies have been estimated at 4,000,000 men. Their equipment is limited only by Soviet Russia's ability and willingness to supply them. When Chinese Communist troops are hard-pressed, all they have to do is to withdraw into the "privileged sanctuary" of Manchuria, there to regroup and rearm in the safety insured them by our State Department and the UN. Under these circumstances, how could the limited number of troops we can make available for the Korean operation wage a successful war of manpower attrition against Red China backed by Soviet Russia?

Furthermore, while some 300,000 to 500,000 Chinese troops are engaged in killing our boys in Korea, our Government is using the Seventh Fleet to protect the Chinese mainland against diversionary attacks from Formosa by the Free Chinese, which would relieve the pressure on our troops. In other words, the Seventh Fleet is being used to protect the Chinese Communist flank, and to enable the Chinese Red generals to concentrate on killing American boys in Korea.

Why should we not use our fleet to blockade our Chinese Communist enemy, and our air power to destroy military and industrial objectives and transportation facilities in Red China and Manchuria? Why should we not allow Free Chinese forces to make diversionary attacks on the mainland, thus reducing the capacity of Red China to kill our troops in Korea? This would have the added advantage of preventing the Communists from consolidating their hold over all of China so that when the Korean action is finished they can throw all of their weight against Southeast Asia, which Dean Acheson and Dr. Jessup insist we must hold at all costs.

6. What are the intentions of the United Nations?

The United Nations in June 1950 declared the North Koreans guilty of aggression and authorized General MacArthur to organize and lead a United Nations force against them. It also called upon all member nations to aid the United Nations forces in every way possible and to refrain from aiding the aggressor. As a result of this action, an international force was organized to defend South Korea. So far the United States has furnished about 90 percent of the UN troops and suffered about 90 percent of the casualties.

Although the UN, 106 days after the Chinese Communists openly entered the Korean War, at last declared that they had "engaged in aggression," it has still not authorized effective action against Red China. Also, despite the fact that all member nations were called upon to refrain from aiding the aggressor, Soviet Russia (still a member in good standing) has supported the North Koreans and Red China with supplies and equipment, particularly jet planes, tanks and other items which they could not conceivably have procured from any other source.

No war against aggression can be carried on successfully so long as the UN, on whose authority it is being conducted, spends months in discussing what, if anything, should be done about the aggressor, while refusing to allow UN troops to fight him on equal terms.

7. Who is to pay for reconstruction?

Both North and South Korea, particularly South Korea, have suffered vast destruction in consequence of Communist aggression. This destruction and the surging tides of battle have rendered millions of Koreans homeless and destitute. Does the UN intend merely to push the aggressors back to the thirty-eighth parallel, then condone the aggression and leave the nations of the free world—primarily the United States—to shoulder the burden of reconstruction while the aggressors escape any penalty for the devastation they have wrought? If this is so, if nonaggressor nations are to be expected to pay for the damage caused by aggressors, then the basic purpose of the UN is made a mockery, and a premium is placed on aggression.

President Truman and Secretary Acheson cannot escape responsibility for our losses in Korea. Having allowed the UN ample opportunity to declare a workable policy with respect to the open aggression of Communist China, and having failed to elicit any clear-cut authorization to meet the military issue, they were under a solemn obligation to serve notice on the UN that if it did not, by a fixed date, allow its forces to attack Communist China as a declared aggressor, the United States would reserve the right either to take such action as it might deem necessary in order to protect its own troops, or to withdraw them from the UN forces in Korea.

It is the failure of Truman and Acheson to define our own objectives in Korea, and their instructions hamstringing our troops there, which have caused our unnecessarily heavy casualties. Truman and Acheson will continue to be responsible for the cruel and senseless waste of American lives and treasure until they either permit our land forces there to defend themselves effectively, or admit the ghastly failure of their Asiatic policy by withdrawing our land forces from that theater of war.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman had his way in the Korean misadventure which, up to this date, has cost 57,000 casualties among our fighting forces. Now, then, what would have happened had there been no Congress? I am inserting an article which appeared in the Republic Bulletin on March 26, 1951:

IF WE HAD NO CONGRESS

If Truman had his way, this country today would be under a complete system of socialized medicine, like Russia and England.

If Truman had his way, every farm in America today would be under the quotas and allocations of the Brannan plan—socialized agriculture.

If Truman had his way, there would be no Federal legislation on the books today to imprison Communist spies, traitors, and saboteurs in the Government departments.

If Truman had his way, Red China today would be a member of the United Nations, to vote with Russia and her iron curtain prisoners on every ballot against world peace.

If Truman had his way, under the Government reorganization scheme last year, this country would be saddled today with a Cabinet department of health and welfare under that great medical genius, lawyer Oscar Ewing.

If Truman had his way, all America's secrets in atomic energy would have been traded freely with our allies.

If Truman had his way, every nation in the world would have direct call on the United States Treasury for technical assistance and economic development loans, under his point 4 program.

If Truman had his way, there would be no Taft-Hartley provision today requiring the official registration of Communists in labor unions. He vetoed one.

If Truman had his way, every major river in America today would be a part of some new TVA, with state and local government submerged by Federal bureaucrats.

If Truman had his way, every school in America today would be under direct daily supervision of the Washington do-good bureaucracy—socialized education.

If Truman had his way, housing and home building today would be a complete Government monopoly, with subsidies for socialized housing.

If Truman had his way, there would have been no investigation of communism in the State Department and other Federal agencies. His "red herring" statement of August 1948 would have ended the Alger Hiss case.

If Truman had his way, total Federal spending since 1946 would have been about $75,000,000,000 more than it has been to date. That is the accumulative cost of all the new programs proposed, but turned down by Congress.

These are the things Congress saved us from during the last 5 years. Had it not been for the defenders of constitutional government in the House and Senate, Truman would have had his way in all these things. He urged each of these programs at least once, some several times. In other cases he vetoed acts of Congress, which promptly were enacted over his veto. How much we owe Congress.

In one major decision President Truman had his secret way—without consulting Congress. He, by his own decision, plunged our boys into war with the Mongolian hordes in Korea. He now seeks blanket authority to send American boys to new wars the world around, at will.

Today only Congress stands between that program and the American people.

Our prayers should be with Congress.

Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to say a few words about Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who presided at the first atomic-spy trial recently concluded in New York. Generally described by courtroom attachés as a "tough judge," Judge Kaufman has conducted the trial in a most exemplary manner.

It goes without saying that this case will go down in the annals of American history because of its nature, importance, and historical value. Judge Kaufman ably summed it up when, following the jury's verdict of guilty against three American citizens who conspired to steal atom secrets, he said:

I must say that, as an individual, I can't be happy because it is a sad day for America when citizens lend themselves to the destruction of our country by the most destructive weapon the world has known. I cannot find words to describe this loathsome offense.

Judge Kaufman is a fraternity brother of mine in Tau Epsilon Phi fraternity. During the years that I have had the pleasure to know him, I found that he has a keen and analytical mind. He is always fair and judicial, and has made a wonderful record since he has been on the bench.

Born in New York City in 1910, Judge Kaufman received his preparatory education at Fordham University and his LL. B. from Fordham Law School. For a period of 5 years until 1940 he was an assistant United States attorney for the southern district of New York, then entered private law practice as a member of the firm Noonan, Kaufman & Eagan. In 1947 he became special assistant to the United States Attorney General, in charge of lobbying investigation, and served in this position until October 1949, when he was appointed to the southern New York Federal court. His appointment was subsequently confirmed by the United States Senate.

He has served with great distinction. We of New York are very proud of him, his record, and the role he played during the recent trial.

History-making as the decision handed down by Judge Kaufman may be, it was a most difficult and responsible decision which required a great deal of forethought, deliberation and soul-searching. I am not surprised to learn that the jurist, who is a deeply religious man, went to his synagogue several times during the past few days to seek spiritual guidance in final formulation of his epochal decision.

The statement which he has prepared in conjunction with the sentence he has imposed will, likewise, be of great historical importance. I am, therefore, placing in the RECORD the full statement of Judge Kaufman as published in the New York Times on April 6, 1951, and a news item on the jurist also published in the same issue. I commend these to the attention of the Members of this House. They are as follows:

JUDGE KAUFMAN'S STATEMENT ON SENTENCING BOMB SPIES

In view of the importance of the sentence I am about to impose, I believe it is my duty to give some explanation respecting them.

At the outset, I would like to say a few words about the law under which these defendants are about to be sentenced.

THE LAW

It provides for the following punishment: If the espionage or the conspiracy to commit espionage is committed during time of war, the punishment might be death or imprisment for not more than 30 years. If the espionage or conspiracy to commit espionage is committed at any other time the maximum punishment is imprisonment for not more than 20 years.

This section, under which the defendants were prosecuted and convicted, was enacted in 1917, at which time the Russian international spy ring did not present the threat to all of us which it does now. Today, it is a well organized, well directed ring, with tentacles which reach into the most vital places.

The incongruent penal provisions of the statute are spotlighted by the 30-year maximum imprisonment provision for commission of the offense of espionage during peacetime. I ask that some thought be given to that for a moment, for it most likely means that even if spies are successful in the year 1951 in delivering to Russia or any foreign power our secrets concerning the newer type atom bombs, or even the H-bomb, the maximum punishment that any court could impose in that situation would be 20 years.

I, therefore, say that it is time for Congress to reexamine the penal provisions of the espionage statute.

In the case before me, the conspiracy as alleged and proven commenced on or about June 6, 1944, at which time the country was at war. Overt acts were committed during the period of actual hostilities. Therefore, the maximum penalty is death or imprisonment for not more than 30 years.

Espionage, as viewed here today, does not reflect the courage of a Nathan Hale, risking his life in the service of his own country. It is rather a sordid, dirty work—however idealistic are the rationalizations of the persons who engaged in it—with but one paramount theme, the betrayal of one's own country.

SPIES UNDER NO DELUSIONS

Citizens of this country who betray their fellow countrymen can be under none of the delusions about the benignity of Soviet power that they might have been prior to World War II. The nature of Russian terrorism is now self-evident. Idealism as a rationale dissolves.

The issue of punishment in this case is presented in a unique framework of history. It is so difficult to make people realize that this country is engaged in a life and death struggle with a completely different system. This struggle is not only manifested externally between these two great forces, but this case indicates quite clearly that it also involves the employment by the enemy of secret as

well as overt outspoken forces among our own people. All of our democratic institutions are, therefore, directly involved in this great conflict. I believe that never at any time in our history were we ever confronted to the same degree that we are today with such a challenge to our very existence. The atom bomb was unknown when the espionage statute was drafted. I emphasize this because we must realize that we are dealing with missiles of destruction which can wipe out millions of Americans.

The competitive advantage held by the United States in super weapons has put a premium on the services of a new school of spies—the homegrown variety that places allegiance to a foreign power before loyalty to the United States. The punishment to be meted out in this case must therefore serve the maximum interest for the preservation of our society against these traitors in our midst.

SENTENCE OF JULIUS AND ETHEL ROSENBERG

It is ironic that the very country which these defendants betrayed and sought to destroy placed every safeguard around them for obtaining a fair and impartial trial, a trial which consumed 3 weeks in this court. I recall the defendant Julius Rosenberg testifying that our American system of jurisprudence met with his approval and was preferred over Russian justice. Even the defendants realize—by this admission—that this type of trial would not have been afforded to them in Russia. Certainly, to a Russian national accused of a conspiracy to destroy Russia not 1 day would have been consumed in a trial. Yet, they made a choice of devoting themselves to the Russian ideology of denial of God, denial of the sanctity of the individual and aggression against free men everywhere instead of serving the cause of liberty and freedom.

Your crime is worse than murder. Plain deliberate contemplated murder is dwarfed in magnitude by comparison with the crime you have committed. In committing the act of murder, the criminal kills only his victim. The immediate family is brought to grief and when justice is meted out the chapter is closed. But in your case, I believe your conduct in putting into the hands of the Russians the A-bomb years before our best scientists predicted Russia would perfect the bomb has already caused the Communist aggression in Korea with the resultant casualties exceeding 50,000 Americans and who knows but that millions more of innocent people may pay the price of your treason. Indeed, by your betrayal you undoubtedly have altered the course of history to the disadvantage of our country. No one can say that we do not live in a constant state of tension. We have evidence of your treachery all around us every day—for the civilian defense activities throughout the Nation are aimed at preparing us for an atom bomb attack.

Nor can it be said in mitigation of the offense that the power which set the conspiracy in motion and profited from it was not openly hostile to the United States at the time of the conspiracy. If this was your excuse then the error of your ways in setting yourselves above our properly constituted authorities and the decision of those authorities not to share the information with Russia must now be obvious.

The defendants are American citizens who profited from our system of free higher education. I additionally must assume that the basic Marxist goal of world revolution and the destruction of capitalism was well known to the defendants, if, in fact, not subscribed to by them, when they passed what they knew was this Nation's most deadly and closely guarded secret weapon to Soviet agents.

NATION MUST BE SECURE

In the light of this, I can only conclude that the defendants entered into this most serious conspiracy against their country with full realization of its implications. The statute of which the defendants at the bar stand convicted is clear. I have previously stated my view that the verdict of guilty was amply justified by the evidence. In the light of the circumstances, I feel that I must pass such sentence upon the principals in this diabolical conspiracy to destroy a God-fearing nation, which will demonstrate with finality that this Nation's security must remain inviolate; that traffic in military secrets, whether promoted by slavish devotion to a foreign ideology or by a desire for monetary gains, must cease.

The evidence indicated quite clearly that Julius Rosenberg was the prime mover in this conspiracy. However, let no mistake be made about the role which his wife, Ethel Rosenberg, played in this conspiracy. Instead of deterring him from pursuing his ignoble cause, she encouraged and assisted the cause. She was a mature woman—almost 3 years older than her husband and almost 7 years older than her younger brother. She was a full-fledged partner in this crime.

Indeed the defendants Julius and Ethel Rosenberg placed their devotion to their cause above their own personal safety and were conscious that they were sacrificing their own children, should their misdeeds be detected—all of which did not deter them from pursuing their course. Love for their cause dominated their lives. It was even greater than their love for their children.

What I am about to do is not easy for me. I have deliberated for hours, days, and nights. I have carefully weighed the evidence. Every nerve, every fiber of my body has been taxed. I am just as human as are the people who have given me the power to impose sentence. I am convinced beyond any doubt of your guilt. I have searched the records, I have searched my conscience, to find some reason for mercy, for it is only human to be merciful, and it is natural to try to spare lives. I am convinced, however, that I would violate the solemn and sacred trust that the people of this land have placed in my hands, were I to show leniency to the defendants Rosenberg.

It is not in my power, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, to forgive you. Only the Lord can find mercy for what you have done.

The sentence of the court upon Julius and Ethel Rosenberg is that for their crime they are sentenced to death. The sentence will be executed according to law in the week beginning on Monday, May 21.

SENTENCE OF MORTON SOBELL

While I have not the slightest sympathy for you or any of your associates, I must, as a judge, be objective in the examination of the evidence in this case. I do not for a moment doubt that you were engaged in espionage activities however, the evidence in the case did not point to any activity on your part in connection with the atom-bomb project. I cannot be moved by hysteria or motivated by a desire to do the popular thing. I must do justice according to the evidence in this case. There is no doubt about your guilt, but I must recognize the lesser degree of your implication in this offense. I, therefore, sentence you to the maximum prison term provided by statute, to wit, 30 years.

While it might be gratuitous on my part, I also note at this point my recommendation against parole for this defendant.

KAUFMAN REFUSED TO LET REDS TOUR—YOUNGEST FEDERAL JUDGE HERE, EX-PROSECUTOR, DENIED PLEA IN FIRST MAJOR DECISION

Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman, mild-mannered, soft-spoken but sharp in detecting legal trickery by attorneys, is the youngest jurist in the Southern District of New York.

Shortly after he took the oath of office November 1, 1949, the 40-year-old jurist decided his first major bench problem. He denied a motion by the 11 convicted Communist leaders to enlarge the jurisdiction of their bail. The defendants wanted to barnstorm the country.

Several months ago Judge Kaufman presided at the trial of Abraham Brothman and Miriam Moskowitz for conspiracy to obstruct justice. This was an offshoot of a Federal grand jury's espionage investigation. The jury found the two guilty and Judge Kaufman imposed the maximum punishment.

The judge was born here June 24, 1910. He has two brothers, one a doctor and the other a dentist, and two sisters. The youngest student to enter Fordham University at the age of 16, he was graduated from the university's law school at 21 and admitted to the bar in June 1932.

Two and a half years later he was appointed a special assistant to the United States Attorney in this district. In June 1936, he became an assistant United States Attorney. He prosecuted many publicized cases, including the McKesson & Robbins case.

He resigned from the United States Attorney's office in 1940 to enter private practice with Gregory F. Noonan, who was appointed a Federal judge the same time as Judge Kaufman was, and Col Edward P. F. Eagan, now chairman of the State athletic commission.

Judge Kaufman was assigned along with Federal Judge Harold R. Medina, before the latter's appointment to the bench, by the Association of the Bar of the city of New York to investigate, with a view toward disbarment, Magistrate Thomas A. Aurello's nomination for the Supreme Court after it was made public that Frank Costello, gambler, had backed Mr. Aurello's candidacy.

In October 1947, Judge Kaufman was appointed a special assistant to the Attorney General to set up and head a lobbying investigation under the Federal Regulations and Lobbying Act. He resigned this position in August 1948.

Occasionally Judge Kaufman has been confused in public with Federal Judge Samuel H. Kaufman, who presided at the first perjury trial of Alger Hiss, which ended in a hung jury.

Judge Irving Kaufman is married to the former Helen Rosenberg. They have three sons, Robert, 12, and James and Richard, 9-year-old twins.

Draft Exemptions on Basis of Scholarship Wrong in Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in one of Michigan's leading newspapers, the Escanaba Daily Press, on March 29, 1951:

DRAFT EXEMPTIONS ON BASIS OF SCHOLARSHIP WRONG IN PRINCIPLE

The proposal of Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the Nation's draft director, that top-ranking students in high schools and colleges be exempt from military training is drawing a mounting tide of resentment around the country, as well it should.

The general's theory presumably is that the Nation's best brains, as measured in terms of scholastic rankings in the high schools and colleges, should not be subjected to the hazards of military life.

The proposal, of course, is a slur on the American armed services by conveying the idea that only second-rate brain power should be drafted for military service.

The plan is wrong in principle and wrong in application. It is contrary to American principles of democracy that a segment of our draft-age people should be exempted from service in the country's Armed Forces because of scholastic attainment. And it is wrong to assume that the bright boys of the classroom are necessarily the only hope of the Nation for leadership in the future. An examination of American history will reveal that a large percentage of leaders in every field of endeavor have come from the ranks of average scholastic attainment. Leadership and success require more than the ability to absorb textbook knowledge.

It has been expressed by military experts time and again that American successes on the battlefield have developed because American soldiers are intelligent, that they possess the ability to think quickly in emergencies without waiting for directions to filter down from the high command.

If the future of America and the safety of our people is dependent upon the protection that the armed services can give us, it surely is essential that we build our Army, Navy, and Air Force with the best manpower that we have available. We can hardly afford to place our lives and our heritage in the hands of those who have been chosen for service because they could not reach scholastically the upper one-third or one-fourth of their class.

Cost of Experimental Unit of Universal Military Training at Fort Knox, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1948, after obtaining unanimous consent, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD of that date an article entitled "Cost of Experimental Unit of Universal Military Training at Fort Knox, Ky."

Purely as a matter of information, I thought it might be interesting to the membership of the House to know the cost of the experimental unit of universal military training at Fort Knox, Ky., as reported in a letter to me from the then Army Comptroller, dated January 21, 1948.

Therefore I am inserting, by leave of the House, the insertion which I placed in the Appendix on January 30, 1948. The basis of cost may have changed, and doubtless has, since these figures were furnished me by the Comptroller of the Army more than 3 years ago. Just how much the cost has increased due to inflated values on everything, I am unable to state.

My former insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, 1948, follows:

COST OF EXPERIMENTAL UNIT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AT FORT KNOX, KY.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I think all are aware that an experimental program of universal military training is being conducted at Fort Knox, Ky. Various opinions have been voiced as to the cost of the training which has been envisioned and advocated by President Truman. The Department of the Army has set up a model universal military unit at Fort Knox, Ky., and I have had several inquiries as to the cost of this experimental unit. On December 8, 1947, I asked for the figures, and I am happy to give my colleagues the benefit of the information which I received.

The following is a copy of a letter addressed to me under date of January 21, 1948, by Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, the Army Comptroller, Department of the Army, which I think needs no explanation, but speaks for itself and gives us the information on the cost of the experimental unit of universal military training at Fort Knox, Ky.:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ARMY COMPTROLLER,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1948.

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: Reference your letter of December 4, 1947, relative to the operating cost of the universal military training unit at Fort Knox, Ky., and my interim reply of December 8, 1947, I now have additional information in this regard to transmit to you.

On January 16, 1948, Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, sent a letter to the chairmen of the Armed Forces Committees concerning the cost of the Fort Knox universal military training unit. Mr. Royall's letter covers the question you asked in such a comprehensive manner I feel you would be interested in its entire contents. I am therefore quoting to you the Secretary's letter in its entirety:

"I have been asked for certain specific information regarding the universal military training experimental unit at Fort Knox. As similar inquiries have reached me from other sources, or have been addressed severally to various Army addresses, I am including in this letter all of the information presently available with respect to the size and cost of the project.

"The UMT experimental unit was organized for two purposes:

"1. To obtain experience of value in a universal military training system covering a special age group, on a national scale, if authorized by Congress as recommended by the President, the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, and the armed services.

"2. To obtain experience of value to the armed services in revising and modernizing their own training programs in the light of the Doolittle committee's recommendations.

"In pursuance of these purposes, a new training formula has been introduced at the experimental unit, with greater emphasis on education, moral controls, broader concepts of discipline, and close supervision of off-duty as well as on-duty activities of trainees.

"In computing the cost of the UMT experimental unit, no attempt has been made to separate the cost of training the 646 enlisted men in the experimental training battalion from the total cost of the unit, nor is such a separation possible. The figures which follow therefore represent a break-down of the over-all cost of an experiment undertaken for the purposes indicated. The figure given as the cost per trainee is likewise the pro rata cost of the unit as a whole, as applied to the men in the UMT training battalion, and not the cost of training these men alone.

"SIZE OF UMT EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

"Two cycles of training were completed by the Army Ground Force experimental unit on December 20, 1947. The first cycle extended from January to July 1947, the second from July to December 1947, inclusive. During this time the following personnel were involved:

"(a) Average number of trainees (privates, Regular Army battalion strength), per cycle, 646. For 2 cycles, approximately 1,292.

"(b) Average constant training cadre (military personnel):

Number of officer-instructors	77
Number of enlisted personnel	495
Total	572

"(c) Approximately 21 civilians were employed during the two cycles as members of the training staff, all but four on a part-time basis. For the second cycle an estimated 17 part-time instructors were required in teaching auto mechanics, radio, typewriting, Spanish, and bookkeeping. Of the four full-time civilian employees, one was an educational counselor, one an assistant educational counselor, and two were stenographers for the Educational Center.

"Cost of universal military training experimental unit, second cycle, July-December 1947, inclusive

1. DIRECT COSTS

Pay and allowances of trainees (Army pay rate)	$383,167
Pay and allowances of trainers (officers and enlisted men)	472,098
Costs of subsistence (enlisted men)	196,975
Costs of clothing (enlisted men)	73,311
Costs of transportation	52,320
Equipment replacement	171,182
Total	1,349,053

2. INDIRECT COSTS

Transportation	73,080
Repairs and utilities	24,705
Medical care	70,940
Supplies	290,582
Equipment maintenance	43,996
Administrative overhead and supervisory personnel	60,733
Total	563,256

3. ADDITIONAL INDIRECT COSTS NOT PROPERLY CHARGEABLE TO UNIVERSAL MILITARY EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

Appropriated funds for rehabilitation of post facilities for universal military training experimental unit, but not included in universal military training costs because available for other purposes later	200,000
Grand total, universal military training costs, second cycle (1 and 2 above)	1,862,309

Average over-all per 6 months enlisted trainee (at Army pay rate and including all other unit costs), $1,862,309 divided by 646 equals $2,807.

COST FACTORS IN UMT EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

Because of the nature of the experiment, and the fact that cadre training and orientation courses for officers and enlisted men of the several branches of the Regular Army, not connected with the experimental UMT unit, have been conducted contemporaneously with the training of the experimental battalion of 18-year-old recruits, the administrative and instructor personnel of the unit were larger than would be required for training either an ordinary tactical unit or a prospective UMT unit.

The ratio of trainees to trainers in the larger system, for example, would be more than double that indicated in the figures for the experimental unit. At Fort Knox the military personnel necessarily included all elements of a division staff, although only a single battalion of men were being trained for 6 months by the experimental UMT formula. In the first training cycle all arms and technical services were represented. Each training company had to be organized

differently. The Information and Education and Special Services staffs were organized on approximately a regimental level. There were two chaplains. The personnel of the unit, in short, was organized to perform a multiple function, and not simply to train 646 enlisted men assigned to it for this purpose. As with any experiment, whether conducted by the military services or in industry, the cost of the pilot model is always higher than the cost of the subsequent product.

Since the trainees were all enlisted men of the Regular Army, and receiving an average of approximately $100 a month in pay and allowances, the cost also reflects this pay rate rather than the $25 a month recommended by the Compton Commission or the $30 a month provided for in H. R. 4278 for the pay of UMT trainees in the proposed national system. The pay differential alone represents an added cost per trainee of at least $70 a month, or $420 for the 6-month training period, while the other factors add substantially to the total cost of the unit.

For these reasons the cost figures given cannot be considered as in any sense a criterion of the per capita cost of training large numbers of men at a very much lower pay rate under a national plan. The Army estimates the cost of training 618,000 men by the UMT formula on a national basis, once the program is standardized to eliminate the added expense of current experimentation, at approximately $1,000,000,000 annually.

AUTHORITY AND COSTS OF BRINGING VISITORS TO FORT KNOX

It has been asked by what authority visitors were flown to Fort Knox, the amount and source of funds used for this purpose.

The few groups representing the press and national organizations, invited by the former Secretary of War as a matter of broad public interest to visit the UMT experimental unit at Fort Knox, were transported by Army aircraft pursuant to authority contained in paragraph 1C (1), Army Regulations 95-90, published on April 28, 1947, which provides: "Upon approval by the Commanding General, Army Air Forces * * * personnel of the following categories may be permitted to ride as passengers in aircraft * * *

"(1) Any individual, without reimbursement, when the flight is on matters of concern to the Armed Forces."

Acting under authority of section 5 of the National Defense Act (10 U. S. C. 34), making it the specific responsibility of the War Department to plan for the national defense, and appropriate Army regulations with reference to the maintenance of public relations, the Department of the Army as a matter of broad public interest continuously attempts to inform the Nation of planning developments relating to universal military training as well as all other Army operations.

In inviting individuals and groups to visit the UMT experimental unit we hoped to obtain and did obtain helpful suggestions from outside sources. We cannot obtain public reaction to our programs unless we take the people into our confidence.

TRAINING PROGRAM OF UMT EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

All trainees in the UMT experimental unit are enlisted men in the Regular Army. Every Regular Army enlistee is given 13 weeks of basic training. The additional training given in the experimental unit, and which is contemplated in the national plan, if authorized by Congress, is intended to qualify the trainee as a specialist in some arm of the service. It will be obvious that no matter whether the soldier receives the training in the experimental unit or in a tactical unit, it must be accomplished in any case. While not a characteristic training unit of the Army as now constituted, the UMT experimental unit by no means involves expenditures incurred for other than normal service requirements.

In addition to training the experimental battalion of 646 men (average constant enrollment), the UMT training cadre is currently required to instruct 480 potential UMT training cadre personnel each month. This instruction covers all the positions from platoon sergeant to division commander, and results in a peak load of 200. For the period August 11, 1947, to December 20, 1947, approximately 2,565 students were given such cadre instruction.

It is estimated for planning purposes that of the 1,200,000 men annually reaching the age of 18 years, a total of 850,000, or approximately 70 percent of this figure would be found physically fit and inducted for training under a universal military training system. Of the latter number, an estimated 618,000 would be trained by the Army and Air Force and the remainder by the Navy, under the plan currently recommended by the three services. By carrying on this cadre training now, we shall have made a substantial start in building the organization that would be necessary to train the larger load of trainees later should the universal training program be authorized by Congress.

ARMY PROFITING FROM UMT EXPERIMENT

Regardless of the final action on the proposed national universal military training program, all of this instruction and indoctrination at Fort Knox is of great benefit to the Army and already is being translated into training doctrine for the Regular Establishment. It is finding its way into replacement training centers and has been adopted as the training formula for the Third Armored Division at Fort Knox on a division level.

The modification of disciplinary training through the adoption of a special code of conduct for this special age group, built around a demerit and trainee-court system, is only one of the new methods whose usefulness has been demonstrated in the experimental program. Sound discipline is the first principle of military effectiveness, since without it any military organization would be little more than a mob. It is believed that under the UMT formula, subject to further testing, discipline can be improved, rather than weakened, by giving the trainee and in fact, all elements of the Army, a better understanding of its meaning and importance.

Thus the UMT experimental unit has served and is serving as a laboratory test of training methods and doctrines which will prove of increasing value to the military service as time goes on. It has permitted close study of the problems inherent in training men of the 18-year or minimum-age group not previously explored in any prior training. In fact, I know of no other single experiment in this field which has been so richly productive of constructive results.

I feel sure Secretary Royall's letter will give you the information you desire. However, if you need additional information, I will be glad to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. RICHARDS,
Major General, the Army Comptroller.

United States Marines Should Help Plan Wars They Must Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated that the United States Marine Corps be represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This was the subject that I wrote President Truman on, which prompted his now famous reply to me last August in which he stated that the United States marines were the "police force of the Navy" and that they would remain just that as long as he was President. He further stated that they were represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the Navy.

The marines did not agree with him, neither did most of the people in the Nation.

Many Congressmen have introduced bills to place the United States Marines on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including myself.

I am submitting herewith a recent editorial from the Saturday Evening Post which urges that the United States Marines be so recognized which I am certain many Members of the House will be interested in reading:

MARINES SHOULD HELP PLAN WARS THEY MUST FIGHT

In their valuable and compendious volume, The United States Marines and Amphibious War (Princeton University Press), Jeter A. Isely and Philip A. Crowl start the proceedings with this wartime quotation from Gen. George Marshall:

"My military education and experience in the First World War has all been based on roads, rivers, and railroads. During the last 2 years, however, I have been acquiring an education based on oceans and I've had to learn all over again. Prior to the present war I had never heard of any landing craft except a rubber boat. Now I think about little else."

As Messrs. Isely and Crowl make convincingly plain, much of General Marshall's education was provided by the United States Marine Corps, which had been thinking of, and experimenting with, landing craft for 20 years before the war. "That the United States Army was so quickly able to train troops for crossing beaches held by hostile nations is attributable to its own flexibility and leadership and, equally important, to the availability for its guidance of a sound body of amphibious doctrine previously drawn up by the United States Navy and the Marine Corps." The hard work put in by the Marine Corps, often, according to General Vandegrift, in the face of uninterested or doubting military orthodoxy, paid off all the way from Guadalcanal to the beaches of Normandy.

This contribution to what turned out to be one of the basic concepts upon which Allied victory rests might be expected to earn for the Marine Corps better recognition than it has received from the other services. Leaving aside Mr. Truman's contemptuous and politically careless dismissal of the Marines as "the Navy's police force," the present mobilization plan provides for less expansion of the Marine Corps than its esprit de corps, competent planning and fighting record would justify. The brilliant use which the Marines have made of their own air units to support ground fighting in Korea is another testimonial to the hard-hitting efficiency and excellent coordination of this elite outfit. As the news from Korea makes plain, it is upon the Marine Corps that the country depends for immediate offensive strength in time of emergency or hastily conceived "police actions." As long as we prefer to keep war at a distance from American soil, so long will skill in amphibious warfare be basic to our security.

Despite its remarkable record, the Marine Corps is not represented at all in the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is a startling ommission in view of the debt which Army planning owes to Marine military concepts and experimentation, not to mention fighting spirit and thorough training which have always distinguished the USMC. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, a Marine veteran himself, has introduced a bill to correct this defect by placing the Commandant of the corps on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The present Commandant, Gen. Clifton B. Cates, who has a distinguished combat record through all ranks, would undoubtedly add solid military experience to the deliberations of the JCS. It should not take a "propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's" to convince people that the Marine Corps will continue to provide leaders whose advice on military planning would be worth having. At any rate, the past service of the Marines is a reason to think so.

Farm Bureau and Grange Oppose UMT Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as public understanding of the issues involved in the UMT proposal increases, there is also an increase in the expressions of grave concern and of desire to divorce this proposal from the needed draft-extension legislation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letters from the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange which came to my desk today urging support of H. R. 3364, the Barden bill, for separation of the two proposals:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1951.

To all Members of the House of Representatives:

The American Farm Bureau Federation, representing 1,440,000 farm families, is vitally concerned over the provisions of S. 1, already passed by the United States Senate, and H. R. 2811, now being considered by the House of Representatives. At the thirty-second annual convention of this organization, the voting delegates passed the following resolutions with regard to universal military training and selective service:

"We of the American Farm Bureau Federation believe that to add universal military training to the selective-service program would result in ineffective and inefficient use of manpower. However, with the need for strong military preparedness, we suggest consideration of expanded and improved military training in secondary schools and colleges."

We believe that the amendments proposed in H. R. 3364 (Barden bill) conform to the expressed wishes of the farmers of the United States, and we urgently recommend that the language in H. R. 3364 be substituted for the language in the bill now being considered by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Associate Director, Washington Office.

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Grange believes that the selective service is meeting fully and to spare the emergency defense needs of the Nation; and the military concedes this. We have faith in our people, in democracy, and in Congress to support selective service to the fullest necessary extent as long as danger threatens; and we wish the armed services had this faith and would not try to pass peacetime UMT under the cloak of the present grave danger.

H. R. 3364 meets our officially declared stand on this profoundly vital problem in that:

1. It discards universal military training and calls for the fullest necessary use of selective service, with lowered physical and mental tests if needed;

2. Calls for induction at age 19 instead of 18, and for maximum of 24 months' service, or of not over 2 years of a boy's school life, and for release to Reserve status if national safety requires it;

3. Provides that Congress by concurrent resolution can change service requirements or suspend the draft when the danger is passed, and for a preservation of selective service machinery but a definite termination date for the draft which automatically gives you as an individual Congressman the right to review your present stand;

4. And provides for a democratically and economically sound occupational deferment based on obtaining maximum national service in the field in which each man is best fitted to serve his country.

The National Grange has no official stand on the provision of H. R. 3364 for services in racially segregated units.

We sincerely hope, for the sake of adequate provision for the present emergency, and for the preservation of democracy and the right of Congress to reflect that democracy, that you will support a bill carrying the four numbered items mentioned above.

We sincerely hope and pray also that every Member of the Congress, will put forth all possible efforts to bring about a safe and sound reduction of armaments for all nations alike, for a strengthening of law and order and a Christian peace for the world.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. SAUNDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

America in Her Hour of Test and Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, at the recent conference of the International Christian Leadership, Inc., a group sponsoring the breakfast clubs, our Director of Legislative Reference Service, Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, presented an eloquent statement on the basis of the faith of the American people in the ideal of freedom and justice which distinguishes the free nations from the philosophy of government known as communism. I am sure that the Members of the House will be impressed by this document.

The statement follows:

We are a part of America—Christian men and women drawn from government, from business, from labor, from the professions, from agriculture—from diverse backgrounds, but united in humbly seeking the mind of Christ for America and for us as citizens of America in this hour of her testing and decision. What follows has been hammered out of our experience; it has come to us as we have prayed. We share it with you, not that we are sure we have the answers, but that we have tried, with God's help, to find them. We hope and pray that each of you will search your own heart also; that you and we together may keep faith with our Christian heritage; that we may be steadfast in the days and years that lie ahead.

We hold these truths to be self-evident.

Two ways of life are struggling for mastery today.

1. The Christian way sees the universe as God's handiwork. The Communist way sees it as blind mechanism, neither coming from anywhere, nor with any destiny save an ultimate oblivion.

2. The Christian way sees man a child of God with the gift of immortality. The Communist way makes him one with a mechanistic universe, and death the inevitable end.

3. The Christian way sees government the servant of man, an instrument designed to establish the great freedoms, whose policies are aimed at releasing man's inner powers. The Communist way has established the state as man's master, and in the name of man's well-being has created a regime of fear that stultifies the creative and withers the spirit.

4. The Christian way would establish world peace on a foundation of righteousness and the brotherhood of all peoples. The Communist way extends the false peace of terror and death wherever it prevails; toward those peoples who would remain free, it holds out the threat of aggression, sabotage, and war.

5. The Christian way recognizes the dignity of work and the function of industry, both in an atmosphere of freedom. The Communist way enslaves its millions in work camps; and forces its scores of millions to conform to a regimentation, the end of which is the perpetuation in power of its overlords.

6. The Christian way believes in political imperialism only as a temporary trusteeship, with freedom for all peoples—an urgent as well as ultimate goal—a freedom already the proud possession of India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and many another nation formerly in political tutelage. The Communist way, behind a false facade of words, would extend the ruthless imperialism of Moscow to every nation it subverts or conquers.

7. The Christian way holds all men brothers, regardless of race, alike entitled to live a life of freedom, of dignity, of service to humanity. The Communist way would seize these so-called colored races at the very moment they are achieving both freedom and creative nationalism; and would drag them into a world of terror under the control of an oligarchy far more ruthless than they have known in the worst days of colonial rule.

8. The Christian way believes in the sacredness of marriage and the family, husband and wife, parent and child. The Communist way claims the child for the state; it makes of marriage a thing of convenience.

9. The Christian way holds science the handmaiden of integrity. The Communist way bends science to propaganda; it substitutes party line for truth.

These are the ways of life that are struggling for mastery. This is the struggle which is the greatest single fact in the world today. In such a world, we call upon all individuals—

(a) To deepen their faith in God and His purposes for man.

(b) To deepen their faith in man and man's possibilities as end and not as means.

(c) To deepen their own personalities by prayer; by contact with the great and sacred things in literature, music, and art; by humility before the testing that lies ahead.

(d) To dedicate themselves to bringing about in our America better understanding and mutual help between groups, races, classes, and creeds.

(e) To see to it that their sense of obligation to serve others, their country, and their world, overrides any concern for their own selfish interests.

(f) To recognize their interdependence upon each other and upon those all over the world whose values include freedom, the dignity of the individual, his obligation to serve.

In such a world, we call upon our country as a unit—

1. To keep faith with Christ and its Christian heritage. Into our Nation and people have been built the prayers and struggles and selfless service of millions of Christian men and women. To them we owe much of our belief in freedom, much of our American dream of equality of opportunity, much of our constitutionalism with its responsibility of the governors to the governed. If these religious springs of actions wither, the days of our national strength are numbered. We gladly recognize the contribution to this same end of other faiths, notably that of Israel, who share with Christians the view of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man.

2. To rise to its responsibilities of leadership. So much of the world is terribly weak; so much is groping for new gods with its old gods in the dust; so much is under a cloud of terror. However reluctant we are to assume it; God has called America to leadership in this our day. May we answer the call.

3. To use its power only to serve. Our Nation finds itself with a material and economic strength unparalleled in all history. Power tempts to arrogance; the siren of self-centeredness beckons. May America be humble in this day; and know the inner meaning of the words of the Master of us all, "He that is greatest among you, let him be the servant of all."

Before concluding, we want to make a few other things clear.

(a) With the Russian people we have no quarrel. They like so many others are exploited and deceived by their masters.

(b) We favor military and economic strength as necessary, but believe that the final outcome of the struggle lies not with them, but rather in the field of men's loyalties; in the intensity and enthusiasm with which they believe in their way of life.

(c) We recognize the sacrifices already made by the free in other lands, and salute them as comrades in the great battle. So we conclude:

"God has sounded forth a trumpet that shall
never call retreat
He is sifting out the souls of men before His
judgment seat
Be swift, my soul, to answer Him, be jubilant, my feet.
Our God is marching on."

San Carlos Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, on a recent visit to Phoenix, Ariz., I had the opportunity of visiting the Pima Indian Reservation in company with my colleague, Congressman HARRISON, of Wyoming. This visit was in connection with the existing water conditions in Arizona.

We discovered that the Indians on this reservation had received a formal notice that their water allotment for the calendar year of 1951 would be only one-half acre-foot per acre for the entire San Carlos project. This meant, according to the letter of notification from the superintendent, Mr. A. E. Robinson, that they would only be able to plant from one-eighth to one-tenth of the acreage on the reservation and, as the letter stated, that any operator who planted more than 20 acres of cotton out of his 160 acres would not have sufficient water to even irrigate that 20 acres.

Now naturally this is a very serious condition when we consider that this land is exceedingly fertile and classed among the most tillable land in the San Carlos area. Added to this problem was the fact that the superintendent told us that the Indians had to haul in all of their domestic and drinking water. One of the Indian escorts stated that it took 1 day out of each Indian's week to hitch up the horses and haul sufficient water back for the week's use. They claimed that this shortage was due to the fact that the water level had dropped below the depth of their wells.

They then told us that this was largely due to the fact that the white men were drilling wells immediately adjacent to the reservation at a greater depth and drawing out the water to irrigate their cotton acreage.

When I asked the superintendent what they could do about it he stated there was not anything they could do because this was the responsibility of the State of Arizona.

While this area was declared a critical area, the present wells can still continue to draw water from this area for the cotton acreage of the white man at the expense of the original American, the Indian. The Indian, because he is directly under our wardship and is dependent upon us for money because we have made him that way, cannot get the money to drill his wells deeper and, therefore, the white man takes all of the water away.

To add to this tragedy we discovered that the man who drove us back to our destination was one of the men who has been practicing this artifice and taking water that rightfully belongs to the Indians, and has been working in Washington in an attempt to get the Government to expend a billion dollars to rescue him and others by bringing in Colorado River water to bring up these water tables.

The question I raise is, What are we going to do for the Indians? We turn around and tie their hands through our wardship and then allow the white man to steal the very thing which we supposedly are giving them.

PIMA INDIAN AGENCY,
Sacaton, Ariz., March 8, 1951.

To Indian Irrigation Committee and Indian Farmers:

This letter is being addressed to you so that you will all be fully advised of the present irrigation water supply. Under date of January 22, 1951, Mr. Warnock, project engineer, recommended to the office a first apportionment of one-half acre-foot per acre for the San Carlos Project for the calendar year of 1951. We have delayed writing this letter to you until this apportionment was approved in Washington. We have received this approval dated February 23, 1951.

At the present time there is no water stored behind the Coolidge Dam and the latest snow surveys show that there is little possibility of receiving any run-off from the upper watersheds. Therefore, for the present it appears that the only water which will be available will be the one-half acre-foot apportionment which of course will be made up entirely of water pumped from our irrigation wells. Those farmers who have planted wheat and barley crops have already or will shortly use up their first apportionment.

We are attaching hereto a copy of a letter dated February 21, 1951, that has been addressed to the farmers in the White District as to just what they can expect as far as planting is concerned and the conditions set forth in that letter will also apply to the Indian farmers, namely, that only one-eighth to one-tenth of the acreage on the Reservation can be planted.

The office is now working in Washington endeavoring to raise a sum of $150,000 for irrigation well rehabilitation. At the present time we are advised that the prospects for the approval of this appropriation seem favorable and with the receipt of this money there is a possibility that a small additional apportionment may be made at a later date, but not in time for cotton acreage.

You will be kept fully advised from time to time as to the water situation. But at the present time it would appear that we are facing the most critical water situation since the project was placed in operation.

Yours very truly,
A. E. ROBINSON,
Superintendent.

SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION AND
DRAINAGE DISTRICT,
Coolidge, Ariz., February 21, 1951.

To District Landowners and Water Users:

On January 11, 1951, we wrote district owners and operators advising with respect to the outlook for irrigation water supply for the year 1951. The outlook was then critical.

This letter to you has been delayed in the hope that precipitation would occur during January and February which would give promise of some substantial run-off. Up to this time no such rain or snow has fallen on the upper watershed. Therefore we can report no improvement. Based on prevailing conditions the Gila River is expected to deliver less water during 1951 than in any previous year of record.

There is no usable storage in San Carlos Reservoir. At present we can expect to have no dependable supply except what can be delivered by pumping from project wells.

It is expected that the apportionment will shortly be made in the amount of one-half acre-foot per acre. No further apportionment can be expected. The delivery of this water will be limited to the amount which pumps can deliver during each day and will be limited further to lands which can be reached with such pumped water. Under these conditions the water supply appears to be sufficient for about one-eighth to one-tenth of the acreage of district lands.

It is our opinion that under the present outlook for water, the operator who plants more than 20 acres of cotton out of each 160 acres, cannot expect water enough to properly mature his crop. Between now and planting time there may be a change in the weather to bring some improvement. It is doubtful that change will come at this late date. Should there be substantial improvement in water supply prospects during February or March, we shall report the same promptly.

Yours very truly,
C. A. ANDERSON,
District Engineer.

Baskets of Groceries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, five Members of the House recently appeared on the floor with baskets of groceries and in a graphic and dramatic demonstration called attention to the increased cost of food and the small amount of groceries $5 buys today in comparison with what it would buy in 1919.

While no direct charges of farm profiteering are made, the inference is that farm prices are too high and the consumer is paying more for food than his meager income justifies. This widespread impression so generally accepted and so industriously disseminated, is being emphasized by determined campaigns to roll back farm prices and fix farm price ceilings below parity and below comparative incomes of all other industries.

Mr. Speaker, there are two glaring fallacies in this food-basket demonstration and in these covert drives to reduce the wages of farmers and the dividends on investments in farm lands and stock and equipment below the wages and dividends paid other workers and on other investments.

In the first place the farmer receives only a small part of the $5 paid by the consumer for that basket of food. A 16-cent can of tomatoes brings the grower 3 cents. A can of corn selling for 19 cents brings the farmer 2¾ cents. For a pound of onions selling at 6 cents the truck gardener received a penny. Wheat in a 16-cent loaf of bread sells for 2⅔ cents at the elevator. Milk doubles in price after leaving the farm. And while there were no shirts in these baskets, the price the planter receives for the cotton in a shirt is an infinitesimal part of the cost of the garment. So do not hold the farmer exclusively responsible for the cost of the baskets exhibited here on the floor of the House.

But the most specious sophistry, the greatest fallacy in the wood pile, is the fact that the yardstick is money when it should be income—dollars and cents when it should be dividends on investments and wages for a day's labor.

The real question is not how much food $5 bought in 1919 and will buy today but how much food annual dividends and a day's pay bought in 1919 and will buy today. Judged by that criterion—measured by that yardstick, farm products are today cheaper than they were in 1919 or 1929 or 1939.

Compare dividends. Sears, Roebuck & Co., a firm with a large farm clientele reports a net profit for the year ending January 31 last of $143,654,981, equal to $6.08 a share of common stock as compared with a net of $108,206,718 or $4.58 per share in 1949. But let us go back with the baskets to 1919. Here is a tabulation from the Department of Commerce:

Net income after taxes, selected large corporations in the United States, 1919 and 1950

[Thousands of dollars]

Firm name	Net income after taxes	
	1919	1950
United States Steel Corp.	76,296	215,335
General Motors	60,518	834,044
Standard Oil (Indiana)	34,904	123,891
Du Pont de Nemours	15,058	207,692
General Electric	26,078	173,424
Bethlehem Steel Corp.	25,357	122,976
Anaconda Copper Mining	5,103	27,253
International Harvester Co.	12,878	94,715
American Tobacco Co.	15,906	41,733
Westinghouse Electric Corp.	18,789	77,923
Kennecott Copper Corp.	447	88,161
Republic Iron & Steel Corp.	2,141	65,795
Reynolds, R. J.	11,272	40,253
Goodyear Tire & Rubber	28,277	35,199
Ligrett & Myers Tobacco	5,949	29,658
Phillips Petroleum	−413	51,557
Eastman Kodak	18,326	61,950
Firestone Tire & Rubber	9,307	33,288
Atlantic Refining Co.	8,871	40,842
American Telephone & Telegraph	44,306	286,802

And here are comparative tables on wages of other workers than farm workers for an 8-hour day prepared by the United States Department of Labor and the United States Civil Service Commission:

Occupation	Average daily rate	
	1919	Jan. 2, 1951
Bricklayers	$7.68	$23.12
Carpenters	6.20	19.68
Electricians (inside wiremen)	6.36	21.28
Painters	6.12	18.64
Plumbers and gas fitters	6.60	21.20
Automobile workers (Michigan)	4.90	14.24
Federal employees (Washington)	[1] 1,026.00	3,936.00

[1] Per annum.

In order to get a cross section of the increase in the pay of Federal employees under civil service in the country at large, it is to be noted that the average annual salary of all postal employees during fiscal year 1919 was $1,175 and in fiscal year 1950 it was $3,488.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer believes these wages are fully justified. If anything they are not high enough. No one believes more firmly than the farmer that the laborer is worthy of his hire, and with the cost of living at its present peak workers and their families could not reasonably subsist on less. The only point on which the farmer insists is that he and his family are also entitled to a living wage and an American standard of living.

But it is evident that it requires less investments and less dividends and less working time, by far, to buy the baskets of food displayed here in the House the other day. The American consumer has never been fed so sumptuously at such small comparative cost as today.

And this does not take into consideration the vastly increased costs of production on the American farm.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports that the prices of farm machinery in 1919 compared with the latest prices are as follows:

Twelve-tube grain drill: 1919, $149; September 1950, $426.

Five-foot mower: 1919, $34.50; June 1950, $197.

Disk harrow, 7-foot single section: 1919, $56.60; September 1950, $123.

Corn planter: 1919, $76; March 1950, $202.

And the cost of fertilizers, insecticides, and all other costs of production have advanced in proportion.

In the face of these added costs and the constantly advancing prices received by everybody else in the last few months farm prices have dropped. Wheat sold for $2.81 a bushel in 1943. On January 15 of this year it was $2.09 a bushel. Corn in 1948 brought $2.46 a bushel. On January 15 of this year it brought $1.54. Hogs, on the same basis of price comparison, were $27.40 and have dropped to $20 per hundredweight. Eggs are lower. So is butterfat. Though the typical diet of one person increased in cost from $112 in 1939 to $252 in 1950, 1950 consumers could buy for 17 percent of their personal income the same quantity and quality of food which cost 22 percent of that same 1939 income.

Yet there are those who want to push the farmer still further down and roll his income still further back by freezing his prices below parity levels.

The situation is admirably summarized by a statement issued April 4, 1951, by the board of directors of the Missouri Farmers Association:

CEILINGS ON FARM PRICES AT PARITY LEVELS

The farmer's economic position does not justify the agitation in Washington by some people for Congress to fix farm price ceilings below parity levels. If ceilings are placed on farm products, the lowest ceiling which could be imposed should be that which would give farmers purchasing power high enough to warrant a high level of farm production and adequate food supplies.

Income received by farmers is not abnormally high and is not likely to be even under present inflationary conditions. It is not likely that the 1951 net farm income will exceed $17,000,000,000. This would be below the 1947 net income which was almost $18,000,000,000. The net farm income dropped to around $16,500,000,000 in 1948 and to about $14,000,000,000 in 1949. In 1950 the net farm income, even after a period of increasing farm prices the last half of the year, was only $13,000,000,000. In 1947 the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities, interest, taxes, and wage rates was 259, in January 1951 the index stood at 272 or 14 percent higher than the 1947 level. Therefore, in 1951 the net income of farmers will buy considerably less than it did in 1947.

Although the farmer's price level is supposed to be 13 percent above parity, the farmer is far from parity so far as his income is concerned. In 1947 the income per capita of the farm population was $647 compared with $1,409 for the nonfarm population. In 1951, the income of the farm population probably will amount to around $625 per person while the income of the nonfarm population probably will exceed $1,600. Consequently, the farmer now is receiving only about one-half as much income per capita as the nonfarm population.

In comparison with corporate profits the farmer is still in an unfavorable position. Corporate profits have risen from $18,500,000,000 in 1947 to a record peak of $21,900,000,000 in 1950 after taxes. At the same time as the farmer's income was dropping from nearly $18,000,000,000 to $13,000,000,000, the

incomes of corporations were rising from $18,500,000,000 to nearly $22,000,000,000.

Another indication of the disparity so far as farmers' incomes are concerned is the fact that the farm population is 18.8 percent of the total population, while the farmer in 1949 received only 7.8 percent of the total national income. In 1947 farmers received 10.1 percent of the national income while providing 19.3 percent of the total population.

Although food prices are high in terms of dollars, it must be remembered that they are not high in terms of purchasing power of wages. As of December, 1950, the latest date for which figures are available, prices of farm products averaged 8 percent above parity. In that same month the market basket of food, representing the typical purchases of a 3-person family for 1 year would have cost $861. The average rate was $1.54 an hour, which means that the city wage earner could have purchased that market basket with only 440 hours of labor. In comparison that market basket of food would have taken 461 hours of labor in 1949, 527 hours in 1947, 479 hours in 1942 and 609 hours in 1933. The 1933 figures are interesting because the market basket at that time would have cost only $277, but would have required 609 hours of labor or nearly 40 percent more than at present.

The recent publicity in some of the slick magazines has attempted to point out the exceptionally large incomes of so-called "typical farmers." According to available statistics these so-called "typical farmers" are considerably above average so far as incomes are concerned. In 1945 farm prices stood at 206 percent of the 1910–14 level, or about two-thirds of the present level, but the purchasing power of farm products at that time was only 9 percent above normal. In that same year, farmers were receiving only $685 of income per capita compared with $1,284 for the nonfarm population. According to census figures, less than 12 percent of the farms in the United States were returning their owners as much as $3,000 of net farm income during that year. It must be remembered that the farmer is not only a worker but a capitalist and consequently his net income must include a return for the capital which he has invested as well as for his own labor. In a year when prices were supposed to have been favorable from a purchasing power standpoint, the facts show that 88 percent of the farmers were receiving less than $3,000 a year as returns for their labor, capital and management and average incomes were much lower. In that same year wage earners in the manufacturing industry were averaging $2300 per year for their labor only.

If price ceilings are set on farm products, the parity level is one basis for making certain that farm prices are increased as costs of farming increase. Although rigid ceilings were in effect during World War II, it must be remembered that the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities used in production and living increased from a level of 152 in 1942 to 167 in 1943, 176 in 1944, and 180 in 1945. Thus, prices paid by farmers increased 12 percent during the 3 years from 1942 to 1945, or 4 percent per year. Unless farm prices had been permitted to rise the farmer would have been caught between rising costs and rigid price ceilings which would have forced many of them out of production.

The use of the parity price level as the lowest possible ceiling is one means of keeping farmers from being crushed between these two forces, as well as a means of insuring the adequate production of food.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I append statements on the subject by the Secretary of Agriculture during a recent hearing before the Committee on Appropriations:

POSITION OF FARMER

Mr. CANNON. The farmers are in a much better position to cooperate in winning the war this time than they were at the beginning of the last war?

Secretary BRANNAN. They are, Mr. Chairman. On the other hand they are more dependent on things which must move to them from outside their farms than they were at the beginning of World War II.

As you go back to earlier in our history, the farmer was more and more self-sufficient. He did not use large quantities of fertilizer. He did not need complicated machinery and machinery parts. He did not need gasoline, rubber, and a lot of other things of that character. He did not have to go elsewhere for his hybrid seed each year.

Now the farmer is dependent upon the movement of all of these things to his farm each year. In one sense he is better equipped to produce for the emergency, but at the same time he is more dependent upon the balance of the economy to be able to carry out his job than he was in earlier history.

COST OF PRODUCTION

Mr. CANNON. Even though his productive capacity has increased, this change has increased his cost of production disproportionately to what it was in 1940?

Secretary BRANNAN. Very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. The cost of production per unit is today greater than it ever was before on the American farm.

Secretary BRANNAN. Greater than it was at any time in all our history, and it is continuing to advance by the year and by the month.

PROFITS OF FARMS

Mr. CANNON. Are the farmers' returns or profits increasing in proportion as his costs of production increase?

Secretary BRANNAN. No, Mr. Chairman. From 1948, when farm operators realized incomes reached their peak, in net terms around $18,000,000,000, their net incomes have gone down until toward the end of 1950—it went from about $18,000,000,000 in 1947 to around $13,000,000,000 for 1950. It is just now turning back up again as a result of the improved price situation arising incident to the emergency.

COMPARISON WITH INDUSTRY

Mr. CANNON. How does that decrease in income compare with the income of industry, commerce, labor, transportation, banking, and so on?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the nonagricultural income in this country, profits, margins, and all the rest of the major economic factors, have been on an uptrend since before the Second World War. It is still on an uptrend at this very moment.

During the period from 1948, when farm prices and farm incomes were falling off drastically, both wages and other forms of nonfarm income were going up. You will note on the charts in 1949 there was a small drop-off in corporate profits, but that was all regained and the graph goes right on up from then on.

Mr. CANNON. While the farmer is producing more for the Nation's economy every year he is being paid proportionately less or comparatively less for his services?

Secretary BRANNAN. Certainly, by comparison with other segments of the economy, that is true.

OBJECTIVE

Mr. CANNON. You mentioned the cost of formulating and carrying out programs. In what respect does your goal or objective at this time differ from what your goal or objective was at the beginning of the Second World War?

Secretary BRANNAN. The goal then was all-out production. The goal now is all-out production. The goal then was all-out production within the pattern of special needs. It is still so at this time. In other words, it is not an all-out production of everything.

If you will observe our production guides for this year, we suggested a little less emphasis on soybeans and greater emphasis on corn, because we are going to need increasing supplies of corn for increasing the livestock population, and the production of livestock products, which is the one good way, if not probably the only successful way, we will ever be able to reduce meat prices to the consumer at the market place.

Mr. CANNON. Really, the only available remedy for high meat prices is to increase the supply?

Secretary BRANNAN. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. To more nearly meet the demand?

Secretary BRANNAN. That is right.

As the economy ceases to produce some of the other semidurable and soft goods, as we cease to produce as many automobiles, as a result of the cut-back orders of Mr. Wilson, and perhaps fewer radios and perhaps less of all other durable types of goods, and families have more money in their hands, they are going to spend more of it for food.

The very striking example comes to our minds each time we talk about this, when you remember that in 1946–47, when meat prices went up so rapidly, the per capita consumption was also close to the highest in our history. People simply did not have anything else to spend their money for. They were competing for meat. They were driving the price up, and all of them were eating more meat. Even the increased supply could not match the increased demand as a result of the shift of purchasing power from the durables into the food items.

HEALTH OF PEOPLE

Mr. CANNON. Would you say that that increase in the consumption of meat and of vital foods was reflected in increased health and efficiency of the people of the country as a whole?

Secretary BRANNAN. It certainly was, Mr. Chairman. There is worldr of evidence of that fact.

PROGRAM FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. CANNON. In the event of an all-out war, Mr. Secretary, which we trust will not materialize, what increase would be made in food production and how would it have to be applied?

Secretary BRANNAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say that a great deal higher volumes of commodities would be required than we are shooting for this year. As a matter of fact we are asking the farmer to plant more acres this year than we really should from the standpoint of conservation.

Mr. CANNON. And to produce more hogs and cattle?

Secretary BRANNAN. And to produce more hogs and cattle. We are not asking them for more than we have previously asked. In other words we have requested higher acreages and production than we had last year; this year's request is higher.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, you are asking the limit?

Secretary BRANNAN. We are asking the limit. The problem which would come, in the event of an outbreak of all-out hostilities of some type, would be a shifting between the various commodities. Perhaps there would be less of one and more of another.

That will be true, anyway, Mr. Chairman. I referred to soybeans a little while ago. We very fortunately last year had the greatest soybean crop in our history, and I say very fortunately because soybean oil is a substitute for or concomitant to cottonseed oil. Last year we had one of the smallest cottonseed crops in our history. The slack in the oil market was absorbed by the very large supply of soybeans.

There will be, perhaps, a shift back and forth among those kinds of commodities, and a shift in other directions, as the defense effort indicates.

You will recall that at one time during World War II an all-out effort was made to secure flaxseed because we could not import flaxseed oil or linseed oil from the Argentine or other sources. To that end we used the price-support mechanism and placed a price support of $6 a bushel under flaxseed to get the amount needed.

We are now changing our emphasis very materially to get the fiber crops. We have been doing a considerable amount of work on that this past year or so, both research-wise and stimulating production through educational programs running out to the farmers.

ALL-OUT PRODUCTION OF FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. CANNON. You are asking for the all-out production of food products; you are appealing to the farmers to produce to the limit, to the utmost. What would happen in the event that all-out war does not materialize, and you have this surplus thrown on a peacetime market? You are asking the farmer now to produce more than is required for normal consumption or domestic consumption, and the farmer is responding, as he always does, and is providing more than is required by the domestic consumption. Now, if there is no war, if there is no wartime demand, what effect will this have on the farmer's economy when all of this surplus food that you are appealing to him to produce must be consumed at home in the normal channels of trade?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, you have touched on a point that has been a very worrisome point for us. I am not so much concerned about the fact that our production is geared to the possibilities of all-out hostilities as about the fact that our production has been geared to a very high level of economic activity in this country which is putting purchasing power in the hands of many, many millions of people, very adequate purchasing power. If, for example, there was a very drastic cut-back in the production program as now outlined by Mr. Wilson, and people began to be laid off, and I certainly do not anticipate anything like it, but if that were to happen, probably then we would have some troubles in agriculture, Mr. Chairman, but our troubles in agriculture would not be any more severe, I am sure, than the troubles which would come in the other parts of the economy, too.

Mr. CANNON. Just there, Mr. Secretary, you do not mean that we are also producing automobiles, tractors, and fertilizer at a rate which would be embarrassing in that it would produce a surplus which would be thrown upon the market in case of permanent peace?

Secretary BRANNAN. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, I was referring to a cut-back in the production of tanks, guns, and things of that character.

Mr. CANNON. They do not affect other industries as adversely as a surplus of food would affect the farmer's market.

Secretary BRANNAN. That is right. If we curtail the production program for tanks, guns, and the rest of the things that are now scheduled, as a result of which there is a very high level of employment, then there might not be such strong competition for the American farmer's products in the market place, and he would stand to suffer some price depreciation and, except for the very fine price-support program which the Congress has provided—I mean the very fundamentally sound theory of price supports which this Congress has continued to provide—the American farmer might start into a tail spin that would be comparable to the one he led the whole country into and which resulted in the situation we had in 1929–32.

Mr. CANNON. Then, the national program is subjecting the farmer to a danger to his postwar price structures, such as you very aptly say, produced devastating results in previous agricultural depressions, notably 1920 and 1921. No other industry or class of business in the United States is being asked to assume a similar risk, is being asked to accelerate its production program to a point that would depress its price structure following the days of war. The farmer alone is being singled out to run that risk.

Secretary BRANNAN. That is correct, sir.

In the event of a very substantial decrease in purchasing power in the United States, there would be some commodities which would be adversely affected pricewise. Our price-support programs would then come into play, and perhaps some of these commodities could be utilized in the implementation of our foreign-program objectives. We now have facilities for storing a good quantity of the grain and to keep a considerable quantity out of the market place and relieve its depressing pressures, but it would certainly be foolhardy to say that we would not be faced with some new and serious problems. Of course, we would be faced with some problems in the way of the perishable commodities, just as we were a short time ago.

STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. CANNON. What provision are you making for storage facilities to take care of this expected surplus?

Secretary BRANNAN. Mr. Chairman, we have built approximately 550,000,000 bushels of grain storage in 1949, and it is now out there, dispersed over the country, and it is available to carry some of our large stocks. Simultaneously we have encouraged private trade to increase its storage capacity, and there have been increases and approved facilities in the hands of the private trade.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. CANNON. What is the food-rationing outlook at this time, the prospect that supplies will have to be curtailed at the market place, such as was done in the last war?

Secretary BRANNAN. Mr. Chairman, we do not contemplate an early application of any kind of rationing program. We certainly are not talking about it, and we are bending every effort in the opposite direction, attempting to put enough on the market that no rationing program will be necessary.

Mr. CANNON. Would you have authority to establish ceiling price below the legal rates, the legal prices under the law supporting the price of farm products which fall below parity?

Secretary BRANNAN. I think not, Mr. Chairman. I hope that problem never arises, and the probability that it will arise is pretty remote, because, as you recall, the Defense Production Act sets the legal minimums at 100 percent of parity or the prices prevailing during 30 days prior to Korea, whichever is higher. We might get into a situation in which there would be conflict between a desire to set ceilings at the legal minimum, which is 100 percent of parity or pre-Korea, if the Department decided that in order to stimulate production we would need to increase or maintain prices above the parity or pre-Korea level.

If we said, for example, that we wanted to set the support level at 110 percent of parity, and the legal minimum would be 100 percent of parity, and Mr. DiSalle insisted on the price being at the minimum of 100 percent of parity, there would be a 10-percent overlapping there which might give us trouble; but I am reasonably sure, Mr. Chairman, if we ever had a situation in which we had to do something extraordinary to stimulate production in this country, there would be little tendency to try to fix the minimum price below our support level.

Mr. CANNON. Your statutory support level?

Secretary BRANNAN. No; the support level designed to induce production. We do have the authority to use support prices above the fixed statutory levels under certain circumstances, where it is in the national interest.

DEFINITION OF PARITY

Mr. CANNON. What is the Department's interpretation of the term "parity"; what is parity?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, there are many definitions, Mr. Chairman.

Parity, in one word, is equality for farmers; in an effort to achieve economic equality for farmers.

A little more extended definition is that parity represents the relationship between the cost of the things that farmers have to buy, for production and family living, and the prices which they get for their commodities in the market place. It is tied to a base period which was established as 1910–14 and is then projected down to date. For example, the parity price for a bushel of wheat today is enough to allow the farmer to buy the same amount of goods as would have exchanged for a bushel of wheat in 1910–14.

Mr. CANNON. In brief, parity means equality, the farmer's equality with other industries?

Secretary BRANNAN. That is right, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Summarizing it still more briefly, parity is fair? It is equity.

Secretary BRANNAN. That's right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Whenever you reduce the farmer's price below parity, you are not being fair to the farmer. Then you are giving him an unfair price?

Secretary BRANNAN. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. CANNON. You are favoring other industries at his expense?

Secretary BRANNAN. Yes, sir; that is right.

I am also including an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. DiSalle, the Director of Price Stabilization:

Mr. CANNON. You have additional livestock regulations in contemplation?

Mr. DISALLE. Yes, sir. We have a beef regulation being written and a pork regulation.

Mr. CANNON. Does that apply at the counter, in the market place, on the farm, or at the point of distribution?

Mr. DISALLE. It will apply from the point of production to the point of sale.

OBSERVANCE OF PARITY IN DETERMINING PRICES

Mr. CANNON. Every effort will be made to arrive at an equitable price, and you will observe parity in determining prices being imposed?

Mr. DISALLE. Yes. Beef is at 141 percent of parity right now.

Mr. CANNON. What about hogs?

Mr. DISALLE. They are right about parity. They have been below parity most of the time. It keeps fluctuating back and forth.

Mr. CANNON. It is axiomatic, Mr. Director, that in an inflation the farmers' prices rise last and fall first. That was true in the last war and in recent wartime developments. Since 1945 industrial prices, dividends, freight rates, price of farm machinery, fertilizer, wages of all classes of labor, especially farm labor, and the national income and the Federal revenue have reached peaks never before attained. I suppose you might say they are now at the highest point of many years.

Mr. DISALLE. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. With one exception, however. The price of hogs has been dropping until recently. It went up above $30 and went down to below $18.

Mr. DISALLE. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. Well, while everything else was going up together including the cost of producing the hog, the price was falling. You will take that into consideration so no step will be taken to place it lower than parity?

Mr. DISALLE. Under the law we are bound to observe parity.

Address Delivered by Dr. Percy L. Julian at Sixteenth Annual Patriotic Award Dinner of the Chicago Decalogue Society of Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, each year the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, one of the distinguished bar associations in the city of Chicago, commendably presents its coveted award of merit to an individual who, in the opinion of the society, has done most to advance the cause of humanity and democracy in our community.

This year the award was appropriately given to one of Chicagoland's most civic-minded citizens, the world renowned chemical scientist, Dr. Percy L. Julian. More than 1,300 people, including numerous dignitaries, crowded the grand ballroom of the Palmer House on March 3, 1951, to pay tribute to Dr. Julian on the occasion of his receiving the award.

Dr. Julian, as is known, is the discoverer of numerous life-giving drugs arising from his research on the soya bean. Among them are cortisone, the hormone compound used in the treatment of arthritis; physostigmine, used in the cure of the eye disease, glaucoma; prostigmine, used in the treatment of paralysis; synthetic male and female hormones credited with saving the lives of countless unborn babies by protecting expectant mothers from miscarriage, and others.

From the soya bean, Dr. Julian also discovered the use of aero-foam, the fire extinguisher which saved so many lives aboard ships during our naval war in the Pacific.

At the present time, he is working hard on pregnenolone to combat fatigue and amino acids for the treatment of infection and starvation.

By his brilliant discoveries in the field of chemical research, Dr. Julian has demonstrated unusual service to mankind and dynamic leadership in his chosen field. The award of merit given him by the Decalogue Society takes cognizance of the fact, morecver, that Dr. Julian is also unselfishly and continuously at work on the critical problem of improving the science of human relationships which exist between man and man, group and group, and for his avowed championing of the cause of decency and the progress of a free America.

Reprinted below are the remarks made by Dr. Julian after acceptance of the award:

THE IMAGE OF OUR NATIONAL CHARACTER

Mr. Chairman, friends of the Decalogue Society, distinguished guests, I would not be a realist at all if I failed to appreciate the inspiring and typical American flavor of this occasion. For my children I must honestly record that this testimonial transcends anything that has to do with the feeble efforts of their father to be a good American citizen; it is rather a part of the traditional and finest American spirit—that we are never too coldly critical in our appraisal, that we never set our standards of worth so high, that we cannot pause and extend our love, our generosity and our food to the spirit of the humble who need it, that their spirits may be rekindled and their faith deepened. And my children will remember the spiritual of their forefathers, "Let us cheer the weary traveler." I can only say with deep humility that I shall strive someday to be worthy of only a small part of your outpouring, and I thank you from the bottom of my heart for this symbol to my children of the ties that bind them to the hearts of their fellow Americans.

You who have gathered together at this feast of love and human generosity represent the custodians of an image which hundreds of millions of people in this hour are attempting to bring into focus to discern clearly its real and basic outline. It is an image around which the ferments of an entire world are today seething. With mingling feelings of fear, of trembling, of yearning, of futility, of resignation, of despair, and of hope, the millions of surging humanity, standing upon the brink of a new age, are seeking a view of this image. For you are the custodians of the image of our national character. Honest recognition of its inescapable fact, with deep humility, involves at the same time an acceptance or a rejection of significant and history-making responsibilities. Whether we, as custodians of this image, can be entrusted and will be entrusted by the gracious God of human destiny to lead humanity with intelligent humility and understanding into the promised land of beauty of which the prophets have prayed and the angels have sung—or whether mass hysteria, fed upon the love of confusion, which is the essence of satanic glee, shall make of the struggles of humanity nothing other than the Shakespearean cynicism that "day by day we ripe and ripe, and day by day we rot and rot, and thereby hangs the tale"—this is the basic issue of civilization's conflict today. Is so-called human progress a delusion? Is human history to be considered as horses moving in a theatre but getting nowhere? The answer to these questions depends, to no little extent, upon the basic outline of the image of our national character, as that image emerges into the focus of the gaze of the trembling children of this earth.

No nation in world history ever had a more peculiar and strategic rendezvous with the gracious God of human destiny. A Nation that has gathered itself by its own bootstraps from the sea-level of the jungle to the amazing elevation of unparalleled order, beauty, and power; a Nation that juts above the tableland of world morality as a massive peak; a Nation that has dared to keep the flame of freedom burning within the breast of the lowliest child of this earth; a Nation whose tortuous struggles toward articulation of this freedom have involved it in a maze of paradoxes, but has nevertheless stolidly maintained its determination to replace uncertainty by certainty, vagueness by definiteness, and confusion by order; a Nation that approaches its present historical rendezvous as a crown in the nobility of the ages. To such a nobility must its great debate in this historical hour address itself, and the greatest treason that its thinking citizenry could commit in this dark hour of uncertainty would be to approach its challenge with anything but unflinching honesty.

Sometime perhaps in the thirtieth century A. D. a world historian is going to write a chapter entitled "The Age of Approaching Honesty." A part of that chapter may be devoted to an apparently trivial portion of the American scene and may read as follows:

"And it came to pass that one day in this approaching millennium, a wise city father listened with patience but with determination to the angry protests of a few of his assembled councilmen. 'Sir, you bring ruin upon our beloved city with your unrealistic policies. These enterprising men of wealth and holdings will bring millions to the coffers of our fair city if you will but let them do so; there will be jobs for thousands; parks and terraces of untold beauty shall blend with the matchless beauty of our metropolis; no city of our land may boast of more beautiful homes for its citizens. All they ask is that in making land available to them for this glorious crowning feat of free enterprise, you give them the freedom to reserve these institutions of beauty for those whom they consider bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. Without this freedom, we fear they may take their capital elsewhere for investment.' And the city father answered them, saying 'It is not freedom these men covet, it is license. The concept of freedom is too precious to every American to be subjected to such idle mockery. My message which you will take to your clients is clear and unequivocal. Tell them to take their money and go elsewhere, for I do not intend to preside over a city whose social citadels do not point always to the impregnable battlements of a city of God.' And the remaining councilmen stood up in one body of acclaim for their wise leader, and assemblies of freedom-loving men the world over burst forth in thunderous applause. Perhaps the heavens smiled and the angels sang, for had not Glaucon said to Socrates ages ago: 'Socrates, I do not believe that there is such a city of God anywhere on earth.' Socrates replied, 'Whether such a city exists in heaven or ever will exist on earth, the wise man will live after the manner of that city, having nothing to do with any other, and in so looking upon it, will set his own house in order'."

Now our most intimate concern, Mr. Chairman, is with the dream of this city of God in the evolution of the image of our national character. It seems appropriate that we consider for a moment the peculiar identity of the roles which science and the law share in this evolution. These two, apparently distinct, and apparently unrelated intellectual disciplines have a remarkably similar operating base, for the cardinal essence of the approach of each of these disciplines at its best is the use of the human imagination. We speak here of imagination not in terms of the nostalgic and mystic beauty of Alice in Wonderland. We speak rather of imagination, as Walter Kerr recently expressed it, as the power to construct images of truth and goodness that render the truth and concomitant goodness more intense—that make truth and goodness more identical with reality in its broadest sense. The imagination of an Alice in Wonderland is not imagination at all; it is rather invention—"the invention of hypothetical states beyond and even contrary to any reality or any truth we have ever known." In the history, both of our disciplines, the products of such invention have unfortunately posed as truth and as reality, and if, indeed, the image of our national character is in this moment in any wise blurred, the confusion resulting from the substitution of invented pictures for reality itself, bears a large part of the blame. There is grave danger that the contagion of such a confusion will sap the vitality and robustness of our national character in a manner that will lead to disaster. Dr. Fred Hoskins told an intriguing story a few days ago, which aptly illustrates how prone is the human mind to accept invention as a substitute for reality and truth.

A little boy was running along the street as fast as his feet would carry him and came upon a woman who stopped him, saying "Now, my lad, where do you think you are going in such haste?", "Why, I'm going to fetch a doctor for Granddaddy; he is very ill." "Oh, your Grandfather is not ill at all; he only thinks he's ill, and you just go back home and tell him so." Whereupon the lad did as he was told. A few days later he met the same woman again. "Oh, how is your Granddaddy, my young man?" "Oh, he's fine; he thinks he's dead and we're burying him on Saturday." Now, the imagination which we identify with the core and cardinal essence of these two disciplines to which you and I are devoted—science and the law—strives to keep before us a vitalizing and impelling picture of ultimate truth—yea of eternal verity.

Now I am perfectly aware that the down to bedrock, pragmatic intellect will object to the introduction of such resilience in what to him is a comfortably static discipline of conveniently fixed reference points. He will complain that only chaos can result from a confusion of the isness of the law with its inevitable oughtness. And he will take pride in recalling for you the story of the student who allegedly cried out to Dean Pound, "But, professor, that is not justice," whereupon the learned Dean is reputed to have replied, "My boy, we are teaching the law; if you want justice, go to the divinity school." Now most of us believe that Dean Pound was libeled by his story. Certainly, however, when mature devotees of legal discipline are impressed by this reduction to absurdity it is a blot upon the high calling of your profession and another contribution to the blurring of the image of our national character. For, if justice is consistent with truth in an ordered world, there can be in the long run no basic conflict between justice and the law.

If then, such is the essence of legal objectives, then the first and most sacred duty of the judiciary, and its high calling, is to seek at all times the synonymity between the intent of the law and an image of eternal verity. And beyond this comes the determination to expand the law so as to bring it into consonance with such an image. Enslavement to custom, enticement by the opportunism of the moment; fever psychology should then be considered a disease by an enlightened judiciary and should never thwart the emergence of the true imaginative force. A beloved man of the Chicago bench, in supporting the validity of restrictive covenants some years ago is known to have said "Though my decision runs directly counter to my personal convictions as a Christian and contrary to the basic concepts of our American democratic faith, I can make no other decision for such is the law." Here on the part of a good man is a striking illustration of this disease of enslavement to custom of which I have spoken. As a Nation we are beginning to feel the effects of this all-too-prevalent reluctance to apply the true imaginative force to our social problems, this reluctance to travel in the valley of the shadows beyond the calloused husk that hides the force of inevitable truth. And yet nothing is more imperative to us at this crisis in world history than that we accelerate this very process. Indeed the stern lessons of history teach us that nothing is more tragic than the reluctance of mortal man to face the stark realism of cumulative truth. That Newton's revelations were like an earthquake to the foundations of the intellectual world of the eighteenth century is well-known history; it is equally well-known history, however, that Newton's victory was inevitable. For Newton has attempted the construction of an image of cosmic order in applying his laws of gravitation to the apparently wayward movements of the shooting stars. The victory of the ordered over the wayward; the victory of reality over the apparent—just had to prevail. Likewise the struggles of Galileo with the church over the truth or falsity of his heliocentric doctrine is an historical tragedy which none of us likes to recall.

Now what does all of this have to do with the evolution of the image of our national character? To begin with, whether we will it or not, we have come to the point in world history where we are literally expected to be the torch-bearers of world morality. The image of our national character must be consistent with the dreams and aspirations of mankind down the ages for an ordered world. It matters not how comfortable may be the concept of our geographical position as that of an island arsenal; the stark truth is that we are just as harnessed to the remainder of the world today, as the wayward planets of Newton were harnessed to one another by his universal laws of gravitation. The social forces of a dawning new age are constituting a geocentric system as inevitable as the planetary system of the physical world. To assume anything to the contrary is sheer, nonsensical invention. And the great debate needs more than anything else the application of that genuine imaginative force that constitutes the essence of the disciplines of science and the law, the willingness to identify our concepts of the future with the reality revealed by the cumulative lessons of human history.

Perhaps the most explosive paradox in world affairs today is the danger that the American Nation may take an excursion away from the cumulative historical realism of the past few centuries, and thus inadvertently attempt to stop the clock of human progress. Paradoxical because for centuries the dominating force in the image of our national character has been a vigorous frontier motif—aggressive and progressive change—ceaseless, restless, disturbing change. The world has come to recognize these positive elements of our national character as healthy elements in social, economic, and political progress. Now all of a sudden when the social forces of the world need badly a unifying or regulating concept, when the wayward movements of these social forces threaten the scheme of things to which we have become accustomed, we do not present a calm faith in the identity of our structure with history's long cherished aspirations. We develop instead an hysteria that spends much of its energies in thought control movements—in the feverish efforts to convince ourselves that we are all right just as we are. Few men in public life today dare a candid examination of these facets of hysteria that blur the image of our national character. We are jittery; we are frantic with fear, and we want no part of anything new. It is not a healthy, courageous, positive faith which we offer the world today; it is an uncertain and jittery negativism. Indeed some of us would go so far as to suggest that in the realm of interacting social forces, we have made all the discoveries; we are paragons of virtue—there are no more frontiers ahead of us.

To such a thesis no scientist can subscribe despite his pride in the historical greatness of our Nation. Our present American tendency toward smug refuge in omniscience and a sense of physical power is the direst disease that ever set upon our spirits as a people. We cannot be reminded too often of the scientist of something more than a hundred years ago who voiced the opinion that all of the great fundamental discoveries of science had been made, that it only remained for future generations to polish them, refine them, and adapt them to our practical needs. That man had reached the zenith of his capability for exploring the fundamental unknown.

Almost as if God, Himself, had been angered by such arrogant skepticism there descended upon this pronouncement an avalache of the most glorious discoveries that have ever been credited to the human intellect. For shortly thereafter Michael Faraday drew a living spark from the lifeless magnet. And Daniel, Grove, and Bunsen, following close on the heels of Faraday's discovery, gave us an enduring source of electrodynamic power. And Ohm in Germany taught us how to measure such a power when obtained. Yes, hardly had the ink dried upon this pronouncement when Bessel detected the parallaxes of the fixed stars, and Adams and Leverrier threw their grapples out into space and felt the influence of unseen planets trembling along the delicate lines of their analyses. Draper, Daguerre, and Talbot revealed the wonders of actinism and gave us the new science of photography. Yes, in another field, almost bordering on the aesthetic, Agassis in Italy rode down the Alps upon the backs of the glaciers and proved their steady flow. And Darwin lifted the veil from the mysteries of organic development.

I like to think of Stokes as he stood one afternoon in the English countryside gazing at a rainbow—and as he looked from the red to the violet end, he wondered what became of yonder violet as it faded into the invisible. And lo. Stokes with this dream had discovered for us the ultraviolet—beyond the violet—and blessed us unwittingly with vitamin D, the sunshine vitamin, so that today our children need not grow up with the crooked bones of rickets. So that today we have thrust deep at the heart of arthritis or rheumatism. And so today, they tell us, a hen that used to lay you 150 eggs a year now lays you 300 eggs a year because du Pont's cholesterol. All because Stokes gazed at a rainbow and had the courage to dream of good things yet to come.

And in our own country Edison discovered that hot bodies give off electricity—fast-moving electrons. And with this discovery he had written the first—even if relatively insignificant—chapter in the history of the atomic bomb. And when Roentgen in Germany read of Edison's discovery, he decided to place a piece of tungsten metal in the path of these electrons. And when did, he noticed new types of penetrating rays emitted from the tungsten target. And lo and behold. Roentgen had discovered for us the X-day enabling our eye to see where hitherto we had not dreamed it would.

And when Becquerel in France read of Roentgen's discovery he decided to look at his uranium from a new point of view. Yes; Becquerel's uranium from the pitchblende of mountain Austria, known to man partly because a poor Russian, Mendeleef, had struggled through the university and, out of the brilliance of his intellect, harnessed the wayward masses of the atoms into a system of periodicity, leaving a blank space which one day a metal, uranium, was to occupy. And now Becquerel had it; he wrapped a photographic plate up in a piece of black paper and laid it near a piece of uranium. And when he opened up the paper a short time later the photographic plate was as black as if it had been exposed to the direct rays of the sun. And Becquerel had written a second and very significant chapter in the history of the atomic bomb.

And when Pierre and Marie Curie read of Becquerel's discovery, they knew where to look for radium, and they went straight to that pitchblende from mountain Austria, and there they found it, and gave to humanity not only the first concrete remedy against the malady of cancer but to us a new image of a whole new science of rapidly moving particles charged with electricity—electrons, protons, and alpha particles. And a third

and most significant chapter had been written in the history of the atomic bomb.

And when Rutherford in England read of the Curies' work, he bombarded an atom of nitrogen with their alpha particles and converted the atom of nitrogen into an atom of hydrogen and an atom of oxygen. And Rutherford had written a fourth and vital chapter in the history of the atomic bomb.

And the years pass on with increasing perfection of the image of ultimate truth. When Marie's daughter, Irene Curie, working with Joliot, learned of Rutherford's work, she reexamined the beloved uranium of her mother, and there she found something that her mother's eyes had not seen, that there were other fast-moving particles emitted, not charged with electricity, not susceptible, therefore, to deflection in the electromagnetic fields of Faraday and Daniel, Grove and Bunsen, but fast-moving particles which went straight to their target. And a fifth and crucial chapter had been written in the history of the atomic bomb. And these workers had brought us close to the basic building stones—and some say the obliterating stones—of our material existence, ever closer and closer to reality, to ultimate truth.

This chronology of genius at work is but a striking illustration of history's summary rejection of any attempt to bottle up cumulative wisdom into a fixed and static formula of human behavior. I have often recalled a story told by Harry Emerson Fosdick of a minister who went into his study and found his little daughter busily sketching something on paper. "Why, Anne, what are you drawing?" he asked. "Oh, Daddy, I'm drawing a picture of God." "But, Anne, no one knows what God looks like." "Well, they will when I'm through."

We need gravely to ask ourselves whether we are tending toward a people with the mentality of Anne. Have we become so smugly satisfied with ourselves as we are that we reject any picture that we cannot reconcile with our man-sized God? Shall we allow the image of our national character with a devotion to the mere husks and rinds of good?

And Socrates replied "Whether such a city of God exists in Leaven or ever will exist on earth, the wise man will live after the manner of that city, having nothing to do with any other, and in so looking upon it, will set his own house in order." We cannot escape our historical destiny. Our house must be so set in order that the image of our national character will be identified with the image of order and truth for which noble men have bled and died down the ages.

I would be faithless to my strongest convictions as an American citizen did I not tell you that the image of our national character is severely blurred for the rest of the civilized world by the miserable eighteenth and nineteenth century European-like ghettos which choke the honor and human decency out of nearly every major metropolis of this Nation. It is symptomatic of our smugness that we expect to weld Americans together in a unity of purpose, while we subject the spirits of 15,000,000 of Americans to the horrors of a Dachau and Buchenwald psychology. In the sense of the Thracian maiden's evaluation of Thales of Miletus, some of us have been so busy studying the stars of freedom that we have literally fallen into the wells of spiritual degradation at our feet. We cannot hold the garment of God in our right hand and raise it to our lips while a left hand behind our back is clasped firmly in the grip of Satan, and expect a world of people to discern a coveted image of our national character. I warn my fellow citizens that no true patriotism can emanate from the American ghetto. It has only served to create a house bitterly divided against itself, and though the house may stand, its strength and fiber are vitiated. Someday someone will write a dramatic story for the rest of the civilized world of the detailed horrors of the American ghetto and the peculiar helplessness of its innocent victims. I say unto you now that the forces which have fought to maintain American Negro ghettos must be destroyed. Foremost among these forces is that section of the real-estate group which spreads the doctrine that if a Negro moves next to you no matter who he is, the value of your property goes down. This insidious propaganda and incidentally, this vicious lie, has ceased to carry the flavor of privileged speech. It has become vile slander, incitement to arson, to murder, and to the wildest forms of mob violence. But for a half hour delay, by the grace of God, I would today be a mute victim of this propaganda. The time has come when Federal and city statutes may well be necessary to insure citizens against first degree or premeditated murder by these members of the real-estate clan. I have never witnessed a more subtly generated hysteria than that created daily in the mind of the American property owner by the so-called respectable real-estate dealer. A few months ago one of my coworkers went with her husband to Elmhurst to look for a piece of property. Anxious to get the best for their youthful and sacrificial savings, they were told, as the first of their assets, by the real-estate dealer, "You need never have any fear of any Negroes living in Elmhurst!" One is prone to ask how long must decent Americans die in Korea and still be the subject of such slander?

It is not worthy of citizens of a great nation like this to make an already sorely harassed minority the scapegoat in vital issues that affect the image of our national character. For example, the issue of public versus private housing has degenerated into unreasonable slander of the Negro minority. We cannot in this city apparently meet squarely and honestly the issue as to whether public housing is consistent with the spirit of our free-enterprise system and our American desire for beauty in our cities, simply because demagogs insist upon keeping before the public the invention that public housing is designed primarily for the Negro population. It is almost inconceivable that a great people like ourselves should allow such a discussion to degrade into spurious logical sequences such as "You are for some public housing, eh?" "Then you are against free enterprise." "Then you are for the Negro." "Then you are for the destruction of white neighborhoods." "Then you are a Communist."

It is to the great credit of our mayor that he is reputed to have stated last year in the fever of this hysteria, "There is no such thing as a white neighborhood in the city of Chicago." I hope, and there are thousands who hope with me, that we may have that statement repeated by our mayor. It is a good statement, and if the image of our national character is to be a real world force it is a patriotic statement. We certainly cannot weld together a nation of one people by reminding 15,000,000 Americans constantly of white neighborhoods any more than by asking them to die for a white country. Such behavior is unworthy of the nobility of our Nation and blurs the image of our national character.

And, speaking of dying in Korea, let me quote you from a recent segment of the American Negro Press: "Meanwhile, a news story broke which was given scant editorial attention in the daily press, but was a matter of considerable concern in the Negro press: South Koreans were being integrated into white units of the American Army. Robert Bennyhoff, UP correspondent wrote, 'They are being incorporated into American platoons and squads on an equal basis with American soldiers. The Koreans wear American uniforms, live and eat with the GI's, and get the same treatment.' The order came from MacArthur; it was, according to the general, 'in keeping with the true concept of a United Nations army.' Meanwhile the Twenty-fourth Infantry regiment was listening to the following words from its commander, 'You people have a history of running from battle. You ran in the Ninety-second in the last war. Now you are the frightened Twenty-fourth Infantry regiment. I intend to change that to the fighting Twenty-fourth.' And the Twenty-fourth remains a Jim Crow outfit while the Pittsburgh Courier writes to 15,000,000 Negro Americans, 'This is an insult which burns deep into the soul of every black American.'"

Whether all of this represents moral indifference, ignorance, or downright moral turpitude, we who are gathered here this evening must, of necessity, be determined to erase these elements of disgrace from our national character. The image of that character must stand unblemished as a beacon light of hope to a confused world. It has been too hard earned and is too precious to be tampered with. I fervently hope, Mr. Chairman, that I may record for my children that you have done me this great honor because we share in common these concepts of the sacred mission of our respective disciplines to which we have alluded. That the ideals implied in these concepts are those by which we live and for the defense of which we would gladly die. And that one and all here this evening we share this coveted image of our national character as the most precious heritage for our children. That we are assembled here to pray that that image may blossom forth in a new birth of freedom, a unity of purpose, a dauntless faith, so that the peoples of this earth may see that we have no fear, for that which we seek is the kingdom of God.

Migratory Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission on Migratory Labor has now filed its report, and I should like to include in our RECORD an article published in the New York Times yesterday explaining said report. I should also like to direct the attention of the membership to an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Migrant Farm Labor."

The recommendations of the President's Commission are strikingly similar to those made by a California commission appointed by Gov. Earl Warren. In view of the fact that all impartial and nonpartisan agencies which investigate the problem tend to arrive at the same conclusions and to make the same recommendations, it is difficult for me to understand why our own Committee on Agriculture seems blind to the obvious facts, and has brought forth no comprehensive legislation aimed at a satisfactory solution of the migrant farm labor problem.

Of course, the reference of bills dealing with migratory labor is made to the Agriculture Committee in obvious disregard of the law, as set forth in Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The whole subject matter legally and rightfully belongs in the Committee on Labor and Education.

[From the New York Times]

TOP FEDERAL AGENCY URGED FOR MIGRANT FARM WORKERS

(By Louis Stark)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—The President's Commission on Migratory Labor reported today that the industrialization of agriculture had brought with it all the social evils that accompanied the earlier industrial revolution. In an 80,000-word report to the White House the Commission pointed out that while workers in industry had derived benefit from the rapid increase of productivity in mine, mill, and factory, similar strides in production on the farm had, on the contrary, thrown the farm and migratory workers backward.

The Commission's principal suggestion for corrective action centered about its proposal for an entirely new Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor.

This group, as recommended in the report, would coordinate all Federal activities concerning itinerant farm workers. The body, to be named by the President, is not intended to be a permanent new agency, but rather a top functionary unit to unify all the efforts of Federal agencies that have to do with the itinerant problem. The ultimate goal of the new set-up would be complete elimination of farm-labor migrancy by gradual steps.

Current approaches to the problem, according to the Commission's findings, have been to deprive the migrant of the benefits of farm mechanization and the advances in social legislation. Some of the migrants, it was stated, live in a state of "virtual peonage."

TRUMAN SEES ULTIMATE BENEFIT

On receiving the report President Truman issued a statement in which he said that it "makes an impressive contribution to a subject which should be of serious concern to us all."

Mr. Truman thanked the members of the Commission for their efforts and said that "their contribution will assist greatly in developing fair and practical solutions to what is admittedly a complicated problem."

The Chairman of the Commission is Maurice T. Van Hecke, professor of law, University of North Carolina. The other members are Noble Clark, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin; William N. Lieserson, economist, Washington; the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio; and Peter H. Odegard, professor of political science, University of California, at Berkeley.

The report deals with the plight of 1,000,000 migratory farm workers, of whom half are domestic migrants. The other half is made up of 400,000 illegal Mexican "wetbacks" (persons who cross the border by swimming or wading or just walking) and 100,000 Mexicans legally here under contract and a small number of British West Indians and Puerto Ricans.

BLAME IS WIDELY SPREAD

Some of the evils which the commission says it found during its eight months' investigation were pinned on the large industrial growers, many of whom deal with so-called contractor and crew leaders. These last-named bear no direct responsibility to the migratory workers.

The commission, too, discovered an anomaly in the employment conditions of migratory farm workers. Alien workers, such as those who come here from Mexico, for example, are, by intergovernmental treaty, guaranteed employment, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, medical care, housing, and sanitation standards. But domestic migrants not only have no protection through collective bargaining but employers refuse to accord to them the guaranties they extend to imported alien farm workers.

This leads the commission to conclude that the importation of foreign contract labor be undertaken only on the basis of intergovernmental agreements which should be uniform for all foreign governments.

This recommendation is based partly on the fact that from some regions, notably the West Indies, alien farm workers arrive "on whatever terms these foreign governments were able to secure in negotiation with private employers of the United States." In these cases this country has "given no official scrutiny to the terms of the work contracts or their enforcement."

PROBLEM NOT A SMALL MAN'S ONE

It was emphasized by the commission that the problems under study were not primarily those of "the poor little farmer" but were largely confined to conditions on about 125,000 farms which "amount to 2 percent of the farms of the Nation and produce crops equal to approximately 7 percent of the value of all farm products."

While governmental agencies do not escape criticism in the report, the commission finds that, primarily, the failure of Federal and State agencies to remedy conditions affecting migratory farm workers is traceable to the fact that virtually all social legislation exempts agricultural workers on the assumption that they are employed on small family farms.

The commission submitted a series of specific recommendations for raising the standards of life among the migrant farm workers.

FINAL CHANGE OF POLICY ADVOCATED

It is suggested that dependence on foreign labor for farm work be reduced until this source is no longer required. When it is necessary to import labor, first preference should be given to United States citizens from Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

The conclusion that it is not necessary to import aliens in large numbers during the present emergency is supported broadly by this argument:

Estimated farm output for 1951 is 3.6 percent above 1949. If this additional output were to require an equal percentage increase in man-hours then we would need about 700,000,000 additional manhours to produce the 1951 output. These additional manhours could be supplied by the present domestic labor force, including farm family labor, if each worker put in 6½ more days per year. And, even at that, they would be working 3 days fewer per year than in 1945. The average hired farm worker who in 1949 was getting only 90 days of farm work—23 fewer than in wartime—would be willing, if given the opportunity, to contribute this amount and more.

In a chapter on alien contract labor the report refers to the difficulty of negotiating the intergovernmental agreement for farm labor importation from Mexico.

Mexico and the United States do not approach the negotiations with equal freedom for bargaining, according to the Commission. This is so because Mexico prescribes minimum standards for nationals leaving the country for employment abroad, while we prescribe no minimum standards for domestic farm workers.

STATE DEPARTMENT HINDERED

Then, too, the Commission notes, the State Department is handicapped in negotiating the treaty with Mexico by not being able to consult all interested groups. Farm employers who are well organized and articulate are consulted, but farm workers with virtually no organization, are not in a position to set forth their views.

The Commission heard a sizable volume of testimony which indicated that imported Mexican labor in the southwest encroached on domestic labor, while illegal wetbacks and also the legalized worker of the same category further depressed already low standards.

So vast was the wetback invasion by Mexican nationals from 1947 onward, that the Republic south of the border opposed the recruitment of workers from its interior regions when large numbers of its nationals already were illegally in the United States.

To meet this condition, the United States agreed to legalize wetbacks in 1947, 1949, and 1950. These illegals received identification papers from the United States immigration service, after which they stepped over the border as a token deportation, then stepped back and were permitted to become contract workers.

From 1947 to 1950, according to the Commission, Texas, with a large supply of wetback and contract labor, reduced its wages 11 percent; California, with little contract labor and relatively smaller wetback saturation, raised its wages 15 percent.

The conclusion is drawn from these and other figures that the Government agencies responsible for importing and contracting foreign labor have not protected domestic farm labor from detrimental effects of imported, contract alien labor.

The report describes what the Commission considers the inadequacies in the method of ascertaining whether a farm labor shortage exists.

The farmers, it was pointed out, meet at the beginning of the season and decide unilaterally what the prevailing wage is to be. The rate is usually low before the season begins, and so, the report finds, it is possible that insufficient domestic labor is attracted. Therefore a labor shortage can be said to exist at that price.

Since foreign workers cannot be imported until the United States Employment Service certifies that a shortage exists, this apparent lack of applicants becomes the basis for the necessary certification.

HOW TO CERTIFY A SHORTAGE

To safeguard the interests of domestic farm labor and to avoid, so far as possible, discrimination that favors imported alien contract labor, the Commission proposes that no certification of shortage of domestic labor should be made unless and until continental domestic labor has been offered the same terms and conditions of employment as are offered to foreign workers.

The official vigilance during World War II that provided for temporary admission of alien farm workers was abandoned in the postwar years, the report points out.

Since then, responsible Government administrative agencies have ceased putting forth efforts to preserve national immigration policy, the report continues.

The Commission, in fact, found that the importation of alien farm workers since the war had been on a larger scale than during the war.

The result is that temporary foreign laborers have come to furnish the very competition to American labor that it is the purpose of the immigration law to prevent.

The responsibility for organizing an orderly and expeditious movement of farm workers to successive jobs with minimum loss of time between work opportunities is the responsibility of the Farm Placement Division of the United States Employment Service. But the report offers the opinion that hardly a dent has been made in the disorder that accompanies the migration of domestic farm workers across the country, and [that] the Farm Placement Service has made little progress toward its goal.

SMOOTH SYSTEM NOT DEVISED

While the normal procedure of public employment offices in placing industrial and commercial workers is to have employers file applications for the personnel they seek, the Commission notes that the Farm Placement Division believes it impractical to devise a system for taking employment applications from migratory workers and orders from employers for seasonal or migratory laborers.

But the Farm Placement Division, according to the Commission, is more successful in winning the confidence and cooperation of employers than of the migratory workers.

"This seems to be due to the fact that in practice the service places greater emphasis on its function as a recruiting agency for farm employers than it does on the equally important function of a work-finding agency for the migratory farm laborers," the Commission points out.

In some areas migratory workers who apply at the public placement offices of the Farm Placement Division are actually referred to crew leaders and other types of labor solicitors, according to the report.

These practices have convinced the Commission that the employment service conceives its functions as rather narrow and limited. Moreover, its activities are marked by a certain one-sidedness in favor of corralling supplies of migratory farm workers to meet growers' labor demand regardless of the effect on the workers.

The general attitude of the Farm Placement Division which impressed the Commission as one-sided was that although Congress, in establishing the United States Employment Service, provided for a Federal Advisory Council representing workers, employers, and the public, the Farm Placement Service (a part of the Federal Employment Service) has disregarded this tripartite principle. Instead, it has organized and depended for advice on a special farm labor committee, composed wholly of farm employers and their representatives.

The Commission, however, softened these strictures by absolving the Placement Service of sole responsibility for present unsatisfactory labor-placement practices. It points out that while the Government has been responsible for two decades for labor placement, administrative transfers of the Employment Service to various Government departments in those years may have interferred with the development of a well-rounded placement program.

ONLY TWO LABOR PACTS UNCOVERED

Only two instances of farm employees being covered by collective-bargaining contracts were found during the Commission's study.

The Commission said it was convinced that balanced organization and effective collective bargaining would be of great assistance not only to farm workers but that it would also contribute to more orderly management of labor. Adoption of the system would, for instance, eliminate the labor contractor and middleman and the "sweatshop conditions that are frequently associated with them," the report said.

As a result, it was recommended that the Taft-Hartley Act be amended to cover employees on farms having a specified minimum employment.

A widening inequity between wages paid to migratory farm workers in nonagricultural employment, was noted by the Commission.

Comparing the hourly earnings of farm laborers and factory workers the Commission reported that during 1910–14, the period designated by Congress as the base for the farm parity price system, farm wages were two-thirds of factory wages. Today they are a little more than one-third.

Actual average hourly earnings of farm workers in 1950 was 55 cents and those of factory workers $1.45. In 1910–14 the comparable figures were 14 and 21 cents.

Notwithstanding perquisites furnished by employers such as housing and transportation, the Commission finds that farm workers' annual earnings, compared with the pay of factory workers, are even worse than is suggested by relative wage rates because factory employees get more work than farm employees.

Whereas average cash earnings of factory workers in 1949 were $2,600, average earnings for both migratory and nonmigratory farm workers were only slightly more than $500.

Thus, while average factory workers' wages were two and a half times the average pay on farms, the average annual factory earnings were five times the average farm earnings.

The Commission condemned most of the on-the-job housing offered to migratory farm workers as "below minimum standards of decency." As to the so-called permanent housing in which the migrants live for the 6 to 8 months of the year when they are not working on the crops, the Commission characterizes them as "among the most deplorable in the Nation."

The Government, according to the report, does not assume any responsibilities concerning conditions of work for which it recruits farm labor.

This was emphasized to the Commission again and again by officials of the United States Employment Service.

HEALTH CONDITIONS NOT AT ALL GOOD

The summary found, too, that migratory workers were more subject to sickness and had a higher death rate than most other segments of the population.

The diet of migrant farm laborers was described as insufficient to maintain health.

Also, the growing trend toward mechanization of agriculture, according to the report, has substantially increased the risk of injury in farm employment.

The use of tractors and other machines, of mechanized blades and other cutting tools, and of noxious gases in fumigation, as well as the truck transportation of farm workers, all have contributed to make the accident rate in agriculture one of the highest in the United States.

With this in view, the Commission proposes that the United States Departments of Labor and of Agriculture lay the foundation for a safety program in agriculture.

In this connection it was pointed out that safety programs and workmen's compensation legislation have proved of benefit to employers and employees in industry and that no responsible spokesman for either group would question their value or seek their repeal. Most State workmen's compensation laws exclude farm workers, the report showed.

While child labor has all but disappeared from American industry, the Commission found, nevertheless, that it still was a serious problem in agriculture.

The Commission found evidence, too, that some employers had put pressure on school authorities to permit children to work in the fields.

Following the President's directive to inquire into the educational conditions among migratory workers, the Commission reports that "migrant children are among those with lowest educational attainments found in the United States. * * * Nor are they likely to get educational opportunities so long as they work during school hours and move from place to place with their parents in search of employment."

At the same time the Commission also found that children of migrants suffer from the discrimination and social stigma which excludes them from full participation in the community.

After describing a few educational experiments for migrant children in New Jersey, Michigan, and California, the Commission proposes joint educational programs by the Federal and State Governments for migrants and their children.

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Following is the text of a statement issued today by President Truman on receiving the report of his Commission on Migratory Labor:

"I have today received the report of the Commission on Migratory Labor which I appointed in June 1950. I asked this Commission to investigate the whole range of problems associated with the use of migratory labor to meet agricultural labor needs.

"This report makes an impressive contribution to a subject which should be of serious concern to all of us. It will be useful to Government officials and the general public alike.

"The report contains a careful and painstaking collection of the basic facts about social, economic, health, and educational conditions among migratory workers. It analyzes in detail the forces which have caused increasing use of migrants, particularly foreign workers, in agriculture. It deals systematically with basic public policy issues.

"The report suggests that primary reliance must be placed on the use—and better use—of our domestic farm labor force. The report makes a number of suggestions and recommendations for Federal and State legislative and administrative action.

"The report represents diligent and careful work on the part of the Commission and deserves the careful consideration of all of us—of the Congress, the executive agencies, and the general public.

"I want to thank the members of this Commission for their efforts. Their contribution will assist greatly in developing fair and practical solutions to what is admittedly a complicated problem."

SUMMARY OF MIGRANT RECOMMENDATIONS

BASIC PREMISES

1. That agriculture, like industry, is capable of providing decent jobs.

2. That the recurrent shortage of manpower for seasonal agricultural work is basically a problem of job standards.

WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS COVER

A coordinated public program, the emergency, alien contract labor, "wetback" labor, recruitment of farm workers, labor relations, minimum wages, housing, unemployment compensation, health and welfare, child labor and education.

A COORDINATED PUBLIC PROGRAM

A Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor, to be named by the President for the purpose of coordinating and stimulating the activities of the Federal Government relating to migratory farm workers and to coordinate programs undertaken by the States and private groups.

The committee to consist of eight members—three public members and one each from the Departments of State, of Agriculture and of Labor, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Security Agency.

THE EMERGENCY

1. More effective use of the domestic labor force is necessary.

2. Number of contract alien workers should not be increased to more than the 1950 figures, and all efforts be made to end dependence on foreign labor.

3. Where importation of labor is necessary, preference be given to citizens from Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR

Foreign contract labor be imported only on the basis of intergovernmental agreements which should be uniform for all foreign governments. This aims to avoid lowering of standards by competition of foreign governments to get their laborers into this country. The United States Employment Service should certify the existence of farm labor shortages and administrative responsibility for their importation should be the sole function of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

"WETBACK" LABOR

There is no legal penalty for employing or harboring an illegal immigrant. Legislative measures making it unlawful to employ such aliens should be adopted. The Immigration and Naturalization Service should have the right to enter places of agricultural employment to search for illegal aliens and penalties should be provided for harboring, concealing, or transporting them.

The present practice of legalizing aliens who entered this country in defiance of the law should be forbidden.

RECRUITMENT OF FARM WORKERS

Adoption by the United States Employment Service of safeguards in public recruitment of farm workers. These safeguards to include written terms of employment so that growers will advise the employment service what they will pay, what housing they have, and other employment conditions.

Federal legislation to ban the interstate recruitment of farm workers except under license by Department of Labor. This is designed to regulate so-called crew leases and contractors and to avoid sweatshop conditions for migratory farm workers.

LABOR RELATIONS

Farm workers should have legal assurance of their right to organize by extension of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (the Taft-Hartley law) to employees on farms having a specified minimum number of workers.

MINIMUM WAGES AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Minimum wage and unemployment compensation codes should be extended, through legislative measures, to migratory farm workers.

HOUSING

No foreign farm workers should be imported nor domestic farm workers be sent by the Federal Employment Service from one State to another until the State in which employment is offered has established minimum housing standards which meet those prescribed by the Federal committee.

The Department of Agriculture should extend grants-in-aid to States for establishing labor camps in areas of large and sustained seasonal labor demand.

Development by the Public Housing Administration of a rural nonfarm housing program for migrants during period of the year when they are not on the road.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Amendment to the Social Security and Public Health Service Acts to provide matching grants to States for (1) general assistance including medical care, provided that no needy person be excluded for lack of legal-residence status, and (2) health programs and clinics for migratory labor to be conducted under the supervision of the Surgeon General.

CHILD LABOR

Retention and vigorous enforcement of the 1949 child labor amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act and further amendment to restrict employment of children younger than 14 years outside of school hours.

EDUCATION

Development of an adequate program of education for migratory workers and their children, to be undertaken by the Federal committee through cooperation of public and private agencies. A study to be made of how interstate provisions can be formulated for education of migrant children since educational authority is necessarily local.

[From the Washington Post of April 9, 1951]

MIGRANT FARM LABOR

The exhaustive survey of social, economic, health, and educational conditions of farm migrants made by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor is a shocking exposé of official neglect and private exploitation—a story about men and women living in insanitary camps without community ties and usually beyond the reach of local school, health, and welfare authorities. There are at least a million of these migrants, about half of whom are domestic workers. The other half is made up of approximately 100,000 Mexicans legally under contract, 400,000 so-called Mexican wetbacks who have illegally entered the country by slipping across the land border or wading or swimming across the Rio Grande, and a small number of British West Indians and Puerto Ricans. These migratory workers supply only 3 to 4 percent of the man-days of work used to produce the Nation's farm output. The great majority are employed on some 125,000 large farms producing cotton, fruits, vegetables, and sugar beets. Nevertheless, they make important contributions to farm output and are in great demand at critical periods of crop production.

Since more farm labor will be needed this year to replace men entering the military services and to harvest an extended acreage, pressure for increased importation of foreign labor, chiefly Mexican, is mounting. However, the Commission concludes that no special measures should be taken to increase the number of alien contract laborers beyond the number admitted last year and that legalization for employment purposes of aliens illegally in the United States should be discontinued. "We are convinced," it declares, "that by better recruitment and placement of domestic labor we would have eliminated most, if not all, of the occasion for the certifications of labor shortage during the years 1947–50."

In that connection the report sharply criticizes the practice of legalizing the status of wetbacks and giving them employment in preference to workers who have not violated our immigration laws. It charges, too, that field officers of the Immigration Service have been under pressure from Washington to go easy on deportations until crops have been harvested. It further implies that if the Farm Placement Division of the United States Employment Service had done a more effective recruitment and placement job at home there would not have been a labor shortage requiring the importation of large numbers of aliens. As a matter of fact, the Commission received evidence that last year some American workers were actually dismissed to make way for contract Mexican labor.

Numerous recommendations are made by the Commission designed to raise the living standards of migrant farm labor, such as minimum-wage legislation, establishment of Federal and State minimum housing standards, grants to the States to conduct health programs among migratory workers, and vigorous enforcement of child-labor laws. These recommendations, which cover both alien and domestic migrants, provide evidence, if any were required, of shameful neglect of this group.

The problem growing out of our dependence on alien labor is only one aspect of the general problem of migratory labor, but it is an important one. For cheap foreign labor creates the very scarcities that lead to an influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards. We agree with the Commission that our efforts in future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

Dragon by the Tail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, just how long is the Congress of the United States going to suffer and permit through its inaction the hands of General MacArthur to be tied where he can neither advance nor retreat?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article in the RECORD which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 4, 1951, entitled "Dragon by the Tail."

If Secretary Acheson were tied to this dragon's tail for the rest of his life that would be one thing, but instead our boys are tied to the dragon's tail, the consequence of which is that thousands of our boys are being either injured or killed every week.

DRAGON BY THE TAIL—LIMITED WARFARE IN KOREA PLACES MILITARY STRATEGISTS IN UNEASY POSITION; THEY CAN'T ADVANCE OR RETREAT

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The stern, commanding voice of General MacArthur has been no more successful than the mild pleading voice of Sir Benegal Rau and other would-be United Nations mediators in bringing about a cessation of hostilities in Korea. Yet MacArthur's proposal for a conference with the Chinese commander in the field with a view to arranging a Korean cease-fire without discussing such questions as a seat for Red China in the UN or the disposition of Formosa was worth while, for several reasons.

It is a new intimation, and from the man who is most prominently identified in public opinion with a tough, unyielding policy, of willingness to stop the present fighting on reasonable terms. And it has again focused attention, in the United States and abroad, on the question of what aims are being pursued in Korea, and what is the prospect of realizing these aims.

TWO UNDESIRABLE EXTREMES

Exasperating and frustrating as it is, the kind of limited warfare which General MacArthur's forces are waging in Korea today is the only visible alternative to two undesired extremes. One of these alternatives would be an evacuation of Korea lock, stock, and barrel. Objection to this is that the spectacle of a United Nations army with heavy modern equipment taking to its heels before a Chinese Army very inferior in firepower and without substantial air and sea power would be a terrific blow to western prestige. It might well be the prelude to the conquest by Mao Tse-tung of French Indochina and the lands of southeastern Asia, rich in tin, rubber, and other strategic materials. It could set in motion the process of crumbling that would bring down the prowestern or neutral governments in Japan, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

The other alternative—all-out war against the Chinese mainland—is apparently ruled out both by the limitation of American military power and by the fears and inhibitions of the countries with which America is associated in the United Nations. It is one of the many illogical aspects of the present situation that the UN vote to condemn Red China as an aggressor was apparently obtained only on the condition that no sanctions should be imposed.

ANOTHER INCONSISTENCY

Still another inconsistency is that, although most members of the United Nations have given very lukewarm support to American action in Korea, the maximum ideal of the Korean campaign, the creation of a unified, independent, and democratic government of Korea is based on a United Nations resolution. It would be only fair if the critics of General MacArthur, who have been especially vocal in Great Britain, would bear in mind that the United Nations vote on the issue of crossing the thirty-eighth parallel was 47 in favor (including Great Britain and France), 5 against (the Soviet bloc), and 7 abstentions, including India, Egypt, and Yugoslavia.

So long as the Chinese refuse to show the slightest inclination to talk peace, strategic, rather than political, considerations should determine whether and how far the parallel should be crossed. Under General Ridgway's leadership, at once aggressive and careful, the UN Army has been clearly outfighting the Chinese and the North Koreans and inflicting disproportionately heavy casualties during the last 3 months.

If it were possible to establish a strong defense line along the thirty-eighth parallel there would be a good case for stopping the advance there, digging in and helping the South Koreans to carry out elementary reconstruction and build up an army strong enough to defend themselves against future attacks. There may also be convincing military arguments for moving northward approximately to the thirty-ninth parallel, taking in the important cities of Pyongyang and Wonsan and fortifying the narrow waist of the Korean Peninsula.

NORTHERN FRONTIER

There would seem to be little advantage in launching another drive for the Yalu River. Korea broadens out in its northern reaches and in the type of war which is now being fought the army with the longest communication lines is at a disadvantage. Even if all Korea could be cleared of Chinese and North Korean troops, the prospect of holding a long northern frontier with Manchuria and Siberia would not be inviting.

It seems reasonable that considerations of military security should decide how far the recent slow, grinding advance should be pressed. It would be a good thing if voices of timidity and division could be muted; these are only calculated to encourage the Mao Tse-tung regime to prolong the struggle, even though it now seems that a decisive victory is beyond its grasp.

Meanwhile several political lessons may be drawn from the Korean experience. First, the United Nations has proved itself an extremely weak reed on which to lean, and the worst possible agency for conducting a war. The campaign in Korea is much more justifiable as a defense of American strategic interests in Japan and in the Pacific area generally than as a crusade for United Nations ideals.

ENLIST ASIATIC ALLIES

Second, situations of regional strength are far more valuable than UN resolutions, however imposing, which lack the backing of armed force. It is high time that we consider the more effective utilization of those forces in the Far East which are on our side, even if they are not on our side for what we might consider the right reasons. There is something wrong and unnatural about a situation in which Americans, with a sprinkling of Europeans, constitute the main striking power of an army in an Asiatic theater. There would seem to be a case for reexamining the decisions that have led to rejecting the aid of the Chinese Nationalists and to disregard the large pool of trained military manpower in Japan. In the long run, it must be Asiatics who will defend Asia against Communist aggression.

Finally, we may as well recognize that we are in the awkward position of having caught a dragon by the tail. Our associates are unwilling to cooperate in trying to give the dragon a knock-out blow. But if we let him go there is no reason to expect that he will be any friendlier than a dragon normally is.

Make Assaults on United States Soldiers a Federal Offense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, at an appropriate time, during the further consideration of Senate bill 1, authorizing universal military training and service and the extension of selective service, I shall present the following amendment:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SENATE BILL 1

Whoever forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with any member of the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Whoever in the commission of any such acts uses a deadly or dangerous weapon shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

Whoever kills any member of the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in the performance of his official duties or on account of the performance of his official duties shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of title 18, United States Code.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is obvious. It would make it a Federal offense to assault or murder a member of the armed services. At present, members of the Coast Guard have this protection in law, but members of the other branches of the armed services do not. If a member of any of these other branches of the armed services is beaten or killed by civilians or local peace officers, and the local community does nothing about it, no action can be taken to punish the guilty party.

The problem is one of long standing, and the Department of National Defense and the Department of Justice have been officially on record for nearly a decade in support of legislation to provide protection for all members of the armed services against such felonious assaults. Under existing law, it has long been a Federal offense for any person to kill or assault any Federal officer, such as a United States marshal, members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Secret Service agents, post office inspectors, personnel of the Coast Guard, and other similar officers.

I attach hereto a letter addressed to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate on November 8, 1943, by the then Attorney General Francis Biddle, stating that such legislation as is here proposed would be in the interest of protecting military personnel:

NOVEMBER 8, 1943.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This acknowledges the letter dated November 1, from F. J. Mattice, Esq., clerk of your committee, concerning a bill (S. 1227) to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers.

It is my understanding that this bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of War.

Under the existing law, it is a Federal offense for any person to kill or assault any Federal officer belonging to one of specifically enumerated groups, while engaged in the performance of his official duties or on account of the performance of official duties (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 253, 154). Generally, the enumeration consists of law enforcement officers such as United States marshals, personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Secret Service agents, post office inspectors, personnel of the Coast Guard, and other similar officers.

It is the purpose of the statute to protect Federal law enforcement officers in the performance of their duties and, thereby, enable a more effective enforcement of the law than might otherwise be the case.

In response to a question contained in the foregoing letter, I desire to say that this law applies throughout the United States being an act of Congress, is not dependent on State legislation, and does not vary with State laws.

The bill under consideration would add persons in the Armed Forces to the enumeration contained in the existing statute. The result would be that to kill or assault a person in the Armed Forces of the United States while he is engaged in the performance of his official duties or on account of the performance of his official duties would be a Federal offense.

The question is propounded in the foregoing letter, "Why this legislation was desired when the Military Establishment could usually handle a situation of the kind itself without going into the civil courts."

In reply I desire to call your attention to the fact that, while the Military Establishment could handle itself without going into the civil courts any offense committed by a member of the military personnel, it has no jurisdiction over offenses committed by a civilian against a member of the military personnel. A civilian in such a case would be tried in the civil courts. Under existing law, if the murder or assault was committed in an area other than on a Federal reservation, the appropriate State court would have jurisdiction over the offense. If the abovementioned bill is enacted, the Federal courts would have cognizance of the matter.

As the Secretary of War deems that this legislation is desirable in the interest of protecting military personnel, I find no objection to its enactment. I suggest, however, that there be deleted from the bill the following words: "Any member of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States." It is understood that the auxiliary military police as distinguished from the regular military police is composed of plant guards who are paid by owners of plants and not by the Federal Government. This Department is of the opinion that the proposed legislation should not include any person whose compensation is not paid by the United States.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, I also attach a letter dated June 10, 1943, addressed to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate by the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, reading as follows:

JUNE 10, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: There is enclosed herewith draft of a bill to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting of Federal officers, which the War Department recommends be enacted into law.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the scope of section 1 of the act of May 18, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 780; 54 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 253), so as to include officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and members of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States, while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of the performance of their official duties.

The mentioned section as it now exists, provides punishment for any person who kills, forcibly resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates or interferes with certain Federal officers, including United States marshals, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, post-office inspectors, Secret Service operatives, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, and so forth, while engaged in the performance of official duties, or any person who kills or assaults any such officer on account of the performance of his official duties. It appears that there is at this time no appropriate Federal statute providing punishment in the case of such an act against an officer or enlisted person of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, or a member of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States, while engaged in the performance of official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties. It seems manifest that similar punishment should be provided in case of such attacks against personnel of the military and naval establishments.

Although section 1 provides only for the offense of killing, it is believed that the suggested amendment to that section would also have the effect of extending the scope of section 2 of the act of May 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 781; 18 U. S. C. 254), to cover officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and members of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States in the case of resisting, interfering with, or assaulting such personnel while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of the performance of official duties, as section 2 by reference relates to assaults on all persons of the categories named in section 1, of the act.

The proposed amendment if enacted, will result in little if any, increased cost to the Government.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Members of the House that the Department of Defense is now in favor of the principle of this proposed amendment.

Nearly 3,300 Residents of the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania Take Part in Newspaper Poll of Public Opinion on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, 3,285 residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, comprising the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, participated in the newspaper poll conducted by the daily newspapers in that area.

A breakdown of the questionnaires by counties reveals that 933 residents of Blair County, 654 of Clearfield County, and 1,698 of Centre County participated in the poll of public opinion.

The tabulation of the 10 questions representing the views of 3,285 residents of this area follows:

	Yes	No
1. Should we withdraw from Korea immediately?	997	1,998
2. Should we drop the A-bomb now and take chances on Russia doing likewise?	579	2,142
3. Should we release the Chinese Nationalist Army and allow Chiang Kai-shek to wage war on the mainland against the Chinese Reds?	2,259	540
4. Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations?	405	2,880
5. Should we expect foreign nations to supply the bulk of the United Nations armed forces?	2,190	588
6. Should we send American troops to Europe?	1,717	1,452
7. Should we defend our outlying bases with air and sea power and keep our armies at home?	1,725	1,164
8. If necessary, should we draft 18-year-olds?	2,220	960
9. Should we have stiff price and wage controls applied at the same time?	2,265	357
10. Should the President's budget of $71,000,000,000 be drastically cut, even if it means the cancellation of local nondefense projects?	2,805	438

NOTE.—Many participants did not answer all questions giving as their reason a lack of sufficient information on the subject to vote intelligently.

A study of the questionnaires discloses that about 25 percent of them were accompanied by explanatory letters either qualifying the vote on the various questions or discussing other subjects of national importance. Many stated that this was the first time they had ever written to their Congressman, and some said they had never realized that their opinions would be welcomed.

A large number of the questionnaires that were accompanied by letters revealed that the conclusions reached followed a family conference or a discussion of the subjects with neighbors. A great many residents voiced their concern over the seriousness of world conditions and their effect on our standard of living, and our future as a nation.

It is significant that not a single letter or questionnaire revealed a belligerent attitude on the part of newspaper readers. While there was constructive criticism expressed regarding some Government departments and individuals, yet the general feeling was to be helpful in our efforts to meet the present crisis.

In thanking all those who returned the questionnaires, and especially the newspapers for their splendid cooperation which made the poll possible, I call attention to the fact that last year in the first poll conducted 1,876 residents took part, compared with 3,285 who participated in this year's poll of public opinion. Such an increase of interest by the readers of the daily papers in this congressional district in the second annual poll is very gratifying.

Parity Is Not a Fair Guide as to What the Farmer Should Get for His Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I note those officials in charge of economic stabilization and price control are advocating that parity be frozen so as not to reflect increased costs which are being added to the sale price of what the farmers must buy. Some advocate forcing back to parity farm prices that exceed parity and freezing other farm prices before they reach parity. They would make a sad mistake to undertake any such action. In the first place, parity is not and has never been a definition of a fair price. It was worked out by the Congress as a means of setting a floor or support price on agricultural products to prevent depression and a breakdown in the national economy. The 90 percent of parity which is the support price for basic commodities may well be compared with the minimum wage which at 75 cents per hour is not considered by labor to be a fair price at all but a floor or minimum.

Parity theoretically is supposed to give to the farmers the same comparative purchasing power as they had in the base period 1909 to 1914 but if that be true and if it does give him the same comparative purchasing power with other

segments of population such as they had in the base period of 1909 to 1914, at that time the farmer did not have sufficient purchasing power to provide himself with electricity or ordinary conveniences that others had. He did not have the automobiles that other segments of our population had. As a group the average farmer did not have purchasing power with which to provide himself with a home of equal convenience, including even indoor bath facilities to the extent that others had. During the base period it was the exception for the farmer to be able to send his boy or girl to college. Also, in the base period 1909 to 1914 land constituted the farmer's chief investment and in fact was about 70 percent of the value of the farm. If he had his land, he did not need to buy much else in order to farm.

Now, however, the value of the farm shown by recent surveys is about 45 percent land and 55 percent improvements including machinery which must be purchased at a high rate of cost, and in most cases, of short life. In the base period the farmer did not have to buy the very expensive farm equipment now necessary, such as tractors, threshing machines, combines, fertilizer distributors, and the thousand and one things which are absolutely necessary to operate a farm under present conditions, and, with the present labor shortage, such equipment is absolutely essential if he is to maintain his production, much less increase it. In other words, during the base period 1909 to 1914 the farmer did not have to buy these things which must be paid for from the prices he receives and as a matter of fact, on a comparative purchasing basis, at that time he was unable to buy these things which are now more than 50 percent of his investment in the farm. In 1907, shortly before the base period, it would take about 9.7 years for the cost of operations of the average farm to equal the farmer's investment in the farm. Under present conditions, however, it takes only 2.6 years for the annual cost of operations to equal the investment in the farm. In other words his cost of operation can cause him to lose his farm three times as fast now as in the base period. It is true that from the period 1907 to 1947 prices for agricultural products increased nine times, but during the same period the cost of operations increased 14 times. This is shown by surveys.

The point of all this is that if parity would give to the farmer comparative purchasing power with other segments of our population, equal to that on a comparative basis which he had in the base period 1909 to 1914, it would not enable him to in any way meet on the whole the increased demands on such purchasing power which the operation of his farm in our day requires.

All of this is to show that the word "parity" and the basis on which it is set up in no way is a fair guide as to what the farmer should be permitted to get for his products in the market place. In fact 90 percent of parity as has been stated is approximately equivalent to the 75-cent minimum wage. The average wage is around $1.25 an hour and on the same basis farm products to be on a comparative basis would have to be much higher than so-called parity. Some consumer groups may not agree with that. However, the facts that absolutely cannot be overlooked by the Government and those interested in keeping a sound basis for Government operation of balancing supply with demand and to provide a sufficient supply of food is the fact that parity does not include or recognize costs of production. Those fixing parity do not have to, nor do they, take into consideration the farmer's cost. It is also true that those in charge of price control can fix prices without regard to the farmer's cost of production. That does not mean, however, that the farmer is not going to take into consideration such cost. If he is going to hold his farm and avoid bankruptcy he has to consider costs. If he cannot make cost plus a reasonable profit on any given commodity he will turn to another or limit his cultivation to that which is least expensive. There is no need for Government leaders to fool themselves into believing that he will be able to maintain normal production, much less increase his production, because to increase his production beyond his normal production, with present labor shortages and high costs, is to increase the unit cost, especially in view of the present requirements of expensive fertilizers and other materials. Not only does he increase his per-unit cost but he depletes his soil or his farm plant. If, as the price-control authorities are threatening to do, they set out to let the costs of other things go up but prohibit such increased cost being reflected in increased parity or prices received, if they freeze parity they will in effect reduce production when we need increased production.

They can do that under the present law, but they cannot require the farmer to continue to produce at the present level, much less at a higher one.

If there is no money to be made in dairying, many of the dairy herds will be sold and the milk supply will get shorter and shorter. We have seen that in times past. Already it is hard to find labor to do this exacting work, which must be done at all hours of the day and part of the night, 7 days a week. If there is no money to be made in buying feeder cattle and feeding them corn and thereby increasing the supply of beef, the people in the Midwest will quit buying feeder cattle so as to increase the supply of beef or even to maintain it. It is difficult to get sufficient labor to chop and pick the present cotton acreage, and costs are terrific. How are the farmers to increase cotton production? Thus it goes throughout the whole field of farm production. The pressure is already great on the individual farmer to reduce his production because of the shortage of labor, machinery, and fertilizer. In his patriotic desire to meet his obligation the average farmer is trying to not only maintain but increase his production. But there is a limit as to how far he will or can go. He will pull in his production before he will lose money and eventually his farm.

The trouble is that with the increased demands for food for the Army, with the tremendous expenditures of money in national defense, which is giving increased purchasing power to some segments of our Nation, an unusual demand is being made on supplies of foodstuffs.

There is just more demand than there is food, notwithstanding the fact that on the over-all there is a greater production of agricultural products than ever before. This is working a real hardship on people with fixed income. The answer, however, is not to cut down production, which certainly would result from increasing the farmer's cost, but freezing his prices received at a level which would prevent such increased costs being reflected in his market price. The price-control people are given lots of authority under the law. They do not have to recognize cost in fixing price ceilings, but the farmer recognizes it. He is forced to recognize it, and the price-control people are merely sticking their heads in the sand if they do not recognize that fact.

This is no threat that I describe here, but a recognition of realities. I have the honor of serving as chairman of the subcommittee for appropriations handling agricultural appropriations in the House of Representatives. We deal with all agriculture. I am very much interested in agriculture and in the farmers but I, together with many others, felt that we would have all been better off had we frozen everything across the board at the time of the attack in Korea. Prices, wages, rents. We could not get the Congress to take such action. Since this was not done, however, there just is not any way for the Government to let costs of productoin go up, but freeze the price of farm products at a level which prevents taking into consideration such increased cost and then get increased production. If they do that they will reduce production and make a bad situation worse.

The Nation in this instance faces a fact and not a theory. Under our system of free enterprise we have provided by law the authority to freeze prices, but if costs go up, but the selling price stays the same, you will not have the same production, much less the increased production which after all is the only cure for our present difficulties. You may say, "Ration the supplies." That is easier said than done and supplies under that system dwindle rather than increase.

The Secretary of Agriculture has been assigned the task of getting increased farm production. If the Secretary would render real service to the consumers, including you and me, by increasing agricultural production, he must urge recognition of these facts by the stabilization and price-control authorities, and if possible prevent them from taking any such unfortunate action as to let costs go up but not be reflected in the price received.

We cannot have our cake and eat it too. At least, if the price received does not reflect increased cost of production there will be even less cake, and staple groceries as well.

Unity Comes the Hard Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the March 17 issue of Collier's magazine there appeared an editorial entitled "Unity Comes the Hard Way." I recommend that it be read by all who are interested in our Nation making a maximum military effort.

The editorial reads as follows:

UNITY COMES THE HARD WAY

It seems a long time ago, but actually it is less than a year and a half since the bitter, intemperate dispute which had rocked the Defense Department for months reached its climax with the firing of Admiral Louis E. Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations. This was the signal that the fancy Dans, as Gen. Omar Bradley christened the supporters of balanced naval power, had lost the theoretical argument over how the next war should be fought. Henceforth, the country's main defense was to be entrusted to strategic bombers.

Well, the next war began on June 25, 1950. It forced the unified armed services to relearn unity the hard way. It brought the military strategists back from theory to reality. And, at the sobering cost of thousands of casualties, it taught them some valuable lessons.

It showed, first of all, that no military group can predict what sort of a war a next war will be unless, perhaps, their government starts it. And the United States does not start wars.

It showed that a country cannot base its military planning on the hope of a quick, easy, one-weapon, one-shot victory. UN air power has been almost unopposed in Korea, yet air power has not won the war. There have been times when, to the embarrassment of neat theory, the UN forces were winning the war in the air and losing it on the ground.

The next war has also demonstrated something that the air-power enthusiasts were inclined to forget: That the moral and political consequences of using atomic weapons can outweigh the strategic value of those weapons.

The champions of strategic bombing criticized the Navy for an exaggerated insistence on the importance of close air support of ground troops. They saw the need of only a convoy Navy to haul men and supplies with Air Force protection. And they favored cutting the Marine Corps to a point near extinction.

The Korean War, and the Inchon invasion in particular, showed the error of that thinking. Even the flush-deck supercarrier, which was scoffed out of its first promise of existence, has been justified and authorized.

In saying this, Collier's in not trying to revive any old arguments. We are not minimizing the great importance of air power or ground power. We are not slighting the brilliance and bravery of the men who have employed those powers in Korea. But we are glad to recall that this magazine opened its pages last year to men like Admiral Denfeld, Rear Adm. Daniel V. Gallery, and Maj. Gen. Merritt A. Edson of the Marines, when their voices were officially silenced. We are glad to have published such articles as We Need Carriers and the B-36, by Richard Tregaskis, at a time when reasonable compromise was not a distinguishing feature of the "Battle of the Pentagon." And we are particularly happy, as all Americans must be, that the disagreements among the high brass had not wrecked the services' morale or seriously damaged their fighting efficiency when the unexpected crisis developed.

Now, in the light of Korea, it seems to us that, as one Marine Corps officer put it, the "fancy Dans" were right. And it might well mean the salvation of freedom that this was found out in time. We would not be so cold-blooded as to call the Korean War a breathing spell. Yet since the threat of general war remains, it is fortunate that our military leaders discovered in a limited war that a flexible, balanced, well-rounded armed force is still needed.

If further fighting breaks out, the aggressor and not the defenders of freedom will again have first choice of where and how it starts. So the free world must do more than exploit its great latent strength over the long haul. It must be ready to meet fresh attacks with versatility and adaptability as well as with power.

Let us hope that these facts, which have been established at such high cost of lives, will not be forgotten by well-meaning but stubborn men in another series of Pentagon squabbles.

Give MacArthur a Free Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this news item which contains a report of Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, in connection with the freeing of MacArthur's hands, is very pertinent today. It is time to let a military leader fight the war and not a bunch of international politicians:

THE EDITOR VISITS FRONT IN KOREA—PAUL C. SMITH SAYS MACARTHUR CAN WIN IF HE IS GIVEN FREEDOM TO FIGHT

(By Earnest Hoberecht)

TOKYO, April 4.—Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, said today (Wednesday) in an interview that the United Nations forces in Korea can win the war if permitted to attack across the Yalu River into China.

"I think the present forces in Korea can win the war against the Chinese Armies in Korea if they are permitted to liquidate the present military handicaps which result from those directives which prevent them from operating on the other side of the Yalu River," said Smith, who visited North Korea with Gen. Douglas MacArthur Tuesday.

Smith gave his views on the Korean situation after he returned from Korea, where he flew Tuesday with MacArthur. He jeeped 15 miles into North Korea on the east coast with the United Nations commander in chief.

WAR EXPERIENCE

In World War II, Smith served in both the Marines and the Navy. He was a commander in the Navy at the time of the Japanese surrender.

"With our forces in the Orient," he said, "all we need is freedom to conduct a sound military operation."

He explained that this means that "when and if necessary, we knock out the supply lines of the Communist sources of power in Korea by air and sea.

"This means a sea blockade of China and air attacks where required," he pointed out.

"I admit," he said, "there is a calculated risk involved with the possibility of yet another intervention by Russia, but in view of China's repeatedly stated determination to drive us from Korea, it seems to me that anything short of acceptance of that risk will just result in no net gain for the anti-Communist forces of the world.

FREEDOM TO FIGHT

"These anti-Communist forces, of which the UN units in Korea are both the spearhead and the main body must be given freedom to fight as sound military leadership would normally fight or they are being sent to die for a lip service cause with their hands tied behind them."

Smith said he was deeply impressed with General MacArthur, whom he had never met previously.

"General MacArthur suffers only from two things," said Smith. He listed these as his fair-weather friends and his very petty detractors.

Smith said MacArthur suffered less at the hands of his petty detractors "because they really can't touch him much."

Smith said General MacArthur possesses one of the "greatest vocabularies that I have ever encountered."

"And," said Smith, "he impresses me as having even the greater distinction of knowing what every word means."

He expressed complete confidence in MacArthur's leadership.

He paid tribute to the field forces serving under MacArthur.

Smith said that in view of what MacArthur and his fighting men in the field have had to work with, the American people can be grateful as hell to this leader and his men.

Smith said after studying the situation and seeing considerable background material on the situation he was convinced that there has never been at any time a retreat.

TOUGH TERRAIN

He said that sometimes the United Nations forces were outnumbered as high as 20 to 1 and had to fight their way out but they were only fighting in a different direction, as Marine Maj. Gen. O. P. Smith had stated.

"The terrain in Korea is as rotten and rough as I have ever seen," the San Francisco editor said.

He said he was greatly impressed with the evidence of complete unification of the Armed Forces under General MacArthur. He said he had observed this at both the top level and the working level.

"The services work well together and understand each other's problems," he said. "Every unit has done a hell of a job."

Smith said he was convinced that the only thing General MacArthur needs—and which he should have fast—is clarification of the mission in Korea as well as Asia as a whole.

"If our mission is unification of Korea, then the thirty-eighth parallel is not a proper political question and it is a tactically improper military line."

Smith said, "One of the main jobs of the American people, who are 7,000 to 10,000 miles from the scene of the showdown, is to see that the outfits here from MacArthur to the newest recruit, have the wholehearted support of the Nation and those allied with them in the United Nations."

"It is difficult for anybody to keep his eye on the enemy at the front if he has to spend most of his time and energy pulling political stilettos out of his back," Smith said.

He said he fully understood that there are political questions which can be decided only at the highest levels in the United Nations.

He said he was convinced that this point is well understood by General MacArthur.

But he said he was not convinced that some of those in high political quarters understand the urgency of General MacArthur's position as a field commander.

"As a field commander," Smith said, "he has every right to point up the urgency of the situation and to meet the situation on the strength of his own resources when there is pussyfooting or quibbling and his over-all directives are inadequate or confusing."

Smith said he has been interested here in running down some of the so-called expert criticism of General MacArthur and his staff members.

For example, he said, he had been interested in the charges that some of MacArthur's staff had been with him too long.

On the basis of his experience here, he said he found this criticism completely invalid.

"I have been impressed with the exceptional competence of MacArthur's staff," Smith said. "This exceptional competence stems from the fact that they have been working together through thick and thin for a decade.

"Any idea that such experience and understanding within a top staff is bad rather than good is to me contrary to practical sense."

World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article that appeared in the New York Times on April 7, 1951, concerning the position of His Holiness Pope Pius XII on world government. The Pope stated that world government was in keeping with the traditional objectives of Roman Catholic doctrine which strives for peace. As a Catholic and supporter of the World Federation resolution in Congress, I am pleased at the Pope's position on this issue:

POPE BACKS PLAN FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT; SEES IT AS A MEANS TO ESTABLISH PEACE

ROME, April 6.—Pope Pius XII praised today the principle of world government as a means to establish peace and bring about collaboration among all the nations for the common good of mankind.

The papal thoughts on that subject were expressed in a speech to delegates from 22 countries, including the United States, attending the fourth annual congress of the World Federal Government Movement in Rome. Lord Boyd Orr of Britain is head of the movement, which has an estimated 150,000 members in Europe.

World government was in keeping with the traditional objectives of Roman Catholic doctrine, which strives for peace, the Pope said. A political organization of that nature is all the more necessary today "if only to end the armaments race that for tens of years has been ruining the nations and exhausting their resources with nothing to show for it," the Pope declared.

He warned, however, that world government must not be based on what he called "mechanical unitarianism" but on the broader and more humane principles that take into consideration and seek to safeguard and promote the welfare of the individual within society.

Although the Pontiff did not give a definition of what he meant by "mechanical unitarianism," it was clear from the contents of his speech that he was opposed to a federal organization that would regard individuals merely as voters and not as people in need of both spiritual and material aid, which should be first and foremost the concern of a world authority.

As illustration of his thoughts, the Pope deplored the fact that "in the national and constitutional field everywhere today the life of nations is disintegrated by the blind cult of numerical value."

He then added: "The citizen is a voter. But as such he is in reality no more than a unit whereof the total adds up to a majority or a minority, which the shifting of some votes, even only one, suffices to upset. The voter does not count if he is only a voter. Of his position and his task in the family and in his profession no heed is taken."

The Pope implied that present systems of government, based as they were on the "numerical" principle, had proved inadequate to cope with the problems of society and that a world organization should therefore "depart from the beaten track" and by taking advantage of the experience of history should be guided by "healthy social philosophy."

Harvard Offers Happy Hunting Grounds for Pinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, with thousands of our fine young men suffering and dying in distant Korea it is little short of terrible for us to give shelter to many thousands whose principal purpose seems to be to find fault with our country and our Government.

The following article which appears in one of our leading newspapers on April 8, 1951, is very enlightening:

HARVARD OFFERS HAPPY HUNTING GROUNDS FOR REDS AND PINKS—RADICAL PROFESSORS GIVEN FREE REIN UNDER CLOAK OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

(By William Fulton)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 7.—Harvard University, going into the fourth century of operation as a brains factory this year, is a happy hunting grounds for Communists, doctrinaire pinks, and radicals of all hues. Many of the professors are leftists who subtly instill their propaganda into the budding brains of the students.

Under the protective umbrella of academic freedom the fomenting of subversive alien theories is allowed to go on unmolested. President James Bryan Conant, a red-hot interventionist and globalist, has refused to curb radicalism on the grounds his pedagogs should have freedom to search for the truth.

SPY TRIAL RECALLED

In the opinion of local law-enforcement officers and members of the legislature, the matter goes far beyond a mere question of academic discussion among radical professors and credulous students.

Recalling the various spy trials, investigators point out Cambridge is a focal point for subversive activity because of the many atomic energy specialists here and work going forward on atomic energy projects. The projects are under way not only at Harvard but also at the neighboring Massachusetts Institute of Technology which has its share of fellow travelers.

In their assessment of the dangers involved local investigators have not forgotten Alger Hiss, former top State Department official and Roosevelt adviser, went through Harvard Law School. Hiss is now serving a 5-year sentence for perjury, in which his clandestine peddling of war secrets to a Soviet spy ring was involved.

LAW SCHOOL UNDER FIRE

It is the law school that is particularly under fire today. Samuel P. Sears, an alumnus of both the law school and Harvard College, now president of the Massachusetts Bar Association, recently said he thought it about time Harvard cleaned house and stopped encouraging and playing host to the Communist Party.

Sears is not the only Harvard alumnus hot under the collar over the way affairs are conducted back on the campus, or "yard," as they call it here. There is increasing criticism, particularly among Harvard men who have sons fighting against communism in Korea while the Red doctrine is allowed to flourish back at the old alma mater.

ALUMNI REFUSE DONATIONS

Alumni have refused to make donations because of their strong feeling over the situation at Harvard.

Undergraduates in Harvard College with whom this correspondent talked admitted they knew of Communists among their fellow students but were inclined to minimize the danger. They parroted their professors' phrases about "academic freedom," "search for truth," "liberalism," and the like.

One student said when a leftist professor's subject was remote from the political field, as for example geology, the pedagogue carried on his propaganda at "bull sessions" outside the classroom or by other activities, such as getting youths to attend meetings for some cause or other.

This corroborated the findings of City Councilman John D. Lynch, banker and former mayor of Cambridge.

"I've talked with students," he said. "They tell me about professors inviting them to left-wing meetings, and then the first thing you know they are filled up with this evil stuff."

Lynch, who says the city of Cambridge is controlled by Harvard influence, vainly attempted last fall to force the registration of all Communists in the vicinity. He did, however, succeed in having a copy of the dossier, "Red-ucators at Harvard University," placed on file for public perusal at the city clerk's office a few months ago.

"Red-ucators at Harvard," an expose of the Communist-front affiliations and connections of 76 faculty members, was compiled by the National Council for American Education, with offices at 2 Maiden Lane, New York City. It shows affiliation with Stalinoid movements during recent years, principally since the end of World War II.

The "Red-ucators" list was checked against the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, printed on March 3 of this year under the auspices of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. The Guide lists various organizations deemed to be "outright Communist or Communist-front enterprises."

Harvard faculty members showed up with affiliations with 124 Communist fronts.

The check against the congressional list revealed 64 on the "Red-ucators" roster of Harvard were identified with Red facade groups. Some have retired as "emeritus" since the canvass was made but carried on the front activities while working full time in the classroom and are still carried in the university catalog.

NAMES AND FRONTS

These 64 and the number of Communist fronts with which they have been affiliated are as follows:

Comfort A. Adams, professor of electrical engineering, 12 Red-front connections.

Douglas P. Adams, visiting lecturer on engineering sciences and applied physics, two.

Gordon W. Allport, professor of psychology, 12.

Leona Baumgartner, visiting lecturer on maternal and child health, two.

Francis Birch, professor of geology, two.

Garrett Birkhoff, professor of mathematics, one.

Brand Blanshard, lecturer, one.

Bart Jan Bok, professor of applied astronomy, eight.

Edwin G. Boring, professor psychology, three.

Percy W. Bridgman, one.

HISTORY PROFESSOR NAMED

Clarence C. Brinton, professor ancient and modern history, two.

Charles F. Brooks, professor of meteorology, five.

Jerome S. Bruner, associate professor of social psychology, one.

William H. Burton, lecturer on the principles of teaching, two.

Allan M. Butler, professor of pediatrics, eight.

Hugh Cabot, lecturer on human relations, six.

Zechariah Chaffee, jr., professor of law, five.

Halvor N. Christensen, assistant professor of biological chemistry, one.

John Ciardi, assistant professor of English composition, two.

Stanley Cobb, professor of neuropathology, one.

Thomas C. Cochran, visiting lecturer on entrepreneurial history, four.

Albert S. Coolidge, lecturer on chemistry, 12.

William J. Crozier, professor of general physiology, two.

Edwin M. Dodd, professor of law, two.

Frederick M. Eliot, preacher, 14.

Kendall Emerson, associate in medicine, two.

John K. Fairbank, professor of history, one.

Alexander Forbes, professor of physiology, one.

Carl J. Friedrich, professor of government, two.

Wendell H. Furry, associate professor of physics, nine.

James L. Gamble, professor of pediatrics, one.

Sergei I. Gaposchkin, astronomer in the Harvard College observatory, two.

Sheldon Glueck, professor of criminology, three.

Avram S. Goldstein, instructor in pharmacology, one.

Walter Gropius, professor of architecture, two.

Alice Hamilton, assistant professor of industrial medicine, emeritus, 22.

LINKED TO EIGHT FRONTS

William E. Hocking, professor of natural religion, moral philosophy, and civil policy, emeritus, eight.

Arthur N. Holcombe, professor of the science of government, two.

Bruce C. Hopper, associate professor of government, three.

Mark de Wolfe Howe, professor of law, three.

Josepf Hudnut, professor of architecture, three.

Leland Hamilton Jenks, visiting lecturer on entrepreneurial history, one.

Howard M. Jones, professor of English, four.

Edward C. Kemble, professor of physics, one.

Robert P. Lane, visiting lecturer on sociology, three.

Samuel A. Levine, professor of medicine, two.

Karl N. Llewellyn, visiting professor of law, three.

Sidney Lovett, preacher, four.

Charles H. McIlwain, professor of the science of government, emeritus, one.

James A. McLaughlin, professor of law, two.

Kirtley F. Mather, professor of geology, 38.

THIRTY-NINE FRONTS LISTED

Francis O. Matthiessen, professor of history and literature, 34.

George R. Minot, professor of medicine (deceased), four.

Samuel E. Morison, professor of American history, one.

Kenneth B. Murdock, professor of English literature, one.

Gardner Murphy, fellow, 10.

Dean Peabody, professor of architecture, one.

Ralph B. Perry, professor of philosophy, emeritus, 13.

Walter Piston, professor of music, two.

Roscoe Pound, former law school dean, two.

George Sarton, professor of the history of science, 10.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, professor of history, 10.

Harlow Shapely, professor of practical astronomy, 20.

Pitirim Sorokin, professor of sociology, 10.

Randall Thompson, professor of music, two.

Hassler Whitney, professor of mathematics, one.

John Wild, professor of philosophy, one.

Payson Wild, Jr., professor of government, one.

Arizona Reclamation Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the article entitled "Arizona Reclamation Muddle," by Oliver Carlson, a very able writer. It should speak for itself:

ARIZONA RECLAMATION MUDDLE

(By Oliver Carlson)

Reclamation is a sacred word to the people of the water-hungry States of the Far West. Ever since the days of Brigham Young in Utah a hundred years ago, Westerners have been reclaiming arid lands and turning them into fertile farms and orchards. Slowly and painfully they have learned how to impound the water from melting snows, from the occasional rains, and from mighty rivers such as the Colorado and the Columbia. The great urban and industrial centers of southern California would be nonexistent but for the genius of reclamation engineers. The careful husbanding and scientific distribution of the impounded water have increased the well-being of farmers and city folk alike throughout the entire West.

Every Westerner knows this. That is why reclamation is a sacred word to him. That is why reclamation has become a potent factor in western politics. In recent years almost every ambitious politician, no matter what his party label, has promised his constituents more water through greater and ever greater reclamation projects.

For the past 3 years Congress has been considering the most fantastic reclamation project—as to scope, cost, and amount of land to be reclaimed—ever to be conceived by the United States Bureau of Reclamation. Known as the central Arizona project, this amazing irrigation plan was approved by the Senate of the United States last year and may very well have been passed by the Senate again by the time this article is in print.

The overwhelming mass of Americans have never heard or read about the central Arizona project. Most of those who have heard about it think of it primarily as a battle between the States of California and Arizona for the use of Colorado River water—with big, prosperous California seeking to deny little, underpopulated Arizona its just share of this water. Public sympathy, therefore, quite naturally goes to the underdog—to Arizona. The propagandists and lobbyists for this project have succeeded in keeping public attention focused on the have-versus-have-not aspect of the controversy rather than on whether it is economically justifiable or financially sound. What does the central Arizona project propose to do? Its primary purpose is to rescue approximately 150,000 acres of Arizona desert land which were put under cultivation during the war-boom days of the early 1940's, and to supply water for a possible additional 100,000 acres.

To achieve this rescue it is proposed (1) to build a mighty dam on the Colorado River above Hoover Dam; (2) to build, below Parker Dam, 4 pump lifts which would raise 1,200,000 acre-feet of irrigation water to a height of almost a thousand feet; and (3) a network of aqueducts and canals for transporting this water over 315 miles across Arizona where it finally would be used to grow ordinary field crops.

Here, indeed, is an engineer's dream. Here is to be erected a mighty Niagara in reverse, with 10,000,000,000 pounds of water being lifted to a height of 965 feet every 24 hours. The amount of electric power needed just to lift this water from Lake Havasu to the top of the ridge would be more than ample to power a thousand large factories or to meet the domestic needs of a city of half a million population.

The cost of this amazing project was estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation at $738,000,000 in 1948. In view of the Bureau's long record of underestimating costs, plus the increased costs for both labor and materials since 1948, it is a safe assumption that original costs on the central Arizona project would exceed a billion dollars today. This is five times the cost of the Hoover Dam, many times the cost of the Panama Canal, much more than the cost of developing the TVA, and far greater than the cost of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

The area to be benefited is all within the State of Arizona, and the project would directly benefit only about 25,000 farmers. Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman and his Reclamation Bureau's report admitted that there are only about 6,000 farms within the project area and that, of these, 420 farms contain 55 percent of the land to be irrigated. In other words, the project would give benefits of more than $550,000 to each of these 420 large landholders, and of tens of thousands of dollars to each of the other 5,600 farm owners.

If the people of Arizona wish to make such magnificent gifts to a few of their farmers, we in the other 47 States have nothing to say about it. But when the entire billion-dollar cost of this project is to be borne by the taxpayers of the Nation, for the benefit of a handful of land speculators in Arizona, then the matter is very much our concern. And that is precisely what the central Arizona project proposes.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Reclamation insists that the Arizona farmers who are to receive the water can afford to pay only $4.50 per acre foot for it. But, on the basis of the 50-year repayment period proposed, the cost of delivering this water would amount to $18 per acre foot annually—or approximately four times the charge estimated by the Bureau. Here again the burden of cost would fall upon the taxpayers from Maine

to Washington, and from Minnesota to Mississippi.

Former Senator Downey, of California, testified last year:

"Central Arizona land is worth at most $300 per acre * * * but at $300 per acre, the whole irrigated area of central Arizona, less than 600,000 acres, could be bought for $180,000,000, and the 150,000 acres at stake could be bought for $45,000,000."

I find that the United States Agricultural Census for 1945 lists the total value of all farm lands and buildings in the State of Arizona at $287,000,000. The original expenditures for the central Arizona project would be almost three times that figure.

There are times and conditions under which we cannot count the dollars-and-cents expenditures for a project. Could it be that the products to be grown on the rescued land are so vital to our national existence that we must not count the cost? They are potatoes, wheat, corn, cotton, barley, oats, and sorghum. Are these scarce products? Quite the contrary—they are precisely the ones which have been in oversupply year after year. They are the ones for which the American taxpayer has paid out hundreds of millions of dollars for price-support programs precisely because they were a drug on the market. To spend an additional billion dollars in Arizona to keep these surplus crops on the market appears to be the height of economic stupidity.

At this point readers may well ask themselves how such a fantastic project can receive serious consideration by Congress or be seriously proposed by the Department of the Interior and its Reclamation Bureau.

First and foremost, this billion-dollar project has vast political implications. The project, it has been estimated, would take from 8 to 12 years to complete. A working force of from ten to twenty thousand people would be constantly employed within the State. The number of Federal patronage jobs would be very great, and the spending of a billion dollars in a State with a population of approximately 750,000 would give the party in power a complete stranglehold over the people of the State. To land speculators, contractors, jobbers, liquor dealers, gamblers, and union bosses, it should prove a bonanza of fabulous dimensions. And a grab-bag pattern would have been set, which politicians and land speculators in other Western States would rapidly seek to follow. For there are still millions of potential irrigable acres in the West. The Bureau of Reclamation has already worked out plans for projects which would cost nearly $19,000,000,000, and it has on its drawing boards an additional set of projects with an estimated cost of $29,000,000,000.

Here indeed are projects to gladden the heart of every believer in the continued expansion of big government. But it is a frightening prospect to all others.

Bernard DeVoto, who was born in the West and knows it well, called this development "A state of mind * * * that could produce a national disaster.

"The engineering projects in the West (he wrote) amount to an American 5-year plan, 30-year plan, and 100-year plan rolled up together. They are going to be carried through as far as the credit of the United States will permit. The western bloc in Congress will see to it that they are, and Senator DOUGLAS' superb and wholly futile attack on the last pork bill shows what the technique is. What President Truman said about these projects on his western tour amounted to just this: I bought the West 2 years ago and I'm here to assure you that there is enough money so that you'll be happy to stay bought. There is no party line in these matters, the only answer a Republican candidate would bother to make out West would be a promise to pay still more.

"Meanwhile the 5-50-100-year plan calls for by far the largest expenditure the United States has ever made for internal improvements, by far the largest it has ever made for anything except war and defense. Ninety percent of its objectives, at this stage, are entirely hypothetical. An undetermined part of them are also fantasy, guess, mirage, dream, vision, hope; some part of them will fail; some part of them may turn out to be fairly large-scale disasters."

It is high time that the people of the Western States look more closely at the reclamation projects offered to them by the Bureau of Reclamation and power-hungry politicians. No land should be reclaimed and irrigated at excessive cost, or to produce crops of which we already have a surplus or which can be produced cheaper elsewhere. There are tens of millions of acres of cultivatable land in the Midwest, the deep South, and the East which can be reclaimed at a fraction of the cost of western lands. In these areas the problem is simple—that of draining swamp lands and of building dykes and levees.

A group of experts at Stanford University who have been working on a water resources policy for the United States declared in their group report that "agricultural production in excess of its present output must increasingly rely on the area of the Nation which has a net surplus of precipitation, i. e., the eastern half." And they warned: "If irrigation to expand farm production in the West should be given priority, the transfer of population westward would have to stop far short of what it otherwise might be * * * therefore, the use of water for agricultural irrigation should by no means have priority when it would curtail the desirable expansion of homes or industry."

These experts further insisted: "In our view there is no longer (if there ever was) any economic or social justification for subsidizing Federal irrigation projects, whether by charging no interest on allocated costs, leniency in levying interest-free charges on users of irrigation water, or by transfer of either surplus power revenues or interest collected on the power investment. These practices have been the source of waste of Federal funds, which will presumably be multiplied many times if the practices are continued."

Arizona has in Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND (majority leader of the Senate) and Senator CARL HAYDEN two astute and powerful champions of the fantastic central Arizona project. By political logrolling, trading, and through their key positions on the Rules and Appropriations Committees, these Senators were able to get their measure passed by a vote of 55 to 28.

The present national emergency may give pause to many Senators and Congressmen before they vote for this measure again in 1951. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that politicians will attempt to tie it in with national emergency measures.

Making Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the April 4 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. If the United States is to assist India at this time, action must be taken by the Congress without delay. I hope the legislation will come before the House so the entire membership can work its will on this vital problem.

The editorial reads as follows:

MAKING COMMUNISTS

Some Members of Congress who, on paper, are most passionate anti-Communists have found an extremely effective way of making Communists. It is to let 100,000,000 people in India go hungry while Americans sit tightly and comfortably on a stored surplus of wheat amounting to several times the famine need in that land.

Congress has had before it since February 12 a recommendation to give India a needed 2,000,000 tons of grain besides the roughly 2,000,000 tons that nation is buying in the United States and 2,000,000 tons it is buying elsewhere.

Meanwhile, a great deal is said in many quarters about convincing the rest of the world of the advantages of democracy and free enterprise, about selling capitalism instead of communism.

In the state of Bihar in India the grain ration has been reduced below 9 ounces a day and is considered less than enough to assure survival for long of those who depend on the ration alone. Relief of such conditions takes weeks even after shipment of grain is authorized and other provinces are approaching similar distress.

In such circumstances discussion of ideologies becomes academic, but Communist incitement and agitation thrive. So great an American as Senator Borah, an authority on the United States Constitution and its importance, said in 1934, "The people can't eat the Constitution."

The people of India cannot satisfyingly fill their stomachs with preachments on freedom and opportunity if they have not the opportunity to eat. It rests with the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives to put on the legislative calendar a bill which would give them a little nourishing evidence of the free world's efficiency and its interest in their fate.

Now It's Meat Tax To Control Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John C. Davis, from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 7, 1951:

NOW IT'S MEAT TAX TO CONTROL INFLATION

(By John C. Davis)

According to a United Press dispatch from Washington on April 2, the House-Senate Economic Committee has just released its annual statement. Attached to this document is a report of suggestions compiled by the committee's staff of economic experts and advisers. It contains a suggestion that the committee recommend a luxury tax upon meat as a means of controlling inflation.

Just how a tax that would increase the already high price of meat would help to hold down inflation is a bit obscure. It becomes more confusing when the average citizen recalls that another Government agency, the Office of Price Stabilization, is busy thinking of ways and means to bring prices down, notably that of meat, to control inflation.

PAPA KNOWS BEST

Doubtless in due time, our present paternalistic administration that would have us view things not as they are but as we are told they are by "papa" will get around to explaining it all. Our proper function in this socialistic scheme of things is just to pay and pay but never question why. But the idiocy of one governmental body recommending taxes that will raise prices to control inflation while another attempts to hold prices down to control inflation is not the most startling piece of misinformation in this report.

Justifying its reasoning for a luxury meat tax, the report explains that "from the sheer standpoint of production, meat, it has often been pointed out, is in reality a luxury food."

Such a statement coming from a supposedly responsible Government advisory staff is not only amazing; it is incredible in the ignorance expressed of this Nation's agricultural pattern and the influence of that pattern upon our American way of life.

WHAT PAPA DOESN'T KNOW

Meat and meat products—pork, beef, milk, cheese, butter, and eggs—are the chief income producers that give our farmers the highest standard of living of any similar group on earth. Any governmental tax that would raise consumer prices of these would curtail consumption and lower farm income, already below parity with other branches of our economy.

If the clammy hand of taxation, which incidentally is the power to destroy a free economy, were to fasten upon these items and grow strong enough to force farmers to change our pattern of agriculture, it could be a national calamity. As matters stand, we grow crops, feed them through livestock and eat the livestock instead of eating the crops directly from the land, as do the less-favored peoples of the world.

It is our diet of high protein, carbohydrates, vitamins, and mineral meat products that gives us the drive and energy that is the envy of the rest of the world. Even in countries with living standards above those of the peoples who eat directly from the land, only the upper classes enjoy an animal diet comparable to our average. It is one of the reasons those favored few are the upper classes since what you eat determines in large measure what you are.

CRONY FEEDING

A change in our agricultural pattern that would produce a change in our eating habits might produce a class society here. Such a change would have fat political bureaucrats munching upon filet mignons while the rest of us eat mush.

Aside from its effect upon our diet a change in our agricultural pattern would have far-reaching effect upon our entire industrial system. Consider that almost the entire refrigeration industry is based upon animal agriculture. You do not need much refrigeration if the diet is raw corn, wheat, oats, and potatoes. Four million of the eight million trucks in the Nation are engaged primarily in transporting meat and meat products from farm to processor to market and our tables.

The above are just a few illustrations of why meat is not a luxury but a necessity in our American way of life. The staff of economic advisers that advised the House-Senate economic committee otherwise must have been kidding—let's hope.

Amendment to S. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday, in the consideration of S. 1, I stated that at the proper time I would offer an amendment in connection with the Executive order providing for examinations of college students as a basis for deferment. At that time I submitted tentative language of that amendment. After further consideration I have decided to revise the language of the amendment. The revision does not change the purpose of the amendment. Should the amendment be adopted, local boards will pass upon educational deferments as has been the case in the past. That the language of the revision may be available to the membership prior to the consideration of the bill, I include the same, as follows:

Page 46, line 13, add the following:

"Notwithstanding any provisions of this act, no local board of the selective-service system shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by any agency or department of the Federal Government."

"The Chips Are Down—the World Is Now in a Fight—Unless Every Man in This Room Stands Solidly Behind Our Nation's Defense Mobilizer, Charlie Wilson, and Helps Him Save Our Country, There Will Be No Country Left for Us To Save"—Frank W. Boykin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, the Members of this House witnessed a scene depicting the ever-increasing costs of food—a problem which concerns every housewife in these United States. I have reference to five of our very distinguished women colleagues, who carried in food baskets containing the amount of food that could have been bought, in 1909, with a $5 bill, as contrasted with what was bought in 1919, 1929, 1939, and in 1950.

Picturesque as was that presentation, the American people have, as yet, seen nothing that even approximates true inflation of our own money or price structure, as compared with what has happened in many, many other countries. Drastic as we have found the increased costs of food stuff and other necessities and goods, I doubt if much of the increase in prices that we Americans experienced, prior to 1950, should be classed as true inflation.

Personally, I incline to the belief that the costs which previously so adversely characterized our price structure in the past 20 years were an increasing high level of prices, which were bound to follow in the wake of the higher standards of living, of higher wages, shorter work hours, and other factors that make up the American way of life which our people have enjoyed.

In other words, I think that, up until last June, we were merely living in a high-price era, rather than in what others have come to know as an inflationary period.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of inflation, I do not have in mind an uncontrolled inflation—wrecking the price structure of a nation by debauching its currency to such a low value that it takes an astronomical sum to make even the most meager purchase. I know that our people here in the United States can feel inflation, and feel it badly, when prices rise and get out of line as little as from 2 percent to 10 percent.

I am, however, reminded of what a friend who, upon his return from Greece, told me but a year or so ago. He said that, in 1937, the drachma had a value of 111 to the American dollar—that, in 1947, the same drachma had dropped to a point where it took 8,000 drachmas to buy one American dollar—but that, in 1950, and despite all the acknowledged benefits that the Marshall plan has brought to that little democracy, its internal monetary system is debased to a point where there are now from 15,000 to 20,000 drachmas to the dollar.

To express it still another way—think of figuring your daily wages in "the millions per day," and you will have some idea of the conditions that developed in Greece. There, a package of cigarettes now cost anywhere from 25,000 to 37,500 drachmas—and a pair of shoes costs from 350,000 to 600,000 drachmas—while a suit of medium-grade clothes costs well up in the millions of drachmas.

More particularly, when I think of inflation as it might come to us in America, I am reminded of what happened in Germany, subsequent to World War II, when it required half a million German marks, which had been previously worth as much as 100,000 dollars in American money, to buy a single copy of a daily newspaper.

In that never-to-be-forgotten period of German inflation, German paper money became so cheap that it had greater value when it was packed into bales, shipped across the ocean, and sold as scrap paper in the markets of the United States * * * than it did as currency in Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I need not point out to you that it is that very type of inflation that now threatens these United States. Neither must I stress the fact that it was the threat of that kind of inflation which caused President Truman, some ninety-odd days ago, to ask the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, then president of the General Electric Co., to come to Washington to direct the Office of Defense Mobilization—the most important office in the United States of America, outside of the Presidency itself.

The Office of Defense Mobilization is charged, by Congress, with doing any and all things necessary to secure the peace and defenses of this Nation. Among

these are the establishment of fair, equitable, and effective controls over wages, prices, materials, and production.

Mr. Speaker, no man in the history of this world, either in peace or in war, has been burdened with a more difficult task than that now confronting Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization.

By the same token, I doubt if in the history of this Nation a more representative and disinterested group of Americans ever sat down to break bread together than was that group assembled in the Speaker's private dining room Tuesday, March 13, at midday.

The roster of the men assembled included not alone Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of these United States, but Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff, United States Army; Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force together with the heads of other executive departments of Government, and a score or more of Representatives and Senators—all members of House and Senate committees.

They were assembled at the invitation of the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, and, acting as cohost was the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, Representative to Congress from South Carolina.

All had come to do honor to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, and the resounding acclaim which his name brought forth gave greater evidence than word can express of the respect and esteem in which he is held by every man present.

Mr. Speaker, your own generous, tribute and evaluation of the worth and merit of C. E. Wilson to his country in this crisis was second not even to the gracious and generous tribute paid him by FRANK BOYKIN.

Congressman BOYKIN told of conditions which face not alone this Nation but the whole world in this present hour of tension and darkness.

He pulled no punches, either in describing the situation which confronts us as a Nation nor in describing the backbiting and vituperation currently being leveled at the heads of Government doing their very best to bring us out of the depths of despondency and despair and lead us again into the valley of peace and national security.

In telling his guests of Charles Wilson, FRANK BOYKIN described an incident that occurred at a dinner which he gave some years ago. President Roosevelt, who was scheduled to make an address, phoned to say that due to his personal fatigue at that moment, he begged to be excused from attending the dinner. He asked FRANK if he could send Charlie Wilson, "the great president of the General Electric Co., instead of coming myself." The President, however, told of how tired he was, and stated that "You couldn't get my chair up there without making a lot of preparation," and so Charlie Wilson came over alone. "And it was at that time," Mr. BOYKIN said, "that I first got acquainted with him."

Mr. Speaker, there are few men that have ever walked across the pages of American history whose experience has been more peculiar, unique, and extraordinary, or more American than has been that of Charles Edward Wilson, who was president of the General Electric Co. from January 1, 1940, until he resigned on December 16, 1950.

Here is a man who spent his entire business career, except for such times as he served his country, with one single employer—at a time that saw the ever-expanding electrical industry develop in the United States.

It was in 1899, at the tender age of 12, that Charles Wilson entered the employ of the Sprague Electric Co. of New York—one of the organizations which later went to make up the corporate structure of the General Electric Co. Since that time, he served in practically every function of that great business and industry—and on September 1, 1949, completed 50 years of service with the General Electric family.

Mr. Speaker, these 50 years have seen not alone the electrification of American industry and the home but they have, at the same time, seen the rise of the United States to a great industrial nation and a place of undisputed supremacy.

Power, lighting, communications, telegraphy, telephone, and radio, entertainment, industrial and electrochemical processes, the Nation's transportation, its heating and refrigeration, have all been transformed during the very time that Charlie Wilson has worked in the industry. There is hardly an article of daily life that had not, in some wise, been touched by the great magic of electric power. These are inclusive of all things from newspapers to carpets, hydroelectric dams and electric blankets, the Nation's skyscrapers as well as its morning coffee.

Due, in no small measure, to the generation and transmission of electrical energy came the rising standard of living which we now enjoy and the American way of life. During the first half of the twentieth century, the workweek has been cut from 61 hours in 1900 to a mere 40 hours per week as of today.

Mr. Speaker, the saga of Charlie E. Wilson is not the story of a man concerned, per se, solely with a great business concern, but rather with an era that characterized the entire expansion and diversification of American industry as well as with the forces that have made this country the greatest on the face of the earth.

The General Electric Co., as is true of a great many business houses have long since ceased to exist as merely manufacturers and sellers. Today many of these concerns are the driving forces in government and in social progress.

Mr. Speaker, our Government today has within its power the ability to influence the course and the character of all private enterprise, and that is, indeed, a heavy responsibility because it reaches into every land and into every level of society. What industry does today may be of historic significance whether it concerns atomic power at one end of the scale or the betterment of human relations at the other.

Mr. Speaker, Charlie Wilson attended the elementary schools of New York City, and, at the age of 12, started his career as an office boy in the Sprague Electric Co. At Sprague Electric, he moved from position to position, and took the advice of his factory superintendent "look forward and equip yourself for the next job."

At night school, he learned cost accounting, general accounting, and enrolled in correspondence courses, one upon another, in practically all phases of engineering. The cost of these courses he paid by tutoring backward students in physics, mathematics, and other courses that he himself had previously completed.

Through these years of hard work he equipped himself with the physical fitness necessary to meet every requirement demanded of those who, having built empires, now watched, with the sun at their backs, Charlie Wilson advance across the horizon.

He was named assistant to the vice president at about the time that President Hoover was elected to office in 1928. Mr. Wilson's efforts were then primarily devoted, however, to the multitudinous problems of manufacture. In 1930 he was elected vice president of the company and a member of the newly formed appliance sales committee.

It was not until he was elected executive vice president that he moved his offices from Schenectady to New York City. Two years later, in 1939, the board of directors of the great General Electric Co. elected Charlie Wilson the fourth president of the company—into whose employment he had entered 40 years before. He had, indeed, proven a worthy successor to such men as Charles A. Coffin, Edwin W. Rice, Jr., and Gerard Swope—as well as a coworker with the world-renowned Owen D. Young, long general counsel and chairman of the board.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to recapitulate to you the tremendous labor pains suffered by this Nation in its attempt to give birth to increased industrial production in the prewar period of World War II.

Time after time all efforts failed, and every board superimposed upon all others to bring up the Nation's productivity—one after the other—bogged down.

September of 1942 found this Nation in a death struggle to increase our national production of war material. It was then that Charlie Wilson resigned all business connections, came to Washington, and, at the request of President Roosevelt, became the Executive Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, armed with complete authority over all war production.

As wartime boss of the United States production effort Charlie Wilson achieved spectacular successes—and particularly so in the construction of aircraft, shipbuilding, munitions production, and in all other war accoutrement programs. These began to reach unprecedented heights when subject to the magic wand built of the experience in direction and production abilities of the new production boss.

When war ended his resignation was finally accepted by President Roosevelt—and, like Cincinnatus, Charles Wilson, returning to his plow, was again elected president of the General Electric Co. on September 8, 1944.

Long distinguished among his colleagues for his creative ability in industrial production as well as his demonstrated interest in expanding the distribution of goods to absorb unemployment and promote higher living and working standards for all, he stands today—preeminent in the field of humanities as well as of industries.

Congressman BOYKIN stated that "The chips are down and the world now is in a tight place." He challenged every man in that room "To get behind Charlie Wilson," and, as he put it "Help this man save our country—or else there will be no country left to us to save."

Mr. Wilson's response was modest, simple, and direct!

He told his audience that he has, on more than one occasion, been accused of being "big business." But, no one ever thought of Charlie Wilson as anything but a little fellow when he started in with Sprague, 52 years ago today. He saw General Electric Co. grow as this Nation grew—from the period that marked the horseless carriage to the present age of the atom bomb, high-frequency circuits, television, guided missiles, and supersonic speeds.

In his boyhood, this America of ours was not even a first-class power. The world powers were Russia, Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, France, and the British Empire. No one ever thought to invite the representatives of the United States to sit down at any round table discussion of world affairs. But, Mr. Speaker, America has traveled far—and it has traveled fast, and today we are classed as first in the family of nations.

The last time our now Chief of Defense Mobilization came to Washington, he came down here to do a job, and then return to his work. But, this time, he has made public announcement that he has retired from General Electric, and has come down here to do a job that was so stupendous that he himself doesn't know whether he can do it or not. But the American people know he can.

He has intimated that he has no misgivings whatever as to the ability of our Nation to produce all the physical goods that we need to secure our peace and our defenses, and that this Nation, will be reasonably mighty by the end of this year—and that in another 2 years, it will be so mighty that neither Russia, nor any other nation in this world, will even bother us.

Mr. Wilson, in his report to the Nation made it clear that our potential productivity is so great, that we can ultimately impose our military production on top of our civilian economy, and, without so much as affecting our normal life.

He has, however, given full warning that inflation is the thing that could destroy our great might. It is to that end that we must hold down all prices, labor, agricultural, and all others, and, at the same time, keep all costs and prices in balance.

It is Charlie Wilson's faith that the dignity of man and of labor was born into the bone and the sinew of every American. He would be untrue to his own character if he should fail in any position which he might hold—to sit down and discuss fairly and justly all labor grievances with any representatives of organized labor that the rank and file saw fit to nominate to discuss that question with him.

Charles Wilson was a laborer and a member of a labor union—and is proud of it. And I am happy to learn that some of the differences that precipitated a sharp controversy between the mobilization director and labor representatives apparently have been resolved.

When at President Truman's request, Mr. Wilson left General Electric to take over the Office of Defense Mobilization, he, and those associated with him in the defense effort, approached the job—not as leaders of industry or of agriculture—not as lawyers—not as doctors—not as engineers or as economists. They approached all problems which confronted them first, and last, as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, next to the Russian Comintern, the greatest enemy of this country is inflation for, like a prairie fire, it will inevitably consume every last thing that lies in its path. Millions of wage earners today are asking themselves the question, "How can I provide food for the table in my home and pay for the other necessities of life in the face of the ever-increasing and rising costs that confront us each succeeding day?"

Mr. Speaker, let me point out, as Mr. Wilson has, that the Nation's budget this year is in the round sum of $71,000,000,000. These appropriations could be dissipated in the form of higher prices without adding one iota to the defense of this Nation.

Take the price of a pair of combat boots. Prior to Korea, they sold at $5.72, yet these same boots today cost our defense services $11.61—or an increase of nearly 100 percent. Twelve-ounce twill serge, which was bought for uniforms in May of 1950, for $3.54 a yard, is today costing $6.69 per yard—or an increase of 88½ percent—while cotton twill has jumped from 46.8 cents per yard to nearly 86 cents per yard.

During the same period, Garand rifles, which 9 months ago, cost a mere $41 each are currently quoted at $64—while Bailey bridges have jumped from $37,000 to $55,000 per unit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention here that all the taxes that we in the Congress have been asked to levy, if inflation is not controlled, would not even be able to meet the cost of providing for the Nation's defenses, to say nothing of all other services.

Now of course it is unnecessary to tell you that all of these increases in price are not attributable altogether either to the cost of raw materials or the labor necessary to the production thereof. But if and when labor costs are increased, material costs are likewise increased—distribution costs are increased—and the ultimate prices to the consumers are increased. It is the ultimate consumer—be he a farmer, an industrial worker, or the Government itself, who buys the goods and pays the bill.

Were we to make an extensive grant or generally increase wages or costs in any line whatever, be it agricultural, manufacture, transportation, or distribution—increased selling costs would follow, just as surely as night follows day.

Then, with newer and still higher prices prevailing in the consumer market, immediate outcry would be heard—and justifiably so—for further wage increases all across the board and a still newer price spiral generated.

When control of prices across the board is established, the responsible officials acknowledged that was not the ideal procedure to follow with respect to certain groups of labor and certain commodities. But they had to start somewhere to establish a cut-off point—and time has already proven that what they did was the wise thing.

Of course, the Office of Wage Stabilization, within the Defense Mobilization set-up, was faced with an accomplished fact when they agreed to grant a 22-percent increase to the United Mine Workers of America. That contract had been signed, sealed, and delivered, and it was not in their power to abate the same.

If the price of automobiles and trucks are advanced, the cost of all Army motor vehicles go up in proportion and Federal taxes will have to be raised still higher in order to get the money with which to procure them for our armed services.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember, at all times, that our armed services use many articles and goods that are used in everyday civilian economy—motor, oil, gasoline, hardware, metal goods, motor vehicles, clothing, shoes, and other items.

Uncontrolled and sharp competition between civilian use and defense needs could only result in higher prices, and hence, in higher taxes.

It is because of these facts, that we must control inflation by the application of price and wage controls, and the allocation of materials. The policies established to carry out these controls cannot be arrived at by any committee gathered around a table, each man representing some special interest or some special group.

They must be determined altogether with a view to what is best for our Nation and its future security.

These controls must be determined fairly, equitably, and dispassionately, or else we shall find ourselves engulfed in an economic chaos, from which, to my mind, there can be no other but a tortuous escape. I believe this is what Charles Wilson and his associates are trying to do. Let us support them in doing it.

Mr. Speaker, this job has got to be done—that it is a tremendous task and can be done only by someone like Charles E. Wilson, whose leadership, broad vision, and wealth of experience, when translated into action, programs will be carried out in behalf of the conservation of the taxpayers' dollars, the Nation's security, and the peace of the world.

Probe of United States Gold Policy Would Outdraw Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., which appeared in the Grand Rapids Press, has created considerable interest in and criticism of such Government policies among citizens in western Michigan. So far I have been unable to find any logical answer or explanation.

Mr. Lewis' article is as follows:

PROBE OF UNITED STATES GOLD POLICY WOULD OUTDRAW KEFAUVER

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Judging from the mail response to my comments in this space on the Government's silly policy of selling gold to foreigners for $35 an ounce, a public hearing on Federal monetary policies might even outdraw Senator KEFAUVER.

I pointed out that foreign governments and individuals can buy United States gold at $35 an ounce and resell it in Europe and elsewhere at $57 an ounce. I have since found that I was slightly out of step with fiscal realities. United States Treasury Department losses, as noted herein previously, were about $1,000,000,000 annually. I figured low on all counts.

EUROPE BUYS FOR $35, THEN SELLS FOR $70

Refined gold can be bought for $35 an ounce from the Treasury, but instead of being purchased at the rate of a billion dollars annually, foreign buyers are gobbling it up at the rate of two billion. As for resale value overseas, $57 an ounce is merely the bargaining price. Experts say the normal overseas asking price for an ounce of gold is probably closer to $70 an ounce and that if you find someone who is really greedy, you can get more than $100 an ounce. In fact, the British Government, which buys large quantities from our Treasury Department, has set a monetary value of $101.17 an ounce, according to United States Mint figures.

If you have a pot of gold—and you are breaking the law if you have—the thing to do, if you want to make a neat profit, is trot over to France and sell it. Even better, set up a dummy corporation with offices overseas and then you can buy and sell gold legally. Smuggling gold out of this country is on the increase, but customs officials are alerted to examine anyone wandering around the docks looking as if he had lead in his pants.

ALL DEMAND AMERICA MAKE PAYMENT IN GOLD

Some countries, including Russia, demand gold when we buy anything from them—and that is where you and I, as taxpayers, take a beating from the low evaluation of gold. For instance, less than a year ago an ounce of gold would have bought 60 pounds of tin. Today it will buy 15 pounds. The same applies to raw rubber and other industrial materials purchased overseas. If the Treasury Department hiked up the value per ounce of United States gold to somewhere near the world market, we wouldn't be taking such a beating from foreign traders, but with United States gold stabilized at $35 an ounce foreign traders can continue to hike the price of their goods and we must continue to shell out more gold to pay for it.

Current shipments of gold per week out of the country average almost as much gold as is now produced in the United States in a year. Back in 1933 the British abandoned the gold standard. Gold was worth $20.67 an ounce then. We shelled out so much of it to the British that in May of 1933 Congress passed a law nationalizing gold trading and making it a crime for a private United States citizen to trade in gold.

BUYING OR SELLING, WE END UP ON SHORT END

In view of current headlines, it is interesting to note that at that time the RFC started buying back, at $35 an ounce, most of the gold we had sold to the British for $20.67, which may account for some of the weird fiscal policies still practiced there today.

Only gold-backed currency rates high in the world today. This is even more true when war threatens. Everybody wants gold. In the United States there is the general feeling that most of the gold in the world is buried at Fort Knox, Ky.

Here are the facts: Our total supply of gold on the basis of the $35-an-ounce price would pay for less than one-third of the 1952 budget now before Congress. In fact, gold buried in Fort Knox and elsewhere backs up less than 10 percent of the money in circulation today, and this does not include the billions of dollars worth of Government bonds extant.

Everybody but us taxpayers makes money from our low gold price. India, Britain, Russia, France, and other nations sell us goods for gold at $35 an ounce. At the same time we ship Marshall-plan countries goods and machinery paid for with American dollars. Then the Marshall-plan countries sell the goods and machinery to Russia and to one another for gold that brings over $100 an ounce. While they build up their gold reserves, ours are depleted.

Since the British devalued the pound some 15 months ago—a step similar, in result, to going off the gold standard in 1933—the United States has lost the equivalent of 30 percent of all the gold produced in the United States in the last 150 years. If the British can hold off for another 20 years, maybe we can get more gold mines operating in the United States so we can build up our supplies again for another raid on Fort Knox.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Philip W. Porter, from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 7, 1951:

PORTER ON PRICE CONTROL—WAILS AND MOANS FROM ALL SIDES INDICATE THAT IT SHOULD END SOON—IF NOT SOONER

(By Philip W. Porter)

The attempt at price control was expected to end in a farce, but it has reached that stage even sooner than anticipated. Already, though all the red tape, gobble-dygook and snooping jobs haven't even been filled, the signs of disintegration are evident. And long before the law expires June 30 you'll begin to hear cries from many quarters that it ought to be scrapped. Speed the day!

One particularly poignant wail is already coming from the union bosses, who were long the principal advocates of price control. What they really wanted was price control without wage control; they also hoped to call the signals in the top office. However, wage control is in the law, and Charles Wilson, whom they can't intimidate, is in the top office, so they are now yipping their heads off.

Another groan is coming from the cotton bloc, which resented its ceilings bitterly and you can bet it won't be long before the Congressmen from the cattle raising States will also be moaning, for OPS has already nicely loused up the meat growing and slaughtering business, just as did its predecessors, OPA.

Farmers are not delivering as many cattle to be slaughtered. Signs of skirting the law are appearing in upgrading of poor quality meats and insistence on tie-ins with scarce items. Packing-house managers are going crazy with the silly and useless bookkeeping required to fix profit margins and it won't be long before OPS will be discovering there is a black market. It couldn't be otherwise.

WINS UNPOPULARITY CONTEST

If ever there was a piece of unpopular legislative nonsense, this is it. A recent Gallup poll showed that 75 percent were dissatisfied with it and 65 percent expected prices to go higher. Most of them had the silly notion, cultivated by politicians who flaunted the magic word "controls" before the voters, that all we needed to reduce prices was for Congress to pass a new law. They found out differently. Congress can't repeal or amend the law of supply and demand.

The afore-mentioned groups are opposed to the price-wage control law for special selfish reasons. But you don't need any better reason than this: Prices can't be fixed except in a slave state, with a policeman watching every family, or a docile country where everybody obeys without thought of self or resistance. Since we are adequately supplied with selfishness and signs of resistance are many, price-fixing has already degenerated into just a roost for more job holders and paper-pushers. People generally are either ignoring it or just plain confused as to what it's all about. Who can make any sense out of the mumbo-jumbo?

PRICE INDEXES DROP

Meanwhile, the most ironic possible thing is happening. Weekly and monthly price indexes are dropping. Retailers are suddenly getting inventory-happy and starting to advertise some big price cuts. The television industry is already knocking prices down in large chunks and big electrical appliances are also going begging. There are ample signs that buyers have zipped up their pocketbooks after the scare splurges of several months ago. It's similar to what happened in early 1949. The folks who helped accelerate the inflation by buying too much all at once are already helping produce a slowdown in business. They've already bought and are now paying.

This noticeable slowdown, widely commented on by business analysts, hasn't shown up yet as much as it will soon in all the indexes, but is noticeable even now in food. The Dun & Bradstreet index is down for the third week, the lowest since the controls were applied. And don't forget that most food was not controlled. It started down without artificial wand-waving, of its own accord, because the demand was less. Simple, isn't it?

RAT RACE OF CONFUSION

So, while Mike DiSalle's operatives are just getting into high gear with nonunderstandable directives, mark-ups, mark-downs, and all-out rat race of confusion, designed in theory to keep prices from going up, prices on plenty of items are sliding down fast, and others are likely to drop in the future. How silly can you get in Government? We need this expensive price-control machinery, complete with new job holders, as much as a hole in the head.

All we need right now is allocations of scarce metals and other materials used in production of war goods. Yet OPS is fretting around about the price of potato chips, parking lot fees and flowers. Such stuff is peanuts, merely an annoyance. How could it affect the general price level?

Well, I suppose the boys drawing Federal checks, putting new titles after their names and writing letters to each other, have to do something to look busy.

American Air Power in a Struggle With Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky entitled "Reds Can't Shift Base Once War Has Started," which appeared in the New York Journal-American March 25, 1951. I believe Major de Seversky's comments deserve national attention.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS CAN'T SHIFT BASE ONCE WAR HAS STARTED

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

American air power of the right kind and the right size could knock out the war-making industry of Soviet Russia. That much is conceded even by most military men who are skeptical about all-out aerial strategy.

But what good will it do to disarm the Soviets in Russia, they ask, if Stalin can occupy Western Europe, organize its industrial potential, and continue aggression from the new base?

The picture that our top military men are trying to sell to the American people is roughly this: After our atomic attack, Soviet industry in ruins at home, but the Soviet regime still supreme, resting on economic strength beyond its own frontiers. It will function even better, some of them warn, from its new industrial citadel.

SAME OLD STORY

This argument has a familiar ring. We heard it in the final stages of our war with Japan. As the industrial set-up on the Mikado's home islands crumbled to ashes under the concentrated B-29 offensive, our old-style strategists refused to see the possibility of victory.

Japan, they pointed out, still had a great industrial base and some 6,000,000 fresh and well-equipped soldiers in Manchuria. Its war machine would simply be moved to Manchuria, and the struggle would go on for years.

Events quickly showed how grotesque was this concept. Having been thoroughly disarmed at home, Japan gave up, though its Manchurian potential was still intact. With the homeland reduced to impotence, it became politically and psychologically impossible to continue the contest from an alien base.

PAID THROUGH NOSE

It was because of this fallacious concept and the archaic belief that a war cannot be won without a show-down bayonet battle that our leadership was so anxious to draw Stalin into the Pacific war.

To buy Stalin's entry, we paid through the nose with vast concessions to the Soviets in Manchuria. We are still paying through the nose by the appalling casualties in Korea. Let it be remembered that Chinese Communist victories and our present desperate position in Korea are the direct result of those concessions.

Yet the very military men who were so tragically wrong 6 years ago are urging the selfsame fallacy today. They insist that Soviet Russia, though knocked out at home, could maintain the struggle from Western Europe. That is what I deny.

They forget that a regimented dictatorship cannot survive once its aura of invincibility at home is destroyed. Even in normal times the Kremlin needs huge armed forces, a colossal secret police system, a great empire of concentration camps to hold its subjects in line.

WILL NEED HOME ARMIES

How long will it hold them once its industries are wrecked, communications smashed, all normal life disrupted, while American air forces cruise at will in the Russian skies? How long will the restive satellite peoples of Eastern Europe continue to obey their hated Communist masters under those conditions?

With industry halted and life paralyzed by punishment from the air, Russia will be rocked by explosive discontents and perhaps revolutions. The Kremlin will need its best armies for domestic use. It could not possibly sustain the fighting spirit of its troops abroad in any case, each soldier knowing that his loved ones at home are caught in a maelstrom of disorder, hunger, and violence.

We know that Moscow today is obliged to use drastic measures to isolate its occupation forces in Germany and Austria from the local population and to stop the epidemics of desertion. If this is true in relative peacetime, with the Kremlin's prestige higher than ever before, how will it control its occupation forces under continuous air attack, the home base destroyed and the regime's pretensions of unbeatable power discredited?

FINAL BLOW FROM AIR

When the Soviet octopus has been struck in its heart, its tentacles around other countries will fall limp. Only superior strategic air power can deliver that blow.

Our military spokesmen insist that the Russian army, after its own country has been devastated, can pick up its stockpiles, shift bodily to Europe, impose itself on western civilization and live happily ever after.

More than that, they insist that the invaders can then proceed to transform Europe's industries into an industrial power superior to that of the United States. If the Russian soldier-peasants can perform such a miracle, then there is some magic in communism after all, and the free world is doomed anyhow.

But no such miracle would transpire. Stripped of prestige and productive capacity at home by our Air Force, the Soviet regime would cease to be a military treat. Its efforts to create a new industrial base could readily be canceled out by selective bombing.

Its transport and communications could be cut faster than they could be rebuilt. Life would in effect be brought to a standstill by such aerial siege. Stalin's armies would then be open to leisurely and systematic suffocation from overhead and would deteriorate into a helpless mob of displaced persons.

True, air siege means a certain amount of destruction by bombing. But how about the "slow retreat" by inadequate American and Allied ground forces? We need only look at devastated Korea to realize what this would do to Europe. Yet this is the only alternative offered.

COULD WRECK EUROPE

Admittedly such forces would not be enough to hold Europe against the overwhelming might of the Red armies. But they would perhaps slow up the conquest, retreating slowly, and thus chew up the Kremlin's stockpiles of weapons and fuel. Further, if worse comes to worst and we are pushed off the continent, we would destroy the European industrial potential to prevent it from falling into Russian hands.

By some strange quirk of logic, our military mentors look calmly at the prospect of total annihilation of West European civilization in a mile-by-mile scorched earth struggle from the Elbe to the Atlantic. But they shrink in horror from limited and highly selective destruction from the air. Somehow the brand of destruction with which they are more familiar seems to them more acceptable.

Ground forces sufficient to stop the Soviet armies might land and ultimately take the offensive are another matter. But we do not have them. With our limited manpower we can never have them. Those who are trying to stampede the United States into the rearming of Europe—which means war—on the assumption that Russia is already cowed by our atomic stockpile, are courting disaster.

RUSSIANS KNOW

Russian experts have studied the results of bombardment in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and were invited to the atomic tests at Bikini. From information published they know the capabilities of our Air Force.

Having similar information, being acquainted with the nature of Russian targets and estimating their air defenses, I fear that should we attack Russia today with our present skeleton strategic Air Force we would invite a Pearl Harbor in reverse.

We would sacrifice the precious nucleus of our strategic air power, squander our atomic bombs by inflicting only indecisive damage, and then we, like the Japanese after the battle of Midway, would have nothing left with which to follow up to a decision.

Let's have a big stick first, then we can do what we please.

Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the recent Executive order providing for a blanket deferment policy for college students has brought about a critical situation in Kent County, Mich. The Grand Rapids Herald and the Grand Rapids Press have written editorials in which I concur. In addition, I include in my remarks a column on the same general problem by Lowell Mellett.

The three newspaper comments follow:

[From the Grand Rapids Herald]

IN A "CLASSLESS" SOCIETY

Kent County Draft Board No. 43 acted patriotically and in the best interest of the Nation it serves when it formally protested the President's order granting deferments

to hundreds of thousands of college students, with no specific obligation to serve later.

This board and others like it, together with other protesting citizens, will have saved the Selective Service System from the worst of possible mistakes if it brings about the reexamination and correction of this policy.

For this is class legislation in a historically classless society.

It sets apart a whole group, not because as individuals they may be able to contribute more to the national defense as civilians than as soldiers but only because they are enrolled in colleges or can in the future get under the wire before they reach draft age and manage to keep up their grades.

An aptitude test is being set up, but this, be it noted, is secondary. Only students already enrolled are eligible to take it. Such a test in no way sorts out the geniuses and the brilliant men whose continued technical training conceivably might be in the national interest. The nonstudent is barred. The apprentice in a shop doesn't get a chance at it.

Rather it harks back to the iniquitous Civil War practice of buying draft substitutes. The youth whose only advantage is parents with money enough to keep him in school can be deferred. The youth who must go to work, or who simply prefers to learn on the job, gets no such break.

In his speech here Tuesday night, President Otto A. Seyferth of the United States Chamber of Commerce said that "for the first time in our history, we have begun to set class against class. Under the political leadership of men who cared more for votes than for the good of their country, we have been led to forget the essentially classless character of our society."

He wasn't talking about the draft policy, but here it is again. The college class is set against the noncollege class.

Mr. Seyferth also said, speaking of controls, that they can succeed only to the extent that the people accept them willingly. That applies with equal force to any law, including the draft law.

There lies the great danger. We need the draft. We must have it in this period of peril. We cannot afford resistance to it or even nonacceptance of its fairness, and this singling out of a whole group of young men is manifestly unfair.

Members of Board No. 43 are indignant over the discrimination. They are not alone.

Such wholesale deferments as are contemplated cannot be justified on any ground.

We have been talking about universal military training. The first word is the key to its success—universal. There should be no blanket exceptions.

It would be regrettable if able members of draft boards were to find it necessary to resign because of their objections, as of course they must do if they cannot conscientiously comply with what they consider to be an obnoxious rule. It would be equally regrettable if they were to be removed by higher authority because of their protests.

It would, indeed, be most unfortunate—and most dangerous—to allow discrimination in favor of one large group of men merely because they managed to get into college before being drafted.

[From the Grand Rapids Press]

DEFERRING COLLEGE STUDENTS

President Truman's draft deferment plan for college students has provoked loud protests. The plan's critics are opposed to determining whether a young man shall or shall not be drafted on the basis of intelligence and aptitude tests. They contend that this would set up a standard for military service that is both undemocratic and unfair. Grand Rapids draft board members have been among the first to complain.

These objections hardly can be ignored. While it is true that persons with money could buy their way out of the Union Army in Civil War days, this Nation otherwise never has made money, intelligence, or anything of the sort the deciding factor in raising an army. The rich and poor alike are expected to serve. And up to now the genius and the average man have been also.

Under the President's plan, however, about half of the men now in college could be expected to score high enough to stay in school. The other half would have to don uniforms. One grave question raised by this setup is whether deferment wouldn't actually amount to exemption from military service. If so, it would come dangerously close to creating an elite corps, which is something that we could expect the majority of Americans to oppose violently. Nor would it be a kindness to the supposedly favored group.

For if we look ahead down the lifetime of these exempted students, it will be a poor service to them and their children to mark them in this way, as having sought and received exemption for scholarship only—as against other citizens who stood ready to fight when the Nation needed its citizens to stand up for its very life. If a large number of these potential scientists, doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., are actually needed for continuity of research and development in the war effort, why not have them drafted and assigned to these specific war training purposes, with nominal pay as Reservists so long as they proceed with their education, but with transfer to the Armed Forces if they should fail to meet the grade? On graduation they would be assigned to definite scientific war projects or as doctors, judge advocates, Army or Navy dentists, etc., to the extent required at the time.

To exempt all students on a sole basis of scholarship, aptitude, and intelligence, without considering whether their courses would be of any military use or any war industry benefit, seems fundamentally wrong. It may excuse itself for colleges desperately in need of students and funds—but not on the far more important basis of justice both to the pupils involved and to the millions who could not claim exemption.

The Grand Rapids draft board protest is in advance of actual receipt of the cards to be mailed in by students, and far ahead of the examinations which are supposed to screen out and protect the brightest half of the million male college students in America. It is a protest on the whole principle involved. We believe it will be widely echoed.

BRIGHT BOYS POSE A PROBLEM—BUT SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM'S APPROACH CARRIES TOO MANY UNPLEASANT IMPLICATIONS

(By Lowell Mellett)

One wonders if our Selective Service System isn't in danger of becoming too selective.

Heretofore it has operated to exclude from the armed services a certain percentage of our boys on the ground that they are too dumb to fight or, at least, too lacking in education. Now it is proposed to exclude, or defer for the time being, a certain percentage on the ground that they are too bright to fight. We are to have a military machine manned by men who are neither too dumb nor too bright; just right.

It may not work out exactly that way, to be sure. The bright boys won't actually be excluded because they are bright. They are only to be deferred if they desire to be and many, without doubt, will prefer to fight.

This state of affairs appears to be the result of 2 years of heavy thinking on the part of some of the Nation's leading educators, who undertook the task at the request of the Government. It is an answer to the problem that comes up in every major war; how to prevent the interruption of the education of the boys in college or on their way to college. That's a serious problem for the boys involved and for the parents who are making it possible for them to achieve an education. Just as serious as the problem of the boys whose parents cannot send them to college, including the boys who must work to help support their families and who are getting their education in the form of the trade or the business they may be learning. Just as serious, but no more so.

But, it is said, there is another and even higher purpose in this proposed separation of the sheep and the goats. It is necessary, it is said, to develop, through education, the brain power that will enable our country to compete on better than even terms with the rest of the world in this educated age. That is a way of saying that this country must have an intellectual elite, a group to do our thinking for us while others do the fighting. Modern war, it is said, requires that.

But going to college and learning to think are not precisely the same thing. The pages of history have been brightened by the names of boys who never got to college, but became great thinkers nevertheless. Abraham Lincoln for one. Jesus Christ for another.

The day may come, and it will be a great day if it does, when every child will be able to obtain all the education he can hold. But in this rich country we haven't yet made certain that every child shall have even the beginning of an education. For some there are literally no schools. The schools are only for the fortunate. Now we propose to double the good fortune of the fortunate.

It doesn't seem to conform to the ideal of democracy we are voicing to the world. It is about as democratic as the draft system that operated in the North during the Civil War. Then the parents of a boy who had been drafted could buy a substitute for him, if they had $150. Now they can obtain his deferment by sending him to college. They can if he is just reasonably bright.

The bald fact is that this country must either be a democracy or something else.

The new system of selection revised for our fighting forces seems perfectly designed to make it something else.

Service of the Forty-fifth Division, and Comment on General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release I issued yesterday regarding the use of the personnel of the Forty-fifth Division, and also commenting on General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secretary of the Army Pace has assured me that there is no plan to use the personnel of the Forty-fifth Division for combat relief in the Army rotation program just announced for Korea.

With Oklahoma's National Guard bound for Japan, I have received a good many queries as to whether their possible movement to Korea might be hastened by the new rotation system which will bring home a good many of our fighting men. The answer is "No," according to Secretary Pace.

Replacements for that program will come in the future, as in the past, from training centers in this country. Secretary Pace is very much aware that divisional morale and tradition has far too great a value to be damaged by breaking up the Forty-fifth in any way.

Secretary Pace reiterates that the division will first complete its training. If and when it does move, the entire division will go together. No units or individuals will be withdrawn for replacements or other uses, it was stated.

The Secretary of the Army tells me again that there is still no plan to use the Forty-fifth for other than occupational purposes in Japan. However, any plan is always subject to change upon the decision of the theater commander, who is ———? Who is ———? Oh, yes; his name is MacArthur.

And speaking of General MacArthur, I should like to add his name to my list of letter writers who need the writer's cramps.

As the big chief in the Far East, General MacArthur is said to wear many hats to represent his many titles. But he isn't satisfied with all that big brass on his head. Now he is trying to grab the high silk topper of the diplomat. I must say it looks inappropriate with his military uniform.

With our Oklahoma boys assigned to the Far East, I have an added concern for what is happening out there. How can our general welfare be served by General MacArthur's open disregard of superior authority, his failure to cooperate with his own Government or promote harmony with our allies?

I'm not denying that he is still MacArthur the Magnificent, but I think the prolonged performance of his one-man act is wearing the patience of the rest of the team mighty thin.

In fact, it is getting about as threadbare as the general's much-touted oriental prestige. The time may be nearer than we think when the over-all cost of keeping MacArthur as the theater commander will be greater than the value of his position with the Asiatics.

Sometimes I fear that parts of what MacArthur is doing could get us deeper into war instead of successfully ending the one we are already in.

There seems to be a new wave of argument and confusion as to our specific purposes in Korea. The answer is very definite and very simple: Our aim wherever we are and in whatever we do is peace. We do not seek to go beyond that. Under no circumstances can we afford to stop short of it.

While we are conducting the Korean campaign on its present basis, it would be nothing short of insanity to take any action that might provoke an all-out conflagration. Our efforts must continue to limit the conflict in every possible way in the hope of achieving peace at the earliest possible moment.

Again, I repeat, our aim is more peace and less war.

Appropriation for Federal Civil Defense Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am astonished and alarmed by the severe slashing of more than 75 percent from the first appropriation for the Federal Civil Defense Administration as reported in the third supplemental appropriations bill of the House for 1951.

There is no question that this action of the Appropriations Committee will have grave, if not fatal, consequences to the civil-defense program throughout the Nation, as well as to our entire security program. This action by the House committee will set the civil-defense program back at least 6 months even if all the funds are restored. The States and the cities and their people have been waiting to see if this Congress lives up to the serious responsibilities which it laid down for itself in the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. Now we have solidified public apathy by our own actions.

In the States, governors have been urging their legislatures to provide funds and machinery to take advantage of such Federal aid as might become available under our law, as well as for their own administration of civil defense. With one eye on the apparently healthy Korean situation of the past few weeks, most of these State legislatures have held off waiting to see what we were going to do. As of today, 28 of them are still in session and must be dismayed and disgusted with the news they received from Washington last Friday.

This Nation and this Congress willingly spend billions of dollars for munitions in the military services and yet the Congress refuses to provide even a token protection of the home front which makes a military war effort possible.

This Appropriations Committee report reduces the Civil Defense Agency to a small advisory group, with no real means of helping States and cities get ready to help themselves, except by training some trainers and distributing a few pamphlets. This action negates the whole principle of civil defense, as it was thoroughly understood by the House Armed Services Subcommittee last December, and as it was understood by the full committee.

The Federal responsibility in civil defense goes far beyond the distribution of educational material and the training of State and local training supervisors, plus a meager amount for equipment and shelter facilities. One of the fundamental principles is that the Federal Government shall assist the States by contributions to build up their ability to meet enemy attack, and keep the production line going, to the end that our military forces may continue to receive the support they need in the prosecution of a war.

In the early spring of 1950 the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of both Houses began exhaustive executive hearings on the civil defense problem. The record of that testimony shows that the National Security Resources Board, then in charge of civil defense by Executive order, was making realistic progress in preparing a program to protect the lives and property and production of 150,000,000 American people.

The reports of the joint committee hearings and those which followed in the Senate and House Armed Services Committee are grim records of the realities of civil defense.

Because civil defense was recognized as a key of our security program, members of the Eighty-first Congress reacted in a sound and wise fashion by passing with one dissenting vote, Public Law 920—the Civil Defense Act of 1950.

In the declaration of policy for that act it says flatly "it is the policy and intent of Congress to provide a plan of civil defense for the protection of life and property in the United States from attack." The remainder of that act, which grants widespread powers and delegations of authority to the civil defense authorities at the Federal, State, and local levels, is a tribute to the Congress because it met the vast civil-defense problem by significant action.

Now, I must point out that we are ridiculing the policies of this Congress and hoodwinking the American people by this ruthless elimination of funds for a soundly conceived program to protect our entire home front.

Fundamentally, what the action of the House Appropriations Committee does is tell the Civil Defense Administration that it can plan for a disaster but that it can have virtually no means to prepare for that emergency.

I ask you to give serious consideration to the program activities which are wiped out by the action of the Appropriations Committee.

The entire civil defense research and development program in a field which the Appropriations Committee admits is full of unanswered problems, has been completely eliminated.

A. The entire program for blood plasma and blood substitute research has been wiped out.

B. The committee action grants the Civil Defense Agency $75,000,000 for shelter construction. Then the committee denies its own statement that the answers have not been found to the shelter problem by refusing to grant any money to the administration for shelter research, both on existing structures and on actual tests of American-type shelters which must be made under atomic blasts.

C. The action of the House committee effectively eliminates further progress in our defenses against biological warfare.

D. Funds have also been eliminated for the development of a badly needed hospital mobilization and operation plan for wartime disasters.

E. One of the major responsibilities of the Federal Government as set forth in Public Law 920 is the provision of substantial stockpiles of civil defense emergency materials to be used in the case of disaster by the States and cities. Principal among these materials for Federal stockpiling, as recognized by the Eighty-first Congress, were a large number of medical supplies, including first aid items, first-aid station supplies, medical and surgical instruments for emergency treatment of casualties, mobile laboratories for detection purposes, vaccines for immunization against biological warfare, blood-transfusion equipment, blood substitutes and blood plasma, Geiger counters and other radiological

safety instruments, and a number of other such crucial items.

Without these items in adequate stockpile in advance of attack the Congress recognized in Public Law 920 that the casualty rate in event of attack on our cities would be severely higher. Yet the committee eliminated all funds for such stockpiling.

I will not take the time of the House to discuss in detail the various reductions which have been made by the Appropriations Committee. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks for the RECORD and by such means will comment upon the committee report point by point. Some of the statements made in this report are manifestly unfair.

I am mystified to note in the report by the House Appropriations Committee that "the committee is rather amazed at the approach the Civil Defense Administration appears to be taking with reference to these activities." A little more study of the problem would have indicated that nothing could have been a more contrary statement of fact.

I particularly want to take issue with the so-called nebulous nature of the civil-defense warning system which the committee said had been coordinated "only slightly" with the military forces.

Contrary to the committee report, the Defense Department, and particularly the Air Force, have testified repeatedly that there is absolutely not "a wholly adequate and efficient civilian attack warning system" in the Air Force or anywhere else. The Air Force testified before the Armed Services Committees that it desired that civil defense take over the public warning phase of the Nationwide warning system. The fact has been widely known and understood in the Congress for many months. The Air Force has flatly testified that it has not the personnel nor the funds, nor does it seek the responsibility of handling the civil air-raid-warning program. In this connection, may I also comment that the recognition by the Appropriations Committee to the Defense Department that it make every effort to expand the present radar system is a sound one. May I point out, however, that radar does not alert the public. No matter how well the Defense Department improved its radar system it would be absolutely useless for public warning unless there is established now, under the Civil Defense Administration, in coordination with the Air Force, a wholly adequate public warning system.

During the past year, whenever the headlines in Korea took a turn for the worse, the States and the cities and the public and the press exerted a great deal of pressure on the Congress and on the executive department to do something about civil defense. That "doing something about civil defense" was meant in the sense of doing something honest and concrete and in the magnitude of the problem. No token gesture was called for. But I must say that the action of the House Appropriations Committee is literally and psychologically not even a token gesture for the protection of the home front through the civil-defense program.

We learned from bitter experience in World War II, and then from Korea, that preparedness and mobilization are not faucets that can be turned on and off at the whim of any morning's headline. Despite the fact that we should have learned that lesson we are acting entirely contrary to it in this rash handling of the civil defense program.

I ask you not to be misled by the fact that the total suggested appropriation is $186,000,000; $100,000,000 of that is locked up by a provision of the bill which provides that it can be used only when a civil defense emergency is declared. In terms of modern warfare, that means after the bombs have fallen—when it will be of no value.

If the remainder of 1951 is our period of greatest danger from enemy action, as the committee report states, we are saying in effect to the American people that nothing can be done for you right now. After the bombs fall and there are casualties by the hundreds of thousands we will be very pleased to furnish $100,000,000 in cash as substitutes for blood and blood plasma, for monitoring instruments, and for innoculations against biological and chemical warfare. I am certain it will provide a great deal of comfort to the public to know that instead of the things they will need immediately for those who survive an enemy attack, our Congress will be happy to provide them with dollar bills instead of bandages and blood.

We have been accused for the past several years of "government by crisis." Certainly the history of civil defense in the past year shows just that. We have blown hot and cold on it in direct proportion to the criticality of the international situation. If this big enemy push that is being predicted should come to pass with all the forces that we are told are massed in North Korea and Manchuria, you will be hearing from home again on the subject of "Why didn't you do something about civil defense?"

I urge that we stop this backing and filling and make up our minds that we were right last January when we authorized an all out civil defense program for this country. As long as there is the faintest threat of war we will need a strong and well organized home front defense. We will not get it by starving it to death while it is just getting started.

The public impact of this action by the House Appropriations Committee can hardly be retrieved by any action of the Congress. Looking back on our past history I can believe that it is precisely in the pattern that an enemy would ask of this Nation—the graver the crisis, the more inadequate the action by the Federal Government. I feel certain that such an action by the Appropriations Committee and by this Congress is aid and comfort to the enemy of the highest order.

Summary of House action

Program	Original request	House action
Fire-fighting services	$6,840,000	
Warden service	2,773,000	
Engineering services	11,330,000	
Transportation services	1,500,000	
Rescue service	500,000	
Warning and communications system:		
Organizational equipment	5,521,000	[1] [2] $110,000
Operating costs	237,000	
Reserve supply operations	2,058,000	
Medical services:		
Organizational equipment	13,850,000	
Stockpile	61,761,000	
Operating costs	27,000	
Welfare service	15,426,000	
Training and education	787,000	[3] 890,000
Research and development	3,875,000	0
Executive direction	1,515,000	750,000
Shelter and protective facilities	250,000,000	[1] 80,000,000
Procurement fund	25,000,000	5,000,000
Emergency fund	0	100,000,000
Total	403,000,000	186,750,000

[1] Organizational equipment for communications provided in "Shelters and protective facilities" in the amount of $5,000,000.
[2] Equipment only.
[3] An increase of $103,000.

Status of State civil defense appropriations

1951 LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS

States:	
Now meeting	28
Adjourned	15
Meets next in 1952	5
Total	48
APPROPRIATIONS MADE—TOTALS	
Administration	$3,892,485
Matching funds	29,769,600
Other: Stockpiling, emergency, and contingency	94,863,700
Total	128,525,785
APPROPRIATIONS PENDING—TOTALS	
Administration	$8,378,085
Matching funds	21,614,185
Other: Stockpiling, emergency, and contingency	43,725,000
Total	73,717,270
TOTAL—APPROPRIATIONS MADE AND PENDING	
Administration	$12,270,570
Matching funds	51,383,785
Other: Stockpiling, emergency, and contingency	138,588,700
Total	202,243,055

Government of Petroleum, by Petroleum, for Petroleum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, in Cleveland, Ohio, February 24, 1951, at the annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make two and one-third pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $191.34.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HAROLD L. ICKES, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, FEBRUARY 24, 1951

GOVERNMENT OF PETROLEUM, BY PETROLEUM, FOR PETROLEUM

I appreciate this opportunity to speak before this convention of Americans for Democratic Action. Every citizen who is concerned that laws in the interest of the public welfare should be passed by the Congress and enforced by the executive and judicial branches of the Government knows pretty generally what the ADA has stood for in the past and he knows that it is good. He knows that he can have confidence that, if the ADA continues along the course that it has so far followed, it will be, in the future, as it is now, one of the greatest influences in the country in encouraging our Government to put the welfare and peaceful security of the people above all other considerations, especially personal, political considerations.

We have great problems to solve, not only internationally, as I need not tell you, but in the domestic field. We cannot afford, because of our concern and anxiety over what may happen in Europe, or what is happening today in Asia, to be indifferent to what is happening at home. Just as a pickpocket can employ his skill to the best advantage and with the greatest immunity to himself in a crowd whose necks are straining in an effort to see some curiously exciting object, so does a political crook know that he is safest in plying his even more obnoxious trade at home when the attention of the people is monopolized in the direction of Russia or China or Korea where American troops are fighting or may be called upon to fight.

With this in mind, I shall discuss with you today the subject of oil—off-shore oil, tidelands oil—federally owned oil that has already been discovered in vast quantities and rich quality off the shores of California, Texas, and Louisiana, with prospects of finding more along the seacoasts of other States. In addition, there is an almost certainty of discovering, on the Continental Shelf, lying seaward of the Pacific Coast, unpredictable quantities after the technicians have developed ways and means for discovering and capturing it. The considerations have persuaded me in considering what to talk about today to fall back on the subject of oil, upon which I have had something to say in the past, and as to which I may have more to say in the future. One inducement to talk about oil is the fact that, as was expected, there has been introduced in the Eighty-second Congress a Senate joint resolution which seems to consider, first, the interests of the private oil industry, and, second, the coastline States.

In the apparent nature of an afterthought, there is a suggestion that perhaps the people of the United States who own these offshore oil lands, according to the United States Supreme Court, may also have an interest which should be given some recognition. I have been referring to Senate Joint Resolution No. 20, introduced on January 18 by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, for himself and Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, a resolution upon which hearings have already been held by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Then, on the morning of February 15, when I was reading, at the breakfast table, my copy of the Washington Post, which I am sure you will agree with me is one of the outstanding and most reliable newspapers in the United States, my eye was struck by a headline on the front page: "Army Studies Lower Draft Standards." The article itself was under the byline of Sam Stavisky, with whose name in connection with responsible stories, readers of the Post have become accustomed. The subhead was to the effect that "two new methods would be applied to those who flunk intelligence tests." The first paragraph of the lead announced: "The Army has under study two plans for lowering induction standards for draft-age men who fail the mental qualification test, it was learned yesterday."

"One approach would permit the induction of a percentage of substandard selectees, as fixed or suggested by Congress."

"The other approach would allow the induction of virtually any physically-fit man who knew his right hand from his left."

Omitting several intervening paragraphs, I came to the concluding one: "In World War II, mental standards for induction were progressively lowered. After failing the standard test, the draftee was given a literary examination, a test by pantomime (whatever that may mean), and then an individual psychiatrical test before being rejected as useless to the Army. The wartime bottom-of-the-barrel mental rejection rate was 8 to 9 percent, or one out of four of all draftees rejected."

I confess that there was nothing in this article to make me thrust out my chest in my pride at being an American. However, I did feel that I would like to do something to help in a distressing and almost unbelievable situation. So I began to look up other facts and figures. I discovered, what you probably already know, and that is that the percentage of our total adult population, of less than 4 years of schooling in the United States, amounts to 13.5 percent. This percentage ranges from 6.3 percent in the West to 22.9 percent in the South and 10.1 percent in the North. Glancing down the lists of the States, one discovers a 4.1 percent illiteracy in Iowa, which jumps and dodges to a high of 35.7 percent in Louisiana. It appears that 4 years of school, or less, is generally considered the jumping-off place of literacy by the armed services.

Considering the percentages of adult illiteracy in the population of various countries, we find that Finland is the most literate of all, with an average of illiteracy of only one-tenth of 1 percent. It could well be that the intellectual qualities of the Finns have had something to do with their willingness to fight for their liberty even against that monster that dwells in the Kremlin as well as their knowledge of how most effectively to do this.

The United States measures literacy by asking a person if he is literate. This might be regarded as self-serving testimony in connection with which I suggest that there might properly be a preliminary question which would be, "Do you know what literate means?" My guess would be that such a question would cause confusion in the minds of at least some who are ready to vouch for their own literacy. The illiteracy of the United States, which I have quoted as being 13.5 percent of the adult population, really means the percentage of that population with less than 4 years of schooling. In truth, in these days in the United States, an adult with less than 4 years of schooling would hardly rate as literate by any realistic standard.

It cannot be determined by statistics whether a man can be a brave and intelligent soldier, whether literate or illiterate. There have been fine soldiers who could not read or write, just as there have been highly educated ones who do better in the classroom than on a battlefield. However, there is nothing for Americans to be proud of in the fact that the percentage of our adult population with less than 4 years of schooling, amounts to 13.5 percent. No one could deny that even a good soldier might be a better one if he had a better education. He would have a better opportunity to know what he is fighting for. Least of all, can we be proud of our too high a degree of illiteracy when we consider that a citizen in a country that is self-governing needs, above all other things, intelligence based upon an adequate education in order to qualify him to be the kind of a citizen that we can depend upon to understand our institutions and be willing to fight for them.

The trouble with our educational system is that we have allowed it to become run down at the heel. We have money to spend for other things, and we spend it, in large measure, at the expense of our children. Of course, no child can go from an underprivileged home where he does not have enough to eat or wear or enough heat to keep him warm and expect him to compete on an equal basis with children from homes where such conditions do not prevail. At the very least, we ought to give underprivileged children the chance to acquire an education, because that is the surest way of eventually improving the economic and social conditions of our down-at-the-heel residential areas, both urban and rural. We are willing to tax ourselves for roads. We are willing to buy automobiles even when we cannot afford them and the gasoline at the continuously rising prices with which to operate them. Why read if one can go to a movie? Why pick up a book or a serious magazine when it takes time from comic strips? We have money to spend lavishly on war which is the greatest waste of money conceivable. We even have money to pour into the "operation rat hole" operated by Chiang Kai-shek, whether hiding out on Formosa or not. We are finding money to hand out to the Fascist dictator of Spain, Franco. His impoverished and half-starved country does not have sufficient credit to borrow from private sources, the money that he wants to squander on his spoon-fed army, but there in the background is the United States Treasury, out of which, not only he, but his fellow dictator—Salazar of Portugal—have received, and still expect to receive, millions upon millions of dollars, not for education, but to maintain themselves in power and to keep satisfied greedy and corrupt retainers who make it possible for the dictators to use their ill-begotten power to oppress the people and deny them any semblance to liberty.

There is wealth enough in this country to educate every child up to the limit of his capacity to acquire and use that education. Beyond that point, I would not go, even if I had all the money in the world. But we have been as careless with our wealth as we have about the education and welfare of our underprivileged children and even of those children who come from middle-class homes and who have to depend, for their primary education at least, upon schools built and maintained by the taxpayers. Recently, the Supreme Court told us on six separate occasions that the offshore oil lands, especially those off of the coast of California, Texas, and Louisiana, belong to all of the people. Until the decision in the case of the United States of America against California which was orginally instituted by your outstanding national chairman, Francis Biddle, when he was Attorney General, we suddenly found ourselves in possession of mineral wealth in the form of petroleum, the value of which can hardly be estimated. Dr. E. L. De Golyer, of Dallas, Tex., probably the most outstanding petroleum geologist of the United States or even

of the world, wrote an article for Life, a little over a year ago, in which he estimated that there might be ten and a half billion barrels of oil along the Texas and Louisiana coasts alone. This figure did not include California, Mississippi, Florida, or any other coast-line State along which oil has been or may be discovered. Other estimates are lower than that of Dr. De Golyer, but, on the contrary, there is one that holds out the hope that there may be perhaps one thousand billion barrels under the 10,000,000 square miles of ocean bottom that constitutes the various Continental Shelves of the world.

It is interesting to know that the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior, which, generally speaking, is conservative in its estimates, thinks that there may be 13,000,000,000 barrels on the Continental Shelf adjoining Texas and Louisiana, with an additional 2,000,000,000 barrels lying seaward of the coast of California. This would make 15,000,000,000 barrels within the projected boundaries of the United States, rather than the De Golyer estimate of 10,500,000,000 barrels. Let us regard the Geological Survey estimate of 15,000,000,000 barrels along the Texas, Louisiana, and California coasts and ignore all other estimates or possibilities. After all speculation on the basis of 1,000,000,000,000 barrels, or even of one-tenth of that number, might be so fantastic as to be confusing, to the average mind.

The average price of crude oil today is $2.56 a barrel. On the basis of this price, the 15,000,000,000 barrels of the Geological Survey would reach the enormous sum of $38,400,000,000. This is better than a tidy sum, and it might grow beyond imagination if a greater quantity of oil should ultimately be discovered or if the price, as the result of increased demand, should go even higher. Those of you who have to buy food and clothing and shelter should be grateful for the bargain prices that you pay due to the prompt action of the Government in cutting them back; or have Washington officials only promised to cut them back sometime, somehow? In any event, the cost of petroleum and its products is continuing to rise along with an increasing demand that has become so large that it cannot now be satisfied by the crude oil produced domestically. As I predicted in a magazine article some years ago, considerably before the event, we are now, on balance, an importing nation as to petroleum, and therefore no longer an exporting nation.

If this wealth belongs to the United States, why should not all of the States share it in proportion to population and need? New Mexico has an illiteracy rate, according to the Army standards, of 27.3 percent, yet we find the junior Senator from that State joining forces with Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, which has a more fortunate illiteracy rate, to enrich the oil companies, as well as the Coastal States, and give as little as possible to the United States, including the State of New Mexico.

South Carolina, with a 34.7 percent illiteracy rate, to say nothing of Mississippi, which is 30.2 percent illiterate, certainly need more money for their schools. We cannot develop evenly as a nation, or even regard each other with that degree of affection and respect that makes for a homogeneous citizenship, if such a large proportion in some States are in the classification of "poor relation" as compared with others in the more fortunate States of Oregon, Idaho, Maine, and Minnesota.

Or, if we don't want to spend any part of this money on education, why not hold it in reserve for the use of our Armed Forces? Compare our fortunate situation, with respect to oil, with that of Russia. Some of us look under the bed every night before turning in in the full expectation of finding at least one Russian Communist armed to the beard. We spend much valuable time, that could be put to better use, wondering, not whether Stalin is going to strike, but when. In doing so, we overlook entirely the fact that a modern war cannot be waged without oil and there is not sufficient oil within the vast domains of the Russian empire to justify the risk of going to war when the United States would be the principal opponent. What defeated Hitler and Mussolini, particularly, and to a lesser degree, Japan, in the last war, was their lack of oil as compared with our comparative plentitude. So there is much to be said for setting up an Armed Forces reserve out of these oil-rich lands of which we find ourselves the fortunate possessors.

Or, there is the matter of the national debt. The gross public debt today stands at $255,900,000,000. Rather, this was the figure as of February 12, 1951. My suspicion is that, without even having taken a good long breath, the public debt is going to begin to grow again. Astronomical figures could beget astronomical figures. How about applying some of the wealth that will accrue to us from our oil to reducing the public debt? Certainly, those American citizens who were persuaded by their patriotic enthusiasm to buy E bonds would like to see something done to restore the dollar at least to the value approximating what it was when they bought these bonds.

Here are two other alternatives that can be proposed for giving ourselves the benefits that we are entitled to have from our ownership of petroleum. However, I come back again to the thesis that the best use to which we could put this money would be for education. A democracy needs education, as the human body does air and a good circulation. Without an education, which, after all, must be paid for, we are defrauding our children of their very birthright, their most valuable possible asset. I have suggested in the past, and I propose again, that the Federal Government create a trust out of these offshore oil lands modeled on the Rockefeller Foundation which, by comparison with the Federal investment, would become a dwarf. Here would be a huge sum of money increased as probable new discoveries of oil would be made that would be beyond the budget and would not have to be supported by Federal taxation. If wisely administered by competent officials under carefully drawn legislation, this would supply the people with the education that is particularly essential if our form of government is to endure.

The National Education Association, basing its estimate upon recent birthrate figures, has warned that by 1955, only 4 years away, the number of children waiting for admission to our public schools will be larger by seven millions than it was a year ago. Understandably, it asks, "How will this 30 percent increase—over the enrollment of 24,373,000 in 1948 to an estimated 31,393,000 in 1955—affect the already complicated problems of school finance and teacher supply?". Already there is a drastic shortage of teachers. According to an article some time ago in the New York Times, "Every State in the Union needs more qualified teachers." We can't get teachers, especially qualified teachers, for our children without paying them. We all know that inflation has hit those of our citizens who have to depend upon a fixed income, such as the teacher does upon his salary, even more than people who are in business and can raise prices to keep pace with the advance in costs. We have to have money to build new schools, as well as to maintain and improve old ones. Only money can buy the supplies necessary to educate our children and only money can pay for the lunches that are so essential, especially to undernourished children who have to sustain their bodies if they are to improve their minds.

One would have thought that the discovery of this vast new wealth would have inspired some degree of statesmanship in the Congress. One might have expected an enlightened and patriotic competition among statesmen to see what could be done with this unexpected and greatly appreciated wealth to advance the welfare of the people. Fortunately, there are some Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who are not willing to use this money for the further enrichment of those who already have more than is good for them, either as citizens or as Members of Congress. Instead of seriously considering how best to use this unexpected wealth to promote the public welfare, many Members of Congress act as if it were not income to be used for the benefit of the people but swag to be divided among freebooters.

One would expect a man like Senator MCCARRAN to deny benefits to the people of Nevada who have mistakenly elected him to the Senate time after time, but it is a surprising role in which Senator O'MAHONEY has cast himself. The Kerr gas bill of the last session of Congress was bad enough. Here was an unholy effort by greedy and selfish rich men, their lawyers and lobbyists, and others wholly subservient to the oil and gas interest to increase the price of natural gas. But even higher prices for natural gas would not have been nearly so bad for the Nation as that money that should accrue to the Federal Treasury for the equitable benefit of all of our citizens should be diverted to States that have already profited inequitably out of public property to the detriment of people in less fortunately situated States and to grasping, selfish, and not always too scrupulous oil interests with which to increase their own emoluments and give larger dividends to their stockholders.

I challenge anyone to show at any point along the long corridor of history such improvidence, waste, and outright thievery as can be read in the bold-face type in which the chronicle of the ruthless development and use of American oil has been written. American oil companies, generally speaking, have no feeling of deference for their Government and show no consideration to the American people. It is a case of grabbing while the grabbing is good. When it comes to foreign countries these interests do act with some degree of consideration, but that is because they have to. Four American companies, to cite only one example, Standard of California, Standard of New Jersey, Socony Vacuum, and Texas, operating as the Arabian-American Oil Co., pay into the Treasury of King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia 50 percent of the net profits after making allowance for customs duties and taxes. Compare this return with the paltry royalties exacted in this company by the States or Nation from oil companies operating under concessions. To be sure, King Ibn-Saud is only an ill-educated absolute monarch in a desert land where his downtrodden subjects are little better than serfs. But he knows how to bring the powerful and arrogant American oil companies to heel while our policy is to try to smother them with favors and add to their fat, perhaps in the hope that they may die of their own obesity. We simply do not have the heart to refuse them extra helpings of dessert while throwing a thin dry crust to the underprivileged people of America, some of whom have the absurd idea that, to some degree at least, our natural resources, and especially petroleum, should be so managed that our institutions may receive a greater benefit from them than they have been vouchsafed in the past. If Saudi Arabia had such an intelligent government as the United States, the oil companies that I have mentioned would receive more lenient treatment. They would be allowed by King Ibn-Saud to live in the manner to which they are accustomed in the United States. They would be required to be satisfied to pay more meager royalties. Least of all, would they be expected to pay such meager royalties. Least of all, would they be expected to share their profits in any percentage, let alone on a practically 50-percent basis. On the contrary, they would exact of the King a generous allowance for depletion because, after all, he cannot guarantee for all time to come to renew his oil resources so that the lessee companies may continue to accrue more and more profits.

There may be instances when Members of Congress, who have investments in oil or who represent oil interests, either as lawyers or in some other capacity, who have been able to consider objectively, and from the point of view of the public interest, bills introduced in Congress for the benefit of the oil industry. However, at the moment, I cannot call the name of any such Member. The oil companies are the most favored among American industries. When they operate on public lands, they pay an average royalty per barrel of about 12½ percent. Of this, 37½ percent goes to the State in which the oil is produced, 62½ percent into the reclamation fund, while a bare 10 percent dribbles into the Federal Treasury. On some State-owned lands, such as in California, they pay higher royalties, but in no instance do they pay as much as they do to King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia. While taking the riches out of the earth that were put there by the Creator for the benefit of all, the oil interests demand that the United States Treasury make them a depletion allowance in their income-tax returns of a mere 27½ percent. President Truman has pointed out the iniquity of such a tax and it is indeed iniquitous. It amounts to a subsidy paid out of the United States Treasury to the oil interests that we already are allowing to exploit, for private profit, this great natural wealth. It is a charge collected from the Government to pay the expenses of the companies in exploring for more petroleum to exploit for their own private profit. It would require a Gilbert and Sullivan to do justice to a cynical situation that has in it more sadness than humor.

What is the answer to the question, "Why do the oil companies have such potent influence in Congress?" That is indeed an easy one. The answer is campaign contributions; newspaper and magazine display advertising running into the millions of dollars every year; high retainers paid to influential lawyers; and funds supplied heedlessly for expensive and far-flung lobbies. In connection with the stupendous sums paid for advertising by the oil companies, it should be borne in mind (1) that little, if any, advertising is required to stimulate a market of eager buyers; (2) that probably we are on the verge of a scarcity of gasoline which may require rationing and which already has required a reduction in quality; (3) that the companies charge their advertising as expenses of doing business so that in reality they are paid, if not in whole, at least in large part, by the United States Treasury. We taxpayers are making allowances to the oil interests out of their income taxes which they use to build up public favor with the press in return for which, as a whole, the newspapers of the United States today are so little critical of the oil interests that they will not even print the news if it is regarded as being even slightly adverse. They go further and lower soundproof curtains around any man who insists that further favors be denied this already greatly pampered private interest.

One is tempted to paraphrase the great utterance of Abraham Lincoln's, "Ours is a Government of petroleum, by petroleum, for petroleum."

Grazing Problems of Blackfeet Indians of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, during the past few months a situation has arisen on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in Montana which has been a source of great concern to me. The members of the Blackfeet Tribe had protested action by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in issuing grazing permits for the use of some Indian land over the objections of the Blackfeet Tribal Council. This council had adopted several resolutions—all by unanimous votes—withholding consent to such sales of grazing permits. The Indians contended that the action of the Bureau was in defiance of the Federal laws requiring the "consent of the tribe" before such transactions could be effected.

Adding to the friction between the Blackfeet Tribe and the Indian Bureau were several other points of contention, one of which was a proposed increase by the Indian Bureau in the minimum grazing fees for allotted Indian lands, which would have been very injurious to the Indians who engaged in the raising of livestock on a limited scale. This proposed increase, while it might not have been disadvantageous to large-scale livestock men, could easily have made it impossible for many Indians to bid on grazing permits because of the prohibitive fees.

On these issues, an appeal was recently submitted to the Secretary of the Interior for a determination on all questions. I am happy to say that a final decision favorable to the Indians has just been made, and it is indeed gratifying to me to know that the Indian Bureau will no longer lease Blackfeet tribal lands without tribal consent, and that hereafter Blackfeet Indian range users will be exempt from all restrictions not applied to non-Indians.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an unusually well-informed comment on the Blackfeet problem which appeared recently in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPICS OF THE TIMES

BLACKFEET ON THE WARPATH

It has been many a year since the Blackfeet Indians of Montana have been in the news. In the newspapers of a hundred years ago and less they were in them all too frequently, as all who ran up against them agreed. What brings them back into the news today is no exploring party wiped out, no wagon train waylaid, no Army fort attacked, but a simple and chronic quarrel between Indians and whites, over the use of Indian lands for grazing. That's the very place where many a good western movie has begun. The Indian Bureau, so the Blackfeet tribal council says, is violating the law by issuing grazing permits for the use of Indian land without tribal consent. The chairman of the council further adds that the Indian Bureau "is doing its best to stir up an old-fashioned cowboy and Indian war."

BLACKFEET FOR BUFFALO

A century ago the Blackfeet were one of the leading plains tribes of Indians. They and their fathers before them camped and hunted from the north Saskatchewan to the headwaters of the Missouri, over thousands of miles of land, pitching their circular tents wherever the buffalo might be, as uprooted as the wind of the prairies. They were a warlike people and famous for their horsemanship. By their own folklore they were an ancient people; the sun had been their mentor. It was the sun who told one ancestor how he might best catch buffalo, by rubbing his feet with a black medicine. From that prescription came the tribal name.

THE ROAD WEST

The Blackfeet could defend their range, far up into Canada and as far south as the Great Salt Lake, against invasion by other tribes, and they tried to defend it against the invasion of the white men. They were one of the hazards to any exploration of the Northwest. Time and again the explorers' chronicles of a century ago include the line, "* * * then we were attacked by the Blackfeet." They might hold their range against the Crow and the Assiniboine, but they lost out against the white man. In 1855 they were pushed onto a reservation that ran from the Continental Divide to the Dakotas. Once cornered there, the white man used two lethal weapons against them—the whisky bottle and control over food supplies as the number of buffalo decreased. During the winter of 1883, when Government rations to the Blackfeet were reduced, more than 600 died.

TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-THREE SQUARE MILES

Today the few thousand remaining Blackfeet live on their reservation in the northwest corner of the State, by the little town of Browning. The whole tribe owns 2,343 square miles of land, much of it of little value; the average family has about 400 acres. The Blackfeet garden a bit and raise a few cattle. Many of them have gone to Indian schools and speak much better English than the passing tourist who believes that the one universal phrase among all Indians is "Heap big chief, ugh." Over the years their huge reservation has been whittled away from them—often, to be sure, at a price. They were eventually paid $450,000 for land taken from them by Executive orders of Presidents Grant and Hayes. They got another $1,500,000 for the eastern part of Glacier National Park, which was cut out of their reservation. Some of that money went for irrigation, the rest for avocation. Today they receive some income as royalty payments from nearby oil wells.

A NEW WEAPON

Times change. Faced with what they considered encroachment on their lands a century ago, they would have come riding in silently on the usurpers by night. The rosy dawn would have shown not one live Indian for miles around, nor one live usurper. Today it is different. The chairman of the Blackfeet Tribal Council tells reporters of the wrongs he feels being done to his people. "The Indian Bureau," he says, "is footing some cattlemen and sheepmen by telling them that the Blackfeet Council has consented to grazing permits, when, in fact, the council has adopted several resolutions, all by unanimous vote, withholding consent."

Resolutions? Unanimous vote? Withholding consent? Instead of answering with arrow, tomahawk, or Winchester stolen from an Army fort on the upper Big Horn, the Blackfeet today do battle armed with Robert's Rules of Order.

The Visit of the President of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by one of our great journalists, Anne O'Hare McCormick, printed in the New York Times of April 4. There are many who feel that Mrs. McCormick's columns show more insight into the problems of our foreign policy than those of any other journalist. This column appeals to me not merely because I was so deeply impressed and emotionally moved by President Auriol's speech to the joint session of Congress, but also because my father spent most of his life as a professor of romance languages and a teacher of French, and Mrs. McCormick reminds me of my boyhood when my father and mother gave me undying respect for the French people and the great and unrivalled traditions of French culture.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABROAD—THE STARS AND STRIPES AND THE TRICOLOR

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

This week New York rolled out the red carpet and waved the flags for the visit of the President of the French Republic. It was not a perfunctory welcome. New Yorkers like to see the Tricolor and the Stars and Stripes flying side by side in the windy canyons of our town. The red, white and blues make a different pattern, but they have a special kinship, evoking memories of the time when the oldest existing great republics were young together, and stirred by the same revolutionary dream.

New York liked the glimpses it had of the smiling face of the President and the tone of the speeches he made on so many occasions. They were variations of the same theme, but a theme developed with deep sincerity, with a delightfully Gallic blend of wit and seriousness, and with such feeling that, though he spoke in French, listeners who did not know the language understood what he meant.

Nor was M. Auriol a perfunctory visitor. Overworked as he was in days crowded with receptions, dinners, functions of all kinds, he appeared to enjoy the whirl he was given. He was as enthusiastic and exclamatory about New York, "the audacious, the organizer, the generous, the ever-changing," as if he had not come from the city that all Frenchmen, and most other people, regard as the matchless mistress of all cities.

INSTABILITY VERSUS CHANGE

He seemed to like being here, in short. So did Mme. Auriol, and the response to this show of pleasure in our company demonstrated a rather touching fact about the United States. It shows that we feel the need to be assured that we have friends as much as other people—perhaps more, for it is doubtful if any great power before us cared so much for the opinion of others. We are so rich and self-sufficient that it is hard for allies to understand that we yearn to be loved, too. It is true, nevertheless. In bringing the two countries closer together M. Auriol gave as much as he received.

Certainly he labored hard, and successfully, to make France better understood. Before he left Paris he spent weary days and nights patching up a political crisis, and he goes back to face another. The present Government was formed to prepare for elections that cannot be postponed much longer, but for this reason it is peculiarly vulnerable to the jockeying for position of the various parties as well as to the pressure of the mounting inflation that shakes every other government. Yet M. Auriol has been at pains to point out that the constant shifts of administration that mark the course of the Fourth Republic—and the Third, for that matter—are not as significant as its continuity of policy. In his address at the mayor's dinner at the Waldorf he quoted a French writer to the effect that "under the appearances of instability there are no changes in our country, whereas in certain other countries under the appearance of stability there are changes."

It is true that under a succession of weak and precarious governments France has managed to find and maintain a middle-of-the-road course since the war. The Communists have been kept out of power and the balance between right and left has somehow been preserved. Only two Ministers, Georges Bidault and Robert Schuman, both of the same party, have directed foreign policy, with the result that it has followed a firmer and more consistent line than our own. In his attitude toward Germany, M. Schuman has not been diverted by the divagations of the United States and Britain. He has stuck stoutly to the thesis that the Schuman plan for pooling coal and steel—which means putting under joint direction the war potential of France and Germany—is the precondition to any discussion of armament. The French can be accused of obstinacy or obstructionism in international affairs but not of changing their policy with changes of government.

CONTRASTING SYSTEMS

It is true also that Britain has staged a revolution since the war under the appearance of stability. Probably no other country in history has carried out so drastic an economic and social upheaval without a sign of disorder. For 6 years the Labor Government has been the steadiest in Europe; and while it cannot function much longer on a hairline margin, there will be no violent upset if it falls. But the contrast between the political habits and behavior of France and Britain does not alter the fact that the rotating teams at the top have not interrupted the remarkable progress of French recovery or altered the direction of policy. By some dangerous legerdemain (which they enjoy) the French manage to govern without government.

M. Auriol is the head of the state. Yet in spite of the President's clear and cogent explanations of a system in which he is the one sign of continuity, it is not political France that he suggests as he moves among us. Rather he is the typical "bonhomme" of a nation which has always been stronger than its government. He is the citizen whose language we understand without translation because he speaks the "lingua franca" of free men. When he says that this France can never be neutral in a battle for freedom we believe him because he expresses something that the excesses and corruptions of democracy cannot smother, something that echoes in our own minds and hearts. This is the bedrock of the enduring understanding between America and France; we are children of the same half-forgotten revolution, and M. Auriol has done much to reestablish the kinship.

What of Congress in Atomic War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of the atomic age is to anticipate the destruction of key Government officials through an atomic attack and to devise a means by which the Government can continue to operate effectively with as many constitutional safeguards as is possible. A thoughtful and provocative study on this subject has been made by Clinton Rossiter, of Cornell University, which I commend to the consideration of those who are concerned with this matter. Mr. Rossiter's article is as follows:

WHAT OF CONGRESS IN ATOMIC WAR?

(By Clinton Rossiter, Cornell University)

The people of the United States are bracing themselves reluctantly for the shock of atomic war. Within the limiting framework of American political and economic freedom, preparations are being made institutionally and psychologically for a catastrophe beyond imagination. Although the pace of preparation goes on more haltingly than this country's wisest heads would like, the Korean incident has speeded up noticeably the tempo of active (military) and passive (civil) defense.

I

It does not take too extravagant an imagination to outline the probable shape of the National Government in the event of atomic war—or, more specifically, in the event of an atomic attack upon the American continent at least as devastating as 15 or 20 Hiroshimas though not so devastating as to leave no cities to salvage or people to save. A look at our present institutions of government and a review of past national emergencies (especially the first weeks of the Civil War) should result in these hard but inevitable predictions:

1. The focus of government, to which all executive and military officials will look for authority, will be the constitutional power of the President as Commander in Chief. The first President, or acting President, to face atomic war will be a Lincoln 10 times over.

2. The top governing agencies—President, department heads, Chiefs of Staff, area commanders—will operate under a Nation-wide declaration of martial law.

3. The governors of the 48 States and their executive-military subordinates—National Guard commanders, mayors, county executives, chiefs of police—will likewise govern strongly, in cooperation with Federal officials.

4. If in the next few years permanent, effective organizations of civil defense are developed at the several levels of government, these too will join in the great emergency effort.

One way or another, government will be almost completely an executive-military affair, with the accent on law and order rather than on liberty and justice. The absolute weapon will have brought absolute government. These are dismal predictions that will stick in the throat of any free citizen of this Republic, but the facts of atomic war must be faced and must be called by their right names.

II

So much for the executive branch and its key office, the Presidency. But what of our other great political institution, the Congress of the United States? Where does the National Legislature fit into this pattern of strong and arbitrary government? Before answering this question properly, one even more challenging problem must be taken into consideration: Is there a place for Congress in all-out emergency government? Indeed, is it at all desirable to have a Congress in atomic war?

The answer should be an unhesitating yes—unless Americans are to despair of the vitality of constitutional government. The uses of a legislature in periods of extreme national emergency are almost inestimable, as the British House of Commons proved in 1940–41, and as we must believe the United States Congress would prove with similar force in a similar state of affairs.

If it is the President's special duty to make emergency government effective and powerful, it is the duty of the Congress to make such government responsible and constitutional. The great functions of Congress in time of peace—legislation, appropriation, criticism, control, investigation, education—are modified, but not rendered inoperative, in time of war, even atomic war. Most important, Congress is the only institution with the residual authority to break up the emergency concentration of powers in the executive branch.

The leading arguments of those who would dispense with Congress altogether in severe crises—that unity of purpose and performance must be achieved at all costs, and that Congress would be the fly in the ointment of harmony—were exploded quite convincingly in the first weeks of the Korean emergency. In time of unmistakable national danger Congress stands as ready as the President to forget politics, personalities, and the antipathies inherent in the American system of independent executive and legislative branches.

It is a difficult role that the legislature has to play in modern crisis government, but it is one that the stage managers of democracy will dispense with at their peril. The fact that the mark of constitutional democracy at peace is a robust legislative assembly is prima facie evidence that it ought to be maintained as far as practical in time of war. Congress should not carelessly be discarded as unfit for emergency service. There may be conditions of transient crisis when it can do no more than watch and wait, but watching and waiting has saved more than one free people from destruction. And certainly in any protracted emergency the dictates of constitutional government would seem to make imperative the continuous session of the Nation's representatives.

III

A major dilemma arises if the above-mentioned premises are accepted. On one hand, it is agreed that Congress has important, even indispensable, functions in the Government which will meet atomic attack. On the other hand, the probability must be faced that Congress will be prevented physically—that is, by atomic destruction—from sitting at Washington. It is an extremely difficult affair for a deliberative, multimembered group with an established place of doing business to move to another location under emergency conditions and continue to function effectively, or even legitimately. Perhaps more important—if one can imagine Congress meeting in Mammoth Cave, Sun Valley, or Senator BYRD's apple orchard—it is altogether possible that neither House could muster a quorum, thanks to several well-placed hits and the difficulties (under State legislation) of filling vacancies in Congress, especially in the House of Representatives. The United States might well be left for a considerable length of time without a legislature meeting the requirements of the Constitution.

The solution of this dilemma is as simple as it is unusual: the statutory creation of a joint interim committee of 15 or 20 leading Members of both Houses and parties. In time of acute national emergency this committee would come into existence automatically whenever Congress could not sit, and would go out of existence just as automatically when the two Houses were able to convene. This interim committee would be given a standing mandate to act for the whole Congress in the former situation and to report to the whole Congress in the latter. Although such a committee could not be constitutionally empowered to legislate in place of Congress, it could be granted both contingent authority to declare emergency laws in or out of effect and full powers of investigation and criticism.

This supercommittee would do away with the manifest inexpediency and confusion of 10 or 12 standing committees and 30 or 40 of their subcommittees looking for trouble all over the stricken Nation. With its relations to the President and the Department of Defense carefully blocked out, as an entire body and through subcommittees of its own it could attach itself to the agencies prosecuting the emergency government. Like Walter Gagehot's famous queen, the committee would assert "the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn." Most important, it could recommend officially to the President the termination of martial law or of any other extraordinary emergency activity.

IV

Fifteen or 20 members of this committee would seem to be the largest number that could move around in a body and meet in one small room (or cave), the smallest number that would represent all important groups and interests in the American community and thus lend the Government the coalition character so essential in democratic emergency government. The personnel would have to be selected with excessive care. At least half the members would probably be ex-officio appointments—the Vice President (who could serve as chairman), the Speaker of the House, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the majority and minority floor leaders, and perhaps the ranking Members of the important standing committees. The remaining places would best be filled by a group of young, strong, able men of varying political and sectional backgrounds. Were such a committee of 20 being set up now, it might include BARKLEY, MCKELLAR, LUCAS, MCMAHON, TYDINGS, TAFT, VANDENBERG, LODGE, WILEY, RAYBURN, MCCORMACK, VINSON, MONRONEY, KENNEDY, MARTIN, Case of New Jersey, HALLECK, and three other outstanding younger Members of the House. Or perhaps some of the older men—such as Senators MCKELLAR and VANDENBERG—would have to give way to juniors with less prestige but more stamina. A line of succession 8 or 10 deep could be staked out for each place on the committee.

Obviously, this committee would be moving on untrodden ground. There is nothing in American, and less in European or Latin-American, experience to assure that an interim committee with virtually unlimited authority would operate successfully in so delicate a situation. The mere proposal of such a departure from our ancient ways presents perplexing constitutional, political, and moral difficulties. Yet, in the event of a novel type of national emergency the American political genius and the American constitutional system should both be sufficiently flexible to permit the erection of an equally novel legislative institution.

V

This proposal has been made in the most general terms, for it is a scheme that would have to be worked out with great deliberation and good will by the leaders of Congress and the President. The suggested interim committee, or something much like it, would be the one alternative to no Congress at all, and Americans would commit a serious mistake not to consider every feasible substitute before dispensing altogether with congressional authority in atomic war. With the bonds of civilized society loosened and unraveled, the President and his chief commanders may be forced to wield the most naked sort of power to hold the country together. In such an event, a tough-minded, able, independent committee not beholden to the President for continued existence would help mightily to keep his feet in the paths of democracy. Such an autonomous council would provide both the restraint and the support the President would find helpful in making his emergency regime effective and responsible.

Since it is to the particular interest of Congress to make its own authority felt in the event of atomic attack, it is plainly up to Congress to take the first step in this direction. The possibility of a joint interim emergency committee should be thoroughly explored in the Eighty-second Congress.

Proposed Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding the proposed deferment of college students, recently published in the Port Washington Herald, of Port Washington, Wis.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: AN ANSWER

"President Truman in a sweeping order Saturday authorized draft deferments for hundreds of thousands of college boys whose grades are good or who pass a special aptitude test."

Why?

To provide future leaders of this Nation? There is no doubt but what this country could stand some trained men at the helm. And neither is there any doubt but what college training is necessary for that task.

But is it fair to defer men who have an opportunity to attend college while those less privileged are to be drafted?

The argument is offered that the test is based on aptitude. If that is true, why can't these youths, who purportedly are the future leaders of the Nation, serve as all other men must do? And if these youths have this alleged superior ability, couldn't they resume their studies after their term of

service as was done after the second blood draining contest?

Or is it possible that life is so much more dear for these elite than for those of the common herd that it must be preserved?

The sweeping order is an ill concealed attempt to save the skins of those who have the financial opportunities to attend a university. It is a scheme whereby a youth, who is not a complete moron, can purchase immunity from service in the Armed Forces. What provision is made for the student, who through working for funds to finance his education, is forced to drop out one semester to build up his backlog. Regardless of his academic standing, he becomes eligible for induction.

If ever a violation of the Constitution was flaunted in the face of the American public, this order is that instance.

If money can protect some Americans, why not hire the Hessians and protect them all?

Why?

This question will be sent to Senators A. WILEY and J. MCCARTHY and Congressman VAN ZELT.

Live Safely, Live Happily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, John G. Decker, son of Mr. and Mrs. Woodrow Decker, of Milo, Maine, the winner of the national speaking contest sponsored by an Omaha insurance company, came to Washington Thursday, April 5, to receive an award as the winner of the contest. He was accompanied by his coach, Mrs. Pauline Kelleher, a Milo high-school teacher of English and Latin, who as a hobby attempts to interest her students in entering all writing and speaking contests. She modestly said that was the first national contest any of her students ever won.

John Decker started this whirlwind contest in February of this year by winning at his own high-school contest with the delivery of the self-written address which I hold in my hand. He then went on to the State of Maine finals in Bangor, Maine, and as the winner of the Maine contest journeyed to New Hampshire, again to defeat the two other entries in the northern New England region. The next stop for the young orator was New York City, to compete with the finalists from the eight other United States regions. The happy ending is that John Decker won the national speaking contest, and as the winner receives a $4,000 scholarship to any college of his choice, and since John is a high-school senior, this scholarship is most opportune. His high school also receives a $1,000 award. The brief Washington visit was terminated Thursday afternoon at 3:30 as Vice President BARKLEY extended his congratulations.

With such talent and such financial assurance of his future, John Decker is a very lucky young man. I extend to him my congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. Decker's oration makes very good reading, and I believe the Members of this body would enjoy it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVE SAFELY, LIVE HAPPILY

(By John G. Decker)

In my fancy, I have created the pleasant, average American town of Smithville, United States of America. It could be in California or Tennessee, or it could be in Maine. Children romp in the pleasant streets. Their merry shouts fill the crisp, autumn air. There is a flash of a careening car, a shriek of brakes and the car comes to a jerking stop—but too late. As the quickly gathered crowd raises the broken body of a child there arises a solemn and often heard murmur: "He was speeding."

It is a bright summer's day. On the shores of Lake Windermere, England's knight of speed, Sir Henry Seagrave, steps into his powerful twin-engined speed craft. He is strapped into the seat and the engines start. Out across the placid waters shoots the powerful craft. He deftly makes the circuit once, twice, then suddenly, as he speeds by the third time, the powerful motors literally rip the boat apart. Tragedy reigns, and Mercury, the God of Speed, has taken another life. Comes the echo: "He was speeding."

The night is dark, the moon has flitted behind a cloud, the engineer of a great streamlined train speeding across the continent wants to get home to his wife and children. He opens the throttle just a little wider. The great iron monster shudders as it rounds the last turns on the road home, and with a violent snap flicks off the tracks.

Speed again has taken its toll. It has once again deprived many of their desire to live safely, to live happily.

These incidents are typical of the cost we pay for speed and more speed. Each year these incidents and many like them are multiplied many thousands of times, in our homes, on our highways, and in our factories.

Our mania for speed is characteristic of our everyday life. We begin our day in our factory or school where the highest virtue is speed. After a half day spent in this atmosphere we rush across the streets barely missing onrushing cars with their drivers also bent on speed. We eat a quick lunch and repeat the same performance for the afternoon. At night we probably dance to a speedy, fast jazz band, finally going to bed to take a quick sleep to wake the next morning to start the new day in a world with too much speed. We are living to the tune of hurrying feet and the hum and buzz of speed in general.

Speed is a wonderful thing. It has enabled us to rise to a great Nation, in fact, the greatest of all nations both commercially and economically, but it has also pushed us towards attaining the high accident and death rate that we now have. Our fire trucks and fighter planes need to be swift and speedy, and our doctor's hands need to be fast and sure, but it is the misapplication of this type of speed that is costing us thousands of lives each year. We who have made speed our slave are now letting it backfire and become our master. Speed must not be allowed to take the driver's seats in our cars, our planes, and our lives in order for Americans to live safely, to live happily.

America is looking through eyes that see not: they do not see that child playing in the road; they do not see that car coming at them as they stop from the sidewalk; they do not see that the faster you go does not necessarily mean you will reach your destination quicker. Their mind is possessed with one word—speed. Our cemeteries are full of people who looked through eyes that did not see. Americans must make a choice; whether to be speed demons or to stop, look, and listen once in a while and live a little safer and a lot longer.

A man, sometimes young, sometimes middle-aged or older, takes a drink or two on the way home from the club in the late evening. Not a great deal, but just a little; anyway, just a little drink couldn't hurt anybody. As he nears the suburbs the smooth concrete just seems to roll away under his vision and he presses a little harder on the accelerator. "Joe Smith only got 80 miles an hour out of his car on this stretch, but I know I can beat that without even trying." He is beating Joe Smith's record, too, even though he doesn't see that car coming from the side road with his best friend, Tom Brown, in it. His name was in the headlines the next day—not for breaking Joe Smith's record but for putting his best friend in the hospital for weeks and demolishing his new car. Just a little drink—but it helped no one to live more happily. Speeding and its devastating effects cannot be confined to the highway alone, either. It harbors itself in the home when Dad trips on Junior's toys, at school when we trip on the stairs, and in the workshop when the worker loses a finger trying to be just a little more efficient and, above all, a little speedier. Safety devices help but many are not foolproof.

In the fall of the year, in our State of Maine, thousands of hunters take to the woods in search of deer and other game. But last year and in previous years this army took the lives of more than a score of their buddies. Why? Because some of them were after just one thing and didn't care how they got it. They shot and looked later. They were in too much of a hurry to let others live safely—live happily.

There are many other types of accidents and one of the most disastrous of these is fires. Yet, one of these tragedies takes place every 20 seconds. Ninety percent of these are caused by pure carelessness. Why do people gamble with so many lives and homes at stake? The odds are against them and they know it, but they continue every 20 seconds to break a home, burn a building, and destroy the happiness of many.

These types of accidents are no respecter of persons; they strike in all places and against all colors and creeds, in the home, at the individual and at the masses.

An incident that illustrates this happened not many weeks ago. Over the Yankee network flashed the news bulletin of the crash of a troop train near Wilkes-Barre, Pa. More than a score of American soldiers on their way to fight for a great cause were killed in this tragedy. During the mass funeral the tolling of the great bells of every church, Catholic and Protestant alike, filled the great Wyoming Valley.

Yes, the effects of accidents are no respecter of persons and we encounter them wherever we go—from the man in the office who would always make a fast buck if he could, but would gamble his life away in trying to get across the road a little faster, to the boy in the home who is just too busy to take care of his toys.

America is often called the melting pot of nations because of the many races and creeds of which it is made up. But no race or creed has escaped the ravages of speed and accidents in the United States.

All have suffered, and all will continue to suffer until the people of America come to the realization that man is not invincible, and that he's rapidly losing his dominion over speed and machines.

A week ago yesterday the newspapers carried a striking headline "61 killed in railroad wreck." A jam-packed Pennsylvania commuter train was speeding along and suddenly derailed. The cars telescoped into a mass of sharp, deadly metal wreckage killing 61 passengers instantly. The cause? One passenger who was lucky enough to escape injury said, "I noticed the engineer trying to stop her. He was doing his level best to hold her back. He was trying to stop her." But a little push on the throttle turned this train into a raging monster.

Engines and machines can be rebuilt, and new parts substituted for old, but the human body is not so constructed. A pair of eyes once gone is gone forever. A life once taken can never be restored. Americans of today don't seem to realize this. They're continually letting machines, the slaves, speed, the slave, become the masters, the captains of our lives. America must examine herself and come to the realization that we're headed down the wrong road and we're going too fast. We must stop, look, and listen in order to live safely—to live happily.

No Wonder the Senator Wept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Mirror on Monday, March 19, 1951. This editorial is another discussion of the sad plight of our Government as a result of the present low level of ethics now prevailing.

Mr. T. B. Cosgrove, an attorney and a prominent civic leader in Los Angeles, has directed my attention to this editorial. I believe that every Member of the House will find it worthy of consideration. It follows:

NO WONDER THE SENATOR WEPT

The picture of aging Senator TOBEY of New Hampshire weeping for a return to moral and ethical values in the United States made a dramatic moment in the Kefauver crime investigation hearings.

Well might the Senators weep, and honest Americans with them.

No one can read the headlines from Washington for the past 6 months without a deep feeling that the United States is suffering from moral atrophy and ethical dry rot.

While American kids are dying in Korea, smart operators with White House connections are getting theirs in ways which are shady, if not illegal.

Fast buck boys with an in are placed in fat jobs with companies beholden to the RFC for loans made with tax money, at the behest of Bill Boyle, the national chairman of the Democratic Party. (RFC Director Walter Lee Dunham testified that Boyle and Donald Dawson, a White House employee, had pressured him to find places for their pets in such companies.)

A White House stenographer gets a $9,450 mink coat, charged to the account of a lawyer operating with unusual success before the RFC. Her husband gets an $18,000-a-year job with Lustron, Inc., obligated to RFC for a $37,500,000 loan, and does no work for his $1,500-a-month salary. He had an "in." He worked for Boyle as advance man for several Presidential tours.

A former Congressman testified that a syndicate of Washington smarties engineered a deal to buy surplus tankers. They put up only $100,000 capital, and cut up a $5,000,000 profit melon. They knew the right people.

Gen. Harry Vaughan, the President's pal, pressured Government officials to cut corners in sugar allocations for his political playmates, and was all messed up in the deep freeze "gifts" to top brass.

This week's latest scandal, which passes almost unnoticed, is the disclosure that the Coast Guard is providing a safe draft dodgers' paradise for the young sons and nephews of Washington "insiders."

The Coast Guard is at full strength, but they are enlisting around 40 recruits a week, almost all of the them from Washington, most of them draft eligible who are kinfolks of VIPs. There have been instances where these favored relatives have been driven to the USCG recruiting offices in Government limousines.

A special port brigade has been set up in Washington by the USCG, a happy billet for draft evaders. They only have to report for a drill once a week, but it makes them draft-proof.

This country and our way of life are gravely threatened by the vicious march of communism in the world. That is not the only threat to this country, however. The threat of rot and corruption and special privilege is serious.

By the strict letter of the law, these shady Washington deals may not be penal offenses, but they are moral offenses. Enrichment of insiders by favoritism is not less wrong in 1951 Washington than it was in Rome of 50 B. C. or Marie Antoinette's Paris.

It was heart-rot that caused the collapse of Rome and France, the atrophy of public morals, the greed of smart operators with an "in."

It could happen here.

Senator TOBEY wept openly at disclosures that the whole fabric of Government is shot through with "fixes" and "ins." It may be the tragedy of our time that so few men weep, or even pay much attention, as the tradition of clean Government grows daily more smirched.

The Burden of Taxation in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a front-page editorial entitled "Down the Road to Disaster," published in the Philadelphia Dispatch of April 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN THE ROAD TO DISASTER

Taxation in the United States is now approaching a point where a citizen is practically working for the Government.

With Federal, State, and city taxes growing by leaps and bounds, the people are now asking just when and where this tax octopus is going to stop. Taxes just can't rise forever.

The time is not far away when the Government will take most of the earned dollar from the pocket of the taxpayer. With three forms of Government taking a bite from the dollar, just what will the taxpayer have left?

Already the flow of new capital into private business has been slackened because the Government gets an increasing slice of profits. Incentive of the individual has been crippled.

Responsible officials who continue to find the easiest way out by imposing new taxes should take time out and read the history of the world to see what happens to nations which have bled the taxpayers white.

The Townsend Clubs Are Here To Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, whenever a red-hot issue of the Binghamton Press which directly or indirectly concerns your Congressman comes off the rollers, somebody manages to waylay the issue which comes to my Washington desk. This has happened on a number of occasions, so I realize there is collusion somewhere.

Therefore I did not see the vicious attack upon the Townsend organization of Broome County in last Friday's issue. The Press issues of Thursday, Saturday, and Sunday had reached me, but I was still curious about what happened Friday.

I found out soon enough; and, for their information, all I have to do is obtain a copy from the Library of Congress. I will doubtless continue to see the missing Press issues through this medium as I do not think they will dare hold up the copy that the Library receives.

Friday's Press carried what I thought it would, a scathing affront upon the whole Townsend movement by the mayor of Binghamton.

It is well known that some of the wealthy advertisers of local newspapers have sworn to get the Townsendites because they allow free speech in their meetings. Not being able to control their leaders or members, the bosses are determined the Townsend clubs must go.

They chose the mayor of Binghamton to sound off their initial blast, because he has been presented to the public by the Binghamton Press in a simon-pure role without a flaw or a word ever having been said against him.

I am predicting that he will neither scare the Townsend clubs out of existence in the Triple Cities nor weaken their position as the strongest political group in the southern tier.

In 1940, the present mayor of Binghamton ran against your Congressman and was supported by the press, the old guard, and every other pompous antagonist I ever had in Broome County. The record shows that the greatest plurality ever amassed by any candidate in our section was given to me, not because I was especially outstanding, but because the people had absolutely no use for the type of opposition they lined up against me.

The same gang is now dedicated to breaking up the Townsend organization, once and for all and they will go to gangster lengths to accomplish it. I might add this mob is nonpartisan.

But they can count on my getting into this fight on the side of the Americans in the Townsend movement. They can be sure that I will not stand idly by and let them ruin the painstaking work of so many years put forth by the Townsendites.

If they should succeed, because of their widespread real-estate holdings, to deprive Townsend clubs of places to assemble, thus violating the United States Constitution and further presecuting the Americans of my district, I will personally see to it that fitting places are provided in the Triple Cities for the Townsend clubs to meet.

The mayor may be all-powerful, with the weight of the press behind him, the force of radio, and the might of financial wizards as backers, but he cannot blot out the Townsend clubs from the valley of opportunity.

They are there to stay.

Necessity of an American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the question has been raised more than once, in connection with proposed legislation to aid the United States merchant marine, Why a merchant marine?

An article in the Mooremack News for March 1951, entitled "Korean Epic," and an editorial entitled "Why a Merchant Marine?" give very persuasive answers to the question as to the need of maintaining and supporting a merchant marine whose first loyalty and efforts will be devoted to the interests of the United States in war as well as in peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mooremack News of March 1951]

KOREAN EPIC

In the past few weeks stories have drifted back from Korea, through letters and news dispatches, feature pieces in the newspapers, and official Washington statements, telling of the tremendous role played by American merchant ships in the difficult tasks faced by the United Nations forces in the Pacific war.

Moore-McCormack Lines has been honored by the participation of several of its ships in the operation, including the most fantastic incident of all, involving the vessel *Meredith Victory* which, late in December, evacuated more than 14,000 persons from Hungnam, Korea, to Pusan, a nightmarish voyage that lasted three terrible days.

Both the *Mormacmoon* and the *Hunter Victory* which, along with the *Meredith Victory*, have been under charter by Mooremack to the Military Sea Transportation Service, also have written chapters in this newest record of achievement and have been accorded formal acknowledgment by the Government.

The *Meredith Victory* story, however, tops everything else in sheer drama. Indeed, when the first reports came in, officials of Military Sea Transportation Service and Mooremack expressed disbelief that this ship, built to carry 12 passengers, commanded by Capt. L. P. LaRue, of Philadelphia, had actually carried 14,000. But quick checks supported the first report, and letters from men who were aboard.

Hardly were the fear-driven passengers aboard the ship after a desperate flight across the country, according to Dino S. Savastio, the ship's mate, than calls came to help with the delivery of mothers, five of whom gave birth within the first 24 hours. "There I stood with babies all around and something doing every minute," he wrote his parents in Franklin Square, Long Island, as reported by the Nassau County paper Newsday.

The Philadelphia Bulletin, reporting the *Meredith Victory* story with special relish since her master, Capt. L. P. LaRue, is a native of that city, said that the crew had loaded the 14,000 Koreans by using booms and makeshift elevators and when the ship was loaded, she shoved off. One picture, reproduced on this page, shows a makeshift elevator in operation.

Formal naval commendation for their work came to all of the Mooremack ships and to those of other operators as well. Vice Admiral C. T. Joy, USN, of the Far East command, sent this message to Captain LaRue:

"My most sincere congratulations on a job well done. Your performance throughout the Korean campaign has always been notable. In the successful redeployment of ground forces from northeast Korea your initiative and your enthusiastic and prompt response to all demands indicate that your organization is at its best when the chips are down. The merchant mariners who performed for you did so silently but their accomplishment speaks loudly. I find it comforting to work with such teammates."

Capt. A. F. Junker, USN, Deputy Commander of the MSTS, Western Pacific, transmitting Admiral Joy's message, added this on his own: "The cooperation and assistance of the merchant marine in the above-mentioned operation adds but one more page of glory to merchant-marine history, and I desire to add my own congratulations to those of Admiral Joy."

Charles Regal, editor of the column, Down the Hatch, for the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, wrote:

"Man of the year in this, man of the year in that. How about the ship of the year? As far as Down the Hatch is concerned, 1950's outstanding merchant ship was the steamship *Meredith Victory*, the ship that on December 22 evacuated 14,000 South Korean refugees in one load."

Mr. Regal quoted Capt. Raymond Fosse of the transport *Sergeant Truman Kimbro*, as follows, describing his thought when he saw the *Meredith Victory* approach Pusan:

"When we first saw that Victory ship we couldn't figure out what in the world it had on deck. From a distance it was simply a dark, solid mass. As the ship came nearer we could see it was human beings. They were packed so close you wondered how they could breathe. And there wasn't a sound from them. They just stood there, silently, waiting. Even the babies and children were strangely quiet. Unless you saw it, you couldn't believe it."

Mr. Regal said of the *Meredith Victory's* 14,000: "That surely was the largest number of persons ever taken aboard a freighter, of any size, and it may be the largest load ever taken by any ship. The *Queen Mary* (81,235 gross tons) reportedly averaged ten to twelve thousands troops during the war. (The *Meredith Victory* is listed at 7,607 tons)." Inquiry at the New York offices of the Cunard White Star Line revealed that the largest passenger load ever carried by either of the Queen ships during the war was 15,000. The *Queen Elizabeth* in peacetime can carry 2,200 passengers, the *Queen Mary*, 2,000, as against the *Meredith Victory's* 14,000. The feat of the latter at Korea becomes the more striking on the basis of comparison.

The *Mormacmoon*, too, found drama when she was assigned to the Hungnam operation to pick up 2,800 evacuees. The Koreans, carrying rations of fish and rice, were sent to the ship's hold where many of them climbed into trucks and, despite orders from the ship's officers, proceeded to run truck motors to offset the cold. Fifty Koreans were overcome by the fumes, and their lives were saved only because the ship's officers carried them to the deck and worked on them. This detail of the story, also carried by Newsday, was reported in a letter by James G. Wilkerson, her second mate, of Bellerose, Long Island, to his parents.

The effort of the *Hunter Victory* in this operation may be gaged by the following letter to the president of Moore-McCormack Lines, sent from Pusan by the Reverend Father P. H. Cleary, a chaplain, a member of the Maryknoll order of priests:

"Permit me to convey to you an expression of congratulations and sincere thanks for the splendid conduct of the officers and crew of your ship *Hunter Victory* in its recent evacuation operation of our forces from Hungnam to Pusan.

"The group with which I came out, Tenth Corps, loaded Saturday night, December 16, left Hungnam early Sunday morning, the 17th, arrived Pusan Tuesday the 19th.

"As we neared Pusan, I have never heard of any ship's personnel from all sides such acclamations of praise as came spontaneously from the officers of the Tenth Corps for the officers and crew of the *Hunter Victory*. The way they had gone all out to take care of us and make us as comfortable as possible at the cost of innumerable privations and actual hardships to themselves was the general topic of conversation among the groups of Army men wherever they gathered about the ship. The gratitude of all was sincere and deep. Personally, the officer whom I wish to commend most highly is the chief steward, Mr. John J. McGee. He went all out, performed a difficult job with unfailing courtesy and good humor successfully and to the delight of all aboard.

"I know that several of the Tenth Corps officers intended to write you to express their thanks and appreciation. The press of present circumstances of war and the crowded conditions here at the port may prevent their doing so. As the Catholic chaplain aboard, I wish to perform the very pleasant duty of addressing you in their behalf. Only the conditions I have just referred to have prevented me from doing so more promptly.

"With every assurance of grateful respect for you and your worthy representatives on the *Hunter Victory*."

A. V. Moore, president of the company, replying to Father Cleary, expressed his appreciation and that of the company, advised Father Cleary that he was sending a copy of the letter to Captain Preusch and Chief Steward McGee, and added:

"I know all the officers and crew of the *Hunter Victory* will indeed be most pleased to see that their efforts to serve under extremely difficult conditions were so well received. Yes, indeed, all of us admire the courage of all those engaged in this present crisis in Korea. May the prayers of those at home help to speed a just peace and end this worldly unrest."

Capt. Philip W. Atkinson, of the *Mormacmoon*, is a veteran Mooremack skipper. A native of Fitchburg, Mass., he worked up to chief officer through several of the company's ships, including the *Saquache*, the *Carplaka*, *Argosy*, *Scanmail*, *Scanpenn*, *Scanstates*, *Scanyork*, and others, and got his first command in 1936, the *Cliffwood*.

Captain LaRue won promotions through chief officer and became master of the *Smith Thompson* in 1944, then the *George B. McClellan*, and the *Whittier Victory*. He served 6 months as first officer of the *Uruguay*, commanded the *Deborah Gannett* and the *Mormacwren* before taking command of the *Meredith Victory* in July of 1950.

Capt. Charles H. Preusch, of the *Hunter Victory*, was born in Elmhurst, went to sea after his high-school work, as an assistant purser, then studied at City College, worked as a clerk and mechanic until he entered the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point in 1942. He was graduated in 1944, worked up from cadet through chief mate on several ships and obtained his first command, the *Hunter Victory*, in August of 1950.

[From the Mooremack News of March 1951]

WHY A MERCHANT MARINE?

Every so often the question is raised—Why a merchant marine? The fact that it has been answered a thousand times seems not to matter; again and again the facts must be presented in reply to the arguments that you can build a ship at lower cost in a foreign yard, and man her much more cheaply with non-Americans. So why not build our ships in foreign yards? And why not man them with foreigners and operate them under another flag? Why not, indeed?

Of course, anyone who knows the story of the merchant fleet in the recent war does not ask these questions. The men who served in the war and saw our ships in action as transports of men and matériel, especially those high officers of Army and Navy who have openly and gladly conceded that their branches of our Armed Forces could never have achieved their wartime records without the help of merchant ships, are not likely to ask, either. But unfortunately such folk appear to be in the minority.

Something of a new type of answer may be found on pages 4 and 5 of this issue of the Mooremack News, in the stories of the *Mormacmoon*, the *Meredith Victory*, and the *Hunter Victory*. When reading that story, remember that the United States is not now at war, that we as a Nation are merely participating in Korea as a unit of the United Nations.

But these American merchant ships have served, nevertheless, as part of our Nation's contribution to the great cause that involves the democratic peoples of the world. Because we have merchant ships we were able to send them to help with such tasks as that article describes.

Imagine a ship built to accommodate 12 passengers, and in an emergency moving 14,000 panic-stricken souls from the scene of their peril, the young officers burdened with problems beyond anything they had ever imagined in their days of training. That is the *Meredith Victory's* story. Yet she was only one of more than 300 ships, merchant ships, at work on the Korean assignment.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Koehler, addressing the Propeller Club of the Port of New York, in January, described the Hungnam evacuation, the operation in which the *Meredith Victory* achieved her almost unbelievable feat. He said that "in the face of greatest possible odds, despite the handicaps of terrain and worse weather, and regardless of enemy assaults, the Navy safely loaded aboard ship and evacuated 105,000 fighting men, 100,000 civilians, 17,500 vehicles and 350,000 measurement tons of material."

Quoting Vice Admiral Struble, who was present at the operation, he said that for the first time in history, "an entire army with all its supplies and equipment has been successfully deployed by sea in the face of emergency pressure." Then Mr. Koehler added, as his own words, the following very significant and very gallant expression of the sentiments of the Navy:

"While this is no time for self-adulation, to suppress a surge of pride at this accomplishment would be somewhat less than human. Nor should I fail to point out to you that it would obviously have been a physical impossibility to carry out this staggering task without the ships and crews of the American merchant marine who were a vital component of this operation.

"Not only at Hungnam, but at Pusan, Inchon, and other Korean ports these merchant vessels have played vital roles in every operation since hostilities began. Consequently, our traditional 'Well done' goes equally to the American merchant marine and to the Navy."

If additional figures are needed, here are a few. In a 4-month period following the outbreak of the Korean hostilities nearly 4,000,000 tons of cargo, exclusive of petroleum products, were moved from the continental United States to the Pacific theater in support of the United Nations forces. Of this, more than 80 percent moved in privately owned American flag ships. In addition, 185,000 military passengers were moved to the fighting front.

Any sound student of national defense or national economy will explain quickly enough that the merchant marine stands abreast the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the waging of war, an essential peacetime protection to our foreign trade in the fierce competition that exists for markets throughout the world. They will point out, too, that millions of dollars spent in labor and materials in the construction of a ship and then in operating her, are part of our national income. They would not be if the ship were built abroad and manned by foreign crews.

The distressing feature of all this is that the lesson seems never really to be absorbed. There must be other Hungnams, other *Meredith Victories*. And even then we will find ourselves facing that question: Why a merchant marine?

Overseas Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted on February 8, 1951, at the regular session of American Legion Post No. 519 of Mineral City, Ohio:

Inasmuch as we are in an undeclared war, or police action, in Korea, and our boys have not been told why they are fighting, and our casualties are mounting higher, and none of our leaders can give us any information as to what we expect to gain; we hereby request that our troops be withdrawn from Korea and returned home, and furthermore we urge that no more troops be sent overseas to fight the battle of the world unless it is on a voluntary basis. Several States have already passed the same resolution and the issue is being pressed by some of the biggest men in the Nation.

We do not believe that it is just or right that a boy born in America must face years of military service for the sake of a foreign entanglement and we further resolve that the power to wage an undeclared war or police action rest solely in the hands of Congress, who are the sole representatives of the people, that we may not be involved in any more Koreas.

We believe these measures are in the best interest of our beloved country, that it may serve the purpose of saving our economy, our resources, and our youth.

R. M. GAY, *Commander*.
OTIS A. PENLEY, *Adjutant*.

A Second Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of April 6, 1951:

A SECOND FRONT

A second front on the Chinese mainland has been proposed by General MacArthur in a letter to Congressman MARTIN of Massachusetts, minority leader in the House.

The commander in Asia believes the time has come when the United States and the United Nations must take a realistic view of the position of the Chinese Nationalist forces under Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, and without too much delay agree that this Chinese force, poised for action when given the word, must enter the campaign in Asia.

General MacArthur wants a second front on the Chinese mainland with Chiang's armies, reinforced by American equipment and military strategists, leading the campaign against the Chinese Communists. That, of course, would immediately relieve pressure in Korea; it would mean that the Chinese Reds would be caught in a great pincer movement. It is doubtful that they could escape, unless given help from the Soviets.

Up to this point, the arguments against using Chinese Nationalists have been based primarily on the opinion that by giving the green light to Chiang, the Russian Reds would immediately become active belligerents and world war III would be started.

Russia, however, is not so devoted to the Chinese that it is going to enter a "do or die" campaign in China. A second front, added to the present retreat of the Chinese Reds in Korea, would be enough to convince the war lords in Moscow that this is no time to jump into a losing cause.

General MacArthur has no doubt weighed all the possibilities of his proposal to use the Chinese Nationalists before sending them on to Washington. He is certainly not anxious to advocate any arrangement which will automatically touch off the big guns of world war III.

Meanwhile, however, we again repeat that this would be an excellent time for General MacArthur to come back to the United States to have a few direct talks with both the President and Congress. Letter-writing

serves a purpose, but direct contact would be much more beneficial in unpredictable situations such as we are now in. Moreover, we believe that if the able commander in Korea should come to Washington for but a flying visit and should place all of his ideas on the congressional table—making certain allowances for military security—he would be given complete sanction to move ahead in his own capable way. He might not have any difficulty in convincing this Government of the advantages of a second front with the Chinese Nationalist forces in the front ranks.

Illegal Mexican Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of five articles by Gladwin Hill, dealing with the illegal Mexican immigration into Southwest United States, which appeared in the New York Times March 25 to 29. Notwithstanding the estimated cost of printing these articles is $430.50, it is most timely that the economic and sociological problems analyzed in them be now brought to the attention of Senators and Representatives. The Nation's manpower needs are becoming acute. The agreement with Mexico is up for renewal. Legislation is about to be reported out in the House and Senate. The report of the President's Commission on Migrant Farm Labor has just emphasized again the grave consequences of our neglect of this situation. And the so-called wet-back traffic affords alarming opportunities for the entry of Communist spies and saboteurs.

The New York Times has again performed a significant public service in arranging for this survey and printing its findings on this problem.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 25, 1951]

MILLION A YEAR FLEE MEXICO ONLY TO FIND PEONAGE HERE—ILLEGAL MIGRATION ACROSS 1,600-MILE BORDER BY SEASONAL SLAVE LABOR DEPRESSES LATIN AND UNITED STATES LEVELS ALIKE

(By Gladwin Hill)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., March 24.—A visitor to the Southwest today has to make a double mental adjustment to comprehend the conditions he finds.

First, he has to think back 20 years to prohibition days, when wholesale violation of the laws of the United States was being ignored, tacitly sanctioned or overtly encouraged by a large cross-section of the population.

Second, he has to project himself in imagination back a full century to the days of slavery, when the systematic exploitation of an underprivileged class of humanity as cheap labor was an accepted part of the American social and economic order.

Then the observer has to compound mentally these two diverse anomalies and conceive of their existence in 1951.

For that, in effect, is the situation today in the Southwest, and in parts of the deep South and the far West as well, arising from the ceaseless and steadily increasing tide of illegal immigration from Mexico into the United States.

This illegal immigration now amounts to more than 1,000,000 individuals a year. They sneak across the thinly patrolled 1,600-mile border between Brownsville, Tex., and San Diego, Calif., in an unending hegira from Mexican unemployment and wage levels as low as 40 cents a day, seeking farm work and any other labor available in this country.

Some 500,000 of these wetbacks—so-called because of those who swim the Rio Grande, the Texas-Mexico boundary—were caught by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Services' border patrol last year and put back across the international line.

The estimate of a total traffic of 1,000,000 is conservative, based on the surmise that for every one caught there is one who isn't caught. Most immigration officers would concede a more likely average of 5 or 10 to 1, and for some areas responsible estimates go as high as 100 to 1; in such a reckoning many of the total would be not different individuals, but repeaters who recross after having been deported.

There are fewer than 900 border patrol officers to guard the whole 1,600 miles of boundary, and sometimes the deportees get back into the United States before the deporting officers do. Some Mexicans have been deported as many as 20 times, only to return again and again.

SOME RETURN, SOME STAY

A large number of wetbacks regularly slip back into Mexico after seasonal farm work ends. But tens of thousands of others have remained in the United States, managing to settle down in semihiding in hundreds of communities along the border, or becoming transient laborers and filtering northward over the western half of the country all the way to the Canadian border.

Technically every one of these wetbacks is an illegal alien, the same as a foreigner who slipped through the paradoxically tight immigration patrols at Ellis Island—a violator of the Federal law, subject to imprisonment.

But because the bulk of this immigration is tidal, advancing and receding with the regularity of the seasons, it has come to be taken for granted, both by the United States border population and the Nation at large.

Superficially, the wetback traffic is just a picturesque cat-and-mouse game on a grand scale between a mass of amiable Latins and an overwhelmed border patrol.

In actuality, however, a year's study of the situation by this correspondent, ending in a recent 5,000-mile tour of the border area, shows it to be a phenomenon whose real economic and social implications should shock the average American when fully known and comprehended.

PEONAGE AND SLAVERY

The impression is widespread that these Mexicans simply come over as a regular essential and harmless supplement to the domestic harvest forces.

The fact is that they are attracted by the glittering prospect of high American wages, and in many cases actively recruited by large-scale ranchers or their representatives, only to work for wages that have been described by United States immigration officers as tantamount to peonage and under conditions compared on the same authority to antebellum slavery.

"This traffic in contraband labor actually is worse in its elements than either prohibition or slavery," a nationally prominent figure in the Southwest commented a few days ago. "Prohibition involved only traffic in alcohol. This is traffic in human beings. And in slavery some responsibility, at least, was acknowledged for the release of the slaves. Here there is none."

The wetback, a penniless fugitive, has to take whatever wages are offered, which, because of the multitude of wetbacks available, usually are at a bare existence level or below it. His traditional housing is the crudest form of shack or hovel, wherever he can find it, or just the open air. His status denies him access to regular community legal and welfare agencies. If he doesn't like his situation he can go back where he came from. There are thousands of other hopefuls south of the border ready to take his place.

AMERICAN LEVELS DEPRESSED

Aside from the abuses to which these Mexicans themselves are subject, the traffic in wetbacks has manifestly baneful effects on the citizenry with which they mingle.

In many sections of Texas, Arizona, California and other areas they depress the general standards of wages and working conditions below the accepted American levels. Instead of supplementing the domestic labor force they undercut it, taking jobs from tens of thousands of native citizens, farm and urban workers alike.

In the agricultural field, particularly, the resulting native displaced persons have to join the great stream of migrant labor that fans out annually northward all the way from New York to Oregon, working a good deal of the time for substandard wages and working conditions and, in turn, taking jobs from resident local workers.

From a sociological standpoint, the wetback traffic has obliterated the border completely, transforming the 3,000,000 Spanish-American citizens of the Southwest—many of whose families have been in the area for centuries—into a cultural peninsula of Mexico, retarding their assimilation, in the opinion of experts, by a generation or more, and perpetuating and aggravating some of the worst conditions of health, education and social, economic and political unintegration that can be found in the country.

Finally, the wetback traffic has engendered, in somewhat the way prohibition did, an atmosphere of amorality and warped thinking which demonstrably extends from the farmer exploiters of wetback labor through their communities and local and State officials, to the highest levels of the Federal Government.

IT'S OUT IN THE OPEN

Although this may sound sensational, the remarkable thing is that there is no secrecy about the situation. Despite an elaborate legendry that has grown up to screen it, and occasional efforts to dissimulate the facts, most of the details are matters of formal public record or common knowledge in the region.

The main problem in inquiring into it is to preserve one's sense of proportion and avoid entanglement in the falsework of rationalization that has grown up over the years to justify the system and maintain it.

The wetback situation is of particular pertinence at this time. The defense emergency has evoked official proposals for the importation of hundreds of thousands of workers from outside the continental United States.

Before Congress is a draft extension of the 1949 agreement between the United States and Mexico, which expires in June, governing the so-called "importation" of Mexican farm workers under contracts which in actuality have degenerated into the legalization of wetbacks.

Before President Truman is the initial report of the special lay commission he appointed last summer to investigate the problems of migrant farm labor and the wetback evil.

Also, it has lately been realized that the wetback traffic offers a wide-open avenue for Communist spies to enter the country. There is no public record of any having been caught lately. But immigration officers acknowledge that every year at least a handful of Europeans, some of them with Communist backgrounds, are netted among the wetbacks, and that in cold fact Joseph Stalin might adopt a perfunctory disguise and walk into the country this way.

Legal immigration into the United States from Mexico—on which there is no quota limit—involves such complications as fees, literacy standards, job assurance, and consular approval. It is much easier to sail, wade, or swim the Rio Grande, seldom more than 100 yards wide, or just to walk across the largely unfenced dry sections of the border.

Such an illegal crossing is a misdemeanor the first time and a felony after an initial deportation, subject to 2 years' imprisonment and $1,000 fine. But the wetbacks numbers largely defy prosecution.

Detention facilities and court dockets are so crowded that anything beyond quick deportation of first offenders has had to be abandoned. The latest authoritative analysis indicates that only about 25 of every 10,000 caught are prosecuted.

So the influx has snowballed. In the San Antonio immigration district, the largest of three covering the border, the number of apprehensions—generally conceded to be in direct proportion to the total traffic—has jumped from 43,000 in 1945 to 315,000 last year.

In the Los Angeles district, covering California and western Arizona, they jumped from 4,000 in 1943 to 230,000 last year. And the traffic is mounting steadily. The Los Angeles district's apprehensions in January and February of last year totaled 19,500; for the same period this year they were 33,800.

The wetback traffic dwarfs the legal contracting of Mexican labor under the international agreement, and has become almost inextricably enmeshed with it. At the moment, according to the United States Employment Service, there are about 26,000 contract Mexicans in the country. Most of them were not imported at all, but are ex-wetbacks who were rounded up north of the border, processed at border immigration and consular stations, and given legal work permits under guaranties of somewhat better conditions than those accorded wetbacks.

Once across the line, the wetback passes himself off as one of the 3,000,000 citizen Mexican-Americans. The main centers of wetback labor are the large-scale cotton, citrus, and vegetable ranching areas of Arizona, and the Imperial and San Joaquin Valleys of California.

In lesser numbers wetbacks can be found seasonally on farms in Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and other parts of the West, and over in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Missouri. Every week or two a planeload is shipped from Chicago back to the border.

Employment of wetbacks, although from a realistic standpoint tantamount to harboring a fugitive, has been held by the Federal courts to be not a punishable offense because of the omission in the 1917 version of the immigration laws of any specific penalty.

[From the New York Times of March 26, 1951]

PROBE NET FARMER A FABULOUS PROFIT—ILLEGAL MIGRANTS FROM MEXICO WORKING RICH SOIL OF WEST, A BONANZA TO EXPLOITERS—PAY 15 TO 25 CENTS A DAY, AND MANY RECEIVE FOOD ALONE, WHILE SHELTER IS A HUT, A THATCH, OR THE STARS

(By Gladwin Hill)

BROWNSVILLE, TEX., March 25.—The lower Rio Grande Valley is the heart of the 1,600-mile wide border belt stretching from Texas to California into which more than 1,000,000 Mexicans annually infiltrate illegally in quest of work.

Here, amid such towns as Weslaco, Donna, Harlingen, and McAllen are some of the most fertile and productive cotton, citrus, and vegetable lands in the country.

The lower Rio Grande Valley comprises principally three counties, Cameron, Hidalgo, and Willacy, with 300,000 population. Their only fractionally cultivated gross area of 3,000 square miles, although constituting only 2 percent of the total area of the State, yields some 15 percent of its farm income.

In this relatively small area on an average day during last year's harvest peak, according to a careful study by two leading southwestern sociologists, about 100,000 wetbacks were working. A check of 14 farms taken at random by Dr. Lyle Saunders of the University of New Mexico and Dr. Olen Leonard of Vanderbilt University, disclosed that 93 out of every 100 workers were illegal Mexican aliens.

THROUGHOUT WHOLE AREA

In lesser concentrations as the distance from the border increases, but still in swarms of thousands, other wetbacks can be found in the harvesting and thinning seasons in the Salt River Valley of Arizona, the Imperial and San Joaquin Valleys of California, and many other sections of the West and South—legally fugitives from justice, but beneficiaries—or victims—of skimpy border protection, grasping farmers and an apathetic public.

Over the whole area there are many farmers and farm associations that, because of special circumstances or plain scruples, do not use "wetbacks"; but for the average farmer such a course means bucking an entrenched cheap-labor system.

In contrast to visions of affluence conjured up by the wide disparity in United States and Mexican living standards, the "wetback" finds himself under a system of wages governed entirely by what the traffic will bear.

Farmers acknowledged to the President's Commission on Migratory Labor last summer that they paid field hands as low as 15 cents an hour. According to the Saunders-Leonard study, the prevailing hourly wage for "wetbacks" in this valley last year was 25 cents an hour.

TWENTY-SIX-DOLLAR COTTON PICKERS

Although cotton was selling at exceptionally high prices, the cotton picking rate in the valley was at its lowest in some time, $1.25 a hundred pounds—at which, it was calculated, the average picker might earn a maximum of about $26 for a 7-day week.

Hourly rates like 25 cents do not necessarily indicate the real wage level in a particular situation, because they may be replaced by piecework rates that are less, or by day rates based on a theoretical 8 hours that in practice may stretch out to 10 or 11 hours.

Gross wages, moreover, are often subject to deductions for meals, commissary purchases, and special assessments, such as the common practice of charging workers for binding wire for vegetables, a practice obviously implying either a paring of the nominal wage or profiteering on the wire.

Two cases reported last summer at McAllen were a father, mother, and two children who had worked 4 days for a net of $6.50 and an inexperienced cotton picker who after 3 days' work was told he had just earned the food he had eaten.

SOME GET NO CASH

It is not extraordinary for "wetbacks" to report having worked for weeks only to be told that there was no cash due them. In such a circumstance the "wetback" has little scope for argument; the farmer can just turn him into the immigration authorities for deportation.

A few days ago I talked with a "wetback" named Felix Moreno who had come into El Centro, Calif., to get help in collecting $47 he said a nearby farmer owed him for 10 days of carrot-bundling. He was 1 of 50 "wetbacks" in a crew of 65. A typical "wetback" in many respects, Moreno was 24 years old and had a wife and year-old child back in Mexico.

Last fall he had taken more than a month's Mexican wages to buy a train ticket from Santiago, Guanajuato, 800 miles south of the border. He had walked across the line in the desert and worked intermittently in cotton and vegetables in the 6 months since. In his pocket he had 20 cents.

Aside from wages, the "wetback" gets nothing. His lodging is seldom better than an irrigation ditch-bank or hut improvised from junk or thatch. The worker housing situation in Lower Rio Grande Valley ranches was tersely summarized in a report published by the University of Texas last December:

"No housing facilities exist."

Southwestern farmers have two principal explanations for the wholesale resort to labor that is contraband but the employment of which, because of legal technicalities, is not subject to prosecution.

One is that "local labor is not available."

It is true that, under present arrangements, peak harvest labor requirements often exceed the immediate local supply. The University of Texas survey, made by Prof. Eastin Nelson and Prof. Frederic Meyers, found, for instance, that in the Lower Rio Grande Valley seasonal cotton labor needs fluctuated from 5,000 to 125,000 against a permanent total labor force of only 36,000.

However, the same study found that an adequate supply might well be drawn from within the State of Texas if adequate monetary and other considerations were offered.

Observing that "much of the agricultural labor in the valley is performed by illegal entrants from Mexico," and tactfully skirting the question of wages with the notation that they were "low" even in comparison with other parts of Texas, the Nelson-Meyers report continued:

"The valley has an opportunity almost unique in a largely agricultural area of providing steady year-around jobs for a permanent resident labor force * * * (but) no such stable and desirable conditions exist, and the reasons for their lack lie plainly in the instability created by the continuous traffic back and forth across the Rio Grande.

FACILITIES UNNECESSARY

"The living standards which Mexican nationals are willing to tolerate, and the fact that so many of them are only temporary residents, have made it unnecessary for valley farmers to provide housing, sanitary facilities and other nonwage perquisites adequate to retain a permanent resident farm population."

During the last few years while the "wetback" traffic has been increasing at a rate of 50 percent or more a year, there has been more or less constant farm unemployment in the Southwest.

In the face of purported shortages of labor in Texas, every year around 100,000 residents of the State take to the road, joining the migrant farm-labor stream to the States north, west and east, where lessened "wetback" competition brings more adequate compensation.

Granting the possible occasional need for foreign labor, there is machinery under the United States-Mexico agreement of 1949 for the legal importation of workers under contract. But the farmers do not like this, because contracting involves minimum wages—ranging currently from 40 cents an hour for Texas to 69 cents for California—and guaranties of housing, insurance, and other conditions that make it far more expensive than "wetbacks." Consequently, legal contracting has remained minute in comparison with "wetback" employment.

Although wetback employment is such an established institution that Rio Grande Valley newspapers refer to it baldly as "cheap labor," farmers often argue that any greater labor costs would put them out of business.

CAN BE DONE

There is telling evidence in contradiction of this contention. For virtually every case where a crop is being produced with wetback labor, instances can be found of the same crop's being produced competitively—often in less favorable areas—with legal Mexican contract labor or domestic labor.

At the time farmers in the lower Rio Grande Valley were paying $1.25 for cotton picking, farmers in California's San Joaquin Valley—300 miles north of the border—were paying $3—and making impressive profits. Similar differentials customarily exist in citrus and vegetable production, despite California's more costly distance from eastern markets.

Even within Texas, at a time when daily wages for cotton chopping (thinning) in the valley were about $2.25 the Nelson-Meyers report said, "in the northeast Sandy Lands of Texas they were $3, in Corpus Christi and the coast prairie areas they were $4, in the rolling plains $5, and in the high plains $5.25."

The Saunders-Leonard study indicated that valley farmers were able to realize upwards of $5,000,000 extra profit on their cotton crop last summer by their illegal-labor wage rates. This comfortable differential possibly throws light on the fact that during 1949, when the farm income of the State as a whole was declining 8 percent, according to statistics of the State Department of Agriculture, valley farmers were able to increase their income by 7 percent.

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1951]

PROBE IN THE WEST LOWERING CULTURE—ILLEGAL MIGRANTS FROM MEXICO FORM VAST UNASSIMILABLE BLOC OF POPULATION—ALL STANDARDS DECLINE—HEALTH, EDUCATION, DEMOCRACY IN AREAS WHERE WETBACKS WORK ARE DEPLORABLE

(By Gladwin Hill)

EL PASO, TEX., March 26.—The annual invasion of the United States by more than 1,000,000 illegal Mexican border-jumpers, long regarded by some as merely a quaint regional phenomenon of the Southwest, is emerging as a prime factor in some of the worst economic and social conditions in the Nation.

It is a matter of extensive public record that the 3,000,000 Mexican-American citizens of the Southwest are one of the most underprivileged segments of the population, in earnings, health, education, and equality of treatment.

The wetbacks, whose influx in its present proportions is a development of recent years, did not originate these conditions. In the opinion of a large number of expert observers, however, their presence has done much to perpetuate and aggravate them.

"From a cultural standpoint," states Dr. George Sanchez, head of the department of history and philosophy of education at the University of Texas, and probably the foremost student of regional interracial affairs, "the influx of a million or more wetbacks a year transforms the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest from an ethnic group which might be assimilated with reasonable facility into what I call a 'culturally indigestible' peninsula of Mexico.

NULLIFIES INTEGRATION

"The wetback migration tends to nullify processes of social integration going back 300 or 350 years, and I would say at the present time has set the whole assimilation process back at least 20 or 30 years."

It is the Mexican-American citizens whom, primarily, the wetback cheap-labor invasion deprives of jobs and, through broad economic pressures, pulls down to its own primitive living standards.

It is the wetbacks, as parties to an informal system of peonage, who inexorably tend to set the level of the far from frictionless relations between the Mexican-Americans and the Anglos.

"No citizen who wants to live in even a minimum of comfort and decency can compete with the wetback wage scale," Dr. Sanchez and Dr. Lyle Saunders, of the University of New Mexico, said in a recent report of the University of Texas' continuing study of the Spanish-speaking peoples, a project of the Rockefeller Foundation's general education board.

"With an oversupply of cheap, unprotected labor always present, organization of workers is impossible, individual bargaining is futile.

"There are only two choices: work for what the wetback works for and live as he lives, or leave the area. Many accept the former alternative. Those who can, choose the second and become displaced persons. Either choice results in undesirable conditions for the individual and social problems for the community."

IN THE WAKE OF POVERTY

"For those who stay and attempt to compete, there is poverty and all the evils associated with it: disease, ignorance, child labor, crime and delinquency, lack of concern with civic affairs, slum conditions, and always the weight of a deadened, passive, apathetic population to be carried on the shoulders of other elements of the community.

"For those who leave, there are similar problems of health, education, welfare, and housing—problems that affect those migrating and those in the communities to which they go."

The second alternative is exemplified in the annual migration of around 100,000 Texans, along with thousands of farm workers resident in other wetback States, to other harvest areas of the Nation in quest of remunerative work.

It is possibly more than coincidence that the number of migrant farm workers who course the Nation annually has been independently estimated at 1,000,000—on the order of a conservative estimate of the number of wetbacks who annually breach the border.

The sources of this migration vary in many cases in direct proportion to the presence of wetbacks. In the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, the heart of wetbackland, where as many as 100,000 wetbacks may be working at one time during the harvest peak, a recent survey showed that of 15,000 families, 8,000 had hit the migrant trail during a 2-year period.

NOT MERELY AGRICULTURE

The dislocations are not confined to the agricultural field. Wetbacks filter into every occupation from culinary work to the building trades. Practically any labor union in the 1,800-mile border zone from Texas to California can cite local instances of wetback competition in its field.

An analysis of a group of 160 supposedly agrarian wetbacks picked at random from among a summer's deportations by Dr. Saunders disclosed nine bricklayers, seven truck drivers, three miners, two factory workers, two welders, two weavers, a painter, a barber, a blacksmith, a butcher, a shoemaker, and a policeman.

A check of a single residential block in El Paso, Tex., one day last summer turned up three wetbacks doing craft work—a painter, a carpenter, and a carpenter's helper—working at rates from 57 cents an hour down to 37 cents.

In southwest Texas, wetback competition is so strong that even such nationally powerful unions as the teamsters' and the building trades' are only sketchily organized. An organizer for the American Federation of Labor in the area acknowledged sadly that even loyal union members had got in the habit of working on jobs beside wetbacks without protest.

The approximately 1,250,000 Mexican-Americans in Texas comprise one-sixth of the State's population. In many parts of southwest Texas they are predominant in the population.

COMPARATIVE DEATH RATES

Among the Anglo-American population, the 1946 death rate from diphtheria was 1.81 per 100,000 population; for the Spanish-speaking people, a synonym for Mexican-Americans, it was 6.47; the Anglo-American whooping cough rate was .64, the Mexican-American 5.73; the tuberculosis death rate was 25.4 for Anglo-Americans, 159 for Mexican-Americans.

In San Antonio, the largest city of southern Texas, the tuberculosis death rate among Anglo-Americans is 40, among Negroes 50, and among Mexican-Americans 150.

General conditions worsen as you progress into the wetback country. In Hidalgo County, one of three that make up the lower Rio Grande Valley, a United States Public Health Service survey of 3,103 resident Spanish-speaking families comprising 16,782 persons, disclosed that in 1947–48, 9.8 percent had annual incomes below $500, 41.6 percent below $1,000, 68.3 percent below $1,500, and 82.9 percent below $2,000.

In Hidalgo County in 1949, the infant death rate among Spanish-speaking people was nearly five times that among the non-Spanish speaking. In 1949, Hidalgo and adjacent Cameron County, although containing only one-thirtieth of the State's population, accounted for one-fifteenth of all the State's meningitis, one-twelfth of its typhoid and diphtheria, one-seventh of its dysentery, and one-fifth of its malaria.

EDUCATIONAL DEFICIENCIES

Comparable educational deficiencies characterize the region. The farm-worker migration from Texas customarily starts in the early spring, months before the school year ends, and the workers do not return until fall, after the school year has started.

Among families who do not migrate, and who are faced with making livings under the competition of wetback wages, child labor is so common that in some parts of west Texas the public schools remain closed for an extra month while the fall harvest is on. They remain open an extra month at the end of the year, but this evidently is a minor compensatory factor. In the three valley counties, a recent University of Texas study disclosed, in the age bracket 6 to 17, more than 40 percent of the children were absent from school on a given day.

"It seems perfectly plain from the figures that a fairly large percentage of the scholastics belong to the labor force in some degree * * * and that a fairly large percentage of (children above 14) belong regularly to the labor force."

The United States Public Health Service survey of 3,103 Hidalgo County Spanish-speaking families disclosed that 53 percent of their members had no formal schooling, 75 percent had less than 3 years, only 15 percent had from 3 to 6 years, only 1 percent had completed high school, and only 1 out of 1,000 had attended college.

Of those persons over 21, 45 percent had no schooling, only 2 percent had completed high school, and only 2 out of 1,000 had attended college. Sixty-seven percent could not speak English, and 39 percent were illiterate even in Spanish. For comparison, the latest available State statistics on education among the over-all population of the same county show that 54.6 percent had completed five grades or more, and that 20.6 percent had completed high school.

The retarded assimilation of the Spanish-speaking people, the University of Texas report stated, is revealed in second and third generation citizens who do not speak or who are not fluent in the language of their country, in poor school attendance records and low educational attainments, in abnormally high concentrations in unskilled occupations, in the persistence of separate, segregated institutions, and in subjective outgroup feelings toward non-Spanish-speaking citizens.

Despite all the problems of assimilation, Dr. Saunders concluded from a recent study of the valley, it is conceivable that a mutually satisfactory adjustment involving a considerable cultural and perhaps even biological blending of both groups might have been reached had it not been for the continual inflow of large numbers of wetbacks.

"For the wetback embodies most of the elements necessary to reinforce the stereotyped notions of the Anglo through which he sees or fancies he sees undesirable characteristics in the Spanish-speaking group, and tends to assign to all Spanish-speaking people the characteristics he thinks he sees in the wetbacks. * * * poor, uneducated, unskilled, underfed and frequently unclean.

DISCRIMINATION RAMPANT

Although the Texas courts have held that Mexican-Americans are white and therefore not subject to the same level of segregation as Negroes, they are still subject to extensive discrimination—both organized as in certain public housing projects, and informally. A typical example reported by Dr. Saunders is that where Anglo-American stenographers get between $150 and $250 a month, and average about $167, the standard scale for Mexican-Americans, despite their convenient bilinguality, is $100 to $150.

Although constituting some 16 percent of the population of Texas, Mexican-Americans account for only 2 percent of the enrollment in the State's 4-year colleges and universities.

Consonant conditions obtain, in varying degrees, throughout the Southwest.

Possible illumination of the correlation between the status of the wetbacks and that of the Mexican-Americans is provided by a comparison of their role in public affairs, in the States of Texas, New Mexico, and California. In all three States, Spanish-speaking populations have been established for more than a century. In New Mexico, the Spanish-speaking people constitute a larger proportion of the over-all population than in the other States—about half—but from a governmental standpoint their concentration is no greater in various areas than in important sections of Texas and California.

In the latter two States, prime termini of the wetback influx, you can search the rosters of State, county and local legislative and administrative personnel through hundreds of names without encountering one that is Spanish.

In New Mexico, which has only 100 miles of border contiguous to Mexico and where there is relatively little farming to draw wetbacks for practically every Anglo-American in public office—including the State's representation in Congress—you can find a person of Latin extraction.

[From the New York Times of March 28, 1951]

SOUTHWEST WINKS AT WETBACK JOBS—ETHICS CAST ASIDE AS GROWERS ACCEPT PEONAGE IDEA AND BRIDLE AT INTERFERENCE—FEDERAL SANCTION NOTED—BORDER PATROL OFFICERS REPORT PRESSURES FROM WASHINGTON TO "GO EAST" IN RAIDS

(By Gladwin Hill)

EL PASO, TEX., March 27.—The rise in illegal border-crossing by Mexican wetbacks to a current rate of more than 1,000,000 cases a year has been accompanied by a curious relaxation in ethical standards extending all the way from the farmer-exploiters of this contraband labor to the highest levels of the Federal Government.

Although wetbacks are fugitives from justice, southwestern cotton, citrus, and vegetable growers have come to the fixed view that there is nothing wrong in employing them, harboring them or even in actively recruiting them across the international boundary.

Further, they have come to feel they have a vested right in the traffic. Any more than the normal token interference with it by the Immigration Service's skimpy border patrol—with less than 900 officers for the 1,800-mile expanse from Texas to the Pacific Ocean—brings an outraged hue and cry from communities thoroughly indoctrinated with the farmers' attitude.

A year ago, in a special drive, border-patrol officers were concentrated temporarily along the Rio Grande and in 1 month increased their apprehensions from 16,490 to 24,415.

GESTAPO TACTICS CHARGED

Newspapers of the lower Rio Grande Valley immediately accused the Immigration Service editorially of "siding with Mexico" and described valley farmers as "justifiably resentful" at having their scheme of things thus disrupted.

A barrage of feature articles followed, describing in emotional verbiage the purported separation of families by the deportation of border jumpers (an exigency specifically exempted in the immigration laws); and dire conditions allegedly created on the Mexican side of the border by the congestion of deportees (which Mexican officials promptly denied).

The border patrol, long known for its anomalously amicable relations with both the farmers whose fields it periodically raids and the Mexicans it deports, was accused of almost as heinous a roster of outrages as was laid to the Nazi Government, in headlines such as: "Says border patrol uses Gestapo methods." * * * "Illegal search and seizure is issue" * * * "Valley Legion scores acts of border patrol." * * * "Crime against humanity."

Representative LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., Democrat, of Texas, member of a prominent valley farming family, took the floor of Congress to demand a full-dress investigation of a report that border patrolmen called at a house in Mission and questioned the occupants "without a search warrant."

SOCIAL SECURITY CARDS ISSUED

Communities have become so accustomed to "wetbackism" that in the leading "wetback" areas of Texas, Dr. Lyle Saunders, University of New Mexico sociologist, recently reported after extensive first-hand study of conditions, "almost anyone who needs help of any kind will hire a wetback—farmers, contractors, businessmen, housewives, city governments, county governments, and even the International Boundary Commission." In this, Texas does not differ substantially from the wetback areas of Arizona, California, and other Western States.

On the hallowed bureaucratic principle of the left hand's not knowing what the right hand is doing, while the Immigration Service struggles with the wetback influx, the Social Security Administration freely issues cards to wetbacks on which they have little chance of collecting benefits, but which are handy for pseudo-identification. Wetbacks get draft board cards for the same purpose, giving worthless addresses. State employment offices in many places—quasi-Federal agencies—refer wetbacks to employment opportunities right along with citizens.

A leading California labor contractor, asked by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor where he located the wetbacks in which he admittedly trafficked, replied blandly: "From the State employment service."

The notion that wetback labor is both proper and indispensable has become so firmly implanted in southwestern communities that its accompanying evils are taken as a matter of course.

WETBACKS LINKED TO CRIME

The (Lower Rio Grande) Valley Express last March quoted District Attorney Jack Ross, of Edinburg, Tex., as saying that in the previous year as much as 75 percent of the convictions in certain major crime categories had been against wetbacks and that since the stepped-up drive against them crime generally had dropped off 50 percent. The newspaper added, without comment, that local police in several valley cities reported such petty crime as pilfering and drunkenness had dropped sharply.

About the same time the San Benito (Tex.) News reported blandly: "It was quite a weekend in San Benito. Only a few habitual drunks got into jail. The round-up of wetbacks may worry San Benito district farmers and cut down receipts of beer joints, but it is a blessing to local police. 'No petty thefts, few fights, no burglaries, and everything peaceful with most of the wetbacks gone, at least for a time, is the police view."

Sheriff Robert Ware, of Imperial County, California's leading wetback area, asked by this correspondent if wetbacks constituted any particular law-enforcement problem, said, "No, they don't give us much trouble. They're mostly quiet, law-abiding people who just want work." A few minutes later he acknowledged that of 185 inmates in the county jail, he estimated 25 percent were wetbacks.

The public record offers extensive evidence of tacit or active Federal sanction of the wetback traffic all the way from the border patrol to the White House level.

ARREST TRENDS ANALYZED

Some responsible regional observers have noted a curious inverse correlation between the rate of the border patrol's apprehensions, which vary widely seasonally, and local demands for wetback labor. One way or another, these sources suggest, the border patrol functions less as a law-enforcement agency than a checkvalve, restricting illegal immigration to the level of active public alarm. No corruption of border-patrol officers is implied. It is just, these observers explain, that after apprehension activities have gone so far, as in last year's special Rio Grande campaign, pressures, public and private, build up to damped the border patrol's ardor.

Some immigration officers deny this, contending that they consistently and conscientiously do as well as they can with their skimpy resources to stem the wetback tide, and that fluctuating apprehensions simply reflect fluctuations in the over-all wetback migration rate.

Other officers differ. One after another testified before the President's Commission on Migratory Labor that the border patrol was subject constantly to invisible but emphatic pressure exerted from farm quarters through Washington and relayed through Immigration Service channels, to go easy on the wetback round-up.

This was epitomized in the testimony of the late Grover C. Wilmoth, veteran director of the El Paso Immigration District. He said:

"All we need is a go-ahead signal and we can enforce the law 90 to 95 percent. With a little additional men and equipment we could do an efficient enforcement job. It's a disgrace to this country that her laws are openly flouted and evaded. The farmers once were ashamed of using wetbacks. Now they have come to the point where they believe they have a vested right in these illegal workers. They go to their Senators,

their Congressmen, the Attorney General, or the President to complain."

It was in Mr. Wilmoth's district, during the 1948 Presidential campaign, that there occurred the notorious "El Paso tea party." The supply of Mexican labor had not been sufficient to satisfy farmers of the area.

As reported by Art Leibson of the El Paso Times, "When President Truman came to El Paso for a campaign address, the problem was laid before him by cotton men and by Texas and New Mexico Congressmen. Soon after his train moved east through Texas, there was a meeting of top immigration officials at El Paso." What went on behind the scenes is still a matter of equivocal explanation by immigration officials. What happened openly was that—in outright violation of United States commitments, according to the subsequent protest of the Mexican Government—border patrol officers turned their backs for 48 hours while some 7,500 wetbacks streamed across the river unhindered to fill the farmers' wants.

A similarly questionable incident occurred only a month ago in California. Some ranchers rounded up one hundred-odd wetbacks some 30 miles north of the border and took them in chartered buses to the immigration station at Calexico. The ranchers and the border patrol were in the midst of a still mysterious proceeding evidently aimed at legitimizing these workers for transportation to ranches in the north, when representatives of the National Farm Labor Union, AFL, intervened and protested to the local Mexican consul that the law was being violated. Although the district headquarters of the Immigration Service still contends that the proceeding was in full compliance with regulations, the union's protest had sufficient validity so that the operation was halted and the wetbacks returned to Mexico.

AGREEMENT CALLED A TRAVESTY

The most conspicuous official hypocrisy regarding wetbacks has been that surrounding the United States-Mexico farm labor agreement of 1949, one of the periodical extensions of which is now before Congress. The professed aim of this agreement was to eliminate the wetback traffic by providing for the recruitment of Mexican farm labor below the border and its orderly importation into the United States for maximum work periods of 1 year where real shortages of domestic labor were duly certified by the United States Employment Service.

After 18 months of its operation, however, many close observers feel that the agreement manifestly has worked out as a travesty on this intent.

The agreement opened with a solemn declaration of representatives of the United States State Department and the Mexican Foreign Ministry deploring the wetback traffic of Mexican workers, which has mounted steadily and no appreciable steps have been taken to reinforce the border patrol.

The agreement then offered an incentive to border jumping by providing that wetbacks should have preference in hiring under the contract system. Such priority was limited to wetbacks in the United States at that time, but this deadline for absolution from law violation has been extended over and over. Last summer the legalization of wetbacks in the United States before July 26 was authorized. When this did not produce enough cheap Mexican labor, the preference was extended to all wetbacks in the country before October 20.

CROSS BORDER IN RITUAL

Of the first 96,000 laborers contracted under the agreement in the fall of 1949, 78,000, by acknowledgment of the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security, were wetbacks who were legalized.

Nominally this legalization process consists of the wetbacks voluntarily surrendering and returning to Mexico for subsequent recruiting.

As it works out in practice, the wetbacks are rounded up in the United States and taken to legalization centers on the border, where as part of their processing they go through the formality of momentarily crossing the Mexican line—a ritual that has become known as "walking around the statue."

Of 28,000 Mexican contract laborers now in the United States, virtually all were wetbacks legitimized in this way.

Article 6 of the agreement affirmed that Mexican nationals should not be contracted to work "in localities where Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or race." They have been put to work in such localities.

Subsequent articles said Mexican contract labor should be paid the prevailing wage rates for a given area, that this should not be promised on wetback-wage scales, and that the contract labor should not displace domestic citizen labor.

These stipulations, if complied with, observers agree, would virtually have precluded contracting, since farm wages in key areas of the Southwest are geared to the wetbacks' minimal compensation to such a degree that domestic citizen workers by the hundred thousand are frozen out of the market. This was circumstantially corroborated when contract minimums of 40 cents and 60 cents an hour were adopted under the agreement, respectively, for Texas and California, for identical work—reflecting accurately the differing concentrations of wetbacks in the two areas.

The final irony of the agreement was a stipulation that contract workers should not be provided to employers of wetbacks, and that any employer found to have wetbacks should have his contracting privileges withdrawn.

This again, if complied with, virtually would have eliminated key areas of the region, wetback employment is so prevalent.

In one day recently the farm-labor union supplied United States and Mexican officials a list of eight large vegetable ranches in the immediate area of El Centro, Calif., employing wetbacks, the most prominent being the firm of O'Dwyer & Mets, headed by Frank O'Dwyer, brother of William O'Dwyer, United States Ambassador to Mexico. Immigration officers seized 300 wetbacks on that ranch. The union demanded that its contracting right be withdrawn.

Six weeks have elapsed, and as this was written the regional office of the United States Bureau of Employment Security in San Francisco acknowledged that no action had been taken. It said an inquiry was under way. The first step in the inquiry was a so-called hearing at El Centro of parties in the case.

The hearing was an unannounced private conference on a Sunday night between a lawyer from the Employment Security Bureau and representatives of O'Dwyer & Mets.

When this correspondent sought to interview Mr. O'Dwyer, the latter referred him to Mr. Mets. Asked where Mr. Mets could be seen, Mr. O'Dwyer said, "He's in Washington."

[From the New York Times of March 29, 1951]

INTERESTS CONFLICT ON WETBACK CURE—EVEN BORDER POLICE DISAGREE ON MEASURES TO STEM FLOOD OF MEXICAN LABORERS—NATIONS' PACT IN DISPUTE—UNIONS SEE A MOVE TO CUT PAY BY FARMERS WHO OPPOSE UNITED STATES RULE ON CONTRACTS

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, March 2.—Almost every segment of the Nation's population interested in the wetback problem has a simple straightaway solution for it.

The trouble is that because of conflicting interests, no group's solution is very satisfactory to anyone else.

Even experienced officers of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Services, targets of a mounting barrage of criticism as illegal crossings of the Mexican border have mounted, are in wide disagreement about the most effective measures.

Some contend that simply augmenting the border patrol's present skimpy facilities—with a nucleus of less than 900 men to guard the 1,600 miles from Texas to the Pacific coast—might largely stem the tide of upward of 1,000,000 Mexicans who annually cross the line to work for minimal wages and who depress both economic and social standards in the Southwest.

Others contend that it would take a large standing army to make the border impregnable, and that the problem should be tackled from another angle.

Most concur that stiffening the present penalties for illegal entry—up to a year's imprisonment for the first offense and 2 years for a repetition—would be useless against the horde of amiable wetbacks who, by their numbers, overwhelm the facilities for apprehension and prosecution.

THE POLITICAL FACTOR IS CITED

Some think that if the immigration laws could be fixed up logically to make it an offense to employ wetbacks, who are technically fugitives from justice, it would eliminate their chances of getting jobs, and along with that the incentive for sneaking into the country.

Here again immigration officers disagree about the political practicality of such proposals. Some think that Southwestern farmers, with their vested interest in cheap wetback labor and their influential lobbies, would surely try to scuttle such steps. One immigration officer of exceptionally long experience, however, said: "They wouldn't dare to oppose it, because that would focus public attention on their system."

Members of Congress, whipsawed between the constant farm pressure for alien labor and the obvious need to do something about the wetback traffic, ratified the 1949 agreement between this Nation and Mexico for the importation of Mexicans under contract. A periodical extension of this agreement is now before Congress.

This agreement has not pleased anybody particularly. By providing for preference in job recruiting to wetbacks already in the United States, it has probably acted as an incentive to border-jumping, which has increased at a rapid rate ever since the agreement became effective.

FARMERS DISLIKE THE PACT

Farmers dislike it for many reasons. Requests for labor to be imported have to be filed 60 days in advance. With the principal Southwestern crops of cotton, citrus, and vegetables, it is often difficult to predict precisely so far ahead just how many hands are going to be needed, when and for how long.

Also, minimum wages—ranging from 40 cents an hour in Texas to 60 cents in California—and housing, insurance, transportation, bonds, and other requirements under the contract system, raise the cost of this labor. In some cases, farmers have averred, actually above the cost of domestic citizen labor.

Farmer objections to transportation costs and complications have brought about the virtual scrapping of the original concept of recruiting labor in the interior of Mexico, where there was a dearth of local employment opportunities, in favor of recruitment right at the border through the legalization of wetbacks.

A return to recruiting south of the border is one of the principal proposals in connection with extending the international agreement, now under debate. Another is for resumption of active participation by the United States Government—as during World War II—in the transportation and allocation of the imported labor and in the handling of certain of the moneys involved.

This is objected to as quasi socialism. There is also palpable concern in farm circles that Government management of alien labor would soon extend to allocation of domestic labor. Such a step, it may be noted, might nullify the traditional contention that domestic labor is not available, a contention that farmers use to justify the employment of alien labor, legal and illegal.

In contrast to such proposals, influential farm quarters long have been advocating what they habitually refer to as a simple crossing-card system, but which critics call simply legalized wetbackism.

Under this system, Mexicans would receive border passes to circulate in the United States, confined in theory to areas of farm labor shortages, and to work without any of the burdensome guaranties of minimum wages, housing, insurance, and transportation required under the present contracting system.

Organized labor in the United States, as expressed in repeated declarations particularly of the American Federation of Labor and its affiliates, would approach the problem from the other end.

It contends that the agitation in the United States since World War II about obtaining alien labor generally has been an oblique effort to undercut American workers, predicated on illusory shortages of domestic labor. These shortages are said to result from a refusal to offer adequate wages.

This contention is at least partially corroborated by a recent study at the University of Texas, previously cited in these articles, which concluded that the labor needs of certain key farm areas could, with adequate inducements, be filled entirely from within the State. This is contrasted to the present situation in which wetbacks pour in by the hundred thousands, while domestic workers leave the State regularly in similar numbers to seek more adequate wages elsewhere.

The National Farm Labor Union, the A. F. of L.'s principal affiliate in the field, contends that domestic labor shortages should be established by public hearings in the areas in question instead of by the present unilateral certification by Federal-State employment offices, whose personnel may be subject to local pressure from farmers.

Secondly, the union advocates on the question of what is the prevailing wage for given work in a given area—a critical factor in considerations both of the availability of domestic labor and of the terms that should be accorded alien labor—that this wage be similarly arrived at in open hearing rather than as now, in the uncertain realm of administrative decisions.

If these two conditions were met, labor maintains, many of the current problems would be dispelled because underlying them is a simple reluctance to pay adequate wages.

With these conditions met, it is contended, domestic citizen labor would be forthcoming; and even on the condition, quite foreseeable in the current war emergency, that alien labor were needed, a frank approach to wage and cost economics would eliminate the present haggling and complications that attend the contract system.

From labor and independent observers of the wetback problem, including educators, economists, sociologists, and welfare and church agencies, the suggestion also has come that the wage chiseling that underlies the wetback influx might be obliterated by applying Federal minimum wages to agriculture, at least in cotton, which is a Government-subsidized crop around which much of the wetback traffic revolves.

Farmers have long contended that minimum wages in agriculture are unworkable. But a minimum wage has long been in effect under an exceptional Federal law for the sugar-beet crop.

Radio Spot Announcements on Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the truly great organizations in this Nation is the American Heritage Foundation located at 25 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y. The purpose of this organization is clearly indicated in its title itself. It is designed to encourage our citizens to respect and maintain the great values that comprise our magnificent heritage.

One of the important elements of its work is the forwarding to some 1,700 cooperating radio stations each month of a series of spot announcements which can be broadcast in between programs and at other convenient times and which contribute tremendously to an awareness of the American heritage. I can think of few more constructive uses of America's great media of communications.

Some of the forthcoming radio spots are devoted to focusing attention on supplementing the job which has been performed by the Senate Commission Investigating Interstate Crime.

I have been delighted to read these spot announcements because it has been my deep conviction that only when John Q. Public at the grass roots of the 48 States really gets hold of this issue and starts to clean up his own town, his own county, and his own State, can we say that the forces of lawlessness will really be on the run.

Each of these announcements is simple, clear-cut, wisely directed to the average citizen. By the repetition of the important theme of cooperating with law-enforcement officials, the announcements drive home a message which cannot be overemphasized nor repeated too often. By reference to past incidents in history, the announcements draw attention to the relevance of past experiences to our present and future.

I ask unanimous consent therefore that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following items:

(a) A list of the distinguished officers of the Foundation—a list which is a hallmark of some of the finest leaders in all phase of American life who devote their valuable time selflessly in the public interest.

(b) A list of the members of the great board of trustees of the Foundation.

(c) The text of several of these spot announcements on the crime problem.

I conclude with the keynote of the Foundation: "Freedom is everybody's job."

There being no objection, the lists of names and the text of the spot announcements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION

OFFICERS

Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board; William Green, vice chairman; Philip Murray, vice chairman; Robert G. Sproul, vice chairman; Thomas D'A. Brophy, president; Louis A. Novins, executive vice president; Edwin L. Weisl, secretary; James G. Blaine, treasurer.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Winthrop W. Aldrich, William D. Askren, Barney Balaban, Chester I. Barnard, Don Belding, James G. Blaine, Thomas D'A. Brophy, Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, Norman Chandler, Henry Corbett, William W. Crocker, John Cowles, C. Donald Dallas, John W. Davis, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Francis P. Gaines, William Green, Walter Head, Clifford Hood, Eric A. Johnston, Harry T. Kendall, Robert H. Lehman, Henry R. Luce, Charles Luckman, Gen. Timothy A. McInerry, Harvey Mudd, Philip Murray, Reinhold Niebuhr, Louis A. Novins, Irving S. Olds, Fred D. Patterson, Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, Samuel F. Pryor, Andrew W. Robertson, Edward L. Ryerson, Gen. David Sarnoff, Paul Scott, McGregor Smith, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Robert G. Sproul, Robert L. Thornton, DeWitt Wallace, Thomas J. Watson, Edwin L. Weisl, Charles E. Wilson, Robert E. Wilson, Thomas E. Wilson, James W. Young.

A TIME FOR RALLYING TO THE LAW

These are days of a double danger.

War threatens our heritage of freedom from abroad, and widespread lawlessness threatens it here at home.

Can we, you and I, as citizens, help against lawlessness?

Well, millions of Americans, who are "good citizens"—active and positive in their citizenship—are helping in the fight against lawlessness right now.

These millions resent being pushed around by contemptible crooks such as those exposed by the Kefauver investigation.

These millions are righteously angry against the arrogant criminals who look on them, mistakenly, as slaves. So these millions now help wage the war against crime by cooperating, however, wherever, and whenever they can, with public officials and with the courts.

This fighting spirit, this righteous anger, on the part of millions of awakened American citizens—including yourself no doubt—will be a triumphant weapon against the tyranny of crime, and for the preservation of freedom—that priceless freedom which is everybody's job.

In these days when our heritage of freedom is threatened by criminals both abroad and at home, these words of Woodrow Wilson are reassuring:

"If I did not believe that the moral judgment would be the last judgment, the final judgment, in the minds of men as well as the tribunal of God," Mr. Wilson said, "I could not believe in popular government. But I do believe these things."

It is the moral judgment of millions of our people that inspires our defiance of communism. And it is the moral judgment of

these same millions of Americans that inspires the present Nation-wide drive against immorality, against criminals and their crimes.

Many, many millions who believe in morals are in the fight, and in it to win. A "good citizen" obeys all laws himself, of course, but he goes much further: He helps public officials and the courts to bring criminals to justice and to prevent further lawlessness.

Yes, it is the moral judgment of these millions—you among them, of course—that freedom is everybody's job.

The University of Illinois has a professor of law by the name of Dr. George Washington Goble. And this famous authority wrote in his book The Design for Democracy, these challenging lines:

"If there is to be liberty there must be order, and if there is to be order there must be law."

So wrote Dr. Goble. And if we may rearrange that challenge, putting it loosely yet truthfully in reverse, we would say it this way: When laws are violated on a wide scale, how can there be order? And where there is no order, what happens to our most priceless possession—our heritage of freedom?

You know from a mass of shocking evidence that laws have been and are being violated on a large scale. But fortunately an aroused America, with its millions of good citizens, is doing something about that.

They are—and this "they" includes you, of course—they are not merely obeying every single law themselves, but they are assisting public officials in preventing crime. They are saying—and again that "they" includes you—they are saying that the law shall prevail, and that there shall be order, so that there shall continue to be freedom. They are emphasizing this familiar challenge: That freedom is everybody's job.

In 1830, one of our leading public enemies was the pirate, Charles Gibbs.

This buccaneer had compelled scores of innocent men and women to walk the plank before he was taken captive on Long Island, and presently hanged.

Now the person who discovered the clues that led to his capture was a plain every day citizen, known simply as Leonard. But he was surely a good citizen, this Leonard. For in addition to respecting the law himself, he helped public officials to arrest a law breaker, and so helped prevent lawlessness.

And just good citizenship is the obligation of us all today. Now as never before it is our responsibility to be vigilant, and help our public officials to prevent lawlessness whenever, wherever, and however we can.

For as lawlessness is a dangerous threat to freedom in peacetime, it is a more dangerous threat to freedom in wartime, and as every good citizen agrees, freedom is everybody's job.

You keep up with the news. So you know about the lawlessness that is horrifying the country.

Well, how do you like it? How do you like to be annoyed or even pushed around by cheap crooks in these tense busy days of mobilization?

How do you like it when these luxury-loving gangsters mock and sneer at plain everyday citizens, and eminent officials just as Russian commissars sneer at their slaves?

And now for the big question:

As a "good citizen," what are you doing about these small contemptible men who steal and lie and cheat and even murder? Who may have taken property from you somehow, and would as readily take your life?

Well, you obey and respect the law, of course. But "good citizenship" demands more. It demands that we all cooperate, however we can, with public officials in the enforcement of the laws, and so help stop criminals, help prevent lawlessness.

When we do this—keeping constantly vigilant with a righteous anger in us—we illustrate once more the hard blunt fact that freedom is everybody's job.

Do you know what General Lafayette said about liberty? About freedom?

David Loth quotes Lafayette in Mr. Loth's new book about him entitled "The People's General."

"Anyone who ostensibly struck a blow for freedom could count upon the backing of his speeches in parliament," writes the Mr. Loth. "One day early in 1834 the chamber heard him at his favorite oratorical task of defining the aims for which he strove; 'Liberty must always be a living thing, never laid away in the archives.'"

This conviction of Lafayette's about liberty, about freedom, takes on special meaning today when our freedom is threatened by war abroad and by lawlessness at home. And surely Lafayette would say that in order to keep freedom a "living thing," every good citizen must respect the law, and also must vigilantly cooperate with public officials and courts for the prevention of lawlessness.

Or in other words, freedom is everybody's job.

A voice of long ago spoke words of special significance for today when our freedom is threatened by two dangers: War abroad, and lawlessness at home.

The voice was that of James Bryce, who said with blunt emphasis: "Patriotism consists not in waving the flag, but in striving that our country shall be righteous, as well as strong."

Mr. Bryce probably would be well pleased could he look in on America now.

For while we are gradually but surely mobilizing to meet whatever enemy may attack from abroad, we are also mobilizing by country, States, communities, and individuals against lawlessness at home.

Our people who love freedom, millions of good citizens, have come awake with righteous anger against this lawlessness. They are determined that America shall be righteous as well as strong and free. So they obey and respect the laws, and also cooperate with law officers vigilantly and fearlessly, however they can, in the fight against lawlessness.

That's what you're doing, and your neighbors as well, of course. For you know—as everybody knows now—that freedom is everybody's job.

Do you know who captured Maj. John André, the famous enemy spy, in the War of the American Revolution?

Well, our histories say he was stopped by "three militiamen." They quizzed him, examined his papers, and took him prisoner. Three militiamen. Not professional soldiers, not trained intelligence officers, but three plain everyday American citizens in uniform. And they were surely good citizens, those three. For by stopping this dangerous spy, they helped prevent dangerous espionage.

And just such good citizenship is the obligation of us all today. Not that we'll have an opportunity to catch spies. But now as never before it is our responsibility to be on the lookout for enemies of our freedom, and help our public officials to prevent lawlessness whenever, wherever, and however we can.

For as lawlessness is a dangerous threat to freedom in peacetime, it is a more dangerous threat to freedom in wartime. And as every good citizen agrees, freedom is everybody's job.

In his book entitled "Modern Arms and Free Men," Dr. Vannevar Bush declares that "the strength of democracy lies in the manifold blessings of freedom."

Well, if ever it was important that democracy be strong, the time is now.

The time is now, when the blessings of freedom are threatened not alone by war abroad, but by widespread and perhaps increasing lawlessness at home.

While we make ready to meet any danger from enemies abroad, we must at the same time triumph successfully over high crime and low criminals here among us.

We can do all that and more.

We can do all that by seizing our opportunities as "good citizens," especially the opportunity not only to obey and respect the law, but also to cooperate with officials in enforcing laws, in preventing crimes.

Millions of Americans, now righteously aroused, are vigilant to help however they can. For the strength of democracy does lie in freedom. And what we are saying by our cooperation against crime is just this: "Freedom is everybody's job."

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, public enemy No. 1 was Billy the Kid.

This smart-aleck gangster-on-horseback reviled his victims before he murdered them. But Sheriff Pat Garrett killed Billy quite dead in Billy's final gunfight.

Now a plain everyday citizen, known to us as a Mr. Brazil, wrote the letter that tipped off Sheriff Garrett as to where Billy could be found. And he was surely a "good citizen," this Mr. Brazil. For he not only respected the law, but by helping a law officer to catch a lawbreaker, he helped prevent lawlessness.

And just such "good citizenship" is the obligation of us all today. Now as never before it is our responsibility to be vigilant, and help our public officials to prevent lawlessness whenever, wherever, and however we can.

For as lawlessness is a dangerous threat to freedom in peacetime, it is a more dangerous threat to freedom in wartime. And as every good citizen agrees, freedom is everybody's job.

In his farewell address as President of the United States, Andrew Jackson made a blunt statement to his listeners.

"Providence has showered on this blessed land, blessings without number," he said. Then came the blunt statement: "Providence has chosen you," he said, "as the guardians of freedom."

Well, wouldn't Old Hickory say the same thing to our listeners today? To you?

Of course. And he probably would be quite solemn, too, observing that our freedom is now threatened by criminals both abroad and at home.

But we could reassure him. For as we become better prepared day by day to guard freedom from criminals abroad, millions upon millions of Americans—righteously angered—commit themselves also to the fight against lawlessness in America. This includes you, probably. For surely you who respect the laws yourself, help public officials, however you can, to prevent crime.

Old Hickory would like that. Fearless and honorable himself, he would be proud of you, proud of everybody who says by positive citizenship, that freedom is everybody's job.

The late Wendell Willkie stated in his book, One World, that the best answer to communism is a living, vibrant, fearless democracy.

But as Mr. Willkie would surely agree, a living, vibrant, fearless democracy cannot endure, freedom can't endure, in the face of widespread increasing crime.

It seems that crime is widespread and perhaps increasing in our own democratic Republic. And if we are successfully to meet the threat of communism, every citizen must be faithful to our laws.

Being faithful means to obey the law and to respect the law, of course, but that's not all by a long shot. Truly good citizenship, active citizenship, demands also that we assist public officials in preventing crime and the courts in giving evidence.

Now, of course, you are doing what you can to help prevent crime. Surely you are one of the millions of aroused citizens who will keep this democracy living, vibrant, and fearless. For you, like other millions, are dedicated to the proposition that freedom is everybody's job.

In these days good citizens are urged to be specially careful to support the law.

That's because there is much evidence today that lawlessness is active in some quarters—shamefully active at the critical moment when we are mobilizing to be able to meet any dangers from abroad.

Well, since the days of the Mayflower compact, days of the Virginia bill of rights, days of the Orangetown resolutions, and other early documents in the behalf of freedom, many eloquent Americans have paid high tributes to the law—such tributes as to make us more proud than ever to support it.

Dr. John W. Burgess paid it such a tribute when he said that the source of law is the national consciousness of truth and right.

Truth and right, they are the worthy qualities that we support when we obey the law, respect the law, and help our officials and courts however we can to enforce it.

And remember, only because we have law, do we have freedom. So surely freedom is everybody's job.

As we have been told all our lives, our Government is a government not of men but of laws.

Today when it's more than ever important that we all rally to the support of the law, lest lawlessness destroy our freedom, it is refreshing to read these lines that the late Mr. Justice Cardozo quoted from the Harvard Law Review:

"Code is followed by commentary, and commentary by revision, and so the task is never done."

So it is a living thing, the law that we must diligently and faithfully uphold.

In these tense days war threatens from abroad, and lawlessness threatens in America. So it is our obligation not only to respect and obey the law ourselves, but also to be energetically cooperative with officials and courts in enforcing the law.

It is our law. It came from us. It is alive. It is the one thing that keeps freedom alive. Naturally we are loyal to it. Everybody must be loyal to it. For freedom is everybody's job.

It's written down with finality, though with brevity, in the dictionary.

Citizenship is the status of being a citizen, we read. And a citizen is a person who owes allegiance to a government and is entitled to reciprocal protection from it.

Surely everybody agrees with that definition. Surely everybody agrees that he, as a citizen, owes allegiance to his government.

Well, as we've been told from childhood, ours is a Government not of men, but of laws.

So we owe our allegiance to our laws. And while there is evidence of widespread lawlessness in these days of international tensions, all but a few of us, comparatively, are faithful to our laws. All but a few of us obey and respect them, and cooperate with officials and courts in upholding them.

Yes, there has been evidence recently of lawlessness in the country. It makes a man righteously angry, of course, because he knows that lawlessness has been known to destroy freedom. It won't destroy ours as long as all of us, but a disloyal handful, agree on this point: That freedom is everybody's job.

A devoted servant of the people and President of our country, Grover Cleveland, had this to say of fellow citizens who became careless about their obligations as good citizens.

"The abandonment of our country's watchtower by those who should be on guard," President Cleveland said, "and the slumber of the sentinels who should never sleep, directly invite the stealthy approach and the pillage and loot, by forces of selfishness and greed."

Well, Mr. Cleveland would probably be proud of his country today.

For today all but a shameful handful of the 150,000,000 Americans are vigilantly within the country's "watchtower"—wide awake instead of sleeping—readying themselves to protect our freedom from the forces of selfishness and greed, whether these forces be enemies abroad or lawbreakers in America.

Yes, while our good citizens mobilize to meet any danger from abroad, they obey and respect the law, and also, they help officials in preventing lawlessness, and the courts in giving true evidence.

And in these ways they help preserve our freedoms. Surely you are among them? For freedom is everybody's job.

Assignment of Ground Forces to Duty in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials having to do with the proposal to send troops to Europe. The first is entitled "Troops for Europe," and appeared in the New York Times of April 5, 1951. The second is entitled "The Bridges Are Burned," and appeared in the Evening Star of the same day.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 5, 1951]

TROOPS FOR EUROPE

On the second anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Pact, the Senate has approved by a large majority a resolution which constitutes another historic landmark in the development of American foreign policy. With this resolution the Senate reasserts the vital principle, long evidenced by the events, that the security of the United States and its citizens is directly dependent upon the security of its partners under the North Atlantic Treaty, and that the commitments of that treaty are therefore an essential part of our foreign policy.

In keeping with this principle, it specifically approves the appointment of General Eisenhower as Supreme Allied Commander of the unified defense forces now being created under that treaty. Furthermore, it declares that American security requires us to station abroad such units of our Armed Forces as may be necessary and appropriate to contribute our fair share to the forces needed for the joint defense of the North Atlantic area, and for that purpose formally approves the earliest possible dispatch of four additional divisions to bring our total ground force strength in Europe to six divisions.

The impact of this resolution should be all the greater because it was adopted by a final vote of 69 to 21—a better than two-thirds majority—which should help erase the more dubious aspects of the long debate. This is a solid achievement and a long swing of the pendulum from the Neutrality Act of the mid-thirties. In a decade and a half American opinion has swung from an almost unquestioning faith in isolation to a judgment completely contrary. Not only have we thrown off all pretense of neutrality, not only have we come out of isolation to associate ourselves with a world organization for the maintenance of peace, and not only have we broken the traditions of a century and a half by entering into a binding defensive alliance with certain European powers, we now also recognize that the security of these powers so directly involves our own security that we are prepared to draw the first line of our defense across Europe and to station along that line six divisions, or all that can be provided at the present time.

This achievement must not be obscured, either here or abroad, by the commotion caused by the McClellan amendment advising the President to obtain further congressional approval before sending additional ground troops to Europe beyond the four divisions specified. That amendment, a product primarily of domestic politics, like the concurrent resolution inviting the House to repeat the debate, is regrettable because it might raise new doubts about the earnestness of our intentions and might even be exploited to precipitate new quarrels over the dispatch of troops needed to complete the task.

In that respect it is not exactly a testimonial to the Senate's statesmanship or certainty of its own mind. But it need not be the disaster it is represented to be. In fact, together with the McCarthy amendment regarding Germany and Spain, it might even do some good if it prods European nations into even greater efforts, both in respect to their own rearmament and the inclusion of a German and possibly Spanish contribution to western defense.

What must not be overlooked is that, in the final analysis, the McClellan amendment merely makes more imperative what is already demanded by the gravity of the measures we have taken, and what to some extent was also provided in the original resolution text—namely, that there must be consultation and agreement between the President and Congress on the policy involved. Furthermore, the language of the resolution clearly implies that, though specific approval is given only for four divisions, it is also the sense of the Senate that we must subsequently supply such additional divisions as may be necessary and appropriate both to contribute our fair share and to guarantee the validity of the North Atlantic Treaty. The Senate cannot very well go back on this pledge without repudiating the policy it has just approved, or proclaiming the six divisions in Europe to be just expendables.

Even with its amendments, therefore, the adoption of the resolution should provide Western Europe with new confidence to go full steam ahead with the defense programs

agreed upon. For this resolution notifies Soviet Russia that we intend to fight in Western Europe if Western Europe is threatened with aggression. Twice, on the eve of the two most calamitous wars in history, we notified the potential aggressor that we intended to follow a hands-off policy in the event of aggression. We seek now to prevent a third world war by telling the aggressor that if he goes to war he will find us in the center of the fighting.

[From the Evening Star of April 5, 1951]

THE BRIDGES ARE BURNED

Now that the "great debate" has ended, one tremendously significant fact has been put upon the record for all the world, and the Kremlin in particular, to see.

The United States is finally and irrevocably committed to fight on land, on the sea, and in the air if Western Europe should be attacked.

Nothing in the debate or in the resolutions finally adopted by the Senate can destroy or seriously impair the overriding importance of this plain declaration of our intentions. It is regrettable that the Senate adopted the amendment calling upon the President to obtain congressional approval before sending any troops to Europe in addition to the four divisions now scheduled for overseas duty. The practical effect of this may not be great. It is unfortunate, however, in that it implies, or may be interpreted as implying, a certain unwillingness on our part to do all of the things that may have to be done if the Communist threat is to be successfully met.

Actually, such an inference would not be warranted. Of the 21 votes finally cast against the troops-for-Europe resolution, only 19 came from Senators who oppose such a commitment. They constitute the hard core of what is left of isolationism in the Senate, and there is very little prospect that their thinking will ever prevail. Most of the support for the limiting amendment came from Senators whose grievance grew out of a constitutional difference with the President. Mr. Truman has a large responsibility for this conflict. Had he shown more wisdom and better judgment, the issue might have been avoided entirely. In any event, he could have done much more than he did to compose the difference amicably, once it had developed.

This water, however, has passed over the dam. Nothing is to be gained now by stirring the ashes of that conflict.

The thing that really counts, the thing that history will record as one of the most significant developments of our generation, is that the Senate has given its approval to the stationing in Europe, in peacetime, of a total of six divisions of American troops as a garrison force. The Senate has done this in explicit recognition of the fact that "the threat to the security of the United States and to our North Atlantic Treaty partners" makes it necessary to station United States armed units abroad so as to "contribute our fair share of the forces needed for the joint defense of the North Atlantic area."

If the full meaning of this is obscure to any of our own people, it will not be obscure to the Russians. They will understand that we have put them on notice that an attack on any member of the North Atlantic Pact means war—instant and total war—with the United States. We may well hope that this, of itself, will prevent war—that the Russian masters will not be insane enough to unloose on themselves the terrible destruction that will follow an attack by them. We may also have hope that this evidence of our good faith and firm intention will expedite the organization, under General Eisenhower's command, of the projected international army in the west, so that if war should come the free nations will not be devoid of means to fight and win it.

Colonialism: United States Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the February 1951 issue of the Progressive, published at Madison, Wis., entitled "Colonialism: United States Style," and written by Mr. Felix S. Cohen, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Cohen served as an associate solicitor in the Interior Department, and is the author of the Handbook of Federal Indian Law. He teaches jurisprudence at Yale Law School, and philosophy at the City College of New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONIALISM: UNITED STATES STYLE

(By Felix S. Cohen)

It was on a late spring afternoon in 1950 that the seven councilors of the Omaha Tribe gathered with their "nephews and nieces" on a little fragment of what was once their great cornland empire to plan defenses against white aggression. There is not much left of the 6,000,000 acres or more that was once their own, along the Nebraska bank of the Missouri River, but what is left, with its deep black soil and its bursting corncribs, its heavy mud and its fat horses, these Indians love, as they love the little fragments of self-government they still enjoy.

They were deeply disturbed over schemes hatched in high places to dispose of the remaining fragments of their age-old homeland. From long experience these Indians knew that the process of turning their land over to white men always began with an attack on the honesty, intelligence, or competence of Omaha Indians. Such attacks, inside and outside the Indian Bureau, had reached a new high intensity in recent months. Obviously there was danger in the air.

Suddenly, down the center aisle of the meetinghouse, walked the young wife of the council chairman, carrying an airmail special-delivery letter from Washington. The letter was opened and read circumspectly, as men of other races might read a letter from an archangel or a commissar. Dark eyes widened as the reader intoned the words of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs himself. He had carefully considered the plea of the Omaha Indians "that the Government give the tribe entire control of its own affairs, without the interference or expense of an agent or of agency employees."

II

He thought this request reasonable and in line with his own policy of encouraging Indians "to take care of themselves." Instructions had therefore been issued, according to the Commissioner's statement, "to turn over to the Omaha councilmen, in trust for the tribe, the mills, shops, dwellings, school houses, livestock, and all public property on the Omaha Reservation." All of the agency employees except those engaged in medical and educational work were being relieved of their posts.

The mounting delight that showed in Indian eyes suddenly blurred and the anxious brows of the two Government observers relaxed. The date of the Commissioner's statement was read. The date of the statement was 1884. It had been dug out of musty archives and mailed to the tribe by a friend in Washington. The next Omaha play would have to start 66 years behind the line of scrimmage.

The policy of cutting down Bureau controls and encouraging our Indian citizens to assume full responsibility for their own affairs has been vigorously proclaimed by every Commissioner since 1884. And yet these Omaha Indians, like many other tribes, have far less control over their own affairs than they had in 1884, and less in 1950 than in 1949. How come?

Back in 1854 the Omaha chiefs were invited to the White House. The tide of western migration had reached the wide Missouri, and the Great White Father wanted to buy 5,000,000 acres of the fat Omaha land, at about 15 cents an acre, to sell to white settlers at $1.25 an acre. Reluctantly the Indians agreed, but only on one condition. They insisted that the 15 cents be paid to them and not to Indian agents.

At the end of the conference President Pierce agreed that no Indian agent would handle the Indians' money. The great Omaha orator, Chief Joseph La Flesche, had used a silver dime to illustrate the plea of his people for the right to handle their own finances. The silver dime was brought to the Omaha reservation and was cherished as a symbol of a great victory in the Indians' struggle for freedom.

Ninety-six years have passed, all Indians are now citizens, and yet today no Indian on the Omaha Reservation is allowed to lease his own land and handle his rental income without the interposing of Bureau fingers. And during this entire 96-year period the Indian Bureau has been reporting to Congress on the steady progress that it is making in turning over to Indians an increasing responsibility for the managing of their own affairs and in cutting down controls which the Bureau still exercises over Indian life.

III

In 1885, the Commissioner reported:

"More than a year ago the Omahas felt themselves competent to do their own work and attend to their own affairs. At their request all their employees were discharged and they were left to themselves. The result, which then seemed doubtful, has shown the wisdom of their choice. They have attended to their own business and paid for their own work and are more independent and manly than before because of the consciousness that they are becoming men."

Similar reports were made by the Commissioner in 1886 and 1887. When and how and why the Indian Bureau crept back and took over control of Indian fields, buildings, and funds does not appear in any Commissioner's reports to the President or to Congress. Nor is much reporting done today on current Bureau activities which are depriving Indian tribes of the right to hold local elections without Bureau interference, the right to employ their own lawyers and technicians, and other rights that were guaranteed to them under the Roosevelt-Ickes-Collier administration.

The Omaha case is not unique. Most Indian tribes in the United States can report similar experiences. Federal promises that the Indians would be allowed to assume control of their own affairs go back at least to the 1830's. Usually but not always, there is a time qualification to the promise. Before the Indians can be trusted to take over complete responsibility for their own affairs, we are told, there must be a period of preparation during which the Indian Bureau will help to civilize—the current term is rehabilitate—the Indians.

IV

Back in the 1830's the transition period was generally fixed at 10, 15, or 25 years.

In the latest Indian Bureau drafts of tribal "rehabilitation bills" the date 1994 is generally fixed as the point at which Bureau supervision over Indian finances can safely be terminated for the more progressive tribes.

There is no tribe that has more control over its own affairs today than it had a year ago or a hundred years ago. There are few tribes that have as much control over their own affairs as they had in 1884. And yet during this period Commissioners of Indian Affairs have inaugurated more than 500 programs for liquidating Bureau activities. Most of these programs were directed to particular reservations or States, but several were of national scope.

During this period of intensive "liquidation" the annual Indian Bureau budget has increased from less than $6,000,000 to approximately $80,000,000. Some of the "rehabilitation" bills recently put forward by the Indian Bureau, often over the protest of the alleged Indian beneficiaries, would triple or quadruple Bureau expenditures for the more progressive tribes, in the expectation that by 1994 these Indians might safely be allowed to take care of themselves.

How a Bureau's efforts to "work itself out of a job" can produce these results presents a fascinating puzzle for white men as well as Indians, and for students of law and government of all colors and political faiths. The puzzle is particularly baffling because we Americans have had so little direct experience with colonialism.

Having started our existence as a Nation by repudiating colonial status, and having repudiated the role of empire with equal vigor, at least during the first 122 years of our national existence, we are not accustomed to the high moral talk by which great empires "aid" and "protect" backward peoples out of their independence, and impose a dependent status and a dependent psychology upon people who once managed their own affairs in a self-reliant way. Only in obscure places in the Indian country, in Alaska, and in a few small Pacific islands can we see what happens to our own Government experts when they are not responsible to the people they are governing or aiding.

The simplest explanation of the gap between Commissioners' programs and Bureau performance is the "devil theory," according to which the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is a satanic hypocrite, who makes fine promises merely to fool Indians and Congressmen. According to the adherents of this popular view, the only good Indian Commissioner is a dead Indian Commissioner.

Unfortunately, life is not so simple. The harm that good commissioners do is often greater than the harm bad commissioners do. All but 3 or 4 of the 36 Commissioners of Indian Affairs who have served during the past 118 years have been honest, sincere, hard-working men who wanted to help the Indian and wanted also to work themselves out of the world's worst job.

Something more than a "devil theory" is needed to locate the source of the Indian Bureau's drive for expansion and aggrandizement and to understand the mental makeup of the men who carry on this drive while they think and talk (quite sincerely) of "liquidating" their Bureau. Perhaps if we understood the psychology of such officials more clearly we could see more plainly what is happening in other parts of the world where "liquidation" and the "withering away of the state" go hand in hand with a tremendous increase in bureau controls over individual freedom.

The Indian Bureau itself has a ready explanation for the discrepancies between proclaimed Federal policy and actual practice. Those Bureau officials who are most active in breaking down Indian self-government have their own "devil theory" to explain their failure to carry out the Bureau's public promises and policies. According to this theory, Indians are inefficient, dishonest, wasteful, ignorant, selfish, impatient, and generally drunk, or, at least, not so efficient, honest, economical, wise, public-spirited, patient, and sober as their Indian Bureau tutors.

Moreover, any white man outside the Bureau who seeks to help Indians is either a crank or a grafter or a paid agitator—a grafter if the Indians pay him for his help, a paid agitator if white sympathizers pay him, and a crank if nobody pays him. It is, of course, the duty of loyal Bureau employees to protect Indians from all cranks, grafters, and paid agitators. Accordingly, it is the unshirkable duty of the Indian Bureau to carry on its shoulders the "white man's burden" of telling the Indians what to do.

Essentially this is the philosophy of colonial administration in all parts of the world. It is instructive to see how this philosophy works out in day-by-day Indian administration.

V

The most plausible argument against local self-government, Indian or white, is the argument of inefficiency. Obviously, it is more efficient to have one official make decisions than to have 450,000 individual Indians scattered all around the United States and Alaska making different decisions for themselves as to how they will earn their livings, spend their money, use their land, litigate their grievances, or educate their children.

We see the most recent example of this efficiency drive in the latest Indian Bureau orders transferring authority over 200 reservations from the reservations to half a dozen so-called area offices. (These were originally called regional offices, but when Congress, in response to Indian appeals, refused money for such offices, they were rechristened "district" offices, and when district offices were forthwith abolished by Congress they were renamed "area" offices.)

Decisions that are made on the reservation cannot be very efficient because they are made in the presence of Indians, who like to participate in such decisions and require time for thinking, which is not as necessary for loyal Bureau employees. Decisions in Washington are made under congressional scrutiny, and, since many Indians are voters, this scrutiny interferes with speed and efficiency. But when decisions are made in Billings or Portland, most of the Indians affected are hundreds of miles away and their Congressmen are thousands of miles away. It is thus possible for such decisions to be highly efficient, that is, to disregard all the human desires and intangibles that do not show up in efficiency reports. The cult of efficiency thus makes it possible to recite all the proper phrases about liquidating the Indian Bureau while, at the same time, upholding every extension of Indian Bureau power over Indian lives on the ground that a poor (or rich) Indian cannot possibly be as efficient as an $80,000,000-a-year Indian Bureau.

VI

The argument of Indian inefficiency has one serious inconvenience. Any Bureau employee who uses it invites attention to his own inefficiencies. If they are notorious, he will find it safer to pitch his arguments on a plane of high morality. When the Federal courts held that the New Mexico Pueblos were not under Indian Bureau control, the Indian Bureau produced reams of gossip as to the immorality of various Pueblo Indian customs and ceremonials, and the Federal courts then backed down and admitted the necessity of Indian Bureau supervision.

Inexperienced freshman Congressmen sometimes think that Indian bureaucracy can be cut down by trimming appropriations. This is a naive view. To the experienced bureaucrat a cut in funds is always the best possible reason for centralizing power, which means transferring authority from people to agencies, or from local agencies to area offices or Washington officials. In fact, every expansion of a Bureau function is customarily justified on the ground that it will bring economy in the long run. Unfortunately, as Keynes has noted, in the long run we are all dead.

Once grant that expert government is better than self-government and there is no stopping the expansion of the Indian Bureau, or any other bureau, until it fills the whole space of the individual's life.

Back in 1834 the Congress decided that the time had come to wind up the fast-growing Bureau of Indian Affairs and that one of the best ways to do this was to allocate Indian Bureau positions to the Indians themselves. Every 30 or 40 years since then Congress has passed a new law to the same effect and several such bills have recently been introduced with much fanfare. These laws have great popular appeal because they conform with the American creed that self-government is better than expert government and that men and children learn by doing. None of us would ever learn to walk in childhood if the job of walking were assigned in each family to the expert walkers, as the theories of colonialism and Indian bureaucracy would require.

The Bureau never has carried out these acts of Congress, which have remained largely dead letters. The Indian Bureau never has given a general employment preference to Indians outside of ditch-digging and similar inferior or temporary jobs that whites were reluctant to tackle.

In the special vocabulary of Indian Bureau gobbledegook, policy decisions made by Indians for themselves are "politics" while decisions made for Indians by the Bureau are "sound administration." If elected Indian councilmen select friends and supporters for tribal jobs, this is described as "nepotism" and proves that Indians cannot be trusted with self-government. But if a Democratic President picks a Democratic Indian commissioner, if such a commissioner appoints old friends to high posts, and if an Indian superintendent has his wife appointed to a job in an institution financed by his Indians, this is accepted as a part of the democratic process.

Every now and then a Commissioner reveals the large number of dishonest officials that held jobs under a prior administration. But the real corruption of the Indian Bureau is institutional, not personal. It is like the corruption of prisons, insane asylums, concentration camps, Fascist and Communist states, and other societies in which men cannot talk back to officials. It is what Lord Acton had clearly in mind when he pointed out that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

VII

Thousands of solutions have been proposed in the last 450 years for the Indian problem. And this is as it should be, for thousands of Indians have thousands of problems, just as white men do.

The great thing about American democracy is that most of us have an unprecedentnd power to shape our own lives, make our own mistakes, and attain new understanding and strength from the mistakes we make. To extend such democracy to Indians—to let Indians spend their own money, run their own schools, use or lease their own lands, and hire their own lawyers to defend their rights, just as neighboring white communities do, would not establish utopias on our 200 Indian reservations, but at least it would remove from our democratic professions, in our dealings with nonwhite peoples, the taint of hypocrisy.

If to this simple measure of justice were added a full and prompt settlement of all Federal debts to our Indian fellow citizens, we would have no need to worry about how they would fare under the self-determination we have so long promised and so long withheld.

While You Read This, a Child May Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a powerful article by Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, as reprinted in a full-page paid advertisement in the New York Times dated April 6, 1951.

This House must take action. I cannot understand the delay on the measure to authorize emergency food-grain shipments to India in the face of this terrible urgency.

I am receiving scores of letters from the people of my congressional district. For the most part, the people who live in the Nineteenth Congressional District never achieve any economic security; most of them have known hunger—actual gnawing physical hunger—in their own lives, and will know it in the future.

Yet I have not received a single letter opposing the India relief bill. This article by Mr. Cousins was sent to me by Mrs. John E. Scanlan, of 223 East Fifth Street, accompanied by an urgent letter to act at once.

Mr. Speaker, we must have action.

WHILE YOU READ THIS, A CHILD MAY DIE—AMERICA CAN HELP AVERT A FAMINE IN INDIA THAT MAY CLAIM 14,000,000 LIVES THIS YEAR

NEW DELHI.—Once you have seen the look of hunger on the face of a man it is difficult to put it out of your mind. I have seen the look of hunger on the faces of thousands of men, and I know I shall never forget it.

I first saw the hungry in a jail on the island of Ceylon. They were illegal immigrants fleeing the famine in the south of India, and the Government of Ceylon was detaining them in a prison in Jaffna until arrangements could be worked out for their return to India. They had come by small boat, landing during the night on the north coast of Ceylon, where some of them had been picked up by the police. No one knew how many Indians had fled to Ceylon in this summer.

In the jail at Jaffna I spoke to a woman of 55 who looked closer to 90. I doubt that she weighed 80 pounds. Her face was little more than a bare skull out of which small eyes glowed feverishly. She had come to Ceylon to join her married daughter, who had escaped successfully 2 months earlier. This much she was willing to tell, but she would not tell the police where her daughter might be found, even though it meant she herself would be returned to India alone.

I next saw the hungry in the south of India, where the suffering is most acute. I saw them against a background of parched and browned fields, with pale stubbles where rich rice paddies should have been. The reason for it was that the rains never came this year. They didn't come last year either or the year before that or the year before that.

"Four years, no monsoon," one of the elders in a village 40 miles from Madras told me. "The older people have thought hard but they do not remember when before the fields have been so dry. The wells are very low."

He looked up at the scudding clouds. "Clouds like this used to bring rain. Now they go out to sea and drop their rain where there is no need of it. The old people can eat little. If they are thin it is no great harm. Gandhi was thin. But the children are thin and they become sick quickly. Smallpox has killed many of them. Thirty had smallpox in this village. Sixteen died.

"We send men into the cities to work so they can buy rice to bring back to the village. But there is so little rice and the rations have been cut again, and what they bring back cannot fill the bowls of many persons. We eat what we can—bananas and some coconuts—but very many people here are starving."

I next saw the faces of the hungry on the streets of Calcutta. Many of them were homeless. They had lost their homes during the partition of India when Pakistan was created. They were Hindus who feared the Moslems, and they had abandoned their homes in Pakistan and crossed over into India. In India there are perhaps eight or ten million such refugees—it might be millions more; no one knows exactly how many. Thousands of them came into Calcutta, the world's largest city, looking for food and homes. They slept in the streets. Wherever you went at night, on the main thoroughfares or in the alleys or in the hallways, you could see the human forms huddled together against the cool night. During the day they waited in lines for Government food or they begged.

Near the luxurious Grand Hotel in Calcutta was a child of 8 or 9, with not enough clothes to conceal the bloated, empty belly of hunger. He was looking in the streets for scraps of food. Nearby was a young woman of about 20, her body covered by the rags of what once must have been a handsome sari. A child of two was on her hip. The child was badly undernourished, and his head rested on his mother's shoulder. His face was empty and expressionless. I also saw the hungry of Bangalore. They sat against the walls of buildings and waited.

Then I saw them in Delhi. There are more of the hungry and homeless in Delhi than in any other city in the world. As in Calcutta, many of them are refugees—maybe 500,000 or 600,000—and they have crowded into the city, setting up crude wood-and-straw shelters, most of them closet size. And every day the dead are carried out by men who are little more than half alive themselves. I stood on the corner of a busy street in Delhi and watched the refugees as they passed. Out of the thousands who passed by only two would be considered plump by American standards.

The Indians are reluctant to talk about themselves or about their hardships. I was able, however, to win the confidence of the attendant assigned to my room. He told me about his 6-year-old son, the one with tuberculosis. He said his son had been praying a great deal recently, much more than usual, and he had asked his son what he had been praying for. "My son was praying that he might die. He wanted to die and he wanted God to make him into a crow. I had told him about the crows that fly into the open windows of the hotel rooms and pick up food on the tables and then carry the food off. My son said he wanted to be a crow so he could fly wherever there was food and bring it back to our family."

Then the attendant, whose name was Arun, turned away from me and knelt down to fix the fire. "India has been hungry for many months," he said. "They are saying that America has known about this need and that America has not wished to send us food."

I replied that what he had been told was not true. What had happened was that we had been too slow in responding to India's need, and that was bad enough. Americans had to operate through their Government, and often democratic government is slow in doing what has to be done promptly. I asked him to believe that millions of Americans were deeply concerned and were prodding our Government to action.

Then he mentioned the report he had read in the newspapers about the American Senators who wanted to punish India, because India did not agree with the United States in the United Nations.

"It is true, is it not, sir, that we may not get the food because we do not say what you wish us to say?"

I had to think a little while before replying, because I wasn't too sure that what he had feared might not turn out to be true. Should I have told him that it might take many days before the wheat bill might pass during which time he would have to watch his youngsters continue to eat out of partially filled bowls?

Finally, I told him that there was no real answer to his question, except to say that we would do our best, our very best, and that the American people would be angry if any attempt were made to deprive other people of food because we might disagree with their leaders.

Arun finished making the fire and left. It occurred to me that what ought to be done was to take Arun to the United States on the very next plane and bring him before the Senate of the United States.

If the Congressmen don't want to give wheat to Arun and countless millions of his countrymen, then they ought to tell it to Arun directly. Let them answer Arun's questions—if they can. Let them hear about Arun's children and then tell him exactly why a nation which has a surplus of wheat does not feel that it wants to put politics to one side when peoples are starving.

Then, after telling Arun why he will get no wheat, let us finish the job. Let us recall the appropriation for the Voice of America and for all our information services abroad. Let us shut down all our efforts to combat Communist propaganda against us. There is no point telling our story to the world if there is nothing for us to say. All the Voice of America can do is to try to provide a real, true account of what is happening in America. What we say can and should be a reflection of what we do.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about the need to speak to peoples and not only to governments. The most powerful language in the world today is food. It is clearly understood. It builds bridges mightier by far than radio broadcasts or published material, especially when people have no radios or cannot read.

My purpose in coming to India was to try to tell the Indian people about America and to try to answer the many lies being told about us. Those lies are aimed at splitting America off from the rest of the world. Yet there is nothing Soviet propaganda can say about us that can do nearly the harm that we can do to ourselves if we should turn our back today not only on India but on the meaning of America itself.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, if we are to continue to avoid entanglement in a global war we must take full advantage

of the manpower available to us. Universal military training should have been passed in 1945. If it had been enacted at that time the manpower situation now would not be so precarious. It would not have been necessary to call 800,000 reservists to serve at this time.

If universal military training is passed, most of these reservists will be free to come home to their wives and children.

In answer to critics who charge that universal military training in France and other European countries tended to weaken those nations, the same does not apply to the United States because of its geographic position.

Universal military training would be an indispensable contribution to the avoidance of a global war and would be an indispensable need if such a war were forced upon us.

John W. Gibson, Chairman of the DP Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of our younger and most able executives in the Federal Government is the present Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission, Mr. John W. Gibson, a very dear friend of mine. Both by character and experience he is admirably fitted to serve our Nation in unusual and difficult posts.

The son of a coal miner who came to this country from Durham County, England, John Gibson himself entered the pits as a boy of 16. For several years he alternated working in the coal mines and in mastering arc welding in the automobile shops of Detroit. It was at this time that he became interested in workers' welfare and took special university courses in labor relations. For a time he was a union official for the United Dairy Workers Union, and later became secretary-treasurer of the Michigan CIO.

Between 1941 and 1943, Gibson was chairman of the Michigan State Department of Labor and Industry, appointed first by a Democratic Governor and reappointed later by a Republican Governor. After dealing with labor problems in various capacities during the war, he entered service with the Department of Labor in 1945, and became an Assistant Secretary of Labor in the following year.

John Gibson has had considerable success in conciliation work and often likes to refer to himself as a labor trouble-shooter.

He has shown much interest in the displaced persons problem since the end of the war and has often spoken publicly on the issues involved. He brings to his present task a rich store of knowledge and experience on the subject, which should enable him to make a worth-while contribution in the months ahead toward the solution of the DP problem.

I am placing in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of March 11, which already stresses a notable contribution by Mr. Gibson. It reads as follows:

TRAGIC PARADOX

This country is indebted to John W. Gibson, Chairman of the Government's Displaced Persons Commission, for removing the obscurity from the question of the impact of the Internal Security Act of 1950 upon the flow of displaced persons to this country. According to Mr. Gibson, there are approximately 100,000 persons now in Europe who wish to come here and who are otherwise eligible to do so but who are barred by the McCarran Act. They are barred because they belonged to civic, fraternal, labor union, military, or other organizations dominated by Nazi, Fascist, Falangist, or Communist movements, though their membership was only nominal or was forced.

Somewhat less than half of these 100,000 persons belonged to Nazi, Fascist, or Falangist dominated groups. Their problem would be solved and the barriers before them removed if the present Walter bill, passed by the House and pending before the Senate, were to be passed. Roughly 55,000 persons, however, Mr. Gibson estimated, are refugees from the Soviet Union and other Communist-dominated countries who have fled their homelands, often at great personal risk, because of their opposition to communism. These persons are specifically excluded from relief by the Walter bill and there is no present prospect for lifting the barriers that keep them out.

Here is surely a tragic paradox. Many of those whom the Walter bill would admit fought against us in the Italian or the German Army during World War II or otherwise aided the enemy war effort. Yet in this period when we are contending with communism, seeking to fan dissension in Communist-dominated countries, and hoping for defections from those countries, the Walter bill proposes to institute a discriminatory barrier which will assure that the great majority of those who have defected from the Soviet Union, for example, can never come here. It is difficult to think of how we could do more to discourage defection if we were to set about doing so deliberately.

Security and proper screening of would-be immigrants to this country are, of course, essential, but the discriminatory type of situation that will exist if the Walter bill becomes law can only hurt our friends and give comfort to our enemies. We should treat all anti-Communists at least as well as we do persons who helped the fight against us in World War II.

UMT and Draft Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following telegram be printed in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The following national organizations urge your support of Senate bill No. 1, as amended by House Armed Services Committee, including UMT and extension of draft in one bill.

National Guard Association of the United States, by Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, President; Reserve Officers Association, by E. A. Evans, Executive Director; Military Order of the World Wars, by Milton G. Baker, Commander in Chief; Adjutant Generals Association of the United States, by Maj. Gen. W. H. Harrison, Jr., President; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, by Charles C. Ralls, Commander in Chief; The American Legion, by Miles D. Kennedy, National Legislative Director; Disabled American Veterans, by Boniface R. Malle, National Commander; AMVETS, by Harold Russell, National Commander.

Unconventional Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker under permission to extend my remarks, I include an important address made on Sunday, March 18, 1951, over the Mutual Broadcasting System network by Gen. William J. Donovan, former Director of the Office of Strategic Services, for the Committee on the Present Danger of which he is a member.

These views of General Donovan should be read as widely as possible:

UNCONVENTIONAL DEFENSE

(By William J. Donovan)

Fellow citizens, I am speaking as a member of the Committee on the Present Danger, under whose auspices weekly Sunday evening broadcasts are being given on the peril that faces the American people and on how it can be met.

This committee is a bipartisan, nongovernmental group of citizens who have organized to work together as the Nation prepares to safeguard freedom.

The first broadcast 2 weeks ago was that of Dr. Vannevar Bush, a scientist of world reputation, and the second was that of former Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson. Others will follow this broadcast.

On March 4 over this network Dr. Bush told us (and now I quote his words): "We wish to avoid war * * * we wish to preserve our freedom and the free way of life. In a world where aggressive dictators are still at large, there is but one way to achieve these ends. That way is to be strong. * * *"

"The key to the matter is the A-bomb. The deterrent effect of our A-bombs is real, but we cannot count on its remaining fully effective forever. I trust we have time—time to prepare the defenses and avert war * * * but we do not have time to waste."

Last week Judge Patterson, speaking from his broad experience in high office during and after World War II, explained that the time will come when Soviet defenses against atom bombing will be more effective and a Russian stockpile of atom bombs will tend to neutralize ours.

For that reason he said our Nation's defense line must be in Europe. He stressed the imperative need of giving united support to General Eisenhower and told us that the unanimous judgment of our military leaders was, that only by joining with the free

nations of Europe can be build a sound defense.

Generally, nations make use of two methods for reaching the goal of their policies. These are: (1) The employment of skill in diplomacy; or (2) the use of violence by shooting in conventional warfare.

Both Dr. Bush and Secretary Patterson were speaking of defense by orthodox methods. Americans are accustomed to think of war in these terms. They picture traditional and organized forces with planes, marching troops, ships, guns, bombs, grenades, and guided missiles.

There is, however, a phase of war which is not shooting. It is irregular and unconventional. It uses weapons other than those of the military and its methods are as diverse as the situation requires. This is called subversive war and it has been waged and is being waged against the United States by the Soviet Union at least since 1945.

This kind of war may be defined as a war of maneuver by subversive means, short of involvement in open hostilities. In varying degrees this kind of war has been used through the centuries. Hitler and Mussolini took it, modernized the propaganda and fifth column activities, and used them in support of conventional operations. Stalin improved upon this by holding his Red Army as a threat, and employing his subversive maneuvers on the main field of attack.

The Soviet fifth column is different from the Nazi fifth column as we saw it in World War II. The Nazis had only small groups of adherents in the democratic countries and their espionage operations were limited. On the contrary, the Soviets make use of the fifth column and the Communist Party as an army of occupation. The Communists stress the tactical importance of the channels of public information, the infiltration into radio, movies, music, and other arts, and special effort is made to obtain Communist control of labor in key industries in order to disrupt a nation's economy.

The pattern of this program is found in its purges in southeastern Europe; its pressure even today upon France, Italy, and Germany; its activities in Africa and the Middle East; its masked guerrilla war in Greece; and its full-scale military operation in Korea.

In each target country, operations are directed by Moscow-trained leaders with a small but strategically well placed hard core Communist minority, ready to engage in sabotage and in partisan warfare.

To visualize the interplay of that kind of war, there is no primer where it is more simply described than in the White Book recently issued by Yugoslavia on the aggressive activities of the Kremlin against Tito. You will see there in detail the political forms of aggressive pressure all the way from breach of treaties to Soviet organization of Yugoslav deserters and terrorists to undermine the internal security of the country. You will see economic aggression in the obstruction of free navigation to Yugoslav vessels in the Danube and in the stoppage of railway traffic and postal service. You will see the pressure of espionage and terrorist action by the smuggling of spies and saboteurs, and finally military pressure by provoking border incidents and massing Hungarian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian armies on the Yugoslav frontier.

We have only just begun to grasp the special nature of Communist organization and methods. The real strength of the Soviets lies in their world-wide organization, highly developed techniques and communications and in the discipline of leaders especially trained in the Lenin School in Moscow.

All of this should teach us that we are faced by an enemy against whom we cannot lower our guard—a foe that is always alert—and ruthless—and tenacious. Against such a foe we must exercise sustained effort, perhaps for many years. Soviet tactics may change even to the point of temporary retreat, but the objective is always the same—a world empire.

Only by our understanding of the manner in which the fight will be carried to us will we be able to deal with it. We can't sit back and hope to be let alone. There is no place for complacency, or indifference, or fear—we can't buy our way out or dream our way out, nor should we be misled by seeming successes until we have totaled the score on a global scale.

We must win this subversive war. It is necessary to win it because in winning it we would have the edge in the shooting war, if that war should ever come. It is essential to win it because in winning we may make a shooting war impossible. Therefore, we must be strong enough to compel the peace.

For a period of many months to come we will be building up our military forces and turning out armament. During that period unless we take positive and affirmative action in countermeasures, the free nations can lose strategic areas and strong points needed for defense against military operations by the Soviet Union.

Let us see how one of these areas is already endangered:

An AP article March 15 states that the Soviet Union has been courting Iranian officials for 6 months with presents such as release of captured Iranian border guards and the signing of a $20,000,000 barter treaty.

Iran produces 6 percent of the world's oil. It is the most valuable of the non-American supply sources which serve the western nations. It is a vital strategic area and therefore a sought-after military prize. There has been open speculation on the possibility of a Stalin invasion and what we should do in that event. But why should Stalin run the risk of a shooting war? Instead he called upon Tudeh, the Soviet-controlled political party to lead a movement in the Iranian Lower House to nationalize the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., despite the fact that it is 53 percent British-owned and is operated under a concession that does not expire until 1993.

Watch the succeeding steps. Moscow has already paved the way to obtain a trade agreement, an agreement which could give her use and control of these British wells and refineries. If this cold-war tactic proves successful, Stalin will have outmaneuvered us again, without the necessity of taking over the Government, let alone of a military invasion.

Victories like this should teach us that it is nearly past the time to integrate our unorthodox resources as we have unified our conventional services. Economic political and psychological countermeasures, pulled together under centralized direction, with a well-conceived strategic concept and the recruitment of the best brains and most courageous spirits can be of great assistance as a counteroffensive in this war, whether we call it hot or cold.

Today the way to prevent a war is to put aside our own fear and create fear in the minds of our enemy. Dr. Bush has told us that Stalin can be deterred from waging a total war by his fear of the atom bomb. Stalin might be equally deterred by the fear that he cannot determine in advance the loyalty of his own people. For no dictator dare move if uncertain of his safety at home. It is well to keep in mind that our greatest ally can be the Russian people.

More than 2,000 years before either the atom or the hydrogen bomb was known, Demosthenes wrote the following:

"Shame on you Athenians * * * for not wishing to understand that in war one must not allow oneself to be at the command of events, but to forestall them. You Athenians are the strongest of all the Greeks, in ships, cavalry, infantry, and revenue, and you do not make the best of them.

"You make war against Philip like a barbarian when he wrestles—if he suffers a blow, he immediately puts his hand to it. If he is struck again he puts his hand there too; but he has not the skill or does not think of parrying the blow aimed at him or of evading his antagonist. You, likewise, if you hear tell that Philip has attacked the Chaeronea, you send help there; if he is at Thermopylae, you run there; and if he turns aside you follow him, to right or left, as if you were acting on his orders. Never a fixed plan, never any precautions: you wait for bad news before you act."

Thus Demosthenes, the Greek orator, in the fourth century B. C. speaks from Athens to the people of America in 1951 this message of warning we so much need today—that we, in our present danger, must not wait for the bad news of enemy action against us before we act to defend ourselves.

Genocide in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years occasional reports have been filtering through from behind the iron curtain of the mistreatment of Jews in Soviet Russia, the annihilation of Jewish cultural life and religious activities, the closing down of Jewish schools and the press, and so forth. It seems that every trace of organized Jewish life in Russia has been wiped out, and this concerns a community of several million souls.

A very prominent Jewish national organization in the United States, the Jewish Labor Committee, has now brought this matter to the attention of the United Commission on Human Rights as a case involving spiritual and cultural genocide. The fate of the Jews in Russia is assuming alarming proportions, the more so since it is almost impossible to ascertain what is actually taking place in that unhappy land and whether the Communist persecution of a minority is limited only to cultural and religious matters or also extends to physical extermination of the Jews.

As for those who are hasty in their judgment of a whole people because of the misdeeds of a few individuals, I can refer them to the current treatment of the Jews in Russia. No better commentary or reply is necessary.

In this connection, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial from the Jewish Advocate, of Boston, March 29, 1951, which reads:

WHAT OF SOVIET JEWRY?

The question of what has become of the Jews in Soviet and satellite countries was brought officially before the international tribunal of the United Nations Human Rights Commission last week. A delegation of the Jewish Labor Committee, consisting of top leaders of the labor movement, including David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union; Joseph Baskin, general secretary of the Workmen's Circle; and Adolph Held, chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee, presented a memorandum on the spiritual and cultural "genocide" suffered by the Jewish people in the Soviet Union and its satellite states.

The memorandum, a bulky document based on evidence collected by agents of the Jewish Labor Committee in Communist countries, made certain definite charges and asked specific questions.

According to official Soviet reports, there were 3,000,000 Jews in Soviet Russia in 1939 and some 2,000,000 more were added since World War II. What has become of all these Jews physically and culturally? asks the memorandum. Not a word has filtered through from behind the iron curtain about them for nearly 2 years. It is true that little is known about most other national minorities in the Soviet Union, except what is contained in the official Communist press, but Soviet Jews now lack even this official mention for there is not a single Yiddish newspaper in the whole of Soviet Russia; not a single Yiddish book has been published during the last few years, and not a single act of cultural, literary, religious or artistic activity has been reported on in the Communist press, indicating the existence of any kind of a Jewish group life in the entire country. It is as if the entire 5,000,000 Jews have disappeared culturally and spiritually.

This, the committee rightly considers, is very disturbing, suspicious and even alarming. For until 2 years ago, it was a prominent feature of Soviet propaganda to stress and even to boast of its Yiddish schools, theaters, books, writers, and cultural activities. The committee, therefore, asks: What has become of the network of 1,500 Yiddish schools of which the Soviet press boasted until recently; of the Yiddish Art Theaters, whose fame resounded throughout the world? Where are the newspapers, books, clubs, and social institutions which make up a cultural life? Above all, where are the people who for years had conducted these activities? Where is the group of fine Yiddish novelists, poets, dramatists, and writers whose names have become classics in Yiddish literature and who used to figure so prominently in all Soviet propaganda? And what has become of the famous Crimean colonies; of the so-called Jewish Republic of Biro-Bidjan and of the other specific Jewish social, political and cultural efforts of more than a generation of Jewish life in Soviet Russia?

From these questions the committee easily passed to charges and accusations of spiritual and cultural annihilation of the entire Jewish group in Soviet Russia and made a specific demand of the United Nations to start an investigation, with public hearings similar to those on slave labor, in order to unravel one of the great mysteries of the period and to ascertain with more or less certainty what actually happened to these Jews.

The Jewish Labor Committee, while raising the problem of Soviet mistreatment of the Jews to an international level, also limits it to cultural and spiritual persecution and discrimination, which makes the charges more plausible, more specific and more certain of the sympathy of the entire civilized world, including even parts of the pro-Communist world. It would be futile and it would recoil against the initiators of the effort, if this new move against the Jews were to be compared with the Nazi genocide attempt to exterminate the Jews physically; but a type of genocide effort it nevertheless is, one which seems to work all too effectively, and the Jewish Labor Committee is fully justified in trying to draw the attention of the world to it.

Senate Bill 1, an Act To Provide for the Common Defense, History of Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the present bill before us, S. 1, has two main purposes. The first purpose is that of providing for an extension of selective service and to this purpose there is no real opposition at the present time. The second fundamental purpose is to provide for universal training and service, and to this purpose there is strong and active opposition.

Of course, the history of draft legislation is well known to all of us. The first draft bill in modern times passed by the Congress, was the draft act of the First World War. Again in the course of the Second World War, the draft was put into active operation, but the first peacetime passage of a draft law in this country was immediately before the Second World War when the House Military Affairs Committee reported to the Congress a bill invoking selective service in anticipation of the military needs of the country as we approached the obvious eminence of war.

Universal military training in this country is not a matter of recent origin or discussion. Shortly after the end of the First World War, patriotic and service organizations and leading exponents of a strong national defense, urged the early adoption of a system of military training to give our country a strong military posture. It was not, however, until the establishment of the Woodrum committee, headed by that able former colleague of ours now gone to his reward, Cliff Woodrum, of Virginia, that Congress took official recognition of an argument which had been waged in this country through more than two decades. I was a member of the Woodrum committee and I attended most of its sessions which ran for 3 or 4 months daily, hearing arguments and assembling information as to universal military training. Its report is available to Members of Congress at the present time.

Following the end of the Woodrum committee hearings, the old House Military Affairs Committee held one or more extensive hearings on the same subject and as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I sat through these hearings also. In fact, the House Military Affairs Committee voted out a bill which, however, was never favorably approved by the House of Representatives.

The present bill, S. 1, represents the result of extensive hearings of both House and Senate. These hearings have extended over a period of many weeks when military leaders and civilians were heard either for or against the present measure. Heretofore the House has taken the lead in handling this type of legislation, but in this instance the Senate has acted upon universal military training and sent the measure to us for our consideration. Our Committee on Armed Services reported the measure favorably with only three opposition votes to it.

MANPOWER IS OUR GREAT PROBLEM

Mr. Speaker, manpower today is our great problem. National defense requires the service of many, many persons. As national defense is set up today, it in effect requires the full response of a Nation in time of crisis or of war. This has produced a strong need of manpower. The anomalous situation is that 10 years ago this country had a population of 132,000,000 people and an unemployment load of 15,000,000 persons. There were those at that time who were loud in proclaiming that this country had reached the saturation point in population and that there would always be a a surplus of persons in our midst.

In a few short years, our population has increased to 153,000,000 people and in the same time the employment situation has completely reversed itself. At the present time, there is an extreme shortage of manpower. This shortage has gone into the labor market to bring into use women in employment and many jobs heretofore jealously guarded by the male segment of our population are now made available to trained women personnel so badly needed by this country in crisis. The shortage in agriculture workers has reached the point where we are extending our program of bringing hundreds of thousands of Mexican laborers into this country for the purpose of helping grow and harvest our farm crops. I saw official figures given by the government recently to show that at present over 63,000,000 persons are employed in the United States, an all time record for employment. Yet all of this is not enough. It does not relieve all of our present problems.

We are in a world crisis and in this crisis we are seeking by this legislation to put our defense house back in order. From a position of military preeminence in 1945, we fell quickly into a position of military impotence. A great machine put together for the successful waging of World War II, disintegrated so rapidly as soon as fighting ceased as to cause the Nation to rub its eyes in wonderment as to whether it could be so rapid and so complete. We are now engaged in the difficult job of providing the Nation with a well-balanced Military Establishment of 3,500,000 persons and at the same time, we are engaged in a program of reinforcing our Army, Navy, and Air Force with needed implements and machines for the conducting of modern war. We, therefore, find our machine shops, lathes, and factories competing with the armed services in their efforts to obtain the needed personnel.

Because of this, our committee presents to you a program for the extension for 3 years of the program for the drafting of military personnel by selective-service means. There is no alternative to this if we are to make an honest and faithful effort to give to our country reasonable national security.

It is a sad chapter in our national defense history to read of the failure to develop a proper Reserve program. George Washington, our first Commander in Chief, warned that the duties of defense fall upon the militia, meaning all able-bodied men of the Nation. In spite of repeated warning from the birth of this Republic to the present day, our Reserve program has been sadly neglected. For the first time this bill will provide the fundamentals for the organization of such a program.

Under the terms of the bill men from 18 years 6 months to 26 are subject to induction and service, not to exceed 26 months. Under the terms of this measure these men are subject to a total of 6 years active and reserve service. When a period of active training and service is completed, these men are referred to the Reserves. They may go into the National Guard or into the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard Reserves. They will then no doubt be placed in organizations and assigned definite duties depending upon their previous training, education, aptitude, and locality. The program will then have to determine what part of these men will be put in organized units and Congress will have to provide the money for them.

I personally believe that out of 1,100,000 men reaching the age of 18 years 6 months, some 550,000 or 600,000 will be immediately available for training under the provisions of the National Security Training Corps. The difference is represented by those who are weeded out due to mental or physical deficiencies and disabilities, by those deferred for educational and occupational reasons or who are granted hardship deferments or discharges. Many of these men will subsequently come into training and service as reasons for the deferments are eliminated. While the Security Training Corps may begin with 550,000, in time it may reach a peak of 700,000 or 750,000, and in the overall set-up there should in time be 3,000,000 men in the Reserves. If the number becomes greater than Congress wishes to provide the funds for, under regulations, those furthest removed from training and service can be discharged from the active Reserve. This can be done by regulations.

During the course of this debate already universal training has been repeatedly referred to as an alien philosophy by those who would defeat this proposal in this bill. They refer to this as an alien doctrine imported from the Old World into the New.

These people who would wreck the UMT proposal fail to heed the history of this country and the facts of this case. It was General Washington, the Father of our Country, who suggested many years ago that the burden of defense of a country falls properly upon all of the militia, meaning all of the male citizens of this country. Through the years our leaders interested in our security have urged the need for an extensive program of national defense based upon the use of a militia, both organized and unorganized, and in recent years, since the organized militia has been turned into the National Guard, they have urged universal military training. Leaders, such as Dr. Connant whose reputation as patriotic Americans and educators of international reputation, after making most careful studies of the proposal of universal military training, have repeatedly urged the adoption of such proposals.

More than that, every patriotic organization in the country has gone on record in favor of UMT, which the opponents have dubbed "alien philosophy." If it is an alien philosophy to follow the recommendations of great patriotic organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, then I am willing to rest my case on these recommendations from them. On the contrary, rather than being an alien philosophy, a system of providing for universal training is more nearly democratic than that system which provides for selection of only a limited number of people upon whom the whole burden of defense may fall.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

The fundamental question which must be resolved by this House is whether or not we are to have a universal military training and service program? I think it is most appropriate that this matter should finally, at long last, come before the House for a vote. The country has waited many years for us to stand up and be counted on a controversy which involves the safety of the Nation.

Years ago I become interested in a program of universal military training. In fact, I introduced several universal military training bills at the request of the American Legion. I became interested in the universal military training program because of my deep and abiding interest in the Reserve program. I believe also that the burden of defense of the Nation should not rest upon a selected group of individuals called upon to carry the full burden of defense responsibility. I have always entertained the view that the obligation of national security should rest as far as possible uniformly upon all members of the male segment of our population within certain active ages. I, therefore, have supported, and do now without reservation support, S. 1, and especially the provision relating to universal training and service.

I have devoted much of my time while in Congress to work on the Reserve program. In my judgment, it has never been what one would call an adequate or a satisfactory program. The Navy Reserve program has been fairly satisfactory in the past and at least there has not been the friction observable in the Navy Reserve program as has obtained in the Army Reserve program. The Air Reserve program is of short history and during the time when it has been in operation it has been changed and reorganized one or more times because of difficulties and objections to the prevailing program.

The coming of the First World War found us without any Reserve program whatsoever. We had to start from scratch, enlisting first by voluntary means the needed manpower for our Army and Navy. We followed this belatedly with a selective-service law which was in full operation before the war ended.

The coming of the Second World War found us with a makeshift Reserve program. Even before that many of us had urged that a more adequate Reserve program be built up to implement the provisions of the National Defense Act relating to the Reserve Establishment. In spite of this fact, when the Second World War came, we found that we had a National Guard in varying states of readiness numbering 350,000 men and had a Reserve wholly inadequate and without personnel, training, or equipment necessary. In fact, the Reserve program, outside of the National Guard, consisted largely of Reserve officers, and when the War Department called all of the Reserve officers to active duty, it found that this call produced only 110,000 available, physically fit officers of the proper age. This call of 110,000 completed the activation of the War Department Reserve program.

With the coming of the crisis in Korea, we found ourselves with a Reserve program numbering roughly two and one-half million persons. This Reserve included the Army, National Guard, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Of this two and one-half million persons, only 900,000 were on a pay status. The others were largely inactive or volunteer Reserves serving without pay and without regular training. The Congress began at that time to appropriate roughly $1,000,000,000 per annum for the Reserve program, but this money included the ROTC as well as the other parts of our Reserve program. To date roughly 30 percent of our total National Guard has been called into service, consisting of about 80 percent of the Air National Guard, and four divisions of the Ground Guard, plus two regimental combat teams of the National Guard. At the time Korea broke upon a peaceful world, the Navy had the largest active Reserve Establishment which totaled 1,200,000 persons. At the present time almost the entire Marine Reserve and almost the entire Enlisted Reserve of the Army has been called into service.

Mr. Speaker, during the time that I have remained in the House of Representatives, I have always exhibited a real, active interest in our Reserve establishment. As a result of this fact, I believe more than any other person, I have received criticisms, suggestions, and advices as to the handling of the recall of our Reserves into active service. I have literally received thousands of letters from Reserves from all over the country, protesting induction into service and asking that the burden of defense be made more universal. Many of these men are veterans with years of active war service. Thousands are men with families who have for the second time within a short period left their homes, their families, and their businesses to fight for the security of this country.

Many of these men are Organized Reserves; but they feel in many cases that others upon whom the burden of national defense has not yet fallen should be called upon to do their part. Many of them are men with hardship cases; and they have gone patriotically to do their duty the second time for their country within a few years. Thousands of these men are what are called inactive Reserves; and they are men without training as Reserves, without uniform, without organization, and without pay as Reserves. They were certainly led to believe that they would be called to the colors only after the Organized Reserves; and they feel that they should be used again only in the case of an all-out war. Not a mail comes to my office which does not bring new appeals from these men, many of whom are in far-off Korea.

I believe firmly in rotation. I believe in liberalization of the burden of defense. I believe in equity and fair treatment. I believe that these men have a case; and that they are entitled to come home after a reasonable service. The provision of this bill as written will give these men hope of an early return to their homes and their families. I submit these men have a right to life and home just as much as others who have not carried the full burden of American citizenship. We cannot have a satisfactory rotation policy without legislation. We must have this bill.

Under the terms of this bill, our men upon reaching the age of 18½ years would enter the Military Establishment. They would then replace those who are presently serving with long tours of duty in the present Korean war and during the Second World War. They would then do their part in the defense of this country. There would then be equity and fair treatment in the handling of the military burden.

Heretofore, our theory of the duty of the Reserve was to be available for call out in the case of an all-out war. Few of them contemplated, as they year by year worked actively in the Reserve program, that they would be called to Korea or to other parts of the world in times such as this. They were willing to go when the all-out needs of the country demanded. They were willing to grow older, acquire responsibilities, businesses, and families under these conditions. They are not going now to stay in this program.

Many of these men tell me that they will not continue in the Reserve program once they are out of service. They tell me that they are not satisfied to carry the entire program. In fact, I have not heard of a single one who has said that he will continue voluntarily in the Reserves after he serves a second time in the active establishment.

We here in the Congress are going to wake up some morning and find that we have no Reserve personnel. We are going to find that the program upon which we have spent so much time and to which we have given so much lip service has dissipated as a mirage in summer. We are then going to look around and find ourselves stripped of our national defense except the Regular Establishment filled with cadres from the Reserves with long years of service, and with men from selective service.

Our Reserve defenses are getting into bad shape, and our hope of bringing them up to par again is to work out a new Reserve program, one which will bring new blood into the program and which will be fair to those who participate in it. This bill holds out these hopes for the future.

Here we are in the midst of a world crisis. We are face to face with Communist aggression; we are beset with troubles in the Far East and in Europe. Every few months, a new crisis appears, threatening to engulf the world again in war. Sinister and sadist influences fan out from the Kremlin; and seek to enslave the world. I doubt that any more loathesome and despicable doctrines have ever been carried on the winds of propaganda which sweep the world than those which emanate out of the Kremlin, and at this moment we find our reserve defenses in a wretched condition.

Oh, you may try to place the blame for this condition on first one cause or the other; but regardless of who or what brought this about, we are dealing with a fact—an accomplished fact—and only by treating with the existing condition can we hope to meet this situation.

We must establish a sound program of building up and maintaining a sound reserve. We can do this by establishing universal military training, which will be the vehicle for supplying the men for this strong reserve.

But if we choose to defeat UMT—then we must depend upon our veterans; or we must continue to induct men for service, followed by required service in the Reserve.

In that respect, I must say that I am somewhat amused by some of the arguments that I have heard against UMT. I have heard that it will destroy democracy; I have heard that it will corrupt the morals of our youth; I have heard that this proposed bill is an unholy alliance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the bill before us today is an unholy alliance, then the Selective Service Act of 1940 was a Judas kiss, and the 1948 act is the ethereal spirit of Benedict Arnold, because it will come as an awful shock to some people to learn that we had substantially this program by a different name on the statute books twice since 1940. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the 1940 act inducted men for service and then provided that they be put into the Reserves for 10 years; and the 1948 act inducts men for service and provides that they serve in the Reserves for 5 years.

And, in both the 1940 act and the 1948 act, this so-called awful military bastille, the Pentagon, retained complete control over the training and the Reserve assignment.

It is time the opponents of this bill realized that the provisions of this bill provide for civilian control of the universal military training features of the bill.

And, if we do not adopt this bill, we will have to continue drafting men for service for the indefinite future. For those who distrust the men we have selected to lead our Armed Forces, I say this, the bill before you today places universal military training in the hands of civilians; but if we compel the drafting of men for service for an indefinite period by defeating this bill, we will be forcing the Nation to maintain a large military force under the complete control of the military leaders, and at a tremendous cost to the Nation's economy.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about this—the American people will not permit this Nation to become weak during these perilous times. They will demand protection, as they have the right to demand, and that protection will either be a large standing Army, or an adequate, well-trained Reserve. We propose the creation of a strong Reserve—constantly maintained by freshly trained men who have completed a period of 6 months of universal military training. Our proposal provides security. It provides security at far less cost than the maintenance of a large standing force. And it provides security with far less disruption of American lives. Which do you prefer: Keeping our World War II veterans on active duty and drafting men for 26 months of service; or a system by which young men can be trained for a short period of time and then returned to their communities for normal peacetime pursuits and a reasonable Reserve obligation?

I suppose it is natural for a general and an admiral to want to command more and more men. I have even known Congressmen who have wanted to enlarge their constituency. But it seems to me that we ought to pause here for a moment and consider just what UMT means to the generals and the admirals.

As the size of our Reserve increases, the size of our standing forces will decrease. That is the economic justification for UMT. And, let us give credit where credit is due. As the size of our standing forces decrease, the need for general officers and increased rank decreases proportionately. No, Mr. Chairman; instead of criticizing our military leaders for favoring UMT, I think it is time we gave them the credit that is their due.

UMT has also been called a foreign ideology. I never knew that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other patriotic organizations sponsored un-American ideas. It is the first time I have ever heard Dr. Conant called un-American. It has surprised me to hear that George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison embraced a foreign philosophy. And, contrary to all of the laurels that have been heaped upon him, it is the first time I ever heard George Marshall accused of favoring the destruction of democracy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people are thinking far ahead of some of the opponents of this bill. I believe the American people, being realists, want preparedness. I believe they want universal military training. And I, for one, will support this measure without reservation. If it is undemocratic to favor national security, then I answer the charge of being undemocratic; if it is un-American to favor UMT, then I answer the charge of being un-American; if the proposed bill is a shotgun marriage, then I can think of

no better honor than to be the best man; if this bill is an unholy alliance, then the preservation of freedom and liberty is grim mockery.

Let those who oppose preparedness now, as they did in 1940, and again in 1948, explain their actions to posterity. For me the course is clear—preparedness now or disaster later.

India's Food Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Washington Post of April 2 contained a very fine editorial urging the Congress to act and to act now on the proposal to extend emergency food aid to India. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA'S FOOD CRISIS

Congress ought to stop dilly-dallying with the President's February 12 request for emergency action to cope with the mounting food crisis in India. The longer the necessary legislation is delayed, the more acute will grow the threat of famine. By the same token, the easier it will be for subversive Communist forces to capitalize on the accompanying unrest in the great Asian subcontinent.

As pointed out by the President in his February message, India's 1950 food crop has been sharply reduced by earthquakes, floods, droughts, and locust plagues, with the result that 6,000,000 tons of grain must be imported this year. The Nehru government has arranged for the cash purchase of four million from Canada, the United States, Australia, and several other countries. It is hard put, however, to finance the remaining two million, which apparently can be procured only from us.

To meet this critical situation, the President has recommended to Congress that it promptly authorize shipments to cover the 2,000,000-ton deficiency, but that it appropriate—in the form of an outright grant—funds to cover just half of the total, with India paying all the ocean freight charges. As for the question of financing and supplying the remaining 1,000,000 tons, action would be deferred pending additional study. Further, as far as conditions are concerned, the Nehru government would undertake to distribute our aid fairly, keep the public fully informed as to its source, and employ the proceeds from its sale to help improve the Indian economy with the assistance of a special mission from our Economic Cooperation Administration.

But the President's request—which he has just described as urgent in a new appeal for congressional action—has bogged down in the House. Although approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee, it has run into a road block in the Rules Committee. Some members are opposed to the idea of a grant. Others want the proposed aid conditioned on a new commodity agreement with India. And more than a few are inclined to be hostile because Prime Minister Nehru—whose efforts to walk a neutrality tightrope between the free West and the Soviet Union have led him to make some pretty muddled statements—is in disagreement with the United States over Red China and how best to stop aggression in Asia.

But while Congress hems and haws over issues of this kind—and while Moscow and Peiping reportedly are making good propaganda for themselves with offers to send small supplies of food—the specter of hunger looms larger and larger for many millions of Indian men, women, and children. Famine does not wait on legislation. As the President has pointed out, prompt action is vital. It is vital because summer will bring the monsoon season to India, and many roads will then become impassable for grain shipments to remote parts of the country.

Thus, from now on, every day that Congress fails to deal with this matter will increase the difficulty of heading off starvation conditions in India. The House and the Senate, if they are going to act favorably at all—and it seems inconceivable that they will not do so—ought to act now. Our humanitarian traditions, the simple rules of Christianity, demand as much. Beyond that, our own self-interest is directly involved, for the consequences of an Indian famine could gravely affect the security of this Nation and the entire free world.

Pity the Poor Retailers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been hearing from retailers and their organizations as to the hardship and complications incurred by the new pricing regulations.

One of the newspapers in my district, the Edison-Norwood Review, covered some of the retailer's trials and tribulations in their editorial of Friday, March 30, which follows:

Washington has again hit the small-business man with a new price regulation order called ceiling price regulation No. 7. This instrument is designed to establish fair mark-ups and in its way, curb inflation.

The new regulation will need a Philadelphia lawyer to interpret its meaning and figure out how it is to be complied. A local merchant has had a qualified man working full time for 3 weeks compiling the data for his store. The man has spent over 100 hours and is now half done.

Another merchant stated that he would have to close his store in order to fill out the regulation on time.

Meetings have been held in Park Ridge and many local merchants have attended them in order to acquaint themselves with the requirements. After three meetings they stated they didn't understand it any more fully.

Why does a Government agency have to be so complicated, why are things made so hard that the people for whom they are intended can't understand them? Most retailers want to do a good job and follow the regulation.

If the Government continues to make ceiling-price regulations so difficult that they are not understood, then they will not be followed.

It can be summed up from a quote from another small-town paper:

Jefferson (Ky.) Jeffersonian: "Pity the poor retailers as they tackle the tape that ties together the big bundle of price-control regulations. 'O, simplicity, thou art a jewel.'"

The Responsibility of the United States in Building a Stable World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "To Regain the Peace Initiative," written by me and published in the New York Times magazine of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO REGAIN THE PEACE INITIATIVE

(By HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.)

After an American writes an article or makes a speech or persuades a group to adopt a resolution, he feels that he has accomplished something real—and rightly so, because we live in a country in which words are important. Words matter in America because ours is a government in which public opinion underlies all our public-policy decisions. Words matter also because ours is a government of laws in which due process, and not the whim of an individual dictator, counts.

Perhaps this American faith in words explains the fact that our most frequent error in foreign relations throughout the years has been our tendency to believe we have accomplished something in international affairs merely by uttering words and then proclaiming our agreement with them. The ineffectiveness of such proclamations becomes painfully clear when we reflect that the most powerful nation outside of the United States is not moved by public opinion, and authority in that nation rests on the whim of the dictator rather than the due process of impartial law.

This overreliance on words has in many vital international undertakings caused us to put the cart before the horse. In the United Nations Charter, for instance, we subscribed to an all-embracing commitment to repel aggression wherever, whenever, and under whatever conditions it might occur, regardless of the lack of military force without which aggression could not be repelled, let alone prevented.

This is undoubtedly the rock on which the United Nations is most likely to founder—and the aggression in Korea very nearly did wreck it. Should another aggression occur and should once again the rank and file of member states of the United Nations fail to put up military manpower in proportion to their populations, the faith of the American people in the United Nations will fall to a new low.

We read of "victories" at Lake Success for the American viewpoint, but it is not much of a "victory" for the United Nations to vote 54 to 5 in favor of our position when the only result of the vote is to permit us—and a few other stalwart nations—to expand

our own manpower. As a United States delegate to the United Nations, I was frequently reminded that it was only fair for the United States to make a large financial contribution to the United Nations because we had more dollars per capita than any other nation. To this truth must be added the far more poignant truth that our manpower per capita is no greater than that of the other nations of the world.

When, therefore, we consider the world role of the United States, we would be wise to ask, "What can we do?" before we ask "What should we do?" Such an attitude would at least mean that whatever decision was finally made would be a valid decision with a practical hope of success. In conformity with unhappy tradition, many of us still argue foreign policy by trying to divide the American people into globalists, internationalists, and interventionists on the one hand and retreatists, nationalists, and isolationists on the other. Actually it would be far more fruitful to argue on the basis of what we can or cannot do. If our potential is clear, our course will no longer be obscure.

When we think of the world role of the United States, there comes to mind the picture of a great powerhouse from which huge cables extend to engines in distant parts of the world. The force of the current flowing through these cables, the very length of the cables themselves, and the size of the engines in foreign lands all depend on the amount of power which the United States powerhouse can generate.

National power is not a fixed quantity. A nation, like a man in a rowboat on a river in front of a float, is either going backward or forward; he is never standing still. Nor can national power be measured like so many yards of cloth; there is too much stretch to it. It certainly cannot be measured by population, since people in some countries are much more productive than they are in others. It cannot be measured by natural resources—whether agricultural or mineral—because these have to be converted into usable goods. The best measure of national power is production. The trump card of our national defense in World War II was our productive power. Thus the first requirement for a successful American role in the world is big production.

This is, in truth, the lifeblood of our economic influence abroad. But this is not all. Without big production, we cannot have other forms of national power such as scientific development, which is of such great international importance, notably in atomic and medical fields. Without it we cannot have military power, which gears itself to industrial production and thus to the economic strength of the entire civilian community.

Without it we would lose our ideas of political freedom, which can only exist in a climate created by a competitive and productive economy. These are the ideas which give life to the whole system and, in essence, are that for which we fight. While military power cannot exist without big production and cannot exist without men, the basic truth is that men will not be effective fighters without an affirmative and enthusiastic faith in their country's institutions. This they will not have if the pressing social problems which our competitive economic system in some instances is not able to handle effectively are not solved by public action.

The world role of the United States, therefore, regardless of social justice or of ordinary liberal or conservative political philosophy, requires policies which stimulate production. These may take the form of tax laws which encourage the little man with the bright idea who is fundamentally the source of new jobs and new wealth, or keeping the dollar constant and requiring economy and efficiency in Government, which will maintain economic health and make production attractive.

And this same American role equally calls for social action that meets whatever pressing problems are not solved by our competitive, free-enterprise system. There must thus be certain standards of living—of health, of security, of housing, and of civil rights—so that the young men who come out of American homes will be enthusiastic for American life as they actually know it. On no other basis can American Armed Forces be constructed. American political leadership must thus demonstrate by deeds that our society has dynamic purpose, which, in the words of the Constitution, is "to establish justice"; and that we really believe the words which we all learn in school, "that all men are created equal."

These are some of the things which make a strong American potential, which provide the energy for the American powerhouse. If America is not strong, she cannot have an effective world role. Without an effective American world role, the free world is in danger.

Let us assume a powerful America and face the questions of how to use our potential and how to determine our responsibilities as a member of the family of nations. The aim of American foreign policy, which must also be the aim of the free world, is: To preserve peace, and if the struggle against communism should turn to war, to have effective partners.

We, therefore, should help to build a stable world. This does not mean a static world. Ideally speaking, it connotes rapid yet orderly progress. It requires a multipurpose effort and before we can really set about it we must first regain the initiative which we lost in 1945, when we so imprudently disintegrated our Armed Forces which had won us the victory, and lost the chance to create a lasting peace.

The first step is to build military strength both at home and abroad, which we have started to do. Secondly, based on our productive power, we must build economic strength abroad. We must also, in the third place, conduct a really effective campaign of information which not only gives the truth about America and the free world but which will be part of whatever promising counterrevolution for freedom there may be. Underlying these programs is the one rule in foreign policy which applies without exception—that all programs be on the basis of "continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid." These words, taken from the North Atlantic Pact, are "the law and the prophets."

1. In the military field this obviously means: A maximum effort in the most efficacious manner by our allies in the Atlantic Pact; by the former neutrals and former enemies of World War II; and by the stateless men in all parts of the world who wish to make their military contribution to the defense against Communist imperialism.

Perhaps our greatest military weakness as a Nation is in the quantity of our manpower; due to the requirements of production only a comparatively small residue is left for the armed services; of this residue a large part goes to highly mechanized branches, such as the Navy and Air Force, leaving a relatively small number for combat troops. In this regard we ourselves must always do our full part and never accept foreign help as a substitute for our own effort. But obviously we must welcome any supplement to that effort, whether it comes from allies in their own uniform and under their own flag or from aliens who fight as individual allies in our uniform and under the Stars and Stripes.

2. In the economic field the Marshall plan shows what great things can be accomplished when the principle of complete self-help and mutual aid is applied. We cannot stop economic aid now. A revolution is under way in the world, particularly in the East. Less-favored nations will not stand still and be content with the low living standards of the past. The agents of communism have their greatest success in countries in which poverty and disease prevail.

These conditions cannot be met with military power—or with propaganda. The young American doctor, with his capacity to cure diseases, and the young engineer, with his knowledge of irrigation and electric power, can discharge a vital American responsibility, which will pay immense dividends in peace for ourselves and the world.

As General Eisenhower said:

"Communism inspires and enables its militant preachers to exploit injustices * * * among men. This ideology appeals not to the Italian or Frenchman or South American as such but to men as human beings who become desperate in the attempt to satisfy common human needs. Therein it possesses a profound power for expansion. Wherever popular discontent is founded on group oppression or mass poverty or the hunger of children, there communism may stage an offensive that arms cannot counter. Discontent can be fanned into revolution, and revolution into social chaos. The sequel is dictatorial rule. Against such tactics exclusive reliance and military might is vain. The areas in which freedom flourishes will continue to shrink unless the supporters of democracy match Communist fanaticism with clear and common understanding that the freedom of men is at stake; meet Communist-regimented unity with the voluntary unity of common purpose, even though this may mean a sacrifice of some measure of nationalistic pretensions; and, above all, annul Communist appeals to the hungry, the poor, the oppressed, with practical measures untiringly prosecuted for the elimination of social and economic evils that set men against men."

Much can also be done by an overhaul of our own economic policies to end the present economic dependence of foreign governments on the United States Treasury. In this respect it is easier to say what is wrong than to point unhesitatingly to what should be done. But the following observations are perhaps useful; the old system of congressional tariff-making was dangerous and evil and must not be revived; the present system is based on a conception of reciprocity which does not actually exist; there are probably foreign goods which could be admitted without danger to American industry; the new overhaul should be truly national in scope and must not result in a few industries carrying a destructive and unduly heavy burden caused by tariff changes.

As an integral part of this overhaul, our agricultural policy should certainly be revised so that farm prices are not kept so unrealistically high as to push overseas farmers into uneconomic plowing of such crops as cotton and wheat, thus reducing United States export of these items.

Paul Hoffman shows that agricultural products have comprised 24½ percent of all United States foreign trade and entire areas in the Southwest Cotton Belt and various wheat States depend largely on foreign customers. He adds that if we believe—as we should—that the mainspring of free enterprise is to expand production by means of high-volume output at low unit cost, we must be troubled by the deadening effect on American agriculture which comes from reversing this process. The Commodity Credit Corporation in 1950 held billions of dollars' worth of surplus grains, eggs, butter, soybeans, and other products which it is either forced to continue to hold or to dump—a procedure which angers the foreign farmers and causes their governments to retaliate.

The harmful effect of such policies on the American consumer is all to clear.

3. We seem to lag behind in the campaign of information and the total political campaign of counterrevolution of which this campaign should be a part. Perhaps one reason we lag is that we have not seen it in its true perspective. When we speak of the "war of ideas," we tend to think in terms of radio broadcasts, printed matter, and the exchange of students. These are all obviously very good things and should be done intelligently and, if done intelligently, should receive adequate funds.

But there are undoubtedly many millions of people in the world whose ideas are much more influenced by being cured of hookworm or by receiving some much-needed food or by converting some desert into land from which they can live. There are undoubtedly many more millions whose ideas will be much more effectively influenced if we can end their fear that either military strength or political guile will make them satellite peoples. There are still many more millions, who are now behind the iron curtain, who will be much more influenced by help in organizing an efficient underground, either in the form of parachuted radio sets, of actual individual helpers, or of any other concrete activities necessary to advance a real counterrevolution for freedom.

Certainly no counterrevolution was ever successfully fomented from outside of a country solely by the use of a broadcasting station. This last is perhaps another example of our reliance on the power of words.

These activities will, if successful, regain the initiative for peace which we lost in 1945. We are justified in believing that, without fighting a war, the Soviet leaders, confronted with such force, will agree to the organization of the peace based on justice which they now spurn. But, of course, if war should come, the policies herein outlined will help us to win the war.

It is natural and human, when we are so clearly on the defensive, to think solely in terms of that defense and to refuse to discuss the day when the arrow of strength points from us to them. But we must, none the less, start planning now the broad policies which we and our partners will favor once we have regained the initiative. We must not be caught once again with a victory on our hands and no mature idea of how we intend to use it. Some broad aims to be achieved after we have regained the initiative are:

1. To establish a reliable program of international inspection and control of atomic activities and conventional armaments on which real disarmament must be based.

2. After halting the present lawless aggression of the strong against the weak, to encourage the freedom-loving elements in all the satellite countries to become members of the free world on an equal basis.

3. To pursue every effective means to give greater strength to the United Nations, urging a special session of the General Assembly to amend the United Nations Charter, as proposed in the Vandenberg resolution of 1948, so that we may actually profit by the bitter experiences which we have recently had, and thus build a truly effective world organization which is based on realities and which cannot be paralyzed by members who actually want to destroy it.

4. The complex of military, economic, and political policies herein described should result in an improvement in the standard of living in the poverty-stricken and disease-ridden areas of the world, notably the East, which will eventually free them both from the suspicion which they now have of the motives of the United States and from the Communist clutches.

5. It should result in the creation of a really strong complex of European peoples—a regional organism which can function efficiently in its own defense, even though it may not be a full-blown United States of Europe.

With the help of providence and an effort which is both vigorously sustained and intelligently led, we might see the sharply defined shape of these five broad aims within 10 years—and without a war.

Thus will be ended the present highly dangerous condition in which there is no balance of power in the world and the United States must carry such an undue part of the load of preserving world peace.

Thus can we start looking for the growth of a common sense of justice on which closer collaboration between peoples can be based.

Thus will we, inspired by the dreams of our founding fathers and doing our share, of course, to keep the peace, be free once again to pursue our own American ideals because there will at least be other strong people to carry a major part of the load.

Thus will an advancing world be able to benefit by our American Revolution, which Lincoln called the "germ which has vegetated and still is to grow and expand into the universal liberty of mankind."

Moral Disarmament and the Propaganda of Chinese Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, last year in the Senate I compared the propaganda war now raging throughout the world with a vast political campaign. I was therefore particularly interested in an editorial titled "Moral Disarmament" in the March 24 London Economist. This editorial says:

No local politician, however inexperienced, is so foolish as to think that he stands a chance at the polls without the aid of an active party machine. There is no reason why foreign ministers should be more optimistic in the international contest that is now on. A permanent machine for western political warfare should be created, and, once in action, it must be used for firing incessantly into the enemy's ranks.

The editorial concludes along lines recommended in a resolution I submitted to the Senate last year, on which hearings were held by the Foreign Relations Committee. The editorial calls for a North Atlantic political warfare executive, and points out that in political warfare the western nations have, in freedom and truth, two potent weapons which the Communists cannot copy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this penetrating editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed a column from the same issue of the Economist entitled "The Propaganda of Chinese Communism." This column shows what we are now up against in China. It was Russian propaganda which softened the Chinese peoples for the marching Communist armies. It is propaganda today which is being used to keep the Chinese people whipped up to the task set for them by their new Red rulers. This column points out how the Communist speakers of China "proudly proclaim that the most concrete and best contribution China could offer to universal peace at this time is in fighting against American aggression in Korea." I think the Congress will be interested in other illustrations in this column, which parallel the policy pattern set forth in Moscow for Communist propaganda activities throughout the world.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORAL DISARMAMENT

Napoleon's maxim that in war the moral is to the material as three to one has been overquoted and overrated. But it has sane truth, and even in the midst of material preparations for self-defense, the moral campaign should not be forgotten. For a period of time, the length of which no one can foresee, both the free nations and the Soviet Empire face a test of the morale of their citizens. A continuous struggle will be waged for the minds of men, which will range across the frontiers between the two worlds. Political warfare will seek to weaken the resistance of the opponent as well as to strengthen the staying power of friendly populations.

Perhaps these phrases seem overdramatic when applied to Great Britain. Morale to an Englishman is something that only foreigners have—some of them have good morale, some bad. It is true that Great Britain's psychological defenses against political warfare are perhaps the strongest in the world. There are few Communists here, and even in the trade-unions, as an article last week pointed out, their influence, though by no means negligible, is small. But even in England Soviet political warfare should not be written off; the last 6 months have shown how many people will dance to a tune composed in Moscow who would be horrified to know that they are helping the Soviets win the cold war. And in other countries, with livelier imaginations and less fortunate pasts, political warfare can be all-important.

In this campaign the Russians have already secured the initial advantages that come to the party that is both organized and unscrupulous. They have in the World Peace Council, the body which directs the Soviet peace propaganda, an instrument for the moral disarmament of the West which is worth serious attention on account of the part which it plays in Russian strategy. There is some danger of underestimating the council, which recently held a conference in the Soviet sector of Berlin to deal in particular with the question of German and Japanese rearmament. On the face of it, the Berlin conference seemed to be just another gathering, under the sign of Picasso's preposterous bird, at which insults were hurled at America by the stage army of Signor Nenni, the Red dean from Canterbury, Mr. Kuo Mo-jo from Peking, a Soviet woman agronomist, a black African student, German proletarian poets, and Professor Joliot-Curie, in absentia because he had once again been refused a visa. Moreover, the council had mournfully to record that none of its previous demands to the United Nations had been considered by that body. And its latest set a resolutions look on the surface turgid and pretentious.

The council decided to send a last warning to UNO and to present itself as an alternative where the "people"—especially the people of the colonial territories—can air their grievances; it decided to organize regional conferences in France to oppose German rearmament, in India to oppose Japanese rearmament, in Mexico to oppose "Truman imperialism" in Latin America. It will seek joint action with pacifist societies, the Quakers and others, it will canvass the support of the churches, it will set up a propaganda office, start its own newspaper with M. Pierre Cot as editor, and award peace prizes worth 15,000,000 francs through a jury on which the Dean of Canterbury will sit. On the whole, it seemed the council might be dismissed as a talking shop.

There are, however, a number of reasons why such a judgment would be wrong. The first concerns the nature of propaganda in general. Mere reiterated talk with the object of hammering in one simple lesson is the basic method of all effective methods of influencing the minds of men en masse. Once external circumstances appear to accord with the propaganda, the simple slogans that have so often been half-consciously heard become an explanation of events and a guide to behavior. Specifically, the sudden threat of American action against China to counter Chinese intervention in Korea for the first time made large members of Europeans almost automatically conclude that the United States was a potential danger to world peace. At that moment, the Russian campaign scored a victory.

In the second place, the World Peace Council is relatively potent in comparison with western propagandists because it constitutes a branch of an organization. Lenin laid down, and Stalin has adopted the principle, that organization is vital, that once the "correct" policy has been decided upon by the party leaders, everything stands or falls by the extent to which a disciplined organization is in existence to carry it out. The peace campaign is no exception. Policy is laid down by the Cominform, which represents, in the language of capitalism, a holding company with two principal operating subsidiaries—the World Peace Council with the intelligentsia as its "market" and the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) to corner the labor world. In each case the directing brains are provided by the parent company working through the local Communist parties of the world.

All the Cominform branches have a special task allotted to them. The WFTU and subversive agents everywhere must create civil wars, strikes, mutinies, sabotage, and rebellion, and the World Peace Council must see that western governments do nothing about them. The basic aim of all is to bring about "revolutionary situations" in the western camp, following the Leninist tactic whereby the Communist elite preserves itself as a general staff, directing the masses into the front line without exposing itself to disastrous reprisals. Behind the peace campaign are the same revolutionaries who seized power in Russia after mutinies of the masses against an imperialist war, following years of underground subversive work. It is, indeed, one of the most disquieting features of the present situation that so much evidence offers itself to prove that the minds of Russia's aging rulers dwell so much on the experience of their early careers. They appear to be seized with a mortal terror lest any Communist at home or abroad should think that history is not precisely repeating itself down to the last dot of Marxist-Leninist theory and Stalinist practice.

The aim of the peace movement is, then, to aid subversion, not mere pacifism. Quakers and neutralists will be used, but Stalin demands positive actions. The World Peace Council met in Berlin with a directive from the Kremlin, conveyed in Stalin's recent interview with Pravda. It was to take action because, although war is "not yet inevitable," it can only be avoided if "the people's will" makes itself felt. To aid this process, the World Peace Council has two main tasks: The first is to prevent the United Nations from supporting the western powers if they take action to resist aggression, to subdue rebellions, or to arm the Germans and Japanese. The second, related to the first, is to foment the very actions which the western powers are to be hindered from resisting. A resolution at the Berlin conference revealed very clearly the importance which Moscow attaches to unrest in the colonial territories. It was also explained recently by a propagandist speaking to the Russian people. America, he said, would find it hard to start a war until the colonial revolts had been suppressed. In other words, the native rebels are to act as cannon fodder in order to give Russia time to complete its rearmament. This, according to Moscow, is the era of colonial liberation—of the attack on the "rear of the capitalist camp."

The democracies, therefore, are faced with the problem of combating a much more insidious attack than one launched openly by Communists for communism. They must meet an appeal not to do something unpleasant but—far more seductive—to do nothing. How should they best tackle the task? It is clear from the outset that no success can come of trying to overwhelm an organized campaign designed to win the educated masses of the world by an occasional address from an individual to individuals. Western statesmen, foreign offices and broadcasting services must rid themselves of the idea that to make an admirable, weighty rejoinder to Moscow's charges, and to make it once, is enough. If they find it difficult to grasp what is required of them, let them imagine themselves involved in a permanent international general election. No local politician, however inexperienced, is so foolish as to think that he stands a chance at the polls without the aid of an active party machine. There is no reason why foreign ministers should be more optimistic in the international contest that is now on. A permanent machine for western political warfare should be created, and, once in action, it must be used for firing incessantly into the enemy's ranks.

Next to the organization comes the policy. Successful propaganda needs a consistent theme, to be plugged on every occasion. And the theme, if it is to be really effective, must not be defensive. It is true that the Communist accusations of warmongering cannot be left completely unanswered. But much the best defense is attack, unceasing attack against the crimes of the Soviet imperialists. There should be a full-scale onslaught on the fraudulent, sinister peace campaign of the Soviet Union's rulers and their cynical misuse of the workers and colonial peoples. An unremitting attack should be made on Russian imperialism, with exposures of the inner contradictions (to borrow a Marxist phrase) of the neo-czarist camp. The point should be made over and over again that communism means economic exploitation, that its first victims are truth and decency, that it is a device for depressing the living standards of the workers.

In such propaganda there is no need to go beyond the truth—indeed, it would be both wrong and foolish to do so. There is plenty of perfectly truthful material to hand. The peace campaign itself has created difficulties for Moscow which offer many opportunities for exploitation. To take only one example from recent weeks, when Signor Togliatti, on his return from the Kremlin, announces that the Communist Party of Italy will drop its opposition if the Italian Government will only change its foreign policy, he provides an opening which should be seized at once until neither a patriot nor a Socialist can remain in the party with an easy conscience.

In material rearmament it is possible only to have larger numbers than the enemy of the same weapons as are in his hands. In political warfare the western nations have, in freedom and truth, two most potent weapons which the Communists cannot copy. But, like all other weapons, they need to be mounted, ranged, and fired at the enemy to produce any effect. That is the task to which a North Atlantic political warfare executive should be addressing itself.

THE PROPAGANDA OF CHINESE COMMUNISM

The propaganda of communism everywhere conforms to a pattern determined by basic Communist doctrine and theory of revolutionary method. A few essential themes are ceaselessly reiterated, though with a great variety of application, and the definiteness of the Communist objective, combined with the Communist exclusion of dissenting opinion, insures that there is always an effective concentration of publicity forces for a psychological offensive at any time, even though there may occasionally be moments of confusion when one of the notorious somersaults of party policy is taking place in Moscow. These general characteristics of Communist propaganda are evident today in China no less than in European Communist-ruled countries, but the Chinese propaganda output has some features of its own which deserve study.

The dominant theme is the task of preserving world peace by fighting the Americans, as laid down at the Second World Peace Conference in Warsaw, which was attended by a strong delegation of 65 members from China. The head of the delegation, the writer Kuo Mo-jo, thus reported to the Central People's Government Council:

"What were the circumstances under which the Second World Peace Congress was held? On the one hand, we have the aggression clique led by United States imperialism madly engaging itself in an armament program, intensifying its war propaganda, continuously threatening the world with atomic weapons and actively rearming Germany and Japan. * * * On the other hand, we have the invincible world peace camp led by the great Soviet Union, its strength greatly surpassing that of the aggression clique. * * * As was described by Chairman Joliot-Curie, the Congress was truly a real international council of the broad masses of the peoples of the various countries * * * the Congress tried its best to dissuade some of the 'pacifists at all costs' in order to achieve complete unanimity among the delegates on the over-all principle that 'to safeguard world peace, aggression must be opposed.' * * * We Chinese people are now engaged with great vigor in the sacred campaign to resist America, aid Korea, protect our homes and safeguard our country. This is what the Chinese people have done to carry out most faithfully and effectively the decisions of the Second World Peace Congress."

The war in Korea is thus presented as a struggle in defense of peace, in which China has not only the support of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies but also the backing of the World Peace Congress representing all the peoples of the world—in contrast to the United Nations, which is dominated by the American imperialists. Great efforts have been made to build up the Peace Congress in Chinese publicity as the true parliament of mankind. In the principal cities of Manchuria mass meetings were held and addressed by the delegates on their way back from Warsaw to Peking, and at the capital they were welcomed by General Chu Teh, the commander in chief of the People's Liberation Army:

"Speaker after speaker urged that a wide campaign be launched immediately to spread the message of the Congress throughout the length and breadth of People's China. They proudly proclaimed that the most concrete and best contribution China could offer to universal peace at this time was in fighting against American aggression in Korea."

Combined with this propaganda of the international struggle for peace is the anti-American hate campaign which lives up to the best standards of Communist invective:

"The American and Syngman Rhee butchers carried out a policy as utterly blood curdling as the worst perpetrated by the Hitlerite

Fascists. The war as exemplified by the MacArthur caveman in Korea is not a war between nations. It is a war between men and beasts in human form."

For those Chinese who still remember American philanthropic activities in China in the medical and educational fields, a special propaganda line is adopted:

"Through their economic exploitation the United States sucked the blood and sweat of the Chinese people and then hoped to buy off the Chinese people with a small portion of what they had squeezed from their toil. The United States imperialists specially intensified their cultural aggression against China with a view to spiritually benumbing the Chinese people. They made big investments to subsidize religious, cultural, and relief bodies in China. * * * But the United States imperialists are completely mistaken in thinking that they can really buy the hearts of the Chinese people with a few of their dirty, blood-stained dollars."

Although America is the principal target, British iniquity is not forgotten. A spokesman of the foreign ministry asserted 2 months ago that the "concentration camps" of Malaya were "filled with innocent overseas Chinese," that many Chinese had been "killed and tortured to death" in these camps, and that 400,000 had been made homeless. He demanded that the British Government "immediately put an end to the policy of persecuting and deporting overseas Chinese," release all those detained and pay them compensation for losses suffered. These demands were adopted in resolutions by youth, labor, and other federations.

Fortunately the people's government is able to assure the people that it has nothing to fear from the imperialist instigators of war. In the words of People's China:

"Efficient and brutal in killing peaceful civilians, levelling homes, devastating cities, burning, looting, and raping, the American troops have proved themselves impotent and even imbecile on the battlefield when pitted against patriots and democrats. * * * Alarm and despondency spreads among the American satellites. * * * Mistrust grows in the thieves' kitchen, and particularly mistrust between the United States and Britain and France."

The Chinese people, according to the argument, have for several thousand years been "in the front rank of world culture," but for the past century they were "ruthlessly oppressed" by the capitalist imperialist nations. But Chinese patriots "found the truth of Marxism-Leninism as a weapon to free the Chinese people." This has enabled China "to surpass the western capitalist nations ideologically, politically, and even militarily." With its Russian alliance China is now invincible:

"The alliance of the victorious Chinese people and the Soviet people is not only the alliance of the countries of the largest populations and territories in Asia and Europe; it is also the alliance of the most advanced and most consolidated countries. Therefore, such an alliance is matchless."

Letter From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Edward Menhennett, 389 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N. Y.:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *March 19, 1951.*

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I wish to thank you very much for all the legislation which you have introduced in the Congress of the United States.

I feel free to express my feelings concerning my friendship for you because you support the desires of your constituents who have placed their trust in you as their Congressman we all know.

This is true, you supported the Townsend bill in Congress, and may the good Lord bless you and that we may always keep you in Congress as long as you wish to stay.

I remain,
Most respectfully,
EDWARD MENHENNETT.

Another Marine Speaks His Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, another Marine speaks his thoughts as follows:

FORT WAYNE MARINE SAYS KOREAN WAR IS "USELESS"

FORT WAYNE, IND., March 29.—President Truman has received a letter from a Fort Wayne Marine lieutenant, serving in Korea, denouncing the Korean War as useless.

The letter was received by the editor of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel from Marine Lt. Gale C. Buuck, of E Company, Second Battalion, Seventh Marines, First Marine Division, who has been in Korea since January. The letter said:

"Will you please relay the following question to Harry S. Truman?

"How many years are you going to let American manpower, materials, and money drain into this Korean sewer? How many more of my men must die on account of your stubborn refusal to pull out of Korea? The undersigned dares you to take the following issue to the people:

"Shall we pull out of Korea?

"Some day you shall answer for this sell-out of American manpower and materials. Unfortunately, on account of you and your administration, most of the boys over here won't be alive to register their righteous wrath against this sell-out.

"Again the question, Mr. Truman, how long must we stay here in this God-forsaken hole of Korea?"

Lieutenant Buuck also sent the following note to the editor:

"I believe that you stand a better chance of getting this message to H. S. T. than I do. Do what you will with it but I had to sound off.

"I could write 20 pages on the utter uselessness of this war in Korea. All my men hope for two purple hearts, or a wound severe enough, which will make them eligible to return home.

"Two days ago, I lost over 50 percent of my men taking one hill—and for what? None of us know why we are here and none of us can understand why we stay.

"Never have American men fought in a more useless war. (At least, that's the way they feel about it.)

"Surely, someone back home ought to wake up Congress or somebody and get us out of here."

The News-Sentinel announced it had forwarded the letter to President Truman.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what he thinks of the sending home of 123,000 South Koreans and how many here at home are in doubt as to the cause of this war—its objectives—the things which our fighting men must accomplish before it is over.

Europe Sells Our Steel Back to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, press reports reveal that America has shipped to Europe more steel than certain countries can use. This is a strange anomaly, especially in view of the shortage which many manufacturers are experiencing. Some of the steel which we have shipped to Europe is pouring back into this country at exorbitant prices, a Government agency has admitted. Other steel of an inferior quality is being shipped to America from Marshall-plan countries which have found they can get a better grade of steel free from this country and sell their inferior products to us.

The Economic Cooperation Administration is authority for the statement that the Netherlands has been selling in America large quantities of steel given them under the foreign aid program. That country has been given so much steel that it has been able to invade the American market in which our own manufacturers have been unable to buy the specified steel at any price.

The ECA admits that other countries which are receiving steel under the ECA are not only selling some of it in American markets—they may be selling it to the iron curtain countries. A spokesman for the ECA explained that much of the steel sent to foreign countries had been sold to private operators who had stored it instead of using it for reconstruction purposes. Some of this steel had been stored since lend-lease days.

This situation was first called to the attention of the ECA when an Atchison, Kans., manufacturer paid premium prices for steel and then discovered it was stamped "Lend-Lease from U. S. A."

It seems strange that in our rush to distribute our resources all over the world, we should not find time to study the problems of other countries and place our gifts where they are needed, and where they will be used for the purposes for which they are intended. The merits of lend-lease and Marshall aid may raise debatable questions in the minds of some people. There is no argument, however, in favor of grants of aid to countries which do not need the materials furnished them and which by subterfuge attempt to gouge American firms through the sale of our products back to us at exorbitant prices. Some effective manner of preventing such injustice is the responsibility of those who administer our foreign-aid program.

Curbing Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach (Calif.)—my home town—Press-Telegram is a daily paper.

Its headline editorials for January 12, 1951, January 15, 1951, and February 28, 1951, are ones which I feel pleased to call to your attention and to that of all of my distinguished colleagues in this Congress.

They are as follows:

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of January 12, 1951]

NEW CONGRESS FACES CHALLENGE OF CURBING DANGEROUS INFLATION

Inflation faces the Eighty-second Congress with a challenging problem.

Immensely larger military outlays will be necessary. They may rise about $75,000,000,000 in the 12 months starting next July. Congress will not stint these appropriations. But authorizing heavy expenditures is easy. Financing them by methods that won't eat away the buying power of money that people receive for their labor is what will put political courage to the acid test.

The frightening fact about inflation is that it has occurred because the people thought it was inevitable.

Applied in time, price and wage controls could have stopped the spiral. But the authority Congress voted last August is defective. It actually forbids effective controls of farm and food prices. And only now is the Government setting up the machinery necessary for enforcing controls at all.

In 1951 inflation has gained alarming headway even before the forces that set it off in 1941 really have begun to operate again. But this year will witness a rapid acceleration of those forces. Government spending for rearmament must be vastly increased. That, inevitably, despite our tremendous productive capacity, must mean fewer goods and services for the civilian market.

For whereas the defense program of 10 years ago started from a depression, this one starts amid a great boom. The labor force is almost fully employed. Most industries are operating at or near their plants' capacities. The national income in 1951 is expected to be more than two and one-half times what it was in 1941.

This country cannot produce enough guns to insure its safety in a threatened world, and at the same time, enough butter to increase, or even maintain, its people's present living standards. If a swelling supply of dollars chases a shrinking supply of things the people can spend them for, disastrous inflation will result. They are quite right who say that price-wage controls alone cannot prevent it. Nothing can prevent it unless other stern measures counteract the tendency of huge defense spending to increase the already vast supply of consumer cash and credit.

Chief of the weapons that should be used is taxation. Still higher tax rates on individuals and corporate incomes; taxes on purchases; taxes enough to pay as you go the costs of the defense program and of Government.

Restrictions have been imposed on consumer and business credit. They should be further tightened to keep income not yet earned from joining money already circulating in the competition for scarce goods.

A companion weapon is rigorous economy in Government, an economy that will slash drastically spending on all ordinary projects and activities, cuts that will fully match the sacrifices demanded of the people.

Taking such steps is the duty that confronts the new Congress and challenges its courage.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of January 15, 1951]

WHO SHOULD FOOT DEFENSE COSTS?—INCOME STATISTICS SAY EVERYONE

President Truman's request for $140,000,000,000 for lending and spending in the 2 years ending June 30, 1952, emphasizes the gravity of the international problem and this country's relation to it. The request also raises the question of how the costs of this program will be divided.

Notwithstanding passage of two tax measures and imminence of a third, Washington has not yet faced up to the question of who will pay for rearmament, just as it has avoided making many another hard decision since last June. Yet it is clear that if a slow, protracted erosion of United States currency is to be prevented, the cost must be wrung out of today's toil. As 1951 wears on, the piper will grow increasingly importunate. He must be paid. Experiences during World War II and afterward have shown he had best be paid promptly.

Who is to foot the bill? One good measure of ability to pay is the statistical record of national income. From that single gigantic purse must be taken the bulk of the taxes needed each year to defray Federal expenses. In the September quarter of 1950, the United States was earning at the rate of $240,000,000,000 a year (before taxes), or roughly $4,800,000,000 a week. Of this amount, $145,000,000,000 was wages and salaries. Individual proprietors, such as small-business men, professional people, landlords, and farmers, gathered in $45,000,000,000. Corporate earnings retained totaled $25,000,000,000. Dividends were $9,000,000,000 and interest $5,000,000,000.

These figures speak volumes. They prove that business alone, even if it were to sacrifice every penny of profit, could not begin to support rearmament. Military spending in the coming 2 years is apt to be around $70,000,000,000 a year. The most business could contribute to this is $34,000,000,000. And, in that unhappy event, what would become of the unprecedented program of industrial expansion mapped out for 1951, most of which will be financed by retained earnings?

More than this, the figures reveal unmistakably that the heaviest part of the load will have to fall on wage earners, salary holders, and individual proprietors. Together, these groups receive more than three-fourths of the annual national income. Inevitably, they face the necessity of bigger income and excise taxes, and stiffer credit controls, if the United States is to pay as it goes.

Support for this thesis has come from the Council of Economic Advisers which in its fifth annual report to the President, noted: "The total amount of wages available for spending cannot, in real terms, rise in accordance with cost of living and annual improvement formulas. It certainly is not too much to ask that wage earners in general forego efforts to increase their living standards at a time when the economy simply cannot produce more civilian goods and also carry the heavy burden of rapid rearmament."

The curbing of farm prices is one thing which the wage earner regards as necessary if he himself is to make comparative sacrifices, and this should be done by Congress immediately. The wage earner regards the cost of food as the unerring barometer of his well-being. He will not supinely watch it rise—still less will he incline to sacrifice—when his grocery bills are racing skyward.

If the economy of this country is to stand up under the cost of rearmament, every American—and there can be no exception—must make sacrifices of money and luxuries.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of February 28, 1951]

EACH STAGE OF INFLATION CYCLE CREATES PRESSURE FOR CONTROLS

Necessity for widespread military preparedness to protect this Nation and for assisting the peoples of other countries to build their own defences against the threat of a Communist Russian dominated world is hardly open to question.

But unless these objectives can be accomplished in a way that preserves the financial integrity of this country and basic incentives of its free enterprise system, the United States will as surely have lost its American heritage as if it had been taken from us by military defeat.

Some indication of the extent of inflationary developments in recent years is provided by the fact that today the dollar will buy only 59 percent as much as it would in 1939. The burden of this depreciation in the dollar is unevenly distributed.

Obviously, those whose incomes have remained more or less stationary in dollar terms have suffered severely from the inflation of prices.

Inflation penalizes the traditional American practice of individual savings which have provided the capital to finance development of the Nation's resources. Billions upon billions of dollars in savings have had their purchasing power whittled away by inflation in recent years. Since 1939 the sum of the annual savings laid aside from year to year by the American people in form of private insurance, United States savings bonds, savings and time deposits, and other forms of liquid savings is approximately $180,000,000,000.

However, if each year's savings were discounted to allow for the depreciation that has occurred since they were set aside, total loss in their purchasing power would amount to roughly $44,000,000,000. Similarly, since 1939, the investors in the United States savings bonds alone have suffered an erosion in purchasing power of $13,000,000,000 out of $49,000,000,000 of principal and accrued interest they accumulated in this medium of savings.

From time to time the Government has justified its policies of holding interest rates at artificially low levels because of the importance it attributes to keeping the cost of interest on its tremendous debt at a low level. It has, of course, been frequently pointed out that it is only by inflationary credit policies that low interest rates have been maintained. In this connection, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that while the Government has saved on interest it has lost many times over, due to inflation.

The Government is paying a terrific toll in higher cost of its functions. For example, during the years 1947 through 1950, the Federal Government will have spent a total of $161,000,000,000 in cash payments. Of this sum roughly $92,000,000,000 will have been spent for purchase of goods and services in

which the element of price inflation can be identified clearly. If it had been possible for the Government to buy the goods and services represented by these $93,000,000,000 of expenditures at the average prices prevailing in 1946 instead of those prevailing in the years of actual disbursement, the Government would have saved approximately $16,500,000,000.

The relationship between inflation and socialism is closer than is generally appreciated. At every step in the inflationary process new distortions arise and new pressures are created for Government to "step in" with a new set of controls designed to rectify the difficulties, real or imagined, in which one group or another of the economic body finds itself.

Thus the risk of inflation may be used for an excuse for assumption by the Government of responsibilities beyond its capacity to discharge, except by diffusing and obscuring the real causes through further inflation.

Kentucky Baptists Oppose Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. W. O. Carver of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary of Louisville, Ky.:

THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Louisville, Ky., April 7, 1951.

The Honorable DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SHORT: I am writing especially to express appreciation of your leadership in the effort to prevent the use of the present emergency in the conflict between the United States and Russia as leaders of the opposing forces in the tragic division of human life today, to bring about the further solidifying of the movement toward military domination of our country. The emergency is being used, as you well know, to try to fasten on us permanent universal military training for our youth. Current developments make it entirely clear that no such universal conscription is necessary even for the emergency, to say nothing of establishing UMT as a permanent policy in American life. We are in imminent danger of having the entire Nation put in subjection to a military hierarchy, to employ a very apt phrase found in an editorial of the Courier Journal recently.

I am in position to appraise with a good deal of accuracy the feeling in my own section. I can say quite positively that relatively few of our people realize that the bill now under consideration does involve setting up a permanent policy and not merely meeting an emergency which we hope may be resolved within a few years.

No matter what the promoters of this program may think about it, its success would inevitably move definitely toward totalitarian control; toward the militarizing of the thinking of our people; and toward the destruction of that individual freedom which is the basic principle and factor in the American ideal.

You are rendering a great service to our ideals, our history, and our future in the leadership which you are now providing. May the efforts which you and others are making be rewarded with success.

Sincerely yours,

W. O. CARVER.

Let Us Not Kill Incentive—27½ Percent Depletion Allowance Should Not Be Reduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there is under consideration now a reduction in the 27½ percent yearly depletion rate allowed for income from oil-producing properties as provided under the present Internal Revenue Code.

This reduction would seriously curb the oil industry and discourage experimental drilling for the purpose of developing new sources of oil at a time when we need to increase our supply of oil for the defense program. The maintenance of the oil resources of this Nation is vital to our national security, and we should recognize this fact when considering any proposed reduction in the present depletion allowance for the oil industry.

The provision for depletion allowance was originally provided by act of Congress some 25 years ago in recognition of the fact that, to assure an adequate supply of oil for this Nation, for each barrel of oil produced another must be found, and drilling for oil is a hazardous business undertaking which involves financial risk.

At the present time the oil industry accounts for 3 percent of the national income, but produces 7 percent of all taxes, which indicates that the oil industry is already paying more than its portion to taxes.

From the facts there can be no sound reason for decreasing the depletion allowance for the oil industry at this time. We need all the oil we can produce in view of the critical world situation, and we must encourage the development of our oil resources to the maximum.

The California State Legislature recently passed the following resolution urging the Congress to refrain from any action which would reduce the present depletion allowance on oil-producing properties, and I fully agree with this resolution:

Assembly Joint Resolution 22

Assembly joint resolution relative to continuing the 27½ percentage depletion rate for oil-producing properties in the Internal Revenue Code

Whereas committees of the Congress are considering a reduction of the 27½ percentage yearly depletion rate allowed for income from oil-producing properties as provided by the Internal Revenue Code, section 114 (b)(3); and

Whereas any reduction would decrease incentive for oil exploration, reduce reserves at time of emergency, cause shutdown of marginal wells with a consequent irrecoverable loss of oil, and cripple the program for expanded emergency production; and

Whereas a percentage depletion is the only just method of avoiding a tax on return of capital which is expended on experimental drilling (60 percent of which proves unprofitable); and

Whereas the present income-tax laws penalize a taxpayer who produces oil from a well, in that tax advantages would result if he sold the well immediately after discovery, or held it for over 6 months, the tax on the gains being respectively limited to 30 percent and 25 percent; and

Whereas the percentage depletion of 27½ percent does not fully make up for this vice; and

Whereas the depletion over the years can never exceed the actual amount of capital expended by a taxpayer; and

Whereas the oil industry accounts for 3 percent of the national income but produces 7 percent of all taxes, and any reduction in depletion allowances would further burden an industry paying more than its portion to taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to refrain from any action which would reduce the present depletion allowance on oil-producing properties; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California.

Missouri Farmers Oppose Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Mr. H. E. Slusher, president of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

This is a great organization, and though we differ at times on public issues I am happy that they have approved my position on the present draft and UMT bill.

The letter follows:

MISSOURI FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Jefferson City, Mo., April 6, 1951.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHORT: If the House and Senate have not definitely made final disposition of S. 1, which provides for universal military training, and H. R. 2811, I hope you will give careful consideration to the plans as outlined in H. R. 3364 (BARDEN, of North Carolina). This new bill certainly conforms more nearly to the policy of the American Farm Bureau Federation and that of our Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

This bill provides (1) for the elimination of universal military training provision, which we feel at the present time is both unnecessary under the present draft law and would entail an enormously high cost for administration; (2) it raises the age limit to 19 years; (3) there would be only 24 months of service required; and (4) the ceiling on the number of troops would be left to the discretion of the selective-service program. Furthermore, it shows a definite date of termination to the operation of the law, which to us seems rather fundamental if we are to keep this Nation from becoming a militaristic nation.

We recognize that it is very difficult at a time like this to escape the impact of an emotional appeal which will be brought upon us as a result of the present Korean situation. I sincerely urge that you consider the question from the standpoint of what is best for the United States over a 10-, 15-, or 20-year period.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. SLUSHER,
President.

P. S.—Thanks for all the good work you have done on this question.

H. E. S.

Letter of Clayton C. Edwards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said in the debate regarding universal military training as to the position of the rank and file of members of the American Legion. I have recently received a communication from Clayton C. Edwards, commander of the American Legion, of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, which I feel would be of interest to the membership of this House. I am therefore inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Commander Edward's letter, which reads as follows:

APRIL 1, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOW: I was very happy to read accounts of your stand on domestic and foreign policy, and I wish to say I have talked to hundreds of people on these questions and I will say that 98 percent are agreed on the following:

No American troops to Europe, or only on a voluntary basis, believing that an American youth is entitled to have the right to say whether his life should be given in defense of Europe or in defense of America, and we do not associate Europe's defense with the safety of America in spite of the warmongers and their propaganda.

I am in favor of air and sea power aid to those of Europe who are willing to defend their own land and who wish our help.

Not in favor of the 18-year-old draft or a huge land army.

Do not favor any increase in taxes, but in favor of cutting down Government bureaus and using this money for the defense of America.

In favor of impeachment of Truman and resignation of Dean Acheson.

We think George Marshall has passed the time of usefulness to our Nation and his judgment is not being based on the best interest of the people of America.

His errors being too costly and following too closely the dictates of an unseen Government; as an example, his appointment of Anna Rosenberg, whom we do not have any faith in, regardless of the clean bill given by the Senate committee.

I am the county commander of the American Legion of Tuscarawas County, and these questions have been discussed in our meetings.

Now a big question now being discussed is Korea. Knowing the administration has no desire of establishing peace in Korea, as that would diminish the size of the emergency club being held over the American people, for the purpose of extracting huge sums of money to build up their huge political machine and further their socialistic plans. Who can the people look to for peace? It looks more and more that the people themselves will have to take that matter in their own hands and see that their will is carried out by those who are supposed to represent them. The administration so far has seen fit to ignore the people's wishes, and we feel they will continue to do so unless we stop it.

Yours truly,

CLAYTON C. EDWARDS,
Tuscarawas County Commander of the American Legion.

Those Unfilled Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in further support of the data I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, last, outlining the deplorable situation that has developed in our Veterans' Administration hospitals, due to the shortage of medical, dental, and nursing staff, I would like at this time to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Roanoke (Va.) World News of April 6, 1951, under the caption "Those unfilled veterans' hospitals."

THOSE UNFILLED VETERANS' HOSPITALS

According to Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, Democrat, of West Virginia, there are six Veterans' Administration hospitals completed and equipped that have no doctors and no patients. They are standing idle at vast cost to the taxpayers, with no benefit whatever to veterans.

Congressman BAILEY should know. One of these hospitals, gradually coming into use after months of idleness, is located in his home town of Clarksburg. Another is not too far away, in Beckley.

As Mr. BAILEY tells it, they had a field day in Clarksburg last December when Administrator Carl R. Gray, Jr., dedicated the Clarksburg Hospital. He had dedicated the Beckley institution the day before. Each had cost about $8,000,000. Thousands of people viewed the 200 patient beds, the 900 rooms, the latest medical instruments, and the spotless operating rooms. A month or so later there were only two things missing: They had no doctors and no patients. A month later there were two doctors at the Beckley Hospital but still no patients. The two hospitals cost about $12,000,000. Maintenance comes to about a million dollars a year.

Congressman BAILEY told the House of Representatives recently that the 140 veterans' hospitals in operation at the present time, there is a shortage of 234 members of the medical staffs—that 6 completely equipped hospitals had no medical staff and cannot be opened for the benefit of veterans. Several months after completion, the Clarksburg Hospital had about 150 employees—none of them doctors—and the Beckley Hospital, a staff of 160 with 2 doctors.

The Veterans' Administration has indicated that hospitals will not be opened for patients, even for emergency cases, until each has at least 8 full-time doctors. It would prefer not to operate until there are 12 doctors available.

William J. Barnhard, writing in Tax Outlook, says the Nation's taxpayers have never been niggardly in their treatment of veterans. Even veterans with no service-connected disability have been well cared for in veterans' hospitals. In fact, according to the record, over two-thirds of all veterans' hospital bed patients have been treated as non-service-connected cases.

It is estimated that the Government will spend more than $800,000,000 on hospital and medical care for veterans during the fiscal year beginning July 1. How much of that will go to projects similar to the empty but fully equipped hospitals at Beckley and Clarksburg has not been estimated.

Beckley was the twenty-third and Clarksburg the twenty-fourth building completed in the current program which aims at 75 new hospitals and hospital additions by 1956, with a total of 131,000 available beds, including 80,000 for non-service-connected cases. Yet Administrator Gray has admitted to a Senate committee that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to staff the number of hospital beds now authorized. In many instances the unfortunate choice of site, far from any important medical center, bars specialized assistance and expert treatment required in many cases.

Stop Gerrymandering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement which I submitted to the House Judiciary Committee on April 2, 1951, with reference to H. R. 2648, which seeks to stop gerrymandering of congressional districts:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOURTEENTH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, ON H. R. 2648, TO REQUIRE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS COMPOSED OF CONTIGUOUS AND COMPACT TERRITORIES IN THE ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement to you in support of H. R. 2648.

There can be little doubt that gerrymandering is merely a modern adaptation of the old, rotten borough system. It is not democratic and tends to destroy the democratic process. H. R. 2648, if enacted into law, will go a long way toward carrying out the intent of the founding fathers, as expressed in our Constitution. It will tend to provide fair and equal representation. There can be no justification for having one Member of the House of Representatives elected to act for 600,000 people while other Representatives, elected out of the same State, may represent districts with as few as 200,000 people.

Unless the Congress will perform its duty, as required of it by the Constitution, by the enactment of H. R. 2648, the States will continue to ignore and violate the injunction of the United States Constitution for equal representation. I urge your favorable consideration of this bill.

Let me take this opportunity to commend your chairman and members of your committee for their devotion to duty in this and other matters.

Generating Electricity by Sun Heat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the entire country was taken by surprise when President Peron of Argentina intimated that the scientists of that country had developed a process of generating electricity, or atomic energy, with sun heat. It seems to me that Mr. Peron's scientists were trying to make use of a development which the scientists of this country announced many years ago—that of developing electricity with heat from the sun.

As we move forward into the electric age and note the wonderful progress that has been made since Edison invented the electric light—the incandescent lamp—70 years ago, we are prone to take more seriously the astounding suggestions of the marvelous developments that lie ahead of us. Here is one of the most astounding propositions that has ever come under my observation, that of generating an unlimited amount of electricity by the heat of the sun. If it proves a success, it will mean the production, not of billions of kilowatt-hours, but of trillions of kilowatt-hours of electric energy every year.

In a report made by Dr. Charles G. Abbot, of the Smithsonian Institution, in 1939, it was stated that one of the Southwestern States "could supply from solar radiation over 10,000,000,000,000 horsepower-hours per year of mechanical power, which compares with the power possibilities of all coal, oil, and water at present used annually for heat, light, and power combined in the United States."

I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Abbot, of April 5 of this year, stating that the electric energy that can be produced on one square mile of the arid area in the Southwest would amount to "nearly a million horsepower per square mile." That would mean anywhere from one to three billion kilowatt-hours. If electricity can be generated from the heat of the sun and properly stored, as Dr. Abbot suggests in his letter, it will mean the real beginning of a new day in the use of electric power, the like of which we have never known, and of which most of us have never dreamed.

Remember that when Thomas A. Edison was working on the development of the electric light the leading scientists of the world were ridiculing him, as many of them no doubt are today ridiculing Dr. Abbott and those other scientists who have joined him in this program to generate electricity from the heat of the sun.

The year I came to Congress the people throughout the United States used only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. Last year, 1950, they used a little more than 329,000,000,000, or almost 10 times as much as was used 30 years ago.

Thirty years ago not even 3 percent of our farmers had electric lights in their homes. Today approximately 90 percent of the farm homes of this country are electrified.

If this program of generating electricity from sun heat and storing it for use the day round and the year round could be developed, it would bring about as great a revolution, in proportion, as did Edison's invention of the electric light—the incandescent lamp—which made possible the use of electric power for all purposes for which it is employed today.

At this point, I am inserting Dr. Abbot's letter of April 5, which I trust everyone who reads this RECORD will take the time to read. The matter referred to follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1951.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: As you request, I put the substance of our phone conversation into a letter.

The southwest part of the United States has a very large percentage of cloudless sky. There is a region in Nevada, California, New Mexico, and Arizona where some 150,000 square miles of contiguous desert has an annual rainfall of 3 to 5 inches, and a percentage of 70 to 90 percent of cloudless sky. Other less cloudless areas are available.

The average intensity of the energy of sun rays in the clear sky in this region is about 1.4 calories per square centimeter per minute (5.2 B. t. u. per square foot per minute) equivalent to 1.15 horsepower per square yard, or nearly a million horsepower per square mile.

The devices shown in my patents No. 2,247,830 of July 1, 1941, and 2,460,482 of February 1, 1949, respectively, are computed to be able, in connection with the most mechanically efficient steam engines, to convert 15 and 25 percent, respectively, of the solar energy intercepted by their mirrors into mechanical work. The rectangular mirror, shown in Patent No. 2,247,830, is the easier to construct, but if wholesale production was in question, cheap means of producing the circular, more efficient, mirror of Patent No. 2,460,482 would be prepared.

At efficiencies such as these, if only one-tenth of the desert area above referred to were devoted to production of power, more than 20 times as much power could be produced from solar energy as is used for all purposes, heating, lighting, transportation, and manufacturing in the United States.

Three objections rise to the mind.

Firstly. The sun is obscured at night and in cloudy weather. Continuous power availability may be had by (a) storing heat in water at high temperatures; (b) storing electricity in storage batteries; (c) by electrolyzing water, storing the hydrogen (oxygen is available in the air), and burning it as power is needed.

Secondly. Power can hardly be efficiently distributed by electricity more than 500 miles. Solar power would, of course, be produced also in other States where cloudiness is not excessive. This would cause a movement of population, if solar power was depended on for manufacturing. Similarly, the cotton manufacture, formerly almost confined to New England, has gone to the South to be near the cheaper facilities. Power stored as hydrogen could of course be distributed, and to a moderate extent also in storage batteries.

Thirdly. Large mirrors would present their surfaces to winds. This limitation would perhaps hold solar power units to not more than 50 horsepower. This would require of circular mirrors a diameter approaching 50 feet. Many units could, however, be combined.

The cost of solar power comprises a return on the investment for machines and the cost of supervision and maintenance. The solar boiler, compared to an automobile or a sewing machine, or a typewriter or a computing machine, is far more simple, and if built wholesale would be very cheap. Little expense for supervision would be required, for the apparatus moves automatically to follow the sun. Maintenance also would be relatively inexpensive. It is impossible to estimate with certainty on these things until fairly large solar boilers have been built and tested. But I believe the cost of solar power in California would be less than the cost of coal power at the mines. Of course other areas are available, though less cloudless.

As yet, no engineering-scale solar boilers have been constructed along the lines above referred to. Workable models are on exhibition in the old Smithsonian Building in Washington, D. C.

In closing, I may remark that power was approaching a bottleneck in World War II; that at present a considerable supply of oil for power is imported, and subject to interruption by submarines in war. A power source in the desert, above referred to, would be immune to ships and, covering a wide area, would be difficultly interrupted by bombing.

The solar energy is produced in the sun by atomic processes which, so far, have not been available on earth. The fission atomic-energy production is costly and dangerous. It seems a pity not to avail ourselves of the enormous quantities of atomically produced energy furnished freely by the sun, without the dangers attending terrestrial atomic sources.

Yours sincerely,

C. G. ABBOT.

Exemption of Operas and Symphonies From Admission Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and letter:

STATEMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF HON. ALBERT P. MORANO, OF CONNECTICUT

President Truman has received a request from ALBERT P. MORANO (Republican, Connecticut), to support his bill to exempt operas and symphonies from Federal admissions taxes.

Mr. MORANO, in a letter to the President released today, pointed out that Mr. Truman's reputation as a lover of good music exceeds that of any previous President. His daughter, he said, has established herself firmly in the music world, and the First Lady, active in music circles, is well aware of the cultural need music fills.

The text of Mr. MORANO's letter follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was in the audience which shared with you and Mrs. Truman the wonderful experience of hearing Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, as rendered by the National Symphony Orchestra in Constitution Hall on Wednesday evening.

Fittingly, the inspiring choral symphony was dedicated to Brotherhood Week, for the message of this great work is: "All mankind shall join as brothers."

The visiting foreign ministers of 28 Western Hemisphere Republics surely shared our pride in witnessing the chorus of Negroes and other groups, joined voices in this theme. What better confirmation of the need for the continued advancement of such ideals as wrought through music.

Your reputation as a lover of good music exceeds that of any previous President. Your daughter, with her gracious personality and lovely voice, has established herself firmly in the music world. The First Lady is active in music circles, and well aware of the cultural need music fills.

Good music—the great common denominator between peoples—faces what appears to be insurmountable financial difficulties. This includes our great nonprofit symphony orchestras and opera companies, which cannot survive unless properly supported.

Therefore, I respectfully request that you support H. R. 2524, and that in your weekly meeting of legislative leaders, you urge them to enact this measure. It is a nonpartisan measure designed to assist these great musical organizations in their goal to bring the wonders of music into the hearts and homes of all, especially in these troubled times when understanding between nations and people can benefit from its common language.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT P. MORANO.

Immorality in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., on April 8, 1951:

It is not a very happy or pleasant subject which I have selected for discussion with you on this occasion but it is one which is not only timely but also which strikes at the very foundation and security of our Government. It has nothing to do with communism or Communists, with debts or high taxes, nor with war and conscription or any other of the manifold problems which confront the American people and perplex the Congress. Simply stated, it has to do with honesty and decency, morality, and character on the part of people in government or those dealing with government.

Recent exposures of several investigating committees of the Congress have brought to light a condition which is most discouraging and disheartening—political favoritism has reached a new low in our current history ranging all the way from petty bribery through the medium of mink coats and deep freezers to exorbitant and unconscionable profits to an extent which has brought the entire Government into disrepute and has shattered the public confidence in all public officials.

This condition is distressing and deplorable but it is not new in our history. In times past the people have found dishonest and corrupt public officials who have been promptly punished either through criminal prosecution or summary dismissal from their posts of duty. No such treatment of these corrupt officials now appears to be in the offing; instead, it is proposed that some commission be constituted which will establish a code of conduct for our public officials. That is the development which to my mind is far more deplorable than the fact of corruption itself. To think that we have reached the point in our national life when it is felt that a formal code of moral conduct is necessary to guide the work of our public officials is most distressing—a depth to which I doubt if our country has ever sunk so low. The tragedy of it is that the only solution to be advanced for the correction of this condition of depravity is the formulation of a set of written rules which will be framed appropriately and hung conspicuously on the wall of each officeholder from clerk to President in the naive belief that by doing this the evils will be corrected and thenceforth our officials and servants will perform honestly and honorably. Alice was never more fanciful in her Wonderland peregrinations.

Public office is a post of public trust; no set of formalized rules of conduct are needed. Printed principles of ethics do not make people ethical in their judgments or their actions; laws do not make people honest, they simply discourage dishonesty. Good men in public office need no set of rules, evil men would give no more attention to such a format than as though it did not exist.

Where, then, does the trouble lie that we find corruption rampant in government and that the mode of correction is the concoction of a set of principles which may or may not prescribe the proper attitudes of character which the lessons of the ages have taught to us? To be sure, initially the fault lies with the very persons who have provided the basis for these disclosures of impropriety as well as those in office who through some purpose known only to themselves have failed or refused to take appropriate action to treat the guilty in the fashion which they deserve. But fundamentally the fault lies with us, the American people, ourselves for allowing such persons to be in office and the fact that we have placed them in these positions is the consequence of a new concept of life which has come upon us in recent years but which is quite foreign to the American way.

This new demoralization is the product of two decades of prodigacy and sophistry in government which has blinded and distorted the judgment of the people. It is the concept of a solicitous Santa Claus, of getting something for nothing, of dependence upon someone else for our intellectual as well as economic security. Our sense of moral values has become warped and debased; our self-reliance, our self-initiative, our self-respect have been undermined and weakened.

Only by a reawakening by the American people to the causes of this distressing condition and a reconsecration to the unwritten laws of morality and decency and character which have guided us in the past can this dangerous trend be curbed, decent people placed in posts of trust and commissions to devise rules of conduct be assigned to other fields of endeavor where their talents can be centered in more constructive uses.

The Honorable James M. Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1951, the Honorable James M. Mead, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and a former Member of the United States Senate, appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to present certain testimony and to comment on legislation affecting the Federal Trade Commission.

In presenting him to the committee, our distinguished chairman, the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, addressed him as follows:

Senator Mead is well known to the members of this committee, but as we know, you got your training where it is very often gotten by distinguished Government officials and others, in the House of Representatives. We want you to know that we are glad to have you here a Chairman of this Commission and will be glad to hear you.

At this point Mr. Mead proceeded to present his testimony to the committee, which was followed with utmost interest by the members.

James M. Mead has attained a most impressive career which underscores the opportunities still existing for the average American youth to reach the top through sheer character and industry. At an early age he was elected by the Buffalo railroad switchmen as president of their union. In 1910 he found his way to Washington and received an appointment on the Capitol Police Force, in which capacity he served for a year around the legislative halls where he was destined to sit one day in his own right.

After returning to his home city, Mead became successively a member of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County in 1914, he served as a member of the New York State Assembly from 1914 to 1918, was elected a Representative from Buffalo to the Sixty-eighth Congress and served through the Seventy-fifth Congress. In 1938 he was appointed to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Copeland, and 2 years later he was reelected to the Senate for a full term. In the Senate, he served as chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee, succeeding in this office our present President, Harry S. Truman, who headed the same committee when he was a member of the Senate. Mr. Truman had the opportunity to observe the ability, industry, and integrity of Mr. Mead. Consequently, upon the expiration of the latter's term in the Senate in 1949, President Truman named him as chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Mead's philosophy toward business is aptly expressed in his own words:

It is self-evident that the well-being of our economy cannot be divorced from the well-being of small and medium-sized corporations. * * * The nascence of the

revitalization of small business requires that it be provided with more capital and better credit facilities.

The comments of the members of our committee on Mr. Mead's ability and the fine work he is doing as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission deserve wide attention. After Mr. Mead presented his testimony, the following views and observations were made:

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, Senator Mead, the only thing I have to say is that you said you were unused to being a witness. I do not think anybody ever appeared before the committee with more aplomb and savoir-faire, and it is what we expected from you.

Commissioner MEAD. Thank you very much, Congressman. I feel a little bit uneasy on this end of the project. No matter how often I presided or participated in committee deliberations I felt like a raw amateur the first time I appeared as a representative of the Federal Trade Commission looking for money.

Mr. HARRIS. I also, Mr. Mead, want to accept the statement made by our colleague from New England. You have given us a very enlightening picture of the problems of your great Commission. There are a lot of technical questions that you must deal with. We well recognize that when we get to dealing with our economy of the country and various businesses, entanglements, and so forth, it becomes exceedingly technical, we found out the other day.

You have made some very interesting suggestions here with reference to legislation, most of which, of course, comes under the jurisdiction of this committee. I believe, however, the proposed amendments to the Clayton-Patman-Robinson Act will go to the Judiciary Committee. I assume that as full an explanation as you have given to this committee will be very helpful and beneficial will also be given to the members of the Judiciary Committee in order that their attention will be called to matters you have in mind.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, as a freshman on this committee, I realize that I should be seen but not heard, but may I trespass at this time to join in the sentiments of my colleagues, Congressmen MCGUIRE and HARRIS? I should like this committee to know that Senator Jim Mead is one of New York's favorite sons, and has the love and affection and respect of all of the people of the Empire State. Of course, today he belongs to the Nation as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and he is doing a swell job. The statement which he just gave this committee was informative, interesting, and constructive. To my mind his testimony clearly indicates that he has made a very intensive study of the problems confronting the Commission, and I want to commend him for his fine grasp of the subject matter which he has just called to our attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. WOLVERTON is recognized.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues to the right who have sought to pay tribute to the ability of the witness. It has been my privilege to have been associated with him for many years in the House. The ability that he shows today in his splendid statement that he has presented to us is no different than the ability that he showed on all occasions in the House. I concur with the gentleman from New York. I would not ordinarily concur in everything that comes out of New York, but I would concur in the fact that he has mentioned a high regard in which you are held, not only in the State but far beyond the boundaries of the State. It is very gratifying for me to see appointments such as yours made to these boards, commissions, authorities, and so forth, because it brings to those boards a man, as in your case, with a background of experience that makes you realistic rather than theoretical in your approach, and you have demonstrated that this morning in the statement that you have presented to us. I am certain that I echo the feeling that is in the thought and mind and heart of every member of this committee—that we are appreciative of the way in which you have brought this matter to us and the realization upon your part of the desire of cooperation between this committee and those agencies of Government that come more or less within the legislative jurisdiction of this committee.

I think there is a great deal that can be accomplished by a better understanding and a closer relationship existing between the Congress and these agencies, and that it would result in common good.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Senator Mead, I want to concur in what the others said about complimenting you. The thing that has always impressed me about you is that when you were a Senator representing the great State of New York, very, very busy all the time, as everybody knows you always have been, you were never too busy to accord the greatest courtesy to even the most unknown Members of the House, and those that you had from time to time opportunity to meet. It impressed me very much, and I have told a good many of my friends about you in that connection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Senator, I join in the encomiums that have been heaped upon you this morning. I appreciated your statement very much.

Mr. O'HARA. Senator Mead, I share with my colleagues of the committee the very high regard and respect for you. I have been sitting here and listening to all of these tributes which have been paid to you, and knowing your background as a baseball player, I am amazed that you have not been recommended as the commissioner of baseball. You are the only distinguished person in the United States that has not been mentioned.

Commissioner MEAD. Mr. Chairman, if I may just express my deep sense of gratitude for the—and this is uncharitable—undeserved encomiums that have been paid to me this morning, and for the patience with which you listened to me. If I may leave with the assurance that the Federal Trade Commission will respond instantly, and as effectively as we can, to your every request, and that we will try to carry out the law which you have outlined for us, and that we will try to be that arm of Congress in the matter of investigations that it was intended that we should be.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Commissioner, the rest of the committee have done such a wonderful job of appropriating all the beautiful things that could be said that there is not much left for the Chairman to say. But the Chairman assures you that I have the deepest affection for you, and that I am more pleased than I can tell you about the wonderful way you have handled the case here this morning.

An American Plan for National Security Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on April 3 the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] made what I believe to be ill-considered charges against the proponents of national security training. It was somewhat of a shock to me to find a member of the Republican Party unwittingly giving voice and official recognition to the insidious propaganda of the Communist Party.

I should like to have answered the gentleman forthwith, because I felt it important that his charges be answered without delay. It seems, however, that the members of the Armed Services Committee feel bound by precedent to dominate the argument in the Committee of the Whole to the exclusion of noncommittee members, who desire to carry on the debate as a debate rather than as a mere series of overly long prepared statements, having no immediate relation to the phases of the subject which some of the members would like to have discussed.

I have full respect for the older Members of Congress who have served in the House for a long time, but their willingness to spend all of their lives as Members of the House of Representatives, and their ability to get reelected, does by no means give them the omniscience that the seniority system tends to cause some of them to feel they possess. This is evidenced by the fact that most of these older Members have been in power in this Congress while this Nation was drifting into the precarious and confused condition which presently exists. It seems entirely possible that less fixed and inflexible viewpoints brought to the Congress by some of the newer Members might prove beneficial to the Nation, and in this I am, of course, not speaking for myself, except as one who would like the opportunity to hear what some of the newer Members think about some of the issues before the Congress.

Of course, I recognize the heavy responsibility carried by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I feel that under his guidance the committee has done a fine job in endeavoring to hammer out a compromise likely to be supported by a majority of the members, and this without compromising away the more essential beneficial provisions of the proposed legislation.

Now to get back to the speech by the gentleman from California, I will not repeat much of that speech, because it is available in the RECORD. I should like, however, to point out that on February 12, February 26, and March 15 of this year, I called attention of the House to the formation of phony Communist peace organizations, formed for the obvious purpose of fighting national security training through the diabolical method of causing it to become identified in the public mind with German militarism, and particularly with Heinz Guderian, Hitler's chief of staff.

From the standpoint of psychology, the association of ideas employed by the Communists is a tactic well known in psychological warfare, and make no mistake about it, the Communist campaign against national security training is psychological warfare against the people of the United States. Obviously, the Communists are not interested in the legitimate arguments against national security training advanced by many loyal Americans who are most certainly sincere, but who are, in my judgment, mistaken. On February 12, I said:

The Communists are, of course, fully cognizant of the fact that many good citizens are concerned, as we all are, over the necessity of requiring our young men to spend considerable time in the Armed Forces. They are seeking to capitalize upon this concern by using it as a pretense to contact as many citizens as possible in order to spread their propaganda calculated to destroy faith in our Government, weaken our Armed Forces, and our determination to resist the aggression plotted by the imperialists in the Kremlin. We can see the propaganda on the petitions, but we know not what lies the Communists used to obtain the signatures. We can well imagine that those who signed will be indexed and cataloged for future softening up by the Communists.

Before coming here from Los Angeles, I received first a telegram and then a mimeographed letter from this so-called peace council. The communications denounced the draft and universal military training. They claimed that these proposals emanated from a Nazi general, and were so obviously the product of the Communist Party that I immediately forwarded them to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At the same time, I sent an investigator to the address of the so-called peace council. He found there only a locked door with a paper on the outside and the name "Southern California Peace Council" written on the paper. Apparently, this Communist brainchild was hastily conceived, and the nefarious propaganda was considered so important to the Communists that they started spewing it out before they had time to give their infant front organization even the outward appearance of legitimacy.

The Communists are against national security training only in the United States and other non-Communist countries. They are all for it in Russia and Kremlin-dominated countries, and this of course shows the sheer hypocrisy of their position.

That the Communists set out last year to attack our proposed military training plan the label "Guderian" is evidenced by the telegram which the so-called Southern California Peace Council sent on October 27, 1950, to various candiates, including myself. The telegram reads as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *October 27, 1950.*

Hon. SAMUEL WILLIAM YORTY,

Los Angeles:

Current United States News and World Report details plan devised by Nazi General Heinz Guderian for universal military service plan calls for drafting all 19-year-olds regardless physical or mental condition for 2 years training in military and key civilian jobs. It would accomplish complete military control of American economic and political life. Southern California Peace Council in name of all peace groups this area requests statement of your attitude toward Guderian plan now called Universal Military Service.

CHARLES GLENN,

Executive Secretary, Southern California Peace Council.

As a follow-up to the telegram, I received a mimeographed letter. It read as follows:

Re our wire of October 27

(A bulletin of the Southern California Peace Council, 326 West Third Street, room 310, Los Angeles 13, Calif.)

THE GUDERIAN PLAN

United States NEWS and World Report (October 27, 1950) reports on plans for universal military service already approved by military leaders for presentation to Congress. This plan threatens democracy at home and peace throughout the world.

Universal military service differs from universal military training or selective service. Without going into details of other plans, here is what UMT would do:

UMT would conscript every youth of 19, regardless of mental, physical, educational, or marital status. Period of service would be 24 months, with no exemptions from foreign service for youth mustered into military services.

UMT would train only part of the physically adequate youth for the military. Other physically adequate youth would be trained for service under the military in key defense jobs. The military, then, would enter the civilian economy picture as a dominant force.

Most youth aspiring to college would have to give it up until age 21 at least. A youth, entering school at 18, would be removed at age 19 for performance of his 24-month tour of duty. A youth of genius, enrolled at an early age in scientific or medical institute, would be removed from school at 19, regardless of his closeness to graduation. Remove from school as a junior or senior, he could resume studies only after his 24-month tour.

Disabled youth (even to the point of being legless) and physically weak youth—even mentally undeveloped youth—would be conscripted and placed in noncombat jobs with military services or industry.

It is not an accident that UMT follows in carbon-copy detail those plans followed by Adolph Hitler. Presented as a plan of the American General Staff, UMT actually finds its genesis in the work of Gen. Heinz Guderian, former Chief of Staff to Hitler. Guderian was admittedly employed by the United States military to draw up total mobilization plan, UMT.

In its issue of February 10, 1950, United States News and World Report detailed work done by Guderian, calling it "a blueprint to remove defects in a staff plan under which Germany lost two world wars * * * centralization of power in professional military hands is at heart of the Guderian plan. There would be no layers of civilian authority between military and the President as Commander in Chief."

On September 8, 1950, the same magazine reported Guderian's boast that his plan is a Bible for American military officers and is approved by President Truman and Gen. Omar Bradley.

Universal military service is at best a pretty way of saying "the Guderian plan." Although United States News does not, in its October 27 issue, call UMT Guderian's plan, its earlier reports make such a step unnecessary.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

The blueprint for total American fascism has been known to exist in Washington for some time. Many candidates, some of them incumbents, may choose to deny knowledge of UMT and Guderian's part of it. When such is the case, you can still inform your candidate of the facts behind UMT which will face Congress at its next session.

There is adequate time to so inform your candidate and to secure an expression of opinion from him. There is also time to react to his expression of opinion, time and opportunity on November 7 at the polls.

There is adequate time to protest UMT and the part of General Guderian in its formulation. Protest to your Congressman, the President and Cabinet members.

There is also adequate time to tell your friends and neighbors wherever they gather, in their homes, churches, places of employment, to tell them of UMT—the Guderian plan—to organize and mobilize their sentiments against universal military service.

The expenditures of this time and this energy is vitally necessary if we are do do our share in bringing peace to the world and defeat of UMT would be a seven-league step in that direction.

The Guderian plan, once put into action, won't stop in the United States. It is a plan for domination of the world by a United States under the iron heel of a military dictatorship. History has proved time and again that such a dictatorship is not an end in itself, but is a means towards a larger end—military conquest. The Guderian plan is proof—if such is needed—that the American military machine does not intend always to stop at some Manchurian border.

In this regard, the Southern California Peace Council urges that protests on the Guderian plan be accompanied by resolutions on the use of United States armed force in Asia.

The wanton destruction of Korea—its people and its industries—is followed now by a $2,000,000,000 armaments loan to France for the purposes of building up the French Government's "dirty war" invasion of Indochina for the purposes of supporting the corrupt night-club emperor, Bao Dai; and there are broad hints that American military might well be committed to Indochina, even as it has been committed to Korea.

As the same time, we press Western Europe into rearmament program, putting guns once again into the hands of Nazis, and forcing upon the North Atlantic nations a military combination under the leadership of General Eisenhower.

These moves portend war. These moves can be halted by action of the people in pressing for abandonment of the Guderian plan for adoption in the United Nations of the Nehru plan. This is the central hope for world peace.

THE NEHRU PLAN

The very character of the United Nations would be destroyed if current United States efforts to bypass and undermine the Security Council were successful. In the words of India's Premier Nehru, such steps, if successful, would make of the UN "an organization for war, rather than peace."

All Asia is today up in arms against the military domination policies—the "new colonialism"—of the U. S. A. In this regard and at this moment, India, with a seat in the United Nations, finds herself Asia's spokesman against settlement by saturation bombing of the problems which beset whole peoples to search for freedom.

Through Sir Benegal Rau at the UN, India's Premier Nehru has proposed that the Korean War and all other conflicts in Asia and Europe be mediated by the UN; he has proposed that such mediation can have real meaning only if the People's Republic of China be seated in the Security Council and the General Assembly of UN; he has proposed that UN mediation can have real meaning only if voice is given both North and South Koreans; he has proposed that the UN concern itself with conciliating the differences between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. in approaches to the Korean problem.

None of Premier Nehru's proposals has been adopted in the UN. The peoples of all Asia are today expressing their desires for national freedom. The UN Charter guarantees the right to expression of such desires; the Nehru proposals would implement the guarantles of the UN Charter. American military might in Korea, Indochina, all Asia, undermines those guarantles.

The Southern California Peace Council urges that the Nehru proposals be made known to every peace group, in churches, in homes, in shops and offices and that support, in the form of letters and resolutions go to Sir Benegal Rau, India's UN delegate, Lake Success, N. Y.

We urge, too, that a stand on the Nehru proposals be taken by all incumbent Congressmen and Senators. We urge, in these days before elections, that all candidates be approached by delegations and in meetings, that candidates be made to take a concrete stand on peace or war by an expression of support or opposition to the Nehru plan, by an expression of support for or opposition to the Guderian plan, now known as universal military service.

In all instances, the people must know what is happening to their peace. Tell your neighbors, your coworkers, your organizations about the Guderian plan and the Nehru plan. The people can be organized for peace. Knowledge is your best organizer.

ATTENTION

Armistice Day is November 11. On this day the Southern California Peace Council will sponsor a work meeting for all individuals and organizations interested in peace. Plans for activity of all in search of peace will be presented. A concrete program for full activity will be presented Saturday, November 11, 1 to 5 p. m., Park Manor, 607 southwestern.

After receiving the telegram and letter, I investigated the peace council because it was obvious to me that it was a Communist-front organization. In 1939 and 1940 I was chairman of the California State Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, and because of that experience I can usually discern Communist propaganda, which is in reality quite transparent to anyone who has taken the trouble to study their methods and objectives. My suspicions were borne out by the later activities of the so-called peace council which I described in my talks referred to a few moments ago. These activities included the barring of a newspaper staff writer from one of the so-called peace meetings because of the fact that he was seen taking notes. It is no coincidence that last Friday our own House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a report describing the activities of these phony Communist peace organizations.

I have no way of knowing why the gentleman from California permitted himself to be the vehicle by which propaganda spread by the Communist Party was placed in the RECORD of this House. The gentleman is a fine, loyal American and most certainly would not knowingly spread Communist propaganda. It is obvious, however, that he either agrees with the Communists and believes that our Armed Services Committee is furthering some kind of a plot to turn this country into a military dictatorship along the lines of German militarism, or else he is himself the victim of subversive propaganda. Those of us who favor national security training are certainly entitled to answer the gentleman by making it clear that we are not militarists; we do not favor dictatorship of any kind; and we are proposing an American plan for national security training, our own plan, and not a plan suggested by Guderian or any other person of similar views.

In his laborious attack upon our Army leaders, the gentleman omitted the admirals, and I suspect that much of the classified matter which the gentleman inserted in the RECORD was nothing more than a rehash of the bitter recriminations over the unification program—recriminations which in the interest of national security and unity should be allowed to remain buried. The gentleman accused the Army of circulating in the Pentagon a military analysis by Guderian, and inserted that analysis in the RECORD, but the letter of transmittal from the Historical Division of the Army says, in plain words:

The solution outlined in Manuscript No. T-113 was evolved by Guderian without guidance or suggestions from Army personnel; its distribution does not constitute endorsement of Guderian's recommendations by the Historical Division of the Department of the Army.

There were times during my own service in the Army when I was called upon to see that histories were prepared of the operations of our units, in order that any mistakes might be subject to later study. It seems to me the Army Historical Division would have been negligent indeed if it failed to study the causes of the failures and successes by both sides in World War II in order to enable us to avoid repetition of our own undiscovered errors which our adversaries might be in a position to disclose to us, or to discover errors which they themselves made about which we might have no knowledge. The analysis by Guderian would quite naturally be of interest to the military leaders of all nations, and I am sorry that the gentleman has seen fit to make it available to our enemies in spite of the fact that it evidently was classified by the Army in order to keep its contents from falling into the hands of our enemies who might desire to see it.

This whole matter of divulging the contents of classified material is serious indeed, and if the gentleman has served in the Armed Forces, he should know better than to lightly divulge the contents of classified documents. Classification of documents is a matter of consequence, and in many cases only a trained intelligence officer is in a position to know the importance of keeping a particular document classified. Breaches of security can cost many lives.

I am reminded of the shock I received when our wartime breaking of the Japanese secret code was made public. As one of those who regarded our success in breaking that code as a top-secret matter, I could not understand why we should put any possible future enemies on notice relative to weaknesses in the Japanese security system, thereby giving them the opportunity to avoid similar weaknesses in their own system. Whoever divulged to the gentleman the contents of the classified matter which he placed in the RECORD should be investigated, and I believe this is particularly important when one sees the similarity between the argument used by the gentleman and the propaganda spread by the phony Communist peace groups. We simply cannot afford a break-down of military security. The lives of too many people are involved. If the documents were cleared, as to security, which I hope was the case, the gentleman should so inform the House, and that phase of the matter will no longer cause concern to those of us who dislike and fear the effects of breaches of security.

Without going into great detail, it is obvious from a comparison of what the Comunists claim national security training to be, and what our Armed Services Committee has proposed, that there is no similarity except that any plan for national security training must, of necessity, involve an obligation on the part of every eligible person to accept training, or the plan cannot truthfully be called democratic and universal. The plan proposed in S. 1, as amended by our committee, is in line with the recommendations made by George Washington, when he was President of the United States. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has made a very excellent analysis and historical summary of universal military training and the problem of military manpower—Public Affairs Bulletin No. 90, February 1951. I should like to commend it to all persons interested in what I believe to be an impartial survey of the available evidence both for and against national security training. On page 25 of the document, there appears the following:

During the 7 years under the Articles of Confederation the same situation prevailed. A primary objective of Washington himself in supporting the new Constitution was to provide adequately for the national defense. His idea was that there must at all times be a small professional army, but the primary purpose of this army was to provide a nucleus for a national militia. "Although a large standing army in time of peace," he wrote in a recently discovered treatise, Sentiments on a Peace Establishment, "hath ever been considered dangerous to the liberties of a country, yet a few troops, under certain circumstances, are not only safe, but indispensably necessary. The only probable means of preventing insult or hostility for any length of time, and from having exempted from the consequent calamities of war, is to put the national militia in such a condition as that they may appear truly respectable in the eyes of our friends and formidable to those who would otherwise become our enemies." (Washington, George. Writings of George Washington from the original manuscript sources, 1745–99. (John C. Fitzpatrick, ed.) Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office (1931–44), vol. 26, p. 374 ff.)

Washington's concept of the national militia (i. e., a militia not controlled by the several States but by the Federal Government), as expressed in this document of 1783, runs thus:

"It may be laid down, as a primary position, that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a proportion of his property, but even of his personal services in the defense of it, and consequently that the citizens of America (with a few legal and official exceptions) from 18 to 50 years of age should be borne on the militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to the use of them that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice (and) duly organized into commands. * * * They ought to be regularly mustered and trained, and to have the arms and accoutrements inspected at certain appointed times (and) able-bodied young men, between the ages of 18 and 25 * * * drafted to form a corps in every State * * * to be employed whenever it may become necessary in the service of their country * * * but no independent or volunteer companies foreign to the establishment should be tolerated."

It now appears that Washington's professional army, established to be the nucleus of a nation (that is, a Federal) militia, was itself to be a citizen army, a special fraction of the militia.

On becoming President, Washington called upon Congress for a "uniform and effective system for the militia of the United States," pointing out the diminishing number of veterans of the Revolution who were well-instructed officers and soldiers. The only response was an authorization to call into service from time to time such part of the militia of the States, respectively, as he should judge necessary. The States were unwilling to give up their control. A year later, in 1790, Congress authorized enlistment for a regular army of 1,216 officers and men, to be formed into one regiment of infantry and one regiment of artillery. Congress rejected in that same year the bill for a national militia, the Boudinot bill, which had been the result of many years of study and collaboration on the part of Washington himself, General Knox (the first Secretary of War) and Baron von Steuben, who has been called "Washington's one-man general staff." Strictly speaking, the Boudinot bill was not rejected; it was emasculated by amendments, and finally emerged as the "Militia Act of 1792" which stood on the statute books for over a hundred years.

The Militia Act of 1792 affirmed the citizen's obligation for military service, and the Government's power to compel such service. Section I provided "that each and every free able-bodied white male citizen * * * who is or shall be of the age of 18 years shall * * * be enrolled in the militia * * *." The value of the act for national defense, however, was vitiated by the fact that the "Uniform Militia" which it established was not a Federal force, but 13 separate armies under the control of the 13 separate States. The Federal Government had to leave to the States all requirements for training, discipline, and inspection. The Federal Government could call out these troops under certain conditions, but had to take what the States offered. It was not long before the States had granted so many exemptions, had suffered so much favoritism to develop in the choice of officers for political reasons, had provided for no service of supply, and in general had administered their militia with so much laxity, that when the test of real service came, the militia was found wanting and fell into disrepute.

The essence of the plan which President Washington proposed is the one the proponents of S. 1, as amended, wish to see adopted. We want a strong Nation. We want our citizens trained to defend the Nation, but we do not want a huge, permanent, standing Army which lack of national security training might make necessary for a period of indefinite duration. Now, it is obvious that the Communists could not have made headway against national security training by calling it the President Washington plan, which it is. They were forced, for their purposes, to call it the Guderian plan, which it is not. The great wisdom of President Washington is once again demonstrated by the fact that the Eighty-second Congress is today finding it necessary to adopt the more essential features of the plan which he proposed to the First Congress.

National security training cannot be considered in an abstract way without relation to time, place, and circumstance. As an abstract proposition, very few of us would favor it, but man has not evolved sufficiently or become sufficiently civilized to compose his differences with others without resort to force. To protect those of us who believe in peaceful methods against the ruthlessness of would-be tyrants, it is necessary that we remain at all times prepared to defend ourselves, and it is for this reason only that national security training can be and is, in my opinion, justified. No hysteria impels me to this conclusion. Several of the opponents of national security training have, during the course of this debate, accused the proponents of acting in an atmosphere of hysteria. It is a strange coincidence that hysteria, too, is a word always used by the Communists to describe efforts to discover them and nullify their influence. The proponents of this legislation are proposing it in a calm, deliberate manner, not as something new, but something old which has been too long neglected. We cannot make our Nation secure by castigating our military leaders, many of whom are too disposed toward pomp and ceremony, and who most certainly suffer from some of the shortcomings ascribed to them by the opposition, but we cannot prepare our defenses or prevent war by destroying our Military Establishment, much as we dislike some of its practices. Of course, in a way, I suppose we fulminate against our generals because we hate war, and all that goes with it, and our generals symbolize the fact that, no matter how distasteful war may be, it nevertheless hovers over us like an ominous black cloud.

I had plently to say about the generals during my military service, but the fact remains that our generals have always guided our Armies to ultimate victory, and I take it we are all agreed that this is an important measure of their ability. It probably is not easy for our military men, who bear full responsibility for our protection, to watch our political antics which some continue to indulge in right up to the brink of disaster. They would like to get on with the job, and some of them might harbor an impulse to overstep their proper bounds in order to acquire power and speed and direct our decisions, but I do not believe that there is any concerted Pentagon plot to make this country a military dictatorship, and certainly if there were national security training would be a mistaken way to accomplish it. Civilians who have served in the Armed Forces, as have many of the Members of this House, and who have been subjected to military discipline, can certainly be depended upon to resist military control even more than those who have never personally experienced it. National security training will, in my judgment, cause our young men to be more attached, and not less attached, to the principles of our Constitution.

The bill is, of course, not perfect. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has announced his intention to amend it in a manner suggested by some of the members. I, myself have an amendment already drawn, deleting the provision of the bill dealing with segregation. I regard this provision as retrogressive and unwise. The bill is, however, essentially sound and capable of being amended in such a manner as to make it acceptable to all who believe in the principle of, and necessity for, national security training.

State Bar of Texas "ROD Month" Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the State bar of Texas has set a precedent in my home State through its January citizenship project, designated as "ROD Month"—responsibilities, obligations, and duties of the citizen. The "ROD" idea was conceived by John Ben Shepperd, Texas, secretary of state and chairman of the Texas Bar's American Citizenship Committee. Following the announcement of the idea in a speech at a San Antonio bar convention in San Antonio last summer, the American citizenship committee, under the direction of Shepperd, began formulating plans for the State-wide project, the first of its type ever to be undertaken by the Texas Bar. My friend, fellow townsman, and distinguished lawyer, T. Kellis Dibrell, of San Antonio, served as chairman of the ROD subcommittee.

Other committee members were: Roberty Storey, Jr., Dallas; Dalton Cross, San Antonio; Levert J. Able, Houston; Homer E. Dean, Jr., Alice; C. W. Kennedy, Jr., Crockett; George Grant Roane, Rosenberg; Byron Skelton, Temple; and James C. Watson, Houston.

Slogan for the month was "Spare the 'ROD' and spoil the country," and its purpose was to encourage Texans to think more about what contributions they can make to democracy rather than what they can get from it. The program was based on the assumption that in order to perpetuate individual freedoms and to have liberty without hindrance, it is necessary to make wise use of these freedoms and liberties and to be responsible to them. The committee also advanced the idea that as efforts are increased to build up the physical defenses of this democracy it is fully as necessary to increase vigilance over the personal freedoms of its citizens.

Many civic clubs and schools over the State were invited to participate in the project. At the close of January, 1,500 ROD programs had been reported by these groups. Speakers on these occasions were members of both the junior and senior bar associations of Texas. ROD month received wide publicity through the press, radio, and television.

The committee, in order to remind Texans of their responsibilities to the rights granted them in the Constitution

and Bill of Rights, prepared a bill of responsibilities which catalogs duties of allegiance, awareness, defense of rights, patriotic activity, education, propagation of democracy, free enterprise, and self-reliance. The bill is thought to be the first authoritative statement of a citizen's responsibilities ever to be drafted, and since it was written, approximately one-quarter million copies of it have been distributed. A copy appears below:

BILL OF RESPONSIBILITIES

We who advocate democracy as the best form of government for an enlightened and progressive people, enjoying as we do the blessings of liberty under the Constitution of the United States, do set forth this bill of responsibilities as a guide to all citizens for the preservation of individual freedom and democratic government.

I. It shall be the duty of every citizen to render undivided allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, to work for its betterment and perpetuation, to respect the sovereignty of the people's government, and to defend the Nation against all its enemies whomsoever.

II. It shall be the duty of every citizen to be familiar with the Constitution of the United States and to be informed as to what rights and liberties are his, and to use these rights in such manner as is consistent with his own welfare and the welfare of his fellow citizens.

III. It shall be the duty of every citizen to defend with his life the rights and liberties granted to him and to his fellow citizens by the Constitution, to obey the laws of the land and aid in their enforcement, and to oppose vigorously any persons whose intention is to transgress the law or to oppress the rights of others.

IV. It shall be the duty of every citizen to make honest, wise, and courageous use of the free and secret ballot at every election; to exercise freedom of thought, speech, and worship; to protect the freedom of the press; to safeguard the right of trial by jury and to render willing jury service when called upon; and to perform all other acts conducive to the perpetuation of the rights set forth in the Constitution.

V. It shall be the duty of every citizen to protect and sustain the unwritten liberties and rights vested in him by custom and usage and to perpetuate the ideals of the equality and dignity of the individual, upon which the Constitution is founded.

VI. It shall be the duty of every citizen to be active in the political party of his choice, and to be vigilant of the public officers, to render all possible aid to them, and to serve in public office by appointment or election when qualified and when called upon to do so. It shall be his duty to strive for the selection of public officers of ability and upright character; and when holding public office, to serve in such manner as will subordinate private or minority interests to those of the people at large.

VII. It shall be the duty of every citizen to achieve the highest practicable level of education, and to work for the advancement of education by supporting and improving the public schools and by fostering the desire for education among his fellow citizens.

VIII. It shall be the duty of every citizen to instruct his children in the principles of freedom and to spread the ideals of democratic government at home and abroad.

IX. It shall be the duty of every citizen to defend the right to buy and sell, to own land and other property, to engage in commerce, and to work and earn a living wage, as a fundamental guaranty of the freedom and welfare of the Nation.

X. It shall be the duty of every citizen to preserve an attitude of self-reliance, and to use all legitimate means to achieve financial independence and security; to practice thrift and economy in his own affairs and to require the same of local, State, and Federal Government.

In order that citizens of Texas might take stock of their citizenship activities during the past year, the committee prepared a citizenship questionnaire called Were You a Full-Time Citizen in 1950? It was reprinted in many newspapers and one-quarter million copies of it have been distributed. The questionnaire is reprinted below:

WERE YOU A FULL-TIME CITIZEN IN 1950?

(Prepared by the American Citizenship Committee of the State bar of Texas)

Test yourself and find out if you were a full-time citizen in 1950. Consider only the questions which are applicable to you. The highest possible score is 130. You may type your citizenship according to the following scores: 110–130, superior; 95–109, good; 70–94, average; 50–69, fair, and below 49, poor.

1. Did you pay your poll tax in 1950? (Five points.)
2. Did you vote—
(a) In the July primary? (Five points.)
(b) In the August primary? (Five points.)
(c) In the general election? (Ten points.)
(d) In your city election? (Five points.)
(e) In your school election? (Five points.)
3. Did you make a conscientious effort to find out something about all the candidates on the ballot each time you voted? (Ten points.)
4. Did you attend—
(a) The precinct or county convention of the party of your choice? (Five points.)
(b) A meeting of your city council during the year? (Two points.)
(c) A meeting of your school board during the year? (Three points.)
(d) A meeting of your commissioners' court? (Two points.)
5. Did you do any work in your party in 1950? (Five points.)
6. Did you serve on a jury in 1950? (Five points.)
7. Do you know—
(a) Who the two United States Senators from Texas are? (One point each.)
(b) Who your United States Congressman is? (Two points.)
(c) Who your State representative and senator are? (One point each.)
(d) Who the State Governor is? (One point.)
(e) Who the speaker of the State house is? (One point.)
(f) How your United States Congressman voted on any major bill during the last session of Congress? (Five points.)
(g) How your State representative or senator voted on any major bill during the last session of the legislature? (Five points.)
8. Did you write to your Federal or State representative or senator on any issue during 1950? (Ten points.)
9. Are you active in a civic group such as the chamber of commerce, Rotary Club, Lions Club, Jaycees, American Legion, VFW, study or business club, PTA, League of Women Voters? (Five points for each with a maximum of 10 points.)
10. Do you keep well informed on current public issues? (Five points.)
11. Can you list the Bill of Rights? (One point for each.)
12. Did you attend church regularly in 1950? (Five points.)
13. Did you contribute regularly to the support of any church in 1950? (Three points.)
14. Did you contribute to a worthwhile charity during the year? (Two points.)

One of the first radio talks on ROD month was presented over the Texas Quality Network by Secretary of State Shepperd, with the introduction by Mr. Dibrell. The text is printed here:

TQN BROADCAST, JANUARY 5, 1951, STATE BAR ROD MONTH

Mr. DIBRELL. In our present state of national emergency, we have been asked to contribute our every physical resource to the defense of the country, we have been asked to forget such selfish interests as higher wages and shorter working hours and to pledge ourselves to the burden of higher taxes and longer hours on the job. We are asked to help preserve our democratic form of government through military preparedness which must be accomplished through financial, mental, and physical sacrifices on the part of every person. Most of us have no doubt at all about the final outcome of a total war, should the situation come to that, we are confident that right would win in the end, that the United States and her allies would defeat the communistic aggressors. But right now here at home, how are we progressing in our small, silent battle against those of our citizens who have lost their spirit of self-reliance, unselfishness, initiative, and industry and their sense of obligation to themselves, to others, and to their freedom? The lawyers of Texas have united themselves in order to intensify the battle against those who are in arrears in discharging their citizenship responsibilities. During January, which the State bar Texas is calling "Responsibilities, obligations, and duties month"—or in short ROD month—the American Citizenship Committee of the bar is launching a campaign to get every Texan to think more about his duties to his citizenship rights than about the rights themselves. Our committee has adopted this project because we believe that the light of freedom cannot burn forever without constantly being watched and rekindled by freedom-loving people. Many ROD speeches and programs will be presented during the month for civic organizations and schools, and one of the first of these is scheduled for tonight by Secretary of State John Ben Shepperd, American Citizenship Committee chairman, who first advanced the ROD idea in a speech at a July bar convention in San Antonio. Mr. Shepperd, former national president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, is well known for the citizenship work he has done as originator of Democracy Beats Communism Week, now known as the Gladewater plan, and as chairman of the 1950 Texas H-Y Youth and Government program, of the Americanism Committee of the Texas Department, American Legion, and of the Education for Citizenship Committee of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce. As chairman of this first ROD project to be directed by the bar, I now present my distinguished friend and fellow lawyer, John Ben Shepperd.

Mr. SHEPPERD. One hundred and sixty-four years have passed since the Constitution of the United States of America was written for a "by, of, and for the people" form of government. During this period, which is only a brief moment in the span of time, Americans have enjoyed a freedom acquired only after a small group of our ancestors undertook a perilous trip across the sea, spent many years of privation and tyranny in tiny, insecure colonies and fought a war with their mother country.

We Americans come from a sturdy stock, from a group of pioneers who were willing to risk their lives many times for the freedom of religion, speech, and action—the freedom which would give them worth and dignity as

individuals. The sturdiness and strength of the first American settlers became innate characteristics in each successive generation, and the history of those generations is a series of epic tales of territorial expansion, scientific discoveries, important inventions, economic and political growth.

As we take a backward look over the past three centuries, we see in a vast panorama the growth of the United States—a growth which began in tiny settlements on the New England coast and spread at tremendous speed from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean and from the Canadian to the Mexican border.

The growth was not realized without hardships and adversities nor without wars.

The American people have fought wars for economic reasons, for expansion, and in self-defense. We have also fought wars for liberty.

Many moving stories, poignantly expressing the desire and the will to ever be free, have had their beginning when our country was in war or on the point of war. Some of the most famous have lived through the ages and are just as moving today as they were many years ago.

Everyone knows the story of how Patrick Henry roused the colonists, who were on the verge of making a peaceful settlement with England, to open rebellion against their mother country, which had grown to be tyrannical. His "Give me liberty or give me death" inspired the colonial group, inferior in numbers and means, to a victory which meant a place for them among the free nations of the world.

Our own Texas ancestors scored another victory for freedom when they fought and defeated their Mexican rulers who outnumbered them 2 to 1. But Texas independence was not won until such valiant crusaders for right and freedom as Travis, Bowie, and Crockett were killed at the Alamo, as fewer than 200 Texans fought 4,000 Mexicans led by Santa Ana.

Out of World War I comes the story of a soldier whose dying words were, "I am glad I gave my life for the freedom of the world."

We now smirk at the statement that we have fought two world wars to make the world safe for democracy—but behind that smirk is an inner feeling of sickness at the realization that neither war accomplished its purpose for long. We become even more sickened when we are reminded in the daily news that a third world war is lurking near.

It is imperative that we defend our country against communism; it is imperative that we make an all-out effort to throttle the aggression of the malicious enemies of mankind. Through our concerted efforts we can set the world right again, we can suppress communism perhaps even without an all-out war. But when then? What of our personal rights and liberties granted to us by the Constitution? Will they still be intact? We have been enjoying them for a long, long time. So long, in fact, that we now take them as a matter of course.

We have gladly accepted every right and freedom that the Constitution and Bill of Rights have offered us. How highly have we valued these things? What have we given in return for our everyday liberties?

It hasn't occurred to a great many people that with each right accorded us, we have a corresponding duty. This fact has become very real to the lawyers of Texas in their daily dealings with legal matters pertaining to rights and responsibilities, and offenses against the rights of others. With the ROD program, sponsored by the State Bar of Texas, we want to awaken the public to their citizenship responsibilities. It is with great concern that we as lawyers face the fact that an American man will engage in physical warfare to defend the country itself and to defend his right to vote, but he will not insure the internal safety of the country by spending 30 minutes finding out something about the man who is running for district attorney—and he will not spend another 15 minutes going to vote for the qualified candidate who could be of real benefit to the country.

We will fight a war, but we won't serve on the jury without being almost forced to do so.

We are willing to give our lives for our country, but we will not take time to make occasional visits to meetings of the city council or school board where vital issues affecting us and our children are decided.

We will die for democracy, but we won't take time to write to our Representatives or Senators on any controversial issue.

We are willing to serve in our country's Army, but we won't work actively on citizenship and Americanism projects sponsored by civic organizations.

Too many people believe that their liberties are secure as long as the Constitution exists. That is only partly true. If liberty is to live, the people of the United States have got to stop looking at Government as though it were the job of the other person. Does the business man wait for a friend to replenish the stock in his store? Does a doctor just sit back and wait for his patient to be cured miraculously? Does a farmer plant cotton year after year in the same field and expect the yield to remain constant? Does a professor stay away from his classes expecting his students to learn his course by themselves?

No; the business man looks after his merchandise, the doctor makes a great effort to find a cure for his patient, the farmer keeps up his crop yield by rotations, and the professor spends much time in preparing lectures which will enlighten his students.

But what of the citizen and his citizenship? Do we sit back expecting to have the liberties promised by the Bill of Rights and Constitution fulfilled with no effort whatever on the part of the individual? Yes, most of us do. We feel no responsibility at all to our rights. We do not realize that if we ever lose our liberties it will not be through defeat on the battlefield, but it will be caused by our failure to keep faith with them by fulfilling our duties as citizens.

What exactly are our duties as citizens? To answer this question the State bar's American Citizenship Committee has prepared a bill of responsibilities which is designed as a guide to good, responsible citizenship. During ROD month the bill will be distributed over the State. I would like to read it to you. (Bill of responsibilities.)

A bill of responsibilities such as this, if kept ever before us, will help us fight not only public lethargy and gradual dwindling of hard-won freedom but also against the tendency in times of crisis for rigid controls to put a permanent halter on the rights of the individual, which tendency is fatal to the democratic ideal.

Representative editorial comment on ROD month follows:

One of the most comprehensive and unusual citizenship programs yet devised is now actively underway in Texas. * * * As the fundamental basis for this ROD program the Texas American Citizenship Committee prepared a bill of responsibilities which was widely distributed through the State. A copy of this outstanding document is enclosed with this bulletin. It deserves the widest publicity throughout the United States (Citizenship Bulletin, January 1951, published by the American Citizenship Committee of the American Bar Association).

"Government for the people" is the ascendant political philosophy of 1951, with millions of Americans thinking only of the favors they can get from the Government. They are completely disinterested in the implications of government of and by them. It is the purpose of the Houston Junior Bar Association, cooperating with the State Bar's ROD program, to prevent the further spread of this attitude toward government before it destroys democracy (the Houston Chronicle, January 28, 1951).

A "citizenship score card" is being used by the American Citizenship Committee of the State Bar of Texas in its January educational programs in civic organizations and schools. The score card permits the individual to rate himself on 14 points of good citizenship. * * * Some pretty low scores might be turned in, even by recognized civic leaders and those who consider them exemplars of citizenship in their communities (the Austin American, January 8, 1951).

How many Americans were full-time citizens in 1950? Not many, if the quality of their citizenship is based on a questionnaire prepared by the American Citizenship Committee of the State Bar of Texas. * * * The citizen, who can say "yes" to all these questions is such a rarity he might be nonexistent. (Beaumont Enterprise, January 4, 1951.)

Through the ROD month program, the bar leaders hope to arouse the people to inform themselves better, and to think more seriously concerning their civic obligations than they have up to now. What public service is more needed, or could prove more useful? (San Antonio, Tex., Express, December 27, 1950.)

Most publicity material that comes into a newspaper office is not worth the paper it is mimeographed on. But, despite the high percentage of stuff that is absolutely unusable, all such material must be opened and at least scanned. You have to scan it because once in a while something worth while turns up in the mimeographed letters. Just such worth-while material came to my desk the other day from an organization that might do a lot worse, the State Bar of Texas. * * * There is only one thing I would like to suggest to the State Bar of Texas. Wouldn't it be better to make the ROD campaign not just a project for January—but a continuing campaign to last all year? I think it would. (Al Altwegg in the Arlington, Tex., Journal, January 22, 1951.)

Probably no better way for self-appraisal of citizenship could be devised than the point system of the citizenship questionnaire the ROD committee has outlined. (San Antonio, Tex., News, January 16, 1951.)

Quotes from letters on the ROD month project follow:

I returned a few days ago * * * and found on my desk the very interesting communications indicating the progress of your ROD citizenship program in Texas. Needless to say, I am very greatly impressed. (John C. Cooper, Princeton, N. J., chairman, standing committee on American Citizenship of the American Bar Association.)

The American Citizenship Committee of the State Bar of Texas, of which the Honorable John Ben Shepperd, secretary of state of Texas, is chairman, has prepared a bill of responsibilities for the guidance of our citizens. A copy of this excellent document is enclosed herewith. * * * Members of the American Bar Association have long felt that too little emphasis has been given to the responsibilities of a citizen. The State Bar of Texas, through its American citizenship committee, has performed an outstanding public service in preparing the enclosed bill of responsibilities. (Taken from a letter written by the Honorable John C. Cooper,

Princeton, N. J., to Tappan Gregory, editor of the American Bar Association Journal.)

I received a copy of the bill of responsibilities today and I think it is one of the finest resolutions I have read. (Taken from a letter written by Hon. John R. Sailer, attorney at law in Elizabeth, N. J., to Vernon Law Book Co., Kansas City, Mo.)

Thanks for the ROD month material and the bill of responsibilities. You are on the right track in an excellent manner. (F. G. Swanson, Tyler, Tex., attorney.)

We had a wonderful talk on a ROD program last night. I didn't realize that we as American people could do as little as we do and still think that we are doing our best as citizens. * * * I wish to take the opportunity as secretary of the Axle Lions Club and as an individual to thank the State Bar of Texas for giving us this most unusual and inspiring speakers' material. (Jim Bob Nation, Axle.)

This program you have this month is certainly one that can do much good. I would like to see all of the other clubs in this town use it at one of their meetings; also I would like for the schools here to inject some of it into their classwork. (L. E. Ray, Aransas Pass Lions Club.)

We had a splendid address on ROD month and had distributed the citizenship questionnaire to our membership, to the superintendent of the Grand Prairie school system, the Business and Professional Women's Club and the Federated Women's Club. We have had a number of requests for the bill of responsibilities. (Joe F. Cooper, commander, American Legion, Grand Prairie.)

Thanks for sending enough copies of the bill of responsibilities for the pupils in my class. The bill is so excellent that I would like to have enough additional copies for all the students in my building. (Miss Jacqueline Pratt, teacher, Mission Public School.)

We have presented ROD programs for the Rotary, Lions, and Kiwanis Clubs and have given ROD radio programs over two local stations. * * * All professors of business law at A. and M. College have gladly agreed to speak 30 minutes in each of their classes on the ROD subject. It is significant to note that by this channel, our program will be brought to the attention of 750 heterogeneous students who will represent a composite group of the entire student body of this institution. (Arthur Stewart, Bryan attorney.)

Manpower Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Jim G. Lucas which appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 9, 1951:

TWENTY THOUSAND NONESSENTIALS IN D. C.—SERVICEMEN ARE WASTED

(By Jim G. Lucas)

(NOTE.—You've heard a lot lately of this country's manpower problems at a time when we're trying to build up our Armed Forces. Manpower is a basic and precious commodity for the military—but it can be wasted. How much of that is going on today? Scripps-Howard Reporter Jim Lucas, a World War II veteran who spent 5 months in Korea and is nationally known as an analyst and writer on military affairs, has recently completed a careful study of the question. This is the first of a series in which he sets forth his findings.)

The Armed Forces have been pressing Congress for more fighting men, ever since the Korean War broke out.

Yet the record shows that they're wasting much of the manpower they have.

Without too much digging you can count 20,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines—most of them around Washington—working in nonessential jobs. Nonessential, at least, in the sense that they're not what the men were hired to do—fight battles, man ships, and fly planes.

Between 3,000 and 4,000 work in the Pentagon. Another 1,900 hold public relations jobs, and 13,000 are on recruiting duty here and all over the country. Another 1,350 are on or subject to ceremonial details here. Approximately 800 fly special missions out of Washington for high Government officials. Another 225 are running a correspondence school. In lesser degree, it's the same at military command headquarters wherever they are located.

Some of these nonfighters in uniform like their work and are good at their respective jobs. But others are frankly embarrassed and eager to get on with the Military Establishment's main job—which is the build-up of a capable, well-trained fighting force.

ONE MORE DIVISION

Twenty thousand men would give us an extra Army division. We could use it in Korea. Or it would give us seven heavy-bomber and 12 jet-fighter groups. It would man six aircraft carriers the size of the Midway, with 2,000 men left over. That would be enough for a battleship. Naturally, it would be impossible to lump them together and assign them to the same outfit, because they come from all services. But the illustration shows what's happened.

That's only scratching the surface. These 20,000 men are the ones you can put the finger on and say "Here, Joe." It doesn't include the countless thousands clerking in post exchanges and ships stores, in laundries, officers' clubs, or in Army and Fleet post offices. For some reason, information cannot be published on the post-office roster.

No one contends that the services these men perform aren't necessary. The armed services must have post exchanges, laundries, clubs, and post offices. But a strong case can be made that these are jobs which can be filled by civilians or by men now rejected as unfit for combat duty.

It does little good to check the personnel files. Because the records conceal—rather than tell—the story.

MOS DEVICE

All services, for instance, employ a little device known as the MOS. MOS stands for Military Occupation Specialty.

Theoretically, a man's MOS is the key to his job assignment. He may have several MOS numbers revealing he's competent in several fields.

In practice, however, the system is a good cover-up. A man may be listed in the MOS files as a machine gunner but given the job of mowing a general's lawn. The only way to find out he's doing something else is to watch him doing it.

When I began research on this series I submitted a number of questions to all the services. Among them was one asking how many enlisted men were assigned to the Pentagon. After a week and a half an Army public information captain came up with the answers, warning in advance that they weren't what I wanted because I hadn't put the questions properly.

SOUNDS SILLY

"There are no enlisted men assigned to the Pentagon as such," he said, and he added, "I know that sounds silly."

He went on to explain that Army enlisted men working in the Pentagon were assigned to a number of paper units throughout the city and detailed to the Pentagon as "additional duty." As far as the records were concerned, however, they were stationed at Fort Meyer, Fort McNair, etc. A couple of enlisted men were busily typing while this discussion went on. Before we were through an enlisted messenger deposited a sheaf of papers on the captain's desk.

I'd also asked how many enlisted men were assigned as clerks, typists, cooks, messengers, waiters, etc. After each question the Army had written a big zero.

I protested that I'd eaten lunch in the general's mess and seen six enlisted men—all of combat age—waiting on tables.

"Probably true," the captain said. "But that's not their MOS. You'd have to check the file of each man personally. As far as their MOS is concerned, they're doing some other job. They're probably carried as drivers of riflemen. They're just filling in as waiters. I'll bet you can check every MOS in Washington and you won't find a single man listed as a waiter."

THE MILITARY SIDE

The services have some apparently valid explanations. One general pointed out that if we begin accepting 4-Fs, "they'll be on the taxpayer's back the rest of their lives. Every one of them will qualify for a pension. We'd lose money in the long run."

The Navy said its policy was to guarantee a man 2 years of shore duty after he'd been at sea 2 years. As long as he's ashore he might as well work at the Pentagon and save the Government that much.

The Air Force says it's trying to replace enlisted men with enlisted women, but is not altogether successful.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Pilgrim is a worthy designation of a weekly church bulletin, printed by the First Congregational Church of Long Beach, Calif., of which church I am a charter member. It is one of the largest churches of that denomination in the United States. The distinguished pastor is Rev. Emerson G. Hangen, formerly a chaplain of the United States Navy. Each week in the Pilgrim, on the back page thereof, is printed some pertinent or appropriate word which has more than just local significance or origin. The Pilgrim is mailed to me each week.

In view of the instant and immediate need of this Congress doing something tangible and intelligent and generous to the starving people of India, in connection with supplying of grain during this time of present famine in India, I know that you and my colleagues of this Congress will be pleased to read these two articles herewith by Dr. John C. Bennett, in the March 11 and 18, 1951, issues of the Pilgrim; and one by Dr. James K. Mathews, in the February 25, 1951, issue.

Dr. Hangen informs me that Dr. Bennett, the author of two of these articles, is one of the keenest Christian observers of our world, and one of the great theologians of our day, and is located at

Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Dr. Hangen further states that "This is one of the great issues of our day—a problem with which Christian people should be familiar."

Dr. Mathews is associate secretary of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church.

The articles follow:

[From the Pilgrim of March 11, 1951]

HAS INDIA AN ALTERNATIVE?

(By John C. Bennett)

PART I

What is the alternative to communism? That is the question that has haunted me ever since I left India. Everywhere I went in India that was the question that the most thoughtful people asked. Many of them saw no alternative shaping up in their own country. Any alternative must deal radically with the three great problems of most Asian lands: desperate poverty, oppressive landlordism, and political corruption. Nehru is generally admired but there is great disillusionment about the Congress Party. I am sure that the Indian people want to have a constitutional democracy and that they abhor totalitarianism, but I found many who fear that because of failure to solve economic and social problems and because of the corruption that gnaws away at the foundations of government, communism will come whether they want it or not.

I went to India to discuss with Christians the Christian response to communism, but I had to admit that Christianity does not have a full economic program and that it is not a movement with political power which would put such a program into effect if it had one. It is the responsibility of the Christian to try to find the best program on which Christians and non-Christians can unite to solve the problems that drive people to communism as a desperate remedy. But a small Christian minority cannot, of itself, create such a program, even though it should do everything in its power to aid in its development.

Are we deceiving ourselves?

America may think that it has a program. But everything that we do presupposes such fabulous prosperity that our institutions and our advice seem irrelevant to the needs of a very poor country. Also, Americans speak so often as though they care only about freedom, but freedom alone will solve no problem. I often wonder why it is that America cannot make clear to the world that we really do care about justice and security as well as about freedom. I had to explain to Indian audiences that our actual institutions are better than our ideology and that we have had something like a social revolution in the past generation ourselves. If we were to emphasize all that we have accomplished in the interests of justice and security in recent years we would seem less irrelevant than we do when we stress only freedom; but, even so, in this country we were able to begin at such a different point from India with its vast population. We should give all the assistance possible to India—technical assistance and immediate economic help—but the task of creating an effective political alternative to communism is a task for India, and one of the greatest difficulty. I have organized my conclusions about the situation in India under the following generalizations:

First, the Communist movement at present is not very strong. In fact, I was surprised to discover much less sympathy for communism than I had expected. The Communist Party had shocked India by its use of violence during the years immediately after the war. It had to change its policy and it has been badly split. There are many ex-Communists who know what communism is and they can provide insight about communism that is very much needed in Asia.

We must remember that in India communism never did gain the leadership of the movement for independence. In fact, during the final years of the struggle when the Congress was opposed to the war the Communists were on the side of Britain as an ally of Russia. So the Communist use of the drive for national independence—so important today in Indochina, is not an important factor in India. This first generalization may seem to be a very hopeful one, but I warn the reader that it is the only one that can give him much comfort.

Communism's open door

Second, the external conditions that invite communism are present in India. I have already mentioned them—poverty, landlordism, and political corruption. They are not equally bad everywhere. I found that conditions are much more serious, for example, in Hyderabad than in Travancore. In the southeast, famine conditions are widespread. I spent some days in Madras and Tambaram, which are protected urban centers surrounded by a famine area where people are slowly starving. I shall tell about one experience that helped me understand the way in which poverty, landlordism, and political corruption constitute a single problem.

On a visit to the state of Hyderabad, I found that in the villages there is a civil war between the police and the Communists. The Communists do not control any villages fully, but they come out at night and make trouble. The villagers are often more afraid of the police than they are of the Communists. The police tend to be more indiscriminate in their violence than the Communists. I found that there are laws on the books which would rid the state of the worst features of its old feudal system (thus removing the chief condition which invites communism) but that these laws cannot be applied because the agents of government are bribed by the landlords.

Never before had I seen the full meaning of corruption. It is not merely a morally offensive accompaniment of government activity. It paralyzes government activity if the vested interests succeed in bribing the agents on which government must depend. It prevents the necessary social changes. Corruption is probably the major source of frustration because it prevents the overcoming of other sources of frustration. In every country I visited (Lebanon, Pakistan, India, Thailand, the Philippines) I heard the same story of corruption. This may be the factor which, more than any other, will drive people against their will to communism. Whatever may be said about communism, it does seem to be able to cut through this appalling corruption, at least for a time. So, while communism is not popular in India, the external factors that make for communism are there.

[From the Pilgrim of March 18, 1951]

HAS INDIA AN ALTERNATIVE?

(By John C. Bennett)

PART II

Third, I found a very general tendency to take an optimistic view of Chinese communism and of any likely development of communism in Asia. Asia has for so long been able to blame the west for its own ills that there is a natural habit of thinking that if only Asia is left to itself it will do better than the west. In discussion I always emphasized the fact that wherever communism has had power for long it has become intolerably oppressive tyranny. I explained the steps by which this tyranny developed in Eastern Europe. But usually there was a response to this effect: That was Europe; it will not be so in Asia. Even though I stressed the danger of losing national independence because of the way power is centralized in Russia, there was not a very vivid awareness of such a threat. Let me repeat that there was not much pro-communism or pro-Russian sentiment. Also, there was a definite rejection of the Indian communist party. But there was this vaguely favorable attitude toward communism in China.

Fatalism widespread

Fourth, what distressed me most was a very widespread fatalism about communism among people who were opposed to it. This fatalism may be related in part to a fatalistic tendency in the religions of India, but it has its chief source in the fact that the problems of the country are so desperate. If there were any alternative to communism on the horizon this fatalism would probably disappear, but I found no one who has great confidence in any such alternative. Communism may not solve any problem in the long run but it does appear to have a solution. It is a movement that has a definite program related to the special grievances of people and a definite political strategy for putting the program into effect. It has the momentum that comes from successes in other lands, especially in China. It is now almost impossible for Americans to understand how people anywhere can think of communism as a solution. For us it constitutes the greatest problem.

I always emphasized, while in India, the illusions in communism and especially the sad way in which what appears to be good turns out in practice to be the entering wedge for overwhelming evil. But this kind of argument is much more convincing to people in the west who have much to lose in terms of economic opportunity and cultural and spiritual freedom. How much do the 90 percent who are illiterate and who eke out a bare existence have to lose? Talk of loss of freedom means very little to people who cannot read and who never travel far from their village or who, as refugees, have no permanent home. I can foresee a situation in which communism will make a whole nation literate in order to indoctrinate it with its false slogans of hatred. But it is hard to make any such spiritual danger vivid in advance.

This was the most difficult question that I had to face: Is it not possible that the oppressive aspects of communism may be only a phase that will pass and that in a generation or so the majority of people in a country that has a feudal background may be better off as a result of a Communist revolution?

Will Communist tyranny pass?

It is easy to answer that question in New York, but I wish that more Americans had to answer it in Calcutta. I could point out both the uncertainty that any such permanent good might come and its cost even if it should come. The uncertainty would be admitted but about the cost I would be pressed with the question: Cost to whom? To the 90 percent or to the 10 percent? When driven back to this point I would often say that, granted the possibility assumed in the question, it is still premature to decide that India cannot find its own way to a constructive social revolution without having to rely upon the leadership of Moscow—an independent Indian social revolution that would prepare the people for opportunities that communism itself would deny them. But that leads us back to the original question of this article: What is the alternative to communism?

The difference between the west and the east is that we in the west have so much to lose that communism itself is our great problem. In the east the strength of communism is the symptom of more urgent problems. It is this different way of feeling about the issue that causes the people of India to be so indifferent to America's effort to save Asia

from communism in Korea. I personally believe that effort, supported as it is by the United Nations, is right. Also I believe that we must make military preparations on an adequate scale to ward off a possible Russian attack upon some other part of the non-Communist world.

Causes and effect

But all this military activity is a way of gaining time to do more constructive things to counteract communism in the world. We are becoming so obsessed by this military approach that we may forget these other tasks. As we think of Asia cannot we give less attention to deliverance from communism and more attention to deliverance from the poverty, landlordism, and corruption which are the causes of Asian communism? This is far removed from the present American mood. It is harder and more baffling than to make ourselves militarily strong. But if we do not place our emphasis here, communism will advance in Asia no matter how great our military strength.

At this moment when feeling runs high in America against all in other countries who do not see the Communist issue exactly as it is seen here, I plead for better understanding of the Indian position. I have tried to explain some of its backgrounds in this article. I agree with the criticism that Indian statesmen have some illusions about Chinese communism, but I doubt if these illusions are worse than the prevalent American illusion that the Communist problem is primarily a military problem. To return to America today is to discover here a strange intransigence, a great narrowing of spirit, a growing inability to understand points of view other than our own. There could be no better corrective than for American Christians to go out of their way to see this greatest struggle of our time as it is seen in India.

[From the Pilgrim of February 25, 1951]

STORED FOOD IS AMERICA'S ARSENAL OF PEACE

(By James K. Mathews)

These are days when we are preoccupied by wars and rumors of wars. But Christians must also be occupied with the ways of peace. During World War II the United States was known as the arsenal of democracy. We have today an arsenal of peace. Will we learn to use it?

America's arsenal of peace is her great store of food. Under the price-support program, the American people, through their Government, possess food stores reported to be worth as much as $4,000,000,000.

Presumably our political and military leaders are aware that this is a great potential weapon for peace. Recent grants of aid in the form of food to Yugoslavia and Italy would seem to indicate as much. Leaders of hungry nations know we possess this weapon. So doubtless does Joseph Stalin. But are we American Christians sufficiently aware of it? Will we insist that our Government utilize this food as a nonmilitary measure of meeting our present situation? Rightly used, it can do much to preserve peace and at the same time combat the Communist menace.

A major opportunity for us to use our arsenal of peace now confronts us. The Government of India has recently approached the United States Government for a grant of 2,000,000 tons of food grains, particularly wheat. This food is desperately needed, but India, a dollar-scarce land, can ill afford to pay. It should be made available as an outright gift, or at concession rates on extended credit. The right response promptly made by Americans may help to preserve peace and to assure the continued friendship of democratic India.

India's need for food is not well understood in this country. She has now undergone nearly 10 years of shortage, although she has been fighting a fierce, and until recently a winning battle on the food front. Prior to 1942 India imported a large part of Burma's rice surplus. The Japanese invasion cut off that source, which, due to continued disturbed conditions within Burma, has not been restored. The situation became so acute that in 1943 between 3,000,000 and 5,000,000 Indians in Bengal died of starvation. American GI's saw thousands die on the streets of Calcutta.

To meet these unpleasant situations, India has taken extreme and heroic measures. She has strict rationing and a careful procurement of food by government. Her rationing system has been called the most efficient in the world. Furthermore, India has embarked on extensive land-reclamation schemes. These involve clearing lands and draining swamps. The Saturday Evening Post, December 17, 1950, tells of the most extensive project in central India, the reclaiming of 3,000,000 acres of fertile land, up to the present rendered useless by a pernicious type of deep-rooted grass.

From natural causes India has been visited with additional leanness in recent months. In parts of the south, drought is now in its third year. In some other areas—Bihar, Crissa, East Punjab, and some of northern India—there have occurred severe floods. In other areas locusts have damaged crops. Assam was visited in August with the most severe earthquake yet recorded. All these natural disasters caused a loss of 6,000,000 tons of food from the country's already slender supplies.

It is this deficiency that must somehow be made up. India proposes to do this by purchasing 4,000,000 tons from Canada, Australia, Argentina, and the United States of America. The remaining 2,000,000 tons is the quantity India is requesting from the United States on the most favorable terms.

It is the opinion of many Christians, including this writer, that the United States should make available this food, preferably as a gift. Here are some of the reasons:

1. Because of India's acute need and valiant endeavor to meet it by her own resources. In her present circumstance of desperation and our situation of abundance, the problem becomes, under God, a moral one for us. Our store of food grains under Government control is variously estimated at from 7,000,000 to 11,000,000 tons. It is said that it is costing us over $70,000,000 yearly simply to store this grain. Remember, India is not asking for aid as a gift; she does not wish to assume the beggar's role. We should see the need and be inspired to give.

2. Because India is a bulwark of democracy. Her constitution and tradition are democratic; her leaders are democratic.

3. Because such an act may do more to combat communism than many armed divisions. Our use now of our "Arsenal of Peace" may win the abiding friendship of India's people.

To make grain available to India will require Congressional action. Christians can register their sentiment on this question in Washington. Thousands in many parts of the country have already done so. Church people can write President Truman, Senators, and Congressmen. Christian bodies, such as the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the Methodist Board of Missions, the American Board, the Golden Rule Foundation, and other such groups have gone on record by resolutions, favoring such action. But individuals must act, and promptly. It is a matter of life or death for many people in India. May it not be a matter of life or death for us?

The Confusion of UMT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, April 9, 1951:

THE CONFUSION OF UMT

The House has gone to work on Mr. Truman's program to convert America into a military state and has started auspiciously by compelling the Administration to abandon its demand for immediate passage of a universal military training bill. In theory, the measure has been shelved for study during the coming 6 months. More probably, it has been killed.

At best, UMT would have been a confusing and contradictory project while the country was engaged in peacetime conscription and the creation of large standing forces. There is no connection between these two designs for the procurement of military man power, yet the Administration tried to serve them up in a single package. Universal training would have competed with conscription, so that, if there is a requirement to prepare men for action quickly, UMT would have hindered the attainment of that end.

At worst, UMT would have saddled on the country a permanent state of militarization, in which the high command would have been vested with a claim over every young man as he came to military age. This system has long been in effect in Europe. It accounts for much of the great European emigration to the United States. Its military effectiveness may be disputed on the ground that the nations which practiced it were the losers in every great war.

The sentiment of the House on this issue was so manifest that the Truman leadership abandoned the project without a fight. The victory was the more striking in that the Senate, on March 9, had refused, by a vote of 68 to 20, to strike UMT from the military manpower legislation approved on that day. The Senators passed both UMT and a 24-month draft, beginning at the age of 18.

THE PUBLIC KILLED IT

It is clear that the House, on this issue, is close to the sentiments of the people—much closer than the Senators, who either have not been reading their mail or who, having read it, were too timorous to buck the administration. The recent Easter recess gave House Members an opportunity to get home and find out what their constituents were thinking. They returned to Washington with a knowledge of the people's convictions, and the shelving of UMT resulted directly.

With this proof of its understanding and temper, the House may now be expected to deal firmly with Truman's thesis that he possesses inherent powers to dispatch troops to the proposed European army under General Eisenhower without let or hindrance by Congress. The Senate met this challenge by passing an advisory resolution that he be permitted to send up to four divisions, after which he would be expected to obtain congressional approval for further levies. The Senators also proposed that the House act with them in the form of a concurrent resolution.

What the people expect of the House, and what we confidently believe the House will do, is to speak with none of the Senate's equivocation on this subject. Congressmen have urged that the House address itself to the problem through a joint resolution, having the force of law, which would put it up to the Senate if the two Houses were to agree. It has been further proposed in the House that Mr. Truman be required to obtain the permission of Congress before he sends any troops at all, and that this provision be written into the pending conscription bill.

We believe that this is the way to deal with the matter. Truman and his military cronies have tried to steal the ball and run with it, and they should be brought down by a hard tackle. The President is even now proposing to start two divisions to Europe without awaiting House action. He should not be allowed to get away with it. He is subject to the authority of Congress—which means the whole Congress, not merely the Senate half of it. The House can warn him that if he persists in endeavoring to usurp powers not fully allotted him, it can, through its control of appropriations, stop him in his tracks.

THE OLD SCARE TECHNIQUE

The administration has sought to bring pressure upon House Members by voicing veiled hints of impending calamities. Speaker RAYBURN descended from the rostrum to hint that Russian troops were massed beyond the Manchurian border in China, ready to intervene in Korea or strike elsewhere. The Speaker referred to "a terrible danger and maybe the beginning of world war III." Truman confined himself to the delphic utterance that RAYBURN is a "truthful man."

Congressmen have freely asserted that this looks like the same old scare technique employed by the administration countless times to jam pet legislation through a reluctant Congress. How can Congress or the people know the truth? The administration has lied to them so many times that they are no longer trusted. If RAYBURN and Truman hoped to profit by crying, "Wolf!" the strategy misfired. The refusal of the House to submit on UMT showed a skepticism which should be carried over to the related issues of conscription and troops for Europe.

One Hundred and Thirtieth Anniversary of Greece's Independence

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there are appended hereto news reports from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune of today on the parade marking the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of the independence of Greece.

This is an outstanding event for it commemorates a new achievement of Greek independence, the triumph at long last over the Communist invaders and subversives who were responsible for the devastating civil war just brought to a close during this one hundred and thirtieth year of Greece's independence. In World War II Greece fought magnificently against the legions of Mussolini and Hitler and made a glorious record among all the free peoples. In their successful struggle against the Communist horde in the recent civil war Greece showed her enduring belief in freedom by refusing to be dismayed by disconcerting Communist tactics and by the aid to the Communists of powerful neighboring states, and went on to ultimate triumph. The American people recognize in Greece a powerful ally and a fighting friend in the vitally strategic Mediterranean area situated at the crossroads between Europe and the Near and Middle East.

The friendship and cooperation between the people of the United States and the people of Greece has been earned in common trial and suffering. It will be enduring through the years. The fine Americans who marched in the parade and the tens of thousands of other Americans of Greek extraction will keep alive in our country a knowledge of Greek history, culture, and tradition which will additionally fortify this friendship.

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1951]

FIFTH AVENUE PARADE HAILS FREE GREECE—125,000 WATCH 15,000 MARCH IN PAGEANT DEPICTING GLORY OF PAST, HONOR OF TODAY

Hellenic-American societies celebrated the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of Greek independence yesterday with a Fifth Avenue parade that portrayed the colorful story of Greece's history.

Mayor Impelliteri was honorary grand marshal, leading the marchers up the avenue from Sixty-second Street to the reviewing stand at Sixty-eighth Street, where he was joined by Greek dignitaries, other city officials, and representatives of the United Nations.

There were 15,000 persons in the parade, and, according to the police, 125,000 spectators lined Fifth Avenue sidewalks all the way to Seventy-fourth Street, where the marchers turned east to the Greek Cathedral to receive the blessing of Archbishop Michael, of North and South America.

A THREEFOLD OBJECTIVE

The parade had a threefold purpose. It was an expression of gratitude to the people of the United States for their aid to Greece; it protested the abduction of 28,000 Greek children who are being detained behind the iron curtain, and it called for the reunion of the island of Cyprus with Greece.

One of the placards depicted Cyprus held by British chains and asserted that "Cyprus prefers her poor mother to her rich stepmother."

As the parade drew to a close Mayor Impelliteri, in a brief address, praised the pageant, declaring that the placards represent what a free people want for the democratic people of Greece.

In the parade were golden chariots of ancient days, likenesses of Alexander the Great and Homer, elaborate floats with Grecian goddesses and scores of other visual reminders of the glory that was Greece.

Leading the marchers was 9-year-old Anastasia Vagionis, wearing a Royal Guard evzone with great poise, for this was her fifth casting in the role. She is the daughter of Nicholas Vagionis, general chairman of the event. Behind her marched mounted policemen. Thirty-one bands provided music.

COSTUMES OF MANY VOGUES

Costumes worn by the members of the various Hellenic societies represented virtually every vogue from every province since the days of ancient Greece. There were old warriors with spears, and a relatively modern military man on a gray horse representing Gen. Theodore Kolocotronis, who was credited with Greece's victory over Turkey in 1821. And there was a group of Greek sailors who came from Boston where they are preparing to take two destroyers, gifts of the United States, to Greece on April 18.

The real show stopper was 20-month-old Katherine Stegrist, of 515 West Eighty-fourth Street. She held up the parade in front of the reviewing stand when she burst into tears as photographers swarmed around her. Mayor Impelliteri called for her and her tears ceased, but there was a new outburst when the photographers again approached her. Finally, after posing with the mayor, she rejoined the parade.

Earlier, Mr. Vagionis had sent a telegram to President Truman expressing gratitude for American aid to Greece and remarking that the march would signify "our admiration for the United Nations forces in Korea who are now fighting communism and for the Greek battalions, which in recent days were so highly lauded by General MacArthur and you, Mr. President, for their heroic gallantry."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 9, 1951]

PARADE MARKS ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH YEAR OF GREEK LIBERTY—15,000 MARCH UP FIFTH AVENUE—AMERICAN INDIANS AND THREE BAGPIPE BANDS IN LINE

New Yorkers of Greek ancestry marched in a Fifth Avenue parade yesterday afternoon to commemorate the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of Greece's independence. The 15,000 paraders included many women dressed in costumes native to various Greek provinces and bearing jugs and fruit, but also incongruously, three bagpipe bands and a contingent of American Indians.

The spectators, who were estimated by police at 125,000, crowded along the line of march from Sixty-second to Seventy-fourth Streets. They appeared not to notice the violations of the parade theme, and clapped heartily for the Indians and bagpipers, as well as for stately floats decorated with cheerful bunting, and municipal, school, and military bands.

MAYOR MARCHES SIX BLOCKS

Anastasia Vagionis, 9, daughter of Nicholas Vagionis, president of the Federation of Hellenic American Societies, the sponsoring organization, led the parade, which started from Sixty-second Street at 2:30 p. m. Mayor Vincent R. Impelliteri marched six blocks and climbed aboard the reviewing stand at Sixty-eighth Street, where he was joined by Athanasios Politis, Greek Ambassador to the United States; Alexis Kyrou, permanent Greek delegate to the United Nations, and Anthony Poumpouris, Greek Consul General in New York.

One of the parade high lights was a rider on a snow-white horse symbolizing Gen. Theodore Kolocotronis, who led the Greek Army to victory over the Turks in 1821. The actual date of Greek Independence Day is March 25, but since the Greek parade would have coincided with the Easter parade this year, it was postponed to yesterday.

Several floats in the parade were devoted to themes demanding that Great Britain relinquish jurisdiction over Cyprus and return the island to Greek control. Banners and placards stated that 97 percent of Cypriote residents had favored Greek annexation in a recent plebiscite.

SECOND REVIEW AT GREEK CATHEDRAL

The paraders turned right at Seventy-fourth Street and continued to a second reviewing stand in front of the Greek Cathedral of the Holy Trinity, 319 East Seventy-fourth Street. A 33-man contingent of the

Greek Navy formed the honor guard across the street, facing the reviewing officials.

These officials included Archbishop Michael, of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, and the Rev. Basil F. Efthimiou, dean of the cathedral.

The parade was followed by a doxology in thanksgiving for the liberation of Greece. Archbishop Michael led the service in Greek within the cathedral.

Packaged Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised and chagrined to receive the following letter from the fine patriotic women of Caldwell, Idaho, and at a loss to understand their reasons for writing such a letter until I read the editorial titled "Packaged Thinking" in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, April 8, 1951, which is hereto appended.

Despite the fact that the United Nations has proven to be an instigator rather than a preventer of wars, has supplied a sounding board for our enemies to besmear and slander us, and has become a roosting place for spies, traitors, and fugitives from the New Deal, many honest sincere people still give support to this iniquity because they have been propagandized into believing that the United Nations is the world's last hope for peace.

I trust that after reading this editorial, the good women of Caldwell, Idaho, will recognize the United Nations for what it is—an ineffective debating society to lull us into a false security while our enemies without and traitors within replace our American system of Government with a militaristic, fascistic, totalitarian power state.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CALDWELL,
Caldwell, Idaho, March 29, 1951.

Hon. JOHN WOOD,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOOD: The League of Women Voters of the United States has from the founding of the United Nations wholeheartedly supported it. We of the Caldwell League, having studied the UN and watched current events affecting the UN during our 3 years of organization, join in that support.

We believe that even if there were no atomic bomb the steady march of scientific progress makes isolation impossible. We believe that membership in a world organization dedicated to the elimination of the causes of war and implemented to settle disputes offers the only possible hope for achieving ultimate peace. By supporting the UN and such regional arrangements as the Atlantic Pact, provided for under the UN Charter, we Americans can safeguard our own interests.

There are naturally military risks involved, but no course open to our country is without those risks. As wives and mothers we are all too aware of the possible suffering and heartaches that lie ahead for all of us, but we know that by acting wisely now our leaders may not only reduce future suffering, but eliminate future crises. The present Korean war has brought suffering to many Americans, but its shadow is small compared to that of a total war.

We urge you to work toward the building of a stronger United Nations. We hope you will vote for legislation that will not only strengthen the UN and develop its several agencies, but that you will support sufficient appropriations to enable us to meet our commitments under the UN and the Atlantic Pact and thus make them more than moral instruments for peace.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. ELDEN DARLING,
President.
Mrs. JOHN V. WALKER,
Action Chairman.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 8, 1951]

PACKAGED THINKING

There has just started up in this city of 1,001 nights and a night of intrigue and even more by day, still yet another operation designed to press life, light, and independent intellect out of the American citizen.

This latest one calls itself "The Women's Clearing House for National Security." Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton, chairman. Member organizations are:

American Association of University Women, American Legion Auxiliary, American Women's Voluntary Services, Association of Women of the American Farm Bureau, Soroptimist, General Federation of Women's Clubs, National Association of Negro Professional and Business Women, Association of Women Lawyers, Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Pilot International, Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary, Zonta. It is instantly obvious that here are collected under a single dispensation, some of the finest and most useful women's organizations in the United States, superb in accomplishment and purpose.

But if it is one thing for the Women Lawyers to have their own special group, the Soroptimists to have their affairs, the American Legion Auxiliary to have theirs; it is quite another thing entirely for all of them to be tied together as above indicated.

The reason why, for the benefit of those ladies who may sense something wrong, but have not had time to dig into the details, is that such set-ups produce intellectual robots instead of citizens.

HOW IT IS DONE

Any woman who wants to see how that is done should write to the National Industrial conference board, 247 Park Avenue, New York City, and ask for a copy of an article entitled "Packaged Thinking for Women," by Lucille Crain and Anne Hamilton.

You will have to send along 25 cents, for this survey is no free throwaway, undertaking in itself to produce packaged thinking in disguise by opposing somebody else's packaged thinking.

All it does is to analyze the way 10,000,000 American women enveloped in some 21 organizations, were being subjected to thought control by a handful of specialists here in Washington, as of 1948 when the article was written.

Says the opening paragraph:

"The political structure of American women has the form of a pyramid. Its base is 10,000,000 federated women. They are represented by 21 separate organizations. At the apex is the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, seated in Washington."

MAKING THE BULLETS

The joint committee, in 1948, was making the bullets, over at 1649 K Street NW., and the ladies' clubs all around the country were shooting them.

Most of the deadly consequences, in affairs both foreign and domestic, were achieved without the rank and file ever knowing what they had done.

Now, 3 years later, a feminine observer says:

"This Women's Clearing House for National Security, my suspicious mind tells me, is a sort of marriage of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, which packaged thinking first presented in its true light, and the program information exchange, now defunct, also analyzed in packaged thinking.

"My suspicion is that this is one more way by which important women's organizations are going to be used to reflect administration propaganda."

PACKAGED THINKING TECHNIQUE

Of course that is probably an obvious purpose. More than that, the packaged thinking technique can be further demonstrated with evidence and material at hand here at the Times-Herald in the form of exhibits furnished to this newspaper by members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

For instance, the blue-covered job labeled: "How shall we strengthen the United Nations? Program outline and discussion hit on various proposals looking toward world government now before Congress and the American people."

Inside the covers there is package thinking, for sure, put together with all the slick silky style of the propagandist at his most deadly.

COUPLE OF SAMPLES

BENTON and Bowles, before BILL became one of the windiest of Senators and Chester a has-been ex-Governor of Connecticut, were never more razzle-dazzle.

Members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs should just dig out one of those kits and read it all through again now. A second look will open any innocent's eyes.

Compare, for instance, with another such kit in gray and brown, entitled: "Briefing Session on Foreign Policy, January 28 to February 2, 1951, Washington, D. C., and New York City."

Read, compare, and ask yourself how your own ideas of the world and what's in it got that way.

Women's organizations, like men's, can do good when the members are in control of the programs, not when the programs are in control of the members.

Incidentally, packaged thinking is no special sin of women. If anything, men are worse. For as indicated by the devices and evidence above cited, at least it requires the most professional order of technique to get the ladies lined up.

But as for the men, they have been lassoed by the millions and their hides nailed on the barn doors of the Nation with no trouble at all.

Indeed, it has not even been the work of strangers. The boys have done it to themselves.

California-Arizona Water-Rights Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Pasadena Star-News of March 19, 1951]

SECRETARY OF INTERIOR CHAPMAN AGAIN LINES UP WITH ARIZONA

The California-Arizona water-rights controversy, growing from the Arizona Central

Valley project bill, has, as recently remarked in this place, begun boiling in Washington, and now Interior Secretary Chapman has added fuel to the fire by renewing his endorsement of the measure.

For 3 years how Congress has been considering this fantastic reclamation project, whose primary purpose would be to rescue approximately 150,000 acres of Arizona desert land which were put under cultivation during the war-boom days of the early 1940's and to supply water for an additional 100,000 acres.

To accomplish this, authors of the plan propose to build a mighty dam on the Colorado River above Hoover Dam; to build, below Parker Dam, four pump lifts which would raise 1,200,000 acre-feet of irrigation water to a height of almost 1,000 feet; and to construct a network of aqueducts and canals for transporting this water over 315 miles across Arizona where it finally would be used to grow ordinary field crops.

Cost of this amazing project was estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation at $738,000,000 in 1948. Considering increased prices of labor and material since then, it is safe to assume original costs alone would be near $1,000,000,000. This is five times the cost of the Hoover Dam, many times the cost of the Panama Canal, much more than the cost of developing the TVA, and far more than the cost of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

Area to be benefited is all within the State of Arizona, and the project would directly benefit only 25,000 farmers. Interior Secretary Chapman reports there are only about 6,000 farms within the project area and that of these, 420 farms contain 55 percent of the land to be irrigated. In other words, the project would give benefits of more than $550,000 to each of these 420 large landowners, and tens of thousands to each of the other 5,600 farm owners.

If Arizona wishes to defray the entire expense of this project, doubtless it would be all right, providing its installation did not take water away from California, where a greater number of people reside. But when the entire billion-dollar cost of this project is to be borne by the taxpayers of the Nation for the benefit of a handful of land speculators in Arizona, the matter is of serious concern.

The Bureau of Reclamation insists Arizona farmers who are to receive the water can afford to pay only $4.50 per acre-foot for it. But, on the basis of the 50-year repayment period proposed, the cost of delivering the water would amount to $18 per acre-foot annually, or four times the charge estimated by the Bureau. Here again the burden of costs would fall upon the taxpayers in the other 47 States.

Former Senator Downey of California testified last year: "Central Arizona land is worth at most $300 an acre, but at $300 an acre the whole irrigated area of central Arizona, less than 600,000 acres, could be bought for $180,000,000, and the 150,000 acres at stake could be bought for $45,000,000."

The United States agricultural census for 1945 lists the total value of all farm lands and buildings in the State of Arizona at $287,000,000. The original expenditures for the proposed central Arizona project would be almost three times that figure.

No land should be reclaimed and irrigated by the Federal Government at excessive cost to produce crops which are already surplus or which can be produced more cheaply elsewhere; water should be allotted from the Colorado on the basis of the most water for the greatest number of people: California and Arizona should obtain just and proportionate shares. Logic and justice argue strongly against a billion-dollar central water project.

In the Interest of National Unity, General MacArthur Should Report in Person to the Congress of the United States on Conditions in Asia

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a House resolution that conveys to the President of the United States that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that he, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, should direct General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur to return to the United States and to report on the progress, problems, and probabilities of the Korean situation at a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives in order that the duly elected representatives of the people may be fully informed thereon.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are split today as to our policy in global defense against Communist aggression. This condition results from the fact that we have full information as to what the conditions are in Europe as presented to Congress and the American people by General Eisenhower.

This is not true as far as Asia is concerned because we have been denied a first-hand report from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who knows more about the Orient, the oriental mind, and our economic and military problems in Asia than any other living American.

To successfully defend ourselves against world communism, we must have a united people supporting a world policy which will not put all our military eggs in the European basket at the expense of our reputation and prestige in the Far East.

You will recall that during World War II, from the standpoint of manpower and war matériel, including $11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease to Russia, we predominantly favored the European theater, leaving General MacArthur to achieve his miraculous victory on a shoestring. To top it off, Russia was permitted through a 9-day participation in the Pacific war to claim equal credit in this victory.

Today we have a similar situation as prevailed during World War II, with the policy of our Government favoring Europe and very little consideration being given to the Far East which without doubt holds the solution to a lasting world peace.

Let us examine the situation. It is no secret that the Chinese Reds, with the assistance of Russia, are assembling in Manchuria units of the old Japanese Kwantung Army which surrendered to the Russians, but were never repatriated. It is also known that with this added strength the Russians are not only regrouping the Chinese Red Army, but they are training, equipping, and supplying them for future campaigns.

In addition, it has been disclosed that in the deployment of this Communist-trained hard core of the Kwantung army at least a part has been quietly infiltrated to the south half of Sakhalin Island which is 40 miles north of Japan.

To strengthen the communistic Chinese Army the presence of Russian jet planes in the Canton area, manned by Chinese pilots, reveals that for the past 8 months Russian instructors have trained hundreds of the Chinese in the handling of jet planes. While this has been going on, the Chinese Reds in turn have made available to the Russians the port of Tsingtao on the China coast, and three snorkel-type Russian submarines have been sent there to be used in the training of Chinese submarine crews.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an alarmist, nor am I carrying anybody's banner. As a Member of Congress, I feel it my duty and responsibility to recognize the situation in the Far East. I feel that before we can legislate intelligently on our global defense, we must have that half of the picture which has been held from us. I repeat that only General MacArthur can give us that picture honestly and completely.

World war III, if it comes, will take every ounce of unified American effort. Therefore, every difference of opinion and division of thought among our people must be reconciled.

The answer to the problem of achieving national unity is to give equal emphasis to the problems of Asia that have been given to the problems of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, this is possible only when you and I and every Member of this Congress have heard from the lips of General MacArthur the unvarnished, uncensored, and unflavored report on conditions in the Orient.

The United States Air Force Fighter and Bomber Groups Are Hard-Bitten Veteran Outfits Which Will Go to Any Target on Earth With Atom Bombs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune of March 22 carried an article by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson, noted feature writer and aviation editor, with respect to the status of our fighting men of the Air Force now stationed in England. Among other interesting observations made by Mr. Wilson was one which had to do with the benefits which have accrued through basing our Air Force training on the British Isles.

In its deterrent effect—

Gill Robb Wilson wrote—

the command of General Johnson is acknowledged throughout Europe to have played a vital part in influencing the Soviet.

In commenting further with respect to this training, Mr. Wilson went on to say that—

Seven hundred and seventy crews from the United States have passed through the hands of the Third Air Division since its inception, and 1,600 crossings of the Atlantic Ocean racked up without accident.

Mr. Speaker, this article is so timely and of such informative value with respect to the splendid work which our Air Force is doing abroad that I am asking unanimous consent of my colleagues in the House to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD this article by Gill Robb Wilson, now aviation editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Wilson's article reads as follows:

THE AIR WORLD—UNITED STATES AIRMEN IN BRITAIN—A DETERRENT TO RUSSIA

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

SCULTHORPE, England.—United States air power in the United Kingdom is organized under the title of the Third Air Division. Based on British airdromes in two general areas, East Anglia and the Midlands, its mission has been twofold.

In one case the Third Air Division is in position to supplement British retaliation against sudden aggression. In the next case its mission is to train United States strategic air groups in rotation from America. Both missions involve close coordination with the Royal Air Force and the warning system of England's defense.

In composition the American outfit involves 20,000 airmen and officers who staff a general headquarters and maintain the bases and supply depots necessary to serve the rotating bomber and fighter groups from home.

Commanding the Third Air Division from headquarters near Northhold Air Base outside London is Maj. Gen. Leon Johnson, former commander of the Fifteenth Air Force and wearer of the Medal of Honor for gallantry in leading the Ploesti raids against Romanian oil. Deputy to General Johnson is Maj. Gen. J. P. McConnell, and heading the big maintenance depot at Burtonwood and the supplemental one at Sealand is Brig. Gen. Robert Oliver.

UNDER WASHINGTON

When originally organized by General Johnson in July 1948, the Third Air Division came under control of United States Air Forces in Europe, but subsequently was placed directly under the Chief of Staff of the Air Forces at Washington. In the overall plan of reorganization for European defense, the division is once again under USAFE, commanded by Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad.

In its deterrent effect, the command of General Johnson is acknowledged throughout Europe to have played a vital part in influencing the Soviet. The Third Air Division, usually supporting medium-bomber groups (B-29's), still has big teeth. Its bomber and fighter groups are hard-bitten veteran outfits which will go to any target on earth with atom bombs in necessity. Their training over the oceans and free lands of Europe is not exactly of the primary type. Mid-air refueling is, of course, routine procedure for both bombers and fighters.

For actual practice bombing, two ranges are available, one at Helgoland and the other off the Wash on the east coast of England. Radar bomb scoring can be practiced on any target in free Europe and the same is true of photographic simulated targeting. Air-to-air gunnery practice and escort tactics are furnished by both the Third Air Division's own fighters and those of the RAF.

During the usual 2-month period for which any one bomber or fighter group is trained under the Third Air Division, its individual crews will fly a dozen missions of an average 10-hour duration. Some of the missions may be 20 hours and others but 5 or less, but the average is about 10.

ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED OCEAN CROSSINGS

Seven hundred and seventy crews from the United States have passed through the hands of the Third Air Division since its inception, and 1,600 crossings of the Atlantic have been racked up without accident. Since GCA (radar) landings are as routine in European weather as they are abnormal in Texas, the safety factor compiled by the Third Air Division's training is remarkable.

Until recently the antiaircraft defense of United States air bases in England was provided by the British Army, but now the Thirty-second AAA Brigade of the United States Army has taken over ack-ack responsibilities to secure training with the division. Gen. Thomas Handy, commanding United States Army forces in Europe, has just completed his first inspection of the Thirty-second Brigade—a vivid memory to the writer who followed the doughty general for 2 days in the deluge and mud of an English March. Col. Metticus May, commanding the Thirty-second Brigade, reports that his GI's and the Third Air Division's airmen already have been welded together in a working unit.

Presently dispersed around the east Anglican group of air bases—Mildenhall, Sculthorpe, Lakenheath, Wyton, and Basingbourne—are the bombers of the Five Hundred and Ninth Wing of the Eighth Strategic Air Force, under Col. John Ryan. In support is the Thirty-first Fighter Wing equipped with Republic F-84E's, under Col. E. H. Dunham, and an element of the Thirty-eighth Strategic Reconnaissance Wing.

Opposition to the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Comes From Every Nook and Corner of the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it has been said without fear of contradiction that only 15 percent of our population will benefit from the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, but every American taxpayer will be called upon to foot his share of the bill for such an economic monstrosity.

From every nook and corner of this Nation the newspapers of the country are protesting the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and the editors of these papers are speaking up for the 85 percent of us who will receive no benefits but who will have to chip in and pay the bill.

Here are just a few of the editorials from newspapers in various States who speak out against the St. Lawrence seaway project.

[From the Independence (Mo.) News of February 2, 1951]

HAPPENINGS THAT AFFECT THE FUTURE OF EVERY AMERICAN INDIVIDUAL

The country was prepared for a shock from Mr. Truman's budget message. It got a sharper one than many had bargained for.

The most striking part of the message lay in the way domestic projects were lumped with the defense effort. As a Wall Street Journal news account described it, "President Truman is putting the Fair Deal into uniform. All the old familiar ambitions; from the Brannan farm-subsidy plan and the St. Lawrence seaway project to establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Committee and Federal health insurance, were injected into the gigantic defense budget for 1951-52."

[From the Dover (Del.) State News of February 1, 1951]

TAXES PLUS ECONOMY

The country was prepared for a shock from Mr. Truman's budget message. It got a sharper one than many had bargained for.

The most striking part of the message lay in the way domestic projects were lumped with the defense effort. As a Wall Street Journal news account described it, "President Truman is putting the Fair Deal into uniform. All the old familiar ambitions, from the Brannan farm-subsidy plan and the St. Lawrence seaway project to establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Committee and Federal health insurance, were injected into the gigantic defense budget for 1951-52."

[From the Gloucester (Mass.) Times of March 3, 1951]

SEAWAY SILLINESS

Whenever we want to write an easy editorial, we find the chance usually before us in Washington's foolish dragging out again of the St. Lawrence seaway project. The project is to the front again, and it doesn't take any more thinking than it ever has on the part of either writer or reader to condemn it as a typical political way of wasting our money.

President Truman just now tries to give some semblance of real need to the thought of deepening the St. Lawrence River and its connection with our Great Lakes so that deep-draft boats can navigate it by suggesting it will help our national defense; in particular, would allow iron ore to be carried easily from Quebec and Labrador to land-shipping points on the lakes adjacent to steel centers. All that doesn't take away the foolishness of it all. It will be years before we've really got to have those ores.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Journal of January 18, 1951]

MR. TRUMAN, YOUR "DEAL" IS SHOWING

Every man, woman, and child knows that a new dress or a new suit can lift the spirit and bring a measure of new hope even to the downcast.

President Truman knows this. Accordingly, he has dressed his Fair Deal program in a new suit—a military uniform—and has sent it on a fresh parade before Congress. The uniform is fine, Mr. Truman—only trouble is, your Deal is showing.

In your call for a $71,500,000,000 budget for the next fiscal year and stupendous new taxes, Mr. President, your cloak of military necessity has been stretched so thin that the old Fair Deal program is showing all around.

There's the old Brannan farm-subsidy plan, repudiated by the people throughout the great Midwest farm belt; there's the St. Lawrence seaway project which has previously been rejected; there's the old project to establish a Fair Employment Practices Commission; there's the same old socialistic Federal medicine program; and, among other things, another proposal to get the Federal Government deeper into the electric-power business, and national meddling with the public school system supported by the States.

[From the Kingman (Kans.) Journal of March 2, 1951]

NO END TO USELESS SPENDING

The current world crisis, which has come home with a bang to the United States, should have at least one beneficial effect and that is to discourage certain costly and highly dubious political schemes. But will it? Present indications are it will not. Instead, there are those in high places who are using this emergency to foist their schemes upon the public under the deceptive guise of national defense.

One such scheme—out of many others—is the St. Lawrence waterway, on which the Government would spend hundreds of millions of dollars for inland water transport facilities in Canada. The same thing was proposed in 1941 when we were told that it was a must and we would have to have it to win World War II. Now we are being told again it is a must and we will have to have it to win the next war.

It is claimed that the St. Lawrence project would result in cheaper transportation and power. This is true only if a large part of the cost were charged off to other purposes—only, in other words, if Government subsidized the business with the taxpayers' money similar to the bookkeeping system now used on the TVA.

[From the New Orleans (La.) States of January 30, 1951]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Inclusion of the St. Lawrence seaway project as one item in President Truman's budget has stirred proponents here and there to dust off their pleas for the gigantic international boondoggle.

One such editorial the other day in a northern paper followed the theme of its caption, "St. Lawrence seaway—A defense must."

Maybe they're dreaming about what the seaway might do, if it worked, in world war IV. It's a cinch it would have no defense value earlier than that. Quite likely it would weaken America's defenses by pushing the Nation's financial load to the breaking point.

[From the Oklahoma City (Okla.) Oklahoman of February 8, 1951]

CHEAPENING PATRIOTISM

With a measure of presumption and considerable brass the supporters of the long-debated St. Lawrence waterways project are now out with a declaration that their pet project should be completed forthwith as a measure of national defense. Of course they are trying to make capital of a grave national emergency. They believe that Congressmen who never have looked with any degree of favor upon the St. Lawrence project will support it now if they can only be convinced that the country never will be safe again unless their project is completed.

With the St. Lawrence running exactly as it is running today the United States has won several full grown wars. And we are persuaded that the United States will remain capable of defending itself, even if the St. Lawrence Basin is never improved.

[From the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times of February 19, 1951]

It is difficult to comprehend how the proposed St. Lawrence waterway would be an aid to our defense efforts, but President Truman again recommended it to Congress. We won two world wars without it and engineers have estimated that its completion would require 7 years and it would be icebound for 5 months out of the year. The old argument was that the seaway would aid our farmers in shipping wheat to Liverpool which controlled the world market. Well, Liverpool controls nothing anymore and the amount of wheat which farmers can now ship abroad and the price is fixed by international agreement.

[From the Newburgh (N. Y.) News of February 24, 1951]

ARGUING FOR ST. LAWRENCE SCHEME

We are not spending money fast enough, so we must go into the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, Secretary of Defense Marshall tells us. This is the gist of what he says, even though there is a camouflage of national defense. The fallacies of arguments for this scheme have been exposed for more than a generation, but its backers seemingly never give up hope.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Dispatch of February 20, 1951]

ATLANTIC PORTS IN DANGER

Norfolk port interests wisely are taking steps to organize opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway project which was pressed first by President Roosevelt and now is being pressed strongly by President Truman. The opposition is based upon the fact that the development of the proposed waterway for ocean traffic into the Great Lakes would create grave danger for the Atlantic and Gulf ports. The need for action on the part of the opposition arises urgently.

[From the Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftain of January 17, 1951]

DOES PRESIDENT TRUMAN MEAN WHAT HE SAYS?

In his report on the state of the Union and again in his budget message President Truman lays great stress on the necessity of refusing appropriations on nonessential projects at this particular time, when our program of national defense and aid to our friends abroad is so important.

But in his budget message the President also demands appropriations for projects which are not a part of our defense program in any sense of the word.

For instance, Mr. Truman wants an appropriation to build the St. Lawrence tidewater canal which would cost many millions of dollars with Uncle Sam to be asked to put up about 60 percent of the cost.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of February 4, 1951]

MR. TRUMAN AND TAXES

Whatever it takes in the way of taxes to pay for mobilization as we go should be levied. And whatever it takes in the way of cutting back domestic civilian expenditures of the Government to equalize the burden on the taxpayer should be done.

President Truman's request for $10,000,000,000 in new taxes, therefore, should be granted, because it will probably take that much more than we are already paying to meet the cost of mobilization.

* * * * *

Or, if Congress grants President Truman's request and authorizes the St. Lawrence seaway, the Government will be putting vast quantities of materials, labor, and money into postponable civilian production when they ought to be going into war production.

The Government, then, will be bidding against its own war production to carry out its postponable civilian production.

And that means more burdensome taxes for all of us.

Let us, then, pay that $10,000,000,000 in extra taxes without complaining, but let us as individual taxpayers demand that Congress hold back the other six or seven billion dollars that Mr. Truman will ask until he demonstrates that his administration is willing to make the same kind of sacrifice that he demands of us.

The Crime Probe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Indianapolis Star of March 27, 1951. It pertains to the demand on the part of the people in my district to have the estimable work of the Kefauver committee continued:

KOKOMO PETITION URGES UNITED STATES CRIME PROBE CONTINUE

KOKOMO, IND.—A factory foreman's letter urging longer life for the Kefauver committee snowballed within a few hours into a petition asking Indiana Congressmen to help keep the committee's probe going.

Representative JOHN V. BEAMER announced at Washington yesterday he had received a petition signed by 60 Kokomo residents.

It asked that "you do all that is possible to keep in effect the Kefauver crime-investigating committee."

It was sent by Fred E. Parker, a Chrysler Corp. foreman, who said it was "the first time I'd ever written anybody about anything."

Before mailing it he showed it to a few friends, who immediately wanted to sign it and have their friends sign it, too. Parker said he did not solicit any signatures.

Copies of the letter also were sent to Indiana's two Senators, WILLIAM E. JENNER and HOMER E. CAPEHART.

BEAMER said it was the first formal Hoosier expression of approval of the Kefauver investigation.

To the Point of Absurdity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Reporter-Dispatch, White Plains, N. Y., for February 21, 1951:

TO THE POINT OF ABSURDITY

Although many of us abhor wire tapping and all that it connotes, the fact is being brought home more and more clearly that—under court authorization—it contains more benefits to society than fundamental harm.

We are learning that, if wire tapping can embarrass law violators without harming honest citizens, it should be used.

We are beginning to recognize that, if a wire tap can confound a traitor to our country, we should not hesitate to give preference to our country and what it stands for rather than to a person who would betray our Nation and its freedoms.

Congress right now finds itself confronted with that very choice. It is unpleasant, certainly, to think of legalizing wire tapping. Nobody would argue wire tapping is a nice thing to do. Yet nobody would hesitate to confess that catching and prosecuting criminals is not a nice business, either.

Wire tapping that has been authorized by the county court has been effective as a tool of law enforcement. It has ripped out telephone service from hundreds of places discovered to be violating the law. It has stopped what was described as an interstate gambling information service in Yonkers.

In the national picture, the Judith Coplon spy case dramatized the embarrassment that came to the prosecution because it could not use wire-tapping evidence. A higher court held the evidence thus obtained to be illegal. The court ordered a new trial, while declaring that the girl's guilt was plain.

The court suggested to Congress that legalization of limited official wire tapping would obviate such a paradox as it found itself in.

One of the primary rules for any government—particularly for our Federal Government—is not to permit itself to become a darned fool. There is no need to stymie the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation so that the criminal gentry always have an upper hand. There is no reason for giving traitorously inclined persons an advantage over and beyond that which accrues to decent citizens.

The FBI has been entrusted to protect national security. It deserves to have the tools and the laws to enable it to do a good job.

The bill now in Congress, H. R. 479, by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York State, should become law without too much delay. It incorporates safeguards to honest citizens. We share Congressman KEATING's suggestion to Congress that our present inhibitions in trying to protect ourselves against treason are "certainly carrying the right of privacy to an absurd and ridiculous length."

We believe, as Mr. KEATING does, that "no nation can survive which does not meet problems threatening its very existence with more realism than this."

Letters From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] made some remarks in regard to two letters from soldiers in Korea, which have been inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The first by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] on March 13, and the second inserted by myself on April 5. The gentleman from Illinois calls attention to the almost identical language of these two letters and attributes the similarity to some deep, dark Communist plot to undermine the morale of our troops in Korea, and demands that the Army immediately conduct an investigation into the source of these letters. I wish to state first, that I had no idea at the time I inserted this letter into the RECORD that another letter containing almost identical language had previously been inserted. However, since having this called to my attention I have conducted a little research into the matter and think possibly that I have an explanation for the similarity which is a little less sinister than that suggested by the gentleman from Illinois. I find that the writers of both letters are assigned to the same unit—an Engineer detachment. One is a corporal and the other a private first class. I also learned that five men in this unit got together and composed the letter in question and then sent it to five different papers in different parts of the country.

However, it seems to me that this is not the important issue raised by these letters, irrespective of what their original source might be. I have read the reports of the propaganda campaign which the Communists are waging against our forces in Korea, much of it aimed at undermining our morale by raising the very questions posed in these two letters. One of the strange quirks of the military mind is that they sometimes seem to think that they can maintain morale within military units subject to such attacks by somehow or other insulating them from the propaganda. Such an effort is foredoomed to failure, because the enemy will always succeed in planting the seed of dissatisfaction. The only effective way to cope with such propaganda is to keep the forces in question well supplied with answers to all the questions which the enemy raises. If there are no satisfactory answers, bad morale is bound to result.

This gets me back to my original purpose for inserting the letter in the RECORD. It seems to me that the questions raised in the letter should be answered. We cannot expect to draft men and send them to fight and possibly die for us in Korea and then refuse to tell them why we are doing so and what our purpose is in fighting such a war. I inserted the letter in the RECORD because I felt that the questions raised in it should be and must be answered to the satisfaction not only of Corporal Case but of every other man in uniform in Korea. I also felt that I did not myself know any satisfactory answers to these questions, and if anyone did know it would have to be here in Washington. It was my hope that by my insertion of the letter in the RECORD it might come to the attention of some authority here in Washington who felt he knew the answers and would accept the corporal's challenge to write him and give him satisfactory explanations.

The answer certainly is not to have the Army investigate into the matter with the view that it is some sort of a Communist plot. Such investigations would usually better be described as inquisitions, generally serving only to aggravate the morale problem rather than to rectify it. We have only to remember the statement issued by a supposedly responsible military official at the Lackland Air Force Base in Texas last January, attributing the reports of overcrowding and bad organization at that base to some sort of a subversive plot.

I would like to state further that I feel that Corporal Case has every right to be dissatisfied with the way in which he has been treated by the so-called freedom-loving Nation. He was drafted at the age of 18 and taken out of high school before the completion of his high-school course, sometime about the end of World War II. After spending 3½ years in service, including a tour of duty in Germany, and after having managed to complete his high-school course via a correspondence school while in service, he was discharged from the Army with the understanding that he would go into the inactive Reserves and not be recalled except in case of a national emergency. He then attempted to further his education and entered Indiana University. After barely 1 year in the university, he was again recalled to active military service last September 13 months before the national emergency had been declared by President Truman. I say that as an American citizen and as a man in uniform against his will, he has every right to ask these questions and he likewise has every right to receive satisfactory answers.

Justice Department Enforcement of the Antimonopoly Laws Faulty and Injurious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, everybody complains about monopoly and criticizes the laws now on the books for failure to curb the evil, but nobody ever does anything effective about it. Elaborate and expensive investigations about monopoly are conducted, usually ending in the rediscovery that a small number of corporations control a great portion of business, that over the years the number of individual proprietors has decreased, that wealth is concentrated and is growing more so, that prices are controlled and yet have risen, and so on. The investigations generally end with recommendations that something ought to be done, that bigness is bad and should be prohibited, that fines should be increased, that more money should be appropriated for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, that consent decrees should not be made, that corporations should be required to have licenses from the Federal Government, and so on. More economic books are written based on the material gathered in the investigations; more and more money is appropriated; but the evil of monopoly continues and grows. As the Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly of this House has stated, "Investigations of monopoly have not been lacking in recent years, but inquiries in this field which have had as their aim concrete legislation have been few." (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, of the Committee on the Judiciary, serial No. 14, part 1, p. iii.)

I have received a letter from Mr. Harry C. Arthur, Jr., a constituent who is an

independent exhibitor engaged in the motion picture theater business, describing some of the monopoly conditions in that business which he and others have had to endure for a generation or more, and calling attention to grave weaknesses and failures in enforcement of the law, manifested by the manner in which the Department is at this time failing to deal adequately with the dissolution of the motion picture trust. Mr. Arthur's letter makes clear that at this time deficiency in the antitrust laws lies largely in the Department of Justice rather than in the law itself. This inadequacy of enforcement can be easily, and should be quickly, corrected by the Department of Justice. The facts and views stated by Mr. Arthur, it seems to me, will be enlightening and of value to Members of Congress, and they clearly demand the serious, sympathetic and prompt action of officials of the Government in charge of the enforcement of the antimonopoly laws.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including Mr. Arthur's letter as follows:

FANCHON & MARCO, INC.,
Los Angeles, March 20, 1951.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: This letter is written to bring to your attention certain improper methods of the Department of Justice in the administration of the antitrust laws, which strengthen and increase unlawful monopoly and restraint of trade; and to propose legislation for the correction and prevention of such methods.

For many years I have been engaged as an independent exhibitor in the motion-picture business, principally in St. Louis and Los Angeles, Long Beach, and nearby places in California. I will, therefore, deal specifically with the conduct of the Department of Justice relative to unlawful monopoly and restraint of trade in the motion-picture business, although I am reliably informed that the motion-picture case is by no means a rare or peculiar instance.

The several theater companies in which I am interested are among the people of whom the Supreme Court made the following statement in a recent decision about the motion-picture monopoly: "The trade victims of this conspiracy have in large measure been the small independent operators. They are the ones that have felt most keenly the discriminatory practices and predatory activities in which defendants have freely indulged. They have been the victims of the massed purchasing power of the larger units in the industry. It is largely out of the ruins of the small operators that the large empires of exhibitors have been built."

The motion-picture business is about 80 percent monopoly and 20 percent independent American competitive enterprise, the latter, however, being subjected to heavy burdens and restrictions imposed by the monopoly overlords. The motion-picture industry is probably among the first 10 or 15 largest industries in the United States, representing in proprietors and employees half a million or more people, the great majority of whom are in the independent competitive part of the business. The total income of the industry is larger but most of it accrues to and is distributed among people in the monopoly part. As of this date, about 69,000,000 people (or less) attend motion-picture theaters each week in the United States, which is a decrease of about 80,500,000 in 1946, and a very substantial falling off.

The two great and ancient evils of monopoly are impoverishment of the product and excessive prices. Today this industry is the chronic and dying victim of both diseases. As the monopoly has grown the quality of the pictures has deteriorated and the admission prices have increased. Patronage has fallen away. But the independent exhibitors desirous of retrieving the lost patronage by admission price reduction are obstructed and prevented from doing so by continuation of the monopoly dictation of high admission prices; while the monopoly theaters, though free and able to reduce prices, are unwilling and refuse.

For 10 or 15 years prior to 1938, independent motion-picture exhibitors all over the country poured into the Department of Justice a steady stream of complaints and cries for protection against the discriminatory practices and predatory activities of the large film and theater companies, referred to many years later by the Supreme Court in the quotation cited above. With minor and ineffectual exceptions, however, nothing was done by the Government under the antitrust laws, until July 1938. Meantime the monopoly had grown to enormous proportions and to virtually indestructible strength. Many independent exhibitors had been cracked on the head by the monopoly blackjack, their businesses ruined, their theaters closed up or torn down. I was forced to give up to the monopoly companies, theater interests in California, Arizona, and elsewhere. In a typical case, my business associates were compelled to transfer to the Fox combination a beautiful, modern, newly built theater in Inglewood, Calif., because of the conspiratorial refusal of the other companies to furnish pictures for use in competition with Fox. Some of the independent exhibitors sold out in whole or in part to the monopoly, and became monopoly subordinates and employees. Therein the country has suffered another of the evils of monopoly, the relegation of many independent proprietors to the subordinate status of dependents and servants of the monopoly.

In July 1938 the Government filed a suit under the antitrust laws to break up the monopoly. It charged that five great film companies had acquired practically all of the large first-run theaters in the principal cities in the country and many of the later-run houses, and had divided the country up among themselves as to exhibition; for instance, the Eastern and Southern States being assigned to Paramount, and the Western and Pacific Coast States to Fox. It charged a Nation-wide system of admission price fixing by these companies, the establishment and practice of a multifarious system of discriminations and restrictions imposed on the independent theater and film companies, and a strict and unlawful regimentation of the entire industry for the benefit of the large companies. In that suit the Government asked that the defendants be divested of the many theaters which they had acquired by the unlawful methods. Naturally, the filing of the Government suit inspired the independents with hope that this harsh and un-American system would soon be at an end.

But, having filed the suit, nothing else was done by the Government for a long time. Two years later, in November 1940, the Department of Justice and the defendants entered into a consent decree, which provided for leaving the monopoly structure organically intact, and for the application of an experimental and obviously ineffectual remedy for the restrictive practices. That pretended remedy was the establishment of a system of tribunals throughout the country, financed and controlled by the monopoly companies, which were to receive complaints of the independent exhibitors. The decree was a distinct victory for monopoly, and a sad and discouraging disappointment for the independents.

It took the Department of Justice about 4 years to discover the futility of this experiment by which monopoly was expected to cure monopoly. On August 7, 1944, more than 6 years after the institution of the suit, the Department officially stated that the consent "decree is now inadequate to perform its intended function of restraining the violations of law alleged in the complaint and conforming the operation of the decree defendants to the requirements of the Sherman Act."

The Department of Justice is the largest, the best equipped, and most expensive law office in the world; and it is hard to believe that the futility of that consent decree was not clearly obvious to it in the beginning.

The consent decree having failed, the Department of Justice brought the case on for trial, and the trial began in October 1945. The defendants were held guilty of practically all the discriminations and predatory acts charged, and those acts were prohibited. Although for many years the Department of Justice had collected and undoubtedly possessed much evidence of the unlawful methods used to eliminate independent theaters, to ruin the exhibitors and to acquire their properties and businesses, not one of the victims was called as a witness to prove this ugly and brutal phase of the case. Although the Department of Justice records must be loaded with information of such methods, no evidence at all to that effect was produced by the Government. As a result, the trial court refused to order the divestiture of any theaters.

On the refusal of divestiture by the trial court, the Department appealed the case to the Supreme Court, and on May 3, 1948, the Supreme Court handed down an opinion which amounted to a complete victory for the Government on that phase of the case. I am told that the decision of the Supreme Court is the greatest victory ever achieved by the Government with regard to dissolution of corporate monopoly, that it is a clarifying landmark case in antimonopoly law, and should be a powerful and effectual precedent for use by the Government in similar cases. Briefly stated, the rule laid down in that decision was that every acquisition made by the unlawful methods and practices by the defendants was subject to divestiture. The Supreme Court, therefore, sent the case back to the trial court with instructions to ascertain what theaters had been acquired by such methods and to require that they be disposed of.

Had that mandate been carried out, many of the theaters would have been recovered by former owners, and the rest would have come into the hands of a diversity of independent operators. By that method, without a doubt, competition would have been restored, and much of the wreckage and ruination caused by the big film companies would have been repaired.

But any such wholesome result had been forestalled by further consent decrees between the Department of Justice and the monopoly companies, which represent a surrender by the Government of at least 75 percent of the fruits of the victory in the Supreme Court. These consent decrees were made by drawing a curtain over the savage and criminal competitive methods used by the defendants, the large film companies. As the trial court to which the case had been remanded for divestiture said: "We were also directed to determine whether any 'illegal fruits' were acquired or maintained by the defendants as results of unlawful conspiracies and to divest any such fruits, irrespective of whether the monopoly had in fact been achieved. The plaintiff (the Government) has not introduced evidence to support any claim of divestiture of 'illegal fruits'

and expressly reserves the presentation of such an issue for the future."

As of this time such consent decrees have been made with three of the five monopoly combinations, and according to latest reports, the fourth, dealing with the Fox combination, is to be presented to the Court early in April. The decrees already filed relate to the Paramount, Warner, and RKO combinations. As all are substantially alike, I will confine my description to the Paramount decree.

Paramount was a great combination of picture making and exhibiting corporations. It had about 1,500 of the principal theaters in the country, and was the largest aggregation of theaters in the world. It enjoyed very valuable and exclusive preferences in the use of the Paramount pictures. Considering the similar preferences and priorities with regard to the pictures of the other film companies, which the Paramount theaters also enjoyed as a result of the unlawful division of territory condemned by the Supreme Court, the mere number of theaters did not correctly reflect the dominating position of the company. Had the principle of dissolution pronounced by the Supreme Court been applied, I venture to say Paramount would have retained less than 100 theaters.

The Paramount consent decree was entered March 4, 1949. The leading feature of that decree was the separation of the theaters from the picture-making and film-renting part of the business. All of the theaters were transferred to a newly created corporation.

As that decree was originally entered, it was provided that the new theater corporation and the corporation retaining the picture-making and renting business should not have common stockholders; but already that requirement had been modified with the consent of the Department of Justice. Experience justifies the fear that future modifications will be made and in the end a complete community of interest and reunion of the companies will occur. In fact, the decree provides that the court shall retain jurisdiction for future modifications.

The second main feature of the Paramount decree was an ostensible requirement that the new theater company should dispose of some of the theaters received by it in the divorcement transaction. The maximum requirement of the decree is that the corporation shall divest about 700 theaters, which would still leave it the largest aggregation of theaters in the world, still possessing the massed purchasing power condemned by the Supreme Court. I say the requirement to dispose of theaters is merely ostensible because in this respect the decree is so heavily loaded with conditions, alternatives, choices, options, and qualifications favoring the retention of theaters by Paramount that it amounts to no real requirement at all. Moreover, those contingencies and escape devices with which the decree is loaded will give rise to so many complex factual and legal issues to be referred to and decided by the court that compliance, if it ever occurs, will be postponed for many years.

The third main feature of the decree is the express permission to Paramount to acquire many theaters. One would not expect to find such permission in a judgment whose ostensible purpose is to end monopoly and dissolve the massed purchasing power which had been used so injuriously to the public interest. In many instances exhibitors found it impossible to get a necessary supply of pictures unless they gave up an interest in their businesses to the monopoly film companies, and as a result Paramount acquired stock interests in many such companies. In such cases, the decree, instead of compelling relinquishment of the acquired interest, permits Paramount to acquire the outstanding interest. The decree of March 1949, however, placed a limit on such acquisitions. For instance, as to theaters in Texas, the permission to make such an acquisition is limited to 44 theaters. But as recently as March 1 that limitation has been modified and broken down with the consent of the Department of Justice, and by a method which seems to have been largely devised by Government lawyers.

That transaction, which was effectuated by an amendment of the decree of March 1949, also provides for the ostensible divestiture of other theaters, supposed to offset in some measure the number of theaters acquired, but, again, that provision is subject to a complexity of conditions, exceptions, options, and qualifications, which make the divestitures improbable and long delayed, and which will involve the court in the decision of numerous questions, all favoring the retention of the largest number of theaters by Paramount. The mere administration of this amendment, which is to occur over a period of 5 years or more, will undoubtedly cost the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars of the money appropriated by Congress for the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

On March 1 last the Court was asked by the Department of Justice to approve a transaction by which Paramount acquired and added to theaters already held from 95 to 171 theaters in Texas, by acquiring the Consolidated Theaters, Inc., for $12,500,000. Three Government lawyers appeared and strongly urged the Court to approve the transaction, on the specious theory that to increase the number of theaters already controlled by Paramount would promote competition in the exhibition field in Texas and elsewhere. Two short days before the hearing a statement was published in one of the trade periodicals that objections to the transaction would be permitted. Naturally, because of the extreme shortness of the time and the meager and inexact information published, few people in the industry were able to take advantage of the permission. Nevertheless, my counsel appeared and registered serious objections to the transaction. Under the circumstances, those objections were foredoomed to failure; and the Court accepted the proposal of the Department of Justice. For our pains my counsel and the people represented by him were severely criticised by the Government and Paramount counsel for making the objection.

It was, indeed, too much to expect the Court to reject such a transaction sponsored by an important department of the Government in conjunction with the $100,000,000 Paramount Co., merely upon the objection of a few small companies, however valid and correct their criticisms might be.

The manner in which this case has been handled has produced widespread lack of confidence among independent exhibitors throughout the country in the sincerity and effectiveness of the Department of Justice in the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Supreme Court Justice Jackson, and former Attorney General, is reported to have stated that antitrust cases have been brought for political reasons; and, in the light of the motion-picture consent judgments, one wonders whether they are not also settled on the same basis. The following is an excerpt from newspapers published on February 10, 1951:

"At a recent New York Bar Association dinner, Supreme Court Justice Jackson stated that for some years antitrust suits were started against business firms on a political basis.

"Jackson added that he saw no reason for not being candid about the situation. 'After all,' he said 'they had to be picked on some basis.'

"Reports of those present at the dinner reveal that Jackson and others present got a big laugh out of his admission."

The foregoing is by no means a rare and isolated case. If such maladministration of the antitrust laws is not ended, Congress ought to cease appropriating money for the enforcement of those laws. I am informed that the current appropriation is close to four million dollars, much of which, as I have shown, has been misused for the creation and protection of monopoly and restraint of trade.

Specifically, I suggest that Congress should amend the antitrust laws by enacting that no decree in any antitrust case shall be consented to by the Department of Justice and entered by the court until at least 90 days public notice shall have been given to people in the trade affected, and a full and complete opportunity has been had to register their objections and counter proposals in the court, with the right to appeal if the objections and proposals shall be disregarded. I suggest also that the appropriation for the enforcement of the antitrust laws should contain a limitation to the effect that no part should be paid for services incident to the entry or modification of any consent decree providing for the retention or acquisition by any company of any property or business which has been, or may be, acquired or used by or for monopolistic methods.

If only part of what I state is true, I think you will agree with me that the powers of our great and beloved Government for enforcement of the antitrust laws have been greatly abused, and that the restrictions described above should be imposed so that the laws may be enforced against and not in favor of monopoly. All, or almost all, of the foregoing can be proven by records of the Department of Justice, including records of interviews with and evidence furnished by many independent exhibitors throughout the country.

I stand ready, also, to furnish such other information to the same effect as is available to me.

Respectfully,

FANCHON & MARCO, INC.,
By HARRY C. ARTHUR, Jr.

Cincinnati Enquirer Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from a recent issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer which centralizes the results of a poll taken by that newspaper on 10 of the most important subjects of discussion today. Since the ballots on these questions went into more than 300,000 homes in the Central Ohio Valley, the viewpoints of those who replied are of particular interest.

The editorial follows:

READERS VOTE "NO" ON "18" DRAFT, PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION, TRUMAN, ACHESON—ALSO ARMY ABROAD—UNLESS CONGRESS ACTS—"YES" ON RED INQUIRY, WAGE, STRIKE CONTROL

(By Ollie M. James)

History is on the dead run these days. Profoundly important decisions are being reached almost amidst a millrace of moments. From the somber chambers of city council to the august assemblies at Lake Success, things are happening. The destiny of the Nation is being written with a hurried hand. The shape of tomorrow's world is being determined. Everybody, it would seem, is speaking in the name of the public.

What does John Smith think about it—and his wife Mary?

A plain wholesome curiosity about the individual viewpoint on the urgent issues of the day prompted the Enquirer to run an Enquirer Reader's Poll ballot last week end, urging the expression of individual viewpoints on 10 of the foremost topics of popular discussion.

These ballots went into more than 300,000 homes in the central Ohio Valley, concerting both the daily and Sunday subscription lists of the Enquirer. There was no expectation that the return would constitute a scientific poll, even though the base of public opinion thereby contacted was vastly broader than ordinarily is reached by the scientific pollsters No prizes were offered, and no pressure was exerted for people to respond. The ballots merely were printed as an opportunity for individuals to register their viewpoints.

Some of the results were surprising. A straight news story would blurt them out in the lead. In this report, though, they are purposely subordinated to all this preamble of explanation to emphasize that the editors of the Enquirer are not trying to prove anything, nor did they want to prove anything, by calling on the voice of the public.

Only 1,610 voted in the reader's poll. We say "only 1,610" again merely for the sake of keeping things in proper perspective, although that was a fair sample or cross-section of readers who took the time and went to the trouble and expense of filling out the poll forms and mailing them back to the Enquirer. (Many pretentious scientific polls have based their conclusions on far fewer responses.)

Furthermore, readers were asked to vote on all 10 issues—and most did. So it was assumed that there would be some balancing-out of personal prejudices on the various issues.

This was the "sock-dolager": In response to the first question, "Were Harry Truman to run again for President of the United States, would you vote for him?" Only 93 out of 1,566 persons said "Yes." Percentagewise, the reader opinion against President Truman's reelection was equaled in only one other category. On the seventh question of the poll, "Do you believe in Government prevention of strikes during time of war and national emergency?" there was another preponderance of 94 percent—this time affirmative.

Although comments were not solicited, some readers went to special effort to emphasize how they felt on the subject of reelecting President Truman. Here are a few comments culled from the returns: "Hell, no." "A thousand times no." "We need character, ability, and thrift in Washington." "Never did vote for him." "Yes; if he is opposed to TAFT or MCCARTHY." "He should be impeached."

Eighty-eight percent of the readers responding to the poll answered "Yes" to the second question on the list, "Should the military forces of Chiang Kai-shek be used in the conflict in Korea?"

There was a notable unanimity of response to the third question on the readers' poll, "Is President Truman justified in keeping Dean Acheson as Secretary of State?" Eighty-five percent of the poll returns were marked "No" on this question.

Were the ballot markers strictly men and women opposed to administration policies? The returns provided some answer (and tended to bear out the hope that individual prejudices and biases would level off in the answering of 10 different questions) when readers voted almost 2 to 1, or 938 against 520, in favor of continuing the United Nations' offensive north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

"Shall we send four more divisions to Europe without the consent of Congress?" This question—hewing to the heart of the great debate in Washington—was answered in the negative by 80 percent of the readers.

"Is the drafting of 18-year-olds necessary and proper?" On this question there was a significant division of opinion. Forty-six percent said "Yes" and 54 percent said "No." (Of all 10 questions, the second largest number of readers avoided committing themselves on this issue.)

"Do you favor tighter control of wages as well as of prices to halt inflation?" That, the last question on the poll, encountered surprising accord. The vote was 91 percent for tighter control.

By the same precise percentage, readers expressed approval of a State-wide investigation of communism in Ohio, as recently ordered by unanimous vote of the State general assembly. Only 9 percent of the readers opposed the idea.

A local issue, phrased in this question: "If you voted for the proportional representation type of election in 1947, would you again vote for it?" yielded a striking response. The vote, as broken down into percentages, was 65 to 35 against proportional representation. The totals ran: For proportional representation, 359; against, 654; not voting, 597. (The poll ballots asked persons living outside Cincinnati to ignore the question, so the number of those not voting therefore included both nonresidents as well as previous opponents of proportional representation.)

What does it all prove? The editors of the Enquirer do not undertake to say. But they are proceeding on the assumption that it has been an interesting experiment in sampling general public opinion on the foremost issues of the day—and that it has given John Smith and his wife Mary a chance to say what they think on specific questions, apart from Election Day pressures of politics. The poll will be repeated periodically hereafter, as important issues arise.

This newspaper—and every conscientious man in public office—wants to know how America thinks.

Ballots were received from some very important personages. But the editors rested their opinion, in deciding on the worth of the readers' poll, on a note from one woman reader. It said simply:

"Thanks for the privilege of expressing my opinion."

Address of Hon. John Davis Lodge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of remarks of the Honorable John Lodge, Governor of Connecticut, before the quarterly New England Council dinner, Hartford, March 22, 1951:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Robertson, officers and members of the New England Council, honored guests; it gives me especial pleasure to welcome you to Hartford, and to meet with so many citizens of distinction from Connecticut and from our sister New England States.

Your distinguished president, Mr. Wheeler, has accorded me what I can describe only as an overwhelming introduction. Assuredly my own modest merits deserve no such generous accolade. I can only assume that as a large, handsome man, he is accustomed to doing things in a large handsome way.

In recent weeks it has been my privilege to see Mr. Wheeler in action at close range. I noted with admiration the vigor and tenacity with which he grapples with problems close to his heart. It was never my good fortune to see him play football for the alma mater which we share in common, but knowing that he was one of the greatest tackles ever to perform for Harvard, I found myself wishing that there could be a few Walter Wheelers on Harvard's present day football squads.

This morning, attracted by the beauty of the scene, I walked part way to the office. And as I went along, I thought what a remarkable organization the New England Council is. I reflected upon all that the Council has done to promote winter sports in New England. It has given us skiing for the Christmas week end and for the New Year's week end. And now, lo and behold, it provides us with skiing for the Easter week end.

Recognizing the indomitable spirit and resourcefulness of your president, I have no doubt that that ingenious gentleman could, if he put his mind to the problem, see to it that we have skiing also for the Fourth of July.

I take great satisfaction from being with my fellow New Englanders this evening. For, both as individuals in your several communities and as a well-organized body, you represent the best in civic responsibility. Because of your devotion to this historic and beautiful region, because of your faith in yourselves, and your neighbors, you have banded together to foster, not merely the economy of the New England States, but the ideals and the traditions stamped by our stout forefathers upon the rugged hills and gracious valleys of the area.

In your more than a quarter century of service to New England, you have contributed tellingly to the development of our industries which now produce manufactures totaling more than $14,000,000,000 annually. Because of your far-sighted and constructive attitudes, you have assuredly been a compelling factor in the attainment of New England's excellent labor-management record. You have helped to make famous the agricultural products of our region. You have given impetus to the sound growth of our many colleges, universities and technical and preparatory schools.

Moreover, while on the one hand you have encouraged among us a prosperous business and industrial economy, you have also made your influence felt in the achievement of greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of State and local government affairs. In short, the New England council has been a good friend and wise counselor to the entire region. Under your guidance and tutelage you have enabled New England to fulfill more abundantly the destiny to which it is entitled through the superlative character and ability of its people.

Such thoughtful efforts have not only their long-term value. Their worth becomes dramatically apparent in times of stress. There is no doubt in my mind that we in New England have been enabled by the program of the council to make a notably more effective contribution to the national defense effort than would otherwise have been possible.

At the opening of the Connecticut General Assembly, I said, "We in Connecticut must, as we have done in the past, throw into

the scale of our national defense all the creative energy and all the productive increase of which our 2,000,000 citizens are capable. Connecticut is a famous arsenal of the Nation" and has been since Eli Whitney at an abandoned sawmill in Hamden developed the methods of mass production to provide rifles for Washington's army. During the last war Connecticut had the highest per capita production of war goods of all the States. Springfield, Vt., achieved the same honor for communities. Many of the things which can be said for each of the New England States can be recited with equal accuracy for all New England. We in New England must, as we have done in the past, throw into the scale of our national defense all the creative energy and all the productive increase of which our 9,330,000 citizens are capable.

One of the reasons for the creation and for the continued existence of the New England Council is to provide a medium whereby the business leaders of New England can express their opinions concerning public affairs and help guide the actions of government. The existence of the organization as such a medium seems, however, to have led some business leaders to believe that there is no need for them to be vocal individually.

Inasmuch as the business leader is almost invariably a person of superior initiative and sense of responsibility, and since in many instances he is able to express his views forcefully and cogently, it is to be hoped that you who play leading roles in our economy will be willing individually, as well as collectively, to demonstrate your belief in our economic, social, and governmental systems by expressing your opinions freely and in public.

The currency of the businessman is dollars. We who hold public office are concerned with another kind of currency—the currency called public support. May I be so bold as to suggest that if our business leaders are to be truly influential in public affairs, they must be as courageous in terms of their own currency as they would like their public servants to be when those public servants are placed under pressure by certain segments of the electorate.

At the suggestion of the six New England governors, the New England Council was brought into being a little more than a quarter of a century ago. The succeeding governors have continued to cooperate with each other in the furtherance of projects of value to all New England.

As we become more and more concerned with the same problems we shall need further to implement the New England Governors' Conference by some kind of informal machinery to develop material for consideration by the governors at their meeting and for carrying out the policies determined by them.

Each of the States has a commission on intergovernmental cooperation. I am suggesting to Gov. Sherman Adams, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Governors' Conference, that those commissions be utilized to do the staff work.

I attended earlier this month in Washington the New England Economic and Defense Conference sponsored by the New England congressional delegation and the New England Council. To me it did not seem that the Federal procurement agencies have set up at this time adequate machinery to keep small business informed on contract and subcontract opportunities. The New England people might well work out more practical methods. I have designated the Connecticut Development Commission as the official State agency to assist small business in this matter. That agency will be glad to work together with similar offices in the other New England States and with your council.

The New England States have for many years cooperated with one another in the conservation and development of our natural resources through the medium of interstate compacts.

All the States except Vermont are partners in the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact. All have joined the compact for mutual assistance in fighting forest fires. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut are members of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Compact. It seems likely that Vermont and New Hampshire and possibly Maine will join this year. The Federal New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee a week ago gave the States a green light for going ahead with action on interstate compacts concerned with control of floods in the Connecticut and Merrimack River Valleys.

Currently, the New England States are working on a compact for mutual assistance for civil defense. Massachusetts and New Hampshire have already ratified a civil defense agreement. I understand that the civil defense authorities of the area are to meet in Boston on April 3 to devise an agreement for all the New England States which can be submitted to Congress for approval as a compact. As a further safeguard for the lives and homes of our people, and in protection of the New England industries so vital to national defense, I trust that this compact will shortly come into being.

Of considerable interest to everyone in New England is the 4-year study of our natural resources and those of New York State by a committee of six Federal agencies created by Presidential directive.

I might say, parenthetically, that of all the water flowing in Connecticut's 8,500 miles of rivers and brooks, 70 percent comes into Connecticut from outside the State. The Connecticut River at the Massachusetts-Connecticut State line represents approximately two-thirds of our inland water resources. We are naturally keenly interested in working with the up-river States in water management problems.

I am very much pleased that the Inter-Agency Committee last Friday, in response to my urging, gave the four States in the Connecticut River Valley full clearance to ratify the Connecticut River flood control compact as drafted by the duly authorized representatives of the States. That action lends much weight to the statements of the interagency committee that it wishes to cooperate with the State governments in resources management programs. Failure to have given New England a green light in this matter and on the New England interstate water pollution control compact would have constituted a serious setback to State participation in the work of the committee.

We can also all approve the action of the interagency committee last Friday during its meeting here in Hartford, giving the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission clearance to take such action as they see fit, without waiting for further study by the committee, relative to the proposed construction of a hydroelectric dam in the Connecticut River at Enfield Rapids.

This constitutes a favorable precedent for leaving the way open for the development of other desirable power projects in New England and New York without waiting for the conclusions of the interagency committee in June of 1954.

But your program tomorrow morning includes a discussion of the interagency committee's work and I will refrain from further comment concerning it, other than to express the opinion that the States seem to be more than pulling their weight in the boat.

It is to be hoped that the results of the 4 years of study will be such that all New England can support it.

I am sure you will understand if I take some family pride in the Federal Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1950. Section 205 of that act, as most of you know, resulted from the introduction in the Congress of the so-called Lodge-Furcolo amendment, a bipartisan measure sponsored by my brother, Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, and Congressman FURCOLO, of Springfield, Mass. That amendment was the inception of the program being carried out by the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee.

I am still at a loss to understand why this section, which had the general approval of both Houses of the Congress, should have been so severely criticized by the President and why it should have been necessary for him to resort to a Presidential directive to achieve the same general objective. But this is not the time to debate that question.

At a meeting of the New England Governors in Boston last January, I asked whether the study authorized by the Congress was to be forgotten and whether there would be duplication of expenditure or manpower to cover the same field under both congressional and Presidential directives.

I have been assured by Col. F. F. Frech, chairman of the committee, that this matter has been given continuing and serious consideration and that every effort is being made to avoid such duplication.

When the interagency committee completes its study in 1954 the New England States should continue their interstate cooperation in the development of plans, programs, and projects for the continued management of natural resources in those ways which will best satisfy the needs and desires of our people.

Those needs and desires will increase and change from time to time and those changes will always make it possible to undertake new plans. We must be sure that interest in our soil, forest, mineral, wildlife, and water resources is not permitted to diminish with the ending of the study.

When I first accepted the invitation to speak at this meeting I hoped to be able to make a definite statement concerning the proposal to build a steel mill in New England. Unfortunately, it is not possible to do so tonight. In connection with the discussion of whether a steel mill should be built in Connecticut or in New England, it is of interest to note that the first successful iron mill in America was in Massachusetts and that the first steel made in America was produced in Simsbury, Conn.

As you know, the New England Steel Development Corp. established by your organization, to promote the construction of a steel mill in New England, engaged a firm of consulting engineers to determine the potential market which could be supplied competitively by a steel mill in Waterford, Conn., and also to prepare estimates of the cost of construction and of operation for such a mill and to determine whether it would be a sound business venture. Governor Bowles appointed a Governor's steel advisory committee to advise Connecticut as to the feasibility of constructing such a mill in this State.

The report of the engineers was submitted 2 weeks ago and was immediately withdrawn. Your steel development corporation is now awaiting a revised report. Until it is received and can be studied neither your corporation nor our committee can state definitely whether the mill can be expected to operate as a private enterprise project. The Governor's steel advisory committee has reported to me that it cannot make a recommendation as to the desirability or feasibility of the project.

Your corporation obtained from the Federal Government a certificate of necessity under the internal revenue law which would permit the steel mill to depreciate three-fourths of its investment at 20 percent per year instead of the normal 3½ percent. This certificate expires in 7 weeks.

A number of such certificates have been issued to encourage expansion of steel production capacity of the country as a defense measure. The Federal agencies have indicated that additional certificates will not be issued. We have not yet learned definitely whether the certificate for the New England mill can be renewed.

The Connecticut General Assembly has before it a proposal that the State grant power of eminent domain to acquire the site in Waterford, Conn., selected by your corporation, for the mill. There is understandable reluctance however, about taking such a drastic step until there is sufficient guaranty that the proposed mill will be economically feasible and will provide the hoped-for benefits to New England's and Connecticut's economy.

I have appointed a community adjustment committee to define the type of collateral problems which might develop in eastern Connecticut as a result of the construction of the proposed steel mill and to suggest what steps should be taken to meet those problems.

It seems likely that the reports of the consulting engineers, the New England Steel Development Corp., the governor's steel advisory committee and the committee on community adjustment problems will shortly be available for consideration.

Despite the fact that New England is a well-knit entity in many respects there still is less community interest throughout the area than was once the case. The New England Council has done much to better this situation, but there remains room for improvement.

We in Connecticut have too little knowledge of what goes on in the northern New England States, partly because the news from there which reaches Connecticut papers through various news services is to a considerable degree the sensational type. Similarly, the newspapers of the Northern States carry too little news of what is happening in Connecticut.

For example, we in New England are very much interested in hydroelectric power, but there are few people in southern New England who know that a power dam was finished on the Connecticut River in New Hampshire and Vermont last year and that another is proposed for construction in the near future. Residents of northern New England have little knowledge of the proposal to construct a power dam on the Connecticut River in Connecticut.

New England's consumption of power is growing by leaps and bounds. During the war a number of power generators scheduled for installation here were diverted by the Federal Government to other parts of the United States and to Russia. Since the war, much new generating capacity has been installed. We have managed to meet all demands and at the same time keep on hand a larger margin of emergency reserve than any other region in the country. Power consumption will continue to grow at a rapid rate. Consummation of present plans will keep us ahead of the demand.

New England is a high-cost area for making power as it is a high-cost area for making other things. We have high wage scales and must import raw materials. In the scurry to see that we always have adequate facilities for making all the power we can use, we must not forget to keep a sharp pencil at work on the cost of power. It is not enough to simply make sure that rates are equitable as between producer and consumer. Keeping the rates just is one thing. Keeping them as low as possible is even more important.

The proposals for the St. Lawrence seaway, and the development of hydroelectric power at the International Rapids and projected redevelopment of Niagara Falls for additional hydroelectric power are of more than academic interest to the people of New England. For many years there has been a belief in New England that development of the St. Lawrence seaway from the ocean to the Great Lakes would have adverse effects on New England's harbors and on the waterway and railway transportation systems of the area.

Recommendations by General Marshall and Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilizer, that the St. Lawrence seaway should be built promptly, indicate the importance ascribed to this project as a defense measure. We in New England should make every effort to determine the adverse effects which this development might bring about in New England and to take steps to compensate for them.

New England, which provides such a relatively large portion of the Federal tax dollar, should obtain dependable assurance that the proposed seaway, which would cost the citizens of this area so much money, must at least not hurt the citizens of the area. Moreover, those parts of New England which, geographically, are in a position to benefit from the projected new hydroelectric power development should seek to establish that such benefit is to be forthcoming.

For many years there has been an exchange of some power between New England and New York State. We should determine the plans of New York State for integrating the power developed at the St. Lawrence and at Niagara Falls through existing transmission and distribution systems of New York State and the surrounding States, particularly New England.

The St. Lawrence and Niagara power is largely base power and there is a likelihood that peak power developed at proposed hydroelectric sites in New England can be exchanged with New York.

In the best interests of New England we should work with the New York State people in the furtherance of their program.

Possessed of relatively meager natural resources, New England has evolved from a wilderness into a densely populated and heavily industrialized region with unusually high per capita income and standards of living. Ingenuity and a willingness to work together have been welded by a traditional independence of spirit into a winning formula.

Our spiritual, educational, and cultural standards do not lag behind our material attainments.

It is interesting to reflect that three-fourths of New England's land area is covered by forest growth. In no other region of the United States is the proportion of forest land as great as it is in New England.

Early in the twentieth century New England took the lead in the United States in working for the purchase of mountain lands for national forests. The two national forests in New England have a significant role in the New England forestry picture, but they are small in relation to the total forest area of the six States. New England's forestry problem is primarily a problem of management of privately owned lands.

In thickly populated and heavily industrialized Massachusetts and Connecticut, forests occupy two-thirds and three-fifths of the land areas. Population is concentrated and cropland is scarce. Agriculture, like population, is concentrated in the most suitable areas and like industry is highly specialized. New England counties in Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut rank high among 2,500 competing counties in the United States in the value of farm products.

We cannot, as you of the New England council so well recognize, rest on our oars. Other areas, until recently, relatively undeveloped, with more abundant natural resources and with new-found devices are building fast on the industrial and commercial foundations on which our forefathers struggled laboriously. We must not be content to keep abreast of the stream of civilization which forever flows at an increasing speed. We must continue to pioneer—not against the obstacles of a new country, but to surmount the higher and higher hurdles which are natural developments in an old region. Our job is one of rebuilding and redevelopment.

I had opportunity the other day to read the attractive and tastefully compiled booklet recently issued by the New England council. I was particularly struck by its compelling title "The Rising Tide Lifts All the Boats."

"The rising tide lifts all the boats." How aptly that phrase describes the meaning which underlies the work of the council. For your efforts are not channeled into a narrow field. You do not concern yourselves solely with greater volume of business or larger output of production, useful though such progress is to the development of our region. You have enlarged your concepts to the circle of your duties. In a large-spirited way you have directed your very great talents and energies to the whole problem of making New England a better and still better area in which to live, to work, and to bring up the children whose endeavors will be built upon our own. This is an intelligent and modern-minded approach.

We who have been entrusted with public office in New England must look increasingly to you of the New England council for informed opinion and for help in the shaping and execution of the policies which we hold vital to the well-being of our communities, our States, and the entire section.

New England has a unique flavor. Around the very words, "New England" have accreted a store of legend and tradition. It is a flavor compounded of our salty ways and our fabled independence of spirit. Its essence clings to our picturesque hills and nestles around the centuries old homesteads of our quiet valleys.

When we think of New England, what pictures come to the mind: Magnificent stretches of white sea beach, brooks, and streams turbulent as the course of our history, wide rivers, and majestic lakes. New England is the laconic twang of the Yankee farmer; it is the skilled fingers of the artisan; it is the deep snow of Maine winters; it is the diverse arts and crafts of a hundred hardy racial stocks; it is the clang of 20,000 busy factories; it is the immemorial shade of campus elms.

But for all New England's scenic charm, for all its quaint lore, for all its mighty tradition, this region of ours owes its real greatness to another factor, and that factor is the human growth and progress which have been made in our six States for more than 300 years. Roll back that long chronicle and you will observe that the core of New England is the courage, the hardihood, and the dynamism of her people. Those are the qualities that have made us a great region, and that will keep us a great region.

I salute you gentlemen of the New England council for your determination that these priceless attributes of New England character and talent shall be given their fullest encouragement to flower and to spread. For what God has given us in New England let us offer thanks not alone with our tongues but with enduring creative enterprise of hand and heart and mind to the end that this region which we love and serve shall become a land teeming with productive increase, and shall prosper in all its ways.

Voice of America and Charles M. Hulten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, during debate yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] read into the RECORD a portion of the committee hearings which pertained to the Voice of America program where he was interrogating Mr. Charles M. Hulten, general manager, International Information and Education Exchange Program. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] left the impression that he does not believe Mr. Hulten is qualified to be general manager of this tremendous operation, and particularly the Voice of America program. I concur in the opinion of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

There seems to be a discrepancy between his evaluation of Mr. Hulten and the profile of Mr. Hulten which appears on page 10 of the March 21, 1951, edition of the U. S. A. Life Air Bulletin, for use by press and radio. The profile of Mr. Hulten which appears in this bulletin reads as follows:

CHARLES M. HULTEN, GENERAL MANAGER, INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATION EXCHANGE PROGRAM

(In Burma an agriculturalist tells a farmer how to improve his crops. In Indonesia a musician reads a review of a New York concert. In Chile a classroom of children watch an educational film. In Poland a woman turns a radio dial to hear how the United Nations is fighting Communist aggression. These and countless similar incidents are the end result of America's information and educational exchange program, which every day sends the voice of democracy sounding around the world.)

In January 1950 the United States Department of State decided that this program, which is the Nation's most effective method of combating Kremlin propaganda, needed a general manager. The decision was made so that Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, could be freed of the day-to-day problems of the expanding program to devote more of his time to high-level policy matters.

There was one logical person to fill the position of general manager for the program: the dynamic, square-jawed man who was then serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administration—Charles M. Hulten. Mr. Hulten had had wide experience as a newspaperman and university professor. He had held executive positions in the Government for almost 10 years. His abilities in the fields of administration and information had won him the respect and admiration of all who had worked with him.

As general manager of the program, Mr. Hulten has charge of the Office of International Information and the Office of Educational Exchange. Under the Information Office the Voice of America radio programs are broadcast to countries all over the world, including Russia and the iron-curtain countries, and news reels, film strips, press features, and other material are sent to nations that have a free flow of information.

The Educational Exchange Office arranges for the exchange of students, teachers, journalists, and labor leaders between the United States and other countries. This program also includes the setting up and maintaining of more than 150 free libraries in countries all over the world.

Mr. Hulten was well qualified to take over the demanding task of managing these two programs. He was graduated from the University of Wisconsin's School of Journalism in 1929 and received his master of arts degree there 2 years later. During his college course he worked as a staff member of the Wisconsin State Journal in Madison. For 4 years he worked on several other Midwestern newspapers, both as a reporter and editor.

In 1934 he joined the faculty of the University of Oregon as associate professor of journalism. It was there that he met Margaret Britts Reid, a charming young writer, and they were married in 1936. In 1939 Mr. Hulten took a leave of absence from the University of Oregon to spend a year at Stanford University as acting assistant professor of journalism.

A few months after the United States entered World War II, he was brought to Washington as a consultant to the United States Bureau of the Budget. He continued with the Budget Bureau as senior management analyst for a year and a half. Mr. Hulten then transferred to the Office of War Information, where he became Assistant Director for Management. It was there that he met Edward W. Barrett, the Assistant Director for Overseas Operations. The two men built up a sound working cooperation in those days that continues in their present close association.

After the war ended, Mr. Hulten joined the Department of State as a top executive in the information program, and the following year was appointed deputy to WILLIAM BENTON, then Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Mr. Hulten took over many of the operational duties of the Public Affairs program and represented Mr. BENTON on committees and in policy conferences.

A man of great force and personal magnetism, Mr. Hulten was named in February 1947 as deputy to John E. Peurifoy, Assistant Secretary of State for Administration. In that important post he was closely associated with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). He was a United States delegate to the UNESCO general conference in Mexico City in 1947 and in Beirut in 1948. In 1948 and 1949 he was the United States representative of the UNESCO Advisory Panel on Finance and Administration in Paris.

Since he became general manager of the information and educational exchange program, Mr. Hulten has traveled in South America, Europe, and the Near East to see at first hand the field operations of his program.

Mr. Hulten, whose grandparents came to America from Sweden, was born in Athens, Wis., on June 10, 1909. He is proud of his Swedish inheritance and of being brought up in the midwestern region of the country, which he considers the heart of America. He and Mrs. Hulten live in Washington, D. C., with their 9-year-old son, Charles. Mrs. Hulten has given up her writing career and now devotes her time to her family and community activities.

Mr. Speaker, this reminds me of the way Members of Congress are asked to write up their own biography for insertion in the Congressional Directory. In all probability this profile was edited, if not actually written by Mr. Hulten. It states, and I quote:

Mr. Hulten was well qualified to take over the demanding task of managing these two programs.

Is it not strange that out of the millions of men in the United States that, and I quote again from the profile, "There was one logical person to fill the position of general manager for the program: the dynamic, square-jawed man who was then serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administration—Charles M. Hulten."

I cannot help but wonder if Mr. Hulten's wide experience could be the few years he spent as a young man working for newspapers.

Again, the author of the profile of Mr. Hulten, which evidently was meant to be beamed over the ether waves of the Voice of America did not spare himself when he states:

A man of great force and personal magnetism, Mr. Hulten was named in February 1947 as deputy to John E. Peurifoy, Assistant Secretary of State for Administration.

Mr. Speaker, it is natural to assume that the people who know Mr. Hulten will be in the best position to judge who is right, Mr. ROONEY or the author of the profile. From Mr. Hulten's performance with the Voice of America I reiterate that I concur in Mr. ROONEY's opinion that Mr. Hulten is not qualified to be general manager of this tremendous operation.

The Nation's Predicament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial, entitled "The Nation's Predicament," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Monday, April 9, 1951:

THE NATION'S PREDICAMENT

General MacArthur's letter to Representative JOE MARTIN has touched off a new tirade against the general in Washington and London.

Let there be no mistake about it. The American people have no quarrel with General MacArthur. They do not resent the advice he has offered and much less do they resent the fact that he has offered it.

The American people know that 9,000 American boys have been killed in the Korean War, but do not know what purpose this sacrifice is supposed to serve or how it is to be ended. They want to hear anything General MacArthur may have to say on either point and they don't care a hoot if Mr. Truman's feelings are hurt or the feelings of the British Foreign Office are hurt.

Mr. Truman, the addle-brained gift to the Nation of the Prendergast mobsters, put the United States into the Korean War without the advice of Congress and in violation of the constitutional provision that only Congress may declare war. He still doesn't know what the war is about. He doesn't know how to win it and resents the advice on this point offered by General MacArthur. Mr. Truman isn't supporting the war to the available limit, for he intends to send four divisions to Europe where there is no war instead of Korea where there is one.

Instead of heeding MacArthur, Mr. Truman leans on Acheson, the Anglo-Canadian friend of a traitor; on the Pentagon brass who have sold out for foreign decorations; on civilians whose main concern in life is gaining social recognition abroad; on international bankers and industrial profiteers.

The only hope for the country lies in Congress. We believe there is enough intelligence and devotion there to work out an honorable escape from the predicament which the addlehead has brought about. But if a majority of the Members of Congress betray their country, we are, indeed, lost.

The Editor Visits Front in Korea—Paul C. Smith Says MacArthur Can Win if He Is Given Freedom to Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Members to the following newspaper account of an interview of Mr. Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, by Earnest Hoberecht of the United Press. Mr. Smith is one of California's most widely known editors, and is a gentleman whose attainments cause his carefully considered statements to be of considerable importance.

The article follows:

THE EDITOR VISITS FRONT IN KOREA—PAUL C. SMITH SAYS MACARTHUR CAN WIN IF HE IS GIVEN FREEDOM TO FIGHT

(By Earnest Hoberecht)

TOKYO, April 4.—Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, said today (Wednesday) in an interview that the United Nations forces in Korea can win the war if permitted to attack across the Yalu River into China.

"I think the present forces in Korea can win the war against the Chinese armies in Korea if they are permitted to liquidate the present military handicaps which result from those directives which prevent them from operating on the other side of the Yalu River," said Smith, who visited North Korea with Gen. Douglas MacArthur Tuesday.

Smith gave his views on the Korean situation after he returned from Korea, where he flew Tuesday with MacArthur. He jeeped 15 miles into North Korea on the east coast with the United Nations commander in chief.

WAR EXPERIENCE

In World War II, Smith served in both the Marines and the Navy. He was a commander in the Navy at the time of the Japanese surrender.

"With our forces in the Orient," he said, "all we need is freedom to conduct a sound military operation."

He explained that this means that "when and if necessary, we knock out the supply lines of the Communist sources of power in Korea by air and sea."

"This means a sea blockade of China and air attacks where required," he pointed out.

"I admit," he said, "there is a calculated risk involved with the possibility of yet another intervention by Russia, but in view of China's repeatedly stated determination to drive us from Korea, it seems to me that anything short of acceptance of that risk will just result in no net gain for the anti-Communist forces of the world.

"FREEDOM TO FIGHT

"These anti-Communist forces, of which the UN units in Korea are both the spearhead and the main body, must be given freedom to fight as sound military leadership would normally fight or they are being sent to die for a lip-service cause with their hands tied behind them."

Smith said he was deeply impressed with General MacArthur, whom he had never met previously.

"General MacArthur suffers only from two things," said Smith. He listed these as "his fair weather friends and his very petty detractors."

Smith said MacArthur suffered less at the hands of his petty detractors "because they really can't touch him much."

Smith said General MacArthur possesses one of the "greatest vocabularies that I have ever encountered."

"And," said Smith, "he impresses me as having even the greater distinction of knowing what every word means."

He expressed complete confidence in MacArthur's leadership.

He paid tribute to the field forces serving under MacArthur.

Smith said that in view of what MacArthur and his fighting men in the field have had to work with, "the American people can be grateful as hell to this leader and his men."

Smith said after studying the situation and seeing considerable background material on the situation he was convinced that there has never been at any time a retreat.

TOUGH TERRAIN

He said that sometimes the United Nations forces were outnumbered as high as 20 to 1 and had to fight their way out, but they were only fighting in a different direction, as Marine Maj. Gen. O. P. Smith had stated.

"The terrain in Korea is as rotten and rough as I have ever seen," the San Francisco editor said.

He said he was greatly impressed with the evidence of complete unification of the Armed Forces under General MacArthur. He said he had observed this at both the top level and the working level.

"The services work well together and understand each other's problems," he said. Every unit has done a hell of a job.

Smith said he "was convinced that the only thing General MacArthur needs—and which he should have fast—is clarification of the mission in Korea as well as Asia as a whole.

"If our mission is unification of Korea, then the thirty-eighth parallel is not a proper political question and it is a tactically improper military line."

Smith said, "One of the main jobs of the American people" who are 7,000 to 10,000 miles from the scene of the show-down, is to see that the outfits here, from MacArthur to the newest recruit have the whole-hearted support of the Nation and those allied with them in the United Nations.

"It is difficult for anybody to keep his eye on the enemy at the front if he has to spend most of his time and energy pulling political stilettos out of his back,' Smith said.

He said he fully understood that there are political questions which can be decided only at the highest levels in the United Nations.

He said he was convinced that this point is well understood by General MacArthur.

But he said he was not convinced that some of those in high political quarters understand the urgency of General MacArthur's position as a field commander.

"As a field commander," Smith said, "he has every right to point up the urgency of the situation and to meet the situation on the strength of his own resources when there is pussyfooting or quibbling and his overall directives are inadequate or confusing."

Smith said he has been interested here in running down some of the so-called expert criticism of General MacArthur and his staff members.

For example, he said, he had been interested in the charges that some of MacArthur's staff had been with him too long.

On the basis of his experience here, he said, he found this criticism completely invalid.

"I have been impressed with the exceptional competence of MacArthur's staff," Smith said. "This exceptional competence stems from the fact that they have been working together through thick and thin for a decade.

"Any idea that such experience and understanding within a top staff is bad rather than good is to me contrary to practical sense."

The Price of Inaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commonweal of April 6, 1951:

THE PRICE OF INACTION

India is thousands of miles away. Its masses are chronically poverty-stricken. The peoples of the East have ever been subject to drought, flood, and famine. That is one way some balance is maintained between powers of sustenance and population. Besides India's threatened famine is largely due to her own chauvinism, from failure to purchase surplus grain from Moslem Pakistan. And why should India be deserving of special American consideration? Have not Mr. Nehru, Sir Benegal Rau, and others opposed this country's proposals about North Korea and Communist China when the chips were down in the UN? Too many other items deserve precedence at a time when we are girding strenuously for our own self-defense.

Some such sentiments are believed to account for the failure of Congress to take action on Mr. Truman's formal request for surplus grain for India of over 6 weeks ago. Meanwhile Indian conditions have grown considerably worse. Pakistan no longer has an exportable grain surplus. Continued drought in Bihar has meant the failure of the winter crop and some forty millions there are in immediate peril. Will this in itself have any appreciable effect on men who subscribe to the sentiments outlined above—to those who would make a sharp distinction between "playing Santa Claus" and carrying on what they hold to be the only proper functions of a government, the pursuance of a policy of strictly national interest, come what may?

But in the interim other things have also been taking place. Communist China has agreed to ship in 50,000 tons of rice and more than a quarter of it has already arrived, although negotiations with China were instituted some time after American negotiations were begun on the same subject. Soviet Russia likewise has offered a barter arrangement of 50,000 tons of wheat—an agreement similar, it is true, to what was effected betwe

the two nations last year. But no American grain, aside from that procured here by straight purchase, is en route or even in prospect at this most critical hour.

Perhaps the moment has arrived to reconsider. Leave the humanitarian argument out of it, put it all on cold-war terms. Think of our potential support in India and throughout all non-Communist Asia. How will that be affected by our refusal to avert a major famine by shipping some of our grain surpluses at the very time both Communist China and Soviet Russia are sending in grain (if in far from adequate amounts)? That puts a different complexion on the matter.

When Congress reconvenes after its Easter recess, it should consider the editorial reaction of an Indian weekly newspaper, the Naya Sabera, of Lucknow, on continued American inaction and the first grain shipments from Communist China. It is "quite clear who has genuine concern for the welfare of the Indian people." There is only one possible answer to that.

What Should Be Our International Economic Policy in a Period of Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 26 last Mr. George A. Sloan, chairman of the International Chamber of Commerce, made a splendid contribution to the subject of our international economic policy in a very able address before the Economic Club of Detroit at Detroit, Mich. Mr. Sloan, in addition to occupying the important position of chairman of this group, is a man of broad knowledge and ability. His utterances are usually worthwhile. His address before the Detroit group was no exception.

With the thought that Mr. Sloan's thinking may be of value to our people generally, and in order that it might have a broader circulation, which it deserves, I submit it herewith.

Mr. Sloan's address is as follows:

It is indeed an honor to appear before this distinguished group and to explore with you some of today's economic problems with particular reference to international trade and policy in a period of rearmament.

Looking over the list of your past speakers I find the names of many friends who have addressed you. It is with a sense of humility that I come to the Economic Club of Detroit in the footsteps of such outstanding industrial and financial leaders as Thomas J. Watson, Sr., Phil Reed, Randy Burgess, Irving Olds, Paul Hoffman, John Hancock, and Warren Lee Pierson.

The subject assigned to me is an exceedingly difficult one, too often obscured because of the constant changes in the international field from month to month. It would be presumptuous of any businessman to undertake to explain specifically where business stands or should stand in the present confused state of world conditions. And yet I have no hesitancy in expressing the opinion that a sound solution of pressing economic problems, of international nature, is imperative if we are to maintain a healthy political and social America.

In the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce are businessmen from all walks of industrial and corporate life. For many years these businessmen, many of them colleagues of yours, have worked actively on our study groups and devoted many hours of careful thought to possible solutions to international economic problems. Often we have succeeded; other times not.

Because of frequent exchange of views with these businessmen and also with businessmen of other free nations who are actively engaged in the International Chamber of Commerce, I am willing to expose myself to you in the hope that we might clarify our mutual thinking.

The free world is faced with a grave crisis and perhaps its greatest challenge to survival. We must develop—and we have made a good beginning—the strength of the free nations to counteract the aggressive moves of communism.

A foreign economic policy, by definition, should be the true reflector of the world we live in. Let us for a moment, therefore, examine the world at midcentury.

The paramount objective of our foreign policy should be the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace. It should include friendly cultural intercourse among nations as well as mutually advantageous trade among nations.

What many of us knew for many years has been brought out into the open with the invasion of Korea by the Communist hordes. But Korea has carried us nearer to facing reality: Our lives are threatened by an aggressive force that has shown its intentions to eliminate from its well-planned path of imperialistic advances the obstacle represented by the freedom of the individual.

Today, more than ever before, we Americans are called upon for an expression of national unity, for a sense of purpose, and for a decisive spirit. Unity must start at home in our foreign dealings, especially our international economic relations.

Nearly 6 years ago the United States was at its prime of strength as a world power. No one doubted this strength. Today there are doubts about our leadership and policy in many capitals of the free world, in London, in Paris, in Rome. Actually, the power of the United States has not diminished to warrant such doubts.

The Soviets have made two major gains. They have swung China into their orbit and they are said to have the atom bomb. On the other hand, the United States has made tremendous gains. Since Korea there is more of a spirit of unity. Production, economic growth have been our determining factors. Korea has awakened many of those who did not previously visualize the antagonism in the Soviet system.

The Western World, especially Western Europe, is better off today than in any period since the end of World War II. Western Europe has turned from an area disorganized by the effects of war into a smoother-flowing economic and political community. While not completely recovered from devastations and dislocations the most difficult part of the Western European reconstruction task has been achieved.

The established centers of freedom have survived. They have withstood two attacks by German militarism. Where free institutions are maintained, men have continued to make advances in material wealth, in understanding of fellow men, in science, in tolerance, and in decency.

Still, the world today has no peace. There are large masses of people—good, intelligent, industrious people—who are being led to slaughter by political leaders and are denied the right to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The world continues to consist of the "haves" and the "have nots." You may ask, "Have or have not what?" And my answer is have or have not freedom of access to the world's raw materials (as promised in the Atlantic Charter to victor and vanquished alike); have or have not the freedom to own, to use, and to risk the mechanical means of production; have or have not the right to the just rewards of their honest labor; have or have not the right to determine and to control their own destiny as freemen; because they are denied their rightful opportunity to utilize nature's endless bounty for their own well-being and individual happiness.

Human misery in the Western World is certainly much smaller now than it was in the nineteenth century. That this was possible in spite of two world wars is sufficient answer to those who claim Western civilization is in decay. Notwithstanding the postwar poverty of Europe and the rest of the world, the West as a whole is richer in kind and in spirit than ever. But the situation in many friendly countries still presents a challenge to the United States if the spread of communism is to be held in check.

The twentieth century has witnessed the United States coming of age as a world power. "The leadership to which the United States has succeeded," said the renowned London Economist recently, "has turned out to be that not of a gloriously expanding world economy but of a half-world on the defensive, therefore imposing more in responsibilities than it provides in privileges. America has accepted these responsibilities with doubt and hesitation and now and then with inconsistencies. But on the whole," concludes the Economist, "the performance has been one * * * of remarkable foresight and energy."

The present world situation requires an expression of utmost responsibility and leadership from the United States, from American businessmen. In the past, many of us have been most reluctant to accept this responsibility. We can offer as alibi the fact that we survived the early years of our Republic only by avoiding entangling alliances. World leadership has been thrust upon us so rapidly in the last decade or so that we appear to be inexperienced and in fact we are inexperienced. When we are faced with international problems we are frequently, if not mostly, indecisive because we have few precedents on which to base our policy.

A transformation so swift as that of the last 10 years cannot be experienced by a relatively young nation without mistakes in action and without moments of doubt. It should be most reassuring to all of us who believe in the freedom of the individual that our system of democracy always induces self-doubt. The current congressional debate on foreign policy is a true indicator of this.

Surely, America's future depends on how widely and how wisely it carries out the responsibilities of leadership. The central point must be the unification of the free world in the face of aggression and threats of aggression. Each member of the free world acting alone is too weak to counteract these threats or to resist attack. Not even the United States standing alone can be powerful enough for self-defense. Acting together, the free nations by moral standards and productive achievements will bring about the currently lacking balance of power. In all these endeavors our basic aim must always remain the same: The maintenance of peace but without sacrifice of freedom.

The fear of what the next moves of the Soviets and their satellites will be is inherent in the policies and the thinking of free peoples everywhere. Hearings before congressional committees, debates before the House of Commons, discussions in the French Parliament—all are influenced by the foremost consideration of what the next moves of the Soviets may be.

With the free world in a twilight of war (which we hope will brighten rather than darken in due course by our own actions) the challenge is even greater. We have to superimpose a military economy on a civilian economy in the hope that the least amount of belt-tightening will be necessary. This situation brings with it an inflationary tendency.

Actually, the foremost enemy of the Western World, at the present, is inflation. We must stop putting fuel on the flame, while, at the same time, feebly trying to put out inflation's flame with a sprinkling can. Either we all—and I mean all—make the necessary sacrifices now to stop inflation or we will be faced later with the reality of making much bigger, if not total, sacrifices.

If you want any substantiation of this, study the inflation experiences in Germany, in China, in France, in Italy. The aftereffects of inflation in Germany helped in producing Hitler; it gave China Mao Tse-tung; to Italy Mussolini, and to France an unhappy parade of cabinets that require a score card to keep track of. But more than this, inflation destroyed confidence everywhere in these countries. And even here in America, it has and is steadily undermining the confidence of our people.

Inflation is Stalin's best ally. Next to Soviet imperialism this is the most difficult problem facing America and our friends abroad.

This then is a bird's-eye view of the world we live in. It is the setting on which we must apply our foreign economic policy.

The first question that now arises is: What should be our short-range, our immediate, international economic policy?

Development of strength at a rapid pace to offset the military power of the nations in the Soviet orbit is, I should think, objective No. 1. The plans are becoming better defined. They are being carried out by the Office of Defense Mobilization in Washington on the American level and the Defense Production Board under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Businessmen are and should be the prime policy movers of these efforts. And, industrial operations, as can be witnessed so well in Detroit, are carrying the production effort.

I am confident that rapid rearmament of the non-Soviet world will—within a short period—create superiority of political, economic, and military strength on our part. Such a state of conditions would make the Kremlin stop, look, and listen before embarking on other diversionary invasion movements. The Western World must concentrate its efforts for the next 2 or 3 years on harnessing its resources for defense.

In the process of rearmament, some distortions in production, prices, and trade already have become apparent. Resources that would otherwise be available to civil consumption and investment in the promotion of freer trade and raising standards of living have been transferred to military needs.

The businessman (wherever he lives in the free world) is committed to do all in his power to assist his country in utilizing the productive facilities for the rearmament of the Western World. In our defense efforts we will undoubtedly have to endure mental and physical strain for an indefinite period if we are to maintain our freedom and economic liberties. Without freedoms the heart will have been removed from our defense.

The free world cannot go on focusing exclusively on being strong enough to wipe out aggression before it actually occurs. At some point, whenever the Kremlin will decide, there has to come a break in the international tension. At some point the success of the free world will be measured not by self-preservation efforts, but by our ability to expand economic capacity to such an extent that we can offer to both our own people and the people in the underdeveloped areas increased standards, both material and moral, that dictatorships of any kind are in no position to provide.

In the knowledge of this important factor, it stands to reason that the free world must move forward to expand its productive facilities, its economic strength, its scientific knowledge. So we therefore come to objective No. 2:

We cannot withdraw behind a protective curtain of isolation because for many vital commodities the United States is dependent on external resources. Of the 15 basic minerals, the United States is relatively self-sufficient in only 6—coal, petroleum, iron, sulfur, phosphate, and potash. In the case of iron, various ferro-alloys must be imported before steel can be made. The automobile industry in Detroit is well aware of the fact that 100 percent of tin, chrome, and cordage fibers are imported. Ninety-two percent of our manganese and cobalt, 73 percent of tungsten, and 34 percent of our yearly requirements for lead are mined outside of the United States. Our foreign economic policy must be based on a full realization of these facts. In order to make their economies most productive, the countries of the Western World need an adequate and equitable supply of required raw materials, together with a flow of essential consumer goods.

To assure an adequate supply of strategic raw materials for all countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), and the other non-Soviet nations, it is necessary to have in permanent operation joint allocation boards, eliminating thereby the inflationary effects of free-market competition for scarce material. The price effects of such an uncontrolled rush for materials is imposing severe strains on the economy of some countries, including our own.

It is gratifying to know that a start in the direction of international allocation and procurement of materials is now being made. The current sessions of the raw-material commodity groups in Washington are one way of controlling this weakness. It is essential, however, that private channels be assigned, wherever possible, the responsibility to carry out this raw-material goal. Also, an international arrangement like this should be maintained only for the period of the emergency. Then it is imperative that free-market competition must be reinstituted.

There is still a puzzle as to who in Washington is responsible for our own international allocation-procurement activities. About 10 agencies and departments are in the picture, despite the fact that the first order issued by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, as Defense Mobilizer, created an interdepartmental Committee on Foreign Supplies and Requirements, under the chairmanship of ECA Administrator William C. Foster.

The United States Government should immediately clarify the raw-material situation so that there will be an end to the kind of vacuum that seems to persist in Washington. Instead of the many overlapping agencies in the field now, there should be one Government agency—possibly ECA—in sole charge of the temporary allocation and procurement of raw materials.

One of the most crying needs of the moment is the elimination of the inconsistent performance by a host of administrative agencies—some 23 of them—that have a governmental finger in the international economic pie, with resultant confusion to all concerned.

Three notable and informed sources lately have proposed that the proper exercise of our foreign economic policy demands the consolidation of all the scattered efforts within a single governmental agency. Headed by a man of outstanding ability with public acceptance, this agency should have the equivalent of Cabinet status.

First, there was the Gordon Gray report, rather outdated at this time because it was originally conceived before Korea. Then, the speeches and writings of our own United States Council executive committee member Paul Hoffman (who certainly knows this problem first-hand and can speak with feeling about administrative foul-ups in the Government). And finally, we are confronted with the recent report of Nelson Rockefeller's International Development Advisory Board. (This report, though its other recommendations require careful study before we can determine whether businessmen should endorse them is unqualifiedly correct on the demand for a single agency.)

The Hoover Commission in many other fields has pointed out the waste and inefficiency and stupid duplication of much of our administrative structure in Washington and abroad. Here, in the field of foreign economic policy, is a situation ripe for a Hoover Commission approach.

These then are some factors that make up our short-range foreign economic policy.

It behooves businessmen to look beyond this period of emergency, the period when we have reached a balance of power, with rearmament complete so that no nation would dare attack us. What will we do then, I might ask, with the resources in materials and manpower that have been increased. Will we have to cut back and expose ourselves to the fear of depression and unemployment? I think that every businessman in the United States should look ahead to that future date and ponder over the possibility of formulating a program that would assist in furthering economic growth and apply the gains made to the common good. This would enable us to minimize unemployment and to utilize the expanded resources in such a way that they will be available to more and more people.

At the forthcoming Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce, which will be held in Lisbon, Portugal, from June 10 through 16, the world business community, including the American representatives, will discuss aspects of such a program for action by the world business community. We hope that the Detroit business group will be most helpful in looking ahead along these lines when the United States Council, together with some of your outstanding groups here in Detroit, will have a meeting in your city on May 3. And of course, we sincerely hope that Detroit will be represented in Lisbon. It seems to us that these meetings provide a tremendous challenge to the businessmen to preserve a competitive enterprise system which otherwise might falter.

If the free nations of the world do not succeed in avoiding economic maladjustments—if they fail to establish an environment in which communities can advance materially and spiritually—there is always the danger that the people will be driven into communism. Only by our performance can we hope to contain the advances of communism. Take the example of the Chinese. The Chinese farmer who has accepted or even welcomed communism as relief from the misery, oppression, and corruption of his lot will learn in time that the promises of the Communists are hollow. Collectivism will soon take back the land made available

to him. The cancellation of debts, which was made possible through liquidation of the money lender, will be replaced by oppressive taxes. Communism will soon become a yoke.

But communism has never yet been eliminated in any country where a Communist regime obtained power. We must act, therefore, before the cancerous growth of communism can spread.

An economic strategy for peace should certainly include a drive to reform traditional modes of production and distribution and increase sharply the productivity of men and machines. This is one way to meet threats of foreign aggression and international collapse. One of the major steps in that direction is to demonstrate the adaptability and flexibility of the American productive system to our European friends. Fortune magazine, in its February 1951 issue, made quite an essential point in this respect. "United States business is the best-qualified group in all the world for getting the American idea across to European top management. It is hardly necessary," said Fortune, "to suggest the means: there could be seminars and international conventions—organizations such as the International Chamber of Commerce are ready-made for this—trips and private exchanges of all sorts."

American capitalism—as exemplified in particular by industry in Detroit—has learned that the secret of national prosperity is to eliminate the idea that the many cannot have what the few enjoy. American capitalism of 50 years ago can hardly be recognized when compared with American capitalism of today. Unhappily, the same cannot be said for European capitalism. One of the gravest weaknesses in the armor of the Western World's economic policy is the persisting, time-worn attitude of European capitalism.

In the United States the living standards and working conditions of the average citizen have shown constant and remarkable improvement. In Europe this has not been true. There are many reasons for this, including the trend to socialism and the emphasis which European capitalism places on an outmoded cartel system. Many European businessmen dislike competition. I think there is great danger in this state of mind. We must distinguish between capitalism which works for the few and capitalism which works for the many. The trend of European capitalism has been away from a sense of responsibility to the community. I am sure the morale of people of Europe would rise if they could identify European capitalism with a positive rather than a negative policy.

Today many ardent anti-Communists abroad are suspicious of the motives of American capitalism. By explaining the true contribution of American capitalism to the world in terms of the gains of the individual working men and women here in Detroit and in other great industrial centers, I am sure we as businessmen will develop our most successful weapon against Soviet propaganda. This should be a major component of our foreign economic policy.

We must win people as well as diplomatic and military battles if we hope to stop communism. Communism has been making progress in other countries under oppression and poverty. Our long-range international economic policy must keep in mind that a removal of these conditions is an obligation. The Communists have imagination, boldness, and courage—all couched in a fanatical devotion to a cause. We can reply with far more effective boldness and courage.

It is significant that I am speaking to you on the same day that in Washington the Foreign Ministers of the 21 American Republics are opening their deliberations on, among other things, how the raw material and productive resources of the Western Hemisphere can be stepped up.

Point 3 on the agenda of the sessions is the following:

"Emergency economic cooperation: (a) Production and distribution for defense purposes; and (b) production and distribution of products in short supply and utilization of necessary services to meet requirements of the American Republics and measures to facilitate insofar as possible the carrying out of programs of economic development."

As we understand it, the Latin-American countries are asking such questions as: Can a reasonable market be guaranteed after the emergency for expanded Latin-American production? Will we (Latin Americans) be able to obtain sufficient technological know-how from the United States to expand production and increase standards of living? The question of additional American capital investment will also be on the minds of our friends from below our southern borders.

We are asking the Latin Americans to expand raw material production for the current defense program. And the Latin Americans are determined, as we understand it, to bargain for a position where the gains made during the emergency would be of benefit after the emergency is over.

As part of our long-range foreign economic policy, there should be an expansion in the investment of private companies abroad. Many American companies that have invested in subsidiaries and affiliates abroad have had satisfactory experience with the exception of transferring earnings to the United States. Naturally, we must do all in our power to convince the Government that the obstacles to foreign investments, such as double taxation, lack of convertibility, and other similar controls, be corrected so that American business will have incentives to take its dollars abroad.

Private investment going abroad is a desirable way to fortify the economies and raise the standards of living of foreign countries. It is a most effective countermove to the conditions that breed poverty and oppression. Private foreign investment would also relieve the taxpayer of the burden of providing through his government direct assistance and grants to other nations. When private capital goes abroad it brings with it American know-how and managerial skill and thus directly contributes to the welfare of the recipient nations.

But we must be realistic. Congress should provide much of the necessary encouragement by passing legislation deferring taxation of earnings on foreign activities of American companies until they are brought home. At the same time bilateral treaties must be concluded to assure the transfer of earnings to corporations in capital exporting countries and to eliminate double taxation.

You will hear more about such programs from the International Chamber of Commerce and the United States Council. Our foreign-investment committee is at work now to offer specific recommendations to governments and business looking to increased flow of capital across boundaries.

In summary, our foreign economic policy, both short range and long range, should embrace the following:

1. Establishment and maintenance of just and lasting peace as our paramount objective.
2. All-out drive to stop inflation in every part of the free world.
3. Increase of efforts to develop, procure, and allocate raw materials internationally—to be maintained for period of emergency only.
4. Development of non-Soviet world's strength at rapid rate.
5. Administration of all United States aid efforts under a single agency.
6. Enlightened and active United States world economic leadership.
7. Planning by business today beyond emergency period.
8. Fulfillment of business' role with enlightened cooperation by governments in making possible an extensive flow of foreign investment abroad.

These ideas reflect the discussions at the International Chamber of Commerce and the United States Council; they also reflect discussions with government leaders in many parts of the world.

In the past the United States has followed a short-sighted course in our foreign economic relations. We sought and rejoiced in the expansion of our foreign trade. But we were reluctant to accept the fact that it lacked a healthy balance and that it was being sustained by loans and grants that in the end would be too great a burden on foreign debtors, not to mention our own taxpayers.

We claimed repayment of war debts which prejudiced prospects of solvency of private industrial development which we ourselves were encouraging.

It is a challenge to the American business community to learn from our mistakes and to act accordingly.

We would be right in risking much on the faith that economic improvement and development, widely shared and achieved by cooperative efforts, will make it more likely that the free nations will stand together. The ultimate result would be that at some day in the future the Soviets will realize the futility of their efforts in undermining the free nations and suspend their struggle for world domination. We must be ready to work in this direction and to rise above the problems of the day and plan as business statesmen.

The Senator and the General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, merits careful scrutiny and study by every person who is interested in understanding the true issues involved in the current foreign policy debate, which is attracting such wide attention:

THE SENATOR AND THE GENERAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Senator TAFT is talking about Korea and Formosa in a way which sounds as if he had not understood General MacArthur.

The Senator seems to think that there are 800,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on Formosa who—if only we permitted it and gave them arms—would march onto the transports, would sail across the Formosa Straits, would land on the mainland, would invade Red China, and take the pressure off our boys fighting in Korea.

To the Senator it is, therefore, tragic and ridiculous not to use this gigantic military asset. Here we are hard pressed in Korea; there in Formosa is a huge army, an army bigger, he thinks, than all the armies on both sides now fighting in Korea. All that this huge army lacks, he thinks, is arms and President Truman's permission to invade China and some United States naval and air assistance involving, the Senator thinks, no American infantry.

But who told Senator TAFT about this army on Formosa, and about how big it is, and about what arms it could use, and what it would take to have it invade China? Not General MacArthur in his many public pronouncements. The general has not said that Chiang and his troops on Formosa are able to decide the struggle in our favor. The general has not said, as Senator TAFT and Representative MARTIN seem to think, that if Chiang's men were helped to fight more, we would have to fight less.

What General MacArthur is arguing for is not less fighting by Americans in the Far East but much more fighting by Americans in the Far East. He wants, as he wrote to Mr. MARTIN, to "follow the conventional pattern of meeting force with maximum counterforce." He wants to wage an all-out war against China instead of the localized war he is now waging in Korea. The general does not say—and obviously he does not believe—that this would be the camparatively easy little war, fought largely with Chiang's infantry, which Senator TAFT is dreaming about. The war which the general is advocating is the great war which, he contends, would decide the world-wide conflict. He wants the third world war now and he wants to fight it in the Far East.

But what the Senator wants is not to get us deeper into a bigger war. He wants a way out of the war which is already too big for him—which, as a matter of fact, was already too big for him on the 25th of June. Because he wants less war, especially less war involving the infantry, the Senator has allowed himself to believe that Chiang's army can take over and be a substitute for our ground troops.

There is a great difference—in fact, all the difference in the world—between Senator TAFT's idea that Chiang could "take the pressure off our boys fighting in Korea" and General MacArthur's idea that this is the time and that the Far East is the place to join the issue with the Communist powers and seek a military decision.

Senator TAFT ought to know, though apparently he does not, that Chiang's policy is not to invade China in order to relieve us in Korea. Chiang's policy is to get us into a general war with China in order to make certain that he can stay in Formosa and in the hope that General MacArthur would eventually put him back into power in China.

The argument about Chiang and his army is not at all, as Senator TAFT seems to think, about whether to accept or to refuse the assistance of an important military ally. If Chiang were an important military ally, nobody in his senses would refuse his assistance. But the fact of the matter is that there is serious doubt as to whether Chiang's army could even be relied upon to hold Formosa, and I do not believe that there is a responsible military man in the world who thinks it could invade China.

The argument about Chiang is an argument about whether to enlarge the Korean War into a general war. Those who believe in a general war with China know perfectly well that if Chiang's army were able to invade China it would be only because there was an American Army in front of it.

Coordinated Recreation Program Needed by Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter which I have presented to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, requesting consideration of H. R. 2766, a bill to create a Federal corporation which would provide a nearly self-supporting coordinated recreation program for Federal employees, which I introduced on February 19.

I am also including as a part of my remarks the text of the bill, in the belief that it will be of interest to hundreds of organizations.

The letter follows:

APRIL 9, 1951.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While we gather our energies to meet the threat of foreign aggression which endangers our Nation we must not lose that fight by ill-considered manpower policies at home. I recently introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the main body of an article titled "Don't Send Your Daughter to Washington." This article was based on the evidence and facts gathering dust in the files of Community Chest agencies, Federal Government offices, and elsewhere, and well on the way to being entirely forgotten. Yet if we are to avoid the disastrous mistakes of World War II we must become concerned in the present emergency with the lessons we should have learned but seem too willing to forget or ignore.

The Liberty magazine article by the able writer of the Washington Post, Sam Stavisky, points out:

"It's an ugly fact that the tremendous influx of 'G-girls' into Washington during World War II, together with wartime conditions and tensions there, combined to make Washington the Nation's No. 1 boom town for unwed mothers in 1944.

"The records of the National Office of Vital Statistics give evidence that the Nation's Capital has held on to that unenviable record ever since.

"In 1945, Washington's illegitimate babies numbered 105 out of every 1,000 live births; in 1946, there were 98 out of 1,000; in 1947, there were 94 out of 1,000. In every one of those years, Washington's illegitimacy ratio has been more than double the national average. The Federal statistics don't go beyond 1947, but the local statistics for the first half of 1950, as collected by the District of Columbia Health Department, indicate that the unmarried mother boom is hitting an all-time high.

"Even as the boom expands, approximately 100,000 more 'G-girls' will be herded into Washington—as the mobilization effort intensifies through 1951—to pound the endless rows of typewriters and to cultivate the endless columns of files in ever-burgeoning defense agencies.

"These recruits are trooping into a city short of decent housing and short of adequate recreational facilities. They are crowding into a city in which—according to a 1947 Census Bureau survey of metropolitan Washington—there are five women for every four men 14 to 44 years of age, four women to three men in the 20-to-24-age bracket. The combined shortages—housing, recreational facilities, eligible men—provide a fertile ground for giving another spurt to the boom in unwed mothers.

"The same combination of shortages was discovered in Washington by 'G-girls' of World War II, who flocked to the Nation's Capital to do their part. Poor, sometimes vile housing, insufficient recreational outlets, and desperate competition for the available men broke down the unstable girls, mentally and emotionally. Some got in trouble through unwed pregnancy; some with venereal diseases. (Oh, yes; the Nation's Capital also has a thriving boom in VD.)

"What's in store for Washington—unless corrective measures are taken—can be glimpsed in the report of the Committee on Unmarried Parenthood, District of Columbia Council of Social Agencies, made late in 1944. It read in part:

"'Individual agencies all reported an increase in the number of unmarried mothers coming to them, particularly the young pregnant girl. One agency which had in 1938 accepted for care 16 unmarried mothers and pregnant girls in 1943 accepted 128. * * * This increase does not allow for those cases which might have been accepted if there had been adequate staff and facilities to meet all requests.

"'Most agencies have been experiencing an increase in applications among unmarried mothers who are new settlers in the community, many of these being young Government employees who plan to resume work in the District of Columbia after the birth of their babies and prefer not to return to the place of their legal residence.'

"The report pointed out that the local agencies, already overburdened with the requests for help from legally resident unwed mothers, were generally unable to assume responsibility for the newcomers. As a result, some of the unwed mothers had to be thrust, along with their illegitimate offspring, back into the community from which they came—and into social ostracism. Because of the legal red tape, lack of funds by the municipal government, indifference, and apathy of the Federal Government, the nonresident unmarried mother—the report observed—'is frequently cut adrift from all normal human relationships through which she might receive help. * * *'

"The situation hasn't changed much since that report was read. The municipal and local community chest agencies are still understaffed, overworked, and lacking in funds. And Uncle Sam is still pretty much indifferent to the problem.

"Along with illegitimacy, the venereal disease rate also boomed during the war and postwar years in Washington. By 1948, VD was claiming six times as many victims in the District of Columbia as in 1941, with 13,000 cases reported, and 25,000 more cases unreported but suspected by health officials. By 1948, Washington's gonorrhea rate was five and one-half times the national average, with three to four times the number of cases than in cities of comparable population—such as Baltimore, Cleveland, and St. Louis.

"Back in 1941 the local health department reported that 93 percent of the VD infected soldiers at Fort Belvoir, Va., and 43 percent of the infected draftees at Fort Meade, Md., blamed Washington girls for their trouble.

"Two years later—in 1943—Washington was accused by the Army of infecting twice as many soldiers with VD as any other city.

"Now who do you suppose was blamed for this situation? Streetwalkers? Camp followers? Prostitutes? Not at all. Washington police did a commendable job in cleaning up and eliminating the Capital's bawdy houses.

"But the police found themselves helpless in attempting to cope with the 'victory girls,' with the 'cuddle bunnies.'

"Efforts at controlling the amateur boom in illicit sexual relations made little headway. In 1945, the last year of the war, more than 65 percent of GI's infected with VD could blame their disease on 'amateur' carriers. Twenty-four cases of GI gonorrhea were traced to one 'nice' girl, whose promiscuity made her as dangerous to our troops as a full battalion of enemy soldiers on the front line.

"The Washington Federation of Churches investigated the problem during the war and came up with the conclusion that 80 percent of infections among GI's were attributable to the young, 'innocent' type of

girl. The local Criminal Justice Association found that the sharp increase in juvenile delinquency was due to the 'uniform-happy' girls who feel they can't say no to a soldier.

"Several times during the Second World War, congressional committees took a hurried glance into the shameful conditions but did little or nothing about it. Testimony before these committees, however, demonstrated that Uncle Sam was largely to blame.

"Testimony before congressional committees, presented by Dr. Winfred Overholser, Superintendent of famed St. Elizabeths mental hospital, made it clear that Uncle Sam's indiscriminate hiring program during World War II brought hundreds of mentally and emotionally unstable girls into Washington at a time when the economic and social tensions were at their worst.

" 'Too many of the girls brought here were young adolescents not very well adjusted, who found the excitement of wartime Washington conducive to recklessness,' observes Miss Patricia Morse, license officer of the District Public Welfare Department.

"Instead of glamour, the girls discovered Washington was a place where the abnormally high cost of living nullified what looked to them like high salaries. Decent quarters were hard to obtain and even poor quarters were expensive. The files of the Community Chest agencies and municipal welfare units abound with instances of a half dozen or more Government girls being jammed into a single cellar or attic room at $25 or more a month for each girl. * * *

"Of course, it is true that good housing, adequate recreational facilities, and the opportunity to meet single men won't stop girls from getting into trouble. But as Capt Rhoda Milliken, of the Women's Bureau, points out, these three things will help prevent a number of individual tradegies. * * *

"Recently, Ray Everett, of the Social Hygiene Society, issued a strong statement warning the Federal agencies that their recruiting drives were duplicating the ballyhoo and repeating the take-one, take-all mistakes of World War II. 'There were too many needless home-front casualties,' he said."

This is part of the Liberty magazine article which I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now the District of Columbia Armed Services Hospitality Committee, whose seventy-odd members are appointed by the District's Commissioners, has recently, as a result of the facts set forth in this article, set up a subcommittee "to foster recreation activities for women in uniform, young Government employees, and wives of service personnel." But is this enough? Do the District Commissioners fully meet their responsibilities by the appointment of a public committee which has no funds? Will this new committee be able to adequately meet a situation that the Community Chest, the District Public Welfare Department, the churches, and other agencies of Washington's municipal government was unable to meet during World War II, and afterward?

What does the Federal Government propose to do about this problem? Will it continue to evade its responsibilities during this national emergency as it did all through World War II?

I for one am not content to wait for the next thrilling installment, while the Government recruiting drive suffers from the Capital's reputation for evil.

On February 19 I introduced in the Eighty-second Congress H. R. 2766, a bill to create a Federal corporation for an organized recreation program for Federal employees with special attention to metropolitan areas. The same or similar bills were introduced at the same time by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], and in the Senate by Senators LAUSCHE, MURRAY, DOUGLAS, and MORSE.

It took little persuasion to convince me of the merit—nay, the necessity—of such legislation. Not even the busy day of a Member of Congress is impervious to the parade of human tragedies running through the daily newspapers of Washington, and of other large cities with heavy concentrations of Federal employees, such as my own city of New York.

So far as I am concerned, I believe I am fully aware of the valid criticisms of such a program, and in the balance I find the arguments in its favor far, far outweigh those against.

The bill which I have introduced, H. R. 2766, has been referred to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of which you are chairman. In deference to you and to my other friends on the committee I wish to explain that the bill I have introduced is, as far as I am concerned, little more than a legislative draft. It may well be that any bill reported by the committee will be much changed in language.

However, I am convinced that the fundamental idea is sound, and that the time is long overdue for the Congress and the Federal Government to recognize its responsibilities as an employer of young people whom it is recruiting from all over the Nation, and its responsibilities to their families.

The National Industrial Conference Board, a management-research agency, in its study, Employee Recreation Activities—Studies in Personnel Policy No. 102, has made a definitive report on the welfare and recreation policies of some 250 of America's major industries and shown that they invest up to a median annual expenditure per employee of $10, with a median annual total expenditure for recreation per employee (company and employee contributions and payments from other sources) of $14.60. These companies know that such programs pay off in increased loyalty, efficiency, morale, and health terms for their employees. My bill, which is before your committee, is based on the experience of American industry over the past 50 years or more.

The bill is in a very real sense a wartime measure. There is no reason, however, why the program, once established, could not continue on in peacetime after the termination of the national emergency, since Federal employees will contribute half of its funds probably.

I urge you, therefore, to request reports on my bill from the appropriate Federal departments and agencies, and that you grant hearings on it as soon as these reports are in, with leading representatives of industrial recreation programs invited to testify, as well as spokesmen for social welfare, social hygiene, mental health, and other interested agencies.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress, Nineteenth District, New York.

H. R. 2766

A bill to create a Federal corporation to improve the efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare of Federal employees, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to establish and maintain a recreation program among Federal employees for the improvement of their efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare, and to establish and maintain in the District of Columbia and in other areas of substantial Federal employment, recreation centers primarily for the service and benefit of employees of the Government, there is hereby created as an agency and instrumentality of the United States a body corporate, to be known as the Federal Employees' Recreation Corporation, hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation." In its capacity as sole owner of the Corporation, the United States shall be represented by the President, or the head of such Government agency as may be designated by him, hereinafter referred to as the "supervisory official."

SEC. 2. The Corporation shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of 25 directors who shall be appointed by the supervisory official. Nineteen of these directors shall be selected from the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government, not more than one being selected from any one department or agency. The remaining six directors shall be selected from nominees designated by national labor organizations with which associations of Federal Government employees are affiliated, not more than two being selected from nominees designated by any one labor organization. One director shall be designated by the supervisory official as chairman of the board. The board shall meet at least quarterly. Directors shall serve without pay, but shall receive their actual and necessary travel and other expenses in connection with their attendance at directors' meetings without regard to the Travel Expense Act of 1949 or the Standardized Government Travel Regulations. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the board, and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The board shall confine itself to over-all policy making, directive, and general supervisory functions. Directors shall serve for a term of 1 year.

SEC. 4. The Corporation shall be administered by and under the direction of a President to be appointed by the board of directors and responsible to such board in the discharge of the duties of his office.

SEC. 5. To the extent necessary to enable it to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this act the Corporation shall have the following powers:

(a) To have succession until dissolved by act of Congress.

(b) To adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its general business, and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law.

(c) To adopt, alter, and use a seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) To sue and be sued in its corporate name.

(e) To determine the character of and necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to laws specifically applicable to Government corporations.

(f) To acquire, in any lawful manner, any property—real, personal, mixed—tangible or intangible; to hold, maintain, use, and operate the same; and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of the same.

(g) To appoint and prescribe the duties of such officers, attorneys, agents, and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions, to fix and pay such compensation to them for their services as the Corporation may determine, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(h) To enter into contracts and to execute all instruments necessary or appropriate consistent with the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law.

(i) To use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(j) To accept gifts or donations of services, or of property—real, personal, or mixed—tangible or intangible, in aid of any of the purposes herein authorized.

(k) To take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers herein specifically conferred upon it.

SEC. 6. In fulfillment of its objects, the Corporation is authorized—

(a) to organize and sponsor recreation programs for all employees of the Government, including theatrical and musical productions, drama groups and little-theater activities, choruses, symphony orchestras, bands, ballet, all performing arts, visual arts, lectures, folk arts, and handicrafts, including folk dancing, athletics of all kinds, including outdoor and indoor sports, travel tours, swimming, vacationing, and all other forms of accepted recreational activities;

(b) to arrange for and secure the fullest use of all public land, including Federal park land, for such activities;

(c) to arrange for and secure the participation of all Federal Government employees who are competent as teachers or interested as employees in participating in such activities;

(d) to arrange for and secure the use of any Government buildings suitable for any of such activities;

(e) to lease or build and maintain buildings and other facilities in the District of Columbia and in other areas of substantial Federal employment for use in carrying on such activities, including, as appropriate dining facilities, lodging for transients, lounge facilities, reading rooms, space for social functions and amusements, libraries, and auditoriums;

(f) to organize a National Advisory Committee of outstanding national leaders in such activities. The National Advisory Committee and the individual members thereof shall advise the board of directors in planning, judging, and setting standards of performance, and assist in such other ways as will generally serve to advance the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Corporation shall authorize the establishment of reasonable charges wherever practicable, the proceeds therefrom to be utilized in defraying the general expenses of the Corporation.

SEC. 8. The Corporation shall pay the cost of all services, supplies, utilities, maintenance, and repairs furnished or performed by any Government agency for the benefit of the Corporation, but shall not be required to pay rent on space occupied by it for any purpose in any Government building, public park, or other public land.

SEC. 9. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

SEC. 10. As used in this act, the terms "Government building" and "public land" mean any building or portion thereof or any land (including improvements thereon) owned or controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, but do not include the Capitol or the Senate or House Office Buildings.

SEC. 11. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting after "Panama Railroad Company" a semicolon and the following: "Federal Employees' Recreation Corporation."

SEC. 12. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 13. This act shall become effective 60 days after the date of its enactment.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "Federal Employees' Recreation Act."

"National Calamity Would Ensue Were We To Reach the Peak of Our Productivity and Find Ourselves Financially a Broken Nation; Because of This Fact We Must Successfully Combat Inflation in Order To Become the Mightiest of All Nations."—Charles E. Wilson

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is time for this body to ascertain and with definite certainty the actual conditions that face this country not alone with respect to our foreign problems but with the problems that confront us right here on our home front.

The existent war situation has now forced new shortages of materials and new controls upon wages, labor, prices, and other segments of our economy, to the end that it becomes difficult to assess day by day what particular business or enterprise will next be adversely affected in this fight to control inflation and keep our arms production booming.

Americans everywhere feel secure in knowing that there is no man with greater capabilities to handle the stupendous job than Mr. Charles E. Wilson, whom the President recently called to Washington to take over the colossal task of running the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. Speaker, already the Nation has been made immeasurably safer against aggression due to the leadership of Mr. Charles Wilson—and that much has been accomplished with respect to the stabilization program is even now reflected in the suspension of increased tax rates—in credits, savings, prices, wages, and rents.

Mr. Speaker, I intend within a short time to address the House and recite in detail the wonderful accomplishments that have been already thus far effected through the Office of the Defense Mobilization, but I now want to direct the attention of my colleagues to an interview with the Director of Defense Mobilization, as carried in the United States News and World Report.

I can think of no other man in these United States who could have boiled down into so few words every fundamental and economic facet of our economy as well as did our good friend, Charlie Wilson; and it is because of the fact that this interview in the United States News and World Report is so terse, short, factual, and informative that I ask the unanimous consent to spread it, black on white, on the records of this day's proceedings, in order that businessmen everywhere may learn how well the affairs of this Nation are being cared for under the capable leadership of one of America's greatest business executives.

Interview in the United States News and World Report with the Honorable Charles E. Wilson reads as follows:

WE'LL BE MIGHTY WITHIN 3 YEARS—AN INTERVIEW WITH CHARLES E. WILSON, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE. New controls and new shortages have been forced by the war situation now facing United States. What can manufacturers, businessmen, workers, and consumers expect in the months ahead? Who will be affected next as regulation follows regulation in the fight to control inflation and keep arms production booming?

(To answer these questions, United States News and World Report invited to its conference rooms the man who knows most about the defense effort, Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization. The interview follows:)

Question. Do you look upon this program, Mr. Wilson, with any feeling that it will last 1 year, 2 years, 5 years? Are you planning for this emergency period with a definite duration in mind?

Answer. We hope it will be short but intend to achieve great potential military strength over about a 3-year period.

Question. You mean that within that 3-year period the bulk of your organization of the defense effort will have been completed?

Answer. Not only the organizational phase of it, but I believe that over that 3-year period our production of defense material and building of Armed Forces will have brought our country both to a point of real military strength and to an even greater military potential.

Question. Do you believe that the civilian needs and the military needs will tend to complement one another in about 3 years?

Answer. Our belief is that if we can go on with a civilian production of approximately $275,000,000,000 income figure, and superimpose on that a defense-material production of about $50,000,000,000, at the end of calendar 1951, we ought to be able to take care of our military requirements and the training of our vastly increased Army, Navy, and Air Force. We should also have considerable equipment for fighting a considerably greater engagement than we now have in Korea, if an enemy should make it necessary.

In 1952, if we can get approximately $60,000,000,000 worth of defense material produced, we think we would be in a position at the end of that year to fight a pretty substantial war with materials in existence. And, God willing, if there is no all-out war, at the end of the third year it seems to us that we will have a really mighty array of weapons ready, and facilities available to increase military production very rapidly, if necessary.

Question. When do you look for the peak of this current program to be reached?

Answer. In the third year. By that time it is our belief that we would be able to fight an all-out war from the production lines of the country.

Question. Can we assume that your program is based upon stockpiling immediately the things that you would use in war and also on the building up of plant capacity?

Answer. We are building plant capacity. It is not only for weapons. We are increasing plant capacity for those items of raw materials, steel, aluminum, and so on, that are in scarce supply now. About the only reason we have to cut back civilian production is because we just can't afford the full use of those items for civilian production and meet our requirements of defense material at the same time.

But in the third year, as the program of steel expansion and aluminum expansion and other items come through, we ought to

be able actually to expand our output of civilian goods and, at the same time, meet our requirements of defense material.

Question. If international tension eases, do you think it will have an impact on your program?

Answer. It hasn't to date because I don't think it has caused the legislators to refuse needed appropriations to go ahead with the very large programs. Of course, if the world tensions eased tremendously, the problem would be different. It would depend on how much they eased, and how much people believe tension had really eased.

Question. Do you think there will be runaway inflation?

Answer. No. I don't think there will be run-away inflation. I think it is one of the most serious enemies we have, however. It is one that we've got to combat if we're going to become mighty. America must be mighty. It would be a terrible price to pay, however, if when we reached that mighty position we were a broken nation financially.

Question. Do you feel yourself getting hold of inflation?

Answer. After all, remember I've been here 3 months. I think my associates have made some progress and I think there is need for a great deal more progress. We're going to give it everything we have.

Question. In all fields—in finance and direct controls?

Answer. Absolutely. We've been criticized a great deal, you know, for inadequacy of our efforts at price control and wage control, so far. I have no doubt we deserved the criticism. At least we've established some ceilings. The situation leaves room for lots of improvement. We've begun to establish controls of various kinds. All in all, I think there are some signs of progress.

Question. There are lots of complaints that goods aren't flowing as rapidly as they might—but industry hasn't had orders very long, has it?

Answer. That's right. But that will come.

RISING OUTPUT IN 3-YEAR PERIOD

Question. On the matter of armament production, do you visualize a gradual rise over a 3-year period, or hitting a $50,000,000,000 plateau and staying there for 3 years?

Answer. Production of defense goods will go up on a rising scale for the 3-year period. Suppose we place orders at the rate of forty-some-billion dollars this year. Goods won't come off the production line at that rate this year. Next year production will rise much more rapidly, and in the third year it will be coming out at the rate of $50,000,000,000 or more.

Question. And then do you expect weapons production to fall off, or will that rise?

Answer. I don't know what the world condition will be. Our policy depends on the world tensions. It depends on whether we obsolete the things we are making this year, and you know how fast we obsolete, especially big airplanes. In the last war, before we got the last runs of them they were obsolete or we thought they were. So things go in America.

Question. The armament business, then, is going to be a large business for some time to come, isn't it?

Answer. My guess is that it will continue for quite a while.

Question. Are controls here to stay?

Answer. I will say this—one of the real jobs we have this year is to keep our economy in balance. That is, to keep a proper balance between plant expansion for future raw-material production and future weapons production on the one hand, and the output of end items this year on the other. If we were willing to forego all plant expansion, we could increase the end-item production this year. We are striving for proper balance.

CAPACITY: DOUBLE 1940

Question. There has been a tremendous increase in plant capacity in the last 5 years since the war, hasn't there?

Answer. Yes, there has been. It has been variously estimated, but in some categories I believe it is a 100-percent increase over our production capacity of 1940. It has been 50 percent in many categories since the end of World War II.

Question. Has that been accomplished by many companies through a plowing back of their profits?

Answer. Plowing back their profits, greatly expanding their plants and improving their existing facilities.

Question. And a new expansion program is under way now?

Answer. That's right. The one under way now is running into many billions of dollars.

Question. Do you have any estimate about how many billions?

Answer. No. I know what the figure is of Government loans and Government amortization. Somebody contrasted it with the iceberg—only about one-eighth shows and the other seven-eights is under water. That's a good deal like the situation with regard to the expansion of plants by private organizations. They have been spending a great deal of money on expansion, and not many people seem to know about it.

Question. What will happen when we are able to meet the military needs and the civilian needs? Will we get a terrific depression at that time?

Answer. Well, we certainly won't get the kind of depression or set-back we would have gotten had we tried to meet this defense-material production problem by going straight up in, let's say, 2 years. You would have had terrific dislocation. I hate to think what would have happened to us.

Question. Have you a fixed understanding as to the size of the military budget for the next 3 years?

Answer. We have an understanding with the military that if we can go through with approximately $50,000,000,000 a year for the next 3 years for defense materials——

Question. That $50,000,000,000 is on material alone, not on services?

Answer. That's on the soft and hard goods for the military. If we do that, we will meet their requirements. We have fully approved the military program.

Question. How is industry adjusting itself to this situation as you see the picture?

Answer. I think it is adjusting itself very well. The Defense Department has actually contracted with industry in the last 2 months over $10,000,000,000 and industry has absorbed it very well.

Question. Do you think many industries will be able to do what you said in your speech the automobile industry was going to do, that is, put out a 1948-size production and still fill your defense orders in 1951?

Answer. Raw material is the only limiting factor that I know of now.

Question. Because the capacity exists, apparently, to do the military job and still give us what we got in 1948—only 3 years ago?

Answer. The capacity is unlimited. That's what we really have—capacity unlimited.

Question. Seems to be a terrific country——

Answer. It's wonderful—and I believe the country can absorb the impact of defense cost.

Question. What about raw materials?

Answer. Of course, that is one of our difficulties at the moment. In steel and aluminum we are hoping to meet the shortages with a greatly expanded program already agreed to. But we have other problems. Copper offers some problems in getting enough, but I think we can do it.

SOLVING LABOR SHORTAGE

Question. Are you going to have enough workers for these great productive machines? Isn't there going to be a shortage of manpower?

Answer. There may be. We haven't the unemployed that we had at the beginning of the last war to draw on. I don't think we will need as many workers for defense work as we needed before.

Question. You will have a drain from the military, too, on workers, won't you?

Answer. Yes; but women will take defense jobs, and, of course, there are a million new workers becoming of working age every year. We are working only 40 hours a week now, and we can work overtime. After all, a 44-hour week would give us 10 percent more hours. Ten percent more production would be quite a little on a $300,000,000,000 annual output. It would be $30,000,000,000 of the fifty billion of defense goods right there alone.

Question. Are we going to get any unemployment in this interim?

Answer. It hasn't shown up. I think that shows what a good job Bill Harrison and his group in the National Production Authority have done. While there have been curtailments in use of material, yet defense-material production to beginning to pick up any slack that may come about as nondefense production may decline. I think there will be more dislocations. I am quite sure there will be, especially as we cut back the automotive industry, as one illustration. I think we are bound to get dislocations of labor and of other groups, which are unpleasant to contemplate.

Question. Will it last long?

Answer. No; I don't believe it will. Many of the new jobs are opening up. For example, the automotive industry is pretty fast at lining up the new productive facilities and they'll swing the workers over pretty quickly. I don't think we are facing very serious dislocations of labor there.

Question. Are civilians going to face very much cut-back on what they can have?

Answer. We have cut back raw materials to automobile and refrigerator manufacturers, as one instance. I think by the third quarter there may be a 20-percent reduction in certain consumer goods. But that's from a very, very high level.

Question. Are you contemplating, when you begin these cuts, any such thing as rationing?

Answer. We may have to come to it in some places and under certain conditions. But so far our plans don't contemplate rationing.

RATIONING MAY NOT BE NECESSARY

Question. Then you're depending upon our privately operated distribution system to do its own allocating of what's left after the Government takes its share?

Answer. That's right. And I think the reason that that is sound is that, if we can keep the civilian economy at something like $275,000,000,000, rationing may not be necessary.

Question. But some form of controlled materials plan may be necessary?

Answer. We will undoubtedly have a controlled materials plan in operation by the middle of the year.

Question. To what will that apply?

Answer. We know now that it will have to apply to steel, aluminum, and copper. Those are the principal commodities. There are many other shortages, however—cobalt, nickel, other metals. But it's a strange thing how industry works out. It finds a way to eliminate the need for some of those scarce materials. Take the electronics industry. They have very adroitly, I think, minimized the use of scarce materials—cobalt, for example.

Question. Could you give us some estimate of when the supply of consumer durables is likely to loosen up again?

Answer. Well, it is pretty loose now. It's going to get a little tighter.

Question. It is getting tighter now, but when is it going to start the other way?

Answer. Oh, it will be well over a year—I would say at least 18 months from now.

Question. Sometime during the latter part of 1952?

Answer. Yes, somewhere in there.

Question. Would we begin to get more new cars?

Answer. Yes; we may be down considerably by that time from our current high production rate—perhaps 30 or 40 percent down.

Question. But even that's not a very low rate for producing automobiles, is it?

Answer. No; if you stop to think, it's more than we produced in 1948—or about what we produced in 1948—and that wasn't too bad. We got along. When you see the roads and the parking lots jammed with shiny new cars—I think maybe we can stand a slowing down.

NEED FOR MANPOWER COMMITTEE

Question. What is there to the reports that come bobbing up every now and then about some plan or idea of conscripting labor—what is there to that?

Answer. I don't know what there is to it. All I would say is that there is absolutely no substance to it. I know of no one—and I mean no one—in the Office of Defense Mobilization who has ever for a moment considered the necessity of conscription of labor in this situation.

Question. You've never thought of the situation in manpower being that tight?

Answer. That's right. How silly it would be with defense production only about 20 percent of our total requirements to think of conscription of labor.

Question. Will you have some drain, however, through the draft on key executives and key people, skilled workers?

Answer. We will have, I'm sure.

Question. How are you going to deal with that problem?

Answer. It's one of the reasons that we have a manpower committee that will have to deal with those problems. We have established a committee with representatives of the Departments of Defense and Commerce and Agriculture and Labor and headed by a man from our own office, Arthur Flemming.

Question. Do you think you will need manpower controls—such as those we had during World War II?

Answer. If we have an all-out war.

Question. But in this 3-year period?

Answer. I am hoping we will not need compulsory manpower controls.

NEUTRAL BODY FOR LABOR CONTROL

Question. Do you visualize the selection and allocation of manpower as a job that has to be done by so-called neutrals who are not identified with the various contending groups?

Answer. I don't think you can use for that purpose any agency that is at the same time a claimant for manpower. It can't be a claimant and a judge. The Labor Department, for instance, is a claimant. It operates the United States Employment Service as one of its many jobs.

Question. Isn't that true of Agriculture, which will want to keep men on the farms?

Answer. That's right, and that's why we've got to come to a neutral body. At least, that's my belief.

Question. The Labor Department would, however, continue its present operations?

Answer. There would be no change in its operations at all. This is only policy making and the laying down of fundamental principles. That's all—no changes in administrative responsibilities.

Question. No directives—nothing to get excited about?

Answer. I think not. The Manpower Policy Committee is a policy-making group. I don't anticipate any difficulty in getting unanimous decisions from its members. Incidentally, they would also deal with the problem of colleges—whether boys with 3 years behind them, say, should be taken out immediately—all that sort of thing.

Question. Would the Labor Department still be in charge of getting manpower for industrial plants?

Answer. Absolutely—no function they now have would be taken away at all. None whatever.

Question. Isn't that the phase that the unions are worried about?

Answer. I said that in my interview in Florida and I've been criticized for saying it. They say that isn't what's bothering them at all. We had had meetings with labor officials and I listened to a great many speeches on that subject. I thought from what they said that it was worrying them.

Question. What is worrying them?

Answer. There are a lot of things worrying them, of course. The decisions we made on wage ceilings, as an example.

Question. They were generous, weren't they?

Answer. That's a matter of opinion, I'm afraid.

Question. What were the other things?

Answer. Well, they think that the price control hasn't been as effective as it should be. And I guess we have to admit that—it's far from perfect. But I don't know whether you could expect to get it working perfectly in such a short time. I think it will take a little longer, and we will need understanding and cooperation.

WAGE LEVELS VERSUS LIVING COSTS

Question. It's a question of which comes first—the chicken or the egg, isn't it?

Answer. That's right. This business of stemming inflation, I am beginning to find out, has many, many facets to it. Here we are sitting as a Nation now with greatly increased wage levels. Then we have numerous labor contracts, the cost of living, the improvement factor, the incentive factor—really what is being asked over all, is the sixth wage-increase round—at the moment when all are being asked to make sacrifices. I don't think there is any question about it. Now that inevitably would make the cost of living go up.

Question. A vicious circle?

Answer. Yes—because wage increases affect parity prices and drive up the cost of food. Therefore, the cost of living goes up again, and then the cost-of-living allowance in wages goes up again, so "round and round she goes and where she stops, nobody knows."

Question. Aren't you really describing the difficulties democracy has with a planned economy?

Answer. Of course.

Question. In your set-up, are you trying to work out your problems with different economic groups? For example, are you looking at this picture as necessitating cooperation with agriculture, with transportation, with business, and with labor?

Answer. That's right.

Question. And do you see these various economic groups as cooperating in your future program?

Answer. I'm certainly hoping they will. And as a matter of fact, I'm going one step further with it. In addition to having the advisory committee of labor, I'm hoping shortly to establish an agricultural group to advise on the problems of defense mobilization. And, of course, a similar group of businessmen, to go the next step. As great questions arise—maybe controversial questions—where what is done for one group has considerable impact on the other groups, I hope to bring them all together and consider the problem over all.

Question. Some sort of over-all advisory group?

Answer. That's right. I just don't believe that you can settle separately some of these questions with respect to inflation and wage control. You can't settle the wage-control problem unless at the same time you look at the impact of that settlement on, say, parity prices in agriculture.

HOW BUSINESSMEN COOPERATE

Question. Where are you going to get the personnel for those advisory commissions, and so on? Are they to be people who are going to detach themselves from their businesses and their vocations?

Answer. No. The advisory groups will remain in their own businesses, but give us such counsel as we need.

Question. But in the top-level group such as your own will you have people devoting their time wholly to Government?

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. That's in the Government service?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Do you think people in that category should divorce themselves from their businesses while on the job for the Government?

Answer. I think so; certainly while actually on the job.

Question. You've done that yourself?

Answer. I have. I quit industry completely this time, as I did in 1942.

Question. Are you going back this time?

Answer. I think not.

Question. Devote yourself to public service, perhaps?

Answer. I don't know. I don't know whether I should live so long as to even think about it, the way things are going.

Question. Haven't you been under a good deal of a strain?

Answer. Slightly.

Question. Did you have a nice time in Key West?

Answer. Yes. I had a nice day in Key West with the President. I spent about 3 hours down there. It was the first time I had been down there in years. When I went down there before it was for fishing. This time I wasn't fishing for anything. But I spent a good deal of time with the President going over the program.

Question. Did you get the green light?

Answer. Oh, yes. Especially on this debt-control business that I have been working on.

Question. What do you mean by debt control?

Answer. Interest rate, credit control.

Question. What do you see in the way of any revision, or perhaps suspension, of our current laws during this period of emergency? Do you see any need for suspending or revising the antitrust laws or Taft-Hartley law?

Answer. No, I don't. I know of no good reason to do it.

Question. Do you think we need a no-strike pledge from labor now? Are we having any trouble with strikes?

Answer. We have had some serious trouble in the woolen industry. It's a very, very serious thing. We have been unable to get the woolens that we need for the uniforms.

Question. Would a no-strike pledge help that kind of situation?

Answer. Yes, I think a no-strike pledge—if you could get it—would help.

Question. Is there any talk about asking for a no-strike pledge in connection with a labor disputes board?

Answer. If we have a disputes board that will probably be one of the considerations. But we haven't decided on a disputes board.

Question. We've seen in the papers a good deal about the complaints made by labor. Have you received any complaints from other groups? For instance, has business felt that sometimes you weren't doing what they wanted done, too?

Answer. Oh, yes. To some degree on amortization of new plants.

Question. Distribution of materials?

Answer. Yes—cutting them back—but mainly on the amortization program. I just don't happen to believe in complete amortization of plants at taxpayers' expense.

Question. So you've had some differences with industry on that?

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. They haven't, however, made vocal their complaints, perhaps, have they?

Answer. No, they haven't been as vitriolic about it and they haven't gone on the radio about it every night as some groups are doing.

DEFENSE ROLE OF INDUSTRY LEADERS

Question. What is your thought as to the comment which has been made that big business is really in control of the defense program?

Answer. Of course that has been aired. I haven't seen any sign of it. I'm the fellow who has been shot at principally on it. I might say that I feel that my associates need no defense because I've never seen any sign of prejudice on their part. You know, I've been perfectly amazed at the way men from big business, medium business, any kind of business, come into the organization. They just become Government employees without any regard for their former status. And, as far as hours of work is concerned, usually I leave the office at 7:30 or 8 o'clock, and when I go down the halls there are those men at their desks—and their secretaries. That's one of the eye-openers to me—everybody working until all hours. It amazes me that men will come in from their normal vocations and undertake conscientiously work of this kind and then find themselves damned for being big business. Patriotism cuts across all economic lines. I believe that.

Question. Do you think that, when these men take positions as representatives of the Government of the United States, they feel a sense of responsibility to the Government rather than to any other interest?

Answer. I do. The only reason that most of them are down here is that when the President said we were in a very, very severe crisis, they believed him. They're willing to sacrifice themselves and their jobs. They entirely forget their own interests. I've never seen any sign of class partisanship among my associates at all.

TRUST BUSTER TO BUREAUCRAT

Question. In choosing your lieutenants, you haven't selected them entirely from "big-business," have you? Isn't your general counsel, Herbert Bergson, the former trust buster of the Department of Justice?

Answer. That's right. The very fellow who has just prosecuted me in any number of cases.

Question. And you made him your general counsel?

Answer. Sure, because I knew he was able to forget the past and just become a Government employee as I was. I quit the General Electric Co. and became a bureaucrat, and I had no doubt that he would be able to do the same thing—meanwhile, he had gone into private law practice. He has been a wonderful adjunct to our office.

Question. If you should succeed with this program of getting this enormous output in 3 years, and if you do it by voluntary means, will it not be a rather exceptional feat? Is not this the first time such a program has been attempted in this country in what you might call a near-war period?

Answer. Yes. It will be a huge production. I believe that voluntary means is the only way we can achieve it.

Question. We have heard much talk about whether you can justify 120,000,000 tons of steel or near that in anything but a war period. What's going to happen afterward?

Answer. That's a question that doesn't bother me one bit. If you believe that this is a mature economy and that we are going to have 18,000,000 more tons of steel to use in a static civilian economy, you've got something to worry about. But I don't believe it's a mature economy. I think we're still in the pioneering stage in the United States. I think that 10 years from now, if we have peace—and God knows I hope we have it—you will be talking about more production, not less, for the civilian economy.

Question. What do you think of Jesse Jones' idea that you take over the RFC, too?

Answer. I think Jesse is kidding me.

Second Annual Big Ten Conference of Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday evening I had the pleasure of talking to an enthusiastic group of young Republicans at Madison, Wis. These young people gathered there from the universities of the Middle West which comprise the Big Ten conference. On Friday afternoon they listened to a fine keynote address by His Excellency, Walter Kohler, Jr., Governor of Wisconsin. The remainder of the 3-day conference time was spent in committee work and plenary conference sessions.

The meeting at Madison was the second annual Big Ten Conference of Young Republicans. The first was held at Ann Arbor, Mich., in 1950 with the University of Michigan Young Republicans as hosts, just as the University of Wisconsin Young Republicans were hosts at Madison. At their first conference, the delegates were privileged to hear Gov. Harold Stassen and our able and hard-working colleague from Michigan, JERRY FORD.

I was glad to join the distinguished company of Walter Kohler, Harold Stassen, and Jerry Ford by talking to the fine group of young men and women who attended the conference at Madison.

As a part of the record of this successful conference, I include here the text of my remarks:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GLENN R. DAVIS, OF WISCONSIN'S SECOND DISTRICT, AT LORAINE HOTEL BANQUET OF THE SECOND ANNUAL BIG TEN CONFERENCE OF YOUNG REPUBLICANS, FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1951

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow young Republicans, all of you have been welcomed here both officially and unofficially so that it is not necessary for me to welcome you to the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. His Excellency Governor Kohler, our State chairman, Wayne Hood, and your conference chairman, Roland Veith, have put that welcome in words, and I'm sure that the young Republicans here at the University of Wisconsin have put that welcome in many actions during the course of the day. On the other hand, it is indeed a welcome sight and a source of real inspiration and encouragement to look upon this fine gathering of middle western young Republicans. All of us here speak the same kind of Republican language and I'm sure that we shall have no difficulty in understanding each other here tonight, and that all of you will be able to understand each other in the course of your discussions here at this conference.

I mention the importance of our understanding in the light of the experience of a foreign-born plumber here in Madison who had some difficulty with the English language, who used hydrochloric acid to clean a clogged drain. The success was so immediate that he wrote to the Bureau of Standards in Washington to explain his success. In due time he received a letter from an official in the Bureau of Standards which read as follows: "The efficacy of hydrochloric acid is indisputable but the corrosive residue is incompatible with metallic permanence." The plumber wrote back that he was glad the Bureau of Standards agreed with him.

Sometime later the plumber received a subsequent letter from the Bureau of Standards which said: "We cannot assume responsibility for the production of toxic and noxious residue with hydrochloric acid and suggest you use an alternate procedure." The plumber again wrote he was happy that the Bureau agreed. Finally someone in the Bureau caught on to the fact that the plumber didn't understand the fancy and technical language and so he wrote: "Don't use hydrochloric acid. It eats hell out of the pipes."

It does help to understand each other. In your discussions here in your committees in this conference I hope that you will be able to reach real Republican understanding.

It was here in the Middle West that the Republican Party was born and cradled. Its birth at Ripon, Wis., was followed by its baptism at Jackson, Mich. Illinois claims the man whose leadership brought our party to national strength and ascendancy. It was Indiana which raised that man to manhood before he moved to Illinois. Even today, the Middle West is our party's greatest source of strength. The heartland of our Nation is also the heartland of our party.

I feel very much at home here in this company tonight, not only because this happens to be in the district which it is my honor to represent in Congress, but also because I can talk to you as a middle western young Republican to middle western young Republicans. We young Republicans, the youthful leaders of our party, are here without boasting, but in a sincere determination to recognize and face up to the importance of our position. It is clear to us that our Nation needs a strong Republican Party and that the Republican Party needs us young Republicans.

I'm happy to point out that here in Wisconsin youth has a dominant position in the councils of our party. In the Badger State we have a lieutenant governor, two members of the House of Representatives, and the State chairman of our party who are under 40; and we have a governor, a United States Senator, and two other members in the House of Representatives who are in their forties. This youthful Republican vigor cannot be discounted in explaining that we have all Republican State officers, two Republican United States Senators, 9 out of 10 Republican United States Representatives, and three-fourths of the membership of our State legislature who are Republicans. We Wisconsin young Republicans intend to keep it that way. The people of Wisconsin, as in most of the States of the Middle West, know that the letters GOP stand for economy, efficiency, and honesty in government.

In your organization and discussion programs of today, tomorrow, and Sunday I trust that you will lay the foundation for new future hopes and aspirations. It has ever been the habit of youth to look forward

instead of backward, to the future instead of to the past. As young men and women of high ideals of citizenship, we need to recognize that our ideals can be realized only through the practical application of our rights and privileges of citizens—in other words, through practical politics. We need to realize that every good citizen is a politician, for politics, while not an exact science, is nevertheless the science of government. In this republican form of government every citizen ought to be a student of that science. Let us recognize frankly that politics is to be the aim and the objective and the practice of young Republicans. Our job is to sell practical politics to other young people as a part of their responsibility of citizenship and to interest youth in working within the framework of the Republican Party. To be successful in this, we must offer not only a year-round program of activity, we must be able to demonstrate that the hopes and ideals of young people are best expressed in the principles and programs of our party. While thus serving as a rallying point for youth, we can well serve our party, for we must not overlook the fact that we, as individual young Republicans, are also members of the Republican Party.

We have a dual membership in our party just as we have a dual citizenship in our State and Nation. It has never been intended that young Republicans shall serve as apprentices before active participation in party and governmental affairs. It has never been intended that young Republican meetings shall be polite debating societies for the discussion of academic or moot questions. Young people seek action, and I suggest that young Republicans are admirably fitted for the following fourfold task:

First, we can have a lasting effect on our party and its program by taking leadership in a year-round program of political education and discussion. Youth can best sustain necessary party activity in the period after one election is over and before another election is hard upon us again. A youthful group of Republican workers with the initiative and the public-spiritedness to make theirs a year-round program will soon find that they are the leaders of their party and that their party has become the leading party in their community. By knowing more, by doing more, we can give meaning to our viewpoints. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and by year-round discussion programs in our local communities we can achieve the knowledge and know-how to be effective in politics and effective in Government.

Second, we must make ourselves heard in party councils. Success as young Republicans will not be measured alone by the size of membership rolls or the existence of live, working organizations. It must be measured also by the number of young Republicans who are members of county Republican committees, are precinct committeemen or committeewomen, and are in attendance and take active parts in county, district or State Republican conventions. Again I repeat—we are an integral part of the Republican organization. Our identity as young Republicans is significant as a meeting ground and as a training school for our work in the senior councils of the party.

Third, we young Republicans must be active in Government. It is not enough that we shall demonstrate our effectiveness as practical political workers in behalf of Republican candidates, we must furnish some of the candidates of the Republican Party at local, State, and National levels. All of us cannot be officeholders, but many of us who could be competent Republican servants of our Government have never offered ourselves for public service.

Political campaigning and political office holding is hard lot, discouraging at times and often unappreciated, but they are functions that young people are admirably fitted by youth, energy, and spirit to perform. I know from experience, from having worked with them, that some of the outstanding present and future leaders of the House of Representatives are to be found in the ranks of the young Republicans. The names of JERRY FORD and CHARLIE POTTER, of Michigan; BILL AVERS, of Ohio; BILL STRATTON and TOM SKEEHAN, of Illinois; ROSS ADAIR, SHEP CHURCHACHER and CHUCK BROWNSON, of Indiana; and JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin; are certainly to be found in the category of young Republican leaders of the House.

To them politics, public service, is a career. Robert Louis Stevenson once said that politics is perhaps the only profession for which no preparation is thought necessary. Robert Louis Stevenson, of course, was strictly a writer of fiction. It may be true that few people think preparation is necessary, but that too is fiction.

At the National Republican Convention at Philadelphia in 1948, former President Hoover told the delegates: "If you follow the counsel of those who believe that politics is only a game to be played for personal advantage, you are wasting your time and effort."

Young Republicans must stand ready for active responsible stewardship in Government.

Fourthly and finally, young Republicans—and youth has always furnished the steamen of all generations—must instill within our party a fundamental honesty in political principle and political practice. We must be the conscience of our party as well as the guardian of its principles. Some of our older brethren, who have watched our opponents win elections through misrepresentation and vilification, may well express wonder as to whether a conscience pays off in practical politics. As young Republicans we must prove to them and to the American people that honesty and forthrightness are as important in politics as in any field of endeavor and that there is still enough respect for those virtues in this America to eventually bring down scorn and repudiation upon the heads of those who believe and practice otherwise. Sooner or later the time will come when the American people will repudiate those who seek to maintain or obtain the control of Government on the basis of misrepresentation, half-truths, vilification, trick phrases, favoritism, and influence. We must be sure that we stand clean and ready when that time arrives.

Surely the moral fiber of the American people is much higher than the morality of the present national administration would indicate. Given the leadership of young men and women with clean hands and clear hearts, the American people will repudiate those who have at least tolerated, if not encouraged, reprehensible standards of loyalty and trust. Grover Cleveland, who certainly would not recognize his current Democratic successors, often repeated the statement: "A public office is a public trust," and he governed himself and his administration accordingly. Under the Truman administration code, basic integrity has been replaced by technical legality. People in high appointed places of influence no longer ask "Is it right?" Rather they ask, "Can I get by without being prosecuted?" This attitude has been evident in Washington for too long a time. In recent weeks, it has become evident to the American people everywhere.

For instance, the American people now know the name of the White House stenographer who received a $9,500 natural pastel mink—"one of the better coats"—from a friend of her influential husband.

The American people now know the name of that husband of the White House stenographer who, until his wife became secretary to Senator Harry S. Truman, was a clerk in a chain store, a dairy worker, a restaurant worker, a garage man. Then when his wife came to Washington he did, too, and before World War II worked in a bureau at not more than $1,800 a year. Following the war (in the meantime his wife had moved to the White House with her boss) he rose rapidly in the RFC to $7,500 a year. He became the man to see when White House influence was wanted. He became an insurance counselor, he had acquired parts of oil wells, a brewery, and other business enterprises. He bought a $52,000 home in Washington. His income rose to $50,000 annually. There is where the Fulbright committee found him and burst his balloon, but his wife continues to work as a White House secretary. It might be mentioned that she quit wearing the mink coat before spring came to Washington.

The American people now know that before the site for the H-bomb plant in South Carolina was publicly announced friends of people in high places quietly bought up thousands of acres of land in the immediate vicinity.

The American people now know that Mississippi Senators and Members of the House publicly complained that Federal jobs were sold in their State by Mississippi Democrats friendly to the administration. The payment was in cash, never by check.

The American people now know that Gen. Harry Vaughan, exposed as the friend of the fixer and perjurer John Maragon, and as the employer of an Australian lady friend brought to this country under special legislation, continues as military adviser to the President.

The American people know of these and many more like them. President Truman knows about them, too, but faced with this kind of a record of imposition on himself and on the American people, did the President ask any sort of an explanation from his "friends"? He did not. Did he dismiss any of them? He did not. When confronted by a reporter who asked what he proposed to do about these scandals the President's reply was, "My people are all honorable—all of them are. * * * My house is always clean."

The editor of the widely read U. S. News and World Report summarizes the President's attitude this way: "Mr. Truman is to ignore the storm over influence business in Washington. The President won't fire anybody, won't believe that anything is wrong. RFC, if abolished by Congress, will be saved by Presidential veto. Influence business, very big business, will continue to thrive. It is not viewed with disfavor by the White House. It greases political wheels."

We all admire loyalty to friends. It's a fine gesture to refrain from turning your back on a friend. That is one thing—it is quite another for the President to turn his back on the rest of the American people.

This obvious cloak of immorality which enshrouds this administration is there for all to see. For about a score of years now there has been another cloak less visible, yet less revealing, just as immoral, just as conscienceless. This lack of conscience will be paid for by our children and grandchildren, and other generations to come. It is the immoral and destructive habit of repeated deficits in our Federal finance.

If any man shall keep his family in luxury while he is alive, meantime saddling himself and that family with debts that can mean only hardship or bankruptcy in the future—would anyone here say that was not immoral? What then shall we say about the leaders of the Democratic administration which has conducted the financial affairs of our country in such a manner?

In our House Appropriations Committee now we are wrestling with the President's budget requests totaling more than $84,000,000,000—$71,000,000,000 to be spent in the

coming fiscal year. The balance to be authorizations for spending in the years to come.

That amount can be and must be reduced. Budget cutting always is difficult and always painful but that does not detract from its necessity. The people are looking to the Republicans in Congress, with help from moderate Democrats, to cut the fat from this spending program. Federal programs which might be classed as justifiable conveniences in normal times, become unjustifiable luxuries in times like these.

Early this year, in his message to Congress, the President stressed the necessity for defense and soft-pedaled his habitually expensive so-called welfare program. But his voice was evidently softened simply to lessen the vigilance of the American people. For neatly tucked away in convenient corners of the budget tent, near flaps through which two familiar characters with long ears and humped backs named "Charles" and "Oscar" could get their noses—near those flaps were additional appropriations for the unauthorized and repudiated Brannan strait-jacket, give-away farm plan, and the Ewing compulsory free-doctor-nurse-and-pill plan. There were other such programs which the President included in his budget in the guise of defense necessity. They spell out the measure of the insincerity—yes the cynicism, the fiscal irresponsibility of this administration. In the daylight of peace, in a darkness of war, in the twilight of emergency, the practices of political patronage are never set aside; the lust for power is ever present; their habits of spending have not been reformed. It is inescapable that these habits and these practices would not only continue the depletion of the Treasury, but that they move in the direction of debauching—destroying the moral fiber—of the electorate. By this method, through Government hand-outs, grants, subsidies, and aid programs, has the traditional republican form of government, the government of Jefferson and of Lincoln, been weakened and transformed. The normal relationship of the levels of government has been reversed. Their proper relationship, it seems to me, can be illustrated by a triangle, the broad base which represents our local units of government, the government units which are closest to the people, most responsible to the people, and can in most cases most effectively deal with their problems. As the triangle narrows from the broad base we reach the legitimate area af the operation of the State government. This area of problems includes those which cannot be adequately handled at the local levels. Then as we approach the apex we reach the legitimate area of the operation of the Federal Government in dealing with our domestic problems.

In the last score of years, the Democrats have, however, completely reversed this traditional relationship. Under the current practices, the broad base of the triangle now represents the enveloping field of activities of the Federal Government.

The triangle then narrows into the area of the State government with a closely confined area of local responsibility in the region adjacent to the apex. Our tax moneys are being poured in at the top of this inverted triangle, the largest portion taken by the Federal Government, and then what is left trickles down into the area of the State and local governments. Thus have the legitimate areas of taxation of the State and local governments been usurped. Thus has the Federal Government made it impossible for these units of Government to meet the responsibilities which are rightfully theirs. I think we can attribute no small portion of the lack of civic responsibility and civic morale to the fact that State and local governments have been placed in a completely dependent and subservient position with relation to the Government in Washington.

By way of summation let me restate what I consider to be the four particular functions of Young Republicans and young Republican organizations. First, a sponsorship and participation in a year-round program of political education and discussion. Second, effective participation in the councils of the Republican Party. Third, active participation in and responsible stewardship in government. Fourth and finally, the championship and guardianship of the conscience, the forthrightness, the sound traditional principles of our party and our government.

I hope, fellow young Republicans, that you will leave this conference with the inspiration and the determination to do all that which needs to be done between now and November of 1952. Other young people must be brought into the Republican fold. The leadership for which the American people are crying must be developed, a leadership which is worthy of the confidence of the American people, a leadership which will stand for fiscal responsibility, for honesty, for decency, for respect for the republican form of government.

Our cause is not only the cause of young Republicanism. We are to be but the instrument for righteousness, and the beneficiaries of a change in government only insofar as those benefits are to be distributed to all the people of America. We Republicans must fight for and accept the responsibilities of the leadership of the Nation in 1952. Much of the work that must be done, much of the leadership that must be furnished, must come from Young Republicans like ourselves. A Republican victory in 1952 will be a victory for decency, a victory for all America, a victory for freemen everywhere.

I hope that in your work here tomorrow and Sunday and in your work between now and November of 1952, your realization of the importance of your task as young Republicans will gladden your heart and give speed and lightness to your hands.

Congress Should Keep Faith With Heroes Who Have Given Their Lives and Fought Valiantly for Their Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in every war America has called on our citizens without regard to race. In Korea today history is being written and the heroic deeds of men of many races are daily brought to our attention. Congress should keep faith with these heroes. It can do it by refusing to write into the universal service and military training bill now under consideration requirements for segregation.

The articles which I include herewith appeared in the Nation's newspapers recently. I could fill the RECORD with hundreds such stories.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of March 3, 1951]

PFC JONES WREAKS HAVOC IN KOREA—ANOTHER HERO FOR MEMPHIS

ON THE HAN RIVER, KOREA.—Pfc Aaron Jones, 21-year-old native of Memphis, is in line for the Silver Star Medal, third-ranking United States combat decoration, for his heroic action sparking an attack upon some 200 Chinese Red troops here recently.

The outstanding feature of Jones' action was the fact that he is a Browning automatic rifleman, but used unfamiliar weapons, such as hand grenades, a captured rifle, and an abandoned machine gun to wreak havoc upon the enemy.

GUN JAMMED

The only Negro in his nine-man squad, Jones and his comrades were part of a force assigned to take a hill on which the Chinese Red troops were dug in. Just as the signal for the charge came his gun jammed.

Not wanting to be left out of the excitement, he grabbed up some hand grenades and closed in with the rest of the outfit. Halfway up the slope, the hand grenades came in handy. A burp gun, firing from above, pinned down the American attackers.

Jones, with complete disregard for his life, jumped to his feet and hurled a grenade up the hill. There was an explosion, then silence, and the attack again rolled forward.

GRABBED NEW WEAPON

Reaching the top, the American troops locked in hand-to-hand struggle with the enemy, Jones grabbed up a rifle, a Japanese single-shot rifle, with no bullets, and scurried around quickly to pick up some ammunition. When he had gotten some he downed two of the enemy as they were running.

The following day, in another hill attack, he spotted a Red force advancing up the other side of the slope. The regular machine gunners were eating at the time, so he took over one of the spray guns and downed 11 of the advancing enemy on the first burst.

EX-BOY SCOUT

Pfc Jones' parents are Mr. and Mrs. Frank L. Jones, of 959 Porter Street. He attended Booker T. Washington High School and was a member of Boy Scout Troop 166, sponsored by the LeMoyne Gardens Tenant Association. He has several brothers and sisters.

A few weeks ago another Memphis soldier, Pvt. Edward O. Cleaborn, was posthumously awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for exceptional gallantry in action in Korea, giving his life to save his comrades.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 25, 1951]

DSC AWARDED NEGRO PRIVATE WHO GAVE LIFE TO SAVE OUTFIT

TOKYO, January 25.—A Tennessee private has been awarded posthumously the Distinguished Service Cross for giving his life so his platoon could evade a Communist flanking action near Nuri in Korea.

The citation praised Pvt. Edward O. Cleaborn, Jr., of Memphis for extraordinary heroism in action.

The colored private single-handedly wiped out Red machine-gun crews threatening his unit.

In awarding him the Nation's second highest military award, Far East command headquarters said that on August 15 Cleaborn's unit, Company A, Thirty-fourth Infantry Regiment, "attacked a ridge where the enemy was occupying positions with excellent observation and fields of fire.

"Some of the enemy had infiltrated and flanking action had occurred and his platoon was pinned down almost immediately by machine-gun fire from the rear.

"Despite the extreme hazard of interlacing machine-gun fire Cleaborn gained the ridge and killed the machine-gun crews to the front. From the continuous firing of his weapon Cleaborn's hands were severely burned.

"Disregarding his burned hands, when his platoon began a withdrawal he remained on the ridge to cover withdrawal of his comrades and to permit evacuation of the wounded. He continued firing from this position, thus denying the enemy access to adjacent high ground.

"While furnishing protective fire, Private Cleaborn was mortally wounded. His heroic self-sacrifice permitted the withdrawal of his platoon to new positions."

HERO COULDN'T FIND JOB, SO HE JOINED THE ARMY

MEMPHIS, TENN., January 25.—Pvt. Edward O. Cleaborn joined the Army because he couldn't find a job.

The heroic youngster was one of nine children of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Cleaborn, Sr. He was a native of Merigold, Miss.

In his last letter home, Private Cleaborn told his mother he had been "in a tight spot but came out all right, thank the Lord."

Maj. William R. Oliver, Organized Reserve Corps instructor here, said the award will be presented either by Lt. Gen. John R. Hodge, commander of the Third Army in Atlanta, or by a general on his staff.

Major Oliver said Cleaborn's mother said she preferred to have the ceremony held in a church. They live in a slum section.

[From the Washington Post of March 31, 1951]

SOLDIER'S IS POSTHUMOUS—NAVY FLIER, INDIAN CORPORAL AWARDED MEDALS OF HONOR

(By John G. Norris)

Two stories of extraordinary heroism involving a white Navy pilot from Massachusetts, a Negro flier from Mississippi, and an American Indian from Wisconsin fighting Chinese Communists in North Korea were told yesterday by the Department of Defense.

Lt. (jg) Thomas J. Hudner, Fall River, Mass., the Pentagon announced, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for risking his life in a vain attempt to save the life of a squadron mate, Ensign Jesse Leroy Brown, Hattiesburg, Miss. Brown was the first American Negro naval officer to lose his life in combat and the Navy's first Negro aviator.

Corp. Mitchell Red Cloud, Jr., Friendship, Wis., who died saving his Army company from a fanatical Chinese attack, was awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously at the same time.

Navy pilots Hudner and Brown, both of the aircraft carrier *Leyte*, were flying close support for marines fighting near the Changjin Reservoir December 5, when Brown's plane was hit by Chinese ack-ack fire and crashed.

"Quickly maneuvering to circle the downed pilot and protect him from enemy troops infesting the area," said the citation of yesterday's award, "Lieutenant Hudner risked his life to save the injured flier who was trapped alive in the burning wreckage.

"Fully aware of the extreme danger in landing in the rough mountainous terrain and the scant hope of escape or survival in subzero temperature, he put his plane down skillfully in a deliberate wheels-up landing in the presence of enemy troops.

"With his bare hands, he packed the fuselage with snow to keep the flames away from the pilot and struggled to free him. Unsuccessful in this, he * * * radioed other airborne planes, requesting that a helicopter be dispatched with an ax and fire extinguisher."

When the 'copter arrived, rescue attempts were renewed, but failed.

President Truman will personally present the Nation's highest military award to Hudner at a White House ceremony April 13. He will be the first Navy man to receive the Medal of Honor for Korean service.

Corporal Red Cloud was with his outfit, Company E, Nineteenth Infantry of the Twenty-fourth Division, near Chongyon, North Korea, at dawn, last November 5, when the enemy attacked without warning. He opened fire with his automatic rifle without waiting to take cover.

Badly hit by a burst from an enemy "burp" gun, the Winnebago Indian wrapped his arm around a tree to keep from falling and continued to fire until he fell mortally wounded.

"This heroic act," said Red Cloud's citation, "stopped the enemy from overrunning his company's position and gained time for reorganization and evacuation of the wounded.

"Corporal Red Cloud's dauntless courage and gallant self-sacrifice reflects the highest credit upon himself and upholds the esteemed traditions of the Army of the United States."

Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will present the Medal of Honor to the deceased soldier's mother, Mrs. Nellie Red Cloud, at a Pentagon ceremony Tuesday. Red Cloud, a World War II marine, was the son of Mitchell Red Cloud, Sr., a former White House guard, who died in 1946.

Deferment of Some College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the Boston Pilot:

NO DODGE FROM THE DRAFT

The President's plan which allows the deferment of some college students has been the occasion for more than the usual quota of scatter-brained reactions. Some people who are quite incapable of seeing the more subtle issues arising in the problems of our national life found here something they could really put their teeth into; in too many cases, however, having reached the dental area, this was as close as the matter came to the brain. To them it appeared to be nothing more than a defiance of all the democratic traditions, to be in fact discriminatory; it is a poor politician or public figure who does not know what stand to take on these subjects. The results then have made up in vigor and passion for what they lacked in rationality and reflection.

If a man limited his reading on this subject to the large literature of its objectors, he would be under the impression that the President of the United States had suddenly exempted from the necessity of military service a certain portion of the community whose numbers were to be decided by their relatively high I. Q. This would indeed be the creation of an intellectual elite and those first to complain should be the Armed Forces themselves who, by this means, would become a vast mass of unlettered or at least less educated men. The process too would be undemocratic since the norm for exemption would be restricted to one single quality—intellectual ability—and not the most important one at that. The results would be catastrophic from every point of view—military, political, scientific, cultural, and not the least of all, that of public morale.

Fortunately for all concerned the situation we face is not at all like this one envisioned by some of our more easily alarmed citizens. There is no question at all of grounds for exemption; there is quite a different matter under discussion, that of deferment. Here the question is not, "Who can best serve his country?" but rather, "Among those who can best serve the country when are college students most valuable in the service of that country?" It is not an attempt to remove those who go to college from the necessity of serving in the Armed Forces of the Nation; it is a practical program designed to take them into that service when they are most valuable to it and generally most valuable to the Nation as a whole. It would be the height of folly to exclude college students from the draft; they are the strong citizens of tomorrow and they have a most significant contribution to make to the Armed Forces as to society itself. At the same time wisdom as well as prudence suggest that we use this significant group in an economy which will produce the most effective results. This way of acting is in keeping with our policies in other areas of our population. The farmer, the man in industry, the scientist, the clergyman, the father of a family—all of these are absorbed into the service of the country in a manner which will insure the best possible contribution to the war effort and the general health of the community as well. To be just as rational about the college student is not to display favoritism but simple common sense.

Nor is it, as some maintain, merely a question of providing in the future enough scientists to carry on the researches necessary for the progress of our mechanical civilization. There are values which when weighed beside this one make it shrink into insignificance. Our colleges have as their principal work the task of producing not merely scholars or scientists but mature men; in times of crisis like this one it would be foolhardy indeed to cut off the supply of this rarest of all commodities. The college and the university must not be sacrificed to the god of war; its facilities and its extraordinary powers for good must however be directed toward the saving of our civilization.

Training the American Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Cy Snyder:

What we have a right to expect of every American boy is that he shall turn out to be a good American man. Not $4, not $40, but over $400,000,000 was spent across the retail counters of America in 1950 for what—cap pistols, toy machine guns, cowboy hats, pants, shirts, vests, shoes, boots, belts, badges, saddles, cereals, tooth brushes, and a mile-long list of cowboy merchandise for our American boys.

It was purchased by American women because our primary education is controlled by women, our manners are dictated by women, and 90 percent of our earnings are spent by women. In face of all this, the real old-time cowboys have changed their trade name titles to ranchers, like the baby sitters have changed their profession to child monitors for fear someone in the clothing industry will start to promote outfits for them with guns and knives to kill the kidnapers.

Every little boy likes to play with a hammer, saw, wrench, and rule. Every little boy likes to dabble in red, white, and blue paint. Every little boy likes to build his

scooter for the soap box derby. All you have to do is give a boy a tool and he won't want a gun.

Parents all over the Nation are stirred by this social menace, and everywhere are asking for an answer to this problem. I have no desire to start a local, State, and National movement. I only wish that we could go to Hopalong Cassidy, Roy Rogers, and Gene Autry, since they have become the idols of our American boys, and ask them if they will start to show the boys over television and radio what can be done with tools rather than guns. I wish that some one could go to Hollywood and show them that interesting things can be done with tools to entertain the minds of our youth constructively rather than destructively.

I realize that we live in and under a capitalistic system of government in which profit is the selfish motive of all things. But I wish that we could go to the manufacturers who sponsor six-gun this and six-gun that radio and television shows, and ask them to please make it six-tools for this and six-tools for that. I realize that it is too late now to help those of our youth whose crimes are being committed daily, in which we read in our papers such headlines as appeared a few days ago: "Boy, 8, kills mother and father." But it is not too late to start today teaching and showing our children the use of tools for entertainment and knowledge.

The strong influence among youth is to look like, and act like, their idols in their dream world. But suppose for a moment that these idols of screen and television would change to good American clothes with a dash of buttons, carpenter aprons to replace holsters for tools, I will assure you that the fad of cowboy outfits would begin to diminish overnight, along with crime magazines.

However, where there is life there is hope. Let us be thankful for the work of the 4-H Clubs of America which are keeping our farm children busy building the constructive things of life. Thanks for the Boy and Girl Scouts of America and their great leaders.

It always makes my heart thrill in listening over the radio to Horace Heidt's program when he says, "It's better to build boys than to mend men." Let us start to dramatize the life of Jesus, the great Carpenter of Nazareth, down through the ages of our great builders of the universe. These men's lives can be dramatized on the screen, radio, and television so great and powerful that they too can become the idols of our American boys. They, too, were given tools, for they did not want guns.

And now as my contribution to American youth may I start a slogan here in your county that will echo throughout the Nation: "Give a boy a tool and he won't want a gun."

Barred From Ride but Not Silver Star Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Pilot, Saturday, April 7, 1951:

HE WAS BARRED FROM RIDE TO SCHOOL BUT NOT FROM WINNING HERO'S MEDAL

OLYMPIA, WASH., April 5.—They wouldn't let him ride a school bus here because he went to a Catholic school. But there is no embargo on Silver Star Medals for bravery when any fighting man in Korea shows the courage in action that merits one—and young Francis Normoyle has won his.

The parents of the 22-year-old United States Naval hospitalman, Mr. and Mrs. George J. Normoyle, have been notified that Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Smith, commander of the First Marines, has pinned the Silver Star on him in Korea.

Serving as a corpsman with the Marines, young Normoyle went out under heavy fire to bring in three wounded Marines, the last of whom he rescued although he himself was wounded in the meantime.

His father, asked for a picture of the young high-school football and track star, brought it to the offices of the Catholic Northwest Progress, diocesan paper of Seattle. He was asked what school young Normoyle had attended.

HARD AND EVIL THING

"Well," he replied, "Francis went to St. Michael's School in Olympia until they made that rule about not letting Catholic school pupils ride on the school buses. After that he had to go to Tumwater School; we live 8 miles out of Olympia."

And then Mr. Normoyle, a kind and gentle man, added:

"It is a hard and evil thing, that rule."

Francis' Silver Star citation read:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action against the enemy while serving with a Marine infantry company in Korea on 25th September 1950." Hospitalman Normoyle was acting as a corpsman when his platoon was engaged in a heavy fire fight with a well-entrenched and concealed enemy.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address, recently delivered by Prof. Louis F. Budenz, on the Justice for Poland radio series sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress, together with the introductory remarks by Attorney Paul P. Flak:

INTRODUCTION BY ATTORNEY PAUL P. FLAK

Munich in 1938 and Yalta in 1945 are two black pages of recent history. The appeasement of Hitler brought on World War II, while the appeasement of Stalin confronts us with world war III.

Western democracies under Chamberlain betrayed Czechoslovakia, while under Churchill and Roosevelt Poland and other countries were betrayed and Communist chains riveted on their lands and souls.

Both Munich and Yalta violated international morality and exposed ugly indifference and cynicism of western leaders who, in place of honesty employed temporary expediency.

At Yalta Roosevelt threw aside the opportunity to rebuild the world on justice, preferring materialistic instead of Christian code of ethics. The world has lost faith in our leaders and respect for our democracy, for while we proclaim loudly the merits of freedom and independence, we have thrown our friends into Communist slavery.

We are paying now for our folly at Yalta through the expenditure of billions of dollars and sacrifice of the lives of our men in Korea.

Appeasement of tyrants is indeed a black page in our history and in order to erase this moral crime we must repudiate Yalta and wipe out the curse of the United States.

Our speaker today is a man who startled the world by his candid exposure of secret Communist activities in the United States. As editor of the Daily Worker he had an opportunity to know and study the workings of communism. Resigning the editorship in 1945 he returned to Catholicism and is at present assistant professor of economics at Fordham University. It gives me pleasure to introduce Louis F. Budenz.

TRANSCRIPTION OF RADIO TALK BY LOUIS BUDENZ FOR THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

Poland is a name which brings warmth to the hearts of every lover of freedom throughout the world. Our United States owes a special debt of honor to the Polish people—they whose heroism has kept alive so long the light of freedom in eastern Europe. It is Poland which was made the reason for the opening of World War II. It is Poland which, ironically enough, we find nevetheless today in the toils of Soviet tyranny and slavery.

How has this event occurred? In order to answer it, in order to meet this challenge, in order to plead for freedom and justice to Poland, I am indeed honored in speaking these few words to you today. Particularly do I consider it of the most importance that this be done, since the Polish people, in addition to their great love for their native liberty, have ever cherished a devotion to the mother of God, the Blessed Virgin Mary. Their great national shrine is dedicated to her, and around that shrine there still rise the hopes of those people who have encouraged all Europe and the entire world to hope that sometime we could write down in the annals of mankind the end of totalitarianism and of Soviet tyranny.

Let us review for a moment what has occurred in regard to these Polish people, 95 percent anticommunistic in sentiment. When I was a member of the Communist conspiracy I was advised that the Communist Party of Poland was particularly weak. They received criticism from Moscow because they did not win the adherence of more than 2 percent of the Polish people. It is this conspiracy, this small band of brigands, which today imposes its bloody hand upon 95 percent of the Polish people. We Americans cannot wash our hands of what has transpired. Our security is bound up in the fact that there is a Red Poland today. One is bound up in the fact that we, in a certain sense, so shamelessly acquiesced in permitting Soviet Russia to achieve its conquest of that nation.

In 1944 the Red armies were advancing toward Warsaw, the capital of these people. They were only a short distance away—some few miles—when Molotov, then the "mouthpiece" of Soviet Russia, called for the Poles to rise. They did so under General Boer—250,000 of them—and were made the victims of Nazi artillery and superior mechanized warfare. All through the ferments of their struggle the Red armies remained the same distance away from Warsaw. Let us not forget that, although we very soon did so in the months that were to follow.

Then, beyond all this, the United States asked Stalin to grant permission for a shuttle, an air shuttle, across Warsaw in order to drop into that city supplies—that is, of food and military equipment—to help the Poles in their battle against the Nazis. This was essential in order that the shuttle could reach Soviet soil at the other end from Great Britain. Permission was denied the American soldiery and Air Force to undertake any such shuttle adventure; and, indeed, finally only the smallest shuttle was permitted—inadequate, thoroughly inadequate, to meet the great emergency.

That meant that Stalin decreed, by keeping his army so far away from Poland, that Warsaw should be destroyed.

In the face of this we find that at Yalta, under the guidance of Alger Hiss, we acquiesced in giving Stalin control of the destiny of Poland. We instituted the idea of so-called free and unfettered elections, but these free and unfettered elections were to be supervised practically and realistically by Joseph Stalin and his agents in Poland. This has been brought to our attention so eloquently by our Ambassador in that country at the time, Arthur Bliss Lane, that I need dwell upon it no longer.

America thereby made itself a party, at least in part, to what transpired in Poland. It put the seal of approval in reality upon the achievement of a Red Poland. Incidentally, I do know, as a Communist leader in the United States at this time, that it was the great desire of the Kremlin that there be achieved during that immediate period after World War II, a Red Poland and a Red China. This Red Poland was to insure the conquest of Europe.

Poland's coal, second only to that of Russia's herself or perhaps even superior to it on the continent of Europe, was to be added to that of Russia and to such coal as could be bought by Soviet control in Germany as a means of a dynamic material upon which to base the coming conquest in Europe.

In a like manner, Red China was to assure the conquest of Japan, the Philippines, Hawaii, the Pacific, and the driving of America completely from the Pacific and all adjoining lands. It was this dual attack upon the United States from Europe and from Asia which the Kremlin decided upon before World War II had terminated and which I, incidentally, called to the attention of the American people upon leaving the Communist Party in the fall of 1945. I stated then that there would be a creeping blitzkrieg across the continents of Europe and of Asia, designed to attack the United States, but first submerging certain nations beginning with Poland on the one hand and China on the other hand. We can see then that Poland was very essential to the security of the United States, and we can observe that the failure to protect Poland and to protect Polish liberty has had a very adverse effect upon the fortunes of the United States so far as its own security is concerned. We can say, of course, without wishing to oversimplify the matter, that the 40,000 casualties in Korea tonight are in part due to the lack of appreciation by America as a whole of the importance of Poland, as it is likewise due to the lack of appreciation by America of the value of China to the United States, as a defense against Soviet aggregation. Beyond all this, the United States does have a special responsibility to the Polish people in that out of the betrayal of Poland in which we acquiesced, that is, to a large measure, there has come the betrayal of the Hungarian people, the conquest of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Many of those nations have been involved in what has occurred. Out of it, fear transpired in Poland. This was totally unnecessary; it was absolutely criminal. There can be no excuse whatsoever that today a Red Poland sits in the United Nations. It is my furthered hope—I hope it will be your furthered prayer, all of you listening to this radio audience—that the United States will be able to understand its moral responsibility to the Polish people and insist that a Red Poland be driven out of the council of the nations.

I say that the first measure in regard to the justice of Poland should be the expulsion of the Red Polish representatives from the United Nations and that the motion should be made by the delegation of the United States.

We are today branding Red China as the aggressor. We must, if we are to be logical, brand Soviet Russia as the aggressor in Poland. We cannot from any viewpoint appease that state of affairs which imposes a small coterie of armed brigands upon a people which is totally anti-Communist and which is out of sympathy completely with the Communist regime.

One of our best allies in the coming struggle with Soviet Russia (for this struggle will be intensified due to Soviet Russia's intent to dominate and conquer the world) will be those Polish patriots who have so long made their mark upon the pages of the struggle for liberty throughout the world.

Let us hope and pray that each one of us in our own community will be able to do our part to make America conscious of its duty to Poland to win, in the years that are to come, genuine justice to the Polish people.

Prosegregation Provision in Military Service and Training Bill Should Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the prosegregation section of the legislation we are now considering in the House on military service and training should be stricken from the bill. I will offer an amendment tomorrow to accomplish the defeat of this unfair and unwise provision. The Defense Establishment supports my position.

Let the following editorials give the Members of the House some idea of the evils of such ill-conceived legislation.

[From the Norfolk Journal and Guide of March 31, 1951]

A LESSON IN HOW TO WIN VOTES—AND LOSE A WAR

Under a directive of the President, who is also Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the various military services have for some time been working toward equality of opportunity (widely called integration) in the military services. Notable progress has been made.

The Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives recently had under consideration legislation dealing with military manpower. Amendments designed to defeat the program of integration were presented by southern Congressmen.

Voting against them were able Chairman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, and two other southern Members; among those voting for the crippling amendments was Representative PORTER HARDY, of Virginia's Second District, embracing Norfolk and Portsmouth and contiguous territory.

As so often happens, some Republicans not from the South joined with the southern bloc of Democrats in supporting the measure, some of them, no doubt, for purely political reasons—to embarrass the majority party and the Democratic administration.

The merits of military equality of opportunity, both as a democratic step and as a proper utilization of our manpower, have been reviewed too often in these columns to make necessary a restatement of them at this time. What strikes us as nearly treasonable while we are fighting a bloody shooting war in Asia and a losing propaganda war—is that any American could so embarrass our Military Establishment under the circumstances.

The Army particularly has moved most cautiously, if not reluctantly, in carrying out the integration program. Those who would seek to force it now to upset its training procedures in order to enforce harsh and wasteful and dangerous segregation and discrimination, would place a nearly intolerable burden on the Army.

This is tragic. We may very well, and soon, be fighting for our actual existence as a free Nation. Millions of men and billions of dollars are needed to build up a defense force insuring our safety.

To achieve the objectives will require near miracles. To turn back the clock, as would the dissident element in Congress, could easily undermine the training of service men and drastically reduce the efficiency of the fighting forces. The Army should be trusted to do what is best for the Nation.

Under Russia's prodding we are fighting hordes of nonwhite soldiers now. Half of Korea and the hundreds of millions in China are against us. India with its teeming millions is hearing constantly that racial intolerance is the earmark of America. The Communists are telling the populations of other Asiatic countries that we seek to dominate the world and enslave the darker races.

If we fight in the name of democracy, freedom, and equality and, in our own Armed Forces, deny that by our actions, then we hand our enemies a great weapon on a silver platter.

[From the Cleveland Call and Post of March 24, 1951]

DEFEAT THIS INSULT

With the fearful shadow of equality in the Armed Forces of this Nation staring them in the face, a group of unreconstructed rebels, led this time by Representative WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, is desperately seeking to write into the Military Training Act a vicious and insulting amendment that would permit their equally unreconstructed sons to refuse to serve in units with members of the Negro race.

When will we ever learn?

In addition to hurling an insult into the faces of the gallant Negro men who are presently bleeding and dying in Korea for the so-called preservation of a democracy falsely called democracy, these Dixiecrat southerners continue in the most effective way to provide grist for the Russian propaganda mill. The end result is the prolongation of the cold war that is uncomfortably hot these days, and a further deflection away from American ideals by the millions of nonwhites throughout the world.

Even Committee Chairman VINSON, who hails from Georgia, was in opposition to this latest Dixiecrat whimsey. VINSON not only realizes its adverse effect on American diplomacy in these critical times, but even more realistically pointed out that the stupid amendment won't work even if enacted into law.

Significantly the Republicans are again guilty of aiding and abetting their southern colleagues in this attempt to evade the fulfillment of real democracy in our Armed Forces. They evidently consider it a small price to pay for southern support later on more important legislation they desire.

The NAACP has notified all of its branches to shower their Representatives in the Congress with protests against this amendment urging them to vote against it.

We urge readers of this newspaper to add their protests today.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of April 7, 1951]

FUNNY BUSINESS WITH UMT

Last week Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers CIO, protested that "antiviolence and anti-Jim Crow amendments" had been eliminated from the universal training and service bill which is still

in the House Armed Services Committee, and pointed out that the "Winstead pro-segregation amendment" has been approved by the committee.

There seems to be little doubt that certain elements in Congress and the country at large are bent on using UMT as a means of fastening Negro segregation and discrimination more firmly on the armed services.

They hope that the current war hysteria will enable them to stampede this bill through Congress, with all of its undesirable amendments intact.

It is doubtful in our minds whether universal military training is desirable or necessary, and there is justifiable fear that it may be used not only to fasten Jim Crowism to military training but will give our fascistic brass hats too much control over the young workers of this Nation. That would be another blow to democracy.

[From the Chicago Defender of March 31, 1951]

CUNNING LITTLE BLOCKHEADS

The crafty fighters for white supremacy do not always show their hand in public, but it is not difficult to find evidence of their handiwork. Last week the House Armed Services Committee held a closed-door meeting on the draft bill, and when it was over a Jim Crow provision was attached to the measure. By a 20-11 secret vote, the committee was sucked in by Congressman ARTHUR WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, who engineered the segregation deal.

Reporter Robert S. Allen revealed that 12 Republicans joined the Dixiecrats in approving the Jim Crow rider although 3 southern Congressmen refused to go along. The chairman of the committee, CARL VINSON, of Georgia, voted against the Jim Crow rider because he said the military leaders did not want it in the bill and had warned him against it.

The boys on the side of white supremacy, however, do not care what happens to the United States military machine as long as they keep dear old Jim Crow. The Yankee Republicans, who should know better, seem to be unusually willing to oblige their Dixiecrat friends.

This shocking action taken in secret by the House Armed Services Committee will destroy the new program for integration if the rider is allowed to stand. Every effort must be made to alert the entire Congress on this issue. The cunning little blockheads who put their prejudices above the best interests of their country have got to be defeated. They are playing Stalin's game whether they know it or not.

The Italian Peace Treaty of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks the question as to whether or not American troops should be sent to Europe to help defend the nations of Western Europe was debated before the American people. None of us minimize the importance of this issue. All of us were aware of the great impact it had on the American home. For, resolving this issue in the affirmative meant that once more boys in American uniform would be going to foreign soil prepared to defend the principles of democracy.

As one who has great faith in, and esteem for General Eisenhower, I am thoroughly in accord with his conclusions that the free nations of the world must band together or else freedom perishes. However, I believe it significant too, to point out that considerable emphasis was made of the fact that these nations of Europe should not lie down, that the job could not be done and would not be done by us alone—but, that the nations of Europe must have the will to resist and defend themselves. In his report to the people, upon his return from Europe, General Eisenhower indicated that the people of Europe were eager to do their share—and, had already taken steps to build up their own defenses—that everywhere the will to resist was evident.

It is inconceivable to me, therefore, that we continue to recognize the validity of treaties which impose restrictions on some of these nations of Europe to arm in their own defense. It is anomalous that we can expect a nation such as Italy to defend herself and her friends in Western Europe, while we continue to give assent to the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947. This treaty, a product of postwar hatred and revenge, was engineered, in a great measure, by Russia. It was deliberately designed to reduce Italy to a condition of helplessness; to render her militarily and economically weak. Under the terms of this Italian Peace Treaty of 1947, Italy has been limited to a 185,000-man army. This is the same country which during World War II raised an army of 8,000,000 men and contributed, in the latter years of the war, very much toward the victory over Germany.

General Eisenhower has said, and every available report will show, that Italy has always indicated her willingness and her eagerness to resist any Russian aggression and to fight on the side of the free world. She has indicated her eagerness to raise a substantial army, and to do her part as a party to the Mutual Assistance Pact.

However, because of the restrictions placed on the size of her army, Italy cannot take such steps. And, while Italy is rendered militarily weak, Russia, the principal author of the harsh terms of the Italian Treaty, will also be the principal benefactor, for she will be gaining in strength.

The Italian Government has warned the West that Russia's Balkan satilites are rearming and she has appealed for a revision of this treaty. However, nothing has been done. And, as a result, it is impossible for Italy to contribute her fullest potential to the defense of her friends and neighbors in Western Europe.

Mr. Speaker, this Italian peace treaty is totally inconsistent with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, Marshall Plan, mutual defense assistance programs, and our North Atlantic Treaty. How can we possibly stand in the anomalous position of urging this nation to defend itself, when we recognize the validity of a treaty which makes it impossible for her to do so.

I am fully confident that the people of Italy who, as recent as 1948 successfully threw off the yoke of Communism, will not be found wanting in their will to resist any Communist aggression, providing they are permitted to properly defend themselves. And, that which is basic and which we cannot lose sight of, is that if we permit Italy to increase her armed forces, it will not be necessary for as many American boys to go abroad and defend the Europeans.

The question, therefore, is not only whether the Italian Peace Treaty should be declared invalid, but, how best can we permit the nations of Europe, with whom we are banded, to increase their armed forces to defend themselves in case of aggression. I think we can expect the fullest participation from a nation such as Italy in the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact, if we declare the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947 invalid.

For this reason, I have today introduced a Joint Resolution to relieve the Government of Italy of its obligations to the United States under the Treaty of Peace with Italy and which requests the President to join with other signatories as may accept, in negotiating a new peace treaty.

Public Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic on the subject of public morality. Since there appears to be so much agitation for improvement of the ethics and morality of public officials, it might be well to give consideration to these qualities in our people generally. I commend this article to the attention of the Members:

PUBLIC MORALITY

In the midst of the congressional committee hearings and investigations that have become one of the most important elements in American life today, a United States Senator comes forward with a suggestion for a study of ethical standards in public affairs by a commission of eminent private citizens. This seems to revive a notion expressed quite often that there is a particular sort of morality that applies to public life and that it is different from the ordinary type of morality.

From this talk about public morality, one might conclude either that the person in public office enjoys certain exemptions from the moral code imposed upon the private citizen, or that he is held to a stricter code. The one attitude claims that allowances must be made for the heavy responsibilities borne by the public officials, that he can't be bothered with too many fine distinctions of right and wrong, and should be judged only by the general results of his conduct in office; the other view would transfer to the public official the blame for any and all wrongdoing on the part of his subordinates.

The fact is, of course, that there is not, and cannot be, any distinction between public and private morality; if the standard of morality respected by the private citizens is low, it is idle to expect that public morality

will be high. Every individual has the obligation to obey the moral code as it applies to his particular state in life; this means that he must obey the natural law and the Commandments of God, without exception; that he must comply with the Constitution and with the duly enacted statutes of the country of which he is a citizen; that if he is elected or appointed to public office he must conscientiously fulfill all the duties of that office. The citizen has an obligation to support the law just as binding as is the public official's obligation to enforce it; violation and evasion on the one hand are just as reprehensible as favoritism and malfeasance on the other.

ON THE SCREEN

The Kefauver committee television hearings have put graphically before the country a lot of shocking evidence about the prevalence of organized crime in this country, and of the grip it has established on public officials in many places. None of this was new; the committee had all its facts carefully assembled, and merely called its witnesses to tell their stories personally so that people everywhere could get a better idea of what it all meant.

And what has been the reaction? A wave of indignation demanding reform? Some deep searching of consciences on the part of the members of the television audiences as to whether or not they are to blame in part for the shocking conditions uncovered? Or just a sort of surprised enjoyment of the whole thing as a strikingly different show, with some admiration for the skill and efficiency of the investigators who built up the cases and perhaps some near-sympathy for the racketeers who showed themselves skilled and efficient, too, in carrying out their greedy, ruthless objectives?

It is a foregone conclusion that this unprecedented 1951 crime study will bring no improvement to the moral climate of the Nation unless it stirs the people to action. This action must take place on the local community level, in demands that police departments and other law-enforcement agencies do the work entrusted to them, in checking the records of candidates for public office, in refusal to be quieted by spasmodic clean-ups that leave the basic evils untouched. Here in Pittsburgh we have had many newspaper exposés of crime and racketeering in the past. How long was public interest, or the interest of the crusading newspapers, maintained?

ONLY ONE CURE

Reform is necessary; exposés are necessary; clean-ups are necessary. But there can be no hope of getting the country out of the clutches of the present crime ring, or of a new crime ring that will spring up the day after the present one is eliminated, unless and until there is a resurgence of true morality among the people of this country.

For our moral standards are low; we tolerate and practice all sorts of evasions of the natural law and the commandments, as well as of the civil law. Some of our colleges teach our young men that getting ahead is more important than adhering to truth and justice; there are whole sections of the learned legal profession that study the law for loopholes and never bring the moral code to the attention of their clients; there is a new profession of psychiatry, some of the practioners of which give their patients comforting and immoral assurance about adultery and other transgressions of the commandments; we have a business code that practically means grab all you can.

To build up all these false values, we have had a whole generation exposed to newspapers and magazines and motion pictures that sensationalized and glamorized crime, that made heroes and heroines of Hollywood figures of low character; we have had these agencies of public information belittling the commandments and preaching the doctrine of secularism. (They are not so bad today, but it is a belated and inadequate change that has come over them.) They bear a heavy responsibility for the terrifying increase in divorces, for the prevalence of juvenile delinquency, for the lapse of respect for the Lord's Day.

So it is in the face of powerfully debasing influences, and against a tradition that accepts too many violations of justice and decency, that right moral standards must be established among the people, and thereby established in public life. This is precisely the mission of the church in society; this is serving the cause of God. It will be difficult, but to say that it is impossible is to deny our faith. Step by step, zeal and holiness can lift men out of the swamp of materialism and immorality that has brought such disorder and unhappiness upon us.

Celler Reapportionment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD the text of a statement I have submitted to the House Judiciary Committee regarding the Celler reapportionment bill—H. R. 2648—which the committee now has under consideration. I wholeheartedly support this legislation because I consider it an important step in the direction of eliminating abuses to which I refer in my statement.

My statement is as follows:

STATEMENT ON REAPPORTIONMENT (THE CELLER BILL, H. R. 2648)

The Celler bill, on which public hearings are now being held, goes to the very heart of representative government. Because of its deep significance I am happy to be permitted to present my views to the committee at this time.

When the United States Constitution was adopted, provision was made for representation in the Congress through two United States Senators representing States, embracing the total population of their respective States. It was also provided that the people in all the States shall have representation through their Representatives on the basis of equality of population.

James Madison, who played such a prominent role in the drafting of the Constitution, insisted that the legislatures of the States ought not to have the uncontrolled right of regulating the time, places, and manner of holding elections. This philosophy of fair and equal representation is indeed a foundation stone of representative government under our Constitution. In the constitutional debates it was clearly the view of the framers that each constituent should have equal voice with others throughout the land in the election of their representatives. It was equally stated that each representative should have as nearly as practicable an equal number of persons whom he represented.

Through the failure of Congress to establish standards for the States to follow in the election of the Members of the House of Representatives, some State legislatures have abused their power in carving out congressional districts within their States. Flagrant abuses have crept into our system of electing Representatives.

For instance, it was never intended that Members of the House should represent the whole population of a State except, of course, where a State does not have adequate population entitling it to more than one representative. As early as 1842 (in the Apportionment Act of that date) the Congress specifically spelled out this idea that representatives should be elected from specific districts and not at large. But we still have today examples of this abuse. A representative is elected at large in the State of Ohio, representing the total population of that State—approximately 8,000,000 persons. In that same State the Representative from the Fifth District has only 166,982 constituents. This makes a farce of representative government. In a lesser degree the same thing is true in Connecticut where one Representative is elected at large representing the entire State having a population of almost 2,000,000 persons in 1950. One congressional district (the Fifth) in this same State had in 1950 only 278,594 persons.

But the greatest abuse of all lies in the discrepancy in the size of population between districts within some of the States where no Representative is elected at large. Here are some examples from the 1950 census: For instance, in Ohio, the Twenty-second Congressional District contains a population of approximately 968,000, while the Fifth District contains approximately 167,000. In Texas, the Eighth District has a population of 802,000, while the Seventeenth District has only 236,000. California presents a similar picture with a spread of almost half a million population between the most populous and the smallest districts. Frankly, these are the most flagrant cases, but such inequality prevails in very many of the 48 States.

It is clear that such reapportionment made by the State legislatures, unregulated by the Congress, has led to a gross departure from the fundamental principle of representative government in our democracy. The framers of the Constitution would have viewed this existing situation with dismay. How far the State legislatures have wandered away from the ideal is further seen in the gerrymandering process in many States. Political parties which dominate the State legislatures indulge in the nefarious practice of so dividing up the States into congressional districts as to preserve their partisan political advantage; and, of course, to the disadvantage of the minority party. In this practice, no fair consideration is given to the people who reside in the districts affected.

To fully appreciate how gerrymandering is practiced, one has to study the maps to see the strange contours and shapes of the districts after they are carved out in the gerrymandering process.

As I read the Celler bill, H. R. 2648, I am persuaded that its provisions will go a long way toward eliminating the abuses to which I have referred. My understanding is that the bill does not take away from the State the function of carving out the congressional districts. The bill does, however, set up congressional standards to which the State must conform. The standards are those which it was always intended that the States themselves would use but have failed to do so. The Celler bill, for the first time, implies that the House, being the judge of its own Members, will use sanctions against any State that fails to conform to the standards set up in the bill.

I shall not enter into a discussion of the constitutionality of this proposed measure. The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of this learned committee, has expressed his positive belief that the bill is constitutional and has cited court decisions to support his view.

Editorials, as well as the writings of nationally known columnists clearly reflect a public opinion favorable to the objectives

of the Celler bill. I should like to cite a few examples:

One of the country's outstanding, if not the outstanding, newspaper, the New York Times, had this to say:

"In a recent message to Congress, President Truman rightly declared that 'it is fundamental to the whole structure of the Constitution that all citizens have equal representation, so far as practicable, in the House of Representatives.' This principle has been damaged over the years by the reluctance of State legislatures to alter the boundaries of congressional districts in conformity with the uneven growth of population; and it is this situation which the administration is now seeking to correct through legislation just introduced in Congress. * * * Whether the bill just introduced by Mr. CELLER to accomplish this purpose is too extreme is a fair subject for debate. Whether the proposed reform would benefit the Democrats rather than the Republicans, the city rather than the rural areas, is interesting but irrelevant. But the intent of equalizing the congressional representation within the States is sound, and certainly in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution."

From the deep South, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, after calling attention to some of the possible objections to the Celler bill, has this to say:

"But it can be said that it also would go far toward achieving the desirable objective of fair and equal representation of the State's population in Congress. Although under its terms Congress would go further than ever before in directing the State legislatures how to redistrict, it may be that the Texas Legislature would welcome such guidance."

In Ohio, the Cleveland Press editorial states that—

"He [CELLER] says the Supreme Court has held that Congress has power to set up standards which the States must follow. Citizens who believe that each American has a right to an equal and effective voice in the conduct of his Government should favor and work for adoption of such reforms as CELLER proposes."

From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette comes this statement:

"This is an excellent bill and should be speedily approved by Congress. Experience shows that the States aren't always scrupulous about seeing to that equality of representation in the House inherent in the Constitution. A club such as Mr. CELLER has fashioned would go a long way toward correcting their laxity."

These are typical of many editorial comments from various geographical sections of the country. It is true, of course, that there have also been editorials adverse to the Celler bill.

President Truman deserves great credit for having called the attention of the Congress and the country to the need for legislation dealing with this important subject. Congressman CELLER has implemented the President's recommendation in the proposal which I heartily endorse.

It's Your Food Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to make some references to an extension of remarks by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, in the RECORD of March 28.

Senator SPARKMAN's extension of remarks included an article by Lauren Soth of the magazine Successful Farming. The lead paragraph states:

America's No. 1 farm problem today is not fair prices for farmers. Neither is it adjustment of production, soil conservation, nor any of the other perplexing questions which have bothered farmers and the Government in recent years. It is manpower.

Mr. Soth's article is an intelligent discussion, and I commend its reading to all Members of Congress who have problems of farm manpower existent in their districts or in their States. Senator SPARKMAN is to be commended for making this timely and important contribution.

The farmers of this Nation have been asked to produce to the maximum. Being still free and with an intelligence enlarged by experiences dating as far back as 1914 through two wars and numerous emergencies, our farmers will of necessity take an inventory of the calculated risks that the coming tillage and harvest may involve. If manpower is to be short, they will plant those crops entailing the least demands for manpower. They may have to let their lands lay fallow. They must have manpower.

In any event we of the Congress cannot ignore or escape their problems. If those problems can be solved by our action—let us act.

SUPPLY STILL AFFECTS PRICES

Farm production is vital. Food and fiber rank high as defense material. Moreover, peak production of a balanced supply is the only economically sound means of just, equitable and inexpensive price control.

Those in urban areas might well withhold their comments on rural problems until they have thought through the entire procession of circumstances that may influence adequate supplies—and, therefore, by causing scarcities, force high prices. Too often this is not done. The clamor goes up for strong-arm legislation with its expensive corollary of administration, including sleuths and enforcement. And so, by superficial thinking and reactionary legislation to control a scarcity we add to the costs of government and further deplete an already short supply of labor.

There is, of course, a common purpose for American achievement. The present defense effort is one. If it is western civilization we are defending, let us know clearly what the virtues of western civilization are. Free producers, free production, and free markets could be one—but those virtues have long since been lost in the fogs of expediency. Yet, free production, ample production, today, is one of our goals. It is time that urban and rural America sought out and planted their feet firmly on common ground.

THE ISSUE MUST BE CLEAR

We do not lack evidence, today, of the basis of our differences. They have been well outlined.

The President's Commission on Migratory Labor has now issued its report. In the name of full farm production that report needs constructive criticism. Yesterday my colleague, the Honorable SAMUEL W. YORTY, of California, placed a most complete summary of that report in the Appendix of the RECORD along with editorial comment from the New York Times and a copy of President Truman's statement. Let me recommend, also, a reading of Mr. YORTY's extension to all those who would fully understand both sides of the American farmers' No. 1 problem.

Yesterday, also, the Washington Post had an editorial on migrant farm labor. It follows:

MIGRANT FARM LABOR

The exhaustive survey of social, economic, health, and educational conditions of farm migrants made by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor is a shocking exposé of official neglect and private exploitation—a story about men and women living in insanitary camps without community ties and "usually beyond the reach of local school, health, and welfare authorities." There are at least a million of these migrants, about half of whom are domestic workers. The other half is made up of approximately 100,000 Mexicans legally under contract, 400,000 so-called Mexican wetbacks, who have illegally entered the country by slipping across the land border or wading or swimming across the Rio Grande, and a small number of British West Indians and Puerto Ricans. These migratory workers supply only 3 to 4 percent of the man-days of work used to produce the Nation's farm output. The great majority are employed on some 125,000 large farms producing cotton, fruits, vegetables, and sugar beets. Nevertheless, they make important contributions to farm output and are in great demand at critical periods of crop production.

Since more farm labor will be needed this year to replace men entering the military services and to harvest an extended acreage, pressure for increased importation of foreign labor, chiefly Mexican, is mounting. However, the Commission concludes that no special measures should be taken to increase the number of alien contract laborers beyond the number admitted last year and that legalization for employment purposes of aliens illegally in the United States should be discontinued. "We are convinced," it declares, "that by better recruitment and placement of domestic labor, we would have eliminated most, if not all, of the occasion for the certifications of labor shortage during the years 1947–50."

In that connection the report sharply criticizes the practice of legalizing the status of "wetbacks" and giving them employment in preference to workers who have not violated our immigration laws. It charges, too, that field officers of the Immigration Service have been under pressure from Washington to go easy on deportations until crops have been harvested. It further implies that if the Farm Placement Division of the United States Employment Service had done a more effective recruitment and placement job at home, there would not have been a labor shortage requiring the importation of large numbers of aliens. As a matter of fact, the Commission received evidence that last year some American workers were actually dismissed to make way for contract Mexican labor.

Numerous recommendations are made by the Commission designed to raise the living standards of migrant farm labor, such as minimum wage legislation, establishment of Federal and State minimum housing standards, grants to the States to conduct health programs among migratory workers and vigorous enforcement of child-labor laws. These recommendations, which cover both

alien and domestic migrants, provide evidence, if any were required, of shameful neglect of this group.

The problem growing out of our dependence on alien labor is only one aspect of the general problem of migratory labor, but it is an important one. For cheap foreign labor creates the very scarcities that lead to an influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards. We agree with the Commission that our efforts in future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial obviously presumes that there is a larger supply of available migrant farm labor in the United States than actually exists. For our own information, the principles involved and the actual practice of recruiting farm labor from existing domestic labor pools has been tried before. It was not successful for several reasons. First, those not employed in a period of high production are obviously those who will not be employed continuously or effectively in any economic situation.

The farmers of this Nation wish that this were not true. But, again, they have had actual experience with domestic labor, forcibly recruited—and often from those lists most unlikely to succeed as tillers of the soil or harvesters of crops for the tables of our cities and armed camps. Moreover, most of our effective producing rural areas are today mechanized and the era of specialization influences them also. Skill is as much a prerequisite on the modern farm as it is in the factory from whose shadows the migrant laborer may have been moved, at Government expense, both ways.

Let us note the conclusion of the above editorial:

The problem growing out of our dependence on alien labor is only one aspect of the general problem of migratory labor, but it is an important one, for cheap foreign labor creates the very scarcities that lead to an influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards. We agree with the Commission that our efforts in the future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

I feel it a duty to point out the fallacies in this editorial's conclusions. There would be no demand for foreign labor were there an available supply of trained domestic farm labor; also, under programs which we finally had to resort to—in all logic—in World War II, Mexican and other foreign labor could not be designated as cheap. These programs were inaugurated under the full jurisdiction of the Agriculture, State, Labor, and Justice Departments. This labor was recruited legally where available farm-labor pools existed in Mexico and other foreign labor areas. This auxiliary labor was brought into the United States under complete regulation. There was no violation of the immigration laws. The wage scales paid were the same as those paid to other farm laborers of like ability and at the end of the contract period this labor was returned to its source. To say that this labor was employed for wages that are unusually low, obviously, points up one of the difficulties that exists in our society today by reason of a jumping at conclusions already existing in a closed mind.

Let me conclude these remarks by again stating that the Congress of the United States has a real problem on its hands as the farmers of this Nation face the task of supplying you and the defense effort with the food and fibers necessary to a successful conclusion of the national responsibility which faces 150,000,000 Americans.

The MacArthur Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on April 9, 1951:

THE MACARTHUR ISSUE

President Truman and his political and military advisers are in a quandary over what to do about General MacArthur.

Involved in that decision is the larger and more perplexing problem of what to do about the Korean war.

General MacArthur would have been relieved of his command long ago were it not for the fact that his return would focus the attention of Congress and the country on questions he has raised which the administration would rather not discuss.

The very thought of the colorful commander relating the untold part of his story to a congressional committee, and the vast audiences such committees now command, could cause sleepless nights in some high places.

The vital question, of course, is the matter of bringing the war in Korea to a successful end. If the President has such a plan, he has kept it to himself.

All the proposals General MacArthur has made have been vetoed by the White House, in concert with the British Foreign Office—or possibly under prodding by it.

He wanted to bomb the Chinese railways and the Manchurian bases which were supplying the enemy, but the answer was no.

He wanted to allow the Chinese Nationalists to open a second front on their own mainland. Again the answer was no.

Most inexplicable of all is why South Korean recruits are not being armed and trained eventually to relieve our troops. When he was asked why this was not being done, General MacArthur replied that it was due to "political considerations" over which he had no control.

If he were relieved of his command and called before Congress, the general probably would explain just what these political considerations were. They could be interesting.

Why should Americans bear the brunt of the fighting when there are Asiatics who could do so, if they were given the equipment and permitted to fight?

General MacArthur is on the spot only because he has raised these questions, despite the attempts to silence him. Even most of the second guessers now concede his handling of the war itself has been admirable, particularly considering his limited resources and the restrictions imposed upon him.

Recalling or reprimanding General MacArthur will not clarify the question of our war objectives, and it must be clarified. Nothing will be settled by trying to silence the legitimate spokesmen for the American troops who are fighting in Korea and who want to know why they are there. That is the issue.

American intervention in Korea as an agency of the United Nations made sense when it was understood to be a part of a larger plan drawing a line against further Communist aggression everywhere. But that plan has been abandoned in favor of appeasement, under pressure from Britain and India.

So what are we fighting for now?

Are we merely holding a line, at a fearful cost in American lives, until the Communists can be bought off by giving them Formosa, and perhaps additional territory? Nothing else can be inferred from the only plans for a settlement which have been approved or seriously entertained by the United Nations.

General MacArthur has repeatedly asked for new instructions, but has received none. In the absence of such instructions, he has offered his own plan to win the war. That has been disapproved without the formality of a vote by the organization he is supposed to be serving. So there is no plan. That is General MacArthur's complaint, and it is a legitimate one.

If President Truman will take counsel with himself he will see that the fault is not with his commander in the field but with the British Socialists and their yes men and fellow travelers in the State Department who have taken the conduct of the war out of the general's hands and now do not know what to do with it.

How United States Dollars Have Been Arming Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which I prepared for the April issue of the Reader's Digest:

HOW UNITED STATES DOLLARS HAVE BEEN ARMING RUSSIA

(By Hon. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, of Illinois)

American dollars and American technical skill built the Russian military juggernaut. Over the last 10 years, the tremendous industrial capacity of the United States has been the principal source of supply for the curtain armament. Without the strategic raw materials and critical machine tools supplied, directly and indirectly, by American dollars, the Kremlin's imperialistic war engine could not have attained its present menacing power.

We began in the years 1941–46 with $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease gifts to Russia. We contributed almost $2,000,000,000 to her between the years 1945 and 1947 under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In April 1948 we launched the Marshall plan. Although Russia was excluded from direct participation in its $13,000,000,000 fund, she was aided immeasurably by indirect trade through the 16 Marshall-plan countries.

The ruble area has received from these countries about $2,500,000,000 in raw materials, tools, and critical machinery—the very sinews of war. We supplied the raw materials to Western Europe in the form of Marshall plan gifts. Western Europe fabricated the essential industrial products required for the Kremlin arsenal, and traded them eastward for wheat, cotton, grains, caviar, tobacco, furs, and ores.

Not until December 1950, when the Hungnam evacuation was under way in North Korea, did our State Department begin to close the leaks in the Marshall plan pipeline. In the preceding decade, United States contributions, direct and indirect, commercial and governmental, to the Kremlin war machine totaled $16,000,000,000.

Two additional decisions in United States foreign policy after 1945 further strengthened Russia's industrial potential for war. We permitted the removal from Germany of several billions of dollars' worth of key industrial plants—machinery, tools, equipment, and skilled manpower. While these plants were being dismantled and moved to Russia, we were supplying, under the Marshall plan, tools and materials with which to rebuild, in part, the identical industries in Western Germany, as necessary to general European recovery. And on the other side of the world we withdrew all support from the Chinese Nationalists, while we permitted Russia to take over the vast industrial potential of Manchuria.

With these industrial resources from Germany and Manchuria, plus freedom of trade with all Marshall plan recipients, Russia soon emerged as a dominant industrial power of Europe and Asia.

Our lend-lease gifts gave Russia her first free access to American industrial secrets. Complete industrial plants were transported behind the Urals. The catalog of plants shipped to Soviet territory included three oil refineries and a tire factory. We also provided an electric-power program, which cost $135,000,000; a railroad-improvement program; and a steel-expansion program which involved more than $300,000,000.

At the same time the Soviet purchasing mission, which at one time numbered 1,500 especially schooled spies, was permitted by us to inspect, document, and photograph significant industrial centers in the United States.

Direct shipment of atom-bomb materials to Russia from the lend-lease air terminal at Great Falls, Mont., in February 1944, is recorded in the annual report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for 1950:

"The United States, through actions of the Office of the Foreign Economic Administration, had licensed for export to the Soviet Union materials vital to the production of the atom bomb. The Soviet Union received on one occasion a shipment of 200 pounds of uranium nitrate. On another occasion it received a shipment of 468 pounds of uranium oxide, 1,000 pounds of uranium nitrate, 2 shipments of heavy water, and 25 pounds of uranium metal.

"Investigation further disclosed that the Soviet Union was permitted, without regard to censorship or customs-inspection regulations, to send out of the United States blueprints of the General Electric plant at Lynn, Mass.; diagrams of an electrically operated ship developed by the Groton, Conn., shipbuilding works; diagrams of an A-20 type military craft; and other blueprints and data relating to our industrial strength."

The committee reported that Semen Vasilenko, a member of the Soviet purchasing commission in Washington, returned to Moscow early in 1944 carrying "six bags containing special information concerning metallurgical research and other developments vital to the military. Vasilenko today is head of the production of metal pipes and tools in the Soviet Union."

This intensive course in American industrial methods was aided further by another act of incredible American naiveté. Immediately after the war the Department of Commerce allowed Russia free access to all American patents, of which some 13,000 were microfilmed for transmission to Moscow. Through this Department we also gave Russia access to almost all the technical and scientific secrets obtained from the Germans by our occupation forces in Europe.

Russia got approximately 30 percent of all our lend-lease grants. The list of things we gave her is too long to cite here, but an idea of its scope can be gained from these few items: 376,000 motor trucks; 7,056 tanks; 51,503 jeeps; 345,000 tons of explosives; 15,417,000 pairs of Army boots; $1,100,000,000 worth of machinery and tools.

The basic tools, equipment, and metals thus obtained were the seedbed of Russia's postwar military expansion—and her diplomatic arrogance. Despite the tremendous destruction wrought on her by the Nazi invasion, Russia's industrial production for 1948, measured in over-all tonnage, began to approach her prewar volume of 1940.

This revitalized productive capacity was aimed primarily at future military potential. By 1946, to illustrate, Russia's production of heavy capital goods was 14 percent above 1940, while her production of consumers' goods was still 43 percent below 1940. So marked was the development of Stalin's military potential that the House Committee on Foreign Aid (the Herter committee) reported in April 1948: "It would appear incorrect to argue that the Soviet Union is not now strong enough to undertake substantial military operations."

Despite this clear warning, our diplomatic policy continued to provide the iron-curtain area, through normal trade channels, with every basic and scarce item required for its expanding military machine. In a press conference in November 1947, President Truman stated that he saw no reason to interfere with shipments of industrial equipment needed by Russia for postwar reconstruction. In line with this policy, United States exports to Russia and her European satellites in 1947 amounted to $432,000,000, including $81,000,000 worth of industrial machinery and $23,000,000 in machine tools.

W. Averell Harriman, roving ambassador under the Marshall plan, was questioned about our trade with Russia by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in January 1948. He stoutly rejected the suggestion of an air-tight military embargo against the ruble area. So did ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman when he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February 1950.

Under this policy, every attempt in Congress to curb around-the-corner shipments of strategic tools and materials to Russia from Marshall plan countries met with determined opposition, not only from the State and Commerce Departments and ECA, but from the White House as well.

As soon as the Marshall plan became effective in April 1948, the European nations began carrying out a series of trade treaties to facilitate exchange of western industrial products for Russian wheat, furs, and minerals. By January 1950 there were 96 such treaties in effect between Eastern and Western Europe.

The British Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers' Association, as one example, disclosed that Russia had obtained from Britain $34,129,037 worth of electrical generators and powerhouse equipment during the years 1946–50. This represented about 28 percent of the entire British export of these items. It was under these same trade treaties that Britain shipped to Communist China in July 1950—the first month after the Korean aggression—650,000 gallons of gasoline and 9,000 tons of rubber.

In one 3-month period in 1950, Britain shipped $42,532,000 worth of machinery and basic war materials to the iron curtain nations. During the same period, Italy shipped $26,897,000; France, $18,694,000; Belgium, $19,603,000. Here is more than $100,000,000 in war potential shipped to Russia from Western Europe in 3 months.

The frank willingness of many of Western Germany's industrialists to continue to do business with Russia results also in a steady flow of goods through the interzonal border. The rate of these shipments, substantially increased since the Bonn government assumed control over all German exports, is now estimated at about $230,000,000 a year. Such shipments include sheet and tubular steel, ball bearings, machine tools, rubber and copper.

In Vienna the energetic Soviet-manned International Trading Corp. is busily rounding up strategic material for Russia, sneaking Marshall plan goods under the iron curtain at a rate of $4,000,000 worth each week.

Our Marshall plan grants to Europe during the first quarter of 1950 were $770,000,000. During those same months Western Europe shipped $176,000,000 in machinery and strategic materials to Russia and the iron curtain arsenal. These official figures mean that, indirectly, Russia got about 22 cents of every Marshall plan dollar to help build her war machine.

In the original Marshall plan authorization, Congress inserted two provisions specifically designed to head off sales of critical and strategic materials to Russia by nations that were given Marshall plan aid. The first directed the ECA, "in the interest of national security," to "refuse delivery insofar as practicable" of materials to be manufactured into products for a nonparticipating country, if the finished product would be refused an export license by the United States of America. A second safeguarding amendment authorized ECA to challenge any export license to a nonparticipating country if it deemed the transaction inconsistent with the major purposes of the European reconstruction program.

To what extent did the administration enforce these provisions? One revealing answer is found in the address on August 26, 1950, of Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington, in the House: "In 1949 these western democracies, to whom we are supplying arms, sold more than $1,000,000,000 in supplies to Russia and her satellites. If we want the nations of Western Europe to cease trading with the enemy, we must stop trading with the enemy ourselves. Several Congressmen, including myself, have implored the State Department to stop this senseless business of supplying the Russians, by our trade with them, American dollars with which to buy war supplies."

On November 29, 1950, the O'Conor subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported: "We found that shipments to Red China have gone forward in substantial quantities from both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of our country, even after the Communist attack on Korea last June." Among the shipments were 15,000,000 gallons of petroleum products; 10,000 tons of steel plate; 4,500,000 pounds of copper ingots; 5,347,000 pounds of tin plate. These shocking revelations precipitated the embargo on American shipments to China in December 1950.

Public opinion is aroused and indignant. If Congress faithfully reflects the mood of America it will say, in effect: "Not one dollar for any country which supplies, directly or indirectly, an iota of military potential to the Kremlin's arsenal of aggression."

Big Business, Big Profits Under Our Democratic Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during my absence I received from Mr. A. B. Kaiser, general manager of the tax department of Sears, Roebuck & Co., a copy of an address which he delivered in Chicago on March 8, 1951. It is quite lengthy, which prevents my inserting it in the RECORD. In the speech he criticizes and complains unfairly and without reason or justification against the Democratic administration. He sheds crocodile tears about business conditions and finds fault in general. To my mind his statements were ridiculous, especially since his firm had a deficit of over $2,500,000 in 1932—the last Republican year—but whose profits during the Democratic administration of which he complains so bitterly, both before and after taxes, mounted to heights never before attained in history, as is the case with most other big business.

Sears, Roebuck & Co. made profits of well over $1,500,000,000 before taxes and almost a billion dollars after taxes under this Democratic administration. I note in the press of April 10 that business corporations paid cash dividends of almost $8,000,000,000 in 1950, which is almost 20 percent over the 1949 banner year figure. The December figure of almost two billions was 45 percent higher than for December 1949.

I sent a letter to Mr. Kaiser which I am inserting with my remarks, giving him the true facts, in an effort to set him right, and in the hope that other men in high position with big business will take notice and not make such unwarranted and untrue accusations and statements.

Mr. A. B. KAISER,
Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. KAISER: I have seen a copy of your address, Socialism and Polio, and would like to make a few comments thereon.

I also am opposed to waste in government—and elsewhere—but apparently you regard as wasteful the whole successful program of the Democratic administration for the past 18 years. As has been done for 18 years, you prate about the impending "bankruptcy." You cast your eyes backward to the "good" old pre-New Deal days of President Hoover.

Perhaps you would like the country—and Sears, Roebuck & Co.—to enjoy such prosperity as was ours under Hoover's Republican administration. Need I remind you that at the end of this administration—for Sears' accounting period ending January 28, 1933—your company sustained a deficit of over two and one-half million dollars? Being somewhat more practical, I would appreciate receiving the "loss" sustained by Sears, Roebuck during the 18 years of Democratic administration, which you claim is bringing rack and ruin to the business of the Nation. The administration which you consider a socialistic-communistic dictatorship enabled your company to make profits of about $1,063,000,000. In one fiscal year alone, you made over $363,000,000.

By the first year of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's second term, your company was making far greater profits than it made during 1929, the peak year of the Republican boom economy. These profits were made of sturdier material than those of the twenties; they were to continue and to increase. They resulted from President Roosevelt's fundamental idea that a sound economy must be based on the policy of getting purchasing power into the hands of the average man. This average man is the person who buys your products. If he does not have the funds to buy, you will again get the good old days of Hooverism—if that is what you want.

The truth of the matter is that business sometimes has to be pushed into doing what is really best for it. Judging from your remarks, some segments of our business community have not yet learned that what helps the average man is in the long run helpful to their business. I might remind you that business prospers more on a large volume with high wages and fair prices than it does when low wages and unemployment prevail and prices are kept artificially higher than they would be under competitive conditions.

Let me close with a word about our unbalanced budget in the postwar years of prosperity. President Truman did his best to give the country a balanced budget, but the big taxpayers had enough influence to override his ideas and have their rates cut and have loopholes created, by which they could avoid paying their just share of the Nation's tax burden.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress.

Resignation of Hon. M. E. Thompson from Office of Price Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the taxpaying public are continually asking where their tax dollar goes. This case of former Governor Thompson, of Georgia, which I am inserting under unanimous consent, of undisclosed parasites can be multiplied hundreds of times.

REFUSING TO BE TAX PARASITE, OPS OFFICIAL QUITS IN DISGUST—CONSULTANT AT $63.48 A DAY

Former Gov. M. E. Thompson, of Georgia, yesterday quit as a consultant with the Office of Price Stabilization, charging that "official Washington is drifting in a sea of confusion, inefficiency, waste and extravagance."

Thompson said in a statement that he came to Washington as codirector for territories for OPS.

"Knowing that it was impossible to have two directors for the same job," Thompson said, "I offered to resign and accept another assignment."

But, he added:

"For 12 weeks I have been carried on the payroll as a consultant at a salary, plus expense account, of $63.48 per day. Yet, during this time, I have been consulted about nothing. I have had no assignment to do anything.

"On February 19 at the White House, I told the President the story up until then. He called Don Dawson (Presidential assistant) and instructed him to see that the mess was straightened out immediately. It hasn't been done.

"Under the circumstances, I refuse to accept salary and expense money from the taxpayers when I am rendering no public service.

"I am resigning and returning to my home in Valdosta, Ga., I refuse to be a parasite on the American taxpayers."

Thompson said that there are "thousands upon thousands of others who are rendering no service but are on the public payroll, not only in Washington but throughout the United States."

He charged that no real effort has been made to stabilize prices.

"Even those charged with the responsibility have contributed to the upward surge of prices by deliberately predicting higher prices," he said.

"While the price spiral continues to rise, the bottom is dropping out of moral values."

He continued that "thousands of loyal Americans are giving unselfishly of their time to defense work, but their efforts are being nullified by the indecision, bungling, and interference of scheming politicians who are motivated solely by their desire to stay in power. The American people are being victimized by a national conspiracy of mediocrity."

Thompson, a Democrat, said that now is the time for "the people of America to make plans to free themselves in 1952 from the gang that has led the people into this mess.

"And as for me, I will not support the Democratic Party in the national election in 1952 unless its banner is rescued from the greedy hands of the gang now hiding behind it for protection. If this be political treason, make the most of it."

Thompson said that no one could question his record of unfaltering loyalty to the Democratic administration.

He said that in 1948 when the States rights movement split the South, "my efforts resulted in Georgia remaining loyal to the Democratic Party."

But he continued:

"Conditions existing in the national administration are so deplorable today that loyalty to party and patriotism to country constitute a conflict."

Thompson said that in Washington the "only refuge being held out to a confused people is the sign of the double cross."

Explaining his job status with OPS, Thompson said he received a telegram last January 21 from OPS Director Michael DiSalle "asking me to come to Washington to accept the job of regional director of OPS with headquarters in Atlanta. I accepted."

En route, Thompson said he was intercepted in Atlanta by telephone calls from the Democratic National Committee "telling me that Dixiecrat Herman Talmadge, Governor of Georgia, was protesting my appointment."

Arriving in Washington, I reported to Mr. DiSalle's office. Mr. DiSalle refused to see me, and I was told to report first to the Democratic National Committee office. There I was requested to accept the directorship of OPS for Territories. For the sake of harmony in the defense effort I agreed to accept.

"For 8 days I remained in my hotel expecting any moment to be assigned to the duties of the office, and when the assignment was made I was amazed to learn that another man and I were at the same time to be sworn in for the same office, at the same salaries and with the same duties.

"During the next 2 weeks, nothing was done and no program for administration of price controls in the Territories was promulgated."

Thompson was sworn in as codirector along with former Mayor Herbert Meighan, of Gadsden, Ala.

Thompson told a reporter he submitted his resignation to DiSalle yesterday afternoon.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—DiSalle last night said in a statement that Thompson actually was sworn in as Acting Deputy Director of the fourteenth region but was dissatisfied with the role of deputy.

("Many times as I worked late at night," DiSalle said, "he would call me from his hotel room complaining bitterly of his lot as deputy. * * * I asked him to be patient * * * until we could find a position that suited him and fitted his capabilities. We finally determined that in view of the fact that he was a former governor he might be helpful in contacting governors and other State officials in explaining the price-control program and the part they might play in making the program a success.

(DiSalle said "It is to be regretted that in the administration of a very important program the action of 1 employee out of 4,000 should necessitate the taking of time to make this statement."

(White House Press Secretary Joseph Short knew nothing about Thompson's blast until reporters called it to his attention in the late afternoon. President Truman had left his office for Blair House, and Administrative Assistant Dawson was in El Dorado Springs, Mo., where he went to visit his ailing father.

(Short said he would try to find out something about the Thompson matter today.)

All Should Be Dealt With Alike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Herald-News, Passaic, N. J., for April 4, 1951:

ALL SHOULD BE DEALT WITH ALIKE

The draft is the democratic way of raising a wartime army. It treats all men alike. If a young man is physically fit and of sound mind, he goes into service when he reaches military age. In an expanding army a young fellow with intelligence and the right attitude has a good chance to get ahead.

The Army needs men with special skills. It gets them from its manpower pool of buck privates by trade-testing those whose records show previous experience. That's how it selects truck drivers, telephone linemen, and bridge builders. That's how premedical men could be routed back to professional study after completing basic training.

A soldierly bearing and a high I. Q. in his intelligence test is a recruit's passport to officer candidates' school. Many a rookie has gone from private to major in the draft army.

That's the way it was and that's the way it should be. But from now on it's not going to be that way.

President Truman's Executive order, which authorizes selective service boards to defer the bright college boys, will make many a veteran of 1917–18 and 1941–45 ask himself, "Who sold the President that idea?"

With more than a million nonveterans in college now and more coming up, no one knows how many hundred thousand students will be exempted from service because they had good grades or because they will be able to pass the aptitude tests to be given on May 26 and June 16 and 30.

The order prompted many a cynical remark by boys who are crowding closer to the draft age. The policy makers in the Defense Department ought to hear what is being said. What this order will do to the morale of men fighting in Korea today is your guess, or anybody's.

Mr. Truman has set up a caste system. Nobody would suggest that a medical student be yanked out of school and put into camp, or that a research student in chemistry should be denied a deferment. But why exempt a bright lad who is spending 4 years in a liberal arts college simply because it's the thing to do and because his father can afford to send him? And why put a uniform on the boy who decided to learn a trade at 17 if the school athlete can beat the draft by proving his aptitude for a career in physical education? Let's apply the UMT principle, which means everyone fit for service undergoes training.

After the First World War the American Legion, in national convention, made a ringing declaration for an all-inclusive draft of manpower and other national resources, if war came again. Has the Legion forgotten its high resolution of a bygone day?

Every post in the country ought to make itself heard so that sentiment back home can find expression in Congress.

Continuance of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available to each Member of Congress the fine statement made by Director Walter E. Cosgriff, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in defense of that agency. As you know, Director Cosgriff's appointment to this board was made just last August, and so he has not been with the RFC long enough to be biased, but long enough to know of its value to small businesses. His reasons for the continuation of the RFC as an experienced banker can, I assume, be accepted at face value. Certainly no one will challenge his figures.

The matter follows:

Assailing the privately owned national banking system for failing in its job, Reconstruction Finance Corporation Director Walter E. Cosgriff yesterday called for a house cleaning of "those who have abused authority." He urged the continuance of RFC as an essential to American economy.

The former president of a 16-unit western banking chain and the only RFC director so far untouched by Fulbright committee criticism, Mr. Cosgriff answered in an interview those calling for abolition of the loan agency.

"No one called for abolition of the Army when Maj. Gen. Benny Meyers went to jail," Mr. Cosgriff protested.

The 19-year-old RFC must continue, he contends, "because the Nation's private banking system is either unable or unwilling to meet national credit needs."

SAYS AGENCY MUST CONTINUE

"If both long-term loans and the financing of such large new enterprises as the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. were available in the regular credit market, I would favor abolishing RFC even if Abraham Lincoln were its single administrator," Mr. Cosgriff said. "But private banks are not doing the job and, for that reason, I, as a Republican, believe the abusers of authority—including myself, if I'm guilty—should be turned out and the agency continued."

To document his charge of banking failure, the 37-year-old Salt Lake City banker who became an RFC director last August cited key RFC statistics: 631,351 business loans totaling $16,000,000,000 made over 19 years with only $134,000,000 of bad loans and a $600,000,000 net profit to the Federal Government.

"With all the scandal, the influence and the favoritism," he said, "the RFC has a loss record of about 1 percent on more than 600,000 loans. Each of these loans was made after the applicant produced certifications from the bank with which he does business, and from one other, that credit was unavailable. That our 'bank reject' loans pay out 99 percent seems sufficient evidence that banks are not servicing legitimate credit needs."

PRIVATE BANKS SHUN RISK

Mr. Cosgriff says American bankers fail in today's obligations because Government-backed bonds and guaranteed home loans lead them to shun business risks.

"Business that could have got private credit in 1910 are today denied it," he said. "Kaiser-Frazer is an example. Kaiser came to the RFC for $666,000,000, first, because big banks that could have made the loan listened to his competitors who did not want it made and secondly, because it was simpler and safer for them to put their cash in Government 'sure things.'

"This typifies a fundamental change in a banking system which, until the 1930's lived off the interest from business loans. In the last 20 years bank deposits have multiplied and, simultaneously, Government bond issues and guaranteed mortgages have offered profitable and sure investments."

"The result," said Mr. Cosgriff, "is that American bankers have turned their backs on the business loans with which America was built."

"I am against wild banking," he insisted, "but the pendulum has now swung too far to the conservative side."

The RFC Director agrees with the Hoover Commission that Government guaranties of business loans, similar to FHA insurance of home loans, would be better than direct Federal advances to private borrowers. But he added:

BANKERS' GROUPS KILL PLAN

"Every time a definite business-loan-guaranty plan is advanced," he said, "the American Bankers Association and other powerful groups kill it in congressional committee."

Since its 1932 birthday, the "average" RFC loan has been for $35,000, and 19 out of every 20 loans made have been for less than $100,000, he said.

"The Commerce Department counts 3,000,000 so-called small businesses. Our record of 500,000 small loans means we have helped 1 out of every 6 of them at some time or other."

In Fairness to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the New York Daily Mirror, April 3, 1951, published as a public service by a group of leading citizens of Greater Lynn, Mass.:

ORCHESTRA OF EIGHT MILLION

We wish to congratulate three fine Americans of our city: Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who presided over the court which tried the atom-bomb spies, and United States Attorney Irving H. Saypol and his assistant, Roy Cohn, who prosecuted and convicted those spies, Julius Rosenberg, Ethel Rosenberg, and Morton Sobell.

Some bigots will say the three spies are Jews and will denounce all Jews. They will forget to say that the judge, the prosecutor, and his assistant who did such a magnificent job for America, are also Jews.

The unfairness of drawing general conclusions from particular instances; the indecency of fixing a universal stereotype from a bad type is here exemplified.

It would be like saying that all the fine Americans of Italian descent in our city are like Frank Costello or Joe Adonis, rather than Arturo Toscanini or our Mayor Vincent Impellitterri.

It would be like saying that all the hard-working, decent Negroes in our city are like Paul Robeson, instead of like Ralph Bunche or Jackie Robinson.

It would be like saying that all the Americans in our city of Anglo-Saxon stock are like Alger Hiss, instead of like Bishop Sherrill.

It would be like saying that all Irishmen are like "Cockeye" Dunn, instead of like John Coleman and Gen. Rosie O'Donnell.

There is no logic in drawing false conclusions from a minimum of facts. Who dares say this Rosenberg creature is typical of our citizens of Jewish persuasion, when against him can be pitted millions of Americans such as Bernard M. Baruch, Bernard Gimbel, Jesse Isidor Straus, Barney Balaban, Admiral Lewis Strauss, Chaplain Joshua Goldberg, Rudolph Halley, and so many others who come quickly to mind?

We raise this very sensitive question because our city is the home of citizens of fairly immediate foreign origin. Of course, we are all of foreign origin at one time, and the history of our city shows that when a group became "old timers" they tended to look down on the "newcomers."

In a list of the white population in 1940 whose mother tongue was other than English, there were 429,000 Germans, 896,000 Italians, 163,000 Poles, 149,000 Russians, 121,000 Spaniards, and 911,000 who spoke Yiddish, a Germanic dialect used by Jews. Altogether this list included more than 26 varieties of "mother tongues" for a total of 3,000,000 persons.

Undoubtedly, during the past 10 years, this list has decreased, for the pattern is constant in our city, namely, that by the third generation the process of relating the "newcomer" to America completes itself and the "newcomers" become "old timers."

But we are not a melting pot, as Israel Zangwill so graphically described us. We are more like a symphony orchestra, in which men play various instruments, violins, 'cellos, flutes, oboes, trumpets, drums, and so on. Each plays differently; yet out of their differences comes the glorious Beethoven's Fifth or even George Gershwin's Rhapsody in Blue.

Harmony means neither sameness nor monotony. It does mean cooperation, self-discipline, and teamwork.

Of course there will sometimes be a devil who plays out of tune and out of time. He has to be straightened out or kicked out.

But because there is one sour note, we do not tear down Carnegie Hall.

Hon. William T. Granahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD mention of a fine tribute accorded a distinguished fellow Member of the House of Representatives, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of the Second Congressional District. On Wednesday, February 21, 1951, my colleague from the city of Philadelphia was awarded a life membership in the American Legion, Breen-McCracken Post 270, of that city. Presentation of the life membership, accompanied by a gold membership card, was made by the Honorable Vincent A. Carroll, judge of the Court of Common Pleas No. 2, of Philadelphia; and participating in the special presentation ceremonies were Welden M. Trauger, commander of Breen-McCracken Post; Harry Stinger, national committeeman of the American Legion; James Aitkins, sixth district commander; and John Stay, fourth district commander of the American Legion.

This high honor was bestowed upon Representative GRANAHAN in recognition of his tireless efforts in behalf of veterans' legislation and American Legion activities. A veteran of World War I and an active member of the Legion of long standing, Representative GRANAHAN'S sympathetic, understanding work in behalf of veterans' legislation has ever been in the highest tradition of American citizenship, and as an able and responsible representative of his constituents in our National Government. It is with pleasure that I record the high tribute and honor bestowed upon Representative GRANAHAN and express my firm conviction, as well as the feeling of others among his colleagues, that the recognition conferred upon him is well deserved and likewise reflects credit upon Breen-McCracken Post of the American Legion.

The New Draft Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by the president of Princeton University which I feel should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress. Dr. Dodds made this statement on the contemplated change in our selective service policy on Sunday, April 8, 1951.

This distinguished educator calls the new policy "wrong for the country" and feels that college students generally have suffered because of the temporizing in Washington on the draft situation.

The statement follows:

As one who has consistently believed that universal military training and service is essential in the present world situation, I naturally view the proposal for almost blanket deferment of college students as wrong for the Nation and detrimental to the best interests of the colleges in the long run.

The Executive order places college students, as such, in a preferred position which entirely misrepresents their basic patriotism and willingness to serve. On the other hand, the proposal to defer students in subjects essential to the defense effort is sound and should be preserved. The impact on the morale of troops now in service of any program of college deferment beyond essential needs is obvious.

I yield to no one in the importance I attribute to the national need for young men broadly educated in the fields of humanities and social sciences. If, as I hope, a system of universal-military training is adopted promptly, these values need suffer no essential loss once that system is established and the rotation of men through the armed services permits a return of the college population to normal.

To be sure, the period of transition will create the gravest difficulties in the educational world. But I believe that these difficulties can be resolved without resort to a deferment policy so broad and so little selective as the Executive order contemplates.

College students have suffered greatly from the strains imposed by the temporizing in Washington and continued confusion over the Government's plans for the immediate future. They can and will adjust patriotically to national needs.

As one close to the strains they have been under and sympathetic to them, I hope that the present confusion will be quickly resolved in the interest of the principle of share and share alike in posts in which the individual's services will count for most.

After all, this is what the college man want. And I believe it preferable to protecting them against interruption of their college careers, which would react adversely upon their influence as future leaders and the long-time values of the subjects they are studying.

What Price Patriotism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article titled "What Price Patriotism?" This article was written by Dr. J. Ollie Edmunds, president of John B. Stetson University, at DeLand, Fla. It follows:

WHAT PRICE PATRIOTISM?

There is no evidence to suggest that Lord Macaulay was an especially malicious individual, but if he was, and if he were alive today, he might very well be rubbing his hands and preparing to say, "I told you so." That sagacious English statesman didn't think very highly of Thomas Jefferson's ideas and he predicted that the democratic government which Jefferson evolved for America would

crack up about now. He declared that one of two things would happen: (1) Either "some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand" or (2) "your Republic will be as fearfully plundered * * * by barbarians of the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference * * * the Huns and Vandals who ravished the Roman Empire came from without. * * * Your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own institutions."

Macaulay was pretty sure that pressure groups eventually would bring about the Nation's downfall by electing legislators who would hand over to them the wealth created by others. He thought of pressure groups in terms of workingmen hearing their "children cry for more bread," for he came along several generations too soon to think in terms of political action committees, farm blocs, veterans' organizations, old-age pension clubs, manufacturers' associations, and similar symbols of an age in which most of us are less worried about getting bread than we are tires.

If pressure groups didn't cause the crash, he figured that some strongly entrenched group (he thought it would be the military) would do the trick by depriving us of our liberty in their efforts to save order and prosperity. Such pessimistic conclusions were not arrived at impulsively. Macaulay watched our Government in operation for half a century before he made his dire predictions. He did not expect to see the smash-up in his time, but he said, "Your fate I believe certain, though it is deferred."

Today thoughtful Americans are wondering a bit fearfully just how good a prophet Macaulay was. They see the shadow of the Government growing larger and that of the individual citizen growing smaller. They see free enterprise becoming restricted enterprise. Even in the face of socialistic disillusionment abroad, they see Americans who, under private management, have made themselves the most prosperous and successful people on earth, being gently coaxed into trying Government management—with pennies from their own till. They see Washington swarming with economic doctors, who, though pleased with the golden eggs, are itching to operate on the goose.

These economic experimenters are causing increasing concern to many citizens. Now, with so much of our attention focused on our tremendously vital defense effort, the set-up should be about perfect for them. With powerful propaganda machines at their command, millions of dollars of tax money to play with, and almost everybody looking the other direction, they should be in a position to "correct the shortcomings of our democratic form of government" to their hearts' content.

What will our Government be like when the smoke lifts? Will these well-meaning planners turn out to be a twentieth-century variety of kind Huns and gentle vandals (armed with pens instead of spears) who will, with the most altruistic intentions, destroy our time-tested way of life if we don't watch out? Nations catch socialism in two ways: Either they are exposed to it through revolution or, as is the case with creeping socialism, they breathe too long the stagnant air of apathy.

With uncanny foresight, Macaulay pointed out some of the problems that would be facing us a century after his death. But the most important factor of all he overlooked—the one thing that can save us from the fate he predicted: that is, the character of the American people—the fact that when they get their back up Americans can be a strong for preserving their Government as he thought they would be for overthrowing it. He failed to realize that by the middle of the twentieth century most Americans would still like their form of government—imperfect though it is. He thought their selfishness would be the rock upon which their ship of state would be wrecked. What he did not foresee was that out of the self-reliance and individual initiative engendered by their institutions the great body of Americans—both inside and outside of pressure groups—would have become so contented and prosperous that their selfish desires would be less compelling than the deep pride they would have in their country. Loyalty—though he did not know it—will dissipate selfishness and apathy, too. He failed to take into account that wonderful thing called patriotism.

We are likely to be hearing a great deal about patriotism in the months ahead. It is probable that a lot of strange items will be offered in patriotic wrappers. It might be a good idea to take time out to discover just what patriotism is. Exactly what is this powerful force that can upset Macaulay's unhappy calculations? What does it require of us as individuals?

Dictionary definitions are inadequate. Patriotism is more than "love of ones' country"; it involves attitude, alertness, action. It requires, first of all, a deep conviction that the principles for which our country stands are right. It implies a personal determination to guard these standards, not from change, but from unwise change, or change slipped over on us. It connotes an active loyalty—not the kind that lets George do it.

There are two kinds of patriotism. The wartime patriotism which all of us know about, and a deeper, less emotional kind—the patriotism of peace. The first kind we usually turn on and off on holidays and during war scares. The other is something continuous, an element in our character like self-respect, good sportsmanship, or love of one's family.

Like freedom, patriotism is not free. The price was high at Valley Forge; it is higher today in Korea. For us at home, there is a price. We must believe fervently in our country's basic ideals, and stand for them ourselves—boldly and unashamed. We must protect these ideals against the political dreamers and economic theorists who offer us enticing substitutes, some original, some imported (with the directions on the box). We must support the institutions which are teaching our time-tested principles to the young men and young women upon whom we must depend to preserve our national heritage in the future.

Among such institutions are the hundreds of small, independent, Christian colleges which for so many years have been training their students, through precept and example, to pull their own weight as good citizens—self-respecting, self-reliant, loyal. America will be needing these privately supported colleges in the years to come—perhaps as never before—for they are ramparts from which our American way of life will be defended. Are you helping to keep these ramparts strong?

Myself I Must Make Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Hubert M. Harrison:

MYSELF I MUST MAKE STRONG

(By Hubert M. Harrison)

In the midst of confusion, criticism, and near chaos that overshadows our democratic effort to arm ourselves to save our Nation's life, the average citizen is bewildered. Every honest patriot wants to do his part for his country and yet he doesn't know where to fit into the giant plan.

For most of us, the best thing to do is to attend to our own jobs with a new spirit of devotion. The armchair strategist who thinks he can give MacArthur a few pointers, the radio diplomat who questions the loyalty and integrity of high officials, the selfish schemers who are trying to make money out of this crisis of mankind, the workman who risks slavery for his children by refusing to produce, the fomenters of race prejudice; all these are hindering the war effort and playing into Stalin's hands.

No matter how weak and corrupt some of our leaders in Washington are, the fact remains that they are our leaders. Although Alan Valentine, former Economic Stabilizer, may be right in his indictment of the low moral tone of the Capital, impeachment is difficult and practically impossible under our system. Valentine said: "The moral ground on which contemporary Washington now rests is so low that mists of contagion can rise quickly and spread far." The official Government, Valentine said, is headed by "an honest, well-intentioned, and industrious President." But there exists a "second government nominally headed by the President but with activities of which he can be only vaguely aware."

I am glad I do not have General Eisenhower's terrifying responsibility but I do have my own little job to do. I am accountable for the way I serve now and shall be throughout all time. Myself I must make strong.

The farmer who does not do his utmost to make his acres produce food or feed to full capacity; the workman who does not do an honest day's work; the businessman who does not do the best possible job of management with all his heart and soul; the housewife who refuses or neglects to make a home to comfort, sustain, and inspire her menfolks in their tasks; the community that does not do its best by its own efforts, without calling on Austin or Washington for help; all these are weakening the Nation.

The man or woman who through lack of will power, sickness, or overindulgence, comes to the point that he is not self-supporting and becomes a charge on relatives or the community, is a liability to family, community and state and hinders the war effort although not intentionally disloyal.

This Nation, rich as it is, cannot afford to defeat communism at home and abroad and take care of everybody at the same time. All who possibly can must stand on their own feet.

Under God and my Nation's flag, my duty is to do my job the best that I know how. Myself I must make strong.

The MacArthur Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include yesterday's editorial from the Washington Post:

THE MACARTHUR PROBLEM

The crisis produced by General MacArthur's repeated efforts to run away with the diplomatic ball in the Far East seems to have excited little more than a ripple among the American people. This is due to the way that the crisis has been muted. In reality civil supremacy is at stake in our Government. General MacArthur has now told all and sundry, including a leader of the opposition, that he is not in sympathy with the United States or the United Nations policy in the Far East. Nor is this all. General MacArthur, in his repeated statements, is trying himself to seize the initiative in policy making. Over the week end several United Nations governments, including Canada's and Britain's have expressed open alarm, and the crisis is thus as much one in our international relations as one in our domestic Government.

Since the outbreak of the Korean War, the President has given his confidence to the supreme commander without stint. This has been due in some part to the lessons that he has drawn from our history. The chief lesson stems from some of Lincoln's intervention with the conduct of war operations. Mr. Truman, indeed, has gone too far in deferring to the supreme commander. Not once but several times he has answered the question of action beyond the thirty-eighth parallel by saying that the issue lay with the military commander on the spot. He never seemed to realize that beyond the thirty-eighth the question was not military but politico-military. General MacArthur knew better, and, before he seized the initiative, he complained of a "policy void." However, there was no policy void on the subject matter of MacArthur's letter to Representative MARTIN on March 20. Here the American policy on the neutralization of Formosa stands, yet General MacArthur came out for support of a Chiang Kai-shek attack on mainland China. And 7 days later, having already seen a summary of a policy directive on Korea, he issued his own cease-fire, and in a manner calculated to inflame the situation with regard not only to our enemies but also to our allies. This is a course of conduct that the President, out of sheer protection of his office and his prerogatives, simply cannot ignore.

Any reassertion of the President's authority as Commander in Chief and initiator of the country's foreign policy would win him, we feel sure, the support of the American people. That's what they are crying out for—leadership. The institutions of this country are too precious to be trifled with. Mr. Truman is not without courage, as was shown when General MacArthur last time sought to distort the President's foreign policy before the Veterans of Foreign Wars. But the present question is one of extraordinary delicacy. We are in a hairsbreadth zone of war, and the state of our policies, moreover, has run down so rapidly that the spirit of faction is uppermost. General MacArthur has become more of a politician than a general. He appears to have a sort of personal organization here, there, and everywhere. And to many of the Republicans he is sharing the spotlight with McCARTHY as a symbol of opposition. It is a thoroughly unhealthy situation—alien to our institutions, likely at any time to tip the scales in favor of all-out war with China, and destined to leave this country isolated in what the Arizona Daily Star calls "hopeless crusades for unlimited objectives impossible of attainment."

Farmers Face Big Crop Loss—1950 Wheat Rust May Strike Area Again This Year

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Agriculture appropriation bill will shortly come before the House, I believe a study of the article which appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune on April 8 will be of interest to the Members.

Evidence has shown that the farmers of the Midwest lost $20,000,000 at least in wheat production alone in 1951 due to the outbreak of a new race of rust known as 15B. To combat this outbreak it is very necessary that a new strain of wheat be developed which will be resistant to that particular rust. Closely allied to this is the need for a sufficient appropriation to continue the very worth while work of barberry eradication. The article reads as follows:

FARMERS FACE BIG CROP LOSS—1950 WHEAT RUST MAY STRIKE AREA AGAIN THIS YEAR

(By Russell Asleson)

Minnesota's legislature is being asked to appropriate $210,000 for emergency rust-control research.

Farmers and the grain industry alike have marked such a program "rush." They've got to find new rust-resistant wheat in a hurry to stay in business.

Rust is an airborne fungus that can cause a wheat field to have an almost complete crop failure. It's been around to plague farmers in one form or another for years, but plant scientists have been breeding new kinds of wheat to meet such emergencies.

For 10 years the situation was well under control. Until 1950.

Years of good work were toppled almost overnight when a new strain of rust, more infectious than any previously known, suddenly found weather conditions ideal and began to race through the durum fields of northern North Dakota and Minnesota.

Scientists had labeled it 15B and knew it had been around for nearly 15 years, lurking undercover and waiting. It had been termed "potentially dangerous" by Dr. E. C. Stakman, University of Minnesota plant pathology chief and the world's leading authority on rust.

As early as 1938 Stakman had predicted its explosion.

The 1950 eruption cost Minnesota and the Dakotas an estimated twenty-three and a half million dollars in lost crops, hitting hardest in North Dakota's durum area where farmers lost nearly $20,000,000.

Farmers viewing ruined fields found no variety withstood the fungus onslaught. All commercial wheats, including durum, which is used in making of macaroni and spaghetti, were affected.

That's the situation that brought on the emergency, not only on a State but a national level.

Another 15B invasion this year must be liberally sprinkled with big "ifs," but the possibility must be considered by agricultural experts fitting together the jig-saw puzzle of the Nation's food supply.

What measures can be taken as preventive medicine against any future epidemic? There are three steps:

The immediate is development of new resistant varieties.

The permanent is eradicating barberry bushes on which new rust races develop.

The experimental is chemical control of rust.

For some time it has been known that sulfur dust can control rust. But it takes more than one application, making it too costly and uneconomic. The Bureau of Plant Industry is working on other chemicals but to date has nothing promising.

Any permanent solution must take the barberry bush into consideration. Barberry is the only plant on which rust exists in its sexual stage and it is on this host that races do their crossing—or hybridization. It is fortunate that not all such hybrids are as virulent as their parents.

Since 1918 barberry elimination has been a cooperative State and Federal venture. Field headquarters for an 18-State area are in Minneapolis, in charge of Raymond O. Bulger.

The barberry program has eliminated 393,830,000 bushes on 143,039 properties, but work must be stepped up. Congress is being asked to increase the present appropriation of $700,000 by 15 percent. Minnesota has been providing $15,000 a year.

It is in the plant breeding end of the fight, however, that scientists are racing against time. It takes from 12 to 15 generations of wheat to develop a new variety.

To speed up the process, promising strains have been grown this winter in California and will be planted this spring in the North. Thousands of types are being tested for resistance under the widest ranges of temperature, light, and humidity. Last year the breeders were working on the second to sixth generations of some strains.

If they get the legislative appropriation fully half will go into new greenhouses at the University of Minnesota. With adequate help and space, the breeders say they can grow three to four generations a year instead of two, as they are now doing.

When they do find a resistant strain their work isn't done. The farmer wants a wheat that will yield well, stand up well, and retain its kernels when ripe. The miller wants a high protein wheat that will make fine, white flour.

While the plant scientist is trying to combine all these factors into a wheat that also has resistance to rust, a new rust may also be developing to lay waste to the new wheat.

E. R. Ausemus, University of Minnesota agronomist, has some promising rust-resistant strains but say that even at best it will be several years before varieties resistant to 15B and with the right growing and milling qualities are available for planting.

Minnesota and North Dakota scientists are playing a vital role in a Nation-wide effort to protect the food supply. North Dakota's Legislature appropriated $83,000 for the work, and a Federal grant of $60,000 is being sought from Congress for research.

What are the possibilities of another outbreak of 15B this summer?

The potential is there. It could break out if a spell of hot, humid weather hits at a critical time.

But because of the uncertainties of weather, predicting rust epidemics is a bit risky.

"Look at all the heat the weatherman gets when he predicts a clear day and snow turns up," said Don Fletcher, executive secretary of the rust prevention committee.

It is entirely practicable to determine the areas of danger and name the races which are prevalent, thereby supplying the material for storm warnings.

Such storm warnings are flying this spring. Agricultural men know that the rust spores

blew South last fall and were found in southern wheat fields. They were perpetuated on green grains and wild grasses always present in the continuous grain belt from Mexico to Canada.

They also know race 15B is now independent of barbery, and any strong southern wind will start the return journey. Some of the stem-rust spores have been found as high as 10,000 feet.

But the South had a hard, tough, and dry winter, and a lot of the wheat crop was lost. If the patches of rusted grain still left do not develop the northern crop may be safe—from 15B.

"There are no grounds for flatly predicting a return of 15B this year," reported Fletcher. "The threat is there, however, and we have no way of stopping it if weather conditions are right for rust."

Let's take a look at this saboteur:

Rust looks just like the ordinary iron pipe variety, except that it is found on the stems of the grain. The dusty, brick-red substance, however, is a living parasite—a fungus so tiny some are less than one-thousandth of an inch in diameter.

The collection of parasites suck the food sap in the stems—food that should be going up to the kernels to make them plump and full. When the wheat stem is completely girdled by the rust, considerable moisture also is lost and the stem is weakened so it breaks off easily in the wind.

The result of rust is seen in shrunken kernels of poor quality. It can cause any degree of damage to a crop, depending on severity of infection.

North Dakota farmers were cut some 9,000,000 bushels of durum worth $18,013,000 and 2,000,000 bushels of bread wheat worth $3,720,000. Minnesota lost 550,000 bushels of durum worth $1,145,000. South Dakota had a $700,000 loss, mostly in bread wheats.

Through many years of wheat breeding and selection, plant scientists had been able to give the American farmers wheats that resisted the rust diseases most prevalent.

But like the youngster vaccinated for smallpox who then turned around to catch measles, 15B came along to supply the measles.

The late 1950 spring put wheat crops several weeks behind normal development. It also gave 15B its chance to invade wheats never before rusted. Only the fact much of the bread-wheat crop was mature prevented it from being hard hit.

How do these new races spring up to menace crops?

Wheat rust is in the red spore stage when it multiplies on the growing crop. When the straw becomes dead, the rust goes into the black spore stage in which it survives the winter's cold, coming to life and germinating the next spring. The wind picks these newly germinated spores from the straw and deposits them on young barberry leaves.

The spores dig into the leaves and start building up, producing small, blister-like sores called cluster cups. Later, spores from the cluster cups are mixed together, either by insects or by two cups growing together.

The mating of spores from two cluster cups if they are of different races may produce a brand-new race—a hybrid—ready to make a short hop via the wind to a susceptible plant.

"Nature," says Fletcher, "is continually plotting such disease warfare against our crops and only continual scientific defense will save us from future food shortages. If our farmer and miller is to stay in business, he must be given means to outmaneuver these rusts that destroy overnight what it has taken years to develop."

Income Tax Relief for Professional Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in today's press by one of America's most distinguished commentators, Mr. George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., is introducing a bill into Congress to rescue the professional workers of this country from permanent poverty. For precisely that fate faces lawyers, doctors, architects, writers, and others, who, no matter what they earn, are being squeezed between taxes and high prices, without any opportunity to save for the future.

COUDERT's bill is to aid those men and women who are not eligible as beneficiaries of corporate or other private pension plans. These plans are really savings.

For instance, I was recently looking at the card of a Sears, Roebuck file clerk who had been with that company many years and, as I calculated it, she has saved, through their plan, $60,000. I would not mind being a file clerk with such savings.

Professional men, writers, artists, farmers, and small-business men are now unable to make great savings, unless they swindle, because of taxes which are geared against them.

COUDERT's idea is to permit the postponement of Federal taxes as regards a portion of their earned net income, so that the amount of money shall be contributed as a restricted retirement fund.

The worst phase of this situation, as it affects professional men, writers, and artists, is that their earnings are up and down, a lot one year and not so much another year.

If they could keep their earnings, they could average out over a few years. But the way it is, a writer may earn a fortune in 1 year and get taxed for the full amount in that year, and then he does not earn for a few years and is broke.

The Treasury amortizes machines; why not men?

COUDERT says:

"It is of utmost importance to encourage young men to enter the professions and small business. Yet the operations of the present tax laws, instead of giving this encouragement, tend to do the exact opposite by making corporation employment more attractive to young men. I believe this to be against the public interest."

I tried to read the Coudert bill and, like all other acts of Congress dealing with taxation, it gets so involved that you have to hire a lawyer and an accountant to discover how it works.

But it is enough for me that it gives to the white-collar folks a chance to put aside something of their earnings for the day when the joints ache and the hand is shaky and the eyes not so good.

Even columnists lose their popularity after a while, and some even lose their value. Yet, under the present set-up, they cannot save in their limited good years. I, for instance, started this business in 1917. I have, I hope, worked hard at my trade, which involves voluminous reading, the cultivation of memory, travel in many parts of the world, and some small, unheroic element of risk.

In our business a young person is hired on the general assumption that he knows nothing. Then, for 10 or 15 years, he keeps on learning the hard way, his product appearing in black ink on white paper for all to see.

So our hero arrives. But so has Uncle Sam. He tells his wife that he is now a big shot, but she wants to know how it happens that E. Merl Young's wife grabs a $9,540 mink coat while she has to wear mouton, which is fancy for sheepskin. Our genius tells her to go fight the Treasury.

Well, maybe there are 10 wonderful years, during which the great man sits on the dais and rises for a bow and then up comes another young fellow and pushes him into the back pages. So there is nothing to do but to become a ghost writer.

But savings. There are none except what Uncle Sam gave to the British to bridge their dollar gap—only a small share of it—which must make a man feel noble.

A man really earns little more than he can keep after he has met taxes and his cost of living. Men who want to save and cannot save because their taxes are too high are not earning what they think they earn.

Actually, they are only an intermediary step between those who pay them and the Treasury.

What remains is hardly compensation for the work they do. They are being kidded; they are kidding themselves.

The Coudert bill offers a good way out and should be supported.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by President Truman comes as a severe shock to me, and I am sure to 99 percent of the people in my congressional district. It is true that the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power under the Constitution to wield the ax wherever he sees fit as far as his military commanders are concerned, but the reason given for the firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur really takes the cake.

If I read the President's statement correctly, the reason given for the dismissal was that—

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations.

What policy is the President talking about? You cannot support or implement a policy that you know nothing about or that is nothing more than a figment of a few people's imagination.

We have been doddling along so long now in Korea that it took some kind of statement from General MacArthur to arouse the State Department, the White House, and the United Nations out of their lethargic sleep and let them know there is a war going on, that more and more of our boys are dying every day and being maimed for life, simply because we have had no clear-cut policy in the Far East and we still have not one today. There has been a lack of direction, and no ultimate objective for the fighting in Korea has been established.

These people who talk about General MacArthur's dismissal opening the gates to a peaceful conclusion of the Korean War do not know what they are talking about. I would just like to point out that General MacArthur had nothing to gain by prolonging the Korean War for he already has his five stars.

It could be that the well-known armchair strategists, General Marshall and Anna Rosenberg, had their say along with our renowned Secretary of State, whose magic wand still waves over the administration.

Then, too, I just cannot understand how our United Nations allies, who have made a combined contribution in manpower and material of less than 15 percent of our own contribution in Korea always seem to have so much to say about how the Korean War should be fought.

As the President said in his statement, "General MacArthur's place in history as one of our greatest commanders is fully established," and I would like to add to this that the final chapters in the life of General MacArthur, as yet unwritten, will bring to light the sordid tales of how the Roosevelt and Truman administrations sold China down the river and opened the floodgates of godless Communist aggression upon all of Asia.

For a Sound National Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter which has been sent to the Members of this House by a former distinguished Senator from New York and Representative from New York's Forty-first Congressional District, James W. Wadsworth. No man in America has given more careful and more extensive consideration to the problems of forging a sound national military policy for this country, in time of peace as in time of war, than has Senator Wadsworth. During the decades when he was an illustrious Member of this Congress, he worked with dedicated purpose toward that end. His plea in the following letter for a national military policy which will include provisions for a continuing program of military training for our young men deserves attentive consideration by every Member of this House.

Senator Wadsworth's letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 6, 1951.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Returning to my Washington residence temporarily after 2 months' absence from the country and being deeply concerned by the trend of events, I venture to address you on a subject which has gripped my attention for a long time—the subject being national military policy.

I think you will agree with me that the United States has never, up to this day, adopted a military policy endurable in time of peace and effective in time of war. Lacking such a policy we have been forced to meet attacks upon us by the desperately hasty mobilization of untrained manpower. In other words, we have commenced to get ready to fight after the fight has started. The cost in dollars has been staggering (witness the national debt) and, more important, the sacrifice in lives has been tragic. Moreover, our unreadiness, well known over the world, has tempted the aggressor to attack, confident that he could attain his objective while we were still in the throes of preparation.

None of us can be certain about what the future will bring. We may have strong allies or we may be caught alone. In any event, our best protection is strength, organized and maintained in time of peace. I am sure no thoughtful person will deny the truth of that statement. Then, how shall we develop and maintain peacetime strength? Shall we support, in time of peace, a regular, professional military force strong enough to meet a major emergency? It is obvious, if we think twice, that we can't do it unless we are willing to pay two fearful penalties—one a crushing financial burden and the other the creation, eventually, of a dominating professional military caste. The payment of such penalties would go far toward Prussianizing this country—a prospect which is abhorrent to every thoughtful American.

Is there no other way for us to be strong? For more than 30 years I have been convinced that there is such a way and that, if followed, it would provide strength without injuring our free institutions. Look back at the two great wars which we have fought since 1917 and it will be noted that the overwhelming majority of our defenders was drawn from civil life. Those defenders came into the service of their country eager but untrained. They served and suffered. Without them we would have lost. Trained or untrained, the civilian summoned to the defense of his country is the man who, in the long run, must save it. Without him we're gone. If this be conceded, is it not wise for us to see to it that the civilian is trained in time of peace so that we may have a great civilian reserve ready to answer the call, should it come? Is there any other way by which we can be strong? There is none.

And is it undemocratic to require capable young men to prepare themselves for the defense of their country? Is it not a part of the true democratic spirit for all such men to assume the obligation? If it is not their obligation, who will assume it? Volunteers? Our history shows conclusively that reliance upon volunteers has failed utterly and the underlying reason for the failure has been that such a system, if you can call it so, is fundamentally undemocratic.

Today there is pending before the House of Representatives a measure which, if approved, will establish, for the first time in our history, a national military policy emerging from the experience of the past, calculated to meet the strains of the future and, most important, founded upon a truly democratic concept. To strike from this bill those provisions relating to the training of our young men under predominant civilian control would throw us back into the confusion of no policy—the same old story—and cause every potential aggressor to rejoice.

Remember, they are watching us. I am hoping earnestly that the Congress will dispel further confusion at home and deny encouragement to our enemies abroad by adopting this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. WADSWORTH.

Ousting of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the ousting of General MacArthur completes the Truman administration record of capitulation to British foreign policy. Even though the people of this country, and their elected representatives, have overwhelmingly expressed the desire for freedom of action in Korea and a quick end to the killing of American boys in that battle area, the President's advisors in the State Department have succeeded in subordinating our wishes and in upholding Britain and other nations of Europe in declaring that continent the most critical military area.

This is not merely the firing of a general in the field but a complete sell-out of a strong American foreign policy. There have been over 1,000,000 casualties in the Korean War to date on both sides—yet the President refuses to consider this as a major war area and to take the appropriate steps to assure victory in Korea.

MacArthur has gone about his task of winning the Korean War despite the handicaps placed upon him. The United Nations has taken no stand in over a month on the ultimate aims in Korea, and the Truman administration has adopted a similar stand-pat program. Despite these factors, MacArthur has been trying to win a major war as quickly as possible with the smallest number of casualties.

President Truman's action will bring unbridled joy to the hearts of the Communists in Moscow and Peiping and in other capitals of the world. The American Communists and fellow travelers are now in complete command of our foreign policy. This is appeasement of the worst sort.

A War Without Plan, Without Preparation, and Without Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit herewith a column entitled "They're Never Mailed,"

by Henry W. Clune, which was published in the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle on March 6, 1951, together with a copy of my reply to the column, which was published in the Democrat and Chronicle of March 20, 1951:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of March 6, 1951]

SEEN AND HEARD

(By Henry W. Clune)

THEY'RE NEVER MAILED

Sometimes I wake up in the middle of the night in a cold sweat. Then it becomes a hot sweat. Then I get up and go downstairs and write a letter to the Congressman. A letter written to a Congressman in the middle of the night under a head of steam is nothing to put in the mail, and in the morning I have always destroyed what I have written. "Mad Letters" are often unreasonable, always intemperate and seldom effective. And I am not mad at my Congressman as a person. I am mad only at the craziness that appears pandemic in Washington.

I got off of those unmailed "mad letters" the other midnight after reading in the newspapers that the casualties among our fighting forces in Korea now number more than 50,000. That is an awfully lot of good American men to be knocked off in what the President of the United States once blithely described as a "police action." It seems particularly tragic when the thing goes on interminably, with no one, so far as I have been able to find out, defining its objective.

I don't pretend to know anything about the international situation. It's not my line. I'm no pundit or seer. Neither am I overly impressed by those who claim to know all the answers to the problems of the present crisis. I can second guess as well as they can, even though my finger isn't held tightly on the pulse of the world, as a fellow on the radio, with a little too much boast for my taste, claimed the other day that his was.

But I have three sons of military age, one of whom is back in the Army for a second hitch, and several of his friends who were called back with him now lie dead in Korea, sacrificed to a horde of barbarian monsters who are too great in number ever wholly to be defeated by American forces. I don't know the international score, but I'd be as bitter as gall and think it a wasteful sacrifice, if my son suffered a similar fate.

I'm biased by personal and selfish interests, to be sure. But a man worrying about his own son can also have a good deal of concern for the son of the man sitting next to him at a restaurant table or in a bus. From what I ascertain from listening to the comments of people in the street, the great majority of them have no stomach for the Korean war, and the soldiers who suffer the possibility of exposure to it definitely want out.

They write to me about it and they don't write as they did during the last war. There was a fine high spirit among them then. It was reflected in their letters. They thought they knew what that was all about. This time they write bitterly about what one of them called the muddling by the meatheads in Washington. One man who left a wife and two children and a home he had just started to buy, recently wrote:

"They have given the unorganized Reserves, of which I am one, a lousy deal in this thing. I had nearly 3 years of overseas service in the last war. Much of that service was fighting service. I came out with a good 10 years added to my life. I thought at last I had a chance to live a normal life. Now I'm back in the Army, and God knows where I'll be a month from now.

"They say Korea. They say our job is to bleed the Chinese Communists white. And that we've got to save face in the Orient. Who's face? Harry Truman's at the loss of a couple of hundred thousand Americans? Or a million. It could reach that number, if the Chinese keep pouring in, and we keep pouring in against them. What's our goal, how will we know when we've won? Joe Stalin must be laughing."

A couple of soldiers have sent me columns by Westbrook Pegler. One who did this wrote, "I never liked Pegler before. But read what I have underscored, and see if you don't agree." The lines marked were these:

"Why are American men in Korea? How can this ghastly folly end in any advantage to this country? They are there for a jumble of disgraceful reasons, starting with Roosevelt's 'recognition' of Soviet Russia and rising to the lamentable climax of Truman's offhand decision to send a few companies of milk-fed riflemen into a loathsome, unknown country to be slaughtered by an enemy as elusive as a fog. * * * How did we get into this damned thing? Does anybody want to go on with it besides the contemptible fakers who make war medicine?"

As I said, I tore up my midnight "mad letter" to the Congressman. But maybe he'll read this. I hope he does.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of March 20, 1951]

SEEN AND HEARD

(By Henry W. Clune)

CONGRESSIONAL REPLY

DEAR HENRY: That midnight "mad letter" about Korea that you wrote to your Congressman, tore up, and then wrote about in your column of March 6, has wound up on my desk in multiple copies. You say modestly that you "don't claim that your finger is on the pulse of the world," but a couple of typical correspondents indicate the contrary. One writes that "Henry Clune has put his finger on one of his readers' pulse, namely mine." And another encloses your column with the comment that your view that Korea is a "wasteful sacrifice" is "so true."

Of course, it is true, Henry. I doubt that Americans realize yet how true it is. I said last summer that we had been plunged into a war with Korea, "without plan, without preparation, and without objectives." (And, of course, without consultation. Time has only deepened my conviction that the decision to intervene in Korea was not a military decision: it was a political decision, and moreover, a political campaign decision. We have just seen the Reds move in on Tibet, but not one official hand has been wrung, so far as I know, over the Tibetans. Could it be a matter of timing?)

As you know, at the time the decision was made to go into Korea we had withdrawn our Armed Forces from the peninsula, accepting the Army's view that it was militarily undefensible.

We knew, from official reports of the UN Commission on Korea, that the North Koreans and the Chinese Reds had completed a military-aid agreement in 1949. We knew, because the UN Commission on Korea had told us so, on May 10, 1950, that the North Koreans were massing and mobilizing on the thirty-eighth parallel and that "there was imminent danger of invasion from the north."

But the administration had officially washed its hands of Korea, had evacuated our Army, had announced that our western line of defense did not extend to the peninsula. Korea was a political and military vacuum and the Reds moved in.

If during our occupation, a stable republican government had been established in South Korea, our "police action" might still have been justified on the basis of a gallant defense of a sister republic struggling to establish democratic self-government. The plain fact is that the contrary was true. Our efforts at creating a sound civil, democratic government and a working economy were a spectacular and extravagant failure.

According to C. Clyde Mitchell, an American administrator in the United States military government of Korea: "In 1948, as the United States transferred authority to the new government of South Korea, the industry of the country was virtually wrecked. Inflation was growing worse. Koreans were slaughtering Koreans by the hundreds in bloody riots. Political parties multiplied; seldom were they able to reach an agreement on any course of action. Korean police were as brutal as the Japanese police had been. Civil rights were practically unknown; restrictions on the freedom of speech had been instituted which were so severe as to be called by responsible Korean observers 'totalitarian thought control.' The new Korean Government had shown no great desire to change the traditional way of government by squeeze and patronage."

I am not pointing the finger of scorn in citing this. There are understandable historic, psychological, and ethnic reasons why this was so. But that was the situation. Korea was regarded as militarily undefensible. And experience had proved it to be disastrously unready for a republican form of government. Why, then, did we let Stalin choose it for us as a battleground? I did not know at that time, and I still do not know.

And I am less irked than some over the fact that the UN drags its feet in supporting us in Korea, because I realize that the Europeans and Latin Americans may be as puzzled as I am over this campaign to defend "democracy" at the gates of Seoul. Europe fears, as one of her leading statesmen recently put it, "that the United States might lose itself in an Asiatic war where it might find a fate similar to that of Napoleon in Russia: numerous and great successes, but absolute impossibility of bringing the war to an end, a terrible waste of strength for a problematic result."

What, then, to do about it?

Well, Henry, Alcoholics Anonymous have a wonderful prayer which goes something like this: "God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change; the courage to change the things I can, and the wisdom to know the difference." Perhaps that is also a prayer for our times.

For example, sooner or later we are going to have to arrive at a settlement in Korea. It is now a ruined country, economically, spiritually, and in every other way. I do not imagine it greatly matters to the plain people of Korea today who wins the fight, so long as the fighting stops. The least that we will probably settle for is a toehold on the peninsula to save our so-called face. The most that we can win is a destroyed, demoralized, subjugated, and bankrupt country. We shall pour more billions into it, after the settlement, to repair some of the destruction, but the major problem of establishing stable self-government there will be farther than ever from solution. It seems to me that this is the time to reflect that there are some things we cannot change, in 1 generation or 10, and I hope, we shall have the serenity and the intelligence to accept that fact.

There are some things we can change though, and I also hope we have the courage to recognize and change them.

As freeborn Americans we do not have to continue in office an administration which has brought us to this disastrous pass. We have learned the hard way that in foreign affairs this administration has been soft-

headed, opportunistic, purblind, and unrealistic. In domestic affairs, it has been extravagant, capricious, and corrupt. We do have the ballot box where we can correct these things. Let us have the courage and sustained conviction to use it.

I am not saying to you that the Republicans, if in power, will correct these things in a week or a year. I am saying that this administration has stayed in power too long; that, as one of the Washington newspapers recently put it, it can no longer distinguish between the fruity, ripe aroma of hung pheasant and something that just plain stinks.

We are today saddled with the highest budget, the largest debt, the most far-flung commitments, and one of the most extravagant and corrupt governments in the history of our country. Stalin himself couldn't have planned it better. And American voters are the only ones who can do anything about it.

Very sincerely yours,

HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Representative, Forty-first Congressional District.

Use of Chinese Nationalist Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Question of Calculated Risk," regarding the proposal to use Chinese Nationalist troops, which appeared in the Washington Star yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTION OF CALCULATED RISK—ADMINISTRATION MUST SOON FACE SQUARELY ISSUE RAISED BY MACARTHUR ON CHIANG TROOP USE

(By Constantine Brown)

The question the administration may have to face squarely in the near future is whether to take a calculated risk and give the Chinese Nationalists the green light to land in southern China, as General MacArthur has recommended, or follow the British-Indian line and accept a peace with the Chinese Communists in Korea on their own terms.

General MacArthur's statement last week is reliably reported to have been preceded by a realistic summation of the situation, as follows:

1. Because of our commitments in Europe there is no likelihood of the United States sending any further reinforcements.

2. The other members of the United Nations which have forces in Korea cannot increase them. Neither Britain nor France can add a single platoon to the forces available there. France has her hands full in Indochina, while Britain has engaged everything at her disposal for the Far East in Malaya and Hong Kong.

3. For reasons known best to the administration in Washington no support has been given to the South Korean Government to increase its fighting power. Some 250,000 South Koreans are available. These men, who could have been trained for combat, did not receive the needed weapons for training or fighting, despite President Syngman Rhee's repeated pleas to Washington.

Dr. Rhee had to draw on his meager dollar reserves to engage American Reserve officers to train his young men and also to purchase some equipment. Recently more than 100,000 men in training camps had to be released because of lack of food and clothing.

When queried about the correctness of this report, which was published in American newspapers, General MacArthur stated that this was a matter between the American and Korean Governments and outside the scope of his authority. Thus, the United Nations forces are being deprived of between 150,000 and 200,000 reinforcements, which could have been drawn from South Korean manpower, because "something had gone wrong in Washington."

4. The Chinese Communists are building up their striking power for an early spring offensive. Their ground forces are estimated by Allied intelligence at between 400,000 and 500,000 men in North Korea. A force of undetermined strength is being gathered on the eastern and western North Korean boundaries.

There are good reasons for believing that for the first time since the outbreak of hostilities the enemy will be provided with an adequate air force and possibly will be supported by volunteer submarines.

Thus, on the Allied side we are confronted with a situation in which we cannot possibly hope for any additional ground forces. These are a top priority in the present war in Asia, since the high command is not allowed to use its air power strategically.

The enemy, relying on his masses of ground forces and reassured that his sanctuaries across the Yalu River will not be molested by UN aviation, can look to the future with confidence.

Under these conditions General MacArthur once more has made a final plea to his superiors in Washington to permit the Chinese Nationalists to enter the war. The opposition to use of these forces came last summer from the State Department where it was believed that so long as the Nationalists did not intervene the Communists would remain outside the conflict.

The diplomats were wrong, principally because the Indian ambassador at Peiping, who was our listening post, had drawn the wrong conclusions from his conversations with the Communist leaders. But it would be useless now to try to place the blame on anybody for such a plausible error. The important thing now is to prevent a defeat or stalemate, which might be tantamount to defeat.

The Nationalist Government in Formosa is a charter member of the United Nations. Its representative in that organization is a permanent member of the Security Council. The fact that some governments, such as those of Britain and India, have withdrawn their recognition from the Nationalists and extended it to the Communists does not change in any way the situation of Nationalist China in the UN. Hence, legalistically and realistically the Nationalists are entitled to every assistance for opening a second front in guerrilla-ridden Southern China.

The Final Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the firing of MacArthur is another and perhaps the final step of appeasement by Truman and Acheson and ranks in the American hall of shame with the sell-outs at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran.

When generals who are military pygmies compared to MacArthur prepared the order relieving him of command, they told every American fighting man that courage, skill, intellectual honesty, and a deep conviction in fundamental American principles of individual liberty and freedom, for which they are asked to die, had been relegated to the scrap heap.

When President Truman directed the removal of MacArthur, he told the world that henceforth the clique of Lattimore, Jessup, and Dean Acheson, the discredited leader whose policies brought about the Korean War and 60,000 American casualties and who is a professed supporter of a convicted traitor, will direct future military policies.

America faces its greatest crisis. It is not of a military nature. The people must now decide for all time whether they will permit a Communist-sympathizing Secretary of State to tear out the fighting heart of America and deliver it on the platter of appeasement to our enemies.

Attitude of British Labor Party Toward General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence regarding the attitude of the British Labor Government toward the muzzling or removing of General MacArthur, which appeared in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SET OF RULES SUGGESTED—BRITISH LABOR "LEFT-WINGERS" COULD BE PLACATED BY MUZZLING OR OUSTER OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

(By David Lawrence)

There's an ironical answer—although perhaps one not too palatable for Americans—with which to try to placate the "left-wing" members of the Labor government in Great Britain who seems to think General MacArthur should either be muzzled or removed from his command. It would be to formulate a new set of rules somewhat as follows:

1. No officer or enlisted man of the Armed Forces of the United States shall hereafter answer any letter from any Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, who addresses any inquiry to him.

2. If any military man happens to write a personal letter or a letter commenting on matters of public interest to some Member of Congress who makes such a letter public, believing it in the public interest to do so, the immediate expulsion of any such Member of Congress shall be ordered and a certified copy of the removal action shall be sent to the British House of Commons or to any other complaining governments in the UN.

It might, of course, encourage the British Socialists who have introduced a motion in the House of Commons calling for an expression of "no confidence" in General MacArthur to feel that the adoption of such a motion is tantamount to an order to President Truman to discipline General MacArthur and that it will establish a precedent for regulating the behavior of other American officials in the future.

Seriously, however, the episode is likely to split the British Parliament as it is bound to split the American Congress if it is pressed. The Labor government in Britain really cannot afford to make an issue of it with the American Government without at the same time creating in the United States the very kind of dissension that the British are represented as anxious to avoid with respect to European as well as far-eastern problems.

For, if the British "left-wing" move proceeds further, it is bound to have repercussions on this side in Congress. Already the United States Navy is seriously considering withdrawal from the over-all command principle with respect to the inter-allied command in the Atlantic. American Naval officers say they do not want to see any of their number subjected to the same kind of criticism that has already been directed toward General MacArthur.

The truth of the matter is that General MacArthur is just being made the scapegoat for the differences of opinion which have existed between Washington and London for several months as to what should be done in Korea. General MacArthur has publicly appealed to the United Nations for military help. He has appealed for reinforcements again and again to no avail. He has pointed out the dangers of stalemate. He has urged that he be given the right to bombard the bases from which the Chinese Communists are coming to attack his troops. He has made his recommendations through official channels and has got nowhere. It is apparent that General MacArthur is pleading on behalf of the 230,000 Americans who are stagnated in Korea and destined to fight indefinitely there without further help from the European allies.

Maybe the British criticism will unwittingly have a beneficial effect. It may compel a showdown inside the UN on Korea. For it looks as if a decided effort is being made to force the UN out of Korea through a program of abject withdrawal. Again and again these elements have called for peace negotiations, and every time the Chinese Communists have answered with arrogance and defiance, because they undoubtedly regard these constant overtures as a sign of UN weakness. But irrespective of the sacrifices that have been made, the "left wingers" in London, through professing to believe in freedom of speech, now evidently object even to the statement of the case to the people of the world as General MacArthur has tried to do. They do not want any further discussion by the man on the ground—even though he be the UN Commander in Chief—unless it fits their point of view.

President Truman has been urged here, too, by some of the anti-MacArthur group to discipline or reprimand the general. Some of the pressure is coming from the peace-at-any-price elements here. All that can be said is that if General MacArthur is disciplined, it will touch off a political controversy that will not end with the fate of the general himself but will affect American policies toward Europe in general and Britain in particular for a long time to come.

The American Government has kept silent too long as to its own viewpoint with respect to Korea. A declaration of aims and purposes in Korea might at least clear the air and let the world know that the sacrifices undertaken since last June in the name of a war against aggression have not been in vain.

St. Lawrence Waterway, Panama Sea-Level Project, and National Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, two gigantic construction projects, strenuously advocated over many years primarily on the basis of their alleged necessity to the national defense, are the St. Lawrence waterway and the so-called sea-level canal at Panama.

During the hearings on the St. Lawrence proposal before the House Committee on Public Works on April 9, 1951, former Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California, in a notable presentation definitely clarified the principal national defense issues concerning these two undertakings and revealed the major fallacies in the reasoning underlying their advocacy.

In this connection special attention is invited to a list of authoritative articles on the atomic bomb, security, and national defense in an extension of remarks of Representative CLARE W. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Operation of the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 16, page A5580—entitled "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Bibliographical List." More recent articles dealing with the same subject have been published in subsequent issues of the RECORD in extensions of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN of Iowa.

The main ideas in these articles obviously apply to the St. Lawrence waterway as well as to an Isthmian Canal, and support the opinions expressed by former Representative Bradley. His views, backed as they are, by a broad naval and civil governmental experience, merit the most careful study by every Member of Congress, especially those on the committees charged with responsibilities affecting the national security. They clearly emphasize the urgent need, long recognized by distinguished Members of Congress, for the Congress to have the benefit of technical opinions by the best qualified independent authorities whenever considering construction projects of vast magnitude.

For the complete record of former Representative Bradley's discussion, attention is invited to the forthcoming printed hearing on the St. Lawrence proposal. Meanwhile, under special leave accorded, I quote the full text of his basic statement:

STATEMENT BY CAPT. WILLIS W. BRADLEY, USN, RETIRED, BEFORE THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, my name is Willis W. Bradley. While I am appearing at the invitation of the St. Lawrence Project Conference, I do not appear as one of its officials or representatives. Rather, I put myself in the category of the average American taxpayer who views with alarm as taxes rise and the value of his dollars melts away.

To save time, I submit the following information in an effort to qualify as a witness whose ideas deserve consideration in the formulation of your views on this St. Lawrence project.

I am a captain in the Navy, retired after more than 40 years of service. However, the opinions I express here should not be taken as having any connection, either direct or implied, with the Navy Department. I am a graduate of the Naval War College and a postgraduate in naval ordnance and gunnery. For some 7 years, I was a member of the Board of Inspection and Survey of the Navy, inspecting more than a thousand ships of all types and accepting, on behalf of the Government, more than 500 ships of various categories. In the political and administrative fields, I have been Governor of Guam and a Member of this House of Representatives. While a Member of Congress, I served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and was chairman of the Subcommittee on Ship Operation, Construction, and Maritime Labor. For some years I have carried out extensive studies of the Panama Canal and have participated in the controversy over the proposed replacement of the present lock-type installation with a sea-level canal, due to alleged inability to defend present locks and dams against aerial bombing.

I trust these comments will serve as an adequate qualification.

II. GENERAL

With all due respect for the prominent gentlemen who have appeared heretofore in advocacy of this St. Lawrence waterway, I find myself in opposition to it purely on the basis of what seems to be for the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

Let me quote from the Wall Street Journal of February 26, 1951. Under the heading "Review and outlook" we read:

"One of the serious dangers to which the country's rearmament effort is being exposed is the anxiety of almost innumerable interest groups to grind their particular axes on it. This, that, and the other project and pet legislative scheme is declared, in terms of alarm, to be essential to our survival as a Nation.

"Let enough of these plots succeed and Marshal Stalin may well grin contentedly behind his pipe * * * etc."

It is easy to recognize the solemn truth of these words of the Wall Street Journal.

III. SECURITY

A major claim of the waterway proponents is that the national security will be greatly enhanced by an extension of deep-water shipbuilding and ship-repair operations to the Great Lakes. This claim seems to resolve itself into two phases: First, greater security from enemy attack; and, second, provision of needed additional shipyards.

Prior to the advent of long-range bombing the Great Lakes region was one of the most secure areas of the Nation insofar as damage from enemy action is concerned. Even now, it might be so if our prospective opponent were situated in the Southern Hemisphere or were of small potential air effectiveness. However, such conditions do not prevail and are not likely within the foreseeable future.

We have only one potential enemy sufficiently strong to worry us in the sense of national survival. That is the Soviet Union.

The Soviet is not a great sea power and there is small prospect of it becoming one, other than as this might be accomplished

through the operations of a huge submarine force. The really great strength of the Soviet Union is in its army and its air force. It must be apparent even to the novice in world strategy that any assault upon the continental United States is almost certain to be from the air. The shortest route from probable Soviet air bases is across the Arctic to the Pacific Northwest, the upper Great Lakes country, or the New England States.

I doubt if the Soviet Union now has any aircraft which can fly a worth-while bombing mission to the United States and return to base, but I haven't the least doubt they will have such craft in the near future. They can fly such a mission now on a one-way basis, deliver their bombs, and land for capture or internment as the case might be. This assertion is verified by Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, who stated in the Saturday Evening Post of February 17, 1951, that—

"The Soviet Union, for example, now has at least 450 planes that can strike our major population and industrial centers from bases in the U. S. S. R."

Thus, we find that the Great Lakes area has become one of our most exposed frontiers and any idea that the national security can be enhanced by increasing the density of shipbuilding facilities therein, at the expense of less-exposed regions, should be abandoned as without foundation in fact.

Additional shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, other conditions permitting, would best enhance the national security by being situated in the deep South, say a hundred miles up the Mississippi, up the St. John's River in Florida, and in other spots similarly located with reference to exposed frontiers.

Permit me to quote Vice Adm. Russell Willson before a Senate subcommittee holding hearings on this St. Lawrence waterway project in 1947. Admiral Willson said:

"In my opinion, the concept that this project would make a substantial contribution to national security by providing additional facilities for deep-sea vessels in a relatively secure area has been nullified by the recent and prospective developments in the field of warfare."

IV. SHIPBUILDING

At the hearing above mentioned, Admiral Willson also said:

"I see nothing in the warfare of the future to change the role which the Great Lakes shipyards played in the last war. They built 510 small vessels up to and including escort vessels and submarines. Any additional capacity could be used for similar purposes, as this was only 12½ percent of the number of these types of vessels built during the war."

And also:

"Had I the decision I would think long and hard before I counted heavily on shipbuilding facilities for deep-water vessels on the Great Lakes, when all facilities there could be used many times over for equally necessary small vessels."

The fact is that we now have many times the shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities needed in time of peace. We have so many yards that our west coast is without a single large ship under construction—that yards stand empty from Canada to the Mexican border—that others exist precariously on repair jobs and on crumbs thrown by the Government as vessels are taken out of reserve and restored to active service.

Shipbuilding has become so scarce since World War II that mechanics and other artificers employed in the trade have scattered to the winds—obliged to turn their hands to any job offering a living wage. Great yards—such as Calship at Los Angeles and Oregon Ship at Portland—yards which in their heyday delivered a Victory ship every 4 days—are dismantled as unneeded in the future.

Yards on the east coast and in the Gulf have been more fortunate than those in the West but, at times, these big establishments have been reduced to a single job in hand.

I quote from the 1950 annual report of the Shipbuilders Council of America:

"The report of activities for the past year and the outlook for the immediate future is not encouraging.

"No contracts for naval vessels were placed with private shipyards since the last annual report in 1949 and no new contracts for naval vessels are in sight.

"The present and prospective activity in the industry is not now sufficient in volume to maintain that degree of efficiency necessary to have an adequate core of shipbuilding and ship repairing know-how available to meet another emergency."

Facilities for expansion of shipbuilding on salt water coasts are tremendous as has been shown in the two World Wars.

Great Lakes shipbuilders have done excellent work in the past on vessels which can be brought to the sea through existing outlets, but, as previously stated, they produced only 12½ percent of the smaller ships constructed for the Navy during World War II. The need for these small vessels (mine sweepers, antisubmarine craft, picket and patrol boats, landing craft of various types) is likely to be just about unlimited in the event of another great war.

I should strongly recommend to the Great Lakes people that they put aside local pride and ambition and recognize that their most valuable contribution in any future war effort in this particular field is in the expeditious and economical production of ships which can utilize present outlets to the sea.

In concluding this section, I submit that, in my opinion, the argument that additional deep-water shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities in the Great Lakes would materially enhance the national security is fallacious, and that expenditures of Federal funds to bring about the establishment of such facilities in the Great Lakes would be unsound, uneconomical, and a travesty on the efforts of this Congress to hold the cost of national security to the lowest level consistent with the safety of the United States.

V. CANALS

The St. Lawrence seaway project involves an extensive use of canals for ships passing from salt water to the Great Lakes. As a general rule, both owners and masters of large ships regard canals, more especially lock canals, with distrust and dislike due to the time required for passage and the very considerable risk of damage to the ships, the locks, or both. In view of this, canals for large vessels cannot expect to be successful financially unless they serve as an indispensable link or are great time savers, for there is no place in industry where the adage "time is money" is more applicable than in shipping.

As a partial consequence of the above, estimates of probable overseas world trade which would move through the waterway are quite likely to be exaggerated, and the adverse sentiments expressed by American steamship men in letters inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1947, by Senator Overton, are likely to be more nearly accurate than the estimates of proponents of the project. Even the most discerning man cannot say just what trade will or will not utilize the waterway. It is not as simple as that. One can only surmise from a general knowledge of ships and seamen, of probable profits, of risks and delays involved.

Canals are alike in many ways, and one such is their actual cost as compared to preconstruction estimates. Each time the estimators are sure they are right. Each time they turn out to be wrong. This is just a human failing because even the best engineers are not omniscient and so are not able to foresee costs for years ahead. Also they can't foretell what legislators and politicians may do in the construction period.

Take these few figures from the Minority Report by Senator LODGE in 1948 (80th Cong., Rept. No. 810, pt. 2):

	Estimates	Actual costs
Welland Canal	$40,000,000	$120,000,000
Chicago drainage canal	16,000,000	53,000,000
New York State barge canal	62,000,000	175,000,000

Completed costs for these canals averaged 197.5 percent above the estimates.

Of course, a considerable part of the St. Lawrence costs will be for dam construction. So let us take Senator LODGE's figures on dams:

	Estimates	Actual costs
Bonneville	$42,000,000	$80,000,000
Coulee	113,000,000	189,000,000
Hoover	70,000,000	116,000,000

Completed costs for these dams averaged 57.7 percent above the estimates.

When one carefully considers these statistics he is quite likely to arrive at the conclusion that the St. Lawrence waterway project will cost at least 100 percent more than current estimates. This is not said in a critical mood but rather in the spirit that we may better face the music now than in 1953 or in 1955 when we have gone too far to reconsider. We have excellent engineers and estimators but, with minor errors for round numbers, human limitations seem to be expressed in the cold figures given above and I hold that the evidence is quite conclusive.

Here let me quote Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, before a Senate subcommittee on June 13, 1947:

"With regard to your query as to what the actual cost of construction would be should the project be built within 7 years, it is difficult to form an opinion. I believe we are now in the peak period of postwar construction cost levels. However, conjecture is dangerous and I cannot make a forecast."

In view of the increase in costs during the last year or so, what a wise man General Wheeler was when he made that statement.

The estimates presented by General Pick in his recent statement before this subcommittee covers 6 years instead of 7. The estimated costs for the United States are $566,794,000. In the light of the above figures, it would appear that we can arrive at only a well-calculated guess of what the actual costs would be.

VI. LOCKS

The basic purpose of a navigation lock is to transfer a ship from one water level to another.

The avowed purpose of the St. Lawrence locks is to open the Great Lakes to deep-water shipping.

The alleged reason why this great project should be undertaken now, in a time of deficit governmental finance, is the enhancement of our national security through the assurance of a flow of Labrador ore sufficient to maintain an adequate supply of high-grade iron ore for Great Lake furnaces.

Our problem then is:

Are Americans justified in placing major dependence for an adequate steel supply in time of war on a flow of iron ore which must pass through 16 widely scattered locks situated in territory decidedly vulnerable to enemy air attack?

The answer to that question should, in my opinion, be a major factor in the consideration of this proposed legislation.

Current proposals for the St. Lawrence waterway envisage three sections with locks for navigational purposes. These are: Welland Canal, length 27.6 miles with eight locks having a normal lift of 327 feet; International Rapids Section, length 46 miles with three locks having a normal lift of 84 feet; Canadian Section, length 68 miles with five locks having a normal lift of 183 feet.

In all, 16 locks having a normal lift of 54[illegible] feet.

The standard lock dimensions are to be in accord with those of existing Welland Canal locks, that is, 800 feet by 80 feet by 30 feet.

VII. PANAMA CANAL

A comprehensive study of canal vulnerability to enemy attack has been made recently covering the Panama Canal. We should be able to draw conclusions, both valuable and pertinent, from that study.

In Public Law 280, the Seventy-ninth Congress authorized the Governor of the Panama Canal to investigate the means of increasing the capacity and the security of the Canal to meet future needs both as to interoceanic commerce and as to the betterment of the national defense.

The Governor, in making his investigations, had the services of a board of consulting engineers employed under his authority. These engineers reviewed the studies made by him and concurred with his report which was transmitted to the Eightieth Congress on December 1, 1947.

In his report, the Governor recommended what amounts to a new Panama canal at sea level at an initially estimated cost of $2,483,000,000, and an estimated time of completion of 10 years.

The Governor's report is long and complicated but its main features have been summarized in the Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers, 1949, volume 114, by Col. James H. Stratton, United States Army, who was the supervising engineer in the preparation of the report.

Colonel Stratton writes:

"Although no one can say what course World War II would have taken had the Japanese followed up Pearl Harbor (Hawaii) with an attack on the Panama Canal, it is now clear that the locks could have been destroyed and the canal emptied into the sea had an attack been made and the defenses penetrated. The development of larger bombs and new weapons of both conventional and atomic types since Pearl Harbor leaves no doubt as to the vulnerability of the canal to enemy attack and sabotage."

And further—

"It can be stated, however, that the lock canal cannot be made resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons. At best the protection that could be provided a lock canal would only increase the difficulties rendering it useless. * * * The lock type of canal, no matter how strongly constructed, would not increase security to meet the needs of national defense."

Although I have been a consistent opponent of the sea-level project, as recommended by the Governor of the Panama Canal, my opposition has not been on the ground that the locks or other structures in the present canal can be made impregnable to severe damage by bombing or sabotage. Rather, it has been because of my belief that the alleged advantage in security of any practicable sea-level canal over the present lock-lake type, when reasonably protected and prepared to withstand attack, has not been sufficiently established to justify the vast expenditure required to change over to the sea-level type. It is my opinion that the sea-level canal, as recommended by the governor, would cost the American people in excess of $8,000,000,000 by the time of its completion and I have not, so far, been able to see that the additional security afforded by the change would be worth that price.

However, I find myself in agreement with Colonel Stratton, when he writes:

"The penetration of canal defenses by rockets, guided missiles, or robot planes loaded with powerful conventional or atomic explosives launched from the air, from ship or submarine at sea, or from a land base, must be accepted as a possibility."

I am, therefore, of the opinion that we must accept Colonel Stratton's statement—"It can be said, however, that the lock canal cannnot be made resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons—as a reasonable premise, in fact, as a declaration of the very best technical knowledge available along these lines at the present time."

VIII. ST. LAWRENCE RELIABILITY

As the alleged reason for undertaking this project now is to assure Great Lakes furnaces of an adequate flow of high-grade iron ore in event of hostilities, and as it is maintained that a considerable part of this ore must come from Labrador via the proposed waterway, then real lack of security of locks, dams, or other vital waterway structures, will destroy the reasonable assurance of that Labrador ore supply and thus eliminate the basic reason for enactment of this legislation.

Just how reliable will the St. Lawrence waterway be in event of war with the Soviet Union?

Consider here a few extracts from General Vandenberg's article in the Saturday Evening Post:

"The American people must realize it is impossible to amass or invent an absolute, impregnable defense against bombing attacks by a strong, determined enemy.

"Should war come, we can expect to destroy not more than 30 percent of the planes making an attack in strength on the United States before their bombing missions are accomplished.

"Even if we had many more interceptor planes and antiaircraft guns and a radar screen that blanketed all approaches to our boundaries, a predictable 70 percent of the enemy's planes would penetrate our defenses despite the extraordinary valor and skill of our pilots.

"The bleak and blunt evidence of the last war proved conclusively that no bombing attack mounted in sufficient strength by the Americans, British, or Germans ever was turned back by the most strenuous defensive action. The offensive always has a crushing advantage in aerial warfare, and there is no prospect that the balance will change in the foreseeable future."

And now for a few expressions of opinion by Maj. Gen. Follette Bradley, United States Army, retired, before the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on this same subject in 1947:

"The St. Lawrence seaway and power project now lies in the most exposed and vulnerable part of continental United States except Alaska.

"The real question is: Can the project with its 40 locks, more or less, and its proposed dams and powerhouses be defended against enemy air attacks? I answer categorically, 'No'."

Just recall, please, pertinent extracts from the Governor's report:

"It can be stated, however, that the lock canal cannot be made resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons.

"The lock type of canal, no matter how strongly constructed, would not increase security to meet the needs of national defense."

There we have the cold, hard facts from men who are trained at public expense to know what destructive forces locks and dams may be expected to resist. And these gentlemen say "the lock canal cannot be made resistant to atomic bombs or modern conventional weapons."

Is it possible to present more blasting and conclusive evidence that the proposed waterway cannot be made a secure link in the system of national defense?

Thus, I believe we have arrived at answers to the several questions previously propounded.

Question. Can enemy attack inflict sufficient damage of the proposed waterway to stop the flow of iron ore from Labrador for an extended time?

Answer. Assuming the enemy to be of the strength and location of the Soviet Union—most decidedly, yes.

Question. Just how reliable will the proposed St. Lawrence waterway be in the event of war with the Soviet Union.

Answer. Thoroughly unreliable.

Question. Are Americans justified in placing major dependence for an adequate steel supply in time of war on a flow of iron ore which must pass through 16 widely-scattered locks situated in territory decidedly vulnerable to enemy air attack?

Answer. Emphatically, no.

We arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that the American people should reject as detrimental to the public safety the claim that the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway project would greatly enhance the national security by providing an adequate and dependable flow of high-grade iron ore from Labrador sources.

IX. PROBABLE OVERSEAS-GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

Proponents' claim is that the provision of a 27-foot waterway into the Great Lakes would result in the establishment of a considerable overseas Great Lakes shipping. This claim deserves careful consideration.

At present there is a 14-foot channel into the Great Lakes. As far as I know, not one single American-flag ship is utilizing that channel in regular trade, and there is no change in prospect.

I quote from the statement of Mr. Harry C. Brockel, director, Port of Milwaukee Commission, before this subcommittee, in 1950:

"This trade went into eclipse for several decades, but was briskly revived after World War I, when European shipowners sought new trade routes. The St. Lawrence gateway, neglected by American shipping interests, was recognized as a new shipping artery by European shipowners. British and Scandinavian tramp vessels able to carry about 1,500 tons of cargo on the 14-foot draft of the St. Lawrence canals were chartered to haul bulk cargo between European ports and the Great Lakes."

The uninformed, reading this statement, would conclude that our American shipowners just neglected their opportunities—their responsibilities to the American people—and so let this trade go by default to the foreigners. I doubt if Mr. Brockel had any intention of conveying this impression but, to me, it seems to do so, and I want to go on record as of the belief that such an idea is entirely erroneous. American shipowners just couldn't make a success of that shipping. Their expenses for ship construction and operation were so high that the business went to foreigners whose ships and labor cost less than similar items under the American flag.

In my dealings with American ship owners and operators, I have found them to be rather keen businessmen, fully alive to their responsibilities to the public, both as individuals and as a Nation, but, nevertheless,

obliged to meet their payrolls, expenses, and taxes.

According to figures just furnished to me by the National Federation of American Shipping, only 115 American-flag vessels out of our 1,177 privately owned ships, as of January 1, 1951, draw 25 feet or less at full load. Only 94 such vessels draw 24 feet or less at full load.

A 27-foot channel would be usable, then, for only about 9.7 percent of these ships even if one were willing to take the considerable risk of having only a trifle more than 1 foot of fresh water under the keel of ships drawing 25 feet in salt water. Only 8 percent would come within the more reasonable category of drawing 24 feet or less.

I realize that ships do not always sail at full load, and I have read Admiral Cochrane's statement and statistics covering possible utilization of the waterway by partially-loaded American-flag ships which could, in many instances, load to full displacement after reaching deep water. I believe this statement may lead one to be overoptimistic. I think it tends to make the listener accept the possible traffic as a somewhat sure-fire indicator of probable traffic, whereas I am of the opinion that the normal need of topping off in cargo, fuel, and supplies, will score heavily against any extensive use of the proposed waterway under these conditions.

A knowledge of the history of the American merchant marine leads me to believe that such shipping as would use the 27-foot channel into the Great Lakes for regular service would be almost 100-percent foreign flag. With current costs of American-built ships and American labor, I do not see how it could be profitable for our ships to compete in this foreign trade. Neither can I see shipping of any volume between Great Lakes ports and ocean ports of the United States, as the length of the voyage, terminal charges, stevedoring, and so forth, would likely make such a service unprofitable.

For years I have fought steadily to keep American-flag merchant vessels on the seas and to prevent our seamen and engineers from being displaced by foreigners working for wages entirely too low for a decent standard of American living.

I have made this fight with full appreciation of the fact that foreign-flag vessels can carry the goods cheaper than Americans, and just as efficiently, and that transportation might be somewhat less expensive if foreigners were allowed a clear field in the water-borne trade. But America has not reached its present position of the world's greatest nation by utilizing the cheapest of everything as we go along. We protect our farmers, our manufacturers, and many of our basic industries. We permit and encourage labor unions so the working man may receive a fair return for his toil. We do not allow the foreigner to engage in coastwise commerce and we have extended this rule to include Puerto Rico, Alaska, and the Hawaiian Islands. We encourage and protect essential trade-route ocean shipping by means of subsidies. We do these things because we have learned by experience that the best interests of all of us are served thereby.

Over the years we have built up a huge transportation system to care for the Great Lakes region. That system includes immense facilities in the way of ships, railroads, terminal set-ups, canals, and a thousand and one other things. It is operating satisfactorily, generally speaking, with American labor, American capital, and American equipment. It may not operate as cheaply as could be expected if foreigners took over. It may not be quite as economical to some of the particular interests in the Great Lakes region and contiguous States as a foreign set-up would be. But, when one thinks of the Nation as a whole, of the average taxpayer from Maine to California, it is my opinion that the present arrangement is more economical than one which would result from the enactment of this legislation, and that it should not be scrapped either for the benefit of the relatively few Americans who would profit therefrom or of the foreign shipping which might prosper by taking over in this internal economy of the United States.

X. SUMMARY

I submit, Mr. Chairman, as a summary of my statement, these conclusions:

(a) The Great Lakes area has become one of our frontiers most exposed to enemy attack.

(b) Additional Great Lakes shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities for large deep-water ships are unnecessary either in peace or war.

(c) War shipbuilding in the Great Lakes should be restricted to local needs and to such other vessels as can reach the sea through current outlets.

(d) The argument that deep-water shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities in the Great Lakes would materially enhance the national security is fallacious.

(e) Previous experiences indicate that the actual cost of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway may well exceed current estimates by 100 percent.

(f) An impregnable defense against determined air attack has not so far been achieved and there is nothing to indicate that it will be achieved.

(g) A lock canal cannot be made "resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons."

(h) Enemy attack can, and likely would, seriously damage the proposed waterway and thus block ship transits for an undetermined time.

(i) America is not justified in placing dependence for a reliable ore supply in time of war on the proposed waterway.

(j) Such overseas trade as might develop through a 27-foot channel would likely be 100 percent in foreign bottoms.

(k) The present set-up for Great Lakes region transportation is more economical to the average taxpayer of the Nation than would be the case if this proposed legislation were enacted.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that this proposal for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway should not be enacted.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I view with alarm the increasing power being assumed by the President over the military affairs of our Nation as shown in the summary dismissal of our outstanding military-government leader in Korea, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

It is in the same category with Truman's vicious letters to some other people who have been brave enough to face his personal wrath by giving honest constructive criticism of our Executive.

It is my humble opinion that this Nation does not have any other person who is so well versed in the physical, economic, and financial situation among the peoples of the Far East, and the loss of General MacArthur from our staff will greatly weaken our position among the members of the United Nations.

This action on the part of our Chief Executive in his role as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces is a stunning blow to my optimism which I have felt about the Korean situation during the past few weeks.

Questionnaire on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN REGAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from a brief trip, during our Easter recess, to my congressional district of west Texas, which includes the city of El Paso.

Many fine, patriotic Americans of pioneer stock make their homes in El Paso and throughout my area and they are gravely concerned with the course of events in our country; the many real and nonessential services dispensed by our Government; the aid being given to European countries and peoples; our many costly bureaus and the huge number of governmental employees, now exceeding 2,000,000 persons; our huge national debt and our constantly increasing tax burden.

Recently, one of our businessmen, Norman L. Casner, Jr., president of the Casner Motor Co., of El Paso, became so concerned that he sought the views of the citizens of that area through publishing a comprehensive questionnaire in the daily newspapers, the space for which he paid regular advertising rates.

It is my opinion that the membership will be interested in the views as expressed in the preliminary returns as they bear on matters now before Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that they be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today at the close of these remarks:

CASNER MOTOR CO., INC.,
El Paso, Tex., March 26, 1951.

To the United States Congressional Delegation of Texas, Washington, D. C.:

GENTLEMEN: We have in our files over 3,000 signed ballots concerning the matters listed below. For your information and guidance we respectfully submit the tabulated results of these ballots:

1. Are you for or against our representatives taking action right now, to eliminate the waste, the unnecessary jobs, inefficiency, and extravagance within each major department of our Government?

A. For, 2,970—99 percent.

B. Against, 20—six-tenths of 1 percent.

C. No opinion, 11—four-tenths of 1 percent.

2. Do you think our Government should stop giving and lending money and materials, other than military material, to foreign countries, until we can do so with a reasonable tax load, and a diminishing national debt?
A. Yes, 2,799—93.1 percent.
B. No, 158—5.1 percent.
C. No opinion, 55—1.8 percent.

3. Do you think our representatives should take action to correct legislation that requires our Government to buy farm products and other commodities in huge, unusable and unsalable quantities, with taxpayers' money?
A. Yes, 2,906—96.9 percent.
B. No, 58—1.9 percent.
C. No opinion, 37—1.2 percent.

4. Are you for or against admitting Red China into the United Nations?
A. For, 162—5.4 percent.
B. Against, 2,722—90.7 percent.
C. No opinion, 117—3.9 percent.

5. Are you for or against legislation that will prevent the President from ever again committing our Nation to undeclared war, or to any other unusual foreign duty, without consent of Congress or congressional committee?
A. For, 2,513, 83.8 percent.
B. Against, 361, 12 percent.
C. No opinion, 127, 4.2 percent.

6. Do you think the UN should impose an embargo and blockade against the Chinese mainland, and encourage Chiang Kai-shek with moral and material support against the communists?
A. Yes, 2,755—97.9 percent.
B. No, 61—2.7 percent.
C. No opinion, 165—5.5 percent.

7. Do you think our State Department needs a "good overhauling" beginning at the top?
A. Yes, 2,797—93.2 percent.
B. No, 64—2.1 percent.
C. No opinion, 140—4.7 percent.

8. Are you for or against legislation to stop all trade, direct or indirect, with Russia, and forbid entry of people, ships, and goods from Communist dominated countries, into this country?
A. For, 2,764—92.1 percent.
B. Against, 110—3.7 percent.
C. No opinion, 127—4.2 percent.

9. Are you for or against an immediate and all inclusive clean-out of Communists and "Fellow Travelers", from every department of the Government, and air-tight steps taken to keep them out?
A. For, 3,042—98.9 percent.
B. Against, 25—eight-tenths of 1 percent.
C. No opinion, 34—1.1 percent.

10. Are you for or against sending a large standing army to Europe?
A. For, 810—27 percent.
B. Against, 1,623—54.4 percent.
C. No opinion, 556—18.6 percent.

We will be very glad to forward these ballots to any responsible party requesting them. Otherwise, we shall retain them in our file for a reasonable length of time before disposing of them.

Very respectfully yours,

NORMAN L. CARNER,
President.

DOUGLAS, DOUGLAS, OLIVER & HUGHES,
El Paso, Tex., March 28, 1951.

Mr. N. L. CARNER,
Carner Motor Co., Inc.,
El Paso, Tex.

DEAR MR. CARNER: We have counted the ballots submitted to us as at March 27, 1951, and we hereby certify that there were 3,001 ballots.

DOUGLAS, DOUGLAS, OLIVER & HUGHES,
By R. A. DOUGLAS.

The Price of Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have, written by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, regarding the price of lead.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 6, 1951.

Mr. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I noticed in the Wall Street Journal of last Wednesday that the British Ministry of Supply has raised the price of lead to 20 cents a pound and the price of zinc to 20 cents per pound, an increase of 3 cents. The British Ministry of Supply does all the buying and selling of metals in Great Britain. Our ceiling price is 17½ cents, East St. Louis, for zinc, and, in lead, I find there is a two-price ceiling recognized, that is, 17 cents per pound, New York, for lead mined in my own State of New Mexico, and 18½ cents, New York, for lead mined in Mexico, Peru, Canada, and elsewhere and imported into the United States. So far as I can ascertain this discriminatory two-price system in lead has not been duplicated in other commodities. I understand that the volume of foreign lead being sold at the 18½ cent level is roughly the same as the volume of domestic lead sold at the 17-cent level. It seems to me manifestly unfair to all the lead miners in the United States for them not to be able to receive the same price for their product as manufacturers are willing and permitted to pay for lead of foreign origin.

If a two-price ceiling is to be permitted for lead there should logically be two prices for storage batteries, white lead paint, Ethyl gasoline, plumbing goods, and other articles made from lead. I am wondering how the Office of Price Stabilization proposes to facilitate the flow of such lead ores and pig lead from foreign countries, which we need to supplement our domestic supply, when the ceiling prices here are now at least 3 cents below the market in England. Obviously, England and European countries will be able to outbid us and draw any Mexican, Canadian, and other lead they might need at the 20 cent price. Inasmuch as the tremendous volume of lead now consumed in the United States, about 1,250,000 tons per year, requires the importation of a certain amount of foreign lead, our domestic civilian and defense production will suffer unless the Government agencies quickly make up their minds as to how they are going to reconcile a low domestic price for lead with a higher foreign price, either through Government purchases at a high price and disposal here at the ceiling price, or raising the domestic price to the world level. During the last war premiums were paid to stimulate domestic production. In view of the high world price of lead today premiums should not be necessary if the miners get the benefit of the world market, or its equivalent.

I know from my own experience that the prospectors and miners in my own State of New Mexico generally do not know very much about the world picture in the metal markets. They merely read the metal quotations in their local papers and, unfortunately, the only price quoted nowadays is the ceiling price of 17 cents. I doubt if very many of them know that the world market is now far above this quotation. They get very little satisfaction out of technical discussions of world trade and a world fight against inflation. They have payrolls to meet and money is what they need to meet them.

I take it that Great Britain is just as much concerned with inflation as we are. If that nation is apparently prepared to pay 20 cents per pound for its lead, I should think we could do likewise. What answer can I give to lead producers in New Mexico?

In any event, the two-price ceiling for lead is inexcusable and should be abandoned speedily.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

Proposed Amendment of Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding hearings by the Committee on Banking and Currency on the proposed amendments to the Defense Production Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARINGS ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

In view of the statement made this afternoon by the majority leader, Senator MCFARLAND, urging Mr. Charles E. Wilson and the heads of the defense mobilization agencies to speed up their work on recommended amendments to the Defense Production Act, I am glad to make known the decisions of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which met early this afternoon.

The committee will begin consideration of an extension of the Defense Production Act and any amendments to the act on Tuesday, May 1, and will continue through Friday, May 25. The committee will meet daily, Monday through Friday.

In view of the fact that several titles of the Defense Production Act and the Rent Control Act expire on June 30, it will be necessary for the committee to complete its hearings not later than May 25 in order to have the bill before the Senate in June.

Realizing the tremendous interest in this legislation, the committee has further instructed me, as chairman, to limit oral testimony during these hearings to representatives of major national organizations who will be able to represent the various segments of the national economy. I want to make it plain that, while we will not be able during the remaining time to hear each individual, the committee will welcome any written statement which may be filed for the benefit of the members during their consideration of this legislation.

The committee had previously agreed that any extension of Federal rent control would be considered in conjunction with the hearings on that portion of the Defense Production Act relating to authority for general economic controls.

The committee also agreed that any request to testify during these hearings must be filed not later than Wednesday, April 25, in order that the committee may determine the order of appearance for the witnesses who will open the hearings the following week.

Easing German Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Easing German Controls," which appeared in the Washington Star on yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASING GERMAN CONTROLS

The common defense of the Atlantic community has been additionally strengthened by the latest Anglo-French-American relaxation of controls on West Germany's industrial production. The Ruhr—"the workshop of Europe"—will now be rid of many former restraints, and its stepped-up output, in addition to promoting the country's internal economic health, cannot fail to contribute significantly to the free world's effort to counter the threat of Red aggression.

As agreed upon by the three-power Allied High Commission, the relaxation covers a wide and varied field of productive enterprise. Among other things, it removes all limitations on the size and speed of the merchant ships that the Germans are capable of building, and it permits them to resume the manufacture of synthetic oil and rubber. Further, it authorizes them to make ball bearings, primary aluminum, electronic tubes of different kinds, certain types of machine tools and similar items heretofore prohibited or rigidly restricted. Finally, it provides that the present ceiling on their steel output (11,000,000 tons yearly) may be lifted to help build the defenses of Western Europe.

The only thing still subject to strict limitations and outright prohibitions is West German production of a military nature. A special three-power Allied law continues to apply against atomic activity, and other controls remain in force against the manufacture of aircraft, certain electronic equipment and weapons in general. It is noteworthy, however, that the new Anglo-French-American agreement makes allowance for the possibility of granting licenses to companies in the Ruhr and elsewhere to turn out armaments or related items when, as and if such output is found to be desirable or necessary to bulwark the security of the Atlantic community as a whole.

All this is a far cry from the time when some people saw wisdom in the so-called Morgenthau plan. That political and economic absurdity would have done violence to all the laws of nature with a program designed to reduce the Germans to a completely deindustrialized nation of farmers. But the character of Soviet policy, if not simple sanity, soon demonstrated how such "pastoralization" could have ended only in a Western catastrophe. Our Allied relaxation of controls represents a common-sense recognition of the fact that Germany's productive capacity is of prime importance to the defense of freedom.

Posthumous Decoration of Corp. Bobby Smith, of Anderson, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial which appeared in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent on April 5, 1951. It is an open letter to the United Nations concerning the presentation posthumously of the Distinguished Service Cross to Corp. Bobby Smith, of Anderson, S. C., who gave his life in Korea. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONCERNING THE LATE CORP. BOBBY SMITH

UNITED NATIONS,
Lake Success, N. Y.

DEAR SIRS: We have just learned that the United States Army's General Hodge is coming to Anderson April 12 to present the Distinguished Service Cross to Corp. Bobby Smith, of Anderson.

Corporal Smith will not be here to receive the medal. Corporal Smith is dead.

The medal will be awarded, as they say, posthumously. It will be given to Bobby's parents, who live at No. 5, Bailey Street, in the pleasant Equinox community.

The medal is in recognition of Corporal Smith's devotion to duty, and to his willingness to sacrifice above and beyond the call of duty.

He is one of many heroes, living and dead, whose courage nourished on the good South Carolina air hereabouts and whose love of country springs from a long line of patriots who have fought in all our wars, from the Revolution forward.

Corporal Smith is not the first Anderson County boy to breathe his last in Korea, nor will he be the last.

All of us realize that men are going to be killed when there is war and the families of those who are on the battle lines steel themselves daily against bad news, the meanwhile praying that the fateful telegrams will not come.

Many such telegrams came to Anderson during the last war, gentlemen. Too many have come this time.

It is bad enough when the aims of the war are clear. It is much worse when those aims are confused, faltering, and uncertain as they are today.

We would like to think that when Corporal Smith fell he was convinced that he was dying for his country, and that his sacrifice would contribute in some effective way to eventual peace on earth.

It is fitting and proper that a high general should come to our city bearing a medal for Corp. Bobby Smith, thus assuring that this soldier will be remembered always in the hearts of his countrymen.

But, gentlemen—

The list of Bobby Smiths is growing every hour while you so-called diplomats chatter away inanely, sidestepping the cold facts, dodging the issues, and generally putting on as cowardly a display as has ever disgraced the pages of human history.

You sit there in the security of lushly furnished meeting rooms fearing to show leadership, backing away from challenging all-out the aggression which brought Bobby Smith and others like him to their untimely graves.

You backbite General MacArthur and others who are trying to bring the killing to an end. You want to gag those who would tell the truth about Korea.

It is understandable that you would gag MacArthur. Every time he opens his mouth and says anything about ending the Korean War he puts the UN on the spot.

Every day you procrastinate you are building higher the fire of demand that MacArthur be brought home and allowed to tell the people the truth.

People want to know why the war is being dragged out, they want to know why the killing continues, and the demand will mount in coming days when and if the Chinese Reds launch their threatened offensive which may result in the greatest blood-letting of the war thus far.

People want to hear from the White House, too. It's time for the American voice in UN to be heard a lot louder than ever before. There has been too much pussyfooting, too much fear of stepping on toes, too much regard for the next election and not enough for the lives of American men.

The life of one "Bobby" Smith is too high a price to pay to keep your shabbily operating organization alive if you can offer no more than you have to date.

There was a day, gentlemen, when the UN was looked upon as the hope of the world. You have succeeded only in killing thousands of American "Bobby" Smiths, and you can't or won't say why.

Ours is the voice of one newspaper in what you striped-pants boys sarcastically refer to as the hinterland, but we've got millions of cousins throughout the land who are in chorus with us.

Pay heed, gentlemen, lest that chorus mount in volume until it blows down the hypocritical house of straw in which you cower, paralyzed by fear, and shamed by the deeds of valor of Cpl. "Bobby" Smith and his comrades in arms.

THE INDEPENDENT.

An Undemocratic Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following news story carried by newspapers in the Forty-first Congressional District, New York, bearing on the President's recent executive order exempting college students with certain scholastic

ratings from the draft. The news story, datelined Batavia, N. Y., April 8, follows:

President Truman's recent Executive order exempting college students with C ratings from the draft was attacked here today by former Senator James W. Wadsworth, who said he was "aghast" at its implications. Speaking over station WBTA as a guest on Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG's weekly radio program, the former Representative from the Forty-first District expressed the hope that widespread opposition to this order would be registered throughout the country, and that it would be heard.

The President's order says, in effect, according to Senator Wadsworth, "that if you attain a rating of 70 percent you need not serve your country, but if you obtain a rating of only 69 percent, you must go into the foxholes."

"I don't like it," he said. "I don't believe the Armed Forces should be made up of men who don't stand high in school. They should be made up of men of every conceivable rating in school."

Senator Wadsworth said he favored deferment of certain students who are being trained in science, engineering, electronics, etc., but objected to the blanket use of a "C" rating for deferments.

Congressman OSTERTAG, concurring in these views, commented that the deferment of draftees on the basis of brains rather than character or military requirements is both unsound and undemocratic.

Concentration of Power in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, last week end I returned to Kansas for a few days. While in Topeka I visited with a former colleague and distinguished Member of this body, Senator Arthur Capper, who retains his interest in public affairs, as is evidenced by his broadcast of April 8, 1951, from Station WIBW, Topeka, Kans.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Capper's broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because the former Senator gives a timely warning on what is going on in the grab for power within our Government.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPPER SAYS—INCREASINGLY DISTURBED BY GRAB FOR POWER WITHIN GOVERNMENT

A post card from a Mr. J. K. Leiser of Hartford, Kans., indicates that I did not cover quite enough territory a few Sundays ago when I discussed socialism and communism, and attempted to define the same. That was in answer to a letter from Mrs. M. F. Davis, of Neodesha, Kans.

Mr. Leiser wants me to define also fascism, and express my opinion on fascism.

Well, the best definition, and most easily understood, is that fascism is socialism effected through the corporation.

That is, fascism is that form of socialism—abolition of private property—in which the Socialist state is operated through corporations, either government owned or government controlled.

Most recent example, of course, was furnished by Mussolini's so-called corporate state.

As I believe I pointed out 2 weeks ago, communism and socialism hold this in common, by definition:

Communism: The opposite of the system of private property.

Socialism: A state or system in which there is no private property.

To which I now add—

Fascism: Socialism (or the Socialist state) accomplished and operated through the corporation.

You will notice that what we call Russian communism in reality is state socialism. That Soviet Russia takes this same view is evidenced by the official name, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

You may remember also that the word Nazi in common usage a few years ago, is an abbreviation of national (or state) socialism.

All four isms—communism, socialism, nazism, and fascism—are forms of the same concept of government and the relationship between government and the individual.

What we now see in Britain is the spectacle of state socialism masquerading as a labor government.

When the United States withdraws—perhaps I should say if and when the United States withdraws—its financial and other forms of economic support from the British Labor government, the odds strongly are that Britain will have to become openly a Socialist state.

Whether you boldly call the onion an onion, or try to kid yourself and others by calling the onion a rose, you still get the smell of the onion instead of the scent of the rose.

Returning from the realm of poesy to the starkness of fact.

In the Socialist state—whether you call it by that title, or call it the Communist state, the Fascist state, the garrison state, or the police state—the outstanding feature of that state is that the government is everything, all-powerful; the individual is nothing, powerless.

As one Frank Chordorov, a classic economist who also is able to write, put it in one of his articles in Human Events weekly pamphlet recently:

"Any course that tends to increase the power of government must deplete the power of the individual."

I say to you, and I should ponder that statement well, my friends, and very seriously and thoughtfully—

"Any course that tends to increase the power of government must deplete the power of the individual."

That is why some of us, for some time, have become increasingly disturbed by what might be termed the "grab for power" in government.

This grab for power has not been just in the Federal Government in Washington. It has been evident in State capitols; in municipal governments—city councils and commissions and managers; in school boards; throughout Government bureaus and agencies.

And moreover, this grab for power is not just power in government and power over patronage.

The grab includes the grab for power over business; over agriculture; over industry; over money and credit; over electrical power, transportation and communications; down the road, power over labor—after using arrogant but short-sighted labor leaders to center all power in a government which these anticipate they can control, forever and a day; and of course, power over the individual, his life and living, his freedom of thought, action, movements.

In the last analysis, the exercise of this power calls for dictatorial methods, dictators, dictatorships—all the way from local school boards to the supposedly three-branched Federal Government.

The focal point in this contest for several months past has been the Senate of the United States, over whether the war-making power resides in the White House or in the Congress of the United States.

Public attention on this struggle between the White House and the Congress has been diverted in the past few months by (1) the crime investigations by the Kefauver committee of the Senate, and (2) the RFC investigations by the Fulbright committee of the Senate.

Instead of following the so-called great debate in the Senate, and the almost equally important struggles in the House of Representatives, people have been regaled with spectacular and televised developments by those committees.

The heart of the issue, the kernel of the coconut, in the great debate is over the war-making power in our Federal Government.

I do not mean at this time to go into the proposition of the transference of the war-making power of the Government of the United States to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In the long run that might be even more fatal than what the fight in the Senate is against today—whether the President shall be allowed to usurp the war-making power.

But for the immediate future, who shall exercise the war-making power is the all-important issue involved in the "great debate." In the news columns and to a great extent in the public mind the issue is figured "troops to Europe."

But the "troops to Europe" really is only the superficial issue, the token, so to speak, of the real issue.

The real issue, I will say again, is who shall exercise the war-making power.

At the risk of repetition of some ideas I expressed some 6 weeks ago, I propose to discuss again this matter of war-making power.

First, I quote from Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, who said a few days ago:

"One of the major struggles in the evolution of both modern and ancient democracy has been to popularize controls of the decision on war or peace, and to restrict the freedom of the head of the nation to use the armed forces at his own discretion.

"For centuries kings, at whim, sent armies to fight in foreign lands where thousands of voiceless subjects paid the price of their lives. Memories of these evils left strong fears. * * *

"The American colonists inherited these fears, strengthened by forced participation in colonial wars which were the result of decisions over which the colonists had no control. * * *

"It was with these traditional fears that the founding fathers set out in framing the Constitution to control the power to involve the new Nation in war. It was to Congress that the Constitution specifically entrusted not only the sole power to declare war but also (other powers in connection with waging war). * * *

"The makers of the Constitution did not conceive of the President's powers as commander in chief to be unlimited.

"They clearly intended that the danger of an irresponsible sovereign were to be avoided by the United States. * * * They concentrated the power to raise, finance, and govern the armed forces, as well as the power to declare war, in the hands of Congress.

"A long line of distinguished Presidents, reaching down into the twentieth century, thought these decisions wise and abided by them."

A few more than a hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln put it this way:

"Kings have always been involving and impoverishing their peoples in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object.

"This our (Constitutional) Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no man should hold the power to bring this oppression upon us."

More than a half-century before Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson expressed it this way:

The Constitution, he said, "had muzzled the dog of war" by transferring the power of "letting him loose from the executive to the legislative * * * from those who spend to those who are to pay."

And I would add this comment of my own, in reference to the great debate of 1950–51.

If the war-making power resides in the President, then America has returned to the days of the ruler—the days when the ruler's word was law; the days when the people themselves had nothing to say about the Government's decisions as to war or peace.

Of course, the one-man rule of a subject people was one of the things our forefathers left Europe to escape.

Europe, after they left it, has remained much the same, despite the claims to the contrary. Even since the American Revolution we have seen a Napoleon, a Bismarck, a Wilhelm, a Hitler, a Mussolini, a Stalin, and the evils they have brought to the world, through one-man rule.

I fear too many of our present generation do not realize this. So they are falling for the idea of turning over to a strong man the powers—not only the war-making powers, but also the taxing powers, the money and credit and other control powers, the conscription powers, that the kings used to have.

And as surely as we surrender those powers to the all-powerful, we will have our Napoleons, our Wilhelms, our Hitlers, our Mussolinis, our Stalins, and all the attendant evils.

It is far from happy prospect.

Friends, I believe the country is becoming aroused to the danger, as evidenced by the growing public support accorded Senators who have been waging the fight against turning the war-making power over to the President.

This is one fight that should be continued, and waged with undeviating vigor. Eternal vigilance and eternal resistance are the only guaranties of liberty.

The Dakota Cowboy Who Became President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Dakota Cowboy Who Became President," by Hjalmar Bjornson, which appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune on April 8, 1951. It deals with the life of the late Theodore Roosevelt.

It is estimated that it will cost approximately $150 over the regular amount allowed for printing, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, even though the cost exceeds the regular amount.

In my opinion, Mr. President, it is one of the finest, most concise, and clear articles ever written about Theodore Roosevelt's life in the State of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAKOTA COWBOY WHO BECAME PRESIDENT—SAD, DISCOURAGED TEDDY ROOSEVELT FOUND IN THE BADLANDS A NEW VIGOR THAT CARRIED HIM TO THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Hjalmar Bjornson)

For more than 60 years Teddy Roosevelt and the badlands of North Dakota have been associated as closely in the public mind as Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Yet many may not realize today how potently the Little Missouri wastelands influenced the career of the future President.

Theodore Roosevelt was both a sad and disillusioned man when he came to Dakota Territory in 1884. In February of that year his mother and his wife had died within a few hours of each other. The slender young New York assemblyman was left a widower at 25, with an infant daughter to rear—Alice, who was to become the darling of the White House.

Not many weeks after that personal tragedy, Roosevelt suffered a bitter political disappointment. The Republican Party machine soundly defeated an independent faction Roosevelt had led.

Life seemed dark indeed as Roosevelt gloomily packed his bags and boarded a train for the Little Missouri to get away from the world. He was, said a friend, "a broken-hearted man." Roosevelt himself wrote his sister, Anna, some time after his arrival in North Dakota:

"I am sorry my political career should be over, but after all it makes very little difference."

Roosevelt at that time could not foresee the therapeutic value of the West and of his new cowboy companions. Neither did he count on the force of his own ego. Before his badlands venture ended 3 years later, a Medora friend prophesied: "That man will be President someday."

How the rough frontier life restored Teddy Roosevelt's health and confidence in himself is clearly revealed in the Letters of Theodore Roosevelt, now being published by the Harvard University Press. Edited by Elting E. Morison, the first two volumes throw new sidelights on the factors that made Theodore Roosevelt the political maverick he was.

Roosevelt first fell in love with the Little Missouri badlands in the fall of 1883, before his wife and mother died. He had journeyed West to hunt buffalo as a guest of the Eaton brothers of the Custer Trail ranch, who then were in the process of founding the dude ranch industry. The wild beauty of the buttes and brakes, the rugged life of the cattlemen, enthralled him. He purchased, before he returned East, a partnership in the Maltese Cross ranch adjoining the Eatons, 7 miles up the river from present-day Medora. He renamed the ranch Chimney Butte.

It was to Chimney Butte that he fled to forget his personal grief and get away from political problems in 1884.

"I am out here," he said, "because I cannot get up any enthusiasm for the Republican candidate (James G. Blaine) and it seems to me to punch cattle is the best way to avoid campaigning."

But soon after he reached Dakota, Roosevelt's melancholy vanished. The West gave him new excitement and a new gamble. Within a month he wrote to his sister Anna, enthusiastically:

"Well, I have been having a glorious time here, and am well hardened now. I have just come in from spending 13 hours in the saddle. For every day I have been here I have had my hands full. First and foremost, the cattle have done well, and I regard the outlook for making the business a success as being very hopeful.

"This winter I lost about 25 head from wolves, cold, and the like; the others are in admirable shape, and I have about 155 calves. I shall put on a thousand more cattle and shall make it my regular business. In the autumn I shall bring out Bill Seawall and Bill Dow and put them up on a ranch with a very few cattle to start with, and in the course of a couple years give them quite a little herd also.

"I have never been in better health than on this trip. I am in the saddle all day long either taking part in the round-up of the cattle or else hunting antelope. I got one the other day—another good head for our famous hall at Leeholm.

"The country is growing on me, more and more; it has a curious fantastic beauty of its own; and as I own six or eight horses I have a fresh one every day and ride on a lope all day long. How sound I do sleep at night now. There is not so much game, however; the cattlemen have crowded it out and only a few antelope and deer remain.

"I shot a few jack rabbits and curlews, with a rifle; and I also killed eight rattlesnakes. Tomorrow my two men go east for the cattle; and I shall start out alone to try my hand at finding my way over the prairie by myself."

Roosevelt had caught the enthusiasm that was roaring through the Dakota country like a prairie fire. It was a good year, and everybody plunged in the wildest speculation. The New Yorker's interest in politics flared again, too. He paused in the heat of the round-up to write to Henry Cabot Lodge that summer:

"I shall be East about a week after you get this letter and I wish to see you at once. I am very anxious you should take no steps hastily for I do not know a man in the country whose future I regard as so promising as is yours; and I would not for anything have you do a single thing that could hurt it, unless it was a question of principle when of course I should not advise you to hesitate for a moment."

Back in Medora after that trip East he again wrote Lodge:

"In a day or two I will start out with two hunters, six riding ponies and a canvas top prairie schooner, for the Big Horn mountains. You would be amused to see me, in my little broad sombrero hat, fringed and beaded buckskin shirt, horsehide chaparajos or riding trousers, and cowhide boots with braided bridle and silver spurs.

"I have always liked horse and rifle. Being like yourself, I prefer * * * sport which needs a buckskin shirt to those whose votaries adopt the red coat. A buffalo is nobler game than an anise seed bag. The Anglomaniacs to the contrary notwithstanding."

Roosevelt took pride in his hunting prowess and he loved to boast about his successes. He wrote his sister Anna from Wyoming: "We met a dozen parties either of English or eastern amateurs or of professional hunters, who were on the mountain at the same time we were; but not one of them had half the success I had. This was mainly because they hunted on horseback, much the easiest and least laborious way, while Merrifield and I, in our moccasins and buckskin suits, hunted almost every day on foot, following the game into the deepest and most inaccessible ravines. (Arthur Merrifield was one of Roosevelt's partners in the Chimney Butte ranch.)

"Then again, most of them would only venture to attack the grizzly bears if they found them in the open, or if there were several men together, while we followed them into their own chosen haunts, and never but one of us has shot at a bear."

Though Roosevelt the hunter was to follow his hobby to the remotest corners of the world in later years, he never forgot the first bear he killed.

"We had found where he had been feeding on the carcass of an elk; and followed his trail into a dense pine forest fairly choked with fallen timber. While noiselessly and slowly threading our way through the thickest part of it, I saw Merrifield, who was directly ahead of me, sink suddenly to his knees and turn half around, with face fairly ablaze with excitement.

"Cocking my rifle and stepping quickly forward, I found myself face to face with a great bear, who was less than 25 feet off—not eight steps. He had been roused from his sleep by our approach; he sat up in his lair, and turned his huge head slowly toward us.

"At that distance and in such a place it was very necessary to kill or disable him at the first fire; doubtless my face was pretty white, but the blue barrel was as steady as a rock as I glanced along it until I could see the top of the bead fairly between his two sinister looking eyes; as I pulled the trigger I jumped aside out of the smoke, to be ready if he charged; but it was needless, for the great brute was struggling in the death agony, and, as you will see when I bring home his skin the bullet hole in his skull was exactly between his eyes as if I had measured the distance with a carpenter's rule.

"This bear was nearly nine feet long and weighed over a thousand pounds. I had grand sport with the elk too, and the woods fairly rang with my shouting when I brought down my first lordly bull, with great branching antlers; but after I had begun bear killing other sport seemed tame.

"Oh, I have had good sport; and enough excitement and fatigue to prevent overmuch thought; and moreover I have at last been able to sleep well at night. But unless I was bear hunting all the time I'm afraid I should soon get as restless with this life as with the life at home."

Roosevelt's life in Dakota, however, was not all hunting. He became the owner of two ranches—the Chimney Butte, near Medora, and the Elkhorn, 35 miles down river. He apparently intended to remain a rancher for he wrote his friends back East, "I do not believe that I shall ever be likely to come back into political life."

Roosevelt enjoyed ranch work and, whether he knew anything about cattle or not, felt his work was important. He wrote Lodge from Medora in 1885:

"I have had hard work, and a good deal of fun since I came out here. Tomorrow I start for the round-up, and I've just come in from taking a thousand head of cattle up on the trail. The weather was very bad and I had my hands full, working night and day and being able to take off my clothes but once during the week I was out.

"The river has been very high recently and I have had on two or three occasions to swim my horse across it; a new experience to me. Otherwise I have done little that is exciting in the way of horsemanship; as you know I am no horseman, and I cannot ride an unbroken horse with any comfort. The other day I lunched with the Marquis de Mores, a French cavalry officer; he had hunted all through France, but he told me he never saw in Europe such stiff jumping as we had on the Meadowbrook hunt."

The name of Antoine de Vallombrosa, Marquis de Mores, introduces one of the more bizarre incidents of Roosevelt's life in Dakota.

The Marquis de Mores, a hot-blooded French nobleman about the same age as Roosevelt, had arrived in Dakota in the spring of 1883, some months before the New Yorker's first visit.

De Mores had made nearly half a million dollars trading on the Bourse in Paris. Then he had married Medora Van Hoffman, daughter of a Wall Street banker and multimillionaire.

He came to the Dakota hamlet then known as Little Missouri, bought an estate totaling some 600 square miles, built a new town across the river from Little Missouri and named it Medora, for his wife.

The marquis had conceived the idea of establishing a huge packing plant at Medora, building a chain of refrigerated storehouses across the country and, in short, running the Chicago packers out of business by slaughtering beef at its source. His plans were sound—so sound that, his sympathetic biographers claim, the big packing companies and their Wall Street financiers ganged up on the Franchman and forced him to abandon his enterprise, after he had spent nearly $1,500,000.

De Mores unjustly connected Roosevelt, his badlands neighbor, with his Wall Street enemies—and with a prosecution for murder, in which De Mores was acquitted but which he also blamed on his financial foes. De Mores wrote Roosevelt a note in the fall of 1885, saying: "If you are my enemy, I want to know it. I am always on hand as you know and between gentlemen it is easy to settle matters of this sort directly."

Roosevelt was well aware that the Frenchman had killed two men in earlier years, in duels in France. Yet he quickly responded:

"Most emphatically I am not your enemy; if I were you would know it, for I would be an open one and would not have asked you to my house or gone to yours. As your final words, however, seem to imply a threat, it is due to myself to say that the statement is not made through any fear of possible consequences to me; I too, as you know, am always on hand, and am ever ready to hold myself accountable in any way for anything I have said or done."

That was sufficient to soothe the count, but rumors of the incident spread over the badlands. The marquis had challenged Roosevelt to a duel, the story ran. Roosevelt had accepted, had chosen to fight with rifles at 12 paces. But the duel never came off.

Roosevelt did have some experience with frontier gunplay.

Three rustlers fleeing from a posse stole a boat from his headquarters ranch and rowed downstream. Roosevelt, then a deputy sheriff in Billings County, started in pursuit. He described the chase as follows:

"I got the three horse thieves in fine shape. My two main men and I ran down the river 3 days in our boat and then came on their camp by surprise.

"We simply crept noiselessly up, rising when only a few yards distant, covered them with cocked rifles while I told them to throw up their hands. They saw that we had the drop on them completely and I guess they also saw that we surely meant to shoot if they hesitated and so their hands went up at once.

"We kept them with us nearly a week, being caught in an ice jam; then we came to a ranch where I got a wagon, and I sent my two men on downstream with the boat, while I took the three captives overland, a 2 days journey, to a town where I could give them to the sheriff."

Rustlers were a constant problem of the early cattlemen, and Roosevelt was an active member of the stockmen's association, whose main concern was curbing cattle thieves. In the spring of 1886 he wrote: "I have just returned from the stockmen's convention at Miles City, which raw, thriving frontier town was for 2 days thronged with hundreds of rough-looking, broad-hatted men, numbering among them all the great cattle and horse raisers of the Northwest. I took my position very well in the convention, and indeed these westerners have now pretty well accepted me as one of themselves, and as a representative stockman. I am on the executive committee of the association and president of its Dakota branch—all of which directly helps me in my business relations here."

Roosevelt had some misgivings about how he was being accepted as a cowhand. There was reason for this.

The first time he took part in a round-up, the story goes, two hardened cowboys heard him shout, "hasten forward quickly there," in his shrill eastern accent. The phrase became a byword in the Dakotas. He was called "Four-eyes" because of his glasses, and cowboys often smiled as he joined them on the round-up or at the bar. But he earned the respect of the westerners and they were his stanchest political supporters in the years that followed. He took part in their fun and other affairs, and in 1886 delivered a Fourth of July speech at Dickinson to "a great crowd of cowboys and grangers."

Roosevelt enjoyed the vigorous life of the range, thinking nothing of spending as much as 18 hours a day in the saddle. But he was only a part-time cowboy. He never forgot his literary interests and even when preparing to chase horse thieves, he wrote Lodge. "I shall take Matthew Arnold along. I had had no chance at all to read it as yet."

He spent part of his time writing and had fixed up a study in his ranch house. In a letter to his family he told how his time was divided:

"Three out of four days I spend the morning and evening in the ranch house where I have a sitting room all to myself reading and working at various pieces I have now on hand. They may come to nothing whatever, but on the other hand they may succeed. At any rate I am doing some honest work whatever the result is. I have managed to combine an outdoors life, possessing much variety and excitement and now and then a little adventure, with a literary life also."

Once when a relative was thinking of coming West to visit he wrote back and said: "I rather dread seeing you at table, for we have of course no social distinctions, and the cowboys sit down in their shirt sleeves."

His family wrote him about the strikes that were then troubling the country and he answered by saying: "My men here are hard working, laboring men, who work longer hours for no greater wages than many of the strikers; but they are Americans through and through; I believe nothing would give them greater pleasure than a chance with their rifles at one of the mobs. When we get the papers, especially in relation to the dynamite business, they become more furiously angry and excited than I do."

Roosevelt believed in direct action, and had little patience for arbitration or a peaceful approach. A border incident with Mexico in the early fall of 1886 bothered him and in referring to it he gave first expression to an idea that formed the basis of his "rough riders" in the later Spanish-American War. He wrote to Henry Cabot Lodge from Medora: "I have written on to the Secretary of War Endicott offering to try to raise some companies of horse riflemen out here in the event of trouble with Mexico.

"Will you telegraph me at once if war becomes inevitable? Out here things are so much behind hand that I might not hear the news for a week. I haven't the least idea there will be any trouble; but as my chance of doing anything in the future worth doing seems to grow continually smaller I intend to grasp at every opportunity that turns up.

"I think there is some good fighting stuff among these harum-scarum rough riders out here; whether I can bring it out is another matter. All the boys were delighted with your photographs except the one in which you left the saddle which they spotted at once."

Nothing came of the Mexican incident, but the idea that there was fighting stuff in the harum-scarum West never left Roosevelt. He turned to it again when he felt a need to grasp every opportunity that was available to him.

Roosevelt's boyish enthusiasm for the badlands and the life of a gentleman cowhand lasted until the winter of 1886–87—the winter of the big blizzards that ruined cattlemen all over the West. He spent that winter in the East, as usual, but he returned in April to Medora and its desolated ranges.

"I am bluer than indigo about the cattle," he wrote. "It is even worse than I feared; I wish I was sure I would lose no more than half the money, $80,000, I invested here. I am planning how to get out of it."

He wrote to Lodge in the same vein: "Well, we have had a perfect smashup all through the cattle country. The losses are crippling. For the first time I have been utterly unable to enjoy a visit to my ranch. I shall be glad to get home."

But Roosevelt doubtless would have quit the West eventually, without the impetus provided by the blizzards. In 1887 he married again, and by that time he was again taking an active interest in politics. From then on his interest in the West was largely sentimental.

He did go back, however, to hunt and to seek votes—once while running for Vice President in 1900, again in 1903 when he was President and looking forward to the nomination in 1904.

When his train reached Medora on the latter trip, he wrote afterward, "The entire population of the badlands, down to the smallest baby, had gathered to greet me. This was formerly my own home station. The old men and women I knew well; the younger ones had been wild, tow-headed children when I worked along the Little Missouri. They had all gathered in the town hall which was draped for a dance. I shook hands with them all, and almost each one had some memory of special association with me which he or she wished to discuss. I only regretted that I could not spend hours with them."

The cowboy who had become President then looked back upon his life in the free and open West and extracted from it the philosophy of his later years. "We knew toil and hardship and hunger and thirst," he said, "and we saw men die violent deaths as they worked among the horses and cattle, or fought in evil feuds with one another; but we felt the best of hardy life in our veins, and ours was the glory of work and the joy of living."

The swashbuckling life of those years was gone, as he said, "to the isle of the ghosts and of strange dead memories." But Theodore Roosevelt had taken with him to the Presidency the free spirit of both the old and new West.

Proposed Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from Mr. Robert Delson, of New York City, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, urging immediate action on the aid to India proposal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN FOR INDIA, NOW

It is of the utmost importance that Congress should take speedy action to make available grain to India and to do so on a gift rather than a loan basis.

Our differences with India on foreign policy should not lessen our interest in aiding its suffering millions. To argue otherwise is to assume that no nation may expect help from the United States unless it is a willing satellite. Such an assumption can only serve the purposes of the Kremlin and must be vigorously repudiated by the American people. I believe, however, that the fundamental sympathies of the Indian Government and people are in accord with our own and that this will be manifested as our own position and that of the Soviet Union is demonstrated in action.

In the meantime, we should not too hastily reject the possibility that India's independent role may help to retard the transformation of the political into a military war. If, as now appears, this should prove impossible, our sympathetic understanding of India's role is likely to influence the Nehru government to associate itself more closely with the democratic governments against Soviet aggression. Let us understand, however, that the heritage of suspicion bequeathed by western colonialism can be dissipated only very slowly and will continue to retard cooperation even on matters of common interest.

In order that the proposed legislation should serve its full purpose, the grain should be made available as a gift. Careful study has revealed the fact that India would be unable to repay a loan without seriously impeding its ability to carry out its development program, including its plans for producing desperately needed foodstuffs.

Even more undesirable is the proposal that India acquire the grain from us on a barter basis. India is already making available to us all of the strategic materials and other export commodities which she can presently produce. (India shipped to the United States in 1950 three-quarters of its total exports of manganese and mica; 1951 deliveries are continuing at a greater rate than the 1950 average.) The dollars she is to receive for this are already earmarked for imports of food and other essential commodities and could not be diverted to repayment of a loan.

ROBERT DELSON,
Member, American Emergency Food Commission.

NEW YORK.

The United Nations and Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Gould Lincoln, dealing with the war in Korea and the attitude of the United Nations toward the Chinese Communist Government, which appeared recently in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

IT'S TIME UNITED STATES PUBLIC KNEW OF KOREA DEALS—BRITISH SHOULD STOP TAPPING ABOUT GENERAL MAC ARTHUR

Does the United Nations wish to win the war in Korea (against Red China) or not? Or is the purpose to make some deal in the future which will admit the Chinese Communist Government into the United Nations itself? It's about time these questions were cleared up.

The loud screams from Britain, particularly the members of the Labor government and the supporting press, over the military views of Gen. Douglas MacArthur—who very clearly wishes to win the Korean war and not to make any concessions to the Chinese Communists—point up the issue. Not only do these British demand that General MacArthur be recalled or controlled, but they assert the purpose of the United Nations is to avoid an all-out war with China and to bring the new China, by peaceful means, into the world family of nations.

THREE MAJOR CRITICISMS

The United Nations many weeks ago voted Communist China an aggressor—because of the war the Communist Chinese are waging against the UN forces in Korea. But it was with apparent reluctance that the British and some of the other member nations supported this condemnation. The Red Chinese remain aggressors. The military situation in Korea, however, because of the unwillingness of the United Nations to permit an attack on Communist bases, supplies, and men across the border in Manchuria, is made tremendously difficult for the UN armies, under the command of General MacArthur.

General MacArthur has been variously criticized—in this country as well as in Britain—for outspoken comments and his proposals that the UN forces attack the Communist bases wherever they find them and that the Chinese Nationalist armies in Formosa be used in a direct attack upon the Chinese mainland. One of the criticisms here is that a military commander has no business making political statements—such as his recent letter to Republican leader JOE MARTIN, of the House. Another is that he is preventing a settlement of the war in Korea, and a third that his statements and proposals threaten to force a third world war.

An answer to the first criticism is that Mr. MARTIN, having made a speech in which he urged the use of the Chinese Nationalists in an all-out effort to end the Korean War, wrote to General MacArthur and asked his views. To the second criticism, it may be said that the Chinese Communists have given no indication they want a settlement—and they seem to be satisfied to continue a war in which the UN's armed forces are hamstrung by being prevented from attacking enemy bases. In reply to the criticism that MacArthur's statements may bring a third world war, it may be pointed out that the present efforts to discredit General MacArthur can only result in encouraging the Chinese Communists to continue the war in Korea, and in making them believe that the United Nations never intended to do more than slap them on the wrist.

CLEAR STATEMENT NEEDED

General MacArthur's letters and statements do not alter the underlying issues in this Korean war—troops now by the Chinese Communists, with Russian support and supplies, if not men—against the United

Nations. A failure of the UN to win the Korean war—and by winning the war is meant a settlement that will provide for a free Korea, without appeasement of the Chinese Reds—would be a tremendous blow to the free nations which are opposing world Communist aggression. The loss of the war would mean, in all probability, a consolidation of Asia under Communist domination. On the other hand, a defeat for the Red Chinese would be a major blow to Communist aggression everywhere in the world—and that includes Europe and the British Isles.

It's time that the administration make a clear pronouncement on Korea and what goes on there, so that the American people, who are supplying the vast majority of the fighting men and practically all of the supplies to carry on the war, may understand what they may expect; and it's time the British stop their yapping about General MacArthur—a great general who does not go two ways at the same time.

Should the RFC Be Abolished?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senate will soon begin debate on Reorganization Plan No. 1, pertaining to the RFC.

Last Sunday, on the American Forum of the Air, I debated the proposal, Should the RFC be abolished? with Mr. Wendell Berge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of our discussion.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE RFC BE ABOLISHED?

ANNOUNCER. Should the RFC be abolished?

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the Continental Room of the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D. C. Each week at this time the American Forum of the Air presents special guest speakers, so that you in your home may enjoy authoritative discussions of the provocative and vital topics of our time.

Here today to discuss this problem is Senator JAMES P. KEM, Republican, of Missouri, a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and author of a resolution to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Mr. Wendell Berge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States and Chairman of the Small Manufacturers' Emergency Committee, and your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. Recent hearings by the Senate Banking Subcommittee, headed by Senator FULBRIGHT, have uncovered evidence of mismanagement and so-called influence in the granting of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—the RFC. President Truman has proposed that the agency be reorganized, replacing the five board members with a single administrator. But many have urged that the RFC be abolished; that there is no longer a need for it, that its functions can be handled otherwise.

Today, the American Forum of the Air attempts to look at both sides of the RFC case. Should the RFC be reorganized? Or should it be abolished as proposed by Senator JAMES P. KEM, of Missouri?

Now, Mr. Berge, as Chairman of the Small Manufacturers' Emergency Committee, would you explain your charges that big business is trying to kill off the RFC at the expense of small business?

Mr. BERGE. Mr. Granik, one of the crying needs of small manufacturers and small business generally in this country today is for long-term and intermediate credit in order to expand their businesses and get their share of the production that is necessary for our national economy.

Local banks are not permitted to make intermediate and long-term loans; I mean, loans for 3, 5, and 10 years, which small business urgently needs.

When it comes to the big banks of the country, the Wall Street banks and insurance companies, they are not interested in making a loan for $100,000 or $75,000 in some remote place in Georgia or Texas. Moreover, since these loans that small manufacturers' enterprise needs, generally put those manufacturers in competition with big business, with monopolistic interests, these banks and insurance companies are all the more unwilling to help out because it is a well known fact that there are interlocking directorates between the large, monopolistic corporations of the country and the larger banks.

The banks are represented on the boards of the big corporations, and the big corporations are represented on the boards of the banks. They are seizing on this opportunity which they think is a windfall because of certain revelations about irregularities in the RFC. They are seizing on this to make an all-out drive for abolition of the RFC which I think would be disastrous to the small businessmen of the country.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KEM, do you have a statement?

Senator KEM. I have seen no evidence whatever that big business and banking interests oppose the continuation of the RFC. Those who stand to profit from the RFC's operations through favoritism and influence are the principal ones that are opposing the discontinuation of the RFC.

Those who value RFC as a useful tool to bring about and promote the handout state, that is, as a step toward socializing banking in the United States, and those who are holding lush jobs under the RFC, favor its continuance.

Many of these are liberals; that is, they are liberal with other people's money.

My opinion is that the RFC has survived its usefulness. For that reason, I have introduced into the Congress a bill to abolish it, lock, stock, and barrel.

What I propose is an orderly liquidation under the Secretary of the Treasury.

Moderator GRANIK. And with a decent burial?

Senator KEM. Yes; and with a decent burial as Mr. Jesse Jones so well said.

There is nothing so permanent, as has been said, as a temporary government agency. The RFC was organized as a temporary agency: It was to last for a year, and it was to help banks and businesses through the depression.

Since that time, RFC has been like Topsy. It has just growed and growed. Now we know, unfortunately, it has become more and more corrupt.

Moderator GRANIK. Mr. Berge, do you think it has outlived its usefulness?

Mr. BERGE. No; I certainly don't. The fact that it was originally organized for a temporary purpose, I think is irrelevant.

In 1932, when it was formed, we were in a banking and industrial crisis brought about by mismanagement of private business. A lot of the big banks of the country were about to fail. Railroads were in receivership. That was the need then, and the RFC met that need. It made big loans; loans to banks like the Dawes' Bank in Chicago. It was $80,000,000 as I recall it.

I don't criticise that because if the bank had failed, a lot of people would have suffered. But that was the need then.

Conditions changed. In the war, World War II, RFC was needed for necessary financing of war enterprises and now, since the war, during the late forties, RFC served a very important need in supplying long-term and intermediate credit to small enterprises, small manufacturers who could not get it, as I have said before, from their local banks.

At the present time, the RFC is needed in the mobilization program. Without going into detail, it is carrying on the financing of many projects that are essential in the mobilization effort which, again, can't get private credit.

So the fact that something was regarded as temporary at its inception, does not necessarily mean that it should be abolished now, because times change. Congress has apparently changed its mind from time to time by extending the RFC.

I would like to ask Senator KEM a question. He said there wasn't any evidence that big banks wanted the RFC abolished. What is the significance of the fact that the Wall Street Journal is making an all-out drive for its abolishment, and we might mention Colonel McCormick's papers, and the Scripps-Howard papers, and the fact that it is the bigger enterprises and not the small businesses that want the RFC terminated.

Senator KEM. I did not know that. I know that those papers you have mentioned have always stood for the free-enterprise system. They have been against socialization of industry in any way.

The disclosures brought about by the Fulbright committee make it clear that, as a result of political pressure, unsound loans in large amounts have been made by the RFC. In many cases, the intent of Congress has been wholly disregarded. These aromas emitting from the RFC—it has been called a Royal Fruit Cake—prove that it is spoiled through and through. The American people want it abolished.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to ask a question?

Mr. BERGE. I just thought that it is in order, briefly, to go into the banking record of the RFC.

Senator KEM. It seems to me, Mr. Berge, if you will permit me to say so, you meet yourself coming back. You say, first, that the big banks and the big business of the country want the RFC abolished, and then you complain about large loans made to the RFC.

I think that shows why there is only one banker who appeared before the McClellan committee. He was Mr. Cosgriff, the president of a bank in Utah and a member of the Board of Directors of RFC, who made a strong plea for the continuation of the RFC. That is the only banker that appeared before the committee.

I just want to say this. One of the fundamental principles in the American constitutional system is that the control of the purse strings of the Federal Government shall remain in the hands of the elected representatives of the people.

The RFC purse strings are in the hands of power-hungry, self-seeking bureaucrats who never have to answer to the people.

Mr. BERGE. I am not criticizing any large loans of the RFC because whether a loan is large or small can only be judged in relation to the industry. A loan of half a million dollars may be large if it is for a manufacturer of toys, say, or gadgets. But it would be small in relation to steel and aluminum. What is small business, small manufactures, has to be judged in relation to the industry where the loan is made.

The loans that the RFC has made have promoted competition in steel and in aluminum and in other principal industries where the loan might, in terms of dollars and cents, be large. But the fact is that something like 90 percent of the loans of RFC have been under a hundred thousand dollars, and a substantial number of those have been under $25,000.

Senator KEM. Let me say, in that connection, that 75 percent of the total amount of the loans made by RFC have been in loans of more than $100,000. In other words, over $4,000,000,000 has been loaned by RFC since it started, and three-fourths, or more than $3,500,000,000 has been authorized in loans of more than a hundred thousand dollars.

Now, we do not have time to go into the loans, but I might mention that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad received $85,000,000. Kaiser-Frazer, in 1949, received an RFC loan of $44,000,000, and in December of 1950 came back and got another $25,000,000. Then there is the odiferous Lustron loan of $37,500,000. The RFC tells us they have charged off as a loss almost all of that loan. The people have taken on the chin a loss of $35,500,000.

Then there is the Texmass, or perhaps it ought to be called the Texmess, loan of $10,100,000.

It just does not do to talk here about the great beneficence of the RFC to small business. The fact is that over three-fourths of their loans have been made to these agencies of special privilege who come down here and wangle through loans in tremendous amounts.

Moderator GRANIK. I would like to ask how this great banking institution can regain public confidence after all it took about finagling and improper influence.

Senator KEM. I could answer that question. I would like to say that the RFC, in my opinion, must go. The people will be satisfied with nothing less. They are fed up. They are fed up with political favoritism, influence, unearned fees, natural royal pastel mink coats, free luxury hotel accomodations for Government officials.

People from all over the country are writing to Members of Congress and asking, "Are there no more public morals in Washington? Have they gone out of style?" That sort of thing hurts the pride of every American, every decent American.

Mr. BERGE. About those things, nobody is going to defend, and I am certainly not, any of the irregularities that have been shown by the Fulbright committee. But you do not throw the baby out with the bath. Those instances of influence, deplorable as they may have been in some instances, are not any argument against continuance of the RFC.

There have been numerous instances in our history where people have not been entirely faithful to their trust. When Secretary Fall was sent to prison that was no argument for abolishing the Department of the Interior. For that matter, let us look at private business concerns.

There are plenty of instances where private bankers have not lived up to the highest ethics of their calling. I remember that a man named Whitney and a man named Mitchel went to jail in New York for mismanagement and various derelictions in connection with their private banking operations. That was no reason for closing their institutions.

Senator KEM. If those men were running the RFC, that would be one very good reason to abolish it.

Moderator GRANIK. Gentlemen, I have before me a copy of last year's Senate hearings relating to the transfer of the RFC to the Commerce Department. I would like to quote part of Secretary Charles Sawyer's testimony. He said:

"I do feel that the lending of money as it is done by the RFC, or should be done, is a business function. Believing, as I do, that the job of the Department of Commerce is to assist business, it does not violate any theory of mine, to say that the RFC and its activities is a very proper part of our effort to help American business."

Just prior to his saying that, Senator SCHOEPPEL said:

"Mr. Secretary, you are the head of the great Commerce Department of the country and doing a very creditable job. * * * I think that has been pretty generally reflected in your activity and in your conduct of the Department."

In view of that feeling, would it not be a possible solution to put the RFC in the Department of Commerce?

Senator KEM. That plan has been before the Congress and was turned down sometime ago. I do not feel that you gain any thing by taking the same personnel over and putting them under Secretary Sawyer. He is pretty busy, busy in court and otherwise. I do not think you gain anything by that. I think what the people want is to have the house cleaned, lock, stock, and barrel, as I have said.

Mr. BERGE. Certainly there is no objection to cleaning the house. If you have a few bad apples in a barrel, you throw them out. You don't throw away the whole barrel.

The question here is whether the RFC performs a vital function in our economy or not.

Senator KEM. There are a lot of other questions besides that. One is whether it wouldn't be a wholesome example to every other agency in Washington to move in on this one that has proven itself to be unfaithful in its trust.

Mr. BERGE. No, Senator, there are a large number of employees in the RFC. They have a fine technical and competent staff. Only a relatively few people have been involved in these charges.

I want to point this out. At the hearing before the Expenditures Committee of the Senate, I believe it was, the Chairman of the Board, W. E. Harber, and Director Walter E. Cosgriff were complimented by Members of the Senate for the way they had administered their trust. As I recall it, when Mr. Cosgriff pointed out, that in the last 6 months they had instituted numerous reforms within the organization which saved the taxpayers money and which assured better administration in the future, Senator SCHOEPPEL, from your neighboring state in effect said, "I didn't know about that. Why haven't we learned about it?" Mr. Cosgriff stated, "We couldn't get it in the papers. They wouldn't print it."

Senator KEM. If you are calling Senator SCHOEPPEL as a witness for the continuation of the RFC, I think you have a very poor witness because just yesterday he voted for the resolution disapproving the reorganization plan of the President. The record I think shows that Senator SCHOEPPEL is against the continuation of this political grab bag for White House favoritism.

Mr. BERGE. I don't know whether voting against that particular resolution means he is against continuing the RFC or not. There are a number of legislators, I understand, who will disapprove the President's plan but don't want the RFC abolished.

Moderator GRANIK. Let us take some question from the audience to see how people feel about it.

Congressman BROWNSON. I have a question for Mr. Berge. I am CHARLES B. BROWNSON, a businessman and Representative from the State of Indiana.

In this time of inflation when there is too much money in circulation already, how can you justify the effects on our total economy of continuing this depression-born RFC which loans public funds and only adds to the inflationary spiral?

Mr. BERGE. Sir, since the middle of 1950 the offices of the RFC all over the country have been directed only to make loans that are connected with the defense effort, defense loans or defense related loans. Those are not inflationary. Moreover, loans to increase production, as I understand it, do not have an inflationary effect. Inflation comes from a shortage of goods. If the RFC hews to this line that has been laid down for this period, its effect is not going to be inflationary.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KEM?

Senator KEM. I want to point out in connection with Congressman BROWNSON's question, that we see the Government crying out and scolding the banks for making too many loans. The banks are told: "You are lending too freely." Yet we have 60 or 70 Government agencies opening the sluice gates of public money and distributing it around. By doing so they are adding fuel to the fires of inflation.

As Senator BYRD pointed out, by abolishing the RFC you can get rid from the payroll over 3,000 people, you can save $18,000,000 a year in administrative costs.

Now there are some useful functions of the RFC such as the rubber, tin, and strategic programs. They can go to the Commerce Department, of the Defense Department, or somewhere else. We don't have to carry on this huge agency distributing public money all over the United States, to make favors in California, gambling casinos in Reno, Nev., and luxury hotels in Florida. I think the people are thoroughly convinced that they have no interest in financing enterprises like that.

Mr. BERGE. We are talking, Senator, anyhow about the present, and the loans that are authorized now are only defense loans and defense related loans.

Senator KEM. Defense production authorities are authorized to make loans for defense purposes directly and are set up to do that. There is no reason to have the RFC competing with defense production authorities in making loans. My position is that most defense loans can be made by commercial banks. Where they can't, they ought to be made by defense production authorities.

Mr. BERGE. Do you know, Senator, what the small manufacturers in Missouri think about this? There have been some 180 of them that have been beneficiaries in the last couple years when they couldn't get credit from the big banks.

Senator KEM. I wish time permitted us to discuss some of the loans made in Missouri.

Mr. BERGE. Our association of small manufacturers has some letters from your constituents who are very eager to have this organization continue.

Senator KEM. It is peculiar and an interesting thing that not one of them has contacted me.

Moderator GRANIK. Let us hear from another Member of the House.

Congressman LECOMPTE. My name is KARL M. LECOMPTE, Member of Congress from Ohio. I have a question for Senator KEM.

Senator, have you at any time asked the RFC to make a loan to small private business?

Senator KEM. I am glad you asked that, Congressman, because I am glad to be able to state my position on that. Since I have been in Washington, I have felt that funds of the public money when they are made should be made on a business basis and not a political basis. I have been importuned by many citizens in my State to assist them

to get loans from the RFC. I have told them politely but firmly that I couldn't do it.

It is a source of satisfaction to me to know that Mr. Truman has in his files no letter from me urging loans from the RFC to private business concerns in my State or anywhere else.

Moderator GRANIK. Mr. Berge, do you want to comment on that?

Mr. BERGE. Well, I am willing to go along on any law which would forbid a Senator or Congressman from bringing pressure on the RFC to make loans. We are all for having this thing conducted on a clean basis. My organization of small manufacturers is not seeking, certainly, to condone any influence or favoritism, but just as we would want private business conducted on a high standard, we are eager that public business should, but people are essentially the same whether in Government or out, and the banking record of the RFC is a good one. It has made money.

The Senator talked a moment ago about economy. The RFC is one institution that has made money for the taxpayers. Its losses have been less than 1 percent over the years.

Senator KEM. Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, introduced in the RECORD last Thursday some figures that he has just secured after much insistence from the Bureau of the Budget. Those figures showed that RFC has operated at a loss of over $12,000,000,000.

Now this notion that the RFC has made a profit just cannot stand up. Theodore Hertz, the accountant for the Fulbright committee, who has been a professional accountant of high standing for 20 years, says that the figures that the RFC issued showing a profit for 1949 of some $5,000,000 are absolutely fallacious. As a matter of fact, the RFC that year operated at a loss of $6,000,000.

Now I would like to ask any businessman in the radio audience if he believes that a business that has been conducted as it has been shown the RFC has been conducted in the last few years can make money.

Moderator GRANIK. Mr. Berge.

Mr. BERGE. When you say they have lost money, Senator, you are taking into account the projects they have operated at the request of Congress under special legislation that required it. They operated the Defense Plants Corporation and during the last war the RFC had numerous war activities which certainly were expendable and not to be reckoned as showing a deficit. When I say they have made $500,000, I am talking about their banking operations where the RFC Board exercised the discretion that bankers exercised.

Senator KEM. I will tell you another reason, Mr. Berge, why I take with a grain of salt these figures that have come from the RFC showing a profit. The law requires the RFC, as every other Government corporation, to make to the Congress by January 15 of every year a written report of its operations during the preceding fiscal year ending June 30. The RFC has wholly failed to comply with that requirement of law. Now if we cannot get the figures from them, except after we have a Fulbright committee investigation, should we continue an organization like that, lending enormous sums of the peoples' money taken from the people in taxes?

Moderator GRANIK. May we take another question? Go ahead, sir.

FROM THE AUDIENCE. I have a question I would like to direct to Mr. Berge. Is not the handling of banking matters by the Government charged in some quarters with being socialistic, being competitive with private business?

Mr. BERGE. The RFC loans are not competitive with private business, because the RFC won't make loans unless they have a letter from the local bank that it will not handle the loan. In other words, the credit needs of the country as business is being conducted today need an RFC, and the RFC will not compete with private banks. The trouble is that private banks today don't want to risk capital any more. They sit around and clip coupons on Government bonds rather than make loans to small-business enterprises. So, except for the RFC, a lot of small manufacturers today would not be in business.

Senator KEM. I just want to say that I think there is no reason for the RFC to be kept alive any longer. I think its end is overdue. I believe that these men that Mr. Berge weeps about, these small-business men, can get money at the local banks. If they can't get it down there and they are engaged in defense activities, they can come up here and get it from defense production authorities. If they can't get it either place, there is considerable doubt in my mind whether in a period of inflation there is a public interest in having such a business expand.

Mr. BERGE. Our Small Manufacturers' Committee results from the fact that there are plenty of small-business men who are not able to get credit although the enterprises are sound.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for summary, Mr. Berge.

Mr. BERGE. My argument is that there are several reasons why the RFC should be kept. I won't undertake to cover them all in the summary.

First, small business finds it difficult, if not impossible, to get capital from local banks for long-term or intermediate capital investments and hence must turn to the RFC.

Second, new business finds it difficult, if not impossible, to get started without obtaining Government credit, because, being new businesses, it does not have a previous record of earnings which can be submitted as a basis for obtaining loans; hence they, too, must turn to the RFC.

Third, there is no doubt but that big investment houses have agreements with each other to restrict the entrance of new business in industries dominated by a few firms. Firms which are dominant in the capital goods industries are so interlaced with the investment houses and the banks that the investment banking facilities of the country do not look with approval in many cases on promoting competition for existing business.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Berge. Your summary, Senator KEM.

Senator KEM. What Mr. Berge has been talking about is clearly a violation of the Sherman antitrust law, and I wonder why, when Mr. Berge was head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, he did not prosecute people who were doing things like that.

The RFC's contribution toward a sound economy in my judgment has been on the negative side since the close of World War II. There is no public interest in prolonging the life of a business that can't exist without artificial oxygen from the Public Treasury. There is no public interest in financing a business where the people running it have no particular qualifications or have had no experience in business. There is no public interest in forcing competitors to the wall by artificially flooding the market with goods of a Government-financed enterprise.

All of these economic sins are being committed by the RFC.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on "Should the RFC be abolished?" Our speakers have been Senator JAMES P. KEM, Republican, of Missouri; and Mr. Wendell Berge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States and chairman of the Small Manufacturers' Emergency Committee.

Fair Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that H. R. 2648, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, has aroused Nation-wide interest and support. Typical of editorials appearing throughout the country is the following which appeared in the San Francisco News of April 2, 1951:

FAIR REPRESENTATION

Each Member of the United States House of Representatives ought to represent approximately the same number of people.

There are good reasons why each can't represent exactly the same number. But there's no good reason for, and no fairness in, the huge disparities that now exist.

One Ohio Representative, for example, has over 908,000 people in his district. Another from the same State has only 167,000. And one from South Dakota has only 148,000.

In six States there is a difference of more than 400,000 between the populations of the largest and smallest congressional districts.

In six other States, the gap is more than 300,000. In 12 others, it is more than 200,000.

That's not all. Some States, instead of forming new districts as their populations increase, elect Representatives at Large. And many States have districts "gerrymandered" into peculiar shapes to block in or block out groups of voters for political advantage.

Growth of the Nation's population, as shown by the 1950 census, means that some States are now entitled to more seats in the House, others to fewer, others to their present number.

So, before the 1952 elections, redistricting will be necessary in many States and desirable in almost all. This redistricting ought to correct the present inequities. Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of New York, has introduced an administration-sponsored bill intended to force their correction.

The bill proposes:

That each State entitled to more than one Representative shall establish a congressional district for each Representative. (To stop the practice of electing Congressmen at Large.)

That each district shall be composed of compact and contiguous territory. (To stop gerrymandering.)

That each district's population shall not be more than 15 percent larger or smaller than the average number obtained by dividing the State's total population by the number of districts in the State. (To insure that each Representative shall represent as nearly as possible the same number of people.)

Mr. CELLER's bill would enforce itself by denying a seat in the House to any Representative elected from a district not conforming to the bill's requirements. He says the Supreme Court has held that Congress has power to set up standards which the States must follow.

Many politicians, in and out of Congress, may not like this bill because it would deprive them of unfair political advantages now enjoyed.

But citizens who believe that each American has a right to an equal and effective voice in the conduct of his Government should favor and work for adoption of such reform as Mr. CELLER proposes.

A Turkish View on Friendship With Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Turkey and Israel are sometimes referred to as the only two great military powers of the Near East and the only two countries in that area of the world that are truly democratic. Both are great friends of the United States.

In this connection, I believe the Members of this House will find it extremely interesting to read the views of a Turkish official on the friendly and peaceful relations of his country and Israel. Turkey, a Moslem country, was one of the first in the Near East to grant recognition and establish friendly relations with Israel.

Mr. Altemur Kilic, the author of the article The Friendship of Turkey and Israel, is an information officer in the press bureau of the Department of Public Information at the United Nations. He is scheduled to return to Turkey soon to assume the editorship of a new afternoon newspaper in that country. His article appeared in the March-April 1951 issue of the magazine Land Reborn, published by the American Christian Palestine Committee, and is as follows:

THE FRIENDSHIP OF TURKEY AND ISRAEL

(By Altemur Kilic)

I feel safe in asserting that Israel has no better friend in the Middle East than the Turkish Republic. This friendship is not merely a government-to-government relationship. Nor is it only the Realpolitik of both nation's statesmen. On the contrary, the friendship goes deeper; for Israelis and Turks have, I believe, much in common.

Foremost among the factors which encourage Turkish-Israel friendship is the youthfulness of minds and ideas in both peoples. Although Turks and Israelis are proud of their respective pasts, they have their eyes firmly fixed on the future.

Secondly, both Israel and Turkey are European in outlook. They may be situated on the western fringe of Asia, but neither the customs nor the culture of the Orient have as much influence as do the mores and morals of the West.

Thirdly, both Turks and Israelis are activistic in their approach to social and political problems. Both nations are not retarded by a yearning for the splendors and glories of their historic pasts. They are rather impelled by a modern desire to rid their lands of the disease, poverty, ignorance, and feudal structures which have far too long been the curse of the Middle East. Here both Israel and Turkey join in a modern crusade.

Fourthly, Turkey and Israel are the only two genuinely democratic states in the entire Middle East. Turkey granted full diplomatic recognition to the new State of Israel, not only because the Turkish people admired the courage and steadfastness of the Jews in their recent struggle for a home of their own, and their zeal in creating their new, modern state, but also because Turkey anticipated a healthy flow of Israel-Turkish trade and thus an ever closer bond between the two lands. (It is true that our economic relations with Israel mean, at present, many more exports from Turkey to Israel than exports from Israel to Turkey; but this imbalance is in process of being righted.)

In these four respects, we Turks directly parallel the Israelis. On several other scores we have somewhat divergent characteristics:

1. Turkey must transform its masses into an industrial population while Israel must reverse the industrial-rural process for many tens of thousands of its people.

2. We still have a considerable amount of illiteracy to alter; Israel has an unusually high rate of literacy, not alone for the Middle East where illiteracy abounds, but even in comparison with the highly literate nations of the European land mass.

3. Turkey has moved swiftly in this past generation since the days of the great Kemal Ataturk, but still has a long road to travel in search of its ultimate goal of urbanization, industrialization, modernization, and western education; Israels' particular problems are, in contrast, those of deurbanization and the training for productivity and integration of its industry and agriculture.

4. Turkey belongs to the West, not only because the Soviet Union demands our vital Straits and two of our eastern provinces, but also because of our concept of democracy. Israel, doubtless mindful of the problematic fate of several million Jews still behind the iron curtain in Russia and Soviet-oriented lands, prefers a policy of "nonidentification" with either East or West; but Turkey believes Israel's preoccupation with her own particular problems will, in time, give way to the necessity of taking sides in the East-West struggle and joining a collective security arrangement against the Soviet bloc.

I believe that Turkish-Israel friendship promises many fruits for the future, within both the framework of Middle Eastern politics, in particular, and the framework of our common quest for world peace, in general.

Two-Ocean Issues Unchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TWO-OCEAN ISSUES UNCHANGED—MACARTHUR WAS RIGHT IN 1942 AS HE IS NOW IN PLEAS FOR DUE ATTENTION TO PACIFIC

(By David Lawrence)

Starting just 9 years ago, in the spring of 1942, and continuing from then on throughout most of World War II, the same controversy was going on as is emerging today—how much force to allocate to Asia and the Pacific and how much to Europe.

But the public didn't know much about it at the time, nor did it know how earnestly General MacArthur, backed up by Fleet Admiral King, pleaded for enough strength to win the war in the Pacific.

The fundamental issues haven't changed. When all the emotion has been removed from the present atmosphere of politics in Washington and London, and the European leaders face realistically the fact that from the Pacific Ocean can come a direct threat to United States territory in Alaska and to our vital bases on Okinawa, the Philippines, and Japan, a global strategy and viewpoint will come into its own once more.

It was because the American people for the most part had their eyes fastened on the spectacular battles in Europe that they did not appraise the remarkable struggle under heavy odds that our Army under MacArthur and our Air Force and Navy put up in the Pacific against a major power which had the naval strength and the air power to sweep to the tip of southeast Asia even while fighting a major war on the mainland of China. All this happened in the three long years before VE-day, while the American people looked on it as a secondary, if not unimportant, adventure in what was sometimes referred to in a somewhat derogatory fashion as "island hopping."

Few people today realize that, apart from heavy casualties of ground troops, 10,000 American boys were killed or wounded on the decks of American naval vessels in the immediate vicinity of Okinawa—the largest casualty list for a single battle in the history of any navy—as the ships stood guard there like sitting ducks for 83 days. They couldn't move away because the Navy's own air power was busily engaged in protecting ground operations and no other air power was available in the western Pacific to destroy the bases on Formosa, on the mainland of China and in south Japan from which the suicide planes were coming day after day. It did not hearten the American boys on the ships or in our Army and Marine Corps fighting on Okinawa—we had more than 275,000 men committed to the action there—to be told that our big B-29's were doing strategic bombing and were destroying vital factories in Japan. What the troops and sailors wanted and begged for was the destruction of the land bases just a few hundred miles away from which those enemy bombers were coming to Okinawa. It was the same old story of inadequate strength.

General MacArthur begged his countrymen not to forsake those vital air and submarine bases, but to do everything in our power to help Chiang Kai-shek or any other friendly influence inside China so as to keep the Communists from dominating the Far East. It goes without saying that the next time all of China and Korea and important bases in Japan will be in the hands of a hostile power unless the Communists are licked—and licked now.

It is therefore, a basic concept of global strategy which was ignored by the European press and to no small extent by those American observers who regarded the present flare-up as just a little matter of personalities or of excessive zeal by a prominent general. What seems to be overlooked is that if World War III breaks out, the Pacific Ocean will not be a quiet lake. There are the factories on our Pacific coast which will hardly be immune from attack if the defenses in the Pacific are neglected—if America does not plan its strategy so as to reach out as effectively to destroy submarine bases in Asia as we appear to be doing with respect to those hostile bases in Europe from which submarine threats can come to menace shipping and the transportation of troops in the Atlantic.

Europeans who are not bounded on any coast by the waters of the Pacific do not seem to realize that the United States is a two-ocean country. Even today the European press is talking about American military strength getting bogged down in Asia as if there were some magic way of erasing the Pacific and the Asiatic seacoastline from the map and persuading the military chiefs of the Communist regime entirely to give up any idea of attacking us from that quarter of the globe when war comes.

High officers of our Navy, it can be stated positively, say that, while General MacArthur has not always selected the most tactful way to express himself, fundamentally he was 100 percent right when he declared America must be sure of winning the war now in Asia or else Europe will be lost too.

General MacArthur was right in 1942, and he was right again in arguing for due attention to the Pacific and most of all against any abject surrender or compromise in Asia that means the same thing militarily. He was arguing for the mothers and fathers of the boys enlisted today in the United States Navy who again will bear the brunt of any such attacks. He was arguing for the 250,000 men of our Army and Air Force now in the Pacific. He was making a sensational plea against misunderstanding of the fundamentals of global strategy.

MacArthur Has Outlived His Usefulness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not practice the profession of "arm-chair general." I do know enough about military affairs and Government, however, to appreciate that a man in public office who desires to direct a military campaign should become a member of the armed services, and that a general who attempts to direct the affairs of state should retire from the armed services and run for elective office. No matter how much praise may be due to General MacArthur as a soldier all must agree that he has outlived his usefulness as a general because of his insistence upon entering into the field of civil affairs.

Whether you agree or disagree with MacArthur's foreign policy no one can deny that as one in charge of military campaigns he has no right to make foreign policy.

I am happy to direct your attention to the fact that I am not alone in this conclusion. The syndicated columns of Drew Pearson and Stewart Alsop, and an editorial in this morning's Washington Post, are in agreement with my thoughts on the subject. Those articles are as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 11, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

MAC ARTHUR FRICTION RECOUNTED

At two Cabinet meetings in the past 3 weeks, General MacArthur's unauthorized policy statements have come in for important, even heated, discussion.

Most heated debate was not last week but immediately after MacArthur's pre-Easter statement of March 24, in which he proposed a peace meeting with Chinese military commanders.

At this Cabinet meeting the President remarked that he was sorry he hadn't fired MacArthur last summer—following his out-of-line statement to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. What aroused the President's heat just before Easter was that MacArthur's peace statement was one which Truman himself was planning to make.

What happened was that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had cabled MacArthur, for his perusal and personal reaction, a copy of an Easter appeal for peace which the State Department had already discussed with the British and French and which Truman planned to issue publicly.

But, without a word to Washington, MacArthur made the statement himself. Part of his text was almost verbatim with that sent him by the Joint Chiefs, though his threat to bomb Chinese bases was entirely his own.

MAC ARTHUR'S RECORD

Naturally washington boiled.

Next day, Secretary of Defense Marshall sent MacArthur a personal cable ordering him to clear all future policy statements with him. That cable was dated March 25, and MacArthur's letter to former Speaker JOE MARTIN was dated March 20, so technically, at least, MacArthur is in the clear.

In the eyes of the Defense Department, however, he is not. For on December 5, 1950, confidential orders were sent to all military commanders to clear all policy statements with the Defense Department in Washington. Furthermore, MacArthur has had a history of jumping the traces, some of which is well known, some not, but all of which has made relations between him and his Commander in Chief more strained than at any time in recent American history. Here is the record:

Jump No. 1: In December 1949 MacArthur let off steam to a group of Republican Senators visiting him in Tokyo about sending United States arms and troops to Formosa. This teed off the running debate between the administration and the China bloc in Congress over Chinese intervention which continued for months.

Jump No. 2: In the spring of 1950, MacArthur took an unauthorized trip to Formosa, got a lot of publicity kissing Madame Chiang Kai-shek's hand, and openly discussed the idea of building up Formosa as a base. This was in complete contradiction of the Government's policy, and he obviously knew it.

Jump No. 3: After we got into the Korean War, MacArthur sent his famous letter to the Veterans of Foreign Wars regarding the use of Formosa as a base. He was reprimanded by Truman.

Wake Island: It was around this time that Averell Harriman, special representative of the President, went to Tokyo to soothe the general's fur. At this time Harriman got MacArthur's solemn promise to make no more policy statement without clearing them with Washington.

TRUMAN IS CHARMED

Following this, Truman made his special pilgrimage to confer with MacArthur on Wake Island. When he first arrived, he was a little nonplussed by the way the general strolled nonchalantly down to the runway—a little late—to meet him; and by the fact that MacArthur failed to salute his Commander in Chief. He was also disappointed that MacArthur's accompanying party consisted chiefly of his personal doctor, his valet, and Ambassador Muccio, whereas Truman had brought the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a group of experts prepared to discuss important Far Eastern problems.

It was because MacArthur brought no experts to discuss anything that the conference was so abbreviated.

However, during their brief time together, MacArthur charmed Truman completely and the President came away singing his praises.

Jump No. 4: Came during MacArthur's November drive into North Korea. This was only a partial jump-over-the-traces, because Truman had given him the green light to dash up to the Manchurian border. However, on more than three occasions the State Department relayed warnings that the Chinese were about to attack—one from the French, one from India, and several from the British.

On another occasion, when the State Department urgently proposed a public statement assuring the Chinese that the big dams supplying water power to all Manchuria would not be bombed, MacArthur sent back a curt three-word telegram: "Do not concur."

[From the Washington Post]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

MAC ARTHUR

It is at least conceivable that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur will be recalled by President Truman, perhaps even before this report is published. Truman is furious at what he considers MacArthur's insubordination. Those around Truman are convinced that the recent spate of pronouncements from MacArthur have been consciously designed to forestall Truman, who had planned to issue a statement of his own on Korean War aims. Finally, the pressure is heavy on Truman to demonstrate once and for all that he is master in his own house.

Yet on balance it is much more likely that cautious counsels will prevail, and that the administration will try to deal with "the MacArthur problem" by pressing ahead with a Japanese peace treaty with all possible speed. MacArthur himself has often intimated that he will lay down his proconsular duties once a Japanese peace treaty is signed.

It is therefore fervently hoped in administration circles that final arrangements for signing a treaty can be reached by early midsummer, that MacArthur will sign in the name of the American Government; and that he will then retire in a final blaze of glory, to a chorus of sighs of relief in Washington and the European capitals. This spectacle, of the American Government pressing feverishly for a peace treaty with a former enemy nation in order to dispose of a supposedly subordinate American official would be laughable if the issue raised were not so serious.

For there is nothing at all laughable in the issue which has caused a bitter public dispute between the American Government and its field commander at a time when a new Chinese offensive is certain, and Soviet intervention in Korea at least possible. The issue is this: Should the United States engage in a major war with China, in alliance with Chiang Kai-shek?

Surely if MacArthur's statements mean anything, they mean that this is what MacArthur wants to do. And the great majority of the policy-making officials of the Government are convinced that such a course would lead straight to disaster.

In the first place, they argue, such a war would be "a war between the shark and the tiger," an impossible war which could never be won. In the second place, the course MacArthur proposes would destroy the whole painfully built structure of American alliances. Finally, this country's European allies, and especially the British, are convinced that such a course would make inevitable a third world war for which our European allies are nakedly unprepared.

British intelligence has warned repeatedly that the Soviets are committed to intervene openly in case of an American attack on the Chinese mainland. Such intervention, which would presumably include bombing MacArthur's own "privileged sanctuary" in Japan, could hardly fail to lead to a third world war. MacArthur is reported to dissent strongly from this view, but it is worth recalling that the British also warned of the Chinese intervention, which MacArthur assured Truman on Wake Island would not occur.

Yet MacArthur's position has one great strength. It is simple, positive, and understandable—the way to fight a war is to try to win it, by using all available means to defeat your enemy. The official administration thesis sounds, by contrast, fuzzy and Micawberish. If the forthcoming offensive is amashing, according to this thesis, the Chinese and their Soviet masters may be willing sooner or later to come to terms.

This may not be quite as Micawberish as it sounds. For it is certainly true that both the Chinese and Russians have paid heavily for their Korean adventure. The Chinese have lost the flower of their best army, while their plans for expansion in southeast Asia have had to be at least postponed. As for the Russians, they have seen the western allies awakened from their lethargy by Korea, and beginning to organize their defenses in earnest.

Thus what seems to be in prospect is a long test of staying power, in which all the advantages are by no means on the side of the Communists. The trouble is that MacArthur is unfitted by temperament to command a local war of limited objectives and indefinite duration.

Yet MacArthur is right when he implies that this country cannot accept a bloody stalemate in Korea forever. Perhaps, as the administration hopes, the Chinese and the Russians will decide to cut their losses if the prospective offensive fails, and will then agree to an acceptable settlement. Perhaps the Russians will force the issue by intervening openly. If neither happens, there must be some sort of show-down eventually. When that time comes, however, it will be well to remember what MacArthur and his admirers forget—that the Ruhr Valley is a far more important stake in the world struggle than the Yangtse Valley, and that the real source of Communist power is in Moscow, not Peiping.

[From the Washington Post]

BRING MACARTHUR HOME

The issue that General MacArthur has catapulted into the camp of the free world is not Asia or Europe, Korea, or China, or a local or a continental war. It is General MacArthur versus Authority, and Authority can no longer duck it. In the circumstances the resolution that Senator FERGUSON has proposed for the visit of a committee of Congress to General MacArthur has become ridiculous. General MacArthur should do the traveling—and with Washington as his destination.

Why another congressional mission to Tokyo, anyway? Scarcely a month passes without one or other legislators traipsing across the Pacific to listen to the authoritative words of the Supreme Commander. After 15 years, when General MacArthur was last in America, the trips are beginning to look like pilgrimages. It is hardly dignified that our representatives should have to go all the way to Japan to check what General MacArthur is expressing so freely in public and private. The time has come for General MacArthur to be recalled for report. He has now launched a campaign upon the free world for the extension of the military campaign against communism throughout Asia—to free Asia, as he put it awhile ago. For this all-encompassing crusade he is reported to be demanding a free hand, something unheard of in history and something in the present circumstances of the United Nations war that the United States itself hasn't got. It is clearly impossible to keep General MacArthur in the command so long as this major conflict between subagent and agent and between both he and the principal remains.

The time, aside from the new urgency, is long overdue for General MacArthur to return. Government and people before this needed a chance to become acquainted with a man who by his long absence was becoming a myth and yet who was carrying a great responsibility to the United States on his shoulders. General MacArthur would have himself benefited from it. Even Antaeus had to renew his strength and refresh his outlook by occasional contact with the earth, and the same prescription would have profited General MacArthur. He would at least have been able himself to check at first hand with his somewhat intimidated and silent superiors.

In default of President Truman grasping the nettle in the manner of Lincoln and Polk, the way to get General MacArthur here is through the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Recall for report is the general practice with the diplomats and military chieftains of all countries, and General MacArthur has been left too long in Napoleonic aloofness. It may be argued that for military reasons MacArthur cannot leave his post. But MacArthur's headquarters are in Japan, not in Korea, and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway is in operational or tactical charge in Korea, with a virtually autonomous command. General Ridgway has done so well there that there can be no doubt of his competence to be left alone for a spell.

Senator FERGUSON excuses the waiting upon General MacArthur because the President himself journeyed over the Pacific to meet General MacArthur. However, the President did not go to Tokyo. Nor did he establish any precedent. He had in mind the convenience of both himself as Commander in Chief and General MacArthur in holding the rendezvous at Wake Island. At that time the Supreme Commander, in spite of his situation at the Japanese base, was handling operations more intimately than he is now. So far as is known, the President chose the site, and his purpose, it is said, was to hear from General MacArthur's own lips the data about Chinese dispositions in North Korea and an estimate of the situation created by them. The general was put on the beam on policy, and the President in turn got an assurance that the Chinese would not intervene, though this is what they did almost before MacArthur got back.

All this, of course, is supposition but a reason for any hearing that Congress might call in case General MacArthur comes to town, presumably, would be to clear up the fog over this Wake Island meeting. Congress is likewise entitled to some comprehension of the help (or lack of it) that in the light of changing requirements MacArthur has been afforded to execute the command he was given. But the Executive must take action beforehand in laying down policy anew and restoring authority. If, after report and consultation, this means the supercession of General MacArthur, that must be faced, for if the conflict continues, our feeble Government will be left without any standing at home, and abroad we might as well prepare to see our allies in NATO, RIO, and the United Nations fade away.

Divine Discontent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following sermon preached in St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Akron, Ohio, by the rector, the Reverend Walter F. Tunks, D. D., on Palm Sunday morning, March 18, 1951, and broadcast over Station WADC:

In recent years have appeared many books designed to tell us how to achieve inner calm and serenity. The experiences with which they have been bought and read would indicate that they have answered a real need. They reflect the pressure and tension of our day—the demons that, in some form, all of us must fight—fear, worry, frustration, personal inadequacy, and that tired feeling of being pushed beyond endurance. The story may be apocryphal, but is typical of our overwrought nerves, that a tired businessman sank into a dentist's chair with a sigh of deep satisfaction and said, "Thank God for the opportunity to come here once in awhile and relax."

Long on the list of best sellers was a helpful book called Peace of Mind, by Rabbi Joshua Liebman, whose untimely death removed a distinguished scholar and teacher. Then came a book which had wide circulation called Peace of Soul, by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, known to many Americans through his preaching on the radio Catholic hour. Many people have been helped by the preaching and writing of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale. He has shown them how to relax their bodies, release mental tension, by opening hidden reservoirs of spiritual power. All these books answer a need that was voiced by Whittier so beautifully in his well-loved hymn:

"Drop Thy still dews of quietness
Till all our strivings cease,
Take from our souls the strain and stress
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace."

Peace of mind and peace of soul are great possessions. Together, they form one of life's greatest blessings—contentment. Through the ages poets and philosophers have sung the praises of contentment. Confucius wrote of himself, "With only plain rice to eat, with only water to drink, and with only an arm for a pillow, I am still content." In a world where material things are so fragile, he had discovered that the only durable wealth is the inner riches of heart and mind and soul. "Contentment is natural wealth," said Socrates, "luxury is artificial poverty." That is the essence of Thoreau's teaching about his simple life at Walden Pond. A man can live happily and well in a cabin in the woods with the breeze and birds as his companions, if he has a good conscience and a sensitive mind, plus an appreciation of nature. I like to think that it was the King himself who wrote in the Book of Proverbs: "Better is a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox with hatred." Perhaps he had stopped one day at a peasant's abode and discovered how good food can taste in a simple home where there is love and understanding and comradeship, and he recalled how tedious were court banquets with hatred, envy, and intrigue lurking in the background. Shakespeare knew what a great blessing is contentment and how rarely those in high office possess it. In Henry the Sixth he makes the King say:

"My crown is in my heart, not on my head;
Not decked with diamonds, and Indian stones,
Not to be seen; my crown is called Content:
A crown it is that seldom kings enjoy."

Contentment seems all the more praiseworthy when we encounter those who never seem to possess it. Restless and dissatisfied, they are unhappy wherever you find them. Put them down anywhere and they will find something to complain about. You never ask them how they are. You know in advance. They are not well. They grumble about the weather, about their food, about their church, and they can tell you all that is wrong in our country. Their conversation is a monologue of discontents. The world was not made to their liking.

Their unhappiness is, of course, only the toxic poisoning of their self-centeredness. They never get themselves off their hands. On the other hand, you think of a great soul like Paul, chained in a prison cell, writing confidently to his friends, "I have learned in whatsoever state I am to be content." Anyone who can say that has mastered one of life's hardest lessons. What happens to us is not the decisive factor. It is our inner response that tells the story. Happiness is mental rather than environmental. In his deep concern for others, Paul had learned to think less and less about himself. There is no inner peace without that. Dr. McCracken writes of a woman who had lost her son and had become bitter, hard, and inconsolable until her health failed and her mind weakened. Her husband took her to a famous French neurologist who undertook an unusual method to effect her cure. He took her for a long drive through villages that had borne the fear and fire and devastation of war. "Madam," he said, "in nearly all these humble little homes there is a poor woman who has lost a son. In some there are mothers who have lost two or three sons. Is your grief greater than theirs? Go home and bear your sorrow with courage and patience." Some of us, I feel sure, would be ashamed of our petty complaints if we had imagination enough to understand the far heavier loads some people are carrying with cheerfulness and fortitude.

Probably there would be no disagreement among us this morning as to the value of contentment. Yet, I venture to say, that it is not the supreme goal of life. A popular radio program advertises the fact that its product comes from contented cows. That brings to your mind a lovely pastoral scene—a herd of cattle grazing peacefully in lush meadows under a bright summer sky—amid all the beauty of the countryside. But we humans are different from cows. We have moral consciousness. We have ambitions. We have ideals for ourselves and for our world. We dare not live in lazy indifference to what goes on around us. There are times and places and situations in which we have no right to be contented. We have no right to live in peace with racial discrimination and social injustice. We have no right to close our eyes to slums and poverty and crime. Who wants to live with inner peace that can be had only by closing one's ears to the still, sad voice of humanity?

When Catherine the Great made a tour of her country, her ministers went ahead of her, carefully arranging her schedule. Nice little homes were built along the route the Empress was to travel—like the fake houses that are a part of Hollywood technique—made for the cameras, not to live in. Peasants were instructed to appear along the roadway wearing their Sunday best, with happy smiling faces. The lame, the blind, and the deformed were hustled off the streets. The Empress must see no misery and want. She must not know the desperate condition of her people.

What decent person wants contentment at such a price? I think Fulton Oursler is right in something he wrote recently: "Our greatest danger is not from Russia, but from ourselves, from our growing disregard of principles, and our reliance upon expediency. Along this immoral road, we have already gone too far, feeling meanwhile more discontent than ever before. In book shops and drug stores, in correspondence courses and lectures, we seek peace of mind, peace of soul. Our private lives reflect the public evidence of decay and we are not happy about it. The renewal of conscience in modern society is its only hope."

We Americans may well take that rebuke to ourselves. We are an easy-going, complacent people, too ready to compromise with evil because it takes too much trouble to correct it. Perhaps the greatest weakness in our country today is our lack of moral indignation. We have no right to be satisfied with the low moral standards that prevail in high places today. We have no right to make peace with crooks and gamblers and racketeers and to accept the criminal alliance between the underworld and politics. The scandals that have come out of the mismanagement of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the brazen peddling of influence in high government circles, the old Pendergast morals that are so generally accepted in Washington today, the betrayal of trust by officials in our State Department, and the nonchalance of those who call treason only a "red herring" ought to stir us with righteous wrath. At any social gathering you can hear plently of grumbling about the corruption in Washington, but how easily we charge it off as the inevitable spawn of politics. "To the victor belongs the spoils" we say, and with a synical shrug of the shoulders, we seem to imply there isn't anything we can do about it.

But there is something we can do about it. We can examine our own individual lives and strive to correct what is wrong with them. Bad government always leads to our own doorsills—our willingness to live with low and easy moral stahdards. We are like the farmer who said "Don't tell me how to farm any better. I don't farm as good now as I know how." Most of us make the same confession. We don't live nearly as well as we know how. We know better, but it is too much effort to do better. We permit our children to do questionable things, not because we approve of them, but because we don't want them to be thought queer or different from our neighbor's children. With most of us selfishness is still the major sin. Expounding his philosophy of life, George Jean Nathan, the drama critic, said, "To me pleasure and my own personal happiness are all I deem worth a hoot." There is pure, unadulterated selfishness for you. Where would our city and our country be if all of us decided that the only thing worth a hoot is our own personal happiness? What decent person wants contentment if it means only the ability of the biggest hog to get to the feeding trough first?

Religion can bring us inner peace. But it ought also to fill us with divine discontent. Religion was never meant to be an anesthetic. Paul spoke of it as power. The word that he used was "dunamos." Dynamite, if you please. Every moral gain that has ever been made in this world was the result of someone's revolt against the status quo.

Again and again in the Gospels we hear Jesus saying, "Ye have heard it said of old time * * * but I say unto you." He walked straight across those old traditions and they snapped like cobwebs. It is pleasant to think of the Master healing the sick, forgiving the sinful, and taking little children into His arms to bless them. But there is no mistaking the moral indignation that flamed in His words and looks as he lashed out against the moral complacency of his times.

On this Palm Sunday we think of that strange procession that paused for a moment on the brow of Mount Olivet before entering the Holy City. There were tears in the Master's eyes. He was not thinking of himself and the suffering that lay ahead for him. He was thinking of the city and the people He loved, so blind to their impending fate. How contented the city was as it lay there bathed in the morning sunlight—how proud of its past history, how indifferent to its spiritual need. There was Pilate, the Roman Governor, the very embodiment of human pride—more concerned about holding his office than administering justice, and ready to turn an innocent man over to be crucified rather than take any chance of stirring up trouble for himself. Jesus must still weep when He sees how much irresponsibility still remains in high places.

There were the money changers in the temple, making fat profits out of their unholy traffic in the sanctuary of God. They had turtledoves for sale. Who raised them? They came from the pigeon farms of Annas, the ex-high priest and father-in-law of Caiaphas, the reigning high priest, and they sold, of course, for a nice profit. If you wanted to buy them you had to exchange Roman coins for temple currency, for the Roman coins bore the image of the hated Emperor—and the exchange, of course, brought further revenue for the high priest. Is it any wonder that Jesus strode into the temple a few days later and drove the grafters out. It wasn't the small whip of cords that frightened them. It was the high and holy indignation they saw in those eyes that looked straight through them. And He said unto them: "It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves." Graft is still graft, whether it be in turtle doves or deep freeze deals or mink coats or bribes paid by the underworld for police protection or the public money siphoned off to individuals by influential politicians.

Jerusalem was quite content that spring morning when Jesus looked out over the city with tears in His eyes. How perilous complacency can be. Little did the people understand or care about the destruction that was impending.

What of America? I pray that the spirit of Jesus may fill us with divine discontent with all that is wrong in our national life. Wherever there is injustice, wherever there is racial hatred and discrimination, wherever there is graft, corruption, and crime, wherever low moral standards prevail, we have no right to be contented. Are we for Jesus or against Him? Each gives his answer by the quality of his own life.

VA Sees Doctor, Nurse Loss to Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as further proof of the desperate situation that has developed in our veterans' hospitals, due to inadequate medical, dental, and nursing staffs, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Maj. Gen. Carl Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, dealing with the problem that now exists and with the acute situation brought about by the arbitrary action of the armed service in raiding these staffs by calling up for active duty medical reservists and other medical men now in the service of the Veterans' Administration.

General Gray's letter, which follows, is self-explanatory:

VA SEES DOCTOR, NURSE LOSS TO ARMED SERVICES' NEEDS

(By Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator, Veterans' Affairs)

WASHINGTON.—An 8-year-old specter has returned to haunt Veterans' Administration officials—the serious depletion of professional medical personnel by the present military situation. The situation isn't as desperate as it was in early 1948 when the loss of doctors threatened to wreck the entire VA medical set-up, but is gradually moving in that direction despite law and and increasing work load.

VA has lost approximately 400 physicians to the Armed Forces since the start of the Korean hostilities. Nearly that many nurses have been called to active duty, and the dental service losses have been in about the same proportion.

The growing shortage of physicians is the gravest of VA's medical manpower problems. Approximately half of VA's 4,900 full-time doctors are Reserve officers. Many of these are senior Reserve officers in organized units. Others are senior Reserves not in organized units but in categories badly needed by the Armed Forces. Add to these the residents in the Reserves and those vulnerable to the draft, many of whom were trained as Navy V-12s or under the Army specialized training program, and the picture becomes even darker.

WHAT VA IS DOING

First, VA is attempting to call to attention the fact that under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, it has priority equal to that of any other agency in the manpower pool and the problems of supply. This VA did not have in 1948.

Second, VA has established a manpower board that makes representations to the Armed Forces for delays in calls to active duty of all physicians, dentists and nurses and for many other essential medical personnel who are members of the Reserves. To date, the board has been only moderately successful, and the best it can obtain for those ordered into uniform is a 6 months delay. Full-time physicians subject to the draft must take their chances with their local selective service boards, but hospital managers have been instructed to go to bat for them wherever possible.

Third, Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS has introduced H. R. 2998 in the House of Representatives, a bill that would have the effect of freezing all VA Department Medicine and Surgery employees in their positions. This measure, which has been referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, should have the immediate effect of emphasizing the seriousness of the situation and may result at the hearing in calling attention to the little-noticed fact that VA does have equal priority under the law and that it was the intent of the Congress to confer such a priority on VA to prevent the very thing that is now happening.

LOAD IS INCREASING

Fourth, representatives of VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery have appeared before the Health Resources Advisory (Rusk) Committee of the National Security Resources Board and, together with the Deputy Administrator, have conferred with the NSRB chairman to present VA's problem. They have also appeared with the Deputy Administrator before the Armed Forces Personel Policy Board to point out that we have a current and increasing load, a part of which can be attributed to the agreement by VA to accept as patients service personnel with certain types of chronic illnesses and disabilities. They have further pointed out that the existing procedures for calling Reserve officers have resulted in serious losses in certain categories of medical specialties.

Deferments and delays in calls to active duty provide little help since they are but temporary in nature and there is no source of medical manpower from which replacements can be recruited.

VA officials hope that one or all of the four courses of action will stem or help to stem the tide. Otherwise VA will be placed in the same disastrous position as it was in 1948 when no positive protective action was taken until too many of its physicians and dentists had entered the military service. Finally, the only effective procedure was the commissioning of VA physicians and dentists generally, and eventually it was even necessary for the Armed Forces to supplement VA staffs with military personnel.

Price Control on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter received by me from Mr. R. M. Eaton, resident manager of the Hazard Insulated Wire Works, division of the Okonite Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

HAZARD INSULATED WIRE WORKS,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., March 28, 1951.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: In letter of the 15th (acknowledging receipt of Bache & Co.'s release entitled "Bucking the Law of Supply and Demand," you asked me to prepare a statement, which I have been trying to do ever since.

It has taken so long because I feel that handling of the copper situation by present governmental controls is not entirely in accord with basic economy, as I understand it. I do not pretend to be an economist, but in nearly 50 years of active business life have always found supply and demand to be the factor regulating price, and it would seem to me the metal markets are simply acting in accordance with the law. In this respect let me quote from the above-mentioned release:

"When that law (supply and demand) is interfered with, then supply and demand get out of balance. Representatives of the domestic copper-producing industry who met recently in Washington with officials of the Defense Minerals Administration, told these officials, according to the trade press, that current ceiling prices on copper are diverting some foreign supplies from the domestic market. We anticipated that that would happen, and in our market letter dated February 13, 1951, we said:

"'If the Government should impose a ceiling on the domestic price of copper and if this ceiling should be lower than the world price, the domestic supply position may be placed in double jeopardy, through a drop in domestic output and the loss of foreign copper. Producers in other parts of the world will seek an outlet for their copper where the highest prices are being paid and many European consumers are already paying more than 24½ cents for copper and are anxious to buy large quantities at higher prices.'

"It should be obvious that if this situation is allowed to continue unchecked, the domestic shortage of copper is likely to become much more serious than it is already."

The above being so, it would seem to me that the 2-cent-per-pound import on copper should be suspended, and it should have been done long ago for the benefit of everyone and not retained for the benefit of a small minority group. The market should be allowed to find its own level so that consumers permitted to use the metal for making civilian articles (who are unable to get all they need at the market price of 24½ cents per pound) can buy additional amounts at whatever price necessary and pass this increased cost on to customers who want to buy finished products—no matter what the price is.

While certain producers may accumulate enormous profits by this process, they could be siphoned off to the Government by excess-profits taxes, so that in the long run the Government would benefit.

It is my contention, therefore, that all producers of virgin materials should be encouraged to produce, since everything is in short supply. It is also my contention—as stated above—that there is no greater incentive to production than the natural law of supply and demand. If that law is allowed to function freely, all domestic and foreign producers will be attracted to the best market—which should be in this country since the potential consumption is far greater here than anywhere else in the world.

The present price controls and tariffs on virgin materials are preventing necessary supplies of these materials, and Congress can profitably weigh the advantages of free markets for these raw materials versus the hamstringing caused by controls.

Very truly yours,

HAZARD INSULATED WIRE WORKS,
DIVISION OF THE OKONITE CO.
R. M. EATON, *Resident Manager.*

Graft Endangers Federal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the March 22 issue of the Verndale Sun, published in Verndale, Minn., appears the Weekly Newsletter of Representative FRED MARSHALL, Sixth District, Minnesota. Representative MARSHALL is known throughout the State of Minnesota as a man of great integrity, sincerity, and courage. His comments regarding moral and ethical standards of conduct in the Federal service are worthy of the study and attention of every citizen. I ask unanimous consent that Representative MARSHALL's newsletter be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAFT ENDANGERS FEDERAL SERVICE

Everyone interested in honest government must be bewildered and alarmed by the almost daily reports of corruption and scandal being disclosed in Government operations. The very fact that this is headline news indicates that it is the unusual and not the usual.

I have no patience with those who betray their fellow workers and their Government by dishonesty. They are parasites and we must work to rid our Government of them and their practices. Their effect is even more far reaching than their immediate evil.

It is difficult to know just how much our Government has been weakened by acceptance of good men and women to assume positions because of these scandals.

In hearings last week on the Voice of America program it was revealed that Edward Barrett left Newsweek magazine at a considerable financial sacrifice to take charge of this important work. He then discovered

that topflight personnel he needed refused to accept positions for fear of character assassination and the stigma of bureaucracy.

This situation makes it imperative that the present disclosures be pursued and that action be taken to encourage the loyal officials and employees who are quietly and efficiently serving the taxpayer. Only by ridding Government of graft and corruption can confidence be restored.

Corruption is not new or unique. Every administration has suffered from the greedy and power-hungry who seek to use Government for their own selfish interests. No political party is immune from those within its ranks who are there only for power or profit without regard for its political philosophy or principles.

This is true at every level of government—city, county, State, and Federal. And it will remain true until the facts are given to the people and they act to correct the abuses of authority and prestige. Our kind of government does not usually permit these things to remain hidden long, unless the people themselves permit it.

Those who out of false loyalty to party or friends defend dishonesty are most guilty. The attitude of my party or my friends, right or wrong, is moral cowardice which breeds corruption and undermines the fabric of government.

Outright theft or embezzlement in government cannot go long undetected. More dangerous are the peddlers of influence, the 5-percenters, the fixers, and the shake-down artists. These are the men and women who use their positions and their friends for personal gain.

The acceptance of a mink coat by a White House stenographer from persons interested in obtaining Federal assistance is an indication of moral laxity which a good citizen cannot condone.

The whole intricate maze of doubtful operations in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by some of its officials endangers a program which makes 80 percent of its loans to small businesses needing less than $50,000. But this fact is obscured by the disgusting spectacle of its officials collaborating with men in the White House and in Congress to set up questionable financial ventures and Miami Beach hotels.

Throughout history there has been a market for the intangible commodity known as influence. As long as men choose to be greedy and to profit from the needs or suffering of others, there will be a market for influence.

In exposing the officials who willingly permit themselves to be used, we sometimes overlook the moral degeneration of those who buy influence. Those who sell influence and those who buy influence are equally bad.

Elected officials as well as appointed officials are a part of the pattern of evil. Charges of patronage being peddled over the counter in Mississippi are not isolated incidents. Employment of persons by any agency without regard to ability is a dangerous practice. We, too, find people administering important programs who have little conception of the problems involved.

It is shocking to find that many Congressmen and Senators are receiving retainers or salaries from other sources. I have found my job more than a full-time job—it is a job that can never be completely done. Yet if these men are accepting salaries or retainers they must be providing services. And can anyone vote in the best interests of all of the people of a district, if he stands to make personal profit for a particular interest?

Though committees of the House and Senate are performing a great service in uncovering corruption and dishonesty, Congress must also look at itself. It may be legal for a Senator to spend thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money to send telegraphic accounts of his speeches all over the country. It may be legal but it is morally wrong.

This is the heart of the problem. Many of the practices disclosed are not illegal. Yet, we cannot set mere legality as the standard of public life. Rather we ought to set the moral virtues as the standard of service in Government and to restore confidence in Government.

FRED MARSHALL.

In Memory of the Greatest American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been the fortune of our Nation to have had great leaders come to the fore in the times of crisis. Six years ago tomorrow the free world mourned the death of one of the great leaders of all time—Franklin D. Roosevelt. He came to us when our Nation was in the midst of a terrible depression. He warned against fear and made the decisions which led us out of the depths of economic distress. He was ready when the Nazi monster unleashed war on our world. His decisions and his leadership led the free world to victory.

Six years ago tomorrow his successor, President Harry S. Truman, stepped into Roosevelt's shoes. President Truman has had to make great decisions during his 6 years in office. Every decision he has made has been made in the desire and in the great wish that it will take us farther down the road to eventual peace and security. President Truman had a tremendous decision to make on the question of using the atomic bomb. He made his decision resolutely.

He had a decision to make as to whether our Nation would give its unfailing support to the international cause of the United Nations. His critics, those men of little faith fought him, but he has not turned back.

He fought for the Truman doctrine, he gave his wholehearted support to make the Marshall plan work. His was a guiding hand in bringing the North Atlantic Pact into being.

Last year he was faced with an invasion of the Republic of Korea by the forces of the Kremlin. He made the decision that the Kremlin had gone far enough. The people of the free world have applauded his decision. His decision was made in the belief that it was another contribution to peace.

It is not easy to make controversial decisions in the time of great crisis when emotions and partisanship are running rampant. History only will record the correctness of the decision which is made, and history will record that the great decisions which have been made in the first 6 years of President Truman's administration have been made in the interest of peace for our generation and for generations to come.

Sometime in today's early hours President Truman had to make another controversial decision of high moment to the world; and, knowing the storm of abuse which would fall on him, he made that decision resolutely: To relieve Gen. Douglas MacArthur of his command functions.

This was a decision as painful as any ever made by President Roosevelt; and it may be as great in its impact on the world's future.

I remember vividly the sense of loss that I felt myself when I learned of President Roosevelt's death; I know that almost every man and woman in the free world felt the same sharp sense of personal desolation; and I know that Harry Truman, taking his sacred oath of office in the midst of the world's greatest war was not immune.

He has told us so; humbly and honestly, he has told the world that his only hope was to so conduct his office that he would not be ashamed to face his predecessor.

Surely today we need to hark back to the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his calm assurance. We need to remember his most striking phrase: "All we have to fear is fear itself."

Rev. Joseph Murgas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent in this House the Eleventh Pennsylvania District, comprising the county of Luzerne in the State of Pennsylvania, with Wilkes-Barre as the county seat. And further I have the distinction of living in that part of the city of Wilkes-Barre—up in North Wilkes-Barre—within the very parish so satisfactorily served by that great and beloved priest, distinguished scholar and scientist, Rev. Joseph Murgas.

And so on this day in April I use this great forum of democracy and freedom to pay tribute to his memory and I read from the book written by Mr. Stephen J. Palickar, an excellent biography of Father Murgas:

REV. JOSEPH MURGAS

As a servant in the vineyard of Christ, a humanitarian, and a man of science, Rev. Joseph Murgas' immutable characteristic was his intense love of truth and accuracy. A conspicuous manifestation of his quality in his life is traced to the early days of his priesthood when, as an austere art critic in his native Slovakia, he pointed to the false interpretation of a painting in the Hungarian House of Parliament by a famous Magyar artist who attempted to portray a certain historical event in the life of two nations. The circumstances which followed the daring performance of Father Murgas brought him to America where, as a priest, he continued to spread the truth of the gospel to his countrymen, a task he was aptly qualified to fulfill because of his sympathetic understanding of the human heart and a firm belief in the immortality of the soul.

His keen intellect and the blessing of his theological training helped in providing him with a sound scientific grounding which not only added to his lore, but also proved beneficial to civilization. In this category his fertile brain enabled him to emerge as a pioneer inventor in the field of wireless telegraphy and radio, and as a result of his work in this realm of science, he gained an aura of glamour which since has been denied him.

In addition to his religious, social, artistic, political and naturalistic accomplishments, Father Murgas' creative ability led him to invent a new and faster method of wireless communication known as the "Tonesystem" by which, instead of the "dot" and "dash" spark impulse used in the Morse method, a musical effect arranged in different tones representing each letter of the alphabet was used to dispatch messages by wireless telegraphy.

Rev. Joseph Murgas further delved, and was the first to succeed in transmitting voice sounds by means of wireless which contributed toward making his device the forerunner of present-day radio.

An Ex-Artillery Captain Fires a General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, an ex-artillery captain has achieved the ultimate. He has fired the general.

I wonder what Hiss counseled this.

The supreme irony is that Mr. Truman invokes the Constitution as the basis of his action. This is the same Constitution which Mr. Truman flouted when he plunged the Nation into war without the authority of the Congress.

History records that one famous American general was fired—Gen. George McClellan—because he would not fight. Not until this morning, however, has an American general been fired because he insisted upon fighting a war he had been ordered to prosecute.

The President complains that MacArthur "is unable to give wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations."

He spoke more truly than he realized.

Certainly MacArthur has been unable to give his wholehearted support to the tragic absurdity that it is possible to repel and defeat aggression without defeating the aggressor and without using every military resource to accomplish that defeat.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to a blockade of Formosa which denies the Nationalist Chinese Government the right to fulfill its United Nations obligation to resist aggression.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to failure to provide South Koreans with arms to resist the invaders of their homeland and thereby save countless American lives.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to policies which prevented his carrying the war to the enemy's supply bases.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to the perpetuation of a futile stalemate in an aimless war which already has cost nearly 60,000 American casualties.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to policies which can have no ultimate outcome but appeasement.

If that is insubordination, then millions of MacArthur's fellow Americans are insubordinate.

Will the ex-artillery captain fire them, too?

Operation Statesmen—Increased Enrollment at Military Colleges Points Up Need for an Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Newsweek Magazine carries on the cover a picture of West Point cadets in the historic dress uniforms that are a heritage from the earliest days of the United States Military Academy. Out of date though these uniforms of 1802 seem in the year 1951, there is nothing old-fashioned, out-of-date, or superfluous about the training the cadets at the Academy are receiving today. These picked young men, being educated at public expense, are being educated to become public leaders. As the author of the article states:

> In the present (or Kremlin-spooked) world it was apparent that, whether all Americans liked it or not, military leadership was playing and would continue to play a vital part in Government policy and administration. As Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently put it: "Today, in this half peace, half war, neither the soldier nor the diplomat alone can lead the American people in a wise course of international action. Both voices must be heard if American policy is to be realistic and effective."

Facing the realities of this period of tension in which we live, the West Point Military Academy is giving its handpicked men the best education for all eventualities—and for service to their country as soldiers and leaders.

What is happening at West Point is also happening at Annapolis, at the Coast Guard Academy at New London, and at eight civilian schools specifically recognized by the Department of Defense as preferred sources for officer procurement. New courses are preparing men for new responsibilities. Increased applications are permitting new and even higher standards of selection. But new quotas are also permitting larger graduation classes. The military schools of the country are girding to face an emergency, and are in every way proving their own sense of responsibility to the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in this Newsweek article on what the military academies are doing to turn out the best men, mentally, morally, and physically, to serve our country in any eventuality, one important fact is conspicuous by its absence. There is no Air Force Academy. There is nowhere in the United States an academy that trains leaders for our United States Air Force in the way in which other schools train leaders for our Army, our Navy, and our Coast Guard.

The Air Force, it is true, has its own cadets—and trains them to be pilots, navigators, and bombardiers. But their Air Force training is technical and begins only after their required civilian and academic training has been completed. The Air Force has no opportunities and no facilities for taking young men just out of high school and giving them the sort of intensified training in leadership that the other services are giving other young men who will become leaders.

This deficiency is being met, after a fashion, by taking 25 percent of both Annapolis and West Point graduates for the Air Force—an expedient that creates a situation that is at once unfair to the Air Force and to the other services. It deprives both the Army and the Navy of leaders trained for the responsible needs of these services, whereas it gives to the Air Force officers presumably trained in fields other than those involving basically Air Force requirements. Basically, the training that must be given an Army officer is training in civil engineering, and West Point graduates have built most of our harbors, many of our bridges, and our great Panama Canal. Basically, the training that must be given a naval officer is training in mechanical engineering, and Navy Academy graduates are outstanding among men who follow the sea. But what the Air Force requires is officers trained in aeronautical engineering—for the mastery of a third element, that is neither sea nor land.

The unfairness of the existing situation points up the pressing need for an Air Force Academy, but the need is now greater than the need of a single service for military leaders. In this air age, in which our survival may depend on our ability to retain control of the air, not only over the United States but over any lands where freedom is threatened, the need is for strategists who are educated in the problems, the tactics, the responsibilities and the science of the air.

The forces with which we are confronted in the world today demand that we seek perfection in our armed forces. We must rely on quality rather than quantity, on the effective use of technical equipment rather than on manpower. Along with other essential qualities our officer corps must have a high intelligence and educational level. All of them should, in fact, have a full college education as a minimum requirement.

If an Air Academy could be opened in the summer of 1952, its first contribution

to an increase in the officer corps of the three services would not occur before 1956. The first full strength class of graduates could not reasonably be produced earlier than 1960. Hence, it is perfectly true that an Air Force Academy, even if authorized today, would have little or no effect on the specific emergency with which we are now confronted. But the tensions that disturb the peace today may well last through the lifetime of most of us, and through future generations. We must build our defenses not merely for 1951, but for 1961, and for all the years ahead. An Air Force Academy at this time is necessary as part of our long-range insurance, not merely to build up the Air Force but the Army and the Navy as well, since West Point and Annapolis do not actually meet the needs of Army and Navy, much less those of the Air Force.

We must remember the stern warning of Winston Churchill, who said:

For good or ill, air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power.

If the United States is to retain leadership in the world, and hence in the air, it becomes the responsibility of American citizens and of the American Congress to establish an Air Force Academy that will produce the leaders qualified to win and maintain for us military mastery in this element which Americans were the first to conquer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, Operation Statesmen, from the March 26, 1951, issue of Newsweek magazine.

The article is as follows:

WEST POINT PRODUCING SOLDIER STATESMEN AS MILITARY COLLEGES FACE BUDGET BOOM

The rush was on. There hadn't been anything like it since 1942. While many college leaders in America deplored the loss of boys to the services and predicted declines in enrollment of up to 40 percent, military colleges braced themselves for the biggest boom in their history.

The three service Academies—West Point, Annapolis, and the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.—are limited by law in their enrollments. They were turning away more applicants than ever before. Most of the eight "tin colleges," civilian schools especially recognized by the Pentagon for their strict military training, were getting about two or three times as many applications as they could accept. The eight: Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Clemson Agricultural College, the Citadel, Virginia Military Institute, Norwich University, Pennsylvania Military College, and North Georgia College. In Army slang they are called "tin" to differentiate the "brass," or top officer personnel, which traditionally comes from the official schools. Gen. George Marshall, top Army officer of the Second World War and present Secretary of Defense, is a graduate of VMI.

The tin colleges, whose enrollments now total some 13,000, could expect the pressure on them to get heavier. Since the schools require virtually all male students to take ROTC and live a military life in uniform, the recent Senate draft bill (Newsweek, March 19) grants the ROTC men of these eight colleges the same deferments as service-Academy students. The House bill, up for an early vote, contains the same provision. And the 100 Regular and 400 Reserve Army commissions that usually go to these 8 schools will be more than doubled this June.

ACADEMY RUSH

At Annapolis, largest of the service Academies, 3,000 middies were crammed into huge Bancroft Hall's space for 2,900. The present student body is the largest in the 106-year existence of the Naval Academy.

The Coast Guard Academy, smallest (with an enrollment of 500) and youngest (75 years old) of the federally supported Academies, had room for only 1 out of every 30 men who qualified mentally. In February, 6,201 took its exams; only 200 were picked.

West Point, oldest of the three official military schools, was taking the boom most calmly. Celebrating the start of its one hundred and fiftieth year last week, the great gray fortress above the Hudson maintained the same enrollment that it had 5 years ago—the authorized 2,496. But for last year's 14 Presidential appointments, 310 had competed. Some 1,500 Regular Army personnel applied for the Point; 50 applicants took exams, and 12 were selected. Congressmen and Senators appoint 85 percent of the cadets and 60 percent of Annapolis' middies. Some reported 100 applicants for each of the 4 Point and 5 Annapolis appointments which they may have attending at the same time.

Military instructors saw only one reason for the boom. Thousands of boys preferred several years in a military school, followed by an officer's commission, to a drafted private's job in the Infantry. As for the service Academies, by initial selection, training, and constant culling in the course of the free education they give their students, they still produced most of the cream of the country's military leadership. And of a significantly different kind.

In the present (or Kremlin-spooked) world it was apparent that, whether all Americans liked it or not, military leadership was playing and would continue to play a vital part in Government policy and administration. As Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently put it: "Today, in this half peace, half war, neither the soldier nor the diplomat alone can lead the American people in a wise course of international action. Both voices must be heard if American policy is to be realistic and effective."

There was no question that the voice of the military was being heard in statesmanship. George C. Marshall, Virginia Military Institute, 1901; Dwight D. Eisenhower and Bradley, United States Military Academy, 1915, were clearly helping to shape the vital foreign-policy decisions of the Republic. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, United States Military Academy, 1903, could not stay out of the dire headlines from Asia even if he wanted to. Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Naval Academy, 1905, headed up the ticklish work of the Presidential Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.

LEADERSHIP

Both Annapolis and West Point have realized the new trend in military education. Since the end of the Second World War, both have established new departments of "leadership." Of the approximately 3,000 hours each West Point cadet spends in study and recitation during his 4 years, roughly 40 percent are now devoted to social-humanistic studies. (Cadets take an additional 2,000 hours of military training, mostly in the summer.)

Old-time Pointers might frown on such newfangled ideas. These were certainly different from the original concept of a United States Military Academy when it was founded as an engineering school under Maj. Jonathan Williams in 1802. The original 5 officers and 10 cadets had dwindled to 1 of each by 1812, when the war with England brought new strength to the United States Military Academy. In the nineteenth century, Pointers built all the Nation's main and cross-country railroad lines and mapped and surveyed the coasts and frontiers. Later they completed such major engineering projects as the Panama Canal.

Something like that atmosphere has returned to the Point. Under its 1945 Superintendent, Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, geography was restored after a 50-year absence from the curriculum; history of the Far East, Russia, and Latin America, and United States diplomatic history were modernized. Subjects like economics of security now give first classmen (seniors) training in resources and manpower and their capability of conversion to a wartime economy. Student conferences with other colleges bring cadets in contact with their civilian brothers.

In international relations, contemporary problems are studied. In part of the course—Operation Statesman, begun in 1947—first classmen finish their international-relations training by studying a major United States foreign problem. In groups of 18, they examine and report on such thorny projects as writing a peace treaty for Japan or Germany, implementing the point 4 program, or proposing United States policy toward the disposition of Italy's former African colonies.

JETS AND ATOMS

Each cadet must take a language—the only choice he has in the curriculum—and 180 hours of English. In the scientific-engineering side of his liberal education, the Pointer studies atomic energy and electronics via oversize machines and demonstrations. The principles of jet propulsion can be learned firsthand from an F-80 jet engine donated last January by the Air Force, whither, incidentally, 25 percent of the cadets and of the Annapolis middies go on graduation. The $180,000 gift is the only such bodiless engine outside research laboratories and roars its exhaust out over the Hudson River, much to the consternation of nearby Cold Springs, N. Y., residents.

The department of military psychology and leadership, suggested in 1946 by General Eisenhower, proposes to the cadets such concrete problems as how to tell an incipient squad leader that he is about to be sent to cooks-and-bakers school instead, how to cope with a pregnant girl who accuses a soldier in your company of fatherhood, or what to tell your roommate when he breaks a fighter-plane formation which you command. (Annapolis has a similar course.) Military psychology and leadership also oversees the aptitude system whereby each man grades the 100 men of all classes in his company on leadership qualities. Each cadet is rated 9 times in his point career. If he consistently ends up at the bottom of the list, he gets advice from his superiors and the staff psychologist. If this does not help, he is advised to resign without disgrace because of his lack of leadership qualities. (Annapolis aptitude ratings do not permit a middie to rate a man above him.)

PLEBES AND RULES

Military psychology and leadership also takes the plebes (freshmen) under its wing. Hazing and the miseries of "bracing" (sucking in the chin and stomach, throwing out the chest and shoulders) were long the tradition at the Point. Today the plebe need never brace in public and physical hazing is forbidden. As one first classman puts it, "instead of driving the plebes we're leaving them alone. That old stuff was nonsense." Plebes each have an officer adviser among the 310 faculty members. These advisers invite the plebes to their homes and listen to their worries.

Bound by duty and honor, cadets are now allowed to drink in uniform 25 miles from the Academy (formerly they never could drink in uniform). While the new Point Superintendent, Maj. Gen. Frederick A. Irving, who took over in January,[1] is willing to trust his men with less discipline under the honor system, Annapolis is now undergoing a tightening-up of already strict rules. Vice Adm. Harry W. Hill, Superintendent since last April, felt the middies were having it too soft. First classmen who in years past enjoyed every other week end off have suddenly found that they now have only four or five a semester. Annapolis plebes may not "drag" (date) except on rare occasions.

Civilians may wonder at the purpose of such training. But it is part of the Academies' attempt to turn out the very best men mentally, morally, and physically.

About half of each Coast Guard class "bilges out" before graduation, as the heavy engineering course is a tough one. Some 25 out of every 100 middies don't make it. West Point has managed to cut its "foundlings" from 50 percent 100 years ago to the present 20 percent. At the eight tin colleges drop-outs are much lower, with Texas A. & M.'s 11 percent unusually high.

Training for peacetime governmental service, as well as possible war command, has put a tremendous responsibility on the military academies and colleges. Out of a wave of applicants they have had to choose not only the good men. They have had to pick the best—and give them the best education for all eventualities—to wit, "Operation statesmen."

[1] General Irving succeeded Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore, General Taylor's successor in 1949. General Moore recently died in Korea after a helicopter accident.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in connection with the recall early this morning of General MacArthur, an editorial entitled "What Now, Mr. President?" published today in the Washington News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT NOW, MR. PRESIDENT?

Now, Mr. President, that you have fired General MacArthur, what next?

You have appointed General Ridgway as his successor to all United States and UN Far East commands.

Yet, 2 days ago, General Ridgway said:

"I see no end to the military operations unless there is a political settlement. I have no personal knowledge of negotiations for a political settlement. * * * There is nothing transitory, nothing temporary, about this situation we are in so far as a fight against communism is concerned. For Communist leaders this is a life and death struggle. The Communists will not vary their objectives. These fellows are out to destroy us no matter how long it takes."

Isn't that the same thing that General MacArthur has been saying?

By firing General MacArthur, Mr. President, have you come any closer to winning or ending the war in Korea?

That, eventually, is the test you must meet.

Serving General MacArthur's head up on a platter may temporarily appease the yapping yahoos of the British Socialist Government. But Britain has only 13,000 ground troops in Korea.

It may bring a frenzied delight to Prime Minister Nehru of India. But India has sent only an ambulance unit and some gunny sacks to Korea.

It may give some satisfaction to the French, but they have only 600 men in Korea.

Yet, what word goes to the 250,000 Americans alive and fighting in Korea? What is to be done in retribution for the 60,000 American casualties, including the 9,000 American dead—what assurance that their bleeding and dying shall not have been in vain?

General MacArthur has been sacked because, it is said, he was insubordinate.

General MacArthur's crime is that he saw no sense in fighting a losing or a futile war.

He insisted that we get this war over with—by victory, as has been the American habit.

To do the job, he asked for reinforcements—from all members of the United Nations—and a free hand to mount the maximum counter-offensive against the enemy. He asked that the 500,000 troops of Nationalist China be permitted to fight on our side.

He asked for these things because he wanted to win the war so that our troops could come home.

Secretary of State Acheson and the British Socialists and Nehru have won a great victory. They have got General MacArthur's scalp—which has been their goal for many months.

But now that the diplomats and the politicians have taken over this war, what are they going to do with it?

The President's order relieving General MacArthur of his command authorized him to issue such travel orders as he wishes to go any place he sees fit. But that does not apply to the 250,000 American troops under his command. They are left in Korea.

What is to be done about these men?

What about Korea?

What about the rest of Asia?

Centralization of Military Apparent Aim of Vinson UMT Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there is strong evidence to support the conviction that the UMT proposal submitted by Secretary of Defense Marshall represented one more attempt in the series of efforts to centralize all military power in the Federal Government.

The most ominous feature of the UMT issue will be missed completely if this factor is overlooked or minimized.

The fact that both the Senate UMT bill, as finally adopted, and the House bill, now under consideration, modify the original Marshall bill provisions to some degree, particularly so far as the status of the National Guard is concerned, does not alter the facts as to the apparent intent of General Marshall and the Pentagon to move substantially closer to complete centralization of military power.

Unless there is constant alertness to this aspect of the UMT proposal, there is still no assurance that this further centralization will not be an effect of UMT legislation.

The original Marshall bill puts Congress on notice as to the Pentagon's intent and continued desire on this score. It puts Congress on notice that there has been no serious effort to approach the problem of preparedness through the decentralized National Guard approach. And it certainly puts Congress on notice that it can expect stubborn resistance and obstruction, so far as the Pentagon is concerned, to any attempt to make that approach.

THE GRAY BOARD'S KIDNAPING PLAN

There are strong grounds for believing that the Marshall UMT bill was an attempt to accomplish, through the back door, what it hoped to achieve by the 1948 proposal to kidnap the National Guard.

It is important, for background purposes, to review the essential facts of this kidnaping effort, represented by the recommendation of the Committee on Civilian Components, commonly called the Gray Board, in its report of June 30, 1948.

On October 13, 1945—just prior to the retirement of General Marshall as Army Chief of Staff—a statement of approved War Department policies affecting the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserve Corps was issued by the War Department. This plan contemplated an M-day force, to comprise the Nation's first line of defense, made up of approximately 850,000 men in the Regular Army and Air Force, another 680,000 men in the National Guard, and approximately 220,000 men in the Organized Reserve, for a total of 1,750,000 men capable of immediate mobilization in the event of aggression.

In 1947 the Committee on Civilian Components was brought into being. Its report of June 30, 1948, included certain findings and recommendations which added up to a proposal that the National Guard be brought directly under control of the Federal Government.

Before these findings and recommendations are cited, however, attention should be called to the constitutional provisions regarding a decentralized militia which, today, is the National Guard of the several States.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution provides:

> The Congress shall have power—
>
> To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

The Constitution, in the same article and section, also provides:

> The Congress shall have power—
>
> To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

The significance of these two provisions is a twofold balancing of powers, responsibilities, and authority so far as the Armed Forces of the Nation and the States are concerned:

First. The Federal Government was given the power to provide for a standing Army, subject to the 2-year appropriation limitation; the Federal Government also was given authority to prescribe the discipline to govern the State militia.

Second. The States were assured the support of the Federal Government for its militia—National Guard—since the Federal Government would organize and arm these State troops; at the same time the States retained control over the militia through its power to appoint the officers and train the troops comprising the militia.

This, then, is a provision for effective decentralization of military control and authority except (a) for Federal control of the standing Army; (b) Federal control of the militia when called into the service of the United States.

Thus the Constitution did not contemplate (a) a permanent, peacetime Federal Militia; (b) the right of the Federal Government to federalize the militia in peacetime—that is, at any time other than when necessary "to call forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

GRAY REPORT PROPOSAL

The Gray report held that "the National Guard must be directly under Federal control" in order to accomplish its accepted national role or mission as defined in the October 13, 1945, War Department policies.

The report further recommended specifically:

1. Establishing the Reserve forces of the Army under the Army clause of the Constitution.

2. Establishing the Reserve forces of the Air Force under appropriate (Federal) legal authority.

3. Incorporating the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps into the Army Reserve force under the name of the "National Guard of the United States."

4. Incorporating the Air National Guard and Air Reserve into the Air Force Reserve under the name of the "United States Air Force Reserve."

Subsequently the Secretary of Defense, on December 15, 1948, recommended to the President, among other things, the federalization of the Air National Guard, and greater Federal control over the personnel, equipment, facilities, and allocation of moneys to the States.

PROTESTS MADE BY STATE LEGISLATURES

These developments brought vigorous protests from the States. Memorials to Congress were adopted opposing the proposed federalization. Besides the Michigan Legislature, acting under dates of April 29 and May 17, 1949, similar action was taken by the States of South Carolina, Maryland, South Dakota, Indiana, Massachusetts, Utah, Arkansas, Maine, Minnesota, and Oregon, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Michigan resolution stated, among other things:

> Such federalization would violate the principle of State's rights.
>
> * * * Federalization * * * would violate existing agreements between the Federal Government and the sovereign States whereby the States accepted in good faith the allotments made by the War Department in 1945, and have completed the organization of such allotments, insofar as authorized by the Congress and for which funds have been provided. * * *
>
> * * * Federalization would destroy at one blow the Nation Guard as it now exists * * * and would result in the centralization of all military power in the Federal Government and ultimately in the hands of a few, and thus pave the way for the establishment of a dictatorship, military or otherwise, in this country. * * *
>
> * * * The States * * * would be compelled to organize and maintain State troops at great cost to the States with the result that there would thus be maintained a Federal reserve and State military force, creating a great duplication of effort and expense. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, pp. 7214–7215.)

The resolutions adopted by the other States contained similar statements as to the consequence of proposed federalization of the National Guard.

STATEMENTS BY GEN. JULIUS KLEIN

In an address at Bloomington, Ill., January 27, 1949, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, commander of One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade, Thirty-third Division, Illinois National Guard, made these statements regarding the proposed federalization of the National Guard:

> From time to time, powerful groups of individuals have sought to destroy the traditional principles upon which the National Guard was founded and has been maintained throughout our history. They have repeatedly attempted to kidnap the Guard from the States and place it directly under control of the Federal Government. The latest assault on the National Guard, and the rights of States, has been launched under the cloak of so-called unification of the Armed Forces by the Committee on Civilian Components.

General Klein quoted former Governor Green, of Illinois, as saying:

> I am sure that I voice the sentiments of the Governors of almost all States when I say that we will fight to the last ditch against this proposal. National Guard officers and men have proven themselves superior to the fighting men of the strongest militaristic nations of the world. They are ready for effective action sooner than officers and men in the Federal Reserves which were organized after World War I. * * * I believe * * * the War Department records will reveal that in World War II not a single unit of the Organized Reserve Corps was called into Federal service as a unit—a record not conducive to capturing the trust and confidence of the Nation.

General Klein then added:

> The Federal Government has also had direct Federal control of the Organized Reserve Corps since the end of World War II and has had the opportunity to make the Organized Reserve Corps as efficient as the National Guard is under State control, but has failed to do so. Thirty years of apparent failure with the ORC prior to World War II and continued failure since World War II is a poor recommendation. What assurance has the Nation that the Army, with the National Guard under Federal control, will be more successful than the States have been?

General Klein pointed out that the concern of the Gray board over delay in putting the National Guard into Federal service and transfer of Federal property could be corrected by an amendment to the National Defense Act "which would automatically place the National Guard under Federal control the instant Congress declares a National Emergency." He said such a recommendation had been submitted to the Defense Department some time ago.

Then General Klein gave this warning:

> It is not too difficult to visualize that at some future time an ambitious, selfish individual, group or organization would be able to use this great power to continue its control of the Government, or endeavor to seize such control. This one possibility alone is enough to condemn forever this great centralization of power, which one day might place this, the last free nation in the world, in jeopardy of losing the freedom for which so many of our people died.
>
> * * * The National Guard system, comprising as it does—citizen soldiers—has always been a bulwark against the concentration of military power in our Federal Government. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 2, pp. 1493–94.)

General Klein cited as one further argument against federalization the fact that in event of an atomic attack wiping out Washington, it would be tremendously important to continue military decentralization "of, if you please, a continuation of the present National Guard system." In such an emergency, he pointed out:

> The only remaining recognized authority in such a crisis would be the governors of the sovereign States. If the National Guard were federalized * * * these governors would be without the legal power to employ the troops.

COLLIER'S EDITORIAL ON FEDERALIZATION

The March 26, 1949, Collier's carried a vigorous editorial opposing the federalization of the National Guard. Its argument is summed up as follows:

> Ours is a Federal and not a National Government. The difference is far more than a matter of words. It is the difference between a Nazi or a Communist state and a free state. * * *
>
> * * * Let's not federalize the National Guard or any other governmental enterprise that can be successfully operated by State or local governments. (Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 13, p. A1967.)

GENERAL MARSHALL'S ADMISSION OF FAILURE

Apropos of what General Klein said, above—and Governor Green—regarding the failure of the Federal Government to develop an effective Reserve system, note the following statement by General Marshall, quoted in the April 13, 1951, United States News and World Report, page 31:

> We started in June from a state of bankruptcy as to available trained reserves. Whatever Reserve organizations we had were only 40 or 50 percent of strength, and that strength only partially trained. * * * What we are now trying to do is overcome this complete deficiency of trained men that we've had.

While this may be in part an attempt to belittle the National Guard, although Marshall said, page 28, "the National Guard as part of" the "Reserve system have the equivalent of 34 divisions of ground troops with 50 percent strength," it obviously applies particularly to the Organized Reserve Corps.

Insofar as what Marshall says is true it is an admission of the Pentagon's failure to obey the orders of the President issued October 15, 1948—Executive Order No. 10,007, Federal Register, volume 13, October 19, 1948, page 6099.

Included in this order was the following:

> The Secretary of Defense, and the head of each Department in the National Military Establishment, shall proceed without delay, utilizing every practicable resource of the regular components of the Armed Forces, to organize all Reserve component units, and to train such additional individuals now or hereafter members of the Active Reserve, as may be required for the national security; and to establish vigorous and progressive programs of appropriate instruction and training for all elements of the Reserve components, including the National Guard.

FAILURE TO ACTIVATE THE NATIONAL GUARD

In this connection, it is interesting to note the criticism voiced in the House on April 14, 1948, by Congressman Keefe. After pointing out that the War Department had spent or obligated only a little over $30,000,000 after making a showing of need for $143,000,000, which was appropriated, Mr. Keefe said:

> b. The National Guard units have not been activated and have not been made attractive to the boys who would otherwise enlist in the National Guard. They have not been given the equipment that they ought to have in order to make it attractive to enlistees to go into the National Guard. In the face of the Army's contention that they need more young men in the armed services to the extent that they are carrying on a constant campaign for universal military training, it seems to me there may be some logical connection between their failure to lay emphasis on activation of the National Guard until they get the UMT put over. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 4, p. 4444.)

Mr. Andrews, of New York, pointed out, further—and this was 3 years ago—that under the selective-service provisions for exemption of men who signed up with the National Guard—

> It will add enough men to the National Guard so that they will have all that they possibly can use, and they will be under World War II officers if the Government recognizes them in a way they should be recognized (ibid., p. 4448).

WARNING WAS GIVEN IN JANUARY 1948

General Marshall now complains of the state of bankruptcy so far as trained reserves is concerned. The Pentagon has no one but itself to blame. As long ago as January 15, 1948, Congressman SIKES said this in the House. After pointing out that "a very small percentage" of the military budget had been used for the Reserves, he continued:

> I believe the departments received all they requested from Congress for Reserve and National Guard activities. * * *
>
> * * * The strength allotted to the National Guard by the Departments of Army and Air is close to 700,000 officers and men. Today in fact the National Guard is made up of skeleton units, partially equipped, which total about 200,000 men. Can we afford to allow the National Guard to remain as skeleton units awaiting possible passage of UMT legislation? Is it not more practical to inaugurate a drive of sufficient amount to bring these units up to usable strength, to equip and train them for modern warfare, as War Department blueprints long ago envisioned?
>
> The Organized Reserve, in which over a million wartime officers and men signified their interest by joining, is today anything but an effective security force. Only a small percentage of its officers have received assignment to actual functioning units. The enlisted reserves, about 600,000 of them, are altogether too small in number. * * *
>
> * * * Certainly 2½ years is sufficient time for the leaders of our Armed Forces to realize that something should have been done with our citizen components to effectively weld them into the proper kind of security forces. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 1, p. 223.)

Yet today Marshall scolds the American people for letting down in peacetime. He insists on UMT to build an enduring posture of defense.

On April 8 of the same year, Congressman Mathews charged that the Defense Department was failing to use funds voted by Congress and at the same time there were rumors that "the Army says it does not have the funds to finance the field training of the National Guard." And Mathews asked:

> Is the high brass of the Army again sabotaging the National Guard? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 3, p. 4252.)

GENERAL WALSH TESTIMONY BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE

Here is the pattern: An attempt by the Pentagon to take over, "kidnap" the National Guard. At the same time neglect of the National Guard as now constituted; neglect of the Organized Reserve; and still complaint, as of April 1951, over the bankruptcy of the present Reserve set-up when desperately needed in June 1950.

Now does not the situation highlighted by the testimony of Gen. E. A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association of the United States, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, January 19, 1951, fit into this same Pentagon policy of "rule or ruin"?

First. Walsh said National Guard Association officials had not seen a copy of the Marshall bill until the afternoon before they were called on to testify.

Second. Walsh said the bill "did little" for the National Guard and "may, in effect, mark the end of the Army and Air National Guard."

Third. He charged that the bill was before the committee illegally since there had been a failure to bring the matter before a War Department committee on which National Guard was represented, as required by law.

Fourth. He said it had never been contemplated by the National Guard that UMT would be tied to a draft-extension bill.

Fifth. He warned that the service called for under this hyphenated bill "will accrue to the Regular Armed Forces" rather than to "organized units of the civilian components"—including the National Guard.

Sixth. He said:

> The National Guard is most dubious that under the provisions contained in this bill, it will obtain any substantial numbers and anywhere near sufficient to maintain its required strength. If this proves to be the case, and we think it will, then the Army and Air National Guard will wither and die.

Seventh. He charged that the Marshall bill eliminated the exemption from the draft of present and potential National Guard personnel, cutting off the guard's source of manpower.

Eighth. He said the bill omitted the declaration of Congress' intent that when units and organizations are needed in excess of the regular forces, the guard shall be ordered to active service. I believe this item is the one Marshall told the House committee was omitted by oversight due to the Defense Department working until 2 or 3 in the morning. It was added to both the Senate and House bills. Are we sure this oversight was unintentional?

Ninth. Walsh complained that the National Guard had not been activated except for a few units and added:

> The sounder approach to the problem would be, in our opinion, to order into the active military service of the United States all of the Army and Air National Guard * * * which is not now in * * * active service * * * on the basis of a phased mobilization. (P. 718, Senate hearings.)

Tenth. Walsh ridiculed the argument that prospective draftees were using the National Guard to hide from the draft, pointing out that they wouldn't be hiding from the draft if the Defense Department called the guard to active duty.

Eleventh. Walsh asked that if only half of the 18-year-olds were going to be taken for active service with the Regular forces, could not they be used as a source of added manpower for the National Guard?

Twelfth. He further charged:

> We are being in a large measure reduced in efficiency rather than having our efficiency increased at this time, because a lot of our equipment is being taken from us, some of our enlisted men and * * * officers have been permitted to volunteer for active service, and all those things reduce the efficiency of the National Guard as a reserve ready for mobilization.

Thirteenth. It is apparent that Walsh later gave his endorsement to the House bill because he felt that it restored the omissions he objected to, corrected many of the weaknesses of the Marshall bill, and provided for UMT, which he favors.

CONCLUSION

The fact remains that the intent of General Marshall and the Pentagon seems clear. The kindest thing that can be said is that it was not their intent to strengthen and safeguard and utilize to the maximum the National Guard as now constituted.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that having been stymied in their effort to kidnap the National Guard they purpose to starve it to death, weaken it as a competitor to the Pentagon-controlled Organized Reserve.

Certainly the basic consideration in any approach to UMT must be a complete reversal of emphasis and interest—from that of empire building by the Pentagon which is on record through its effort to centralize military control to development of decentralized, citizen-type reserves and military training program.

Certainly the Pentagon has given ample notice within the past few years of the need for the Congress and the American people to be vigilant.

The Barden substitute to S. 1 must be adopted.

Legion Head Urges Korean Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, current press reports indicate that National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., of the American Legion, has offended the White House by a statement that, "General MacArthur has been fighting the Korean war with both hands tied behind his back." This conclusion is not entirely new to far as Commander Cocke is concerned. Under leave to extend my remarks I quote here extract from a report written by Mr. Cocke following his recent visit to the Korean front as published in the March 29 issue of the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes:

From private and from command officers with multiple stars on their shoulders I received queries as to what Washington was going to resolve on the Korean situation and when. I could not answer that query, but countered by asking them what they thought should be done.

They were not hesitant in their answers, posed in various ways but all adding up to: "Send us more men. Decide upon what our ultimate goal is to be. Realize that even to win a stalemate additional strength must be sent and sent soon."

That from these men, wise in military lore, gave me pause.

As darkness precluded further visits we returned to General Ridgway's headquarters and batted the breeze, as old soldiers will. I found that this grenade-toting ex-paratrooper worries over the questions asked, too. He is striving to find the answers. But the answers, it seem to me, are not at Army level. They lie in the much higher echelon. But answers there must be. There is a limit to human endurance, and that limit is reached much quicker when one doesn't even know what the ultimate goal is.

We have crossed and recrossed the Han River many times. Now it is ours again. The thirty-eighth parallel is close by. Is that to be our digging-in place, or are we going back to the Yalu River again? Who is going to decide whether the Manchurian border, across which the enemy brazenly stores matériel of war and masses his troops, is to be inviolate again? General MacArthur's communiques have stopped hinting that it is within his province to order our planes across that line. Yet, if we are to be successful in this war, we cannot afford to allow the enemy to mass his strength and thumb his nose at us while we sit on this side of the border and await permission to cut the cancer at its source.

Wars are not won that way.

There definitely is a crying need for replacements and, if we are to be successful in even accomplishing a stalemate and maintaining it, there must be some definite goal established.

Whether that goal be the thirty-eighth parallel or whether we must strike at the root of the enemy's supply bases, is a question that General MacArthur says is beyond his authority.

But someone's authority it is. Is it President Truman? Is it the United Nations secretariat? Is it the free nations as a unit, or is it the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Frankly, I do not know, but an answer must be given and a decision made—and soon.

Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota takes great pride in the success and growth of its cooperative movement and associations. One of the outstanding examples of effective cooperative enterprise is the Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis. Recently this organization celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. Mr. Russell Aslesen, staff writer for the Minneapolis Tribune, has described the growth of the Midland Cooperative Wholesale in an article in the Minneapolis Tribune, March 25, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDLAND CO-OP SUCCESS EXCEEDS ROSY DREAMS OF EARLY BACKERS

A handful of discontented Minnesota farmers met at the old State Capitol Building in St. Paul September 8, 1926.

Most were directors of local cooperative oil companies which were springing up in the area and trying to weather the financial storm.

Like the rest of the Nation, these men had been watching—or taking part in—the successful fight of Minnesota's dairy interests to unite local cooperatives into the area-wide marketing associations.

"If you can carry cooperation in a milk can, you can carry it in a gasoline can," said more than one riled-up southern Minnesota farmer.

After the mutterings against "obstinate petroleum industry" and "exorbitant profit margins" died down, the farmers formally signed articles of incorporation for the world's first wholesale oil cooperative.

It was thus that Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis was born.

Even its most rabid backers, like A. P. Bartsch, Owatonna, Minn., first president, had no idea they were starting the modern miracle of cooperative success.

The most fanatic would have hesitated to predict that in 25 years, the cooperative would have a volume of business totaling $29,460,995 or facilities worth $3,411,788. Or have returned $5,483,843 to patrons over the 25-year period.

That is the success story Midland officers will carry to their membership at the silver anniversary meeting Monday through Wednesday in Nicollet Hotel, Minneapolis.

From a rented desk, a dynamic manager and an idea 25 years ago, Midland has mushroomed into an organization owned by some 600 local co-ops and serving 300,000 families in Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Iowa.

It no longer distributes only oil and gas. It has a line of food and farm supplies, in many cases manufacturing them. Either outright or with other co-op partners, it owns oil wells in Oklahoma, refineries in Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma; mills in Minnesota and Wisconsin; fertilizer plants in Idaho; farm machinery manufacturing plants in Ohio, Indiana, and Minnesota; and food plants in Indiana.

Midland often has been referred to as "an idea whose time had come."

The "co-operative ground," well fertilized by failures, was ready to produce.

Farmers at that time had watched the sharp price breaks following World War I and later watched farm credit shrinking.

A group of farmers at Cottonwood, Minn., in 1921 had applied the basic principles found successful in their co-op creameries and shipping associations—and gone into the gas and oil business.

Not long afterward, Casco, New London, Van Dyne, and Manawa, Wis., had organizations distributing petroleum products on a cooperative basis.

The idea came of age when Marshall, Jackson, Owatonna, Redwood Falls, Dawson, and Albert Lea, Minn., soon followed and by 1926 co-op bulk plants and filling stations were being put up all over both States.

They bought their products from the "old line" companies, an arrangement they found unsatisfactory at times. The idea of a central organization to wholesale their own oil began to take form.

There were other unrecorded preliminaries that culminated in the St. Paul meeting to draw up articles for the wholesale oil co-op, then called the Minnesota Co-op Oil Co.

At that point, they had the cooperative. But they had no capital, no manager or facilities.

That was the situation that faced E. G. Cort, Freeborn County agent, late in November 1926, when the board of directors "hired" him.

Cort, a dynamic worker, was obsessed with the cooperative idea and to demonstrate his faith in that idea, "gambled" with the board. He was hired without salary, with salary to be discussed if he made good.

So it was that on January 2, 1927, Cort slid behind a desk in an office at 3300 East Hennepin Avenue he shared with another firm. He was manager of a corporation without working capital or capital stock.

Cort was a pioneer in trail blazing the program to put more ownership into the hands of more people. A graduate of Iowa State College in 1911, he had taught school and farmed in Chippewa County, Minn., before going to Albert Lea as county agent in 1923. While county agent, he became active in the cooperative movement and helped form the Freeborn County oil cooperative.

With no angel to underwrite the enterprise, the new co-op led a hand-to-mouth existence. It was set up on a membership basis with a local co-op becoming a member by paying annual membership fees of $20 for the first bulk station and $5 for each additional bulk or service station.

It also is recorded that the local co-ops paid in advance for cars of gasoline.

Cort was a driving force but a quiet, unassuming man named F. H. Osborne, Albert Lea, the first secretary-treasurer, provided an ideal balance wheel to him. Osborne worked behind the scenes, advising Cort in a fatherly fashion and husbanding the meager resources. He was a businessman turned farmer, who knew farm problems could not be solved on an individual basis.

The first year's operation showed net savings of $3,473 on a volume of almost $270,000. It spurred the men of Midland to increase their tempo and the successes of the first few years may have produced a confidence not completely justified.

Achievements did not come without compensation or opposition but by the end of 10 years, the volume grew to more than $3,000,000.

The co-op got a permanent home at 739 Northeast Johnson Street in 1931 when it bought a World War I chemical plant, idle since hostilities. They paid $9,000 for the building and land now valued at more than $150,000.

Present responsibilities of Midland management rest on the shoulders of 6-foot 4-inch A. J. Smaby, a Minnesotan of Scandinavian ancestry. He was manager of the Tri-County Co-op Oil Association in Rushford, Minn., before coming to Midland in 1936 as credit manager. He became manager in 1941 when Cort suffered a heart attack.

J. F. Shea, Pickett, Wis., now is president of the board.

Under this management, sales hit a record high of $29,549,000 and net savings of $2,276,000 in 1948.

Midland, although having interests in oil wells and refineries, still isn't self-sufficient in crude oil. As a result of a squeeze of crude and refinery prices of petroleum products in 1949, the firm was in the red for the first time in history and lost $197,164.

It bounced back in 1950 with net savings of $1,064,332.

Here are some other highlights in its rise:

1933: Sales reach $1,000,000.

1934: Change name to Midland Co-op Wholesale and change from membership organization to capital-stock firm.

1935: Second largest distributor of petroleum products in Minnesota.

1941: Teamed with Indiana Farm Bureau Co-op to get fertilizer plant at Hartsdale.

1943: The year of going into production. Authorized purchase of refinery at Cushing, Okla., for $1,000,000; also with other co-ops bought refinery at McPherson, Kans., and Ohio Cultivator Co., at Bellevue, Ohio; and bought Burkhardt Milling Co. and started to process feed.

1944: Bought $200,000 warehouse at Northwest terminal, Minneapolis.

1945: Organized Northwest Co-op Mills along with Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, Farmers Union Central Exchange, and Central Cooperative Wholesale.

1946: Bought 21 producing oil wells in Oklahoma. With others helped organize Millers Creek Coal Co-op.

1948: One of three firms in Premier Petroleum Co. with four refineries in Texas and one in Louisiana.

Midland points with pride to a record of $195,642,430 in sales in 25 years and its gross margin of $24,452,671.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the summary dismissal of General MacArthur is shocking and dictatorial. Before taking any such drastic steps, General MacArthur should have been recalled for consultation with congressional leaders and given the opportunity to present his views in person.

No man in the service of the American Government knows more about the Far East than General MacArthur. No man in current history has done more to secure the safety of our country. No man in our entire history has done so much to establish American prestige in the most important area of the Asiatic world, the islands of Japan.

Dismissing him from his command shakes the confidence of the entire Far East in American policy and destroys what he has built up for the American people during a lifetime of devoted, faithful service to our Government, and all that America represents in the world today.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks, I want to include several documents pertaining to the action early this morning by the President in relieving General MacArthur of his Far East command. These are important documents and must be carefully considered by every American.

The first document is a statement by the President announcing that he had relieved the general. The second document is his order to General MacArthur relieving him. The third document appoints Lieutenant General Ridgway as General MacArthur's successor. The remaining documents were issued by the White House to indicate the background which made the President's actions imperative. They show that General MacArthur had been fully cognizant of the desires of the President and that in spite of this knowledge he had continued to act without regard for the President's wishes. One group of these releases show that despite the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had proposed armament for the South Korean military forces, General MacArthur had tried to get the arms for the Japanese police forces.

The documents follow:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, APRIL 10, 1951

With deep regret I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations in matters pertaining to his official duties. In view of the specific responsibilities imposed upon me by the Constitution of the United States and the added responsibility which has been entrusted to me by the United Nations, I have decided that I must make a change of command in the Far East. I have, therefore, relieved General MacArthur of his commands and have designated Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway as his successor.

Full and rigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of our free democracy. It is fundamental, however, that military commanders must be governed by the policies and directives issued to them in the manner provided by our laws and Constitution. In time of crisis, this consideration is particularly compelling.

General MacArthur's place in history as one of our greatest commanders is fully established. The Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for the distinguished and exceptional service which he has rendered his country in posts of great responsibility. For that reason I repeat my regret at the necessity for the action I feel compelled to take in his case.

ORDER TO GENERAL MACARTHUR FROM THE PRESIDENT, APRIL 10, 1951

I deeply regret that it becomes my duty as President and Commander in Chief of the United States military forces to replace you as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief, United Nations Command; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East.

You will turn over your commands, effective at once, to Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. You are authorized to have issued such orders as are necessary to complete desired travel to such place as you select.

My reasons for your replacement will be made public concurrently with the delivery to you of the foregoing order and are contained in the next following message. (See attached statement by the President.)

APRIL 10, 1951.

ORDER TO LT. GEN. MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY FROM GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The President has decided to relieve General MacArthur and appoint you as his successor as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief, United Nations Command; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East.

It is realized that your presence in Korea in the immediate future is highly important, but we are sure you can make the proper distribution of your time until you can turn over active command of the Eighth Army to its new commander. For this purpose, Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet is en route to report to you for such duties as you may direct.

DECEMBER 6, 1950.

From: Joint Chiefs of Staff.

To: Commander in Chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan (and Other Commanders).

1. The President, as of December 6, forwarded a memo to all cabinet members and to the chairman, NSRB; administrator, ECA; director, CIA; administrator, ESA; and director Selective Service, which reads as follows:

"In the light of the present critical international situation, and until further written notice from me, I wish that each one of you would take immediate steps to reduce the number of public speeches pertaining to foreign or military policy made by officials of the departments and agencies of the executive branch. This applies to officials in the field as well as those in Washington.

"No speech, press release, or other public statement concerning foreign policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of State.

"No speech, press release, or other public statement concerning military policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of Defense.

"In addition to the copies submitted to the Departments of State or Defense for clearance, advance copies of speeches and press

releases concerning foreign policy or military policy should be submitted to the White House for information.

"The purpose of this memorandum is not to curtail the flow of information to the American people, but rather to insure that the information made public is accurate and fully in accord with the policies of the United States Government."

2. He also forwarded the following to the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense:

"In addition to the policy expressed in my memorandum of this date to the heads of departments, concerning the clearance of speeches and statements, I wish the following steps to be taken:

"Officials overseas, including military commanders and diplomatic representatives, should be ordered to exercise extreme caution in public statements, to clear all but routine statements with their departments, and to refrain from direct communication on military or foreign policy with newspapers, magazines, or other publicity media in the United States."

3. The above is transmitted to you for guidance and appropriate action.

MARCH 20, 1951.

To: Commander in Chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan.

From: Joint Chiefs of Staff.

State planning Presidential announcement shortly that, with clearing of bulk of South Korea of aggressors, United Nations now prepared to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea. Strong U. N. feeling persists that further diplomatic effort toward settlement should be made before any advance with major forces north of thirty-eighth parallel. Time will be required to determine diplomatic reactions and permit new negotiations that may develop. Recognizing that parallel has no military significance, State has asked JCS what authority you should have to permit sufficient freedom of action for next few weeks to provide security for U. N. forces and maintain contact with enemy. Your recommendations desired.

[From the New York Times of March 26, 1951]

TEXT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR'S STATEMENT

TOKYO.—Operations continue according to schedule and plan. We have now substantially cleared South Korea of organized Communist forces. It is becoming increasingly evident that the heavy destruction along the enemy's lines of supply, caused by our 'round-the-clock massive air and naval bombardment, has left his troops in the forward battle area deficient in requirements to sustain his operations.

This weakness is being brilliantly exploited by our ground forces. The enemy's human wave tactics definitely failed him as our own forces become seasoned to this form of warfare; his tactics of infiltration are but contributing to his piecemeal losses, and he is showing less stamina than our own troops under rigors of climate, terrain, and battle.

Of even greater significance than our tactical success has been the clear revelation that this new enemy, Red China, of such exaggerated and vaunted military power, lacks the industrial capacity to provide adequately many critical items essential to the conduct of modern war.

He lacks manufacturing bases and those raw materials needed to produce, maintain and operate even moderate air and naval power, and he cannot provide the essentials for successful ground operations, such as tanks, heavy artillery, and other refinements science has introduced into the conduct of military campaigns.

Formerly his great numerical potential might well have filled this gap, but with the development of existing methods of mass destruction, numbers alone do not offset vulnerability inherent in such deficiencies. Control of the sea and air, which in turn means control over supplies, communications and transportation, are no less essential and decisive now than in the past.

When this control exists as in our case and is coupled with the inferiority of ground firepower, as in the enemy's case, the resulting disparity is such that it cannot be overcome by bravery, however fanatical, or the most gross indifference to human loss.

These military weaknesses have been clearly and definitely revealed since Red China entered upon its undeclared war in Korea. Even under inhibitions which now restrict activity of the United Nations forces and the corresponding military advantages which accrue to Red China, it has been shown its complete inability to accomplish by force of arms the conquest of Korea.

The enemy therefore must by now be painfully aware that a decision of the United Nations to depart from its tolerant effort to contain the war to the area of Korea through expansion of our military operations to his coastal areas and interior bases would doom Red China to the risk of imminent military collapse.

These basic facts being established, there should be no insuperable difficulty arriving at decisions on the Korean problem if the issues are resolved on their own merits without being burdened by extraneous matters not directly related to Korea, such as Formosa and China's seat in the United Nations.

The Korean Nation and people which have been so cruelly ravaged must not be sacrificed. That is the paramount concern. Apart from the military area of the problem where the issues are resolved in the course of combat, the fundamental questions continue to be political in nature and must find their answer in the diplomatic sphere.

Within the area of my authority as military commander, however, it should be needless to say I stand ready at any time to confer in the field with the commander in chief of the enemy forces in an earnest effort to find any military means whereby the realization of the political objectives of the United Nations in Korea, to which no nation may justly take exceptions, might be accomplished without further bloodshed.

MARCH 24, 1951.

To: Commander in Chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan.

From: Joint Chiefs of Staff, personal for MacArthur.

The President has directed that your attention be called to his order as transmitted December 6, 1950. In view of the information given you March 20, 1951, any further statements by you must be coordinated as prescribed in the order of December 6.

The President has also directed that in the event Communist military leaders request an armistice in the field; you immediately report that fact to the JCS for instructions.

JANUARY 4, 1951.

To: Commander in Chief, United Nations Command, Tokyo, Japan.

From: Joint Chiefs of Staff.

1. The problem of arming additional ROK manpower is under consideration by JCS. Following information is furnished:

(a) No machine guns, mortars, antitank guns, or artillery can be made available from the ZI; however, the following can be made available in a reasonably short time:

(1) 100,000 model 1903 rifles, with a backup of spare parts for 50,000.

(2) 70,000 submachine guns.

(3) 150,000 M1 carbines.

(4) 8,000 model 1918 Browning automatic rifles.

(b) Ammunition supply for the M3 submachine guns, the Browning automatic rifles, 100,000 model 1903 rifles, and 100,000 M1 carbines is feasible.

2. Based on availability of above weapons it appears that ROK forces could be increased by from 200,000 to 300,000 men, armed with rifles, automatic rifles, carbines and submachine guns. However, unless used in part to form new divisions, which would be relatively ineffective due to lack of infantry-supporting weapons and artillery, it is probably that only on the order of 75,000 can be effectively utilized initially, with an ultimate build-up to approximately 100,000 in the following type organizations:

(a) Augment the rifle strength of ROK divisions and other U. N. forces.

(b) Form special units for guarding lines of communication and for operations against Communist guerrillas.

(c) Conduct guerrilla operations in Communist-held territory.

3. JCS are of the opinion that recruitment for new units should include, but not be limited to, the membership of the Korean Youth Corps and/or any other group in the ROK. Arms should be issued only to organized units under the control and discipline of the military authorities in Korea.

4. Request your comments and recommendations to include:

(a) Total number of additional ROK personnel that can be profitably employed.

(b) Method of employment, namely, new divisions, additional strength in current divisions, etc.

(c) Length of time required to organize and train additional manpower.

(d) Other points in connection with current problem.

JANUARY 6, 1951.

From: Commander in Chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan.

To: Department of the Army for the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Considered here that influence of past and possible future events is of importance equal to or greater than matériel availability in analyzing problem of arming additional ROK manpower.

Continued effort has been made since June 25, 1950, to effect the most practicable utilization of Korean personnel. In addition to materially augmenting the ROK army, members of the Youth Corps and other qualified males have been supplied with significant quantities of small arms for the purpose of strengthening police units, antiguerrilla security elements, and creation of special organizations to operate in enemy-held territory. Despite the relatively large number of nonarmy personnel now under arms, enemy guerrilla units continue to operate effectively in many widely scattered regions of South Korea. Friendly guerrilla forces, however, have accomplished little in Communist rear areas—primarily due to lack of strong willed leadership.

The type and quantity of weapons indicated by JCS as being currently available would have equal application to equipping the National Police Reserve of Japan, the immediate requirements for which were stated. Unless the quantities listed in JCS message are in excess of the current and foreseeable needs of the NPRJ, it is possible that the over-all interests of the United States will be better served by making these weapons available to increase the security of Japan rather than arming additional ROK forces.

In view of the probable restricted size of the battlefield in which we may operate in the near future, and the high priority of NPRJ requirements, the value of attempting to organize, train, and arm additional ROK forces in the immediate future appears questionable. It is considered that the short-range requirement can best be met by utilizing available manpower to replace losses in existing ROK units rather than creating new organizations. The long-range requirement for or desirability of arming additional ROK personnel appears to be dependent primarily upon determination of the future United States military position with respect to both the Korean campaign and the generally critical situation in the Far East.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1951]

LETTER TO REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN OF MASSACHUSETTS

MARCH 20, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: I am most grateful for your note of the 8th forwarding me a copy of your address of February 12. The latter I have read with much interest and find that with the passage of years you have certainly lost none of your old-time punch.

My views and recommendations with respect to the situation created by Red China's entry into war against us in Korea have been submitted to Washington in most complete detail. Generally these views are well known and clearly understood, as they follow the conventional pattern of meeting force with maximum counter force as we have never failed to do in the past. Your view with respect to the utilization of the Chinese forces on Formosa is in conflict with neither logic nor this tradition.

It seems strangely difficult for some to realize that here in Asia is where the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that we have joined the issue thus raised on the battlefield; that here we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight it with words; that if we lose the war to communism in Asia the fall of Europe is inevitable, win it and Europe most probably would avoid war and yet preserve freedom. As you point out we must win. There is no substitute for victory.

With renewed thanks and expressions of most cordial regard, I am

Faithfully yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

Resolution by City Council of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of the House to the following resolution introduced in the city council of the city of New York by Hon. Edward Vogel, the councilman representing my own district:

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Congress of the United States, H. R. 2156, by Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Congressman of the Fourteenth New York District, to provide for a Christopher Columbus memorial arbor in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the act provides, "The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to receive, through the Citizens Committee for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor, donations of 52 trees and 52 bronze plaques each inscribed with the name of one of the States;" and

Whereas the act provides that said row of trees shall be known as the Christopher Columbus memorial arbor; and

Whereas the act further provides that said row of trees shall be maintained by the National Park Service "in honor of Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of America, and as a perpetual tribute to those members of the Armed Forces of the United States who gave their lives in Italy during World War II, for the preservation of freedom in America and the liberation of Italy": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council of the city of New York, does hereby memorialize the New York delegation of Congress to support this act and does hereby memorialize Congress to enact this measure at its present session.

British Mercenary China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily News by Jay Franklin:

BRITISH MERCENARY CHINA POLICY

(By Jay Franklin)

American observers recently returned from Britain report that British policy in the Far East is concentrated on the object of collaring as much as possible of the China trade for the benefit of the United Kingdom.

They point out that it was the British officials in Asia who did most to circulate the report that the Chinese Communists were only agrarian reformers and who also did their best to undermine the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek.

The benefit to Britain promised to be enormous: By underwriting the overthrow of Chiang, the British would not only get the good will of the Communist regime but we would automatically be stripped of the prestige we had earned by liberating China from the Japanese and staking Chiang to control of China.

Chief operating force in this policy is said to have been the famous British shipping and trading concern of Jardine, Matthieson which traditionally is allowed by the foreign office to determine British policy in China.

Hence the bitterness of the British against Chiang's naval blockade of Shanghai until President Truman obligingly compelled Chiang to withdraw his squadron under the pretense of defending Formosa. Hence, too, the fury of the Hong Kong merchants at the American embargo on shipments of contraband of war to that British colony on the China coast.

The Korean war has placed this British policy under a severe strain. American public opinion has no use for a policy of appeasement toward the Chinese Communists. British attempts to persuade us to go slow in Asia have boomeranged against the natural British desire to have us continue to support their military and economic position in Europe.

This is what lies behind the British fuss over whether our forces shall pass the thirty-eighth parallel. Since that imaginary line did not stop the Chinese troops that General Mao poured across the Yalu River last fall, it is hard to see why we should regard it as an obstacle to our military operations, provided, of course, we can get north of it again.

Truth is, the fight we have put up in Korea has increased our prestige in Asia, and since trade follows military prestige as day follows night, the problem that confronts London has become more difficult. Before the game is played out, the British may decide that they let themselves be played for suckers by the Chinese Reds in the hope of lining their commercial pockets at our expense.

Committee of One Hundred, of Birmingham, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article on a very important job that is being done in my district.

It is with pride as a member of the Committee of One Hundred, of Birmingham, Ala., that I insert the following news story in the RECORD. This article, by Birmingham News staff writer Robert Kincey, tells of the awakened community spirit abroad in our district as a result of the fine work of the Committee of One Hundred in a campaign to promote our area. We owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., chairman of the Committee of One Hundred, and William P. Engle, president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, who were in Washington with us today in connection with this challenging project. We are also indebted to their coworkers at home, Clarence Lloyd, committee director; Hugh Bigler, executive vice president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce; and W. W. French, Jr., chairman of the campaign which has far exceeded at this time the $552,362 raised at the time the following story was written:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of April 3, 1951]

THEY'LL TELL THE WORLD—COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED, ARMED WITH $552,362, TO "SELL" BIRMINGHAM—CAMPAIGN GOES OVER TOP AND KEEPS RIGHT ON GOING

(By Robert W. Kincey)

Birmingham's Committee of One Hundred was all armed Saturday night for the biggest game hunt Alabama has ever known.

They're going to beat the bushes from Maine to California and from the Gulf to the Lakes in a Nation-wide advertising and promotion campaign for which business, industry, and individuals of Jefferson County have made a cool $552,362 available.

And in setting a record for the community with the most spectacular successful campaign of all time, the committee stands ready to tell the world:

"That's typical of the way it's done in Birmingham."

This is a city, they will point out from the records, that doesn't fall in its own undertakings. What it starts it finishes.

That's the way it is in Birmingham; the way it will be for those who get themselves a slice of the biggest cake ever to be cut in the community.

SHORTEST, SWEETEST

The campaign is far and away over the top, with pledges still coming in, most of them on a voluntary basis.

The campaign, the shortest and sweetest in the history of the community, has shattered every box-office record Birmingham and Jefferson County have ever known.

And it's going to play an extended engagement because of popular demand.

The advisory committee of the Committee of One Hundred will hold open house at the chamber of commerce for all who want to ride the bandwagon, but, thus far, had not been able to get a seat.

The standing-room-only sign was hung up Friday while the committee solicitors and the auditing staff were counting the cash and rounding up eleventh-hour prospects.

OVER TOP, FOR SURE

"The drive is definitely and measurably over the top," said W. W. French, Jr., chairman. "But we cannot and we will not close the door in the face of those firms and individuals who have not had an opportunity to participate. It is their town as much as it is ours. We've already set what looks like a national record in such undertakings. We might as well make it even more spectacular."

To which Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., chairman of the Committee of One Hundred, and William P. Engel, president of the chamber of commerce, added:

"The more money we get, the better job we can and will do. This community effort has attracted Nation-wide attention. It is unequaled, so far as we know, in the history of American cities. It is a magnificent tribute to the awakened spirit of Birmingham and its Jefferson County neighbors.

"This is not and never has been a campaign in the ordinary sense of the word. It is a demonstration that the people of this great county are determined to exploit to the fullest the fabulous resources in these rugged hills and valleys."

PURE INVESTMENT

"This national advertising fund is exactly what we have emphasized from the start. It is not a contribution to pay someone's salary down at the chamber of commerce. It is not a contribution of any sort. It is a cold dollars-and-cents investment in Birmingham and Jefferson County.

"And to the everlasting credit of Birmingham and its neighboring communities, we have reached the point where we have put aside petty differences and jealousies and can pull together for the utmost development of the greatest county in all the land.

"The response has been so enthusiastic, spontaneous, and contagious it is amazing. There is a new spirit abroad in Jefferson County today. This most sensational of all campaigns is ample testimonial to that.

"Birmingham and Jefferson County now have no records to break but their own. We invite every citizen, every firm, and every industry to participate. We could scarcely do less in view of the tremendous and heart-warming response. Nothing even approaching it has ever happened in this community before."

WHEELS ARE ROLLING

And the wheels of the advertising campaign already have started to roll, even while the money continues to come in.

Approved yesterday afternoon was an advertisement in the New York Times to tell the world what Birmingham has done. Press associations were asking for the story before the money had been counted. They are that much interested in what the biggest city on earth for its age has done, the like of which probably never has been done before.

It all started a year ago in January when the now famous Committee of One Hundred came into being at a meeting at the Tutwiler Hotel.

That meeting was remarkable for the fact that not a man declined his appointment. The committee rolled up a collective sleeve and went to work. And 1950 was a spectacular year in Birmingham. Mr. Engel, a member of the original Committee of One Hundred, assumed the presidency of the Chamber of Commerce a year later.

Subsequently he made his talk-of-the-town "Hold That Steel" address to the Kiwanis Club. That address, which had repercussions over the length and breadth of the land, further fired the imagination and the enthusiasm of the entire county.

THINGS ARE POPPING

Mr. Engel then and there predicted nothing but the district's ineptitude stood between it and a population of 1,000,000 by 1970. He envisioned great things for the district. And those things have started to happen.

Not the least of which, the city's leaders are agreed, is the half million campaign. There was scarcely a "no" to an assigned quota to business firms or individuals. There was hardly a suggestion that an assigned quota be lowered. There were many instances in which they were voluntarily raised.

Nest egg for the $500,000 advertising fund came from the Alabama Power Co., whose board chairman, Thomas W. Martin, swept the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce off its feet in January when he said Alabama Power Co. would make available $100,000 of a half million dollar fund to advertise the district nationally provided the community raised $400,000, payable over a 5-year period.

Mr. Engel then and there accepted the challenge. The campaign was carefully mapped. First meeting was a week ago Friday. Solicitors did not take the field until Monday afternoon of last week.

They found many ardent Birmingham boosters out of the city. Others still have to clear the matter through regular routine. All that is to be taken into account when the effort is stamped "finis" and the books closed.

OTHERS CHIME IN

Illustrative of the country-wide enthusiasm was a quick announcement that the Bessemer Chamber of Commerce would heartily join hands with Birmingham and put $25,000 in the pot.

Along came the Tarrant Chamber of Commerce with $5,000 and the Fairfield Chamber of Commerce with another $7,500, all unsolicited.

From the Shades Valley Chamber of Commerce Saturday came pledge cards bearing the signatures of every merchant in Homewood.

And that's the reason it's a county-wide proposition and an extended engagement has been ordered. So that everybody who wants in on a good thing can do it and do it to his heart's content.

Removal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement regarding the removal of General MacArthur:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RALPH W. GWINN, OF NEW YORK, REGARDING REMOVAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

MacArthur has been busted out with Wedemeyer, Chennault, Hurley, Denfeld, and Cromelin, because our own popular-front Communist-dominated Government does not really want to win the war in Korea. It refuses to answer MacArthur's questions on that point. He has asked for the help of the 2,000,000 men now in China and Korea. He asked for the help of the Japanese. Our Government refused. It would not even feed and supply 400,000 reservists now in training camps in Korea to relieve the pressure on our own boys, fighting and dying in Korea.

Thus the program mapped out by Alger Hiss and Owen Lattimore in 1945 to deliver the Asiatic people to godless communism is working out according to plan. They destroyed Chiang Kai-shek and his forces. They are determined to destroy Syngman Rhee and leave him no organized forces against communism.

Now with MacArthur out of the way Red China can be added to the family of nations and Formosa delivered to it. What is more with MacArthur out of Japan the floodgates are open to the organization of the Communist Party there. The Japanese people who made such a magnificent recovery under MacArthur—in fact all of the forces of freedom, have been let down into what looks like a red sea surrounding the whole of Asia.

This conduct of our foreign affairs in Asia and the refusal to give MacArthur help throws light on the European situation. We are sending ground forces to Europe to fight unequal ground forces from Russia. The commander in chief of these forces in Europe speaks freely as a military and political leader on both military and political subjects without censure. MacArthur confined his remarks to military affairs and was busted for that alone. Will our popular-front Communist-dominated Government in European policy deliver our forces in Europe to Moscow in the same way it has delivered them in Asia? This is the terrifying question growing out of the MacArthur incident.

Possibly nothing short of the setting of the stage for impeachment proceedings will bring out the tragic corruption in the management of our foreign affairs. It greatly exceeds our domestic corruption and its consequences are more damaging. Out of such a proceeding the people might organize an honest Government and offset the notion in the Kremlin that America will not fight communism at home, in Asia or in Europe.

It is depressing beyond words that the Communist-dominated government in Britain was ready to blast the news, almost before we got it, that the victory had been won—MacArthur was out—Red China would be recognized and Formosa delivered to it.

Our Country, MacArthur, Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the Republicans, having no issue with which to go before the American people, are stopping at nothing to gain some publicity in the hope that it may aid them in the 1952 campaign. In their conference this morning called by the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], they saw fit to criticize the President's action in relieving MacArthur of his imperialistic and czarish activities and are making a political issue of it. Some of the Republican newspapers, of course, will hail this attack against the President

with glee. However, I feel that the Republicans have overplayed their hand as to impeachment. I did not quite gather from the verbal explanation of the statement given me today whether it was the impeachment of MacArthur or the President that was suggested. Perhaps, if any action is to be taken, it should be a court martial of General MacArthur for deliberately and willfully disobeying orders of his superiors.

Mr. Speaker, now, who is General MacArthur about whom there is such a hullabaloo? I recall that in 1932 former servicemen came to Washington to plead with President Hoover and the administration for food and relief. These veterans, without funds either for cheap hotel accommodations or rooming quarters, were obliged to sleep in the parks or on Government properties in the vicinity of the Capitol and the Mall, and it was President Hoover who gave orders to move them from the premises they occupied. General MacArthur, head of the Military District of Washington, brought Fort Myer troops to effect their dispersal. When some of the veterans did not move fast enough, it was General MacArthur who issued orders to fire. Instead of obtaining work or bread they sought, he fed them with lead. Several were killed, one from my congressional district, and many were wounded.

Several of the large Republican newspapers have been building up General MacArthur as a great general and a legendary figure in military prowess. I, myself, have known him only from the time that he was part of the drastic and outrageous action against Gen. Billy Mitchell who ventured the opinion in an address or magazine article that airplanes could destroy battleships. The resulting court martial and his forced resignation from the Air Force hastened General Mitchell's death. Congress posthumously elevated him to the rank of a general officer.

Today our President, after long and careful consideration given to the problem, has finally removed Five Star Gen. Douglas MacArthur from all Far East commands.

This action on the part of the President has been long awaited by the country and is long overdue. It is elementary that a private who disobeys his commanding officer may be court martialed, and if found guilty, will be dismissed for the good of the service.

The President's statement clearly sets forth the necessity for taking action. It follows in part:

> With deep regret I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations in matters pertaining to his official duties.
>
> Full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of our free democracy. It is fundamental, however, that military commanders must be governed by the policies and directives issued to them in the manner provided by our laws and Constitution. In time of crisis, this consideration is particularly compelling.

Now let us briefly take up the President's reasons. We must remember that the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the United States military forces and keep this fact in mind throughout the discussion. We must not let our bias and prejudice make us forget this paramount constitutional provision.

I stated before that the private who disobeys his commanding officer is subject to court martial and dismissal if not death, depending on the situation. Let us take MacArthur's case, for, after all, his is a case just like that of the doughboy, the corporal, or the sergeant.

The statement "Formosa Must Be Defended," which MacArthur made and sent to the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago last September, was certainly one calculated and designed to stir up contention and controversy in the country. It was not his prerogative nor within his official duties as a military man to talk about "misconceptions currently voiced concerning the relationship of Formosa to our strategic potential in the Pacific," nor was he required "in the public interest to avail myself of this opportunity to state my views thereon."

Did he not consider for one moment that as the leader of the United Nations military forces, he was also subject to the requirements of the diplomatic and military considerations which devolved only upon that body and its officials?

Was it proper, becoming, and wise for him, in the same message, to continue in the following view:

> Nothing could be more fallacious than the threadbare arguments by those who advocate appeasement and defeatism in the Pacific that if we defend Formosa, we alienate continental Asia.

And following in further critical language against administration policies:

> Those who speak thus do not understand the Orient.

Only the general understands the Orient. The President does not know what is going on there, the State Department, and the other agencies of the Government, with their various officials who have been in the Orient for many years, who have been studying and are intimately acquainted with these questions, do not know what is going on. The astute orientals who form part of the United Nations—they, too, know nothing about the Orient, although they have lived with their problems during a lifetime—they also do not understand though they themselves are orientals.

And then, as if to further embarrass those directing our policies in the Far East, MacArthur grows more sarcastic and belligerent when he states that—

> They do not grasp that it is in the pattern of oriental psychology to respect and follow aggressive, resolute, and dynamic leadership to quickly turn from a leadership characterized by timidity or vacillation—and they underestimate the oriental mentality.

Now, I ask, under what process of logical reasoning could any fair-minded aid unbiased thinking person come to the conclusion that MacArthur was within his rights as a military man, commanding military forces, to make and publish these observations? All the Veterans of Foreign Wars asked MacArthur to do was to extend greetings in response to those sent him by the organization.

Now if this were MacArthur's first outburst on the subject, we might pass it off as coming from a soldier under constant and steady pressure letting off steam. But no; this not the case of a first time.

In December of 1949 the general, surrounded by his Republican friends, a group of Republican Senators visiting in Tokyo, divested himself of some unauthorized remarks concerning sending United States arms and troops to Formosa. As a result, heated debates were touched off in Congress between the partisan minded Formosan interventionists and the administration supporters—all of which, it is clear, had nothing to do with MacArthur's duties and responsibility as a military commander of troops of all nations, including our own in the Far East. Of course the Republicans howled and cried out that the general was gagged by the administration which they charged was keeping the truth from the American people. If ever a man deserved a reprimand certainly MacArthur deserved that one.

It may have escaped the memory of some, but certainly not mine, that just about a year ago, the general, with no reason at all for being in Formosa—no doubt for the purpose of giving greater publicity to his position in regard to Formosa—allowed himself to be photographed kissing the hand of Madame Chiang Kai-shek. She is the wife of a general allegedly the most questionable of all Chinese war overlords. At the same time he publicly supported the policy of building Formosa as a base of operations. Again MacArthur knew full well at the time he made the statement that he was running at cross purposes with the Government's position. Yet he chose to sound off regardless of the consequences which his unauthorized remarks might produce, since he considers himself the sole authority both in matters military and diplomatic relating to the Orient, and more than often on subjects covering the entire world.

We all remember shortly after the incident of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that MacArthur himself met on Wake Island with W. Averell Harriman, who acted as the President's special representative, and agreed implicitly that he would refrain from making declarations on policy unless he received Washington clearance. He broke his promise. Why? I will develop that later because I want to bring to your attention the hostile attitude which he demonstrated toward the President, his Commander in Chief, shortly after the Harriman conference on the occasion of the President's special visit to MacArthur on Wake Island. The press reports told us that MacArthur arrived late for the meeting, failed to accord the proper courtesy he owed the office of his superior and, most important of all, had neglected to prepare himself for the conference, with experts and others who might supplement his, MacArthur's, views. The newspapers further reported that the President believing this an important meeting, for he had traveled thousands of miles under great physical inconveniences, had

brought with him the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a number of experts on the Far East for discussional purposes. Nevertheless, the President came away from the short meeting, no doubt planned for a longer period, apparently satisfied that General MacArthur would stay "hitched" to his military duties.

Another disagreement came to light as a result of last November's dash into Northern Korea which resulted in disastrous UN military defeat and, instead of "Home by Christmas" which he had publicly proclaimed to the troops, we are still in Korea and have been obliged to send additional troops and replacements. We are informed that on several occasions prior to this march to the Manchurian border, he had been officially informed that the Chinese were massed for attack and that warnings from the French, from India, and the British had come to him to the same effect. Yet he went on his own and incurred severe losses in men and equipment as well as causing loss of our prestige among the Asiatics and in the United Nations. I believe this action might have had an appreciable effect upon the fall elections.

It is further reported that on the occasion of the State Department's public statement assuring the Chinese that the large dams supplying water and power to Manchuria would not be bombed, MacArthur cabled a curt "Do not concur."

And, as if all these headstrong and unwise actions were not sufficient to overturn our Nation's policy to contain the war in Korea and avoid a general war in China with its terrific and disastrous consequences, we find the general divesting himself of a most incendiary statement, namely, that sent a few days ago to the minority leader of the House, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

It is beyond my comprehension that such a letter containing so much dynamite and calculated to upset the equilibrium of our diplomatic course should have been made public. It could only serve to do harm wherever and whenever it might be publicized in view of the nature of the writing.

First. It was unauthorized and was in the nature of a special pleading—a pleading for the MacArthur cause to win the war in the Far East at all costs and unmindful of the over-all position in Europe and of the world.

Second. It was political in nature—its only purpose being to choose up sides and bring on a highly controversial subject, the discussion of which would be harmful to and create disunity in the country.

Third. Militarily, the use of National Chinese troops to fight the Chinese Communists would not necessarily bring victory and would, of course, involve us in an all-out war, which the President and the Nation are seeking to avoid, and thereby bringing about a lasting and enduring world-wide peace.

Mr. Speaker, I have many interesting and factual newspaper articles and editorials which have appeared in impartial and independent publications which have the real interest of our country's welfare at heart. However, I do not wish to unduly encumber the record by inserting all of them, but under the leave given me to extend my remarks I shall include an editorial entitled "Mac and Political Policy," which appeared in the April 8 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, an outstanding metropolitan daily. This editorial, in all likelihood, together with other forceful articles and editorials appearing in the press throughout the country express the views and opinions of the vast majority of the people of our Nation, and contributed in some degree in aiding the President to reach the conclusion that he should demand the resignation of General MacArthur. The editorial is as follows:

MAC AND POLITICAL POLICY

We have called frequent attention to a saying of Clemenceau, French "Tiger" of World War I and Versailles, to the effect that war is too important a business to be left to the generals.

That's a good maxim for any democracy which is unfortunate enough to be engaged in war, as we are in Korea at this moment. Nobody likes war, least of all the people who live in a democracy. When the people of a real democracy engage in war, it is only to preserve their free way of life. They have no aggressive designs, no lust for conquest.

The American people want to avoid a general war with China—or any other country. But powerful forces are moving to bring on such a conflagration, intentionally or not. Senator TAFT, Senate Republican chief, and House GOP Leader MARTIN have joined the parade. MARTIN was first, advocating in a recent speech that Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist troops be used to open a second front on the Chinese mainland. TAFT jumped into line yesterday, urging that Chiang's forces be let loose to conduct raids on the mainland.

Ostensibly, either action would relieve Red Chinese pressure in Korea. But realistically, either maneuver could easily fan the Korean action into a major war before the free world is strong enough to fight such a war.

There was a big wave of excitement the other day when General MacArthur told MARTIN that he was right. Actually, MacArthur himself for a long time has been agitating for a big push aimed at the heart of China. MARTIN and other Republican lawmakers in Washington who have been spouting that line are merely following MacArthur's lead.

They are pleased to do so, not because they really want more war—for most of those Republicans are isolationists—but because they feel it is one way of embarrassing the Truman administration. They think that pitting MacArthur against President Truman is sound policies in the year preceding the 1952 Presidential election.

Administration policy, which is the official policy of the United States, is to keep the war in the Far East localized in Korea if at all possible. The policy also places the greater stress on rearming Western Europe and helping defend it against possible Communist aggression.

Along with most American military experts and diplomats, Mr. Truman and Secretary Acheson believe that the grand prize in Russia's eyes is not the conquest of Asia at this moment. The consensus is that what Russia wants is Iranian oil and the rich industrial plant of Western Europe to produce the steel and the machines of war needed for Soviet domination of the world.

MacArthur does not agree. He is far away from Europe and contends that the world stands at the crossroads in Asia. He says that if Asia is lost, Western Europe is bound to be easy prey for the Russians. He apparently believes that all Russia needs is the raw materials of Asia rather than the industrial might of Western Europe.

MacArthur sees only one side of the world picture. Certainly the raw materials of Asia are as vital to us as they are to Russia and should be kept out of Communist hands if possible. But there is a difference between the policy of keeping the Communists pent up where they now are and the MacArthur proposal to throw Communists out of huge land masses that they now occupy.

We do not blame MacArthur unduly for his zeal in his cause. Any good general—and MacArthur is a great general—wants to win the war on his front. That is the job of a professional soldier.

But it should be part of the job of a professional soldier serving under the flag of a democracy to respect our institutions and traditions. One of those traditions is that military authority is subordinate to civilian authority. Our civilian authorities make the political decisions in times of war and our military authorities do their best to carry out those decisions.

If MacArthur wants to belabor the political decisions which have been made by our civilian authorities, we believe he has a perfect right to do so—as a civilian.

But so long as he remains as commander of the United Nations forces in Korea he should address his political statements and views to UN officials and to Mr. Truman.

MacArthur's stature is hurt when he engages in subterfuge and ruse in an attempt to get across a political point.

Government Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the administration is spending considerable time in trying to find a new source of tax revenue. On the other hand, little effort is being made to curtail expenditures. The handling of veterans' hospitals is a national scandal, and in southern California we have a fine example of that. We all know how the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital in Van Nuys was closed in May 1950 and moved to Long Beach merely to help a Democratic Congressman. Now, since the Navy needs a hospital in Long Beach, the Navy intends to build another one instead of the Veterans' Administration moving back and reactivating the Birmingham hospital which is not in use.

I am attaching a letter from Mayor Bowron, of Los Angeles, calling my attention to that very matter:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 4, 1951.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POULSON: It has come to my attention that consideration is being given to the construction of a new naval hospital building in Long Beach.

As you may recall, I registered a protest in behalf of the citizens of Los Angeles against the closing of the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital in Van Nuys in May 1950, and the moving of several hundred patients to the present naval hospital in Long Beach, allegedly for reasons of economy.

Now it is proposed to build another hospital in Long Beach for the Navy, with the Veterans' Administration continuing to use

the present naval hospital, which is not equipped to provide for paraplegics or tubercular patients.

Would it not be more logical and economical to return the present Long Beach hospital to the Navy Department and remodel the Birmingham hospital in Van Nuys, a site which is ideally suited for the treatment and care of paraplegics and those suffering from respiratory conditions? It is believed that this would accomplish the desired objectives at a considerable saving to the Government and with greater consideration for the needs of the veterans.

I strongly urge that you do all in your power to bring about this suggested change in planning for Federal hospitals in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

Sincerely yours,
FLETCHER BOWRON, *Mayor.*

Some Questions, Mr. Andrews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times for Tuesday, April 3, 1951:

SOME QUESTIONS, MR. ANDREWS

Mr. BERT ANDREWS,
Gridiron Speaker, Memorial Union.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: As principal speaker at the gridiron banquet tonight, you will undoubtedly discuss some of the aspects of the current Washington scene as it relates to the newspaper profession. We wonder if you will touch upon a point which has lately disturbed us.

For years the organizations which are supposed to be the spokesmen for the profession of journalism have been pinning medals on themselves as the unswerving defenders of a free press. The American Publishers' Association, the Inland Press, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Associated Press, and the others gather at their periodic conventions, roll their eyes, beat their stuffed shirts, and intone their solemn vows to uphold and defend freedom of the press. They talk sanctimoniously of their sacred obligation to guard against any invasion of the freedom of the press.

For all this preening and strutting, for all the loud and brave talk, it has become increasingly apparent in the last decade that the American press is abdicating its responsibility to fight for a truly free press in America. Its spokesmen recite the pompous clichés of the past and rededicate themselves to defending freedom of the press in the abstract. But when they face a specific case of a dangerous assault on the free press, they are indifferent or are busy throwing editorial thunderbolts at some violation of the right of a free press in a far away Afghanistan or Argentina.

We are currently witnessing a typical example of this. The outrageous silencing of La Prensa by the Argentine Dictator Peron is engaging the attention of the American press. But when the same kind of an assault is made on the freedom of the press in this country a brooding silence lies over the editorial rooms of our big newspapers.

We refer to the assault made on Drew Pearson by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. In the 40 years of our newspaper experience we have not seen a more dangerous attempt to subvert the freedom of the press than was made by the political mountebank who now serves this State in the United States Senate.

We saw in this assault an attempt on the part of MCCARTHY to use the power of his place in the United States Senate and the privilege of his immunity to destroy a newspaperman with whose views he disagreed. Hiding behind the official immunity granted him by the Government of the United States he sought to silence Pearson by smearing his reputation and by calling for a boycott against Pearson by radio sponsors and newspaper publishers.

What is the difference between his technique and that employed by Peron? Both seek to use government power for their ends. Peron to destroy La Prensa. MCCARTHY to destroy Pearson.

If MCCARTHY can use the power of his public office in this way, then every other member of the United States Senate can do likewise. If every Member of the Senate can use this type of terrorism, then every Member of the House of Representatives can use the power of his office to silence newspapers and newspapermen who disagree with them. Members of the State legislatures can do the same. The fruits of McCarthyism are already ripening in the Wisconsin Legislature where we see the watch fob McCarthy's following the Senator's lead in their irresponsible and slanderous attacks on people with whom they disagree.

If McCarthyism goes unchallenged, then officialdom, the Government, has found the way to use the Peron technique in silencing the radio and the press in the United States. Think what it would mean if every Member of Congress and every member of every State legislature, operating from foxholes of legislative immunity, could attack and urge a boycott of every newspaperman or radio commentator who criticized a Member of Congress or a legislator. Today we are witnessing a trend in which McCarthyism is using a system of political terrorism and intimidation to establish a system of thought control and conformity. McCarthyism may be the forerunner of a totalitarianism which will be a threat to the American free way of life. And the American press continues to remain silent in the face of this dangerous assault.

MCCARTHY is a politician who has shown nothing but contempt for the laws and traditions of this State, whose veracity has been publicly challenged by the State supreme court, who has been charged by his profession and found guilty by the highest court of violating the laws and the constitution, the moral code, and his oath as an attorney and a judge. This is the kind of a man who can make a dangerous attack on a basic American freedom and go unchallenged by the press of this country.

None of the organizations which are supposed to speak for the press has challenged the McCarthy assault on Pearson. None of the spokesmen for the schools of journalism, which are supposed to be teaching our students their future responsibilities as custodians of the traditions of the free press, have spoken out against the dangerous precedent set by MCCARTHY in his demand for a boycott against an American writer and radio commentator.

This dereliction of responsibility and this spineless surrender to the loud-mouth demagogs promoting the current hysteria has sickened us of these publishers pow-wows, journalistic banquets, and gridiron shindigs at which the professionals get together for an orgy of undeserved self-praise.

It was in 1948, Mr. Andrews, that you won the Pulitzer price and the Heywood Broun memorial award for your splendid expose of the Washington witch hunting which, given new life by the lies of MCCARTHY, has made a cowardly cabal out of a great profession. What about you, Mr. Andrews? Have you got the stamina to stand up like you did in 1948 or does MCCARTHY have you joining the ranks of conformity, too?

Have you got the courage to tell the newspaper people in Wisconsin what they need to hear or will you speak from under the bed and tell them what they want to hear? Will you tell them that McCarthyism is a dangerous threat to a free press and a free radio?

Sincerely yours,
THE CAPITAL TIMES.

Post Office in Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a Federal building in the city of Lawrence

Whereas the city of Lawrence is sorely in need of increased post-office facilities; and

Whereas the presently existing building housing the post office in said city is inadequate for the purposes of said office and for the offices of other agencies of the Federal Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a new Federal building in the city of Lawrence to house the post office and other Federal offices; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the state secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted March 28, 1951.
IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence April 2, 1951.
LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

A true copy.
Attest:
EDWARD J. CROSTIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The President's Radio Address on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the text of a radio address by the President of the United States:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S RADIO ADDRESS ON KOREA, UNITED STATES FAR EASTERN POLICY

I want to talk plainly to you tonight about what we are doing in Korea and about our policy in the Far East.

In the simplest terms what we are doing in Korea is this: We are trying to prevent a third world war.

I think most people in this country recognized that fact last June. And they [illegible]

supported the decision of the Government to help the Republic of Korea against the Communist aggressors. Now, many persons, even some who applauded our decision to defend Korea, have forgotten the basic reason for our action.

It is right for us to be in Korea. It was right last June. It is right today.

I want to remind you why this is true.

The Communists in the Kremlin are engaged in a monstrous conspiracy to stamp out freedom all over the world. If they were to succeed, the United States would be numbered among their principal victims. It must be clear to everyone that the United States cannot—and will not—sit idly by and await foreign conquest. The only question is: When is the best time to meet the threat and how?

The best time to meet the threat is in the beginning. It is easier to put out a fire in the beginning when it is small than after it has become a roaring blaze.

And the best way to meet the threat of aggression is for the peace-loving nations to act together. If they don't act together, they are likely to be picked off, one by one.

ASSAILS INACTION OF THIRTIES

If they had followed the right policies in the 1930's—if the free countries had acted together, to crush the aggression of the dictators, and if they had acted in the beginning, when the aggression was small—there probably would have been no World War II.

If history has taught us anything, it is that aggression anywhere in the world is a threat to peace everywhere in the world. When that aggression is supported by the cruel and selfish rulers of a powerful nation who are bent on conquest, it becomes a clear and present danger to the security and independence of every free nation.

This is a lesson that most people in this country have learned thoroughly. This is the basic reason why we joined in creating the United Nations. And, since the end of World War II, we have been putting that lesson into practice—we have been working with other free nations to check the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union before they can result in a third world war.

That is what we did in Greece, when that nation was threatened by the aggression of international communism.

The attack against Greece could have led to general war. But this country came to the aid of Greece. The United Nations supported Greek resistance. With our help, the determination and efforts of the Greek people defeated the attack on the spot.

Another big Communist threat to peace was the Berlin blockade. That, too, could have led to war. But again it was settled because free men would not back down in an emergency.

The aggression against Korea is the boldest and most dangerous move the Communists have yet made.

The attack on Korea was part of a greater plan for conquering all of Asia.

I would like to read to you from a secret intelligence report which came to us after the attack. It is a report of a speech a Communist Army officer in North Korea gave to a group of spies and saboteurs last May, one month before South Korea was invaded. The report shows in great detail how this invasion was part of a carefully prepared plot. Here is part of what the Communist officer, who had been trained in Moscow, told his men:

"Our forces," he said, "are scheduled to attack South Korean forces about the middle of June . . . The coming attack on South Korea marks the first step toward the liberation of Asia."

Notice that he used the word "liberation." That is Communist double-talk meaning "conquest."

QUOTES ANOTHER SECRET REPORT

I have another secret intelligence report here. This one tells what another Communist officer in the Far East told his men several months before the invasion of Korea. Here is what he said: "In order to successfully undertake the long awaited world revolution, we must first unify Asia . . . Java, Indochina, Malaya, India, Tibet, Thailand, Philippines, and Japan are our ultimate targets . . . The United States is the only obstacle on our road for the liberation of all countries in Southeast Asia. In other words, we must unify the people of Asia and crush the United States."

That is what the Communist leaders are telling their people, and that is what they have been trying to do.

They want to control all Asia from the Kremlin.

This plan of conquest is in flat contradiction to what we believe. We believe that Korea belongs to the Koreans, that India belongs to the Indians—that all the nations of Asia should be free to work out their affairs in their own way. This is the basis of peace in the Far East and everywhere else.

The whole Communist imperialism is back of the attack on peace in the Far East. It was the Soviet Union that trained and equipped the North Koreans for aggression. The Chinese Communists massed 44 well-trained and well-equipped divisions on the Korean frontier. These were the troops they threw into battle when the North Korean Communists were beaten.

The question we have had to face is whether the Communist plan of conquest can be stopped without general war. Our Government and other countries associated with us in the United Nations believe that the best chance of stopping it without war is to meet the attack in Korea and defeat it there.

That is what we have been doing. It is a difficult and bitter task.

But so far it has been successful.

So far, we have prevented world war III.

So far, by fighting a limited war in Korea, we have prevented aggression from succeeding, and bringing on a general war. And the ability of the whole free world to resist Communist aggression has been greatly improved.

SAYS FOES HAVE RECEIVED LESSON

We have taught the enemy a lesson. He has found out that aggression is not cheap or easy. Moreover, men all over the world who want to remain free have been given new courage and new hope. They know now that the champions of freedom can stand up and fight and that they will stand up and fight.

Our resolute stand in Korea is helping the forces of freedom now fighting in Indochina and other countries in that part of the world. It has already slowed down the timetable of conquest.

In Korea itself, there are signs that the enemy is building up his ground forces for a new mass offensive. We also know that there have been large increases in the enemy's available air forces.

If a new attack comes, I feel confident it will be turned back. The United Nations fighting forces are tough and able and well equipped. They are fighting for a just cause. They are proving to all the world that the principle of collective security will work. We are proud of all these forces for the magnificent job they have done against heavy odds. We pray that their efforts may succeed, for upon their success may hinge the peace of the world.

The Communist side must now choose its course of action. The Communist rulers may press the attack against us. They may take further action which will spread the conflict. They have that choice, and with it the awful responsibility for what may follow. The Communists also have the choice of a peaceful settlement which could lead to a general relaxation of tensions in the Far East. The decision is theirs, because the forces of the United Nations will strive to limit the conflict if possible.

We do not want to see the conflict in Korea extended. We are trying to prevent a world war—not to start one. The best way to do that is to make it plain that we and the other free countries will continue to resist the attack.

But you may ask, why can't we take other steps to punish the aggressor? Why don't we bomb Manchuria and China itself? Why don't we assist Chinese Nationalist troops to land on the mainland of China?

POINTS TO RISK OF WORLD WAR

If we were to do these things we would be running a very grave risk of starting a general war. If that were to happen, we would have brought about the exact situation we are trying to prevent.

If we were to do these things we would become entangled in a vast conflict on the continent of Asia and our task would become immeasurably more difficult all over the world.

What would suit the ambitions of the Kremlin better than for our military forces to be committed to a full-scale war with Red China?

It may well be that, in spite of our best efforts, the Communists may spread the war. But it would be wrong—tragically wrong—for us to take the initiative in extending the war.

The dangers are great. Make no mistake about it. Behind the North Koreans and Chinese Communists in the front lines stand additional millions of Chinese soldiers. And behind the Chinese stand the tanks, the planes, the submarines, the soldiers, and the scheming rulers of the Soviet Union.

Our aim is to avoid the spread of the conflict.

The course we have been following is the one best calculated to avoid an all-out war. It is the course consistent that our obligation to do all we can to maintain international peace and security. Our experience in Greece and Berlin shows that it is the most effective course of action we can follow.

First of all, it is clear that our efforts in Korea can blunt the will of the Chinese Communists to continue the struggle. The United Nations forces have put up a tremendous fight in Korea and have inflicted very heavy casualties on the enemy. Our forces are stronger now than they have been before. These are plain facts which may discourage the Chinese Communists from continuing their attack.

Second, the free world as a whole is growing in military strength every day. In the United States, in Western Europe, and throughout the world, freemen are alert to the Soviet threat and are building their defenses. This may discourage the Communist rulers from continuing the war in Korea—and from undertaking new acts of aggression elsewhere.

ASSERTS DOOR TO PEACE IS OPEN

If the Communist authorities realize they cannot defeat us in Korea, if they realize it would be foolhardy to widen the hostilities beyond Korea, then they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression. A peaceful settlement may then be possible. The door is always open.

Then we may achieve a settlement in Korea which will not compromise the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

I have thought long and hard about this question of extending the war in Asia. I have discussed it many times with the ablest military advisers in the country. I believe with all my heart that the course we are following is the best course.

I believe that we must try to limit the war to Korea for these vital reasons: To make sure that the precious lives of our fighting men are not wasted; to see that the security of our country and the free world is not needlessly jeopardized; and to prevent a third world war.

A number of events have made it evident that General MacArthur did not agree with that policy. I have, therefore, considered it essential to relieve General MacArthur so that there would be no doubt or confusion as to the real purpose and aim of our policy.

It was with the deepest personal regret that I found myself compelled to take this action. General MacArthur is one of our greatest military commanders. But the cause of world peace is more important than any individual.

The change in commands in the Far East means no change whatever in the policy of the United States. We will carry on the fight in Korea with vigor and determination in an effort to bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

We are ready, at any time, to negotiate for a restoration of peace in the area. But we will not engage in appeasement. We are only interested in real peace.

GIVES BASIS FOR PEACE

Real peace can be achieved through a settlement based on the following factors:

1. The fighting must stop.
2. Concrete steps must be taken to insure that the fighting will not break out again.
3. There must be an end of the aggression.

A settlement founded upon these elements would open the way for the unification of Korea and the withdrawal of all foreign forces.

In the meantime, I want to be clear about our military objective. We are fighting to resist an outrageous aggression in Korea. We are trying to keep the Korean conflict from spreading to other areas. But at the same time we must conduct our military activities so as to insure the security of our forces. This is essential if they are to continue the fight until the enemy abandons its ruthless attempt to destroy the Republic of Korea.

That is our military objective—to repel attack and to restore peace.

In the hard fighting in Korea, we are proving that collective action among nations is not only a high principle but a workable means of resisting aggression. Defeat of aggression in Korea may be the turning point in the world's search for a practical way of achieving peace and security.

The struggle of the United Nations in Korea is a struggle for peace.

The free nations have united their strength in an effort to prevent a third world war.

That war can come if the Communist leaders want it to come. But this Nation and its allies will not be responsible for its coming.

We do not want to widen the conflict. We will use every effort to prevent that disaster. And in so doing, we know that we are following the great principles of peace, freedom, and justice.

Salary Raises for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address of Henry J. Mahady, Latrobe, Pa., State commander of American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS—before Clyde Kelly Branch, No. 84, National Association of Letter Carriers, at Pittsburgh:

Each year I look forward to meeting my old friends from the Pittsburgh post office. On such social occasions one ordinarily does not discuss weighty or serious matters. This year, with your permission, I will yield to the necessity of the times and take up a matter which from the viewpoint of the public and yourselves needs immediate attention and consideration.

I have received many letters from my many friends in the postal service. Some have given up their jobs with Uncle Sam and joined the ranks of industrial workers. Some have surrendered the hard-earned seniority and earned credits toward retirement while others were younger but promising top-flight men, of the type that merit the reputation the postal workers have earned so well and have gone into other work. Why has this occurred?

Their letters have explained why they have so acted, or were planning to so act. Economic necessity is the only way you can sum up the reasons given. One couldn't afford to "set up" his own home. Another couldn't support his family as rising prices plus his fixed obligations were forcing him deeper and deeper into debt and into the hands of creditors.

Inflation has pressured our Government and postal workers into leaving their chosen work to go into other fields because their fixed income couldn't stand the demands of rising prices.

How can we keep our career men? How can we stop this flight of top-grade men into other fields? How can we continue to attract top-grade men into postal service? Only by forwarding that legislation which will adjust their wages to the changed cost of living caused by inflationary pressure. One of the inequities caused by inflationary pressures is the fact that white-collar and Government workers and pensioners bear the brunt of it and generally they are a class who are least able to bear it.

Veterans who went into service are least able to stand this pressure. I am sure that dignified assertion of your demands to Congress will show them your necessity. I am sure that the public when it is pointed out to them will back legislation like H. R. 244 and S. bill 355.

I knew that there were many veterans among you. However, I never realized that there were so many veterans in the postal ranks until this last 2 months. I am proud of that fact. The armed services and postal employment are both services to the public as a whole. In both you keep the society functioning. In both you have a duty. Where there are so many veterans and so many high-type men as in the postal service we know communism is at a minimum and its doctrines will be given short shift.

I know there is a limit to patience where one's family is denied economic necessities and debts are piling up. But you as citizens must be patient. These times of crisis and adjustment require that the Government be strong. You are not only an arm of the Government but a necessary link in the industrial system. You must keep the postal service strong.

There are a number of bills before the Congress of the United States providing for raises in pay. H. R. 244 and Senate bill 355 are but two which strive to bring your pay in line with remuneration in other fields. You must have faith. You must have patience. Your lawmakers are alerted to your needs and I feel sure that you will not be disappointed.

You must realize that there are a class of people who think that anyone who has a Government job has a sinecure. They do not know of your problems. Little do they realize that you compete for jobs; that you are on your feet for many hours; that you must please the public no matter what the difficulty; that mail delayed by strikes or weather or holiday rush must be delivered on time; that you get sick and tired and worn out even as others do; that your children cry at night and disturb your rest; and finally that your wages must keep pace with prices.

Your reputation for delivering the goods and as citizens is good. You have earned this reputation by sacrifice and hard work, patience at this time will keep it.

I have examined charts, statistics, articles, arguments, and countless releases. The story is clear, the need apparent. Reasonable men cannot long deny apparent and obvious need. You must have confidence in your elected officials. They are reasonable men and should act promptly. I have no doubt that your matter will be given every consideration at an early date.

We, in AMVETS, feel that service to the community is the prime aim of our organization. We salute you as you have proved and will continue to prove that this is the prime objective of your organization. I apologize for talking shop at a social function, but you must pardon me. I and others are much concerned over the matter.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Will Ruin the Bituminous Coal Industry in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the evil effect of the St. Lawrence seaway project on the bituminous coal industry is evidenced by the following resolution adopted by the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association and the Eastern Bituminous Coal Association.

Every Member of Congress should read the following resolution because it proves conclusively that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is a menace not only to the economy of our Nation but principally to the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas—

"1. The members of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association and Eastern Bituminous Coal Association are producers of bituminous coal from mines located in the central district of Pennsylvania, the State of Maryland, and the counties of Grant, Mineral, and Tucker in West Virginia.

"2. The production of bituminous coal is by far the major industry in this area and its economy is largely dependent upon production and transportation of coal and many communities are solely dependent upon them. In 1950 the area produced 46,250,000 tons of bituminous coal and employed more than 47,000 miners to whom it paid more than $130,000,000 in wages. The

market value of its coal product was more than $230,000,000.

"3. Approximately 85 percent of the coal produced in the area is transported from the mines by rail and delivered to those portions of the United States and Canada lying east of a north-south line drawn through Buffalo, N. Y., and north of an east-west line drawn through Washington, D. C. Large quantities of coal produced in the area are shipped to points in northern New York and in eastern Ontario.

"4. The entire bituminous coal industry of the United States, which in 1950 produced more than 500,000,000 tons of coal, employed approximately 425,000 miners to whom it paid more than $1,300,000,000 in wages, will be adversely affected by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric project, because

"(a) It will make accessible to foreign-produced fuel an area which currently consumes large quantities of coal of which, it is reliably estimated, more than 35,000,000 tons of coal per annum, the equivalent in domestic coal production of 544,000 man-days, may well be displaced by foreign fuel. Without the seaway, this area cannot be reached by foreign fuel in significant quantities because of prohibitive transportation costs from the seacoast;

"(b) The hydropower development on the St. Lawrence River, estimated at from 570,000 to 750,000 kilowatts of firm power, will displace (or prevent its future use) an average of 2,500,000 tons of coal per annum, the equivalent in domestic coal production of 38,880 man-days;

"(c) The loss of employment in the railroad industry will equal that of the coal industry, for it requires a man-day of railroad labor to transport a man-day of coal production.

"5. Aside from the loss of employment and loss of invested capital in the coal and railroad industries, and the adverse effect upon the economy of the communities dependent thereon, the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric project is not in the Nation's interest because

"(a) The Nation cannot afford to pile the cost of the seaway, estimated at $1,500,000,000, on top of the tremendous cost of the current defense program which now strains the national economy, nor can it afford to divert manpower and materials to a project which because of the length of time required for its construction (at least 7 years) cannot be of immediate aid to defense;

"(b) If the country needs more electric power, it can obtain it more speedily and at less capital cost by the construction of steam-operated plants, and at less operating cost unless the public project be subsidized by the taxpayers;

"(c) the seaway is of doubtful value in time of war (it would be unnavigable 5 months of every year) and would be difficult to defend (the bombing of its locks would put it completely out of commission);

"(d) the seaway is of value in time of peace only to a small segment of the total economy of the Nation and will do much damage to many other segments, not only to the coal and railroad industries, but also to the American merchant marine, the established coastal ports, and others: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the directors of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association and Eastern Bituminous Coal Association, in joint session assembled, do hereby record their opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric project and do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to oppose the same; and further

"*Resolved*, That the executive director of these associations be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit copies of these resolutions to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the President of the Senate, to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, to each of Pennsylvania's Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to such other persons as he may deem advisable."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of resolutions adopted unanimously on March 29, 1951, by the boards of directors of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association and Eastern Bituminous Coal Association in joint session.

R. T. LAING, *Secretary*.

What the People Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I feel fortunate today, to be able to present this House of Representatives with some figures, reflecting the state of public opinion in the Seventeenth Michigan Congressional District, concerning the very issues raised by President Truman's action, which only yesterday shocked and alarmed every patriotic American.

The action I refer to, of course, was the tragically misguided, and possibly disastrous, order issued by the President, relieving Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur of his American and United Nations commands in the Far East.

In presenting these figures, representing a poll taken in my behalf by two fine newspapers, the Pontiac Daily Press and the Royal Oak Daily Tribune, perhaps I should mention the fact that the Seventeenth Michigan Congressional District is one of the largest in the Nation, from the standpoint of population.

Located within the Seventeenth District are several great industrial areas, extensive farming areas, commercial areas, and a tremendous concentration of homes, from the wealthiest to the poorest, whose owners have their places of business and employment variously, throughout the Detroit metropolitan area.

I think I can say without question, that the Seventeenth District offers a cross-section of the thinking, political and economic, which prevails everywhere in the great American Middle West. And more than that, too, because of recent years Detroit's vast industrial expansion has drawn to the Seventeenth Congressional District, literally scores of thousands of Americans, of all races and creeds, from every State in the Union.

The public opinion poll, which I am about to give you the results, was taken by means of a questionnaire, published for 2 days on the front pages of the newspapers I have mentioned. The questionnaire contained 10 questions, as follows:

1. Do you favor the administration's foreign policies?
2. Do you favor arming North and South America?
3. Are you in favor of all-out mobilization?
4. Do you favor strong defenses in the Atlantic?
5. Do you favor sending troops to Europe?
6. Do you favor keeping troops in Korea?
7. Do you favor military aid to Chiang Kai-shek?
8. Should our foreign policies be reexamined?
9. Do you think Mr. Acheson should resign?
10. Should nonessential civilian expenditures be reduced?

Of the 697 newspaper readers voting on question No. 1—do you favor the administration's foreign policies?—645 voted "no." Only 52 voted "yes."

Of the 689 voting on question No. 2—do you favor arming North and South America?—488 voted "yes." Only 201 voted "no."

Of the 690 voting on question No. 3—are you in favor of all-out mobilization?—400 voted "no." Those voting "yes" numbered 290.

Of the 696 voting on question No. 4—do you favor strong defenses in the Atlantic?—609 voted "yes." Only 87 voted "no."

Of the 673 voting on question No. 5—do you favor sending troops to Europe?—456 voted "no." Only 217 voted "yes."

Of the 708 voting on question No. 6—do you favor keeping troops in Korea?—474 voted "no," Only 234 voted "yes."

Of the 703 who voted on question No. 7—do you favor military aid to Chiang Kai-shek?—406 voted "yes." Those who voted "no" numbered 297.

Of the 732 who voted on question No. 8—should our foreign policies be reexamined?—692 voted "yes." Only 40 voted "no."

Of the 708 who voted on question No. 9—do you think Mr. Acheson should resign?—582 voted "yes." Only 126 voted "no."

Of the 722 who voted on question No. 10—do you think nonessential civilian spending should be reduced?—647 voted "yes." Only 75 voted "no."

From the foregoing, which I trust has not proved tedious, it may be concluded that public opinion in the Seventeenth Michigan Congressional District, as a cross-section of Middle Western thought, if not that of the entire Nation, inclines as follows:

First. Strongly against the Truman administration's foreign policies.

Second. Strongly in favor of arming North and South America, as recommended by former President Herbert Hoover.

Third. Slightly against all-out mobilization at this time.

Fourth. Strongly in favor of adequate defenses in the Atlantic.

Fifth. Strongly against sending troops to Europe, presumably at least until European nations of the west show a real disposition to rearm and resist Communist aggression.

Sixth. Approximately 2 to 1 against keeping troops in Korea.

Seventh. Rather strongly in favor of extending military aid to Chiang Kai-shek, the ratio in favor being about 4 to 3.

Eighth. Almost unanimously in favor of reexamining the foreign policies of the Truman administration.

Ninth. Very strongly, indeed, that Mr. Acheson should resign, the ratio being almost 5 to 1 in favor of his resignation.

Tenth. Almost unanimously in favor of a drastic reduction in all nonessential civilian spending by the Government, the ratio being nearly 10 to 1.

It is my conviction that anybody who will consider the results of this public-opinion poll, as I have given them to you, can conclude in the light of common sense, only that the American people, not only in Michigan but throughout the Nation, overwhelmingly support the ideas of former President Herbert Hoover and Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur.

And now I hope you will bear with me, while I repeat something I said earlier.

The action of President Truman in removing Gen. Douglas MacArthur of the far-eastern command is one of the most tragic events in American history. There is no precedent for it.

Lincoln removed several generals in the Union Army during the War Between the States because of incompetence. This is not the case with General MacArthur.

The President demanded the impossible; namely, the support of a virtually nonexistent foreign policy with respect to Asia. MacArthur is a great general and a great statesman. Because he sought to fill a void, where no real policy, either of the United States or the United Nations, was in existence, he has been sacrificed on the altar of politics.

President Truman has liquidated communism's greatest enemy, in the person of General MacArthur, who has served so long, so nobly, and so well. The President's action has gone far to destroy what little confidence the American people, the people of Japan, and the other peoples of the Far East ever have had in the objectives and purposes of the Truman administration.

It has been well said that today there is rejoicing in the Kremlin, as the Red dictator and his regime arrive at the natural conclusion, that preparations are in progress for a new appeasement—another Munich—in the Far East.

Railroad Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the inauguration of the railroad retirement system, it has been my earnest desire to make it the best retirement system in the world. The insufficiency and financial instability of the old private so-called pension systems prevailing on the railroads led me, in the latter part of the Hoover administration, to introduce the first bill for the protection of railroad workers. My interest in the subject continued and has continued to the present time.

I, therefore, sponsored the Railroad Retirement Act of 1934, the 1935 act, the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and all important amendments to these acts up to the present time.

There is a general desire among railroad workers at the present time for amendments which would increase the benefits to which the railroad workers should be entitled. This is not an unnatural desire when we realize that the purchasing power of a dollar has lessened very substantially since the enactment of the provisions of the railroad retirement law. Among railroad workers, there is also an even more general feeling of opposition to the increase in assessments for the purpose of providing more liberal benefits. It is easy to see, therefore, that the problem confronting us in the effort to be of assistance to the railroad workers is not an easy one.

Any true friend of the railroad men of the United States who understands the requirements of a sound railroad retirement system must first of all be certain that what is proposed will not jeopardize the financial soundness of the system. For many months, I have been making a very careful study of the whole situation and have been in consultation with those who are most competent to advise in regard to the matter and who are most familiar with the problem as at present presented.

After many consultations with experts of the Railroad Retirement Board and officials of the Railway Labor Executives Association, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 3669, which I believe will afford substantial help and, at the same time, will not jeopardize the financial stability of the retirement system. I may say here that already during the few months of the present Congress approximately 30 bills have been introduced for the purpose of increasing the benefits payable under the retirement law. Practically all of these measures, if enacted into law, would menace the soundness of the system, if not immediately wreck it. I am anxious above all other considerations to avoid any such disaster as the destruction of the financial soundness of the system. I am more than pleased with the good will evidenced by many of the bills, but I am sure that their authors will understand that they will be of greater help to the railroad workers by cooperating in the passage of this measure which will result in the increase of benefits and in no way harm the system.

I hope that we can arrange for hearings on my bill at the earliest possible date available to our committee. At that time, we shall be glad to hear well qualified witnesses in regard to the different aspects of the problem.

Maturing War Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many people who are concerned with what to do about their maturing war bonds. If they cash them in at the present time, they must report a profit for income-tax purposes and will lose a part of their increased value. On the other hand, many people are concerned about holding on to their bonds for a greater period of time because of the depreciation of the dollar over the past 10 years.

This depreciation is most readily seen in the following case: If a man in 1941 bought a brand-new low-priced car instead of a war bond for $750, he could have enjoyed a moderate use of that car over a 10-year period. If he invested it in war bonds, he would now get back $1,000 from the Government, of which he would have to pay, say, an average of 30 percent income tax on the $250 increment. Therefore, the citizen would have a net amount of $925 available to date. However, if he went to buy a new low-priced car today of the same make as he bought in 1941, he could not touch it for much less than $2,000.

The above example holds true for practically any other commodity one would care to select. Therefore, it can be seen that many people are quite concerned with this problem and the various answers to the problem were very well brought out in the following article by Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Sun-Times:

WAR BONDS MATURING; PUBLIC ASKS: "WHAT SHALL I DO?"

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

On every hand one hears the question: "My first war bonds soon will be maturing. What shall I do?"

Many of those who bought war bonds never made any other investments. Consequently they lack the experience needed to decide wisely.

First, let us examine the alternatives. Anyone who owns series E savings bonds purchased after May 1, 1941, has, on their maturity, three choices.

He may turn the bonds in at his bank or at the Federal Reserve bank and receive the full redemption price, $25 for a bond originally bought for $18.75; $50 for the $37.50 bond; $100 for the $75 bond; $500 for the $375 bond; and $1,000 for the $750 bond.

In such case he will have to include in his income when he files his return next year the entire interest accrued on the bond, as for example the $25 on a $100 bond. In short, he will have to pay back to the Government in the form of taxes, depending on his income bracket, from 20 percent to 91 percent of the interest he receives for the 10-year loan of his money. This, despite the fact that the purchasing power of the $100 he receives today is substantially less than the $75 he invested 10 years ago.

Bondholders can escape temporarily this tax charge by accepting the second alternative. This involves doing nothing. The owner can just hold on to his bonds. He can do this deliberately or simply through negligence or forgetfulness and the result is the same.

The bonds will automatically be extended indefinitely up to a maximum of 10 years. Interest will accrue at a straight 2½ percent rate for the first 7½ years and then at an accelerated rate so that if held for a full 10 years the return would approximate 2.9 percent compounded semiannually.

Such bonds can be cashed in at any time and the interest obtained to the nearest 6 months' period prior to the date of cashing.

INTEREST ADDED EVERY 6 MONTHS

In other words, during the first 6 months no additional interest would be payable but after that each half year 1¼ per cent would be added to the original redemption value of the bond until 7½ years elapsed. After that,

the interest would be at an accelerated rate and if a $100 bond is held for the full 10 years the additional interest would be $83.33.

When the bond is cashed, the interest for both the first 10 years and the subsequent period must be reported as income for Federal tax purposes.

The third option is to exchange maturing E bonds for registered series G bonds. These will bear interest at the flat rate of 2½ percent per annum payable semiannually from the issue date until their maturity in 12 years. The minimum denomination, however, is $500. Until such a total is reached, maturing E bonds may be accumulated over any 12 consecutive calendar months and presented for exchange not later than two calendar months after the month of maturity of the last bond in the group.

These G bonds may be redeemed at par at any time after 6 months upon one calendar month's notice. However, the privilege of deferring taxes on the interest of the E bonds (also the interest each 6 months on the new G bonds) does not apply if this exchange is made.

I repeat what I have said many times before: That as long as the purchasing value of the dollar has depreciated substantially during the period covered by this loan of money to the Government and particularly inasmuch as this decline in the value of the dollar has occurred largely as a result of Government policies, it does not strike me as fair that the patriotic buyers of their country's bonds should have to pay taxes on an income which in terms of purchasing power is actually a loss rather than a gain.

However, until or unless Congress changes the law that is the situation.

Which of the three alternatives should the bondholder decide upon? This depends upon individual circumstances and individual conclusions as to the outlook.

DELAYING TAX MAY BE ADVANTAGEOUS

For an individual above the age of 55 and anticipating retirement at 65 and a consequent sharp decline in his income, postponing the date when the tax collector must be paid holds certain obvious advantages. If one believes that the tax rates will be lower some time during the 10 years ahead, again there are obvious advantages in postponing the year in which the taxes on these investments will be paid.

On the other hand, if one feels that the Government will have no better success than it has had in stopping inflation, the depreciation in the true value of the dollar is such as to make any fixed-income investment (all bonds, saving accounts, insurance, annuities, preferred stocks, mortgages, etc.) unprofitable.

If such a conclusion is reached, the bondholder is faced with other problems. First of all, should he hold the bonds as a duty of citizenship? Second, should he hold them as part of the fight against inflation? Any other course would probably add to the inflationary pressures. Third, if his duty as a citizen rests lightly and he cares little for his responsibility to fight inflation, what will he choose to do with the funds obtained from his maturing bonds? Go on a spending spree at today's all-time high prices, adding fuel to the fires of inflation? Or shall he invest in other things, stocks, perchance, also already selling at around the highest prices in history, or real estate where inflation has sent values soaring?

The choice, it will be seen, is not an easy one. Many other individual factors will govern the decision.

The average citizen, I suspect, will follow the easiest course of doing nothing, which, in effect, means extending the bonds. He should do something more—write another and still another letter to his Senators and his Congressman demanding more effective action against inflation than anything witnessed thus far.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Scranton Times, Scranton, Pa., dated April 11, 1951, entitled "MacArthur Ousted":

MACARTHUR OUSTED

That there would be a show-down with General MacArthur over his policies and pronouncements with regard to the war in the Far East was inevitable. What happened early this morning—relief of General MacArthur of his command by President Truman—should have been no great surprise. Mr. Truman says his action was based on General MacArthur's inability to give "his wholehearted support to United States and United Nations policies." In a nutshell, General MacArthur not only wanted to direct the shooting war but the diplomatic war as well. Had he confined himself to his own particular field, the one for which he was trained—the shooting war—he would have been immeasurably better off and President Truman would not have been forced to take such drastic action as relieving him of his command. In World War I, General Pershing did just that and in World War II General Eisenhower stuck to fighting and left diplomacy to those who were delegated to attend to diplomatic missions.

As the New York Herald Tribune said only yesterday, and the Times quoted that declaration, "there must be unity of command and if General MacArthur cannot accommodate himself to the basic strategy of his Commander in Chief—President Truman—his further usefulness as a general must necessarily come in question." General MacArthur had unfortunately allowed himself to become a disturbing element in a political as well as a military sense. His pronouncements of policy as regards the Far East, apparently without consulting the State Department or the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were embarrassing and annoying. While many will take sides with him, some merely because they are against the Truman administration and can see political advantage in a disturbed situation, the great majority of the American people will conclude there must be one commander in chief, that his decisions should be accepted and those refusing to abide by them should retire from active service.

It can hardly be said President Truman acted hastily in relieving General MacArthur of his command. Months ago Mr. Truman made a long journey to the mid-Pacific to confer with General MacArthur. Emissaries of the administration have gone to Tokyo and met with the general. Only a few days ago Army Secretary Pace conferred with MacArthur. As of yesterday it was announced from Tokyo that General MacArthur made it plain to his superiors that he intended to keep right on fighting for a freer hand in the Korean War.

General MacArthur, it has long been contended, is Asia-minded. He sees the future of the world decided upon the soil of Asia rather than of Europe. His pronouncements, it is contended, have embarrassed General Eisenhower in the latter's efforts to build up the defenses of Europe. Now the situation has been resolved, unfortunately but nontheless necessarily, through relief of General MacArthur of his command. He has been succeeded by Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who is all soldier and who since he was put in command of the Eighth Army in Korea has done a great job. It is expected General Ridgway will stick to his knitting—that is fighting.

President Truman expressed his regret that he had to relieve General MacArthur of his command. He said at the same time that MacArthur's place in history "as one of our greatest commanders is fully established" and that "the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for the distinguished and exceptional service which he has rendered his country in posts of great responsibility."

President Truman is not the first Chief Executive faced with situations similar in many respects to the controversy which has raged around General MacArthur. Lincoln and other chiefs had to act summarily and relieve commanders who assumed too much authority and who insisted on acting on their own. There was great hubbub at those times and efforts made to gain political advantage over the action, just as there is today, with President Truman's opponents dragging the whole thing down into the swamps of petty politics. Whatever way you look at it the present situation is not nice. To General MacArthur it is humiliating. He brought it on himself by talking too much and too often.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Winchell:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

MACARTHUR—THE STORY BEHIND THE STORY

The greatest scandal in American history is now out in the open. The scandal is not the dismissal of General MacArthur; it is the foreign policy which made it inevitable. General MacArthur and Secretary Acheson are only symbols in a titanic struggle going on behind the scenes. The forces which caused MacArthur's dismissal are not in Washington. They are in London. The administration, faced with the break-up of the Atlantic Pact by Great Britain unless it appeases Red China, took the step of double appeasement (of both Moscow and London) by firing MacArthur.

These are the facts: Secretary Acheson, as recently as last summer, attempted to honor his secret commitment to Great Britain to recognize Red China and admit her to the United Nations. He is on record as stating we would not veto Red China if she succeeded in getting a majority vote. Great Britain, as Red China's floor leader, attempted to get the majority. As another step, Secretary Acheson initiated a deliberate program to play down the importance of Formosa. Senator KNOWLAND, of California, produced documentary evidence that Secretary Acheson had secretly instructed all State Department policy makers to minimize the strategic importance of Formosa. In short, the Chinese Nationalist government, by secret agreement between the United States and Britain, was to be thrown to the wolves. American public opinion stopped this also. MacArthur, of course, opposed it throughout.

The President and Secretary Acheson, until public opinion reversed them, took the view that since Asia has no industry, that continent would never be a factor in the next war. The Acheson formula called for the virtual abandonment of Asia. It was, of course, heavily supported by those who believe communism can be appeased. The American public did not subscribe to the view. It became impossible for the administration to force its secret agreement through the Senate. After practically declaring Korea could not be defended, the President ordered the troops in when Acheson's appeasement failed again. The same action followed in Indochina. After refusing arms, the President sent them.

The reason Great Britain is desperate is that Red China is even more so. The whole of South China is in a virtual state of insurrection. Guerrillas, to the extent of more than a million, are in operation on the Chinese mainland. Until Formosa is liquidated, until Chiang's army is out of existence, Red China will always be on the brink of civil war. The Reds realize this so much that they are prepared to vacate South China, if attacked there. Thus, Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek are at the heart of the Far East question, and not Korea. MacArthur favors using them. Acheson's commitments to Great Britain forbid it. As an example, a shipment of rubber is being loaded at Singapore, destination the Red forces.

MacArthur, contrary to the general impression, is within his rights even as a soldier in defying the President. His oath is to the Constitution and to the men under his command. If he deems the orders of his superiors in conflict with them, he is under a duty to make known his objections. The President, by the same token, has a right to relieve him but he cannot punish. Under the Constitution General MacArthur cannot be dishonorably dismissed from the United States Army for adhering to his oath to the Constitution as he sees it.

It is well that the struggle is at last out in the open. The deadlock of the forces behind the scene was strangling the Nation. Because the truth is that while MacArthur has just been relieved by the President, the United States Senate has long ago dismissed Secretary Acheson for all practical purposes. Acheson is Secretary of State in title only by whim of the President and not by will of the people. Both the Democratic and Republican Senate leaderships have repudiated him. They have put all foreign nations on notice that the Secretary is without power to reach any agreement without their consent. And that consent is not forthcoming.

As recently as last week, Acheson's Voice of America appropriation was cut 90 percent which is a repeated demand that he resign. Nor is the rebellion against Acheson confined to the Senate. General Eisenhower has abruptly ended the efforts of Secretary Acheson to name his political advisers. The ECA Administration, the Marshall plan—ignores the State Department, to its intense rage—and carries on its own foreign policy. Since this bureau deals out the goods, it has far higher prestige than the State Department. Its domestic policy is very clear: It avoids Acheson because it doesn't want its appropriation cut, too. Thus, the United States has three foreign policies: One military, one economic, and the third, a poor loser, the diplomatic one.

It is not the struggle between MacArthur and Acheson which is paramount. The first consideration is the welfare of the Nation. Paradoxically, General MacArthur has been relieved but not dismissed with dishonor. Secretary Acheson has been dismissed, practically with dishonor by the United States Senate, but has not been relieved by the President. It is only natural, therefore, that the Nation itself is dividing into two camps.

By purely objective reporting standards, the country has never been so divided since Fort Sumter. All thinking Americans must realize the division within the action is far more serious than any personality involved. General MacArthur's removal has its chief meaning in its political repercussions. General Ridgway is an able soldier; he is capable of carrying on the command. But the blocking of the President and Acheson by the Senate has resulted in the stoppage of universal military training and a general desire to limit the personalities of the administration as much as possible. In this, the Congress as a whole reflects the will of the American people. They simply will not trust their sons to State Department policies under Secretary Acheson. Experts call them reversals when leaders contradict themselves in diplomacy. But reporters call them massacres when it happens on the battlefield.

The administration would never have fired MacArthur if left to itself. The mighty pressure necessary to dismiss the general came from the West, and not from the East. It is this simple. London blackmailed the White House with threats of breaking up the Atlantic alliance. The White House caved in. The great struggle between the President and the Senate has reached final showdown. It is the Senate's move; in removing General MacArthur the President has defied the Senate to impeach Secretary Acheson. It is put up or shut up now.

To Clean Up the Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial entitled "To Clean Up the Ohio," which appeared in the New York Times this morning:

TO CLEAN UP THE OHIO

A long stride forward in the control of river pollution has been insured by a notable decision this week of the Supreme Court. Many more spectacular cases may have a less permanent effect than this one on the welfare of our country, for pollution of streams and rivers has become a national problem of the first importance.

In a far-seeing attempt to do something about the increasingly intolerable pollution of the waters of the Ohio River Basin, the eight States of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Virginia, and West Virginia in 1948 joined together in a compact establishing the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission. They recognized, as the Court says, "that they were faced with one of the problems of Government that are defined by natural rather than political boundaries." Interstate action was essential to clean up the waters of an area covering about 155,000 square miles, waters into which some 1,100 cities and towns drained their sewage and waste; and interstate action was taken. But then the Supreme Court of West Virginia held that that State legislature's adherence to the compact was invalid, as it violated the State constitution. It is this ruling that the Supreme Court of the United States overturned, thus firmly establishing the Ohio River compact as a workable method of interstate cooperation.

"The compact involves a reasonable and carefully limited delegation of power to an interstate agency," Justice Frankfurter noted; and Justice Jackson added that "if the compact system is to have vitality and integrity" West Virginia may not unilaterally "read herself out" of this interstate obligation. As an official of the sanitation commission has said, the Court's decision confirms the right of the various States "to join together to develop a more effective campaign to promote clean streams." It should give encouragement to other States that may be considering this method of attacking a problem that is general throughout the country and that cries out for remedial action.

Slovaks Protest Against Religious Persecution in Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an appeal sent by Mr. Philip A. Hrobak, president of the Slovak League of America, to the President and the Congress of the United States:

SLOVAKS PROTEST AGAINST RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN SLOVAKIA

To the President and Congress of the United States of America:

As Americans of Slovak descent we protest against the imprisonment of Bishop John Vojtassak, Bishop Michael Buzalka, and Bishop Paul Gojdic. We have been profoundly shocked by the mock trial and by the harsh, unjust, and inhuman treatment they have been subjected to by the Communist regime of Gottwald.

The travesty of justice, as manifested in the trial and verdict of the three Slovak bishops, is merely another example of the persecution raging in every country where the Communists rule. We are convinced that the Slovak bishops—like Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac—have been imprisoned because they, too, dared to oppose a totalitarian dictator for his suppression of religious freedom.

The Czechoslovakia of today would not exist except for the free flow of American blood and American dollars during the war. America cannot and must not stand idly by while Slovakia is being sacrificed to the Red Moloch of Moscow. Perverters of decency must not be permitted to destroy the forces of good without challenge by governments which call themselves Christian. The crimes committed in Slovakia are crimes not only against the unfortunate people living there, but crimes against ourselves as members of the human family.

We are so concerned about the injustice of the trial and the sentence of the three Slovak bishops not because we happen to be of Slovak descent, but primarily because we are Americans. The Slovak bishops represent each one of us. It is because in defending human rights, the inherent rights of their people to political and religious freedom, they are defending the rights of the individual person. They are defending our rights. And it was for those very rights that we toiled, suffered, and sacrificed so much during the war years.

The Czecho-Communist regime of Prague knows that the Slovak people rejected communism long ago. They know that the Slovaks have fought against it relentlessly for over a century. That explains why that regime is so determined to exterminate all Slovak political and religious leaders who oppose them and their brutal rule.

We urge the President and the Congress of the United States to make an official protest to the Czechoslovak Government against the imprisonment of the Slovak bishops and the persecution of religion in Slovakia. We also urge our President and our Congress to break all diplomatic relations with the Czecho-Communist regime of Prague which has sinned so grievously against humanity and the fundamental principles of freedom. Finally, we urge our President and our Congress to bring these crimes against humanity, the crimes against the Slovak nation, to the attention of the United Nations and request that body to investigate those crimes.

Today we protest before God and the world against the systematic torture and persecution of the Slovak bishops and the murder of the faithful whose lives already have been taken by the godless Reds of Prague.

PHILIP A. HROMAK,
President, the Slovak League of America.
MIDDLETOWN, PA., *January 23, 1951.*

Segregation Provision in Draft-UMT Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to me, and I believe to everyone here, that this motion to strike the segregation portion of the draft-UMT bill providing that any soldier might have the right to request that he serve in a unit of his own race is not made for the purpose of aiding the war effort, or to make us stronger, or to make an attack by Russia more remote, but to bring into play more agitation, more strife, and their partisan politics into a most serious matter. This provision is as fair provision as I ever saw. This provision simply allows our boys to cast a vote for their preference.

Much has been said on the floor here by the opposition to the effect if a boy is old enough to fight, he is old enough to vote, and then this opposition proceeds to try to deny these boys the right to vote on this important question. Those who want to be in unsegregated units need only express his desire to do so, and by the same token those who desire to serve in segregated units should be allowed to express their wish to do so. The people of the United States want this provision in this bill. The boys—and they are just boys—have the right to insist that you not require them to be guinea pigs for a social experiment and to make them the only people in this country that this experiment is tried out upon. It is a cruel thing to say to these boys that we will take you from your homes, we will put you in war, we will bury some of you, no doubt about that, but, nevertheless, we have some minorities we intend to honor at your expense.

If you will give this bill a try, you will find to your entire satisfaction that the Negroes, if let alone and are not high pressured by pressure groups, there will not be one Negro in a thousand that will ask to serve in a mixed unit where they will suffer complete embarrassment. If there be any person who insists upon legislation requiring another to associate with him, that insistence would prove an unmistakable sign of inferiority when one is not content to remain with his own race, then that person is inferior and a troublemaker. I respectfully ask that no consideration be given that silly prattle that to leave this portion in the bill will furnish propaganda to Russia. One of our main troubles here is that we have kowtowed to Russia and off-color groups too long, and we have too many times forgotten the rights of the old-fashioned Southerner and the old-fashioned Yankee.

I will tell you how to talk to Russia, and that is simply to talk to Russia in the only language she understands. That language is force and might. Let us tell Russia that we have had all the foolishness from her and her stripe, whether in Russia or in the United States, that we will tolerate; that peace is what we want if we can have it honorably, but if fight we must, we will do it, and so efficiently she will not rise to fight again.

Let us pass this bill just as it is, and let us do it now. This bill is a sobering thing, but it is life insurance to us and to our boys. It has been said it is fine to die for your country, but I declare it is much better to make the enemy die for his country. Let us tell Russia and the trouble makers at home that they are no longer the "Who's Who in America," but that they belong to that class of "Who's Through in America."

Aid for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial printed in the San Francisco Chronicle for March 31, 1951, on the subject of the proposed shipment of grains to India. I want to express my own personal concern over the failure of Congress to act on this vital, humanitarian project. The editorial aptly expresses the feelings of, what I am sure is, the great majority of people in this country. It seems to me inexcusable that we should trifle with human lives by delaying action on H. R. 3017.

Further in regard to these proposed shipments I should like to comment on the various proposals and questions about methods of shipment. In my personal opinion, inasmuch as the wheat to be shipped will be in the nature of a gift from the people of the United States to the people of India, there is no reason why all of that wheat should not be carried in American owned and manned vessels as long as any such vessels are available. With our own merchant marine and seamen not fully employed, there is no justification for subsidizing any foreign shipping interests through payments for these shipments. In conformity with established practice on ECA and other similar goods, I shall support an amendment to H. R. 3017 requiring at least 50-percent carriage in American bottoms; however, I strongly urge all those concerned with administration of the program to use 100 percent of the available capacity in American vessels.

The editorial from the Chronicle follows:

DAWDLING IN INDIA AID

The Congressmen who for a month and a half have stalled American famine relief for India will no doubt have noticed the New Delhi report that in some villages inhabitants are eating one meal every other day. Also the news that the Indian Government has had to break its promise, made on the expectation of American generosity, to increase the 9-ounce daily food ration.

These news items do not take much space in the papers, but they do in the consciences of many Americans and in the attitudes of most Indians. The bank account of good will which the United States might have hoped to create by the gift of 2,000,000 tons of our surplus wheat is being squandered through delay.

Surely it is time for Congress to come to terms with a proposal that, as former President Hoover said, "has nothing to do with politics but with our fundamental Christian faith." It is not agreeable to see the United States, for the first time in its history, failing to answer the appeal of a famine-stricken people.

It is indefensible for Congressmen to withhold the gift out of pique over differences between Nehru's policy and their personal policy. It is unfortunate that some of them, from motives that they would be quick to condemn in foreign colonial relations, insist upon squeezing out payment for the wheat in Indian raw materials. The basic fact is that if India had the raw materials to get the dollars to buy the wheat, she would doubtless buy it and be done with it. As a matter of fact, India is buying 1,500,000 tons in the United States and Canadian markets; it is because she cannot pay dollars for the balance of 2,000,000 tons she needs that the administration has proposed a Marshall-plan kind of gift.

Russia is already in with an offer of wheat for India—a show-window offer, no doubt, and unlikely to be performed, but still more of an offer than we have yet made. We wonder what the Congressmen who are concerned about India's politics think about the politics in that?

The People of My Congressional District Resent the Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the dismissal of General MacArthur from his far-eastern command by President Truman I have received the greatest barrage of protests on any subject during my congressional career.

These protests come from people of all shades of political faith; and while they do not question the President's right as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to relieve General MacArthur, they express indignation over the shabby manner in which he was treated, despite the fact that it is universally recognized that General MacArthur knows more about the Orient and its inhabitants than any other living American.

The people of my congressional district realize that the President's action against General MacArthur was motivated by the desire of the Chief Executive to uphold the policies that were formulated by the Truman-Acheson-Hiss regime.

In addition to the many long-distance telephone calls from my congressional district and the hundreds of letters and telegrams, I have not received one single communication supporting President Truman.

Here are only a few of the telegrams I received deploring the action of President Truman:

DuBois, Pa.: "As an American I resented the President's insult to the Marines a year ago. I resented the President's insinuation of red herring. I also have resented the manner in which the President of the United States has conducted himself through his letters and threats to individuals. I now resent his firing General MacArthur. I speak as an American and as a veteran of World War II, and I am in favor of impeachment and whatever you deem necessary, JIMMY, it's all right with me."

Claysburg, Pa.: "Removal of MacArthur most deplorable and dangerous action taken in years. Public sentiment here strong against Truman. Impeachment of Truman and Acheson demanded."

Altoona, Pa.: "Removal of MacArthur most deplorable and a tragic happening for America. Public opinion demands impeachment of Truman and removal of his henchmen in Washington."

Altoona, Pa.: "I recommend you impeach Truman and Acheson, the friends of Uncle Joe and Alger Hiss."

DuBois, Pa.: "Are you a Communist or an American. Impeachment."

DuBois, Pa.: "Moral and intelligence level of Chief Executive has become so low, see impeachment proceedings as only hope for future of United States."

Tyrone, Pa.: "Can't something be done to stop Truman's blunders. Dean Acheson's part in the MacArthur decision should not go unnoticed."

Clearfield, Pa.: "President Truman should be impeached. We need a capable, self-reliant man to head our Government."

State College, Pa.: "My family and I strongly object to removal of General MacArthur. Never could understand the reasons behind Korean War. If we are not fighting it to win we had better pull up stakes and come home. To summarize, we have no confidence in the present administration either here or abroad."

Snow Shoe, Pa.: "Would recommend MacArthur be reinstated and Truman impeached."

DuBois, Pa.: "Son-in-law in Korea doesn't like ousting MacArthur. Impeachment for Truman."

Altoona, Pa.: "We protest very vigorously treatment given MacArthur from across the pond and from those in high positions in Washington. Are we going to have another Billy Mitchell? We heartily agree General MacArthur should come home and tell the American people the true story of the situation in Asia." Adjutant, veterans' organizations.

State College, Pa.: "The British sneak attack on General MacArthur has made an isolationist out of me. I now take my place beside Colonel McCormack."

Altoona, Pa.: "Can't you fellows harness Harry? You have my support."

DuBois, Pa.: "We, the undersigned, highly resent the withdrawal of MacArthur. We urge the impeachment of the President of the United States" (signed by 15 constituents).

Altoona, Pa.: "The action of President Truman last night deserves the severest condemnation of all true citizens. By his dismissal of General MacArthur he has accomplished surrender of our country to the British and to appeasement-loving State Department officials. Hope that you will take the lead with vigorous action tending towards removal of these incompetents or worse from public office."

Clearfield, Pa.: "Approve your recent resolution recalling General MacArthur to appear before your session of Congress; inadequate military condition in Korea which has caused great international crisis should be aired to the country."

Tyrone, Pa.: "Following General MacArthur's dismissal, I demand the impeachment of President Truman."

Hollidaysburg, Pa.: "Things are going from worse to horrible. Impeach Truman."

Altoona, Pa.: "We demand immediate action on reinstatement of General MacArthur as commander of far eastern Armed Forces and immediate action on impeachment of Truman as President of the United States."

Altoona, Pa.: "Just heard the tragic news of MacArthur's dismissal. No tragedy could be greater to the future of our national welfare; would encourage the impeachment of Truman. Absolutely mentally incompetent and unfit for leadership in the hour of our greatest need."

Altoona, Pa.: "Time to impeach Truman and Acheson."

DuBois, Pa.: "For the sake of America. Vote to impeach Truman."

Bellefonte, Pa.: "Relieving of MacArthur was typical of an unsuccessful shirt salesman in a job too big for him."

Altoona, Pa.: "Impeach Truman, fire Acheson, and reinstate MacArthur."

DuBois, Pa.: "Highly resent removal of MacArthur. Urge impeachment of President."

DuBois, Pa.: "I consider it a national disgrace the firing of General MacArthur. Any man who has done so much with so little for his country has certainly earned retirement with the highest possible honor award. Should be called to Washington for first hand Far East information for Congress, State Department, and UN."

Altoona, Pa.: "As your constituents we ask you to do your utmost to have Truman impeached for his infamous action in relieving MacArthur of his command."

Altoona, Pa.: "We mothers disapprove of President Truman's action with General MacArthur. Stalin must be as happy as our boys in Korea and Japanese people are disillusioned." (Signed by 11 mothers.)

Clearfield, Pa.: "Feel MacArthur's removal is an infamous act. Suggest stopping all aid to England until they stop all aid and comfort to Red China."

State College, Pa.: "Feel that MacArthur in right. Who runs the war, the military or the political. Time something is done."

State College, Pa.: "Now is the time to put the ax on Harry. Impeach him now."

Altoona, Pa.: "Impeach Truman and Acheson."

DuBois, Pa.: "Am against dismissal of MacArthur. Want it corrected even if it means impeachment of Truman."

East Freedom, Pa.: "The people demand quick action from you and your fellow Congressmen. They want a sweeping clean-up at once of this disgraceful administration. Their only hope is action at once by the Congress."

State College, Pa.: "Violently opposed to MacArthur's dismissal. Letter of explanation to follow."

Altoona, Pa.: "Truman should be impeached, Acheson forced to resign, and MacArthur reinstated."

DuBois, Pa.: "Have son in Korea. Do not oust MacArthur. Impeach Truman."

DuBois, Pa.: "At times situations warrant drastic measures but from past performances the removal of General MacArthur is probably just another one of those mistakes. Why should the facts be hid from us if, repeat, if there are such facts. I would back you on the immediate suggestion of impeachment of the President." (Signed by four constituents.)

San Francisco Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial published in the San Francisco Call Bulletin on April 9, 1951. The editorial deals with the crippling effect on maritime commerce through the port of San Francisco as a result of undermanning of the Customs Bureau staff and provision of insufficient funds for the Bureau to properly perform its functions in processing shipments through the port.

The editorial cites the fact that there are now 22,000 individual shipment entries at the port which are awaiting processing. The inevitable result of such a situation is to drive business away from the port of San Francisco. In view of the vital importance of the city as a link with the East in these troublous times, when so many critical imports are in urgent demand, and in view of the harmful effects to the city, the State of California, and to the Nation as a result of this serious situation I call the attention of Congress to the urgent need for providing an adequate staff for the Customs Bureau at San Francisco. I particularly wish to call the attention of the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for acting on Customs Bureau appropriations to this matter, and to urge that they investigate the San Francisco needs thoroughly with a view to correcting the situation, and permitting prompt and efficient service at the port.

The editorial follows:

SAN FRANCISCO IRON CURTAIN—CRIPPLING CUSTOMS SERVICE IS FALSE ECONOMY WHICH INJURES SHIPPING, ASKS SMUGGLING

A sort of inadvertent iron curtain of commerce has been dropped around the port of San Francisco.

It is, you might say, a "customs tailored" curtain. For it has to do with customs.

And if the general public does not realize the significance of this curtain, you may be sure that the people in maritime commerce, the traders and shippers and importers, do.

Prompt, efficient customs service is vitally important as a stimulus to increased shipping here—a goal for which all are striving.

Conversely, delays and slowdowns in the administration of the customs regulations and duties—and they are many and varied—tend to discourage shipping and shunt it away from this port.

However, such slowdowns and delays are inevitable when the Customs Bureau here is undermanned and when it is forced to skimp along on insufficient funds.

And that, at present, is the case. For instance, there are now some 22,000 entries at the port of San Francisco which have not yet been processed.

These consignments are shut out, in effect, by the afore-mentioned iron curtain. Customs agents simply haven't had enough time to get around to them.

Customs Collector Paul Leake and his staff are doing the best they can with what they've got, but the fact of the matter is they haven't got the wherewithal to do their best job.

The business which has to be done by the Customs Bureau here has, during the current fiscal year, increased 95 percent over the amount (as reflected in customs collections) during a comparable period during the preceding fiscal year.

Necessity for administering the export controls which prevent contraband shipments to Communists in the Far East, and the increasing menace of smuggled dope from the Orient, place additional burdens upon the customs men.

In the face of all this wouldn't it seem advisable and prudent that the allocations for customs service here be increased?

But Members of the House of Representatives, it seems, can't see it that way.

The Appropriations Committee, for example, chopped $800,000 out of the original Customs Bureau budget. Then the House itself whacked off another $675,000.

Governmental economy, of course, is essential in these times and always to be desired. But it should be real economy.

To log-roll through juicy pork-barrel items here and there and then make up for it by cutting down on essential services is not economy.

Penny-pinching which results in loss of customs revenue and which injures shipping is not economy.

Our backlog of 22,000 entries held up because of a shackled Customs Bureau is an example of how this kind of shortsightedness jams up shipping.

It is to be hoped that the Senate will see the importance of an adequate customs service, and that Congress in the future will see to it that this important service is given the attention it deserves.

Hard-Coal Miners Outproduce the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article taken from the Sunday Independent of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., for April 25, 1951:

HARD-COAL MINERS OUTPRODUCE THE WORLD

Pennsylvania's anthracite miners have the best production record of any coal diggers in the world.

The 75,377 of them average 2.87 tons, or 5,740 pounds, of coal each shift.

This is more than twice the output per man per shift for the miners of Great Britain, who turn out only 1.32 tons a shift.

BELGIANS FAR DOWN

And Belgium's miners, about whom much has been written on their ability to mine coal, average only 0.766 of a ton a shift. This is only 27 percent of the production of a Pennsylvania miner.

In Western Germany the miners average 1.14 tons and in France the production average per shift of a miner is 0.834 of a ton, or 146 pounds better than the Belgium average.

PLENTY OF HEAT

On the basis that a Pennsylvania hard-coal miner works about 200 days a year, it is estimated that each of them produces enough coal annually to heat the average home for 45 years.

Another interesting fact obtained from State department of mines statistical division concerned the use of 1.09 pounds of explosives for the production of every ton of coal.

In 1949 a total of 48,766,255 pounds of explosives—24,383 tons—was used. This tremendous amount of black powder, dynamite, and other permissible explosives is believed to equal the total amount of powder used during the entire Revolutionary War.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the action of the President in summarily dismissing General MacArthur creates a situation that causes deep concern to all thoughtful citizens. That he had the legal right to do so there is no question in my mind. However, I doubt the wisdom of his doing so at this time and in the manner in which he did so. This is no time for precipitous or impetuous action.

The situation is so involved that I think an opportunity should have been afforded for the fullest consideration and study. To that end, I think General MacArthur should have been requested to return and permitted to express his views based on his long and intimate knowledge of far-eastern affairs. For this reason I am fully in accord with a complete investigation of our military and foreign policy and an opportunity for full expression by General MacArthur of his views. I want the American people, as well as their Congress, to be fully informed.

On the basis of such facts as I now have, I am of the opinion that the President has committed a grievous error. It seems to me that his action in dismissing General MacArthur at this time plays right into the hands of the Communists and those nations, supposed to be our allies, who have recognized Red China and continued to ship strategic materials to them, that could and probably have been used against our boys fighting in Korea. When you consider that we have 250,000 men there at this time, and have had 60,000 casualties, as compared to a small handful from a few other nations of the United Nations, and no support in the way of men from upward of 45 nations, members of the United Nations, then I think our policies should be determined with due regard to our own interests and not those of nations who have contributed so little to support us in Korea.

The time has come when the lid should be taken off and the American people fully advised of what is going on—why our boys are called upon to die, and whether our Nation is a party to the appeasement of Red China; I want the fullest possible disclosure of all the facts. Then our people and their Congress can determine, on the basis of such facts, what our course should be. In the meantime, I shall endeavor to be circumspect in word and act, and I will continually seek to ascertain every available fact pertinent to the entire subject.

President Truman Shocks and Injures the United States Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, never before since I have been a Member of Congress, have I known the citizens in my district in Kentucky to be shocked so profoundly as they were on yesterday when they learned the sad and tragic news that President Truman had peremptorily removed Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his command of our troops in the Korean War and his position in occupied Japan. Citizens of all walks of life and members of both great political parties in our district in Kentucky were so stunned that it temporarily stopped and paralyzed the business life of various communities, and I have been informed by reliable persons that congregations and town meetings were held, groups were gathered together upon the streets, and almost a universal expression of protest went up against this sudden action of the President of the United States.

The people of America know that General MacArthur has made an outstanding success of the occupation of the island of Japan. They further know that this has cost the United States taxpayers very little money as compared to the outlay of billions of dollars of American money in the European theater since the close of World War II.

The average American citizen also knows that mainly through the efforts of General MacArthur and his wise and

humane administration of our affairs in Japan since the fall of that country near the end of World War II, a great spirit of friendliness and cooperation has spread throughout the nation of Japan toward America. General MacArthur has been a wise administrator, he has built up good will, confidence, and respect among the Japanese people for the American way of life, for freedom and liberty and the worth of the individual. Nowhere in the world has a greater contribution been made upon behalf of free governments in their struggle against communism, dictatorship, and oppression, than MacArthur has made in Japan.

His sudden removal by our impetuous President leaves America with no man that can fully and adequately take his place.

We were upon the verge of signing a treaty with Japan and bringing her into the society of nations upon the side of decency, Christianity, and freedom, for which our great country is struggling.

For the President of the United States to suddenly remove Gen. Douglas MacArthur from the theater of operations in the Pacific, is a great shock, not only to the American people, but to the Japanese people, and I fear that it may open the door to an encroachment of communism on the islands of Japan and among the Japanese people.

Aside from this, with America engaged in a bloody war in Korea, the action of the President of the United States has suddenly removed from our side in that great struggle, the greatest military genius that America now possesses, and a man who understands and knows more about Korea, China, Japan, the Pacific and Asiatic theater than any other man in the United States.

The argument is heard that the President removed MacArthur because MacArthur had requested and urged the use of Nationalist Chinese troops on Formosa to help us fight the Korean War and to strike back at the continent of China and oppose the Red Chinese armies in China, so as to divert pressure from our own forces fighting in Korea.

When General MacArthur first suggested allowing Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Army of half a million men, helping us, the argument by the present administration was advanced that it may cause Red China to come into Korea and assist north Korea against our forces. Well, this great Chinese army that would have been glad to assist us, was immobilized and prevented from coming in on our side, and the fear of the administration and Dean Acheson that we may make the Red Chinese armies mad, proved to be just one more mistake made along the appeasement road that has been followed so often by the State Department.

Red China came in anyhow, and has been killing American boys for weeks and months.

MacArthur took the position that we should blockade the coast of Red China and prevent much necessary war materials from reaching the enemy and he advocated, if necessary, to bomb the supply depots of the enemy, and apparently was of the opinion that no victory could be had in Korea by our forces unless we used the troops available to us in the Nationalist Chinese Army, and unless we used the power we possessed to stop and destroy the enemy.

It is my opinion that General MacArthur more nearly represented the sentiment of the American people when he, in substance, made the statement that we were suffering approximately 1,400 casualties a week and that we were accomplishing practically nothing, and that we had very little hope of ultimate victory, unless he were permitted to use some of the power that we have and use some of the friendly allies that were anxious to come in and fight with us.

Some fear among the leaders of the Truman administration has been expressed that the war in Korea may spread.

The fear which I now have, after the State Department has succeeded in inducing President Truman to remove MacArthur, and after the British Government has apparently caught the ear of the present administration with their appeasement arguments, is that we can accomplish nothing in Korea, that our only hope will be an appeasing compromise which will, in substance, be a defeat for our great Nation, that our chances to retrieve anything in China will be now forever lost, and I fear that the war may indeed spread to Japan and Formosa, and maybe to the Philippine Islands.

For the past 5 years, every time any sort of appeasement has been undertaken, instead of stopping Russia and communism, it has encouraged her and she has gone forward to conquer more free peoples.

Of course, the great principles of freedom and liberty and Christianity that America stands for, is far more important than the fortunes of any man; more important than Truman or Acheson or MacArthur, or anyone else.

This great country of ours has been floundering for five long years under the incompetent and weak leadership of the present Truman administration. Long and sincere efforts have been made by many of us to bring about unity of purpose in the United States, regardless of politics, in this time of crisis.

Nothing could have happened, that I know of, that will come nearer destroying the unity among our people than the sudden and peremptory dismissal of General MacArthur from his command in the Pacific.

Where do we go from here? Will we continue to listen to England, that has been the beneficiary of many billions of American dollars and who contributed only a handful—a token force—in the battle in Korea? Will we weaken further and give Formosa to Russia and the Red Chinese, so as to insure the domination of the entire Pacific by this monstrous enemy of mankind? Will we take the advice of England and some other vacillating nations, and grant to this barbaric aggressor, Red China, a seat at the council table in the United Nations? Will we continue to fight and spend a thousand or more American lives each week in Korea, without knowing where we are going or what our ultimate purposes are?

It is a terrible thing to contemplate, a great country, in possibly its darkest hour, to be under the leadership of a weak and impetuous man like our present President.

We heard on the radio this morning that more telegrams of protest are arriving in Washington addressed to Congressmen than ever before in the history of the Western Union Co. I believe this is true, because citizens from my own district are flooding my office with telegrams protesting this drastic action on the part of the President in removing a great commander at a crucial time, and while many of these telegrams express shock and bitterness and lack of confidence in the administration, it is perfectly apparent that the American people feel that a grave mistake has been made and that something should be done about it. I am including one of these telegrams which I received this morning from my home district. It follows:

HARLAN, KY., *April 11, 1951.*

Hon. JAMES S. GOLDEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In the opinion of all that I have talked to regarding the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It should not have been done and some action should be taken. Evidently the wrong man was dismissed.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED G. AANDAHL

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement I have given to the press and used in reply to numerous communications deploring the situation of General MacArthur:

A long series of events, crystallizing in the recent unfortunate MacArthur incident has disturbed the American people to Nation-wide publicly expressed indignation.

The vindication of either of the principal participants, or the chastisement of the other, is of secondary importance. The foremost question is that of maximum protection for the members of our Armed Forces on the field of battle, and the influence of what we may do on the future peace of the world.

At a moment when outward congressional expressions follow a close party viewpoint, it is hard to know where political ulcers end and true statesmanship prevails. Political opinions should be reserved in the back of our thinking for use at a subsequent time.

Most of the Members of Congress in both parties feel that General MacArthur should be invited to return to the United States and give a report to the American people. I feel very strongly that this should be done and am fully supporting the Republican resolution.

It will be many years before we can fully measure the impact of the MacArthur dismissal on the present war, and on the future peace, and we will never be able to know it with complete exactness, because we will

not experience the result under the other condition. Calm judgment must prevail. Even then, carefully considered decision may result in drastic action.

In the dismissal of General MacArthur, we have certainly suffered an unwise loss of a colorful and able leader, one who held the respect and admiration of the Asiatic people, and who constantly exerted aggressive, forthright support of all that is truly American against the abusive wave of spreading communism.

Louisiana Is Proud of the Outstanding Career and Public Service of Col. Henry A. Rougon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article reproduced from the Pointe Coupee Banner which so vividly describes the amazing public service for 22 years of one of Louisiana's most distinguished, unselfish, and outstanding citizens. The article is as follows:

Col. Henry A. Rougon, veteran employee of over 22 years of active service with the State, was retired by the Louisiana State Employees' Retirement System on December 31, 1950, having served Louisiana since September 15, 1928, in key positions with the department of highways, department of State police, secretary of state, and for the past 9 years as field auditor, corporation franchise tax division, State department of revenue, with headquarters in New Orleans.

From young manhood, Rougon has taken an active part in parish and State affairs and politics. A business and civic leader, he has always been on hand to accept public responsibilities. Rougon has been a member of the parish police jury from ward 8 since 1936, having served as president of that body for 8 years. He has also been a member of the Democratic State Central Committee since 1936, and is presently serving as First vice president of the Louisiana Police Jury Association of Louisiana.

His brilliant military service record is thus described in the Historical Encyclopedia of Louisiana: "Enlisted at the age of 26 on August 26, 1917, as a private in the Regular Army and detailed as a student officer to the Second Reserve Officers Training Camp at Camp Pike, Ark. Assigned to the Eighty-seventh Division, United States Army, and attached to the Personnel Force, Intelligence Section, with active military service in England and France. Due to his intimate knowledge of military science, he was later assigned with the Allied troops and received official recognition for meritorious service from the French, English, Belgian, and Italian Governments. He was a friend of Marshal F. Foch, generalissimo of the armies, and in 1927 personally represented the State of Louisiana on a diplomatic mission of good will to the Allied Nations, as the personal representative of the Governor of Louisiana and officials of the Louisiana Department of the American Legion to the Second American Expeditionary Force, and was officially received by the governments of France, England, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Luxemburg, and the territory of Germany. Colonel Rougon served as military aide and on the governors' staff of O. H. Simpson, Huey P. Long, Alvin O. King, Oscar K. Allen, James A. Noe, and Richard W. Leche. On his mission to France in 1927, he was presented by the French Republic, a special certificate of commemoration, signed by President Gaston Doumergue of France, and the military governor of Paris, Gen. Henri Gouraud. He was presented with a tableau de la reconnaissance nationale, 1914–18, by the Union Nationale des Combattante of France, the tableau representing the military leaders of the Allied nations of World War I, Colonel Rougon's picture being part of the group appearing on the tableau. He was received by King Albert of Belgium, and in the name of the Belgian Government was presented a parchment commemorating his service with the United States Army. Rougon was received by the President of France, Gaston Doumergue, and General Foch, and presented with the French Government's high military honor, The Meritorious French Legion of Honor.

The encyclopedia further records, "Colonel Rougon is one of the most beloved members of the American Legion in Louisiana, and for many years devoted the greater part of his time unselfishly, and wholly without compensation in behalf of former members of the American Expeditionary Force. He has filled many offices in the organization, and is in addition, a member of the Louisiana Society Des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars."

When Miss Margaret Wilson, daughter of the late President, visited Europe to entertain the soldiers, Colonel Rougon served as her military aide for the period of the tour. At the Allied Peace Mission in Paris, in 1927, he was the choice of the Allied Nations, by special preference, to stand between Marshal Ferdinand Foch and Gen. John J. Pershing, during the passing in review of the Allied Nations parade, and at all official military receptions held.

Rougon was drafted into service for the first and second inaugurations of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and pressed into active service with the United States Secret Service at the White House in Washington, D. C., remaining on active duty for a period of some 15 days upon each occasion.

His service with the State began in 1928 when Gov. Huey P. Long personally appointed him a captain inspector of the State police, and from September 15, 1928, to the time of Senator Long's assassination in the State capitol at Baton Rouge on the night of September 8, 1935, at 9:26 p. m., Rougon was an intimate of the late Senator. He was an eye witness of the shooting, having been only a few feet from the late Senator at the time of the assassination. Following the shooting, Rougon remained in charge of State police on duty at the capitol until the building was cleared of everyone. He was with Long when he died September 10, 1935, and on duty at the burial of the famed politician, September 12, 1935.

Colonel Rougon is an active member of many organizations. He has held membership in the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks for the past 39 years, Woodmen of the World for the past 42 years, the American Legion since 1919, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Louisiana Society Des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux since 1920. He has been a fourth-degree Knight for 12 years, and a member of the Knights of Columbus for the past 16 years, and has held membership in the New Roads Lions Club for 12 years.

Colonel Rougon is joint owner with his sisters, Misses Ida and Itha Rougon of Austerlitz, Mathilda, and adjoining tracts of land, and as manager of the large plantation, has made a success of the operation of the place. Austerlitz, and the livestock farm rank among the outstanding farms of the parish. Rougon's home has been termed "the garden spot of Louisiana."

The 60-year old colonel had this to say, when queried as to what was next on his agenda: "Retired, I should say not. I am still young and in my prime, and ready to go, now that I have severed by State connection, it's my intention to devote most of my time to the affairs of my parish and State, and I expect to take an active part in politics in the coming parish election and that of the State gubernatorial primary and campaign to start during the latter part of the year."

The Civil Versus the Military Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include two excerpts from Public Affairs Bulletin, No. 94, published by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress entitled "The Concept of Civil Supremacy Over the Military in the United States," by William R. Tansill.

The first excerpt is a statement by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, setting forth the desirable and ideal relationship between the soldier and civilian in working out our world interests and responsibilities. Writing in Reader's Digest last October, General Bradley said:

The conduct of foreign affairs is a civilian responsibility. Military policy in our democratic America must always remain the servant of national arms. But today, amid new global dangers, neither the diplomat nor the soldier alone can lead the American people to wise international action. Both voices must be heard if the course pursued is to be realistic and effective.

The soldier can see strategic perils that the civilian might readily overlook. The soldier must not direct the civilian policy, but the civilian must never overcommit the soldier. We must never have a foreign policy that sends our Armed Forces to world tasks beyond their capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, the second excerpt from this bulletin which I wish to include in RECORD is a statement made by General Eisenhower to the Manchester Evening Leader on January 22, 1948, in explanation of why he was not available for nomination to high political office.

General Eisenhower wrote:

It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained, and our people will have great confidence that it is so sustained, when lifelong-professional soldiers, in the absence of some obvious and overriding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office. This truth has a possible inverse application. I would regard it as unalloyed tragedy for our country if ever should come the day when military commanders might be selected with an eye to their future potentialities in the political field rather than exclusively upon judgment as to their military abilities.

Happenings in Washington—Program No. 38

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release prepared by me, entitled "Happenings in Washington—Program No. 38," in the nature of a report to my constituents in Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM No. 38

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

One of the most encouraging developments in recent years is the great wave of moral indignation now sweeping the country as a result of the Kefauver and Fulbright committee investigations.

The disclosures of crime, corruption, and bribery, in and out of government, have proven beyond any question, that the great majority of our citizens are on the side of law and order. They want to drive out dishonesty in public office, wherever it exists.

The impact of television on the public consciousness has been tremendous. Of course there are some who looked upon the television broadcasts as mere entertainment, but they were very much in the minority.

For the most part the decent, self-respecting citizens were shocked and outraged by the sordid story brought right into their own homes on the television screen.

It is not necessary for me to review the scandalous testimony unfolded on the witness stand before the Kefauver committee. Most of you have heard some of it or have read about it.

The question to be considered now is, What can be done about it?

That question logically splits up into four parts:

First, what can the President do about it?

Second, what can Congress do about it?

Third, what can State and local government do about it?

Fourth, and most important of all—what can you—the general public—do about it?

As to the first question—what can the President do?—it has been traditional in our country to look to the White House for moral leadership.

The Presidency is a symbol of integrity, of resolute and unswerving devotion to the spirit, as well as the letter of the law and the highest ethical standards.

I have the deepest respect for Mr. Truman and the highest regard for his many admirable personal qualities. During World War II he was chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee, and gained an outstanding reputation as an aggressive fighter against contract frauds and profiteering.

That is why it is so difficult to understand the protection with which he has surrounded those whose questionable, if not illegal dealings, have been brought to light by the investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In the face of plain evidence that political influence and favoritism were bought and sold in the granting of loans running into millions of dollars, the President has taken no action. He has ignored demands from members of his own party that he clean house.

He has closed his eyes to the deep freeze deal, the mink coat episode, the free vacations at expensive Florida hotels, and the operations of influence peddlers who claimed close White House connections.

No word of condemnation or even criticism came from the President. He said the members of his staff are all honorable men. He insisted there was no evidence to prove they had done anything illegal.

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the RFC investigating committee, took a different view. He put it this way, and I quote:

"It is bad enough to have corruption in our midst, but it is worse if it is to be condoned or accepted as inevitable."

It seems to me that the first thing the President can and should do is to have a spring house-cleaning—and when I say house-cleaning I mean a thorough house-cleaning from the top floor to the basement.

He should welcome the opportunity to rid himself of those who have betrayed his confidence and trust.

By so doing he could help restore confidence in the integrity of his administration. He could set an example of official morality for every other department of the Government.

He could strike an effective blow at organized crime and racketeering by directing the Bureau of Internal Revenue to demand the same accurate and detailed income-tax returns from racketeers as are now required from decent people.

Why should a racketeer be allowed to file a return listing "miscellaneous income" while the ordinary citizen must show the nature of his business and reveal all the sources of his income?

It has been charged that the Government has been defrauded of millions of dollars by loose handling of income-tax returns from gamblers and other underworld characters.

The President has complete power to put an end to such practices. He can order the Bureau of Internal Revenue to carry on relentless war against these chiselers and tax dodgers.

The next question is concerned with what Congress can do.

It must be remembered that Congress has no power to legislate in local or State gambling. It has jurisdiction only over rackets operating across State lines.

In the last session Congress passed a law forbidding the interstate shipment of slot machines and other gambling devices, except into States where their use has been legalized.

Federal legislation should also make it a criminal offense to place or accept bets and transmit information across State lines to be used in gambling establishments.

Such legislation must be carefully drawn so as not to impair the fundamental right of the freedom of the press in the legitimate use of sports information for the benefit of newspaper readers.

Congress should give thought to the establishment of crime investigation commission to advise on further legislation needed to wipe out the activities of interstate crime syndicates.

We turn now to what State and local governments can do. Here we reach the foundation on which we must build good, decent government.

I cannot express as clearly or as forcefully the importance of State and local law enforcement as was done by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI when he appeared before the Kefauver committee.

Here is what he said, and I quote:

"If the laws against gambling were earnestly vigorously enforced, organized gambling could be eliminated within 48 hours in any community in the land. * * *

"The local gambling czar stands at the very center of gambling in this country.

"He is the man who controls the so-called mobs, pays for or arranges for police protection and is the directing energy of the entire mob, of criminality which protects such activities in the local community."

Mr. Hoover continued:

"Without question, these local czars have common purposes and working tools, and may well have contacts with national figures in gambling. * * *

"But these same national figures are themselves dependent, in their operations, upon local gambling czars.

"If you would strike at the national ramifications of gambling, the only effective way I know to do the job permanently is to blast the foundation out from under them."

Mr. Hoover stated, and I agree with him whole-heartedly, that the law-enforcement officers of our Nation, for the most part, are honest and are anxious to do a good job. "Regardless of their personal honesty, however," Mr. Hoover said, "they are frequently powerless to act. If they are dominated by the criminal-alined politician, ruthless rackets and vice are inevitable."

From my own experience in State government I am convinced that the most successful battle against vice and racketeering must be fought at the local level.

Now, let us turn our attention to the fourth and most important phase—what can you, the general public, do?

I think it is generally understood that law enforcement in any community can only be as effective as the citizens demand.

The crime investigations will have served no useful purpose whatever if we say, "What's the use? We will always have corruption. We will always have racketeering."

In many cities definite steps have been launched for a more vigorous fight against organized crime.

But permanent results can be gained only by a new awakening of civic responsibility.

We can only hope that the citizens generally will be aroused to look upon participation in political affairs as a duty which must not be evaded or ignored.

If that condition is achieved, we can restore political management of both parties to the people.

It will serve notice that only men of character and integrity can be elected to public office. It will attract men of that caliber to present themselves as candidates.

We can drive out of power every politician who looks upon public office as a source of private profit.

We can smash, wherever it exists, the unholy alliance between the crooked politician and the slimy underworld racketeer.

These things can be done not by passing new laws, not by grand-jury action, not by the courts, but by the irresistible force of public opinion, translated into political action at the ballot box.

And when I speak of political action I am not pleading the cause of any particular party.

I have in mind the kind of politics in which every good citizen has an active part; that produces good government and promotes the welfare of all the people.

The ballot is the greatest weapon in defense of right, honor, and decency.

There are enough clean, decent, God-fearing people in the United States to overwhelm the evil influences that have brought us to a condition of moral depression.

But the citizen who fails to vote ignites corruption by his indifference and neglect.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Federal Aid for Public School Teachers' Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 28, 1951, I introduced a bill, which is Senate bill 990, which would result in the extension of Federal aid to assist in raising public school teachers' salaries. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA, RELATING TO S. 990, A BILL TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. President, on February 28, 1951, I introduced a bill which would give Federal aid to help raise public-school teachers' salaries.

For over 30 years, Congress has been considering general Federal-aid-to-education bills. I, myself, have sponsored several comprehensive Federal aid bills, but no comprehensive Federal-aid-to-education program has passed Congress; not mine or anyone else's. Yet, the need for Federal aid to education continues to demand the Nation's attention.

There are many fields in which Federal aid is needed, but I am convinced that there are five fields in which the need is most pressing. These fields are:

1. Aid for public school teachers' salaries.
2. Aid for public school construction.
3. Aid to provide funds for scholarships and loans for worthy, needy students.
4. Aid to help eradicate adult illiteracy in United States.
5. Aid to provide essential services for all children in America to protect and promote their health and welfare.

While many Federal-aid bills, which have been before Congress, were of such general nature that any or all of these needs could have been met through these bills, only a few of the bills thus far introduced have specifically provided that each and all of these needs must be met, and have provided a special means through which to meet them. It is essential that each need to be met be expressly provided in the bill, lest any State decide to use all of the funds granted for one of these purposes, or for general maintenance. Actually, the bill which the Senate passed last year, did not assure a single teacher in the United States 1-cent increase in his or her pay. It did not assure a single service to any child in the United States.

Now I voted for the bill because it was the only Federal aid bill which I had a chance to vote on, and I hoped the House would write more specific provisions into it. Let me emphasize that the need for specific authorization for specific purposes must be set forth in the bill, or else the full sum may be used for any one purpose stated. I base this statement on the decision of the United States Supreme Court in a case arising in Washington State.

The case of *King County, Washington v. Seattle School Board District* (263 U. S. 361), establishes the need for specific legislative allotment for each specific purpose for which funds are desired. This case grew from a special Federal appropriation board, to the State of Washington, "for education, roads, and bridges." All three purposes were named in the bill, and at first, all three purposes were equally served from the Federal funds. However, soon thereafter, the practice was started of cutting down on the sum allowed for education, and later for bridges. Finally, not one cent of the money allocated in the total fund was given for education. The board of education decided to take the case to court, and carried the case to the United States Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ruled that if the State uses all of the funds for any one authorized item, it does not have to use any of the sum for the other two authorized purposes. By similar reasoning, it follows that if the bill authorizes funds for school maintenance and teachers' salaries, that the State may use all of the sum for school maintenance so as not to increase the State's appropriation for maintenance and deny the teachers 1 cent of increase.

It is not the intent, I believe, of the Members of the United States Senate, to support Federal aid for education to make it possible for any State to deny to the public-school teachers of any State, any increase in their salaries through a Federal aid bill. Yet, the only way to assure to the teachers that they will receive an increase in pay through a Federal aid appropriation, is to have the law expressly require such payments. This requirement is the basis of my bill.

Yet, judging from the action of our Congress, I now realize that while some Members may accept a general bill with specific purposes for the use of authorized funds precisely set forth, and many others would take a chance on letting the several States each allocate the funds as may be desired, that more and more Members are eager to have a chance to vote on each provision for which Federal aid is needed in a separate bill.

There is a growing feeling that each provision should be voted up or down on its own merits. I have, therefore, introduced the bill which appears to me to provide aid where it is sorely needed, to raise the salaries of public-school teachers. I can not see how the principle in such a bill can be controversial.

I had, in this bill, introduced another basic principle in relation to the distribution of funds.

I believe the funds given to each State should not only recognize the relative need of the State among the several States, but we should also serve as a means of help and requiring a State to more nearly equalize salaries within the States.

In some of our richest States today, teachers are paid less than $150; some even less than $100 a month. I am most concerned with helping raise the salaries of the lowest paid classroom teacher. Thus, the bill I am now introducing, will provide aid for just this group. As for the other four needs which I have mentioned, and I feel must be met, I believe they will be taken care of. I am happy to note that the emergency housing program bill provides aid for community facilities, including public-school construction.

Next, I note with pleasure that there are a number of bills in, already, to help provide aid for loans and scholarships for worthy, needy, American students. I think that even the American Medical Association will not, at this time, try again to stop legislation to help provide training for more doctors. Our Nation is keenly sensitive now, for utilizing and training our natural resources—human resources, I mean.

I shall, myself, later sponsor a separate bill, providing Federal aid for services, to protect and promote the health and welfare of every child in our America. Please note that I favor such aid for every child in our America, and not only for every American child, for today every child is sacred because he is a child, regardless of his race or creed, nationality or status, and every child in our America is today a great and magnificent responsibility of every American citizen.

The last of my five needs, I presume, will again be covered in a bill which I expect my good friend the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Senator KILGORE, will sponsor. He has, for several years, spearheaded the fight to wipe out adult illiteracy. I shall help him in every way I can in that fight, but today I plead for American public-school teachers and the children whom they teach. I hope that we may soon have hearing on this bill.

Development of Public Opinion on International and Domestic Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter I have received from Mr. Frederick C. McKee, chairman of the Committee on National Affairs. I feel that the information contained in this letter is of such value and importance that it should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS,
New York, N. Y., April 6, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR IVES: The Committee on National Affairs seeks the development and the mobilization of an informed public opinion on international and domestic questions important to the welfare of the United States.

Its officers, directors, and membership represent a wide variety of political views, and it takes no public position upon any major issue without the consent of its executive committee.

The committee is dedicated to the maintenance of the civil liberties guaranteed under the Constitution, and to international political, military, and economic cooperation among freedom-loving peoples. It has vigorously supported the United Nations, the European recovery program, the Atlantic Pact, the military-assistance program, and the exposure of the dangers of Communist infiltration in this country and Communist aggression abroad.

In implementing its educational work the committee supports candidates for national office whenever a political campaign involves issues which the committee considers important to the national welfare. Among such candidates whom the committee has at one time or another supported are a number of Members of the present Congress of both major parties.

The committee believes that it is eminently proper that the citizens of all States should help to bring home to the voters in individual States the salient facts concerning the views and voting records of their candidates for Federal office, since obviously the welfare of every American citizen from Maine to California is affected by the caliber of the Members of Congress elected in each State. The vote of a Senator from Maine or a Representative from California touches the life of the citizen of New York and Florida, Illinois, and Texas as much as it does that of the citizen of the State or district he represents. Furthermore, the salaries of Members of Congress are paid by the Federal Government from the taxes levied upon all the people, not by the individual States.

The committee looks forward to devoting ever more vigorous and effective efforts to its objectives, believing that the organized activities of patriotic Americans to develop and mobilize public opinion represents a natural and desirable function in any progressive democracy.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK C. MCKEE.

Letter of Condolence to Family of Sam Durrance From Hon. Claude Pepper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of a letter written by Hon. Claude Pepper, former United States Senator from Florida, to the family of a recently deceased rural minister who had spent a lifetime preaching and administering to the needs of humble people.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *March 27, 1951.*

MRS. SAM DURRANCE AND FAMILY,
Zolfo Springs, Fla.

DEAR MRS. DURRANCE AND FAMILY: I was in Washington when Sam passed away and didn't know of it until Ches just got word to me. I wish I could have been in Florida so I could have personally attended his funeral and joined the other thousands there to pay tribute to your dear husband and father, my unfailing friend, this great man for God and good, Sam.

Ches was here yesterday and was telling me about the truckloads of flowers, as well as the thousands of friends at his funeral. It was a deserted reward, for Sam has spent a diligent lifetime serving and helping other people, as you so well know. It is encouraging to believe that a man who spent a lifetime doing good, attending the sick and the imprisoned, helping the needy, comforting the sorrowing, and inspiring the discouraged, who sacrificed nearly all material possessions to his high ministry, should have come to old age with enough material possessions to give comfort and security to him and his family and to have been so wonderfully and widely loved and honored as he was. So Sam's life was fittingly rewarded and he had the kind of a monument he most cherished.

A great emptiness has come into the world for me in losing Sam. I thought he was one of the finest men I ever knew. He was one of the most eloquent men I ever heard. My memory will never dim of the speeches I heard him make in the camp and in the company of good friends when we were all happily together. Sam was the people's minister and friend. The poor were his charge and his flock. Like the Christ he went about teaching and doing good. It was for them he cared and it was they who poured out their hearts in affection and gratitude to him.

I told Ches yesterday that I regretted that somehow I had failed to get an autographed photograph of Sam. Ches said he would get a photograph if he could.

Mrs. Pepper and I want you to know that we share your sorrow at Sam's passing; that we join the host who honored him, and we will ever be among the multitude to revere and to love him.

If I can ever be of any service to you, or to any member of the family, it will be a privilege to have you call upon me.

Warmest regards, and

Always sincerely yours,

CLAUDE PEPPER.

Discovery of Oil in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Welcome, Podner!" published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of April 9, 1951. This editorial deals with the discovery of oil in North Dakota. I particularly invite the attention of Senators to the fact that it contains a very pleasing reference to myself.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME "PODNER"

Oklahoma welcomes North Dakota, its twenty-sixth partner, into the oil-producing fraternity and ponders the change the completion of a thousand more successful wells would make in the Sioux State.

We hope the wells will come in flowing black gold. It is too early to tell, of course. Amerada's discovery last Thursday in the Williston Basin of northwestern North Dakota is full of significance, but it must be admitted that so far it isn't as commercially important as the stock traders make it. A well producing 250 barrels of 53-gravity oil a day from 11,860 feet is hardly a gusher, even when it is accompanied by steady gas pressure.

The significance lies in the fact that the well seems to have been completed in a new horizon, one which has hitherto been found to be unproductive. The structure is said to take in considerable area in North Dakota, Montana, and the province of Manitoba, in Canada, and it will now be tested throughout, so in thousands of ranch, farm, and village homes today they are singing the petroleum hymn that begins "Praise God from whom oil blessings flow."

There is more prosperity per pint in petroleum than in any other of Mother Nature's precious possessions. There is prosperity even in the search for petroleum though not a pint is found. The free-spending exploration and drilling crews give the locales they visit something to talk about for years afterward.

North Dakota can use a little more prosperity, and the United States needs another great oil field, for we are dependent now on imports to avoid rationing of gasoline. Wheat has always been the mainstay of the State's economy. It is first in the Nation in the spring and durum varieties. But wheat has its ups and downs, and there have been times when North Dakotans suffered from crop failures or low prices or both and gave vent to their disappointment in disconcerting ways. The Nonpartisan League of the period 1910–20 was one outgrowth of such a disappointment. It socialized segments of private competitive business there and spread into Minnesota, where it also succeeded in putting a governor in office. It threatened for a time to set the politics of the Midwest on fire politically as far south as Oklahoma.

It has since almost disappeared as a separate political force, though such colorful remnants remain before the public as United States Senator BILL LANGER, of North Dakota, who defies classification as anything but a flame-spurting economic rebel on the national scene. Some of the changes the league instituted in the name of reform remain woven in the fabric of the State, such as the powerful cooperatives. Others have been discarded after trials. But every device known to the rebellious farmer to snatch him from the wringer if worse comes to worse should titillate him remain ready for use. It will be exciting to be in the oil business in North Dakota, where such divergent philosophies as the State and the industry have are bound to clash. The oil way will finally prevail. There is nothing so soothing of passion as a monthly production or royalty check.

The rugged honesty of the North Dakotans will make a hit with the oilmen. There is no doubt about the ruggedness of the old-timers there. One has to be of good material to wear through the winters on the vast, unprotected rolling plain that is the eastern part of the State. One has to be downright tough to make a living ranching in the Badlands in the western part, or to put up with the vagaries of the big Missouri River, which flows across the State from upper Montana toward its rendezvous with the Mississippi, and the smaller but equally flood-famous Red River, which parts North Dakota from Minnesota.

Honesty comes natural in rugged people who know and respect each other. And plenty of North Dakotans know nearly everyone of importance in their State. After all, there are only 616,000 of them, or were before the oil boom hit last week. Besides, if they have a traditional leader in North Dakota, it is Theodore Roosevelt, whose ghost gallops around Medora, one of the Badland towns. The great Roosevelt lived there once as a rancher and a park nearby is a memorial to him. Another park marks the starting point of Gen. George Custer's ill-fated expedition against Sitting Bull and his Sioux warriors. Still a third park in the Turtle Mountains on the international boundary celebrates the unanimous peace between the United States and Canada.

North Dakota is apt to give the petroleum industry a new slogan. It may break out any day with the claim to being the oil center of the continent. There will be a certain justification for it. Oil does seem to be everywhere if only one will search long and deeply enough for it. And North Dakota is the geographic center of North America. The exact spot is in Pierce County, about 50 miles west of Devils Lake.

Tulsa, the oil capital of the world, won't mind the competitive slogan. The discovery in North Dakota has also widened our importance in the industry. Most of the companies with great acreage under lease

there are directed from here. But even if they were not we would still wish North Dakotans a new oil well every day in the year and extra ones on holidays. Our word to them is: It's great to live in a State of fine people, good wheat, broad-backed cattle—and oil.

Can Security Be Socialized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Can Security Be Socialized?" written by Asa V. Call, president of the Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., and published in the Journal of the American Society of Chartered Life Underwriters.

I think the article presents an issue with which we are to be faced very shortly. I have been receiving letters from mothers and fathers who now have to make social-security returns. They must sign applications if there is a maid working in the house. I have also received letters from farmers who have helpers. When we think of the thousands of persons whom the Government is going to reemploy, I believe that this article will throw light on the question whether security can be socialized.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN SECURITY BE SOCIALIZED?

Less than 20 years ago few Americans favored any part of the program now called social security—known then as the dole.

Today, however, and despite the increased need of economy in a nation committed to a vast defense program, all too few appear ready to challenge the concept of socialized security and its staggering costs. Anyone who dares do so is likely to be confronted with, "But we cannot let people starve." This supposedly conclusive response is made with the implication that it is monstrous to think of leaving to voluntary effort the care of the indigent.

In fact, however, compulsion—government or private—is the surest way to bring about mass hunger and starvation. And the surest way to abolish hunger and famine is to establish freedom, including freedom to own and bestow goods obtained by production, trade, and thrift.

How can this restrictive pattern of life be changed? Only by individuals willing to risk persecution to keep what they produce and earn, using it for themselves or disposing of it as they see fit, without regard to collectivistic notions. Americans can help by maintaining their own freedom, so that they may show what a free, individualistic people can do. They can help by opposing those who would squander our Nation's wealth in collectivistic programs, which have impoverished and degraded men since history began.

Only free persons develop the high productivity, income, and wealth necessary for generous aid. That is because freedom means opportunity, which permits development of initiative and enterprise. It also means individual responsibility, resulting in foresight, thrift, and industry. Moreover, since production and accumulation of wealth are easier as individuals specialize and exchange services, free peoples also develop the attitudes necessary for cooperation: consideration for others, dependability and honesty, open-mindedness, and the types of personality that engender good will and mutual esteem. These attitudes all make for increased output, which in turn increases capacity for mutual aid. Both the increase in prosperity and the cooperative attitudes make it easier for persons of limited talents to make a living.

Free persons progress in ability to produce, in recognition of self-responsibility, and in sensitivity to the wants and interests of their fellows. They attack the problem of hunger and want by increasing production and by developing the attitudes and institutions of self-help and mutual aid.

Forced charity is not charity at all; it is expropriation. Forced saving is not thrift, and forced cooperation is not cooperation. All are forms of slavery. Neither expropriation nor enslavement encourages enterprise, teaches responsibility, or develops philanthropy.

As the incentive to self-help is belittled and exploited, a sense of frustration and futility seizes upon both indigent and producers. They become easy prey for fakers of every sort—political, economic, medical, and intellectual—who offer utopian schemes for getting something for nothing, or who peddle miraculous cures and wondrous new revelations.

Only gradually does it become clear that compulsion is a degenerating influence; that although it can seize and restrict it cannot invent, inspire, or efficiently manage.

Freedom means exposure to competition. In a free market, producers compete to offer more and better goods and services to everyone. This competition makes it necessary for producers constantly to improve their methods in order to survive in business.

Good societies develop only as individuals gain freedom and learn to bear responsibility. Over the ages, increasing numbers of persons have realized this. They have recognized that only in freedom can they attain their full stature as human beings. Increasingly they see that only in freedom can they find increasing satisfaction for their desires and needs.

We must steadfastly keep alive the ideal of individual freedom and the means for achieving earned security, for in sober truth, there is no other kind.

Opposed to Winstead Segregation Provision of Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Winstead provision in the pending bill. It provides for a system of segregation in our Armed Forces. This, in my opinion, would be un-American in principle. We call men into the service of our country regardless of race, color, or creed. Patriotism is not and cannot be based upon the color of the skin of the soldier. Colored troops have shown in every war this Nation has been engaged in that they fight with honor and rare courage. Furthermore, we should not discredit our Nation in its fight for freedom of all peoples by any indication that we make distinctions on the basis of color in our Armed Forces. The result of such a course could seriously and detrimentally affect not only unity within our own borders but likewise diminish our influence among the peoples of the world. Therefore, I support the Price-Powell amendment to strike the Winstead provision from the bill.

Public-Opinion Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which came to me from a friend of mine in Nebraska. It has to do with public-opinion polls on some of the very important questions such as troops to Europe and the Korean situation, now being discussed by many Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Radio station WJAG, Norfolk, Nebr., completed a public opinion survey April 8, 1951. The survey consisted of three questions, originally broached on the station's noon forum program, The Voice of the People. Interest was entirely spontaneous. No prizes were offered. Questions were repeated once each day.

The duration of the survey was 3 weeks. Opinions were received through mail, personal interviews, and telephone interviews. The total responses totaled 756. Of this number, 460 were by letter, 200 by personal interview, and the remainder by telephone interview.

The tabulated results of the opinion survey were as follows:

Question No. 1: Shall we withdraw our troops from Korea and leave that country to the Communists? Yes, 46.6 percent; no, 48.4 percent; qualified, 5 percent.

(The popular qualification, stop at the thirty-eighth parallel.)

Question No. 2: Should the President or Congress have the authority to send United States troops overseas?—Congress, 69.9 percent; President, 5.9 percent; President and Congress, 15.4 percent; undecided, 8.8 percent.

Question No. 3: Should the United States send additional troops to Europe under General Eisenhower's command? Yes, 39.5 percent; no, 52.6 percent; qualified, 7.9 percent.

(The popular qualification, United States supply troops in fair proportion with European countries.)

Radio station WJAG has drawn these conclusions after completion of the tabulation of the opinion survey:

First. Persons submitting opinions by letter were more extreme; that is, more conservative or radical.

Second. Persons submitting opinions by personal or telephone interviews were by far the more aggressive. These persons tended to favor remaining in Korea and also sending more troops to Europe. A majority personally interviewed bemoaned General MacArthur's present position; most of them feeling he and his troops were not receiving proper support.

Third. That a definite state of confusion exists within the public minds pertaining to United States foreign policy, but that the trend is definitely established for more decisions to be made by Congress. Those advocating withdrawal of troops from Korea frequently asked "Why are we there?" Others suggested withdrawal unless we fight more aggressively.

Fourth. Those interviewed complained the public was not being properly informed. Many expressed doubt that Congress was being taken into confidence on foreign issues.

A separate breakdown of the survey by sex showed no substantial change in the above percentages. Women displayed only a slight tendency to avoid conflict by returning our troops or keeping them at home.

The Defense Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relating to the defense housing bill recently passed by the Senate, which appeared in today's edition of the Wilmington Morning News, of Wilmington, Del.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEFENSE HOUSING BILL

In ordinary circumstances it would be safe to prophesy favorable House action for the defense housing bill that has just passed the Senate. Any measure the Senate can debate in a mere 2 days, and then approve without dissent, ought to commend itself to the "other body."

Besides, this one appears to be a big improvement on similar bills passed in previous emergencies. It is more modest than the administration draft—the $1,500,000,000 it would make available in Government-insured mortgages to stimulate private construction of rental housing in defense areas is only half the amount sought. But that may not be a draw-back as far as the House is concerned, and in the bill there are many provisions of solid merit.

The bill provides, for example, that no builder could get an insured loan in an amount greater than the actual cost of the housing involved. If that seems like an unnecessary safeguard, the appearance is deceptive. During the debate Senator MAYBANK declared that in World War II builders had got loans as high as 120 percent—even 150 percent, according to Senator LONG—of the cost of the housing they were putting up. Senator DOUGLAS said some had put up no money at all and some had made money on the mortgage.

Other language would limit application of the law to those parts of the country the President designated as "critical defense housing areas." In cases where private contractors did not bid on a project within 90 days the Federal Government would be authorized to undertake it—up to a maximum amount of $50,000,000.

The need for legislation of this kind is obvious. As Senator FERGUSON has pointed out, something must be done when a tank plant threatens to double the population of a town like Newark in a matter of months. But it is not so obvious that the House, in its present negative mood, will see it that way.

Pacifist Stand by a Quaker, and Threat of Loss of Citizenship by Disabled Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled Two Cases Strike Sour Note, by Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Washington Star on Tuesday of this week.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO CASES STRIKE SOUR NOTE: QUAKER GETS 10-YEAR TERM FOR PACIFIST STAND—DISABLED SOLDIER MAY LOSE CITIZENSHIP

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Some months ago Robert Mitchener, an 18-year-old Kansas student, a Quaker of Quaker missionary parents, refused on religious grounds to register for the draft, was arrested, pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to a short term in prison.

On his release, he received a questionnaire and orders to report. He again advised the authorities of his conscientious objections. He was rearrested, charged with failing to fill out a questionnaire, to report for a physical examination, and to report for induction, tried, and sentenced to 10 years in prison.

The Constitution protects freedom of religion. The Society of Friends stands against participation in war, although it leaves individual decisions to its members.

Robert Mitchener believes war is incompatible with the teachings of Christ, and registry for the draft an act of participation in preparation for war. His mind is clear. But what of the mind of Judge Hill, who sentenced him?

Can the armed services thereby compel Mitchener to become a soldier? On the contrary, as a felon, the Army could not accept him.

Will the example deter others? Hardly. There is nothing more stubborn than a man fanatically holding a faith. The British could not compel Gandhi and every time he was imprisoned, his following increased.

Will 10 years in prison make Mitchener a better citizen?

I have never believed that conscientious objectors should be exempted from national service. But there are many services which a conscientious objector can perform.

The judge who sentenced him was a prosecutor of Japanese war criminals. He then sentenced men for preparing for aggressive war. Young Mitchener, by the same judge was sentenced for refusing to have anything to do with war.

American authorities caused it to be written into the Japanese Constitution that Japan should never have an army. So a Japanese subject to an American commander, who tried to organize a soldiery, would be acting feloniously.

No wonder the human mind is confused.

Thirty-four-year-old Cyril Claude Andersen was not a conscientious objector. He believed Nazi Germany and Japan should be stopped. He entered the American Army, became a major, and in 1947 was retired, so badly injured as to be rated a 100 percent disability case.

Mr. Andersen's father, a native of Denmark, had been naturalized in 1925. He had temporarily left his family in England. Anticipating their arrival he erroneously registered them as residents at his own Brooklyn address.

Last fall Mr. Andersen was informed that the certificate issued his mother and her children by the American consul at Newcastle in England on the ground of his father's error was not an immigration visa. Therefore he is liable to deportation.

But the law requires an American officer to be a citizen. If his citizenship claim was illegal, he was an illegal officer, and is an illegal cripple.

The law may be able to do something about the first two, but what medical science failed to accomplish the law cannot.

By admitting that he was never a citizen and applying now for naturalization, Mr. Andersen would jeopardize his status as a retired officer. He would also have to "forswear allegiance to a foreign government," which, with his broken body hung with decorations for heroic service, seems to him a cosmic joke.

In the current "struggle for the minds of men," which revolves around the relation of the individual to the state, these cases strike a sour note.

Proposed Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short but timely editorial from the Denver Monitor of April 6, 1951. This editorial pulls the rug from under those who would classify some young Americans as second-class citizens. Military service in time of war has ever been an honored and glorified service in the United States, and worthy of all citizens. Let us keep it that way.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW CASTE SYSTEM?

President Truman's action providing for deferment of college students from the draft on the basis of scholarship and aptitude tests looks like the beginning of a new caste system. Membership in this "elite" group will apparently be limited to students with above average grades.

The scholarship deferment plan is basically undemocratic—this Nation was founded on the premise that all shall have equal opportunities. Moreover, the plan is impractical since it assumes that by academic hocus pocus all the "brainy" young men can be separated from the "dummies." Albert Einstein, unquestionably one of the world's greatest geniuses, was regarded as slow and unpromising by his teachers who, if they had been asked for an opinion of young Einstein's mental ability, would undoubtedly have classified him as mediocre.

And, finally, the plan is unfair because on the one hand it places the stigma of mediocrity upon thousands of young men and tells them in effect that they're cannon fodder material, and on the other hand, it coddles a small group of untouchables as being mentally superior and therefore too good to fight.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, two of the Nation's outstanding columnists commented this morning on the MacArthur dismissal. I should like to include their articles in our RECORD along with an editorial entitled "On the Record" which appeared in the Washington Post today. The articles follow:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE PRESIDENT AND THE GENERAL

When Taft was President and Stimson was his Secretary of War and Gen. Leonard Wood was Chief of Staff there was a very able officer with powerful supporters in Congress who disagreed sharply and profoundly with the basic military policy of the United States. That was some 40 years ago. Maj. Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth, the Adjutant General, was opposed to what was then a new development in the American Army, namely, the General Staff which in matters of policy was under the President but over all commanders and bureau chiefs.

The purpose of the General Staff, as Stimson and Bundy describe it in their book, On Active Service, was to "meet three requirements: Civilian control in the executive branch, sound general planning and constant cross-fertilization between the line of the Army and its high command in Washington."

But though General Wood was Chief of Staff, the most powerful officer in the War Department was General Ainsworth who had more friends in Congress than did General Wood. A conflict ensued over many matters. The basic issue in all of them was whether the Chief of Staff—who is called that because he is the agent, via the civilian Secretary of the President—was superior to all other officers of the Army. General Ainsworth resisted this idea and though Secretary Stimson had "once before been forced to warn Ainsworth against insubordination," it was not long before Ainsworth again took issue with the Chief of Staff "in a memorandum so grossly insubordinate that as soon as he read it, Stimson realized that the time for drastic action had come."

Stimson consulted President Taft and Senator Elihu Root who, as Secretary of War, had created the General Staff. They agreed with Stimson that discipline had to be restored and Taft said to him: "Stimson, it has fallen to you to do a dirty job which your predecessors ought to have done before you."

Ainsworth was relieved. Twenty-five years later after he had again been Secretary of War, Stimson wrote that "since the relief of Ainsworth no important challenge has been given to the final authority of the Chief of Staff, under the Secretary and the President. Even the great Pershing, field commander of the entire fighting Army in 1918, learned that in the making of long-range decisions he was subordinate to the Chief of Staff in Washington."

It has fallen to President Truman and to his Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, to do the same kind of dirty job which President Taft and his Secretary of War had to do 40 years ago. The final authority of the Chiefs of Staff under the Secretary and the President has been openly and repeatedly challenged by a much greater and more powerful man than Ainsworth. The President and the Secretary have done their duty. They have been faithful to their trust.

General MacArthur's actions are a great enigma. He challenged the President publicly, defiantly, and on issues of such moment that they concern deeply not only this Government but some 50 other governments. It is impossible to believe that a soldier of his eminence and his experience, himself a former Chief of Staff, himself a commander of armies who must know the importance of discipline, cannot have known that he was challenging the authority of his lawful superiors.

What, then, did he believe would be the outcome if he persisted, and indeed made his challenge to the President ever sharper? Can he have failed to realize that either he would have to be relieved or that the President of the United States would have publicly to abdicate the substance of his whole authority in the issues of war and peace? General MacArthur must have known that there was no third course, one of compromise. He must have known it because the President has tried compromise for over a year. But General MacArthur himself has in fact taken the position that the issue could not be compromised.

The question, therefore, is whether General MacArthur chose to force the President to relieve him—or whether he thought from what he had seen during the past year that the President would give in and would take his orders from Tokyo.

A plausible case can be made for either of these theories. Neither can as yet be proved. But this much is certain: General MacArthur deliberately narrowed the choice and meant to force a showdown with the President of the United States on the issue of a general war in the Far East. He did that by compelling the President to choose publicly between relieving him and submitting to him.

MACARTHUR'S POSITION

(By Marquis Childs)

MARTYRDOM VERSUS WAR WITH CHINA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following column was written a few hours before President Truman relieved General MacArthur of his command.)

Future historians of the present era, if anyone is left to write history, are bound to find some puzzling contradictions in the days we are now living through. How they will finally explain the Republican position on the controversy over Europe or Asia, peace or war, it would be interesting to know.

During the debate on the issue of troops for the North Atlantic defense command, Republican Senators warned in ominous language of the dangers of a military dictatorship. To give the Commander in Chief, and through him General Eisenhower, the right to determine whether additional divisions should go to Europe without the approval of Congress would be to surrender the preeminent right of civilian control over the military. Even such ordinary sensible men as Senator MORSE of Oregon fulminated on this theme.

Yet now they support apparently without any reservations a commander in the field who has decided to establish a new policy in the Far East. Actually, of course, it is not a new policy.

What General MacArthur said in his letter to Representative MARTIN is what he has said repeatedly to almost every important visitor to Tokyo in recent years. Many of these visitors have come back ardent advocates and agents of the MacArthur policy. In recent months they have brought ever greater pressure to reverse the United Nations-Truman-Marshall-Acheson policy, which is for limited war restricted to Korea, in favor of all-out war against Communist China.

General MacArthur seems to have decided that the time has now come to bring this out into the open and force the issue. That is shown even more clearly in Russell Brines' latest dispatch from Tokyo. The Brines dispatch, inspired at the highest level, declares that officers on MacArthur's staff are sure that his views are increasingly popular back home. Therefore, he can have what he has apparently meant to have from the beginning—a full-scale war in Asia.

Here is an extraordinary situation. One can feel the deepest sympathy and understanding for MacArthur's position as a military commander who sees an offensive being built up from a privileged sanctuary. As a professional soldier, loyal to the American tradition of civilian authority over policy, the general has the choice of carrying out the orders he is given or resigning his command.

In a full-scale war against Communist China the United States would have no allies in Asia or the Middle East. Perhaps this would not be important for the immediate future in view of the military deficiencies of these countries.

What would be vitally important is that the common front of western nations against communism would be cracked or shattered. Great Britain probably would be brought into a war against China by the force of events. But we would have reluctant and unhappy allies in the west in such a war.

MacArthur's staff may be right about public opinion in this country although how they make this determination from a distance of 7,000 miles is hard to see. Surely, however, they cannot understand the depth of feeling in the rest of the Western World.

Canada is a significant example. Next week 6,000 Canadian troops are due to sail for Korea. These men had their basic training in Canada and their combat training at Fort Lewis in the State of Washington.

They are the only sizable reenforcement for the UN army that is now in sight. Those who know Canada say that if these troops sail to what appears to be a war in China rather than in Korea, there will be a very angry reaction in Canadian public opinion. Support for the MacArthur policy of a showdown with communism in Asia rather than in Europe is said to be negligible to the point of being nonexistent in our neighbor to the north.

If we look candidly at what has been happening here at home, we must admit that in important areas the soldier has been supplanting the civilian as policy maker. It may be argued that military policy is superior to civil policy. But a conflict between the two, dividing Americans at home and estranging America's allies abroad, is intolerable.

With his innate predilection for the dramatic, accentuated by the frustrations and the slights he felt in the last war, MacArthur is determined to come home—when he comes home at last—as hero and savior. He seems now, however, to have decided that if he canot be a savior, he will at least be a martyr.

ON THE RECORD

The confidential documents released by the White House in conjunction with the announcement of General MacArthur's recall afford full proof of the President's conclusion that the Far East commander "is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations." They show, indeed, that the general had persistently thwarted those policies, and, judging from the climactic interview with Secretary Pace, intended to maintain and even prosecute his defiance. In the circumstances, his removal from command was inescapable if civilian authority was to prevail over military rule.

Three stark facts emerge from the documents. The first of these is that General MacArthur repeatedly violated the President's directive that statements relating to the political implications of the far-eastern war be cleared first in Washington. Such breaches of discipline would have been tolerated on the part of no other officer—and could no longer be tolerated on General MacArthur's part without a complete abdication of the policy-making function by the President.

The second plain fact disclosed by the documents is that General MacArthur himself—not the President or the Joint Chiefs of Staff—was responsible for the failure to rearm South Korean military forces. The Joint Chiefs sent to General MacArthur a proposal to provide a very considerable supply of rifles, submachine guns, carbines, and automatic rifles, together with stocks of ammunition, in order to increase the number of South Korean troops by 200,000 to 300,000 men. The general, having his own ideas about expansion of the war to areas outside Korea, rejected this proposal, urging that the available arms be used to equip the National Police Reserve of Japan. From the point of view of effective prosecution of the Korean War, this disagreement as to policy was profoundly significant.

The third and most important of the revelations was that General MacArthur deliberately forestalled United Nations diplomatic overtures for a settlement of the Korean War by the wholly unauthorized issuance of a truce proposal from his own headquarters—a truce proposal couched in such terms as to be manifestly unacceptable to the enemy. The general had been advised by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the State Department was planning a Presidential announcement to the effect that the United Nations was ready to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea. General MacArthur, instead of responding to the Joint Chiefs, issued a public statement on his own initiative, using in part the very language contained in the proposed Presidential statement—and adding to it words which made diplomatic negotiation impossible. Thus the diplomatic demarche had to be withdrawn. This was insubordination of a most mischievous and disingenuous kind. The general's continuance in command, after that action, became a menace to American and United Nations policy.

Does the President's Policy Offer Hope of Peace in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems that no act of the President has created more interest upon the part of citizens than his abrupt dismissal of General MacArthur. I am including as part of my remarks, with the consent granted by the House, an editorial appearing today in the News, of Washington, D. C., entitled "A Policy Without Hope." It reads as follows:

A POLICY WITHOUT HOPE

President Truman last night called the war in Korea a struggle for peace, but his speech was in fact a defense of appeasement.

He said the Communists in the Kremlin are engaged in a monstrous conspiracy to stamp out freedom all over the world.

But his only answer to that threat was a limited war in which a ruthless enemy will continue to enjoy all of the advantages of initiative.

He implied that the peace-loving nations had united to defeat aggression in Korea. But that is not the case. The United States has 250,000 ground troops in Korea. No other member of the United Nations has more than 5 percent of that number there. Most members have contributed nothing.

This is not collective action against aggression. It is little more than the action of a single Nation—the United States. And our own part has been less than wholehearted, for our troops have been sent into battle with restraints on their freedom of action.

That is no way to win a war, and nothing Mr. Truman said offered any hope of winning the war.

SITTING DUCKS

Mr. Truman said the whole Communist imperialism, headed by the Soviet Union, was behind the attack on the peace in the Far East.

There can be little doubt about that.

The best chance of stopping this aggression without what he termed "a general war," the President said, "is to meet the attack in Korea and defeat it there."

That was General MacArthur's position, too.

But our limited military efforts are not calculated to defeat this attack, and that is where Mr. Truman and General MacArthur parted.

"There are signs that the enemy is building up his ground forces for a new mass offensive," Mr. Truman acknowledged. But he did not say that the United Nations forces are being reinforced to meet this attack, for that is not being done.

Because of this neglect the UN forces, awaiting the enemy attack, are like sitting ducks.

This was one of the major issues between the President and General MacArthur.

Nothing the President said last night offered any alternatives to any of General MacArthur's recommendations.

Meanwhile, quite contrary to Mr. Truman's view that "men all over the world who want to remain free have been given new courage and new hope" by what he called our "resolute stand in Korea," our Government has lost prestige everywhere by its procrastination and indecision.

Nine months ago, 53 of the 59 members of the United Nations supported military sanctions against North Korea. But by the time the Chinese Communists intervened in the war we could not muster a corporal's guard in the UN to vote similar sanctions against them. Beyond Greece, Turkey, Nationalist China, and the Philippines, what nations can we count on today to support a forthright stand against aggression in Asia?

THE ENEMY BASES

The President touched on the crux of the immediate issue when he tried to explain why our forces have not been allowed to bomb the enemy bases in Manchuria and China proper, where the Reds are organizing for the spring offensive.

To do so, he held, might lead to a general war.

If the war in which we are now engaged is not a general war, it is at least a greater war. Our casualty lists prove that.

But if it is a third world war the President is thinking about, would not a defeat in Korea, which we are inviting, be more likely to lead to such a war than a show of determination and strength? Weakness usually prompts attack. That was General MacArthur's view when he urged that we hit Red China so hard that it would stop asking for trouble.

"What would suit the ambitions of the Kremlin better than for our military forces to be committed to a full-scale war with Red China?" Mr. Truman asked. We would say, an appeasement policy which would give the Kremlin what it wants without fighting, as the British are eager to do in the case of Formosa.

But bombing enemy bases in Manchuria need not lead to a full-scale war. The moment Red China backed out of the war our bombers could be recalled. No one, certainly not General MacArthur, has urged use of American ground troops in Manchuria.

THE UN'S PRINCIPLES

Mr. Truman said our major objective is to achieve a settlement in Korea which will not "compromise the principles and purposes of the United Nations." What principles?

The United Nations has a standing offer to discuss paying blackmail to buy peace with Red China. What kind of settlement would be more immoral?

This cowardly proposal cannot be defended in the name of peace; nothing could be better calculated to encourage Red aggression than a policy of rewarding aggression.

Finally, Mr. Truman reverted to the subject of collective security. The fighting in Korea, he said, is proving that "collective action among nations is not only a high principle but a workable means of resisting aggression."

Any soldier in Korea knows better.

No nation but our own has given more than token assistance in this war. A late call of the troops in Korea will show that. And because of that, public confidence in the principle of collective security is being destroyed.

Yet the President's speech gave the impression that he actually believes the war in Korea has the united support of the United Nations.

Shadow and Substance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of April 10, 1951:

SHADOW AND SUBSTANCE—A STABLE DOLLAR IS INFINITELY MORE IMPORTANT THAN CHEAP MONEY POLICY, WHOSE PRINCIPAL VICTIM IS THE SAVER

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Congressman HOWARD BUFFETT, of Nebraska, a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, recently raised a very important point that is usually overlooked by orators who specialize in denouncing the "bad old days" before the coming of the New Deal. In a message to his constituents the Congressman drew a startling comparison between losses through bank failures and losses through inflation.

"Remember the bank closings up to 1933?" he wrote. "And all the money people lost in busted banks? For years those losses—a real tragedy—were favorite campaign oratory of New Dealers. Large as those losses were, they were peanuts compared with the losses now being forced on United States savings-bond holders. During 1950 alone United States savings bonds lost $3,600,000,000 in purchasing power. By contrast, all losses by bank depositors from 1921 through 1932 totaled $1,900,000,000."

ALL FORMS OF SAVINGS AT STAKE

This is a forcible illustration of the grave illusions which are sometimes fostered in the name of state provision against want. The validity of many of the means of promoting individual security which have become popular during the last two decades—social-security benefits, pension funds, artificial supports for high farm prices and high-money wages—is inseparably linked with the stability of the dollar. This is equally true for those who have tried to assure their own security by saving money, or by purchasing life insurance or investing in Government and private bonds and stocks.

When there is steady erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar through improvident Government finance and a steady increase in currency in circulation and bank holdings of Government securities an investor must run very fast, indeed, if he is not to remain in the same place, or even fall behind.

LOSS IN BUYING POWER

Take the case of a man who, in 1941, paid $7,500 for savings bonds, on the promise of the Government to pay him $10,000 in 1951. He can claim his $10,000 now. But they are not the same kind of dollars that he invested 10 years ago. Although the interest he received by holding his bonds to maturity works out at 2.9 percent annually, his $10,000 today is worth less, in terms of almost anything he might wish to buy, than $7,500 was worth 10 years ago. And the Federal and perhaps the State tax authorities take a substantial cut of his illusory paper gain of $2,500.

An investment of $7,500 in reasonably well-selected common stocks would have probably doubled in value during the 1941–51 period and would have given a much higher annual yield. This fact should not be considered an argument for a general stampede into common stocks on the part of inexperienced investors. The law that whatever goes up must come down has often found painful application in the case of stock, real estate, and other speculative values.

FIGHTS INFLATION

The savings bond is an intrinsically desirable form of investment. It makes for a wide distribution of the public debt. The money that is used for the purchase of savings bonds is withdrawn from circulation and from the chase of dollars for goods. This is certainly a worth-while objective when the prospective heavy increase in spending for military purposes will strengthen inflationary pressures.

However, it seems doubtful whether a high level of purchases and holding of savings bonds can be maintained by exhortation and advertisement alone. The amount of these bonds sold to the public increased enormously during the war years, 1941–45. There is a danger that, if holders are dubious about their long-term value, we may face a situation of "bonds bursting in air"; of large amounts of these bonds being cashed, with a consequent heating up of the inflationary boiler.

Congress has now authorized continued payment of interest on these bonds for a second period of 10 years after they fall due. One wonders whether this meets the fiscal needs of the situation. The individual who may be hesitating whether to cash his bonds or renew them for another 10 years may take a pad and pencil and engage in figuring. He may wonder whether, just as 1,000 1951 dollars are unequal to 750 1941 dollars in real value, the same may not be true of 1,333 1961 dollars, compared with 1,000 of the present vintage.

TAX-EXEMPT ANNUITIES

Apart from broader measures designed to combat inflation, the Treasury could make the savings bonds more attractive by giving them, perhaps with some limitation as to amount, tax-exempt status.

To insist, as the Treasury has been doing until there was a recent modification of policy, on maintaining cheap money and an artificially low yield on Government bonds at the expense of enhancing inflationary pressure is indeed to sacrifice substance for shadow. The stability of the dollar is infinitely more important than the day-by-day quotation on Government securities. Steps to insure this stability should include a constant war on waste and appropriate credit restrictions, along with a more realistic attitude, designed to attract investment by private individuals in Government securities.

General MacArthur Insists That He Complied With All Directives and Did Not Disobey Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, those who defend the action of President Truman in dismissing General MacArthur do so in many instances by the claim that General MacArthur was guilty of insubordination. On this subject an article appearing in today's issue of the News, Washington, D. C., sheds considerable light. In accordance with the consent granted to me, I include the article as part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

OBEYED ORDERS, MACARTHUR INSISTS—COMPLIED WITH ALL DIRECTIVES

TOKYO, April 12.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur today indirectly contested the charges that led to his dismissal and insisted he had complied with all Washington's directives on the Korean War.

Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, the general's closest adviser, issued a formal statement setting forth for the first time General MacArthur's views on the arguments cited by President Truman in firing him as Supreme United States and UN Commander.

"The general feels that he has complied meticulously with all directives he has received, not only recently but throughout his entire military service," General Whitney said.

He said General MacArthur did not believe he had exceeded his authority either in his March 24 offer to discuss a military truce with the Communist commander in the field or in his controversial letter to House Republican Leader JOSEPH MARTIN on possible use of Chinese Nationalist troops.

WITHIN HIS RIGHTS

"The general has interpreted both * * * as dealing exclusively with the military situation and within the area of his uncontested authority to speak," General Whitney said. "The one bore not the slightest relationship to the other."

General Whitney issued the statement after announcing that he had requested retirement from active duty in order to accompany General MacArthur on his departure from Japan.

General Whitney said he was issuing the statement to clarify news dispatches from the United States referring to President Truman's directive of December 6. That warned no public statements should be issued on foreign policy without clearance by the State Department.

NOT A GAG

"The directive of December 6 was not directed to General MacArthur personally, but * * * to all executive agencies of the Government," he said.

"Immediately after its receipt, General MacArthur submitted a proposed communique to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who informed him, among other things, that it was not necessary to submit military communiques referring to military operations. * * *

"Furthermore, the directive of December 6 (by its terms and spirit, was interpreted at this headquarters as applying solely to formal public statements and not to communiques, correspondence, or personal conversations with others."

Moreover, he said, President Truman denied at a press conference, January 13, that there was any curb on General MacArthur's authority "to speak freely on the Korean War."

ON ROK ARMY

General Whitney also referred to the exchange between General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on organizing, training, and arming additional South Korean Army units.

General MacArthur recommended against it when early "conditions indicated the possibility of evacuation," he said.

"Subsequently, when our initiative had been reassumed," he said, "General MacArthur * * * authorized a 25 percent increase in each Republic of Korea division.

"It was obviously quite beyond the capability of this theater to arm and equip 500,000 more Koreans. Their utilization, therefore, became a matter of political policy under the global military assistance program," General Whitney explained.

Amendment of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution making application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the constitution of the United States

"Whereas article V of the Constitution of the United States reads in part as follows: "The Congress * * * on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States"; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Iowa, in view of the increasing tax problems of the State, caused in large part by the invasion of tax sources by the Federal Government, believes that its problems as well as the problems of other States similarly situated, can be solved only by some restraint upon present unrestrained exercise of the taxing power by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is using and has been using for a number of years the taxing power to produce revenue beyond a legitimate necessity of a Federal government, other than defense needs, and has been using the funds so raised to invade the province of legislation of the States and to appropriate in many fields that which amounts to a dole to the States of the money raised therefrom to accomplish many purposes, most of them worthy, but by the described process making the money available only under conditions which result in a control by the Federal Government from centralized agencies in Washington, in many cases unfit, and in other cases unable to administer the laws according to the local needs because of varying conditions in the country as a whole; resulting in inequities in the administration of the very benefits purported to be granted; and

"Whereas State and local needs are disadvantaged because the people are already taxed far beyond the real need for any purpose other than forcing the centralization of all government in Washington; and

"Whereas the framers of the Constitution of the United States clearly foresaw the possibility of a condition similar to that herein described, and made provision in the Constitution for safeguarding the States against any oppression or invasion of rights by the Federal Government: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Iowa*, That said legislature, hereby and pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the proposing of the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The power to levy taxes and appropriate the revenues therefrom heretofore granted to the Congress by the States in the several articles of this constitution is hereby limited.

"'SEC. 2. This article shall be in effect except during a state of war, hereafter declared, when it shall be suspended. The suspension thereof shall end upon the termination of the war but not later than three months after the cessation of hostilities, whichever shall be earlier. The cessation of hostilities, may be declared by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by concurrent action of the legislatures of 32 States.

"'SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of article V, this article may be suspended for a time certain or amended at any time by concurrent action of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

"'SEC. 4. There shall be set aside in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund into which shall be paid 25 percent of all taxes collected by authority derived from the sixteenth amendment to this Constitution, except as provided in section 5, and 25 percent of all sums collected by the United States from any other tax levied for revenue.

"'SEC. 5. There shall be set aside in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund into which shall be paid all sums received from taxes levied on personal incomes in excess of 50 percent thereof and from taxes levied on income or profits of corporations in excess of 38 percent thereof.

"'SEC. 6. Before paying any sums into the funds created by sections 4 and 5 hereof, the Treasurer of the United States shall deduct therefrom 20 percent which shall be used in payment of the principal of the national debt of the United States.

"'SEC. 7. No tax shall hereafter be imposed on that portion of the incomes of individuals which does not exceed, in the case of unmarried persons the sum of $600 per annum, and in the case of married persons the sum of $1,200 per annum jointly. A minimum deduction of $600 per annum shall be allowed for each dependent.

"'SEC. 8. The Treasurer of the United States shall once in each year, from the separate fund created by section 4 hereof, pay to each of the several States one-fourth of 1 percent of said fund and from the remainder of said fund shall pay to each State a portion of such remainder determined by the population of each State in ratio to the entire population of the several States according to the latest Federal decennial census or any subsequent general census authorized by law.

"'SEC. 9. The Treasurer of the United States shall, from the separate fund created by section 5 hereof, pay to each State, once in each year, a sum equal to the amount of money in such fund which was collected from persons or corporations within such State.

"'SEC. 10. Any sums paid hereunder to the several States shall be available for appropriation only by the legislatures thereof. The legislatures may appropriate therefrom for any purpose not forbidden by the constitutions of the respective States and may appropriate therefrom for expenditures within the States for any purpose for which appropriations have heretofore been made by the Congress except such purposes as are specifically reserved by this Constitution for the exclusive power of the Congress. The people of each State may limit the expenditures of funds herein made available to the legislature, but shall not direct the appropriations thereof.

"'SEC. 11. Each legislature shall have power by rule or resolution to provide for the assembly thereof in special sessions for the purpose of considering amendments to, the suspension of or the ratification of amendments proposed to this article.

"'SEC. 12. Each legislature shall have power to elect one or more persons to represent such legislature in any council or conventions of States created by concurrent action of the legislatures of 32 States for the purpose of obtaining uniform action by the legislatures of the several States in any matters connected with the amendment of this article.

"'SEC. 13. The Congress shall not create, admit, or form new States from the territory of the several States as constituted on the 1st day of January 1949, and shall not create, form, or admit more than three States from the Territories and insular possessions under the jurisdiction of the United States on the 1st day of January 1949, or from territory thereafter acquired without the express consent of the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"'SEC. 14. On and after January 1, 1953, the dollar shall be the unit of the currency. The gold content of the dollar as fixed on January 1, 1949, shall not be decreased.

"'SEC. 15. Concurrent action of the legislatures of the several States as used herein shall mean the adoption of the same resolution by the required number of legislatures. A limit of time may be fixed by such resolution within which such concurrent action shall be taken. No legislature shall revoke the affirmative action of a preceding legislature taken therein.

"'SEC. 16. During any period when this article is in effect the Congress may, by concurrent resolution adopted by two-thirds of both Houses wherein declaration is made that additional funds are necessary for the defense of the Nation, limit the amount of money required by this article to be returned to the several States. Such limitation shall continue until terminated by the Congress or by concurrent action of a majority of the legislatures of the several States. Upon termination of any such limitation, the Congress may not thereafter impose a limitation without the express consent by concurrent action of a majority of the legislatures of the several States.

"'SEC. 17. This article is declared to be self-executing'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That attested copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress and to each Member of the Iowa delegation in Congress, and that printed copies thereof, showing that said concurrent resolution was adopted by the Legislature of Iowa, be sent to each house of each legislature of each State of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this application hereby made by the Legislature of the State of Iowa shall constitute a continuing application in accordance with article V, of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States shall have made similar applications pursuant to said article V; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That since this is an exercise by a State of the United States of a power granted to it under the Constitution, the request is hereby made that the official journals and RECORDS of both Houses of Congress shall include the resolution on a notice of its receipt to the Congress, together with similar applications from other States, so that the Congress and the various States shall be appraised of the time when the necessary number of States shall have so exercised their power under article V of the Constitution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That since this exercise in proposing amendments to the Constitution has never been completed to the point of calling a convention and no interpretation of the power of the States in this exercise of this right has ever been made by any court or any qualified tribunal, if there be such, and since the exercise of the power is a matter of basic sovereign rights and the interpretation thereof is primarily in the sovereign government making such amendment and that

the power to use such right in full also carries the power to use such right in part the Legislature of the State of Iowa interprets article V to mean that if two-thirds of the States make application for a convention to propose an identical amendment to the Constitution for ratification with a limitation that such amendment be the only matter before it, that such convention would have power only to propose the specified amendment and would be limited to such proposal and would not have power to vary the text thereof nor would it have power to propose other amendments on the same or different propositions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Iowa does not, by this exercise of its power under article V, authorize the Congress to call a convention for any purpose other than the proposing of the specific amendment which is a part hereof; nor does it authorize any representative of the State of Iowa who may participate in such convention to consider or to agree to the proposing of any amendment other than the one made a part hereof; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That by its actions in these premises, the Legislature of the State of Iowa does not in any way limit in any other proceeding its right to exercise its power to the full extent; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress, in exercising its power of decision as to the method of ratification of the proposed article by the legislatures or by conventions, is hereby requested to require that the ratification be by the legislatures.

"HERMAN B. LORD,
"LEO ELTHON,
"EARL C. FISHBAUGH, Jr.,
"X. T. PRENTIS,
"W. ELDON WALTER,
"CHARLES S. VAN EATON,
"PHILIP T. HEDIN."

We, W. H. Nicholas, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa and Carroll A. Lane, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate and house of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa.

CARROLL A. LANE,
Secretary of the Senate,
W. H. NICHOLAS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.

For GI's: Ham 'n Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, any improvement in the necessarily unpleasant life of the GI is good news, and I am glad to report that field rations are taking a turn for the better.

Yesterday's New York Times reported as follows:

NEW FOR GI'S IN FIELD: CANNED HAM AND EGGS

VINELAND, N. J., April 10.—Seabrook Farms, near Bridgeton, is venturing on something new—canned ham and eggs for GI's in the field. The Department of Defense announced the award of the contract. For Seabrook, which also is in the frozen-foods business, the ham 'n eggs is something new. The eggs will not be the powdered variety, at which GI's turned up their noses during the last war, but scrambled whole eggs. The ham will be chopped.

The company also won a contract for beef and vegetables for the Armed Forces. The products will be part of a "five-in-one" ration replacing the old K-ration. It will provide 4,000 calories a man for five men for one day.

The Venice Maid Co., of Vineland, has received a contract for spaghetti and meat balls, for the Armed Forces, adding more variety to the field menu.

It is a pleasure to report that my district will be contributing ham and eggs, beef and vegetables, and spaghetti and meat balls in lieu of the old K-rations.

On the same day that this article appeared, Mr. C. F. Seabrook, the founder and president of the famous Seabrook Farms, the largest freezing and processing plant of its kind in the world, was honored by leading citizens throughout New Jersey at a dinner in Princeton for his outstanding contributions to agriculture and food processing.

General MacArthur's Distinguished Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in all the discussion that has taken place concerning the act of President Truman in dismissing General MacArthur, no question has been raised or denial made that General MacArthur has had a distinguished career as a soldier.

An article by Oland D. Russell, Scripps-Howard staff writer, appearing in today's issue of the News, Washington, D. C., in few but sufficient words sets forth the general acknowledgment of the distinguished career of General MacArthur. It reads as follows:

MACARTHUR PROMISED TO STAY "UNLESS"

(By Oland D. Russell)

Gen. Douglas MacArthur once said he would stay in Japan until his task was completed, unless he was called away by some "extraordinary occurrence." The extraordinary has occurred. He will be home soon.

Biographers use mostly superlatives to describe his meteoric career: Graduated from West Point with the highest scholastic and military standing in history, youngest division commander in World War I, "the greatest field commander produced by the war" (Newton D. Baker), youngest major general, youngest ever to serve as superintendent of the Military Academy, youngest Chief of Staff, at 50.

Planner and executor of the most brilliant campaign of World War II, "one without a flaw" (Gen. George C. Marshall), leader of first foreign armed force ever to invade Japan, his landing there in the face of several million organized and armed Japanese "the outstanding accomplishment of any military commander during the war" (Winston Churchill). "With the full realization of our Pacific victory, you have been its principal architect" (Henry L. Stimson).

As Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, he was clothed with the highest exclusive responsibility ever entrusted to an American officer overseas. As virtual ruler of 70,000,000 people his new role raised him from the field of military science to international statesmanship. In a swift flow of directives to the Japanese Emperor and Government, he set about to transform a feudalistic, medieval Oriental people into a democratic nation.

To the Japanese people he became a liberator rather than a conqueror. They all but deified him. A Tokyo paper once had to remind the populace that he was not a living god. He gave them a new democratic constitution, drastically revised their way of life, and by the end of June 1950 he could look back on another of his many jobs well done.

Then came Korea, and he took over a new task, when he was 5 months past 70 years old, to command United Nations forces, almost altogether American, first defensively, and then offensively, against full-scale Communist attack. The Inchon landing behind the enemy, "the most masterful and audacious strategic stroke in all history" (Admiral William Halsey). "A miracle" (Gen. Omar Bradley). The push to the Manchurian border, then Chinese Red intervention in overwhelming numbers, driving our forces again below the thirty-eighth parallel to an unending stalemate, his hands tied because Washington and the UN denied him authority to bomb the Chinese bases in Manchuria for fear of risking a war with the Chinese Reds he was already fighting.

On that and allied issues—his insistence on use of Chinese Nationalist troops to open a second front against the Reds, and on his contention that the main threat of Russia to the free world must be met in Asia rather than Europe—the Truman-MacArthur differences flared to an inevitable showdown which came yesterday at the White House, the long-ago-forecast extraordinary occurrence.

Operation Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a brilliant address by that outstanding national vice commander of the American Legion, the Honorable Lewis K. Gough, before the spring rally banquet, department of South Carolina American Legion, in Columbia, S. C., on March 20, 1951.

Mr. Gough speaks as a distinguished veteran of the recent conflict. He speaks the thoughts and the feeling of this fine organization. His thoughts are timely and pertinent to the discussion of UMT and preparedness in general.

I want the entire Congress to have the opportunity to read the remarks of this outstanding young Californian:

OPERATION SURVIVAL

(By Lewis K. Gough)

My fellow Legionnaires and members of the Auxiliary, it is a real pleasure being with you again in South Carolina. I have had the privilege of partaking of your justly famed southern hospitality before in frequent visits to the South, and it is particularly enjoyable to be with you this first day of spring and on such a beautiful day.

I regret that I am going to have to inject a sober note into this pleasant gathering. However, I am going to speak to you on a grim subject—that of operation survival. I am not speaking abstractly about survival of freedom-loving people everywhere or even of the people of America. I am talking about us—you and me—the people of Columbia and Charleston, and the people of Pasadena and Santa Barbara. We are in a struggle for our lives—to the finish—now. If we lose—as a nation, as a free society, as a people, we die. If we win we may live in peace.

Lenin has said the only safe enemy is one whose power has not just been defeated but destroyed and annihilated, and if his disciple Stalin is successful we will lose forever. Our margin of safety is less than you think.

I am speaking to you today on the basis of information made available to me as your representative on frequent visits to our Nation's Capital. I have had the opportunity of hearing first-hand from leaders in Congress, in the State Department, in the military, and I shall endeavor to give you an estimate of the situation as of the present moment.

It is most difficult to speak on a situation which is ever changing, and the mood in Washington reflects the material changes in world conditions from week to week. Last December there was a wave of despair in our Nation's Capitol which no longer exists. The mood has changed so much that our Congress seems to have lost its sense of urgency.

Let us think back to December for a moment. The Chinese Communists were on the offensive in Korea where we had just experienced our first Gallipoli or Dunkerque and another seemed to be pending. The fall of Indochina seemed imminent as the Chinese Reds massed at Nanning on their southern border. Indications pointed to communistic offensives in Germany or Yugoslavia, or both, in the spring of 1951.

The thinking of the State Department in December seemed to be that we would face our period of greatest danger in the immediate future. They seemed to feel that the relative superiority of arms between the Soviets and this country was at its peak, and the imbalance was already starting to decline. They seemed to feel that war was a definite possibility in 1951.

It must be recognized, however, that the thinking of the military leaders in December represented a consistent attitude in that they felt that our greatest danger would be when the Soviets had achieved a strategic stockpile of atomic bombs, adequate transportation facilities, and the necessary oil to conduct a global war.

Let us analyze this further for a moment. Strategic stockpile means just what it says, not a balance of one for one, but rather a sufficient number of A-bombs to be able to retaliate effectively against our centers of production if we should loose the A-bomb on them. Our very knowledge of such a stockpile would be a deterring factor of our use of the bomb in their opinion.

During 1950 the Soviets put top priority emphasis on production of transportation facilities. In the 5 years prior to this their emphasis was on the hardware of war—the tanks, the artillery, the ammunition. And they put twice as much steel into this hardware in this period as did we, a Nation five times greater in steel production. The switch in emphasis came because they had achieved the superiority they desired in such tactical items, but they needed locomotives and trucks, and intelligence tells us now they will have their adequate stockpile by the end of 1952.

Oil is a necessity for any war machine, and the most tragic news we have heard for our hopes for peace in a long time was the announcement a few days ago of the recent nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian oil industry in Iran which starts tipping the tank toward Russia. The Soviets have worked for this for many months through the Tudeh subversive organization in Iran, through which the Communist phase one is being actively furthered. This phase is the subversion, treason, infiltration operation which has been so effective in other countries and leads to phase two—the violence and police-state methods. And it is entirely possible that the Soviets will have the oil they need from the great oil center of Iran in the near future.

On the basis of the above the Pentagon leaders seem to feel that our period of greatest danger is still ahead.

Why, then, has there been such a change in the general attitude in our Nation's Capital; First and foremost, the Soviets themselves have eased the tension until war does not seem as imminent in March as it did in December. Since December our resolution has become more apparent. The Korean War is now going well. European rearmement is starting to move. Last month Washington signed $5,000,000,000 worth of arms contracts, which is double the December figure. The draft bill and UMT are meeting less opposition than was anticipated. A major factor relates itself to the atomic explosions near Las Vegas, Nev., where we pulled up the corner of the curtain just a bit and lowered it before the Soviets could have a real look. We let them know that we had sufficient A-bombs to test them in number whenever we desired, and that further tests would be held this summer. We implied that we had tactical atomic weapons as well as strategic weapons far superior to those previously developed. This must have had a terrific impact on the Soviet planning, and they purposely relieved the tension which existed in December and asked for negotiations in a Four Power Conference.

And so it seems immediate war is not as imminent. However, global war is still definitely possible any time with present tensions as they now exist. The most optimistic view is that if war can be averted these tensions will continue for many years to come, during which time we must build and maintain power to deter the aggressor or to fight if war should come. These will be years of partial normalcy for us—of austerity and frugality beyond precedent, which we must accept with individual patriotic willingness.

Our present policy of firmness may avert war, but a real danger will arise if Congress should allow itself to be lulled by Soviet strategy and lose its sense of urgency. This would slow up our program as each point is argued and would undermine the very program which now gives us such hope. It is as self-evident in March as it was in December that if immediate war is averted we must have speed and effectiveness in matching a firm policy for peace with adequate power to implement it effectively.

Such a firm policy must embrace realistic conditions for peaceful coexistence with the Soviets as its No. 1 objective. We of the American Legion believe the emphasis must be on averting war, and the objective of preparing ourselves to fighting a war if it comes should always be secondary. In averting war we must end the arsenist's ability to continue to light fires around the Communist periphery. We must roll back the power of world communism by dismantling police and slave states until they are no longer puppets, and through effective inspection and control of arms, atomic and otherwise.

We will have to win one of two conflicts, either the ideological or the military, and until we do we will live in dread, with our youth in uniform, spending seventy billions per year and upward, and without the normalcy we love. We have been losing the ideological war through apathy and lack of understanding of the problem. This is evidenced by the fact that in 1945 the ratio of communism to democracy was but 1 to 9 in our favor. But 5 years have passed—years based upon the decisions arrived at in Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran—years which felt the influence of Alger Hiss, Remington, Dr. Fuchs, and Henry Wallace. And now the ratio is 5 to 4 in favor of the Communists.

Let us now make a quick estimate of the situation to help us with our own thinking. In such planning we first must establish our appreciation of the objective, and I should like to tell you what the Communists say that communism is, and I quote from their own publication, Pravda: "The nature of our program is not mere talk, but is an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality. Our objective is world revolution, our ultimate aim is world-wide communism. Our fighting preparations are for the conquest of power on a world-wide scale and the establishment of a world proletarian dictatorship."

We were so naive in 1939 when Hitler in Mein Kampf told us of his intentions, and those of us that served in the ETO know how close he came to making good his boasts. Now Stalin is telling us in "Lessons in Leninism" that it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should exist side by side over a long period of time with imperialistic, capitalistic democracies—ultimately one or the other must conquer. He tells us further that the only way the final test may be averted is for the United States to surrender in the face of ever-growing socialistic encirclement.

To give you a conception of our task, let us consider forces available and forces opposed. Lieutenant General Gruenther and others, in appearing before our last session of Congress, told us that the Soviets had 14,000 combat planes in operation to our 6,000, that we were producing only one-fourth as many planes on Korea day as we were on Pearl Harbor Day. The Soviets have 175 army divisions to our 17, and we possess but 44 divisions among the democracies. Our great Navy is gradually emerging from its moth balls, but the Soviets have 300 submarines, including 70 type No. 21, Snorkel underseas craft. The Soviets have made great strides in developing their magnetic 5-mile target-seeking torpedoes. We said in 1945 that we will need no more tanks and we let many rot and rust, or destroyed them. At present we have but 7,000 tanks to [illegible] for the Soviets, of which 700 of their's are the Mark III Joseph Stalin superheavy, and we have no heavies. Both countries have atom bombs. Our superior strategic stockpile has been a great deterring factor. It is interesting to note that Russia has expended 18 percent of her per capita income for her armed services in the last 5 years and we spent 6 percent for the same purpose—and Russia never demobilized as we knocked our Armed Forces apart with a hammer, literally speaking.

As already pointed out, we produce five times as much steel as Russia, but she has put twice as much steel into war hardware as we have since 1945. Russia possesses the advantage of a tremendous fifth column and we do not.

This strength-in-being implements the Soviet program of world conquest. Their main objective is to dominate the minds of men throughout the world. Their tool is communism, a versatile and effective plan which they sell in the name of peace, unity, and individual prosperity, and those that buy this package deal learn too late that they have bought mass slavery instead. Their successes are due largely to our weakness and appeasement. We started a trend with our withdrawal at the Elbe in 1945 that has not been reversed since, and the American Legion continues to urge that the very term "appeasement" must be stricken from the lexicon of American diplomacy as we make ourselves strong and respected.

One of the most encouraging signs recently has been the great awakening of our citizens for at last they have become awake, alert, and aroused. Through manipulation of events they have taken a more vital interest

in foreign affairs than ever before in recent history. A year ago this Nation was in a mood of fatalism close to helpless despair. We feared we had lost the ability to control our own destiny. With our awakening we are still despondent, but no longer do we carry our despondency to the point of a hopeless defeatism. We are beginning to speak up. We find we are still freemen. We will not be carried blindly where others direct. We will control our own destiny. In this rebirth of determination there is a new source of strength. If freemen think, speak, and act resolutely we may still be able to ward off the evils of war, and we will be more effective in the fighting if it comes. As General "Ike" has said: "One hundred and fifty million freemen can accomplish practically anything if they put their mind to it."

With this awakening the administration has suddenly discovered that the people disagree with many policies of their leadership. This is a fact that they must recognize. We must have no "red herrings" now.

As our people become aroused and shed their apathy and the administration feels the weight of their opinion, we may still be able to prevent the cycle of man of which Tom Payne speaks when he says: "Man lifts himself from subjugation and slavery to liberty and freedom, from there to opportunity and prosperity from which he declines to luxury and apathy and finally to subjugation and slavery." Americans must have a sense of urgency—an awareness of personal dedication and a blazing faith if we are to escape this cycle—as we have been in the luxury and apathy stage for the past 5 years.

This year of our Lord 1951 must be a year not only of reexamination, but of decision. The hour is late. The year of decision should have been made in 1945 when we had adequate power to implement our policy. It was then we should have had realistic decision plus adequate power to make it effective. Instead we chose the soft, easy road, the road of weakness and appeasement, the road of Neville Chamberlain or a Stanley Baldwin. We thought we could buy friends and security. We took refuge in our possession of the atom bomb. When we learned the enemy had this awful secret, we found our solace and comfort in the strategic concept of long-ranged bombers, atomic weapons, guided missiles, and push-button warfare; and as we enjoyed our luxury and apathy we had our business as usual, our politics as usual, and a lavish standard of living. John Foster Dulles was so right when he said: "We have made all the mistakes we can afford to make and still survive." Our first step in reexamination is a comprehensive all-inclusive study of our national purpose in world affairs. Our foreign policy and its implementation must have top priority above all else in our interest, for the decisions we arrive at affect our country's future and the fate of the world.

A very encouraging sign is the sincere, earnest, and useful attempt to reexamine our policy in the recent talks of many of our national leaders. They are giving us basic principles of grand strategy to consider. This is good as long as it remains above personal and partisan levels. Their points of view differ you say—but the differences are more constructive than confusing and there are certain key points that stand out from all their talks in which they are in agreement. These are:

1. We must have no more appeasement.

2. We need effective deterrence to Russia's armed aggression. We must rely on our power to deter and we must have the kind of military power which can retaliate effectively against Russia if the Red army marches in Europe and which can deny to the Soviet Union the use of anything which they might conquer, by destroying it and keeping it destroyed.

3. We want all the allies we can get who are willing and able to fight but we want to know now who will stand up and be counted. We do not intend to carry any excess baggage with us in this life and death struggle.

4. We must have full speed ahead in accelerating our war potential. Time is the most fragile of our strategic weapons.

5. We will rely on the United Nations to provide our goals providing it shows requisite moral courage.

Korea has moved up the time table for Russia. The purpose of our intervention there was to prevent a general war—on the assumption that the Soviets would not face the calculated risk of a general war beginning in so unstrategic an area. We assumed that Korea was the first step in the long program of aggression which, if continued, would lead to a Munich-like situation. Our assumptions were probably correct then. We were probably being tested. However, as Korea fighting disclosed the true extent of American disarmament, weakness and unpreparedness, the Politburo concluded it was willing to risk a general war after all as it pressed the button for the Chinese Reds to enter the fray. Consequently, Russia greatly contracted the time table of her immense imperialistic program. Our trouble in Korea stems not from having gone too far—but rather we did not go far enough soon enough with firm, resolute, definite decision, implemented by adequate power to make it effective. As usual our sins are those of omission, not commission. We cannot seem to learn that as Winston Churchill says (and he says so much in such few words): "The weakness of the virtuous permits the malice of the wicked."

Indochina may be Russia's next one-alarm fire. To take this country would round out the Kremlin's triumph in Asia. We hear that our fighting force in Korea is tying up the Chinese Communists best fighting force, which postpones interventions in Indochina, but the situation there is tense and dangerous. Recent intelligence tells us that a Chinese liberation army of 250,000 is now at Nanning just above the border. This army, with its heavy equipment, plus Ho Chi Minh's 100,000, would mean the same imbalance of power contrasted with the 150,000 French Vietnam forces that caused our difficulty in Korea. Recently the French were forced to close their consulates in Kunming and Canton so that they may no longer observe. A Soviet air mission landed this month in Hainan with modern planes, including jets, which soon may be transferred to China's Reds. We have noted recent changes in propaganda of the Nationalist Vietminh forces which no longer are "exclusively Nationalist," but Ho himself, a long-time friend of Mao, who controls Red China (they were together in the Cominform in Moscow for their early training), is quoted as telling of the glorious advantages of Indochina being liberated by their friends the Chinese. We hear that non-Communist Nationalists are being liquidated from the Vietminh forces.

With the imminent fall of Indochina, Siam, Burma, and Malaya will soon follow. Indochina is the olive in the top of the bottle and the other countries of southeast Asia with their deplorable economic and political conditions provide the troublesome waters where the Communists like best to fish.

This spring is critical in view of the perils that surround us. While the French, British, and United States are occupied in Asia, Stalin may take advantage of this diversion to light the four-alarm fire by striking into Western Germany and Yugoslavia before the West can build the force that is now on paper. I know if I were Stalin and had his disregard for human life, I would risk the atomic bombing of civilians, realizing the results of such bombing on dispersed military targets and dispersed technical forces probably would not be decisive. The imbalance of power will probably never be more favorable to Stalin. Maybe he is thinking of just this, as we hear that the bridges of East Germany and the Balkans are being reinforced to take his heavy tanks. Thirty Soviet divisions are available for immedi te action in East Germany with artillery and mechanized units attached. Four thousand planes and six thousand tanks are stationed in this area. Perhaps, however, he may plan to use the Poles, Czechs, and East Germans for a Korean-type action with Russian support against our weak defensive divisions.

Why, you ask, has he not marched already in Europe? I concur with Churchill that the atom bomb as retaliation has been a strong deterring factor. Also, he undoubtedly considered we were stronger than he now knows us to be. Also, Stalin has been doing well so far without having to resort to force as is so evident graphically if you look at the map of the world in 1945 and now.

In view of all these considerations a lack of feeling of urgency in Washington is alarming. The weight of expressed public opinion must be felt at once. The No. 1 weapon now as in the past for world peace is informed, expressed public opinion. Without citizens recognizing their individual responsibility in a democracy we have government by default as the organized vociferous minority will predominates. This was evident in the year just past when approximately 80 percent of our people who preferred universal military training could not obtain it because the articulate minority prevented such legislation. Informed, intelligent, patriotic American citizens on the basis of reexamination must achieve decision and action. For 31 years the American Legion has been dedicated to this purpose.

Germany and Japan are major factors in the world situation. These two nations were bulwarks against the expansion of the czarist regime of Russia in their imperialistic designs. The same two nations prevented the Communists from expanding in the same manner, but then in 1945 we destroyed first Germany and then Japan, and then in 1946 we destroyed our own power. What has happened since was inevitable.

There are four major industrial areas in the world today. These are, in order, the United States, Soviet Russia, the Ruhr of Germany, and Japan. If we should lose these areas to the Communists, either through phase one, subversion, or phase two, violence, we would lose the balance of power industrially speaking, perhaps irretrievably.

In the East we have committed ourselves to defend Japan in a defensive line which extends from Japan through Okinawa, Formosa, to the Philippines. In the West we must defend a line as far east as the combined thinking of our statesmen and military leaders think is feasible. The thinking of Generals Eisenhower, Bradley, Marshall, and Clay must be given much weight in arriving at this very important decision. The trouble spots at the present to watch carefully are Iran, Indochina, Japan, Germany, and Yugoslavia.

On the basis of the foregoing the American Legion presents "operation survival" as a program to bring us peace by compulsion. First and foremost, we must have a systematic mobilization of all armed forces in sufficient degree to meet the immediate peril. This must be done on an enduring basis as quickly as training facilities and materials will permit.

Secondly, we must have universal military training to provide trained manpower for the long-range pull. No longer must we go from the valleys to the peaks in our national preparedness with each world crisis. Such a policy has forced us to fight a war on the average of every 20 years of our national existence. The full force of the Legion and the Auxiliary is fighting this moment for

UMT in our Nation's Capital, and in our fight we will not compromise on our long-established principles that UMT must be civilian controlled. It must have adequate safeguards for education, religion, science, and industry, and it must have a mandatory provision to make it effective when selective service expires to adequately deal with crises of the future.

Third, we must have industrial mobilization sufficient to give us strategic stockpiles of all essential materials as soon as possible.

Fourth, we must strengthen our internal security through strict enforcement of the Communist-control law, to destroy the Communist beachheads within our midst. We must intern the known Communists now as 1 day after war is declared, if such there be, will be 1 day too late to deal with this fifth column, without parallel in world history.

We must curtail or eliminate every possible public and private nonessential expenditure. This means achieving proper priority of expenditures at top level. We must put first things first; henceforth, American dollars must be fighting dollars. Years of austerity and frugal living are ahead if we are to avoid national bankruptcy.

Fifth, last but not least, in our strategy for peace we much achieve rearmament not only militarily but spiritually as well. In the early days of this country our founders and forefathers, our builders and defenders, asked and received guidance, inspiration, help and strength from God in achieving a great Nation. Now too many of us have forgotten our faith. There are veterans among us who found religion so naturally in their fox holes, in liferafts and parachutes, and many have forgotten as well. We must return to God in our daily lives as the firmest basis in solving our problems, which today as before, are beyond human achievement to work out alone.

The Bible tells us peace is not to be obtained by merely saying peace, peace, when there is no peace. The Bible realistically says, "Be strong and acquit yourselves like men." The Bible, in St. Luke 11: 21, tells us, "A strong man armed keeps his palace, his goods are at peace." We should be proud of the shining armor that we wear as modern Christian crusaders—the last defenders of a way of life brought to us by Christ himself, defending against the pagan philosophies of communism that deny the very existence of Christ and all his teachings. This is the real struggle for God and country—the very precept of the American Legion.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 12, 1951:

HIGH-SCHOOL PUPILS HEAVILY FOR UMT—STUDY REVEALS A TERRIFIC PROTEST AMONG SENIORS OVER SCHOLARSHIP DEFERMENTS

High-school seniors, selected as a random sample by the board of education's division of educational and vocational guidance, favor adoption of universal military training by as much as 8 to 1, Dr. Morris Krugman, an assistant superintendent, announced yesterday.

Addressing the New York City Welfare Council's unit on vocational guidance at the McBurney Young Men's Christian Association, 215 West Twenty-third Street, Dr. Krugman, who is in charge of guidance programs, said that the seniors favored UMT over the present Selective Service System.

Dr. Krugman said the study was conducted in six senior high schools and that the 8-to-1 vote was given in an academic high school, where a detailed analysis of 125 seniors' opinions had been made. He added, however, that in general the students favored universal military training. Further proof of this, he said, is that students intend to enter colleges with Reserve Officers Training Corps units.

Dr. Krugman reported that comments made by the students showed a tremendous protest against deferments for superior college students.

Col. Candler Cobb, city director of selective service, said that high-school students were pretty safe from induction even if the proposed bill to draft 18-year-olds was passed.

ONLY ONE IN FIVE FEELS FUTILITY

Dr. Krugman noted that 80 percent of the students in the survey said they were studying either harder or as diligently as they had been before the present emergency. Only 20 percent indicated they had a sense of futility in their work.

Both students and educators are confused by the ever-changing draft regulations, Dr. Krugman said, adding that this confusion makes it difficult to give students adequate educational and vocational guidance.

Despite the world situation and the emergency mobilization here only 30 percent of the students were mildly or severely disturbed by events. The other 70 percent indicated no anxiety, Dr. Krugman reported.

In the academic high schools superior students are neither discouraged nor are students leaving in droves as some reports have indicated, Dr. Krugman said. Even average students in academic high schools are not leaving. However, in vocational schools, where promises of good jobs and pay are beckoning, more pupils are leaving as soon as they have developed a skill, Dr. Krugman said.

Korean Policy in for Censure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

KOREAN POLICY IN FOR CENSURE—GOP DETERMINED TO PRESS ISSUE AGAINST TRUMAN AND TO SEEK REMOVAL OF ACHESON AND OTHERS

(By David Lawrence)

Six years ago today Vice President Truman took the oath of office as President—and now a substantial number of Republicans in party conference are talking about presenting a resolution of impeachment and trying him before the Senate of the United States.

The charge would be that Mr. Truman violated his oath of office by carrying on a war in Korea against China without the consent of Congress. The Constitution specifically says that only Congress may declare war.

The Republicans are determined, first, to investigate all phases of foreign policy as well as the circumstances surrounding the removal of General MacArthur. They are determined also to press in due time for the impeachment and removal of Secretary of State Acheson and any other officials who may be implicated in what the Republicans feel is a betrayal of the Nation's interests in Korea and the Far East.

An impeachment resolution requires a majority vote of the House of Representatives. Removal requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Obviously at this time, with the apparent line-up of many Democrats on the side of Mr. Truman, there are not enough votes as yet to impeach. But the Republicans will carry the issue to the country and in the next several months attempt to line up enough public sentiment to compel many of the Democrats in Congress to break with the President, or run the risk of themselves being beaten at the polls on an emotional issue.

For the whole Korean policy will come in for censure. Why, it will be asked, were 250,000 American boys sent to fight in Korea without authority of Congress and to suffer more than 55,000 casualties while the commander of the armies there was forbidden to prosecute the war effectively against the enemy?

Mr. Truman's action in ousting General MacArthur will accentuate the underlying issues—appeasement of communism in the Far East while resisting it in Europe. Some of the consequences that may follow from the President's sensational step are the following:

1. The Japanese people may become alarmed and fearful of Communist infiltration. The Communist Party there will be encouraged, for it was General MacArthur who really held it in check.

2. The Nationalists inside China will become discouraged and will feel that resistance against the Communists now is futile.

3. The British Labor Government and particularly its left wing will be stimulated to criticize American policies in the future and will step up its demand for a recognition of Communist China, admission of the Communist regime into the U. N., and the turning over of Formosa to the Communists.

4. Russia will feel that the United States Government is weak and irresolute, and Moscow may go ahead with plans to start trouble in other areas—pressing harder in Iran and Yugoslavia and perhaps renewing its pressure on Turkey.

5. Appeasement will be denounced on all sides, but nevertheless a truce involving a compromise will be offered to the Communist Chinese. This could virtually nullify all the sacrifices made by U. N. troops and particularly by the South Koreans, who now fear they will be turned over for massacre to the Communist authorities.

6. Demands will arise for the immediate withdrawal of American troops from Korea on the theory that their effectiveness as a fighting force has been impaired because no authority is forthcoming to bomb Manchurian bases or use Chiang Kai-shek's troops to aid in opening a second front in Asia as MacArthur advocated.

7. Domestic political strife will be intensified. The issue will not remain narrow, as the administration may wish to keep it—that is, focused on the simple question of whether a military man did or did not obey orders. It will be broadened to force a showdown on the views held by General MacArthur on far eastern policy.

8. An explanation will be demanded by the Republicans as to why General Bradley was permitted to express political views on the whole far eastern political situation within the past few weeks and was promoted after his utterances. He told the press that the United Nations might well stop at the thirty-eighth parallel and achieve victory. He discussed highly controversial questions relating to U. N. policy. Was this cleared first with the authorities in Washington?

9. No committee of Congress hereafter will dare to question any military officer without the feeling that it is not getting the facts or the true judgment of the witness. Instead, only one viewpoint will prevail—that of the party in power.

10. An appeasement program could mean a third world war in a year or two, just as Munich in 1938 was followed by the outbreak of war in 1939 after Hitler had concluded that the Allies were divided and America would not fight.

These are but a few of the many effects that may ensue as the National Capital is rocked by one of the most emotional crises in many years—something that will not end with the ouster of General MacArthur but only at the polls in 1952. And all of this might have been avoided if Mr. Truman had called General MacArthur back for consultation, had given him a chance to express his views face to face, and then asked him point blank whether he wished to be relieved of his command or accept the Truman policies without further discussion. This would have been more statesmanlike than dismissing a general and announcing it first to the press of the world without even an opportunity for conference.

Certainly Douglas MacArthur deserved more consideration from the Government under whose flag he has fought so long and so valiantly.

The Impact of Mobilization on the Constitutional System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Prof. Clinton Rossiter, Cornell University, speaking at the afternoon session of the spring meeting of the Academy of Political Science at the Hotel Astor, New York City:

THE IMPACT OF MOBILIZATION ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM

Life in the United States in the twentieth century seems to have been, as an amateur historian once remarked, "just one damned thing after another." The conditions under which the American system has been operating ever since 1914 have been those of emergency rather than routine, strife rather than stability, tension rather than serenity. Threat of war, war, inflation, deflation, boom, panic, depression, recession, industrial conflict, threat of war, total war, inflation, industrial conflict, and cold war with hot flashes have followed one another in bewildering succession. Four decades of crisis have left many Americans convinced that there is nothing quite so normal as abnormality.

The effects of these years of emergency upon our social, economic, and political institutions have been profound, so profound indeed that some thoughtful people are wondering out loud whether what Karl Popper calls the "open society" has the stamina to survive in a world that seems to have gone permanently mad. Our task today, as I understand it, is to do some "wondering out loud" ourselves: to take stock of our situations as of April 11, 1951; to list those changes now being worked in our system by this most recent emergency, mobilization; to recognize the threats to freedom inherent in the methods and values of the garrison state; and to put our minds at rest, but not to sleep, about the capacity of a free United States to survive this extended crisis.

The sources and characteristics of this most recent emergency are too familiar to bear repeating. Our decision to mobilize and to build up our defenses was the result of a reluctant judgment that an imbalance of power among the great nations would exist for an indefinite period, and that we had best be ready for anything up to and including all-out war. The present emergency can therefore be described as "watchful waiting." We are in for who-knows-how-many years of guns and butter at home and a "respectable posture of defense" abroad.

Watchful waiting has already worked several notable changes in our constitutional system. In some instances this has meant the acceleration or redirection of a trend already under way, in others the creation of an entirely novel arrangement or problem. But in all instances the electric touch of emergency can be clearly felt. I should like to call the briefest sort of attention to the most important results of these months of mobilization for the Presidency, the administration, Congress, the Supreme Court, the parties, the Federal system, and the Constitution itself.

The Presidency: An axiom of political science to which all history votes support is this: Emergency in the life of a constitutional state inevitably brings an increase in executive power and prestige, always at least temporarily, more often than not permanently. The past 18 years have constituted one of the great historical meridians of the Presidency, and not just because Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman liked to think of themselves as "strong presidents," men who like Jackson, Lincoln, and T. R. were jealous guardians of their legitimate prerogatives. Because of war and depression the Presidency is a visibly more potent and complex instrument of democratic Government today than it was 20 or 30 or 50 years ago.

Mobilization and cold war have certainly done nothing to reverse this trend. It might almost be said that Mr. Truman now takes for granted many powers and arrangements that Mr. Roosevelt recognized as strictly emergency in character and purpose, for example: the rich deposit of laws designed for Presidential use in war and emergency that has been building up in the United States Code for 160 years; the effective merging of the President's activities as Commander in Chief and as Chief of Foreign Relations, with the obvious result that his position in each of these areas has been strengthened considerably; and, the President's participation, as the most interested third party imaginable, in the settlement of emergency labor disputes.

The most momentous change of all, one that has been especially pronounced in the Truman incumbency, even more pronounced since June 1950, has been the progressive "institutionalization" or "pluralization" of the Presidency. Ever since the establishment of the Executive Office of the President in September 1939, the most interesting fact about the Presidency has been the growth of that complexity of offices and officials that today includes the Bureau of the Budget, the National Security Council, the White House Office, the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Resources Board, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and a flying squad of formal and informal advisers. The Presidency, looked at as a working instrument of government, is no longer a one-man job; or rather, the Presidency remains constitutionally a one-man job only because there are a thousand or so persons in and around the White House, 30 or 40 of them operating at the very highest level, with the one purpose in life of helping the President to execute his own responsibilities. We will be shrewder observers of events in this period of mobilization if we will think and speak of the Presidency rather than of the President. For many paramount purposes the office has indeed been institutionalized and pluralized, and the citizen who observes Truman alone—and not Wilson, Acheson, Harriman, Eisenhower, Barkley, Steelman, Bradley, Murphy, Lawton, Symington, Keyserling, and the rest—is getting a blurred picture of our great executive institution. The conjunction of mobilization, which has thrown a hundred new burdens on an already overburdened President, and Mr. Truman, who knows how to delegate authority as well as any President in history, has accelerated this development to a noticeable degree.

The administration: The impact of mobilization on the national economy has raised up two major problems in public administration. I use the word "problems" rather than "effects" or "changes" advisedly, for it is not at all clear what their outcome will be. The most that I can do in this instance is to indicate that certain developments are under way. I would hardly dare or care to predict that they will continue indefinitely along the lines already being followed.

The first point to be noticed about the national administration under the stress of the past 9 months is that the machinery of mobilization—the offices and agencies through which we hope to stimulate production, allocate short supplies, distribute manpower, control prices, handle labor disputes, and in general produce all the guns and all the butter we could possibly require—seems to be better organized and better directed than the complexity of emergency agencies that performed these functions in World War II. I must confess that I, like any good citizen, have my full share of trouble following the lines of responsibility that head up through Mr. Wilson to the President himself; and I must confess, too, that it often seems that we are making mistakes and experiencing confusion that we were sure we were not going to have to tolerate again. Yet there are many hopeful signs, at least of an administrative nature: the forthright manner in which Mr. Truman has delegated his own authority over the home front primarily to one man, and has made him the nearest thing to an assistant president we could possibly want; the way in which Congress has left the President pretty much alone in his efforts to shape up an organization for mobilization, principally by refusing to establish an independent agency like OPA; and the vital fact that ODM is a truly parent and directing authority, as OEM, Mr. Roosevelt's paper holding company, was not.

The second problem cast up in our laps by the troubled waters of a combined war-peace economy is the perplexing and still unresolved conflict between the Secretary of the Treasury, an official directly responsible to the President, and the Federal Open Market Committee, an appendage of a statutorily independent commission, over the ticklish question of support of the market in Government bonds. Political scientists have always wondered just how independent the independent regulatory commissions really were, and the tempest they blew up in early February was made to order for classroom discussions.

Unfortunately but not unexpectedly the conflict was resolved in no clear-cut fashion, and we must wait the usual decent period to know what passed among the President, Mr. Snyder, Mr. McCabe, Mr. Martin, and the other principals. The administrative lessons we can learn from this passage-at-arms, which was clearly a product of the strain of mobilization upon an already inflated economy, would seem to be these:

First, the independent commissions—FRS, ICC, SEC, FCC, FPC, FTC, CAB, and NLRB—are not as independent of Presidential solicitude as the theory nourished by *Humphrey's Executor v. U. S.*[1] had led us all to believe. Second, when an independent commission exercises authority in an area in which the President is vitally interested, even constitutionally responsible, we cannot expect him to let it go its own independent way. And, third, Congress would therefore be well advised in establishing and empowering such commissions to confine them to functions that are in fact no concern of the President's. If a commission is to be legally independent, it must first be factually independent. We should not forget that in this instance the Federal Reserve System was dealing, as was its statutory right and duty, with an issue that mobilization had made equally the President's right and duty. Under the circumstances of mobilization conflict was inevitable.

Congress: The pressures of the present emergency have initiated or redirected several interesting developments in the organization and methods of Congress. The National Legislature seems determined to make the best of normal abnormalcy, to give the lie to those skeptics who insist that the one clear duty of a legislature in time of international tension is to emulate Brer Fox ("he lay low") and Tar Baby ("she ain't sayin' nuthin'"). Quite the contrary, Congress is riding high and saying plenty. Mr. Truman himself gave the Houses a left-handed but nonetheless effective compliment in his press conference of March 1 when he remarked that the debates in Congress might have a very ill effect on the success of our foreign relations. To the President's credit, it should be added that he acknowledged without qualification the right of Members of Congress to make any number of speeches on any number of subjects. Had he been asked, ex-Senator Truman would doubtless have added that the committees and subcommittees of Congress could make any number of investigations on any number of subjects in the area of mobilization, something that the specially created Maybank committee (Joint Committee on Defense Production) is just beginning to undertake in force.

Certainly the great debate, however sure the dispatch of additional troops after General Eisenhower's return and report, has been a healthy affair. Our last two Presidents have been far too cavalier in their prewar diplomacy, and it was high time that Congress, even if it has lost all final choice whether to declare war or not, be at least consulted on the major steps that might lead to war. The debate in the Senate and out of doors brought millions to the realization that the dispatch of several divisions of citizen soldiers to Europe for an indefinite period of watchful waiting was something quite different from the dispatch of a boatload of Marines to repay an insult to an American consul by the aroused citizens of a banana republic. Congress may henceforth insist that on occasions of this moment—when the very future of the Nation is at stake, and when there is plenty of time to consult the two Houses and their leading committees—it have, like the Queen in Bagehot's the English Constitution, "the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn." The single-house or concurrent resolution could well become a vital factor in the future conduct of American foreign affairs. If used with tact, vigor, and frugality, it should strengthen rather than weaken the President's necessarily dominant, but not necessarily absolute, position as Commander in Chief and chief of foreign relations.

[1] 295 U. S. 602 (1935).

Another healthy departure has been the brilliant defense of the Federal Reserve System by several outstanding Senators of both parties. If the independent commissions are to maintain their independence, their first line of defense must be intelligent support in Congress. And the beginning of intelligence in this delicate political and administrative problem is, as I have already indicated, a recognition of the legitimate interests and responsibilities of the President of the United States.

The congressional ledger is unfortunately loaded with the usual array of debits. Political scientists, who suffer gladly the professional disability of boundless naïveté, probably never will understand why Congress is so remiss in the matter of self-improvement. We will never understand why something can't be done about the filibuster, lobbies, roll calls, the seniority rule, the burden of the District of Columbia, overbearing investigating committees, inadequate staffing, private bills, logrolling, lack of party discipline, and a system that forces all but the toughest or safest Member to be something quite remote from Burke's idea of a national legislator. Above all, we will never understand why the gentlemen who grieve most openly about the "designs of the encroaching Executive" are the very same gentlemen who block or vitiate those reforms that would raise the level of legislative efficiency to a point where Congress could begin to make good some of the pretensions of its chief defenders. Congress will do more leading when it is organized to lead. It is primarily for Congress to decide how important Congress is going to be in the garrison state.

Our other major institutions—the Supreme Court, the parties, the Federal system—may be disposed of briefly. The Court seems destined to go on indefinitely as an extremely negative factor in the decision of the great constitutional and political questions that the emergency keeps tossing up. The nature of the present crisis, the make-up of the Court, and the heavy-handed precedent of such World War II cases as *Korematsu v. United States, Steuart and Brothers v. Bowles, Woods v. Miller Co.*, and *Yakus v. United States* lead me to predict with some certainty—and this is one of two predictions I will indulge myself—that the great weapon of judicial review of Federal legislation will remain in the arsenal of disuse where it has been, except for one or two faint-hearted sorties, for 14 years. In this regard I think the blunt words of Justice Jackson in *Korematsu v. United States* are well worth remembering:[2]

"I would not lead people to rely on this Court for a review that seems to me wholly delusive. * * * If the people ever let command of the war power fall into irresponsible and unscrupulous hands, the courts wield no power equal to its restraint. The chief restraint upon those who command the physical force of the country, in the future as in the past, must be their responsibility to the political judgments of their contemporaries and to the moral judgments of history."[3]

The most noticeable effect that mobilization and cold war have had on our two parties is one that the Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association must look upon with misgivings. For a number of reasons, most notably the way in which the issues of domestic mobilization and foreign policy seem to cut across party lines, there is even less party discipline in the Eighty-second than in the Eighty-first Congress. Moreover, mobilization and cold war may postpone indefinitely that break-up of the solid South that many of these same observers agree is the one sure step toward what the Committee on Political Parties pleads for—a more responsible two-party system.[3]

The Federal system—which is at once a network of institutions, a patter of legal and constitutional arrangements, and a basic American value—continues to develop under the impetus of mobilization in the same two directions it has been traveling ever since the Civil War: away from State rights and toward centralization, away from competition and toward cooperation. At the first trend we can look with disquiet but hardly with surprise. If the Government at Washington grows ever more powerful, it is because the problems delegated to it for solution grow ever more pressing. War, whether hot or cold, is a near-monopoly of the National Government. The trend to Federal-State cooperation is one that we can all welcome. Through a courageous and inventive use of the new techniques of Federal cooperation a wise Congress might yet stake out that sphere of decentralization called for by David Cullenthal in his This I Do Believe. The Selective Service System is the most instructive example of the effectiveness and essential democracy of a national program in which major policies are laid down at the center and wide discretion is left to the extremities. This truly Federal technique may be one bold answer to the problems and dangers of the leviathan state.

Finally, a word about the Constitution itself. I remember clearly, like the good student he wanted me to be, an observation of my distinguished teacher, Edward S. Corwin, on the nature of a constitution. A constitution, said he, could be looked upon as two things: as a grant of power, and as a catalog of limitations. Now there can be no doubt that the problems of the past two decades, the efforts of President and Congress to solve them, and the refusal of the Court (since 1937) to sit in severe judgment on these efforts, have placed the emphasis in present-day constitutional law on the concept of the Constitution as grant of power. John Marshall expounded the Constitution; we have expanded it. The mighty bulwarks of the constitutional limitationists—the separation of powers, the principle of nondelegation, the equal protection and due process clauses, and the necessary and proper clause—have been flattened and pulverized by the engines of war. I do not lament this turn of events as tearfully as do some teachers of constitutional law, because I honestly do not see how the United States could have met the social and military challenges of these brutal decades without a Government exercising power on a spacious scale. And however varied our answers to the question, "What has become of our Constitution?" no one of us will deny that in the garrison state the emphasis must be on constitutional power rather than on constitutional limitations.

By way of conclusion, may I make my second prediction. I feel as certain as one can feel about such things that our constitutional system will prove equal to the tasks and the threats of the garrison state. The classic textbooks, especially those printed across the water, have always made much of the rigidity and limitations in the American constitutional system. Perhaps the successors to these classics will make much of its

[2] 323 U. S. 214, 248 (1944). The citations of the other three cases are, respectively, 322 U. S. 398 (1944); 333 U. S. 138 (1948); 321 U. S. 414 (1944). I have tried to explain why these precedents are "heavy-handed" in The Supreme Court and the Commander in Chief (Ithaca, 1951), 48–54, 85–87, 98–99, 126–132.

[3] The report of the committee, Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System, was issued as a supplement to the September 1950 issue of the American Political Science Review.

flexibility and powers. Even now our institutions, as I have tried to show, are shaping themselves slowly, carefully, searchingly, pragmatically—in other words, democratically—to the exorbitant pressures of mobilization and cold war. Even now we are recognizing once again the transcendent political wisdom of the framers of the Constitution, who gave us a system with so nice and adjustable a balance between power, which will save us from destruction, and limitations, which will save us from ourselves.

Draft Deferments for College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Port Washington Herald, of Port Washington, Wis., April 4. The question of dividing our society by way of granting deferments to certain classes and groups is certainly not consistent with our American way of life. I have received many protests from the citizens of the Sixth Wisconsin Congressional District and I want to protest vigorously Executive Order 10230 which was issued by the selective service office March 31. It is my earnest hope that the Armed Services Committee will see the fallacy of this order and do everything that they can to correct this injustice. The draft boards of Wisconsin consist of men and women who are most capable in determining in their own areas the deferments necessary to the welfare of our people.

WANTED: AN ANSWER

"President Truman in a sweeping order Saturday authorized draft deferments for hundreds of thousands of college boys whose grades are good or who pass a special aptitude test" (Associated Press).

Why?

To provide future leaders of this Nation? There is no doubt but what this country could stand some trained men at the helm. And neither is there any doubt but what college training is necessary for that task.

But is it fair to defer men who have an opportunity to attend college while those less privileged are to be drafted?

The argument is offered that the test is based on aptitude. If that is true, why can't these youths, who purportedly are the future leaders of the Nation, serve as all other men must do? And if these youths have this alleged superior ability, couldn't they resume their studies after their term of service as was done after the second blood-draining contest?

Or is it possible that life is so much more dear for these elite than for those of the common herd that it must be preserved?

The sweeping order is an ill-concealed attempt to save the skins of those who have the financial opportunities to attend a university. It is a scheme whereby a youth, who is not a complete moron, can purchase immunity from service in the Armed Forces. What provision is made for the student, who through working for funds to finance his education, is forced to drop out one semester to build up his backlog. Regardless of his academic standing, he becomes eligible for induction.

If ever a violation of the Constitution was flaunted in the face of the American public, this order is that instance.

If money can protect some Americans, why not hire the Hessians and protect them all?

Why?

This question will be sent to Senators A. WILEY and J. MCCARTHY and Congressman VAN PELT.

Danger From Sabotage, Espionage, and Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address delivered by Mr. Elliott Earl, former Naval Intelligence Officer, at the joint meeting of the Chelsea and Everett Rotary Clubs of Massachusetts, which appeared in the Chelsea Record, of Chelsea, Mass., on April 10, 1951:

As serious and grim as this problem is, there is no reason why I can't lighten it a little with a story or two. Perhaps I can start out by defining what intelligence is. My notion is that it is knowing with assurance. The day after I made my Bostonian Society talk I had the privilege of addressing the Faculty Club at MIT and my friend and counselor, Dr. Karl T. Compton, favored me with his presence. During lunch the subject of education and intelligence were discussed. I ventured the thought that intelligence might be a product of education. Dr. Compton asked me what I thought education might be. My answer was the incompetent teaching the incomprehensible to the ignorant—and I suppose I should say that this gives you an idea of what I think some of our efforts in connection with intelligence activities have amounted to in recent years in this country.

SPIES HERE NOT CAUGHT

But, seriously, I want you to know about the spies who have transmitted atomic information to Russia, and who have not yet been either arrested or sentenced to death—as they promptly would be if they were operating in Russia.

On March 26, 1951, the Attorney General of the United States and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation appeared before the Kefauver crime committee. They made some very important statements. You probably heard them if you had access to a television set. I think the remarks made by Mr. Hoover were particularly significant. He said that many criminals were engaged in legal enterprises. You will recall that he said it was the duty of local communities and States to see that these characters were cleaned out. You will then recall that when Senator WHERRY pressed him about Communists in business he didn't have a very satisfactory answer.

In general, I agree with Mr. Hoover that this problem of Communist espionage, sabotage, and subversion is a local problem, but when local folks or the FBI or the military intelligence services get irrefutable evidence of espionage it seems to me that the Department of Justice should prosecute.

TELLS ABOUT TYPICAL CELL

If I am right, let me tell you about a Communist espionage cell which was operating at high speed in 1943 in the University of California radiation laboratories. Let me tell you about Comrades M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, and T—they are still free and they are still alive and none in the Government has done anything about them, in spite of the fact that one of the group was observed by the FBI and military intelligence service delivering atomic data to a Russian espionage courier in 1943.

Let's study this espionage cell, maybe we will learn something. Maybe we will then understand why it is necessary to have on the books the Internal Security Act of 1950. It is a pretty stringent piece of law.

ACTIVITIES OF WOMAN

Consider Comrade M, if you will—a woman—and in context with a consideration of her, I would like to have you consider a crate of sardine cans which contained the so-called Little Sports Collection of Bolshevik sabotage manuals written in Spanish, disguised as sports manuals. That is on the outside they looked like directions for playing games—kind of rough games—like blowing up power plants, and taking over communications facilities. You will recall the New York Herald Tribune ran a series on them called The Threat of Red Sabotage. My point is in connection with Comrade M, who is a biologist with slightly Red views, went to Spain in 1937 looking for a man. He was a member of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade who had been killed by the time she arrived. The sad duty of informing Comrade M of the death of her lover fell to Comrade N, then a lieutenant colonel in the brigade. He has many aliases and is one, if not the one most effective espionage agent for the Bolsheviks now running around free in this country. He has been arrested many times but somehow the Government seems unable to hold him, or, pin anything on him. At this time I should tell you that it is pretty well accepted in intelligence circles that the hard core of Bolshevik espionage agents are made up of individuals who served with the Communists in Spain. They are the elite of the Communist espionage apparatus. If you know of any of them keep your eye on them and turn your observations over to the FBI. So Comrade M, the woman of the cell, qualifies as one of the elite Communist spies. Who do you think she married after she returned to this country from Spain? No less than the scientist who helped to assemble the atomic bomb. Don't ever discount the ability of the MVD, the Russian intelligence service. I consider them to be the best in the world today. They don't make many mistakes because when they do they liquidate those who make them.

NOW WIFE OF SCIENTIST

Now, let's consider Comrade N, who met Comrade M in Spain and who is now the wife of one of the scientists who assembled the atomic bomb. Comrade N really is "it" when it comes to espionage, sabotage, and subversion. He was assigned as the special agent in charge of the cell as early as 1940 at the University of California to find out what experiments were being carried on there in the field of nuclear research—the Russian intelligence service having learned as early as 1939, that our knowledge in this field might have military implications.

ATTENDS SCHOOL FOR SABOTAGE

In 1931 Comrade N was sent to Moscow and there he attended the Lenin school for world revolution. There he learned the fine arts of espionage, sabotage, and subversion. Mind you, this was 20 years ago. He is today a postgraduate student of the art of espionage. He is a doctor of spying, sabotage, and subversion. He received his passport from our State Department under fraudulent circumstances.

Taking the short course at the Lenin school, he only spent 2 years there. He then

went to Shanghai where he served his internship in the black arts. Back in the United States in 1934 he served as a "section organizer." Soon he was tapped by the Politburo for service in Spain—and that is where he met Comrade M, the woman in the cell. During his war service in Spain, the Daily Worker ran numerous articles praising his activities. Upon his return to America from Spain he was given a top position in the espionage apparatuses in America. He was given the job of collecting secrets about the atom bomb as it was being developed at the radiation laboratories at Berkeley, Calif. Probably one of the reasons he was given the assignment was because of his intimate knowledge of Comrade M, the woman he had met in Spain, and who became the wife of the scientist who directed the assembly of the atom bomb.

Now, Comrade N had learned his lessons at the Lenin school of sabotage well. His first job was to assemble the espionage cell. N recruited a bright lad whom we will designate as Comrade O. He was the organizer for the cell. It is believed he recruited Comrades P and Q, both brilliant students and physical scientists. Occasionally the group used to meet at Comrade M's home, either through pre-arrangement or by chance. At these meetings Comrade N would sell the idea that the Russians were allies and therefore entitled to know any advantages which might accrue from scientific developments.

NO ARRESTS WERE MADE

About this time the CIC intelligence agents became a little frantic. Here was espionage going on in front of them. Hurried appeals were immediately made to the Department of Justice and State Departments to pick up the cell—the same faulty reasoning as prevailed in the case of Lt. Andrew Roth, the intelligence officer involved in the Amerasia case. Both the Department of Justice and the State Department refused to authorize the arrests.

Imagine, if you can, the heartsickness of the intelligence officers in this case. Here they had the goods. Here they had perhaps the future of western civilization in their hands—and what happened—some strange characters in the Department of Justice and State Department—perhaps enemy agents like Coplon and Hiss—refused to authorize arrests. The Bolsheviks considered the information so important that the third secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington flew to San Francisco soon after its receipt. That is the receipt of the formula in Washington in the Soviet Embassy—and grave Comrade N a handsome cash bonus for his traitorous and nefarious activities.

NO AUTHORITY FOR ARRESTS

Comrade N continued his spying, and our intelligence services, both military and FBI, kept our Government informed day by day as to the activities of this cell. Our security agents at the University of California denied authority to make arrests pleaded with the authorities to discharge the members of the cell from the staff of the radiation laboratory. Was this authority forthcoming? It was not. Russia was our friend. Pro-Communists in our State Department and in the Department of Justice refused to uphold our espionage statutes. And I say to you now that it is not too late to find out who these traitors were and bring them to the bar of justice—and I demand that it be done. The other members of the Communist cell at the University of California have not been prosecuted for wartime espionage. They should be. The House Committee on Un-American Activities in September 1948, recommended that Comrade N be prosecuted under the provisions of the espionage act of 1917—the same act under which the Rosenbergs have been sentenced to death. Why hasn't the Department of Justice done its job?

As late as December 4, 1950, Comrade N and numerous other members of the Berkley Bolshevik espionage cell were cited for contempt of Congress, taken into custody, and later released in $1,500 bail.

INDUSTRIAL SABOTAGE

Three or four months ago I attended a closed conference in New York dealing with this subject. Actually, the subject of the discussion was controlling sabotage and espionage in industry. Most of the informed people in this country on this subject were in attendance at that conference. Because it was a closed conference I cannot report on it. Except this—the responsibility for controlling Communist espionage sabotage and subversion rests with the local management of a business or industry in which Communists may have an interest. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with this policy. There is no one in the stream all the way to the White House who is in a better position to identify Bolshevik spies and saboteurs than the folks who run businesses who may be the target of their activities. If you have any suspicions, turn them in to the FBI. Or if you do not wish to be identified, turn them in to me. I'll see that they get to the FBI without disclosing the source. Now, you may say, "What is a suspicion?" And now I want to pay my respect to a son of Chelsea—a great artist, perhaps the greatest in the use of motion pictures as a medium of expression. I pay tribute to Louis de Rochemont, the creator and editor of the March of Time, and such masterpieces of American life as Lost Boundaries, The House on Ninety-second Street, Whistle at Eatons Corner—real life motion pictures of America—the authentic America—the America that is, with all of the incisive clarity of a de Rochemont publication—and by that I include film production.

DE ROCHEMONT TO PRODUCE SPY FILM

Well, I have good news. Mr. de Rochemont is going to turn in his talent to help to show how the Bolshevik espionage apparatus works in this country. Actually, he is now at work producing a film titled "Turn East on Beacon Street?" He is going to show how an espionage ring actually works right here in Boston, with incidents culled from FBI files. Seventy-five percent of the movie will be filmed in and around Boston, although names and places will be disguised, as I have done in my talks. They are true incidents in connection with the work of a present ring of Bolshevik spies working against American democracy with their headquarters right here in Boston.

Mr. de Rochemont will help you to see how little people—perhaps our neighbors—who ride on busses and perhaps belong to this club, make a fast buck, and then regret it all the rest of their lives, because when they take that buck they become entrapped in the Communist espionage web. A friend persuades them to steal a small part of a secret formula like Comrade N and P at Berkeley, maybe it isn't the atomic bomb, maybe it is only some data on a bateriological test that has been run at Boston University, maybe it is not even classified as a military project. But the results are wanted by the Russians. So maybe your son or a friend says "what harm, I'll give him the answer, besides I need the money." Then when your son or your friend is approached again, what happens? He is ordered to do something—this time a little more dangerous—a little closer to treason—so he refuses. Then the MVD makes itself felt. He is told to do it. He has no choice—otherwise he will be turned in as a Russian spy. He does what he is told, and thereafter there is no questioning what he will do. He has become a traitor—an active agent for the MVD, the Russian intelligence service.

The Russian intelligence service is the slickest bunch of confidence men on the face of the earth. The reason the public does not realize this is because they do not get caught. When they get caught, they have outlived their usefulness. Coplon's boy friend, the Russian engineer who worked for the United Nations secretariat is no doubt dead now. I guess I won't say anything about Coplon—there isn't time and I do not like to get too exercised about this problem.

I am telling you now, that the danger from the atom bomb is very real and present, but it is only half the story. The other half is the danger from sabotage, espionage and subversion, which can do just as much damage to our industrial production.

This form of attack is considered by many who are informed to be much more likely than bombing. Plants engaged on defense contracts are considered to be prime targets. The range of activity of saboteurs will be wide and very difficult to detect—from damaging our utilities to tampering with the control mechanism of our production, and even creating conditions to damage wholesale our personnel engaged on defense work.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Back of the Brannan Plan," by Louis Bromfield, which appeared in the April issue of the Freeman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK OF THE BRANNAN PLAN

(By Louis Bromfield)

The Brannan plan, along with much of Mr. Truman's Fair Deal program, appears to be dead. Its revival or the appearance on the horizon of something like it might well occur if inflation continues to a point where the national economy breaks down and a depression follows. This, of course, is exactly what Stalin is waiting for, along with the Communists in this country and their fellow travelers in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere in our bureaucratic structure. Not only would we be in for more intricate and comprehensive agricultural supports and regimentation, but we should find at once that the Communists were up to their old tricks. There would probably be a whole new set of borers from within like those who in the thirties infested our Department of Agriculture and made their way into other divisions of the Government.

Therefore, it might be worth while to look into the past in order better to understand the future. The bag of tricks would probably be the same.

The story of the infiltration of Government agencies is not half told as yet. And beyond it, there were other elements which confused the situation during the thirties. One of them was the fact that John L. Lewis and the CIO were welcoming the Communists into the fold of organized labor and condoning, if not cooperating with, their operations within government. John L. eventually

found that you cannot play with Commies, but it took the CIO much longer to repudiate them and clean house.

For a long time certain leaders of labor have cherished two dreams. The first is to turn the whole Government into a Socialist operation; the second, to bring about an alliance between organized labor and the farmers—which alone could make it possible to attain the first ambition. The attempt on the part of labor leaders to organize everybody is not merely sociological and benevolent; it is also political, particularly in the minds of leaders like Walter Reuther and apparently, of late, even like Philip Murray. This ambition suited the Communists. It was the same trick by which they had duped the organized labor forces of other nations and then taken over. So we got a curious pattern of the Communists attempting to use organized labor, and organized labor thinking it was using the Communists, while both were bent upon using the farmer together with his great political influence.

As a rule the farmer isn't easy to use. He is an independent cuss who doesn't like Government intervention and hates anything connected with socialism. In every country where the Communists have taken power, the landowners and even the prosperous peasants and tenants represent the stiffest opposition to the regime. But to the Communist, control of the landowner and farmer is first on the schedule for the revolution—if the farmer does not raise enough food the rest of the nation does not eat, and a counterrevolution can occur.

John L. Lewis with his catch-all District 50 tried again and again to organize the farmers into a force cooperating with labor in the role of stooge, and failed. Here enter the Farmers' Union, Lee Pressman, and a very smart gentleman called James Patton. Together with certain labor leaders they decided to set up their own farmers' organization not upon a union basis but ostensibly upon the basis of the already sturdily established Grange and the Farm Bureau, both of which had steadfastly refused to be taken in either by the blandishments or the threats of organized labor and of the Communists lurking in the background.

In their corner, the labor leaders, spurred by the clever Mr. Pressman (who recently confessed that he had been a member of the Communist Party) and abetted by Mr. Patton, set out to split up the farmers and capture them by surprise. This again was a sound Communist pattern. The only thing lacking was the tools. It was quite impossible to penetrate and capture the two great farmers' organizations, so they virtually invented a stooge called the Farmers' Union. Until that time the organization had had a kind of lingering existence; it still has today save for the brazen voice of Mr. Patton, which makes it sound far more important than it is, and the sympathies of Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, who was declared the special "darling" of the Farmers' Union during its 1950 convention in Denver.

The capture of the Farmers' Union was a comparatively easy operation. Early in its career the headquarters were moved into the offices of Communists Lem Harris and Harold Ware, the latter an acknowledged, violent leader trained in Moscow. But that was not the only headquarters it used. When you wanted to contact some official of the Farmers' Union, it was often necessary to go to the headquarters of the CIO to find him, generally in Jim Carey's office. At that time Carey was not the ardent enemy of the Communists that he became when they took over his own United Electrical Workers and threw him out of office. The whole business in those days was a triple play from the Communists to the CIO to the Farmers' Union and back again.

It is probable that the move-in on the Farmers' Union was made on Communist advice, since the organization represented on the whole the farmers of the lowest economic status. Its membership is still made up largely of sharecroppers and tenant farmers, and it prospers not at all in the more solid agricultural areas or among the more successful farmers who feed the Nation. In such an organization it was possible to apply the old Communist technique of appealing to class hatred to divide the farmers, a technique still used by Mr. Patton and his friends.

During this period a double picture was presented. On the one hand there was a CIO-Communist-guided Farmers' Union; on the other, Communists and fellow-travelers working simultaneously inside the Government and notably in the Department of Agriculture. These inside operators were all in divisions set up to impose regimentation in one form or another upon the farmer, or to court him with bribes and free payments and political favoritism. There were the wise guys, like Lee Pressman and Alger Hiss, who eventually outsmarted themselves, the soft-headed sentimentalists of the Henry Wallace type who looked upon Moscow as the New Jerusalem, and the bright young men who came to town, often from fresh-water colleges, and overnight were given positions of great authority—not upon any grounds of ability or experience but simply because they were devoted to New Deal precepts.

In all of this the Henry Wallaces and the bright young incompetents were a great help. And when Chester C. Davis cleaned house in the Department (a scared Wallace lacked the courage and hid away in Virginia), a great troop of this element resigned and followed the guilty ones into the street. Most of them, like their leaders, simply moved over into other Government departments to continue their sabotage. But the purge was a great setback to the whole plan of taking over the farmers either by guile or by force, either through the Department or through the stalking horse of the Farmers' Union.

It is noteworthy that with Henry Wallace began the whole policy of taking into the Department all sorts of people who knew little or nothing about either agriculture or agricultural economics. Until this time it had always been assumed that men and women in the Department should have some knowledge which equipped them to aid the farmer; but with the establishment of countless New Deal agencies and bureaus, outsiders streamed in until 90 percent or more in the New Deal bureaus, even down to those who filled minor positions, were Communists, fellow travelers, or at least pinks. Mr. Pressman, the confessed leader, Mr. Chambers, and Miss Bentley, have testified to this. At that time or even today it would have been difficult indeed for the Communists to recruit agricultural authorities or politicians who had any sympathy for communism—except from the Farmers' Union.

In referring to the whole group that infested the Department of Agriculture, including Pressman and a half dozen other leaders who were fired, Chester Davis said with notable moderation that "their object was to remake our economic system and they would subordinate every other consideration to that end." Obviously the interests of the farmer and even of agriculture itself were of little or no importance to them.

In several cases the leaders actually attempted to carry off or destroy the records in their offices, which were, of course, Government property. A lot of their underlings resigned with them. However, a great number of those involved in one way or another in the infiltration remained with the Department and are still there, using pressures and influences toward the socialization of agriculture and the capture of the farmer. This is well known and accepted in Washington. All of these bureaucrats are in the administration bureaus set up under the New Deal and the Fair Deal. You will find none of them in the research bureaus, the extension service, or in any of the legitimate agricultural bureaus.

It is this group, an offshoot of the old infiltration, who together with James Patton of the Farmers' Union and a couple of other outsiders, concocted the Brannan plan of noisome and ill-fated history. When you take the Brannan plan apart all the past influences become evident, even to the influence of the CIO through its perpetual ambition to take the farmers into camp.

The intent of the very first principle of the plan is childishly apparent. It would lower the cost of food to the consumer while guaranteeing a profitable price to the farmer, with the taxpayer—a faceless, nameless fellow whom everybody kicks around—paying the difference. This was calculated to bring together organized labor and the organized farmer, while making everybody else happy. By tying two such powerful groups into one force it would guarantee complete political power to the organized labor group, which could then set up a labor government along Socialist lines, perhaps with some Communist trimmings. The plan deliberately left out the big farmer and the highly prosperous farmer, which meant in most cases the better kind of farmer. In other words, the rich farmer became a sort of kulak; the next stage might well be confiscation and division of his land. The regimentation of the farmer proposed in the Brannan plan was a bureaucratic nightmare and, once enforced, it would leave the farmer bound and tied, a captive and a victim.

How much Mr. Brannan actually had to do with the plan has never become clear. His is the prime example of the bureaucratic career. Originally a not-too-successful lawyer in Denver, he was one of those bright young men who came to Washington with the New Deal. Finally he found a berth as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and when Clinton Anderson resigned was made Secretary to keep the seat warm for a political appointment after the Presidential election. Here he exercised a talent for edging upward and making his position secure. When most big Democrats were lukewarm about Mr. Truman's chances, Mr. Brannan campaigned day and night and made himself generally indispensable. His reward was the Secretariat. How much Mr. Brannan knows of agriculture and what sympathies he has toward the farmer are questions which remain wide open, to put it mildly. What he did produce out of the hat, whether on his own or as a stooge, was a first-class socialist proposal designed to take the farmer into camp and deliver him over to organized labor. And all of this was the natural outcome of that triple play back in the thirties.

The triple play is still in operation, although the CIO has cleared its skirts of the Communists and would prefer to forget the days when it played ball with them. Mr. Pressman went on to become secretary and legal advisor to the CIO and was the guiding spirit in the organization of its Political Action Committee, whose campaign turned out so disastrously in the last elections. Mr. Patton continues to be perpetual president of the Farmers' Union, and brought Secretary Brannan to its 1950 convention to be canonized as a patron saint of the radical minority farmers' organization.

The program adopted at that convention, a document written with dialetic skill and shrewdness, places great emphasis on the family farm. It neglects to say that many a large and prosperous farm is a family farm. It neglects to say with a curious ignorance of American agriculture, that the size of a farm has little to do with whether or not it is a family farm. In the Southwest 50,000 acres may be a family farm. In other areas I have known family operations on a few acres to produce incomes in excess of $100,000 a year.

The Brannan plan and the purpose of the Farmers' Union is avowedly directed at the redistribution of large farms and their division into small farms. The program implies that everybody should have a small farm, whether the unit is efficient or not. This, of course, is the first step to be taken when Soviet Russia invades a country. The land is divided arbitrarily into small holdings; then, after it has been proved that this cannot work, the next step is to establish collective farms, dispossessing the small owners and putting them all under the direction of the state.

The published program puts great emphasis on youth camps and recreation camps where special study can be given to specified problems. This, again, is a page directly out of the Communist book. It is now well known, even by the labor unions through sad experience, that such camps become centers of intensified Communist indoctrination.

Strongly urged is the formation of farmers' committees so designed as to "build a direct channel of administrative and policy communication between farmers' committees at the grass roots and the Secetary of Agriculture in Washington." What is this but the local Soviet? A little further on we read:

"The function of the local committees should be broadened so as to include responsibility in its area for all action programs of the Department. In some instances there are statutory difficulties to this arrangement as in the case of the soil-conservation district boards of supervisors. For purposes of coordination, farmers' committees should include members representative of the programs for which it has no statutory responsibility. [The object is to give farmers one committee to deal with instead of many]."

The matter in brackets are mine, but the meaning is clear enough. Plausible, but out of what book did it come? This is followed by:

"We recognize, however, that our legislative efforts must be fortified with political action. Family farming must be defended at the ballot box. Candidates must be judged, elected, and defeated on a basis of their records in light of the Farmers' Union program or our legislative efforts will be hampered."

Innocent? Read some of the propaganda addressed to the peasants when the division of land occurred in Poland. The wording is almost identical. Still further we read:

"We deplore the continuation in peacetime of so gigantic a Military Establishment as the United States now maintains. We take this position not only on economic grounds but because the existence of so large a military class is always a threat to civil government. On the same grounds, we restate our opposition to universal military training and to further extension of the Selective Service System."

Why should what is assumed to be a purely agricultural organization make such a careful point of cutting down our military forces? The next follows naturally:

"We believe that disarmament in this respect (the hydrogen and atomic bombs) and in all others must begin at once, and that the key to atomic disarmament lies in action through the UN for the destruction of all bombs, an end to further work of any kind in the development of these weapons, and the simultaneous imposition of a rigid control and inspection system."

Very plausible again and something which any citizen would advocate, but why is such emphasis put upon it by what is ostensibly a farmers' organization? And what nation is the only one in the UN which objects to any system of rigid control and inspection?

A dozen other passages could be quoted which appear equally odd in the program of a farmers' organization. (Incidentally, the Nebraska branch of the Farmers' Union refused to endorse the program and withdrew.) Naturally support is given not only to the Brannan plan but to every bureau or proposed bureau which tends to socialize the Nation and to concentrate power in Washington and especially in the Department of Agriculture. It is not difficult to see why Secretary Brannan and the Farmers Union love each other.

Recently Secretary Brannan advised the appointment of James Patton to the advisory committee on agricultural controls appointed by Secretary of Defense Symington, although Allan Kline, president of the largest and most representative of the farmers' organizations, the National Farm Bureau, was passed over entirely. The appointment of Murray Lincoln of the Ohio Farm Bureau Insurance Co. to a post on the committee was merely slippery deception. Mr. Lincoln, once secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau, has no connection whatever with the National Farm Bureau, and only vaguely with the Ohio Farm Bureau through its subsidiary insurance company. He has always been looked upon with disfavor by the national organization because of his radicalism. In the vicious campaign of labor to defeat Senator TAFT in Ohio, Mr. Lincoln, alone among those having any connection, even remote, with the Farm Bureau, came out publicly for TAFT's opponent and gained the name of "would-be Judas goat" of the farmers. Although he represents no group of farmers save perhaps some of the minority in the Farmers' Union, Secretary Symington selected him to regulate the farmers, along with Patton, who represents the smallest and weakest of the farm organizations.

The third appointee was Albert Goss, head of the National Grange, a fine man but not a fighter like Kline of the Farm Bureau, or Patton. Mr. Goss died recently, and at this writing no appointment has been made to fill his place. So the farmers of America are left to the doubtfully tender mercies of Jim Patton, Murray Lincoln, and Secretary Brannan. This may mean that for the moment Patton and Brannan have got what they want, but it is mighty poor politics and may account to a large extent for the overwhelming defeat of the candidates who advocated the Brannan plan. The people do eventually smell things out, and the farmer is not so dumb as the "liberal" bureaucrats in Washington would like to believe. In short, Mr. Brannan has become a serious liability to Truman and the national Democratic organization, both of whom ostensibly believed not so long ago that the Brannan plan was going to take in everybody and pave the way for a Labor-Socialist government. It may just be that this is another instance of the "wise guys" outsmarting themselves.

Senator MCCARTHY has been loud and perhaps rash in his wholesale denunciations of the Communist and Socialist influences within the Government, but there is a considerable quantity of truth in his accusations. The whole truth is difficult to unearth because of the devious ways in which the Communists operate, because of the cooperation given them by now disappointed and bitter bureaucrats, and because much of the story goes back into the thirties. From the Amerasia case and the State Department's China policy through to the Brannan plan, the old influences are still operating, and as the Nation faces crisis after crisis, the whole web-like structure of influences may well prove even more tenuous than it has been up to now.

Contributions to Public Health Legislation by the Late Senator Virgil M. Chapman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article paying tribute to the late Senator Virgil M. Chapman, published in the Food and Drug Review for April 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

Senator Virgil M. Chapman's tragic death on March 8 brought many splendid tributes to his public service during a distinguished legislative career. To these, Deputy Commissioner Charles W. Crawford adds the following comments on Senator Chapman's outstanding contribution to the history of Federal food and drug regulation:

"Because of Virgil Chapman's great modesty, he did not gain the public recognition he deserved for his vitally important role in enacting the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. He often told me he felt that this was his greatest contribution during his long career in Congress.

"When the bill which eventually became our present law was passed by the Senate in 1935 and went to the House, it was referred to a subcommittee of which Mr. Chapman was chairman. It was loaded with emasculating amendments forced into it by the patent medicine industry over the heroic opposition of Senator Royal S. Copeland, its sponsor in the upper House. The industry group was elated in the belief that they had such command of the situation that they could either compel the enactment of a new law that would give less consumer protection than the Food and Drugs Act of 1906, or at least prevent new legislation of any kind.

"But they had not reckoned on facing a man like Chapman. Between sessions of his committee he worked far into the nights reading publications and records and talking with persons familiar with the problems. Industry witnesses before the committee found themselves in trouble when they tried to distort facts or gloss over those unfavorable to their objectives. Always courteous and good-humored, his cross-questioning was as keen and skillfully directed as a surgeon's scalpel. It laid bare for all to see the greed and disregard for human welfare that underlay so much of the opposition to a better law.

"This hearing turned the tide. As the facts Chapman exposed became more generally known, real progress set in. He continued his active support until the measure was finally passed. He was responsible for including a highly important provision during the last committee meeting before the bill went to the floor for passage. This was section 301 (k), which asserts control over articles received from interstate sources until sale to the ultimate consumer. Chapman aided in writing the Miller amendment of 1948 which broadened and consolidated this control.

"Virgil Chapman's place is secure as a distinguished legislator, statesman, and humanitarian. The public generally, and

particularly we who enforce food and drug legislation, owe him an everlasting debt. We who were privileged to know him and work with him have lost a dearly beloved friend."

The Atomic Secrets Spy Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation has followed with tremendous interest the historic legal decision in New York which saw the sentencing of two individuals to death for the first time in American history by a civil court on the charge of having committed treason during wartime.

One could dwell at great length on the meaning of that decision, and on the historic verdict rendered by Federal Judge Irving Kaufman, after what must have been, I am sure, much soul searching. But I think that better than any comments which I could make, the Judge's own address to the convicted traitors speaks eloquently for itself. His remarks may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6 on page A1835, as reproduced by request of Congressman LOUIS HELLER, of New York.

I was particularly interested in this case because it had been my pleasure, as ranking Republican member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to support the confirmation of Judge Kaufman, who, although of a different political faith than my own, came to us with the sort of outstanding qualifications which I have sought for all nominees to the bench. Coincidentally, in fact, the United States prosecuting attorney in this case, Hon. Irving Saypol, had also received my support, although here, again, we are of different political faiths; but his record, too, spoke ably for itself.

So at this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following material:

(a) An Associated Press news story carried in newspapers of April 6 regarding the precedent-making nature of this sentence;

(b) An editorial carried in the April 6 issue of the New York Daily Mirror expressing patriotic sentiments which I think will be of interest to every American; and

(c) The text of a Milwaukee Journal editorial of the same date.

I particularly commend the reading of the New York Mirror editorial to those folks who might, unfortunately, have some bit of un-American racial or religious prejudice in their systems. This editorial, I feel, may help to cleanse such prejudice from them, and make them better Americans.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From a New York dispatch of the Associated Press of April 6, 1951]

SPIES, TRAITORS, SABOTEURS—DEATH SENTENCE FOR ROSENBERGS IS WITHOUT PRECEDENT IN CIVILIAN COURTS, HISTORIAN REPORTS

The sentencing of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, both citizens, for espionage adds a new page to American history. The penalty has never been imposed on a spy in this country by a civilian court.

Dr. Allan Nevins, Columbia University professor of history, author and twice a Pulitzer prize winner, said that no death sentences, either in peacetime or wartime, have been handed down by the civil courts against an American since the Government enacted its Espionage Act in 1917. This does not count executions ordered by wartime courts-martial.

Under the older laws on treason and sedition, he said, several death sentences have been rendered but not carried out. He said he recalled no major Federal civil court case in which an American traitor paid with his life.

However, in a famous case on the eve of the Civil War, Abolitionist John Brown was hanged in 1859 for treason against the State of Virginia. This was not a Federal case. Brown was convicted in Virginia of murder and treason in fomenting a slave uprising and leading an attack on the Federal arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Va.

Principals in other celebrated cases of treason and conspiracy noted by Nevins include:

"John Fries, an American agitator and opponent of direct taxation, who led the so-called Fries rebellion in Pennsylvania in 1799. He was convicted of treason by a Federal jury, and sentenced to death, but was pardoned by President John Adams. Aaron Burr, who after his close defeat by Thomas Jefferson for the Presidency, plotted to set up an independent government in the Southwest, with New Orleans as capital. He was charged with treason, but acquitted after a 6-month trial at Richmond, Va., in 1807."

In the Civil War period, Lambdin P. Milligan, an Indiana editor, was sentenced to death in 1866 by a military court for treason, insurrection, and giving aid to the Confederacy. However, the Supreme Court freed him, ruling that the military courts had no jurisdiction, even though the State was under martial law, because civil courts were still functioning. Nevins said this case has "always been regarded as a great vindication of civil liberties in this country."

Several other persons were arrested on treason charges after the Civil War, including President Jefferson Davis of the Confederacy, but were later freed under a general amnesty.

The most famous American traitor was Benedict Arnold, Revolutionary War general, who funneled information to the British and later joined the British forces against the Colonies. Afterward, he fled to England. "If he had been caught, he would have been tried by a court martial and put to death," Nevins said.

Most noted cases in which military courts recently have imposed death penalties on Americans on such charges are those of William C. Colepaugh and Herbert Hans Haupt.

Haupt, 22, a German-born naturalized citizen, was one of six Nazi saboteurs executed in 1942 after they landed on the Atlantic coast from a submarine, were caught and tried by a military commission. The others were Germans.

Colepaugh, 26, of Niantic, Conn., was tried by a court martial as a Nazi spy, and sentenced in 1945 to hang. President Truman later commuted the sentence to life imprisonment.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 6, 1951]

ORCHESTRA OF 8,000,000

We wish to congratulate three fine Americans of our city: Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who presided over the court which tried the atom-bomb spies, and United States Attorney Irving H. Saypol and his assistant, Roy Cohn, who prosecuted and convicted those spies, Julius Rosenberg, Ethel Rosenberg, and Morton Sobell.

Some bigots will say the three spies are Jews and will denounce all Jews. They will forget to say that the judge, the prosecutor and his assistant who did such a magnificent jobs for America, are also Jews.

The unfairness of drawing general conclusions from particular instances; the indecency of fixing a universal stereotype from a bad type is here exemplified.

It would be like saying that all the fine Americans of Italian descent in our city are like Frank Costello or Joe Adonis, rather than Arturo Toscanini or our Mayor Vincent Impellitteri.

It would be like saying that all the hard-working, decent Negroes in our city are like Paul Robeson, instead of like Ralph Bunche or Jackie Robinson.

It would be like saying that all the Americans in our city of Anglo-Saxon stock are like Alger Hiss, instead of like Bishop Sherrill.

It would be like saying that all Irishmen are like "Cockeye" Dunn, instead of like John Coleman and General Rosie O'Donnell.

There is no logic in drawing false conclusions from a minimum of facts. Who dares say this Rosenberg creature is typical of our citizens of Jewish persuasion, when against him can be pitted millions of Americans such as Bernard M. Baruch, Bernard Gimbel, Jesse Isidor Straus, Barney Balaban, Admiral Lewis Strauss, Chaplain Joshua Goldberg, Rudolph Halley, and so many others who come quickly to mind?

We raise this very sensitive question because our city is the home of citizens of fairly immediate foreign origin. Of course, we were all of foreign origin at one time, and the history of our city shows that when a group became "old-timers" they tended to look down on the "newcomers."

In a list of the white population in 1940 whose mother tongue was other than English, there were 429,000 Germans, 896,000 Italians, 163,000 Poles, 149,000 Russians, 121,000 Spaniards, and 911,000 who spoke Yiddish, a Germanic dialect used by Jews. Altogether this list included more than 26 varieties of "mother tongues" for a total of 3,000,000 persons.

Undoubtedly, during the past 10 years, this list has decreased, for the pattern is constant in our city, namely, that by the third generation the process of relating the "newcomer" to America completes itself and the "newcomers" become "old-timers."

But we are not a melting pot, as Israel Zangwill so graphically described us. We are more like a symphony orchestra, in which men play various instruments, violins, cellos, flutes, oboes, trumpets, drums, and so on. Each plays differently; yet out of their differences comes the glorious Beethoven's Fifth or even George Gershwin's Rhapsody in Blue.

Harmony means neither sameness nor monotony. It does mean cooperation, self-discipline, and teamwork.

Of course, there will sometimes be a devil who plays out of tune and out of time. He has to be straightened out or kicked out.

But because there is one sour note we do not tear down Carnegie Hall.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 6, 1951]

IT IS A LIFE AND DEATH MATTER

There was no sentence other than death justified in the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, convicted atom bomb spies.

In ordering the execution of the Rosenbergs Judge Irving R. Kaufman made clear something that needs to be impressed upon every American—that betrayal of our country in these perilous days is far more serious than merely engaging in an interesting conspiratorial pastime.

It is, as the court said, "crime worse than murder." The Rosenbergs plotted, in time of war, against their own Nation. From time immemorial there has been no more serious crime.

We still have too many misguided persons who seem to feel that it is still possible to play at pro-Russianism and excuse it as juvenile idealism. If the Rosenberg case helps make it clear that the struggle between the free world and Soviet imperialism is in fact a life and death matter, it will do the Nation a great service.

Strengthening of the Government's Loyalty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "To Plug a Loyalty Loophole," from Tuesday's Washington Star. The editorial relates to the bill (S. 1273) which I introduced last week as an essential first step in strengthening the Government's loyalty program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO PLUG A LOYALTY LOOPHOLE

A serious loophole in the Government's loyalty program would be plugged if Congress approved an amendment to the Hatch Act proposed by Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan. The amendment would bar from Federal employment any worker about whose loyalty there is reasonable doubt. Had such a rule been in effect when the case of William Remington was before the Loyalty Review Board it is highly improbable that he would have been cleared. Board officials have disclosed that they had serious doubts about Remington's loyalty, but felt that the wording of an Executive order did not permit dismissal.

It was the Remington case which moved the Loyalty Review Board to request President Truman to change the order so as to give the Government, not a suspected employee, the benefit of any doubt. The Board pointed out that under the original loyalty order issued by President Roosevelt in 1942 the doubt could be resolved in favor of the Government. That order authorized the firing or rejection of any Federal employee when "there is a reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the Government of the United States." When the postwar loyalty program was instituted, however, the wording was modified so as to require a showing that "reasonable grounds exist for a belief that the person is disloyal to the Government of the United States." The Review Board placed great stress on the "is," contending that this meant that even if the Board had positive proof of disloyalty a year or a month ago, but lacked evidence of the employee's disloyalty at the time of the inquiry, he must be cleared. It was under this interpretation that the Review Board overruled a Department of Commerce loyalty board which had recommended Remington's dismissal.

J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, made an oblique reference to this loyalty situation during his testimony recently before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Questioned about the presence in Washington of 210 known Communists and about the possibility that some of them may be in the Government service, Mr. Hoover commented that the FBI passes all pertinent information along to loyalty boards, but that the boards operate under the policy that unless an individual can be proved to be a Communist he cannot be denied Government employment. He added that the Communists "are not carrying cards any more and they have no membership lists."

Chairman Hiram Bingham of the Loyalty Review Board is right in holding that it should not be necessary to produce a membership card in order to oust an employee about whose loyalty there is a "reasonable doubt." The Ferguson amendment to the Hatch Act would give the loyalty boards full authority to protect the Government in such instances. The Remington case ought to convince Congress of the wisdom of adopting the amendment.

General MacArthur, American Martyr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, since President Truman announced to the world early Wednesday morning that General MacArthur was being relieved of his Far East command, Americans have been voicing their indignation. My office has been deluged with telegrams and letters voicing disapproval of this arbitrary action of the President.

A few apologists for the Acheson policy of appeasement toward the Communists in China would have us believe that the people are supporting President Truman's action. If the reaction of the people of the Twelfth District of California is any criterion, I do not believe that this is true. Information has reached my office to the effect that the entire west coast is aroused and is seething with indignation. The people have construed President Truman's speech of Wednesday night as further evidence that the ill-advised policy of the past few years which has caused our Nation to suffer 60,000 casualties in Korea will be continued. President Truman has shown that he still places a high value on the judgment of Dean Acheson and his confederates in the State Department. The following article which appeared in the New York Times of April 11 will give the members of this body some idea of what folks think out on the west coast:

DISMISSAL ANGERS SOUTH CALIFORNIA—TRUMAN HANGED IN EFFIGY AT SAN GABRIEL—LOS ANGELES COUNCIL HALTS IN SORROW

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., April 11.—Protests against President Truman's dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur flared through southern California today and were capped in many cases by demands for impeachment of the President.

In San Gabriel the President was hanged in effigy. In the Los Angeles City Hall the city council adjourned "in sorrowful contemplation of the political assassination" of General MacArthur. Mayor Bowron said he was greatly concerned, agitated, and discouraged.

Automobiles suddenly appeared on downtown streets plastered with signs: "Oust President Truman."

Lifelong Democrats joined Republicans in the complaints.

CALLS TO PAPERS CONTINUOUS

Telephone calls to newspapers began immediately after the firing was announced. They continued all Tuesday night, all day today and on into the night again.

Thousands asked for information on how to write and wire their Representatives and Senators KNOWLAND and NIXON. Others added they were sending additional telegrams direct to the White House.

Nine out of ten were vehemently critical of President Truman's action. Occasionally one voice in the deluge would rise to defend him.

Clergymen, diplomats, and businessmen joined unidentified workmen—veterans and relatives of servicemen now in Korea—in castigating the President.

"I am thoroughly incensed," said Byron C. Hanna, former president of both the chamber of commerce and the Southern California Businessmen's Association. "Of all the series of blunders this administration has committed this is the most calamitous one for the American people.

"The administration seems to have discharged General MacArthur because he wanted to protect the lives of American soldiers fighting in Korea. The administration didn't want him to do that.

"I think President Truman should be impeached."

James Roosevelt, unsuccessful candidate for Governor last November, said he hoped the debate over the President's action "will not resolve into a political dogfight."

"The President is the Commander in Chief," Mr. Roosevelt said. "If he felt any commander in the field was not carrying out the policy of the Government, just as Abraham Lincoln found in the Civil War, it was his duty to remove him.

"Nevertheless, having served under General MacArthur's command in the Pacific, I feel from a military point of view he is one of our greatest generals."

LEGION OFFICER SHOCKED

Lewis K. Gough, of Pasadena, national vice commander of the American Legion said: "I know that the amazing news of the removal of one of the greatest military leaders of all time will stun and shock the 4,000,000 members of the American Legion and its auxiliary.

"While serving as commander in chief in the Pacific General MacArthur's voice should have been heard and listened to influencing proper global strategy. That it was not listened to is largely due to lack of requisite moral courage on the part of the United Nations.

"His unfortunate removal will jeopardize the United Nations position in the far-eastern theater and undoubtedly will have shocking effect on our officers and troops there."

Patrick J. Cooney, lifelong Democrat and father of five sons who entered military service: "MacArthur repeatedly refused to obey his Commander in Chief and refused to follow the United Nations' policy.

"This very momentous decision required great strength of character but was necessary if we are to preserve our governmental system set up by our founding fathers. History will record that President Truman was right."

Assistant Attorney General William V. O'Connor said "whenever any military commander in the field is unable to give loyal and wholehearted support to the policies formulated by the United States and the United Nations, in the time of such a crisis, the President as Commander in Chief has no alternative but to relieve that commander."

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this newspaper article which cites the statements of many prominent figures including Mr. Lewis K. Gough, National vice commander of the American Legion, I have received many telegrams from people in all walks of life expressing disgust at this latest Administration bungle. The following are examples of the type of telegrams I have received:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Representative PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

For heaven's sake get this man Truman out of the White House before he bungles us into oblivion.

H. T. GATES,
DITTO, INC.,

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

MacArthur affair is travesty of justice, spineless leadership by Truman, and despicable foreign intimidation.

J. E. COBERLY, Jr.

POMONA, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Bitterly protest MacArthur's removal. Obviously beginning of appeasement Red China. Are we headed for another Munich. Above wired NIXON, KNOWLAND.

F. BAKER WALLACE.

PASADENA, CALIF.

Representative PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Start impeachment proceedings immediately against Acheson for gross incompetence. His only success has been in getting rid of his competent opposition. And against Truman for unlimited graft and corruption in office.

ROBERT P. POTTENGER.
HELEN C. POTTENGER.
ROLAND C. POWERS.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Must honestly urge you do everything in your power impeach Truman. Dismissal MacArthur climax of most disgraceful administration our history. As a Knight of Columbus you know we are obligated to do things constitutionally. Fear two-bit ward heeler will deliver us to Communist if allowed to complete term of office.

EARL DAVIS.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

My organization very incensed over the MacArthur discharge. This critical development seems to demand that Congress and Senate take immediate steps about the State Department. How can we help? Having meeting Thursday morning. Please wire instructions.

HELEN WYSONG,
President, San Gabriel Valley Republican Women.

SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAT: Phones been ringing since MacArthur fired. Everyone irate. What can be done?

JACK MOORE.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.

Representatitve PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Replacement of General MacArthur is last straw. How long is Congress going to allow Truman and his British confederate to imperil our country. Suggest immediate impeachment proceedings against Truman and immediate withdrawal from UN. Acheson should be forced to resign at once. Enough is enough.

JAMES AND HAZEL RABBITT.

BALDWIN PARK, CALIF.

Representative PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

What can an American do to have any effect on a President who puts appeasement of communism above the lives of the American boys fighting in Korea.

MRS. DOROTHY CLARK.
OTIS CLARK.
IVA LEE RUDD.

SAN MARINO, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Entire Twelfth District and San Gabriel Valley in uproar over MacArthur's dismissal. Suggest resolution to remove Acheson and restore MacArthur to duty. Please get in and fight.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR F. SIMPSON.

DUARTE, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to impeach Truman for selling out the country by firing MacArthur.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN R. CLARK.

PASADENA, CALIF.

PATRICK HILLINGS, CONGRESSMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Relieving MacArthur of his far eastern command is the final slap in the face of the citizens of America and to a great man who has truly dedicated his life to his country. I recommend that you do all in your power to curb the action of a President and State Department who are responsible for the stupid policy.

ROBERT H. BENSINGER.

SOUTH PASADENA, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

We feel our foreign policy is in a complete state of confusion and that the dismissal of General MacArthur is a grave mistake and merely adds to the confusion.

FISK & MASON.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

We cannot find words to express our disappointment, disgust, and apprehension at removal of General MacArthur. Suggest everything possible be done to correct situation.

TEMPLE CITY REPUBLICAN CLUB.

SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Impeach President Truman and get rid of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Mrs. EDNA S. DILLON.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest ouster MacArthur. Demand his full reinstatement or impeachment Truman. Clean out State Department.

DOROTHY J. WOLFF.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

To save our great country, impeach Truman and Acheson.

GEORGIA MAXEY.

POMONA, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Now is the time for all good Congressmen to come to the aid of their country and impeach the White House haberdasher. Let's do it.

F. C. FARWELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The Honorable P. J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

It is imperative that the blundering Truman be impeached before he completely surrenders these United States to communism.

ROLAND SEIDLER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to add my protest to the ill-advised action taken by Mr. Truman. General MacArthur has a glorious record of 48 years' service to his country. Most Americans appreciate what MacArthur is doing, even if Mr. Truman does not. Please help put a stop to any further playing into Communist hands.

WM. H. SIMON.

AZUSA, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

I think the action of our President in regard to MacArthur is outrageous. Won't you please do something about it? Everyone with whom I have come in contact is deeply resentful.

WILLIAM MICHAEL ANDERSON.

WHITTIER, CALIF.

Hon. PAT HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Truman's action removing General MacArthur arousing entire west coast in protest. We have last last trace of confidence in Truman, Acheson, and Marshall. We urge you vigorously oppose this drift to appeasement. Devote all energy to removing from office this totally incompetent President whose leadership we renounce.

MORRIS FRANKLIN EUCHARISSON.

COVINA, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

MacArthur incident biggest of the many administration blunders. America has been sold out to the Communists thru this act. Bring our boys home from every foreign country. Impeach Truman and Acheson.

TRACY SKELTON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Congressman PAT HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Eighty-four of my fellow workers at the plant demand impeachment of Truman and Acheson. Can't something be done.

R. J. PIERCE.

MONROVIA, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest strongly dismissal of MacArthur. Urge your support to dismiss Acheson and Marshall. Watch England. If possible, impeach Truman.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES E. ATWOOD.

POMONA, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

MacArthur case last straw. Demand you support immediate impeachment Truman and Acheson. Demand MacArthur address Congress.

R. V. BOLTON.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

How long, yes, how long are you all going to sit by and watch our country being handed over by Truman, Acheson, Marshall, et al.? I ask you.

HEDDA HOPPER.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

We are firmly convinced Harry Truman is not the man for President. Has fallen down on the job too often. We have no faith in our administration.

HARRISON AND PHYLLIS BEMIS.

SAN MARINO, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe Acheson's policies are wrong and I strongly favor those of MacArthur.

ROBERT F. MARONDE.

Inefficiency and Waste in the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s, broadcast of April 10, 1951, is of interest to the Members of this body. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD and believe that it will be enlightening.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM BROADCAST OF FULTON LEWIS, JR., APRIL 10, 1951

You, out over the country, hear a lot of rumblings about the confusion, the inefficiency, the waste, the politics that is going on in the defense program here in Washington, and no doubt it has troubled you to some extent. There have been charges that the defense agencies have been manned on a political-patronage basis, with appointments being cleared through the Democratic National Committee, that the whole thing has been made a gigantic political pork barrel, in a glorified pattern of the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, that there is no real program in the interest of the public and no regard for the amount of money being spent, that the one objective seems to be to get as many people on the payroll as possible and spend as much as possible.

You may remember the day of the dual governorship fight in Georgia, when Herman Talmadge was trying to claim the Governor's chair against Lt. Gov. M. E. Thompson. The courts ruled that Thompson was next in line due to the fact that the Governor-elect, Gene Talmadge, died before he took office, and Thompson served a 2-year term as Georgia's Governor as a result. Last fall, after completing those 2 years, he retired to private life until he was brought to Washington early this year to become an assistant to Mike DiSalle, head of the Office of Price Stabilization, in the defense effort.

This afternoon he turned in his resignation from that job, and I have here a statement from him which I believe will be of tremendous interest to you. Please note that this does not come from any Republican; indeed, until he came to Washington, Governor Thompson was an uncompromising supporter of Mr Truman and the Truman faction of the Democratic Party, as against the Dixiecrat faction. So this is the statement of one of Mr. Truman's own supporters—up until the present time.

What is even more important, it is the story of a patriotic American who has seen the inside of what is going on here His statement needs no comment from me. I present it to you verbatim:

"No one can even question my record of unfaltering loyalty to the national administration and Democratic Party. The record speaks for itself.

"In 1948, when the Dixiecrat movement split the solid South, my efforts resulted in Georgia remaining loyal to the Democratic Party.

"Conditions existing in the national administration are so deplorable today that loyalty to party and patriotism to country constitute a conflict.

"Official Washington today is drifting in a sea of confusion, inefficiency, waste, and extravagance, with the only refuge being held out to a confused people is the sign of the double cross.

"On January 21 I received a telegram at my home in Valdosta, Ga., from Mike DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, asking me to come to Washington to accept the job as regional director of OPS with headquarters in Atlanta. I accepted.

"On my way to Washington to assume the responsibilities of the office, I was intercepted in Atlanta by telephone calls from the Democratic National Committee telling me that Dixiecrat Herman Talmadge, Governor of Georgia, was protesting my appointment.

"Arriving in Washington, I reported to Mr. DiSalle's office. Mr. DiSalle refused to see me, and I was told to report first to the Democratic National Committee office. There I was requested to accept the directorship of OPS for territories. For the sake of harmony in the defense effort, I agreed to accept.

"For 8 days I remained in my hotel expecting any moment to be assigned to the duties of the office, and when the assignment was made I was amazed to learn that another man and I were at the same time to be sworn in for the same office, at the same salaries, and with the same duties.

"During the next 2 weeks nothing was done and no program for administration of price controls in the territories was promulgated.

"Knowing that it was impossible to have two directors for the same job, I offered to resign and accept another assignment.

"For 12 weeks I have been carried on the payroll as a consultant at a salary plus expense account of $53.46 per day. Yet, during this time, I have been consulted about nothing. I have had no assignment to do anything.

"On February 19, at the White House, I told the President the story up until then. He called Don Dawson and instructed him to see that the mess was straightened out immediately. It hasn't been done.

"Under the circumstances, I refuse to accept salary and expense money from the taxpayers when I am rendering no public service. I am resigning and returning to my home in Valdosta, Ga. I refuse to be a parasite on the American taxpayers.

"There are thousands upon thousands of others rendering no service but are on the public payroll, not only in Washington but throughout the United States.

"No real effort has been made to stabilize prices. Even those charged with this responsibility have contributed to the upward surge of prices by deliberately predicting higher prices. While the price spiral continues to rise, the bottom is dropping out of moral values.

"Thousands of loyal Americans are giving unselfishly of their time to the defense work, but their efforts are being nullified by the indecision, bungling, and interference of scheming politicians who are motivated solely by their desire to stay in power. The American people are being victimized by a national conspiracy of mediocrity.

"In 1951 is the time for the people of America to make plans to free themselves in 1952 from the gang that has led the people into this mess.

"And as for me, I will not support the Democratic Party in the national election in 1952 unless its banner is rescued from the greedy hands of the gang now hiding behind it for protection. If this be political treason, make the most of it."

That is the end of the statement.

Now, I have also a carbon copy of the actual memorandum which Governor Thompson tells me he personally handed to President Truman on February 19. He tells me the President read it in full, commented that it was an awful mess, called in assistant Donald Dawson—the same Donald Dawson who was mixed up in the RFC investigations—and told Dawson to have it corrected. Let me read you the memorandum to the President:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1951.*

"MEMORANDUM

"1. Early in January I was told by Mr. DiSalle, at his office here in Washington, that I could expect the appointment of regional director (region V), with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga.

"2. On January 21 I received a telegram from Mr. DiSalle to that effect in Valdosta, Ga. I immediately sent a telegram accepting the appointment.

"3. On January 24 I reported to Mr. DiSalle's office in Washington and to the Shoreham Hotel for a conference as instructed by the telegram from Mr. DiSalle.

"4. While en route to Washington to assume my duties, I received a telephone call in Atlanta, Ga., from Turney Gratz, of the Democratic National Committee, informing me, in effect, that Governor Talmadge, of Georgia, opposed my appointment, even though United States Senators GEORGE and RUSSELL had recommended my appointment.

"5. On the day of my arrival in Washington I was told by Turney Gratz that I would be transferred to the fourteenth territorial region as its director.

"6. I remained in Washington 8 days without anyone informing me as to my status. On the eighth day, when I appeared in office as a director, I met, for the first time, a Mr. Herbert Meighan. He and I were informed that we were going to be appointed codirectors of regional district XIV. On that day both Mr. Meighan and I were qualified, through form 57, as consultants to OPS.

"7. Eight days following my qualifying as a consultant, Mr. Meighan and I were sworn in with considerable ceremony and newspaper publicity by Mr. Justice Tom Clark as regional codirectors.

"8. Six days afterward Mr. Meighan and I were informed by Mr. Richard Cook, Assistant Administrator for Management, that it was impossible to have codirectors for any region. Upon receipt of this information from Mr. Cook, and in order to prevent further confusion and embarrassment to Mr. Meighan, I suggested to Mr. Cook that Mr. Meighan be named the director of the fourteenth region.

"9. You can readily understand and appreciate the personal and public embarrassment that I sustained during the confused period of time, as I have outlined above; especially the fact that news releases, presumably by the Public Information Section of OPS, and certainly not by me, had been released and printed over the entire State of Georgia concerning my appointments, transfers, and demotions.

"10. For the sake of harmony and loyalty to the administration and my country, I have refrained from giving any interviews to the press or otherwise making my position known to the public until it has at this time reached a point that I must call the matter to your attention.

"Present status: Despite my willingness to accept practically anything that may be offered, in order to keep the administration's agency in a creditable light before the public, I can tell you with certainty that I have no status at this time. In other words, status unknown."

That is the end of the memorandum; and there is the story of ex-Gov. M. E. Thompson, of Georgia, and his experience in the defense program, which is supposed to be building up the Nation's strength for the future.

How do you like it?

Richland's New Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from a recent issue of the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review regarding the new school buildings at the atomic-energy reservation in the State of Washington.

I am, of course, happy that the Government workers there have these facilities there in which to educate their children. However, the issue arises naturally as to the equity involved by the amount of money expended by the Atomic Energy to supply school facilities for these children while similar facilities are not granted to the children of other Government workers on other Government reservations in the State of Washington and elsewhere in the Nation. Many of my colleagues have fought long and hard and worried much over Federal funds to assist school districts to enlarge their school facilities that they might take care of the influx of Government workers and their children on Government reservations at dams, defense plants, cantonments, reclamation projects, and the whole great list where Federal aid is recognized and granted.

There should be some uniformity in the treatment of school districts. To spend $4,000,000 on one junior high school almost by wave of a hand and then to make it difficult for the granting of appropriation items such as one-fourth million or one-half million dollars for similar facilities elsewhere just does not appear to be equitable.

I am inserting this article in the RECORD because these facilities obviously were provided from funds which the House of Representatives was asked to appropriate in the guise of secrecy when there was no need of having these super-secret funds hidden behind such a cloak. They were to be used not for Atomic Energy as such but for the creation and supplying of facilities for educational purposes.

I do trust that a study of this problem will be made by the appropriate committees and some standards of appropriations arrived at that will be fair to all concerned.

RICHLAND'S NEW SCHOOLS—CARMICHAEL AND SPALDING ARE MODERN AS THE ATOM

(By Halwyn R. Smith)

CARMICHAEL JUNIOR HIGH

Every week-day morning at the stroke of 9, Nancy Ann, age 13, passes through the portals of one of America's newest and most modern junior high schools with her fellow classmates, Betty and Jane.

Carmichael junior high school was completed in Richland, "the atomic city," last year at a cost of $4,000,000.

Entering the grand foyer of the school seems to the girls that they are passing in to Grand Central Station. The ceiling is 30 feet skyward and supported by a number of massive columns, 4 feet square.

Nancy and her two classmates pass down the south wing of the school's 4 wings and enter one of the 17 classrooms. They begin wracking their brains over the intricacies of mathematics. The classroom is typical of the others and is 40 feet long and 25 feet wide. It accommodates 30 students. One whole side of the room is comprised of steel-framed windows so that the room is extremely well lighted. What really strikes the eye, though, are the white blackboards upon which the students write with black chalk.

Brain weary after toying with five times five, Nancy and her friends emerge into the hallway and walk back to the grand foyer where they strike down off the west wing. At the end of this they walk down a series of steps into the gymnasium. All told they have walked two blocks.

The gymnasium is 97 feet long and 81 feet wide. It is laid out for two badminton courts, two volleyball courts, and one basketball court. It has folding bleachers which can be pushed up out of the way to give additional floor space.

Nancy feels extremely fit after her day's exercise, and it is well, for her next class is in the music room which is directly underneath the auditorium stage. Her class consists of 40 musicians, which comprises the school orchestra. The music room is soundproofed and quite ample in size to house the embryo musicians. There are three individual practice rooms to house those students who need a little more practice to perfect their umpahs and allay their squeaks on the violins. After this they join the full orchestra and give forth with the strains of Auld Lang Syne. What catches the eye in this room is the green blackboard upon which the students write with yellow chalk.

As Nancy puts away her instrument and walks down the hall to the foyer, her steps quicken for it is lunch time. Adjacent to the foyer is the school cafeteria. She passes into it and is soon busily engaged in stuffing herself with a combination of meat, vegetable, fruit, and milk, all for the price of 30 cents. This is varied on Thursday with the pièce de résistance which is turkey. One whole side of the cafeteria is devoted to glass windows which look down over the vast expanse of school grounds.

During the day's grind of classes there are two intermission periods during the morning and the afternoon. Nancy and her students invariably retire to the school grounds which is equipped with basketball courts, softball diamonds and football fields.

There are many other rooms contained in the new school that do not concern Nancy for there is a very modern woodworking shop, general science room, audio-visual room, mechanical drawing room, handsomely equipped home economics and lecture room, school supply salesroom. All told there are 17 classrooms, one cafeteria, one gymnasium and eight special purpose rooms. What is most impressive perhaps is the fact that when small cubicles such as the janitor's supply room, halls and similar rooms are counted the school has a total of 123 rooms.

The building itself is of poured concrete and its exterior is plastered with metal trim for the cornice. It is well lighted on all sides by steel sash windows. The floors are poured concrete covered with various types of tile, asphalt tile, quarry tile, felt tile.

It covers an area of 101,000 square feet and is located on a tract of ground 23 acres in size. It has 24,000 square yards of asphalt for parking and 3,600 square yards for tennis courts.

Many community activities are held in the school, for there are classes in dancing, folk dancing, and evening games of volleyball. Then there are various classes in handicraft, art, woodworking, and others held for village members. Meetings of various clubs and groups are also held. Mixers are held after sports contests.

SPALDING GRADE SCHOOL

When Johnny went marching off to school this fall he may or may not have had as nice a school to enter as Spalding elementary school in Richland. If he did have he was fortunate; for it was designed by one of the Nation's foremost architectural firms and represents the absolute ultra in modern grade-school design.

It was completed last year to provide educational accommodations for the ever-increasing number of children of the atomic workers who have been added to the city. The building is of composite wood frame and concrete construction and cost $2,000,000. Painted a dazzling white it looms up on the landscape as a ship of knowledge floating down the ways to the seas of higher learning.

Possibly the Johnny of your town attends a school cramped by congested streets and dwarfed by tall buildings. Maybe he goes to one of the little one-room schoolhouses which are still existent in many parts of the country. The boy from the city would love Spalding for it is located on a tract of ground 17 acres in size. Every room is exposed to fresh air and sunlight. The boy from the country would probably be amazed at the school's size, but he would not be lacking the broad expanse which surrounds his own little school. The school itself covers 1½ acres of the tract, or more exactly 56,000 square feet.

If Johnny had entered Spalding he would have found himself 1 of 604 pupils who are accommodated by its 18 classrooms, 2 kindergartens, 5 special-purpose rooms, and last but not least, a cafeteria.

He wouldn't find himself crowded, for the average classroom is 24 by 40 feet in size, which gives him 32 square feet of space or an area 6 by 6 feet.

There are added attractions that Johnny would like; an art room if he is artistically inclined, or a library if he is literary minded. If athletic, he would like its gymnasium, which is 76 by 86 feet and equipped with three volley-ball courts. At one end he would find a stage 22 feet in depth on which he could do a little acting good or bad. Other special-purpose rooms consist of physical-education rooms in which he would be trained to grow straight and tall.

Lunch time might find him in the school's very modern cafeteria, which is 76 by 47 feet in size, but many of the pupils go home for their noon-day luncheons in the surrounding new 1,000-ranch-house district, for which area the school was built to serve. Many community functions as well as church services are held in the school.

Johnny would find Spalding not only interesting inside but outside as well, for its grounds encompass tennis courts, basketball courts, and playground equipment of every description.

ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL,
Spokane, Wash., April 4, 1951.

Hon. WALT HORAN,
Member of Congress, Fifth District of Washington, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALT: Pursuant to the matter of the nursing-education program in Congress that we discussed by telephone last Friday, I believe that many Members of Congress are beginning to realize that the American taxpayer is genuinely adamant against further extravagances in Government, and new taxes are not smiled upon while the administration continues to insist on pushing their thinly veiled social program. There is a rumor afoot that in addition to paying hospital employees excessive salaries in Government institutions the proponents of socialized medicine are attempting to gain support of the national nurses organizations as a step toward controlling the medical profession and hospitals. This is purely a rumor but is worth considering in any proposed legislation.

There are many Federal educational programs in effect at the present time with scholarships in mining, agriculture, etc., given. However, none of these has entailed setting up special bureaus for its administration, but, as I understand it, Federal funds are allocated through existing State agencies with certain requirements to be met. Why can't Federal subsidy to nursing education be handled on the same plane? Under the Cadet Corps program, all controls came from Washington, which necessitated national audits at the end of the program that cost the taxpayer far more than they ever recovered in misspent funds. We had periodic inspections by well-meaning nurses who had no more idea of State requirements or regulations than the man in the moon, but they spent money and hours of nursing time in each hospital, not to mention the oceans of reports. It is my opinion that a simple program of Federal assistance to schools of nursing on a scholarship basis would produce an increase in graduate nurses, and the overwhelming majority of funds allocated would go for the purpose intended if handled in the manner described above.

Believe it or not, there is quite a feeling that all the brains in the country are not centered in the District of Columbia. The administration is supposed to support the philosophy of States' rights, believe it or not. Therefore, let's stick to the simple legislation and assist the States in producing nurses through Federal allocation with a minimum of red tape, distributed by existing State agencies to those hospitals operating a 3-year school, producing registered nurses, and collegiate schools of nursing that meet the requirements of their respective States, not the goals set by a few nursing educators from the American League of Nursing Education in New York who have not nursed a sick patient in 15 years and haven't the slightest idea of practical nursing education. They had their innings the last time and look at the mess they made of it with their uniforms, brass buttons, and costly periodical reports which I doubt were ever read.

I would be glad to appear before your committee but I fail to see where I could do any good that Al Whitehall of the Washington Bureau of the American Hospital Association could not equal if not surpass.

Kindest regards to you and Sally.

Very sincerely yours,

GORDON W. GILBERT,
Administrator.

Public Reaction to MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the contents of a number of telegrams which were received at my office. For the information of the Members of Congress, these are typical of the hundreds and thousands of telegrams being received since the President relieved General MacArthur of his command. It is quite significant of the feeling of the people back home that I have not received one single message in support of the President's action. For brevity I am omitting the datelines and signatures. These telegrams came from Chicago, Ill.:

Sincerely urge you do everything possible to correct President's decision re MacArthur. Also strongly protest other snap decisions by President. Suggest you do everything possible to curb power of Executive Office in future to protect American interests. Further suggest you do everything in your power to end present Korean situation victoriously by whatever means at hand.

Western Union will not accept expression of true thoughts of this household. Let's impeach Truman.

Just heard of MacArthur being kicked out. Suggest you look for another Hiss in Blair House.

In the firm belief that Gen. Douglas MacArthur was prosecuting the fight in Korea to as near a decisive victory as can ever be attained by anyone in dealing with communistically backed or fostered forces, we believe the dismissal of the soldier in time of war conditions and conflict, under whatever guise and circumstances, gives ready aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States of America alone and without consideration whatsoever to United Nations entanglements. Therefore, we, as loyal Americans, fearful for the future of this, our country, in the hands of a Commander in Chief who gives such treasonable aid and comfort. Earnestly urge and beseech you to institute on our behalf proper proceedings for the impeachment of Harry S. Truman, and this at once or show cause.

I protest the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and humbly beseech you to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once.

Protesting MacArthur's dismissal. Humbly beseech you start impeachment against Harry S. Truman immediately.

As an American citizen and taxpayer I urge immediate proceedings for the impeachment of President Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, and Secretary of War Pace.

I want to vigorously enter my protest in the strongest possible way against the firing of MacArthur.

We wish to protest this latest outrage on the part of the pig in the White House. We demand his immediate impeachment and the reinstatement of General MacArthur.

I want to vigorously enter my protest in the strongest possible way against the firing of MacArthur.

I protest the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and humbly beseech you to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once.

Vigorously protest dismissal of General MacArthur. Suggest and recommend your immediate action in my behalf as a citizen and taxpayer.

We the people expect our Congress to do something immediately pertaining the lousy decision made about the MacArthur situation in Korea.

Demand immediate investigation of MacArthur release.

Make report to public.

Please, not another Munich. Do not appease Reds. Uphold MacArthur.

Your loyalty to the people of the United States at this historical moment will support General MacArthur's position against President Truman's latest decision to support England at all costs with American lives, to stall the efforts of an all-out war with Russia. American Lithuanians have denounced administration's policy of appeasing Russia while our country is being exterminated. We call upon you now as an American citizen to prove your right to represent our people in Washington during this greatest crisis in our history. Your own action and vote in Congress will determine your future length of servitude to the American people. America must remain free and strong to preserve everything we fought for in many centuries and to protect our citizens' lives at the expense of those who desire to conquer America and subject her people to communism. We must remain free with

our own representatives of Congress supporting the great majority thinking in our democratic Nation. We call upon you at this hour to support General MacArthur's position to defeat Russia's world conquest.

Use every effort to impeach President Truman.

Let's see some action now. Make investigation and report to public regarding disgraceful firing of MacArthur. (Two signatures.)

We protest undignified and unjust removal of MacArthur. (Two signatures.)

In view of shocking news report this morning suggest the following: Immediate impeachment proceedings. Bring MacArthur home. Get out of Korea. Run allen-dominated United Nations into the Atlantic.

If impeachment of the President is not possible, let's work for a constitutional amendment to prevent such outrages. The MacArthur dismissal was an exercise of authority which might be safe in the hands of honest men, but we seem to need protection against others.

Impeach the imbecile.

Impeach the Judas in the White House who sold us down the river to left wingers, and the UN. American people never did get a chance to vote for the UN, if they wanted it or did not want it. Long live MacArthur.

We vigorously protest President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur from the command in the Far East. Suggest the general be brought home and be permitted to tell the American people the truth on conditions in Korea. We are fed up with political double talk emanating from our State Department. (Two signatures.)

The voters demand impeach President. Recall MacArthur.

Registering protest on unjust and unwise dismissal of General MacArthur. (Two signatures.)

Demand you start impeachment proceedings against President. His removal of MacArthur shows his preference for American boys to be killed in Korea.

We beg of you to fight for MacArthur, a man of truth and fearlessness. Impeachment for Truman.

A great American is crucified and Stalin's stock zooms. When the wicked rule, the people mourn. Truman must be impeached.

We veterans of Southwest Pacific protest the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and humbly beseech you to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once.

May I express with many others that the unprecedented action of relieving General MacArthur of his command is beyond any understanding?

I strongly protest the removal of MacArthur; remove Truman instead.

Impeach Truman and Acheson.

We, as your supporters, demand you back MacArthur to the limit. Fight the monsters.

Impeach the B who calls himself President.

Could MacArthur's dismissal be reason for impeachment Truman and Acheson removal?

We taxpayers of Illinois protest the firing of MacArthur and as our Representatives we demand you fire Truman and Acheson.

Consider MacArthur ouster national disgrace exceeded only by presence of Harry Truman in White House. Implore you to do everything in your power to correct both conditions.

As a citizen of the United States the only way you can support the oath you took to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, is by the immediate impeachment of Harry S. Truman, George C. Marshall, and Dean Acheson. Everything they have done without the approval of Congress has brought this country closer to defeat. The Congress of the United States is now the only bulwark between the citizens' freedom and slavery under the Communists. I ask nothing but that you do your duty as a Member of the Eighty-second Congress.

As State senator and congressman we demand your action on return of General MacArthur to his former command. (70 signatures.)

MacArthur dismissal one of the greatest blunders and catastrophes in our history.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two is too late for America. Save her now.

Why don't you impeach Truman?

Please remove the menace from the White House at once before Joe Stalin moves in.

Unless you take immediate action to force the President to represent the people you might as well resign and admit we have a dictatorship. If the only way is impeachment, let's start proceedings.

Protesting removal General MacArthur. Urge his hearing before joint session.

We, the taxpayers of Illinois, protest the dismissing of General MacArthur and humbly beseech you as our Representatives to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once. (Six signatures.)

Indignantly and vehemently denounce MacArthur's ouster. How stupid can we get?

You should demand the impeachment of President Truman, the dismissal of Secretary of State Acheson, and the reinstatement of General MacArthur. You, as well as President Truman, were elected to represent the American people, not the United Nations. Let's not be sold down the river.

We demand disciplinary action for Trumans' greatest mistake. Impeachment desired.

Does not Truman's removal of our great General MacArthur constitute treason? He has certainly sold out the country he swore to defend. We beseech you to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once.

When outside forces can dictate who shall be in command of United States fighting forces it is time for Congress to assert itself.

Please support impeachment program against Truman and Acheson.

Strongly urge MacArthur be restored; Truman impeached. (Five signatures.)

Demand action against Truman. Please support MacArthur.

Demand vigorous protest over MacArthur. Suggest Truman's impeachment.

Impeach Harry S. Truman.

Truman Administration Policies Versus MacArthur Republicism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more apparent as we view the activities of the Republican Party leaders that they are in desperate search of issues upon which they can go to the country with a reasonable chance of winning in 1952.

This pattern extends even to local elections where, witness the recent test which was had in the Chicago mayoralty election. There the Republican candidate, Robert L. Hunter, and his Republican followers sought to convince the electorate that the Truman policies were leading us to disaster and ruin. Mayor Martin H. Kennelly who has supported President Truman in 1948, campaigned on his record with the result that he received a thumping majority of 152,000 votes in a light cast of votes. In this instance, at a local level and in the second largest city of the Nation, the effect of the Republicans who had injected national issues in the campaign to convert the people against the President's policies, proved to be in vain.

Prior hereto, House Republicans believing that the results of the congressional elections of 1950 were a strong trend in their direction, succeeded, with the help of some southern Democrats to modify the liberalized 21-day discharge rule in the House Committee on Rules, and reestablished the old reactionary rule whereby worthwhile legislation could be "bottled up" through a coalition of 7 of the 12 members constituting a majority of the 12 members comprising the membership of the committee. The effect of this change means that legislation could not be considered by the House unless a petition signed by 218 Members of the House was effected—a very difficult condition or procedure to comply with.

Now comes the MacArthur incident, and again we find the Republicans attempting to make capital of his dismissal, which, in my opinion, was long overdue and well-deserved by him.

Loud cries of impeachment came from the Republicans with the first news that

General MacArthur had been relieved of his command because of insubordination. Today the noise is faint and indistinct because it was found that the people agree with President Truman when he said last night, "full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of a free democracy." The Truman critics have found out in a short time that the American people are firm in their determination that they will not tolerate military dictatorship of the Peron type in Argentina, or the Franco kind in Spain, or for that matter any type of military dictatorship as against the Nation's supreme civilian authority, namely, the President of the United States and commander of the Armed Forces.

Yesterday, in my remarks to the House under title, "Our Country, MacArthur, Politics," I inserted an editorial which appeareed in the April 8 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times. This forceful article certainly expresses well the futility of Republican efforts to make capital of the MacArthur dismissal.

Notwithstanding that General MacArthur indirectly claimed today through his adviser, General Whitney, that he did not disobey orders, the record is replete with the directives given him by the duly constituted authority. I set forth yesterday in my remarks for the RECORD instances of such misconduct, and I am certain that when the full record is made clear to the American people at the appropriate time and in the proper form, General MacArthur will have been found to have transgressed more often than is generally thought today.

Mr. Speaker, personally I feel that the President, in his speech to the country last night, made his position and that of the United Nations very clear. I am satisfied that, notwithstanding the attacks of certain newspapers and commentators, the outstanding and most noted journalists fully endorse the President's position.

In conclusion, I wish as an extension of remarks to include a few of the more informed factual newspaper accounts, including excerpts from an article by Marquis Childs, appearing in the Washington Post, as follows:

General MacArthur seems to have decided that the time has now come to bring this out into the open and force the issue. He can have what he has apparently meant to have from the beginning—a full-scale war in Asia.

As a professional soldier loyal to the American tradition of civilian authority over policy, the general has the choice of carrying out the orders he is given or resigning his command.

[From the Washington Post]

THE PRESIDENT AND THE GENERAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

When Taft was President and Stimson was his Secretary of War and Gen. Leonard Wood was Chief of Staff there was a very able officer with powerful supporters in Congress who disagreed sharply and profoundly with the basic military policy of the United States. That was some 40 years ago. Maj. Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth, the Adjutant General, was opposed to what was then a new development in the American Army, namely, the General Staff which in matters of policy was under the President but over all commanders and bureau chiefs.

The purpose of the General Staff, as Stimson and Bundy describe it in their book, On Active Service, was to "meet three requirements: civilian control in the executive branch, sound general planning, and constant cross-fertilization between the line of the Army and its high command in Washington."

But though General Wood was Chief of Staff, the most powerful officer in the War Department was General Ainsworth who had more friends in Congress than did General Wood. A conflict ensued over many matters. The basic issue in all of them was whether the Chief of Staff—who is called that because he is the agent, via the civilian Secretary, of the President—was superior to all other officers of the Army. General Ainsworth resisted this idea and though Secretary Stimson had "once before been forced to warn Ainsworth against insubordination," it was not long before Ainsworth again took issue with the Chief of Staff "in a memorandum so grossly insubordinate that as soon as he read it Stimson realized that the time for drastic action had come."

Stimson consulted President Taft and Senator Elihu Root who, as Secretary of War, had created the General Staff. They agreed with Stimson that discipline had to be restored and Taft said to him: "Stimson, it has fallen to you to do a dirty job which your predecessors ought to have done before you."

Ainsworth was relieved. Twenty-five years later after he had again been Secretary of War, Stimson wrote that "since the relief of Ainsworth no important challenge has been given to the final authority of the Chief of Staff, under the Secretary and the President. Even the great Pershing, field commander of the entire fighting Army in 1918, learned that in the making of long-range decisions he was subordinate to the Chief of Staff in Washington."

It has fallen to President Truman and to his Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, to do the same kind of dirty job which President Taft and his Secretary of War had to do 40 years ago. The final authority of the Chiefs of Staff under the Secretary and the President has been openly and repeatedly challenged by a much greater and more powerful man than Ainsworth. The President and the Secretary have done their duty. They have been faithful to their trust.

General MacArthur's actions are a great enigma. He challenged the President publicly, defiantly, and on issues of such moment that they concern deeply not only this Government but some 50 other governments. It is impossible to believe that a soldier of his eminence and his experience, himself a former Chief of Staff, himself a commander of armies who must know the importance of discipline, cannot have known that he was challenging the authority of his lawful superiors.

What, then, did he believe would be the outcome if he persisted, and indeed made his challenge to the President ever sharper Can he have failed to realize that either he would have to be relieved or that the President of the United States would have publicly to abdicate the substance of his whole authority in the issues of war and peace? General MacArthur must have known that there was no third course, one of compromise. He must have known it because the President has tried compromise for over a year. But General MacArthur himself has in fact taken the position that the issue could not be compromised.

The question, therefore, is whether General MacArthur chose to force the President to relieve him, or whether he thought from what he had seen during the past year that the President would give in and would take his orders from Tokyo.

A plausible case can be made for either of these theories. Neither can as yet be proved. But this much is certain: General MacArthur deliberately narrowed the choice and meant to force a showdown with the President of the United States on the issue of a general war in the Far East. He did that by compelling the President to choose publicly between relieving him and submitting to him.

[From the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of April 12, 1951]

THE TRUMAN-MACARTHUR SHOWDOWN

Circumstances have forced President Truman to make many momentous and controversial decisions. One of these was his decision to fire General MacArthur for insubordination.

As we said in late editions of yesterday's Sun-Times, the decision was inevitable in a democracy such as ours. No general is bigger than the Government of the United States or his constitutional commander in chief.

The lifeblood of a democracy is the supremacy of civilian authority over military authority.

Nevertheless, national passions have been inflamed by the incident. National unity is threatened at a time when the Nation can ill afford to face such a threat.

All thoughtful Americans will regret, as Mr. Truman himself did, that he was forced to have a showdown with MacArthur at this time. But it was MacArthur and his highly voluble backers, particularly among the President's political enemies, who brought the issue to a head.

The President's last line of retreat was cut off when MacArthur openly disregarded Mr. Truman's constitutional powers to make our foreign policy by advocating the opening of a second front on the Chinese mainland. It was a direct challenge of the administration's policy of trying to localize the Korean conflict.

The course advocated by MacArthur was not less war but more war. It courted the beginning of a third world war at a time when the free nations of the world are not fully prepared for such a struggle.

In their eagerness to make political capital of MacArthur's head-on clash with Mr. Truman, many Republicans who have been howling for peace fell for the MacArthur line. One of these Republicans is Senator TAFT, of Ohio.

Other Americans who long have been warning against the danger of a military dictatorship in this country nevertheless allied themselves with MacArthur in his defiance of the Nation's supreme civilian authority.

The isolationist Republicans justified their support of MacArthur's position by echoing his argument that it would be possible to open a second front in China without drawing Russia into the war.

They forgot—or conveniently ignored—the fact that it was also MacArthur who had advanced the argument that United Nations forces in Korea could drive to the Yula River without drawing Red China into the war.

As we have said before, and as Mr. Truman said in regretfully dismissing the colorful general, MacArthur will still rank in history as one of our greatest military commanders. But the quarrel today is not with MacArthur's performance in strictly military matters.

In attempting to set himself above the constitutional powers of the presidency, MacArthur not only was insubordinate; he also was doing violence to one of our most cherished traditions—that the ideal soldier is one who respects and observes the essential civilian nature of our institutions.

Next year, 1952, is a presidential election year. It is almost too much to ask even in the name of national unity that the President's more rabid political foes cease fanning the flames of the MacArthur incident.

But we can hope that the American people as a whole eventually will tire of the sport

and buckle down to the tremendous mobilization job that still lies ahead of us. In the final analysis, the American people can retain their heads even when their political leaders can't.

Even without MacArthur there is still a war to be won in Korea. His successor, General Ridgway, is a brilliant and conscientious soldier who adheres scrupulously to the historic division of military and civilian powers in this democracy of ours. He merits, and we are sure he will receive, the support of every American.

When MacArthur comes home, as he intends to do, after an absence of 14 years, he will receive the tumultuous welcome earned by a military hero. We feel that he should present his views to the American people. As Mr. Truman said, "Full and rigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of a free democracy."

The crying need today is for national unity. We believe that the good sense of the American people will prevail and give us that unity in spite of the politicians.

Appeasement and Surrender of Independence Go Hand in Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many wires, letters, editorial comments, are to the effect that Russian and other Communists throughout the world are rejoicing because of the President's removal of General MacArthur from his Far East commands.

Communists, quick to recognize their enemies and the removal or demotion of any opponent from a position of authority, are jubilant because their most powerful single foe in the Far East, General MacArthur, has been arbitrarily kicked out of the position in which for so long he has acted effectively to unite the Japanese people in opposition to the Communists' attempt to infiltrate into their government.

Acheson and those who have for so long been sympathetic to the Communist cause; who have so often, whatever may have been their intentions, followed a policy detrimental to the interests of this country, have won another victory in their campaign to displace MacArthur, to place the Chinese Communists and Russia in a commanding position in United Nations.

Last night, in New York, at the annual meeting of the New York Society of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, Mr. John B. Trevor delivered an address well worthy of everyone's attention.

Mr. Trevor is president emeritus of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, which he organized in 1929. He is a graduate of Harvard and of Columbia University Law School. During the First World War, he was in command of military intelligence in the entire New York area. In 1919, he served as special deputy attorney general for the State of New York, and later, as associate counsel for the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

For many years, he has devoted his time and efforts to the elimination of subversive elements in our Government, and to the perpetuation of our Constitution and the principles for which it stands.

Mr. Trevor's address of last night was as follows:

The problem which faces us as a result of the President's impulsive action is no mere question of discipline for a general or even of justice for a great leader. You must realize that what we do now will set the pattern for the future in the European theater. If we bow to the demands of our more vociferous allies in this matter, we shall be setting precedents that will haunt us in the future. If we allow Britain and France and India to ally themselves with Acheson and his kind, what can we do when they try to use the same methods on General Eisenhower—if they insist on hampering his movements and limiting his striking ability? Stupid and vindictive decisions now may cause us to lay millions of American boys on the battlefields of Europe.

The morning papers offer us conclusive proof that this hasty removal of General MacArthur is no mere accident nor isolated happening. It is obviously part of a pattern of foreign policy which is going to be thrown in the faces of the American people before they have time to take decisive action upon the decisions which will be made. Take note of this Washington dispatch dated April 10, to the New York Times: "Britain has suggested to the United States that Communist China be brought into negotiations of the Japanese Peace Treaty, and that provision be made now for the eventual return of Formosa to Communist China. Obviously, these steps could not be taken until General MacArthur had been removed from the scene."

We shall be told that General MacArthur had to be removed because he has interfered with the political aspects of our problems. Then let us be logical. We should, on the same ground, lose no time in removing Secretary Acheson, who has consistently and persistently meddled in strictly military matters and has carried on a feud with General MacArthur with catastrophic results for the United States.

We are at war with China. Chinese divisions of the Red Army have been, and are being thrown into battle against American forces. The killing of American boys in Korea is just as much an act of war against the United States as the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor.

The folly of our Government in its policy toward Korea has been monumental. In part, of course, it is the fruit of the greater folly—our association in the United Nations and the consequent embroilment and prospective embroilment of the United States in controversies which are of no concern to the great mass of the American people.

The order for the withdrawal of United States troops from Korea and the abandonment of South Korea in June 1949, as ordered by the President, was an invitation to the Communists of North Korea to overrun the whole country. The subsequent order by the President for the United States troops to reenter Korea and act as a foreguard of the United Nations forces was, so far as can be ascertained at this moment, a violation of the law.

For example, section VI of the act of Congress, which took us into the United Nations, provides in substance that the President should negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council of the United Nations, which shall be subject to the approval of Congress by appropriate act providing for the numbers and types of Armed Forces to be made available to the Council for the purpose of maintaining peace and security. So far as can be ascertained no such agreement was ever submitted for the approval of Congress.

In the light of these disquieting facts, it would appear to be urgent that the American people demand of their representatives in Congress, both in the House and the Senate, that an immediate and comprehensive investigation be made of our foreign policy and commitments of every nature. Obviously the first step in such an inquiry should be the extension of an invitation to General MacArthur to appear before this investigating committee and lay all the facts at his disposal before it for the information of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, not only, as Mr. Trevor so clearly pointed out, has the President surrendered to those who by their actions, at the request of Britain, France, and India, have lent support to the Communist program, but apparently he intends to go another step down that ruinous road and after carrying on a war in Asia on the pretext that we dare not appease Stalin, that we must fight the Communists, by supporting Britain's move to cease fire in Korea, he intends to turn over Formosa to the Chinese Communists, and to continue indefinitely the occupation of Korea by American Armed Forces, to protect the British in Hong Kong, the French in Indochina; the interests of both nations wherever in the eastern world they may need protection, and so appease the Communists.

I have never favored, I do not now favor, a war in the Far East, but I do believe with MacArthur that, if we are to have a war, our enemy should not be given sanctuary, "cities of refuge," behind an arbitrary geographical line, where he may lick his wounds, repair his losses, and again go forward to murder Americans.

What, you ask, would I do? As always, I would follow, insofar as it is possible and consistent with our own national security, the advice given by George Washington in his Farewell Message to the Continental Congress, the similar advice given the Congress by Thomas Jefferson in his inaugural address.

Never would I conscript American youth, American flesh and blood, to fight under a foreign flag, a foreign commander, solely for the advancement of the interests of countries other than my own.

Mr. Truman said last night it was his desire to limit the war in the East to Korea—fine. If the war is to be limited, why then send an Army to Europe while turning over China and Formosa to the Communists?

The Tidelands Oil Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial by Ken Byerly, of the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News, dated April 2 1951, dealing with the so-called tidelands oil question.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As We See It

(By Ken Byerly)

WHO WANTS TO GRAB IN THE "BIG GRAB"?

The Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, according to Editor and Publisher, has launched a crusade against the "big grab" of the Federal Government, and is getting newspapers throughout the country to join.

The Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News would like to be included among those who will not join.

The Dallas paper (circulation 150,000) says the "big grab" is the Federal retention of control over the tidelands and an estimated $268,000,000,000 in oil reserves contained in these off-shore underwater lands.

The Lewistown paper (circulation 4,000) thinks that the Dallas paper has confused the issue—that instead it is advocating the "big grab" when it proposes taking these vast riches away from the people of the United States as a whole and turning them over to a few States. It feels that Texas, and a few other coastal States, are doing the grabbing. But, with $268,000,000,000 as the take, this is apparently worth a try.

ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-TWO MILES

It is 1,832 miles from Lewistown to the Texas tidewater at Galveston, but Montanans have quite a stake in the Lone Star State's attempt at the "big grab" for themselves, as do people in all the 17 reclamation States of the West.

To review history a bit, when Congress opened up western lands for homesteaders or sale, the proceeds went to the dry or reclamation States, of which there are 17. They used the money to develop irrigation projects.

When, this income fell off, Montana and other reclamation States were cut off from this source of revenue.

But under the Federal Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, minerals and oil on Federal lands which were reserved by Uncle Sam have closed the gap and provided money to replace that formerly received from sale of public lands.

Nobody paid much attention to the ocean belts, which are included in the public lands, until the oil companies discovered that they were rich in oil resources.

SOFTER TOUCH?

The tidelands States, urged on by the big oil companies, then decided they wished the States rather than the Federal Government to control these riches. The theory, apparently, of the big oil companies was that they could get more out of the tideland States than they could out of Uncle Sam.

But if the tidelands should go to the States on which they front, then all Federal lands in inland States should also be turned over to the States in which they are located. After all, there is no difference.

Putting it in another way, if Texas or California has a right to demand the tidelands, then Montana, Wyoming, or Idaho have the same right to demand all of the Federal lands within their borders.

A tideland test was made a few years ago, which was carried all the way to the United States Supreme Court, which decided in 1947 that Federal ownership of the tidelands was proper.

But this didn't satisfy the big oil companies, and certain of the tideland States. They continue to demand control of the $268,000,000,000 oil reserves. And this is where the Dallas News comes in with its series of articles entitled "The Big Grab," which is an attempt to grab the tidelands.

Actually, forgetting the rights of the reclamation States, we can't see what all the shouting is about. After all, the tideland States still have their fingers deepest in the "sugar bowl."

KICKBACK ANYWAY

Under present laws, 37½ percent of the bonuses, royalties, and other take from the tidelands oil will go back to the State of origin, which would be Texas in the case of oil off the Texas coast. Ten percent remains with Uncle Sam to administer the fund, and 52½ percent will be appropriated by Congress for use on reclamation projects in the reclamation States.

Congress even decides how this will be divided so far as projects are concerned, which means that the larger States with the bigger congressional delegations—such as Texas and California—will have the greatest advantage in securing the larger share of this money.

So Texas and California, for example, will no doubt get quite a share of the 52½ percent that goes into the Federal Treasury from the tidelands, to be distributed to the 17 reclamation States.

Add it all up, and it looks like the tideland States are already in the saddle. They not only want the grapes—they want the vines, too.

When the Dallas News cries about the "big grab," the term is misleading. It applies to Texas and other tidewater States in the present fight, and not to Uncle Sam.

It is an attempt to grab, by a few, what rightly belongs to the many.

The United States Can Have But One President at a Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under our form of goverment our President is elected. We elect only one President and we must be served by only one President. No man has a right to accept a public trust whether in the armed services, the diplomatic service, or otherwise, at the hands of the President, unless he is responsive and responsible to him. When the holder of any such public trusts refuses to follow the directions of his Commander in Chief, when he no longer sees eye to eye with the policy of his President, he should relieve himself of the embarrassment by resigning.

When he does not follow that course, but persists in making his own policy, he necessarily incurs whatever shame must go with a dismissal.

No self-respecting President, no President who is faithful to his oath of office, could do other than dispense with the services of a man who willfully sets himself up as more authoritative or more important than his superior even if the latter were not vested with the sole constitutional authority.

President Truman is to be congratulated for the wisdom and the courage he displayed in relieving General MacArthur of his commands.

I am happy to note that the responsible press of the country overwhelmingly endorses the President's action, even though a part of that same press disagrees with his policy. The New York Herald Tribune of April 12, 1951, editorializes as follows:

The most obvious fact about the dismissal of General MacArthur is that he virtually forced his own removal. In high policy as in war there is no room for a divided command. Basic American policy—as defined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the State Department, the President, and, apparently, by the majority opinion of the country—has been to fight a holding war against Communist aggression in the Far East in conjunction with our allies, while building the alliance to a point at which it can prevent Communist aggression in Europe. General MacArthur disagreed with this basic strategic concept.

* * * * *

Here was divided command at its worst.

The Christian Science Monitor on April 11, 1951, said:

The situation had become such that the United States was speaking with two voices on national policy and military measures. Moreover, the UN commander in Korea was evidently not in sympathy with UN aims there—poorly defined as they are. The situation could be cleared up only by a decision on one side or the other. Unless the basic policies of the United States and the United Nations were to be overturned, it became necessary for General MacArthur to conform, to resign, or be removed.

The New York Times on April 12, 1951, said:

Throughout the first 6 months of the war in Korea statements issued in Tokyo by Gen. Douglas MacArthur at fairly frequent intervals indicated dissatisfaction on his part with one aspect or another of the policy, or lack of policy, demonstrated in this struggle by the United States, the United Nations or both. The record now shows that on two occasions (December 6 and again on March 24) General MacArthur was warned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that no further statements regarding policy should be issued by military commanders in the field without first being cleared in Washington. The record also shows that General MacArthur ignored both these warnings and subsequently made such statements.

* * * * *

Policy with respect to the conduct of a war cannot be made in two places. Under the American system, and specifically under the American Constitution, policy is made by the President of the United States. The policy chosen may prove in any given case to be wise or unwise; it may require a fundamental change on the basis of experience; but the Constitution puts the making of policy in the civilian hands of the Chief Executive, and it is the clear duty of the military to express its doubts or its dissent through proper military channels and not in public debate. It is, furthermore, the clear duty of the military to follow a specific Presidential directive, such as was twice issued to General MacArthur in this case.

We have no doubt, therefore, that the President acted properly in dismissing General MacArthur on the grounds stated, and no doubt, on the basis of the record, that a point had been reached at which it was necessary for him to take this action. Nor have we any doubt that these conclusions are fully shared by General MacArthur's fellow-officers in the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In the Washington Post of April 12, 1951, we find the following:

The illustrious career of General MacArthur came to an end upon an inglorious note which will be regretted by all America. But there was no help for it. There is no room in our society for indispensable men or for ungovernable generals, no provision

in our Constitution for the President to play second fiddle. Civil supremacy had to be reasserted, and it was wisest to reassert civil supremacy unmistakably. The German peril got its head and sustenance from the hospitality of the German people to a general staff that had become a law unto itself. Japan was taken on the warpath by an army clique that overrode civilian government. These things must not happen here. We all have reason to be grateful that no segment of our society has been more critical of the self-willed conduct of General MacArthur than the high officers of our armed services. MacArthur, we feel sure, had no military following outside the damned court with which he had surrounded himself in Tokyo.

The supercession of General MacArthur is the first sign in months of a firm hand at the helm of our affairs. Mr. Truman should never again relax his initiative. He is the Commander in Chief and the organ of our foreign affairs.

The Baltimore Sun of April 12, 1951, approves the President's action in the following language:

Mr. Truman's decision to relieve General MacArthur of all his commands was a proper and necessary one. Whatever the partisans may say or do, the simple fact remains that we cannot have two commanders in chief. All soldiers must obey the orders that come to them from above; otherwise there is chaos.

The New York Post of April 11, 1951, very properly said the following:

President Truman has shown wisdom and courage in ending General MacArthur's one-man rebellion against civilian rule of American foreign policy.

We believe the great majority of his countrymen will support the President's stand. We think history will record it as a moment in which he rose dramatically to the tragic demands of his office.

The confusionists have rushed to their posts. There is tremendous sound and fury as the Old Guard Republican battalions take their front-line places along the Potomac. Long may they rave.

Yet the issues are as clear as they are fateful.

General MacArthur was engaged in open and reckless revolt against his Commander in Chief and the civilian officials who administer our foreign policy. They believe (and most Americans agree with them) that the soundest course for America and the world is to limit the Korean War and, if humanly possible, achieve an honorable peace.

MacArthur dissented. He viewed the Korean conflict as the opening skirmish in world war III. He was determined to plunge the United States and the United Nations into all-out war with China. He did not merely voice these opinions in private recommendations to Washington. He shouted them to everyone who would listen.

When he was directed to clear any public pronouncements with his superiors, he flagrantly defied the directive.

If MacArthur's coup had succeeded, he would have in effect engineered a successful military uprising against civilian authority, which is a pillar of our democracy.

If MacArthur's coup had succeeded, the coalition of free nations in the United Nations would have been destroyed and we would find ourselves engaged in a lonely war with China's millions.

In the face of MacArthur's calculated insurrection, plainly documented in the exhibits released by the White House early today, the show-down was inevitable.

Mr. Truman didn't start this fight. He didn't seek it. He tried long and hard to resolve it without an explosion.

But each conciliatory gesture increased MacArthur's defiance. The general was literally engaged in a two-front war, and his obsession with his war against the White House steadily overshadowed his interest in the Korean front.

President Truman was confronted with the choice of summary action or total abdication of national leadership.

We applaud his action.

* * * * *

The irresponsible will have their field day. Puny men who would rather fight Harry S. Truman than build freedom's defenses against Communist aggression will aim all their popguns at the President. But Mr. Truman will gain new respect and affection from men of good will at home and abroad for his gallantry under fire. There are no persuasive words of restraint we can address to the know-nothings at this juncture, but we are sure that thousands of citizens who appreciate the nature of the President's ordeal will let him know their feelings now.

In recent weeks many eminent Republican philosophers and essayists have suggested that the only real question confronting the country was whether MacArthur would let Mr. Truman remain in the White House.

Mr. Truman has given them their answer. In doing so he has reaffirmed the dignity of his office and the strength of our free institutions.

Finally, let me direct your attention to the column by Walter Lippmann which appeared in newspapers throughout the country on April 12, 1951, in which he said:

The question, therefore, is whether General MacArthur chose to force the President to relieve him or whether he thought from what he had seen during the past year that the President would give in and would take his orders from Tokyo.

A plausible case can be made for either of these theories; neither can as yet be proved. But this much is certain: General MacArthur deliberately narrowed the choice and meant to force a show-down with the President of the United States on the issue of a general war in the Far East. He did that by compelling the President to choose publicly between relieving him and submitting to him.

Republicans Might Remember Calvin Coolidge and General Mitchell

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, to say that I have been shocked by the clamor in support of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the face of his clear insubordination to his superior military and civilian chiefs is to indulge in a masterpiece of understatement.

While I myself have received almost as much mail in support of President Truman as I have from the administration's critics, there is one inescapable fact which shines out from the hysterical letters and telegrams from MacArthur's idolaters: That there was nothing spontaneous about this response.

The similarity of the language, of the names signed to the wires, letters, and post cards, and in one case a curious error in the return address, all suggest a systematic campaign with a central direction. The fact that the more scurrilous attacks on the President preceded by several hours the utterance of the same kind of attack on the floor also suggests a coordination of effort which certainly is not the spontaneous ignition of an inflamed public opinion, but rather the planned work of a sort of arson by propaganda.

THE BILLY MITCHELL CASE

In my own remarks yesterday I suggested a comparison between the action of Maj. Gen. Douglas MacArthur as a member of the court-martial which tried Col. William Mitchell in 1926 on eight specifications of a charge of violation of the Ninety-sixth Article of War, and the present case of General MacArthur as the insubordinate.

I have since received additional information which further points up the parallel.

In confirming the finding of the court—though reducing the severity of the penalty—the late President Calvin Coolidge made a statement astonishingly like that made by President Truman in the relief of General MacArthur.

It must be remembered in this context that the offenses were similar.

It was not for their personal views but for their open defiance of superior authority that both Mitchell and MacArthur were relieved, and certainly MacArthur's defiance was more flagrant and more portentous.

Are we to believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the view of the minority party a Republican President can do no wrong and a Democratic President can do no right?

I am certain that those with more time and facilities at their disposal will explore further the parallel between the Mitchell and the MacArthur cases.

NEW YORK POST SUPPORTS TRUMAN

Meanwhile, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of an incisive editorial from the New York Post of Wednesday, April 11, and, from the same paper the same day, an editorial column by Max Lerner, both of which reflect a much more mature reaction to world events than I have seen in the sensational yellow press:

[From the New York Post of April 11, 1951]

THE GREAT DECISION

President Truman has shown wisdom and courage in ending General MacArthur's one-man rebellion against civilian rule of American foreign policy.

We believe the great majority of his countrymen will support the President's stand. We think history will record it as a moment in which he rose dramatically to the tragic demands of his office.

The confusionists have rushed to their posts. There is tremendous sound and fury as the Old Guard Republican battalions take their front-line places along the Potomac. Long may they rave.

Yet the issues are as clear as they are fateful.

General MacArthur was engaged in open and reckless revolt against his Commander in Chief and the civilian officials who administer our foreign policy. They believe (and most Americans agree with them) that the soundest course for America and the world is to limit the Korean War and, if humanly possible, achieve an honorable peace.

MacArthur dissented. He viewed the Korean conflict as the opening skirmish in world war III. He was determined to plunge

the United States and the United Nations into all-out war with China. He did not merely voice these opinions in private recommendations to Washington. He shouted them to everyone who would listen.

When he was directed to clear any public pronouncements with his superiors, he flagrantly defied the directive.

If MacArthur's coup had succeeded, he would have in effect engineered a successful military uprising against civilian authority, which is a pillar of our democracy.

If MacArthur's coup had succeeded, the coalition of free nations in the United Nations would have been destroyed and we would find ourselves engaged in a lonely war with China's millions.

In the face of MacArthur's calculated insurrection, plainly documented in the exhibits released by the White House early today, the show-down was inevitable.

Mr. Truman didn't start this fight. He didn't seek it. He tried long and hard to resolve it without an explosion.

But each conciliatory gesture increased MacArthur's defiance. The general was literally engaged in a two-front war; and his obsession with his war against the White House steadily overshadowed his interest in the Korean front.

President Truman was confronted with the choice of summary action or total abdication of national leadership.

We applaud his action.

In the clamor that has already begun the Republican strategists and their typewriter commandos will valiantly strive to befuddle the country.

They will attempt to prove that the only issue in the dispute was whether General MacArthur should have been allowed to use Chiang Kai-shek's idle troops.

In reality, of course, what MacArthur was proposing was no such limited and luxurious course. He was proposing—and on this point he was more honest than his political cheer leaders—total war with China. He was proposing an infinitely greater commitment of American troops to China than any now contemplated. None of his political supporters has dared to spell out the dimensions of his dream.

The MacArthur blueprint for the conquest of Asia inevitably collided with all UN efforts to achieve peace in Korea. That was the heart of the rising anti-MacArthur resentment among our allies. That was the basic cause of the deepening divisions in the free world.

Today the fog may seem thick on Capitol Hill but the ouster of MacArthur has cleared the international air.

It has cemented the unity of free men. It has destroyed any moral uncertainty about our cause in Korea. It has once again put the issue of war or peace where it belongs—squarely up to the Chinese Communists.

Mr. Truman's action has blasted the biggest propaganda guns of the commissars in Europe and Asia alike. We do not know whether new mediation efforts in Korea will succeed or fail. We do know there can be no doubt anywhere in the world about responsibility for prolongation of the war. The President's dismissal of MacArthur in itself reaffirms the integrity of the goals which we and our allies have proclaimed in Korea.

The irresponsibles will have their field day. Puny men who would rather fight Harry S. Truman than build freedom's defenses against Communist aggression will aim all their pop-guns at the President. But Mr. Truman will gain new respect and affection from men of good will at home and abroad for his gallantry under fire. There are no persuasive words of restraint we can address to the know-nothings at this juncture; but we are sure that thousands of citizens who appreciate the nature of the President's ordeal will let him know their feelings now.

In recent weeks many eminent Republican philosophers and essayists have suggested that the only real question confronting the country was whether MacArthur would let Mr. Truman remain in the White House.

Mr. Truman has given them their answer. In doing so he has reaffirmed the dignity of his office and the strength of our free institutions.

[From the New York Post of April 11, 1951]

THE CRACKDOWN

(By Max Lerner)

The crackdown on Gen. Douglas MacArthur by President Truman had to come. And it is well that it came when it did instead of being delayed again and again. There could never have been any doubt on the main issue, which was not the question of policy in Asia but the question of who has the right to shape the foreign policy of the United States.

Nevertheless it took courage for President Truman to do what he did. When a general hurls a direct challenge at the whole civilian authority of the American Government, and refuses to conduct his command except on the terms of his own political high policy, his challenge cannot be met by appeasement or double-talk or cowardly acquiescence.

There is only one way to meet it, and that is by the resolution and courage which the President has shown.

This MacArthur crisis is the first major internal crisis of the military caste that America has had to meet during this era of world wars. To find anything like its equal one must look to the political adventures of the Reichswehr generals or of the military dictatorship of Latin America. Since the days of Cromwell the British, with their common sense and their discipline, have managed to steer clear of such crises. America has had the good fortune to have military heroes like Eisenhower and Marshall, Bradley and Nimitz, who have had a basic concern for civilian democratic practices. Even the Billy Mitchell affair and the recent battle of the Pentagon over the admirals have been minor compared with the MacArthur crisis.

The first result of the President's decision is bound to be healthy. America itself was caught in a conflict of loyalties, between loyalty to democratic government, and loyalty to a flaming military symbol who had become a hero and myth to many, and an antiadministration messiah who could never do wrong. Such a conflict of loyalties between a military hero and a democratic society is bound to end in disaster unless it is decisively resolved.

We are also caught in a crisis of confidence in the United Nations, and among our allies in Western Europe and in the Near East and India. Another few weeks of this crisis, and the whole fabric of understanding that we had labored for years to build up with our allies would have toppled in ruins.

Now that crisis of confidence has been resolved, and the free world can once more stand together in unity against the threat of Kremlin imperialism, in Asia and Europe as well.

But it would be folly to believe that the MacArthur crisis is now over. In one sense the rough part of it has just begun. The real fight is still ahead.

Don't underestimate MacArthur's flair for the dramatic, or his sense of destiny at whose service his dramatic sense functions.

Will he accept his dismissal from his high posts, and come home as a private citizen determined to do nothing to split his country further and exploit the split? Or will he lend his name and fame and personality to a movement that can fan all the worst hatreds and the most inflammable emotions in the Nation?

In The Riddle of MacArthur, John Gunther says there is much of the old-fashioned nineteenth century political liberal in him. I hope Gunther will be proved right, for a nineteenth century liberal—or a twentieth century one for that matter—would never dream of pushing his fight to the edge of civil strife. Will MacArthur show that kind of restraint?

One can guess that on his return to America from which he has been absent so long, MacArthur will be received by a considerable segment of the press and Congress and the people both as a hero and a martyr. I have been traveling currently in the deeply Republican territory of Rochester and Buffalo, and many of the people with whom I have discussed MacArthur give him an almost grotesque idolatry and have made him the symbol of all their anxieties and frustrations. Both those who want the Korean war extended and those who think we should never have entered it link hands in supporting him and cursing Truman and Acheson.

Once the big batteries among the Congress Republicans and the press reactionaries start firing, the din will be deafening. This is what MacArthur has all along counted on, and the threat of this was his trump card. He is now probably ready to play it.

President Truman has known all this, which is what makes his act all the more courageous. He has shown himself willing to meet one of the peak crises of his Presidency unflinchingly.

He has been patient, all too patient, for months. He has given MacArthur the benefit of every doubt, shown him every deference.

Surely never in the history of a democracy has a civilian government acted so patiently, and never has a military man so blatantly goaded it and jibed at it.

In the end there was no other answer but to show that the foreign policy of the United States is shaped in the United States, by the people we have elected to shape it, and not at the whim of a supreme commander in Tokyo.

Wagner once had the fantasy of a Gotterdamerung, or Twilight of the Gods, in which they went down with a magnificent crash, pulling the pillars of the world down after them. It remains to see whether MacArthur has still this delusion of Wagnerian grandeur.

If there is to be a fight, there is no question that American democracy will win. But what a tragic waste it will mean at a time when every energy is needed for the larger world crisis.

Indian Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the following recent article concerning our American Indians, written by George Sokolsky, brought to the attention of the Members of the House:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Every day there is something new to discover in the United States. This country is so big and varied, and in each section the people are so different.

The other day I was in Tucson, Ariz., and I went to the Rotary Club there to listen to the chief of the Papago deliver one of the most eloquent speeches that I had ever heard.

His name is Thomas A. Segundo, and he is so obviously a leader of men that were

he not an Indian—a ward of the Department of the Interior—he could have been a Member of Congress without any loss to that august body.

What struck me so closely is that we, who are so eager to aid every nation on earth, do practically nothing for those from whom we have taken this country; that we violate our treaties with them; and that there are bills in Congress, at the present moment, designed to rob them, to steal their lands, and to deprive them of the few benefits remaining to them.

Perhaps we need a point 4 program for the American Indian right here at home.

Millions, if not billions of dollars, have been spent by the American taxpayer on the Indian Bureau, but there is little evidence to show benefits to the Indian from these expenditures. In fact, it would seem, from the results, that the design of the Bureau has been to make the Indian more dependent upon the bureaucrats.

The Papagos, for instance, can report that they have fewer schools and hospitalization facilities than 10 years ago.

Most Americans might look at the figure of 2,855,024 acres that the Papagos have as a reservation, and assume that they are land rich. But Arizona is an arid country, its desert lands being among the least productive in the United States.

I am told that in many parts of the West the Indian reservations are on bad lands where living is difficult unless oil or minerals are found and the Indians are not robbed.

We know too little about these people whom we conquered. We, who have the advantage of living here, owe them at least the debt of fair treatment.

I have on several occasions in these pieces called attention to the facts that the so-called pigmented peoples of the world, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, distrust the United States more than they do Soviet Russia.

The reason is that they are more offended by our social attitude toward the pigmented people in our midst.

Soviet Russia has taken full advantage of this and has conducted a long and successful propaganda against this country on the basis of what they call white supremacy.

While not accepting the Russian version of our social position, I cannot deny that they have presented a picture which Chinese, Indians, Iranians, Pakistani, and all the peoples of Africa accept as true.

In Korea many of our major difficulties have arisen from the belief that all Americans hate and like to kill those who are not white.

This presents a serious problem for a nation which is seeking allies among these very peoples. Certainly our treatment of the American Indian confirms the suspicion of unfairness. Even if we cannot be responsible for what our ancestors did, we must avoid doing more of the same, and if we do not behave decently for the sake of the American Indian, we might from the standpoint of national self-interest.

I was told that some of the most outrageous bills introduced in Congress are designed to rob the Indian of his lands in the interest of oil companies which know of oil deposits beneath the soil.

It would be advantageous to the United States to give the Indian a square deal, to make him an independent citizen, and to protect him in his economic rights. We have taken a good country from him.

We have treated other peoples whom we have conquered, the Cubans, the Filipinos, the Japanese, and the Germans, with fairness. We can treat the Indians with fairness and justice.

Money wasted by a Washington bureau does not always indicate benefits to those who require them. Perhaps if we consulted the American Indians, they might come up with a better program than we have yet seen.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to the Federated Legislative Committee of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me at Harrisburg last Tuesday, April 10, at the annual luncheon of the Federated Legislative Committee of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an inspiration to meet again with this courageous group of God fearing men and women.

Over the years you have manned the ramparts defending good government. You have battled bravely for law and order, the Constitution and the American way of life.

Year after year you have taken part in government in order that we may have good laws and that good men may have aid in properly administering them.

Never in the history of the United States have we needed organizations like yours as much as we do today.

Our country is confronted with so many dangers. People point to the dangers but take no action. They fail to realize that in America the laws are passed and enforced by the people. The source of all power is in the hands of the people if they will assert themselves.

The greatest danger to America is not from without. It is from within. The real dangers are here at home.

The terrible revelations we have had during the last few months should shake us out of our complacency.

There has been brought forcefully to our attention the existence of widespread evils which threaten the foundations of free government.

There has been produced clear and convincing evidence that men in high Government places have betrayed the responsibilities entrusted to them.

We have been told how racketeers and gambling syndicates have gained wealth and power through corrupt alliances with some law enforcement officers and crooked politicians.

These shocking disclosures should have only one meaning. They should be a call to every decent, self-respecting American to engage in relentless war against the forces of vice and lawlessness.

Senator FULBRIGHT stated the case very clearly when he said:

"It is bad enough to have corruption in our midst but it is worse if it is to be condoned and accepted as inevitable."

It has been proposed that we formulate a new statement of ethical standards and moral principles for the conduct of public affairs.

That might be helpful, but I believe we can place complete reliance upon the eternal truths that have guided men of good will on the path of honor and righteousness since the dawn of Christianity.

No man in possession of his mental faculties is unable to distinguish between right and wrong. Even those whose vision is blinded by selfishness, greed, and the desire for quick riches are aware of what is good and what is in violation of law or morality.

No man-made code of ethics can replace the guide to human conduct set forth in the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount.

Obedience to the laws of God and man is the foundation of good citizenship and good government.

Patriotism, religion, and high moral standards are fundamental qualities without which no nation can go forward.

Regardless of its form of government, regardless of the laws placed upon its books, no nation can rise above the moral and spiritual standards of its people.

No community can be better than its individuals.

That is why I say that every good citizen, every man and woman who worships at the altar of God, should take an intelligent, patriotic, and militant part in government.

That means taking part in politics. It means working for the election of men of integrity and high character—dedicated to public service rather than personal power or private gain.

It means arousing public opinion to a higher standard of morality, to inspire deeper respect for the law and to assure confidence in the integrity of our officials and our courts.

An informed and aroused electorate could overnight transform corruption into sound government by turning grafting officials out of office.

In his testimony before the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, made this significant statement, and I quote:

"If the laws against gambling were earnestly and vigorously enforced, organized gambling would be eliminated within 48 hours in any community in the land."

I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Hoover but I know that permanent results cannot be achieved without a great awakening of civic responsibility.

The most effective leadership in that direction should, and must, come from the pulpit and from the great body of laymen who hold official positions in our church organizations.

The ills from which our Nation suffers today can be overcome if we have a strong, militant church, battling day in and day out, for good sound, clean, economic Government.

That means fighting for a solvent America. It means vigorous and aggressive action against all forms of waste and extravagance in Government spending. It means determined opposition to unsound fiscal policies, unbalanced budgets, excessive taxation, increasing public debt, and the destructive force of runaway inflation.

We must remember that bankruptcy is the inevitable consequence of spending beyond one's means, whether by an individual or a government. And we must take warning from history that national bankruptcy always brings a totalitarian form of government. That means the loss of all individual freedom, including the most precious of all, freedom of religion.

Therefore, I say to you men and women of the church, clean and decent government is your business. Economy in government is your business.

There must be a real understanding of patriotic Americanism. All must recognize the sovereignty of God and the immortality of the soul. Then we shall have brotherhood among men. Churches and nations will unite for peace and good will in the world.

Lastly, in this period of stress and uncertainty we should all live so we may be counted on the Lord's side.

That will give us an army of such strength and with such faith that none can defeat us.

Immigration Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following resolution which was adopted by the United States Grand Lodge, Independent Order Brith Abraham, with reference to pending immigration bills. I heartily endorse the recommendations set forth therein.

Whereas for more than 2 years committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been studying and conducting hearings for the purpose of revising the United States immigration and nationality laws; and

Whereas hearings on bills introduced by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, and Representative EMANUEL CELLER are now being held in Washington before a Joint House and Senate Judiciary Committee: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Independent Order Brith Abraham go on record that the sections of the proposed bill the order is interested in are:

1. To support the pooling of unused quotas, which would utilize unused portions of annual quotas and make them available to other qualified immigrants so as to assure the admission of the over-all total of 154,000 immigrants per year as originally fixed by Congress.

2. To support maximum review of judicial and administrative rulings and to support the proposal for the establishment of a Visa Review Board, the same as presently exists in the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

3. To oppose any provisions in the bill which do away with or fail to include provisions for statutes of limitations.

4. To oppose the principle of selective immigration on the ground that it approaches the immigrant from an economic standpoint; regards immigrants as commodities, and ignores the basis of traditional American immigration policies.

5. To support the principles of equal treatment of involuntary members of totalitarian groups, whether of the left or right.

6. To favor the use of the latest possible census period as a basis for computing quotas so as to take into account the latest changes for distribution of population.

7. To support liberalization of the provisions for suspension of deportation, and not to remove the existing law which requires either a stated period of residence or proof that deportation would result in hardship.

LOUIS A. WEISSMAN,
Grand Master.
ADOLPH STERN,
Grand Secretary.

The Communists Rejoice Over the Removal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Times-Herald of April 13, 1951, by Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher, expresses quite accurately the sentiments that are disclosed by true Americans from whom I am receiving communications.

The Communists have infiltrated into the key positions of our Government throughout a long period of time, and have practically taken over our foreign policies. Some years ago I published at my own expense a list of over 600 alleged Communists in Government, and gave the name and address of each, and claimed no immunity for mentioning their names and alleged communism. I circulated this list among all of the Legion posts of my district. This was years before present developments.

I have called attention time and again in the RECORD of the activities of Alger Hiss in the trade-agreements program. It will be recalled that I warned the House that a large percent of the 101 experts who went to the Geneva Conference to deal with tariff rates were Communists.

The time has long since passed when the American people can afford to surrender their vital interests to these subversive elements, domestic and foreign, that are now applauding the removal of General MacArthur in the Far East.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks the editorial to which I have referred:

LITTLE LIES TO SUPPORT THE BIG LIE

The Communist Party in the United States has enthusiastically endorsed the dismissal of General MacArthur, calling him an "ultra-warmonger" and "the Caesar of the Pacific." They know their real enemies from their pretended ones.

The British Socialists are ecstatic, for they really procured MacArthur's dismissal through their tool, Acheson, the Anglo-Canadian friend of traitors. They hate the general because his efforts to rehabilitate Japan threaten them with a trade rival. They are anxious to give Korea and Formosa to the Communists as a bribe for their retention of Hong Kong.

The French are also exultant. Their political structure is so permeated with communism that they can organize neither industry nor an army effectively enough to defend themselves. Their contributions to the United Nations forces in Korea have been minuscule, and they resent the use of American forces there. The French want those divisions in Europe to give France the protection her people will not give themselves.

NATION SHOCKED

The people who are shocked and horrified by Mr. Truman's dismissal of the Nation's greatest soldier are the voters of the United States. Their spontaneous protests have overwhelmed the telegraph offices of Washington. Thousands of their messages demand the impeachment of Truman and Acheson.

Mr. Truman went on the radio Wednesday night in an effort to stem this national tide of anger. He and Acheson realized that they had fired the general for saying what the people of the Nation think. It was therefore necessary for Truman to defend his foreign policy, particularly in Asia. That policy is based on a big lie, the big lie of collective security. Its defense required a series of little falsehoods and half truths.

"If history has taught us anything," asserted Mr. Truman, "it is that aggression anywhere in the world is a threat to peace everywhere in the world."

This is a lie, often repeated to justify killing American youths in every swamp or desert on the globe, in the role of world policemen. If aggression anywhere is a threat to peace everywhere, why is Mr. Truman silent about British aggression against the free nation of Egypt; about British exploitation of Iranian oil that is threatening to drive the Persians into the arms of Russia; about French enslavement of Morocco, and all the other aggressions of European colonialism?

He dwelt on free nations banding together for collective security. This is a double-barreled lie. There are no free countries aside from the United States, Scandinavia, and Switzerland. Britain is a Socialist tyranny at home and a colonial tyranny abroad. France combines Communist decay with tottering imperialism. Both have succumbed to the theory that man is the property of the state, which Truman seeks to inflict on us, and that means the death of freedom.

As for collective security, where is it? We provide the security, and the rest of the world does the collecting. The United Nations is a fraud. It reluctantly endorsed Mr. Truman's unconstitutional war in Korea, and has been doing everything in its power since to placate the Communists and give them across the conference table what they have failed to win by arms.

LIMITED WAR IS ITSELF A LIE

Mr. Truman said that in Korea we have taught the enemy a lesson. In the next breath he said that the enemy is building up forces for a new attack. What he didn't say is that this rally of Communist strength is being accomplished with his approval and assistance. His directive of March 20 forbade General MacArthur to go in force across the thirty-eighth parallel. This is what Mr. Truman calls limited war. It is not limited merely to Korea. It is limited to South Korea.

"Limited war" is in itself a lie. What is being conducted in Korea, by direction of Truman and the United Nations, is a war without an objective and without end. This is supposed to keep us out of a general war. Communist China fights us, but we are not to fight China. There is nothing limited about the casualties that this folly has inflicted on America.

Mr. Truman quite obviously doesn't want a military victory in Korea because the British, who dominate his policy, don't want one. This sell-out to the Reds is already prepared. They are to have Formosa and a seat in U. N., the British promise. In these circumstances Mr. Truman's conditions for peace in Korea become a mockery.

He says that fighting must stop, concrete steps must be taken to insure against resumption of fighting, and there must be an end to the aggression. This, he says, will prepare the way for the unification of Korea and the withdrawal of all foreign forces.

These are empty words. They cannot mean what Mr. Truman wants people to believe they mean. If he and the United Nations pursue such a program, Korea will be unified, but it will be as a Red Korea.

He would withdraw foreign forces. That leaves the North Korean Communist Army the master of the peninsula.

Mr. Truman's joint chiefs of staff only recently reported that it had no supply of such infantry weapons as mortars and machine guns with which to arm idle South Korean reserves. Those weapons, apparently, are earmarked for Europe. The Truman program, his speech makes apparent, is to liquidate his Korean misadventure in order to prepare American conscripts for a new slaughter across the Atlantic.

Truman's folly is as appalling as his falsehoods.

He and his Svengali, Acheson, must be impeached.

Scandal Marked White House Since Truman Took Over Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the deluge of telegrams and letters from the highways and byways of the Nation and from people in all walks of life, protesting the middle-of-the-night action of President Truman in firing General MacArthur and the bitterness which his action has engendered on the home front is due in a large measure to the nausea inflicted on the people by the Truman administration.

This latest episode came almost 6 years ago to the day from the time the ex-Missouri haberdasher, who had been rescued by Tom Pendergast, was shoved behind the Chief Executive's desk in the White House.

On that occasion, Mr. Truman likened his feelings to having a load of hay fall on him. Almost each new act and each new utterance emphasizes the existence of the effects of such an experience.

Millions of Americans are suffering from an ailment which the family physician used to call overloaded stomach. They are sick at stomach and weary at heart. The high blood pressure among the citizens, brought on by the MacArthur removal, is as much a flare-up from national malnutrition caused by absence of grounds for confidence in officials in charge of foreign and domestic affairs in Washington as anything else.

This malady has been induced and aggravated by ptomaine poisoning from such things as 5-percenters, mink coats, deep freezers, perjury, disclosures of alliances between politicians and crooks, and ill-framed utterances from the White House in men's room language, concerning punched noses to be forthcoming when the Chief Executive turns in the keys to the White House because certain newspapermen have not always said honeyed words about the President and his family.

American citizens are once again proving themselves a patient lot. The President would do well to look about him for this trait in his fellow citizens and try to absorb some of it himself in these trying times.

Americans have had the atom-bomb secret stolen from them by Communist spies and yet heard the Chief Executive berate a congressional committee attempting to expose Moscow-directed espionage operations. They have learned of the theft of top-flight Government secrets and yet heard the Secretary of State say "he would not turn his back" on one of his aides accused in the plot. The aide, incidentally, was convicted of perjury and is now in jail.

They have tolerated a long list of scandals that have decorated the Truman Fair Deal administration like a Christmas tree.

A Washington newspaper, the Times-Herald, has summarized these scandals which have been inflicted on the public since Mr. Truman became boss in the White House. It appears they will have historical significance in this great and tragic era, and for that reason I am asking that the article be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SCANDAL MARKED WHITE HOUSE SINCE TRUMAN TOOK OVER RULE—FAVORITISM, INFLUENCE ORDER OF THE DAY PUNCTUATED WITH FREEZERS, MINK COATS

The Truman administration has been pockmarked by scandals almost from the day Harry S. Truman raised his right hand in the Cabinet room of the executive offices and became the thirty-third President of the United States.

While the new Chief Executive humbly begged for help in carrying out the task thrust upon his shoulders by death, an army of cronies, friends, political pals, and relatives went to work to help themselves mostly at the expense of taxpayers.

Favoritism and influence became the order of the day. Fixers, swindlers, manipulators, Communist spies, and Red fellow travelers operated within the administration and even from within the White House.

SCANDALS GALORE

The administration has been marked by scandals bursting in the air. These include favors, vote frauds, deep freezes, mink coats, vast profits for pals, spying, treason, 5 percent operations, and other forms of graft and corruption.

Administration apologists maintain that Mr. Truman doesn't know about the corruption around him. Critics maintain he doesn't care. The record is at hand to speak for itself.

Shortly after he became Vice President, Mr. Truman flew to Kansas City to attend the funeral of Tom Pendergast, boss of the notorious Kansas City Democratic machine, who had not long before been released from prison for income-tax evasion. Pendergast had picked Mr. Truman, after he had failed as a haberdasher, and launched him into politics. For loyal service to the machine Pendergast made him a Senator.

FIRED PENDERGAST'S JAILER

Almost his first act as President was to fire Maurice Milligan, United States attorney general in Kansas City. Milligan had put Pendergast in jail. Mr. Truman also fired Attorney General Francis Biddle, who had refused to remove Milligan.

Mr. Truman won the senatorial election in 1934 by 41,000 votes. The majority came from Kansas City where the Pendergast machine had long been and still is adept at stealing votes. In the 1934 election the announced count showed 120,180 votes for Mr. Truman and only 1,221 for his opponent.

Two years later a Federal judge started a clean-up which ended in removing 58,881 ghost votes from the Kansas City polling lists.

In the August 1946 primary vote frauds were charged and ballots were impounded. On a night in May 1947, while Mr. Truman was sleeping in a hotel a few blocks away, the courthouse safe, containing the ballots, was dynamited and the ballots were stolen. No one was ever prosecuted for the crime.

PARDONED IN VOTE FRAUD

A few months later Mr. Truman pardoned Mrs. Frances Ryan, one of 63 Kansas City election frauders, and restored her civil rights. This cog in the Pendergast machine was convicted for her part in 1936 vote frauds. The White House described the pardon as routine.

Last year another scandal exploded in Kansas City with fatal results. As the Senate Crime Committee was investigating the alliance between crime and the Democratic machine in that city, Charles Binaggio, gangster, was slain with his bodyguard in a Democratic ward headquarters. Binaggio met his death underneath a picture of Truman.

Binaggio's assassination blocked his plans to invest $200,000 in the New Mexico pumice enterprise of David F. Wallace, brother-in-law of the President. Wallace became interested in developing pumice when it appeared that the material might be used in building blocks more impervious to atomic radiation than other building materials. The involved fortunes of Pumex, a corporation formed to follow the development, have never been untangled by Congress.

From the outset of his administration Mr. Truman doled out plums to his pals and cronies with the lavish hand of a medieval monarch. Ability counted for nothing against friendship.

MRS. TRUMAN ON PAYROLL

The President began doling out Federal largesse when he was a Senator. He put Mrs. Truman on his senatorial payroll and eventually raised her to $4,000 a year. When this became a scandal because Mrs. Truman did not go to his office it was explained that Mrs. Truman helped her husband at home by reading Missouri newspapers. Daughter Margaret has parlayed the White House and an undistinguished voice into one of the highest paying radio contracts.

It was not long before activities of the President's official family were revealed. Brig. Gen. Wallace H. Graham, the President's personal physician, was found to have been trading in the grain market, using inside information to make profits. Instead of being removed, he was promoted.

FIVE-PERCENTER JAILED

Major General Vaughan, the President's military aide, was revealed to have accepted seven deep freezes in return for favors granted. One of the freezes went to Mrs. Truman. Vaughan pulled many wires even to getting scarce materials for a race track when veterans were clamoring for homes.

The deep freezes were an incident in the scandal of influence peddling by persons who charged 5 percent for their wire pulling. The inquiry by Congress resulted in only one jail sentence—that for John Maragon, a one-time Kansas City bootblack, who was sentenced to jail for perjury. Investigators charged him with making $120,000 in a 5-year period when he had sworn his income was only $30,000.

Donald Dawson, White House administrative assistant on personnel, is the latest member of the Truman official family to be involved in scandal. He is charged with employing influence to win RFC loans for friends and deserving Democrats. He has refused to appear before a Senate subcommittee investigating the RFC. Mr. Truman has not made him appear to tell his story.

Mrs. Lauretta Young, a White House stenographer, got a $9,500 pastel mink coat, which has figured in the investigation. Joseph Rosenbaum, interested in securing RFC loans, says he loaned money to her husband, E. Merl Young, so that he might purchase the coat.

FROM $1,900 TO $80,000

Mrs. Young was a secretary to the President when he was a Senator. Mr. Truman got the husband a job as messenger at $1,900 a year. When Mr. Truman became President, Young became an RFC examiner and then an expediter. That is, he assisted persons desiring RFC loans. His income for last year was estimated at $80,000 by Senate investigators.

The RFC scandal also uncovered a ship deal under which a group of administration figures and military men made a $2,800,000 profit on an investment of $100,000. The group included the late former Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, former Representative Joseph Casey, Democrat, of Massachusetts, Admiral William F. (Bull) Halsey and Brig. Gen. Julius Holmes.

The administration is working to shut off investigation of the RFC scandals. It is reliably reported that there are available almost a thousand influence letters to the RFC. Of these it is reported that Dawson wrote 100, Democratic National Chairman William Boyle wrote 50 and various Members of Congress wrote 800.

The administration is also seeking to shut off the investigation into crime, which has linked Democratic city machines to crime. Alliances have been uncovered in Chicago, Kansas City, Miami, New York, and other cities.

In New York gangsters were revealed as associating with top Democratic figures, including former Mayor William O'Dwyer, who resigned the mayoralty just before the lid blew off the scandal and was appointed ambassador to Mexico by Mr. Truman.

OTHERS GIVEN PARDON

James W. Curley, Democratic leader in Massachusetts and former mayor of Boston, got a pardon from Mr. Truman. He was sentenced to prison on a mail-fraud charge. Another New Dealer was convicted on the same fraud. He was Donald W. Smith, former National Labor Relations Board member.

Mr. Truman opened prison doors last December to E. F. Prichard, Jr., a protege of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, who was sentenced to 2 years in jail for ballot-box stuffing. Prichard, a Harvard graduate, was a New Deal lawyer.

Other recipients of Truman pardons and parole were Joseph M. Schenck, the motion-picture producer who was convicted on income-tax dodging; James Gavin, a pal of Vice President BARKLEY and a contributor to the Democratic Party, who also ran afoul of income-tax laws, and Frank Banning, a jewel thief. Banning admitted his pardon had been obtained by political influence. Within a year he was put back in jail under a 60-year sentence for shooting a policeman.

New Dealers and Fair Dealers sent to prison during Mr. Truman's years in the White House include: Former Representative Andrew J. May, Democrat, of Kentucky, who was convicted of accepting bribes of $53,634 to further fortunes of an Illinois munitions firm. Murray and Henry Garsson, heads of the firm, also went to jail.

Maj. Gen. Bennett E. Meyers of the Air Force, sentenced to prison for inducing a former business associate to lie under oath. Testimony showed that as second ranking Army Air Force purchasing officer he took profits of $150,000 out of an aviation electric corporation.

Eugene B. Casey, former White House aide to President Roosevelt, was sentenced to 6 months in jail and fined $30,000 in 1947 for income-tax evasion.

Kenneth Romney, Sergeant at Arms of the House for 15 years, was jailed in 1947 when a $143,863 shortage was found in his accounts.

The most sensational scandal of the Truman administration has been the disclosures of the influences of Communists and fellow travelers in the administration.

FIELD FLEES TO RIDE

Capstone of this scandal is Alger Hiss, who went to jail last month after appeal to the Supreme Court failed on his conviction as a perjurer-spy. Although Hiss' spying was done under the Roosevelt administration, the Truman administration bent every effort to win his release. Even after the conviction State Secretary Acheson said he would not turn his back on his pal.

Harry Julian Wadleigh and Noel Field, State Department officials figured in the Hiss trial but were never accused themselves. Wadleigh admitted stealing 400 to 500 documents and passing them on for relay to Moscow. Field fled behind the iron curtain and is assumed to be in Russia.

Judith Coplon, an employee of the Justice Department, was convicted of spying by juries in New York and Washington. The New York conviction, which involved a Soviet U. N. attaché, Valentin Gubichev, was reversed and remanded for new trial. A Washington spying conviction still stands over her.

William Remington, a Commerce Department official, was convicted of lying about Communist connections. The administration had worked to discredit the case against him in a general indictment of Communist exposures as "red herrings."

BRIDGES CONVICTED AS LIAR

Harry Bridges, head of the west coast longshoremen's union, who was a stanch New Dealer, was convicted of lying when he swore that he wasn't a Communist at the time he took out naturalization papers.

The Amerasia case is another phase of the administration scandal involving Communists and Communist spying. John S. Service, a State Department official, and Philip J. Jaffe, editor of the magazine Amerasia, were among six persons involved in the case.

Others were Kate Mitchell, coeditor of the magazine; Andrew Roth, a Navy lieutenant; Emanual S. Larsen, another State Department employee, and Mark S. Gayn.

Class Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution:

CITY OF CHELSEA, MASS., *April 9, 1951.*

RESOLUTION AGAINST THE DEFERMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS FROM ENTERING THE MILITARY SERVICE

Whereas the President has promulgated an order deferring the drafting of college students; and

Whereas the city government of Chelsea consider this an un-American method of all citizens bearing the same burden, both poor and rich; and

Whereas there should be no class legislation where the safety of a country is concerned and all Americans should bear their equal rights, privileges, and duties of their citizenship: Now, therefore, we register our protest and urge the President and Congress not to enforce this promulgation:

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and all the Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts.

JAMES A. HANLON.

In board of aldermen, April 9, 1951, adopted.
Approved, April 11, 1951.

JOSEPH A. MELLEY,
Mayor.

A true copy.
Attest:

JOSEPH A. TYRELL,
City Clerk.

Senator Wherry Defends General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the American people are deeply disturbed over the action of President Truman in summarily relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from command of United Nations troops in the war in Korea.

Some observations on this tragic action were made by the junior Senator from Nebraska over the Mutual Broadcasting System last night in reply to a radio address by the President the previous night.

The junior Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent for insertion and printing of his address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WHERRY DEFENDS GENERAL MACARTHUR

(Senator WHERRY denounces President Truman's removal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as supreme commander of United Nations forces in the war in Korea—as shabby treatment for a great soldier, statesman, and patriot; urges congressional hearing for General MacArthur and investigation of administration's foreign policies and national defense planning.)

My fellow Americans, the action of President Truman in summarily relieving Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his command over the United Nations forces in Korea—and from his other high commands in the Pacific—is added evidence there is vital need for examination and investigation by the Congress of the administration's foreign policies and national defense planning.

As we survey the world of today, the record of failure in foreign policies, that has brought us dangerously near another world war, the war in Korea dragging along in indecision, and increasing the tear-stained pillows across the Nation, the exposures of moral decay in high places, the Government's fiscal situation depending upon deeper and deeper drafts upon the taxpayers, the times cry aloud for this Congress to reassert its independence and develop a sound national defense policy.

In both foreign policy and national defense partisan political approaches deserve the condemnation of every patriotic citizen.

We must accomplish a united front in our dealings with foreign nations. To inject partisanship into national defense planning in which the lives and future of our youth are at stake is completely in contradiction with the American way.

But it is the right and duty of every citizen—and especially those of us in the Congress—to offer constructive criticism. That is the process of our republican form of government.

It is in this spirit that I address you tonight, and judging by the flood of telegrams and letters which have come to my office, and the volume of telephone calls from all parts of the country in the last 48 hours, the American people are deeply disturbed over

the dismissal of General MacArthur, our vacillating foreign policy, and our hit-or-miss national defense planning.

What the American people want is national security. They are asking for a sound program of national defense. They are demanding a thorough congressional ventilation of the Truman-MacArthur affair, and other phases of the administration's zigzag, inept foreign policies that have led our Nation to the brink of another world war.

Cries of "wolf, wolf" and charges that others are trying to maneuver the United States into another world war, will not enable those responsible for our present perilous situation to escape the wrath of the American people.

To charge General MacArthur with attempting to involve the United States in a gigantic war with Red China and precipitate unleashing of a third world war is resented by every thinking American familiar with the glorious record of this great statesman, soldier, patriot.

The pygmies cannot bring down this giant, this tower of strength and deserving idol of the American people.

Compare the monumental record of General MacArthur with that of his accusers, with their record of moral decay, greed, corruption, and confusion of these weaklings in the Truman administration.

The result of such a comparison can be only an alarm to the American people.

With all the force that is in me, fellow Americans, I ask you to remember the admonition that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The obvious truth is that the ship of state is floundering in a whirlpool of mink coats, paternalism, RFC-influenced loans, crooked political machines in league with national organizations, class arrayed against class, and a new scandal the order of the day.

Yes, fellow Americans, it is high time to become vigilant and militant. Your freedoms are at stake, and there is danger that runaway inflation will consume the people's wealth and render our beloved country unable to stand as the bulwark of freedom against the communistic threat.

Pollyanna speeches by the President that he is against war and is trying to prevent a third world war are not enough. The American people do not question his sincerity or his patriotism. None of us wants another world war. But there is an old adage that the road to destruction is paved with good intentions.

Fellow Americans, Gen. Douglas MacArthur needs no defense. He will take care of that when he comes home. And this leader of our victorious forces in the Pacific in World War II, this wounded hero of World War I, will return to his beloved country in triumph armed with the sword of experience and a knowledge of economic, political, and military conditions in the Far East unsurpassed by any living American.

On behalf of many Republican Members of the Congress (an overwhelming majority of them), I have introduced into the Senate a concurrent resolution, inviting General MacArthur to address a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives.

An identical resolution has been introduced in the House by the minority leader, JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts. These resolutions should be adopted by both Houses, and we are making every effort we can for their adoption. On the floor of the Senate I invited all the members of the Democratic Party to join in support of the resolution.

General MacArthur is entitled to his day in court. The American people want to hear what General MacArthur has to say. They are waiting for his words of wisdom.

The Nation heard over this mutual network last night the President's weak defense of his shabby treatment of this great general and statesman. Now, let us hear from General MacArthur. Let's extend him an invitation to report to the Congress and to the American people.

But more than fair play is involved. Fundamental basic issues are at stake. They can be resolved only by the Congress as representatives of the people.

I do not question the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to relieve General MacArthur—or any other military officer from his command or commands. But I do question the wisdom of the President in removing General MacArthur.

My memories go back to the court martialing of Gen. Billy Mitchell, the great exponent of air power. Oh, yes; there was a roar of condemnation against Billy Mitchell, because he exposed the stupidity of majoring in ground forces where there was available the overpowering weapon of airplanes.

Billy Mitchell, too, was smeared and finally drummed out of the air corps by court martial. But Billy Mitchell was right and—long after his death—the Congress belatedly recognized the tremendous service he had given to his country. A resolution was unanimously adopted and this great patriot was decorated posthumously. And this Nation owes Billy Mitchell an everlasting debt of gratitude for the services he performed.

Again and again the President, in his radio address last night, stated that he was trying to prevent a third world war, and that his removal of the general was designed to show, that it was done to prove he does not want a third world war.

Well, who got us into this war? This is Truman's war and let the record show that the President did not obtain a declaration of war by the Congress as the Constitution provides.

I have seen no statements by General MacArthur that he wants a third world war. I have not seen any statement by him that he wants to send American foot soldiers into Manchuria. Certainly he has not suggested an all-out war with China. He has advised, that the offer of a half-million anti-Communist Chinese on Formosa to join the United Nations forces should be accepted.

Is there any reason why these volunteers should be rejected? They will take the places of thousands of American boys who will be drafted and sent to Korea.

The North Korea Communists have no qualm against accepting the aid of any Communists, whether they be Chinese, Japanese, or Russian.

These anti-Communist Chinese on Formosa are directly interested in victory for the republican forces of Korea. They desire to aid the South Koreans. Why should their request for an opportunity to help be denied? Is it better to let your sons fight and die in Korea than to let these anti-Communist Chinese fight for a toehold toward eventual liberation of their native China?

But, yet, fellow Americans, that is what the administration's policy means.

General MacArthur has said that the United Nations forces are fighting with one arm behind their backs, meaning inability to bomb Communist supply bases across the Yalu River creates a great handicap. Everybody knows this is true. General MacArthur revealed no military secret in pointing that out.

And, fellow Americans, the constitutional power of the President—as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces—gives him no authority to consign American troops to fight under conditions in which they cannot defend themselves.

Certainly the Constitution does not give the Commander in Chief the power to subject American boys to enemy fire without the right to fire back.

Certainly this is the position that the Commander in Chief has taken in Korea, and you can interpret it no other way.

Over and over, the President says, he is against a third world war growing out of the conflict in Korea. But our forces in Korea are now fighting Chinese Reds. They are there by many thousands and there are hundreds of thousands behind them in China. Indications now are that they are going to continue to pour into Korea, and the fighting against Red Chinese and perhaps other "volunteer" Communists, will continue on and on in Korea.

And, I ask you, what hope did President Truman offer to you, the American people, last night for a victorious conclusion of his mission to Korea? When will it ever end?

Yes; and lest we forget, fellow Americans, it was his mission. He ordered the American forces into action without approval of the Congress. He usurped that power to make war. He did so without authority of the Congress; and, let me remind you, Congress never has surrendered its war-making power to the United Nations.

It appears, from the President's radio address, that there is a new policy for our forces in Korea. They were sent there originally to liberate all of Korea, take the offensive, and punish the North Koreans and their helpers into submission.

But now it is evident we are to wage a holding action in Korea somewhere near the thirty-eighth parallel. Our forces are to stand there like the Rock of Gibraltar—beating down the onrushing hordes from across the Yalu River.

We now are to prove to the Communist by this firm stand that it is folly for them to continue the war and they should humbly appeal for peace, turn over all of Korea to the Koreans, and never make war again.

Fellow Americans, the President now has written off his original venture into Korea to defeat the North Koreans and restore freedom to the whole country. His new policy now is to show the North Koreans and Red China that they cannot drive us out.

That's the Korean policy of the administration.

O Mr. President, there is not much comfort in this outlook. The new strategy means more and more tear-stained pillows throughout our land.

This is why the American people want to hear General MacArthur. They believe that from his vast knowledge and experience in the South Pacific, he can recommend a better way to accomplish vindication for the forces of freedom in Korea.

There is much more to this desperate situation than the mechanics of warfare. The attitude of Western Europe is obvious to the American people. It is quite natural that Western Europe would like to have priority on America's manpower and America's resources.

Why, the Socialist Government of Great Britain, which has not hesitated to permit the sale of war materials to Soviet Russia and Red China, and which has conducted a thriving business with the Communists through Hong Kong, now has the audacity to insist that Formosa be turned over to Red China and that Red China, the Moscow-directed bandits that took over the Republic of China, should sit with the United States in making a peace treaty with Japan.

The pattern is familiar. Step by step the Dean Acheson policy of appeasement of the Communists goes forward. There is rejoicing tonight among the pro-Communists who run in and out of the State Department like water through a sieve. Under

Mr. Acheson's let-the-dust-settle policy in Asia, the Reds were able to take over all of China and thrust their tentacles southward.

General MacArthur was in the Pacific all of this time. Let us hear from him. Let us have the truth, exposing the blackest chapter in American history. Let the American people know what pressures have been brought upon the Truman administration from Western European countries to wind up the Korean war with the best face-saver terms possible.

All of these matters should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress. The United States Senate in adopting recently a resolution approving the sending of four ground divisions to Europe for integration into the North Atlantic Treaty International army served notice upon the President that he should obtain the approval of the Congress before sending any more divisions over there.

This was a wholesome indication of revival of the Congress as the policy-making department of the Government. It was one road block to President Truman's efforts to establish a military dictatorship.

It was notice to the President and his power-grabbing clique that the Senate and the American people reject his philosophy that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, can assign them anywhere in the world for any purpose he deems in the public interest, and wherever he alone believes American security is threatened.

The President is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, but he is not a dictator over the Nation's defense policies. Congress alone has the power to declare war.

We Americans don't believe in divine rights for kings or presidents.

My fellow Americans, there is grave danger that unless the Congress develops a sound global defense policy the Nation's manpower and resources will be frittered away by the administration in preparedness for a land war with Soviet Russia if she attacks.

The bayonet generals who dominate the Pentagon in Washington are calling the signals in cooperation with Dean Acheson's political manipulations around the globe.

The kind of thinking that dominates our national defense planning is reflected in an address made by Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, at the Army Day conference in Boston on February 4, 1949—and I quote General Bradley:

"I am convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that should this Nation be forced into still another conflict, we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground."

Now, General Bradley has served his Nation with great distinction. We honor him for his great contribution to victory in World War II, but he plainly wants to prepare for war along classical lines, long before the advent of the war plane.

General Bradley, General Marshall, General Collins, and the other dominant voices in the Pentagon are foot soldiers by training. They apparently have never learned the lessons in air power that Gen. Billy Mitchell gave.

They fail to recognize that the advent of the intercontinental bomber has revolutionized warfare. They refuse to admit that the United States now has long-range bombers that can fly from this country to any target in Russia and back home nonstop.

They fail to recognize that the Red air force is just 5½ hours away from the United States. They ignore the warning of General Vandenberg, a Chief of the Air Force, that if Russian long-range bombers strike the United States in force, over the North pole, 70 percent of them would get through and reduce our industrial centers to ashes.

No, fellow Americans, the bayonet generals of the Pentagon want to build a defensive army in Western Europe to fight Russia on the ground, Russia with her present 175 divisions in being, hundreds more available within weeks, and backed by 500,000,000 slave laborers.

To engage the Russian army on the ground, before her war industrial potential has been pulverized by air power, would be sheer madness, a reckless, wanton disregard for the lives of American boys and a cruel hoax upon the people of Western Europe.

General LeMay testified before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees on the Wherry resolution, as follows:

"General LEMAY. Well, sir, I do not believe that we need to match Russia division for division fighting a full-scale war on the ground. I do not believe we should conduct a war against Russia in that manner.

"Senator WHERRY. How would you conduct it?

"General LEMAY. I would use the weapons at which we are more proficient and better capable of providing. We are not capable of fighting the Russian Empire by matching their manpower.

* * * * *

"Senator WHERRY. What would happen to the armies of Russia in the field if her war potential, the industrial war potential, were destroyed at home?

"General LEMAY. An army in the field becomes impotent when it is not resupplied.

"Senator WHERRY. So with the destruction of Russia's war potential, the Russian Army would disintegrate?

"General LEMAY. If they could not be resupplied they would become ineffective.

"Senator WHERRY. If you had to choose between defense dollars, and I would like to say that I accept the figures of Senator BYRD that the expenditures of budgets for the balance of this fiscal year and next year will reach approximately $144,700,000,000, if you had to choose defense dollars, what would you choose to spend to build the deterrent which you think would stop a Russian invasion?

"General LEMAY. I would choose the weapon of air power."

That was General LeMay speaking, the man who delivered by air the knock-out blows that paved the way for victory over Japan, blows that made it unnecessary to land foot soldiers on the soil of Japan.

Gen. Carl Spaatz, who commanded the Allied air forces in Western Europe in World War II, says, and I quote:

"A wall of flesh is being built in Western Europe."

General Spaatz further says that if we had been properly prepared in bombers at the outset of World War II there would have been no need for the Normandy landing.

My information is there has been a slowing down of orders for long-range bombers, the kind that can pulverize Russia's war potential, and a stepping up of orders for tactical planes, to be used as support for ground warfare in Europe if war comes.

Our air power is being dribbled out, deployed around the world in the fatuous planning to engage Russia in ground warfare, when, for every $1,000,000,000 spent on troops for Europe, we can build 200 strategic bombers which could be used to destroy Russia's war industrial potential. You would be shocked if I told you the small number we have.

The American people simply do not have the resources to raise, equip, and maintain an army in Western Europe big enough to stop the Russian hordes and at the same time finance an invincible navy and obtain mastery of the air.

We should cut our defense cloth to fit the pattern. We can afford to obtain mastery of the air, to build an invincible navy, and we can also afford to finance a mobile army.

But first priority is mastery of the air. Control the air and you control the ground under it.

Fellow Americans, crucial decisions in national defense planning are in the making. The issue soon will come up in the Congress when appropriations for national defense are considered. Then it will be up to the Congress to determine how the defense dollar shall be divided.

You, my fellow citizens, are the sovereign power to determine through your Congress how that defense dollar shall be divided and how many dollars shall be appropriated.

Congress, all of us, need the advice of such great military experts at Gen. Douglas MacArthur to help us in determining this question of high public policy.

We, the American people, want no more Yaltas, no more Tehrans, or Potsdams; no more Pearl Harbors; no more secrecy on matters that affect their lives and fortunes.

Time and again we Republicans in the Congress have offered our full, complete cooperation with President Truman in developing some effective foreign policies and national defense policies.

He has ignored the Republican leadership of the Congress in the development of both.

He claims the power of a dictator over our national defense policies and in foreign affairs and international policies. We learn of his commitments only after they have been made, sometimes through the press and radio.

My countrymen, this condition is intolerable among free people. Again I appeal to the President to work hand in hand with the Congress in determining the policies upon which the very life of the Republic may depend.

With all kindness in my heart, I urge the President to cast aside the radical clique that envelops him, to share his heavy burdens with the American people and their representatives in the Congress.

This is the historic way.

This is the American way.

And now, Mr. President, the American people demand it.

Public Opinion Poll by Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News Upon National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for printing in the Appendix a very interesting poll of public opinion which was recently compiled by the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News.

The results are extremely interesting from both a local and a national standpoint and indicates by the size of the poll how deeply interested the people are in the matters which presently challenge the attention of Congress.

I believe the Elgin Courier-News is to be congratulated on this constructive effort in the field of public service. It will enhance citizen interest in the issues before Congress, in national affairs generally, as nothing else can do.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cumulative and percentage results of the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News readers' ballot upon national issues

[Ballot published in 1 issue of the paper, Mar. 31, 1951. Results include those received and tallied Apr. 2-9, 1951]

	Yes		No		Not voting (percent)
	Votes	Percent	Votes	Percent	
Should 18-year-olds be drafted?	294	13.0	1,917	84.0	2.4
Should the Nation commit a large standing army to service in Europe?	66	3.1	2,054	95.0	1.9
Should a congressional committee continue an investigation of organized crime and graft in this country?	1,997	92.4	52	2.4	5.2
Should nondefense spending be cut to the bone?	1,575	66.7	234	10.8	2.5
Should Congress act to rid every department of the Government of Communists?	2,127	98.4	11	.5	1.1
Should the State Department be overhauled from top to bottom?	2,069	96.7	44	2.0	2.3
Should the President be prevented from committing American manpower to undeclared wars?	2,067	96.6	75	3.4	1.0
Should the Nation adopt universal military training?	1,060	49.0	1,012	46.8	4.2
Should Congress adopt all recommendations of the Hoover Commission for streamlining government?	1,830	85.0	159	7.3	7.7
Should Congress appropriate taxpayers' money to bolster prices of farm products and other commodities?	89	4.1	2,009	92.9	3.0

Voting upon the readership ballot was voluntary. Readers were invited in the news columns to clip and mark the ballots and mail or bring them to the newspaper office. Through the April 2 to 9 period in question, 1,497 ballots were returned, while the total of readers of legal age voting upon the issues were 2,161. Net paid circulation of the Courier-News upon the day the ballot was published, March 31, 1951, was 21,058. Additional returns are being received, but only those tallied through April 9 are included above.

The Korean War and the Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject the Korean War and the Dismissal of General MacArthur, which I delivered last night before the Yale Club of New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The administration invoked the Korean war. In our general resistance to Communist aggression throughout the world we have necessarily adopted different policies in different places. To some states we give only economic aid. To other states, such as Greece and Turkey, we send military equipment and American officers for training purposes. In a few locations we are prepared to send American troops. Our program must be limited by our total economic and military strength, and by the hope for practical success, particularly if we are to send American soldiers into battle. Our Government decided that Korea was not defensible and withdrew our troops from Korea, something we never should have done if we intended to return. We put Korea in the class of those states which were to receive military aid, but we gave no aid, except small arms and military advice. We failed to send airplanes or tanks and heavy artillery. The State Department asked for money for that purpose but, after a year, it developed that none of the money had been spent. The President himself said finally that we were only undertaking to give arms to the South Koreans to prevent border raids and internal aggression. Some appeaser in the State Department was afraid that with real arms they might have attacked the Communists in North Korea. Then, in January 1950, Secretary Acheson made a public statement to the effect that the American line of defense in the Pacific was Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. In order to support the State Department's left-wing prejudice against Chiang Kai-shek and the policy of defending Formosa, which he and others had suggested, Acheson made clear his policy that the United States would not assure either Korea or Formosa against attack by the sending of troops. With such a reaffirmation of our far eastern policy, is it any wonder that Soviet Russia and the Korean Communists took the Secretary of State at his word? If we were contemplating the recognition of Communist China, as the Secretary clearly indicated at that time, then certainly the Communists could well believe that if they could once occupy Korea, they could look forward to recognition by the United States of Communist Korea. To Soviet Russia, Korea was a soft spot into which they could move their Communist satellites without cost. Every indication is that a firm anti-Communist policy in Formosa and Korea would have avoided war altogether.

2. When the North Koreans attacked, the President without authority from Congress sent American soldiers into war. I have pointed out frequently that he completely usurped power where he had no constitutional right.

The President last night spent half of his speech justifying the action of the United States in entering the Korean war, on the ground that the attack was the first military aggression since the war and that failure to resist North Korean aggression would have led to world war III. Against the most serious handicaps, with full risk of involving both Communist China and Communist Russia in the war, he rashly sent to Korea every American soldier who was available. There have been nearly 60,000 casualties.

I agree there was a good logical argument for the United States, by action of President and Congress, to reverse our past policy and undertake to punish the first outright military aggression since the Second World War. We secured a recommendation of the Security Council to that effect, because the Russians were then boycotting the Council and were not present. But we overlooked the fact that this was merely a temporary condition and that when the Russians returned we could no longer count on United Nations support.

The United Nations army, made up almost entirely of Americans, was successful and captured most of North Korea. Certainly it had to move beyond the thirty-eighth parallel, and was authorized to do so; otherwise the whole theory of the United Nations would have been nullified. If the United Nations only drives back an aggressor to the border after the war has destroyed the country attacked and the aggressor country is not invaded or punished, then nations will have everything to gain by aggression, and nothing to lose.

But when the United Nations objective in Korea was almost accomplished, we faced a second aggression from a much more powerful nation, namely, Communist China. This was not only an aggression against Korea, it was an aggression against the United Nations itself and an attack on its army and its authority. This aggression has been largely successful and has reconquered half of Korea from the United Nations. But the Security Council refuses to act at all, and the United Nations Assembly at last reluctantly denounced the Red Chinese as aggressors, a fact obvious to everybody else for months. But they did nothing more, and they have, in fact, tried to hamper any punishment of the aggressor or even a retaking of the land which the aggressor has seized.

In this treatment of Communist China, the United Nations has abandoned every ideal for which it was established. If the original sending of American troops to Korea was to prevent world war III, then that purpose has been long completely lost from sight. It cannot now be accomplished without an aggressive war against Communist China and a punishment of the aggressor, as the North Koreans were punished.

The President's position is completely inconsistent. He justified an active move against Korean aggression as a means of preventing world war III. In the second half of his speech he claims world war III is prevented by a timid war against Communist China, and maintaining a Maginot line defense against an aggressor who has already accomplished half his purpose. He justifies two completely inconsistent courses as means of preventing world war III. I don't suppose there has ever been a more ridiculously inconsistent justification for vital moves in foreign policy.

The truth is we misjudged the power of the United Nations; we misjudged the intentions of the Chinese Communists and now we are in a situation to which there is no completely satisfactory solution.

3. Three policies are being proposed in Korea. Policy No. 1 is a more active battle against Red China. From a moral standpoint, we would be wholly justified in a complete invasion of China to punish an unprovoked aggressor. Practical considerations, of course, make it impossible, and no one has proposed it. General MacArthur and everyone else knows it would take many American divisions, and that those divisions are not available and will not be for 2 years. Also I agree that such a move might unduly incite Soviet Russia to war.

Proposals for a more active war have been limited to two, as referred to by the President in his speech. One is that we assist Chinese Nationalist troops to land on the mainland of China. Second that we bomb communications, supply depots, and industrial plants in Manchuria and China itself. Neither of these would mean a general war in China. Both of them would have a direct effect in weakening the Chinese armies in Korea. It seems utterly ridiculous to me that when there are 500,000 soldiers on Formosa, some of them well-trained and ready to go, and thousands of guerrillas in south China with whom they can cooperate, we should not permit raids and invasion to make as much trouble for the Chinese Communists as possible and force the withdrawal of some of their troops from Korea. Probably Chiang could not make at this time an all-out invasion, but he could keep south China in an uproar and many Communist troops diverted from Korea. That might make all the difference in our success there, and might save thousands of American lives. I cannot see why such a policy would in any way incite Russia to war. Or we could use these soldiers in Korea, as Chiang proposed. The truth is that this policy is not undertaken, first, because of the prejudices of Secretary of State Acheson and Secretary of Defense Marshall against Chiang and, second, because it would upset the trade of the British with Communist China.

The bombing of communications and concentrations in China might have more possibility of bringing Russia into the war. But without it our Korean War presents a ridiculous spectacle. The whole Chinese attack on our Army can be built up behind the Yalu River in a kind of game sanctuary.

If there is no other way to bring war in Korea to an end, I think we would have to bomb these Chinese communications and Chinese Armies and take a chance of Russian aggression. In Europe we have not hesitated to do many things which the Russians may well regard as threatening their security. The whole Atlantic Pact, certainly the arming of Germany, is an incentive for Russia to enter the war before the army is built up. I cannot see that any bombing of China without invasion can be regarded in any way by Russia as an aggressive move against Russia itself, or a reason for war, unless they have made up their minds to start a third world war anyway.

The whole thesis of Senator KERR yesterday in the Senate that a full-scale invasion of China means a third world war is of no consequence because no one is proposing such a war. We are only trying to fight more successfully a war in Korea.

Policy No. 2 is that proposed by the President last night. It is a Maginot-line policy. We are to continue to conduct a war with our hands tied behind our backs. We are to refuse all assistance from the Chinese Nationalists. It is like a football game in which our team, when it reaches the 50-yard line, is always instructed to kick. Our team can never score, and sooner or later somebody on the other side will catch the ball and make a touchdown. As I read the President's speech, he suggests that if we don't notice that the Chinese are there in Korea, after a while they will go away. His hopes are almost pitiful. If we inflict sufficient casualties, he says, this "may discourage the Chinese Communists from continuing their attack." If they see the world arming "this may discourage the Communist rulers from continuing the war in Korea." If they realize they cannot defeat us in Korea (except to the extent they have already done so) "then they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression. A peaceful settlement may then be possible." This certainly proposes a stalemate war. It makes a joke of the United Nations ban against aggression, and encourages aggression elsewhere. The President himself points out that back in China there "stand additional millions of Chinese soldiers." They will have lost nothing except a few men, and manpower in China is cheap. It is ridiculous to say that we are preventing either aggression or world war III by this stalemate war. The Chinese aggression has captured half of Korea and cowed most of the free world. Half of our effective Army is tied up in a position 5,000 miles from home, from which it would be very difficult to rescue it if the Russians started a war. It must be quite a temptation to them, if they really contemplate starting world war III.

Policy No. 3 is to end the war by appeasement. That is the policy with which the administration has constantly flirted. That is the policy which Secretary Acheson indicated before the Korean War when he proposed to turn over Formosa to the Communists. That is the policy the State Department approved when it instructed the American representatives to accept the cease-fire plan of January 13, 1951. That plan provided for the withdrawal of all foreign armies from Korea—almost certainly leaving the Korean Communists in full control. At the same time we agreed to sit down with the British, the Russians, and the Chinese Communists to discuss the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, and also the disposition of Formosa. The Chinese Nationalists were to be excluded. This is also the policy urged upon us by the British, who wish us to surrender Formosa and recognize Communist China by admitting them to the peace negotiations with Japan.

In view of Secretary Acheson's past acts, and under this wavering administration, no one can be certain that they will not adopt this program. The President uses the words "no appeasement," but he completely omitted from his speech any repudiation of the policy of surrendering Formosa to China or the United Nations or the policy of recognizing the Chinese Communists. Of course, such a policy would destroy the whole basis of the United Nations as an instrument against aggression. It would reward the aggressor instead of punishing the aggressor. Such a policy would render useless the death and wounding of 60,000 American boys in Korea. Such a policy would encourage the Chinese Communists to invade Indochina, Burma, Thailand, and Malaya. It would be undiluted appeasement and would not even save our face. I have never been able to understand the British position, which seems to me a terrible mistake from their own standpoint. We certainly know enough of Communist thinking today to be certain that they would sweep on into the soft spots of southeast Asia until the British lose both Hong Kong and Singapore. The British ought to be backing Chiang Kai-shek in South China to prevent the development of any such program.

I have discussed the three plans for conducting the Korean War. General MacArthur favored the first, but I think his determination to bring his views to the American people was brought about far more by his fear, and his justified fear, of the adoption of plan No. 3. I think he spoke out, endangering his own position, because he felt that only thus could the American people be brought to realize the danger of the Acheson policy. The firing of General MacArthur has led the world to believe that we are looking in the direction of appeasement. It is a blow to every man and every country in the Far East that favored an aggressive attitude toward the spread of communism. It is an encouragement to every Communist in the Far East and throughout the world. It has caused a tragic weakening of our moral position.

More than that, it throws away a large part of the good will we had created in Japan. The white man by himself cannot today undertake to rule the Far East. The influence of freedom can only be built up by believers in freedom among the far-eastern peoples themselves. The only strong friends we had in the Far East were the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa and the Japanese. The President has discouraged both by the dismissal of MacArthur.

It would be hard to deliberately invent a more disastrous series of policy moves than this administration has adopted during the past 18 months in the Far East. Far from preventing world war III it has involved us in a major war which now has no purpose whatsoever; and it has encouraged an aggression which makes a larger war far more likely in the future. Any American must be sick at heart to see the useless waste of life and the wavering weakness of the administration, which has reduced the United States position in Asia to a new low.

The Place of Big Business in Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial entitled "Bigger and Better Businesses Needed," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIGGER AND BETTER BUSINESSES NEEDED

Bigger and better businesses will be needed in the United States in the years ahead to meet the tremendous expense of mobilization in combating the threats of world conditions, especially the determined aggressions of Soviet Russia.

The United States News and World Report in the current issue cites General Motors Corp. as an example of what one of the big business firms of the Nation is doing to help keep the wheels of our Government turning.

General Motors during 1950 did a gross business of $7,500,000,000. It turned out products that satisfied its customers.

Of that amount, United States News states that $1,700,000,000 was paid directly to the Government in taxes.

The firm's workers, 465,000 of them, received $1,900,000,000. The Government collected at least $300,000,000 in taxes from the workers. Firms supplying General Motors with needed materials and equipment received $3,500,000,000. The Government collected another $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 from the supply firms.

The 445,000 stockholders received $530,000,000 in dividends. The Government collected an estimated $150,000,000 more in taxes from the stockholders.

General Motors produced at least $1,700,000,000 taxes for the Government.

United States News Week makes this comment:

"With $70,000,000,000 in bills to pay, the Federal Government must encourage corporations to grow and to be prosperous. Otherwise the Government will find it harder to do the things it wants to do."

The Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column of Walter Winchell published in the New York Daily Mirror on March 27 last, in which he discussed the investigation by the Kefauver committee.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN NEW YORK

(By Walter Winchell)

MR. AND MRS. UNITED STATES: The Kefauver committee has done a good job of showing up the American underworld with its political tie-ups. But never in history has the sinful life been given the effective—and misleading—advertising it got from the Senate hearings in the last few weeks. When the average, hard-working, debt-ridden citizen heard that a Frank Costello can swing elections and keep $50,000 in cash around the house for spending money—his first reaction was not apt to be indignation so much as envy.

But that's one of the limitations of this modern world. Television can give a picture, but only the mind can give the view. For every so-called successful Costello there are 5,000 misled kids in reform schools and 10,000 men behind prison bars. Frank Costello, on the surface, was a winner. But the losers in the criminal game—the prisoners in the penitentiary—could have testified that all of Costello's money isn't worth the right of a free man to take a walk in the spring.

When the chic Virginia Hill unfolded her amazing life story (contributing nothing to the committee's knowledge of crime—after her tardy arrival was excused by Senator KEFAUVER with the explanation "ladies from my part of the country are traditionally late"), many a young girl must have wondered: Who really knows best? Mother or Virginia Hill? After doing all the things called wrong, there she was on top of the world, with a beautiful home in Miami Beach and a handsome husband and baby.

But it is a very hard life for any woman to receive more attention than affection—and even harder to receive more affection than respect. The life of Virginia Hill sounds glamorous to the uninitiated. But as Damon Runyon said: "It reads a whole lot better than it lives." Most women would gladly trade every fur coat or Miami mansion they might own to avoid having the man they love shot between the eyes with a rifle—or the thousand tortured hours spent waiting for it. And, of course, for every girl like Virginia Hill who hit the high lights of the shadow circuit, there are 10,000 pitifully dependent upon the whim of a criminal's twisted mind for their next meal. Television could not tell anyone of their stories—not only because it is too gruesome—but because there is nothing more boring than repeated sordidness.

The Senators have proven that the underworld is based on one principal source of revenue—gambling—and 90 percent of that horse gambling. But some eminent psychologists would tell you the reason public interest and indignation are so high was not because the spotlight was on Frank Costello—but because America was holding the mirror up to itself. Frank Costello, sitting in the witness chair, was not the average citizen's $2 bet come home to win—but come home to roost.

Whether or not the average citizen likes to believe it, it is just as immoral for him to place an illegal bet with the gamblers as it is for the gamblers to bribe public officials. The gamblers do not use their own money to bribe public officials; they haven't enough. They must use the public's. Anyone born before noon today knows that part of his $2 bet goes to the crooked combine between criminals and politicians. Under the common law, knowing that, makes him an accessory before the fact—and an accessory before the fact is a principal to the crime. Accordingly, Mr. and Mr. Betting America, take a good look at Frank Costello, because more than he was your enemy—he was your agent.

What the television pictures lacked was a montage. They should have had plenty of background shots; in fact, they left out the main character, which was Mr. and Mrs. Millions of Betting Public. They should have shown background shots of the crowds swarming up to the betting windows; the busy horse rooms around the country serviced by the eminently respectable A. T. & T., and the conservative newspapers with the racing results. And, of course, the delegation of happy United States Senators being received by the Governor of Kentucky at last year's Kentucky Derby. Or, to make it more timely, the horde of Washington politicians skipping the Kefauver hearings to swarm out to the opening of Laurel last Good Friday.

This is no defense of gambling or official bribing, but it is an attack on hypocrisy. Under his constitutional rights, Frank Costello need not confess to anything on the witness stand. On the other hand, Costello is perfectly satisfied with the gambling situation. Mr. and Mrs. America and the United States Senate are not. They want to do something about it. But, unfortunately, it is a first rule of the law they say they seek to uphold that the applicant come in with clean hands. Well, Mr. and Mrs. America, at least half of you haven't got them. The hands of half the adult population are soiled by the billions of dollars they have paid out in $2 bets—the tiny little raindrops out of which comes the torrent of corruption. Mr. and Mrs. Two-Dollar Bettor, you can stop speculating on who is the man higher up. Not very surprisingly—to those who know how the system works—Mr. and Mrs. Two-Dollar Bettor—it is you.

Vice alone does not make a hypocrite. A hypocrite is a man who denies his own vices—while he seeks to punish his own failings in others. Whatever the betting laws may say, betting on horse races is an ancient American tradition, a long-fixed habit, and a time-honored institution. Once this is admitted, the public won't need the underworld as its broker—any more than it now needs a rum-runner to deliver its $8,000,000,000 annual intake of alcoholic liquors. Sure gambling is bad for you, but overeating kills 1,000 times more breadwinners yearly than all the roulette wheels combined.

Gambling is as broad as the Nation—and not as narrow as the televised pictures of the witness stand. What people are—and what people should be—is as old a story as the Garden of Eden. As Lincoln Steffens said of that: "It wasn't Adam's fault and it wasn't Eve's fault. It wasn't the serpent's fault either. It was the fault of the apple they wanted."

The great crime of a hypocrite is that he demands a scapegoat as proof of the truth of the lie he is telling to himself. In the long scheme of justice, it can't be good law that a nondescript goes to jail as a common gambler, while the judge who sentences him knows that the prisoner helped pay the man who gave the judge his job on the bench. A long historical record proves that if the code of the silent criminal were not stronger than the criminal code of New York State, there would have been many prisoners who would have testified they were less guilty than the judges who sentenced them—and that the hearts of those judges were as black as their robes.

Again, this is no defense of gambling. But it does charge that the aristocratic blue-bloods of the jockey club—who stage the races—and Frank Costello, the common gambler—are more than brothers under the skin. They are brothers under the table. And Mr. and Mrs. Two Dollar Bettor—you are the first guilty link of the chains—on another man's wrist.

Hope for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Only What You Help Make It," written by "Bud" Calman, and published in the April 5 edition of the Sturgis News, of Sturgis, Ky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY WHAT YOU HELP MAKE IT

(By "Bud" Calman)

A young man asked of me the other day, "To what does the present generation have to look forward to and plan for?"—that was a real question. I know that in back of that young man's mind were the thoughts of continued rising taxes; taxes for this, taxes for that, give to this and give to that—blood banks to try and save lives offered up in the name of peace, with little outlook for peace; save on this and save on that—sacrifices—buy defense bonds, high prices and hard to make both ends meet with only the forecast of things to get worse, rather than better. Yes; our forefathers had a struggle to establish this country of ours, but then each day, each week they could see some progress being made, while today the young people see naught in the future but sacrifices, while all the time the conditions seem to get worse. What hope does the future hold? Only, my young friend, that men may be free eventually from tyranny of men like Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Stalins—when that will be, if you will live to see it, none can foretell, but whatever the price, it is not too great so long as you can call yourself free men, so long as you can have sanctity of home; so long as you are free to choose your religion; so long as there is hope left in man, there is a chance for a better world for some future generation,

maybe not yours, maybe for your great-great-grandchildren—it was to that end that the Pilgrims made the initial sacrifice and to which generations since on this continent have dedicated their endeavors. Raise your head young man, look to the heavens, there is a future for you—where and when, only time will tell, only God in those heavens knows and he will reveal that time to you, when in his plan of things, the time is right, but never, never give up hope, it is the foundation on which the structure of your life is built; it is the bulwark against the rising tides of hate and greed and tyranny; it is the rainbow that promises for you and all mankind a tomorrow, which can only be what you help to make it.

The President's Radio Address on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Winchell:

NEW YORK, April 12.—The President's speech—and the truth—false and misleading statements are shunned in the commercial world. In the diplomatic world, however, they are exalted as state papers. The President gave his grounds for firing MacArthur at 10:30 Wednesday night, but the real reasons and the real cause had been printed that very morning on the front page of the New York Times.

This is the dispatch: WASHINGTON.—"Britain has suggested to the United States that Communist China be brought into the negotiations for a Japanese peace treaty * * * and, further, that the treaty provide for the ultimate if not immediate return of Formosa to 'China.' * * * By China, the British mean the regime of Mao Tse-tung (Communist)." In short, Secretary Acheson's commitments to London call not only for the sellout of Formosa, but Japan also.

Said Mr. Truman: "If history has taught us anything, it is that aggression anywhere in the world is a threat to peace anywhere in the world. And since World War II, we have been putting that lesson into practice—we're working with the free nations to check the designs of the Soviet Union. * * * That is what we did in Greece."

The actual records show that since the Second World War, the President has earned the title of the greatest appeaser in history. "This is what we did in Greece," is not what Mr. Truman did in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and 11 other countries. He surrendered them. He didn't intend to oppose Communist imperialism. If he did, why did he, as recently as 1 year ago, pigeonhole the 70-group Air Force, mothball the fleet, and then tell the American people that "peace" was near? The news is that until very recently history hadn't as yet taught President Truman the simple fundamental that you can't appease a dictator.

"The attack in Korea was part of a great plan for conquering all of Asia," said the President. This is the very same man who called it a "police action" only eight bloody months ago. "I would like to read to you from a secret intelligence report which came after the attack," continued the President. It is apparent that for a considerable time the President has been furnished an intelligence report after events happen, such as the Bogota riots. An intelligence report after an event isn't an intelligence report at all. It is an alibi. Obviously, if the intelligence report had been effective, President Truman would have had more troops ready to meet the attack. The so-called intelligence report had already been confirmed by thousands of American corpses. If the President really wanted the people to read an intelligence report, he would release the Wedemeyer report to the public. That will be the day.

Said the President: "The whole Communist imperialism is back of the attack on peace in the Far East. It was the Soviet Union that trained and equipped the North Koreans for aggression." But the President failed to mention that the Russians were sold jets by Great Britain; that the Soviet Army rolls on British rubber and the Soviet soldier sleeps in an English woolen blanket. The President did not say that the chief source of Red China's supply was not Moscow, but Hong Kong and Singapore. That would interfere with peaceful international relations, as the truth often does.

"The question we have had to face," continued the President, "is whether the Communist plan of conquest can be stopped without a general war." The President apparently forgot his Secretary of Defense, George Marshall, had within the last month told the American people they were already in a global war and fighting for their lives.

"We have taught the enemy a lesson," intoned the President. "He has found out that aggression is not cheap or easy." The truth is, however, and the records show, that the enemy seized 11 countries while Mr. Truman was busy disarming our country on an economy basis. The "enemy" took 11 countries without firing a single shot, and without loss of a single Russian soldier. That's an easy bargain, as the Gold Star Mothers of Korea would be happy to testify.

"The Communist side must now choose its course of action," said the President. This, in diplomatic language, is a frank admission that the President has surrendered the initiative. It is not a United Nations or an American program that is to be decisive. In short, what happens next is Stalin's choice. This is great policy for Marshal Stalin—especially to tell him so.

Said the President: "Behind the North Koreans and Chinese Communists stand millions of Chinese soldiers. And behind the Chinese soldiers stand the tanks, the planes, the submarines, the soldiers and the scheming rulers of the Soviet Union." But this isn't what the President said last June. At that time he called it a mere "police action." The President failed to tell the American people what he was doing while the Communist strength, which he now admits, was being built up. President Truman's administration was busy selling war factories, mothballing the fleet, and disbanding the Army. As a matter of fact, within the last month his own Democratic Senators proved that ex-convict John Maragon, armed with a White House letter from General Vaughan, was selling the very United States arms the President now says we must build up.

Said the President of General MacArthur: "It was with deepest personal regret that I found myself compelled to take this action. General MacArthur is one of our greatest military commanders. But the cause of world peace is more important than any individual." The Daily Worker, in much more abusive language, heartily agrees with President Truman in calling General MacArthur a danger to world peace. Today's headlines in the Daily Worker hail President Truman—and say that no greater blow has ever been struck for their cause. For once, the Daily Worker is right.

Will Communist China Become a Member of the United Nations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the administration's sudden effort to go back to appease Russia through the urging of India, Great Britain, and quite a majority of the members of the United Nations, will not succeed in the admission of Red China to membership in the United Nations, the surrender of the Nationalist Chinese to their executioners and the abandonment of Japan and the Philippines.

With Russia in the League, no world peace is possible and anyone with any understanding at all of the aims of Russia ought to know that. If Red China is admitted, the chances of world peace become much less. With India and Great Britain clamoring for this recognition of Communist China, you can see that world peace of the capitalistic countries is doomed. Russia is determined to exterminate the religion of all countries and to destroy capitalism anywhere and everywhere. An appeasement program makes Russia just that much stronger, and the recognition of Red China would be a fitting climax to the downfall of all hopes of world peace and the downfall of the United Nations, so far as we are concerned. If our purpose in the Orient is to stop the spread of communism, the recognition of Red China, branded by the UN as an aggressor, is furthering and not arresting the spread of communism.

If Red China is admitted to the UN., it is noticed that if any aggressor wants to start on a campaign of slaughter of the troops of the UN and do enough of it, that is the surest way to gain a membership in the UN.

The President says he wants to confine the war to Korea and not cause a third world war. That is just what Russia wants—they want to have us fight in Korea and not go beyond that while Russia siphons the troops of Manchuria and the rest of China to meet us with hordes that we can never kill off fast enough to win that war. It's a nice arrangement for our enemies, but an impossible goal for the United States.

England is dead-set on having Red China recognized. Does anyone not know why the English take this attitude? They take it for business reasons—just as they always do in protecting the trade of England. They are nicely seated in Hong Kong and Singapore, and are carrying on a brisk trade right now in

strategic war material with Red China, while her own men—what few she has sent to Korea—are presumed to be fighting against Red China. There is no doubt now—none whatever—that England will transfer material—which we give her—to our enemies. England is likewise still trading with the Russians.

Under these circumstances, should this Nation feel disposed to send our boys overseas to protect England? Have not we any sense left, or have we lost our balance?

The President has boldly told Congress that he will send troops anywhere he wants and engage in any conflict he wants to, in any part of the world, without the consent of Congress. The President will do it, too, because there is not moral fiber enough left in a spineless Congress to stop him. An attempt was made Wednesday to do it, but the vote was 168 to 192 against interfering with the President.

A Guy Who Knows the Score

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ed Kennedy, from the Indianapolis Times of April 10, 1951:

A GUY WHO KNOWS THE SCORE—BATTLE-WORN GI'S SHUN POLITICS, BACK UP MAC—PLASTER PARIS ROW IN ATTERBURY HOSPITAL REBS ALONG WITH GENERAL IN CONDUCT OF WAR

(By Ed Kennedy)

They don't give a damn for politics on plaster-paris row.

But they have some very definite ideas on the way the Korean War should be handled.

Plaster-paris row is made up of the wards at the Camp Atterbury General Hospital where the boys back from the front mend their Commie bullet-shattered bones.

Nobody's asked them what they think about the present row over General MacArthur. Nobody ever asks combat soldiers what they think.

"We'll take that hill, men"—or "we'll hold this line if it takes all winter" is all they ever hear until a spade slaps them in the face—with full military honors, of course, or they land in a hospital.

NUTS

As the "MacArthur's genius" against MacArthur "should be sacked" argument sweeps Washington and European capitals, the wounded GI's at Atterbury got a chance to voice their opinions to the Times.

"Nuts to the politicians," one of them cracked. "Mac's the only one in the bunch that understands the far-eastern problem and has guts enough to stand up to it."

The soldiers expressed no great love for MacArthur the man. But they did express great respect for MacArthur the soldier and statesman.

On his present statements they backed him to a man.

1. Chinese Nationalist troops should be permitted and helped to make a landing on the Red-held mainland of China.

2. Our planes should not be restricted in their bombing of Red bases which supply their forces in Korea.

A HELLUVA NOTE

3. The United Nations commander is a country mile ahead of Washington, the State Department, and the politicians who would smear him.

"It's a helluva note to be out there fighting for a guy who knows the score and then read your home-town newspaper to see some jerk back in Washington blasting him," a young officer remarked.

Another officer summed it up another way: "To me the argument is stupid. They call one issue a military issue—this they say MacArthur can talk about. They call another issue political and say he can't talk about it. They put that out of his realm.

WAR IS POLITICAL

"This is screwy. War in itself is political. It is a continuation of our national policy by force. Policy is politics. Not Republican versus Democrat politics, but international politics. At MacArthur's level you can't separate the two," he asserted.

Other typical comments:

"If he hadn't been out there the last 6 years, they would have talked us clean back to Pearl Harbor." "He never made any secret deals with the Russians." "He's getting old—but he knows how to handle them." "He'd turn his back on Alger Hiss, I'll bet." "If he wants it and thinks it's best for the country, I'm for it." "What a show-off, but he's the only real authority on the problem; they're damn fools to treat him the way they do." "I'm only 17. I enlisted in a peacetime Army. I think everything stinks. When I'm better I want out. The hell with it. Got a cigarette?"

"THINK" STUFF IS OUT

Comic books are the only thing that would stand a chance to make a best seller's list at the Atterbury hospital—the "think" stuff is out.

But when it comes to the Korean War they have some ideas. And the ideas of the privates first class and platoon leaders alike, are with Doug.

Training of Draftees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include the following letters in the RECORD, which are in connection with the training some of our draftees are receiving before they are sent into combat. This brings out one reason why I believe we urgently need UMT in the very near future, because the present training system is not working in the best interests of either our men or of our country. A study of the separation of procedures for combat training and technical training should be made by the Armed Services Committee in detail and in an early attempt to produce workable UMT legislation for the period of the emergency instead of the unforeseeable future.

The letters follow:

APRIL 10, 1951.

Hon. CHARLES BROWNSON,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We received a telegram last Friday, April 6, telling us our son was killed in action in Korea on March 16, 1951. He was our only child and we are heartbroken to get such news.

We are also very, very bitter, not because he was drafted, but because he was sent to cooking school at Fort Knox, Ky., from which he graduated January 2, 1951, then they turned around and sent him right to Korea with no advanced training whatsoever and put him in the First Cavalry Division and into the front lines. In less than 3 weeks in action and 6 months in service he was killed. I am not the only bitter and grieving mother of boys here from Indianapolis whose boys are in the same division over there now whom I know are being slaughtered in the same way. It is about time something is done to stop these wars.

Our son was inducted into the Army here in Indianapolis, September 6, 1950, and sent to Fort Knox, Ky. After just barely 5 weeks of basic training, he was sent to 212th ASU Food Service School there at Fort Knox to become a cook. He graduated from there and received his diploma on January 2, 1951. He came home on a 14-day furlough and left here January 19, 1951, for Camp Stoneman, Calif., arriving there January 22, 1951. Their ship (U. S. S. *Gen. Stuart Heintzelman*) sailed January 30, 1951. They arrived at Tokyo, Japan, about February 19 or 20 and were at Camp Drake, near Tokyo. We had the one letter from Tokyo written February 21. The next and only letter from Korea was written March 4, 1951, so, you see, they were just about 1 week in Tokyo and sent right into Korea and put in the front lines where he was killed March 16, 1951, after not even 3 weeks in battle.

Our son never handled a gun in his life and was it fair to train them to be cooks and then put them in the front lines? Perhaps if he had been trained for such a thing he might have had a chance. Now, the rest of those boys who were his buddies are perhaps still in there fighting with no more training than he had.

Most sincerely,

——— ———.

APRIL 9, 1951.

Hon. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
Office of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHUCK: This morning one of our employees came to me with a problem that I believe is worthy of investigation at your level.

His son was called into service, September 5, 1950, and sent to Fort Knox, Ky. After just 1 month of training he was assigned to the cooks and bakers school. He attended this school until December and upon graduation was sent home for a 3-week leave. At the end of his leave he was sent to San Francisco and within a week was shipped to Japan. Four days after arrival he was in the front lines as a combat infantryman. It is obvious on the face of it that this lad was sent into combat with only a month of training which is totally inadequate. You and I both know the terrific cost that we paid by sending untrained personnel into battle. Recently I attended a conference in Chicago at which a member of the Defense Board was present. I asked him about this question of untrained personnel being sent into combat and he stated that it was their policy that lads with no previous military training were to be given 4 months of basic training before they could be shipped out of the country. Following their movement to foreign shores they would be given 2 months of combat training before they would be allowed to enter combat. This is an excellent policy if it is followed. While I recognize that mistakes can be made, in this particular case the boy had two friends of his who had about the same experience. All three boys were from Indianapolis and all three were sent into Korea with inadequate training. One of those boys was killed a couple of weeks ago. The son of our employee was wounded on March 8.

I really believe that this is a matter which you should investigate for the good of our Army as well as the interest of our citizenship. Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

APRIL 11, 1951.

Hon. CHARLES BROWNSON,
Office of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BROWNSON: Following is a letter which I also sent to the Secretary of the Army. I am appealing to you as my Congressman to see if there is something that you can do to aid in the investigation of this practice. I would appreciate any assistance that you can give to see that problems like this are straightened out.

As a parent I wish to register a protest against a practice of sending untrained boys into combat. This practice is contrary to my understanding of the policy of the armed services and it should be investigated.

My son, ——— ———, was inducted September 6, 1950, and sent to Fort Knox, Ky. After about a month of training, he was sent to the cooks and bakers school there. Graduating January 2, 1951, he came home for 3 weeks. Then he was sent to San Francisco. Within a week he was sent to Japan and 4 days after arrival he was in Korea as a combat infantryman. He was wounded March 8, 1951, and since March 20 I have had no word from him.

It is my understanding that new inductees without any previous military service were supposed to receive 4 months' basic training and 2 months of combat training before entering combat. My son had hardly a month of basic training. His schooling is completely wasted.

Do you not agree that this is an example of some of the mistakes made in World War II? Untrained men suffer more casualties than trained men. Surely some system can be worked out to see that the men we send into battle know how to do their job right.

I would admit the possibility of a mistake if it were not that two other men, just like my son, from Indianapolis, and at the same time, had almost the same experience. One of these men is now dead.

For the sake of insuring the best army that we can get, can you not investigate how such errors can be made. I am positive my son was sent into battle months before he was adequately trained.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

The Bonus March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in view of the rumblings coming from the underground and rumors emanating from the left-wing press, it is clearly evident a campaign is getting underway to start smearing General MacArthur.

These Communist-inspired forces will attempt to show that General MacArthur was the one who inspired and caused the "bonus marchers" to be evicted from the Capital. In view of this prospective smear campaign, I set forth what I believe to be the facts relative to this eviction.

The Communist-inspired bonus march in 1932 is described in un-American activities reports and other official documents as Communist inspired and led.

It was the first open effort to coerce the Congress of the United States by physical manpower force.

July 28, 1932, found a portion of the bonus marchers camped in abandoned temporary buildings from which the police were ordered to move them. They defied the police. Several policemen were injured.

In the fighting which followed one bonus marcher was killed and another received injuries from which he died.

The civil authorities, in writing, told President Hoover that the civil authorities could not control the situation and asked for troops.

The President told Secretary of War Patrick J. Hurley to restore order.

Hurley passed the order on to General MacArthur as Chief of Staff of the Army.

MacArthur told Lt. Col. George Patton, Jr., to submit a plan.

Patton proposed use of a company of tanks and a squadron of cavalry, pointing out that if infantry were used the agitators would push participants against the bayonets and bloodshed would follow. Patton contended that cavalry on horseback and men in tanks could see over the heads of the crowd, spot the agitators, and retain control without bloodshed. The plan was approved by MacArthur.

The Patton-led troops, accompanied by MacArthur, moved to the bonus-marchers' encampment.

MacArthur, moving out alone, ahead of the troops, met the leaders and told them they had 1 hour to get out of town.

By the end of that hour the movement out of town began.

From the time the military took over no one was seriously injured, no shot was fired, and the subsequent propaganda in Communist publications that soldiers of 1932 used bayonets and bullets to kill veterans of 1918 was flat falsification.

The War Department release of August 3, 1932, over the signature of General Hurley, covers these facts. It is a matter of filed record and can be obtained by the Armed Services Committee or any other committee of Congress which cares to look at the record.

When Representative PAUL SHAFER, of Michigan, read into the RECORD yesterday the exultation of the Communist Daily Worker over the decapitation of General MacArthur, the reasons for the Communist jubilation were not, perhaps, fully explained. But consider these facts:

The Communists, by their bonus march, tried to use physical force to intimidate Congress in connection with pending legislation.

Four men, in chain of command, stopped that move. They were President Hoover, Secretary of War Hurley, General MacArthur, and Colonel, later General, Patton.

Every Member of this House knows the subsequent continued drive of the Communist forces in America against these four men. Every Member who is willing to look at the record knows that each of the four fought the Communists to a bitter standstill.

President Hoover and Secretary Hurley are out of office and General Patton is dead. General MacArthur was the one remaining target.

There has been loose talk about the bonus march, and what it really was, and who motivated it.

I am presenting these facts, without rancor, just to keep the record straight, by sticking to the record.

Heroic Stand of Sixty-fifth Puerto Rican Infantry Regiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I called the attention of the House of Representatives to the heroic stand made by the Puerto Rican Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment in covering the successful retreat of our mainland Marines in Korea.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading the latest report coming out of Korea dealing with the bravery and stamina of these Americans from Puerto Rico. It appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, April 8, being a dispatch from Greg MacGregor, a correspondent.

This article points out that our Puerto Rican soldiers have "won the highest respect from men of all nations fighting in the United Nations line" and that despite the history of heavy action by this group, the Puerto Ricans have more volunteers than they can use. It is said this is the only regiment in Korea that has no replacement problem.

Since this story appeared at about the same time, the press carried the decision of a Federal judge imposing the death penalty on a Puerto Rican for his part in a revoluntionary plot, this account of the daring of a truly American regiment of Puerto Ricans is worthy of our attention:

SOMEWHERE IN KOREA, April 7.—Only 8 miles behind the front lines, a hard-played softball game was going on this afternoon. Going into the ninth inning, with the score tied, both teams were giving everything they had.

As the sun beat down on the diamond, marked off by flour on a flat tract in the rice paddies, the spectators were going wild with excitement, jumping up and down and shouting encouragement and advice.

Just 5 days ago, the same players and spectators were fighting for their lives as they drove the Chinese Communists back across

the thirty-sighth parallel. These were members of the Puerto Rican Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment of the Third Division.

Since these Latin-American warriors arrived on the peninsula on September 23, they have shown the same spirit on the battlefield that they showed in the ball game this afternoon. They have asked no quarter nor have they given any. They won the highest respect from men of all nations fighting in the United Nations lines.

This war has given these Americans their first chance to show their mettle as a unit. Although they fought with credit during World War II in southern France and North Africa, they were always assigned in small units to other regiments. In this war, they were determined to prove to their country and the world that they take a back seat to no one on the field of battle when they work together as a team.

The Sixty-fifth has been cited for its accomplishments in Korea "above and beyond the call of duty." They distinguished themselves at Hamhung, they fought a rear guard action at the Hungnam evacuation and aided materially in preventing this retreat from becoming a hopeless rout. And, recently, they fought their way from the Han River up over the thirty-eighth parallel.

Despite this history of heavy action, the Puerto Ricans have more volunteers than they can use. It can be stated accurately that this regiment is the only one in Korea with no replacement problem. It has replacements in rear areas eager to be called into action against the Communists.

In addition, military leaders here have been notified that it would be no problem to raise another 50,000 Puerto Rican volunteers in their homeland, which is justly proud of its own regiment.

Although the sub-zero Korean winter is very foreign to these troops, accustomed to the warm sun of their island, their casualties from frost and cold are no greater than those suffered by any other regiment.

Colonel William W. Harris of St. Louis, who commands the regiment, has only the highest praise for his men.

"I have never seen men more eager and willing to do a good job for you," he said. "They are very proud people, both as Puerto Ricans and members of the Sixty-fifth. Morale is no problem in this outfit. I can honestly say it is as high or higher than in any other regiment in Korea."

To date, the Puerto Ricans have destroyed 19 of the enemy for every man they have lost.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power-Development Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System on Tuesday, April 10, on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and power-development project.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the many questions involving the security of the Nation, now pending before the United States Congress, is the question of the St. Lawrence seaway and power-development project. This is not a new question. It has been under consideration in one form or another for more than three decades. Today, however, it is an urgent and vital question which must be taken up and acted upon without further delay.

I have always favored the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and have urged it for the past 30 years. It has been similarly urged and advocated by every President of the United States since Woodrow Wilson—both Republicans and Democrats. Today, however, we can no longer afford to spend more time in merely urging it. Today we must build it. Today it is a question of our national security.

I am not alone in making such a statement. This statement, as to the vital necessity of the St. Lawrence undertaking, has been made by the Secretary of Defense George Marshall, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by our Secretary of State, by the Secretary of Commerce, by the Secretary of Agriculture, and by the Secretary of the Interior. It has been made by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Charles E. Wilson.

Every civilian and military authority in a position of responsibility for our defense and mobilization, and many other ranking Government officials have stated that this is an essential project and must be immediately undertaken.

I cannot understand how the opponents of this project can assume for themselves the responsibility of declaring that this project is not essential to our security. Who are these groups and individuals who presume to tell the people that General Marshall is wrong; that General Bradley is wrong; that General Collins is wrong; that Admiral Sherman is wrong; that General Vandenberg is wrong; that Secretary Acheson is wrong and that President Truman is wrong in declaring that the St. Lawrence Project is necessary to the defense and the effective mobilization of the United States?

These opponents are the spokesmen for certain railroad interests and for certain shipping and port interests which believe—very mistakenly—that their own business and economic enterprises would be harmfully affected by the construction of this great project. These opponents are the private power interests who are opposed to the low cost public power that would be available for the industries and people of New York State and of the neighboring New England States.

These are the groups which declare that the St. Lawrence Project is not essential for our defense and security. These groups argue that the St. Lawrence Project would cost too much and that it will not be useful.

Of course neither of these arguments is true. Every responsible official has testified to the economic soundness of the project, to its feasibility, and to its necessity. By further delaying this project we cater to the fears and prejudices of a few private interests—fears and prejudices which are entirely unfounded—at the expense of the welfare of the entire Nation and, under present conditions, at the expense of our national security.

Today we are short on electric power throughout the Northeast. In many cities and towns, industries cannot expand—and new ones cannot be located—because of the shortage of available power, and especially of low-cost power. Yet here is a river rushing down to the sea carrying water which could, at this very moment, be providing us with 2,200,000 additional horsepower.

Every year that the St. Lawrence Project remains unbuilt we are losing 13 billion kilowatt hours of electrical energy. Every day, every hour that goes by without this power project, we are wasting electricity and committing an extravagance just as great as if we were to throw the number of dollars equivalent to the value of this power into the Atlantic Ocean.

At this moment all of our efforts are being directed toward increasing the productive power of our national industrial machine. The St. Lawrence project is a necessary step toward that end. It will increase the ability of the United States to turn out the matériel and armaments necessary to defend our territory and our people. But the St. Lawrence project goes beyond this. It will safeguard the lives of American seamen in the event of hostilities. For these reasons alone, how can we hesitate to give it our full support?

The St. Lawrence project involves improving short stretches of the St. Lawrence River channel in order to make this entire river navigable for ocean-going vessels. We would thus provide a new waterway from the Atlantic reaching into the very heart of our country and of Canada. This is the seaway part of the St. Lawrence project.

As a sponsor of the St. Lawrence legislation, I have had to give serious thought to the burdens now weighing down on the American taxpayer. The St. Lawrence dual project, I am happy to say, will completely pay for itself. Over a period of 50 years, the seaway will pay for itself. Over a much shorter period, the power project will pay for itself.

Besides costing the taxpayer nothing, the project will save millions of dollars in transportation and power costs. We in New York State can well appreciate that, for we now are paying higher rates for electricity than all but seven States in the Union.

I mention the cost, however, only to give an idea of the soundness of the proposal. I am firmly convinced that no matter what price we must pay for the security of our people, it is a bargain. But in the case of the St. Lawrence, the result will be not an expense but a vast saving, not only to the people but to the Government.

If the St. Lawrence River is made navigable, ships will be able to bring iron ore directly from Labrador and Canada to steel mills at Cleveland, Toledo, or any port on the Great Lakes. Compared with shipping the ore through the Atlantic Ocean and then inland by rail, the savings will be tremendous. Those savings would be reflected in the price of steel, since you, as taxpayers, are buying colossal quantities of steel through your Government, it is in your own interest to build this seaway.

More important, the cargo shipped through the seaway is sure of reaching its destination. The tragedy of ore ships, torpedoed in the last war is too recent to be forgotten. Five out of seven of our ships bringing ore from Chile through the Atlantic were sunk in the last war. American lives were lost. Now we have an opportunity to ship ore through a protected waterway which in wartime would avoid dangerous Atlantic waters. And by doing this we would avoid risking the lives of many American boys.

There are some people in my own city of New York who oppose the St. Lawrence project. They claim that the export trade of New York will be harmed by the seaway. Their fears are unfounded. The 30,000,000 tons of iron ore which will one day move through the seaway are not New York traffic. The grain freighters which will bear 10,000,000 tons of the Nation's wheat and corn from the Midwest to the markets of the world are not stealing that traffic from New York.

New York is entering, I am sure, a great period of expansion. This will be promoted and encouraged by the St. Lawrence project.

Russia has announced that she will develop 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity on the Volga River. That is roughly twice what we plan to develop on the St. Lawrence. Russia is building canals across hundreds of miles to connect the White, the Black, the Baltic, and the Caspian Seas. How can we dare to sit back and watch these activities without taking some action on our own? Only 114 miles of the St. Lawrence River remain to be cleared to open a waterway almost 2,500 miles long, a lifeline from the Atlantic Ocean to the interior of the continent. The cost, about $566,000,000 to be expended over a period of several years and all of which is to be repaid, is tiny in a $60,000,000,000 defense budget.

The signs point to a long period of mobilizing our strength. General Bradley and General Eisenhower have estimated this period at 10 to 20 years. By starting the St. Lawrence project immediately it can be finished in 4 years and the strength of this hemisphere immeasurably increased.

My fellow citizens, this is a matter of the greatest urgency. This is not a matter of my personal opinion. It is the consensus of our responsible defense leaders. Would you take the word of General Marshall and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the need to build three new aircraft carriers or B-36 airplanes? Why not take the word of these same leaders on a project which would cost even less than the aircraft carriers or B-36 planes, which would be self-liquidating and which would result in great benefits for this country of ours, for which our children and our grandchildren will thank us?

Indicate your support of this project to your Representatives and Senators in Congress. The time is now. We shall have a tragic account to settle with history if we delay this project any further.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, during all my service in Congress I have never seen such a spontaneous uprising on the part of the American people in indignation over the firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by President Truman.

The people of my district are alarmed, disgusted, bitter, and angry. They have every reason to be. I have received many long-distance phone calls, and hundreds of letters and telegrams expressing resentment of the President's action.

No words of mine can adequately convey just how the people of my district feel about this, and I am accordingly inserting in the RECORD just a few samples of the telegrams I have received. In this way I shall be able to convey to the Congress and to the country what my people think about the firing of our country's great military leader who probably knows, more than any other man, the exact situation in the Far East.

Here are some samples:

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—For heaven's sake, Les, what has happened to this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Let's forget about the Republicans and Democrats for a while and try to find enough real Americans down there to salvage something from this wreckage.

PAXTON, ILL.—Time for Congress to change Commander in Chief, that American affairs, both national and foreign, be conducted by Americans for Americans. Time that we stop appeasing the enemies who are killing our boys in Korea. Time for Congress to work on the American plan. Do it now.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—Firing MacArthur is Joe Stalin's greatest achievement. Worst news since Pearl Harbor. Everybody wants to know where do we go from here.

KANKAKEE, ILL.—As a good Democrat, I advocate the impeachment of President Truman.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—If you can't oust Truman please kick out Marshall and Acheson.

PAXTON, ILL.—It's later than you think. At least MacArthur had his own foreign policy—more than we can say for our State Department. Let's wake up, give us some legislation to let us at least know why our boys are being killed. We veterans of World War I and II think the whole mess stinks, especially in Washington.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—Please use your influence to have terrible wrong done American people and General MacArthur corrected by having Acheson fired and General MacArthur appointed Secretary of State.

CHENOA, ILL.—This community shocked by treatment of General MacArthur. This has brought about more comment and discussion in our grain office today than anything in history. We feel that the time has come for action to remedy this situation that brought this about. We hope action will be forthcoming by all Members of Congress.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—Impeach the little ward politician stupidity from Kansas City. This is another sell-out of our country to those dirty Britons who run the Far East while our sons give up their lives for British domination and dirty dollars. It's just more dirty politics.

ROANOKE, ILL.—Keep MacArthur and impeach Truman.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—Shocked with irresponsible dismissal of MacArthur. Administration policy threatens our survival. Congress must reestablish its constitutional powers. Impeachment urged.

We Must Not Rush Into World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject We Must Not Rush Into World War III.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the present turbulent days when people are greatly upset over world conditions in general, it has been difficult to explain why General MacArthur should leave his post and be replaced at the President's orders by his former subordinate. Possibly General Eisenhower gave us a clue in his address to Congress on February 1 immediately after his return from Europe. When he had outlined the powers and resources of the democracies, he was asked why we should be frightened of dictator nations if we had great quantities of oil and steel far superior to theirs. He replied, "Only for one reason—because they have unity of purpose." Then he added: "What we have got to do is to meet that unity with a higher type, the unity of free men that will not be defeated."

It has been interesting to me that a group of scientists working at the research laboratory at Los Alamos, N. Mex., which is the principal center of study on all atomic explosion activities in this country, have seen the issue more clearly than most people view it. They sensed that the demands of General MacArthur could bring on a third world war. It has been pointed out in the last few hours that MacArthur sought the right, not only to bomb Chinese bases in Manchuria, but also to bombard the China coast and that he would have liked to have the troops of Chiang Kai-shek armed by the United States and land on the Chinese mainland in a major invasion. That, of course, could only mean that everyone of Chiang's troops would have to be accompanied by a half-dozen soldiers from the United States, since Russia has a nonaggression pact with China, that could only mean the beginning of world war III.

These scientists at Los Alamos preferred to have a group in the United Nations direct the army in Korea. They know the power of the weapons which they are helping to create. They know how much the destructive force of an atomic explosion has been multiplied by recent scientific developments which they have largely directed. Therefore, it was of particular interest to me to read in the Albuquerque Journal of April 8 an item pointing out how these men at Los Alamos tried to make their contribution toward keeping America out of a third world war. They wanted the research and study which they have been making of nuclear energy to be of benefit in lifting burdens off the backs of the peoples of the world and not used in a sudden attempt to see if explosion after explosion could rock our great cities, destroy our homes and slaughter people by the millions. The article from the Albuquerque Journal is as follows:

"Some of the leading scientists at Los Alamos, research center for hydrogen bomb work, are worried men these days. Working with weapons of cataclysmic proportions naturally makes for sharp reflections on world conditions, and the thought of many physicists, chemists and mathematicians is that the conduct of the Korean war is bringing the world dangerously near the inferno of an atomic world war.

"These men, many of them from countries all over the world, feel the Korean war should be conducted by the United Nations rather than by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The fear is that MacArthur may provoke the Chinese Communists into a large-scale move against the UN forces which would be certain, in their opinion, to precipitate a world-wide conflagration.

"For the past few years, any worries or thoughts Los Alamos residents have had have been limited to private discussions among friends. But 2 weeks ago, some scientists felt that continued silence was shirking their duty and they met to draw up a proposal calling for creation of a group in the UN to direct the army in Korea.

"The feeling was that a statement of this kind coming from Los Alamos might be taken more seriously than a similar action from other cities."

In addition, I think it noteworthy that not all our military leaders were trigger-happy,

that nearly all of them were opposed to an Army clique overriding civilian government. It is of tremendous significance that every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff favored the removal of General MacArthur. They recognized that it was his privilege to want to conduct a general war, but they could remember how wrong he had been in his judgment that the Chinese Communists would not be brought into the Korean conflict if he crossed the thirty-eighth parallel and shoved his armies close to the Manchurian border.

Therefore, it is possible that other military leaders might not have been impressed by his feeling that if we bombed the mainland of China and placed our battleships off the Chinese coast and sprayed shells into their cities, the Chinese Communists would flee in fright and that Russia would not come to their assistance. There were those who believed that such an action by us could only be the beginning of a third world war.

One of the most useful editorials that I have read was one which appeared in the Washington Post of April 12, entitled "The President Acts." It is quite obvious that the editors of the Washington Post regretted that the career of General MacArthur should end on such an unhappy note but they proceeded to analyze the crisis which had developed. It is that analysis which strikes me as helpful in trying to understand the reasons for the President's action. The editorial is as follows:

"THE PRESIDENT ACTS

"The illustrious career of General MacArthur came to an end upon an inglorious note which will be regretted by all America. But there was no help for it. There is no room in our society for indispensable men or for ungovernable generals, no provision in our Constitution for the President to play second fiddle. Civil supremacy had to be reasserted, and it was wisest to reassert civil supremacy unmistakably. The German peril got its head and sustenance from the hostility of the German people to a general staff that had become a law unto itself. Japan was taken on the warpath by an army clique that overrode civilian government. These things must not happen here. We all have reason to be grateful that no segment of our society has been more critical of the self-willed conduct of General MacArthur than the high officers of our armed services. MacArthur, we feel sure, had no military following outside the dazzled court with which he had surrounded himself in Tokyo.

"The supercession of General MacArthur is the first sign in months of a firm hand at the helm of our affairs. Mr. Truman should never again relax his initiative. He is the Commander in Chief and the organ of our foreign affairs, yet he had seemed to be giving General MacArthur one opportunity after another to indulge his assumption of the highest authority. This he did, in particular, when he declared time after time that decisions at the thirty-eighth parallel were properly those of the supreme commander. In so doing he seemed to be giving a free hand to a man he knew had no sympathy with the policy he was given to execute. Our policy is to fight a limited war in the Far East; MacArthur wanted to fight a general and an all-out war. MacArthur is a crusader who feels that, with or without allies, the United States must embark up a 'jihad' against communism in Asia—which means communism everywhere. This is an aim that has no settled lodgment in official Washington.

"Our policy-makers, alas, have hitherto blown hot and cold about the nature of our adversary as well as about the problem of authority. It is time they developed a new clarity. To act upon the theory that our military enemy is communism is to condemn this country to an endless military adventure that would dig its grave and the grave of Western civilization. The religious wars of the sixteenth century are the supreme lesson in history that an idea cannot be conquered militarily. On the contrary, an idea thrives on military operations against it, and it is conceivable, perhaps sure, that communism would still be going stronger after all Russia had been laid in waste. The enemy against which the free world is arming is the gang who have captured Russia. Any identification of the enemy along the ideological lines of General MacArthur's reasoning is the way to play the game of Soviet Russia. 'So long as there are discontented groups within the Western nations,' says Herbert Butterfield in Christianity and History, 'the Soviet Union is perhaps clear-sighted in its recognition of the interest it has in keeping diplomacy on an ideological basis.'

"So the greatest urgency underlines the need to set our military sights straight in our two-headed struggle. This the President can furnish by leadership. To be a leader in a democracy in a crisis is to be a prophet—an awakener, as Jacques Maritain calls it. Lack of such leadership will infallibly turn people to false prophets. And that is not all. Popular recognition of leadership requires not only inspiration at the top but confidence in the men in positions of subordinate authority. Now that the President has shown who's boss, he ought to seek the people's suffrage by revamping his official family. Certainly the crisis is not over as a result of his ouster of MacArthur. It may be only beginning, and the President should rise to his opportunity, not be content to react to a breach of discipline. There is a house to put in order in Washington as well as in Tokyo."

Finally, I have been greatly interested in the appraisals of columnists and commentators. From the column of Stewart Alsop in this morning's Washington Post I pick out these words as informative: "Either President Truman or General MacArthur had to be fired, and a general cannot fire his Commander in Chief. It is really as simple as that."

Marquis Childs, under the heading, "Storm over MacArthur," had many interesting things to say. Here are two or three paragraphs from that article:

"Some who are so passionately for MacArthur seem to be for him in the belief that if he were only given his own way, he would find a magical means to end the war and bring peace to the Pacific. This does not, of course, conform to the facts. The MacArthur policy would certainly have expanded the Pacific war.

"Behind MacArthur is the whole of the so-called China lobby. It has large resources of money, including the support of a half-dozen Chinese in this country, most of the members of the Soong family, who are reported to have sums in banks in Switzerland, the Argentine, Holland, and the United States.

"This violent quarrel can mean a further paralysis of Government at a time when it is vital to rearm and, through rearming, to unify the coalition of western nations. If we can't have our way in the Far East, the extremists may say, in effect, to the President, "Then you will not get your way in Europe." Obstructionism under our system of divided powers can do a lot when there is no really responsible control in Congress as between Republicans and Democrats.

"Already the evidence of it has been ample in this Congress. If it now goes on to impede vital measures, we shall have paid a terrible price for our divisions."

That is the note which needs to be remembered. The actions of General MacArthur in proclaiming that Formosa is more important to the defense of the United States than France, his action in writing to the Republican leader of the House of Representatives, JOE MARTIN, in support of a policy completely contrary to the policy of his Commander in Chief could only mean a division, a disunity, and give a clue as to why his removal was imperative. Our country had to come to the principle which General Eisenhower had laid down. One thing was required and that was unity of purpose. If it has been impossible to achieve it in the Congress, it nevertheless had to be obtained in the Korean command.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the St. Lawrence seaway, written by Clem Norton and published in the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News of April 8, 1951, including certain corrections of typographical errors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE

Boston's leaders are wrong in opposing the St. Lawrence waterway. It will help the port of Boston. Every President since Wilson has recommended it. President Truman and Eisenhower claim that it's necessary for national security. Steel officials who once termed the idea a "Socialist's ditch" now approve, so as to bring ore by ship from the Quebec, Labrador area, because our Mesabi ore is running out. Today, Quebec ore comes by ocean steamer to Montreal and is then dumped into boats small enough to navigate the 14-foot Canadian Canal which bypasses the International Rapids, but this method is too expensive. United States Steel has built a plant on the water near Philadelphia so as to utilize ore from Venezuela. National Steel contemplates building mills in Connecticut. If Midwest steel is unable to obtain foreign ore by water, then it may mean that it will have to move east, and this would mean ghost cities and a tremendous economic upheaval.

The St. Lawrence is the greatest undeveloped hydroelectric river on the continent. It's a Mediterranean Sea, stretching 2,200 miles into the heart of the continent from the ocean to Duluth. It reaches right into the great industrial and agricultural heart of the Midwest. The steady-flowing St. Lawrence, fed by the Great Lakes containing half the fresh water of the world will produce 2,600,000 kilowatts of electricity annually, half to go to Canada, at about half the cost of steam-generated power. President Truman claims that we produced over 100,000 planes during the war, a fantastic figure, only because of Tennessee and Columbia River hydroelectric power. New England a power-starved area, can use some of that cheap electricity. American homes have more than doubled their consumption of electricity in the past 10 years.

WHO?

Well, who is stopping this development? Who is strong enough to thwart our war chiefs who claim that it's necessary for national security? A lobby made up of representatives of utilities, chambers of commerce, railroads, and ports on the eastern seaboards, plus banks and insurance companies who have investments in the said enterprises. And what's their argument? That they'll lose freight revenue. That the cocoa and coffee, say, that now comes by boat to an Atlantic port and is then shipped by rail to Detroit, will be taken by ship, right to Detroit if the St. Lawrence is deepened. That autos that now come from Detroit to Boston by rail, will then come by ship, but why not if the freight rate is $20 to $30 less an auto?

The Boston Chamber once approved the idea when private capital was to do the job. Ninety percent of the work has been completed. Less than 125 miles of dredging remains to be done at the International Rapids between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Cornwall, Ontario.

Here are other arguments used against the idea, but none seem valid. It will be frozen up, 5 months of the year. There is fog. A 27-foot depth is not enough. The Federal Government will have to dredge out harbors at Chicago, Detroit, and so on. Answer: Montreal, frozen up 5 months a year, does more business than any port on the continent with the exception of New York. Fog does not interfere. The Soo Canal on the Great Lakes, frozen up 5 months a year, does a bigger business than the Panama and Suez Canals put together. General Marshall testified that most of the world's ships could use the 27-foot depth, and facts support him, for the average ship is seldom loaded to the limit. And if a greater depth is necessary, that can come later.

Opening up the St. Lawrence will bring up a Midwest market to, say, the baby-carriage manufacturer in Gardner, Mass. A thousand other illustrations might be given. And Boston, being the largest near port to the St. Lawrence, should benefit, as it benefited by the opening of the Panama Canal. But when Panama was suggested, certain Boston officials objected, as they object today to the St. Lawrence affair.

How much longer will millions of our people in the Midwest allow themselves to continue to be locked up from access to the oceans of the world, when the project calls for an expenditure of less than $800,000,000 and the dredging of less than 125 miles? The money will be paid back, because the idea is self-liquidating because of tolls.

We think nothing of giving a needy nation $800,000,000 or more outright. The sum, as money goes today, is peanuts.

With a third world war threatening, and millions of our boys offering their lives, and our national leaders demanding this improvement for national security purposes, how much longer can selfish interests prevent progress?

But the idea is so right, that it is coming, just as sure as is tomorrow.

If we only could get these basic facts to the people.

Presentation of ECA Certificates of Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. William C. Foster, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, at the national presentation ceremony of ECA certificates of cooperation, held in Washington on April 3.

Mr. Foster is one of our ablest and most distinguished administrators, with long experience, both in business and in Government. He came into Government with the admiration of the business community through his outstanding work for the Committee for Economic Development and elsewhere. He has won the support of everyone with whom he has worked in Washington, and, although there are many executives who are more publicized, I doubt whether there is any in Washington today who is more popular or respected.

I call the particular attention of the Congress to his admonition that—

If anything approximating a $100,000,000,000 increase in European productivity is to be achieved, it must have the full support of European management and European labor—and to obtain that support, the ECA must undertake one of the greatest educational jobs in history—to teach new ideas, new techniques, to peoples whose economic tradition causes them to reject innovation almost by reflex action.

In these few phrases Mr. Foster outlines the difficult road of the future on which we are now embarked. I know his many warm friends in the Congress, among whom I am proud to number myself, all wish him well in his great and unprecedented task.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM C. FOSTER, ADMINISTRATOR, ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

My principal assignment today—certainly one of the most pleasant that I have ever had—is to express, on behalf of all of us in ECA, the profound appreciation we all feel for the constructive and intimate cooperation we have received from American management and from American labor.

I am especially pleased that our colleagues and partners in the European Recovery Program, as represented by the distinguished Ambassadors and Ministers of the Western European governments, have been able to join us today. By their very presence, they testify to the appreciation felt by their own peoples for the contributions of American management and labor to the success of the Marshall plan.

From the outset, the support of management and labor—both through their individual members and their associations and chambers and unions—has helped to sustain the Marshall plan and to give it drive and direction. Such organizations as the NAM and the CIO, the United States chamber and the A. F. of L., the CED and the International Association of Machinists, the Foreign Trade Council and others have conducted their own careful and searching studies of the Marshall plan. Then they endorsed it, helping to sway public opinion in its favor. And every time the Marshall plan came up before Congress for a review of things done, and a forecast of things still to be done, these groups of management and labor continued their support—not by means of any blanket approval but by means of constructive criticism, and suggestions for improvement. Equally important, perhaps, has been the way in which these management and labor groups have helped us at ECA to recruit the kind of skilled executive and technical and labor personnel to staff ECA here in Washington and overseas.

In my opinion, however, the most valuable contribution American management and American labor have made to the Marshall plan is to be found in their wholehearted cooperation in our technical assistance program.

For I firmly believe that the future of western civilization in substantial measure depends upon the ability of management, labor and governments in Western Europe to grasp the principles of American productivity and put them into practice. The essentials of American productivity are being demonstrated by our technical assistance program, and are being applied, at an ever-increasing rate. But both demonstration and application need to be tremendously stepped up in speed, in size, and in scope. No need is more urgent; no task demands more attention than to expand and to quicken our technical assistance program which must stand at the very core of our efforts to produce more in Western Europe—to produce more so that everybody will have more.

I should like to summarize—very briefly—a few of the accomplishments already chalked up to the credit of our ECA technical assistance program.

During the past 2 years, ECA has brought to the United States more than 400 teams of technicians, managers, and workers from almost every sector of Western European industry.

Thanks to the cooperation of our business and industrial associations, and particularly the individual manufacturing firms, these teams were able to visit more than 2,000 plants, to study our American methods in production and distribution. They have been able to discuss their observations with all ranks of American producers in the plants they visited. They talked to top executives in the board room and to workers at punch presses and looms and lathes and along assembly lines. Thanks to the cooperation of the labor unions, these teams have been given the opportunity to discuss work conditions in United States industry with thousands of our own working men and women. They have heard from them what American productivity means to them and their families.

It is still too early to fully assess the results of this program. But we do know it is yielding encouraging results. This is reflected by the fact that industrial production in Western Europe had in 1950 reached a level of 27 percent above 1938; agricultural production 9 percent above; intra-European trade 26 percent, and European exports to the rest of the world 30 percent above prewar.

But quite as significant as these physical results is the fact that Western Europe is rapidly becoming "productivity conscious." This is particularly true among younger executives and labor leaders. In many plants, in many industries, they are building up pressures to break down the obsolescent, wasteful methods that have become so firmly entrenched in the European industrial tradition. They are replacing outworn methods with modern methods. And in hundreds of Western European factories, they are succeeding with astonishing results. To illustrate this trend, let me read just a single paragraph from the report of one of our ECA representatives abroad, written after a visit to a French foundry:

"Upon his return from a technical assistance mission to the United States, the head of the foundry division at Etablissement Japhy Freres decided to overhaul operations. He cut out the making of certain castings, rearranged his equipment, and retrained his workers. In 1 year he reduced man-hours per ton from 222 to 23, cut his prices 25 to 30 percent, and raised wages 20 to 25 percent. A year ago this foundry was

losing 2,000,000 francs a month; today it is in the black."

Today, on the third anniversary of the Marshall plan, all of us in this room can feel a deep sense of gratification at the goals that have been gained. In most of Western Europe the job of rehabilitation has been largely completed. If we lived in a peaceful world, today, I think we might well be able to say that the job of European recovery has been virtually accomplished, and that Marshall plan outlays could be reduced to a small volume of "wind-up" aid to a few countries.

But I am compelled by the circumstances we all face to tell you very bluntly, there is more to do. For the brutal fact is that we do not live in a peaceful world today, nor in anything approaching it.

We live in a world that may be plunged into total, atomic war, by one of the most ruthless, imperialistic powers in history—a power that has already demonstrated through its satellites and puppets, its willingness to resort to naked aggression.

Remarkable progress—as General Marshall says "near miraculous" progress has been made by Western Europe under the Marshall plan. Nevertheless, the ERP countries are still not strong enough to sustain—by themselves alone—the kind of defense program that the Soviet menace requires—without seriously impairing the living standard they have recently restored. To reduce these living standards now, to any appreciable extent, would be to jeopardize the gains we have scored during the first 3 years of the Marshall plan. People who have just emerged from the quagmire of poverty and deprivation will not welcome the prospect of being bogged down again. Any serious impairment of living standards in Western Europe today would change the psychological climate from hopefulness and confidence and the will to resist Soviet threats into pessimism, doubt and "neutralism." It would certainly generate the kind of social and political unrest which might very possibly leave Western Europe even more vulnerable to aggression from within than she is to aggression from without.

I have already mentioned that the industrial and agricultural production of the ERP countries is well above prewar. Against this, however, must be weighed a 10 percent increase in population and the crucial fact that prewar standards of living in most European countries were so low that they gave rise to nazism and fascism, and plunged us all into World War II.

To many Europeans the defense program which we are urging upon them, looks, not like a choice between guns and butter but like a choice between guns and bread. The limiting factor of preparedness efforts in Western Europe is not the unwillingness of the governments or the peoples to defend themselves; it is simply their economic inability to carry an adequate defense program, superimposed upon the civilian economies.

The United States is now compelled, in its own self-interest to help Western Europe rearm.

However, we in ECA believe that the western European countries, within a few years, cannot only assume the full burden of a defense program, but also can raise the living standards of their people—at the same time.

We do not believe that the choice for Western Europe is between guns or bread. We are convinced that Western Europe can—if its people will make the necessary effort and take the necessary risks—have both guns and bread, and a little butter too. We are convinced that the ERP countries can, within a reasonable number of years, increase their total output of goods and services by an additional $100,000,000,000 worth annually. That should be their goal.

Obviously, if anything approaching a $100,000,000,000 increase in annual output can be achieved by Western Europe, its countries can undertake a defense program many times the size of the Military Establishment now proposed. They could carry a defense program of $40,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000 annually, if necessary, and at the same time raise their living standards by 50 percent. And what is most important both to American taxpayers and to the western Europeans themselves, today's ERP countries could soon become completely independent of outside economic assistance.

Many of us in ECA think that one answer to Western Europe's defense problems, her economic problems, her social and political problems, can be summed up in one single word—productivity. And when I say productivity, I include all of the elements—human and material—that make productivity possible and effective.

I am sure that many of our friends in Western Europe share with us the conviction that the very existence of their civilization, that the success of the Western World's effort to meet the menace of communism depends upon a creative and operative and very specific and realistic program to raise their productivity. Our particular part of the job is to show them that the goal of raising that productivity by even such a high amount as $100,000,000,000 is something that can be—and, indeed, must be—achieved. It is our part of the job to help them realize more clearly and perhaps more understandingly the inescapable necessity of doing all the difficult and even painful things that are part and parcel of a successful productivity program.

Let me list what we in ECA consider to be the indispensable ingredients in any such undertaking:

First of all, there must be an expanded technical assistance program. Under our present TA arrangements, we have been able to convey the lessons of American productivity to a few thousands of western European managers, technicians, and workers. Now, we must develop techniques to drive these lessons home to all European management, to all European technicians, to all European labor, and to their governments.

Second, a mass market must be created to enable western European producers to sell their wares at a price at a profit that will justify their adoption of mass production and distribution methods. By this I mean that the ERP countries must take swift and positive action to bring into being now a mass European market.

Third, the savings which result from improved production and distribution methods must be passed on to the consumers in the form of lower prices and to the worker in the form of higher wages. Otherwise, it will be impossible to release the purchasing power required to create that mass market and to keep it going. To say all this in another way, what I mean is more goods, such as bread, and shoes, for the people and more services, such as electric light and medical care for the people and more guns and more tanks and more planes for their defense.

Fourth, the self-strangulating practices of so many European industries in restricting output, in limiting markets, in pegging high prices must be abolished. In their place must come both the psychological and practical acceptance of high-volume production, high wages, high profits, all based upon an ever-lower-unit cost.

Fifth, sound fiscal and financial policies must be vigorously applied both by European governments and by the European business community. Without drastic fiscal reforms, without new attitudes toward the role of the budget and the fiscal machinery, it will be impossible to develop mass markets in Western Europe.

Sixth, our friends in Western Europe are recognizing more and more that American productivity does not derive only from installing expensive equipment in a factory—even though that equipment may be important to that factory's record of production. They are recognizing that even more important is the ability—the know-how—of making the best possible use of all the equipment, of all the tools, of all the material on hand. Consider, for example, the experience of a French shoe manufacturer who visited the United States with a technical mission last spring. His name is Maurice Douheret. He is the manager-owner of Etablissements ROC, and he has been able to increase his output from 400 to 600 pairs of shoes per day, simply by rejigging his machines and standardizing his output. His only capital expenditure was a modest sum to install automatic regulators, and improve his lighting and ventilating systems. As a result of this productivity increase, Mr. Douheret reports that he has raised the wages of his workers 20 percent and absorbed a 20-percent advance in raw-material costs, without raising his prices.

The ECA therefore believes that Western European industry could quickly achieve a substantial increase in its ability to produce with a comparatively small outlay of new capital, simply by using more efficiently its human and material resources inside the plant and by completely revamping its merchandising methods. These, of course, are problems of education. They are problems of teaching; they are problems of imparting the lore and learning of American management and technicians and labor to their opposite numbers in Western Europe.

In view of this need to educate, I think that the ECA has got to find a way to bring management and labor even more closely into our program than ever before. I am sure that you, representatives of the great business and union organizations appreciate quite as much as I do that the venture I have just outlined cannot fulfill its aims through the efforts of governments alone. If anything approximating a $100,000,000,000 increase in European productivity is to be achieved, it must have the full support of European management and European labor. To obtain that support, the ECA in concert with the governments of Western Europe must undertake one of the greatest educational jobs in history. It is the job of teaching new ideas, and new techniques, to peoples whose economic tradition causes them to reject innovation almost by reflex action.

I am only revealing the obvious when I say that you representatives of American management and American labor can certainly command a more sympathetic audience from your opposite numbers in Western Europe than can ECA officials. We are, after all, the officials of a foreign government. But you can discuss new methods and new ideas from a common approach, a common concern, a common preoccupation, and a common store of experience. Your opposite numbers abroad will therefore heed you more attentively than they would heed even the officials of their own government agencies.

In the very near future, my associates and I expect to call upon you gentlemen and your colleagues in industrial and labor groups, to seek your advice and recommendations. We are going to ask you to join us in this educational job, along every step of the way.

I have said that a prodigious increase in productivity for Western Europe can build the strength to forefend both internal and external aggression. Hence productivity has to be regarded, not merely as a means to heighten physical resources but also as a means to heighten spiritual resources. When the chips are down men will defend only those values in which they believe, only those institutions in which they participate. Seen in this light, productivity is an instrument of peace—that peace which can be based only upon "strength for the free world." Strength for the free world is more than a slogan. It is the lifeline of freedom in our day.

Proposed Amalgamation of Dixie Democrats and Yank Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Monday last, April 9, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] delivered an interesting and informative speech to the Exchange Club in Jackson, Miss.

An editorial written by Mr. Fred Sullens, distinguished and able editor of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, and a report of the speech of the Senator from South Dakota, appeared in the April 9 issue of this newspaper.

On behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the news report of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the news report of the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of April 10, 1951]

SENATOR MUNDT'S GREAT SPEECH

Senator KARL MUNDT, South Dakota Republican, has the answer, and it is a very definite answer.

Only through a coalition of conservative Republicans and States' rights Democrats can the Nation's drift toward a welfare state be checked.

A welfare state, be it understood, is communism in the making.

When the South Dakota Senator, addressing the Exchange Club of Jackson Monday afternoon, proposed a coalition of this character in the presidential campaign next year to oppose the welfare-state Democrats he was cheered to the echo. Not mere polite applause, mind you, but ear-splitting rebel yells of the kind heard at political gatherings in this State threescore years ago. Members of the Exchange Club and their guests almost lifted the roof from the Hotel Edwards ballroom. It was a complete refutation of the belief that citizens of Jackson had long since forgotten how to cheer; that they manifest applause only by polite handclapping. This time they surely had their hearts in it.

The Exchange Club is not a political organization—just another of those rather numerous luncheon clubs—but it has within its membership many of the leading business and professional men of Jackson, mostly of the younger generation, men who keep abreast of the times, who are familiar with current trends, and of whom it can be fairly said that they represent a first-class cross-section of public sentiment in this community.

That such a body of men would not only respectfully listen to a proposal from a Republican political leader, but receive his proposal with the wildest enthusiasm, would have astonished President Truman and his welfare-state leaders if they had been privileged to hear it.

The important truth is that political history was written at that Exchange Club meeting in Jackson Monday afternoon—history from which this Nation is going to hear some distinct repercussions in the near future.

In truth and in fact, it was the beginning of a movement to launch a new national political movement or organization that will have to be reckoned with in the presidential campaign next year.

It may be known as the Democratic-Republican alliance, the Liberty Party, the Human Rights Party, or some other name that will adequately describe its purpose, and that purpose will be to get rid of the Government now in power in Washington.

Senator MUNDT was coldly logical in his proposal. Affirming his faith in the doctrine of States' rights as it has been so earnestly preached by southern Democrats, he declared that this doctrine is equally important in all other States of the Union. It is a doctrine now denied in platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. In fact, the platforms of the two parties are so much alike that one might well say to each, "A plague on both your houses."

With cogent reasoning and splendid eloquence Senator MUNDT drew a picture of the dangers into which this Nation is drifting. The rights and functions of free men are dwindling, free enterprise and individual initiative are being thwarted, and if the freedom for which our forefathers fought is to be restored in these United States we must have a political upheaval that will sweep out of office all who favor a welfare state, White House dictatorship, and the deadly encroachments of bureaucracy. Our citizens have inalienable rights in the Federal Government and the States that must not be surrendered or modified. It is the curse of communism slowly eating at the vitals of our Nation, just as it is doing in other parts of the world where more than one-half of all people now living are dominated by communism and will eventually be reduced to an economic state nothing short of slavery.

Communism is a lie on its face, said Senator MUNDT. It is not a sharing and sharing alike of worldly goods. It is not even a sharing according to need as preached by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. Communism is a Godless way of life. It is financial control by a greedy and remorseless few of the entire social and economic fabric of the Nation. Communism is a remorseless dictatorship that not only denies God but likewise the rights of free men and women.

It is to battle with a deadly menace such as this that Senator MUNDT urged southern Democrats and conservative Republicans to join forces next year and put forth a candidate for President who will recognize the rights of States, the time-honored traditions of the South, and offer to the Nation a platform of which all citizens who love freedom can stand.

It will be useless, said the speaker, for the South to hope to win its fight within the Democratic Party. The melancholy truth is that the South lost control of the Democratic Party at the party national convention in Chicago in 1936 when it agreed to repeal of the two-thirds rule, and that power will never be restored to the South by Northern, Eastern, and Western States.

Throughout his address, covering more than an hour, Senator MUNDT was earnest, forceful, and plausible. Not once did he descend to demagogy or sprinkle his speech with specious reasoning.

And he did bring down the house—something no other Republican ever succeeded in doing in this general latitude and longitude. That in itself was an astonishing achievement.

Just about this time next year—maybe sooner—you are going to be hearing some lively echoes of a political speech delivered in Jackson on Monday afternoon, April 9, by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of April 9, 1951]

MUNDT TELLS JACKSON CIVIC LEADERS DIXIE DEMOCRATS CAN JOIN YANK REPUBLICANS

"It is entirely within the realm of political possibility that northern Republicans and southern Democrats may form an alliance by the next presidential election," Senator KARL MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota) told the Jackson Exchange Club Monday at noon.

About 300 Jackson and Mississippi leaders heard the Republican Senator make this history-making statement.

Senator MUNDT is one of three Members of the United States Senate investigating committee who Monday morning opened hearings on charges of Federal job sales in Mississippi.

"All over America, in every State, there has never before been so much interest in the alliance between southern Democrats and northern Republicans of like mind, so that they can vote for the same candidate for President and elect an administration dedicated to the preservation of States' rights, the protection of the individual freedoms of our citizens, and our private enterprise economy," MUNDT declared.

He declined to predict who might be favored as a Presidential candidate in the event the two groups formed an alliance by the next election.

He said, however, that perhaps the slate would be a combination of northern Republicans and southern Democrats.

"As in any alliance, each group has to come halfway across the street," he continued.

"By bringing together two groups that have the same basic political and economic interests the hurdle of party labels can be eliminated in the interests of basic American principals," said MUNDT.

Today, said MUNDT, America is reaping the sorry dividence of a multiparty system. He warned that splinter parties were becoming so numerous that they were weakening the Nation.

The Republican Senator, introduced by Senator JOHN STENNIS, paid tribute to Gov. Fielding Wright for the courage to stand up against the Truman Democrats and their platform of socialism.

Senator MUNDT said for the 16 years he has been in Congress, "I have voted with the conservative Senators from the South against legislation with socialistic trends."

He said he would like to see the Democrats of the South walk out again if their party at the 1952 convention nominates Truman or any other of his kind with leftist leanings.

Then, he added, these Southern conservative leaders could instead of trying to form a third party, come to the Republican convention and tell us Republicans to nominate a conservative Democrat for the Vice Presidency on a Republican ticket * * * and also advise us about what planks in our platform are repugnant to the South.

Since the socialist trend began in 1936, MUNDT emphasized, both major parties have been appealing in their platforms for the big city socialistic blocs.

"What we have today," he declared, actually is four splinter parties * * * the conservative and so-called liberal elements of Republicans and Democrats."

Predicting that with ingenuity and proper engineering the conservative elements of the North and South can form an alliance to insure proper leadership, MUNDT suggested:

"Let's abandon the elephant and the jackass of the two major parties by forming this alliance and use maybe the eagle as an emblem of a party. Surely, we would then have a genuine two-party system in which there would be no mistake or misunderstanding on principles."

"Only Dixie can save the Nation, and saving the Nation means saving the world," declared Senator KARL MUNDT in a mind-gripping speech that held the closest attention of its hearers.

Senator MUNDT is the open champion and staunch advocate of a coalition between conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats for the purpose of restoring State rights as a fundamental principle of our Government.

"We are today in the midst of that ageless contest between man and State to determine which shall be the master," said Senator MUNDT. "Today we see our Government steadily encroaching on the rights as well as the plain duties of our people, through a vicious policy of asking them to look to Washington for everything.

"Personally, I am a liberal in the concept of Thomas Jefferson. I am a firm believer in State rights but I also believe in the people assuming their full responsibility and not looking to the Government to provide them with easy living. When all these new proposals are being made to us by those who champion the welfare State we should stop and ask ourselves are such things necessary, are such things practical, and can we afford the expense involved. If we continue in our present path the end is bankruptcy. We must not permit the Government to become masters of the people. Too many men are exercising too much authority over too many people for too long a time. They must be forced to remember that they are servants, not masters."

Senator MUNDT's statements on States rights and private-enterprise principles were interrupted by generous applause of Exchange Club members and about 200 guests of outstanding Mississippi political leaders and businessmen. He spoke 30 minutes past the civic club dead line.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Seaway Arguments," published in the Omaha World-Herald of March 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEAWAY ARGUMENTS

When the St. Lawrence seaway project was proposed to Congress this year, the battle lines formed almost immediately.

New England, the Atlantic ports and the Eastern railroads were against it. Most of the Great Lakes ports, except Chicago, were for it. Chicago, as always, seemed to be suffering from a bad case of schisophrenia. It was both for the seaway and against it.

New York's Mayor Impellitteri sounded off about this madcap scheme and Detroit and Milwaukee interests implied that grass will grow in their streets unless the seaway is completed. Such extravagant claims are no longer news.

The seaway is not a madcap scheme, nor is the commercial future of a few lake cities a matter of compelling national importance.

The only possible justification for the project in these huge-spending times is its importance to national defense.

The Department of Defense and Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson say it is urgently needed. They say the channeling of the St. Lawrence will permit Labrador iron ore to reach Pittsburgh and Gary, thus easing the American shortage of high-grade ore.

If the seaway can be sold to the country on this basis, well and good. But there should be no more of the regional sparring by the what's-in-it-for-me boys. Long ago they prejudiced many people against the St. Lawrence seaway project and they could be the means of killing it now.

MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "MacArthur's Dismissal," published in the Birmingham (Ala.) News of April 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

Pronounced differences of view between General MacArthur and those to whom he was responsible produced a situation that could not be permitted to continue indefinitely.

To have ignored that sharp conflict over policy in the conduct of the Korean conflict would probably have had progressively serious effects.

Surely the reaction among United States and United Nations troops to such a continuing situation would have been bad. Our relations with our allies would likely have been worsened. The Communists doubtless would have exploited these differences to the utmost. Something had to be done.

This paper believes the great majority of the American people will recognize that military commanders should be subject to their superiors in the making of general policy. MacArthur has indicated quite clearly that he intended to make certain of his own views known, notably in his recent letter to Representative JOE MARTIN, Massachusetts Republican. The general plainly desired to extend the conflict. He endorsed MARTIN's idea of using Chinese Nationalist troops to open another front. He expressed the view that Asia rather than Europe is the major theater of conflict now with communism.

These ideas go directly against the policy of the United States Government and of the United Nations to limit the Korean conflict as much as is feasible.

The divergences produced great uncertainties as to the conduct of the war—uncertainties among our allies, uncertainties among the Communists.

President Truman could have rebuked General MacArthur. But the commander already had had repeated plain indications that his comments expressing conflicting views on broad policy were not in order. The President evidently felt that the results of a reprimand would not be satisfactory. And while such a drastic step as removal of a great military leader produces deep regrets in this country in one respect, it is not difficult to understand how Mr. Truman reached the conclusion that such a step was now called for.

It should be borne clearly in mind that the differences in this situation did not involve only the President and MacArthur. The Joint Chiefs of Staff is largely responsible for American military policy. It has opposed extending the war.

What General MacArthur thought would be the course of such an extension is far from clear. Of course he has not set forth his ideas in that connection. Could he have thought a decisive victory could have been won over the Communists in a general war in China? Does he believe the Russians would remain out of such a conflict? Where would it lead?

MacArthur, as Mr. Truman emphasizes, has performed tremendous services to the country. He has been responsible for some great military achievements. He has the gratitude and admiration of the Nation for these services.

It is fortunate that so able a commander as General Ridgway is available to take over the far-reaching responsibilities of command in the Far East.

Value of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Dollars and Sense," delivered by Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash., before the Coeur d'Alene (Idaho) Chamber of Commerce on April 5, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLARS AND SENSE

(By Frank Lilly)

If, back in 1940, your doctor told you after a physical check-up that you were sound as a dollar, and if, thereafter, it developed that you actually had various weaknesses which have resulted in the loss of sight of one eye, the loss of hearing in one ear, the use of an arm and a leg, and in addition, you now have both asthma and stomach ulcers, your doctor was absolutely right: you were as sound as the 1940 dollar which has had a bad case of dropsy, dropping down to a present value of less than 50 cents on the average and as low as 27 cents for such items as bread, butter, coffee, sugar, corn, cotton, beef, lard, copper, lead, zinc, tin, among numerous examples that could be given.

Thus, even if you now have more than twice as much in the bank, twice as much savings, life insurance, bonds, real estate, and other assets as you had in 1940, you are not quite so well off as you were at that time, and 11 years of your life are gone. Believe it or not, you are not so well off as you were in 1933 unless you now have assets more than two and one-half times larger than in that depression year if measured in terms of the constant dollar used in a recent report of the United States Department of Commerce.

The practical effect of this decrease in the value of the dollar is the same as if the Government had made a capital levy of over 50 percent, leaving you the short end of your

savings, life insurance, and any pensions you may have earned in the service of an employer of your Government.

It is true that a part of the dollar's depreciation was due to the war, and few of us object to the loss sustained in the purchase of the so-called savings bonds, but the fact is that the depreciation started before the war and that the largest part of the loss of value has occurred in the last 5 years.

It is important to bear in mind that the dollar has no meaning except in terms of what it will buy. Confusion in this connection is responsible for much of the muddled thinking and the hue and cry over inflation, as if it were some new and strange animal that ate dollars. Actually inflation is the corollary of the depreciation, or deflation, of the dollar.

The stage for inflation was set back in 1933 when we went off gold and adopted irredeemable printing press paper currency. Like the sawdust that Mortimer Snerd substituted for the wheat bran he fed his chickens, it seemed to work; but it was inevitable that sooner or later we would find ourselves getting woodpeckers instead of little chicks out of the settings of wooden eggs.

This is the way the paper currency system works: Federal Reserve notes (IOU's) are issued against public and private debt, and because such so-called money is easily created it is in turn easily spent. Sooner or later, usually sooner, these debt-based dollars become so numerous that they lose a part of their buying power. In other words, prices rise and you have inflation through deflation of the dollar.

At this juncture, I suggest that you take a good look at one of your $10 bills. You will find that it is a Federal Reserve note which is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury. If you are curious to see what "lawful money" looks like and send your bill to the Treasury, you will receive two $5 United States notes which are redeemable in lawful money—and that is as far as you go.

You may say, as some people have said to me: I don't care what it is, money, currency, or what not, just so long as I can get enough of it to buy what I want with it. And, because more currency is needed to buy what people want to buy, wages are increased to meet higher prices and more and more debts are created as a base for more and more paper currency. This puts prices and wages up again and so on and on.

Eventually efforts are made to stop the paper-money racket responsible for the inflation. Price and wage controls are tried with resultant black markets and strikes. Bankers are required to tighten up on loans which, for the most part, are required only by small business since big business usually has ample funds, or can get them through Government loans by hiring the right attorney or with the gift of a pink mink fur coat.

In some quarters, it has been suggested that higher taxes will halt inflation. Maybe so, but an increase of 1,117 percent since 1940 in the Federal tax-take from your income and profits has not stopped inflation. Under the present monetary set-up, any increase in the tax-take will, in all probability, be offset by more printing-press debt-based currency.

The plain, unadulterated, and simple truth of the matter is that we must restore to this country the sound money of the Constitution, after which all other reforms can be accomplished. Managed currency requires a management to control prices and management of personal affairs, and these in turn lead to socialism and/or communism.

If and when an American citizen can redeem his currency in hard money, his bonds will have a sound and relatively constant value. Why doesn't our Government give us honest, gold-backed money so that we can know that the bonds we buy will be good down through the years? Provide such a bond and it will not be necessary to put on expensive campaigns and pressures to buy and hold them, or to pay more than a minimum interest on them if the interest is made payable in gold.

The United States should set an example for the world by providing its citizens with the best money in the world. As matters now stand, our paper currency is not as good as some other currencies, and no one wants our paper dollars except to buy goods from us or exchange them for gold which we sell abroad at a lower price than any other country will sell, while, at the same time, denying the right to own gold to our own citizens.

To put back into the dollar the cents it has lost we must put some sense into our monetary system and discard the practices foisted upon us by textbook economists and Marxists. No nation can be truly free with a paper currency that is not redeemable in something which has a storage of value.

Gold and silver are simple and definite forms of wealth, understood by men throughout the civilized world. They are not tainted with debt or deceit; they cannot be created at will and can be produced only by honest sweat and toil. They cannot be inflated, deflated, or debauched. Why don't we make full use of them, instead of kidding ourselves that a debt-based printing-press paper currency can be as good as gold?

It is your inalienable right as a citizen to own gold, which is the one best and safest form of wealth in this world. You owe it to yourself and to your loved ones to insist that this right be speedily restored by providing our country with a sound, honest constitutional hard money system:

In conclusion, I quote from Money Makes the Mare Go, by John McBride:

"An unsound monetary system is more fruitful of human misery than war, pestilence, and famine, and has brought more injustice than all the bad laws ever written. Until a sound monetary system is adopted, all the present frenzied efforts for permanent peace, economic recovery, a balanced budget, tax reduction, better labor-management relations, foreign aid, and a free world are just so much sound and fury signifying nothing. The dumping of additional billions of dollars into Europe and Asia will serve only as a temporary expedient, just prolong the agony, and hasten us on the way to bankruptcy."

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on the 12th day of April, the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette carried a surpassing editorial entitled "Battlefield Courage." It should be read by all, but particularly by all who are suffering from the present Nation-wide epidemic of acute MacArthuritis. I ask unanimous consent that this praiseworthy editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLEFIELD COURAGE—MACARTHUR WAS DISMISSED FOR DOING WHAT HE HIMSELF WOULDN'T TOLERATE

Yesterday marked the passing from the active military picture of one of this country's greatest generals. The man whose name has been gospel to adult and schoolboy alike for more than a decade as he led our GI's to victory after victory from Pearl Harbor to Korea was placed on the inactive list for the one thing he himself would not tolerate—insubordination.

General MacArthur was fired by the only man in the world who could do the job, his boss—the President of the United States.

Mr. Truman, regardless of any shortcomings, has shown once more that he has guts and he will act when he thinks he acts for the welfare of the Nation.

Make no mistake about it. It took battlefield courage—the same kind of courage with which the general is familiar—for the President to remove MacArthur from his command.

He fully realized the decision would be unpopular. Certainly he anticipated the reaction arising from the people who idolize MacArthur and think he can do no wrong. This newspaper has been one of his stanchest admirers.

Many of these are the same people who elected Mr. Truman as their President in 1948. By doing so they made him Commander in Chief over all branches of the Armed Forces and every man serving in them—including General MacArthur.

These are the people to whom Mr. Truman must answer for his every act, while his subordinate, General MacArthur, had only to answer to his Commander in Chief.

The removal order was not the idea of President Truman alone. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, highest military authority in the United States, stamped their approval on the order. It was not done with snap judgment but only after days and months of studied consideration.

General MacArthur was relieved of his armies because of insubordination which can no more be condoned in a general than it can be in a private in the ranks.

He was disobedient—not once, but repeatedly. To allow such disobedience to continue would make the function of the military impossible. In every sense and under every condition, it was MacArthur's duty to obey orders from the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff strictly and without question. This he did not do.

His flagrant defiance of the President was indirectly a defiance of every citizen of the United States. This defiant and arrogant ignoring of Mr. Truman had weakened the authority and the influence of the President of the United States throughout the world.

And for all of General MacArthur's tremendous reputation, he could not act as President, the chosen leader of all the people of the United States.

While MacArthur wielded his great influence in a restricted sphere of the world, the President is the symbol of this Nation's authority throughout the globe, encompassing that part that General MacArthur has preferred to treat peculiarly as his own.

MacArthur had plainly tried to dictate our policy as respects conditions in that zone. He had no authority whatever to do so. His actions repeatedly have crossed up Washington and the United Nations. The President is authorized to set foreign policies. His military commanders are required only to carry them out, not make them. This MacArthur was trying to do despite the fact his knowledge was limited to the East. It must be remembered he has been absent from this country for 15 years.

The President, holding in his hand the fate of our reputation in the over-all, broad realm of policy, would not let MacArthur get away with it.

As long ago as last December 8 the Gazette said editorially:

"To keep MacArthur in command because of any sentimental consideration would be such disregard of practical procedure as to be not only childishly foolish but positively criminal. The lives of hundreds of thousands of our young men are at stake, and the prestige of this country has already suffered distressingly. We cannot afford to risk anything more on a man who has pitifully failed and who, under the circumstances, could be depended upon to be responsible for further failures."

We have not altered from that position.

About the most charitable thing we can say about General MacArthur is that the piling up of the years may have served to warp his judgment and to impair his usefulness.

Whether he is the unwitting tool of certain politicians is not entirely clear. We are slow to believe that he would sell out his command and his country for political office, misled as he may be. But he has followed what many define as a party line instead of the patriotic line.

For some time it has been obvious that MacArthur was the darling of the Hearst newspapers. Now the blatant Hearst press, the antiadministration newspapers, and MacArthur's own sizable corps of press agents will drum up his dismissal into a cause celebre.

The deposed general should take a hint from our other remarkably popular general, Ike Eisenhower, who has expressed the hope that MacArthur will not intentionally allow himself to be held up as a wounded martyr to the further disunity of a troubled Nation faced with growing danger.

Leaders of both our major political parties must reassess their consciences and reawaken again that spirit of cooperation which carried America through the perilous years of World War II. There has been disunity in the ranks of both Democrats and Republicans. Things must be put right.

The people of our Nation too must stop and reflect. Hasty, feverish, and thoughtless action will not suffice.

Let the people answer these questions:

How would MacArthur have acted if one of his battlefield commanders had disobeyed?

How has he acted?

From its very birth, the Republic has feared militarism, meaning rule by generals who scorn the civil authority and force it to do their will. This fear emanated from the experiences of the early settlers in their native lands of Europe. They knew that militarism led to oppression and tyranny, and often to war for the aggrandizement of military leaders. This fear was reflected in the Constitution, which subordinated the military services to the civil authority by making the President Commander in Chief, and through the first 10 amendments (the Bill of Rights) placed certain restrictions upon the military to protect the rights of civilians.

It is only necessary to recall the march of militarism in other nations in our own time to realize how wise the founding fathers were in definitely subordinating the military branches to the civil authority, and how wise each generation has been in guarding against any step which might breach this safeguard. No democratic republic could long survive as such once the military establishment gained supremacy, for military rule and popular rule simply cannot operate simultaneously.

The record now released shows that General MacArthur had clearly and persistently flouted the civil authority and the policy-making, over-all strategic authority of the Military Establishment itself. He went over the heads of his constitutional superiors, to Congress and people. This he could properly have done by retiring from his vital command positions and going openly to the hustings. Instead, he chose a path of defiance, and one which invited a serious and perhaps fatal rupture with our allies in the free world.

President Truman has shown real courage in dealing condignly with the great hero. He knew that for relieving him, he would be assailed by Republican leaders with all the vigor and vituperation at their command, and that they would have a strong measure of popular support because many will believe MacArthur right in his concept of Asia as the decisive theater and in his demand for freedom of action against Communist China.

When this second great debate has ended, the majority support of Congress and people will be behind the President, for he has necessarily upheld the civil authority in recalling a general who would not take orders or directives, and the realities of the world situation make Europe and not Asia the decisive theater for years to come. Moreover, there is a wide realization that MacArthur has had a Jehovah complex for years, and the American people generally do not cotton to a leader who believes himself infallible, the late F. D. R. to the contrary.

All sorts of black results will be written into the President's action. It will be viewed as destructive of Army morale in Korea, as alienating the Japanese people, who have come to look upon MacArthur as something of a god, and as aiding the Communist armies by removing a leader with strategical genius who is feared by the enemy. The extreme view which some no doubt will advance is that world war III will be hastened because of the advantages accruing to the Soviet.

It is too much to expect the Republicans and other critics of the administration's handling of the war and the program for defense of the free world to keep their shirts on. None of the dire results already being predicted will eventuate, but the rearmament program will be slowed down by Republican attacks. They would have found something else of which to make political capital, however, so Mr. Truman was wise in disregarding the ammunition he would provide them in firing MacArthur. It is nothing short of tragic that the people in Washington can't pull together in war and defense matters and fight their political battles over domestic issues.

In addition to upholding the power of the civil authority, the President's summary action should result at least in the formulation of clear-cut policy in regard to the Korean War, on the part of both the United States and the United Nations. With China ignoring all efforts of the latter to negotiate and this country engaging in a controversy over the question of basic strategy, there is little probability that Peiping will backtrack now on its appeasement demands. Washington and the UN majority have shown no disposition to entertain those demands, and they will certainly not be tolerated now that the UN forces have shown their ability to maul the Reds in Korea and either advance or hold.

With Russia pledged by the Moscow pact with Red China to assist the latter if attacked, there will be no diminution of western fears of all-out war if the MacArthur demands for action against the mainland were to prevail. With no negotiations in progress and none in prospect, and with appeasement of Red China unthinkable, the wisest course for the west is to announce that there will be no general advance beyond the vicinity of the thirty-eighth parallel and that it will hold on that line until the Reds get enough men killed to stop their aggression.

Concurrently, an effective South Korean defense army should be built, equipped, and trained, that the UN forces may eventually disengage. If there is any other course open, other than a continuation of the present impossible war without objectives, it is not apparent unless western nations decide they are willing to risk all-out war in the Orient, which would mean the certain fall of Western Europe to Russia.

The Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Fundamental Principle Was at Stake," published in the Staunton News-Leader, Staunton, Va., on Thursday, April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE WAS AT STAKE

Involved in the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur is a more fundamental question than that of doing something to win an outright victory in the Korean War, or of the decisive theater (Asia or Europe) in the war for survival. It is that of the supremacy of the civil government over the military establishment and over any great general, however popular a hero he may be.

Dismissal of General MacArthur is a Victory for Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of many, including myself, it would seem that the dismissal of General MacArthur by the President is a victory for Soviet Russia. If anyone has a different viewpoint a reading of the Daily Worker would convince them otherwise. This paper which is looked upon as the mouthpiece in the United States of Moscow policy has demonstrated time and again its opposition to General MacArthur. It has time and again demanded his recall. When this was accomplished it literally screamed its satisfaction.

In an article appearing in the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., today by George Sokolsky, he says:

The President's dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur may prove to be as great a military victory for Soviet Russia as Stalingrad and as great a diplomatic victory as Yalta.

The article in its entirety reads as follows:

THREE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The President's dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur may prove to be as great a military victory for Soviet Russia as Stalingrad and as great a diplomatic victory as Yalta.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur did not make the Korean War. Every step he took after VJ-day (August 14, 1945) has been designed to prevent just such a war.

He sought to build an East Asian League of Nations, including Nationalist China, which would be a bulwark against the advancing might of Soviet Russia in that vastly populated area of the world. He realized early that our policy in China was ill-conceived and without reality.

He supported the Wedemeyer reports on China and Korea—reports which would have saved us from our current grief. MacArthur did not believe that Korea could be held by the United States on the terms arranged at Teheran and Yalta, but when on June 25, 1950, he was ordered into war there by President Truman and Dean Acheson, he undertook to save the glory of the American flag with his eyes blindfolded and at least one hand tied behind his back.

Within a few days, he discovered that he was not an American commander, but a United Nations commander.

He discovered that unlike any other commanding general in the field, his decisions were subject to the approval of a vast congress of nations, large and small, among whom are our enemies, Soviet Russia and Poland, to mention only two.

He also discovered that Great Britain, with as much responsibility as we have to maintain treaty obligations and the integrity of the United Nations, was engaged in a weird strategy which included three divergent and contradictory factors:

1. To send token troops to fight in the Korean War;

2. To oppose such second-front tactics as might be useful, as, for instance, support of Nationalist China and the anti-Communist guerrillas on the mainland;

3. To use all efforts, including their effective propaganda agencies, to limit the Korean War to a stalemated, targetless action with the view that American aid and largesse might not be diverted from Europe to Asia.

And in conjunction with this, MacArthur discovered that India, just freed from the British raj, emerged as a Soviet spokesman, the reason for this unusual demarche being the Kashmir and other antagonisms against Pakistan, Nehru seeking Russian support in his struggle against Moslems in India.

On all sides he saw the United States being sacrificed while American sons were being killed.

War is unpleasant under any circumstances; it becomes a horror when the commanding general is being stabbed in the back and the troops under him are being sacrificed on the altar of political necessities. No general wants his men to die for nothing.

All this, General MacArthur in his roundabout language to Congressman JOE MARTIN, has made clear to the American people.

It is a pity that General MacArthur had to use such means as letters to Congressmen and private individuals to break through his muzzling by the Pentagon and the State Department.

He wanted his own people to know that it is impossible to bring this Korean War to a victorious end. For this, he has been dismissed on the basis of insubordination.

As a military man, he knows that what the geniuses in Washington want to do is ridiculous, impossible. They want to play an unending game of tag, with nobody getting hurt except the troops there.

The plan is the loquacious dream of gentle personalities who have a great capacity for loving the enemy.

Their confusion arises from a lack of focus; they are global in their outlook, without anchorage in the United States of America.

They do not quite know whether they really prefer the American system of life or any other. Acheson and Marshall accept British policy because they cannot devise a policy of their own.

To a man of MacArthur's training and history, these men must appear like curiosities, more perilous than a fighting enemy, for lacking cohesion of thought, they move simultaneously in different directions which at times make them appear to be miasmic.

The crime against Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been that he has been given responsibility, but he has not been permitted to win a war or to tell America why we are failing in a war. No man could have held such a position too long with dignity and honor.

Televising of Congressional Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from all over the Nation I have received innumerable letters from average citizens, attorneys, radio and TV people on the subject of my comments on the televising of congressional hearings. I have pointed out that television is a miraculous medium which can have tremendous constructive values for public education.

At the same time, I have also indicated that the televising of open hearings at which criminals and other questionable characters appear, can lay the basis for slander to a degree which we have heretofore never conceived. In other words, if poorly prepared open hearings are held, without there having been executive sessions previously to sift testimony, weigh facts, consider evidence, and give individuals the opportunity to defend themselves if they are accused, then congressional committees will have violated their responsibility. They will have permitted the smearing of innocent names and reputations before millions of televiewers. That is why I submitted Senate Resolution 106, providing for a study of this whole subject.

As an indication of the reactions of many people throughout our country, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

(a) Excerpts from numerous letters to me on this issue, as well as

(b) Excerpts from a column by Mr. Allen Sims which appeared in the April 5 issue of the Barron (Wis.) News-Shield.

(c) Excerpts from a very interesting article on the more general subject of broadcasting legislative proceedings. This article, entitled "Congress on the Air," was written by Mr. Ralph Goldman and published in the Public Opinion Quarterly, winter 1950–51 issue. It reviews the long controversy of broadcasting floor sessions of the Congress.

There being no objection, the correspondence and news comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From a distinguished attorney in Milwaukee:

"MARCH 31, 1951.

"Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
"*United States Senator,*
"*Washington, D. C.*

"MY DEAR SENATOR: I think that you are to be congratulated in the stand that you have taken with reference to televising proceedings of committees of Congress. You are certainly the very first to point out the dangers inherent in a congressional investigation which is being televised. Some of us feel very strongly that if a witness does not desire to testify before the television apparatus, that such witness' feelings should be respected, at least within certain limits. You have performed an outstanding public service in suggesting the difficulties inherent in a congressional investigation, and I am sure that as a result of your analysis, either legislation will be proposed or a tradition established by the Congress which will represent whatever compromise may be necessary between the public welfare on the one hand and individual rights of witnesses on the other."

An individual in Missouri:

"MARCH 26, 1951.

"Hon. Senator WILEY,
"*Washington, D. C.*

"DEAR SENATOR: I want to endorse your position relative to the television shows that are being put on by some television companies. This exhibition is not in my opinion for the purpose of promoting law enforcement but purely for commercial business. It seems to me that thing is below the standards of dignity. It will not be long if this thing is allowed to be carried on that the soap, beer, and cereal companies are advertising their wares at these investigations and court trial."

From Brooklyn, N. Y.:

"MARCH 22, 1951.

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY:
"*Washington, D. C.*

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have just been reading an Associated Press dispatch in which you are quoted as having said that the televising of congressional committee investigations could 'become a monster which can destroy innocent individuals, whole corporations, political parties and entire administrations.'

"Much the same thought must have come to millions of others during the broadcasting of the Kefauver hearings in New York.

"In view of your many months of experience with the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I hope that you will be able to make a substantial recommendation to the Senate soon in this regard."

[From the Barron County (Wis.) News-Shield of April 5, 1951]

YOU AND I

(By Alan Sims)

How would you like to be listening to or watching a television program and suddenly hear your name or telephone number mentioned in connection with some gambler, gangster, or hoodlum?

How would you like to be asked to tell in public how much you earn or how much wealth you have?

These are not ridiculous questions. The recent hearings held by the very sincere and capably led Kefauver Crime Committee had such experiences. Gamblers were asked to check lists of telephone numbers which had come to the attention of the committee. Among the names and numbers were those of other gamblers * * * but also there were names of relatives, social acquaintances * * * and even that of a doctor. And in another instance the name of a well-known industrialist, a man of high standing, was used by a gangster to try to convey a close friendship and to excuse his appearance at a political meeting.

The Kefauver Crime Committee has accomplished much good. It has shown the public what lies behind political campaigns in New York City and in some other large communities. It has shown the public what gangsters look like. It has revealed connections between certain politicians and law-enforcement officers and criminals. But the general implications of a Senate Crime Committee are most dangerous. It is too easy to bring in the name of innocent people and in this present day we are too apt to judge a man by association. And the questions that inquire into a man's wealth or earnings * * * even those of a gangster, it seems, would be best asked in private hearings. The answers to these questions are too tempting to other criminals in terms of blackmail or kidnaping or robbery.

In our courts, many safeguards have been built over the centuries to protect innocent people. These safeguards are lacking in these crime investigations.

And consider, too, what might happen if a crime committee were put under the leadership of less honorable men * * * possibly of some fanatical laborite or industrialist or some overzealous religious mind. Such powers could be used to destroy one's enemies, to ruin innocent people, to bring disaster upon great institutions.

* * * *

Senator WILEY has come out emphatically against more crime investigation as it is now being done. He has pointed out the dangers and has requested a thorough study of the problems that have developed and the dangers to innocent people. He should be given fullest support to the end that every fair effort to combat crime should be developed while at the same time everything that can be should be done to protect innocent men and women.

Law-enforcement agencies should be made to do their work honestly and fully * * * under the usual safeguards for innocent people * * * then there would be no need for these public television shows.

CONGRESS ON THE AIR

(By Ralph M. Goldman)

The impact of communication technique upon the scope, intensity, and very nature of politics has long been recognized by political professionals. In the field of Presidential campaigning alone, the sources, content, methods, channels, and effects of communication have been of keenest concern to the men in charge. Hamilton spoke through John Fenno's Gazette of the United States. Jefferson's party had Philip Freeneau's National Gazette. Jackson's managers used the mass meeting as it never had been used before. Ben Day's one-cent New York Sun in 1833, supplementing the six-cent newspapers, brought the newly enfranchised masses into national politics. Mark Hanna revolutionized campaigning with his army of 1,400 campaign speakers and his barrage of 120,000,000 campaign pamphlets and other documents. Coolidge pioneered in making use of the new radio medium. Franklin D. Roosevelt's effectiveness over the air made history. The National Conventions were televised in 1948.

Thus the party contest for the office of Chief Executive has become a complex and massive communications operation, involving television, radio, newspapers, magazines, motion pictures, rallies, telephone, correspondence, pamphlets, and personal face-to-face forms of communication. The rest of the world generally looks to an American Presidential contest as one of the most important ingredients of our democracy-at-work.

But American democracy has its legislative as well as its executive aspect. The communications revolution is bound to catch up with the legislative process even more than it already has. The newspapers have long covered and interpreted Congress, its activities and its leadership, with amplitude and skill. Radio and television have only begun to explore the possibilities. A new synthesis of legislative process and mass media is in the making and seems only to wait upon the appropriate catalyst, for the elements to be combined are many and the inertia to be overcome is great.

LEGISLATIVE BROADCASTS: PRO AND CON

Broadcasting congressional proceedings is no longer a novel idea, nor would it be an adventure into uncharted fields. Experience in the field of broadcasting legislative proceedings is plentiful at every level of government, from the United Nations to the New York City Council. The synthesis is not an easy one to make, but the ways in which it has been achieved have been numerous, and often ingenious. Before examining some of these, it may be useful to mention some of the theoretical pros and cons on this subject. On the credit side the arguments run as follows:

1. Legislative broadcasts help focus public attention upon the debate and discussion stage of democratic policy making. Recent use of radio by public executives and strong leaders has given a monolithic appearance to the policy-making processes. The give-and-take of debate and reconciliation has been obscured and could best be presented to the general public by broadcasts of legislative proceedings.

2. Legislative broadcasts tend to strengthen our conceptions of popular sovereignty. The people have the right to hear their representatives in action. In like manner, the awareness of a large and immediate public audience has a salutary effect upon the activities of representatives in legislative session. Popular sovereignty is effective in direct proportion to the extent to which representatives are self-conscious and responsible.

3. Legislative broadcasts serve as a major channel for popular political education, a testing ground for the quality of leadership and the issues of the day.

4. Among the media of mass communication, the psychologists tell us, radio is the one which gives its audience the greatest sense of direct personal participation. This sense of participation is another vital aspect of democratic group life and one which is enlarged and reinforced by the broadcasting of legislative deliberations.

5. Reports of legislative activity usually reach the public through several different channels, with varying degrees of accuracy and objectivity. Putting the legislature on the air is a method of checking the reports received by way of the other media.

6. Such broadcasts help constituents to separate out the worth-while from the inept among their representatives.

There are a great number of difficult technical questions, which, of themselves, operate to discourage proposals for legislative broadcasts. Setting these technical matters aside for the moment, the more general criticisms usually are as follows:

1. Legislative proceedings bore the average radio listener and succeed in attracting only a very limited audience.

2. Legislators use air time to harangue the folks back home rather than concentrate upon legislative business.

3. Public knowledge of legislative goings-on and bickering might seriously discredit the entire legislative process itself.

4. American commercial radio cannot meet its business requirements by putting prolonged legislative proceedings on the air. The objections of advertisers—the main source of operating income for broadcasters—would have to be given serious consideration so long as American broadcasting remains a self-supporting industry.

5. Selective broadcasting would present delicate, even insurmountable, editing problems.

6. Since legislators are immune from suit, radio would provide them with another outlet for abusive slander, libel, and innuendo, with perhaps even more serious consequences than now experienced through the other media.

SOME EXPERIENCES: INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL

The United Nations: Legislative broadcasts have emanated from different levels of government—international, national, State, and local. At the international level, it is premature to call the United Nations a government or a legislature in the true sense of these terms. At most, we may call the UN an incipient government. In any event, the broadcasting of UN proceedings goes back to its very first sessions, in 1946. Early coverage was quite inadequate. Complaints were heard that the large networks scheduled only a smattering of the UN broadcast material made available to them. Distant stations found the costs of telephone lines from UN headquarters prohibitive. Commercial requirements forced the networks away from this kind of public-service broadcast and the task devolved upon WNYC, New York City's noncommercial, low-budget station.

Station WNYC gives complete coverage to the Security Council and the General Assembly meetings, providing its own pick-up and serving as an originating station for any other independent station which may care to carry the material (a popular practice during the UN's first year.)

* * * * *

In addition to the programing offered to it by Station WNYC, the American public also hears the United Nations Today, a daily quarter-hour review of significant international developments. This program is highlighted by the recorded voices of delegates as they speak. It goes over more than 170 stations coast to coast and is heard in 16 States. Weekly programs include: Memo from Lake Success, carried by 96 CBS affiliates; Two Billion Strong, a half-hour ABC program; and UN Story, carried over 300 stations.

New Zealand: What have been the developments with respect to legislatures at the national level? The first country to broadcast the proceedings of its legislature was New Zealand. In 1936 this country's first Labor Party Prime Minister, Michael Joseph Savage, contended that the Conservative-dominated press was not giving his party fair news coverage. When the Government-owned Station 2-YA was established, Savage appointed himself as the first Minister of Broadcasting. Broadcasting the proceedings of the House of Representatives was his own project, to serve not only partisan but also national needs.

Since the House of Representatives is the heart of the New Zealand legislative process, it alone was wired for broadcast purposes. Some five microphones were strategically located throughout the Chamber. At first, all proceedings were broadcast, the time span usually running from 2:30 p. m. to 11 p. m. or longer, with a two hour intermission for dinner. Later, the broadcasts were limited to fewer and more closely scheduled hours, 11 p. m. becoming the regular sign-off time.

The use of radio made necessary some modifications in parliamentary practice. For instance, the selection of speakers from both parties, from day to day, and the order in which it was agreed that they should take the floor became matters of considerable importance in view of the fact that those who took the floor during the most popular listening hours were assured of a wider audience than they would otherwise enjoy. In addition, both Government and opposition insisted upon an equal number of speakers

in each and every debate. For purposes of military security during wartime, the Speaker was authorized to censor speeches by use of a push-button which could cut off the broadcast. A green light in front of the Speaker's table indicated that the speech was on the air; a red light flashed on when a speech had been cut off.

* * * * *

On July 10, 1946, broadcasts from the Australian Parliament were commenced over the government-owned radio station of that country. Before broadcasts began, there was an intensive search for some formula whereby the weekly 16 hours of air time could be divided equitably between the Senate and the House of Representatives. Steps were taken in the direction of protecting members against libel suits. There was also great anxiety that the public might view with contempt the legislative proceedings and much attention was given to the matter of controlling the more boisterous members. That the program has been a success is evident from the results of a survey made in August 1946, by the Australian public-opinion polls. Asked: "Do you think the broadcasts from Parliament should be continued, reduced, or stopped," the Australian people voted decisively for continuation. Specifically, the distribution of the vote was:

	Percent
Continued	68
Reduced	7
Stopped	18
Undecided	7

* * * * *

THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The case history with respect to our own Congress has been more experimental and inconclusive. It is generally known that Congressmen, as individuals, have made good use of radio. For example, the Columbia Broadcasting System alone has reported that, from 1928 to 1940, Senators addressed radio audiences over Columbia sustaining programs more than 700 times and Representatives over 500 times. * * *

At a time when a resolution to authorize direct pick-up broadcasting was pending before Congress, New York's Station WMCA undertook to dramatize the proceedings as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. During December 1944, "The Halls of Congress" went on the air. Senators and Congressmen were portrayed by professional actors. Many outstanding congressional debates were presented; for example, those on FEPC, the poll tax, Bretton Woods, etc. Best broadcast hours—during 1 year from 3:30 to 4 p. m. on Sundays, during another from 9:30 to 10 p. m. on Wednesdays—were assigned to this popular weekly program.

"Following Congress," a dramatization similar to that of WMCA, has been one of the novel public-affairs offerings of the University of Wisconsin College of the Air. It is a weekly half-hour program on some important subject selected from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Speeches are abstracted and parts are acted out by students. The entire project is aimed at augmenting classroom contact with the work of Congress. Copies of the script are mimeographed for use by other schools.

In Congress itself, bills and resolutions have been introduced from time to time since 1931 calling for the broadcasting of proceedings directly from the floor of each House. * * *

Putting Congress on the air was one of the more significant matters dealt with during the 1945 hearings before the LaFollette-Monroney Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Some of the testimony and comment are both informative and suggestive.

A limited broadcast period with short speeches was among the suggestions offered. One Senator suggested a daily Senate broadcast from 10 a. m. to noon, with the speaking schedule arranged by committees on the majority and minority sides. The problems of time allocation, unrepresentative coverage, and public disinterest were stressed by one critical Representative. Another Representative argued that selective broadcasts need emphasize only the more dramatic moments in the legislature's work. Since half or more of congressional time is consumed in technical and detailed discussion of bills, use of recording devices was recommended so that edited transcriptions could be put on the air during evening hours. It was noted that American commercial stations must necessarily plan their broadcasting schedule a week in advance, a factor which would require that meetings of Congress be more closely planned.

Among the questions raised were these: (1) Should the listener have the option of tuning in to different stations in order to hear the separate proceedings of the Senate, the House, or the various committees? (2) Would a Government-owned station be necessary in order to get this type of broadcasting onto the air? (3) Would it be desirable to make some prior announcement of legislative program content for the information and convenience of listeners?

* * * * *

A statement by Dr. Robert D. Leigh, director of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, set forth a particularly interesting approach to this problem. "It will be necessary for Congress to organize its procedure and discussion so that the necessary condensations and emphasis upon important issues can actually be brought to the microphone." Full meetings of the two Houses, he pointed out, generally serve either of two purposes: (1) To record the votes on measures reported out from committees; and (2) to carry debate aimed primarily at influencing opinion among the Congressmen's constituents or at explaining reasons for individual decisions taken on particular measures. Dr. Leigh suggested that these functions could be performed over two kinds of evening radio sessions, each of which would occupy one evening a week. One would be a voting session very much like an opinion day in the Supreme Court. The other evening would carry congressional debates on important issues, arranged by a special bipartisan steering committee.

Typical of the kind of resolution placed before Congress is the Pepper-Coffee resolution which was pending at the time of the La Follette-Monroney hearings. In part, it stated: "Radio broadcasting stations and radio broadcasting networks are hereby authorized to broadcast any proceedings on the floor of the Senate or of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however,* That no station or network shall be required to broadcast any proceedings; nor shall any proceedings of either House be broadcast when such House otherwise orders." This kind of resolution, of course, is entirely inadequate to the proposal it makes. Its generality ignores the intricacies of arranging this kind of broadcast. It calls for no permanent or certain commitments on the part of either Congress or the stations. It gives no permanent agency the responsibility for getting things done and for resolving operating problems.

At the time of the La Follette-Monroney investigation, engineers of the Federal Communications Commission favored the use of Government-assigned short-wave facilities. It was estimated that a new broadcasting plant in the Capitol would cost about $2,000,000. The annual cost of two congressional stations was set at about $300,000. The Big Four among the networks—Mutual, NBC, CBS, and ABC—also submitted plans describing proposed recording, broadcasting, and television facilities. To date Congress has taken no action on any of these proposals.

CONCLUSIONS: RECONCILING LEGISLATIVE PROCESS AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

We see, therefore, that broadcasting the proceedings of a legislature is no longer a matter of reform. It is more a matter of initiative and working out the details. However, these are no small obstacles. The details include the wide diversity of interests to be reconciled and the hard-to-crack technical questions. The American system of radio broadcasting is a complex commercial process, involving relationships among network, regional, and local broadcasters, advertisers, advertising agencies, the Federal Communications Commission, the manufacturers of radio sets, programing organizations, and trade, labor, professional, and audience groups. The United States Congress is an equally complex legislative process, involving relationships among its Members, political parties, pressure groups, constituents, and other branches of the National Government.

Some of the technical questions are these: Shall AM, FM, or short-wave channels be used? Shall the program be financed by the broadcasters, by Congress, or by some new blend of public-service broadcasting and commercial advertising? Shall coverage of the proceedings be complete or selective? If selective, shall selection be a preliminary process, for example, closer planning of legislative proceedings, or shall selection take place ex post facto, perhaps by having transcriptions edited by a bipartisan committee? What are best broadcast hours? What about the use of commentators and professional actors? Are these desirable?

The most stubborn stumbling block of all is the question of initiative. * * *

Finally, there are the broadcasters, facing, as always, the hard necessity of earning their own way. For them, the proposal to put Congress on the air may offer a rare opportunity for rendering public service, for meeting the challenge of the other media, for broadening the base for cross-network cooperation, for dealing with the notorious shortage of fresh broadcast material, and for undertaking new experiments in broadcaster-advertiser arrangements. On the other hand, it is easy to understand why broadcaster initiative might be resented by the other principals. In the final analysis, some specially created, representative, and thoroughly detached agency, capable of carrying the ball and of inventing adjustments for the achievement of short- and long-term objectives, may be the most effective way to reconcile the needs of the legislative process and the communication system.

One thing, however, seems certain. The Congress of the United States should enjoy all the advantages and disadvantages of twentieth-century communications in the same way that the Presidency does. Furthermore, putting Congress on the air would demonstrate for all the world to hear how a democracy is able to create unity out of diversity.

A Victory for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of sincere and thoughtful Americans who see in President Truman's shabby treatment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur a victory for Russia.

The following editorial taken from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune is well worth reading:

A VICTORY FOR RUSSIA

Soviet Russia won its greatest victory of the cold war Wednesday at 1 a. m. when President Truman announced to the world that Gen. Douglas MacArthur had been relieved of all his commands.

Perhaps an adequate commentary on this action is to be found in the words of a British diplomat, quoted by the Associated Press Wednesday night. Said the Briton, "Good old Harry."

But, observe what some leading Americans said:

Former President Hoover: "This action can bring great tragedy to our country."

An Altoona shopman said, "I believe he should have been left there (MacArthur). He knows what it's all about."

Mr. Truman has given in again to the pressure of the British Socialists, who have been clamoring for him to get rid of MacArthur for months. The British don't want anything to upset their position in the Orient any further. They even had the gall to demand that Red China, our bitter enemy, shall have a role in the Japanese peace pact.

MacArthur constantly sought to crush the enemy, to get the job done. He repeatedly has asked for more troops, more freedom to wage war against the Reds. Always he has been refused.

Well, now the British Socialists have won. And Mr. Acheson, who places Europe above all, has succeeded in removing a thorn in the side of the State Department, MacArthur. A thorn, because MacArthur ignored State Department stupidity, and handled Japan as the State Department has never handled any responsibility.

Calls received from the public, at the Tribune office, and at the local office of Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT in the postoffice building, show the trend of thought.

And, that trend tragically shows a lack of confidence in the administration.

Why? Because in one instance after the other, those who called proved to be women, wives and mothers, and all showed concern for their men in the service now.

What does that show? Certainly, it shows lack of faith in our Washington leadership, and confidence of the highest caliber in MacArthur.

That is the real test of leadership, no matter what else one may say—faith.

A Japanese cab driver remarked, "It is a great pity."

It is a great pity that international politics, and diplomacy in this country directed by inept men, can remove one of our greatest leaders.

It is enough to cause concern for the future of America.

General MacArthur has shown the only successful administration of an occupied land, Japan. He has succeeded in keeping Russia in its place in Japan. And he is the only American, civilian or military, who has been able to do this.

Since the end of World War II, the Russians have fought with MacArthur over the occupation of Japan. Time and again he has put them in their place. They have made no headway against him.

Now, their greatest obstacle in Japan has been removed, and by his own Government.

He has had over 30 years' experience in the Far East. General Ridgway, undoubtedly an able soldier, who replaces him, served in Sicily and Normandy.

How is he fitted to take over command in the Far East?

It is amazing that the President should show such prejudice and ill judgment as to remove our top commander while our forces are advancing in Korea, and bracing for enemy attack.

General Ridgway, MacArthur's successor, is quoted as saying much the same thing MacArthur was fired for saying.

Ridgway said only 3 days ago, "I see no end to the military operations unless there is a political settlement. For the Communists, this is a life and death struggle. They will not vary their objective. These fellows are out to destroy us no matter how long it takes.

MacArthur wanted to destroy the enemy in the quickest, most efficient way, and with the least cost in American lives.

Both these military men, Ridgway and his predecessor, MacArthur, see no end to the bloody Korean war as it is being fought now.

Yet, Mr. Truman insists that it be fought that way. London wants it that way. Paris wants it that way.

But, how about the 200,000 Yanks who are doing the fighting and dying? How do they want it? Don't they want to get it done, and get out of there? How does Mr. Truman's action serve them?

Peanut Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, "peanut politicians" in high places are still at work. The latest display of really petty stuff was the snub given the head of the Nation's largest farm organization when President Truman failed to appoint President Allan B. Kline, of the American Farm Bureau, as a member of the new Mobilization Policy Advisory Board.

The following article by Earl Richert which appeared in the Washington News of April 10, 1951, tells the story. It can fairly be assumed that Secretary of Agriculture Brannan passed upon the appointments as far as the four agriculture members of the Board are concerned before the appointments were made by President Truman. Friends and members of the American Farm Bureau sincerely hope that President Truman and Secretary Brannan are getting a lot of satisfaction out of such petty political maneuvering:

President Truman has gone out of his way to snub the head of the Nation's largest farm organization, President Allan B. Kline, of the American Farm Bureau.

Result is that now, with labor officially back in the mobilization set-up after weeks of maneuvering, it's the Farm Bureau that's "off the reservation."

The Kline snub—one of the most direct the Capital has seen in a long time—came last week end when Mr. Truman appointed the 16 members of his new Mobilization Policy Advisory Board. (This is the Board that's supposed to bring harmony to the mobilization set-up.)

As agriculture's four board members the President named the presidents of the No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4 largest farm organizations—Herschel D. Newsom, of the Grange; James G. Patton, of the Farmers' Union; and D. W. Brooks, of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. Then for the Farm Bureau's representative the President went far down in the bureau set-up to pick Ray B. Wiser, president of the California Farm Bureau. Mr. Wiser is not even on the Farm Bureau's 20-man board of directors.

Mr. Wiser, reportedly because of the snub to Mr. Kline, informed President Truman yesterday that he would be unable to serve. A White House spokesman declined to comment on the resignation. No successor has been chosen.

Farm Bureau leaders say no boycott of the Mobilization Board is contemplated.

"How can you boycott something you haven't been asked to join?" asked Roger Fleming, legislative representative of the Farm Bureau.

It was pointed out that Mr. Truman had named to the new board the presidents of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, and the CIO, as well as the presidents of the other three big farm groups.

Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, said he thought all American Farm Bureau members would take the Kline snub as an affront. "I think it most unfortunate that the administration saw fit to take a slap at the largest farm organization at this time when we need cooperation from everybody," he said.

Mr. Kline has long been the major thorn in the side of Agriculture Secretary Charles Brannan. He has been the most active opponent of the Secretary's controversial farm plan.

Mr. Kline only recently recommended a 20 percent slash in the Agriculture Department's administrative expenses and a large cut in funds for the soil conservation program. He said this should be done in the interests of Government economy.

"I guess," said one Farm Bureau official, "that John L. Lewis now has a rival. Mr. Truman wouldn't even consider Mr. Kline for dog catcher either."

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD BREEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, in the thousands of paragraphs that have already been written in the pro and con discussion in regard to General MacArthur's removal as United States commander in chief in the Far East, the following editorial, which appeared in the Dayton Daily News for April 11, 1951, spotlights with great clarity some of the important features of today's most controversial subject.

The publisher of the Dayton Daily News is the Honorable James M. Cox, former three-time Governor of the great State of Ohio, and the Democratic standard bearer for the Presidency of the United States in 1920. The Governor's thinking in the matter is directly reflected in this editoral, and his excellent background and study in national and international matters makes this editorial doubly valuable and important.

I wish to extend my compliments to the editorial staff of the Dayton Daily News; and to my colleagues, I respectfully invite their attention to the following editorial:

TRUMAN AND MACARTHUR

It is a tragedy, in many respects, that the long and brilliant command of General MacArthur in the Far East has ended in his dismissal by the President. MacArthur has been one of the world's outstanding soldiers and soldier-strategists. He has been a fine administrator of Japan. His prestige is deservedly high in Asia. He has great claims on the gratitude of America.

On sober reflection, we are sure, a majority of Americans will come to feel that the President had no choice but to terminate MacArthur's command. MacArthur's view of global policy was badly distorted; from most of a military lifetime spent in Asia, he thought, perhaps naturally, that the fate of the world revolved about Asia. If his advice had been followed, it could have led us into tragic pitfalls.

But that is not the issue on which MacArthur was dismissed. If he had been content to press his views through military channels, to argue to his heart's content with his superiors, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and then to accept their decision and carry on like the good soldier, the case would have been different. But MacArthur, in spite of repeated urgings that later were translated into definite warnings, insisted on going over the heads of his superiors and carrying the arguments to Members of Congress, the newspapers, and the people.

To put it bluntly, MacArthur was insubordinate. Insubordination is one quality that cannot be tolerated in a soldier, whether he be a general or a private. Without discipline, without loyal discharge of the commands of superiors, there can be no effective army. Would MacArthur himself have permitted General Ridgway to lobby in the press and in Congress against his (MacArthur's) strategy? Would Ridgway have permitted his division commanders this freedom? Would one of Ridgway's brigade commanders have allowed a captain to make a public issue of whether Hill 101 or Hill 114 should be the next objective of his company? Surely not. What would happen, even in a football game, if a halfback who didn't think the play called by the quarterback would work, were to rush to the sidelines, grab a megaphone from the hands of a cheerleader, and make an impassioned speech to the spectators about it?

Abraham Lincoln had trouble with more than one general, such as McClellan and "Fighting Joe" Hooker, who were mixed up in their view of the pyramid of authority. Lincoln, after many displays of patience, got rid of his insubordinate generals. It is hard to imagine what the outcome of the war might have been if he hadn't.

At issue here, of course, is not only the inviolability of a military chain of command, but something even higher. That is the American principle of ultimate civilian control of military policy. Theater commanders who will not stick to commanding but who insist on invading the field of over-all military and diplomatic strategy present a direct challenge to this basic safeguard planted in the United States Constitution by a very wise set of founding fathers.

The immediate issue is that of MacArthur's insubordination, and the impossibility of conducting effective policy in the atmosphere created by it. However, it is not beside the point to consider where the country might have been led had MacArthur's advice finally prevailed, or, worse still, had he at last embarked on certain military actions in defiance of authority.

1. We might easily have precipitated war with Russia, which no person of sound sense wants to do at this time. Russia has a mutual assistance pact with China, which might be brought into play if we bombed Manchuria or if we turned Chiang Kai-shek's troops on Formosa loose for an invasion of the Chinese mainland. This, incidentally, is the opinion expressed by Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, who in World War II was one of MacArthur's two top Pacific commanders. General Eichelberger said:

"I believe Stalin committed himself to protect China from attack when he succeeded in getting the Chinese Reds into action in Korea."

2. At the least we would have spread the war in China, extending our involvement from the narrow peninsula of Korea, which can be held with a couple of hundred thousand men, to the mainland, in which we might have to sink millions. In this way we would have bled ourselves white while Russia sat back and watched without expending a single division of her own army.

3. By getting bogged down in Asia, we would have diverted our main drive from the defense of Europe, presenting Stalin with an easy conquest of highly industrialized nations which, once settled in his orbit, would give him the power to outproduce us for war and make our ultimate defeat inevitable. MacArthur would have succeeded in doing what he failed to do in the last war, namely, in overriding the very wise priority which was given to European operations by Roosevelt and Churchill.

4. We could have lost the vital support of our European allies. Sensing our inability to give them effective help in defending themselves while our face was turned toward Asia, they would be likely to give up the ghost and seek to make the best terms possible with Stalin.

5. We could have pushed the 400,000,000 people of India (and millions of other Asiatic waverers) from the neutral column into the enemy column. The ultimate consequences of uniting all Asia against us would be incalculable.

6. We could have lost our chance to detach 450,000,000 Chinese from the Russian orbit. As developing Communist tyranny rips the mask from the falsely advertised face of Red benevolence, there is a chance that the Chinese, fiercely individualistic and never for long hospitable to foreign masters, will take the path that Tito took in Yugoslavia. But if we were to loose the hated, discredited Chiang Kai-shek upon them, we would be the villains in their eyes. Instead of giving the Russians enough rope to hang themselves, we would take the rope right out of their hands and fit it to our own neck.

There will be much discussion as to whether President Truman, by moving drastically to preserve the integrity of our chain of command, the inviolability of our principle of civil control over the military, and the chance for success of our foreign policy, acted, from the standpoint of politics, unwisely. We say there was nothing else he could do, and we think the public will come to admire a President, who, with his country's safety at stake, had the courage to rise above politics. It is fair to assume, meanwhile, that the decision was shared by Secretary of Defense George Marshall, Chief of Staff Omar Bradley, and the three service chiefs, Admiral Sherman and Generals Collins and Vandenberg, and that it was applauded by our allies.

As we said in the beginning, it is a tragedy that MacArthur's brilliant and immensely useful career had to come to this end. But it is not President Truman who has tarnished the bright shield; MacArthur did it himself by his own rash refusal to play a team game in America's greatest crisis.

Public Reaction to MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include additional samples of the hundreds of messages which I have received since the President relieved General MacArthur of his command. They are from citizens of Chicago, Ill.:

Why have the people's representatives in Government in Washington allowed corruption, scandal, communism, sex perversion, gangsterism, swindling, and all the evils that go with our present Government to remain in spite of public exposure. Why don't you act to remove the stench? The time has come for you and your colleagues to look deeply into your souls. America first before party loyalty. America first before you trade your political favors. America first before internal graft and corruption. America first before England and Europe. I urgently petition the immediate removal of Truman, Acheson, and Marshall from office. I petition MacArthur be reinstated and given a full public hearing in the United States Senate and House.

MacArthur dismissal tragic almost unbelievable. Looks like Russian victory from inside Washington. Please protest out loud. Need your help.

Dismissal MacArthur stunning blow to myself, family, and friends. Stop. How long can this fine country of ours tolerate deceit, half-truths, insincerity, inefficiency, and political corruption promulgated by present administration? Stop. Impeachment proceedings should be seriously considered.

We think that Presidential dismissal of General MacArthur is tragic and deplorable. A great loss to our country. We cannot go on forever killing and wounding American boys in Korea for what. We have faith in MacArthur's wisdom. Washington's whole Asiatic foreign policy needs revealing investigation. We are looking to you for action. You have our support.

What difference does it make whether or not we have a united Korea. Ireland is not united, so what? Ask the President to fire the boys in Korea and bring them back with MacArthur.

Say, the people I have contacted are bitterly shocked over the President's actions towards General MacArthur is putting it mildly. As long as Mr. Truman saw fit to take this action against one of the greatest generals ever known, why not pull our boys out along with him?

Urge impeachment of Truman and congressional investigation of Acheson. Please notice Communist approval of Truman's base action.

Truman-Acheson policy of appeasement must be stopped. Impeachments imperative.

Urge immediate dismissal and investigation of Dean Acheson and impeachment of President Truman. Urge appearance of General MacArthur before joint session. America's future now depends on the action taken by you and your colleagues. We urge you to act vigorously and promptly.

Just heard President Truman's speech. Think it very poorly said. Please impeach him.

Deplore MacArthur's dismissal. Demand Truman's impeachment. No appeasement of Communists.

After hearing our beloved Harry speak tonight our club is unanimous opinion impeach him (141 members).

Because the United States is not a British Colony you will have the complete support of this family of four in any impeachment proceedings against the President.

Firing of MacArthur a terrible tragedy and a national disgrace. Situation should be investigated to find out why American interests are subordinated to those of England and other United Nations. MacArthur is superior to all in the administration, in everything but title. Administration's Far East policy proved wrong in every phase during the past 5 years. Why not get MacArthur to state his views to Congress (20 signatures).

Urge immediate impeachment President Truman and cronies. America must be represented by people whose real interest is in their own country and not influenced by foreign nations. Reinstate MacArthur (18 signatures).

You are undoubtedly conscious of the widespread concern of our fellow Americans in this critical hour in Washington. We trust to you to support all necessary measures and make use of the guiding knowledge that General MacArthur has for us Americans in this critical hour. We are all worried and feel you are not going to fail us.

I want to register my protest of the firing of General MacArthur. Of all the people in the United Nations and our Executive and State Department, he is the only one who has a policy and objective. President Truman and Secretary Acheson should be impeached. They have played into the hands of the Russians.

Truman finally showed his hand. Let us know ours and impeach an untrue man.

As a common voter I am not in favor of Truman's firing MacArthur. To me it is the act of an inferior leader. There was time enough for a good leader to have prevented the incident. There is a very fine line being drawn between military and political policy.

Stunned over Truman's arbitrary dismissal of General MacArthur. This is not a matter of party politics but of national existence. Congressional inquiry is mandatory.

MacArthur a casualty of political factors behind our effort in the Korean war. The President declared war in Korea without authority of Congress and then dismissed our most brilliant military leader. President's action is a victory for communism even if he is too stupid to see it. Down with communistic thinking here and abroad. Down with inefficient thinking in high Government offices. Impeachment action desirable to stop wasteful spending of American lives and money and to stop goofy Government.

Harry had his inning. See that Mac gets to bat.

When an ex-National Guard captain fires a 5-star general impeachment of the National Guard captain is in order.

Truman has again proven his inability to think clearly or act wisely. Unless he is removed from office promptly we are facing a tragic future.

Please register protest to blundering Truman policies in foreign affairs and especially to the MacArthur removal.

MacArthur dismissal is the most disgraceful act in American history.

As our representative in Congress your duty lies in demanding impeachment Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson. The fumbling incompetence of their administration must be removed while we still have a country and a way of life to protect.

So the best general in the world gets fired by the worst President in the world. Nice knowing that we have so many Representatives in Washington that really believe in protecting the American way of life.

The deplorable lack of firm and moral leadership is a national disgrace. Congress must take over that leadership immediately, and if necessary start impeachment proceedings.

Shocking isn't it. A great American like General MacArthur treated so terribly by the little men in high places in Washington.

The men who have fought and died in the Pacific have died in vain. Throw off the British yoke. Restore MacArthur. Oust the State Department crowd. Do it now.

It is my honest belief that the people of the United States are being sold out and American blood is being spilled and will continue to be spilled to satisfy and justify the whims and stubbornness of a man who has repeatedly exhibited his ignorance and incompetence in the highest office in the land.

The action strikes me as being the most drastic of a long series of circumstances leading to eventual complete capitulation to communism by the administration.

You must realize that the latest outrageous act of the President and his cohorts is more than the American people can stomach.

Impeach that stupid President and let's get back to a free country. Also while you are at it run the United Nations back to Switzerland and let's have a free America again.

In view of the many disclosures of decadence within the administration and the petty politicking in the removal of General MacArthur, I respectfully request that you move for the immediate impeachment of President Harry S. Truman and the dismissal from office of Secretary of State Acheson and others of his ilk.

Because General MacArthur dared to be an American he is summarily discharged. We have finally sold out to England and the other Europeans who do not like General MacArthur.

Address of His Holiness Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, one of the deepest elements of religious conviction since the beginning of time has been the aspiration of man to exist in a world without war. For many centuries this has been a great hope—in our own country it has become a great necessity. The development of the atomic bomb makes it certain that another world war may mean the end of our planet.

In this connection, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement recently made by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in the course of an audience with delegates of the Fourth Congress of the World Movement for World Federal Government, on April 6. Among those present at this audience were two Americans, Paul Shipman Andrews, dean of the School of Law of Syracuse University, and the Reverend Donald Harrington, of New York City, who represented a United States organization which participated in the Congress, the United World Federalists.

As one who has been a consistent supporter of House Concurrent Resolution 64, to strengthen the United Nations, which has been cosponsored by Representative HAYS of Arkansas and Representative JUDD of Minnesota, and who has always regarded the development and strengthening of the United Nations to the point where it can prevent aggression and maintain peace, as an act which accords with my deepest religious convictions, I am proud and happy to learn that the Pope has expressed his support for those who are striving to achieve a federal world government.

The address follows:

We are very appreciative of the deference you have shown us by this visit to the Vatican, and we have pleasure in addressing you members of the World Movement for World Federal Government. We give you cordial greetings of welcome. Our warm interest in the cause of peace in the midst of humanity so grievously tormented is well known to you. We have given frequent proofs of this interest. It is, moreover, inherent in our mission. The maintenance or reestablishment of peace has always been and always will be the object of our constant solicitude. And if, too often, the results have been far from equal to our efforts and our acts, lack of success will never discourage us, so long as peace does not reign in the world. Faithful to the spirit of Christ, the church is striving and working with all her strength; she does this by her precepts and by her exhortations, by her incessant activities, and by ceaseless prayers.

The church is indeed a power for peace, at least where one respects and appreciates at their true value independence and the mission which the church holds from God, in spheres where one does not seek to make her the docile servant of political egoists, and where she is not treated as an enemy.

The church longs for peace, she strives incessantly for peace, and her heart is always with those who, like her, desire peace and devote themselves to it. Also, she knows, and this is her duty, how to discern the true and the false friends of peace.

She desires it, and therefore she applies herself to the promotion of everything which, within the framework of the divine, natural and supernatural order, contributes to the assurance of peace. Your movement, my friends, has the task of creating an effective political order. There is nothing more in keeping with the traditional doctrines of the church, or better adapted to her teaching, as to legitimate and illegitimate war, especially in the present world crisis. An organization of this nature must, therefore, be set up, even if only to end the competitive rearming of nations, through which, for decades past, peoples have exhausted their efforts and drained their resources. You, my friends, are of the opinion that, in order to be effective, this world political order should be of a Federal nature. If you understand by this that this order should not be bound to the wheels of some mechanical system, you are again in harmony with the principles of political and social life so firmly laid down and sustained by the church. Indeed, no world organization could exist if it did not harmonize with human relations as a whole and with the normal organic order regulating relations between men and between diverse peoples. Failing this, whatever might be its structure, it would be impossible for this organization to stand up and endure.

For this reason we are convinced that your first care should be to establish solidly and restore these fundamental principles in every national and constitutional, economic and social, cultural and moral sphere.

At the present time in the national and constitutional sphere, the life of nations is everywhere dislocated by the blind worship of the value of majorities. It is the citizen who is the elector. But, as such he is in reality nothing but one of the units, the total of which constitutes a majority or a minority, which the displacement of a few votes or even of a single one would suffice to reverse. Although an elector, he does not count as such, but there is no question as to the place and part he takes in his family and profession.

In the economic and social sphere there is no natural organic unity amongst producers, since quantitative utilitarianism, which is the sole consideration in the matter of cost price, is the only norm determining the places of production and distribution of labor; since it is the question of class which divides men artificially in society, and the standard is no longer that of cooperation within the professional community.

In the cultural and moral domain, individual liberty, freed from all ties, all rules, all objective and social values, is only in reality a devastating anarchy, especially in the education of the young.

Until one has strengthened the universal political organization and placed it on the indispensable basis, there is a risk of it infecting itself with the deadly germs of mechanical unitarianism. We should like to invite those who are thinking of this remedy, for example, to a world parliament, particularly from a federalist point of view, to reflect on this. Otherwise, they would be hand in glove with the forces of destruction, from which our political and social order has already suffered too much; they would only finish by adding one more legal automaton to the many others which threaten to stifle the nations and to reduce man to the state of an inert instrument.

If, therefore, within the meaning of federalism, the future world political organization cannot, under any pretext, allow itself to be caught up into the movement of the unitarian machine, it will not possess effective authority except insofar as it safeguards and favors everywhere the clean life of a healthy human community, of a society all the members of which vie with each other for the good of all humanity.

What a large amount of moral firmness, intelligent foresight and supple adaptation this world authority will have to possess, these being more than ever necessary in critical moments when, in the face of malevolence, people of good will need to be supported by authority. After all our past and present trials, should we dare to say that the resources and methods of the governments and politicians of the day are adequate? In truth, it is impossible to solve the problem of a world political organization without agreeing to leave the beaten track from time to time, without appealing to the experience of history and to a sane social philosophy, and also to a certain intuitiveness of creative imagination.

There, my friends, is a vast field of work, study, and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face; you have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We would express to you our wishes for your entire success and with all our heart we will pray to God to grant you His light and His help in the performance of your task.

If You Want To Practice Real Economy, Then Junk the St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Jackson (Miss.) News, of February 9, 1951, recommends the immediate junking of the proposal to construct the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The editorial follows:

THIS PROJECT NEEDS JUNKING

President Truman's renewed pleas for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, this time on the basis of defense necessity, should be shelved quickly and decisively by Congress. Even to debate this extravagant, impractical, repeatedly discredited venture would be sheer waste.

In his $71,600,000,000 budget message the President again trotted out this moldy old joker—it's been hanging around since 1895—along with a lot of other costly nonessentials. A few days later, in a letter to the chairman of the St. Lawrence deep sea waterway labor conference in Detroit, Mr. Truman said that "in the present emergency" the project has become urgent.

Furthermore, he added that, because our steel industry must be built up, the seaway was needed to bring in iron ore, not only from Labrador but from Venezuela by a route well protected from enemy submarines. Just how Venezuelan ore would be protected on the long ocean haul to the mouth of the St. Lawrence wasn't made clear.

But what, precisely, is the seaway's urgency from a defense viewpoint? This high-priced water connecting Great Lakes ports with the Atlantic Ocean is ice-bound about 5 months of the year, rendering it useless for long periods.

To transport ocean tonnage to lake ports would require the building of some 50 dams. One enemy bomb that shattered a single lock could tie up the whole system.

A few years ago the expense of this vast spending project was figured at $642,000,000, of which Canada would pay $204,000,000. In 1948, when the seaway was debated in Congress without action, the cost was estimated variously at $750,000,000 to $1,500,000,000. Today's cost would be vastly greater.

And that isn't all. By diverting ocean freight, including iron ore, to the Great Lakes, the seaway would cause untold losses to eastern United States seaports, including Philadelphia. Projected steel plants along the Delaware will require a great deal of that Venezuelan ore the President talked about.

Revival of the St. Lawrence seaway hoax now, when this Nation is faced with defense necessities involving multibillion outlays, is thoroughly inexcusable. Congress should pay no attention to the seaway bills already introduced, and get on with real security needs.

Who Is Cheering the Dismissal of MacArthur?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, a matter of days—4 to be exact—has intervened to give the Nation and the world an opportunity to evaluate the effect of President Truman's startling announcement that General MacArthur had been relieved of his command over American and United Nations forces engaged in bloody war with the Communist aggressors in Korea. There has been no abatement in the fiery protests of outraged citizens across the land despite the address of the President to the Nation which sought to justify the action. These protests have continued, and grown in volume, notwithstanding the fact that few argue the President's authority to act as he did. That is not the issue. The wisdom of his policy is challenged, not his authority.

The protests have come, not from organized groups directed by leaders self-appointed or otherwise. Rather they have come from individual citizens, from "the man on the street," the housewife, the mothers and wives of servicemen, from Americans without regard to creed or politics.

Perhaps, then, it would be significant to note the source of some of the reaction on the other side of the question. Who, if anyone, is applauding the action of the President?

It is now a matter of documented record that first favorable action came from foreign shores. Not on the American battle lines in Korea, to be sure, but from the seats of government in England and France, and most unfortunate of all, from the Lake Success headquarters of the United Nations. Unbiased news reports are the source of word of cheers for the dismissal of MacArthur in London, for instance. There the Socialist

Government of Britain hastened to announce the removal of MacArthur might pave the way for the admission of Red China to Japanese peace treaty discussions, the sacrifice of vital Formosa to our present enemy, the same Red China, and ultimately a seat in the United Nations for that nation. To go further to observe that such a policy would preserve Hong Kong and Chinese trade for the British would not be to depart far from the obvious.

France, even though to a lesser degree, has been reluctant to move too vigorously in the Far East with the hope of preserving in part a crumbling empire in Indochina. To this list, Italy can be added, and for similar reasons.

And the United Nations, embryo hope of ultimate world peace, found less and less interest in the efforts of a brilliant American commander who insisted on winning a war he did not seek and a war he was ordered to prosecute.

But most appalling of all is the cheering from quite another source. It comes from the heart of enemy power. It comes from the Kremlin itself. The Daily Worker, New York newspaper, acknowledged as the mouthpiece of the Moscow line and Joe Stalin himself, brazenly applauded the ousting of MacArthur. "Way paved for peace," the Daily Worker shouted. Peace on Moscow terms, of course, a second Munich so to speak. For the Daily Worker confidently predicted the terms cautiously voiced in London.

The American effort seeks peace, of course, as President Truman repeatedly asserted in his address Wednesday night. But the American people who have already suffered 60,000 casualties in the so-far-undeclared war in Korea do not regard any degree of appeasement with communism as peace. They do not regard the granting of rewards for aggression as any guaranty against future aggression.

Obviously, then, there must be an immediate reexamination of the entire problem of American foreign policy and American military policy. There must be a searching study of the Truman-Acheson foreign policy in which convicted traitor Alger Hiss once played such an important formulating role. For President Truman, in ousting General MacArthur, clearly has made his choice on the side of the Secretary of State, for he has shown he will not turn his back on the man who said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss.

To the now vital review of American aims in the Far East, and, indeed, throughout the world, the views of one man can offer more substantial guidance than any other single person. That man, of course, is General MacArthur. It should not be necessary to force the Truman-Acheson-State Department clique to cooperate in making his views available. It should not be necessary to force reluctant administration leaders to invite MacArthur to appear before a joint session of the Congress at the earliest possible moment to give his countrymen the benefit of his views and experience. Those views should be sought voluntarily, immediately, and in justice to 200,000 American troops left behind to carry on a struggle bogged down not in the mud of Korea but in the bureaucracy of Washington.

It is only natural that much of the present demand for action should come from those who regard General MacArthur as one of the greatest military leaders of all time. Even those who ousted him concede the general's stature in the field of his life-long service. But the more important point has best been stressed by a distinguished colleague qualified to speak by background, experience, and intimate knowledge of the far-eastern problem. Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, after the news of the President's action, had this to say:

My concern is not for General MacArthur. He is a giant whom the pygmies cannot tolerate because he has been so consistently right about Asia and they so consistently wrong. His place in history is secure. It will vindicate him and condemn his opponents who threw away in five short years the magnificent victory in the Pacific which he and 4,000,000 Americans won at such great cost—108,000 of them with their lives.

My concern is for the peace and security of the United States.

Few people seem to realize the completely unique position of prestige and confidence which General MacArthur commanded in Asia, and especially in Japan. His removal is likely to open the way for the Communists to chip away and destroy the faith of the Japanese people in us and in the United Nations. If that happens, then a settlement in Korea will not end the war, it will just move from Korea to Japan. If we abandon Formosa in a futile effort to buy the Reds off, we do not end the struggle; we simply shift it from Formosa to the Philippines. And if we let the Philippines and Japan go, "in order to avoid war with Communist China," do we solve the problem? No. We just move the conflict to Alaska and Hawaii. And if we sell them out "in order to get peace," we do not avoid world war III; we just make certain much of it will be fought in the northwestern States of our own country. You have to stop this glacier somewhere. We did not stop it at the 50-yard line at the end of the last war. Instead we moved back to our 40-yard line and invited the Russians to take Eastern Europe, Manchuria, North Korea, and the strategically placed islands north of Japan. Now we are down to about our 30-yard line due to the idiotic attempt to make the Chinese Communists our friends by walking out on our Chinese allies. Now it is proposed, in line with British ideas, to move back to the 20-yard line—the move MacArthur opposed so strenuously. Just where are we to stop retreating? At our 10-yard line when only Europe remains? Or the 5-yard line when only the Western Hemisphere remains? Or the 1-yard line when only the interior of the United States remains?

I do not want to have to fight at the last ditch for the sheer survival of the United States; that is, the real issue: not the fate of MacArthur, but of ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the facts, as we know them to exist now, it is impossible for the Nation to feel any measure of security in the words of President Truman as he sought to justify his willful and precipitate action. None will doubt his sincerity as he said the war in Korea is "a struggle for peace," but a careful study of his address gives rise to the conviction that though he hopes truly to avoid a general war in Asia, he has no real plan for the attainment of that goal.

The President quoted from intelligence documents revealing the Communists regard the United States as the only obstacle in the road for the "liberation"—Communist term for conquest—of all the countries in Southeast Asia. One of the documents asserted the Communists must "unify the people of Asia and crush the United States."

Commenting on this, the Washington Star, not an antiadministration newspaper, observed editorially:

Does Mr. Truman believe that these reports accurately reflect the Communist aims in Asia? Presumably so, for otherwise he would not have put them before the American people. But if he does believe them, if he believes that the real objective of the Communists is the conquest of Asia and the destruction of the United States, then he believes what General MacArthur believes, and what the general has been saying ever since the fighting began.

In the light of these Communist objectives, what justification is there for the hope that our enemies will agree to any settlement in Korea that will bring peace and an end to aggression in Asia? Is it not more reasonable to believe that General MacArthur is right—that the Communists have launched their bid for world domination of Asia, that they will not enter into any decent settlement in which we can have the slightest confidence, and that we have no rational choice except to take up the challenge and meet force with superior force? No doubt it was done unwittingly, but Mr. Truman has made himself a persuasive witness in support of the MacArthur thesis.

Mr. Truman's plan, if he can be said to have a plan, was summed up in this paragraph: "If the Communist authorities realize that they cannot defeat us in Korea, if they realize it would be foolhardy to widen the conflict beyond Korea, then they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression. A peaceful settlement may then be possible."

"If" this and "may" that. A something-may-turn-up strategy in which the wish is father to the thought. What kind of a basis is that for the conduct of a bloody, bitter war which has cost the United States nearly 60,000 casualties and which will cost us thousands more? Is it right to send men out to fight and die in a war which depends for its objective on nothing more than a flimsy hope that somehow the Communists, who have betrayed every promise that they have ever made, will be induced to sit down and make a trustworthy settlement forsaking all of their self-proclaimed ambitions?

Hope may spring eternally, but it does not win wars. The more one weighs the President's remarks, the stronger becomes the conviction that we are simply deluding ourselves if we believe that the war in Korea can be won and peace restored to Asia by anything less than the maximum effort of which we are capable.

Mr. Speaker, out of indignation of Americans generally must come a new determination to examine the facts, to weigh the issues, and to formulate a policy which has for its goal the security of the United States. For only the security of the United States will preserve the hope of ultimate freedom for men and for nations. To that task General MacArthur may yet make his greatest contribution toward the preservation of his country. The hour is late, but not too late for a people united in purpose and strengthened in faith. General MacArthur has the capacity to crystallize that purpose and restore that faith,

The MacArthur Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Parkersburg Sentinel, Parkersburg, W. Va., April 11, 1951:

THE MACARTHUR AFFAIR

The angry storm of debate, criticism, and resentment which broke over the head of President Truman today as a result of his dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur will, it is safe to predict, overshadow any other single issue to date in his administration. The lines in Washington are going to be drawn largely along political boundaries, with Republicans hailing MacArthur as the savior of the West and Democrats expressing regret that he is such a devil. Neither description is true.

The confidence and trust which people in these United States repose in Gen. Douglas MacArthur—despite past criticisms—cannot be gainsaid. The course which he advocated in fighting communism in the Far East, in general, and Korea in particular, is the course which, we believe, the bulk of the American people would wish the administration to follow—and damn the Russian torpedoes.

MacArthur's great experience in the East, and his confidence in the policy he advocated carry tremendous weight in this country. Putting it briefly, General MacArthur wanted more troops and arms for an all-out war against communism, including hitting China proper and including the use of Japanese and Chinese Nationalist forces.

We agree—but the administration does not, and the President is General MacArthur's Commander in Chief, as he is ours. We believe that public pressure eventually would have forced a change in administration policy, but we must also remember that policy is formulated largely on the advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, who know our military capacities at this hour. It also should be remembered that the joint chiefs include men fully as able as Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

It is true, also, that there are sometimes many considerations—of which the public is not and cannot be aware—taken into account by the administration in formulating foreign diplomatic and military policy.

In spite of all this, the emotions of the people generally are going to figure largely in the debate over General MacArthur's dismissal. Yet there are certain incontrovertible facts, which lead us to believe that MacArthur's ego convinced him that he was so big a man the administration would not dare to dismiss him no matter how flagrantly he disregarded instructions. Even President Roosevelt, noted for his handling of men and for his inflexible insistence on discipline, complained about MacArthur's pronounced tendency to set his own judgment above all other considerations.

It is a fact which cannot be disputed that on December 6, 1950, the Joint Chiefs of Staff instructed all military and civilian bigwigs "to refrain from direct communication on military or foreign policy with newspapers, magazines, or other publicity media in the United States." This was clearly designed to prevent long-distance debates between military commanders and Washington, and between high Government officials and the administration. It also clearly implied that differences of opinion should be ironed out within the administration.

On top of that, MacArthur was informed on March 20 that the President planned to announce that the United Nations was under pressure for a negotiated peace in Korea, and that diplomatic discussions would be sought. In the face of these advices, only 5 days later—March 25—General MacArthur sought to grab the ball and run by offering to arrange a political settlement by meeting with the Chinese Communist commander in Korea. He was rebuked for that, and instructed that the December 6 order must be obeyed. Yet, thereafter a letter dated March 20, written to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican, Massachusetts, again challenged administration policy and called for all-out war against communism in the Far East.

The manner in which General MacArthur was dismissed rankles even with those who believe that an insubordinate general—no matter how high his position nor how much public favor he holds—should be deposed. It would have been a much more satisfactory solution, we are certain, if General MacArthur had been recalled to Washington—in itself a form of discipline—and given his choice of obeying orders or being dismissed. At least such a method would have satisfied those who have so much confidence in the general.

The conclusion is inescapable, we believe, that while the dismissal of General MacArthur was undeniably justified on the basis of his own considered acts, the manner in which it was brought about was far less than desirable. It is saddening to see the brilliant military career of a great man marred by such an affair, however necessary.

H. R. 1870, for the Protection of the Bald Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1951, I introduced H. R. 1870 for the protection of the bald eagle which is legislation of great merit and which should be passed at once. In fact it was passed by the House in the last session of the Congress but did not receive Senate action due to lack of time. I hope it will be passed by both Houses and approved by the President at an early date.

I have just received a letter from Inez E. Moore, of Valdez, Alaska, urging the passage of this legislation and enclosing a poem entitled "The Bald Eagle," which is of interest in consideration of this important problem. I include the letter and the poem as part of these remarks:

VALDEZ, ALASKA, *April 9, 1951.*

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: I see by the Alaska Sportsman where you tried to get a law passed to protect the American Eagle and now that Alaska has raised the bounty to $2.50 on Bald Eagles in Alaska I do hope you will try again to make it a crime to kill them.

I have tried to put into rhyme my feelings in the matter since I mailed a copy to Liberty magazine. I hope they will publish it and perhaps get some of the lawmakers awake to the fact before the bird is entirely exterminated. A copy of the poem is enclosed.

Thank you,

Mrs. INEZ E. MOORE.

THE BALD EAGLE

I'm the emblem of Freedom with a price on my head,
No right have I now, my proud wings to spread,
My food I obtain with beak and with claw,
While predacious man is protected by law,
His meat he will get with dogs, traps or guns,
He'll gaff the poor fish when spawning time comes,
He kill off the caribou just for its hide
While a baby fawn starves, cause its mother he spied.
When you look at a dollar—with my wings outspread—
Remember, its two fifty he placed on my head.
Our Congress, almost, a bill did it pass
That would have protected my rights, but alas.
They squabbled and argued on this and on that
So the bill—it was shelved—and let me down FLAT.
When you look at your dollar—do this for me—
Look in their lockers and name what you see—
Moose, Caribou, Deer, and Fish out of season,
Ducks, Geese, and Swan—all without reason.
Then pass a law—"A bounty to pay."
For predacious man, who takes game that way.

Glenn H. Curtiss Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, for many years, I have sponsored a resolution in the House of Representatives providing for the creation of a Curtiss Memorial Commission for the purpose of erection of a suitable monument commemorating the contribution of Glenn Hammond Curtiss in the discovery and development of the art of aviation and commemorating the first sustained kilometer flight and the first seaplane flight in all history.

Recently a communication has been sent me by Miss Joan Lofgren, secretary of the Glenn Curtiss Chapter of the Historical Association of New York State located at Hammondsport, N. Y., in which the pupils of the Hammondsport Central School express their reasons for urging the creation of such a memorial. I am pleased to extend in the RECORD this communication:

HAMMONDSPORT CENTRAL SCHOOL,
Hammondsport, N. Y., April 3, 1951.

Hon. STERLING COLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are students of the Hammondsport Central School, Hammondsport, N. Y. This year we organized a branch of the Historical Association of New York State.

Hammondsport has a very interesting historical background. We were surprised to discover that no one had started a memorial here for Glenn Curtiss, one of the greatest pioneers in aviation. Glenn Curtiss was born and lived most of his short life here in Hammondsport. Our club's greatest ambition is to have a memorial in honor of Glenn Curtiss.

We visualize in our dreams a small attractive building in his memory. There are tentative plans for building a new school where he had the original hangars for his "infant" planes. We feel that back of our new school would be an ideal place for such a memorial. In this building which would be open to the public, we would put relics, pictures, and information connected with Glenn Curtiss and his achievements.

As young citizens we do not feel ashamed to ask the National Government for help in financing a memorial for so great a man. We feel he did much for our country. He founded the first flying school to which people from all over the world came. Glenn Curtiss had many inventors as friends such as Alexander Graham Bell, Henry Ford, and Harold McCormick. On March 2, 1908, Curtiss made his first little airplane. He flew the one-stop flight along the Hudson from Albany to New York. It was the first flight in the Empire State. In 1909 Curtiss won the James Gordon Bennett trophy in France.

He opened the Curtiss Exhibition Co. and people like Lincoln Beachy, Fred Havens, and Eugene Ely became well known with their daring stunts. When the First World War broke out Curtiss was kept busy making planes for the Government. When Curtiss died many famous men came for his burial. After all of these national achievements we feel that not only his community, but also his country, should have the privilege to honor him.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN CURTISS CHAPTER,
JOAN LOUGHEN, *Secretary*.

What Honorable Men Are Doing in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, This week the former Governor of Georgia, M. E. Thompson, resigned his job as a consultant with the Office of Price Stabilization because he refused to accept a salary and expense account without working. He was asked to take the position of Codirector for Territories for the OPS at a pay rate of $53.48 per day. This is approximately $15,000 per year. He was listed as a consultant, but nobody bothered to consult him. He had not a single assignment in 12 weeks. So he quit.

In case you think that the Governor did not try very hard to get work, do not. He tried. On February 19, 1951, he told the President what was happening. The President called in his assistant, Mr. Donald Dawson, and ordered him to straighten out the whole mess pronto. It never was done. In resigning Mr. Thompson said:

Under the circumstances I refuse to accept salary and expense money from the taxpayers when I am rendering no public service. I am returning to my home. I refuse to be a parasite on the American taxpayers.

He added one additional thought:

There are thousands upon thousands of others rendering no service, but still on the public payroll, not only in Washington but throughout the United States.

Sweat on, Mr. Taxpayer, sweat on.

National Service Life Insurance Benefits Continued for Future Veterans—Amendment Sponsored in House Adopted—Veterans Gratuitous Indemnity Act Perfected or Improved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the conferees on H. R. 1 reached agreement on the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 and today this measure has been adopted by both bodies. The work of the conferees in this connection was most creditable and insures that this meritorious proposal shall be made available for men in the service, those later called into the service, and to our future veterans.

It was the source of much gratification to me personally and to many other Members that the conferees saw fit to include in the conference bill the provision to permit future veterans to continue national service life insurance after service in the same manner that veterans heretofore have been permitted to maintain such insurance.

Section 8 of the conference report provides as follows:

Within 120 days after discharge (during which time the veteran is covered by the gratuitous indemnity) he may apply for, without medical examination, a term policy up to $10,000. The premium is to be based upon the 1941 commissioner's standard ordinary table of mortality with interest at 2¼ percent per annum. In the future all NSLI policies will be issued on this table which means greatly reduced premiums but no dividends will be payable, and the only plan on which the insurance will be issued will be on the 5-year level premium term plan.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the House did not include these provisions in the bill which it passed. There were many members, like myself, who felt that the inclusion of such was most desirable—but the amendment which I was pleased to offer to that effect was turned down by the House. However, it was the source of much gratification that the amendment which I introduced and proposed has been adopted by the conferees and both Houses and is now near final enactment into law. The other features of the bill are excellent and desirable, and I consider that this important legislation has been perfected—certainly greatly improved.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from debate on H. R. 1 when it was before the House. The excerpts, as presented here, are from the RECORD of January 24, 1951.

The excerpts are as follows:

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I think the gentleman should point out that while there is nothing in this legislation which would impair the right of contract with veterans of World War I and World War II, if part II of the bill is adopted there will be no further issuance of national service life insurance to future veterans.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Except those who are disabled, in accordance with the provision that I have mentioned.

* * * * *

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering here today is substantially the same measure as was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress and passed by unanimous consent on the floor of the House at that time. It has been again favorably reported as was well pointed out. I think in view of the Korean situation it is very important that this constitute a part of the initial legislation of this new Congress. I have supported this measure both in committee and on the floor of the House. It has already been pointed out as to what the bill provides. It provides $10,000 indemnity coverage for all men called into the service. The bill is made retroactive to June 27, 1950, and covers the National Guard men who were killed in the train crash in Ohio last summer, and also the Tennessee guardsmen who were killed in an airplane crash while returning from maneuvers in South Carolina. There are other excellent features of the bill, including the monthly installment payment of $92.90 per month over a period of 10 years. The bill also restricts payments to member of the serviceman's family. The measure exempts the indemnity from claims of creditors and from taxation. All of these features of the bill are meritorious and beneficial and commend it for passage.

However, as has been pointed out, a new policy is injected into the bill with respect to part II of the bill. The position of the American Legion has not been made known heretofore with respect to this legislation. It has been said several times that two or three of the major veterans' organizations favor it, but we have here the testimony of representatives of the American Legion with respect to the measure. In brief, I might quote them as follows:

In testimony before the committee on this bill, T. O. Krable, chairman of the national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion said:

"We cannot be a party to any abridgment of the benefits and provisions that have been made by the Government to both veterans of World War I and World War II. The American Legion strongly urges that provision be made that veterans be permitted to continue their national service life insurance after separation."

Certainly the right of the veteran to obtain national service life insurance should be preserved and the right to existing benefits continued, all considerations of service being taken into account. The American Legion adopted a resolution at Indianapolis on November 19, last, reading, in part, as follows:

"The American Legion reaffirms its stand that national service life insurance and

United States Government life insurance contracts and trust funds established heretofore should be preserved, and that an opportunity to obtain national service life insurance should be continued for members of the Armed Forces and veterans."

I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk which would permit a man, after being discharged, to apply for national service life insurance if he cares to do so. The argument has been made that such a provision would continue the Government in the insurance business. Let me say that the Government is going to continue in the insurance business for a long time to come, regardless of the action we take here today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. May I just finish this statement first, and then I will be glad to yield.

The information I have been able to obtain is that only one out of seven ex-servicemen have continued their national service life insurance after discharge. That is, as of now, only 10 percent of the veterans of World War I have continued their national service life insurance, and only 25 percent of the veterans of World War II have continued their insurance. So the number is not great, but those who wish to contract for Government life insurance should be permitted to do so after discharge. My amendment would permit this.

Here are some of the reasons why it should be done: Because it is a right that was given to veterans of World War I and extended to veterans of World War II. But to veterans of the Korean War we would deny them the right to have national service life insurance. Those men who are fighting today will probably be 2, 5, or 10 years older after the war, by which time the commercial insurance rates for them will have been enhanced. We do not know how long the emergency will continue. Commercial rates to some of our veterans might have become prohibitive by the end of the emergency and during the time they are in service. Disabilities might have been incurred which, although not recognized by the Veterans' Administration, might be recognized by commercial insurance companies, and a veteran thereby might be denied the right to take out insurance after discharge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. EVINS. I am wholeheartedly and strongly in favor of the automatic coverage feature of this bill and am, of course, supporting the legislation, but I feel my amendment would improve and perfect the legislation by permitting the continuance of national service life insurance after discharge. Let us not say in effect to our future veteran that "After you are released from the service we will forget all about your service;" but rather let us say that a grateful Nation appreciates the service and sacrifice of our men of arms. Let us say that America will not forget. Let us perfect this legislation and let us pass it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has mentioned certain coverage. Would it cover a case of this kind? A plane from the Philippines to Okinawa went into the mountains on December 19. The plane went down and some Army personnel were killed. Would this bill cover a case of that kind?

Mr. EVINS. If the accident occurred after June 27, 1950, and if it were incident to call or maneuvers it would cover such an accident.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentlewoman. I hope that the amendment which will be offered later may have the favorable consideration of the House.

The argument was made, as was pointed out, that this bill will take the Veterans' Administration out of the insurance business. May I say that it is going to be necessary for the Government to continue in the insurance business for the next 50 years because of existing contracts.

It has been further insisted that the bill will effect a savings in manpower. To the extent that the measure does so, I applaud the action taken. However, the manpower requirements of the bill will take effect largely after the war is over and history and experience of veterans' insurance show that only about one out of seven ex-service men continue their insurance and the manpower argument is not persuasive. As I say, I hope the amendment will be agreed to. If it is not adopted here, I feel sure I can predict that it will be adopted in the other body.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORROW. In World Wars I and II men had no coverage unless they paid for it. Is not that correct?

Mr. EVINS. That is quite true.

Mr. MORROW. So the enlisted man gets the benefit of this indemnity even though he is not permitted under the terms of the bill before us to get in on the national service life insurance program.

Mr. EVINS. Not on the national life insurance program for that is, in effect, discontinued, but he is given war service insurance coverage. After serving a period of four, five, or more years, and after discharge the veteran may find the commercial insurance rates so high as to be prohibitive.

Mr. MORROW. We can deal with that when that question comes up.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman has pointed to the crux of this bill, the question of insurance coverage after a man has been honorably discharged and released from the service. Our future veterans should be entitled to apply for national service life insurance on the same basis as veterans of World Wars I and II.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee whether he has submitted this amendment to the committee and whether it was considered there? And, if so, what was the result?

Mr. EVINS. This amendment was not considered by the committee. The bill was reported out the first day that the committee met when the committee was organized, and the amendment was not considered. But I will say to the gentleman that it has had very careful consideration in its draftsmanship.

Mr. RANKIN. Why does not the gentleman from Tennessee tell the House that he did not bring this amendment before the committee, and that he seconded the motion to report the bill out as it is?

Mr. EVINS. I not only seconded the motion to report the bill, but I have consistently supported this measure. I think the bill is a good bill, but that we could improve upon it by adoption of the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. RANKIN. Another point I would like to make for the benefit of the Members is that in previous wars the serviceman did not have the benefit of this automatic insurance.

Mr. EVINS. I may say to the gentleman that representatives of the American Legion not only made logical positions clear to the committee before the committee had any more to read a statement of its position on this issue and this statement was passed around by the to members of the committee but was not read upon.

What action we take here today may well determine the economic security of literally thousands of families of veterans in the future.

* * * * *

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. EVINS: Strike out all of part II and substitute the following:

"'PART II—INSURANCE OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

"'SEC. 10. Section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"'(4) Any person who has had active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to the termination of the present emergency, as proclaimed by the President, shall be granted national service life insurance upon application thereof in writing after his discharge or release from such active service and upon payment of premiums and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing such person to be in good health at the time of such application: Provided, That in any case in which such application is made within 5 years after discharge or release from active service the Administrator shall not deny for the purposes of this paragraph that the applicant is in good health because of any disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree, and waiver of premiums under section 602 (b) shall not be denied in any case under this paragraph on the ground that total service-connected disability commenced prior to the effective date of such insurance: And provided further, That in any case in which insurance is granted by reason of this paragraph proof of the premium paid on such insurance shall be credited directly to the national service life insurance appropriation, and any payments of benefits on such insurance shall be made directly from such appropriation.'

"'SEC. 11. This part may be cited as the "Insurance Act of 1951."'"

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. May I say that I have had the assistance of the Legislative Drafting Service, of the general counsel's office of the Veterans' Administration, and of the officials of the various veterans' organizations with respect to the language in this amendment. So it has been carefully prepared. It provides simply in substance that an honorably discharged veteran after the present hostilities may make application for and where qualified and on the same basis be granted national service life insurance as veterans of World War I and World War II. All this amendment does is give to future veterans the opportunity to acquire national service life insurance. We know that there will not be the great administrative cost of the insurance program during any future war under terms of this bill. The amendment which I propose would permit those who desire to continue the Government insurance after discharge the right to do so. We have already pointed out that the percentage of veterans who acquired insurance after discharge has, in the past, been limited to a minimum, but those veterans who do desire to continue veterans' insurance should be permitted to do so. My amendment provides the same benefits that have already been provided. It is not a revolution, it is not a revolutionary idea nothing

back. My amendment would preserve benefits for future veterans which are presently existing in law.

I hope the amendment may be favorably considered by the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, of course this amendment would merely kill the bill.

Mr. EVINS. I disagree with the gentleman.

* * * * *

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman spoke of additional benefits. All we are going to do is to preserve and save the present benefits; not to cut back.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Let me answer that by saying this: That when we give increased and improved benefits to veterans of each succeeding war of this country, does the gentleman feel that there is an obligation, in addition to those improved benefits, to add thereto any benefits that any veteran has ever had in the history of the United States? I think that is about what the position of the gentleman amounts to.

* * * * *

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, the indemnity provisions of H. R. 1 are certainly sound and desirable, but there should be added to this bill the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, which amendment would give to the veterans now in service the same opportunities to acquire national service life insurance that were given to those of us who served in World War II.

Truman Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the important factor in the Truman-MacArthur controversy centers around the determination of our American foreign policy. No military commander, no matter how brilliant he may be, shall have the right under the Constitution to assume the authority of determining our foreign policy.

General MacArthur, in assuming such authority, has created great danger to this country. Those who, like the Republican leaders, have encouraged him in his course for political reasons, should be made to understand that they are playing with fire and are subverting the safety of the country to their own sordid political end. Our ship of state cannot be guided by two men at the same time without endangering the ship.

The President had no choice but to recall General MacArthur, and in due course, the sober sense of the American people will prevail. The present intense emotional clamor will die down. The more intense the feeling the more quickly it is expended.

The President stated the aims of our Government effectively and with due solemnity when he appeared on television and radio this past Wednesday evening. Our policy is to thwart aggression in Korea and wherever else it raises its ugly head, in association with the members of the United Nations. We must act in concert with these nations. We dare not isolate ourselves. We will not go beyond Korea unless Communist China and Communist Russia force us to do so. By bombing Chinese bases and following the MacArthur suggestions we would be in a world war up to our necks. The American people do not want this, and the President has gaged properly the fundamental American viewpoint. If the Communists want world war, so be it. We have no choice. But the awful responsibility will be on them.

Under the Constitution, the President is Commander in Chief. General MacArthur disobeyed not only instructions given by the Commander in Chief, but he also disobeyed instructions of his other superior, Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General MacArthur's course was also opposed by Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Sherman argued that we could not afford to get involved in a war with Communist China and that if we followed General MacArthur's insistence upon bombing Chinese bases, we would do so. Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg of the Air Forces, and Gen. Joe Collins, Army Chief of Staff, concurred in this view.

The War Department—

Remarked General Eisenhower before the Congress in 1947—

understands its place in this Government and does not try to usurp anybody else's place. We are an executive agency. We recognize where the policy-making responsibility lies, and no matter what is done, we will be in there pitching to carry out exactly what we are told to do.

General MacArthur has failed to carry out the orders of the policy-making branch of the Government. General MacArthur is a strict disciplinarian. He would not tolerate any disobedience from any officer under him.

This is not the first time in our history that the civilian authority was compelled to crack down on the military when the latter sought to bypass its authority. President Lincoln did exactly what President Truman did when he relieved Gen. George B. McClellan of his command. McClellan was a brilliant soldier and the darling of his day with a large part of the public. McClellan's intransigeance and his bypassing of the White House in bidding for public support, caused the end of his military career. President Wilson was compelled to discourage in forceful manner the disobedience of Gen. Leonard Wood.

If General MacArthur differed with the over-all policy of the Government and wished emphatically to protest, his course was plain. He should have resigned his command and his commission, and as an ordinary citizen he could have vigorously fought his cause. But he chose to do this in uniform. That he could not do in our governmental structure.

I approve of the President's course, and I do this despite the past attainments and rare ability of General MacArthur.

Christian Churches Uphold MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include the resolution passed by the National Association of Evangelicals in its convention in Chicago, Ill., on April 11, 1951, expressing admiration of General MacArthur's Christian character and personal integrity and calling for an immediate investigation of all circumstances attendant upon his recall:

Resolution passed by the special assembly of the National Association of Evangelicals called to consider the crisis facing the Nation:

"Inasmuch as Gen. Douglas MacArthur has opened the door and encouraged and welcomed Christian missionaries to Japan and the Far East; and

"Inasmuch as his Christian testimony has always been courageously given and his opposition to communism widely known; and

"Inasmuch as his position has made him one of the greatest foes to communism and friend of democracy or the American way of life; now

"In the light of his being relieved of his commands, we the National Association of Evangelicals desire to go on record expressing our confidence in the General and therefore be it:

"*Resolved*, That we send to General MacArthur this expression of our confidence and admiration of his Christian character and personal integrity, our appreciation of his devotion to the principles of Christian liberty, especially religious freedom during his term of duty as general in charge of the Army in the Far East, as general in charge of the occupation forces in Japan, and as general in charge of the United Nations forces in Korea, and assuring him of our prayers; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we now call upon all Christians within these shores and abroad to get upon their knees in prayer to the end that this Nation might be preserved in liberty and God be truly honored."

Resolution presented by special committee and unanimously passed by the general assembly of the National Association of Evangelicals, Chicago, Ill.:

"Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur has demonstrated irreproachable personal integrity in contrast with the lack of integrity and widespread corruption and graft in high places, and whereas General MacArthur has demonstrated his understanding and insight of communism by firm and unrelenting opposition to its extension, while others in high places have displayed their lack of understanding by their record of appeasement and failure to oppose Communist aggression, and whereas General MacArthur has proved in a decade his wise and able leadership both in war and reconstructive peace in a time when the American international policy has been vacillating, impotent, and culpable; and

"Whereas the national confusion and uncertainty growing out of General MacArthur's removal from command in the Orient, coupled with the lack of a stable and well-developed foreign policy, has resulted in immeasurable bewilderment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the National Association of Evangelicals, representing 33 denominations and a service constituency of more than 10,000,000 Evangelical Protestants, declare in view of these basic facts, that we confidently leave with God and with the judgment of history the complete vindication of this great man; and further be it

"*Resolved*, That we call the American people to a national day of humiliation and prayer for divine guidance in this critical hour of national affairs, and that we call upon every pastor to set apart a portion of the morning service on Sunday, April 15, for special intercession for Government and Nation; and further be it

"*Resolved*, That, without implying our competence to judge the technicalities of this case, we appreciate the example of Christian citizenship and moral and spiritual alertness provided by General MacArthur in a period of national duress, and further, that we deplore the alarmist tactics of many of our present national leaders, which might easily plunge us into a third world war, and caution against the employment of the sense of urgency for purposes of political expedience."

A second and stronger resolution arising from popular demand unanimously passed by the general assembly, following the adoption of the above resolution:

"Moved, seconded, and unanimously carried that we call upon the Congress of the United States to undertake an immediate investigation of all the circumstances attendant upon the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his commands and take appropriate action."

Truman Versus MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a telegram outlining my position on the Truman-MacArthur controversy, which my hometown newspaper, the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, had asked me to submit:

HAROLD HARRIS,

Brooklyn Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

While General MacArthur's departure as Far Eastern Commander has momentarily aroused a national controversy I feel history will eventually vindicate President Truman for the step he has taken. It is worth remembering it was done after deliberation and consultation with top governmental and military leaders. At stake here is not the fate of an individual, no matter how great or important, but the fate and future of the American people and of all western civilization. By continually thwarting the policies of the United States and the United Nations, MacArthur breached discipline to an extent which threatened to embroil the whole world in a new and most destructive conflagration, namely, a third world war which we are desperately trying to avoid. At the same time, the President was faced with the surrender of his policy-making functions as established by the Constitution. Civil authority had to be reestablished for the continuation of our democratic process, otherwise we would have drifted into military dictatorship. Let us not forget the example in Rome when the greatest and most powerful republic in ancient times came under the domination of popular military heroes who seized control and ended the republic forever. It is to the credit of the founders of our Republic who, in drafting the Constitution, were cognizant of Roman history and wisely entrusted supreme power to the civilian government over the military in our country. Hence the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of all our Armed Forces and the military authorities are subordinate to him. General Eisenhower made a very striking observation, saying "When you put on a uniform there are certain inhibitions you accept." In a democracy such as ours unruly generals are as such outmoded as indispensable men.

Congressman LOUIS B. HELLER.

Removal of General MacArthur a Severe Loss in the Fight To Prevent the Spread of Communism in Japan and the Entire Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, an article in today's issue of the News, Washington, D. C., by Oland D. Russell, Scripps-Howard staff writer, points out forcibly and logically the disastrous effect that may result from the withdrawal of General MacArthur in the fight to prevent the spread of communism in Japan and other countries of Asia. I include it as part of my remarks in accordance with the unanimous consent granted by the House.

It reads as follows:

MACARTHUR WAS WORTH 10 DIVISIONS

(By Oland D. Russell)

Observers here familiar with the Far East are seriously disturbed by one aspect of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal that so far has got scant attention.

It is the fact that, in the eyes of 80,000,000 Japanese and many other orientals not yet behind the iron curtain, he will be irreplaceable as the symbol and outstanding proponent of resistance to Red aggression.

The able Lt. Gen. Matthew Ridgway in time may meet the expectations of his supporters as an over-all commander, administration, and occupation chief. But he can scarcely hope to reach the eminence of General MacArthur or his incomparable influence and hold on popular imagination of the Japanese and other free orientals.

To General MacArthur communism has long been the biggest threat to the postwar world, and he has been convinced that there is no mission more important than meeting this challenge—in Asia. This has been the underlying precept of his occupation policies as he sought to turn Japan into a democratic nation which of its own accord would resist communism.

A psychological trait of the Japanese themselves is responsible for his unique, almost miraculous sway over the people dating from the very moment of his arrival in Japan in 1945. Feudalism is still a recent thing in Japan and exerts a strong influence on the people. In feudal times the Japanese were mostly divided into clans. In their centuries of clan wars, when one feudal chief lost to another, the defeated clan unquestioningly transferred its allegiance to the victorious lord. It became an ingrained tradition.

Projected into modern times, it explains, in the opinion of Americans familiar with Japan why the Japanese docilely submitted to the American invasion even when Japan still had a huge army under arms. Japan had lost the war and their modern clan ruler, the Emperor, acknowledge it, thereby simply transferring rule to the victor, General MacArthur, and that, in turn, explains why the supreme commander has carried out the occupation for 6½ years without a single revolt or violent incident.

The pattern of peaceful occupation has now been well set and it may not be disrupted. But neither General Ridgway nor any other possible replacement for General MacArthur will ever command the veneration and adulation that has come from the Japanese.

That is why the Japanese masses were stunned and frightened by his dismissal; why Japanese newspapers came out that first day with extras carrying editorials in black.

What the Japanese fear now is that the change may mean that the United States in removing General MacArthur has decided to abandon Asia completely to communism. As long as General MacArthur was there they—the Filipinos, the free Chinese on Formosa, the guerrilla forces on the China mainland, and the people of Southeast Asia—were certain that he stood as the symbol of our determination to keep them out of Communist clutches.

As one observer put it, General MacArthur in himself was worth 10 divisions to the peace of mind of those in the path of spreading communism.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following telegram received by my office today:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 13, 1951.*

Representative JOHN J. ROONEY,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Please wire collect your position on Truman-MacArthur controversy to be used for publication.

HAROLD N. HARRIS,

Brooklyn Eagle.

In reply I sent the following telegram:

APRIL 13, 1951.

HAROLD N. HARRIS,

Brooklyn Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

In response your wire please be advised that as far as I am concerned President Truman, as Commander in Chief, has the constitutional right and power to discipline or remove from office General MacArthur or any military commander for insubordination or any other reason. In a democracy it is absolutely essential that military men be controlled by authority of their elective superiors. Should the day arrive when such authority is flaunted or ignored it would be the beginning of the abrogation of our freedom and democratic way of life and ultimate destruction of the ideals and principles we have nurtured and cherished. I feel that we must not yield in the slightest to the Chinese Communists. I also feel that Congress should insist upon General MacArthur's

immediate testimony before the proper committee on the past and present military and political situation in the Far East.

Please use in toto rather than quote parts of this wire.

Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, this morning there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial and three articles by prominent columnists concerning the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I ask that these articles be made a part of our RECORD:

[From the Washington Post of April 13, 1951]

NOW IT CO ES OUT

One important point to digest in respect of the removal of General MacArthur is that it will make no difference in the operations in Korea. For all practical purposes Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, the new supreme commander, has been making the decisions since his appointment to head the Eighth Army last December. To him belongs the credit, as put by one officer quoted by Christopher Rand in the New York Herald Tribune writing from the battlefield, for getting the Army "turned around in the right direction" after the retreat last fall. It was he who infused new spirit and master-minded the solidly based advances which have been taking place.

What has been suspected, but never before mentioned in so many words, is the growing antipathy that existed between MacArthur and Ridgway. A good soldier, General Ridgway never complained. But, according to Mr. Rand, correspondents observed many indications of jealousy on the part of General MacArthur, including a seeming effort to play down Ridgway's successes, brief dramatic appearances of MacArthur at the front apparently designed to attract publicity, and a double censorship in Tokyo which reportedly was more political than military. General Ridgway, in Mr. Rand's words, "is a well-disciplined man who has kept his peace under slights from General MacArthur's headquarters that have caused widespread talk (in Korea). There is no question that he will be strictly amenable to Washington and will refrain from independent policy by independent statements."

There is every reason to believe that relationships now will be vastly different. General Ridgway and the new Eighth Army commander, Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, are technicians, as well as men of moderation and understanding. Moreover, there will be mutual confidence and similarity of purpose between the Pentagon and the field command. Divided counsels, in short, is at an end, and we now ought to get some teamwork.

[From the Washington Post of April 13, 1951]

BROOM OVER MACARTHUR

(By Marquis Childs)

TRUMAN'S CRITICS

Where and when the storm now sweeping over Washington will end no one can predict. Not in a long time has there been anything like it. The telegraph boys are carrying bushel baskets of wires to practically every office in the Senate and House and almost without exception they oppose President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur from his command.

The talk of impeachment was inevitable. Partly it is political in origin. But in the thousands of wires pouring into the Capital it reflects a long pent-up fury and frustration.

Those who use the word glibly do not realize that impeachment is a solemn constitutional procedure rarely evoked. Only the House of Representatives can vote on the impeachment of a President.

When an impeachment has been voted against a President, the trial is held before the Senate, with the Chief Justice presiding. Conviction is on a vote of two-thirds of those present. The language of the Constitution provides impeachment for "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." The Supreme Court has never interpreted that language.

When President Truman first came into the White House, he talked about the trials of one of his predecessors. That was Andrew Johnson, who succeeded to the office on the assassination of Lincoln and thereby inherited the tribulations that come in the wake of a great war. Johnson is the only President in our history to be impeached. By a margin of one vote the Senate failed to vote that impeachment.

It seems most unlikely that anything so drastic will occur in this instance. Yet in the inflamed state of opinion, with all the confusions and conflicts, doubts and uncertainties that beset the American people, one must add that anything can happen.

In the present violent reaction there is plainly a current of unreason. Truman is the symbol on which long-stored-up wrath is being poured out. And that wrath probably traces back in part to the tensions under which we have been living in recent months.

Some who are so passionately for MacArthur seem to be for him in the belief that if he were only given his own way, he would find a magical means to end the war and bring peace to the Pacific. This does not, of course, conform to the facts. The MacArthur policy would certainly have expanded the Pacific war.

Whether it would have meant the start of a third world war is another matter. The British were convinced that Soviet Russia would honor its treaty of mutual assistance with Communist China and come in if American planes attacked the Chinese mainland. MacArthur believed that this danger was negligible.

Whether the storm goes to the point of action against Truman, and the Democratic Party still has at least nominal majorities in both Houses of Congress, its violence will not soon subside. Quite apart from popular feeling, powerful engines of publicity are behind MacArthur. They will work night and day. MacArthur's return to America for the first time in nearly 15 years, his appearance before Congress, the drama in his every word and gesture, all this will keep it going.

Behind MacArthur is the whole of the so-called China lobby. It has large resources of money, including the support of a half dozen Chinese in this country, most of the members of the Soong family, who are reported to have vast sums in banks in Switzerland, the Argentine, Holland and the United States.

It is certainly too early to say what the political consequences of the President's action will be. He is a stubborn man. The very force of the reaction might persuade him to reverse a decision not to run for office again if, as many believe, he has made such a decision.

One thing does seem fairly clear. Even though they may not be able to get at the President himself, his critics and attackers in Congress can take revenge on his policies. And it is here, in my opinion, that there is the possibility for tragedy transcending any man's personal fortunes.

This violent quarrel can mean a further paralysis of Government at a time when it is vital to rearm and through rearming to unify the coalition of western nations. If we can't have our way in the Far East, the extremists may say in effect to the President, then you will not get your way in Europe. Obstructionism under our system of divided powers can do a lot, when there is no really responsible control in Congress, as between Republicans and Democrats.

Already the evidence of it has been ample in this Congress. If it now goes on to impede vital measures, we shall have paid a terrible price for our divisions.

[From the Washington Post of April 13, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

MACARTHUR EVENTS DISCLOSED

It was not until about 11:15 Tuesday night that President Truman actually decided to issue his 1 a. m. statement firing General MacArthur.

The decision to make this momentous step had already been taken, but the timing was set for Friday, not Tuesday midnight. And the reason for the sudden nocturnal press announcement was a telephone call from Secretary of the Army Pace in Tokyo tipping off Truman that MacArthur planned to jump the gun and get out his own statement first.

The President was still smarting from an incident around March 24 when MacArthur had jumped the gun on him, so naturally he was leery. He had sent MacArthur a policy statement for his perusal and personal reaction—a policy which the White House planned to announce as a peace feeler to China. But MacArthur, without notifying Washington, issued the statement himself.

So when Secretary Pace called from Tokyo Tuesday night intimating that MacArthur might rush into print again, the President called Secretary of State Acheson and Deputy Under Secretary Dean Rusk to the White House where they prepared the MacArthur press release.

Prior to that, late on Monday afternoon the Joint Chiefs of Staff held a highly secret session at which there was unanimous sentiment that MacArthur must go.

Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a most mild-mannered man, was hottest under the collar against MacArthur. He complained to colleagues that MacArthur's constant sounding off about war with China was undercutting our whole defense plan in Europe and making General Eisenhower's work three times as difficult.

Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, and reported by some as favoring MacArthur's strategy against China, actually threw his weight behind Bradley. Though MacArthur's tactics included a naval operation against China, Admiral Sherman argued that we can't afford to get involved in war with China, and that if you go into China just a little bit—as in bombing bases—you have to be ready to go in all the way.

Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg of the Air Forces and Gen. Joe Collins, Army Chief of Staff, concurred.

Only military man who dragged his feet on MacArthur's ouster was Secretary of Defense Marshall, who has known MacArthur a long time, is 70 years old against MacArthur's 71, and who was in France as a World War I captain when MacArthur was a brigadier general.

One highly significant exchange of information made between the Pentagon and Lt. Gen. Matthew Ridgway in Tokyo was a cable from Ridgway stating that no matter what happened, his troops could hold out for 60 days. Regardless of what was thrown at him, Ridgway informed the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he could hold for 2 months.

This cable was in reply to White House fears that following MacArthur's removal, there might be a Chinese attack and a series of American defeats for which Truman, having removed the supreme commander, would get the blame.

HUMBLE HARRY

President Truman's usual peppery remarks have not been in evidence during the MacArthur controversy—not even to his personal advisers. The nearest he came to pepper was at last week's Cabinet meeting, just after former Speaker JOE MARTIN released the MacArthur letter.

"It's time to show the MacArthur's, the Time-Life people and the Scripps-Howard newspapers who is running American foreign policy," he observed tartly.

Day after MacArthur was relieved, however, Truman received a call from former Congressman Maury Maverick of Texas, who congratulated him.

"What you have done will make sure that my grandchildren will be free and that civilian Government will continue in the United States," Maverick said.

The President was neither cocky nor apologetic. He looked a little sad, as if he had made a terrifically hard decision and knew that a terrible storm was going to break over his head.

"Thank you, Maury," he replied. And he wept just a little. "I do my best. I have to follow the Constitution."

Truman went on to tell how hard he had tried to cooperate with MacArthur, how he had flown across the Pacific to meet him on Wake Island.

"You will never know how hard I tried," he said.

General MacArthur's grand strategy for China has never been spelled out in detail to the public but it has been argued back and forth repeatedly with Army Chief of Staff Gen. Joe Collins and Adm. Forest Sherman during their trips to Tokyo. Here is what it boils down to:

1. A mighty United States air strike against Chinese bases in Manchuria where Chinese reserves do their regrouping; also against the Mukden arsenal which sends arms to Korea.

2. A United States air and sea bombardment of the China coast. This would include United States battleship bombardments of China's big coastal cities, such as Shanghai and Tientsin.

3. Chiang Kai-shek's troops to be armed by the United States and landed on the Chinese mainland in a major invasion.

4. Simultaneously an all-out United Nations attack in Korea, with additional troops sent from the United States.

[From the Washington Post of April 13, 1951]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

TRUMAN AND MACARTHUR

Either President Truman or General MacArthur had to be fired—and a general cannot fire his Commander in Chief. It is really as simple as that. The fact that MacArthur not only violently opposed the administration's policy, but continued to say so in an endless stream of pronouncements, made a show-down sooner or later inevitable, as MacArthur himself probably recognized. The only real surprise is that Truman decided to dismiss MacArthur immediately, rather than taking the easier way of waiting for the signing of the Japanese peace treaty.

The reasons he did so are inherent in his character and outlook. For one thing, Truman is extraordinarily sensitive where his powers as President are concerned, perhaps in part because he knows that he became President by sheer happenchance.

For another thing, there is Truman's absolutely rigid code, deriving in part from his days as a machine politician, which demands a relationship of unquestioning political loyalty, given and returned, between "the boss" and his subordinates.

With Truman cast in the role of boss and MacArthur in the role of subordinate, this relationship was bound sooner or later to break down. The breaking point came with MacArthur's statement of March 26, which challenged Truman's Presidential authority, and with the Martin letter, which in Truman's eyes was the equivalent of trading with the Republican enemy.

From beginning to end, then, the decision was Truman's, and Truman's alone. In the battle of the titans which is now in prospect, this should be borne in mind. Already MacArthur's dismissal is being described as a triumph for Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and for the views which Acheson is supposed to represent. This is inaccurate on both counts. Acheson was, of course, consulted, but he played no decisive part. He was not even present at the White House meeting on Tuesday afternoon, attended among others, by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Omar Bradley and Presidential Adviser Averell Harriman, when the President finally decided to act.

Moreover, it is odd but true that after the Chinese intervention in Korea, Acheson was the strongest proponent of precisely the course MacArthur now advocates, including bombing the Chinese mainland and using Nationalist troops. He was only dissuaded when it became clear that this course would wreck the Anglo-American alliance, the keystone of American foreign policy.

In fact, the strongest pressure for dismissing MacArthur came, not from the State Department, but from the Pentagon, Secretary of Defense Marshall, Under Secretary Robert Lovett, and all four Joint Chiefs, whose directives MacArthur had consistently disregarded, unanimously favored the move. But the final decision was Truman's and it is Truman who must now play David to MacArthur's Goliath in the great struggle, with its enormous implications for American domestic politics and world strategy, which will now certainly ensue.

This is written on the day of MacArthur's dismissal, and the future is even less clear than usual. But it does seem certain that the MacArthur issue will divide the Congress on fairly strict party lines. As of this writing, the Democratic strategy is to go along with the Wherry resolution inviting MacArthur to address a joint session, but to arrange a joint meeting of the Senate Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees beforehand, at which MacArthur can be asked some very pertinent questions. Meanwhile, Truman is expected to take the offensive to explain his constitutional and other reasons for dismissing MacArthur.

As for the Republicans, the Taft-Wherry wing of the party clearly sees MacArthur as the ideal rallying point for an all-out attack on Truman and through Truman, on American foreign policy. The results are likely to depend very largely on what actually happens in Korea. For if the American forces suffer a shattering reversal in the expected Communist offensive (as is all too possible, for reasons which will be discussed in a forthcoming report) MacArthur will seem to be triumphantly vindicated. The demand for the bombing of the Manchurian bases will then become almost irresistible, and Truman, who has resisted this demand, will appear as the architect of disaster. It may be that MacArthur himself has been fully aware of this possibility.

Bombing the Chinese mainland might be the prelude to a third world war. But whatever happens, one thing is clear. The basic issue which has now been posed is whether or not the main American effort, in peace or war, should be diverted from Europe to Asia. MacArthur himself has repeatedly posed this issue, most recently in his astonishing reported statement that Formosa is more important to the defense of the United States than France. This familiar problem is the real issue, behind all the drama and uproar, and it is as crucial an issue as this country faces. If the United States is not to be left without an ally in the world other than Chiang Kai-shek, it can be decided in the end, as it has been decided before, in only one way.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD, a petition signed by a number of residents of the Takoma Park area of Maryland, a part of the Sixth Congressional District:

Whereas this Nation is confronted with ever-increasing domestic perils and world crises which threaten our continued existence as a free and independent people; and

Whereas President Harry S. Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson have been dominated and controlled in their foreign policies by other countries all to the detriment of the best interests of our country and to the jeopardy of its safety; and

Whereas President Harry S. Truman and Secretary Acheson at the behest of the United Nations have involved this country in a costly and destructive Asiatic war without the approval of Congress or the consent of the American people; and

Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur, whose high prestige throughout the entire Orient is universally recognized, has been engaged in an epochal work of reconstruction in Japan and has by brilliant leadership achieved remarkable military successes in Korea; and

Whereas in his capacity of Commander in Chief of the Allied Forces, he has very properly, as a matter of military strategy and patriotic duty, called attention to the necessary steps that must be taken to win the war and prevent our forces from being overwhelmed and eventually defeated and destroyed by the increasing hordes of Red China armed and supported by communistic Russia; and

Whereas the President of the United States has summarily dismissed Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his command—an act which will go down in history as a base appeasement of North Korea, Red China, and Soviet Russia and a craven surrender of the security and best interests of South Korea, Japan, Nationalist China, and these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the undersigned, That the Congress of the United States be called upon thoroughly to investigate the above-described conditions and particularly the dismissal of General MacArthur and to demand the resignation and impeachment of any and all persons responsible for the incompetent, unpatriotic and war-breeding foreign policy of the Truman-Acheson administration; and

Resolved, That the original copy of these resolutions be sent to Congressman J. GLENN

BUALL, of the Sixth District, and authentic copies to United States Senators HERBERT R. O'CONOR and JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of the State of Maryland.

William E. Van Zile, Leonard R. Ansell, George E. Nelson, L. V. Lampson, Takoma Park, Md.; S. C. Mitzel, Baltimore, Md.; Ralph F. Sidell, J. Douglas Bradshaw, J. W. Rhodes, F. A. Dierkope, Takoma Park, Md.; M. A. Main, Silver Spring, Md.; Thomas I. Connor, Carl D. Ford, Takoma Park, Md.; O. W. Menefee, Washington, D. C.; Robert E. Lohr, Silver Spring, Md.; O. W. Youngblood, G. W. Holland, Jack Kroehmal, Victor Kroehmal, Le Roy M. Rubottom, Anthony Anselson, Takoma Park, Md.; Antonio Errigo, Washington, D. C.; Russell Carter, Jr., Ervin E. Roenfelt, Errigo Frank, Takoma Park, Md.; Isaac N. Cramer, Lanham, Md.; Frank E. Lucas, Fred J. [illegible]tor, Takoma Park, Md.; Idris Mor[illegible] Washington, D. C.; Karl Xander, Charles H. Klimck, C. P. Cresse, Takoma Park, Md.; Wendell Mongain, Bethesda, Md.; P. J. Michael, Newton M. Brooke, Jr., Takoma Park, Md.; Simon O. Smith and W. Arline Sanl, Rockville, Md.; Roy C. Potts, H. T. Morse, M. D., R. C. Miller, Takoma Park, Md.; William A. Benjamin, Ednor, Md.; M. C. Taft, W. E. Phillips, Takoma Park, Md.

The Real Story of Sampson Will Be Shocker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE REAL STORY OF SAMPSON WILL BE SHOCKER

(By Alexander F. Jones)

The real story of the Sampson Air Base rehabilitation, and of the waste and irregularities involved, has not been told as yet.

But it will be told as soon as the congressional subcommittee digests the findings resulting from its brief trip to Sampson. The committee, composed of Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican of Pennsylvania, and L. GARY CLEMENTE, Democrat of New York, knew what it wanted before it arrived and, therefore, spent a minimum of time examining plumbers and other workmen on the amount of their overtime.

What the committee really wanted to know was how the contract for the work was let in the first place and this inquiry was very much on the q. t.

Here is what they found out:

The bids for this job were opened on December 24, last, and the low bid of $2,677,000 won the contract for the Five Boro-Malan Co., of New York City.

The low bid was $700,000 under the next lowest and $4,000,000 under the bid of one well-known construction firm which had sent a crew of estimators to Sampson before making its bid. Executives of this firm stated that the work of rehabilitating Sampson could not possibly be done for $2,677,000.

The Five Boro-Malan Co. started work at Sampson on January 2.

On that very day the company received a letter from the district Army engineer stating the initial phase of the work would have to be completed in 30 instead of 90 days and to accomplish this the job was being placed on a cost-plus basis. The sky was the limit, the original contract did not mean anything, and the gate was wide open on costs.

And on the day before, January 2, the Five Boro-Malan Co. was incorporated under the State of New York laws at Albany, with an issue of 250 shares of stock, no par value.

It is small wonder that the congressional committee is very, very interested.

Here is a New York City company, which did not exist as a corporate entity in this State when it bid on the contract—and was granted it—being given a spare no expense carte blanche on the day it started work. The contract on which it got the job on a ridiculously low estimate did not mean a thing.

The Congressmen were particularly interested in the matter of what happened at Sampson between January 3 and February 23.

For on February 23 two other construction companies were added to the Sampson project and a new contract, including Five Boro-Malan, was let for $18,000,000.

A neat little jump from $2,677,000.

It was from January 3 to February 23, when the Five Boro-Malan Co. was operating exclusively, that the incidents of extreme overtime, dumping of usable lumber and other materials, occurred.

A very pretty picture.

For the Army engineers to contend that their sole interest in the Sampson project is and has been, to complete a rush job is so much eye-wash.

The Army Engineering Corps knows every construction firm of importance in this country. It knows all about awarding contracts. That is why it sends bright boys to the Harvard School of Business Administration.

We hope the committee, and its counsel, go to the very bottom of this matter. It is only one example of many in this country where the armed services have wasted uncounted millions of dollars by neglect, unbelievable stupidity, and worse—and we mean worse.

The United States Navy got out of Sampson so fast after World War II that bread dough was not even taken out of ovens. The water was not even shut off and pipes froze and burst. No provision was made for watchmen and millions of dollars in property was lost in vandalism.

We hope we live long enough to see a new kind of parade on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington.

In the reviewing stand in Lafayette Park across from the White House would be the President of the United States, his Cabinet, the high command, and all officers connected with disbursement in the armed services, and the entire Government, and all Members of Congress.

The marching divisions, keeping step from gutter to gutter, would be the taxpayers.

There would be division after division of men and women who pay up to $100 annually in Federal taxes.

It would take about 20 minutes for them to pass the stand with their banners: "It took all of us to pay for your neglect at Sampson."

Then would come the divisions in a higher bracket bearing the banner: "It took all of us to pay for your bad RFC loans."

And so on—hour after hour—division after division—until the "big brass" in the reviewing stands collapsed.

Such a parade is long overdue.

The vast sums that Washington throws around have lost all significance in terms of money.

But translate them into terms of people and the Government would learn—or relearn—that it takes the sacrifices of thousands, yes, of millions—to pay the cost of a single blind, stupid mistake—like the neglect at Sampson.

Manpower Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree this is the time to place a limit on the size of the Military Establishment we are building for national defense. I am not aware that there is a ceiling on the number of men being kept under arms by our enemies, or any limit on the number of threats they can direct at us. Nor am I aware that there is a ceiling on the number of Americans who might be killed by any enemy attack on the United States; though there is good reason to fear that a ceiling on the size of our Defense Establishment would invite such an attack.

A ceiling on the manpower we would muster for our defense is not so much a ceiling on strength as it is a reduction to weakness. It is like telling a basketball player he must make no more than 10 goals in any game, or a halfback that he must never run more than 20 yards.

When I spoke last Wednesday, I deplored the complacency of Americans in assuming that because there is no danger today, though there was danger yesterday, there will be no danger tomorrow. The patriotism of Americans in meeting an immediate emergency has always been great; but our unwillingness to face realistically an undefined future is equally characteristic. If we impose a ceiling on the Military Establishment we are reluctantly about to raise we expose ourselves even further to the charge of complacency. A limited defense against unlimited aggression can scarcely prove more profitable than no defense at all. If we place a ceiling on our Military Establishment, are we not telling our enemies to exceed that ceiling, and their victory over us is assured.

In searching for an explanation as to why intelligent men, sincere men, and good Americans all should yield to the lure of such complacency, I begin to wonder if communism has not already won a victory. Limited aggression in Korea—therefore limited mobilization here. But meanwhile, behind the heavy blackness of the iron curtain, and deep in the remoteness of Eurasia, communism mobilizes its own unlimited manpower.

How trusting we are, but how gullible. How peace loving we are, and how misguided. How honest we are, and how foolish. Has Russia told us how many men she has under arms, or what ceiling she means to place on her own mobilization? Has Russia made a bargain that if we raise an army of only three and a half million men, she will raise an army of only 4,000,000. And has she promised that with only this half million advantage over us, she will not attack us? It is possible that we could be defeated, even if her advantage were less.

Russia makes no promises that she intends to keep, and does not keep those she has made. Why should we therefore, make promises to her? We promise to raise a military force of only three and a half million men. Why not more consistently promise not to fight if attacked, or to surrender promptly at the first act of aggression? Ceiling on manpower, indeed. Since when has our democracy consented to enjoy only limited freedom, or limited democracy?

Mr. Speaker, there was a time, in another, but not less critical, period in our history when Americans were not so faint-hearted. The response one American made to the threat of aggression was to assert, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." And with those millions to support it, our democracy endured.

Today the faint-hearted among us would paraphrase that cry: "Three and a half million for defense—and tell us what you exact in tribute."

Surely, surely, we are not so faint-hearted, or as yet so defeated, that we are ready to make such a bargain.

The amendment to place a ceiling on military manpower in this critical period should be defeated.

Ours Not To Reason Why?—MacArthur or Gag Rule Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the MacArthur dismissal, one of the most historic decisions of our times, represents the most flagrant effort on the part of the national administration to curb freedom of expression in the past generation. General MacArthur has been far more than a military officer. He has been our administrator in full charge of Japan. To an extent unrealized in our own country, he has been running the Japanese Government, its economy, its social institutions, and its educational structure. By dismissing MacArthur, Truman has not only silenced a general, but has also checked the entire course of our far-eastern policy development.

These elements are sufficiently destructive in themselves, but the further implication of the gag is equally shocking. Mr. Truman and his advisers have apparently decided that the rule for Americans henceforth must be "Ours Not To Reason Why, Ours But To Do and Die." If we are not to be permitted to speak freely and to analyze the reasons for our decisions, the age of American freedom is past. American generals have historically asserted the right to think and to speak up. On the urgent immediate question, most Americans share the common belief that MacArthur knows more about the Far East than the President and his entire far-eastern department put together. If we are dismissing people, there may be good reason to think the wrong fellow was dismissed.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, today I received the following telegram:

Hon. DONALD L. O'TOOLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please wire collect your position on Truman-MacArthur controversy to be used for publication.

HAROLD N. HARRIS,
The Brooklyn Eagle.

In response to the telegram from the Brooklyn Eagle, I sent the following reply:

Mr. HAROLD N. HARRIS,
The Brooklyn Eagle,
Brooklyn, N. Y.:

As a Member of the House of Representatives the Constitution does not provide me with any official right to question the President's actions in the MacArthur case. Article II section 2 of the Constitution names the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. Under this article he has the right to name or remove with or without cause any of his military subordinates. It is not incumbent upon the President to furnish any explanation regarding the removal of any subordinate. Since this is a constitutional government with the Congress having definite constitutional limitations you may rest assured that there will not be any action on the part of Congress other than the utterance of words that will be ineffective. The President's decision is final.

Congressman DONALD L. O'TOOLE.

Autobiography of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this very excellent sermon by the pastor of my church in Bronxville, N. Y., the Reverend Dr. Lowell Russell Ditzen:

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF FREEDOM

(By the Reverend Lowell R. Ditzen, D. D., Bronxville, N. Y.)

Text: "The truth shall make you free"—(John 8:32).

Today, in the turbulent forum of world opinion, freedom is on trial.

Communism blatantly labels it "a vestigial remain of bourgeois ideology," and cries for its destruction.

Totalitarianism, in a hundred guises, adroitly points out its weaknesses and urges that its banners be forsaken.

Materialism puts out its choicest wares and affirms that all of man's hungers can be filled by its products.

Against all these, the apostles of freedom sometimes find their listeners few, their advocates all too often silent.

It is little wonder that many, once possessed by the dream of freedom, now waver before the loud evangelists for "order" or "security."

For how can an idea argue with substance? With what weapons can David overcome Goliath when the strength of David is of the spirit and the strength of Goliath is of the forge? How can the delicate steel of eternity and righteousness win an immediate round against the bludgeons of noise and prejudice?

If the present defense and future course of freedom depended alone on outward trends that seem to dominate our modern life, the way of freedom would seem clouded indeed.

But there is yet another hall of judgment, another court of opinion, where the voice of freedom cannot be stilled. That court and throne of power is in the soul of every man.

There: where deep calls unto deep; where truth will have its say even though error appears to govern; where the still small voice of right will be heard though the words of half-truth and ignorance reverberate in the ears; there, in the soul of man, freedom speaks.

And it says:

"I am called by the name of Freedom.

"My origin is in the unknown beginning before the worlds were brought into being. Ere the fires and mists of nothingness swirled and cleared to reveal stars and sun and the majesty of the firmament, I was. Before the beginning of time I lived in the heart of God.

"When that Eternal Spirit molded a figure from the dust and breathed into it the warmth of existence, the glory of hope and the balances of reason, I, Freedom, was imparted, too—a pure spark from the soul of perfection—into the life of man.

"As God watched His last and crowning creation walk into his new world, He mused:

"'He must travel twixt darkness and the light, between heaven and hell, between good and evil. He will falter. He will fail. The dreamless dust from whence he came will seek to claim him again.

"'Yet on the altars of his soul I have lit the fires of truth, of love, of faith, and of freedom. If he will but walk by these lights, he will triumph. The dust will loose its hold, and I shall claim him as my own.'"

"Of my beginning this is all I know. But knowing this, I know that I live, as strong as hunger, as compelling as love, as sure as death, at the inmost core of man's being.

"There are those who have not so understood. Some have sought to stifle me in their own soul and to destroy me in the lives of others. Club and spear, arrow and battering ram, the rack and the stake, musket and cannon, tank and bomb, have been vainly used to destroy me. They have tried but to no avail—for I yet remain. Like embers still glowing deep within the ashes of a forgotten fire, so I still live, even in the soul of those who profess to hate me and seek to destroy me.

"Many have been the sufferers, many have been the broken bodies that have borne the fury and the anguish of the world's ignorance on my behalf. Sad, mangled bodies there have been—from which some men have turned, saying, 'it's over now. This one no longer will give us his idle talk of freedom. Yes, this one is dead.'

"But it is not over, for I yet live.

"Socrates drank his hemlock. It is right to say that his breath ceased. His body was put away. His words were no longer to be heard by the ears of men. Yet the yearning to think without restraint and to speak openly, to be free in mind and soul and voice—that part of me that lived in him lives on. That, the hemlock could not claim.

"On Golgotha's dark brow the nails pierced deep. The spear added its final assurance that life was done. Even the noble lips

themselves had whispered, 'It is finished.' But it was not finished. The spirit of Jesus lives on to fan the delicate flames of liberty and of longing for freedom, into a consuming fire. A power it is, that spirit of Christ—a power to set men free—free from error, free from sin, free from death.

"Time would fail me to tell of all who suffered for freedom's sake, who were stoned, who were burned, who set out on pathless oceans, through unknown forests, seeking a place where they might live as freemen. Many were lost. But their longing for freedom was not lost.

"This I know, that as God's Spirit lives, and men remain men, I too shall live.

"You ask me what I am?

"I am longing and hope. I am dreams. I am faith. I am incorruption growing in the soil of corruption.

"When voices are raised saying, 'These poor shall not perish; this injustice must be righted,' it is my voice that speaks. When opportunities are enlarged, when privileges are increased, when shackles are broken, when burdens are lifted, there am I. And when the Cross is raised to comfort and redeem the children of men, again it is I who am the deed and the doer, the act and the actor.

"Some have cried 'Down with tyranny,' 'Give me liberty or give me death.' These are my words. Though they are spoken by men it is the ageless singing of my song that is sung.

"What am I?

"I am tears that weep over oppression. I am the curses that damn the injustice of the slums. I am the sadness that mourns untimely death. I am the struggle against dark selfishness which blights another's hopes. I am the patient minds that seek the paths of cooperation toward the best good for all mankind in the councils of statecraft. I am the heart of every righteous act. I am the voice that pleads of fairness, for justice, for tolerance and consideration of man for man. I am the painstaking observation that weighs the balances in the halls of justice. I am the hand that clothes a naked body, that heals a wound, that gives a cup of water to the thirsty. I am the sweat that comes in work to clean a filthy street. I am the plan and the sharing which enables children with bloated stomachs and spindly legs to sit at a farmer's table and romp in a green meadow. I am the precious memories of saints and scientists, the poets and philosophers in whom my light became a beacon.

"This is what I am. I am the spirit that creates a song, a church, a letter, an oration, a hospital, a book, a laboratory, a constitution, a college, in which there is a seeking to unshackle the mind, to soothe pain, to send God's children onto higher paths of peace and plenty.

"My enemies—who are they?

"The tyrant? Yes; the tyrant, whether he sits on a throne or at the head of a family table, he is my enemy.

"The greedy? Yes; wherever the wild horse of personal desire runs without control to injure or trample another, there is my enemy. More surely my enemy is that ignorance which permits the spirit of avarice to dominate the concern of man for his fellow men.

"The careless who sell their birthright as freemen for a mess of pottage, no matter to what label they succumb, whether it be 'peace,' or 'security,' or 'safety'—for these I weep. They are the foolish and deluded ones who learn their gold has purchased a false idol, when the price has been their liberty. They are enemies to the best within themselves—and so, enemies of mine.

"It is not alone tyrants or the lustful or the indifferent against whom I am opposed—but caution, which holds back from a venturesome act for freedom's sake; fear that stays the hand which should strike with courage; silence which dumbs the lips that should cry boldly in times of decision—these, too, are my enemies.

"Of them you should be aware. They lurk in the depths of each man's being, ready to blot out the light of independence and the flashes of truth that lift like from the jungle and spur man upward toward the life of God.

"But though such enemies be on the field—I will not be destroyed. They may claim a battle, but the final victory is yet to be decided.

"You would know of my future?

"How can I reply but to say that you will be the one to answer. My tomorrow will be determined by your today.

"If I may make a plea, it is that you, who are the sons of men and the sons of God, will not allow my betrayal within yourselves or in the world without. Should you deny me, you deny the best within your heart and mind. Your act is treacherous to God.

"I am freedom, the breath of eternity, seeking through you to bring true life into the world. It is you, the man and the woman of today, who, for good or for ill, will add to my chronicle that shall be read tomorrow.

"Will the future generations be shackled by the grim forces of ignorance and arrogance? Will they curse the Esaus of this day who would exchange their free birthright for a mess of pottage? Must they regird themselves to rewin inalienable rights and privileges at the cost of blood and death?

"Or standing on a higher plateau of peace and prosperity shall they face their future with hope and look back on their past with gladness?

"That future, be it for the good or the ill of freedom, is yours to determine now.

"Be adequate. Be strong. Be free!"

The Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make the statement that my vote of nay on Senate bill 1 was an expression of no confidence in the President of the United States to whom this measure extends further authority.

1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1951, in my debate in favor of this bill, on pages 3435–3436 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I said:

I do wish to now mention a couple of subjects and ideas that I mentioned in the Armed Services Committee, and I do it with a great deal of feeling that they are important to consider under this universal military training proposal. I think this House should be reminded of the fact that if and when this UMT program is set up it is set up for the youth of our Nation between 18½ and 19 years of age, the "tender" young men of our Nation, so-called, the youngest in our military call. On pages 36 and 37 of the committee hearings there is quoted there a discussion between myself and General Marshall. Then later in the report, a discussion between myself and Mrs. Rosenberg and General Hershey dealing with the matter of the morals and welfare of these young men in the UMT.

I wish to say, as one Member of Congress, I shall expect the commission, when it is set up, and if no commission is set up, I expect any bill passed by this Congress to contain adequate provisions to protect, as far as they can be, the morals and the welfare of the young men who go into this national training corps. I think it is high time that we in this Congress declare ourselves that we are not afraid to speak clearly and firmly on the proposition that the conditions and circumstances surrounding the training of boys and young men must be to the uttermost for their protection and their strength, rather than for their weakness and the destruction of their character and their morals. Such protection against commercialized vice of all kinds is a must.

Since my remarks of April 6 referred to, some have asked me to call attention for the RECORD in this debate today the discussion on this question of vice surrounding the camps as it occurred in the Armed Services Committee of which I am a member.

Here it is verbatim, to wit:

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

Some of us, General, have had sons that have served in the last war and aren't with us today, can't be, and some of them went in at very tender ages.

Have you yet directed or has anyone under you yet directed that there be any established policy to see to it that the conditions surrounding the camps and in the camps, referring to the use of liquor, referring to prostitution and other problems that arise out of mass military effort, are such as to make it as positive as possible that the boys, whose parents are desirous that their boys come out of their military service without their morals having been unnecessarily destroyed are provided with adequate recreation and athletic and sports facilities and other programs for the men and women in all the armed services?

Secretary MARSHALL. Well, frankly, sir, I have not, up to the present moment, gone into that particular aspect of the matter. I am quite certain——

Mr. DOYLE. Don't you think it is necessary——

Secretary MARSHALL. May I finish my answer?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Secretary MARSHALL. Because I said up to the present moment I haven't done it, but that doesn't mean I am not going to do it. And I also feel assured that it is being done, because we learned that out of the last war and it presents a great many difficulties.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I——

Secretary MARSHALL. And it is very important to us from several standpoints. It is important to morale of the Army and it is vital to the support of the civil population.

Mr. DOYLE. I hope we are promptly advised that it has been done.

Secretary MARSHALL. I will have that brought before your committee in detail.

Mr. DOYLE. One more statement, General. In reading the objectives of this bill and its proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act of 1948, I recognize that, of course, the military service is but temporary in the experience of American boys at present and I hope it will always be temporary, consistent with the best interests of our national defense.

In other words, one of the fears that many of my people have is that our Nation may unnecessarily become militarized. Therefore, may I ask you this, as I read this bill: Will it be inconsistent with this bill in the form of amendments to have a statement also included in the policy that it is the policy of Congress that these boys who are called into service get this training, in scientific research and development and health and education and military training, and return to civilian life as soon as possible, consistent with our national defense interests?

Secretary MARSHALL. Offhand, I wouldn't see any objection to that, but I would like to have a little bit more time to consider it.

Mr. DOYLE. Isn't that one of the objectives of our Nation?

Secretary MARSHALL. It is, and I must address myself to one phase of what you have just said as to militarizing our people. Anybody who watched the demobilization of our armies never got that idea, because the minute the emergency ceases everybody goes home and our great complication is to keep a few on guard until the next phase.

I think that was the case after the Civil War. It certainly was the case in 1919. And it was—well, as an understatement, it was quite the case in 1945. I remember I had to come up here and explain to as many as 600 Members of Congress once or twice something about the demobilization, when the Army was dissolving literally in my lap. I couldn't find the Army one day to the next. I don't think you can change the American boy. He doesn't change very readily into a military automaton.

Our great problem is to get him into the military system to the extent that it is necessary. I think one of the failures of our planning in the War Department in the last war was we hadn't given the same amount of attention to how we were going to affect the state of mind of the soldier and the people as the demobilization period came up. As a matter of fact, the Lord blessed us and war came to an end so suddenly that we were caught off center. We are now in the midst of tremendous effort. But every indication that we have is that you can't enforce a military feeling on our people unless there is an immediate objective before them that all can recognize is of vast importance to the country.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I make this statement in closing so the general will understand the import of my question.

I am very vigorously in support of an adequate armed military strength, but I do wish to emphasize that that to me should only be according to our present need and that always the objective of the military is to return those boys to civilian life in the utmost good health and the utmost good character and the utmost strength to protect our Nation.

Secretary MARSHALL. That certainly would be our desire.

I am very happy, therefore, that Mr. COLE, the distinguished Armed Services Committee member from New York, offered his amendment. The record shows I offered a similar amendment in committee which was not adopted. This amendment offered by Mr. COLE is better, I believe, than the one I offered.

"Our Strength Is Being Used To Prevent War, Not To Wage It; the Young Men in Uniform Are Standing Between the American People and Destruction; We Are Proud of Every One of Them"—Dr. John R. Steelman

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to address the House, then to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD of today's proceedings a script of the thirtieth Battle Report, Washington—the National Broadcasting Co. television program presented each Sunday afternoon.

On the occasion of the broadcast of this particular teledocumentary, Dr. John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, was with President Truman in Key West, Fla., and made his talk from there. The presentation was made by way of film recording and on this occasion Dr. Steelman brought to the television audience Hon. George Allen, United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia; the internationally famous authority on the Arctic and Arctic flying, Col. Bernt Balchen, a man to whom the area of the North Pole is almost as familiar as the dome of the Nation's Capitol is to the Members of this House. Colonel Balchen is now the United States Air Force's expert on Arctic aviation. His talk is something that will long be remembered by those who heard him discuss the Arctic center of the globe on this notable television broadcast.

On the program also was Maj. William W. Wright, one of the first United States marines returned to this country from Korea under the new rotation program, and as he told of his return, one can live and sense the glorious feeling experienced in having been one of the thousand marines homeward bound on the U. S. S. *Breckinridge*, sailing into the Golden Gate on this unforgettable voyage. Last but not least on the program were some of the greatest pictures ever filmed and presented on any television screen. They were taken by the Jones Brothers, the twin photographers of NBC, and made particularly for the Battle Report, Washington program. As historical documents, they will forever constitute one of the most complete records of this day and time ever recorded.

I am happy to announce that what was presented was a small part of the wonderful picture footage taken by the Jones boys and scheduled for reproduction on Battle Report, Washington.

What follows is but a few lines of an epic word picture painted by Lou Hazam of the story in Yugoslavia—commenting on the photo news as exhibited on the screen. This word-picture by Hazam constitutes one of the best pieces of script writing ever presented on the television screen:

The story of Yugoslavia is written in the faces of its people, 16,000,000 of them, who are making history by insisting on being themselves. Principally Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, they occupy a mountainous country, big as New York and Pennsylvania put together, a country of six republics and several different languages. Let us read what is written in their faces by what the camera finds behind them, stopping first for a brief visit with our Ambassador to Yugoslavia, George Allen, who makes this special statement for you who watch Battle Report.

Mr. Speaker, thus on another Sunday, the National Broadcasting Co. and Dr. John R. Steelman have brought to the American people a report on several most interesting subjects—made by men who by virtue of both experience and training are highly qualified to address themselves to the subjects selected for discussion.

The thirtieth Battle Report, Washington, as produced by Ted Ayers, was as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON, MARCH 18, 1951

Mr. DAVID BRINKLEY. Once again NBC television turns its cameras on the Nation's capital for your weekly Battle Report.

Washington, one eye on the Big Four deadlock in Paris, the other on Korea—Korea where our forces, slowed by rain, are now within 20 miles or less of the controversial thirty-eighth parallel.

Today on Battle Report the famous Arctic flier, Col. Bernt Balchen, who knows the top of the world like you know your own back yard; Marine Maj. William W. Wright, one of the first home from Korea under the new rotation plan; and the third of NBC's exclusive teledocumentaries on Europe, Battle Report, Yugoslavia. But first, by way of Size from Key West, Fla., where he is with President Truman—the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. JOHN R. STEELMAN. Like many others in Government, I frequently receive letters from parents who complain because their sons are selected for military service. Today I have been thinking about those letters. I can understand why they were written. I have sincere and deep sympathy, not only for the parents, but also for the sons whose careers are interrupted.

There is no doubt in my mind that parents everywhere in the world dislike the idea of their sons being called into the armed services. That includes the parents behind the iron curtain as well as those in the free world.

But, just so long as tyrants seek to dominate the world, we in the United States have no alternative but to build up our military strength. That is the only language the tyrants understand. If we were weak they would trample over us without mercy; destroy every material thing we own and make us slaves of a cruel and autocratic state. We have been with our own eyes the tragic fate which has overtaken weak nations.

We have chosen to build up our armed strength so no one will dare attack us. Our strength is being used to prevent war, not to wage it. The young men in uniform are standing between us and destruction.

All over the world today, representatives of our Government are working tirelessly to prevent war. That is their primary task. Some are engaged in efforts to build a more prosperous world for less fortunate peoples. These are the men and women working on

the so-called point 4 program. Others are in daily contact with the officials of foreign governments. Still others are busy telling the story of our country and making it clear to all that we want peace.

Back of all these men and women is our strength. Our ability to produce the material things of life is one asset. Our unselfish willingness to help others is winning new friends for us every day. Our armed might—these young men in uniform—are the bulwark behind which we can keep working to build a world of peace and prosperity.

We are proud of every one of them.

Mr. BRINKLEY. This is the armed border of Yugoslavia—Yugoslavia which faced the Soviet giant, once its brother, and cried aloud to the world its declaration of independence. This is the border that touches four Soviet satellites—Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania—and Italy and Austria in the north, Greece on the south. This is Communist Yugoslavia where the impossible has happened, affecting the whole balance of power in Europe. Rebellious Yugoslavia, which only last week handed the governments of the west this tough-talking, 481-page white book, formally challenging Russia with applying threatening pressure against her. It is from this Yugoslavia that our cameramen, the Jones brothers, send us their third NBC exclusive documentary report on Europe. We invite you now to see this country, as no American camera has been permitted to show it in recent years through Battle Report, Yugoslavia.

The story of Yugoslavia is written in the faces of its people. 16,000,000 of them, who are making history by insisting on being themselves. Principally Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, they occupy a mountainous country, big as New York and Pennsylvania put together—a country of six republics and several different languages. Let us read what is written in their faces by what the camera finds behind them, stopping first for a brief visit with our Ambassador to Yugoslavia, George Allen, who makes this special statement for you who watch Battle Report.

Hon. GEORGE ALLEN. Good afternoon. Yugoslavia is the only eastern European country from which this program will be able to report to the American people. And that fact alone is significant. Although Yugoslavia is a communistic country, this report comes from a country where, fortunately, the heavy iron curtain of the Cominform has been lifted, and it comes from a country that fiercely determines to defend itself against aggression. Yugoslavia is in the Balkans, and that term conjures up pictures today more than ever before of the powder keg. Today, Yugoslavia's existence is threatened by Russia's satellite troops—troops which we know are far in excess of treaty limitation. These troops stand ready on Yugoslavia's frontier. Guns are poised, the powder is dry; the only remaining question is whether the masters of the Kremlin will give the orders for the fingers to touch the triggers.

Mr. BRINKLEY. This is the heart of the embattled Yugoslavia of which Ambassador Allen speaks—Belgrade, Yugoslavia's Moscow, much destroyed by the war. Work on a new Belgrade ceased when the break with Russia came in order to concentrate workers on defense projects.

For industrial goods Yugoslavia, always predominantly agricultural, has been trying to build new industries. This machine-tool factory, outside Belgrade, was shipped down from Germany in toto after the war and given to Yugoslavia as its share of reparations from the Nazis. It employs 4,000 workers on day and night shifts to provide the nation with the machines they'll need to make their own goods.

Coal is needed to power this rush to industrialize—coal essential to fueling Yugoslavia's defense. And, along with coal, wood—making these two items of vital importance in Yugoslavia today. This coal mine, near Zagreb, about 300 miles north of Belgrade, is practically closed and deserted owing to a breakdown of irreplaceable machinery, illustrating how Yugoslavia is further hampered in tapping its right mineral resources, by being equipment-poor. Thus one vicious circle: Machines needed to produce power to produce machines.

The faces of these people whose government is seeking to industrialize are the faces of farmers, men and women who know only the plow, peasants who form the backbone of the country. Russian propaganda leveled at Tito charges that individual peasant farming still predominates in Yugoslavia, and the land is not yet completely nationalized. But Tito, who knows his fate is bound closely to the peasant, proceeds cautiously here.

Tito, like Stalin, also has a plan designed to streamline agriculture.

On farms like this one, while this still looks primitive, the idea is to introduce modern equipment and farming methods to land that often never before felt an iron plow. But pressure to socialize a large segment of the farm population and land has lapsed in the past year, so that today only about one-fourth of Yugoslavia's farmland has come under some form of cooperative, collective state management.

More faces—the faces of Yugoslavia's children, much like children anywhere in whose hands will lie the future of Communist Yugoslavia in the new, untraveled road it has cut out for itself.

With schools like this elementary school in Belgrade, Yugoslavia struggles to meet its youth's educational needs. At the same time it wrestles with the country's economic problems. This school, one of the best, handles 3,000 pupils—pupils from whom must come the future experts now so scarce and so necessary to Yugoslavia's economy, scientific development, and public life. Schooling is compulsory up to high school.

The state, too, in this communized land, has bold programs for the health of its citizens. This modern hospital in Belgrade renders free service to those who cannot pay. Typhoid, malaria, and TB take a high toll in a country that has only 4,000 doctors and needs 10,000.

And these faces? These are the faces of the people's rulers. As the Jones boys put it, "Lots of stuff in Yugoslavia was restricted and the weather was lousy for outdoor shooting, so we tried to concentrate on the political and government angle to show just how this Communist-type government runs."

See this for yourself in scenes never filmed by westerners before through the Jones brothers' cameras.

Yugoslavia's Government is modeled after the Soviet Union. However, the Communist workers' council such as you see meeting here is typically a Yugoslav Communist experiment. The idea—to give to men and women who run the machines in industry and operate the farms the responsibility for management and production.

The basic unit of local government is the people's committee. Every village and every few miles of city area has one. They function in the conspicuous shadow of Tito's giant-size portrait, now no longer inevitably flanked by Father Stalin's.

And now another NBC exclusive. You are looking at scenes no western cameramen have ever been permitted to shoot before. You are in the inner sanctum of the Federal Council—the House of Representatives of Yugoslavia's Congress. Here meet 405 delegates from the 6 republics, roughly analogous to our States, that go to make up the country.

And here are the heads of the Government, the 16 principal ministers—the men who actually do the ruling.

Speaking, Edward Kardelj, former school teacher, now Vice Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, intellectual and political architect of the state. He is called by many Tito's probable successor.

And finally the man whose daring has challenged the Soviet and astonished the world, the man whose determination that his country shall be master of its own fate and shape its destiny to something more than a Soviet satellite makes him, as someone said, the greatest single threat to world communism—Josip-Broz, commonly called Tito, really seven Titos—(1) marshal of the Yugoslav Army and its commander in chief; (2) Minister of National Defense; (3) secretary general of the Yugoslav Communist Party; (4) chairman of the party's central committee; (5) leader of the Yugoslav Politboro; (6) chief of the people's front; and (7) Prime Minister of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. Of this Tito, Ambassador Allen reports to us.

Hon. GEORGE ALLEN. Probably no single person on Joseph Stalin's purge list has as high a price on his head as Marshal Tito. Stalin would relish his liquidation with a deeper personal satisfaction than anybody else. Stalin has not yet ordered his satellite troops to march, and from this we may gain a very good lesson. That lesson is that determination and a sound military defense are very persuasive arguments these days in favor of peace.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Determined to help those standing up to Russia's ambitions to overrun the world, United States ships are now carrying to Yugoslavia cargoes of needed supplies such as no longer reach her from Russia and her satellites. In addition to sending food, we have loaned Yugoslavia $55,000,000.

We are also exporting information about the United States of America—truthful information about our country to counteract the previous untruthful propaganda about us. In Belgrade's America House American books, magazines, newspapers, phonograph records are finding an eager audience among young and, yes, among old.

But where American democracy is truly making friends and influencing people is through American observers who travel about the country to see if our food is really reaching the people.

Following one such observer with their cameras, the Jones brothers saw him warmly greeted in one of Yugoslavia's rural communities.

He is assisted by an interpreter. The Yugoslav Government provides gas for the jeep.

Here, the exchange of a cigarette—valued highly in an austerity-stricken country—does more for international understanding than a million treaties.

An American hand put in a Yugoslav hand and shaken in warm parting, speaks what is in our heart—America's desire to live in good will and friendship with all the world's peoples.

And who is to say this man and this jeep—America—is not helping peace to prevail?

And now, to close this third NBC Battle Report, Europe, back to our Ambassador to Yugoslavia, George Allen.

Hon. GEORGE ALLEN. One might expect, in the face of the mounting threat, to find the people of Yugoslavia worried and jittery, but the fact is that, while they are naturally concerned about the future, they are by no means jittery. Yugoslavians are a very realistic people, and today we find them quietly courageous and astonishingly determined. Those of us who are able to observe the situation here close at hand are convinced that insofar as the Yugoslavians are concerned, there is no danger at all of a Munich-type settlement here. The Yugoslavians will fight, no matter who the attacker might be nor in what form the attack comes. And the way the Yugoslavians can fight was demonstrated with deadly earnestness during their

fight against the Nazis. It is not for us to say that the Yugoslavians cannot be overcome. One thing, however, seems certain—anyone who undertakes to challenge this nation with arms will pay dearly for the offense.

Mr. BRINKLEY. If we would defend ourselves and the free world, one place we must be prepared to dig our foxholes is in the arctic snow. Since the potential enemy is closest to us over these north polar regions, here we must learn to live and fight. Under simulated combat conditions—as shown in these pictures—American troops and specially designed equipment are now being tested against the rigors of some of the bitterest climate on earth.

To our next guest, even the North Pole is no stranger. Norwegian-born, and once with its air force, he is now an American citizen. In the last war, he built the Army base on Greenland; later served with the Eighth Air Force and OSS in Scandinavia. Until January, he commanded the Tenth Rescue Squadron in Alaska. For an appraisal of the strategic arctic from a man who knows what he's talking about—here is the Air Force's arctic expert—Col. Bernt Balchen.

Col. BERNT BALCHEN. The old Mercator projection map of the world with its inhabited areas about in the center of the map, topped off at either end with the desolate, unproductive polar areas, is not applicable any more for our geographical conception of our world. It is also interesting to note that the large industrial and commercial centers—which in time of war would become the prime targets for the strategic air forces of the countries involved in an armed conflict—practically all are situated between latitudes 35° and 50° north.

Long range traffic between the commercial centers, or, if war should come, long range strategic missions between North America and possible targets in Soviet, will naturally take the shortest route—the great circle track.

The vertex of these air lanes all converge toward the North Pole and into the Arctic regions. Up till now we have had two large areas of our globe that have not been the place for large military strategic operations. These are the Arctic and the Antarctic regions. Having been considered of little or no commercial or strategic value and the logistical problems too difficult to tackle with the knowledge up till now.

As far as the Arctic regions are concerned, this is a thing of the past. The Arctic regions are located in the center of the big industrial and strategic target areas of our globe. One can say with justification that the Arctic from being one of our coldest areas has turned to become one of the "hot spots" of today and tomorrow.

This attracted attention is partly due to recent discoveries of natural resources, but overwhelmingly from its new increased military strategic importance.

In any future conflict, it is reasonable to assume that the arctic and subarctic regions might be the areas from which some of the first, and maybe decisive, aerial attacks would be initiated.

Three of our inhabited continents—North America, Europe, and Asia—meet at the ice-covered beaches of the Arctic Ocean, and the extreme northern parts of these continents are the arctic land areas.

The shortest routes—the great circle tracks—between a number of industrial centers and military bases in North America and the Soviet, particularly points in the Ural and Siberian industrial complexes, are all passing through the arctic regions and some of them nearly across the geographical North Pole.

This strategic problem is very convenient for the Air Forces' strategic bombing of industrial targets with modern types of high-efficiency projectiles. Wiping out the war production potential of an enemy should greatly reduce our loss and costs of any future war.

Our latest types of aircraft are well capable of performing these missions.

The low temperatures that would be encountered on these flights across the Arctic regions are no more severe than encountered in daily operations at high altitudes anywhere else on the globe.

On the whole, flights across the polar regions have no major problems with our electronic aids to polar navigation. High aircraft and engine efficiency and high proefficiency level of flight crews make this type of operations practically daily routine flights.

On a military mission across the polar regions, most of the track would be inside the Arctic Circle and, also, likely most of it over the Arctic Ocean. With the exception of the southern parts of the Arctic regions, it is very unlikely that any opposition in the form of antiaircraft, radar, and defensive fighters should be encountered. The unlikelihood of not encountering opposition on about two-thirds of the trip would give the crews a better opportunity to concentrate on navigation and flight problems. To quote Gen. H. H. Arnold: "If a world war III should come, the strategic center will be the North Pole."

To quote General Spaatz: "Across the Arctic, any industrial target (country) is within the reach of our Air Force. The United States is similarly exposed. We are really all open across the Arctic."

It is obvious, from the previous, that as we improve the range of our bombers or, looking at the peaceful aspect of the picture, the commercial long-range nonstop operations, for instance between the west coast of the States and India, the Near East or the east coast of the United States and China, would all cross the Arctic regions, and some of them very close to the pole.

With the progress of aviation, military or civil, ground installations all over the Arctic land areas are needed for efficient and safe conduct of these operations. A complete network of weather, radar stations, also some emergency landing fields, would be required. These installations would provide a permanent bulwark in the defense line of our continent.

Mr. BRINKLEY. The memory of our retreat to Hugnam will live long in many minds. Cold, snow, and sleet seemed to join with the enemy in one unholy conspiracy to bring death to those who dared to try to make it. The same tough conditions were faced by others all throughout the winter in Korea. Many men, there since the first day of the North Korean invasion in June, battled on without relief as the Communist tide poured down on the heels of the North wind.

Recently, the U. S. S. *Breckinridge* sailed into the Golden Gate of California with many who tested this unforgettable experience * * * the first Marines brought home under the Armed Forces new rotation plan. To tell you who were chosen to come, and how * * * as well as how it feels to be home again, here is one of the passengers on the *Breckinridge*—Maj. William W. Wright.

Maj. W. W. WRIGHT. Just a little over a week ago, I was one of a group of a thousand Marines listening to the cheers of thousands as we rode down Market Street in San Francisco. We were the first Marines to return to the States as a result of the recently-established Marine Corps' rotation plan. It was a mighty satisfying thing—that reception accorded us in San Francisco. Passing under the Golden Gate bridge is always a satisfying experience, but this time there was more to greet us than that beautiful piece of engineering.

When our ship, the U. S. S. *Breckinridge*, arrived in Frisco, each of us was given one of these cards which reads, "With pride and gratitude, San Francisco welcomes you, a fighting marine, home from the battlefront of Korea." Thousands of San Franciscans turned out to lend proof to that message of welcome. There was the band and welcoming committee at the dock, the motorcade through ticker-tape and cheers, and later, numerous parties and receptions, all adding up to a mighty warm welcome—a far cry from the cold of Korea. This reception plan was evidence to those of us who were aboard the *Breckinridge* was selected for rotation because of three things. The first group was selected for their long period in combat duty. Another group was selected because they had been awarded two Purple Hearts—evidence that they had been twice wounded in action. The third group, of which I was a member, was what the surgeons called cold weather cases—victims of the rugged winter weather which brought on an unprecedented number of cases of frostbite and respiratory troubles. * * * That Korean weather will long be a subject of discussion among military personnel. We learned a lot from it. As the officer in charge of keeping a battalion of the Seventh Marines supplied, I know first-hand of our attempts to meet the Korean winter head-on. Even before I was evacuated late in November, each marine in my outfit had been properly equipped with the latest available cold weather clothing. But in spite of our years of experimentation, and in spite of our extensive preparations for winter fighting in Korea, mother nature proved a pretty tough enemy to lick. * * * I know that reports circulated here in the States to the effect that, at one time, our Marines in North Korea were fighting in below-zero temperatures while still clad only in their summer uniforms. It is difficult to understand just how such rumors got started. * * * When the First Marine Division headed for Korea from California, we took with us complete supplies of cold weather clothing, and we had them on hand when the weather turned cold. Of course, at times, enemy action made the supply problem difficult, and some of the marines were temporarily without their winter gear. But by the time things really got rough, every marine in Korea was equipped with the best winter clothing we had developed up to that time. Right now the lessons we have learned in Korea are being evaluated, and new winter clothing is currently being developed. But a wonderful way to keep warm, I discovered, is to make that most welcome incoming trip through the Golden Gate.

Mr. BRINKLEY. And so—until we turn our cameras on the Nation again the week after next for another telecdocumentary—this, then, against the background of Battlefront Korea, is David Brinkley putting a period on your thirtieth battle report, Washington.

United States Lacks Aim in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following column of comment by Hanson W. Baldwin,

from the New York Times of Friday, April 13:

UNITED STATES LACKS AIM IN KOREA—NO EARLY END SEEN TO LIMITED WAR—AMERICAN PEOPLE BECOME MORE IMPATIENT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The controversy over General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has had at least one beneficial result; it has served to dramatize and define one of the basic problems we now face in the Orient—how to end the Korean War.

This problem is bound to become more acute as the weeks pass, as the American toll of casualties becomes bigger and bigger, and as no clear end to the fighting appears. Americans are an impatient people, as Lieut. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, General MacArthur's successor, has noted. They can take casualties when there is a clear and stated objective, but if no such objective is apparent their national impatience is certain to manifest itself.

Yet it is clear that, as of today, we have no clear-cut objective in Korea; there does not appear to be any quick political or military end in sight to the fighting; we have the bull by the tail and don't know how to let go.

The normal objective of military operations is to destroy the enemy's armed forces, or, as the Air Force would prefer to put it, to destroy the enemy nation's will and capacity to resist. Under present conditions neither is possible in Korea.

LIMITED WAR BEING FOUGHT

We are fighting a limited war there—a war limited geographically by the Yalu River on the Manchurian frontier and limited, in the amount of force we are willing to commit, approximately by the dimensions of the present army. We have had, since mid-January, our period of greatest success, as measured by our casualties as compared to the enemy's. Yet the United States alone has been suffering battle casualties in this period at the rate of about 1,900 weekly.

Our total battle casualties—now approximately 60,000 killed, wounded, prisoners, and missing since the Korean War started—probably would be swollen to considerably more than 100,000, if accidental casualties such as motor accidents and plane crashes, frostbite, disease, etc., were included. One hundred thousand total casualties in 9 months of war is a sizable price to pay for a limited conflict in which no decision against the two major aggressors in the Orient—Communist Russia and Communist China—is possible.

There is, moreover, no proof whatsoever that our objective since January 15, defined as "homicidal and not geographical," is really paying off in terms of weakening Communist China. It is certain that Red China is a nation under strain; it is probable that Peiping's preoccupation with the Korean fighting has diverted its attention from more vulnerable areas of possible Communist aggression in Asia.

RED CHINA NOW STRONGER

But a case can be made that Communist China is militarily stronger today than it was when it intervened in Korea last October. It has mobilized more manpower; Russian material aid has been increased and the Chinese Communist air force certainly is much stronger.

The administration, Britain and other of our United Nations allies have expressed the hope, which seems fatuous against our background of experience to date in Korea, that the enemy may be willing to negotiate and to end the Korean campaign.

It is entirely conceivable that Peiping and Moscow may indeed interpret the MacArthur removal as an invitation to negotiate, although it seems unlikely that any such attempt will be made until the enemy offensive, generally expected in two or three weeks, has run its course, and perhaps has driven us back south of the thirty-eighth parallel.

ROTATION SYSTEM STARTS

But even if the enemy achieves no decisive success in any new blows he may launch against us, any negotiations the Communists are willing to undertake will almost certainly be based on the old familiar formula, a place for Communist China in the United Nations and the surrender of Formosa to Peiping. If we accept such terms they can mean only an oriental Munich; not a prevention of general war, but merely a postponement of it, and at terms that will be extremely disadvantageous to us. Negotiations, therefore, do not appear hopeful at present.

Yet despite, or perhaps because of, the fact that no end is in sight in Korea, and in the face of an impending enemy offensive, the Army has started a rotation system for our soldiers there. The system will in a few weeks take 500 experienced and battle-hardened men a day away from the Eighth Army. In other words, the Eighth Army will be losing shortly the equivalent of virtually a division a month in trained fighting men, and these men will be replaced by green replacements from the States.

The men in Korea need rest, but the rotation system is still based on the faulty individual replacement basis that caused so much harm in World War II. It will mean, if it is carried out, the virtual disruption of some of our combat units in Korea, just as the point system tore apart our Army after the end of World War II.

It is clear, too, as spring and the season of intensified fighting comes in Korea that the United States and the United Nations powers that are fighting in Korea are deeply divided not only about Korea and what the course of action should be there, but about far-eastern policy in general.

General MacArthur's sudden replacement, therefore, is certain to dramatize the need for some definite answers to pressing questions.

Are we getting anywhere in Korea, or are we becoming more deeply mired in a strategic morass?

How can the Korean War be ended?

What should our foreign policy be in Asia?

These questions—and their answers—are the key to the great debate that took flame Wednesday when the American "proconsul" in Tokyo ended his military career.

The Late Joseph G. Pummill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the March 1951 issue of Missouri Schools by Forrest E. Wolverton, editor of the publication. The article, entitled "Mission Accomplished," is a worthy and merited tribute to a master teacher, a valuable citizen, a noble character, and an appreciative friend.

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

Down in Shannon County they closed the schoolhouse door on Joe Pummill for the last time. There were flowers and music and the Word.

It happened May 13, but the editor only recently learned of his passing. We had missed him around the department offices. We missed his broad, tall form, strong as the sturdy oaks that grew from his planting at JoLanta Springs. But most of all we missed the bright, sincere smile, warm as reflected sunshine from the southern slope of his native hills. It was a good smile. It had to be, because he kept it going through 45 years of school teaching.

Joe would be amused and a little embarrassed if he thought anyone was calling him a master teacher. Yet, in the editor's book he is so listed. Not because he was a scholar, as his long time membership in Phi Delta Kappa attested. Not because of his technical skill, which his professional degrees established. Important as these things are, they are not enough to make the teacher a master. Joe opened little minds, tightly closed by ignorance and superstition. He fanned faint sparks of ambition into sturdy flames of success. He handled spirited youngsters with a tight rein, but in the manner that the driver of thoroughbreds encourages and coaxes rather than restrains. He could "light a shuck" beneath the indolent, and love them none-the-less. He infected his pupils with his own joy in learning, and he shared his rich storehouse of knowledge with thousands of boys and girls. Joe listened when famous educators explained new systems of pedagogy, but it was he who went back home and directed the learning of the young.

Joe could put on a pair of scuffed shoes and strike out across fields and woods with some Ozark boy or girl, bent on a mission to convince Pop and Mom that high school wasn't "foolishment" for a "purt-nigh grown man or woman." He did. No one will ever know just how many bright boys and girls Joe found in dark hill cabins where environment was slowly stifling real talent, undiscovered and uncultivated. Nor can anyone know how many hours he spent sitting in hickory-bark chairs, around stone fireplaces, explaining to a suspicious parent just how high-school training could be the golden key that unlocks the door to success for talented youngsters. No one can really know, but in 45 years of trying there would have to be many. The editor can think offhand of a dozen successful professional people who owe their start to Joe's gentle pushing.

Joe's experience ran the gamut of positions in the teaching field. He was both a teacher and a State supervisor of rural schools; he was a high-school teacher, superintendent, and State supervisor of high schools. He was a statistician in the Jefferson City office of the State department of education, and he taught classes in college. He taught the children; he taught the children's teachers, then he went out and supervised these teachers on the job. He worked 19 years in one position; 25 years teaching with his wife, Atlanta. That's about all there is for a teacher to do.

The editor recalls that Joe was uncomfortable when he had to ask for special approval of substandard teachers. He was most professionally minded. Neither could Joe follow the easy philosophy of expediency. Rather than sign reports that he knew were inaccurate, he would prefer to give up his position. He did.

Joe loved life and knew how to enjoy it. Atlanta says that she cannot recall a day when he did not say it was great to be alive and he was so fortunate. He was almost never ill. His interests, avocationally, were many and varied. Old-timers recall that around the Ozark hard-ball loop Joe was a whiz. He supported school athletics with interest—but honesty. Active in church work and other community affairs, he was closing the annual drive for funds for the cancer society when the last bell rang for him. He liked to recognize individual worth when he found it. Among the papers in his desk administrators discovered a fine tribute to a long-time coworker, Mrs. Ida Seaman, of Eminence, who recently closed

more than 50 years of service to the public schools of this State.

Many years ago Joe an Lanta Pummill selected a quiet wooded plot near Eminence, long known to them, as the site for their dream home. Nine years ago they built a livable, modern house near the crest of a hill, beneath tall, sturdy trees and beside a friendly spring that gurgles around the clock. The house was built for gracious living and it was chinked with pleasant memories. Joe liked to show each convenience to old friends who dropped in, and he was hurt if the guest departed too soon. Complete with birdhouses, fish pool, and winding drives, they called it JoLanta Springs.

There can't be much of Joe in the Salem cemetery. He was too eager, too enthusiastic, to restless in life to remain inactive long. Possibly Joe is walking hill trails with discouraged Ozark boys and girls, offering an encouraging pat on the shoulder. He must be moving through hundreds of schoolrooms, where teachers are unconsciously following his retreating shadow. Could is be that Joe is ringing in a group of heavenly cherubs to a classroom they had to leave suddenly when they were called up? We don't mean to be sacrilegious but, knowing Joe, we can't help wondering.

We never learned what words they cut on his marker, but we are carrying around in our memory a line for Joe. Direct and sincere—as was his life. It goes like this:

Joe Pummill—Teacher—Mission Accomplished.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Truman is going to recall everyone in Korea who has expressed a strong dissent from the conduct of American foreign policies, who will be left to fight?

God or Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a part of a radio presentation delivered by Stella Terrill Mann on Christmas Day, 1950. The address follows:

GOD OR GOVERNMENT?

We come again to celebrating the traditional birthday of the Prince of Peace in a world at war. But there is hope. For never before in the history of man have there been so many people determined to make the world a better place for all men as there are today.

We are on the threshold of the possibilities of the blessings of the atomic age. To use atomic energy only for atomic bombs is about as intelligent as it would be to use electricity only for the electric chair. Our scientists and industrialists say all the other problems for a world of abundance, leisure and culture beyond belief have already been solved except the human relations problems. How to get each man to treat all men as brothers, how to get each man to use the creative spirit of God within him, and not hand over this privilege and responsibility to some one else, is the problem. That is all that stands between our threat of an atomic war today and an atomic age of peace and plenty tomorrow.

It all comes down to one question: Shall we the people look to God or to Government for a better world?

The people want peace. History shows us that governments which have total control of their citizens soon run them into debt and misery. It cannot be otherwise. For men who would control the lives of others are blinded by their own greed, egotism, and arrogance. They do not see that the methods which create abundance work only under freedom. To hide their failures they demand more powers, more taxes, build war machines, wage wars of aggression to steal what they failed to produce, the while promising a better world and permanent peace. It happened to Germany twice in our day, to Italy, to Japan, and is now happening to Russia. Surely not one American mother wants a war in Korea. Yet our Government, without ever declaring war, has taken us into war in Korea. I am sure the Russian people do not want war. It is the Russian Government that wants war.

We must conclude government cannot keep peace. For peace we must look to people, who look to God. For the individual who looks to God for help lives at peace with himself and has good will toward his fellowmen.

We the people want food, necessities, conveniences, and even the luxuries of life for all men. America has the highest standard of living in the world. This is not due to superior resources, land area, or manpower. Russia has more natural resources, the British Empire has more land; China, with one-fourth of the earth's population, has more manpower. America's wealth is the result of our peculiar form of government which always has until the last 20 years or so, left each man alone to find God and to work out his destiny with his own abilities, unhampered. Our motto was, "That governs best which governs least." Under it this country flourished.

America's free religion, science, art, literature, and industry produced abundance. The individual's freedom to criticize, investigate, fail, try again, improve, work as long as he cared to, produced as much as he desired, with a reasonable hope of extra reward for extra effort, is what made America prosperous.

This free Nation under God produced great men and brought genius to us from around the world, here to work freely. Individuals earned fortunes, set up industrial laboratories, built and endowed universities and experiment stations. These institutions perfected know-how that produced an economy of plenty. As for good, free men, asking questions of God, nature, learned to produce 10 bushels, a hundred bushels of wheat or corn where only a few bushels grew before.

But now, in our day, with this Nation under Government regulations we see men paid not to produce, food animals destroyed, food plowed under, burned, to keep up Government fixed, Government controlled, Government forced high prices. The Government's blue potato scandal cost the American people $500,000,000. Government's paper plans for a better world destroyed the increase God had given. Little men, presuming to know more than God, flung back God's plan for plenty in favor of their own human wisdom. Meanwhile, millions go hungry. Such crimes against nature will not go unpunished. We shall all suffer for it; those who committed the crime and we, the people—who permitted it.

Communist Russia, the world's supreme example of a totally governed people, is violently anti-God, believes only in government—in men, as means of a better world. Russia rants that the Western Powers are "materialistic." This makes a strong appeal to many idealists who do not think it through. For the fact remains that the total benefit to be derived from Russia's better world plan is a wholly materialistic one—more bread for more people. But she promises it only at the expense of all else. She demands that the individual give up his mental, physical, spiritual, social freedom. He is forced to become both liar and coward. He must deny God, himself and his brother man. He is robbed of life if his party superiors deem it necessary in order that the government plans might go through.

The Russian Government is breeding poverty and stagnation by cutting off plenty and growth at the fountainhead, the creative spirit which God planted in every man. Russia's leaders do not see that the purpose of life is not merely more bread but more of total livingness. Man does not live by bread alone, but by giving free outlet to all those qualities and abilities which make of him not only a man, but an individual man, different from all other men. When a free man works with God for his own benefit he develops himself by working without limitation, fear, or hate. When he succeeds, all the world benefits.

The evidence is all around us: Government cannot produce a higher standard of living. Government has no productive power. Government has only force of law, police powers, backed up by punishment, the ultimate of which is death. Unlimited production results only from unlimited thinking, unlimited effort, unlimited love of individuals who believe man is unlimited when he works under freedom and justice. For that, we must look to people who look to God.

To look to God for help is an old American custom. All of America's greatest men including Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln looked to God for help. America was settled by people who wanted less of government and more of God. Our republican form of government came out of the Bible. Benjamin Franklin reminded the disagreeing framers of our Constitution they needed guidance of God and moved that they have prayer every morning before the business session opened. His motion carried and from that day, the work went on smoothly.

George Washington Carver tells us he walked in the woods and fields asking questions of God. He said, "Anything will give up its secrets if you love it enough." The totalitarian government controlled experiment conceived in hate, born of fear, has neither time nor inclination for loving investigation.

Henry Ford did not look to government but to God for a personal fortune and a better world. He once said he kept a Bible in every room so he could always have one at hand wherever he sat down. We are not surprised to learn the announced purpose of the $238,000,000 Ford Foundation, largest in the world, is to help create a better world by studying problems of human relations and finding a way to end war.

The Christians are only one group of Americans who believe in looking to God for help. Desiring a better world for all men these Christians have as individuals sent billions of dollars around the world for schools, churches, hospitals, food, clothing, shelter. They have put the Bible into 1[illegible] languages and 50 nations.

Everywhere the people who believe in God are trying to stop governments, more men, from taking away rights and liberties of individuals. If governments succeed in further controls, civilization will go backward. We shall have war. Since it is a self-evident truth that all men are created equal, no

man should look to men for peace and progress, but to God. We cannot trust our welfare to human egotism, frailty, or lack of wisdom that ends in secret agreements and acts that we, the people, will have to pay for in taxes, freedom, and lives.

What we must have is a people's peace. When we get that all else will follow naturally. But we must first have peace before we can go forward, one world, under God. We can get that peace only by turning to God. For when we look to God we unify ourselves with the Creative Spirit of the universe. We work then with the Mind that created the world and man; with the Love that is mindful of man. He who made the ear, can He not hear? When we look to God we do not want to control or exploit our neighbor. Instead, we want to give him the greatest possible amount of freedom. When we look to God we free ourselves. When we look to government for help we enslave ourselves; we sell our birthright of freedom for a temporary mess of pottage. All over the world the people are awakening to this fact.

You and I, individuals, can put an end to Government dictatorships that lead to war, poverty, and misery. The individual who works with God cannot fail. Gandhi, one individual, whipped the British Empire with love and peaceful resistance. His faith moved mountains of opposition. He, an individual, opened the way for India's freedom.

If one man will today make up his mind that he will get behind the Russian iron curtain and tell the truth about freedom and America to the Russian people, it will be done. When he gets there, he will find God and the people waiting to welcome him. For one man and truth is mightier than the whole Russian Government and its lies. For good is not accomplished by "might nor by power but by my spirit, saith Jehovah."

God or government? How long shall we halt between two decisions? Let us this day begin a one-person campaign for a people's peace through love and prayer. Let each of us set aside 5 minutes of every day to pray for individual and world peace. Presently we shall see it go national, then world-wide, covering every minute of the 24 hours. We shall get peace, then a better world for all men. I have set 3 o'clock every afternoon as my time to turn to God. Will you join me, my friend?

Show-Down on Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Los Angeles Times of April 11, 1951, clearly points out the danger that confronts western reclamation in the fantastic central Arizona project bill now pending in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

THIS IS THE SHOW-DOWN ON WATER

This is the supreme moment in southern California's long struggle over the water of the Colorado River.

In Washington this week the final decisive events are shaping in the United States Senate and House of Representatives. At issue is the so-called $798,000,000 central Arizona project, around which revolves the entire great controversy over use of Colorado River water.

No longer can southern Californians shut their eyes to the danger that confronts them.

DECISION IMMINENT

The decision probably is to be made in the next few days.

And Arizona definitely is sweeping toward a political offensive of unprecedented ferocity, entirely unmindful of legal, moral, or financial considerations. The plain truth is that the apathy of California may result in a permanent crippling of the future of this State, unless there is an immediate awakening.

In its simplest terms the whole question has resolved itself into a startling combination of fanatical zeal on one side and sleepy indifference on the other. Arizonians have joined in a holy crusade to put over their objective. Most Californians don't even know what it is all about and are too bored to find out.

The awakening for residents of this area and, indeed, for the taxpayers of the whole United States is going to be cruel and bitter, indeed, if Arizona succeeds in its aims.

The central Arizona project is easily explained.

It is an attempt, by political pressure, to force through Congress a scheme so far-fetched and fabulously costly that many people literally have been unable to grasp its preposterousness.

ARIZONA'S PROPOSAL

Arizona is asking, in a bill known as S. 75, that more than 1,000,000 acre-feet (325,000,000,000 gallons) a year be diverted from the Colorado River at Parker Dam, be raised 1,000 feet by pump lift and be run through hundreds of miles of canals to the central Arizona section around Phoenix. The area is to be benefited consists of about 500,000 acres.

The Interior Department has estimated that the interest charges on the project would toal more than $2,000,000,000.

It admittedly is impossible for the relatively small population of central Arizona to pay the costs. These would have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United States.

Thus the project is not reclamation in the always-accepted sense that an area needing water contracts for it and pays back the costs in 40 or 50 years. Instead, it is straight subsidy out of the United States Treasury.

California always has paid her way in water projects, such as the Metropolitan Water District Aqueduct from the Colorado River.

Why should Arizonans be supported from the United States Treasury when Californians and all other westerners stand on their own feet and pay their bills in a regular business way?

This matter involves no question of the right to the water itself. Arizona may or may not have a legally sound claim to the 1,250,000 acre-feet of water in controversy. Only the Supreme Court can decide that issue.

But, regardless of whether Arizona or California owns the water, the present question is solely one of the attempt to provide for its use at a cost of more than $2,000,000,000.

And here is where Arizona's sheer political effrontery comes in.

Democratic Senator HAYDEN is chairman of the Rules Committee, Democratic Senator MCFARLAND is floor leader. They carry tremendous power.

JUSTICE FOR CALIFORNIA

California, on the other hand, has only justice and right on her side. Her contracts are threatened without benefit of a court decision; her water future is jeopardized by sheer political steam rolling. Her only recourse is to acquaint Senators and Representatives from other States with the truth and the financial facts.

It should be a powerful argument in New York or Pennsylvania or Illinois or Texas to know that the residents of those States and all the other States are going to have to pay more than $2,000,000,000 to support Arizona.

Of course Arizona needs the water. It is hard hit by drought. So is California. But the rules of common sense and fair play still have to prevail in both States.

Legally established contracts must be fulfilled. Normal standards of reclamation and business must be met.

California asks no more and will accept no less.

But the immediate political threat must be met in Congress with every weapon of truth and reason that can be mustered. The fight still can be won, if Californians will awake.

A Sorry Day in Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a part of an editorial which appeared in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel under date of April 11, 1951, and my response thereto:

A SORRY DAY IN INFAMY

President Truman has capped a career already replete with blunders with the most tragic blunder of them all in firing General MacArthur from his far-eastern commands.

Never was the tragedy of a small-minded county politician sitting at the head of the greatest Nation on earth more apparent. Never has executive infamy reached such a low. Never has it so endangered the future of the world.

The Pendergast machine product is showing his real colors as never before. President Truman should be impeached. The sooner Congress gets on with it the better.

To that end, the News-Sentinel today has wired Indiana's Senators and Representatives as follows:

"In the light of the shockingly tragic discharge of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, we urge the immediate impeachment of President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson. The honor of the United States before the anti-communistic world demands no less a step."

It is characteristic of the crudeness of a Chief Executive who would like to go around punching people's noses that General MacArthur, with 50 years of long and distinguished service as a soldier, received his first dismissal notice over the Armed Forces radio newscast.

Could it be that General MacArthur, by making forthright statements on the Asiatic situation of which he is an acknowledged authority, was deliberately forcing an intolerable situation to a head? Knowing the personal risks involved, did he invite recall or reprimand for the larger purpose of bringing the issue into clearer focus?

Whether so intending, General MacArthur, statesman, world policeman, and military leader, has brought this about, with backhanded cooperation from an inane President.

General MacArthur's recall is a great loss to Japan where he was revered as statesman and soldier. It will render an already explosive situation even more explosive. It will be hailed in the Fremlin as a great victory for the cause of communism. MacArthur has long been a symbol of the anti-Communist forces.

MacArthur's dismissal means that Dean Acheson is still in the saddle. Indeed the sickly conciliatory order of recall might well have been composed by the Secretary of State.

Japan is now understandably shaken in its confidence of the United States whose weak and vacillating position is evidenced by the Communist infiltration, if not open attack. Japan now becomes an inviting target for Communist infiltration, if not upon attack. The fine relationship between our country and Japan, built, by General MacArthur's genius as an occupying commander, has been imperiled by one mad stroke of the Truman pen.

General MacArthur is the victim of too many rear seat drivers. The mixed command in which he found himself was intolerable from the first. Unhappily he was expected to reconcile the American way with the UN way, an impossible task.

General MacArthur's stature gains in his dismissal. The American people are with him.

A Harry Truman firing a Douglas MacArthur, in the perspective of time, will approximate the effect of a Pekinese snapping at a St. Bernard.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN E. ROSS ADAIR, APRIL 12, 1951, ON PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

This is indeed a dark day in American history.

The President's peremptory dismissal of General MacArthur is deplorable. It has thoroughly aroused the American people. Their denunciation of our irresponsible and incompetent leadership is bitter. Many have urged impeachment proceedings.

All wonder what his next foolish step will be to jeopardize further our Nation's security.

Truman's impetuous demonstration of authority as Commander in Chief in removing General MacArthur amounts to capitulation to the demands of the Chinese Communists and the British Socialists in the Far East. Asia is in danger of being turned over to the aggressors. It could mean that we have sacrificed in vain the blood of 60,000 American soldiers to Truman-Acheson diplomacy. The sell-out to the Communists which was begun at Yalta and Tehran has now taken its next logical step.

General MacArthur guided our military forces to victory in the Pacific in World War II. He carried out the high ideals of our Nation in establishing the peace in Japan. After the President brashly plunged us into the Korean war, he relied upon MacArthur to lead the United Nations against the Communist aggressors. Now, he brusquely casts that trusted leader aside because he dared tell the truth about our blunders in Asia.

I have consistently attacked the foreign policies of this administration as being contrary to the best interests of our country. After this tragic demonstration, I am more than ever opposed to permitting the destiny of America to continue in the hands of diplomats of the Acheson-Hiss stripe.

Even though the President has dismissed General MacArthur from his post, that shall not stop our demands for a reversal of our foreign policy. To make this possible we must have the support of some members of the Democratic Party which is in control of Congress.

For the good of our Nation and in order to prevent further assumption of powers by the President, this must be done.

The battle to save our country and protect the freedom-loving nations of the world from aggressive totalitarianism must be won here. Continued irresponsible leadership can lose it.

Farm Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon be faced with the necessity for extending price and wage controls beyond their present expiration date of June 30, 1951. One of the questions sure to come up is what to do about fixing price ceilings on agricultural commodities. Some will want to continue the present policy of not allowing these ceilings to be placed below parity; others will want to do away with this restriction.

A teacher of vocational agriculture in my district has written me on the general subject of farm income, expenses, and profits. His letter presents the point of view of the small farmer, and he cites figures on the production of hogs, beef, and eggs, to substantiate his statement. I think the letter is worthy of consideration by all Members of Congress, and I take pleasure in inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEAR SIR: There is much talk today about regulating farm prices. As a teacher of vocational agriculture I have an opportunity to see the farmers' cost of production from many angles. I also find it hard to teach at the present time because of price uncertainties. The veterans that I teach seem to be wondering if their efforts toward expansion and becoming established on the farm may lead to failure.

I realize that it is next to impossible to see the farmer's situation all the way from Washington and to get the best qualified men to work on farm price controls. As the veterans and I see it price controls could do much more harm than good. It is hard to believe that price controls will work on anything but finished products.

The class and I have endeavored to work up the basic commodities in our community in order to give you a clearer picture of what we farmers are up against. I find that many farmers do not realize what their cost of production is, and as a result produce that commodity at a loss. As a result the market price is lowered still more. Maybe our education program for farmers has failed to get results, or maybe the educators aren't going about the job the right way. What a farmer needs to know is what it is costing him per pound, dozen, bushel, or hundredweight to produce that certain commodity. This information is difficult to find written in farmer language, or even in teacher language.

The enclosed figures have been figured on the high side instead of the low side. The average farmer would not make that much profit on the particular commodity. Cotton and beef cattle have not been figured due to such a great variation in production per acre. As for cotton it will cost the farmer between 20 and 30 cents per pound to produce a pound of cotton. If a farmer clears $35 per acre he is doing good. Beef cattle is the rich man's enterprise. The large cattleman is where he is today because he inherited the money or business, he is an oil man, or he has been in the business many years and has seen many hard times. The veterans that I teach aren't in this class. They are struggling trying to get established.

It is hoped that this bit of information will help you see the picture as we farmers see it. As long as there is no shortage of food and basic items why control prices? If necessary we can send you the middle man's mark-up on farm commodities. I am sure that you realize this though.

Yours truly, ——— ———.

Hog production

[Feeding 200 head of hogs to 225 pounds market weight]

Expenses:	
Cost of feeder pigs $7 each	$1,400
Cost of feed:	
Corn $4 per hundred, 750 pounds per hog	600
Supplement $6.75 per hundred, 80 pounds per hog	1,080
Supplies and vaccine	200
Depreciation on equipment	10
Cost of production, not including labor or gasoline	3,690
Income: 200 head of hogs at 22 cents per pound	3,900
Profit, not including labor or gasoline	1,210
Profit per hog	6.05
Profit per day	6.72

Beef production

[Feeding 50 head of beef steers, starting weight 250 pounds, for 120 days]

Expenses:	
Cost of steers (250 pounds each)	$4,375
Cost of feed:	
Concentrates, 1,440 pounds at $4.75 per hundred	3,420
Hay, 18 tons at $30 per ton	540
Supplies and vaccine	100
Cost, not including labor or gasoline	8,435
Income: 50 steers, weight 490 pounds, at 35 cents per pound	8,575
Profit, not including labor or gasoline	140
Profit per head	2.80
Profit per day	1.16

The capital investment is what keeps most veterans and beginning farmers out of the business.

Egg production

[For a 500-hen flock with 175-egg average per hen]

Expenses:	
Cost of chicks at 1-day old, 40 cents each	$200.00
Cost of feed up to laying, $1.50 per bird	750.00
Cost of feed for 1 year's lay:	
Grain, $3 per hundred	600.00
Mash, $5 per hundred	1,100.00
Medication and supplies	100.00
Depreciation on building and equipment	40.00
Electricity, $2 per month	24.00
Cost of production not including labor or gasoline	2,826.00
Income:	
400 layers housed, with 175 eggs per hen, 5,833 dozen at 40 cents	2,333.20
Sale of old birds, $1 each	400.00
Total income	2,733.20
Net loss not including labor or gasoline	92.80

To make a profit today on eggs, the egg average per hen must be at least 200 eggs. Many egg producers don't get that many eggs.

McCarthyism Is Good for Acheson's Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it was just about a year ago that the administration was in the white heat of perhaps its greatest effort in moving heaven and earth to prevent the exposure of the Soviet dictated Tehran-Yalta-Potsdam line it had been following in far-eastern policy for several years that finally resulted in the loss of China to the free world.

Against an avalanche of opposition, Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, pressed for an investigation which, of course, the Tydings committee never really conducted.

Following is speech of Alfred Kohlberg given April 3, 1951, at the Lost Battalion Hall, Queens, New York City, which I wish to include in my remarks:

MCCARTHYISM AND KOREA

(By Alfred Kohlberg)

Recently, before a panel of the American Civil Liberties Union in Washington, Senator LEHMAN said:

"The black evil of McCarthyism has captured the imagination of the American people."

That's the most encouraging statement I've heard out of Senator LEHMAN since way back when he backslid from Wall Street and landed way down in the New Deal.

What is McCarthyism?

Very simply put, it consists of exposing disloyalty, dishonesty, and actual treason in Government, and demanding something be done about it, now, before it's too late.

McCarthyism is a very old American custom. It is an age-old American determination to get rid of traitors and grafters and disloyal servants.

You all remember the fall of France to Hitler, in just 6 weeks of June and July of 1940. You remember how it became known that a Nazi fifth column and a Communist fifth column, working together under the Hitler-Stalin pact, had undermined the French Army and Air Force. Even the Minister for Air was suspected of being a member of the Communist conspiracy. The French cried: "Nous sommes trahui" (We are betrayed.) But it was too late.

France had had a McCarthy. His name was de Kerillis. But they would not listen.

You all remember how Czechoslovakia was seized from within in 2 days of 1948. After it was over, Foreign Minister Fierlinger and other high officials revealed that they had been secret Communists all the time. Czechoslovakia fell for lack of a McCarthy in time.

When suspicion pointed to Gen. George Washington's close friend and favorite officer, Gen. Benedict Arnold, he said nothing about "red herrings" or "not turning his back," but had him watched and broke up the conspiracy. Just a little early-American McCarthyism.

During World War I President Woodrow Wilson said:

"We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. Honesty and competence need no shield of secrecy."

Let me repeat that: "Honesty and competence"—and, I might add, loyalty to one's country—"need no shield of secrecy." Sounds just like JOE MCCARTHY; doesn't it?

Shortly after Wilson's death, during the moral let-down with which we seem to indulge ourselves after each war, two Democratic Senators charged corruption in the Teapot Dome leases. Anticipating Democratic President Truman and Attorney General McGrath, 36 years later, Republican Attorney General Dougherty called it a "red herring" and refused to open the files. But Republican President Coolidge, in the American tradition, fired the Attorney General and opened the files. As a result his Secretary of the Interior and several others went to jail. McCarthyism triumphed.

We badly needed some good old American McCarthyism when the Reds and pinkoes in the State Department were making the deals at Moscow, and Tehran, and Quebec, and Yalta, and Potsdam, that sold out Poland and Yugoslavia and all Eastern Europe, and China, too.

We suffered from lack of some active McCarthyism when Alger Hiss was put in charge of organizing the UN and being its first Secretary General, and when he sat behind President Roosevelt's chair at Yalta. Also when he was Dean Acheson's right-hand man in firing the anti-Reds out of the State Department in 1944 and 1945, as testified to under oath by Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle.

There should have been a little sample of McCarthyism back in 1942, when Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson cleared Nathan Gregory Silvermaster for access to top secrets, over the objections of Major General Strong, head of Army Intelligence.

And, when General Eisenhower ordered General Patton to stop 30 miles from Prague, and General Keating 30 miles from Berlin, so the slowpoke Russians could have both prizes. And then ordered our troops to draw back from Jachimov in Czechoslovakia, and from Thuringia and Saxony, in Germany.

Only later we began to learn that the Erzegebirge area lies in Jachimov and Thuringia and Saxony. And it's from the Erzegebirge that Russia is now getting its uranium. Maybe when the atom bombs fall, we'll realize just how sad it was that JOE MCCARTHY was flying in the Marine Air Force in the Pacific at that time, instead of raising hell in Washington.

We needed a MCCARTHY when Lauchlin Currie, secretary to President Truman, countermanded the order from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to General Eisenhower, to send surrendered German arms and ammunition to Chiang Kai-shek. It was all destroyed, instead.

And, MCCARTHY was still in the Pacific when somebody ordered destruction of all the Chinese lend-lease ammunition at the end of the war. The Army admits the destruction, but we don't know who ordered it.

When Henry Wallace went to China in 1944 with three famous pro-Reds, Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent, and John Hazard, he secretly reported to President Roosevelt, but his secret reports were omitted from the famous China white paper. Senator HERBERT O'CONOR, of Maryland, got one of them from Mr. Wallace, and made it public. It's refrain was "Chiang must go." O'CONOR having accomplished that much, we now turn to MCCARTHY to find the Guru behind Henry Wallace that time.

That mention of John Carter Vincent, brings to mind his recent demotion from Minister to Switzerland, to be Consul-General in the dirty little North African town of Tangier. The Washington scuttle-butt on this strange proceeding is that Vincent was caught leaking secret information to the Soviets; that prosecution was demanded by Gen. Bedell Smith, but that the State Department prevailed on him to be satisfied with Vincent's demotion. Then General Smith is supposed to have come into possession of a letter from Secretary Acheson to Vincent saying he had done all he could to protect him, but this demotion was the best he could do. I don't know whether this story is true, or not. If Americans are to have any faith at all in their State Department, and if Vincent and Acheson are to be cleared, nothing but the most thorough McCarthyism, and exposure of all pertinent facts, can bring that about.

Going back to China, who planned the Marshall mission to make Chiang take the commies into his government? Maybe, considering how many Communists we have in ours, it all seemed perfectly fair to General Marshall at the time.

And, who wrote the Truman message of December 15, 1945, saying: "No aid to China unless the Communists are taken in?" And, who induced General Marshall to put an airtight embargo on all arms and ammunition to Chiang Kai-shek all during 1946, 1947, and 1948—the crucial years? General Marshall, referring to the embargo, is reported to have said: "As Chief of Staff, I armed over 30 Chinese divisions. By a stroke of the pen I have disarmed them."

And, who, just last year, put the ORO, the Operations Research Office of the Department of the Army, under the School of International Studies of John Hopkins University? The ORO is the super-secret research outfit that evaluates the effectiveness of weapons and has first access to all super-secret weapon developments. And, guess who is head of that Hopkins School of International Studies—none other than Owen Lattimore. That was only last year. You seem to have missed out on that one, Senator. Maybe, you cannot cover the whole waterfront. Maybe, we badly need more JOE MCCARTHYS.

I could go on with instances like this all evening, but I'm supposed to talk about China and Korea.

Korea is only a little peninsula that hangs down from Manchuria, which is a part of China. And the story of China cries aloud for some McCarthyism, and also more MacArthurism.

At the end of World War II, America counted 108,000 dead and 350,000 wounded in the Pacific. But we were unconditionally victorious, and the victory was ours, alone. The British and Anzacs had only token forces. The Russians came in only for the last 5 days, to grab what they could. The Chinese fought for 8 years, and suffered fantastic losses, but theirs was mainly a holding action.

The victory was ours. And every one of the billion people of Asia understood it perfectly, even if the American State Department didn't.

Shortly after VJ-day our supreme commander forwarded a report to the War Department, evaluating the armed forces in China. He reported the Chinese Communists had between 125,000 and 250,000 guerrilla troops, badly armed. Under his command were 4,000,000 Chinese regulars, and the American-Chinese Air Force.

He proposed that, with Chinese Government agreement, America guarantee the personal safety of the Communist leaders, and their right to participate as a legal political party in free elections under American supervision, after peace was restored. For this, they were to lay down their arms. If the Communists refused to agree, he proposed that he surround and disarm them by force. Dozens of officials of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, and OSS saw that report. Our commander's proposal was exactly in accordance with the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms, for which we claimed to be fighting.

Decision on this report was postponed. The next month, Ambassador Pat Hurley returned, and resigned, for reasons never made public.

General Marshall was appointed, and on December 11 sat down with Dean Acheson to write out the instructions President Truman was to give him. According to the general's testimony, the rough draft was sent over to this same John Carter Vincent to be polished up. The instructions were the exact opposite of the Supreme Commander's recommendations. They demanded practical control of the Government of China by the Communists, without an election, and while they kept their army.

Right there, a good dose of McCarthyism was needed to find out who overruled the plan to prevent a civil war in China. Was he the same man who now has turned that Chinese civil war that didn't need to happen into a Chinese-American war? And, is he the same man who now ties General MacArthur's hand, so that he may not bomb Manchuria, and so he may not use the troops of Chiang Kai-shek, either in Korea or to establish a second front in China, and who orders the Seventh Fleet to protect the coast of Red China so the oil and cotton and steel and copper and tools and ammunition may flow in to kill our sons in Korea? Just last week, the new commander of the Seventh Fleet, Vice Adm. Harold M. Martin, stated that it was his duty to protect the coast of Red China.

Ever since that December 11, 1945, President Truman, Dean Acheson, and General Marshall have been jointly and separately in complete control of our China policy. The blame, or the credit, for everything from the civil war that didn't need to happen in China to the 60,000 American casualties in the present United Nations civil war in Korea is entirely theirs.

If, like the French, we are not some day to cry out when it is too late, "We are betrayed," then we must have scores of Joe McCarthys in the Senate and a George Washington, or Woodrow Wilson, or Cal Coolidge in the White House to open up the files. We, the people, are the rulers of America. Who are these hired servants who say we may not check on the way they are running and have run our affairs?

We need a million little McCarthys, like you and me, to demand a clean-up that's long overdue, to dig out the facts, to exonerate the innocent, to convict the Soviet agents, and to fire their dupes. Senator, is this a private fight, or can we all get in it, too?

You all know that sometimes in the fall you hear the scurrying of little feet in the walls and attic and find signs of mice in the garret. You may not see any mice to point at, but you know they are there, and you set the traps or call in the exterminators.

The sign of mice or rats are apparent all over our national structure. Due to congressional pressure, a couple of the rats named by Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley were finally convicted, 11 years too late. But more than 30 others named by Chambers and Bentley have not even been arrested and are going about their regular business. And their regular business is bad business for us.

Just one illustration of what they put over is Gen. Omar Bradley's statement of no aid to Chiang Kai-shek. He says if we arm Chiang's forces and land them on the beaches they'll go right over to the Communists. Here is General Bradley, a good American, with no personal knowledge of China, being hoodwinked into a complete Communist-line statement. The facts are simple, and his own Intelligence Department must have them, but somebody is keeping them from him.

The facts are that all but a few thousand local volunteers of Chiang's 700,000 troops on Formosa are mainland boys. They fought their way, short of arms, and practically without ammunition, to coastal ports in 1949, when the Nationalists were overwhelmed. I saw some of these men being landed when I was in Formosa in July 1949. Wounded, sick, defeated, in rags, they had fought their way out. Yet, somebody makes General Bradley believe that they would go over to the Communists now. Because of this theory, we won't let any anti-Communist Chinese fight on our side. It looks like a very exclusive war out there—for Americans only.

While we wait and do nothing, the rats are double-crossing our sons fighting in Korea; they are double-crossing the only native anti-Communist armed force in all East Asia—the 700,000 men and 2,000,000 guerrillas of Chiang Kai-shek. And they are preparing a slow-appeasement deal in the UN, while they tie General MacArthur's hands behind him, and now gag him besides.

It's high time to set plenty of traps and also to call in that famous firm of rat exterminators, the Messrs. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and company.

Who Is Responsible for Our Far-Eastern Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the question has been properly raised as to who is actually responsible for our far-eastern policy. Time and again it has been apparent that some of our supposed allies have shown a desire to appease Red China. In many instances it has gone beyond appeasement and taken on the aspect of actual help. Recognition of Red China by Great Britain, the shipment of strategic material, even the sending of jet engines to Russia, and many other acts of similar character by nations members of the United Nations have made our war in Korea more difficult, is undisputed. Thus, the question naturally arises to what extent has foreign influence brought about a willingness upon the part of our administration to participate in the appeasement policy toward Red China.

Two editorials appearing today in the News, Washington, D. C., shed some light on this important question I include them as a part of my remarks in accordance with the unanimous consent granted to me. They read as follows:

LONDON-MADE POLICIES

Two basic issues were involved in the controversy which led to President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur:

1. The restrictions which compelled the general to conduct a war of limited operations against Red China.

2. The relative importance of Asia in the conflict with communism.

Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway is a thoroughly capable officer. But his Korean command wears the same handcuffs that chafed General MacArthur.

The President is gambling on the assumption that peace can be achieved by letting the Chinese Reds off with an easy war. The politicians in Washington, London, and New Delhi are to have their inning before further consideration is given to the question of pushing the war to a successful military conclusion.

Meanwhile, Mr. Truman is risking fearful odds in not reinforcing our troops to meet the enemy's spring offensive, if pending peace proposals fail. A bad guess could lead to a military catastrophe. Adequate insurance should be taken so that our forces are not caught in a trap.

The issue between General MacArthur and the State Department on our policy in Asia involves the security of the United States in a much larger field.

In making the original decision to resist the Red attack in South Korea, President Truman apparently intended to extend the Atlantic Pact doctrine to the Pacific area by drawing a line against Communist aggression everywhere. The United Nations supported that position when it adopted military sanctions against the invading Communists.

The British Foreign Office, however, persuaded the State Department to scrap that policy in favor of one of appeasement the moment Red China entered the war.

Britain traditionally has regarded Asia as a field for commercial exploitation, and has relatively little concern for the welfare of the Asiatic peoples. Against that background it is understandable why an impoverished Britain, now governed by a Pacifist-Socialist regime, should adopt a one-ocean defense program in the search for a cheap and limited security. But how can any American statesman or military leader defend such a strategic concept for a country which has both Pacific and Atlantic coasts?

General MacArthur raised this question again and again without getting a satisfactory answer.

Three years ago, Secretary of State Acheson dismissed the idea of a Pacific defense pact as "premature." Since that time the State Department has accepted the Downing Street thesis that Europe should have first priority in all measures adopted to contain communism, despite the fact that it was in Asia where we first became involved in World War II. And despite the fact that we are now engaged in a shooting war in Asia.

Britain has lost most of her great Indian Empire, so today is willing to trade Formosa to the Reds in the hope of buying immunity for her crown colony at Hong Kong. In General MacArthur's view—and who knows the Pacific area better?—Formosa is as important to us as France when American security is considered. The Japanese used Formosa as the springboard for their attack on the Philippines, and Formosa could serve the same purpose for the Reds. American policy should not be made in London on this matter.

In the present discussion of a Japanese peace settlement, the British want to impose restrictions upon Japanese shipping, because the two countries are competitors in that field. Again, however, American interests are in the other direction, for we are underwriting the Japanese economy until it can become self-sustaining.

These considerations would suggest that the British attitude toward General MacArthur was not due solely to differences of opinion with respect to the Korean War.

And now who is left to speak up for American interests?

THEY KNOW THEIR STUFF

It is interesting that the State Department saw fit to inform the Indian Embassy in Washington of General MacArthur's dismissal a full hour before the news was released to the American public.

Mme. Pandit, India's Ambassador to this country, disclosed that—not without a note of pride. She told a radio interviewer that the news was conveyed to me at midnight. Americans could wait.

The anti-MacArthur State Department knew, of course, that Socialist Prime Minister Nehru's India would be delighted with the advance tip.

Nehru's country has been consistently on the side of Red China, whose forces are

fighting the MacArthur-led American troops in Korea. India looks upon General MacArthur as the bogeyman of western imperialism. And only the other day Nehru, out of his vast knowledge of such matters, said it was a mistake to let military commanders make policy statements. Meaning, General MacArthur ought to be kicked out.

We wonder whether the busy little beavers of the State Department were equally prompt in phoning the Free China Embassy. It's doubtful. There wouldn't be any chance of mutual congratulations in that quarter.

Correcting an Injustice to Fred Searls, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, recently Representative ENGLE, a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, criticized Mr. Fred Searls, Jr., in connection with his services as assistant to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization.

As Mr. Searls was never given the opportunity to be heard by the committee, I am including in my remarks copy of letter directed by Mr. Searls to the Honorable JOHN R. MURDOCK, chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and a letter from Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, former War Mobilization Director, under whom Mr. Searls served. It appears to me that an injustice has been done a man who has served his country unselfishly, patriotically and well, and I want the record to show it. The letters follow:

NEWMONT MINING CORP.,
New York, N. Y., April 6, 1951.

Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. CHAIRMAN: Current daily papers of New York and Washington have carried statements that Representative ENGLE of your committee has called for my resignation or at least attributed my recent resignation as Assistant to the Director of Defense Mobilization to improper conduct in my position. I understand that it is charged that I have used my position to benefit the Newmont Mining Corp. of which I am president, while opposing proposed subsidies under the Defense Act to other mining companies or individuals.

Inasmuch as your committee had requested me to testify today in respect to those matters, I had expected to use the opportunity to refute such charges and to defend my views. Since you have now canceled the hearing, and left me no opportunity to defend myself, I am using this letter as a means of doing so and respectfully request that you make it a part of the permanent public record of the committee.

At the request of Mr. Wilson and General Clay, who is a friend of mine from the last war, I entered the service of the Office of Defense Mobilization on December 27, 1950.

Prior to entering the service, I advised Mr. Wilson and General Clay that the only possible reason I could think of for not complying with their request, was that I understood that the Magma Copper Co., in which Newmont owned at that time and still owns a share interest of about 22 percent, had been requested by the Defense Minerals Administration to equip its San Manuel property; and that a negotiation was being had, with which, however, I had had no contact or connection. I also explained that I had never been an officer or director of Magma Copper Co. Mr. Wilson and General Clay stated they could see no objection to my aiding them in the capacity of an adviser on materials. I have had no contact of any kind with such negotiations in Washington, New York, or elsewhere.

General Clay further explained that I would probably not have any direct responsibility or connection with the negotiations for expanding domestic mineral production, anyway, because under the set-up and regulations, these matters would be in the hands of DMA, unless some dispute arose or some question requiring Mr. Wilson's attention was brought up. I have had no connection or even discussion regarding the various projects for expansion of domestic mineral production, except to deliver to Mr. Boyd and Mr. Larson—on one occasion—an expression of anxiety on the part of Mr. Wilson that the aluminum expansion contracts were not proceeding fast enough.

I have, as a result of experience in the last war, been opposed to subsidies being paid to marginal mines and undeveloped prospects during the periods of full employment, believing that the desired end is not accomplished by these measures. My testimony before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has apparently been made available to Mr. ENGLE, sets forth the loss in total nonferrous production which occurred during the last period of subsidies.

The desired end could be very much better accomplished by minor changes in the tax laws to permit "expensing" of exploration development by mining companies, and in the case of small mines and small deposits, to permit an easy write-off of losses incurred by owners or participants in development when efforts to develop and operate incur losses. In this connection the recommendations of the American Mining Congress should be given serious consideration.

While in Washington I wrote a letter to Mr. Harrison, of the DPA, and discussed with Mr. Boyd, of the DMA, these ideas. Neither of them agreed with me to the point of believing that subsidies to domestic marginal mines and prospects could be avoided. Whereupon I dropped the matter, except that I also tried to explain my position in this respect to the Senate Committee on Internal and Insular Affairs on February 13.

I resigned from the Office of Defense Mobilization because the business of my company required my constant presence. My resignation was before, and not because of, the criticism of your committee.

I have cleared the above statements with Gen. Lucius D. Clay, who authorizes me to state that he will confirm them to the committee if requested.

Mr. ENGLE is also quoted as having lifted out of its context a sentence in my testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to the effect that "any type of subsidy for the mining industry is objectionable." I think it is. I also think all controls are objectionable. But that does not mean that we do not have to have some forms of both in wartime. The testimony as a whole, however (cf. pp. 258, 279 et seq. of the record), recognizes that the Government must accord some sort of financial aid to concerns who are required to alter normal plans and procedure in favor of expedited expansion of facilities and production required to meet wartime needs.

What I fear, and am on record as opposing, is the sudden revival and reopening during a period of short labor supply, of hundreds of marginal mines and prospects. Such projects are too likely to be affected by the fact that "The squeaky wheel gets the grease," with the inevitable result that the more marginal the mine, the bigger the subsidy and the smaller the production. With a fairly constant mine labor supply, there could be a serious drop in production, as bad or worse than in 1944 to 1946.

In conclusion, permit me to ask that you give me the break of believing that I have at all times endeavored to give the Government, honestly and sincerely, the benefit (or detriment if that is the opinion of the committee) of my views on the subject under discussion. I yield to no one in my desire and in the somewhat successful efforts of my company to increase mineral production. We are all Americans and we are in trouble. Congressional committees should not be so ready to impugn the integrity of experienced and willing contributors to the defense effort as to make it impossible to attract them.

I believe that the country's interest will be best served if the Congress will pass a law which will lay down the procedure to be followed, rather than to leave it permissive, and subject to debate amongst the interested agencies. I would like to persuade the committee to go the tax change route, but I pledge myself and our company to follow, as we always have, the legislation that is finally passed.

I append my record of Government service.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SEARLS, Jr.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE OF FRED SEARLS, JR.

September 1940–November 1941: British Purchasing Commission.

November 1941–April 1942: Civilian consultant, Ammunition Division, Ordnance.

April–October 1942: Executive Assistant to Deputy Administrator, War Shipping Administration.

October 1942–February 1943: Director of Facilities Bureau, War Production Board.

February 1942–February 1943: member, Planning Committee, War Production Board.

February–June 1943: Executive Assistant to Deputy Administrator, War Shipping Administration.

June 1943–May 1944: Assistant to Director, Office of War Mobilization.

November 1944: Strategic-bombing survey inspection of European targets.

December 1944 to about October 1945: Assistant to Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

October 1945–November 1946: Special Assistant to the Secretary of State.

March–October 1946: President's Evaluation Commission, Atomic Bomb Tests.

March 1946–January 1947: United States delegation to the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy.

December 1947–January 1948: Ruhr survey for General Clay.

March 1948: National Security Resources Board.

December 1948: German-war-potential report.

December 1950–March 7, 1951: Office of Defense Mobilization.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbia, April 11, 1951.

Hon. JAMES P. RICHARDS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DICK: Fred Searls, Jr., president of Newmont Mining Corp., served in my office during the war while I was Director of War Mobilization.

He is one of the finest characters I have ever known. He served as my representative with the representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and in many other capacities. When I became Secretary of State, he again helped me in my efforts to negotiate for bases in foreign countries.

Recently, Representative ENGLE, a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs criticized Mr. Searls in connection with his service as assistant to Charles E. Wilson. Searls has written to Chairman MURDOCK a letter, copy of which is enclosed. Because a meeting at which Searls was to testify was canceled and he has had no opportunity to defend himself against the criticism of Congressman ENGLE, he has requested me to have some friend in the House insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I should appreciate it if you would do this.

My experience with Searls causes me to say that I will vouch for the truthfulness of any statement he makes in this or in any other communication. Furthermore, I know that while serving various agencies during World War II, he frequently advocated policies he believed advantageous to the Government when it was against his financial interest. He is one man who always places the interest of his country above his personal interest.

With best wishes to you.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many Members who were seeking recognition, among them many who had not heretofore had an opportunity to express themselves in regard to the provisions of the bill under consideration, and since my position on this legislation is so well known that I have yielded to my colleagues who have just come to the Congress.

However, Mr. Speaker, I might reiterate, just for the record at this time that, since I have been a Member of Congress I have consistently worked for the building up of the national defense of our country, and especially have I supported universal military training.

Universal military training was a part of the original bill when introduced, and I am sorry to say that while I do not agree to the "watered down" provisions of the bill under the amendments presented, this provision is better than no provision at all for universal military training.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that when legislation was reported out of the Armed Services Committee some years ago I was the only member who introduced discharge petitions to force the Rules Committee to report out these bills for consideration by the Congress.

It will be recalled that I introduced a discharge petition on the bill by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], as also I introduced a discharge petition on the legislation on the bill by the distinguished Member from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

Unfortunately, neither of the bills above referred to were ever dislodged from the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, with full respect for the members of the Rules Committee, I feel that they were sincere in their position; however, I feel that a great mistake was made which is borne out by the situation which we face today.

Communist Daily Worker Cheers the Firing of MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, April 11, 1951, was a great day for the Communists. With tremendous jubilation they shouted their delight in the elimination of their most formidable opponent in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The Communist Daily Worker, quickly able to recognize the discharge of MacArthur as the abject act of appeasement that it was, shouted in the largest size type available "Now End the War." Not since Neville Chamberlain returned from Munich proclaiming "peace in our time" has the world been witness to such a disgraceful abandonment of the hopes of millions of people for liberation from their tyranny.

I include herewith articles which appeared in the Communist Daily Worker of April 12, 1951:

NOW END THE WAR

A tremendous feeling of gratification will be felt all over the Nation today that the war-hungry General MacArthur who called openly for world war III has been fired by the Government.

With the firing of this arrogant militarist, the peace camp of the world has won an important gain which opens up very great opportunities to advance the cause of peace.

MacArthur is out.

Now the war in Korea must be ditched as well.

The men who pushed the United States into the suicidal invasion of Korea in June 1950 betrayed the Nation. They are responsible for the 60,000 American casualties, and the more than 1,000,000 Korean dead and wounded men, women, and children.

If it was a betrayal of America to start the war against Korea, it is equally a betrayal to continue it another single day, with all its horror, devastation, and useless massacre of innocent people.

In firing MacArthur, President Truman has not ordered General Ridgway to cease the bloodletting. On the contrary, General Ridgway has just announced that he wants more war in Korea, that it "cannot be called off like a baseball game." He has also announced that he looks toward a world war with the socialist states of which the Korean slaughter was merely "the first round."

All Americans who rejoice today that the war incendiary MacArthur is out owe it to themselves to put enormous public pressure on the Government to negotiate for peace in Asia with China, and for peace in Europe with the Soviet Union.

It was Truman who gave MacArthur his orders for war in Korea; it was Truman who ordered the seizure of Chinese Taiwan (Formosa). It is Truman and Eisenhower who will seek the rearming of the Nazi war leaders in West Germany. These dangers still face America. In fact, under the inevitable howl of rage from the Taft-Hearst-MacArthur forces against the Government, President Truman now will seek to prove to those groups that the basic Washington-Wall Street program for "war against communism" on a world scale is not only unchanged but will be pressed more than ever.

Why did MacArthur have to go? Because he was embarrassing the Government before the world with his open demands for starting world war III immediately in Asia.

The Government's plan for world domination rests on the rearming of German Fascist war power, with Europe as the planned main battlefield. MacArthur would not accept this variant of the basic strategy.

By revealing the Government's goal to a world war, MacArthur was exposing the Truman government before the world. The Atlantic Pact was beginning to burst at the seams as Britain and France saw MacArthur pushing them into a vast colonial war against all of Asia.

The British and French capitalist classes know they cannot win such a war against all of Asia; they know they could not persuade the people of Western Europe to follow them into it. MacArthur was making it impossible for the prowar governments in West Europe to hide their aims from their restless and angry populations.

The military failure of the MacArthur-Dulles-Truman war in Korea is a failure of the political aims of the Government in Asia. It has been proved beyond all doubt that the aggressive aims of the Washington-Wall Street leadership in Asia cannot overcome the overwhelming resistance of the Asian people now striking out for their national freedom. The heroic Korean and Chinese people proved that. India knows it, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaya, Indonesia, Burma, etc., all know it.

In preparing for world domination via Europe, the Government hopes to cover up this growing crisis in its policy of rejecting an American-Soviet peace agreement. But the fatal weaknesses in this pro-Fascist prewar plan will become just as stark in West Europe as they have been revealed in Asia.

The popular applause approving the dismissal of MacArthur arises from the profound mass yearning for peace in Korea, and for a genuine peace negotiation with the Soviet Union.

That yearning for peace must not be betrayed or deceived. It must not be bullied into silence by the ragings of the pro-MacArthur forces clamoring for war against China; it must not be silent while the Truman Government refuses to settle with People's China and the Soviet Union as great powers on an equal footing.

There is no question that there are millions of Americans passionately eager for peace, disgusted with the whole Truman-led war in Korea, who have been sold the view that the way to peace lies along the line preached by MacArthur-Taft-Hoover. We need solidarity with these fellow-Americans on the common desire for peace, even though we must convince them that the MacArthur-Taft path, no less than Truman's, leads to the war they fear. Millions applaud Truman's action because they want peace; millions denounce Truman out of the same desire for peace. The desire for peace should unite them all.

Common sense and the national interest demand that President Truman return Formosa to its rightful owner, China; that a cease fire in Korea be immediately established with negotiations for the rapid withdrawal of all non-Korean forces, leaving the Korean people to decide their own destiny. China must be admitted to the UN. Instead of the continuing Washington sabotage of an agreement with the Soviet Union at the Paris Big Four ministers conference, the Nation should insist on real negotiations for a peaceful, united Germany, for disarmament, and for outlawing the A-bomb with UN inspection. Our country should enter into a Five Power Peace Pact with the Soviet Union.

The Communists were among the first to demand the recall of MacArthur as a menace to America and world peace; this was a patriotic service for which they were reviled and smeared. But events have proved them right.

The job now is for all Americans, regardless of their views on many issues, to unite now to press forward the gain which the peace camp and the American people have achieved. This must be the swift ending of the suicidal, criminal sacrifice of our American boys in a war against the freedom-seeking Korean people.

End the Korean War at once!

PEACE GROUP SAYS: "QUIT KOREA"

Organizations dedicated to peace yesterday urged President Truman to follow up his recall of General MacArthur by ending the Korean War and initiating a big-power conference to end all existing differences. The American Peace Crusade, in a wire to Truman, declared:

"Long overdue removal of General MacArthur opens new opportunity to end bloody Korean conflict. Urge you heed the hopes of millions of Americans by initiating immediate negotiations for peaceful settlement in Korea and withdrawal of United States troops. Urge further that you instruct Ambassador Jessup at Deputy Foreign Ministers' Conference in Paris to use this moment of high hope for peace to reach effective agreement with Soviet Union and other nations leading to long-term peaceful relations on world scale."

Former Congressman Vito Marcantonio, ALP State chairman, said:

"The order dismissing General MacArthur was signed by President Truman, but dictated by the American people.

"The White House has had to recognize the meaning of mail to Congressmen and the President, which is running 100 to 1 in favor of bringing the boys home from Korea and stopping the senseless slaughter by immediate negotiations for peace. From the homes, the farms, the shops, the factories of our land comes the urgent mandate that now is the great moment to end the hostilities and to substitute the conference table for bloody battlefields in the settlement of differences.

"The dismissal of General MacArthur is a great victory for the millions of Americans and for the people all over the world who want peace. His plans for deliberately spreading the area of combat and for lighting a fuse on an atomic world war must be decisively and unconditionally dismissed, along with himself.

"A change in military commanders is not enough.

"There must be a change—sincere, prompt, and effective—in the whole bipartisan policy of war. There must be a halt to the scuttling of the four-power peace conference now going on, and a genuine effort at peaceful negotiation must be begun.

"We call upon President Truman to dismiss the program for war and to install a program for peace."

LABOR PLEA

The text of a wire to President Truman by the New York Labor Conference for Peace, signed by Samuel Freedman, chairman, read:

"We are convinced that the great majority of the American people approve your action in relieving General MacArthur of his command. The removal of General MacArthur who not only blocked settlement of the Korean war but also sought to spread the war to China, should be followed by an immediate peaceful settlement of the war in Korea. We trade unionists urge you to take steps now to initiate peace negotiations to bring about an end to the war in Korea and the return home of the American troops.

"This occasion also offers a new opportunity to call a conference of Britain, France, Soviet Union, China, and United States to discuss settling all existing international differences."

PROGRESSIVE PARTY

A statement by Progressive Party leaders Elmer A. Benson, chairman, and C. B. Baldwin, secretary, said:

"The dismissal of General MacArthur by the President is a significant victory for the peace forces of this Nation and the world. At every important step, General MacArthur's statements have been designed to prevent peace and widen the war in Asia. The American people want not only the dismissal of a general but an end to the tragic war in Korea that he prolonged.

"This step can be the beginning of the road to real peace which the American people are demanding. What is necessary now is to initiate negotiations for a settlement in Korea, to carry out the conference of Foreign Ministers, and to stop the rearming of Germany.

"The American people will not be misled by any Taft-Hoover-Wherry partisan sideshow over MacArthur's dismissal for they recognize that it is his policies which have led to the tragic consequences in Korea. The American people reject the administration's substitute of arming Europe for war. They demand peace first—either war in Asia, or rearming of Europe."

Thousands of telegrams were pouring in at the White House, among them one from CIO President Philip Murray congratulating the President and predicting that the "overwhelming mass of American citizens" will support his action.

NOW OUST WAR POLICY

Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party, yesterday issued the following comment on the removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by President Truman:

"The long overdue ouster of the ultra-warmonger, General MacArthur, Caesar of the Pacific, must be more than a change of command. The people should demand that it be the first step in swiftly negotiating an end to the Korean War, returning our boys, making peace in the Far East and re-creating the United Nations in the spirit of the UN Charter by inclusion of People's China. The American people desire profoundly to avert world war III. They are striving not only to silence and shackle the more open and rabid exponents of a preventive war now, but more and more are moving in opposition to the Truman-Dulles bipartisan war policies which led to the Korean War and which, if unchecked, will lead to an atomic world war.

"In short, the people want peace not only in Asia but in the whole world. They don't want world war III ignited in Asia by a MacArthur or in Europe by an Eisenhower.

"The real issue today is not an Asia first war vs. a Europe first war. The real issue is world war or world peace.

"Peace supporters, regardless of political differences or past prejudices, must seize this unique moment to intervene. They should act unitedly not only to end the bloodletting in the Far East but to relieve war tensions everywhere. That requires that the American people and labor in the first instance press for: the success of the current Paris Foreign Deputies Conference, negotiations for a five-power peace pact, and a return to the Roosevelt 'grand design' of big power unity with its keystone of American-Soviet friendship."

GOOD RIDDANCE TO MACARTHUR

(By William Z. Foster)

The forced retirement of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his position as Mikado and general imperialist dictator in the Far East will be welcomed with a sense of relief by the peace forces all over the world. MacArthur's whole course, especially since the outbreak of the war in Korea, has been to spread the war in Asia and thus to precipitate a third world war. His steps in this general direction have been bold, brazen, and unmistakable.

All over the world there has been a rising demand for the removal of this arch warmonger and firebrand. From day to day the peoples of all countries have feared that this fanatical imperialist, upon his own initiative, would arbitrarily bomb China or take some other brutal and irresponsible steps that would plunge the world irretrievably into a disastrous holocaust. The peoples will hail his removal as a victory for peace.

That the world-wide protest of the peoples had much to do with MacArthur's being fired unceremoniously is indisputable. But it would be the gravest kind of a mistake to conclude therefrom, that the war danger is now past and that peace is assured.

The actuality of the situation is that the quarrel between Truman and MacArthur is not over whether or not there should be a war. Both of them are warmongers, and their dispute is as to where the war should be made to begin. MacArthur is one of that powerful group of imperialists, especially supported by the Republican Party, who want to start the great conflagration by attempting the conquest of Asia. Whereas Truman, an even more powerful spokesman for Wall Street than MacArthur, voices the demand of those monopolists, who hold that the conquest of the world must start with the overrunning of Europe.

Truman was also moved to fire MacArthur from fear that the latter's bull-in-the-china-shop aggressions would break up the imperialist war alliance that is being so carefully built up by the State Department.

Instead, therefore, of the Truman administration utilizing the removal of the jingo MacArthur to establish world peace, it will aim to put more steam into its campaign to militarize the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany, and thus to prepare even more frenziedly for a clash in Europe with the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. At the same time, but as a subordinate part of its strategy, Truman will strive to defeat People's China and all other democratic forces in Asia.

This is no occasion, therefore, for the forces of peace to fall victims to peace illusions regarding President Truman. Instead, the peace forces, who have raised their voices so sharply in the MacArthur incident, should now press harder than ever to have the Korean war ended with a democratic peace. They should also demand emphatically that the four-power conference now going on in Paris be the opening door to a real easing of the present dangerous world tensions. As things stand now, the Paris meeting is being sabotaged by the State Department, which in no sense wants a democratic peace settlement with the U. S. S. R.

Good riddance to MacArthur. All peace-loving people may well rejoice at his being fired. But if his displacement is to be made into a real step toward world peace, this can be done only by sailing into the Hoovers, Tafts, McCarthys, and Knowlands who are backing him, and especially by defeating the militaristic plans of the even larger menace of war represented by the Truman administration itself.

The Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable time consumed on the discussion of the draft bill. I have been surprised that there seems to be very little consideration being given to what we are doing to the morale of the people affected. In my opinion the following letter shows that we must give our boys more protection during the training period:

Dear Mr. AYRES: Mrs. B——— and myself returned last evening from visiting our only child, a boy 19, who is in the Air Force, stationed at Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss. What we saw in and around Biloxi is hard to believe.

Gambling joints run wide open, with soldiers in uniform losing their paltry few dollars at dice tables and roulette wheels.

Although I understand Mississippi is a dry State, bars and saloons operate just as openly as they do here in Akron. I saw many a young boy in uniform who obviously could not have been over 18 or 19 buying liquor at these bars with no questions asked.

Wherever you go in Biloxi there are hundreds of slot machines all openly displayed.

It is obvious that such a condition could not exist without the connivance of local enforcement officers, and while I can understand crooked enforcement officers, I cannot understand how the Air Force tolerates such a condition.

There are 40,000 young men in this camp with thousands continuously passing through and the moral effect upon them must be tremendous. Most of them are away from home for the first time in new and strange surroundings and instead of being treated the way they are entitled to be treated, they are being victimized wherever they turn.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PENNSYLVANIA FEDERATION OF
YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS,
April 7, 1951.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCOTT: Now that the universal military training bill is currently being debated in the House of Representatives, I felt that you might like to know that the Pennsylvania Federation of Young Republican Clubs stands in favor of the establishment of universal military training.

At our most recent convention, the federation went on record as recommending "the establishment of universal military training so that young Americans will be properly prepared to serve their country in the armed services if needed; and to prevent the unnecessary casualties which are inherent in untrained troops."

The above resolution is by action of our complete convention and not just the board of directors. We are bringing this to your attention for whatever effect it might have on your decision in the current debate.

If the Young Republicans can be of any assistance to you, don't fail to call on us.

Sincerely,

K. L. SHIRK, Jr.,
Chairman.

LANCASTER, PA.

MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the April 12, 1951, issue of the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat:

MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

Seldom has American public opinion been so sharply divided as on the MacArthur issue, climaxed yesterday by President Truman's order that the recalcitrant general be removed immediately from his Far East commands. With some, regrettably, the issue involves politics, and that angle will be pursued relentlessly, we can be assured, to the end that the general may come home to blast the administration in public statements and addresses which may well figure in the 1952 election. But for most the issue is this:

Was General MacArthur right or wrong in departing from his responsibility as a military commander to express sentiments on foreign policy and strategy that ran counter to those of the UN, the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the State Department? Was he right or wrong when he became a self-appointed diplomat, over and above his duties as the commander of the United Nations forces in Korea?

With full appreciation of the General's high qualifications as a soldier and his eminent success in the rehabilitation of Japan, this newspaper believes the drastic action by the President was justified.

MacArthur was guilty of insubordination, which cannot be tolerated within the military set-up. He deliberately assumed authority in a field which was not his to command—the making of foreign policy. He violated the explicit orders of his Commander in Chief, a procedure he would not have countenanced for a minute by his subordinates. He flouted his superior command not once, but many times, and after several warnings.

He would have been removed months ago had not the President, with a wary regard for the political dynamite in such action, been well aware of the explosive content in the emotions of the American citizens. Now he has taken the long step with reluctance. MacArthur was and is on all counts the "hottest potato" Mr. Truman has been called on to handle.

General MacArthur expects to return to the States within 3 weeks. He may address a joint session of Congress and air his views on the entire Far East situation. His remarks, to Congress or otherwise, will attract the serious attention of every American citizen, and may serve to clarify White House thinking, or at least put its Korean policy in sharper focus. As a retired Army officer, he can speak without restraint—and doubtless will.

The most unfortunate aspect of the controversy is that in many respects the program which MacArthur championed, in defiance of the President, was realistic and logical. He would have been no soldier at all had he not chafed at the restrictions imposed on him in fighting the Reds in Korea. He was not permitted to bomb the supply concentrations of the enemy.

His UN directives were vague, never clearly detailed. He knew that a stalemate at the thirty-eighth parallel settled nothing, yet when he called for reinforcements to exploit the gains made in recent months, he was denied them. He wished to employ the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa, either in Korea or in an assault on the Chinese mainland, but Washington did not approve.

This newspaper believes he was in error in stating that the place for a showdown with Russia is in Asia, that Europe is secondary.

But above all, there can be no denial that the general was the spectacular victim of a White House-State Department foreign policy that has been exceedingly inconsistent and vacillating. Neither MacArthur nor the American people have ever been clearly advised as to the precise program the administration has fixed for Far East operations. Mr. Truman has repeatedly sought refuge in the United Nations when a forthright decision was required—and the impotent UN, timid and [illegible], sat on its hands while the situation worsened.

The UN never had much stomach for the Korean "police action." And when MacArthur became a problem child who threatened to involve the UN in a world war by operations against the stooges of Moscow, the Red Chinese, Great Britain, and France, in particular, were apprehensive and called for caution. Well they knew that if the United States went to war against Russia in the Orient, we would not have enough men or material to do a good job of helping defend West Europe against Communist aggression. Presumably the President was influenced by British and French representations, and for good reason.

Technically, when the UN was committed to action in Korea, the war should have been directed by its Security Council. But this was impossible while Russia had a seat on that Council. Hence, the United States was given the job in view of our leadership in securing UN approval of the aggressor resolution and the preponderance of our commitments in men and material in that area. MacArthur's appointment was in line with that agreement.

But notwithstanding the frustration that plagued MacArthur, his conviction that our Far East policy was bungled and [illegible], he was a soldier, subject to the same fundamentals of discipline as any private in the ranks. When he gave a command, it was obeyed or else. When he received a command, it was his duty to obey or take the consequences.

We understand that General Eisenhower, while in supreme command in Europe in the last war, did not approve of many things he was asked to do. Certainly, for instance, he believed the western allies should have been permitted to occupy Berlin instead of allowing the Russians to take it over, with results we all know. But Eisenhower had his orders and he followed them. MacArthur had his orders and he flouted them.

We by no means agree that the White House-State Department policy for the Far East has been without fault. Neither the President nor Secretary Acheson at any time have indicated they knew where they were going or how they expected to get there, and we can imagine MacArthur's soul-writhing because of his conviction that he knew best.

But something that was earmarked as policy had the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President, both in superior command to MacArthur, and what they ordered he should have done his best to carry out. The proper place for him to lodge his protests was with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President, and it is their ultimate responsibility if they ignored him and adopted a plan that proved to be wrong.

Flamboyant critical statements from the battlefield, letters home to sympathetic friends who made them public, proposals to negotiate with the enemy at a time when, to the President says, the UN was well along toward an understanding with Red China—all these are extracurricular procedures which

are not a military prerogative. If every general in a war disdains orders and operates on his own and as he thinks best, the end result could be disaster.

The chain reaction of the MacArthur dismissal will be heard for many months. The general, now released from all restrictions, may be expected to speak his piece to the American public. He will have ample help in and outside Congress.

Basically the general would expand the war, make the Far East the chief area of combat, go against the UN policy of isolating Korea and concentrating on the defense of Europe. It is difficult to see how those who agree with MacArthur that the war must be carried to China can in the same breath declare that his program must be followed to save the further slaughter of American soldiers.

General MacArthur makes his exit after 48 years in the Army service of his country. His achievements in the Pacific were historic; he was a brilliant occupation commander in Japan. It is unfortunate that he is compelled to quit under tortured circumstances.

President Truman's Speech on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night, April 14, 1951, a great Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner was held at the National Guard Armory in Washington, D. C. Many outstanding speeches were delivered on this occasion. I include herewith the unselfish and courageous remarks of the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, of Missouri:

My fellow Americans, this is a meeting of Democrats. More important than that, it is a meeting of Americans. It is a meeting of Americans who put the welfare of their country first.

This is a time when all Americans should put their country first. This is no time for business as usual—or for politics as usual.

There are some people, I am sorry to say, who are playing petty politics right now with the future of the country and the peace of the world. These people seem to think that it is more important to win the next election than it is to prevent another world war. I don't want any Democrat to have such ideas.

I want every Democrat to put patriotism above politics.

Our country is in deadly danger. We face a powerful and ruthless enemy. The only way we can prevail over that enemy is for every man and woman in this country to put national interest above personal interest.

What we are trying to do is to establish peace in the world. And the only way you can have peace in the world is to bring about international law and order.

The men we are honoring here tonight—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson—knew that.

In their day, the United States was small and weak.

Nevertheless, Jefferson and Jackson stood up for international law and order. They worked for peace, but they would not stoop to appeasement. They knew that the United States could not be safe unless it was willing to fight for what was right.

When Jefferson was President our merchant ships were attacked by the Barbary pirates who ruled the north coast of Africa. These pirates lived by robbery and human slavery. They were collecting huge sums of money in tribute from European nations. Then the Barbary pirates began to demand that the United States pay them millions of dollars for leaving our ships alone. They were arrogant and they were brutal, and they got away with it until someone finally stood up against them.

Jefferson decided to put a stop to the whole thing. He knew that there were times when a country has to fight against international crime. He sent the United States Navy to Africa. He sent the marines ashore at Tripoli. He carried the battle to the enemy nearly 5,000 miles away from the United States.

We smashed the power of those bandits, and we won the praise and gratitude of the world. The Pope at that time, Pius VII, declared, "the American commander, with a small force and in a short space of time, has done more for the cause of Christianity than the most powerful nations of Christendom have done for ages."

Jefferson did not believe this Nation could submit to pirates, and neither do we.

Now, as then, there is no room for piracy in a free world.

Now, as then, there are times when our country has to fight for law and order.

Today, however, the danger we face is not just a gang of pirates in one part of the world.

It is a danger that threatens every nation on earth, every religious faith, every home, and every person in this land. It is the danger that arises from the plans of the Kremlin to conquer the civilized world.

The rulers of the Kremlin have abandoned any serious attempt to improve the lives of the people they control. They are taking the men and women and the resources under their control and welding them into a mighty machine for war and conquest.

They think they can divide the democratic nations and overthrow them one by one.

If they can do that, they will succeed in isolating and surrounding the United States. Then we should either have to fight a terrible war, against great odds—or yield to the demands of the Kremlin.

Either alternative would be a desperate one.

We must meet this threat just as firmly as Jefferson met the threat of the Barbary pirates.

There is no higher purpose to which we can dedicate ourselves as Democrats and Americans.

For 5 years, we have been checking and countering the threats of Communist expansion—all around the world. We have been helping to strengthen free nations to stand up and resist this pressure. Our policy thwarted the Soviet master plan of expansion. So the Communist leaders reported to open aggression.

This called for a show-down.

The free world gave its answer.

We went to the defense of Korea.

When we did that, nearly everyone in the United States approved. Nearly everyone but the Communists agreed that it was the only thing to do. But now, there are people who say we should not have done it. There are people who say we should get out of Korea.

These people are making a terrible mistake.

They think that we could stop the fight if we got out of Korea. That is not true.

If we got out of Korea, the Communist leaders would strike somewhere else. They would strike at Japan, or the Middle East, or in Europe.

And sooner or later they would go on to strike at South America, and at our own country.

We do not have a choice between fighting in Korea or not fighting at all. Our choice lies between fighting in Korea or fighting somewhere else—somewhere more difficult—and probably somewhere closer to home.

Our struggle against aggression in Korea has had profound effects.

First, it is preventing our Communist enemy from carrying out his plans. By fighting in Korea, we have kept the rulers of the Kremlin from conquering other countries on their list.

Second, it has given the free world warning, and time to begin building up its own defenses. Our struggle has made it clear, not only here, but abroad, that the free world must prepare to defend itself.

Third, our firm stand in Korea has placed a great strain on the whole system of dictatorship. Dictatorships cannot survive continued reverses. Cracks are already beginning to appear in the structure of international communism.

I do not want to hear anyone say that our effort in Korea has been wasted. Our men there have been fighting for you and for me—for everyone of us—for our homes, our futures, and the future of our children—just as surely as if they were fighting on our own soil.

They are fighting in Korea to save us from having to fight on our own soil.

They are fighting to prevent the sacrifices and suffering of a third world war.

It is important to remember that our purpose in Korea is to stop the world war that would result if Communist aggression were to go unchecked. Our purpose is to restore peace.

If the Communist leaders have learned the lesson that aggression will not be tolerated by the free nations of the world, it should be possible to reach a peaceful settlement in Korea.

But it must be settled on a basis that will protect the objectives for which the United Nations are fighting.

To reach such a settlement, the Soviet and Chinese Communist leaders must abandon their aggression.

On that point there can be no compromise.

We will not engage in appeasement.

We will make no deals that would reward aggression.

Let there be no mistake in the Kremlin. We want peace—in Korea and in the rest of the world. But we will not give in to aggression.

We know that appeasement does not lead to peace but leads to war. Our efforts to prevent war must be founded upon the preservation of freedom and justice.

That is why we are supporting the United Nations.

That is why we are aiding the free countries to build their economic strength.

That is why we are building up our own military defenses and helping other free nations to build theirs.

These are basic elements of our foreign policy.

Our foreign policy is a world policy, a policy of world peace—peace not only in the Wester Hemisphere, but in Europe, in Asia—all around the globe.

It is a foreign policy which is above any one party. In recent years, our foreign policy has been shaped by, and supported by, many leaders in both political parties working together. Our foreign policy is truly bipartisan. It is arrived at by "give and take," and improved by criticism and discussion.

That is the way it ought to be, and the way we are going to try to keep it. We welcome fair and honest debate.

But in recent months we have heard too much political hokum attacking the bipartisan foreign policy.

The people who are making these attacks cannot agree on any foreign policy of their own. They are just against the foreign policy this country is following. They are not trying to help this country find its way in these troubled times. They are just trying to confuse us. Why? Because they think if the country is confused enough, they may be able to win the next election.

Let me give you a few examples of the thinking of these confusers.

They say they want a powerful defense system, second to none—but they are against universal military training.

They say they want other free nations to resist aggression—but they don't want us to send any troops to help.

They want us to get out of Korea—but they urge us to wage an aggressive war against China.

They say it will provoke Russia to attack if we send troops to Europe—but they are sure Russia won't come in if we carry the war to China.

They say they want to crush communism—and yet they want us to draw back into our shell and let the rest of the world be overrun by the Reds.

They say they are worried because the Russians outnumber us—but they are not interested in keeping allies who can help us.

The long and short of it is that they want defenses without spending the money, they want us to wage war without an army, they want us to have victory without taking any risks, and they want us to try to run the whole world and to run it without any friends.

We can't afford to be diverted and upset by these political attacks.

We have a big job to do here at home. Our job is to get our defense program carried out quickly and efficiently.

We have made tremendous strides in building our defenses in the last few months. We have more than doubled the size of our Armed Forces since last June 25; the newest types of planes and tanks are coming off the assembly lines; and we are building an industrial system which can turn out more military supplies than ever before in our history.

With our European partners, we are building a strong combined defense force for the North Atlantic area, under the leadership of a great American, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

At a time like this, when we as a Nation are having to build up our Armed Forces and turn out all the material they need, we cannot—as individuals—do all the things we would normally do here at home. We can't build all the new houses we would like; we can't buy all the new gadgets and conveniences we would like. All of us will have to wait a while or do without many things we want.

But I know all Americans will gladly sacrifice some of the material comforts of life to defend the freedoms which give us our inner strength and security.

The Democratic Party has pioneered in the great advances our Nation has made in providing a better life for all our people. The Democratic Party has led the way to better homes, better education, better health, and higher incomes. The Democratic Party has led the way to new respect for the dignity and the worth of the individual. These achievements have come about because of our basic belief, the belief that every individual and every group in our Nation should have a fair deal.

A fair deal has been our pledge to the American people.

It is still our pledge.

In a time of national emergency like the present, when we all face danger together, it is more important than ever before that everyone have a fair deal.

A fair deal for everyone today means that we all share—and share alike—the responsibilities and sacrifices of our defense program.

On the battlefields of Korea our men fight together for a common purpose. Black and white, rich and poor, share common hardships, and often a common fate. The laborer's son, the farmer's son, and the businessman's son are fighting shoulder to shoulder in Korea.

We must have that same united approach to a common cause here at home.

It is as clear now as it was in Jefferson's day that we can enjoy the benefits of freedom only if we assume the responsibilities that go with it.

At this critical time in world history, men and women everywhere look to our Nation for leadership. They know that hope for a better life, human freedom, decency, justice, religion—all these things—depend upon the vigor with which we lead the free world in its fight for survival.

We shall not fail them.

We have known danger many times before, and we have never yielded. The ideals of Jefferson and Jackson have carried us through crises in the past.

They have given us a better and a fuller life.

I am confident that these same ideals will lead us to our goal of a free and peaceful world.

International Children's Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on chapter X in Report No. 298 accompanying the third supplemental appropriations bill for 1951. On the basis of this report, the committee appears to be under a misapprehension as to how the International Children's Fund operates.

Last year I inserted in the RECORD a letter from Herbert Hoover concerning UNICEF in which he stated:

> I do not believe there is any foreign activity in which our Government can engage that has as many returns both from a human and from an economic point of view.

Mr. Hoover does not make exaggerated statements, nor is he a blind follower of the United Nations. He is a statesman known throughout the world for his understanding and support of sound humanitarian enterprises. My concern for this program stems from exactly these two points stressed by Mr. Hoover and my comments today are to further elaborate this position.

The difference between the supposedly high percentage of United States support for this program, as compared with our share in other United Nations programs, is explained first, by the misunderstanding concerning the basis of the matching ratio, described in the following paragraph, and secondly, by the type of program carried out by the Children's Fund. Most of our contributions to the regular budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies are utilized entirely for administrative purposes, on the other hand, the greater part of United States appropriations to UNICEF are used for procurement, particularly dried skim milk, and shipping. It is precisely because our contributions to UNICEF have made it possible for this tangible program of international assistance to children to operate in the practical form of a commodity supply program at the community level that outstanding leaders such as Senator TAFT and Mr. Hoover have enthusiastically endorsed this program. The fund is administered by an American businessman, Mr. Maurice Pate, of Massachusetts and Colorado, who has kept administrative costs at an average of 5 percent during the first 3 years of its operation.

The printed report of the hearings accompanying this bill indicates that the Department of State urged support for an appropriation of $12,500,000, on the basis of 72-28-percent formula, which the Department said carried over from UNRRA. The present matching formula did not come from UNRRA but was established by Congress. Originally, this House suggested a 50-50 formula as the basis for financing UNICEF. Fifty percent of the total new resources available for child care programs were to come from the United States, the other 50 percent would comprise 25 percent contributed by other governments for use outside their territories and 25 percent in new resources from receiving countries. The conference altered the proportions somewhat and established the formula of 72 percent from the United States, 28 percent from other governments, for use outside their territories and another 100 percent from receiving countries. Thus the United States share was 36 percent of the total government contributions.

I am attaching a table showing the composition of resources for UNICEF assisted child-care programs from June 1947 to March 1951. This table shows that the United States has actually contributed 34 percent of all resources, which include some nongovernmental contributions. In order to maintain this position and stimulate the additional 100-percent contributions from receiving countries, it will be necessary to retain the 72-28-percent ratio for government contributions used outside national territories.

Thus for the current year, the fund needs $12,500,000 from this country, $5,000,000 from other governments—half of which has already been received and allocated—and another $17,000,000 from receiving countries.

Since UNICEF resources have never been adequate to meet more than the minimum needs of children in most UNICEF receiving countries, the fund has utilized its meager resources in strategic programs designed to help governments establish services for children which could be continued by those governments after UNICEF leaves. Successful pursuit of this policy has made it possible for UNICEF to shift its emphasis from countries which were the immediate victims of the Second World

War to the long-range, but nevertheless emergency needs of the less developed countries in Asia and Latin America.

As a result of these humanitarian programs many millions of children have already been protected from death, disease, and malnutrition, and many millions more will benefit from the national services stimulated by UNICEF assistance.

All this has been accomplished at an incredibly small cost as indicated by the UNICEF total annual expenditures to country programs:

1948	$43,000,000
1949	36,000,000
1950	32,000,000

Under the present formula these sums amount to one-half the cost for specific programs, the other half being contributed by the receiving countries.

It is for these reasons that I would urge the representatives of the House Appropriation Committee, when they meet in conference with the representatives of the Senate, to restore the full appropriation to the International Children's Fund so that the United States may continue to provide at least one-third of the total resources raised for international assistance to children.

Composition of resources for UNICEF assisted child-care programs

[In thousands of dollars]

	United States	Other governments	Total
I. Composition of all UNICEF resources from June 1947 through March 1951:			
(a) Government contributions	75,000	32,400	107,400
(b) Private contributions	1,300	11,300	12,600
(c) UNRRA residual assets	20,000	2,000	22,300
(d) Miscellaneous (interest, sundry claims, difference in exchange, etc.)	1,300	600	1,900
Total resources available for allocation	102,600	48,000	154,600
II. Estimated local contributions of recipient governments made to match UNICEF imports under country agreements		142,000	142,000
Grand total	102,600	190,000	296,600
III. Percentage	Percent 34	Percent 66	Percent 100

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter I am today sending to those who have written to me relative to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal:

Dear ———: This will acknowledge receipt of your recent communication relative to the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his far eastern command.

As you know, I have at all times been an ardent supporter of General MacArthur as a military leader, and I am still of the opinion that he ranks among our Nation's top military tacticians. However, no military leader, no matter how brilliant he may be, shall or can have the authority under the Constitution of the United States to assume the responsibility for determining our foreign policy.

On our policy in the Far East, I feel—and I have always felt—that we should continue to recognize Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government; that we should refuse recognition of Communist China; and refuse admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

No American general is bigger than the Government of the United States. No American general is bigger than his constitutional Commander in Chief. The very existence of our democracy demands that military authority be subordinate to civilian authority.

I am quite certain that President Truman fully realized that his decision to depose MacArthur would be unpopular. It took battlefield courage on the part of the President of the United States to remove MacArthur from his command. I am in wholehearted accord with the President's decision because I have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States—without any reservations whatsoever—and under article II, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, the President is specifically named as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

Under article II, he has the right to remove any of his military subordinates. The authority of the civilian Commander in Chief must always be supreme. Civilian control is essential in a democracy. The day military men are encouraged or permitted to flaunt the orders of their civilian superiors, is the day our democracy starts on the last long mile to destruction. Had President Truman not acted as he did, his political, personal, and emotional critics would then, I believe, have some justification for demanding his impeachment for not carrying out his sworn duty as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The most obvious factor about the dismissal of General MacArthur is that he forced his own removal. He would not tolerate any disobedience from any officer under his command. Yet, he willfully disobeyed not only the Commander in Chief, President Truman, but also his military superiors on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is an attitude I cannot and will not condone under any circumstances.

I believe that General MacArthur should be accorded the honor of addressing a joint session of Congress and I further believe that he should be requested by the appropriate committees of Congress to give us the benefit of his views on the Far East and answer questions pertaining to our far-eastern policy. I intend to request the Committee on Foreign Affairs to issue an invitation to General MacArthur to appear before that committee so that he can be questioned and so that his answers to the questions asked may be fully known not only to the American Congress but to the American people as well.

I realize full well that as far as the present controversy is concerned, I am not on the popular side. It has been a privilege to serve you in Congress under our present form of government. Under a government controlled by the military, I doubt if you could write to your Congressman and tell him whether you approve or disapprove his actions in representing you in the Congress of the United States.

The question of MacArthur is of little importance compared to the question as to whether or not we shall have a representative government under civilian control or a military government to which civilians will be subordinate. The founding fathers of this great Republic recognized this question and acted wisely in subordinating the military.

I am not one of those who can swing with the political pendulum. My decision is to stand on the side of the Constitution of the United States which I will uphold and defend to my last breath. What happens to me because of this decision is unimportant; my country and our Constitution must always come first.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

MacArthur Issues Brought Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an open letter by Drew Pearson, undoubtedly a most controversial figure inside and outside the ranks of journalism, to the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, who himself could not by the farthest stretch of the imagination be called a noncontroversial figure.

I call this open letter to the attention of the House because it makes sense to me, good sense, common sense—a commodity which is being used less and less during an era when we need more and more of it.

It makes little difference whether or not we agree or disagree with Drew Pearson, and it makes less difference whether we like or dislike him. But it does make a great deal of difference whether or not we rise above personalities in a crisis when personalities seem to outweigh sober judgment and cold logic.

It does not make any difference from whom words of sound advice come, just so long as the words generate stability. For my part, I believe Drew Pearson has performed a public service in writing this letter and has contributed much in these tense times.

Here is the open letter which appeared in today's press:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—MACARTHUR ISSUES BROUGHT OUT

(By Drew Pearson)

Today's column takes the form of a letter from Drew Pearson to Senator ROBERT A. TAFT on the MacArthur-Truman controversy.

APRIL 14, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: When your father was President of the United States, my late father-in-law, a general and a military man all his life, had about the same opinion of him that Douglas MacArthur has of the present occupant of the White House. In fact, your father, whom history records as having done a fine job as Secretary of War, incurred the wrath of many military men, because he both kept within his budget and kept the military in their place.

He fully grasped the fundamental fact around which our Constitution is written—that ours is a civilian government, in which the military takes orders from civilians. He even carried it out so conscientiously that, when your father was Secretary of War and used to come to the White House, Teddy

Roosevelt would jokingly tell Mrs. Roosevelt to put away the carving knife for fear my father-in-law, a cousin and side of T. R., might use it against Taft.

I mention it because the easiest thing in the world today is to join the wolfpack and kick Harry Truman in the pants. You, however, have not attained your present position by taking the easy way.

And you, in view of your father's record, in view of your own record as a champion of the Constitution, can better understand this fundamental issue than any other man I know.

That issue is the Constitution of the United States—which provides that, if a general wants to run the Government, he must take off his uniform and become a civilian like the rest of us. He cannot have the perquisites and protection of the uniform and give orders to the White House, too.

Furthermore, you cannot have a general who has been running for President and who may still have political ambitions overruling the President of the United States.

As far as President Truman is concerned, my personal feelings toward him are about the same as yours. He has castigated me just as much as he has you. But there is a difference between respect for the office of President and respect for the man. The former is something which must not be soiled or sullied by unfair Senate debate. And the office of President carries with it not only the power but the obligation, under the Constitution, to remove a general who challenges the Constitution.

People are easily confused these days, but you can help to prevent their confusion. And while it might be popular and even healthy to impeach Harry Truman, do it on the grounds of corruption in his administration. There you might be on solid ground. Don't do it on an issue for which your father and every other President has kept the torch of civilian government burning—the principle that no soldier can overrule a civilian elected by the people.

Or, if you will, impeach the President on the ground that his policy is wrong. Impeach him on the issue of failure in China.

It might be healthy if you or Senator WHERRY introduced a resolution embodying the exact terms of the MacArthur letter to JOE MARTIN, and let the Senate debate it—debate the bombing of Chinese bases, the landing of Chiang Kai-shek's troops on the mainland, and the full probabilities and objectives of war with China.

This is an important, vital question upon which we should have full debate, upon which the public should be fully informed. I hope such a resolution will be introduced.

But do not, I urge, confuse the issue by challenging the basic principle of our Constitution in regard to civilian rule.

I have just returned from a trip through Europe. And I can report that you cannot travel abroad these days without sensing how vital is the issue now before our country. Many of the European nations have been through the struggle between military and civilian rule. They have seen the elected parliaments of Italy and Germany weaken. They have seen the people—shaken in their confidence of the democratic system, confused by unfair debate—turn to military dictatorships.

It is out of such confusion, when nations have weak civilian leaders and strong military leaders, that dictatorships spring.

Now, it is easy to jump on an unpopular President—as your family well remembers. It is easy to jump on him and to muddy up public opinion with confusing issues—such as the so-called Ballinger scandals which led to the overwhelming defeat of your father, and which history later proved not to have been scandals after all.

It is also easy to fool the public with a lot of phony flag-waving on an issue which your father and no other President worth his salt would have stood for—namely, permitting a general to thumb his nose at the civilian branch of the Government and get away with it.

But the times today are too dangerous. And it is in days such as these, when we do not have the most astute brains in or around the White House, that we need leadership and courage such as yours outside the White House to keep us on an even keel.

Respectfully yours,

DREW PEARSON.

Voice of America Spreads Its Message Through Classics and Jam Sessions Alike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alice Eversman, from the Washington Sunday Star of April 15, 1951:

VOICE OF AMERICA SPREADS ITS MESSAGE THROUGH CLASSICS AND JAM SESSIONS ALIKE

(By Alice Eversman)

The broadcast of the final program of the National Symphony Orchestra to all parts of the world on the Voice of America called attention in a personal way to this important service being tendered in the name of music. Although most of the broadcasts are concerned with the spreading of necessary facts about this country, the spirit of our people as reflected in the music they hear, perform, and compose is also made known. About 15,000 recordings of transcribed programs are sent monthly to 75 countries. During November, December, January, and February some 10,601 hours of programing time were used.

The material for the broadcasts has been assembled and sorted since 1943, when the American Federation of Musicians granted permission to the Voice to record any music put on the air. The music unit staff is one of the busiest in the set-up. They must be constantly on the lookout for the kind of performances to select and have the proper knowledge to prepare the program notes accompanying each recording. Furthermore, they must be ready with an answer to any question that might come up in the 220,000 letters sent the Voice annually from the far corners of the world. Each month a committee of music experts must audition about 100 hours of material, some of which will be discarded, and others put into the library for future use.

The sending of recorded music is governed by the wishes of the people in the area to which it goes. Unfortunately, symphonic music rates the lowest attention. American popular songs and dance music are much in demand, the Voice supplying 250 stations in Brazil alone with the former in the Your Hit Parade program, and European stations with the recordings of Dixieland jazz. An effort is made, however, to maintain a balance between serious classical, semiclassical, and popular music.

Compositions by American composers, recitals by native musicians, as well as those by renowned instrumentalists and operatic singers, and programs by the great orchestras of the United States are included in the first category. One performance by the Metropolitan Opera is always part of the shipments and some particular event, such as the Bach Festival in Bethlehem or the Boston Symphony concerts at Tanglewood, is included.

RELIGIOUS MUSIC INCLUDED

Excerpts from musical shows as South Pacific, the favoriate singers on radio programs, dance and jazz bands, constitute the popular list, while pleasant orchestral numbers, instrumental music of the same kind, spirituals and folk songs form the semiclassics. Every Sunday there are religious broadcasts, with music by such groups as the Trinity Choir of St. Paul's Parish in New York, the choir of East Liberty Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, the Schola Cantorum of St. Thomas' in Bloomfield, or that of the Church of the Immaculate Conception in Los Angeles. Most of these latter programs have been beamed to the Far East.

One of the most notable programs is, Fun With Music, designed for children all over the world. Already 26 15-minute recordings have been sent to a number of countries for local broadcasts with commentaries in the language of the country. They follow, mostly, the style used in the youth concerts with some deviations. For instance, there is one program of circus music where calliopes and beasy melodies create the atmosphere for elephants and clowns. Excerpts from Humperdinck's Hansel and Gretel are among the children's operas given which also include Douglas Moore's, the Emperor's New Clothes, and George Kleinsinger's, Tubby the Tuba. The story of the instruments in the orchestras occupies three programs and the history of the piano from 1700 to the present, is traced on two. The highlights of American history from 1620 to 1865 are told for the youngsters in music and even the geography of this country is described in this medium. High school boys and girls, in choruses or ensembles, participate in these programs.

The Voice uses its musical material in two ways. Some of it is transmitted by shortwave broadcasts as programs or as incidental or atmospheric music for some of the dramas. Others are put on the records in assembled programs which are shipped to 90 Embassies, consulates, and other far outposts of the State Department.

The local radio stations receive these packaged programs and clubs or schools are permitted to borrow them. The problem lies in supplying the music of most appeal to the different countries. France, Italy, Spain, and Latin America like our popular music best. India and Indonesia favor military bands. A special tribute was paid to the Marine Band for its recorded performance of the Pakistan national anthem by its composer, Ahmed G. Chagla. He wrote:

"This is exactly how the music should be interpreted. The Marine Band performance is all the more commendable because the melody is foreign to western instrumentalists—." Only Northern Europe craves the symphonic music with soloists.

A particular effort is being made to acquaint the world with the serious works by American composers. Most European nations feel they can supply what music of that nature is wanted and ask for the lighter American kind so popular abroad. However, there is a series called "American Composer" where native compositions in orchestral, chamber music or soloist performance are recorded and sent out. More than a hundred overseas offices receive this allotment. Commercial recordings and published compositions are also supplied to information centers for study and performance by any who desire to have them.

PORTABLES REACH THE REMOTE

Where there are no radios, the Voice sends out jeeps, as in Aden, Arabia, for instance,

equipped with portable sound-producing units. There, in the public square, the program will be played, usually accompanied by a documentary motion-picture film flashed on a sheet stretched across the square. In some cities, where the United States has public-information libraries, transcribed concerts are given to audiences.

How much of the shortwave broadcasts reach the people has not been estimated definitely, although it is known that 50 percent of all residents in Western Germany hear them and there are 2,500,000 steady listeners in France. Some of it gets through the iron curtain, for one Soviet magazine wrote that the Voice was "synonymous with lying and provocational fiction to millions of Soviet people." The jamming that takes place on broadcasts beamed to Russia requires that most of the time be utilized for news and comment so that some of it will get through. Also, music is easily detected, when not of the Soviet vintage, and dire punishment may descend on those who listen to it.

The Voice, however, continues its good work. It sends to Radio Tjanst of Sweden some of the "jam sessions" in Greenwich Village, or the Philadelphia Orchestra for Radio Turkey at Ankara. Radio Rome hears the Metropolitan's performance of "Don Carlo" exactly as produced in New York, and the program of Fred Waring and his Pennsylvanians will be sent over the Andes. Now, in its recorded form, the performance of the National Symphony Orchestra of April 4, broadcast "live" that night, will be placed in many of the "packages" sent out to the far away places of the world.

No Defense Need in the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Dallas (Tex.) News of February 4, 1951, carries the following editorial under the caption "No defense need in St. Lawrence." Every Member of Congress should read this interesting editorial:

NO DEFENSE NEED IN ST. LAWRENCE

Patriotism, remarked Samuel Johnson, who knew men, is the last refuge of the damned scoundrel. He said that close to 200 years ago, and human nature has not changed for the better. So when your sleazy politician can think of no better argument, he proffers his shoddy ware in the name of national defense.

So back to Congress once more comes the St. Lawrence project. Hurry, boys, hurry. We must have it for national defense. Forget all of your old objections. Get the thing under way.

To start on, the St. Lawrence is not a genuine waterway project. Even under the best of conditions, it would not be an all-year thoroughfare for deep-draft, oceangoing vessels. The river is ice locked for a substantial part of every year and impassable for traffic. But, as W. F. Heavey, general manager of the Port of Houston, pointed out the other day in a letter to the Wall Street Journal, the proposed 27-foot project is impracticable for ocean ships with pay loads to and from the Great Lakes ports. Even the Houston Ship Channel has an authorized depth of 36 feet. So the obvious idea is to get 27 feet approved, then go later to 36 as a necessity. But costs are estimated only on the first figure.

The St. Lawrence is a hydroelectric power project. In spite of the claims for its prospective power, river flow, as the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, opposing the plan, points out, will limit kilowatt production to 820,000 in the flood season and 570,000 in any low-water period. Present steam plants serving New York City are capable of more than 570,000 kilowatts individually.

The St. Lawrence is not a necessary project. It is questionable if it is in any way desirable. Fully 15 years back the exhaustive research study by the nonpartisan Brookings Institution analyzed the proposal and demonstrated conclusively that the costs would be far out of proportion to the potential benefits. Since then the costs have risen enormously and the benefits have not enlarged. No one has successfully refuted the Brookings figures. Proponents of the project do not even try.

But once more we are told that a costly folly is necessary to defense. Patriotism, as Sam Johnson remarked, is the last refuge.

Talk of Impeachment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Thomas L. Stokes expresses my views and, I am sure, the views of a substantial majority of the dispassionate citizens of the United States and the free world:

IMPEACH TRUMAN? FOR THESE "CRIMES"?

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—There's been lots of wild talk about "impeachment" of President Truman because of his removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Republicans spilled it all over the Capitol—for 1 day—to try to indicate their high dudgeon and to give an incendiary slogan to telegram and letter addicts all over the country. They never meant it seriously. For they are wise enough politically, since they have created a martyr of their own, not to offer one to the other side. They would thus lose their advantage.

WOULD CLEAR THE AIR

But it might, indeed, clear the air all around if an impeachment of Harry Truman were sought. For there are many counts. Those of us who are familiar with impeachment proceedings can imagine the scene—the solemn managers on the part of the House, which prefers the charges, being announced formally before the Senate, which is the trial body, and submitting the bill of indictment, somewhat as follows:

1. He, Harry Truman, upheld the Constitution of the United States by removing a general who had arrogated to himself the making of policy and thus asserted the supremacy of the civilian over the military.

2. He, Harry Truman, opposed this particular policy which would begin an all-out, all-Asian war, a trap long laid by the Kremlin.

3. He, Harry Truman, formulated the "Truman doctrine" for aid to Greece and Turkey, which was approved by Congress and which checked the advance of Soviet imperialism in that strategic area.

REVISED EUROPEAN ECONOMY

4. He, Harry Truman, espoused the Marshall plan, which Congress approved and which has revived the economy of Western Europe so that its people again are at work, again have hope, and are no longer willing prey for communism which is rapidly losing ground.

5. He, Harry Truman, sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty which the Senate ratified, and which implemented economic aid with military assistance so that Western Europe can defend herself.

6. He, Harry Truman, appointed Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to command the combined Western European army, which won united support of Congress and the Nation.

7. He, Harry Truman, evolved a new defense program to strengthen our own Nation which Congress is working out, step by step.

8. He, Harry Truman, initiated the United Nations challenge to North Korean Communist aggression, boldly and promptly, recognizing clearly the new Russian strategy of striking through masked satellites and understanding, too, that aggression must be checked where it appears, else the dictator will be emboldened to move as he pleases and on his own terms.

GAVE MACARTHUR SUPPORT

9. He, Harry Truman, opened the way for appointment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as commander of the U. N. armies, and gave him every support.

10. He, Harry Truman, is for a civil rights program to assure every American citizen the rights guaranteed by our Constitution regardless of race, creed, or color.

11. He, Harry Truman, is for decent wages and working conditions for our people in peace and war; for decent housing, for improved education and health methods and facilities; for development of our natural resources to provide new opportunities for our people.

12. He, Harry Truman, is for curbing the rapacity of the selfish and powerful who would exploit others to their advantage.

13. He, Harry Truman, won the 1948 election.

14. He, Harry Truman, is a Democrat.

15. He, Harry Truman, is a human being, not a superman.

Of all these things he, Harry Truman, is guilty.

And may God have mercy on his soul.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NORTH COLLEGE HILL PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 6, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESS: Though I have been one of your constituents for several years, I have never bothered your office with a communication, but now it's different: Today I received a release from the National Education Association opposing universal military training. I am a life member of the NEA, and a churchman from my youth, but the present leadership of both organizations totally misrepresents my views on national preparedness.

The NEA (see enclosure) criticises "setting up a permanent system of military training in the United States." I protest the term "permanent" since statutes are always subject to repeal by the Congress. Use of such term seems designed falsely to excite people and thus to build up opposition. The NEA release also counsels delay on UMT until "present critical international disputes * * * have been settled." Six years since the collapse of the Axis, is there any evidence that such disputes ever will be settled? The NEA release continues the argument over 18, 18½, or 19 as the age, and over 21, 24, or 26 months as the period of military training. All those questions have been thrown up by opponents merely to fill the air with dust, produce delay, and defeat action.

In the stress of actual war we are fully ready to trust our all to the military authorities. But whenever immediate danger seems to lessen, teachers and preachers by the thousands, do-gooders, and America-lasters—all are ready to tell the military just what we need. If our military heads do not know what we need, let us replace them; but let us forsake the leadership of those who mostly know nothing at all about the matter, and begin to rely on the experts. The supreme tragedy of our democracy today is not that so many of our people are "blind mice," but rather that so few of us even suspect our blindness.

The simple fact is that we have never been prepared for a single one of the wars fought since we became a Nation. Had not other democracies fought the opposition almost to a standstill before we entered, we might have been thoroughly beaten in both World Wars. I condemn all this quibbling and ask that just once we get ready for war in time of peace, after having followed the opposite course for 175 years.

I believe this is enough, but sometimes I feel that I should love the privilege of having my remarks extended a few thousand words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very respectfully yours,

WM. A. COOK.

Will the President Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 14, 1951:

WILL THE PRESIDENT ACT?

President Truman has shown that he has the determination and the courage to rebuke insubordination, but the list of unrebuked improprieties among his associates is a growing one. Why does he not deal with them with the same forcefulness?

While applauding Mr. Truman for his handling of the MacArthur problem, the Post-Dispatch is bound to deplore his totally contrary handling of other problems of personnel which come within the Presidential responsibility.

Two new problems of this nature have just been added to an already long list.

There is the Mississippi job-selling scandal, involving Paul Dillon, of St. Louis, one-time lawyer for Capone gangsters. There is the case of the White House aide who is said to have tried to persuade Senator TOBEY not to be too tough on another White House aide in the inquiry into the RFC.

What is the President going to do about these new cases? Is he going to pass them by complacently, as he already has done with many, with such unfortunate results?

Or is he going to begin, even though belatedly, to make plain to present offenders, and to potential future offenders, that ethical laxity in the administration and in the party will not be tolerated by him?

In the Mississippi scandal, Chairman Boyle, of the Democratic National Committee, has fired National Committeeman Hood, but testimony given to the Senate investigators implicates members of the State committee as well. By sworn testimony not only were jobs bought and sold. By admission of the committees' own counsel the committee made it a part of its stated policy to exert political influence on the RFC.

Paul Dillon's alleged part in helping Hood form the pro-Truman committee makes that proceeding all the more suspect, and all the more damaging to Mr. Truman. Dillon once managed a Truman campaign in St. Louis. It was he who helped obtain a parole for four Capone gangsters—Philip D'Andrea, Paul Ricca, Charles Gioe, and Louis Campagna. An appellate court, upholding their conviction, had called these men "a ruthless and grasping crew of blackmailers whose crimes struck at the very heart of society."

Under these circumstances, does Mr. Truman deem it enough for Chairman Boyle to fire the national committeeman from Mississippi? Should not all members of the State committee who participated in the sale of Federal office, or who countenanced it in silence, be replaced with members who can be relied upon? And should not the President in clear terms denounce what has gone on in Mississippi and pledge every effort to expose, halt, and punish all such wrongdoing in the future?

In the affair of the White House aides, former Senator Wheeler, of Montana, says that at the request of one of them, David K. Niles, he asked Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, "not to be too tough" on another of them, Donald S. Dawson, who has been mentioned as one of the inner clique exerting political influence on RFC lending policies.

Did Mr. Truman know what Mr. Niles was doing? What kind of check is there against political manipulations by persons close to the President? Does Mr. Truman not think that an attempt by one of his aides to suppress or tone down evidence in a senatorial investigation is grounds for dismissal?

As the Post-Dispatch said the other day, the moral tone of official Washington can hardly be expected to rise higher than the tone the President sets. Here are two cases in which what he does, or fails to do, will either put a brake on the deterioration of Washington ethics, or permit it to go unimpeded on its downward way.

Universal Military Training Necessary to Long-Range Security Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion after much study and reflection that we must have UMT as part of our long-term policy for our national security.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, who has an unusual grasp on security problems, had a very penetrating article, which expresses my views, in the New York Herald Tribune on April 16, 1951.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article, which I hope every Member of the House will read:

IS UMT NECESSARY?

Considering how hard it is for the layman to understand UMT (universal military training), it is, it seems to me, doing remarkably well in Congress. The reason that UMT is so hard to understand is that it is not needed now, would not and could not be put into general operation now, and if the world conflict brings us nearer to war, it will not be used at all.

The case for UMT rests on the possibility that having rearmed and improved the balance of power we may succeed in doing what we say we are trying to do—namely, to avert a great war. UMT is designed not for a third world war, but for the only alternative to a third world war—namely, for an armed truce between the two coalitions in which they find it possible to coexist.

UMT, therefore, is designed for a time which may or may not come. No one can possibly know for certain whether that time will or will not come. That is to say a time when we are not engaged in ground fighting, as we are now in Korea, when it would be sound military policy not to have so big a standing Army as we hope to have in 1952; when, nevertheless, it would be suicidal folly not to be able to enlarge that smaller Army quickly in case of trouble.

It is fair to say, I think, that the measure would pass readily enough, substantially as General Marshall wishes it, if it were made plainer than it has yet been made that the military-manpower bill contains the draft and universal military training in one package because we must be prepared both for war and for an armed truce—and that it would be exceedingly dangerous not to be prepared for both of these contingencies.

If unhappily war were certain, there would be no point in talking about UMT. We should rely entirely on the draft to prepare for the war and to fight the war. Today, and for at least 2 years to come, our task is to build up our Armed Forces, which were at the level of about 1,400,000 men at the start of the Korean war. The level which we are aiming at is 3,500,000. This is being done by volunteering backed up by the draft. While this build-up is going on UMT is not needed. The men are being trained in the Army before they serve in the Army, and when they have finished their term of service they will remain in the Reserve for some years to come. In this period of emergency build-up the facilities and the instructors needed to operate universal military training on any large scale are preempted by the Army itself.

Moreover, though expert opinion is not unanimous on this point, it is probable that if we are compelled to keep the Armed Forces at the level of 3,500,000 men in uniform, then probably UMT could not be put into operation, nor would UMT be needed with such a big standing Army replenished by the draft. The drafted men, with their long training and service in the Armed Forces and, after that, with their 6 or 8 years in the Reserve, would be all the military manpower that the country—considering its ocean frontiers—could use in the early stages of any war.

Universal military training is preparation for the long pull, the long armed truce which is the best that anybody has reason to hope for. If there is to be a long armed truce, the maintenance of a huge standing army will become a very serious matter. The financial cost to the Government will be huge. But that is almost certainly a comparatively minor part of the trouble. The

serious difficulty will be the young men in the camps—their education and their careers interrupted, separated from their families and friends, their normal plans to marry and raise families postponed—with not enough to do and with no reason to feel that what they are doing is urgent and important.

A great standing army, which is not going off to war, is—as the American people have always known—dangerous and demoralizing and wasteful. It will generate pressures—pressure to have a war and get it over with or pressure not to have a war and to go home. An Army affecting Congress and public opinion in this fashion will make it impossible to carry out a firm and prudent foreign policy. Universal military training is designed to train a Reserve for the Armed Forces which will permit the standing Army to be reduced—if 2 or 3 years hence when we are rearmed, war is not imminent and we are in an armed truce.

The more one studies the matter, the more impressive—so it seemed to me—is the military statesmanship of Marshall and Lovett. They have understood, as almost everyone has, the imperative necessity of increasing rapidly our immediate military power. They have understood, as I suppose most of us have, that our military power must be capable of rapid expansion beyond the expansion which is actually undertaken now.

But they have understood also, though not many understood it at the outset, that they must not expand the Military Establishment beyond the point of no return—that is to say to a size where it cannot be supported indefinitely and where, therefore, a war becomes necessary before the Military Establishment deteriorates. It is a very high form of statesmanship—to have grasped this and to have been able to translate the idea into a concrete military program. But that is how and why universal military training has become an integral part of a sound military policy.

Letter From a Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a ringing letter of Americanism addressed by Marine Sgt. Albert Currier to all Americans:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe of April 1, 1951]

LETTER FROM A MARINE

(Marine Sgt. Albert Currier, 26-year-old Nahant veteran of World War II, is a patient at Chelsea Naval Hospital where he has been recovering from severe head wounds received while serving with E Company, Second Battalion, Seventh Regiment, First Marine Division at the Chosin Reservoir, Korea. He wrote this letter to parents before starting convalescent leave which he will spend with his wife and three children. He tells what the Marine Corps has meant to him. He expects to be hospitalized for the next year and a half. Sergeant Currier's father and two brothers were also marines.)

DEAR PARENTS AND MOTHERS OF MEN WHO SOON MAY ENTER SERVICE: I know it's tough to see your boy leave home to enter military service, but, believe me, the forces that threaten our American way of life aren't fooling. Even though you realize this you're probably lying awake nights wondering what is best for your boy to do.

Perhaps, as you read this, you'll wonder how a guy with a hole in his head can bring you any comfort. Well, there's no getting round it, that's a chance that every man takes when called to defend his country.

But, sure as shootin', his chances for survival are greater if he belongs to an outfit that demands ample training before going into combat and teaches him, through mind and body coordination, to think and act quickly. That's what you get in the Marine Corps and that's what paid off at the Chosin Reservoir. There could have been thousands more casualties in the strategic withdrawal from Hanghum but for the discipline, unity, and teamwork of marines trained for leadership.

It was that strict discipline throughout the ranks that made it possible for the marines to fight their way out of the icy Communist trap at the reservoir, bringing their wounded with them. It was why they were able to salvage men and equipment with the exception of useless articles of personnel gear in the successful though desperate evacuation of Hanghum.

To be a marine is to learn the meaning of comradeship. Take me, for example. I got hit up near the reservoir on top of a 3,500-foot hill. It was November 4, and the day before we'd seen our first Chinese Communist, two prisoners in heavy quilted clothes who walked into us. I was covering our forward observers with harassing fire—setting my mortar to the right range when I saw a green flash, felt something like a bee sting, and that was the last I knew till I woke up in the Tokyo General Hospital 6 days later on the birthday of the Marine Corps.

GETS BEST TREATMENT

But my buddies took care of me. They applied wound compresses and carried me down the hill, on a stretcher, two at a time on relief. I don't know how long it took them to get through the thick underbrush and shrubbery, but I do know that it took 3½ hours to climb the hill in the first place.

They turned me in to the aid station, where I got blood plasma and had my dressings changed. Then they went back to fight. Later I got a letter from them with a paragraph from each gun crew and every guy in the platoon signed it. I won't part with that letter in a hurry. You see, I'm 26, years older than most of my buddies, so they used to call me the mother of the outfit.

To show the kind of medical care that a man gets in the Marine Corps, I want to tell you that 9 hours after I got hit I was on the operating table at Tokyo General Hospital, after being flown out of the line by helicopter to Hungnam Airfield and then by emergency flight to Tokyo.

The wound had caused hemorrhage of the brain and 32 fragments of bone were removed from the back of my skull. I got 7 pints of whole blood and 47 spinal taps. While I was unconscious a Gray Lady wrote to my wife in almost the same words I would have used myself. Every week while I was on the critical list my wife was notified of my progress.

If your boy joins the Marine Corps, I hope he'll never need the drastic medical treatment I did; but if he does, he'll get it—the best all the way through. He'll also have religious guidance and counsel in personal problems from the chaplain of his faith. He'll be taught discipline, manners, and morals. And he won't lack for educational opportunities.

THE OUTFIT IS TOPS

The Marine Corps Institute offers more than 200 correspondence courses, at Government expense, earning up to 2 years' college credit. Marine Corps training courses in aviation, Diesel engines, photography, radio, telegraphy, cooking, baking, engineering, business administration, and other subjects fit a man for a civilian job and additional income after retirement. The higher his rating, the more retirement pay he'll get.

Pride in the Marine Corps, in being a member of a tough outfit that has been winning battles for 175 years, is something a man never loses. Once a marine, always a marine; and if you see a man who has served in the corps walking down the street in civilian clothes, you'll recognize him. It's a wholesome feeling.

During the war we were all together in the Pacific, all in the Second Marine Division. My brother Bill was the first to go in 1942. He served in First Marine Aviation at Munda. Then my dad, Donald H. Currier, volunteered at the age of 48. He was the only one of us to get wounded—on the Marshall Islands. I joined up after he did, and then my brother Donald H., Jr., came in.

I saw dad at Pearl Harbor, then went on to Saipan and then to Tinian, where I met Donald. From there I went to Okinawa, and after the Japanese surrender served 3½ months' occupation duty. I got my discharge from the Marine Corps Reserve that year, but reenlisted in the Regulars in 1947.

My son wants to be a marine, and if he was 18 he would be.

Good luck to you and your boy.

Iran's Crisis Explosive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Iran's Crisis Explosive," written by Joseph G. Harrison, foreign editor of the Christian Science Monitor.

This article was reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., and appeared in the Washington Post on April 3, 1951.

The International Latex Corp. has established a wide reputation over a period of years of public service advertisements in order to bring to the attention of the public various views and information available on many important problems.

The article is as follows:

IRAN'S CRISIS EXPLOSIVE

(By Joseph G. Harrison, foreign editor of the Christian Science Monitor)

Most of vast Asia, from its dripping jungles to its glacial highlands, is in turmoil.

Whole nations, peoples, and areas—some of them with cultures thousands of years old—are in upheaval, discarding the old, trying the new, overthrowing governments, strengthening democracy, or establishing dictatorships.

Surprised by the violence of movements affecting hundreds of millions of persons, the Western World must adapt itself now to a new Asia. And it must do so swiftly and wisely if it is to save what remains of that immense land mass for democracy and progress.

If there has been any doubt about this, it now has been forcefully dispelled by the recent events in Iran.

TRIGGER-TINE STATUS

With the assassination of Premier Ali Razmara and former Minister of Education

Abdul Hamid Zanganeh, and the decision of the Iranian Parliament to nationalize the great Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., the situation in that country has reached trigger-fine explosiveness. Upon the outcome of that situation could depend no less a thing than world peace itself.

Lying on the southern borders of the Soviet Union and within a few minutes' flying distance of the main Russian oil fields, Iran is of great importance for at least two reasons. First is its strategic importance. If Iran should go Communist, Russian influence would reach the Indian Ocean, the Middle East would be isolated from India, and the whole balance of power in that part of the world would shift.

The second reason is oil—black, thick, priceless, and nearly inexhaustible. Several thousand years ago the ancient Iranians founded a religious movement called Zoroastrianism, based upon the worship of fire, which they would kindle from the dark, oily ooze which soaked through their country's soil. Now, however, that oil is used to fire something else—the trucks, tanks, planes of the West's military might.

CRUCIAL TO RUSSIA

Yet important as this oil is to the West—it supplies the major portion of Britain's home consumption and is a tremendous dollar earner—it would be even more important to the Soviet Union. Best estimates are that oil production is lagging throughout the Communist world, and it is believed that this may be one of the reasons Moscow so far has avoided a general war. With reserve stocks from Iran, Russian hesitancy might possibly change.

As well as any place in the world, Iran typifies what the forces of democracy are up against in their effort to establish stability and to insure peace. Simply put, Iran is a bewildering compound of unbelievable poverty, stupendous riches, diplomatic intrigue, and hatred for foreigners.

On one side stands the mass of the people—toiling, illiterate, and so poor that they are barely able to feed and clothe their children. On the other side stands the tiny coterie of land owners, industrialists, tribal sheiks, and politicians—owning most of the land, receiving all the privileges, giving all the orders, and monopolizing the country's fabulous wealth.

TWO SEETHING ELEMENTS

This condition has produced two dangerous elements of discord. The first is the Communist Tudeh Party, which aims to turn the country into another Soviet satellite. The activities of this party gave the United Nations its first crisis when, in the spring of 1946, Tudehists attempted to set up an independent left-wing state in the Iranian Province of Azerbaijan.

The second dangerous element is that of wild and exaggerated nationalism, which sees every foreigner as an enemy and every tie with the outside world as exploitation. It was this element which caused the assassination of General Razmara and forced through the nationalization of oil. In a way, these nationalists are as dangerous as the Tudehists, since their activities, if unchecked, could produce such economic and political chaos as to cause Iran's internal collapse.

In other words, conditions in Iran are those which produce the muddy waters of social and economic discord in which communism has learned to fish with signal success. Once roiled, such waters seldom clear until at least some of the legitimate demands of the poor and discontented have been satisfied.

While it is true that a few preliminary steps have been taken in the direction of greater social justice, such as distribution of the royal estates among the needy peasants, only the surface has been scratched so far.

In the opinion of those who have followed Iranian developments most closely, two things are needed.

First and foremost, the West must avoid further antagonizing the nationalists. With patience, it seems likely that the nationalists can be satisfied and the West can obtain Iran's oil.

After that, it is clear that some new and greater contribution must be made to Iran's economic betterment. For many months, Iran has sought a $25,000,000 loan from the United States—a tiny amount when set against today's vast military expenditures. When the loan did not materialize, it added noticeably to that antiwestern sentiment which lies as close to the Iranian surface as do the oil deposits—and is just as inflammable.

Iran is not lost to the West yet. Indeed, there is no irresistible reason why it should be lost. But events of the past month have shown how easy it could be to lose that rich and strategic area. Only wisdom, firmness, diplomacy, and generosity on the part of the West, principally in Washington and London, can prevent the iron curtain from enclosing that land as it has enclosed so many others.

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.)

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the State, Columbia, S. C., of April 13 and 14, 1951:

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of April 13, 1951]

THE MACARTHUR CASE

Since General MacArthur is a military man, born and bred, it is hard for us to understand why he would continue to broadcast his views on the international situation, when his superior in rank had admonished him not to do so. Evidently the general was so convinced that his program was necessary that he felt he should disregard usual military injunctions. Or, perhaps, the general, so long accustomed to being a law unto himself, not even returning to this country some months ago to testify when invited by a Senate committee to do so, had begun to think he was not subject to orders. As to the whys and wherefores of General MacArthur's attitude, we wouldn't know. We are only speculating. But the fact cannot be overlooked that he is charged with ignoring directives, and if he did, therein lies a basic weakness in his case.

That General MacArthur not only was expected, but was obligated, to give the country the benefit of his thinking as to our future course in the Far East is not to be denied by any fair person. But if those responsible for our overhead planning felt that public utterance of conflicting views by one in General MacArthur's position hindered the Nation's efforts to avoid a third world war, then it was reasonable to ask that such statements be cleared through Washington. If General MacArthur felt he could not comply with this request, he could have freed himself from any limitations by asking to be relieved. And we don't understand why he didn't do so and beat the President to the draw.

As to whether the MacArthur plan or the Washington plan is the better way to prevent a third world war is not a question to be settled by public debate. But in forming policies, authority must be placed in some hand, and the Constitution gives this supreme command to the President, whether or not he be an able military man. However, a wise executive in any field seeks and takes sound advice from competent people. We hope President Truman availed himself of the counsel of such men as General Marshall, Chief of Staff Collins, and others before determining upon a course.

The debate will rage for years as to whether General MacArthur should have been relieved. And there will always be differences of opinion in the matter. But for the moment, the question is academic. General MacArthur is no longer in command, and the President is not going to reverse himself and reinstate him.

General Ridgway, a competent officer of wide experience, is the man charged now with the responsibility of leading our troops in Korea and directing Japanese affairs. It is an almost superhuman task that has been assigned him, to take over where General MacArthur, with years in the Orient, has left off. But General Ridgway's shoulders are broad, and we believe he is competent to assume the multipost role which has been thrust upon him so suddenly.

When General MacArthur returns to the States there will be much to do over him. He likely will be the center of demonstrations. The public will line up for and against him. He will be spoken of as the Republican candidate for President, and might get the nomination. All of which is all right. This is a free country and we should have free expression. But this is all right only so long as the dispute does not hamper us in our war effort. Personalities must be placed second when a country is fighting for its existence.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of April 14, 1951]

NO PLACE FOR POLITICS

One unfortunate angle to the MacArthur removal is that already it is taking on a political aspect, and this is no time for a partisan line-up on foreign policy.

The Republicans are leading the denunciation of the President. They are even talking of instituting impeachment proceedings, but on what ground it is not clear. Democrats of the national hue are lining up behind Mr. Truman. And a merry war of party accusations is in full rage. This is to be regretted. The MacArthur case should be argued on its merits, and on its merits only.

If General Ridgway proves to the leader that those who know him expect him to be; if he does as well as chief of the Far Eastern Command as he did as general of the Eighth Army, the fury will in comparatively short time be spent. But if there is a turn for the worse in Korea, and the international situation elsewhere does not look so good, MacArthur's stock will rise, and Truman will be blamed for the course the war has taken.

As the State sees it, this is no time for wild talk, incrimination, and recrimination. It is a time for calm deliberation. Love or dislike of either Truman or MacArthur should have no place in the appraisal of the drastic action which removed with one stroke of the pen an honored general from all of his commands.

If General MacArthur failed to respect the admonitions of his superior officer, the President, and persisted in making statements which embarrassed Washington in its dealings with other countries, he invited reprimand and possibly removal. Perhaps that was his way of making his point. We don't

know. On the other hand, if, as one of his chief aides declared, the general disobeyed no directives, the specific cause of removal is not so clear. But this much is certain: The President, acting either on his own or with advice of consultants, decided he thought General MacArthur's attitude was hurting the country's chances of remaining out of a third world war, and, justifiably or unjustifiably, ordered the general to turn his duties over to someone else. Mr. Truman having acted, General MacArthur is out, but our problems in the Far East and elsewhere are still with us: This it would be fatal to forget.

To show how the argument is becoming an interparty one, Senator WHERRY in replying to the President spoke not as an individual Senator incensed over what had occurred but as the Senate's Republican leader. He made no effort to conceal his partisan approach.

If the defense effort has been set back, as many contend, by MacArthur's removal, it will be further set back if our foreign relations are put on a partisan, rather than a bipartisan, basis. The good of the country must be put above the 1952 election.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have wondered how long the President of the United States, Commander in Chief, would tolerate the disobedience of General of the Army MacArthur to the orders of his superiors and his disregard of the policies of our Nation and as approved by the United Nations and all of our leaders.

In the past few days I have inserted in the RECORD, for the information of the House and the country, several articles, editorials, and comments of several outstanding recognized international authorities. Today I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Wallace Deuel which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of April 15 that clearly sets forth the willful disregard of General MacArthur on four occasions, to assurances given to the emissary of the President, W. Averell Harriman, to Chief of Staff General Collins, and to the President himself who, for and in the interest of peace, traveled thousands of miles to confer with General MacArthur. Consequently, I cannot understand why many people fail to realize that it is not a question between President Truman and General MacArthur as individuals but one involving the authority of the office of the Presidency under the Constitution of the United States.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this situation has arisen by willful disregard of orders and purposely made to create a political issue, in cooperation with and upon the insistence of the Republican leaders and newspapers. Mr. Deuel's article follows, and I also include an Associated Press report captioned "Vatican paper backs Truman firing of Mac":

[From the Washington Star of April 15, 1951]

CONSTITUTIONAL DIVISION OF POWERS FIGURES IN TRUMAN-MACARTHUR RUPTURE—PRINCIPLE IS OFTEN MORE HONORED IN BREACH THAN IN PRACTICE—OTHER MILITARISTS HAVE RAISED ISSUE

(By Wallace Deuel)

The Nation's most colorful and most controversial senior soldier tried to defy the Constitution this week—and failed.

President Truman relieved General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of his command for prolonged and repeated flouting of orders and replaced him with Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

Republicans, who have long been partial to MacArthur—as he has sometimes seemed to be to them—sprang to his defense, the general prepared to come home to state his case, and the country was plunged into a bitter controversy.

The final outcome and consequences of these dramatic events remained uncertain at week's end. At least one towering fact emerged out of all the fire and fury, however:

This fact is that President Truman has reasserted the constitutional principle of the supremacy of the civilian authority of the Republic over the military.

HONORED IN BREACH

It has sometimes seemed, during the past decade or more, that this principle has been more honored in the breach than in the observance.

Enjoying vast powers, and checked by few lets or hindrances, some of America's strong-willed generals and admirals have tended to act as though they were answerable to no superior authority, civil or military. Discipline, to these men, has appeared to be something which they imposed on others, but which was not to be imposed on them. There has been no one, it has seemed at times, who could command the commanders.

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into actual service of the United States," the Constitution provides. Some generals have not obeyed.

The Constitution also makes the President primarily responsible for the conduct of the country's foreign relations, too, but some generals have not paid conspicuous heed to this provision either.

General MacArthur has finally forced this constitutional issue of the powers of the Presidency.

MacArthur has been a proud and imperious man all his life, and he has been increasingly intransigent since the end of World War II. He has outdone even himself, however, since the outbreak of the Korean conflict.

The drama of his defiance during this latter period has played itself out in a prologue and four acts—up to now.

PROLOGUE

The curtain rose on the prologue early in August, when MacArthur flew to Formosa, last precarious foothold of the Chinese Nationalist regime of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, to discuss plans for the island's defense.

The military dispositions which MacArthur made are still official secrets. In addition to making these arrangements, however, the general also did two other things which, far from remaining secret, attracted world-wide and not altogether indulgent notice:

He kissed Mme. Chiang's hand (notwithstanding the fact that the hand was gloved at the time) and he uttered spirited and martial sentiments about Formosa, the Chinese civil war, communism, and world policy in general.

The Chinese Nationalists exploited these statements to the utmost. They also intimated that MacArthur had gone much further, in secret conversations, and had promised them support above and beyond any contemplated by American policy.

This all caused some unease in Washington, and it caused even greater unease among America's friends and allies.

The United States had U. N. sanction, and it had allies, in what it was doing in Korea, but it had neither in what it was doing in Formosa. There, America was alone. Its allies, indeed, heartily disapproved of America's China policy. The United States might completely isolate itself in the world if it did what MacArthur seemed to propose should be done.

President Truman decided there was some danger that MacArthur might have mistaken what American national policy was. Accordingly, he sent W. Averell Harriman, special White House adviser on foreign affairs, on a mission to explain matters to the general.

Mr. Harriman returned to Washington, in due course, full of assurances. All was in order, he said. MacArthur understood what policy was and would, of course, respect it. The general is a soldier, said Mr. Harriman; he will do what he is told.

The prologue of the drama ended on this tranquillizing note.

Hardly were Mr. Harriman's shirts back from the laundry, however, when General MacArthur demonstrated that he could not have paid too close attention to what the White House emissary had said. For the curtain now rose on the general's first virtually open defiance of the President.

ACT I

Mr. Truman had proclaimed that the United States had no selfish interests in Formosa, and no aggressive designs on it. This country had intervened in the island only temporarily and only to neutralize it, the President had said—to protect the flank of the forces fighting in Korea, and to prevent the spread of the conflict. The future status of the island could be determined only by international agreement after peace had been restored.

This policy was not to MacArthur's liking, and he opposed it in official recommendations to his superiors in Washington. The general was overruled, however. The policy would stand, he was informed, and must be upheld.

But MacArthur refused to uphold it. On the contrary, he appealed to public opinion against his superiors.

He sent a message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, then in convention assembled in Chicago, in which he repeated the same arguments against the national policy which his superiors had rejected. Some of the arguments were even stated in the same language in the message as that in which they had been stated in the recommendations.

American policy, General MacArthur said, must be aggressive. The whole Pacific must be an American moat.

Formosa, he insisted, was an essential link in an "island chain" from which "we can dominate with air power every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore." America must, accordingly, retain control of the island indefinitely, for the purposes of this country's own national security.

The arguments of those who differed with him were "fallacious and threadbare," MacArthur said, and were marked by "hypocrisy and sophistry." It was unfortunate that these arguments had "confused and deluded" many individuals "distant from the actual scene."

The general sent a large number of advance copies of this remarkable statement to friends and acquaintances in the United States, and to a wide assortment of editors, but he did not send any to the State Department, the Pentagon, or the White House. Official Washington learned about the message from newspapermen shortly before it was due to be released.

President Truman was intensely annoyed. He immediately ordered MacArthur to withdraw his message. The general complied. The message could not be suppressed, however. It was already in the hands of too many people. It was published on August 28.

American policy thus was again frustrated, American pledges were again made suspect, and America's allies were again alarmed and alienated.

The President nevertheless made another effort to keep the peace with MacArthur. He sent the general a message praising him for his military accomplishments and explaining once again, with conspicuous tact, what American policy in Asia was and why he had had to ask that the general's message be withdrawn. General MacArthur seemed to accept the President's position and once again harmony seemed to reign.

Once again the curtain fell on a peaceful note. All seemed well, or at least reasonably well.

ACT II

Yet misgivings may have lingered in the President's mind. In any event, Mr. Truman flew to Wake Island on October 12 for a personal visit with MacArthur.

There were conferences in which other officials took part, and the President and the general talked privately for an hour as well. Mr. Truman returned to the United States on October 16, professedly as full of confidence and good will as Mr. Harriman was previously.

The President paid stirring public tributes to MacArthur, and proclaimed that all was and would be well. He denounced a reporter who asked him at a press conference on October 19 if he and the general were now in agreement. It was outrageous even to raise such a question, the President angrily declared.

This was not, of course, an answer to the question which the reporter had asked. Were the President and the general in agreement or were they not? Perhaps the President wasn't sure himself.

But if there were any doubts in Mr. Truman's mind, they were soon dispelled.

ACT III

In November General MacArthur launched an offensive which was to destroy such of the enemy's remaining forces as could be destroyed and drive the rest out of the country.

This was to be an "end the war" offensive. "I want to make good on my statement that they (the U. N. troops) are going to eat their Christmas dinner at home," the general said.

But the offensive ended in tragedy. The Chinese Communists intervened in Korea on a massive scale, and threw the U. N. forces reeling back to below the thirty-eighth parallel.

This was a military disaster, but not yet a political one. MacArthur, however, now threatened to turn the defeat into a political disaster too.

There was some public criticism of the general's conduct of the "end the war" offensive, and some questioning as to whether he should have undertaken it at all. MacArthur reacted with characteristically fierce resentment.

"Never was a man so sorely tried," he exclaimed, and he made a whole series of public pronouncements in which he blamed the defeat in Korea on Washington and on the United Nations.

He blamed them for not warning him that the Chinese Communists would intervene. He blamed them for denying him authority to bomb Manchuria. He said that the limitations imposed on him were unprecedented in military annals.

General MacArthur also asked that he be allowed to use Chinese Nationalist troops in Korea, and he said yet once again that it was necessary to destroy world communism in Asia.

There was much sympathy for MacArthur at this juncture of affairs. But the course of action he was advocating was contrary to the best military judgment in Washington. It was contrary to national policy. It was contrary to repeated assurances as to American intentions which this Government had proclaimed to the world. It was contrary to the policies of America's principal friends and allies. It was contrary to MacArthur's instructions.

Once again the general seemed to be confirming Communist charges that the United States had embarked on a policy of aggression in the Far East, and once again he alarmed and alienated America's allies.

This was the third occasion in 3 months on which the general had undertaken publicly, contrary to the orders of his Commander in Chief, to reverse the Nation's foreign policy. The President, however, still tried to keep the peace with his commander.

Publicly, Mr. Truman stoutly defended General MacArthur against his critics, and even privately he limited himself to directing the Joint Chiefs of Staff to admonish the general to clear future military and foreign policy utterances with his superiors. Categorical instructions to this effect went to MacArthur on December 6.

Washington also sent Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, to the Far East to confer with General MacArthur and, among other things, to request him to pay more heed to orders and advice from the Capital.

General Collins returned as optimistic as Mr. Harriman and the President had been after their conferences with MacArthur. He had just as little justification for his cheery mood as the President and Mr. Harriman had had for theirs, as events were once more to prove.

ACT IV

The fourth and thus far final act of the drama opened March 20.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff on that day sent MacArthur a message informing him that the United States was planning, in cooperation with other United Nations members, to make a new cease-fire proposal to the Chinese Communists. The Joint Chiefs asked the general to send them any comment he might care to make on this proposal.

General MacArthur did not reply to the Joint Chiefs' request. Instead, on March 24, he made a cease-fire proposal of his own. In it he threatened that the U. N. might attack the Chinese mainland if Peiping did not stop fighting in Korea.

General MacArthur followed this up with a second stirring manifesto which he gave out the next day.

This 48-hour period of March 24 and 25 was the point of no return in the general's destiny. The action of the drama now quickened.

On March 24 the Joint Chiefs sent MacArthur a new admonition:

"The President has directed," they informed him, "that your attention be called to his order as transmitted December 6, 1950. In view of the information given you March 20, 1951, any further statements by you must be coordinated as prescribed in the order of December 6."

"Must?" This reminder had no more effect than the original order had had.

On April 5, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican, of Massachusetts, House minority leader, read on the floor of the House a letter General MacArthur had written him insisting yet once again that world communism must be fought in Asia, and fought now—as, indeed, the general said he was doing.

On the same day, the London Daily Telegraph published an interview which it said General MacArthur had given its military correspondent and in which the general was quoted as saying much the same things he had written to Representative MARTIN, but in even more intransigent tones and terms.

There was to be one more incident before the denouement. The Associated Press published a message from General MacArthur to one of its editors in which the general asserted that 120,000 South Korean troops had been released from combat duty by "political" decisions beyond his authority.

The clear implication was that this action had been taken against MacArthur's wishes, and that it had unduly weakened his forces.

In fact, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had proposed providing arms for these troops, and for a considerable larger number in addition, for the purpose of maintaining them in the field in Korea, but MacArthur had recommended that the arms be given to the Japanese national police reserve instead.

It was only now, finally and at long last, that the President took decisive action against his contumacious commander. Mr. Truman acted in the only manner which remained possible if any action was to be taken at all: He relieved General MacArthur of his command, told the world why he was doing so, and published some of the evidence in the case.

General MacArthur's challenge to the constitutional authority of the President has been so spectacular that some shrewd observers think the general has deliberately forced the climax which was reached this week. He was determined to achieve either absolute authority or a sensational martyrdom, in this view.

The martyrdom, if that should be his lot, would be peculiarly poignant if General MacArthur should appear to fall victim to foreigners, politicians, diplomats, and other such unloved persons, and the general has sought to formulate the issue in these terms. The more raucous of his admirers echo and outdo him in this claim.

In fact, however, the issue is between MacArthur and the Constitution of the United States. The issue is whether the civilian Commander in Chief is to exercise effective authority over the military.

This would be the issue even if there were important disagreements between America and its principal allies and associates on the fundamentals of the policy which the general has defied, or between the Pentagon and the White House. But there are no such disagreements, so far as the duly constituted authorities are concerned.

There is a clear consensus among these authorities, both military and civilian, that the challenge of world communism must be met in the first instance in Europe, not in Asia.

There is a clear consensus, furthermore, that the Communist challenge must be met, so long as conceivably possible, by means short of general war—and that there is a fair chance that it can be met successfully by such means.

The free nations must seek to implement this and every conflict which may break out, in this judgment. Above all, they must avoid, at almost any cost, being drawn into a major war on the mainland of Asia.

If general war is to come, then it must come only because the Communists are determined it must come, and force it on the world. The free nations must not scare it.

And again, if general war comes, the primary effort to win it must be made in Europe, not Asia.

This country's constitutional authorities also agree with those of most of the rest of the free world in their attitude toward MacArthur's policy acts and utterances of the past 9 months.

They do not mean and do not intend to be overruled and reversed by any single individual. Least of all do they mean or intend to be overruled and reversed by the open defiance of a general who, no matter how great a field marshal he may be, they have finally, reluctantly, and regretfully concluded is dangerously mistaken in his thinking and dangerously unsuited in temperament for the great responsibilities which always must accompany great authority.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of April 14, 1951]

VATICAN PAPER BACKS TRUMAN FIRING OF MAC

VATICAN CITY.—Observatore Romano's news commentator said Saturday, President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur proclaims a "desire for peace, not by words, but by a decisive act"—one that might even be against his own popularity.

The comment—by Giorgio Luigi Bernucci—was the first on MacArthur to appear in the Vatican newspaper that usually reflects the opinion of Pope Pius XII.

Bernucci pointed out that some commentators had observed that the Korean situation would not be altered by the general's recall, but only if the United Nations desire to negotiate met a similar willingness on the part of Peiping.

"But," said the Observatore writer, "MacArthur remained the expression of that policy that held all further diplomatic effort to be useless and thought that the decision could be obtained only by military success—in practice, war against China with all the risks that could come from it."

Inviting World War III?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the United States News and World Report for April 20, 1951:

INVITING WORLD WAR III?

(By David Lawrence)

One issue transcends all others in the controversy that has risen over the removal of General MacArthur as the United Nations Commander in the Far East.

It is whether this sensational step will be construed by the Politburo in Moscow as a sign of strength or of weakness. Will not the very circumstances under which the general was relieved of his command encourage the aggressors and lead them to extend their bold adventures in different parts of the world?

General MacArthur has been the symbol of a determined resistance against Communist aggression—a symbol of the use of total force against an unscrupulous enemy. His removal amounts to a political restriction upon the right of a military commander to fight the enemy with a maximum use of his power directed to any part of adjacent enemy territory.

Instead of fighting a war to win, we are to drag along in a stalemate in Korea—we are to fight without a decision or a second front in Asia to harass our enemies. For months and maybe years, our troops will be subjected to recurrent attacks, while the Chinese Communists, aided by Russian supplies and equipment, continuously pour their manpower into the Korean Peninsula and steadily increase our casualty lists.

The American is not one accustomed to fighting with his hands tied behind his back. Several hundred Russian jet planes attacked our air force last week in what the news dispatches described as "the greatest jet battle in history." Yet Mr. Truman says we must not attack the bases from which these jets came. If the Commander in Chief in Washington, however, calls for a limited war and wants it fought that way, every soldier and sailor and airman must obey. Certainly the President has a constitutional right to secure compliance with his orders and to remove General MacArthur. Similarly, the general now has a right as an American citizen in a democracy to accept that dismissal and carry his case to the country.

If we are to grow technical, Congress, too, has some constitutional rights. It can impeach President Truman not only for carrying on a war in Korea without a declaration of war by Congress, but primarily for failing to let our troops fight the enemy with all the weapons at their command. We already have had 60,000 casualties in 9 months—more than we had in the first full year of World War II.

The debate will go on for a long time now. It will, regrettably, become political. The President may have satisfied Britain, but he has split America. He has destroyed the bipartisan approach to foreign policy which we had a right to hope for. Certainly MacArthur was entitled to a personal hearing before any order of dismissal was issued.

Meanwhile, what do the Russians think? They read that our Department of State on March 20 requested MacArthur to agree to deploy his troops in such a way as to avoid "any advance with major forces north of thirty-eighth parallel" and yet to "permit sufficient freedom of action for next few weeks to provide security for United Nations forces and maintain contact with enemy," so as to give time "to determine diplomatic reactions and permit new negotiations that may develop."

They read the speech of the American President publicly confessing his fear of enraging the new master of Asia—Communist imperialism.

They read also that the Labor government in Great Britain is proposing to placate the Communist Chinese by turning over Formosa to them.

They read that the British Government not only wants Communist China admitted to the United Nations but to sit as a partner at the treaty conferences which are to determine the fate of the Japanese people.

If this doesn't all add up to appeasement, then the Kremlin doesn't have any interpretive brains, doesn't know the difference between a cringing, craven attitude and a forthright, courageous position.

England says: "Appease in Asia and save Europe."

MacArthur says: "Appease in Asia and you lose Europe."

Truman says, in effect: "Don't appease but also don't fight with all your might—the enemy might get mad."

The average American will say: "Appease anywhere, show weakness to a bandit or a bully, and you're lost. To keep on saying you're afraid to go into a big fight will only invite attack from the other fellow."

We must now increase even more our military strength. To diminish our armament and reward the aggressor for his aggression by admitting Red China into the U. N.—as the British advocate—is just to invite world war III. Chamberlain, by his compromise at Munich, invited World War II. It could be that, in beginning to yield step by step to the British policy, President Truman—with the best intentions in the world to do the very opposite—has committed us to fighting world war III both in Asia and Europe.

Public-Assistance Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

HOUSE RESOLUTION 37, SUBMITTED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the lower house of the Illinois State Legislature has for some time last past carried on an investigation on behalf of the State of Illinois in order to determine accurately the facts pertaining to the public-assistance program operated by the State in conjunction with the Federal Government under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

The lower house of the State Legislature in Illinois is in favor of amending the public assistance code of Illinois and thereby make available to public inspection a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State.

It is conceded that such an amendment is in conflict with the present Federal law.

I call attention to the language of the resolution which follows and, under unanimous consent, extend the resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD, to wit:

House Resolution 37

Whereas the Congress of the United States by amendment to the Federal Social Security Act has provided that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public-assistance programs operated by the various States in conjunction with the Federal Government under provisions of the Social Security Act shall be limited to purposes directly connected with the administration of these programs; and

Whereas this injunction of secrecy imposed on the States by said amendment to the Federal Social Security Act is a matter which causes great public concern and is directly responsible for numerous injustices, abuses, and fraud by permitting many individuals not actually in need to receive assistance and to escape detection because of the stringent regulations guarding the names of recipients of public assistance, thus creating dissatisfaction with the public-welfare program in many communities of the State; and

Whereas said secrecy provision violates the fundamental principle that any expenditure of public funds should be subject to public audit; and

Whereas members of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois repeatedly have expressed themselves as favoring an amendment to the Public Assistance Code of Illinois which would make available to public inspection and sound use a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State, only to be advised that such an action would be in conflict with the

Federal Social Security Act and would result in loss of Federal funds for public-assistance purposes; and

Whereas the so-called Federal funds were collected from the taxpayers of Illinois to the extent of almost $3,340,000,000 during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, while less than $3 out of every $100 collected from the people of Illinois was returned to the State of Illinois in so-called Federal aid for all purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we go on record as recommending to the Congress of the United States that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible date amending pertinent sections of the Federal Social Security Act in such a manner that State legislative bodies desiring to do so would be permitted to remove restrictions in State laws concealing the identity of public-assistance recipients and to provide that a list of the names of all recipients of assistance be available for public inspection in a proper public office; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eighty-second Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

Adopted by the house March 28, 1951.

WARREN L. WARD,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

FRED W. RUSSO,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Unacceptable Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Joplin Globe of April 13, 1951:

UNACCEPTABLE EXPLANATION

In his radio address to the Nation Wednesday night, President Truman attempted to justify his summary dismissal of General MacArthur by explaining that the general is not in agreement with United States and UN policy in the Far East.

Even if one grants that this is true, it by no means will be deemed a sufficient excuse by MacArthur's admirers and supporters for the harsh and spectacular method used in ousting the general from all his commands.

But it is also true that millions are by no means convinced United States and UN policy as President Truman outlined it has been clear enough heretofore for General MacArthur or anybody else to understand just what it is or has been.

Merely to plead that we want no third world war is no explanation for the unceremonious firing of MacArthur. Nobody wants a third world war. Certainly MacArthur doesn't. But neither he nor millions of others are ready to accept a back-down from the position taken by the United States and the UN last June as the only safe recipe for avoiding a third world war.

Such a back-down is exactly what is proposed by the Asia policy as described by President Truman Wednesday night.

When he directed MacArthur to use United States military forces to challenge the aggression of North Koreans last June the idea was that the free nations of the world must make all of Korea safe for freedom. Now the President and his advisers are apparently convinced we cannot do this; that the best out is to accept a compromise that will leave the North Koreans at the thirty-eighth parallel to ready themselves for another march into South Korea at some future date.

Is it surprising General MacArthur would be dissatisfied with any such conclusion to a war that has already cost the United States more than 50,000 casualties? He is the type that believes in finishing a job. He doesn't accept defeat, partial or complete, with complacency, which is the major explanation for his great popularity with so many Americans. And which also is a major and sufficient reason why he should never have been subjected to the outrageous treatment he has been accorded.

General MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to insert in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the New Haven (Conn.) Evening Register April 11, 1951, which reflects an unbiased and mature reaction to the removal of General MacArthur.

I am proud to see the New Haven Register join the great majority of the responsible press of the country by endorsing the action of President Truman:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

It had to happen.

President Truman's decision to remove General MacArthur from the Supreme Command in the Far East involving not merely the war in Korea but also the supreme command in the whole Asiatic area and the occupation of Japan was determined upon, no doubt, after the most serious consideration. The policies of the President and of General MacArthur were clearly divergent. The general had merely a military situation to consider; the President had both the military and the diplomatic situation to pose upon.

Under the Constitution the President is declared to be the Commander in Chief of our military forces. However wise the attitude of General MacArthur in deciding upon a total all-out war in the Far East and that of the President in proceeding more cautiously, taking into consideration the views of our allies in Europe and in the United Nations, the decision was up to the President and to the President alone. General MacArthur could not be permitted to assume the dual role.

Whether in the course of events the President or General MacArthur is right as to the policy that should be pursued, it was certainly not up to the general to decide. He necessarily could not know all the facts and it was his duty to fall in line with the instructions he received, whether they seemed to him wise or not.

This leaves the situation very unclear. For a long time the American public has been deeply divided in its opinion as to what our policy in this whole world crisis should be. The American public has been restless under what has appeared to be a policy of indecision in our national leadership, an indecision made more evident by divergent political views expressed in Washington. For a time at least, this apparent indecision must continue for the simple reason that it would be most unwise from any standpoint to let the Russians know just what our ultimate plans are to be. They will not know now whether they have got to prepare for a long war in Asia or in the Middle East or in the Balkans or in Western Europe. What they do know now is that plans are being made to cope with aggression wherever it may seem to be most threatening and to meet it there, not merely with all the power we can command, but with the fullest cooperation of the countries in Western Europe and our allies in the United Nations, to whom we are committed and whose opinions and judgment we are naturally called upon to consider if we are to preserve that unity which is essential to a final accomplishment of our aims. While the American people are naturally most anxious to know what our policy is to be, they should, in our opinion, exercise the greatest patience and not participate in any political maneuvering that should make it necessary to let the Russians know what to expect.

In the meantime—and, in fact, that has been true from the very beginning—the most unwise and unpatriotic course at the moment would be to force a disclosure to the Russians of what they may have to meet. Let us keep them guessing. We should proceed as rapidly as possible in our military and industrial preparations so that if and when a more immediate crisis or threat of aggression should develop it can be promptly and effectively dealt with.

Rubber Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include two announcements as recorded.

A number of my colleagues have discussed matters related to the following announcements, and some of them asked me to secure information for the RECORD so the questions could be pinpointed:

The Board of Trade announced last night that licenses will be required from April 9 for the export of raw gutta-percha, raw natural rubber, including crepe, and natural rubber latex, to all destinations other than the Commonwealth, the Irish Republic, and the United States.

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE BY THE FEDERATION OF MALAYA AND SINGAPORE APRIL 5, 1951

The Governments of the Federation of Malaya and Singapore announced jointly last night their intention of adopting measures of destinational control over rubber exports. This conforms with the recently announced decision of the British Government to control such exports in order to prevent unduly large quantities of rubber being sent to any destinations so that insufficient supplies are left available for the United Kingdom and other friendly countries.

2. In the Federation, open general licenses for rubber exports will be withdrawn from April 9, when all exports will come under

licensing control and quantities sent to various destinations will be kept under continuous supervision. No special written application for export licenses will be necessary for shipments to the United Kingdom, Canada, the sterling Dominions, the Irish Republic, and the United States; instead, authority to export will be endorsed by the customs officer upon ordinary export declaration. In all other cases advance written applications must be made for export licenses.

3. In Singapore, where rubber exports are already subject to licensing for other reasons, destination control will now be introduced.

The Act of an Irresponsible Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, by both word and deed President Truman has proven himself unpredictable, unreliable, and irresponsible. He should have been impeached when he ordered MacArthur into Korea in the first place. MacArthur's removal is the act of an irresponsible man. Tragic consequences can be expected as a result of that act. Joe Stalin must be wearing a broad grin these days.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent. It expresses the general feeling of the people of my district so well that I place it in the RECORD as a true expression of the indignation and resentment of the people of Illinois:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MASON: As a citizen of the United States of America and a veteran who saw combat in the last war, I wish to express to my elected Representative my deep outrage at the manner in which the President has violated the trust of the American people and failed to support the interests of his country.

By his blundering and thoughtless act in relieving General MacArthur, the President has placated the cowardly diplomats of our self-interested and parasitic allies, deserted the thousands of Americans who have died or will die in Korea because he ordered them there in the first place, completely and despicably shattered the prestige of the American people and American military leaders as far as Asia is concerned, and given more aid and comfort to our enemies than can be measured.

I tolerated his unstatesmanlike "a. o. b." letters, his labeling the marines as policemen; I accepted his ordering of Americans to die in combat without the sanction of the people; I was disgusted but willing to wait when I heard how his multitude of questionable friends had taken the American people for everything from deep freezers to million-dollar RFC loans, but this final act has completely destroyed my faith in his ability to administer the great office which he holds.

I don't care if the President is a Democrat or a Republican, but I insist that he must always and unswervingly be an American. I can no longer figure out who Mr. Truman represents, but it sure as hell isn't the American people.

If the President's current acts are guided, there are certainly some large "red herrings" in Washington. If his acts are his own ideas, the man is utterly incompetent to hold his office.

I hope you know what flag is flying over the White House. I am beginning to doubt that the President does.

No Time for Hasty Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a thoughtful and impartial editorial which appeared in the Orlando (Fla.) Morning Sentinel on Friday, April 13, 1951, discussing the events of the past week, under the heading "No time for hasty judgment":

NO TIME FOR HASTY JUDGMENT

Never in the modern history of our country has it received such dramatic news as the firing of General MacArthur by President Truman.

MacArthur, although an able general with a brilliant war record, has not lacked for personal publicity. His staff has done a wonderful job of selling him to the American public as well as to our soldiers on duty all over the world. He has constantly been in moving-picture news reels and magazine articles in the most favorable light.

At best, MacArthur is, to tell the truth, a complex individual.

As John Gunther writes in the Riddle of MacArthur:

"Brilliant and masterful on one hand, vain and enigmatic on the other—what manner of man is Douglas MacArthur?"

To the average American, however—and particularly to the women—he represents the idol and ideal of our military prowess. This is even more so of MacArthur than Eisenhower. We don't think Eisenhower has worked at the publicity job as much so as the older man in the Pacific.

Meanwhile, as all of his favorable publicity was building up MacArthur as the modern George Washington, Mr. Truman has been receiving almost as much unfavorable publicity as MacArthur received favorable publicity. The President has been inclined to go off half-cocked, write scorching letters to individuals, low-rate the marines, cram social equality down the throats of Americans, and otherwise make himself thoroughly hated.

So now, when the President may have come up to size and for once, acted like a great leader for the long-range welfare of his country, his countrymen, and the peace of the world, the people doubt him. Having lost complete confidence in Mr. Truman, the people seem to think that he fired MacArthur out of spite. That he just wrote another nasty letter—this time, to a general sitting out there on the frontier of our security and doing what he could to protect it. All of which has certainly made many an American as sore as a wet hen.

But, while General MacArthur is a popular hero in the eyes of the average American, the public should not condemn his discharge by the President too hastily.

Unfortunately, we are not allowed behind the scenes in Washington. We, who are prone to criticise Truman and his advisers for letting this grand old warrior out now, must realize that Washington has more information than we have.

Washington knows, for instance, whether or not we are now able to fight a war with China. Washington knows, for instance, whether Stalin is trying to suck us into Asia and while we are thus employed, on an all-out full-scale war, tear the guts out of Europe, take over its industrial centers, and conquer Europe quite as easily as Hitler did. With Europe in the bag, England would be a pushover and then China would fall at Stalin's ease just as Paris fell after Hitler rushed to the Channel coast.

We must also remember that MacArthur is 71. We must also realize that when we see him debarking from a plane in Korea, he is bent and stooped. He is old and he looks it.

It may be that Mr. Truman and his advisers are trying to forestall world war III right now, simply because they know that this Nation is not ready for it.

It is apparent that MacArthur was willing to take the risk of world war III. He was willing to send the Nationalist troops from Formosa into China. But should he do so? This might mean the beginning of another, perhaps the last, war.

As we said no longer than a week ago, we believe the troops of Chiang Kai-shek should be employed in a second front of China. But now that Mr. Truman and his advisers have ousted General MacArthur so dramatically, it is apparent that Truman and others know considerably more than the editor of this newspaper. It seems that they have interpreted the design of the Russian attack and that they are now refusing to stick their heads in a trap. If Truman is thinking thusly, he is thinking correctly.

But what has happened in such dramatic fashion in the last few hours cannot detract from MacArthur and his record.

MacArthur is certainly crowned in glory.

He has won himself a position in American history, the like of which few of our military commanders have achieved.

At 71, it is time for him now to retire and rest.

He should wear the laurel leaves, the crown of glory. But to wear them well he should neither aspire to the Presidency in 1952—because he will be too old at 72—nor should he seek to create a third world war by speaking and writing assignments.

He is a great man—as history will record him—if he is great enough to quit now.

Van Fleet to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, under permission to extend my remarks, an editorial from the Washington Post of April 12 about a man whom I consider one of our great generals, Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, the new commander in Korea. I had the opportunity to see General Van Fleet's work in Greece at the close of the campaign against the Communist guerrillas, and it seems to me that it is a chapter in American military history that the entire country should know

about. I have always felt that General Van Fleet did not receive the recognition which he deserved.

VAN FLEET TO KOREA

James A. Van Fleet and Matthew B. Ridgway have proved their mettle brilliantly, and should make a great team in the Far East. The ability that General Ridgway has displayed in retrieving the near-debacle beginning last November in Korea is already the theme of many encomiums among military experts everywhere. Of late he has become well known to all Americans. Ridgway's successor in the field command, Van Fleet, is, however, hardly known at all. Yet he is a born soldier, and has already covered himself with laurels in almost precisely the same kind of operation in Greece which he will now undertake in Korea. In military circles the Greek campaign is called a classic.

No commander in modern times has been handed such a platter of handicaps as Van Fleet was given in Greece. Talk about "sanctuaries"—meaning the political limitations imposed by limited wars: the Greek guerrillas had a real sanctuary which fitted Greece almost like a canopy. It stretched across nearly 1,000 miles of frontier from the Adriatic to the Aegean belonging to Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. Directed from a capital in a mountain fastness in northern Greece, the guerrillas fought mainly as raiders, but they also put up pitched battles, and kept the whole countryside terrorized. Time after time General Van Fleet went after them, but was met by a combination of factors which for months had him baffled. There was the mountainous terrain, which is similar to Korea's. Then there was the fear that had all Greece in its grip which made the country people the accessories of guerrillas who always came back. Finally, there was the facility with which the guerrillas, when hard-pressed, could skip over the overarching frontier for rest and replenishment from the larder and arsenal of the three neighboring countries. It was the stiffest task that any field commander could possibly imagine, but Van Fleet was undaunted, let alone uncomplaining.

Early in 1949, Van Fleet engineered a totally new campaign. He instituted a curfew in rural Greece, persuaded this land of villagers that his troops would never relinquish protection, and then proceeded systematically to flush mountain range and valley of the guerrilla bands. The final stroke was delivered when he pushed them to prearranged destinations at Grammos and Vitsi on the Albanian border. Then he drove right along the border and simultaneously loosed Hell-divers with which his Greeks had been trained in secret and made his final bag. The war was over, August 1949, but the world by that time had other preoccupations with Moscow, and failed to appreciate the success. When you think of Pershing's and Kitchener's 3-year travail in the Philippines and South Africa, respectively, you get some comprehension of this man's achievement.

Van Fleet, we wrote a year ago, has left a memory with the Greek soldiers that is bright and shining as well as indelible. They know him as a great captain who welded together a new army and led it to victory and left it a real factor in any future reckoning in the Balkans. We know him as a fine and authentic American with a modesty and a simplicity and a loyalty which are altogether admirable. Policy toward Greece dictated that Van Fleet should take no credit for the successful campaign, but this was natural to Van Fleet, who is one of the most self-effacing men in the Army. There could not have been a better choice to succeed General Ridgway, who now goes to Tokyo with a new assignment, in filling which he will have the good wishes of his countrymen.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the letter which follows so clearly states the fundamental issue underlying the relief of General MacArthur that I consider it well worth every Member's time to read. The author of this letter, W. Prewitt Ewing, of Kansas City, Mo., understands that the future of the United States and freedom is vastly more important than partisan political advantage.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *April 11, 1951.*

HON. RICHARD BOLLING,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLLING: In spite of all the tumult and furor over the President's relieving General MacArthur of his commands, it seems to me as a private citizen that no good purpose would be served by the general's being invited to address a joint session of the Senate and the House. It is my hope that you will vote against such a resolution if presented to the House.

It is my judgment that, had the debate between the President and Commander in Chief and the general been permitted to continue by reports on the radio and through the press, it would have been the cause of bad morale in the enlisted ranks of all the Armed Forces and that it would have caused widening of the rifts between the various branches of the Armed Forces. For General MacArthur to be permitted to dignify and glorify his opinions and himself by appearing before a joint session would only add to the probability of these unhappy results. It is hard for me to believe that any soldier failed to recognize the acts and pronouncements of General MacArthur as insubordination.

Anybody with one eye and half sense knows that General MacArthur will have every opportunity upon his return to express his opinions—and probably for highly lucrative stipends. He will not go without a hearing. It may be that he shall have opportunity to express himself before a committee, or committees, of the Congress. It is certain that Robert McCormick will be hard put to find room in his Chicago Tribune for news other than MacArthur in the next coming months. It is further certain that the Republicans in Congress who put the next election ahead of the next generation will make every effort to exploit the MacArthur incident, although their doing so can only increase the confusion and disunity with which the Nation appears now to be so beset. There is an immorality and debasement of integrity which they would pass off in the name of patriotism.

The broad issues which we face are above and beyond the fate of the Democrats or the Republicans in the next election. It appears that Republican Senators, like DUFF and SALTONSTALL, have shown their greater stature in recognition of this fact, and we can only hope that their views will prevail upon their sides in the two Houses of Congress.

Let us, whatever the hardships and whatever the outcry, see that the supremacy of the civil Government and civil policy shall prevail over the military. To reverse this bedrock principle is to follow the course of Mussolini's Italy, of Hitler's Germany, and of Hirohito's Japan—directly to the Fascist state.

If the President made a mistake, and I do not think he did, the mistake was of but temporary consequence. To have condoned and encouraged the military over the civil Government would have been to set us upon a tragic and possibly fatal undemocratic road.

Very truly yours,

W. PREWITT EWING.

I have read Mr. Ewing's letter and wish to say that it expresses my sentiments and judgments.

EUGENE M. MOORE.

Mother Extraordinary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the time will soon be here when the entire Nation will be observing Mother's Day. I think it is most fitting that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on February 18, 1951, concerning Mrs. George C. Eisenhart. All of Nebraska is proud of this mother and her family.

The article is as follows:

MOTHER EXTRAORDINARY—NINE SUCCESSFUL SONS, TWO DAUGHTERS ARE TRIBUTES TO MRS. GEORGE EISENHART

(By Doris Minney)

If you had chanced to stop in at the George G. Eisenhart home in Culbertson, Nebr., in the 1920's you would have come upon a cluster of romping, rosy-cheeked youngsters and growing young men and women—the 15 children of the late pioneer banker and Mrs. Eisenhart.

Today the 11 remaining children and their remarkable mother are living illustrations of the fine democratic citizens that develop in the typical, well-managed American home.

Now the nine sons and two daughters are scattered over the United States; their father is dead, but their handsome, bright-eyed mother is keeping "the heart of the home" alive for her children and her children's children to return to when they can.

"I want to keep them united as long as I can," she says if you ask her what is her greatest desire.

THREE COLONELS IN FAMILY

An airplane may suddenly rumble in the skies above McCook (where Mrs. Eisenhart has lived since December 1940). The pilot may be one of her two aviator sons, Col. Don Eisenhart, from Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, or Col. Charles Eisenhart, deputy director of public relations with the United States Air Force in Washington, D. C. Or it may be her son-in-law, Col. M. R. Lemon, flying in from Kelly Field at San Antonio, Tex., to bring word from her daughter, the former Elinor Eisenhart, and their three tots.

If the weather is open and there is a homecoming football game at the University of Nebraska (which school was attended by 10 of the Eisenharts) you may see a dark red roadster cruising along on Highway 6 toward Lincoln. Behind the wheel is brunette Marjorie Eisenhart, principal of East Ward School in McCook. Other occupants are her mother, Mrs. George Eisenhart, and Sally Cunningham, McCook physical education

teacher, who makes her home with the Eisenharts during the school term. She is the daughter of Congressman PAUL CUNNINGHAM, of Des Moines.

The trio of women are chatting at a lively pace about the beauty of the crispy fall weather; about how fine it will be to see a football game; about their anticipated reunion with Wayne, a senior in vocational agriculture at the University of Nebraska, and with Carroll, a representative of an insurance company in Omaha.

Eight of the Eisenhart boys—all except Charles, who graduated from Kearney State Teachers College—attended the University of Nebraska and were members of Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity.

"I always plan to attend at least one football game each fall," Mrs. Eisenhart remarks enthusiastically. And you recall that her son, Kirwin, now with an insurance company in Alhambra, Calif., had played on the Nebraska football team, and that two other sons had lettered in track. They were Edward (Ned), now cashier in the Culbertson State Bank founded by his father in 1886, and Warren, a cadet in the junior class at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

When Mrs. Eisenhart tells you that all of her children have been athletic and that she and her husband made great efforts to attend all the football, basketball, and track meets in which their lively progeny participated, you understand when she says:

"My hobbies were always keeping in touch with my children's activities."

After that thrilling football game in which Nebraska defeated Missouri, Mrs. Eisenhart, Marjorie, and Sally enjoyed the planned reunion with Wayne and Carroll.

Later as they were driving homeward they stopped at Clay Center hoping to see Russell Eisenhart, who is with the Soil Conservation Service, but Russell and his family were not home. So they drove on to Cambridge, where Hugh Eisenhart is an attorney with Frank Butler, brother of United States Senator HUGH BUTLER. But when they reached Cambridge it was late, so they did not stop—since it was only 30 miles on to McCook—so Hugh and family would be driving home soon.

LOVE AND DISCIPLINE

As you talk with this alert mother whose gray hair is arranged in a pompadour that frames her vibrant face and high lights her dark, penetrating eyes, you notice that she wears silvery earrings to match the buttons on her trim, dressmaker-style dress. And you wonder how she managed to preserve that well-groomed appearance after a lifetime of serving her children.

For Mrs. George G. Eisenhart is typical of the mothers of the 1900's who sewed and mended and cooked for her family with "changeable help." Not only did she make dresses for her four daughters (two of whom are now dead), but she made underwear for her 11 growing sons (two of whom died).

"We were a family in which the father just loved all of us. The boys had implicit faith in their father—in his goodness," she says with a touch of emotion in her generally controlled voice.

Then she goes on in a brisk manner to say, "Yes, it was their father's goodness and my discipline by which our family developed. My husband and I never interfered or overstepped one another's orders. We were careful not to infringe upon one another's ideas."

Mrs. Eisenhart says there's no secret about how she succeeded in raising so large a family to become healthy, well-educated citizens. "It just took hard work. Faith. Perseverance. You just never let up for a single day when you have a family."

The family lived by a very definite schedule.

"Every child had a hook by the back door on which to hang his clothes when he came in from play. Each child had his own drawer for clothing and underwear (which was never put away unmended). And meals were always at a regular time. My babies had to go to bed at 7 p. m., rain or shine, until they were 4 or 5 years old," the mother recalls.

Democratic principles were established in family living. Mrs. Eisenhart says: "I put it up to the children this way: This home belongs to all of us. It's up to all of us to help take care of it. I tried to show them that they were a part of an organization.

"Each one had definite tasks. The boys always helped with the dishes.

"I always tried to stress in my children responsibility and the necessity of keeping their promises," the wise mother recalls.

"CHEAPER BY THE DOZEN"

Smiling, she continued: "When Charles was home recently some one asked him: 'Do you remember anything particularly well about your childhood?' Charles replied readily, 'Hardly a week goes by that I don't remember one thing.' Well, I wonder what that one thing was. Then Charles went on to say: 'I remember that some one was always saying to me, "The older boys wouldn't have done that."'"

Mrs. Eisenhart read the book, Cheaper by the Dozen, and saw the movie version. She feels there was little similarity between the Gilbreath interpretation of communal life of a big family and the Eisenhart family life.

"I wasn't that good," the Nebraska mother says simply, in referring to the smooth manner in which Mrs. Gilbreath handled the often stormy impacts of her impetuous children and efficiency-expert husband.

"The part I enjoyed most in the book and movie was that referring to the Gilbreath family going for a ride in their automobile."

For every Sunday after all of the Eisenharts had attended Sunday school and church and had a good dinner, 10 or 11 of the children and their parents would take off in the family auto which had a drop seat to accommodate the extra load of small passengers.

"That was our Sunday recreation and the children loved it," she remembers.

Another form of recreation of which the Eisenhart boys were particularly fond was camping out.

Mrs. Eisenhart recalls that although her husband was not especially fond of this rugged form of diversion, he saw that his sons had the opportunity to enjoy the wholesome activity.

"I remember once he camped out with the boys near Estes Park when it was very cold and seemed disagreeable to him. However, he put up no objections because the boys thought it a wonderful event."

THE GIRLS CAME LATE

There wasn't a girl in the Eisenhart family until after six sons had put in their appearance, so the girls were never assigned to too much supervision.

"I was glad the girls weren't among the older of the children," Mrs. Eisenhart says. "They might have been inclined to shoulder too many responsibilities of rearing the other children. The boys were always good to help, but boys always get away from home more than girls, so duties are not so constant with them."

This innate sense of justice seasons all of Mrs. Eisenhart's dealings with her "considerable" family. There was never any partiality or prejudice demonstrated by this judicious woman, who says:

"The children all have been wonderful to me, and I'm equally fond of all of them."

Sally Cunningham, who has been adopted into the clan of recent years since she and Marjorie Eisenhart began sharing an apartment, says:

"I've met every one of the children, and they are a perfect tribute to their parents."

ON SCHEDULE

In matters of discipline Mrs. Eisenhart was firm and fair.

"I seldom punished them," she says. "The most severe treatment I employed was the use of a little green switch when they ran off. A primary rule was that the children were all to come directly home from school and change into play clothes. If they planned to go elsewhere to play, they were to report such to me. If there had to be punishment, that was by denying them the privileges they most liked (such as camping trips)."

There were narrow escapes in the Eisenhart family just as there are bound to be in any sizable family. One of the narrowest occurred at the swimming hole on the Republican River. It was the custom of the boys to run down a bank to the river, jump a barbed wire fence that fringed the bank, and jump directly into the water.

One time Charles Eisenhart slipped when he attempted to clear the fence, fell across the jagged wire and was torn open until his "innards" were exposed. The doctor who sewed him back together doubted that Charles would survive, but he did.

Three of the Eisenhart children died of diphtheria; one died of strep throat.

"The only way you live through such tragedies is that there are tasks awaiting you so you can't stop. There's a baby crying. So you just have to go on—working it off—whether it's grief or otherwise," she says philosophically.

AND 16 GRANDCHILDREN

Humorous incidents were so numerous in the course of family living that if you ask Mrs. Eisenhart to tell of such, she'll say:

"You should ask the children that."

She does recall that when one of the Eisenhart boys brought his fiancée home to give the family a "look-over," the girl, an only child, was almost bewildered at the sight of so many handsome boys gathered around the family table.

"She just kept looking from one to another in amazement," Mrs. Eisenhart recalls as amusement lights her dark, intelligent eyes.

Incidentally, the girl became an Eisenhart by marriage. As of now there are seven daughters-in-law; one son-in-law; 16 grandchildren.

In Mrs. Eisenhart's opinion, large families may not be advisable for all people. She thinks it would be difficult to raise one in the new, smaller houses. But she says:

"I know that a large family was meant for me. It was almost a religion with me."

She considers her greatest reward "seeing my children grow up to live well-adjusted, useful lives."

IN CIVIC AFFAIRS

Despite the demands of motherhood and home making, Mrs. Eisenhart found time to serve as chairman of the Culbertson Public Library Board for 26 years. She was thrice matron of the Culbertson Order of the Eastern Star; a charter member of the Culbertson Woman's Club; an active member of the Presbyterian Woman's Group.

Her married children all have families.

"They all love children," Mrs. Eisenhart says happily.

Then smiling, she adds, "Occasionally the boys tell me they know too much about child care. 'We have to help our wives too much,' they chide good-naturedly."

For the Eisenharts are known for their cooperativeness. The second generation, like the first, continues to carry the torch of service not only at home but in public affairs.

During World War II seven of Mrs. Eisenhart's sons were in service. Four of them and her son-in-law were overseas at one time.

Ask, "How do you keep up with letter writing?"

She'll reply, "I don't. And sometimes I hate myself for it. The children all write. Some of them regularly each week."

REMEMBERED BY PUPILS

That Mrs. Eisenhart devotes the major portion of her time and thinking to her family is admirable and expected. Equally admirable is her concern over the development of her community and State.

She was born in New York; came with her parents to Hayes County, Nebr., when she was a small child; returned to Ballston Spa, N. Y., to attend high school. Then she came back to Nebraska to teach school winters; attend school each summer.

It was while she was teaching in Culbertson that she met and married George Eisenhart. One of her fondest memories is of how her banker husband served as counselor to farmers of that prosperous agricultural area.

Today Mrs. Eisenhart speaks with enthusiasm of the continued extension of irrigation facilities in that community by the Bureau of Reclamation. "This will help stabilize the farmers' income," she says with genuine concern.

Among the farmers and farmers' wives in the Culbertson vicinity are many who were students of Mrs. Eisenhart. One such is Mrs. Alex Eisenach, who was born in Russia and came to Culbertson with her parents when she was 6 years old. Mrs. Eisenach says:

"I started to school when I was 7. Mrs. Eisenhart was my teacher. I couldn't speak English very well (the child spoke German) and I liked her because she was so kind and patient with me. In later years I clerked in the Wacker store in Culbertson and I was pleased because Mrs. Eisenhart always came to me to be waited on."

The estimation of Mrs. Eisenhart's exceptional talent for teaching and motherhood is multiplied by the number of people one may talk with who have known her through the years.

Even though Mrs. Eisenhart will never find time to paint a picture, or write a book, she has created a family that reflects the finest in democratic ideals. In her life motherhood has become an art.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, reaction to President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur has been extensive and varied. To cite one instance, I include the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, April 15, 1951:

VATICAN PAPER BACKS TRUMAN STEP IN MACARTHUR CASE AS AID TO PEACE

ROME, April 14.—President Truman's dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was described by l'Osservatore Romano today as a decisive act proclaiming a desire for peace.

The MacArthur case was removed from the international plane to one essentially domestic by the dismissal, said the Vatican newspaper, which usually reflects the opinion of Pope Pius XII. The newspaper noted that President Truman's decision might even be against his own popularity.

This first editorial comment on the case by l'Osservatore Romano was written by Giroglo Luigi Bernucci.

It said General MacArthur had been "the expression of that policy which held all further diplomatic effort (toward a Korean settlement) to be useless and thought that the decision could be obtained only by military success—in practice, war against China with all the risks that could come from it."

"He found himself waging limited war, but not the enemy, which could count upon vast numerical superiority that could not be touched beyond the Manchurian frontier," the editorial added.

"The logical deduction he drew was that of making means adequate to the end. But the consequence—Truman observed—could be a general conflict.

"The President of the United States refused a policy that presented such a risk for the United States and the world.

"With the discard of the hypothesis to attempt to end the conflict by force of arms, there now remains that of seeking a solution through negotiations."

Noting foreign Communist declarations that General MacArthur had been dismissed because of military reversals or popular opinion against the war, the paper said the affair had "ignited a discussion between the two parties that monopolize the great majority of the American electorate."

It went on to say that President Truman "has—it has been observed—placed himself above contingent party interests with a gesture to ease the situation.

"Unfortunately, it seems that the reply to Truman's gesture comes only with propaganda, which, however, will not change the facts," the newspaper concluded.

He Defied His Superior Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Detroit News of April 12 regarding the recent decision to relieve General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his command in the Far East:

HE DEFIED HIS SUPERIOR OFFICER

Three years ago next November the American people made their choice of a Commander in Chief as well as a President to guide their affairs until 1952.

By the vote of the majority, these responsibilities were given to Harry S. Truman.

Under the system of government in which this majority believes, and must continue to support if we are to remain a democracy, the major policies of our Nation are administered by him, even as they are formed by his guidance and the action of the elected representatives of the people.

Were we to depart from this system, we might still endure, but it would not be under a Government of the United States as we have known it since the days of the founding fathers.

So long as the fundamental principle remains, it is unthinkable and intolerable that any lesser servant of Government, either in a civil or military capacity, should undertake deliberately to overrule the President of the United States or seek by counsel to change what is being done.

When the principle is violated, the main victim is the system itself, and the political discipline which as a people we derive from it.

During his last several months as Supreme Commander in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur gave repeated and deliberate offense to this concept of how the Nation should be governed.

He intervened in political and foreign policy matters not within his province; he ignored the instructions of his Commander in Chief.

The President, in due course, removed him.

Probably no event since Pearl Harbor has more thoroughly shocked and stunned the Nation than this one action closing the public career of one individual. It remains to see whether we will prove capable of viewing the case in perspective, clearly recognizing the vital issue, or will permit partisan prejudice and personal respect for MacArthur's great services to the Nation to compound the damage already done.

The signs are not yet hopeful.

Almost before the ink was dry on the President's order, political party leaders were being routed out of their beds so that they might make capital of the incident.

Resolutions of condemnation were being passed by organizations throughout the country before they had paused to acquaint themselves with all the facts.

What can possibly come of all this except a further beclouding of principle, and a greater deterioration in a situation which calls above all else for national unity?

Never once has the road been closed to MacArthur by which other men bring their influence rightfully to bear in the making of national policy.

At any stage he could have returned to Washington, given his counsel to Mr. Truman and his advisers, and either persuaded them to his way, or resigned, if he believed their policy unsupportable. But this he did not do.

That put it up to the President, after repeated affront, to take the hard and unenviable decision which he regarded as necessary.

In so doing he must have had the advice and support of Defense Secretary Marshall, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs General Bradley, Secretary of the Army Pace, and Army Chief of Staff Gen. J. Lawton Collins.

All these men, by virtue of their training and responsibilities, must be concerned with the question of whether this Nation can survive, or its arms endure in strength, when basic disciplines are trod underfoot.

The American people cannot do better now than turn their minds to this same question, not alone as it applies to the removal of a general, but as it bears on all aspects of the national life.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is overwhelmingly in favor of tidelands legislation which will reestablish in the States the title to all lands within their described boundaries. Congress should act at once to reassert the principle that a sovereign cannot take property without compensation. When the House last

expressed itself on this subject, it voted 257 to 29 against the Federal Government's seizure of State property. Prior to 1937, no good lawyer ever questioned the title of the States in this property which said States had possessed for more than 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, the attorney general of Texas has been a champion of right principles in this matter. He has recently addressed to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY a letter reviewing some of the issues. This letter should be made a part of the RECORD, and I offer it for the benefit of those interested in the subject matter:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., April 10, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I appreciate your sending me a copy of your letter of April 6, addressed to the Governors of the 48 States in which you present your views in favor of Federal interim control of the so-called tidelands and against restoration of State ownership.

While we have always disagreed as to the ultimate permanent solution of this long-standing controversy, I have had the highest respect for you and for the sincerity of your views. In fact, I have agreed with you on the desirability of interim legislation which would permit uninterrupted development of natural resources from the tideland belt, provided the interim legislation does not prejudice the position of the States in their aim for a quitclaim bill as the proper and just permanent legislation.

At your recent hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 20, Texas' Governor Shivers, Land Commissioner Giles, and I filed a joint statement approving the general idea of your interim bill and suggesting amendments which we hoped would be adopted in order that we might support it. These facts are cited merely to recall to your mind that I have favored continued development of this property during the present national emergency the same as you have done. The only major difference between us results from the insistence of Federal officials that they be given exclusive leasing powers over the area during the interim. This is a position with which you agree because it would not hinder, but would actually help, in your fight for permanent Federal control. For the same reason, it is only natural that State officials should fear and oppose such a provision in interim legislation. I see no reason why this interim legislation should not allow continued operations by the States with approval by the Department of Interior, just as has been done for nearly 4 years in California under stipulations between that State and Federal officials. Or a joint operation between the State and Federal officials could be provided so as to give neither side an advantage when permanent legislation is considered.

Regardless of who is right, the fact remains that a majority of the Members of the House (257 to 29 on the last vote in 1948 after the California decision) and a majority in the Senate favor ultimate restoration of this property to the States because of their long-recognized ownership and good faith possession. The States discovered and developed the resources in these lands; and, except for recent Federal claims and lawsuits, there would be no threat of delay in development today. The President and his Cabinet members ignore the majority in Congress, as well as the national emergency, when they threaten to stop production from these lands unless it is placed under exclusive Federal control. If the emergency is as great as you indicate, it would seem that the President would be willing to sign any bill that receives a majority vote in Congress and guarantees continued development of the property. If you are correct in saying that Federal officials would stop production of resources from these lands rather than permit a majority of Congress to provide for their continued development by the States, then the need for their development must not be as great as your letter to the governors would indicate.

Still hoping that a fair interim bill can be worked out, I regret that you have by your letter to the governors raised points which are aimed solely against permanent State ownership legislation. I fear this will cause more opposition to the general idea of interim legislation. At least, you have directed arguments to the governors which I feel compelled to answer as follows:

1. You state that the officials and the press of only three States—California, Texas, and Louisiana—seem to be interested in this issue. Possibly you have overlooked the fact that the Governors Conference (composed of the 48 governors) has been on record since 1948 in favor of State ownership legislation. This is also true of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of Attorneys General, the American Bar Association, the American Association of Port Authorities, National Association of State Land Officials, National Conference of Mayors, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, National Reclamation Association, and many others whose resolutions are listed in the previous lengthy hearings which were made a part of the record in your present hearings in order to conserve the time of your committee. It is doubtful if there is any one domestic issue today on which State officials stand more united than the fight to restore and confirm State ownership of submerged lands. The quitclaim bill now before your committee, authored by 35 Senators representing 24 States, further demonstrates that interest is not localized.

2. You state that if for any reason this bill (your interim Federal control bill) should not pass, this production will be suspended. This assumes that the President and Federal officials will substitute their will for the will of the majority in Congress and end all production rather than yield to the Congress. I do not believe this exists as a real danger. In fact, I raised this as a possible result in a Supreme Court brief in *United States v. Texas*, and the reply filed thereto by Solicitor General Perlman said:

"The United States has no intention of stopping production of oil from existing wells * * * the Secretary of Interior stands ready, on behalf of the United States to authorize continued production from existing wells on proper terms and conditions."

As you know, such continued production has been authorized by order of the Secretary of Interior dated December 11, 1950, and subsequent extensions thereof.

3. You say that nationalization of oil by Iran may result in our loss of this supply of oil to Russia, and urge this as a reason for immediate Federal control of heretofore State-operated marginal sea lands. Actually, the States feel that in nationalizing tidelands, our Federal Government is doing to us exactly what Iran is doing to the British lease owners and that danger lurks in nationalization of State resources here at home as much as abroad. Your own colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming, Hon. LESTER C. HUNT, made this point very forcefully when, as Governor of Wyoming, he wrote the Senate Judiciary Committee in favor of State ownership legislation on February 21, 1946, as follows:

"I share the fear of our people in the establishment of the Supreme Court's doctrine in the tidelands case to the effect that the Federal Government has paramount rights and dominion over the California tidelands. * * * This paramount right and the dominion superior to the rights of the mere title owner to these lands would be the establishment of a dangerous doctrine in America. If this doctrine could be established as to oil because of its part in national defense and the Federal Government's utilization thereof in its conduct of international affairs, this would be the entering wedge toward the nationalization of other vital natural resources. Every State in the Union has some vital natural resource that the National Government could use for national defense and its conduct of international affairs."

Also, eminent authorities on international law believe that Federal control of these submerged lands under the theory of the Supreme Court that they are part of the international domain may result in Russia or other countries making some claim to share in the resources. Judge Manley O. Hudson, Chairman of the United Nations Commission on International Law, Dean Roscoe Pound, Dr. Charles Cheney Hyde, and other experts in the field recently made this joint statement:

"Implicit in the denomination of the area as international domain is the possibility of other nations having rights therein other than innocent passage through the waters. Spain, Mexico, France, England, Russia, and other nations can make no reasonable assertion of an interest in the oil and other minerals within the 3-league Gulfward boundary of Texas so long as this Court recognizes that the area was removed from international domain when it became a part of the Republic of Texas. * * * A contrary conclusion by the United States Supreme Court could well be used by other nations as an opening for claims not now asserted."

4. You urge that governors of interior States should have no fear of losing their river beds, lakes, and other lands beneath inland waters because "the executive branch of the Government has never asserted title to the lands beneath navigable waters, whether * * * the beds of streams or the beds of harbors or bays." The answer is that neither had Federal officials asserted claim to the marginal belt for over 100 years. According to the Supreme Court's California tidelands opinion, the recognition by Federal officials of State ownership is not binding. Promises of Federal officials as to what they will or will not claim are not given much weight by their successors in office. For instance, President Polk, when negotiating for Texas' annexation, wrote Sam Houston, "Of course, I will maintain the Texian title to the extent which she claims it to be * * *." In 1950 Federal officials not only failed to maintain Texas' title but laid claim to it for exclusive Federal use without compensation. In doing so, they also reversed many recent statements of a contrary intention.

If Congress allows the tidelands cases to remain as the law of our land, there is real danger that future Federal officials and Supreme Court Justices will extend it to inland waters. Your colleague from Wyoming, Senator HUNT, also made this point in his letter of February 21, 1948, to the Senate Judiciary Committee, as follows:

"The doctrine announced in the California case is so broad that it is susceptible to the theory's being applied to lands under lakes, bays, rivers, and other navigable inland waters."

Both the Senate and House Committees on Judiciary made the following report after 17 days of testimony on this subject in 1948:

"State officials from every inland State in the Union, except three, testified or submitted statements that in their opinion the decision had clouded the long-asserted titles of the inland States to lands and natural resources below navigable waters within the boundaries of the inland States. * * *

"The Supreme Court has as much power to overrule its prior decisions laying down the inland-water rule as it had power to change its belief regarding ownership of the marginal belt within the boundaries of the States; and it may well do so in view of its holding in the California case, unless Congress acts to establish the law for the future."

The very fact that you have in the past offered a bill to quitclaim lands beneath inland waters is evidence enough that their titles have been clouded. However, inland waters cover 45,251 square miles of land as compared with 26,606 square miles of marginal sea within coastal State boundaries. Oil, coal, and iron ore beneath inland waters are just as necessary to national defense as are the same minerals beneath coastal waters, and the Federal Government has the same duty to protect and defend them. Therefore, it has been consistently agreed among coastal and inland State officials that it would be unfair to quitclaim lands under inland waters without quitclaiming the same type of lands under coastal waters lying within State boundaries. The quitclaim bill (S. 940) introduced by 35 Senators covers both inland and coastal waters. It is not limited to the 26 coastal and Great Lakes States but treats all lands beneath navigable waters of all 48 States as State property just as all previous Supreme Court decisions did for over 100 years.

5. You argue that in view of the Supreme Court decisions the marginal belt lands of Texas, California, and Louisiana belong to all the people of the Nation and should not be quitclaimed to those States. I am sure you would not be so harsh with us if you compared our position with that of your own State of Wyoming when the Federal Government obtained a Supreme Court decision against your State declaring the United States to be the owner of a section of land which had been held in good faith for 57 years by your State public-school fund. Oil, valued at more than $3,000,000 had been discovered on this section of land. The Supreme Court went against Wyoming in a case which Senator HUNT (then Governor) said was an almost identical situation with the California tidelands case.

In this situation, you very properly authored a bill in Congress quitclaiming this section of land to Wyoming. In spite of the Supreme Court's decision and in spite of the argument of the Department of the Interior and Department of Justice that it belonged to all the people and should not be quitclaimed. Congress restored title to Wyoming on that part of the section on which oil was being produced. We who urge restoration to the public-school fund of Texas of the lands which we have held in good faith for over 100 years occupy the same position as you did in the case of Wyoming. The oil under our lands is no more valuable for national defense than the oil under Wyoming land, and the Federal Government is as much obliged to defend Wyoming as it is to defend Texas. The truth is that regardless of which government owns or administers the land, oil and other necessary resources will always be available to our Nation for defense, and it is sincerely believed that with the long experience and present machinery in operation, more oil can be produced in this emergency under State control than would be produced if this added burden is placed upon an already overburdened Federal agency.

I would appreciate your inserting this letter in the record of your present hearings, and I will take the liberty of sending copies to my fellow State attorneys general.

While I have felt compelled to answer some of your arguments against the quitclaim bill, I still stand ready to support your interim bill if it is amended so as not to prejudice, or gain undue advantage against, the States on permanent legislation.

I assure you of my continued esteem.

Sincerely yours,

PRICE DANIEL,
Attorney General.

Mr. Thompson Tells All as Democrat Ears Burn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, former Governor Thompson, of Georgia, has given a splendid example to the American people, the method by which the New Deal bureaucracy picks the pocket of the taxpayers. I feel that he has performed a real service because the charge of waste and extravagance comes from a man who, normally because of his official position and previous service, would be reluctant to criticize the Democratic Party. It is to his everlasting credit that he has disclosed the outrageous manner in which the bureaucrats disregard the public which they are supposed to serve.

The Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., has written an editorial which I feel should be brought to the attention of the American people and especially to the attention of the Truman administration. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks the editorial to which I have referred:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of April 12, 1951]

MR. THOMPSON TELLS ALL AS DEMOCRAT EARS BURN

The Democratic Party's high command will have quite a time laughing off M. E. Thompson. Mr. Thompson is a former Governor of Georgia, naturally a Democrat by birth and inheritance, and one who has carried many a precinct in his time. Therefore his roar of outrage as he resigns from the Office of Price Stabilization, protesting that it is an obese bureaucracy and that the whole structure of government is no better, gets a play that the MacArthur headlines could dwarf.

Going to Washington on invitation to talk about helping out in OPS, Mr. Thompson found himself after more or less mysterious adventures set down in a cubbyhole with the title of consultant. Nobody consulted him, though he was drawing $53.48 a day plus expenses. He had plenty of time to look around, and the more he looked the more he saw of a clutter of idle consultants. As he tells it, he was there to do a job, not just to get a job, and the situation palled on him. What he exploded at last, with all those good round words like "confusion, inefficiency, waste, and extravagance," would have done credit to a Hoover, if not to a Wherry.

For Mr. Thompson's purpose the timing of his blast was perfect; for the Democratic strategists, it couldn't have been worse. It came on top of the accumulating revelations about the RFC and about the trails of patronage and influence that led to the President's secretariat and the office of W. M. Boyle, the Democratic National Chairman. It was intermingled with the echoes from Mississippi, where even the weary ears of investigating Senators prick up at testimony of arrant pedding of Federal jobs for cash on the barrel. It was supported by, at the same time it gave added volume to, all the testimony on 5-percenters and political spoils that has been pouring out for several years.

There must be considerable consternation as Mr. Thompson pulls out and tells all as he goes. They must have expected that he would be quiet and grateful along with others whom the organization felt it had to take care of as deserving Democrats. But it is plain that when Mr. Thompson consults, he wants to be consulted. He is obviously a rare bird in the political bush.

Thought Control in the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a condensation of an article entitled "Thought Control in the United States of America," which appeared in the American Legion magazine. The condensation was published in the April issue of the Catholic Digest.

THOUGHT CONTROL IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—PUBLISHERS ARE PERMITTING COMMUNISTS TO CENSOR THE BOOKS YOU READ

(By Irene Corbally Kuhn)

John Smith went into a bookstore for a copy of Seeds of Treason. He had followed the Alger Hiss trial. He knew this book was an objective study of the whole sordid affair.

The clerk, without looking up, told him they didn't have the book in stock. "Why not?" he asked. "How should I know?" she said. "We just don't have it."

"How about that book by Owen Lattimore called Ordeal by Slander?" She fell over herself in her eagerness to haul out a fresh copy. "Such a wonderful book. You'll be so glad you bought it."

Smith didn't buy, because he knew it was a self-whitewashing job by an accused leftist badly in need of whitewashing.

The next day, near his own suburban home, Smith dropped into a book-and-stationery store run by a woman he knew. No, she didn't have Seeds of Treason either. Yes, she did have Lattimore's book. Why? She depended on the reviews in the New York Times and the Herald Tribune for directions on the purchase of books. Neither thought much of Seeds of Treason, but they praised the Lattimore book. So she bought it to sell and didn't buy the other.

John Smith could be anybody. And the town could be your town. His two experiences represent two techniques used by Communists to exercise their thought control over all of us.

In the 1930's Russian-born propaganda had a fantastic success in our country. Eugene Lyons, longtime foe of Communists, called those years the red decade. The Communist popular front penetrated into our every walk of life and thought. It got into the labor movement, education, youth activities; it poisoned the movies, art, and every branch of publishing. At its highest point (1936)

it had deliberate agents and starry-eyed collaborators among New Deal officials, educators, rich women, novelists, and editors. One phase was book publishing and reviewing.

Books are published to be sold just as shoes or sardines are. They are advertised, too, just as other merchandise. But a book gets free advertising that shoes do not. A book is reviewed in papers and magazines, over the radio and on television. Most book reviewers tell the public whether the book is worth buying or not. On the reviewer's honesty and knowledge a book stands or falls, and so does the author's reputation and his livelihood.

If the reviews are unfavorable, the publisher won't spend money on advertising. He can't afford to. If there are no reviews, he can less afford it. The bookseller, who depends on reviews and advertising to purchase, will, therefore, not stock it. Thus many important books can be left to wither on the vine, provided the right techniques are used on them.

The Communists were first to realize what the effective techniques are. They got trusted party members into publishing houses. They made sure they had plenty of authors to log-roll for other party authors, or to apply the hatchet to anti-Communist writers. They spotted fellow travelers among book reviewers. Finally, they put their own little people in retail bookstores as sales clerks.

Whenever a book comes along that is damaging to the Communist effort, the entire strength of their forces is marshaled against it. They bear down on naive people in book reviews, syndicated columns, and editorials.

The syndicated columnist, Bob Considine, is one of the country's best writers. He is fearless, calls the shots as he sees them. Last summer Considine spoke about his field of specialized writing on a national radio network. He said it wields the greatest power. The writer, therefore, should have a corresponding sense of responsibility. By and large, he said, columnists are fair-minded men and women. But he added, "If there is any apparent antireligious feeling among these specialists in journalism, it will be found chiefly among the book reviewers of certain leading New York newspapers and literary publications.

"Here a rather shocking situation prevails," he went on. "If you write a book which steps on the toes of our home-grown left wingers, bamboozled liberals, or outright Communists, or their idols abroad, you can almost count on receiving a number of sour reviews—where the reviews hurt most. There are, of course, outstanding exceptions to this rule. But the average big-city book critic sets himself up as a defender of the legend that those who speak out against Communists and their pale pink carbon copies are automatically cheap sensationalists, warmongers, and unctuous serfs of Wall Street.

"Some of these book reviewers get away with murder, even though their reviews appear in newspapers and magazines which could not possibly exist under communism. The reader of a fat Sunday newspaper digests an editorial renouncing communism, or shudders through stories of torture behind the iron curtain, and then turns to the book-review sections to encounter an inbred critic beating to a pulp a book author who is trying to say the same thing. They seem to produce nothing, these critics. Their role is simply to belt any writer who has the industry and knowledge to produce an anti-Communist tome. Deplorably, few authors have any way of retorting, rebutting, or suing the critic for pulling the rug from under years of devoted work.

"We have book publishers, too, among them who will not touch an anti-Communist book. Among these are some shrewd fellows who have sense enough to know that such books will be solidly battered by the critics, and probably lose money. But there are others who seem to believe with the critics and, like them, are Russia-firsters.

"I can speak with a little personal experience in this latter respect," Considine continued. "I had something to do with the editing of a book named The Rape of Poland, written by the exiled Premier, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk. He gave a detailed account of how Communists were able to seize that predominantly Catholic country with hardly the firing of a shot—except in the prisons of the secret police. The publisher who originally planned to produce the book actually asked Mikolajczyk to tone down his accounts of the tortures and murders inflicted on Polish patriots during the destruction of that country's hard-won liberties. Mikolajczyk, of course, refused to go along with this treacherous suggestion. He found another publisher—one with the courage to let the truth be told."

Mikolajczyk's book, The Rape of Poland, subtitled "Pattern of Soviet Aggression," was published, without censorship or distortion, by Whittlesey House, a division of the McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.

Sometimes the attack centers on the author, regardless of the book. John T. Flynn, author of The Road Ahead, is one such victim. His book is a warning that millions who say they hate communism are actually helping them at every turn. The Communist Party has been able to use the professional liberals to do their dirty work.

Devin Garrity of Devin Adair reports, "We published the book and waited for the reviews, especially the Sunday New York Herald Tribune. After 2 months, when it seemed fairly certain there would be no review, I began inquiries and learned the review copy had been received and was on file, but it had been marked for the silent treatment. No review was scheduled for it. We then bought advertising space in the Herald Tribune's Sunday book section and ran the excellent and fair review of Mr. Flynn's book which had been published in Human Events, a small Washington, D. C., publication. The Herald Tribune then changed its position and a review did appear—a smear job to counteract the effect of the favorable review we had bought the space to run."

For a perfect example of the all-out, four-alarm attack on an anti-Communist book by another well-known anti-Communist author, W. L. White's Report on the Russians, is probably the classic example. In the summer of 1944, when the United States and Russia were fighting Hitler, Mr. White accompanied Eric Johnston, then president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, on a 6 weeks' trip to Russia. It was decidedly to Russian advantage to put aside its long-standing rule of secrecy and allow these American visitors to go about the country.

The White book, telling of his trip through Russia, was published by Harcourt Brace. The book was so abused by Stalinist agents in the book trade that reviewers for libraries and church organizations were suggesting, "Don't read it; it's a prejudiced book." The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., a Red outfit subsequently declared subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, led the attack with an elaborate, expensive, 32-page two-color brochure, which boldly purported to be "the truth." The Rev. Dr. William Howard Melish followed with an adverse review in the Churchman. Dr. Melish is notorious for his consistent support of Red fronts. It is difficult to see what kind of clairvoyance he has in Brooklyn that would enable him to judge the accuracy of the eyewitness reports of Mr. White from Russia. One of the hatchet men on Mr. White's book was Edgar Snow, writer-editor for the Saturday Evening Post. Mr. Snow has long been on good terms with the left. The Saturday Review of Literature chose Mr. Snow to do the job on George Creel's latest book, Russia's Race for Asia, and Snow produced a highly unfair review.

No better illustration of the effectiveness of the campaign to distort opinion on China can be found than a look back at China now, and at our terrible adventure in Korea, all the more heart-rending because it should not have been necessary. And while we're looking at the wreckage, let's take a look at the battle of the books, a battle which the Communists won through their involuntary helpers as much as through their dedicated party comrades. The American people had no real knowledge of China. The leftists filled the vacuum with their own books, reviewed favorably by each other; and by deriding and denouncing all others who had a kind word to say for the lawful Nationalist Government of China, or its leader and sworn enemy of communism, Chiang Kai-shek.

Who are some of these authors and reviewers?

One is Gunther Stein, who in 1945 brought out The Challenge of Red China. This book was reviewed in the New York Times by Nathaniel Peffer. It was a glowing review.

Another is the late Agnes Smedley, who wrote numerous flattering reviews of comradely books. She herself delivered a hefty volume, which Knopf brought out in 1943, titled "Battle Hymn of China." The Chinese Communists were glorified in this one, not only in the text, but in artful juxtapositions of photos and captions. On one page, for instance, is a heart-moving photograph of a Chinese war orphan and a flattering portrait of Chu Teh, captioned "Father of the Red Army."

It was not until after the war was over, however, that the bumper crop of books on China and the Far East appeared. Most, if not all, were reviewed in a way that must have been highly pleasing to Moscow. Take John K. Fairbank, of Harvard, for instance. In 1948, Professor Fairbank wrote The United States and China, published by the Harvard University Press.

The book was praised with enthusiasm by the late Richard Lauterbach and Owen Lattimore. On February 9, 1947, Mr. Fairbank reviewed two other books for the Times: China's Destiny, by Chiang Kai-shek, an edition approved by the author; and an added unauthorized version of the same book prepared by Philip Jaffe. Fairbank reviewed these together and managed to say nothing about Jaffe's known bias for the pro-Communist case in China, or of his involvement in the Amerasia case, in which Jaffe was fined for participation in the theft of secret documents from the State Department.

For more logjamming, Mrs. Annalee Jacoby appeared in the New York Times Sunday book section on December 16, 1946, as reviewer of My Twenty-Five Years in China, by John B. Powell, an American of unquestioned integrity who lost both his feet in a Japanese prison. Here she took sharp issue with the author, who persisted in calling the Chinese Communists bandits. Mrs. Jacoby berated the author as a "reactionary" and insisted that peace in China's civil war depended on "progress in negotiations between the Kuomintang and the Communists." She was especially contemptuous of Powell's suggestions that there is a "Red menace."

When another non-Communist book, this time on Japan, Japan and the Son of Heaven, by Willard Price, was reviewed in the Times of October 14, 1945, the reviewer was none other than Owen Lattimore, who criticized the book unfavorably. When Lattimore's own book, Solution in Asia, was reviewed in the February 25, 1945, issue, Edgar Snow was given the task. Between them they sold the readers of the Times book section the perfect appeasement-of-Russia program. Snow found the book "penetrating and comprehensive, yet a succinct and logical exposition of the main dilemmas which face us."

Neglected almost entirely, when it wasn't slammed and damned, was Freda Utley's Last Chance in China, which attempted to awaken the American people to the dangers that would face us if communism succeeded in capturing China. Mrs. Utley, as a very young woman, was a member of the British Communist Party and lived in Moscow for 6 years as wife of a Russian citizen who was not a Communist. She worked as a specialist on far-eastern questions at the Moscow Institute of World Economy and Politics. Her rapid disillusionment and why she came to regard the Soviet Government as a tyranny as bad if not worse than Hitler's, is related in her The Dream We Lost. Needless to say, the book was equally, if not more, lost than her later one on China.

The studied practice of ignoring, neglecting, or damning with faint praise books that sought to show the danger from Communist infiltration began far back. The Red Decade, by Eugene Lyons, published in 1941, was the first really authoritative and informative book on the Stalinist penetration of America. At the time he wrote it, Mr. Lyons was editor of a national magazine and had behind him a successful record of best sellers in books and an equally distinguished record as a foreign correspondent and magazine writer. He speaks Russian, worked in Moscow for the United Press, and was the first American newspaperman to interview Stalin. The Red Decade, even more than his earlier work, Assignment in Utopia, earned him the title of red baiter and got him damned high and low by the "intellectuals," "liberals," and Russophiles. Most reviewers were displeased because Mr. Lyons' probing in The Red Decade revealed the infection among their friends, the intellectuals.

The current party line is to sneer at all ex-Communists, to deny and insult their repentance. This is particularly necessary to the Communists because they must try to offset the damage done their cause by such sincere and repentant men as Whittaker Chambers, who testified against Hiss, and Louis Budenz, whose testimony helped convict the 11 top Communists in the United States.

The latest victim of their sneers is Angela Calomiris.[1] When she was a girl, and weighed only 90 pounds, she was invited to join the FBI. She did. But the job she got was to join the Communist Party and to report the treason of these Russophiles to the Government. She spent 7 years doing just that. She did a superb job, at great personal risk and at no salary.

When the 11 Communist leaders were being tried in New York, she appeared on the witness stand against them. They were amazed, but they quickly recovered. At once the air was filled with Communist cat calls. These traitors to the United States shouted, "She is a spy. She is a traitor." All the Marxist monkeys, who had been collecting pennies from the faithful, put down their tin cups and ran up and down chattering, "Spy! Spy!" poor little Angela, who had given 7 years of her young life to her country, was called, by Marxist stooges for Stalin, a spy.

Then Angela wrote a book about her experiences. She called it the Red Masquerade, and the J. B. Lippincott Co. published it. The New York Times and the Herald Tribune gave her book the silent treatment. It should have been reviewed on the first page of their book sections. It wasn't reviewed at all. It was ignored. Communist Party technique No. 1 was applied to the book.

[1] Material from this point on is new; it did not appear in the original article.

On November 2 George Sokolsky got mad. He had met Angela and read her book. He looked for the reviews and, when they failed to appear, he let out a blast in his column that was heard even in the Times and Tribune offices.

On November 19 both of these great papers got the word. A. H. Raskin reviewed the book for the Times. He began: "The war against Communist infiltration has produced a new kind of spy. * * *" This sort of technique is called damnation by indirection. Later he says it cost Angela $30 a month for party dues and the Government footed the bill. Therefore, he concludes the Government is a contributor to the Communist Party. Marcus Duffield reviewed Angela's book for the Herald Tribune (also on November 19, after the Sokolsky prod). He also comes to the dues. He says, "The FBI, being outrageously thrifty, paid her nothing, except bare expenses, such as party dues."

Now you have the cloven hooves on both feet. One says the FBI shouldn't have paid anything. The other says it paid too much. All of this is an attempt to smear Angela. This is professional integrity gone to Moscow. If a lady were so treated in a bar, any one real American would have thrown these two reviewers out. If our publishers are real Americans, they, too, should give the heave-ho to their pinkos. The people of free America demand professional integrity in professionals. They do not like the present second-hand thought control exercised by dishonest professionals.

How To Steal and Profiteer Legally—OPS Is the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article entitled "The Return of the Prodigal" by Harry Serwer, and published by Human Events on April 4.

Price control is an economic narcotic. Like other narcotics, an excessive dosage leads to moral degeneracy.

OPS today is about as useful as a rowboat on a desert, or a sprinkling can in a flood.

THE RETURN OF THE PRODIGAL

(By Harry Serwer)

On January 26 the OPS issued an arrogant order known as the general freeze. It was as cruel as a brat plucking wings off an insect, and for the same reason: The OPS didn't know any better. The order limited the ceiling of each item to the highest price it actually brought in the open market between December 19 and January 25, inclusive.

On the day of the freeze every producer and distributor in this country—bar none—was committed for large blocks of merchandise at increased prices—prices which had been soaring, backing, and filling since the inauguration of the Korean shindig. Much of this merchandise had been ordered many months before, and some at prices that were then shooting through the roof. The OPS said, in effect: "If you have goods coming in at high prices, that is your hard luck. You sell them at the ceiling even if you lose money."

Obviously, there wasn't a businessman in the whole Nation who could add a legitimate mark-up to such merchandise without committing a crime; and so, at one fell swoop the OPS added a horde of criminals to the roster. Businessmen were frantically calling their lawyers and accountants and asking what course they should pursue; many were told to ignore the general freeze, and so did. Others took it on the chin by adding the decreed profit which, in many instances, did not cover overhead.

The resentment and clamor became so great that the OPS ducked into a huddle, and on February 27 it came up with a directive captioned "CPR 7," which replaced, in part, the retail stipulations contained in the general freeze. It covered more than 200,000 items—truly a gargantuan job for the Falstaffian misfits who had concocted it.

CPR 7 is known as a divisional factor directive. It aims to control prices by limiting ceilings to historical mark-ups. The divisional factor is a formula introduced apparently to complicate matters.

A couple of vinegar plants got into the wine barrel. Business was asked to absorb all or some of the rising costs. Labor was busting through the 10-percent wage rise limit, sending prices up still further. There was no real shortage because retailers were cutting prices on even such critical merchandise as television sets, furniture, and electrical appliances in order to encourage sales and reduce inventories.

Indeed, there were fairly reliable reports that warehouses were clogged to the rafters with all sorts of commodities. One economist, who represents a number of substantial appliance manufacturers, told me that only 33⅓ percent of current accounts receivable were being collected. This meant that inventories were very heavy, and obviously as large as—or larger than—the capital and surplus of the business.

II

There is no need for control at this moment, if the Department of Commerce is correct in its Survey of Current Business (January 1951 issue). The Survey reinterprets current unit production in 1939 dollars and arrives at a unit increase of 70 percent over 1941. This was accomplished with a labor increase of 24 percent and a working-hour decrease of 10 percent. Thus we have a weighted increase of 66 percent in production. Since our Armed Forces are now limited to 3,500,000 men as against 14,000,000 in World War II, it would appear that we have ample production for both civil and war needs unless the Government plans monumental stockpiling beyond the needs of its own Armed Forces. That may very well be. If the administration proposes to stockpile and all comers willing to take up arms against Russia—then only does the general freeze make sense.

Control must therefore be considered as a part of the psychological pattern for making the country war-minded again. War-minded people particularly give up more and more of their traditional rights and freedoms. If there is no shortage, control is meaningless; it is not only difficult to attain ceiling prices, but a demand may even develop for floor prices. If there is a shortage, control is a successful device for generating black markets, because the latter are nothing more than free markets vitified.

There are legitimate black markets as well as illegitimate black markets. If a retailer pays the ceiling price plus some cash under the table—that is illegitimate. If the retailer says to the wholesaler, "Sell me 50 dozen of your rayon blouses and I'll feature your name in a newspaper page," that's legitimate.

In the first case the manufacturer received the cash direct. What did he do with it? He socked it away; or he in turn paid under-the-table cash for prime or semi-processed commodities, without which he

couldn't continue business; or he tried to find subterfuge to sneak that dough into his business (very difficult with a lot of OPA harpies snooping around for a fast buck).

In the legitimate case the retailer picked up the wholesaler's advertising check (or the wholesaler picked up the primary producer's advertising check). Flip through World War II advertising pages and note how many resource brands were featured by wholesalers and retailers. The great majority were direct or implied deals for merchandise.

III

Another legitimate black market was called copping the double profit. This was a diller. There were many large producers who, in peacetime, sold only to jobbers, sales agents, and wholesalers. These producers wanted none of the headaches which come with direct distribution. But in war shortages all these headaches disappear: production is king. So, these producers double-crossed their historical outlets and sold to the retailer directly. It paid off—and how! Stealing the wholesaler's 10- or 20-percent discount, and getting it without any additional overhead cost, was a windfall. It was legitimate but shockingly immoral; and, yet, a large number of America's substantial business firms went after that double profit. The gimmick was called going vertical—very snooty terminology.

Another phase of the black market is the gadget racket. Sure, the auto dealer will sell you a new car at ceiling; but you must buy $600 worth of unneeded gadgets or you'll wait until judgment day. In fact, accessory gadgets provided more black-market dough than the basic item.

Then there was the tie-in. If a pen was price-fixed at $3, it practically disappeared from the market; but the company which made it would brazenly insist—or hint—that if you wanted a couple of dozen, you'd have to take, as a part of the deal, a few $64 pens and one or two $125 sets. This was also indulged in by top concerns.

Another legitimate black-market operation ran something like this. A need black "wiffnuff" very badly. B has them and is confining his sale to his old customers. B sells strictly at ceiling—not because he is honest, but because he is afraid of taking under-the-table cash. A tells B he has a hot tip on the market and that he is buying 200 shares for B. A doesn't want the money just yet—he'll lay it out and tell B when to send it. Three weeks later—usually sooner—A consults the stock-market page, chooses a stock that has gone up 5 to 10 points, notifies B that he sold the stock at a profit and sends him a check for that profit. B knows it is a phony but keeps the dough; and in a day or two A gets all the black "wiffnuff" he needs at ceiling—and why not? Sometimes A tells B he can get him an auto at strictly ceiling. A pays the black-market price and loses the difference; but the "wiffnuff" is worth a "heluva" lot more to him, because unfinished merchandise is piling up on him, waiting only for "wiffnuff."

IV

Now, let me explain a very legitimate black-market racket. Mr. Jones weaves "gray" (unfinished) goods. His ceiling markup is 10 percent. The cloth costs 45 cents a yard to produce. He is legally entitled to 50 cents a yard. Jonesy is making a wad of dough on a nickel-a-yard profit, because his volume has doubled in a seller's market, his distribution cost is nil, and all the hazards of doing business have disappeared. But he is not satisfied.

He puts his nephew, Willie, into the converting business. (A converter buys "gray" goods and finishes them for the cutting-up trade or for retailing over the counter.) Willie's converting cost is about 20 cents a yard, which brings his total per yard up to 70 cents. He is legally entitled to a 17 percent mark-up, which brings his selling price up to 85 cents a yard. But Jones, who is really Willie's undercover partner, is still not satisfied. So he puts his other nephew, Richard, into the jobbing business. As jobber, Richard is allowed a 12-percent mark-up on the 85-cent cost. This now brings the cloth up to 95 cents a yard.

Is Richard allowed to sell the goods in the open market? Oh, no! Jonesy now scours the market for manufacturers who will give him a partnership for a nominal or no investment; and he, in turn, will supply them with all the cloth they need. (Remember, this was in a period when any dope with a fabric allotment could open a hole-in-the-wall business and get all the orders he wanted.)

Now, you may be sure that Jonesy was at least an equal partner in each of these enterprises. The OPA allowed Jonesy a nickel profit. Instead, he wound up with that nickel plus half of the difference between 50 cents and the final 95 cents at the jobber's level. But that isn't all. Suppose he has an interest in a blouse factory which has a $60-a-dozen ceiling. There may be a net profit of $9 a dozen in a seller's market. Since a dozen blouses averages 25 yards, Jonesy splits half of another 36 cents a yard. That Government-allowed nickel becomes 45 cents profit on a fabric which cost him 45 cents—quite legitimate.

All this seems to be on the way back. The general freeze is the royal red carpet for the prodigal son of the OPA.

The Larger Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the recent removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his post in Japan has brought forth both instantaneous and spontaneous replies from people all over the country. The citizens of the United States are deeply concerned, as they have a right to be; and Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned over this action.

I have made it a point to talk to the people who should know whether the course of action taken by the President was right or wrong. Within the last few days I have read in the newspapers and heard over the radio and saw on television the views and comments of various persons. I have studied it all with great interest, and I feel that the solidest approach to the question is contained in an editorial appearing in the New York Times on Saturday, April 14, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the aforementioned editorial entitled "The Larger Issues":

THE LARGER ISSUES

In many respects the present controversy over General MacArthur represents an elemental and emotional outburst expressing the anger and frustration of a nation which, less than 6 years after its greatest victory, finds itself again at war and facing the danger of another world war. But the storm could reach its present violence only because it has been and is being whipped up by political partisans of often opposite persuasion—ranging from Republican extremists on one side to the lunatic fringe of the British Labor Party on the other—who seek to exploit General MacArthur's colorful personality and positive views for their own ends, irrespective of the merits of the case.

This situation makes it all the more necessary for men of goodwill to consider the fundamental issues involved, soberly and realistically. As we see it, there are three such issues. The first, fundamental to free government, is the issue of civil versus military authority. That issue has already been decided in President Truman's favor. Even the strongest partisans of General MacArthur refrain from challenging the President's authority to dismiss him, and the record shows clearly that the general laid himself open to such action. This was not a case of "theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do and die." General MacArthur had the right, the opportunity and even the duty to present his views and recommendations—through military channels. He had no right to challenge the policy of his Government, or even the prescribed strategy where it involved policy. Such a challenge, especially when backed up by appeals over the President's head to the public and especially to the political opposition, was insubordination which challenged the fundamental concept of our Government.

The second issue, stated by President Truman in his address on Wednesday evening to the Nation, is how best to avoid a new world war. General MacArthur holds that such a war can best be prevented by extending the Korean war to China—by bombing that country's military bases, especially in Manchuria, by blockading its coasts, and by using Chiang Kai-shek's forces to establish a second front on the Chinese mainland. Such measures, he is convinced, can crush the Chinese Communists without bringing Soviet Russia into the war, despite the Chinese-Soviet pact and his wrong guess on Chinese Communist intervention in Korea.

In contrast, President Truman holds that such measures could well precipitate the new world war; that we must avoid every action that could be exploited in order to put responsibility for such a catastrophe on us and thus isolate us from our allies and split the free world, and that the best way of avoiding such a situation is to limit the present war to Korea, despite the handicaps involved, in the hope of a peaceful settlement. This policy may fail, and Soviet imperialism may yet lead to all-out war. But in such a case the responsibility will be clear, and the free world will have gained both time and solidarity. We agree with the President.

The third issue is which is our first front—Europe or Asia? General MacArthur and many of his supporters hold that it is Asia—that, in the general's words to Representative MARTIN, it is in Asia that the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that by fighting in Asia we are also fighting Europe's war for salvation. This view is based partly on the fact that we are already at war in Asia, partly on opposition in some quarter to our European policies, and partly on Lenin's and Stalin's own maxim that the Western World will be conquered by conquering Asia first.

There is no doubt that the global conflict in which we are engaged has two fronts, and that it is essential to hold both of them. There is likewise no doubt that our front in Asia has been gravely impaired by the blunders of our policy toward China. But now, as during the last war, it is and will remain true that Europe is our first front and concern. For while Asia may have the manpower, Europe is both the cradle of our civilization and the continent of our allies, with an industrial potential that can spell the difference between victory and defeat. It was such considerations as these that led to the recent overwhelming approval by the Senate of the dispatch of additional troops for Europe, and the MacArthur dismissal has not changed the situation.

We Are at War With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the administration is attempting to justify President Truman's removal of General MacArthur as supreme commander in the Far East on the basis that General MacArthur was attempting to get us into war with Red China by advocating the bombing of air bases, supply lines, and troop concentrations in Manchuria.

If we are not now at war with Communist China, I think the President and his advisors would do well to advise Congress and the people just whom we are fighting in Korea. Last December hordes of Chinese poured across the Yalu River and drove our forces to a point south of the thirty-eighth parallel. Airplanes bearing the red star of Communist China take off from airfields in the so-called privileged sanctuary of Manchuria, rise to a safe altitude, then zoom across the Yalu River dealing death and destruction to our forces in the air and on the ground. A military commander in such a situation would be most derelict if he did not have the inclination to use every means at hand to strike at these troops and destroy these aircraft before they could get into a position to inflict casualties upon his own forces.

To date we have suffered 60,000 casualties in Korea, and despite the handcuffs placed upon him by Truman and Acheson, General MacArthur's outnumbered forces have succeeded in destroying large numbers of Chinese Communists.

Despite these facts, Truman and Acheson tell us that if MacArthur attempts to protect his men from further casualities, he is trying to get us into war with Red China when it is the very same Red China that is causing us so much grief.

In scanning the news columns, I have not detected any let-up in the war in Korea. The same Communist Chinese are continuing to kill and maim our boys and reports are filtering in to the effect that new forces are massing for a spring offensive. The Daily Worker has hailed Mr. Truman for "exercising sound judgment in dismissing General MacArthur." The Communist press knows that with MacArthur gone the United States has lost one of its greatest bulwarks against Communist expansion in the Far East and that the policy of appeasement of the Reds engineered by Dean Acheson over the past 5 years will continue.

It is tragic to note that President Truman who flew to Kansas City at the expense of the taxpayers to attend Tom Pendergast's funeral several years ago will be too busy to greet General MacArthur at the airport when he arrives Thursday. In his place he is sending his military aide, Gen. Harry Vaughan who is noted for his deep freeze deals, corruption, scandals, and dispensing of favors at the White House.

A Century of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the 24th of last month Rev. Paul W. Rishell, pastor, and his parishioners celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the South Congregational Church in my congressional district.

For over a century now the South Congregational Church has been a pillar of strength to the community life of Brooklyn. I am sure I bespeak the thoughts of the great majority of the residents of the Twelfth Congressional District when I wish Pastor Rishell and his congregation many, many more years of fruitful service to our community.

Under the permission previously granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Saturday, April 14, 1951:

A CENTURY OF SERVICE

It's a tough job to live a hundred years and all that time serve the community with humane and spiritual purpose. It takes an unusual resiliency against the world's chill and sometimes unfriendly winds and it takes living, vibrant faith in the task at hand.

Brooklyn's South Congregational Church had what it takes 100 years ago when it organized on March 24, 1851, with 23 members. It still has it and it still thrives as a great community institution, serving its people and spreading divine and human good in its everyday activities.

The church has had a fine history and is retaining its good name under the guiding hand of the Reverend Paul W. Rishell, the eleventh pastor. The first church was dedicated by Brooklyn's famous Henry Ward Beecher. We wish the South Congregational Church and its parishioners many more fruitful years to come.

Shameless Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with the sentiments and the indisputable facts set forth in the editorial in the Standard-Times of Bedford, Mass., under date of April 13, 1951, with reference to the brutal dismissal of General MacArthur by President Truman. It requires hours to open the letters and telegrams that are pouring into my office asking for the impeachment of President Truman and Secretary Acheson.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting the editorial entitled "Shameless Betrayal," to which I have heretofore referred:

SHAMELESS BETRAYAL

President Truman's speech Wednesday was a shameless attempt to undermine the confidence and affection which the American people feel for General MacArthur by accusing him of provoking a third world war.

As an excuse for his shocking removal of MacArthur, the President charges MacArthur with "provoking" world war III by (1) asking that he be allowed to bomb the bases of the Communist army in Manchuria, a classic tactic in modern warfare, and (2) by urging we give support to Chiang Kai-shek instead of the present policy of tying his hands.

To charge that bombing Manchuria and freeing Chiang would provoke world war III is spineless speculation by minds without courage.

Winston Churchill said in the Commons in November Stalin would decide when world war III would start and probably nothing England or ourselves could do would change the Moscow timetable.

The world knows with what genius and courage MacArthur was trying to win the war in Korea, handicapped at every turn by the indecision and nonsupport of the President and of Secretary of State Acheson, fronting for the United Nations.

The President's policy in Korea was to fight a little war, fight it hard, but not too hard, for fear it might become a big war.

Of course, this policy couldn't win as MacArthur knew and said, and for this frank honesty of the soldier he is fired "so that," as the President weakly said, "there would be no doubt or confusion as to the real purpose of and aim of our policy."

After probably the greatest military service to his country since George Washington, General MacArthur is removed from all authority because he asked for authority to fight the Korean War successfully, a war that already has brought America more than 60,000 casualties.

This present Korean dilemma has no precedent in American history.

We are fighting Communist China in Korea, but we are her faithful ally in Formosa, where we have forbidden Chiang Kai-shek to make an aggressive move.

What could please Communist China more than to have MacArthur ordered to fight hard "but not too hard" in Korea, while Acheson ties Chiang's hands in Formosa?

This Truman-Acheson Korean War formula is a perfect set-up for Communist China.

Communist China can only hope it will remain in status quo until, by wholesale liquidation of anti-Communist forces, Moscow style (said already to number many millions), all hope of a National counter-revolution is destroyed.

No wonder three offers of truce to Communist China have been turned down. Disgraceful as the terms were to our honor, they were contemptuously refused.

Yes, we are fighting Communist China in Korea but we are faithful allies of Communist China in Formosa.

Meanwhile, there is no hope of victory.

Truman is afraid to fight hard for fear it might bring on world war III.

Communist China hesitates to drive us off the Korean peninsula for fear that might bring on world war III through a realistic and aroused America.

The Truman-Acheson formula for the Korean War is a war without victory and without peace.

Watch for the most degrading moment in American history, an offer (British leftist Labor inspired), to extend to Communist China a seat in the United Nations, a voice in the treaty with Japan, and surrender of Formosa—in return for a Korean armistice.

Such an offer, of course, could not be made without United States approval.

Not only would such a proposal be the final betrayal of the only remaining Chinese leader capable of opposing communism in China, our ally of World War II—but, miserable as is the idea of such a proposal, I believe it would be refused by Communist China and Stalin—even if it were proposed to deliver Chiang Kai-shek in person to his—and our—enemies.

BASIL BREWER,
Publisher.

MacArthur: The Man and the Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, as MacArthur returns home, both his accomplishment as a soldier and his views on foreign policy will be most carefully weighed and analyzed. As a contribution to this discussion, I desire to place in the RECORD the following article and editorial from the April 2, 1951, Fortnight:

MACARTHUR: THE MAN AND THE MYTH

Gen. Douglas MacArthur needs no defense from his enemies. But how can he protect himself from his friends, those idolatrous worshipers who make him internationally ridiculous by deafening the public ear with claims of his omnipotence and omniscience; by attributing to him all the wisdom and all the virtue under the sun, with none of the faults that flesh is heir to?

After all, General MacArthur is only human. If you cut him, he will bleed. If you shoot him in a vulnerable spot, he will die. He has had a long and distinguished career in the service of his country. There can be no possible question of his personal courage, nor of his normal competence as an officer. He proved that in World War I.

Like any normal human being, General MacArthur has made his share of mistakes. Unfortunately, the foremost of these have been tragic ones in times of crisis, in the Philippines and in Korea, and have cost many American lives.

WHY?

On December 7, 1941, when news of Pearl Harbor reached the Philippines, where he was in command, Air Force officers begged for permission to take off and bomb Japanese airfields on Formosa, whence they knew attacks on them would soon and inevitably come. This permission was refused because there had been no official declaration of war by the American Congress. Surely enough, 8 hours after Pearl Harbor, the Japanese bombers came down from Formosa and destroyed virtually all the American planes in the Philippines as they sat helplessly on the ground.

This error in judgment rested squarely on MacArthur. It was first brought to light in Bill White's book, They Were Expendable, published early in the war. It was confirmed by Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert for the New York Times, in his recent book, Mistakes of World War II.

ACTION?

MacArthur's mistakes in Korea have received a lot of recent publicity and his strident apologists have rushed in to shout them down or shift the blame to other shoulders. The most recent factual report, and a shocking thing it was, was published in Fortnight, February 19, in an unsigned article by an officer who landed and served with the First Marine Division in Korea. This anonymous writer told of gross incompetence and actual cowardice on the part of some Army officers, and of the complete lack of training and morale of many of the enlisted men who had been part of MacArthur's occupation forces in Japan.

After all, MacArthur had been superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point and he certainly knew how to train officers and men. Why hadn't he done so?

The Fortnight article practically blew the roof off the Pentagon. Maj. Gen. F. L. Parks, the Army's Chief of Public Information in Washington, issued a statement branding the charges "irresponsible and ill-considered." To borrow an old legal cliché, he couldn't deny the allegations so he defied the allegators.

It was reliably reported that the Pentagon's hatchet men were sharpening their tomahawks to have the scalp of the unidentified writer, who was a Navy chaplain recently returned from Korea. These hatchet men are not to be laughed off when one considers how they got Admiral Louis Denfeld summarily fired as Chief of Naval Operations for speaking his mind when asked about internal politics in the Department of Defense.

There is a rising indignation among some of the less informed upon discovering that their military idol has feet of clay. He has been so sickeningly goose-greased and blatantly ballyhooed by such a large section of the American press since the beginning of World War II that the general public lost its perspective of the man. He could run faster, jump farther, dive deeper, and come up drier than anybody. He knew everything. He could do no wrong. The dawning realization that they have been deceived has made some people pretty mad and the natural human tendency is to take it out on the doughty General.

WHO, ME?

Unfortunately, there's a lot of evidence to the effect that he, too, has been deceived. He has come to believe his own publicity, just like a Hollywood screen star. The late William S. Hart, strong, silent hero of early films, was a broken-down third-rate Shakespearean actor when he got his first break in western pictures. His producer's press agents concocted a tailor-made biography for him telling how Hart was a child of the western plains raised among the Indians, speaking many of their dialects. The tale told of many hair-raising battles with bear, bison, and aborigines; of great exploits with that white-maned old fraud, Buffalo Bill. Hart swallowed it whole and believed it to the hilt. He went to his grave mumbling, "They went that-a-away, pardner." It's deplorable that General MacArthur has shown symptoms of the same ailment.

In our books he was caught completely off base by the sudden beginning of hostilities in Korea last June. His vociferous claque in Tokyo and Washington rushed into print to say that Korea was not a part of his command and so he was not supposed to know what was going on there. But his title was supreme commander in the Far East. That included Korea.

You can't marshal overnight an army of 100,000, with tanks, big guns, and other heavy motorized equipment; you can't hide that under a silk handkerchief as a magician does a bowl of goldfish. It would seem that in the weeks necessary to mount this attack a small, idle portion of General MacArthur's omniscience would have smelled it out. One good intelligence officer in Korea could have warned him.

The occupation troops he threw into the fray from Japan, who had been under his command and available for training for an adequate period to make them soldiers, wrote one of the most disgraceful chapters in American military history. In the face of the enemy they threw down their arms and ran, screaming like hysterical high-school girls that they were occupational troops, not combat forces, and they didn't want to fight.

MAC ARTHUR AGAIN

The Americans were about to be pushed into the sea when the First Marine Division and First Marine Aircraft Wing arrived to stem the tide. The subsequent Marine landing at Inchon, behind the enemy's lines, and their swift penetration inland broke the back of the North Korean Army and assured a swift victory for MacArthur.

He took all the bows. Reams of copy poured from the typewriters of his personal publicity staff to the effect that MacArthur had personally staged all this, even to figuring out the tides at Inchon. Expert oceanographers can tell you what the tides will be anywhere in the world a hundred years from now. This landing was no different from the ones the First Marine Division had been making for several years in practice from Camp Pendleton. No unit as small as a marine raider platoon would ever make an amphibious landing without a thorough advance check of the moon and the tides. But it was a great MacArthur victory.

THE TREATMENT

Early in the Korean hostilities a number of American newspapers printed a syndicated serial labeled "the MacArthur Story" by one Frederic S. Marquardt, who was billed as the Chief of the Office of War Information in the Southwest Pacific during World War II. MacArthur should have sued for libel.

The opening article said: "MacArthur has been called, with justification, the savior of Australia, the liberator of the Philippines, and the conqueror of Japan."

What is the justification? He was not the savior of Australia. He was not the conqueror of Japan. And with all due respect to the great warrior, he did have some help in the Philippines—such as, for instance, Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet, which was probably the most powerful armada that has ever been afloat.

MORE

Marquardt warmed to his work with: "A Japanese in Tokyo once solemnly assured me that MacArthur had a Japanese mother. 'Otherwise,' he said, 'General MacArthur could not have conquered Japan.'"

Nobody conquered Japan. The Nipponese threw in the towel because the going got too rough. MacArthur had nothing whatever to do with the circumstances that brought this about.

Marquardt continued: "Many others have helped make the MacArthur story. His Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. Edward M. Almond, called MacArthur the greatest man alive."

This is the same General Almond who, against all intelligence reports and all expert advice ordered the First Marine Division into the disastrous venture of fighting their way across a 7,000-foot mountain range in blizzardy, subzero weather on a hopeless, fruitless mission from which they had to fight their way back with heavy losses for themselves but almost unbelievable losses to the enemy.

OTHER FOLK

One wonders if General Almond, who has not yet been court-martialed, has ever heard of a chubby old gentleman in England named Winston Churchill; or of affable "Ike" Eisenhower, who successfully commanded in Africa and Europe infinitely more troops in infinitely bigger operations than MacArthur ever dreamed of; or of dignified, white-haired Admiral Chester Nimitz, whose official designation in World War II was "Commander in Chief of the Pacific Ocean Area," which would seem to include the territory in which General MacArthur was throwing his weight about at the time.

But wait. Marquardt has more: "Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, commander of the Far Eastern Air Forces, went Almond one better. 'He's the greatest man who ever lived,' Stratemeyer said of MacArthur."

Phew! That really is taking in a lot of territory. But do you think even this satisfies Mr. Marquardt? Read him further: "An unidentified Japanese spokesman once topped both the generals. He is quoted in John Lacerda's book, The Conqueror Comes to Tea, as saying, 'We look to MacArthur as the second Jesus Christ.'"

No human being can possibly live up to such ridiculous adulation and flattery. And yet it is still going on.

A brief, unbiased, and objective review of the war with Japan might clear the atmosphere a little and put General MacArthur in his proper and, surely, not unfavorable light. Both credit and blame should be placed where they are due.

One does not need to be a military expert or have access to secret files to know that there were six major phases of this war which culminated in the enemy's unconditional surrender before his country was conquered.

First. The first phase started the day after Pearl Harbor. It comprised the whittling down of Japan's navy and merchant marine by submarines of the United States Fleet. Japan was not self-supporting. Food and oil and raw materials for her war machine had to be brought from Manchuria and other captured territory. The American submariners were the great unsung heroes of the war. In constant danger for months at a time, they gnawed away at Japan's life lines until the pinch was felt there long before there was a possibility of an attack on the homeland.

General MacArthur had nothing to do with this. His only connection with a submarine was early in 1942 when one of them helped the MacArthur family to escape to Australia from Corregidor.

Second. The second major phase of the war included the air and naval battles of the Coral Sea, Midway, and the many engagements around Guadalcanal. Until then, the Japanese had not only superiority but almost complete dominance on the sea and in the air. But they lost so many ships and planes, and, what proved to be even more important, they lost so many first-string pilots, they were never able to recover their advantage. We lost heavily, too, but America's replacement potential was so preponderant that from then on the advantage was increasingly on our side.

General MacArthur had nothing whatever to do with these operations. They were not in his area of command. He was sitting helplessly in Australia with practically no one to boss. Virtually all of Australia's and New Zealand's fighting strength had been lost in North Africa and Malaya, and Uncle Sam had not been able to send him many troops yet.

To say that he was the savior of Australia is absurd. Australia was saved when the Marines took Guadalcanal. That was the Allies' first land victory over the Axis. It was Japan's farthest point of advance. From then on to the end of the war, Japan was backing up.

General MacArthur had no more to do with Guadalcanal than he did with the landings in Normandy. The Marines were led in the field by Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, later commandant of the corps. Admiral Halsey was commander in chief, under Admiral Nimitz, of the South Pacific area.

Third. The third major phase of the war was the taking of Saipan, Tinian, and Guam—and later Iwo Jima. These bloody and costly operations were carried out by marine divisions with well-coordinated support from the Navy. General MacArthur was thousands of miles away. All he knew about these activities was from routine reports he received after they had taken place.

These islands provided bases for the massive B-29 raids on the Japanese homeland, which constituted the fourth phase of the war and the beginning of the end. These raids not only razed factories, shipyards, and other military targets, but forced down the throats of the Japanese people the bitter knowledge of their eventual, inevitable doom. The B-29's were under the personal direction of the late Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Air Force. "Hap" Arnold was MacArthur's equal in rank, and certainly not his lobbygow.

END

The fifth phase was made up of the spectacular victories of Admiral Halsey and his famous Third Fleet in the Philippine and China Seas and around Japan itself. They destroyed practically all that was left of the enemy's fleet and air force. They ranged the eastern coast of Japan, firing at will and without return at any targets within range, while Navy planes from Halsey's carriers swarmed over the cities and towns, making it unsafe for a Japanese gardener to ride a bicycle or trundle a wheelbarrow down the main street of his village.

General MacArthur certainly did not control Admiral Halsey. Admiral Halsey couldn't even control himself. He made some pretty silly statements about riding Emperor Hirohito's famous white horse down the main street of Tokyo, and later admitted ruefully that he never had learned to keep his big mouth shut. But this didn't affect his record as one of the greatest fighting sailors since John Paul Jones.

FINALE

The sixth and final phase of the war was hardly a phase. It was more of a coup de grâce. It was the dropping of two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Japanese were already thoroughly licked and knew it. They had already started overtures to negotiate for peace without the unconditional surrender demanded by the United States. The A-bombs saved their face. Nobody could be expected to stand up against such weapons. They could surrender unconditionally and still retain a little self-respect after their brazen declaration following Pearl Harbor that the ultimate peace would be dictated by them in the White House.

Even the most bumbling Boswell in the MacArthur entourage would hardly claim that he invented the atomic bomb and personally hurled two of them across the intervening waters at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the way Washington petulively pitched a dollar across the Potomac.

MacArthur did not command or participate in any major action against the Japanese. Bataan was a hopeless holding action. The American forces there were written off from the start. They gave a gallant account of themselves. It is not to MacArthur's discredit that he escaped and left Jonathan Wainwright to become the martyr of Corregidor. Both were following military orders from their superiors.

It is not to MacArthur's discredit that he had little to work with when he arrived in Australia and that it was a long time before he could get going. It is not to his discredit that he played a minor role in the Pacific war. The conflict was much bigger than any one individual. His conquest of New Britain and New Guinea were bloody and dreadful affairs for those involved, but they had little bearing on the final defeat of Japan.

REMEMBER?

The liberation of the Philippines was a moral but not a military necessity. Many thousands of American lives would have been saved if that had been postponed until after the Japanese surrender, which was then inexorably in sight. Surely General MacArthur must have been misquoted in the bombastic utterances as he landed at Leyte: "I have returned. Rally to me." Surely he must have known how much better it would have sounded to posterity to say: "We have returned. Rally to us." For he was not alone.

It is not to MacArthur's discredit that no troops under his command ever came in contact with the main body of the Japanese Army. This latter force was in Manchuria facing the Chinese Communists and the Russians. They only gave up their arms upon the definite order of their deified Mikado.

It is not to MacArthur's discredit that Admirals Nimitz, Halsey, and Spruance, and Marine Generals Vandegrift, "Howling Mad" Smith, and the late Roy S. Geiger commanded in more important strategical victories than he did. That is the fortune of war.

APPROPRIATE

General MacArthur's appointment to preside at the Japanese surrender on the deck of the Battleship *Missouri* was undoubtedly a tribute to his age and seniority in years of service, a tribute which he justly deserved. But this was not an admission that he had fought the war all by himself, as his fanatical followers would now have the world believe. His subsequent selection to command the occupation forces did not make him a star-spangled Mikado, or a Shinto god.

Mr. Marquardt has been quoted here far beyond his deserts because he is typical of the fawning sycophants who are so wild in their adoration of the aging general. The panegyric petered out pitifully toward the end. After all, when you open by calling your hero a second Jesus Christ, what is there left for an encore?

WHERE NOW?

In baseball when a player loses his batting eye, or a pitcher loses control and walks too many men, he is benched to let someone else try to pull the game out of the fire. There's no sentiment involved. Winning is the important thing. Why shouldn't this obtain in the much grimmer game of war?

General MacArthur has already achieved all the personal glory that one man can carry to the grave. He has given more than a half century of his 71 years in distinguished service to his country. He has been twice wounded. There are no further medals to give him.

Why should the autumn of his life be distorted to absurdity by those overdazzled by the reflection of his effulgence? Why can't he be brought home now, in all dignity and honor, to receive the triumphant acception that is his due, and then be turned gratefully out to grass?

THE MACARTHUR LEGEND: FACT AND FANCY

The accompanying article on Gen. Douglas MacArthur tends to deflate one of the most fantastic legends of our time—and we regard it as long past due. The author, who served as a bomber pilot in the Army Air Corps in World War I, and in the Pacific in World War II, reflects accurately the viewpoint of many thousands of men of all branches of the service who spent weary years between Noumea and Tokyo.

To these men Nimitz, Halsey, Hap Arnold, Vandegrift, Jimmy Doolittle, Buckner, Roy Geiger, "Howlin' Mad" Smith, Lemay, Cates, Patch, Spruance, Mitscher were the names to conjure with.

To those who were there it has always been a mystery why the American people ever swallowed the myth of General MacArthur's preponderant part in the Pacific war.

Nonetheless, we regard General MacArthur as one of the world's major figures because he has ruled Japan so effectively that today we are just about ready to count on the Japanese—our savage enemies of a few year back—as trusted allies against world communism.

We also regard him as having been as right about the American destiny in Asia as Secretary of State Acheson has been wrong.

The civilized world owes a vast debt to General MacArthur for his magnificent performance in Japan and for his advocacy of a militant and realistic, rather than a theoretical and defensive, policy in Asia. History, we believe, will grant him laurels for these two phases of his amazing career far beyond the laurels he will receive for his military prowess.

It is not pleasant to recall that General MacArthur was the commanding officer of the occupation troops in Japan who failed so miserably in the early stages of the Korean War because they had been permitted to grow soft and indolent, because no one had bothered to train them or indoctrinate them in the duties of a soldier, and because they were permitted to go into battle with officers many of whom proved unfit to lead troops. As commander of these troops it was MacArthur's duty to train them and keep them trained, and in this he signally failed.

No Fortnight article has elicited more heartfelt thanks from more diverse people than has the Shame and Glory of Korea—February 19 issue. Men who served in every branch of the service have applauded it. Corroboration has come from many quarters. It is quite clear that the United States Army, which has, of course, officially scoffed at the story, is on the spot with the American people.

It is Fortnight's sincere belief that the basic philosophy of the Army leaves much to be desired and that its methods are inadequate to the successful defense of the Republic.

We believe that the American taxpayer is not getting enough fight per dollar out of his Army, callous as that may sound, and that the Army brass had better reexamine its situation with a cold, stern eye and do something about it—fast.

Fortnight has recently extolled Gen. Matthew Ridgway, now in active command in Korea, as the kind of Army leader of which we need more. Reports from Korea indicate that his capacity for front-line leadership has done wonders for the morale and courage of his troops and that his bold, aggressive methods are finally welding a real army in place of the sad motley originally sent to Korea by General MacArthur.

In subsequent issues Fortnight—with the help of a number of military experts—will venture to propose changes in the Army's basic philosophy and improvements in its methods—training, promotion, recruiting, etc.—which, we believe, will make it possible for a 2,000,000 Army to do the job of the seven- or eight-million Army of World War II—and do it far faster at a fraction of the former cost.

For hundreds of years Rome, even when rotten at its core, was successfully defended by the Roman legions who never exceeded 375,000 at any one time, yet defended Roman rule in Britain, Gaul, along the Rhine and the Danube, in North Africa, Egypt, and the entire Near East.

The United States needs what Rome had—a relatively small, rigorously trained, well-officered, dependable combat army.

Thirty divisions of crack troops can better defend this country than 100 unreliable divisions that eat the taxpayers out of house and home and take years to become effective in actual combat.

An expanded Marine Corps, as proposed in Senate bill 677 by Senator DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois), is an essential part of the answer. The other part lies in the reform of the United States Army. Fortnight will have more to say on this subject in subsequent issues.

O. D. KUP,
Publisher.

Bill To Permit Registration of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Bill Ziebach, sports editor of the Mobile Press Register in Mobile, Ala.

As one who is qualified to judge, Mr. Ziebach is unhesitating in his opinion that H. R. 3023 should be passed as soon as possible.

I hope that petty politics will not deter action on this measure.

Mr. Ziebach's column is entitled "Out o' Doors" and is widely read throughout the South. I feel sure that support for the Hall bill will increase as the result of his words.

OUT O' DOORS WITH BILL ZIEBACH

BILL TO PROHIBIT REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

At last a man's man has taken legal steps to close a loophole that could result in seizure of citizens' firearms and consequently render this country's civilians impotent to resist aggression from within or without. Representative EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, of New York (may his name be blessed for his action) has introduced H. R. 3023 into Congress, which, if passed, will prohibit any State requiring citizens to register private weapons.

Although the Constitution of the United States gives every citizen the right to own and bear arms, its makers had no experience with the sly methods of modern traitors who use the writing pen as an instrument to first suppress, then arrest and liquidate men and women who would fight for their freedom.

Taking cognizance of this unholy situation, Representative HALL's bill provides as follows:

"A bill to prohibit registration of firearms already issued legally and to protect citizens against unconstitutional seizure of private weapons

"Whereas during World War II, Nazi-minded officers attempted to pass laws abridging the constitutional right of a private citizen to bear arms; and

"Whereas these same officers started their anti-American program by calling for registration of all privately owned firearms; and

"Whereas our founding fathers wisely incorporated within the Constitution of the United States this inherent privilege to our citizens to protect their hearths and homes by possessing arms; and

"Whereas in the several States, the revival of tyranny is asserting itself in the form of proposals to register all legally issued private weapons with design to eventual seizure of firearms owned by individual citizens: Therefore

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That no citizen shall be compelled to register firearms which he is in legal possession of.

"SEC. 2. No Federal, State, or local officers shall have the power to seize firearms belonging to private citizens who legally possess them."

The measure was referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means on March 1.

There is again a movement in some of the States to register firearms. This bill, if passed, would prevent any such further promotion to curtail the rights of our people which are guaranteed by the Constitution.

Year after year, a slimy few have repeatedly introduced legislation into Congress and State law-making bodies to compel registration of firearms owned by civilians. Year after year it is necessary for patriotic citizens to defend themselves against laws which would put every gun owner under police supervision and enable fifth columnists to quickly gather patriots before firing squads when and if they deem force necessary to subjugate this country.

If ever a law was needed, Representative HALL's bill is the one, and every patriotic organization and individual citizen should let their Congressmen know their will—as well as conveying word of their support to HALL.

But let no man be subdued if ever gun confiscatory legislation is passed. Let him register one, if he must, but bury two for readiness, as the time will be near when he'll need them.

Congratulations to Archbishop Molloy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to note the granting last week by His Holiness Pope Pius XII, of the title of archbishop to the Most Reverend Thomas E. Molloy, beloved bishop of Brooklyn for these past many years.

The following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of April 12, 1951, indicates the esteem and respect in which Archbishop Molloy is held by the citizenry of Brooklyn and Long Island of all religious faiths:

CONGRATULATIONS TO ARCHBISHOP MOLLOY

The people of Brooklyn—of all faiths and shades of religious belief—were pleasantly surprised to learn of the latest honor bestowed upon the Most Reverend Thomas E. Molloy, the reverend bishop of the Catholic faithful here.

He has been singled out to receive the title of archbishop as a personal recognition by His Holiness Pope Pius XII, for the exemplary execution of his episcopal duties as head of this diocese, which has the largest Catholic population of any in the country.

This honor, we are informed, comes in the nature of a personal tribute rather than one which would designate Brooklyn as an archdiocese. The proximity of Brooklyn to the Archdiocese of New York may be the reason for the unique distinction of conferring the title of archbishop upon His Excellency while Brooklyn still remains a diocese.

We think it is not too much of an exaggeration to say that in the hearts of the Catholics here Archbishop Molloy has won such high esteem that no ecclesiastical dignity would be unmerited.

As a citizen, a public figure, an administrator, a speaker, and scholar as well as a religious leader, Archbishop Molloy has won the respect and good will of the whole community of Brooklyn during his nearly 30 years as head of the diocese. In these days when the very foundations of the world are threatened by onslaught from materialistic and atheistic forces, it is reassuring to have spiritual leaders of the stature of the new archbishop.

The Brooklyn Eagle joins with all men and women of good will in extending to Archbishop Molloy heartfelt expression of felicitations on his well-deserved honor.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by W. L. Clayton before a joint session of the Texas Legislature, Austin, Tex., March 6, 1951:

It is a great honor and pleasure you have given me to speak to you on the foreign policy of the United States, the most important subject in the world today.

We could be wrong on every other subject and right on that and the country is rich enough and virile enough to pull out of its mistakes and go forward; but if we are wrong on foreign policy we could be right on everything else and the results still could be disastrous, not only to the people of the United States but to the whole world.

Now, what is the foreign policy of the United States?

Whatever division there may be among our people regarding method or procedure, there is no difference of opinion regarding objective.

The United States covets neither the lands nor possessions of any country or people; on the contrary our interests lie in the maintenance of the independence and integrity of all peoples.

The objective of United States foreign policy therefore is world peace and its preservation under conditions which will insure to all law-abiding peoples life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now how is this objective to be achieved?

Should we continue military and economic aid to our allies in Europe or should we follow the advice of Mr. Hoover and send not another soldier, not another dollar to Europe until they have got themselves in condition where they won't need either?

Should we continue to fight alongside United Nations forces in Korea until the Communists learn that they not only cannot run us out but that it is too costly to try or should we turn tail and get out now as best we can?

These are some of the vital details of foreign policy on which opinions differ.

I recently saw a cartoon in which the snout of a symbolic elephant was labeled "Put 'em in the front lines," whereas the tail said "Keep 'em in the rear," and the principal proponents of these contradictory policies were to be seen in the background shouting their respective arguments—Dewey and Stassen upholding the snout and Hoover and Taft the tail.

Nobody suggests the withdrawal under present conditions of the United States troops already in Europe; and if our military authorities decide that these troops should be reinforced, that is a military decision which should not be reversed by political laymen. Any policy question involved here was really decided when the North Atlantic Treaty was entered into under our leadership.

That treaty commits us to go to the defense of our European allies if they are attacked. Would it not be wise when we are all gravely threatened with attack to take concerted measures to try to prevent it rather than sit supinely back and wait for the blow to be struck?

What the free world faces is just what our Original Thirteen Colonies faced when they created a Federal Union and wrote the Constitution of the United States and is expressed in this simple phrase: "United we stand; divided we fall."

Europe is the next great prize Russia seeks.

If Communist Russia should conquer Western Europe with its vast complex of coal, steel, industry, and technology, you may be sure that the end of world war III would find the United States, winner or loser, no longer the home of the brave and the land of the free.

But all these arguments about Europe are now academic because the decision has been made and the American people have made it. Our destiny is insolubly linked with Western Europe, the home of our ancestors and the birthplace of our social and political ideals.

The only question is, Can this link be made strong enough in time to prevent world war III, or to win that war if it should come?

Unfortunately, the answer to that question is locked in the minds of a little group of rapacious and powerful men sitting in the Kremlin—men without religion, without conscience, without decency, without mercy.

These men intend to conquer the world; they have told us that.

But they want to do it the cheapest and easiest way for them.

If by pressing a button they could gain world victory they would not hesitate to press that button even if it meant murdering millions of innocent men, women, and children.

As these men look out over the world and try to appraise the chances and risks involved in their schemes, we can imagine their leader Stalin addressing them somewhat as follows:

"Our greatest advantage lies in the disunity of our enemy. It is true they have entered into a pact but we all know what that means; pacts are made to break whenever a member finds that it no longer serves his interest.

"Imagine their difficulties. There are 12 members of the pact; they have selected a military head but he is subject to 12 political heads, now conducting 12 separate foreign policies. They are continually squabbling about Asiatic policy, about German policy, about the so-called Schuman plan, etc. They are unable to reach agreement on vital issues. How can this general organize and lead an army of 12 different nationalities subject to orders from 12 different governments? They will find themselves entangled in red tape, in the endless conferences and inefficiencies of their own boasted freedom. That kind of organization cannot stand up against the unity, the cohesion, the discipline of the Communist forces."

When General Eisenhower addressed Congress on February 1, immediately after his return from Europe, he spoke of the vast resources and great potentialities of the democracies and asked why we should be frightened of dictatorial government and then he gave this answer: "Only for one reason—because they have a unity of purpose." And then he said: "What we have got to do is to meet that unity with a higher type, the unity of free men that will not be defeated."

In this vast struggle which is raging throughout the world for the minds and loyalties of men, the weakness of the foreign policy of all the democracies lies in the fact that such policy is mostly negative—it is against something. The Communist policy on the other hand is positive; they have a program to cure all the ills of all people. It is a false program, of course, but anyway it is something positive. And make no mistake about it, it is catching on in the world.

The free world must shift from the negative to the positive if it is to win this struggle.

All history proves that peace cannot long be maintained by pacts and armaments races. The two ideas are completely antithetic. And we must never forget that the very foundation of our foreign policy is the establishment and maintenance of permanent world peace.

As vicious and repugnant as communism is, permanent world peace will never be secured by simply fighting communism even though the Communists lose.

To think that this road would lead to peace is to completely misunderstand what is happening to the world in which we live.

It is a tragic mistake to look upon communism as the only obstacle to a continuation of our tranquil enjoyment of the luxurious life, while much of the rest of the world lives in poverty.

Communism is but an outward manifestation of the world revolution now in progress—a revolution of the "have-nots," not so much against the "haves" as against their own lot in life. This is particularly true of the Orient with more than a billion people, 60 percent of whom are clustering at the ragged edge of a miserable existence.

When the Premier of Pakistan was in Texas about a year ago, he said that when he thought of the United States, he saw an island, fabulously prosperous, but still an island, surrounded by a sea of poverty, of cold and of hunger; and it frightened him.

There are just too many hundreds of millions of people in the world who go to bed cold and hungry every night to expect that victory in the fight to contain communism will bring peace to the world.

Some one will probably say: "But this misery of which you speak has always been with us. How does the situation today differ from the past?" The answer to that is to be found in the techniques of the modern world.

Formerly the miserable lived and died in ignorance; so far as they knew the whole world lived and died in misery; but today they know better.

Justice William Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, stated the other day in a speech in Arizona that when he was recently in Iran, he found in a city of 40,000 people on the Russian border, 10,000 radios, all battery operated. You may be sure that Communist Russia tells those people every day and every night that the United States lives in luxury at their expense; that we are exploiting their oil and other raw materials and sucking the life's blood out of the people who are the real owners of the wealth of the world.

Those who do not hear this over the radio will get the story from those who do.

The first job of the free world is to make itself so strong that the aggressor dare not strike. Peace can doubtless be secured temporarily in this way, and only in this way.

The free world is proceeding on this policy through the machinery created by the North Atlantic Treaty, as cumbersome and inefficient as that machinery is.

This will give us a breathing spell. It would be a tragic mistake to expect that it will give us permanent world peace.

The ferment which is working at the heart of the world, keeping it in pain and anguish, is too potent to yield to the persuasion of armies, of battleships, and bombers.

Indeed, that sort of extravagant trappings, created out of the blood, sweat, and tears of men, will in the end add fuel to the seething caldron of unrest which is now gripping the world.

In truth, the road to permanent world peace must be a much less costly road than the one we are now following.

It is the job of the United States, as leader of the free world, to find this road and to lead the democracies of the world in planting their feet firmly upon it, determined to follow it to the end.

For some time now the free world has been drawing closer and closer together.

The foreign policy of the United States is largely responsible for this—lend-lease, UNRRA, the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the British loan, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, and numerous other international actions under the leadership of the United States all attest the strong community of interest of the democratic nations.

But the free world is still separated into too many political and economic compartments to bring about the kind of strong organization necessary, first, for its own preservation, and, second, for the job of raising the standard of living of the peoples of the world if foundations of permanent peace are to be well laid.

To create such an organization and to do such a job, the free world must unite politically, militarily, economically. It must speak with 1 voice instead of 12 or 15 or 20 voices, not all saying the same thing. It must eliminate barriers to the movement of goods within its own boundaries, preliminary to the elimination of world barriers, to the end that markets may be enormously enlarged and that production may be rationalized on the basis of comparative advantage. This would substantially reduce the cost of goods to the people, would bring about a great increase in the production of raw materials throughout the world, and result in the development of the world's resources and production facilities on a scale never before seen. The need of subsidies and grants would cease; the standard of living would automatically rise throughout the world; tranquillity would be restored, and permanent world peace would be within our grasp.

Mr. Charles Wilson and Defense Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles E. Wilson, who is doing a most creditable task as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The address was delivered by Mr. Wilson over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Tuesday, April 10, 1951. Those who know him know that Mr. Wilson clearly set forth his basic and most constructive views:

A week ago the President gave the American people the first report of our progress in defense mobilization. It was a heartening report in many respects. But both before and after it was issued there has been much evidence that many Americans believe we can slacken our efforts to achieve America's might.

It is to caution against this tendency to complacency—rather, in fact, to tell you of the dire need to go forward energetically and resolutely and unitedly—that I talk to you tonight.

The whole history of the human race is the story of the struggle of men to be free—to determine the kind of government under which they would live—to worship God in their own way—to choose freely how they would earn a living.

This struggle went on all over the world for more than 50 centuries during which the war lords, kings, and emperors ruled the earth; tyranny was the common lot of man.

Men before us fought for the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights, but the great liberation really began with the founding of this Republic. Before that, out of all the billions who inhabited this earth, never more than three or four million people, at any one time, had enjoyed liberty and freedom as we conceive liberty and freedom.

Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton intended us to be forever free. Government was to be the servant of the people and not their master. Government was to represent all of the people and no man or any group of men were to have any rights or any freedoms beyond those that were to be enjoyed by all of our people.

Under that Government, as conceived by the founders of this Nation, we have developed a freedom and an economy that have given liberty to more people and a better standard of living to more people than mankind has ever known.

All over the world, free nations, inspired by our example, came into being. Within the last 40 years these free nations, in two great world wars, have united to resist assaults upon the liberties of mankind.

Now once more tyranny is on the march. A dictatorship, more absolute and ruthless than any that the world has ever known, challenges all that we have so dearly won. It believes that the only way it can be safe is to undermine or overcome all other governments.

Please do not believe that I seek to frighten you. You know the basic facts as well as I know them. The dreadful shadow moves over this earth. In a short 12 years nation after nation has disappeared behind the iron curtain—Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Eastern Germany, part of Finland, China, and half of Korea—800,000,000 people—a third of the population of the earth.

Untold millions are in slave labor camps and mines and factories, producing materials and munitions of war. Other millions are impressed into the largest armed force this world has ever known—all of these poised to be hurled at the last bulwarks of freedom and liberty.

This brings us face to face with the question whether our country and our way of life are worth the price we must pay to defend them. Here and now we must decide for ourselves the price of freedom. Each of us must decide in his own heart whether he will do his part niggardly or magnificently.

We must decide whether we will be greatly patriotic or whether we will be meanly partisan for ourselves or for any group or class.

I know you will agree with me that what we have here in America is not only worth fighting for, but worth sacrificing for.

And this brings us face to face with the question of what we must do to defend ourselves.

I repeat, we live in a democracy. The Congress will determine how much money is to be made available and for what it is to be spent. The President will administer this program, and as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces will direct their use.

The Office of Defense Mobilization is charged with the mobilization of men and materials and the over-all direction of the acquisition of everything required by the Armed Forces.

We are charged to do this without destroying or impairing the economy of this Nation.

This requires, in effect, almost a miracle of equilibrium. Give the Army and the Navy and the Air Force the millions of men they require, without destroying the labor force which must produce their weapons, and give them food and clothing, equipment, and arms without destroying the labor force which must produce all of the things necessary for the maintenance of our civilian economy.

At the same time we must see to it that rents and prices and wages do not get into an upward spiral, or there would be no money left from the civilian economy to support the defense effort.

We also need what amounts to almost a miracle of timing. The development of scientific weapons of war means that the rate at which some weapons become obsolete is terrific. So we must make, or be ready to make, all of the things that our Armed Forces need with which to defend us, without having to maintain maximum weapon production at all times.

But at the end, what we really need is an honest will on the part of everybody to seek the best solutions that will protect this country in its essential defense program, and that will stop the inflation which may destroy that program.

The defense program is rolling.

The transition from a full employment economy to a defense program is being achieved in matters of production with less dislocation and more speed than anyone had thought possible.

We are building up the facilities to produce for the Armed Forces, so that they can be expanded with the greatest rapidity in any situation that confronts us.

Contracts for defense production are moving at the rate of nearly $4,000,000,000 a month. Actual production should catch up, this very year, with the rate of spending.

Tonight I can report to you with the utmost confidence that there is building up, here in America, a machinery of defense so powerful that when it is completed no dictator in his right mind would dare attack us.

At the same time, I want to make it crystal clear that we have a gigantic task here at home to maintain our economy under this tremendous burden.

It is necessary that this program have the support of every man and woman in the United States. Every one of us must be willing to give up something—but, more important, we must resist the temptation to claim or grab more than is rightly and justly due us.

When the President asked me to undertake this task, he outlined a single and wholly patriotic goal—to mobilize our strength for defense, to mobilize it in the shortest possible time, to mobilize it with the least possible danger to our economy, and to mobilize it with no impairment of our freedoms and with the least possible impairment of our standard of living.

I can say to you with utter sincerity that he did not ask me to serve any selfish purpose—his own or any other man's.

If I am to carry out the instructions of the President, and if I am to live with my conscience, I must put aside self-interest, and I shall expect others—all others without exception—to do the same. On this point there can be no compromise. For the important thing to bear in mind is this—and let me emphasize it from my heart—no man has a right to compromise the life or safety of a single boy in Korea or to compromise the future of this Nation.

We have had our difficulties, even as we have had our triumphs of progress. But only yesterday there met for the first time with the President the National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy, representing substantially all segments of our people—agriculture, commerce and industry, labor, and the public. It is my sincere hope that this Board will be the means of giving a strong impulse to the successful carrying out of our program of defense mobilization on a basis of equality of sacrifice.

As Chairman of the Board I represent no group except that magnificent one known as the people of the United States. I will listen to advice from the representatives of any group, big or small. In fact, I welcome it, and I will give it all heed. I will listen to the advice of any single citizen. But in the end I am sure that the people of this country want their governmental policy to be determined by their Government. I cannot act in any interest except in the interest of all of our people.

I think I know our people and I think I know the great spiritual values they will bring to the task of uniting our country.

This Nation has victoriously survived every crisis. Now—aroused, strong, unified, confident, each in his own place seeking to serve our country, trusting in each other, and trusting in God—I know that once again we will successfully defend our homes, our liberties, and the land we love.

The Tafts and the MacArthurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, by coincidence, the Associated Press, on April 14, carried two Taft-MacArthur stories. These were reported in the New York Times on April 15. It happens, however, that one described a clash between the father of the Senator from Ohio and the father of General MacArthur. The other concerns a proposed joining together of the famous sons of these famous men. Because of the rather odd coincidence, I am asking that these articles be included in our RECORD:

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1951]

MACARTHUR'S FATHER WAS IN NOTED ROW—CLASH WITH EX-PRESIDENT TAFT ON RULE IN THE PHILIPPINES LED TO GENERAL'S REMOVAL

WASHINGTON, April 14.—The father of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, a noted soldier of 50 years ago, also had a bitter dispute with civilian authorities.

Although it involved a domestic political controversy of the period, in a few respects it was strikingly similar to the present situation evolving around Douglas MacArthur.

It may have affected the final years of Gen. Arthur MacArthur's career.

According to historical accounts of the incident this is what happened:

The United States had acquired the Philippine Islands from Spain as a result of the Spanish-American War. In the summer of 1898 Arthur MacArthur went to the Philippines. In May 1900 he became Military Governor.

About that time Republican President William McKinley sent William Howard Taft at the head of a Commission charged with establishing a civilian government in the Philippines. Taft arrived June 3, 1900, just a month after MacArthur had assumed his governorship.

Back home there was a national political fight going on, with President McKinley under heavy pressure from his Democratic opponents to end what they considered expensive military operations against Philippine elements fighting the American takeover. There were demands for early establishment of civilian government in the islands.

In MacArthur's command there was a feeling that only the Army could do the job of restoring order and giving western civilization to the Islanders. The Taft Commission encountered a cold attitude on the part of the general.

Taft waited for MacArthur to pay his respects, but the general sent a colonel instead. Finally Taft himself went to see MacArthur, who gave him a cool welcome and assigned for the commission's use only one small room in the Governor's palace.

Taft thereupon undertook a series of reports on MacArthur to Secretary of War Elihu Root in Washington. He even threatened to resign.

In this antagonistic atmosphere the two men and their associates existed for a year. Then on July 4, 1901, Taft became Civilian Governor of the islands. MacArthur was relieved of his command and returned to military duty in the United States.

In 1907 MacArthur finished a tour of duty as commander of the Army's division of the Pacific and was considered by many in line to become Chief of Staff.

But Secretary of War Taft preferred Gen. J. F. Bell, and MacArthur remained in semi-retirement until his actual retirement at 64 years of age in June 1909.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1951]

TAFT, MACARTHUR FAVORED—THEY ARE CAPEHART'S PICK FOR 1952 PRESIDENTIAL TICKET

FRENCH LICK, IND., April 14.—Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, today proposed a 1952 Republican ticket of Taft for President and MacArthur for Vice President.

He said that Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, "has more delegates than anybody and is the popular choice."

Senator CAPEHART told newsman that Mr. TAFT would give the Republican party the best leadership on domestic issues and that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur would do the same on foreign policy.

Asked how General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower might figure in next year's Presidential campaign, Senator CAPEHART replied:

"I don't suppose he could get away from his mission in Europe. He is tied up in Europe and will be inactive politically for many years."

Senator CAPEHART came to French Lick, a southern Indiana resort, to address a meeting of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly in favor of scrutinizing carefully every request of any kind for funds which comes to Congress in these days of mounting deficits. I want to have all of the facts—and the story behind these facts. But I do not see how anyone can feel that the proposition to send grain to India has not been fully explored, and how anyone can question the need.

I should like at this time to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two very fine editorials from a very fine newspaper, the Salt Lake Tribune, which point out the dangers of any further delay in voting the funds to send grain to India immediately:

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of March 16, 1951]

DELAYING AID TO HUNGRY PEOPLE IS DANGEROUS

Backfiring of some assistance programs in the past and realization that our resources are limited has slowed down some American international relief undertakings.

It was sensible, therefore, for Congress to examine carefully the proposal to send food grain to India, where many thousands of persons are starving. The entire proposition has been explored and the testimony is in. There is no question of the imperative need. There should be no further delay. Famine does not wait.

In a sense, the good intentions and honesty of the United States are on trial before the world. Even the most rabid critics of India and its Government have not proposed that we refuse to furnish food to the starving. Only the details about payment and terms are debated. We have the grain and ships are available. All that is required now is appropriate Government action.

If the United States were to refuse aid now countless peoples throughout the world would be convinced that we put a price tag on our acts of mercy, that we help only when we can coerce. However false the charges might be, it would not help us to win friends throughout the globe. The cognomen, "Uncle Shylock," is less flattering than "Uncle Sugar." More important than reaction of other peoples, however, is our own self-respect. We simply cannot afford to be unresponsive to pleas to mitigate human suffering.

Hunger is on the march in India. It is extremely dangerous to further delay the food we have and they need so urgently.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of March 28, 1951]

WHILE HUMANS STARVE

The humanitarian phase has been repeatedly stressed in connection with the proposal to send surplus grain to save lives in India.

While droughts were followed by hurricanes, destroying India's maize and wheat crops, contrary nature has overflowed the wheat bowl of the United States. Not to be outdone by nature, Congressmen have perversely decided that starving stomachs can wait. There is grave danger that the grain measure, proposed by the administration with the blessing of Herbert Hoover,

will be talked to death. Meantime, the President of the India League of America says that at least 1,000,000 Indians will die of disease or starvation unless Congress quickly approves the grant.

Approval of this program no doubt would do more than all possible diplomatic maneuvers to win friends in the Far East. Meantime, it is reported that congressional reluctance to act has driven New Delhi to ask Russia for grain. What a potent propaganda subject would be created if the Soviets furnished the Indians the needed grain while American Congressmen indulged in futile filibusters over the question of repayment.

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to the Congress and the country the prize-winning essay of Miss Sue Rowe, a Bexley, Ohio, high school senior, in the Ohio American Legion essay contest for 1951. It is worth reading by all of us, and I am proud that Miss Rowe comes from my district.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Sue Rowe)

The Constitution in today's world is not a charter of rights handed down by the Government to the people, but a limit of power placed on the Government by the people. The Constitution is not a law granted to the people, but a supreme law made by the people for the United States of America. It is in these facts that the glory of the United States Constitution lies.

People today say that our generation knows more about the Constitution than the founding fathers; but the Constitution makers knew more about good government. Our forefathers laid the foundations and the framework of the Government which are stated in the preamble to the Constitution. Because these men had great foresight in realizing the requirements of a true and lasting democracy, they left the next generation free to establish the Nation socially and economically. The people have been so busy building the Nation that they have not yet nearly begun to fill the inherited framework of freedom.

These pioneers of democracy knew the temptation of a government to take more power or to misuse the power granted to it. Any clause which would make the Constitution superior to the people was removed.

The originators of the Constitution also knew that these fundamental principles must last, not for an age, but for all time. The final draft of the Constitution was so successful that it has been used as the framework of the United Nations Charter.

Today's world is divided by an enormous chasm between two schools of thought. One idea is stated word for word by the preamble and the Bill of Rights. The other centers around the ideology that the state is the supreme power and that the individual exists only to serve and to promote the Government. Education in such a government exists only to make the individual more useful to the state. All opposition to such a government is suppressed.

The Constitution has been found so flexible, so elastic, and so adaptable that it fits perfectly into this world of constant change and has been equal to every new condition presented to it. The elastic clause which gives Congress the power to make laws necessary for completing the work of the Government has been one factor which has made the Constitution so flexible. In these times of economic distress, inflation, and unrest in foreign countries, our supreme law has new goals to conquer.

The Constitution defends us daily; it stands between us and the fallacy that man belongs to the state. The throne, crown, and sceptor of the people is the Constitution which, as long as it is maintained in letter and in spirit, secures liberties and pursuits of happiness. The Constitution is the candle which will light the way of the world through future years and centuries.

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting essays written by Mr. Kenneth Creasy of Delaware, Ohio, and Mr. Maurice Boufflous of Mt. Vernon, Ohio. Mr. Creasy and Mr. Boufflous are two of the winners of the Annual Essay Contest sponsored by the Department of Ohio American Legion and the Auxiliary.

Twelve winners were chosen from the thousands of essays submitted with three being selected from each high school grade. Mr. Boufflous placed first, along with two others, in the ninth grade division, while Mr. Creasy shared top honors in the senior class.

The title, Mr. Speaker, this year was "The American Constitution in a Modern World." The work of these young men certainly merits the time of every Member of Congress to carefully analyze their recommendations.

I am indeed very thankful, Mr. Speaker, that the American Legion and the Auxiliary sponsor such a program and I am grateful that so many young people—the youth of today and the manhood and womanhood of tomorrow—will devote many hours of time and study in preparation of an essay of this type.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Creasy of Delaware and Mr. Boufflous of Mt. Vernon for their endeavors and their achievements and I am happy to submit their essays for your consideration.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Kenneth Creasy)

Any sensible person will tell you that a building, in order to stand over a long duration of time, must be of firm foundation and structure. Likewise, governments must be sound in structure, and they must be built upon foundations that can withstand all that might challenge them.

Think back with me, if you will, to the years immediately preceding 1789. During that time, the leaders of our country grasped a belief in an idea, and this idea was later to become the foundation of our democracy. In truth, they wished to do something that would let us live and do as we had dreamed of doing since our venture onto this great continent. Thus, our forefathers came upon a plan for organizing a government dedicated to the belief that all men should be free to live in peace. They believed, as we believe today, that we should be a self-governing people. Yes, these men began to develop their dream, and then, they began to act as if what they believed were true. The result was the Constitution of the United States of America.

Thus, by virtue of our Constitution, our Government was established, consisting of three branches: the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. In more common terms: the President, the Congress, and the Courts. With these established, our country began to make history. We grew, we prospered, and in doing so we rejoiced.

As times changed and life in our world, and our United States became more and more complex, our Government had to adjust itself to meet many changing conditions. The tests of the strength and flexibility of our Constitution became great and numerous. But, as the forward-looking men who had conceived it had believed, the Constitution was strong enough to withstand even the problems offered by a more modernized world.

Let us look at the preamble of the Constitution and see precisely what is promised by that document. It goes as follows: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

From its very beginning, the Constitution has been used for guidance in all our governmental undertakings. For example, our courts provide justice to all who come before them.

Much has been done to provide for the common defense, as can be witnessed by the establishment of military power. Closely related to the common defense is the general welfare. Along this line Federal highways, parks, and the like have been constructed. Of necessity, a system of social security was set up to provide for the economic and social well being of the individual.

Obviously, the American Constitution works extremely well in the modern world. This is evidenced by the fact that it has been amended only 21 times in 162 years.

To sum it up, I would say that our Constitution has proved itself to be a firm foundation for Government, and the guiding light behind our success. This document, developed in 1789, is the basis of the American way. Truly, it has made our Government, as Abe Lincoln said, "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Maurice Boufflous, Mount Vernon, Ohio)

The American Constitution in this modern world of today, is, as it was intended to be in the beginning, a workable government based on the fact that all men are created equal and have inalienable rights which must be protected. Since it is based on these God-given rights, it has, and is destined to endure and guide the lives of its citizens through social, economical, and political strife.

This essay attempts to prove that the American Constitution is what Gladstone called "The greatest work ever struck off by the mind and purpose of man" and that it is superior as an instrument of government even in this complicated modern world.

What qualities make this body of laws so outstanding at the time it was written and in our own day? The Government under the Constitution determined to be democratic, to work under a system in which all the citizens decide questions of public policy, either directly or through their elected representatives. The people profit by a democracy because it strives to promote the interests of society as a whole.

Democracy respects the civil liberties of all. Among these liberties are the right to form one's opinions and express them freely, the right of petition, the freedom of religion, and the right to impartial justice.

It furnishes every individual with equal educational opportunity, regardless of race, religion, social status, and so on.

Democracy promotes those economic, political, and social conditions that are necessary for the enjoyment of liberty.

Democracy demonstrates that far-reaching changes can be carried out in an orderly and peaceful fashion, when the decision to make the changes has been reached by democratic means, that is, by the majority.

It liberates, develops, and uses the intelligence of all its citizens and equips them with the knowledge needed for the promotion of national efficiency.

Democracy teaches that every privilege entails a corresponding duty, and carries with it an obligation to subordinate personal interest for the common good.

The above principles are the ideals that the American Constitution has striven for but they have not always been perfectly realized in our country due to weak instruments. The courts under the American Constitution since the time that John Marshall established their prestige have attempted in all possible ways to administer justice. The Supreme Court has kept apace with the expansion of the country, the complicated social problems, increase of transportation and commerce, and big business—problems which did not exist at the time of the origin of the Constitution. The ability and right to cope with these situations have been handed down from the time of John Marshall who insisted that Congress had implied powers as well as expressed powers.

Another reason the Constitution has guided our ship of state so successfully is the wise system of checks and balances. The power of the Constitution was divided into three separate functions, the executive, legislative, and judicial.

The task of putting and keeping the country on a financial basis was one of the headaches of the framers that was alleviated by Hamilton. Our country has been prosperous and blessed by God despite panics, depressions, and wars, but never has it been faced with such a huge debt as today. Congress, using the powers given by the Constitution, is trying to cope with the situation.

The National Government under Congress today furnishes much leadership, driving force, and money for education, health, and social security. Institutions for the aged, blind, and mentally deficient have been the result of Government aid and supervision.

In relation to the defense program the Constitution gives Congress the power to declare war, raise and support forces for the national defense, make laws for the regulation of these forces for the national defense, to provide for calling forth the militia and the organizing, arming, and disciplining of it when in the service of the United States.

We have seen how this power has been utilized for the successful defense of our land.

If it had not been for the regulations of Congress under the Constitution in regard to commerce and big business, we would probably have a dictatorial government.

The United States has made a supreme effort through the Monroe Doctrine, League of Nations, the United Nations, and other foreign policies, to preserve world peace and normal economic conditions with all her neighbors in other lands.

Today our Government faces a critical and complicated situation in world affairs and we pray that it will stand the test as it has so courageously done in the past.

The Constitution is now more than a century and a half old. It has been praised and it has been severely criticised. It was written for a primitive rural people with an eighteenth-century background but it has grown through amendments and custom and decision to such an extent that it serves as the written instrument of government for a highly industrialized people of 150,000,000 covering a vast expanse of territory. It has survived prosperity and panic. And remember, the Nation is still young.

The Martin Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of the Members have wondered, as I have, whether or not General MacArthur intended that his letter to our minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], should be made public. In a personal letter, a military officer is apt to freely express himself without considering the results that might flow from publication of his private thoughts. I do not quite understand why the Congressman from Massachusetts expected the general to send him a second message, telling him not to make the first public. Yet this is evidently what the gentleman expected if the following news story by the Associated Press is a correct account of an address by the gentleman.

The rule that silence gives consent applies legally only when one is under a duty to speak, and I cannot conceive, under the circumstances, that the general was bound to affirmatively inform the gentleman that the letter was not for publication. If military personnel cannot trust Members of Congress to keep private letters confidential, we will lose the opportunity to obtain information not otherwise available. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts had better authority than his North Attleboro speech indicated for his publication of the general's letter.

The article follows:

[From the Evening Star of April 16, 1951]

ADMINISTRATION SEEKS TO SMEAR MACARTHUR, MARTIN CHARGES

NORTH ATTLEBORO, MASS., April 16.—* * * Mr. MARTIN declared "the issue in this dispute is much greater than MacArthur's career or the loss of a continent to the Communists."

He said: "We are barred from hearing the views of anybody who owes his position to the Truman administration if those views disagree with Truman's. * * * According to this rule Eisenhower cannot speak unless it is what Truman wants to say. When such rules govern we are coming pretty close to dictatorship."

HELD LETTER 10 DAYS

Mr. MARTIN said he had withheld for 10 days General MacArthur's letter stating the general's views on far eastern policy while he (MARTIN) waited for some indication from MacArthur that he wanted the letter withheld from publication.

The minority leader said he finally came to the conclusion he "owed it to the American people to tell them the information I had from a great and reliable source."

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, department of Ohio, in sponsoring an annual essay contest for high-school students, is certainly stimulating the Americanism of the youth of our land, this year's subject being the American Constitution in a Modern World.

As the Representative of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Ohio, I am, indeed, proud that one of our fine young boys, Leo Collins, of Alliance, is among the winners.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is a pleasure to include Leo's essay:

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Leo Collins, Alliance, Ohio)

In September 1788 the Constitution of the United States of America was finally ratified and put into effect. The efforts and sacrifices of thousands of men and women, who for centuries had had that hope for freedom, went into that document. The men who wrote and made our Constitution did not write it to meet just the present needs of a small and poor country, but they had visions of a nation which would someday be truly great.

In the approximately 163 years since our Constitution was formed, our Nation has grown from a few small Colonies along the eastern coast of North America to one of the largest, richest, and most powerful countries in the world. Stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and with approximately 150,000,000 people, the United States has proved that a nation based on a constitution of freedom can and will survive and prosper.

The American Constitution has changed very little since it was first formed. It has proved that the common people, once they realize what freedom in a democracy like ours can mean, will never give it up. The modes of transportation and material surroundings and even the methods of waging wars to defend our hard-won freedoms have changed, but as our Constitution was not based on material things but rather on ideals, it has endured through the years. It is a guide which helps you to gain material things and bring greater happiness into your life while still allowing you to have your personal freedoms.

Yet you often wonder just what effect our Constitution has on our modern world. But, actually, it is not a hard problem to solve when you realize that today, even more so than back in 1788, people all over the world are crying out against and trying to escape from the persecution and injustices which dictators and communistic governments are forcing on them. Our Nation, with our Constitution as its base, stands as the only truly free country in the world. The world is slowly but surely learning that a nation can be free and prosper with equality for all of the people.

As you look around you, you realize that behind all of our conveniences, which we consider so important today, such as the telephone, electric light, and the automobile, is our Constitution. It has given our people the freedoms that are so necessary for a person to be able to sit down with an untroubled mind to work on problems of bettering himself and his fellowman.

Yes; when we begin to think about it, we realize that we owe our forefathers more than we will ever be able to repay for their sacrifices and hardships which they went through to make our Constitution live. It is our duty to carry on the traditions of our country so that our Constitution will live on and our descendants will reap the benefits of it just as we have done.

CARE: An Asset for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have contributed to the humanitarian work that CARE is doing across the world—alleviating human suffering and bringing happiness to countless thousands—know that all too little is known of this splendid organization. Under unanimous consent of the House, therefore, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the March 4, 1951, issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, entitled "An Asset for Freedom."

The editorial follows:

AN ASSET FOR FREEDOM

People around the world, whatever their nationality, their race, or their religion, have very elementary aspirations. They want enough to eat, sufficient clothing, a roof over their heads, and the means to make the lot of their children better than their own has been.

This fact explains more about the world, the struggle to control it, the basis of political power and the opportunities for leadership than pages of governmental statistics on steel production, shipping tonnage, or wheat output.

The idea is that of Paul Comly French, executive director of CARE (Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe), who spoke before the City Club Forum yesterday, especially on the needs of Yugoslavia. In the last 4 years French has been in virtually every country in the world, mixing not only with the heads of governments, drawing up relief agreements, but what is more important, with the common people. In that time French has crossed the Atlantic 51 times and has been around the world three times. Twelve days ago he was in Yugoslavia.

The work that CARE has done in transmitting more than 10,000,000 packages to needy persons abroad since the war has been one of the greatest assets for freedom in the postwar world. It has reached down to the lower strata of society in every country, places where Marshall plans do not reach and where such aid, going mainly to industries that only indirectly pass on the benefits to the individual, are often never heard of.

In the next 6 months, under the government and CARE distribution of food surpluses in Yugoslavia, one-fourth of the population will receive aid from the United States and will know it is from the United States. The aberrations and political chicanery of UNRRA will be avoided. While Marshal Tito still proclaims his independence of both the east and the west, this distribution to be carried out under the constant checking throughout the country of 16 inspectors, will do more to win support for the west than all the diplomatic arrangements that Washington may make.

CARE operates only in those countries where it can supervise its work. It has pulled out of such nations as Rumania and Bulgaria, where the Communists were interested only in using it as a political weapon. In its operation, we believe, is to be found a key to success in international relations on the level that counts most—the good will of the populations. Governments, especially our own which has so badly fumbled its propaganda opportunities, might well take a lesson from this humanitarian, nonprofit organization.

MacArthur and Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members will be interested in the following editorial by Mr. Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News. Mr. Boddy has long advocated greater interest in the peoples of Asia. His calm analysis of the General MacArthur episode is worthy of attention:

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of April 12, 1951]

DANGER OF UN SPLIT OVER KOREAN POLICY

Until repercussions from the violent shock of General MacArthur's removal from command subside there will be little if any chance for the voice of reason and common sense to be heard.

Even now, however, it is well to keep in mind that the split between General MacArthur and his followers and the Truman administration with its supporters is only one part of the picture.

There is grave danger that the United Nations itself may be divided into two irreconcilable blocks.

Carlos P. Romula, 1949 president of the General Assembly of the UN, gives this clear picture of why United Nations forces are fighting in Korea (the Yale Review, December 1950):

"After centuries of obscurity and submergence, Asia has assumed a new importance in world affairs. It has emerged as one of the main proving grounds of the United Nations, a place of decision on the issue of war or peace, and one of the reasons for which the deep social and economic disequilibrium of modern society will have to be redressed if the future is to be made secure from ruinous conflicts, wars, and revolutions.

"Korea, which is the epitome of the plight and the challenge of Asia, is a turning point in the life of the United Nations. The attack upon the Republic of Korea on June 25, 1950, drove the world organization to the wall. It had to resist aggression and maintain the rule of law or surrender its right to continued existence."

UN FACED DEADLY PERIL

"After 5 years of alternating crises and recoveries, which sorely tried its vitality and power though never to the point of mortal danger, the United Nations suddenly found itself confronted with deadly peril south of the thirty-eighth parallel in embattled Korea.

"There it had to make a stand, politically and militarily, and it did."

It made a stand, right enough, but about 98 percent of that stand was made by the United States, and every day it is becoming increasingly obvious that the United States and the United Nations are not, in fact, "standing" for the same objective.

A large section of UN members is growing more and more voluble in its demand that Red China be admitted to membership.

An overwhelming majority of the people of the United States on the other hand, do not hesitate to express their conviction that the UN has no more chance to survive Communist cells within its organization than a human body has to survive cancerous tissue.

As of today, at least, it appears that the Truman administration is unwilling to compel a showdown on this issue as it would be doing if it followed General MacArthur's proposed program.

This unwillingness may be caused by some important facts that are not available to the public.

For one thing, the MacArthur plan of war against China might cause an immediate split between the United States and her European allies at the very time when General Eisenhower is moving heaven and earth to prepare defenses against Red aggression in Europe.

UNITED STATES WOULD STAND ALONE

In any event, it seems certain that if we were to pursue an uncompromising policy of all-out war against communism in Asia we would have to stand alone except for such manpower help as could be organized among the rebellious hordes within Asia itself.

Even though the Truman administration were in agreement with the MacArthur policy in principle, the practical question of whether we are yet ready for the drastic action called for by that policy is one this writer, certainly, is unprepared to answer. And being unprepared he feels that hot, emotional outbursts would be a grave disservice to the public.

For many years the Daily News has been expressing the conviction that the era of the Pacific is at hand; that with mass man on the land mass of the world, which is Asia, and not Europe, which is the sick appendage of Asia, rests the fate of western civilization.

Our course of action, however, must be the product of extremely careful timing, enlightened statesmanship and diplomacy.

It is very easy to get into a terrible war of destruction and almost impossible to get out of it. It seems to us that now is the time to prepare defenses against war rather than a time to expand the one we are in.

The Communists are not getting stronger in Asia. Starvation, disease, internal confusion, lack of transportation, oil and production facilities combine to work against them.

The United States, on the other hand, is getting stronger with each passing week.

For all of these reasons we cannot escape the feeling that the administration had no choice but to head its team in Asia with a commander who can conscientiously play the kind of game upon which we are now relying to win the long, weary years that lie ahead in the battle of readjustment.

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial appearing in the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, April 13, 1951, that seems to me to be pertinent at this time. If all the newspapers and news commentators would have exercised the same good judgment in the MacArthur case as did the Deseret News there would have been less hysteria among the people and certainly the advice given in the editorial of ascertaining all the facts before expressing a judgment is sound for both newspapers as well as individuals.

The editorial follows:

MACARTHUR CASE DEMANDS ALL FACTS BEFORE JUDGMENT—SO LET'S WAIT

If ever there was a time when snap judgment was dangerous, impertinent, and even maliciously mischievous, the case of the abrupt removal of General MacArthur from his hatful of commands is one.

If it should be true that MacArthur has been an insubordinate soldier, and that is the one prime hard fact in the case, then Mr. Truman performed no more than his obvious duty in replacing him with a soldier who will obey orders as a military man is sworn to do.

But even if that should be true it would be hard to see that prime fact clearly as things stand now.

The incident is an element in a stew of domestic and international politics which boils so hot and tumultuously that the comment and debate it has aroused, not only in this country but across the world, is thus far almost altogether the sharp ejaculation of personal and political emotion rather than expression of objective reason and considered judgment.

The latter must wait until all of the facts are known.

Certainly not all of the facts are known now; for one thing, among many, MacArthur himself has not been heard, and how nearly those who have taken it upon themselves to speak for him come to saying what he himself would say, no one but the general himself now can know. And it will require the consideration of international lawyers to make clear to most of us exactly how the President of the United States could remove a United Nations generalissimo and replace him with a man of his own choice, without formal UN by-your-leave.

The answer to a good many other questions, all equally important connected with this business remains obscure.

Until thorough and competent investigation clears them up, until all of the pertinent facts are plainly established, the Deseret News prefers to reserve judgment on the MacArthur case.

This is too important a matter for it to be in the public interest for any responsible public expresser of opinion to permit itself to go off half-cocked. That includes newspapers.

We do think it correct, however, to hope at this point that the complete clarification of all of the facts connected with the MacArthur case will help to unmesh the tangle of acts and motives and curiosities of politics which seems to make the whole pattern of this country's international policy during recent years, obscure.

If anybody now can give a flat outright answer to every question that has been asked in good faith about the conduct of our international policy since 1945, we have not met him—in Washington or anywhere else.

What the country wants in that connection is precisely what we are waiting for in the MacArthur case. A plain, frank, unequivocal display of the facts.

Revenue Taxes Affecting Wine-Producing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, Congress will shortly be asked to legislate on a new revenue-raising bill. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has concluded lengthy hearings on all phases of the subject and is now in the process of marking up a 1951 tax bill for reporting to the House. I have been seriously disturbed by the possibility that the President's recommendations for wholesale increases in excise taxes will be accepted, without adequate consideration of the use of more equitable means of obtaining increased revenue, such as closing the many loopholes in corporation and income-tax provisions which we all know to exist. I have been most particularly alarmed at the consequences should the proposed excessive increases on wine taxes be put into effect, as have my colleagues from California and other grape-producing areas.

My mail has been full of letters from grape growers and others engaged in some phase of the wine-producing industry documenting the disastrous effects to be anticipated if the ruinous taxes proposed are enacted. One of these letters so intelligently pictures the situation, and includes such conclusive arguments, that I ask that it be reproduced in the RECORD accompanying these remarks. I sincerely hope that all of my colleagues, both on the Committee on Ways and Means and in the House as a whole, will give very serious thought to the points raised in the letter written by Mr. Laurence F. Hosmer, of Lodi, Calif., which follows:

LODI, CALIF., *March 29, 1951.*

The Honorable JOHN F. SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been operating a vineyard for 30 years, deriving all the income for the support of my family from that source, and can honestly say that I am familiar with the production of grapes. Since the repeal of prohibition I have been a member of a cooperative winery, and as such have become very much aware of the relationship of the wine market to the other two segments of the vineyard industry, the fresh grape shipping, and the raisin market. They are so closely balanced that disturbance of any of the three results in distress to all. On a total of 30 acres, my annual production varies between 300 and 370 tons per year. Of this total, about 85 tons are of strictly wine varieties and of the balance, less than half are of premium quality profitable to ship. Consequently, of my total production, less than 30 percent can be counted on to show a profit if packed and shipped, and if the wine market is depressed, the portion that is shipped will show very little or no profit either.

During the years 1943 to 1946 inclusive, the price of wine was high, and the fresh grapes shipped also brought good prices. In addition to the tax on wine, I was also paying a heavy income tax, so the Government was deriving quite a bit of revenue from my few acres. At the close of 1946 the wine market became badly depressed, continuing to be increasingly so through 1947, 1948, 1949. During these years, even with the utmost thrift and diligence, I could scarcely get back the cost of production from my vineyard, and paid no income taxes. My situation was almost universal among vineyardists during these years, and some were in worse case than I. Bear in mind that 158,000 families in America derive their livelihood from the growing of grapes. Experience has shown that as little as 10 percent of the total overproduction of wine can depress the entire grape industry; and this proposed fantastic tax on wine would have the effect of producing many times such a surplus constricting the market for wine by over 80 percent.

That would be the initial effect, but the cumulative piling up of surplus on surplus through successive vintage seasons would result in such economic catastrophe that a few seasons would mark the complete destruction of the vineyard industry of this country. Perhaps a few of the huge corporations, as Schenley, would survive, but the farm families would be finished, 158,000 of them. I believe that an intelligent examination of this question would show that if this wine tax were left as it is, the huge harvest of income tax from growers of grapes, and all persons connected with the wine industry, would surpass any increase of the tax on wine, with its inevitable decrease in taxes paid by growers and others.

In the hard years of 1947–49 the Government family had to step in and support the sagging raisin industry with millions of dollars. If the wine industry becomes a dead

goose, throwing vast surpluses of grapes into the shipping channels, and the raisin drying yards the same thing will happen again. No revenue, but millions again poured out to save the raisin farmers. Why not let the goose live, and you can continue to pick up the golden eggs? As citizens and farmers, we don't object to paying our share of the taxes—and big ones in these times—but we claim the right to make the money to pay them with. We get along nicely without mink coats but are passionately addicted to the practice of feeding and clothing our families. This proposed tax on wine is so unrealistic that it seems incredible that a responsible public official could have suggested it.

Yours very truly,

LAURENCE F. HOEMER.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, of Pontiac, Mich.

This is one of Michigan's great newspapers and the editorial reflects in large measure the anger of the people of the Seventeenth Congressional District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent:

GENERAL MACARTHUR

America is seething.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been given the Presidential heave-ho in the most brutal manner possible. He was baldly kicked into the alley and the door slammed in his face.

Here is United States diplomacy at its worst.

Again Truman reaches the bottom of the barrel.

General MacArthur has been a controversial figure much of the time recently, but his severest critics can hardly condone the wanton and calculated cruelty in the manner a great man's military career has been terminated.

There were many avenues open to the President if he wished to end the general's services. He could have recalled him to this country. He could have returned him to Washington as an adviser. He could have brought him home for a personal discussion and kept him here as long as he wished.

The general's a gentleman.

Many feel he's a great national hero.

He deserved to be treated like one.

Certainly, an individual with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's capacity and incisive mind is bound to pop off occasionally. That's a part of the package. Even President Lincoln didn't look for perfection in his generals and when he was advised that one of his top sources was nipping a bit, he suggested the brand be ascertained and some provided the other generals.

Whether you believe that the American leader in Japan was an asset or a liability at this particular time, his great service to his country should guarantee him consideration, respect, and even Presidential deference.

President Truman blunders again.

His infinite capacity for diplomatic ineptitude is emphasized once more.

The Nation is rallying to the general's cause in sweeping condemnation of the back alley methods employed by the White House. The question of whether MacArthur was the proper man for the Korean campaign at this moment is quite aside from the question of whether a great national hero should be summarily kicked out the window because a small-time politician sits in the White House and possesses the authority.

In fact, the pronouncement occasioned so great a turmoil that the President went to the radio the same night to explain his action to an angry Nation. His reasoning may have been perfectly sound so far as the situation is concerned, but nothing he said explained the method employed.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star is running a series of articles from Mr. John Gunther's new book, The Riddle of MacArthur. Right now, while the Republicans are blaming the administration for all of our Asiatic troubles, the following article rather interestingly points up the fact that even the great General MacArthur has been accused of making errors:

THE RIDDLE OF MACARTHUR—GENERAL WAS BRILLIANT SOLDIER, BUT IS ACCUSED OF BLUNDERS—PLANES CAUGHT ON GROUND IN PHILIPPINES 10 HOURS AFTER JAPANESE ATTACK ON HAWAII

(By John Gunther)

General MacArthur came with the Rainbow Division to France in October 1917, and won practically every medal that the Army could bestow. His bravery was brilliant. He fought in the Champagne-Marne area, and took part in the Aisne-Marne offensive. He was wounded twice, gassed once. One legend is that the first wound came because of an error in the high command; his troops were bombarded by their own artillery.

General MacArthur rose to the rank of brigadier general and, at last, became commander of the division he helped create. One of his officers for a time, though he never met him, was a Missourian named Harry Truman. The general fought at St. Mihiel, Wouvre, and Sedan. Then, after the armistice, he got his first taste of military occupation and the administration of a defeated enemy by serving briefly at Bonn, now the capital of Western Germany.

Back home, he worked in the office of the Chief of Staff, and then for 3 years (1919–22) was superintendent of West Point. Twice he returned to the Philippines for brief tours (1923 and 1928), and in the United States he successively commanded the IV, III, and IX Corps Areas, until he was appointed Chief of Staff in November 1930. In this post he won both loyal friends and unrelenting enemies. He pressed for bigger Army appropriations, gave heed to the problems of a unified command, and preached for mechanization, mobility, and the vital importance of air and armored warfare. Normally his term would have expired in 1934, but President Roosevelt kept him on till October 1935.

MAC ARTHUR FURIOUS WITH DOUGLAS

Lewis Douglas, Mr. Roosevelt's first director of the budget (who many years later became American Ambassador to London), had the job of paring down Government expenditures 25 percent. General MacArthur came to a budget hearing, to resist cuts in the Army appropriation, and spoke for an hour strenuously. Then Mr. Douglas quietly asked him, "General, do you expect a serious epidemic of dysentery in the United States Army?" General MacArthur, taken aback, said "No."

Mr. Douglas then inquired why his budget for toilet paper—among other things—was so extraordinarily high; he had gone through all the Army figures, and thought that they were padded. General MacArthur was so furious that he stopped his testimony forthwith and bluntly left the room. A year or so later Mr. Douglas ran into him, and apologized for the way he had put the question. Then General MacArthur handsomely apologized, too.

Under President Hoover, General MacArthur had been the focus of a bitter controversy because he evicted the bonus marchers from Anacostia Flats in Washington, D. C. Photographs showing him in suavely shined boots and brilliant, glittering uniform as he directed this unfortunate business did not do him much good. But he himself was not responsible for the eviction; the order came to him from higher up, through Secretary of War Hurley, and he had no choice but to obey. There has never been an instance in General MacArthur's history of specific refusal to obey an order. But it has taken him a long time to live down what seemed an outrageously harsh and flowery display of force against a hungry, miserable group of fellow citizens.

RETIRED FROM ARMY IN 1937

General MacArthur didn't know quite where to turn when he finished his tour as Chief of Staff in 1935. He had reached the top; he was only 55, ambitious, and in perfect health. The political atmosphere in Washington was not congenial. So when his old friend, Manuel Quezon, President of the Philippines, suggested that he go out to Manila as military adviser to the Commonwealth with the unprecedented rank of field marshal, he accepted. He retired from the United States Army in 1937, and devoted himself exclusively to the Philippines (his fourth term of service there) for the next 4 years.

He liked the life of Manila, and worked at his job—the organization of Philippine defenses on a long-range basis—with zeal and acumen. He hoped, if the Japanese gave him time, to train 40,000 men annually for 10 years, build up a small fleet of patrol torpedo boats and create a seasoned air force. His basic tenet was to equip the islands so that an attack would cost an enemy more than the value received, he told me in Manila once. He was convinced that there were only two beaches in the archipelago where an enemy could land, and (again if he had time) that the invaders could be held. Like practically everybody else he underestimated the Japanese.

It is hardly necessary to recapitulate here the story of General MacArthur in World War II. By the summer of 1941 practically everybody knew that war was coming—sometime. Mr. Roosevelt recalled him to active status as a major general on July 26, 1941, and promoted him to lieutenant general the next day, in command of all United States Army Forces in the Far East; the Philippine army became part of the American command. General MacArthur was severely embarrassed by the destruction of his planes on Clark Field on Pearl Harbor day. The Japanese caught him in exactly the same naked and exposed state as they caught the Americans in Hawaii, though he had ample warning since the Pearl Harbor attack had come 10 hours before.

Today the inclination of his staff is to blame a subordinate officer for this botch and

blunder. General MacArthur himself thought that war was inevitable, but he did not expect it till the spring of 1942, and he felt that the Japanese would probably bypass the Philippines in favor of softer spots to the south.

SERIOUS BLUNDER RECALLED

One may bring this story up to the present again by mentioning that General MacArthur has several times made serious blunders in judgment, based on faulty information. The attack on South Korea on June 25 apparently took him by complete surprise, and he thought that the Korean War was won after the landing at Inchon on September 15. He told Mr. Truman at their meeting on Wake Island a month later that the danger of Chinese intervention had passed, but the Chinese drastically fooled him. Then (though he tried to wriggle out of this by saying that the remark had only been "jocular") he predicted lustily that the American troops would be home by Christmas—only 3 or 4 days before they were caught by surprise and hammered back. General MacArthur, having scouted the ground personally for what was to have been his final advance, crashed into a colossal trap—moreover a trap about which he was fully aware.

Yet he has been generally regarded as the very symbol and incarnation of military omniscience. Few people dared to criticize him when he lost his planes on the Philippines; it was almost as if a conspiracy of silence existed to protect him, and most people are loath to criticize him now.

Mr. Roosevelt was, as everybody knows, violently attacked because American officers at Pearl Harbor were caught unaware and unprepared. Those who like to calumniate Mr. Roosevelt usually take earnest care to ignore the fact that General MacArthur in the Philippines likewise lost most of his planes on the ground. Most Roosevelt haters are MacArthur lovers (and vice versa) which perhaps serves to explain their easy exculpation of General MacArthur while Mr. Roosevelt is still venomously maligned.

General MacArthur thought—another error—that Manila could be held for a long period, because Corregidor was "the strongest single fortified point in the world." He did not think that the Japanese, or anybody, were capable of the type of attack they launched. He was wrong.

It's Your Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein part of a short address delivered by Abraham Lincoln at Indianapolis on February 11, 1861.

I know of no statement or opinion expressed that has a greater challenge in it for America today than this short address by the Great Emancipator, delivered nearly 90 years ago. All Americans should read it:

IT'S YOUR BUSINESS—HERE'S AN ALMOST-FORGOTTEN MESSAGE FROM ABRAHAM LINCOLN

In all trying positions in which I shall be placed, and doubtless I shall be placed in many such, my reliance will be upon you and the people of the United States; and I wish you to remember, now and forever, that it is your business, and not mine; that if the Union of these States and the liberties of this people shall be lost, it is but little to any one man of 52 years of age, but a great deal to the 30,000,000 people who inhabit these United States, and to their posterity in all coming time. It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me. I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with office seekers, but with you, is the question: Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?

The Fallacy of the Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway Cannot Be Overcome by Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting editorial exposing the fallacy of the St. Lawrence seaway was taken from the columns of the March 5, 1951, issue of the Mobile (Ala.) Register:

FALLACY OF THIS PROPOSED SEAWAY CANNOT BE OVERCOME BY ARGUMENT

The more its proponents clamor for its construction, the more obvious and irrefutable becomes the fallacy of the proposed so-called St. Lawrence seaway.

Long alert in counseling against dumping American tax money into that hocus-pocus project has been New York City's West Side Association of Commerce.

One of the conspicuous facts about the proposed so-called seaway is, of course, that for several months out of each twelve it would be icebound and not available for use by shipping.

Among other conspicuous facts is that the channel would be too shallow for most American merchant ships, while a vastly larger proportion of foreign-flag ships would be able to navigate it.

Thus the proponents of the so-called seaway are in a position of clamoring for the expenditure of American tax money to create a rank discrimination against the American Merchant Marine.

This contrast between the percent of American and foreign ships that could negotiate the seaway has just been cited by James W. Danaby, vice president of the West Side Association of Commerce in New York.

Mr. Danaby called it an "incontrovertible fact that 58 percent of foreign-flag ships have a draft which would permit use of the seaway, while only 10 percent of American ships come within this classification."

Meanwhile United States Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, has delivered another blast at the project.

Congressman VAN ZANDT speaks of "manifold reasons" why the proposed so-called seaway is "an economic monstrosity and should not be foisted upon the American taxpayers who are already overburdened by taxes that take about 35 cents out of every dollar they earn."

He reminds that "the St. Lawrence project is nothing new," because "for the past 50 years it has been talked of at different intervals, only to be shunted aside as impractical and unsound." As others have done, Mr. VAN ZANDT points out that now "advocates of this economic monstrosity have garbed it in the armor of national defense" in the hope of shoving it across under that label.

But nobody is being fooled. The fallacy of the project cannot be concealed by parading it "in the garb of national defense."

As Mr. VAN ZANDT recalls, its advocates over a period of many years have urged construction of the proposed so-called seaway for "practically every reason under the sun." But none of these arguments, nor all of them together, can ever overcome the fundamental fallacy of the project.

A Policy for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, over the networks of the National Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the Liberty Broadcasting System, on Friday evening, April 13, 1951:

Good evening.

The midnight removal of General MacArthur has brought into clear focus the fundamental issue facing the American people. That issue is whether the United States shall be bled white by an endless chain of puppet wars and puppet crises promoted by the Kremlin or whether the United States, through courageous and bold leadership, can take decisive action that will put an end to Russia's schemes and thus avert a third world war.

It was on this grave issue that one of the greatest military geniuses of all time, General MacArthur, patriotically decided to stand or fall. His place in history was already secure; he is now immortal.

Let us examine the administration's case.

The administration says that it is trying to prevent a little war from becoming a world war. At the same time, it says that it intends to do this without further appeasement of the Communists. In the same breath, it speaks of willingness to negotiate a peace.

PEACE

First, what is peace?

True peace is obtained when two or more nations agree to mutual courses of conduct and then live up to the letter and spirit of those agreements.

When the administration talks about the possibility of a negotiated peace, we must ask ourselves with whom are we negotiating? The answer to that question is that we are negotiating with the Communists.

In other words, the administration again is flirting with the dangerous idea that you can make a deal with the Communists, when everybody knows that no one has ever made a successful peace with the Communists. Why? Because the Communists have never lived up to a single agreement in history.

What kind of a negotiated peace would we get?

Would it be the so-called peace that we had from 1945 until the outbreak of the Korean War?

Would it be the same kind of peace that let the Soviet Union take over control of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Eastern Germany, one by one?

Would it be the kind of peace that would again permit the Soviet Union to knock off one country after another like so many ninepins?

Would it be a kind of peace that would now let the Soviet Union add South Korea, Formosa, Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Indochina, the Malayas, Pakistan, and Thailand to the already conquered areas of Manchuria, China, North Korea, and Tibet?

Even the administration admits the Kremlin has laid out a plan for world conquest. This plan calls for the eventual seizure of every nation on earth by any one of four means—by infiltration, by revolution, by external pressure, or by war. China, for example, was taken by revolution, Czechoslovakia by infiltration, Rumania by external pressure, and war was resorted to in the case of South Korea.

The truth is that the Soviet Union is never at peace and never has been. It is always employing one or more of its four means of forcing its political objectives upon unwilling peoples.

Let the administration explain how it proposes to negotiate a peace under such conditions. To lead the American people to believe that such a thing is possible is barefaced deception.

Until we face the stark facts that confront us in the Communist conspiracy to take over the world, we are certain to drift steadily toward ultimate disaster.

AVERT WAR

Now, then, is peace possible? How do we avert a third world war?

The only thing that has ever stopped the Kremlin is a show of strength, a display of will and incisive leadership on the part of those threatened by the Soviet Union.

Milquetoast leadership is the Kremlin's dish.

It grows fat on negotiated deals.

Let us look at the record.

So long as the principal nations of the world were strong, Communist success was limited to the confines of the Soviet Union. In fact, as any schoolboy knows, the only reason Russia became the victim of communism was the appalling weakness of the czars, coupled with the fatal disintegration of that nation as a result of the First World War.

So long as Poland, Czechoslovakia, China, and the other victims of Soviet expansion remained strong, they remained free. So long as Britain, France, and the United States displayed courage and strength, the Kremlin planners kept their plans hidden from the world.

Even little South Korea is an example of how the Kremlin has always pounced at the slightest display of weakness. Less than a year after we had withdrawn our troops from South Korea, the Communists invaded.

I think, therefore, we can consider it a basic principle of conduct in meeting the Communist problem, that only by full employment of strength, courage, and incisive leadership can the world Communist conspiracy be repelled and eventually defeated.

And I am convinced that it is only by adopting this principle that we can avert a third world war. Only by strengthening the hands of our friends in Europe and in Asia and by remaining strong ourselves can a general conflict be avoided.

But that is not all. We must forge new methods and new techniques to meet the threat of communism without resort to war. We are in default in the field of psychological warfare; our counterpropaganda is weak, unimaginative, and without appeal to the oppressed peoples of the world. It is paramount that new methods and techniques be devised.

The great tragedy today is that we have people in high office who either cannot see the need of, or provide the leadership for, such a course of conduct.

FORSAKING ASIA?

In the field of practical application of policy, there are many of us who are convinced that the present plans of the administration call for us only to strengthen our friends in Europe while deserting our friends in Asia. We are forced to this conclusion by two sets of facts:

1. From 1945 until June 1950, the administration pursued a frustrating and contradictory policy of containment of communism in Europe and appeasement of communism in Asia. The policy on Asia had its roots in the Yalta Conference, but it was clearly enunciated when President Truman, on the advice of Dean Acheson, announced to the world on December 15, 1945, that unless Communists were admitted to the established Government of China, aid from America would no longer be forthcoming. At the same time, Mr. Truman dispatched General Marshall to China with orders to stop the mopping up of Communist forces which was being carried to a successful conclusion by the established Government of China. American aid was cut off to China early in 1946 by General Marshall to force a truce at the very instant when government troops were winning their battle against the Chinese Reds—the very same Chinese Reds who today are waging war against us along the thirty-eighth parallel. That is all a matter of record, uncontested and undisputed.

2. In June 1950, on what appeared to be a sudden impulse, the administration without consultation with Congress, plunged the United States into the Korean conflict, obtaining the approval of the United Nations after having done so. In the next 6 months, the fighting surged from the tip of Korea to the Manchurian border, only to become mysteriously stalled in recent weeks in the general area of the thirty-eighth parallel, while rumors of a negotiated peace have circulated freely. Now, General MacArthur—a firm believer in the principle that only by a show of strength and decisive leadership can the Communists be repelled—has been removed because he opposed maintaining a costly stalemate in Korea at the expense of American lives.

APPEASEMENT REVISITED

Those of us in Washington who have watched the emphasis shift in recent months, from winning the war in Korea to proposals to send American troops to Europe, have had every reason to believe that the old policy of opposing communism in Europe, while appeasing it in Asia, is with us once again.

It is significant that General MacArthur's removal on Wednesday coincided with the disclosure that the British Government was proposing to our Government that Formosa be turned over to Red China, that Red China take part in writing the Japanese peace treaty, and that Red China be admitted to the United Nations. Nor have we forgotten that only a few short weeks ago our own Government endorsed a United Nations proposal for a negotiated settlement in Korea that abandoned basic principles which made this country great.

In short, there is evidence on every hand that appeasement of communism in Asia is again the watchword.

Certainly, we should exert every effort commensurate with our security to give Europe the strength so essential to blocking the conspirators in the Kremlin. Certainly, we should do everything possible to prevent the free peoples and resources of Europe from coming under Soviet domination. To fail to do this would be calamitous.

But we insist that to do this, and only this, while deserting Asia, would mean eventual Soviet domination of the entire world.

This administration cannot long continue to hold the world up like an apple, inviting the Soviet Union to take fresh bites, without eventually ending up clutching only the stem of disaster. Make no mistake about it, the Kremlin appetite knows no limits.

If we are going to stop communism, and if that is our policy as the administration claims it to be, then let's stop it on our own terms and not those of the Kremlin.

ASIA IS THE KEY

We will never be able to dictate peace on our terms unless we maintain strength in Asia. Asia, with its vast resources and enormous pool of manpower, is the key.

What we desperately need are policies and a strategy of a truly global nature because we are confronted with a global threat. Anything less than policies of these dimensions can only fail. Anything less can only mean a third world war and untold destruction.

The Kremlin shakes a fist at Europe, but its eyes are on Asia and have been for a quarter of a century. All anyone has to do is read the writings of Lenin, Stalin, or the Communist Daily Worker.

William Z. Foster, the head of the Communist Party in the United States, wrote in the Daily Worker on December 2, 1945: "The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front."

Hitler, in Mein Kampf, stated emphatically that Asia was the key to the world situation.

Tojo knew that Asia was the key to the world situation.

Military strategists of many governments have declared the same thing time and time again.

General MacArthur knew it, and he was fired summarily for attempting to impart his knowledge to the American people.

In fact, almost everybody except the administration in Washington seems to know it, if we can judge by the thousands of telegrams descending upon our Capital.

SECOND FRONT

On February 12, the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, I made a speech on this very vital issue. I proposed that the anti-Communist Chinese forces on Formosa be permitted to open a second front in China to relieve the pressure on our American boys in Korea and to lessen the threat to Europe.

Subsequently, I sent a copy of my speech to General MacArthur asking his views. The general replied that he was in accord with the proposal. He took the eminently sound position that while we were only exchanging words in Europe, we were exchanging bullets in Korea, and that our forces in Asia were entitled to the employment of policies that would win the struggle in Korea.

There have been attempts, notably in the Communist Daily Worker, and on the part of some befuddled thinkers, to label MacArthur as a war maker who was seeking a third world war. Such diabolical nonsense as this needs no answer in America, acceptable though it may be in Socialist circles in Britain and Communist circles in Russia. No clear-thinking American doubts for one moment the integrity of General MacArthur and his earnest desire to bring the war in Korea to a successful and speedy conclusion and to establish world peace. And I am certain that our people will give General MacArthur the most heart-warming reception in history when he returns home next week.

I think it is plain to the American people that General MacArthur was given an assignment to win the war in Korea. I think it is plain to every one of us that things had finally reached the point where not only the general but every American had the right to raise the question of whether we were in Korea to win *or* to lose.

Speaking only for myself, I must say that I was, and am, more so today than ever, deeply disturbed over the prospect of American boys continuing the struggle in Korea against the overwhelming hordes of Chinese Reds without some supporting move to relieve the pressure upon them.

WHO IS WAR MAKING?

Why this administration-ordered stalemate at the thirty-eighth parallel? Why this mysterious death lock while American casualties mount endlessly?

I think the American people are entitled to answers to those questions, and they have not received them.

For weeks our American forces have been on a treadmill of destruction along the thirty-eighth parallel where they die by the hundreds daily without so much as gaining a meter or losing a mile.

And the President tells us, as General MacArthur before him warned us, that the Chinese Reds are mounting a new and gigantic offensive.

But no one save MacArthur has told us what we can do about it, and he has been fired.

Talk about war making.

At its present rate of reckless conduct, this administration is likely to go down as the most senseless war makers of all time.

I ask you: How much longer can we sacrifice American lives and risk America's future when it should be perfectly clear to anyone that we are lacking the essential global strategy to meet the threat of world communism?

I think the American people have every right to know what the prospects are of such over-all policies being formulated and put into action. I would be less than truthful if I failed to point out the present chances are practically zero.

The reasons are right before us in Washington. We have only to call the roll of the top military and diplomatic advisers to the President here in Washington to understand why we are not going to achieve this desperately needed over-all strategy under this administration.

NO POLICY IN SIGHT

In the Pentagon the five top advisers to the President are Generals Marshall, Bradley, Collins, and Vandenberg and Admiral Sherman. Except for Admiral Sherman, every one of these men has mainly gained his experience in Europe. These generals have neither the background nor the knowledge of the complexities and subtleties inherent in the Far East.

This is not to say that our armed services are devoid of generals and admirals who have the necessary experience. There are plenty of them, both on the active and the retired lists.

Why does not the White House consult and give equal weight to such outstanding authorities on the Far East as Gens. R. O. Richardson, Jr., Kruger, Sutherland, Whitney, Chennault, Hodge, and Wedemeyer; and such Naval admirals as Spruance, King, Halsey, Radford, Yarnell, Bogan, and Denfeld; such Marine Corps generals as Vandegrift, Cates, Edson, and H. M. Smith?

But the domination of Europe-minded advisers is not limited to our Department of Defense, but extends to our policy-making State Department.

The record of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, needs no introduction here. The strange background of John P. Davies, John Stewart Service, Owen Lattimore, and the rest of the appeasement clique of the State Department officials and consultants on far-eastern policy, have long since been exposed by the fall of China to the Communists.

Yet, the influence of Dean Acheson upon the White House is profound and far-reaching. It is to our everlasting chagrin that this clique of appeasers should be regularly consulted while outstanding men of reputation and experience in the Far East have been dismissed from or deported to harmless outposts of our diplomatic service. I refer to such eminent experts as Joseph Grew, Nelson Johnson, Stanley Hornbeck, Patrick J. Hurley, Eugene Dooman, Joseph Ballentine, Adolphe Berle, William Bullitt, Everett Drumwright, and Angus Ward.

It is a black page in American history when a Dean Acheson triumphs and a Douglas MacArthur falls.

Little wonder that we lack the breadth of policy and strategy so necessary to defeat world communism, when you realize that for the most part our policy-makers resemble the fabled Cyclops who had only one eye and it in the center of their foreheads.

THE DILEMMA WE FACE

It has been the hope of many of us with respect to Asia that the administration might some day realize the folly of appeasement in the Far East, much as it reversed its policy of appeasement in Europe in 1947 and promulgated the strategy of containment of communism. Unfortunately, however, the words may be written by the White House, but the real tunes are called by the State Department and the Pentagon.

Yet no one can deny that in this crisis the need for sound policies can no longer go unfulfilled. The question is what can we do about it?

Plainly, the burden is on the Eighty-second Congress. When the executive branch fails, the Congress must act.

So far Republicans in Congress have taken the lead in the demand for a complete reexamination of our foreign and military policies. Scores of Democrats tell us privately that we are right and that action is imperative. It is our hope that outstanding Democrats will see their way clear to join us in a major move to strengthen American participation in world affairs.

This should be no party issue. This should be an American cause in which every citizen, regardless of party, should join.

There are millions of American mothers who want for their sons the peace, the prosperity, and the happiness that free men are rightfully entitled to. There are millions of patriotic American men who are willing to offer their services and their lives to preserve America and to bring about world peace, but they, too, deserve assurances that the sacrifices they make will lead to a better world for everyone.

We in America must not be misled by the nearsighted or selfish aims of any nation, friendly though it may be to us. Beyond a doubt, it is up to us to provide not only the sinews but the clear thinking to win the fight against world communism.

We should work, and work hard, to strengthen the North Atlantic family of nations, the Asiatic community of free peoples, and our sister republics in the Americas.

We should continue our efforts to work within the structure of the United Nations, and to strengthen that organization so that it can become inevitably the instrument of peace in the world.

We should meticulously avoid errors in the future that will weaken our hand anywhere. The removal of General MacArthur weakened us in the Far East; it did not strengthen us. For Japan, the day of General MacArthur's dismissal was a day of profound sorrow. In fact, all over Asia, the removal of the general sent a chill of horror down the backs of freemen, lest it mean that they were to be abandoned to Communist expansion.

General Ridgway, the successor to General MacArthur, is a man of outstanding ability. We hope and pray for his success, and we fervently desire that he, too, may rise to the stature in the Far East which General MacArthur attained.

Above all else, we should reach a clear decision on the Korean question.

If we are going to stay in Korea, let us not shackle General Ridgway as General MacArthur was shackled.

If we are not going to stay in Korea, let's make the decision now and stop what would amount to senseless destruction of American lives.

Finally, let me say that time is not on our side. Time, as things stand today, is a full partner in the Communist conspiracy.

There are 1,500,000 anti-Communist guerrillas in the south of China. How long do you think they can hold out if we do not aid them?

There are 800,000 anti-Communist Chinese on Formosa who can be used in military service. How long will they hold out when our British friends talk of turning Formosa over to the Chinese Reds?

To French Indochina, to Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Pakistan, and India, the operations of the Chinese Reds are a constant threat. How long will they hold out if we turn our backs on Asia?

We are a mighty Nation, and we are entitled to mighty leadership.

We are too mighty for appeasement.

We are too humane to support a senseless drain of American blood in an endless treadmill war.

We must remember that if we have the proper leadership, a little in material things can go a long way when effectively applied. Successful policies are not measured in billions of dollars, millions of foot soldiers, and thousands of planes. The true measure is how effectively those dollars, those men, and those planes are employed.

Every American citizen has a part to play in the molding of public opinion and in obtaining the best out of Government and the best in leadership. If each of us puts his shoulder to the wheel, his mind to the task, and his faith in God, we can achieve the objectives we all seek.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Scranton Tribune, Scranton, Pa., dated April 12, 1951, relative to Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

HE ASKED FOR IT

There unquestionably will be deep regret and resentment among the many friends and supporters of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the result of the action of President Truman in relieving him of his command in the Far East.

Hardly anyone will question the fact that MacArthur has established himself as one of our Nation's greatest soldiers. Volumes could be written on his accomplishments in the military field. His courage, his ability as a military leader, his integrity, and his fine reputation cannot be questioned.

As the President so aptly said, "The Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for the distinguished and exceptional service which he has rendered his country in posts of great responsibility."

Under the circumstances, the President's action in relieving MacArthur of his command represented a grave and serious decision which is bound to have repercussions of far-reaching effect. There will be those, for example, who will inject the issue of politics into this situation. That issue does not belong and honest-thinking persons will dismiss it.

There will be others who will endeavor to becloud the real issue by injecting that of our foreign policy—a highly controversial subject. There is no question that our foreign policy was a major factor in this situation. It was in this field that MacArthur

and the President disagreed. But it cannot be said that the disagreement was the issue determining the President's action. MacArthur was entitled to his own views on foreign policy, just as every other citizen. But in MacArthur's case the parallel ended right there.

MacArthur, first of all, was a soldier and he was subject, as a soldier, to the orders of his Commander in Chief, President Truman, and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Not once, but several times, MacArthur was given specific orders by those in higher command to refrain from making public utterances relative to this Nation's foreign policy without first clearing them with his superiors.

MacArthur chose to ignore those orders, time after time and despite repeated warnings.

As far back as December 1949 MacArthur voiced sentiments contrary to the administration's policies in the Far East by telling, publicly, a group of United States Senators who visited him in Tokyo that we should send arms and troops to Formosa. Then in early 1950 he took an unauthorized and highly publicised trip to Formosa to fraternize with Chiang Kai-shek and openly discussed the proposition of building up Formosa as a base, contrary to our expressed foreign policy. After the Korean War started MacArthur sent a message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars here advocating a policy contrary to that which our State Department had announced relative to Formosa. He was reprimanded by the President.

Mr. Truman, recognizing the gravity of MacArthur's continued conduct, even flew out to Wake Island to confer with him and to reach an understanding about clearance of his, MacArthur's, statements in the future. But the result was negative.

It was not long before MacArthur suggested that he be allowed to supersede the President, the State Department, and the United Nations and go out on the field of battle and make a deal for peace with a Chinese Red general. Then followed another public declaration to the effect that the United Nations forces should be allowed to bomb the Chinese mainland and the United States should release the Nationalist Chinese army from Formosa to attack the Chinese mainland.

Obviously General MacArthur could not be silenced; just as obviously he refused to take orders. As recently as less than a month ago the Joint Chiefs of Staff again told MacArthur to clear his statements on foreign policy and the Far East with Washington.

Commenting on this last warning, the Tribune, in an editorial on March 28, said: "It might be said that the talkative general was so instructed before and has ignored the instructions. In that case, he has been given another chance and if he muddies up the water again the consequence will be his own doing."

General MacArthur asked for it.

Please, Mr. DiSalle, Read This Letter and Then Quit Demanding the Impossible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a letter which points out in clear, concise words just how impossible it is for the little-business men of America to comply with CPR Order No. 7.

A like letter has been received by other Iowa Congressmen.

IOWA RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION,
Mason City, Iowa, April 12, 1951.

Representative BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: This letter is a personal appeal from me to you to help a considerable number of your constituents who are hardware retailers and are among the 20,000 members of this association.

The Office of Price Stabilization has just issued an amendment to its order CPR-7 to include a considerable amount of the merchandise which these small retailers handle.

If their sales of all the goods carried total $20,000 a year, these retailers must abide by this regulation. That means that a very considerable majority of our members will be subject to it.

This order provides an elaborate, complicated system of making price charts. You would be interested to have the OPS send you a copy of the entire CPR-7 order and just glance through it. I wouldn't ask any busy man like you to read the whole thing.

But your little hardware man, with his undermanned establishment, is required to read, and understand, this entire order and to make charts showing his cost and selling prices on all the items he carries which are subject to this order—and they will be about 10,000.

This little dealer—most of them don't even have an adding machine, much less a machine for calculating percentages—is required to figure his margin on each separate item and then his average mark-up on the category in which these particular items are placed.

That procedure is all right for a great department store with its staff of trained accountants. But it is just out of the question for a little hardware store with an entire crew of perhaps five people who are just getting into the busiest part of their business year.

We wonder, however, if it is all right for the big stores because this morning we received a bulletin from Roland Jones, secretary of the American Retail Federation, in Washington, D. C., and we quote:

"Far more disturbing is the fact that out of some 35 charts received by the Washington office (OPS) last week, only two of them were correctly made out."

Now, if the big operators can't do it right, how can the little fellow do it?

Now, the small hardware dealer, Mr. JENSEN, is required to have these charts prepared by April 30. If he waits for the Government he won't even have a copy of the order by then. These dealers don't subscribe to the Federal Register. And OPS doesn't have any list of them to which it mails its regulations.

How in the name of peace can the dealer ever get this job done in less than 3 weeks?

We will send him information but it will take us 3 weeks to get the material printed that we will require and get it into his hands.

Just one example of the absurdity of this regulation, for retail hardware stores, is the requirement that each cost on the list that the dealer enters must be supported by an invoice showing that it is the actual cost.

Well, most hardware retailers buy the majority of their merchandise from jobbers. And a single jobber's invoice may have as many as a hundred different items on it. But the dealer who puts down that his cost of a certain hammer is $1 is supposed to hunt through these jobber invoices until he finds the one on which he was billed $1 for these hammers and then enter on his pricing chart the name of the jobber and the date of that invoice.

Then every dealer has lots of merchandise that he may have had on hand 2 or 3 years. He hasn't saved the invoice for that merchandise. He has his cost marked on the item, or the box in which it is carried, but when you tell him he has to produce an invoice to prove that he has told the truth when he entered that cost, you are asking for the impossible.

Well, suppose the dealer decides he just can't live up to the requirements of this order. What are the penalties? Very light, I can assure you, sir. If the dealer hasn't complied with the price filing by May 30, he is prohibited from selling any of the merchandise. All he has to do is to go out of business because some crazy loons in Washington have cooked up an order that he can't conform to.

Our representative has told OPS people from the beginning that hardware retailers couldn't comply with the CPR-7 order and was assured by them that they wouldn't be required to. But here they are.

Please don't answer this letter with a form reply. I don't care if you don't answer it at all. But please do call Mr. DiSalle, or some one else and see if those OPS people can't be taught some sense.

If you want to, send them this letter and ask them to tell you where it is wrong.

I am going to count on you for some action, Mr. JENSEN. I believe you are a good friend of the little fellow and the hardware retailer is surely one of them.

Yours very truly,
IOWA RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION,
PHILIP R. JACOBSON, *Secretary.*

Address Before Rhode Island Automobile Dealers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by me before the Rhode Island Automobile Dealers Association in Providence, R. I.:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Rhode Island Automobile Dealers Association, invited guests, and friends, whether you selected the date of your banquet by accident or design, it fits in perfectly with the congressional Easter vacation. Thus I am able to escape the hurly-burly of Washington for the moment and mingle with you gentlemen who are, whether or not you know it, business associates of mine, for following the illustrious example of our United States Attorney General, I, too, have an interest in a Rhode Island dealership.

I can say in all sincerity that it is a pleasure for me to be with you and to be associated with you because I have a great admiration for the industry you represent. I also have sentiments of respect for your business acumen, because whenever you have occasion to write me on matters which affect your business, I have always been impressed with the force and logic which accompanies your views on legislation.

In our American industrial civilization of today the automotive industry is not only a most important sustaining unit, it might

be called the keystone of our industrial arch. This great automobile business had its birth when our people were emerging from an agricultural or agrarian civilization and were turning those qualities of imagination, initiative and resourcefulness to increasing American production.

The automotive industry has been in the forefront of that development and set the pattern and created the blueprint of that productive capacity which has made the United States the leading nation of the world. Today in this country it can be said that our economy is geared to the rubber-tired wheel. Leadership among nations cannot be maintained with the noblest motives energizing that leadership unless a position of economic leadership is sustained. The automotive blueprint of production, adapted to other industries, has been responsible for the fact that while the people of the United States constitute less than 7 percent of the world's population, they produce 50 percent of the world's manufactured goods.

This is something of which you may be proud. I am aware that you gentlemen represent not the production segment, but the distribution and servicing part of this great automotive industry. But I am likewise aware that production could not have attained its impressive totals unless you as a class of American merchants distributed and serviced the vehicles which the factories produce. Although Rhode Island is a tiny portion of the retail automobile industry, it is common knowledge that automobile dealers by and large in the United States, from standpoint of the aggregate number of employees in your part of the industry, namely, distribution and servicing, is greater than the number engaged in production. I understand also that the aggregate investment of 45,000 dealers throughout the United States is a greater aggregate than the total investment of all the automobile factories combined.

Regarding modern civilization it has been said that agriculture and transportation are the handmaidens of industry. This automotive business is not only a prime factor in industry, it might also be said that it produces the instrument for transportation so that in addition to being the most important stone in our structure of industry, it likewise produces the instruments upon which a good part of our transportation depends.

The burden of responsibility created by the very importance of this industry is a heavy responsibility. Though it might be contended that the preponderance of investment and number of employees being in that branch represented by you gentlemen should result in the ground rules of this great industry being promulgated by you, it nevertheless is a fact that the ground rules are promulgated by the production segment of the industry. Perhaps it is fair that the ground rules be laid down by that other branch of the industry, the production branch, because though you gentlemen carry the ball, they make it. But I would say the legal maxim that "there is no right without a responsibility" is not only a legal guide, it is an immutable truth. It behooves those who lay down the ground rules to be fair and equitable. It behooves them to take cognizance of the rights and equities of their team mates who distribute and service the vehicles that the manufacturers produce. It behooves them to police their industry to guard against the imposition of requirements which can be so economically detrimental as to cause disruption and distress in our economic fabric. It behooves them to so interpret the ground rules that there will be no repetition of the condition of some years ago, in which the average business life of an automobile dealer was 3 years, according to a study made by a great university. It behooves them to refrain from imposition of requirements which may hamper imagination and the disposition of the individual to do his best work without arbitrary interference.

Of course, it goes without saying that while the factory has an obligation to be fair with the dealer, the dealer in his turn must be fair not only with the factory but with the public. In my opinion the great bank of good will which the dealers the length and breadth of the country built up during World War II by their ingenious and effective means to maintain civilian transportation melted away in the immediate years following the war. Then, tempted by the great demand of the public for new cars and the willingness of the public to pay any price for them, the few dealers who could not resist the opportunity for big profits did irreparable harm to you all as merchants.

Today's rearmament program in this country undoubtedly will afford a similar opportunity for dealers to swell their profits and with no thought of preaching to you let me strongly urge you one and all to conduct your business in such a manner that the public may continue to have full faith and confidence in you.

Today our Government is in the process of imposing ceilings on new and used cars, parts and services, as well on all other items of business and while of necessity these ceilings will require considerable revision and adjustment, as time goes on, I cannot urge you too strongly, in the common cause of defense, to hold the line and accord to the Office of Price Stabilization your full and willing support.

I suppose I should not take my seat without discussing to some extent the taxes which may be imposed upon your retail business by the Government. Frankly, I do not intend to say or promise too much, for I am but one of 435 Representatives in Congress and then, too, there is the Senate which plays its full part in the legislative picture, but I will say this much—I intend to scrutinize closely all taxes contemplated to make sure that your industry is not compelled to pay more than its full share. The costs of building up the defenses of this country are, as you well know, great. They will continue for some time to come. I know, that as loyal and patriotic citizens, you are willing to pay your full share of these costs. But whenever in my opinion these costs are excessive or unfair, you can rely upon my voice in opposition to pyramiding these taxes to a point where they will tend to slow down or obstruct such an important segment of our retail industry as the automobile business. That I promise you. Taxes defeat their purpose when by their very weight they retard acceleration of business and industry or discourage initiative. And acceleration and the building-up of production today is all important.

To determine the fine line between adequate revenue and taxes that are unduly oppressive is the task which today confronts your elected representatives. Let me assure you we fully recognize that responsibility. The problems confronting us would disturb us far more did we not feel that the American people today fully recognize the importance of our regaining with the utmost speed a position of such military power as to deter those whose professed objectives have been to plunge the world into a third war. United we stand today. The issues involved which are the cause and purpose of our rearmament are so weighty as to enable us, both in Government and industry, to jointly cooperate in their adjustment and solution.

You automobile merchants played your part nobly in World War II. I know we can count on your effective cooperation today, tomorrow and until the hour of peril is past.

The Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, the distinguished military expert of the New York Times, has this morning made an extremely valuable contribution to the great debate which has now been brought into focus by the dismissal of General MacArthur, over the course which our far eastern policy should take. The analysis by Mr. Baldwin of the different courses which the United States might pursue concludes with the recommendations for extension of the war in the Far East, but by strictly limited means. His detailed recommendations as to the specific measures which the United States should take seem to me to parallel very closely the policy advocated by General MacArthur. They should be studied with care by those who today are condemning MacArthur's policy, even before the general has had a full hearing.

THE GREAT DEBATE: II—FOUR POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION SEEN IF KOREAN CEASE-FIRE NEGOTIATIONS FAIL

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The fighting in Korea yesterday was—as it has been for many months now—vicious but indecisive; no end was in sight.

Political negotiations directed toward the ending of that war should be welcomed. But if, as seems probable, any negotiated termination of the campaign on a basis acceptable to us proves impossible, we then will face only four possible courses of action:

1. Indefinite continuation of the present limited war in Korea.

2. Withdrawal from Korea.

3. Unlimited extension of war to Communist Chinese territory; and if necessary, to Russia; in other words, unlimited war in the Far East, and perhaps in the world.

4. Extension of the war, but by strictly limited means; in other words, fighting a less limited war than we are now doing.

Any and all of these courses must be based on two basic postulates: (a) Even though Europe should have strategic priority, Europe cannot be saved by losing Asia; in other words, the spread of communism in Asia must be halted if we are to win the struggle for the world; (b) there is no possible course of action that does not involve risks—grave risks and the ultimate risk of general war.

FIRST COURSE HELD IMPRACTICAL

The first course—indefinite continuation of the present situation in Korea—can be ruled out as a practical possibility on psychological and political grounds. Unless some end to fighting looms in Korea, the morale of our troops and of the South Koreans is bound to deteriorate; moreover, public opinion in this country will not tolerate indefinitely a toll of casualties with no end in sight. From the strategic point of view, the continued concentration for an indefinite period of so much of our strength in Korea, and the military and economic drain it represents should not be tolerated for more than another 3 to 6 months.

The second course—deliberate withdrawal from Korea—means throwing in the sponge before the knock-down. It would represent a run-out, not only to those we supported in Korea but to all anti-Communist forces in Asia; it would represent appeasement in a new form. It would have intolerable political, moral, and psychological consequences throughout Asia and the world; United States prestige would fall to a new low; our position in Japan would be imperiled; and communism almost certainly would spread.

The third course—unlimited extension of the war to Communist Chinese territory—and if Russia intervened, to Russia—would, as President Truman said, bring on the very thing we are trying to prevent, world war III. An invasion of Communist China with United States forces, or even large-scale blockade and bombardment of China by United States sea and air power, would mean the commitment of far greater force to the Orient than we now have there. If Russia abstained from direct aid to China, we would become involved in a major war against a secondary opponent—a war that would be likely to continue for a long time and that would leave Russia relatively free for other moves in Europe and elsewhere.

This policy suffers from the same disadvantages as does the "preventive war" theory; it brings on the very thing we are trying to prevent—general war—and it might commit us to that war at a disadvantage; we might be shadow-boxing with the real opponent, Russia, while heavily engaged with the secondary opponent, China.

Only the fourth course offers, at least for the foreseeable future, any conceivable hope. Yet we must frankly face the fact that this course, like all the others, runs the risk of war. Any attempt to fight a limited war—though limited wars are the only ones that offer the hope of future political stability—may be doomed to failure; wars have the habit of spreading; and if we deliberately make the war in Korea less limited, we may not be able to control its ultimate spread. But, given the position we are in today, there is no alternative, and any course we take—most of all appeasement—runs the risk of general war.

A limited extension of the war in Korea should include immediately the following positive measures:

1. A large-scale rearmament and reorganization of the Chinese Nationalists' forces on Formosa, supervised and directed by a large United States military mission.

2. Restriction of the Formosan functions of the United States Seventh Fleet to defense of Formosa against Communist invasion; that is, permission for the resumption of the limited blockade of the Chinese coast by the Nationalist Navy, and for Nationalist air raids and commando raids on that coast.

3. A large-scale effort to supply, arm, and organize Chinese guerrillas. This should be done quietly, but vigorously. Our aim should be the fractionalization of Communist China, and support, not necessarily of one anti-Communist leader but of many.

4. The equipping, as rapidly as possible, of additional South Koreans, but no faster than they can be trained effectively and screened politically.

5. A speed-up in the rearmament of Japan.

6. Continued political, economic, psychological and military aid to selected non-Communist governments and factions in Asia, but supervised by United States missions and on our terms.

STEPS HELD INADVISABLE

The new less limited war should not include, at least initially:

1. Large-scale invasion of the Chinese mainland by the Nationalists.

2. Use of United States planes or ships against Communist China outside of the Korean area.

3. Bombardment of the enemy's Manchurian air bases and supply dumps and communication lines. This prohibition, however, should remain in force only so long as the enemy air actions in Korea remain defensive. If enemy air force should intervene massively in deep penetration of Korea against our air, naval, or ground forces, and/or if the safety of our troops in Korea were imperiled, Manchurian bases should be bombed immediately, even though there are both military and political liabilities to such action.

We face, therefore, as the great Truman-MacArthur debate opens, a crisis in the Orient, and in the world. We should welcome political negotiations, on the basis of the thirty-eighth parallel, looking toward the end of the Korean War, but we should never make any basic concessions, such as the admission of Communist China to the United Nations or the surrender of Formosa to the Communists, to secure an armistice. If a negotiated end to the war proves impossible, we must resolutely face the extension of military measures, despite the risk implied.

Three considerations are basic to any course we may follow in the Orient. The first is that we must use Asians to fight Asians. The second is that a defensive policy, or a policy of drift-and-wait never can stem the tide of communism; a policy of a limited offensive—politically, economically, militarily, psychologically—is essential. And the third is that, if Russia and Communist China want general war, any of our attempts to limit the Korean conflagration are futile. In other words, world war III is more likely to be the result of what the enemy does than of what we do. If we fear to take action because of possible enemy reaction, obviously we can formulate no policy worthy of the name.

Bureaucrats at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on the shocking waste and extravagance in Government departments:

BUREAUCRATS AT WORK

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Washington in the spring: The Navy is in a stew. A House Appropriations Committee has just discovered that the Navy has 11,000,000 dozen oyster forks on hand. That's 11,000,000 dozen. Nobody in the Navy quite knows why or how so many were purchased, or what they are going to do with them. There aren't that many oysters, let alone Navy personnel.

But any howling over this extravagance will be drowned out. The Government is buying 100 electric organs, valued at $150,285. That's $1,502.85 per organ.

Along with the 99-year supply of light bulbs accumulated by one Washington bureau there are stacked up 3,000,000 pounds of peanut butter, 6,000,000 pounds of sugar, 175,028 cans of condensed milk, and something to sneeze about, 1,000,000 pounds of black pepper.

Lawyers, of course, never need fear unemployment so long as Washington exists.

The Department of Justice has 1,600 lawyers on its payroll, wants more. Sixteen of them engage in private practice, seldom visit their offices, yet receive full pay, accrued leave, and a 30-day annual vacation.

Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, is hiring a $10,000-a-year recreation specialist to help out in the defense emergency. Apparently the plan is to teach people how to use all the WPA parks scattered across the country. Ewing also is embarked on an extensive program of vocational training for industry, although thousands of GI's were trained under the GI bill of rights.

To add to the confusion, Congress is about to approve a $25,000 request to test air raid sirens around the country. And the Civil Defense Administration has changed its mind. It no longer wants to build concrete bomb shelters deep in the ground to protect civilians against atom bomb attacks. Now the agency proposes to shore up basements in Government buildings and others and to reinforce buildings with concrete shock walls. And to learn how badly scared we are the CDA is conducting polls across the country. The big test will be whether or not people worry more about the atom or the administration.

Fish have also gone to war. The Fish and Wildlife Service has set up a defense fisheries agency to coordinate fish activities into the defense effort. Naturally this will require money and manpower.

To keep us posted on this and other ideas emanating from Washington the Department of the Interior has 110 press agents. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, as an emergency measure, is demanding 100 more employees to gather housing statistics, although the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration have tons of facts on housing gathering dust in their files.

If you want to travel, the Defense Production Administration is the place to work. It has requested from Congress funds amounting to $1,200 each for employees to travel in 1951. It is also paying average salaries of $7,000 annually, compared to overall Government average of $3,600.

One bureaucrat has admitted to Congress that he has "stockpiled" stenographers. He keeps them shuffling papers until there are typing chores as a result of the defense emergency. Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, is pleading with the Government to use women more extensively in the defense effort. This may be the answer:

The Office of Price Stabilization now has 120 lawyers on the payroll. Its enforcement officer, Edward Morgan, was chief counsel of the Tydings Investigation Subcommittee that whitewashed charges of Communists in Government. Morgan also helped handle the Senate Pearl Harbor investigation for the Democrats.

As a wind-up to Washington in the spring it might be well to remind the bureaucrats that since they started spending billions to control inflation, prices, wages, etc., it is costing us on the average of 43 percent more to live today than before the Korean War started.

When the Emerald Isle Is One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by Ray Beckett, of Providence, R. I., on March 17, 1951:

WHEN THE EMERALD ISLE IS ONE

Let's say a prayer, when the world's aware
That the Emerald Isle is one.
They'll be no North of Ireland
To darken the Irish sun.
We'll click our heels, to the Irish reels
When the pipers gally play,
We'll celebrate, from Malin Head
To the end of Bantry Bay.
Let's tip our hats to the Mikes and Pats
Who fought and died unsung
With the Parnells, Moores and Emmets
Of the silv'ry Irish tongues.
March on me boy, let's not destroy
The work already done,
And Irish hearts will know no joy
'Til the Emerald Isle is one.

—*Ray Beckett.*

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, I directed attention of the House to an editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Now It Comes Out." The following editorial is a sequel. I am also including an interesting editorial from the Post, entitled "MacArthur's Return." The above-mentioned editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post of April 14, 1951]

NOW IT COMES OUT—II

Every Washington reporter is familiar with the diplomatic denial—the procedure whereby a news story is denounced by an official if it becomes embarrassing, even though the facts originally came from him. The practice is a vicious one. It victimizes the public as well as the press; and it has been responsible for the scrambling of an awful lot of history. Now the tales are beginning to unfold of how General MacArthur's headquarters participated in this little game.

Item: In January, Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News reported from Tokyo that according to an authoritative source General MacArthur wanted to pull American troops out of Korea and carry the war to China by air and naval blockade. The story was immediately denied in both Tokyo and Washington. Col. Marion P. Echols, General MacArthur's press officer who passed the story, later denounced it as a figment of the imagination.

Now Mr. Beech discloses in a new dispatch that the source of his information was Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, military secretary to General MacArthur and virtually an echo of the supreme commander. It is inconceivable that General Whitney, whose loyalty has been slavish, would misrepresent the feelings of his superior. Christopher Rand, reporting from Tokyo in the New York Herald Tribune, adds confirming evidence that General MacArthur was not misrepresented. General MacArthur's aim, he says, "seemingly was to provoke a large-scale showdown with Red China and possibly Russia. Korea was a minute detail in it and probably an unwelcome one—there always has been sentiment in the MacArthur headquarters for abandoning Korea and removing the hostilities elsewhere."

The blanket of censorship in Japan has hitherto made it virtually impossible, of course, to ascertain the facts. Now that this cat is out of the bag, perhaps we can learn of the other instances in which the press has been victimized for telling the truth.

[From the Washington Post]

MACARTHUR'S RETURN

President Truman has accepted with good grace the decision of congressional leaders to invite General MacArthur ceremonially to speak before a joint meeting of the House and Senate. Naturally this does not mean that the administration wishes to give General MacArthur a great national forum for the airing of his disagreement with the President or even for the exposition of his views on far-eastern policy. Rather it means that General MacArthur is to be accorded the reception he deserves as a military hero in spite of his dismissal from his far-eastern command.

It must be taken for granted that General MacArthur will understand the situation and will not take advantage of this generous gesture to magnify the schism that his removal has caused. Belatedly he is to be honored for his illustrious service in World War II and for his commanding work in Japan. In that tribute all the people as well as all of Congress can join without reserve. The fact remains, however, that he has been deposed from his command for insubordination, and if the joint session should be used in any way as a protest against that essential action or to enter into controversy on the points involved in his dismissal, the joint session would become a reproach to him and to the dignity and judgment of the Congress.

Quite apart from the joint session, there is a natural desire on the part of Members of Congress to hear General MacArthur's version of the events that led to his dismissal by President Truman and his view of the conflict in the Far East. The country has a similar interest in the MacArthur story, and it is good news that he is coming home to tell it. Just before the President ousted General MacArthur, this newspaper suggested that he be recalled for report. What is wanted in this connection is not oratory but exposition, and that exposition can most appropriately come in sessions of the committees dealing with the armed services and foreign relations.

In this atmosphere General MacArthur should have complete freedom for telling his story. The important thing is that the controversial aspects of his return to Washington shall not be injected into the congressional ceremony in his honor. Congress as well as the people must learn to distinguish between MacArthur the military hero and MacArthur the superseded exponent of a rejected policy while in an administrative role.

Higher Mail Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress is considering the advisability of a general increase in postage rates, it might be well to look at the problem from the angle of the folks who will be called upon to pay these increases. Sometimes higher rates do not result either in improved service or increased returns, and a recent editorial in the Ottumwa (Iowa) Daily Courier indicates that a sharp increase in postal rates might actually mean less money for the Post Office Department. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include this editorial:

HIGHER MAIL RATES

There is another side to the question of whether postal rates should be raised, as Mr. Truman desires. The Government has said the increases are needed to cut $275,000,000 off the Post Office Department deficit. Mail users show the argument is not all on the Truman side.

Abolishing penny post cards never has worked. When the 2-cent rate was tried in 1917, the volume dropped 70 percent. The same thing occurred, after a brief trial, in 1925.

Second class is used by newspapers and magazines. The proposal is to double the rates. For a figure close to the proposed costs, many publishing companies could set up their own delivery systems or switch to some other method. The post-office revenues would go down, not up. Small, nonprofit, and educational periodicals would be real sufferers in a rate increase. Many would go broke.

Direct-mail advertising uses third-class mail. A rate boost would force some of the thousands of businessmen who use this service out of business. First-class mail is regarded by the Post Office Department as a paying proposition, so it doesn't intend to change the 3-cent rate.

Operating costs of the post office are fairly well fixed. Those who oppose the proposed increase in mail rates cite the case of the telephone companies. The cost to them of a nighttime long-distance call is much higher than in the daytime, but the rate to users is much lower.

The same thing applies to the post office. It has to pay overhead, whether it does any business or not. Mail users are convinced that with the proposed increases, postal business will fall off so sharply that the Department, in the end, will lose more money than it is losing now.

The Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the tragic dismissal of General MacArthur who has been looked upon by millions of Japanese and the people of the Orient as a "symbol of the justice of democracy and the military power of the United States" at this critical time has not only shocked the people of the Orient, but has been a great shock to the people of the United States who have protested by wires and letters to Members of Congress with a deluge of mail never before witnessed in Washington.

Whether or not the President had the right to dismiss General MacArthur is not now of too great importance. The important thing now is that the Military

Affairs Committee in questioning General MacArthur, the military leaders here in Washington, and the State Department bring out all of the facts surrounding the present unfortunate situation. General MacArthur's brilliant military achievements and experience in the Philippines, and his administration of Japan, totaling a period of 14 years, permits him to speak from a background of greater knowledge and experience than the President or anyone in the Pentagon or the State Department.

General MacArthur and General Ridgway as well have stated in substance "that unless the foreign policy is changed here in Washington so that our military commanders in the field are permitted to destroy by bombing enemy bases and supply lines beyond the Yalu River the war in Korea will be dragged out indefinitely into a stalemate."

Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur took this position to prevent the repetition of hundreds of thousands of Chinese troops who struck us near the Yula River during the terrible cold of last winter and who drove our forces back far below the thirty-eighth parallel, and forced evacuation of Hungnam in the dead of winter resulting in the loss of the lives of thousands of soldiers in that long and terrible retreat, and millions of dollars' worth of munitions, equipment, and supplies that fell into the hands of the enemy.

Lieutenant General Stratemeyer in command of the Air Force in Korea has warned that hereafter we can expect serious competition from a newly created North Korean air force equipped with jet fighters and operated by trained Chinese Communists trained by the Russians again flying over at will for an assault on our troops, with our Air Force being allowed to chase them back only to the border.

It has been a cardinal principal of war that the supply lines and bases of an enemy must be destroyed to reduce the power of the enemy in the field.

General Eisenhower and our Chief of Staff agree that if a war comes with Russia in Europe we must, by air power, destroy with bombs the industrial plants back of the line, and the enemy's concentration depots to prevent supplies reaching the enemy in the field. The same should hold true in Korea now.

That is exactly what General MacArthur and General Ridgway or any military man knows must be done if we are to bring the aggression in Korea to a successful conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, the issues in the controversy between President Truman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur will require time-consuming investigations and studies before they are resolved to the satisfaction of the American people.

For more than 6 years our people have lived in a state of confusion. They have been confused by the mistakes of our foreign policies and by our domestic policies as well. We have moved from one emergency to another, but always with heavy Federal expenditures, which increase as time goes on.

To appraise Truman's judgment now in the Far East the people have a right to ask:

Was his judgment good when at Potsdam he approved an agreement that gave Russia and the Chinese Communists control of Manchuria and the north half of Korea which ultimately gave them control of all of China?

Did he use good judgment when he later sent General Marshall to China to carry out his policy to force the Chinese Nationalist Government, then our ally, to accept the Northern Chinese Communists of Manchuria with equal rights into a coalition government of all China? This action helped to defeat the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Was the President's judgment sound when he and Secretary of State Acheson stated to the world prior to the war in Korea that Korea and Formosa laid outside of our sphere of influence in the Orient, and outside of our perimeter of defense?

The people have a right to ask, If we intended to defend South Korea, why were those statements made and why did the President cause all of our military forces to be withdrawn from South Korea?

They have the right to ask the further question, Why did the President and Secretary of State Acheson change their foreign policy within 24 hours after South Korea was invaded in June 1950?

Here again, Mr. Truman's judgment appears subject to question. He sent the Seventh Fleet to patrol the waters surrounding Formosa, to prevent raids by Nationalist Armies on the mainland, and raids by the Communist Armies on Formosa.

When the Reds invaded South Korea, and Chiang Kai-shek offered 30,000 trained troops to help halt the aggression, this aid was refused. However, American soldiers were rushed from Japan, and the United States to carry the burden of thrusting back the invaders.

Mr. Speaker, our whole diplomatic and military policies since Yalta need to be reexamined. The Congress needs to have all the facts. The cloak of secrecy should be removed from our diplomatic blunders, and those responsible for the mistakes should be ousted from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, when General MacArthur returns to Washington Thursday to present his story to the Congress and the American people he will face several handicaps.

First of all, he is still in the military service of his Nation. He will not be allowed to disclose facts that affect the military security of the Nation, regardless of whether or not they are right or wrong.

He will not have at his disposal a large force of publicity men and writers to present his side of the controversy. But President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Secretary Marshall do have at their disposal a powerful propaganda machine of hundreds of informational and publicity personnel, who will present the administration's side of the picture in great details, magnifying, of course, every small digression or apparent mistake during General MacArthur's administration and glorifying the aims of President Truman to contain the aggression.

Mr. Speaker, the question now resolves around one single factor:

Was General MacArthur right in his military appraisal of the situation and should the military situation be subordinated to political international considerations?

If General MacArthur has blundered in Korea, it will be the first acknowledged blunder of this great military leader in his career. If the international political advisers to President Truman have blundered, the Congress and the American people have a right to know all the facts.

It appears the following are some of the questions which should be answered:

First. What directives, if any, were issued by the United Nations to General MacArthur?

Second. What counter directives, if any, were issued by President Truman to General MacArthur?

Third. What contributions by other nations to the expeditionary forces in Korea were made with the understanding that the Supreme Allied Commander would not be allowed to exercise full and complete military discretion in conducting the campaign to repel the invaders and achieve a military victory?

Fourth. What members of the United Nations, if any, have been supplying neutral aid—conducting business with both sides—to the enemy in South Korea?

Mr. Speaker, when these questions, among others, are answered, the American people and the Congress will be in a better position to judge between the policies of President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and the internationalists in our Government, and the strictly military policies and objectives of America's greatest military leader of modern times—Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are in fact the Government. Their thousands of letters to their Congressmen by over 100 to 1 condemn the action of the President in his removal of General MacArthur. They appear to have lost all confidence in his Secretary of State, Acheson.

The Congress must assert itself, bring out all the facts, and assume greater control in the direction of the affairs of the Government.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who may not have seen the following articles in the Washington Post, I should like to call attention to the columns by Mr. Walter Lippmann and Mr. Marquis Childs, and also an editorial entitled "Churchill on War":

[From the Washington Post of April 17, 1951]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

LIMITED WAR

It is sad but true that no good solution is now possible in Korea. The high objectives which the General Assembly proclaimed in the resolution of October 7—namely, "the establishment of a unified, independent, and democratic government of Korea"—are not now attainable.

The best that can be had now is an armistice at the old frontier of South and North Korea, at the thirty-eighth parallel. It is also the least the United Nations can accept. An armistice in the middle of Korea would amount to a recognition by both sides that Korea cannot be unified in a limited war—in a limited war both sides will have to be content with limited objectives.

The restoration of the status quo ante is a limited objective. The war which is being fought in Korea has been a limited war—that is to say it has been confined to hostilities within the Korean Peninsula; each side has operated from a "sanctuary" outside the limited theater of hostilities, which the other side did not attack. Only a limited objective can be attained by a war which is limited.

If we want more than the limited objective of restoring the South Korea frontier, having repelled the original aggression of June 25, then we must accept the risks of a general war in the Far East. The UN resolution of October 7, insofar as it was sincerely meant, authorized and indeed directed General MacArthur to unit Korea by force of arms, and then to hold elections, etc., etc.

General MacArthur's great error was that he misjudged the intentions of Red China, and thus persuaded the civilian authorities here to believe that the UN resolution could be carried out by the limited forces and the kind of limited war which General MacArthur was conducting. Had General MacArthur's estimate of the situation been better, he would have advised the President that the UN resolution of October 7 should not be adopted unless the United States and its principal allies were prepared to engage in a general war in the Far East. That is what he is saying now. That is what he should have said before October 7.

By the same token had the State Department's intelligence been better, had it not been swept off its feet by the Inchon victory, had it not been so much the captive of its critics that it dares not have the courage of its convictions, it would not have promoted the UN resolution of October 7. It would have worked to attain in September, when we were victorious, the armistice which it would now, after so much bloodshed, like to attain through a stalemate.

The question now is whether the country will agree with reasonable unity that our military objective in Korea is the limited one of repelling aggression south of the thirty-eighth parallel and restoring the South Korean Republic. We can, and we should, still hold it as a political and a diplomatic objective that Korea should eventually be united by democratic means. But we cannot unify Korea by a war confined to the Korean Peninsula, and we shall get nowhere in this controversy until we make the choice of limited objectives out of a limited war or unlimited objectives out of an unlimited war.

The critical weakness of President Truman's position is that while he proclaims his intention to limit the war, he has not mustered up the courage to tell the people clearly that in a limited war we can obtain only limited results.

The view which General MacArthur laid down to Congressman Martin was, unless he has been greatly misunderstood, that if the limitations on our military actions were removed, a victory not only in Korea but in the global issue could be attained. No one has yet explained publicly how so great and glorious a result can be achieved by bombing Chinese cities and using Chiang's troops on Formosa, as Senator TAFT now describes it, "to conduct raids on the mainland." No one has explained how the Soviet Union can be defeated by a hit-and-run campaign against China.

Until it is explained more convincingly than it has as yet been, it must surely be the first principle of our strategy never to commit our main forces—namely our strategic air power and all the forces on which it depends—except against the main adversary. There may be, and indeed there is, room for argument as to whether the main theater of war—in the event of war—would be Europe, the Middle East, or the Far East. But there can be no room for argument, I submit, that the main adversary is the Red Army of the Soviet Union, and that it would be strategic lunacy to commit our main forces, the main forces of the Atlantic community and of western Christendom, until the Kremlin commits its main forces.

[From the Washington Post of April 14, 1951]

RIDGWAY'S TIMETABLE

(By Marquis Childs)

WHY CHIANG'S TROOPS CAN'T BE USED

The documents released by the White House show quite clearly how impossible it was to have any coherent policy with Tokyo pulling one way and Washington another. That is the paramount fact that must not be lost sight of in the midst of the violent reaction the President's decision has produced.

But now the burden is on the coalition of western powers within the United Nations to show that they can carry out a policy intended to resolve the conflict in Korea. Too often delay and indecision have seemed to justify General MacArthur in rushing in to fill a vacuum. The generalizations contained in President Truman's speech do not constitute a policy.

Before the clash with MacArthur reached the head-on collision stage, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had worked out a military plan. It had been accepted by the new commander in chief in the Far East, Lieut. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who actually has been directing military operations in Korea for some time. The plan called for a tentative timetable more or less as follows:

The United Nations armies will meet the new Communist offensive. They may be compelled to give up some of the ground won in recent weeks. But there is confidence in the Ridgway command that the offensive can be repulsed. With additional large-cale Communist losses piled on top of the half-million or more suffered after the November intervention, the Chinese will then conclude that they cannot win in Korea.

This will be apparent by mid-September. At that time the Korean situation will be stalemated. The way will then be open to truce negotiations with the Communist regime in Peiping.

But even if they still refuse to consider any negotiation, as they have done for the past 2 months, a stalemate in fact will be taken for granted and plans based on that assumption. If events develop in this fashion, it is estimated that two American divisions will be left in Korea along with some other UN units.

At the same time four trained and seasoned American divisions will be kept in Japan. These divisions will not be allowed to lapse into occupation status, but will be kept in a state of readiness. They could be quickly shifted back to Korea should the Communists again invade from the north.

A basic consideration in this plan is to build up South Korean troops through training and arms provided from this country. This last, as the documents released by the White House show, was blocked by General MacArthur who wanted the arms given to the Jap police.

In this connection it is interesting to note the recommendations of William R. Mathews, editor of the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star, and an authority on the Far East and MacArthur's command. In an article written before MacArthur's recall, Mathews suggested that "instead of demobilizing more than 200,000 Koreans for lack of arms, we should find the arms for them and continue their training." Frequently a supporter and long an admirer of MacArthur, Mathews wrote:

"If we allow ourselves to be drawn into a war in China, we will not win it militarily or politically. We will exhaust ourselves. We will not harm the source of communism, we will allow the Soviet Union to grow so strong that it can choose its own time to march west in Europe."

Much of the anger directed at President Truman appears to be motivated by the belief that through using the Nationalist Chinese forces on Formosa, as MacArthur advocated, the war in Korea could be shortened and American lives saved. This touches the usefulness of the refugee army under Chiang Kai-shek. The illusion is cherished by some that this is a force in being, trained, seasoned, equipped, which could be picked up in a matter of days or weeks and dropped down on the mainland of China or onto the Korean peninsula.

Even the most ardent advocates of Chiang and the Nationalists, including retired American admirals and generals who are Chiang's paid advisers on Formosa, have never said that. A large amount of equipment is needed to rehabilitate an army that for nearly 2 years has been held together under difficulties. Rear Adm. Charles M. Cooke (retired), former commander of the United States Seventh Fleet, and Chiang's most important adviser, put the cost of that equipment at $250,000,000 some time ago and rising prices would have upped it considerably by now.

But realistic observers on Formosa point to a far more important consideration—that the United States would have to give 100-percent air-sea support to any action by the Nationalists against the mainland. The chances were at least 20-to-1 that this would have meant a war of indefinite duration and extent with China. It was this risk that President Truman and the Western powers refused to take.

[From the Washington Post of April 17, 1951]

DULLES AND THE JAPANESE PACT

(By Marquis Childs)

NEW IMPORTANCE

A few hours after the dramatic White House announcement of General MacArthur's dismissal, President Truman summoned John Foster Dulles from the State Department. The President told Dulles he wanted him to go to Japan immediately to push as hard as possible for a peace treaty with the Japanese.

Behind the urgency of this request was a deep concern over Japanese reaction to MacArthur's removal. If it was a shock in this country, it exploded with the force of a bombshell in Japan and particularly among middle- and upper-class groups that have looked to America for protection from communism and for economic stability.

The reaction has in fact been far more serious, according to confidential reports to Washington, than the news has indicated.

The Japs have traditionally bowed to authority and General MacArthur had become a kind of second emperor; a symbol of power and security. It was ever feared that the government of Premier Yoshida might fall as a consequence of the news.

After Dulles had heard the President outline this newest mission to Japan, he hesitated for a moment. Both men seated in the quiet of the President's oval study were aware of the extreme difficulty and gravity of the assignment. In the vacuum left by MacArthur's departure a multitude of problems, both military and diplomatic, would have to be solved.

Dulles replied that he was willing to go but he wanted to be reassured that there was no change in American policy with respect to Japan and the Far East. In pushing for a peace treaty at the earliest opportunity, he has been determined not to permit Russian obstructionism to stand in the way of a settlement. He does not believe, as the British seem to, that Communist China should be permitted to take part in decisions on the treaty.

The President responded with great earnestness. He said there was no change whatsoever in the basic policy of the American Government. He gave his special ambassador full power to proceed with a Japanese treaty along the lines he has been following.

In the way in which he has proceeded to try to bring order and stability in the Pacific through a union of non-Communist powers, including Japan, Dulles has given one of the few examples of constructive statesmanship in the postwar world. Secretary of State Acheson gave his Republican adviser virtually a free hand on Japan. And instead of waiting to react against Communist action, as has happened more often than not in other parts of the world, Dulles has gone ahead with a constructive program intended to integrate Japan into the society of free nations not later than the end of this year.

This is the third time in less than 9 months that Dulles has made the long and wearying flight to Tokyo. He was at MacArthur's headquarters when the North Korean Communists launched their attack on the South Korean Republic last June. Returning to America, he expressed the belief that the United Nations would meet aggression with force.

His second trip began shortly after the first of this year. Five weeks were spent in laying the groundwork for a Japanese treaty and a possible future Pacific defense pact with all the nations involved. Besides Japan, Dulles visited Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. He expressed the hope at the end of his tour that a treaty might be concluded not later than midsummer.

If he had permitted political considerations to sway him, Dulles might have hesitated about going on this third assignment for another reason. He went into the State Department at the request of his good friend, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan. The ailing VANDENBERG made it a specific condition of a continuing bipartisan approach to foreign policy that Dulles be made one of Acheson's chief advisers. Several other Republican names had been suggested, after Dulles' bitter and unsuccessful contest with HERBERT LEHMAN for the New York Senate seat in the fall of 1949, but VANDENBERG insisted on Dulles.

Now, however, extremists in Dulles' party are out to destroy anyone who tries to work with the administration toward a constructive foreign policy. Dulles knew that the attacks would be tripled and quadrupled in the context of the MacArthur controversy. Yet he went—and he went, in my opinion, because he has a deep sense of responsibility in a world torn with dissensions that threaten utter destruction.

It sometimes seems as though the extremists here at home were perfectly willing to bring on this destruction. If only they can heap the blame on Truman and Acheson, they seem ready and even eager to embrace any calamity. And correspondingly they vilify any and all, regardless of party or conviction, who work constructively for stability.

[From the Washington Post of April 17, 1951]

CHURCHILL ON WAR

We'll let the man who woke up this country to the Soviet menace with his Fulton, Mo., speech of March 1946, Winston Churchill, write an editorial for us today, with a reprint of a passage from his The Gathering Storm. Says this modern man of war, in some reflections about Munich:

"Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. Religion and virtue alike lend their sanctions to meekness and humility, not only between men but between nations. How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands. How many misunderstandings which led to wars could have been removed by temporizing. How often have countries fought cruel wars and then after a few years of peace found themselves not only friends but allies.

"The Sermon on the Mount is the last word in Christian ethics. Everyone respects the Quakers. Still, it is not on these terms that ministers assume their responsibilities of guiding states. Their duty is first so to deal with other nations as to avoid strife and war and to eschew aggression in all its forms, whether for nationalistic or ideological objects. But the safety of the state, the lives and freedom of their own fellow countrymen, to whom they owe their position, make it right and imperative in the last resort, or when a final and definite conviction has been reached, that the use of force should not be excluded. If the circumstances are such as to warrant it, force may be used.

"And if this be so, it should be used under the conditions which are most favorable. There is no merit in putting off a war for a year if, when it comes, it is a far worse war or one much harder to win. These are the tormenting dilemmas upon which mankind has throughout its history been so frequently impaled. Final judgment upon them can only be recorded by history in relation to the facts of the case as known to the parties at the time, and also as subsequently proved."

Great Man Fired for Standing by America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Port Jervis Union Gazette on the only topic the American people are interested in—the so-called firing of General MacArthur:

GREAT MAN FIRED FOR STANDING BY AMERICA

To say that most Americans were astounded this morning on learning that the President had fired General MacArthur from four or five big jobs, is putting it mildly, although this action had been foreseen for some time. It was long known that the man on the spot was having trouble trying to get the Truman, Acheson, Hiss-loving crowd at the White House to really see what was needed if the UN (mostly American) forces were to be kept from annihilation in the Far East.

Ever since General Marshall advocated the selling of the Chiang Nationalists down the river and thus letting the Reds, backed by Russia, take over the celestial millions, it has been known that little was to be done to save the Far East from communism. Of course the little police action in Korea could be fought by a few thousand soldiers, and let China be overrun if necessary.

There must be joy as well as Joe at the Kremlin today, for even Joe himself could not have won a bigger victory for himself than the UN, mostly British and French, have won for him. It will eventually turn out to have been another Yalta or Potsdam.

While we have been shelling out money to protect and save Europe, we have been sending men over to Korea, and although MacArthur has continually asked for more men and munitions and quick help, the White House has listened to the Europeans and given what they wished, letting the Far East sink deeper into Red hands.

Just what caused the sudden midnight action at the White House may never be known by the general public until years later. The American people want to know what sort of shenanigans have been going on lately, and if the United States is again to be the sucker for someone else. The man who likes to talk of hitting people on the nose has a real problem facing him.

Our candidate for the Presidency next year is a man named MacArthur. America needs him, and he is now free.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the great New York Times, on Sunday, April 15, ran the following weekly summary of the dispute occasioned by the dismissal of General MacArthur:

GREATER DEBATE ON MACARTHUR AND POLICY

The great debate—which had ended the week before with Congress' endorsement of the dispatch of American troops to defend Europe—was succeeded last week by the "greater debate." It was touched off by one of the most dramatic incidents in American history.

On Tuesday General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, 71, held the offices of Supreme Commander, United Nations Forces in Korea; Supreme Commander for Allied Powers, Japan; Commander in Chief, Far East.

On Wednesday Douglas MacArthur was a general without a command. His President and Commander in Chief, Harry S. Truman, had dismissed him for insubordination, for openly and repeatedly clashing with the administration on basic matters of foreign policy.

The dismissal of General MacArthur brought into acute focus three issues:

1. The issue of the President's use of his constitutional authority to maintain civilian supremacy over the military.

2. The issue of where to concentrate the west's power in the world struggle against communism—in Europe or in Asia.

3. The issue of whether to keep fighting a limited war in Korea or to take the risk of a big war in trying to force a decision against the Chinese Communists.

The debate over these issues came immediately. In many parts of the Nation there was an outcry of protest against the MacArthur ouster. President Truman went on the air to explain his position to the people. Leading Republicans, hotly denouncing him, flung down a challenge to the fundamentals of the administration's foreign policy.

This week the debate moves into a spectacular phase. General MacArthur returns to set foot on the soil of the continental United States for the first time in 14 years.

THE BACKGROUND

Douglas MacArthur had from his youth a feeling that he was to be a man of destiny, that in Shakespeare's words, he was "not born to sue, but to command." He was graduated from West Point with the highest 4-year average (98.14) in history; he was the youngest division commander in France in World War I; then the youngest Chief of Staff; then youngest four-star general since Grant. In World War II, in his sixties, he led 11 landings personally.

His theatrical flair caught the imagination (his famous statement upon landing at Leyte in 1944, "I have returned. By the Grace of Almighty God, our forces stand again on Philippine soil. * * * Rally to me. * * * Let no heart be faint"). His imperious manner rubbed many people the wrong way. His communiqués referred to "my air force," "my navy." Yet even his critics, after an interview with him, would come away impressed by his personality. In the Japanese occupation headquarters in Tokyo General MacArthur was surrounded by aides who almost idolized him. In his office in Tokyo's Dai Ichi building hung the framed story of a Roman general who said, "We shall pay no attention to any counsel but such as shall be framed within our camp."

CHAPTERS OF DISPUTE

The direct controversy between General MacArthur and President Truman took the form of a long series of disputes. Some are public knowledge; others are recorded in documents that are still in secret files.

These were outstanding chapters in the controversy:

Chapter I took place when the Korean War was in its beachhead phase. There were reports of Chinese Communist divisions massing in Manchuria. A prime concern of the administration was to keep Communist China, if possible, from intervening in the war. In August General MacArthur sent a statement to an encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago. He recommended strongly that the United States hold on to Formosa—the sanctuary of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government—as a base vital to American security in the Pacific. President Truman saw an advance copy of the statement; he ordered it withdrawn but it got into print anyway. Then the President, in a fireside chat, said: "We do not want Formosa or any part of Asia for ourselves. We believe that the future of Formosa * * * should be settled peaceably * * * by international action."

Chapter II took place when the UN troops—ordered into an "end-the-war" offensive by General MacArthur—were sent reeling back by Chinese Communist forces in North Korea. There were hurried and delicate negotiations between the United States and its Allies on what to do about the Chinese aggression. The decision was to fight on but to leave the door open to negotiations with Communist China. On December 1 General MacArthur said that because he was not given authority to bomb Communist China, he faced "an enormous handicap, without precedent in military history." On December 6 the Joint Chiefs of Staff sent to General MacArthur copies of a Presidential memo applying to officials of the executive branch. It said: "No speech, press release, or other public statement concerning foreign policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of State; no [such statement] concerning military policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of Defense."

Chapter III took place during the UN's attrition offensive—the offensive that slowly pushed the Chinese Communists back toward parallel 38. Intelligence reports had it that the Chinese Communists were massing in North Korea and Manchuria for a big push. Fourteen UN countries with troops fighting in Korea were working on a restatement of their aims. They hoped that Mao Tse-tung could be induced to reconsider the refusals he had made in the past to UN truce proposals.

On March 20 the Joint Chiefs of Staff sent General MacArthur a message which said: "State planning Presidential announcement shortly that, with clearing of bulk of South Korea of aggressors, United Nations now prepared to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea."

Four days later General MacArthur, without consulting Washington, offered to meet on the field of battle with the Chinese Communist military commander and talk truce. He coupled the offer with an implied threat. He said: "The enemy must * * * be painfully aware that a decision of the United Nations to depart from its tolerant effort to contain the war to the area of Korea through expansion of our military operations to his coastal areas and interior bases would doom Red China * * *."

TRUMAN WAS FURIOUS

The MacArthur statement caused dismay and anger at the UN and in Washington. President Truman was described by his intimates as furious. At his direction the Joint Chiefs of Staff sent General MacArthur a message sternly recalling the December 6 document advising him and all other commanders to steer away from foreign and military policy statements until they had been cleared by Washington.

Chapter IV opened at 3:04 p. m., Thursday, April 5. A news ticker in a White House office tapped out a bulletin from Capitol Hill reporting that House Republican JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., had read in Congress a letter from General MacArthur calling for a new United States foreign policy: The landing of Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa-based troops on the mainland to open a second front against the Chinese Communists and the concentration of power in Asia rather than Europe. There followed quickly additional bulletins, and the text of the general's letter, which read, in part: "It seems strangely difficult for some to realize that here in Asia is where the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that we have joined the issue thus raised on the battlefield; that here we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight it with words."

An assistant White House press secretary tore the yellow sheet of copy from the ticker and within minutes handed it to the President. Mr. Truman read it quickly. Then and there he made up his mind:

MacArthur must go.

For 5 days after reaching his decision—alone—President Truman weighed the best way to carry it out, the question of who should succeed General MacArthur, and the timing of the announcement. Only a very few, through those days, knew that he had made up his mind. It was one of the best-kept secrets in Washington history.

On April 6, a week ago Friday, at the close of a Cabinet meeting, Mr. Truman asked Defense Secretary George C. Marshall and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Omar Bradley to stay behind. The President informed them of the decision. The machinery for the dismissal of General MacArthur was set in motion.

Such was the prelude to the high drama of last week.

WEEK OF DRAMA

Over last week-end there grew in Washington a feeling that something was up. The scuttlebut was that Mr. Truman probably would deliver a direct rebuke to General MacArthur, but nothing more.

On Monday the President met with his congressional leaders. The question of General MacArthur came up. But even then he did not make it quite clear that he had reached an irrevocable decision.

On Tuesday morning Mr. Truman ordered the assembly of documentary material for the order dismissing General MacArthur. A small group, including General Bradley, Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Matthew Connelly, Secretary to the President, and Joseph Short, White House Press Secretary, started to work in the Cabinet room. At around 10 p. m. they went to Blair House with the assembled documents. The President approved the papers with a few changes.

UPROAR ANTICIPATED

At this Blair House meeting there was discussion of probable reaction. The conferees figured—accurately—that there would be an uproar in Congress and that the first response from the public would be adverse. But the President said: "If your decision is right you must go ahead with it even if you know there will be a storm of disapproval. If you are right," he said, "the American people will in time support you."

That evening the White House correspondents went home at the usual time. At midnight telephone calls from the White House routed them out of bed; they were summoned to a press conference. At 12:05 a. m. Wednesday, the Associated Press sent out this alert to papers throughout the country:

"Extreme: The White House has called in reporters for an announcement at 1 a. m. eastern standard time. There is no indication of the subject matter."

At 1 a. m. Press Secretary Short greeted 50 sleepy-eyed reporters. The President had already gone to bed. The conference lasted 5 minutes. Mr. Short read out the Presidential statement. It said:

"With deep regret I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations in matters pertaining to his official duties. * * * I have decided that I must make a change of command in the Far East. I have, therefore, relieved General MacArthur of his commands and have designated Lieut. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway as his successor."

At the same time an order went out from Secretary Marshall to General Ridgway, notifying him of his promotion and of his replacement as Eighth Army commander by Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet.

It was 3 p. m. in Tokyo. At his American Embassy residence, General MacArthur had just finished luncheon with friends. An aide delivered a brown envelope marked "Flash." Inside was the dismissal notice from President Truman. General MacArthur did not change expression as he read it.

MAC ARTHUR'S STAFF INCENSED

His aides showed hot anger at the news. One, reading the order, which gave the general authority "to have issued such orders as are necessary to complete desired travel to such place as you select," said bitterly, "Why didn't Truman say 'To Elba'?"

The news reached General Bidgway at a command post near the Korean battle front where he was escorting Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., on an inspection tour. The general said, "This thing just hit me." The next day he and Mr. Pace flew to Tokyo for a talk with General MacArthur. General Van Fleet was in Florida when he got word of his new assignment; he flew immediately to Washington and from there to Korea.

By mid-Wednesday the reaction in the United States to Mr. Truman's bold decision was boiling up. The volume of protest was extraordinary. Letters, telegrams, and telephone calls by the tens of thousands poured into the White House, congressional offices, and newspapers. Across the country demonstrators carried signs saying, "Oust Truman" and "Out with Acheson." In at least one town, in California, the President was burned in effigy.

In Washington, House and Senate Republican leaders held a tense strategy conference. During the meeting Representative MARTIN telephoned Tokyo and spoke to a MacArthur aide. Afterward he announced that the GOP would move to have General MacArthur invited to address a joint session of Congress. "Impeachments," he said, had been "discussed." In using the plural he apparently had both Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson in mind.

At the same time the President's staff was hastily drafting a radio and television address to state his case to the public. Mr. Truman delivered it at 10:30 p. m.

By Thursday General MacArthur was packing for his homeward journey. In the United States it was announced that he had accepted a job as an official for Remington-Rand, Inc. In a speech in New York that night Senator ROBERT A. TAFT served notice that the main line of Republican attack on the President will be the charge that General MacArthur's dismissal means appeasement of communism in the Far East.

INVITATION BY CONGRESS

On Friday decisions were made for a full inquiry into the dispute. The Democrats cleared the way for an official invitation for General MacArthur to address the Members of Congress. Mr. Truman announced he was "happy" that Congress planned to "bestow this honor" on the general. At the same time the Senate Armed Services Committee voted unanimously to investigate General MacArthur's dismissal and invited him to be one of the first witnesses.

In New York Mayor Impellitteri announced that the city would honor the general with the traditional ticker-tape parade and ceremonies accorded returning heroes and special visitors. The major cabled the general the invitation along with New York's cordial greetings.

Yesterday from Tokyo, General MacArthur cabled his acceptance and said he would arrive in New York this Thursday. He also notified the Senate Armed Services Committee he thought it inappropriate for him to appear as a committee witness while Congress was considering the invitation to him to address Congress as a whole. He said he wanted to talk to Congress in general terms.

THE ISSUES

Out of the events of the week there emerged sharply the three issues of the greater debate.

As for the first issue—the employment of the President's authority over his military commander—these views have been set out: Some said that it was the politicians who had encroached on General MacArthur's realm, and not he on the politicians. This school feels that the general knows far more about the true situation in the Orient than anyone in Washington. But on the other side was the traditional argument that in a democracy, the soldier—as General Eisenhower said—"accepts certain inhibitions" when he puts on the uniform. His job is to carry out policy, and his views on what it should be must be conveyed through channels and not voiced in public.

As for the second issue—whether to concentrate on Europe or Asia—these are the main arguments: Those who hold the MacArthur view believe world war III has already started, that the Russians have chosen Asia as their battlefield, that a fight to a decision must be pressed against Communist China. On the other side are those who argue that Western Europe, with its industries, is the prime Russian target. They say that the Kremlin would like nothing better than to have the west's major forces committed in Asia, leaving the Russians free to move into the vacuum in Europe. This school believes a world war may still be avoided if the West builds strong enough forces in Europe to make aggression costly.

As for the third issue—policy on the Korean war—these are the conflicting positions: General MacArthur and his supporters hold that the only way to avoid an endless and bloody stalemate is to bomb Chinese bases and land Chiang Kai-shek's troops on the mainland. The administration school says this would lead Peiping to invoke the Sino-Soviet mutual-aid pact, the Russians might come in, and world war III would be on. The UN's job, this group argues, is to halt the aggressor, and then try to get a negotiated peace.

We Have a Better Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the prize-winning oration for boys by Gerald Ottenheimer, of Georgetown Prep, in the twentieth annual oratorical contest sponsored by the Catholic University Conference of Clerics and Religious held at the Catholic University Gymnasium on April 15. The judges of this contest were my charming colleague, the Honorable Edna F. Kelley, of the Tenth New York Congressional District, the Honorable Stephen Jackson, from the Department of Defense, and the Honorable Edward A. Tamm, judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and I had the honor to be the presiding chairman:

WE HAVE A BETTER ANSWER

Just recently we were offered the strange, sad picture of a United States Senator weeping over the Nation, weeping over the decay of morals which is eating at the vitals of the country he loves. Strange, this picture? Yes; for when have we ever seen the like before? Sad? Yes; because there are so few who realize the conditions that bring tears to his eyes. Although he may not have known it, the Senator was weeping over a condition brought about by the two great demigods of the twentieth century, the Divinity of the Dollar and the Goddess of Sense Satisfaction.

Let us consider what the first demigod has given us. When a student athlete betrays his college for the tinkle of a coin, when a California orange grower doubles his prices after a hurricane in Florida and calls it the law of supply and demand, when a sewer rat pollutes the souls of innocent children by peddling dope, when a quisling betrays his democratic nation to an atheistic tyrant, and worst of all, when the Christian population is so unconcerned that well it may be said of it—it fiddles while Rome burns—then, perhaps, the Senator has some cause to weep.

The second demigod is sense satisfaction. The warped mind that constantly craves to gratify every whim of passion is like the maddened vulture that gnawed out Titius' liver time and time again. When purity is flayed alive and sex becomes a science, when the blessings of a family are neglected for the purchase of a Cadillac, when the bond of marriage is regarded as a temporary spree, when the filth of a pagan feast is portrayed behind the colorful jacket of a best seller, then, perhaps, the Senator has reason to weep.

But, fellow students, is weeping the answer? Is that all we are going to do? No; we know better than that. We know that our religion is a brave optimism that hopes in man because it believes in God. What are we going to do? We will fulfill our responsibilities by living as best we know how in the mystical body of Christ. For the mystical body is at the heart of all true Catholic action. I shall give three ways by which, I think, we students may really live in the mystical body of Christ.

First, we must realize that the sacrifice of the Mass is not just a Sunday morning prayer meeting where we donate a quarter and ardently hope that Father won't talk too long. It is not a devotion at which we take a merely passive interest in the age-old drama being enacted on the altar. But it is a living sacrifice in which we, the congregation, the priest, and Christ, offer the divine victim to God. Remember that at every moment, somewhere throughout the world, a sanctus bell chimes, a ray of light in all the darkness, and the faithful offer God to God.

But, fellow students, this is attending Mass; we must live the Mass. Look at the motley crew at the first sacrifice—Calvary. He died for them. Some of us are not even willing to live with them. We must not grade a man on the color of his skin but by the metal of his soul. We must think, pray, and live in the plural of we, us, our, and not in the narrow selfish—I, my, mine. This, fellow students, is living the Mass.

Our second responsibility is expressed in the words of St. Ignatius, "Age quod agis"—"Do what you are doing." At present our task is to get an education. Each man's soul is a container ranging in size from a thimble to a 500-gallon tank; our task is to fill that container. Some of us are thimbles, some tanks, and the fortunate are just middle-sized buckets. But remember that the full thimble is more precious to Christ than the half-filled tank.

By constant application to study we shall train ourselves so that one day Catholic truth and Catholic ideals may penetrate every corridor of life. We have enough so-called great men on whose tombstone could well be inscribed:

"Here lie the bones of Dr. Smythe,
He knew everything but the purpose of life."

We must prepare ourselves so that in the silently approaching future we are capable of fulfilling our mission—spreading and preaching Catholic action—as a lawyer, doctor, housewife, janitor, or farmer—the love and knowledge of Christ are needed everywhere. Well might we keep in mind the old words, "Learn as if you were to live always."

Our third obligation is to resist the temptations of these twentieth century demigods—the dollar bill and sense satisfaction.

A 32-inch television screen, a flashy sport coat, a souped-up hot rod, these are all very flattering to our ego. And a peacock-feathered hat, provided the feather be long enough, might possibly help us brush the gates of heaven, but it will never open them. For money is a means, not an end. If we use it to gain our heavenly goal, it is one of the greatest gifts we have. However if we use it merely to fill our wardrobe or our stomach, it were better we never owned a cent. We must not succumb to that modern heresy that the dollar is divine but must place our capital in the bank of Heaven—there will be no crash there.

The second demi-god is sense satisfaction. The sixth and ninth commandments were never so ignored as they are today. If we follow the maxim of eat, drink and be merry, it is not tomorrow we die—we are already dead. Will we trade in the peaceful quiet behind the sanctuary lamp for the voluptuous gaiety behind the neon one? Are we to exchange the majestic harmony of the liturgical chant for the impassioned downbeat of night club jazz? Will we, can we abandon the blue veil of Our Lady's purity for the black rags of modern vice?

Fellow students, you and only you can answer these questions. There is no middle road. For—

"To every man there opens
A high way and a low;
And some take the high way
And some men take the low;
And in between on the misty flats
The crowd moves to and fro.
But to every man there opens
A high way and a low;
And you must choose the way
You want your soul to go."

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, may I direct attention of the House to two thought-provoking columns in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 15; one by Mr. Andre Visson, and one by Mr. Stewart Alsop:

[From the Washington Post of April 15, 1951]

DIVISION OVER MACARTHUR

(By Andre Visson)

QUESTION OF STRATEGY

The dramatic dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur has stirred up such violent emotions that it has become almost impossible to analyze the sensational developments calmly and objectively. This, however, must be done if we want to evaluate its political impact on the future of this country and of the free world.

The first, natural reaction of the people in this country was to approach the MacArthur drama on either a partisan or human level. This was perhaps inevitable, since MacArthur and Truman are both standard-bearers of their respective parties. Moreover, MacArthur is one of the most striking personalities of our time.

Other great American generals—Eisenhower, Marshall, Bradley—are both leaders and common Americans. MacArthur is the only general—the only living American—who for millions of his countrymen has become the symbol of their Nation outside its borders. He is the only living American who has become the object of hero worship. He has been absent from this country for 15 years, but he has remained present in millions of American hearts.

His personality has many typically American characteristics. He is bold, fighting, uncompromising, impatient, and has an exceptional penchant for drama. All this, added to his striking physical appearance, has made him the great national hero. And if his military prestige has been somewhat impaired by the defeat at the Yalu River last November, following the imprudent announcement attributed to him that the boys would be "back for Christmas," he has now probably acquired the new prestige of a martyr.

All men of outstanding personality who cannot find their place in the conventional structure of modern society inevitably become controversial figures. France recently had a similar experience with General de Gaulle, and in the late nineteenth century with General Boulanger. But it is especially unfortunate when such men divide their nation as deeply as General MacArthur has done.

All thinking, patriotic Americans, whether Democrats or Republicans, are extremely unhappy over this division. But as human beings they find it hard to control their emotions. And when it comes to politics, they have a natural desire to turn this great national drama to their party's advantage.

The Democrats, even those who reproach President Truman for having waited until this dramatic denouncement became inevitable, are trying to present a united front in support of the President. The Republicans, even those who do not agree with all MacArthur's strategic conceptions, are trying to present a united front in support of MacArthur. But behind these human emotions and partisan passions are fundamental and vital issues. And these issues cannot be approached on an emotional plane.

The first fundamental issue is the supremacy of the civilian over the military in the American democracy. On this point, the overwhelming majority of Americans, if they could make themselves forget that the "civilian" is Truman, and the "military" is MacArthur, would undoubtedly agree that "of course, in our democracy the military must be subordinate to civilian authority." This is the view not only of civilians, but of all great American military leaders.

The second fundamental issue is the kind of strategy best suited at the present time to American interests and American possibilities. Here the views are divided.

MacArthur's strategy has been stated by him both privately and publicly: the strategic priority of Asia; the strengthening and defense of Formosa; the use of the Chinese Nationalist forces; the blockade of China; the bombing of Manchuria and, if necessary, other Chinese provinces. In other words, MacArthur—and his strategic views are shared by a certain fraction of Republicans—sincerely believes that the struggle against communism should be decided in Asia, even at the risk of an all-out war with China, and if need be with Soviet Russia.

The strategy of the administration has been different. And it is necessary to emphasize that this is not Mr. Truman's personal strategy. It is the strategy worked out by both his political advisers in the State Department and his military advisers in the Pentagon. It can be summed up as follows: The strategic priority of Europe; the containment of Communist expansion everywhere; fighting Communist aggression wherever possible, but trying to avoid an all-out war until Western Europe is strong enough to resist, with American aid, a Communist attack. As for Formosa, the view of the Pentagon has been that in a war it should be denied to the enemy, but that it is not strategically vital enough to start a world war for it.

Since these two strategies are in opposition, the conflict was inevitable. President Truman has emphasized that General MacArthur was dismissed because his strategy could lead to a world war. It can be assumed that this risk has now been reduced. But for how long? The answer can be given only by the Kremlin. What will be the next Communist move? Now that they have conclusive evidence of our desire not to carry the war to China, will they be willing to work out a compromise? Or, feeling secure in Manchuria, will they not make a new move in Indochina—a much richer prize than Korea?

Western Europe is relieved by MacArthur's dismissal. But responsible circles in Washington have the unhappy feeling that the end of fighting in Asia is not yet in sight.

[From the Washington Post of April 15, 1951]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

THE TIMING FAVORS MAC ARTHUR

It may well be that in choosing this particular time to dismiss General MacArthur, President Truman has chosen the best possible time—for MacArthur. It may even be that General MacArthur had just this in mind when he decided to force the issue. For it is clear that the outcome of the battle between the President and the general will be determined, in the end, not in Washington, but in Korea.

In dismissing MacArthur, President Truman has, of course, risked his political life. In the most unlikely event that the attempts to reach an acceptable settlement with the Chinese and their Soviet masters now succeed, and the fighting ends, Truman will enjoy a great historic triumph. If there is no settlement, but the expected Communist offensive is contained, the stalemate on the battlefield will be reflected in a stalemate between Truman and MacArthur.

But if the Communists again break through our lines; if this time the breakthrough is successfully exploited, and if our forces are seriously endangered, then disaster in Korea will be disaster also for Truman. For then the demand for attacking targets in China proper, for using Nationalist troops, and for fighting the war in Asia, which MacArthur wants, will become irresistible.

MacArthur will seem triumphantly vindicated, while Truman will appear the architect of national disaster. And as both Truman and MacArthur are certainly fully aware, the danger of a successful Communist offensive in Korea is now as great as it has ever been.

The best way to explain why the danger is now considered so serious is, oddly enough, to quote from a report cabled from Korea by this reporter's partner some months ago:

"The recurrent crises in the fighting here always took the form of a great hole being torn in our lines, and then being stopped by our mobile reserves being moved up before the walking enemy could exploit the break-through. But even two enemy intruder fighters, attacking the interminable lines of our transport * * * would have been enough to produce a 24-hour tangle. Then the holes in our line could not have been stopped in time. The break-throughs would then have been fully exploited. And we should have lost our foothold in Korea."

This pattern has held throughout the Korea fighting. Sheer weight of manpower has made possible numerous Communist breakthroughs, the most serious being the near-defeat after the Chinese intervention. But the Communist breakthroughs have

never in the end been fully exploited, because the Communists have lacked sufficient heavy weapons and mobility, and above all because they have lacked any offensive air power at all.

That is why reports that the Chinese are for the first time receiving important quantities of heavy weapons and transport from Soviet Siberian stocks are taken with deadly seriousness by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But what is taken even more seriously is the report that an offensive Communist air force is now being organized.

This force is believed to consist of about 500 Russian fighters and light bombers, manned by intensively trained Chinese and North Koreans. Such a force could not seriously challenge American air superiority. But given cloud cover during the Korean rainy season, and given the interdiction against attacking Manchurian bases, our Air Force cannot possibly prevent strafings and hit-and-run strikes behind our lines.

General Ridgway, who, rather than MacArthur, has actually been in full command of the United Nations forces in Korea for many weeks, is a brilliant field commander, and his troops are more battleworthy than ever before. Yet the danger of a successful enemy offensive is real, and it is a danger which might all but destroy President Truman, as Truman himself must know.

Infinitely more is at stake, of course, than the political fortunes of a Truman or a MacArthur. War, even a small war, has a sullen, imperious logic of its own. If an enemy offensive, supported by air power based in Manchuria, endangered our troops, the logic of war would demand the bombing of the Manchurian bases, however much Truman might wish to localize the conflict. This would logically lead in turn to the bombing of Chinese lines of communications, and cities. Then the Soviets would be forced to intervene openly, or accept the equivalent of an intolerable defeat.

Thus the logic of a small war leads to a great war. This logical progression toward world disaster cannot now be halted by Truman or MacArthur. It can be halted only if the men in the Kremlin decide to cut their losses in Korea, or if Ridgway and his men smash at the outset the offensive which is otherwise in prospect.

Post-Office Workers Should Get a Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the April 12 issue of the Cleveland Press, entitled "Post-Office Workers Should Get a Pay Raise."

POST-OFFICE WORKERS SHOULD GET A PAY RAISE

Postal workers are organized into unions but don't have the right to strike because they're Federal employees.

When they want a pay raise they have to appeal to Congress. But they aren't a strong lobby in Washington. They aren't in a position to swing the vote in any key States.

So, unless public opinion is on their side, Congress is likely to pass them up.

The starting wage of the highest-paid post-office employee, a clerk or carrier, is $2,670 a year. After 9 years they get $3,670, and after another 15 years the top-grade worker can earn $3,970.

Despite the pension and security that go with the job, this pay isn't enough to attract, keep, or satisfy the intelligent, reliable kind of employee the post office needs.

Bills have been introduced in the Senate and House to give postal employees a raise. The underpaid workers shouldn't be the goats of the big argument over postal rates and the Department's deficit.

They don't have parity to protect them from climbing living costs. They need and deserve that wage boost.

The MacArthur Ouster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article appearing in the April 21 issue of America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "The MacArthur Ouster":

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

From almost any angle you look at it, the storm now swirling around General MacArthur is deplorable. What remains of our national unity is in danger of being destroyed by the supercharged lightning flashes of emotion generated by personal and political partisanship. We discern but one hopeful ray in the lightning-riven clouds: If the controversy can be brought under control and carried on calmly on the basis of the issues involved, it may become the last great debate on United States foreign policy.

The one Herbert Hoover touched off 6 months ago, apparently settled by the Senate's troops-to-Europe resolution of April 4, dealt largely with our policy for Europe. Our far eastern policy, or lack of it, was not formally debated in the Senate. The MacArthur incident, for better or worse, has made such a discussion inevitable. We can only hope that it will be productive of a renewed national unity.

Already as Walter Lippmann observed in the curious case of Senator TAFT, there is confusion as to what General MacArthur meant in his now celebrated letter to Congressman MARTIN. The general, as the columnist pointed out, wanted more than permission to bomb Red China's Manchurian bases and to use the Formosa forces of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese mainland. The general wanted permission to wage all-out war against China. Contending that the global conflict with communism has already begun, the general argued that it could be won by defeating Red China. The way to save Europe, he wrote in effect, is to defeat communism in Asia.

That involves an almost complete reversal of our present policy. The United States and its allies have long since decided to concentrate on Europe while diverting the necessary minimum to prevent a Communist sweep in Asia. The fundamental issue is therefore clear-cut. Shall the United States abandon its present efforts to safeguard Europe and devote its resources chiefly to a full-scale war with Red China?

Those who join General MacArthur in an affirmative answer to this fateful question should not overlook these considerations:

1. If we decide to join the issue in Asia, we shall have to go it alone—our Atlantic allies, the Asian-Arab nations and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

2. Attacking China in the belief the U. S. S. R. will not come to her aid is not a calculated risk—it is the widest sort of gamble.

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the west, will be relatively ineffective in China. If we contemplate using them for atomic bombing, let us reflect that such bombing would have little military value, would infuriate all Asia and might invite Russian retaliation. Thus there is no hope of a short and cheap war.

4. Our long-neglected tactical air force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.

5. Even if Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take over an almost defenseless Europe, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. If we tempt Russia into a war for which we are still unprepared offensively, we shall expose our people to destruction, since our home defense system, both military and civil, is pitifully incomplete.

7. As the President emphasized in his address to the Nation on April 11, our present policy is designed to avoid world war III. Though it may fail, it furnishes a hope lacking in the MacArthur approach.

If these considerations are put forcibly to the American people, we believe that the last great debate will not be prolonged as its predecessor was, and that our people, finally satisfied that we are on the only course open to us, will then settle down to the supreme task of ensuring their security.

From Where I Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following column written by Dr. Harry Halpern, which appeared in the April 6, 1951, Bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center. It speaks volumes:

FROM WHERE I STAND

As I descended the steps to the subway station, a man walked in front of me carrying a small valise and an overcoat slung across his arm. He fell and I helped him get up. He brushed his clothes and said, "Thank you. It's very nice of you." It needed only a brief look to realize that he was drunk. We waited for the train and he began to talk with the trace of an Irish accent. Obviously he was not a common drunk. With the typical loquaciousness of the inebriate, he told me his life's story. He had taught Latin as a young man and had served in World War I. His quotations in Latin were well chosen and correct.

"It doesn't matter," he said, "whether a man knows how to square X—Y, or whether he talks many languages. It's being human that counts. I'm drunk and I know it. Yet I'm a better man than some lousy guy who hates others because they're black or Jewish or Catholic or anything else. Picking up a man when he falls is the biggest thing in life." He went on and on.

Engrossed in the conversation, I, together with my "friend" boarded the wrong train. We sat down together. Just then a white-bearded Jew approached me. "Does this train go to Utica Avenue?" he asked. I answered him and he sat down near me. "I'm still green here," he said, "and I don't know my way around." My Irish acquaintance gazed upon this patriarchal Jew. He asked me to translate what he was saying. "You know," he said, "that fellow looks like a character out of the Bible."

The old Jew told me how much he admired America. Here in the subway he wasn't lost because he found someone who could speak Yiddish. From the other side of me came the incessant talk of the Latin teacher. "You must be a lawyer," he said. I asked him how he knew. "Well," he said, "if you were a teacher you'd be in school. If you were a physician you'd be carrying your tools. You're not a salesman because you're reading a book on philosophy. So you must be a lawyer." I didn't contradict him.

So we rode together, the Irishman, the old Jew, and I. At Borough Hall the gentleman carrying his valise got up with me, "I'm getting off here," he said, "and you must have a drink on me." I told him I was busy and bid him farewell.

Many people have tried to define the spirit of America. But here was a definition found in no dictionary. The bearded Jew, a son of Erin, and I—this is America, a place where, "picking up a man when he falls" is considered one of the great, if not the greatest thing in life.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention of the House to the following excerpts from an article by the famous writer, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin. The article appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, April 15.

I should also like to call attention to an editorial from the same edition entitled "The MacArthur Storm." The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1951]

GENERAL RIDGWAY TAKES OVER IN A CRITICAL SITUATION—ENEMY IS PREPARING A BIG OFFENSIVE AND JAPANESE PROBLEMS ARE PRESSING

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

In Japan itself, the MacArthur retirement is almost certain to mean major staff changes. The Bataan crowd that has been with General MacArthur so many years is likely to retire; one of the MacArthur stalwarts—Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, the general's political and government adviser and close confident—is returning to the United States with MacArthur and already has applied for retirement. Another controversial figure on the staff, Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, intelligence officer, had been anxious to retire before the Korean War started, and is now almost certain to do so.

In addition to these and other extensive staff changes, there will be profound changes in methods with General Ridgway as the new Supreme Commander, Allied Powers, in Tokyo. General Ridgway is not a man to isolate and insulate himself, as did General MacArthur. MacArthur concerned himself only with the broadest problems of the occupation and our military policies; he rarely deviated from the beaten path between his Embassy quarters and the Dai Ichi Building; he had very few personal contacts with the Japanese (and only intermittent ones with others than those close to him on the staff) and he had little first-hand knowledge about Japan.

RIDGWAY'S JOB

Ridgway will want to see for himself; he will concern himself particularly with the maintenance of discipline and training in our military forces in Japan—standards which had fallen to a low ebb before Korea; and as a good disciplinarian, he will stamp out rackets and black marketing, which at periods and in places during the occupation flourished unchecked.

General Ridgway's designated relief in command of the Eighth Army, General Van Fleet, is an experienced division and corps commander from World War II, and he comes to Korea after postwar experience in Greece. This experience, where the general had to combine military knowledge with a hard-won appreciation of the intricacies of international and (Greek) domestic politics and of guerrilla warfare, should stand him in good stead in Korea, where both guerrillas and South Korean politics are major factors influencing the military campaign.

Staff changes under General Van Fleet in the Eighth Army are not likely to be major; the new commander will inherit the staff which supported the late Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker and General Ridgway. There may be some slow infiltration of new blood, but not quickly.

SMOOTHER RELATIONSHIPS

The principal change will be in smoother command and staff relationships with Tokyo. In the MacArthur regime one man was king, and there were no crown princes. MacArthur's staff—and quite possibly the "Old Man" himself—were jealous of too much publicity focused on any of his major subordinates. Moreover, Tokyo knew that Ridgway was a "Pentagon man." Prior to his arrival, Tokyo had been running the Korean War from hundreds of miles away; after his arrival the consolidation of command in Korea and General Ridgway's own quiet forcefulness led to a greater concentration of control in Korea. Undercover friction had, therefore, existed between Tokyo and Korea—though probably not on the MacArthur-Ridgway level—and this will now be largely eliminated.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1951]

THE MACARTHUR STORM

It is possible that by the time General MacArthur returns to the United States this week some of the initial fury of the storm raised by his dismissal will have blown itself out. From the standpoint of national unity in a time of grave trouble this is greatly to be desired. Calamity will have been added to the tragedy of the MacArthur case if high passion and partisan politics are permitted to turn this necessary disciplinary action into a national rift that cannot be closed in the face of danger. On the other hand, some good purpose will have been served if calm discussion of the really vital issues involved brings out a clearer policy in the United States and in the United Nations in respect to Korea and the rest of the Far East.

We believe that the majority of sober-minded Americans will agree that President Truman's action was justified in the light of the complete difference of opinion on Far Eastern policy between Washington and General MacArthur and the general's demonstrated unwillingness to accede to the decisions of his superiors. These same Americans may not be willing to agree that the action finally taken by the President was inevitable from the start. They may quite properly hold that wiser courses of action, taken earlier, would have made this final step unnecessary.

Moreover, we believe that most Americans will be unimpressed by the shouts of delight coming from various parts of the world over the general's dismissal. There is, inevitably, the uneasy suspicion in this country that at least some of this expression of joy has arisen from a desire to follow an appeasement policy toward Red China and the knowledge that General MacArthur was adamantly opposed to that appeasement.

The members of the United Nations who have been sighing with relief over the general's recall can justify their attitude only if they take a strong position on the issues which are still before them. If, on the other hand, they use his departure as the occasion to promote fresh and further concessions to the aggressors whom they have named, Americans will be right in their suspicion of motives.

Some of the criticism of General MacArthur has been based on the assumption or misapprehension that it was his personality and his opinions, and those alone, that stood in the way of a prompt settlement of the Korean issues. There has been the repeated implication that once he was out of the way the Chinese Communists and their Russian masters would immediately be ready to sit down in reasonableness and agree to an honorable peace. There is little ground for this sort of optimism. The most recent military news from Korea, indeed, would point in exactly the opposite direction.

It takes two parties to make an agreement. It takes some measure of good will and some desire for peace on both sides to have peace. The United Nations has repeatedly affirmed its desire for peace and its essential good will. Thus far there has been no sign that these sentiments are reciprocated. It is difficult to see how General MacArthur's departure will bring that reciprocity into being.

It is plain, however, that the Chinese Communists are interpreting this action in the case of the general as a sign of weakness and confusion. Since they assume that we are weak and confused, we may expect that their attitude toward a settlement now will be at least as arrogant as it has been in the past. They will demand, as the price for their halting their military attack on the United Nations, that they be rewarded by the grant of the island of Formosa and honored by an invitation to membership in the organization that they have attacked.

The storm that has been raised will, of course, force a reexamination of our far-eastern policies. In that reexamination it will be well for the United States and the United Nations to remember that the choice of peace or war lies now, as it has previously, in hands other than ours. Clarification on that point may be one good thing to come out of the present unhappy situation.

Izaak Walton Director Endorses Hall Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows the Izaak Walton League to be one of the foremost outdoor organizations in the country.

Therefore, support of the Hall bill, H. R. 3023, is materially strengthened with receipt of the following letter and

resolution from the league's national director, Mr. Burton H. Atwood:

ISAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Winnetka, Ill., April 14, 1951.

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I offer my congratulations for the introduction of H. R. 3023. It is so important to the rights of citizens that it should receive wide support.

Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed last week at the national convention of the Isaak Walton League. It steals some of your words because they so aptly describe the situation.

However, may I suggest that you give consideration to amending the bill to read "no citizen shall be required to register or license firearms. * * *" Such a change might prevent registration by the subterfuge of licensing.

Very truly yours,
BURTON H. ATWOOD,
National Director.

Resolution 6

Whereas our founding fathers wisely incorporated within the Constitution of the United States the inherent privilege of our citizens to protect their hearths and homes by possessing arms; and

Whereas in the several States the revival of tyranny is asserting itself in the form of proposals to register all legally owned weapons: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Isaak Walton League of America, Inc., in convention assembled at Cincinnati, Ohio, April 5–7, 1951, That no citizen shall be compelled to register, or license, legal firearms which he is in lawful possession of; and be it further

Resolved, That no Federal, State, or local officers shall have the power to seize firearms belonging to private citizens who legally possess and use them.

Are We a Nation of Dopes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems a tragic shame that Great Britain has been able for so many years, to dictate American foreign policy in the Far East.

The removal of General MacArthur from supreme command in the Pacific gives the Communists more cause for rejoicing than the abdication of the Mikado. Everybody knows MacArthur is the symbol of American strength in the Orient.

The British have long feared that MacArthur's program of winning the Korean war would sound the death knell to their flourishing opium trade. Six hundred million Chinese are addicted wholly, or in part, to the use of opium, because Lord Sassoon forced them into opium dens a century ago.

Hong Kong is the dope capital of the world and harbors the dregs of society, ruled over by a handful of little dictators.

The British have a secret deal with Communist China. The Red government will let Lord Sassoon sell his opium to the Chinese, if Britain will throw a monkey wrench into the MacArthur program of victory for America.

Is the United States to be a sovereign Government with an American policy toward the Commies without tthe British telling us to surrender to them? Or should we reenter the British sphere of influence and flood our own markets and submit our own people to the influence of Britain's billion dollar, going concern of opium peddling?

If we give up without a fight, we are a Nation of dopes, stupid from the pipe dreams of British opium clouds.

Farm Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the annual convention of the National Independent Meat Packers' Association, at Chicago, Ill., April 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR., CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION AT CHICAGO, ILL.

I am delighted and honored to meet with you in Chicago today. As independent meat packers you represent both a vital defense industry and an American ideal. Meat packing is essential to building national strength—the strength we must have to meet the challenge to our freedom—the strength we hope will lead to world peace. The American ideal is the free enterprise system under which your industry was made possible and under which it has prospered and developed.

Freedom to make our own decisions—by that I mean independence of thought and action—has been the cornerstone upon which we have built our great community. It was for this freedom that the signers of the Declaration of Independence mutually pledged their lives and the future of the Nation they created. Today we should all make the same pledge, to each other and to America.

Under this freedom our Nation has become great. Under this freedom our people enjoy the greatest blessings on earth. We are the best fed, the most adequately clothed and housed, and the least-governed people on earth. And we have reached such heights through the freedom of our private enterprise system, a system in which initiative is encouraged, not hampered, by government.

The very fact that we have achieved so much, places a tremendous responsibility on our shoulders. We have become the citadel of democracy. All the free peoples of the world look to us to help defend and nourish the freedom we cherish for ourselves and for them. But at least one group is out to destroy our way of life. Through brute force and by the instillation of fear, its leaders seek to stamp out the torch of freedom wherever it burns.

The liberty-loving people of the world should know that all we ask is that in the name of freedom the people of each country should be given the opportunity to have a government of their own free choice.

We all want peace. We are now enlarging our military force in the hope that by becoming strong we will deter further aggression, and as a result bring lasting peace. We hold membership in the United Nations because we believe this organization offers the best and perhaps the only way to peace. The United Nations is yet young and undernourished. It needs the solid food of confidence and trust amongst its members. I feel that our Nation has contributed its share of these. Would that other nations had done as well.

On Sunday, June 25, 1950, the Communist forces of North Korea crossed the thirty-eighth parallel. This open act of aggression challenged the very existence of the United Nations. If we backed down, which country might be next? Would we not be repeating the errors that preceded World War II? What of Manchuria, Ethiopia, and Poland? When do you put out a fire? Do you try to get it under control while it is small or wait until it is burning the roof over your head? We learned the answer the hard way, and a million American casualties will prove it.

The Korean situation may yet result in a blessing in disguise. It shocked us into the realization that the Communists are determined to stamp out the concept of freedom from the mind of man. It awakened us to our own weaknesses and pointed out sharply our basic unpreparedness. We had drifted into the old American brand of complacency and we were laying ourselves wide open to attack. Like Rip Van Winkle, we slumbered without realizing it. But now, finally awakened, we have set out to build our national strength, having learned that force is the only language understood in the Kremlin. We are a long way from being out of danger, but we are making exceptional progress. We are still confronted with the problem of some countries allied with us but continuing to supply Red China with war material. That must be stopped if the free peoples of the world are to prevail.

Even here in this country we are divided as to just how our strength should be used. When the decision was made to stand up to the Communists in Korea there was a shout of "bravo." "It's about time," was the comment everywhere. But a few months later, when reverses set us back, the doubters began to cry that we should never have gone into Korea. We should get out and come back home. Let the other freedom-loving people of the world stand by themselves. Let us violate the pledge made by the United Nations, they said.

If anyone can think of a better way to turn the world over to the Communists than by pulling out of Korea, I'd like to know what it is. The Kremlin expected us to follow the course advocated by the doubters.

All this hesitation and indecision gives just that much more encouragement to the aggressors. We should leave the question of deploying our military forces to military leaders. Check the list: Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley, Collins, Sherman, Vandenberg, and many others. I have faith in them. They are men who have proved their worth. They led our troops to victory in World War II.

But we cannot stand alone. Other freedom-loving peoples should not expect us to carry the full load. They may not be able to do all that should be done, but if they will do their best, it is all we can ask of them.

I think we should stand up for what we believe to be right and let Russia know that we mean business. We must impress upon her that we are not going to permit further aggressive moves by her satellites. If we warn Russia that we will construe such moves as aggression by the Kremlin itself, then there is a good chance for peace. But backing up and compromising our position on the issues of freedom will only lead to further aggression.

It is indeed fortunate that we are entering this period of great emergency in a strong economic position. When the Korean trouble began last June, all of our major economic groups—agriculture, industry, and labor—were in a comparatively sound and healthy state. Industrial production was high and has since gone even higher, making it possible so far to not only supply our defense needs but at the same time produce an almost normal stream of consumer goods. Unemployment is on the wane.

Agriculture is in an exceptionally strong position. Financially, farmers are in good shape, despite a postwar decline in income, and they have the capital or can obtain it, to finance the increased production that is needed. Several years of intensive conservation programs have greatly strengthened the Nation's farm economy, and the reserves in the soil are bolstered by substantial reserves in our granaries. These grain reserves have been a godsend. They are the direct result of the price-support provisions of the farm program, provisions that have enabled us to store for later use a supply of our basic commodities produced over and above immediate needs.

But we must not take this agricultural strength for granted. You who process meat have a direct stake in the ability of agriculture to produce and to prosper. Not so long ago I had an opportunity to visit the Middle East, and what I saw there made a deep impression on me. Centuries ago the people who lived along the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers undoubtedly felt that nothing could disrupt their agricultural productivity. How wrong they were. And how poor their economy eventually became is apparent throughout the area—and all because of the loss of soil fertility. An area that once supported 25 or 30 million people now gives a bare existence to a scant 3,000,000. Some historians say that ancient Persia could at one time support agriculturally an estimated 105,000,000 people. Now, at most, not over 15,000,000 exist there. Proper conservation practices could have averted this catastrophe.

Surely this experience of an older nation holds a striking lesson for our own people. We cannot take our great heritage of rich soil for granted. It is the basic source of our national strength. The rich and productive soil provides the tremendous quantities of all varieties of food and fiber that are so vital to our existence. We must take all necessary steps to insure its continued productivity.

And right now in our whole agricultural picture, nothing is more important than a continued high level of production of the commodity that you deal in—meat. Meat is the basic ingredient of our Nation's diet. It provides essential quantities of the protein, fat, iron, thiamin, and other important dietary items that make up our high standard of living. Your industry—the packing industry—is a vital link in the chain of our meat supply. It performs the service of processing and moving large quantities of meat on its way to the consumer.

In addition to this, your industry supplies byproducts that are vitally needed, and which today—in this time of emergency—are doubly important. Insulin, for example, the drug that means life to a half million diabetics, comes from meat animals. I was surprised to learn—as even some of you may be—that it requires 20,000 animals to produce 1 pound of this life-saving drug. In addition to insulin, the new healer, ACTH, and scores of other life-giving pharmaceuticals are obtained from various glands of meat animals. From facts such as these, the public can obtain some slight conception of the importance of even this secondary aspect of your industry.

The pituitary glands from 400,000 hogs are required to provide 1 pound of ACTH. Nor does the contribution of the pig, the steer, and the sheep, to our welfare end with a constant flow of these vital miracle drugs from the packer. All of us, in our everyday life, are in almost continuous contact with such well-known products as lard, leather, soaps, gelatin, glycerin, tallow, casings, and fertilizer—which are derived through the packers' operations.

Yes; yours is a great industry—one that has made and will continue to make a great contribution to our country's welfare.

I might add, incidentally, that my own interest in your industry goes back many years. As a young lawyer, in my first trip out through the country, just before World War I, I visited packing plants in Chicago and saw at first hand the operations of these plants as they were carried out at that time. Even before this, as a college student, I worked as a harvest hand in the wheat fields of Oklahoma and other States to the north. I remember my interest in the livestock yards and packing plants at Omaha, and I have a vivid recollection of the large herds of cattle that roamed the ranges of the great cattle States. I have not lost that early and basic interest in this phase of agriculture, and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I find that these early experiences give me a better perspective on the varied problems that concern our great agricultural Nation.

One thing that we have learned over the years is that more income in the hands of more and more people means more and more money spent for food. Meat, perhaps to a greater extent than any other agricultural commodity, is directly affected by increased spending power. People will buy meat and more meat if they have the wherewithal to do so. They are buying larger quantities of meat now than 10 years ago, because buying power has been given to millions who, not too many years back, were among the unemployed. Our national buying power has been spread out, and these new income earners are all potential customers for meat. As they get regular work and regular incomes, the demand for meat increases.

The result of all this is that even an estimated 148 pounds of meat available per capita this year will not be enough to prevent inflationary pressures from developing. This means that production must be raised to even higher levels. What is needed is the maximum production of meat animals consistent with available feed and forage supplies.

Fortunately, we have large reserves of grain, particularly corn, that are providing feed for livestock. But we must look ahead to future years, and statistics show that we are currently using up our feeds at a faster rate than we are producing them. To meet this situation, the United States Department of Agriculture is urging farmers to do everything possible to increase corn production this year, and so provide the increased feed supplies that are essential for our meat, dairy, and poultry industries.

As a further step toward bringing feed supplies into better balance with needed livestock production, we must also do everything possible to husband the feed supplies now on hand. Making the most efficient use of these feed supplies is important to all of us. It is important to you as processors because I know that you would be the first to recognize the hardship of a forced liquidation of livestock, brought on by a feed shortage. We must do everything we can to prevent that.

Because production of livestock is vitally important, nothing should be allowed to interfere with it. I have opposed price ceilings on livestock for this reason. I believe that if price ceilings on agricultural commodities are necessary to fight inflation, they should be imposed as near the final product as possible. Any action taken that would result in lowered meat production will come back to haunt us a hundredfold.

I am basically opposed to ceilings on any raw agricultural product when we need increased production. Increased production in itself will solve the problem in time. That can be attained, provided we do not shackle incentive by restrictive regulations. A price ceiling tends to offset incentive, and should be avoided as long as there are other and safer ways of achieving the same effect in fighting inflation. I might add—for your information—that when the time comes to renew the current defense production authority, I intend to take steps to limit the scope of the act with respect to raw agricultural products.

Naturally some controls are needed in the emergency confronting us. But—and this is basic—we don't want to hamstring our economy with a lot of unnecessary controls. I intend to scrutinize closely all new proposals from bureaucrats whose only answer to a difficult problem is to slap on additional governmental regulations.

As I said, some controls are needed in an emergency. During the last war we had a lot of controls in the livestock and meat industry. They seemed to be needed then, and we imposed rationing, price controls, slaughter controls, set-asides, and subsidies. We ended up, however, with black markets. I hope that we have learned a lesson from the troubles we had during that period.

The situation is quite different this time. For one thing, we are starting from a higher level of production and we are not yet engaged in an all-out mobilization effort. In fact, quite the reverse is true, in that we are trying to preserve our strength in preparation for whatever may lie ahead, whether it be a year from now or 10 years hence.

Slaughter controls have already been announced, and I think this is a good move. Such controls, if properly handled, will keep fly-by-night operators out of business. It is essential, too, that consumers everywhere get fair and proper distribution of meat, and slaughter controls are one of the methods that, if properly administered, can help assure this. Furthermore, these controls are designed to keep slaughtering within legitimate channels, so that all of the important byproducts will be recovered and utilized. In substance, I feel that we need some control measures to protect consumers and the economy as a whole, but my underlying philosophy here is: Let us not have any unnecessary regimentation.

Your own industry can help a lot in this situation by instituting a bit of self-policing. For example: if you refuse to take undue advantage of a favorable price situation that will work hardship on others—you may be able to make the case against price ceilings more acceptable to the average consumer. You in the meat industry are in the middle of this problem. Your product has triggered much of the public support for price controls. I'm not going to say that the price rises that brought the demand for controls were solely due to actions of the meat industry, but I do feel that more self-restraint at the proper time might have headed off some of this price pressure.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been making a study of various food prices. We have gathered some interesting material from figures obtained from retailers and from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Such statistics as these, for example: Between the latter part of January 1950 and January, 1951, the price of good grade steers (now called choice) increased about 17 percent at Chicago. During the same period, the wholesale price of comparable carcass beef increased 20 percent, and the average price of several retail cuts went up 31 percent in the Washington area and 26 percent in eight representative cities.

During the same period, the part the farmer received of the consumer's dollar spent for beef dropped from 75 cents in January 1950 to 71 cents in January 1951. I might add that material gathered in other fields showed somewhat the same conclusions.

Along this line I hope that the large packers will not take advantage of the present situation and do anything which would serve to drive smaller packers to the wall. This national crisis must not be used as an opportunity for the big packer to put the small packers out of business. This would be most unfortunate for the welfare of our country. The smaller independent businesses are essential to our free economy. One thing that we all must watch out for is the danger of too much concentration on big operations, whether they are in big business or in big government. There are inherent evils in both. Efficiency, as reflected in big business, can be very attractive, but it can also be dangerous in a democracy such as ours.

We have seen the danger signs of large-scale operations in agricultural production. We have seen communities where the small farmer has been squeezed by mammoth commercial operations, and I want to say that I am in full agreement with statements recently made by the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants regarding the need for more positive help in maintaining the family-sized farm as a fundamental part of American agriculture.

One hundred years ago about 85 percent of the people in this country tilled the soil, while the remainder lived in towns and cities and were occupied in industry. Today the reverse is true. And this trend away from the farms continues. In part, this movement into the cities is inevitable, the natural result of our tremendous industrial development in the last hundred years. But we must see to it that the industrial growth that has drawn so many of our farm youth to the cities does not eventually take over American farming. Our farms and our farm families are the primary bulwarks of our democracy, and we must insure them against extinction. The tradition of the American farm is part and parcel of the spirit of America.

Back before the First World War my late father was a sugarcane planter. His operations supported many families. In order to operate the farm, about 125 laborers were required during harvest time. He needed 12 wagons with 4 mules each and a large number of cane loaders. Today my brother and a cousin operate this same farm, with 3 tractors and 12 workers. One harvesting machine, operated by 2 men, takes the place of 80 laborers, and 1 cane loading machine, run by 1 man, does the work of 16 cane loaders. It cost my father, before World War I, about a dollar per ton to harvest and load cane on cars, in contrast to the 85 cents per ton that present operations require.

I have a farm of my own, but it is too small to operate mechanically. I grow some sugarcane, and my cost of harvesting is more than double that of my brother. Obviously, I am at a disadvantage to compete with him in these operations. But nonetheless, there must continue to be a place for small operators in American agriculture. The same truth applies, I am sure, to the small packer.

I mentioned the fact earlier that agriculture was in a strong position when this emergency developed. This means much to the Nation, and we should all realize that this didn't happen just by accident. Sound farm programs through the years have built this strength. Certainly it means a lot to your industry, which is so directly dependent on productive agriculture.

I sponsored the basic farm legislation which made our present farm programs possible. I am very proud of that fact. In 1937, when I first came to the Senate, my first major assignment was to serve on a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, created for the purpose of holding hearings pertaining to our farm problem. It will be recalled that the basic act of 1933 had been declared unconstitutional. In drafting legislation to replace the 1933 act, we decided on a new technique. Instead of having farm leaders come to committee hearings in Washington, we decided to take the hearings to the farmers throughout the country. The hearings that we held at these grass roots formed the basis of our present program.

Ten years later, I was again selected, with others, to make a further study to determine how the program had worked and whether it needed improvement. It was my privilege to again hear as witnesses many of the farmers who had testified 10 years previously, and it warmed my heart to hear them say, almost in unison, everywhere we went, "Senators, we are satisfied with what we have. Unless you can give us something better, let well enough alone."

There has been too much loose talk lately about farmers having an unfair advantage in current defense laws and otherwise. That farmers have an unfair advantage is just not a fact. The farmer is entitled, like everyone else, to a fair price for his products. If prices for certain of his commodities are forced to stay below a fair parity figure, we are inviting trouble in the form of an unbalanced or dislocated production later on. Net income of farm operators dropped from almost $18,000,000,000 in 1947 to sixteen and five-tenths billion in 1948, to fourteen billion in 1949, and to thirteen billion in 1950.

The farmer is asking only for a fair break. In the period just before the Korean attack, no other major segment of our economy went through so severe an economic set-back as did agriculture. Both corporate profits after taxes and hourly earnings of factory workers are well above the 1947 level. Corporate profits, after a small decline, have now climbed up to new records and are running 32 percent above the 1947 figure. Similarly, hourly earnings of factory workers in 1950 were 18 percent above the 1947 level. And yet the farmers, as certain interests would have you believe, is the villain. It just isn't so.

We must continue a sound price-support structure for agriculture. I, for one, will have no part of the thinking that this is the time to do away with these farm programs, or to give up the parity-price concept of fair returns.

The Defense Production Act contains a provision that ceiling prices cannot be placed on agricultural commodities at a level below parity, or below the prices farmers received during the month before Korea—whichever is higher. There have been suggestions that this provision should be removed or modified. There have also been suggestions that the parity level should be frozen as of some definite date, and not permit any adjustments after that date no matter how much prices might increase for the things a farmer has to buy.

In my opinion, it would be a fatal mistake to destroy the parity principle in that way. Parity is the measuring stick of fair returns for farmers. It is the assurance that he can pay his costs of production and stay in business, producing at the high levels demanded by the emergency.

The provisions in the present Defense Production Act are almost identical to those under which OPA operated during World War II. The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, provided that no maximum prices should be established at less than the higher of parity or prices in a base period. Let us not get stampeded into giving up agriculture's basic protections. The whole economy will suffer if we do. And as a matter of fact, it has been estimated that the cost of living index would go up less than 2 percent if all farm commodities now below parity were automatically brought up to the parity level.

I understand that you men in the meat packing business are still in relatively good shape with regard to materials and facilities needed to continue your operations. Reports show that few requests have been received from your industry for assistance from the National Production Authority. Apparently you have not been having as much trouble as some other industries.

We know, however, that shortages of certain critical materials you use can be expected as we move further along with the national mobilization effort. And we know that you must have repair and replacement parts for grinders, boilers, motors, canning lines—and all the other equipment of a modern packing plant. Shortages of steel—and particularly stainless steel—probably will be felt first.

To prepare for what may lie ahead, the Department of Agriculture has cooperated with the American Meat Institute in working out the requirements of the packing industry for the rest of this year and the first part of 1952. These requirements are presented to the National Production Authority.

The Department of Agriculture acts as a claimant before NPA and other Government agencies, supporting the requests of farmers and the food industry for the scarce items they must have. It does everything it can to head off shortages. It will not be possible, however, for this claimant work to be fully effective until a program similar to the controlled-materials plan of World War II is in operation. Such a plan, which I understand NPA expects to have in effect this summer, will make possible definite allocations of scarce basic materials for various users—including food processors.

Meanwhile, Department officials who are representing agriculture and its related industries before NPA report that they are receiving full cooperation. A good illustration is the recent amendment to the tin order (NPA M-25) which makes tin cans available to perishable-food processors. Under this amendment, cans will be available in unlimited amounts—or at 100 percent of the base period—for almost all canned meats except prepared chicken and scrapple. We must keep driving for this sort of consideration for the vital food production and processing industries.

The emergency we face is very real and very serious. Only the future will reveal the extent to which we will have to expand our economy and tighten our belts on the civilian front. We can and we will win the struggle, however long it may require, if only we protect and encourage our private enterprise system, and avoid throwing needless bureaucratic road blocks in its way. We should provide Government help where it is appropriate and needed, but we must impose only those controls which are necessary.

It is essential that we rely primarily on the democratic system of free enterprise that has made us the greatest productive force on earth.

America's productive might should give any would-be aggressor pause to stop and think. Let us hope that we will not be compelled to expend our energies and our life-blood in the fighting of another cruel world war. Instead, let us continue to protect, develop, and conserve our resources, and at the same time expand our industrial might. Let us make these United States a better place in which to live, and a source from which the light of freedom can shine undimmed throughout the world.

Proposed Alliance Between Democrats of the South and Republicans of the North

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio interview of myself by Bert Andrews, of the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. This is Bert Andrews, reporting from Washington.

A new investigation is about to get under way. It will begin in Jackson, Miss., on Monday, and it will deal with charges that Federal jobs were sold pretty freely there—to people who had the money to pay for them. Some of the jobs were in the new price-control set-up. Some of them were post-office jobs. With me tonight is a member of the subcommittee that will do the investigating—a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. He is Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota. We're going to talk about the up-coming investigation—and about Senator MUNDT's belief that a true alliance ought to be formed among Republicans—and among Democrats who think the way Republicans do. First, Senator MUNDT, what do you think will be turned up in the hearings that will begin in Jackson, Miss., on Monday?

Senator MUNDT. First, I'd like to point out, Mr. Andrews, that none of the members of the Mississippi delegation in the Senate and the House are involved in any way in these charges. As a matter of fact, all the members of the delegation have been very helpful in bringing evidence before our committee and in suggesting leads for our field investigators in Mississippi—so the investigators could dig out the facts. What we have here is an outgrowth of the presidential campaign of 1948 in which Mississippi cast its electoral votes for the Dixiecrats. That naturally didn't set too well with the Truman administration and the Democratic National Committee here in Washington.

Mr. ANDREWS. And as I understand it, one of the results was that the national Democratic administration did what could be expected in such a case—they decided to cut patronage off from the Dixiecrats.

Senator MUNDT. Yes; and the Administration established a State Democratic patronage committee of its own selection down in Mississippi, with headquarters in Jackson. It wasn't long before rumors began to fly that jobs were being handed out—at a price. And it wasn't much longer before those rumors began to solidify into facts that seemed to warrant a thorough investigation. Our committee first heard of it when Senator EASTLAND and Senator STENNIS—both of Mississippi—put some evidence before us in executive session. They placed evidence and affidavits before us, citing specific cases where jobs had been offered for sale. This evidence came from individuals who—as good honest citizens—refused to try to buy Federal jobs.

Mr. ANDREWS. Can you tell me how many examples of that practice were supplied to the committee, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I presume the initial evidence furnished by the two Senators from Mississippi related to 10 or a dozen cases. Since then, our field investigators have discovered quite a number of additional cases. All of this will be made a matter of public record at the hearings which will open in Jackson on Monday.

Mr. ANDREWS. You emphasized, Senator MUNDT, that the Mississippi Senators and Congressmen were not involved in this matter in any way. But I know enough about politics to assume that any matters dealing with Federal patronage stem in some way from somebody in Washington. Do you have any idea who in Washington may be mentioned in the hearings?

Senator MUNDT. Keep in mind, Mr. Andrews, that the spadework thus far has been done by investigators for the committee, as is the custom in such inquiries. Senator HOEY, of North Carolina, and Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and I haven't had the opportunity of studying the field reports as yet. We'll go over them when we get to Jackson—go over with the chief investigator, Mr. Flanigan. Until then, I can only guess as to what names will come out. But I would imagine that we'll run into some of the usual influence peddlers in Washington who are willing to sell their country short even when our boys are dying in Korea. I'll tell you, Mr. Andrews, that if we don't clean up some of these messes our way of life may be destroyed by these slimy creatures who undermine it from within. I think their practices are pretty sickening and before these investigations are over I expect some of them to land where they belong—in the Federal penitentiary.

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, since you're going to head south, Senator MUNDT, let's talk about another subject on which you have expressed some interesting ideas. I mean your suggestion for an alliance between the Republican Party and the Democrats who shy away from the regular Democratic Party. Do you think it's a really workable idea?

Senator MUNDT. I have no doubt at all that the idea of forming a formal alliance between the Democrats of the South who believe in States rights and oppose state socialism—and the Republicans of the North—is feasible. In the main, northern Republicans share many of the basic political and economic convictions of the antiadministration southern Democrats. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that in the Congress—for the past 15 years—southern Democrats and Republicans have joined together time after time to defeat the major encroachments of big government and many of the moves that would take us down the road to socialism.

Mr. ANDREWS. What would be the primary purpose of this working alliance, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. It's primary objective would be to develop a political formula by which the voters who support these Members of Congress who think alike and who vote alike, regardless of party lines, could vote for the same candidate for President. That would give us an administration in the White House and a Congress which could work in harmony for the preservation of private enterprise and States' rights in this country.

Mr. ANDREWS. We were speaking, Senator MUNDT, of your belief that an alliance of Republicans and southern Democrats could be made to work, and could nominate and elect a President of its own choice in 1952. Let's look at it concretely—what is the first step that would have to be taken?

Senator MUNDT. Well, Mr. Andrews, here is what I have proposed in a great many speeches in the South and in several talks in New York, Pennsylvania, and other northern points. First, I think it is a perectly safe political prediction that the next national Democratic convention will either nominate President Truman for another term or somebody to the left of him—somebody even more inclined to favor socialistic enterprises, the break-down of State's rights, and the build-up of an all-powerful Federal Government. I base this prediction on the fact that those controlling the Democratic Party today have found it politically profitable and successful to write a platform and to nominate a candidate that will appeal to the pressure groups and the big city Democratic machine organizations. They simply ignore the desires and the ideals of southern Democrats in the belief that southern voters will continue to support the Democratic Party regardless.

Mr. ANDREWS. But that isn't quite responsive to my question, Senator MUNDT. My question is: What is the first step that would have to be taken to set up an alliance such as you suggest?

Senator MUNDT. Let me answer that question directly, Mr. Andrews. The first step would be a sort of declaration of independence by southern Democrats such as they engaged in at the 1948 National Democratic Convention. If President Truman or somebody to the left of him is nominated in 1952, I would expect many of them to walk out of the Democratic Convention. That would set the stage for the operation of the alliance I have in mind. I would suggest that a group of southern leaders would then send a committee to the Republican Convention—which, I hope, this time will be held after the Democratic Convention—and suggest a panel of candidates whom they would be willing to support. Candidates recommended from among both Republican and Democratic prospects.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does that mean that holding the Republican Convention after the Democratic Convention is an essential part of your proposal, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. Not exactly, Mr. Andrews. I think it would be helpful since it would permit the dissatisfied and unhappy delegates from the Democratic Convention to have a voice in suggesting a panel of acceptable candidates. However, should the Republican National Committee insist on holding its convention first once more, a pre-convention caucus or meeting could still be arranged with representatives of the Southern group because by convention time it should be clear as to just what type of Democratic Presidential candidate is likely to emerge from the convention.

Mr. ANDREWS. You spoke of dissatisfied and unhappy Democratic delegates and you were talking about the coming conventions. So you sound as though you were pretty sure that there will be some such Democrats who will be unhappy after their convention and completely dissatisfied. Are you suggesting that they ought to declare themselves now?

Senator MUNDT. Yes; that would certainly be helpful, Mr. Andrews. As a matter of

fact, Governor Byrnes, of South Carolina, has rather clearly indicated his dissatisfaction with the trends of the Truman administration. Obviously, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has done the same. I am hopeful that before convention time a considerable number of courageous leading Democrats from the South—both in and out of public life—will declare themselves as being willing to help formulate an effective alliance between Democrats with their point of view and the Republican effort to stop today's mad march toward the all-powerful state and national socialism.

Mr. ANDREWS. You say you are hopeful, Senator MUNDT; have you received any evidence that such hopes might be realized?

Senator MUNDT. Indeed, I have, Mr. Andrews. My office has received over 500 letters from 39 different States. Fully 300 of these letters have come from the South, and I am frank to say I have been both surprised and gratified at the great support that this movement has in the States south of the Mason and Dixon's line. But as a former reporter, myself, Mr. Andrews, let me throw that question back at you. You have a Democrat on your program one week and a Republican on the next week. You are completely fair in alternating them and in your questions. Do you believe that all Democrats are Truman Democrats or have you detected signs of dissatisfaction among those that you have interviewed?

Mr. ANDREWS. After all, Senator MUNDT, I do the questioning and let the listeners make up their minds. However, since you asked me I would say that there are both Truman and anti-Truman Democrats just as there are pro-Taft and anti-Taft Republicans.

For one final question, Senator MUNDT—do you, as a Republican, really believe that there is danger of this country going down the road to socialism as you said earlier or are you just talking as a Republican?

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Andrews, I am completely serious and sincere in my fear that unless we can elect a national administration that will respect individual enterprise and States rights we may end up with a Socialist government just as was the experience of Great Britain. Britain—as the evidence clearly shows—went Socialist because in that country those opposing it were divided into two different groups just as is the case in America today. For example, had there been no Liberal Party candidates in the field in the last British election, the records show that the anti-Socialists would have elected a majority of 29 in the House of Commons. If that had happened, Britain would never have nationalized steel and, as you know, the nationalization of steel is really the final step to socialism in an economy based on modern industry.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 14, 1951, Washington celebrates with another of its famous Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners.

The following quotation from Thomas Jefferson is most appropriate today:

Reading, reflection, and time have convinced me that the interests of society require the observation of those moral precepts only in which all religions agree (for all forbid us to murder, steal, plunder, or bear false witness), and that we should not intermeddle with the particular dogmas in which all religions differ, and which are totally unconnected with morality. In all of them we see good men, and as many in one as another. The varieties in the structure and action of the human mind as in those of the body, are the work of our Creator, against which it cannot be a religious duty to erect the standard of uniformity.

Assignment of American Ground Troops to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address on the subject It's Not War; It's Not Peace, delivered by me at a meeting of the League of Women Voters in New York City on Saturday, April 14, 1951, and broadcast over the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last week's action by the United States Senate in finally determining Senate policy with regard to the assignment of American ground troops to Europe would demonstrate that the title of my remarks today was a potent factor in the Senate's deliberations.

One group in the Senate has seemed to argue that we are at peace because no declaration of war has been made by the Congress and that, regardless of any amount of fighting which may be involved, no condition of war can exist until a formal declaration to that effect has been made by the Congress. Another Senate group has seemed to argue just as ardently that war itself is a condition and a fact and that when this condition and this fact exist, there is war, regardless of congressional attitude concerning the matter.

Today we seem to be at peace only to the extent that Soviet Russia has not yet seen fit to make a direct attack upon us or our allies, and that a declaration of war itself has not been made by ourselves or by our allies or by Soviet Russia. In every other way, the evidence points strongly to an actual condition of war at the present time.

Surely the violent fighting which has occurred in Korea and the heavy casualties we have suffered there over the past 9 or 10 months cannot be construed by any stretch of the imagination to be acts of peace. Whether or not the United States forces are fighting there as a component part of the forces of the United Nations in a so-called police action, they are fighting, nevertheless, in our own interest and for our own defense against the armies of Red China. Very large numbers of Americans—in the air, on the sea, and on the land—have been and are participating in a growing war for the defense of ourselves and the protection of our free institutions, as well as for the defense of other free nations and free institutions everywhere. The fact that, as a member of the United Nations, we are thus participating in war, makes war itself no less a reality.

In the European theater, Russian strategy thus far has not called for a hot war. The difference between a cold war and a hot war is merely a difference of degree and severity. The motive, the intent, the purpose, and the objective in both types of war are identical.

The very fact that, during the period since the close of World War II, Soviet Russia has been devoting her chief effort to the building of armament and the raising of armies, while the free world has been disarming and struggling to rehabilitate its peoples and to restore its economies as preliminary steps to the restoration of peace and freedom everywhere, is indicative of the sinister purpose of the Soviets. The very fact that, during this same period, through intrigue and subterfuge and infiltration, Soviet Russia has been pursuing a course of aggression and conquest among her neighbors, provides further conclusive evidence of her diabolical intent. The very fact that, by obstructive tactics, Soviet Russia has conspired with her satellites to make the United Nations virtually impotent and to frustrate its every effort to preserve peace and to establish security against aggression and attack for every nation on earth, offers undeniable proof that Soviet Russia intends to conquer the world and to destroy all freedom and to employ to this end every effective device at her command.

And so, for the sake of self-preservation, the free nations of the world have been forced to take defensive action. The Marshall plan was undertaken and the North Atlantic Treaty was effectuated. And now, under the terms of that treaty, the United States is in the process of implementing it by sending additional Armed Forces to Europe.

There may be some who regard these activities as belonging to a regime of peace, but in a very real sense they are a planned maneuver against the armed attack which threatens. There may be some who regard these military operations as belonging to the ways of peace and I wish that this were so, and I pray that it may be so. But no longer can there be doubt that these defensive maneuvers are calculated to provide an effective fighting resistance if and when the freedom and independence of our European allies are challenged by Soviet Russia through the medium of armed conflict.

As long as there remains in the world an aggressor as powerful and ruthless as is Soviet Russia, there can be no peace. Periods of comparative calm, when there is little or no fighting, must not delude us and our allies into thinking that peace has come. Indeed, such a delusion can be our greatest danger as we proceed in preparations for defense. This delusion can be the Achilles' heel of the western world. More than anything else, it can cause our ultimate downfall and destruction.

This year and the years immediately ahead are likely to be for America among the most trying years in our whole history. As a free people, we hate regimentation and controls in any form and under any conditions. They are wholly contrary to American life in time of peace, but they are essential to American life in time of war, and they are essential to American life right now if we are to be able to avoid all-out war or if, not avoiding all-out war, we are to be able to survive it when it may come.

I realize, of course, that a substantial number of the American people are most reluctant to entrust President Truman with the powers which are essential to the Presidency if our preparedness program is to be completed on time. Lack of a definite foreign policy—in fact, almost no foreign policy at all—and unsavory disclosures concerning State Department personnel and activities have occasioned a public distrust, which borders on outright hostility, toward those responsible for our foreign affairs. The confusion, incompetence, and questionable practices, which so patently exist in certain

administrative agencies, have served further to reduce public confidence in the administration. The lack of leadership on the part of the President himself and his personal shortcomings, including his unfortunate displays of temper, have still further aggravated the situation. His action in removing General MacArthur from the position of supreme commander in the Far East is the latest incident to cause public indignation toward Mr. Truman.

The President's defiance of the Congress has resulted in the worst kind of relationship between our national legislative body and our Chief Executive. This impasse has served to intensify the growing demand that the Congress take over the direction and operation of the Government.

I can well appreciate the provocation for this attitude, but I must point out that, even were the Congress able—legally and constitutionally—to grasp such control and to assume such responsibility, it is not geared to do so. Five hundred and thirty-one persons, influenced by varying pressures and local interests, can never effectively direct or administer functions of Government which require immediate decision and swift action. The fact that the Senate alone has just consumed 87 days—almost 3 months, in reaching a conclusion regarding the matter of congressional policy with respect to the assignment of American ground troops to Europe, is compelling evidence of the inability of a legislative body to act in an executive capacity.

Recognizing, as I do, the weaknesses of the President and his administration, but recognizing, most of all, the grave crisis which now confronts the country, I believe that the Congress should insist upon exercising its basic function as the over-all policymaking body in those fields of activity which constitutionally are within the domain of the Congress. At the same time, I believe that the Congress should not seek to usurp the prerogatives of the Chief Executive; rather, it should endeavor to cooperate with him and to support him in every reasonable and necessary effort affecting the safety and defense of the country. The President's refusal to reciprocate can never excuse the Congress from failing to do its share in its relationship with him. Angry as many of us may be because of overt actions by the President, we cannot afford to lose our perspective. Only through reason and common sense and rationality can the Nation, in the present circumstances, prepare to meet whatever eventuality may impend.

So I say to you today: Call present conditions what we will—peace or war—we must prepare for the worst. And we must have the courage and faith and conviction to continue in this preparation and defense as long as we and the free world are threatened by powerful forces of aggression. Upon our capacity temporarily to endure privation and sacrifice depends our ultimate survival as a free people. May God grant to us the strength of character to do the job that must be done.

Challenge to Mr. Truman To Follow MacArthur's Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last fall, as chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, I introduced Hon. Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, for a radio address. In asking that the address be printed in the RECORD at this time, I wish to point out that in this concise, straightforward address, delivered 6 months ago, Governor Stassen brilliantly analyzed with remarkable accuracy the mistakes and blunders of the foreign policy of this administration in the Far East, and warned of the dangers toward which those mistakes were leading us, resulting, as they have, in the high-handed dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

This address constitutes a prophetic, concise, and specific evaluation of the circumstances that have brought our far eastern foreign policy to its current tragic crisis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF STASSEN'S BROADCAST CHALLENGING TRUMAN TO FOLLOW MACARTHUR'S ADVICE ON ASIA

My fellow citizens, President Truman has just returned from a meeting with General MacArthur at Wake Island. I am glad he went. I am glad the conference took place. Gen. Douglas MacArthur is one of the greatest generals in all of history. He has demonstrated over and over again his brilliant knowledge of military strategy, his magnificent execution of well-conceived plans, his understanding of all related factors of people and of materials and of terrain, and his inspiring courage in the face of danger.

Any impartial observer must agree that General MacArthur is the best informed American with regard to the entire Asiatic situation.

It is very clear that if President Truman had asked and accepted General MacArthur's advice 5 years ago China would not today be under Communist leadership.

If President Truman had asked and accepted General MacArthur's advice 4 years ago, the Communists would not today be worried about what would happen next in Burma.

If the President had asked and accepted General MacArthur's advice 3 years ago, the United States would not today be reading casualty lists of the youth of our Nation killed and wounded in Korea.

If the President had asked and accepted General MacArthur's advice 1 year ago the United Nations would not now be concerned about what to do next in Formosa.

SOME KEY QUESTIONS

Therefore, I believe that the key question on the lips of the American people, the direct question which they would ask President Truman as he reports to the Nation tomorrow night is this:

"Will you now accept General MacArthur's advice in Asia and in the western Pacific?"

To be more exact, the people ask of the President:

"Will you now accept General MacArthur's advice as to the United States position in the United Nations with reference to Communist China?

"Will you now accept General MacArthur's advice as to the United States position in the United Nations on the question of Formosa?"

"Will you now accept General MacArthur's advice as to the United States' position with reference to Indochina?

And in view of the fact that General MacArthur has been right through these years, and the President and the State Department have been wrong, I believe the people of America are further entitled to say to the President that if he is not willing to commit himself at this late date to follow General MacArthur's advice, then he should explain in detail to the people why not.

The courageous fighting and heavy sacrifice of our men in uniform, and the brilliant leadership of General MacArthur, have combined to pull the United States and the United Nations out of a very bad hole in Korea through a hard-won military victory. They have redeemed in blood the postwar blunders of diplomacy in this one spot in the world.

There are a large number of other blunders in Asia which are still unredeemed. The big question of the future is whether able leadership and competent advice is to have a chance to redeem them before they too must be redeemed at such high cost and in the most precious of all payments—American blood.

CITES OPPOSITION

A review of the 5-year postwar record in the far Pacific sounds almost unbelievable today. Time after time, since that dramatic ceremony on the U. S. S. Missouri ending the Japanese War, the administration and the State Department have endeavored to undermine and weaken General MacArthur.

In the fighting he had command of all the forces in that far Pacific area. But after his forces won the victory, China was promptly taken out of his jurisdiction, Formosa was taken out of his jurisdiction, the Philippines were taken out of his jurisdiction, Indochina was taken out of his jurisdiction, and even Korea was taken away from his supervision.

In Japan itself, in instance after instance, the State Department tried to weaken and confuse and depreciate his efforts. On the twentieth day of September 1945, a direct and outrageous effort was made to slap him down when it was stated by the then Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, that General MacArthur was wrong to announce policy with regard to occupation troops and that the Truman administration and not the Occupation Command in Japan would decide the policies.

In December 1945, he was not consulted about the Moscow Conference on Far East decisions.

Then as recently as August 26, 1950, he was summarily told to withdraw a message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars which sincerely stated his views of the United States military strategy in the Pacific in response to a request.

Great soldier and statesman and patriot that he is, he overlooked all of these things without ever complaining. He did the greatest occupation job in all history. He successfully administered the rebuilding of a nation of 70 million people in a brief space of 5 years, and won the friendship of the Japanese population notwithstanding the terrific defeat which he himself had supervised in World War II.

ASSIGNMENT IN KOREA

With this same great spirit he accepted the sudden assignment to defend Korea, an assignment which up to the time of that order on June 27, 1950, after the fighting had started, had not been in his jurisdiction and had not been his responsibility. In spite of the weakened and partially armed units which were available due to the mismanagement of affairs in Washington, he rapidly brought together a magnificent fighting force which is winning the victories in Korea.

It is indeed strange that in these five long years, the Commander in Chief has never invited this great general to come to the National Capital to there receive the recognition and acclaim of a grateful Nation.

But be all that as it may, in the very critical dangerous world situation now confronting America, I am pleased that at long last

the President has talked to General MacArthur.

If the President will now appoint him supreme commander of American military interests in all of the Asiatic-Pacific area, we will acclaim the President for that action.

We will acclaim him for that action just as we have in the past commended him for the appointment of Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the Marshall plan, under bipartisan supervision; and just as we have in the past commended him for the appointment of George C. Marshall as Secretary of Defense, with bipartisan approval.

Such action on his part would result in strong, bipartisan support in Asia and the backing of all of the people of America. If the President will do this I believe the United Nations Assembly would soon appoint General MacArthur as the United Nations supreme commander of all of their military forces and strategy in the Asiatic-Pacific area.

A MACARTHUR PLAN

From such action there would rapidly develop a MacArthur plan for Asia, which would do for that vast and important area and for its billions of peoples the parallel of what the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact have done for Europe.

Such action would immediately make it clear to the Communist rulers in the Russian Kremlin that they could no longer look to profit from the blunders and the weakness of American policy in Asia.

Such action would do more to stop the Soviet Union's drift toward war and to lead to genuine moves by Premier Stalin and the Politburo for a just world peace than any other single move that could now be made.

Under our political system, no one person can really speak for the Republican Party when it is in the minority in the National Government. But I am confident that I can speak for the Republican Party in this one thing. If the President will place General MacArthur in supreme command of American military policy and interests in all of the Asiatic-Pacific area and will follow his advice, the President will have the united enthusiastic backing of the Republican Party for this action.

But if, on the other hand, the President returns from this long and dramatic journey, occurring as it does on the eve of the senatorial and congressional elections, and if he by careful staging speaks from one of the crucial States in that election—California—and if he poses for numerous photographs with his personal candidates for the senatorship and governship of California—and if he says nothing more to the people than vague talk about Korea and defense which could have been written up before he ever left Washington, and if he talks about agreement with General MacArthur over Korea and Japan in matters in which there could be no real disagreement as the United Nations has already acted in Korea, and General MacArthur is already in military command in Korea and Japan, and if he glosses over or evades these key and difficult and dangerous Asiatic policy questions of China and Formosa and Asiatic communism on which he and America desperately need General MacArthur's advice and leadership, then the Republicans and the American people will conclude that the flight to the Pacific has not been a sincere statesmanlike journey, but rather a sinful political escapade.

There is a very disquieting report here in Washington. It is a report that this flight to the far Pacific did not arise from any conferences with the President's diplomatic or defense officials. The report is that it arose in a conference with his Missouri political friends during the evening hour on board his yacht in Chesapeake Bay.

WHERE THE CREDIT WENT

According to this report one of his political friends told the President that his senatorial and congressional candidates were in a bad way throughout the country because of the feeling that things had been badly handled in Washington, and that the people were giving all of the credit for the Korean victories to General MacArthur and the marines and the Army and the Air Force and the Navy.

This adviser said, according to the report, that the President had to share the headlines with General MacArthur, and that the way to do this was to fly out to see the general, and then to translate that into political assistance for the embattled candidates for Senators and Congressmen in the key States before the November 7 election.

The report continues that this political observer pointed out that the great strength of the unusually able group of Republican candidates who are before the people in the key States of the Nation, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in New York, Governor Taft in Ohio, James Duff in Pennsylvania, Eugene Millikin in Colorado, John Lodge and Prescott Bush and Joseph Talbot in Connecticut, Governor Youngdahl in Minnesota, Governor Kelly in Michigan, Walter Kohler in Wisconsin, Val Peterson in Nebraska, Joseph Martin and his associates, and a host of others, including many young veterans of World War II as new candidates, could well lead to a devastating defeat on November 7.

DANGER AT HOME

According to this report the subject of the conversation on the President's yacht when the decision to make the MacArthur flight occurred was not the dangers to our country of an Asiatic Communist advance, but rather the danger to the President's political friends of an American Republican advance.

The only way to judge whether this report is true, or whether the President is sincerely endeavoring to work out Asiatic policy in his visit to General MacArthur, will be to observe the circumstances and actions of his journey and of his conduct after he returns.

If this whole effort is an attempt to bask in the luster of this great military leader and his hard-fighting, deeply wounded but victorious forces, and then to reflect a portion of that luster to the political advantage of candidates who have themselves in many instances opposed everything that the general and his fighting forces stand for, then the Nation will say to its President—for shame.

DISQUIETING CIRCUMSTANCES

There are a number of circumstances that are rather disquieting to the people in connection with the trip.

The fact that General acArthur did not know about it until after it was announced sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

The fact that the top officials of defense and diplomacy did not know about it until after it was decided sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

The fact that one of the largest airplanes built is used to take along a full load of motion picture cameramen and photographers and writers sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

The fact that he talks about the unification of the services and their joint operation under General MacArthur without acknowledging that the Unification Act was passed by the Eightieth Congress with a Republican majority sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

The fact that the report to the people upon return is to be made from the hot election State of California rather than the nonelection Capital at Washington sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

It is a fact that the candidate for Senator in California whom he will be supporting, and with whom the Vice President was extensively photographed as they paraded around Los Angeles last Monday, voted against many of the key laws which have been passed to strengthen the fight for freedom and against communism.

This candidate voted against the law which now permits the key defense departments to discharge poor security risks, even though the law passed overwhelmingly with solid Republican votes and considerable Democratic votes for a total of 327 to 14.

This candidate also voted against the program for aid to Greece and Turkey in their fight against Communists.

This candidate voted against selective service in 1948, without which General MacArthur would have had even fewer forces at his command for the Korean fight.

This candidate voted against the appropriation for the Un-American Activities Committee as recently as March 23, 1950, even though it passed with a solid vote of Republicans and a substantial vote of Democrats.

HE FORECASTS EVENTS

If it is politics that he is playing, then it will further show itself in appearances on one pretext or another in Illinois and Ohio and Connecticut and Pennsylvania and New York and Indiana.

If it is politics that he is playing then in these last days before election we can look for additional dramatic moves, such as the appointment of Chief Justice Vinson as Secretary of State and the appointment of Dean Acheson as Chief Justice; such as the announcement of intention to appoint General Eisenhower as commander of Western Europe, but without actually making the appointment; and such as the announcement of the intention to roll back the consumer prices, but without actually starting the rollback, knowing full well that it is too late to effectively carry out a roll-back.

A soldier's mother said to me that as she thinks of the tragic price we have paid in Korea for the errors at the end of World War II, and thinks of the sadness and anxiety in so many homes in America tonight, and thinks of the young lives that have been disrupted or destroyed, she has a sense of indignation at the circus celebration atmosphere of this multi-camera escorted journey of the President.

A young veteran commented to me that the President is riding his airplane all the way to Wake Island in order that he can ride General MacArthur's coattail all the way to November 7. I sincerely hope this comment proves to be unfounded. I say that with deep feeling, because what our America and the cause of freedom needs in these weeks and months immediatey ahead is not clever politics, but, rather, great statesmanship.

AWAITS THE REPORT

The President, and only the President, can appoint the top leadership in the broad strategic commands in Western Europe and in Asia that are so essential to our future security and the prospects of freedom.

The President, and only the President, can clean up the all-time record high of corruption and of gambling and of vice sordidly peeping out into view in the great cities of our country by taking forthright action of the type that cleaned out the Capone gang and other hoodlums of the prohibition period.

Let me close with this solemn pledge: That whatsoever may be the strength of the Republicans after the people make their decision on November 7, we will support the President in every measure of rearming and in every measure for economic stability and in every measure of world policy in which

he leads in a frank and open and American manner.

As an earnest of that we can point to the remarkable record in the Eightieth Congress with its Republican majority and its many key decisions under Senator VANDENBERG's leadership; and before that to the constructive service of our Republican Party in strengthening the Dumbarton Oaks Charter and developing the clauses which in recent years have saved the United Nations from veto strangulation; and before that in steadfastly backing lend-lease and similar steps in the fight for freedom in the 1940's.

My fellow citizens, we await the report of the President.

Better Medical Care in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a most illuminating address delivered by Dr. Norman H. Gemmill to his colleagues of the York County, Pa., Medical Society. In his address Dr. Gemmill asks his fellow doctors to take the same constructive approach to winning the good will of the American people that I have urged on the American Medical Association for many years. Specifically, he points out that if the doctors themselves were to undertake first to discover and then to meet the real needs of the American people for better medical care, they "would not be expending the millions of dollars that they are today, through lobbying and the channels of advertisement, in order to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address, as reported in the columns of the Gazette and Daily of York, Pa., for March 15, 1951, together with a follow-up editorial on Dr. Gemmill's remarks, which appeared in the same paper on Friday, March 23, be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily of March 15, 1951]

PHYSICIANS REBUKED FOR IGNORING PUBLIC, AND EXCESSIVE FEES

(Dr. Norman H. Gemmill, retiring president of York County Medical Society, tells colleagues some doctors charge excessive fees and are indifferent to night and Thursday calls. If profession was not in "public disfavor" it would not be spending millions through lobbying and advertising "in order to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public," Dr. Gemmill declares.)

Excessive cost of medical care, physicians' indifference to night and Thursday calls and to "good doctor-patient relationship" draw criticism in the parting message of Dr. Norman H. Gemmill, Stewartstown, retiring president of the York County Medical Society.

The medical profession, Dr. Gemmill declared, is in public disfavor for these reasons.

"If we were not held in this public disfavor at the present time (and there's no use kidding ourselves that it doesn't exist)," he said, "I daresay we would not be expending the millions of dollars that we are today, through lobbying and the channels of advertisement, in order to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public."

Dr. Gemmill yesterday gave the Gazette and Daily permission to use the text of his message, which was delivered as an address before the medical society at its annual banquet last month at the Country Club of York, and will be reprinted in the society's March bulletin.

Throughout the speech, he noted that his criticisms did not apply to all doctors.

Text follows:

There are several pleas I would like to leave with you as I relinquish my position as President of our medical society.

ASKS DEEPER CONSECRATION

The first is a plea for a deeper consecration on the part of all of us to the noble profession we represent, viz medicine, and an honest effort by each of us to try to regain some of the high esteem and respect of the people which our profession has lost in the past decade. The time has arrived when we, as a profession, should pause and take inventory of ourselves because never before have we experienced such poor public relations at a time when we urgently need good public relations.

If we were not held in this public disfavor at the present time (and there's no use kidding ourselves it doesn't exist) I dare say we would not be expending the millions of dollars that we are today through lobbying and the channels of advertisement, in order to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public.

To what can we attribute this change in attitude by the public toward our profession?

BLAMES DOCTORS FOR DISFAVOR

Can all the blame be placed on the so-called left wingers or "pinks" throughout our country who we know advocate a program of socialized medicine? No, I dare say not. Is it because patients have changed? No, I believe not. Although they may be more exacting and demanding of the physician today, due to their increased medical knowledge obtained through the sources of the radio, newspapers, and certain magazine articles, they still represent sic: people, approaching the doctor in a friendly spirit, choosing him in whom they have the most confidence to give them relief from their physical and mental sufferings.

Therefore, we must conclude that doctors themselves have made some "changes for the worse" during the past years. Not in regards to their professional competence, for medical education and training is infinitely better today than it was in my student days, but in regards to their relationship with mankind. Might we say that some of us have gained such a lofty opinion of ourselves as to regard ourselves "masters of the universe" rather than "servants of humanity" which God intended us to be as physicians.

Let us consider what I believe myself to represent some of these "changes for the worse" which may have crept into our profession.

CITES HIGH HOSPITAL COST

Certainly the cost of medical care is excessive today. Especially in the case of hospitalization over which, of course, we as physicians can exert very little control. But this high cost is also due in part to exorbitant fees charged by a minority in general practice and in the fields of specialization.

If every pre-medical student were asked why he had chosen medicine as a profession, I am afraid a great many of these young men, by their answers, would visualize themselves in a fairly high income bracket, living a somewhat smug and comfortable life without the expenditure of too much time and effort, while the motive of service should have been uppermost in their minds in enabling them to have arrived at such an important decision in their life. And this "profit motive," in too many cases, is carried down with them through medical college, hospital training, and into private practice.

If we want to determine whether this profit motive activates any of us today we can do so by our answer to several questions.

Do we manifest as deep an interest in those patients who cannot pay as in those patients whom we know will pay us well? And do we readily agree to accept house visits to new patients without first being assured they will pay for the service?

Another change for the worse, on the part of doctors, is our indifference and independence, on the part of some of us, to accept calls at any hour of the day or night or on any day of the week. (Sweet oil for the child's earache or paregoric for his bellyache until morning.) Or worst of all when your local telephone exchange can't locate a doctor on a Thursday or a holiday in the case of an emergency.

RECALLS PAST

In the younger days of our fellow practitioners who have received their 50-year service medal, and others in this age group who will soon have this signal honor conferred upon them, I dare say this was a thing unheard of, for I am certain their patient's interests came before their own, and many a vacation was given up due to a seriously ill patient or expectant mother. Night calls were no more agreeable in those horse-and-buggy days than they are today. And yet they cheerfully accepted them as a necessary part of their profession and even though the call may have come in at night they didn't charge a double fee for such service.

True, it is still the right of every American doctor to determine how hard he will work and what he will charge for doing his work. But the abuse of this right by some of us has not improved public relations one bit.

I oftimes wonder if hospital staff and dispensary members realize their golden opportunity to help improve public relations. I dare say this is too frequently overlooked. Institutional care oft becomes so mechanical with us that we frequently forget the personal equation. It must be difficult to be on your guard at all times and render the same service and attention to all patients, irrespective of their race, creed, or whether it is an indigent case. And yet there should be no difference.

ADVICE TO YOUNG DOCTORS

The young man who is just entering private practice can do much to endear himself in the hearts of his clientele and thus help rekindle a burning fire of warmth toward the medical profession. You must remember that although you are far better equipped and trained than we were, the world still doesn't owe you a living until you can justify it.

The moment you enter private practice you are confronted with responsibilities and complex problems which you never encountered before as an intern or resident. It behooves each one of you, especially those who desert the larger cities for the smaller communities, to study the social and economic structure of that community which you have chosen in order that your relationship with the public at large will not be overlooked and neglected while at the same time you are concentrating so much on building up good doctor-patient relationship.

SERVICE TO HUMANITY

In other words what I am trying to say is that the success of any of us is not measured by the wealth we accumulate nor the luxury in which we live, nor by the number of patients we can boast of seeing in our office each day, but rather should we be judged by the service we render to humanity and to the community in which we live.

So much for public relations. The thoughts expressed are not necessarily new to you, but it is good for us to keep turning them over in our minds, and, if guilty as charged, let's try to improve ourselves.

In conclusion, my final plea is for increased tolerance and less professional jealousy among the members of our profession. (And I direct these remarks to the profession as a whole and not just our own local group.) If we can't get along with ourselves, how can we hope to get along with society?

As we meet on such formal occasions as these, with a few cocktails to add to the merriment, an outsider would gather the impression we are one happy, harmonious family. And yet we may no sooner leave this room or building ere someone stabs us in the back.

How quick we are to see and condemn the faults of others while at the same time we consider ourselves above reproach. As the Moffat translation puts it, "Why are we so quick to see the splinter in our brother's eye and so often fail to see the plank in our own eye?"

Or as Kipling states it in that great poem of his, If: "When being lied about, don't deal in lies," if you would be called, "A Man."

Therefore, it behooves us at all times to be guarded in our criticism of a fellow practitioner, lest what we say, when repeated by the other fellow, is misconstrued, or misrepresented. How often I have been misquoted to any of my brother practitioners, by some patients who dislike me, I do not know. We all experience some of these unpleasant relationships.

QUOTES SCRIPTURE

Wouldn't we all be far better off, if, when such stories of criticism are carried back to our ears by the way of the grapevine, that rather than assume that tit-for-tat attitude (an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth) we would let our minds revert to those passages of Scripture as recorded in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, the twelfth chapter, where we read these words: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves but rather give way unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

In the December issue of a booklet on daily devotions called Today, I ran across these verses which presented a challenge that I thought was well worth passing on to you and would be a splendid New Year resolution for each one of us to make. And I quote:

"I asked the New Year for some message sweet,
Some rule of life with which to guide my feet.
I asked, and paused, He answered soft and low,
God's will to know.

"Will knowledge then suffice, New Year,' I cried;
And are the question into silence died,
The answer came, Nay, but remember, too,
God's will to do.

"Once more I asked, 'Is there nothing more to tell?'
And once again the answer sweetly fell,
'Yes,' this thing, all other things above,
God's will to love."

If each of us were to search our hearts to discover God's will for us (and surely He has a plan for each of our lives) and once we discover it, would attempt to carry it out, irrespective of the self-denial and sacrifice it would entail, and above all, to have in our hearts a burning love for our fellow men, even as God loves us, then the relationship between us would be such as to enable us to be that one happy, harmonious family which I stated earlier in my remarks does not exist today. And this goal is one which each of us should earnestly desire and strive to attain.

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, March 23, 1951]

HEALTH AND DOCTORS

When Dr. Norman H. Gemmill, retiring president of the county medical society, told his colleagues recently that they should reform in certain ways in order to "regain the high esteem and respect of the people," he hit upon a very important point.

It was this. Dr. Gemmill, remarking that the profession was in disfavor, said frankly that the millions being spent "through lobbying and the channels of advertisement" by the AMA (American Medical Association) are being spent "to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public."

Dr. Gemmill, of course, was a professional man speaking to brother professionals when he made the remark. Perhaps that is why he put the case so bluntly. It should be noted, however, that the AMA, in its messages to the public, never lets on that what it is trying to do is purchase a better reputation for doctors.

Not at all. The theme of the AMA is that its campaign, costing an amount estimated by Senator JAMES MURRAY at $20,000,000, is in the public, not the doctor's, interest. The AMA is spending the millions collected at the rate of $25 per from individual doctors, and in huge contributions from drug-trade associations and insurance companies, to tell the people that their health care is in good hands, that Federal health insurance is not only unnecessary but an actual menace to the well-being of United States citizens.

If Dr. Gemmill's references to the AMA campaign can be assumed to reflect the opinions of the medical profession, the doctors' organization is engaged upon a very dubious enterprise. It is informing the people that what it chooses to call "socialized medicine" is a threat to their independent selection of doctors and methods of health care. But the real threat of socialized medicine, if one goes by the implications of what Dr. Gemmill had to say, is not to the people at all but to the privilege of the medical profession to think of themselves first and the health of the people second.

This is not to say that all doctors are so minded. But according to Dr. Gemmill there are many that are. He very honestly deplored the fact and he urged his listeners to become once again "'servants of humanity,' as God intended us to be as physicians." He told the doctors that high fees, disregard for patients of low income, unwillingness to accept night calls, and so forth, were indications that the profit motive had come to dominate elements of the profession. He called for a return to the ideal of service to the people.

No one would argue with him on that score. His analysis of the failings of certain doctors, his recommendations to his colleagues, were impressive and forthright. But might it not be possible for Dr. Gemmill and other enlightened representatives of his profession to turn their attention also to the professional standards and ethics of the AMA? Could it be that in employing the AMA phrase, socialized medicine, Dr. Gemmill, without realizing it, is adopting standards in the field of propaganda which he would scorn in the field of science?

As matters stand, not one doctor in York County has ever taken the public position that the facts about the Nation's health and the facts about a proposed system of Federal health insurance be discussed in a rational and democratic fashion. Would not such a position, taken, say, by the medical society itself, be the best possible means for local practitioners as a group to reestablish, in the words of Dr. Gemmill, their relationship with mankind?

Research Into Causes and Treatment of Asthma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication with respect to the need for an all-out effort to find the causes and cures of one of our most widespread health problems.

I am very glad to be able to inform the writer that through the National Institutes of Health created by the Congress, and sponsored by all members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, such research as my correspondent mentions is now being carried on. The work is being done both at the Bethesda institutes, and through grants made by the institutes to research workers in universities and medical centers throughout the United States. It is limited only by the necessity consequently faced by the Congress of determining what amounts of money can be made available by the people of the United States for such life-saving work, as against the amounts which, through the machinations of Communist Soviet Russia, we are forced to expend in creating instruments of death and destruction.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POMONA, N. Y., *March 27, 1951.*

DEAR HON. SENATOR MURRAY: I trust you receive this card. The Good Book states, "Seek and ye shall find." So why can't some real smart doctor with ability discover a cure for asthma? Some can work miracles with the heart, eyes, brain, etc., but asthmatics painfully almost choke to death and a great many have. Like many, I cannot find any real lasting relief. What is asthma? Is it smarter than doctors? Bah. Time, life, and science march on, yes, for better bombs, aircraft, better this and that as we read, hear, and see. But asthma, a great basic health enemy, is still with us in the millions throughout the United States of America. Why? A cure for asthma is urgently needed—not pity or a truckload of someone's old Christmas cards. It's about time now to hear about a safe, lasting, reliable, effective treatment or a Senate national health-investigating committee on why asthma is still smarter than doctors. The great many that have died, the dying that can't write, and the asthmatics still praying in hope—with these facts, prompt me on

to a national crusade to bring about a cure for asthma, so help me God.

As a humane interest of public service, I beg of you to kindly voice my above sincere letter into the RECORD before the Senate and Congress, also release my letter to the press for publication, please.

God bless you and yours.

S. G. LYMAN.

Maine's National Oratory Champ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Maine's National Oratory Champ Would 'Stump' for Governor Payne," which appeared in the Portland Press-Herald on April 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, April 6.—A 17-year-old Milo High School senior who earlier this week was asked to assist Vice President BARKLEY in the art of public speaking agreed today to mount the stump for his State's Governor.

And John G. Decker is qualified to assist either man. He won a national oratorical contest this week, a $4,000 scholarship and an extra $1,000 for Milo High School.

Handsome and quiet, the youth who from all appearances takes celebrities in his stride today, received his initial introduction to Maine's governmental set-up.

He was vigorously applauded when introduced to both the Maine Senate and House of Representatives. In the next breath he told Gov. Frederick G. Payne he would answer his call to pinch-hit on a speaking engagement or two.

"Do you think you might like to enter public life, John?" Payne asked the youth.

"Well, I'm thinking of taking engineering in college," he replied.

"I may send you a note asking you to go out and make a few speeches for me, O. K.?" the Governor asked.

"Sure, if I can help," was the answer.

The dark-haired, dark-eyed Decker arrived here yesterday morning after winning the national competition at Columbia University, New York, last Tuesday night.

He had visited New York City and Washington, D. C., where he received congratulations of Vice President BARKLEY and Maine Senators MARGARET CHASE SMITH and OWEN BREWSTER.

"Live Safely, Live Happily" was the title of Decker's winning speech. He participated in observances in connection with New York City's safety week.

On the trip with John was his teacher at Milo High, Mrs. Pauline Kealiher, who says she "had John under my wing for just this year."

To her goes much credit for his success, John says.

Just after the Governor and State Senator Carroll McKusick, Republican, of Parkman, had praised the youth for his ability and for the fame he has brought his State, Decker was asked in an interview:

"What is your reaction to this sort of thing, to meeting such persons as the Vice President, your State's Senators in Washington, and the Governor? Make you nervous?"

"Gee, it might if they weren't such swell people to meet," he replied, "nobody could get nervous with them. They put you at ease. They're swell."

Official Inspection Trip of Commissioner F. A. Delgado in Different Provinces of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I enclose a report of a very interesting inspection trip made in the Philippine Islands by our former colleague the Honorable F. A. Delgado, a member of the United States Philippines War Damage Commission, which I include also with my remarks regarding the distinguished career of our former colleague:

OFFICIAL INSPECTION TRIP OF COMMISSIONER F. A. DELGADO IN DIFFERENT PROVINCES OF THE PHILIPPINES

"By resolution of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission of December 8, 1950, a final inspection of the different provinces was authorized. Accordingly, Commissioner Francisco A. Delgado, accompanied by Engineer Jose Garrido of the Bureau of Public Claims and Examiner Vicente Roco of the Bureau of Private Claims made a tour of inspection through almost all the provinces of the Philippine Archipelago beginning December 26, 1950, and ending on January 22, 1951. The trips were made by plane and by automobile.

"Starting in the Province of Laguna, Sta. Cruz, the capital of the province, and the municipality of Pagsanjan, were visited. In passing the different municipalities from Sta. Cruz to Pagsanjan were inspected.

"The inspection proceeded to the Province of Queson, through many municipalities of the Province of Laguna and the Province of Quezon, which were also inspected in passing. Lucena, the capital of the Province of Quezon, was visited.

"The next trip took the party to the Mountain Province and the City of Baguio, and thence to La Union Province, inspecting on the way the municipalities of both provinces through which they passed. San Fernando City, capital of La Union Province, was also visited.

"Baguio was made the headquarters of the party while in northern Luson and from there they proceeded to Lingayen, capital of Pangasinan Province, visiting on the way the municipalities of the adjoining provinces through which they passed.

"The next tour of inspection was to the Visayan Islands and Mindanao. From Manila the party proceeded to Iloilo City and Iloilo Province; thence to Bacolod City and Province of Occidental Negros; thence to the province and city of Cebu; thence to the province and city of Zamboanga via Dipolog; and thence to the City of Dumaguete and Province of Negros Oriental.

"Upon their return to Manila the party proceeded to the Bicol region, visiting the Provinces of Camarines Sur, Albay, and Camarines Norte, the cities of Naga and Legaspi, and the municipalities of the said provinces accessible by automobile.

"The last tour of the party was in central Luson, visiting the Provinces of Batangas, Pampanga, and Bulacan, their respective capitals, and other municipalities.

"In all the provincial capitals, cities, and towns visited, the members of the party were met and otherwise shown every courtesy by the respective provincial governors, members of the provincial board, city and district engineers, city mayors, municipal mayors, and other provincial, city, and municipal officials, as well as by the officers of civic organizations such as the Jaycees, the Rotary, and Lions Clubs, and other prominent citizens.

"In all the places visited the party held conferences and an open forum in which everybody was given a chance to speak his mind in connection with public and private war-damage claims. Explanations of the work and procedures of the Commission were made and the doubts and misgivings in connection with the private claims brought to the attention of the party were explained away.

"As regards the public claims in the different provinces and cities inspected, the party has found that all the public projects to which the Commission has made awards have been completed with the exception of some details which cannot be completed because of the insufficiency of the funds allocated. There were projects, however, which looked even better than the original ones. The party also found out that the great majority of the municipalities inspected badly needed barrio schools, municipal buildings, public markets and other public buildings, hospital, dispensaries, and school equipment which were destroyed during the last world war and which could not be rehabilitated for lack of funds.

"Provincial, city and municipal officials in the different provinces, cities, and municipalities inspected were unanimous in clamoring for additional funds to complete the rehabilitation of the uncompleted projects and to rehabilitate the many buildings and equipment for which no awards were made.

"As regards the private claims, the feeling was also unanimous that the Commission has acted with fairness and justice to all private claimants but that a third payment, at least sufficient to complete the 75 percent of the approved amount promised in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, is needed if the good work already started is to attain at least a practicable rehabilitation of the economy of the provinces and the individual citizens thereof.

"Commissioner Delgado has had the previous opportunity during 1947 and 1948 to go through most of the provinces visited in his final inspection and for this reason he was most profoundly impressed with a deep feeling of satisfaction to have observed the extent of the rehabilitation accomplished by the Philippine War Damage Commission, with the limited funds at its disposal, throughout the entire Philippine Archipelago. He found out that every provincial capital and town now presents, so to speak, a "new look," at least in the center of the "poblacion." Also that provincial capitals, hospitals, high schools, trade schools, central schools, dispensaries, other school buildings, and some barrio schools looked normal and as in the prewar days of peace and prosperity in the Philippines. Indeed, in many cases, the reconstructed buildings were by far better in appearance and usefulness than their prewar counterparts. Withal, it was also obviously apparent that much more still remains to be done, specially in the case of barrio schools, hospitals, dispensaries, waterworks, municipal and market buildings, equipment, etc. It is, therefore, no wonder that the feeling is absolutely unanimous among officials and private citizens of all classes of the absolute need of further assistance. All realize the great good accomplished by the aid thus far rendered and are profoundly grateful therefor to the American Government and people. But they also

feel that there is urgent and essential need for more assistance. The feeling is general that the Commission has acted fairly and justly with the limited funds under its disposal, and that the work of the Commission has greatly enhanced the traditional good will and friendship of the Filipino people for the American people, their ideals and their way of life.

"In view of the foregoing, Commissioner Delgado's only recommendation in his report to the Commission was that the latter, or at least the individual members thereof, do all they can toward the immediate consideration and approval of the Kefauver bill or some other measure which would authorize the appropriation of an additional $100,000,000, at least, for further war damage compensation in the Philippines.

"Acting with rapidity apparently hitherto unknown in agencies of government, the United States Philippine War Damage Commission has concluded the task assigned to it by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. It has finished its work prior to the legal deadline fixed by the Congress and at less than the legislatively prescribed cost.

"The Philippine Rehabilitation Act was a nonpartisan measure. It was enacted shortly before the Philippines was granted independence by the United States, after having been under this Nation's tutelage for nearly 50 years. A strong mutual friendship had existed between our two peoples during this half century. The Philippine people fought side by side with us during the war and remained loyal to democratic ideals and to the United States during the grim days of the occupation. When it came time to grant them independence, their country had been ravaged by war. Their finances had been depleted sorely; individuals had suffered terrific personal losses and were in dire need of aid.

"As a partial measure of assistance, and so that our friends would not be granted independence as a free nation when they were not in a financial position to start on such a grave, new venture, the Congress adopted the Philippine Rehabilitation Act. This law provided for payment in part of war-damage claims arising out of the destruction to, or loss of, private property, as well as for partial rehabilitation of damaged public property. At the time of the adoption of the law, it was almost impossible to determine the exact amount of money that would be needed to finance reconstruction, but the Congress authorized the expenditure of $400,000,000 for the payment of private claims and administrative expenses relating thereto. This fund was placed under the jurisdiction of the War Damage Commission, as was an additional $57,000,000 for the payment of claims for damage to public property.

"The Rehabilitation Act, in itself, was unprecedented in that no nation previously had undertaken to pay war damages in another country in a similar manner or on such a scale. The Commission, therefore, had no precedents to follow. Yet, today, its work is completed. First, the law required it to end its operations relating to the adjudication of public property claims by June 30, 1950. This was done and, when the Commission concluded this part of its activities, the benefits of its public property rehabilitation awards included classroom facilities for 3,200,000 students, hospital beds for 3,300 patients, water for 6,700,000 people, direct employment for 20,000 workmen, and extensive office accommodations for the executives and staffs of the national, provincial, and municipal governments.

"In addition, the law required the Commission to complete its entire operation not later than April 30, 1951. It has been finished ahead of schedule. The Commission was allowed $12,600,000 for administrative expenses attendant to the adjudication and payment of private claims. Actually, $10,350,000, or only 2.6 percent of the total appropriation, was expended and the savings are being returned to the Treasury of the United States. The Commission, prior to its closing, had adjudicated approximately 1,250,000 private claims and had paid the beneficiaries almost $390,000,000. Industry, business, and agriculture, as well as the individual, have benefited substantially although the appropriated funds have not permitted the full payments authorized by the Rehabilitation Act. There are many people who believe the United States should appropriate additional funds so that the commitments of the act would be met fully. Others believe we should give even more extensive aid to the Philippines. This is not the medium through which to espouse either of these proposals, regardless of one's sympathies. There will be other times and instruments for that."

Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Delgado has occupied the unique position during his service with the Commission of being the only foreign national to be nominated to a post on a United States Government agency and to have had that nomination confirmed by the United States Senate. Prior to his appointment he had a long and illustrious record. He attended Compton High School, Compton, Calif., as one of the first group of Filipino students to study in the United States. He pursued his education at the University of Indiana, where he received his degrees of bachelor of laws and doctor of laws. He received his master of laws, cum laude, from Yale in 1908. After a distinguished career in the Philippines, which included service as a member of the Philippine House of Representatives, he served in the United States House of Representatives as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States. He has been a justice of the Philippine Court of Appeals, and declined a nomination to the Supreme Court of the Philippines. He is president of the Philippine Bar Association. He was a delegate of the Philippine Commonwealth to the International Committee of Jurists at Washington, April 1945, which prepared the draft of the Statute of the International Court of Justice of the United Nations. He was a member of the Philippine delegation to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in 1945, and was nominated to the International Court of Justice of the United Nations in 1946 by the Philippine Government.

A distinguished jurist and statesman, Commissioner Francisco A. Delgado has concluded his occupancy of a high post in the United States Government after serving in it for almost 5 years. In that period, as always, he has been vitally concerned with the welfare of his own people but has scrupulously acted in the interests of the United States, for which he has constantly maintained a deep and abiding friendship. It has been said that no man can serve two masters. In Commissioner Delgado we have an illustrous public servant of the Philippines and of the United States serving both at the same time on the highest plane, giving to each the full benefit of his ability and integrity. For this notable achievement and for his outstanding contribution to the lasting, harmonious relationship between our two nations, I can but extend to him the most infinite praise.

Kefauver Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting item from Mr. Clement Norton, well-known Boston newspaperman, that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Sunday, April 1, 1951, concerning the Kefauver Crime Investigation Committee:

KEFAUVER

The biggest political shock of the day, was the smash hit of television in the Kefauver committee hearings. Politicians are still running and ducking and whispering trying to find out what it all means. What it all adds up to. For, if millions of people can watch them, many of them are done. They might as well throw in the towel and quit, in the language of the ring.

And, if you were to select from all the Congress a cast, you could not have selected a better one, than the Kefauver group for the curtain opener, in which millions of Americans saw and heard their first congressional hearing. The puritanical, honest New England TOBEY, crying like a child twice. I liked him. The able Senator O'CONOR. The 48-year-old chairman, Senator CAREY ESTES KEFAUVER, a Chattanooga, Tenn., lawyer and Yale law grad, televised well. He was clean-cut and good-looking, and best of all, he gave every one of the millions of people who saw and heard him, a first-class lesson in basic culture, in innate kindness, in everyday charitableness. In understanding and in social sensitivity to the rights of others. His equable, calm, warm, resonant, low, well-spaced words with just a hint of a delightful southern drawl, calmed the troubled waters time and time again.

It was one of the greatest lessons ever taught to the largest class in history, and I'm sure, that as a result of it, thousands of judges will go back on the bench and be more considerate to unfortunates, and millions of people will quietly but surely improve their manners, after being subjected to the terrific impact of seeing and hearing the cultured Senator KEFAUVER with his innately fair technique.

MIGHT

The Senator might have sat up there and lorded it over everybody. He might have yelled and roared and bellowed at the gangsters and been applauded by the multitude. He might have literally strutted sitting down for he was in a position that no person in American politics had ever been before, and he fully realized all this, and deliberately decided to be himself—to be natural. In short, to be innately kind and considerate to everybody. He did not try to hog the show, but would let other Senators and committee attorneys take over. He might have jumped on Frank Costello and waved the flag and Bible, a sure-fire hit, but no, he was gentle and kind to Costello.

I like that kind of conduct. It showed that KEFAUVER had real class. Real culture in his make-up. It made me feel that my country, my Government, never can go down, so long as such outstanding men are on guard in Washington. And I was pleased to find that everybody had a good word for Senator KEFAUVER that I asked in my poll. The man out of the bar, the college professor, the department store clerk, the barber.

And then, I could stand up and cheer for KEFAUVER, when I found that on his Washington office wall are the scribbled drawings of his 7-year-old daughter. That he had two children and wanted a third, and thought that this was impossible, so he adopted a third child, and now, to his joy, a third child has been born into the family, making four children, all told. KEFAUVER has fought monopolies, has fought for public housing for the underprivileged, and has, on the whole, a grand record of standing for the people against powerful entrenched interests.

I'm completely sold on Senator KEFAUVER. That television performance was terrific. Science has brought something new and something better into our lives.

Food Aid for India—On-the-Spot Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

I

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, without reading political implications into the bill for food aid to India, it is nevertheless proper to understand the impact upon government stability of famine there. The best evidence on this situation is an on-the-spot report from Dr. Frank Laubach, special counselor and representative of the committee on world literacy and Christian literature, Foreign Missions Conference of North America, showing the Communist menace in the various famine-affected areas in India. This letter is Dr. Laubach's normal report to his own committee dated March 4, 1951, and received here the end of March, and transmitted to me by Executive Secretary Alfred D. Moore, of the committee, with permission to insert pertinent excerpts from it:

BOMBAY, INDIA, *March 4, 1951.*

I was asked in America to collect material about the Christian answer to communism in India. I am here with 30 of the leading Indian Christians of all India. I told them about this request and asked them to be frank. The result appalled me. Communism is far more menacing than even I had dreamed.

The delegate from Amritsar close to Pakistan said the Communists are very active, persuading millions to believe that they must kill the rich and take what they have. As minister, he wanted to know how to stem the tide.

The delegates from Telengana (Hyderabad State) said that the Communists have so swept that pathetically hungry state that if a Communist army marched in, 99 percent of the people would welcome it. Hyderabad in the past has been the most terrible example of enormous wealth and terrible poverty side by side, in all India. The Communists took many rich landowners out and cut them to pieces with the hearty approval of the poor.

The delegate from Madras state said the Communists have workers everywhere, and that they go and read to the people, who being ignorant and hating their landlords are rapidly becoming Communists. They tell the people, "We are going to kill the big landowners and distribute the land." The tenants, the robber castes, and the idle ex-servicemen are falling for it.

Another delegate from Madras says the people are told that Nehru is backing the rich who run the government, and so all the poor are being turned against Nehru. The new government, when it took over from England, promised to right the wrongs allowed by the British, but the poor still have little or nothing more than they had before.

Communist teachers are converting their students, and there are fifth-columns in all colleges. The Communists say they are the only people in India who really try to emancipate the poor. They constantly threaten to kill Christian pastors unless they become Communists. They are getting many Christians to adopt what they call "Christian communism."

One delegate from the center of the greatest violence in Telengana (Hyderabad) said: "I believe God sent communism to destroy the wicked rich; 75 percent of the rich were murdered by the Communists and the other 25 percent are now repentent and good. The Communists said to the masses: 'You built the roads, but you cannot ride on them. You built the houses, but you cannot live in decent houses.' "

In the March 1 Times of India, the leading article says that not even in Telengana has the Communist menace assumed such dangerous proportions as in Assam, among the most backward and impoverished tribal people.

The delegate from Calcutta is very reticent to say even one word, but did say that the people there are just waiting for the Communists to come and liberate them.

I must not write a long letter, but these delegates agree that India is rapidly going Communist in every state and province. They say that every day the American Congress either criticizes the Indian Government, or delays helping the starving in India, millions of Indians are going Communist, believing that only the Communists can liberate them from poverty. Before many months it will be another "too little too late."

I was told that some Congressmen are coming to India. They should come soon and they should listen, welcome frank truth, and not do all the talking. I was told by missionaries recently from China that a Congressman I shall not name, called them together in Shanghai, talked to them for 4 hours and went away without listening to them. I suggest that they consult not missionaries nor Indian officials, but Christian native pastors.

A recent shipment of only 12,000 tons of Russian grain to India brought the bitter newspaper comment: "It begins to be evident who it is that is concerned about the people of India."

Very sincerely yours with my prayer,

FRANK LAUBACH.

II

Mr. Speaker, there is also attached appended an on-the-spot report contained in an editorial by Norman Cousins in the Saturday Review of Literature of March 31, 1951. This editorial was also the subject of full-page advertisements in New York and other papers, sponsored by Freedom House:

NEW DELHI.—Once you have seen the look of hunger on the face of a man it is difficult to put it out of your mind. I have seen the look of hunger on the faces of thousands of men, and I know I shall never forget it.

I first saw the hungry in a jail on the island of Ceylon. They were illegal immigrants fleeing the famine in the south of India, and the Government of Ceylon was detaining them in a prison in Jaffna until arrangements could be worked out for their return to India. They had come by small boat, landing during the night on the north coast of Ceylon, where some of them had been picked up by the police. No one knew how many Indians had fled to Ceylon in this summer.

In the jail at Jaffna I spoke to a woman of 55 who looked closer to 90. I doubt that she weighed 80 pounds. Her face was little more than a bare skull out of which small eyes glowed feverishly. She had come to Ceylon to join her married daughter, who had escaped successfully 2 months earlier. This much she was willing to tell, but she would not tell the police where her daughter might be found, even though it meant she herself would be returned to India alone.

I next saw the hungry in the south of India, where the suffering is most acute. I saw them against a background of parched and browned fields, with pale stubbles where rich rice paddies should have been. The reason for it was that the rains never came this year. They didn't come last year either or the year before that or the year before that.

"Four years, no monsoon," one of the elders in a village 40 miles from Madras told me. "The older people have thought hard but they do not remember when before the fields have been so dry. The wells are very low."

He looked up at the scudding clouds. "Clouds like this used to bring rain. Now they go out to sea and drop their rain where there is no need of it. The old people can eat little. If they are thin it is no great harm. Ghandi was thin. But the children are thin and they become sick quickly. Smallpox has killed many of them. Thirty had smallpox in this village. Sixteen died.

"We send men into the cities to work so they can buy rice to bring back to the village. But there is so little rice and the rations have been cut again, and what they bring back cannot fill the bowls of many persons. We eat what we can—bananas and some coconuts—but very many people here are starving."

I next saw the faces of the hungry on the streets of Calcutta. Many of them were homeless. They had lost their homes during the partition of India when Pakistan was created. They were Hindus who feared the Moslems, and they had abandoned their homes in Pakistan and crossed over into India. In India there are perhaps eight or ten million such refugees—it might be millions more; no one knows exactly how many. Thousands of them came into Calcutta, the world's largest city, looking for food and homes. They slept in the streets. Wherever you went at night, on the main thoroughfares or in the alleys or in the hallways, you could see the human forms huddled together against the cool night. During the day they waited in lines for government food or they begged.

Near the luxurious Grand Hotel in Calcutta was a child of 8 or 9, with not enough clothes to conceal the bloated, empty belly of hunger. He was looking in the streets for scraps of food. Nearby was a young woman of about twenty, her body covered by the rags of what once must have been a handsome sari. A child of 2 was on her hip. The child was badly undernourished, and his head rested on his mother's shoulder. His face was empty and expressionless. I also saw the hungry of Bangalore. They sat against the walls of buildings and waited.

Then I saw them in Delhi. There are more of the hungry and homeless in Delhi than in any other city in the world. As in Calcutta, many of them are refugees—maybe 500,000 or 600,000—and they have crowded into the city, setting up crude wood-and-straw shelters, most of them closet size. And every day the dead are carried out by men who are little more than half alive themselves. I stood on the corner of a busy street

in Delhi and watched the refugees as they passed. Out of the thousands who passed by only two would be considered plump by American standards.

The Indians are reluctant to talk about themselves or about their hardships. I was able, however, to win the confidence of the attendant assigned to my room. He told me about his 6-year-old son, the one with tuberculosis. He said his son had been praying a great deal recently, much more than usual, and he had asked his son what he had been praying for. "My son was praying that he might die. He wanted to die and he wanted God to make him into a crow. I had told him about the crows that fly into the open windows of the hotel rooms and pick up food on the tables and then carry the food off. My son said he wanted to be a crow so he could fly wherever there was food and bring it back to our family."

Then the attendant, whose name was Arun, turned away from me and knelt down to fix the fire. "India has been hungry for many months," he said. "They are saying that America has known about this need and that America has not wished to send us food."

I replied that what he had been told was not true. What had happened was that we had been too slow in responding to India's need, and that was bad enough. Americans had to operate through their Government and often democratic government is slow in doing what has to be done promptly. I asked him to believe that millions of Americans were deeply concerned and were prodding our Government to action.

Then he mentioned the report he had read in the newspapers about the American Senators who wanted to punish India because India did not agree with the United States in the United Nations.

"It is true is it not, sir, that we may not get the food because we do not say what you wish us to say?"

I had to think a little while before replying, because I wasn't too sure that what he had feared might not turn out to be true. Should I have told him that it might take many days before the wheat bill might pass during which time he would have to watch his youngsters continue to eat out of partially filled bowls?

Finally, I told him that there was no real answer to his question, except to say that we would do our best, our very best, and that the American people would be angry if any attempt were made to deprive other people of food because we might disagree with their leaders.

Arun finished making the fire and left. It occurred to me that what ought to be done was to take Arun to the United States on the very next plane and bring him before the Senate of the United States.

If the Congressmen don't want to give wheat to Arun and countless millions of his countrymen, then they ought to tell it to Arun directly. Let them answer Arun's questions—if they can. Let them hear about Arun's children and then tell him exactly why a Nation which has a surplus of wheat does not feel that it wants to put politics to one side when people are starving.

Then, after telling Arun why he will get no wheat, let us finish the job. Let us recall the appropriation for the Voice of America and for all our information services abroad. Let us shut down all our efforts to combat Communist propaganda against us. There is no point telling our story to the world if there is nothing for us to say. All the Voice of America can do is to try to provide a real, true account of what is happening in America. What we say can and should be a reflection of what we do.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about the need to speak to peoples and only to governments. The most powerful language in the world today is food. It is clearly understood. It builds bridges mightier by far than radio broadcasts or published material, especially when people have no radios or cannot read.

My purpose in coming to India was to try to tell the Indian people about America and to try to answer the many lies being told about us. Those lies are aimed at splitting America off from the rest of the world. Yet there is nothing Soviet propaganda can say about us that can do nearly the harm that we can do to ourselves if we should turn our back today not only on India but on the meaning of America itself.

General MacArthur's Greatness Cannot Be Subdued by Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the rising flood of indignation from average citizens all over this Nation is pouring into Washington in support of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and in protest against the action of President Truman in summarily dismissing General MacArthur.

Never before in history have the people so strongly protested the action of a Chief Executive. Never before have the American people completely lost confidence in the administration elected by them to office, and viewed with suspicion and distrust the motivation behind the acts of the President and the Secretary of State.

Angry demands for drastic action have been voiced by an outraged citizenry which fears that a continuation of the senseless blundering mistakes of the President and his administration will bring disaster to the United States.

The people today look to the Congress to rise to its responsibilities and develop a leadership which the Nation can trust to consider the welfare and security of the United States of America, and to take such steps as are possible to prevent further blunders and mismanagement in the administration.

From all parts of the country editorial writers have voiced their regret that the President chose to remove General MacArthur from his command. The following is one of the most eloquent and direct reviews of the MacArthur dismissal which appeared in a recent edition of the Tidings, published in Los Angeles, Calif.:

The symbol of hope becomes the legend of despair. The Nation reels in stunned dismay with the MacArthur dismissal. Resentment flares in a fateful hour. The spokesman of Christian values and American ideals in the Orient, whose towering courage won the respect of friend and erstwhile foe and steeled them both against a newer menace, is abruptly silenced and humbled while Acheson's design of disaster sweeps inexorably toward deeper disgrace and newer infamy.

There has been torment for General MacArthur since a decade ago when the goading of diplomacy outstripped military preparedness and brought about the fiasco of the Philippines. Even in the tragedy of Corregidor, when he was narrowly spared the death march of Bataan, he kept alive the hope of freedom in Asia by vowing victory and return. Slowed by a lack of matériel in what then too was considered a secondary theater of operations, he nevertheless by a brilliant series of tactical surprises in hedge-hopping maneuvers finally sloshed ashore at Leyte and readied the final thrust at the enemy mainland. Victory hovered even before Hiroshima.

He pursued his undeviating way ignoring the petty jealousy of President, circumventing diplomat playing at strategy, unheedful of the biting carp and cant of the liberal fringe peddling the planted alien propaganda that could not diminish his stature or deflect his resolve not only to defeat the enemy but to thwart the pretensions of supposed friends. He knew the caliber of our dubious allies and like General Patton, whose spirit was also seared by the foreign flame, tried to alert America to the sinister peril that shaped. Who can deny that if the views of these two God-fearing men and eminent military strategists had prevailed, we would not now be in dread with apprehensions of doom?

General MacArthur was nowhere more magnificent than amid the ruins of Seoul leading his men in the Lord's Prayer even as the United Nations planned the sell-out of American valor and sacrifice. His was the responsibility for American lives in Korea, and in the welter of conflicting directives and tactical restrictions he knew the danger that massed against our soldiers in the privileged sanctuary of Manchuria. With 60,000 casualties in Korea, he could be pardoned if he was compelled to speak yet again when he was not heard before.

His long experience in the Orient ranked him as an observer of American interests in the Far East far more qualified in the sequence of events than Lattimore, Acheson, Service, Carter, and Jessup, and he recognized that an Asia in chains boded ill for the future of freedom in Europe as well. But there was never even the will to measure his views in the unfolding series of diplomatic blunders.

It is our tradition both in peace and war that the military bows before the higher word of the Executive. This has been a workable policy insuring unity of direction in a common effort. The repeated remonstrances of General MacArthur revealed deep-seated divergence with the views in Washington. Yet who will say in the days we see that Acheson is right and MacArthur wrong? The mandate of the people last November should have given point and meaning to the unfortunate episode.

It is regrettable that Mr. Truman resolved the impasse by summary dismissal. He might have understood with more patience the anguish of a commander in the field, with death and devastation all around, hindered and hampered by diplomacy in a situation without precedent like the Korean incident. He might, if he considered removal justifiable, have brought a show of unity to the land and preserved the respect of the world by appointing a noble American to higher honors in other avenues of service. The country in this hour has need of men of the character and integrity of MacArthur. This is no time to invite suspicion and deeper distrust by the callous disregard of one who has served America faithfully, wisely, and well.

National Disunity Worst Effect of MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, April 17, 1951:

NATIONAL DISUNITY WORST EFFECT OF MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—President Truman has split America. He has stirred up such dissension and division among the American people that the disunity which prevails today transcends in importance even the issues which led to his dismissal of General MacArthur.

From all over the country the evidence is piling up that Mr. Truman has stirred up bitterness such as has not been noted since the days before the Civil War. The emotional reaction to the dismissal of General MacArthur has not been lessened by the strangely partisan behavior that has developed in Congress itself.

Thus, the Democrats at first resented the idea of a joint meeting to hear General MacArthur. Only upon further reflection did they decide to go along with plans to welcome the general.

Then came the sniping and the insuendoes. Mr. Truman, who told the Democrats gathered at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner last Saturday night to put the national interest above personal interest, promptly followed his own political impulses and started off another wave of bitterness by his innuendo against General MacArthur.

VAUGHAN TO BE GREETER

Within the last 24 hours another incident has brought more irritation. It has been announced that, when General MacArthur returns to Washington after an absence of 14 years spent fighting for his country, the only man who is to be sent to the airport by the White House to greet him is General Vaughan.

No more stupid way of belittling the visit of General MacArthur could have been dreamed up at the White House. If this is a sample of the political judgment of the President or of his advisers, it indicates that the poor strategy which led to the peremptory firing of MacArthur has not been followed by any better understanding of the public temper.

There were half a dozen ways by which the President could have relieved General MacArthur of his command. There were many ways by which the split in this country could have been avoided. But what is much worse is that the Democratic Party in Congress has lined up solidly against General MacArthur and in defense of President Truman's arbitrary action. Conversely, the Republicans, seeing the whole thing taking on a political flavor, have themselves lined up in self-defense and in defense of General MacArthur.

TRAGEDY FOR AMERICA

Thus has the most important issue before the country—how to prevent a big-scale war—been turned over to political handling. This cannot bring a bipartisan approach to world policy. It cannot bring a united spirit behind any program of the administration. It is about the worst tragedy that could have befallen America.

President Truman must accept full responsibility for the blunder. He did not tell the party leaders in advance what he intended to do or how he intended to do it. He asked opinions from a few of the leaders, to be sure, and indicated that he had to do something. But it was one-man Government that finally functioned. One man in the White House, in a sudden decision late last Tuesday, decided to dismiss a general who had served his country well and to announce that decision to the press. One-man Government treated with contempt not only the valiant service of a great general but also the principle of affording a hearing to an important official engaged in an important assignment 8,000 miles away from home—a mission of civil as well as military management of an occupied country.

Mr. Truman could have sent for General MacArthur and could have threshed out the differences. If they could not have been resolved, Mr. Truman could have given MacArthur the choice of retiring or of being relieved forthwith.

FALSE ISSUE TRUMPED UP

A false issue is now being trumped up. It is an argument being advanced by the President that MacArthur wants to bring on a large-scale war and that Mr. Truman wants peace. Nothing could be more illustrative of the narrowness of vision that prevails in Washington today. For General MacArthur is sincerely convinced that the proposals he has championed mean peace. Many observers—not in the Military Establishment—believe an appeasement policy by the President and the Department of State will bring on a third world war with all its horrible consequences.

General MacArthur has been reported as opposing peace at any price. Actually he has not been doing any more than asking for a vigorous prosecution of a war in which 60,000 casualties already have been suffered by the United States—more casualties in 9 months than in the first full year of World War II for this country.

The effort to misrepresent MacArthur's position has begun. All the engines of publicity of the administration have been started. The President's gibe at MacArthur at the political dinner Saturday night was the beginning. Already the Democrats are getting ready to turn on the smears. These are sad days for America.

Attempted Regulation in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a very pointed and powerful editorial which appeared in the Fox Valley Mirror, published at Carpentersville, Ill., and edited by a two-fisted American citizen, Leonard Fowler.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE AMERICANS ARE NOT BASTARDS; THEY ARE OUR SONS

Something more than a week ago the newspapers read by most of us here in the Middle West flung into our faces, in big, black type across their first pages, this imperiously insolent phrase:

"Aids at Washington consider edict to curb business profits."

Who is it that thus dares to speak of "edict"—when addressed to free American citizens?

Are they so woefully ignorant of the seignorial estate of an American's citizenship?

"Edict!" Do they know not the meaning of this abominable word?

An "edict," however, and whenever used, signifies a directive of supreme command; a rigid law, enunciated by an autocrat before whom all must bow and obey.

How dare, then, do these negligent writers speak of "edict"?

An "edict" is a rule of conduct imposed by an absolute monarch upon his subjects. It is a word that may be addressed solely to bondmen or to slaves.

From the terms of an "edict" there can be no manumission. "Edict" is the merciless tool of the relentless tyrant.

How foolhardy have these traitorous servants of ours grown?

"Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

Must these war-mad, power-drunk servants of ours force us to spurn their meretricious dominion?

If that be true it is time that we repudiate the authority of this mutinous crew of predacious politicians who have seised upon the riches of our treasure and now pretend to assert a dictator's supremacy.

There are 145,000,000 sovereigns in this great land of ours, and not one owns the prerogative to speak for any other.

Before the law all Americans rightfully stand equal—rightfully so.

"Edict." I abhor the word.

How did they dare venture to employ so hateful a term?

Even though used with the utmost discretion, words are tricky tools, ambiguous and cunning; they deceive the unwary. Honeyed and melting, they bring us to the pitiless place of appeasement at Yalta, Potsdam, Tehran.

It is the lying words of beguiling pretenders that have ambushed us so that our fine young men fall by thousands to lie in windrows, at the harsh command of political tricksters. It is they—skilled in the wily use of our mother tongue—that have melted our emotions to provide fortunes for the Double Dealers so safely seated in their morass of chicane politics. They have lured us to our possible destruction because—

The supine and most corrupt amongst us have been given the authority to set up a monopoly of labor—the purchase price of labor's vote, turned into an illegal power to enforce greater excesses for their own gain and against the common weal.

Through the most fantastic injustices this same sordid crew at Washington, that would fix the prices of the products of man's labor, would deny an equal justice in dealing with capital, management, and material, without which not even labor can function.

They have snatched our boys from their schools and their books. In the infancy of their maturity our youth have been conscripted to form an army to fight the battles of other nations in Asia—10,000 miles from their homes. If permitted to continue, we shall be bankrupt in resources, broken in manpower, destitute of initiative. We shall rear a despondent generation—already surrendered to the bitter embrace of despair.

The newspapers suppress some of the more wanton facts, but the backwash of the news reeks with rumors of the perverts in the State Department, traitors dyed red with treason, who have sought to destroy this Nation and all that home and country stand

for. That they may gratify their own whispered indulgences in the lewdness of lechery, they laugh at those who would pursue the pathway to the peaks of glory. Hence this wave of crime against women and children. Sensualists; corrupt weaklings, of the most dissolute depravity and lascivious tongue are drowning in their own slime the pure vision of home, the safety of woman's virtue, and man's sacred obligation to his children.

To march against, to destroy these, death itself would be a sweet sacrifice.

In the whole of Korea—not too much greater in size than the State of Illinois—there are 20 of those yellow devils to 1 of our own brave youngsters.

Even though each American lad be armed with a machine gun, that far land's 23,000,000 barbarians could stone our boys to death—were their rock pile big enough.

In the days when so few of us at Boston were dumping British tea, brought by British ships into Boston Harbor, held by the British Army, there was in the House of Commons, in England's Parliament, a brave man. History has named him "Mr. Pitt."

Pick out all the other Pitts, and there were many of them, but you will find in the annals of those who served Britain only one "Mr. Pitt." When he protested against the enforcement of the Stamp Act; when he decried the use of arms at Concord; when he condemned all harsh measures against the Americans, Mr. Pitt, all alone, had the courage to stand, shaking his finger at the King's bench, and send forth his clarion denunciation:

"Those Americans are not bastards; they are our sons."

Where, in this great Nation; in what place between these broad oceans, lives there another Mr. Pitt?

THE FOX VALLEY FREE PRESS,
LEONARD FOWLER, *Editor*.

Pan American Day, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, it has been our custom for many years to celebrate April 14 as Pan American Day. It affords an opportunity to demonstrate anew the friendship existing among the 21 American Republics, a friendship which has been cemented for more than half a century by the agreements signed at the various inter-American conferences. These agreements have formed the basis for the inter-American system. Of special importance are three of these, namely the Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, commonly called the Rio Pact, which was signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1947; the Organization of American States; and the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement. The two latter were the result of negotiations at Bogotá in 1948. Great progress in Pan American relations is evidenced by the signing of these treaties which should be of great assistance in keeping peace in the Western Hemisphere and even throughout the world. The successful application of the Rio treaty in disputes in the Caribbean area has already given promise of a more peaceful future.

It is not only in political affairs that the American States have drawn closer together. The idea of the "good neighbor" has been extended to many other fields. As early as 1936 at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, held at Buenos Aires, a treaty was drawn up for the exchange of professors, students, and teachers among the American nations. This treaty was called the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations and was subsequently ratified by 17 of the American Republics. The convention provides that every other year professors shall be exchanged, while every year each government will exchange two students selected according to an established procedure with each of the other countries. In addition to the United States, the participating countries are: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela. Under this program and subsequent arrangements many students have learned the real meaning of inter-American friendship.

One of the most active organizations for inter-American cooperation is the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, whose activities are based on technical and scientific cooperation with the other nations of the hemisphere in order to strengthen the foundation of their freedom and ours. The programs of the Institute are developmental programs in which technicians from the United States work abroad with the technicians of the cooperating countries to increase the productivity of the farmers, wipe out disease, and to reduce ignorance. These cooperative programs have been outstandingly successful and each of the other participating governments has requested continuance of the programs and has progressively increased the proportion of its contribution. They have been helpful in strengthening democratic institutions and in counteracting the spread of communism throughout the Americas.

While inter-American treaties between the governments are desirable and essential and have brought about a system of cooperation unequaled elsewhere in any region of the world, it is interesting to note other ways by which good relations between the United States and Latin America have been cultivated and promoted.

In these days of almost universal air travel, many persons fly to the various Latin-American countries from the United States and conversely, many persons come to the United States from the States to the south of us. Miami, Fla., in my district, is a central point of departure or arrival for great numbers of these travelers. It is one of the largest air terminals in the United States. Its international airport is the most important serving the Caribbean area and Central and South America. Moreover, it probably serves more vacation travelers than any other airfield. It covers 2,555 acres, has hundreds of buildings, and employs many thousands of people. It has four runways, each of which is approximately 7,000 feet in length and all are 150 feet wide and hard-surfaced. It serves 14 scheduled air carriers and 44 nonscheduled. Probably no other airport takes care of as many unscheduled carriers; and many of these operate between the United States and the Latin-American and Caribbean areas.

English is the prevailing language at the International Airport but Spanish is almost as common. Signs in restaurants, shops, rest rooms, and other facilities appear in both languages. Arrivals and departures are announced in the two tongues. It is not unusual to hear Portuguese or any other half a dozen tongues in the waiting room.

Not only do many passengers arrive and depart from Miami International Airport but tons of mail and even greater tonnage of cargo are handled each year. Much of this is from or bound to some Latin-American country. It has been designated an airport of entry by the Treasury Department. In 1949 customs agents collected more duty on airborne goods here than at all the other airports in the Nation combined. A separate postal station has been set up since the war to handle the postal business. Mail going out of the country is sorted and quickly sent on its way without having to go through the regular Miami post office.

Pan American World Airways has its overhaul and maintenance shops here. They are the largest in the world. Pan American planes fly to all the nations of Latin America, affording quick and reliable transportation. There is no doubt that this has done much to further inter-American understanding since it has made it possible for many people from all of these nations to visit the United States and for Americans to travel southward with great ease and speed.

Florida was originally settled by the Spanish and many Florida inhabitants are descended from these early settlers. Naturally, therefore, the people of my State have a warm affinity for our neighbors in Latin America, many of whom are also descended from these early explorers. They have many common interests and Spanish-speaking peoples are given a cordial welcome in Florida.

A number of inter-American centers were established in various parts of the United States in the early forties under the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. These centers proved to be of great benefit in implementing the good neighbor policy. They afforded an opportunity for citizens of one American country to learn more about the history, culture, geography, and trade of the other American nations. Such a cultural and trade center has been established at Miami, which is already the focus for so much inter-American activity. There is no doubt that this center when completed will further promote the cordial friendship among the American nations.

We of south Florida salute our American neighbors on this Pan-American Day and join in the hope that the fellowship and friendship existing between the freedom loving nations of the Western Hemisphere will serve as an inspiration to the other nations of the world.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by Mrs. India Edwards, vice chairman, Democratic National Committee, and director, women's division, at the National Guard Armory, Washington, D. C., on April 14, 1951:

Tonight I am the representative of the millions upon millions of women who four times voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt for President and who 3 years ago voted for Harry Truman to continue to be our President. Women who voted Democratic in 1946 were not, to put it bluntly, buying a pig in a poke for President Truman had been demonstrating his brand of leadership ever since he took office in 1945 when Roosevelt died.

Women who voted Democratic in 1948 knew they were voting for a President who courageously would carry on the fight for peace and a better life for all, which is the goal of every woman, be she white, yellow or black, a college graduate or illiterate, whatever her status, occupation or profession.

Remember that the great statues of peace, justice, law and order are the faces and forms of women; that the great torch of liberty is held aloft in the hands of a woman. I have never had the misfortune to meet a woman who did not abhor war, who did not feel that wars never have settled anything. But this does not mean that women are idealistically impractical or that they are appeasers. No, they know that when evil forces are at large, they must be destroyed and sometimes it is necessary to use force to destroy them. But women know that if our civilization is to survive we must wage peace with the same energy and crusading devotion with which we have waged war when it has been thrust upon us. Women know that President Truman has the same abhorrence of war, the same desire to avoid a third world war that they have.

I believe that women all over this land were encouraged when they heard the President simply and solemnly state the far-eastern policy of the United States last Wednesday night. Women everywhere, even in Russia and the other countries behind the iron curtain, if the Voice of America could reach of them, must have been impressed with his sincerity and the rational policy he was enunciating. Let us hope that the Voice of America soon will be a strong voice, clearly heard behind the iron curtain and that we, as a unified people, will use every means within our power to make the Russian people believe that we honestly want true peace, that we do not seek war and that we would rather use our vast resources and power to build a decent world than to destroy any part of the world.

The President made it clear Wednesday night that the United States and the United Nations will not take action that might start a third world war, but that they will resist aggression. They are fighting in Korea as a warning to the Communists that the free nations will and can defend free people. Fighting in Korea may have averted a third world war; it could be that the reason we can meet here tonight, unafraid that enemy planes might drop bombs on us while we dine, is because our President had the courage to send our troops into Korea and because he has the courage to refuse to allow a military commander to take action that might inflame the Communists into starting a third world war.

On Wednesday night, President Truman warned that the Communist rulers may take further action which will spread the conflict. "They have that choice," he said, "and with it the awful responsibility for what may follow."

So, I say to you, Mr. President, and the 5,000 other Democrats who are here tonight, women everywhere can have renewed hope for eventual peace because you, as the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Nation have the same profound devotion to peace—peace with honor, peace not just for our time but for all time.

We thank God that we have a President who will fight for peace, who will not be swayed by those who place politics above our national security; who will not be intimidated by those who would sacrifice peace for their own political ambitions.

Tonight, as we pay honor to the founders of the Democratic Party, Jefferson and Jackson, let us salute our great President who is carrying out the principles of Jefferson and Jackson.

Our children and grandchildren will be free to assemble as we are assembled tonight because we had Roosevelt in the White House for 12 years and because we have had Harry Truman there for 6 of the most perilous years in our history. And we will have him there for 5 more, please God.

A Tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur by Alfonso Mirabal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur by my friend Alfonso Mirabal.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

(By Alfonso Mirabal)

It is proper and appropriate that at the termination of a lifelong service rendered our country by a famous contemporary personality that a tribute be paid him.

Words seem very inadequate, inept and ineffectual to fully honor the leadership and aspiration that this great military leader and statesman gave to all Americans throughout the years of ordeal and wars, in which he devoted his life, and to which so willingly he served his fellowmen.

A brief review of his life is a review of "Americana."

Douglas MacArthur was born at Little Rock, Ark., on January 26, 1880.

His military career began with his graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point, where he graduated with the highest honors in 1903.

The first assignment was with the Engineers Corps in the Philippine Islands. It was in these islands MacArthur many years later led one of the most dramatic defenses in military history.

In 1914 MacArthur made a creditable and fine record in an expedition to Mexico.

He was selected as Chief of the Censorship Division when the United States entered World War I. His work was of such high merits that he was promoted to the rank of colonel in August of 1917. He asked for active duty and soon became Chief of Staff of the noted Rainbow Division in October, 1917. This division was one of the roughest, hard-hitting forces in the war area. In February of 1918 he received a citation for gallantry from the commander of the French Seventh Army, and the next June he was promoted to brigadier general. He was placed in command of the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade, which broke the Kriemhilde line north of Verdun in October; he next commanded the Rainbow Division. He led it through the Meuse-Argonne offensive and in the advance of Sedan, and later took it to the Rhine as part of the Army of Occupation.

In June, 1919, he became the youngest officer ever to be honored with the superintendency of the Military Academy at West Point.

In 1922 he was assigned to command the Manila District.

He was made a Major General in 1925—being the youngest with that rank in the Army. So, again in 1930, when he was selected as Chief of Staff, United States Army, with the temporary rank of General, he was the youngest man ever appointed to that post. As Chief of Staff he was military adviser to several presidents.

In 1935 he was granted leave to help the Philippine Commonwealth prepare its national defenses.

At his own request he retired in 1937. His retirement, however, was not for long, as his knowledge of military strategy was widely recognized as unsurpassed. He was recalled to duty with the appointment of commander general of all United States troops in the Far East and promoted to the rank of lieutenant general. He became a full general in December of 1941. In March of 1942 he received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Perhaps one of the most notable events, still fresh in the minds of Americans, occurred in March 1942, when General MacArthur on the direct orders of President Roosevelt relinquished his post on Bataan and made a dramatic 2,000-mile trip by plane, submarine, and motor torpedo boat to Australia, where he assumed the supreme command of the land, sea and air forces of the United Nations in the southwest Pacific during World War II. He was accompanied on this most historic trip by his wife and young son Arthur. It is now history how he conquered one island after another to fulfill his dramatic vow to return to the Philippines and forcefully retake it from the enemy. While the whole world of free, liberty-loving nations prayed, he led the troops in hand-to-hand combat into Leyte. At the head of his troops he waded through the surf in that famous battle. Even grade-school youngsters today can relate how MacArthur, after taking the Philippines as commander of the allied forces, spearheaded the war against Japan. Aboard the battleship *Missouri* he in company with our other military leaders signed the formal surrender in Tokyo Bay. Over and over again he has set aside any regard for his personal safety by going to the front in the battles in Korea as was his custom in the two World Wars.

In the present Far East war, MacArthur had a fourfold duty. He was supreme allied occupation commander in Japan, United Nations commander in chief for Korea, United States commander in chief for the Far East, and commanding general of the United States Army in the Far East.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by the Honorable William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the National Guard Armory, Washington, D. C., on April 14, 1951:

On behalf of the Democratic National Committee I welcome you to the 1951 Jefferson-Jackson dinner. I thank each one of you for your attendance—for your enthusiasm, and for your party loyalty.

I extend special thanks to the members of the dinner committee for the long hours and hard work that have made this occasion so outstandingly successful under the chairmanship of a distinguished Democrat, the former Secretary of the Navy, John L. Sullivan, and the equally distinguished cochairman, the charming wife of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mrs. Charles F. Brannan, and under the stewardship of our able treasurer, the Honorable Sidney Salomon, Jr.

Because of their efforts and your constant and loyal support, my job as chairman has been made a pleasant one.

We are meeting tonight at a serious and solemn hour. We are gathered to rededicate ourselves to the principles of two great Americans—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

However, we do not meet solely as partisan members of a political party. Instead, we gather together as Americans to join hands with all other Americans—to pray—to work—to fight for the security of our country.

Your meeting here in a spirit of patriotism and unity is a tribute to the courage and leadership of our great President, Harry S. Truman.

At no time in the history of this Nation have the words "Let us unite with one heart and one mind" meant so much as they do today. These were the words of Jefferson 150 years ago. These are the sentiments of our great leader, President Harry S. Truman.

This we gather not merely to celebrate—not merely to achieve political aims—not as representatives of any partisan group—but as Americans who are concerned with the problems which confront our Nation and the world.

This is the hour in which we proudly point to our heritage as Americans. The founders of this Nation proved ready and willing to make any sacrifice for the good of the Nation and its people.

No sacrifice will be too great. We in our generation must meet whatever demands are made for the sake of our country, for the patriotic citizens to make for the security of the Nation.

When the security of this Nation is at stake there is no time for partisan politics.

Patriotism must come before politics.

The hour has passed when men may think in terms of pettiness. Selfishness, envy, and greed must not be part of the thinking of mankind if we are to save America, preserve our freedom, and give hope to a troubled world.

We need a single-minded unity in our determination to preserve our national integrity and our American way of life.

We have repeatedly asked for unity for all patriotic Americans regardless of political affiliations to work together for the security of our country and we continue to ask for unity.

We have borne with patience and, if necessary, we will continue to bear the abuse, slander, smears, and lies which some members of the minority party resort to in order to further their own selfish purposes.

These irresponsible attacks are not in the interest of America. President Truman has dedicated his very life toward the attainment of world peace—and he, like Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt in their days, has had to endure the attacks of the powerful interests who use devious and underhanded means designed to mislead and confuse the American public.

But the American people have repeatedly proven themselves to be too well informed to be misled by such tactics.

In politics as in life itself, right will prevail. The American people know that the Democratic Party stands for what is right.

We must refuse to listen to the shrill voices of discontent and disunity. Those individuals who seek to sow seeds of distrust and to divide our people should feel the full weight of public condemnation.

The Democratic Party will hold intact the progress we have made for the benefit of the farmers, the workers, business and professional men and women, and for all the people in this country.

The Democratic Party will continue to be the party of the people as it has since the days of Jefferson and Jackson.

It has advanced under the stirring leadership of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman.

The fundamental issue of our time is the fight between freedom and Communist slavery. In this fight our country by the grace of God stands a free, prosperous, and strong Nation—we intend to keep it that way—and we will under the leadership of our great President, Harry S. Truman.

This is an hour in which men with firm convictions renew their belief in the democratic way of life—indeed in their faith in Almighty God. The faith of our fathers must be found in our hearts—in our minds and souls—as we stand steadfast today in support of our leaders.

In this hour of peril we who are part of the Democratic Party have no desire for partisan political advantage and we ask all patriotic Americans to join with us to give to America its greatest strength and thereby bring about world peace.

America will win through this period of danger. I pray God that the day will soon come when the blessings of peace and prosperity will be made secure to every person in this land, and when the bountiful production of all the great industries of the world will be fully available for the peaceful advancement of mankind instead of for destruction.

These are our objectives. I ask all Americans to join with us tonight in support of our great leader in this fight to save the world.

Proposed Grant of $150,000,000 to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Louisville Times of April 4 published an editorial entitled "Israel Deserves Our Assistance in Its Time of Trouble." This is a very fine editorial, from an outstanding newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL DESERVES OUR ASSISTANCE IN ITS TIME OF TROUBLE

The bill introduced in the House of Representatives this week to grant $150,000,000 to Israel points up again for us far removed from the scene (those who are there need no reminder) how desperate is the situation in that newest and most hopeful of countries. Surrounded by hostile peoples, overpopulated in relation to production, suffering from an inflation which makes ours look mild and torn internally by conflicting viewpoints, Israel is in a serious condition.

The bill granting the $150,000,000 was introduced by Representative MCCORMACK, House Democratic leader, and thus presumably is an administration measure. But even its passage would go only a short way toward solving Israel's trouble. Some idea of the magnitude of that problem can be gained from the fact that the Israeli government is seeking in the next 3 years a development fund of $1,500,000,000, including a $500,000,000 bond issue in this country.

According to Moshe Brilliant in a New York Times dispatch early this year, Israel's principal economic problems, "the gap between consumption and production, the adverse balance of trade and the threat of inflation," result largely from the doubling of the country's population (to 1,350,000) in 2½ years, the growth of the Arab minority through territorial expansion and the fact that Israel's neighbors are hostile.

It is the population expansion which particularly interests us because, in a sense, Israel was formed to give homeless Jews a home. This she has done and is doing. In 1950 alone, 170,000 persons entered the country. At the end of the year 40,000 were living in immigrant camps, dependent on the Jewish Agency while awaiting work and living accommodations.

Even in a naturally rich country expansion at this rate would create enormous problems. But Israel is not rich. Hal Lehrman, writing in Commentary some time ago, said: "The simple truth, to begin with, is that no more than a quarter to a third of Israel's economy can be agricultural. This country must sell abroad in order to buy food; in the long run, it must export or die." But in order to export it needs to import raw materials, machines, and money. It needs money to develop new territories, new industries, new factories, new housing accommodations.

As a result of the current economic instability, private sources of money are drying up. Lehrman, in the article mentioned previously, said, "The high costs of labor, fuel, electric power and transport, the low level of mechanization, the Israeli pound's lopsided rate of exchange all go into the making of a headache which many prospective foreign Jewish investors show themselves reluctant to chance for the sake of uncertain and slender profits."

With Israel importing about seven times as much as she exports and with private capital becoming reluctant to invest in those fundamentals which would ease that imbalance, it is no wonder that Israel has been seeking assistance from the United States Government. Nor is there any doubt that we should give all the help we can to aid that country for whose founding we are partly responsible.

The Anglo-American Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, the Anglo-American partnership, by Lawrence Hunt, of New York City, at the fifty-fifth annual convention of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, in Philadelphia, on Saturday, April 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members of the academy, ladies and gentlemen, I am highly honored and deeply grateful for the opportunity to address the annual convention of this great institution about some of the questions for which we are seeking honest and sensible answers.

One of the major lessons from Asia and the chief lesson of our times is the supreme necessity, for the survival of the free world, of our Anglo-American partnership.

Today Russia has a great hope and a great objective—that Britain and America will fail to win the battle for freedom throughout the world. Her leaders shrewdly count, not only on their own skill, but on our follies, to disunite us; they count on the reactionaries who never learn; they count perhaps even more on the pseudo intellectuals, the doctrinaires, and the perverse perfectionists with their frantic lust for self-deception. The Communists today, like the Nazis yesterday, know that if they can divide Britain and America they can conquer the world. To divide Britain and America—that is their supreme hope, as it is the supreme hope of all the enemies of man's freedom.

Will the Russian Communists succeed?

If the outcome depended on our frustrated and glamour-seeking politicians and our pseudo intellectuals, the answer would be "Yes." There is no use denying that they have done some harm and will do much more harm if they can. But those people do not speak for America.

It is true that there is an extreme but very small left-wing group in Britain which does not like the Anglo-American partnership and is unfairly critical of America. But the responsible leaders of both the Labor government and the Conservative opposition have repudiated these extremists and have expressed, again and again and again, inside and outside of Parliament, their understanding and appreciation of America's efforts to protect the free nations against Soviet imperialism. They have expressed, again and again and again, the British people's gratitude for the help of their American partner.

Here in America we have been deluged in recent months with a constant stream of propaganda about Brition trading with the enemy, Britain's appeasement of China, and about the British dragging their feet. There has been no serious effort here, comparable to that in England, by the responsible leaders of both our parties, to refute this vilification and abuse which can only give aid and comfort to Soviet communism; no real attempt by our leaders in or out of politics to tell the American people the truth about our British partner, to urge understanding and fair play, even when there are differences in methods about meeting the menace of Soviet imperialism.

The upshot of it all is that the thinking of many honest people has become confused, their nerves jangled and their emotions jaded. Even supposedly intelligent people—even lawyers—frequently stop thinking these days and mentally go to sleep with a slogan or a catch phrase.

The chief purpose of my remarks today is to suggest briefly that we question some of these abusive criticisms, and, however painful to the prejudices or disturbing to the ignorance of some Americans, that we try—really try—to be fair to our British partner. Without fair play toward others, we shall become a mentally corrupt people. Without fair play, our Anglo-American partnership will ultimately fail. Without fair play, our civilization will go down in ruin.

Of course I do not mean that there should be any suppression of honest differences among the members of our English-speaking family. Advice to other nations has always been the greatest American export, in volume if not in value, and we must expect and even welcome a fair balance of trade in that respect, as in others. But in these days of high tension we have what Anthony Eden calls "the responsibility to choose our words." Our propagandists for world war III are perversely imitating the Russian tactic of vilification and abuse, even toward our staunchest ally, about comparatively minor differences. These Russian tactics have not been persuasive with the free peoples of the world, and their imitation by people in this country obscures America's finest purposes and tends to thwart her best efforts to avoid another war.

Now about Britain "trading with the enemy." That accusation is chiefly concerned with Hong Kong's trade with China and Russia. Let's face the facts. Hong Kong applies the same controls to trade with China as are applied by Britain. This trade is nearly all in goods and materials produced in many other countries. The export to Communist countries of nearly 300 articles, including munitions, chemicals, machine tools, etc., is absolutely forbidden, and the export of another hundred articles is carefully restricted, and the export of still another hundred articles is subject to the constant supervision of the British Government.

Many of the free nations are receiving in this trade with Russia and China materials necessary to their own economic strength and essential to their ability to rearm and defend themselves against Communist aggression. It is helpful to note that the occupying authorities in Japan recently accepted Chinese conditions for the continuation of the import of coke coal from certain mines in north China in exchange for the equal value of Japanese cotton yarn on a barter basis. Such an exchange makes sense under present world conditions; is this "trading with the enemy"?

Let's face the facts.

About one-third of Hong Kong's trade is with China. In the first 11 months of 1950 about $340,000,000 in trade went to China and about $144,000,000 to the United States. There are now about two and one-half to three million inhabitants of Hong Kong as compared with 600,000 in 1945. If that crowded little island, an outpost of democratic civilization, is not permitted to conduct legitimate trade, the consequent economic collapse and civil strife would make almost certain its conquest from within. It is true that Russia is buying some rubber from the rubber producing countries, including some of the British Commonwealth countries. But the United States is taking eight times as much of the total world rubber production as Russia and 10 times what China purchased last year.

Again I say, let's face the facts.

Britain and America are not at war with China or Russia. Our policy is to avoid war with them. That is what our political leaders are constantly telling us and the rest of the world. We must assume that they are telling the truth. It is true that a few noisy fanatics, possibly some stock speculators who are worried about a peace scare, and some strangely perverse folk with the gruesome faith that the atom bomb will solve the major problems of a turbulent world, actually think that a third world war is imminent and inevitable, and even desirable. But the American people don't want another world war, and they do want their Government to avoid such a war.

An economic blockade of China would be a major act of war, an act which would assume that war with China, a world war, had begun. Our British partner does not believe that such a blockade could be effective, and it would, of course, create more difficulties than it would solve. Would such a blockade try to prevent Indian cotton and Pakistan jute and Indonesian rubber from getting to China's ports? Would we sink Indian ships carrying goods and materials? Would such a blockade make China more or less dependent upon Russia's aid and support?

One of the hardest tasts of statesmanship is to keep local wars from becoming major conflicts; to end local wars, not extend them. That is what all the free peoples, including the American people, desperately want. But we Americans must make our actions fit our words, or the Voice of America will be a monumental sham.

Whatever we do, let's stop talking nonsense about Britain trading with the enemy, and let's try to use some of the common sense which we are so sure we possess.

Our propagandists for a third world war and many self-deluded perfectionists are denouncing Britain's so-called appeasement of China, particularly because Britain has recognized the Communist Chinese Government and has supported the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Again I say, let's face the facts, painful though they be. The fact is, much as we and Britain dislike it, that the Communist Chinese Government is in control, as far as any Chinese Government ever has been, of the mainland of China. America recognizes, as Britain recognizes, the governments of Russia; of Poland, whose United Nations representative is on our program; of other Russian satellite countries; of Yugoslavia, which boasts that its communism is purer than the Russian brand; of Spain, Argentina, and other governments with an unpleasant odor. Why not China? Diplomatic recognition, as our British friends point out, does not mean approval, but simply means the recognition of a fact—even an unpleasant fact.

Russia and her satellites, and some other nations we do not like or admire, are members of the United Nations, which is a world organization embracing all kinds of nations, and not a defensive alliance such as the Atlantic Pact. If Russia and its satellites are members of the United Nations, why not Communist China?

Our British partner has no illusions about the Communists in China nor any hope that tomorrow, or next week, or next month, Communist China will become a democracy or will sever her present ties with Russia. But the British do believe—and I submit that we Americans should also believe—that in the long run there is a chance that China will become less dependent on Russia and that her national interests in the future, as in the past, will keep her from becoming a vast Russian satellite without a life of her own—another Russian slave state. Hard as it may be, we should try to take the long

view and not resort or succumb to the slogans and catchphrases of our propagandists for world war III.

But the most unscrupulous and the most malicious accusation by these propagandists is that the British are dragging their feet.

Again I say, let's face the facts.

In proportion to her population—one-third of ours—Britain has today as many men in her armed forces combating or restraining Communist aggression as has the United States. Her forces are fighting or are on guard at 19 key points throughout the world. Anthony Eden has pointed out in the April issue of Foreign Affairs that these British forces are stretched in relation to the availability of trained men and modern arms more tautly than those of any other country, ally, or enemy. The British were fighting in Malaya for 2 years before the Communist aggression in Korea last June. Britain has had universal military training for men 18 to 26 since 1947. We are still talking about it. The British people, for more than 10 years, have voluntarily submitted to a rationing system, in some respects severer today than ever before, unknown and perhaps even unbearable in this country. And why? To repair the awful damage of war, to enable their country to pay its own way, to meet its obligations, and to play its part in the defense of the freedom of mankind. One egg and 8 pence worth of meat a week.

Who are dragging their feet?

The results of this self-restraint and self-sacrifice on the part of the British people should be reassuring to their friends and astounding to future historians. Our partner has achieved solvency at least for the moment. She has raised her industrial production 60 percent and her exports 70 percent above the prewar level. Proportionately, she is doing at least as much as America in meeting the menace of Soviet communism.

Nor is this the whole story. It is much easier for a rich man to contribute 15 percent of his income to worthy causes than it is for a man of modest means. In the one case there may be the sacrifice of some luxuries, in the other of bare necessities. The true test is how much a man is doing as compared with what he can do.

Who are dragging their feet?

You can't expect a Republican like me to sing hosannas to the British Labor Party. Many of us Americans have grave doubts about the doctor's prescription now being administered to the British people, but I have not the slightest doubt that they will survive both the malady and the remedy. Moreover, we must admit, again in the spirit of fair play, that many of the measures adopted by the British Labor Government during the past 6 years would also have been adopted in substance by the Conservatives. And as regards the main problems of foreign policy, the British people are united. As Winston Churchill remarked in the House of Commons on the eve of Prime Minister Attlee's recent visit to America—"Here in Britain, and I doubt not throughout the British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations, we always follow a very simple rule which has helped us in maintaining the safety of this country—the worse things get the more we stand together."

Armament is not enough to save the world. That is one of the chief lessons from Asia. Our British partner knows that, and despite all the sacrifices and hardships of her people, Great Britain and the other members of the Commonwealth are already making, under the Colombo plan, the most constructive and statesmanlike effort of our generation to preserve and to develop the democratic way of life in Asia.

The Colombo plan, as you know, is a comprehensive 6-year program for economic development in South and South East Asia which was drawn up by seven nations of the Commonwealth—Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ceylon, India, and Pakistan. The plan was first proposed in January 1950, and after several other meetings was finally announced last November. It covers an area of 570,000,000 people—one-quarter of the world's population. Its aim is to put 13,000,000 more acres under cultivation, to increase grain production by 10 percent, and electricity generating capacity by 67 percent. The total 6-year cost is estimated at about $5,500,000,000, of which $2,200,000,000 will be raised within the Commonwealth countries in Asia, exclusive of their sterling balances, and $3,300,000,000 will be raised by external financial aid, including sterling releases and outright gifts. Britain has already pledged $40,000,000, including sterling releases of nearly $700,000,000 dollars, and will probably make an outright gift in the near future of $150,000,000. A central agency known as the Council for Technical Cooperation, has already begun operations at its headquarters in Colombo, Ceylon. Representatives from other Asiatic countries such as Burma, Indonesia, Thailand and Indochina are working in close cooperation with the Commonwealth countries. What have we done? We are appropriating about $85,000,000 for our point 4 program.

Who are "dragging their feet"?

We could participate in the Colombo plan on a bilateral or a multilateral basis and contribute the balance necessary to achieve its goal. Or we could, in a spirit of partnership with the British Commonwealth, work out some feasible plan for dovetailing a greatly expanded point 4 program with the Colombo plan. What the American people must realize is the urgent need for such a great undertaking. The problems of Asia can't be solved by radio broadcasts, by dropping atomic bombs, or by letting hundreds of thousands of people starve to death because American politicians are piqued by the failure of Indian politicians to agree at all times as to the best methods of preserving a free and democratic world. The magnificent American effort under the Marshall plan helped save Europe from communism and helped restore her war-damaged economy. In Asia, the Anglo-American partnership must work literally "from the ground up" to prevent hundreds of millions of human beings from sinking even lower in the scale of living and from becoming a prey to Communist propaganda. Our British partner and her sister nations in the Commonwealth are leading the way to meet the most pressing problems of Asia. What will we do?

Perhaps we can get a suggestion from Thomas Jefferson.

You will remember that President Monroe wrote to Jefferson asking his advice about the British suggestion for what later became known as the Monroe Doctrine. On October 23, 1823, the author of the Declaration of Independence wrote to Monroe as follows:

"The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of Independence. * * * One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this proceeding; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition, we * * * bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke, which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty. * * * With her on our side we need not fear the whole world."

"Emancipate a continent." With our British partner we did emancipate the South American Continent from the menace of the holy alliance. In the last war the Anglo-American partnership emancipated the continent of Europe. Together America and Britain, in these next few years, can emancipate the continent of Asia, including perhaps even China.

The skeptics and scoffers will again talk about rat holes. But they are not the kind kind of people who will save their own country or the world from disaster. They do not know, or do not want to know, the facts of life in the year of our Lord 1951.

What Britain and the other nations of the Commonwealth are doing is not charity or a mere stopgap measure to feed people one year and let them starve the next, but a program of self-help which, in terms of the objects to be achieved and the needs which must be met, will cost very little. If we are willing in one form or another to play our part, it will cost us less than one-tenth—less than one-twentieth—of what we propose to spend on armament during the next 2 years. Are we willing now, as Jefferson proposed long ago, to join our British partner in the emancipation of a continent? Or shall we Americans drag our feet?

We need not only a Voice of America but a voice to America—a voice which will tell us that the desperately hungry peoples of the world must have the means to earn their daily bread, that the starving masses of Asia cannot eat the Constitution, that noisy boasts of American democracy do not satisfy the empty bellies of children, that we cannot long enjoy a paradise inside of America with hell outside.

The task will not be easy. We Americans will continue to be denounced as "greedy imperialists." We are finding that criticism a little hard to bear, because it's not true and possibly because it was once the favorite epithet of many Americans when Britain alone was doing the thankless jobs of the world. At any rate, our British friends can assure us that the first hundred years are the hardest.

When you hear or read any more malicious nonsense about the British "dragging their feet," I suggest that you look at the record of yesterday as well as at the facts of today.

Much as some Americans would like to forget it, the record shows that, in the first 2 years of the last World War, we were a mentally confused and spiritually sick people. Our right-wing isolationists thought we could do business with Hitler, our left-wing isolationists thought it was an "imperialist war" until Russia was attacked, and most Americans hardly knew what to think. Even after the invasion of Holland and Belgium and the slaughter of Rotterdam, even after the fall of France, even after the Battle of Britain, even while nearly the whole European Continent writhed under the torture of German tyranny, even while the British Commonwealth stood utterly alone, even then both the candidates for the Presidency in the election of 1940, despite their obvious sympathies, deemed it politically necessary to assure the people, in the most fervent terms, that the United States would not enter the war "except in the case of attack."

And yet, throughout that dismal period of doubt and delay, the American people did slowly but surely come to realize their danger and their need of Britain for their very salvation. We knew, deep down, that if Britain were conquered, the very soul of western civilization would be gone forever. British courage gave us good cheer and strengthened our hearts. Dunkerque, Britain's greatest defeat, helped us on the hard road to moral recovery. So did the Battle of Britain, her greatest victory. The blitz helped. The fires of London rekindled the American conscience.

Yes, we also did a magnificent job. I simply suggest that we look at both the record of yesterday and the facts of today so that we can understand and appreciate the kind of partner we shall have in the long, hard days ahead.

In the future, there will be world conferences, and many of them will fail. There will be all kinds of international formulas and

they will fade away. There will be glittering slogans and they will be forgotten.

But if the American and the British peoples have faith in each other's purpose, hope in each other's future, and charity toward each other's shortcomings, then, as friends, as partners, and as allies, they can go forward together into the future, as far as the human eye can see, in dignity, in freedom, and, let us hope, in peace.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by the Honorable John L. Sullivan, chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Committee, at the National Guard Armory, Washington, D. C., on April 14, 1951:

It is for me a very great honor to welcome so many real Democrats to the 1951 Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in Washington. We meet here on the day after the two hundred and eighth anniversary of the birth of one of America's greatest Presidents, Thomas Jefferson. He and Andrew Jackson—the other great President in whose memory we meet tonight—for more than 100 years have furnished a great part of the inspiration, the courage, and the vision which has lighted the way for a greater America and a far better world.

It is a real thrill for a man from New Hampshire to see over 5,000 Democrats gathered under one roof. We don't have Democratic crowds quite this size in the Granite State. But we have just as much enthusiasm and just as much courage.

Before proceeding to introduce the distinguished guests at this head table there is one thought that I would like to give this audience.

For the past several months in the newspapers, on the radio, and through all the media of communications, the American people have witnessed a constant barrage of charges and countercharges involving varying derelictions of duty by Federal employees and former employees. Some of these incidents have been displeasing and repugnant to us all. However large the organization of Government becomes, any deficiency of malfeasance in the discharge of a public trust by even the least of our public officials or employees is a matter of concern to us all. Insofar as such derelictions are proved, they must be punished, and the offenders removed from the Government. In public affairs, public self-criticism is the mark of a progressive, dynamic democracy. Today such self-criticism and searching examination is very properly being carried on at great lengths. Whenever it is motivated by a desire for improvement it is all to the good.

It would be well, however, for us to cultivate a sense of proportion, and to evaluate the relative importance of these incidents. We must remind ourselves and our friends of the truly great issues which face the world today, of the truly great progress that has been achieved in the last few years toward preventing the outbreak of world war III and preserving the peace of the world. We must do this frequently lest these issues that are of paramount importance to us all, and which will determine the kind of world in which our children and our children's children will live, become obscured in the minutiae of the moment.

I ask you to turn your minds back 4 years to March 1947. At that time the most optimistic among us felt that Greece had been lost to the free world, that Turkey was in dire jeopardy, that Italy was ready to fall into the hands of the Communists. Yugoslavia was the brightest satellite in the Communist crown, and the future of freedom and democracy in France was most uncertain to say the best. What a difference has come over the face of Western Europe in these few short years because of changes in the viewpoint, in the hope of the people of those five countries. Great comfort and new courage was born to all the freedom-loving peoples on both sides of the iron curtain. This was not just an accident. This new birth of freedom and hope from the Bosporus to the English Channel in very large part was due to the vision, courage, determination, and the leadership of the one man who, as head of the greatest nation in the free world today, bears the lion's share of the responsibility of preserving freedom and democracy wherever it now exists—our great President, Harry S. Truman.

The Greek-Turkish-aid program, the Marshall plan and its effective implementation through the Economic Cooperation Administration, the North Atlantic Treaty with its mutual-defense-assistance program are among the things which our President has achieved. These are the things which flow from the Truman doctrine. These are the things that restored hope in the world. They are the things that will be remembered in this world 100 years from tonight.

America's resolute resistance to the blockade in Berlin and our defense of South Korea in the face of cruel aggression prove once and for all that the champions of freedom can and do stand up and fight.

Realizing what Korea is costing us in the lives of fine young men and the disruption of our economy, some people today question the wisdom of our decision to resist aggression in Korea. There will never be any doubt in my mind that this decision was right.

It so happens that I was in Europe when the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel. During those 48 hours in which our Government remained silent while going through the procedure of the last-resort provisions of the United Nations Charter, the confidence of Western Europeans in America melted like butter in the noonday sun. On all sides I was told that this was a repetition of our failure to follow through on the League of Nations after World War I. Things looked pretty grim. If the doubt in America's integrity and resolution had continued for another week, Western Europe would have been lost to democracy for generations, and the cooperation we are now receiving from the Atlantic Pact nations could never have been achieved.

However, 2 days after the invasion of Korea the President of the United States in a ringing statement announced our resistance to aggression in such clear and unmistakable terms that people all over Western Europe were lifted from the depths of despondency to the heights of hope. Well may that decision of the President of the United States be recorded by the historians of the twenty-first century as the turning point in the world conflict between the powers of evil and the friends of freedom.

The people of America, knowing that the fate of civilization, that human freedom, and the dignity of man is at stake, will in my opinion support in 1952 the party that has waged for many long years such a heroic struggle against oppression and aggression, the party that has fought such an enlightened and courageous fight in behalf of all those things that make life worth the living, the party of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman.

Conditions in the Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Star of April 12, 1951, entitled "It Stinks—Clean It Up."

This editorial has been sent to me by a number of people in my State indicating that it has made a profound impression. They ask: Cannot Congress do something constructive about the deplorable conditions existing in the executive branch of our Government, as shown here?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT STINKS—CLEAN IT UP

The furor over dismissal of General MacArthur should not obscure what is, if anything, an even more serious matter.

It is the gross political maneuvering, the wire pulling, the use of influence in dispensing jobs and favors, the confusion, the inefficiency, and the waste that dominate far too much of the Washington scene right up to the top. It is the evidence of the exceedingly low standards of conduct that govern a good section of the Nation's public life today.

And this at a time when people are being called upon to labor and to sacrifice, to support the program of mobilization and defense, and to be on their guard against any complacency or let-down at a time of stress when the Nation's security is gravely endangered.

The American people are ready to do their full part in mobilization and the rest. They are not ready to tolerate the mismanagement and the rottenness that are presently being laid out before their eyes.

For added to the exposures by the Fulbright committee investigating the RFC, the Kefauver committee investigating the underworld and its political links in the big cities, the revelations of influence peddling, and the work of the 5-percenters along with the scandals in the handling of surplus war materials—added to all that is the amazing account of former Gov. M. E. Thompson, of Georgia, and his experience with the job business in Washington.

Here was a loyal Democrat with a fine record of public service who presumably was being called in to take over a responsible position with the Office of Price Stabilization. Although he was not hard up for a Government job, Thompson responded with a feeling of partiotic duty.

To his consternation he found on reporting to the OPS that he couldn't be seen by Director DiSalle but instead must report to the office of the Democratic National Committee. That political agency evidently was serving as the clearinghouse for important jobs and the proper official agencies were being short-circuited. But after his discovery that another man was being considered for the same job, Thompson agreed to a reshuffle of his supposed duties and then waited for a call to take over.

He waited till the patience of any conscientious man would have been exhausted. He was being paid his salary and $53.48 a day for expenses—yet for 12 weeks had never

been consulted or called upon for any official work. His response was to resign and expose the whole mess, denouncing the "deplorable conditions in the national administration" that make party loyalty and patriotism impossible at the same time, and declaring there "are thousands upon thousands" of job holders on the Federal payrolls in Washington and throughout the country who "are rendering no service."

There in the whole shameful record is the grave situation that confronts the American people in a time of stress. It's a call for Nation-wide protest and a demand for correction—if it can be had under the conditions that exist today. In time, if not soon, it will be had. For public indignation will mount until a clean-up has been achieved in the name both of decency and the Nation's well-being.

Public Acclaim for MacArthur—Public Disgust for Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the interests of the American people and the United States have once again been subordinated to the scheming machinations of foreign interests, and Anglophile Americans, led by Secretary of State Dean Acheson and President Truman, and a great American patriot and military leader, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, has been purged from his command.

What manner of administration do we have in America today? Who are these men in the highest positions in the land serving? Have they forgotten their oath of office, which pledges them to represent the people of the United States? Have they ever heard of the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution which established the sovereignty of the United States?

General MacArthur had the courage as an American citizen and as a professional soldier to face facts realistically in this period of world crisis, and to report bluntly to his Government and to the American people that the time has come to end this state of "war which is not war" in Korea, and either attack the enemy at every point or withdraw.

For his patriotic stand General MacArthur has been dismissed. He has been dismissed because of criticism from a foreign nation, a nation whose first consideration is its own self-interests and now how many American boys are spilling their blood on Korean soil.

The people of America are outraged at this latest Truman blunder, a blunder which may cost far more than anyone can today estimate in American lives and resources. At a time when the administration has again and again stressed the need for unity in our land, Mr. Truman has again demonstrated his elephantine tact by the removal of General MacArthur, the most effective action he could possibly have taken at this time to create Nation-wide disunity in our land.

Wires are pouring into Washington demanding the removal of Truman and Acheson without further delay. Certainly there can no longer be any doubt that President Truman is not capable of holding the high office to which he was, unfortunately, elected. The wave of indignation sweeping this country is without precedent. Never in history have the people demanded the removal of a President and a Secretary of State as they are today demanding the removal of Truman and Acheson.

More than 6 months ago I demanded the impeachment of Truman and Acheson in response to the urgent requests for such action from citizens in all parts of the Nation. Today I believe this action is still needed for the good of the United States.

If Mr. Truman wants unity in America and is willing to make a patriotic sacrifice in the best interests of his country, he would resign from the office where he has failed so miserably and at so great a cost to the United States.

This Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Douglas MacArthur, a brilliant military strategist, a good American. His name will be honored in the history of his country. Those who would humiliate and defile him will be remembered for their infamy.

MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who's President?" from the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News of April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S PRESIDENT?

Most sober, thinking persons, regardless of their political affiliation, subscribe to the statement that in view of all of the circumstances President Truman had no other course than to relieve General MacArthur of his command.

General MacArthur has been a good soldier, but apparently either he or his advisers—or both—believe that he, MacArthur, had become more important than the office of the President of the United States. The American people, as much as they may admire MacArthur as a military man, did not elect him President. They, or a majority of them at least, elected Harry Truman President of the United States.

It makes little difference whether one believes that Harry Truman is a great President or an indifferent President. The real thing to remember is that throughout all of the years of our Republic's life it has been found that it was not safe to permit the military to run the Nation. In fact, our Founding Fathers made considerable effort to avoid this situation and their fears were well based in historical fact.

General MacArthur has no more right to address a joint session of Congress than any other general who has been relieved of his command. Obviously, his address could be nothing more than a defense of his actions as commanding officer of the Far East and if he wishes to defend that action he, no doubt, will be given ample opportunity to do so by the Republican Party that at long last has found a candidate to run for the Presidency.

General MacArthur has a perfect right to run for the Presidency of the United States. That right, if not opportunity, is available to any American citizen, but he doesn't have the right as commander of a military force to take over the duties of the President of the United States. And that is exactly what he has been trying to do—and doing in some respect—for the past several years. He has violated almost all of the rules laid down by the Government for the military even to the extent of using the military wires to funnel some of his "messages" to such sympathetic organizations as the Chicago Tribune and other comparable publications. Instead of informing his Commander in Chief, President Truman, of his actions in many cases, as MacArthur demanded his subordinates do, he communicated directly with JOE MARTIN, the Republican leader in Congress.

So, the issue has been joined. General MacArthur must come home and we certainly hope he runs for the office of President of the United States. Several years ago he dabbled with the idea and figuratively speaking "poked his toe in the water" in one of the Midwestern States' primaries. He failed to finish in the money, to use a phrase. Perhaps he will fare better the next time—and the next time in 1952 because he is the darling of the Chicago Tribune and its vast network of propaganda.

But the important thing is that in 1952 MacArthur will be running as a private citizen for the Presidency and not in the dual role of commander in chief of our far eastern forces as well as a self-appointed king above the Presidency which is, of course, the highest gift in the hands of the American people.

We do not pretend to have any information relative to the consequences of peace in Korea in view of the MacArthur ouster. Neither do we assume to pass upon the manner in which MacArthur had to be removed. We do insist that in view of the repeated acts of defiance to the authority of the Presidency, however, that the only criticism that President Truman justifiably should face is the criticism of waiting too long.

There was a feeling prior to Wednesday amongst many people that MacArthur was too powerful for the President of the United States to either discipline or remove.

There was feeling among some of the MacArthur military clique—and that clique was and is large within the military—that MacArthur was more important than the President. There is a feeling amongst the military too—that part of the military which is by far the most substantial part, that MacArthur was bad for the Armed Forces Establishment in that he took the attitude that whatever he did was right—regardless—while the same thing done by another might well bring on a reprimand or a court martial.

Yes, we hope that MacArthur is the Republican nominee for the Presidency. That will put the issue where it belongs—on the soap boxes—and take it out of the military where it never did belong but where too much of MacArthur's public relations have been for far too long.

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Allegan, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith a resolution adopted by the city council of my home town of Allegan, Mich., together with the letter which accompanied it:

CITY OF ALLEGAN,
Allegan, Mich., April 13, 1951.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This community, like the rest of the Nation, is stunned by the recent action of the President in the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The enclosed resolution expresses the feeling of the city council. I sincerely hope you will make those feelings known to the Congress.

Cordially and sincerely yours,
P. H. BEAUVAIS,
City Manager.

"Whereas it is the judgment of the City Council of the City of Allegan, Allegan County, Mich., that—

"1. Shortly after the cessation of hostilities in World War II it became apparent to most intelligent people that the Communist government of Russia had dedicated itself to the expansion of Communism and the destruction of the free nations of the world.

"2. Despite the necessity of opposing communism by the use of all reasonable and available means and forces in the best interest and security of the United States, President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson did, contrary to our welfare and security, aid and abet communism in China and withheld material aid and support from Nationalist China.

"3. President Truman and Secretary Acheson did, precedent to June of 1950, contrary to a legislative enactment of the Congress of the United States, with apparent intent to circumvent and evade the will of Congress, arbitrarily and willfully refuse to advance to the Government of the Republic of Korea upwards of ten billions of dollars, appropriated by the Congress for the defense of said republic against a possible attack by the Communists of North Korea.

"4. By reason of the direct aid given to Red China and the refusal of our State Department to render aid to Nationalist China, and the refusal to advance the moneys appropriated by the Congress for the defense of South Korea, the Communists of North Korea were enabled to, and did, in June of 1950, launch a successful invasion of South Korea, and in which they were later fortified and assisted by Red Chinese armies.

"5. Immediately thereafter President Truman did, contrary to his constitutional authority, engage these United States in a war, under the guise and pretext that he was acting under authority of the United Nations and engaging solely in a police action.

"6. Having involved this Nation illegally in a war in Korea, the President and the Secretary of State did, in contradiction to the security and welfare of the Armed Forces committed to action in Korea and under his command, arbitrarily refuse authority to Gen. Douglas MacArthur to—

"(a) Bomb the staging areas and sources of supply for the Communist hordes, located across the Korean border in Manchuria.

"(b) Blockade the coast of Red China so as to prevent the shipment of supplies and war matériel to Red China.

"(c) Use the armies of Nationalist China stationed on Formosa.

"(d) Equip and arm an estimated 500,000 South Koreans, able, willing, and anxious to fight.

"7. By reason of the foregoing acts and policies, thousands of our American men have now become casualties of war, to be followed by untold thousands.

"8. General MacArthur did, from bitter experience and first-hand knowledge in the interest of those fighting under him and for the ultimate security of this Nation, properly and openly publicize his request for authority to wage a war as it should be waged, successfully.

"9. President Truman did, we believe at the instigation of Secretary Acheson and by reason of the influence exerted by the British Foreign Office, without justification and contrary to the welfare and security of this nation, which he has sworn to defend, summarily remove General MacArthur from his position of command in the Asiatic theater.

"10. General MacArthur has, insofar as it was within his power to do so, acted in the best interest of those serving under his command and this Nation, and President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson are guilty of gross neglect and incompetence in office and the usurpation of authority to the detriment of and danger to the United States.

"Therefore the city council of the city of Allegan, Allegan County, State of Michigan, memorializes the Congress of the United States to institute an investigation, and if the finding warrant carry out proceedings appropriate to impeach and remove from office the President of the United States, Mr. Harry S. Truman, and the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, as we firmly believe such action is necessary for the safety, security, and future welfare of this nation."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution made and unanimously adopted by the city council of the city of Allegan, Allegan County, Mich., at a special meeting thereof held on the 12th day of April A. D. 1951.

P. H. BEAUVAIS,
City Clerk.

The President Should Be Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as an answer to some of those critics who have condemned the President for his recent action in relieving General MacArthur, I have requested permission to extend in the Appendix an editorial written by Kent Wilson, editor of the Missouri Cash-Book, one of the leading newspapers of southeast Missouri.

While this editor does not at all times see eye-to-eye with President Truman, and has from time to time been critical of this administration, I believe that in this editorial he has pointed out the fallacy of the argument being used by those who are seeking to use this incident as a rallying point for a political campaign issue in 1952. While, of course, I have received a few—less than a dozen—telegrams and letters condemning the President, it is interesting to note that most of the communications have come from those who have been most critical of everything that this administration has done.

In addition to the letters of condemnation, I have also received messages supporting the President. Typical of these is a letter which states:

I want to express to you my support of the President in his decision to dismiss General MacArthur and I urge you to use your influence in his behalf.

In my opinion MacArthur should have been released from his command long ago. A man who causes disunity in these times when unity of purpose is essential and who puts his personal ambitions before his country and who believes himself to be bigger than his Government has no business being in a place of authority be be general or private.

No doubt the action will arouse a storm of controversy and much abuse will be heaped upon the President, but I think he has proved himself to be of great moral stature and has shown that he is a man of unbounded courage in making this decision and I believe he should be supported.

Herewith follows the editorial from the Missouri Cash-Book:

The following editorial was written Monday night, some 24 hours prior to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal from all his military commands, which is concrete evidence that this paper endorses President Truman's action.

If the editor was in President Truman's shoes, General MacArthur would have a gag shoved into his big mouth and retired to public life where he could hobnob with the Republican congressional leaders and tear loose on our administration to his heart's content, and we wouldn't fear the results. These Republicans who have suddenly become so hopeful of the discord he would cause in an open fight on our foreign policies should be be retired, would be sorely disappointed. They do not know the public pulse.

The general has been more of an actor in recent years than a soldier, boiling over with ego. The editor of this paper has never talked with a veteran of either of the two last world wars who had a good word for him, and they are too patriotic ever to be swayed by any of his arguments.

MacArthur should at least be relieved of any authority outside of Japan. We at one time thought he was a great soldier, but recent events cause us to doubt this. The Christian Science Monitor says, "A number of GI's remember ruefully that the five-star general was sure the Communist Chinese would not intervene when he spread his troops widely over North Korea, where they took one of the worst defeats in American military history."

To cover up his failures to date in the present strife, MacArthur is strongly demanding that the Chinese Nationalists be urged and aided to invade China. Those who are in a position to know state that China is prepared for such an attack and that when it happens we will be momentarily thrust into world war III. It does not require a military genius to know that such a move

would not "take the pressure off American troops in Korea" as the five-star general says, but would bring Russia into the conflict, first by aid of an adequate air and submarine force furnished by Russia which would render our present position untenable. Further, Russia will never sit idly by whenever the defeat of China by the United States appears ever probable.

MacArthur loses sight of another great danger, and that is the mobilization of Russian divisions in great number in East Germany and at several other points in Europe. Should we be drawn into a war with China, just what would happen if we were forced simultaneously to wage war both in Asia and Europe now?

We believe that the administration's present policy is to avoid another world conflict by a delaying action, the purpose being in the interim to use every available means to effect a peace agreement, in order to gain 2 or 3 years to get adequately prepared for defense, if not aggression.

We firmly believe that the ambition of Taft for the presidency far exceeds his love of country, and if we should be suddenly rushed into another world war the responsibility will rest upon the shoulders of the Tafts and the MacArthurs.

Attitude of Great Britain Toward Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The British Solution," which recently appeared in the Idaho Statesman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRITISH SOLUTION

The reported British demand for a major sellout to Communist China, coming at the same time as the MacArthur dismissal, puts a fitting climax on a comedy of errors. Only it's really not so funny.

All that the British foreign office has in mind is turning over Formosa to the Peiping bandits (which would mean wholesale slaughter of thousands of Chiang Kai-shek's followers) and allowing Mao Tse-tung a full voice in formulating a Japanese peace treaty. Next step, logically, would be to admit Red China to the United Nations.

Surely no more craven and unprincipled suggestion has ever passed from one government to another. Its acceptance would once and for all scuttle any hope that the United Nations can be made an instrument to enforce world peace (a pretty dim hope at present) and its reward for brutality would turn into bitter mockery the sacrifices in lives which have been made.

The mere suggestion that the Communist rulers of China should have the least word in drawing up a peace treaty with Japan—a nation where Douglas MacArthur worked mightily to destroy Communist influence—is an insult to the people of the United States. What the men who fought from Guadalcanal to Okinawa would think of any such concession could not be printed.

Obviously the time has come for the United States to ask Britain bluntly if it knows which side in the far-eastern dispute it wants to be on. Certainly American soldiers have little business fighting in Korea if Britain has for its long-range goal a series of lucrative concessions to Red China.

This newspaper has no use for the Anglophobic attitude of some publications, but it can recognize the odor of skunk when it detects it. And that is precisely the smell connected with the latest policy statement of the British Socialist Government—strong enough to turn stomachs thousands of miles away.

Kicking General MacArthur out of command was bad enough. Offering to give Communist China all that it could conceivably want constitutes an act of lunacy, and betrayal.

MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the round-up of editorial comment on the dismissal of General MacArthur which appeared in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette of April 14, 1951.

The Charleston Gazette's own front-page editorial on this subject on April 12, entitled "Battlefield Courage: MacArthur Was Dismissed for Doing What He Himself Wouldn't Tolerate," was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on April 13, upon the request of my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

There being no objection, the compendium was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN RIGHT IN FIRING MACARTHUR, OUTSTANDING EDITORIALISTS DECIDE

Sober opinion of most of the Nation's outstanding newspapers reflect the editorial view that President Truman followed the only course left him in dismissing General MacArthur.

Here are excerpts from editorials written after studied reflection in the case:

The New York Times: "Policy with respect to the conduct of a war cannot be made in two places. Under the American system, and specifically under the American Constitution, policy is made by the President of the United States. The policy chosen may prove in any given case to be wise or unwise; it may require a fundamental change on the basis of experience; but the Constitution puts the making of policy in the civilian hands of the Chief Executive, and it is the clear duty of the military to express its doubts or its dissent through proper military channels and not in public debate. We have no doubt, therefore, that the President acted properly."

The Christian Science Monitor: "The situation had become such that the United States was speaking with two voices on national policy and military measures. Moreover, the UN commander in Korea was evidently not in sympathy with UN aims there—poorly defined as they are. The situation could be cleared up only by a decision on one side or the other. Unless the basic policies of the United States and the United Nations were to be overturned, it became necessary for General MacArthur to conform, to resign, or be removed."

The Atlanta Constitution: "There is just one issue: Who is going to give the orders and who is the supreme authority? Is it a general serving in a nation's army, or the government of the nation? General MacArthur is a great general and a great man. But his country is greater than he. Whatever the sacrifice or loss of face or dangers incurred by his dismissal, they must be met. To do otherwise would be to destroy the authority of the Government of our country."

The Baltimore (morning) Sun: "The correct decision, so far as can be judged now, would be to continue the course which Mr. Truman has done his uncertain best to justify. If we are to fight the hordes of Russia and China and their satellites it is surely better to fight them with allies at our side to help us than to go it alone. If we deliberately start to fight them in Asia we shall almost certainly be alone."

The Wall Street Journal: "Given the situation as it stood, it is difficult to see how President Truman could have done other than he did in dismissing General MacArthur. That is true regardless of how much provocation General MacArthur had for acting as he did act. Indeed, he must have known that he would be dismissed and thought that he would accomplish something by forcing the President's hand."

The Dayton Journal Herald: "Let there be no mistake about it, the President was justified in removing MacArthur. The general has been repeatedly insubordinate, and insubordinate in a way which threatened the success of the country's foreign policy. That he got away with it so long is not a tribute to Mr. Truman's patience, for no strong President up to his job could be patient in that way. Rather it is a disclosure of Mr. Truman's futility."

The Charlotte Observer: "Since General MacArthur had demonstrated by his persistent public statements that he would not abide by the directives of his superiors, there was nothing left for the President to do but to relieve him of his commands, regardless of who was right or wrong or errors had been responsible for the developed intolerable situation."

The Louisville Courier Journal: "This would be the worst of all times for a field commander to dictate the foreign policy of the United States. That is what MacArthur showed himself determined to do, in spite of repeated and specific orders from Washington. The Korean conflict cannot be isolated from the rest of the world. An action by an American general there could bring a hail of atom bombs on the roofs of a dozen American cities. * * * So President Truman took the inevitable step."

The Roanoke Times: "It was clearly within the President's power and authority to dismiss a general who had repeatedly defied instructions * * *. The bitter controversy that is in prospect over the affair cannot be helpful and will, on the contrary, be most unfortunate if not actually disastrous."

Abuse of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and intelligently written letter addressed to the editor of the Seattle

Times, by a citizen of the State of Washington, and published in April 6, 1951, issue of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

EDITOR, THE TIMES:

Gross abuse of American freedom is a national danger. Liberty under law is the foundation of durable democratic government. It means that each person is free within the circle of his own right. Law seeks prevention of injury and would do justice to those who suffer harm.

Lamentably, liberty is abused by men of all stations. Even governments pervert their purpose to preserve order and justice; they enact unjust laws and adopt sinister policies. Legislatures stop clocks despite time limit; courts validate such glaring law evasion.

Pressure groups, factions, lobbies, powerful individuals abuse liberty in pursuit of selfish ends. Men alone or in gangs commit atrocious murders. Thieves, cheats, frauds, and racketeers abound. Gambling and vice flourish. Bribery and perjury may soon become popular habits.

Evil men congregate in cities to feast off the gullibility of others. Criminals from abroad live here as princely jackals. Organized crime is rife, the Communist dastardly contrives treason against our whole system of liberty, while cynically invoking protection of the liberty he would destroy. On the other hand idealists fear to defend liberty lest they abridge it.

Contributing to delinquency is the good citizen's disregard of civic duty, his own refusal to obey the law because it is the law, his fatal undervaluation of priceless lawful liberty. Laws must be enforced; if enforced, fewer would be necessary.

Constitutional democracy, if neglected or abused, quickly decays. But fortunately it carries within itself recurring strength through the supreme right of self-rule at the ballot box. This right must be revered and all citizens alerted to evils which corrupt or endanger the Republic.

If we do not rule ourselves, others will. There is no escape from the rule. The duty to vote for competent men and to administer impartial government is a duty of stern realism, for government is what we make it, not a self-executing ideal.

Hard-headed men, who flinch not from corrective action, must take the helm of state. A republic rich in purse but poor in character is foredoomed.

Who then is responsible for what is wrong in this free country? The citizens—you and I—are responsible. Our hope lies not in sporadic reform but in a sustained national revival of personal rectitude.

AUSTIN E. GRIFFITHS.

Proposed Freezing of Farm Parity Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unjust to the Farmer," published in the Greenville (S. C.) News on April 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNJUST TO THE FARMER

Senator MAYBANK uses vigorously emphatic language in his expressed determination to oppose the proposed plan to freeze farm parity prices as a way of curbing food-price rises.

But we think not only farmers, but most other citizens who endeavor to think this matter through, will agree that his position is sound and logical.

The calculated parity price for farm products, of course, rises when the things the farmer has to buy rise in price; and so the brilliant idea has occurred to some of our controllers to decree that what was parity last January, must continue to be parity no matter what other prices do, subjecting farm products to ceiling price orders at that level.

Any such action would destroy the whole theory of parity prices for farmers, and might as well be accompanied by total elimination of all legal and other conceptions of parity, along with an arbitrary ceiling on all these prices at a level no higher than the parity figure of last January.

Let it be kept in mind that the conception of parity for farm products is essentially a price relationship. It grows out of calculations that in order to be on a balanced price relationship with the rest of the economy, the farmer should receive prices for his products which bear the same relationship to prices of other goods as they bore during a former period regarded as a normal economic time. And it is obvious, of course, that if the prices of other goods rise, the farmer's calculated parity must rise also if there is to continue to be that same balanced price relationship.

There may be argument as to whether or not this is the most accurate means of figuring how the farmer ought to stand in price matters on an equitable basis with the rest of the economy, but we don't believe any of the critics, even, have suggested what he regarded as a fairer formula for this purpose. The Government, of course, does not guarantee farmers parity prices, but the whole theory of this policy is that it is desirable from the standpoint of fairness that the farmer receive as much as parity prices, and the Government gives him some help in the effort to do so by granting commodity loans at some figure below parity.

The issue now is that the price control law does not permit a ceiling to be placed on these farm commodities until and unless they reach parity prices. And that certainly seems a fair and logical proposition, so long as it is held as a public policy that it is only equitable that the farmer should receive as much as parity for his goods.

It should be obvious that if other goods rise in price and the farmer's so-called parity is not permitted to rise beyond an arbitrarily designated figure of some months ago, his price cease to be parity and the term becomes meaningless.

And it ought to be clear that farm parity prices will not rise unless other prices rise. The way to keep parity down is to keep the other prices down, since they are the basic cause of the rise and fall of parity.

One might pertinently ask the question: Is it in any way fair to the farmer to allow price rises in other goods, yet prevent him from receiving, even if the market offers it, a price that would maintain an equitable relationship with the things he must buy?

As a matter of fact, the greater part of the farm products from which foods are made still sell below the calculated parity. To fix a ceiling at what parity was a few months ago, would thus not probably at this time reduce the price of many or any of them. And unless our controllers, who say they are going to keep other prices from rising, really think other prices are going up considerably more, how can they claim that this proposed step would be of any real value?

Senator MAYBANK has spoken forthrightly on this issue. His words are worth reading again. Noting that farmers' income has shrunk $6,000,000,000 since 1948, he added: "There has been an outrageous campaign to deceive and fool the people of the United States, to have them believe that parity prices are largely responsible for inflation."

And that is well said, we think.

The Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Tragic Error," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick on April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER TRAGIC ERROR

Add another tragic error to the tragic career of a little man trying to fill a big job with a jocular grin and an inflated ego as his only assets.

For the ousting of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by the temporary resident of the White House is, to the average citizen at least, nothing short of a tragic error.

It removes from the active military scene at a time of great national peril one of this Nation's outstanding soldiers and a man whose years of experience have schooled him in far-eastern problems to a far greater degree than the cumulative total of all the political demagogues in Washington. That, in itself, is tragedy enough.

But more tragic than the ousting of a military commander, though he be one of tried and proven ability, is the implied determination of the socialistic nitwits to continue the hesitant and wavering policy in the Far East—a policy that already has gotten us into one of the sorriest messes in which this Nation ever has found itself; a policy that has cost us upward of 60,000 casualties in Korea with the end nowhere in sight.

General MacArthur was fired for insubordination, so the little man said. Technically, that may be true. But to the average citizen he was sacrificed on the altar of appeasement because he dared raise his voice against the futility of waging a war in which his hands were tied and his movements restricted, while his enemy was given privileged sanctuary and was free to use every means at his command to deal out death and destruction.

The ouster of the heroic commander was received with cheers in the capitals of Britain, France, India, and some other nations allied with the United States in the Korean struggle. And well it might. For theirs has been a puny contribution to the common fight against communism. They consistently have sought to appease Red China and have been gunning for months for MacArthur's scalp because he dared appraise the situation in its true light.

But in the cities, the towns, and the rural areas of America, there was no cheering.

For herein reside the families of those 60,000 brave youths who already have been sacrificed on bloody Korean fields, and the additional 250,000 youths now waging a heroic but apparently futile struggle 9,000 miles from home.

It was for these brave youths that General MacArthur dared speak out. His was a voice crying in the wilderness for the troops, the facilities and the freedom of movement necessary to avoid useless sacrifice and to win the war for freemen everywhere. But his voice was drowned out by the pussyfooters and wishful thinkers who still believe you can compromise and negotiate with international communism.

General MacArthur's ouster removes a pillar of strength from the free world's far eastern defense. And it still fails to solve the primary question of how to end the fighting in Korea without advantage to Communist China and its master, Soviet Russia.

This is the question in which all America is vitally interested. And the man in the White House will be held strictly accountable to the American people for the answer. The outlook is fraught with fear. For it was disastrous leadership and bungling policy that led us down the road to bloody Korea. That leadership and that policy still are with us.

It is difficult to see how the firing of General MacArthur brings us any closer to winning or ending the war in Korea. But for the sake of those brave youths on the fighting front, for the sake of this Nation and freedom-loving peoples everywhere, it is to be hoped that out of the furore and the debate aroused by the general's ouster will come a firm and resolute policy under which Americans may unite and march forward to victory and lasting peace.

MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "MacArthur Forgot," from the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR FORGOT

When a young man is selected to enter the United States Military Academy at West Point, he is regarded as officer material for the United States Army. During his years of training at the Academy he learns first of all how to take orders. You cannot learn how to give orders unless you know first how to take orders.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur had all the benefit of the fine training that the Nation gives its selected military men. Certainly in his undergraduate days he learned how to take orders. And he became a great military man well qualified to give orders.

But since 1937 General MacArthur has been in the Pacific, first in the Philippines, then directing the war in the Pacific, accepting the Japanese surrender, remaining as occupation commander in Japan, and finally leading United Nations forces in opposing Communist aggression in Korea.

In all this time General MacArthur has not returned to the continental United States. Although many times during those years General MacArthur's actions and public pronouncements seemed to redound mostly to the glory of MacArthur, no one in high position questioned his military sagacity. His succession of important assignments indicates the confidence that his superiors had in his ability.

What many seem to forget right now is that General MacArthur did have superiors. He was not a law unto himself. He was accountable to the Commander in Chief, who is the President of the United States.

During the past few months General MacArthur has overstepped the bounds of military propriety to oppose publicly the military and world political policies of his Commander in Chief. Other military leaders have been at odds with their superiors but it hasn't often caused them to air their private views to the public.

MacArthur's willingness to state his own views, even though they clashed with those of the Commander in Chief and with those of the United Nations delegates indicates that the general has been too long out of touch with his country and too much enamored of the title of Supreme Commander. His refusal to go along with the policies of the United Nations violated the first rule of a soldier. He forgot how to take orders.

It is unfortunate that the whole affair now is a domestic political affair with the Republicans rallying to defend MacArthur and the Democrats supporting President Truman. But General MacArthur made his actions political by permitting his views to be aired by Republican leaders here at home. General MacArthur had no objection to having his statements released by House Republican Leader JOE MARTIN. General MacArthur expressed no objection to the frequent injection of his name as a Republican Presidential possibility.

The situation became intolerable when General MacArthur, apparently without the knowledge of his superiors, offered to accept the surrender of the Chinese Reds and North Koreans and make a battlefield settlement of the Korean War. This unilateral action upset whatever political maneuvering for a negotiated peace was under way.

President Truman could do no less than relieve MacArthur of his duties. It became clear that General MacArthur was unable to play on the team because he objected to the strategy. General MacArthur during his years of high command has forgotten how to take orders.

President Dropped Emotional Atom Bomb Not on Enemy, But on America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following penetrating analysis of the MacArthur dismissal by Dr. D. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of Nashville, Tenn.

The column is from the Nashville Banner:

THE MACARTHUR AFFAIR

(By Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor, First Presbyterian Church)

Early on Wednesday morning, April 11, the President of the United States dropped an emotional atomic bomb on America. Unlike the usual atomic bomb the force of this one was not limited to a scant 10 miles of territory. It blasted the entire Nation, nay, its force was felt in every capital in the world. Not even Pearl Harbor produced more confusion and emotional shock. A declaration of war with Russia could not have created greater comment and activity.

As the emotional smoke continues to billow and roll back and forth across the land, depending on which way the political and emotional winds blow, there are several things we must keep in mind.

1. General MacArthur is a great soldier. His record speaks for itself. His record as a cadet at West Point; his record in World War I; his record as Superintendent of West Point; his record in World War II, underscore with heavy lines this first contention. He was and is a great soldier and a brilliant general.

2. He is a great administrator. He proved that in the Philippines. He has proved it again in Japan. In Japan he has set an all-time high in the reconstruction of a defeated nation.

3. He is a great American. I make bold to assert that the reason why he talked out of turn, if he did, is to be found in his high sense of patriotism. What else could he do? The White House would not listen. The State Department would not listen. The Pentagon would not listen. They were looking at the Korean War in terms of getting along with England, France, and India. MacArthur saw it purely from the American standpoint. Since we are doing nine-tenths of the fighting, and nine and nine-tenths of the paying, sustaining too, nine-tenths of the casualties, why shouldn't our considerations come first? Why should nations that have recognized Red China for commercial reasons, who advocate giving Formosa to China, inviting the Red rapists to participate in the peace treaty with Japan, and in the future of the United Nations, exert more power over our conduct of the war in Korea than we do?

I thank God that MacArthur would not be muzzled like an ox. I am glad that he put our national safety above his own advantages. I rejoice in the knowledge that there is at least one leader left who will not be dominated by fear of Russia or Washington, and who refuses to permit America to be sold out in the interests of our so-called friends.

MacArthur knows as none other, save those associated with him in Asia, that we have surrendered our safety as a nation to the unsafe United Nations; that without bombing bases beyond the Yalu we cannot win the Korean War; that the present plan plays right into the hands of the Soviet which is not swayed in its actions by our hopes; that the Korean War has not and will not prevent world war III if the Russians are set to wage it; that there can be no peace between Communists and Americans, and that our men and our money are being ground to bloody dust in a venture that cannot end in victory without becoming bigger.

MacArthur did not bomb bases beyond the Yalu. He did not open a second front. He did not release the Formosan forces. He did write his convictions on kites and fly them world-high that all Americans outside of Washington might see and be warned. For that I am grateful.

America today is like a lifeguard that jumped into wave-beaten seas to rescue a group of people whose boat had capsized. The swimmer is strong, skilled, and courageous, but what can he do when all these people lay hold on him, demanding that if he saves any he must save all? Try as he may, he makes little progress shoreward. The people he went to rescue cling to his arms, his head, his legs, his body; tugging, screaming, beating. Will he ever be able to make the shore?

That is the way MacArthur sees the situation confronting his country. He has given

his best to America. He has fought to win, and that against almost impossible odds, and because he advocated the only honest measures that can bring victory to our forces he is relieved of his command.

If he is guilty of talking out of turn today, he was just as guilty 5 months ago. Why was he not recalled to the States, faced by his critics, and, then, either removed or supported?

I fear it is a case of an ex-captain of artillery lowering political guns against a five-star general. Once more greatness has been misunderstood by those who lack it.

The Fair Deal has again dealt unfairly with America's welfare, smearing for reasons one of the truly great men in the history of this Nation, a great military leader, a skilled political administrator, a sincere Christian gentleman, and a true son of Uncle Sam. Under the leadership we have we can never win at home or abroad.

Replacement of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful editorial written by Mr. Ed Post, Jr., and which appeared in the Cleveland Times, of Shelby, N. C., on April 10, 1951. Mr. Post served in the recent World War and has had extensive experience under General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESIGN OF INDISCRETION

The confusion born of Douglas MacArthur will not cease until he is relieved of all command.

MacArthur is not naively blundering into these indiscretions. There has been a sufficient number of them to indicate a purpose and a strategy behind them.

The Republicans appear delighted to nurture the cause of MacArthur as a source of embarrassment to the Democratic administration, but that is the game of playing with disastrous fire, because MacArthur is forcing the issue of whether or not the military arm or the civilian arm shall formulate international policy for our Nation. If MacArthur wins, it could well mark the beginning of the end of American democracy in eventual subservience of our Nation and our free political structure to the militarist clique.

We would admit and accord whatever claims of merit might be made for Douglas MacArthur as a military commander, with the reservation that has ever been or shall be flawless or unsusceptible to error. But, even granting all exaggerated as well as founded claims of his military prowess, there remain in the man three indisputable traits which minimize his greatness and make of him a real threat to any cause he serves:

1. Indiscretion. MacArthur's unwillingness to fulfill his commission within the bounds of authority bestowed by it, his laxity in self-discipline, both in restraint of his personal opinions and in carrying out his mission without undue complaint that he is not supported as he deserves or given the free hand he thinks he merits; this stubborn indiscretion by its repetition is revealed to be in fact disregard of his mission as defined.

2. Devotion to himself: It would not be stretching the everyday evidence to say that MacArthur's primary aim is to build and preserve the myth of himself as an historic hero. The successful and determined execution of his mission is incidental or secondary at best. Even remotely selfless loyalty and devotion to a people and a cause is not characterized in a commissioned—not elected—servant who unrelentingly thrusts himself daily to the forefront of publicity and continues a distracting and surely time-consuming stream of personal and irresponsible communications to publicity media, broadcasting his private opinions with abandon, regardless of whether or not they conform with the decisions which he is hired to execute.

3. Messianic complex: It is the evident conviction of Douglas MacArthur that he was sent to this earth for the purpose of redeeming the entire world and redeeming it with arms and bloodshed alone. His apparent conviction is that he, and he alone, is possessed of the knowledge of destiny and correct action.

Lest some may think that the appearance of these traits in Douglas MacArthur are to be dated with the Korean War and may have resulted in the man as a result of the confusions and frustrations of the Korean War, we hasten to reprint a doggerel classic which appeared in the Pacific theater during the waning years of World War II. It first appeared in this column on February 27, 1948, and we reprint it now to show that these traits of MacArthur were documented in satire long before he was thwarted in his desire to launch all-out war on the Asiatic mainland.

Three years ago we wrote:

"For a year before and after the invasion of the Philippines by the Great Returner, the quantity of classified information which was revealed in daily press communiques from MacArthur's headquarters was a major topic of bull-sessions in the Pacific. While most military headquarters in that theater of operation kept silent about possible future operations, General Doug, striking the pose of a messiah, refused to let anyone forget that, even if no one else was, he was pressing the war effort. Finally, it became a standing joke that soldiers, sailors, and marines—all of whom MacArthur claimed in his oracular pronouncements to the press as members of his own personal crusade, speaking of 'my' troops, 'my' ships, and 'my' planes—could learn where they would land next by keeping up with Doug's communiques and by tuning in each evening on the Voice of Freedom, a 1-hour broadcast beamed from the general's headquarters by a licensed commercial station, allegedly paid for by the Army and used to reassure the American Armed Forces in the Pacific that Doug was looking after them, would deliver them from evil and was arranging to win the war for them—not only in the Pacific, but by repeated inferences, through his influence on strategy in the European theater also.

"Shortly before the Philippine campaign was launched a doggerel epic appeared in the Pacific theater and passed from ship to ship in the Third, Fifth, and Seventh Fleets and from battalion to battalion through the Army and the Marine divisions stationed on that half of the globe."

This is the document:

"For two long years, since blood and tears
have been so very rife,
Confusion in our war news burdens more a
soldier's life.
But from this chaos, daily, like a hospice on
the way,
Like a shining light to guide us, rises Doug's
communiqué.

"For should we fail to get the mail, if prisoners won't talk,
If radios are indisposed and carrier pigeons
walk,
We have no fear, because we'll hear tomorrow's news today
And see our operations plan in Doug's communiqué.

"Here, too, is told the saga bold of virile deathless youth
In stories seldom tarnished with the plain unvarnished truth.
It's quite a rag, it waves the flag, its motif is the fray,
And modesty is plain to see in Doug's communiqué—

" 'My battleships bombarded the Nips from Maine to Singapore.
My subs have sunk a million tons; they'll sink a billion more.
My aircraft bombed Berlin last night. In Italy, they say,
Our turn's tonight, because it's right in Doug's communiqué.

" 'My armored tanks have mowed his ranks, so Rommel's gone to hide;
And the frozen steppes of Russia see my wild Don Cossacks ride.
My brave beleaguered Chitniks make the Axis sweat and pay.'
It's got to be—it's what we see in Doug's communiqué.

"His area is quite cosmic and capricious as a breeze,
Ninety times as big as Texas, bigger than Los Angeles.
It springs from lost Atlantis up to where the angels play,
And no sparrow falls unheeded—it's in Doug's communiqué.

"He used to say, 'And with God's help,' but lately it would seem
That his patience is exhausted and God's on his second team;
And the Cabots and the Lodges, too, have long ceased to pray
That they'll even squeeze a byline into Doug's communiqué.

"And while possibly a rumor now, some day it will be a fact
That the Lord will hear a deep voice say, 'Move over, God; it's Mac.'
So bet your shoes that all the news that last great judgment day
Will go to press in nothing less than Doug's communiqué."

MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman and MacArthur," from the Bluefield (W. Va.) Sunset News of April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN AND MACARTHUR

President Truman's action in ousting General MacArthur has stirred the Nation and the world as few other actions of his administration have done. We believe he had

no alternative. MacArthur himself, whether deliberately or not, made his dismissal inevitable by his continued disagreement with the policies which he was duty-bound to carry out. Any United States President facing the same situation, would have been compelled to make the decision Mr. Truman made. The policies of government must be made by duly constituted civilian authorities, not by military commanders in the field.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Truman had to act as he did. Many Americans are indignant, for they believed in MacArthur. But General MacArthur had shown that he was not in sympathy or agreement with United States or UN policies in Asia, which, right or wrong, were made by the Government the people elected.

In simple and candid language the President last night told the Nation we are fighting in Korea to prevent world war III. He dismissed General MacArthur, he said, because MacArthur's insistence that the war be expanded into China jeopardized that aim.

We are trying to stop a war, not start one, the President said. It would be tragically wrong to take the initiative in spreading the war in Asia.

General MacArthur is unquestionably one of the great military figures of all time. He is a man of sincerity and high purpose, a great soldier. His record throughout the Pacific war and the occupation of Japan is unique. He has truly been a bulwark against communism in the Orient.

The record shows that President Truman, too, has been a bulwark against communism. The fight he has waged has been equally effective against its spread.

History will show that the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the decision to use force against the Reds in Korea, the building up of Europe's strength, the rearming of our own country are positive and aggressive measures which have already contained and curbed the Russian aggressors.

The action in Korea is a vital part of the Truman policy of meeting Red aggression wherever it shows itself and we believe that policy should be continued. In Greece and in Berlin similar action short of all-out war stopped the aggressors. Mr. Truman believes it will do so again. Until now it has, and we have gained precious time to rebuild our strength while another general war is held in abeyance. We are hurting the Reds in Korea more than they are hurting us. It seems sensible to continue that course.

Attempts to make MacArthur's dismissal appear as appeasement of the Soviets are distortions of the truth. We will not appease Russia. The terms which the President set last night for peace in the Orient made that clear. In addition the action of Secretary Acheson in rejecting British overtures to give Red China a voice in the Japanese peace treaty points up the fact that the cries of another Munich are not based on fact.

But to launch attacks on China now as MacArthur wished to do, would mean the United States would be committed to an interminable war on the continent of Asia. We would lose Europe, which would be far more costly in the long run, for we could not fight now on two such fronts. With Europe would go our allies of the Atlantic Pact, and what is even more important, the continent's industrial productive capacity. The United States would stand alone against a dominant Russia. It is unthinkable.

We are winning now in Korea. We are building strength at home and in Europe. We are gaining steadily in the efforts we have launched to crush the ugly serpent head of communism. But this is not the time to launch attacks on China and start the war which we are trying to prevent.

Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Latin Resources Vital to United States in Time of War," written by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, published in the New York Journal-American of April 8 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN RESOURCES VITAL TO UNITED STATES IN TIME OF WAR

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, internationally famous airplane designer and aviation authority)

The current meeting of the organization of American States, which unfortunately has received very little attention from the press, is, in the opinion of this writer, of the utmost importance. Its success or failure may determine our very survival if the world situation deteriorates and we are forced into a major show-down with the Communist nations.

Should this occur, the world will immediately be divided into two geographical halves. We shall be excluded from the enemy half as effectively as he will be excluded from ours. All sources of strategic supplies outside of this hemisphere will be denied to us by enemy air power.

It is, therefore, patently clear that we must proceed without further delay to develop the raw materials, productive capacity, and unity of purpose of the Americas so that this hemisphere will be, in fact and not merely in prospect, a completely self-contained and self-sufficient base to sustain the military power against Communist aggression.

SHIPS WERE IMPORTANT

Before the advent of global range aircraft, only navies could project military force from one hemisphere to another. Our ships not only carried our war machine to overseas bases, but also brought the needed strategic materials from the distant corners of the earth back to this country to keep our industrial effort going.

During the last war, therefore, the only way that the Axis powers could deny us vital strategic materials was to attack our shipping in an effort to cut off our lines of supply. That is why Germany invested a great part of its national effort in submarine warfare. And they nearly succeeded when our shipping losses in the Atlantic reached the colossal figure of 1,000,000 tons a month.

Fortunately for us, the battle of supply lines had at that time stopped being solely a naval problem. Air power had entered the equation. It was air vigilance, air search, and air attacks on submarines both on the high seas and in their breeding grounds on enemy soil that eventually emasculated the enemy's grip on our supply lines, and saved us the victory.

SOVIET SUBMARINES

It has been said that Russia is building a great fleet of submarines. Such a step is militarily profitable from the Russian point of view so long as we persist in the balanced-forces strategy and accordingly disperse our land forces all over the world, maintain bases along the entire periphery of the Soviet sphere of domination, and draw our strategic materials from the enemy's back yard thousands of miles away. They are building undersea weapons because we are building targets for these weapons.

On the other hand, Russia is quite capable of a strategic deception, and we must treat the propaganda concerning her great undersea fleet with a grain of salt.

Once her air power assumes major proportions and can deliver its massive stroke in any direction of the compass, she may ignore our supply lines and strike directly at the sources of strategic materials instead.

ENEMY AIR POWER

The enemy's air force based in China and the Balkans can readily reach any spot in Europe, Asia, and Africa that attempts to trade with us, and keep them neutralized. The very threat of annihilation from overhead may intimidate these regions and prevent them from supplying us.

The choice they will have is to desist, or be destroyed. One need not be a strategist to realize that it is beyond the realm of possibility to endow all of these remote spots with air defense capable of warding off the entire striking power of the Eurasian continent.

Thus we may have an invincible Navy, complete command of the seas and a vast merchant marine, and yet face strategic strangulation because our ships have nothing to transport.

Under these new conditions, therefore, it is not sea power, but again air power that will be decisive. Only the right kind of air force, if and when created, operating directly from this hemisphere, could destroy the enemy's air power and regain access to these strategic points.

But in order to guarantee our air force such an uninterrupted offensive, we must forge it from strategic materials located in this hemisphere.

However, the United States alone, for all its amazing riches, is a have-not Nation in terms of certain strategic materials. In the past we have counted complacently on a flow of rubber, hemp, and other key materials from the East Indies, the Philippines, and Indochina.

Smugness gave way to alarm early in the last war when Japanese aviation closed off our access to Manila hemp, silk, quinine, and rubber. We lost 90 percent of chromium, 87 percent of tungsten, 85 percent of mica, 80 percent of tin, 60 percent of wool.

We are headed for a similar shock if we do not organize this hemisphere now for development of its resources. Taken as a whole, the hemisphere has all the ingredients required for the implementation of a modern military force. Yet, at this very dangerous moment in world history we are still not self-sustaining. The cause of our plight lies in the absence of adequate planning and foresight.

TIME YET TO ACT

Fortunately, there is still time to open up the almost inexhaustible resources of South America, to replace or supplement those that are located within the sphere of domination of the Communist nations.

For example, there is enough managanese in Brazil to supply the needs of our entire steel industry. Tungsten and wolfram, which we derived largely from China, is available in northern Argentina, Bolivia, and Chile. The cobalt that is so crucial for jet engine production exists in South America.

The success of the organization of American states, therefore, is not only of the greatest importance to every living person in this hemisphere, but to all freedom-loving people, and particularly to Europe, whose survival depends on the deterrent power of America's military strength and industrial output.

GLOBAL WAR RIVALS

Tomorrow's global war, if it comes, will find the total resources of one hemisphere pitted against the total resources of the other. It is evident, then, that hemispheric solidarity is not merely desirable—it is imperative. In any showdown, our destinies are irrevocably interwoven with those of our South American neighbors. We shall all sink or swim together.

The South American countries must be given assistance and encouraged to develop their resources with the utmost dispatch. We must unite this hemisphere into an efficient organization, and see to it that our standard of living will never the impaired by the shutting off of vital materials elsewhere.

LATINS ARE PROUD

Recently I visited South America and had the opportunity to discuss the defense of our hemisphere with the presidents and military heads of several countries. The Latin Americans are proud and sensitive. They are aware that we need their help even as they need ours.

What they want are opportunities to collaborate as equals among equals. Our very stature and power require that we act in a spirit of fair neighborliness, and we may be sure that it will be answered in kind.

This is the challenge that now faces American statesmanship and the American people. When our policymakers have grasped these basic conditions, we shall then be able to work out a realistic hemisphere policy under which the Americas can be truly unified to face the common danger.

The Political Effect of the MacArthur Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio discussion which took place over the American Forum of the Air on the subject, "The Political Effect of the MacArthur Incident," on April 15, 1951, participated in by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

There being no objection, the radio discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL EFFECT OF THE MACARTHUR INCIDENT

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the Continental Room of the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D. C. Each week at this time, the American Forum of the Air presents special guest speakers, so that you in your home may enjoy authoritative discussions of the provocative and vital topics of our time.

Here today to discuss this problem are Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat of Oklahoma, and Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican of California, and your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. Gen. Douglas MacArthur will soon land in the United States for the first time in 14 years. By relieving MacArthur of his command, President Truman has touched off one of the most explosive issues on Capitol Hill. The debate, which found congressional leaders divided on the troops-to-Europe issue, has now been expanded to include the controversy over our policy in Asia.

General MacArthur is expected to address the Congress, his remarks—his differences with the President over foreign policy—will unquestionably have far-reaching repercussions.

Today, the American Forum of the Air considers the so-called MacArthur incident in a special round-table discussion. Because of this internationally important controversy, we have postponed for a later date the program originally scheduled, "Would a Realinement of Our Political Parties be Beneficial?"

Now to start the debate, Senator KERR, just why did the President replace MacArthur?

Senator KERR. Well, the President had to replace MacArthur or permit the military authority to be neutralized, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff being disregarded by a field commander. He had to remove MacArthur or permit the military to dictate to the civilian authority. He had to remove him or abandon the United Nations objectives in Korea—to stop aggression, to punish the aggressor, to limit the conflict. He had to remove him or risk MacArthur's taking this Nation alone into the jungle and mire of China in an all-out world conflict.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. I disagree with Senator KERR in his statement. In the first place, it was not necessary to eliminate General MacArthur from command. The situation is that General MacArthur has made a great contribution to our opposition to communism in the Far East. He stood as a symbol to the opposition to communism. This has undermined the anti-Communist forces in the Far East. It has undermined our position in Japan.

No one questions the constitutional power of the President to do what he did, but we do question his judgment in doing what he did.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Sparkman?

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Granik, I feel that the President had no other choice. I agree with Senator KNOWLAND that General MacArthur has done a great job in Japan, and he has made a great contribution in the fight against communism. But I don't think anyone can dispute the fact that General MacArthur had reached the point where he simply was out of step, out of step with the policy laid down by our Government relating to our program in the Far East, out of step with our Joint Chiefs of Staff, who were laying down the military program. And it was either to go over the heads of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and yield to General MacArthur, or else it was to continue to take the advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and replace General MacArthur. I think the President had no other choice.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Granik, it seems to me that the President's action with regard to MacArthur is just another indication that a pernicious pattern of performance is developing in the White House which does not augur very well for America's future. It appears to me that the attitude in the White House today is: either agree with everything that is done, or else you are going to be deposed. I suppose you could say it: if you don't agree, you are going to lose your position. First it was Louis Johnson; now it is Douglas MacArthur; tomorrow it may be Ike Eisenhower.

In other words, if Dean Acheson and Harry Truman find themselves in disagreement on policy with someone, and if they find those people who oppose them talking to Republicans, out they go. Cut off their heads. That, I think, is rather dangerous in American policy, and it has never been part of the American tradition.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. It wasn't a contest between MacArthur and Dean Acheson. It was a contest between MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It wasn't a contest between MacArthur and the State Department. It was a contest between MacArthur and the Defense Department. It wasn't a matter of agreeing with a whim of the President of the United States. It was a matter either of carrying out a policy agreed upon by the United Nations and about which we are working over there, or of the field commander carrying out the orders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

When matters get to that point, it isn't a question of debate between the superior and the subordinate commanders. It is either a job for the subordinate commander to obey the orders and carry them out, or move out of the way and let somebody in who will.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KNOWLAND.

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, Mr. Granik, the actual facts of the matter are that General MacArthur violated none of his military directives. To the contrary, he was given certain directives by the United Nations for the purpose of unifying and making a free Korea. When he tried to carry out those directives successfully, he was interfered with both at Lake Success and Washington, in carrying out his military responsibilities.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to answer that, Senator Sparkman?

Senator SPARKMAN. I just can't agree with Senator Knowland in that statement. In fact, I think it is noticeable in the press throughout the country that it is conceded that General MacArthur was out of step with the directives and failed to go through with the directives that had been issued by our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Now, let me give one example. On March 20, our Joint Chiefs of Staff notified General MacArthur that due to the fine progress that had been made, some kind of a plan was going to be approached toward opening up negotiations. It just simply tipped him off, with a highly secret document. Four days later General MacArthur comes out and issues a statement along the same line. Now, if that was not being out of step, I don't know what is.

Just one other example. The Joint Chiefs of Staff suggested to General MacArthur the rearming, or the arming—the supplying—of the South Koreans, and sent a long directive regarding that. And General MacArthur, instead of acceding to their wishes and arming the South Koreans to help fight the North Koreans, decided he wanted to use that equipment on the Japanese state police. Now, if that is not being out of step with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with our policy that has been established by our Government, I do not know what can be.

Senator MUNDT. Of course, as long as you keep talking about the Joint Chiefs of Staff, you have a great advantage over us; because any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who talks to the Republicans loses his job. The only people who have been talking publicly are Dean Acheson and Harry Truman; so consequently the Senator from California and I have to quote them. We know we

would not lose our jobs if we mention their names.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KNOWLAND, do you want to add a word there?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes. The fact of the matter is that in one of the national news magazines this last week General MacArthur wired to say that he had never seen this directive prior to the time that he issued his statement on March 24.

Senator SPARKMAN. You mean the directive of March 20?

Senator KNOWLAND. That is right. And it had never been presented to him. He had never seen the details of the situation at all. Now, that is one thing.

The second is that they have released certain extracts from hitherto top secret documents which will support their position, and they have denied to the Congress of the United States, upon the official request of its committees, the surrendering of the Wedemeyer report, which I think will show gross incompetence in the executive branch of the Government.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR, are you bursting with a question?

Senator KERR. No, I am not bursting with a question. I am enthusiastic with an answer. The remark that he made about MacArthur saying something over there is in error. The statement was made by Whitney.

You remember, JOSEPH MARTIN, the Republican leader in the House, came out and said that he had talked with MacArthur and MacArthur had accepted his invitation to come back and address the Congress. And everybody was all excited about whether he should or should not; when, lo and behold, some enterprising newspaperman broke through the censorship which MacArthur has imposed over there——

Senator KNOWLAND. At the request of the Joint Chiefs.

Senator KERR. To advise the American people that MARTIN hasn't talked to MacArthur at all, that MARTIN had talked to Whitney. Now, MacArthur is going to be back here in a few days. He wants to come before the Congress. The Democrats want him to come before the Armed Services Committee. And we want to find out what it has been that he has been advocating over there about aggressive action, about carrying this war to China.

I notice in the Christian Science Monitor, here, of Friday, a quote from Senator TAFT in New York the other night, in which it says: "Senator TAFT's New York speech in which he said prevention of a third world conflict cannot now be accomplished without an aggressive war against Communist China." That is the basic issue here politically, Mr. Moderator, as to whether or not the American people are going to permit a few Republican leaders and General MacArthur to lead us into a situation of all-out war against Red China on the continent of Asia, or whether we are going to limit our forces over there to the accomplishment of the objectives of stopping aggression in Korea, punishing the aggressor, limiting the scope of the conflict, and then working out peace.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Moderator, I would like to say that I think we are getting down to brass tacks now. The Senator from Oklahoma has begun to bring in the name of Congressman MARTIN, of Massachusetts. And that probably is the reason why Douglas MacArthur is no longer in charge of the Asiatic theater. Because Douglas MacArthur talked to a Republican Member of Congress. Because Douglas MacArthur thought that Republicans as well as Democrats had a right to know what was going on in Asia, now he is to be pilloried. Now they are anxious to get him into a secret committee room, so that the public cannot be there, rather than have him address the Congress. But fortunately the ire of the American public is such that they are insisting that he talk to them.

Actually, MacArthur made two mistakes. The first mistake he made was in talking to a Republican Congressman. That was considered bad in Democratic circles. Then he made the error of turning his back on the man who would not turn his back on Alger Hiss. Consequently they are pilorying him for that. As far as his specific activities are concerned, up to now, anyhow, no one has questioned the fact that Douglas MacArthur did not start the war in Korea. Somebody in the White House, or the State Department, ordered him to start the shooting. So they can't say he upset the peace of Asia.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR referred to the possibility of an aggressive war against Red China. Would you care to comment on that, Senator KNOWLAND?

Senator KNOWLAND. I was in Korea this last November, and I can say that General MacArthur has never recommended an invasion by American forces of Red China. I believe it is necessary to get rid of that red herring to start with. I do not believe it is necessary to have a declaration of war, but I do think it is necessary to untie the hands of our fighting men there, so that they are not being required to go up as our fighting planes and bombers are, and find that the Russian-made enemy planes can go back into a sanctuary area and keep from being attacked in their nests.

General Stratemeyer yesterday pointed out that it was an almost impossible task to ask men to risk their lives when the enemy is operating from a sanctuary we could not attack. That has never before happened in American history.

Senator SPARKMAN. I want to get back to something my friend KARL MUNDT said. Now, everybody knows that there have probably been twice as many Republican Members of Congress visiting General MacArthur in the east as there have been Democrats. I think there is no argument about that at all. And goodness knows, we are not objecting to his appearing before Congress. We are joining in the invitation. We do say that he ought to subject himself to questioning before a congressional committee, upon which both Democrats and Republicans sit; and it will not be a secret meeting, because there is no reason why it cannot be an open meeting.

I think we ought to stick to the gist of this subject, and that is that General MacArthur undoubtedly was advocating a policy that meant the spread of this war, when we are trying to localize it. He undoubtedly put himself on that side. And now we find our Republican friends lining up with him, advocating what would amount to a third world war.

Senator KNOWLAND. Don't you think this means the survival of the Nation is at stake?

Senator SPARKMAN. I think it means the spreading of the war, when we are trying to localize it.

I want to quote from Senator TAFT's New York speech. Now just listen to this. This is from the New York Times: "A more active battle against China, involving use of the National troops on Formosa under control of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and an invasion of China was"—he was talking, by the way, about this aggressive plan that General MacArthur was advocating—"was justified from a moral standpoint, but practical considerations, notably the size of the armies and the danger that it would incite Russia into an active war, made it impossible."

Now, that is Senator TAFT speaking about this very program. And I think everybody who goes into it will realize that the inevitable result of what General MacArthur was advocating was a spread of this war and the start of world war III at a place where we don't want it, and at a time when we are not prepared to meet it.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KNOWLAND, do you want to comment on that?

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, what General MacArthur was trying to avoid was a far eastern Munich that would make inevitable world war III.

Senator SPARKMAN. We do not have to have a Munich.

Senator KNOWLAND. We know that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. The British just a few days ago advocated that Formosa be turned over to the Chinese Communists; that the Chinese Communists be admitted into the United Nations and that they participate in the Japanese peace treaty. If that would not be a full-fledged far-eastern Munich I would like to know what you would consider it. The removal of General MacArthur was the first step in being able to achieve that surrender to British appeasement.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Moderator, I want to challenge that statement, and I want to say here positively that the United States has no idea and never has had of letting the Red Chinese participate in the Japanese peace treaty or of surrendering Formosa. I happen to be chairman of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee and I happen to know that Britain did not propose this 3 days ago, they proposed it 10 days or more ago. We immediately had a hearing on it and the statement was made positively that we would not, under any conditions, and Britain has been informed that we would not accede to it. And we are going to stand fast on it. The removal of MacArthur has no bearing on it whatsoever.

Senator MUNDT. I am not so sure about that.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, I am.

Senator MUNDT. Whether it was 10 days or 3 days is immaterial. But these proposals that Great Britain makes have a habit of being accepted by the administration. Great Britain was in favor of removing MacArthur and has been in favor of removing MacArthur for a long time. So has France, the Communist Party in America, and so have a great many others. You give one reason for his removal. It looks to us like there is another reason for it. At least it is a concession to the appeasement forces around the world and every Communist country ran its colors at the top of the mast when MacArthur was eventually removed. They consider it an appeasement of Red China and an appeasement of the Communists.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. I want to go back to the statement made about the secret meeting. The Armed Services Committee, including the Republicans and Democrats, invited General MacArthur to come before them in a public meeting where he could make his statement and be cross-examined. Now, my good friends over here say they do not want MacArthur to be up against a sanctuary. Yet they seek to place him in a sanctuary.

Senator KNOWLAND. He will take care of himself when he gets here.

Senator KERR. He has already wired back that he will not appear before the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Armed Services Committee until he finds out whether he is going to be given a hero's welcome.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Kerr, I am sorry.

Senator KERR. I want to say that I am opposed to his being offered a sanctuary where he will not be subject to cross-examination. Any time Congress lets a man, who has been relieved of his command for insubordination come before them to make a speech and at the same time be free from cross-examination, Congress is tying both of their hands behind them. And I get back to the statement Senator MUNDT made about disagreeing with Dean Acheson. Dean Acheson had no more to do with the military orders that went down to MacArthur than Senator MUNDT did. They were issued by the Commander in Chief and when MacArthur disregarded and disobeyed them he was disobeying the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander in Chief.

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, I would like to speak on that subject. I happen to be a member of the Armed Services Committee. General MacArthur has not declined to appear before the committee. He suggested that he should not make an appearance before the committee until he had had a chance to appear before the full Congress. And, Senator RUSSELL, the chairman of the committee is now in communication with him. That is the first situation. The second one is that the State Department has interfered in the military strategy of the Far East and as far as I am concerned I would rather take the judgment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as to our defense needs in the Pacific than I would the judgment of Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. Of course that is the trouble with this whole debate. They try to shove aside the fact that stands out just as clearly as it can for those who want to see it that our policy in the conduct of the Korean war was decided upon by the military experts upon whom we depend for military advice in our Government, the three who make up the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They keep referring to Dean Acheson. Dean Acheson has not one single thing to do with the military policy in Korea, it is the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and every single paper that was issued to General MacArthur comes from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Why do we not talk about their judgment as to how to run things in Korea, as to how to run the war? Why is it that the people who were afraid of provoking war by sending troops to Europe are not afraid of provoking an all-out effort in China? Why is it that they desire appeasement in Europe and aggression in Asia?

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. The reason we talk about Dean Acheson is because I happen to know, having served on the House Foreign Affairs Committee all the time this Chinese policy was being shaped, that Dean Acheson and the State Department stood as a road block consistently stopping us from doing anything that would be of assistance to Nationalist China. That fact stands out. The fact as you mentioned it that Dean Acheson had nothing to do with foreign policy does not stand up very clearly to me because the Joint Chiefs of Staff had to make this program consistent with the foreign policy of the country.

Senator KNOWLAND. How do you account for the fact that on the 23d of December 1949 Dean Acheson and the State Department sent to all of our consular officials overseas a communication which was withheld at that time from the American public to get them acquainted with the facts, so they could educate the public that Formosa had no strategic value, when that was contrary to the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and it was contrary to the judgment of our responsible military and naval commanders in that area of the world? It was not until they disclosed the matter on the floor of the Senate that the State Department finally admitted that they had sent that out, but they refused to furnish the original documents to the Senate of the United States.

Senator SPARKMAN. Was that on December 23 of last year or year before last?

Senator KNOWLAND. 1949.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, 1949. As a matter of fact, if you will refer back to that whole statement, and particularly to the explanation that was given a few days after that for which Dean Acheson had been so severely attacked, you will see that he outlined our responsibility for defense, and he said that that line ran down through Japan and the Philippines, and he went on to say, not that Formosa had no strategic value, but that the question of defense of Korea and Formosa was a United Nations question rather than a United States question.

Senator KNOWLAND. He amended that statement by saying that Korea and Formosa were outside our line of defense. He issued an open invitation for the North Korean Communists to attack Korea and for the Chinese Communists to attack Formosa.

Senator SPARKMAN. Not at all. What he was saying was that it was not the individual policy of the United States. Read the statement.

Senator KNOWLAND. I have read it many times.

Senator SPARKMAN. Read the statement. He said definitely that the defense of Japan and the Philippines was the individual responsibility of the United States but that Formosa and Korea were the responsibility of the United Nations. It was all in the same question and when you quote one you ought to quote the other.

Senator KNOWLAND. The responsible command out there, naval and military, feels that the loss of Formosa would be detrimental to the strategic defense of this country and would move our defenses back to the Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California in this age of the atomic weapon and the airplane.

Senator SPARKMAN. We will not lose Formosa.

Senator KNOWLAND. We will if the appeasers have their way about it.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are not the appeasers.

Senator KNOWLAND. But the British are.

Senator KERR. We are not going to lose Formosa for the very simple reason that our fleet is now protecting it. You cannot escape your responsibility in this regard by favoring MacArthur and his policy, that would spread the war, by talking about Britain. Certainly Britain is our ally and there are things with them that I do not agree with but I am mighty glad they are allies. You cannot escape the responsibility of MacArthur by attacking Dean Acheson for the very simple reason that MacArthur was the man who refused to obey orders of the Commander in Chief and refused to carry out the policy of the United Nations, and refused to operate on a basis that would prevent the spread of the conflict, but rather favored that which would cause it to spread.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. Let's straighten out, first of all, what the fleet is doing around Formosa. The fleet is around Formosa in order to keep the Nationalist government in Formosa from attacking the Red Communists in China and the Red Communists are attacking us. That makes it a pretty difficult war for our GI's in Korea because it is the first time in American history that you have had the American Navy on one side of the war and the Army on the other side of the war. That is carrying competition a little too far between Annapolis and West Point. All that we are asking is that the fleet be withdrawn and let the Nationalists in Formosa decide what they want to do about attacking our enemy, the Red Communists in China.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to answer that?

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, I do. That just simply is not the case. As a matter of fact, if our fleet were not protecting the Nationalists on Formosa the Chinese Communists would take it overnight. We are protecting the Nationalists rather than holding them off the mainland.

Senator KNOWLAND. We are doing two things, John, we are protecting the Island of Formosa and we are preventing them from making any incursions on the mainland. It is a two-edged situation.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, we are preventing the Chinese from making incursions on Formosa, too.

Moderator GRANIK. One question?

Question. My question is for Senator KERR. Is the MacArthur incident the kick-off for the political campaign for 1952, or was it just a coincidence?

Senator KERR. It was just a coincidence but it is going to result in the American people finding out the hopeless confusion and the hopeless dissension in the ranks of the Republican Party. It is going to prove that the responsible leadership of the Republican Party here in Washington is a war party. It has shown that men like Lodge and Saltonstall and Duff and Dulles and Austin have been shoved aside, those who helped build the bipartisan policy and who helped fight for it and support it. They are being shoved aside and those who believe in the program of spreading this war in China to follow MacArthur are in the saddle and I think it is going to result in that which will be most helpful to the Democratic Party and the American people.

Senator KNOWLAND. Just let me say this, Mr. Moderator. Since the year 1908, when I was born, we have been in three wars, including the Korean war. All of them have been under Democratic administrations. I participated in one as a soldier. If Senator KERR would take the position that the Democratic Party is a party of peace that does not make sense.

Now all Americans, Republicans and Democrats, have had to fight in all three of these wars including the Korean war, which is now going on.

Senator KERR. That is the reason we do not want it to spread to Red China; that is the reason we want to prevent a world war now; that is the reason we want to limit the conflict and make the peace as soon as we can, instead of permitting it to spread around the world and get to the point where there never will be any hope of getting out.

Senator MUNDT. I do not know where Senator KERR has been living in the last 6 months if he thinks there is danger of the war spreading to Red China. Red Chinese have been shooting American GIs for a long time in Korea. That war has already spread. What we want is a chance to defend the lives of the American GIs now fighting for freedom on the Korean Peninsula.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Policy, Not Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the times are too perilous for us to indulge in the luxury of a free-for-all partisan scrap, even if the President has acted impulsively and thrown the administration into a vulnerable political position.

The somber background of our young men, dying on foreign soil, and the growing menace of communism might call for restraint and sober nonpartisan judgment.

If we allow our minds to be diverted by political expediency, or secondary arguments over military properties, the control of the military by civilians and similar traditional issues, we will only compound mistakes already made.

It is generally admitted that, constitutionally, the Chief Executive is within his legal rights in changing commanders. Let us concede that, and also the fact that any military commander is justified in obeying his own conscience, even as did Gen. Billy Mitchell.

The real need of the hour is a sound and practical objective with respect to the war in Korea and the over-all policy in the Far East.

Congress is not the only branch of the Government that should be sensitive to the will of the people in policy matters. The executive branch, likewise, is only an arm of the Government of the people, by the people.

The people are speaking and, if my mail is at all indicative of the general sentiment, they want a firm policy in Asia that will end all traces of appeasement of communism and give our forces in Korea the green light to end that conflict victoriously, with as few casualties as possible.

The President and the State Department would do well to listen to these voices with the view of guiding the ship of state in accordance with the will and judgment of the Nation as a whole.

The following editorial from the April 13 edition of the Easton Star-Democrat, a Maryland paper that has always been Democratic, as it name implies, ably states what many of the citizens in my district are saying and thinking at this crucial moment:

THE MACARTHUR DISMISSAL

President Truman's summary dismissal of General MacArthur has profoundly shocked the Nation. Immediate reaction to this rash act in this area was that the President had gone too far; that it is too bad Truman cannot be removed from office with the same ease. Indeed, several Republican Senators were quoted as demanding President Truman's impeachment, although this can be considered virtually impossible in view of the two-thirds rule.

The President's action should touch off a round of official celebration in the Kremlin. MacArthur was an archenemy of communism at the time when the boys in Washington were holding hands with the boys in the Kremlin. It can be said with truth that at least part of the clamor for General MacArthur's dismissal was sponsored, aided, and abetted by the Communists throughout the world.

British and French politicians are more than pleased over MacArthur's downfall, although they haven't had the courage to state their pleasure publicly even though it is they who have been calling for this action all along. Their contention has been that an aging general was being allowed to lead the world into another war. Their real reason for opposing MacArthur was the fear that emphasis on the fight against Communist aggression in Asia would divert military aid from Europe. What these foreigners fail to realize and what President Truman is learning with emphasis at the moment is that to many Americans General MacArthur is a treasured symbol of dynamic democracy in the best Teddy Roosevelt tradition.

We are not among those who have been blinded through the years by the so-called MacArthur magnetism, and certainly his actions in the past few months cannot be condoned on a purely military basis. Under our present system of government a civilian, the President, is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and the military is expected to take orders and remain silent. On this basis there can be no denial that General MacArthur is in the wrong; although in his position as supreme commander he violated no rule or regulation.

Apart from this narrow military viewpoint, it must be acknowledged that the general's long years of military and political experience in the Far East make his opinion of particular value. The President or the Congress should have provided a channel for the expression of these views. General MacArthur should have been recalled to Washington to testify in full, once and for all. His testimony would have been certain to intensify the debate regarding far-eastern policy, but such searching examination of policy would have been good for the country, just as it was in the instance of the debate on aid to Western Europe. (In which General Eisenhower had a hand.) Out of it might have come a far-eastern policy that was at once realistic, and supported by a clear majority of the American people. Heaven only knows this country needs a far-eastern policy. There would have been no MacArthur incidents, and possibly no war in Korea if administration policy in the Far East had not been such a deplorable failure since World War II. The supreme tragedy is that even now, with men dying or being wounded at the rate of 1,400 a week in Korea, there is still no clear-cut American policy in the Far East. Where leadership was needed, there has existed a vacuum.

Right or wrong, General MacArthur has always been a leader. His recommendation of a policy to avoid a stalemate in the Korean war is the only definite and authoritative statement of policy on the subject available for consideration. And the general's warning that Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest in Asia, is also a compelling declaration deserving of the most searching examination.

President Truman's actions in recent months to muzzle the most outspoken critic of a State Department in which the American people have no confidence on far-eastern affairs, have left a bad taste in everyone's mouth. His surrender to the demands of foreigners and weak-livered diplomats in the State Department in dismissing MacArthur is a great disservice to the American people.

In many respects this could be General MacArthur's finest hour. If he will use his new freedom to return to the United States and give the American public the full benefit of his views, he is likely to find more support than has ever been accorded him in his long and gallant career. We may now see the true temper of MacArthur steel as compared with Truman mink coats and red herrings.

The Issue in MacArthur Dismissal Is One of Policies in Asia, Not One of Civilian Versus Military Control, for There Was no Insubordination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extraordinarily sane, sound, and lucid broadcast on April 15, 1951, by Mr. David Lawrence, editor of United States News and World Report:

The American people seem to be talking about just one thing and asking many questions about it, and that is the removal of General MacArthur. The first question, as you might well surmise, is this: "Hasn't the President of the United States the right to fire any general?"

Of course he has that right. But the real question is, "Was President Truman right in firing General MacArthur?"

I think the President need not have dismissed MacArthur but could easily have resolved the differences in a manner that would not have split America and would not have humiliated a national hero. When an important executive is 8,000 miles away from home base on an important assignment, and the wires get crossed up with messages from his employer, you don't fire him on the spot—you bring him home and have a face-to-face talk with him and a showdown, and then if you can't clear up the misunderstanding you ask him to resign or fire him. Tokyo, after all, is less than 48 hours away from Washington in flying time.

The next question: "What was the misunderstanding? What are the facts? Didn't MacArthur just simply disobey orders?"

As I examine the facts, MacArthur complied with his orders as he understood them, and his military secretary, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, says the same thing. This is an odd time to accuse a man who has been Chief of Staff of the United States Army either of not knowing how to obey orders or of willfully disobeying orders. The orders given MacArthur, as I read them, were never explicit, and the so-called policies, if there were any, were never explained clearly to General MacArthur. The whole key to the controversy can be found by taking as an example one of the important messages released by the White House last week. This was sent to MacArthur on March 20 by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Because that message is bound to be the basis for the judgment of this case in history, I'm going to read it to you and then explain it. It is brief. I quote:

"To the commander in chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan.

"From (the) Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington.

"State (Department) planning Presidential announcement shortly that with the clearing of (the) bulk of South Korea of aggressors, the United Nations are now prepared to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea. Strong UN feeling persists that further diplomatic effort toward a settlement should be made before any advance with major forces north of (the) thirty-eighth parallel. Time will be required to determine diplomatic reactions and permit new negotiations that may develop. Recognizing that (the thirty-eighth parallel has no military significance, (the) State (Department) has asked (the) Joint Chiefs of Staff what authority you should have to permit sufficient freedom of action for (the) next few weeks to provide security for (the) UN forces and maintain contact with (the) enemy. Your recommendations (are) desired."

Now note carefully the language. There is not a word in that message which says that the United Nations has decided on a policy, nor that the United States has decided on a policy. It simply says that "a strong feeling persists." It sounds like the speculative dispatches of any Washington newspaper correspondent as he writes about the fluctuating sentiment in Washington.

Now what is a military commander 8,000 miles away to do when he gets a vague message like that which does not give him any decision on policy, but merely the expression of some bureaucrat's plan in the Department of State? And who operates our Army nowadays, anyway? Surely not the Department of State! Yet, that Department asks a general in the field to deploy his troops, not for a day or two, but for a few weeks—a few weeks, mind you—in such a way as to prevent any advance of his major forces. At the same time he is asked to provide for the security of UN forces and he is told to maintain contact with the enemy. What kind of double-talk is that, really?

The next question—"Isn't the Commander in Chief, namely, the President, supreme? Can't he impose whatever policy he pleases?"

No, he cannot, if Congress disagrees, because the President is accountable to his boss—the people of the United States. Under our written Constitution, the people's representatives, namely, the Congress, can, so to speak, court-martial the Commander in Chief. They can impeach the President and remove him from office if they think the people want them to do it.

On what charge can a President be impeached—you might ask. He can be impeached for failing to do his duty as he has sworn to do it under the Constitution. One charge being mentioned in Congress is that the President failed to get a declaration of formal authority from Congress to conduct an action with 250,000 American troops—Army, Navy, and Air Force—8,000 miles away from our mainland, all of which the President now in his speeches frankly calls a "war." Congress alone has the authority to declare war.

Another charge mentioned is that he has refused to grant our troops in Korea permission to strike at enemy bases even though they have been under enemy air attack and that he has thus needlessly sacrificed American lives.

It takes a majority vote, however, of the House of Representatives to present a formal charge of impeachment, and it takes two-thirds of the Senate to remove a President.

Next question: "Is this MacArthur controversy a partisan matter?"

No, of course not. We have already had 60,000 casualties in 9 months in Korea, which is more casualties than the United States suffered in its first full year of World War II. The sons of Republicans are being killed or wounded in Korea as well as the sons of Democrats.

Next question: "Isn't this an issue of civilian authority versus military authority?"

No, it is not. The Congress is also a civilian authority and it was the letter which General MacArthur wrote to Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts, minority leader, in answer to one from Mr. MARTIN, which really infuriated Mr. Truman and caused him to remove General MacArthur.

I was talking with Representative MARTIN on that point today and he authorized me to say:

"After what happened to MacArthur we in Congress cannot expect to get the truth. In the future no member of the armed services will dare to testify before any investigating committee of Congress or answer any letter from a Member of Congress if his information or judgment is at variance with the Truman policies. There goes our much-vaunted civil authority—for Congress is a coordinate branch of the Government of the United States under our Constitution, and when we get one-man government we don't have representative government any longer." (That's the end of the quotation from Mr. MARTIN.)

Now the next question: "Is it correct to say that MacArthur wants to extend the war and Truman wants to prevent a war?"

No, it isn't correct. For each man is sincerely convinced that he has the answer as to the best method of preventing world war III. I leave it to you, however, as to what prevents a big war. Is it when you tell the enemy every other day that you're afraid to get into a big fight and keep on saying to your own troops, "You must not fight the enemy with all your might because it might antagonize them"—or is it when you give your troops the right to fight the enemy with maximum force? We never yet have entered any war just to get a stalemate or a draw. We go in to win, and to secure respect for our rights.

"But was not MacArthur told not to issue foreign policy statements?"

Yes; but he is on the ground in a military area. Commanders have the right to discuss military and related questions. I examined all the directives and statements made public last week by the White House as having been sent to MacArthur, and I did not find a single explicit instruction that covers what MacArthur wrote to Congressman MARTIN. If by any twisted construction of those messages, it is said he did violate orders, then so did General Ridgway on March 12 when he said if we stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel we would achieve victory. This could be taken to be a political statement, too. Also, General Stratemeyer, of the Fifth Air Force, pointedly told the press last Friday about the bases in Manchuria from which planes were coming every day now to destroy our planes and attack our troops. That is an expression of opinion similar to MacArthur's, especially as General Stratemeyer pointed out how difficult it will be for us now to protect our troops. Incidentally, those six B-29's, with all their crews, those big superfortresses, have been lost by enemy action, and yet we are unable to attack the bases from which those enemy planes are coming.

"Did General MacArthur's statements hurt us with our allies in the United Nations?"

The answer is to ask: "How much actual agreement is there among our allies today?" The British recognize Communist China, yet they are at war with Communist China. They want us to turn Formosa over to Communist China. We don't want to do so. They want Communist China to sit in at the treaty conferences to determine the fate of the Japanese people. The American Government doesn't want Red China in that conference. The British are sending war supplies to the Communist Chinese. What kind of a United Nations policy is that when our best friend in the UN actually follows a policy opposite to that of the United States?

And General MacArthur is relieved of his command supposedly, as the President puts it, for failing to give "wholehearted support to UN policies." What UN policies?

America is disunited today. It will not be reunited by the wishful thinking of pollyannas who cry out that we just must not debate among ourselves. The real answer is to discuss all this freely in the court of public opinion and have it out.

If General MacArthur is wrong, let us have the facts to prove it. If Mr. Truman has committed a blunder that may aggravate world conditions and invite a third world war—just as Chamberlain by his appeasement policies invited World War II—then let Congress consider the facts about that also.

For both General MacArthur and President Truman are now on trial in the court of public opinion, and the only answer that can come in this controversy must come from the people themselves, by the fullest expression of opinions communicated freely in our democracy to their Representatives in Congress and to the President.

Effect of Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Applecart and Its Badly Teetering Load," by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

THE APPLECART AND ITS BADLY TEETERING LOAD

WASHINGTON, April 16.—The Stars and Stripes snapshot of General Eisenhower—when he was told at Coblenz that General MacArthur had been relieved of his duties in the Far East—is one of those rare news photographs which reveal more than words can do. Many of the implications and conceivable consequences of the President's order have been listed, analyzed and forecast. But in the troubled look which the camera caught and was broadly circulated on the first page of this newspaper and others today it is possible to see the greatest of these:

Will Mr. Truman's action provoke a controversy in the United States that will seriously deflect the military program for the defense of Western Europe, which the North Atlantic Treaty nations have entrusted to General Eisenhower? Will General MacArthur dedicate himself to that objective, and by what means?

It is already apparent that, if these were the thoughts behind the Eisenhower look of anxious regret, they were prescient. The effects of the relief order on official Washington have been numerous, among them the manifestation of a popular will to pay public honor to General MacArthur for his military achievements and his extraordinary record as proconsul in Japan. But not only those Republican politicians who long have been critics of the administration's Far East policies have seized upon the President's action as a catalyst to combine with irresistible force all the pressures for an open reexamination and change of these policies. A number of Democrats and many students of foreign policy outside the political community also have their doubts, and welcome any incident which might produce a resurvey of global strategic values as estimated by the administration.

The existing handicaps

Considering his assignment, bearing in mind the difficulties of carrying it out successfully even in ideal circumstances, it is obvious that General Eisenhower requires national concentration on his problem as well as national support of his efforts to solve it. Except for Great Britain there are soft spots throughout the military foundation for the Eisenhower army; this correspondent noted some of them in recent dispatches from France, Italy, and Western Germany. And divisions on policy and purpose in many areas between the United States and Great Britain diminish the impact of the highly creditable rearmament program undertaken in London.

The West German Government's partnership in European defense is beset by the

Communist propaganda of "unification and neutrality," which has also attracted many young people and sincere anti-Communists in that country, and is the dream of the German population. The same propaganda has penetrated into the thinking of the French, despite the gallant strivings of the Government to repel it. There is little relish among the Italian people for the military posture which Mussolini was the last to try and fail to establish, and partisan politics is impeding the effort of the Government at Rome to pass the rearmament budget.

These and other situations—the diplomatic impasse over joining Spain, Turkey, and Greece to the NATO; the mounting threat to Yugoslavia, which puts a new burden on the allied channels of supply; the sputtering fuses which lead to nationalistic explosives in the Middle East—have added critical factors to the many General Eisenhower has encountered from the beginning. If now the United States is to be diverted seriously from his mission, and if this—whether or not it brings about a change of military emphasis—is to lessen, however briefly, the faith of the treaty nations in our devotion to his enterprise, that is a very serious possibility from the standpoint of those who believe in the essential priority of what General Eisenhower has been directed to do.

A "PEARL HARBOR" INQUIRY

The events of this week in the United States, and especially in Washington, will furnish some of the answers and point the way to the rest. And today's demand of the Republicans for a "Pearl Harbor" inquiry into the administration's courses in the Far East since the Japanese war ended may tend toward the very answers which would imperil General Eisenhower's project. This possible consequence could have been uppermost among his thoughts on the instant of hearing about General MacArthur.

The administration's critics on the Far East have had a strong case for years. But as long as General MacArthur was on active service they could count only on his oblique assistance in promoting it. That was powerful and took direct form in his letter to Representative Martin, of Massachusetts. Yet what these critics still needed for a "Pearl Harbor" inquiry was his presence in this country and his unfettered testimony. The first, knowingly and with basic courage, the President provided them with when he relieved the Far East commander. Whether the second will be what the critics hope for must await General MacArthur's first question-and-answer appearance before congressional committees, though its nature may be foreshadowed by his address to the joint meeting of the House and the Senate.

Assuming that the MacArthur contribution will be documented proof of all the Far East policy critics have contended, the record will not necessarily lead to that diversion of military emphasis to Asia which would end the Eisenhower project. But that is among the grave possibilities evoked by the President's order, and no one is more aware of it than Eisenhower himself.

Small War or Big?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very well considered editorial entitled "Small War or Big?" which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Boston.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL WAR OR BIG?

To get at the central meaning of the MacArthur controversy Americans need to ask themselves this question:

"Which of two wars do we want to fight, the war which began in Korea on last June 25 or 'an entirely new war' which would certainly spread to much of China and might envelop the world?"

The American purpose as stated by President Truman is to prevent world war III by vigorously resisting aggression but starting no new fires.

The war which the North Korean Communist puppets started—and which was taken up by the United States, the United Nations, and the Chinese Communists—was and still is a war for specific objectives and within geographical limits. The objectives, from the United Nations side, are (1) to repel and discourage aggression, and (2) to establish an independent, unified Korea.

The United Nations forces have won notable gains toward those objectives and are still advancing.

But is that too slow? Are Americans so eager to get out of a small war that they must take on a very much bigger war to extinguish it? Or does this sense of urgency arise from an exasperation with communism, a fear of it which has smoldered since the Reds first took over Russia in 1917, and a tacit assumption of irrepressible conflict which can end only in final war with that system?

The struggle has taken place, by means short of war, by limited wars, by propaganda, and by civil strife, and it will continue in some form until the fallacious tenets and methods of communism no longer appeal to extensive sections of humanity. Whether the struggle shall be peaceful or violent, narrow or broad, rests partly with Communists, partly with opponents of communism.

Where Communists choose the road of war, as in Korea and earlier, Greece, they must be met with arms. But if Americans deliberately choose to bomb Chinese cities, containing great numbers of people not in sympathy with the Communists, even because Chinese Reds have shot American soldiers in Korea, it will certainly look to the ordinary Chinese and to a great many other people as if Americans are the aggressors.

When, as is commonly suspected, the Soviet rulers in Moscow gave a go-ahead to the North Koreans the conclusion was widely drawn that the Kremlin was willing to risk precipitating a third world war in reaching for its objectives. This was rightly considered a cold-blooded and reprehensible attitude.

Would a similar judgment be passed on the United States if, rather than accept a sharp handicap in the UN's method of waging war for Korea, it should insist on making air attacks which—if last year's Sino-Russian Treaty means anything—would bring Russian arms in on the side of the Chinese?

Of course, it is argued by advocates of such a course that Russia would not actually intervene but would back down before a show of sufficient force. Possibly that is true, but it may also be remembered that the original Communist move across the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea was predicated on a belief that the United States would not use force to resist that action.

To be sure, there is need for sharper crystallization of policies and courses of action by the UN in bringing the Korean matter to a satisfactory conclusion. There should be earnest Anglo-American consultations to bring the views of these two leading nations closer together on dealing with Communist China. And there should be more meaningful discussions in the UN Sanctions Committee looking toward tighter control of trade with China and toward added contributions of troops to Korea.

The choice of broad courses here described is scarcely one on which any mortal could assume to know all the pertinent factors or to exercise an infallible judgment. The subject is one for earnest public debate and equally earnest individual soul-searching. To us it seems that the more justifiable course lies in the direction of limitation of war and of refusing to foment additional hostilities.

Another Idea Would Be To Have Our Own Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Bruce Barton entitled "The British:"

Dr. George Riley, the famous osteopath, was once invited to meet George Bernard Shaw, a devotee of osteopathy.

They had hardly shaken hands before Shaw burst into bitter vituperation of America.

Dr. Riley stood it for about 3 minutes and then cried out: "Stop that. You ought to be ashamed of yourself. How dare you, a man whose food and clothes and roof-tree are principally paid for by the money of American book buyers and playgoers, how dare you say such things about a country and a people of which you are so abysmally ignorant? I never knew such impudence."

Shaw shut his mouth. A look of amazement came into his eyes, but with it a glint of admiration. He told a friend afterward: "That man Riley is one of the most interesting people I ever met."

Too many British authors and lecturers have accepted our hospitality—often lavish and effusive to the point of servility—taken their winnings and gone back home to write and talk scurvily about us.

Too many of the British people as a whole, jealous of our prosperity, are unfriendly at heart. For years they sold us the idea that, except for protection of their fleet, we would have been helpless. But they never said from whom their fleet was protecting us; and in our Civil War, when our need of help was most desperate, their seapower, instead of helping us, tried to destroy our merchant marine.

Yet I admire the British. They write the English language better than we—we have no Shakespeare, no Milton. Their administration of justice is swifter, cheaper, and more dignified. In the conduct of foreign affairs they are so much smarter that it just is not funny.

Indeed, one of my distinguished lawyer friends, a long-time subscriber to the London Spectator, tells me that by reading it he has long been able to predict 6 months in advance just what our State Department would do—the British loan, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, and so forth.

Lately, Russia has been making our foreign policy. When she lets out a blast, we promptly blast her back. When she nudges the North Koreans into starting a rumpus, we obligingly reply with our whole Army and heaven only knows how many billions of dollars, while she loses not one soldier or one ruble.

Dancing to Russia's fiddle is getting us nowhere. We might better go back to letting the English manage us, however much we may dislike them. They know their way around, especially in the Orient, where they operated for more than 150 years at a handsome profit.

Another idea, of course, would be to have our own foreign policy. But since, to make any sense, this would have to be based on America first, it is out. Every other nation can be for itself first. But not the United States. The mere suggestion is "un-American."

The Lincoln Legend, Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 15, 1951, a group of several hundred citizens gathered at Ford's Theater in our Nation's capital. It was there, on April 14, 1865, that an assassin fired a shot, that, on the following day, ushered into eternity, one of the world's greatest characters. Although 86 years have elapsed since that tragic hour the name of Abraham Lincoln still "belongs to the ages."

The chairman of Sunday's memorial service, sponsored by the National Park Service and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, was our colleague, Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Royal Oak, Mich. The principal address was delivered by Dr. J. Walter Coleman, superintendent of the Gettysburg National Military Park of Gettysburg, Pa., and is hereto included as an extension of my remarks:

I undertook this little task in the belief that it would be an interesting exercise to compare some of the opinions which people expressed toward Lincoln in his own day and at present. Due allowance must, of course, be made for the familiar American tendency of letting adverse opinion of public figures mellow rapidly with the years. But, while some of this change in attitude toward Lincoln is sentimental, much of it, as I shall illustrate, is carefully considered. Unfavorable criticisms must be viewed against the customs of the times. If the late President Roosevelt, for example, had delivered an oratorical gem like the Gettysburg address, what would have been the comments of his severest editorial critics? I doubt that any of them would have sought an unenviable immortality by calling it disgraceful, but we must bear in mind that a considerable percentage of the comment on any incumbent President is automatically unfavorable. It is also human nature for indignant objectors to a Presidential course of action to be more vocal than the supporters.

We would therefore expect bitter expressions of disapproval during his lifetime and a generally more friendly attitude in later years. But this natural trend does not account for the even heightening interest in the man on not merely a national but a world-wide basis. The Lincoln legend is growing.

The reasons for this growth are not hard to find, but let me present a few personal observations to illustrate that it is a fact. For example, the Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania has members scattered throughout the country. It meets at Gettysburg, always on November 19, and at some other times throughout the year. Mr. John D. Lippy, Jr., who is with us today, proprietor of the Lincoln Room in the White House is the president and I am the secretary. Its membership is a cross section of American life. From Philadelphia we have had a woodworking craftsman, an express agent, an AFL organizer, and the president of Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co. We have battlefield guides, a grocery store manager, a college president and a high executive in the Du Pont Co. They belong to the organization because they are interested in attending programs devoted to Lincoln, the man of the people.

I have been at Gettysburg 10 years. My observation has been that people visiting the park and cemetery are about as much interested in Lincoln's address as they are in the battle. This opinion is supported by the guides, our historians, and persons operating the several private museum displays in the town. Dr. Henry Hanson, president of Gettysburg College, told me once of the visit of a famous Japanese educator whom he conducted over the battlefield as his guest. It was a cold rainy day. They finally reached the national cemetery and the visitor left the car and stood, hatless, on the spot where the address had been delivered. "This is the memory," he said, "that I want to take back with me." Dr. Waldo Leland, last Wednesday, related an almost identical experience with the Minister from Norway.

Travelers have told me that they have commonly encountered school children in countries like Denmark and Switzerland who could recite the address perfectly in English. I think there can be no question that Lincoln's stature as a world figure is constantly increasing. Our American stronghold of democracy is, of course, more important in world affairs now than it was nine decades ago, but much of its importance stems from the fact that we had a Lincoln when we needed him, and that "When the Judgment thunders split the house, he held the ridgepole up and spiked again the rafters of the home." Great scholars are constantly finding in him a subject for study. They tell us how he emerged, how he found a general, how he conducted diplomacy in carpet slippers and how he shared the ordeal of the Union. If we cannot all understand the deeper complexities of that social and political cataclysm of the sixties, we all do know that the man surmounted fantastic difficulties in rising to our highest national honor, and in steering the ship of state through those troubled waters.

Lincoln's background, for an American legend, could hardly be improved upon. His people were English, they came to America before the Revolution. They migrated gradually westward by going down the great valley of Virginia from Pennsylvania, like Daniel Boone. Lincoln was born in a log cabin. His grandfather was killed by the Indians. Thomas Lincoln, his father, was poor but he possessed those skills essential to the frontier which gave his family enough to eat and wear. Abraham's schooling was brief, even for the frontier, but this unlettered man was able, by keen logic and homely aphorism, to hold his own in the courtroom or on the stump, with the smartest people, first in that part of Illinois or later, most anywhere. Abe Lincoln was big and strong in the days when the expression a "good man" had two different meanings, depending on which word received the inflection. He could chop and split rails, he could shoot. His private life was impeccable, but he could tell and enjoy a story as well as the next fellow when he was out with the boys. He didn't mind people taking a drink, although he didn't use the stuff himself. He had sincere Christian convictions which were, however, not formalized into any particular dogma. This Horatio Alger formula for human interest is doubtless a factor in the legend, if it does not affect our objective estimate of his ability. Contemporary critics were not impressed by it.

I have often talked with my father about the Civil War and Lincoln. Born in 1856 in Susquehanna County, Pa., he retained vivid childhood recollections. When I recently visited the little family burial plot a hundred yards from our home, I discovered the reason why memories of the Battle of Gettysburg were a trifle vague. Six of his little cousins were buried that week, victims of typhoid fever. His recovery left him too weak to be much interested in affairs of 1863, but he remembered well his tenth birthday, Monday, April 17, 1865. The mailman, slogging through the spring mud, brought stirring news that day. He first reported that two local Republican youths had been drafted, and a friendly Democrat had escaped the call. He was quite happy. Was there any other news? Oh, yes, Old Abe has been shot and I'm glad of it. The brutality of the statement shocked the little boy, and he often mentioned it. Fifty years later, when I was 10, my father reminded me of the incident. He said, "You know, I've thought about it quite a lot, and as near as I can figure out, Lincoln was about as great a man as Washington." A ground swell for the Lincoln legend.

Grandfather's comments come to me second hand, but on the subject of Lincoln they are definitely pungent. His district was famous, briefly, in the middle forties because of Congressman David Wilmot and his famous provisos, but, by the fifties, as Prof. Avery Craven recalls, Wilmot had already returned to enjoy a well-deserved obscurity in his backward constituency. He had been the lone Pennsylvanian to vote against a protective tariff. The irate Governor of Pennsylvania declared that the only thing that district ever manufactured was shingles and they stole the lumber to make them. He was wrong on two counts. They had plenty of shingle timber, and they also made whisky.

Congressman Wilmot was succeeded by his law partner, and my grandfather's attorney, Galusha A. Grow. Mr. Grow, later to become Speaker of the House, switched from the Democratic to the Republican Party, and grandfather disapproved of him and his famous Homestead Act. He thought that the new party was giving away land to worthless migrants who should have to buy it like his grandfather had done. His widowed sister, married to a Maryland Carroll, killed in the Confederate Army at Bussard's Roost, had brought back reports about slavery that were somewhat at variance with Uncle Tom's Cabin, and he had a poor opinion generally of President Lincoln.

One of grandfather's youthful friends was an eccentric boy named Locke. His mother was a Ross who lived about a mile away. David Ross Locke had gone out to Ohio and become a newspaper man, writing what my grandfather called nonsense. He was a great favorite of Lincoln and had been entertained at the White House. He wrote under the absurd name of Petroleum Vesuvius Nasby.

But the years were to mellow even the considered opinions of Mr. Darius Coleman. He died thinking that Lincoln's Presidency was maybe the best thing that could have happened, but he always wished that Horace Greeley could have beaten Grant.

Lincoln made men follow him. When Noah Brooks went to hear him at the Cooper Union Institute he was cynical. He saw his awkwardness and heard the uncouth frontier pronunciation. "Old fellow, you won't do," he said. "It's all very well for the Wild West, but this will never go, down in New York." As Brooks recalled it later, "A friend said to me after the meeting, What do you think of Abe Lincoln, the rail-splitter? He's the greatest man since St. Paul, I said, and I think so yet."

In 1884 Woodrow Wilson was a professor of jurisprudence and political science at Wesleyan College. In an article for Forum magazine, entitled "A Calendar of Great Americans," he designated Lincoln as "the supreme American of our history."

Lincoln is a man of so universal appeal that he has become virtually all things to all people. Like the scripture, he is quoted by all shades from reactionary to pink. Conservatives warn us that we must return to the Lincolnian principles of government if our Nation is to remain free, overlooking the dire fact that Lincoln's government was at war from the outset and was forced, as I see it, to employ all kinds of restrictive measures, repugnant to Americans at times of peace. Radicals, on the other hand, assure us that freedom can only be attained by more and more drastic legislation, curbing the evils of capitalistic slave driving, and citing the Emancipation Proclamation and the thirteenth amendment as the beginning. Would Lincoln, if he were to be reincarnated today, be puzzled by these apparent contradictions? No, they existed also in his day. He would recall that the Republicans were denounced in 1856 as Communists and as high tariff economic royalists, alike.

Lincoln is great because he served as a fine leader of a mighty nation in the first war of modern times, in terms of the mechanical age. He had the courage to try to keep that Nation one, choosing the awful alternative of internecine war, rather than to let the dissenting States form their own government. In poker parlance, they might have split the pot, and ended the game peaceably, but this was not to be, and the times have borne out the wisdom of the course of action. The war for the Union was the first fought with weapons of steam (the gunboat and the locomotive), electricity (instantaneous communication by telegraph), and the enormous ramifications of these devices. It was the first great war directed from headquarters at the Nation's Capital. It was the first struggle of major proportions to be adequately reported in the daily papers.

We know that Lincoln's greatness is based on tangible evidence of his vast ability. And yet we love him, we revere his memory for other qualities. About a week before his death, when Lincoln entered Richmond he called at the home of Gen. George Pickett. The general was originally a Virginian who lived in Illinois as a young man and had been appointed to the United States Military Academy from that State. The President knew him quite well. He asked if General Pickett was at home, and he was told that the general was with his command in the Army. The servant offered to take a message, and asked who it was that he should say had called. The President replied, "just tell him that it was an old friend from Illinois." When I recall that expression, I feel that in a very real sense, to me, to all of us, Lincoln is primarily an old friend from Illinois.

Preservation of American Sovereignty Over Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement presented by me to the House Committee on Public Works on April 11, 1951, pointing out what I believe to be a serious defect in the agreement with Canada for construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVE AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY OVER LAKE MICHIGAN

(Statement by Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, since the birth of this Nation and its expansion to the west, we have adhered to the position that Lake Michigan is wholly American. It lies entirely within our boundaries and is fed only by water that has fallen on our soil—and its waters are ours to do with as we will. That position has been expressly recognized and conceded in formal treaties with Canada, particularly the treaty of 1909, which is the basis for our present relationships with Canada with respect to these waters.

For many years, our diplomatic representatives exercised constant vigilance to insure that there were no encroachments upon our sovereignty over that great body of water. And it required much care and vigilance. Our neighbors, with true British tenacity, have constantly sought to obtain some sort of toehold that would give them ground to assert an interest in it.

That tenacity of the Canadians first bore fruit in the early treaty negotiations between the United States and Canada for development of the still pending St. Lawrence seaway project. The treaty negotiated some 20 years ago contained a provision, article VIII, which would have internationalized Lake Michigan.

Under this proviso, Lake Michigan would have been placed in the category of the boundary Lakes—Superior, Huron, Erie and Ontario. Article VIII specifically empowered an international board to enter all cases of disagreement in matters relating to the waters of Lake Michigan. The international board thus was empowered to control and perhaps prevent the use of waters of Lake Michigan by Chicago or any of the other lakes or cities.

That treaty fortunately failed of ratification in the Senate. There can be no doubt that the inclusion of article VIII in the covenant contributed largely to its defeat.

The present proposed agreement between the United States and Canada for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway was negotiated by the two Governments and submitted as a substitute for the defeated treaty. Again, those who represented us in the matter would have surrendered our sovereignty over Lake Michigan. Article VIII in its original form was rewritten into the new covenant. The framers didn't even have the originality to change the article number.

The abhorrence with which the legislative branch regards this reversal of our traditional policy has been demonstrated in the past and is again shown in the case of the pending resolutions to approve the St. Lawrence seaway agreement. Even those who favor the project have taken exception to this article. Their resolutions specifically provide for its elimination from the agreement.

I feel that I may fairly state that we have good ground to be suspicious of our own diplomats so far as this question is concerned. Twice within 30 years they have attempted to enter into deals with Canada that would undo the efforts of their predecessors for a hundred years before them. We have learned through experience that we must be constantly on guard if we are to protect our heritage in the waters of that Great Lake.

The Secretary of State has lately appeared before this committee in support of the pending resolutions, including the elimination of article VIII (c). However, his statement has raised very serious questions in my mind. By a series of half-truths and omissions of highly important facts, he has created the distinct impression that he is prepared to surrender to the British Empire the power to tell us what we may or may not do with the waters of Lake Michigan.

While the Secretary agreed to the elimination of article VIII (c), I am fearful that the very nature of his reasoning on the subject, as expressed in his statement before the committee, may have tended to restore it in full force and effect.

He argued that striking out article VIII (c) does not weaken Canadian rights and does not make American rights any more secure. In this fashion, the Secretary would negate the efforts of the Congress to safeguard the traditional United States jurisdiction over its great inland lake, 60 miles from the international border. Statements of highly placed Government officials in formal hearings before congressional committees may be given great weight in the future interpretation of the agreement.

Mr. Acheson's reasoning requires some analysis. First, he states that "the 1909 treaty provides that no uses, obstructions, or diversions of boundary waters might thereafter be made on either side of the line without respect to the International Joint Commission or to a special agreement between the parties."

Later, discussing specifically the elimination of article VIII (c), he acknowledges that that article (for the internationalizing of Lake Michigan) was intended in particular to relate to possible future increase in the diversion of Lake Michigan waters through the Chicago Drainage Canal. In that connection, he went on to say: "The issue as to the Chicago Drainage Canal was settled by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Wisconsin v. Illinois*, in April 1930, which enjoined the objectionable diversion. The International Joint Commission has complete jurisdiction over diversion of boundary waters in general, and both countries have regarded with satisfaction the exercise of that jurisdiction by the Commission."

Thus, we have a responsible official of our Government stating categorically that the question of diversion at Chicago is settled for all time. He certainly implies that any other question that might arise would fall within the jurisdiction of an international tribunal. What he did not explain is that the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 contains a definition of boundary waters which excludes Lake Michigan in its entirety. Included within that term are only those waters through which pass the international boundary, while the northernmost point of Lake Michigan is some 60 miles south of that line. Specifically, the definition excludes those tributary waters which flow into boundary waters.

This entire exclusion of Lake Michigan was no matter of accident or happenstance. It was done deliberately and carefully in order to insure that our complete sovereignty was in no way endangered.

On January 30, 1909, the Honorable Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, a great diplomat, and a great American, appeared before the Senate committee to explain the provisions of that treaty. After the preliminary article, containing the definition, was read, Secretary Root states: "The definition of boundary waters was carefully drawn in order to exclude Lake Michigan."

The 1909 treaty, and the explanatory statements of those responsible for its promulgation, seem perfectly clear as to the strict limits of the jurisdiction of the international tribunal. Not until recent years, when it seems to have become the fashion for our diplomats to give away that for which our predecessors strived, has anyone thrown doubt upon it. Now we have from the Secretary of State a statement which might well be cited by our neighbors in support of a contrary view.

So far as the diversion question itself is concerned, Mr. Acheson would brush it aside by the bland assertion that it has been finally and conclusively settled by the Supreme Court in the Lake Levels case. He implies that the whole question is now of no importance.

If it is of no importance, why should our Canadian neighbors have been so anxious to write article VIII into the treaty which was signed in 1932, and defeated in the Senate a couple of years later? Why have they insisted on inserting article VIII (c), into this agreement? The answer is obvious from the Supreme Court decision, which may be found at 281 United States 179.

There the Court, Mr. Justice Holmes delivering the opinion, clearly recognized that it was dealing with a controversy between States, in a field where the Congress had not exercised its authority. The decision is strictly limited to those issues.

The prospect of such congressional action appears throughout the opinion, as where the Court said, "These requirements (of immediate action) as between the parties are the constitutional right of those States, subject to whatever modification they hereafter may be subjected to by Congress acting within its authority. It will be time enough to consider the scope of that authority when it is exercised. * * * The right of the complainants to a decree is not affected by the possibility that Congress may take some action in the matter."

At other points the Court said, "All action of the parties and the Court in this case will be subject, of course, to any order that Congress may make in pursuance of its constitutional powers and any modification that necessity may show should be made by this Court," and "The amount of water ultimately to be withdrawn unless Congress may prescribe a different measure is relatively small."

In its decree, the Court specified that any of the parties might from time to time apply to the Court for action or relief with respect to various points of its provisions, including the diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

It therefore is evident that the diversion question is far from being settled in the conclusive manner that Mr. Acheson implies. To the contrary, it may be reopened at any time that need therefor becomes pressing—by further proceedings in the Court, or by action of the Congress.

In the light of this diplomatic background, it is extremely important to be sure exactly what Mr. Acheson meant. When he said, "The issue as to the Chicago drainage canal was settled by the decision of the Supreme Court," was that statement intended to give assurance to Canada that the case would never be reopened? In other words, is his entire statement to be interpreted as an assurance to Canada that we are prepared to relinquish our complete sovereignty over Lake Michigan? If such an assurance is to be part of the permanent record of these hearings, it may be difficult to prevent such an interpretation of this agreement.

Although the Secretary of State may not be able to tie the hands of future Congresses completely, he may make it exceedingly difficult for Congress ever to take action in opposition to his interpretation of the agreement. The Executive has a veto over the actions of Congress, which can be overridden only by a two-thirds vote of both Houses.

If the question of the use of the waters of Lake Michigan should be opened by Congress, what then? Mr. Acheson implies that any possible dispute between this country and Canada will be settled by the International Joint Commission. Judging from his remarks, Canada is satisfied that leaving out article VIII (c) will make no difference in the actual interpretation of the agreement. Certainly Congress is under the impression that deleting article VIII (c) does make a difference. That is why we are leaving it out.

Are we to infer that Canada will have just as much to say in the use of Lake Michigan waters without article VIII (c), as they would have with it? That is the only inference that I can draw from the Secretary's remarks.

Gentlemen, this is not a matter to be treated lightly. This is a great Nation with, we earnestly hope, a long and glorious future. The needs of that future cannot now be foretold with certainty. Diversion from Lake Michigan may have to be increased before too long. There already are indications that the present flow may not long suffice to meet the combined needs of sanitation in the growing Chicago area and the needs of the expanding commerce over the Lake-to-the-Gulf waterway, authorized and completed by the Congress since the taking of evidence in that case.

Surely, we must not now permit the creation of a situation which might in the future operate to rob us of rights which have been so zealously guarded by those who preceded us.

When people employ the term "sold down the river," they usually refer to the Mississippi. If this radical departure from our previous policy is permitted to stand, the people of this Nation, particularly those of the midcontinent area, are likely to discover that they have been sold down the St. Lawrence.

I hope the day will never come when we in the United States of America have to ask any foreign country, friend or foe, whether we can divert water out of a lake entirely within our own borders, and drawing water entirely from American soil.

Hearings before this committee have shown that many of the proponents of the seaway have feared economic stagnation in the Great Lakes area if the seaway was not completed. The improper use of the waters of Lake Michigan could stagnate industries already established. The loss of control of Lake Michigan could stifle the development of Chicago, Gary, and many other cities around Lake Michigan.

I submit that this matter is too vital to our sovereignty and our future welfare to be treated casually or informally. In view of Mr. Acheson's position, the entire question of the St. Lawrence should be made the subject of a formal treaty, spelling out in detail just what is intended to be covered, and just how each item is to be treated. We should lay the whole picture before the American people. Only in that fashion can we be sure that we are not through loose interpretation and casual conversation of the diplomatic corps, to lay a basis for abandonment of strongholds so staunchly manned in the past.

Truman's Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include Senate Resolution No. 49 which was adopted by the Senate of the State of Illinois on April 11, 1951:

"Senate Resolution 49

"Whereas early this morning President Truman announced the discharge of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from all of his military commands; and

"Whereas General MacArthur has long been a symbol of the determination of the free peoples of the world to resist totalitarian aggression and has been looked to with hope by the freedom-loving peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the shocking action of the President leaves our fighting men stranded in Korea without benefit of the leadership of General MacArthur, and further leaves the people of our Nation in a greater state of confusion and with further lack of knowledge as to true conditions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois*, That we express our unqualified confidence in General MacArthur and vigorously condemn the irresponsible and capricious action of the President in summarily discharging him from his command and that we further condemn such action without an opportunity to General MacArthur and others of his command to inform the people of our Nation of the true condition of affairs in Korea and the Far East; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we further criticize and condemn the policies of the present administration of the United States for withholding information, if any exists, to justify this action."

Adopted by the senate April 11, 1951.

WALLACE THOMPSON,
President Pro Tempore of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tablet, Brooklyn, N. Y., for April 14, 1951:

GENERAL MACARTHUR

A genuine American whose love of his country is first. A commander who won glory on a dozen battlefields; a strategist whose epoch-making achievements saved lives while winning victories; an administrator who obtained the confidence of the defeated foe and brought order out of chaos.

A Christian who believes in God and totally rejects communism, who never called its tyrannical head "Uncle Joe," who never found Russia an enigma and who neither compromised his principles nor attempted to appease an unappeasable tyranny.

A citizen who loves his country, first, last and all the time. For him there is no divided allegiance, no placing of Britain or any other country above his own. To him we all owe a debt which is impossible to repay in full.

HE CAN TAKE IT

The five-star general has lost his four commands. He does not have to worry. He got out at a good time and for a good reason and with the respect of his countrymen. He may be the means of [illegible]

and for all the subversive forces of hidden government assailed last year by Senator McCarthy, whose attacks on the enemy from within—our deadliest foe—are being more widely accepted each day as entirely justified.

It is lamentable that a temporary victory is scored over this rugged and authentic American by Dean Acheson, who could not turn his back on Alger Hiss, and by Gen. George Marshall, whose mission to China and its aftermath transferred that country from a friend to a foe and made communism the victor at a cost in lives, blood, and dollars that is incalculable.

General MacArthur has one charge against him. He was not obedient to civilian political leadership. He was not like other generals who sat silent while Russia was handed half of Germany and was permitted to seize other nations whose freedom they saw betrayed; who likewise offered no protest when our own Armed Forces were liquidated while the Reds solidified their aggression.

General MacArthur lost his command, but he saved his reputation. The charge of insubordination he can wear without odium.

THE PRESIDENT'S CASE

President Truman presented his case over the radio and television networks Wednesday night. Obviously nervous and under strain, Mr. Truman was on the defensive. What he failed to say aroused more interest than what he said. For instance, he emphasized that the United Nations, enemy was Soviet Russia; he failed to mention that Soviet Russia is the predominant force in the United Nations. Again, he declared the aim of the United States is to help peoples enslaved by Soviet Russia regain their independence; he did not mention the assignment of the United States Seventh Fleet to prevent the Chinese on Formosa from attempting to liberate their homeland. Most frightening of all to anyone with an elementary knowledge of communism was his incredible opinion that Soviet Russia could be scared or diverted from her objective—to enslave the world—by a show of strength in Korea.

President Truman has had his say. Now let General MacArthur present his case over the same Nation-wide facilities. The American people will hand down the verdict.

A Tragic Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter. It expresses very clearly the concern and indignation of my constituents in the Sixth Wisconsin Congressional District. It expresses the bitterness of an aroused people who for a week have been flooding my office with telegrams and letters asking that the President be impeached and that our State Department be given a thorough cleaning starting with its head, Dean Acheson and all the others who would not turn their backs on a traitor. The Congress of these United States will and must accept this challenge. It is my sincere hope that after hearing General MacArthur express his own views and opinions to proceed at once on a constructive program—a program that will rebuild the morale of the American people rather than support the retrogressors and the socialists schemers of England. Mr. Speaker, my oath of office was not taken lightly and I pledge to my colleagues my whole-hearted support to clean out the offices of our Government of men and women who would have us appease any foreign power. The editorial from the Reporter follows:

A TRAGIC INCIDENT

Americans are shocked by the action of President Harry S. Truman in depriving Gen. Douglas MacArthur of his commands in the Orient at a climactic stage in the civilized world's battle to halt the spread of Russian Communist imperialism.

The President's orders can be criticized bitterly and defended cautiously, but to remove a great leader in such a manner does not seem the American way.

Yes, General MacArthur was a military man. He was brought up in the Army and lived the life of a soldier. There were many young men who fought in the Pacific during World War II. All of them knew that he was a hard taskmaster. They knew he expected them to act as soldiers and give their lives if need be in the defense of their country. Still, many a father and mother were thankful that so rigid a disciplinarian was in charge of their sons. He fought for the welfare of his men. He believed in ending a war as quickly as possible with a minimum loss of life and in getting the men back to their families.

General MacArthur wanted to finish the war in Korea. He wanted his boys back with their families. He realize that the war never could be won the way it is being fought and the way Washington wanted him to fight it. A stalemate in war is worse than war itself. It means the unnecessary sacrifice of life. We can go on fighting for 25 years or more and in the end be no closer to victory than we are today.

It is admitted that possibly there was little else President Truman could have done under the circumstances, but we believe he might have been more of a diplomat and prevented those circumstances. It is apparent, perhaps, that General MacArthur failed to obey instructions of his Commander in Chief, but there is a serious question who was the better acquainted with the real thing—the man on the spot or the man in the White House.

We regret that there should be so deep and so wide a breach in the difference of opinion between a great commander in the field and the administration itself as to the importance of the far-eastern theater.

Now that General MacArthur has been dismissed, isn't it time that something was done about Secretary of State Dean Acheson who dictated the policies which actually led to the breach between the President and General MacArthur?

The rift between the President and the general reminds us of Munich and Hitler. Serving the general's head up on a platter may appease the yapping yahoos of the British Socialist Government temporarily, but now that the diplomats and the politicians have taken over this war, what are they going to do with it?

General MacArthur, we are convinced, was asked to work completely in the dark. The outcome was inevitable.

The irony of the whole thing is that Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who has replaced General MacArthur, holds practically the same views as his former commander. He has said as much in various statements which have come from him out of Korea.

MacArthur is a great general. Loss of his services to the country in this time of need is tragic.

House Concurrent Resolution 93

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein House Concurrent Resolution 93, which was introduced by me on April 16, 1951, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 93

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is hereby expressed to be the sense of the Congress that, because the people of the Nation have lost confidence in the foreign policies of the administration and in the manner in which those policies have been executed by Dean Acheson, he should be removed forthwith from the office of Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. It is further expressed to be the sense of the Congress that, because of the confidence which the people of the Nation have in General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, he should be afforded an opportunity to appear before a joint session of the Congress to give his views upon the situation in the Far East, and thereafter his experience and counsel should be utilized for the benefit of the people of our Nation at this time of grave crisis.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Rukeyser in the Journal-American on the dismissal of General MacArthur.

Mr. Rukeyser points out clearly that the men rejected by President Truman are the men whose names will be on the honor rolls of the future. The article follows:

DISMISSAL OF MACARTHUR

(By M. S. Rukeyser)

America's top resources consist of the know-how of creative personalities, and the public sense of shock over the ouster of Gen. Douglas MacArthur reflected widespread instinctive appreciation of that fact.

The battle of the routineers against sheer excellency goes on in numerous areas of activity. The intrigue against MacArthur has seen its counterpart in the recent attempt of pressure groups to agitate against Charles E. Wilson, generalissimo of defense mobilization.

In science, as well as in the practical arts, the conventional tend to resent original source minds, on whom accelerated progress so much depends. Back in 1926 General Billy Mitchell was disciplined because he visualized the meaning of air power earlier than the persons who were his technical superiors.

From his days at West Point where he made top grades, General MacArthur has distinguished himself in thought as well as in action.

He has long been a symbol of American intelligence and strength.

He was not disposed to follow the line of least resistance, and permit his silence to give his fellow countrymen a false sense of security.

MacArthur's stature is measured by his unwillingness to alibi failure on the ground that he was following orders.

His chief aide, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney has stated that the general has complied meticulously with all directives he has received.

But as the responsible chief on the ground he undertook to make his full contribution to the formulation of policies in the interest of the United States.

There is no gainsaying the fact that there were differences of opinion between the general and those who tried to put wraps around him which lessened opportunities for victory.

But for the politicians to talk sanctimoniously as though the differences were only those of form, technicality, and discipline is to be grossly misleading.

It is part of the record that President Truman himself was none too meticulous in respecting the legal technicalities. Truman involved the United States in the Korean War without affirmative action by Congress by the device of characterizing it as a police action.

By removing General MacArthur from his command, Truman has in effect removed from the general the inhibitions on his self-expression. Now MacArthur will be released to set forth his ideas for the guidance of Congress and the American people.

None at this stage can add to or detract from MacArthur's record of extraordinary achievement. His record in the rehabilitation of Japan is virtually without precedent, and his great accomplishments on the field of battle in two world wars are recorded in the annals of history.

The slur on MacArthur recalls the fate meted out to the late Andrew W. Mellon, who served two terms as Secretary of the Treasury prior to the New Deal. As a public service, Mellon put his extraordinary fiscal talents at the disposal of the Federal Government. His achievement was epitomized in the reduction of the Federal debt by a billion dollars a year.

On his retirement, instead of erecting a monument to Mellon, the New Deal administration had him indicted for fraud in his personal income taxes. (The fact that Mellon disproved the charges in court is beside the point; it does not erase the record of impudence on the part of vindictive politicians, little men in big jobs.)

President Truman has shown an extraordinary loyalty to cronies and hacks among his employees. He sticks to them stubbornly in spite of revelations of improprieties. But his rejects include such first-rate personalities as MacArthur; Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, former Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers; Admiral Louis Emil Denfeld, former Naval Chief of Staff; and Robert Newton Denham, former chief counsel, National Labor Relations Board. The list of rejects sounds like a roll of honor.

Truman Goes Astray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two leading editorials published in the Oregonian in my congressional district, one entitled "MacArthur Had To Go, but Now What, Mr. Truman?" which appeared on April 12, 1951, and the other entitled "Truman Goes Astray," which appeared April 13, 1951, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of April 12, 1951]

MACARTHUR HAD TO GO, BUT NOW WHAT, MR. TRUMAN?

This newspaper has been besieged with telephone calls denouncing President Harry S. Truman for the removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Thousands of telegrams to the White House and Congress express similar outrage of the senders. Even some who have opposed the Korean War as futile and mistaken censure the President. This articulate reaction is reported from all over the United States. Defenders of the President have had little to say.

This hurricane of criticism cannot be attributed entirely to the popularity of General MacArthur. American public opinion has long been sharply divided there. Rather, it is the culmination of deep and gradually building resentment and apprehension of the foreign policies of President Truman and his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. Republicans in Congress, quick to realize this, already are calling for General MacArthur's appearance before Congress—even for impeachment of the President.

When there is a cooling of public anger, the issues will become more plain. These, we fear, will divide the American people as they have seldom been divided in our times.

Fundamentally, the question is not whether General MacArthur as commander of the American and United Nations forces in the Orient was right in publicly advocating the use of Chinese Nationalist troops against Red China and UN bombing of the China mainland. It is not whether President Truman was right in ordering the UN forces to confine the war to the Korean Peninsula, denying the use of their full strength against numerically superior forces.

The basic issue is whether the traditional authority of civil government over military government shall be maintained in the United States. In plain words, General MacArthur defied the authority of the President in advocating foreign policies contrary to those of the civilian government. We think his purpose was laudable—to arouse the American people to the great peril of our men in Korea and thus to obtain the weapons to fight a successful war. But would it have been laudable had he put his words into action, without Presidential or congressional sanction, and carried the war to China—and to the Soviet Union if need be?

This newspaper stands for the supreme authority of civil government. The President and the general, in the situation which has developed, could not carry on their separate authorities. The general's authority was assumed, the President's founded in the Constitution.

But now that the President has asserted his authority, what will the American people say of his policies which have led us into a war which he is unwilling to let us win? The people's anger at the firing of General MacArthur is their answer. The smug satisfaction in the capitals of Europe, the Arab Nations, the Far East, and the Soviet sphere is the goad to their anger.

It was the soft Acheson-Truman policy in Asia—the abandonment of Formosa and Korea to Communist attack—which brought on the Korean War. Our Government, encouraged by the appeasers in the UN, left South Korea helpless and informed the Kremlin that we would not lift a finger to prevent aggression in the Orient. With that invitation, the Communists swarmed over the thirty-eighth parallel and increased their pressure on Indochina, Malaya, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

Now they are saying in London, Paris, Cairo, and New Delhi that the removal of MacArthur opens a new approach to settlement of the Korean War. What does that mean? The only terms the Chinese Communist government has advanced for even discussing a settlement are the cession of Formosa and the withdrawal of UN troops from Korea.

The British and the French are incredibly enmeshed in their fear and self-interest if they believe that with Formosa and Korea in Communist hands, Hong Kong and Indochina will be safe. It is the old, disgraceful story of Munich all over again. For our part, abandonment of Formosa and Korea would mean that in a brief time we would have to draw another defense line against Communist aggression in weakened Japan, the Philippines, and Alaska.

No one in authority has presented an alternative to General MacArthur's demand for the power and the strength to win the war in Korea and stop Red aggression in its tracks. The President's removal of MacArthur leaves Lt. Gen. Matthew Ridgway in the same exposed and helpless position.

This, we feel, is the deep-lying cause of public anger against President Truman and his European-minded advisers in the State Department. Virtually abandoned by the United Nations in a police action the UN approved, our soldiers await the man-mass of Asia, fighting a defensive war on terms arranged by persons and nations with other fish to fry. Now that the President has rid himself of General MacArthur, whose courage and brilliance as a soldier can be questioned by no one, will the policy be one of submission to communism, or will he give General Ridgway the tools to win?

[From the Oregonian of April 13, 1951]

TRUMAN GOES ASTRAY

President Truman's defense of his limited war policy in the Far East—in his hurry-up radio address intended to counteract the national tide of criticism of the replacement of General MacArthur—is inconsistent. Whether his foreign policy is his own—the sole result of his best judgment and consultation with American advisers—or whether it has been influenced by pressures from abroad is of grave concern to the people of the United States. For it may have to be changed.

The heart of his policy of refusing to permit United Nations forces in Korea to defend themselves by bombing Chinese-Russian supply lines and bases in Manchuria lies in his statement: "We are trying to prevent a third world war."

His initial assumption is that the Soviet Union is encouraging and supplying Communist China to make war against the free nations in Korea. This, everyone knows. The Russians armed and trained the North Korean Communists and led them up to the thirty-eighth parallel. The group of MIG jet planes which attacked American bombers a day after General MacArthur was fired were Russian planes, operating from Chinese bases in the "sanctuary," and possibly piloted by Russians.

The purpose of the Soviet Union, the President avers, is to draw the United States into a full-scale war against China, with commitment of land, sea, and air forces to such an extent that the United States would be terribly weakened. This is the fear shared by the Europeans—that American power may be so exhausted by fighting the Chinese that it will not be available to throw back a Russian invasion of Western Europe.

This theory apparently embraces the belief that the Chinese Reds would fight Russia's war of world conquest in the Orient, as a puppet nation without help or with little

help from the U. S. S. R., while the Soviets devoted their entire strength to the conquest of Europe.

But to have their hands free in Europe, the Soviets would have to be assured first of deep and irrevocable commitment of American forces in the Far East.

Neither General MacArthur nor anyone else has advocated commitment of large-scale American land forces to war on the Chinese mainland. All that has been asked is the right to unleash our Air Force where it will do the most good in stopping the mass invasion of Korea by Chinese troops.

We give no consideration here, nor did General MacArthur, to the mutual-assistance pact signed by Joseph Stalin and Mao Tse-tung. It means no more in Communist performance than did the Soviet-Nationalist China nonaggression pact or the German-Russian-Japanese agreement broken in World War II both by Germany and by Russia. Had the Soviet Union been sincere in declaring the Korean War a defensive war by Red China against American invasion, the Russians would already be in the far eastern fighting.

President Truman's case against bombing Chinese bases falls apart if one accepts, as he seems to accept, the premise that the Soviet Union's hope is to conquer Europe while puppet Chinese armies fight the Kremlin's war in Asia. We suspect, along with General MacArthur, that such bombing would hasten China's withdrawal from the Korean War without added hazard of Russian intervention.

Policy Over Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 17, 1951:

POLICY OVER POLITICS

The first purpose of the American people in the MacArthur affair should be to clarify and unify their aims in the Far East. There is still hope that a firmer, sharper national policy can be hammered out of the debate which started with so much emphasis on personalities and politics. The general's return may even promote the exercise of good will and good sense.

One unifying development is already in evidence—the purpose to give him a warm and appreciative welcome home. Even those most opposed to the general's views are joining generously in paying tribute to his great services. And General MacArthur shows a desire to speak only in general terms rather than to become the angry spearhead of a crusade. We assume that he will follow through with this tone. If so, he can do much to hold the debate on a higher level.

But the discussion will have to go beyond generalities. Questioning by congressional committees rather than formal speechmaking is the most promising way of digging below the surface of this question. Much will depend on whether the politicians continue to make a political football of the general's dismissal. If the Wherry-Martin Republicans pursue their attacks on President Truman, Democrats will doubtless counterattack, hitting the general on the question of insubordination.

Things have gone so far already that this kind of inquiry may be inescapable. But it is likely to be less useful than an effort to get out on the table all relevant and nonsecret information regarding policy issues. General MacArthur has called the policy which seeks to limit hostilities to Korea a "handicap unprecedented in military history." So far we have not seen why bombing Chinese bases is so vital that to do it America should risk appearing as an aggressor, splitting the United Nations and bringing Russia in. But General MacArthur's reasons should be fully laid out.

At the same time it would be highly useful to have a review and estimate of what has been and is being accomplished in Korea. Although General MacArthur has appeared to be out of sympathy with the recent purposes of UN there, we doubt if he will "throw down" the Korean enterprise as completely as Senator TAFT did a few days ago. The latter seemed to regard as futile all the sacrifices made in Korea.

The vast majority of Americans supported the decision to resist aggression in Korea. If it was right last July, is it not right today? As we see it, the action of the UN there may well prove to be a historic step in the organization of peace. It reversed the policy of appeasement which led to World War II and proved the peace-loving nations' ability to join in halting lawlessness. The Kremlin's plans were upset, the North Koreans overthrown, and the Chinese Reds punished.

Senator TAFT says the Chinese have lost nothing except a few men. American military estimates run from 200,000 to 300,000. The economic drain on a poor country is heavy, and the Reds' military prestige has been seriously damaged. Of course, the situation is far from what might be wished and a happy ending is not readily visible. But let us not undervalue the policy which has united the forces of 14 nations in active resistance to aggression. May we not still hope that Korea has raised a real barrier to Russian imperialism and is giving the free nations time to gain the strength which can prevent world war III?

Declaration of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, after visiting the battlefields of Korea, after seeing first-hand the tremendous price being paid by our fighting men in dead and wounded, it seems to me that the Congress has overlooked one responsibility of major importance—that of declaring war.

That we are at war is obvious. All the branches of our fighting forces are employed in combat. Our casualties have now mounted to more than 60,000 men, about 10,000 of whom have given their lives in this, the dirtiest, cruelest war in history. The President of the United States repeatedly refers to the war in Korea. We are asked to draft the boys from our States and districts to fill the needs of the war in Korea. We are required to appropriate billions to prosecute the war in Korea.

The Constitution of the United States places upon Congress, and Congress alone, the power and responsibility to declare war. It seems to me an immoral and shameful thing to send our boys to their death in a war which Congress has not officially declared to exist.

I realize that any Member of this House can introduce a resolution for a declaration of war against those who have declared war, by their aggressions against us and other members of the United Nations. However, I am informed that such responsibility rests primarily upon the administration leaders. I, therefore, call upon the majority leaders of this House to assume their duty in this respect. We are at war. Why then should administration spokesmen ignore their clear duty to recognize the war in a constitutional manner?

Radio Poll in Nebraska on Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the results of a poll conducted by radio station WJAG at Norfolk, Nebr., giving the opinions of a typical cross-section of Nebraska residents on several questions of current interest relating to our military policy. This poll was completed prior to the dismissal of General MacArthur. I offer a news release prepared by the radio station, giving results of the opinion survey, together with various comments on it.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Radio station WJAG, Norfolk, Nebr., completed a public-opinion survey April 8, 1951. The survey consisted of three questions, originally broached on the station's noon forum program the Voice of the People. Interest was entirely spontaneous. No prizes were offered. Questions were repeated once each day.

The duration of the survey was 3 weeks. Opinions were received through mail, personal interviews and telephone interviews. The total responses were 756. Of this number 460 were by letter, 200 by personal interview, the remainder by telephone interview.

The tabulated results of the opinion survey were as follows:

Question No. 1: Shall we withdraw our troops from Korea and leave that country to the Communists?

Yes, 46.6 percent.
No, 48.4 percent.
Qualified, 5 percent.
(The popular qualification, stop at the thirty-eighth parallel.)

Question No. 2: Should the President or Congress have the authority to send United States troops overseas?

Congress, 69.9 percent.
President, 5.9 percent.
President and Congress, 15.4 percent.
Undecided, 8.8 percent.

Question No. 3: Should the United States send additional troops to Europe under General Eisenhower's command?

Yes, 39.5 percent.
No, 52.6 percent.
Qualified, 7.9 percent.
(The popular qualification, United States supply troops in fair proportion with European countries.)

Results of the poll have been requested by Senators BUTLER and WHERRY, and Congressman KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska. Senator BUTLER said he intended to insert the results in the RECORD.

Radio station WJAG has drawn these conclusions after completion of the tabulation of the opinion survey:

First. Persons submitting opinions by letter were more extreme; that is, more conservative or radical.

Second. Persons submitting opinions by personal or telephone interviews were by far the more aggressive. These persons tended to favor remaining in Korea and also sending more troops to Europe. A majority personally interviewed bemoaned General MacArthur's present position; most of them feeling he and his troops were not receiving proper support.

Third. That a definite state of confusion exists within the public minds pertaining to United States foreign policy but that the trend is definitely established for more decisions to be made by Congress. Those advocating withdrawal of troops from Korea frequently asked "Why are we there?" Others suggested withdrawal unless we fight more aggressively.

Fourth. Those interviewed complained the public was not being properly informed. Many expressed doubt that Congress was being taken into confidence on foreign issues.

A separate breakdown of the survey by sex showed no substantial change in the above percentages. Women displayed only a slight tendency to avoid conflict by returning our troops or keeping them at home.

Address of Hon. Kenneth B. Keating, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a noteworthy address delivered by our colleague the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, of the Fortieth District, State of New York, before the New York State DAR luncheon on Tuesday, April 17, in Washington, D. C.:

ADDRESS AT NEW YORK STATE DAR LUNCHEON BY HON. KENNETH B. KEATING, OF NEW YORK

Madam State Regent Cook, my distinguished colleague, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, and Daughters of the American Revolution of New York State, whoever picked out this week for the annual DAR Congress ought to be able to land a job anywhere as a crystal-ball gazer. When your State regent wrote me last November asking me to address your luncheon meeting today, I must confess that in my acceptance I did not envision, as your committee on arrangements seems to have done, the momentous events of last week and this week. You are certainly here at a historic moment, quite in keeping with the traditions of your illustrious organization. My remarks for this occasion were prepared before last Wednesday morning at 1 a. m., hence they will not relate, except in passing, to the great controversy which has rocked the country. Perhaps that is just as well, for if feeling is running as high throughout New York State from which you hail as it is in Washington and as my bushel baskets of mail indicate that it is in my own congressional district, it may be a welcome relief to you to hear, as it is to me to talk, about some subject other than the President's dismissal of a great military figure.

Just let me say this one word. Despite the strong convictions which you or I may have as to the wisdom or otherwise and the justice or injustice of the action which has taken place, the important thing for us as Americans to do is to look to the future. Let us not forget that hundreds of thousands of American youth, our most precious possession, are either in the Far East, or on ships, or in camps destined for that theater of operations. Let us not forget that their welfare and, perhaps, their lives and the lives of you and me and the welfare of our children and grandchildren depend upon keeping our heads and steering the right course in the days that lie ahead.

In other words, the real problem upon which we must focus our attention is not what to do with President Truman or General MacArthur, but what to do with Korea.

Our young men out there are being made targets because someone in Washington or in New York or perhaps London or Paris cannot make up his mind what to do.

We cannot sit still and do nothing. It seems to me we must choose a course and do it soon. We cannot simply sit back and wait for somebody or some event to bail us out. We have gone too far to continue the old policy of "let the dust settle in the Far East."

We must get away from platitudes and get down to business. We have heard enough of phrase making about avoiding a third world war, about the control of the military by the civilian, about the inherent powers of a Commander in Chief—all these so-called issues which are not issues at all. Everyone accepts them as basic principles. At the moment we have only one plan advanced for narrowing the Korean conflict and bringing the Korean War to a speedy conclusion. That may not be the right plan, but it is high time that any others who have any other plan lay it out on the table and let us examine it and compare it with the one already advanced. And in selecting the course to follow, let us base our decision not on personalities, not on a stubborn adherence to positions which may have once been taken but which no longer recognize the reality of the hour, but rather by an open-minded and unbiased appraisal of the evidence which can now be brought to bear on this problem.

One fact emerges starkly from the grim pattern of war and violence—only strength impresses the aggressors. Only strength, military, economic, social and above all, spiritual, can form the soil from which a just, lasting, and honorable peace will spring.

The forces of evil which are loose in the world today are atheistic and lawless, and have no respect for the rights or wishes of either other persons or other nations. Today, much as we may dislike the fact, to be well-intentioned and peace-loving is not enough. America must be so strong that the warlords and dictators will be convinced that they must abandon their announced plans to crush the United States and dominate the world.

The new and terrifying weapons which man has invented have, perforce, altered our conception of our role in the world and our plans for defense of our country. It is no longer enough to possess the productive capacity to turn out weapons in such quantity that we will win the war eventually. Eventually is many atomic bombs too late in this age. With guided missiles and jet planes carrying atomic weapons at hundreds of miles an hour—almost faster than the uninitiated can conceive—our defenses can never be down and our guard never relaxed so long as the forces of aggression continue to demonstrate that they are merely waiting the appropriate time to turn their fury on the free world.

It is startling and unpleasant to have to comprehend these facts, but it is the terrible truth that the world today is, quite literally, sitting on a powder keg.

To spend billions annually on weapons and armies seems a horrible waste of our substance when only a fraction might be spent on projects and activities which would spell permanently a better living for us all. But America must be strong to survive. Some of the luxuries which we have come to take for granted must be sacrificed or postponed until that strength is attained and an era of peace reasonably assured.

We face a long period of personal and national sacrifice in which we all must and will share. The budget for our national Defense Establishment will be increased. Increased taxes—income, excise, and corporation—must be expected. But whatever the price of our freedom, it is small when compared with the alternatives. There is no bargain basement when it comes to buying liberty.

But while we necessarily appropriate more billions for defense we must bear in mind the perils of bankrupting our national economy. America is a tremendously wealthy country, but even we cannot continue to spend extravagantly for both swords and plowshares. We must cut down nonessential spending on the national scene, just as increased taxes and inflated prices force us as individuals to cut down our purchases of luxuries. We must make every possible effort to pare Government hand-outs, subsidies, and peacetime construction to the bone. There is a limit, which I believe has very nearly been reached, to the amount which the Government can extract from the individual taxpayer.

Yet we must attempt to pay as we go as much as possible. The only course of safety and sanity is to cut down on what might be called Government frills.

Our country cannot operate in the red year after year and continue to be solvent. Now that the international situation has become so menacing, it is even more vital that we do everything in our power to balance the budget. If this cannot be completely successful in view of our vast defense expenditures, we must, at least, do all that we can to achieve this goal.

Nothing would please our potential enemies more than to see our economy collapse in a state of national bankruptcy. It would save them the trouble and expense of trying to take us over by other means if we committed national suicide by overextending ourselves to the point of financial exhaustion.

In addition, if we come as close as is possible to balancing the budget by paring unnecessary expenditures, we lessen by that much the inflationary forces. As you housewives know all too well, inflation is no longer merely a threat, it has become the unwelcome guest in your marketing basket and at your dining-room table.

It is a basic economic fact that Government spending which is not balanced by the taxes it collects adds more and more fuel to the flames of inflation, since the Government, unlike business, does not produce wealth or goods when it spends money. It merely puts more money into circulation which in turn causes the prices of all goods to rise.

A dramatic illustration of the effects of governmental spending of more money than is collected can be seen in the price rise from 1933 to the present time. During this time the only years the budget was balanced was during the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress, 1947 and 1948. As a direct consequence, a basket of groceries which cost

$2.50 only 11 years ago in 1939, now costs $5.60—or more than double the amount. Similarly, up goes the cost of guns, tanks, planes, and ships which the Government buys.

Time and time again we have been warned by Kremlin spokesmen of the basic strategy of promoting our destruction by undermining our domestic economy. By this means, it is held, the eventual wreck of the Nation can be accomplished by our enemies just as surely and far more cheaply than by a successful war. By this means we could be made to ruin ourselves. Accordingly, for more than a decade, besides stealing our state secrets and fomenting internal dissension, the Communist effort has been concentrated upon forcing us into a calamitous national bankruptcy from which chaos must ensue.

At the same time there is another peril we must face. If, to finance our defense projects or for any other reason, we resort to the Government taking over private industry or usurping the traditional role of individual initiative in this land, we shall have lost the very freedom we are striving to maintain.

England chose this path in order to finance the cost of rebuilding her war-ravaged country, but without the hypodermics of aid from the United States, she would have been financially ruined. Furthermore, it turned out to be a case of stepping from the frying pan into the fire, since socialism is a false solution and does not represent a real or permanent cure for financial troubles.

If, for any reason, America is led or lured by false promises down this road, we shall have killed the goose that lays the golden eggs, since it is our economic system that has made us the wealthiest and most powerful Nation in the world and made possible the standard of living which, like freedom, we here in America have come to take for granted.

Time and again it has been demonstrated that our free economy has resulted in a higher standard of living and improved working conditions through the initiative and inventiveness of men who are able to reap the benefits of their industry and talent. On the other hand, socialism undermines the character of the citizen and destroys his incentive to better his condition or risk his capital in new ventures.

In a Socialist country, people have no incentive to improve the machine and tools with which they work, since they realize that they will not gain the rewards of their own skill. Anyone will work twice as hard if he is working to improve his own lot in life, and not merely working for the benefit of some vague economic theory or some government bureaucrat. It is only natural and proper that men should wish to improve their economic position in life and thus be able to buy a few luxuries and extras for their families.

People who have resigned themselves to living on government doles or handouts without any hope of improving their status except by government action have forfeited much of the joy of living, and also a vast amount of self respect.

Our country was founded on the desire of men to be independent and free to determine and influence their own futures without arbitrary rule by a Government bureaucrat, no matter whether titled or merely appointed. It was a love of adventure and a willingness to risk unknown dangers, possessed by our pioneering forefathers and inherited by their descendants, that has made our country great, and it is still the chief characteristic of Americans today, whether their ancestors came over on the *Mayflower* or immigrated last year.

So it is not that I fear that Americans would knowingly sell their birthright for a mess of Government pottage, but I do fear that in the press of defending ourselves from possible outside attack we may unwittingly be sold a bill of socialistic goods in the name of national interest.

At the same time, we must beware of placing undue emphasis on the materialistic aspect. We must devote an appropriate portion of our time and energies to building the spiritual side of our national life.

To combat the forces of communism in all their nefarious and menacing guises, it is necessary to understand thoroughly the nature of the evil we face. Communism has become a religion to its followers. They are fanatics, possessed of the zeal and unreasoning devotion which makes all fanatics dangerous. The early exponents and teachers of international communism understood that to be accepted and practiced, religion and faith in God must be supplanted by an equally intense and deep belief in the Communist state and the ultimate victory of international communism. Since it is the nature of man to worship a power greater than himself, the Communist credo substituted the state and the theory of communism. This was a necessity, since communism requires the complete subordination of the individual to the good of the masses, except that as it is presently practiced the masses are synonymous with the Kremlin masters, who are absolute dictators, ruling Russia and the satellite nations for one purpose and one purpose only, their own personal aggrandizement.

As the forces of lawlessness and atheism continue to dominate the lives of millions of people abroad, we must make certain that we do not neglect our privilege to worship at the church of our choice—that privilege for which our ancestors risked their lives and fortunes.

Confidence in the rightness of our cause and the certainty that right will triumph over the evil forces of totalitarianism and godlessness will lend strength to our convictions of ultimate victory. The realization that our entire civilization and culture has at stake will endow us with the courage to resist this terrible menace, without at the same time becoming panicky or losing our nerve. Free men and women, firm in their faith in their fundamental beliefs, will always be able to defend the most determined assaults upon that freedom.

Thus, with deep religious conviction and trust, we must spend our efforts unceasingly to spread the doctrine of the inherent worth of the individual and his right to live according to his own determination, sustained by our knowledge of the moral rightness of our cause and of the eternal justice of the God in whom we place our trust.

MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to consent granted, I include as part of these remarks, an editorial pertinent to the times which appeared in the Mount Vernon Daily Herald, of Mount Vernon, Wash., on April 12, 1951:

Not since the sudden death of Franklin D. Roosevelt 6 years ago today has our Nation been so profoundly shocked as it was early yesterday when President Truman, without preliminary warning or notice, deprived Gen. Douglas MacArthur of all commands in the Far East and told him he was free to travel anywhere he pleased as a five-star general of the United States Army.

Never was Mr. Truman's ineptitude or unfitness as the Nation's Chief Executive so clearly shown following a long chain of inexcusable temperamental actions and unpopular quick decisions. A White House press conference was called at 1 o'clock in the morning to flash the Commander in Chief's order around the world, and while Press Secretary Short read the announcement, President Truman went to bed. It is now certain that MacArthur had no advance information until the cablegram was handed to him in Tokyo. His entire staff was astounded. It is worth noting that Secretary of War, Frank Pace arrived in Tokyo some 24 hours previously direct from Washington and had conferred with General MacArthur with no hint of the bombshell about to be exploded.

Now, America does not treat its hero leaders in this fashion, particularly military heroes, of which MacArthur was and is acknowledged to be one. He was not a defeated and unpopular general, like Meade, whom Lincoln removed in the middle of the Civil War to make way for the aggressive Grant. MacArthur has been running a successful war in Korea, with his hands practically tied, as just reported by National Commander Cocke, of the American Legion, in a blistering criticism on the conduct of the war. Before Korea, MacArthur won undying fame in history for his defeat of the Japanese after one of the most brilliant campaigns in modern military history. It was MacArthur who made the peace with Japan and took over control by order of the United Nations. In 5 years he has brought peace, order, and reconstruction to that nation of 80,000,000. We have never heard it denied that he has done a truly remarkable job in Japan. He has spent most of his life in the Far East. It is said—and it is likely true—that he knows the oriental peoples better than any living American. The President in firing him so ungraciously gave him credit for being one of our ablest military leaders and commanders.

Why, then, an amazed and angry public, both Republicans and Democrats and people who are just good citizens without hidebound political ties, want to know was General MacArthur fired in such a humiliating manner at the very top of such a remarkable career of exemplary public service. The official reason given to him was that he was out of sympathy with his Government's policies and talked contrary to orders of his Commander in Chief—the President—contained in an order dated December 6 last that any and all public statements of Army and Navy officers concerning foreign policies must be cleared by the State Department, and therefore disobedient.

MacArthur has been complaining bitterly over having his hands tied by United Nations and being unable to bring the war to a conclusion while thousands of lives were being sacrificed. Undoubtedly he has expressed his views frankly. After all, he is a great general, in supreme far eastern command, successful guardian of the Japanese Empire, a top authority on the Orient, a great pillar in our Asiatic defense. It is pretty hard, if not impossible, to shut up a man of his caliber, carrying such a tremendous responsibility on the other side of the world. It is difficult to make him a mere Army robot taking orders off the board each morning. He was more than a military commander; he was a trained statesman, but denied by the Truman administration as such.

The bald truth is that some of the advice and recommendations of MacArthur have been finding deep roots of approval and stirring up powerful opposition to the policies of Truman and Acheson, who have been getting nowhere in the Korean War or in making peace with China or in holding the friendship of India, or winning Asiatic allies. General MacArthur should have been brought back here months ago to give his views to Congress and the American people

instead of being gagged by a State Department under the thumb of United Nations. Both the British and the French have been trying to get rid of General MacArthur for sometime past. It looks as though the English were running our diplomacy, telling us what is best for us in both Europe and Asia, probably because we possess so little aptitude and ability ourselves. The French follow the English of course.

President Truman made a very simple, naive, 15-minute defense talk over the radio networks last night, bearing down on the idea that we were trying to keep the Korean War from growing into a third world war and intimating that General MacArthur was taking us into another global war and therefore had to be removed. Opinions on that score will differ widely. The argument has been going on now for almost a year while 60,000 Americans have been killed, wounded, or taken prisoners. Our United Nations allies have been furnishing only around 10 percent of the forces involved. United Nations isn't any nearer peace now than last June; in fact they may be nearer all-out war with China. We're still fumbling and drifting.

We wouldn't say that General MacArthur has all the right answers and, if left to himself, could bring peace in Asia. We can't see some things as he sees them. But we do assert with confidence that he is abler and better informed than our President, the State Department, and the entire Pentagon army staff and that his views deserve the highest respect and consideration. His loss as a far eastern adviser is a tragic one to the country. We are still wholly unwilling that United Nations should run our foreign affairs and dismiss our commanding generals and civil administrators abroad.

Technically, President Truman may be entirely within the law in firing MacArthur for military insubordination but he should have known better than to do what he did the way he did it. His action may have very immediate and serious world-wide effects involving the welfare and safety of the United States. Definitely, all politics aside, we believe the Truman administration has pulled a first-class boner in the MacArthur incident which the American people will neither forgive nor forget. General MacArthur will undoubtedly return to defend himself and his views, when the full measure of his standing among his fellow citizens will be apparent.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Appeasement, 1951 Style," published in the Altoona Tribune of Friday, April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPEASEMENT, 1951 STYLE

As the uproar continues over the President's dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, two aspects of this important incident stand out above all others, and are worthy of serious consideration, uncolored by political bias of any sort.

First, it is sufficiently clear that the President could have averted this uproar by privately asking the general to retire. MacArthur has remarked on various occasions about retiring when his Japan job is done.

Such a move would have been the part of wisdom. It would have prevented showing to the world the demoralizing spectacle of a top military commander being relieved of duty, which spectacle always gives rise to reports of a weak and a divided leadership.

Moscow seized upon this incident at once to declare American leadership is confused. And, indeed, this seems adequate evidence of confusion.

It serves no purpose whatsoever publicly to break MacArthur in this fashion. It is dangerous to American policies in the Far East, for it means loss of face, loss of dignity, in the eyes of the Japanese people, who had the highest respect for MacArthur, and, through him, of American leadership.

This ill-advised public dismissal may have dangerous repercussions in Japan, which we had planned to hold against Red encroachment, and which MacArthur so far has succeeded in doing.

Secondly, Mr. Truman, in his Wednesday night broadcast, put his dismissal of MacArthur on the basis of "peace." Certainly, there is room for controversy on this. Yet, it is important to look at Mr. Truman's explanation closely.

The closer one looks, the more it shapes up into appeasement. The mere fact that the President denied it is appeasement does not alter the fact that it suspiciously resembles it.

Mr. Truman appears content to let the UN forces fight the back and forth war that has been going on for so many months, with a toll of some 60,000 American casualties.

Both MacArthur and his successor, General Ridgway, have said there is no hope in sight for military settlement in Korea. And, both have said there is no political settlement in sight.

What then?

Mr. Truman does not answer that. He merely states his position, undoubtedly dictated by Secretary of State Acheson, and, probably, to Acheson from London, that we do not want the war to spread, to develop into general war, and he charges General MacArthur's demand for permission to use Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist troops, and to bomb China, would invite general war.

Why? He doesn't say. The President doesn't explain that.

Every single move in this cold war has been on Russian initiative. Russia holds the initiative in Korea. She holds the initiative for making general war.

Regardless of anything Mr. Truman might say, Russia is in a position to precipitate general war in Korea just as readily as though we were to carry the war into China.

In fact, Russia's incentive lies in Korea, for there, she held control of the north portion, directly.

General MacArthur was in favor of making war on the enemy. That was his job. To do it effectively, he wanted UN permission to bomb enemy bases and supply lines in Manchuria.

Truman said no, that would invite general war.

What is this but appeasement?

Russia and Communists in general have hailed MacArthur's dismissal. What does that indicate but appeasement?

Certainly, we want no general war. We want peace as soon as possible. But, when did appeasement of the Reds bring peace? The more they are given, the more they demand.

To make a deal with the China Reds, as Britain, India, and some others of the UN want, would be a shameful thing, after all this blood letting in Korea.

Mr. Truman sent our troops into Korea. Mr. Truman refused to let the military wage war. He wants it on the police basis prescribed by Britain, which also wants full recognition of these vicious Reds whom we now battle on the fields and in the mountains of Korea.

The President started this Korean business. But, he can't find the means of ending it, and he refused to let MacArthur try.

That appears to be the substance of this situation. Talk of insubordination and disobedience of orders by MacArthur is just so much wind to blow away the bad smell of prejudice and ill judgment.

The Great Turnout—Hail the Hero!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by H. L. Phillips:

THE GREAT TURNOUT—HAIL THE HERO!—OR HOW TO STAGE A MACARTHUR PARADE AND DO SOMETHING FOR YOURSELF

(By H. L. Phillips)

WELCOME PARADE FOR DOUG

Section I

MacArthur clubs of America.
Societies for promotion of candor.
Anti-double-talkers of the world.
Federated associations of pipe and tobacco men.
Dark sun-glass manufacturers.
Republican clubs of the United States of America.
Organizations opposed to the Missouri Waltz.

Section II

Decorated floats: The GOP in Search of a Winner; the Democrats in Search of an Alibi; Where Am I? (Chiang Kai-shek supporters); the Needler (John Bull getting Uncle Sam to do it his way as usual); Little Red Riding Hood (a novel float depicting the little girl watching the wolf eat grandma but prevented by queer rules from doing much about it); Victory Through Veto Power (this one got in from the Kremlin by mistake).

Section III

UN debating teams (just hoping Douglas will never get back); the international "We Will Vote War but We Won't Do Much To Back It Up" Clubs. Baseball magnates (wondering if he would consider becoming commissioner of baseball); basketball promoters (in a similar mood).

THE BUCKSTERS FIND SOME GAME

Section IV (What's in it for me?)

Book publishers.
Lecture agents.
Video talent scouts.
Hollywood producers, script writers, and idea men.
Advertising agents (all hoping to get him to endorse the cigarette that guarantees nonchalance, the beer that builds morale, the hair tonic that swept the Pacific, the Tokyo to Washington Tours, Inc., and the soap that is dynamite to the Pentagon and other irritants).

Section V

Pageant of bands. Forty UN delegations playing, I Can Send You Anything but Men, Sammy; I'll Always Be Behind You, and Never Mind How Far, etc; Downing Street Fusiliers rendering, Praise the War but Give

the Recognition. Indian lute players giving out with, It Had To Be You.

Section VI

Kefauver committee. (It realizes this is the only way it could get back into the public eye.)

Section VII

Band Wagon Jumpers of America.
Political Trend Interpreters.
Idol Worshipers League of North America.
Pulse Feelers.
Martyr Builders of the World.
Democratic spies (trying to figure out how far this thing can go).
Unemployed Republicans.
TAFT for President, Eisenhower for President, and Stassen for President clubs, all too apprehensive to keep in step.
Joe MARTIN Fife and Drum Corps.

TO KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Section VIII

Omar Bradley and George Marshall (just making sure Douglas sticks to the parade). White House statisticians and checkers (trying to estimate the ticker tape, confetti, etc., for a comparison with the Lindbergh parade and other past events).

Section IX

Advertising floats, cages, Gallup pollers, puzzled voters, national pro-and-con clubs, ambulances, police wagons, etc.

To Perpetuate Good Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, because the editorial is typical of many being printed in newspapers and magazines, large and small, throughout the country, I am having printed in the RECORD the following from the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican concerning H. R. 2524, the bill which would exempt symphony orchestras and opera from the Federal admissions tax:

EXEMPT THE ORCHESTRAS

One particularly unjust tax is the 20-percent box-office levy that adds heavily to the deficits of nonprofit organizations like civic orchestras, dependent on help from their friends to start with.

Amusement is amusement, if you want to look at it that way; but it strikes us as both unfair and unsmart for the Federal Government to take exactly the same kind of cut from the gate receipts at a summer music festival as it takes when some promoter puts on an evening of women wrestlers.

This is why we think it would be wise of Congress to approve legislation introduced by Representative ALBERT MORANO, the Connecticut Representative who took Governor Lodge's place.

The Morano bill is a moderate measure. It doesn't go all the way in drawing the line between cultural and noncultural diversion. It does, however, make a distinction that ought to provide a starting point.

In Representative MORANO's proposed legislation the 20-percent amusement tax that now applies indiscriminately would be modified to exempt nonprofit orchestras—like the Waterbury Civic Orchestra, for instance.

This Waterbury orchestra has had hard going this year. Like all institutions of its kind it has felt the novelty impact of television. Audiences haven't been quite as large as they have been in former years. The civic orchestra, which has to expect each concert will cost from $1,200 to $1,700, has had bad luck with the weather this year, too.

When the Waterbury Civic Orchestra gives its final performance for the season on Sunday, it hopes, naturally, to have a full house. Even if it does, however, it can't hope to break even for the day's event. Musical organizations, like all of us, have felt the effect of higher living costs.

As Conductor Mario DiCecco will tell you, it costs the Waterbury orchestra about $2.50 for each $2 worth of box office receipts.

To help make up the deficit this orchestra, like the world's greatest, is dependent on the generosity of its friends.

But passage of the Morano bill would help a lot, as anyone can see. Of the $2.50 it costs for each $2 ticket, 40 cents is for the Federal amusement tax.

The orchestra's friends could help a great deal if they would write their Senators and their Congressmen urging passage of Representative MORANO's measure, H. R. 2524.

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRAZIER REAMS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 16, the Ohio delegation of the House of Representatives had as their guests the winners of the essay contest held by the American Legion, Department of Ohio. One of these winners is Robert Butz, tenth grade, of Monclova High School, Monclova, Ohio, in the district which I have the honor to represent. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the essay with which this fine young American won an award in the tenth-grade group. It is a lucid and eloquent expression, showing a clear understanding of the Constitution and the practices which will continue to make it the greatest instrument ever devised by man for the government of a free people.

The essay follows:

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Robert Butz, Monclova, Ohio)

Today, our civilization is complex, our problems are difficult, and the Government has greatly expanded its activities. Under these conditions a higher degree of intelligence is necessary for good citizenship, and a broad knowledge is necessary to have good leadership. More extensive study of the basic principles of our governmental system would give a clearer view of our Constitution.

The powers set forth by our Constitution consist of three main branches.

1. Good laws must be made to satisfy the common needs of the people. This is called the lawmaking or legislative department.

2. The laws must be made to work so that the people may benefit by them. The carrying out or enforcing of laws is called executive department.

3. So that the laws may be understood and the difference of opinion be settled we have the judicial department.

Government is a human product and is no better and no worse than the men and women who are responsible for it. The United States Constitution is the oldest Federal constitution in existence. It was so wisely planned that it has served as the basis for our Government without necessary change for almost a century and a half. Calvin Coolidge, as President, said, "To live under the American Constitution is the greatest political privilege that was ever accorded the human race."

Most other great nations of the world have passed through revolutions that have completely changed their system of government.

At the time of the writing of our Constitution, American life was simple, rural, and agricultural. The leaders of the Constitutional Convention believed that the immediate needs of the country at that time was a practical, strong and stable form of government. The members of the Convention debated many of the issues at great length. Some members took a jealous or selfish attitude and were severely scolded for their thoughtlessness of the country. That was indeed similar to the heated debates and committee reports that are evident in the sessions of Congress today. As a result of these sessions, we are advised as to the findings and we must abide by all decisions. We can understand how the finished Constitution contained a series of compromises, adopted to reconcile the different interests of the various classes and sections of the country. Our American history shows that by broad minded compromise a strong central authority and individual freedom of government that had been established for a new and weak nation more than a century ago is still satisfactory for a great and powerful civilization today. We readily see that by the power of amendment to our Constitution we can, if the need be great enough and due to the change in our life and interests, make our governing laws so that a great many people will show progress.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gen. Douglas MacArthur Is Fired but 'Mink Coat' Brigade Marches On," which appeared in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR IS FIRED, BUT "MINK COAT" BRIGADE MARCHES ON

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, one of the most brilliant soldiers and statesmen in the past nearly half century of American history, has been summarily stripped of all his commands in the Far East by President Truman.

The entire world was rocked by the action of the President, which is without precedent in the history of free nations.

President Truman stated that he felt General MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies shaped by the United States and the United Nations. He declared that military commanders must be governed by policies and directives of the Government and in time of crisis this consideration is particularly compelling.

It is quite true that General MacArthur has opposed the policies of the United States, which acts for the United Nations. In recent weeks General MacArthur has been insistent in his demands that something be done to end the aimless war in Korea in which American lives and resources are being squandered to no avail.

There is no record of General MacArthur having failed to perform his duty as commander of the troops of the United Nations and the United States in the Far East, even though he has opposed the general policy.

General MacArthur was discharged because he stated publicly he opposed these policies. He had continued to perform the duties assigned to him. He has never been in sympathy with the Far East policy favored by Secretary of State Dean Acheson and now Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, acting for President Truman. Our methods in the Far East permitted the Communists to seize China.

Sumner Welles, closely associated with former President Franklin D. Roosevelt for about 10 years, in a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post captioned "What is the matter with our foreign policy?" asserted that Soviet Russia planned to gain domination of Asia and then wage full-scale aggression against Europe and the remainder of the free world.

General MacArthur has contended that Soviet Russia must be halted in Asia and that an all-out war must be conducted in Korea against the Chinese and North Korean Reds. He has advocated use of the troops of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek massed and trained on Formosa.

In his reference to the Far East, Sumner Welles, who attained the rank of Under Secretary of State under President Roosevelt, declared:

"During the years before 1939, I was repeatedly amazed that only a handful of the higher officials in Washington had ever read Hitler's Mein Kampf, although in that book, for all who cared to see, were set forth in fullest detail all Hitler's beliefs and all his intentions. It would be interesting to know how many of those chiefly responsible for our far-eastern policy since 1945 are familiar with the writings of Lenin or with the cardinal doctrines that he and Stalin had laid down with regard to the Far East. For these show that one of the basic tenets of Soviet communism has always been that once the billion and a half men and women in China, India, and Southeast Asia have been indoctrinated with communism and are linked to the people of Russia in the struggle to bring about the world triumph of the Communist ideology, the immense superiority in manpower of that alliance will insure the defeat of western capitalism. Certainly the American policy in the Far East between 1945 and 1950 has expedited rather than retarded the achievement of that aim."

General MacArthur, in his effort to bring a change of policy in the Far East, has insisted that the struggle in Korea is in reality a war to save Western Europe and America. Sumner Welles, one of former President Roosevelt's trusted aides, agrees with General MacArthur.

President Truman, Secretary Acheson, Secretary of Defense Marshall, and their advisers have maintained that it is far more important to stop the Communists in Europe than in Asia. They have sided with Great Britain and France in their handling of affairs in the Far East.

Meanwhile, the United States is furnishing the sinews of war in Korea manpower, munitions, warships, and warplanes.

Our men and resources are being dissipated in a conflict in which no real attempt is being made to defeat the Red hordes of China and North Korea.

It is understandable that President Truman has been annoyed by General MacArthur. But the general's chief offense is that he refused to remain silent. He felt impelled to present his views. It is understandable that General MacArthur who has spent most of his active years in the Far East felt that he, as a representative of the American people, should adopt the course he followed.

President Truman has created a new crisis in the conduct of our foreign policy. His action has been lauded in Europe but has spread dismay in Japan, only remaining contact of the west in the Far East, where the general is held in highest esteem.

It might be stated, too, that Japan is the only nation of the Far East in which the Communists have not been able to make gains.

The American people will have a chance to form their opinion for General MacArthur has stated that he is willing to return to America to continue his fight against policies he so strongly opposes.

The Truman-MacArthur controversy could prove to be the spark needed to arouse America and bring an end to the confused and aimless foreign policy of recent years. This policy has been marked by appeasement of the Reds.

General MacArthur opposes this policy of appeasement. He believes that it is weakening and undermining the strength and resources of the free world, especially the United States.

Removal of General MacArthur from the Far East is continuing a policy of appeasement and can only be pleasing to the Moscow schemers for General MacArthur in the Far East and Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia are the only leaders who have successfully thwarted them in their schemes and plans.

So General MacArthur, a man of integrity and recognized ability, is removed from the post he has filled so capably in the Far East but the mink-coat, deep-freeze, 5-percent, war-surplus, and influence brigades are still in command at Washington undermining our morals and wasting our heritage.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the fine address on freedom of the press, which was delivered at the Founders' Day banquet of Delta Tau Delta by Benjamin M. McKelway, editor of the great evening newspaper of the Nation's Capital, the Washington Star.

Mr. McKelway began his newspaper career as a Washington reporter 35 years ago. After working as a newspaperman in Washington and in Connecticut, he joined the staff of the Star in 1921, and was successively reporter, city editor, news editor, managing editor, and associate editor. He has been editor since 1946. He is one of the distinguished newspapermen of our time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(By Benjamin M. McKelway)

I hope there are no newspapermen present here this evening. I don't trust them. They misquote me. Well, they don't exactly misquote me, but this is the way it goes.

After I say my piece I look at the papers to see if they spelled my name right. And to see if they got my name up toward the top of the story, instead of down at the bottom, and if they put in that part about how the audience applauded, when I sat down.

But what do I find? I find a couple of sentences attributed to me in quotation marks. And I say to myself: "The Lord knows I couldn't have said anything like that. No man could be stupid enough to make a statement like that."

And then I begin thinking over what it was I said and I realize I did say something like they said I said in the paper. But why did they want to pick out that part of what I said? Why didn't they take that good part, down toward the end of the speech, where I said—Oh, well—you know what I mean.

But if I were you I would never make a speech when there are any newspapermen around. They are a dangerous bunch of people. Do you know what they would rather do than anything else? Do you know what gives them the greatest amount of purely malicious pleasure?

Well, I'll tell you. They like to puncture a stuffed shirt, and listen to wind whistling out of it.

And speaking of stuffed shirts, Brother Delts, you take a man who has been out of college for 36 years. You invite him to make a speech at a founders-day banquet of Delta Tau Delta. You butter him up a little, stick him up here at the head table, surrounded by people like a distinguished Justice of the Supreme Court and the other big shots up here, looking out over an audience composed of brother Delts who paid $6 apiece to come here. And what sort of wind comes out of this stuffed shirt?

Well, he is apt to reminisce, and tell you about how we used to run a fraternity. How people like Carl Butman, George Degnan, Rhesa Norris, and Tom Peyton—and I—but I am not going to do that, because if I start it somebody else will begin to reminisce and if there is anything that bores me it is reminiscence, except when I'm doing the reminiscing.

So, perhaps the best place to start is with a confession. For confession is good for the soul. And I confess that I've been a pretty sorry sort of Delt.

I haven't been to a chapter meeting for 36 years. I've forgotten the grip. I've forgotten the password. I've forgotten the secret parts I once was so anxious to learn. And I lost my pin, many years ago, under circumstances that I do not care to discuss here.

But I'll tell you some of the things I haven't forgotten. And I like to think they are more important than some of the things that I was told, as a youngster, that I must never forget.

One is the deep pride I felt when I was pledged and initiated into Delta Tau Delta. Nobody can ever take that away from me. Another is that indefinable sense of kinship I've always felt toward anybody who happens to be a Delt, the sort of kinship that binds people together who share something that no one else in the world can share in quite the same way.

And I have been extremely fortunate, as a father, in being able to experience that intimate satisfaction that came to me when three sons, going to two colleges, far apart, went Delt.

And I shall not forget how it felt, when they were in college, to visit them and to enter a chapter house, not merely as another dad, but as a Delt, and to find out that I was mistaken when I concluded that Gamma Eta Chapter in 1916 was composed of

the finest group of youngsters ever assembled under one roof.

For I found that these other groups, assembled under other roofs, 25 years later, were even finer—and I think they get better with every generation of young Americans.

It is a great honor, which I feel deeply, to be here this evening as one of a group of Delt newspapermen who have been singled out for pleasant distinction of being mentioned at a Founders' Day banquet.

It is a great honor to be here with such fine newspapermen as my friends, here at the head table—Oliver Hoyem, Bob Estabrook, Red Mobley, and Charley Gridley—as well as others who are in the audience.

And I find it hard to tell you how pleased I am that a younger Delt, Bill Murphy, back from the wars, is here with us. Everybody who knew his father, loved him, and if young Bill becomes even half as good a newspaperman as his father was, with his father's sense of honor, his gentleness, and his understanding of the responsibilities that newspaper work imposes—young Bill will have something to be proud of.

It makes me very proud of being a Delt and of being a newspaperman to know of how many good newspapermen are Delts.

And now that I have you here, I would like to tell you something of my idea about where that noble calling of free journalism, that we newspapermen try to serve, fits into the great struggle that is going on in the world today between two sharply antagonistic ideas of living and what we call freedom in living.

I believe that the nature of this debate over freedom in the world today is very well illustrated by the outlines of the debate over freedom of the press.

For the debate in the world over freedom of the press goes to the heart of the whole, larger debate over all individual freedoms. And if we understand something of this debate over freedom of the press, we may understand more of what lies behind the debate over all the other freedoms that you and I enjoy as American citizens—freedoms that have never yet been won, or, having been won have been snatched away, from over half of the people of this world.

One of the odd things about this debate over freedom of the press—and it is true, more or less, in the debate over other freedoms—is that there is really no clear conflict over the idea that a free press is wholly desirable in any form of society. Everybody champions the idea of a free press. Everybody defends it.

The argument, in fact, is not over freedom of the press. The argument lies in what we mean by freedom of the press; in other words, freedom from what?

The Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Constitution of the United States both guarantee freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

The Russian Constitution, after setting forth such guaranties, injects a condition to the effect that this freedom depends upon, and here I quote the words, "conformity to the interests of the working people, and in order to strengthen the Socialist system. * * *"

Our guaranty of press freedom in the United States is contained in these simple words from the first amendment to our Constitution:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. * * *"

The essential difference, then, between the Russian Constitution's guaranty of freedom of the press and that which is contained in our own Constitution is that the Russian freedom of the press is contingent upon its use in behalf of the working people and the Socialist system.

In our own Constitution, this freedom is guaranteed without qualification. In Russia, freedom of the press means freedom from private control; in our country, it means freedom from Government control.

Thus, the Russian might argue as follows in defense of his brand of freedom of the press: "In Russia we have a free press. It is free to publish. It is free to use a printing plan. It is free to obtain paper and ink. It is free to use labor and skill of the men who produce it. It is free from private control. And it is free to print the news of what is going on, and to interpret the meaning of that news—provided, that what is printed serves the interest of the working people and is used to strengthen the society under which they live."

But here we interrupt this defender of the Russian brand of freedom. We ask, "Who decides whether what is printed happens to be in the interest of the people of Russia and the system under which they live?"

The answer is, "government." And who is government? The government is the rather small group of men and women who happen to control it, and who look on government as the master, rather than the servant, of the people who live under it.

The decision of what is fit to print in the interest of the people of Russia is left with the people in control of government. They may ban the publication of information they believe is not in the interest of the people.

They regard their press as an important instrument of government, as much a part of government as the army, the police, and the utilization of slave labor, for no dictatorship can survive unless the press is controlled by the dictator.

If the men in control of the Russian Government believe it is in the interest of a people to be told only one side of the story, only that side is told.

If they believe it is in the interests of the Russian people to receive a distorted version of how the people in other parts of the world conduct their affairs, that is the version they receive.

If they believe it is in the interests of the Russian people to be told nothing, then the people are told nothing.

Freedom of the press in Russia, then, means freedom from all control of the press—except the exclusive control exercised by government.

We correctly associate this government control of the press with totalitarianism. And because totalitarianism as we know it today is regarded by us now as something rather new, there is a disposition sometimes to regard the totalitarian idea of press freedom also as something new under the sun. And its apparent newness attracts a following.

As a matter of fact, that idea of government control of the press is about as old as the device of printing words on paper.

The really revolutionary idea of the free press is that which is written into our own Constitution—a press that is free of all government control.

This idea, relatively new in the world and still under trial, emerged from the struggles and the experience of men who lived under a government-controlled press.

They came to know and to feel its tyranny. The invention of the printing press placed a powerful instrument in the hands of government. And the government of a few centuries ago—whether church or state, or a combination of the two—recognized and used that instrument for their protection, just as current dictatorships use it today.

The power to license the printing press gave the government the power to control what was printed; therefore, the power to suppress new ideas. Men were imprisoned and sentenced to fearful forms of torture for the use of unlicensed presses which turned out material not approved by the sovereign. And there is little doubt that such control over what is printed has always been explained or defended by the government on the ground that control is necessary in the best interests of the people.

The great poet, John Milton, was one of the men who gave wings to words in proposing the revolutionary idea of a press free of government control. He was rebelling against government control of the press in a speech to Parliament some 300 years ago when he said:

"And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter."

We believe in a free press in this country. But our idea of a free press is a press free from the control of government. We believe that our press serves the people. But we do not believe that any government should decide whether what is printed is or is not in the public interest. That decision should be left for the people themselves.

Our press is controlled. But it is controlled by men of every conceivable doctrine, in politics, in economics, and in religion. The man who runs a newspaper may be a conservative. Or he may be a radical. He may be one who opposes any change in our form of government and uses his newspaper to resist such change. Or he may believe that our form of government should be changed to something modeled on the Russian plan, and he uses his newspaper to advocate that change.

"He" who controls a newspaper may be a labor union or a religious sect or the owner of a copper mine or a chain of grocery stores. "He" whoever he may be, is the owner of one, or a combination of several, of the 1,850 daily and 9,661 weekly newspapers in the United States.

The result is that when these newspapers speak, they never speak as one voice, as do the newspapers of Russia or other countries where government controls the press. They speak in a multitude of voices, confusing, argumentative, clamorous. But from the babel there is apt to emerge the truth. And we leave to the people rather than to government the recognition of where the truth may lie.

That is the theory behind our freedom of the press. This freedom of the press is something that belongs to the people. It is their property. It is not the property of the owners of newspapers. We know that the idea of press freedom—freedom from Government control—was planted in a fertile soil and cultivated by men who valued freedom above everything else and had staked their lives, their fortunes, and their honor to win it.

It was an idea that was given a new legal basis by being written into the Constitution itself. That legal basis placed it beyond the reach of Government, in contrast to the constitutions of other governments which place conditions on press freedom and permits its curtailment in certain emergencies.

Our freedom of the press does not depend upon the views of the government in power, nor is it affected by some real or imaginary emergency.

The American press is free—with rare and narrow exceptions—to obtain and to print any news that it can secure of what is going on in Government or anywhere else. Its freedom of comment, even to the extent of ridiculing Government and its officials in the harshest of terms, is restricted legally only by the laws of libel, and these are rarely invoked.

This freedom of the press has been encouraged by what might be called a characteristically American attitude toward constituted authority. Americans do not like to be pushed around by Government and are inherently suspicious of any governmental action which suggests the prospect of being pushed around.

The men who wrote our Constitution, for example, were fearful the Government they were creating might, like the governments against which they had rebelled, use the crime of treason to punish citizens who did not agree with Government. So treason, a crime for which thousands of men have been imprisoned and executed in other lands—and for which they are being tried and executed today in the iron curtain countries—is so tightly defined by our Constitution that our Government is rarely able to prove it. The Federal Government has never executed a citizen for treason in the 160 years of its existence—years which included a civil war.

The American press has been able to identify its own interests with those of the public which it serves, and to a degree that is found in no other country of the world. Newspapers thrive on the exposure of wrong from which the people might suffer. They are often the first to challenge the exercise, by any official of government, of anything savoring of dictatorial powers.

American newspapers more often take up the cudgels for the underdog than for the top dog, on the theory that the function of the press, as Mr. Dooley defined it, is "to comfort the afflicted and to afflict the comfortable." For this approach means circulation. And advertising revenue, on which the papers depend for existence, follows circulation and approval by the people of the paper they read.

And so long as this press is free—free to print the news of what is going on, free to place before the people the questions that only the people are capable of deciding for themselves, free to point out what it regards as the shortcomings of government along with the things to be praised in government, free to compete for attention and respect in the market place of ideas—our freedoms are protected.

For we must always remember that freedom of the press is not an isolated freedom that stands by itself. Our various freedoms and rights—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, and of petition, the right of trial by jury—all of these are interdependent, and the destruction of one can bring down others with it.

It is only our people who can preserve these freedoms. And these people must be well informed on the news of the day; they must feel the responsibilities that go with citizenship in a free country; they must take part in their Government by voting; they must stand for good government by voting for good men. They must be bound together by some of those honorable ties that are singled out for mention in the creed of Delta Tau Delta—education, in order "to live and learn the truth," brotherhood, friendship, and a foundation that rests on conscience.

We are probably strong enough to protect ourselves from attack by other powers in the world today, although the threat is grave and always present. But we must be strong enough to protect our freedoms from the less easily recognized menace of those who promise new and glittering rewards, sometimes called rights, in exchange for those basic rights and freedoms that were won for us by men who had learned through bitter experience the dangers of an all-powerful government.

A great lover of freedom, a great defender of the common people, the late Justice Brandeis expressed that thought in words that I would like to leave with you as I close:

"Experience should teach us to be on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the leading editorial in the New York Times of today, Wednesday, April 18, entitled "The Initiative in Korea," which, as I see it, states the problem in that area in a very clear manner.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INITIATIVE IN KOREA

The removal of General MacArthur from his far-eastern commands symbolizes a decision on at least one issue of world-wide significance. Insofar as the United Nations and the United States can control the course of events the Korean war will remain limited to Korea and will not be extended to Communist China. This decision is another demonstration that while the United Nations and the United States continue to resist aggression at the point where such aggression is taking place, they will do all that they can to preserve the larger framework of world peace and to avert a new world war. As such a demonstration, the decision can be welcomed and supported.

But this decision does not end the Korean war. It does not provide any basis for a peaceful settlement. On the contrary, the war continues with increased intensity, and the storm precipitated by General MacArthur's dismissal has served to obscure the vital fact that the United Nations forces have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in force. This is a war which for the moment is being fought in a military and diplomatic vacuum.

Militarily it remains a war of maneuver as the best method of disturbing the enemy's preparation for a spring offensive, and as the only available alternative to an impossible positional war, which, in all expert military opinion, would lead to the destruction of the United Nations forces. In that respect the Korean war continues to resemble the Duke of Wellington's peninsular campaign against Napoleon in Spain. And its achievements are substantial. It has thrown back Communist aggression to beyond the point from which this aggression started. It has saved South Korea, which was the original purpose of the United Nations, even if it has been unable to achieve the larger United Nations objective of unifying all Korea in a free and democratic state. It has upset the Communist timetable of conquest. It has provided relief for other areas under Communist pressure—areas including not only Indochina and Malaya but also Europe. And it has provided a proving ground for western men and arms which has already led to a complete reorganization and reorientation of western strategy and tactics.

But for the present the Korean war must remain, as General Bradley pointed out yesterday, primarily a defensive war, which could result in a military stalemate. This fact, however, puts added responsibility on both the United Nations and on the statesmen of the Western World to take the initiative in seeking a political solution of the issues involved, and if such a solution is immediately unattainable to issue a new and unequivocal declaration of purposes, so that both the fighting forces at the front and the nations supporting them will know what they are fighting for. If the free world fails to do this, the initiative will inevitably be taken by the Communist world. The first attempt at this is already under way, as shown by the North Korean messages to the United Nations proposing, amid insolent diatribes against the United States, a conference of all the countries concerned in the Korean conflict, including Communist China and Soviet Russia, to establish peace on Communist terms.

These messages from the North Korean puppets or the Chinese puppets of the Kremlin have obviously been sent for propaganda purposes and need not be taken too seriously. But they are a token of what may be expected along the same line, and the new Communist peace offensive will not be discouraged by the indecision which continues to mark all United Nations activity with respect to Korea, or by the timid inquiries addressed to Peiping by India, based on the false proposition that the removal of General MacArthur has also removed the main obstacle to peace.

Having repudiated the soldier's solution of meeting force with maximum counterforce, it is the duty of the United Nations to speak out clearly and plainly, not only to define the aim of the war but also to abate the confusion which the dispute about General MacArthur has created. The effort must be to reunite the moral forces of the world as in the brave days of last June, when the Korean action got under way.

Televising Hearings of Congressional Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials from the pages of Broadcasting magazine, the first entitled "Faultless Reporter," from the issue of March 26; the second entitled "Puzzle: Find the Television Cameras," from the issue of April 2; and the third entitled "The Congress and TV," from the issue of April 16. These editorials deal with televising the hearings of congressional committees. I do not altogether agree with the conclusions reached in the editorials, but the arguments made in them are so well stated that I feel strongly they should be made available to the readers of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Broadcasting of March 26, 1951]

FAULTLESS REPORTER

To evaluate the true significance of television as a spectator at public hearings like those of the Kefauver committee, it is necessary to ignore much of the emotional debate that rages on that subject these days and to view the arrival of this incomparable instrument in proper historical perspective.

To a large extent the evolution of government from the monarchial authoritarianism

of feudal times to the parliamentary democracy of today has depended upon the opening of government activity not only to public participation but also to public scrutiny.

The star chamber courts, whose dark secrecy protected the most unjust verdict, gave way to public trials and the jury system. Lawmaking was removed from the inaccessible throne room to the public meeting house of parliamentary bodies.

This evolution has been slow and at times painful (the U. S. Senate met behind closed doors until 1792 when forced by editorial pressure to admit the public), but it has been made inevitable by the very nature of democratic progress. True democracy requires that all branches of the government function in full view of the people.

In television, there is at hand an instrument that brings this evolutionary process to very nearly an ultimate stage of development. If one is to accept the theory that corruption and ineptitudes flourish in concealment and wither when exposed, one must also believe that television is the greatest enemy of governmental chicanery and bumbling yet invented.

In the debate that ranges these days as to the propriety of television's presence at public hearings like those of the Kefauver committee the question has been raised (surprisingly, by some thoughtful persons) as to whether a witness' rights to a fair trial are abrogated if he is required to perform before an audience larger than can be accommodated in the hearing chamber.

We submit that his rights are not impaired. Indeed they are protected to an extent undreamed of by the great jurists who conceived and advanced the principle of public trial. If 50 spectators in a court room enhance a defendant's chances of fair trial, how much greater insurance is provided by an audience of millions?

There is another argument that says television injures the dignity of proceedings, that its lights demean a hearing room to the level of a carnival, that participants are apt to adjust their behavior in recognition of the fact they are being observed and so neglect the essence of the case at hand in their concern for making a favorable impression on the audience. This argument is faulty too.

The lights to which objections have been raised are not necessary to television, but are put there by newsreel cameramen. In itself television provides no greater distraction to the sensible participant than the audience that is present in person.

The onus of propriety in the conduct of a televised hearing is on the examiner and the witness alike. Television has an absolutely impartial eye and ear. It does not edit or interpret. It simply sees and hears. It cannot turn a hearing into a carnival unless the hearing itself is so conducted. It cannot make a man a bum unless he is one.

At every stage of progress since feudal times there have been powerful men who for selfish purposes have endeavored to counteract reforms, to perpetuate the status quo essential to their own survival. There is no doubt that the introduction of television as a spectator at Government proceedings represents an important stage of this continuing evolution, and as a consequence it has its enemies.

Who are the enemies of television? They are those who cannot stand its merciless inspection.

Its friends are all those who believe the star chamber and the unquestioned king are obsolete and that the struggle toward democracy has been worth while.

[From Broadcasting of April 2, 1951]

PUZZLE: FIND THE TELEVISION CAMERAS

Take a close look at this picture.

It was made during a Washington session of the Kefauver committee. The picture was distributed by Acme Newspictures, which serves newspapers, so it could hardly be argued that the photographer was going out of his way to plan a shot that would be especially favorable to television.

Look at the picture.

There are five still cameramen crouched under the nose of the witness. They are waiting to explode flash bulbs in his face.

There are eight motion-picture cameras ranged against the wall. Notice the bright Klieg light at top, left of center. If somebody extinguished that light, the eight newsreel cameras couldn't make a picture that would be decipherable.

Over in the right top corner is one television camera. If that Klieg light that is so necessary to the newsreels were to go out, the operator of the TV camera would make a quick adjustment of its lenses and continue to transmit a picture of high quality. TV doesn't need that blinding light at all. It doesn't need illumination any brighter than that ordinarily provided in a public meeting room.

This picture does not show all the news coverage equipment that was in the room at the time. There were two other TV cameras, and there were also other newsreel cameras (and other newsreel lights) as well as other still cameras (fitted out with flash guns), including the one that made this shot.

It shows enough, however, to emphasize the foolishness of the hullabaloo being raised these days by critics who claim television defaces premises to which it is admitted.

We are publishing the picture because we think it goes a long way toward establishing just which of the news-coverage instruments causes the more distraction to a witness.

A lot of people are confused on this point. They associate television with strong lights and whirring cameras. The gamblers Kleinman and Rothkopf who refused to answer questions last Monday night were represented by an attorney who protested that TV cameras were grinding and that the bright TV lights were on. He also mentioned the presence of newsreel and still photographers, but the emphasis was on TV.

Newspaper reports of the Kefauver committee hearings for the past 2 weeks have repeatedly referred to television lights—so repeatedly indeed that bright lights and TV are by now fixed as inseparable in the minds of many.

To listen to the objections of bashful gamblers and their shrewd attorneys and to read the newspapers, it is easy to believe that there is so much TV equipment in a hearing chamber that there is scarcely room for anyone else. This picture tells a different story.

If contempt proceedings against the reluctant witnesses, Kleinman and Rothkopf, are prosecuted, the legal precedent establishing the rights of TV will unquestionably be set. These rights will also be influenced if the Senate agrees to proceed with a general investigation of the subject.

We suggest that this picture constitutes an excellent piece of documentary evidence in such proceedings. It shows that TV is not the medium that upsets the decorum of a hearing. Indeed, it is the least obtrusive instrument in the place.

[From Broadcasting of April 16, 1951]

THE CONGRESS AND TV

The roar of congressional and editorial comment aroused by the telecasts of the Kefauver committee hearings has, thank heavens, diminished.

We take advantage of what may be only a temporary calm to make a few comments of our own. Such considered opinions, carefully expressed, as were projected in recent weeks were, we fear, drowned out by the greater din of those who joined in an argument that was without articulation and pretty much without thought.

The general hubbub over the Kefauver telecasts did not add up to an enlightening record. So many people rushed to print or rostrum with a frantic contribution, lest the popularity of the question expire before their names and quotes were noticed, that the main issues were utterly deserted. A man anxious to get into an act as big as the Kefauver critical chorus is apt to cast about for a unique angle not theretofore covered by the others. This sort of thing, multiplied by a majority of all those in the act, does not guarantee coherent discussion.

Looking back over the main currents of the argument, one cannot avoid concluding that the debate did not rage over television at all. The thing that was really worrying most of the arguers—although they may not have recognized it themselves—was the conduct of Congress.

Judge SAMUEL S. LEIBOWITZ, the noted New York jurist, told Yale law students that TV could become a "sinister weapon of slander * * * if safeguards are not set up to control its use."

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, introduced a resolution calling for a senatorial study of the intricate problems raised by telecasts of congressional proceedings.

Walter Lippmann strayed from global conundrums long enough to recommend that telecasts of congressional hearings be prohibited until a policy on the subject can be defined.

What worried all three of these distinguished commentators was that somehow the dignity of congressional procedures and the rights of witnesses were jeopardized by television. That is rather fuzzy thinking, coming from such usually sensible minds.

Visualize a telecast session of a congressional committee at which an intemperate interrogator makes an accusatory and unanswerable statement against a witness. It is true that this would be an offense against the dignity of the proceedings and the witness' rights. But we wish to point out that television would only report the offense. It would not commit it.

Indeed, TV would report the incident more accurately than any other news instrument or agent in the room.

The newspaper reporter writes his version of the offense. His story is edited by a copy reader and may be further altered by an editor operating under a policy that either favors or opposes the parties involved. A headline is written, intended not only to summarize the story but also to do its bit in avoiding a decline in the newspaper's sales.

The chances for error, exaggeration, or distortion in the newspaper system of covering news are appalling and constitute an omnipresent problem for the conscientious newspaperman.

What similar chances are run by television? None.

Television is essentially an electronic transmission of a news event as it happens. The system is virtually incapable of error or distortion.

Now what Judge Leibowitz and Senator Wiley, and Mr. Lippmann are really talking about, it seems to us, is that they fear a danger in exposing congressional proceedings to public observation. That is to say, exposing them just as they happen, without editing, without interpretation or—more to the point—protection of any kind.

In one way or another all three of them have participated in, and certainly observed, many congressional sessions. It may be that because of their first-hand experience in these matters their fears are not without ground.

It is conceivable that the political fortunes of some Members of the Congress would not be enhanced if their behavior were projected, undisguised and unvarnished, directly to the citizens. Indeed it is quite possible that the regular and comprehensive telecasting of proceedings would exert a profound change in the personnel and deportment of the Congress.

Such a change would be forced because television, being totally unbiased, shows up a man exactly as he is, whether a phony, a bumbler, or a sensible statesman.

Since Messrs. Leibowitz, Wiley, and Lippmann are learned men and conspicuous champions of democratic government, it is difficult to understand how all of them have fallen into inconsistency in commenting on the subject of congressional television. If any one of them were individually refused admission to a public hearing of Congress or any of its committees, we are sure his protests would be heard from coast to coast.

How possibly, then, can they object to the admission of a larger audience? What the Congress can do in the presence of Messrs. Leibowitz, Wiley, and Lippmann it should not hide from the other citizens of the United States.

The question of television's place in the family of newsgathering media is destined to be argued in the courts and in the Congress. We fervently hope that its place will be defined for what it is—the most impeccable reporter ever to witness and report a news story—and that it will be given free access to all those occasions that the electorate is guaranteed a right to scrutinize under our parliamentary democracy.

The President Rose in Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "With Time Comes Reason," which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of April 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH TIME COMES REASON

A week has elapsed and sober thinking is returning since President Truman released a bomb-burst over the head of General MacArthur.

It has been interesting to watch the gradual descent back to earth of sane Americans who in the heat of the moment popped off into an indignant emotional spree.

Highly significant has been the quieter tone lately adopted by antiadministration newspapers whose first reaction was a barrage of bombast, ballots, and abuse against the President and Commander in Chief of all the Armed Forces.

But with their reasoning returned they now are counseling the people, and the politicians, to restrain themselves, to think this thing through, and above all, not to crucify President Truman.

These pleas for reason are being made through the editorial columns of newspapers where blood pressures ran high and thinking was distorted at first encounter with the news.

While toning down their attacks on this score, however, they have not lifted their guns from Mr. Truman entirely and he still is the recipient of blame for all phases of Government action, even the target of those who seek political favor in city halls.

Frothing outcries of "impeachment" which arose from headline-conscious politicians also have faded to whispers. All the cries, of course, came from Mr. Truman's Republican foes who thought that here was the supreme chance to loosen the axe.

But after realizing what they charged could in no way be supported, and after hearing wiser counsel, they have preferred to forget what they first demanded so vociferously.

The newest charge is "appeasement" of Red China and Soviet Russia and that Mr. Truman has manufactured a new Munich. Mr. Truman is to blame solely, they scream.

It is inconceivable that President Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, General Marshall, and General Bradley would seek to appease any person or any nation for the benefit of communism. The American people know this. Yet when President Truman is charged solely it is inescapable that the same thing is leveled at Acheson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The case in point is that Mr. Truman, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the State Department, acting with the United Nations, had laid down a policy which General MacArthur was to follow. He disagreed and abrogated that policy, sincere in the belief that he was right and that Mr. Truman and his advisers were wrong.

It was then that Mr. Truman chose to exercise his civilian authority over all the Armed Forces and fired the general. The Constitution gives him that authority.

After General MacArthur concludes his triumphal return, one which we think he richly deserves, it is certainly within his rights to tell Congress and the American people what he believes and what he has so strongly advocated. The President was among the first to acknowledge that this is right.

We believe that General MacArthur will say plenty, so much in fact that many prominent Republicans who have geared themselves for a try for the Presidency in 1952 will find their own chances in jeopardy.

Then we will see the usual carping and backfilling of those who have whipped up a bandwagon of steam for a great American soldier-statesman. His present adulators, we predict, will be the first to desert him if they find their personal ambitions are about to be thwarted.

Only events ahead in these historic months will prove or disprove President Truman's stanch adherence to the course that has been set in world affairs, a course that General MacArthur could not follow.

But we believe that, whatever the outcome, history will record that President Truman acted with tremendous courage in firing General MacArthur and that whatever the opinion of him held by the people he rose a great step in personal stature.

Stephen Brunauer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on article under the headline "Under the Navy's procedures," disclosing information with reference to the case of Stephen Brunauer and the inquiry into his loyalty. The article appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal on April 16, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER THE NAVY'S PROCEDURES

Just for the record:

One year ago Senator McCARTHY read off the names of Stephan Brunauer, explosives researcher for the United States Navy, and his wife, Esther, in connection with his charges of subversive influences in Government.

For which Senator McCARTHY was promptly and thenceforward called 17 kinds of a nasty name.

On Tuesday, the United States State Department announced the suspension of Stephan Brunauer "under Navy Department loyalty and security procedures." Esther also was suspended from her post on the Navy's United Nations relations staff pending further action on her husband.

Ex-Senator Tydings' further comment is respectfully solicited.

Home Rule for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a collection of editorials from Alaska newspapers endorsing my proposal that Alaska be given at this time the right to elect its own governor, rather than statehood. Through some oversight one of the editorials I intended to insert, from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, of Fairbanks, Alaska, did not appear with the others. I therefore now ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on this point entitled "First Things First."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST THINGS FIRST

The stage is set in Washington for the introduction into the Eighty-second Congress of legislation to grant Alaskans the right to elect their own governor.

This is a right already enjoyed by all other Americans and by the people of Puerto Rico—it is a right that has been long in coming to Alaskans and one which is needed now as never before.

Never in her 83 years under the American flag has Alaska so required the wise and understanding leadership of a governor whose primary interest is exercising the will of Alaskans in the administration of Territorial affairs. In the years ahead the Territory will be faced with difficult decisions and knotty problems, and the solution of these problems come only through the expressed will of the people if Alaskans are to take their rightful place as full-fledged members of the American Republic.

It is unthinkable that the Territory and its people should be deemed incapable of producing and electing their own state executive, thereby making a first and wholly

logical step toward mastery of their own governmental affairs.

No valid arguments have yet been presented by opponents of this move, but a number of flimsy smoke screens have been set up to becloud the issue.

Principal opponent of legislation providing for the election of the Governor of Alaska is, strangely enough, a man who is himself elected by the people.

Delegate E. L. BARTLETT has refused to endorse or lend his support to the proposed legislation, taking the stand that he will settle for nothing short of statehood. BARTLETT's affection for federally appointed Ernest Gruening has long been known, but it has never been suspected that this friendship runs so deep as to blind BARTLETT to the desires of the people he represents.

Ernest Gruening would naturally find a gubernatorial election extremely distasteful, and he can be counted upon to exercise all of the power and influence of his political machine to defeat the bill which would bring to an end his Juneau gravy train. Gruening is no doubt very aware of the fact that if his name ever appeared on a ballot he would be laughed out of the Territory by the citizens over whom he has ridden roughshod during his tenure of federally appointed office.

BARTLETT's action in refusing to support legislation permitting Alaskans the right to rid themselves once and for all of this man is totally unexplainable even to those who voted him into the office of Delegate.

His sole defense for his action is based on his statement:

"I regret that I cannot agree with you that Alaska is only entitled to an elective Governor. * * * I stand for an elective Governor plus many other things. Some of those changes would be far, far more important than the privilege of electing our own Governor."

In other words, having placed the cart before the horse by urging statehood before we have proven we can govern ourselves, BARTLETT refused to permit the horse to be returned to its rightful place. Like a petulant child tutored only to sing one tune, he cries: "I want statehood immediately or nothing at all."

The plain fact of the matter is that the bill to elect our governor would in no way hinder or retard the Senate action on statehood. Even the most ardent proponents of statehood now agree that there would be a lapse of years between the time the enabling bill is passed by Congress and the time actual statehood is achieved.

This lapse would be due to the necessity of electing delegates to a constitutional convention who would draft a State constitution, after which this constitution would have to be approved or amended by the Congress of the United States.

Alaskans agree that the major need for statehood lies in the desire of the Territory to be freed from the bureaucratic system of Federal controls by which Alaskan development is now hamstrung. And in the drafting of both the Statehood Enabling Act and the State constitution special care must be given to see that this primary aim is accomplished, for without a complete divorcement from present Federal controls statehood would be an empty achievement indeed.

In view of this, does it not seem illogical that the drafting of the Statehood Enabling Act and of the State constitution should be carried out under the direction and supervision of a Federally appointed governor? Where is the guaranty or safeguard against perpetuation of the Federal bureaucracy?

Does it not seem more logical and more in the best interests of the Territory that this work be completed under a man elected by the citizens of Alaska—a man who Alaskans know will carry out their expressed desires and wishes?

Alaskans should now—this year—begin laying the solid groundwork of self-government that will lead to statehood by proving themselves capable of maintaining their own house in good order. They must not be misled by job-conscious politicians who attempt to confuse the issue so as to remain securely in office.

The first move in achieving self-government is to urge Congress to pass immediately the bill granting us the right to elect an Alaskan governor.

Senator McCarthy and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Jumping Joe' in Action," published in the Spring Valley (Wis.) Sun of April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"JUMPING JOE" IN ACTION

Saturday night in the Fort Atkinson city auditorium, Senator JOE MCCARTHY spoke to an audience of 700 skeptics. We were among them.

Attending the Wisconsin Press Association in convention at Milwaukee Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, we had been assured by our friends of the Milwaukee Journal that MCCARTHY would deliver a speech of mild generalities in Fort Atkinson.

"On the Fort Atkinson platform he won't have the protection of his senatorial privilege," they told us. "He won't dare name names."

But the Irishman from Green Bay did name names. He branded as Communists three men currently serving in the State Department, one holding a vital executive post in United Nations.

To our satisfaction, at least, JOE MCCARTHY answered the most frequent of the criticisms directed against him: That he wouldn't say as an unprotected citizen what he says as a protected Senator.

If JOE MCCARTHY dealt in falsehoods Saturday night, he uttered slander against at least five citizens, who can sue him for all he possesses and imprison him for criminal slander.

But he won't be sued, he won't be forced to pay damages, he won't be imprisoned.

Our friends at the Milwaukee Journal and the Madison Cap-Times won't tell you why JOE MCCARTHY won't be sued, but we can tell you. He won't be sued because Saturday night JOE MCCARTHY was exposing a sad situation which exists in high governmental circles, especially in our State Department.

The Milwaukee Journal has a circulation approximately a third of a million. The Sun has a circulation of 2,000. Logically, the Journal should be at least 150 times smarter than we are, and they probably are. But unfortunately the toilers in the editorial vineyards of the mighty Journal and Cap-Times suffer from the same human frailties as us lesser mortals. They love to hear the sound of their own wind whistling past their noses, and they love to choose up sides. To the Journal and the Cap-Times anti-McCarthyism is a fascinating game, pleasing to their ego and pleasing to their circulation departments.

That we can understand. But Saturday night two images kept getting in the way of our understanding of the Journal and Cap-Times motives.

There was the day Dr. E. H. Fast, Spring Valley Legion commander, came into the Sun office to tell us that his brother had been slain in Korea. There was the day more recently when Mom Woodmansee came in to tell us that Jimmy had been killed on the same front.

To Dr. Fast and Mom Woodmansee, McCarthyism and anti-McCarthyism is no game. If it is a game, it's a game in which the chips are all red with American blood.

We supported Bob LaFollette against JOE MCCARTHY. We fought JOE MCCARTHY with all the ammunition we had. But this is no moment for political buffoonery. This is the moment to ask ourselves: Would Dr. Fast's brother and Mom Woodmansee's son have had a better chance to be alive today if the situation JOE MCCARTHY describes didn't exist?

If you forget politics and the sometimes silly political games we mortals play, the answer can scarcely be anything but "Yes."

In the waters bordering Formosa our Seventh Fleet is engaged in the task of keeping the 700,000 soldiers of Chiang from attacking the Communists on the mainland, so that the Communists on the mainland may freely attack and kill Americans on Korea.

What do the Journal and the Cap-Times say about this? That there is grave danger that the hungry hordes of Chiang would desert and move over to the Communist ranks once they were turned loose.

Yet in the same issue of the Journal in which this plausible explanation is advanced, we read that American citizens have been sentenced to death and long imprisonment for revealing atom-bomb secrets. If the situation were reversed, if Chiang were seeking aid from us, he could reasonably reject it with equal logic by the evidence of the Journal's own headlines.

The favorite device of dictatorships has been the splitting of their opposition by planting the seeds of distrust. These seeds have fallen upon fertile grounds in our State Department and in the editorial rooms of the Journal and the Cap-Times.

When JOE MCCARTHY had finished Saturday night, there were few skeptics in the jammed auditorium. We were in a position to witness perhaps 400 of the 700 in the audience. Only two remained seated. The rest rose as one person, clapping and cheering. Among them were four able Fort Atkinson industrialists, two competent Fort Atkinson labor leaders, a half dozen loyal Democrats. When the Journal calls these men spineless hacks, the Journal engages in senseless name calling as regrettable as the angry impulse which prompted Senator MCCARTHY to refer to the Journal and the Cap-Times as the "Wisconsin editions of the Daily Worker."

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Americans All," by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, on the subject of General MacArthur's dismissal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS ALL

(By Daniel A. Poling)

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

Even if the basic arguments for General MacArthur's dismissal are granted—arguments which center in divided authority and the primacy of Washington—this other basic fact stands clear. MacArthur was a civil administrator as well as military. He was the shaper of the democratic destiny of Japan. Almost immediately he would have been at the peace table. His repudiation now brings dismay to all anti-Communist forces in the Far East. It was without discrimination between his two responsibilities. The President not only fired the general, he removed the statesman.

There was a better way than this—infinitely better. Also those responsible were given ample time to discover it. But now we know that it was too much to expect that the State Department would find that way.

The editions carrying the announced forced retirement of Douglas MacArthur also printed on their front pages the news that Britian's Government had formally asked that Red China be invited to sit in on the Japanese peace conference, that the proposed peace terms be submitted to Peiping in advance, and that negotiations proceed looking to the return of Formosa to China. (Britain recognizes Red China.) To all of this the American people will not consent—make no mistake about that. Only the complete reversal of our far-eastern policy can now atone for a moral debacle that could very quickly become an irretrievable political and military disaster.

At this writing the administration's decision makes Nehru of India glad; also the British Labor Government; also the Hongkong villifiers of the great general; and Owen Lattimore, with all other supporters of the "agrarian revolution"; and, of course, the Far Eastern Affairs Division of the State Department. Finally, this dismissal confirms and justifies the strategy of Moscow and Red China.

Throughout the postwar period Douglas MacArthur, of all administrators in occupied areas, has had the clearest vision in dealing with Communist Russia. Also he has been the most implacable though courteous foe of Red Moscow's advance toward world revolution. In two recent visits to the Far East, both of which took me to Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and China, and on the second of which I visited Formosa, I found MacArthur to be communism's No. 1 hate. Now they are free of that—or are they?

It is our good fortune that so competent a general as Matthew Ridgway succeeds to the command in Korea. What he has been handed in Tokyo is quite unfair to him. In Tokyo and at the peace table, as well as for the continuing administration of Japan's new democracy, the wisdom and genius of MacArthur were the first imperative.

Now let the people call General MacArthur home—call him home to make his report to Congress, to give his full story so long suppressed. Let the wild talk of impeachment be dismissed as wild. But there should be a complete investigation of the State Department's far eastern policy and program—an investigation reaching back to the infamous white paper and behind it, and finding answers to the questions: Why the "cease-fire"? Why the determined effort to impose a coalition government upon Chiang? Why the 2 years' of delay in releasing General Wedemeyer's report and the continued refusal to release the Korean section of that report? I believe that inevitably this investigation would expose the fallacy of the arguments advanced to justify rejecting Chiang's offer of troops for Korea. The Korean war is not an all-out world war, but it is a major war for us—count the casualties.

In the President's radio address following MacArthur's dismissal, he offered no alternatives to the General's recommendations. And when our United Nations allies acclaim the dismissal as strengthening the hope for a negotiated peace, always the terms they suggest or imply, involve paying blackmail to Red China.

Douglas MacArthur states and believes that he has followed his directives, been punctilious in keeping his place, and that he has violated no military amenities. Conscious of his dual relationship, for which he was not responsible, he has made an utmost endeavor to be at once a good soldier and a wise administrator of civilian affairs.

It was not without significance that while every Secretary of State since 1945, when the General was given supreme command in the Far East, has made repeated trips to Europe, not one—Byrnes, Marshall, nor Acheson—went to see him. They went to London and Paris, Moscow and Berlin, but they never went to Tokyo. Their failure to travel west was something more than a vote of confidence in MacArthur. This State Department indifference, this lack of knowledge, this failure to include the General and those associated with his convictions in the shaping of high policy, have contributed to a program is Asia almost completely the opposite of the program in Europe.

In the Far East freedom and democracy go forward as with hands manacled and hopping on one leg. But we have faith to believe that they go forward.

As for Douglas MacArthur, again he has fought to win a war as quickly as possible, saving as many lives as possible, and he has not fought in vain. Perhaps he has just begun to fight.

Patience Worn Thin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Patience Worn Thin," which appeared in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATIENCE WORN THIN

Just how far is the President of the United States supposed to go to preen the fine plumage or polish the brass of temperamental military genius?

Now that General MacArthur has been dismissed for what amounts to insubordination, there is such a hue and cry from Republican MacArthur worshipers that you'd think a saint had been insulted.

Don't you remember when the President felt it was necessary to sit down and talk with MacArthur? Did President Truman order him to Washington for a conference? Of course not. Instead, President Truman bent over backward to make it look good for MacArthur. The President agreed to meet MacArthur on a Pacific island.

It was pointed out that MacArthur couldn't be spared from his duties long enough to permit him to go all the way to Washington. Thus it was that President Truman journeyed to Wake Island, met and conferred with MacArthur there. They parted after their conference with the general going back to Tokyo and President Truman returning to Washington.

After that conference President Truman was at pains to express confidence in General MacArthur and his conduct of the Korean war. But it seems clear now that the conference was an attempt to get MacArthur to play ball with United Nations policies instead of trying to direct things himself. Nobody wanted to embarrass the great MacArthur. But we know now that the general was determined to sing the prima donna role. He refused to sing in the chorus as he was ordered.

All along MacArthur has been mollified and coddled because he was temperamental and prone to spectacular actions and startling pronouncements. Some of his acts and statements smacked so much of melodrama that we couldn't help feel that there was a stage manager in the wings. Most likely it was MacArthur himself who pulled the strings to keep the name of the general in the headlines.

No, there most certainly has been no persecution of a great man. Instead there was remarkable patience with a man who became particularly obstreperous whenever a reporter took out his pencil or when the photographers' flash bulbs began to pop.

The idea of permitting a discharged military man to appear before Congress to tell his side of the story is absurd. If you fail to obey orders in your job, you will get fired, too. Will you then clamor for a public meeting at the courthouse to tell the public why you think your boss was wrong?

General MacArthur finally overreached himself in his prima donna pose. He had been petted and pampered so long that he thought it would always be so. But President Truman's patience must have worn extremely thin long before he took action. It was necessary to put an end to pampering and that's what Truman did.

Proposed Assistance for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine speech on the subject of aid to Israel, delivered by our colleague, the distinguished Junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] before the members of the Temple Beth Israel at West Hartford, Conn., on Monday, April 16.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Among the many engagements I have made in a crowded schedule for this one week in Connecticut, I take particular pleasure in this meeting with you. One reason is that it gives me a welcome opportunity to pay simple tribute to one of your members. I have come to know and respect him for his service in Congress, his integrity, his insight on public questions. Certainly it is one

of the happier phases of my service in the Senate to be associated with a man of his capacity. I refer, of course, to your distinguished member, and one of the most distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, ABE RIBICOFF.

Further, I was very glad this evening to talk to you briefly about some aspects of our foreign policy, particularly in relation to the grant-in-aid for the State of Israel which I have joined in sponsoring in the Congress. This project, within the area of our foreign policy, is especially related to my own past experience and my present interest in non-military programs in aid of our foreign policy objectives. In the early 1940's when I served as consultant to Mr. Nelson Rockefeller in the Office of Inter-American Affairs, his brilliant leadership worked out a pattern of economic and technical assistance which was the forerunner—the grandfather as it were—of the present Point Four program. Later, in my capacity as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs in the two years immediately following the close of World War II, I worked at close range with those other non-military aspects of foreign policy, diplomacy, and economic and foreign information policies in all their varied forms.

In setting up this distinction between military and non-military aspects of foreign policy, we must be on guard against the distortions and unjustified criticisms of these nonmilitary programs by some of their opponents in Congress, and by some of our critics abroad—on either side of the iron curtain. In no circumstances do I assert, nor have we built these programs on the assumption, that polemics about the American way will stop military force. Further, let us beware of the fallacy at the other extreme—that the need for military force in appropriate instances shows that nonmilitary programs are a waste of the taxpayer's money.

Once aggression has taken the form of military force, it can only be repelled with effective forces of defense. That is the meaning of UN action in Korea. Further, where military force is ominously threatened, we must employ military assistance to forestall its use. That is the meaning of our Greek-Turkish program, and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which we are now implementing.

On the other hand, it is ultimate suicide to place our faith in those who want us to rely on military assistance alone. We must help our friends throughout the world to build economic stores, for defense against military aggression as well as against economic and political subversion. We must take the lead in helping to develop and improve the economic life in those many areas of the world where economic or political backwardness provide the prime breeding places of communism. Here we have the prime points of weakness in the free world around the Soviet perimeter. As Nelson Rockefeller reported recently in his brilliant report, "To do nothing is to invite despair; to act is to hope." The gains of ECA in rolling back communism in Europe show that this hope is tangible and realizable.

In the area of information policy, no informed observer will question the urgency of the great campaign of truth I have long advocated—to combat the falsehoods of Communist propaganda about the motives behind our economic assistance, our diplomacy, and our military aid. But beyond that wholly defensive effort, we must fortify the spirit and the will to resist. Without this spirit, weapons would be useless. What good is a machine gun in the hands of a man who doesn't want to pull the trigger? Further, we must marshal the great leadership and influence of America in the modern world, in advancing the goals of human rights and free institutions, wherever and whenever we can. A brilliant plan along these lines is the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution of which I am proud to be a sponsor, to get the truth to the Russian people themselves.

All of these objectives and goals and programs are included in this vitally important area which I am calling the non-military aspect of foreign policy.

All these major objectives in American foreign policy would be substantially advanced by enactment of the legislation authorizing a grant-in-aid of one hundred fifty million dollars for the State of Israel. This legislation is in response to the request which has formally been submitted to the State Department by the government of that country. Senators McMAHON, DOUGLAS, and TAFT, and many other Senators of both parties, about thirty-five in all, have joined in sponsorship of this important measure. In the House of Representatives, sponsorship has been equally widespread and nonpartisan.

This bill in my judgment is in line with the long-standing policy of the United States, and especially of the Truman Administration, to help establish a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, or rather, to help re-establish on this sacred soil the commonwealth which flourished there in ancient times and for which the Jewish people throughout the ages have never ceased to aspire, to work, to pray, and to die. All of us here tonight can take great pride in the fact that the United States exerted strong leadership in the United Nations to give legal as well as moral sanction to the State of Israel.

My good friend, Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York Times, has summed up our profound interest in the new State in these terms:

"There are not one but three Israels—the land of the past, the land of the present, and the land of the future—and to the free world—the story of Israel is a vital and intimate part of the story of mankind."

The Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, has spoken of its future in terms which are indeed prophetic:

"I do not think of Jews as being the chosen people. But we have a dream—to build a civilization in (Israel) knowing that this country occupies a special place in world history, which will be free of the evils of our time. It must be a civilization based on the teachings of our prophets and on the strength of modern science. When I say prophets, I mean the ethics of their teachings; when I say science, I mean the material means to make this country a model for the entire Middle East."

These high goals should have a special reality and vividness for all the people of the United States because in many significant ways the birth and development of this small country of Israel so closely resemble our own. Its people are now moved by the same pioneer spirit as we were. It is the scene of a great migration movement which reminds us to the influx into the United States within the last century. It was born in a revolutionary war which recalls our own. Indeed, history may someday record that the emancipation of Israel's people meant as much for the independence and liberation of the Middle East as 1776 meant to this Hemisphere. Yes, this little country of Israel fashions its daily life and its institutions in the image of western democracy. It respects human personality. It defends the right of its people to be free. It encourages private initiative—Fortune magazine has praised Israel's foreign investment law as a model for other countries. While it vigilantly guards the freedoms of its citizens, it mobilizes its economy to raise the living standards of all.

Here is a laboratory for the democratic way of life in the Near East. Here is a pilot plant in an area of the world potentially as sensitive and dangerous as any other anywhere. Here in Israel, within the framework of democratic institutions—businessmen and workers, industry and labor, working together in devotion to the common welfare. Here, as in America, is demonstration to the world that a democratic system which fosters free enterprise and simultaneously stimulates cooperative effort can make tremendous strides for the welfare of all.

The great migration movement is at once the most remarkable feature of the new state and the source of its present economic embarrassment. Those who worked for the creation of the state of Israel—and there are many among you who took the lead—told the free people of the world, they told the Congress, they told the United Nations, they told the people of the United States—that the state if established would provide a sanctuary for all who wanted to go there—that the doors would not only be thrown open but that they would stay open. Now I do not think that many of you ever anticipated that in less than three years the DP camps of Europe would be emptied of all Jews; that Israel's population would be increased by almost six hundred thousand men, women, and children—a seventy-five percent increase in three years. Such a voluntary mass influx has no parallel in recorded history. The United States never in any single year increased its population by more than three percent. By the end of 1954 the State of Israel will have increased its population by two hundred percent. The anticipated increase within the next three years alone would be equivalent to an immigration of seventy million people to the United States. This immigration has been called not a melting pot, but a pressure cooker.

This movement is further remarkable for a great and unique reason; the criterion of admission has not been the welfare of the existing community, but rather the overriding necessity of those who entered. Moreover, the ever deepening crisis in international affairs serves to increase the scale and urgency of this immigration.

I need not tell you here tonight about the significance of this human tide. Too many of you have been closer to the problem than I have. But let me mention the aspects which have impressed me most strongly. This is the emphasis on the welfare of children. Special programs for the movement of orphaned children have been developed with the utmost care and love and effectiveness. They are now pouring into the country at the rate of about one thousand a month, and they come, mind you, from sixty-two different countries, with all the problems and the needs that that single fact implies. As the parents of three orphan children—three of Mrs. Benton's and my children are adopted children—you will understand the strong emotional appeal which this great program has for us.

Receiving and expanding and aiding this great human stream is a remarkable economy geared to long-range economic goals as well as to the urgent problems of immediate rapid growth. Among the many achievements are the growth of thousands of small manufacturers and other independent businesses, in a great variety of fields looking to the self-sufficiency of the country in the not-too-distant future. In a single issue of a monthly publication of the Jewish Agency for Palestine which crosses my desk, entitled "Economic Horizons," I have read in concrete terms the story of new rubber tire factories, of chemical plants, of nonferrous industries, of manufacturers of shoes and clothing, of hotels, shipping, dairy cattle, handicrafts, of new pipelines and agricultural settlements, of new forests and new fisheries. American capital has been the major stimulation of these new and vital horizons in free enterprise in the Middle East—the General

Tire & Rubber Co., the Ford Motor Co., Kaiser-Frazer, and many others. Think a moment of this amazing fact: Investment in new enterprises in Israel was equivalent to more than twenty-five percent of the national income in 1949 and more than thirty percent of the national income in 1950.

The population of Israel itself has tightened its belt to a degree not known in our country—or in Great Britain even in wartime. The United Jewish Appeal has contributed astonishingly more than a total of more than two hundred thirty million dollars from individual Americans between 1948 and 1950. The United States has granted loans through the Export-Import Bank, at interest, to help finance this great capital expansion upon which the future of Israel depends. Yet the need for hard currency continues at high and emergency levels. In order to bridge the gap until the expanded economy of the country can come into balance with the consumer needs of this growing population, Israel will continue to require great economic help from the outside. Otherwise, it cannot maintain its economic gains and fulfill our hopes. The grant which is provided by the legislation now pending in Congress will greatly help in bridging this dollar gap.

Since World War II the United States Government has helped to restore many countries impoverished by the conflict. Its program of assistance has been threefold. It began with direct relief to people in need (UNRRA). Secondly, we went on to stabilize their economies and thus strengthen the democratic institutions of their governments. Finally, we are now assisting them to erect their military defenses.

This three-prong policy has braced the free world. Nations menaced by subversion have been enabled to maintain their freedom. Nations threatened by aggression have been encouraged to buttress their defense and to affirm their determination to resist attack. New vitality has been given to the great concepts of liberty and human rights.

President Truman's chief messages to Congress this year have stressed the importance of continuing now our foreign-aid programs. Military aid predominates in Europe, economic aid in the Near and Far East. President Truman has put it well: "Economic stagnation is the advance guard of Soviet conquest—economic development is the spearhead of freedom." By far the greater part of our foreign aid in recent years has been in the form of grants; in 1950, grants represented ninety-two percent of the total, to countries all around the world. The presently proposed legislation will include Israel.

The Point Four assistance which Israel has thus far received—in the amount of only one hundred thousand dollars—has been devoted entirely to technical assistance. Fortunately this has not been devoted to such areas as elementary sanitation or education, important as these are, but rather advanced techniques in industry and agriculture to the techniques directed to the special problem of this semi-arid country. The newly proposed grants of one hundred fifty million dollars would be a specialized form of Point Four assistance, in the highest and best sense of that program.

Mr. Sidney Sherwood, Secretary of the Export-Import Bank, has publicly paid tribute to the economical and effective use made by Israel of the loans advanced through that agency. With the safeguards written into the proposed legislation, and with the degree of private investment which Israel is achieving, there can be no question of the effectiveness of the grant to accomplish major objectives of the Point Four program; to help other people to help themselves, to develop the means of production and of livelihood, to advance the goals of freemen everywhere.

Israel has already returned compensating benefits to us by its refugee-resettlement program which has vastly reduced the burden of displaced-persons camps on international relief agencies and upon the United States Treasury. The grant now proposed is a substantial investment in progress which will bring far greater dividends per dollar than anything we could spend on the displaced-persons camps. We should consider ourselves well rewarded if, in this critical area of the world, on the bridgehead of three continents, close to the dividing line of east and west, we help to erect a sturdy democratic nation, dedicated to the defense of freedom, determined to resist aggression, pledged to stand firmly in the front ranks of the free world.

Five Years of CARE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of March 11, 1951:

FIVE YEARS OF CARE

It was just 5 years ago that CARE, the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, dispatched its first relief shipment, and since that time an estimated 10,000,000 parcels have been distributed by the agency. Of them, Germany, Austria, Great Britain, France, and Italy have received the greatest share.

Paul Comly French, the executive director, points out that when CARE was organized late in 1945, its program was simple. The agency, established by several large relief and welfare groups, had acquired a stock of surplus Army rations. They could be bought by individuals in this country and CARE arranged the shipping and guaranteed delivery to specified friends or relatives overseas.

Today there are more than 20 different packages from which a donor in this country may choose. While most of them consist of food selected to meet the diet preferences or shortages in various countries, there also are clothing and textile parcels. The program even has been broadened so that packages may be sent to unspecified individuals or institutions. This general relief aspect of the program has enabled CARE to send books and plows as well as food in wholesale quantities.

While the agency has retained its original name, its activities have shifted more and more to the East. It has been shipping supplies to Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, the Philippines, Okinawa, Korea, and Japan. Of the packages shipped last year, 490,000 went to Germany, 106,000 to Great Britain, 56,000 to Israel, 43,000 to Austria, 37,000 to France, 32,000 to Japan, and much smaller numbers to other countries.

Food made up about 85 percent of the 1950 parcels. It is expected that the total number of packages shipped this year will exceed the 1950 total because of new food needs in many areas. Prices range from $4 to $18.25, although the standard food package still is $10. Everyone who has sent CARE packages to needy persons abroad is well aware of the gratitude expressed by the recipients. Many beneficiaries have written long letters in appreciation of the gifts.

It is good to note that CARE is functioning today as faithfully as when first it was established. It has achieved a great deal, too, in acquainting Americans with persons in other countries and in cementing friendships among them.

Profiteering and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, labor organizations, joined together in a mutual purpose, have constantly pointed out the profiteering practices of a number of America's largest industries and called for the Government to stop profiteering. In an article published in the American Federationist, Mr. Boris Shishkin, the American Federation of Labor's nationally recognized economist, protests that "while the Korean crisis was testing the mettle of all Americans in their ability to respond to the great threat to us and to all the free world, quite a lot of corporate enterprises were kindling the fires of inflation at home."

Mr. Shishkin's article follows:

PROFITEERING AND INFLATION

(By Boris Shishkin, economist, American Federation of Labor

Inflation is a menace to everyone. When prices are rising, the dollar buys less. The worker receiving the same number of dollars takes a wage cut. His real wages decline. When a manufacturer earns the same profit, but the dollar buys less, his company's real earnings go down.

To stop inflation is everybody's business. On the stable value of the dollar depends the future worth of our savings, pensions, and insurance policies. Much more depends on it: the future stability and growth of our country; even the future of the free world.

If inflation is to be stopped, sacrifices are inevitable. But inflation controls will not work unless the anti-inflation program is even-handed. No group of people will be willing to give up things they need and want when they see others enriching themselves at the same time.

Workers who work for wages are willing to make their full contribution toward inflation control. But in doing so they want to be sure that the goods and services they produce do not become the source of enrichment, at their expense, to business in which they are employed.

How has the average worker in manufacturing fared during the past year? Between January 1950 and February 1951, average earnings, without overtime, of manufacturing workers increased 9.1 percent. But during the same period the cost of living, as measured by the consumers' price index, went up 9.3 percent. So, actually, the real wage of the manufacturing workers went down during this time. Workers in retail trade fared even worse and in a service trade, such as the laundry industry, the workers had a cut of nearly 4 percent in their real wages.

No one can claim that the explosive inflationary spurt which took place after the Communist invasion of South Korea, driving the cost of living up 6 percent in 6 months, was due to any cause other than shameless, speculative profiteering. Surely it was not

due to an unbalanced Government budget; for once our Federal budget was balanced. Even Government spending was quite a bit less in 1950 than it was in 1949. And certainly it was not due to rising wages.

Our country's national income in 1950 rose 10.8 percent above 1949. And compensation received by all employees in America in 1950 was also 10.8 percent above 1949. But remember that in 1950 more people were employed—this accounts for a good part of the increase—and that those employed worked longer hours than in 1949. So that there was no disproportionate increase in wages.

The favorite myth of the antilabor propagandists—that higher pay of workers enables them to splurge on thick steaks and finery, bringing on higher prices—is completely exploded by the fact that between 1949 and 1950 personal consumption expenditures increased less than the national income.

Now look what happened to commodity prices during 1950. Wholesale prices of nonferrous metals went up more than 40 percent; lumber up 20 percent; livestock up 24 percent.

The real riot of speculation and profiteering—profiteering out of national emergency—followed the Communist invasion of South Korea. In 6 months, July to December 1950, the average American was taken to the cleaners by the get-rich-quick boys. He got fleeced both as a consumer and as a taxpayer who in the end must meet the jacked-up cost of defense.

In the last 6 months of 1950 wholesale prices of fats and oils jumped 61.7 percent. Hides and skins up 36 percent. Cotton goods up more than 35 percent. Woolen goods up 33 percent. Tires and tubes 23 percent. Paper and pulp up 22 percent. And so on. For the American people this was pretty bad business. But many of our businessmen evidently thought that making a quick profit was good business and the public be damned. So wherever they could they tried to buy cheap and sell dear.

Corporate profits in 1950 were 45.6 percent above 1949. In the fourth quarter of 1950 they were 74 percent above the fourth quarter of 1949. Even after taxes 1950 profits were 32 percent above 1949, and in the fourth quarter they were 58 percent above the same period in the previous year.

Take Montgomery Ward & Co. In 1949 their net profit was $18,000,000. In 1950 it was $74,000,000, a gain of 55 percent. Did they sell more goods? Well, their dollar sales increased 8 percent but, since prices were up, they evidently sold less goods for lots more money.

While the Korean crisis was testing the mettle of all Americans in their ability to respond to the great threat to us and to all the free world, quite a lot of corporate enterprises were kindling the fires of inflation at home. And they cannot blame it all on some foreign villains for jacking up the prices of raw materials we get from overseas.

Look at the facts—make a simple comparison of net profits of our corporations in 1949 and 1950. Do clothes cost you more than a year ago? Well, according to the Wall Street Journal, the net earnings of 24 textile companies went up 56 percent. Rubber? Profits of 12 rubber corporations went up 90 percent. Paper? Twenty-one pulp and paper corporations increased their profits 63 percent.

Twenty-three electrical and radio companies increased profits 42 percent. Twenty-five chemical companies raised profits 40 percent. Twenty-eight iron and steel companies earned 48 percent more in profits, and 14 mining and metals corporations earned almost 96 percent more in 1950 than they did in 1949.

These are some of the facts that the Director of Defense Mobilization seems to have missed in his report to the President on April 1. Indeed, Congress and the Government economic stabilizers have been missing such facts all along.

For example, on March 1 the Office of Price Stabilization gave a 3½-percent price increase on automobiles. Did this constitute relief to impoverished and hard-pressed auto manufacturers? Well, on March 5 the General Motors Corp. announced that in 1950 its $834,000,000 profit was 27 percent higher than in 1949, breaking all-time records.

The first step to get the American people behind the anti-inflation drive is to stop profiteering. Labor asks that an even-handed program of just economic stabilization be put into effect before we have to resort to a parade of bigger criminals than have yet been seen on television.

St. Lawrence Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Portland (Maine) Express in the edition of January 31, 1951, asks the following pointed question: "Of what use to our national-defense efforts would a frozen ship canal be?" In his editorial which follows he discusses the question more fully:

ST. LAWRENCE FOLLY

Well, of all things.

The Fair Dealers, casting about for ways to spend money faster and faster, have dusted off the old St. Lawrence River canal and waterpower scheme as a likely prospect. They sure could squirt a good many billions of tax dollars into that rathole—if the taxpayers' Representatives in Congress would just, please, give them the nod.

Anyway, the administration now is getting set to give this old chestnut another big boost. It has had the foresight, moreover, to sell its waterway arguments to certain nominal Republicans. Among these we find Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY and New Hampshire's liberal Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY.

WILEY says it would be "an absolute sin" not to squander our money, right away, deepening the St. Lawrence waterway to permit large ocean-going ships to enter the Great Lakes (small ocean steamers can and do go inland to Cleveland and Detroit now, through the existing canal system.)

And TOBEY, sounding for all the world like any typical Fair Dealer, would have us believe that "our long-term national defense, the economic growth of our good Canadian friends" (who, by the way, have all but put our port of Portland out of business and who have certainly taken no pains to heighten the living standards of Maine coast fishermen and lobstermen, with whom they compete) "the future of heavy industry and commerce of our own great Midwest, the electric-power hunger of our industries and consumers in New England and New York, are all tied up in the success of the St. Lawrence seaway."

No kidding!

What the Senator means, presumably, is that if the present St. Lawrence River canals were widened and deepened to permit the passage of larger steamers that can now navigate above Montreal, big ore-carrying ships could travel from Labrador to Buffalo and Cleveland and Lorain—and that would, undeniably, be important from the national defense viewpoint.

There is just one flaw in this pleasant picture of a steady stream of ocean-going ships linking Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and the other Great Lakes ports with the Seven Seas.

Still, it is a big flaw: Ice.

As Senator TOBEY probably knows, the Canadian cities of Quebec and Montreal, on the St. Lawrence River, are important seaports during 7 out of every 12 months. But during the five winter months, they are as much inland cities, and as completely cut off from the sea, as are Winnipeg or Kansas City. They are cut off from the sea by ice which no steamship can negotiate.

The ice which locks the St. Lawrence from shore to shore all winter would also, just as certainly, lock tight the system of ship canals which Senator TOBEY and his Fair Deal playmates want to build—largely to promote "the economic growth of our good Canadian friends"—with more dollars withheld from the pay envelopes of working people in Maine, New Hampshire, and 46 other States.

Of what use, to our National defense effort, would a frozen ship canal be?

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, here is a copy of a letter that I have received in protest against the firing of General MacArthur. This letter was written by the high school students of Downs, Kans. Here is what they said:

APRIL 12, 1951.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We as a group of high-school students wish to express our opinion regarding the ousting of General MacArthur.

In the first place we question your reasons for dismissing General MacArthur as commander of the United Nations forces. We are aware of the fact that you had given the general orders not to express his opinion in regard to foreign policy. But we also have been taught as Americans to take pride in the fact that we have freedom of speech. Does General MacArthur have freedom of speech? We believe that any American regardless of position, is free to express his opinion. It appears to us that you are afraid to have such a respected man as General MacArthur express an opinion that conflicts with yours. We, as American citizens, are intelligent enough to choose from varying foreign policies.

We feel that you, as President of the United States, should be more concerned with representing the people of America rather than being influenced by foreign elements. If communism is the enemy of democracy, then why cannot all forces opposing communism be turned loose to fight it? If we are opposing the Chinese Reds in Korea, why cannot the Chinese Nationalists be permitted to fight the common enemy?

We question your discharging personnel who have proved themselves worthy, when others who have had evidence brought against them proving them unworthy, remain as our public servants.

It is our earnest desire that this letter be received by you as further evidence of the dissatisfaction of the American public with your actions.

Yours sincerely,

(Twenty-six signatures.)

The Question Never Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of April 10, 1951:

THE QUESTION NEVER ANSWERED

Alger Hiss was smoked out about 10 years after Whittaker Chambers told his story to Adolf Berle for transmission to Franklin Roosevelt. When the House Un-American Activities Committee caught up with the Hiss case, the FBI had known about it for 8 years.

In 1946 the late Canadian Premier Mackenzie King made a special trip to Washington to tell President Truman what he had learned of the Russian spy ring in the United States as a result of the Canadian spy inquiry.

In the course of the recent spy trial of the Rosenbergs and Sobell it was disclosed that the FBI had much of the information in the case back in 1947.

THE FBI HAD THE EVIDENCE

The FBI also knew for years that the Amtorg Trading Co. in New York was the clearing house for Russian spies, whence our techniques in the production of chemicals, war materials, electronic devices and the atom bomb were transmitted to Moscow.

Why was action put off for so long in these and other such matters?

The Hiss case never would have come to trial if the Un-American Activities Committee had not been diligent. Other cases might not have been subject to official action to this day if the arrest of Klaus Fuchs in Britain early last year had not forced the hand of the American administration—for the Fuchs confession spotlighted espionage in the United States so clearly that action could no longer be withheld.

More than a year after Mr. Mackenzie King talked to him, President Truman told the press (on August 19, 1948,) he believed that no war secrets had gotten out of this country. (We shall let the reader off with only this one reference to "red herring," an epithet which Mr. Truman has employed several times since 1948.)

But again the question, why was nothing done when it could have been done, when action on information available might have saved some of our secrets and alerted the Nation for the future?

NOTHING WAS DONE

Nobody outside the Government knows exactly, but it is certain that somewhere in its executive branch some person or group of persons of great influence has kept the bloodhounds leashed. Here is some testimony which hints at where to look for this person or persons:

Larry E. Kerley is an ex-FBI man who once pursued a Russian spy called Arthur Adams. When he had made his case against this man he was ordered to let the spy leave the country unmolested. The order, Kerley said, came through the State Department, whereupon he resigned from the FBI in protest of what he believed was a betrayal of his country. That was in October, 1945.

Kerley was called to testify before Senator PAT MCCARRAN's Judiciary Subcommittee investigating subversive aliens in September of 1949. He said:

"Russia's espionage activities in this country continued almost unchecked throughout the entire course of the last war. In accordance with instructions from the State Department * * * the Federal Bureau of Investigation was not even permitted to open an espionage case against any Russian suspect without State Department approval."

Senator O'CONOR asked: "Did you understand that that was to include also American participants?"

"Yes," said Kerley, "because if they were arrested that would disclose the whole apparatus, you see."

Senator O'CONOR asked: "Mr. Kerley, was the information that was gathered in connection with espionage activity to which you have referred forwarded to the State Department or was the State Department made aware of the nature of the disclosures?"

"In all cases," Kerley said, "they were kept closely advised."

FREE HAND FOR RUSSIANS

It should be borne in mind that Kerley quit the FBI just after the war was over. So it could be explained that what he told the committee about was a tactful wartime accommodation—that State Department officials, along with officials of other departments who fawned on our democratic Russian allies, acted on the belief that the brotherhood of battle entitled the Commies to steal everything which was not nailed down—or which we had not already given them under lend-lease.

But that explanation would not be valid for the lack of action in and after 1946, by which time Secretary of State Byrnes had learned in Moscow, right from the "horse's mouth," that Russia was not a friend but a foe, something which "nonliberal" Americans had been convinced of for 25 years.

We know that the American Communists and their Russian friends have been gingerly handled right down to the present. We know that the Government has taken no action against any of them except under pressure. The trial of the 12 Communist Party leaders in New York resulted from the heat generated by congressional investigation and was an attempt to turn this heat off.

These are facts for a citizen to bear in mind whenever he hears a "liberal" disparage the un-American investigating committee or any like congressional group. If we ever are to learn who in the executive branch of the Government protects the Communists, and why, Congress is our only instrument. The fix is still on in the executive branch.

Equal Status in Medical Professions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in this time of national emergency and mobilization, the various health professions are making a vital contribution by maintaining the health of our civilian population as well as those directly engaged in the defense effort.

Because I believe it is pertinent and important to the selective service and the UMT measure, I am placing in the RECORD excerpts from a statement which was directed to the House Armed Services Committee by Mr. George P. Sheridan, director of Legislative Affairs for the International Chiropractors.

The statement by Mr. Sheridan urged the committee to recognize the part the chiropractic profession occupies in the defense effort by specifically granting equal status with other health professions under deferment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Draft Act, Senate 1:

INTERNATIONAL CHIROPRACTORS ASSOCIATION,
Davenport, Iowa, March 5, 1951.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VINSON: Your committee currently has before it for consideration, Senate 1, Universal Military Training and Draft Act.

As adopted by the Senate, this measure would deny to the chiropractic profession equal status with other healing professions under deferment provisions designed to maintain the national health, safety, and interest.

The nation's manpower requirements, both foreign and domestic, will undoubtedly necessitate the service of doctors and students of chiropractic and they patriotically stand ready to provide whatever share is needed.

A very concrete and serious problem is presented, however, as to the policy which the Congress establishes with regard to the drafting of doctors of chiropractic, in order that there will not be indiscriminate calling of doctors without reference to community needs and without proper safeguards to insure maintaining an adequate balance of supply in each area.

This same problem extends to the educational level and the training of students in chiropractic schools and colleges. Action at the local level which does not conform with national policy will disrupt both the curricular and financial structure of these institutions as well as adversely affect the systematic flow of new doctors to supply the requirements of those who depend upon chiropractic.

The situation is especially important in view of the recognized deficiency of practitioners in the healing arts currently required to meet the minimum health needs of the Nation.

The chiropractic profession is the second largest of the healing arts. Comprising approximately 19,000 doctors, it renders health service to 30,000,000 Americans. As such it represents a vital segment of the total manpower available to administer to national health requirements.

A recent survey by the International Chiropractors Association, using the 12-State yardstick formula adopted by the Federal Security Agency as a basis, establishes 1 chiropractor per 4,000 people as the minimum consistent with health needs. This compares with a present ratio of 1 chiropractor per 8,900 persons. The survey found an existing need for more than 18,000 chiropractors to satisfy minimum requirements. Taking into account population increases and attrition from death, retirement, and so forth, 2,840 replacements must be supplied annually by chiropractic colleges.

Actual present enrollment in the seven largest schools, comprising 80 percent of total enrollment, is 2,482, according to a January 1951 survey. Of these students, 5.8 percent are in the age bracket subject to present selective service regulations, and a large percentage of the remainder are subject to call as members of the active reserve. It is estimated that but an approximate 750 students will graduate from chiropractic colleges annually on the basis of the present enrollment in standard 4-year courses.

From this survey the conclusion is inescapable that the civilian health will be endangered and the survival of the chiropractic profession threatened unless adequate provision is made to insure an equitable quota of chiropractic practitioners and students.

The Congress has indicated that it recognizes this problem as applied generally to all the healing arts. We desire to point out, however, that chiropractic has been held as a separate and distinct profession by the courts and by provision of the licensure statutes in most States. Experience demonstrates that unless chiropractic is specifically named it will not be accorded equality of status with other healing arts when provisions of this bill are carried out within the various jurisdictions.

The chiropractic profession asks no special consideration. It does plead for equal treatment with the other healing professions in order that it may continue to fulfill its demonstrated important part in the public health and welfare.

Deferment of a fair proportion of chiropractic personnel will have no appreciable effect on meeting military requirements, whereas failure to do so will deny to an increasing percentage of people the opportunity to obtain adequate health care.

It is respectfully urged, therefore, that your committee amend Senate 1 by specifically including chiropractic by name in the provisions of the act dealing with deferment of individual doctors and students of the healing professions.

Respectfully,

GEORGE P. SHERIDAN,
Director of Legislative Affairs,
International Chiropractors Association.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of Congress have received many letters and telegrams which contain many fine statements over the midnight firing of General MacArthur.

Here is a telegram that I think is most significant both as to the context and to the number of persons signing it.

Glen Elder, Kansas, a fine prosperous little town in North Central Kansas has a population of 580 people.

Yet within a few hours after the MacArthur discharge was heard, 115 voters had put their names on a telegram protesting this degradation of MacArthur.

Here is what the telegram said:

Impeach the red herring from the Presidential chair and clean up our State Department. If we are going to lose our Government to communism do it honorably on the battlefield.

(Signed by 115 persons.)

Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a letter that expresses the feelings of the farmers in many sections in regard to the selective service board membership:

THE PENDULUM SWINGS FROM ONE EXTREME TO THE OTHER

BROSNICK BROS.,
Wabash, Ind., March 19, 1951.

JOHN V. BEAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: You will perhaps be interested in knowing that the county agricultural extension committee of which you are a member met Friday to discuss the selective-service law in its relation to the deferment of local farm boys who are irreplaceable and more particularly to the over-all level of agricultural production of food, feed, and fiber. The discussion was carried on on a high level and was not injected with petty personal grievances. Mr. Ward Vandegrift, the local draft appeal agent was present and discussed the weaknesses of the draft law from the standpoint of the appeal agent.

We are still so close in point of time to World War II that the abuses of the Selective Service System as then administered are not forgotten.

In the first place, too many men without any true agricultural interest, background, and experience left the city to farm and were granted agricultural deferments, thereby escaping the draft. Second, farmers of financial means bought up more land, equipment, and livestock to qualify sons for deferment under the system of points of production units that was set up as a standard or basis for such deferments. Naturally, such abuses were undemocratic and aroused the ire of city people and farmers of less financial means whose sons had to serve in the Army because of failure to qualify for deferment.

So now the pendulum has swung in the other direction, and perhaps too far, so far that, unless the situation is corrected soon, far greater damage will be done to the Nation's security through a reduction of vital foodstuffs than was ever done by the inequalities in World War II.

Three factors are causing many local draft boards to swing to the opposite extreme in administering the Selective Service Act at the present time. First, the pressure of urban public opinion resulting from these aforesaid abuses of the last war period that the farm boy is no better than theirs (in which they are duly justified). Second, the fact that the law does not require that one member of the local board should be a bona fide farmer, and third, that no standard or yardstick was provided for the guidance of the local board in making their deferments. The absence of such a yardstick or standard makes for a very great lack of uniformity of action among the various county boards and leaves entirely too much up to the local boards whose decisions too often seem to be guided by prejudice rather than facts and economic considerations of maintaining our farm production during periods of national crisis. For example, one board member in Wabash County said that the board did not care whether farmers produced any food during the next 4 years or not as there was plenty of surplus on hand. As another example, in a neighboring county, a man who was appointed to the draft board made the statement that he did not really want the job, but that he would like to be on it long enough "to slap some of those d—— farm boys into the Army." And as a further example, taken from the higher level, out of 55 cases that have been cited to the State Appeal Board by our local appeal agent, 54 cases have been flatly denied by a vote of 3 to 0, and the other one by a vote of 2 to 1. Obviously, the intent of selective service becomes null and void and it becomes instead a universal draft.

At this point, we grant further that if there were plenty of manpower in every productive segment of society, industrial, scientific, and agricultural, then the universal draft would be democratic and theoretically desirable. Equality of opportunity in our democracy carries with it equality of responsibility and sacrifice so one man is no better than another, provided he were not irreplaceable.

But such a satisfactory balance and supply of manpower is not available in the scientific and agricultural fields as compared to the industrial for several reasons: First, because of the lure of short hours and high wages paid by industry, labor has been drained off the farm to a dangerously low level. Second—because a very high percentage of farm owners and operators are now past 50 years of age, and so are no longer able to carry on with their usual vigor and vitality, some annual replacements of manpower on the farm are just as necessary and logical as replacements of machinery, fences and soil fertility.

From whence shall these replacements come? The proponents of the universal draft propose drafting all the farm boys and the bringing in of foreign labor such as Mexicans, and Jamaicans to replace them. True, such labor can help in periods of peak labor loads in harvesting seasonal crops such as tomatoes, sweet corn, sugar beets, etc. But they are not fitted either by training, background, or inclination to carry on the many skilled operations necessary to modern farming, such as tractor and equipment operations, feeding livestock, producing butter, eggs, milk and so on.

Now, having stated the existing ills and dangers to our economy in our present minor conflict, and more especially should we get into an all-out global war with Russia whereby we would again be called on to feed our allies as well as ourselves, it is the opinion of this group as well as that of many other straight-thinking farmers that two remedies should be applied at once.

An amendment to the existing bills now pending in Congress that whenever possible a bona fide farmer should be appointed on the draft board, should be made a part of the new law.

Second, an amendment to this same legislation directing or mandating the director of the draft to furnish a reasonable and workable yardstick or standard to local draft boards as a basis for their decisions in hardship cases and that of irreplaceable draftees. Such a standard would secure much greater uniformity as between counties than now exists, where everything is left up to the judgment of the local board.

Third, this standard or yardstick should also be furnished to the State appeal boards for their guidance in appeal cases.

Anything which you may do to present this viewpoint to the committees in charge of this legislation to make this draft law more reasonable and keep it truly selective will be very much appreciated.

Incidentally, the vast majority of our people feel that we had no business in Korea in the first place, and that we should get out of there promptly, or either give MacArthur authority to fight in such a manner as to bring the war to a quick conclusion rather than sacrifice American lives

unnecessarily in a long-drawn-out stalemate.

Also, the majority of our citizens in this section approve the deferment of students in the upper brackets in colleges as we just cannot afford to kill off the potential scientists of tomorrow upon the grounds that they are no better than ordinary unskilled labor. They may be no better, but they are certainly far more valuable to the Nation's future welfare. To put them on the firing line can become national suicide.

Very truly yours,

L. A. BROSNICK.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, many say that the youth of our country do not think and are not interested in the world affairs. Here is what an 18-year-old wrote in regard to the firing of MacArthur:

APRIL 18, 1951.

Representative WINT SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. SMITH: My name is ——. I am 18 years old and a senior in high school.

The people of the United States are not asking for any more than can be expected from any full-blooded American. They just want to live nice, comfortable lives, with the assurance of good, clean, and sound government and all this yakatea-yaky stuff, that we hear all the time, left out.

There is no sense of any man, whether butcher, baker, or President to offer to those associated with him so little cooperation. This alone proves some of the qualities of any man. Mr. Truman is definitely deficient in this quality; the least he could do is aid Congress, at least a little for the people. No one man, whether President or industrialist, is sufficiently infallable to decide the fate of a nation, without at the very least some of the views of the people and the Congress taken into consideration.

We want peace; there must be unity and coherence, and, above all, integrity and fortitude in the Government. At present we have the most notorious problematical predicament any country has ever known. We have disunity, dishonesty, and little or no courage in all our governmental functions.

The word "peace" is a great, big, and wonderful word. In my dictionary it says it means a state of rest or tranquillity; freedom from war or disturbance. This word, in my estimation, is badly abused.

Did you say peace? Well—look back a little. This country hasn't had a decent day of peace for so long that it had ought to be ashamed of itself. We try to help everyone and look what we got—world war III, we're in it, we were in it, and we will be in it for a long time to come.

I am not saying this in my stupid way, so that I won't be drafted or have an easy life; quite on the contrary. I sincerely believe that all these wonderful Americans had ought to be treated at the very least fairly and honestly.

I think you will find, Mr. Smith, that if this country doesn't do something drastic within the next few days, weeks, or months that this country is lost and may God help us and have mercy on us.

I definitely want Mr. Truman impeached along with Acheson as so many Americans do who love their country. I do believe, however, that Mr. Truman and Acheson are not all our trouble. All Communists and atheists must be extirpated from all branches of our Government.

As far as Mr. Truman's action against MacArthur. I was very sorry to hear this because I believe Mr. MacArthur is a very capable man. He is reliable, efficient, and has demonstrated many of his abilities throughout his life. He gave his entire life for his country and that is something Truman hasn't and doesn't intend to do.

The people of the United States are on the uproar. Why? The people of the United States have been led around by the nose and have listened to this, that, and everything, including true and untrue communistic statements and ballyhoo. Is there any wonder why we have all this confusion.

I pray to God to give to you strength, courage, and guidance through the years to come and may God protect all of us.

Sincerely yours.

Statement by the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by the President of the United States released today at 4 p. m.:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The United States is moving steadily forward in concert with other countries of the Pacific in its determination to make ever stronger the position of the free world in the Pacific Ocean area.

In connection with the reestablishment of peace with Japan, we are discussing with the Japanese Government the implementation of its expressed desire for a post-treaty security arrangement pursuant to which United States Armed Forces might on a provisional basis remain in and about Japan.

The United States maintains, and expects to continue to maintain, its Armed Forces in the Ryukyus, particularly at Okinawa.

In the Philippines, the United States is accorded certain military operating rights and facilities pursuant to an agreement with the Government of the Philippines and the whole world knows that the United States recognizes that an armed attack on the Philippines would be looked upon by the United States as dangerous to its own peace and safety and that it would act accordingly.

The Governments of Australia and New Zealand, in connection with the reestablishment of peace with Japan, have suggested an arrangement between them and the United States, pursuant to articles 51 and 52 of the United Nations Charter which would make clear that in the event of an armed attack upon any one of them in the Pacific, each of the three would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes; and which would establish consultation to strengthen security on the basis of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid.

The possibilities of such an arrangement were fully explored by Mr. Dulles at Canberra, Australia, and Wellington, New Zealand, and have since been informally discussed with the appropriate subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

I have now asked the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and Mr. Dulles, as my special representative in relation to the Japanese peace settlement and related matters, to pursue this matter further concurrently with the prosecution of the other negotiations necessary to bring the Japanese peace settlement to an early and satisfactory conclusion.

The series of arrangements and dispositions outlined above, will strengthen the fabric of peace in the whole Pacific Ocean area, where security is strongly influenced by sea and air power. They constitute natural initial steps in the consolidation of peace in that area and also will contribute to the building of universal peace as sought by the United Nations and under which great goal the efforts of our Nation are now being largely dedicated.

Danger! Communists at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article by Bruno Shaw, radio news analyst and foreign correspondent, which appeared in the April issue of the Elks magazine.

This article points up the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in acquainting the public with the insidious operating mechanics of the Communist Party in the United States:

DANGER! COMMUNISTS AT WORK—LOOK BEFORE YOU SHOP, FOR UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES ARE SKILLFULLY HIDDEN

(By Bruno Shaw)

"Danger! Communists at work." Every high school and college in the country; every industrial plant; every association, group and church of every denomination, should carve that slogan on its doorstep—should exert every last ounce of effort to impress it unfailingly in the minds and hearts of its students, members, employees and associates.

"The Communist Party is like a submerged submarine," said J. Peters, former Russian head of a Communist spy ring in the United States; "the part that you see above water is the periscope, but the part underneath is the real Communist organization; that is the conspiratorial apparatus."

Communist and Communist-front organizers exploit to full advantage the naturally questioning and even rebellious attitude of American youth toward authority. Countless unwary youngsters have been enrolled in renegade organizations such as American Student Union, American Youth Congress, Friends of the Campus, National Student League, World Youth Council, and many more.

Thousands of young Americans on high-school and college campuses from coast to coast, under the delusion that they were joining a liberal, patriotic organization, became members of American Youth for Democracy. Unknown to most of them is the fact that this organization was formerly the Young Communist League.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report for the year 1950,

taken a grim view of Communist activities in the United States. "With the Armed Forces of the United States actually pitted in conflict against the legions of international communism," says the report, "the Communist Party of the United States can no longer be viewed passively as a group of mere political and ideological dissidents, but must be looked upon with all seriousness as a military fifth column actively aiding our enemies."

The House committee is convinced that members of Communist-front organizations which advocate policies designed to weaken the United States resistance to Communist aggression (as all of them do), are, wittingly or unwittingly, enemies of the Nation; and that those who sign Communist-front petitions, offered for their signatures under a variety of disguises, are either extremely naive or fools or knaves.

Representative JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia, is chairman of the House committee. It is possible now, says Mr. WOOD, for American citizens to secure from the House committee information about any petition, appeal, or organization they may be asked to sign or to join. There is no reason in the world, he declares, for anyone to allow himself to be tricked into participating in an un-American activity.

What, precisely, is an un-American activity? "Any action of any individual or organization," says Mr. WOOD, "which seeks to alter or change the form of government of this Nation by other than the method pointed out in the Constitution, or who seeks by violent and unlawful methods to interfere with the orderly operations of the Government or any of its subdivisions—is un-American."

Does the committee stifle public debate? Does it tend to exercise thought control? Does it threaten freedom of expression on behalf of causes which may be unpopular at the moment?

Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, ranking member of the committee, says "No." "The House committee," says Mr. WALTER, "is solely an instrument of investigation and education. It has no punitive power. It may subpena persons and question them about their activities and associations. It hopes that, by revealing the genuine nature of subversive groups in the United States, Americans will become more careful about lending their names and support to causes they have not personally investigated."

There are plenty of such causes. The newest publication of the House committee, Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, lists 654 Communist or Communist-front groups and 284 newspapers and periodicals of a similar nature, actively operating in the United States.

Labor unions are a prime Communist objective. How unions become subject to Communist control is described in the committee's series 100 Things You Should Know About Communism. In the labor section of the series, David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, who waged a successful fight against Communist infiltration, exposes Red techniques. He cites, as an example of their deliberate intent, the Communist-led strike of 1938, which cost $4,500,000 and left in its wake a chaotic garment industry and a crippled union.

Among the Communist-led unions the House committee has helped to expose are the United Office and Professional Workers of America; the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America; the International Fur and Leather Workers. Eleven such unions already have been expelled from the CIO because of their Communist domination, including these three.

WHAT THEY BELIEVE

Communism, in the opinion of the House committee, is the clear and present danger. Prominently displayed on the fyleaf of 100 Things You Should Know About Communism, is the sworn statement of William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States: "No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—the Government will not be a capitalistic government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Does the House committee investigate subversive activities other than Communist? It does, but only to a limited extent. This may be accounted for by its limited budget and staff. On February 7, the House appropriated $200,000 for the committee's expenses for the current year. The staff numbers 34 persons, of whom 8 are investigators. Criticism was expressed to me even in congressional quarters that the committee has not been sufficiently diligent in exposing the man-on-a-white-horse groups, right-wing totalitarian organizations, and racist antiminority groups, the respectability of which rests solely on the slender reed that they, too, are anti-Communist.

Louis J. Russell, 36-year-old former FBI man, is senior investigator of the House committee. What the committee is able to fry at its hearings depends to a large extent upon the number and quality of fish Mr. Russell and his staff are able to gather in their nets.

Mr. Russell and his assistant, Mr. Donald T. Appell, gave full and complete answers to the endless questions I raised in my search for information about the Communist conspiratorial octopus whose tentacles pry into every corner of American life. They seemed to enjoy, for a change, the novelty of being in the witness box.

In addition to the strain of what might be considered their normal activity of searching out and interrogating persons suspected of subversive activities, the committee is harassed by a variety of crackpots and lunatic-fringers who believe that the only way to preserve democracy is to abolish it, and who wear down the flagstones of the House corridors with their unflagging visitations. Most of these eager-beavers find their way to Mr. Russell's office with plans that range all the way from appointing a chancelor of the United States to abolishing Government altogether.

How does the committee's expressed purpose work in action? Generally, in the public interest. It has uncovered or helped to make known to the public hundreds of individuals and groups engaged in operations designed to overthrow the Government and destroy our freedom, all the way from Soviet spies and saboteurs to American youth group organizers.

AGENTS UNCOVERED

The apparatus of the Communist conspiracy exposed to public view by the House committee includes figures such as Semen Vasilenko, who escaped to Russia with vital metallurgical research and atomic-energy information; Arthur Adams, a Soviet agent who obtained information relating to the atomic bomb; Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party, who defied the authority of the House committee to subpena him for hearing and was sentenced to a $1,000 fine and a year in jail, where he is at present.

The 81 pamphlets published by the committee in 1950, describing Communist and Communist-front activities, reveal the nature of the Communist conspiracy in our midst. Typical of the views held by many of those engaged in it is the following brief excerpt from the testimony of Steve Nelson. At hearings held in June 1949, Steve Nelson (alias Louis Evans, Joseph Fletschinger) was questioned by Representative MORGAN M. MOULDER, of Missouri, a member of the House committee:

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Nelson, in the event of war between the United States and Russia, to which country would you owe your allegiance and loyalty in such a conflict?

"Mr. NELSON. I refuse to answer that question."

Steve Nelson was cited for contempt for refusing to answer direct questions throughout the hearings. At subsequent hearings before the committee, the full shocking details of the activities of Nelson and his accomplices were told by Matthew Cvetic, undercover agent for the FBI. Nelson was identified as a Communist organizer specializing in securing control over labor unions in vital industries.

A vast amount of time consumed at committee hearings is spent in an endeavor to persuade recalcitrant witnesses to answer direct questions. After examining thousands of pages of verbatim testimony, one begins to understand the need for almost superhuman patience when dealing with elusive, frustrating characters who, standing on their constitutional rights, and guided by expert lawyer-quibblers, are dedicated to the destruction of the very constitutional rights they call upon for their own protection.

The testimony of Philip A. Bart, general manager of the Freedom of the Press, publishers of the official Communist Party organ, the Daily Worker, is a case in point. The hearing was held on June 21, 1950. Here is a brief excerpt of the questioning by Mr. Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., committee counsel, and the replies made by Mr. Bart:

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been out of the United States?

"Mr. BART. I refuse to answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever used the name John William Fox?

"Mr. BART. I will not answer this question, which, in accordance with article V of the Constitution, may be used by this committee to incriminate me.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bart, I hand you a photostatic copy of an application for passport signed in the name of John William Fox, and I will ask you to look at the photograph appearing on the second page and state to me whether or not that is a photograph of you?

"Mr. BART (after examining document). I refuse to answer."

The House Committee has no power to mete out punishment to those whose subversive activities may be proven, or even to those who refuse to answer the committee's questions. Punitive action rests with the Attorney General and other prosecuting agencies of the Government. And no legal action can be taken against a witness until, and unless, that person has been indicted by a grand jury in the district in which the hearing has been held.

MEANS OF EVASION

Witnesses who refuse to answer questions usually resort to one of three means of evading them. First, by quoting the first amendment to the Constitution, which provides for freedom of speech, press, and assembly; secondly, by declaring that the House committee is not legally constituted and is without constitutional authority to conduct the hearing; and third, by claiming immunity under the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "No person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

The first two of these inviting avenues of escape proved, in many cases, to be blind alleys, and witnesses who attempted to employ them ultimately found themselves in jail. Outstanding examples of witnesses who claimed immunity under the first amendment were the Hollywood Ten: Alvah Bessie, Herbert Biberman, Lester Cole, Edward Dmytryk, Ring Lardner, Jr., John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Samuel Ornitz, Robert Adrian Scott, and Dalton Trumbo. All were sentenced to $1,000 fine and a year in jail. All had refused to answer the question: "Are you a Communist?"

The courts have held that the first amendment does not provide immunity because there is no abridgment of speech in requiring a direct "yes" or "no" to the question. The courts have held, too, that the House committee does have constitutional authority to conduct hearings and question witnesses. The claim of immunity under the fifth amendment still remains to be decided definitely by a test case.

LINE ON FIFTH COLUMN

According to the committee's 1950 report, "some 1,300 witnesses have testified in public and executive hearings held in the past 12 years. The committee's continuing study of Communist activity since 1936 has resulted in a voluminous collection of information concerning the leaders of programs and aims of an entrenched potential fifth column made up of the 54,000 members of the Communist Party and its half million followers, and their increasing efforts in behalf of the forces of international communism. The committee has unearthed information concerning the activities and methods of foreign agents intent on missions of propaganda, espionage, and sabotage. This information will serve as a valuable tool in the protection of our country against espionage and sabotage from within in this period of national emergency."

Witnesses who have appeared before the committee included several whose purpose was to protest against injury to their reputations, either because of the way they were listed in committee files or because of misinterpretation of information supplied by the committee, which, because of incorrect evaluation, caused personal injury to loyal American citizens. Though complaints of this sort have been comparatively few, they are responsible for major criticism of the committee's methods of recording and reporting.

COMMITTEE'S ATTITUDE

The conduct of the present House committee hearings is a far cry from that of the capricious Dies committee, which had seven incandescent years of existence from 1938 to 1944, inclusive, or that of the J. Parnell Thomas committee, which came later. It is unlikely that the present committee, under the chairmanship of Representative JOHN S. WOOD will ever be known as the Wood committee. Mr. WOOD is not, apparently, that kind of a headline hunter. He is not averse to headlines. He would like more of them; but for the committee and its work, and not for himself, in order that the public may better understand the nature of the menace of totalitarianism of any kind.

Mr. WOOD is the kind of person described by novelists who wax sentimental over Dixie, as a southern gentleman. You have a feeling, sitting in his office in the Old House Office Building, of being welcome and at home. You know, because of the burden of his committee work (he is a member of several committees) and because of his congressional duties, that he is a hurried, harried man. But you would never know it when his time is yours for the moment. That segment of time, no matter how small or how large it may be, is yours entirely.

It seems deplorably true that we have not changed very much since Barnum said: "There's a sucker born every minute." Mr. WOOD points, for example, to the Communist-inspired Stockholm peace petition campaign of last year. Marcel Scherr, an individual with a long public record of Communist Party affiliation and activities, who has been identified as closely associated with a Communist atomic espionage ring, appeared before the House committee on June 21 and admitted that he was one of those in charge of this drive in New York City.

Thousands of American citizens throughout the United States affixed their signatures to this Moscow-inspired peace petition. The Cominform officially claims that 2,000,000 Americans signed it. Their names and addresses will constitute a gigantic and valuable mailing list for the Communist Party which will bombard them with deceptively worded literature and solicit them for funds under innumerable disguises.

What the Stockholm peace petition actually called for was the adoption of the Soviet plan for restriction of atomic energy. The peace petition called for a pledge to ban the use of the atomic bomb, but without any international inspection of Soviet activities in atomic bomb production. It did not mention the desirability of banning the tremendous armies and armament the U. S. S. R. and its satellites have built up since 1945, nor did it mention the illegal rearmament by the U. S. S. R. of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania far beyond the limits imposed in the peace treaties. And, of course, it did not mention that this plan, disguised as a peace petition, was overwhelmingly rejected time and again by the majority of the United Nations.

PEACE IN NAME ONLY

A similar subversive call to peace was issued by the Daily Worker on February 1 of this year, calling for a peace pilgrimage to Washington to be held on March 1, under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade, one of the many fronts that more honestly could be called the Moscow sabotage operation.

The American Peace Crusade is the same old Kremlin wolf in a new sheepskin. It is an offshoot of the Communist conspiracy known in 1949 as the Partisans of Peace movement. Its original plan was to collect 600,000,000 signatures throughout the world, of which 5,000,000 were to be secured in the United States. The American Peace Crusade took over early this year with a call for UN forces to get out of Korea, and for Red China to be seated immediately in the United Nations.

On February 19 the House committee published the March of Treason, which lists the leading Communist and Communist-front sponsors of the American Peace Crusade. With information of this kind available for the asking (schools and organizations can get these leaflets free of charge from the committee), there is no reason why any intelligent person should allow himself to be beguiled into signing Communist-inspired petitions.

Before leaving Washington I called once more on Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, who, among his colleagues, is one of the most highly regarded members of the House. I asked him for his estimate of the Nation's awareness of the nature and extent of Communist activities.

"Not 2 percent of the American people realize that communism is a world-wide conspiracy," said Mr. WALTER, "or that when Lenin said, and Stalin reiterated, that our two forms of government could not live peacefully side by side, and that only one of them could survive, they really meant it."

A line needs to be drawn between loyal, intellectually honest Americans who may be in open disagreement with current national policy, whose freedom to express their views must not be impaired or curtailed, and whose persons and reputations must be given every safeguard if we are to remain, in fact, a free people; and those who, for ulterior motives, support policies or actions inimical to our national security.

But clearly, if Mr. WALTER's estimate is even approximately correct, much educational work remains to be done. Equally clear is the fact that in the present clouded ideological climate there must be available a responsible source of information concerning individuals and groups whose activities are subject to question, and a tribunal before which those persons may be questioned. The record demonstrates that the present House committee serves this useful and essential function in our national community, and that we would be badly off without it.

The record provides unmistakable warning, in addition, that it is high time for all Americans—men and women, boys and girls—to pause for reflection before signing petitions and appeals for projects which, on the surface, seem in accord with their own liberal views, and that, remembering the submerged submarine of the conspiratorial apparatus among us, they should bear in mind: "Danger; Communists at work."

Warning on Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, recently several Members of the House have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, articles from the St. Louis Star-Times, regarding the Toronto stock frauds.

It appears that some Toronto brokers and dealers have been promoting the sale of stocks in gold, silver, uranium, cobalt, and oil—all worthless projects. They have obtained lists of prospective American investors and have been circularizing these prospects from the east coast to the west coast, with excellent results, and with intent to defraud. It is estimated that they take as much as fifty-two millions of dollars annually from Americans. Such promotions are illegal in the United States, but are permitted in the Province of Ontario.

These circulars have also reached my district, and while I know some of my constituents have not been gullible, others may fall for this propaganda. Therefore, I am taking this means of bringing this matter to their attention, so they may be duly warned against investing in any stock offered by Toronto brokers, without prior investigation. I am also requesting the Post Office Department to check into the matter to see what can be done to prevent such mail from coming into the United States.

Address by William Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last night I attended a dinner meeting of a type that undoubtedly is held in great numbers throughout our Nation. A panel of distinguished persons presented their views and opinions on the Far East conflict and our international relations. At this dinner conference of the Council Against Communist Aggression, presided over by Mr. Marx Lewis, the best analysis and approach to the subject under consideration was, in my opinion, contained in the address of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. His message I commend to my colleagues for their consideration:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM GREEN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, AT A DINNER CONFERENCE OF THE COUNCIL AGAINST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 17, 1951

Today the menace of Communist imperialism presents the entire free world with a clear and immediate danger. If there was once a time when vain hopes and wishful thoughts could be safely indulged, that time is past. If we now prepare for the worst, we are not likely to be disappointed.

The first shot fired into the back of the free Republic of Korea should have sufficed to awaken the most distant and complacent of nations to an awareness of peril—if any new alarm were still required at so late a stage. That vicious attack was aimed not at one small republic only, but at the institution of human freedom itself.

Regardless of subsequent events, it will stand to the everlasting credit of this Nation that it acted with supreme courage in the face of this critical challenge to its role as the champion of liberty and international morality. In rallying the moral and material support of the United Nations to the defense of Korea, it accomplished an unprecedented feat of diplomacy. It gave renewed confidence to all who stand for freedom and decency against heavy odds elsewhere in the world.

If this brutal crime against humanity had been allowed, through our default, to find reward rather than retribution, we would be meeting here tonight in desperation rather than in hope. The moral and physical defenses of the free world would have suffered an irreparable breach. The will to resist aggression in India, in Iran, in western Europe—in every nation around the whole circumference of communism—would have been undermined.

It is well to remember that fact when these issues are drawn into the arena of partisan contention, to be reexamined in the clear light of hindsight. It is well to remember also, when tardy voices are raised in criticism of the decision which committed us to the defense of Korea, that our own freedom would have been lost long ago if it had been left in the charge of the summer soldier and sunshine patriot.

The vital questions today are concerned with the future rather than the past. The next steps are the important ones.

Honest men may disagree on what these steps should be. But all responsible citizens must surely agree that there can be no drawing back on our part at this late date in the campaign against Communist aggression.

The basic all-pervading issue today, on which there can be no disunity, is the clear and unmistakable one of survival versus extinction. To relax our efforts and to indulge the comfortable illusion that the worst might be past would be to court extinction. To concentrate our forces unwisely, or to seek refuge in grand isolation, would be to assure it.

The dangers we face are impartial and nonpartisan. Democrats and Republicans; liberals and conservatives; workers, farmers, and industrialists—all share the common risk. The chains that are forged in Moscow are designed to fit all groups and individuals, without favor or privilege. We shall all be enchained together unless we prove capable of united resistance. Out of the division and acrimony which surrounds us now, some workable basis must be found for a new popular front—a popular front against Soviet imperialism.

When the survival of freedom is finally assured, there will be time enough for the pursuit of partisan aims and ambitions. For the present, we have but too little time in which to take those necessary steps which will assure the survival of freedom—so that our normal pursuits may ultimately be resumed.

The line of battle in the fight for survival is not remote from any individual, though Korea is half a world away. It is a continuous line, extending from the front in Korea, back over the channels of communication and supply to Washington, to the factories, the farms, the shops, and the homes of America.

Our line of defense extends through the front in Korea in a continuous chain around the entire globe. Korea is but one small segment of the full arc of Communist encirclement and pressure.

The military aggression in Korea is but one of the manifold forces which the Communist conspiracy has set in motion to challenge the peace and security of the free world. Our military endeavors are no more than one phase of the general campaign which will be required to frustrate those forces.

Korea is a small part of the universal pattern of Communist aggression—a pattern which includes systematic obstructionism in the United Nations, sporadic violence in India, a Moscow-inspired civil war in Indochina, the cynical Stockholm petition campaign in the United States, sabotage in England and Western Germany, threats against Iran, the exploitation of race hatred in Asia and Africa—and all the other uses to which slander, subversion, sabotage, and civil strife lend themselves.

It is an old formula, in particularly expert hands—exploit every weakness, divide and conquer.

The constant threat of attack by the forces of communism should be apparent to all. What is not so apparent is where the next blow is likely to fall and what form it will take. We can only be sure that it will probably strike at what the Kremlin considers to be our point of greatest weakness, wherever that might be at any given time. To concentrate all our strength and attention upon any one area is to invite an attack upon other vital areas.

The issue will not be resolved by any simple means nor by any single classic military maneuver, no matter how brilliantly executed.

The enlightened defense of the free world today is the most complex task ever undertaken by man. It encompasses the entire range of human activities—political, social, economic, as well as military. The international activities of free trade-unions, the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, the Voice of America, and grain for the starving masses of Indian are as much a part of it as the North Atlantic Treaty alliance and the United Nations action in Korea. Success in any of these spheres can be more than offset by failure or neglect in another. They all involve contact with instruments and avenues of Communist expansion and aggression.

It is vain to debate the relative importance of Asia and Europe in the strategy of opposition to communism. We cannot afford to indulge the luxury of a choice between the two. Nor can we safely concentrate on any one set of weapons—military, economic, political, or moral—in this conflict. Both areas are vital and all the weapons we can muster are needed.

We must attain military superiority all along our entire line of defense. We must develop a system of working unity with all the free nations of the world, in Asia as well as Europe. We must expand our programs of economic assistance and development so as to give the masses of the world a genuine stake in freedom and to demonstrate the superiority of democracy over Communist despotism.

These primary tasks are sufficient to absorb all our energies and resources for a long time to come. They will require foresight, sacrifice, and courage of a high order.

The price is high, but no price is too great to pay for the preservation of human decency, liberty, and world peace. Our only concern must be to see that we receive full value in return for the price we pay by disposing our resources and forces in such a manner as to best contribute to the ends we seek.

American Eagle Is Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the following speaks for itself:

OBITUARY NOTICE

American eagle is dead. Long live American eagle! She died of exhaustion, caused by loss of blood resulting from the thousands of parasites sucking her lifeblood. These parasites proved fatal to American eagle.

American eagle resisted gallantly until her last breath. She fought for her life; but, the thousands of blood-sucking parasites were too much for American eagle to survive.

American eagle was done to death by parasites known as: "5 percenters," "muscle-inners," "traitors," "homosexuals," "pinkos," "sex perverts," "gangster politicos," "RFC grafters," "deep freezers," "gimmick patrioteers," "mink coaters," and thousands more parasites, of like species.

Turkey buzzard, the bird with the red beak, will be successor to American eagle.

American eagle was a faithful bird. She was 175 years old, when done to death by parasites. She always flew high. She never winked her eye.

American eagle's passing will be mourned by millions, including American soldiers, wearing the uniform of their country; and laying their lives on the line "that freedom and liberty might not perish from the earth."

This obituary notice is being sent to friends of American eagle, everywhere.

Friends will please omit flowers.

JOHN C. CROWE,
Grass-Root American.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Public Speeches by Military Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Bradley Utters the 'Party Line'," by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRADLEY UTTERS THE "PARTY LINE"—HEAD OF JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF OUTLINES THE VIEWS ADMINISTRATION WANTS GENERALS TO PROPAGATE

(By David Lawrence)

If anything were needed to prove how uneven and unfair the Truman administration has been in trying to apply to General MacArthur its so-called rules or orders about public speeches, a reading of the speech just made by General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, supplies that need.

For General Bradley, though disclaiming that he is making a foreign policy speech, goes on to make a speech which is identical in subject matter with the statements of General MacArthur.

General Bradley, however, utters the "party line"—the views the administration wants the generals to propagate. Presumably they are the honest convictions of General Bradley and are not affected by any fear that, if he expressed himself otherwise, he, too, might be fired.

So what America sees now is a system whereby only what the Government puts out can be spoken. There is no such thing evidently as a pro and con debate by the military men about our military situation in the world. They can only say what they are told to say. Hence much of what they do say will be discounted as political in the sense of following a "party line" and not really a military judgment on subjects on which there are obviously differences of opinion. The people will never get the truth that way.

General Bradley himself, moreover, was contradictory. After noting that the Communists in Korea were building up for another drive, he said in his speech:

"There is no assurance that even when this attack is dispelled that the war will be over."

Having, therefore, confirmed what General MacArthur has been saying—namely, that a "stalemate" is in prospect unless American troops can defend themselves against air attack by bombing the enemy bases—General Bradley goes on to say:

"If at all possible, Korea should be settled on the present battleground."

But who will assure any settlement in any place? The enemy which is building up its drive as immunity is given to its own air bases in Manchuria, or the UN forces who are compelled to stand still and take day-by-day punishment without moving forward to win a victory? What soldier ever advocated such a doctrine before to explain 60,000 casualties?

General Bradley does not seem to take account of anything the enemy may do to our troops in Korea, as most soldiers would, but simply contents himself with the statement: "Fundamentally we Americans are apt to become impatient with a situation that has no foreseeable conclusion. We all would like to know when the war in Korea will be over."

That is a masterpiece of understatement. It reflects the whole floundering viewpoint of the administration today. For General Bradley has no answer except to continue negotiation in this world-wide conflict as long as possible.

General Bradley takes his political cue directly from Mr. Truman in making the following observation:

"Enlarging the battle to a full-scale war is never an economical or morally acceptable solution to a limited conflict."

But who limits the conflict? The aggressors who are supposed to be defeated or the defenders who are supposed to stand still indefinitely?

The plain implication is that General MacArthur deliberately wants to provoke a large-scale war. There is not a word of proof to back up such an allegation. General Bradley makes a serious mistake in swallowing the political chatter of the administration when he adopts the assumption that our troops in Korea are to be attacked but not permitted to defend themselves with maximum force.

The crowning irony of General Bradley's speech is in this disclaimer:

"In outlining my thoughts on this matter, I have no intention of entering the foreign policy field or even urging a particular policy in the conduct of foreign affairs. Conduct of foreign affairs is a civilian responsibility. But a soldier can often see strategic perils that the layman might overlook."

General MacArthur, too, saw those perils. He also claimed that he was discussing not foreign policy but only military policy and its strategic perils. But he was fired because he ventured to differ. He did not know that in America freedom to speak by Government officials was accorded only to those who follow the party line.

Someday the Voice of America had better reexamine the glowing things it says about the virtues of free America and concede it is talking fiction when it says an opposition view is not suppressed in America and that purges cannot happen here.

Civilian Supremacy in Our Constitutional System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared today in the Washington Post. The letter deals with the importance of civilian supremacy in our constitutional system. It is signed by a group of distinguished American political scientists, including the President of the American Political Science Association, Professor Peter Odegard.

Mr. President, this is not a partisan document. Both Democrats and Republicans are included among the signers. For this reason I wish that all thoughtful Americans could have the privilege of reading this brief but eloquent statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR AND THE CONSTITUTION

It is General MacArthur, not President Truman, whose actions have imperiled the basis of our constitutional system. The Declaration of Independence, in listing its complaints against George III, contains these words: "He has affected to make the military independent of and superior to the civil power." That was one of the issues which made our forefathers decide to create a new Nation and organize a new system of government.

The Constitution of the United States, over whose drafting George Washington presided, declares with unmistakable clarity that the President is Commander in Chief. All military officers swear an oath of allegiance to the Constitution which automatically requires their obedience to the directives of the President. To argue for or to act upon any other view is to be subversive of the Constitution.

Policy in international relations is determined in our country by the officials whom the people elect and send to the Congress and to the White House. It is not to be determined by Army, Navy, or Air Force commanders.

This principle holds good, irrespective of the party in power for the time being. It would apply with the same force if the President were a Republican and a military field commander were a partisan of the Democrats.

Indeed, it was precisely this situation which confronted Abraham Lincoln, and he met it in precisely the same manner. To hold otherwise is to lay this Republic open to the dangers of Caesarism, and to discard twenty-five centuries of political experience in the Western World.

We, the undersigned teachers of political science, including both Republicans and Democrats, stand by this fundamental principle of democracy and of the Constitution that civilian authority must always be paramount over military authority. Considering the facts that are of public record, we think that the President, who has sworn in his oath of office to uphold the Constitution, was left with no alternative but to dismiss General MacArthur.

Peter H. Odegard, Charles Aikin, Frank M. Russell, Victor Rosenblum, Joseph P. Harris, Julian Towster, T. A. Bisson, Joseph D. Lubin, Henry L. Janssen, Glenn Tinder, Jr., Lloyd Fisher, Robert A. Scalapino, Leslie Lipson, George A. Lipsky, Dwight Waldo, Yosal Rogart, Samuel C. May, John W. Baker, Rogers Hoffman, Robert A. Hayton, Hans Kelsen, Rhoten A. Smith, Ivan M. Ponedal, Christopher Dyer-Bennet, Cheryl J. Petersen, Samuel B. Bloom, Robert J. Pitchell.

SAN FRANCISCO.

"Why Is My Son Fighting in Korea?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written and published by David Lawrence

on the subject of why American boys are fighting in Korea:

"WHY IS MY SON IN KOREA?"

(By David Lawrence)

The mother of a boy twice wounded in Korea asks this writer: "Why is my son fighting in Korea?" The question was not a protest, but an earnest search for a definition.

American boys are fighting in Korea—

1. Because the sacrifice being made in Korea can save millions of young men now at home—the 18-year-olds, the 16-year-olds, the 12-year-olds—sparing them the necessity of fighting another world war.

2. Because from those who fought at the Marne and Chateau-Thierry, in Tunisia and at Anzio, in the Battle of the Bulge, at Midway, on New Guinea, Guadalcanal, the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa—from those brave men there has been passed down the responsibility to preserve the American tradition for which so many of them died. This generation now is demonstrating in Korea that a great nation, untainted by the materialism of territorial ambition or the greed of conquest—having twice fought for principle and laid down its arms without a single act of selfishness toward its allies or a single act of dishonor toward its enemies—still will fight for principle and the cause of humanity.

* * * * *

4. Because an attack against free men anywhere is a menace to democracy everywhere. A readiness to meet the aggressor in Korea can deter the master of that same aggressor from precipitating a larger-scale war elsewhere.

5. Because America cannot allow the aggressor to come by sea or air or land to our shores. If aggression were to be successful in Korea, the Russian-Chinese alliance could then invade Japan and its northern islands and secure air bases for attack on nearby Alaska. If Northwest territory were threatened, so would our own Pacific coast cities soon be threatened, too.

6. Because America must mobilize her strength and not risk the defeat that can come if the whole free world is conquered and the total resources of our present allies are then appropriated by our enemy and its satellites for a final strike against us.

* * * * *

9. Because it is essential to the peace of the world that an international organization, such as the United Nations, stimulate a will to peace, and this means also a will to fight against aggression. Unhappily among our allies it has been questioned whether a shell-shocked populace can regain the will to fight. What we do in Korea can revive the fighting spirit of European peoples and demonstrate to peoples everywhere that the American will to fight for a just cause has not perished.

10. Because the American boys who fought and came home and the boys who never came back from World War I and World War II will have fought in vain if there now is a disintegration of spirit, a dissolution of the great moral purpose that guides brave men to give their lives in a noble cause.

11. Because, just as Christianity does not condone the suicide of the individual, Christianity rejects the suicide of the state—the basic fallacy of pacifism.

12. Because we are our brother's keepers and because, as we see a drowning man struggling to reach the shore, the instinct is to go to his rescue. What that instinct means to the individual, it means to a nation whose greatness today, as in the past, is still sublimated by an unselfish effort to relieve human suffering and to emancipate men, women, and children from slavery. On the battlefields of Korea our youth is saving our own democracy from its sins of materialism and its indulgences and making it strong again. And it must be strong to insure the survival of the forces of good in the world and their triumph over the age-old forces of evil.

13. Because the troops in Korea and the airmen and sailors nearby are the crusaders of our time—crusaders for justice and crusaders for the rights of freemen to live in this world free from fear, free from the perennial terror imposed upon us by evil men.

14. Because the brave youth in Korea are putting to shame those thoughtless brethren in Britain and France and even in America who begrudge the dollars and pounds they now must forego, who worship the false gods of creature comfort even as the battalions in Korea, despising such weakness, lift their faces to the next ridge with the immortal courage that makes them worthy of man's finest accolade.

"The Hundreds of Thousands of Communists Now Buried in Korea, Where Our Entire Force Numbers Less Than Enemy Fatalities, Evidence the Foolhardiness of Launching an Attack by Ground Troops Without Proper Air Coverage and Power"—Gen. Carl A. Spaatz

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the preponderance of thought of the Members of this House is that the first line of national defense is our Air Force. They furthermore believe what Joseph Stalin stated to Winston Churchill while the Battle of Stalingrad was still in progress, when he said:

The bravest of all troops are helpless if they lack adequate air protection.

Moreover, every thoughtful Member is in agreement with "Tooey" Spaatz when he said:

The hundreds of thousands of Communists now buried in Korea—where our entire strength was even less than the number of their dead—gives evidence to the foolhardiness of the Communists launching an attack by foot soldiers without proper air coverage.

The Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force, even in his capacity as a private citizen, has for many years been one of America's greatest exponents of maintaining an adequacy of air power for the peace and security of this Nation.

There has never been any difference of opinion whatsoever between the Secretary of the Air Force and Gen. "Tooey" Spaatz, ex-Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, whom General Eisenhower once characterized as "the world's greatest air strategist."

Secretary Finletter and "Tooey" Spaatz have worked hand-in-hand to achieve "air supremacy" for these United States—and to do so at the minimum expenditure of tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, both Houses of Congress are now concerned with a manpower bill—and the struggle is still on with respect to the number of troops that we are to send to Europe. It seems appropriate, therefore, that I should extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the article addressed to me by my son, Rob, as published in the Air Force Magazine of April 1951—by Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, USAF, retired.

General Spaatz' article entitled "The Airpower Odds Against the Free World," freely discusses the reliance which the military is placing on the number of divisions of ground troops we are sending to Europe—with apparently little or no thought going toward building up our Air Force commensurate with the tactical and strategic strength needed to support the ground troops.

The article by General Spaatz is not alone thought-provoking—it was downright disturbing for me to read that—

In the United States, arsenal of democracy and leader of the free world, we are looking backward and groundward in our military thinking. We are more sentimental than practical in our allocation of manpower for defense, inconsistent and lagging in our scheduling of military and related equipment. We seem reluctant to profit by the military truths gained from hard-won experience in World War II, and blind to the military truths emerging from the Korean campaign. In our approach to the mission in Western Europe we may be betraying not only the youths we would draft for those battlefields but also the war-scarred people of Europe who once again live under the gun.

It is high time we face some facts and live up to them.

Our ability to win this battle and properly support our troops cannot be gaged by looking down and counting our doughboys on the ground, but only by looking up and counting the Russian planes in the air.

Most of the principals in the great debate have finally concluded that it is useless to attempt to match the Russian ground army, man for man. That is rather an obvious deduction, but still a sign of progress. In counting our airpower needs, however, our leaders are left with no alternative. They must out-match Russia in numbers of modern planes, and must build aircraft toward that goal.

To meet the Finletter Commission's survival recommendations—the airpower production needs are more than double the estimated number of aircraft that will be produced for the Air Force this year. To meet the requirements of the 95-group program—more than triple the estimated number of aircraft must be produced for the Air Force this year. To meet the requirements of an air battle with Russia is still another story.

It is because you all know "Tooey" Spaatz and Tom Finletter—know their sincere love of country and devotion to duty—that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the article published in the April issue of the Air Force Magazine, entitled, "The Airpower Odds Against the Free World."

The article reads as follows:

THE AIRPOWER ODDS AGAINST THE FREE WORLD—WE ARE LOSING THE BATTLE FOR COMMAND OF THE AIR AND PROTECTION OF OUR TROOPS IN EUROPE—WE ARE LOSING IT IN WASHINGTON—THE RESULT MAY SPELL DISASTER

(By Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, USAF, retired, chairman of the board, Air Force Association)

"The Germans were able to concentrate in this area great reserves of aviation, and in the air in the ratio of 2 to 1. We have

not enough fighters for protection of our forces from the air. Even the bravest troops are helpless if they lack air protection."

In these words, written October 6, 1942, Marshal Stalin commented to Winston Churchill on the Battle of Stalingrad then in progress.

It has often been said that the Russians will never forget Stalingrad. It hasn't been said often enough that Stalin and Russia will never forget, as a result of Stalingrad, the helplessness of ground troops under air attack, the deficiencies in fighter aircraft, the lack of air superiority—and their meaning in modern warfare.

If Stalin and Russia need current evidence of the plight of ground troops when air superiority is lacking, they are finding it in their Korean experience. The hundreds of thousands of Communist dead in this campaign are grim testimony to the fallacy of launching a surface attack without adequate air cover. Certainly, had Stalin not had every reason to believe that the United States would not retaliate against aggression in Korea, he would hardly have become a party to this aggression. While he now permits Russia's satellite forces to be slaughtered in Korea without air protection, we can be sure he will never allow such a situation to prevail whenever his own well-trained troops might be involved. The Korean experience, it is safe to assume, has stimulated Russia's interest in air superiority to new heights.

The Russians are realists. Are we? Is the free world approaching the threat to its very existence with equal realism? In the answer lies the hope for the future of western civilization.

I must report, on the basis of the evidence available, that unless we call a halt to the present trend, shift our gears, and take off in another direction, that hope is thin indeed.

In the United States, arsenal of democracy and leader of the free world, we are looking backward and groundward in our military thinking. We are more sentimental than practical in our allocation of manpower for defense, inconsistent and lagging in our scheduling of military and related equipment. We seem reluctant to profit by the military truths gained from hard-won experience in World War II, and blind to the military truths emerging from the Korean campaign. In our approach to the mission in Western Europe we may be betraying not only the youths we would draft for those battlefields but also the war-scarred people of Europe who once again live under the gun.

It is high time we face some facts and live up to them.

We must recognize, first of all, the so-called great debate over American divisions for Europe for what it really is—more a diplomatic than a military argument. We must settle the issue with dispatch—provide the minimum divisions required to give the western powers the courage to build up their own strength—and meanwhile get on with other matters more vital in the long run to the people of Western Europe as well as to ourselves. And we must get on with them quickly, for time is running out.

There is no questioning the fact that the free world must be unified, virtually at all cost, to prevent and if necessary to combat further Russian aggression, and if this demands four more American divisions, or whatever number General Eisenhower deems necessary, on the Continent, it may well be a worthy investment. But we must not delude ourselves for a moment that these ground divisions, even if magnified in number many times, will give the powers in the Kremlin a single sleepless night.

Wall-of-flesh strategy is not the answer to our problems or to the problems of Western Europe. It is, in my opinion, the sure way to disaster. And yet, it is the prevailing philosophy in Washington today.

While our leaders are sapping their time and energy over how many ground divisions to send to Europe, over the minimum age of our new draftees, and similar problems, the only deterrent we have to Russian aggression, the only real preventive to all-out war in the world today, goes wanting for lack of adequate attention.

We have created a mental bomb shelter in the belief that our superiority in atomic weapons is the full measure of this deterrent force. It appears easy to forget that a superior atomic stockpile is useless without superior atomic bombers and without a superior air defense to help protect both the stockpile and the bombers. If we remember at all, we take final refuge in the B-36, seemingly unaware of the few B-36's we have on hand and equally unaware of their weakness in sustaining power. We seem undisturbed by the fact that Russia has the motive and the capability for producing intercontinental bombers more modern than those we are now operating, and can be counted on to produce them.

The strengthening and modernization of our own intercontinental bomber fleet must be our first military priority—come what may. Against the military requirement, we are proceeding far too slowly.

While we pursue the wall of flesh philosophy, we are losing the first and crucial battle in any possible war with Russia—the battle for command of the air.

All our responsible military commanders know that command of the air is the first priority of modern warfare. Air superiority, as a prerequisite to all military action on land or sea is inherent in the operational doctrine of all our Armed Forces.

Yet, if she so desires, Russia can command the air over Europe and Asia.

Though we have known and lived with this cold fact since the end of World War II, it becomes a startling revelation when we see it before us in cold print. Let us consider what it means. Let us think back to May 10, 1940, when Hitler began his blitzkrieg of the Low Countries and France. The Allies had 155 ground divisions in the field at that time, well trained and well prepared—for the wrong kind of war. Hitler did the job with far less ground strength (it is reported that 90 percent of the German fighting was accomplished by 10 Panzer and 5 motorized divisions) but he also had command of the air. German superiority in tanks played a major role in the campaign, and this gave new emphasis to tank warfare. Out of World War II came the military axiom that "the only answer to a tank is another tank." And yet, as was reported in the last issue of this magazine, fully 75 percent of all enemy tanks destroyed in Korea have been destroyed from the air. We must proceed cautiously with these axioms from World War II.

It should become known by one and all that the ground divisions the free world hopes to muster by the end of 1952 in Western Europe, if called upon to fight, must do their fighting without the protection that comes through command of the air. Let us consider what this might mean.

In Korea where we enjoy air superiority—at Russia's discretion, of course—our casualties number some 60,000 against hundreds of thousands of enemy casualties. And we now know that 47 percent of these enemy casualties have been attributed directly to airpower. Thus, in a situation where air superiority is not ours, we must be prepared to think of the enemy's casualty rate in Korea as our casualty rate in Western Europe, and perhaps magnified somewhat. We must consider whether the countries of Europe, already torn by the ravages of a recent war, are capable of accepting such casualties. And we must consider whether the mothers of America are prepared to accept them.

In the hands of Russia, command of the air leaves Europe naked and paralyzed, no matter how many ground divisions the free nations may be able to put in the field.

In the hands of the free world, command of the air becomes, not only war-tested insurance that ground action has a fair chance to succeed, but also an added deterrent to Russian aggression (since realistic Russia knows it cannot win without air superiority).

Yet, command of the air over Europe and Asia has been lost to the free world since the end of the last war, and will continue to be lost to it for some time to come. If there is a surer way to national suicide, in a world threatened by international bandits, I have yet to hear about it.

This is a good time to explain—as it seems so necessary to do when discussing air power these days—that air power's priority position in modern warfare in no way implies that air power can do the job alone. The American Navy, now the most powerful in the world, must be kept the most powerful in order to fulfill its important mission in any war with Russia; and the Navy can contribute to the air superiority mission, particularly in the Pacific theater. The American Army, it should go without saying, is equally vital. Let there be no mistake on these points. But we must see the three services in their proper perspective. In a war with Russia there is not, for example, the remotest chance that our ground forces can defeat the Russian Army by coming to full grips with all its divisions. The Russian Army must be strangled by the bombing of the industries behind the troops, the industries supplying them with the weapons of war. Our own ground forces, outside of some local attacks to secure specific positions, must be considered as a supporting force holding the air bases from which we pound the life out of the heart of the Russian military machine. Any other concept is, to my mind, dangerously unrealistic. War with Russia, should it come, will be decided by air power supported by surface forces, and not by surface forces supported by air power. We must recognize this relationship before it is forced upon us by the hard facts of combat.

The battle for command of the air begins, not over the battlefield, but in the White House, in Congress, in the press, on the drawing boards, and on the production lines. In these spheres of military activity (and in a democracy they are all of that) we are certainly losing the air battle to Russia.

We are losing the air battle, first, because our thinking is muddled with regard to the basic requirements, the true goals, in this battle. There is, for example, a dangerous tendency in this country to approach the question of air support for ground troops in terms of the number of ground troops to be supported. We hear, even among Air Force people, that we can provide the necessary support aviation only after we have determined how many ground divisions we will have to support. This is the type of thinking apparently being applied to the military build-up for Western Europe. Establish the ground strength available, so this reasoning goes, then slap an air umbrella of protective aircraft over the heads of the troops as they check in on the Continent—much as you issue them dungarees and mess kits—and you have created the "unified" air-ground team.

This may be the way to get the team, but it is hardly the way to keep it alive.

The air support of our ground troops, in Western Europe, in Asia, and anywhere else in the world, does not begin with the air umbrella over the battlefield. It begins at the source of trouble, the enemy's homeland, and with our only conceivable threat to that source—our strategic air power. And simultaneously it begins with the battle that will determine, in the long run, the personal fate and military contribution of both the

airmen in a B-36 over Moscow and the doughboy in a foxhole in Berlin—the battle for command of the air.

Our ability to win this battle and properly support our troops can be gaged not by looking down and counting our doughboys on the ground, but only by looking up and counting the Russian planes in the air.

Most of the principals in the "great debate" have finally concluded that it is useless to attempt to match the Russian ground army, man for man. That is rather an obvious deduction, but still a sign of progress. In counting our air-power needs, however, our leaders are left with no alternative. They must outmatch Russia in numbers of modern planes, and must build aircraft toward that goal.

The current furor over how many divisions for Europe, from a military standpoint at least, is not the primary point to be argued. Whether we send 4 or 400 divisions to Europe, we must first build and maintain air strength capable of mastering the air strength of Russia. Without this mastery, Western Europe becomes a huge trap for our soldiers and for the soldiers of all the free nations. Without it, our mobilization efforts and mobilization dollars will be wasted.

In our preparation for the battle to command the air we can find little refuge in our stockpile of planes in storage from World War II. Only a few of the light bombers now in mothballs might be utilized in this battle and they will not be adequate much longer. This part of the air-power job calls primarily for fighter aircraft and the thousands of reciprocating fighters we have in mothballs will be useless. This will be a job for jets because Russia has them by the thousands.

An evaluation of our position in an air battle for Western Europe must begin with a comparison of our jet-fighter strength and that of Russia. We can eliminate from the figuring our jet fighters which must be held in Korea or in other parts of the world, depending on the situation of the moment, and those we must hold in North America for the air defense of our homeland, and we cannot depend for several years at least on other nations of the Atlantic Pact providing us with many jet fighters for the air battle. The few jets our allies will be able to produce, even under the best conditions, will be sorely needed for their own local air defense. Great Britain especially will need all the jets she can produce and then some for the defense of her own shores, within which lies some of the free world's most important air bases.

There are many other factors, of course. Quality of equipment and quality of manpower are two important ones, and in neither of these categories should we sell Russia short. As the engineering battle rages today behind the scenes for command of the air, we can find little solace in the knowledge that Russia is building her jet-fighter fleet with the help of and from the designs of some of the world's greatest fighter-plane experts—the German scientists and technicians she obtained as booty from World War II. They put the first combat jets in the air and in 1944 were at least 5 years ahead of the rest of the world in jet-fighter development. Perhaps we have overcome this technological lead, but it would be faulty military thinking of the first order to depend and plan on it. As for the Russian airmen, we know enough about them to judge them with respect; our superiority in this field, if one exists, must not be overemphasized in our planning. All in all, we can presume—but not count too heavily on—a qualitative edge in this battle for command of the air, and this is more than outweighed by Russia's vast quantitative superiority.

The problem resolves itself, of course, on the production lines of America. Here it becomes evident that as a nation we are not taking our own best advice or even meeting our own production programs, much less matching Russia's output.

With the billions appropriated for the military, it is hard to believe that we are not building an air force of the strength recommended as far back as 1948 by the President's Air Policy (Finletter) Commission as a minimum requirement for survival in the air age. It is even harder to believe when we realize that this committee's report preceded evidence of Russia's atomic developments, the Berlin airlift and the war in Korea. And yet, the fact is that we are not measuring up even to this survival program.

True, it has been announced that we are shooting for a 95-group air force by the end of 1952. And the President has announced that we will increase our aircraft production five times by the end of 1951. But let us weigh announced production objectives against production line facts.

Jet engines are the key to our air-power production effort. Shortly after the President's announcement, a leading engine manufacturer stated bluntly that we could do no better than triple our aircraft production by the end of 1951. At the current rate of expansion programing, we will be fortunate to achieve two and a half times the production rate in 1951, and again in 1952.

Our 95-group program is moving slower than planned. We cannot possibly realize it by mid-1952. And even if we could, this program would not equal in numbers of planes or in sustained striking power the 70-group air force recommended by the Finletter Commission. The reason, of course, is that the Commission's program calls for sizable aircraft and manpower reserve—all told, an air force totaling 97 groups, including 27 in the Air National Guard, all equipped, trained, and ready for immediate action in the event of war, plus 34 adequately equipped groups in the Air Force Reserve. The 95-group program, which will absorb virtually all organized Air Reserve and Air Guard groups available, obviously does not call for such reserve strength.

By pulling planes out of mothballs we would have enough aircraft to equip, in numbers, a 95-group air force by the end of 1952. But this would be providing an air force half equipped with obsolescent planes. And we would still be faced with the basic problem of providing by that time sufficient trained personnel.

In terms of the modern planes needed to match Russia in the air—the only terms worthy of consideration—we are building the equivalent of a 50-group air force through 1952.

What are our air-power production needs? To meet the Finletter Commission's survival recommendations—more than double the estimated number of aircraft that will be produced for the Air Force this year. To meet the requirements of the 95-group program—more than triple the estimated number of aircraft to be produced for the Air Force this year. To meet the requirements of an air battle with Russia is another story.

But this is the only story that holds the key to command of the air and, therefore, to the defense of Western Europe. And it is the only story that counts for our ground troops who, however brave, as Russia learned at Stalingrad, "are helpless without air protection."

That we are not preparing to give our troops, and those of the other free nations, even the minimum air protection they deserve, by all the rules of modern war, is apparent in the production deficiencies now staring us in the face.

The air-power odds we have created and continue to create against the ground forces being built up for the defense of Western Europe are nothing short of appalling. From the best available published figures, it can be concluded that in numbers of front-line modern aircraft available for an air battle over Western Europe today, Russia holds at least a 10 to 1 margin; and on the basis of our present production tempo, even if we assume no increase in Russia's current air strength (an implausible assumption used only to emphasize our own position) it can likewise be concluded that the free world will still be on the short end of at least a 5 to 1 margin in Western Europe at the end of 1952. And even this doesn't reveal the true measure of Russia's air superiority in Western Europe, for we must assume that her air strength includes, in addition to front-line aircraft all crews that qualify for such an air battle, and a reserve of planes and crews, also qualifying, as replacements against combat attrition. By the very nature of our air-power buildup, such reserve strength cannot be assumed, under present programing for our own Air Force.

Let us think for the moment of only the front-line odds, of what it means to be outnumbered 10 to 1 or 5 to 1 or even 2 to 1 (as Russia was outnumbered at Stalingrad) in a struggle for command of the air. Think of what it might mean to our troops down below, to the tide of battle in Western Europe, to the whole war effort of the free world.

In these air-power odds against us we find the cold, hard facts of modern war, of inadequate mobilization—of potential disaster.

There can be no more fiddling with our air power. With wisdom and courage we must strive for command of the air. It may not yet be too late, and whether it is or not, we have no alternative but to go after it. We must not deviate from our goal. We must use all the skills and tools necessary for the job. And we must conquer, at the very outset, the one real barrier that faces us. Before we can broaden our mobilization base to achieve command of the air, we must first broaden our mobilization thinking. This is the crucial step in the air battle, and we must take it today.

The MacArthur Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished and respected columnists in America, Jack Bell, of the Miami Herald, has just written a brilliant, sensible analysis of the MacArthur incident. I urge every Member of the House of Representatives to read this article and to especially note the admonition of this eminent journalist that humanity and world peace must be placed ahead of partisan politics.

The article follows:

THE TOWN CRIER

(By Jack Bell)

Our President has fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It had to be. The aging MacArthur who has made his own rules in the Far East for a long, long time had to go or the United States had to scrap the United Nations.

MacArthur was supreme military commander for United Nations. All my Army life—and I've had my share of it—I've heard them say, "As a military man it isn't my duty to shape the policy. My job is to carry out the orders of the State Department and the President."

General MacArthur has gone far beyond that. He openly criticized our State Department, as well as France, England, and other United Nations governments with troops in action in Korea.

More than once, at first surreptitiously then openly, MacArthur has demanded that our Navy be used to ferry Chiang Kai-shek's troops from Formosa to an invasion of southeast China; even when he knew the diplomatic corps felt that would lead to a general war in the Far East.

As a military government ruler in postwar Japan, MacArthur seems to have done a fine job. As a field general or battle strategist, he has shown very little. In World War II we can understand he hadn't the men or equipment to stop superior Jap forces, and that ultimate defeat of the Japs was largely a naval task. But in Korea, MacArthur's tactical mistakes have been obvious, tragic, and too well known to escape censure.

I can understand MacArthur's wishes. He is a soldier, and he realizes the impossibility of defeating the enemy with the men and tactics at hand. In the soldier's code, any war should be all-out war, and that is what he demanded. Our President and leaders of other United Nations governments are working on the premise that all-out war should come only when every possible alternative has failed.

WORLD IS THE STAKE

It has been obvious for some weeks that other United Nations governments were not going along with this all-out war policy. So President Truman, although I believe he agrees with them, virtually had to demote MacArthur or withdraw from United Nations. It is inconceivable that the United States is going alone into a general war with China, which, in fact, means China with Russia as a supply base.

As for the United States political aspects of the MacArthur removal, they make me ill. American troops are dying. American young men are going into service by the hundreds of thousands. Our Nation, our world, is the stake.

And the Republicans rise up and yell en masse. The Democrats pretty firmly support the President. The writers in Washington get the political aspects into the first paragraph of their stories.

Can it be possible that all Republican leaders really want an all-out war with MacArthur in command, or do they think this will help them in the election? And do the Democrats all feel this was the only move, or are they fearful it will help kick them out of office? Is no one in Washington thinking of humanity first, world peace rather than election to office?

Don't forget, in the meantime, that MacArthur has been replaced by a great soldier, a thorough gentleman, a true American, and, I'm sure, a pretty shrewd diplomat. I predict a great change for the better in the Far East diplomatic friendliness toward this Nation. And God knows we can use some.

A Golden Opportunity for General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Golden Opportunity for General MacArthur," by Anne O'Hare McCormick, published in the New York Times this morning. In this article, Mrs. McCormick shows her customary brilliant insight in her advice to our great returning soldier.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABROAD

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR GENERAL MAC ARTHUR

It seems impossible for Americans to talk about anything but General MacArthur, and his triumphant homecoming adds to the general absorption in a single theme. This is an extreme example of the familiar phenomenon that the public cannot get excited over more than one sensation at a time. Other events on the world scene are just as importunate as they were, but they fade into the background like figures on a stage when the lights focus on one spot. In this case the appearance of the general in person steals the light from the political conflict that rages around him and fixes it on the soldier. As he emerges from the clouds of distance and controversy and steps on the home ground he is not so much a burning issue, or the commander relieved of his posts, as he is the conquering hero returning from the wars amid the plaudits of his countrymen.

The all-American welcome is to the great captain of the Pacific campaign. The President has done his part in accenting the soldier's role by clearing the way for a demonstration in the capital and canceling a speech he was to have delivered on Thursday to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in order not to detract from MacArthur's Day.

SIGN OF CONTRADICTION

There are many anxious Americans who wish that the general could hold that note. He comes home to a country rent by angers and dissensions and frustrations. He comes at a moment of crisis when the defense of the free world rests mainly on the United States. The people he has not seen for fourteen years have changed in the interval; they are at once more mature, sobered by the knowledge of what they have to do, and more uncertain, confused about how the heavy task is to be accomplished. Between conflicting counsels at home and pulls and tugs from abroad—all inspired by the same hopes and fears—they are in danger of losing the sense of direction, and the sense of proportion, which will determine the course of many nations besides our own.

General MacArthur comes as a sign of this contradiction. He can add to the confusion and uncertainty. The circumstances of his recall and the time of his return make him the storm center of differences wider than divergences on war policy, and pettier and more partisan than a great Nation, ready to respond to clear and confident leadership, can afford to indulge in at an hour when it must make national and international decisions of crucial importance. He can easily become the means of aggravating these differences, the shiny new instrument of a stale party opposition that works to weaken a policy the majority of Americans have supported at every test vote, and undermine our position in the world.

General MacArthur could do something else. He has not spoken since he was relieved of his commands, and what he intends to say in addressing Congress and the Nation in Washington tomorrow is still a matter of guesswork. He may defend his own course or he may speak in general terms and wait until later to expound the views in regard to Korea and China which put the commander in the field in open opposition to the policy of the United States and the United Nations.

But as a student of history and a lover of drama what an opportunity he has to make history and drama on the grand scale. He has the power to turn the present anticlimax into the climax of a brilliant career. A high American official of the United Nations, developing this theme a day or two ago, grew eloquent in pointing out the electrifying effect it would have if the General could bring himself to say that nothing mattered so much as American unity in the face of danger—neither the President nor himself, neither Republican nor Democratic political strategy, neither personal ambition nor personal grievance. "What an occasion it would be," said this official, "if MacArthur confounded his critics by refusing to be the storm center of debate and becoming the rallying point for national unity."

Such a course would confound the general's supporters as well as his critics. It seems a little beyond the bounds of probability and human nature. The debate on foreign policy, which now involves preparation for peace or war, is likely to go on, whether or not MacArthur allows himself to be used as the Big Stick for the Republicans who want to stop the fighting in Korea one day and extend it to China the next.

THE GREATEST SERVICE

The point is, however, and it will doubtless become clear to the general as he hears at close range the true voice of America, that the country as a whole is already unified behind the policies we are now pursuing. The doubts and confusions of today are not on the central issue of who or where the main adversary is and what we have to do first to save ourselves and a world in which it is possible for free men to live. The misgivings are on the competence of our political leaders, on how to end the Korean stalemate, how to deal with the irritations that are inevitable in partnerships between unequal allies. The problem today is to reunify the people around a policy which has already been accepted because there is no viable alternative.

We are where we are for lack of another place to go, another line to follow. The need is not for debate but for a clear restatement of the principles and limitations which dictate our policy. General MacArthur could perform the greatest of all his services to the country by recognizing these inevitabilities and persuading admirers to follow him.

Famine in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Making Communists," and an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "A Race With Death," both of which were reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., in the Washington Post on April 10, 1951.

These editorials point out that our continued failure to relieve the impending famine in India is a serious blow to

our moral position throughout the world in the struggle with communism.

In reprinting these excellent editorials the International Latex Corp. has again performed a public service by calling attention to the urgency of a pressing world problem.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING COMMUNISTS

(An editorial in the Christian Science Monitor)

Some Members of Congress who, on paper, are most passionate anti-Communists have found an extremely effective way of making Communists. It is to let 100,000,000 people in India go hungry while Americans sit tightly and comfortably on a stored surplus of wheat amounting to several times the famine need in that land.

Congress has had before it since February 12 a recommendation to give India a needed 2,000,000 tons of grain besides the roughly 2,000,000 tons that nation is buying in the United States and 2,000,000 tons it is buying elsewhere.

Meanwhile, a great deal is said in many quarters about convincing the rest of the world of the advantages of democracy and free enterprise, about "selling" capitalism instead of communism.

In the State of Bihar in India the grain ration has been reduced below nine ounces a day and is considered less than enough to assure survival for long of those who depend on the ration alone. Relief of such conditions takes weeks even after shipment of grain is authorized, and other provinces are approaching similar distress.

In such circumstances discussion of ideologies becomes academic, but Communist incitement and agitation thrive. So great an American as Senator Borah, an authority on the United States Constitution and its importance, said in 1934, "The people can't eat the Constitution."

The people of India cannot satisfyingly fill their stomachs with preachments on freedom and opportunity if they have not the opportunity to eat. It rests with the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives to put on the Legislative Calendar a bill which would give them a little nourishing evidence of the free world's efficiency and its interest in their fate.

A RACE WITH DEATH

(An editorial in the Washington Post)

It is not pretty to watch Congress dawdle while the specter of famine hovers over India. Even if legislators act with all possible speed to approve the bill giving India 2,000,000 tons of grain, it will be a close race. The grain must be sent to ports, and ships must be broken out of storage; it has been impossible to keep them ready on a standby basis. Yet unless grain is in Indian hands by June, a breakdown in the rationing system is likely; already the people are on a 9-ounce minimum ration, and even this is not available in some areas. President Truman, in his request to Congress in February, put April 1 as the deadline for delivery of the first million tons.

The depressing part of the affair is that it has become confused with all sorts of side issues. First, objections were cited to Prime Minister Nehru's attitude on Korea; then there was talk of making the grain a loan, although India is in no shape to repay it; then India's embargo on certain strategic materials—monazite and beryl—became a stumbling block. This newspaper believes, as respects the latter point, that the American position on access to strategic materials ought to be made quite plain. But none of these factors is reason to deny or delay the grain. It is not in the American tradition, when a stricken person asks for food, to demand to know first how he voted in the last election.

As the Washington Federation of Churches has pointed out in a letter to Speaker RAYBURN, indifference to starvation is "an evil not to be tolerated by Christian conscience." Help now would be "a merciful weapon in our struggle against communism" and would "do much to heal the widening rift between this country and India." Yet while Congress dallies, Russia has made propaganda by offering to sell India 50,000 tons of wheat, and Communist China—itself faced with starvation in many areas—has capitalized on the American delay by offering a million tons of rice. They are doubtless phony offers, both of them; but they make good propaganda, and are pathetic illustrations of India's desperation.

There is reason to believe that the House Rules Committee, which has been sitting on the bill, will report it out when Speaker RAYBURN believes he has the votes to pass it. The test cannot be put off longer, and we cannot believe that if the issue is placed squarely before House Members, they will turn it down. This country would be harmed as much as India if Congress should turn its back on both a moral obligation to humanity and the opportunity to strike a blow in behalf of stability in India.

Let's Count a Few Noses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial by Mr. King Cady in the Newberg (Oreg.) Graphic:

LET'S COUNT A FEW NOSES

As the great debate still surges across the country it appears that in Washington, at least, some of the fine-feathered pronunciamentos are beginning to hatch out a few brass tacks.

A principal area of contention which recently has become specific is whether or not we should send additional divisions to Europe, and if so, how many.

Senator TAFT is leader of a congressional group which believes that some European nations are only half-heartedly preparing to defend themselves, and that the United States should have certain guaranties—i. e., divisions in being—before we dispatch additional troops.

Administration spokesmen, on the other hand, contend that all European nations are proceeding satisfactorily to organize defense forces, and that no limit should be placed on the number of divisions to be sent overseas.

The question that immediately arises is: Who is talking through what hat? Obviously, both sides cannot be right.

Although the Graphic is far from convinced that additional United States divisions are necessary, or even wise, in Europe, the attitude of the various United Nations members toward stopping Soviet imperialism seems painfully apparent in the present Korean war.

Recently the Graphic wrote Representative WALTER NORBLAD, of the First Oregon Congressional District, and asked him to obtain actual percentages of each of the United Nations in the Korean theater. Mr. NORBLAD secured the information from Secretary of Defense George Marshall, pertinent extracts of whose letter are quoted below:

"The United States Army, in furnishing the preponderance of men and munitions in the action in Korea, has contributed 48 percent of the ground force personnel; the Republic of Korea, about 43 percent; Great Britain, over 3½ percent; and Turkey, 1½ percent. (Eight other) nations * * * furnished under 1 percent (each) of the ground forces. * * *

"The United States Navy is providing 85 percent of the naval strength now operating in Korean waters. * * *

"The United States Air Force is furnishing * * * 95 percent (of the aircraft)."

It is apparent from Secretary Marshall's figures that, aside from the South Koreans, Uncle Sam is carrying the great bulk of the load.

Although the allied members of the United Nations have voted both Red Korea and Red China to be armed aggressors, it does not appear that they are in any great hurry to back up their judgments with fighting men. Such forces as they have sent to Korea are purely token forces useful for securing a voice at the conference table after the blood has been shed.

Although it must be assumed that the European nations would be far more willing to raise divisions for the defense of their homelands than for close-in fighting in a far-off Asiatic country, it does not seem amiss to ask, Exactly how many divisions actually have been raised?

Before Harry S. Truman is given a blank check to disperse America's fighting men over the face of the earth, we should require a few specific answers to that question.

Dangers of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter I have received from the Maryland Action Guild, a group of Catholic men pledged to fight communism, and a resolution adopted by them at their meeting on Monday night. I am bringing this to the attention of the Members, so they may realize that many of our citizens are aware of the terrible danger of communism and are actively working to fight it.

The letter follows:

MARYLAND ACTION GUILD,
Baltimore, Md., April 17, 1951.

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GARMATZ: Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution which was adopted at a meeting of our membership, with about 400 present, on April 16, 1951.

Read this resolution and give it your most earnest consideration. We are gravely concerned that there are indications that our Government is actually considering a negotiated peace which involves the handing over of Korea and Formosa to the Reds, and the recognition of Red China in the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. O'NEILL,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MEMBERS OF THE MARYLAND ACTION GUILD, MEETING AT ST. IGNATIUS HALL, APRIL 16, 1951

Be it resolved, That every member of the Maryland delegation to the United States Congress be advised of our earnest desire that he do everything in his power to insure—

1. That the United States Government will not permit the present, or any other, Communist Government of China to have any voice, directly or indirectly, in the shaping of the peace treaty which will determine the fate of the Japanese people.

2. That the United States Government will not give its assent, tacitly or otherwise, to any agreement or arrangement whereby the present, or any other, Communist Government of China will acquire any control of, or jurisdiction over, Formosa.

3. That the United States Government will not grant any recognition to the present, or any other, Communist Government of China.

4. That the United States Government will resist any effort to install a Communist delegation in China's place on the Security Council of the United Nations, even, if necessary, invoking for that purpose the veto power of the United States.

Asia Military Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Gun Jumped on MacArthur," by Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Evening Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUN JUMPED ON MACARTHUR—HEAVY HAND OF DIPLOMATS IS RECOGNIZED BEHIND BRADLEY'S SPEECH ON ASIA MILITARY POLICY

(By Constantine Brown)

Before General MacArthur had an opportunity to speak to the American people in his address to Congress tomorrow the administration jumped the gun.

In a speech in Chicago the soldier's soldier, General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, attempted to steal the former supreme commander's thunder by stating—without mentioning General MacArthur's name—that Asia military policies advocated by some would jeopardize world peace.

General Bradley is recognized by all as a first-class field commander. He is a well-disciplined soldier who obeys without murmur the orders of his superiors. During the bitter argument which brought about the dismissal of Admiral Louis Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations in 1949, he toed the line indicated by his civilian superior, Defense Secretary Johnson. He denounced the plans for a strong naval air arm and for an increase in the Marine Corps and described the advocates of strengthening those branches as Fancy Dans.

General Bradley's speech was cleared by the White House and the State Department. Those familiar with the views and the style of the latter can see the heavy hand of our diplomats in General Bradley's exposé of our objectives in Korea. The five-star general summed them up as follows:

"1. Protect and maintain our form of government and our way of life against any challenge."

These are magnificent words. But from the practical point of view we did not have to go to Korea, nearly 8,000 miles away, to do so. We went to Korea, ideologically, to repel aggression. Practically, however we went there to prevent the Communists from gaining a vitally important, strategic objective which would have been a dagger pointed at the heart of Japan, where we had four occupation divisions.

President Truman ordered the sending of forces to Korea before the United Nations concurred. Of course, he knew that that organization would not oppose such a step once our Government decided on it, particularly since it was obvious that we would bear the brunt of the campaign.

The "police action," as President Truman described it at that time, had little to do with the "protection of our form of Government and life." If Korea had not been vitally important from the strategic point of view we may have acted as we did in the case of other Russian ravaged nations—deplore it but do nothing about it.

2. Gen. Bradley stated—and once more the heavy hand of the State Department becomes apparent—that in Korea "we seek peace by every means at our command, but there will be only one price we won't pay—appeasement."

We have sought peace in Korea for several months. The State Department was disposed to accept the humiliating terms provided by the United Nations truce team and by the Arab-Asian bloc. These approaches were not dignified by even an answer from the Peiping government. General MacArthur, who now is accused of jumping the gun on the State Department when he asked the Red leaders to hoist the flag of truce or accept dire consequences, was honored with a negative answer by his enemies.

Since that time the British have been active in attempts to settle the Korean problem. The terms are well-known now: The Chinese Communists are to be a party to writing a Japanese peace treaty: Formosa is to be handed over to the Peiping puppets. If that is not appeasement, what is it?

It is true that the State Department has turned down this British proposal as unacceptable. It is difficult to conceive how else Secretary of State Acheson could have acted, considering the high tension which exists throughout this country over our Asiatic policies.

3. The third bromide incorporated in General Bradley's speech by the State Department writers was that our objective in Korea was "to assure peace not only for ourselves but for all other nations. For this reason we support the United Nations."

The latter sentence is true, insofar as we are concerned. But there is little noticeable support for us in that organization. Britain's late Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, spoke in a similar vein after his triumphal return from Munich. People believed then that appeasement was conducive to peace, regardless of what happened to the little fellows at whose expense the appeasement was made.

General Bradley also stated that the use the Reds have made of their air bases in Manchuria to date has not warranted United Nations bombing of them. This is somewhat of a misconstruction of General MacArthur's recommendations.

The former supreme Allied commander urged the bombing not of Red air bases but of their military installations and lines of communication in Manchuria, whence they supply their fighting forces with reinforcements and equipment. And that is an entirely different thing from the use of their air bases, which are of only relative importance.

Truman's Dumbest Act, His View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD, a letter by Mr. J. Webb Saffold, of Cleveland, Ohio, which appeared in the Cleveland News on Monday, April 16, 1951:

TRUMAN'S DUMBEST ACT, HIS VIEW

To the EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

SIR: The real reason that Truman fired MacArthur is that the American general refused to lose the war in Korea to the Communists.

His accusers say that he overstepped the bounds and so should be removed.

What bounds?

Who laid them down?

You should know by now—the Kremlin laid them down through our State Department, or is it theirs? The Reds set out to get MacArthur 2 years ago (according to Louis Budenz) because he was the last obstacle to their taking over all of Asia. Dean Acheson wins again and the Red tide rolls on.

This typically Truman act was the dumbest of all the dumb things that Truman has done while encumbering the high office of President for three reasons.

First, the people of America realize that MacArthur knows more about the Far East than all the other top military brass put together, and, while they are under Truman's thumb, MacArthur is not.

The people trust MacArthur and they do not trust Truman and Acheson.

Second, kicking MacArthur out is the hardest blow to the morale of our 250,000 boys fighting and dying in Korea, as well as the troops of all the other nations standing with them in the freezing mud under the pale blue and white banner of the UN.

Third, it is a terrible blow to the Japanese people, who trusted MacArthur as they have never trusted any other westerner. They now feel that the Communist hordes are closing in around them and that no one will stop the Red flood. That puts in jeopardy all the billions we have poured into Japan since World War II, and all of the blood of our 50,000 dead, wounded, and missing in Korea.

By this act, "Pendergast Harry" impeaches himself, because the Truman administration is corrupt and pro-Communist and has been since the very start, and it grows worse with every passing hour. Now the whole rotten record must be paraded before the American people in full detail so they can read between the lines and remember it forever.

It is the most perfidious record of any administration in the entire history of our great Nation. The New Deal-Fair Deal-"Snare Deal" has sold us out from Yalta to Tehran and from Tehran to Potsdam, and from Potsdam to the scuttling of China to the Reds by Acheson and Marshall, backed by Truman; on down to the war in Korea, which would have been avoided but for the betrayal in China. And now we have the firing of MacArthur to complete the tragedy.

It is all one continuous trail of treason and corruption with more thousands being added to the Government payroll already staggering under a burden of gold bricks who draw your money and do nothing but draw it.

This racket is being perpetrated upon you to build up the payroll vote for the election of 1952 to try to continue in power an administration that is already licked, but which is spending our Nation into bankruptcy on the Lenin plan which underlies the Brannan plan and all the other plans peddled to you by innocuous names at your expense by the Socialistic sell-out on the Potomac.

You must know by this time that the State Department has functioned more as an arm of the Kremlin than a department in the United States Government.

We cannot win the war against communism with that kind of leadership.

We cannot prevent world war III by winning or losing military stalemates in Korea, or by putting up just enough opposition to lose the world to communism in the foreseeable future. The will-o'-the-wisp of a negotiated peace is the bait that you are supposed to take to continue this losing battle.

Our only hope is to change the leadership—and MacArthur should be able to help us clean house in Washington.

J. WESS SAFFOLD.

Republicans and MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, April 18, is well worth the consideration of every Member. It presents an enlightened and objective analysis of a situation which could develop such divisiveness and partisan strife as to seriously affect the national interest in a time of great emergency.

The editorial follows:

REPUBLICANS AND MACARTHUR

The return of General MacArthur to this country presents the Republican Party with an issue which it can legitimately exploit to its great advantage. At the same time it confronts the party with dangerous temptations. Upon the way the Republican leadership acts in these crucial days depends in no small measure the whole political line-up for 1952. The degree of discernment and statesmanship it shows will determine whether it is to be an unbeatable force or profoundly divided and demoralized.

The sudden dismissal of MacArthur brings into dramatic focus the lack of direction and the confusion of policy which have characterized the administration throughout the conduct of the Korean hostilities. Neither President Truman nor his aides made clear to the country the objectives of our fighting or the outlines of a settlement. In addresses since the general's recall the President has, it is true, thrown light upon the general situation. But he did this tardily, after the crisis between Washington and Tokyo had become insoluble except by the most drastic means; meanwhile a vacuum had been allowed to exist. MacArthur was thus incited to supply the missing leadership. Truman's final act in removing MacArthur was unavoidable; but that the situation should have been permitted to deteriorate to this point was not unavoidable by any means. On this score the administration bears heavy blame, and the opposition has a chance to bring it home to the whole country.

The opposition, besides, has the opportunity, as well as the obligation, to see that General MacArthur is given a hearing in secret committee as well as before the Congress. It is more than likely that a full airing of our conduct of the Korean War and of our far-eastern policy will reveal much that is damaging to the administration. Matters will be brought to a head, and the Republicans will be lacking in political sagacity and resourcefulness if they do not press their advantage.

There are limits, however, beyond which the Republican Party can go only at risk of creating deep divisions within its ranks and of stirring up a strongly adverse reaction among the public. Those limits were exceeded by the irresponsible cries for the President's impeachment—now happily subsided. They will be exceeded if the party adopts General MacArthur as its spokesman on foreign affairs, follows after him blindly, and tries to elevate him into a political force. It is one thing for the party to maintain that our policy in Asia could have been pursued more effectively; it would be another, and infinitely dangerous, thing to identify itself with the idea that Europe is to be sacrificed in an attempt to win a decision against communism by general warfare in the east. There is, we believe, no real sentiment for this view in the country, and there is none in the Republican Party, except among a small minority of extremists. Against these extremists the Republicans must now be on guard. For they have the power to darken as hopeful a future as the party has ever faced.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having introduced the first bill providing for the creation of the RFC, and having fought for its enactment, I endeavored to get the floor to congratulate the President on the appointment of Mr. Stuart Symington as the Director of this great Government agency and to set forth some important facts concerning its operation, in view of the unwarranted criticism and attacks made recently and the talk about abolishing the agency.

Consequently, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

I hope you Members who have the interest of the small-business man and the country at heart, and want the real facts about the operation of the RFC from its beginning, the loans made, the losses taken, the profits made, will read my remarks.

During the last few weeks a great deal of publicity and criticism has been leveled at the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The charge has been made that influence was used to obtain favorable action for certain applicants for loans. Later on it was brought out that many Members of Congress had also asked favorable consideration for applicants. I venture to say that there is not a Member of Congress, either in the House or Senate, who has not been importuned, at one time or another, to obtain aid and to urge speedier action on applications filed by constituents or firms in his district or State, and this is entirely natural as part of the duties of a representative of the people. I know the investigation now under way of the letters written by Members of the Congress to the members of the Board in behalf of their constituents will disclose nothing improper. Of course, there is no doubt but that many people have also, in desperation, turned to the White House for aid. There is nothing strange in that. What I have been interested in for years is that loans should be made, and that is why I proposed the creation of such a lending agency in the Government years ago.

I admit that some loans were made that received a great deal of critical publicity, such as the Lustron loan. It must be kept in mind, however, that at the time this loan was made there was a very great and serious demand by the people of the Nation for low-cost housing and it was felt this firm could provide this much-needed housing and at low cost, which unfortunately miscarried.

But let us take up the history of the RFC from the very beginning. When the great crash descended upon the Nation in 1929, during the Hoover Republican administration, and thousands of small-business men and manufacturers found themselves faced with bankruptcy and the complete closing of their plants, I prepared and introduced a bill, H. R. 5116, in the Seventy-second Congress, in 1931, providing for the creation of a National Relief Finance Corporation to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States. Unfortunately I was unable to convince a majority of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, who, under the influence of Mr. Ogden Mills, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Republican President Hoover, took the position that my bill went too far and that it should wait until the following year, which was a Presidential election year. However, in the meantime, the Republicans submitted their own bill, which was approved by the committee and passed by the House. President Hoover vetoed the original bill, insisting that a provision be inserted that no loans be granted to municipalities or States unless such loans were for self-liquidating projects, which denied to the municipalities and States the opportunity to proceed with their plans to provide employment by building many necessary facilities. The bill was amended and finally passed, becoming effective January 22, 1932.

President Hoover then appointed Charles G. Dawes, Republican Vice President under Coolidge, of Chicago, as the first president of the Corporation. It is significant that one of the first loans made under the act was to the Central Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago, Mr. Dawes own bank, in the amount of $85,000,000. While this and other huge loans were made to banks and financial institutions and helped save many of them from complete collapse, it had also been agreed

that aid would be given to the thousands of smaller banks throughout the country that were caught in the crash, but this the banker representatives on the Board failed to do. Mr. Dawes resigned as head of RFC when the loan to his bank was consummated. Shortly after his departure Jesse Jones became Chairman.

Mr. Jones, who was appointed by President Hoover as a Democratic member of the Board and naturally was made chairman following Mr. Dawes departure, together with his banker friends, unfortunately, completely controlled and dominated the RFC. He and his brothers and nephews exercised vast control over banks, hotels, apartment houses, and business institutions upon which loans were made by the Corporation. He was the Board.

I read with amazement that Mr. Jones is now advocating the abolition of the RFC. Is he fearful that the new chairman, Mr. Symington, will follow the same selfish methods that he, Jones, employed while directing the RFC by appointing his relatives as receivers and trustees of properties upon which loans are made?

In the early years of operation very little consideration was given to the needs of small business. However, huge loans were made to the great life insurance companies, nearly all of which were insolvent, and to the railroads, and big business which had been milked dry by the promoters and stock-market operators. The Government had to bail them out through RFC. Small business received no help whatever.

With the inauguration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt the picture began to change. The act was amended in 1935 to include aid to small business. I shall dwell a little more in detail on this later in my remarks. I should like to call your attention now to the following summary of loan activity of the RFC and its subsidiaries from the date of its incorporation to December 31, 1950, as compiled by the Corporation:

Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiaries—Summary of loan activity from dates of incorporation through Dec. 31, 1950

	Authorizations		Amount disbursed	Amount charged off	Outstanding at Dec. 31, 1950[1]	
	Number	Amount			Number	Amount
Loans and securities:						
Industrial and commercial enterprises, including national-defense loans	61,022	$4,744,578,243	$2,313,597,283	[2] $63,572,616	7,068	$653,[illegible]
Railroads	355	1,259,402,287	1,137,731,375	19,124,316	24	107,[illegible]
Financial institutions	26,603	4,799,741,953	3,900,100,730	38,557,706	440	[illegible]
Political subdivisions of States and Territories	4,198	1,510,508,487	1,265,780,398	9,094,422	327	22,[illegible]
Catastrophe	26,315	61,444,880	49,441,085	3,528,614	534	4,[illegible]
Other loans	2,004	417,303,822	285,202,315	212,221	1	43,000
Foreign governments	3	485,000,000	400,000,000		2	97,[illegible]
Subtotal	122,540	13,288,279,672	9,411,953,151	134,064,854	8,396	[illegible]
Insured and guaranteed (FHA and VA) mortgages	513,777	2,864,836,804	2,344,046,866		19,[illegible]	91,[illegible]
Subtotal	636,317	16,853,116,476	11,655,985,047	134,064,854	27,152	[illegible]
Other U. S. Government agencies	110	4,268,089,665	2,997,208,962			
Grand total	636,427	21,121,206,141	14,653,214,009	[3] 134,064,854	27,152	[illegible]

[1] Exclusive of 4,741 deferred participation loans outstanding, RFC's share $97,054,254.
[2] Includes Lustron Corp. charge-off of $35,500,000.
[3] Exclusive of provisions of $30,374,940 and $5,737,001 for estimated losses in collection of direct and deferred participation loans, respectively, outstanding at Dec. 31, 1950.

You will note from this summary the tremendous volume of loans made to financial institutions and railroads. The railroad loans average almost $4,000,000 each, while those to financial institutions average well over $1,500,000. To the credit of the RFC you will note that on a total of slightly more than $14,500,000,000 disbursed during all of these years, only $134,000,000 has been charged off as loss, which represents a loss of about 1 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to another compilation prepared by the RFC, which is a summary of business loan authorizations and amounts written off, divided into two classifications—loans of $500,000 and less, and loans of more than $500,000:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

EXHIBIT A.—*A summary of business-loan authorizations, and amounts written off, by size of loan authorized*

CUMULATIVE THROUGH DEC. 31, 1950[1]

[Dollar figures are in thousands]

TOTAL NUMBER AND AMOUNT APPROVED—CUMULATIVE THROUGH DEC. 31, 1950

	Loan authorizations of $500,000 or less		Loan authorizations of more than $500,000		Total authorized	
	Number	Gross amount	Number	Gross amount	Number	Gross amount
Business loan authorizations, including mining loans, loans for national defense, and direct mortgage loans made by RFCMC	60,016	$2,392,000	1,006	$2,885,000	61,022	$5,277,000

TOTAL NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF LOANS WRITTEN OFF—CUMULATIVE THROUGH DEC. 31, 1950

	Loans written off of $500,000 or less		Loans written off of more than $500,000		Total written off	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Business loans	1,300	$13,846	20	$24,130	1,320	$37,976
Mining loans (including national defense loans)	615	6,496	1	1,173	616	7,669
National defense loans (other)	77	2,344	4	15,714	81	17,058
Total	1,992	22,686	25	41,017	2,017	63,703

[1] Detail of loans written off for the period July 1, 1950, through Dec. 31, 1950, not yet available.

These figures are very significant. They show that some 60,000 loans of $500,000 and less were made to small business, aggregating $2,400,000,000, with an average of about $40,000 per loan. They also show that about 1,000 loans were made over $500,000 for a total of about $2,900,000,000, averaging about $2,900,000 per loan. The compilation furnished me also indicates very clearly that after Mr. Jones' departure as Chairman the volume of small business loans increased greatly.

The figures in the table above definitely indicate that it is not small business that has distorted the picture of RFC operations. Rather, they point out that aid to small business is sound; that it is necessary in thousands of cases; that the average small-business man is honest and trustworthy and highly deserving of the assistance of his Government in time of financial need. There is no way, of course, of measuring the great benefits that have accrued to individual communities and to the Nation as a result of this assistance given to small business. In virtually every case private banks and lending institutions refused to care for the needs of these honest businessmen, so vital to the community life of our Nation. In making these loans to small business, RFC fulfilled the true and original purpose which I proposed, and has contributed immeasurably to the preservation of free enterprise, a sound economy and real service to the rank and file of our people.

During all of my years of service in this House I have fought for the small-business man and his welfare. He is

the backbone of our economy. He is in almost daily contact with the millions of our population, honestly endeavoring to render service at a modest return for his labors. If it be socialism, as my Republican colleagues continually charge, to lend a helping hand to small business when financial stress occurs and relief is denied by the normal channels of credit, the private banks and financial institutions, then let them make the most of it. It is, and always has been, my firm conviction that honest and efficient Government has a major responsibility in protecting the economy generally by stepping in with assistance to this small-business man when he is denied such aid by those who purport to be the only ones endowed with the right to handle such financial problems but fail to do so.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the RFC has made some questionable loans. What financial institution has not? But when the above figures and tabulations have been studied carefuly, it is very clear that the history of the RFC has been one of great service to our economy; it has served a most useful purpose in bolstering our business activity in time of need. Its record of losses is a very favorable one, judged by the great volume of business it has transacted.

This hue and cry about favoritism and influence in connection with the operation of this Government agency is nothing new. I have heard it raised time and again over the years. My Republican friends are cautiously silent whenever the question of huge loans to their favored friends in big business is concerned. There is no criticism from them of the use of this agency and its resources at this very moment by the big steel interests in securing certificates of necessity aggregating almost $2,000,000,000 to expand their plants, under terms of amortization through tax favoritism which virtually turns these huge sums over to them scot free. This will provide them with additional facilities at the taxpayers' expense for future use in reaping tremendous profits at the expense of the rank and file of our people. With the tremendous surpluses they and other corporations now possess, and the great profits they made in 1950, amounting to over $1,300,000,000 for 10 of the largest steel companies, they were fully able to meet this cost of plant expansion without calling upon the Government for this great handout. Their voices are raised to the high heavens, however, when loans are made in good faith for the purpose of providing decent housing for their workers or to small-business competitors. It is a matter of record that nearly all of the very large loans made by the Corporation have gone to Republicans or to Republican institutions.

Yes; I favor calling to account any Government agency that exercises poor judgment in the handling of taxpayers' money, but I resent very strongly the argument and the demand that this great agency—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—should be abolished simply because the big banks and private financial institutions ask it, or that it be placed under the domination of the Republican minority in Congress simply because several errors of judgment may have been made by the Board.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the RFC has a definite and vital role in our economy. It must be continued as a source of relief to small business. Greater leeway should be given it to care for the needs and requirements of small business—financial assistance which is constantly being denied it by the so-called normal channels of borrowing in time of stress.

My Republican colleagues are constantly taking credit for the formulation and creation of the RFC. And yet, as I stated previously, there is hardly a single instance of a loan being made while under Republican control to small business. As I stated before, as soon as the Corporation was created, it was used by the Republican President of RFC., Charles G. Dawes, to take care of his own institution to the tune of millions, and the record is very clear that that original loan has not, to this date, been fully liquidated. There is still a balance due of over $9,000,000.

What was the role played by this important agency during World War II? During this period the RFC built and leased more than 2,000 plants and other facilities to aid in the war effort. No word of complaint was raised by the opposition over its activities when the very life of this Nation was at stake. Among the plants constructed were those for the development and production of synthetic rubber, which today has made us almost completely nondependent upon the Asian sources of crude rubber. This great feat could never have been accomplished if we had depended upon private industry to finance the job. It provided funds for the Texas tin smelter, the only tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere, for which we recently authorized additional help during the present emergency. The RFC provided funds for the creation of 62 flying schools and 150 other facilities direly needed to win the war. It had a very vital part in the ultimate victory that was ours during the years.

In my original bill, it is true, I recommended the appointment of five outstanding Americans as directors of the lending agency proposed. They were Mr. William Gibbs McAdoo, Mr. Calvin Coolidge, Mr. Alfred Smith, Mr. Eugene Stevens, of the Federal Reserve system in Chicago, and the Secretary of the Treasury, but in view of conditions today I have favored the President's proposal for a single director. Under Mr. Symington, whom President Truman has just named to direct the Corporation, I feel confident the business of the RFC will be conducted efficiently and well, and that small business will be given every consideration, thus carrying out the original intent of this legislation.

Let me call your attention to this final set of figures to show how well this agency has performed its work. The RFC has paid into the Treasury of the United States in the form of interest on the money borrowed, about $396,000,000. In addition, the Corporation has earned a net profit of more than $600,000,000. It has paid to the Treasury, also, $327,000,000 as dividends on the corporation's stock, owned by the United States and held by it. The original stock was $500,000,000, and it has retired $400,000,000 at par, leaving a capital stock today of $100,000,000.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is my candid opinion there are very few Members who have not been asked to intercede for some small-business institution in his district or State, as I stated earlier. I know I have done so. I interceded on behalf of the city of Chicago Board of Education in the 1930's when the banks refused to come to the assistance of this great city, notwithstanding its school teachers had not been paid for 2 years. The Board, under Mr. Jones' direction, refused this loan. I found it necessary to secure the enactment of special legislation authorizing the Board to make the loan, and I am pleased to state this loan was not only repaid in full, but the RFC made a profit of $225,000 thereon.

I also aided three small-business firms in Chicago in procuring loans and in every instance the loans were fully repaid with interest. Though I, myself, have found fault with the delays on applications for small loans, and the red tape and time consumed before final action has resulted, I have every confidence in the outstanding administrative ability of Mr. Symington and his desire to expedite procedures in the organization to the satisfaction of small business.

Mr. Speaker, when real facts are laid before the American people and the Congress, they dispel the unwarranted political criticisms launched against this important Government agency in particular, and this administration in general.

The President and the General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the syndicated column of Thomas Stokes which appeared in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—We've had letter-writing generals before.

There was Gen. Winfield Scott, who wrote embittered letters about President Polk. "Old Fuss and Feathers," with his plumed hat and gorgeous sashes, was unsuccessfully running for President while he was successfully running the Mexican War.

There was Gen. George B. McClellan, who wrote embittered personal letters about President Lincoln, but privately to his wife. He was running unsuccessfully for President while unsuccessfully running a war.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur matches the other two in the overweening ego that seems to go with some military temperaments. He is beginning to approach them, too, in magisterial epistolary traffic, which appears the inevitable and necessary outlet for such temperaments. He is a successful general, admittedly so, ambitious also for something or other, vindication or martyrdom, though obviously not for the Presidency. That was tried once—in 1948. Now the general is too old.

But we have a new factor in this modern replica of past history that has been generally overlooked.

Why has nobody gone back of General MacArthur and inquired into the propriety of the inspiration for his latest epistle?

Reference is to the letter from Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, to General MacArthur. JOE MARTIN is leader of the Republican Party in the House, and high in its councils generally. He is a former Speaker of the House. It would seem that, as a civilian officer of our Government, he would look to the civilian head of our Government, the President of the United States—whoever he might be or of whatever political party—who also is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and commander in chief also of General MacArthur.

This is a free country—but there are certain proprieties.

Why is JOE MARTIN writing letters to a general in the field under orders?

The answer appears obvious. His letter was the overt act, at long last, to signify something that has been going on around here a long time. That is that an element of the Republican Party is using General MacArthur to strike at the President of the United States. That mixes politics into management of our foreign policy at a critical time and at what would seem a dangerous risk to our national interests.

It feeds the general's ego—and so he acquiesces with that political naiveté which is often also the attribute of military men. The general also is being used by those in the Republican Party who are jealous of General Eisenhower as a possible political figure.

When you analyze the MacArthur disciples in the Republican Party you encounter a strange psychosis. It might be called jingo-isolationism. It withdraws now, as before the last war, from sound and logical policies designed to buttress ourselves around the world against encroachment of friends and allies, and yet goes off in a weird and dizzy dream of a crusade against the whole continent of Asia. There is a sort of Ghengis Khan atmosphere about it, with panoplied legions, pipes and timbrels, streaming off under the flaming banner of General MacArthur, a veritable American Mikado, and with a coleader in the exiled Chinese generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, who has been rejected by his own people.

Of course, there would be no panoplied legions riding brightly accoutered steeds and carrying spears and long swords, but American doughboys, trudging right into the third world war. Military men generally—except General MacArthur—see it as impossible and tragic.

And here at home, while this dream is being nurtured, those who conjure it up are opposing solid and substantial moves to make ourselves strong, including universal military training, and are alienating our allies of the western world who, after all, must be our chief reliance.

Against UMT they raise the argument that it would give too much power to the military. Yet they are building up a glamorous military figure to the size where today he boldly challenges the civilian head of our Government, the President of the United States.

It gets down to as simple an issue as that—a dangerous blow at our traditional civilian control.

At an appropriate time, President Polk summarily removed "Old Fuss and Feathers" Scott. President Lincoln was very patient with General McClellan, who looked good on paper but couldn't win battles, but eventually supplanted him.

President Truman has been most patient with General MacArthur.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received today from Mr. Joe Kornfedder, formerly known as Joe Zach. He was a member of the Communist Politburo for a considerable number of years, was a very close friend of Joe Stalin, repeatedly attended the schools of sabotage and espionage in Moscow, and finally broke with the Communist Party in the middle or late thirties. The letter is one which I recommend to every Member of the Senate as "must" reading.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 13, 1951.

DEAR JOE: So the thing has finally happened. MacArthur is out. It is a wonder that our system, which has produced so many things for the good of man, can stand the corruption, greed, egotism, hypocrisy, and ineptitude to which we are now subjected. I sometimes wonder if even Stalin's sick totalitarianism may not get the best of us while we are the victims of such leadership. This latest action of Truman is right out of the Pendergast bag of tricks. But it may play the role of the lance that pricked the boil and its long accumulated pus; and who knows, it may in the long run be all to the good.

The spectacle of removing a general of MacArthur's stature as one would kick out a bum has really aroused the country. Truman certainly had the worst possible timing for this action. If he had done it while we were being driven back in Korea it would not have had the same effect. But to remove a general in this fashion who, after taking over an impossible military situation turned defeat into victory twice—that is something which an over-patient public could be aroused about.

MacArthur, who with inadequate forces first defeated Stalin's North Koreans and then the highly over-rated Chinese Communist armies, knew all along and has proved what we long suspected—that Stalin's empire is not what it is cracked up to be by our appeasers. I wonder sometimes whether the Acheson-Truman-Marshall axis did not throw the Korean situation deliberately into his lap in order to discredit him, and now that he has pulled a victory out of it, are removing him in order to stop him in his tracks—or do I give them credit for too much intelligence in that?

It is remarkable with what crudeness they did the job. Even a third-rate politician could have done it better. To treat MacArthur like a dog is, amongst other things, the thing that John Q. Citizen resents. They talk about insubordination! They who have sabotaged congressional decisions for years, bypassed Congress in a hundred ways, made a mockery out of law when the law did not suit their purposes, and honored the law only when it served their ends. Only the Costellos could have made an impudence of that sort.

I don't have to tell you how this rabal sickened loyal and true Americans out of office or shoved them to the sidelines for years, both in the civil and military branches of government. You know a lot more than I do how they enthroned incompetent mummies like Marshall and Machiavellian Rasputins like Acheson, not to speak of the man in the White House who learned his ways with the Pendergast mob and brought the lessons he learned there into the presidency. How much lower can one sink?

Had it not been for a MacArthur, there would now be a Kremlin stooge promoted, Tito fashion, in charge of Japan. And that is quite a story, the particulars of which you know. In that case, the Kremlin would have not only China but Japan as well, and with that there would be indeed peace in Asia—Stalin's peace.

I hope all these facts and many more will come out as a result of the latest adventure of the Acheson-Truman-Marshall axis. It is to the everlasting credit of General MacArthur that he resisted them all these years, instead of fading out of the picture as others were made to do and as they tried to make him do thus forcing them to show their hand at the worst possible moment.

As to Truman's speech, that is for the kindergarten. The assumption that Stalin's policy is determined by pantomime gestures of peace on the part of those he is making war against or is preparing to attack, is senile and ridiculous beyond words. Just the contrary is true; if Stalin is ready for world war, then his appetite for such a war will be whetted by Truman's action. Those who speak out of weakness only invite attack when they deal with gangsters such at Stalin. Is it not curious how Acheson and Truman can coo like doves for peace when they address themselves to Stalin, and strike like a lion against those who are Stalin's uncompromising enemies? All that the Acheson-Truman-Marshall axis has done in this case by removing a redoubtable and able enemy of Stalin's, sending this country into a spin, is to whet Stalin's appetite for aggression. Oh, yes. Truman has done another thing; he has mobilized a maximum of opposition against himself, and that may in the long run bring about the sort of unity this country has been in need of for a long time, and hence be the only good result of Truman's treacherous and inordinate action.

With my very best wishes,

JOE.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in view of the soundness of the sentiment expressed in a letter I have received from

Mr. Clarence Robison, of Shawnee, Okla., I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAWNEE, OKLA., *April 11, 1951.*

Hon. ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senate.
Hon. MIKE MONRONEY,
United States Senate.
Hon. TOM STEED,
House of Representatives of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The bravest and best thing President Truman has done during his term of office has been to remove a field officer who refused to follow the directions of his superiors. This Government in truth "cannot long endure" if such conduct should be tolerated.

MacArthur should not be permitted to come before Congress to attack his superior officers. Unless, of course, impeachment is first ordered by the Congress.

If we are not to be the laughingstock of the nations and of history, in this stern period of our history, we must act like men, and not like spoiled brats, and insubordination should be stamped out. The highest place is the proper place to start.

I trust that MacArthur shall be taken as another man in this case, and his treatment should be as any other officer who refuses to obey orders. As I understand it, he is now at liberty to take the stump on his own, if he wants to, which is the proper place for him to air his views.

The President may be guilty of a lot of foolish things, but this act is not one of them. The very stability of our Nation is at stake here.

Respectfully submitted.

CLARENCE ROBISON,
Attorney at Law.

Massachusetts House Lauds Henry Gillen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution passed by the Massachusetts House of Representatives on the passing of one of the greatest newspapermen in the United States. The late Henry Gillen not only was editor of a large metropolitan paper but he was active in the civic, fraternal, and community life of greater Boston.

He was known the world over for the enlightening and interesting poems that he wrote for his readers, and the general public:

HOUSE LAUDS HENRY GILLEN—RESOLUTION IN HONOR OF LATE EDITOR PASSED

The house of representatives unanimously passed a resolution today in tribute to Henry Gillen, Boston Post executive, who died Friday. It was introduced by Representative Bernard M. Lally, of Dorchester. It was enacted as follows:

"Whereas Henry Gillen, editor of the Boston Post, has passed away; and

"Whereas his death cut short a brilliant newspaper career which he began while a student at college and continued until such time as he became the chief editorial writer; and

"Whereas he will be missed as not only a true and loyal friend by his intimates but by the hundreds who read his lovely verse and enjoyed his keen good sense and literary competency: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby expresses its profound regret and deep sorrow on the passing of one of the Commonwealth's great citizens; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house cause a copy of these resolutions to be forwarded to the family of the late Henry Gillen and the Boston Post."

Labor's Role in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, American labor is playing a great and significant role today in the struggle against communism and is making important contributions in helping to promote our foreign-policy aims. As a result of this development, the Labor Department's Office of International Labor Affairs, in cooperation with the American labor movement, is performing a laudatory task in strengthening the forces of democracy abroad.

This phase of the Labor Department's work is under the guidance of my very good friend, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Philip M. Kaiser. I am particularly proud of Mr. Kaiser's record of accomplishments because he is a native of Brooklyn, where he was born 37 years ago. He is a Government career man, having risen through the ranks of Government service, where he began as an economist with the Federal Reserve System in 1939. In 1946 he moved over to the Department of Labor, where he became director of the Office of International Labor Affairs and last year was named Assistant Secretary. He is the American representative on the governing body of the International Labor Organization and twice headed the United States delegation to the ILO annual conferences.

A very timely and informative article by Mr. Kaiser on labor and foreign affairs appears in the April 1951 issue of the American Federationist, the official monthly publication of the American Federation of Labor. It is as follows:

LABOR AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By Philip Kaiser)

The American labor movement was among the first to appreciate the nature of the Communist menace. As early as its 1920 convention, the American Federation of Labor, concerned about the triumph of communism in Russia, adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the American Federation of Labor is not justified in taking any action which could be construed as an assistance to or approval of the Soviet Government of Russia as long as that government is based upon authority which has not been vested in it by a popular representative national assemblage of the Russian people; or so long as it endeavors to create revolutionists in the well-established, civilized nations of the world; or so long as it advocates and applies the militarization of labor and prevents the organizing and functioning of trade unions and the maintenance of a free press and free public assemblage."

Aware of the threat of communism, the American Federation of Labor has done something about it, freely and voluntarily. American labor, by its own direct efforts and by its support of a constructive American foreign policy, undertook to defeat Communist aggression with the weapons of freedom and prosperity.

American unions have given moral and material support to their fellow workers struggling to stave off the Communist virus in other lands. They have sent abroad many of their ablest leaders to carry high the torch of free trade unionism and all that free labor implies for the democratic process.

Trade unionists have been lent to the Government to represent the American people in the foreign service as labor attachés and in the Marshall plan agency. On its own, American labor has stationed some of its officers in Europe and Asia to deliver the message of American labor directly to foreign workers. Historians of the future will, I am sure, pay full credit to American labor for its achievement in giving the democratic ideal meaning and life for the workers of other countries.

As President Truman said recently:

"The story of free American labor, told by American trade-unionists, is a better weapon against Communist propaganda among workers in other countries than any number of speeches by Government officials."

The American labor movement has done its magnificent job abroad on its own, free from the dictates of Government. This is part of the great American story. Responsible American citizens, acting through organizations of their own choosing, have seen fit voluntarily to give a major part of their resources and efforts to strengthening freedom in other countries.

It is important for every citizen, and especially for American labor, to understand how our own Government—responsive to the will of the people—is organized to conduct a democratic foreign policy in the present world crisis. Our foreign policy today, both in its formulation and in its conduct, takes account of the vital labor factor.

I have been in the Department of Labor since 1946, first as director of the Office of International Labor Affairs and now as Assistant Secretary of Labor. During this period the international activities of the Department of Labor have developed into an increasingly effective operation.

This is the result of a greater awareness that, in a representative government, labor must be an integral part of what we call foreign affairs. It is a result also of our awareness that democracy can survive only if the Communist challenge to free trade-unionism is defeated. A challenge to free trade-unionism is, at the same time, a challenge to the democratic process.

Two years ago the Hoover Commission made an intensive survey of the organization of our Government. In the course of its study of foreign affairs, the Commission made findings which are of great significance to every American citizen. Our foreign policy, the Commission noted, is positive and anti-isolationist. The United States has embarked upon affirmative programs—full and responsible participation in the United Nations, the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, military assistance, point 4—designed to strengthen in freedom-loving nations the economic and security foundations upon which democracy must build.

A second major conclusion of the Hoover Commission was that it is no longer possible to separate domestic policy from foreign policy. The two are inseparable. Our domestic agricultural policies, for example, have their effect upon the prices of agricultural products in other countries. Similarly, products made abroad by cheap labor are a threat to our own labor standards.

From these two basic concepts—our positive foreign policy and the indivisibility of our foreign and domestic policies—the Hoover Commission formulated its recommendations on how our Government should conduct its foreign affairs. The Department of State, the Commission said, is the President's arm for foreign policy, assisting him in formulating that policy and in carrying it out. But the Commission pointed out that the Department of State cannot do this job by itself. It must rely on other agencies of the Government to assist it both in developing and in carrying out our foreign policy.

Thus, where labor is concerned, the Department of State looks to the Department of Labor for advice and assistance. In the same way, the Department of State looks to the Department of Agriculture in the agricultural field, the Treasury Department in the financial field, the Department of Commerce in the commercial field, and so forth.

That is why the Department of Labor participates in foreign affairs. It is important, I think, for the American labor movement to know what the Labor Department, under the able leadership of Secretary Maurice J. Tobin, has been and is doing in the international field.

Since 1946 the Secretary of Labor has had a Trade Union Advisory Committee on International Affairs. George Meany, Matthew Woll, David Dubinsky, and George P. Delaney represent the American Federation of Labor. They are joined at the conference table by four representatives of the CIO and two from the railroad brotherhoods.

The advisory committee has met periodically with the Secretary and other key officials of the Department of Labor to discuss what the American labor movement thinks on the whole range of American foreign affairs.

Naturally, the primary emphasis is on the labor aspects of foreign policy, but by its very nature that covers pretty much the whole field. For who can limit the scope of labor's interests? Labor is as interested in our policy toward Korea or Soviet Russia as it is in tariffs, internationalization of the Ruhr, or international labor standards.

In the Foreign Service Act of 1946, Congress established the philosophy of a unified Foreign Service broadly representative of the interests of all the American people. The act created a Board of the Foreign Service, to "make recommendations to the Secretary [of State] concerning the functions of the Service, the policies and procedures to govern the selection, assignment, rating and promotion of Foreign Service officers, and the policies and procedures to govern the administration and personnel management of the Service.

Congress specified that the Board be composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. In other words, Congress, through the Foreign Service Act of 1946, gave recognition to the principle that American labor has as large a stake in our total Foreign Service enterprise as does American business or agriculture.

In addition to advising the Secretary of State on the over-all operation of the Foreign Service, the Department of Labor is especially concerned with the labor attaché program. The first labor attaché was appointed in 1943. The number has increased to 31 full-time labor attachés and 18 half-time labor reporting officers, stationed in 46 key spots over the globe.

Their job is to report to Washington current labor developments in their areas. These are vital data in the formulation of foreign policies and programs. The labor attachés also inform foreign peoples about American labor affairs and the role of free trade-unions in our democratic society.

In cooperation with the Department of State, the Department of Labor, through the Office of International Labor Affairs, is responsible for recruiting labor attachés and for working out their assignments abroad. A number of our ablest labor attachés have come from the ranks of organized labor. These men are making a great contribution to the Foreign Service because they combine an intimate knowledge of American labor affairs with a facility for establishing a mutual understanding with foreign trade unionists.

I believe the day will soon come when we will have trade unionists serving as American ambassadors to foreign countries. Even now there are former trade unionists among the chiefs of mission of the Marshall plan agency.

Readers of the American Federationist are familiar with the work of the International Labor Organization. One of its great founders was Samuel Gompers. The ILO is unique among international organizations because it is composed of representatives of employers and workers as well as of governments.

George P. Delaney, international representative of the American Federation of Labor, represents the workers of the United States in this important specialized agency of the United Nations. Charles P. McCormick, president of McCormick and Co., Baltimore, has been elected by the employers of the United States to represent them at the ILO. I am the United States Government representative on the governing body of the ILO and have been privileged to head the United States delegations to the last two annual ILO conferences.

Under the over-all foreign policy guidance of the Department of State, the Department of Labor has primary responsibility for United States activities connected with the ILO. The objective of the ILO is to strengthen the foundations of peace by improving the social and economic conditions of workers throughout the world. The ILO is dedicated to the propositions that "poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere," that "labor is not a commodity" and that "freedom of association is essential to sustained progress."

Through the adoption of international standards relating to decent labor conditions and through operating programs, the ILO seeks to improve the economic and social conditions upon which communism and totalitarianism can breed. It has recently created a commission to investigate violations of freedom of association. It seeks to raise the standards of workers everywhere so that our products will not have to compete on world markets with products of other countries produced by sweatshop labor. To the extent that the ILO is successful in this work, our own labor standards here in America are protected.

The ILO is not the only international organization which deals with labor matters. The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations has formulated policies on such matters as freedom of association, forced labor, full employment, slavery, migration, equal pay for equal work, the Covenant of Human Rights, and technical assistance. These issues, among others, are of real concern to labor, and the Department of Labor has participated in drafting instructions for United States delegates to the United Nations.

Officials of the Department of Labor have also served as advisers to the United States delegates at meetings of various United Nations bodies. In addition, representatives of the American labor movement have themselves served as members of the United States delegations to UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization.

The reciprocal trade agreements program is a cornerstone of our country's foreign economic policy. This program is designed to provide both national and international economic stability and progress through the promotion of international trade. The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign nations with a view to reducing American tariff rates, within certain limits established by law, in return for reciprocal tariff reductions by other countries. The President, of course, takes no action which would threaten injury to American industry or to American labor standards and employment.

The Department of Labor, because of the effects which tariff actions may have on such matters as the employment and purchasing power of the individual worker, participates fully in all stages of the Government's work connected with the trade agreements program. One of our important activities is to make sure that all international unions know on which commodities the United States intends to negotiate, so that the unions affected may present their views in the public hearings which are held before the Government determines whether or not it will offer tariff concessions on specific items. Another activity is the study of the effects on foreign labor of possible United States tariff reductions, in order to maximize the benefits of free international trade to workers abroad while at the same time protecting our own.

In all of our international activities, through daily contact with officials of the State Department and other agencies, we strive to see to it that the labor aspects of American foreign policy are given appropriate consideration in both the development and the conduct of our total foreign policy.

The Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Department of State, has been conducting exchange programs designed to strengthen democratic forces in other countries on a level where it counts. Two of these are providing technical assistance to other governments and arranging for foreign labor leaders and officials to observe conditions in the United States.

Under the first we have given training in the United States to officials of foreign Ministries of Labor in such fields as labor law administration, industrial safety, labor statistics, women's employment, manpower training and employment service organization. We have also sent out consultants in these fields.

By helping other countries to strengthen their government labor services, we are helping to improve the lot of the individual worker. Recently, for example, two officials of the United States Department of Labor participated in the Bell mission, which President Truman sent at the request of President Quirino to survey conditions in the Philippines. The mission made several basic recommendations to raise the standards of the Philippine worker. We are now working to put these recommendations into effect.

The program of observation in the United States for foreign labor leaders is one with which the American Federation of Labor is familiar. We have looked to American labor to carry out a major share of the task and labor has responded magnificently. This program brings carefully selected foreign labor leaders to the United States to see for themselves what America is like, how our unions operate, how our people live and the

general role of labor in the American community. The American Federation of Labor, on its own, has carried on similar programs.

In many respects these exchange programs are the meat of foreign relations. There is no more effective way to expose the lies and distortions which Communists and totalitarian propaganda have been spreading about America than to have foreign labor leaders see for themselves the truth about our Nation. Only in this way can they know what we are really doing. Only in this way can they come to understand our great democratic heritage.

One of these visitors, when he returned to his native land, made many speeches. Each time he started off by saying:

"What I am going to tell you about America is not what I was told to say by some Government official because I couldn't hear. I don't speak the language. What I am going to tell you I saw with my own eyes and I know it is true."

He then went on to describe labor's role in American democracy, contrasting the lies the Communists had been spreading with the facts he had himself seen in America.

This is an outline of what the Department of Labor is doing internationally. Our aim is to help strengthen democracy abroad and at home. This is our road to peace.

In the grave crisis that besets the world, totalitarian forces are seeking to extend their power. We have learned from bitter experience that the only language totalitarians understand is the language of strength. Our hope for checking the aggression of Communist imperialism lies in creating situations of strength—where people are united behind a representative government and determined to maintain their independence; where people can count on strong support from other free countries and from the United Nations; where people can hope to win a better life by their own efforts.

The Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the mutual-defense-assistance pact, point 4 and technical cooperation, and our firm stand in Korea—all these are designed to create situations of strength.

The Department of Labor and the American labor movement have both made significant contributions to this basic aim of American foreign power.

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio annually sponsors an essay contest to make us more conscious of the American way of life and the freedom that we enjoy under our form of government.

I am proud that one of the winners is from the Thirteenth District, and I am including the following essay of James Greenawalt, of Vermilion, Ohio:

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By James Greenawalt, Vermilion, Ohio)

The Constitution of the United States is the unique contribution of America to nation building. Its framers showed the world that independent States could, through peaceful agreement, form a Federal Union in which powers of general concern were vested in the Union, while authority in local matters was retained by the States.

The foresight and wisdom of the framers of the Constitution still amazes us. This instrument, created by these comparatively young men in the midst of a great crisis over 160 years ago, has served our Nation long and well. It truly fits the spirit of the people living under it.

A free people forming themselves into a nation will always have to set down the general principles and rules for a new government. Such a written constitution is not incapable of growth and adaption. Our own is not a dead contract which must be interpreted exactly as the parties who entered into it understood it. Rather, it is a living agreement which develops with time and adapts itself to economic and social changes brought about by our greatly increased population, industrialization, new means of transportation and communication.

The elastic clause of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power to legislate on all matters "necessary and proper for carrying into execution" the enumerated powers, makes it flexible to the spirit of the people governed by it and to those who administer it. Ever since the Constitution was framed, it has been undergoing clarification and interpretation.

The Constitution has grown through the years. There have been only 21 formal amendments, the first 12 being added shortly after its framing. An unwritten Constitution has developed through legislation, court decisions, party practices and customs, that is just as strong as the written one in many cases. For example, good legislation establishing Federal courts, administrative departments, boards, and commissions has supplemented the Constitution. The great body of our American law is not in the written Constitution but is to be found in the decision of our courts. The Supreme Court has assumed the power to invalidate acts of Congress which are in its opinion contrary to the Constitution. Party practices have been responsible for the establishment of the President's Cabinet, for the conversion of the electoral college into a party agency, and of the determining by caucuses of procedures and policies of the House of Representatives. Customs in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution have also played their part.

Thus we see that our Constitution has survived the changing times. It has built America into a strong, free nation. It has given us the highest standard of living for the average person found anywhere in the world. It has made us a peace-loving Nation willing to aid other countries in maintaining world peace. It has proved itself to be adequate for past and present needs and it will be able to adapt itself to the future problems and needs of this modern world.

The MacArthur Question—Personalities or Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am now, and have for many years been, an ardent admirer of the military genius of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Through the ages he will undoubtedly rank with the great military commanders of all time.

I think it is altogether fitting that he receive of his country a hero's welcome. I am looking forward to hearing his address to Congress tomorrow. He is certainly qualified to speak on far-eastern affairs, and I am hopeful that his message will be helpful to us in formulating a foreign policy that will be in the best interests of the United States, and that will be helpful in somehow finding a formula that will restore peace to the world.

I personally feel that the issues with which we are confronted are much bigger than that of any personality. I do not believe that we should attempt to make policy decisions upon any basis other than that of fact and principle. Our foreign policy, our military policy, civilian control of the Government, military discipline all appear to be elements of the big question. I hope that it can be resolved on the basis of principle, not prejudice, not personality, not politics. Our 60,000 Korean casualties call on all of us to chart a correct course, to find a sound solution.

As a part of my remarks, I include an article by Alyce Billings Walker from the Friday, April 13, issue of the Birmingham News:

IT SEEMS TO ME OUR MAIN PROBLEM REMAINS DEMOCRACY

(By Alyce Billings Walker)

"My country, right or wrong."

So, I'm going to keep my mouth shut, and pray the good Lord to get us out of the mess that engulfs us.

That, it seems to me, is the best I can do as a citizen. I'll not be a part of the clamoring, hysterical mob behaving just as our enemies would have us do. I'll not take my stand for Truman or for MacArthur, but for the United States of America and democracy as it was conceived by people who placed country before self.

I've read and listened to every scrap of information I could in the last 48 hours. My first impulse, too, was to sit in judgment on one or the other of the two men who have now upset the whole world. I made a list of the merits and demerits of both as recorded in the newspapers, over the radio, and from memory. It added up to the simple fact that I'm neither a Truman or a MacArthur "fan," but for each I have degrees of respect and admiration.

But, out of all the listening, reading, evaluating I have done, there evolved one indisputable fact: The President of the United States and the former commander in chief of the United Nations forces in Korea are each guilty of playing politics when the peace of the world was at stake. For that I cannot forgive them.

Truman is no mental giant, as historians will record. MacArthur is no diplomat, as his well-known temperamental outbursts through the years testify.

But Harry Truman is President of the United States and, as such, was MacArthur's Commander in Chief. I grant you, the latter has been strangely treated, and undoubtedly for political reasons. But so long as he was wearing the uniform of the United States Army, he was obligated to behave as a soldier, not as a leading man with the whole world as his stage.

If he could not conscientiously follow instructions of his superiors, he could have resigned his command. Reputed to be a strict disciplinarian, it seems strange that he should have repeatedly been guilty of what amounted to insubordination.

Time may prove MacArthur entirely right in his judgment of how war in Asia should be conducted—one does remember Billy Mitchell. But I believe he would have guaranteed his personal prestige and better protected the interests of his country by resigning on the grounds of maintaining his principles, than by forcing his discharge.

At the moment, he is martyr in the eyes of vast numbers of admirers and with others who can see no right in anything Truman does.

Frankly, I for one am not too interested in individual political martyrs at the moment. I'm only concerned about the thousands of young, unsung martyrs who are being sacrificed on war's altar trying to defend their imperiled country.

Progress in Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, commends the Congress for its action in voting out the segregation amendment to the armed service or manpower bill which was before the House last week.

His editorial follows:

NO SEGREGATION IN UNIFORM

The House has taken the only honorable action possible by eliminating the segregation clause from the draft bill.

It was an indirect clause, but it was segregation, just the same. It provided that draftees would have the right to ask assignment to units of their own race.

No such provision was contained in the Senate bill. The House Military Affairs Committee inserted it in the measure by a 21-12 vote, on motion by Representative WINSTEAD, (Democrat, Mississippi). It provided that inducted men's preferences would "govern any future assignment * * * insofar as military necessity may permit." The privilege was to go only to draftees, not to volunteers or reservists.

The clause was a definite repudiation of President Truman's Executive order calling for equality of opportunity and treatment in the armed services. It was 2 years ago that the order was issued, calling on the Secretary of Defense "to take steps to have the remaining instances of discrimination * * * eliminated as rapidly as possible."

The Armed Forces have made progress toward that goal. Nearly a year ago a Presidential committee reported that, "All Army jobs are now open to Negroes. * * * All Army school courses are open to Negroes without restriction or quotas. * * * All jobs and ratings in the Navy general service now are open to all enlisted men without regard to race or color. * * * The Marine Corps has abolished its segregated Negro training units. * * * All Air Force jobs and schools are open to qualified personnel without racial restriction or quotas."

The Army now asserts it has complete integration in training centers, though the color line remains in some combat units. As of last March 18, it reported 11.7 percent of its enlisted personnel and 2.1 percent of its officers were Negroes.

Although the Navy says it has "no special or unusual provisions" as regards race, only 3 percent of its enlisted personnel are Negroes while it has only 19 Negro officers. The Air Force has 5.6 percent Negroes in its enlisted ranks and only 0.6 percent among officers. The Marine Corps asserts segregation is gone but has no figures on Negro personnel "because we don't make race distinctions on service records."

The Winstead amendment was an attempt to undo all this by an indirect attack. It represented the sort of thinking that can't be accepted if we expect democracy to stand up in the conflict with communism. Its defeat in the House, duplicating the defeat of a similar move in the Senate a year ago, is heartening.

Veterans' Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter written by Mr. Miles Kennedy, director of the legislative commission of the American Legion; Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, legislative director of Disabled American Veterans; Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director of legislation, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; and Mr. Clarence G. Adamy, national service director, American Veterans of World War II. The statement reads as follows:

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,

Member of Congress:

We, the undersigned, representing the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II wish to strongly protest the report of the Department of Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives which recommends the reduction of the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service from $1,523,000 to $743,500. The committee expressed its belief that one Federal veterans' representative and a clerk-stenographer for each State and Territory, together with a small headquarters staff, would be adequate. This action amounts to a cut of over 53 percent, and in money, an amount of $639,500. This constitutes a staggering and crippling blow to an already small but hard-working and sincere Government service agency.

The Veterans' Employment Service is mandated by the people of this Nation and the Congress under provision of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to cooperate and aid the United States Employment Service and the State employment services to the end that veterans shall receive the maximum of job counseling and job opportunity in the field of gainful employment. To reduce this splendid, compact, well-organized force of 176 professional field representatives together with the eight professional staff members located in Washington to a shell of some 53 field representatives and a correspondingly smaller unit in headquarters would simply render the Veterans' Employment Service incapable of performing the responsibilities and duties mandated to them by law.

Let us point out that there still remains a sizable future task to be accomplished in terms of employment of veterans currently being trained under programs sponsored by the Government. As of February 20, 1951, the Veterans' Administration cites 1,576,494 veterans in educational and training programs under provisions of Public Law 346. On this same date, there were 93,604 disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation. The majority of these trainees are potential manpower for defense industry or activities contributing to the defense program. The present conflict in Korea and the increased mobilization of our Armed Forces can only result in a substantial increase in the number of disabled veterans who will require job-finding assistance. By late 1951 and early 1952, the Veterans' Employment Service will probably be faced with a situation which will not differ basically from that of 1945 and 1946. Thousands of servicemen will be discharged from service with combat disabilities and additional thousands with injuries resulting from training and other accidents. It will be the responsibility of the Veterans' Employment Service to facilitate their return to civilian life by finding them suitable employment.

Notwithstanding statistics which indicate that there are 62,000,000 people employed today and the labor market is tightening, the fact remains that there are many communities where employment is spotty. Many areas still have relatively high unemployment. Opportunity to materially reduce unemployment in these areas appears to be small because of geographical location, housing shortage, and inability of large number of workers to migrate. The particular problem as we representatives of the veterans' organizations see it is that the Veterans' Employment Service can make a most significant contribution in using its special facilities to gain for the veteran advancement from mediocre jobs to positions which will make full use of the skills he has acquired and the experience he has undergone in training.

The task of rendering special services to veterans in the field of gainful employment remains great. Current operations of and deployment of personnel of the Veterans' Employment Service is servicing efficiently and valuably to the welfare of our fighting men and women upon their discharge from service to their country. We believe that it is absolutely essential that their efforts and continuing positive accomplishments be maintained.

The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II at their respective 1950 conventions and encampments mandated full support to the maintenance of the Veterans' Employment Service and its operation of service to veterans in the field of gainful employment. We, therefore, the undersigned, respectfully request that action be taken which will result in the restoration of funds to the full amount as requested by the President in his budget for the fiscal year 1952, $1,583,000.

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director, Legislative Commission, the American Legion.

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director of Legislation, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Legislative Director, Disabled American Veterans.

CLARENCE G. ADAMY,
National Service Director, American Veterans of World War II.

Appeasement or a Munich?—No

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing some shrill talk about appeasement or a Munich in the Far East. I have been shocked by these irresponsible

statements. We must debate the present crisis on the issues and not on emotion or partisan considerations.

The critics of President Truman and the administration are playing directly into the hands of the Communists with their rantings about appeasement. And, at the same time, they are aiding the propagandists of the Kremlin by their talk of war in the Orient.

What do the American people want? They want peace and that is what our President is working for. We are derelict in our duty if we spread hysterical and false statements at this time.

The President is working for peace and the free peoples of the world are behind him. Last June, when the Communists attacked the Republic of Korea, our President made the decision to ask the United Nations to furnish the military force to stop the aggression. This was not appeasement. This was firm, resolute action.

When the Chinese Communists came into the war in November and the outlook was dark, our President and the United Nations did not falter. They declared the Chinese Communists as aggressors. They poured in the men and machines to stop the aggressors. This was no Munich. This action was that of men with the will to fight for what they considered to be right.

The Communists have wanted to take Formosa. Our President has protected that island with the Seventh Fleet. Appeasers would have long since given up Formosa. But, by the action of President Truman not one Communist has set foot on the island.

There have been some in the United Nations who have wanted to give in to the Chinese Communists by allowing them into the UN and by giving them a voice in the Japanese Peace Treaty talks. In spite of the false propaganda by the critics of the President, our Nation has stood consistently against such a deal.

In his speech to the Nation on last Wednesday, the President declared firmly for peace. He said in forceful terms:

> We are ready, at any time to negotiate for a restoration of peace in the area. But we will not engage in appeasement. We are only interested in real peace.
>
> Real peace can be achieved through a settlement based on the following factors:
>
> 1. The fighting must stop.
> 2. Concrete steps must be taken to insure that the fighting will not break out again.
> 3. There must be an end to aggression.

This, I say, is a real program for peace. Anyone who charges otherwise is guilty only of trying to avoid the truth, and of confusing the people. They are guilty of what the President calls political hokum and they have truthfully put their own personal aggrandizement above the good of their country.

If the truth were known, they are more interested in getting us into a war than in trying to bring about a real peace. They should quit hiding behind their sham of misrepresentation and distortion of the facts.

The Mediterranean—Strategic Road to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth in the RECORD a very excellent article by William H. Hessler which appeared in the April 3, 1951, issue of the Reporter.

I feel sure the Members will find this helpful to bring into proper focus many of the matters on which we will legislate.

The article follows:

THE MEDITERRANEAN—STRATEGIC ROAD TO RUSSIA

(By William H. Hessler)

For any nation that commands the sea and air, the Mediterranean is the highroad to the Soviet heartland. To be sure, Korea and Western Europe are getting the headlines at the moment, and, for the tireless writers of science fiction, the new frontier of the Arctic is a theme of endless fascination. But our military planners are giving some hard thought to the Mediterranean.

In February, American and British naval and air officers met in Malta to plan a stronger, more integrated deployment of their strength in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. About the same time, the United States and France began negotiations to reactivate five wartime air bases in Morocco. The upshot is a program for the rapid build-up of air and sea bases from Gibraltar to the Persian Gulf. Runways are to be lengthened and underground gasoline dumps provided in Morocco, Tripoli, Egypt, Cyprus, Jordan, Iraq, and Iran. Weather-observation stations are to be installed and communications equipment set up—so that America's heavier aircraft can fly from these positions, which dot the Mediterranean for more than 2,000 miles from west to east.

This joint program has been made public. But there are certainly other strategic plans not on the public record. When Red Fleet printed a jittery charge that the United States and Britain are preparing offensive war against Russia's Black Sea ports, it revealed the Kremlin's respect for the striking power of carrier-based aircraft. Russia's defenses against fast, low-altitude, sea-based planes are weaker than those against big, relatively slow long-range bombers.

There is no mistaking the stress put on the eastern Mediterranean lately. Along with the Malta and Paris meetings, there has been a thorough canvass of the entire area by Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter, who, although new in that post, is an old hand at air power. British sent Gen. Sir Brian Robertson, commander of its Middle East forces, to Israel on a mission frankly strategic in aim; and Israel has opened the door to staff talks with American military men. George W. Perkins, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, took a trip to Belgrade at the same time that his counterpart for the Middle East, George C. McGhee, led a procession of high officials, military and civilian, to Turkey, a country pressing Washington for outright alliance.

The biggest conference of military leaders, however, was held in Paris in the first week of March, when General Eisenhower and sundry subordinates met with Admiral Robert B. Carney, commanding our Mediterranean forces; Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations; and General Robertson. Their subject was the organization and use of sea power in the Mediterranean. In the aggregate, these top-level dealings bear witness to the urgency of military readiness there.

The constant search of American military planners is for potential means of bringing air and sea power to bear on the Soviet Union if necessary. They can plan to stand on the defensive in the Far East and on the islands flanking the eastern shore of Asia once the Korean War is ended. They can provide radar warning stations and interceptor squadrons for the defense of North America in the northwest, north, and northeast—the possible danger zones. They can anticipate the path of the main Soviet attack in Europe, because it would have to come on the northern plain that extends from Moscow to the English Channel.

But these are problems of defense, and defense of itself does not win wars. America's most telling weapons for offensive war are aircraft—land-based and sea-based. They range from single-place fighters to the six-engine B-36, and their armament from .50-caliber machine guns to the atomic bomb. The strategic planners find their most urgent and most baffling task in determining how to deploy their offensive power where it would hurt the Kremlin most, support our allies best, and also protect our prime sources of strategic materials and our sea lanes to them.

This search for the means of staging a retaliatory offensive and of supporting valued partners leads military men inexorably to the Mediterranean. That tideless sea can best be thought of as an arm of the Atlantic extending into the heart of the Eurasian-African land mass, the "world island" of the geopoliticians. It is a long, irregular corridor, rimmed completely by friendly or neutral nations (except for the short Albanian coast), reaching nearly to the front door of the Soviet Union. For Britain, after the opening of the Suez Canal back in 1869, it was the supreme sea-communication line, linking the homeland with India and Australasia. Today it has four big strategic uses.

First and foremost, it is an avenue on which air-sea power could be brought to bear against the Soviet Union and its European satellites. Second, it is a sea lane for the logistical support of southern France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey. Third, it is an efficient sea lane to the Middle East and the richest petroleum lands of the world. Finally, it would be a formidable water barrier against a European continent held by the Red army, if it should come to that.

The main body of Europe is a peninsula, flanked by the Baltic and the Mediterranean. In war, the Baltic would be a Russian lake, because the entrances are too constricted and shallow for our penetration, because it is too small for maneuver, and because it parallels the flat northern plains of Europe. But the Mediterranean, with ample sea room for ships to maneuver and with friendly nations all around, contains a series of north-south peninsulas (Greece, Italy, Spain). It is evident that the north of Europe, being a wide corridor open at both ends, is vulnerable to any strong land force, while the south of Europe is cut off from the north by mountains and trisected by projecting arms of the Mediterranean (Aegean, Adriatic, Ligurian Seas). By the logic of geography, in modern war southern Europe must "belong" to the dominant sea power, just as northern Europe must "belong" to the dominant land power.

Our chief political allies are in the west of Europe. The problem there is to create

enough defensive strength to fight a holding war. Our natural geographic allies for offensive action are in the south, in a broken east-west row, Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, Italy, Spain.

America, as the preeminent sea power, has a relation of mutual dependence with these impoverished Mediterranean states in a strategic deployment ordered by geography. Turkey and Greece are a shield keeping Russia from the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean. Yugoslavia is a shield keeping Russia from the Adriatic and central Mediterranean. Spain adjoins the only reliable entrance to the Mediterranean. Simply by existing as non-Soviet states, these countries make the Middle Sea a viable sea lane for us. At the same time, while we and the British command its waters, the Mediterranean is a highway on which we can bring support to these partners who are not yet (excepting Italy) formal allies. We look to them as buffers for our sea corridor. They look to us for munitions, supply, reinforcement, and air support.

Starting with these geographic realities, we can piece together the main elements of the potential counteroffensive strategy now taking form. Fast carrier task forces would roam the Mediterranean sending fast, low-altitude fight-bombers northward against tactical targets. Land-based fighters and attack bombers would do the same, working from many bases scattered through the islands and peninsulas of the region. The primary task would be to achieve command of the air, the secondary to slow aggressor ground forces.

Medium-range bombers from well-protected bases farther back would fly north and northeast to smash at strategic targets in the satellite states, European Russia, and the vital area just behind the Urals. The planned improvement of British air bases in Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Cyprus, and Tripoli is a clear preparation for such a counteroffensive. Greek and Turkish airfields could serve as forward bases for fighter aircraft—on bomber-escort missions and offensive sweeps.

Just what our heavier aircraft would be able to do from bases in the British Isles or what our monster B-36's could do from their aerie in Texas only actual performance in all-out war can confirm. It would depend on how well the Russians have developed their high-altitude defenses. Long-range bombers would be relied on to deliver main offensive blows at strategic targets in the Soviet Union, but even if these aerial battleships did all that was expected of them, they could not keep the Red army out of Western Europe. Wrecking Soviet tank factories would then be no more important than wrecking Soviet tanks on the move eastward.

Meantime, if Soviet ground forces attacked, merchantmen of the United States and some allies would be plowing eastward through the Mediterranean under antisubmarine escort. This maritime service of supply would bring to our air bases throughout the area the ammunition, fuel, foodstuffs, defensive ground-force contingents, fighter-aircraft replacements, and other items essential to overseas aerial operations. It would bring the nations of southern Europe equipment to sharpen their harrying thrusts northward against the exposed southern flank of the Soviet war machine, a flank that would grow ever longer as the attack moved westward. On this sea route also we might deploy amphibious task forces of great mobility and fire power for special jobs in southern Europe, the Middle East, or (if Red fleet's fears were confirmed) the Black littoral of Russia.

Middle eastern petroleum poses an acute problem for strategic planners, because the oil-bearing regions of Iran, Iraq, and Arabia are not protected by natural barriers against oil-hungry Russia. If we cannot insure the holding of these areas against Soviet troops (a ground-force task of large dimensions), utilizing these oil fields.

Even in the worst conceivable circumstances—seizure and occupation of the great bulk of Europe by Communist forces—the Mediterranean would remain immensely important in Anglo-American strategy. With their overwhelming superiority in sea power, America and Britain could maintain logistical support for air bases in north Africa and on various islands—Crete, Cyprus, Malta, Sardinia. To hold the islands would be an air-sea task. To hold North Africa would require only sea command of the Mediterranean and ground-force defense of a 100-mile front on the Isthmus of Suez. In 1943 Allied victory was accomplished in north Africa mainly because Anglo-American sea power in the Mediterranean tended to isolate Rommel's armies. In reverse, the same sea command could assure the safety and effective operation of air bases in and south of the Mediterranean.

Whether we assume the best or the worst, whether we should manage to hold most of Europe, or lose it, we cannot hang back and trust to the British Isles—Mr. Hoover's unsinkable aircraft carrier and the cornerstone of his cautious strategy of passive defense. Britain lies at the end of the north European plain, separated from it by 18 miles of water. It backs up a purely defensive position. From British bases, we could launch retaliatory bomber strikes against Moscow and Leningrad, and fighter and attack planes for the support of defensive ground forces on the European plain. But if we wanted to win such a war, and not merely go through the motions of resisting, we would do better to work from the British air bases scattered from Gibraltar to the Persian Gulf. Britain's contribution is not merely a cluster of airfields in the home islands, but a series of shrewdly placed positions along the underbelly of Europe, won by centuries of canny diplomacy and stubborn fighting.

The plan for deploying the power of the West in the Mediterranean are new, but they rest on extensive preparation—on 3 years of support for Turkey and Greece, on the resuscitation of Italian naval power, and on Washington's recent rather wary conciliation of the Franco regime. The Mediterranean area has been cultivated by diplomats in advance of its exploitation by soldiers and sailors.

Italian naval power is not to be laughed away. Set against that of the United States, it is trifling—25,000 officers and men (the limit imposed by treaty) against half a million. Forbidden by treaty to maintain aircraft carriers or submarines, Italy cannot pose as a great naval power. But in the Mediterranean, it could contribute the small, fast craft that count for so much in antisubmarine warfare in calm, restricted waters.

Spain enters the calculations of any Mediterranean strategy because a hostile power in Andalusia could endanger our use of the Strait of Gibraltar. The whole edifice of an offensive and defensive strategy for the region would collapse if the guns or planes of a strong enemy dominated the 15-mile-wide passage. Under Generalissimo Franco or anybody else, therefore, Spain needs to be persuaded—and if necessary helped—to defend its own soil. But that is about all the Western Powers really need from Spain.

To make our offensive-defensive Mediterranean strategy effective, political planners must try to gain the active, full-scale participation of two powers not yet woven into the fabric of the North Atlantic alliance—Yugoslavia and Turkey. Their armies, properly employed, could neutralize nearly half the ground-force strength Russia would have initially for an attack in Europe.

The problems faced by political planners, however, are a story in themselves. It is enough to observe, in purely strategic terms, that one down-to-earth fact must guide our political dealings with the Mediterranean states—that Tito's Yugoslavia can help us prevent war with Russia, or else help us mightily to prevent the loss of Western Europe if war should come, while Franco's Spain could do little more than provide a last-gasp defensive beachhead on the Continent from which to undertake the stupendously bloody and heart-breaking task of reconquering all Europe once it was stupidly lost. This is spelled out clearly by Tito and his spokesmen, who have said Yugoslavia will fight if Greece is attacked, if Italy is invaded through Austria, if Russia strikes in Germany. That covers about everything but an end run through Norway. Yugoslavia is in our corner. And it has force and the incentive to use it.

Our emergent strategy for the Mediterranean needs to be far better understood across the breadth of America. There are two ingredients for a successful strategic plan. One is to keep Soviet armies out of industrial Western Europe. The other is to throw in a relentless succession of hard belly punches by sea and air from all around the perimeter of the Red world. And for this second task, which is the counteroffensive and therefore the decisive task, the Mediterranean beckons. It is a high road flanked by friends, and it leads to the doorstep of Stalin's Eurasian heartland.

New York Editor Approves Hall Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, continuing the long list of valued and ardent supporters of the Hall antiregistration bill, I incorporate herewith in the Appendix a fine editorial by Mr. John J. O'Connor, hunting and fishing authority and editor of the Bronx Times.

Mr. O'Connor's broad outlook both in his own field of sports and also upon our national affairs leads him to some constructive conclusions which are contained in his following column:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Orchids and salutations to Congressman EDWIN A. HALL, Republican, Binghamton, N. Y., for introducing H. R. 3023, a bill which prohibits the registration of firearms.

This bill is so important to the rights of the citizens of this country that it is given here in its complete text:

"A bill to prohibit registration of firearms already issued legally and to protect citizens against unconstitutional seizure of private weapons

"Whereas during World War II, Nazi-minded officers attempted to pass laws abridging the constitutional right of a private citizen to bear arms; and

"Whereas these same officers started their anti-American program by calling for registration of all privately owned firearms; and

"Whereas our founding fathers wisely incorporated within the Constitution of the United States this inherent privilege to our citizens to protect their hearths—homes by possessing arms; and

"Whereas in the several States, the revival of tyranny is asserting itself in the form of proposals to register all legally issued

private weapons with design to eventual seizure of firearms owned by individual citizens: Therefore,

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That no citizen shall be compelled to register of firearms of which he is in legal possession.

"Sec. 2. No Federal, State, or local officer shall have the power to seize firearms belonging to private citizens who legally possess them."

To the good citizens and sportsmen alike, please protect your constitutional rights, and write or wire your Congressman today, telling him to give his backing to bill H. R. 3028, as it is now referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means.

BIRDS GO OFF MILADY'S BONNET

After April 15, the plumage of wild birds may not be sold in New York State, according to a conservation law passed 10 years ago which gave feather merchants and millinery establishments a decade to dispose of plumage already on hand.

That means that milady's bonnet henceforth offered for sale in this State may sport only the feathers of certain birds captivity-reared in the United States, and classified by law as "domestic fowl." Exempt under the law is the plumage of "domestic fowl," such as feathers of the following birds raised in captivity in the United States: chickens, turkeys, guineas, geese, ducks, pigeons, ostriches, rheas, peafowl, and eight varieties of pheasants or their hybrids: ringnecks, goldens, silvers, Lady Amherstsa, Reeves, Swinhoe, and brown and blue eared.

The law does not apply to licensed commercial fly-tying feathers which traditionally have been used in the making of fishing lures, but all feather and millinery merchants, under the law, must turn over all remaining supplies of illegal plumage to the State Conservation Department by May 19, 1951.

Blows Whistle on Additional Abuses of Hazard Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter recently published in Armed Forces on the subject of the abuses of flight pay:

BLOWS WHISTLE ON ADDITIONAL ABUSES OF HAZARD PAY

To the EDITOR:

In reference to a letter concerning sub hazard pay, in the March 24 issue of Armed Force, I am an ex-airedale and can vouch for the fact that submen are not alone in their plight.

While in a patrol squadron in the Pacific men not actually needed in the crews were flown 4 hours a month for the sole purpose of giving them flight pay. That condition exists today.

On several naval air stations, I ran across a more openly unfair deal. There the ground crew men of various departments were given flight pay, chiefs getting most of the skins, first class next, and so on down the line. The seamen and third class got practically no chance at the flight pay. None of the men had any business whatsoever flying. The flight skins were assigned to various departments strictly as a favor.

Paper time was another ruse used during the war. A man who was getting this unneeded flight pay would let some air-happy seaman fly under his name. The seaman got the thrill, the man whose name he signed in the log got the pay.

Another device which was occasionally used was the falsification of the BuSandA form sent to disbursing, which authorized the flight pay. The form would contain one or two names which had never appeared on any flight sheet. These free-riders would then be credited flight pay when they had actually flown no time during the entire month.

Of course, it goes without saying that an officer's life is now worth 100 bucks per month when he risks it. An enlisted man's body, containing less vital chemicals, such as gold, is worth only $50 per month in hazard pay.

AN EX-AIREDALE.

Majority Views on Colorado River Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the following statement:

STATEMENT OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS CONCERNING S. 75 AND H. R. 1500, CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House has given several weeks of study to this proposed legislation. We have heard experts on all aspects of the project. We have just returned from a trip to the Southwest, where all features of the project were viewed and personal interviews were undertaken. As a result of these studies, we have arrived at certain suggestions and conclusions concerning S. 75 and the companion bill, H. R. 1500.

The committee knows of the extreme drought situation that faces the area from western Kansas to the Pacific Ocean and from the Navajo country to the Mexican border. On the trip members of the committee witnessed many empty reservoirs and vast fields that could not be irrigated due to lack of water. We discovered a shortage of power because of shortage of water for hydroelectric facilities. We learned of lowering water tables. On the other hand, in the Colorado River the committee saw thousands of second-feet of water not being presently used.

We are fully cognizant of the great benefit that could accrue to central Arizona if this water, presently going to waste, could be put to use in this drought-stricken area.

We believe, however, that the proposed bills, as presently presented to the committee, would not provide the relief hoped for. We want to be helpful to Arizona and her people in the solving of the serious present water problem. We, feel, however, that the bills, in their present form, would not resolve the water problem facing Arizona. We think that the legal question of the right to the use of waters of the lower Colorado River Basin would not be resolved by the legislation; that the adjudication of the water rights should come before authorization of the project, and not following; the committee is fearful that the method provided in the legislation is not the proper procedure and would not result in obtaining adjudication of these rights by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The need for adjudication of the rights to the use of waters of the lower Colorado River Basin was admitted by every witness before the committee. Adjudication has been recommended by the President, the Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of the Budget, the Judiciary Committee, and this committee of the Congress. It is a fact recognized in section 13 of the bills under consideration. There is no argument on this point. The following quotations indicate the agreement of all concerned for the necessity of the adjudication of the water rights in the lower Colorado River Basin:

"Authorization of any of the projects inventoried in the report should not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President until a determination is made of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system." (H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., p. 1.)

"The first question raised was whether there is enough water in the Colorado River, available for use in Arizona, to satisfy the needs of this project on a permanent basis. The President has stated many times that he would like to see a definitive settlement of the rights of the various States to waters of the Colorado River system, in order that decisions on projects to be developed in the public interest may be made on a firm basis with respect to water rights. The President consistently has indicated his unwillingness to take any position favorable to authorization of the central Arizona project until settlement of the water-rights controversy has been brough about." (Bureau of the Budget, in letter to chairman of House Committee on Public Lands, dated April 19, 1950.)

"There is agreement among all agencies concerned as to the urgent need for resolution of the water-rights issues involved." (Report of Director of Bureau of the Budget, May 19, 1948 hearings, H. J. Res. 225, 80th Cong., House Judiciary Committee.)

"That further development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin, particularly large-scale development, is seriously handicapped, if not barred, by lack of a determination of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system." (Report of Commissioner of Reclamation, H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess., Secretary's interim report on Colorado River.)

"Assurance of a water supply is an important element of the plan yet to be resolved. The showing in the report of the availability of a substantial quantity of Colorado River water for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes is based upon the assumption that the claims of the State of Arizona to this water are valid. It should be noted, however, as the regional director and the Commissioner of Reclamation have pointed out, that the State of California has challenged the validity of Arizona's claim. If the contentions of the State of Arizona are correct, there is an ample water supply for this project. If the contentions of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply available from the Colorado River for this diversion." (Secretary of Interior's report in letter of transmittal of the project planning report, H. Doc. 136, 81st Cong.)

"There is not available for use in the other State sufficient water for all the projects, Federal and local, which are already in existence or authorized." (Report of the Secretary on S. J. Res. 145, 80th Cong.)

"The committee feels the dispute between these two States on the lower Colorado River Basin should be determined and settled by

agreement between the two States or by court decision because the dispute between these two States jeopardizes and will delay the possibility of prompt development of any further projects for the diversion of water from the main stream of the Colorado River in the lower Colorado River Basin.

"Therefore the committee recommends that immediate settlement of this dispute by compact or arbitration be made, or that the Attorney General of the United States promptly institute an action in the United States Supreme Court against the States of the lower basin, and other necessary parties, requiring them to assert and have determined their claims and rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin." (House Committee on Public Lands, in Report No. 910, July 14, 1947, on H. R. 1597 (reauthorizing the Gila project).)

The point we wish to make here is the complete agreement of administrative and legislative agencies, including the President, Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of the Budget, House Judiciary Committee, and this committee of the Congress, as to the need of adjudication of the waters of the lower Colorado River Basin.

If the committee should proceed with the authorization of the central Arizona project, as contemplated in the proposed legislation, in the light of the foregoing, this committee and the Congress might well find itself in the position of having authorized a project which would entail the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars that, because of a Court decision (which must be made), might well find itself without sufficient water and therefore uneconomical and unfeasible.

The testimony before the committee was to the effect that the funds could not be appropriated until the water rights were determined. (See sec. 13 of the bills.) We are not convinced this is the case. It will be noted the section deals with expenditures, not appropriations, and provides for the suspension of expenditures for the construction of certain features of the project while a suit is pending. (Described in section 12.) However, the resumption of the Secretary's power of expenditure is not conditioned on the result of the suit. In other words, he may resume construction and thereby the use of appropriations as soon as the suit is ended, regardless of the result.

To state the matter in another way: The prohibition in this section against expenditures would end (1) if the State brought no action within 6 months, or (2) if the Court should dispose of the action on technical ground without settling the controversy.

It further appears to us that the matter of prohibition against expenditures is one that would be determined by the Secretary of the Interior—not by the Congress—if this bill was enacted into law. In other words, the spending of appropriations would be determined by the Secretary and not by the Congress. We feel that such a determination is one that should rest with the Congress before expenditures are made.

Argument was made before the committee that enactment of this proposed legislation is necessary in order to set up a justiciable case for consideration of the Court. We are inclined to believe that is not the case and that, in fact, because of the limitations in this bill, the matter will cause the Court to refuse consideration. The committee finds that the Court did hear an almost identical case: *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (325 U. S. 589). The prayer, the issues, and the results, as described in that case, all closely parallel with the central Arizona project.

"The prayer was for a determination of the equitable share of each State in the water and of the priorities of all appropriations in both States and for an injunction restraining alleged wrongful diversions." (*Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (325 U. S., at p. 592).)

Again, in hearings on the Gila project in the Eightieth Congress before this committee the committee stated:

"The committee feels the dispute between these two States on the lower Colorado River Basin should be determined and settled by agreement between the two States or by Court decision because the dispute between these two States jeopardizes and will delay the possibility of prompt development of any further projects for the diversion of water from the main stream of the Colorado River in the lower Colorado River Basin. (Rept. No. 910, July 14, 1947, on H. R. 1597.)

"That further development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin, particularly large-scale development, is seriously handicapped, if not barred by lack of a determination of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system." (From Secretary's Interim Report by Commissioner of Reclamation on the Colorado River—H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess.)

"The evidence supports the finding of the special master that the dependable natural flow of the river during the irrigation season has long been overappropriated. A genuine controversy exists. The States have not been able to settle their differences by compact. The areas involved are arid or semiarid. Water in dependable amounts is essential to the maintenance of the vast agricultural enterprises established on the various sections of the river. The dry cycle which has continued over a decade has precipitated a clash of interests which between sovereign powers could be traditionally settled only by diplomacy or war. The original jurisdiction of this Court is one of the alternative methods provided by the framers of our Constitution." (*Arizona* v. *California* (283 U. S. 423, 462–464).)

Obviously, these are parallel situations to one which now presents itself to this committee. The Court's summary of the controversy in the case of *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* reads, in part, as follows:

"If this were an equity suit to enjoin threatened injury, the showing made by Nebraska might possibly be insufficient. But *Wyoming* v. *Colorado*, supra, indicates that where the claims to the water of a river exceed the supply a controversy exists appropriate for judicial determination. If there were a surplus of unappropriated water, different considerations would be applicable. Cf. *Arizona* v. *California* (298 U. S. 558, L. ed. 1331, 56 S. Ct. 848). But where there is not enough water in the river to satisfy the claims asserted against it, the situation is not basically different from that where two or more persons claim the right to the same parcel of land. The present claimants being States we think the clash of interests to be of that character and dignity which makes the controversy a justiciable one under our original jurisdiction. (From p. 610 of the Court's summary.)

It will be noted the Court held that there was a justiciable controversy and one under its original jurisdiction.

It should be remembered that for 29 years a fruitless effort to arrive at an interstate compact for the use of the waters of the lower Colorado Basin has been going on.

In the case of *Colorado* v. *Kansas* (320 U. S. 383), at page 616, the Court has this to say:

"But the efforts at settlement in this case have failed. A genuine controversy exists. The gravity and importance of the case are apparent. The difficulties of drafting and enforcing a decree are no justification for us to refuse to perform the important function entrusted to us by the Constitution."

These considerations justify the opinion stated by the Secretary of the Interior at hearings before this committee on H. R. 934 and 935, Eighty-first Congress, first session, page 1150.

"The bare statement of these questions, the knowledge that there is disagreement between Arizona and California about the answers to be given them, and the fact that, if the contentions of either State are accepted in full and if full development of the upper basin within the limits fixed by the Colorado River compact is assumed, there is not available for use in the other State sufficient water for all the projects, Federal and local, which are already in existence or authorized would seem to indicate that there exists a justiciable controversy between the States."

The committee notes that it took the Court only 3½ to 8 months to decide the three previous cases of Arizona against California. We therefore believe that this committee was wholly justified when it recommended that immediate settlement of this dispute by compact or arbitration be made, or that the Attorney General of the United States promptly institute an action in the United States Supreme Court against the States of the lower basin, and other necessary parties, requiring them to assert and have determined their claims and rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin.

We think that this suit could be brought at an early date and that this committee have the benefit of the determination of the court of the water rights of the lower Colorado River Basin.

We would like to call attention to the limitations in the bills before us which might result in the refusal of the court to resolve the dispute. Sections 12 and 13 prescribe the manner and instructions with respect to the suit proposed in the legislation to be submitted to the Supreme Court. There is a limitation on the subject matter of the suit to the right to divert water through aqueducts or tunnels to be constructed pursuant to this act. It is noted that only the diversion proposed in S. 75 and H. R. 1500 would come within the prerogative of the court under limitation prescribed by this legislation. We doubt the Supreme Court could arrive at an equitable determination of the rights involved if it accepted the case under these limitations.

It appears to us that there are several acts and compacts, in addition to the proposed legislation, that would enter into the controversy. There is the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the California Self-Limitation Act, and the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act. Also, there is the Mexican Water Treaty, the act of the Arizona Legislature of 1944, which recognized certain rights in California, and possibly others. It is difficult for us to see how the Supreme Court could determine the aggregate rights of the States to the use of waters in the lower Colorado River Basin under the limitations imposed by sections 12 and 13 of the bills. It might well result in the Court refusing to consider the suit.

We recognize the great need for additional water for maintenance of the present economy in Arizona and would like to be helpful in solving the present difficulties. We therefore suggest to the proponents of S. 75 and H. R. 1500 that steps immediately be taken for the adjudication of the rights to the use of the waters in the lower Colorado River Basin; that a firm settlement be reached with the Indians who will be damaged by the construction of the project (we feel that section 14 is not a satisfactory solution).

It seems to us most unfortunate that two great States of this Union, both so vitally affected by the use of Colorado River water, should not arbitrate these issues.

Engineers and financial experts, whose position would be one of neutrality between the States involved, could be found to determine these issues on a sound, equitable and feasible basis. Such action by both States would be an indication of a desire to resolve the issue in the best interests of the Nation. Propaganda and charges and counter charges have but befogged the issues and undoubtedly jeopardized the position of both States.

We urge the parties in interest to give serious consideration to such arbitration so that we may take affirmative and constructive action.

WALTER S. BARING, J. ERNEST WHARTON, DEAN P. TAYLOR, JOHN P. SAYLOR, EDWARD H. JENISON, FRED G. AANDAHL, A. L. MILLER, FRED L. CRAWFORD, FRANK A. BOW, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, NORRIS POULSON, HAMER BUDGE, WESLEY A. D'EWART, CLAIR ENGLE, SAM YORTY.

CONCURRING STATEMENT BY ENGLE AND YORTY

The undersigned, not having participated in the original drafting of the foregoing statement, wish to concur with the following explanaton in two instances:

First, with reference to the third paragraph on the first page: There is water presently going to waste and the use of it would benefit Arizona. But, this is water belonging to the upper basin which is unused at the present time; and, water belonging to Arizona and California for presently constructed or authorized projects and to Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico which is not currently being used. Consequently, although this water is currently going to waste, it will be used, and no further projects (the central Arizona included) can be predicated on it.

Second, the third paragraph on page eleven: It is admitted that additional water would help the economy of Arizona as it would any area in the arid southwest. But Arizona has exercised no care in the utilization of her existing water, and is flagrantly over-using her water. The record is replete with evidence of this fact, including the records of the Department of Agriculture that agricultural production in Arizona since 1946 in spite of her short water supply has increased more in volume and dollars than any State in the Union.

Finally, we think the statement is clear that it is premature to determine the disputed question of economic feasibility of the proposed project until the water rights in the lower basin are first determined, and that that basic question is reversed for future consideration.

CLAIR ENGLE.
SAM YORTY.

Key to United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor by Joseph C. Harsch:

STATE OF THE NATION
(By Joseph C. Harsch)
KEY TO UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

WASHINGTON.—The most revealing single passage in President Truman's April 11 radio address on foreign policy was the one which read:

"If they had followed the right policies in the 1930's—if the free countries had acted together to crush the aggression of the dictators, and if they had acted in the beginning when the aggression was small—there would probably have been no World War II.

"The beginning when the aggression was small," in the period which led down the sorry road to World War II, was in 1930, when Japan first tested the waters of aggression in Manchuria.

The historians and the diplomats who have gone back over the record of the pre-World War II period have inclined more and more to put their finger on that year as the place where history could have been shaped differently if the free countries had joined together to halt the first test of aggression instead of pulling apart and letting it happen.

The man who put his finger most emphatically upon that year and upon the story of inaction in the West was Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State at the time in the Cabinet of President Hoover.

And it is to be noted that no other book on the history of that period so often is studied and quoted from by the present planners of our foreign policy as Mr. Stimson's book On Active Service.

In that book Mr. Stimson tells how he begged and pleaded and reasoned with Mr. Hoover to be allowed to use the military power of the United States in a common effort to halt that first case of aggression. He tells with cold disapproval of Mr. Hoover's refusal to allow him to move the Pacific Fleet beyond Pearl Harbor, and how his efforts to organize a collective front with the British broke down because he could do no more than bluff and because the British felt that a bluff was bound to fail.

Mr. Stimson is the real philosopher of postwar American foreign policy. His book is the textbook which has been consulted at every step down this other and different road. Dean Acheson is the foreign-policy disciple of Henry L. Stimson and President Truman is the convinced student.

To a large degree, the great debate through which we have just passed on European policy has been just another round in the old argument between the philosophy of Mr. Hoover and the philosophy of Mr. Stimson. The difference is that this time Mr. Hoover is not President and is not in a position to hold the fleet at Pearl Harbor. The students of Mr. Stimson are in office and have been willing to use the Army of the United States in Greece, the Air Force in the Berlin airlift, and all branches of our Armed Forces in Korea.

So far, the story this time is the reverse of the story of the 1930's. Everything Mr. Stimson wanted to do then and was denied permission to do by Mr. Hoover is being done now in spite of the protests of Mr. Hoover's friends and followers. That they do protest is the most natural thing in the world, because, if the Stimson plan of action succeeds in saving us from a third great world war, Mr. Stimson's stand in 1930 will be vindicated and Mr. Hoover's refuted.

The issue is not really between Democrats and Republicans. By political accident, it happens that Messrs. Truman and Acheson are the present executive heirs of the Stimson tradition. But General Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles, and Senators Lodge, Duff, and Morse—all Republicans—are just as much heirs of the same tradition. And the shadow of Theodore Roosevelt is behind the doctrines of Mr. Stimson.

The duel is between those who believe there can be security in isolation and those who believe there can be security only in collective resistance to aggression. The antagonists of the moment would appear to be General MacArthur and President Truman. The real antagonists today, as at every stage of the continuing great debate, are the philosophies of Herbert Hoover and Henry L. Stimson.

Arbor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, each year, the State of Nebraska, whose Third District I have the privilege to serve, honors J. Sterling Morton, the father of Arbor Day. My State observes its yearly celebration of Arbor Day on the birthday of its founder, April 22.

The significance of what J. Sterling Morton did nearly four score years ago has been almost lost behind the silken mist of the poetry, legend, and emotionalism which is still—and justly so—part of Arbor Day.

What Morton—one-time Governor of Nebraska and one-time Secretary of Agriculture—really did was to give forest conservation back to the people. Successful conservation can only come from individual communities individually aroused. The great Nebraskan provided the spark which spread like a prairie fire across the country from ocean to ocean.

In 1682, when children who had landed at Plymouth Rock were still alive, William Penn decreed that an acre should be maintained in forest land for every five cleared in lands granted by him.

The Penn decree was issued in a community—an area which had not attained the working status of a true province.

Shortly after the acceptance by the original 13 States of the Constitution, in 1791, the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture offered medals for the planting of locust trees—a type of timber then in great demand.

The New York Society heard a committee report in 1795 recommending that inferior farm land be devoted to tree raising.

In 1804 the Massachusetts Society gave premiums for growing trees. This movement did not die out suddenly in Massachusetts. The Massachusetts State Legislature in 1817 asked its State department of agriculture to encourage tree planting, particularly the growing of oaks for ship timbers. Later, in 1837, the same State legislature authorized a survey of forest conditions in the State to induce landowners to consider the importance of continuing, improving, and enlarging the forests of the State.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out at this time that the movements to preserve our forests, to increase them, which occurred immediately after the War of Independence arose from the people and were not imposed on the people. Side by side with this movement of community conservation there was arising still another force—the force of expanding Federal Government.

From 1799, when Congress authorized President Adams to buy reserves of live oak on the South Carolina and Georgia coasts, until the end of the War Between the States there was an almost unbroken record of Federal legislation pertaining to forests. Practically none of this legislation originated with the people most affected by the progressive elimination of forests—the communities actually dependent upon them. During that period Congress took it upon itself to think for the people rather than to represent the people.

War Between the States changed that. The popular voice raised from a matter of displeasure to a roar of discontent. One writer puts it this way:

> The heavy requirements for wood during the war and the extensive destruction in some areas by military operations, the rapid pace of lumbering in the Lakes States and the widespread destruction by forest fires, the growing realization of the relation of forests to stream flow and water supplies—all caused people to think about future timber supplies and the importance of forest cover.

Popular interest was further quickened by the paper by Rev. Frederick Starr in 1865 in which he advocated the immediate undertaking of Government research on how to manage forests and how to establish plantations.

Stirred on, perhaps, by the Starr report, the Wisconsin State Legislature set up a forest commission headed by I. A. Lapham in 1867. The Lapham commssion stressed the need for tree planting. This was in the very year when Nebraska became a full-fledged State.

In 1869, Maine appointed a commission on foreign policy.

Little permanent results came from the Wisconsin or the Maine effort, but better methods of transportation and the printing press spread the news over the Nation.

It requires no crystal ball to picture the resourceful J. Sterling Morton assemblying the forest story from all parts of the United States, analyzing it, and then—determining what was wrong and what must be done to right the wrong.

Let us try to follow his line of thought.

The Constitution has not changed. Over 80 years of assault from without and internal strife has not materially altered it. The Constitution arose from the people. It was not imposed on them. The Bill of Rights arose from the people. It was not imposed upon them. The amendments originated from sources other than the actual people he, J. Sterling Morton, could count on the fingers of one hand. Things which rise from the people endure. If conservation was to endure the determination to conserve forests, to plant trees, must arise from the people and not be thrust upon them from above or from without the community circle.

It must have been in this manner that J. Sterling Morton decided upon the absolute need of Arbor Day.

The first Arbor Day, April 10, 1872, saw more than a million trees planted in Nebraska.

Thirteen years later, in 1885, Governor Morton could tell the American Forestry Congress that Nebraska had more than 700,000 acres of planted trees.

J. Sterling Morton's reasoning paid off.

In 1949, 506 farmers in Nebraska and South Dakota were asked to place a cash value on trees. How much was their annual savings in their fuel bill alone due to windbreaks? Their answer? An average of $15.85.

In an experiment at Holdredge, Nebr., it was found by scientific measurement that trees used as windbreaks reduced fuel costs by 22.9 percent.

Livestock breeders in Nebraska estimated that windbreaks saved them through preserving feed and calf crops some $300 per year. Dairymen in the vicinity placed their savings from the same cause at $600 per year.

Farm families depend on gardens for much of their food. Most of them know the value of trees as a windbreak in increasing the crop from garden and orchard, as well as the quality of fruit and vegetable. Three hundred and twenty-three Nebraska farmers averaged a crop increase valued at $67.15 per year due to trees.

Yes; J. Sterling Morton's reasoning has certainly paid off—in practical cash returns as well as in beauty which may not be measured.

For April 22, 1951—Nebraska's Arbor Day—I have one thought, and that thought is a prayer:

May God bless the enduring memory of J. Sterling Morton, that great man who returned the major share in planting trees back to the people from whom that right was taken, the people to whom that right has always—and justly—belonged.

After the Tumult and Shouting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Lowell Mellett which appeared in the Evening Star on April 17, 1951:

AFTER THE TUMULT AND SHOUTING—MACARTHUR MAY DISAPPOINT POLITICAL PARTISANS SEEKING TO USE HIM FOR THEIR OWN PURPOSES

(By Lowell Mellett)

This week, the tumult and the shouting. This week, the hero's return and the admiring Nation's welcome. Next week and for many weeks to come, the sober business of deciding or trying to decide where we go from here. That, a matter of gravest importance, may depend to considerable extent on the hero himself, on his willingness to subordinate to the country's best interest his natural desire for personal vindication.

As the week began his willingness in this respect appeared open to some doubt. The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee had wired General MacArthur an invitation to appear before the committee to testify and be questioned concerning the military situation in the Far East. Hearings on the subject had already been scheduled with Secretary of Defense Marshall as the first witness. The general in reply had informed Chairman RUSSELL that resolutions were pending in Congress inviting him to address a joint meeting of the House and Senate and until action had been taken on those resolutions he would deem it inappropriate to make any other plans.

Chairman RUSSELL, of course, was fully aware of the resolutions offered by the Republican leaders of the two Houses and, regardless of the spirit in which they were offered, he was as willing as anybody to see this courtesy extended to the general. What he proposed was in no way calculated to interfere with the general's big moment. And as a veteran legislator, the chairman could consider himself quite competent to judge of what is appropriate and what inappropriate in the matter of calling witnesses. His commitee has called lots of generals in the past and will call lots of them in the future.

What Chairman RUSSELL may have thought he didn't say immediately. Disposed to be charitable, he could have thought that the general had confused the United States Senate with the Japense Diet, to which he has habitually handed down the law. Disposed to be charitable in another direction, he may have got an inkling of the patience the President has exercised in his dealings with the general. But his colleagues in the Senate haven't the slightest doubt that in due course the Russell committee will expose the general to a searching examination, no matter how "inappropriate" that may seem to the general.

To be of real service to the country the general will have to respond to the questioning in the spirit in which it is advanced, an earnest desire to clear up the confusion that has been thrown around our far-eastern policy by his political friends. As the situation grows more ominous in Korea, this has become imperative. If the general takes counsel while in Washington with his old companions in arms and submits himself to the kind of briefing on the European and world situation that he seems never to have absorbed while in Tokyo, his experience and judgment can be turned to good account and he can reclaim the reputation of a selfless citizen as well as a brilliant soldier.

If the general, however, takes counsel only of a political group that has its sights set on a target no higher than next year's election he can only serve to confound the current confusion and make the implementation of any intelligent national policy almost impossible.

The political partisans want to use him. The hatchet, or egg-throwing, brigade want to make him their own. It is to be hoped that he understands, or comes quickly to understand, this element and is prepared to disappoint it.

Eagle Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to the work of a great humanitarian organization, the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

I have the deep honor to be a member of the aerie of this organization in my home town of Crookston, Minn.

As an example of the constant effort of the Eagles to relieve human misery, I call your attention to the following article from April edition of the Eagle, its national publication. It concerns the fine work done by the Crookston Aerie in helping the Indians in northern Minnesota:

EAGLE HEARTS—THE SHIVERING CHIPPEWAS, FACING A CRUEL MINNESOTA WINTER, FOUND A TRUE SAMARITAN IN CROOKSTON AERIE

(By Ross O. Schmidt)

Most of America has just passed through a long and rugged winter. In the majority of States there have been record-breaking snowstorms and temperatures that have sent the thermometer dipping to below normal figures. Minnesota has had its share of cold weather and up near the Canadian border there were days when the cold was registered at 25, 35, and even 41 degrees below zero.

Such cold weather poses many problems, even when you have warm clothes to wear and comfortably steam-heated houses or apartments. It is much worse when you have to face such winter weather without shoes and overcoats and nice warm mufflers and mittens. This is the problem that faced the Chippewa Indians on the Red Lake Indian Reservation in Minnesota. The school kiddies just couldn't get to school because they didn't have enough warm clothes to go around.

The plight of the Indians in Minnesota was not overlooked because there is a fine branch of the Eagles, aerie 873, at Crookston, Minn. Brother HAROLD C. HAGEN, United States Representative in Congress from the Ninth Minnesota District, took the problem of the Indians on the Red Lake Reservation to his aerie. Congressman HAGEN told of the plight and hardships facing the Indians—told how the children were forced to stay out of school because of the lack of warm clothing.

It didn't take long for the hearts of the Crookston members to warm to this appeal and a drive was launched to collect clothing for the Indians, especially the children. The first drive was conducted last year and proved highly successful. This winter, with its record-breaking cold, the need was even greater, and Brother HAGEN again appealed to the Crookston aerie. Eagles and their families and friends responded with the result that a great quantity of blankets, scarfs, belts, socks, mittens, stockings, blouses, sweaters, shirts, shoes and boots, overshoes, rubbers, overcoats, underwear, jackets, pajamas, diapers, stocking caps, dresses, skirts, and overalls were donated.

The success of the drive was emphasized by George E. Saunders, superintendent of schools of Beltrami County, who was responsible for the distribution. Mr. Saunders, in a letter to the Crookston aerie, said:

"On behalf of the people of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, I wish to thank you and the good people of Crookston for the fine assortment of clothes you sent us.

"A large amount of the clothes have been given out and I am sure they were appreciated.

"It was wonderful of the people who donated the clothes to have them so clean and nice."

The Crookston Daily Times, in an article telling of the success of the drive, said:

"Drives come and go, but the recipients of gifts of good will from people of good will do not forget. We think those who gave to this cause will be warmed by the thought that the Indians of the Red Lake Reservation are warm this winter thanks to them."

The hearts of the members of the Crookston aerie and the hearts of all Eagles everywhere are warmed by the thought that these Indian children have not been forgotten and that our great order has been able to extend its services to these people who need it so badly.

The real spirit of eagledom was the inspiration for this great humanitarian undertaking, thanks to Brother HAGEN and his fellow members in the Crookston aerie.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat Believes "The Drastic Action by the President Was Justified"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is news when the St. Louis Globe-Democrat admits that the President of the United States is right. Although as stated on its masthead, "The Globe-Democrat is an independent newspaper printing the news impartially, supporting what it believes to be right, and opposing what it believes to be wrong, without regard to party politics," it seems that the Globe-Democrat has almost without exception found some reason why it should not support President Truman, or his policies, and it is a rare occasion when the Globe-Democrat finds anything to commend which originates with a Democratic administration. Despite the fact that the Republican Party has seen fit to make a political issue out of President Truman's courageous action in risking what he knew would be immediate condemnation by those who have been and still are admirers of General MacArthur, I believe, as does the Globe-Democrat, that attention should be directed to the real issue in this action.

Certainly General MacArthur cannot recommend that every officer follow his example in setting himself up as a self-appointed diplomat, over and above his duties as a commander who is obligated to receive and execute the orders of his superiors. It is not a question of whether General MacArthur is correct in his appraisal of the situation in the Far East. It is not a question of whether or not the foreign policy which he recommends is the one the United States should adopt. The question is, Was General MacArthur right or wrong in departing from his military responsibilities to challenge the policies which had been adopted by the United Nations, the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the State Department?

A reading of the editorial from the Globe-Democrat should convince those who believe there must be a unity of purpose that General MacArthur, in order to be consistent with his 48 years of military experience, should have resigned his command before he committed the gravest sin in his own soldier's handbook—failure to obey orders.

The editorial follows:

MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

Seldom has American public opinion been so sharply divided as on the MacArthur issue, climaxed yesterday by President Truman's order that the recalcitrant general be removed immediately from his Far East commands. With some, regrettably, the issue involves politics, and that angle will be pursued relentlessly, we can be assured, to the end that the general may come home to blast the administration in public statements and addresses which may well figure in the 1952 election. But for most the issue is this: Was General MacArthur right or wrong in departing from his responsibility as a military commander to express sentiments on foreign policy and strategy that ran counter to those of the UN, the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the State Department Was he right or wrong when he became a self-appointed diplomat, over and above his duties as the commander of the United Nations forces in Korea?

With full appreciation of the general's high qualifications as a soldier and his eminent success in the rehabilitation of Japan, this newspaper believes the drastic action by the President was justified.

MacArthur was guilty of insubordination, which cannot be tolerated within the military set-up. He deliberately assumed authority in a field which was not his to command—the making of foreign policy. He violated the explicit orders of his Commander in Chief, a procedure he would not have countenanced for a minute by his subordinates. He flouted his superior command not once, but many times, and after several warnings.

He would have been removed months ago had not the President, with a wary regard for the political dynamite in such action, been well aware of the explosive content in the emotions of the American citizens. Now he has taken the long step with reluctance. MacArthur was and is on all counts the hottest potato Mr. Truman has been called on to handle.

General MacArthur expects to return to the States within 3 weeks. He may address a joint session of Congress and air his views on the entire Far East situation. His remarks, to Congress or otherwise, will attract the serious attention of every American citizen, and may serve to clarify White House thinking, or at least put its Korean policy in sharper focus. As a retired Army officer, he can speak without restraint—and doubtless will.

The most unfortunate aspect of the controversy is that in many respects the program which MacArthur championed, in defiance of the President, was realistic and logical. He would have been no soldier at all had he not chafed at the restrictions imposed on him in fighting the Reds in Korea. He was not permitted to bomb the supply concentrations of the enemy.

His UN directives were vague, never clearly detailed. He knew that a stalemate at the thirty-eighth parallel settled nothing, yet when he called for reinforcements to exploit the gains made in recent months, he was denied them. He wished to employ the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa either in Korea or, in an assault on the Chinese mainland, but Washington did not approve.

This newspaper believes he was in error in stating that the place for a show-down with Russia is in Asia, that Europe is secondary.

But above all, there can be no denial that the general was the spectacular victim of a White House-State Department foreign policy that has been consistently inconsistent and vacillating. Neither MacArthur nor the American people have ever been clearly advised as to the precise program the administration has fixed for Far East operations.

Mr. Truman has repeatedly sought refuge in the United Nations when a forthright decision was required—and the impotent UN, timid and unenthusiastic, sat on its hands while the situation worsened.

The UN never had much stomach for the Korean police action. And when MacArthur became a problem child who threatened to involve the UN in a world war by operations against the stooges of Moscow, the Red Chinese, Great Britain, and France, in particular, were apprehensive and called for caution. Well they knew that if the United States went to war against Russia in the Orient we would not have enough men or matériel to do a good job of helping defend West Europe against Communist aggression. Presumably the President was influenced by British and French representations, and for good reason.

Technically, when the UN was committed to action in Korea, the war should have been directed by its Security Council. But this was impossible while Russia had a seat on that Council. Hence, the United States was given the job in view of our leadership in securing UN approval of the aggressor resolution and the preponderance of our commitments in men and matériel to that area. MacArthur's appointment was in line with that agreement.

But notwithstanding the frustration that plagued MacArthur, his conviction that our Far East policy was bungled and unrealistic, he was a soldier, subject to the same fundamentals of discipline as any private in the ranks. When he gave a command, it was obeyed or else. When he received a command, it was his duty to obey or take the consequences.

We understand that General Eisenhower, while in supreme command in Europe in the last war, did not approve of many things he was asked to do. Certainly, for instance, he believed the Western Allies should have been permitted to occupy Berlin instead of allowing the Russians to take it over, with results we all know. But Eisenhower had his orders and he followed them. MacArthur had his orders and he flouted them.

We by no means agree that the White House-State Department policy for the Far East has been without fault. Neither the President nor Secretary Acheson at any time have indicated they knew where they were going or how they expected to get there, and we can imagine MacArthur's soul writhing because of his conviction that he knew best.

But something that was earmarked as policy had the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President, both in superior command to MacArthur, and what they ordered he should have done his best to carry out. The proper place for him to lodge his protests was with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President, and it is their ultimate responsibility if they ignored him and adopted a plan that proved to be wrong.

Flamboyant critical statements from the battlefield, letters home to sympathetic friends who made them public, proposals to negotiate with the enemy at a time when, so the President says, the UN was well along toward an understanding with Red China—all these are extracurriculum procedures which are not a military prerogative. If every general in a war disdains orders and operates on his own and as he thinks best, the end result could be disaster.

The chain reaction of the MacArthur dismissal will be heard for many months. The general, now released from all restrictions, may be expected to speak his piece to the American public. He will have ample help in and outside Congress.

Basically, the general would expand the war, make the Far East the chief area of combat, as against the UN policy of isolating Korea and concentrating on the defense of Europe. It is difficult to see how those who agree with MacArthur that the war must be carried to China can in the same breath declare that his program must be followed to save the further slaughter of American soldiers.

General MacArthur makes his exit after 48 years in the Army service of his country. His achievements in the Pacific were historic; he was a brilliant occupation commander in Japan. It is unfortunate that he is compelled to quit under tortured circumstances.

Japan Under MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Japan Under MacArthur," taken from the Evening Star of April 17:

JAPAN UNDER MACARTHUR

It is not surprising that hundreds of thousands of Japanese got up early in the morning and jammed Tokyo's streets to say a heartfelt good-by to General MacArthur. In paying him this tribute—the most impressive of its kind ever accorded a foreigner in that highly ceremonious land—they undoubtedly reflected the feelings of the overwhelming majority of their countrymen. At the same time, in thus displaying their affectionate and almost reverential regard for him as a person, they gave the world a striking measure of his great success in running the occupation as supreme commander for the Allied Powers.

That success has been obvious for some time past. Unlike Germany, Japan, after its defeat, was not partitioned into four parts and occupied by as many powers. Instead, it remained a unity, with American policy dominant, and General MacArthur—through his SCAP organization—brilliantly capitalized on that fact. With a personality perfectly tailored to the task, with administrative ability of the highest order, and with his extraordinary knowledge of the problems and psychology of Asia as a whole, he quickly shifted from the role of conqueror to the role of reconstructor, setting in rapid motion a Japanese military, social, political, economic, and spiritual revolution of the most far-reaching kind.

One of General MacArthur's first big successes was the program under which SCAP swiftly disarmed, demobilized, and returned to peaceful pursuits more than 6,000,000 Japanese troops. Similarly, through rigid controls and other means, he cut down the country's industrial potential for war. Beyond that, in a move without precedent in modern history, he saw to it that Japan adopted a constitution in which it bound itself never again to maintain an army, navy, or air force. Indeed, if anything, he did almost too good a job in carrying out his demilitarization directives, for the constitutional ban on the military has always seemed unrealistic in the teeth of the Soviet threat—a fact which he himself has implicitly acknowledged in his recent recommendations for limited rearmament.

In other respects, however, the constitution hammered out under General MacArthur's supervision is hardly open to question. Emperor worship, the warrior caste, feudalism, thought control, the secret police, and every kindred instrument of totalitarian regimentation and oppression have been swept away. In their place have been substituted such things as universal free education, collective bargaining for labor, the voting franchise for women as well as men, basic liberties like those of our own Bill of Rights, and similar fundamental constitutional guaranties reposing full sovereignty in the Japanese people, making them their own masters, placing them well on the road toward genuine democracy.

In line with all this, moreover, General MacArthur is to be credited with having hit hard at the excesses of the giant trusts of the Zaibatsu (the "money clique"), through which about a score of families used to control the economy of the entire country. He is to be credited, too, with having effected agrarian reforms that have emancipated millions of tenant farmers from serfdom by enabling them to buy and work their own land. Finally, in the over-all economic sphere, he has so effectively administered our American aid that Japan today—after having been flat on its back little more than 5 years ago—shows an index of industrial activity higher than prewar, and it conceivably may manage, if given some good breaks, to become self-supporting by the end of next year.

General MacArthur, in short, has had a tremendous, and on the whole very beneficent, impact on a nation of more than 70,000,000 people. History offers few, if any, examples quite like it. Japan, of course, is by no means out of the woods. Its democracy is still young. Its economic recovery is still tentative. Its social and spiritual transformation may yet prove to be more apparent than real. Yet, if it holds fast to the road that the great American "proconsul" has carved out for it, it can prosper in freedom. That is the immense contribution he has made to the life of the Japanese. Small wonder that many millions of them deeply regret his sudden departure.

A Newspaperman Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, among those who constantly serve our great Nation and who are among the many going about their daily tasks unsung, and often little rewarded, are the small-town newspaper publishers.

One such publisher was Mr. P. W. Kemp, former publisher of the Marshall County Banner at Argyle, Minn. Mr. Kemp passed away March 25 at the age of 75 years, 35 of which he published his newspaper.

The attached editorial is a tribute to Mr. Kemp and was written for the Banner by his successor, E. L. Holmlund. These beautiful words of tribute to Mr. Kemp are, in a way, a tribute to all small-town editors and publishers.

The editorial follows:

WE SORROW AS DEATH CLAIMS OUR PREDECESSOR

There are many things that for a small-town publisher are not the easiest things to do. But one of the most difficult tasks for him to perform is to chronicle the life and passing of a beloved friend and neighbor. Such is our task today, as we pause briefly to pay tribute to Mr. P. W. Kemp, our

predecessor as publisher of the Banner, and for the past 8 years our mentor and very good friend. Percy, as we had learned to address him, seemed almost like a grandfather to us, so close had our associations become during these seemingly short 8 years.

It is no mere idle expression when it is said, "the community mourns the death of Percy Kemp." He was a full and busy life, and we like to think of him now as having gone to a well-earned rest and his reward.

He possessed the finest of qualities given to man. He was honest, thrifty, frugal, and hard working. When, as a young man he first engaged in the trade he loved, he related to us that he worked almost a full year without a cent of pay just for the privilege of learning the trade of being a newspaperman. As his community-wide associations broadened, he grew in stature, in mind, and in usefulness. He was public spirited, gave generously of his time to community matters, and his advice was sought because he had the respect of his neighbors. Percy was a "gentleman of the old school" who loved his fellow citizens. He was fearless and outspoken but he was a fair fighter, and many of those whom he fought the hardest were his most sincere admirers. He fought in the open, and there was never any doubt as to where he stood on any question of public interest.

Greatness is not always in the high places. It thrives in the hearts of real men in every walk of life. We think Mr. Kemp was one of them, and for this solemn occasion we'd like to close with this bit of verse:

"He is gone but not forgotten—
All his tasks on earth are done—
Hard he worked toward each endeavor
'Til his great reward was one.
See, he sleeps in peaceful comfort
And his loved ones shed a tear.
Gather closer, gather closer,
He has nothing now to fear
For he rests; he rests in comfort,
He has only gone to sleep.
We who loved him linger near him
But we do not need to weep.
—*"Franklin Lee Stevenson."*

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published in the Columbia Daily Tribune, of Columbia, Mo., on the subject of President Truman's action in removing Gen. Douglas MacArthur and replacing him with General Ridgway as our military leader and commander in the Far East:

[From the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune of April 12, 1951]

OUT GOES THE GENERAL

In one of the most spectacular ousters in history, President Truman has relieved Gen. Douglas MacArthur of all his commands in the Far East.

Having decided to discipline the egotistical general, we believe President Truman was smart in firing him completely, because MacArthur is a person who brooks no compromise. You take him whole hog or none. To have relieved him of his Korean command and left him in charge of the Japanese occupation would have left the door open for future trouble.

There is no clear-cut answer to the question of whether MacArthur is right or wrong in wanting to bomb Chinese bases and enlist the support of Chiang's Nationalist troops. But there is a clear-cut answer to the question of whether a man in MacArthur's position should arrogate to himself the responsibility and the power of dictating policy in the global strategy against Communist aggression. The answer is "No."

Rightly or wrongly, we are operating on the principle that the best way to achieve peace is through a world organization. The United States, together with many other nations, has solemnly accepted this proposition, and MacArthur is a soldier working under orders from this leadership. For a top general in a strategic theater to repeatedly challenge that accepted leadership not only precludes the possibility of any coordinated effort, it actually lends aid and comfort to the enemy.

Coming at this time, MacArthur's ouster will precipitate a storm of criticism around President Truman's head. In the eyes of his many worshipers, MacArthur is now a martyr. Truman is the Pontius Pilate. It would have been better—and equally appropriate—to have fired MacArthur last December after his ill-fated promise to bring the boys home by Christmas and while the Chinese hordes were sweeping over United Nations forces which MacArthur had unwisely spread thin over a broad and defenseless front. Truman might well have brought the general home by Christmas.

General MacArthur is now free to speak his piece. Let him lay his views before the country. If the American people are convinced, then they have the power to follow him—even to the point of deciding that to be bound by the leadership of a world organization composed of a lot of weak and indecisive allies is not the best way for the United States to get along in the world.

But meanwhile, let's operate as a team and according to the accepted rules.

Another Iowan Cries Out Against Bewilderment and Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the letter which I am causing to be inserted here was written to me by a friend, John Fletcher, who for many years served as a district judge and attorney general in the State of Iowa.

Mr. Fletcher raises questions which have never been answered adequately either in or out of Congress. Bewilderment and confusion are abroad in this land today because of the failure on the part of responsible officials to answer these and other questions.

It is because I believe his thought-provoking letter is deserving of the consideration of others that I have caused it to be inserted in the RECORD. It follows:

MAPLETON, IOWA.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: You know sometimes I sit around and think and again I just sit. Of late, like a lot of people, I'm bewildered about what has come over our Government. Everybody asks that question.

Unless someone steps forward to the front of the rostrum soon and explains better than it ever has been explained before what this war is about and why, then these American people are going to lose the last scintilla of the faith they have left in our system of government. This does not only apply to the so-called leaders of the administration but to the so-called leaders of the opposition as well.

Neither side answers the questions uppermost in the minds of the average citizen, viz: Is this war necessary? Has there been a good-faith effort by capable men to settle differences by peaceful means? If there has been the people are not advised.

The nations now at war are the United States and China. Have capable representatives of those two countries sat down around a table to discuss their differences in a real attempt to reach an agreement. I'm not talking about the so-called United Nations. That will never unite on anything so long as commercial achievement at any price is placed above the peace and happiness of the individual.

Are we not at war because those in charge want war? If so, why? Can we see an underlying reason for talking war and waging war?

If we stop waging war and talking war, how long would it take for this false economic structure we have been building up for the past 20 years to totally collapse? My own guess is that the collapse would come long before the 1952 elections if we stopped talking war today. There has never been a time since the last shot was fired in World War II that governmentally we have not talked war. Why?

Which would be harder on the American people, economic collapse, which must come eventually, or this war phobia that is destroying the faith of our citizens in their Government as one dedicated to peace and not to conquest of peoples of other nations who want their own kind of government whether it suits us or not.

I am, as you know, that last man who would believe in a communistic form of government but as a true American, I am the last man who would say peoples in other lands have not the right to adopt and live under their own form of government.

We have not set out to police people who are alone aggressors, but all people who believe in communism wherever they may be, whether peaceful or otherwise. We have so declared ourselves whether they are within our confines or live separate as a nation by themselves.

We not only continuously, as a Government, talk war but we are proselyting the people of other nations to become war-minded. We talk war, we eat war, we sleep war. Our topic everywhere is war. Do we actually know what we are doing to ourselves or do we care? Are we interested in the peace of the world or saving a vagabond's dream of an economic utopia where nobody works but everybody eats?

Every military nation since time began has eventually massacred its own citizenry—morally, socially, and economically—and has reduced it to the lowest form of peasantry and finally serfdom. Read your unbiased history since the fall of the Roman Empire down to A. D. 1951. Name one who survived.

What ended the 30 years of Scandinavian war? Poverty. What became of proud old England, the Empire on whose flag the sun never set? Its sun as a world power has set forever. What became of France that boasted the finest trained soldiery in the world? Too weak economically ever to try to defend itself. What of Italy, of the Kaiser's Germany, and of Hitler's Germany? The desire to whip and dictate to all the world killed them all. Great as we may be and

feel, is there an answer for all in the history of the past?

A Nation such as ours might well maintain an Army of considerable size on our own soil and a good Navy and Air Corps so long as there is war and rumors of wars but why should we seek war when we are not assailed? I'm not talking isolation, I'm talking about howling for war and daring others to fight and insisting they arm for war. I remember when the American press praised Hitler's great peacetime army and how he was building a great economic Germany. Thousands of fine Americans paid the price of dismantling it with their lives. The citizenry of Germany will spend the lives of generations yet unborn to build back the destruction militarism caused their country. They had better faced the economic condition with stoicism and fortitude that would have earned the gratitude and praise of a friendly world but militarism lost their all.

Can 6 percent of the people of the world, great and resourceful as we may be, feed, clothe, house, educate, arm, train to fight, whip, and destroy at will the other 94 percent of the people?

I'm wondering if the influence of commercial greed doesn't weigh more with our so-called leaders than patriotic duty on both sides.

Wishing you every success, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN FLETCHER.

Support for MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress today, April 19, 1951, has heard Gen. Douglas MacArthur address a joint meeting and discuss the conduct of the war in Korea. Along with other Members of the Congress, I was deeply impressed by the wisdom and sincerity of his words.

Among other things, General MacArthur advocated the use of the Chinese Nationalist military forces against the forces of the Communist enemy. I wish to inform the Members of the House that on April 12, 1951, the Senate of the State of California passed a resolution relative to the use of Chinese Nationalist troops in combat against the Chinese Communists.

The resolution follows:

Senate Resolution 114

Resolution relative to the use of Chinese Nationalist troops in combat against Chinese Communists

Whereas during the past few days California's National Guard, Fortieth Division, arrived in Japan; and

Whereas President Harry S. Truman has seen fit to relieve General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of all authority as commander of United Nations forces in Korea, commander of United States military forces, Far East theater, for alleged noncooperation; and

Whereas General MacArthur has advocated the use of Chinese Nationalist military troops in combat against Chinese Communist military forces; and

Whereas such dismissal indicates an opinion of the President of the United States to refuse to allow Chinese Nationalist troops to aid and assist United States military forces presently engaged in combat against Communist military units in Korea; and

Whereas the Senate of the State of California recognizes that the military action in Korea is but a battle in the war against communism; and

Whereas the Chinese Nationalist Army leaders have indicated their desire to aid and assist United States forces in engaging in combat for the purposes of defeating and destroying the Chinese Communist military forces; and

Whereas all governments of nations desirous of joining in a crusade to destroy communistic aggressors should be encouraged and utilized to the end that the majority of lives sacrificed in the present conflict against the Chinese Communist troops should not be drawn in vast measure from American military personnel, and in particular the anticipated use of the California Fortieth National Guard Division: Therefore

The Senate of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States to seriously reexamine the desirability of permitting the use of Chinese Nationalist military forces in the common cause of destroying Chinese Communist aggression in Asia, and the utilization of Chinese Nationalist troops prior to, or in conjunction with, utilization of California Fortieth National Guard Division in combat.

J. A. ERRK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Credit Due Joseph P. Kennedy for Part in the Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the great debate has waxed and waned in Congress, and I think the people are due some explanation as to the concepts and origins of the movement toward conservation of our manpower and resources.

These conservationists have been misnamed isolationists, and the connotation of the word has given the general public the erroneous idea that an isolationist is an ostrich with his head buried in the sand.

The conservationist of our blood and treasure, of our manpower, and our resources—which I might add are not unlimited—is not an isolationist nor an ostrich.

He is in allegory an American eagle; watchful, sane, faithful, fierce. He guards his own domain.

As we look back over the great debate, we find a singular figure as responsible for it.

He is Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain.

Mr. Kennedy has been of the opinion for a long time that we can weaken ourselves to the point of emaciation by our foreign adventures.

His philosophy appears to agree with that of George Washington, and I suppose his critics will find ways to blame him for that.

We all know that Mr. Kennedy is one of the closest advisers of former President Herbert Hoover and counseled him to emerge from retirement to his present position of elder statesman. Mr. Kennedy was the activating force in the Hoover plan. He is a human dynamo, as his career shows, and just the man to furnish the string to Mr. Hoover's bow.

It will be recalled that the great debate was opened by Mr. Kennedy's speech at the University of Virginia. It was followed by Mr. Hoover's speech, and the momentum of the issue carried it into the Senate. If there were a medal of honor for civilians, it should have been awarded to these two men.

One of the profound features of Mr. Kennedy's views is the conviction that to commit too much of our power abroad will play into Russia's hands for a quick and decisive victory.

Europe is her front yard and she can crush almost anything by land power.

We can defeat any aggressor who defies our combined land, sea, and air power.

By getting us to commit most of our land power in Europe, he has us in her lap. We can be beautifully booby-trapped.

More and more people are beginning to believe that, although we should fight aggression, we should not commit all of our strength in an area where we are at the greatest disadvantage.

If Mr. Kennedy had not made the effort, the great debate would not have been sparked. And, if the debate had not taken place, the issue of overseas commitments might never have reached a limit.

Truman's Appeasement of the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, why continue Mr. Truman's war against overwhelming Communists and at the same time let them win a victory through appeasement? David Lawrence expresses Mr. Truman's inconsistency in the following words:

DENIALS OF APPEASEMENT BELIED—KOREAN REPUBLIC WILL BE THROWN TO WOLVES BY DIPLOMACY UNLESS UNITED STATES PUBLIC ACTS

President Truman keeps on denying in his speeches that there is any appeasement of the Communists intended, but the fact remains that in the State Department a plan to do what really amounts to an appeasement of Communist China is being hatched.

The first public intimation that appeasement was in the wind came, strangely enough, in a White House release of a message that was sent by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on March 20 to General MacArthur. The real purpose in releasing the message—if it wasn't done accidentally—was to show

that General MacArthur jumped the gun, so to speak, when he broadcast directly his appeal to the Chinese Communist military commander to agree to an armistice.

The stories have been widely disseminated by administration supporters that General MacArthur stole the thunder of the Government back home by making an appeal to his opposite military commander similar to that which the State Department intended to make through the UN and that he followed the wording closely. It has been asserted, moreover, that the policy in question was cleared with the United Nations and that General MacArthur spilled the beans.

There is not a scintilla of truth in either of these allegations. The message of March 20 is bound to become a historic document not only because it shows there was no United Nations policy or decision by the American Government but because it shows that the State Department was telling General MacArthur to deploy his troops in some sort of confusing military operation whereby he didn't advance but yet maintained contact with the enemy while the diplomats were to talk for a few weeks.

Here is the text of that message:

"To the Commander in Chief, Far East, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington.

"State [Department] planning Presidential announcement shortly that, with [the] clearing of the bulk of South Korea of aggressors, United Nations [are] now preparing to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea. Strong feeling persists that further diplomatic effort toward settlement should be made before any advance with major forces north of [the] thirty-eighth parallel. Time will be required to determine diplomatic reactions and permit new negotiations that may develop. Recognizing that [the thirty-eighth] parallel has no military significance, [the] State [Department] has asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff what authority you should have to permit sufficient freedom of action for [the] next few weeks to provide security for [the] UN forces and maintain contact with [the] enemy. Your recommendations [are] desired."

The foregoing shows how speculative and vague the State Department's plan was. It does not reveal the basis, if any, which the State Department had for virtually ordering American troops to stand still and be shot at while diplomats talked even though the enemy had not agreed to hold his fire. Every piece of evidence thus far from press dispatches and from Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, reveals that the Communist Government at Peiping has rebuffed every effort to talk peace and has lately refused even to make appointments at the Chinese Foreign Office with diplomatic representatives there from Britain, India, and Sweden to talk about the subject. Why was the State Department so anxious to stop our side from fighting while it did a job of palavering with other governments? The only answer is that an appeasement program is in the works. Here are its details:

A cease-fire line in a zigzag direction a few miles north and also a few miles south of the thirty-eighth parallel is to be the armistice line. This is supposed to be our victory line. When we gain that line, as General Ridgway in his political statement on March 12 said, America and the United Nations will have gained a victory.

The rest, it seems, is to be left to diplomacy. Thus is the Korean Republic to be thrown to the Communist wolves. Thus also is the UN to accept the thirty-eighth parallel line as all that it ever achieved since last June against the aggressor even though the UN branded Red China as an aggressor and is supposed to have resolved at one time to liberate all Korea. But the new plan presupposes that no liberation by military means can be achieved and that attainment of the barrier at the thirty-eighth parallel is the substitute.

The legal basis for the plan is that, our military objective having been attained, the political objective is a matter for UN determination. The idea of an independent, united Korea is to be left to diplomatic negotiations with Red China presumably over a long period of time. Thus 60,000 casualties will have been suffered by the American Government just to maintain the thirty-eighth parallel and to admit that the UN could not push the aggressor out of Korea but must let him stay where he started from last June—ready, perhaps, to jump across the parallel at any time. The Red Chinese have said all foreign troops must be withdrawn and this presumably means the Communist North Koreans of course will remain. That's the appeasement plan. It will of course be denied that this is appeasement. But this was what was planned before General MacArthur was fired. Maybe it will not materialize now because American public opinion may prevent it from being consummated.

Mr. Speaker, why should we continue to meddle in foreign affairs? Why should we not follow the advice of Washington and Thomas Jefferson, keep our men from fighting in futile wars, wherever and whenever some other nation seeks to use us to their own advantage?

Red China Is Too High a Price for a Truce in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a timely editorial appearing in this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

RED CHINA IS TOO HIGH A PRICE FOR A TRUCE IN KOREA

It's a solid bet that General MacArthur's statement of March 24 didn't burn up the State Department because it suggested the possibility of a military truce in Korea, or even because it hinted at attacks on the bases from which the Chinese Reds spark their attacks on United Nations forces. The general's offense was that he put his finger on the State Department's secret shame—namely, its apparently persistent determination to sell Formosa to the Communists and admit said Communists into the UN, as the price of a shaky peace in Korea.

MacArthur said: "There should be no insuperable difficulty in arriving at decisions on the Korean problem if the issues are resolved on their own merits without being burdened by extraneous matters not directly related to Korea, such as Formosa and China's seat in the United Nations."

This frank and obviously sound observation recalled the United Nations cease-fire proposal of January—for some reason or other concurred in by the United States—which suggested that a conference including Russia and Red China be called to settle Asiatic problems, including, among others, those of Formosa and of representation of China in the United Nations.

Fortunately, the open intervention of Red China in Korea made it difficult to go on with this monkey business, and most people assumed the proposal was a dead pigeon. The ire in the State Department suggests that it isn't; that the Acheron-Jessup zeal for a bad bargain with communism in Asia is as hearty as ever. Anyway, we ought to know soon.

As one ground for suspicion, James Reston, of the New York Times, who often reflects State Department thinking, wrote in his dispatch on the MacArthur statement: "As a matter of fact, the longer the war in Korea has continued, the less confidence there is in official quarters here that any solution can be found on any other basis than the above"—that is, a deal on Formosa and a Red seat in UN.

Most people, of course, agree that political decisions are not for military commanders to make and General MacArthur's proposal for a field armistice was made in full recognition of that fact. However, it is easy to understand that a commander in the field who has at least twice been deterred from pursuing the Red aggressor to his lair might be tempted to use this device to learn whether the war in Korea is something more conclusive than "Operation Killer" or is only a prelude to vast and unnecessary concessions in Asia.

Anyway, it would be a good idea to let the American people in on what's cooking. There is certainly no sentiment for a deal by which, in exchange for a hunk of Korea, which has little military importance, we would (1) hand over Formosa, which has vital strategic importance, and (2) consent to admission into the United Nations of the Chinese People's Republic. In other words, to end a war that we are at least not losing, we would hand over political and military advantages which would make it all but impossible to remain in the western Pacific at all.

But who says we can't end the Korean War on a decent basis, without surrendering our honor or future security? On March 24, MacArthur thought we could. What was wrong with letting him try?

United States Workers' Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we are always concerned with the morale of American workers. There are countless debates on the floor of this House concerning the problems of labor, but it seems we worry only about labor employed by private industry and forget all about the thousands of workers employed by the United States Government.

I think it is time we consider the morale of our own employees if we want to maintain adequate standards in the performance of Government duties. The question of the morale of United States workers has been expertly discussed by Joseph Young, writer for the Washington Sunday Star in an article in that paper on April 8. I recommend this article to the attention of the Members.

It follows:

UNITED STATES WORKERS' MORALE SUFFERS AS A RESULT OF WAR OF NERVES

(By Joseph Young)

Federal employee leaders charge that Government morale is suffering as a result of the war of nerves being waged against Federal workers.

They declare various moves in Congress as well as in the executive department to reduce employee benefits and privileges, plus adverse personnel restrictions already in effect, are causing unrest among employees.

The A. F. of L. Government Employees Council, which is composed of 22 unions with a Federal employee membership of 500,000 declares morale is at a low ebb.

Employee officials say this results from many conditions. Among them they name the moves in Congress to reduce annual and sick leave benefits and lower overtime payments. The stalling tactics by the administration and the House Civil Service Committee on the Federal pay-raise measure is another reason cited. And the proposal to work employees on around-the-clock shifts isn't helping employee morale, they say.

In addition, the present ban on permanent appointments, promotions and transfers in Government is hurting morale, they charge.

The attempts being made by the Defense Department to freeze its employees in their jobs and prevent them from transferring to other Government agencies are also cited as causing great employee dissatisfaction.

RELATIONSHIP TERRIBLE

A top employee leader put it this way: "The management-employee relationship in Government is terrible. Part of the blame rests with Congress and part with the executive branch.

"Where in private industry do you see attempts made to reduce employee benefits? The pattern is just the opposite. Employee benefits are constantly increased rather than decreased.

"This is sound management policy and business knows it. Yet here we have Congress and some parts of the executive branch of Government trying to reduce benefits.

"We're not saying that there aren't some things wrong in Government and that economies should not be made. But why take it out on the employee?

"Why take away vacation and sick leave benefits that employees have had for years? Any money that would be saved by such action would be more than lost by the resignation of top-flight people in Government who would quit in disgust. It's common knowledge that a lot of our top scientific, technical, and professional personnel have been recruited into Government and have remained, not for the money involved, but for the liberal vacation and sick-leave benefits."

OVERTIME PAY ATTACKED

"The same goes for attempts to reduce overtime payments and other benefits. As for overtime, Government employees already receive far less than the time-and-one-half overtime payments that is the law of the land for workers in private industry. And now some Members of Congress want to reduce these payments still further."

Employee leaders also sharply criticize lack of action on Federal pay legislation, declaring that it is terribly discouraging for Government workers to see private industry workers secure cost-of-living pay boosts while they receive none.

Of course some of the moves to cut benefits, such as the one to reduce overtime payments, in all probability won't succeed. But the move to cut annual and sick-leave benefits is a serious one and is backed by many Members of Congress.

Employee officials say that the average Government worker is trying to do a conscientious job to help his country in the national emergency program as well as to serve the public. But they declare that it cannot be expected that employees will do their best work while they are under constant badgering and threats.

Address by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, at Dedication of Kings Daughters' Hospital, Staunton, Va., and Introductory Remarks by Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech made by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, at the dedication of the King's Daughters' Hospital, Staunton, Va., April 15, 1951, and the remarks I made in introducing him.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW KING'S DAUGHTERS' HOSPITAL, STAUNTON, VA., APRIL 15, 1951

A kind and gracious providence has smiled upon us as we gather today to dedicate an institution of peace and to pay tribute to an undertaking in the realm of humanitarianism. May the sentiments for peace in the world that today rise up in our hearts ascend to that judgment throne where Staunton's Woodrow Wilson said, "Justice and mercy are reconciled and the Judge and brother are one." I coveted this opportunity to warmly congratulate the good people of Staunton, Augusta, and Highland on their remarkable achievement of financing a two and a half million dollar hospital which has equipment and facilities that are the equal of any in the Commonwealth.

One of my most prized possessions is a miniature of my mother made when she was 17 years old and a student at the Female Institute in Staunton, now called Stuart Hall. Last fall she died at the age of 92. On her ninetieth birthday she told me that she had lived through four wars and that was enough war for one lifetime. Her father and nine of his brothers served in the Confederate Army. Five of them were killed. In those days a serious battle wound meant death, a tragic reminder of the fact that throughout recorded history man has placed more emphasis upon killing than upon curing his fellow man.

Long before my mother came to Staunton this historic city had become known to the medical profession through the outstanding work of Dr. Alexander Humphreys, a graduate of the University of Edinburgh. In the days of Dr. Humphreys there was no medical school in Virginia or the South and no training school for nurses. Virginia doctors trained abroad would train Virginia boys who desired to practice medicine.

In a remarkable address this morning Dr. Richard Bell told of five boys who were trained by Dr. Humphreys, all of whom became famous. One of them was William Henry Harrison, of Charles City County, Va., who became President of the United States, and another was Ephriam McDowell, who was born in Fairfield, Va., then a part of Augusta County, and after studying at the University of Edinburgh, located in Kentucky for the practice of medicine. In 1809 he performed the famous abdominal operation on Mrs. Crawford and is properly called the father of abdominal surgery. Dr. Ephriam McDowell represents the great State of Kentucky in the Congressional Hall of Fame.

The dedication of this wonderful new hospital illustrates how deeply indebted we are to a city that even in Colonial days was a pioneer in medical science and to the public-spirited women of a previous generation who had a vision of practical Christianity.

Hundreds of years before Christ the temples of Saturn were used as medical schools. But hospitals as we now know them were not established until the fourth century A. D. and in Europe dated largely from the fifteenth century. Not until the eighteenth century were there any hospitals outside of the big cities, and that was true of Virginia even in the nineteenth century. It was not until the latter part of the nineteenth century that we had trained nurses for hospital service. Florence Nightingale began her memorable study of hospitals and hospital nursing in 1854 when England was stirred by reports of the suffering of wounded soldiers in the Crimean War. When Florence Nightingale returned from the Crimean War, after saving many of those wounded in the bloody battle of Balaclava, Queen Victoria instituted a reform in all military hospitals and in 1887 devoted a fund of $350,000 to a training institution for nurses along the lines advocated by Florence Nightingale.

About that time a Christian organization dedicated to welfare work and the care of the lame, the halt, and the blind known as the International Order of King's Daughters and Sons was formed. It was composed of those who acknowledged Christ as King and who were willing to carry on His work. A chapter of that organization was formed in Staunton, and in 1896 it founded the King's Daughters Hospital. That was the first general hospital in the valley, and in the entire State there were only seven more.

The hospital we are to dedicate today is the outgrowth of the efforts of consecrated men and women of Staunton who believe that we build in vain a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of spiritual force and the principles of the Prince of Peace.

For these memorable ceremonies we are indeed fortunate to have as our guest speaker a distinguished statesman from Alabama, who, first as a Member of the House and later as a Member of the Senate, has recognized the need for hospitals and medical care and who sponsored the first bill ever passed by the Congress of the United States to make grants-in-aid to localities for hospital construction.

Our guest speaker, in keeping with his program to promote the welfare of the masses, was author of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to create a Federal yardstick to determine the proper cost of hydroelectric energy and of the Rural Telephone Act. He also has been coauthor of the Farm Housing Act, Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, of the school-lunch program, voluntary health insurance bill, local public health units bill, child health services bill, Federal aid to education, Vocational Education Act of 1946, General Housing Act, the GI bill of rights, and numerous other measures of national import.

As a member of the Senate Labor Committee he endeared himself to his southern colleagues through the preparation of the minority report against FEPC, which Senator

RUSSELL of Georgia, termed "a jewel." But it is the Hill-Burton Act by which he is best known to all Virginians interested in a modern hospital program. His standing in the Senate is evidenced by the fact that from 1940 to 1946 he was the Democratic whip, voluntarily relinquishing that important assignment because of the press of his other senatorial duties.

No doubt from his great grandfather Rev. William W. Hill, and his grandfather, Rev. L. L. Hill, both pioneer Methodist ministers in Alabama, he inherited a zeal for promoting the welfare of the masses and from his father, Dr. Luther Leonidas Hill, of Montgomery, one of the South's foremost surgeons, his interest in medical education and medical care. From his grandfather on his mother's side, Mark Lyons, of Mobile, who fought under Albert Sidney Johnston, he inherited his love for Robert E. Lee and the fundamental principle of State's rights.

It gives me great pleasure to present to you my friend and Senate colleague, Hon. LISTER HILL, of Alabama.

SPEECH OF HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE KING'S DAUGHTERS' HOSPITAL, STAUNTON, VA.

It is pleasant to be in Staunton today on this fine occasion. I want to thank you for letting me come and be with you for the dedication of your magnificent new King's Daughters' Hospital.

I always feel an inspiration when I come to Virginia. The loveliness of the Shenandoah Valley through which I have been traveling this morning is representative of the beauty of Virginia's countryside.

As I drove along I thought not only of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and the other great and illustrious Virginia sons who made such mighty contributions to the building of our Nation—I thought how particularly fitting that this hospital, Virginia's first completely new hospital to be started under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act should be erected in this lovely city that gave us three great doctors, Alexander Humphries, teacher of that pioneer in abdominal surgery, Ephraim McDowell, and that immortal doctor of humanities, Woodrow Wilson.

I am happy to be here in the home State of my good friends and esteemed colleagues, your able and distinguished Senators, HARRY BYRD and WILLIS ROBERTSON. It is good that Senator ROBERTSON can be with us. Senator BYRD told me of his disappointment over his inability to be here.

You who have watched this hospital grow day by day and stone by stone have the immeasurable satisfaction of knowing that the hospital is your hospital—the product of your planning, your energies, and your devotion. It is the product of the splendid vision and untiring labors of Mrs. Herbert Smith and your other hospital trustees and hospital officials. I commend and congratulate each of you.

This hospital marks a new day of medical care for the people of Staunton, Augusta County, and the surrounding area. It will give them the finest medical and surgical care. No resources of time and money, of architectural planning or materials have been spared to make this hospital the most modern, the best-equipped hospital of its kind.

Here are operating rooms, laboratories, obstetrical and pediatric rooms; departments for physical therapy, and emergency and clinical treatment. Here is the finest X-ray equipment for treating cancer and other diseases. The broad grounds and spacious sundeck of this hospital offer the convalescent the healing, strengthening benefits of light and air and sunshine in pleasant surroundings.

In building your hospital you confirm the wisdom of our Hospital Act—the wisdom of helping the people to do for themselves. You show that when the Government helps to meet the need for hospitals by providing assistance grants, the people, with their sense of local responsibility and local leadership, are eager to meet the opportunity and build their own hospitals.

This hospital is built for the future. And even as its doors are opened, I urge you to draw again upon that fine cooperative spirit that brought it into being, to move on to the next vital step for securing its benefits to all the people—the step of integrating voluntary health insurance facilities with your hospital.

I like to use as an illustration of the practical accomplishment of this kind of integration the case of the Lanier Memorial Hospital in my own State of Alabama. Constructed under the same Hospital Act, this hospital opened its doors about 18 months ago. Around the hospital, as the medical center of another lovely valley community, has been built a voluntary system of prepaid health insurance that insures the people that at all times they can receive hospital and medical care without sudden financial burden.

This Alabama community in its accomplishment, has offered as a pattern for all the Nation, the objective of our voluntary health insurance bill in Congress. What they are doing bears out our faith in the voluntary methods of democracy. It supports our confidence in the ability of the people to act for themselves and to provide medical care for themselves by preserving and strengthening and building upon our free American medical system, without compulsion and without reliance upon a socialized system.

We are often reminded that too little thought and effort are being devoted to our health—our most vital personal and national resource. I imagine General Opie, who has given so unstintingly of his time to the building of this hospital, could tell us a great deal about the miracles of modern medicine in rescuing the lives of battle casualties and of the rate at which disease is weakening our manpower resources. He could tell us that the physical rejection rate today under selective service is higher than during World War II. Since Korea the equivalent of 17 infantry divisions have been rejected for physical defects. Think of it. Three hundred thousand young men between the ages of 19 and 25—the flower of our defense manpower—found physically unfit to serve. What better warning do we need before we move on all fronts to correct this appalling situation caused in such large measure by neglect of our Nation's health.

When I talk about health and what we must do for the health of our people, I like to speak of the six pillars of health—doctors, hospitals, preventive medicine, research, education, and the soil—each vital to every one of us and to the Nation's well being.

You have good doctors here in this great section of the Shenandoah Valley. This hospital will help to insure that you continue to have good doctors. But throughout the Nation there is a serious shortage of both hospital and medical personnel. We must train more doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians. We must follow your example and build the hospitals we need to give all our people adequate hospital service.

The marvelous strides that we have made against typhoid fever, scarlet fever, diphtheria, malaria, smallpox, pellagra, and other such diseases is proof of what can be accomplished through our public health services in the field of preventive medicine. We must provide urgently needed help to the States, their counties, and cities in their never-ending struggle against disease—cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, mental disease, infantile paralysis. We must help them in the advancement of such specialized programs as maternal and child care.

We must provide more intense and greater research to study the causes of disease and to bring forth new discoveries for prevention and cure. Surely a nation that can produce the atomic bomb can find the cause and cure for cancer.

I wonder if you were surprised when I named the soil as one of the pillars of health. You and I know what happens to an automobile if we put the wrong kind of oil in it, or if we get grit in the gasoline. The same thing applies to the machinery of the human body. The right food that we put into our bodies makes for health and strength. The wrong food makes for weakness and sickness. The minerals and nutrients which feed and make up our bodies come to us from the plants and products of the soil. More and more doctors and scientists attribute diseases to deficiencies of minerals in our soil.

Down in Deaf Smith County, Tex., they have no decay of the teeth because the minerals in the soil of that county prevent such decay. Missouri does not just happen to be a mule-raising section. It produces big, tough mules because of the phosphorous and other minerals in its soil.

And so the farmer in his farming practices and soil conservation is working and contributing to your health and my health and the health of all our people. That is why it is so important that we continue to help the farmer in his soil conservation. In helping him we are helping all.

Education is essential to health. Health and education go hand in hand. It is the educated person who knows best how to take care of himself and preserve his health. The more uneducated and illiterate people are, the more sickness and disease we find among them. We must make certain that America's children, tomorrow's citizens and defenders of our democracy, have the opportunity for the education that will equip them for the responsibilities of citizenship and the building of lasting peace.

These are six pillars of health. All must be strong if our people are to be strong and healthy and we are to have a strong America.

The great hope of all of us today is for peace. And our hope for building and keeping the peace lies in a strong America. America must be strong in her Armed Forces, her armed might. She must be strong in her economy and strong in the united determination of her people to save and build the peace.

We know that during the last war the final victory of our fighting forces was made possible by production. American workers and American management produced more war materials than the rest of the world combined. American farmers pushed food and fiber production to record heights.

As we produced to win the war, we must produce today to defend our freedom and win the peace. As you increase the harvest of your acres here in the Shenandoah Valley, as you increase the production in your mills and factories, you can know that you are waging the fight for peace and freedom in the spirit of your own great son, Woodrow Wilson, who gave us these words—the finest tribute ever paid to a people:

"There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world, out into pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before."

This afternoon as we dedicate your beautiful hospital, we know that this is the Sabbath Day, the day of Him whom we call the Great Physician, of Him whom we call the Prince of Peace. In His name and in His spirit, let us dedicate this hospital, setting an example to all Virginia and to all the Nation that as we shall follow in His footsteps by healing the sick and binding up their wounds, so shall we follow in His footsteps in the building of the peace of the world.

Letter From a Soldier in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a letter from a member of our fighting force in Korea to his commanding officer in World War II who is a constituent and a valued friend of mine. The letter without the names of the parties and the location of the fighting force deleted is as follows:

At the present time our regiment is in ——— reserve. After our push up to Chunchon we were pulled out into reserve.

I believe our reserve time is just about up now. Not much activity along the front, just light action and naturally very heavy patrolling. I imagine by the time you receive this letter something will have happened one way or the other. I look for the Chinese to start an offensive before long.

———, this is an entirely different war than the one we fought in Germany. These people (Chinese) are fanatics. They have to be dug out, and I mean dug.

The weather is fairly nice now, I am sure thankful for that, because the past winter was rough. Thought I would freeze in spite of everything. It's nice now; not very cold at all.

I have been in Korea 4½ months. When I left Japan in November I was assigned to the ——— division, but when I got to Korea, they assigned me to the ——— and I have been here ever since. I am first sergeant of this company. It's not a bad job, as all the communications jobs are filled, and have been. Got a large company, and a good one. This sure is a fighting outfit. None of us are happy here, and don't enjoy it a bit; but as long as we have to be here we will do our best.

Something ought to be done for some of these boys over here. There are men here who have been over here over 8 months, and ———, they are shot. I've got some boys who are just kids, and they have been up front so long they aren't going to make it much longer. I can't understand what is wrong with the Army. If the Chinese don't kill these men, the Army will. I know there are more men than that in the Army. I don't suppose I will ever be in a position to do anything about this; but my one vote will sure go in the opposite direction, next time. I've seen them crack up. I've seen them brought into the aid station wounded for life, and I've seen the dead ones. I know we are fighting for what is right; but I can't see letting the same ones do it all the time. These poor kids will never be the same again, and if I ever get out of Army this time, I never want anything whatsoever to do with it. You should hear these boys cough at night. I know I am bitter, but not because of myself; but for what I have seen in Korea. It's a dirty stinking mess. The Army isn't what it was when you and I were in before.

It's just about dark and I will have to close. I shall try and write you occasionally. Take it easy and pray for us.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent who has a distinguished record in World War II, informs me that the man who wrote this letter, who is also a citizen of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee which I have the honor of representing, spent 5 years or 6 years in the Army serving throughout World War II, staying in the Reserves after leaving active duty, that he has a wife and one child and that after some 5 years of civilian life he was recalled to active duty, given 9 days' training, and shipped to the Pacific theater.

Mr. Speaker, these men who are going through the horrors of Korea must be relieved. The heritage and history of America is too great to permit this condition to continue.

Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of personal pride, privilege, and satisfaction to be able to number among my constituents Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr., an outstanding American—an outstanding citizen of the city of Newark, N. J. For many, many years Mrs. O'Brien has devoted herself unselfishly and untiringly in the interest of her fellow man. No matter what effort was entailed, so long as the welfare of others was concerned, Mrs. O'Brien, in the true Christian spirit, has always responded to the call.

Some years ago the citizenry of Newark in recognition of her great services had her proclaimed as a real humanitarian. Mrs. O'Brien might easily have rested on this well-deserved distinction, but, instead in a self-effacing manner, she carried on—and her good works multiplied. She continued to bring solace to the afflicted and comfort and assistance to the needy. The governing body of the city of Newark has held it fitting to issue a proclamation, designating April 15 Angel Day in honor of the Angel of Newark—Mrs. John F. O'Brien.

I join in the sentiment expressed in this fitting tribute and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a proclamation issued by Mayor Ralph A. Villani, of Newark, N. J., under date of April 12 concerning the activities of Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr.:

Whereas Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr., identified with all things humane and noble all of her life; and

Whereas, Mrs. O'Brien, having served the city of Newark for 32 years in institutional endeavors with such institutions as the blind, Crippled Children's Hospital, St. Michaels Hospital, orphanages, the Little Sisters of the Poor, Ivy Haven, and numerous other charitable and social agencies; and

Whereas, Mrs. O'Brien, having been greatly responsible for the passage of legislative bills toward the betterment of the underprivileged as well as removing the stigma which might reflect unpleasantly upon individuals and families who have become victims of circumstances beyond their control; having been responsible for the changing of the name of Ivy Haven from Alms House and the permanent removal of the use of the word "pauper" in any way referred to the aged or the poor; and

Whereas, this being the fourth anniversary of the passage of that humane bill, in cognizance of this and her other noble endeavors having received recognition by having been named "Angel" at Ivy Haven and referred to as "Angel of Newark" by the press, and by people of all walks of life and by myself as well, having first-hand knowledge of her many pioneering efforts of which she has given of her own, in time, health and finances:

Now, therefore, I, Ralph A. Villani, mayor of the city of Newark, and for my colleagues, Commissioners Meyer C. Ellenstein, John B. Keenan, Stephen J. Moran, and Leo P. Carlin, do hereby proclaim April 15, 1951, as Angel Day in honor of one who rightfully deserves the nomen for her unstinting sacrifices that Newark may be a better place to live in and humanity may be better to live with.

RALPH A. VILLANI,
Mayor.

APRIL 12, 1951.

Should UN Members Traffic With Our Enemies and Should We Hand Over Formosa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, if the plan of General MacArthur to help the people of Japan, the Philippines, and Formosa to hold out against Communist aggression is accepted and the China coast is blockaded, the war can be ended in Korea. If this blockade is put on, then those trading strategic material to the Reds will be caught red-handed. The very first catch will be Great Britain. As long as England can keep on shipping war materials to China, the war will continue and those materials will be used by the Red Chinese in fighting the troops of the United Nations, which include a small force from Britain. This must be comforting to the British soldiers fighting in Korea to know that their own country is making it possible for the war to continue. When a government can sacrifice its own men to save its trade, it is noticed that we are associating with the most perfidious and selfish nation on the earth today. This same England

is determined that Red China shall be admitted to the United Nations and that Formosa shall be turned over to the Communists. Nothing will prevent it, unless there is an aroused spirit in America. Our State Department often behaves more English than American, and finally may agree to this appeasement. If we reward the aggressors with the gift of Formosa our chain of defenses against the Communists in the Pacific will be broken.

TRADE WITH RED

In view of the shameless trafficking with the enemy by some of our United Nations allies, I have introduced a resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) providing that our UN delegates shall be instructed to move for expulsion of guilty countries from the organization. My bill also provides that any American found guilty of trafficking with those against whom we are engaged in actual combat shall be declared engaged in treasonable activities and tried for treason as the Constitution provides.

The statement made by the President that he will send troops anywhere he wants to any time he wants to without the consent of Congress, and other intemperate statements of the Truman-Acheson administration, the untimely dismissal of General MacArthur—all have aroused the American people to a pitch of alarm never before witnessed in the history of this Republic.

The aroused feeling of the people was not alone the dismissal of General MacArthur but an accumulation of all these unfortunate statements and acts.

REWARD AGGRESSION?

Should the State Department finally surrender Formosa to Red China and break our chain of defenses against the Communists, the fury of the American people will far surpass their reaction to the MacArthur incident, and nothing will stop it except the retirement or impeachment of all those in the administration who are responsible for the move. The State Department earlier scuttled all opposition to the Communists in China, and if Formosa is scuttled, we would lose the key to our defense system against the Communist hordes of Asia.

Treason in the Constitution is defined as levying war against the United States or giving aid and comfort to its enemies. If the administration joins Great Britain in giving up Formosa, it is treason, or I do not know what acts would constitute that crime.

Panama Canal Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since 1947 the Panama Canal has been the subject of recurrent discussion in the Congress, and the time is approaching when definite action should be taken toward the proper resolution of this problem.

In the RECORD of April 11, 1951, in an extension of remarks by Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, was published an unusually able statement by former Member of Congress Willis W. Bradley, of Long Beach, Calif., before the House Committee on Public Works. This statement dealt at some length with the St. Lawrence seaway and the Panama sea-level project.

Another recent contribution by former Representative Bradley concerning the Panama Canal was published as an editorial in the April 4, 1951, edition of the well-known Pacific coast newspaper, the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram.

Under leave accorded, I am pleased to include it in my remarks:

DON'T OVERDO ON PANAMA CANAL CHANGES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author, a former Congressman from the Eighteenth Congressional District, is a recognized authority on the Panama Canal. His home is at 284 Argonne Avenue, Long Beach.)

(By Capt. Willis W. Bradley, U. S. Navy, retired)

The people of the West pay a large part of the expenses of the Panama Canal so what happens there concerns the pocketbook of every resident of this southern California region.

When the Canal was constructed it seemed primarily a national defense feature. In that aspect, the usual way would have been to charge the original cost off to national security. However, since the big ditch was to serve both commercial vessels and warships, its cost was set up as an interest-bearing investment and commercial traffic has paid tolls based on operating expense, plus interest on the investment, from the day of opening. This has kept tolls unnecessarily high and has cost consumers in California many millions more than their fair share of all expenditures incurred by Uncle Sam in the Canal Zone.

Recently, efforts have been made by the Department of the Army, charged with operation of the Canal, to increase tolls because of higher present-day costs of almost everything one buys. The proposed increases have been blocked by loud dissent from the Congress, from shipping activities, and from Pacific Coast States, but Canal authorities are ready to delve into our pocketbooks for more money at the first opportunity.

When the Canal was constructed it was designed to operate on three levels. * * * There is a group of three locks on the Atlantic side (the Gatun locks) which give a total lift of about 85 feet from the level of the Atlantic to Gatun Lake. On the Pacific side we find two sets of locks: First, the Miraflores locks, consisting of two steps with a total lift of about 54 feet from the Pacific level to Miraflores Lake, and then the Pedro Miguel lock, with a single lift of about 31 feet from Miraflores Lake to the upper level of the Canal (that of Gatun Lake), which prevails at the Pacific end of Gaillard (Culebra) cut.

The Canal has been very satisfactory during its short life although operating experience has brought out several serious faults in design.

Now in correcting these faults we should be certain that we are not led into a morass of public spending having every appearance of boondoggling on a gigantic scale. Such spending is threatened in current proposals to lower the present Panama Canal to sea level at an estimated cost of $2,500,000,000. These proposals were made to the Congress by the Governor of the Panama Canal in a report submitted in 1947 and they are being pushed energetically. The main reason assigned for this vast conversion proposal is alleged greater national security in this atomic-bomb age.

There are several fallacies in the sea-level proposals. The suggested project is not a conversion, as represented to the public, but rather an almost entirely new canal. It is a conversion in the same sense as rebuilding your home by providing an entirely new house of different design, but keeping your old front door and street number. The initial estimate of $2,500,000,000 ($2,483,000,000 to be more exact) is considered conservatively to be less than half of the probable final cost. The new canal would infringe on the territory of the Republic of Panama and so require a new treaty embodying additional concessions from Panama which—if obtainable—would undoubtedly be very expensive in increased annual payments to Panama and might involve a heavy indemnity for property concerned. The best information available is that a sea-level canal would be about as vulnerable as the present lock canal to atomic-bomb attack and damage.

An alternative to the expensive sea-level project, proposed by Capt. Miles DuVal, United States Navy, retired, seems to satisfy every apparent need at moderate cost. This plan calls for changes to provide a lake at the Pacific end—accomplished by increasing the Miraflores locks from two stage to three-stage, by eliminating the Pedro Miguel lock, and the construction of a series of larger locks at both Atlantic and Pacific entrances.

Fantastic Claims Are Being Made by the Supporters of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on March 10, 1951, in an editorial exposes the fantastic claims of the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The editorial follows:

FANTASTIC CLAIMS

Fantastic claims are being made by the supporters of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, who see in the war emergency an opportunity to put over a scheme which has been consistently rejected by Congress for 20 years. Almost as far-fetched are some of the arguments advanced by opponents of the seaway, which leaves the average taxpayer, who must foot the bill, thoroughly bewildered.

It is a little hard for him to understand why in the midst of mobilization this country should consider undertaking to spend more than $1,000,000,000, plus urgently needed manpower and materials, to build a waterway, more than half of which lies entirely outside the boundaries of the United States. The best estimate of the manpower required was made by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, then Chief of Army Engineers, in testifying before Congress in 1947. He reported that 111,355 man-years of work would be required to construct a 27-foot channel in the International Rapids section alone. This would mean the services of 23,600 men for 4 years. It does not include the work needed on connecting channels of the Great Lakes, the deepening of harbors, or the work in the Canadian section of the waterway.

Proponents of the seaway urge its construction now on the plea that it would provide a water route for the movement of iron ore from Labrador; a movement which it is estimated would average approximately 10,000,000 tons annually. Assuming that the seaway could be built for $1,000,000,000 this would represent an investment of $100 a ton for Labrador ore at a time when known ore reserves in this country can supply the Nation's maximum needs for more than a decade. In addition there are in this country billions of tons of taconite containing iron. It would be far more practical to spend a small fraction of the cost of the seaway to build taconite processing plants.

The real objective of the St. Lawrence project is not navigation, but power development. New York and New England interests urge the project because they see in it the opportunity to secure the development of electric power at the expense of the taxpayers of the rest of the country. It is, in short, a grandiose TVA, to subsidize power users of New England.

This country does not need more TVA's. It certainly cannot afford to dissipate money, manpower and materials on a TVA scheme which could not be finished in any event until long after the present war emergency is past. Congress has recognized these considerations, and other valid arguments against the seaway in the past. They should prevail again, despite the pressure that is being brought to put over the seaway in the guise of a mobilization project.

Britain Refuses to Participate in Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the supporters of the reciprocal trade agreements program were shocked to learn that Britain has refused to join with other nations in cutting tariffs. At Torquay, England, the United States and 38 countries agreed to tariff cuts, but not the British.

The story about this conference appeared in the Star on Sunday, April 22. Said article is included as part of my remarks:

UNITED STATES AND 38 NATIONS AGREE ON TARIFF CUTS, BUT BRITAIN DOES NOT

TORQUAY, ENGLAND, April 21.—New agreements lowering still further some of the tariff barriers to world trade were signed today by the United States and 38 other nations. The details are temporarily secret.

In addition to 147 separate tariff-reducing agreements between pairs of nations, cuts previously agreed on at two earlier conferences since World War II were continued until 1954.

The Torquay Conference of members of the postwar General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade ended after nearly 7 months. Conference headquarters said "a substantial list of concessions has been achieved which will be applied over a very extensive area of world trade."

TALKS BREAK DOWN

But the biggest failure was a breakdown of negotiations between the United States and most of the British Commonwealth nations.

The United States reached tariff-reducing agreements with 17 of the 24 nations with whom it negotiated, including Canada, a member of the British Commonwealth, and Belgium, Brazil, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Indonesia, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Western Germany, Korea, Peru, and Turkey.

But it failed to reach an agreement with Britain, Australia, New Zealand, India, and South Africa—all Commonwealth members—and Cuba and Guatemala.

COULDN'T GET TOGETHER

"They wouldn't give us what we wanted and we couldn't give them what they wanted," said Carl Corse, State Department trade expert who headed the 99-man American delegation.

Mr. Corse was authorized to reduce by as much as 50 percent the import duties on about 3,000 items. In return, the United States wanted tariff reductions by the Commonwealth countries which would have effectively broken down the empire preference system in operation for 19 years.

Britain was tempted to give up the system which she erected in 1932 as a shield against the world depression. By this system, Britain and the Commonwealth countries charge lower tariffs on each other's goods than they do on the products of other countries.

TARIFF CUTS WOULD HELP

American tariff cuts would have helped Britain's drive to earn more dollars by sales of goods to the United States. But trade experts believe she finally decided to stick to empire preference because she would have difficulty in holding her empire markets against United States mass-production industries if pounds and dollars should become freely convertible some time in the future.

The members of the General Agreement on Tariffs do more than 80 percent of the world's international trade.

The exact tariff cuts that were agreed on will not be published until May 9, when each nation which gave or received reductions will make them public. All the new tariff changes will be published May 12 by Gatt headquarters at Geneva, Switzerland.

Under the Gatt system, the deals are made between the principal buyers and sellers of each separate product. Then the lowered tariffs are extended to all Gatt members.

Our Multiple Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the text of a sermon delivered by the Reverend Edward Hughes Pruden, pastor of First Baptist Church of Washington, on April 15, 1951.

The sermon follows:

OUR MULTIPLE CHALLENGE

Ephesians 6: 12: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

It has been customary to assume that the group of Christians to whom was committed the most staggering task in all of history was that little group of disciples on the Galilean hillside to whom Jesus gave the great commission. We know that they did receive a staggering responsibility. They must have been shaken to their very foundations by all of the implications bound up in the great commission: What it required of them; and how alert, sacrificial, and full of eagerness they would have to be if that commission was ever to be carried out in all of its greatness and power.

But I am inclined to believe today that the Christians of this generation have confronting them an even more tremendous and frightening responsibility, for we are confronted on every hand by a variety of problem situations which give us grave concern, and which are more or less related to one another as far as their total impact upon the cause of Christ is concerned. Looked at together, they might be likened to a mighty octopus with its tentacles stretched toward us in all directions, challenging or threatening us constantly with the possibilities wrapped up in the influences they possess. I should like to mention a few of these particular problems with which we are confronted and indicate ways in which we must face them.

First of all among these problem situations I would mention an engulfing defeatism—a sense of being conquered even before the struggle begins. I am afraid that far too many Americans have been afflicted with this malady. We find fears around us which approach psychopathic proportions. Men and women are not only afraid but are not embarrassed to admit these fears, and they resort to terribly emotional extremes in expressing their anxieties.

This was illustrated last week when the news was released to the world that General MacArthur had been relieved of his command. Some of the excessively emotional responses to that news was due, of course, to great admiration for the general; some of it was due to an unreasoning political partisanship; but much of it was due to the vicious and deliberate campaign of hate and suspicion in which a few newspapers and radio commentators have been engaged. These scaremongers would have us believe that there is a subversive in every Government office; that our leaders are under the influence of some sinister organization of traitors; and that we are on the verge of being taken over by Russia. Those of us who are at all intelligent know that that is absolute foolishness, but the tragedy of it is that there are enough uninformed, simple-minded, emotionally unstable people in the world to accept that propaganda as though it were gospel truth. Many of those who called the newspapers last week and couldn't speak coherently because of the emotional upheaval within them were victims of this kind of propaganda. They were indeed pathetic victims because they were so sincere and honest about it all, having accepted as absolute fact the rumors the suggestions, and the suspicions which had been circulated by some of these commentators. I don't know which commentators you listen to but I hope you listen with a selective mind. You can no more accept everything you hear on the radio than you can accept

everything that is printed in the newspapers. We must use our intelligence and discriminate between that which is vicious and which undermines confidence in ourselves and our Government, and that which our intelligence tells us is sane and reasonable. We have come to a sad day in the life of our country when a United States Senator can stand on the floor of the Senate with so little regard for the truth and the intelligence of the people and make this statement, "Our Government," he said, "is in the hands of a secret inner coterie which is directed by the agents of the Soviet Union." It is hard for me to believe that a Senator could be ignorant enough to believe that. We know that it isn't so, and I am inclined to believe that the Senator knows that it isn't so. We who are Christians must be an enlightening and stabilizing influence in society. We must help to calm those who have been unnecessarily aroused. We must help men to know the truth that they may be free—free from fear and falsehood, from the domination of false propaganda disseminated by unscrupulous men. It is our duty to confront men with the steadying influences of the Christian gospel.

Here again may I quote once more a verse of scripture which you have already noticed is frequently on my lips—the verse from the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians, "Love is always eager to believe the best." If we find ourselves eager to believe the worst, either about America, its leadership, or our fellow citizens, let's reexamine the basis of our own discipleship, for love is never eager to believe falsehood. Love is disinclined to accept uncomplimentary statements regarding one's fellowmen. If I believed that communism was so attractive, compelling and absolute in its appeal that multitudes of people in our Government had fallen for it, it would shake my confidence in democracy, but I don't believe that communism is that kind of thing. I believe it appeals only to people who are so downtrodden that they will grasp at anything to give them some hope, or to people who are mentally unstable. I don't believe there is a normal human being in the world to whom communism has any appeal. That is why I don't lie awake at night thinking of what communism is going to do to America. Our people generally are too well off and too intelligent ever to fall for that kind of philosophy. Of course, here and there you find a few who because of some unusual circumstances have become victims of the communistic ideology, but they constitute a small and an almost negligible minority. We must do something to counteract the campaign of fear which many seem deliberately trying to create at a time when we need all the confidence and courage and united spirit which we can possibly muster.

In the second place, we are confronted by communistic fanaticism. Communism isn't just a philosophy; it is a crusade. It isn't just something which men accept passively, but it is something which they are trying to share intensively. We read in the newspapers about the Communist soldiers in North Korea, and the Chinese Communist soldiers, who come against our fighting men in wave upon wave, like the waters of the sea, giving themselves completely and eagerly in a great crusading spirit for the establishment of their own ideology. Now it isn't enough for us to denounce communism, and be on the alert against it, but we must somehow reproduce in our own relationship to Christianity something of that zeal, determination, and crusading spirit which the devotees of a pagan philosophy are everywhere demonstrating. To some of you I have mentioned before the Indian student at Bacone College in Oklahoma who came back from his summer vacation last September after spending his holidays with his family on the reservation. When he arrived on the campus the president of the college said to him, "John, what is wrong with you? You look as though you are completely exhausted and spent." And the student said, "Doctor, just before leaving the Indian reservation I took part in the sun dance of my tribe." And when the president required as to what that involved he said, "That required that we should dance in a wild, frenzied fashion for 3 days and 3 nights without stopping for food or drink. Every man in the tribe but one fell by the wayside out of sheer exhaustion." Then the president asked, "John, why on earth did you do it?" And John replied, "We did it in the hope that we might drive the war out of Korea." While we may smile at the innocence and the foolishness of trying to end a war by a sun dance, the question we ought to ask ourselves is this, "How much am I willing to endure that the war may be driven out of Korea? What would I do for 3 days and 3 nights if I knew that by doing it the war might be brought to a conclusion?" Would we stay on our knees in prayer 3 days and 3 nights, and if we did, would we not want perhaps a pillow under our knees? It isn't enough to denounce the dangerous doctrines of the enemy; we must match their zeal and enthusiasm, or we shall lose the world while they are winning it.

A third thing with which we are confronted in these days is current secularism—the tendency to put our major time and attention upon things, that which we can see and touch; surrounding ourselves with little conveniences and comforts while neglecting the deeper things of the spirit. Dr. Fosdick was everlastingly right in that line in his hymn which says that we are rich in things, but poor in soul. People all over the world know of America's wealth and our vast variety of bodily comforts. We are noted for those things, but we are not noted for our spiritual power. No one in the world looks to us as the great exemplars of moral characteristics to which they can turn. They think of us in terms of automobiles, radios, and conveniences of every conceivable sort—things which minister to our love of luxury rather than the things which express our spiritual aspirations. Fifty percent of the American people are in no religious organization whatever, and many are only nominal members, so that the impact of America's influence upon the world is by no means a spiritual impact; it is largely a material one. Somehow we must turn the tide of this tendency in our corporate life that we may demonstrate a different spirit to a spiritually hungry humanity.

In the fourth place, we are confronted with militant clericalism—the tendency of a great ecclesiastical hierarchy to seek more and more political advantages in order that it may strengthen its own position in the life of America and the world. You who hear me Sunday after Sunday know how much I believe in cooperating with all Christians, and I shall always believe in that. Not only would I work with Protestant Christians but with Catholic Christians or any other Christians who will help to establish the spiritual foundations of the Kingdom of God. That is one of the great longings of my spirit. But we must never become so obsessed with the idea of cooperation that we close our eyes to the dangers that threaten our historic principles of soul liberty and religious freedom, and those factors which war against our basic doctrine of the separation of chuch and state. We must hold out forever a hand of cooperation along spiritual lines, but forever lift our hands against any efforts to use political means to strengthen the position of any ecclesiastical body, our own or any other, anywhere in the world.

Still again, we are confronted by what might be called splinter particularisms—the tendency to take some phase of the Christian religion and exalt that to a place of prominence to the neglect of all other phases. We have, for instance, the Christian Science movement which emphasizes the healing power of God. We believe in that just as thoroughly as any Christian Scientist in all the world, but we think it is a mistake to take that one phase of our belief and give to it such prominence that all other phases are practically forgotten. We think of moral rearmament with its emphasis upon a changed life and the fact that men need not remain as they are. We believe in that thoroughly, and we preach it constantly, but we must not exalt that idea to the point of ignoring all else within our faith. We think of alcoholics anonymous, and rejoice in the way in which that movement has reached down and lifted men out of hopelessness to a place of respect and honor; but that too is only a partial expression of what the Christian faith can do for humanity. However, while we are mentioning these things we ought to acknowledge that perhaps we too are at fault, for maybe these who were formerly active within the churches are reaching out to other organizations because they have not found in the church that for which their hearts hunger; and perhaps we have been so busy emphasizing other phases of the Christian message that we have neglected these phases to which we should have given more of our time and attention.

We are confronted, too, today by what might be called general indifferentism. The man on the street isn't hostile to the church. In most instances, he is simply indifferent to the church, and we are terribly afraid he is indifferent because he has found so little in us to challenge him or to cause him to look at the church in admiration. The early Christians were a revolutionary people. They accepted a doctrine which was considered dangerous to the state and to society. Why do you suppose they were put to death in the arena in Rome, and why was Jesus crucified at Jerusalem Not for the amusement of the people; not for the satisfaction of their leaders; but because they were considered dangerous, subversive, heretical and all the rest of it. These early Christians were people willing to constitute a small and unpopular minority. Someone has said of us that we are little more than the revolutionary sons of revolutionary fathers. Whereas they were a revolutionizing influence in society, we try to conform to society, to be like the world in which we live. I heard two little boys playing yesterday and one of them did something rather daring, after which he said, "I like the dangerous life." That is the kind of life that appeals to any honest-to-goodness human being with a spark of adventure within his soul and spirit. But we don't present enough of the adventurous character of the Christian faith to cause men to be challenged by it, or to make them turn to the church in great admiration.

We are also confronted these days by aggressive sectarianism. In spite of all our progress in Christian cooperation there are still forces at work in our world seeking to divide us into little competing, warring groups. They do this first of all by trying to create suspicion regarding our great Protestant leaders. They do it by saying that we will be disloyal to our denomination if we are cooperative with other Christians. They do it by saying that if we are not careful we will build up a great superchurch which will rob us of our liberties and take away our congregational and personal freedom. We must be on the alert to answer these charges; to demonstrate that they are not true; and to give ourselves in utmost devotion to the cause of Christian unity in a divided world.

And last of all, we are confronted as Christians today by an incomplete evangelism. In all of our churches there are scores of people who are only partially saved; people who have taken the first step or two on the ladder leading to discipleship; but who have hesitated to go further, or climbed back down altogether. And because of this incomplete evangelism we have great multitudes of people who are only half-hearted in their devotion to Christ and His church. Every now and then the officers of our church hold a meeting to decide how on earth we can get several hundred members of our church who are now inactive to participate in some way in the life of the church; to come occasionally; to give at least once a year; to demonstrate some little semblance of interest and concern. What is going on in our church is going on in every church in America, and all of that is an illustration of an incomplete evangelism. These indifferent members are those who either thoughtlessly, or without any understanding of what they are doing came down to the front and accepted Christ, went back and took their seats, and have forgotten all about it ever since. They started out in a promising way but they never followed through to any kind of conclusion. Until we can do something about this situation the churches of Christ will never be the power in society they were intended to be.

So today as we look at these problem situations all around us, and at our multiple responsibility in a day like this, we are inclined to say, "Who is equal to these things?" If we had a lesser leader we might well give up in despair, but we have a great Leader—One who is strong above all our conceptions of strength; One who is destined to triumph in spite of all the forces that are in league against Him. And we have two words from Him which perhaps will give us the courage we require; "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world"; and "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's pleasure to give unto you the Kingdom."

Arbor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, 79 years ago, on April 10, 1872, Arbor Day was observed for the first time by one of these United States.

It is significant that the State wherein this constructive movement originated was my home State, Nebraska.

Why did Arbor Day begin in Nebraska?

There are many reasons.

Nebraska needed trees to develop and conserve its vast potential for agricultural production. The farmer needed trees about his house for shade in the summer. He needed trees about his house to protect it from the blizzards in the winter. It was only an easy, natural step to establish State-wide tree belts along section lines and along boundaries between farm properties. The tree belt, outgrowth of Arbor Day planting, was a familiar sight in Nebraska long before—yes; many decades before—this method of crop preservation was advocated on a national scale.

The historic origin of the people who pioneered Nebraska gave them a universal respect and appreciation for the beauty of trees. Swedes from the wooded hillsides of far-off Scandinavia became substantial Nebraska citizens early in the saga of our State. Germans from the storied regions of the Black Forest brought their skills and their traditions to early Nebraska. French Canadians from the north woods added their numbers and their ability to the infant State. Czechs from the woodlands of Bohemia brought their keen evaluation of tree beauty to the State I am proud to call home.

Nor were the American-born pioneers remiss in their desire to be tree-planters. Men and women from the great tree stands of Wisconsin and Michigan, alive to the knowledge of the value of trees, were among the first to settle in Nebraska. After the War Between the States, hundreds of southerners from the tree-rich lands of Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina came West, lured by the rumors of the promised land of that time—Nebraska.

With the need and the people present in my home State, it was inevitable that a powerful urge should move Nebraskans to plant trees. Wherever and whenever pioneers got together—at church, at the cross-roads grocery, at the county courthouse—it became one of the certain topics of conversation. Nobody denied the need. Everybody was in favor of it. The favorite question of the era was: "Why don't somebody do something about it?"

It was very much like a situation with which all of us are now familiar. For years—and especially since the outbreak of the war in Korea—alert Americans have been asking themselves: "What is our foreign policy? Do we have any? Why don't somebody do something about it?" General MacArthur, in his recent letter to Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts did do something about it. He focused and crystallized the aroused interest of the American people.

Seventy-nine years ago, when Nebraskans called for somebody to do something about it, their pleas were also answered. J. Sterling Morton did what Nebraskans had thought about and talked about.

Morton—editor, farmer, philosopher—was, above all, a public servant. He was a Democrat, the Nation's third Secretary of Agriculture. Yet, what he did was done for the whole people of the State wherein he lived, regardless of party. He was a two-fisted political battler. Yet, he was never guilty of low-blow tactics. He believed that the people were the power. His creed was to serve, rather than to dictate; to guide, rather than to dominate. No man was more aware of the true responsibilities of leadership under a republican form of government than J. Sterling Morton.

Even in the awareness that he was doing right and that he had popular support behind him, J. Sterling Morton was beset with difficulties. He had to plan. He had to consider the set ideas of like-thinking men. He had to accept recommendations and he had to reject them. The culmination of his plan—to be accepted by the legislature of the 5-year-old State—had to be so worded as to offend neither North nor South, neither Nebraskan of French origin nor Nebraskan of German origin, neither Catholic nor Protestant.

History records that Mr. Morton adopted suggestions and made changes in his original plan; but, nevertheless, kept the germ of his idea intact. History also records that, in line with Nebraska's reliance on education, the father of Arbor Day, called upon the children of Nebraska to help in making his dream into an accomplished fact. Men and women are alive today who, as children, took part in the first observance. Men, women, and children—whole families—"pitched in" to make that first Arbor Day a success. Communities dropped all other work to share in it. It was the greatest "planting bee" up to that time. To get some idea of the enthusiasm with which Nebraskans put their shoulders to the wheel, it is a matter of record that between sunrise and sunset on April 10, 1872, in our sparsely settled infant State more than 1,000,000 trees and shrubs were planted. Nothing short of an all-out community of effort on a State-wide basis could have accomplished that outstanding feat.

Like all good ideas, Arbor Day was not confined within the borders of our State of Nebraska. It spread. It was intended to spread. Today, 79 years after that first Arbor Day, it is observed in every State in these United States and in the District of Columbia. We of Nebraska are not alarmed because Arbor Day is not honored on the same day by every State. In fact, we of Nebraska are pleased that no unanimity does exist among the States. We of Nebraska are, and always have been, individualists. We do not servilely accept regimentation. Neither do we succumb to pressure from the Federal government to give up rights which essentially belong to each of the several States. We are glad that Florida has Arbor Day on January 20 and that Rhode Island has it on May 4. We are glad that it is proclaimed by the Governor in Wyoming and proclaimed by the State legislature in other States. We of Nebraska do not care when other States have Arbor Day or how they officially proclaim it. It is enough for us that they observe it as free components of the United States—with the constitutional right of self-determination.

In Nebraska, we observe Arbor Day on April 22 because that day is the birthday of J. Sterling Morton, its originator. That is our right as a still sovereign State.

Nebraskans are proud that the great movement of Arbor Day originated in our State. We are equally proud that the movement has carried forward, without interruption, gaining momentum—until the present. We pray that it will continue its march of progress into the uncharted future. Whatever the future of Arbor Day, we know that it will contribute to the happiness of all free men since it arose from the mind of men who loved the soil and trees—the gift of the soil—of men whose dedication to nature forever bespeaks their eternal faith in God.

The Korea on the Campus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an article from the pen of Dr. J. Ollie Edmunds, president of John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla., which is entitled "The Korea on the Campus":

THE KOREA ON THE CAMPUS

(By J. Ollie Edmunds)

To realistic Americans it is becoming appallingly clear that unless something is done about it, small independent colleges as we have known them in the past are on the way out. They are caught in a crushing economic nutcracker—between shrinking incomes and skyrocketing costs. The war is tumbling their enrollments. Everything from grass seed to textbooks is going up. Each one faces a Korea on its own campus.

For these valiant grass-roots colleges, where Christian character is considered as important as chemistry and the development of self-reliance as vital to the training of good citizens as the teaching of psychology, the alternatives are stark and urgent:

1. They can give up the ghost and go out of business;

2. They can accept political subsidies from the Government and "let the one who pays the fiddler call the tunes—if they are willing to cease being independent colleges, free to give their students religious training and free to turn thumbs down on socialistic theories; or

3. They can take their case direct to vigilant Americans who believe in perpetuating the private-enterprise system in education as well as in business and ask them to support the institutions that stand for the things for which they stand.

Most of these colleges will choose the third alternative. They will not give up without a struggle, for they are built of the same stuff of which our country has been built. The United States has astonished the world with its vitality. Through self-reliance and individual initiative, it has become one of the most important nations on earth. The small gift-supported colleges which have trained so many of the leaders in our free-enterprise system have played a lively part in bringing this about. They have no hesitancy, therefore, in asking good citizens, many of whom may never have given to a college before, to help them to stay strong so that they can continue to teach tomorrow's young men and young women the principles and ideals which have made our country great.

At no time has such teaching been more desperately needed. An alarming change is coming over many Americans. Like an insidious, sweet-smelling anesthetic, the tempting fragrance of Government-managed "security" is numbing their initiative and dulling their self-respect. Good citizens who once knew the meaning of righteous indignation, and who in the past would have instantly resented any attempt to "plan their economy," have been shrugging their shoulders at practices which should shock them. Even worse, many of their sons and daughters who have never lived in any other period except this narcotic era seem ready to accept as gospel truth the debilitating ideas which have been emanating from fuzzy-minded "planners" who, innocently or for ulterior motives, are sapping these young people of their self-reliance—the young men and young women to whom America must look for leadership in the future.

What is to be done about all this? What can we as individuals do about it? What ought the business concerns which are fighting to preserve their traditional concepts of free enterprise do about it?

Education—aggressive education—provides the only practical answer. We can either sit by and let our principles—and perhaps our country—go by default, or we can take positive action to strengthen the institutions which are teaching their students to understand and appreciate their heritage of freedom, democracy, and individual enterprise—ideals for which, all too soon, they may be asked to die. Such colleges are close to the people. All over the Nation they are a stabilizing influence. If only they can be given relief from their financial worries they can provide our country with the kind of Christian lawyers, ministers, statesmen, educators, business leaders, and clear-thinking citizens that can keep America America.

War-shattered enrollments and rising costs have plunged these colleges into a life or death struggle for survival. Financial help they must have—and quickly. If the men and women and the business concerns whose success has been built on our individual enterprise system do not stand back of such colleges, who will?

Is not what Americans have been fighting with guns to save overseas worth fighting with dollars to save at home?

Who Makes the Wars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the question of war or peace is one in which the people of this Nation are vitally interested. The desire for peace is the spirit and the soul of our people. Consequently, our people are desirous of determining who is responsible when we do go to war. An editorial appearing today in the Washington Times-Herald, under the title "Who Makes the Wars?" goes into this all-important question in a manner that challenges the thoughtful and considerate attention of all citizens without regard to political affiliation.

Under the unanimous consent granted, I include it as part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

WHO MAKES THE WARS?

Three Senators became engaged in a shoving match when Senator CAPEHART, Indiana Republican, registered his outrage at attempts of New Dealers during the course of a radio transcription to represent him as a warmonger, the Republican Party as the party of war, and General MacArthur as its agent in seeking war.

These fantastic aspersions were cast by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota and Senator LEHMAN, of New York, who were obviously following the defensive propaganda line that has been laid down for apologists of Mr. Truman's own war-making policies. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, among others, are engaging in the same slander, and the fact that General MacArthur was constrained to answer the desperate lie that he is a warmonger indicates how the gravest kind of distortion can be given currency through a skillful and persistent propaganda.

NATURAL BEDFELLOWS

The New Deal line on MacArthur also happens to be the Communist line. The Daily Worker refers to General MacArthur as war hungry, war incendiary, and as a menace to America and world peace. It is also the British line. As usual, the New Dealers are making common cause with their natural allies and accepted masters.

Mr. Truman's purpose is to beguile the people into forgetting a fact that should never be forgotten—that he and his party are the authors of wars. Every foreign war of this century has been a Democratic war. The Wilson war, the Roosevelt war, and now the Truman war in Korea are all of undisputed parentage. There has been no Republican war in the twentieth century. There is not now any MacArthur war. If the war in Asia should be enlarged, it will still be Truman's war. He put us there.

He put America into the war in Korea, although the Constitution says that only Congress may declare war. He never consulted Congress.

He went into his war with the pretext that he was complying with a call from the United Nations, and then had to induce the United Nations to give retroactive sanction to his unilateral action. Even if this country owed any responsibility to the United Nations—and no such responsibility existed at the time that Truman acted—the New Deal President did not satisfy the legal requirements established by Congress to fulfill the responsibility.

Public Law 764 had been on the statute books for 5 years when Truman ordered American forces into Korea. That law specified that no American forces could be placed at the disposal of UN until the President had concluded an agreement with UN for their use, and the agreement had then been submitted to Congress and ratified. Truman entered no agreement with UN. He submitted no such agreement to Congress for approval. He acted on his own and the war is his alone.

General MacArthur was not consulted in this decision. He received orders to conduct the war which Truman initiated.

MacArthur's part in the war was discharged brilliantly until the character of an emerging victory was completely transformed by the intervention of Communist China. Truman has sought to blame MacArthur for failing to know that China would come into the war. If MacArthur had been able to guess that development what difference would it have made? We were in Korea, and we were stuck there by order of Truman.

DELUDES PEOPLE

In decreeing the original entry into this war, it was Truman's responsibility to assess the risks, including the always apparent possibility that Communist China, or Russia, or both, might intervene. The decision to accept the hazard was his, and the responsibility for extension of the war through Chinese intervention was necessarily his, for it cannot be separated from the basic decision he made in entering the war.

The Truman propaganda is intended to delude the people into forgetting that he is the author of the war, that the subsequent extension of the war to Communist China flowed out of his unconstitutional act, and that if the war should expand still further, that will also be his responsibility, for the expansion could not affect America if he had not sent American troops into the conflict in the first place.

The present pose of Truman and the Democrats that they are the party of peace, although they made the war, and the blood of more than 60,000 Americans is already on their hands, can only provoke contempt. But they brazenly charge that the Republicans, or MacArthur, or anybody but themselves are the people to blame for the war, and are the people to blame if the war bursts its present bounds and becomes world war III. If it does, it is still Truman's war, still a New Deal war.

The best estimate of why the administration has adopted these tactics is that it is in a desperate predicament. Having committed the United States to the war, it can now see no way either to win or to disengage. It is stuck with the squalling, uncouth brat. It is looking anywhere and everywhere, hoping to unload the unwelcome handful on somebody else. It has tried that on MacArthur, but the thing won't stick. It has tried it on the Republicans, but again the transfer of guilt and odium cannot be accomplished.

In every controvery there is a starting point. First things come first. Why is the Nation concerned about Korea? Why is the Nation up in arms at the unfair railroading of MacArthur? Because, and only because, Truman created the whole situation when he went to war, of his own say-so, in Korea.

MacArthur Will Not Fade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including two very timely editorials that appeared in the Washington Daily News on April 20, 1951. Both are pertinent to the MacArthur story:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 20, 1951]

THIS WILL NOT FADE

The dauntless spirit, the selfless patriotism, which made America the hope and inspiration of the world shone again when Gen. Douglas MacArthur stood before Congress.

Shone with all the more splendor against the shoddy background of present-day political Washington, with its influence peddlers and its favor seekers, its tolerance of mediocrity in moral standards and official conduct.

For the moment the Acheesons and the Vaughans could be forgotten. Here was a man fit to stand with Lincoln when he said:

"I am responsible * * * to the American people, to the Christian world, to history, and on my final account to God."

Douglas MacArthur's speech was a message of hope and courage, of faith and firm conviction.

He offered a way to secure the peace and save American lives. And he laid it on the line that the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the past had agreed to the validity of that plan.

In reply to the appeasers who now dominate American foreign policy, he said that if the enemy can divide his strength on two fronts it is for us to counter his effort, because the Communist threat is global.

Like blackmail, he said, appeasement lays the basis for new and successively greater demands until, as in blackmail, violence becomes the only alternative.

"Why surrender military advantages to an enemy in the field?" he asked. "War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision."

General MacArthur went on to explain that America cannot be secured against the advances of communism by defending Europe alone, for our strategic frontier embraces the Pacific as well as the Atlantic Ocean. We are well protected at present by the island chain, extending from the Aleutians to the Marianas and held by ourselves and our allies, he pointed out.

But the victorious leader of the island war in the Pacific warned that any major breach in that chain, such as the surrender of Formosa to the Reds, would render vulnerable to determined attack every other major segment of our defenses.

This, he asserted, is a military estimate to which he has yet to find a military leader who will take exception. Yet Formosa is the island which Britain wants to hand over to the Communists, and our State Department has supported Britain in that position.

General MacArthur mentioned none of his detractors by name, and he treated his differences with them with dignity and restraint.

"While I was not consulted prior to the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic of Korea," he said, "that decision, from a military standpoint, proved a sound one." But, he continued, when Red China entered the war, that created an entirely new situation which called for new decisions in the diplomatic field to permit realistic adjustment of military strategy.

"Such decisions," he added, "have not been forthcoming."

Indeed, until this very hour none have been made. Yet, because he sought new instructions from the United Nations, General MacArthur has been accused of invading the fields of diplomacy and political policy.

"I called for reinforcements, but was informed that reinforcements were not available," he said.

Without them, "the position of the command from the military standpoint forbade victory."

When he pressed this issue, General MacArthur was relieved of his command and deprived of opportunity to end the conflict "with the least loss of time and a minimum sacrifice of life."

The armchair strategists won't find it easy to make that appear the policy of a saber-rattling warmonger.

The great soldier who was laying down his sword after 52 years in the service of his country faced the verdict of history unafraid, as he prepared quietly to fade away.

But the millions of Americans who heard and read General MacArthur's message will expect answers to the questions he raised.

They will be as one with him in anguish and anxiety for the gallant men left in Korea who remain in his thoughts and prayers. Each new tabulation of American casualties will add strength to his demand for prompt decisions which will end this conflict honorably and with a minimum sacrifice of life.

The old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty will not stand alone in days ahead. He has inspired a resurgence of American faith, courage, and devotion. It will not, must not, fail to make his hopes and dreams for honorable peace become reality.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 20, 1951]

THE UN BRUSH-OFF

The United Nations apparently has no interest in General MacArthur.

This despite the fact that he was the first man to command a military force in the field under the UN banner. And the fact that for the past 10 months he has been fighting for the very survival of the UN.

United Nations headquarters are in New York. General MacArthur is receiving in New York today one of the greatest welcomes ever accorded a hero in our time. Yet there were no plans for him to visit the pretentious new UN building there on his triumphant tour of the city.

The UN officially has expressed no desire to see its former commander. It is just a coincidence that the acting Secretary General is a Soviet citizen, sitting in, under a rotation system which the UN dearly loves, for Trygve Lie, who has gone to visit Europe and the Middle East.

Normally, it might be supposed that an organization of nations which is trying to preserve the fiction of carrying on a war would like to hear from its commander who has just come back from that war. But there's nothing strange about it. For actually, the UN has had no heart for the Korean War since the Chinese Reds joined in.

Only a few months ago the UN listened at length to the shouts and snarls of one Wu Hsiu-chan. He was the representative of the Chinese Reds, whom the British want to seat in the UN.

But the UN has no time for Douglas MacArthur.

Three Choices in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ferdinand Kuhn, from the Washington Post of April 22, 1951:

THREE CHOICES IN KOREA

(By Ferdinand Kuhn)

Now that the emotional jag of the MacArthur welcome is over, the Nation has a headache—and not the kind that will go away with a dose of headache powder.

The Korean war is about to enter its tenth month with no end in sight. The American people would not be themselves if they did not want to end it and get their men home.

"We are a people of convulsive and impatient nature," Dean Acheson wrote 3 years ago, before he learned as Secretary of State how convulsive American opinion could be. We want quick results, whether in sport, in business, or in war.

And because the Korean war does not promise quick results, its idealistic beginnings tend to be forgotten, its coldly practical purposes are ignored, and its future course produces divisions of opinion that seemed last week to be tearing the country apart.

A TRADITIONAL LAG

One would suppose, from the impatience to get this war ended, that a 10 months' war was something new in American experience. Yet 10 months after our entry into the last war, Guadalcanal was still our only land battleground. Ten months after the start of the Civil War, there had been only one major battle, and 10 months after Lexington and Concord the end of the beginning had not yet come.

When a country takes up arms, in a small war or a big one, it cannot look ahead to a stately succession of events, all developing on schedule to a foreordained end. It seldom knows at the start just how or when the victory will come.

War, said Winston Churchill a generation ago, is a voyage "across waters uncharted toward coasts unknown." So it is with this Korean enterprise which now leaves so many Americans impatient for a clean-cut ending.

Even General MacArthur now concedes that the decision to resist aggression in Korea was "sound." Had it not been taken

quickly, with all its risks, the political and military position of the United States and its Allies would have collapsed and aggressors would have been put on notice all over the world that they could strike anywhere, at any time, without fear of being stopped.

To be impatient now, 10 months later, may be in tune with the American tradition and temperament, but it is only another way of denying the rightness of what was done last June. It gets nowhere and it obscures the purposes of the first international peace-enforcement action in all history.

THREE ALTERNATIVES

How, then, is this pioneer effort in Korea to end with success and honor. Three alternatives are up for debate and for national decision.

The first of them General MacArthur outlined from the rostrum of Congress on Thursday. Victory, he assured the watching and listening Nation, could come from blockading China, intensifying economic pressure, ferrying the armies of Chiang Kai-shek to the mainland and destroying Chinese bases in Manchuria. The general would also hold Formosa permanently, so that American guns could "dominate" the coast of Asia from Vladivostok to Singapore and keep the Pacific an American "lake."

The air-sea war against China, outside the Korean Peninsula, has already been ruled out by the administration and its Allies. It has been ruled out because of the conviction that it would bring, not victory, but a ruinous world war; not an end of anything, but the start of a bloodletting that could have no end.

It has been ruled out because of the fear that it would bring Soviet Russia into active intervention in the Korean war, and perhaps in other areas as well.

With MacArthur's prescription ruled out as a quack remedy, what else can be done to end the war in Korea. Senator HARRY CAIN, of Washington, has proposed an answer in the form of a Senate resolution. His proposal has not the ghost of a chance of adoption, but at least it constitutes the second alternative before the American people now.

It is, quite simply, to pull out of Korea altogether, to cut the losses, to retire to a defense line on island territory from Japan to the Philippines. Certainly the course of Senator CAIN would save American lives, in the short run; it would bring home the officers who are needed to train the new draft armies here and it would give the United States the illusion of being the master of events instead of seeming to be their prisoner.

But a deliberate withdrawal would put a curse of Cain upon us in the eyes of small and exposed nations everywhere. It would condemn our South Korean allies to the torture chamber or the execution squad when the Communists marched in.

It would signal to every nation that fears for its future: "This is what you can expect from having the United States as your friend." And it would surely start a worldwide scramble to get on the Communist bandwagon. So this alternative, too, has been rejected by the administration, and General Bradley is only the latest of many official spokesmen who have said we would not get out of Korea unless driven out by overwhelming force.

THE REMAINING COURSE

Only one course remains, the course against which General MacArthur flashed his oratorical sword in Congress on Thursday. It is to stay and fight in Korea, to avoid widening the war by any action of our own, and to be ready for a negotiated truce whenever the enemy is ready to agree to the UN terms.

It should be remembered that the UN did not tell the United States, as its agent, to go and conquer all of Korea. Its instructions, passed on to General MacArthur, were to repel aggression and to restore peace and security in the area. It also had voted long before, in 1947, for the establishment of a unified, democratic, and independent Korea, a goal that had been fixed much earlier in the Cairo declaration of the United States, Britain, and China, and had been accepted by the Russians themselves at Potsdam in 1945.

The UN also called on the Chinese and the North Koreans last January for a cease-fire, to be followed by a withdrawal, by stages, of all non-Korean troops. There would have to be assurance, presumably by the supervision of UN teams, that the truce would not become a screen behind which the aggressors could build up a new offensive. And only after a cease-fire, and after an agreement on the future of Korea, would there be negotiations for a wider far eastern settlement, including a discussion of Formosa and a Chinese Communist seat in the United Nations.

These are still the UN terms; they are still the American terms, in spite of General MacArthur's implied statement that anything of the sort would be appeasement. But there is no indication at the moment that the Chinese Communists are ready to accept anything of the sort.

On the contrary, most military reports from Korea suggest that the Chinese are building up a massive new offensive, this time with the help of Chinese and possibly Soviet airpower from bases in Manchuria and Siberia.

Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, the new commander in Korea, is making all his dispositions accordingly—first, to keep the enemy off balance; second to keep his air force ready to shoot any enemy planes out of the sky; and third, to concentrate his firepower in defensible positions if the long-expected attack should come.

The Army leaders in Korea and in the Pentagon here are steadfastly confident that a new offensive can be smashed. They fully believe that the heavy losses already suffered by the Chinese will be doubled and trebled if a full-scale onslaught is tried.

If Chinese or Soviet bomber fleets should strike as part of a great offensive, the UN command would have no hesitation in bombing to destroy the bases north of the Yalu, as General MacArthur has recommended. The war in Korea would thus be widened by the enemy's own decision, and the threat of a new world war would, of course, be nearer.

If, on the other hand, the offensive should turn out to be another great land drive, of the sort that pushed the UN forces back in November, and if the offensive should result in nothing but terrible Chinese casualties, official Washington believes the Chinese Communists would be more willing to discuss a truce than they are now.

And if the offensive does not materialize, if there is a long lull instead, it is not at all impossible that a cease fire can be worked out on terms the UN can accept.

Such are the calculations of those who dismissed General MacArthur from his command, and who now dismiss his ideas as reckless and dangerous. The calculations rest on one basic assumption; that a new world war has not yet begun and can still be averted. They assume, too, that the limited war in Korea is worth all its cost in lives and treasure if it keeps the Chinese pinned down, makes the Russians hesitate, and shows clearly that aggression does not pay.

A course of this kind will not be pleasant for the American people, for their military leaders, or for the men who may have to fight through another fall and winter in Korea. If it is to succeed, two new ingredients will have to be added to the fortitude of the fighting men on the scene.

One is a far greater effort by other UN member nations to send troops for war and occupation duties. So far, as the American public knows only too well, a dozen other nations are represented in the Korean fighting by a total of only 25,000 men.

Nothing injects as much bitterness into the current MacArthur campaign as the belief, among the general's admirers, that other countries have let him down.

The conspicuous offenders include Australia, with only a battalion in Korea; Brazil, with almost 50,000,000 people and without a single soldier on the scene; and India and Pakistan, so intent on their miserable quarrel over Kashmir that they have not sent any of their excellently trained troops to serve the UN cause.

The administration here is moving heaven and earth to get these and other countries, notably the Latin Americans, to see their duty and to do it without further delay.

The second new ingredient of success, as the administration sees it, is patience from the American people. It will not be easy for the families of fighting men to go on supporting a war in which complete victory is not yet in sight.

Americans "are not interested in moral victories, but in victory," wrote D. W. Brogan, the British historian, an acute and friendly judge of our national character. In all our wars there has come a time of public restlessness because the final outcome was hidden from public view. It is more apparent in the Korean war than in any other because of the unprecedented nature and purpose of the struggle. But those who have the responsibility have the firm and unshaken belief that patience will pay rich dividends in the end.

State Department Gets Aid From Churchmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of April 22, 1951:

STATE DEPARTMENT GETS AID FROM CHURCHMEN

The State Department yesterday announced formation of a religious advisory panel to counsel Assistant Secretary Edward W. Barrett on the religious content of this country's information and educational programs abroad.

The panel, which has held its first meeting with Mr. Barrett, consists of Msgr. Thomas J. McCarthy, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Isaac Frank, of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington; and the Reverend Edward Hughes Pruden, president of the American Baptist Convention. All three men live in Washington.

"We are convinced," Mr. Barrett said in a statement, "that our campaign of truth can be made tremendously more effective through increasing the proportion of religious materials in the radio programs, pamphlets, and motion pictures that we are sending to people of all religious faiths the world over.

"We will of course continue to adhere strictly to the principle of absolute impartiality in dealing with the various sects."

MacArthur's Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Washington correspondent Ingrid Jewell, of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, on the subject of MacArthur's welcome in Washington, which article appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on Friday, April 20, 1951:

FEDERAL WORKERS VIEW PARADE WITH POLITICAL TONGUE IN CHEEK—MILITARY SHOW, FIXED BAYONETS JAR SPECTATORS

(By Ingrid Jewell)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—Washington today gave Gen. Douglas MacArthur a thoughtful, courteous hearing.

It was a pleasant spring day, with a south wind to ruffle the ranks of flags and the blossoming of fruit trees, and spread the fragrance of new grass tramped under many feet.

It was a day for the outpouring of affection to a national hero.

But things didn't happen that way.

The man in the street in Washington more than likely is a Government worker; or he is closely associated with Government workers. He is politically astute. Probably that is why today he viewed with quiet, attentive interest, but without spontaneous enthusiasm, the military pageant that was spread before him. He knew that General MacArthur had challenged not only the President but also the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and he wanted to know why before he made up his mind to applaud.

DAMPENED BY BAYONETS

For one thing, it dampens gaiety a bit to have to look across a line of fixed bayonets to see a parade. Admiral Nimitz, and General Eisenhower, and Wainwright all had parades in their honor when they came back heroes from the war. But no one thought it necessary to fix bayonets. They came immediately after the war's end, when the country was in a celebrating mood, and they came entirely free from political controversy. Probably all those things contributed to the contagious happiness that marked their celebrations. Those parades were fun; MacArthur's was not.

Probably 75,000 people were gathered on the Washington Monument Grounds, a natural amphitheater, to see the General receive the key to the city. Probably as many more lined Pennsylvania Avenue—the Avenue of Presidents—to watch his progress from the Capitol. The street was carefully roped off. That had not been thought necessary for other heroes.

Probably it was not the general's decision. But a great deal of trouble was taken to make sure the public did not participate in this parade. They were kept in their places.

It is consistent that the general's only really uninhibited receptions came from the hard core of Republican extremists in Congress and from the Daughters of the American Revolution, whose convention he visited for a few minutes during his busy afternoon. The Daughters awaited him impatiently; cried excitedly: "He's here!" as he strode on their stage; applauded and shouted when he assured them solemnly, "In this hour of crisis, all patriots look to you"; and would not let him go until they had sung a verse of Faith of Our Fathers, Living Still. In old-time movie parlance, the general would be known as a heavy. The DAR loved him.

FAILURE AT INFORMALITY

He made his triumphal march in an old trench coat, and a cap unadorned by scrambled eggs. Yet he failed to achieve informality. His speech was perfunctory; his actions abrupt. Even his compliments were imperious. Probably he was tired.

There were loud-speakers everywhere. By far the high point of his performance was his speech to Congress. While he was speaking, the city was hushed to follow the radio. In restaurants the diners handled their silver and dishes quietly; on the Monument Grounds, parents hushed their noisy youngsters so as not to miss a word.

MANY ARE IN UNIFORM

Besides the ranks of soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines that flanked the line of march and manned the bands, there were countless young men in uniform among the spectators.

Up the gently sloping park from the reviewing stand at the Monument Grounds was the White House, now bound by scaffolding attendant on its remodeling, but beautiful even in disarray.

The young soldiers looked that way and one said, "Is Truman here today?"

"No, he's hiding," another replied, and they laughed. MacArthur evoked no laughter.

MRS. MACARTHUR APPEALING

Mrs. MacArthur, a generation younger than he, small and pert with her arms full of roses, was appealing, so was the boy, Arthur, sitting between his parents on the back seat of the huge black touring car with the top down. But the illusion of a family drive was dispelled by the motorcycle escort, charging ahead with red lights flashing.

MacArthur's Removal a "Human Sacrifice"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Sterling-Rock Falls Gazette, of Illinois. This is truly a great editorial and should be read by every American:

MACARTHUR'S REMOVAL A "HUMAN SACRIFICE"

This editorial may well be presumptuous.

But as things stand this, Friday, morning, April 20, 1951—there seems little doubt that Gen. Douglas MacArthur's removal was a "human sacrifice."

So far, no denial has been made of General MacArthur's statement that the "top brass" endorsed his Far East military objectives.

In an effort to ease the criticism of the administration, other high officials and the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, the White House has authorized the following statement:

STATEMENT NOT DENIED

"Thursday night's Pentagon statement did not specifically deny what the general said.

"The Pentagon statement said:

"'In response to inquiries from the press concerning General MacArthur's reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Pentagon spokesman said the White House had authorized him to state that the action taken by the President in relieving General MacArthur was based upon the unanimous recommendations of the President's principal civilian and military advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The reasons for General MacArthur's relief have been stated previously by the President.'"

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was placed in supreme command of the United States and UN troops in Korea, to win the war, and as General MacArthur so convincingly stated in his address, "in war, there is no substitute for victory."

We appreciate that the interests of England, France, and other European countries are akin to our own. We realize the desirability of cooperation with our friendly nations.

We also appreciate the magnificent job that General MacArthur did in conquering Japan, and the even more marvelous job he did of making the people of that country our friends.

But it was President Truman who ordered the troops into Korea, in an effort to save the people of that country from the slavery of communism.

It was President Truman who placed General MacArthur in charge of our forces in that country.

It must have been the decision of President Truman, through the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, that MacArthur could not have the help he needed to achieve the victory, presumably he was supposed to achieve.

It was President Truman who removed the General from his command in Korea and his other high positions he had held and executed with such great honor.

The White House statement says the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff endorsed the removal of General MacArthur, but the causes were said to be political, a field in which they are not presumed to function.

It, therefore, is presumed that the removal of General MacArthur and the approval of his removal by the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, was forced, either by President Truman himself or by influences outside this country.

With all due respect to our desire to work with the other friendly nations in this, perhaps the world's greatest crisis, the friendship of every nation in the world, including Communist Russia itself, is not worth the "human sacrifice" of one single man of the stature of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

And even more certain are we, that if to maintain the friendship of supposedly friendly nations, we have not only to furnish the sinews of war, but foot the bill as well; and in addition take our orders from outside the boundaries of these United States, then it is time that we save our materials, our cash, and our Armed Forces and spend our time and strength defending our own Nation.

We believe in the spirit that "we are our brother's keeper," but so far as we know there is no place in the Bible that forbids us from also being "our own keeper," seeking and accepting, of course, divine guidance.

We don't give a "tinker's dam" who the man happens to be; we don't care if he occupies the highest position of honor this country can confer upon him; we don't care if this includes the "highest brass" of which this Nation can boast—the time has come when every citizen of this country must have a rebirth of the "old-fashioned patriotism" that places country above self.

When it is possible in this country to remove from a high position, a man of the

character, ability, and loyalty of General MacArthur, a "human sacrifice" if you please, even when his military tactics had the approval of his superior officers; when it is necessary to appease any nation—even Communist Russia—by the needless sacrifice of the lives of over 1,000 of our young men daily; to satisfy the lust for power, position, or to "cover up" indefensible mistakes of judgment "it seems to me," the time has come to call a halt.

And in our desire to refrain from being presumptuous to speak with respect, as well as decency—that is stating the case mildly.

PRESTON F. GRANDON,
Publisher, Sterling-Rock Falls Gazette.

Let's Keep "That Something"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article entitled "Let's Keep 'That Something'," a thoughtful and inspiring discussion from the pen of Dr. J. Ollie Edmunds, president of John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla.:

LET'S KEEP "THAT SOMETHING"
(By J. Ollie Edmunds)

Americans are different from any other people on earth. Here is why: The men who cut the pattern for them a century and three-quarters ago held a deep conviction that men—all men—are born with qualities that give them an unique status. The simple fact that man was born a human being, they felt, marks him as the most important thing God ever created—and entitles him to a certain dignity and to self-respect. They believed that in this sense men are born equal and are endowed with certain God-given, not man-given, rights—to live, to be free, to build their lives without unnecessary interference.

These profound thinkers designed our Government on the basis of this conviction—a new kind of government—one which would be operated by the people themselves. Jefferson said this was to be a great experiment which would determine for all time whether "men may be trusted to govern themselves without a master." He predicted future happiness for Americans "if we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them."

In the lively decades which have followed we Americans have become a great and virile people—self-reliant and free. Most historians have thought we could write Q. E. D. after Jefferson's theory that men are able to govern themselves—that we had demonstrated the truth of such precepts for all the world to see. Now they are not so sure. Something seems to be happening to America—and to Americans.

During the depression and World War II we gave up some of our freedom temporarily. Since then we have discovered that freedoms relinquished temporarily are hard to get back. Emergency regulations have led to planning and now the Government—which according to our rules is supposed to be the servant of the people—is pretty much taking over the running of our lives. This planning appears to be changing not only the character of our Government but the character of our people. Millions now seem willing to give up some of their independence if only the Government will take care of them.

The great cause for alarm is not that the planners are planning our lives but that we are allowing them to do it. And the most tragic aspect of it all is that so many of us, who should be more far-seeing, are helping them, by scurrying to Washington every time our own security is endangered, every time we ourselves want some planning from the Government.

This country was not built by men who relied on somebody else to take care of them. It was built by men who relied on themselves—who dared to shape their own lives—who had enough courage to blaze new trails—enough confidence in themselves to risk their chances on rewards.

This self-reliance is our American legacy. It is the secret of "that something" which so long has stamped Americans as Americans. Some call it individual initiative; others backbone. But whatever it is called, it is a precious ingredient in our national character—one which we must not lose.

The time has come for us to reaffirm the things we stand for—to reassert our inalienable rights to human dignity, self-respect, self-reliance—to be again the kind of people Americans are.

Such a crusade for renewed independence will require a succession of inspired leaders—not just men who are opposed to communism, or diluted communism, but men who are militantly for the American way of life. Where are we more likely to find such leaders than in the small independent colleges, which teach self-reliance and practice it?

Today these colleges are working against great odds of war-shattered enrollments and shrinking incomes; but they still are instilling "that something" in their students.

Such colleges are setting tomorrow's standards for tomorrow's citizens. Now, as never before, these non-tax-supported colleges need the help of responsible men and women—practical help. At a time like this, it is not enough that they have the support of those who give their approval and nothing more—who give their blessing when it is their dollars that are needed. They must have the help of people like you.

Prophecies of Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Iron County Register, Ironton, Mo., published by Mr. Eli P. Ake in the newspaper of April 19, 1951:

The people are tired of old scarecrows—they frighten no longer. They are tired of hearing that the President is trying to precipitate us into war while he works day and night for peace; tired of the harangue of critics with their insidious charges that Government is ruining business while industrial and commercial prosperity is evident on every hand; tired of being told how Government is going broke because the Democratic Party believes in social security for the masses; tired of having every administration action damned and consigned to failure before it has a chance to succeed; tired of being informed that everything the President proposes is wrong merely because of his advocacy thereof; tired of the pratings of Hoover and other discredited individuals who now seek to define the proper manner for conducting the Government of a country which was left flat and feeble after 12 years of their own management; tired of dismal prophecies of doom and disaster, of destitution and despair—tired of a major political party relying on dire predictions of future calamities under Democratic rule instead of offering a positive program of its own. And isn't it all enough to make everyone tired?

Another Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party, the New Deal, the Fair Deal, or what have you, has developed smear campaigns into a fine art. The cruelty with which it has sought to assassinate the character of prominent and patriotic men is one of the blackest spots in modern political history. The people of this country have not forgotten the extent to which a program of slander and libel was carried out against Mr. Herbert Hoover. The American people have now become aware of this vicious practice of the administration, and, therefore, will be on the alert, and not, I hope, be deceived thereby.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article published in the Washington Times-Herald under date of April 23, 1951:

NIXON BARES WHITE HOUSE MAC SMEAR
(By Robert Young)

Senator NIXON, Republican, of California, charged yesterday that under direct orders from the White House, the Defense and State Departments have been working night and day mapping "one of the most vicious smear campaigns in history" against General MacArthur.

NIXON said that the Pentagon and State Department assigned scores of their personnel to the smear project. They said the campaign is now ready to be sprung.

LISTS SMEAR PROJECTS

"The American people should know that one of the most vicious smear campaigns in history has been mapped out in Washington against General MacArthur," the Senator asserted in a statement. "The smear brigade and professional lint pickers have been working night and day since the MacArthur incident began 2 weeks ago."

Acting on White House orders, NIXON continued, military and State Department employees have been digging through "every single file" dealing with MacArthur's 52 years of service. He listed the following as smear projects which were ordered and which are still being worked upon:

1. Five top staff technicians in the Pentagon have been analyzing for more than a week every military operation conducted by MacArthur in Korea for the purpose of finding flaws in that record and discrediting him as a military leader.

STAFF ORGANIZATION PROBED

2. The Pentagon's military government section has been ordered to comb the five-

star general's record as supreme occupation commander in Japan since the end of the war in 1945 for the purpose of trying to discredit his handling of the occupation.

3. Experts have been directed to explore every aspect of MacArthur's staff organization, both in World War II and the Korean war.

4. G-2 (Army intelligence) has been ordered to make a complete study of all intelligence communications received from MacArthur. NIXON commented that MacArthur's Pentagon critics contend such an analysis "will hit him at his most vulnerable spot."

5. The historical sections of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have been assigned the job of examining every World War II document involving MacArthur, involving his communiques and press statements.

6. The Marine Corps has the assignment of trying to find fault with MacArthur's role in the World War II island-hopping strategy which began with Guadalcanal.

SURPLUS HANDLING STUDIED

7. Scrutiny of MacArthur's handling of surplus property disposal at the end of the last war has been ordered.

NIXON's charges followed the disclosure by the Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune last Friday that the Pentagon had begun in earnest to prepare a defense of President Truman's and the Joint Chiefs of Staff's Korean war and far eastern policies against the smashing attack hurled by MacArthur in his address to Congress the day before.

The Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune learned that Army, Navy, and Air Force staffs were gathering secret documents from their files in an effort to demonstrate that the military chiefs disagreed with MacArthur on major phases of war strategy and policy.

OTHER DOCUMENTS SIFTED

An authoritative source said that for every point made by MacArthur, the Pentagon would try to dig up some statement or document from its files "that might be interpreted as putting MacArthur in a bad light."

The Pentagon announced Saturday in reply to mounting demands that Congress be given access to all documents pertaining to the MacArthur-administration split that only an analysis of the basic differences would be provided. It was reported yesterday, however, that despite this statement, Senate investigators will in the end be given the opportunity to examine anything they wish, although some of the examining and questioning would be in secret session because of national security considerations.

ALL EVIDENCE ASKED

Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the combined Senate Armed Services-Foreign Relations Committee which will investigate the MacArthur controversy, said Saturday the investigators will demand all evidence pertinent to the dispute over far eastern policy and pertinent to MacArthur's dismissal by President Truman on April 11.

RUSSELL said his committee will demand all available documents on last fall's Wake Island conference between MacArthur and Mr. Truman. The administration has been taking the line that MacArthur advised the President on Wake Island that the Korean Communists would quickly be defeated and gave assurances the Chinese Reds would not intervene in the war. The Senate committee hearing is scheduled to open about April 30, with MacArthur as the first witness.

NIXON declared in his statement yesterday that it is significant in connection with the Pentagon-State Department effort to discredit MacArthur that "heretofore secret documents are being reclassified and let out to administration pipelines in the press and radio."

NIXON said that the first salvo in the smear campaign was fired last Friday with the publication of a New York Times story citing secret documents on the Wake Island meeting "obviously selected to spotlight every action of the general which might reflect on him unfavorably."

POINTS TO KOREA JOB

"The new test for classifying documents now seems to be not whether the publication of a document would affect the security of the Nation, but whether it would affect the political security of the administration," NIXON asserted. "Apparently the Pentagon leaks like a sieve when the administration has political linen to wash."

NIXON said that instead of spending time and manpower in an effort to discredit MacArthur's past, the energies of the Pentagon and State Department "might be better spent devising ways to develop an effective far eastern diplomatic and military policy and thereby bring to an end the appalling casualties in Korea."

MacArthur was fired because he offered his program for ending the war in Korea with "victory and not appeasement [and] the administration rejected that program," NIXON said.

Address by Hon. Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, Before the Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on April 17 the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] addressed the congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Constitution Hall in the city of Washington, D. C. This forceful address by our distinguished colleague, discussing the grave issues and problems of our times, should be read by all our citizens, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE CONGRESS OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, AT CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 17, 1951

I esteem your invitation to speak to you tonight as a very great honor. I wish every man, woman, and child in the country could have the opportunity I have to attend a meeting of the descendants of those who fought and died for American freedom, the greatest gift any generation ever made to its descendants.

Such a meeting, of course, is impossible. But, if I were to attempt to repay you for this privilege of rededicating myself to the ideals which have made America the greatest nation in all history, I believe I could do no better than to give you a word of encouragement and appreciation for your efforts to rekindle within us the vital spark of unselfish patriotic devotion and unity in the cause of American liberty, freedom, and democracy.

In the vocabulary of the DAR's, there is only one ism and that is 100 percent Americanism. What I especially like about you is that you not only know what is right but you have the courage and fortitude to fight for what is right, just as your ancestors fought and died to give freedom to us of this generation. These are not the empty words of a politician here to tickle your vanity. They are an expression from the heart of one who appreciates the great work you have undertaken to preserve your heritage, and mine, and that of all who avail themselves of the opportunities this Nation gives so freely.

As I go about the public business which has been entrusted to me I am shocked and alarmed by the delusion and disunity in which we face what is probably our greatest crisis since Valley Forge.

I will speak with the utmost frankness. This is an obligation of every public man which is even greater in the present period of national peril.

I tell you now, as I have said before, the test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, are determined by what I believe to be best for my country. I say with all the sincerity of which I am capable that such must be the test to be applied to everything by everybody in this country—in public office or not—for a long time to come if we are to restore the peace and freedom for which this Nation was founded and to which it is dedicated.

It seems to me if conditions now existing continue, our security is in more danger from disunity at home than from enemies abroad. We cannot prepare ourselves for a global war, which may be forced upon us, if we spend our time and energies fighting among ourselves. We can only have peace, which all of us so earnestly desire, if we remain strong, and strength can only come from national unity, but cohesive action can only come in this democracy of ours by free and full discussions of the great issues confronting us.

For this and other reasons I was one who urged that General MacArthur be invited to address the joint meeting of Congress at the Capitol, to give this great hero the same consideration and dignified reception as was given that other military hero, General Eisenhower, on his return. And then let us all pray that, out of a free discussion, may come the best solution of these grave perils that confront us. Only here in all the world could such a debate occur, under like conditions, but that is how democracy works and this is how democracy is preserved.

May I state in language which is perhaps over-simplified those cornerstones of freedom which must be preserved: American democracy in very simple language, is an association of all American citizens governed by Federal and State constitutions and by-laws enacted by the elected representatives of the people. It relies upon a three-branch government, each independent of the other.

The American people have risen to resist successfully open attacks made upon this system such as the effort of President Roosevelt to pack the Supreme Court because decisions made by the court then did not meet his approval. When President Truman wrote his Secretary of Commerce recently to ignore the order of a Federal court, it was Judge Bennett Clark of the United States court of appeals, who in the court room said these words that will go down in history:

"If you have an idea," said Judge Clark, "that a letter from the President has any weight in this court, you are mistaken. He has no more standing in this court than any other citizen. He has no right to influence litigation."

This is in the traditions of the Clark family and came from a true patriot.

It is the independence of the three-branch government that preserves our liberties and prevents dictatorship.

I do not fear direct assaults upon our principles so much as I fear the sapping of the vigor of our people and our Government by termites boring from within.

In the coming years—and perhaps for generations—we will have two great burdens to carry: On one hand we must make ourselves so militarily strong as to protect us from the aggression of communistic nations, and, on the other, we must preserve and fortify our free enterprise system, which, after all is said and done, is the real source of our strength and future security.

The strength of a vigorous free enterprise system is a greater deterrent to world conflict and a more dependable guardian of peace than a United Nations organization will ever be. It is the only force in the world today that Russia fears. It must be preserved.

Russia well knows of our capacity to mass produce implements of war—those things that kill people—as we furnished these war equipments to her in World War II without which she could not have driven the Germans from her soil. Our best insurance, let me repeat, against war is to strengthen and not weaken this production capacity.

One striking example of America's free enterprise system is that we are now producing twice as much steel as all the world combined and four times more than Soviet Russia under her slave system. As steel is the base of all war materials, Russia has just cause to fear our mass production capacity.

Let us not be deluded. The emergency in which we now find ourselves will exist, in all probability, for many, many years. Today Russia has the time table, and Russia has control of the initiative. She began the Korean war—costly to us in blood and treasure—but Russia has not lost a single soldier. We shall have to live for a long time in a period of crisis and be on a war alert even though world war III does not materialize, and pray God it will not. We must constantly bear in mind that the threat of war in a democracy over a long period can be as destructive to our economic system as war itself.

General Bradley has said that other sideline wars can be instigated by Russia. She can turn these side-line wars on and off like a spigot of water. She can bleed us white before the supreme test comes when we may be called upon to fight the combined might of communistic nations. If Russia determines on war she can fix the hour and the place and the day of the conflict, or she can, for years to come, conduct against us a war of economic attrition, sapping our resources and weakening our system of government. This may be her sinister purpose—I am inclined to think it is—and in the past 5 years she has made considerable progress in this direction.

I am not an appeaser. Our future security demands a definite as well as a realistic foreign policy. Russia has such a policy. She has played her cards diplomatically well—much better than has the United States.

We jeopardize our future if we continue to pursue a vague policy of impractical altruism. It must be realistic—and we serve neither ourselves nor the free people of the world when we undertake burdens beyond our ability to carry; make promises we cannot fulfill. We may be powerful but there is a limit beyond which we cannot go and survive. We cannot, I think, go over the world like Don Quixote tilting our lances at every windmill that may have a Communist behind it.

We cannot go over the world trying to make Democrats of people who do not want to be Democrats and who do not, in fact, comprehend what democracy means.

If first things are to come first, what we need above everything else is an impregnable national defense. This may determine whether or not we will live or die.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I pledge to you that I will continue to do all in my power to provide such a defense.

I am for compulsory military training and spoke for this program in the Senate. I am for an adequate, fully trained army within our borders. I am for an Air Force of 70 groups, or more. I am for a radar screen around this country.

These things I have been advocating and voting for for years. We do not have them now. We must do our level best to prod those responsible to get them quickly.

And I am for a great navy. I am intensely proud of the United States Navy and the United States Marines. I do not think the marines are policemen or propagandists.

Fiscal preparedness is the first step toward military preparedness and this you have asked me to discuss with you tonight.

On January 15, the President appeared before the Congress and made this specific pledge:

"It (the Government) must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

Yet, a week later he submitted to Congress a budget which, if adopted, will actually increase nondefense spending to the highest level in the history of the Nation whether in peace or in war.

Not only that but in the time of our greatest crisis the President renews his advocacy of the socialistic measures known as the Fair Deal.

The President continues to recommend socialized medicine, he recommends socialized farming, he recommends socialized housing. If you socialize your health, your food, and the roof over your head, you have taken a step from which there can be no retreat. We would soon be in the same deplorable condition as is England.

The President said he had a mandate to pass such legislation in his 1948 election but these measures were not even issues in that campaign.

What has prevented the passage of the socialistic measures? It has been a very effective coalition between the southern Democrats in Congress and the Republicans. I, as one constitutional Democrat, am very proud to have been an active member of that coalition.

The President asks citizens to make deep sacrifices in their daily living yet he declines to make political sacrifices by the curtailment or suspension of measures for the distribution of public funds for nonessential purposes.

In my experience of 18 years in the Senate, under the conditions existing, I regard this budget message as the very height of fiscal irresponsibility.

Unity and the sacrifices necessary to save our country must be a two-way street. They must come from the Government as well as from the citizens.

BYRD'S EYE VIEW OF OUR FISCAL AFFAIRS

We began World War I with a debt of $1,000,000,000, World War II with a debt of $60,000,000,000. Our Federal debt now exceeds $260,000,000,000, plus the debts of States and their subdivisions of $21,000,000,000, a total public indebtedness of $281,000,000,000 and the end is not yet.

In the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, if the budget as submitted by the President is adopted and without new taxes, the result will be approximately as follows:

Expenditures	$72,000,000,000
Tax receipts	58,000,000,000
Deficit	14,000,000,000

With the Federal expenditure level running at $75,000,000,000, total public expenditures, including those by States and subdivisions, will reach approximately $100,000,000,000 annually. This would be about 40 percent of the $225,000,000,000 national income earned by all our people. In other words, in each 5-day week we shall be working 2 days for the Government and 3 days for ourselves.

Our Federal Government is permeated with waste and inefficiency and extravagance. We have 2,200,000 Federal civilian employees and are adding 2,200 new civilian employees every day. Last month the military establishment alone employed 60,000 new civilian employees and only drafted 80,000 in uniform.

The armed services are the greatest wasters of civilian manpower of all agencies of the Government.

The military should recognize the necessity of conserving manpower as it is our main strength in war.

In the Pentagon Building alone the military has 35,000 civilian employees under one roof and no real effort has yet been made to place this gigantic operation on a basis of efficiency.

Faced as we are with grave perils, what would you and I do as sensible men and women if we had the power?

We would eliminate every single nonessential expenditure, including those things in the category of being desirable but not absolutely essential. We would cut off 400,000 of the more than 2,000,000 Federal employees, save their salaries and release them for war work.

We would demand a balanced budget. Remember you never go broke when you pay as you go.

We would demand the saving of billions by the elimination of waste and extravagance and in nonessential functions of the Government. If we should save 10 percent in the President's budget, which means seven to eight billions, this would eliminate the necessity of 50 percent of the new taxes that have been requested.

You, the citizens, may not have this direct authority but you do have the power to hold the elective officials to a strict accountability to discharge their responsibilities on the level of high patriotism consistent with the perils of the great burdens that face us.

I am always willing to vote for taxes for national defense, but I do not like the idea of placing great additional burdens on an already overburdened people for wasteful political spending.

There are thousands of ways the President's budget can be trimmed without affecting essential activities.

I have prepared and will take pleasure in sending you a detailed list if you so request.

Remember that deficit spending means one of two things—either higher taxes which are already approaching confiscatory levels or more debt which is bound to be accompanied by inflation that no amount of regimentation can curb.

We have assumed the responsibility of propping up the economy of half the world. We have assumed the responsibility of helping to arm half the world. We have assumed the responsibility of arming ourselves. We have refused to deny ourselves of wasteful, nonessential domestic-civilian luxuries.

We cannot expect much help from the nations which are associated with us for they are more wards than allies.

Neither democratic freedom nor the free-enterprise system can survive either confiscatory taxes or overwhelming debt.

Our worst strain in the desperate days ahead may be economic attrition at home. We must put Santa Claus in a deep freeze for the duration of the emergency. We cannot carry the world on our shoulders abroad and the New Deal on our backs at home.

The President has dared the Congress to reduce his budget. He has spoken in a belligerent tone. His dare should be accepted. The Constitution gives only to Congress the power to appropriate public funds. The President can only recommend. To attempt to coerce or intimidate Congress in the execution of this constitutional power of appropriating money, is a step toward dictatorship, as the power of the purse in the hands of Congress is a major bulwark in our free Government.

The people, I feel confident, want nondefense spending cut to the bone. It remains to be seen whether an obstinate President who has dared the Congress to reduce his budget can defeat this overwhelming public sentiment.

Why is America great? It is not our population, as we have only 6 percent of the population of the world. It is not our area, which is only a tiny speck on the world's surface. It is not our natural resources, which are being rapidly depleted by the obligations we have undertaken. It is our individual freedom and the free-enterprise system is the vital spark that stimulates every American to gain such reward as his own industry and capacity make him worthy of.

This much is certain: The vital need of the moment is leadership characterized by unselfish and selfless patriotism which will present the stern issues and requirements to the American people for the wisdom of their decision, unencumbered by personal jealousies and political considerations. We have had such leadership in every crisis of the past. It is not too much to ask now. If it is not forthcoming then it is up to us, in lesser positions, through unselfish patriotic organizations to do the best we can with the tools at hand.

In such an emergency as this I know of no better organization than the DAR through which effective effort can be made for our survival and preservation as free people individually and collectively.

The first requirement is sound fiscal condition for the Government of the United States. If freedom in the United States is destroyed either by our own economic folly or by totalitarian might, it will not survive anywhere else in the world. When the light of democracy goes out in America, it is gone everywhere. Who is there to take the torch of liberty to follow us if we fail?

It was on Virginia soil at Yorktown that the independence declared in Jefferson's words was made permanent by Washington's sword. It was in Hanover Town on the Pamunkey River on September 21, 1775, that the Virginia Committee of Safety met. Among its resolutions included one that each district of Virginia should provide itself with colors. On one side was to be the name of the district and on the other was to be inscribed "Virginia for constitutional liberty."

I read this to you because it shows, I think, that we have a certain political constancy and consistency in Virginia, and are now, as a State, "for constitutional liberty" as surely as in 1775. I place emphasis on both words, "constitutional" and " liberty."

And so I say that Virginia yields to no other Commonwealth or State in appreciation of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

We are thankful for what your predecessors have done and for the noble work you are doing in this day, and we pray God that the ideals of the DAR will continue in the years to come as a bulwark of strength to hold the line for the preservation of our freedoms founded upon constitutional democracy.

Jackson Day Address by Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Jackson Day address by the Junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] delivered in New Haven, Conn., April 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the second time in thirteen months I've talked to you at a Connecticut Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. I hope you won't decide that every time I open my mouth you've got to charge me $100 to make me enjoy it and to persuade me that I'm a resident Democrat.

But I'll be back next year—and the year after that—even if I have to get a loan from the RFC to swing it.

It's good to be with you tonight. In these times of chaos and unspeakable danger, as Secretary Hull described them to me, it's good to be a Democrat. Yes, I'm very proud to be a Democrat.

Last year my 85-year-old Aunt Mary Benton gave me the theme for my speech. She claimed that the only other Benton ever to make the United States Senate was a distant kingman, or kinfolk as the Southerners say—Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, who a century ago served five terms in the United States Senate. A great Senator he was. Last year I looked him up in the Encyclopaedia Britannica. I think you'll agree that its report shows he was a good Democrat, and perhaps of a kind not yet extinct. I quote:

"Although Senator Benton was so independent that he had a great dislike for party caucuses—and despised party platforms—during thirty years of public life, he never voted anything else but the straight Democratic ticket."

He was Andrew Jackson's majority leader in the Senate. The Britannica reports that he once shot Andrew Jackson in a tavern brawl. That perhaps was carrying independence a little far. Yes, Old Hickory carried Senator Benton's bullet in his tough hide all his days. Last year I asked you where you could find another speaker for your Jackson Day dinner who could claim he was kinfolk to a man who put a bullet into Andrew Jackson. (You can see that you have here a powerful argument for keeping a Benton in the United States Senate.)

Since my election nothing has pleased me more than when Ted Granik, the moderator of the American Forum of the Air, introduced me as "Mr. Democrat" when I debated foreign policy with Senator TAFT on a TV hookup. Last Sunday I was again called "Mr. Democrat" on Mrs. Roosevelt's TV program. Nothing could make me more proud, even though I started late in life to work for the title and can't possibly deserve it until I've worked at it for many, many years to come.

Ted Granik started it all when he introduced Senator TAFT as "Mr. Republican." I immediately disagreed. I said Senator TAFT might more properly be called "Mr. Fifty-Percent Republican." I said I had been listening to Governor Stassen, John Foster Dulles, and Governor Dewey. Senator TAFT replied that I would find out about that later. I then told him I would compromise by agreeing to call him "Mr. Sixty-six and Two-thirds Republican." He didn't seem to like that much better. He may be right, at that. In 1952 we shall find out whether he is right.

Of course, when Ted Granik called me "Mr. Democrat" he tied it up to an event which I sometimes think must have called for divine intervention—my own election. It was my victory—it was your victory—in the senatorial election here in Connecticut which gave the Democratic Party its majority of 49 in the United States Senate.

It was right here in New Haven last June, when I talked before a meeting of Tom Keyes' registrars, that I predicted that our Connecticut election was far more than a local affair. I predicted that the control of the United States Senate would hinge on whether we in Connecticut kept our two Democratic United States Senators in office.

I shall now tell you a secret. I stole that idea. And where did I get it? From my great colleague, BRIEN MCMAHON, without whose support and endorsement Governor Bowles would never have appointed me, nor would I ever have accepted. I shall now tell you another secret, an open one. Whenever I make a smart political prediction there's a good chance I'm plagiarizing from BRIEN MCMAHON, one of our great Senators in the great Democratic tradition of Connecticut.

That prediction to Tom Keyes' boys was fulfilled to the last bitter drop. You may recall the early morning hours of November 8. Certainly I shall never forget them. The United States marshals were at work in the last three towns to be heard from—Monroe, Haddam, Pomfret—when I went to bed at 7 a. m. It looked then like a victory by perhaps less than 500 votes—though it turned out to be 1102. Mrs. Benton, a natural politician if ever there was one—both of her grandmothers must have been Irish—Yankee-Irish—followed me to bed at 10 a. m.

Yes; we won, you and I, and when I reached Washington Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, who had won in 1948 by 88 votes out of a population of 8,500,000, Senator JOHNSON said, "Bill, compared to me, I call you 'Landslide BENTON.'"

I shall now say more. My victory was Chet Bowles' great victory, though it is I who get the plaudits of victory. It was your work and Chet's great run which brought out the big vote, which elected me and which contributed no-man-knows-how-much to BRIEN MCMAHON'S big margin. Senator ANDERSON, Chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, told me that two of the greatest runs in the United States were by candidates who were defeated: Chet Bowles and Frank Myers in Pennsylvania. This is what the professionals at the national level know.

So thanks to you and to BRIEN MCMAHON and Chet Bowles, here I was last November, the newest Democrat, the most junior of all the Senators, Senator No. 96, winning by the slimmest margin and at the latest hour—destined to help keep the management of American foreign policy in the hands of the one party which not only understands the chaos and unspeakable danger of our times, but has a program of hope with which to combat them.

May I now suggest that the control of the United States Senate seems likely to control not only United States foreign policy—but world policy—and the chance, and the risk of war or peace? Little did you know, when you were making new voters, that you were helping determine the course of United States foreign policy, and the risk of war and peace.

One of the telegrams I received on November 8 was from my old friend Beardsley

Ruml. You'll recall him as the author of the famous pay-as-you-go tax policy. He's a professional psychologist and one of America's shrewdest publicists. Pay-as-you-go Ruml wired me, "Congratulations on winning by such a small margin. Now everyone who helped you can claim the credit."

Was there ever a truer statement? Many in this room can claim credit for all of, or most of, or much more than, those 1,102 votes. And was there ever better proof of the value of that extra effort, that final effort? My victory grew also of course from the masterly campaign leadership provided by John Bailey, from the hard work and great fight put up by our fine State ticket; and from the votes pulled to our Democratic ticket by our outstanding congressional candidates. But even more than all this, I learned last fall that in victory the credit must go to you here, to you who raised the dollars and the dimes, manned the headquarters, organized the mailing crews, supervised the doorbell pushing, and got out the votes.

To help show you why all of us should be proud to be Democrats, let me tonight for a moment imagine with you that you are entering the United States Senate, and that you are undecided whether to join the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. Let us all imagine that we are Senate fence-sitters for a while before we decide which way to jump. And before we jump, let us be exposed for a few weeks to what goes on in the United States Senate.

First, we agree that we see the Democratic Party split and divided on a few domestic issues, notably on civil rights. We agree that this is a most unhappy division.

But on most other domestic issues—day after day—we see the Democrats as the men of hope and faith, the men of optimism and courage. We see the Republicans as the men who doubt and dissect and who do nothing.

On international issues the Republicans are even more deeply divided than are the Democrats on civil rights. Here in foreign policy we find the big issues on which our destiny now depends. We see the Republicans rent by a great chasm. It divides those Eastern Republicans who, with Senators Vandenberg and MORSE, in the Senate tend to work with the Administration to help fashion the so-called bipartisan policy—from those Republicans of the Midwest or far West who want to lash out right now this very day and take a chance on the big war—or who want to pull back now and retreat into President Hoover's so-called "Gibraltar," or Senator TAFT's "citadel."

When I prepared this talk for you tonight Senator Vandenberg was living. Last night he died. The tears in my eyes today were tears for Senator Vandenberg. When I served as Assistant Secretary of State I regularly slipped in and out of his audiences for guidance and stimulation and renewed confidence. Without publicity or fanfare he worked with me on my difficult responsibilities in the holding together of the Voice of America, the establishment of UNESCO and the other grave questions with which I was wrestling. He was one of the greatest men of our generation. His loss is a great loss to the Democratic Party, to all the American people, and most particularly to the Republican Party. The absence of his leadership, in my judgment, accounts in considerable measure for the tragic misjudgment and blunders of Republican strategy this very day and for many months past. We Democrats today can join with all our fellow citizens in paying tribute to this great man who in time of his country's peril rose above the Republican Party and above party partisanship to become the chief architect and bulwark of the so-called bipartisan foreign policy—which he preferred to call unpartisan—upon which in my judgment the very life of our country depends.

It is under the leadership of a Democratic President that communism has been stopped in the Middle East, through the Greek-Turkish aid program; that communism in Europe has been checked with the Marshall plan, and now the military aid program; that, we can hope, communism is in process of being rolled back in Asia by the Point Four program, by the Voice of America, by the vigorous action of the United Nations, and by the use of force where force is unavoidable.

You are beginning to see why I tell you that any intelligent fence-sitter who entered the United States Senate today would be ashamed, after a reasonable period of observation, to ask to be listed as anything but a Democrat.

Now, I believe in the two-party system. We need a minority opposition party in this country. Some of the Republicans show some promise of developing into a fairly effective—if permanent—minority opposition. However, I suggest that it has been a couple of Democrats, Senators KEFAUVER and FULBRIGHT, who have done the big job of investigation and exposure, the kind of job historically expected from the opposition.

As a Democrat, in the Senate or out of it, you can justly feel yourselves responsible for our world-wide leadership in this great and terrifying struggle for liberty and freedom. Think it over: it is you and others like you who are responsible for the Democratic control of the Senate and the great gift of freedom for free men everywhere. Yes; that's what it means to be a Democrat.

We Democrats now have a strong and constructive program. We have always had a program. We've always been progressive. Our Democratic Party has risen through generations of growth because it has been an aggressive political force. It served the people in the time of Jefferson and Jackson. It served them under Wilson and Roosevelt. It is serving the people today under a great President to whom the historians will do justice if the newspapers won't: President Harry S. Truman.

You can be proud of the fact our Democratic Party has a solid program. It is a program founded on progress, on humility, and on a desire to give each man his due so that he may live in freedom and security. Further, our program is the program for peace.

We Democrats will have to wait until 1952 to find out what the Republicans think they decide they're going to profess to stand for. We can now say this: they consistently failed at the turn of the century, and the people turned to Woodrow Wilson. Wilson brought about domestic reforms that the Republicans have never dared repeal, though they opposed him and his reforms bitterly at the time. When the Republican leadership failed again in the twenties, the people again turned to the Democratic Party. The major reforms enacted since 1933 under President Roosevelt and President Truman are largely unchallenged today.

For our part, the role of the Democratic Party is to give leadership and to act. Further our role, on appropriate occasions, is to point with pride; and this evening I may say is such an occasion. The role of the Republicans is to criticize, and view with alarm. Let us make sure we keep the Republicans in that historic role.

Without the hopes and ideals of you who are the brawn and sinews of the Democratic Party, without your continued leadership with our voters here in Connecticut and everywhere, and without your willingness to put in long hours and hard work so that we may achieve a place in the sun for free men everywhere—without these things of you and from you, God only knows where this Nation would stand today. And where this Nation stands today, the whole free world will follow. Yes, we can stand tonight and cheer for the Democratic Party, for it guards freedom and security for the world that is not enslaved. Let us remember this as we work for 1952, and for another Democratic victory.

The Use of Television in Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, on April 17, before the National Association of Broadcasters' meeting at the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] delivered a very informative address on the great value of television and radio in the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, STEVENS HOTEL, CHICAGO, APRIL 17, 1951

There is today a new and vital influence upon Government. As Harriet Van Horne said in the New York World-Telegram of April 6, "When this turbulent year departs into the spheres, the learned historians doubtless will pull on their beards and ponder: What hath 1951 done to set it among the high tides of the calendar? And the answer will come: 1951 was the year television rose up to bring the people back into the Government. The year that restored the dignity of plain goodness and reaffirmed the right of the people to protest."

Before we talk about radio and television, I want to salute the responsible press of America. There is no absolute substitute for the printed word. We hear a broadcast; we see a telecast; but, time soon dims our memory of the details. Details are recorded forever by the printed word. There is a definite and peculiar place for all these media. And America is better off because that is true.

Radio and television aroused the public concerning the work of our Senate Crime Investigating Committee. We could not have achieved its goals without them. For that, the committee members are grateful. But, had it not been for the American press—there probably would never have been an inquiry into organized crime.

It was newspaper and magazine articles which first directed my own attention to the need. Coupling these items with reports of crime commissions the country over, I prepared two legislative measures in late 1949. One measure would have outlawed the shipment in interstate commerce of gaming devices. The other would have regulated the transmission of racing information for illegal purposes. The first such bill has since become the law of the land. But neither of my proposals were ever presented in Congress. My legislative assistant and I studied the situations we sought to remedy in great detail. In the process we discovered we knew virtually nothing about the actual conditions we sought to remedy with new laws.

So, instead, we asked the Senate to allow us to investigate organized crime in interstate commerce. We felt that this was necessary to enable Congress to legislate intelligently.

But our proposal was delayed in passage.

It was here that the American press interceded editorially. Demands were made for the passage of the resolution forthwith—and it was passed forthwith.

We sought to exercise extreme caution as we began. We hoped to disappoint those anticipating a circus atmosphere. We resolved never to engage in head-line hunting. We hoped for a calm and serious study of the problem—all without fanfare. Yet, we recognized the newsworthiness of our undertaking. We knew that, by its very nature, it would be somewhat sensational. And we knew also that the sleeping giant of public opinion must be awakened to bring about renewed vigor in law enforcement.

As we swung around our selected circuit radio began to help. Local stations canceled commercial programs to broadcast our hearings. Often, our deliberations were broadcast or rebroadcast from start to finish. This served two purposes. First, it emphasized the sordidness of certain local situations. Local citizens gained knowledge of the corruption by criminals of certain of their officials. They became angry, and determined to clean out their own affairs. Secondly, those who became once interested maintained that interest. They followed our hearings elsewhere when we left their own city. This was important to our mission.

It soon became evident that many underworld characters operated across State lines. It was evident, also, that they enjoyed interlocking understandings. Earlier testimony of officials of the Narcotics Bureau was confirmed. We had been told that these criminals engaged in multiple forms of illegal or immoral commerce. This soon was documented. The interstate pattern began to take shape, but the general recognition of the pattern was not widespread. It was apparent only to a few close followers of our efforts. Nationally, the consensus was that our principal contribution was in unearthing long-dormant cases. The focal point of our undertaking was not being grasped. It would not be, unless and until, the American public gained—through an appreciation of the various intertwining local operations—a national picture.

But a broad view was essential. The sleeping giant of public opinion would not be stirred. Unfortunately, the normal course of public opinion is one of apathy. Because of this apathy, I agreed to write a series of magazine articles. I have been severely taken to task for so doing. But, all of us know that only a small percentage of Americans ever digest the contents of an official document.

I felt the story should be told in more readable manner, if the public was to understand the import of our discoveries. My great desire was for the people to get the facts and to act on the basis of these facts. Law enforcement basically is a problem for local people. The primary responsibility is on Main Street—not on Pennsylvania Avenue. Of course, we in Washington, must share the burden also. We could have expected little correction if the public had not become aroused. I did not foresee television as a medium for doing the job. It did not occur to me that your industry would handle our later hearings as you did. Neither did I anticipate the impact your service would have on Mr. and Mrs. America, otherwise, I would have been less eager to write the story. But television bridged the critical gap. You trained your cameras on us in New York and Washington for 3 weeks. And America saw and heard for herself, then America responded.

For several days, you took us into the living rooms of 30,000,000 Americans. They were first interested, then startled, next indignant, and, finally, determined to do something about it.

Our objective was achieved, but the story does not end. It will never completely end. Continuing viligance is required. There are also immediate tasks ahead. Congress now has full information available to it. Congress must act to make our Federal laws more effective. Congress must see to it that national enforcement agencies actually enforce the laws. And Congress needs a code for the conduct of congressional investigations. The members of these committees must be fair with witnesses. Partisan politics has no place in such activities. There must be no demogoguery. Committee purposes should not be distorted with side issues. We must remember always our office is public service; it is not to permit or encourage a public spectacle. If Congress is at fault in these particulars, it is not the fault of television and radio or newspapers. These media merely report what occurs. Congress should correct its own procedures where they are found to be improper and undignified.

If more functions of Government are subjected to television, we shall achieve better government. Television presents the most nearly perfect facsimile of an actual event yet developed. It is good that the people see their public servants in spontaneous, unrehearsed action. This unseen means of discipline cannot help but improve our efficiency.

Our hearings demonstrated again that, not only does Congress need a code for the conduct of its committees—particularly as to television—but, the television industry also needs a code.

Your experience with this new medium is limited. Hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities 3 years ago when Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers appeared were televised. But, the situation has changed since that time. Back then your audience was limited. Today, it is unlimited. I think you would do well to appraise what has happened and anticipate what is likely to follow.

The particular governmental unit affected is involved in some of these decisions. In others, the decision is entirely yours. Certainly, your code must follow the code of governments.

Tonight, thanks to you, there is a new, live interest abroad in public affairs. We must all work together to nurture that interest on the part of the people. Ours is a Government by the people as well as for the people. When the people are best informed, then, is our freedom the most secure. To hold the interest of the people in public affairs, ground rules must be established.

Your industry must decide which future public hearings to cover. There will undoubtedly follow in the wake of our inquiry, many others at all levels of government. Sometimes, you may not be welcome. Even the doors of the United States Senate were closed to public scrutiny in its infancy. But, when the coverage is in the public interest, it must somehow be accomplished.

It is important that the public know the whole story. One of our witnesses in New York exemplifies this point. Frank Costello was interviewed by Walter Winchell in Florida, following his appearance before our committee. He appears to have been more talkative in that interview than he was in ours. Mr. Costello is quoted as saying the television cameras unnerved him, causing him to lapse into the slang of the tough East Side district of New York where he was raised. Those who were adjudging Costello—from the head down, at least—gained a true picture of the real man if his statement is to be accepted. Otherwise, the youth of this Nation might have retained the illusion that Costello was a suave and glamorous "businessman." Radio and television fortunately ripped the artificial cloak of respectability from this man. The public saw the man for what he really is.

If we did not have public hearings, we would have star chamber procedures. Witnesses have been testifying in congressional hearings since about 1850. Their testimony is printed and circulated; it is quoted in the press, on the radio, and in public documents; and, when the testimony is of sufficient interest it is recorded by newsreel and newspaper cameras and reproduced fully on the radio. Television is but another progressive step in bringing the Government and its people closer together.

There are many safeguards you will need. You must devise ways and means of improving your mechanical participation. There should be a minimum of light and heat, and collateral noises can and should be eliminated. Coverage should never be undertaken unless it can be complete. It is unfair to a witness to present only a part of a matter concerning him.

One of your more delicate problems is that of sponsorship. I would prefer that the programs be free of sponsorship and rendered as a public service. I recognize the expense item you have, and any sponsorship necessary should consist of institutional advertising. Governmental proceedings are not a fit subject to aid the sale of a commercial product. I urge upon you careful attention to this subject.

Your individual stations—107 television and 2,800 radio outlets—can do much to thwart gamblers. You can arrange matters to prevent the perverting of legitimate sporting news by the gambling element. And, of course, your medium can assist local citizens and authorities in stamping out crime at home.

There is no family in America beyond your reach. You are the perpetrators, or inheritors, of a great medium. Your inheritance consists of genius, enthusiasm, and courage which built a great industry. For that, all of you deserve the gratitude of a nation. So long as you operate in free enterprise, there can be no iron curtain thick enough to cause a separation of the people of America.

The Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the appendix of the RECORD a breakdown by States of the estimated $2,000,000,000 cost of the proposed central Arizona project. These figures were computed by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D. C., and are based upon the percentage payments by each State.

There being no objection, the breakdown was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cost to Nation's taxpayers—by States—of central Arizona project—Official statement by Secretary of the Interior indicates extra tax burden of $2,075,729,000 for interest alone if Congress approves fantastic project bill S. 75

State	State's percent of total [1]	Cost to taxpayers [2]
Alabama	1.17	$24,286,000
Arizona	.37	7,680,000
Arkansas	.72	14,945,000
California	8.32	172,701,000
Colorado	.80	16,606,000
Connecticut	1.67	34,665,000
Delaware	.40	8,305,000
Florida	1.20	24,777,000
Georgia	1.40	29,060,000
Idaho	.32	6,642,000
Illinois	7.59	157,548,000
Indiana	2.29	47,534,000
Iowa	1.88	37,797,000
Kansas	1.15	23,871,000
Kentucky	1.20	24,909,000
Louisiana	1.22	25,324,000
Maine	.44	9,133,000
Maryland	1.68	34,872,000
Massachusetts	3.40	70,573,000
Michigan	4.71	97,767,000
Minnesota	1.86	38,609,000
Mississippi	.71	14,738,000
Missouri	2.53	52,516,000
Montana	.35	7,265,000
Nebraska	.86	17,851,000
Nevada	.13	2,698,000
New Hampshire	.29	6,020,000
New Jersey	3.29	68,291,000
New Mexico	.28	5,812,000
New York	14.67	304,509,000
North Carolina	1.59	33,004,000
North Dakota	.34	7,057,000
Ohio	5.78	119,977,000
Oklahoma	1.17	24,286,000
Oregon	1.04	21,588,000
Pennsylvania	7.62	158,171,000
Rhode Island	.56	11,624,000
South Carolina	.76	15,776,000
South Dakota	.36	7,473,000
Tennessee	1.37	28,438,000
Texas	4.38	90,917,000
Utah	.34	7,056,000
Vermont	.18	3,736,000
Virginia	1.49	30,928,000
Washington	1.65	34,250,000
West Virginia	.92	19,097,000
Wisconsin	2.10	43,590,000
Wyoming	.18	3,736,000
District of Columbia; Hawaii and Alaska	1.48	30,721,000
United States total	100.00	2,075,729,000

[1] Percentages of total tax burden that each State will bear were computed by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

[2] Cost to the Nation's taxpayers of $2,075,729,000 is an official estimate of Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior. It is based on the provisions of S. 75 (central Arizona project bill) and the following specified conditions: Construction cost estimate of $708,780,000 made by the Bureau of Reclamation (S. Rept. No. 832, 81st Cong., 1st sess.); an interest rate of 2½ percent; an 8-year construction period; and a 75-year financing period. The Secretary's statement appears in his letter dated June 28, 1950, to J. Hardin Peterson, chairman of the House Public Lands Committee. The statement was approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Death of Walter Damrosch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on December 22, 1950, there died in the city of New York a great musician and musical conductor, Walter Damrosch. Dr. Damrosch, during a long and extraordinarily useful life, brought to millions of people an appreciation of classical music. He was a man of great energy and enthusiasm, and made available to the American public many works by unforgettable composers both of the old and of the new world. He was a conductor of the New York Symphony for 41 years and of the Metropolitan Opera for 50.

His greatest contribution, I believe, however, was in organizing and for many years conducting the children's concerts at Carnegie Hall and over a radio network. Through his efforts and his enthusiasm several generations of children grew to understand and appreciate good music. Walter Damrosch brought happiness to many homes and to countless people.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials regarding this great American, which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, December 24, 1950, and in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, December 25.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 24, 1950]

WALTER DAMROSCH

This is one person's reminiscence of children's concerts at Carnegie Hall 30 years ago: "You never felt as if you were in a big auditorium. You were sitting on grandpa's knee, and he loved music so much he had to tell you about it. He spoke very slowly and with a heavy German accent: 'Now, children, today we have a symphony by Papa Haydn * * *.'"

The conductor was Walter Damrosch, and he introduced millions of persons to classical music that way. For years he had a network radio program like the Carnegie Hall concerts; schools all over the country stopped classes for an hour once a week to hear the program. He was also a conductor of the New York Symphony for 41 years and the Metropolitan Opera for 50, and he had one opera of his own performed at the Metropolitan. Last Friday at 88, Walter Damrosch died at his home in New York.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 25, 1950]

WALTER DAMROSCH

More than one generation knew Walter Damrosch as a great and devoted musician. There are those among us who can remember him as the youthful conductor of the Oratorio Society, which this Christmas, as in Christmases past, is carrying on the tradition established by Walter Damrosch's eminent father, Leopold. The same generation, too, can recall the dramatic day when the young Damrosch took the baton from his dead father's hands to conduct at the Metropolitan Opera House. A still later generation knew him best as the guiding spirit of the New York Symphony, in a bygone era when two major ochestrats, not one, were needed to satisfy this city's musical needs. And, finally, there are countless Americans alive today who first encountered music in Dr. Damrosch's famous music-appreciation programs broadcast every Friday morning in thousands of public schools.

To all these endeavors, Dr. Damrosch brought a compelling and contagious enthusiasm for music as a great gladdener of the human spirit. He was responsible for bringing many new works to the American public by masters such as Brahms, Tchaikovsky, and Ravel, and he was one of the few composers who lived long enough to see one of his own works staged at the Metropolitan Opera House. But it was his energetic and unceasing efforts to inseminate music in a difficult soil, rather than his own creative accomplishments, great as they were, that insured his fame and high place in American musical history. If today we have a large and perceptive musical public in America, it is in no small degree the result of his untiring efforts. He both preached and practiced music, and upon his death at 88, the great multitude of music lovers who mourn him offers the best measure of the success of his life's endeavor.

The Issues of Our Far-Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the caption "The deadly chain," written by Stewart Alsop and printed in the Washington Post of April 20, 1951. Mr. Alsop makes a clear statement of the issues of our far-eastern policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

THE DEADLY CHAIN

Both President Truman and General MacArthur sometimes seem like actors in a play, who have learned their lines well, but who can have no real influence on the outcome of the drama. Certainly, ever since the Korean aggression, each event has had an inner logic of its own, leading inexorably to the next event, irrespective of the views or wishes of Presidents or generals. What has been true of the past may well be true of the future.

Consider how logical, even in retrospect inevitable, has been the progression of events leading up to our present situation:

1. The United States withdraws its troops from Korea, and the Government adopts the policy that South Korea is neither militarily defensible nor strategically essential. Given the nature of the American state, it was inevitable that this policy should become known in detail to the Kremlin. Given the nature of the Soviet state, which demands the expansion of Soviet power wherever the risk does not appear too great, the Korean aggression was then also inevitable.

2. Faced with the reality of aggression, rather than an imaginary contingency, the American Government instantly and inevitably recognized that successful aggression in Korea would lead straight to disaster. With almost unanimous national support, Truman committed American power to Korea.

3. Sooner or later, American power was sure to destroy the power of the North Koreans. Once this was done, the militarily meaningless line of thirty-eighth parallel was sure to be crossed.

4. Given both the fears and the ambitions which Communist doctrine engenders, it was then at least logical that the Chinese Communists should intervene. It was logical that surprise and numerical superiority should give the Chinese initially a great military advantage. And it was logical also that mobility, firepower, and air domination, all of which the Chinese lacked, should then swing the military advantage against the Communists.

5. It was then logical that the Soviets should try to make up these deficiencies, by supplying the missing components for a successful offensive—transport, heavy weapons, and offensive air power—to their Chinese satellites. This the Soviets have now apparently done, and an offensive is in prospect.

This is where we stand now. Fortunately for the sanity of the of the human race, the future is unknowable. But consider the steps which could logically derive from the present situation, whatever President Truman or General MacArthur may propose or desire:

6. The use of offensive air power for the first time behind our lines could have the most serious consequences, as General Stratemeyer has hinted. If the consequences threaten to be sufficiently serious, the Manchurian air bases will certainly be attacked, as both Truman and MacArthur well know.

7. Having once extended the war to Chinese territory, it will then be logical to hit Chinese supply lines and even cities; to blockade the China coast; to support the Nationalists, and to take all the other steps which MacArthur favors. Again, as Truman and MacArthur know, elaborate plans for doing all these things if it becomes necessary have already been made.

8. This will be the great turning point. But judging from the Chinese precedent, the Russians will then logically intervene, whether openly or in some thin disguise. This will lead to a third world war.

It is President Truman's position that somewhere between five and six, or at least between six and seven, this deadly chain of logic can be broken. But he does not say at all how this is to be done. It is General MacArthur's position that six and seven can be undertaken with decisive effect, and without bringing on eight. But he gives no convincing reasons for believing either that the effect will be decisive, or that the Russians will not intervene.

But what is clear from the foregoing is that events, rather than the views of MacArthur or Truman, will determine our future course. The fact is that the United States alone cannot break the chain, simply because the United States cannot and will not adopt a policy of appeasement or surrender. Yet the chain may yet be broken. Events are sure to force some sort of showdown, probably soon. When it comes, the showdown must be with the real masters of the situation, the men in the Kremlin, rather than their satraps in Peiping.

Those best qualified to judge still believe that the Soviet rulers do not want war, if only because atomic war would surely destroy their regime. Thus if it is made crystal clear that the dismissal of MacArthur is not the prelude to appeasement; that a reasonable Korean settlement which does not reward aggression is nevertheless possible; and that the ultimate alternative is a third world war, there is still a chance for peace. It may even be a good chance.

The Menace of World Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an eloquent address on the subject of the menace of world communism, delivered by the Very Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, on April 17, before the annual Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at Constitution Hall.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF WORLD COMMUNISM

(By Rev. Edmund A. Walsh)

May I, at the outset, express to the Daughters of the American Revolution my sincere appreciation of the privilege again accorded me of participating to some slight degree in the important work so long and so vigorously conducted by your organization. Time and the inexorable weight of irrefutable evidence have both conspired to vindicate the warnings and the programs for an alert and concrete national defense which I have heard advocated from this platform for over 20 years. Your organization is not of the Johnny-Come-Lately variety. You are not among those who now feel the spur of the obvious and clamor for protection and preparedness against a menace that was always present and which never deceived the eye or the intellect of informed Americans familiar with the strategy and tactics of world communism. You have no need to take your patriotism cut of moth balls nor seek new ground whereon to stand. You never fell into the trap that Moscow wove for the eager beavers of the pink decade. In this very hall you often raised your voice against the gigantic conspiracy of ridicule and supercilious pedagogy to which the youth of America was subjected in so many colleges and universities of the land during the last two decades. As America sees her younger generation rallying to her defense by millions and dying heroically in distant outposts of the world, our people should thank God on bended knees for a generation that was not lost to civic virtue but proved to be better judges of values than so many of their mentors. Though confused and shaken, perhaps, by the deluge of alleged liberalism, subtle sarcasm, and open scorn directed against the old loyalties by long-haired males and short-haired females posing as advanced thinkers, the youth of the land came through that fiery ordeal substantially unscathed.

Recall for a moment the favored positions then held by the sappers of Christianity and democracy. From high place and from low, from university chair and village green, from the pages of periodicals, from lecture platforms and youth movements, they bored like termites at the foundations of American life, attacking religion in the name of pseudo-science, casting doubt at the Constitution under pretext of political wisdom, seeking social revolution through spurious economic reform, and generally creating the impression that America was a decadent plutocracy ripe for the avenging sword of the left wing.

Where now are the dilettants of organized social demolition—the scorners of patriotism and advocates of alien ideologies? Silent as the tomb in which their intellectual bankruptcy lies buried. They dove into cyclone cellars, to emerge stealthily thereafter and creep, in many cases, into Government posts and defense positions. Their chosen victims, youth in particular, dafled the planned corruption and now form the very bulwark of America. To them and to those who sealed their loyalty with the bright honor of their young blood, be gratitude and reverent memory.

The cessation of hostilities in 1945 in both Europe and Asia ended one phase of human history, only to usher in another not less decisive for the survival of western civilization.

One of the constant objectives of Communist tactics is the creation of confusion, divided counsel, and procrastination in the ranks of their opponents. This Machiavellian device was conspicuous and successful in the conquest of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and other satellite lands whose freedoms have been suffocated under the weight of power devoid of conscience or respect for human personality. Lenin, at a very early date, and with complete frankness set the compass for this wholly materialistic philosophy which controls Communist thought and determines Soviet foreign policy:

"We repudiate all morality that is taken outside of human, class concepts. We say that this is deception, a fraud, which clogs the brains of the workers and peasants in the interests of the landlords and capitalists.

"We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. Our morality is deduced from the class struggle of the proletariat.

"That is why we say that for us there is no such thing as morality taken outside of human society; such a morality is a fraud. For us, morality is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat." (Lenin, speech before the Young Communist League, October 2, 1920.)

This pronouncement explains the apparent lack of consistency and predictability in Soviet negotiators. Their international policy, despite Winston Churchill's celebrated apothegm, is not "a riddle wrapped up in a mystery inside an enigma." It is the most consistent foreign policy in the world today, because tactical inconsistency is made to serve the Communist grand strategy of world domination.

The Russian revolution never relents, though it has sometimes stumbled. It changes tactics and personnel but never renounces its program of planned chaos. It shifts gears and reduces speed but never loses direction or sight of its objectives. It gains or loses momentum but never changes its inner nature or renounces responsibility to itself. It substitutes new forms and places of attack but never relents in its conspiracy for world domination. It swaps the blockade of Berlin for most of China. It concedes you a dime but pockets a dollar. It pretends to love peace and justice but sponsors an aggressive war in Korea.

It must never be forgotten that the Marxian creed, as interpreted by Lenin and Stalin, holds that war between the United States and Soviet Russia is inevitable. Lenin himself laid down that basic doctrine:

"We live * * * not only in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either one or the other will conquer. And until that end comes, a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and bourgeois states is inevitable."

By imperialist states, Lenin meant the non-Communist states of the world. Com-

menting on this fundamental tenet of Soviet belief, Mr. Stalin once added the laconic remark: "Clear, one would think."

He further declared:

"Thus in the course of further development of international revolution two centers will form on a world scale: a Socialist center, binding to itself the countries that gravitate to socialism, and a capitalist center, binding to itself the countries that gravitate to capitalism. The struggle between these two centers for the possession of the world economy will decide the fate of capitalism and communism in the whole world."

Whatever final consequences emerge from the war in Korea, one conclusion seems inescapable. If successful there, the Russian revolution will have gone far toward destroying the United Nations. That would usher in an unpredictable period of interstatal anarchy for an exhausted humanity newly disillusioned. It would mean a return to the ice age of international relations and the triumph of totalitarianism. It would mean another long step on the road to that vision of the world in flames which Zinoviev, then head of the Third International, pictured to the visiting Asiatics, at the Congress of the Peoples of the East, held at Baku, in September 1920:

"The real revolution will blaze up when the 800,000,000 people who live in Asia unite with us * * * when we see the hundreds of millions of people in revolt. Now we must kindle a holy war. * * *."

If checked in Korea, the revolution will assuredly strike again, directly or indirectly, on some other sector of its extended battlefront and at a moment of its own choosing. It can never consent to become a nonpracticing world revolution. At best, its managers may accept a prorogated truce—until a safe opportunity to strike presents itself.

Its tactics, however, are calculated to keep the heart and the central military force of the revolution uncommitted to direct conflict. The risks and the wearing-down process are left to others. By stimulating class warfare on the periphery of the bourgeois world now here, now there, now in Burma, now in Malaya, now in Iran, now in Indochina, or Greece, or Turkey, or Italy, it will force the United States to be forever committed to the piecemeal defense of democracy on an expanding global front without conceivably ever meeting the real enemy face to face except in the form of bootlegged Russian tanks, Soviet-made planes, and disguised Soviet personnel. This exhausting process of attrition can continue without the stronghold of the conspiracy ever experiencing direct assault, while the cost in men, money, and supplies will become a permanent and crushing charge on our national economy. How long can we stand that cost? And what shall we do with that enormous war potential when it reaches full growth? Moscow, on the other hand, can husband its unspent forces against the hoped-for day of complete exhaustion on the part of the United States, which will be expected to bear the lion's share of global defense. Should the lion falter or sustain a crippling wound, the Politburo will recognize the moment and send its hordes across the moat already provided by its expendable satellites for the final encounter with the west. Japan will be a prime target. The Philippines, bound to the United States by many ties, will be in mortal danger, and it is not outside the possibilities that Soviet Russia will one day claim Alaska as rightful Russian land and attempt to repossess it, declaring the sale of that Territory by the czarist government in 1867 to have been a null-and-void betrayal of Russian interest by the Romanov dynasty. The only restraining argument at this moment is the atomic bomb—an advantage that is rapidly diminishing as Moscow increases its stockpile.

The rule-or-ruin psychology was manifested in late October 1950, on the occasion of the debates in the United Nations on the reappointment of Mr. Trygve Lie as Secretary General. Despite the obstinate attempts of the Soviet bloc to repudiate Mr. Lie because of his performance of duty during the crisis over Korea, the Assembly voted to reappoint. Whereupon Mr. Vishinsky announced that the Soviet delegation would have nothing to do with the Secretary General and would ignore the decision of the majority. On November 1 an attempt was made by two gunmen to assassinate the President of the United States in Blair House. Two men were killed and several wounded. Telegrams of sympathy and congratulations on his escape reached Mr. Truman from virtually all major foreign powers except from the Kremlin.

Mr. Henry L. Stimson, long an advocate of conciliation with Moscow, finally though reluctantly came to the only tenable conclusion open either to intelligence or charity. "There can be no lasting settlement," he wrote in 1947, "until the men in the Kremlin either change their minds or lose their jobs." At the present moment there is no sign of either miracle. And should one be announced, the players in this prolonged game of global geopolitics must keep a sharp eye on the prestidigitator as he shuffles the elusive pea back and forth among the walnut shells. He is an old hand at it. And there always lurks in the offing another explosive possibility. Good faith and reciprocated confidence are the cement which makes the diverse human elements cohere within the structure of international relations. Because of the habitual lying and twisted propaganda of Soviet negotiators, it can easily come to pass that no man will believe them even in some great emergency when they may be forced into the necessity of wanting to tell the truth.

The record is clear and the future designs of Soviet Russia are not unclear. Her gamble in Korea was logical perfidy. Edmund Burke in 1772 warned Europe that the partition of Poland by Prussia, Austria, and Russia would not be the end of the feasting. It was, he pointed out, only a breakfast for the great armed powers; but where would they dine? He knew that neither history nor appetite for power ever stops short.

The true question before the American people and before their representatives in Congress is not so much the cost in dollars, though heavy, but the alternative possibilities. If the grim record of the past 5 years of Soviet-American relations has achieved anything, it has clarified the cold war down to a basic consideration. The debate is not whether we can afford to do the necessary things for the defense of Christian civilization, but can we afford not to do them.

It is cold comfort but a necessary audit at this point to remember that when Lenin began translating the complexities of Marxian metaphysics into the hard realities of life in Russia on his return from Switzerland in April 1917, he had possibly 75,000 to 80,000 followers. Some records put the figure as low as 40,000. When he became dictator on November 7, his Bolsheviks had increased to 175,000 in a population then estimated at 150,000,000. Today, 34 years later, the power of the Kremlin reaches down and influences directly or indirectly something like one-third of the human race, possibly 800,000,000 persons. On the continent of Europe one of every two inhabitants lives under controls and policies dictated by the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party. With the momentum acquired by the revolution in China, the same proportion now threatens for Asia. Who shall predict the consequences? What will happen to civilization if another generation becomes enslaved to the earthy humanism which has been dominant in Soviet Russia since 1917 and is now the official goal in the satellite lands? That moral and intellectual degradation of spirit to the level of the flesh and of matter has made fear the dominant atmosphere in which government operates. There is no free science; there is no free church; no freedom of the press, of speech, of labor, of education, of art; nor of literature, nor of industrial enterprise, nor even of movement from one city to another. What will happen to the souls of its victims if the resultant forced obedience and servitude freezes into a fixed culture? What will happen if submission and servility become a habit born of fatigue and frustrated hopes? What will become of truth if its expression is confined to the rigid pattern of dialectical materialism in the service of militant atheism? If falsehood becomes state policy? When even language and the vocabulary of human relationships become distorted and dragooned into the party line? Who shall say that such a sickness will never spread? Even the two-thirds of the human race not directly subjected to the Communist empire are vitally affected by it, since the foreign and domestic policy of every government is profoundly influenced and often conditioned by what the Kremlin does.

One conclusion seems inevitable. Direct conflict with America is definitely assumed and clearly predicted, as must appear to any careful reader of official pronouncements made by Lenin and Stalin. The manner and timing of that eventual clash probably constitute the main preoccupation of the technicians charged with scheduling the progressive stages of world revolution. What counts for the world, then, is the political psychology and declared objectives of Soviet Russia's small governing class at a given moment, not the mute and captive aspirations of her 200,000,000 inhabitants. They are not the real enemy. The only argument respected by their masters is evidence of power possessed, in being, and ready for instant release.

Because of the global strategy of world communism, one must school himself to see its objectives steadily and see them whole. It is the same revolution operating on many battlefronts and in many forms, whether military in Korea or political in Eastern Germany, or through terrorism in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, or by use of spies and traitors in the United States and Canada. Like a chameleon, the Politburo changes color in changing circumstances but never deviates from its plotted course. Wholly devoid of respect for international law, except when it can be invoked in Moscow's favor, the managers of this consolidated world revolution, by their tactics, have maneuvered the Government of the United States into the present tragic impasse between General MacArthur and President Truman. Though patently associated with Communist China in attacking American forces in Korea, Soviet Russia relies on a fiction to cover its participation, even as it relied on a fiction to isolate Berlin in 1948 and starve the inhabitants into submission to the satraps from Moscow. That pretense was met and defeated by the colossal daring and ingenuity of the airlift. Defeated there, the Politburo transferred their attention to China, then to Korea and resurrected the ancient device of warfare by proxy. Charged by the United Nations with the over-all duty of crushing the military forces opposing him, General MacArthur deemed it the part of realism to pursue the aggressor to his lair north of the thirty-eighth parallel and destroy his military capacity to inflict another 60,000 casualties on American troops. His point of view recognizes the practical impossibility of dealing with the fringe of a

conflagration without extinguishing the self-renewing sources of the blaze.

The President, on the other hand, is confronted with an equally impressive weight of argument and public obligation attaching to his high office. As Commander in Chief of all the Armed Forces of the United States, he has the unquestioned right to transfer, relieve, or recall any commander in the field, particularly if he is convinced that the officer's conduct is not consistent with directives lawfully issued. General MacArthur's prompt obedience to the specific recall is in the best tradition of his profession. This is all in the book of regulations and the case would seem to be closed—if it ended there.

But, at bottom, we are not faced with a domestic, a legal, or a jurisdictional problem; the basic issue remains unsolved no matter what happens to General MacArthur. There still remains the historic confrontation between the two mighty opponents who, as Lenin and Stalin both unequivocally declared, must sooner or later meet in some titanic Armageddon. War between them is inevitable according to Mr. Stalin. That being so, the best place to meet the enemy is in Asia, concludes General MacArthur, whose knowledge of the Soviet mind is not inferior to any man I have yet met.

The President, on the other hand, together with his advisers, believes that Western Europe is a more favorable and crucial battlefront. Moreover, to adopt the logistics of warfare presumably favored by General MacArthur, might precipitate world war III before we are prepared for it, in the opinion of official Washington. Hence, regretfully but in good conscience, the President took the drastic step that needs no description here.

I should like to emphasize at this point that I have no political nor partisan motivation in anything I may say touching this dramatic episode. I am only a disenfranchised inhabitant of the District of Columbia and owe allegiance to neither political party, since neither has deemed us important enough to be admitted to the franchise. Hence, like every legal resident of the District, I am obliged by the nature of things to cultivate that impartiality which the Non-Partisan League endeavors to achieve by art. What I do assert is that both the General and the President can remain major influences in meeting the greatest crisis and the greatest peril that has ever menaced this country. One of them is a brilliant and distinguished soldier whose military achievements lie outside the area of the current controversy. The other is the President of that Nation to whom the entire world now looks with hope and expectation of leadership. Now that the military requirement of personal censure have been fulfilled by the prompt return of General MacArthur, a new chapter is about to be written on the blank pages of a very uncertain future. Controversy and disunity at home cannot but please the Politburo and dismay all Christendom. What a thrilling and heartening spectacle it would be to the entire non-Communist world in its present agony of anxiety, if, for example, President Truman were waiting at the airport when General MacArthur descends from his long flight. Such a gesture of national unity, or any other similar proof of greatness of mind would by no means indicate that the European point of view, so widely expressed in the overseas press, had been ignored or minimized. What a shock it would be to the Kremlin to see these two great symbols of power enter Washington shoulder to shoulder in a common resolve to meet the common enemy of mankind in unity of heart, and mind, and might. It would be notice to the Kremlin that the Government of the United States intends to use every component of its physical, intellectual, and moral assets in meeting its international obligations.

Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Trouble Ahead on Student Deferment," published in the Peoria Star on April 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TROUBLE AHEAD ON STUDENT DEFERMENT

There is some logic to support the President's order providing draft deferment to college students on the basis of scholastic ability, but it seems to us more than offset by what may be anticipated in trouble. Doesn't it amount to setting up a Nation-wide competition among college students, with deferment from military service as the winners' prizes?

General Hershey pointed out that the President's order was in harmony with the will of Congress, which provided for draft deferments "in such numbers as may be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety or interest." It requires a broad interpretation of "the national interest" to warrant the deferment of students on the basis of their intellectual capacity. There is some merit in arguing that these are the scientists, doctors, and engineers of the future, but it will be a bitter thought to many a student who is not intelligent enough to win deferment, that a democracy is setting up a class of elite intellectuals from which he is barred.

One can imagine such complaints as "We're dumb, so we do the shooting and get shot at. The smart guys get the soft jobs."

There is a good deal of justification for that anticipated complaint. We see in it an all too prevalent attitude, expressed by the editor of an eastern newspaper. He recognized the need for training bright young men for scientific and technical work. But he added that "provision must likewise be made to insure that the vital thread of our cultural and political heritage will not be snapped by a generation of men who through no fault of their own may have to spend much of their learning years studying the arts of war."

To us that is an odious thought. It means that intellectually gifted young men are too valuable to the state to be used in the defense of the state. Valuable in what way? In that they constitute an elite class in whom our cultural heritage must be preserved.

In addition to the fact that the principle stated above is foreign to the principle of equality in a free country, we can think of two practical objections to the operation of the President's deferment plan.

First, deferment is to be based on students' class standing and on psychological tests designed to measure learning capacity. Is the psychological capacity for learning a guaranty that the man is qualified to be a member of the elite who will preserve our cultural heritage? Some of our greatest rogues and criminals have had the keenest minds. If Alger Hiss were a college student, no doubt he would pass the test with flying colors. And it should be remembered that it has been among the American intelligentsia that communism has enjoyed the greatest hospitality.

Second, in spite of the development of psychological testing, we doubt that the techniques are accurate enough to be used as a criterion for determining who, in the future, will contribute most to scientific advancement or the preservation of our cultural heritage. As we remember it, Thomas Edison was rated a very poor student in his few years in school. And Abraham Lincoln's life was a series of dismal failures before he became President of the United States. We doubt if psychological tests can discover the future Edisons and Lincolns.

The principle of intellectual distinction in selective service, like the recent proposal to provide Federal scholarships for persons who might become most valuable to their country in specialized service, is a totalitarian principle. Its basic hypothesis is that the individual belongs to the state. The principle is abhorrent to those who believe in the democratic ideals and traditions of the United States.

Ambassador O'Dwyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, through the kindness of my good friend, Carroll Cone, an executive of Pan American Airways, I have received a copy of a translation of an editorial concerning Ambassador O'Dwyer, and I ask unanimous consent that the translation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the translation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation of editorial from Excelsior, Mexico City, April 3, 1951]

VAYA GOOD, MR. TRUMAN

It does not escape anyone that the return to Mexico of Mr. O'Dwyer, the United States Ambassador, has been received by the Mexican public with a strong feeling of friendliness. The daily newspapers have been publishing the incidents of the testimony which the Ambassador rendered to an investigating commission of the Senate of his country, and it is looked upon favorably that President Truman has supported him in his high mission in Mexico and that President Aleman has shown his good will with regard to O'Dwyer by sending him the Presidential plane to New York for his return trip to Mexico.

In reality—and we are guided by information published in the New York press—the investigation which the commission of the Senate is carrying on with regard to the activities of the gangsters is nothing new. At least every year some scandal is raised for political purposes, which scandal as a rule melts like a snowball exposed to the sun's rays.

One New York publication calls the investigations referred to an "old story." The political aim pursued with regard to this matter is clearly outlined. It is the continual fight of the two large historic parties of the United States and of the groups within them. On the other hand, using common sense, it sounds ridiculous that the mayor of the largest city of the world, as is New York, should have accepted a donation of $10,000 from a syndical fire chief of that city. Naturally, Mr. O'Dwyer denied this charge before the Senate commission.

What we wish to emphasize is that the testimony in question and its political repercussions constitute an internal problem of the United States. What the Mexican opinion has looked upon with pleasure is the return of the Ambassador, who has known how to win our good will because of his simplicity, of his respect for Mexican customs, and because of the personal interest he has shown for all cultural activities, and therefore for the prestige of our country. Ambassador O'Dwyer personifies good understanding, friendship between the two countries on a firm basis of mutual respect, and the good-neighbor policy.

Wake Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Wake Up, America," delivered by me at the dinner of the Brand Names Foundation in the ballroom of the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on April 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

(By Senator JAMES H. DUFF, of Pennsylvania)

Right now this country faces the most critical period in its history. For my part it is almost impossible to overestimate the danger. And that danger is magnified by the recent let-down both in interest and concern by the public as well as by responsible public officials.

Everything that goes on world-wide indicates that we in America should be acutely aware that we are opposed by a brutal, world-ambitious and powerful enemy—an enemy whose aim is the destruction of the United States. Russia realizes better than we seem to that the United States is the last powerful road block against the domination of the whole modern world by the evil men in the Kremlin. And yet we in America are not united either in purpose or in determination in the face of this threat to our very existence.

The almost endless discussion and wide divergence of opinion on all matters having to do with our preparation for defense is sure proof that as a Nation we are neither fully appreciative of our danger nor of the urgency needed to quickly prepare us to meet that danger. As a people we are undecided where we are headed, how we expect to get there, or what we will do when we do get there.

There lingers among many of us the hope that somehow as a people we can separate ourselves from the problems of the rest of the world, and thereby escape the furious turmoil that surges and flows back and forth everywhere around the globe. There was a time when we could do this. While there are those who still maintain that they can disclaim the tag of isolationism, in substance nevertheless their thinking represents an unawareness of the danger we face together with a lack of appreciation of the complete change in the physical character of our situation today when compared with former years.

In the days when isolationism was a proper and beneficial American policy, the physical facts of our situation justified isolationism, because the barriers of two oceans placed us beyond the probability of successful attack by those who might be our enemies. But that time is past. For while we remain separated by those two oceans from Europe on the east and Asia on the west, neither those oceans nor the friendly nations who are our neighbors north and south are no longer a barrier to aggressive nations. Today we live in an age when both time and place barriers have been destroyed.

What has happened in this age of air communication and transportation has made all nations our neighbors. As a people we can no longer be tempted by the memory of those former days of isolation with the hope that we can still be isolated, because then we were in fact isolated from the rest of the world by physical barriers. But the physical facts of today's world prevent isolation just as in those days they made isolation both possible and desirable.

Last month a British bomber flew nonstop from Western Europe to eastern North America in 4 hours and 37 minutes. That flight was almost as meaningful to America as the discovery of this land by Columbus. It connected Europe and America in only 37 minutes longer than it takes the best express train to make the run between the National Capital at Washington and New York City. Think of it—4 hours by train from the National Capital at Washington to New York City and only 4 hours and 37 minutes by plane from Europe to America. However little we may relish the idea, it meant that whatever happens in Europe also affects us here in the United States almost as much as if it happened in one of our adjoining States. Certainly it means that Western Europe must be denied to the Russians unless the whole concentrated area of industrial enterprise of the eastern United States is open to atomic bombing immediately world war III comes up.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, the other day made this statement:

"Should war come we can expect to destroy no more than 30 percent of the planes making the attack in strength on the United States before their bombing missions are completed. And our preparations today are not yet beefed up even to achieve that figure. Even if we had many more interceptor planes and antiaircraft guns and radar screens that blanketed all approaches to our boundaries, a predictable 70 percent of the enemy planes would penetrate our defenses despite the extraordinary valor and skill of our pilots. * * * The bleak and blunt evidence of the last war proved conclusively that no bombing attack ever was turned back by the most strenuous defensive action. The offense always has a crushing advantage in aerial warfare and there is no prospect that the balance will change in the foreseeable future."

In the light of this testimony by the Chief of our Air Force, and with the knowledge that only 4½ hours separate Europe from America by air, it ought to be clear that we dare not yield Western Europe to Russia if we expect to protect our great industrial centers from continuous bombing from bases in Western Europe should it be overrun by Russia.

With our air-closeness to Europe there can be no safe and sure fortress here in America.

One of the necessary lines of defense for the United States is now certainly Western Europe.

Nor is it of ourselves alone that we must think, because we in America are the leaders of the free people of today's world. We did not come by that leadership out of a desire to carry on war, or to create a colonial empire, or with imperialistic ambitions as the Russians assert. We came into that leadership by default of the power of those who had exercised it before us and because we represent more forcefully than any other great nation the idealism of freedom in today's world.

When we assumed world leadership, even against the wishes of many of our people, it came to us naturally by reason of our power and what we stand for. And we have it today whether we want it or not and with the leadership we also have the responsibility that always accompanies it.

Every realistic person knows that communism is on the march everywhere. Communism is united everywhere. But the free people are not united nor energized by common purpose. If communism is to be stopped, if freedom is to be saved, we in America must exercise the full responsibility that we occupy as leaders of all those opposed to returning the world to a period of darkness to which all the doctrine of communism tends.

Everyone knows that America desires peace. Russia's assertions to the contrary are mere smoke screens to conceal her own imperialistic, power-mad designs. There is every reason why we should want peace here in America. The average American enjoys the greatest material well-being ever enjoyed by people anywhere. And at the same time we have had unexampled civil and religious liberty. We have nothing to gain by war. On the contrary, we have everything to lose by another world conflict.

It is Russia that has decided that war will be the order of today's world. No other meaning can be ascribed to the vast military preparation of Russia that grows week by week, month by month, and year by year. And since Russia has indicated by the whole course of its action since World War II that it is its purpose to dominate the world, we in America dare not refuse to be prepared.

The enormous military preparation of Russia is aimed at ultimate war with the United States. Therefore, we must be prepared for any eventuality, because Russia may attack any hour of the night or day and without notice. That is the method of all totalitarian and aggressive nations. There is no reason to suspect anything less of the Communists because already since World War II Russia has gobbled up all its neighbors, set itself up in the very heart of Europe, and now moves far east across Asia to the Korean Peninsula and the Pacific Ocean.

What must happen to arouse America to the seriousness of the crisis that confronts us? Will it be necessary to repeat Pearl Harbors across America? Will we wait until a great number of industrial centers are struck the same night at the same time by coordinated atomic bomb attacks by the Russian air force in an endeavor to wipe out the industrial supremacy of this Nation? Or will we prepare? And will we prepare in time? And will we prepare sufficiently to develop our might so that Russia will be convinced that even if she should pull a sneak attack our power of retaliation will be so annihilating that communism dare not risk the devastation of that retaliation?

Today's world is on fire. Unless we help to put it out we too will inevitably be consumed in the conflagration.

We are now in far graver danger than before either World War I or World War II. It required the sinking of the *Lusitania* to awaken us to our danger in World War I. The perfidious attack on Pearl Harbor was necessary to awaken us in World War II. In

this atomic age we dare not risk the danger of an all-out attack by atomic bombing on this country before the scales drop from our eyes to disclose the danger by which we are confronted.

When Russia decided to use her puppets in Korea to further extend her control over Asia, we in America were genuinely aroused and deeply concerned by our battle losses in that far-off war. Now, well on to a year later, we seem to have settled down into a period of relative indifference, with business and politics and everything else as usual.

From the very fact that the Red Army in Korea is right now building its forces to a new power and maximum, there is renewed evidence that it is the purpose of Russia to force the fighting there even if world war III comes on thereby.

What do we in America propose to do to meet this tremendous crisis? That is a question every American should ask himself, because in a free country preparation depends in the end upon the sentiment of the people.

In my solemn judgment right now we in America face the ordeal of survival. It is imperative therefore that we make up our minds to what we intend to do. Then we must insist upon a program of action commensurate with the dangers. We must go forward continuously until we are in the position of such power that Russia dare not run the risk of starting world war III.

And to properly prepare this country, the present fogginess and confusion that exists in much of the public thinking must be burned out and that must be done immediately. Examine the situation in the command in Korea; the failure of many to realize the risk of having Western Europe overrun by Russia; and the recent directive on deferment of bright college boys.

The situation in the command in Korea is a specific instance. The American people have a right to know who is going to run the show in Korea, what the objectives are, and how those objectives are sought to be accomplished. There must be a definite, clean-cut statement as to what is political policy and what is Army policy and who is deciding which and why.

The MacArthur situation is a case in point.

It is regrettable that the dismissal of General MacArthur had to take place. But if dismissal was the only way to accomplish unity then it had to be done because the lack of unity was harmful to the best interests of the Nation. When the commander in the field publicly and repeatedly disagreed with the Commander in Chief and the Joint Chiefs of Staff he thereby created an impossible situation that had to be resolved.

Supreme authority in the Armed Forces must reside somewhere. Under the Constitution of the United States it resides in the President as Commander in Chief. To permit a continuous dispute as to authority and military policy at the most critical juncture in our history is unthinkable.

Whether we agree with the political judgment of the President as Commander in Chief is entirely another proposition. That can only be resolved by the American people in the election of a new President.

As another example of the confusion that exists in the country and of the resentment that grows out of lack of proper direction, let us take the matter of deferment of college students of high grade. Certainly, that would be an un-American thing to do. I am sure our people would not tolerate putting bright college students on a pedestal and allowing the rest to remain in a subordinate position in the matter of service to their country. This country needs brains in its armed services right down the line, as well as in the other phases of our national activities. But above everything else, to create exemptions or preferences for any class in America is intolerable to the average citizen's ideas and would not work. The deferment of bright college students would absolutely be in contradiction to the fundamental principles of American democracy.

As for Western Europe, the so-called great debate revealed the utter confusion of many and the failure or unwillingness of some people to understand that we dare not risk the capture of Western Europe by Russia, even apart from the danger of Russia using Western Europe as a base for attack by her upon the United States.

The industrial production of Western Europe is too great to be joined to that of Russia in a war where production may well turn the scales for victory. During the past year the productive capacity of Western Europe increased to 130 percent of what it was during World War II. It is currently running at the rate of 140 percent of World War II production. When we realize that Hitler in World War II without the production of either Russia or England almost overran the world in 4 years, it becomes clear how imperative it is that this increased production of Western Europe must be denied to Russia if we are to win through in a possible conflict for survival against communism.

The people of Western Europe and the people of the United States are together responsible for 90 percent of all the inventions and betterments that go to make up modern living. They have the same know-how as we do. Without Western Europe, Russia cannot possibly defeat the free people of the world in the event the Reds decide to risk world war III in the attempt at world domination. Therefore, above all else, at this critical juncture of civilization, Western Europe with its common cultural, moral, religious and legal background, cannot be permitted to be overrun.

Here in America we are a free, peace-loving people, so we are at a tremendous disadvantage when dealing with an aggressor nation. We are in a terrific dilemma, because we do not know whether Russia will strike in the immediate future or after a long period of years. But in any event the tension will continue to be upon us and the danger will be as great one day as another, irrespective of what horn of the dilemma we face.

Therefore, first off we must be ready at all times against a possible attempt at a knock-out blow by a sneak attack. In this connection, never was this old slogan more apt—"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Consequently, we must prepare immediately to be strong and to stay strong. No halfway measures will do. We must not only be strong in military might, we must also maintain high industrial production geared for defense needs, because in modern warfare, in the long run, industrial production is equally as vital as military preparation. On the long view, if we are obliged to be ready over a long period, it is imperative also that we work and prepare our plans on the basis of feasible and practical financial costs so that we do not ruin ourselves by bankruptcy while we are waiting to prepare ourselves for what Russia will probably attempt eventually.

On the floor of the Senate the other day it was stated that it costs Russia only $7 a year for the pay of a private soldier. Even a brigadier general in the Russian Army receives compensation of only $300 per year. By comparison, the lowest-paid soldier in our Army receives $1,080 per year. And the maintenance of a man in the field in our Army, plus his allotted proportion of all the maintenance and equipment cost assignable out of general operations, puts the expense in the American Army at $10,000 per man per year. A Regular standing army of 4,000,000 men, therefore, would cost this country $40,000,000,000 per year while we stood by awaiting the course of Russian decision and action.

It is clear that this vast expense for a standing army is more than we can afford. Our problem must be solved some other way. The only practical alternative is universal military training.

Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, recently made the following statement with reference to universal military training, with which I am entirely in accord:

"No man is wise enough to know how long the present emergency will last. One thing we do know. Unless we give unequivocal proof now of our determination to organize our defenses on a sound, long-range basis, our potential enemies will be encouraged to believe that we will, sooner or later, relax our vigilance and provide them with an opportunity to achieve their goal of world domination. * * * Scrapping universal military training * * * would be sufficient to cancel the assurance that our defenses would have, for the first time, an enduring base that would guarantee us adequate military strength at a cost we could bear for the years of critical world tension that we now face. Universal military training is not a step toward militarizing our country. Its effect is precisely the opposite. * * * It would require fewer men under arms, while giving us a vastly greater number of trained men quickly available for duty in a sudden emergency."

As I have tried to make clear, in my judgment, we will face the danger of such an emergency for a long time, in the event world war III does not come up with shocking and startling suddenness.

One military crisis after another pops up here and there around the world; in each case with the Russians pulling the strings in the background. Within the last month the Middle East oil picture became strong in focus as a result of Russian manipulation and interference. Now Korea looms larger with mounting Red forces building up behind their front as a part of their spring offensive. In Yugoslavia and the Balkan countries the tempo steps up to a place where the possibility of a start of world war III looms there.

This world-wide movement and anxiety and turmoil makes clear that we in America must avail ourselves of these precious months of time to prepare ourselves for the worst, instead of assuming that our defense is a casual matter that may be attended to at some reasonable leisure. We have not adjusted ourselves and our attitudes or our preparations to the critical posture of events facing us. The fact is we are not treating the situation as the vital and tremendous emergency which it is. That goes for all America and since it does, certainly our slogan ought to be "Wake Up, America."

It must be made clear to every American citizen that unless we are realistic enough to appreciate the danger, to take the necessary steps in preparation of defense, and to make the necessary sacrifices, we of this generation may not be able to transmit to those who come after us the blessings of which we ourselves have been the heirs and beneficiaries and which have made us the most prosperous, the most fortunate, and the most favored of all people in the whole history of civilization. That heritage has come to us as a result of sacrifice and unless we are willing to approach our responsibilities in the spirit of sacrifice, we will not be worthy successors of the great men and women who have given us what we have.

We face the challenge of survival. If we are to successfully accept that challenge, we must be willing to do the things necessary to meet it. And unless we do and until we do, neither ourselves, nor our children, nor our children's children will continue to enjoy the blessings which have made America the most wonderful place in the whole world.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Let us preserve this last best hope of earth."

Crisis in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in these days of stress and trial, all of us are particularly concerned with the present status and future of America's higher education. In the recent past, I have benefited from reading the thirty-first biennial report of the board of regents of the University of Washington. I was particularly impressed by the President's introduction. I believe that every Member of the Congress will benefit from what President Raymond B. Allen has said. Dr. Allen has stated that the University of Washington must and intends to prepare its students, as mature human beings, to assume their personal responsibilities for the welfare of their families, their communities, and their Nation. He concludes his definition of the university's teaching mission in these words:

The noblest end of education is the development of young men and women dedicated to useful lives of self-reliant citizenship and responsible leadership.

I ask unanimous consent that the president's introduction be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, where it may provide the reader with encouragement, and with an awareness of the fact that one of America's great educational institutions is determined to conquer and scale the obstacles and problems of the present in order that the university and its students and graduates may keep pace with progress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S INTRODUCTION

EDUCATION IN CRISIS

This report is written at a time of gravest crisis, at a time when freemen everywhere are striving to purge their institutions of weakness and buttress them for a struggle that threatens their whole way of life. By reason of this fact, this report differs from those that have gone before. It is far different from what it might have been had it been written 6 months ago.

The pattern of Communist aggression is unmistakable. To anyone willing to judge the Kremlin and its satellites by their actions rather than their words, the naked aggression in Asia can appear only as a part of a larger design of world domination.

Communist China's intervention in Korea insults and defies the United Nations decision to protect the free people of the world from violence and terror. The classic strategy of infiltration and of psychological, economic, political, and guerrilla warfare are softening Southeast Asia for conquest. India, Japan, and the Philippines have their places on the Kremlin's timetable. Western Europe raises its guard, uncertain when or where the blow will fall.

Inspired by hate and fear of the ideas, ideals, and moral unity of the West, the U. S. S. R.-controlled international Communist organization is engaged in a brutal international civil war against freedom and is using the United Nations organization as a battleground upon which to wage psychological and political warfare on the free world. Because it suits her design for world dominion, Russia gives lip service to the purposes of the United Nations. But now the Kremlin's true allegiance is clear, and the moral indignation of the free world mounts as practical security measures are finally being taken.

Perhaps the most important of the security measures we can take is the strengthening of education for freedom. Now that we know our enemy and know that he is active here at home and throughout the world, we should strengthen the educational bastions of the free world.

If we are to survive, we must know ourselves as well as our enemy. Our resources are many, but if we are to prevent another world war, or if we are to win such a war should it come, we shall have to excel in more than science, technology, and industrial output. We shall have to show the world that, as individuals and as a Nation, we are clear and strong in our resolution to act in the interest of freemen and for freedom for men everywhere.

Naturally, our enemy wants to engage us on ground that is to his advantage—ground on which guerrilla tactics will win. Fortunately, such tactics are not strange to Americans. By these tactics, Americans won their own freedom and opened up the West. This, however, is not the only lesson our national history has taught us. A more important lesson we have learned, or should have learned, concerns the nature of security.

BUILDING SELF-RELIANT CITIZENS

The only real security a society can have is based on the individual security of self-reliant citizens. Unfortunately, in our quest for security in an industrial society, we have too often weakened the incentives for individual self-reliance. We have done this in many subtle ways, some of which are rooted in education and the home. Are children encouraged to assume responsibility, and thus to become self-reliant as adults, by a society which gives them little or nothing responsible to do? Does lock-step education develop independence?

If education is to make its maximum contribution, it will do so by placing greater responsibility on young people themselves to sharpen their own powers of mind and perception, to strengthen their bodies, and to toughen their moral and spiritual fiber. Such toughness of body, mind, and spirit characterized our forefathers. The present generation has these qualities, but, in the all too many cases where they are only latent, it is the responsibility of the home, the school, and the church to bring them out and develop them and thus to better prepare our youth for survival in a world already at war. I am convinced that youth educated and trained for the kind of war in which we are now engaged will be individuals who can survive and who, by the very nature of their training, will forever cherish the freedom which is the priceless heritage of western civilization.

This kind of training always has been, and always should be, the objective of education in a democratic society. The present emergency challenges education by making clear that this objective is not merely desirable but is essential to survival.

The University of Washington is acutely aware of its responsibility in the present emergency. This report is not, however, a report of a university getting ready for cataclysm. It is precisely the opposite. It is a report showing how the university's long-term programs have actually strengthened it to assume positive leadership in whatever activities are needed, whether in peace or in war. It is this kind of forward-looking management that this report attempts to depict. The report seeks to picture the university's broad, over-all patterns of activity—what the university is, what it does, how well it does it. It does not pretend to detail all of the individual accomplishments, fine as they are, in the scores of colleges, schools, and departments, for to do so would risk losing sight of the forest for the trees.

No one knows precisely what the national situation holds for American education in general or for the University of Washington in particular. We are aware, of course, that the present situation, characterized by simultaneous search for peace and preparation for war, places a heavy responsibility upon higher education and poses for it a tremendous challenge. This is not merely a matter of how selective service calls may affect enrollment, although we must face realistically the probability of some kind of universal service if the Nation is to achieve its goal of armed security. It is not merely a matter of maintaining the Nation's pool of trained scientific manpower during a period of mobilization or universal service, difficult as this problem will be if all young men are called to service on reaching the age of 18 or upon graduation from high school. It is not merely the problem of getting the ablest of these young men back into college for specialized training, both in their own interest and in that of the Nation. It is not only the problem of how colleges and universities can best serve in national defense programs. It is all these things, yet it is something else as well. The real challenge that faces America's colleges and universities includes the challenge of preserving the truths and values of American civilization, of maintaining and enhancing the intellectual and spiritual, as well as the material, strength of the whole Nation and the Western World, of guarding, over a long period, perhaps, the habit of intellectual endeavor and the respect for principles and values which undergird the whole structure of our free society.

THE SEARCH FOR ULTIMATE VALUES

The University of Washington proposes to meet these challenges with selflessness and with a keen awareness of basic moral values. The university is not seeking merely to strengthen itself as an institution, nor does it feel that, if global war comes, it need only convert to training programs while it goes among the people bidding them to be strong. What the university faces is a decision on a course of action that will preserve it and, if possible, strengthen it as a rampart of freedom. If it should fail in this it will have failed to meet the greatest challenge of all.

Against this background the work of the university stands out in its many dimensions. Yet, if one is to judge the university and evaluate its performance, he needs something more. He needs a plumb line of permanent mission, of objectives, against which to measure for trueness the university's work. With this in mind, it has seemed proper to preface this report with a statement of the mission of the University of Washington, as those responsible for its administration conceive that mission to be:

The university exists to serve the people of the State of Washington; through teaching, to train young men and women for more intelligent, responsible, and productive lives; by research, to develop more adequate solutions to social and scientific problems; and by every means to apply its knowledge and skills in the interest of the people who support and sustain the university and thus give it life. The university's function is to so organize and nurture this life as to build ever more securely a free society of free and self-reliant men and women.

The research and service objectives of the university are clear. Their accomplishments depends upon the maintenance of superior staff and facilities, high standards of performance, and the application of energy, skill, and imagination to human and material problems. The university's record in this regard, an excellent one, is becoming better year by year.

The teaching mission of the university, on the other hand, is by no means so simple or so easy of accomplishment. It is a mission shared by education in free institutions everywhere. There is a great ferment over its definition and over means for its full realization. The university is concerned, of course, with creating the proper conditions for learning, with keeping alive the good and true in the past experience of mankind, with the development of skills, with the cultivation of habits of industry, curiosity, and imagination, and with seeking perspective and wholeness of understanding. But the university must go beyond these traditional and admittedly fine concepts if it is to be worthy of its name. It must prepare its students, as mature human beings, to assume their personal responsibilities for the welfare of their families, their communities, and their Nation. The university, then, must not be satisfied with mere training for vocational competence and personal achievement. Above all else, the University must seek and develop in youth those qualities of character, idealism, and spirit without which learning, however brilliant, is socially sterile and possibly dangerous. The noblest end of education is the development of young men and women dedicated to useful lives of self-reliant citizenship and responsible leadership.

This, then, is the mission that motivates your university and unifies it in time of crisis. Never before in history has the accomplishment of these objectives been more sorely needed. Never before have the integrity and security of the Nation been in greater jeopardy. It is the purpose of this report to show how the university has attempted to meet its own high standards and how it will seek to respond with purpose and force to whatever challenge the future may bring.

RAYMOND B. ALLEN.

Proposed Sale of Old German Embassy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Don't Sell the Embassy," which appeared a few days ago in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. It has to do with Senate bill 873, introduced by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], introduced for the purpose of preventing the sale of the old Germany Embassy. I hope the bill will be brought up for early consideration in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T SELL THE EMBASSY

What seems to us to be a waste of time and energy and a deal that we have to pay for in the end anyway, is the attempt of Alien Property Office to sell the old German Embassy on Massachusetts Avenue in Washington.

It is a nice little cottage with 70 rooms and 13 baths. It was seized from the Hitler government when the United States entered World War II. The highest bid received was $101,050, and this, the alien property custodian says, is too low. He will try to negotiate a higher price.

The folly of this projected deal consists in selling this property at a time when diplomatic relations are being reestablished with the Bonn government.

Because military government still retains a measure of control over German affairs, Bonn has not yet been authorized to appoint full ministers or ambassadors. It is empowered, however, to reestablish the consular service and to send charges d'affaires to friendly countries. Sooner or later, as occupational direction relaxes and Bonn becomes sovereign, ambassadors will be accredited to other powers. At the rate controls have been lifted that will not be far off.

Where, then, will the ambassador hang his hat? When, before that time, a charge d'affairs is sent to Washington as one already has been dispatched to London, where will he operate?

It would be much better to hold this property in trust until Germany is back on its feet and then return it to the new, responsible German Government. The Russians have given the German Embassy in Moscow into the keeping of an envoy from the eastern zone. In Prague the Czechs have done the same. Likewise, the Turks have returned the property to the Bonn government.

Maybe this isn't the way to operate on American lines. We will probably persist in selling the property. Then, when the Germans need a new embassy, some agency of the Federal Government will donate them the money with which to buy it just as we donate so much cash to other countries to make up for equally shortsighted mistakes.

Narcotics

REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the press releases over the week end indicate that the Senate Committee on Crime intends to recommend, among other things, legislation greatly tightening up the penalties for narcotic violators in the United States. I am very glad to inform the House that a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means has been working on this problem for the past 3 or 4 weeks, and we have now recommended to the Committee on Ways and Means the adoption of H. R. 3490, which has the full approval of the law-enforcement officials of this country and which, in my opinion, if adopted, will go a long way toward suppressing the narcotic trade in this country.

The letter from the Attorney General and the grand-jury report are as follows:

Hon. HALE BOGGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOGGS: In accordance with the understanding at the hearing held by your subcommittee on various bills, particularly H. R. 3490, introduced by you and proposing certain amendments to the Federal narcotic laws respecting the penalties to be imposed, there is enclosed a copy of a recent report of the Federal grand jury at Detroit, Mich., on drug addiction among teenagers.

You will note that this grand jury recommends the passage of H. R. 2340, which, except for minor changes and clarifications, is very similar to H. R. 3490, and upon which the department commented in its recent letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL GRAND JURY AT DETROIT, MICH., ON DRUG ADDICTION AMONG TEEN-AGERS

We, your grand jurors, duly empaneled in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, to inquire into and investigate such matters as are presented to us, or that shall be called to our attention, involving offenses committed within said district, and specifically matters involving violations of the narcotics laws, particularly the use of narcotics by so-called teen-agers, make the following report on our investigation of such matters:

Your grand jurors report that conditions of the most shocking nature were revealed in the testimony adduced before them; that young people ranging in age between 14 and 21 have become confirmed and inveterate users of heroin, morphine, and cocaine; that these young people, upon becoming enslaved through their addiction to narcotics, resorted not only to thievery in the homes of their parents and relatives but became shoplifters and common thieves, and that many of the young girls became prostitutes because of their craving for narcotics and the necessity of obtaining money to purchase enough to satisfy the daily needs of their uncontrollable craving.

The powerful stimulus of the constant threat of illness soon dominates the life of an addict. In the case of the school youth they start diverting their money for lunches and other school expenses to the purchase of narcotics. Soon they must quit school so that they can devote full time to the pursuit of the money necessary to support their habit. The tragic record shows that the girls usually drift into prostitution as one way to obtain the money necessary, and the boys drift into thievery of all kinds and into gambling. Usually the thefts first take the form of stealing valuables from the home to be pawned. Sooner or later, if the parents or guardians do not learn of the addiction and place the patient under treatment, continued thefts outside the home come to the attention of the juvenile authorities. From the foregoing facts your grand jurors reach the inescapable conclusion that narcotic addiction is the root of, and is responsible for, the widespread wave of crime that constantly plagues our society.

Your grand jurors find that the smoking of marihuana has become the daring thing to do among our school children of the teen-age group, and an increasing number of those who experiment with marihuana go on to experiment with the innocent looking white powder known as heroin, which has suddenly become so easy to purchase in many neighborhoods near schools. At first, there doesn't seem to be much difference between smoking marihuana cigarettes and sniffing white powder in searching for a thrill; the tragic fact is that the majority of the youngsters who start experimenting with heroin do not know that a physical dependence is developed which makes it impossible to stop taking it without becoming desperately ill. The painful withdrawal from heroin and other similar narcotic drugs can be accomplished only by a harrowing withdrawal illness of 10 to 14 days' duration, followed by a period of several months of convalescence

and rehabilitation if the patient is to have any chance of remaining off drugs. From sniffing heroin ("snorting" is the less elegant expression), the new addict soon has to shift to the hypodermic or intravenous injection of heroin by syringe and needle in order to obtain the maximum effect from the drug which his body now demands.

Your grand jurors find that these young people first commenced the use of marihuana through association with those who had formed the habit; that their curiosity contributed to the habit of smoking marihuana and soon thereafter the nervous condition brought on by the smoking of marihuana led them to the use of heroin, which created not a habit but an addiction, dominating their bodies and minds. Your grand jurors were amazed and appalled by the revelations which reflected the moral degradation of the individual and the disintegration of the family life of those who were affected—the misery and sorrow that is caused by narcotic addiction can only be attested to by families whose members have become victims.

Your grand jurors find that in some instances these young people were able to obtain marihuana in stores across the street from some of the schools in Detroit, where they not only purchased it, but were given the opportunity to smoke it. In most of these cases, we find that the student would soon leave school to follow other smokers whose paths lead to bars where the bands are patronized, to a great extent, by young people. We find that there is a strong propensity on the part of users of marihuana to follow bands, a good many of whose members are marihuana smokers, and whose popularity with the so-called "be-bop" music attract large numbers of young people to dance halls and bars, and other places where liquor is dispensed. It was in such associations that most of the marihuana users were introduced to heroin, and once introduced to heroin, they became "hooked."

We find that treatment of the individual addict is extremely important, not only to bring about the rehabilitation of the individual, but also because drug addiction is, in a sense, infectious. Each active addict at liberty in the population acts as a focus for spreading addiction. In teen-agers, the invariable history is that addiction started as the result of association with another addict.

We find that some parents of victims were extremely remiss in their parental duties, manifesting in some cases a total lack of solicitude towards the welfare of their children; that many parents are completely indifferent as to the whereabouts of their children, their associations and social diversions or recreation, and many of these young people were left to themselves to mold their lives without any parental guidance or interest, rendering them in many instances easy prey to evil influences. The indifference and ignorance of some parents was so incredibly profound that some of these children were able to smoke marihuana and even inject heroin in their homes without detection for long periods of time.

We find that in the past very little emphasis has been placed upon the provision of adequate personnel for the enforcement of the narcotic laws; that apathy and total lack of appreciation of the importance of adequate and proper enforcement of the narcotic laws is responsible for the unbelievable numbers of narcotic peddlers providing the teen-agers with a facility for the purchase of narcotics which has led to the increase of narcotic addiction now rampant in our communities, and that, as many teen-agers testified before us, narcotic addiction will continue to increase unless a positive and systematic program of apprehending and prosecuting those who commercialize the illicit sale of narcotics is put into operation and supported with unrelenting vigor.

We therefore recommend the passage of Congressman DONOVAN'S bill, H. R. 2340, as the best weapon to suppress the abuse of narcotic drugs. This bill provides a mandatory sentence of 5 years for the second offense for narcotic peddling and 10 years for the third offense. This recommendation is made without any reflection upon the judge of the eastern district of Michigan, whose heavy sentences in these cases have helped to prevent a much heavier traffic in illicit narcotics here than we now have.

We recommend that the State Legislature of Michigan enact the following amendment to the State Uniform Narcotic Act, and suggest that other States adopt this amendment:

"Whoever violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $——— and be imprisoned not less than 2 or more than 5 years. For a second offense, or in the case of a first conviction of violation of any provision of this act, the offender shall previously have been convicted of any violation of the laws of the United States or of any other State, territory, or district relating to narcotic drugs or marihuana, the offender shall be fined not more than $——— and be imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 10 years. For a third or subsequent offense, or if the offender shall previously have been convicted two or more times in the aggregate of any violation of the law of the United States or of any other State, territory or district relating to narcotic drugs or marihuana, the offender shall be fined not more than $———, and be imprisoned not less than 10 years or more than 20 years. Except in the case of conviction for a first offense for violation of the provisions of this act, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation or parole shall not be granted until the minimum imprisonment herein provided for the offense shall have been served."

We recommend that legislation now before the Michigan State Legislature providing, in substance, that persons under the age of 21 be excluded from establishments where intoxicating liquor is dispensed by one glass, be passed.

We find that some countries in Europe, particularly Italy and Turkey, where heroin is produced for medical purposes, for some unexplainable reason have a production of heroin far in excess of their medical needs. We find that of such excess of heroin produced by these foreign countries, a goodly proportion is being smuggled into the United States and thereafter is being illicitly sold here.

We find that the smuggling of narcotics into the United States from these countries is carried on to a great extent by seamen on steamships traveling between Europe and the United States. We find that vigorous measures to deter these seamen from smuggling must be applied, and that if such measures were used—such as permanent revocation of seamen's licenses and vigorous prosecution upon detection—the supply of illicit heroin in the United States would be reduced to a minimum. This would eliminate many peddlers and the consequent exposure of our youth to drugs.

We recommend that seamen detected in smuggling narcotics into the United States be severely punished by permanent revocation of their licenses, disbarment from membership in mariners' unions, and criminal prosecution. We urge that the United Nations Narcotic Commission make a firm and unrelenting effort to bring about the same vigorous measures in punishing seamen of other nations for the same violations.

We strongly recommend that the United Nations Narcotic Commission exert its influence upon those nations producing narcotics beyond their medical needs and that said Commission request these nations that the production of narcotics be limited to the necessary medical needs of their countries. We make this recommendation with the firm belief and understanding that the elimination of excessive production of narcotics on the part of some of these foreign countries will have a most beneficial effect upon the United States by eliminating much of the illicit narcotics now being smuggled into the United States.

We strongly recommend that the Congress of the United States make immediate appropriation of funds necessary to increase the facilities of the United States Public Health hospitals for the treatment of addicts at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex.

We strongly recommend that the Congress of the United States provide the Federal Bureau of Narcotics with more agents for the entire country, in order to bring about satisfactory enforcement of the law. This recommendation is made with the firm belief and conviction that unless the Federal Bureau of Narcotics is given sufficient personnel to cope with the illicit narcotic traffic, our youth will be constantly in danger.

We recommend that the city of Detroit, as well as other cities throughout the United States, increase their narcotic police forces. This recommendation is made with the firm belief and conviction that adequate personnel in a municipality for the enforcement of the narcotic laws will compensate for itself in relief from crime such as larceny, robbery, housebreaking, and prostitution, which are crimes generally engaged in by addicts to obtain money to support their addiction.

We find that the use of marihuana alone does not create an addiction, and that while the use of marihuana leads to the use of heroin, marihuana does not develop a physical dependence such as is developed following the use of heroin. We, therefore, find that exemption from military service of those found to be using marihuana is not justified. We recommend that no exemptions from military service be given to those merely using marihuana. We recommend that the military authorities set up a special work detail where those using marihuana to any substantial extent may be temporarily confined and rehabilitated for military service.

We recommend that the Michigan State Legislature pass legislation to quarantine drug addicts by requiring them to be committed to hospitals until they are pronounced cured by medical authorities.

Your grand jurors feel that the advisability and propriety of establishing an educational program for dissemination of information concerning narcotic addiction requires a more serious study.

The grand jury deplores the unnecessary publicity which followed the narcotic conviction of a popular picture star and the exploitation of this conviction by certain Hollywood studios, which had a telling impact on many young people who began using narcotics. Glorification of persons who have been connected with the narcotic racket is bound to have a detrimental effect on persons of impressionable age, and glamorizing these questionable characters has contributed to the current wave of youthful addiction.

We urge that the Michigan Liquor Control Commission and other law enforcement agencies increase their vigilance over those bars where the bands feature so-called be-bop music and attract large numbers of our teen-agers.

We urge that the owners of these establishments be compelled to assume more responsibility in guarding against persons suspected of dispensing narcotics; and that while most of these licensees are sincere in complying with the regulations to which they are subject, a few of them have shown a definite indifference to the presence of narcotic users and peddlers in their business places, and we recommend that the Michigan Liquor Control Commission consider seriously the revocation of licenses issued to those who display a lack of interest in and responsibility for the presence of suspected users and peddlers of narcotics in their places of business.

We urge that the parent-teacher organizations become more militant in a program of definitely eradicating demoralizing influences in the vicinity of the schools; that such organizations recruit for members more parents of high-school students, and adopt a system of screening, with vigorous and unrelenting determination, all business places in close proximity to school areas.

We urge that all civic organizations, particularly businessmen's organizations, in our communities seek out the business places where young people are permitted to congregate for long periods of time without any apparent reason and ascertain whether the owners thereof are sincere and conscientious in their efforts to detect the use of marihuana; that they expose business places where tolerance and indifference of the owners have made possible conditions under which users and peddlers of marihuana have flourished with impunity. We firmly believe that a cooperative program on the part of these organizations will contribute materially toward discouraging the use of narcotics among our young people.

Your grand jurors express their gratitude for the splendid cooperation given by the office of the United States district attorney, the agents of the Bureau of Narcotics, and the local bureau of narcotics. These agents are to be complimented for their devotion to their duties, working long hours under difficult conditions with inadequate personnel.

Your grand jury wishes to impress upon everyone that the problem of narcotic addiction places a responsibility not just on the enforcement officers, the social workers, the school authorities, or on any one segment of society, but upon every one of us. We must assume that responsibility and use whatever resources may be at our disposal to combat in every possible way the evil forces and influences that have, thus far, demoralized our youth to an alarming degree.

Respectfully submitted.

In the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commonweal:

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In March 1945, a few days before the death of President Roosevelt, Robert Sherwood returned to this country from the Pacific theater of operations where he had made an inspection tour for the President, having been especially instructed to get General MacArthur's views on our future Pacific policy. When Sherwood, who said he was enormously impressed with the range of MacArthur's views on the Orient, made his report to Roosevelt, the President remarked: "I wish that he (MacArthur) would sometimes tell some of these things to me." So deeply suspicious of the Democratic administration were MacArthur and his staff, that Sherwood said he found the unmistakable signs of a persecution complex at work in the MacArthur entourage.

In recent months General MacArthur chose to impose his private views on his Commander in Chief by means of a message to a veterans' convention, an unauthorized message and implied challenge to the Chinese commander in Korea, and a letter to the minority leader of the House. All told, one can only judge these actions to have been the behavior pattern of a man who put himself above the laws of courtesy and country.

MacArthur's opinion on Pacific policy—which is, that Asia is the decisive battlefield to be defended against the Coramunists and that therefore we should extend and not limit the Korean war—is an opinion totally in opposition to American foreign policy; in holding this opinion, MacArthur was defying the judgment of the President, the State Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Eisenhower, the majority of the United Nations and the majority of the Congress. One may, if he is an admirer of the general's, believe that the general was acting in a democratic manner, in deference to the will of the majority and in the best interests of the principle we fight for, the principle of the democratic way of life. But the burden of the proof is on him. This, it seems to us, was the behavior of a man in defiance of the majority, a man with a will-to-power that was contemptuous of the prevailing reason of the majority; this, in short, was the behavior of the self-appointed genius who always thinks he knows what is best for the ignorant masses and whose actions are in the pattern of history's long chronicle of dictators.

Maybe MacArthur was right; maybe he was one of those rare and enlightened leaders destined to show mankind the way. Certainly he had reason to be restive, since he had been in a most difficult military position ever since the United Nations was forced to defend itself on the distant and disadvantageous Korean Peninsula.

But in our judgment MacArthur was disastrously wrong and we are of the opinion that the mystique of his enlightened leadership was a cult too jealously guarded by a selected group of admirers to be genuine. We consider MacArthur's policy to have been wrong for the following reasons:

First, we believe that in order to wage war now against the West, the Soviets must have the steel-making capacity of the Ruhr, or Japan, or both. Therefore western policy should be to prohibit Russia from the Ruhr and Japan by building up a defensive position in the free world with all haste, in the hope of stalemating the threat of a world war.

Second, we believe that in order to give us time to build these defenses, every effort should be made to limit the Korean war to Korea, because to bomb Manchuria means to bomb the rest of China eventually, and this in turn means that Russia will be forced to come to the direct aid of Mao Tse-tung. Since the United States cannot hope to defeat the Communists through nonatomic air power alone (we could not destroy the North Korean army with air power, nor can we destroy the Chinese armies now, even though we have had absolute control of the air), we would, then, following MacArthur's strategy, have to send our armies into the futile and bloody trap of a land war in Asia. Were this to happen, Russia would have accomplished her desire to spread and thin out our nonatomic air and land forces around the world to a point of such overextension that it is doubtful whether Western arms could be supreme in any one theater of war.

Third, since it is possible that under such circumstances the great powers will resort to atomic warfare (especially if the rumored atomic artillery shells are a reality), we believe that it is the moral obligation of Christians first to exhaust every possible means of averting this unspeakable massacre, and one of those means right now is to limit the war to Korea, making every effort to discharge our moral obligation to defend the United Nations there without providing further conflict.

Fourth, we believe that the present foreign policy of the administration is essentially correct in its European emphasis and in its combined objective of defense and negotiation. This policy is by far a better hope for an honorable peace than the swaggering belligerency of MacArthur.

In his last attempts to dictate the far eastern foreign policy of this country and of the United Nations, General MacArthur clearly exceeded his authority and, in defying the normal processes of the democratic code, he placed himself outside the cause and the ideology we are trying to defend; he in fact brought on his own dismissal. Surely the President acted with sincere regret, as he has said. But certainly his decision was for the common good; it was, we believe, the only decision he could have taken in the interests of discharging his responsibility to the country and to all those throughout the world who look to us now for a reasonable example of leadership.

In a very real sense Mr. Truman could only afford to make this decision trusting in the ability of his countrymen to weigh the facts impartially; if the MacArthur partisans choose to attack Mr. Truman as wildly as we anticipate they will, then we believe that those who support the President in this matter have every good reason to stand by him now and thus vindicate the high trust he has placed in them.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unacceptable Explanation," from the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNACCEPTABLE EXPLANATION

In his radio address to the Nation Wednesday night, President Truman attempted to justify his summary dismissal of General MacArthur by explaining that the general is not in agreement with United States and UN policy in the Far East.

Even if one grants that this is true, it by no means will be deemed a sufficient excuse by MacArthur's admirers and supporters for the harsh and spectacular method used in ousting the general from all his commands.

But it is also true that millions are by no means convinced United States and UN policy, as President Truman outlined it, has been clear enough heretofore for General MacArthur or anybody else to understand just what it is or has been.

Merely to plead that we want no third world war is no explanation for the unceremonious firing of MacArthur. Nobody wants a third world war. Certainly MacArthur doesn't. But neither he nor millions of others are ready to accept a back-down from the position taken by the United States and the UN last June as the only safe recipe for avoiding a third world war.

Such a back-down is exactly what is proposed by the Asia policy as described by President Truman Wednesday night.

When he directed MacArthur to use United States military forces to challenge the aggression of North Koreans last June the idea was that the free nations of the world must make all of Korea safe for freedom. Now the President and his advisers are apparently convinced we cannot do this; that the best out is to accept a compromise that will leave the North Koreans at the thirty-eighth parallel to ready themselves for another march into South Korea at some future date.

Is it surprising General MacArthur would be dissatisfied with any such conclusion to a war that has already cost the United States more than 50,000 casualties? He is the type that believes in finishing a job. He doesn't accept defeat, partial or complete, with complacency—which is the major explanation for his great popularity with so many Americans. And which also is a major and sufficient reason why he should never have been subjected to the outrageous treatment he has been accorded.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter I have received from the rector of Christ Church, Episcopal, of Lexington, Ky. The Reverend James W. Kennedy is pastor of the church of which I am a member. He is the author of the book The Man Who Wanted to Know, and has created the character "Parson Jim" in writings and radio programs.

Personally, I am very much impressed with his plea for wheat for India, because it strips this issue of all the doubts that surround it. This includes, of course, concern over the policies of the representatives of India in the United Nations. No one will question the use of our surplus wheat for this purpose when it is considered entirely as a humanitarian act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRIST CHURCH,
Lexington, Ky., April 14, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR UNDERWOOD: I quite realize the tremendous difficulties in the way of passing that wheat for India bill, both from the standpoint of governmental red tape and the private transportation facilities which it would require. I am also convinced that there is no intention on the part of either the Senate or the House of Representatives to use this bill as a political measure. When I think of the amazing job which Florence Nightingale did in the face of insuperable odds, and those odds mainly with Government officials and procedures, I realize that anything, no matter what it is, if it is right and needful, can be accomplished, provided however there is one man or one woman utterly convinced and given to the cause. I believe more than any other single factor our delay in doing this Christian act has lost us more support in the world at large than any other single thing. Certainly the motivation behind it should not be to gain the good will of anybody, but to recognize the terrible needs which at least we can do what we can to meet.

I feel very strongly about this and I wish there were something I could do about it. I am sure you will do what you can. If only the sentiment of the country could filter into the committee where this is holed up. I believe this humanitarian step must be taken in God's name, or we'll never be able to look ourselves in the face again.

Best regards,

JAMES W. KENNEDY.

The Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a powerful editorial which appeared in the Lathrop (Mo.) Optimist, April 12, 1951. It was evidently written by E. L. Fisher, the editor and owner of this excellent paper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR IS FIRED

Truman has fired General MacArthur. He says, to save the lives of American boys; to prevent the war from spreading beyond Korea. So, American boys and a few from other nations are to continue to give their lives indefinitely fighting Red Chinese who can retire behind a boundary line and be free from any attack by land, air, or sea while they mass their forces to sufficient strength to attack again. They can repeat this maneuver unlimited times until they mass sufficient strength to overwhelm us.

MacArthur kept insisting that a second front consisting of anti-Communist Chinese be armed and given the go sign. No one denies that there are millions of Chinese who are anti-Red, who would love to fight the Communists if they had anything more than sticks and stones for weapons. General MacArthur believes, along with millions of other Americans, that the quickest way to end the war (or Truman's police action) is to use these millions of Chinese on a second front. America is the greatest industrial nation in the world; but we do not have the most manpower. We are pitifully short on manpower compared with China and Russia. But, we could use our vast industrial ability, arm millions of Chinese to fight the Red Chinese, thus combining Nationalist China's manpower and our productive capacity. This should be a winning team if given a chance. But this seems to have no chance under Truman. What if we did have to put a few troops along with the Chinese? An American life lost there is no more precious than one in Korea.

Truman and his advisers have been proven wrong so much in recent events that it is difficult to have any confidence in their judgment now.

Remember, Truman withdrew an American army of 40,000 men from South Korea a few months before the Communist-led North Koreans attacked South Korea. If they had been there well armed, the Reds would not have dared to attack. That blunder started the whole war that has cost all these American lives.

It all adds up to this: Truman has fired one of the most, if not the most, brilliant military men this Nation has ever produced and has failed to accomplish anything by it.

Limited Expansion of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding General MacArthur's address before the joint meeting of Congress, which appeared in the Bluefield (W. Va.) Sunset News of April 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General MacArthur's address to the Congress yesterday was able and more than a little moving in many places. The dramatic manner in which the "old soldier" appeared before the joint session will do more to help sell his point of view than all the words of all the others who favor the policies he advocates.

Except for the maudlin ending of the speech, the general spoke with obvious conviction and sincerity. He condemned the Truman administration's policy in Korea and the Orient, but there was none of the politics evident in the general's speech which others have been carrying on in his name.

MacArthur, however, said little that he has not said before, except his assertion that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have favored broadening the war. That is sharply at variance with the statements of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Omar Bradley, who on Tuesday rejected MacArthur's views and stated categorically that MacArthur's military policies "would jeopardize world peace."

The general did not at any point question the President's right to remove him from command, nor did he deny what most commentators have termed his insubordination. On the contrary, he restated the policies which he previously advocated and which led to his dismissal.

In essence, MacArthur called for a limited expansion of the war in Korea by economic and naval blockade of China, by air operations over China, and by the use of Chiang Kai-shek's nationalist troops on Formosa.

These are proposals which have been considered and turned down, by the civilian policy makers of the Government, and, presumably, by the Joint Chiefs. They were rejected on the basis that although these operations might be conceived on a limited scale, keeping them limited could prove impossible.

The issue seems to us to boil down to this: Can there in practice be any such thing as the limited expansion of the war which MacArthur favors? Can United States objectives in Asia be attained in any other manner? And, if not, are we prepared to fight Russia in Asia, in Europe, or on any other front she might choose such as the Middle East?

It is quite true that we fought World War II on two fronts against great odds and won. If we have to, we can do it again. But let us go into this thing realistically, rather than on a wave of emotional patriotism stirred by a popular military hero.

MacArthur stated that he did not believe the prospect of having to fight on two fronts should deter this Nation. He said that Russia, too, would be fighting on two fronts. But what he did not say is that Russia would be supplying her armies over shorter land routes while we supplied our's across the vast distances of oceans, which this time would be infested with Russian submarines. Nor did he mention the fact that the brunt of Russia's war in the Far East would be borne not by Russians but by China's almost limitless manpower.

MacArthur's chief point was that he does not believe that Russia would necessarily come into the fight. But that is only conjecture. She might and she might not. All we know is that she has an agreement to come to the aid of the Chinese Communists in the event of attack which she might want to keep because of the effect on her other satellites, and that, further, she is masterminding the Korean war.

We agree with MacArthur that it is vital to American security to keep a firm hold on Formosa, but as for his plan to use Chiang Kai-shek's ill-equipped troops, that is another question. The general called for United States logistical support for them, but many competent observers say it would take much more. Chiang lacks sea and air power for an invasion and the only nation we know of which could supply such power is the United States.

Perhaps if the isolationists who have climbed on the MacArthur bandwagon had been a little less bent on keeping the United States from building up its strength, we might be in a better position now to risk starting world war III.

This newspaper has consistently and strongly advocated armed strength as the only answer to the Russian menace. We advocate that now. We firmly believe that only in strength is there a chance for peace.

But we do not advocate starting a new global war now—at least not until we are strong enough to win it, or until such time as the American people demonstrate they want such a war and are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to insure its success. Wars must be made of sterner stuff than ovations for heroic generals.

One positive gain for the Nation could result from all the controversy which the MacArthur case has caused. If the country faced now with the necessity of reiterating its present Asian and world policy or formulating a new and even stronger one—is stirred to a faster rearmament peace General MacArthur will have rendered another invaluable service.

The controversy centers upon the fact that our armed strength is not yet great enough to meet the challenges which it faces.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Wrong Man Was Fired," from the Aurora (Mo.) Advertiser of April 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WRONG MAN WAS FIRED

There must be rejoicing in the Kremlin today. For Harry Truman has fired the man who has stood as the bulwark against complete Communist domination in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

And he did it with all the finesse of a Kansas City gangster bumping off a victim, or a mad butcher wielding a meat ax. The manner he chose is, in military circles, considered as only less disgraceful than by court martial, and many officers in similar straits have demanded a trial so that they could be heard. General MacArthur, notwithstanding he had committed the unpardonable sin of making an accidental President jealous by his stature and by his standing with the American people, deserved better than this.

The dismissal of MacArthur makes it official—ours are suicide troops fighting in Korea. We are not after military victory. They must fight on—die on— until diplomats who have messed up everything they have handled in the past finally achieve a Munich in the Far East. Not only that—any commander who speaks out against such folly must face the headsman's ax.

Yes, it is as if the bat boy had booted Joe DiMaggio off the squad—as if the office boy had fired the chairman of the board. For the man who keeps a General Vaughn has dared deprive the Nation of the services of a Douglas MacArthur.

Why was MacArthur fired?

He was fired because he sickened at the sight of American boys dying in a fight they cannot win. He was fired because he believes we should accept the eagerly offered help of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's armies. He was fired because he tried to secure permission to blockade our enemy's ports, and to bomb the transportation centers through which are moving the men and materials which are killing American boys. He was fired because he asked for more American troops to help fight against such odds. He was fired because when he could not get action from an administration which has made such a muddle of things in the Far East and entangled us in such a hopeless fight he disregarded regulations and discharged his greater duty of informing the American people of the truth as he sees it.

He who dared speak out against a policy Prime Minister Mentzies of Australia has dubbed "midsummer madness" gets the sack.

The administration may try to tell the people MacArthur was relieved because he wanted to embroil us in a big land war in Asia. This is poppycock. He wanted nothing more than to turn Chinese loose on Chinese to blockade China's ports, to bomb Manchuria. A few months ago the general publicly stated that anyone who advocates invading China with American troops should have his head examined.

Yes, Harry Truman fired General MacArthur. Yes, the Stars and stripes have dipped to the Union Jack. Yes, our free enterprise country has knuckled under to Britian's socialist failures. We who put up with a Montie when we were furnishing the bulk of the troops must give up a MacArthur because a government contributing only a token force in Korea does not like him. Yes, American interests have been sacrificed to those of the British Empire.

Let's look at MacArthur.

Fourteen years ago, back in 1937 when an administration in Washington was serenely sure no war was ahead, General Douglas MacArthur, retired after a brilliant career which carried him to the top as Chief of Staff, left for the Phillipines to try to build up the Philippine National Guard against the war MacArthur saw brewing in the Far East. He wasn't given time enough, money enough, help enough, yet when Pearl Harbor came along he and his slender forces waged an epic fight for months against overwhelming odds.

Later, island by island, without a single bloody mistake, without taking a single backward step, using the gleanings left over after the needs of the European campaign had been met, he led our forces to victory over Japan months or years before Washington thought possible.

Then, within few short years as head of the occupation in Japan, he built it into a democratic, friendly ally, far more true than many of those beside whom we fought in World War II. He kept the Commies out of Japan. There were no such occupation headaches as came out of Germany.

In Korea, bound and shackled by ridiculous restrictions and never with enough troops to do the job, he first licked the North Koreans and then the Red Chinese, and had them on the run at the very moment the man who should have been his stanchest backer publicly disgraced him at a 1 a. m. press conference, about which MacArthur first heard on the radio.

In all those 14 years MacArthur has served this country well. In every endeavor of his life he has been a success. No American leader today knows the problems of the Far East so well, or understands the Orient so thoroughly. Never have his talents been so needed by the people.

It is to be hoped that General MacArthur will now return home and speak freely, that he will rally the American people to force our policy into saner channels.

What has happened is tragic, for the wrong man has been fired. The American people would reverse the situation if but given the chance, judging by the temper of Aurorans today.

"There Has Been No Problem Out of the Hundreds in Government to Which John W. Snyder Has Put His Hand but What He Brought Order Out of Chaos, Successes Out of Failures, and Profits Out of Losses"—Frank W. Boykin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, last week I flew home to my district with a heavy heart. I had anticipated for months that traveling with me on that visit would be my good friend and your good friend, Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury. I left him, thank God, well on the road to complete recovery after a serious eye operation, but still in the hospital and unable to make the journey.

The occasion of Secretary Snyder's visit to Mobile was to be in attendance at the annual convention of the Independent Bankers Association of the United States; and, inasmuch as he had previously written an article on the savings-bond program exclusively for the Independent Bankers magazine, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the

RECORD both the talk which I made in Mobile and an article entitled "A Report on the Savings Bond Program."

In the absence of Secretary Snyder, I made the following talk:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, members of the Independent Bankers Association of the United States, and friends, I had long looked forward to this day in Mobile.

I know of no greater honor that could have been paid our city or of a finer American who could have visited us than Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury of these United States.

I note the score that your association placed upon having him here as your principal speaker, and I share with you the keen disappointment that he is not here that we might do him honor.

I am, moreover, concerned with the fact that I left him in Washington recovering from an eye operation, and I know that it is the sense of every man present that the Good Lord keep and preserve John Snyder for many, many years to come, and continue him in the wonderful work that he is doing for our country.

I know of no greater honor that could have been bestowed upon me than to have been chosen to present to you a good, true, and long-time friend—humble, sincere, and yet, at the one time, one of the greatest men in our country today—Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, and second not even to Andrew Mellon or Alexander Hamilton as the greatest Secretary of the Treasury that this country has ever had.

Mr. Chairman, I need neither point up nor elaborate upon the confusion which we see on every hand in this country today. I am, however, assured by those who have recently returned from Europe as well as from the Middle East and the Far East, that the confusion which we know is not peculiar to these United States, but is, rather, world-wide in its scope.

Upon second thought, it is not hard for any contemplative mind to understand the unrest which exists everywhere on earth when one thinks of the millions upon millions of people who are only now emerging—or shall I say being projected—from centuries of autocratic rule into some form or another of self government entirely new to them.

Mr. Chairman, it is scarcely a fortnight since I sat in my office, one evening, discussing with a learned savant the tremendous changes that have been wrought in world governments in the last half century.

It seems like only yesterday that practically all the European and Asiatic governments were dominated by kings, shahs, sultans, kaisers, emperors, and czars. All were more or less absolute monarchs, whose decrees had the force of laws. In the short space of the last three or four decades, however, all of this has changed. Now there are but few royal monarchs sitting on thrones in today's world—and where that type of government still exists, it is more or less symbolic inasmuch as the crowned heads of such countries are more or less social entities and have little or no say with respect to executive, legislative, and judicial procedures. This, in a large measure, has led to the abdication of democratic processes and the success of dictatorship in lieu thereof.

Even here on our shore there have been marked extensions of human rights and liberties, although from abroad as well as at home have come problems that today are trying the very souls of men.

At the turn of the century a substantial portion of the business of this Nation was conducted in the coin of the realm. The pay envelopes of the workers, in both public and private employment, were stuffed with hard money or, at best, with but a little folding money. Such folding money as was in circulation was backed by huge deposits of gold and silver in the vaults of the United States. That, too, has now changed.

Currency or money today, either in the shape of coins or bills, is used merely as tokens and circulated for convenience' sake only.

Today the Nation's business is done under a system of credit rather than on a monetary basis. John Jones has so many dollars' credit to his account in the bank. Bill Smith, a carpenter, does a job for John Jones—and Jones transfers some of his credit to Smith. Now Smith has credit in the bank and he, in turn, issues checks to the rent man, one to the electric light or gas company, one to his grocer, etc. All, in turn, make deposit of these checks which, again, increases their credits, so that, in the large-wise, it might be said that society, as constituted here in America, is today transacting business on the basis of a credit system rather than on a basis of money itself.

I know that all of what I am saying seems elementary to this skilled and experienced banking group; but, concomitant with the turn of the century and, more specifically, upon declaration of World War I, the Federal Government itself began the extensive use of credits and the issuance of long-term bonds to finance its war and other operations—all of which resulted in a huge indebtedness and a great public debt.

Mr. Chairman, it is almost superfluous for me to say that never in history has our Government had to face the problem of managing the public debts that it faces today.

Fortunately, we have as Secretary of the Treasury in the personality of your good friend and my good friend, John W. Snyder, a man distinguished by the genius of his leadership as well as one who inspires the solid confidence of all of his fellow men.

No nation in history has had to struggle more to manage a debt so huge that it taxes both the ability and the willingness of our people to meet it.

Enormous as was our indebtedness when we emerged from World War I, it still was insignificant as compared with the one that exists today.

By way of contrast the problems which faced our country then pale into insignificance.

It is no disparagement to point out that subsequent to World War II and in May 1920, it was practically impossible for the municipalities and States of these United States to sell a single issue of bonds, even though they carried as much as 5 percent interest per annum.

The lack of confidence in the ability of the Treasurer of the United States to manage the debt of that day was so shattered—that a single break in Government bond prices carried United States Liberty Bond issues to discounts of almost 20 percent below par.

Billions of dollars were lost to the holders of all types of bonds—Federal, State, county, municipal, and other bonds—with the financial panic that then swept the country.

True understanding and the real test of successful debt management is best expressed in the situation which exists today with respect to the value of all outstanding issues.

With more than two hundred and sixty billions outstanding, no one person has lost as much as a single penny. This has been due to the effectiveness of stabilization—the Federal-bond program and the successful management of the debt. These are wholly and directly attributable to the understanding, will, skill, and ability of John Wesley Snyder, our great Secretary of the Treasury.

It is indeed no happenstance that John Snyder was able to meet the tremendous task assigned him by the President of the United States when he called him to serve as the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

My friends, I do not have to tell you that John Snyder is no Wall Street tycoon. That he is no feudal baron called into office to serve vested banking interests, international or otherwise—that he is now and has always been a true public servant.

Scarcely 23 years of age, he entered the banking field as a bookkeeper for the First National Bank of a little city in Arkansas. In one aspect or another he has been in the banking business all of his life.

John Snyder has first-hand knowledge of the banking problems of the small-business man, the cotton, the peanut, the tobacco and the wheat farmer. He knows the fiscal problems of the cattle and the hog raisers and to my own mind, no man in the history of our country, with the possible exception of Alexander Hamilton or Andrew Mellon, has had such a comprehensive experience and deep understanding of banking and currency as that possessed by Secretary Snyder.

His steady advancement in his chosen profession had so marked him among those of his profession in the Middle West that it is small wonder he was called into service by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States in 1931.

There, serving as the principal assistant to the receiver of banks, he conducted all administrative duties incident to the liquidation of a vast number of insolvent national banks subsequent to the world-wide depression of 1930.

During the next 5 years, which followed his induction, he proved himself to be probably the greatest administrator and authority on bank liquidation that this world has ever seen.

Mr. Chairman, it was not until 1940 that Mr. Snyder was brought to Washington as special assistant to the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Board. To this duty later was added those of the assistant to the full Board of Directors of that mammoth fiscal organization.

"It was here that his superb talents were directed to developing a program to provide for the building, the equipment, and expansion of war defense plants, and from the inception of the War Plants Corporation, Mr. Snyder was installed as operational vice president and director.

"Within 1 year from the day upon which that huge Corporation was founded, more than $1,000,000,000 had been committed to the construction and equipment of stupendous industrial plants in order to more successfully, economically, and expeditiously prosecute the war effort.

"By the end of 1944, commitments in excess of $10,000,000,000, covering aircraft, steel, machine tool, aluminum, magnesium, chemical, and ordnance facilities were financed. With prudence, sagacity, economic and financial soundness, and in wisdom—moneys had been advanced for plants to manufacture synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline (facilities and pipelines), and the United States Defense Plant Corporation owned not alone nearly 1,000 new huge, gigantic manufacturing concerns but had also financed the expansion of hundreds of privately owned industries in 46 States of the Union.

"Outside of the continental limits of the United States, likewise, commitments had been made for the production of critical and strategic war materials in other countries which ran into the millions of dollars.

"Over this vast banking operation John W. Snyder, war buddy, bosom friend, confidant, and beloved coworker of President Harry Truman—exercising full sway—presided as active administrative officer.

When in July 1945 the President appointed Mr. Snyder Director of the War Mobilization and Reconversion, he immediately initiated an active program to deal with major problems of production and employment and to implement all economic adjustments necessary to a transition from war to peace.

"In preparation for VJ-day, he organized and held successive conference with the heads of all pertinent Government agencies to map out procedure. This to the end that when Japan sued for peace the machinery for a transition to a normal economy was all ready to be set in motion—the construction industry was freed from restrictive wartime controls, other limitations were eased or removed—labor difficulties were adjudicated, and labor strikes in such essential industries as steel and coal mining were quickly settled with both minimum of delay and dislocation in the reconversion program.

Mr. Chairman, I know John W. Snyder. I have been knowing him well—and for a long, long time.

I know that there has been no problem out of the hundreds in Government to which he has put his hand but what he brought—order out of chaos—success out of failure—and profit out of losses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is a single man sitting on either side of the aisle or in both Houses of Congress that did not feel a glow of pride when, on June 25, 1946, John W. Snyder, with all of his great, proven talents and greater abilities, was called to serve by the President as the Secretary of the Treasury of these United States.

Mr. Chairman, the responsibility of that office has grown steadily and tremendously—year by year—since the time it was administered by Alexander Hamilton. The Secretary of the Treasury is today charged by law with the management of the Nation's finances. He superintends the collection of all the internal revenues of the National Government. He directs the form and keeping of public accounts, prepares recommendations for taxation programs and for the support of the public credit.

The Secretary of the Treasury determines methods and policies relating to the procurement of Federal supplies. Under his jurisdiction comes the Coast Guard, the Secret Service, the Bureau of Narcotics, Customs and Internal Revenue. Through the Bureau of the Mint and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, he supervises the coinage and printing of all the money in the land.

Last, but not least, of all the stupendous tasks with which this eminently great public official is charged are all activities of the Bureau of Accounts and of Public Debt. An indefatigable worker, it is the latter single activity that keeps John W. Snyder at his desk until the late hours of the night in the conduct of transactions with respect to Government bonds and Government securities.

Mr. Chairman, my secretary only last Thursday advised me that the cloak rooms of the House were ringing with the praises of my good friend, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon pronouncement that he now hopes that he can avoid an increase in Federal income and other taxes in the year of 1952.

This was because in his recent appearance before the Ways and Means Committee, Secretary Snyder anticipated that he might, even this year, be able to decrease the Federal debt from income-tax receipts, and declared that he would ask for a second round of taxes—only if and when the budget picture changed so much that such a second round would be absolutely necessary to keep the Government out of the red.

Mr. Speaker, the article which Secretary Snyder wrote for the independent bankers magazine is as follows:

A REPORT ON THE SAVINGS BOND PROGRAM

(By John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury)

On May 1, 1951, the popular series E United States Savings bonds will begin to mature. During 1951 the E bond maturities will amount to $1,100,000,000.

Early this year legislation was introduced in the Congress to authorize the Treasury to provide a method whereby owners of matured series E Savings bonds who do not desire to cash them, may retain their Savings bond investment with no inconvenience to the holder. Some of the holders of maturing series E bonds may, of course, desire to cash them on maturity. These bondholders will find cash waiting for them at any of the 16,000 or more financial institutions which are authorized to redeem Savings bonds upon presentation by their owners. The Treasury believes, however, that a great many bondholders will wish to continue their investment in E bonds. Accordingly, a three-option plan was worked out for handling the maturing bonds.

The arrangements decided upon are that the owners of maturing E bonds may:

1. Accept cash, according to the original terms of the contract; or

2. Continue (subject to approval of Congress) to hold matured E bonds, and earn interest on full maturity value; or

3. Exchange the matured E bonds for current income Savings bonds of series G, in amounts of $500 and multiples thereof.

It bears repeating that under option 1, the owner of any maturing series E bond may receive full cash payment for his bond, if he desires. The Treasury wants this to be made absolutely clear to all E bond investors. Nor would a bondholder's choice of option 2 preclude the subsequent cashing of his bond. Matured E bonds which are retained under the extension plan would remain redeemable at any time.

Once the plan is placed in effect, its options will apply to all outstanding E bonds as they mature, and will apply, by right of contract, to all new series E savings bonds that are issued.

Option 2—that is, the option which permits extension with the payment of interest—would allow investors in E bonds to continue their investment without putting them to any trouble or inconvenience. A holder of a maturing E Bond who wishes to maintain his investment does not need to turn in his bond to effectuate the extension.

The tax feature of the plan—also subject to the approval of the Congress—would, in effect, disregard the original maturity date for series E savings bonds for purposes of tax treatment of interest, if a taxpayer elects to hold his investment in savings bonds in the manner provided by the extension plan. Under existing law, a cash-basis taxpayer may elect either (1) to pay income tax on interest in the year of redemption of the bonds or in the year of maturity, whichever first occurs, or (2) to pay the tax yearly as the interest accrues. Under the optional extension plan, interest on matured E bonds which are retained would not be taxable in the year of original maturity, but the entire amount of interest on the investment would be taxable at redemption or final maturity, unless the taxpayer elects to accrue interest on such bonds annually.

This tax provision would be applicable only to cash-basis taxpayers. It would not be applicable to corporations, or to taxpayers on the accrual method of accounting. No postponement of tax liability would be authorized when the bond owner exercises an option to exchange matured bonds for series G bonds.

As presented to the Congress, the extension option calls for the earning of interest on retained matured E bonds at the rate of 2½ percent simple interest for the first 7½ years, and interest thereafter at a rate sufficient to make the aggregate return for the 10-year extension period 2.9 percent, compounded semiannually. As an example of the operation of this option, it may be assumed that in May 1941, $75 was invested in a series E bond of $100 maturity value. The bond matures in May 1951. If the holder retained the bond for 10 more years under the option extension plan, he would receive $133.33 in May 1961.

The last of the series D savings bonds also are maturing this year. The extension plan would be limited to series E bonds and would not apply to series D bonds. The first series D maturities were in 1949. Obviously, serious administrative complications would arise from any attempt to make the extension plan retroactive. At the same time, it would be highly inequitable for the Government to apply the proposal to some series D bonds and not to others. Furthermore, it should be noted that the terms of issue of the vast majority of series D bonds were more favorable than the E bond terms, since all Government bonds issued prior to March 1, 1941, were wholly exempt from Federal income tax up to $5,000 principal amount.

The decisions with respect to the optional extension plan were made after long deliberation and extensive consultation, covering a period of nearly a year. The Treasury met with individuals and business, labor, industrial, and financial groups, who gave us the benefit of their thought and judgment as to a plan which would be in the best interest of both the bondholders and the Government. The program which was worked out was the result of this cooperative effort.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the readers of the Independent Banker, and others of the banking world, for the cooperation they have given the Treasury in the savings-bond program. A great majority of savings-bond owners look to their banks for information and advice about their savings-bond investments. The banks of the country have done a magnificent job in facilitating the smooth functioning of the whole savings-bond program. They can be equally helpful to the Treasury and to the public in carrying out the E bond maturities program.

MacArthur and Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the New York Times editorial of last Saturday headed "Heard Round the World," and also Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick's column, "Arrival and Departure at a Historic Crossroads," which appeared on the same page. I remind the Senate that last Saturday was the day of the late Senator Vandenberg's funeral. I read the Times editorial page on the plane on the way to Grand Rapids as a member of the official United States Senate delegation to the funeral. Against the background of his great leadership, this editorial and this important column by

Mrs. McCormick seem to be extraordinarily apt.

Mr. President, I submit that the Congress must join with the Administration in giving much more attention to the imponderables of foreign policy which, when disregarded, as the Times points out, have often led even the strongest military nations to disaster. We must now build firmly on that structure of policy Senator Vandenberg helped to build. I well remember, Mr. President, his guidance to me during my days as Assistant Secretary of State, when again and again I would slip into his office for advice. He never failed to live up in private to the great reputation for candor and courage which he had achieved publicly throughout the world.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 21, 1951]

HEARD ROUND THE WORLD

General MacArthur's speech before Congress has reverberated around the world, as was to be expected. Also, as was again to be expected, the world's attention is focused at the moment far more on the differences between MacArthur and the Administration, and especially on the possible consequences of the new controversy now dividing the strongest power of the free world, than on the more substantial areas of agreement. Yet, as in the case of the equally important debate on the issue of sending troops to Europe, the agreement on fundamentals is bound to prevail over the differences. There may be some adjustments on subordinate points, but in the end the sound sense of the American people will reassert itself, and this Nation will do whatever is necessary and possible to resist aggression, while striving to preserve the larger framework of world peace.

The areas of agreement have been obscured because the more dramatic passages of General MacArthur's speech dealt with the points of difference. But these areas of agreement are wide enough to assure continued action along lines that have been laid down. This means, first of all, continuation of the global struggle against Communist imperialism on both the Asiatic and the European fronts, and, for that matter, at all points of Communist aggression. It means rejection of any kind of appeasement, and a rapid build-up of our own and our Allies' military strength.

Beyond that, General MacArthur sees eye to eye with the Administration on other points. There are no differences between the two on the important question of Japan or on the proposed Japanese peace treaty. Both agree that the colonial era is being replaced in Asia by a resurgence of Asiatic nationalism which requires complete reorientation of Western policy, and one portion of MacArthur's speech can be quoted verbatim in support of President Truman's Point Four program. Even some of General MacArthur's specific recommendations are not so far out of line with Administration policy that they may not be adopted if circumstances warrant or conditions change. An economic blockade against China is already being considered by the Sanctions Committee of the United Nations. Formosa has not only never been promised to Communist China but the United States is already shipping military supplies to Chiang Kai-shek. Even bombing of Manchuria cannot be excluded if the enemy should resort to massive air attacks.

There are, however, two points on which the differences are substantial, and from these differences the whole controversy derives. One point is that General MacArthur apparently sees not only the Korean war but the whole struggle against Communist imperialism as an almost exclusively American affair, with little regard to the part which the United Nations, the North Atlantic alliance and all the other free nations of the world must play in it. That assumption, which ironically enough runs parallel with the Communist propaganda line, prompts him virtually to ignore the United Nations, whose first military commander he was, as well as the individual free nations and any views they may hold.

The second point of difference is that General MacArthur puts military necessity and quick victory above all other considerations and seems willing to run great risks in their name. That is a military point of view, appropriate for a commander bent upon achieving the objective set for him by the quickest route. But it cannot dominate the decisions of statesmen who must also take into account the political and moral imponderables on which, in the long run, final victory depends.

Disregard of such imponderables has often led to disaster for even the strongest military nations, and this consideration applies with special force to the Korean conflict, which is still dividing the United Nations and the extension of which could lead to consequences that might precipitate another new war requiring new strategic and political decisions, as did the Chinese intervention. It is for this reason that, sometimes in the face of even military advisability, the American Government is moving slowly in order to preserve as much unity as is possible within the United Nations and to avert an American isolation which is the first aim of Soviet policy and which is designed to make us fight a future war alone.

[From the New York Times of April 21, 1951]

ABROAD

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE AT A HISTORIC CROSSROADS

Among the saddest aspects of the stirring drama of the past few days is that the homecoming of General MacArthur overshadowed the passing of Senator Arthur Vandenberg. By custom the Senate adjourns when a Member dies, but on Thursday it had to meet with the House of Representatives to listen and pay honor to the eye-filling and ear-filling hero of the Pacific. Following the joint meeting, his colleagues paid brief tribute to a hero in another field, but their words were all but lost in the reverberating echoes of the oration they had just heard. Hence, even in his death the great Senator from Michigan, leader and victor in one of the most crucial political battles ever fought in the United States, was deprived by a strange coincidence of the full homage he deserved from his country and the world. In the tumult and the shouting acclaiming the warrior's return the departure of the statesman seemed a muted and lonely ending. It was the statesman who faded away and the old soldier who strode into the limelight and assumed a new role.

In a way, however, the simultaneous coming and going of MacArthur and Vandenberg fitted into the historic drama in which both played decisive parts. MacArthur's is not played out; he has captured the center of the stage by sheer power of personality and histrionic art. Instead of diminishing the legend, the real figure enhances it.

NO APPEAL FOR UNITY

The first speaker before the assembly who could be both seen and heard by a national audience, the General did not use that grandstand to make the irresistible appeal for unity that some of us hoped for. He did not carry on where Senator Vandenberg left off. Although he declared that the issues were "beyond the realm of partisan consideration," and although his speech cut across the ideas of hemispheric defense isolationists on the Republican side as well as the political realities on which the Administration bases its course, it is bound to deepen and sharpen division not only on military versus political strategy, but on strictly party lines.

Senator Vandenberg's aim was to unite the country behind a nonpartisan foreign policy. He was so manifestly the prime mover in gaining support for the measures like the Truman doctrine, the European Recovery Program, the Atlantic Pact, and the Pan-American treaty that some of the President's advisers, including General Marshall, suggested at one time that he be named Secretary of State in recognition of his invaluable services as chief architect of an all-American foreign policy.

No doubt General MacArthur also passionately desires an all-American policy, but on his own terms, which he believes basic to our security. Senator Vandenberg was so convinced that unity was the paramount consideration that he was willing to compromise on methods and details in order to achieve it. More important, he was able to convince the majority in his party that a united front at home with the prime essential of American influence abroad. The confusion and schisms in the Republic ranks since he became inactive give the measure of his leadership—and the void his passing leaves in the council of the Senate. His loss at this juncture is as tragic as the break with the Supreme Commander in the Pacific.

VANDENBERG'S LAST PLEA

Yet the structure of policy Vandenberg helped to build remains; it will not fall. He is said to have left a letter which will undoubtedly be a last plea for a closing of the ranks in the face of growing danger. Nor is it by any means certain that the great, if unfinished, work he accomplished will not be furthered rather than halted by MacArthur. Just by stressing the global nature of the war and the necessity of creating strength enough to fight it on both fronts, the general must shock many of his followers—those who clamor for priority for the Asian front, or those who favor a war so much more limited than the Administration that they don't want us to fight anywhere but at home.

The President must be a little shocked, too, to hear the deposed commander come out strongly for Mr. Truman's pet project. One of the most impressive passages in an impressive speech was the insistence of the revolutionary character of the changes in the Orient. In an adroit thrust at his critics in Europe, MacArthur emphasized that "the peoples of Asia found their opportunity in the war just past to throw off the shackles of colonialism and now see the dawn of new opportunity, and heretofore unfelt dignity, and the self-respect of political freedom." The things they strive for he said—food, clothing, shelter, "the realization of the nationalist urge for political freedom • • • form a backdrop to contemporary planning which must be thoughtfully considered if we are to avoid the pitfalls of unrealism."

What is this but support for Point Four? General MacArthur drew cheers for his advocacy of economic help for Asia, more cheers than the President's program had yet evoked from Congress. But the new crusader for Point Four must be a bit embarrassing for its sponsor just the same. Many commentators have pointed out that MacArthur's entry into the great debate actually narrows and simplifies the issues. At least it reveals that they are not fixed or static. The coming and going of two great figures, at the same time reminds us that both are characters in a moving drama in which events are constantly catching up with and modifying the opinions of men and the policies of governments.

General MacArthur's Address at the Joint Meeting of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful column by Lowell Mellett which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 21, last. The article is entitled "Question Must Be Answered."

Lowell Mellett is one of the most thoughtful columnists in Washington. He brings to journalism a rich, indeed, a unique, background as one of the great public servants of our time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTION MUST BE ANSWERED—SPECIFIC INFORMATION FROM GENERAL MACARTHUR BECOMES MORE IMPORTANT THAN SPEECHES AND RECEPTIONS

(By Lowell Mellett)

This one is not a very easy one to write. That's because it has to be written with the cheers for MacArthur still ringing in the air. It's no fun to be a wet blanket at a party. With this weary old town enjoying such an emotional upheaval as it hasn't had in many years, who wants to be the one to say, "Hey, stop, look, and listen or stop and think about what you've looked at and listened to"? Why not leave it alone?

Here's why. Like everybody else with a television set I watched General MacArthur make his speech to Congress and heard everything he said. Like most everybody else I was carried away at times by the man's eloquence. Nothing like it, in my experience, since the early days of William Jennings Bryan. It had everything. Home and mother, our brave boys, hatred of war, love of peace, old soldiers never die, and God bless America.

Far as I know the general believed every word he spoke and I'm sure he made an awful lot of other people believe. But what was the occasion for his speech and what was the basic issue he discussed? It was whether the President had dealt justly with him in relieving him of his command in the Pacific on the ground of insubordination; that, and whether he or the President had the truer concept of what our national policy should be.

As he outlined his own concept, one completely contrary to that of the President, he scarcely endeavored to defend himself against the charge of insubordination. He offered instead a countercharge. This was, in effect, that certain civilians had been permitted to overrule the Nation's best military brains in a military matter. He said—or, rather, he seemed to say—that he had voiced the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when he urged the bombing of Red Chinese supply bases in Manchuria and support for the return of Chiang Kai-shek's troops to the mainland. It wasn't surprising therefore that Republican Senators and Representatives leaped to their feet to give him the biggest cheer of the day. But it made you wonder. Had Generals Bradley, Collins, and Vandenberg and Admiral Sherman been telling MacArthur one thing, while allowing the President to tell the people something else.

So, as soon as it was available in cold print, you read the text of the speech to see exactly what General MacArthur had said. He had said that for entertaining these views he had been severely criticized, despite my understanding that from a military viewpoint the above views have been fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Which, it is fairly clear, does not mean what at first it seemed to mean. All it means is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would readily agree that, all things being equal or if there were no other considerations involved, it would be good military tactics to do the things he suggested. It doesn't mean that the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree that there are no other considerations involved, considerations which the President and the Nation must take into account.

Nevertheless, General MacArthur in his carefully, not to say deceptively, phrased statement, has raised a question that should not be allowed to remain a question. The testimony of General Bradley and his colleagues is now demanded and with it any specific information that General MacArthur may have. This has become vastly more important than the speeches and receptions now being scheduled in Chicago, Milwaukee, and other cities.

Suppression of La Prensa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, realization of the vast implications of the suppression by the Argentine Government of its world-known daily, La Prensa, fortunately is widespread among the people of our country. The hemisphere-wide support accorded the day of mourning recently staged at the suggestion of the National Press Club is evidence of this.

The April issue of the American Federationist, official organ of the American Federation of Labor, contains an editorial entitled "La Prensa," authorized by President William Green, a great American, which presents in scholarly and convincing fashion the dangers inherent in repression of objective and fearless presentation of national and world events.

Indignation at such dictatorial action is completely in line with the progressive attitude of America's great labor organization, and the capable presentation of the matter in the editorial makes a valuable contribution to the discussions on this vital matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the American Federationist be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA PRENSA

No act of Dictator Peron has met with more unreserved condemnation than his attack on La Prensa, the world-famous independent newspaper of Argentina. This paper had standing throughout cosmopolitan circles and was widely read by Spanish-speaking groups. La Prensa, which followed the standards and practices of the free press, continued to publish and comment editorially on developments and trends even after Juan Peron seized control of the government and began nullifying his country's constitution. While the paper was not popular with the dictatorship, it was not until Peron was harassed by economic difficulties that he took steps to silence this faithful recorder of developments and their implications.

He selected as his tool the captive news vendors' union, an affiliate of the government-controlled national labor federation. The sellers of newspapers and magazines submitted a series of excessive demands, concluding with a demand for 20 percent of the paper's gross income from classified advertisements. These demands were served only on La Prensa, although Peron's controlled union also services other newspapers. A picket line, aided by the police, prevented delivery and shipment of copies of La Prensa coming off the press. Publication had to be suspended.

The employees of the newspaper tried to confer with Minister of Labor to make plain that they had no grievance against management. They were dispersed by Peron's police.

The shameful action against La Prensa followed Peron's successful breaking of a nation-wide strike of railway workers. The dictator moved quickly to arrest the strike leaders, charging them with association with members of parties hostile to Peron and therefore suspected of fomenting the strike for political purposes. The government then promulgated an executive order to mobilize all railways for civilian service of national defense under the army. These workers ceased to be free.

These happenings demonstrate the inevitable development of dictatorships. They start by abandoning government by law. Then they undermine the integrity of the courts and educational institutions. They replace free enterprise by government control and undertakings. They replace free unions by government-controlled puppet organizations and lay violent hands on capital and other private property. To get away with these high-handed deeds the dictator must control the press and other information media.

The right to voluntary association is essential to freedom in living and participating in a free national life. Voluntary organizations are possible only when law and property are respected. Too often the first steps toward the curbing of freedom are taken in a national emergency and with the best intentions. Once started down the road to dictatorship, steps are hard to retrace.

That is the reason the American Federation of Labor attacks at once plans and proposals leading to compulsory work. Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom, which must be maintained by each successive generation.

The Organization of American States has been meeting in Washington to consider western hemisphere security against Communist aggression. A vital key to national security is a free press. We who love liberty cannot watch the murder of a great newspaper without vigorous protest. While Dictator Peron was taking the final step to strangle La Prensa, he warned the remaining great independent paper that its editorial freedom will also be ended. A press emasculated and controlled by an irresponsible dictator in what used to be the most progressive country in Latin America is an attack upon the security of all, under present conditions.

MacArthurism: What It Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable editorial entitled "MacArthurism: What It Is," which appeared in the Washington Post last Friday.

Here we have an objective and, indeed, a scholarly analysis by one of America's great newspapers, a newspaper most intimately in touch with national policy, of the emotionally moving and eloquent address last Thursday by that great soldier, General Douglas MacArthur.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHURISM: WHAT IT IS

There was a classic and gladiator quality in General MacArthur's valedictory to America. It was a noble Roman who took his leave before an intent and watching people. The farewell, even if it had been limited to a ceremonial address, would have been charged with drama. But it was much more than that. General MacArthur, against the background of one of the great dismissals of history, made a spectacular attack upon his Government's strategy. No case could have been stated with more power and with more passion. It was an electric performance which had an entire Nation, if not an entire world, spellbound.

Now the real debate is on—the debate upon the edges of which this country has been hovering for a twelve-month past. Some of the facts are still missing. Outstanding among them is the past as well as present position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General MacArthur charged them with a belief at one time in the MacArthur strategy. To what extent is he right? The President must not let Secretary Marshall delay a single instant in putting the record straight. For a long time there has been more than a suspicion in the public mind that the Administration has got out of the habit of coming clean with the American people. It has seemed to forget that its authority springs from the confidence as well as the strength of its constituents. When the facts are in, when the arguments are heard, we have faith that the proper course will be made clear, and that a new unity will be created for following it.

What we plead for in the process is the eschewal of emotion. Wisdom is the product neither of hysteria nor of heat. If, as General MacArthur says (and, in the main, rightly), the Soviet's moves are the response of cold calculation, a free society cannot afford to govern itself differently. It must be sober in decision. To go off half-cocked is to court ruin and disaster. Action must be rigidly realistic when that action may influence the American destiny for a thousand years.

That is why MacArthur's text must be scrutinized with the head and not with either knees or heart. The first point of notice is that not only did he not mention any of the fighting Allies in Korea, he did not once refer to the United Nations. He did not refer to the United Nations because he knew full well that the line of policy he advocated will not commend itself to any of our covenanted allies. On the contrary, his counsel will repel them. This would not, of course, faze the general. The man who used to emit such glowing words about the organization of nations for peace is quite prepared to go it alone. He is a crusader if not a fanatic. But the rest of us must think of consequences. What are they? If Western Europe would not agree with us, then they would go neutral, and 270,000,000 people and 70,000,000 tons of steel would be lost to our armory.

Not only that. It was difficult to figure out whether the general wanted to take up arms against communism or whether he distinguished between Red China or Red Russia. If he had in mind a jihad, or holy war, against a social and political concept, then he should reread his Lincoln. It was not against slavery that Lincoln, idealistic though he was, took up arms, but against a break in the Union. A union is aborning today among all men who cherish liberty. Would Lincoln, as a practical matter, junk this nucleaur community in order to go off at a tangent and try to bayonet an idea? We do not think so.

Aside from the loss of Western Europe moreover, this country would lose the backbone of Asia by following MacArthur. The general is right when he casts out the foolish notion of some of his own supporters that the people of even Communist-run Asia are ideologically Communist. Asians still ask each other by way of greeting, "Have you eaten?" The belly and not the mind is the chief worrier in Asia. Yet, withal, they want to run their own affairs, and, as General MacArthur testified, they are seized with a new and intoxicating nationalism. That means they don't want to be "saved" by America, or by anybody else. To them, overwhelmingly, that would be exchanging one imperialism for another.

For proof of this let those who are bemused by MacArthurism go back to our history. One example will suffice. Toward the end of the First World War the United States decided to intervene in Siberia. The force was under the command of General William S. Graves. It was an idealistic assignment—to get the Czechs, who had been interned in Russia, out of the Siberian ports. But the orders to General Graves gradually changed, and the United States became party to British interventionism "to save Russia from bolshevism." This policy General Graves thought wrong and unwise, but, being a good soldier, he obeyed orders, and never thought of writing to the Joe Martin of his time. However, on his retirement he made known his dissent in a book America's Siberian Intervention. He described how he was the agent for delivering arms and food to one of the Russian Chiang Kai-sheks, Admiral Koltchak. General Graves writes:

"No government can add to its strength from its people while being held in power by foreign bayonets. Koltchak realized this, as I heard him tell Mr. Morris [United States Ambassador to Japan] that he did not want foreigners to fight for him, as the Russian character was such that the Russians would desert him if he received active military support from foreigners. This is not a characteristic of Russians alone, it is the characteristic of all nationals. The United States gained by this act [deliverying food and munitions to Koltchak] the resentment of more than ninety percent of people in Siberia. Our intervention resulted in placing the mass of Russians even more solidly behind the Soviets. This is shown by the promptness with which the Siberian people accepted the Moscow government after the departure of the Allies."

What applies to Russians applies to all nationals.

Ah, says General MacArthur, but the Chinese are different. How much General MacArthur knows about China and the Chinese is shown by the way he let down the President at Wake Island by assuring him that the Chinese would not intervene in North Korea, and particularly by his account of Chinese history. The Chinese, were "nonhomogeneous," he says, meaning without political unity, till the turn of the century, when they became consolidated first by Chang Tso-lin, then by Chiang Kai-shek, and then by Communists. Instead of Chang Tso-lin, who was the independent chieftain of Manchuria in the twenties, General MacArthur meant Sun Yat-sen, father of the nationalist revolution which turned China into a republic in 1911.

But let that pass. General MacArthur, thinking of the Chinese in these pathologically nationalistic times as different from the Russians that General Graves encountered, says that all we have to do is blockade the Chinese coast, help Chiang Kai-shek land on the coastline, and give him "logistical support." Blockade, no matter how you slice it, means war. So, as we found in the twenties, does economic sanctions. Collective reprisals against China are now under consideration at Lake Success. But the issue is highly delicate. An all-in blockade from Vladivostok to Singapore—a tidy distance, if you look at the map—would mean a denial of raw materials to Western Europe and would put Japan solely on American charity. And what does "logistical support" mean? It means that not only would we have to ferry a discarded politician, Chiang Kai-shek, across, we would have to make sure he would win. How could it be otherwise? All our stakes would be on Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang knows that. Having run away from the Communists every time he came anywhere near them, he would never dream of trying to reconquer China without the United States in front of him, back of him, and all around him. General MacArthur can't make a warrior out of Chiang Kai-shek by thinking so.

No, the course that General MacArthur recommends is a course of all-out intervention, step by inexorable step. It is war. It is war against the wrong foe on the wrong battlefield, fought without allies, with our real enemy husbanding its men and resources while we are wallowing in the Chinese bog. The Japanese could tell General MacArthur something about the size and the depth of the morass into which he would commit America. And Chiang Kai-shek would be the tiger on the American back.

There is a remaining item in the American strategy that General MacArthur advised. It is to end the Korean "sanctuary" in Manchuria by bombing it. General MacArthur omits altogether to mention that we, no less than the Chinese and North Koreans, have a sanctuary. It is located in air-free South Korea and Japan. Whether this sanctuary would remain intact after we start to bomb Manchuria—none can tell. General MacArthur thinks so. The Soviet, he says, "will not necessarily mesh its action with our moves." Perhaps not, though after Wake Island, there will be some hesitation in accepting General MacArthur's judgment on that vital score. He is no better judge of the Russians than of the Chinese. Authorities like George F. Kennan tell us that the Russians are sensitive as no other people are about their frontiers. But, as we say, MacArthur may be right. Our own reaction to his view of Russian policy is that it is a good one for us to follow. Let us not mesh our actions with their moves. Let us not fight the foe that Russia picks for us and commit our force on the battlefield she selects. Let us keep the initiative, and be sovereign over our own strategy.

Our country is at the height of its power and glory. No great power in history has been tolerated which fails to act in concert with the general interests of mankind as mankind conceives these interests. That was the guiding rule of Pax Britannica. It must be the guiding rule of the American power, or it will perish. Our actions, in other words, are in the realm of politics as well as in the realm of military power. It was a simple recipe that MacArthur spelled out, too simple, and so simple we would have to do it alone. That the general is a false prophet is apparent in every line of what he said, even in his essay on the strategy of the Pacific. This newspaper pleaded that Formosa be taken over back in 1946; nevertheless it feels that it is nonsense to assert that the whole Pacific and the Americas would be lost by the breach of the Pacific moat through defection of Formosa. After all the aggressive Japanese once had it, and that did not finish America. General MacArthur started his address as a statesman and ended it as a drill sergeant.

Licensing of Radio Broadcast Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors.

Motion Picture Theater Owners of Maryland, Inc., a member of the Allied States Association, through Mr. Lauritz Garman, president, advises that its board of directors feels that the industry has suffered greatly from recent developments in the entertainment field, and that they will be further adversely affected as a result of the action by the Federal Communications Commission, which is discussed in the association's statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WIELDS BLACKJACK

The Federal Communications Commission has just issued a declaration of policy, called a report, which sets a new record for usurpation of authority.[1]

By this report the Commission—

1. Imposes a condition on the right of motion picture companies to qualify for broadcasting licenses based on information coming to it from an unidentified source and without specific findings based upon evidence adduced in support of or opposition to any application for a license.

2. Asserts the authority to regulate the motion picture industry and the use it shall make of its properties although no such authority has been conferred on it by Congress.

3. Would compel the motion picture companies to make available to television broadcasters their finest films and talent as a condition to the right to qualify for broadcasting licenses.

The report was issued as a result of a hearing held a year ago looking to the establishment of a uniform policy to be followed in the licensing of radio broadcast stations to applicants accused or convicted of violating a law of the United States.

[1] Docket No. 9572, March 29, 1951.

The points set down for hearing, as enumerated in the report, did not even hint that the Commission wished to be enlightened as to its authority to advise prospective applicants for licenses or renewals as to the use which they should make of properties which are not subject to the Commission's regulatory powers, in order to qualify for such licenses or renewals.

Specifically, there was not the slightest intimation that the Commission had in mind the possibility of a ruling or even an expression of opinion to the effect that the motion picture companies, in order to be eligible for licenses or renewals, must first make their choicest films and contract artists available for exhibition on television.

While we have not examined all the briefs and arguments offered at the hearing in April 1950, we do not believe that any such startling proposal entered into the discussion. So revolutionary and drastic a proposal would have attracted wide attention and most certainly would have come to our notice.

Sometime between the close of the hearing and the issuance of the report the Commission either evolved the idea, or it was planted with it, that it could force the motion picture companies to supply their best available films and talents to this rival entertainment medium in order to qualify for licenses.

The report recites blandly that "It has come to the Commission's attention that many motion picture companies refuse to make copies of their films available for use by television companies." It then goes on to say that "the success of television will depend to a large measure on the ability of television stations to acquire the best available films and to use the best available talent and stories in their programs."

It would be interesting, and it may become necessary to ferret out the source of this information that "has come to the Commission's attention." We are confident that it was not openly supplied by the participants in this quasi-judicial inquiry. The motion picture companies represented at the hearing apparently had no warning that such a catastrophic ruling was in contemplation. And the thousands of independent theater owners, who are the concern of this association, had no reason to suspect that their interests were involved, much less in jeopardy.

WILL THE COMMISSION NOW REGULATE THE MOVIES?

It doesn't seem possible that the Commission itself could have realized the full implications of its action.

In order to make good on these "primary principles" which are to guide it "in making a case-to-case determination of these applications," the Commission must exercise strict control over the motion picture companies, even to the extent of fixing prices for their products.

Let us consider what could and doubtless will happen if the Commission persists in the policy of requiring the motion picture companies to place their "best available films" at the disposal of its competitor in the entertainment field. A film company desiring a license asserts in its application that it has conformed to the Commission's requirement. A TV station objects and complains that the applicant has not made its best films available. Is the Commission going to set itself up as an expert to pass on the quality of motion pictures?

But that is child's play compared to the difficulties that will arise when a TV station complains—and this will happen—that the applicant has sought to evade the Commission's policy by charging film rentals too high for it to pay. The Commission has proceeded in happy ignorance of the cost of producing the best pictures and the methods used in pricing them, or else it has made the cold-blooded determination to subsidize TV at the expense of the motion picture industry and thus confiscate the latter's property without just compensation.

We are forced to this conclusion because we do not believe it could have been contemplated by the Commission or the person or persons who persuaded it to adopt this policy, that TV would pay film rentals approximating those derived from the theaters.

Admission to a first-run or key neighborhood theater usually is 50 cents or more. Those theaters pay film rentals ranging from 25 to 40 percent of the gross receipts. If the film companies must make their best pictures available to television, they will be entitled to and should demand the same rentals, based on the same factors, that are charged the theaters. But when they demand that the TV people pay from 12½ to 20 cents for each claimed spectator—and we mean the claims they make in seeking sponsors—they will run snivelling to the Commission and claim that the movie companies are flouting the Commission's policy.

Then the Commission will either have to back down on its policy or start fixing the price of film.

COMMISSION WOULD DESTROY GOVERNMENT'S REVENUE

The country is engaged in a mighty preparedness campaign, the object of which is to insure peace. The Congress is confronted with the task of imposing additional taxes to sustain the effort.

Although the motion-picture business is currently in a serious slump, due in some measure to the free entertainment afforded by television, the United States Government still collects a 20-percent tax on every paid admission to a motion-picture theater.

These admission taxes collected from movie patrons amount to about $300,000,000 a year.

Yet the Federal Communication Commission by its declared policy of building up television at the expense of the movies would jeopardize, certainly greatly reduce and possibly destroy this valuable source of revenue.

This grave consequence, evidently not realized or taken into account by the Commission, illustrates the danger of adopting policies affecting industries which are not subject to the Commission's jurisdiction without a full, complete, and open investigation in the course of which information on all angles of the subject is obtained from those most affected and best equipped to furnish it.

Unless the Commission recedes from its position, this phase of the matter should receive the attention of Congress while the tax bill is under consideration.

AND IT MAY STILL BE ALL FOR NAUGHT

The gratuitous nature of the Commission's dictum, and the fact that compliance therewith still will not guarantee any film company a broadcasting license, is one of the most serious aspects of its action.

The greater part of the report deals with the points which were set down for hearing. That part of the report was within the Commission's authority and we have no special fault to find with the conclusions reached. It is true, as the Commission says, that "the major motion-picture companies * * * have violated the antitrust laws over a period of years in the motion-picture field." We think it follows, as the Commission concludes, that such violations are "a matter that the Commission must consider carefully in determining the qualifications of these companies to operate in the public interest."

That is an issue between the film companies and the Commission in which the independent exhibitors have no direct interest. It is a question which will have to be resolved

on a case-to-case basis when and if those companies apply for licenses.

The only phase of the report that affects the theater owners—and it threatens their very existence—is the next to last paragraph therein which says that the motion-picture companies must make their best films, performers and stories available to television in order to be eligible for a license.

Because it is alien to the questions set down for hearing and does not even deal with adjudged violations of law, it seems to have been added as an irrelevant afterthought. The Commission is careful to say, "We express no opinion at this time as to whether such practices (not supplying films, etc., to TV) are or are not in violation of the antitrust laws." So far as we are aware, no law provides and no court has ever held that it is a violation of law for a private corporation, acting alone and not in concert with others to choose its own customers. And yet the whole purpose of the proceeding was to determine the weight to be given law violations in the granting of licenses.

To reduce the Commission's position to complete absurdity, let us suppose that a motion-picture company has attempted in good faith to comply with the Commission's policy; has made its best films available to TV and thus destroyed their value for exhibition in the theaters. It has destroyed one vast market in hopes of gaining another. And then the Commission, applying the principles discussed in the first six and a half pages of its report, decides that it cannot grant a license to that film company because of its antecedent violations in the motion-picture field.

MOWING DOWN THE INNOCENT BYSTANDERS

The report gives the impression that the Commission moved by some undisclosed impulse hurled a rock at the film companies; but it struck the exhibitors.

It might at least have given consideration to the extent of the havoc which its policies, if carried out, will wreak among the motion-picture exhibitors.

When a picture is shown on television its box-office value in the area in which it is shown is destroyed. About 17,000 theaters are dependent upon an adequate supply of box-office attractions. Of the $2,700,000,000 invested in the entire industry, only $160,000,000 is invested in production and distribution. All of the remainder—94 percent—is invested in theaters.

The 1940 census shows that 177,420 persons were employed in the motion-picture industry. Of these, 33,667 were engaged in production, 11,332 in distribution, and 132,401 in exhibition.

Thus the Federal Communications Commission, of its own motion, has laid down a policy which, if carried out, would endanger the more than $2,000,000,000 invested in theaters and threaten the livelihood of many. The rule prescribed by Congress for the granting of licenses is that "the public convenience, interest, or necessity will be served." Certainly Congress never contemplated that the public interest could be served by tearing down an established industry in order to help a rival industry which, once the novelty has worn off, may not retain public favor.

Despite all the hullabaloo, television's future is still clouded with uncertainty. Its forward surge has slowed down to a walk. Those who glibly predict that television will supplant the movies should read the feature story in the Wall Street Journal for March 26, 1951, entitled "Teetering TV." The Communications Commission may wake up some day and find it has backed the wrong horse. In the meantime, grave damage may result from its present policies. They call for stern resistance by the motion-picture industry, the theaters as well as the producers.

Conditions Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Mr. Adin Ladd, of the merchant marine, has written a most interesting letter to his grandmother who resides in my home town of Skowhegan, Maine. His letter deals with what he saw behind the iron curtain and how what he saw gave him a deeper appreciation of the freedom which we of the United Nations still enjoy.

I commend the letter to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Skowhegan (Maine) Independent-Reporter of April 17, 1951]

ADIN LADD, OF MERCHANT MARINE, WRITES HE IS BACK IN SWEDEN AFTER BEING BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Adin Ladd, A. B., merchant mariner, with the Moore-McCormack Lines, aboard the steamship *Mormackfir*, lately behind the iron curtain has written his grandmother an entertaining letter from Stockholm, Sweden, under date of April 6. He says:

"There are only two ports left now before heading back to the States. So far we have been to Goteborg, Oslo, Copenhagen, and Gdynia. I am disappointed that we aren't to go to Helsinki after coming so near.

"If you asked a Pole when it was the last time he smiled, I think he would have a little difficulty remembering off-hand the occasion. My O. S. and I walked from the docks across the city and back just looking and listening. The only person with a smile on his face was the innumerable pictures of one Joe Stalin that in varying sizes hang in nearly every shop window. And at that, his big moustached grin is as mirthless as the mouth of a cannon. There is almost a chill in the air, like the moment between seeing the smoke and waiting for the explosion. People we met on the streets, as soon as they recognized us as Americans, would avert their eyes, stop talking, and walk a little faster. It was almost embarrassing to walk down the street and definitely uncomfortable. I noticed in one clothing store just two suits in the window and they were second-hand, very old and shabby. The price—$200 and $184 or the equivalent in Polish money. There were several posters in the windows showing American planes bombing Korean women and children, and the only film (movie) had to do with racial discrimination and Russian soldiers beating the American Army. They are doing an excellent job of teaching the Poles to hate everything American including the Americans themselves. Well any way, the short time I spent in Poland was enough to make me depressed in mind for a long time, after we left that sorry country. Also, I realize a little better the broader meaning, and greater yet, the value of the thought 'freedom.' How can mankind have lost the right to smile or look at a stranger walking down a street? This is a three-dimensioned society now all right. We have not only a right and wrong but a left as well. The Communists are right in not allowing their slaves to see the rest of the world and vice versa; that is—right in their own power-hungry way because no one would stand for them if they knew what the other half was missing. I think a Pole would be happy to miss the soldiers and sailors with their submachine guns and constant checking of papers that goes on day after day.

"It is a relief to be back in Sweden today and until iron curtain is just a phrase in history books, I don't care about going on the other side of it again.

"I didn't send the Copenhagen address in the last letter because I didn't think there would be time enough to receive a letter over here. Now it is too late but there should be mail in New York when we get there."

Supplies for Soldiers on the Black Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Report From Korea—'GI Says United States Goods on Black Market,'" published in the Bloomington Herald-Telephone, Bloomington, Ind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM KOREA—GI SAYS UNITED STATES GOODS ON BLACK MARKET

A Bloomington soldier, fighting in Korea, asked today in a letter to the editor of the Daily Herald-Telephone why American GI's there are forced to turn to the black market to buy American goods such as cigarettes, candy, beer, and writing paper.

Pfc Gerard N. Sira, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Sira, of Maxwell Lane, is with an engineering outfit in Korea. What he has seen in the far eastern country he apparently doesn't like.

He wrote the following letter to the Herald-Telephone:

"DEAR EDITOR: I am just one of many hundreds of GI's over here in Korea that would just like to have a few of his questions answered. I've never seen the fellows in this outfit with me feeling so low as they are here. Their morale is as low as it could possibly get, and that's not good.

"The first question that I want answered is, What are we here fighting for? It's plain to see that the Korean people don't like us. They don't want us around. As far as we know we haven't any real right to be here."

REPORTS BLACK MARKET

"Where is the stuff that should be on the PX shelves going to? I can answer that one for you. I'll even send you pictures to prove it if you want. Our cigarettes, candy, beer, writing paper, and such stuff is all over the streets of Pusan and other Korean cities, in little stands that the kids have rigged up, and selling for 10 times their values. Cigarettes sell for 25 cents a pack on the black market and 10 cents in the PX. The trouble is that they never get on the PX shelf to start with.

"The paper that I am writing this letter on came from a friend of mine in Bloomington. It's a shame when a fellow has to write home for things he should be able to get right here."

ASKS WHERE TRUCKS ARE

"Where's our trucks? We have to drive trucks that are made in Japan, while our trucks are all used by Koreans who let one last about a month.

"Where's our beer. I am drinking Jap beer right now, because the only American beer we could get is on the black market and it costs $1 a can. Ask yourself these questions and see if you can give me a halfway decent answer.

"Where's our clothes? We all have clothes, yes, but the Koreans and the English soldiers also have them. A soldier is supposed to honor his uniform. I'll ask you people from my home town—could you honor the uniform that all the soldiers of the world, and half of the prisoners of war are wearing? I don't think you could. Our Army is supposed to be outstanding. I don't see how it possibly could be with everything wearing one of its uniforms."

WANTS ANSWERS

"I guess maybe this sounds like a lot of plain old griping to some of you folks back home, but just ask a few veterans around there and see if they don't set you straight. I'd like some of these things answered, so let's hear from someone who thinks he knows.

"I hope this gets in the paper, so a lot of the mothers of boys who are over here can see what they are up against.

"Your friend,

"Pfc G. N. SIRA."

On the Outskirts of Armageddon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of March 27, 1951:

ON THE OUTSKIRTS OF ARMAGEDDON

(By Arthur Krock)

FRANKFORT, GERMANY, March 18.—The historic rift between France and Germany, the tragedy of Europe that eventually brought the United States into two global wars and the leadership of the west, must first be bridged over, then eliminated, to preserve human liberty. This is the task to which the Americans in Western Europe are devoting themselves, on the spot. From all the complicated moves and situations which bewilder the newcomer to Germany from Washington this fundamental fact emerges, and dominates the path to any conclusion.

Paris and France, except for the Hotel Astoria near the Arc de Triomphe, are as native to their own culture as ever. But Frankfort, where the High Commission has its base in the I. G. Farben headquarters, and Wiesbaden, where the Air Force soars through and over the town, have become a visible part of the United States. Many sights and sounds declare this. But among the most interesting are the road signs as the traveler nears Frankfort: "No Passing." "Soft Shoulder," "United States P-X 600 Yards." For this is one of the great focal points for the most unusual adventure ever undertaken by the United States. And the historian would be pressed to present a parallel.

The task is not only that of the Economic Cooperation Administration, now well on the way to transition, which was to restore the productive economy of nations devastated by the Second World War. It is not only that of General Eisenhower, which is to build the military section of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to deter the Soviets from Western European aggression. It is not only that of the British and the Western Europeans, plus some others, to do their part of this building and evolve a continental army at last. It is enormously the task of the Allied High Commission in Germany, of which the American part under John J. McCloy is laboring with extraordinary devotion to instill among the Germans the will to place the independence of the individual and the dignity of the human spirit above every other consideration of human life.

This is not to imply that the High Commissions of the British and the French are not pursuing the same objective. But there are several well-known reasons why the most powerful influence to this end must and does come from the American section. If this goal is not attained, neither of the related ones can be, and it is far too early to form an opinion whether success can come.

The principal labor of Mr. McCloy, which is to forge and bind a common social-economic link between France and Germany, can be only briefly appraised in this space. But at this writing there is reason to hope that before it can appear in print the Schuman plan for the basic economic interdependence of France and Germany will have been initialed by the Governments, to be submitted for legislative approval, and that within a matter of weeks this approval will be forthcoming. There is just about that much time for the west to acquire this essential foundation, in the opinion of informed persons here.

If the Schuman plan, originated by French statesmen in one of the few inspired moments since postwar Soviet foreign policy disclosed itself, shall come into being in the required time the principal personal credit must go to Mr. McCloy. To reach the present status of hope for the Schuman plan he has wrestled with the French, the Germans, the British, the industrialists of the Ruhr—and some attorneys they employed in the United States—with greater exertion than Jacob had to put forth with the angel.

From the outset of serious consideration of the Schuman plan Mr. McCloy laid down three absolute conditions. The Ruhr industrial combine, composed of about a dozen men who follow three or four and were determined to regain their cartelized monopoly, must be broken. Instead of being able to obtain even more of the coking coal of the Ruhr required for their productive capacity, they must be limited to 75 percent (he first tried to make it 50 percent) so that steel mills elsewhere on the continent could have essential supplies. Third, the single procurement agency for coking coal must be disbanded and something resembling a free market take its place. The reason why the Schuman plan is on its way to initialing with the indispensable approval of the United States is because Mr. McCloy gained his objectives in substance and largely in detail. The apex of victory was the signed approval of the Conditions by Chancelor Adenauer of the new West German Republic.

If the Schuman plan gets into operation, and works, then, for the first time since Bismarck failed to interest France more in colonial expansion than in the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine, the basic cause of the tragedy of Europe will be on its way to removal. If that happens, the accomplishments of the Marshall plan will take on the fiber of endurance; the "Eisenhower army" will have shorter life as a mere blueprint surrounded by adoring staff officers; the European army will advance from the stage of debate, and the Soviets will be faced with the plain necessity of a change of foreign policy.

There are lions in the high grasses of the untrod areas near the path to these goals—one can almost smell their feral odor from this shattered city—and they may at any time be loosed to destruction which will include their own. No one in authority here disputes the hazard. But the procession of peace is advancing, and the flag of the United States is at the fore.

The Brilliant Record of General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur's return to the United States after an absence of over 14 years, it is fitting that we pause in our tribute to him and study his remarkable military career which is unparalleled in the history of this Nation:

GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Douglas MacArthur was born at Little Rock, Ark., January 26, 1880. He entered the United States Military Academy on June 13, 1899; graduated at the head of his class on June 11, 1903; and was commissioned a second lieutenant of engineers.

Shortly after he was graduated from the United States Military Academy, he sailed for the Philippine Islands. Here he engaged in engineering duties, including construction work at Guimaras Island until October 1904. Upon his return to the United States, he served at San Francisco with the California Debris Commission and as Assisting and Acting Chief Engineering Officer, Pacific Division, until October 1905. He was then ordered to Tokyo where he served as aide to his father, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, until September 15, 1906. While on this detail he was given a confidential mission which took him to many countries throughout Asia.

Upon his return to the United States, he was assigned to duty with the Second Battalion of Engineers at Washington Barracks, D. C., and, in addition served as aide to President Theodore Roosevelt until August 1907. In February 1908, he was graduated from the Engineer School of Application. He then served as assistant engineer at Milwaukee, Wis. In April 1908, he joined Company K, Third Battalion of Engineers, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. Here he served as company officer and also as an instructor in the Mounted Service School and the Army Service School. His 4-year tour at Fort Leavenworth was interrupted by periods of service at San Antonio, Tex., and in the Panama Canal Zone.

He was assigned to duty in the Office of the Chief of Engineers from 1912 until April 1913; as Superintendent of State, War, and Navy Building, until November 1913; and as a member of the General Staff Corps until September 1917. From April until September 1914, he accompanied our expedition to Veracruz as a member of the General Staff.

He conceived the idea of the Rainbow (42d) Division and as Chief of Staff helped

direct its organization and training. He arrived with this division in France, October 1917, and served with it until August 1918, in the Vaucouleurs, La Franche, and Rolamont Training Areas; in the Luneville, Baccaret, Esperance-Soissin Sectors; in the Champagne-Marne defensive; and in the Aisne-Marne offensive. He commanded the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade in the St. Mihiel, Essey, and Pannes, Woevre, Meuse-Argonne, and Sedan offensives. He then commanded the Forty-second Division until November 1918 and served in the Army of Occupation in Germany until 1919.

Upon his return to the United States, he served in the Office of the Chief of Staff, Washington, D. C., until June 1919. He was Superintendent of the United States Military Academy to June 1922, during which time he modernized the courses in military training.

From West Point he was sent to the Philippine Islands, where he served at Headquarters, Philippine Department, until November 1922, in command of the District of Manila until June 1923, and in command of the Twenty-third Infantry Brigade at Fort William McKinley to January 1925. Returning to the United States, he commanded the Fourth Corps Area, Atlanta, Ga., to July 1925; and the Third Corps Area, Baltimore, Md., to September 1928. He was selected president of the 1928 American Olympic team, which he took to Amsterdam, Holland.

In 1928 he returned to the Philippines where he served 2 years as department commander. Upon his arrival in the United States in September 1930, he commanded the Ninth Corps Area, San Francisco, to October 1930, when he became Chief of Staff of the Army. Funds for national defense were at a low ebb. He first saved the skeleton army from the economy wave, then modernized it. He set up the four army and corps area organizations, and the General Headquarters Air Force. The basic blueprints of manpower procurement and industrial mobilization were developed under his direction.

Upon completion of his duty as Chief of Staff in October 1935, he was appointed military adviser to the commonwealth government of the Philippines. He inaugurated a long-range military training program financed by the Philippine Government. His 10-year plan was based upon universal military service.

As conditions in the Orient became critical, on July 26, 1941, he was designated commanding general, United States Army Forces in the Far East. His command included the Philippine department and the forces of the commonwealth government, which were inducted into the United States Army. When he took over this command the Philippine department consisted of 18,000 American and Philippine Scout troops. There were ample Filipino reservists, but their period of training had not been completed.

The stubborn defense of the Philippine-American forces on Bataan threw Japanese conquest plans out of gear and gained valuable time for the defense of Australia.

In March 1942, President Roosevelt ordered General MacArthur from Corregidor to Australia for the purpose of organizing and leading rescue forces back for the liberation of the Philippines. On April 18, 1942, he was made supreme commander of the southwest Pacific area and a meager force of Australians and Americans.

With insufficient forces to justify aggressive action, he decided to defend Australia, first by blocking the Japanese advance in New Guinea, and then by assuming the offensive. In heavy fighting the enemy was stopped at Gona in December 1942.

The next year General MacArthur assumed the offensive and pierced the strong enemy outer perimeter, between Wewak and Rabaul, by securing the Vitiaz Straits.

Seizure of the Admiralty Islands by a coup de main, February 29, 1944, marked the end of a great swinging move pivoting on New Guinea which has been a basic purpose of operations initiated June 29, 1943, when the Southwest Pacific and South Pacific areas were united under General MacArthur's command. Possession of the Admiralties relieved his supply line from threat of flank attack from the east and enabled him to change the axis of his advance from north to west. In the Solomons and Bismarcks a strong enemy had been isolated and bypassed.

The way was now open for a shore-to shore advance to the northwest along the land mass of New Guinea. On April 22, Hollandia, 500 miles west of the Bitiaz Straits, was occupied. The enemy was completely surprised; our losses negligible. The operation threw a loop of envelopment around the enemy's eighteenth army which was dispersed along the New Guinea coast east of Hollandia. Throughout the campaign the enemy had lost 110,000 men and the remainder of his original strength of a quarter of a million was bypassed and became strategically unimportant. By the last of July 1944, General MacArthur had occupied key positions along the entire New Guinea coast with campaigns at Wadke, Sarmi, Biak, Noemfoor, Opmaral, and Sansapor.

Occupation of Morotai, 300 miles south of the Philippines, on September 15, penetrated the Halmahera-Philippine line and imperiled enemy conquests in the East Indies by the threat of envelopment and air attack.

General MacArthur's landing on Leyte on October 20 pierced the center of the enemy's strategic defensive line which extended from Japan through Formosa, the Philippines, the East Indies, Singapore, and Burma. Both enemy flanks thus created were vulnerable to envelopment to the north and to the south. The so-called greater east Asia coprosperity sphere was cut in two and the conquered empire to the south occupied by half a million troops, was severed from Japan proper. Fully realizing the importance of Leyte, the enemy reinforced to the limit of his ability and with his air, land, and sea forces made suicidal attempts to dislodge General MacArthur from the island. This supreme effort of the enemy failed. His fleet and air arm suffered major defeat and his land forces were annihilated.

On December 15, sites for air bases and naval facilities were occupied on Mindoro which would support Luzon operations and insure domination of enemy sea and air routes in the South China Sea. From Leyte a corridor had been driven from east to west which cut the Philippine Archipelago in two.

Luzon was invaded on January 9, 1945. The enemy expected a landing south of Manila. Consequently the Lingayen Gulf landing north of Manila was practically unopposed. This placed American troops in rear of the enemy's main forces, cut his reinforcement and supply lines, and closed his avenue of escape.

By February a great converging movement on Manila was under way. The XI Corps which landed unopposed was driving east from Zambales coast. The Eleventh Airborne Division of the Eighth Army which landed without losses on the west coast of Batangas February 1, was moving rapidly north toward Manila. The Sixth Army had occupied the entire Central Plain of Luzon and its Thirty-seventh Infantry and the First Cavalry Divisions were fighting their way into the outskirts of north Manila.

On February 3, 1945, in a wide envelopment from the east, elements of the First Cavalry Division entered Manila, seized Santo Tomas and Bilibid Prison and liberated thousands of internees and prisoners of war. After desperate fighting Manila was finally liberated on February 23.

By the end of February, Corregidor and Bataan had been occupied.

In March, a vigorous campaign was launched in the Visayans. Palawan, Zamboanga, Panay, Cebu, and Negros were occupied in quick succession. Seizure of the Sulu Archipelago in early April made Tawitawi available as a great strategic air base from which the enemy empire life line to the south was within easy air range. By the 21st of April, General MacArthur's control of the entire Visayan Group was complete. On the 19th of April, from a surprise landing at Malabang and Parang in western Mindanao, Eighth Army units fought their way eastward in a 2-weeks' overland march which brought them to the outskirts of Davao.

In a collateral drive on Borneo, supported by Allied naval and air units, Australian forces occupied Tarakan May 3, Brunei Bay June 10, and Balikpapan July 1. Possession of these objectives made available sources of oil and other needed war materials and completed General MacArthur's tactical control of the entire Southwest Pacific area.

On the 5th of July, General MacArthur declared his Philippine campaign closed. It had been a campaign characterized by great economy in the lives of his men and heavy destruction of the enemy. Twenty-three enemy divisions, or equivalents, had been annihilated and more than 400,000 Japanese had been killed. Of the Philippine campaign General MacArthur announced:

"Working in complete unison the three services inflicted the greatest disaster ever sustained by Japanese arms.

"The objects of the campaign were as follows:

"1. To penetrate and pierce the enemy's center so as to divide him into north and south, his homeland to the north, his captured Pacific possession to the south. Each half could then be enveloped and attacked in turn.

"2. The acquisition of a great land, sea, and air base for future operations both to the north and to the south comparable to the British islands in its use as a base for Allied operations from the west against Germany.

"3. The establishment of a great strangulating air and sea blockade between Japan and the conquered possessions in the Pacific to the south so as to prevent raw materials being sent to the north and supply or reinforcement to the south.

"4. The liberation of the Philippines with the consequent collapse of the enemy's imperial concept of a greater east Asia coprosperity sphere and the reintroduction of democracy in the Far East.

"5. The liberation of our captured officers and men and of internees held in the Philippines.

"6. A crippling blow to the Japanese Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"All of these purposes were accomplished."

On April 6, 1945, General MacArthur was named Commanding General, United States Army Forces in the Pacific. Three months later his Okinawa-based air force had launched air strikes against Japan itself. On August 14, 1945, President Truman announced the appointment of General MacArthur as Supreme Allied Commander to receive the Japanese surrender and command the occupation forces in addition to his duties as commander of the United States Army forces in the Pacific. In January 1947 he was designated commander in chief of the Far East Command, retaining his position as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in Japan.

On July 25, 1950, a month after the North Korean Communists had invaded South Korea, General MacArthur assumed command of the United Nations command in the Far East, organized to direct United Nations Forces in the defense of South Korea.

DECORATIONS

Thanks of the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Philippine National Assembly, the Philippine Congress, and the Australian Government have been expressed to General MacArthur for his part in liberating the Philippine Islands during World War II.

He has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Distinguished Service Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters, Silver Star with six Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Purple Heart with one Oak Leaf Cluster.

His foreign decorations include the Philippine Medal of Valor, Distinguished Service Star, Defense Medal, and Liberation Medal; British Knight Grand Cross of the Bath; French Grand Officer, Legion of Honor Fourragère, and Croix de Guerre with four Palms; Belgian Commander Order of Crown; Netherlands Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Orange-Nassau with Swords (military division); Italian War Cross and Grand Cordon Order of the Crown; Polish Grand Croix Polonia Restituta and Virtutae Militaire; Hungarian Grand Cross Order of Military Merit; Czechoslovakian Grand Cross Order of White Lion; Yugoslavian Grand Cross Order of Military Merit; Mexican Grand Cross of Military Merit; Ecuadoran First Class Decoration Abdon Calderon, and Greek Medal of Valor.

Following are the citations for his American military awards:

Medal of Honor: "For conspicuous leadership in preparing the Philippine Islands to resist conquest, for gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against invading Japanese forces, and for the heroic conduct of defensive and offensive operations on the Bataan peninsula. He mobilized, trained, and led an army which has received world acclaim for its gallant defense against a tremendous superiority of enemy forces in men and arms. His utter disregard of personal danger under heavy fire and aerial bombardment, his calm judgment in each crisis, inspired his troops, galvanized the spirit of resistance of the Filipino people, and confirmed the faith of the American people in their armed forces."

Distinguished Service Cross: For heroism in the Salient du Feys, France, March 9, 1918. When Company D, One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Infantry, was under severe attack in the Salient de Feys, France, he voluntarily joined it, upon finding that he could do so without interfering with his normal duties, and by his coolness and conspicuous courage aided materially in its success.

Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Cross: As brigade commander, General MacArthur personally led his men and by the skillful maneuvering of his brigade made possible the capture of Hills 288, 242, and the Cote de Chatillon, October 14, 15, and 16, 1918. He displayed indomitable resolution and great courage in rallying broken lines and in reforming attacks, thereby making victory possible. On a field where courage was the rule, his courage was the dominant feature.

Distinguished Service Medal: He served with credit as chief of staff of the Twenty-fourth Division in the operations at Chalons and at the Chateau Thierry Salient. In command of the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade he showed himself to be a brilliant commander of skill and judgment. Later he served with distinction as commanding general of the Forty-second Division.

First Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: As Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States since November 21, 1930, he has performed his many important and exacting duties with signal success. He devised and developed the four-army organization of our land forces; he conceived and established the General Headquarters Air Force, thus immeasurably increasing the effectiveness of our air defenses; he initiated a comprehensive program of modernization in the Army's tactics, equipment, training, and organization. In addition, the professional counsel and assistance he has continuously rendered to the President, to the Secretary of War, and to the Congress have been distinguished by such logic, vision, and accuracy as to contribute markedly to the formulation of sound defense policies and the enactment of progressive laws for promoting the Nation's security.

Second Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: For exceptionally distinguished service as supreme commander of Allied forces in the southwest Pacific since March 1942. Under extremely difficult conditions of terrain, climate, and limited forces and material, he expelled the enemy from eastern New Guinea, secured lodgments on the island of New Britain, and gave strategical direction to coordinated operations resulting in the conquest of the New Georgia group and the establishment of the United States Army and Navy forces on Bougainville Island. He had inflicted heavy losses on the enemy and established his forces in positions highly favorable for the construction of offensive operations.

Third Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: "As supreme commander of Allied air, ground, and sea forces in the southwest Pacific, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur planned and personally directed the campaigns which resulted in the liberation of the Philippine Islands. Strongly entrenched and superior enemy forces were overwhelmed and completely destroyed in a series of decisive operations exploiting United States air and sea superiority, coupled with the resolute and courageous fighting of the ground forces. The immediate result of the campaign was control of the China Sea, the isolation of Japanese forces in Burma, Malaya, and Indochina and the termination of coastwise traffic supporting the Japanese armies in central and south China.

"The liberation of the Philippines began with the landings on Leyte on October 20 in which complete strategical surprise was achieved. After bitter fighting under most difficult conditions of weather and terrain, General MacArthur destroyed the Japanese forces, which included the noted First Division of the Kwantung Army. Again surprising the enemy, General MacArthur moved his forces boldly up the western coast of the main Philippine island and effected a landing on the shores of Lingayen Gulf on January 9, 1945. The flawless execution of this hazardous amphibious approach and landing so disorganized the enemy that in a series of deep thrusts Manila was liberated on February 25. The fortress of Corregidor fell soon afterward in a brilliantly conceived and directed combined land, sea, and air operation. By the end of June only isolated groups of the enemy remained on Luzon.

"While the United States Sixth Army was so engaged, Eighth Army units cleared the enemy from the southern islands in a series of amphibious operations. By July 4 organized resistance had terminated, completing the liberation of the Philippine Islands and the 17,000,000 inhabitants from Japanese domination. More than 300,000 dead and 7,000 prisoners were lost by the enemy, our casualties in killed, wounded and missing totaling 60,628. Seventeen of our divisions had opposed and defeated 23 enemy divisions. The air, ground, and naval forces worked in complete unison to inflict this crushing disaster on the Japanese Army."

HONORS

The following degrees have been conferred upon General MacArthur:

Doctor of Science, Norwich University.

Doctor of Science, Pennsylvania Military College, 1926.

Doctor of Laws, University of Maryland, 1928.

Doctor of Laws, Western Maryland College, 1929.

Doctor of Laws, University of Pittsburgh, 1932.

Doctor of Laws, University of Philippines, 1938.

Doctor of Laws, University of Wisconsin, 1942.

Doctor of Laws, University of Queensland, Australia, 1945.

PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to the grade of first lieutenant on April 23, 1904; to captain on February 27, 1911; to major on December 11, 1915; to colonel of infantry, National Army, on August 5, 1917; to brigadier general, National Army, on June 26, 1918; to brigadier general, Regular Army, on January 20, 1920; to major general on January 17, 1925. He was appointed Chief of Staff, with the rank of general on November 21, 1930. On October 1, 1935, after serving nearly 5 years as Chief of Staff, he reverted to his permanent rank of major general. In 1936, President Quezon appointed him Field Marshal, Philippine Army. He retired from the United States Army with the rank of general on December 31, 1937, but was recalled to active duty as a major general on July 26, 1941, and was promoted to lieutenant general (temporary) on July 27, 1941. He was promoted to the grade of general (temporary) on December 18, 1941, and to General of the Army on December 18, 1944.

The Christian College in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "The Christian College in America," by Ralph Waldo Lloyd, president of Maryville College.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IN AMERICA

(By Ralph Waldo Lloyd, president of Maryville College)

The United States of America has more institutions of higher learning and more college students than have all the other countries of the world put together. The proportion of American young people who attend college has been multiplied by 5 and the number by 10 during the first half of the twentieth century.

These are important facts, but they are not so much reasons for pride as for concern and action. If our colleges wield wider influence than ever before, wider than do colleges in other nations, then obviously the nature of that influence is of supreme importance. It is cause for grave concern that so many contemporary events in the world confirm what Lord Macaulay said years ago, "Nine-tenths of the calamities that have befallen humanity have no other origin than the union of high intelligence with low desires."

The latest report of the United States Office of Education lists 1,808 colleges, universities, and professional schools. In terms of control, 508 of these are independent, 894 are tax-supported, and 706 are church-related (475 Protestant, 226 Roman Catholic, 5

Jewish). In terms of emphasis and teaching, most of the church-related colleges and some of the others state that it is their purpose to be Christian. This bulletin is written to set forth the role of the Christian colleges, of which Maryville College is one.

AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

When the Thirteen Colonies became the United States of America there were in existence nine of the present 1808 institutions (Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Brown, Rutgers, Dartmouth). All of them had grown out of the Christian movement, although none is today actively related to any church. During the first half century after adoption of the Constitution, about forty permanent colleges were opened. Of these, three-fourths (among which was Maryville College) were established directly by ministers and people of the churches. From then until the end of the nineteenth century extension of the southern and western frontiers was accompanied by church missionary enterprises which placed schools and colleges all across the land. Often these institutions provided to vast territories their only facilities for educated leadership.

In 1860 there were in the United States 180 higher institutions related to the church and 17 to the State. In 1900 there were still five times as many church colleges as tax-supported colleges, with twice as many students. Today the colleges which announce that it is their purpose to be Christian constitute a less impressive part of the total higher educational system than they once did. Yet they are more numerous, more firmly established, enroll more students than at any time in the past.

Being church-related does not necessarily make a college Christian and being independent or tax-supported does not necessarily prevent its being Christian. But it is common knowledge that only a few colleges which are not related to a church consider their function to be distinctively Christian or organize their faculties and programs to that end.

In the history of the United States the Christian college has played a far more important role than most historians accord it. When the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were formulated and throughout the ensuing century, a century in which the Nation laid the foundations for its present greatness, Christian colleges carried most of the task of higher education. Might there not be some causal connection between these facts? Among all our institutions, the free Christian college was most closely related to our early history and is the most typically American.

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IS DIFFERENT

It is not different in its general academic standards and procedures. The accredited Christian college must meet the same educational standards that other accredited colleges meet. But it is different, and that which makes it so is something which it is and does in addition to what other institutions are and do. For one thing, it adds an announcement that its purpose is to be Christian. Substantially all tax-supported and most independent universities feel themselves limited in this matter by laws, tradition, clientele, alumni, faculty, or their own educational philosophy. On the other hand, all church-related and some independent colleges are free to adopt, as definitely as they wish, a program for training students in Christian belief, Christian character, and Christian motives of service.

It is true that some church-related colleges make a far more serious and thoroughgoing effort than do others to add the things that create a distinctive Christian atmosphere and influence. One common and disturbing criticism is that college A or B, which announces itself as Christian, is no different from college or university C or D, which makes no such claim.

What must a college do to be effectively Christian? It must be under a controlling body that adopts and makes regulative a purpose to be Christian; it must have a president and faculty who are committed to this same purpose in contrast to the practice of religious neutrality now so dominant in most large centers of American higher education; it must give to Christianity and the Bible a place in the curriculum comparable to the places given to other great fields of knowledge and life; it must have an over-all program and student and faculty organizations which will foster Christian fellowship, expression, and service; it must test its own official policies and practices by the Christian standard. Colleges are not Christian by drift or by imitating other types of colleges, no matter how famous; they are Christian only through strenuous and constant effort.

An institution can accomplish these things without creating sectarianism. It is not a sectarian but a Christian college which we advocate. It is a college which frankly stands with the church in its larger ministry to the world and for the great central affirmations made by all Christian churches—affirmations made in clear language about God as Father, about Jesus Christ as divine Lord and Savior, about the Kingdom of righteousness on earth.

At the heart of these things is the Christian faculty. Only sympathetic and active Christians should ever be appointed. The chief difference between the Christian college and other colleges may well be in that little word "only." It assures that the teaching of all subjects and the management of all its affairs will be from a Christian point of view. Religion thus becomes a natural and organic part of the college.

"Secular education is only half education with the more important half left out," wrote Sir Robert Peel. It is this more important half which the Christian college particularly aims to supply. Fifteen years ago Dr. Kenneth Scott Latourette published an article under the challenging title, "Dare a College Be Christian?" After reviewing the practical factors involved, he came to this conclusion: "In such a situation colleges and universities which will dare to enter on the Christian pilgrimage have a unique and urgent mission."

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IS ESSENTIAL TO THE FUTURE

To some of us it seems self-evident that since Christian belief, character, and service are recognized as essential to our civilization, they should have a regulative part in the life of our colleges and universities where a large proportion of our future leaders spend four or more of their most maturing years. But to a great many people this does not seem self-evident at all. They do not think it matters much what the colleges or the churches do about religion in higher education; or whether there are colleges which can and do give major emphasis to these fundamentals. That is why the case for the Christian college should be stated plainly and urgently. Here are some of the arguments in that case.

1. It is essential to the Nation: The writers of the Constitution of the United States in 1787 rather surprisingly did not include any reference to education. But the famous ordinance creating the Northwest Territory, between Pennsylvania and the Mississippi River, adopted the same year by the very Congress that called the Constitutional Convention, contains a significant statement, which was substantially repeated in the Ordinance of 1790 that created the Territory south of the Ohio, as follows: "Religion morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." Here in the same sentence education and religion, with morality, are magnified. The assumption seems clear—they go together. That is the view of those who founded this Nation.

Those who wrote the Declaration of Independence, with its basic recognition of God, and later the Constitution and other documents which established government on those principles of independence, would doubtless be amazed that their wise provision for separation of church and state has been used to defend the present extensive separation of religion and education. President Faunce of Brown University once wrote: "Here is our national peril, that the supremely important task of our generation will fall between church and state and be ignored by both; the church may say, 'Education is no longer in our hands'; the state may say, 'On all religious matters we are silent.'"

The roots of democracy and the foundations of this Nation are in the Christian convictions and ideals. Decisions of the United States Supreme Court have contained more than once the statement that this is a Christian nation in its historic beginnings and its dominant religion. For democracy and the Nation to endure, those Christian convictions and ideals must influence men and events more widely and profoundly than they have done in our generation.

Secularism, the organization of life apart from God, runs to its logical results in the pagan nazism of Hitler and in the atheistic communism now seeking to dominate the world. Democracy stands against them as the hope of freemen. But if democracy also organizes life apart from God, how can it stand permanently? Many of our political and educational leaders are sincere Christians, but too often they act with unnecessary timidity about religion.

At the heart of the matter is our education, including our higher education whose influence extends into the Nation and its leadership as never before among any people. In 1910 approximately 4 percent of our college-age youth were in college; by 1940 it was 16 percent; since World War II a million veterans have sent the percentage considerably higher than that. This latter is temporary, it is true, but some increases will certainly continue. The President's Commission on Higher Education, in its much discussed report of 1947, proposes that ways be found by 1960 (chiefly through tax-supported colleges and Government subsidies) to increase the number enormously, to 50 percent of all college-age youth.

It is unthinkable that the nation's 700 church-related colleges could be closed or secularized without national disaster. These church colleges, with the 500 independent institutions, constitute the historic American free-enterprise program of higher education. It is essential to the Nation as well as to education that their influence be increased proportionately as tax-supported colleges and universities become larger, more numerous, and more dominant. It would be a national misfortune if all higher education were under the church; however, there is no danger, even remote, that this will come to pass. It would be an equal, perhaps a greater, misfortune if all were under some unit of Government; and that could happen here as it has happened in other nations.

The Christian philosophy of life and standard of morals, a knowledge of the Bible, and the protection of freedom which strong Christian colleges provide, are essential if the original foundations of this Nation are to be kept and if there is to be a free and great American Nation of the future.

2. The Christian college is essential to the church. It is the only medium through which most Protestant denominations now

participate in the formal educational program in the United States. The churches are doing an impressive work through student pastors and foundations on campuses of large State and independent universities; these institutions, therefore, are not without the ministry of religion, a ministry which officials of the universities value highly and encourage. But we are speaking here especially of schools in whose operation the church has a part. In the nineteenth century there were throughout the country hundreds of academies established and maintained under stimulus from the churches. Most of those under Protestant auspices were abandoned as the system of American public high schools was extended in the early years of the twentieth century. The Protestant churches were and are principal champions of tax-supported public education for all people, yet they probably made a mistake in withdrawing so completely from the fields of secondary and elementary education. However, there is no turning back now, and the college level is the only one on which the Protestant church will have any considerable number of institutions in the future.

The Christian colleges do much to keep the church educationally minded; they increase the church's appreciation of the values of Christian higher education; they save the church from losing touch with modern scholarship; they raise the educational standards within the church; and they supply a majority of the ministers and a large proportion of the lay leaders of the churches. Without these colleges is is conceivable that the church's leadership would shrink to a point where its whole program would be threatened. Furthermore, this other simple but fundamental fact must not be overlooked: the Christian college provides higher education in a Christian atmosphere for the youth of Christian homes.

3. The Christian college is essential to higher education. Each group of American higher institutions (tax-supported, independent, church-related) makes a contribution to the whole and to the others. In accepting the place of the Christian college, there is no intention to discount the essential services of the other types of college. State universities are essential and can do some necessary things which otherwise would not be done. Independent colleges draw support and serve a clientele often not available to other institutions. On their part, Christian colleges are in a position, not occupied by the others, to act on the truth that all higher education is incomplete without religion. It can put the study of religion and the Bible on an equal basis with the study of other great fields of knowledge. It need not divide the student into parts, with one part going to college and another part going to church. Christian education says that man's life is a unity and the whole man ought to be educated. A complete education must treat religion as an integral part of the whole. This is a much needed emphasis in contemporary American higher education.

The church-related colleges have a special mission (shared with independent colleges) in behalf of freedom in higher education. The church is freer from political control than is any other body in the world, as recent and earlier history of many nations abundantly shows. The colleges related to the church, therefore, have the strongest assurance of remaining free. They do a major service in preserving the freedom of all colleges. Tax-supported institutions are the more free from political interference because of the strong Christian colleges which cannot be subjected to any political domination.

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IS UNDER SEVERE PRESSURES

That an institution so typically American, so important to the Nation's past growth into greatness, and so essential to the future, should be subjected to threatening pressures exerted by the very society it serves is a strange turn of events indeed. But such is the case.

1. Under and through all other pressures is that of the secularism of our modern society. One historian writes that "the history of the modern western mind may be said to be the history of the gradual secularization of man." As in recent generations man discovered and developed more and more the natural forces in his world, he became more and more self-satisfied and self-confident, believing that by wise planning he could master his own situation without reference to God or religion.

Events of the past 10 years have shocked many out of this self-sufficiency. But on the whole, our society continues to put its faith in itself and in physical power, not in God and in spiritual power. Our American education, with all its marvelous advances, has steadily receded from its earlier emphasis on religion and has become secular with its society. Morality is stressed, but usually in terms of humanism and pragmatism, not on a basis of theism. Men have forgotten George Washington's warning that morality depends on religion. This situation had developed by the time this writer was in the public schools, but at that time so much was left out of the school program on all levels that leaving out religion did not seem so remarkable. Today, however, schools include so many things that to omit religion suggests that society and educators count it relatively unimportant.

2. A natural result is the pressure of unappreciation. In many influential educational quarters the need for a positive Christian emphasis is discounted and the Christian college as such is ignored in educational planning. For example, the President's Commission on Higher Education, in 1947, practically dismissed the church college and even the independent college from serious consideration in its proposals for the future. Educators, political leaders, ministers, parents, and students all are affected by such estimates from high quarters.

3. There is a distracting pressure, educators discover, in the very accrediting processes which are intended to do institutions and education good. The major standardizing bodies render an indispensable service. The Christian college must and should meet the standards set for the accrediting of all colleges. But in the final analysis the accrediting bodies find it necessary to measure chiefly by money—money spent for buildings, for instruction, for books, for laboratories. It is hard to give due consideration to other factors such as tone and spiritual influence. The constant necessity of meeting the accrediting standards and their financial demands tends to turn the Christian college's attention from the value of its distinctive Christian function to the values and requirements of the academic function. There are no corresponding pressures upon the college to develop or even to retain its Christian emphasis.

4. There is a pressure of Government also, usually unintentional and indirect but real. The inexorable growth of Federal, State, and municipal taxes is rapidly reducing the giving ability of individuals who otherwise might provide adequate funds for private and church colleges. Because of the endless search for more revenue and because of a limited appreciation for the colleges which are not tax-supported, there now appear frequently in Congress and legislatures proposals to take away the historic tax-exemption privileges of private and church colleges while keeping them for tax-supported colleges. So far most of these proposals have been defeated by the vigilance of the friends of free institutions.

But it ought to be of deep concern that Federal and State officials so often appear to act on the idea that tax-supported colleges are the only ones seriously needed for the future. At this writing there are bills in Congress to provide various new subsidies or education. Some of these are not available to independent and church-related colleges; some are available, but dangerous. This writer believes that nongovernment colleges should not accept any government subsidy lest that subsidy reduce or destroy their historic freedom.

5. There is, of course, an ever-recurring economic pressure. Operation costs go up with every wave of inflation. Endowments earn less than they once did. Charges to students ought not to be made so high as to put the Christian college out of reach of the average Christian home. Enrollments need to be relatively small to insure an effective Christian program even though large enrollment and higher charges would help financial income. There are no unlimited sources of support available to the private college as the taxing power of Government, theoretically unlimited, is available to the tax-supported college. Where can the necessary support be found?

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGES' FUTURE DEPENDS UPON THOSE WHO BELIEVE IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The Christian colleges have withstood these pressures with remarkable success in spite of the added and continuous problems of war. They have actually grown stronger, not weaker. Yet, under the pressures which have been mentioned "it may well be," as one prominent educator said 2 years ago, "that within the next two decades will be determined the fate of the independent college in America, and therefore, in the world." The term "independent" here refers to all colleges except those supported by taxes.

If they are to continue, the Christian colleges on their part must be true to their distinctive purpose. But that is only half the need; the other half is support in terms of students and money. Both can be provided adequately if, and only if, Christian people, the church, business firms with vision, and other organizations with the motive of service, really understand and care. They must care a great deal—enough to pay double taxes; one required tax to Government for support of its program of higher education, and one voluntary tax (which really is not a tax but a gift and an investment) to the Christian college and the church for the support of a program of Christian higher education.

The cost is high, but the future is at stake. Our plea is for appreciation and support of all worthy higher institutions—State, independent, and church related—because all are necessary to insure a citizenry enlightened and trained enough to meet the demands of democracy in this complicated age. We urge all colleges, just as we urge the avowedly Christian colleges, to give due place to the first essential which is now so often forgotten—spiritual religion. But our plea is especially for the institutions which also are being too frequently forgotten—the historic Christian colleges of America.

Students from Christian homes are as necessary to these colleges as is money or appreciation. There must be many students to give the college strength and breadth of influence. There must be Christian students and alumni to keep the college Christian. A majority of church people agree that Christian colleges are essential to American life, but only a limited number really believe this deeply enough to guide their own young people to them. Christians must take Christian colleges more seriously.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Dr. Charles Devol, a member of the Marion College faculty, Marion, Ind., and an editorial, both of which appeared in the Marion Chronicle, Marion, Ind.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have a copy of the statement of Dr. Devol and of the editorial, and had intended to ask to have them printed in the RECORD. I am therefore glad to join in the request of my colleague.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHINA VETERAN SPEAKS

Dr. Charles Devol, who was born in China and resided there for 25 years, and who is on the Marion College faculty, made the following comment today in connection with the dismissal of General MacArthur:

"I feel that in America, where we are accustomed to the freedom of speech and the democratic form of government, that a change of an officer would not be looked upon so seriously, but in China or India or the Philippines or any place else in Asia, I am afraid that the people would gain the impression that we had lost confidence in General MacArthur or that we were not agreed among ourselves in our policies. Some of the Chinese, Filipinos, and others in the anti-Communist groups will be disappointed while the Communists will be happy, because it was their wish to remove him years ago."

MACARTHUR FIRED

There is no question that General MacArthur knew he had stepped out of bounds repeatedly by ignoring the orders of his Commander in Chief and issuing statements in defiance of them. Why he did all the things he did which seemed calculated to bring his removal is a mystery which the general can be expected soon to clear up. He will be welcomed back to his beloved country which he had not visited in many years, as a returned hero, as a man who put his high position on the altar in order to serve his country.

It had been apparent for a long time that MacArthur was trying to win a war in the Far East rather than fight a "police action" which could not be won in Korea. The Pentagon and the United Nations tied his hands. Two weeks ago he said that the best that could be hoped for in Korea was a stalemate. The wanton sacrifice of thousands of fine young Americans plainly revolted and outraged him. To have continued the war in Korea entailing sacrifices of men on such a scale was not in the MacArthur tradition. Obviously he felt that the time to strike in China had come. But the striped pants boys in the State Department and the British influence there finally had their way. Truman dismissed him summarily and the International News Service said the general read the dispatch from a news report before he received the telegraphed message.

Whether the menace of Red aggression could have been stopped in the Far East will remain forever an unsolved mystery by Mr. Truman's off-the-cuff action. The British were acting in their own interest by holding down the troops committed to the Far East while they were carrying on trade with Red China. Certainly with the men at his command MacArthur could see only defeat for his forces and the sacrifice of additional manpower, 90 percent of which was American.

The general now can perform a greater service for his country by disclosing what as commanding general he was forced to keep secret.

Reaction in the United States to the MacArthur dismissal was immediate and bitter. Plainly the American people are sufficiently informed to have stalwart opinions on a subject of great import to them and their country. Widely expressed was the belief that Truman had created another crisis in order to cover up the scandals that are being exposed by the hour. But this may be a sort of crisis with the consequence of which Mr. Truman had not reckoned. The conscience of the people has been stirred. The feeling of outrage and frustration may take many forms. Certainly it will not pass over without furore the like of which has not been seen or heard in the present generation.

Rather than being finished, apparently the great debate has just started.

Was the So-Called British Loan Aid to the English People, or Was it a Weapon for Socialist Politicians To Enslave Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and disastrous stupidity of loans from one government to another stands starkly revealed in the case of the British loan.

In 1946 the so-called British loan was bulled through Congress. The final tactic to put it through was the claim that handouts to the British Government would prevent the spread of communism.

Now take a look at England. It is far down the road to socialism and communism—thanks to the British loan. That handout burdened the American taxpayer with more inflation and more taxes—and at the same time, was a weapon for shackling the British people with socialism.

How many of the present administration policies will have equally disastrous consequences over the next few years?

A solemn and sobering appraisal of England's plight today is contained in the following review from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of April 18, 1951:

THE SOCIALIST TRAGEDY BY IVOR THOMAS

Not in anger but in sorrow, this brilliant Oxford "blue"—newspaperman, officer of the Royal Norfolk Regiment, M. P., and erstwhile stalwart of the Labor Government—admits the resounding flop of socialism in England.

SOCIALISM UNMASKED

Mr. Thomas, like most of the world, wants to see the greatest good for the greatest number. While never a Socialist himself, he was so sympathetic to the aims of the Labor Party that he accepted the offices of Parliamentary Secretary for Aviation and later Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the Colonies under the present Government.

This gave him a chance to see the fantastic inefficiency of the present Marxist bureaucracy in England. He saw the payroll padding and chronic deficits of the blundering nationalized industries, the growing tendency of the citizenry to consume as much as possible and produce as little as possible. He saw the island steadily plunging toward sympathy with the Communists, toward uncooperative nationalism, and toward bankruptcy.

Naturally there was only one course which an honorable man could take. In 1948 Mr. Thomas resigned from the Labor Party and now tells in detail why this was his only possible choice.

Why have millions of intelligent Englishmen changed their minds about socialism? Because they are beginning to learn that socialism is only communism by degrees—communism by another name—communism by stealth rather than communism by bloody revolution.

Those who still wear rose-colored glasses when viewing socialism should be reminded that in 1948 the British Labor Government published a special centennary edition of the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, admitting their undying gratitude to the authors to whom socialism owes so much.

Mr. Thomas is convinced that in not-too-long an interval, unless the present Government is overthrown, Englishmen will be deprived of profits, interest, and rents, the first aim of Marx in destroying or leveling all classes above the proletariat.

Already private initiative has been virtually destroyed. The confiscatory taxes have knocked the independence and the courage out of large parts of the populace.

Mr. Thomas insists that the principal ultimate difference between communism and socialism is a matter of tactics. But the Communists at least have the honesty to admit their plot against western civilization.

To support the Socialists as "the best bulwark against their fellow Marxists, the Communists," is, according to Mr. Thomas, the rankest folly. Socialists are already convinced Marxists. Socialists pave the way, both through their ideology and through their economic blundering for Communist dictatorship. Mr. Thomas proves his point with six European examples.

There are only two known ways to make men work: The incentive of pay (plus the right to own personal property) and the incentive of the whip.

Already in England miners and farmers may not leave their industries. And discipline has sunk to such a level in some mining areas that a Labor Government professing the complete interest of the workers has had to close down entire pits.

Already members of the Government are telling housewives they have no more intelligence than their 4-year-old children in choosing items of diet. The next step, presumably, is a nationalized menu.

Despite the fact that this summer the Labor Government is trying to add the second element of "bread and the circus" in the form of the rather desperately conceived festival, England is facing moral, political, and economic crisis. As Mr. Thomas does not say, they will soon be asking America for additional funds, while continuing to play the United States against their fellow Marxists in Moscow—a balance-of-power game which has always ended in war, even when England was a first-class instead of a third-class power.

The time has come to tell our ungrateful debtors that we are not giving our billions to underwrite their form or any other form of Marxism.

What Is To Happen to Our Eighth Army in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written before General MacArthur's address before Congress:

[From Barron's of April 16, 1951]

THE EIGHTH ARMY: ITS FUTURE IS THE NATION'S FIRST CONCERN

In the momentous week that lies ahead the chances favor an intensification of the fighting in Korea at the very time that political debate in this country rises to crescendo.

The announced Communist intention to make their big push in April, the pick-up in air fighting, the sighting of large concentrations behind the Yalu—all favor this conclusion. It should be a sobering one, we think, to all those who may be tempted to make General MacArthur's return to this country into a kind of Saturnalia, as well as to his midget detractors.

For the fact is that the times are too serious for emotionalism and nothing could serve the general or the country worse. Nor is there the slightest point now in rehashing whether the President should have dismissed a great and honored commander, and even less whether he had the right to do so. As in a great trial these "procedural" questions lie behind us. It is time to come to grips with the merits of the case. What should be done about some 250,000 Americans now at the battle front What should this country's Asian policy be—not tomorrow, not a decade hence, but now?

THE GENERAL'S STAND

The opening statements in the case, to continue the legal analogy, are by now well known. The essence of General MacArthur's position is as follows:

1. The American Army in Korea cannot go on indefinitely fighting a limited war, under wraps with no power to strike back at the enemy's supply bases.

2. The war therefore should be extended to the extent of bombing Communist supply lines and releasing the potential of Chiang Kai-shek's forces on Formosa.

3. In the all-out struggle with communism, Asia, not Europe, is today the decisive theater.

The administration position as thus far developed is to deny all three of these propositions. It apparently believes that a limited war can be kept going at least until snow flies again and the danger of Soviet adventures in Europe or other parts of the world is put off at least for another year when the United States will be incomparably stronger. It holds to the view that further involvement in China, particularly on the China mainland, would be a total tragedy for this country. As against the Asian emphasis of General MacArthur, it gives top priority to Europe and the rapid implementation of the Atlantic Pact.

EAST VERSUS WEST

In trying to understand, if not pass on, these fundamental questions, it is well to recall that the pull between an Asian and European orientation for this country is an old one. The United States is a continental Nation, clasping, in Theodore Roosevelt's phrase, "the crest of an ocean in either hand." Through historical accident as much as anything else, the Republican Party, from the turn of the century when John Hay inaugurated the open-door policy, has always emphasized the Pacific. The Democratic Party, due in no small part to the fact that it was in power in two World Wars, has always emphasized the Atlantic and Europe.

The fact is that no foreign policy worthy of the name can disregard either ocean. Europe remains the greatest industrial workshop outside this country. It may be readily granted that loss of this workshop to the Communists would be a fatal blow. At the same time, however, the United States has established interests in the Pacific—Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and the protection of Australia, if not of Malaya—which cannot be set aside, and it has been the consistent duty of MacArthur to uphold them. Moreover—and the point is important—it should be noted that the conditions which in World War II made strategic decision as between the two oceans relatively easy no longer exist.

When, specifically, in 1941, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill decided against General MacArthur's judgment to make Europe the primary theater of action and the Pacific secondary, their choice was in large measure dictated by the harsh realities of the situation. In Europe there was a going war against Hitler, carried forward by Britain. In the Pacific the American Fleet lay at the bottom of Pearl Harbor, requiring at least 2 years to rebuild. The orientation to the Atlantic followed almost inevitably from these circumstances.

Today none of these circumstances is present. The going war against the Communists is in the East. In Europe, General Eisenhower still commands a phantom army. That fact may be used to argue for delay on all fronts, but to the degree that the United States purpose is not just to bend to Communist aggression but to defeat it, then it can be argued—as General MacArthur does argue—that one must close with the enemy where one is at grips with him. And we are at grips in Korea, not in Europe.

Finally, and tipping the scales in favor of MacArthur, there remains the hard, persistent question: What is the Eighth Army in Korea supposed to do? Maybe, it can for a few more months go on fighting a delaying action. Yet General Ridgway himself has described his position as impossible. He sees no chance for decision and meanwhile mounting danger, with the initiative in enemy hands. If the enemy throws in additional air forces, then a wider war, such as MacArthur argues for, becomes inevitable. If he does not, the prospect is for continued casualties, with perhaps in the end a negotiated truce which, on the terms proposed by the U. N. and never openly disavowed by this country, will represent complete and abject far-eastern appeasement.

HIS FINAL SERVICE

The return of MacArthur, in short, must inevitably help to end the State Department's double talk, and smoke the administration out of its micawberism. Meanwhile, and particularly in the coming week, it behooves all citizens to keep their heads. They may thank God they personally do not have to make the vital military decisions now necessary. They may and should do their utmost to allow those in command to work in an atmosphere not of hysteria, but a calm determination.

To welcome General MacArthur back as a returning proconsul, to use him as means of advancing purely partisan causes, is to throw away the great service he can still render his country—the spelling out in detail of what he believes should be done. At stake is more than the reputation of a general or the future of a President or a party. At stake is the fate of as gallant an Army as America has ever put into the field.

Britain's Part in the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished former Member of this House, Hon. Bruce Barton, of New York, has long since been known as one of America's most lucid and forceful writers. His books were read avidly by millions of our people and his news articles have been widely read.

The following article touches a hot spot in our relations with foreign countries especially Great Britain. I agree with my friend and former colleague.

BRUCE BARTON SAYS

(By Bruce Barton)

THE BRITISH

Dr. George Riley, the famous osteopath, was once invited to meet George Bernard Shaw, a devotee of osteopathy.

They had hardly shaken hands before Shaw burst into bitter vituperation of America.

Dr. Riley stood it for about 3 minutes and then cried out: "Stop that. You ought to be ashamed of yourself. How dare you, a man whose food and clothes and rooftree are principally paid for by the money of American bookbuyers and playgoers, how dare you say such things about a country and a people of which you are so abysmally ignorant. I never knew such impudence."

Shaw shut his mouth. A look of amazement came into his eyes, but with it a glint of admiration. He told a friend afterward: "That man Riley is one of the most interesting people I ever met."

Too many British authors and lecturers have accepted our hospitality—often lavish and effusive to the point of servility—taken their winnings and gone back home to write and talk scurvily about us.

Too many of the British people as a whole, jealous of our prosperity, are unfriendly at heart. For years they sold us the idea that, except for the protection of their fleet, we would have been helpless. But they never said from whom their fleet was protecting us; and in our Civil War, when our need of help was most desperate, their sea power, instead of helping us, tried to destroy our merchant marine.

Yet I admire the British. They write the English language better than we—we have no Shakespeare, no Milton. Their administration of justice is swifter, cheaper, and more dignified. In the conduct of foreign affairs they are so much smarter that it just isn't funny.

Indeed, one of my distinguished lawyer friends, a long-time subscriber to the London Spectator, tells me that by reading it he has long been able to predict 6 months in advance just what our State Department would do—the British loan, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, etc.

Lately Russia has been making our foreign policy. When she lets out a blast, we promptly blast her back. When she nudges the North Koreans into starting a rumpus, we obligingly reply with our whole army and heaven only knows how many billions of dollars, while she loses not one soldier or one ruble.

Dancing to Russia's fiddle is getting us nowhere. We might better go back to letting the British manage us. They know their way around, especially in the Orient, where

they operated for more than 150 years at a handsome profit.

Many of us have another idea—that we ought to have our own American foreign policy. But since, to make any sense, this would have to be based on America first, it seems to be out. Every other nation can be for itself first. But not the United States. The mere suggestion is branded "un-American."

Why We Are Where We Are

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Witness, a Catholic newspaper published at Dubuque, Iowa, on April 19, 1951:

WHY WE ARE WHERE WE ARE

The dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as commander in chief of the U. N. forces in the Far East has given rise to frenzied argumentation and bewilderment among people in all walks of life. Behind that action is the seemingly impossible war in Korea. And behind that struggle stands the fierce, implacable monster of the Soviet. As from a smoldering current of fear and misgivings, frustrating confusion and a thousand unanswered questions have risen. There is one basic question—why are we where we are?

We are where we are because the nations, as a whole, have rejected Christ. This answer appears to be extremely simple. It is that simple. Yet the failure to accept Christ, that is, His teachings, as proclaimed by His church, is the one big cause of the tragic chaos of today. Historically, the failure in a chain of causes and effects goes back for centuries. Even in our time, however, we have been the witnesses of how that failure has brought us to the door of disaster.

In February 1945 the big three met at Yalta. The meeting was held to plan the strategy for ending the war and building the peace of the world. Roosevelt was there. Churchill was there. Stalin was there. (Alger Hiss was there.) But Christ was not invited.

Mellow-voiced radio commentators and high-salaried newspaper columnists told the public how this great meeting was to lay the foundations for the future peace of the world. The leaders were called the Big Three because they were from the big powers and they were to accomplish big things. But what actually happened?

At the Yalta Conference, Poland (largely Catholic) was sold out to the armed atheism of the Soviet and the way was paved for the Communist domination of Eastern Europe and China. Now these eventualities are ascribed to political or diplomatic blunders. But basically it was all because Christ was not welcome at Yalta.

In July 1945 another big conference was held at Potsdam. Churchill was there. Atlee was there. Truman was there. Stalin was there. But Christ was not invited.

Again silver-tongued radio analysts and fast-writing columnists described the Potsdam meeting with shining words. How wonderful it was, they said in effect, for such powerful leaders to get together to plan the peace of the world. But what actually happened?

The Council of Foreign Ministers was formed at Potsdam. Representing the United States, Great Britain, Russia (and China and far-eastern questions), they were to meet to fashion the framework of peace. They met, remember, five times, and each meeting ended in bitter bickering. Some will say these are matters of international relations. But the real reason why the Potsdam plan failed was because Christ did not have a part in it.

The San Francisco Conference sat from April to June 1945. Representatives from 50 nations participated. But Christ was not invited to take part.

Self-appointed prophets of the air waves and last-word-on-anything newspaper scribes classified the formation of the United Nations as a powerful agency for guaranteeing the peace of the world. Fifty-one nations signed the pact of new union. But what actually happened.

The veto power was insisted on by the Soviet delegation and incorporated into the working program of the U. N. (Alger Hiss, remember, was one of the big wheels in the organization of the U. N.) Ever since the Soviet delegates have been using the veto power to cripple the effectiveness of the U. N. The U. N. is failing because from the start Christ was ignored.

Today there is excited debating and painful confusion all over the land. One faction says, "Bomb Manchuria because Red China is already in the war in Korea." Another says, "Confine the war in the Far East to Korea and concentrate on Europe because the Reds may strike there anytime." And millions of people are asking, "Do we know where we are going or what we are to do?"

All this time Stalin and his atheistic henchmen are laughing in secret. For a long time they planned and plotted to divide and confuse us. And now they are succeeding. Our leaders played games with the delegate of hell. The men from Moscow have led our diplomats and so-called statesmen into a snake pit—any way they move they get hurt (and we get hurt).

Many are deliberating over how we can get out of this mess. But we cannot stop effects from causes once set in motion. Our Nation as a whole has turned its back on Christ and now it must eat the bitter fruits in the chaos of hell that is upon us.

Merchant Marine Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Monday, April 23, 1951. Those of us who have had the opportunity of coming to know the great work done at the Maritime Academy will appreciate the importance to the Academy of the early construction of the chapel and we urge the friends of the Merchant Marine to assist as much as possible:

MERCHANT MARINE MEMORIAL

The United States merchant marine is one of the most useful but least lauded organizations for its military and peacetime service to its country. During the Second World War its members bravely faced the dangers of the seas to supply our embattled forces, following the traditions set down by merchant seafarers since the days of the American Revolution. Although many gave their lives to see that the supplies reached their destination, very few of their number have received the recognition bestowed on members of the military and naval services.

With the naming of John M. Franklin, president of the United States Lines, as chairman of the memorial chapel fund campaign of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, a forward step has been taken toward doing honor to these devoted men, of whom 6,000 officers and seamen and 212 cadet-midshipmen died keeping the supply lines open during the war. The planned memorial is an all-religion chapel to be constructed at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island.

This memorial is long overdue. Contributions for its construction may be mailed to memorial fund campaign, United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.

Cards on Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on Friday, April 20, 1951:

CARDS ON TABLE

Accorded the privilege of presenting his views before a joint session of Congress, General MacArthur acquitted himself with honor and skill.

There was no doubt that the general, who suddenly has become a violently controversial political figure, desired nothing more than to present his arguments to Congress so that the issue may be debated on its own merits.

He did so with conviction and without injecting any political side issues or using the occasion to stir a partisan frenzy.

The policy he presented was a strictly military policy. The administration believes such a policy is unwise at this time because we are not prepared for the eventuality of world war III.

General MacArthur's proposals make sense strategically so long as we are equipped to face the eventuality. The decision to push to the Manchurian border of Korea made sense strategically, too, but we were not equipped to face what happened—the direct intervention of Red China. General MacArthur's estimate of the situation had a great deal to do with the decision to push north.

It is as unreal to call the administration's policy appeasement as it is unreal to call MacArthur's policy warmongering. There is, however, the risk that the pursuit of MacArthur's policy will touch off world war III despite his belief that it won't. We are not prepared to handle both east and west aggression now. Eventually we will be, and it is entirely possible that administration policy can ease its present restrictions. Now, it must be geared to the eventuality and our ability to meet it, even though the Korean stalemate is a regrettable byproduct. The administration in no sense is abandoning the east, but it must be subordinated to global defense.

General MacArthur has given his side of the picture, the administration has given its side. The debate in Congress can now be held to those practical considerations. The general did his final job well. Now we can get on with the business at hand without emotion and partisanship.

Address by Kenneth Erickson, Youth Governor, State of Washington, Before Joint Session Hi Y Youth Legislature, Olympia, Wash., April 13, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the fourth annual YMCA Model Youth Legislature was held in Olympia, Wash., on April 13 and 14. The youth governor this year was Mr. Kenneth Erickson, of Puyallup, Wash. It is a very fine talk, and I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in reading it. The speech is as follows:

Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, Your Excellency Governor Langlie, State officials, my fellow colleagues in the Fourth Washington Youth Legislature, and friends, today we are meeting as the youth of a great Nation and a great State. We are the youth of the world's most progressive and strongest democracy. Yes; our democracy has gained momentum as each succeeding generation of youth has grown and matured to step into the shoes of their elders and take over the ever-increasing problems of national and State Government. Until now, with our generation nearing the threshold of adulthood and responsibility, the United States stands as the one stanch bolt in the door of freedom, straining to hold back the menace of a world threatened by sinister foreign influences.

It is during this struggle, both physical and psychological, that we meet in this legislature; during a time of national emergency, deficit spending, high taxes, and an economy disrupted by enormous defense and rearmament programs. As youth of this State then we have had a great honor bestowed upon us in that we have been given a chance to express our views freely in a State legislature of our own; a chance to use our youthful enthusiasm and optimism, undimmed by prejudice and political viewpoints, to find solutions to the many problems and dilemmas that are unsolved in our State at the present time.

The scope of our task is tremendous. The present National and State situations will hinder us greatly in our attempts to create better conditions in our State. Lack of funds, as you all know, is our main barrier, and it is my firm desire that you take this problem into careful consideration while studying any appropriation bill. In other words, a source of money will have to be found for any legislation which will require funds to enact and carry out. Furthermore it is my desire, and I am sure that it stands to reason, that we confine ourselves with major issues, and discourage any unimportant or otherwise frivolous legislation. The short span of time we have to work in makes this imperative and in the best interests of the success of our legislature.

In short let's use our heads and show the citizens of our State that they have an alert, and intelligent youth, capable in time to take over the real State legislature with integrity and good judgment.

Because time is short and we cannot hope to cover the entire field of wants and needs in our State in 2 days, I have chosen only three main issues which I would like to suggest and outline to you.

National emergency has already been mentioned, defense and rearmament have already been mentioned. They should be spoken of in another regard. Our State of Washington is as important an implement now in our Nation's defense and offense as it was during the Second World War. We are strategically located and within our borders are located some of the Nation's top war installations. Because of these conditions our State occupies a precarious position in case of attack. The science of devastation has made such terrific progress in the last few years that, until effective international controls assure safety, not one country on the earth is entirely safe from the lethal, vehement, and indescribably devastating blows that can be rent with atomic weapons. I have not said these things to scare you or unduly disturb you, but merely to wake you to action on a problem that these conditions bring about. The problem is civilian defense and it is a responsibility and a duty of this legislature to provide an adequate and suitable civilian-defense program. Yes, thousands of our citizen's lives may someday depend on our ability and foresight in providing sufficient protection from attack through a workable plan of civilian defense.

I would recommend for your careful consideration, legislation which would set up a civilian defence commission to be made up of members of the legislature and what technical help deemed necessary. The purpose of this commission would be to set up within our State adequate fire protection, medical aid, and above all a means of educating the public on what to do in case of an attack. Schools present a definite problem in the question of civilian defense. I encourage infinite care in the study of schools' defense problems, and believe me they have them. All students should be taught what to do in case of attack, and drill procedures should be practiced in each school. There is now published by the United States Defense Department a booklet entitled "Survival Under Atomic Attack," which could and should be either given to every student or explained to him carefully. A copy of this booklet should be in the home of every family in the State. Above all, a uniform and clearly defined signal system for caution, warning, and all clear should be set up throughout the State. Cooperation on a local basis will undoubtedly make this problem much easier to solve and is to be greatly encouraged. All in all, this challenge of civilian defense is one which will undoubtedly tax your mentality and knowledge to meet in an adequate manner, but it is a program that must be built strong in our State. We are a link in the Nation's chain of defense, and we owe it, not only to the people of our own State, but to the whole Nation, to be a strong link.

The solving of our defense problem is going to take funds and so it is imperative that you provide a source of revenue to cover the cost of this much-needed program. We have a source of revenue in our State that is providing us with much tax money at the present time, but which has not been developed to its fullest extent, in my opinion. Last year an estimated 2,500,00 tourists visited our State. This was an increase of over 20 percent from 1949. Through proper and intelligent planning this figure could be doubled in a few years. Proper development of our tourist trade could assure monetary changes in our State treasury through gas tax, sales tax, and other revenue paid by tourists who enter our State. We are not doing all we can to develop this important source of income. Actual tourist comments in the Washington Tourist Survey for 1950 made by the State College of Washington School of Economics and Business showed that we do not advertise enough. And may I pause long enough to congratulate the State College on a fine service they have rendered to the State in this survey. Many tourists came to Washington and thoroughly enjoyed it and left wondering why they did not see anything about Washington in national magazines. There is at the present time in our State, a State development agency, which supposedly handles the publicity of the Evergreen State. Yet not one major sportsman's magazine carries advertising concerning our State. Many States have active commissions in this regard and are profiting from them. Mount Rainier, a paradise of scenery for business-weary travelers; Grand Coulee Dam, largest man-made structure on the face of the earth; the beautiful Olympic Peninsula; the ever-interesting Inland Empire; Lake Chelan; Puget Sound, and many other spots of breath-taking beauty and primitive grandeur are located within our borders and afford us with a chance for development toward a profitable end.

I would recommend a complete reorganization of the present agency. This agency should be activated to advertise our State's scenic beauty in a way that would encourage a larger number of tourists. Information should be made readily available to anyone who should inquire concerning our State and careful consideration of the project, I feel, would be of a beneficial nature.

In our State constitution today there is one section which needs amending. Article VI, section 1, of our constitution does not stand up to all our system of government should mean to our people. A democracy is supposed to be a government of, by, and for the people; a government of balanced rights and responsibilities. In my estimation, the fact that 18-year-olds cannot vote, which is a right, and yet fight for our country, which is a responsibility, produces an apparent contradiction to this fact. The educational development of our country also has developed to the point where the 21-year-old vote law now in effect is outmoded and unfair to a faction of our people.

There is nothing so magical about the number 21. We don't suddenly change and become intellectually and mentally capable to cast an intelligent ballot overnight. Rather it stands to reason that an 18-year-old, with his high-school course in civics still making an impression on his mind, would be a better voter than a person who, for 3 years, has been away from much contact with the real processes of elections and the qualities to look for in a candidate. An 18-year-old, if he started voting immediately after leaving high school, or even in his senior year in high school, would be more likely to keep on voting and keep his parents voting than a person who has had to start voting of his own accord when he reaches the present legal age of 21. Our schools could provide information concerning voting; how to register, qualifications for voting and other preliminaries to voting. Qualities of various candidates could be discussed in history and world problems classes on an undiscriminating level. Thus we would not only have an increased vote, but we would have a more intelligent vote.

The true unproportional distribution of rights and responsibilities, however, has been written in blood on the battlefields whenever the United States has gone to war in the last 32 years. Our principles are shaken whenever a soldier under 21 is made to fight and perhaps die for a democracy which has not even given him the prime privilege of a mature citizen, the voting privilege. I say if we are old enough to fight for the future of our country, we are old enough to vote for the future of our country.

These three issues do not even scratch the surface of the bills and ideas which will be presented for your approval or disapproval, but they give you an idea of what seem to me to be the major issues for your deliberation.

Efficiency, good judgment, common sense, and faith in God have made our country

great and have made our State great. Let us, then, in these next 2 days, use all four with equal fortitude and courage. And let us remember and consider this: In a few years we will no longer be the youth and will enjoy the carefree years no longer. We must learn now what is to be expected of us in the years to come. Preparedness will make our task much easier and will enhance our chance to find a solution to brotherhood among men under the fatherhood of God. Abraham Lincoln stated our problem with immortal beauty and simplicity when he said in his famous "house divided" speech, "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it." Today Lincoln's statement still stands as a challenge of tomorrow, and it is our challenge for a better future. It is up to us. Why not start now?

The Importance of Rice in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, those who have traveled in the lands of the earth where rice constitutes the primary food for millions of people will appreciate the keen observations made by Mr. George E. Sokolsky and as set forth in a form letter, "To our Distributors:" mailed by the Adolphus Rice Mills, Inc.

In view of present military activities and the proposal to effectuate a Pacific pact, it will be well for our people to obtain a better understanding of the great economic force which is involved in the little word, "rice."

Peoples who live on lower standards than ours do not vary their foods as we do. They eat with monotonous constancy almost the same food every day.

For instance, rice eaters are never satisfied with any other grain or even with a variety of meats and vegetables. Their basic food is rice and whatever they put on the rice is a side dish. This is true of millions of people in the east of Asia.

The rice line lies south of the Yellow River in China and it includes Korea, Japan, the Malay Peninsula, Burma, Siam, French Indochina, and areas of India. It might be possible in such a country as ours to eat cake instead of bread but a rice eater wants rice. Without it he starves. He might try wheat or millet but they do not serve him adequately. He craves rice even after a full meal.

The world production of rice is about 7,600,000,000 bushels and about 95 percent of it is produced in Asia. China never grew enough rice to meet the demands of her population.

It is just diplomatic trickery that, under such circumstances Soviet China offers to sell rice to India, risking the starvation of the people with the object of winning a propagandistic victory. It is a design for conquest at any cost. On the other hand, if Soviet China should conquer Burma or French Indochina or Thailand during the forthcoming summer, the offer of rice to India could be made with safety.

It is to be assumed, therefore that all the factors indicate that both for internal and diplomatic reasons, Soviet China must seek to increase its rice reserves as soon as possible, even if that means that pressures have to be put on neighboring countries, to the extent of conquering them.

Hindsight is of little advantage and these days usually ends in the loss of human life. The Burma, Thailand, French Indochina situation must inevitably lead to trouble as they are the granaries of surplus rice. It does not make sense to ignore this situation or to misunderstand it. We do not have to wait for another Korea, where we were caught without policy or purpose.

The Manchu dynasty, for instance, fell in 1911. This was preceded by unusually high imports of rice in 1902 and in every year following up to 1911. The import of the staple food of a country weakens that country's economy unless, as in the case of Great Britain, exports of products pay for the food. China obtained its additional rice from French Indochina, Thailand (Siam), and Burma.

If we translate this into current politics, it is essential to Communist China that that country have free access to the rice of these other Asiatic nations. If anti-Soviet countries interfere with the movement of rice from those countries to Soviet China, the lack of rice or the high price of rice could be the reason for revolutionary movements in China. A starving people blames its government for failure to provide food, and rebels.

As a matter of fact, much of the labor troubles in China, which preceded the Communist revolution of 1925, was over rice, and the escalator clause which Walter Reuther and General Motors think that they invented was introduced in China many years ago by the British-American Tobacco Co., whose wage scale was determined by the price of a picul (133 pounds) of rice. They found that rice was more important than money.

But it did not work, because inflationary prices knocked the props out from under all schemes and as the price of rice rose the discontent increased. Thus, Li Li-san, now in charge of Manchuria for Soviet Russia, was able to organize strikes in the Yangtze Valley and Shanghai in 1925 to pave the way for the victories of the armies led by Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and Gen. Galens-Bluecher, the Russian, who then was engaged in conquering China—an effort which failed when Chiang Kai-shek turned on the Russians and the Chinese Communists.

Rice is then the one commodity which is related to the politics of these Asiatic countries as it is the basis of their economic life. And Soviet China does not have enough rice to take care of the needs of the people.

Joint Chiefs of Staff on a Political Limb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of Monday, April 23, 1951:

JOINT CHIEFS ON A POLITICAL LIMB—WHITE HOUSE STATEMENTS ON GENERAL MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL ARE IN VARIANCE WITH WHAT ACTUALLY HAPPENED

(By David Lawrence)

It's a new experience and a very uncomfortable one for the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff to be dragged into the center of a bitter political controversy.

There is, moreover, a serious discrepancy between what the White House has been saying officially—as to the unanimous recommendations of the Joint Chiefs in the MacArthur case—and what actually happened.

The first chapter—the initiative—in the controversy was the administration's sanction of a speech by General Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, last Wednesday in Chicago. This was the day before General MacArthur was due to present his case to a joint meeting of Congress. The big headline in the Wednesday afternoon papers was "General Bradley blasts MacArthur's views." The explanation offered for this advanced rebuttal was that General Bradley had for a long time scheduled the engagement and had to deliver the speech.

The general could as readily have talked about universal military training or something else unrelated to the MacArthur episode.

But once the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs spoke out it was natural that General MacArthur in his Thursday address should reveal that his own military recommendations had been approved in the past by the Joint Chiefs.

Not content with one blunder, the administration then went from the frying pan into the fire with another statement. This one, while issued at the Pentagon, was actually directed by the White House. It came immediately after General MacArthur's speech to Congress on Thursday and the full text of it reads as follows:

"In response to inquiries from the press concerning General MacArthur's reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Pentagon spokesman said the White House had authorized him to state that action taken by the President in relieving General MacArthur was based upon the unanimous recommendations of the President's principal civilian and military advisers including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The reasons for General MacArthur's release have been stated previously by the President."

Now the foregoing gives the impression that General MacArthur's reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in his address to Congress had to do with his removal. Not a word of his address had any reference to that point. He merely outlined his own military recommendations about the prosecution of the war in Korea and stated that the Joint Chiefs had supported his proposals.

This latter point, therefore, the White House in its statement did not deny at all though a local paper headlined its front-page article: "MacArthur says Joint Chiefs shared his views but Pentagon declares they favored ouster."

This was natural in view of the misleading official statement. For the White House declaration that the Joint Chiefs had unanimously recommended the President's action is a half truth.

The facts are these:

1. There was no meeting of the Joint Chiefs and no action of a formal nature taken by the Joint Chiefs.

2. There was a meeting in which civilians and military men met with the President who asked their views about the controversy and they generally felt that since Mr. Truman and General MacArthur differed in foreign policy there should be a replacement.

3. The timing of the replacement and the method of making the replacement was not agreed upon, this being left to the President to decide.

4. Some of those present at the meeting had their first news of what the President finally decided when they read the newspapers on Wednesday morning, April 18.

5. Not a single recommendation of a formal nature is in the record to show that the Joint Chiefs took cognizance of any military insubordination or preferred any such charge against General MacArthur. Yet Members of Congress have been saying so in a chorus for several days just as if General MacArthur, after 52 years of military service, did not know what was and was not a military order or instruction.

6. General MacArthur's summary dismissal was not recommended by any military man since it meant he was instantly relieved and not only could not say farewell to his troops but had no opportunity to turn over the complicated affairs of his command to a successor.

7. Not a single piece of evidence exists that General MacArthur failed to carry out the policies of the President and the Department of State in his post as Supreme Allied Commander in Japan. Though it wasn't necessary to relieve him of his command when General Ridgway was given command of U. N. operations in Korea, the President swept General MacArthur from all three of his posts and gave the impression that this action was based on the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Chiefs.

Small wonder that America is disunited. For, when military men are compelled to become the scapegoats in petty political blunders, respect for institutions of military importance can hardly be enhanced.

Suppression of News Versus Smothering of News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, we live in a time of world-wide tension. Under these conditions, freedom of the press creates more than ever the responsibility to report important news fully and fairly.

A sample of the smothering of significant news has recently come to my attention. It concerns General Eisenhower's 3-week military mission to Europe early this year, which was extravagantly publicized, to say the least.

Yet the significant news that, when General Eisenhower was in Rome, the Pope declined to see him was smothered in the New York Times, which reported it, and not printed at all in most American papers. Obviously, the Pope was not willing to be even remotely identified with our new military intervention in Europe.

The New York Times buried this significant news deep in the middle of a column-long story under a different heading on page 11, January 19. The column follows:

EISENHOWER SIFTS ROME ARMS EFFORT—TWO DEAD AND SIXTY INJURED IN CLASHES DURING VISIT—RED MASS PROTESTS FAIL

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

ROME, January 18.—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower plunged today into his work of investigating Italy's will to fight if attacked and to contribute her share toward the common defense of the West against Soviet imperialism.

His mission being exploratory nothing that could by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as negotiations took place in the conversations that he had this morning with the Italian Cabinet and he limited his role almost exclusively to listening.

This evening after dedicating the rest of his working day to consultations with United States officials in Rome he had a store of data to guide his opinion on how intense the Italian rearmament effort was and how far it might be expected to develop in the future. His task in Rome is thus completed and he plans to leave by plane tomorrow morning for Luxemburg.

Two rioters were killed in clashes with the police during General Eisenhower's stay. One was killed yesterday at Adrano, near Catania, Sicily, and the other today at Comacchio, a poverty-stricken town at the mouth of the Po River. Sixty persons, including several policemen, were wounded or injured in these two places and in minor scuffles in Florence, Milan, Naples, and some smaller places.

ONE THOUSAND COMMUNISTS HELD

About 1,000 Communist activists were arrested or detained in various places. Scattered strikes of brief duration took place in many cities and towns throughout the country today. The day passed in comparative quiet, however, the Communists having abandoned their effort to arouse mass demonstrations against General Eisenhower's presence in Italy.

In Rome the Communist-dominated General Confederation of Labor held a peace meeting with police permission in an open-air theater. Workers were supposed to abandon their jobs at 3:30 p. m. to attend, but all public services continued to run as usual.

Six or seven thousand workers turned up for the meeting but were easily outnumbered by the truly imposing police force that the authorities concentrated in the vicinity. The meeting broke up quietly after Giuseppe di Vittorio, Communist secretary general of the confederation, and other labor leaders had delivered speeches in favor of peace.

General Eisenhower started his day in Rome by calling on Premier Alcide de Gasperi. After a preliminary exchange of views lasting 40 minutes Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza, Defense Minister Randolfo Pacciardi and Treasury Minister Giuseppe Pella joined the session. The meeting went with considerable detail into the problems of rearmament and preparedness, with particular emphasis upon its economic and financial aspects.

TALK WITH MILITARY CHIEFS

General Eisenhower, who was accompanied by Maj. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, his chief of staff, and by Col. Vernon Walters, then conferred with Signor Pacciardi and the Italian chiefs of staff.

He paid a courtesy call on President Luigi Einaudi and later was the guest of honor at a luncheon given by Signor Pacciardi. The general spent the afternoon working with his staff in his hotel and dined with Ambassador James Clement Dunn. Other guests included leading members of General Eisenhower's mission and top United States Embassy, Economic Cooperation Administration and mutual defense assistance program officials in Rome.

General Eisenhower will leave without being received by the Pope. Vatican circles said that General Eisenhower let it be known that he would have been happy to present his respects to the Pontiff and that the Pope also wished to see him.

Later, however, the view prevailed that it was preferable for the Pope, who has never ceased to plead for peace and who considers himself outside and above all "earthly competitions," not to meet him.

NO INFORMATION ISSUED

No information was given either by the Italians or General Eisenhower on what was said in today's meetings. There is reason to believe, however, that in discussing the political aspects of the European rearmament the Italian Government reiterated its view that war was not imminent. It thinks that the West has 1 year to 18 months in which to rearm and that by the end of that time it may be strong enough to deter Russia.

The possible Soviet reaction to the rearmament of Western Germany is regarded by the Italian Government as a danger. Nevertheless, it favors the rearming of Germany, because otherwise it sees no possibility of defending Europe.

Both Italians and Americans emphasized the cordiality of today's conversations. That is not surprising since there are no fundamental points at issue. The Americans stress the necessity of speed. The Italians are willing to exert their maximum effort and to go as quickly and as far as the United States puts them in a position to go.

If Italy has any requests to make to the United States apart from aiding her rearmament effort they could be summarized as follows: To accelerate the dispatch of men and arms to Europe since these are regarded as essential morale builders, to use whatever troops Italy places at the disposal of an integrated European army for the defense of Italian soil since these are conditions under which they would give the best account of themselves and to extend European defense plans as soon as it is feasible to include Italy in the area that is to be defended in case of aggression.

DAV Warns of Repetition of the Economy Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have received from Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director of the Disabled American Veterans, who calls the attention of Congress to the threat of another Economy Act:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1951.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: We, of the Disabled American Veterans, are perturbed and somewhat alarmed by certain recommendations made to the Congress recently. The first report is that of the Committee on Federal Tax Policy, a nongovernmental group. The second is the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, a congressional committee. Each contains recommendations or suggestions to abolish or curtail certain disabled veterans' benefits. Meantime, there are the various pertinent recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission pending in the Congress.

The officers and members of our organization are mainly disturbed because some of the recommendations or suggestions are suspiciously similar to those of two decades ago when the vicious misnamed "Economy Act of 1933" was enacted.

The Committee on Federal Tax Policy labeled its report "A tax program for a solvent America." How much alike is this to the citation of the Economy Act, entitled, "An act to maintain the credit of the United

States." This infamous measure was passed by the Congress with comparatively little consideration and with solemn promises that the disabled veteran and survivors of deceased veterans would not be affected. Within a few months, however, its horrifying results became evident and during the next several years the Congress found it necessary to repeal many of its features. These are so well known they need not be noted herein.

One suggestion in both reports is that all plans for the present Veterans' Administration hospital-construction program be suspended. With this Nation now engaged in the Korean war and seemingly on the verge of world war III, those advisory staffs and researchers responsible for this recommendation should go to some of the Pacific coast ports and meet the hospital ships now returning American war casualties to their homeland. It might be well also for them to visit some of the service and veteran hospitals and meet hospitalized veterans there. Incidentally, these include some of the same service hospitals which only last April were ordered closed in the name of economy.

Other suggestions and recommendations are outlined in the two reports. Explanation of them in this letter would require too much of your time.

The DAV has not objected to any humanitarian project requiring the spending of billions of American dollars and resources abroad, but we do point out these expenditures have increased the inflationary trend and that some of this aid is expended upon former armed enemies of American veterans, with the latter now in danger of another economy act in their own country.

The members of this organization are taxpayers. Their patriotism has been proved. We are as anxious as members of the Committee on Federal Tax Policy to combat inflation. Only recently we vigorously supported the House version of H. R. 1, Eighty-second Congress, because it would provide universal indemnity coverage and, at the same time, we were reliably informed that it would have saved millions of dollars. We desire economy in Government, but we do not desire a repetition of the Economy Act of 1933 at the expense of disabled veterans and of widows and orphans.

It is doubtful if a modern economy act will be a one-package measure. In all likelihood it will be advanced piecemeal and necessarily come from many congressional committees. Therefore, we of the DAV implore you to observe and study each measure before your committees and on the floor to make certain disabled veterans and survivors of deceased veterans will be protected.

The officers and members of this organization will appreciate any consideration you may give to this most important subject.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

Nation-Wide Freedom Day Movement Will Be Launched in Chrisman, Ill., May 4, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, a grass-roots expression of public sentiment against Government controls over the press, radio, and our other freedoms will be demonstrated in Chrisman, Ill., in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, on Friday evening, May 4, 1951. Because it is hoped that the idea may find national acceptance and spread to other communities across the Nation where similar demonstrations may take place, I am calling it to the attention of my colleagues under permission granted by the House.

Stanley R. Kent, editor and publisher of the Chrisman Weekly Courier and chairman of publicity for the program, has announced detailed plans for the event, which is said to be the first such public meeting of its kind in the United States. To provide a clear picture of the scope of the undertaking, I include in the RECORD the announcement of the program as carried in the Chrisman Courier in its issue of April 12, 1951. The article follows:

NATION-WIDE FREEDOM DAY MOVEMENT WILL BE LAUNCHED IN CHRISMAN ON MAY 4 WITH PUBLIC MASS MEETING IN NEW GYM—SPONSORED BY LOCAL LEGION POST, COMMERCIAL CLUB, AND LIONS CLUB

Extensive plans are now under way for the launching of a Freedom Day movement in Chrisman on Friday, May 4, from which may stem a national expression of public sentiment against governmental controls of press, speech, radio, and the other freedoms that Americans take for granted.

The Freedom Day movement will be launched in the form of a public mass meeting that will be held in the new Chrisman gymnasium, with a seating capacity of more than 2,000 people. The meeting will start at 8 p. m.

It will be the first such public meeting of its kind in the United States, and will be the first grass roots expression of opposition to governmental regulations, particularly in its apparent effort to control a free press and a free radio.

Newspapers all over America flew their flags at half-mast last week, in mourning for the newspaper La Prensa that was confiscated by the Argentine Government. This was the first invasion by a totalitarian government against the free press in the Western Hemisphere.

The same thing could happen in the United States unless the people are awakened to the fact that their liberties are being threatened by governmental regulations.

The Freedom Day movement is being inaugurated in Chrisman through the combined efforts of the Chrisman American Legion Post, No. 477; the Chrisman Commercial Club; and the Chrisman Lions Club, with the idea of attracting Nation-wide attention.

The suggestion for a freedom day came from various national organizations and individuals who believe that action by the American people should start in a typical small American town. Chrisman has been selected and designated as the typical small American town for the start of such concerted action.

Principal speaker for the freedom-day meeting in Chrisman on May 4 will be Charles Allen Crowder, publisher and editor of the Flora Sentinel at Flora, Ill., who has consented to speak here in the interest of preserving a free press in America.

Mr. Crowder and the Flora Sentinel were the targets of pressure groups who tried to boycott and suppress the Sentinel in 1949 because of the newspaper's presentation of both sides of a labor controversy in the city of Flora. The bitter fighting over the issue brought Nation-wide attention when six of the opposition leaders bought a note and mortgage against the Sentinel and sought to destroy the newspaper. The freedom-of-the-press battle was won when labor unions rallied to the defense of the Sentinel and Mr. Crowder, and the newspaper was saved from the auction block by the loan of $12,000 from an investment-banking firm in Washington, D. C.

Members of the general committee in charge of arrangements for the meeting are Nash C. Breen, commander of the Chrisman Legion Post; Harry E. Haworth, president of the Lions Club; Harold McGlosson, president of the Commercial Club; D. E. Bradley and Stanley R. Kent.

The Freedom Day meeting is entirely nonpolitical and nonsectarian, and is open to the general public. There will be no admission charge. All expenses will be borne by the three local sponsoring organizations.

Invitations to the May 4 meeting are being extended to Vernon L. Nickell, State superintendent of public instruction; United States Senators Paul Douglas and Everett M. Dirksen; Edward H. Jenison, Congressman from the Twenty-third District; W. O. Edwards, M. R. (Bob) Walker, and John P. Meyer, State representatives from this district; William E. Wayland, State senator from this district; and many other dignitaries.

Arrangements are also being made to have represenatives of press associations, radio stations, and daily and weekly newspapers present at this meeting. An effort is also being made to get writers and photographers from Time, Life, and Saturday Evening Post to be present at the Chrisman meeting.

Radio station WLBH at Mattoon has already made arrangements to send a tape recorder to Chrisman to record the activities of the May 4 Freedom Day meeting. This recording will be rebroadcast on the air at a later date.

Local ministers will also participate in the program, and the Chrisman school band will play several patriotic selections during the program.

MacArthur Blow-Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat of April 12, 1951, which follows:

MACARTHUR BLOW-OFF

Congressional admirers of Gen. Douglas MacArthur have pounced upon his dramatic ouster as Supreme Allied Commander in the Far East as political fodder, which it certainly is not.

The firing of the general, in fact, reflects a legitimate exercise of necessary action and sound executive common sense by the President of the United States.

We have been considerably less than enthusiastic over many of President Truman's policies and performances, but in this instance we do not question the rightness of his judgment.

Had there been any compromise of principle or lack of decision in the light of General MacArthur's continuing and flagrant insubordination, President Truman would have been grossly remiss in the exercise of his plain duty.

Firing MacArthur was no error of judgment on Mr. Truman's part, as is now charged by many Republican congressional leaders.

Throughout his dealings with his prima donna commander in the Far East, Mr. Truman has shown far more patience and deference than conditions warranted. When the blow-off finally came the only criticism we can offer is that it was so long coming.

Last August, on the occasion of General MacArthur's withdrawn message to the VFW convention, the News-Democrat commented:

"General MacArthur apparently has lost sight of the function for which he was hired. Definitely this is not to make or decide the official policy of the United States. His job is merely to help carry out whatever policy is set forth. MacArthur is not Commander in Chief, and although he's been in the service long enough to appreciate this difference, nevertheless he has asserted himself as a rookie."

To this we might add that ever since, he has behaved like a spoiled brat, ignoring the cardinal tenet of the military which is uncompromising obedience to the superior officer.

The headstrong tactics of projecting himself as a principal, responsible only to himself, has unquestionably wrought great harm to our cause. It revealed in MacArthur a streak of ineptness damaging to peace overtures and threatening to spread the Korean conflict into a full-scale world war.

Prior to Korea, MacArthur had generally acquitted himself as a competent, and sometimes brilliant, military leader. With his lengthy and well-rounded background in the Orient he should have been in a position to add counsel of inestimable value to this Nation, if tendered confidentially to his superiors.

If, then, an insurmountable conflict of views still persisted, an honorable alternative would have dictated the general's resignation from office and respectful withdrawal from the scene.

Had he chosen this course, General MacArthur's stature would have been enormously enhanced and his potency compounded.

As things turned out, the general has merely succeeded in fomenting a distasteful political tempest at home that can only serve eventually to lessen his evaluation in the eyes of his countrymen.

Missourians Score in National Poster Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Missourians Score in National Poster Contest," taken from the Missouri Wildlife magazine, an official organ of the Conservation Federation of Missouri edited by Mr. Charles H. Callison:

MISSOURIANS SCORE IN NATIONAL POSTER CONTEST

A Missouri boy, Donald Fleming, of Ritenour High School, Overland, was awarded first prize of $250 in the annual conservation poster contest sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation. Donald's poster was adjudged best among nearly a thousand entries from all over the country in the senior high school division.

A Missouri girl, 12-year-old Margie Buesinger of Carthage, won honorable mention and a $10 prize in the junior high school division of the national contest.

Judges for the contest were Walter Weber, noted nature artist attached to the staff of the National Geographic magazine; Albert M. Day, director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and Dr. William Mann, curator of the National Zoological Park in Washington, D. C.

Last fall the executive secretary of the Conservation Federation of Missouri served notice on the national federation that Missouri was going after some of the poster prizes. All chapters were supplied with information about the contest and urged to encourage local entries. Several of them did, and found the poster contest an excellent project through which to stimulate community interest in conservation.

Margie Buesinger, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James Buesinger and an eighth grade student at Mark Twain school in Carthage, won first prize in a local competition sponsored by the Carthage Sportsman's Protective League. Prizes of $15, $10, and $5 were awarded in the Carthage contest. The winning entries were then forwarded to Washington for the national competition.

Bob Esterly, president of the Carthage league, said plans have been adopted to secure a large participation next year, particularly among the rural schools.

An Authentic, Documented Statement on the MacArthur-Truman Controversy by the World War II Chief of United States Propaganda Warfare Against Japan and on Behalf of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN T. WOOD
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is the last hope of this Republic. Despite the fact that the Congress has abjectly surrendered to the administrative branch of the Government much of the authority vested in it by the Constitution, the Congress still has the power and the responsibility to maintain our constitutional form of government and repudiate those who would surrender our national sovereignty to a totalitarian state in which we would be outnumbered 15 to 1 and outvoted 59 to 1, as we now are in the United Nations.

Knowledge is power, and the Good Book says, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"; but if, because of prejudice or partisanship, we close our minds to the truth, we are in a fair way of losing our liberties.

Jonathan Swift stated an everlasting truth when he said, "There is none so blind as they that won't see." And I implore my colleagues, particularly the members of the Armed Services Committees, to read with open minds, the following documented statement by my good friend, Clay Osborne, World War II chief of United States propaganda against Japan and on behalf of Korea, so that they may understand more clearly our foreign policy which has brought us dangerously close to world war III:

THE MACARTHUR-TRUMAN CONTROVERSY—WHY?

(By Clay Osborne)

The purge of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur by the President of the United States raises two questions of utmost gravity to the people of the United States.

One question involves the motives and aims of Harry S. Truman and his administration in committing an act unprecedented in American experience. Never, from the time of George Washington until now, has any American President exercised authority as Commander in Chief to remove from any field of battle any top American general:

Whose career and record have been unblemished by failure, incompetence, treason, or personal aggrandisement.

Whose patriotism and personal integrity have been unquestioned even by his critics and enemies.

Whose leadership in the field and whose skill as a military tactician and strategist are unsurpassed in American annals.

Who has been recognized by enemies of America as their No. 1 foe.

Who has under the most perilous and disadvantageous circumstances consistently transformed military disasters into unprecedented American victories by the genius and inspiration of his command.

Who has enjoyed the confidence of the American people at home and of their fighting forces in the field.

Who has been universally recognized as a foremost world authority on both the military and political problems of his areas of command.

And who has throughout a long lifetime and useful career unfailingly and unyieldingly placed the interests and security of the United States above all other considerations—who has unfailingly and unyieldingly never compromised in any matter or challenge involving honor, integrity, and allegiance to the people of the United States and their Constitution comprising the highest authority of law and government.

When any attempt by anyone to render voiceless, and indeed to attempt to discredit, an American leader of General MacArthur's caliber is made, there is compelling challenge to the American people to try to find out why.

MOTIVES AND AIMS OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

The second question raised involves the motives and aims of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Here has been one of the greatest of all American generals honored and respected by his own people—and even by his once-bitterest enemies, the conquered Japanese—to a degree unsurpassed in either American or world history.

At 71 years of age this exemplary American patriot might well have rested content with laurels of achievement far beyond the most extreme expectations of his youth. He might then have been secure in position guaranteeing ease and comfort to himself and his family during remaining years. He then would have been certain that the name "MacArthur" perpetually would be engraved in the hearts of his grateful countrymen and their posterity, and forever enshrined among the great of the earth.

What have been the motives requiring him to risk the damnation of his superiors, to dare the wrath of self-styled politicians; and to place in hazard his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor effectively to defy those who have tried to silence him?

In this hour of established real and present danger there can be no challenge more compelling to every American than to try to understand why.

Examination of some basic evidence in the record of the past 5½ years may enlighten us.

One explanation of the MacArthur conduct is implicit in his oath as a soldier of the United States. Accepting responsibility he vowed, in part:

"I solemnly swear * * * to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic * * * so help me God."

Nowhere in the soldier's oath is to be found even implication of unquestioning loyalty

to his Commander in Chief. MacArthur swore a higher loyalty—to the people of the United States who are the government of freemen under the Constitution.

PRESIDENT'S PURGE ANNOUNCEMENT

When the President asserted in his purge announcement of last Wednesday:

"I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and the United Nations."

Mr. Truman stated a fact which has divided MacArthur from the administration and U. N. policy makers throughout the past 5½ years. MacArthur clashed with his political superiors in matters affecting the security of the United States and of the freedom-loving world even before the actual occupation of Japan and Korea after VJ-day.

Some days prior to the occupation of Korea by either American or Soviet forces, in late August 1945, the Japanese throughout Korea surrendered to Korean underground leaders. Immediately thereafter Korea-wide elections were conducted by and among the Korean people themselves in more than 600 of the principal cities, towns, and villages. By this means a provisional government of liberated Korea was established, temporarily headed by the beloved Korean patriot, Lyuh Heung. The post of chairman was left open for acceptance by the venerable Syngman Rhee when he might arrive from the United States—honoring him for his long fight in exile for a free and independent Korea, and recognizing his wartime service to that nation as head of the Korean Commission in Washington, D. C., and leader of all exiled Koreans—except the Communists—in America and on the Asiatic mainland.

There were at that time no Communists of any consequence in Korea, for they had been exterminated or driven to join the guerrilla bands of Chinese Communists. One of Japan's aims was to destroy communism utterly.

STATE DEPARTMENT IGNORES ESTABLISHED KOREAN GOVERNMENT

Washington's instructions—both political and military—were to ignore the government established by the Koreans, and pressure was brought to bear upon Syngman Rhee not to accept the chairmanship of the provisional government. MacArthur was directed to arrange for the second "surrender" of Japanese north of the thirty-eighth parallel to Russians and south of the thirty-eighth parallel to Americans.

MacArthur protested both these decisions—and the later agreement of the Big Three Foreign Ministers' meeting at Moscow, in December 1945, to preserve the thirty-eighth-parallel line of demarcation between Soviet and American forces of occupation—without avail. He was compelled to obey orders.

The policy of the American Government at that time was not to recognize a government freely chosen by the Korean people themselves and to sponsor division of Korea into two zones of occupation. The northern zone, source and center of practically all power, manufacturing, and industrial capacity of Korea, was handed over to the Russians with signed and secret agreements even before the Soviet forces had crossed the Yalu River from Manchuria.

Prior to actual occupation, there had been American political agreement with the Russians at Yalta and Potsdam to reward Russia's entry into the war against Japan by giving the Soviets control of the three northeastern provinces of free China; concessions at the ice-free port of Harbin; control of the Chinese Eastern Railway; the outright gift of the strategically vital Kuriles, Sakhalin and other islands immediately north of Japan—and suzerainty over the northern half of liberated Korea, which had consistently been promised complete freedom and independence by the official propaganda of the United States directed throughout the Far East during the most critical stages of World War II.

Whether or not such policies of the United States Government ought to have been protested by all right-thinking and decent men in 1945 may be made clear to you by information which at that time was classified as secret. This information is now extremely important to understanding by Americans of the controversy between General MacArthur and the President.

G-2 (MILITARY INTELLIGENCE) REPORT

Before he died, President Franklin D. Roosevelt became suspicious of the aims and motives of the leaders of the Soviet Union, and particularly of the activities of the Communist International on the mainland of Asia. For his information, and for the guidance of the State Department and other top-level agencies of the Government, the Military Intelligence Division of the United States War Department undertook an exhaustive study of communism in the Far East.

In final form, this G-2 report was over 100,000 words in length.

It was delivered to the White House, the State Department, and to top commanders of the United States Army, Air Force, and Navy in all the principal theaters of war under date of July 5, 1945.

It was signed by Gen. P. E. Peabody, Chief, Military Intelligence Service. It was entitled "The Chinese Communist Movement." I have a copy of it before me as I speak.

I read to you the exact text of the five fundamental conclusions of this then secret but since declassified intelligence report:

"Careful study of all materials available and examination of over 2,500 documents and reports has led to a number of basic conclusions. * * * The most important conclusions may be summarized as follows:

"(1) The 'democracy' of the Chinese Communists is Soviet democracy.

"(2) The Chinese Communist movement is part of the international Communist movement, sponsored and guided by Moscow.

"(3) There is reason to believe that Soviet Russia plans to create Russian-dominated areas in Manchuria, Korea, and probably north China.

"(4) A strong and stable China cannot exist without the natural resources of Manchuria and north China.

"(5) In order to prevent the separation of Manchuria and north China from China, it is essential that, if Soviet Russia participates in the war, China not be divided (like Europe) into American-British and Russian zones of military operations and occupation."

There are these further conclusions set forth with extensive and detailed authentication in the body of that G-2 report:

"Throughout their history the Chinese Communists have loyally supported and followed the policies of Soviet Russia and have accepted the whole content of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism.

"Contrary to the widely-advertised reports of their sympathizers, the Chinese Communists have fought the Japanese far less than have the National Government troops (of Chiang Kai-shek).

"The Generalissimo and his followers have yielded ground politically and militarily to the Communists in order to avoid an open break; as a Nationalist, Chiang Kai-shek has been primarily interested in the war against Japan."

ADMINISTRATION IGNORES INTELLIGENCE REPORT

And here, Americans, is really a punch-line in this intelligence report:

"The type of peace we shall gain by our victory over Japan depends on our success in aiding the Chinese to regain complete independence * * * for China is the center of the Far East; political, economic and military relationships in the Far East have always revolved around China. Russia became one of the leading world powers by acquiring vast regions from China. * * * Russia's growth as a far-eastern power has depended greatly upon its success in extending its influence in China."

Those are exact quotes from this military intelligence report dated July 5, 1945. It was completed too late to confirm President Roosevelt's own suspicions about the aims of the Communists. But it was delivered to Harry S. Truman and the State Department, as well as to General MacArthur's headquarters:

Nearly 3 weeks before the American appeasement at Potsdam.

Nearly 1 month before the 5-day war of the Russians against Japan, during which the third-rate remnants of the Kwantung Army of the Japanese in Manchuria offered practically no resistance.

Nearly 60 days before the delivery to the Russians of Northern Korea and northern China itself.

It is impossible to overemphasize the importance of these documented facts of record in this particular hour of confusing political propaganda.

Had they been heeded by the President of the United States and the American State Department 5½ years ago in July 1945, there would never have been:

A division of Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel;

An establishment of the Communist Kim Il Sung government in northern Korea, and the infiltration of Korea by the Communists;

Southern Korea would today not be shattered, and a shambles of wrecked cities, destroyed agriculture, with more than 1,000,000 South Korean dead;

China itself would be a great power in the Far East friendly to the United States under that government which we still recognize as the legal representative of more than 400,000,000 Chinese on the mainland, as well as on Formosa;

Russia and the International would not today have the power to cause internal strife in Indochina, Malaya, Indonesia, Korea, and the Philippines, as well as to pose a threat to the internal stability of Japan now that MacArthur is rendered impotent;

Nor would billions of our money be required to finance what Mr. Truman previously has labelled a police action, but which he termed, tonight, for the first time, a war;

Most important of all, there would not today be some 60,000 American dead, missing, and wounded fighting to correct political decisions made contrary to 5-year-old military knowledge.

Despite information and facts made available to the President of the United States in July 1945—the mass of which was not by any means confined to this single G-2 report—there have been more than 5 years of top-level political decisions and unilateral and secret enunciations of American policies which have month-by-month given the Russians and world Communists more power, with a corresponding decrease in the military and political effectiveness of the American people.

FANTASY BORDERING ON IDIOCY

It ought to be clear to anyone possessing common sense that to speak of political decisions in the international arena as something entirely separable and apart from military decisions is fantasy bordering on idiocy. Russian military and political decisions and policies are inseparable: the one implements or complements the other. And the unsupported United States Government propaganda of these most critical years proclaiming a chain of political victories in the so-called cold war comprise a long series of genuine military disasters for the United States and the free world when appraised by the yardstick of the record itself.

On VE-day in 1945, Russia was in no military or political position to compel any nation to her will. British-American power was overwhelming in both the military and political sense.

Yet during the years since then, Russia has acquired domination of more than 40 percent of the world's peoples. Beginning with Estonia and reaching a high-water mark recently in Tibet, the Communists have overrun 21 formerly independent nations. It was not possible for Russia to realize this tremendous expansion by her own effort alone.

It was largely the fantastic sums of money—$19,000,000,000 provided by the United States and Great Britain and never recovered at even 10 cents on the dollar—the mountains of matériel freely given by American appeasers and raped from every territory occupied by the Soviets, and the American policy of granting Russia anything demanded that, the record shows, was responsible.

INCREDIBLE RUSSIAN DEMANDS AND AMERICAN APPEASEMENTS

The incredible extremes of such Russian demands and American appeasements is documented in the single example of a startling disclosure by the United Press, datelined Washington, August 6, 1947: I have this before me and I read it to you verbatim:

"Sledge-hammer diplomacy by Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov and his Deputy, Andrei A. Gromyko, forced reluctant United States Cabinet officers in 1944 to turn over to Russia the American plates for printing German occupation currency, it was revealed tonight by secret records gathered from the files of the State, War, and Treasury Departments and made available by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

"The documents show that Gen. George Marshall, then Chief of Staff, compelled Director A. W. Hall, of the United States Bureau of Printing and Engraving, to give the Russians the master plates, inks, paper, and know-how for printing this currency."

That is the end of the direct quotation. The files of the leading American news services contain additional facts uncovered during the years 1947 and 1948. Among the most important of these is the established fact that American taxpayers redeemed—via the medium of their occupation authorities in Berlin—more than $500,000,000 of this worthless currency up to 1947. There is considerable evidence that this diplomatic triumph of the Washington international policy makers cost Americans in excess of $1,000,000,000 before the occupation reichsmarks were replaced, in 1948, with the new Deutschemarks, and the unlimited and never-accounted-for printing by the Russians at American expense finally halted, after 4 years of unrestricted counterfeiting legalized by the United States Government.

Had Gen. Douglas MacArthur been guilty of this kind of a "deal" with the Russians or Communists in the Far East, he would have been labelled a traitor, court-martialed, and expelled from the service in disgrace.

On November 24, 1947, 12 former Ambassadors of the United States telegraphed the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as follows, and I quote:

"We, the undersigned former Ambassadors of the United States, believing that the vital interests of our country would be gravely menaced if China should fall under the domination of the Soviet Union, urge you most strongly to give essential military equipment and economic and financial aid to the Chinese Government.

"F. Lamont Belin, William C. Bullit, William M. Collier, Josephus Daniels, Wesley Frost, James W. Gerard, Boaz Long, Lithgow Osborne, William Phillips, Robert P. Skinner, William H. Standley, Alexander W. Weddel."

STATE DEPARTMENT PURGED FAR EAST EXPERTS

But by 1947, unfortunately for Americans, the leading authority on Japan and Korea, Mr. Eugene Dooman, and our greatest authority on the entire Far East, Dr. Stanley Hornbeck, had been purged by those in control of the State Department, and altogether excluded and silenced in the policies of American affairs in the world.

Despite the recommendations of the unquestionably patriotic American experts on the Far East, and directly contrary to the information and documentation supplied to the White House and the State Department in 1945 by top-level military authorities, the President according to his own statement of record caused the issuance of an ultimatum to Chiang Kai-shek that he would either take the Communists into his Government or else.

In the summer of 1946 Henry Wallace, accompanied by Owen Lattimore, were sent to China allegedly to gather the facts about the Chinese political situation and to report them to the President. The facts, of course, had already been supplied Mr. Truman a year earlier. But Mr. Truman's decision was based upon the prejudice of those who hated Chiang Kai-shek, rather than upon the knowledge of others who neither loved nor hated Chiang but instead thought in terms of what was best for the United States.

ULTIMATUM TO CHIANG KAI-SHEK

The ultimatum delivered to Chiang Kai-shek was documented in the report of January 7, 1947 by Gen. George C. Marshall—the same policy maker reported by United Press to have caused the American currency plates to be given to the Russians. I now read to you verbatim some choice extracts from General Marshall's report:

"The greatest obstacle to peace has been the complete, almost overwhelming suspicion with which the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang (Nationalist People's Party) regard each other.

"On the one hand, the leaders of the Government are strongly opposed to a communistic form of government. On the other, the Communists frankly state that they are Marxists and intend to work toward establishing a communistic form of government in China."

To depart from the text a moment, I have emphasized some of these words for the reason that they coincide exactly with the conclusions of the secret military intelligence report issued a year and a half earlier.

Continuing General Marshall's text:

"On the side of the Nationalist Government (of China) * * * there is a dominant group of reactionaries who have been opposed, in my opinion, to almost every effort I have made to influence the formation of a genuine coalition government. They were quite frank in stating their belief that cooperation by the Chinese Communist Party in the government was inconceivable.

"On the side of the Chinese Communist Party there are, I believe, liberals as well as radicals * * * it has appeared to me that there is a definite liberal group among the Communists in disgust at the corruption evident in the local governments—men who would put the interests of the Chinese people above ruthless measures to establish a Communist ideology in the immediate future."

To depart again for a moment from this text, I add the personal observation that at no time in the allegedly corrupt local governments of China has there ever been graft and treasonably criminal activities on the scale of that quite recently reported in the American press about some of our own States, and that never during the so-called corrupt regime of Chiang Kai-shek has there ever been betrayal of the people's interests on a scale comparable to the very recent disclosures of the Nation-wide crime syndicate and in exposure of theft of the people's money in investigation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation operations. Also, that for every air-conditioning unit supposed to have been appropriated from UNRRA supplies by Chinese Nationalist officials, there has been a corresponding deep-freeze unit for officials of the United States Government and a mink coat or the equivalent for their employees.

There is the added personal opinion—well documented by news files of the past 5 years—that the so-called one-party rule of Chiang's Kuomintang in China was never more unilateral in making political and military decisions than has been the dominant Truman-Boyle-Acheson direction of our own domestic and foreign affairs without consultation in advance with leaders of the opposition parties.

FINAL BETRAYAL OF WONDERFUL WARTIME ALLY

Comes now the clincher in the January 7, 1947, statement to the American people by General Marshal. I quote:

"The salvation of the situation, as I see it, would be the assumption of leadership by the liberals in the government and in the minority parties.

"If the termination of one-party rule is to be a reality, the Kuomintang should cease to receive financial support from the (United States) Government."

In short, after saying that there were true liberals among the Communists; that the Communists were dedicated to arousing hatred against Americans; that their aim was just as much one-party Communist rule of China as that then being exercised by the reactionaries of Chiang Kai-shek's party, the United States Government declared that Chiang would either have to embrace the Communists and communism or else be deprived of all assistance of Americans.

This ultimatum was delivered, incidentally, after General Marshall had informed the President that the Chinese Communists were counting on an economic collapse of the Chiang Kai-shek government.

It was, of course, powerful diplomacy and highly desirable military tactics and strategy to hasten the economic chaos already threatening the security of the wonderful wartime ally that for three highly critical years had kept the Japanese bogged down in China itself.

For all these and many more reasons, it is not opinion but rather fact of record that the policy of what Generalissimo Truman calls the United States Government between 1945 and 1948, when the Communists began to overrun all of China.

1. To withhold from the legal Nationalist Government, aid, financial and otherwise, even after it had been voted by the American Congress.

2. To assist the Chinese Communists by deliveries to them in Manchuria and Mongolia of UNRRA relief and supplies.

3. To sanction without protest delivery to the Chinese Communists by the Russians of enormous stocks of Japanese guns, equipment and ammunition, as well as transport manufactured in the United States of America and lend-leased to Russia, which had been seized by the Soviets when they poured into Manchuria.

4. To assist the Russians via previously secret, top-level "political decisions" in acquiring control of Manchuria and North China as well as Inner and Outer Mongolia, and in addition to Northern Korea and the strategic islands north of Japan.

5. To undermine the stability of the Chinese Nationalist Government by withholding economic and other aid declared by our military authorities to be essential to the survival of this friendly power, and thus implementing the known aims of the Communists by hastening the collapse of the Nationalists.

PATRIOTIC AMERICANS MUZZLED AND DISCREDITED

General Wedemeyer, whose report was kept from the American people by the President

and excluded from the white paper on China by the State Department, and General MacArthur both repeatedly protested the folly of diplomacy certain to have disastrous effects upon the military and economic future of the United States in Asia.

But these patriots—and every other critic of the pro-Communist American policies in the Far East—have been muzzled year by year and discredited by enormous volumes of distorted facts and propaganda issued to the American people throughout the past 5½ years by the liberals in our own Government.

In 1948 the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs issued a report entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism." This was an exhaustive study comprised of more than 300 pages of careful documentation and analysis of the aims of the Soviet Union and of the Communist International as they had been expressed by their own most important leaders.

I have this report before me: House Document No. 619, published by the United States Government Printing Office in 1948.

Among other findings of this study are the following, which I read verbatim from the text:

"Lenin proclaimed the dictum: 'Some day we shall compel the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy.'

"Stalin in 1927 said: 'Our war against capitalism is inevitable.'

"Stalin in 1938 said: 'The Communist world and the capitalist world cannot coexist on the same planet.'

"Stalin in February 1946 said: 'War until the death of capitalism is our aim.'

"Stalin in September 1947 said: 'Wars are instigated only by the capitalists and imperialists * * * they must be destroyed before there can be peace.'

"Andrei Vishinsky said to the U. N. September 18, 1947: 'The United States is the leading world enemy.'

"In the same month Zhdanov said: 'The United States and capitalism are the real enemies of the Communists and Russia * * * they can be exterminated only by war.'"

The conclusion of this House Committee on Foreign Affairs, FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, chairman, may be summarized in this single sentence:

"The Communists do not believe in peace, and that their hopes are only for chaos and dictatorship must be clearly seen by all Americans."

Therein are stated both the political and military policies of the Soviet Union and of the Communist International guided and controlled by Moscow. Beginning as long ago as the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, in 1918, and unvarying throughout all the years since, the statements of these aims by Soviet leaders and their satellites consistently have made unmistakable the intent of the world Communists to kill everything we regard as decent and right and just on earth—from the spiritual conception of the Almighty to the idea of individual rights and freedom.

These year-by-year statements comprise Soviet directives as clearly stated as were the Nazi directives in Hitler's Mein Kampf and the Tojo directives first enunciated by Baron Giichi Tanaka in his notorious memorial.

After the clarification of these Soviet aims by military intelligence in 1945, and after the compilation of world Communist strategy and tactics by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1948, the counterpolicy of the United States was fondly being announced by Generalissimo Truman in these, which are his own words:

"Joe Stalin * * * you know, I kinda like good, old Joe."

UNITED STATES OPENLY INSULTED AND PILOTS MURDERED

One year ago this month Soviet fliers shot down out of the free skies of the Baltic an unarmed American plane, killing all on board. Stalin himself awarded those Red fliers the highest decoration of the Soviet Union. On April 13 the Soviet Government proclaimed to the world "We have given the brazen, imperialistic, spying Americans a lesson they won't forget." Russia ignored American protests; refused to pay indemnity; openly insulted the United States of America.

One month after this destruction of United States prestige throughout the world, the President of the United States declared: "I think we are now nearer peace than at any time."

It might be well for Americans to remember who has been responsible for ignoring the demands of both his own experts and of the Congress for a minimum of 80 Air Force groups between 1948 and Korea; who caused the disappearance of the American merchant marine from the seas of the world; who has spent more money than all of the preceding Presidents put together in the name of obtaining peace on earth, and at the same time destroyed the capacity of the United States even to defend itself.

Secretary of Defense George Marshall this week has stated that the armed might of the United States simply did not exist last June 25.

Throughout the past 5 years, Russia openly has been building up its military and political power. Throughout those same years, the United States has reduced its power from the predominant force for good on earth to a nadir of ineffectiveness.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR BETRAYAL?

Somebody in the United States Government is responsible for implementing the power of the Soviet Union by destroying the power of the United States.

Four days ago it was pointed out by the leading press services that more than 1,000,000 South Korean men are qualified and eligible for military service. On that same day, April 10, it was also officially confirmed that 120,000 South Korean Reserves had been demobilized.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur stated on that same day of April 10: That this release of South Korean Reserves from call to active duty had been caused by basic political decisions beyond his control.

Since last June, it has been the official United States policy and the official United Nations policy to have 90 percent of all those allegedly fighting for freedom in Korea American fighting men, and the bulk of the expense borne by the American taxpayer. It is now not even good business, according to the policy makers to insist that the vast available manpower of South Korea be trained and equipped to fight its own battles.

Incidentally, also on April 10, the United States announced the granting to Yugoslavia of $600,000,000, "90 percent to be spent for the improvement of Yugoslavia public health and welfare." Yugoslavia has less than half the population of Korea.

ACHESON DEFINES AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The most recent major pronouncement of American foreign policy also echoing United Nations policy was made by the Secretary of State last November 29. At that time Mr. Acheson defined the will of the American people for peace, as follows:

1. The United Nations is the only means by which the United States can conduct its foreign relations.

2. The United States is prepared at all times to "negotiate just settlements of international disputes," but, whereas the Russian concept of international relations is based upon power, the American concept of foreign relations is "founded in humility plus endless patience."

"The United States," said Mr. Acheson, "shall not use its power to settle international disputes."

It was Acheson also who stated American policy last August: "The United States will not use its veto against seating the Chinese Communists in the United Nations." How could the Communists possibly interpret such a statement of American policy in any other way than as an invitation to keep trying—when they already know that Great Britain, India, and all the Soviet followers have already said "amen" to Mr. Acheson's implied invitation?

It was also Acheson who told the world in the name of the American people last year in January: "Korea is outside the defensive perimeter of the United States." Former Secretary of State Sumner Welles is authority for the statement, and I quote:

"The Communist aggression of last June 25 was the direct consequence of Acheson's statement of January"—which to all intents and purposes was a direct invitation to the Communists to go ahead and attack.

GIVE AID AND COMFORT TO OUR ENEMIES

Even after the Communist attack of last June, it was the official policy of the United States Government to give aid and comfort to the Communists of both China and North Korea. It was Mr. Acheson, Mr. Sawyer, and Mr. Truman who permitted the American Department of Commerce to ship, during the single month of last July, $3,000,000 worth of war goods to Communist China. It was also these same policy makers of the United States Government who strengthened the Chinese Communist Government during that same month by purchasing from Mao Tse-tung $12,200,000 worth of Communist goods, and you'll find the documentation for this implementation of political policies at the expense of our military policies in Korea in the United States Census Bureau's Report on Foreign Trade, issued last September 25.

The President's unilateral, unconstitutional, and internationally illegal ukase of last June, ordering Chiang Kai-shek to cease attacks against the Chinese mainland would have been considered an act of war by any other legal government on earth. The Nationalist Government of China is still recognized by both the United States and the United Nations as the only legal government of all of China. But the United States, in the name of the American people, has forbidden that Government to fight for its own life—and is now ready to discuss peace terms with the Asiatic Communists in conferences at which the Chinese Nationalists will be impotent and silenced or ignored. We are ready to make deals with aggressors about lands and areas belonging to recognized governments, but forbidding them to have a voice in the deals.

The most recent policy statement by the President was implicit in his directive of March 20 to MacArthur. This stated: "With the main forces of the enemy in Korea cleared out of South Korea, the United Nations are now prepared to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea."

Last June 27, when the President ordered General MacArthur to send American air power in support of Syngman Rhee's government—a decision then labeled "the most glorious hour in American history"—it was the declared purpose of the United States, later supported by the United Nations, to clear all of Korea of the aggressors. The primary aim of this "police action" was to prove to the world—and to Soviet Russia—that naked aggression cannot be made to pay.

Most of Acheson's statements of policy and the most recent peace aims declarations of the President evidence willingness to dicker with both the Chinese and Korean Communists on the basis of "let's stop the fighting" somewhere near the thirty-eighth parallel. To suggest that such a peace may be made on the basis of withdrawal of all foreign troops can mean only that the U. N. forces and the Chinese forces might withdraw—but the Korean Communists be left in Korea, since they are not foreign.

The aims now do not appear to be the same as the aims of last June.

But 60,000 Americans have died, been wounded, or captured in the magnificent effort by General MacArthur to free all of Korea, as he was ordered to do last June.

MAC ARTHUR CRITICS NOW PARROT HIS WARNING

As for those who now decry what they allege is General MacArthur's intention to commit American forces on the mainland of Asia in all-out war with China—they are in the strange position today of parroting the warning of Gen. Douglas MacArthur enunciated just 1 year ago?

"Anyone thinking in terms of engaging the hordes of Asia on the Asiatic mainland ought to have his head examined."

It was not General MacArthur who engaged the masses of Asia on the Asiatic mainland in Korea. He was ordered to do so—despite his advice to the contrary—by the President of the United States.

In the light of such overwhelming evidence that what Mr. Truman calls the United States Government has consistently surrendered to the demands of the Soviet Union and to the Communist International during the past 5½ years, and the frightening signs that this same government is now willing once more to talk a new peace after previous failures to achieve peace with self-proclaimed enemies—what would you have done in the shoes of General MacArthur?

When Mr. Truman now declares that there will be no appeasement of our enemies, he utterly ignores the established record of his own appeasement of those same enemies in both Europe and Asia throughout the past disastrous 5 years.

The President is himself authority for the fact that Soviet Russia has broken every one of more than 40 international agreements signed with the United States during this time of creeping disaster—and has kept not one. It is a matter of record that during the 30 months between Potsdam, in July 1945, and December 1947, 49 official United States protests were made to the Soviet Government over violations of agreements—and at no time was Uncle Sam powerful enough diplomatically or militarily to even slap the wrist of "Good old Joe in the Kremlin."

What good now to write another treaty with enemies—until such time as they can have kept one or more of the forty-odd already written—and violated?

SUMMATION OF TRUMAN AND MAC ARTHUR AIMS

The aims of the President and of the State Department appear to be clarified unmistakably by the record of their own declarations:

"Our foreign policy is to meet the open or subversive force of the Russians and the international Communists with humility and endless patience, attested by the humility of having our flyers shot out of free Baltic skies, and the patience of 60,000 casualties in Korea. The United States will not use its power to settle disputes; the United Nations is the only means by which the United States can conduct its foreign relations."

One searches the Constitution of the United States in vain to find a paragraph, a line, or a word authorizing the President or the State Department to fulfill in such manner their oaths to preserve and protect that noblest of all documents of freemen, beginning, "We the people of the United States * * * for ourselves and our posterity."

The aims of Gen. Douglas MacArthur have repeatedly been expressed by his view that ruthless, godless force can be met effectively, in Korea, or anywhere else on earth, only with superior, Christian force.

It was the repetition of this view in his letter to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, dated Tokyo, Japan, March 20, 1951, that culminated in the ousting of General MacArthur by the generalissimo. General MacArthur wrote:

"Generally these (my) views are well known and clearly understood, as they follow the conventional pattern of meeting force with maximum counterforce as we have never failed to do in the past * * * as you point out, we must win. There is no substitute for victory."

Perhaps knowledge of this evidence and fact, which is but a fraction of the enormous amounts available in the official—and very often suppressed or censored files of our own Government—enables you to understand why a great American has remained true to the American people above all else in his life.

Because Gen. Douglas MacArthur swore, "To support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic—so help him God."

MacArthur's View on Our Government as a Congressional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky:

THE CORE IS THE CONGRESS

An orderly mind cannot recognize anarchy as within the realm of possibility. General MacArthur once got into a controversy with Kirby Page, editor of The World Tomorrow, in 1931, about some clergymen refusing to serve in war, resulting in a strong letter in which much of his philosophy of life is stated. I take this letter from Frank Waldrop's MacArthur on War, a most interesting study of a truly philosophic mind. MacArthur wrote Page:

"The question of war and peace is one that rests, under our form of government, in Congress. In exercising this authority, Congress voices the will of the majority, whose right to rule is the cornerstone upon which our governmental edifice is built. Under the Constitution, its pronouncement on such a question is final, and is obligatory upon every citizen of the United States. That men who wear the cloth of the church should openly defend repudiation of the laws of the land, with the necessary implications arising from such a general attitude toward our statutes, seems almost unbelievable. It will certainly hearten every potential or actual criminal and malefactor who either has or contemplates breaking some other law. Anomalous as it seems, it apparently stamps the clergyman as a leading exponent of law violation at individual pleasure."

Of course, there is nothing new in this doctrine; it is clearly stated in the Constitution of the United States and in a number of decisions of the Supreme Court. Ours is a congressional government. That is, a representative Republic.

During the last 20 years much has been done to shift the center of authority from the Congress to the President, from the legislative to the Executive. But the will of the people expresses itself best in the Congress, in the debates, the disagreements, the compromises, the acts of the Congress. A willful Executive can work in secrecy and therefore unrelate himself to the will of the people.

Congress can do no business in secrecy and, therefore, cannot betray the will of the people without the knowledge of the people. If the people are careless in their vigilance of Congress, that is the fault of the people who neglect their responsibilities and obligations. But the core of our Government is the Congress and when that core rots, our Nation will fall.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in his magnificent address in 1935 to the Rainbow Division, which he commanded in World War I, said:

"Where are the empires of old? Where is Egypt, once a state on a high plane of civilization where a form of socialism prevailed and where the distribution of wealth was regulated? Where are the empires of the East, and the empires of the West which once were the shrines of wealth, wisdom, and culture? Where are Babylon, Persia, Carthage, Rome, Byzantium? They all fell, never to rise again, annihilated at the hands of a more warlike and aggressive people. Their cultures, memories; their cities, ruins. * * *

"And saddest of all, the downfall of Christian Byzantium. When Constantinople fell, that center of learning, pleasure, and wealth, and all the weakness and corruption that goes with it, a pall fell over Asia and southeastern Europe which has never been lifted. * * *

"Two thousand years of existence of the Byzantine Empire, its size, its religion, the wealth of its capital city were but added incentives and inducements to an impecunious conqueror. For wealth is no protection against aggression. It is no more an augury of military and defensive strength in a nation than it is an indication of health in an individual. Success in war depends upon men, not money. No nation has ever been subdued for lack of it. Indeed, nothing is more insolent or provocative or more apt to lead to a breach of the peace than undefended riches among armed men."

It is when the hard core of a people's tradition rots away and nothing remains but individual excesses and competitions for place that a nation perishes. It is in this same speech that MacArthur said in 1935 what is so absolutely true in 1951:

"We all dream of the day when human conduct will be governed by the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount. But as yet it is only a dream. No one desires peace as much as the soldier, for he must pay the greatest penalty in war. Our Army is maintained solely for the preservation of peace, or for the restoration of peace after it has been lost by statesmen or by others."

Staggering of Loan Maturity Dates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter, dated March 26, 1951, which contains a resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota at its annual convention, held in Fargo, N. Dak., on February 14, 1951, dealing with the matter of staggering of loan maturity dates. It is a very important matter, as applying to the farmers of my State. I ask that that portion of the letter setting out the resolution be printed in the Appendix. I hope every Member of the Senate will read it.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. FRED G. AANDAHL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As of possible interest, the following is resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota at its annual convention held in Fargo, N. Dak., on February 14, 1951, recommending the staggering of loan maturity dates:

"Whereas due to the loans on grain granted to farmers through the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture maturing at approximately the same date resulting in the rails being burdened with the transportation of the old grain at the same time the new crops mature and must be moved: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota recommend to the Department of Agriculture that the PMA stagger the maturity dates on small grain loans to conform to the harvesting date, thus, giving producers in all sections of the Grain Belt the same length of time on loans but at the same time enabling the rails to move the old crop ahead of the new harvest, and relieving the extraordinary demand for grain cars and required to move both old and new crops at the same time from all producing areas."

It is my understanding that the United States Department of Agriculture has decided against such a program on the 1950 crop, except that the loan dates may be advanced or loans called to meet any unforseeable emergency condition which may arise. In view of the interest manifested by the grain people in all the large grain producing States it would seem the USDA should revise its program to conform to the wishes of the producers and operators of country elevators.

Very truly yours,

R. E. CLARK.

American Legion and Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion is not primarily interested in whether the American maritime industry makes 5, 10, or no percentage of profit. However, its members who have been forced to travel across submarine-infested waters cramped in the holds of dirty, hastily converted rust buckets, who have had to eat and sleep in relays for lack of proper accommodations, cannot be blamed for looking upon the transportation which gets him to the wars and—God willing—gets him home again with coldly realistic eyes.

On April 19, before the Washington Propeller Club, Mr. Bruce P. Henderson, chairman of the national security commission of the American Legion, stated the position of the organization he was representing in very accurately chosen words. His remarks seem to me to be of interest to each of us who is charged with a part of the responsibility for the readiness of a well-balanced Defense Establishment. The remarks which Mr. Henderson made are as follows:

No one among you tonight, officials and executives from the shipping and shipbuilding industries, from the Coast Guard, Navy, Army, Maritime Administration, and other segments of Government and industry interested in or concerned with the American merchant marine, ask why you are here.

You realize that your stake in a strong, healthy, and successful merchant marine is both an economic and a social one. Your jobs, your income, yes, even your way of living depends upon such an industry.

But you may be asking why I am here, as chairman of the national security commission of the American Legion—an organization of the veterans of two global wars who have associated themselves together for God and country—to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and to safeguard and to transmit to our posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy—an organization, with its auxiliary, of more than 4,000,000 Americans who are dedicated to the protection of their less fortunate comrades-in-arms and the preservation of those things for which we all have fought—an organization which, over the years, has built up such a reputation that many more millions of Americans look to it for sound leadership in matters pertaining to our national security.

In speaking to you of the merchant marine, I think it is essential that, first of all, you, who represent so many various segments of the merchant marine, and I, who am speaking for this greatest of all veterans' organizations, understand our respective positions with the utmost clarity.

Lest there be misunderstanding, may I point out that our posts are located in every State and Territory of our country and even in foreign countries where American veterans are found—they are in large metropolitan cities and in almost every crossroads hamlet—in the great shipping centers of our coasts and in the great plains of our Midwest.

Our membership comes from every walk of life and is found in every economic level of our population. It is a cross-section of America. The great majority probably never smelled salt water—nor saw a ship—until after they were in the Armed Forces. We are no more interested in shipping as a business than we are in the automobile business, or farming or mining or merchandizing.

As a great national organization, pledged to "inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation, we are devoted—not to the furtherance of any private enterprise—but to the fulfilling of that obligation by working in the public interest for the promotion of all those things which have created—and will increase—the strength of our Nation, its Government, its economy, and what we call our "American way of life."

Aggressive in our efforts to "foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism," we are intolerant of those who would undermine America in any way. Just as we oppose vigorously those subversives who seek to infiltrate into our Government and industry, do we oppose those who seek undue private advantage at the expense of our Nation and to the possible jeopardy of those who will be called upon to risk their lives in its defense.

To be brutally frank, I believe that, in this hour of national peril, when our system of Government is facing a supreme test, private interest must be subservient to the Nation's need for the conservation and efficient use of all of its resources. We are confident that the American people—generally—are taking this attitude and that our Congress is beginning to view adversely those who approach our Government to seek favors for "special interests."

And so we are not interested primarily in whether the American maritime industry makes, 5, 10, 15, or no percent of profit. Fundamentally, we are concerned with how you are solving your share of the problems that face our Nation in these troubled times. Our outlook upon the merchant marine must, of necessity, be cold-blooded, realistic and, on behalf of those whose lives may depend upon you, selfish.

Hard words? Perhaps.

But to men who have fought in muddy foxholes—or have seen their friends plunge to earth in a mass of burning metal or sink quietly beneath the waves—who know what our men in Korea are going through (and those boys become men awfully fast), war is a cold-blooded and realistic thing, and that instinct of self-preservation which is developed so rapidly demands that we examine our merchant marine as critically as a combat soldier examines any other of his weapons.

Our members, who have been forced to travel across submarine-infested waters cramped in the holds of dirty, hastily converted rust buckets, who have been forced to wait in line to get on a jerry-built toilet seat, who have had to eat and sleep in relays for lack of proper accommodations, who have been on a merchant ship that has received so many Coast Guard waivers it's about as acceptable in wartime as an old toothless shark is to his hungry companions, can't be blamed for looking upon the transportation which gets him to the wars, and—God willing—gets him home again, with coldly realistic eyes.

No, gentlemen, to be perfectly honest with you, and to lay all the cards face up on the table, you must understand that basically we cannot be interested in profits, in salaries, in good or bad jobs or in adequate dividends on shipping and shipbuilding stocks.

But don't get me wrong. Sure, these things are important. They are the foundation of free enterprise which has made our Nation what it is today. We know that a successful and healthy maritime industry must have a fair and reasonable profit. We know that these things are tremendously important to you gentlemen here tonight, to any and all of you who depend upon the American merchant marine for his job, his pay check, his dividend payment, to you who have bet your blue chips on this great industry. We have no quarrel with that. I'm just trying to emphasize that we are fighting for the public welfare and not for any "special interest."

I don't want you to forget that the boys who must fight our wars overseas are also interested in your merchant marine, although perhaps in none of these things you hold so dear. They're interested in their lives, in their chances of getting to where they must fight; and in their safe, and comfortable if they can get comfort, return to the land they love so well.

Does all this sound like the beating of emotional drums? I assure you it is not meant to be so. It is only that there are so many Americans who are so concerned with their economic stake in their own particular industry that their thoughts are confined largely to that one small sphere. They don't see the over-all picture. They tend to forget that historically our wars are fought on foreign soils instead of our own, and that,

to carry the war to the enemy, millions of American boys must be carried, preponderantly by our own American merchant marine, to such shores and home again.

You might surmise from these remarks that the American Legion and its millions of members have never been cognizant of these facts before.

The American merchant marine is no newfound love of the American Legion. The history of our organization reveals some very interesting episodes. For example, at our national convention in Kansas City in 1921, just 30 years ago, the American Legion advocated the building, operation, and maintenance of a privately owned and operated United States merchant marine adequate to meet the needs of the Armed Forces in time of war or national emergency, and to serve the commercial requirements of our Nation in time of peace.

Subsequently, for more than a quarter of a century at 30 national conventions, in New Orleans, in Paris, France, in Cleveland, Detroit, Boston, St. Louis, New York, Los Angeles, Miami, and elsewhere, the thousands of delegates at these conventions have mandated our organization to take all practical steps to build up the American merchant marine to a size commensurate with the importance of the United States in world affairs; to provide subsidies if and when necessary to overcome the disparity between American operating and building costs and those of foreign competitors; to ask that at least 50 percent of the trade of the United States be carried in American ships flying the "stars and stripes" and manned by loyal American officers and men; to urge our own members to use American merchant ships for trade and travel.

Tonight you gentlemen here hail the 1936 Merchant Marine Act as your Magna Carta, as a sort of Bible expressing the policy for justification of a strong and healthy American merchant marine. And yet, without assuming undue credit, it is significant that the American Legion was urging, asking, insisting upon the very policies contained in that act at least 12 years prior to its introduction and passage.

In comparatively recent years old-timers in the Legion have listened benignly to expressions from those in your industry which have called the American merchant marine "our fourth arm of national defense," the sine qua non to the successful utilization of our Army, Navy, and Air Force. And yet, again referring to the history of the Legion, 19 years ago at New Orleans, our national convention expressed this same philosophy. In recent years we have been even more insistent "that the development and maintenance of an adequate merchant marine as the fourth dimension of our national defense should be carried out consistently as the national policy declaration of existing law."

It may not be modest to boast about the American Legion and its policies, yet it is only human nature to point with pride to the fact that every Legion mandate about the merchant marine has been amazingly consistent with the verdict of history. The reason is a simple one. Millions of us, in two major World Wars, have had our lives depend upon fast, efficient, and safe troop transports, and the tankers and cargo ships that delivered our supplies.

The foot soldier, in his trench or fox hole was deeply concerned with his supply of food, clothing, and ammunition. The tank or bomber crew soon realized the terrific problem in logistics of supplying it with sufficient fuel, ammunition, and bombs. Even the pilot of the Air Transport Command plane, carrying whole blood across the Atlantic from New York City to the wounded in the Bulge in 24 hours, and returning those wounded to their own country, knew that his mission depended upon the merchant ships that carried the 2,700 gallons of gasoline he took on at the Azores and the food that fed the essential ground personnel there.

Is it any wonder, then, that Legionnaires are fully exercising their rights, as citizens and veterans, in demanding and expecting that the United States shall maintain the kind of an American merchant marine so specifically described in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936? This declaration of policy relates, far better than I, exactly what kind of an adequate and well-balanced shipping fleet this country must have.

With these things in mind, we are determined that Americans shall not learn, from their own bitter experience, the historic fact that nations which have allowed their merchant shipping to fall into decay and decline have also found that their military, political, and economic leadership had disappeared. The stakes are simply too great today to permit anything less than the world's finest merchant marine for the United States of America.

But now we must consider a grievous error which so many national and even local organizations make. Perhaps your Propeller Club has made the same mistake as that made by the Legion up to 1946.

For nearly a quarter of a century, annually and frequently more often, at national executive committee meetings during the year, the American Legion adopted the strongest and most forthright resolutions concerning the American merchant marine. As good and as stimulating as was all of this activity, it became apparent by 1946 that such resolutions were not in themselves sufficient to convince Americans why we must have a strong and adequate merchant marine.

By 1946 we began to witness the diminishing strength of our merchant fleet and shipbuilding activity; our war-built vessels were being sold to foreign interests to compete with our own fleet; the drums began to beat for rebuilding even the fleets of our former enemies; we were failing to build fast, efficient, new ships to replace those lost, damaged, or worn out in World War II; foreign countries, in an effort to build up their own merchant fleets, began to practice unfair discriminations against our shipping while receiving the same treatment in American seaports as that enjoyed by our own ships; our domestic merchant fleet appeared to be slowly strangling to death, and, even worse, a new philosophy began to gain ground that we should, in event of future wars, rely upon the merchant fleets of foreign countries rather than upon a strong one of our own.

It became clear to us in the American Legion by mid-1946 that resolutions and conferences, however stimulating they may be, are simply not enough when a major arm of our national security is imperiled by ideologists, global do-gooders, and economic theorists, often flaunting their unsound but lollypop-tasting philosophies in the very face of that greatest of all American institutions, the Congress of the United States.

Moreover, another and perhaps more timely lesson became so clear as to be startling in its implications. The development of new weapons during and since World War II, and the amazing speed of war itself made us recognize that to have an adequate, strong American merchant marine in times of war or national emergency, we no longer can wait until we are suddenly plunged into war to begin to build such a fleet. We must have a strong merchant marine in times of peace.

I am well aware that such an apparent lesson may be an old story to you gentlemen who deal daily with maritime problems. But I am convinced that this lesson still has not been generally learned by all Americans.

Thus it was in 1946, at our annual national convention in San Francisco, that our national security commission recommended and the convention mandated our millions of members to begin a continuous information and education program in the interests of our fourth arm of national security—the American merchant marine. It became then, and has been ever since, our avowed and patriotic policy to acquaint our membership and the American people, with the necessity for and requirements of the American merchant marine.

Since that time, in cooperation with the maritime industry, the Government and the Congress, tens of thousands of our members have devoted their time, attention, and often energy to this objective of providing more information and education about our fourth arm of security.

It is a tremendous task to inform and educate the membership of an organization as large as ours, and even more laborious to have that membership carry the facts to the public in general. We feel, however, that we have made significant progress during these last 5 years.

During this period, we have printed and distributed well over a half-million pieces of literature—booklets, brochures, pamphlets, folders, personal letters, and bulletins devoted to the facts about the merchant marine. Talks about the American merchant marine have been made in thousands of our 30,000 posts and auxiliary units, located in nearly every city and town in the Nation. In addition, Legionnaires, well acquainted with the facts, have appeared before other civic, business or professional groups, carrying such information to the public and enlisting their support for this cause which is to their own ultimate interest and benefit.

It may surprise you to learn that the American Legion, through its national security commission, has had at least a half-dozen national radio shows, each carried on more than a thousand radio stations, telling and retelling the facts about our fourth arm of security in a dramatic and compelling way.

Through the cooperation of the industry we have been distributing, for nearly the past 4 years, an exceptionally fine motion picture about the merchant marine, which has been seen by well over 2,000,000 Legionnaires, their families, and friends.

More than 25,000 Legionnaires have completed our extension institute which gives them the background, history, programs, activities, and services of our organization. An entire chapter in this course is devoted to the merchant marine.

About a year and a half ago, with the whole-hearted cooperation of your National Federation of American Shipping, the national security commission began publication of a monthly 4-page Merchant Marine Bulletin, designed to keep about 2,000 of our officers and members engaged in merchant marine or security committee work abreast of developments in our fourth arm of security. Circulation started growing with the first issue, and now the Legion's Merchant Marine Bulletin is mailed each month to more than 17,000 posts in every State, as well as to the other Legionnaires, for a total circulation of about 21,000. Members are urged to pass the bulletin along to their comrades, and total readership may well surpass the 100,000 mark.

All this and more has been done, is being done now, and will be continued in the future by the American Legion. We receive daily proof that this information and education program is outstandingly successful. Such results continually assure us that our original beliefs and convictions are sound, are right, are in the best interests of our Nation. Moreover, such a program convinces us that the American people want, and should receive, the facts about our American merchant marine.

If there is any comment I can make to you gentlemen here tonight, who are so familiar with the merchant marine, it is our

conviction of the need for still more and better information about your industry.

Right now we, of the American Legion, feel there is a desperate shortage of high speed, large, passenger-carrying vessels, quickly convertible to troop vessels if warranted by events which seem extremely close today. From what we have read and heard, there also appears to be a serious shortage of large and fast tanker ships, and particularly a necessity for a ship-replacement program worthy of a nation as productive as ours, of sufficient size to meet our growing international responsibilities. Many of us also hold the sincere conviction of the justification for a reemphasis by the Congress of the United States of the increasingly important role played by the American merchant marine in both peace and war.

These basic facts may sound as shopworn to you as a politician's speech at the end of his campaign. But we are convinced that millions of Americans are still not sufficiently aware of them.

A great American once said, "Give the people the facts, then rely upon their decisions."

We believe that when more Americans possess all the facts about the American merchant marine, they will demand that Old Glory fly at the mastheads of the world's finest, most efficient, and safest fleet of merchant ships; that they will realize that nothing short of an American merchant marine strong enough to meet all the needs of our commerce and travel in peacetime and immediately available to meet the needs of emergency of war, is safe or sensible and that they will insist upon the strengthening of this fourth arm of our national security.

Hope for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City Sunday Journal of April 15, 1951:

HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

The hope for the future for the American people is bound up in two things: One, that the forces of aggression will not start a third world war this year or next, and two, that the electorate will take advantage of its opportunity in 1952 to change party control in Washington. If a conflict at arms does not develop, involving the democracies with the Red aggressors, including Soviet Russia, and if the American people vote in a commonsense way in the interest of national welfare and security, the situation may be saved in spite of the harm that is being done today by an officialdom that is inept and untrustworthy.

In recent months the public has had its eyes opened to a shocking state of affairs in Washington. It has been apprised of official transgressions in many directions, of abuses of power by a multitude of officials for which the administration directly is responsible but for whose it makes no apology, of questionable relationships between highly placed officials and the scums of the underworld, of errors in judgment at the very seat of power that are shocking, almost unbelievable. Now at last the people have ample opportunity to realize what a serious mistake was made in the Presidential election of 1948.

Harry S. Truman never has been considered a big, broad-gage, understanding man. Indeed, he has his limitations. Before he went to the United States Senate at a nod from Tom Pendergast, of Kansas City, racketeer and party machine boss, he was known as an average man. He never had done anything worthy of notice by his neighbors. Yet this man became President of the United States, and today, according to trusted observers in Washington, is incompetent and inefficient. Not only that, but he does not even have sufficiently good judgment to select the biggest men available to help him in his difficult job. And how that man needs help.

Mr. Truman has the better part of 2 years yet to serve as Chief Executive of the country. The election will be held a year from next November, when a new Congress is to be chosen, and also, let it be hoped, a new President of the United States. The next administration will begin in January 1953. If Russia only will hold off until then, and if in November of 1952 the people vote in the best interests of themselves, their country, and posterity, there may be some daylight for us in the future.

Not in our entire history has there been such a great need as a new regime in Washington when the present Truman term expires. It will be our great good fortune if a third world war does not come while Harry Truman is in office. Constitutionally, as both Mr. Truman and Franklin D. Roosevelt were so fond of reminding their fellow citizens, he is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. He can, if he wishes, tell the foremost military men in the service what to do. He can decide matters of strategy. He has power almost without limit over men of great experience, training, and ability. It is a strange thing that fate permitted a man of his type to guide the destinies of a nation and people such as this is when he had so little with which to do it.

MacArthur Speech Should Clarify Objectives in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by John S. Knight, esteemed American publisher, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press editions of Sunday, April 22, 1951:

MACARTHUR SPEECH SHOULD CLARIFY OUR OBJECTIVES IN KOREA

Gen. Douglas MacArthur's moving and dramatic speech to Members of Congress and the American people should serve one all-important purpose:

The clarification and determination of our objectives in Korea.

I have repeatedly said in these columns that, as a nation, we would never be content with fighting a limited war that had as its purpose the indefinite containment of the enemy with no decisive victory in sight.

To do so would simply not be in the American tradition.

President Truman, Gen. Omar Bradley, and Secretary of State Dean Acheson have all adopted the view that we can carry on our efforts to stop aggression in Korea without appeasement and without precipitating a cataclysm of arms.

To this, General MacArthur replied: "There is no substitute for victory."

All thinking Americans must agree with MacArthur, and with the architects of our foreign policy, that a land invasion of Red China is unthinkable.

But there is a great division of opinion in this country between the MacArthur recommendation that we bomb China's strongholds and the administration's position that we should do nothing to risk an all-out war with Russia.

This is the basic conflict that led to MacArthur's dismissal by the President. It is being debated in every home, office, and factory throughout the land.

Without recounting all of the pros and cons of this second great debate, it is sufficient to say that in his address General MacArthur fully exposed the vital weaknesses of the Truman administration.

MacArthur was not consulted prior to the President's decision to intervene in Korea.

MacArthur was furnished no clear directives following entrance of the Chinese Reds into the Korean war.

MacArthur's request for reinforcements was denied.

As the United Nations sought to appease Red China, MacArthur believed that we should strike at the heart of their military and industrial strength and thus bring the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion.

To a man of General MacArthur's background, fighting a war without using all of the weapons at his command was beyond comprehension.

When his soldiers asked why military advantages were being surrendered to the enemy, as MacArthur told the Congress Thursday: "I could not answer."

For his vigorously expressed opinion concerning the conduct of the Korean war, General MacArthur was relieved by a petulant President who brooks no opposition from political or military subordinates.

A bigger man than Harry Truman might have found some way to work with General MacArthur and utilize his great prestige in the Far East.

As things were, however, the break was inevitable.

Tragic as we may consider General MacArthur's dismissal to be, once the Nation's highly pitched emotions have calmed down and the parades are over, public opinion will demand that our future policy in Korea be sharply defined.

The people will not long be fooled into accepting Secretary Acheson's assurances that we are pursuing a "steadfast course" in Korea with "unflinching determination."

Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Actually, we are conducting a "diplomat's war"; draining away the blood and resources of our country without decisive results.

This situation, I predict, will not be tolerated indefinitely. Either we must push on, or pull out.

General MacArthur's speech has given the people of this country an understanding of our plight and the courage to demand an accounting from our leadership.

If, from his words, and out of the discussions to follow, can be evolved a sane, realistic course of action, General MacArthur's personal tragedy may become the Nation's gain.

In some 30 years of newspaper work, I have never listened to a more touching and superbly presented address than General MacArthur's.

On either side sat ordinarily unsentimental newspaper editors with streams of tears coursing down their cheeks.

Here, indeed, was visible evidence of the tremendous spiritual influence which MacArthur exerts upon those who come into contact with him.

The quiet dignity of the statesman; the pride of a soldier; the reasoned tones of the advocate; the spirit of a patriot.

Yes; this was MacArthur, concealing his emotions in the vastness of his great soul.

As he stood there in the Chamber of the Capitol, strong and erect, the commanding magnetism of his personality was immediately felt by everyone present.

Here was no mere soldier-politician seeking vindication or warming rounds of applause; but a giant among men.

He spoke without rancor or bitterness, yet his references were pointedly direct.

No other speech in our times, with the possible exception of Winston Churchill's famous blood, sweat, and tears exhortation to the British people in the darkest hour of their history, has made such a profound impression upon human minds.

A great American patriot has come to the end of his glorious career. His life, his work, and his character remain as the Nation's heritage.

"Old soldiers never die; they just fade away," so the ballad goes.

But in the minds and hearts of his countrymen, the example of MacArthur, the magnificent, will ever hearten the timid and inspire the strong.

Living or dead, the footprints of such men as Douglas MacArthur are stamped indelibly upon the sands of time.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Aid to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month a bill was introduced in both Houses of Congress to extend to the State of Israel a grant-in-aid amounting to $150,000,000. This bill has wide bipartisan sponsorship. In the Senate, it is sponsored by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT and 34 of their colleagues. In the House, our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., are sponsoring a similar bill. We can truly say that, in this case, Israel serves as an inspiration to the leadership of both political parties for a notable demonstration of congressional unity.

In extending this grant-in-aid to Israel, we shall be helping her in solving one of the tragic refugee problems of our time—the problem of the homeless Jewish refugees. This is a great humanitarian undertaking which deserves our support.

Israel's success as a democratic state will depend in large measure on the development and stabilization of its economy. A sound economy and a democratic society go hand in hand and should prove to be a determining factor in making Israel impervious to Communist propaganda. The people of Israel are a freedom-loving nation. After a 2,000-year struggle to gain their freedom and independence, they can be relied upon to resist with all the power at their disposal any attempt by a foreign power to destroy their independence and enslave the people.

For the past three decades the United States has supported Jewish aspirations in Palestine, so that today we have the most cordial relations between this country and Israel. As early as June 20, 1922, the Congress of the United States unanimously went on record in support of the "aspirations of the Jewish people to rebuild their ancient homeland." Since then we have voiced our support in word and deeds on numerous occasions, thereby maintaining and continually extending the traditional relationship between the American people and the people of Israel.

Just as American financial aid was helpful to other countries in the achievement of their economic stability and strengthening of their political freedom, so in the case of Israel financial assistance from the United States will surely inspire the achievement of economic equilibrium in Israel.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Israel aid bill when it comes before the House.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Murray Frank, which is published in the April 1951 issue of the New Palestine:

GRANT IN CONGRESS URGED AS SAFEGUARD FOR ISRAEL

(By Murray Frank)

WASHINGTON.—A great stride forward has been made here to secure a grant-in-aid for Israel from the United States in the amount of $150,000,000. A group of 36 Senators, headed by Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois) and ROBERT A. TAFT (Republican, Ohio), introduced a bill in the Senate on April 2 urging the extension of financial aid to Israel for the above sum. An identical bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Democratic Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Republican Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Originally scheduled for introduction on March 22, the bills had to be postponed until after the Easter recess of Congress. Protocol requires that a formal request for financial aid must first be submitted through the proper Government channels by the country seeking such aid. The Ambassador of Israel, Abba Eban, was prepared to submit the formal request to Secretary of State Dean Acheson but in view of the latter's absence from Washington during a good part of March, the meeting between the two did not occur until March 22. Coincidentally, Congress took its recess that day resulting in the postponement.

The bipartisan bill—sponsored by 19 Democrats and 17 Republicans in the Senate—is known as the Israel Aid Act of 1951, but already it is being referred to as the Douglas-Taft bill in the Senate or the McCormack-Martin bill in the House. It contains these highlights:

Financial aid in the form of grants is to be extended to Israel to assist it in developing its natural resources, expand its agricultural and industrial economy, increase its productive capacity and strengthen the friendship between the people of Israel and the American people; a sum of $150,000,000 is to be appropriated during the period ending June 30, 1952, but until the appropriation is made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be authorized to advance $50,000,000 to Israel without interest and this sum is to be repaid when the funds become available following enactment of the bill.

NEEDS OUTLINED

In the memorandum submitted by Ambassador Eban to Secretary Acheson, who promised to give full consideration to Israel's request, the economic needs and problems of the Jewish State are outlined:

The shortage of foreign exchange makes it impossible for Israel to attain economic stability, while the lack of raw materials and capital goods impedes its agricultural and industrial development; large-scale Jewish immigration must continue and the immigrants must be absorbed, over a half-million have been admitted in the last 2½ years and another 500,000 are expected in the next 3 to 4 years. The memorandum indicated that the money is to be used for the following purposes: $30,000,000 toward the cost of 70,000 housing units; $105,000,000 for supplies, including wheat; $25,000,000, petroleum; $25,000,000, fodders; $15,000,000 and $40,000,000 for oilseeds, fertilizers, cotton, and textiles, leather, chemicals, etc.; the remainder of $15,000,000 will be used to cover the costs of shipping and insurance in connection with the importation of these supplies.

Senator DOUGLAS and TAFT issued a joint statement indicating the reasons why the United States should grant economic assistance to Israel at this time. Israel, the statement says, has emerged from a bitter struggle for independence "with courage, honor, and success," it has created "a democratic political structure and participated as a respected member in the councils of the United Nations." Next to Turkey, Israel "probably has the strongest army in the Near East," the country has achieved notable gains in agriculture and industry but because of the tremendous growth in population, its standard of living was reduced and it is now threatened with inflation. Other factors mentioned are Israel's strategic location, its importance as a force for democracy, etc. The Senators end their statement with this observation:

"This can be a timely and effective contribution to the protection of the free world and a welcome continuation of American assistance to a people whose initiative, enterprise, and dedication to the building of a genuinely democratic state in the Near East are an inspiration to all."

COSPONSORS LISTED

House leaders MCCORMACK and MARTIN issued somewhat similar, through briefer, statements at the time they introduced the bill in the House of Representatives. For the sake of the record, the Senators who are cosponsors of the Douglas-Taft bill are: Democrats—CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico; WILLIAM BENTON and BRIEN MCMAHON, Connecticut; GUY GILLETTE, Iowa; THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Missouri; LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota; LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming; EDWIN JOHNSON, Colorado; ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee; HARLEY M. KILGORE and MATTHEW W. NEELY, West Virginia; HERBERT H. LEHMAN, New York; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington; JAMES MURRAY, Montana; HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Maryland; and JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island; Republicans—OWEN BREWSTER and MRS. MARGARET C. SMITH, Maine; HUGH BUTLER, Nebraska; HARRY P. CAIN, Washington; JAMES DUFF and EDWARD MARTIN, Pennsylvania; HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan; ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON and H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey; EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota; IRVING M. IVES, New York; HENRY C. LODGE and LEVERETT M. SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts; WAYNE L. MORSE, Oregon; CHARLES TOBEY, New Hampshire; and MILTON YOUNG, North Dakota.

It may be asked: What are the prospects for early and favorable action on the Israel aid bill? Despite its bipartisan character and the fact that more than a third of the Members of the Senate as sponsors, prompt

and speedy action is not assured. There is considerable degree of sympathetic interest in the matter but it will be an uphill struggle and a long journey. If the State Department should give its approval, passage of the bill will be assured—but this is by no means certain. Undoubtedly, certain conditions of a military and strategic nature may be put forth and other obstacles may arise.

SILVER GIFT HONORS TAFT

An event of considerable interest took place here a few days before the bill was introduced in Congress. At a luncheon given by Ohio Zionists, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver presented a set of 500 volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in honor of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT to the Israel Knesset. The volumes, covering a period of 43 years, were accepted by Ambassador Eban, who praised the graceful initiative of Dr. Silver and others for making possible the presentation of the books.

Dr. Silver spoke of Senator TAFT's aid to the cause of Zionism in the years preceding the establishment of the Jewish State and listed many instances where TAFT was helpful in recent years, including his support and sponsorship of the bill to extend to Israel a grant-in-aid of $15,000,000. The Zionists of Ohio, he said, express their affection for Senator TAFT who did so much to help establish Israel by presenting these books, each of which will bear the imprint that it was given in his honor for his devotion to the Jewish cause.

Senator TAFT was very moved by this gift in his name. He, too, reminisced about his early efforts on behalf of a Jewish Palestine, he spoke in glowing terms of Israel as a truly democratic state and voiced the opinion that Israel is entitled to every assistance from the American Government. TAFT maintained that Israel actually rendered the United States an economic service by receiving hundred of thousands of refugees.

Seated at the head table with Dr. Silver, Senator TAFT and Ambassador Eban were also Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, Librarian of Congress Dr. Luther Evans, Benjamin V. Cohen, former counselor of the State Department, members of the United States delegation to the U. N., and others.

Ambassador Myron M. Cowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ambassador Myron M. Cowen at the commencement exercises at Silliman University, Dumaguete City, Negros Oriental, on Tuesday, April 3, 1951:

When I accepted the invitation to speak to you today I thought of the many things that could be said—and that usually are said—to young people reaching this stage of their lives. I thought of the day when those words of counsel and encouragement were spoken to me, and of the many times I have heard them since. It struck me that the ideas and values and sentiments had changed little during those years, and that the truths and virtues and objectives they touched upon were no less valid today, but it seemed that somehow there was something wrong with the pace.

There is an urgency and immediacy in life today that gives us less time to ponder its problems, less time to translate our decisions into action. And, as our world has shrunk in terms of time, so have its problems assumed a greater intimacy with our individual lives.

It is because of this intimacy that I decided not to speak to you, but, instead, to speak directly to Pablo.

None of you, perhaps, knows Pablo personally. He graduated with the class of 1950—not from this institution, but from one very much like it, one of Manila's better schools. There was little to distinguish him from his classmates except a certain moodiness that sometimes made him seem almost sullen. There was no more than that to explain why, one day soon after graduation, he joined the dissidents and disappeared into the hills. We can only wonder and ask, as I am asking today.

Why, Pablo, did you feel that your place was outside the free society cherished and upheld by most of your countrymen? You had just received a liberal education in a school where, on one side of you had sat a son of a great landowner, on the other the son of a small farmer in Pampanga. During your years at school you came to know all of the great minds that have contributed to man's progress. You were probably stirred by those revolutionary leaders who led their people to freedom and independence. But why, Pablo, did you choose to join a revolution that is trying to turn the clock back?

Your people have fought for centuries to secure freedom and independence. They have had it for only a few years. Why do you now want to turn them back to a system where man's thought and speech and life itself are rigidly controlled by a small group who hold power only through ruthless force and oppression? Why do you want to turn your country over to a colonialism which has been reaching out for control of Asia since the time of the czars?

When you wave the red flag and shout slogans fresh from the Moscow propaganda mills, when you name your secret propaganda schools "Stalin universities," do you mean that you want for your nation the kind of independence enjoyed by Poland, which, after centuries of struggle against Russian imperialism is today ruled by a Russian general who scarcely can speak Polish? Or like Czechoslovakia, whose greatest heroes and liberators have been liquidated or driven to suicide?

I assume, Pablo, that as a student, you were genuinely moved by the poverty of all too many of your countrymen; that in joining the Communists you really hoped to aid the poor. Have you looked about you in recent months at the fertile farmlands that lie idle because your bloody raids have killed or terrified the farmers who once tilled them? Have you seen the hordes of refugees huddled in the larger towns and cities in improvised temporary shelters, eating what little can be distributed by relief agencies? They are there because you have made life on their own lands and in their own barrios intolerable for them. They could be producing food for themselves and the rest of your people were it not for fear of you. Yes, Pablo, fear of you and the others who claim to be their friends—friends who burn their homes, violate their womenfolk, and loot their few miserable belongings.

Maybe you did not understand that you were working to place your nation under the direct and despotic rule of a master from Moscow or Peiping. But just what do you think you have done to help your country, Pablo? Perhaps you are proud of having murdered some unarmed Americans recently. But aside from destroying a promising new enterprise and throwing a number of your people out of work, what did you and your Communist leaders hope to accomplish by that cowardly crime? Disgrace your nation? The world knows that murder can occur anywhere and is no more or less contemptible wherever it occurs, but that it is only the murderers who are despised. Or did you hope to frighten all Americans away, leaving this country to face aggression alone? You should know better than that, Pablo, if only from the thousands of Americans who have but recently given their lives in defense of the independence of Korea.

There was a time when the peaceful beauty of your countryside could be enjoyed in safety at any hour of the day or night. Today, near your haunts, sudden death or robbery lurks behind the beauty of every bamboo grove. Gaiety, charm, hospitality, and devoted fellowship have long been traditions of your race. Today, in many places, Communist doctrine has substituted hatred, suspicion, and naked fear. It may be necessary for you to destroy the spirit of your people before they can become willing slaves of Red tyranny, but do you think your nation can ever honor you for it?

To those who have never read a book or a newspaper or listened to a radio, the lies and distortions and shameless deceptions of your "Stalin universities" may be persuasive. But what of the others who know the difference, who can hear and read the big lie of the Reds, and, at the same time are living the freedoms of democracy? I am told that just recently many here in the Philippines heard Red China's radio telling the Chinese people of the "hundreds of thousands of Chinese being brutally tortured and mistreated in the Philippines." Apparently a base was being laid for a program of brutal retaliation here if the opportunity ever came. But the derisive laugh that went up from the Chinese living peacefully in these islands could almost be heard in Peiping.

Today in Manila there are a number of people on trial, charged with being parties to a Communist conspiracy against the state, as well as complicity in a number of vicious criminal acts. Their trial has been going on for many weeks. They are defended by some of the best legal minds in the land. Evidence is being weighed with the greatest care, and their every right under the constitution of this Republic is being jealously guarded by the judiciary, by the press, and by various civic organizations—all of which communism is pledged to destroy. Contrast that, Pablo, with your system of marching people down to a river bank and shooting them in the back. Or with justice in Soviet states, where people are arrested and simply disappear, or appear at farcical trials where—dull-eyed and haggard—they mechanically repeat ridiculous confessions.

Just recently some university students felt they had a grievance and demanded that they be heard. The President of the Philippine Republic left his work in Baguio and flew down to Manila to discuss the matter with them. Can you picture Mr. Stalin doing that, Pablo? That is just a small sample of the democratic way of life you and your cohorts want to destroy.

You and they must know the value of those democratic freedoms, Pablo, because you protest frantically whenever it seems that they are being denied to you in your efforts to tear down the very system under which they exist. But most of your fellow countrymen know their value, too. They want to continue to be able to speak their minds freely and openly. They want schools and a press that can bring them the truth about all the world, not a carefully strained bit of intellectual pap padded out with lies and inventions. They want their priests and ministers to guide them in the religion of their choice without the constant threat of

prison and humiliation that hangs over the clergy in Soviet satellite states. They want the freedom to move about or stay where they please, to work at tasks to their liking, to enjoy the privacy of their homes and the loyalty of their families. Each one of these freedoms is taken from them under Soviet rule, Pablo. Why do you want to do that to your fellow men?

You see, Pablo, I am still giving you the benefit of the doubt. I am assuming that perhaps you are not like the hardened Communist agitator simply greedy for power. Do you honestly believe that Communist rule would give your people a better living? And do you think it worth sacrificing those freedoms I have mentioned? Remember, now, that even your poorest peasant enjoys those rights and freedoms today.

As for the better living, it is very easy for you to get the facts. If you carefully analyze statistics that trickle out from under the iron curtain you can readily see that even in Soviet Russia itself it still takes many more man-hours of labor to earn a loaf of bread or suit of clothes than in democratic lands—this despite the fact that Soviet satellite countries are drained of everything they can spare above barest subsistence. But let us look at it from another angle. If you are really sincere in your desire to improve this country's standard of living, have you considered every means possible without making slaves of your people?

Of course, most obvious is what could be done by restoring peace and order, by putting people and fertile lands back to work producing more food and other products for your own consumption and for sale abroad. By making traffic on your roads free and safe, so that food from your farms could come to your cities and the products from your industries and imports returned to the farmer—all at lower cost because there would be no need to offset losses by looting. And think of the millions in taxes that would be saved if it were not for the unproductive but grim necessity of hunting you down and stopping you from committing more murders.

For an educated man, Pablo, there is the challenge of old and wasteful methods in agriculture. Have you thought how quickly you could relieve the peasant's grinding toil by showing him how to double and treble his crop by modern means and less labor? And how you could lead him into the rich, untouched lands your government offers pioneers—lands that would become his own? And what have you done about malaria which, aside from the suffering it causes, costs your people many days of useful work?

There is a need to process and find new uses for your raw materials, to explore and develop some of the untapped riches of your land. There is a need for competent professional people, for teachers and engineers, for administrators and organizers, for public servants and legislators. Where, incidentally, were your so-called champions of the worker, Pablo, when your Congress was working hard to hammer out a minimum-wage law that ultimately will increase the earnings of almost 90 percent of this country's workers.

At any rate, Pablo, these are some of the things that need doing for the good of your land. And, whether you and your fellow outlaws like it or not, America is going to help your country do them. We are going to help because the great majority of your countrymen have invited us to help; because they regard us as friends and good neighbors and we feel the same about them. Ours is one relationship that your poison pen pals at Pravda will never break up. True, because of their efforts, the requirements of the free world on our resources for defense and development are heavy. But the American people have shouldered the burden without complaint, firm in the conviction that the survival of freedom is worth any sacrifice.

In your country, as elsewhere in Asia, we are willing to help to the limit of our resources in the real revolution of our time, the constructive revolution that has as its objectives the overthrow of human misery and want and the elevation to power of such forms of free society as best fit the needs, the tastes, and the cultural aspirations of the people who comprise them. All that we seek to gain from the success of such revolution is the assurance that we, as well as all others, may live and work out our destiny in a world community ruled by reason, morality, and a decent respect for the rights of others. There is a place for you in that world, Pablo, but you will have to wash the blood off your hands and leave your gun outside.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] to the Jefferson-Jackson Day audience at York, Pa., on April 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a distinct honor and pleasure for me to be here this evening and to join with you in paying tribute to the memory of those two great Americans, who have given our country and our party the lofty political principles by which this Nation has achieved its present greatness.

Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson need not be recalled to your minds on this occasion, with eloquent words or phrases. It will suffice to say that their epoch-making achievements have left to succeeding generations of Americans a rich and indelible heritage upon which we have patterned this way of life.

I am particularly glad to be here in Pennsylvania, for next to the people of my own State there is no group toward whom I feel closer than the citizens of this great Commonwealth. Pennsylvania has always been a friendly and helpful neighbor to us in Delaware, and in the course of this Nation's proud history our two States have separately and together played important and vital roles.

This fine city of York, which, I understand, was known as the "Bread basket of America" during colonial days, has certainly contributed more than its share to the successful growth and development of the Keystone State. Indeed, there are many of us who gaze longingly at the fertile land and the high productiveness of the farm acreage in this section of Pennsylvania. As a farmer I can say with authority that I wish we had some of your good earth in Delaware.

It is very pleasant also this evening to have the opportunity of becoming better acquainted with your able Congressman, JIM LIND, who is doing such a superb job in Washington. He and the members of the dinner committee have already made us feel very much at home.

There was a time, I suppose, when the membership of political parties could gather on occasions such as this in a spirit of real revelry and relaxation. Most everyone enjoys a little political shop talk now and then, and I can well remember dinners of this type in Delaware and elsewhere, in years past, at which we could afford to indulge in these pleasantries.

Unfortunately, my friends, the present hour of history leaves little time or opportunity for gaiety and lightheartedness. The present tense atmosphere, both in this country and particularly abroad, demands instead serious and unending attention to many grim and unfinished tasks, which yet remain before us.

We, in these United States, have lived and suffered through many great crises in the past decade, and our nature is becoming accustomed to unusual, sudden, dramatic, and highly significant incidents in world affairs. Indeed, it is doubtful if any era in modern times has been more filled with literally earth-shaking and tragic events than have these last recent years.

Today is no exception. For we are confronted with the possibility of additional and potentially more dangerous trials than ever before. I regret to say that this appears true, not only because of the threat to our way of life from without, but because of confusion and destructive criticism which is being incited consciously or unconsciously by some people within our own borders.

I need not publicly observe that a serious controversy is threatening our national unity. But, I trust that the clear but difficult duty of the Democratic Party in this matter is understood by all of us.

Ours is the thankless but vitally necessary responsibility of trying to steer a course toward world peace. The way is made more difficult because we must travel through a tense and dangerous maze of political and military obstacles. More than ever before we need strength and character to meet these new and heavy responsibilities. Unfortunately, we are not being helped by some members of the opposition, who, either unknowingly or for selfish political gains, are constantly seeking to complicate our efforts to fabricate a stable and peaceful world where men may live with dignity and justice.

For weeks the Halls of Congress have echoed with oratory in the so-called great debate on foreign affairs. These discussions, for the most part, were devoted to but one phase of our military and diplomatic policy—that affecting Western Europe.

Now, another storm has broken with dramatic suddenness over the horizon—this one has affected our policy in the teeming, unsettled, and war-torn continent of Asia.

This debate which has already opened and will undoubtedly continue for weeks to come is in itself a desirable and healthy thing. In this country, free discussion is our way of bringing problems out into the open, so that the American people can reach their own logical conclusions upon the presentation of all sides. Tragically, however, the issues at stake are so grave and so far reaching that unless our words are carefully chosen and our feelings tempered, the reaction in other lands may be interpreted in a manner which will be neither beneficial to us nor to our allies, who read and hear them.

How sad and ironic it is that one of the great architects of our bipartisan foreign policy has been lost to the country at a time when he is most sorely needed. Without question, the Members of Congress and the people of this Nation have been deprived of an inspiring and devoted public servant in the death this week of Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg. Would that his calm and steady hand were still helping to guide us in the Senate Chamber now.

I do not propose a lengthy discussion on international problems at this time. However, a few brief observations on what this country is trying to achieve do seem in order if only to clarify the public record. This requires first of all that we approach the problem realistically. We cannot do so by following the whimsical reflections of certain highly respected policy leaders of the Republican Party, who, when all is said and done, have somehow reached the illogical conclusion that the only thing to do is isolate this country from one-half of the world, and, at the same time, launch an all-out war against the other half. Such thinking only creates false impressions among our people who are looking to their representatives in Congress for guidance.

Let us realize that the continued preservation of our way of life, both in this country and in other democratic nations, is a global problem. We cannot separate the issues because some of them are occurring in Europe and some of them in Asia. The fact that war exists now only in Korea should not lead us to the false conclusion that it will not break out tomorrow in Yugoslavia or Iran or some place else. It should be remembered that a leaking dyke must be plugged at all its weak points, or the torrent, built up behind it, will find other openings and engulf us.

But because Korea is uppermost in our minds tonight, particularly as a result of the return of General MacArthur, it might be well to examine briefly the implications of this conflict.

There is, and has been for some time, a school of thought, particularly among some leading Republicans, which calls for an expansion of our military efforts outside the peninsula, into Manchuria, and the Chinese mainland. I wonder, however, if those who have rashly proposed an invasion of the vast Chinese hinterland have ever considered the probable consequences of such an operation—the staggering cost in human lives, or the cost in dollars which could spell ruination for this country's standard of living. And what good, may I ask, would it do if our armies did succeed in capturing Shanghai or Peiping or Chungking or a dozen other Chinese cities. We would have conquered land perhaps, but certainly not the restless millions of Chinese people. And if we sent the remaining troops of Chiang Kai-shek ashore on the mainland, as has been advocated, whom do you think would have to provide the air and sea cover, and, in addition, replace the empty ranks of those who have fallen.

If the Nationalist troops are used anywhere, it should be in Korea, as a part of the United Nations force now engaged against the Communists there. By spreading the conflict to the Chinese mainland we would play directly into the hands of our real enemy, the Soviet Union. It is highly doubtful that if we declared war on China Russia would allow the opportunity to pass without quick retaliation either in Asia or, what is more likely, in Western Europe. If that occurred our thinly spread forces, together with such allies as we might muster, would be neatly buffered by the Chinese Reds, while the Russian Army was free to move at will to outflank us by seizing the North Atlantic area. Surely then there is ample evidence to sustain the thinking that a campaign against China itself is preposterous.

However, the critics of our present policy in Korea, if they fail to steer this Nation into direct conflict on the Chinese mainland, are seeking the same objective through other means. They are calling for all measures short of an actual landing on the Chinese shores. These include, among others, the bombing of bases outside Korea and the blockading of the Chinese coast to mention a few. I will admit that there is more logic for supporting this plan, but even then the likelihood of its success is not overly hopeful. To follow this course would also expand the conflict and draw more men and equipment into Asia. We should take it only as a last resort.

It has been said that there is no parallel to be found in the manner by which the United Nations Forces are conducting the Korean conflict. I believe there is. A parallel exists, or did exist, in the little country of Greece just a short time ago. You will recall at the end of World War II, when Europe lay prostrate and devastated, Soviet Russia, ignoring the principles and aims of the United Nations, threatened, through its satellite powers, to subjugate Greece by direct military methods. The government of that small country was hard pressed, and threatened with disaster by the growing strength of the so-called Greek guerrillas. Had they not been halted, the Communists would have undoubtedly seized that nation, and, perhaps, swept on through Italy as well. But Russia failed in this attempt because the President of the United States, recognizing the Russian aims for what they were, came forward with a bold and imaginative plan to furnish aid to Greece, and to Turkey as well. It was a step which cheered the hearts of war weary freedom-loving men and women everywhere. Backed by our help, the courageous people of Greece rallied against this threat to their homeland. Key American personnel, including our new commander in Korea, Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, revitalized the Greek fighting forces and saved that little country from destruction. I ask you, what would have happened had we followed the isolationists' principles which call for us to virtually abandon the European continent.

There is an important lesson to be learned from the war in Greece. First, it should be noted that the attacks there were put down in the place where they occurred. It was not the purpose of the Truman doctrine to launch an assault upon the satellite neighbors of Greece. To do so then, as now, might well have inflamed the world into war. The Greek campaign was a limited conflict. When it became clear to the puppets, who were fighting against the Government of Greece, that they could not succeed, the Kremlin was compelled to back down. It was not appeasement to refrain from attacking the satellites in our defense of the Greek Government. What we did do, however, was to make plain that an assault upon a free Nation would not be tolerated, and, what is more significant, we beat that attempt where it occurred.

Not only did we succeed in halting communism in Greece, but as a result of another administration program, advocated first by our great Secretary of Defense, Gen. George Marshall, we have now revitalized Western Europe and aided in a rebirth of hope, courage, and strength in those democracies. Yes, as a result of the historic Marshall plan, the local Communist movement in the western democracies have lost in influence and effectiveness.

I well recall the sight of Europe at the end of World War II, and I am sure that there are many veterans of that conflict here tonight, who also remember the chaotic condition of the Continent in 1945. A year and a half ago, I visited sections of Europe again. The magnificent results of the Marshall plan program were stupendous. Europe has reached and passed the crisis successfully. The patient has recovered and, barring only a reckless assault by a desperate foe, the western nations will continue to live and grow in the democratic way of life.

To further strengthen our relationship there, this country has helped to create the North Atlantic Alliance—a treaty which binds the United States and its democratic neighbors in a program of collective security for our mutual welfare and safety.

I am sure that those accomplishments are well known to you here tonight, but they are worth repeating and reemphasizing as a refutation of the reckless and irresponsible charges which we have heard recently to the effect that the United States lacks an effective policy of resistance against the Reds.

Slowly but surely the democratic nations of the west are building and developing their military and economic power. We are doing so, not to make war, but to defend our way of life against a philosophy which, if unchecked, would make slaves of free people everywhere. Much has been accomplished, much remains to be done. Only in Asia on the remote Korean peninsula do the Communists now dare test the strength of the democracies. But, our quick reprisal has stung the Reds and checked them. The loss of American lives in this endeavor has been heartbreaking, but we hope the end is approaching. For those who cruelly say that our intervention in Korea has been in vain, I can only reply by pointing out that thus far we have prevented the spread of this conflict into a full-scale war. In addition, we have raised the hopes of free people everywhere by demonstrating our will to protect the rights of men when they are challenged by those who would enslave them. Korea is a symbol of hope in the free world, which knows the horrors of war and which is preparing to resist such a holocaust if it is thrust upon us.

My friends, the Democratic Party, which has served the best interests of this country for many years, need not cringe before its record in foreign affairs or its achievements here at home. We may be partisan within our own ranks, but we have kept as our objective good government, and for that reason the American people have continued to accept our leadership.

Time is fleeting, and I do not wish to infringe longer on your generous hospitality, but I think we should all keep in mind for the information of those who may challenge our party's principles, that since World War II alone, we have enjoyed the greatest prosperity that ever existed on the face of the globe. The postwar depression, which the crapehangers predicted was coming in 1948, has just never arrived. Instead some 20,000,000 motor vehicles have been built and purchased in the United States in the past 5 years. New homes have been built all over the country. Slums have been abolished. Rural electrification has brought new advances and achievements on farms. Business is healthy and stronger. Look at the corporation profits alone. Wages and salaries are higher. More than 60,000,000 people are gainfully employed, and still we go forward in the fields of science, transportation, communication, and many others.

The free world looks to us for guidance and counsel, because under our system of government, we have achieved a greatness unequaled in the history of mankind. The only grave threat to our future existence and welfare that still lies before us can be surmounted if our global policy for the containment of communism can be maintained. The leaders in the Kremlin will not forever be able to trample the hearts and minds of these millions of people whom they now control by brutal force.

The democratic ideas and ideals which have been given impetus and strength by the party of Jefferson and Jackson shine brightly over much of the earth. Sooner or later that light will penetrate into the darkest recesses behind the iron curtain.

Let us, then, as Americans first and then as Democrats continue to place our trust and confidence behind the lofty principles of freedom and justice. The united strength of the free world, political, military, and, above all, spiritual, is growing greater by the hour. As it does, the chances for the Soviet

leaders to win a war of desperation are steadily waning. Even they cannot be blind to stark reality. As our strength increases, the futility of attack will become more evident to them.

Let us, then, turn to the unfinished tasks with vigor and determination, secure in the knowledge that divine providence is with us in the great crusade to lift the hearts and minds of men above the ignoble and wretched state in which the twentieth-century tyrants of the Kremlin have cast them.

A Few Pertinent Questions, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jefferson (Ohio) Gazette:

A FEW PERTINENT QUESTIONS, MR. PRESIDENT, BY A SMALL-TOWN EDITOR TO A BIG-TOWN POLITICIAN, RESPECTFULLY ASKED

Explanation: Your questioner has been a country newspaper editor for 54 years. His recognition by former Presidents has been their personal invitations to attend the inaugurals in 1897 and 1928; and the offer of appointment by Franklin Delano Roosevelt to be one of the seven NIRA dictators for the State of Ohio. (This appointment was promptly declined.)

Agreement: You and I believe in the American way of life with its two-party system. You have stated your desire for intelligent debate and constructive criticism. Although I am a member of the minority party, I am more interested in a worth-while administration of public affairs after the voters have spoken, than I am in the political label of the administration.

Basis for my questions: My questions are based upon your recent Jefferson Day address, with its $100-per-plate campaign fund contribution. Your political party claims that "The Democratic Party (now the New Deal Party) was fathered by the third President, Thomas Jefferson." You profess adherence to Jeffersonian principles.

With one exception, I follow the 11 Jeffersonian principles as enunciated in Jefferson's letter to Elbridge Gary on January 24, 1799.

I call myself a Republican. President Jefferson said, "We are all Republicans; we are all Federalists." In the broadest sense, we seek to be loyal Americans.

Thomas Jefferson died 6 years before the first national Democratic Convention at Baltimore in 1832. He never heard of a Democratic Party. He never spoke of democracy as if the United States Republic were a political democracy. Our Constitution is based upon a government administered by the people's representatives. It is a Republic, with each of the 48 States required to have a republican form of constitution—a sovereign entity, save in those powers the States or the people delegated to the National Government. Every President from Thomas Jefferson, down to and including Andrew Jackson, until the election of 1832, called himself a Republican.

A CHALLENGE TO MR. TRUMAN

Question No. 1: If you and your political party adhere to the political principles of Thomas Jefferson, have you followed his fourth requirement, namely, "A rigorously frugal administration * * * application of all possible savings of the public revenues to the liquidation of the public debt?"

Answer: No. During 6 years your administration has spent more of the taxpayers' moneys than was spent by all of the Presidents from George Washington, including Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roosevelt, and the waging of two World Wars. Such extravagance results in the average American citizen handing over to the Federal Treasury 2 days of labor out of every 8 days' pay.

Question No. 2: If your political philosophy is based upon the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson, have you followed his principle of "and resistance, therefore, to a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to create partisans"?

Answer: No. The facts stand out. So overpadded is the public payroll and so inefficiently managed is the cumbersome Federal machine that, aside from Federal employees at the National Capital, the Federal payroll for political appointees in many counties in the 48 States exceeds that of elected local and county officers, both in number and tax cost.

My partner and myself and our eight employees pay to Washington about 40 times as much in Federal taxes as is imposed by local, county, and State taxes on our business plant at Jefferson, Ashtabula County, Ohio.

Question No. 3: Mr. President, do you, and does the present Democratic Party, or that of Mr. Wilson or Mr. Roosevelt before you, adhere to principle 7 in the Jeffersonian doctrine, namely, "Opposition to linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe"?

Answer: No! You, like Mr. Roosevelt, and like Mr. Wilson when he got over being too proud to fight, have spent most of your energies upon getting involved in and linking the United States with the quarrels of Europe and Asia. Still you boast of being Jeffersonians.

Mr. Roosevelt ignored Congress when he gave 50 destroyers, 500,000 rifles and other war supplies to England, prior to the declaration of war against Germany and Japan by the Congress. Such gifts constituted a warlike act. It may have been justifiable if the President, as Commander in Chief, drops the robes of a civil executive and assumes the sword of a military dictator. By ignoring Congress, the Commander in Chief elevates the military power above the civil power of Congress, as you did in Korea.

The fact that Roosevelt had been warned that the Japanese navy was moving toward Pearl Harbor and an attack could be expected, and that such Roosevelt information was not communicated to the Army nor Navy at Pearl Harbor has no explanation, save that someone at Washington sought to so excite the American people to justify his previous war-like acts by the public's demand for all-out war.

Question No. 4: You and a majority of Americans were swept into adherence to the Charter of the United Nations as a means of maintaining world peace, through an expected physical power and psychological fear of world power to deter or to punish aggression. Nationalist China was, and still is, a member of the United Nations. Does the United States Navy, by your order, patrol the Strait of Formosa to bar Chiang Kai-shek from seeking to regain his native land? If so, is not such fact an act of aggression by the United States? If so, has not the American Navy been used during the Truman Korean police action (another word for war) as an aid in fact to the mutual enemies of the United States and National China?

Answer: Regardless of any intent of your administration, or the excuse that if the Nationalist Chinese army makes a foray upon the aggressors from Manchuria, it would precipitate world war III, the fact that the American Navy was and is still used to keep Chiang Kai-shek in exile prevents a sovereign power from attacking its enemies in China, who are enemies of the United States. The failure of the United Nations to come to the aid of Nationalist China while a member of the Big Five shows the general hypocrisy of the U. N. as an instrument of peace. This failure shows that it, like the kings of Europe seeking the balance of power, still look to force, coupled with diplomatic dishonesty, as the means of saving their own hides.

Socialist England, to save Hong Kong, demands that the Red aggressors—who have killed, wounded or captured more than 60,000 American boys in this Truman police action in Korea—be recognized as coequals of civilized members of the United Nations. England demands that you surrender Formosa to the Communists. Such act would be followed by the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of the friends of the United States. Such bloody appeasement means more than world war III.

A subquestion No. 4: Mr. President, do you believe that many members of the United States Senate would have approved the U. N. Charter treaty, or made any agreement to yield any sovereign power to the U. N. if they had considered, prior to acceptance, that our own Supreme Court holds that a treaty is the supreme law of the land; and that our treaty in accepting the United Nations takes precedence over the Constitution and the statutes of any and all of the 48 States? Thus you aided the conspiracy to alter the form of government of the United States through the U. N.

Under the terms of the U. N. charter, millions of American boys and girls can be drafted and sent, as you claim is your right and power as President of the United States, without consent of Congress, anywhere anytime for any reason to fight wars not of our own making.

Question No. 5: Mr. President, have you kept your oath of office to preserve, protect and defend the Federal Constitution; and do you follow it along Jefferson's interpretation, or do you, like Mr. Roosevelt, believe that by packing the Supreme Court with party-line stooges you can construe the Constitution to mean anything the Justices say it does? I suggest that you read Mr. Jefferson's first principle, namely, "An inviolable preservation of the Federal Constitution, according to the true sense in which it was adopted."

Question No. 6: And finally, Mr. President Truman, do you follow Jefferson's third principle including "resistance to movements for transferring the power of the States to the general government, and all those of that government to the executive branch?"

Answer: Actions speak louder than words. Mr. Truman, the answer is obvious. For 19 long years the New Dealers have been seeking to socialize the Government of the United States. Some seek to make it a Communist dependency of barbaric Russia. Others have dreamed of world government, ignoring the fact varying social, moral and intellectual grades make world union a mad dream. A world union can survive only by unlimited force and dictatorial power.

As Chief Executive you find excuses for increasing the power of the Executive and the centralization of government at Washington.

You have quarreled repeatedly with the legislative branch of Government; and you now find yourself in a deplorable police action which you dare not force to victory lest it be the excuse for an all-out war by Russia. You are the prisoner of false ideals and of your own diplomatic hypocrisy. You had no constitutional right to set yourself up as a military dictator and start a war under the fiction of a "police action." But you did start it. By the skill of General MacArthur and others in military authority victory was in our grasp. But you listened to the siren of the Thames; and your ship came close to national and international

disaster by reason of orders not to destroy enemy bases in Manchuria by American air power.

General MacArthur led a long war against Japan in the Pacific. Then, as now, his pleas for more men and more ships were ignored. Japan had a great navy, a great air force, and a great army near or in Japanese territory.

The Chinese Communists are countless, but not as an army. They have no navy except such as may be loaned by Russia. They have no air power, save what comes from Russia. And Russia is far to the west, with only a single rail artery to carry Russian gifts of heavy war matériel.

No. Mr. Truman, you put yourself up as a military dictator; so you recalled General MacArthur because he, as a soldier and a patriotic American, would not aid the scheme to make the United States the victim of ill advice and treachery, led by Socialist England.

Would it not have been wiser to have followed the Jeffersonian doctrine and asked the Congress to declare war rather than to have assumed yourself to be the great I am in this Korean disaster?

CHET LAMPSON.

Federal Income Tax on Interest From Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a resolution adopted by the city of Newark, N. J., concerning its opposition to a Federal income tax on interest received from holders of municipal bonds:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, N. J., OPPOSING IMPOSING ON INCOME TAXES ON INTEREST FROM MUNICIPAL BONDS BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Whereas it is reported that the Secretary of the Treasury has indicated that the Federal administration may undertake to impose Federal income taxes on interest from municipal bonds, and in opposition thereto we submit the following from the American Municipal News (February 1951, vol. V, No. 2) to wit:

"The American Municipal Association and the State leagues of municipalities are on record in opposition to any attempt to remove the exemption. Such taxation would add 1 to 1¼ percent to the annual interest cost on municipal bonds, so a $1,000,000 serial issue running from 1 to 30 years now bearing interest at about 2 percent would suffer an increase from $810,000 to $450,000 or more—about 50 percent higher. In a statement to municipal officials last week AMA suggested that those who oppose this proposal should attack it now in the House Ways and Means Committee. Arguments against the proposal are (1) it increases one large municipal cost by about 50 percent, (2) it comes at a time when the Treasury proposes to increase many taxes heavily used by States such as on gasoline, beer, liquor, and cigarettes, (3) it opens the way for Federal taxation of municipal enterprises, possibly leading to Federal taxes on the income of local water and light plants, and (4) many vital municipal projects now financed by self-supporting revenue bonds would be impossible if the interest cost were increased."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the city of Newark, That we do hereby give expression of our opposition to the imposition of income taxes on interest from municipal bonds, and for the reasons aforesaid and the related depression which would result by the imposition of such income taxes, in the sale of municipal bonds, to the detriment of the municipality; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby request the Senators and Representatives in Congress from New Jersey to give voice and support to the objection of the municipality to such proposal to impose income taxes on the interest on municipal bonds; and it is further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress from New Jersey, and the director of the department of revenue and finance be and he is hereby authorized to take whatever further action is necessary to present to the Federal authorities and to the Congress and the House Ways and Means Committee the opposition of the city of Newark thereto.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, N. J.

"Men of the Free World Have the Same Spiritual and Intellectual Horizons Even Though They Speak Different Languages and Use Different Methods To Achieve Their Ends—In Times of Peril It Is This Heritage Which Binds Us Together"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I truly wonder how John Steelman manages to retain the energy to put in the long hours which he does in the discharge of the many and most important duties assigned him by the President—and to seemingly accomplish the desired results with ease, cooperation, precision, and dispatch.

The television program, Battle Report, Washington, upon which he appears each Sunday afternoon—one of his many self-imposed tasks carried on in the national interest—has now become a must item for millions of television viewers each week.

Last Sunday Dr. Steelman brought to the television audience Mr. Thomas D. Cabot, Director of the International Security Affairs of the State Department; Brig. Gen. F. S. Besson, Jr., Assistant Chief of Army Transportation Corps; Mr. Michael Straus, Commissioner of Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and, last but not least, Commander Robert M. Schwyhart, United States Navy Division Chaplain of the First Division of Marines, recently returned from Korea.

In his introduction of these officials, the assistant to the President himself spoke briefly with respect to the meeting which had taken place with the representatives of the American Republics assembled in Washington last week to discuss hemispheric solidarity and to make plans for the future.

In the course of his remarks, Dr. Steelman said:

All these men are working to build a world of peace—a world where every man can hold up his head in dignity—a world where no man is a slave of another—and is free to seek happiness in his own way.

The report made by Mr. Cabot, Director of International Security Affairs, was heartening inasmuch as Mr. Cabot was able to give assurance that we shall not have to bear the entire burden of the defense for freedom—that the taxpayers of all Allied countries will henceforth share the defense burden with the American taxpayers, and in doing so will more surely provide the combined strength necessary to defend ourselves.

In making report to the American people of the great transportation problem that confronts our military on the Korean peninsula, General Besson said, in part:

The transportation job in Korea, punctuated now and then by sudden disaster, has called for countless renovations. These operations are constantly harassed by exploding roadbeds and burning gondolas; by guerrilla-ambushed trains and truck convoys; by smoke and death in railways tunnels; by locomotives plunging over mountain trestles and trucks sliding off ice-covered roads; by road blocks; by rugged terrain, poor roads, snipers, and bad weather.

He spoke more or less in detail of the particularly difficult task that presented itself during the campaign which occurred after the Hungnam evacuation and indicated wherein paper calculations estimated that 100,000 troops cannot be moved over the rocky and rugged terrain in less than 11 days—that mathematics can be wrong—and the division actually moved in less than 5 days.

Mike Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, needs no introduction to the Members of this Congress. In describing the starvation now existing among the teeming populations of the arid zone of south Asia, where in places crops are harvested by hand as they were before Christ was born, he painted a vivid picture of the tremendous job that can be done and is, in fact, being done by use of the comparably small appropriations made by this Congress for carrying out the provisions of the point 4 program.

Mr. Speaker, of all the men who have ever addressed a television audience, none have brought a more heartfelt consolation to the fathers and mothers of American boys who are fighting in Korea than did Commander Robert M. Schwyhart, division chaplain of the First Marine Corps.

The gracious tribute General MacArthur paid to Hawaii's heroic dead in memory of Korea when he said, "I know little of the dignity of their birth but I surely well know the dignity of their death," was equaled by the tribute paid to all American boys fighting in Korea

by Commander Robert M. Schwyhart when he stated:

The men whom we serve in Korea are the finest in the world. The greatest tribute which can come to us chaplains is to be adjudged worthy of those whom we serve. May God keep all of them in his gracious care.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no more fitting way of having the fires of patriotism kindled in one's breast than to listen to the public officials which Dr. John Steelman brings to the television screen on Battle Report, Washington, each Sunday afternoon.

It is because of the marvelous work which he is accomplishing that I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues in this House to again extend my remarks and include therein the thirty-first Battle Report, Washington, which was as follows:

Mr. BRINKLEY. As the Army demonstrates it first new tank since World War II—the Walker Bulldog—26 tons of concrete evidence of our stepped-up defense production—NBC television once again turns its battle-reporting cameras on the Nation's Capitol.

Washington, which, during the past week, greeted the President of France and the Foreign Ministers of Latin America—and Korea, where American troops once again greeted the muddy 38th parallel by crossing it with their heavy "tiger" tanks.

Today Battle Report scans the world through the eyes of its far-flung cameras and four top official guests. They join to bring you a report ranging from the food crisis in southeastern Asia to first-hand experience with the Marines in Korea. But first, we welcome back from Florida, where he has been with President Truman, the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. During the past week Washington has been host to many distinguished visitors. Delegates from all our sister American Republics are here to discuss our family problems, and to make plans for the future. Last Wednesday, President Auriol of France arrived on an official visit.

It is significant that two points are emphasized in the statements made by these visiting dignitaries. First, they proclaim their desire for peace; and secondly, they state, in no uncertain terms, that freedom—the right of every man to seek happiness in his own way—cannot and will not be sacrificed.

Men of the free world have the same spiritual and intellectual heritage, even though they speak different languages and have used different methods to achieve their ends. In time of peril, this heritage is the tie which binds us together. This heritage is the foundation upon which a world of plenty and a world of peace can be built. Let us hope that the plans for mutual help which are now being made will unite us more firmly than ever before.

This afternoon, we will hear from four prominent officials who are engaged in radically different work. First, we have Mr. Thomas D. Cabot, Director of International Security Affairs of the Department of State, who has just returned from Europe where he saw what our partners in the North Atlantic Pact are producing for our common defense. Next, Brig. Gen. F. S. Besson, Jr., Assistant Chief of the Army Transportation Corps, will tell us about the gigantic task which confronts him. It is the responsibility of his organization to transport everything the Army needs to any place on earth. Mr. Michael Straus, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, who has just returned from South Asia, will tell us how we are cooperating with less fortunate peoples to enable them to increase their food supply, and Commander Robert M. Schwyhart, who recently received the Alexander D. Goode award as chaplain of the year, will tell us of his experiences with the marines in Korea.

All these men are working to build a world of peace—a world where every man can hold up his head in dignity, a world where no man is a slave of another, and is free to seek happiness in his own way.

Mr. BRINKLEY. United Kingdom troops, in the vanguard of our forces in Korea, forces now said to have advanced far beyond the most controversial boundary in modern history. These are men of Canada's famed Princess Pat Light Infantry, who were lately joined by the British Twenty-seventh Brigade and are fighting on the east and central fronts. The common power of Canadian and American troops will be increased even more with the recent agreement between the two countries on the use of similar military equipment. Further evidence of our growing unity, America, is this one-millionth ton of military aid leaving New York for Europe this past week. To tell us more of how the free nations are forging themselves into a single fighting force for mutual defense against communism, we bring you now, just back from touring the Atlantic Pact countries of Europe, the State Department's head of military aid—it's Director of International Security Affairs, Thomas D. Cabot.

Mr. CABOT. The great debate on defending Europe has left doubts in some minds as to the willingness of our allies.

I am convinced that the free nations of Europe realize the danger of the Soviet threat against them, that they are determined to defend themselves and are gaining confidence in their ability to do so.

Furthermore, I feel that our allies will bear their fair share of our mutual defense burdens. Their actual achievements so far in strengthening their defenses, increasing their armed forces and converting their industrial capacities to production for defense indicate that they will accept their full share of the responsibility.

We are building for a lasting peace and it is important that we develop the tremendous potential of Western Europe to support its own defenses and resist attack. Through Marshall-plan aid we have strengthened the internal economies of these countries. We must now expand the productivity of their factories to augment the supply of arms needed for mutual defense against aggression.

All the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has made substantial increases in their defense expenditures over the last year. All of them are increasing their military forces. Compulsory military service of able-bodied young men is now the universal rule among our European allies. The period of service is being notably lengthened to enlarge and improve their trained forces.

Production of weapons is increasing, too, as here at Woolwich Arsenal in England, but it will take time to revive Europe's ability to provide its own arms. Europe's industry cannot compare with ours in capacity. Only here can we hope to get within a reasonable time sufficient new equipment for the forces being mustered.

As Mr. Steelman has told you, I have just returned from accompanying our Under Secretary of State, Mr. Webb, on a trip to London and Paris where we have discussed with General Eisenhower and with our ambassadors and other representatives, the defense plans of our European allies.

Much remains to be done in these countries, just as much remains to be done in the United States. But the increasing sense of urgency and determination among the peoples there is evident on all sides. Our Ambassadors, whose job it is to observe public reactions, all report that the determination of the people of Europe to defend themselves has increased spectacularly during the past few months. There can be no longer any question about the outcome of our joint defense plans. All the many representatives with whom we talked—military men as well as diplomats—had witnessed the same heartening trend.

Our allies, without exception, look to us for leadership and assistance, and our enlightened self-interest requires that we furnish both.

Adding our own strength to that of our allies often makes our resources do triple duty, or even more. Often relatively small additional resources are needed to enable our allies to achieve production in excess of what their own economies could produce without our help. For example plants and manpower which are idle can often be put to work by supplying only a small part of the materials and tools which are lacking. Then, at small cost to us, quantities of arms become available for our mutual defense.

Let us realize fully just what all of these heartening events mean to us. They mean that we shall not have to bear the entire burden of the defense of our freedom. They mean that there will be such a wide sharing of this burden, to the benefit of all free countries, that we shall be able to maintain our own economic strength at a level far above what would otherwise be possible. They mean that the taxpayers of all our allied countries will share the burden with American taxpayers and in doing so will they more surely provide the combined strength necessary to defend ourselves.

This is the real purpose and meaning of our mutual defense assistance program. Every American—especially every American taxpayer—should be aware of these advantages. For the United States to provide this defensive strength alone and unaided—which is the only alternative—could well be beyond our capacity.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Williams Air Force Base, Ariz. Looking to the day when wing formations will be made up of teams of fliers from different countries, French and Dutch pilots, training here in the United States for the Atlantic Pact air force, give a special demonstration for Battle Report—some of the most spectacular jet formation flying our cameras have ever seen.

Operation Tomahawk. The planes—flying boxcars and C-46's. The troops—3,300 paratroopers of the 11th Airborne. All add up, northwest of Seoul, to the biggest mass jump of the war to cut off the retreating Chinese. This job called into play not only the courage of our Air Force, but posed a previous problem of supply for our miracle-working Army Transportation Corps. Here the supply problem calls for taking to the sea. Small South Korean coasters are loaded with artillery and mortar ammunition. The vessels, under Navy escort, then move up the shoreline to an advance port. For more facts on the unique problems of supply posed by the war in Korea, we focus our cameras now on the Assistant Chief of the Army Transportation Corps, Brig. Gen. F. S. Besson.

Brigadier General BESSON. From the very beginning of the Korean emergency the Army Transportation Corps was confronted with a challenging situation to deploy and support United Nations forces in combat. Not since the Civil War has transportation become so all-important in military tactical operations.

The transportation job in Korea, punctuated now and then by sudden disaster, has called for countless renovations. These operations are constantly harassed by exploding roadbeds and burning gondolas; by guerrilla-ambushed trains and truck convoys; by smoke and death in railway tunnels; by locomotives plunging over mountain trestles and trucks sliding off ice-covered roads, by

roadblocks; by rugged terrain, poor roads, snipers, and bad weather.

The sudden demand for more cargo and speed posed new problems. To lift cargo over inaccessible areas, the Cargo Combat Command was organized. It transports men and materials via air to points where rail or highways do not exist. For the first time in history, aerial ports of embarkation are operating. We organized the Red Ball Express, a train-to-ship-to-truck operation. It moves high priority cargo from Japan to Korea. Horses, mules, and oxen are pressed into service.

Cargo is carried on the backs of men. Inadequate highways make it necessary to push the railroads within mortar range. These men must fight alongside the infantry to get supplies through. A new role for TC soldiers. Railway men build the roadways as the troops advance, destroy them as they fall back and build them again in the slow grind northward. Transportation Corps is engaged in research and planning for new methods of lifting cargo. Transportation helicopter companies are being organized for combat support. Giant conveyor belts to carry supplies over rugged terrain are under research, also aerial tramways to lift cargo from ship to shore where ports do not exist.

Our most difficult trek during this campaign occurred after the Hungnam evacuation. More than 100,000 corps troops landed in South Korea. They were earmarked for a hurry-up transfer across the peninsula. The single-track rail system northward was overloaded, roads and bridges were out, communications poor, and strong guerrilla forces were active. It was directed the Seventh Division, with equipment, be moved from Pusan to the Tangyange sector in 5 days. According to paper calculations this move was impossible in less than 11 days. But mathematics can be wrong. The Division was moved in 5 days.

The entire southern beachhead was combed for every piece of rolling stock. The "miracle express" began rolling north in a shuttle system—again a difficult task was accomplished.

The transportation corps uses every means of transport to supply an army in the lines. This includes land, sea, and air, plus the ability to solve each complicated problem with a new idea. Transportation is the first to arrive and the last to leave. A successful military campaign depends on transportation of troops, supplies and equipment to the right place at the right time, in the right amount and in good condition. The transportation corps, so far, has met these requirements.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Water, as these tank troops would probably be quick to agree, can be a curse as well as a blessing. Here the water born of the spring thaw in Korea turns the battlefront into a quagmire—impedes the advance of our Patton tanks as they clear the way for our ground troops. Thus held up, they can only move forward field by field—seeking to harass the flanks of the retreating Communists.

But these are symbols of the blessings of water—dams that light our cities with hydroelectric power and, through irrigation, turn the dessert into bountiful fields of fruits and vegetables. Just back from southeast Asia, where water is a key weapon in the struggle for peace and democracy, comes our next guest. That he may report to you on how we are using this weapon in the battle for freedom and plenty, we present the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of the Interior, Michael W. Straus.

Mr. MICHAEL W. STRAUS. Hunger is an invaluable ally to tyranny and war. Our fight to win peace and security will be decided ultimately by our success in helping the world's growing hordes of hungry people find ways to feed and clothe themselves. They can do this by developing and making greater use of their land and water resources, and by harnessing their rivers to make electric power.

Some starvation is usual among the teeming populations of the arid zone of South Asia. Yet Asia has vast lands, now idle for lack of sufficient rainfall to grow crops. If irrigated from the rivers, these lands could produce an abundance of food and clothing.

Asians, through their governments, are now turning to America, and to agencies such as the Reclamation Bureau, for technical aid and advice in putting their idle lands and rivers to work.

Ancient methods of supplying irrigation water to thirsty fields helped to build great Asian civilizations. Primitive methods of pumping water, by back-breaking human labor, are still common. But they no longer suffice, in today's crowded world, even though Asia has plenty of low-cost hand labor. Human, or even animal muscle, however abundant, can't provide water and power on the vast scale needed if food production is to catch up with the population growth.

Many Asians still use buffalo to pull their primitive plows—and, instead of farm machinery, drive these great, lumbering beasts over their fields to prepare the soil to receive the seeds. In many places, crops are still harvested by hand as they were before Christ was born.

Primitive methods of building works to harness the rivers are still prevalent. I saw 60,000 hand laborers, helped by camels, digging one canal. I saw uncounted hundreds of women, toiling like ants under the tropical sun, each one carrying concrete in a basket on her head, to build a dam as high as the Washington Monument.

Inspired by how reclamation dams and power plants, such as Boulder and Grand Coulee, have helped make our own American West prosperous, Asian peoples are taking new hope. They are learning our ways of planning and building.

American reclamation engineers are helping many Asian countries plan and build projects for development of their water resources. This is done in cooperation with the State Department, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the point 4 program. Already this year we have reclamation engineers in Afghanistan, Persia, India, and Ceylon, and others will go to Lebanon and Arabia. These countries, when able, often buy American equipment for construction of their projects.

Asian countries send many of their young engineers to America to gain on-the-job experience with the Bureau of Reclamation. Young engineers from 12 countries are now at work at Reclamation's Engineering Center in Denver, Colo. They come from Turkey, India, Pakistan, Siam, Nepal, and Burma. Some of these young engineers are working on American projects; others on projects for their own lands—such as testing earth to see if it will bear the weight of a dam, testing the strength of concrete—learning how to design structures.

In a single instance, reclamation scientific tests will save the Indian Government $15,000,000 in construction of a dam. Some of our reclamation trainees return home to rise to cabinet rank.

But all of them go home inspired, skilled, and experienced in modern techniques of planning and building water and power projects. They take with them the hope, born of modern America, of peace and better living for their people.

In other days, Reclamation Street, U. S. A., ran from Nebraska to California—where reclamation dams and water and power meant wealth and security for Americans. Today, it runs 25,000 miles around the arid belt of the world—I found it plainly marked Reclamation Street, in both English and Chinese, in the back washes of Hong Kong—and Reclamation Street round the globe is a two-way street—not only do peoples of other lands learn from us, but we gain technical knowledge of great value from them.

We are spending great sums of money to win the world to peace and democracy. But hungry peoples are interested first in something to eat. By helping them to develop their irrigation and hydroelectric power resources, we can make it possible for them to greatly increase their own production of food and clothing. This is the road to peace, democracy, better living and security. That is our destination, travelling on Reclamation Street—round this hungry, troubled world.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Yes, the Marines have landed again—this time, on the Communist Chinese. These are pictures of the first Marine Division back in action. Veterans of the Inchon landing who pushed all the way north to the Manchurian border before being entrapped at the Chonjin reservoir, these Marines were later evacuated by sea. They, are now—after several free months—writing a new chapter in Marine history. (And for most of them it's a grand feeling to be pushing the Communists across the thirty-eighth parallel once more.)

But, though as the Marines are, wherever they go their Chaplains move with them. One such Chaplain is here with us today—the winner of the Alexander D. Goode award for best demonstrating the spirit which motivated the four immortal Chaplains of the ill-fated carrier, the *Dorchester*. Nothing more need be said of him than—we quote—"He expressed his firm faith in God by exemplifying it to the men whom he served." Ladies and gentlemen—the Chaplain of the First Marine Division—Commander Robert M. Schwyhart.

Commander ROBERT M. SCHWYHART. It is indeed a pleasure to be back in the United States with my family and to report to the American people upon the welfare of their young men in Korea.

As Division Chaplain of the First Marine Division, it was my privilege to direct the activities of 28 Navy Chaplains attached to the Division. These men of God, representing many different denominations, are alike in one important respect—they are volunteers. Every one of them is in Korea to serve your men because he has chosen to be there. Furthermore, every one of them is rendering a ministry for which he is especially prepared by training and by experience. A Marine chaplain is as much a specialist in the field of his ministry as a brain surgeon in the field of surgery. You may be sure that your men are being served by ministers, priests, and rabbis, who know their business.

The chaplains are probably the busiest people in the Marine Division. In combat they accompany the troops wherever they go, offering the consultation and inspiration of religion, frequently presenting to their men worthy examples of bravery and devotion to duty. You will be glad to know that eight of the chaplains who serve with me were decorated for bravery in action. Nine chaplains in the First Marine Division have been wounded in action. Day and night, these men of God in uniform devotedly serve their marine parishioners tirelessly, moving from one unit to another, keeping prayerful vigilance over the wounded, pronouncing the last sad words of committal over those who had given their last full measure of devotion. When the battle was done the officers and men of the division went into the rear areas to rest and recover their strength, but this was not a time of rest for the chaplain. His hours were filled with service to his men. He counseled with them, organized recreation for them, shared with them their grief for the fallen, and proudly set up his chapel in a tent over which flew the church pennant.

At night, when the camp was dark, the light was on in the chaplain's tent. He was writing letters of condolence to the fathers and mothers 7,000 miles away who had lost their boys. And it was long after his men were asleep that the chaplain would say a prayer for those committed to his charge and slip into his own bunk.

Although I am proud to have been selected to receive the Alexander D. Goode Lodge award, I could not have done so for myself alone. It represents to me a gracious recognition of the B'nai B'rith of the selfless service offered by all my brother chaplains in the First Marine Division, a tangible token of the strong fellowship which binds us together in spite of our differences of creed, and the common sacrifices which they have endured in order to serve your sons and husbands.

The men whom we serve in Korea are the finest in the world. The greatest tribute which can come to us chaplains is to be adjudged worthy of those whom we serve. May God keep all of them in His gracious care.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Word has just reached us that Robert McCormick, whom you customarily see on Battle Report, put down a few hours ago at Westover Field, Mass.—back from 3 weeks in Europe with NBC cameramen, the Jones brothers. He will be on hand next week to narrate the fourth of our teledocumentaries on Europe—Battle Report, Italy.

Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another teledocumentary—this, then, against the background of Battlefront Korea, is David Brinkley putting a period on your thirty-first Battle Report, Washington.

Trouble for the Tuna Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Coast tuna industry has grown from little or nothing to the point that it is now the most valuable fishery that the United States possesses. Commendably the industry has developed itself with practically no cost to its Government and almost entirely upon its own resources. It was not until its further development became dependent to a considerable extent upon the negotiations with foreign governments that it became unable to transact its business upon an equal footing without the assistance of its own Government in conducting negotiations.

Problems have now arisen which can be solved only by negotiations between the government whose industries or nationals are involved. Faced with this situation the American tuna industry has turned obviously to its own Government. Through a variety of negotiations there ultimately developed the formulation of a convention with Costa Rica which our Government ratified. Implementary legislation passed through the Congress. It now appears that the Inter-American Tuna Commission for which the convention provided may now fail to carry out its objective for want of the relatively small financing which is required. The facts are well-stated in a letter dated April 18, 1951 which was addressed to me by Mr. Milton E. Brooding, chairman of the executive committee of the Pacific Fisheries Conference.

Mr. Brooding's letter is as follows:

PACIFIC FISHERIES CONFERENCE,
Terminal Island, Calif., April 18, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: I am writing to you concerning the appropriations for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

The primary purpose of this convention and the Commission which is provided by it is to ensure peaceful relations between the United States and the nine Latin American Republics directly to our south on the Pacific in the field of fishery development. These relations have been marked on many occasions in recent years by strife, acrimony, and friction arising out of the rapidly developing tuna fishery of the United States.

It is necessary that an inter-governmental body make investigations, analyze the scientific facts so determined, and recommend such regulations as the scientific facts require, to prevent overfishing. These Latin American Governments must have an equal say with the United States Government in the planning of the investigations, the analysis of the facts and framing of the regulations, otherwise they will not accept the findings as being unbiased.

This is the function of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and it is designed admirably to perform this function. If this Commission is given appropriations to go ahead with its work, it is certain that the international friction will diminish, and the resources will be protected in perpetuity for the use of all peoples of this hemisphere.

The tuna fishery of the Pacific has become the most valuable fishery that the United States possesses. Its product, canned tuna, has become a staple item in the American diet, valuably supplementing our supply of animal protein food. Approximately 11,000,000 cases of tuna have been consumed in the United States during the past year, or about 3¼ cans for each man, woman, and child in the country. The annual product is valued in excess of $100,000,000; upward of $125,000,000 is invested in the vessels, canneries, etc., that produce the product, and many thousands of people in the States of California, Oregon and Washington are employed directly in the industry.

The remarkable development of this fishery has been accomplished by the tuna industry by its own initiative, by the investment of private capital, without ever calling upon the Federal Government for assistance, financial or otherwise. It desires to maintain that independent position. It would not call upon the Government for any appropriation whatever if there were any practicable way to handle the problem with private funds.

More than 90 percent of the tuna produced by this industry is caught south of our border. The fishery extends to Northern Peru and works the year around in all of the coastal area between California and Peru. Some of the tuna is caught, under permit from the particular country, in the territorial waters of those several independent nations; most of it comes from the high seas off the coasts of those countries.

Nearly all of the fishing is done by the live bait method. This requires the use of small live fish of particular kinds which are found only in the shallow coastal waters adjacent to the fishing grounds. All of this bait comes from the territorial waters of one or the other of these nine sovereign nations. It is taken under individual boat permits from those nations.

Most of the friction between the fleet and these 9 countries centers on these bait fisheries. These several countries do not use these bait resources themselves but they may want to, at some time in the future when their tuna fisheries develop. They are worried lest the American fishermen overfish and destroy these resources. This worry extends also to the offshore tuna resources, which these countries scarcely use now but may want to use in the future as their populations increase and their supplies of animal protein foods decrease.

These worries express themselves in vigorous political disturbances within some of these countries directed at the United States industry, the enactment of unsound regulations which hamper our industry and do not conserve the resource, and in continual friction which disturbs the friendly relations between the United States and our Latin American neighbors.

The basic reason for this situation is that practically nothing is known about the biology or abundance of the tuna or the bait fish and either their migrations or the effect of the fishery on their abundance. Practically none of the scientific facts needed to detect overfishing or to frame regulations to prevent it are known.

These Latin-American countries do not have trained scientists to do this work. They are so suspicious that the United States is solely intent on exploiting their resources even to the point of destroying them, that they look upon information from the United States on this subject as being biased in favor of exploitation, whether that information comes from the United States Government or from the United States industry. In particular, they are suspicious of the intent of the United States industry. Consequently, the industry itself cannot provide the research information needed. These sovereign nations will not accept it as unbiased information. The industry cannot treat with these sovereign nations. The dealing must be on a governmental level between the Government of the United States and these several governments.

If the Commission is now permitted to die because of lack of appropriations, it is quite as certain that these international frictions will flare up once again in an even more aggravating manner because these Latin-American countries will justly feel that the United States has welshed on the international commitments it has made, and that there is no true interest on the part of the United States in preventing overfishing of these resources. That appears to be what is going to happen.

The Commission held its first meeting in July 1950, and began actual operations in January 1951, when its Director of Investigations entered on duty. The program is under way. Costa Rica has given the Commission its share of the joint expenses, but the United States has only $12,000 of its $50,000 share for the remainder of this fiscal years. These funds will be exhausted by the middle of May and the scientific staff of the Commission will have to be put on payless furlough unless additional funds are forthcoming for the remainder of fiscal 1951.

Pending before the House Appropriations Committee is also the Commission's budget request for fiscal 1952 in the amount of $339,000.

It should be borne in mind that this Commission was established under a convention between the United States and Costa Rica which was ratified without dissenting vote by the Senate of the United States on August 17, 1949, and entered into force on March 3, 1950.

Legislation designed to give effect to this Convention and to authorize appropriations for this purpose passed both the House and Senate last year without dissenting vote and became Public Law 764, Eighty-first Congress.

Failure of the Congress to provide funds for the maintenance of the program would in effect be a rescission of the ratification of a convention to which we have invited other nations to adhere, and of the passage of the implementing legislation (Public Law 764, 81st Cong.).

Members of the Pacific Fisheries Conference believe the Congress would not wish to take any action which could be considered by these other nations as a repudiation of such recently approved legislation and we would very much appreciate your doing anything you properly can to assure favorable action by the Appropriations Committee on these two items which are now under consideration as part of the budget of the Department of State.

The Pacific Fisheries Conference is composed of all labor unions, vessel owners associations and trade associations engaged in all of the fisheries of the United States operating from the States of Oregon, Washington, and California, and from the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. A principal purpose of the Pacific Fisheries Conference is to aid the United States Government in every possible way that the fishing industry can to decrease the international friction which the operations of high seas fisheries has so often brought about.

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission is considered to be a keystone in the progress of a policy of friendly development of the vast food potential of the Pacific Ocean. This conference has followed the development of this subject from the first. It encouraged the Department of State to negotiate the convention with Costa Rica, and participated in the negotiation. It urged the ratification of the convention by the Senate. It pressed for passage of the implementing legislation through the Congress. It now prays that the Congress will provide the funds with which this Commission can engage in its appointed duties, which we feel are of such importance to the international relations of this Nation and to the continued welfare of one of this hemisphere's great natural resources.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON E. BROODING,
Chairman, Executive Committee,
Pacific Fisheries Conference.

Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Fisheries Conference represents all segments of the fishery industry on the Pacific coast of the United States including the organizations of labor, boat owners, producers or processors, and also the professional associations and publications which are interested in the fisheries field. The amount which is presently involved is something less than $400,000. It might be well to point out that the fisheries are an efficient source of food which has not been expensive to the Federal Government. By comparison the average annual contribution of each fishermen and farmer to total production is 47,000 pounds for the fisherman and 34,500 pounds for the farmer. The annual Federal expenditure for each ton of food produced—Senate Document No. 51, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, page 131—was 83 cents for the fishery produce and $7.04 for the farm produce. The industry as a whole has been very conservative in its requests upon the Government.

Address by Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana, to the National Muscular Dystrophy Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] at the National Conference of the Muscular Dystrophy Association in the Statler Hotel, New York City, on April 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I deem it a great privilege to be invited to address your first national medical conference.

As chairman of the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have the responsibility of studying all legislative proposals affecting the health and well-being of our people. But, in addition to discharging that official responsibility, I feel it my duty to keep in touch with all developments which promise to help solve national problems in the field of health, even if they have not as yet resulted in the submission of proposals for legislation by the Congress.

Consequently, when I heard of the organization of the Muscular Dystrophy Association some 10 months ago, I promptly inquired into its nature and its objectives. Since then I have tried to keep informed on its progress. As a result of what I thus learned, and on the basis of more than 10 years of committee experience with legislation resulting from the activities of similar organizations, I know I can say with all confidence that the Muscular Dystrophy Association is a splendid organization with a humane purpose; an organization that has already accomplished much that is worth while in furthering its basic aims; an organization that holds great future promise, not only for its members but for the country as a whole; an organization I deem it an honor to appear before.

Naturally I do not have detailed knowledge of the day-to-day workings or activities of your association; nor can I by the furthest stretch of imagination claim to be an authority on muscular dystrophy. But since most people are altogether unaware of this strange malady, perhaps a recapitulation of what I do know about it would be in order here. This is so because yours is a story that should be told and retold. It is a dramatic story; a story of great courage in the face of tremendous odds; a story of mobilizing for battle against a disease that has baffled medical science for centuries—a disease which is an insidious, silent, creeping sort of killer, numbering its victims in the thousands. Many of these sufferers are adults; at least half are children between 3 and 13 years of age—children who should be running and leaping and playing during the most happy and carefree period of life, but children whose muscles are slowly and mysteriously wasting away; children, few of whom will live to adolescence and none of whom will live to maturity unless, through your generous efforts and with the aid of an understanding nation, our vast scientific resources may be mobilized and directed to discover the cause of this dread disease and find a cure for its victims.

To date, your fellow citizens and your Government has done pitifully little to help solve this problem. Not because of any intentional lack of interest, but simply because the people of our country generally have been and, for the most part, still are wholly unaware of its existence. And when even the medical profession so far have learned so little of the disease that most of them cannot recognize or diagnose it, surely the people cannot be blamed if they remain unaware of the compelling need for concerted action against it.

Obviously, the first step in the battle is to create that awareness. And obviously, this is the most difficult step of all because, in the first instance, it can only be taken by the victims of the disease and by their families; by people who, while carrying their own heavy burdens of pain and sorrow and expense must nonetheless rise above their individual burdens and sorrows and join together to help one another and to help their fellow citizens learn of their common plight. This is the step that calls for courage and determination and for sacrifice. And this is the step which, to your great honor and to the Nation's benefit, you took when less than a year ago you organized the Muscular Dystrophy Association and began to set up chapters throughout the country.

All of this early spade work—and it was a gigantic job—was done with the "blood, sweat, and tears" of the association's members—and most important of all—with money contributed by the members themselves. It was a wonderful and typical example of American humanity; of American grit and courage; of people surmounting their own burdens and pitching in and working together to solve a problem beyond the capabilities of individual effort.

The association's first national convention held in New York in January of this year helped spread the word around. Shortly thereafter, the press became aware of the nature of this murderous ailment in the case of the four Godfrey brothers in New York and other young victims living in the Middle West, the South, and on the west coast. And now you have brought into being this first national medical conference on muscular dystrophy—a conference attended by prominent medical men from every section of the United States and from outside our borders. So now, through your generous and persistent efforts, there is real hope that the research needed to find the cause and cure of muscular dystrophy will be undertaken on a scale large enough to be really effective. If you persist in your efforts with the same determination and energy as you have shown to date, you may be sure that what up to now has been a hope will soon become a certainty.

To be sure, there is much yet to be done. The New York Times recently commented in an editorial, and I quote:

"In 1950 only $20,000 was spent on research in muscular dystrophy, and all but $1,000 of this was contributed by the newly organized Muscular Dystrophy Association. It is an anomaly in a country always ready to support medical science that Dr. Ade T. Milhorat, of the New York Hospital—Cornell Medical Center—is the only scientist who is devoting all his working time to research in muscular dystrophy. The evidence that he has collected justifies the belief that a cure can be found not in the remote future but in a few years. The hospitals are ready, but there is no money for research."

Well, I say that if the hospitals are ready, then the money for research should and must be provided. And I believe that since this is a problem of concern to all our people, that a portion of these funds for muscular dystrophy research, as in the case of other mysterious maladies, ought to be provided by the Federal Government, to supplement the voluntary contributions made by the members of your association and persons sympathetic to its aims.

It is dreadful to think what might have happened had your association not come to Dr. Milhorat's rescue when lack of funds threatened to curtail his very limited research program. While your grant of $25,000 will make it possible for him to continue, and to expand his activities to some degree, it is most obvious that additional help must be found. The funds given New York Hospital will cover operating expenses for only 2½ months.

As a Member of the United States Senate, I am proud to say that I have either initiated or been the cosponsor of such legislation as the National Cancer Act, welcomed by doctors specializing in that disease and by the American Cancer Society; and the national heart bill, which represents the first really effective attack on heart disease by the Federal Government. I hope, and expect, to be of assistance in furthering the cause of similar organizations in the health and medical field, and I most certainly include in that statement the cause to which the Muscular Dystrophy Association is devoted. I have also had the honor and privilege of cosponsoring legislation which resulted in the establishment of the Neurological and Blindness Institute at Bethesda, Md., a division of the United States Public Health Service. Undoubtedly, some of the funds to be allocated to the Neurological and Blindness Institute at this session of Congress will be used for limited research in an attempt to find the cause and cure for muscular dystrophy.

As a matter of fact, there is no doubt but that the work being done in each of the seven great research centers we have created at Bethesda will contribute its part to the final solution of the problem. For that is the great advance represented by the National Institutes of Health. Instead of having scientists working away at their own separate problems, each of them ignorant of the discoveries or new developments perfected by the others, we now have a mechanism through which every forward step in one field is immediately called to the attention of workers in other fields. It is through this concept of separate but coordinated research that we hope to find the causes and cures for disease far sooner than would otherwise have been possible.

This is all to the good. But, while we are discussing the use of Federal funds for such research, permit me because of my experience in this field to offer a word of advice. Despite what you may occasionally read, ours is not a "give-away" government. Time and time again my colleagues in the Congress have proved that, while they will appropriate money to aid in such research, they will do so only when the people immediately concerned are really attempting to help themselves. Usually Federal aid is made available in amounts approximately equal to those raised by the voluntary groups themselves. This has been true in the past and it is most certainly true now when the Congress is faced with the task of raising the huge funds needed to finance an all-out mobilization.

But I know I need not dwell on this. You have already gone a long way and I know you will persevere in your efforts. I am sure you all share in the thought expressed by your own president, Mr. Paul Cohen, when he said- and I quote:

"By joining our hands we have created the organism that can make more intensive research activity a reality. It is simply a matter of basic arithmetic; the more research we can pay for, the more likely a quicker cure."

And while you continue to campaign for funds and to publicize your efforts and make the layman more conscious of what muscular dystrophy is and what must be done to arrest it, I believe there will be further help forthcoming from still another quarter.

Last year the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am chairman, reported a bill to the Senate calling for a national survey of sickness in the United States. The last public census of the various ailments and afflictions affecting our citizens had been taken in 1939. Since then, the United States had engaged in the most disastrous war in her history, with vast population changes taking place. Therefore, we of the committee felt it imperative that the facts concerning the health of the people be brought up to date.

The bill was subsequently passed by the Senate, but unfortunately did not pass in the House because of the great number of other measures which took precedence over it. However, that bill has been reintroduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman JOHN FOGARTY as H. R. 3339. If enough people express their interest and the bill passes the House, I am confident that we in the Senate will again do our part to make it law.

Specifically, as regards muscular dystrophy, such a survey could indicate how many persons suffer from the disease; how many of these are men, women, and children. It would establish just where these individuals live, which of the States have the greatest number of victims; which of the States are devoid of them. It would provide for reports on the disease on a State-wide basis. We would know how the disease strikes as regards age groups, whether it affects all income brackets equally or if it is found just among the middle- or low-income groups. These and dozens of other questions of great importance to our research workers would be answered.

"Knowledge is more than power"—knowledge gives you the power to tackle a problem head on, armed with every available weapon and the right kind of weapon. We, in America, do not have that knowledge as regards the incidence of disease among our people. And if those of you who are kind enough to listen to me today share my belief that it is important to us, I would urge that you let your own Congressmen and Senators know of your interest in the bill calling for a "Survey of Sickness."

And while I am urging action on your part to make this survey possible, let me mention one more bill the passage of which is of great importance to the realization of your hopes. To conquer muscular dystrophy we must first establish the facts; then we must provide for research on those facts; and, finally, we must make sure that we have the skilled medical personnel to put the results of that research to work. The first can be taken care of through the Survey of Sickness bill. The second item through the raising of additional funds for research. But while we are working together on these two, we must also realize all this effort may be wasted unless we move quickly to rescue the schools on which we depend for the training of doctors and nurses from the very grave financial crisis which now threatens them. If we are to have enough doctors and nurses to treat our sick, we must provide Federal assistance to the medical and nursing schools. A bill which will do just that will be debated by the Senate within the next 2 or 3 weeks. It is a strictly nonpartisan and most carefully drawn bill. It is sponsored by Senator TAFT as well as by myself and all of the other members of my committee—Republicans and Democrats alike. It is Senate bill 337—the Federal aid to medical education bill, and it is wholeheartedly endorsed by the deans of our medical schools, by the presidents of our universities, and by the American Dental Association. In addition, it is endorsed by farm and labor groups, by church organizations, and by the American Legion and the Disabled Veterans of America. Yet without your aid and that of other groups throughout the land, this badly needed bill might not pass the Congress because it is opposed by one single organization—by the million-dollar lobby of the American Medical Association.

If we are to conquer muscular dystrophy and similar killers of our people, we must act on all three fronts. We must pass the survey of sickness bill now in the House—so that we may learn the facts. We must provide, through a combination of voluntary and of governmental effort, for greatly increased medical research. And we must pass the aid to medical education bill which is now before the Senate.

All three of these efforts are based on the principle that problems affecting the Nation's health are of concern to us all; that diseases which without warning can strike any family in the Nation warrant the attention of a Government representing those families; that such problems can best be solved when individual citizens join together to attack those problems through their own voluntary organizations and in partnership with their own Government.

It is in keeping with this principle that I urge the members of the Muscular Dystrophy Association to keep working, keep fighting, and in every possible way continue to give proof to the Congress and to the Nation that it is your intention not to rest until this serious malady is tracked down and overcome. With this fact made evident, I am confident that your Government will also assume its share of the responsibility.

And now, in closing, permit me to again express my sincere appreciation of your invitation to join with you today, and also to express my compliments to you for the magnificent effort your association is making in this great humane cause.

"For One Cohen or One Capone, There Are Scores of Less Widely Advertised Tax Evaders of the Same General Stripe—Some of Them Differing Little From the 'Big Fellows'—Even in the Amounts of Money Out of Which They Try To Cheat the Government"—Edward H. Foley, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Independent Bankers Association of the United States met in annual meeting at Mobile, Ala. In attendance at the convention myself, I was privileged to introduce the principal speaker on the program—one of America's youngest, most forceful, and brilliant executives serving the Federal Government in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, Hon. Edward H. Foley, Jr., Under Secretary of the Treasury,

needs no introduction to the Committee on Banking and Currency of either House nor, for that matter, to the great majority in both Houses here on Capitol Hill.

We know Edward Foley as an indefatigable worker. We know him as a man of great force and drive. We know him as a direct actionist and as a prudent, sagacious, and an able administrator. A graduate of Fordham University, one of America's greatest schools of law, he has long since distinguished himself for his aptitude and ability in that profession as well as in finance.

After having served as assistant general counsel as well as the general counsel of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works he was named assistant general counsel of the Treasury Department itself in 1937, and in May of 1939 was appointed general counsel of that most important department of government.

Resigning his Federal appointment at the outbreak of war, he joined up with the troops, was commissioned a lieutenant colonel and given an assignment as general counsel to the Quartermaster General of the United States Army.

In the following summer he was promoted to the rank of colonel and dispatched to Italy to serve as chief American financial representative of the Allied Control Commission. For his duty in this all-important task he was awarded the Legion of Merit for his distinguished military services in this field.

At the end of the war, Colonel Foley returned to civilian life as general counsel in the Office of Contract Termination and Settlement and was then appointed Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1948.

Known as the watchdog of the lend-lease program, he was given full charge of all Treasury's legal activities at the time that that Department was concerned with playing a major role in world affairs through the establishment of the lend-lease program with the embattled British Empire.

Congressional observers are universally agreed that much of the credit for the manner and the dispatch in which this major piece of legislation was administered belongs to Ed Foley, inasmuch as no small part of the work fell upon the broad shoulders of our great Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, in his address before the Independent Bankers Association, Mr. Foley, among other aspects of the Treasurer's duties, discussed the problem of the enforcement of income-tax evasion against characters of the underworld. In doing so, he pointed out that the activities of gamblers and racketeers with well advertised names—like the Capones, the Mickey Cohens, and others—who appeared before the Kefauver committee did not by any means represent the full problem of income-tax enforcement against that ilk or type of citizen.

For one racketeer—

Mr. Foley told the bankers—

with a widely advertised and well-known headline-rating name, such as appeared on television in the Kefauver committee investigation, there are scores upon scores of others about whom the general public rarely if ever heard but who deserve and, in fact, do get the internal revenue service's most energetic and effective attention.

In his address to the Independent Bankers Association, Under Secretary Foley called the roll of a few of the criminal-type characters who had been indicted, brought to trial, and fined or imprisoned, or who had received both penalties, on pleas and convictions involving violations of internal-revenue laws.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that while Mr. Foley spoke he held in his hand a mimeographed sheaf of papers containing the names of the very sort of persons to whom I refer. He stated that "long as it is, it is still merely a representative list 13 pages long, which the internal revenue services of the Treasury Department had previously presented to the Kefauver committee, setting forth the names and addresses of gamblers and other racketeers who operated in practically every State in the Union."

In almost every case—

Mr. Foley said—

the tax deficiencies and individual penalties assessed ran into the hundreds of thousands of dollars and, in some cases, into the millions.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all my colleagues in this House may read one of the most interesting and factual addresses with respect to law enforcement by our Treasury Department, the activities of our Internal Revenue Bureau and other related agencies of Government, that could be made, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include therein the speech made by Hon. Edward H. Foley, Jr., to the Independent Bankers Association, in Mobile, Ala.

The following is the address made by Under Secretary of the Treasury Edward H. Foley before the Independent Bankers Association at the Admiral Semmes Hotel, Mobile, Ala.:

It is an honor to address this gathering of members of the Independent Bankers Association. I am sure every one of you shares my happiness that for tonight's occasion you are convened in this splendid southern city. An unerring destiny long ago endowed Mobile with just about everything to produce a community that is at once beautiful and vital, pleasant, and industrious, restful, and animated.

Born and educated a New Yorker, I must confess that I am not yet completely familiar with all the details of the Mobile formula for city building. But I needed no more than my first acquaintance with this city some 15 years ago, when I addressed a meeting of the Alabama League of Municipalities in Mobile, to be prepared to recommend that formula strongly wherever I may go. Since then I have married one of Alabama's fairest, Emily Ligon, of Montgomery, and with justifiable pride I am happy to relate that the home of Mrs. Foley's parents, the late General and Mrs. Robert F. Ligon, only last January became the new Governor's mansion of this great State.

Many areas of the South have stepped out in front in recent years in planning and carrying through improvement programs. Mobile's great water-front development is particularly notable in this respect, and is a most impressive tribute to the initiative, pride, and civic spirit of its people.

Today we are all giving much thought to the resources on which we rely for defense, and Mobile rates very high among the bastions of production and transportation which dot our coast line.

Tonight I bring to you from Washington a report on another aspect of American strength and American defense. It is a report on a significant phase of that subject of universal interest and concern—Federal taxes.

It is not, let me say at the outset, a report on tax rates. The matter of rates is now before Congress. What I shall talk about tonight is even more important than rates, at least so far as basic and long-range considerations go. It is my purpose to remind you of the salient characteristics on which depend the whole vigor and power of the Federal tax system, and tell you what your Government is doing to protect that system from being undermined by the activities of certain classes of human termites abroad in the land.

You have heard news lately about the relations between the Treasury Department and some of these underworld characters; news of Ralph Capone being arrested at Chicago, of Mickey Cohen being indicted at Los Angeles, and of various similar happenings.

And this may surprise you: If you think those cases of which you have been hearing lately are highly unusual and out of the ordinary, you are mistaken. They are not. The Treasury Department's internal revenue service turns up cases of this nature year after year. Long and painstaking investigations are completed, charges are filed or indictments returned, and fines or prison sentences or both are imposed. If the cases happen to reach the charge-filing stage while some important public inquiry, such as that of the Kefauver committee, is under way, then they rate headlines.

I am glad indeed that this country has had the benefit of the Kefauver committee's work. The committee's program has been of peculiar interest to me because I am the Treasury official designated by Secretary Snyder to supervise the activities of the Department's six law-enforcement agencies.

The Treasury sought to give—and I think did give—to the Kefauver committee the fullest measure of cooperation. Certainly the committee was entitled to nothing less than that.

As to income-tax affairs, however, I am concerned lest misconceptions should gain currency in connection with such discussions and disclosures. I think we must be sure that the conclusions we reach are in correct perspective and reflect a proper emphasis.

For instance, I do not think we can allow the fidelity with which the revenue service administers the income-tax laws to be measured solely in terms of the number of criminal prosecutions it is able to bring, through the Department of Justice, against the Cohens and the Capones.

Not for one minute, let me assure you, will the Service ever ease the pressure it maintains against those notorious boys. But for one Cohen, one Capone, there are scores of less widely advertised tax evaders of the same general stripe, some of them differing little from the "big fellows" even in the amounts of money out of which they try to cheat the Government.

Let me show you what I am talking about. I have here a mimeographed list of names of the sort of people to whom I refer. It is a list 13 pages long which the internal revenue service presented to the Kefauver committee on Tuesday, March 27. The names are those of alleged gamblers, racketeers, and others in the criminal element who have run afoul of the income-tax laws since 1945.

It is merely a "representative list," 150 names, or thereabouts, from a record of 1,500 cases, involving all classes of taxpayers from all parts of the country, in which criminal prosecutions were recommended by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and instituted by United States attorneys.

Here is another list which we handed to the Kefauver committee—34 closely typed pages, this one—giving factual summaries of some of the representative cases prosecuted during the fiscal year 1946 or later. These, I repeat, were cases in which tax evaders allegedly derived their income from such criminal enterprises as gambling, the numbers racket, lotteries, slot machines, extortion, abortion mills, graft and corruption, and vice.

Does the revenue service really make it hot for tax evaders of the gambler and racketeer kind? In these documents you have a pretty conclusive answer. Yes, it does!

We have in this country a self-assessment, voluntary payment system of income taxation. Congress established that system because it accords with the American concept of maximum of individual responsibility and a minimum of Government supervision. It is a fixture in our body of law. Each individual squares his own return with the law's requirements as to reportable income, deductions and credits. We have no Gestapo to look over the taxpayer's shoulder.

In general, this self-assessment, voluntary payment system works pretty well. Nearly all Americans have a sense of responsibility for the common good, and it impels them to try to be honest about their tax payments. Most mistakes in returns are honest ones, with nothing deliberate about them.

The square shooters among taxpayers are entitled to know that they will pay only their fair share of the necessary expense of Government services and protection. They are entitled to know that the proper attention will be paid to those who try deliberately to dodge their tax responsibilities. If in some cases proper attention means the threat or imposition of severe criminal penalties, then the honest taxpayers must know that those penalties are being enforced.

And here let me urge on you an inquiring mind toward any aspersions on the revenue service which you may chance to hear. Before you allow your confidence in the efficiency and the integrity of the service to be shaken, let me urge you to call for more than blanket accusations and vague implications against this vitally important arm of your Government.

I want to tell you a story I heard the other day which is illustrative of the way I feel about the Treasury.

It is the story of a young farmer who assaulted a tramp with a stick of cordwood and wound up in jail. His lawyer finally came to see him and asked, "Jim, how did you come to hit this fellow? You know, you almost killed him. He is in the hospital now and may not live. Whatever made you do it?"

"Well, Mr. Smith," said Jim, "you see it was like this. This feller came by the farm the other night, and I invited him in for supper. Right away he started criticizing the furniture. Well, I let that pass because our furniture ain't any great snakes at best. Then he teed off on the food. Well, I let that pass, too. A lot of times my wife's cooking leaves a little something to be desired. Then my wife came in out of the kitchen, and he jumped on her. He said, 'Say, you ain't nothin' but an old bag, are you?' Well, I didn't do nothing about that 'cause as a matter of fact, when she gets that wrapper on, she don't exactly look like Cleopatra, anyway. But then, by jiminies, he started in on the Treasury Department. That was too much for me, so I let him have it."

If you are inclined to wonder why the revenue service does not rush forward with a defense of itself every time some allegation of laxity or favoritism is made, let me remind you that disclosures of individual income tax returns and related records may, under the law, be made only through court proceedings or under certain conditions to committees of Congress.

Public cooperation, confident and sustained, with the revenue service, keeps our Federal tax system working. I think that you and I and all the other individuals who make up the public, must guard carefully against contributing in an ill-considered way to the weakening of the cooperation.

Let me tell you with the utmost sincerity that your confidence in the revenue service is fully merited. Its personnel enforces the tax laws vigorously, honestly, and impartially.

During the years of my association with the Treasury Department in various capacities from general counsel to Under Secretary, the number of employees of the Internal Revenue service who have betrayed their trust has been infinitesimal. And the departure of these very, very few from the path of rectitude has, in every case that I recall, been discovered through the pride and precautions of the service itself.

You perhaps read in recent months of a blast of criticism against the revenue service issued by the California Crime Commission. When the blast was reduced, through careful analysis, to factual elements, it involved asserted misdeeds of two or three deputies in the California and Nevada collection offices. We stated publicly, by way of comment, that Treasury investigations into these misdeeds had been under way for some time. Since then, on the evidence our investigators obtained, two employees have been fired, and one of them and a former employee have been indicted.

I don't want to burden you with figures. But perhaps a few will be helpful.

The revenue service has at present 55,500 employees.

It administers not only the individual income tax, but 78 other Federal tax levies.

The tax returns which must be received and processed each year number 90,000,000.

In addition, about 120,000,000 related documents, such as records of income tax withholdings, must be received and processed.

Last year the revenue service collected nearly $39,000,000,000. This fiscal year the total will rise to almost $43,000,000,000. In the fiscal year 1952 it probably will reach $60,000,000,000.

The annual costs of the service total about $246,000,000, so that the expense of collecting each $100 of revenue is about 59 cents.

But that 59 cents per $100 is an average figure. What keeps it so low is the fact that 90 percent of the taxes are paid voluntarily by those honest and straightforward citizens to whom I referred earlier.

It takes half of the entire Revenue Service personnel to collect the other 10 percent of the Federal taxes. This half, 26,000 persons, is assigned to what we call front-line enforcement, beginning with the sifting out of returns which appear deserving of close scrutiny, and proceeding through the whole catalog of enforcement work right up to the handling of the cases against the Cohens and the Capones.

When an enforcement case bears the earmarks of fraud it is taken over by the special agents of the Revenue Service Intelligence Unit. During 1950, 314 cases involving racketeers and gamblers received the attention of the Intelligence Unit investigators. They constituted more than 12 percent of all fraud investigations which that Unit conducted. And they turned up $24,000,000 in additional taxes and penalties proposed for assessment. They also resulted in 1932 recommendations for criminal prosecutions.

A new step has just been taken to render front-line enforcement still more effective. By direction of Secretary Snyder, the Revenue Service is now in process of organizing a Special Fraud Section, made up of investigators who have shown superior skill at breaking through the false financial fronts of the big-time tax evaders. This section will devote its entire time to inquiries into tax dodging by gamblers, racketeers, and others of the confirmed criminal stripe.

I am willing to prophesy that the work of this Special Fraud Section will be productive of many violent headaches for racketeers and gangsters in the days to come.

But I distinctly do not want to prophesy that the activities of the Special Fraud Section, or indeed any other portion of the Revenue Service, will obviate the necessity for greater vigilance on the part of local law-enforcement authorities against all maner of racketeer and gangster criminality.

Almost every day some writer or speaker implies publicly that the Revenue Service should bear general law-enforcement responsibilities, and is in fact to blame for the very existence of gambling and racketeering. For this attitude there is no basis in present public policy as expressed in the Federal statutes. Nor is there any basis for it in the Service's appropriations and its manpower situation.

If State and local governments are to remain impotent against the leaders of organized crime, then the question presents itself whether we should enact Federal laws aimed directly, or as directly as constitutional limitations will permit, at the basic crimes of which the hoodlums are guilty. There is little logic in reliance on the Federal tax laws for the general punishment of State and local gambling and similar crimes, as distinguished from the punishment of the crime of Federal income-tax evasion.

Even for more effective Federal tax enforcement, our laws have some shortcomings. We have our problems of income-tax law enforcement just as the Kefauver committee found itself facing problems of how to elicit information from recalcitrant witnesses. And the Kefauver committee, of course, had all the power of Congress behind it to punish contemptuous and lying witnesses.

The very nature of our voluntary self-assessment tax system requires a specially diligent effort to make it work with respect to those who derive their income from illegal enterprises. They are not the sort of people whose records can be relied upon, and our agents are not so naive as to think they can be. This forces our investigators many times to put in long months of work gathering the most difficult varieties of evidence to create a net worth case. Sometimes the job is an almost impossible one.

Suggestions for revision of the tax statutes are now being studied for the Congress by a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee. These suggestions would fortify the tax code against evasions of the types of which I have spoken. Generally, they would give our agents a stronger hand in dealing with willful cases of improper returns and improper tax records.

In closing, I want to repeat some remarks by Secretary Snyder which I had the privilege of reading for him before the Kefauver

committee at the last of its public sessions, a short time ago. The Secretary said:

"Our common purpose is to protect a priceless national asset. That asset is public confidence that the affairs of Government, and in particular the affairs of the Internal Revenue Service, are being properly conducted. The responsibility for keeping this confidence inviolate rests upon us all.

"We in the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service give our best efforts to the preservation and strengthening of that confidence. We have every official reason and every personal reason to do so.

"On the personal score we share the concern of every American for the safety of the country and the preservation of our liberties. And we know that our success in collecting the huge revenues required for national defense is dependent in tremendous measure on every honest taxpayer having assurance that the revenue service will leave nothing undone to bring chiselers to justice.

"There is full warrant in the Revenue Service record for every taxpayer to accept that assurance as an established fact. Bringing chiselers to justice has always been the service's determined policy, and continues to be its pledge."

Air Power in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I read with great interest an article in the February 17 Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Truth About Our Air Power," by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

I served as a combat war correspondent in the South Pacific and took part in the liberation of the Philippines. I found myself in agreement with many of the statements of General Vandenberg.

Because of recent events, I have reread the article to which I refer, and I believe there are several paragraphs in this article giving the views of the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force which will clarify some of the issues being debated today. I quote, in part, from General Vandenberg's article:

It is not my province or my intention to criticize the decision of the United Nations which prevented air strikes at the Manchurian troops and supply depots supporting the Chinese. Isolating the battlefield from reinforcements is the prime function of tactical air, and I am simply stating the military fact that air power was rendered practically inoperative when the U. N., in an effort to avoid a diplomatic rupture with the Chinese Communists, halted offensive action at the Yalu River, the boundary between Manchuria and Korea. U. N. pilots scrupulously obeyed orders by cutting bridges across the Yalu only on the Korean side, but those measures were nullified when the Yalu froze solidly, forming a natural bridge for the Chinese to move up with enough food and light-arms ammunition on their backs to sustain them for weeks.

I believe of further interest is the following statement of General Vandenberg:

A controversy affecting the lives of soldiers cannot be settled by lining up votes as in a popularity contest. It is resolved by weighing the best methods for achieving desired results. All right. The job of tactical aviation is to help win the air war and to weaken the ability of the enemy's ground forces to impede and damage your people.

Mr. Speaker, shall we continue to render our Air Force inoperative in Korea, and permit the continued toll of lives of American troops, which might be saved?

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein excerpts from a sermon delivered last Sunday in the German Congregational Church at Clinton, Mass., by its able and distinguished pastor, the Reverend Harold S. Winship, sergeant major of a machine gun battalion in France during World War I, on the subject of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

None of the many messages I have received on this subject in recent days is couched in such eloquent and balanced language. I am desirous that the House and the Nation should have the opportunity to read it.

Patriotic sentiments contained in this and many of the messages I have received, all point toward the fact that the American people are aroused to the need for decision, unity, and strength in national policy and expect the Congress to discharge its full constitutional duty in promoting these ends. The above-mentioned follows:

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Millions of Americans, through the miracle of radio and television, were deeply impressed when Gen. Douglas MacArthur spoke at the joint meeting of Congress. Why is it that the minds and hearts of so many Americans were stirred and touched and inspired with deep feeling and exalted emotion? Because there stood before us the noble figure of a real man, a true Christian, and a great American.

General MacArthur, in his appearance, his character, and his daily life, is a real man. His splendid physical condition, his self-control over mind and body, and the spirit shown in his words to his fellow Americans—all reveal him as a real man, a man's man, a woman's ideal man.

He stood before us as a courageous Christian—believing in the principles of Christianity, upon which our Constitution is based, believing in the power of prayer to Almighty God, the God of all nations, the Ruler of the universe. What an inspiration it is to us all to see an international leader take such a stand.

General MacArthur made a profound patriotic impression upon his fellow citizens as a great American. His words aroused our enthusiasm, they inspired our renewed loyalty and devotion to our country, and it seemed as if his return home and his presence among us symbolized new hope and stronger faith in the future of our United States of America.

Coal Mines of Pennsylvania Contribute To Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the Times-Leader, the Evening News, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., entitled "Coal Mines of Pennsylvania Contribute to Nation":

COAL MINES OF PENNSYLVANIA CONTRIBUTE TO NATION—12,438,552,000 TONS MINED SINCE EARLIEST TIMES

No greater evidence of human energy exists anywhere in the world than that expended, over the years, in digging the coal of Pennsylvania. From the earliest record of mining to the present date, 12,438,552,000 net tons of coal have been removed from under the hills and valleys of Pennsylvania. For many years Pennsylvania mines were producing more than half of the fuel energy of the Nation. Today the State planning board of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce estimates that with the addition of the relatively small, but highly valuable petroleum output of the Commonwealth and its developed water power, our State's mines produce one-seventh of all energy consumed in America.

In the total of Pennsylvania coal production, anthracite, the earliest form of coal in use in our State, represents about 40 percent of all the coal ever mined in our Commonwealth, though that type of coal comes from a relatively restricted area. Today, Pennsylvania produces about half of all the anthracite mined in the world.

To form some notion of how much actual work is represented by the mining of Pennsylvania coal almost staggers the imagination. The Panama Canal has, in recent years, represented the greatest engineering achievement of the modern world. The construction of that Canal required the removal of 240,000,000 cubic yards of earth. Pennsylvania's coal mined out to the end of 1950 represents a total of more than 17,000,000,000 cubic yards, or a total equal to the bulk of material involved in the digging of 71 channels as long and deep as the Panama Canal. As a matter of fact, in many single years, Pennsylvania miners have removed more material than was involved in the digging of that great passageway between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

One more comparison might perhaps help us to understand the tremendous contribution made by our State to the settlement and development of this Nation.

In the ancient world, the great Pyramid of Egypt was universally regarded as being the greatest single monument ever constructed by human labor. In the accuracy of design and in the great bulk of its stone

work, it is still, quite properly, one of the wonders of the world. It required, over many years, the slave labor of possibly 100,000 men. Massive as that great structure is, and impressive to all who are fortunate enough to see it, the actual bulk of the Pyramid represents only some 3,400,000 cubic yards. In some recent years, the bulk of coal removed from Pennsylvania's mines has represented a volume of material more than 80 times that of the great Pyramid and represents a far greater achievement. It is, in fact, an enduring monument to the thousands of freemen whose energy and skill, over the past 125 years, has done so much to make possible the material progress of our Nation and to create the industrial power which enables us to defend before the world the American system of free enterprise.

Former Governor of Oregon Speaks on MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Charles A. Sprague, former Republican Governor of the State of Oregon, has long held a position of leadership in Oregon politics and affairs. Governor Sprague spearheads political thinking in keeping with the best tradition of liberalism. Always a careful student of affairs, the Governor is to be commended for his straightforward thinking regarding General MacArthur and his return to the United States as he writes in his Salem (Oreg.) Statesman column, It Seems to Me, April 12, 1951:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

The first duty of a soldier is to obey orders. General MacArthur failed to obey the orders of his Commander in Chief. I do not see that President Truman had any alternative than to remove him from his command. This is a very unfortunate termination of a brilliant military career, but the general has invited this summary action by the President.

Partisans of MacArthur and foes of Mr. Truman are having success in stirring up public emotions against the President. That is not surprising, and surely was anticipated by Truman. Yet he had the courage to brave that reaction, proving that he had at least one of the qualities of a commander.

Over a considerable period of time MacArthur has been insubordinate in trying by public statement and personal interview to dictate the international policy this country should adopt. These statements have been disruptive, dividing opinion within the country and causing friction with our allies. Such conduct could not be tolerated by the Chief Executive who is charged with prime responsibility in this area. Truman is our President, not MacArthur; and Truman is the one the people should rally behind and support in this time of crisis, not the general who sought to force his own will on our Government and on United Nations.

I have the opinion that much of the furore that is raised over the President's action, and the calls for impeaching the President are rooted less in admiration for MacArthur than in hatred of the President or in a design to wreck his political power. The baying of the wolves for Dean Acheson's blood starts again. One can see the planning of a Roman triumph on MacArthur's return. The general himself with his sense of history, probably regards himself as another Caesar, proconsul of Gaul, about to cross the Rubicon to challenge those in seats of power.

When the emotional storm is over somber judgment will affirm the decision of President Truman. We cannot have divided authority in the conduct of our foreign and military affairs.

Harry S. Truman, President, Versus Douglas MacArthur, General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, never since Pearl Harbor have so many of our people been so deeply aroused.

On June 26, President Truman, without the consent of the Congress, involved us in world war III. As Commander in Chief, he ordered our Armed Forces to fight that war under General MacArthur's orders.

Our men, the foot soldiers—your sons and husbands—went in, fought heroically and—it seems unbelievable—when they appeared to be winning against overwhelming odds, President Truman, Commander in Chief and MacArthur's superior, ordered him not to accept the aid of the 500,000 Chinese Nationalists who wanted to cross to China's mainland from the Island of Formosa, and, on the flank or in the rear, attack the Chinese Communists who had entered the war.

MacArthur was told that he must not use our bombers or air force beyond a certain point to destroy the enemy's supply lines, ammunition dumps or rest areas.

By his orders, President Truman created a "sanctuary," "cities of refuge," to which—as a criminal in biblical times—Communists might flee and find safety.

The result of this order was that, when MacArthur's men went forward, fought and drove the enemy back to a certain line—at one time, the thirty-eighth parallel—there they must stop. Beyond that line the enemy might not be pursued; back of it he might find safety, sanctuary, rest, and, with reinforcements, launch another offensive—and so on, ad infinitum.

Had General Eisenhower in World War II been likewise denied the use of the bombers which destroyed Germany's munitions of war, her submarine bases, that war never could have been won.

Permit an illustration: A football team has a game on. Its opponent is superior in weight; has greater reserve strength in every position. It is told to win. It has outstanding passers, triple-threat men, but the coach says it must not use the pass nor its open-field runners after it reaches the opponent's 28-yard line. It must just buck the center where it is outweighed, outplayed.

The situation in Korea was intolerable. General MacArthur was ordered to fight and, one would assume, win a war. But he was also ordered not to seek the aid of millions of Chinese Nationalists who wanted to fight the Chinese Communists; ordered not to use his bombers to attack the enemy behind the battleline—not to use methods which would aid in winning.

That meant that our men, under General MacArthur—and more than 9,000 have been killed; they have suffered upward of 60,000 casualties—could not win the war in Korea. It meant that the war would continue indefinitely. With this opinion, General Ridgway, who has succeeded General MacArthur in command in the Far East, agreed when he said:

I see no end to the military operations unless there is a political settlement.

Unfortunately, the politicians in U. N. and here at home have not yet charted their course. The representatives of Britain and France argue with those from Russia and India. The representatives from our country, which has furnished 90 percent of the men, done 90 percent of the fighting, suffered 94.6 percent of the casualties in Korea, apparently await the outcome of that political argument. Our men fight on.

President Truman put us into this war. He is a politician, and the politicians have been running it. General MacArthur is a professional soldier and, as President Truman admits, one of the greatest. Being a patriotic American and a professional soldier, he could not quietly submit, remain silent, while American soldiers were being needlessly slaughtered; their efforts to win the war thwarted. He protested. Because he protested the restrictions which hindered the war effort, he was relieved of command.

President Truman now charges that General MacArthur seeks to involve us in world war III. How false. How absurd. All he asked was that we either get out of this war, or that he be permitted to use established, proven military tactics to win that war as quickly as possible at the least cost in human lives.

President Truman ordered our men into world war III in Asia. His orders created a stalemate there. Indications are that he will follow the policy of United Nations which would give Korea and Formosa to the Communists; make futile the sacrifices of our men who have died there; absurd his contention that we seek through war to contain communism.

Do not be deceived by Mr. Truman's attempt to brand General MacArthur and his supporters as warmongers. President Truman is the man who is

now seeking an army of three and one-half million or four million men, evidently for the purpose of sending them to Europe, where they may become involved in world war III.

Mr. Truman chose to disregard the advice of MacArthur, the outstanding patriot, administrator, and military expert. Mr. Truman chooses to follow the ruinous policy of Mr. Acheson, who has always been sympathetic toward British interests; whose acts so often have resulted in the advancement of communism.

As Commander in Chief, Mr. Truman had authority to recall General MacArthur. To millions of Americans that seems to be the most tragic mistake which he, a man of many mistakes, has made as President.

The President's removal of General MacArthur, his acceptance of Acheson's policies, has aroused the Nation as it never has been aroused since Pearl Harbor. Acheson's removal is demanded. Congress is asked to impeach the President.

Because President Truman ordered our men into a war where they are being killed, but follows a policy which prohibits the effective use of our Air Force which would save the lives of many of our men, in my judgment the Congress should make every effort to oust him from office.

With a corrupt political machine at his back, Congress may not be successful in that effort. But if the people will continue vigorously to express their desires as they have been doing since General MacArthur's removal, there is hope that Acheson, the supporter of Hiss, may be fired, the country saved from disaster by a Congress fully aware and mindful of their constituents' demands.

Overlong the people have condoned Mr. Truman's shortcomings, put up with a complacent Congress. Our danger now is that they may fail to continue their opposition until they have opportunity in 1952 to restore this Government to the people.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of my weekly radio broadcast to my constituents on April 21, 1951:

Fellow citizens of the Third Congressional District, all other news in Washington this week was overshadowed by the appearance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur before the joint meeting of the Congress of the United States on Thursday.

He was a dramatic figure as he strode down the center aisle of the House past his young son, Arthur, who was sitting with the high Army officials in the front aisle seat. He appeared a little tense as he entered the door, but after he had mounted the platform and waved to Mrs. MacArthur, who was sitting on the front row in the gallery, his tension disappeared and he immediately became master of the situation.

General MacArthur's address to the Congress was magnificent. His voice and delivery were superb and his persuasive eloquence made a strong emotional appeal to the entire audience.

With the greater portion of the text of his speech no true American could take exception. It did, however, raise several issues upon which the future security of America depends and it also raised certain questions which demand the immediate investigation of the Congress.

There appears to be a wide difference of opinion between General MacArthur and the administration with respect to our far eastern policies. If the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree with General MacArthur, as he said, the Congress and our people should know that fact. Inquiry should be made by the Congress as to what military assistance this country will have to contribute to the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa to support their effective operation against the Chinese mainland. The ultimate effect of such operations must also be considered. The military advantage must be judged in the light of our global policy, our commitments to the United Nations and our program of cooperation with our allies.

General MacArthur stated that if we bomb the Chinese bases in Manchuria and give support to the forces of Chiang Kai-shek, the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves. We were told the same thing concerning the Chinese Communists when we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. Certainly the intervention of Russia is a factor to be reckoned with and seriously considered before we extend the Korean conflict.

General MacArthur has rendered a great public service in so forcibly presenting these issues. He will not fade away as he predicted. The fact that he is now free to express himself on American policies offers him the greatest opportunity of his brilliant career.

Already General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been invited to appear as witnesses before appropriate committees of the Congress so that their views may be presented and weighed. These issues should not be determined on the basis of a clash of personalities. They are of far greater importance than the welfare of either Mr. Truman or General MacArthur.

Your Representative will follow the testimony before the congressional committees with interest and support those policies which appear to be for the best interests of the Nation. Frankness compels me to say, however, that I am opposed to the appeasement of communism in any part of the world. I agree with General MacArthur that "history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier war." On the other hand, I do not favor starting a big war in China for the purpose of winning a little war in Korea.

It is a tragedy that in the midst of this debate, so vital to our national security, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, the chief author and exponent of our present bipartisan foreign policy, has passed away. No Member of the entire Congress has contributed more to the advancement of world peace than Senator Vandenberg. His views on foreign policy were respected by Republicans and Democrats alike. His services in the Senate have been sorely missed during his prolonged illness. Following his death on Wednesday night, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday approved a formal resolution praising its former chairman and member for his "wisdom, judgment, and patriotism." It is a great pity that the Nation will not have the benefit of his vision, judgment, and nonpartisan approach in the determination of the grave problems which confront us.

Farm Credit Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on February 14 I introduced H. R. 2642 because today there is hardly anything more important to the farmers of the deep South than a sound agricultural program and the credit to finance it.

And of all the things which a farmer needs if he is to do his part in the war effort, the most important is credit. With it, he can get the other things he needs, or do the job which must be done on his farm. H. R. 2642 provides a credit program which will enable farmers to take advantage of the present opportunities to engage successfully in livestock, dairy and poultry production.

H. R. 2642 does not sponsor credit that competes with banks. The loans it deals with are only made to farmers who cannot get financed elsewhere. H. R. 2642 will also develop efficient farm owners.

In farm visits in my own district and throughout the South I have talked to persons who really know farmers and farming, and in their opinion, the farmer is expected to take run-down land, insufficient or inefficient operating equipment, a sorry home and without any help from outside, grow on that farm not only what he needs to feed his own family but also to feed the city production worker and the members of our Armed Forces.

We would not say to a soldier fighting in Korea, "Here is a chuck of wood and a lump of iron ore. Make yourself a gun and beat these Communists." Yet in effect that is what we tell the farmer everytime we deny him credit to buy the seed, feed, livestock, equipment, buildings, or land he needs.

We would not tell the worker in an airplane factory, "Here is a binful of aluminum ore. Use only your hands, but build us an airplane strong enough to defend this Nation." Yet, again, in effect, that is what we are telling the farmer when we ask him to grow the food we need without making it possible for him to do the job. He needs and we must supply credit to do the job.

In 1947 farmers had $18,000,000,000 net farm income. But since 1947 that farm income has been dropping each year as the prices which farmers pay for their equipment and other farm needs rise more rapidly or decline more slowly than the prices farmers receive for the crops and livestock they grow. Last year the farmer's net income was under $13,000,000,000. While that sounds like quite a bit, over 6,000,000 farmers shared

it and the average farmer's net income was only about $2,000.

Almost the cheapest form of city labor gets more for his year's work than that and does not have to take the gamble that the farmer takes.

Almost 3,000,000 farmers, in fact, had gross incomes under $1,500 last year. Out of that they had to pay farm-operating expenses, family living expenses, and to buy whatever seed, feed, fertilizer, or equipment they needed for the next year's crop. They could not possibly do it without credit.

A few of these farmers could get the credit they need from local banks, but not many. With incomes so low, they have not been able to build up the chattels they need for bank security. Even when they can get credit locally, usually the terms require repayment in a short period of time, and these farmers need long repayment periods so they can pay out of increased farm income rather than by selling capital goods. If, for example, a farmer borrows to buy dairy cows, and has to repay the loan in 9 months, then he has to sell the cows to pay the loan and all the benefit he receives is his milk check during the 9-month period.

On the other hand, if he had a long-time loan—say, a 7-year loan such as he might get under H. R. 2642—he should have a number of calves born during that period. He can save some of them to build up his herd, and with the money he gets from the sale of the others and from 7 years of income from milk, he can repay the loan and still have the nucleus of a good herd.

H. R. 2642 makes that type of credit available to the farmer who needs it. It provides a period long enough to repay the loan out of increased farm income instead of sale of capital goods. One indication of the need for this type of credit is the fact that the Farmers Home Administration who now make this type of loan received over 110,000 applications for farm credit during the past 7 months.

Present legislation limits to 5 years the time any borrower may have to repay these Government operating-credit loans. In many cases this is enough; but where the farmer needs to make a complete adjustment in his operations he may require a longer time. In my district, for example, the typical pattern of agriculture has been cotton raising. Today many of these cotton farmers are learning that their farming enterprises are more sound if they also raise other crops and carry livestock. The number of dairy farms in my district is increasing rapidly, and these dairy farmers are getting milk checks every month instead of a cotton check once a year. And their land benefits by being in grass instead of row crops.

But it takes time and money to convert from cotton raising to livestock. A cotton farmer who changes over to a dairyman must develop his pastures, then build a dairy herd. Records kept by the Farmers Home Administration indicate that of the 27,755 borrowers who repaid their operating loans in full during the 1950 fiscal year, 21.5 percent of the borrowers were indebted to the agency longer than 5 years. These farmers proved that they could be successful by earning enough from their farm to repay the loans while supporting their families, but under present laws the Government, after 1951, will allow these potentially successful farmers only 5 years to succeed. H. R. 2642 would allow up to 7 years, a far more realistic figure.

Extending the repayment period and increasing the number of years that a borrower may be assisted are needed to provide a more effective system of credit where larger amounts of credit are required to allow needed expansion or reorganization in farming enterprises.

The bill will also permit loaning larger amounts to a farmer and that too will help his transition to a sounder farming economy.

The bill will also help our Nation's economy by making it possible for more farmers to own their land than to be tenants or sharecroppers on it. The owner husbands his land resources better, tries to build it up, takes an active part in his community affairs. The tenant moves from farm to farm, and seldom remains fixed in one place long enough to build up the land or take an active part in community affairs.

Deep down in the heart of every farmer is an ingrained desire to own his own farm, to have a little bit of America he can call his own. That is real Americanism. The banks know that many of these tenant farmers are good farmers and would be good landowners if given a chance, but the bank's regulations will not permit making long-term real-estate loans to them.

H. R. 2642 helps the banks to make such loans, and to safeguard their own interests, too. The bill broadens the base of the insured mortgage loan program established by the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 so that more local banks can lend money to qualified farmers to become farm owners, and have those loans guaranteed by Government.

This insured mortgage program has been growing in importance each year as more and more banks and other private lenders make loans to qualified farmers and accept Government guaranties of repayment and government servicing of all work connected with making or collecting the loans. It has been estimated that 6,000 such loans will be insured—creating 6,000 new farm owners or making family farms out of two small units in this country—during the coming year. Department officials estimate that at peak capacity the program could create or strengthen 30,000 family farms each year if the provisions of H. R. 2642 were in effect. That amounts to only about 10 per county, and surely all Members of Congress know that in their own districts—unless they represent a purely urban area—there are far more than 10 qualified farmers who should be allowed the privilege of family farm ownership.

The bill also broadens the program of real estate development loans to farmers who need to improve their land and buildings to make their farms efficient operating units. It is just as important to help a small farm owner develop his farm as it is to make an owner out of a tenant.

I therefore offer H. R. 2642 as a method of solving many of the farmer's financial problems. With its aid, I believe we can benefit the farmer, the community, and the entire Nation. It provides the farmer adequate credit to do the job which must be done on our farms. It provides money which will be spent in the local community. It insures our Nation of the food and fiber needed by our defense program.

Safety, Health, and Welfare of Inductees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the letter printed below received from General Hershey certainly shows the need for a coordinated program in our armed services:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. AYRES: This will acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 17, enclosing a clipping from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, April 13, containing the adverse comments of a father and mother who visited their son stationed at Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss. You also express the opinion that it is my responsibility to see that youths inducted under the Selective Service Act are not subjected to the conditions that apparently exist in the vicinity of Keesler Field, Miss.

Under the present Selective Service Act, the Selective Service System is responsible for the registration, classification, and delivery of its registrants to the Armed Forces induction stations for physical examination or induction. The moment they enter the Armed Forces they are outside the responsibility of the Selective Service System and there is nothing that the Selective Service System can do under the law with regard to the conditions of which your constituent complains. Incidentally, no registrants were inducted pursuant to 1948 Selective Service Act, into the United States Air Force, which prefers to recruit by voluntary enlistment.

While I am in sympathy with, and sincerely appreciate the misgivings of, these parents, I believe that the problem involved must be solved by the Armed Forces in coordination and cooperation with State, county, and city authorities in the neighborhood of military installations.

The Senate version of the Universal Training and Service Act now pending in Congress contained a provision for the establishment of a National Security Training Commission which would have the responsibility for establishing policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of the trainees. The House version provides that the Commission is to direct and control the basic military training of the National Security Training Corps, establishing such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training, as are necessary, making adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare

of the trainees. The Commission is required, among other things, to prepare and submit to Congress plans covering measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the members of the National Security Training Corps and to prescribe a code of conduct. These directives of the Congress, in my opinion, are steps in the right direction as far as the members of the National Security Training Corps are concerned. However, as far as the Selective Service System is concerned it has no authority or responsibility over its registrants once they are inducted into the Armed Forces.

It would appear that the questions raised by you more properly come within the sphere of the Department of Defense and I am, therefore, taking the liberty of referring your communication to the Secretary of Defense for his consideration. It is hoped that this disposition of the matter will satisfactorily serve your purpose, and I regret that I cannot be more helpful in this situation.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

The Role of MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine:

THE ROLE OF MACARTHUR—HE HAS A HISTORIC OPPORTUNITY TO BRING FOCUS AND FORCE TO UNITED STATES POLICY

General MacArthur has a great role—a role of greatness—to play in this country now.

The size of the role is indicated by the fact that he was ousted for no petty reason but because he chose to challenge the whole drift of events and the dominant attitudes of the Government of the United States and of the United Nations.

If we remind ourselves of some of MacArthur's distinguishing qualities and characteristics, we shall be able to sketch the nature of the role itself and his fitness for it.

MacArthur is a man of the west, a man of Asia, and an American.

MacArthur is a man of the west. At all those times when we are not bogged down in trivialities, we realize that it is nothing less than western civilization itself which is in peril in this generation. The peril comes not only from the external barbarian but from weakness and betrayal—or sheer stupidity—within. MacArthur is a man deeply of the west. He knows its history—its spiritual no less than its military history. Greece, Rome, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the age of Britain's greatness—all the splendid and tragic meanings of the drama of these centuries are the constant prompters of his mind and spirit.

MacArthur is a man of Asia. Nothing is sillier than the glib punditing that MacArthur is interested in Asia at the expense of Europe. As a matter of fact, if Truman had been inspired, he would have sent MacArthur to Europe and Eisenhower to Asia. Within a week, Eisenhower, an intensely practical soldier, would have seen how right MacArthur is about Asia. Within a week, all Europe would have recognized the truth of what we have said above about MacArthur. But it is significant and terribly important that MacArthur is a man of Asia. He is today the only man of the west who has in Asia not only immense prestige but also the devoted loyalty of millions and millions of Asians. True, he has bitter enemies there. But who are they? They are the Communists and their dupes. For the people of Japan, for the people of the Philippines and of other islands, for the hundreds of thousands of anti-Communists in China, MacArthur is a great symbol. How do they think of him? As imperialist? Conqueror? No—as liberator and friend.

HIS QUALITIES FIT OUR NEEDS

MacArthur is an American. He has not been in this country for 13 years. He may be "out of touch," as his enemies hope and some friends fear. But his is not the pulse-taking patriotism and he is certainly not the typical American of this or any week's Gallup poll. He is something more important: he is the basic American. Indelibly stamped upon his character are the basic precepts by which this Nation has lived and either will live or, in denial of them, perish.

Besides being a man of the west, a man of Asia, and an American, MacArthur is a number of other things. He is a master of his profession—the profession of arms. This he considers to be an honorable profession; he has served it with honor. He is a statesman—a title which few can claim today but which he earned in Japan by a performance without precedent in history.

Finally, MacArthur, though he may be charged with vanity has the humility to believe in God. This last fact has an important consequence for this hour. For it means that for him it is impossible to divorce policy and action from moral principle. He may not always do the right thing, he may do wrong; the point is that for him right and wrong are basic considerations.

Applying these characteristics of MacArthur to our present confused and perilous situation, we see how aptly they fit our needs.

We need a man of the west because we need a grand alliance of all those national and spiritual elements in Europe and the Americas which are still in allegiance to the highest ideals of the west and which refuse suicide and cynicism. (We can't win the struggle for the world through vulgar, ignorant, provincial nationalism on either side of the Atlantic.) But the leader of the west—whether as spokesman or statesman—must be an American; for circumstances have devolved the task of leadership upon this country. We need a man of the west who, by deeds and character, is accepted as a true friend of Asia in travail. We need, above all, a man of moral principles—that is to say, of moral principles clearly understood so that the policy and action he proposes can be—and inevitably will be—grounded in moral principle.

OUR PERILS ARE HIS TEST

It may seem impossible that any man could rise to the greatness which our present perils demand. At the moment, although he wears as he always will the five stars of a general of the Army, MacArthur is free to speak plainly and honestly to his fellow Americans and the world. He has no political obligations, and will, we hope, contract none. He will, we hope, be wary of all cliques or claques which even now so blatantly seek to use him for ends less noble than we believe his to be. Surely he is wise enough to know that he can be destroyed by idolatrous friends no less than by obvious enemies.

MacArthur's task now is to speak—to cut through and disperse the double-talk, the poisonous politics, the meanness and smallness of most of the speech by which we have been engulfed in these last months. He will speak to northerners and southerners, to Democrats and Republicans, to men whose ancestors came with the Mayflower, and to the refugees who came yesterday. MacArthur may have other tasks to perform later, in or out of Government, but in these next few weeks his task is to put before the Nation a believable policy—to tell us what we ought to do, and why, and to challenge us to choose our course now.

What is certain is that this Nation cannot remain in the passive, helpless, and hopeless position into which it was put by President Truman's speech on April 11. In defending his removal of MacArthur, Truman moved on to a calamitous error—he defined the policy of the United States in a way that ties the Nation's hands and gives all initiative, all power of choice, to the enemy. Not even America is strong enough to win if it has to fight under that handicap.

Can any man rise to the greatness our perils demand? MacArthur may fail—and the cloud of disillusionment may again darken the already dreary landscape of our time. Yet he seems to have been shaped for a role of greatness. His chance of fulfilling it may be measurably increased by every American who will strive himself, in his own thinking and in his own private judgment, to rise as an individual to the greatness of this hour.

Prize-Winning Essays—American Legion Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including essays by two of the winners of the American Legion essay contest in Ohio. Of the 12 winners in the State of Ohio, 2 were in my congressional district. I am very proud of these essays by Miss Dolores Amedei, of Steubenville, Ohio, and Miss Mary Ann Wiggins, of Bellaire, Ohio, and I commend them to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN OUR MODERN WORLD

(By Dolores Amedei)

Although conceived by patriots of a new Nation under living conditions and economic circumstances vastly different from those of present days, the Constitution has successfully met the challenge of rapidly changing conditions in all phases of our national life.

Different political parties find no difficulty, when they assume power, in changing the laws of the land in accordance with their principles and beliefs, under the basic tenets of the Constitution as a fluid yet firm guidepost.

It is because the forefathers, in their wisdom, drafted its basic principles in such broad, democratic fashion, that the Constitution has met the test of time and undoubtedly will be found to meet the complex problems facing us in the future under the entirely new conditions of an atomic age.

In essence, the Constitution is a simple document guaranteeing to all citizens certain rights and privileges that cannot be taken away without due process, meaning that any changes in the application (but not the principles) must be done in such a manner that allows the fullest opportunity for all to have their opinion expressed to

those by whom the reins of government are handled.

Those guarantics in the Constitution relating to certain freedoms such as (1) of assembly, (2) of religious belief, and (3) of expression, are the bulwarks enjoyed by citizens of the United States that have never been guaranteed to citizens of any other nation. They are the guideposts that make it impossible for this country to plunge headlong into any form of dictatorship, because such forms of government cannot be instituted, let alone continued, where citizens are possessed of these rights.

Modern times require the presence of a time-tried, flexible Constitution capable of yielding to the swiftly changing circumstances of a machine age, yet firm enough to resist (or at least retard sufficiently to allow time for mature consideration) of any sweeping and sudden departures from the recognized concepts of its meanings.

This country is feeling the effects of the impact of new ideas of government less than other nations because its citizenry, feeling more secure in its rights by virtue of constitutional guaranties, are prone to examine those radically different concepts more leisurely and circumspectly than citizens of countries, where because of the absence of such guaranties, any newly advanced ism is seized upon as an attractive, even if untested and unproved, way of bettering the way of life.

One of the most valuable principles of our Constitution is the protection given minority groups, whether religious, economic, or political. This guaranty perhaps makes us appear slower in meeting changes because of the democratic processes that must be adhered to, but results on the other hand in sounder solutions to our problems.

It is because of these things that we can confidently face any problems that may confront us in the foreseeable future with a calm and assurance made possible by the knowledge that no individual, clique, or pressure group can seize power in such a fashion that its will can be forced on all our citizens without their consent.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Mary Ann Wiggins)

The American Constitution embodies the fundamental principles of democracy. These fundamentals do not change quickly for behind them are people, and the will of the people is the basic reason for a democracy.

People all over the world are very much the same. They all want freedom from oppression by the state or by a dictator. When this freedom has once been obtained it becomes a living thing in the hearts of the people who have worked for it, and it cannot be easily taken away. When you have worked for this freedom and your sons and daughters have died on countless battlefields to preserve it, it becomes very precious to you. Such a freedom as this needs a foundation if it is to be kept alive for future generations. The American Constitution is as strong a foundation as can be found in our modern chaotic world.

In crises where other governments have failed, the Constitution has proved itself a stable foundation for our Government. Compare our Constitution with other forms of government. You will find that many of the things that we take for granted are not known in other countries. Hitler had thousands of helpless people put to death without giving them a fair trial or even a trial at all. Under communism people do not experience religious freedom, they are not allowed to speak their opinions freely. They are told what they should believe, what they should read, and how they may vote. The Constitution has survived because it instituted a government of the people, carried out by the chosen representatives of the people.

Our Constitution stands for equality among men. Through our courts it provides a way for all men to receive equal voice before the law.

The Constitution provides protection for the rights of all citizens of our country. Although the Constitution gives many privileges and rights, it also requires that the citizens perform certain duties and obligations. If we want to see our Constitution accomplish the most good we must work to fulfill our obligations as citizens. The Constitution contains the conditions and terms of democracy by which we all must live or suffer the penalty.

By using the power to amend the Constitution, we can overcome difficulties that did not exist when the Constitution was drawn up.

The Constitution, of course, is not perfect. There are many loopholes that must eventually be cleared up. How much can I say about my neighbors and my Government and still be protected by the Constitution? To what extent may I carry out my freedoms and still claim that they are my constitutional rights? These are some of the problems that often bother us.

Most Americans do not realize the far-reaching effects of the Constitution. Our Constitution was drawn up by the ablest statesmen of that time. These men had experienced oppression, and they were well qualified for the job of making a Constitution for a free people. Let's keep it a Constitution for a free people.

MacArthur's Greatest Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Sees MacArthur's 'Greatest Hours'," written by Edgar Poe, and published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune For April 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEES MACARTHUR'S "GREATEST HOURS"

(By Edgar Poe)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—The two greatest hours in the colorful life of Gen. Douglas MacArthur were in Tokyo Bay when formal surrender was wrung from Japan and Thursday when he delivered a powerful, drama-packed address at a joint session of Congress.

This correspondent was privileged to be present at both of these tremendous occasions.

Perhaps no one has ever delivered a more spine-tingling, thought-provoking address to the American Congress than did the general of the Army, just dismissed from his Far Eastern commands.

When this correspondent was aboard the battleship Missouri to see the conquered and humiliated Japanese representatives of Emperor Hirohito sign the surrender on September 2, 1945, General MacArthur was in his greatest glory. Thursday he was an "old soldier." But to the United States Congress and a jam-packed gallery of leading Americans, General MacArthur truly was "MacArthur the magnificent."

Some veteran observers expressed belief that at no time in American history has a Congress and the audience been more touched than in the general's closing remarks after citing his 52 years of military service. Ringing applause swept over the Chamber. He then told of his hopes and dreams on the plains of West Point.

General MacArthur said those West Point dreams have long since vanished. He said he remembered the old ballad which proclaimed that "old soldiers never die; they just fade away."

"And like the old soldier of that ballad" he said, "I now close my military career and just fade away, an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty. Good-by."

This statement brought tears streaming to the eyes of Members of Congress, to men and women in the gallery. Hardened soldiers and admirals who were sitting on the front rows took out their handkerchiefs and wiped their tear-filled eyes. So did some Members of Congress. One of those affected was General Wainwright, the great soldier, who was captured when Batan fell, but who was freed in 1945 just in time to be alongside General MacArthur when the surrender was wrung from the Japanese.

History was made that day. Peace—which turned out to be only temporary—had come to a world that had paid a tremendous price in blood and destruction.

This correspondent a short time later sickened when he stood in the melted ghost-like city of Hiroshima where an estimated 120,000 lives were wiped out with one single bomb. Some 75,000 to 200,000 others had been wounded.

There was no doubt that one of the great historical and horrible happenings of the world had taken place here. An impact on the world had been made at Hiroshima.

In Washington, Thursday, one felt that here, too, a speech of historical significance had been delivered.

Most of the applause during the general's address came from the Republican aisle. They applauded often. A scattering of applause came from the Democratic aisles, but both Republicans and Democrats gave the general a tremendous ovation when he concluded.

As the general walked down the aisle out of the chamber he waved in the direction of Mrs. MacArthur, who was sitting in the gallery. Youthful Arthur MacArthur, who was sitting on the front row on the Democratic side of the aisle applauded his father along with all the Senators and Representatives and the jammed galleries.

General MacArthur had made a triumphant return to the Nation's Capital.

Proposed Sale of the Former German Embassy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials dealing with the sale of the former German Embassy in this city. The editorials appeared in the German press published in the western occupied zone

of Germany. I particularly wish to read one of the editorials. It is entitled "Under the Hammer: The United States Between Emotion and Reason." It reads:

UNDER THE HAMMER: THE UNITED STATES BETWEEN EMOTION AND REASON

During the First World War the rules of civilization were still observed. The seizure and the announced sale of the German Embassy Building today obviously belong to the progress of international law, which, if not stopped, will hurt each nation in the long run. Political opportunism may go unpunished while violating minor laws of behavior, but it is fatal to violate international law which binds and protects each member of the family of nations. The advertisement in the Wall Street Journal offering the Embassy for sale has a terrible psychological effect because it opens old wounds which had slowly started to heal. (Excerpt from an article in the Dusseldorfer Nachrichten (Christian Independent), March 21, 1951.)

Mr. President, I may say that the editorials bear out the editorial comment which appeared recently in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, to which reference was made by the junior Senator from Nebraska yesterday, and they bear out the argument that we should have an investigation of the proposed sale of the German Embassy.

There being no objection, the other editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT ONLY STONES

In the midst of forming great world policies (by which the Western Powers intend to lead the Germans back into the community of free nations) one should not forget those little gestures which improve mutual relationships. This was clearly recognized by Senator HUGH BUTLER, who has protested against the policy of putting the former German Embassy in Washington up for sale.

The German Embassy in Washington is not only an accumulation of stones worth a certain number of dollars. Tied up with it, there exist certain imponderable values which one should not add to the heaped ruins of World War II without careful consideration. (Wiesbadener Kurier (Independent), March 13, 1951.)

STEPCHILDREN

German consuls abroad have many difficulties. Consul General Krekeler in New York uses the former quarters of a nylon shop. He could easily have found a place in the rooms of the old German Embassy. This hope has now been destroyed by the United States Department of Justice. The Embassy Building is being put up for sale, and for Americans only. Is this "equal treatment for the Germans"? The Germans are being disinherited and told to accept the status of stepchildren. (Westfalische Nachrichten (Christian Union), March 14, 1951.)

On Academic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a two-column article written by James Marshall, a member of the Board of Education of the City of New York, and published in a recent issue of Strengthening Democracy, a publication of the Board of Education of the City of New York. The article is entitled "On Academic Freedom." I think it is particularly important because it shows the reasons why the Board of Education of the city of New York passed a resolution to the effect that anyone who is a Communist is unfit to be a teacher in the American public school system. No one is going to accuse the city of New York of being a reactionary spot on the American map.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

I believe that we have to begin with the principle that in the forum of the mind all is fair and permissible no matter how unorthodox. Suppression of people who hold unorthodox ideas and discrimination against them because of the views which they may entertain must be abhorrent to all of us who are devoted to democracy as we know it, as it has descended to us from the English and American revolutions, as it has been expressed in the English Bill of Rights, our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution and in the writings of men like Milton, Jefferson, Lincoln, Mr. Justice Holmes, and countless others. This freedom is the very basis of all other freedoms. To place restraint on freedom of thought or discussion in classrooms or lecture halls endangers all other freedoms and imperils our basic American civil rights. This freedom of the mind and of expression as applied in classroom and lecture hall is the very essence of what we call academic freedom. Consequently it is basic to American education.

REQUISITES FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Academic freedom is more than a mere guaranteed power for self-expression. There cannot be academic freedom where a teacher himself is not free, where he himself is for some reason unable to be honest, where he is under pressure to say something or not to say something irrespective of objective truth.

The counterpart to academic freedom may be said to be freedom to learn the truth, the right of students not to have ideas perverted and thought controlled. In the name of academic freedom they have the right to have teachers who, if not always competent to think for themselves, at least have not surrendered intellectual integrity to others to do their thinking for them.

The evidence before us is clear that Communist Party members have a loyalty to Soviet Russia and to the promotion of world communism which is a higher loyalty than loyalty to their own country; that class hatred and the destruction of the bourgeois state are part of Communist doctrine; that the seizure of power in the interest of creating a so-called dictatorship of the proletariat is implicit in Communist Party membership; and that party members engaged in education have the special task of using education for these purposes.

HE CANNOT EXPRESS OBJECTIVE TRUTH

Consequently, how can it be said that anyone committed to Communist doctrine, anyone following the Communist Party line is free? By the nature of his allegiance to communism, his adoption of the Lenin-Stalin system of belief, he cannot accept and express objective truth. He must accept and prosecute class war and the destruction of the bourgeois state. He is bound to his principle that democracy is not the democracy that we know, but something quite different called social democracy. He is obliged to doubt the Mendelian law and to espouse the biological theory of Lysenko. He dare not applaud the music of Shostakovich and Khachaturian and others when that is deemed to be contrary to Communist musical doctrine. His political, economic, and social beliefs must follow the ideological meanderings of the Kremlin line. This is not truth. No man accepting such doctrine can claim the right to teach such concepts in classroom or in lecture hall in the name of academic freedom. He is not academically free if he is in such intellectual bondage. Whether in classroom, in guidance work, or in club work after class he cannot be trusted with children.

Where he conceals the fact that he is a Communist he is all the more unfitted to be a teacher because he is mislabeling his wares. Where students are young and immature, where they cannot fairly be expected to form judgments even where all the facts are available, where they are not free to choose their teachers or hear a contrary doctrine and weigh the two, where they are subject to compulsory education law, as are the children in our schools, then it is the duty of the Board of Education to protect them.

JAMES MARSHALL,
Member, Board of Education.

Assistance for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the India emergency assistance joint resolution, I am deeply disturbed over the failure of the Congress to take prompt action on this measure. The people of India are not faced with the prospect of famine at some time in the dim future: the threat is immediate.

The letters which have poured into my office from all over the State of Missouri indicate the very real concern of our citizens for the hunger-stricken people abroad, and urge that we put decency ahead of political expediency. If we have learned any lesson at all from history, we should have learned that communism finds fertile ground amidst poverty and hunger. We will have only our own parsimony and procrastination to blame if the discouraged people of India turn to communism and Soviet Russia for aid.

It is false economy to deny starving millions grain which we have in abundance, and which will, if timely given, save many lives, and be an eloquent testimonial to the humanity of our people.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat has stated the case well, I think, in a recent editorial:

The United States has tried to assume a position of great moral force in the world. The hope for human integrity, justice, and compassion has attracted millions to the policy of the United States leadership among the tenuously free people of south Asia. This is being torn and smothered by failure to help now. * * * Here is an instance where we can serve humanity in traditional American fashion and serve our own self-interest by countering Communist posturing with western generosity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "As India Starves" from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 11.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS INDIA STARVES

The teeming millions of India, confronted with famine, have urgently appealed, through their government, for 2,000,000 tons of grain from the United States. This plea was made last December. More than 3 months have passed, yet Congress has done nothing about the request.

Red China has offered 1,000,000 tons and Russia a smaller amount. Probably neither nation has the grain pledged, but they quickly made the promise and no doubt will send in some food. They recognize and capitalize on the propaganda opportunity. Are the seeds of communism literally to be poured into India, while the grain of American humanitarianism is padlocked under congressional dawdling?

Opposition to sending India foods has arisen in Washington. Some object to Prime Minister Nehru's Red appeasement and criticism of our policy in Korea. Some want to bargain for a loan, for atomic materials, for embargo concessions.

This is a wrong time to bargain. Bargaining with death from starvation would justify the Uncle Shylock sobriquet which already is emerging in India.

The United States has tried to assume a position of a great moral force in the world. The hope for human integrity, justice, and compassion has attracted millions to the policy of the United States leadership among the tenuously free peoples of south Asia. This is being torn and smothered by failure to help now.

The hungry of India should not be allowed to starve because we do not approve of the policies of Nehru. Famine should not be a plaything in politics. Whatever may be the doubts over India's Prime Minister and his occasional pro-Red implications, the helpless people of India need American aid. They need it quickly.

The Indian Government stated it must have 6,000,000 tons of grain to avert critical famine. It can pay for only 4,000,000 tons. Indians were led to believe months ago Washington would open its granaries to give what is needed. Now some counties in India have meager provisions to carry them only three more weeks. Bills in Congress to provide the needed grain have been dormant in the House Rules Committee and in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

If Communist sources provide food for India in crisis, there will be strings attached. Even if there weren't, the cause of communism would profit heavily. If we hope to improve the cause of western democracy, we should send the grain without strings. Margaret Parton, writing from New Delhi in the New York Tribune, observed, "While America may not win India with wheat, America may well lose India without wheat."

We have the grain and can afford to send it. The President should take extraordinary measures to help India whip starvation. Here is an instance where we can serve humanity in traditional American fashion and serve our own self-interest by countering Communist posturing with western generosity.

Screen Actors Guild Replies to Gale Sondergaard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the board of directors of the Screen Actors Guild to Miss Gale Sondergaard, which was published in the Hollywood Reporter on March 21, 1951.

The reply of the Screen Actors Guild to Miss Sondergaard's appeal for support of her attack on the House Committee on Un-American Activities is most commendable. It is reaffirmation of the unquestioned loyalty and patriotism of the great majority of those persons who are affiliated with the motion-picture industry.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCREEN ACTORS GUILD,
March 20, 1951.

MISS GALE SONDERGAARD,
Hollywood, Calif.

DEAR MISS SONDERGAARD: The board of directors of the Screen Actors Guild has received and carefully considered your letter of March 13 which you saw fit also to publish in the press. The Guild's answer should be equally available to the public and will be published.

Your letter (1) attacks as an inquisition the pending hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities into alleged Communist Party activities by a few individuals and (2) asks that the Guild protect you against any consequences of your own personal decisions and actions.

The Communist Party press also has attacked the hearings as a "warmongering, labor and freedom-busting * * * witch-hunt * * * by congressional inquisitors." The Guild board totally rejects this quoted typical Communist Party line. We recognize its obvious purposes of attempting to smear the hearings in advance and to create disrespect for the American form of government.

The deadly seriousness of the international situation dictates the tone of our reply. This is not the time for dialectic fencing. Like the overwhelming majority of the American people, we believe that a "clear and present danger" to our Nation exists. The Guild board believes that all participants in the international Communist Party conspiracy against our Nation should be exposed for what they are—enemies of our country and of our form of government.

It is not the province of the Guild board to decide what is the best method of carrying out this aim. It is our hope that the current House committee hearings will help to do so, in an objective and intelligent manner. We are informed that the committee will guard against smearing of any innocent individuals. We will watch with extreme interest the way in which the hearings are conducted and any and all developments stemming therefrom.

The Guild as a labor union will fight against any secret blacklist created by any group of employers. On the other hand, if any actor by his own actions outside of union activities has so offended American public opinion that he has made himself unsalable at the boxoffice, the Guild cannot and would not want to force any employer to hire him. That is the individual actor's personal responsibility and it cannot be shifted to his union.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Screen Actors Guild.

On the Eve of Victory With MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the memorable day when General MacArthur came home after near completion of his job which began at Bataan and moved to Korea through years of bloodshed, strife, slaughter, hunger, torture, suffering, and conflict—under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article written by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, as a colonel, when he called on General MacArthur in 1945.

General Klein served under General MacArthur in the Pacific theater and holds his past commander in great devotion and esteem, as is set forth in glowing terms in his article entitled "On the Eve of Victory With MacArthur."

This document is submitted with the thought that no matter what accusations are made against him, nor what vindication he achieves, the words of General Klein in 1945 are spoken for the many thousands of men, living and dead, who served under him in the bloody days of Guadalcanal, Biak, Tarawa, and the Philippines—through the tedious years of reconstruction—and now the period of defense of his acts in service to his country. The article follows:

ON THE EVE OF VICTORY WITH MACARTHUR

(By Brig. Gen. Julius Klein)

(Written August 4, 1945, in Luzon, Philippine Islands, for the Army and Navy Journal and International News Service.)

The sign over his door reads simply "CINC." I entered with the natural awe of a soldier for his Commander in Chief, but as he moved from his desk to greet me, I felt my heart pounding as it had so many years ago on my first big assignment as a reporter.

It was late in the day. This man was the nerve center of a gigantic war machine. But I could detect no trace of exhaustion in spite of his many callers and conferences, and the decisions he had rendered that day.

I recalled when I saw him, in the Washington days of Herbert Hoover. I remembered well his youthful dignity, his immaculate dress, and the dashing gallant figure that he cut. With the terrible war at the greatest climax, I was prepared to see a much older man, wear, bearing the mark of the tragic war years.

But the man who greeted me was the MacArthur of old.

He had not altered. He remains the erect, charming, youthful, black-haired soldier of those distant days when he was Chief of Staff.

As he spoke I began to realize the greatness of the man—he has long since proved

himself the soldier. My mind flashed back to the great of another war whom I had interviewed, Pershing, Haig, Foch, March, Bliss and the others, and he suffers by comparison with no man. I know why the United States Under Secretary of War, Robert Patterson, in a chat I had with him a few months ago, referred to MacArthur as "the General of the Age." One could sense in his presence the great general, the fine patriot, the statesman, scholar, and humanitarian who embodies all those qualities that make him the most illustrious American of our time.

We discussed various problems facing America now and after the war. The general's great devotion to the sons of America, his interest in the smallest detail concerning the welfare of his men, were only a high light of the interview. MacArthur knows what he wants for them, for America, and he hopes and prays with millions of others that the sacrifices made by the flower of our youth will not have been in vain.

His memory is remarkable. His eloquent use of the English language, his diction, his own presentation of what he tries to bring home to his listener can be matched with the best I have ever read or heard.

When he talks about war and the suffering that it brought about, you detect a sad emotion. It is the only time he resorts to rough language. He knows what Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor, and Santo Tomas meant to America, and as I sat there I realized what it meant to MacArthur himself.

As may be expected, he discussed the important strategy of the war with equal brilliance as concerns Army, Navy, or Air Corps activities, and he is not only equally well posted but also something of an expert in the economic, political, international, and cultural consequences of the war. He see with great clarity what is needed in addition to the United Nations Charter to assure lasting peace, with a powerful, strong, and free America guaranteeing that our generation will return to its own form of living and pursuit of happiness.

I had given him a 10-page report on my mission, and as he perused it my eyes strayed round the walls and rested on a framed inscription. Reading it I was struck by the key it gave me to the general's life and actions—I took out my pen and wrote down the words, as MacArthur read on.

"I do the best I know how, the very best I can, and I mean to keep on doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right what is said against we won't amount to anything; if it brings me out wrong, all the angels swearing that I was right would make no difference." (Abraham Lincoln.)

I had taken down these words, which I hope I have rendered correctly without knowing that the general had observed me. Looking up, he said:

"I noticed that you were copying Mr. Lincoln's words. I shall remember them always for they give me courage, and often in dark hours I look to that wall and feel comforted."

I was thrilled by the aptness of this inevitable comparison between the two liberators, Lincoln, the great emancipator, and MacArthur, the man who had stood like a wall of steel against the crumbling Australian bastion and held back the yellow tide while he forged the weapon with which he was to cleave his way back to the Philippines. He has returned, and he has brought back freedom and the joy of liberation to our valiant fellow Americans of the Philippine Commonwealth, paving the way for "the road to Tokyo."

Inevitably also, I thought of General Pershing, old "Black Jack," resisting with all his might the inclusion of the young AEF under any but an American commander. His insistance on an integrated American force was fully justified by the triumph of our arms just as MacArthur's embracing courage and brilliant conviction forced recognition of the Philippines as our necessary springboard to victory in the Pacific. Opposition, neglect, apathy, none of these stayed him.

My thoughts turned to the words of Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger as I heard them a few weeks ago at his Eighth Army Headquarters. The man who led the assault on Buna and Biak, and hurled the Eighth Army like an avenging bolt through the Bisayas and Mindanao, had said to me:

"His military achievements are triumphs of courage and ability over limited materials. It was General MacArthur who insisted that the Philippines must be taken as rapidly as possible to divide the Jap Empire, reestablish our prestige in the east and, most important, provide a base for the concentration of overwhelming force for the final blows against Japan.

"Not only did his great heart go out to the people, but he knew that without the Philippines we would have no comparable place where the great supply bases and staging areas, so necessary for our concluding campaign, might be built. So unshakable and so firm was his conviction that this would shorten the war, that he had to express his willingness to advance with what was already available, or not advance at all. His brilliant leadership, statesmanship, and strategy were merely superb tools which he used unsparingly.

"His real claim to greatness in history," concluded General Eichelberger, "lies in the strength of his conviction of the soundness of his daring concept, and in his unparalleled moral courage in beating down all obstacles through years of scarcity, meager troop support, frustration, and criticism."

Typical of the loyalty and esteem in which he is held by his able leaders is the statement made to me some time ago by Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., logistical and tactical genius.

"Klein," he said, "I hope and pray that MacArthur will be our commander in chief. He is the only man whom we can follow with confidence wherever he goes; the only man, moreover, whose concern for the success of his mission is touched by his consideration for the safety of his men. He will do great things at a minimum cost."

Both General Eichelberger and General Richardson are old disciples of MacArthur, their association with him dating back to their West Point days some 40 years ago. They, as brilliant tacticians and commanders in their own right, can keenly appreciate his genius and powers of leadership.

There was another inscription on the wall, an essay on youth written by a close friend of the general's, to which he directed my attention. It read in part:

"Youth is not a time of life; it is a state of mind • • • nobody grows old by merely living a number of years; people grow old only by deserting their ideals. Years wrinkle the skin, but to give up enthusiasm wrinkles the soul. Worry, doubt, self-distrust, fear, and despair—these are the long, long years that bow the head and turn the growing spirit back to dust. You are as young as your faith, as old as your doubt, as young as your self-confidence, as old as your fear, as young as your hope, as old as your despair."

It explained the erectness of his carriage, the firmness of his handshake, the stamina that makes his youthful secretaries and staff officers gasp in wonderment.

This insight is carried into the selection of his able lieutenants—the iron-willed Sutherland; Blamey, the swashbuckling Australian; Kenney, daring and forceful; Krueger, a general's general, cool and calculating; Eichelberger, brilliant tactician, fearless and intrepid; Richardson, a logistical and tactical genius, wise, far-seeing, and intensely loyal.

Prominent in that simply furnished room overlooking the shambles of MacArthur's beloved and once beautiful Manila was a tribute by Walter Lippmann to the heroes of Bataan.

"They fought • • • knowing that they themselves had no hope. This is the very heart of courage, transcending all other acts of which men are capable, and the surest proof that man is more than his flesh, his blood, his bones, and his appetite. On this proof as on a rock, that there is in all men a capacity to live and a willingness to die for things which they themselves can never hope to enjoy—there rests the whole of man's dignity and the title to all his rights."

The general paused as he saw that my glance had centered on this inscription. He rose and, laying aside my report, stood there with me as I read it. He drew his head back slowly as he, too, formed the words silently with his lips. Pain and pride and deep emotion crossed his face. Pain perhaps, in the thought that he had been ordered to leave them there, and pride in the knowledge that he had made his pledge, "I shall return," come true. It was as though he rendered a silent salute to those who had fought and bled with him there, and to those who remained to endure the torture and humiliation of those dark hours of America's history.

His faith in the Philippines was no less great than theirs in him. The failure of Tokyo's "Asia for the Asiatics" policy was foredoomed by this, the mutual love and trust they bore.

Bataan is more than just a historic battleground to MacArthur. His love for that sacred spot goes deeper than his personal devotion to the heroes that lie there in glory. For him whose intense patriotism knows no equal, it stood as a bastion of democracy, of freedom, and of human decency, a symbol of the American way of life. It had fallen only after every last ounce of energy had been expended, only after every sacrifice had been made, only after a display of such courage as the world had never known.

Its fall was a blow to the dignity of man, a treacherous stab at the heart of humanity, a thrust at his beloved country that had to be avenged. And so in the shining hour of victory, when General MacArthur as Supreme Allied Commander directed the Japanese Emperor to send his emissaries to Manila to accept the surrender terms, he erased forever that blot upon America's history by demanding that, on approaching the city, they flash the symbolic identification signal—"Bataan."

The conversation swung into easier channels. One is held spellbound by MacArthur's eloquence. His keen eyes, calm dignity and extraordinary command of speech make one feel that his presence is not only that of a great military leader, but of a great scholar and teacher. One might think that a man in his position would be engrossed in the task at hand—in maps and charts and figures. But his thoughts rise far above and beyond all these. Free from all illusions, he is alive to all the economic, political, and cultural consequences of war, and to the need for a free and powerful America which will guarantee future generations the right to live in peace and to devote their energies to the benefit of men and the glory of God.

A diplomat to the core, his phenomenal memory reaches out to each unit and individual under his command. He spoke with feeling of the citizen-soldier, that unique product of our democracy. National Guard units have fought long and well, often under the most difficult conditions. The general was especially pleased with the Thirty-third Division, my old outfit whose gallant action at Baguio was highly regarded.

As we returned to our chairs, my reporter's curiosity got the upper hand and I could not help asking a few questions.

"General," I said, "I have read many speculations as to what you will do after the war is over. What really are your plans?"

He smiled at this.

"Klein, I'm going to get myself a great big rocker and put it on my porch before a small, beautiful garden, where I can finally spend life as the average American husband with his family in peace and contentment—that is, if the Nips don't get me first."

I remarked that I doubted the American people would let him do that, but he waved the thought aside.

"Why think of it now. There is so much to do and, like every other GI, my thoughts are of home and rest but first I have a job to do and that job isn't finished, and when my job is finished then, and only then, am I ready to go home • • • to my rocking chair, my garden, and my family."

My colleagues among professional newsmen have told me he seldom makes radio broadcasts, has held few press conferences and, when he does see the press individually or in small groups, it is at their request and not his. The American people have demanded that copy be made of their hero. History has not made him; he has made history.

It was dark when I entered the bomb-shattered streets of Manila. An endless stream of trucks rolled by bearing supplies for the front. Thousands of cranes and winches strained at their task of unloading cargo from the myriad ships that dotted the harbor. Everywhere was a scene of antilke activity. My thoughts turned to the main streets of America and I thanked God that they had been spared the horrors of war.

The lights in the headquarters burned brightly far into the night. MacArthur and his men were awake to insure that the children of America might sleep.

I wrote this article on America's greatest general and foremost citizen at the headquarters of General Eichelberger's Eighth Army, then awaiting movement orders. As it was completed, the world began to rock with the staggering series of blows which were to drive the Japanese to surrender; their vocabulary previously void of this word "surrender," had been enriched.

As MacArthur had planned, this victory was chary of American blood. Not so for the Japs. The blinding flash that completely demolished 60 percent of the city of Hiroshima, on the southern tip of Japan's main island of Honshu, was a terrifying, soul-searing blow to arrogant Nippon. The devastation has been admitted to be beyond all human comprehension, retribution in full for the agony and long privation of General Wainwright and his companions in exile—a just and righteous vengeance for the heroic American lives poured out on the sand of Guadalcanal, Biak, Buna, Tarawa, the Pelaus, and the Philippines, poured out that freedom might return from exile.

General MacArthur and his leaders and his men had fulfilled their pledge; the might of America had seived the Nipponese throat in the final grip of total destruction.

When this terrific news broke, I recalled the advance information General MacArthur had given. His comment at this time belied any thought of personal glory. He saw the possibility of an early end to the war and said:

"Anything can happen now. What branch of service gets any credit is immaterial if this horrible war can come to an end and a needless sacrifice of life be prevented."

My head reeled with the grandeur of comprehension. The Russians, our allies now in the East, unleashed their armor and rolled into Manchuria driving all before them. The general's words, spoken to me only a few days before, stood out in my mind in letters of fire. His gift of prophecy, founded on his capability and knowledge, his strength and inflexible determination, had again come true in total fulfillment.

The Japanese Empire awaits its master, its guide, if it chooses, back to rehabilitation as a nation. What could be more fitting than that this task should fall to that great leader of men whose wisdom as a scholar and as a teacher is no less than his genius as a conqueror?

History's pen is poised, stilled over its perpetual creed in which is inscribed the eternal story, the faults and foibles, the grandeur and the heroism of mankind. A chapter has been finished. We and the peoples of the earth await the next.

Whatever the peace will bring, there are men whose passage through time is marked with meteoric brilliance. Such men are history. Many days have passed since the interview which gave birth to this story. Were they years, they could never eradicate the memory of the emotions it roused, or that swift fulfillment of the general's words of prophecy. His slogans, "I shall return" and "On to Tokyo!" were words come to life.

He had kept his faith with America and with God; let faith be kept with him.

MacArthur Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Union on Saturday, April 21, 1951.

The editorial follows:

MACARTHUR IS RIGHT

Now that the tumult and shouting has subsided and the incidents of the past week can be viewed calmly and dispassionately, there can be but one conclusion—MacArthur is right.

We are at war with Soviet China in Korea. It is not called a war; it is called a police action. Americans are being killed at the rate of one every 15 minutes, but they are not called Americans; they are United Nations troops. But to us they are Americans, and we wonder what they are doing there.

The commander was Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the greatest general in the Armed Forces. But he did not take his orders from the United States; he took them from the United Nations, of which Soviet Russia, which instigated the Korean war, is a member with the power of veto.

General MacArthur recognized that this was a war without a target; therefore, as long as it remained so, it could never end except in defeat for our side. He could not fight it to victory, because no one over here knew what a victory would be. General MacArthur was not permitted to fight the war to a victory, because left-wing Europe, refusing to arm itself, sought to appease communism in the Far East and divert all military aid to its own countries.

If the situation is as serious as MacArthur says it is, why are the little men in Washington still debating about how to run the war? If it is not so serious, why are we being asked to pay war taxes?

General MacArthur is one of the greatest Americans in the history of this Nation. His welcome home is without a parallel.

We must never lose sight of the fact that in Korea the Russians are lend-leasing the Chinese jet-propelled planes and submarines, and the British are selling the Chinese rubber and gasoline. Yet Russia is a neutral and Great Britain is actually fighting the Korean war on our side.

It becomes increasingly apparent that the weak and inept administration in Washington—easily the worst in our history—has been used by the British to have MacArthur dismissed. MacArthur is a sacrifice to British trickery.

Most of us are getting tired of what the very little people in Washington think is the art and science of politics. Particularly when they get in the way of great Americans like Douglas MacArthur. For Truman and Acheson have no policy; they play by ear; the chords they strike are consistently flat.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I revise and extend my remarks and include therein two statements, which I made to the press concerning the General MacArthur episode—one, when the general was summarily removed, and the other, after he had delivered a brilliant, eloquent, and penetrating address to the Congress.

Whether one agrees with General MacArthur or not, whether one accepts his thesis in whole or in part, it will be recognized by all fair-minded persons that his speech to the joint session of Congress will go down in history as one of the great speeches of our time.

It is our duty now, as representatives of the people, to try to bring some order out of the confusion that exists throughout the Nation and in the minds of the people concerning national policy. Our democratic way of life permits sharp differences of opinion and that frequently clarifies our policy. But we must never permit these differences to drive a wedge into the structure of national unity and full national cooperation so essential to the conduct of the Koeran war and so vital to the implementation of our national defense. However ardently we may desire peace, however zealously we may strive for it, we must fix our eyes upon the unwavering star of universal freedom which enables us to chart our course safely across the tumultuous seas of confusion and dissension.

We want peace but we do not want a dishonorable peace. We do not want a peace that will carelessly throw away all the fruits of victory. We do not want a peace that will abandon great continents of the world and great historic peoples to the exploitations of ruthless and cruel communistic leadership. We do not want a peace that will further strengthen world communism and enable it in time to destroy democracy and all its blessings and its precious freedoms

so cherished by Americans and other liberty-loving peoples. We do not want, and will not stand for, a dishonorable peace which will compromise the true interests of America before the threats and blandishments of the Kremlin and its puppets.

We seek and will be glad to accept peace with honor, peace with justice, peace with protection for democracy, peace with security for our country based upon liberty, universal disarmament, and mutual cooperation and good will.

The important thing and vital thing is not to flinch, not to fear, and not to fail to stand courageously against our potential enemies. I do not favor preventive war or anything resembling it, but we must keep in mind that every day we delay to press for settlement of these great questions of war and peace the Soviet's stockpile of atom bombs is growing together with the armed strength of that mighty power.

But let us not, greatest and most powerful Nation we are, cringe in cowardly and craven surrender before these threats to our Nation, but rather press with renewed vigor and with genuine determination for the kind of a peace that will let all nations, great and small, choose their own form of government and live under institutions of their own selection, unbridled by international bullies and unfettered by international conspiracy, unhampered by internal plots against their independence and security.

We have had the great debate. Now let us get down to brass tacks and have the great show-down—it is long overdue. The above-mentioned follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, ON THE FIRING OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

The Commander in Chief has full power to control personnel of the armed services. However, I greatly explore the summary manner in which General MacArthur—great war hero and great American that he is—was removed from his command.

This action is a smashing victory for the British Socialist Government policy of appeasing the Soviets, trading even war materials with the Chinese Reds, and scheming and working to bring the latter into the United Nations, even as their hands are dripping with American blood.

It is most unfortunate, particularly at this time, that the impression of disunity in American policy and military command, should be given to our potential enemies and the rest of the democratic world.

This policy may well mean our complete capitulation in Asia to world communism—the yielding of Formosa, the encompassment of Japan and the Philippines, Soviet domination of all Asia and the breaking of our security line in the Pacific.

STATEMENT BY HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, ON GENERAL MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS TO JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS

Congress was profoundly impressed by General MacArthur's stirring, historic address. It was statesmanlike, lofty in tone, and carefully avoided personalities.

The General made it clear that he is not an advocate of all-out general war on the mainland of China.

He intimated that, by reason of higher official decisions here, he was lately compelled to wage the Korean war without benefit of air reconnaissance and without being able to strike enemy troop and supply concentrations and air bases behind the lines, which in effect, has required our American and UN forces to conduct the war with one hand tied behind their backs.

He plainly stated that his over-all military objectives and methods had been previously approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and left the clear inference that their execution was blocked by orders from a higher level.

The address poses the question: Will this Nation permit the British Labor Government and appeasers of the Chinese Reds and the Soviet Union in this country to dictate a policy and course of action that could well have the result of leading us into a still graver situation? How about the gallant boys who suffer and die in Korea?

The American people demand, and have a right to know, who is responsible for such a policy and why it is being pursued. We ardently desire peace but we cannot compromise our national safety and endanger our civil liberties before the pressure and artifice of world communism.

I am sure that the American people will be deeply impressed by General MacArthur's observations and will be very grateful to him for his candid, forthright analysis. I hope that his utterances will clear the way for unity, decision, and strength in facing these great problems.

Through patient understanding, through judgments free of the sinister influences of hysteria and propaganda, and through firm, unflinching adherence to American principles and American interest, may our great Nation find the pathway to security and peace.

Alhambra Citizens Protest Removal of MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have received a petition signed by 240 prominent citizens of Alhambra, Calif., who have been shocked by the President's tragic dismissal of our great American hero, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. These signatures were attached to the petition following:

The undersigned hereby request and demand the reinstatement of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to his full command; and further, because of the ill-advised actions on the part of the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, we demand his impeachment, also the immediate dismissal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson and George C. Marshall.

Mr. Speaker, I share the righteous indignation of these good citizens over the ill-advised action of the President in removing General MacArthur. I feel that General MacArthur's views on our far eastern foreign policy have been far more correct and far more sound than those of Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson who have long followed a policy of appeasement of communism at home and abroad.

In order to clarify my thoughts on this issue, I enclose in my remarks the statement issued recently by four of my colleagues and I from Los Angeles County:

APRIL 13, 1951.

JOINT STATEMENT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION ON MACARTHUR DISMISSAL

In response to the thousands of demands we have received to institute impeachment proceedings against President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson following the summary dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, we believe that our constituents are entitled to an expression of our joint views:

1. We vigorously denounce the ruthless manner which President Truman removed General MacArthur from his command in Japan and Korea. The welfare and safety of the United States was, in our belief, more secure with General MacArthur in Tokyo than under any other available leadership.

2. We believe that President Truman's lack of wisdom in summarily removing General MacArthur has aided the enemy in Korea, given comfort to Moscow and Peiping, and opens the way for communism to prevail in Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and other Pacific island areas.

3. We vigorously support the House concurrent resolution to invite General MacArthur to address a joint session of Congress and to testify before the House and Senate Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees; and insist that a thorough, complete and exhaustive investigation of our military and foreign policy in Europe and Asia be immediately started and speedily concluded.

4. We agree with leaders in both the Senate and the House that no impeachment proceedings should be instituted until this investigation is completed revealing compelling evidence which can be used as grounds for impeachment. It must be remembered that impeachment by the House and trial in the Senate are similar to indictment by a grand jury and trial before a court of law.

5. Attention must be given to the fact if Mr. Truman is impeached by the House, it requires a two-thirds vote in the Senate to remove him from office. In the event of removal, his successor is Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY. If BARKLEY should decline to serve because of his age, and so forth, the successors in order are: SAM RAYBURN, Dean Acheson, George Marshall, and on down through the President's Cabinet.

6. We have given sober and deliberate thought and consideration to this whole problem. We are fully aware of the temper and the aroused attitude of the public at this time. However, we believe that to institute any proceedings before General MacArthur has had an opportunity to present his side of the story to the Congress and the people would minimize and neutralize the effect and force of his testimony.

Results of Fulton Lewis, Jr., Poll of Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months the residents of my congressional district of Pennsylvania have taken part in two polls of public opinion. In addition, some 4,000 telegrams and letters have

been received concerning the Truman-MacArthur controversy.

The sentiment expressed in the two polls and in over 4,000 communications which I have received on the Truman-MacArthur issue is identical with the following tabulation of the results of the radio poll conducted by the Mutual Broadcasting Co.'s Washington commentator, Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Mr. Lewis asked his listeners to vote yes or no on the following 16 questions, and mail their votes to their own Representative in Congress. There were 1,380 post cards and letters received by me as a result of the Fulton Lewis poll, with the results as follows:

	Yes	No
1. As of today, would you vote for Harry Truman for President?	12	1,368
2. Should President Truman be allowed to continue to receive the $30,000 tax exempt salary recently voted him by Congress?	64	1,706
3. Do you believe that Congress should continue investigations such as the one into RFC loans and the Kefauver crime hearings and extend those investigations into other activities of Government?	1,344	36
4. Are you in favor of keeping Dean Acheson as Secretary of State?	12	1,368
5. Do you favor the United Nations being in final control of United States troops in Korea or elsewhere?	144	1,736
6. Should Chiang Kai-shek be permitted to send his Nationalist Armies against the Chinese Communists?	1,352	28
7. Do you feel confident that Europe will fight to the end against communism?	140	1,740
8. Do you approve of the proposed continuation of economic, along with military, aid to North Atlantic Pact nations?	884	1,496
9. Would you favor a requirement that nations receiving military or economic aid from us must agree to stop trading with Russia, Communist China, or any other iron curtain country?	1,364	16
10. Do you believe President Truman's statement that all Communists and Communist sympathisers have been weeded out of Government?	8	1,872
11. Are you in favor of a permanent peacetime program of universal military training?	1,132	748
12. Do you believe President Truman is making a sincere effort to cut out unnecessary Government spending?	4	1,876
13. Should wages be controlled along with prices?	1,788	92
14. Should the Government prevent strikes in time of war emergency?	1,832	48
15. Are you in favor of calling General MacArthur home for a report to Congress on the far eastern situation?	1,716	164
16. Are you in favor of impeaching President Truman?	1,796	84

Mercy at a Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the Washington Post of April 24, 1951, entitled "Mercy at a Price":

MERCY AT A PRICE

Apparently opponents of a gift of grain to starving India have won their argument—or, rather, their sit-down strike in the House Rules Committee. The House Foreign Affairs Committee, which initially endorsed a bill to give the grain India needs, now has tentatively approved a new bill to send the grain on a loan basis. This follows the action of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in reporting a bill to make the shipment on half-gift half-loan basis.

Very well. The placing of a financial tag on the grain is in the opinion of this newspaper a misguided move which not only will hamper the effectiveness of what should have been a humanitarian action but also may result in serious financial consequences in India. This country has had plenty of experience with the misunderstandings and ill will engendered by "fuzzy" loans, and the provision for repayment in strategic materials for which India is now obtaining dollars is no exception to this rule. But the most important thing is to get the grain moving, for inevitably there will be some delay even after a bill has been passed. Once bills of some sort are cleared in the House and Senate, then those bodies as a whole should decide on the terms they want.

Reports from Bihar State in India are pathetic. In some sections the people have been reduced to eating roots. The wheat ration has been reduced to a below subsistence level, and often even this ration is not obtainable. Prices are skyrocketing and farmers are having to sell their land to buy food. In short, starvation is becoming a fact while Congress haggles, and India has nowhere else to turn. That sobering thought ought to be impressed upon the minds of our legislators.

If Old MacDonald Has a Farm in Iowa, on That Farm He Has Electricity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Iowa Development Commission:

MARCH 31, 1951.

If Old MacDonald still has a farm, and it's in Iowa, you may safely bet that on that farm he has electricity.

When the power companies last counted their rural Iowa customers, they found there were more customers than there are farms.

This, the Iowa Development Commission comments, is a far cry from the situation 10 years ago, when only 41 percent of Iowa's farms had the benefits of electricity. Five years ago, 62 percent had electric service.

Iowa's present contradiction of 201,527 electrified farm homes on 200,679 farms is really no contradiction at all. Those 848 extra homes merely prove that both the old folks and the young folks on the "home place" have electricity in their separate houses, or that both the owner's and the hired man's house have electric light and power.

The figures also prove that electricity has moved onto the Iowa farm at an impressive rate in the last 10 years.

In 1940, Iowa had 29,455 miles of power lines in the country, taking electricity to 68,509 farm homes.

Now, there are three times as many rural customers, on 2.5 times as many miles of power lines. Iowa now has 73,890 miles of rural power lines.

Of Iowa's rural power users, 63.8 percent are REA customers, 34.3 percent buy their power from private companies, and 2 percent buy from municipal power plants. REA owns 70 percent of the rural power lines; private utilities, 28.2 percent; and city-owned companies, 1.5 percent. More than half the REA power (53.8 percent) is provided by private utility companies.

Big Steel Companies Are Expanding Their Facilities in the Great Lakes Region and Are Not Worried Over the Iron-Ore Fields in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the February 22, 1951, issue of the Jamestown (N. Y.) Journal in an editorial destroys the desperate effort being made to sell the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to the American people in the name of national defense.

Each Member of Congress should read the following editorial titled "That Seaway Project":

THAT SEAWAY PROJECT

The Truman administration is pulling out all the stops in trying to restore life to the St. Lawrence seaway project. Currently, it is taking advantage of the critical international situation in a desperate effort to sell the plan on the ground that the United States must start its part of the seaway now to assure the country of access to an adequate supply of iron ore if war comes.

That such an argument, advanced by high Government officials including Cabinet members, in the stress of the world crisis, may gain congressional supporters for the seaway is altogether possible. The defense program does emphasize the critical need of a steady flow of iron ore. However, there is every reason to believe that the claims of the seaway supporters as to the limitations of the supply of iron ore in Minnesota and Wisconsin are grossly exaggerated. The fact that the big steel companies are substantially expanding their facilities in the Great Lakes region would suggest that they are not greatly worried over the iron ore fields in the United States.

In any event, it must be borne in mind that the project, if approved, would be at least 5 years under construction, and more likely the period would be even longer. What is further to be considered is the fact that in the event of enemy action the seaway, either under construction or after completion, would be a prime enemy target. The cost for the United States, estimated on figures presumably compiled long before the enormous inflation, and which would be materially higher under prevailing conditions, is $600,000,000. Secretary Sawyer says shipping tolls would pay for it in 50 years. That might be. But it is a lot of money to add to the present stupendous outlays of the Government for defense. And the project certainly could not be completed within the period when Russia can be expected to strike, if it should strike at all.

Gallup Poll Indicates Public Believes in What Truman Foreign Policy Is Trying To Accomplish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as stated in an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal, Sunday, April 22, 1951, a recent public-opinion poll conducted by Dr. George Gallup on the General MacArthur controversy offers a good example of why it is not wise to attach great political significance to the removal of MacArthur by President Truman without doing some soul searching as to the real issues involved.

Everyone has great admiration for General MacArthur as a military leader. It is to be regretted the present action became necessary, but I feel the general left the President no other course. If you will read the attached editorial carefully you will find references to public opinion on policies that are the real issues in the case.

It is doubtful if the majority of those taking the general's side in the present controversy would support his position on matters of policy. I do know from observation of their voting records that the majority of the congressional supporters of the general have taken opposite policy views.

I feel, as does the writer of the Journal editorial, that some people are using General MacArthur's popularity for partisan purposes and in so doing they are endangering national security.

The Journal editorial follows:

THE PUBLIC MIND

A public-opinion poll conducted by Dr. George Gallup on the MacArthur controversy offers a good example of why it is not wise to attach great political significance to the ouster without doing some soul searching as to the real issues behind it.

Voters questioned backed up General MacArthur. The vote was 62 percent to 29 percent for President Truman's decision.

But does that mean that the great majority go along with the theory of expanding the war against Red China? No, according to the replies to the other questions asked in the survey.

Only 46 percent thought bombing of Chinese bases in Manchuria would end the Korean War, as against 40 percent that thought it would not. And the public voted overwhelmingly against any all-out war with China as suggested by the extreme position of Senator CAIN, of Washington.

Further, 7 out of every 10 voters believe that a war with China means global war with Russia, and 6 out of every 10 voters believe that bombing Chinese bases would bring Russia into the war.

And, most surprising of all, in view of the loose appeasement talk, the public, by a 3-to-2 vote, believes the Truman administration should make stronger efforts to find mutually satisfactory peace terms in Korea; that it has not yet gone far enough in this direction.

These statistics indicate General MacArthur's public popularity as a military commander who has done a great deal for his country, and also represents the traditional American sympathy for a person who was fired from a top job he has earned the hard way. They also indicate that the public generally believes in what the Truman foreign policy is trying to accomplish.

Any attempt to use MacArthur's popularity to force a change in that policy is partisan tinkering with national security.

Army Quartermaster Corps Charged With Wasting Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I call attention to a letter written by one of my constituents, Mr. Fred Irish, of Tama, Iowa, who alleges a serious waste of manpower in the Army Quartermaster Corps.

I have called this situation to the attention of the Secretary of Defense and the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

The letter follows:

TAMA, IOWA.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Washington, D. C.:

With the appropriations for our military defense and the utmost utilization of manpower in our Armed Forces in great need of much closer scrutiny, I believe there is an opportunity for a great saving of both men and money in the food-procurement program of the Army Quartermaster Corps. While we have the civilian staff of the United States Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration standing by, and in some instances having already done the inspection and grading necessary, the Quartermaster Corps sends its full inspection and grading staff to handle all of the original inspection of the dairy and poultry products purchased for their use.

It is my contention that our tax money would be, in this instance, used to a much greater advantage and more able-bodied men (over 19 years of age, if you please) made available for other military duty, if the Dairy and Poultry Inspection and Grading Division of the Production and Marketing Administration personnel were to be given the full responsibility of inspecting and grading all of the dairy and poultry products acquired by the Quartermaster Corps.

It has been my experience to see, in many instances, exact duplication of inspection service by the assignment of Army personnel to the point of operation while the contract is being filled in a plant already operating under PMA supervision. The Army Quartermaster Corps will not accept PMA graded eviscerated poultry products even though they do accept PMA approved plants to furnish the product. They will not accept United States Department of Agriculture grading of New York dressed poultry. If a plant wishes to have continuous United States Department of Agriculture supervision in order to comply with the 1951 approved poultry dressing and grading program, it must undergo the necessary expense of paying for this service, and also the expense of making the product available to the Army Quartermaster Corps when fulfilling an Army contract. This is a waste of manpower and tax money.

The same situation exists in the disregard by the Quartermaster Corps for the PMA grading of shell eggs. Many, if not most, of the produce houses in this State, or in any State which at any time requires the inspection and grading service of either branch, have a resident United States Department of Agriculture inspector running a continuous inspection of shell eggs. Why, then, is it necessary to send military personnel to this plant to do exactly the same work that these people are there to do?

The United States Department of Agriculture has been able to further train excellent personnel, already long experienced in the dairy and poultry industries. The Production and Marketing Administration established the standards of quality and grades as well as the operational requirements for approved plants and their men are specifically trained to foster the adherence to these standards throughout the industry.

It has been my experience to notice the uniformity and fairness of grading among the PMA inspectors and I must say that in many instances there is a general lack of this uniformity within the ranks of the Quartermaster Corps personnel carrying on the inspection and grading. I am sure that this difference is due largely to the long background of experience and diligent training of the PMA personnel. They have shown themselves willing to be helpful and cooperative, in every conceivable manner, in carrying out their duties. They have gone out of their way to help the plants produce a better product for civilian and Army use as well.

I sincerely believe that this is a matter that should receive immediate attention. It is not a matter of setting up a new agency. It is a matter of eliminating all inspections, at origin, of dairy and poultry products purchased by the Army Quartermaster Corps.

Very truly yours,

Mr. FRED IRISH,
Partner, J. H. Neil Creamery Co.

MacArthur's Day—And Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the dominating news of late has been the return of and the welcome to General MacArthur. The great majority of Americans were pleased to extend a joyful and hearty welcome home to this great old soldier of our Pacific war and an outstanding administrator of conquered Japan. The welcome shown to him was a deserved tribute and an understanding of our realization of his outstanding service for the United States. However, around this welcome home has hung a pall of doubt and uncertainty as to just what differences between the President and the general had necessitated his retirement. By this time the air is beginning to clear and fairly sharp lines of agreement and disagreement are coming into the fore. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial of April 20 from the Daily Sentinel, of Grand Junction, Colo., carefully spelling out its editorial opinion of the issues. The editorial is written in calmness and has a searching quality after fact. I commend its reading to the Members as a penetrating statement of the issues as seen by one of the outstanding newspaper editors of the Rocky Mountain region. I believe value exists within its contents for believers of either side of the present controversy. The editorial is as follows:

MACARTHUR'S DAY—AND SAY

General MacArthur has had his day and also his say. He has been hailed with an acclaim that should gratify any conquering hero. He has had his opportunity to address the Nation and that address was listened to with close attention and high respect.

From the purely military standpoint the general clearly presented his picture of the Asiatic situation. He made it clear that we must dominate the Pacific. In his picture of the Orient he reaffirmed the well-known fact that it is the Asiatics' urge to nationalism that prompts most of the unrest in the Far East. But in the case of China, according to the general, this nationalism has inspired imperialistic dreams. And out of these new-born dreams developed China's entry into the Korean war. As General MacArthur presented the case, Russia, contrary to general opinion, had little if anything to do with Peiping's decision to invade North Korea. In that belief of the general he apparently holds that we—never once does he mention the United Nations—should bomb Manchurian bases, blockade Chinese ports and fully support Chiang. He discounted fears that such action might bring Russia into the war by only the nonassuring assertion that "the Soviet need not necessarily become involved." We would like for the general to have been more explicit on this. Since he had asserted that the fight between communism and freedom is global, can he assure us that our entry into China would leave Russia unmoved either in Asia or Europe? He ignores entirely the mutual aid pact between China and Russia.

Sincerely disavowing any love for war, General MacArthur still has no faith in organizations such as League of Nations—and by inference the UN— so international issues must still be decided in the crucible of war. While not naming them, the general appears to look upon those who seek to solve the Korean War without extending it to China as appeasers, giving no consideration to their honest aims to limit war while other ways than military are sought to end it.

As a military leader it is easy to understand why MacArthur could not explain the surrender of military advantages in the field—for military victory is the only victory conceivable in this grand old soldier's thinking. But there is a great sector of the human race today that seeks, perhaps mistakenly, to achieve victory without utilizing every military advantage before weighing its ultimate as well as its immediate consequences.

We would have liked for the general to have been more explicit in his advocacy for all-out support of Chiang, one of the most controversial issues of the day.

It was a fine speech, delivered in calmness and earnestness. But it leaves many things to be clarified. Perhaps the general will be more revealing before a Senate Armed Services Committee. The speech may prove most helpful if it forces the United Nations, as well as United States, to fresh consideration of their Far East policies. Whether that consideration would result in any change or not it would prove beneficial in clearing the air and clarifying UN policy—however insignificant that appears to General MacArthur.

Hon. Clare Boothe Luce in Behalf of Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, because Clare Boothe Luce, former Congresswoman from my State, playwright, author, lecturer, and one of the most humanitarian citizens I know, has so eloquently stated the case for the perpetuation of good music by exempting symphony and grand opera organizations from Federal admission taxes, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of her remarks made at a dinner for Friends of the Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York on Monday, April 2, 1951, at the Hotel Plaza, New York, N. Y.:

There are two ways to know how much you need and love music: One is to be able to hear it; the other is not to be able to hear it.

Imagine, if you can, what the world—our world—would be like if no music were ever heard in it. Now that's an amusing idea. Let's play with it for a minute.

Let's imagine the rise of some final, super-barbaric dictator. He's a man, we'll say, who hates music. That's a pretty good definition, incidentally, of the tyrant or hater of humanity. As Shakespeare wrote:

"The man that hath no music in himself
Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds
Is fit for treasons, strategems, and spoils."

So, let's pretend that this harmony-hating tyrant bans all music. That is, all man-made music from the world. He commands all musical instruments to be destroyed; orders all musicians exiled. He outlaws all music and music-making by man, woman, or child, in private or in public. Under pain of fine or imprisonment there is to be no singing, even of lullabies, hymns, or national anthems, and no playing, even on combs covered with tissue paper, no less barrel organs, or any kind of tunes no matter how thin or tinkling. There is to be no humming, crooning, whistling, beating of fingers on the table, which would show that one was listening to unheard melodies. A man who sang in the bathtub would be considered a flagrant lawbreaker. This tyrant—a logical fellow—would not even allow martial music to be played for his troops marching off to the wars—they would have to shuffle off bound together like prisoners in a chain gang. (The murder of music would show men to be what this assassination would surely make of them—slaves.)

Anyone caught operating or attending a musical speakeasy—or "play-softly"—would be guilty of breaking the law even if his excuse were that he went there to hear a love song with his girl. The possession of bootleg phonographs or earphones would call for the most severe sentences. Anyone caught in the company of composers or conductors in the musical underground would be sent to a concentration camp as an enemy of the state. There, all he would hear for the rest of his life would be drilling machines, cement smashers, taxi horns, and factory whistles. And such other sounds as issue from machines instead of the soul. Even people who thronged to parks, picnic groves, or the country would be suspected of subversive activity, particularly if they sat silently listening to the birds, the brooks, the bees, the wind in the trees. For this would show both a musical and a religious tendency. These people would plainly be listening to the harmony that lies at the heart of all nature, the author of which is God. They would be reflecting that music making is merely the man-made organizing of nature's sweet wild sounds. Man's participation with God in the harmonious act of creation—the creating of harmony.

"Music is the greatest good that mortals know
And all of heaven we have below."

How many people in such a world would still claim that music was a matter of indifference to them? That they could take it or leave it; that music—especially fine music—"bored" them; that they had no "ear" for music at all? I expect none.

For in the final analysis, what people who say such things really mean is that they prefer thin, or simple, or mediocre sounds to rich, complex, superior musical sounds such as are made by a great symphony orchestra playing the works of great composers. (They only think they prefer them—but that's because they won't or don't listen enough.) But, being reasonable people they would have to admit that there is a place for the finest and the best music in American life and culture, as well as for the mediocre. And, being reasonable people, they would agree that if we ever got around to destroying or suppressing the best, we'd be driven on to destroy the second best, and finally, like our imaginary tyrant, all music.

The destruction or suppression of the New York Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra would be the beginning of the end of all fine music in America. Whether it were destroyed by dictatorship, by government taxation and high cost of music making, or suppressed merely owing to a lack of public and private support, it does come to the same thing: The beginning of a world without music.

We dare not let this happen. We must set about saving our finest music and supporting our finest music makers in the American way—by private support, such as you will give them tonight, and by public support, such as we will get from our radio audience listening to our appeals tonight.

The great philosopher, Plato, wrote 2,500 years ago in The Republic, that "when modes of music change, the laws of the state always change with them." A great, free, noble people with a rich, free culture will have great, free, noble orchestras like the New York Philharmonic-Symphony. Where such music and music makers flourish, our liberties are safe.

W. Stuart Symington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has nominated W. Stuart Symington to direct the reorganized Reconstruction Finance Corporation and in my opinion, which I am certain is shared by all in Congress, the President could not have made a better choice.

Mr. Symington has had a distinguished career in business and in government. To the latter he brought experience and efficiency which made him an outstanding administrator and public

official. He is recognized by Democrats and Republicans alike as one of the most capable men in government.

His record, as well as the respect he commands from all who are familiar with his work, should enable him to restore public confidence in the RFC. I am certain he will.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial in tribute to Mr. Symington from East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal of Friday, April 20, 1951:

USEFUL SYMINGTON

The Senate can be expected to confirm without delay the nomination of W. Stuart Symington to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Symington, responsible to the President, supplants the five-man RFC Board that came under fire as a result of Fulbright committee revelations of influence in high place, even in the White House circle.

Investigation of the great Government lending agency will continue, but since the inquiry will deal with pre-Symington administration, the new RFC head will be free to make whatever changes are necessary to restore its usefulness and regain public confidence.

The Symington appointment is temporary. The former St Louis industrialist is a troubleshooter who has held a succession of important jobs in the higher levels of the Government. Once the RFC has been reorganized—or, possibly, abolished—he will be available for another assignment, and there surely will be one.

President Truman has complained often of the short supply of men of outstanding ability who are willing to accept low-pay, insecure Government jobs. Because such men are few the President has shifted them about so that a half dozen men have completed almost a score of assignments.

One of those men is Fred M. Vinson, Chief Justice of the United States. Ordinarily that exalted post would be regarded as the capstone to a distinguished career. But Chief Justice Vinson, former Cabinet member and former "Assistant President," is accounted available for further assignment. He is regarded as a possible Democratic Presidential nominee if Mr. Truman does not want another term. Stuart Symington must be accounted for among the Presidential protentials. He has gathered a lot of Government experience in a few years in the National Capital.

The War in Korea and the Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from two newsgrams appearing in United States News and World Report, the first from the issue of April 20, 1951, and the second from the issue of April 27, 1951. I might add that Americans generally have come to realize that United States News and World Report has an objective point of view and a reputation for high reliability. I think Americans generally will want to read these two very significant excerpts written by the staff of David Lawrence, who has unusual facilities for arriving at factual information in connection with the entire Asiatic problem.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From United States News and World Report of April 20, 1951]

TOMORROW

A truce in Korea remains improbable. Expanding war is more likely.

Communist answer to moves for a truce is to be an offensive. Appeals for peace, soundings, offers of a deal haven't sparked Communist interest.

War, as a result, is to go on. Wars, under way, tend to spread.

With MacArthur in command, Communists did not know what to expect. It might be atom bombing, it might be smashed cities, it might be invasion of south China, it might be anything. Peace might seem better. Without MacArthur, all is simpler. Chinese cities won't be bombed. Invasion won't come. A price will be paid by UN to get peace. There's nothing much to fear, so why not go on fighting and maybe get a higher price later on for peace?

MacArthur's going will encourage the Communists.

Mr. Truman, politically, cannot pay the price for peace in Korea.

Formosa is the Communists' first demand. Britain wants to give it as part payment to the Communists for peace. United States can't agree to that.

UN membership is next. Britain says, "Pay." United States can't agree.

Get out of Korea is the third Communist requirement. After going in, suffering 60,000 casualties, United States now can't suddenly pull out.

So the business of chasing each other up and down the Korean peninsula is to go on. The cost, in United States casualties, averages about 1,400 a week. It's a continuing cost, no end in sight under policies spelled out for Comunists. Idea that Communists will tire of losses and sue for peace is highly unlikely. Manpower is China's cheapest commodity. Losses won't discourage Communists.

As the Communists must size up things in planning new moves:

Mr. Truman's nerve broke at chancing bigger war. Britain gets her way.

Appeasement, not bigger war, is in the wind. United States is ready to deal.

Price for a temporary deal can be held high. United States will pay rather than accept dangers of expanded war in Asia. Whip hand shifts to Communist side.

Actually, Communist leaders may be playing with dynamite. Made bolder by soft talk from United States by punishment for an exponent of victory in war, they may misjudge, go too far, and get smacked. Firing of MacArthur, bid for peace, may help to generate the very expanding war Mr. Truman says he wants to avoid.

[From United States News and World Report of April 27, 1951]

TOMORROW

To help you get the record straight on MacArthur and Truman:

Staff Chiefs of United States did not meet formally and recommend dismissal of General MacArthur. There was no action by Joint Chiefs as a group.

Informally, when their opinion was asked, Staff Chiefs did express the opinion that General MacArthur should be replaced as Supreme Commander.

Method of replacement was not suggested by service leaders.

Mr. Truman, not United States Staff Chiefs, thought up the idea of firing General MacArthur in the middle of the night, without prior consultation, without any explanation. A military commander with 52 years of service to the Nation was fired without a hearing or a chance to take farewell of his troops.

Joint Chiefs, definitely, did not recommend that procedure.

It is true, literally, that Joint Chiefs of United States, in the past, were in agreement with General MacArthur on strategy in waging the present war.

MacArthur strategy called for: (1) economic blockade of China; (2) naval blockade of China's coast; (3) air reconnaissance of Manchuria and of China's coast; (4) end of restrictions on Chiang Kai-shek to use his forces on China mainland and support for Chiang with military supplies, not combat manpower.

Strategy favored by Joint Chiefs, at one point, did coincide.

Ideas of strategy, however, do change. United States strategy is influenced by political as well as military considerations, by attitudes of allies as well as by concepts of strictly United States desires and interests.

United States strategy, as of now, calls for: (1) diplomatic moves to try to get settlement; (2) no blockade of China, no air operations above the Yalu River; (3) limited operations above the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea, to provide for security of UN forces and to maintain contact with the enemy.

General MacArthur differed with this strategy. Joint Chiefs approved the new strategy. Strategy adopted formally on March 20, 1951, was influenced by: (1) Dean Acheson, United States Secretary of State; (2) the British Government.

Diplomats, not military men, now will seek to settle the war. How well they succeed remains to be seen. With MacArthur out, they get their chance.

You will be interested in these other points:

The MacArthur letter to JOSEPH MARTIN, dated March 20, Tokyo, had been written and mailed before the new strategy was laid down for the General. The strategy directive, announcing a peace try, reached Tokyo March 21.

A MacArthur peace offer on March 24, Tokyo time, was considered within the prerogatives of a military commander in carrying out his duties.

A directive from the Joint Chiefs, dated March 24, telling MacArthur to coordinate any further statements with Washington was the last word received by the general from the Joint Chiefs or President before the order firing him. The Martin letter was made public in Washington April 5. The order to fire was delivered in Tokyo April 11. That was an interval of 18 days between any exchange of communications with Washington and Tokyo in a war period.

The order to fire was a complete surprise to General MacArthur, wholly unexpected. Its summary nature was without precedent.

In the war itself, Communist leaders, not UN, hold the initiative.

Communists, with initiative, can strike soon or hold off indefinitely, taking whatever time is necessary to build air and ground forces. There will be time to equip new armies, train pilots, acquire planes, build airfields.

The choice of time, methods, build-up of forces is left to Communists.

United States forces, left in the dark, can probe, make limited advances, use planes for attack within a limited area, but can't try to win a decision.

What comes out of that situation is anybody's guess. The next big move, if there is to be one, is up to the Communists. They can play a waiting game or they can throw in all they've got, including air, for a try at

a decision. Only Communists know what the choice is going to be. United States sits and waits.

To get personalities straightened out in a developing argument:

George Marshall, Defense Secretary, is the Europe-first leader. The Marshall thesis is that United States cannot be strong both in Europe and Asia. Asia must be secondary. General MacArthur differs, sees the problem as global.

Dean Acheson, State Secretary, now sides with Marshall. Earlier he had favored broader war with Communist China. Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of Staff Chiefs, is the White House spokesman, expressing official opinions. Chiefs of service staffs operate under White House orders. Staff Chiefs do agree that Korean battlefield could be isolated and the war brought to an end successfully, if Russia did not intervene. Staff Chiefs do agree that, if world war is to come, Europe, not Asia, would be the main theater.

Dwight Eisenhower, supreme commander in Europe, is on the side lines, but inclined more to the Marshall than the MacArthur viewpoint.

Congress Should Review Our Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from Anderson Memorial Post, No. 5996, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Anderson, S. C.:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
ANDERSON MEMORIAL POST, NO. 5996,
Anderson, S. C.

Anderson Memorial Post, No. 5996, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in regular meeting, April 12, 1951, unanimously passed the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved*, That—

"1. Whereas we have served our country overseas and may have to do so again, we want our servants in Congress to know that we believe the Congress should review our whole defense plan without fear or favor as to individual or party.

"2. We stand in awe at the report of more than 60,000 casualties for our forces in Korea. Our county has had its share of these. Is it a United Nations affair, or is it that in name and United States in blood and lives lost? If British interests can force out the Supreme Commander in Korea, their contribution of men and arms should more nearly equal ours. Naturally, our servants are aware of the economic interests of Britishers in Asia aside from their concern for the future of Hong Kong.

"3. Our chief concern is with policy rather than with personality. We do not believe there is any such thing as the indispensable man in any field. However, if the United Nations ties us to a sacrifice of American lives in Korea in a questionable venture, we ask immediate revision of future commitments. In the light of our Korean experience, we already feel that the wise and practical course would be to cease to implement the provisions of the Atlantic Pact before we find ourselves involved in another equally hopeless situation.

"4. A clean-up in our official family in Washington should not be delayed if careful investigation of the Korean situation shows dereliction on the part of the two Cabinet heads responsible for the action in Korea—namely, Secretary Acheson and Secretary Marshall. There are no sacred heads in our Government. We humbly remind our servants that it is almost axiomatic that the boss fixes the blame while the leader fixes the breakdown.

"5. Many of our members are already on active duty, and others will go soon. We do not wish to face active service again without the utmost confidence in our high command. Under present conditions confidence is low and still sinking.

"6. This is no effort to present a "pressure bloc" in favor of any individual. We are simple Americans who enjoy living. We feel that the ruthless sacrifice of 20,000 lives should be justified by more than we have been able to glean from the bloody blunder in Korea.

"7. It is not our good fortune to possess any superior wisdom as to what is best. In all humility and without apology, we implore you not to be blinded by party loyalty in a review of our foreign policy. It may sound strong, but nevertheless, it is the view of real Americans and cruelly true that "In Arlington we do not find Republicans or Democrats but silent Americans who in time of danger served their country honorably and now sleep side by side in peace."

"8. Our final hope is in constitutional government which in American practice properly operates around the three related but independent points of the triangle, namely, executive, judicial, and legislative. We fear that constitutional government is in jeopardy. We are depending on our servants in Washington."

Service Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 24, 1951:

SERVICE INSURANCE

Congressional conferees have done a good job of patching up the totally different House and Senate bills on insurance for GIs. They have taken what we regard as the best features of both versions. The net is to expand insurance coverage of men on active duty by making it automatic and retroactive to June 27, 1950, and yet to continue the right of new veterans to retain their Government insurance by paying premiums on a term basis after discharge.

Reconciliation of the two versions was not an easy task. The House had conferred free insurance benefits on all men on active duty but had eliminated any provision for continuation of insurance after discharge, whereas the Senate had granted coverage for a limited time to men killed on active duty but had left other existing provisions undisturbed. The compromise is a liberal system which satisfies the prime need for permanent, universal coverage of men on active duty, takes care of men disabled in service and permits cash refunds on old-style policies, and still meets the worthwhile objective of enabling future veterans to continue low-cost insurance. The conferees deserve a vote of thanks.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Finance Committee is preparing to report to the Senate the bill H. R. 1612, providing for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The House, in passing the bill, saw fit to amend it in such a way as to seriously hamper the effective continuance of the reciprocal trade principle should the amendments be permitted to become law. I do not believe that the Senate should retain those amendments. When the bill comes to conference, I hope that the House will agree to their elimination.

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has approved a statement issued by their World Trade Committee and World Trade Association which cogently outlines the reasons why the four House amendments of which I speak would render the trade-agreements program practically inoperative. This statement is now before the Senate Finance Committee for their consideration. In the hope that it will persuade my colleagues in the House to reconsider their previous stand on this matter, I ask that the statement be printed in full in the RECORD, and I now submit it for that purpose:

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
March 8, 1951.

To: Board of Directors.
From: World Trade Committee and World Trade Association.
Subject: Approval of Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

REQUESTED ACTION

That the board of directors approve the recommendation of the World Trade Committee and the World Trade Association of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce to approve legislation to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. This act extends the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1951.

STATEMENT

There is attached the report of the World Trade Committee and the World Trade Association dated January 30, 1951, recommending approval of legislation to extend the trade agreements program for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1951. In supporting this recommendation the two groups submitted a lengthy statement reviewing the history and accomplishments of the program.

The House Ways and Means Committee voted approval of the legislation without amendment. Four amendments were approved by the House of Representatives, which, if approved by the Senate and adopted, would have serious effects on our international relationship with the free countries whose aid and cooperation we are seeking. Further, it would play into the hands of the Soviet propagandists, destroy the effectiveness of the operation of the present program, interfere with the present mobilization program for defense, and penalize the public interest and consumers of the United States, and not accomplish the objectives the proponents desire or claim.

The amendments, following thorough investigation, appear to be restrictive, unnecessary, undesirable, and unworkable, as pointed out in the statement below.

(The proposed amendments as submitted to the Senate and now before the Senate Finance Committee are reproduced and attached.)

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, representing a cross section of all business, agricultural, and national interests of the country which appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of the extension of the program, without amendment for 3 years, will appear before the Senate Finance Committee March 21, 1951, opposing all four amendments. In the FC clipsheet of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of February 16, 1951, they have the following to say:

"Those who favor the highly restrictive provisions (the proposed amendments) show lack of understanding, we believe, of the basic purposes of the trade-agreements program and the benefits which have derived to the United States from the program. To enact such a measure as that which is currently proposed is perhaps worse than no trade-agreements program at all. It would be too cumbersome to be of any practical value. Furthermore, the principle of such restrictive measures is inconsistent with the basic concept of competitive private enterprise and with the practical aspects of the current international situation. In times of shortages throughout the world, it is of extreme importance that movement of materials and goods among free countries be as unrestricted as possible. Such, we believe, can be effected without undue injury to United States domestic industry, and, in fact, with great benefit to this country.

"It is inconceivable that the United States can in good conscience continue to press for removal of barriers by other friendly countries, if the United States itself adopts what is equivalent to an inoperative trade-agreements program."

Serious international effects

The trade-agreements program is the keystone of the foreign economic policy of the United States. The policy today is that we must do everything possible to build up the strength of the United States and the other free nations and to give these peoples a real stake in the future. This can be the only policy to meet the threat of military aggression, of subversion, of stirring up class strife, of exploiting discontent and poverty, and of preventing economic improvement.

An integral part of the process of building strength in the free world has been the effort to expand the flow of trade. Only by a greater exchange of goods between countries can the full benefits of economic development and greater production be maintained (and this means sharing our market with the producing nations of the world). The trade-agreements program has been a major element in our participation in this process of expanding world trade. This program has become a symbol of United States determination to lead in the cooperative effort to expand world trade. Renewal of the act will reaffirm that determination. Failure to renew the act would be a symbol of withdrawal from that cooperative effort.

Short-term renewal of the act with the crippling amendments will in the eyes of the free nations be a repudiation of our economic policy. To them it would have the appearance of our turning back to protectionism and economic isolationism. Their being needlessly denied access to American markets would force them to step up their trade with the Soviet bloc and deprive our defense effort of many badly needed strategic and critical materials.

Such a reversal of trade policy recalls the effects of our adoption of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930, which resulted in retaliatory tariffs and a score or more of other restrictive measures and practices on the part of nearly 70 countries, which destroyed two-thirds of the world's foreign trade. History has proved this condition deepened and prolonged the worldwide depression of the thirties. A repetition of this catastrophe would weaken all nations, including our own, and make all an easy prey for Soviet domination without a military struggle.

Another serious effect on our national economy is overlooked by the proponents of these amendments, the jeopardy in which it puts our existing foreign markets for agriculture and industry. The current $10,000,000,000 to $12,000,000,000 annual exports are of great importance to many major industries. These exports are not only the difference between profit and loss and prosperity and failure for the industries, but the share exported helps maintain stable high prices for the full production sold in the American market. Minority agricultural spokesmen overlook the importance of a totally prosperous American economy on the total sales of all American agricultural products. The economic well-being of the large manufacturing industries selling from 10 to 25 percent of their output overseas is the best guarantee for American agriculture for the orderly sale of the larger part of their production at high stable prices.

The reciprocal trade agreements program has proved successful in expanding our foreign trade. According to official figures published by the United States Department of Commerce (Commerce Reports for February 17, 1940), United States trade with trade agreement countries showed a substantial increase as compared with our trade with nontrade agreement countries.

At the end of 1939 the United States had concluded agreements with 18 countries (and colonies). The first agreement was signed September 3, 1934. This period, 1934–39, can be considered the only normal trading period for comparison purposes. Other actions, such as preparations for and World War II itself, altered the normal trade pattern.

These official figures show that our export trade average value for 1938–39 increased 62.8 percent over the average value for 1934–35. Our export trade with nonagreement countries for the same comparable periods increased only 31.7 percent, thus indicating that American export trade with the trade agreement countries was double that of the trade with nonagreement countries, and that the program was successful in accomplishing its objectives.

On the other hand, there was no extraordinary increase in the volume of imports during the same period. Generally imports from trade agreement countries increased 21.6 percent and those from nonagreement countries 12.5 percent.

The reciprocal trade-agreements program has had the approval of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States since its inception. Many national public-interest organizations have approved the trade-agreements program.

Furthermore, several features of the proposed amendments are inflationary in effect, which are contrary to policies of the National Government at the present time.

The proposed amendments

No. 1. Peril points: The peril-point issue was fully debated in connection with the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1949 and the amendment was then repealed by Congress. When the amendment was proposed in 1948 the Chamber of Commerce of the United States made the following statement before the Senate Finance Committee:

"Placing all responsibility in the Tariff Commission for the determination of so-called peril points appears to have several undesirable effects. These peril points are the maximum and minimum points between which negotiations could proceed without reference to Congress. It is doubtful whether the Tariff Commission could achieve the wide correlation of diverse interests that is now obtained through the interdepartmental committees.

"In the light of its historic functions, the Tariff Commission would probably be chiefly concerned with the impact against the specific domestic commodities involved in negotiation. For the best interests of this country, equal consideration should be given to other producers, to consumers, and to the public generally. To vest the power of determining these peril points solely in the Tariff Commission would make that organization vulnerable to the pressure of affected interests to a degree that might challenge the recognized objectivity of this valuable agency.

"Such a concentration of authority might cause the Commission, from the standpoint of self-protection, to set peril points so conservatively that successful negotiation would have to exceed the range of option. This would mean that almost every successful agreement would necessarily have to go to Congress for approval. Thus it is not only conceivable but even probable that this act may return the highly technical subject of tariff writing to the crowded calendars of Congress."

The requirement in the bill that the Tariff Commission hold public hearings results in duplication of effort. Additional hearings still are necessary because the other departments would otherwise be unable to question the witnesses who have appeared at the Tariff Commission hearings and would thus be unable to obtain in many instances a completely clear understanding of the problem. Furthermore, Tariff Commission hearings do not yield information on United States export products or other matters relating to the agreement. A separate hearing is necessary in order that a segment of the American economy can have an opportunity to be heard. This segment is vastly larger than the one which appears at the Tariff Commission hearing. It consists of people interested in exports; it consists of people who are interested in better international relations; it consists of consumers; it consists of a predominant part of labor; it consists of a large share of the farmers.

The Tariff Commission is not qualified to make determinations regarding the national defense.

Under existing procedures the recommendations which go to the President as to concessions that he should make are the collective judgment of representatives of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Interior, Labor, State, Treasury, the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the United States Tariff Commission. This judgment is reached on the basis of the special knowledge of these representatives resulting from their respective responsibilities and after full public hearings. The record shows that these judgments have been sound.

To substitute peril-point proposals for this procedure, which has worked so well for so long, would be as undesirable as it would be unnecessary. The peril-point procedure, in effect, makes the judgment of a single agency determinative of the extent of tariff concessions; deprives that agency in making its judgment of the right to participate in the discussions of the other agencies concerned with the program; requires that agency to perform the almost impossible task of fixing a precise point which will serve as a sort of guaranty against injury for the future; and results in a duplication of hearings.

Nothing has happened since repeal of this amendment in 1949 and no arguments have been presented to change the view that the peril-point amendment is both unecessary and undesirable.

Furthermore, to carry out the requirements of this amendment in determining the peril points on several thousand commodities, it will require an expanded working force in the Tariff Commission many times the present size. Businessmen, farmers, and others could expect a flood of new forms and questionnaries to be filled out and a swarm of investigators to study their costs.

No. 2. The escape clause: Ever since the Trade Agreements Act was proposed and all through the administration of the trade-agreements program, there have been industries which have claimed that they would be injured by the program. There is clear evidence, both in the hearings that precede negotiations and in the congressional hearings in connection with renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, that in very few cases have the fears of injury been justified. However, there are adequate means for preventing or remedying any such injury if it occurs after the agreement has gone into effect.

All the trade agreements which have been signed since 1943, including the general agreement on tariffs and trade, have included an escape clause under which any party to the agreement may modify or withdraw an individual concession if it is found that, as a result of unforeseen circumstances and of the concession, imports of the item in question are occurring in such increased quantity and in such circumstances as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. Under this clause the concession may be either partly or wholly withdrawn, a quota imposed on imports, or a rate of duty even higher than that in effect before the concession may be put into effect.

By joint agreement a substantially identical clause was included on October 13, 1950, in the trade agreement between the United States and Switzerland, concluded in 1936.

For the United States, the escape clause action is administered by the Tariff Commission, which makes its recommendation to the President, directly and without participation of any other Government agency.

An industry claiming injury or threat of injury resulting from a trade-agreement concession applies to the Tariff Commission for an investigation and public hearing. If, in the Commission's opinion, a preliminary examination reveals facts warranting a formal investigation, the Commission conducts one and recommends to the President the action, if any, which should be taken.

Although the United States has made concessions on several thousand items in trade agreements that contain the escape clause, only 20 applications for investigations, covering 17 products, have been filed with the Tariff Commission. Five of these are still pending. Of the 15 which have been disposed of, only 1 (involving women's fur felt hats and hat bodies) was found by the Tariff Commission to justify action. In that case the Tariff Commission recommended withdrawal of the concession and this was done.

The careful application of the safeguards observed before concessions are made and the way concessions are tailored to particular needs are primarily responsible for the fact that need for using the escape clause has been minimized.

Furthermore, modifications and withdrawal of concessions have been made in several agreements signed before 1943 where evidence was submitted or investigation by the Tariff Commission found injury or threat of injury to domestic industries. These included certain types of embroidered handkerchiefs from Switzerland, linen fire hose from Canada, fox furs from Canada, and potatoes from Canada.

In view of this history of the operation of the escape clause as well as the fact that during the 17-year life of the reciprocal trade agreements program no industry has suffered harm or injury and that the value of United States export trade and the world's trade as a whole has doubled, proves that the program has been well administered and that the proposals for amendment are unnecessary.

No. 3. Ban of concessions on foreign farm commodities sold at less than domestic support price: This proposed amendment does not appear to be in the public interest. It would tend to pyramid subsidization, it is inflationary in character, contrary to established policy of the Government, and does not appear administratively sound. Unfortunately, there can be no complete reconciliation between tariff protectionism and the program of price supports for agricultural commodities and the program for multilateral tariff negotiations. Removing of concessions on price-supported agricultural products may well cause other nations to retaliate by withdrawing concessions granted to United States products. Such actions would affect all segments of our economy. Does it seem logical, or just, to permit the operation of the domestic support program to invite almost certain retaliation, on the part of foreign countries, which will restrict the exportation of all types of American products?

No. 4. Forbid President to grant tariff concessions to Communist or satellite countries: The reasons motivating this amendment are easily appreciated. However, it appears to be designed as a measure of economic warfare rather than as a trade or tariff measure. Advantages to be gained will be more than outweighed by disadvantages. Benefits gained by the Soviet Union and her satellite countries are at a minimum as all shipments to iron curtain countries are regulated under the Export Control Act. Important to our economy and to our defense at the present time are certain materials, notably tungsten and manganese, which we are getting from the Soviet Union. Does it seem wise to take a step that would deprive ourselves of needed critical materials?

Another element of this amendment must be given serious consideration. We should remember that the actions of the United States, as determined by the Congress, are the criteria for honorable international behavior. Congressional approval of this amendment might jeopardize our continued efforts to secure an honorable and peaceful way to settle and dissipate world instability. This amendment could prove a tremendous tool of psychological warfare by enabling the Politburo to say that the United States is clearly the aggressor nation since it has taken the initiative in breaking off all commercial relations.

We feel more strongly than ever that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended for 3 years without crippling and unnecessary amendments. Its 17 years of successful administration with a minimum, if any, harm to any segments of the United States economy, should be sufficient recommendation for continuation of the program. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce should reaffirm its position by approving this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted.

T. G. FRANCK,
Chairman, World Trade Committee.
FRANK M. JACOBS,
Acting President, World Trade Association.

Peace Can Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from a forthcoming book by Paul Hoffman, former head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, in which he sets forth his views as to the measures by which the United States can avert a third world war. This excerpt was printed in the New York Herald Tribune on April 18.

I think that his proposal for a unified overseas economic administration, which is substantially similar to a proposal made recently by the International Development Advisory Board, deserves the serious consideration of the Congress.

PEACE CAN BE WON

(By Paul G. Hoffman)

SINGLE ALLOCATION AGENCY FOR FOREIGN AID IS URGED AS BAR TO WASTE AND SPUR TO EFFICIENCY

(This is the seventh of a series of articles condensed from Peace Can Be Won, the forthcoming book by Paul Hoffman, former head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, in which he sets forth his views as to the measures by which the United States can avert a third world war.)

From the standpoint of foreign-aid programs I believe the most important lesson we have learned is this: To get maximum efficiency out of the dollars we spend abroad, we must have only one Government agency with responsibility for allocating all funds. Only by concentrating control over our economic activities abroad in the hands of a single agency can we:

(1) Properly apportion aid among countries (several agencies working separately often tend to give one nation too much help, another too little).

(2) Avoid waste of dollars within a country (two or more agencies often duplicate functions).

(3) Control the impact of our dollars upon the economy of a recipient country (too great a pressure for rearming on a nation of full employment, like Britain, could unduly drive down the standard of living; the same dollars applied to rearming in a nation of unemployment, like Germany, would raise the standard of living).

Therefore I should like to recommend most urgently to the American people and to Congress that an Overseas Economic Administration be formed to administer all aid and technical assistance programs abroad; that this administration have a large measure of control over the policies of such lending agencies as the Export-Import Bank; that United States representatives to all international economic organizations be responsible to it; and that this administration have equal rank with the other departments of the Government, such as State, Commerce, Interior, and that its administrator have Cabinet status.

WOULD TAKE OVER ECA

In effect, I recommend that this proposed Overseas Economic Administration take over the present set-up of ECA; that it absorb the point 4 program now administered by the State Department; that it supervise at least the economic side of all sums to be spent in European rearmament under the mutual defense assistance program. Moreover, American representation in the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, International Trade Organization (when we join) and in all other international government bodies dealing with the world receive its policy direction from such an Overseas Economic Administration.

The sense of interdependence among peoples has given the word politics a new meaning for me. Actually, world politics shapes our lives more tellingly than ward politics. A coffee blight in Brazil, a famine in India, devaluation in Britain, the almost,

perpetual cabinet crises in France, the discovery of uranium ore in Africa, a political assassination in Lebanon, all have an increasingly direct and pervasive influence upon decisions which determine our destiny as individuals and as a people.

What all of this means is that world politics is a vital salient in waging the peace, and that we must have a foreign policy in time of peace which is quite as positive as foreign policy in time of war. Yet it has been only within the last decade that our peacetime foreign policy has been shifting away from the negative toward the positive.

STATE DEPARTMENT HAMPERED

In the broad sense, we all make foreign policy out of our ignorance or out of our knowledge, out of our courage or out of our fear. But the major burden of crystallizing it rests upon the State Department. In coping with this challenge, it is hampered not only by the carry-overs of our ingrained isolationism but also by traditional suspicion of its personnel. I must confess that when I came to Washington I tended to visualize it in terms of striped trousers and wing collars, the mark of an aloof priesthood. I thought of the State Department as an aggregation of cookie pushers whose only diploma was the parchment of snobbism signed by family wealth and connections.

I found out that nothing could be further from the truth. During my 2½ years as ECA Administrator I learned that the State Department is staffed with extremely hard-working, devoted, and competent people. They are drawn from all groups in our society. The very growth of the Department from 5,400 in 1939 to some 24,000 today attests not only to the growth in America's world leadership responsibilities but also to the fact that its qualifications are hardly confined to social position and inherited opulence.

The need for a positive foreign policy to define our relations with all peoples in all parts of the world is of such surpassing importance that I believe the State Department should concentrate all its energies upon this task. It should not dilute its energies nor divert its skills from this transcendent task of policy making by trying to administer a point 4 program or the Voice of America. To engage in these or similar pursuits, instead of delegating them to separate operational agencies, is to confuse staff with line functions.

ADVANTAGES TESTED BY ECA

The advantages of keeping staff and line functions apart have been tested by the Economic Cooperation Administration. ECA was set up as a separate agency to carry out a political aim, a foreign policy directive, by means of an economic-aid program. When the ECA was being established, considerable anxiety was expressed lest the State Department and the ECA get embroiled in jurisdictional disputes. Indeed, Congress was so worried about this possibility that it wrote into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (the enabling legislation for ECA) that the ECA Administrator and the Secretary of State should keep each other fully and currently informed and arrive at mutually acceptable decisions. In case of any moot point which could not be resolved between them, the disagreement was to be laid directly before the President. To date, there has never been a conflict of this kind to take to the President, and I am confident that there will never be one.

Actually, ECA has had the fullest cooperation from the State Department and could not have gone forward successfully without it. I believe that ECA, in turn, by working in the economic field, has helped the State Department move toward one of its major goals: to encourage the peoples of Western Europe to work together more closely than ever before and to perceive more closely the common character of their problems, their opportunities, and their perils. I submit that recent progress in this direction has been due in part to ECA's drive to foster economic integration.

When I made my first visit to Europe as ECA Administrator, back in July 1948, I saw that Western Europe's economy then was like a crazy quilt whose varicolored squares had been cut out but not sewn together. Each nation was striving to be self-sufficient. With this as a goal no single country, nor all 16 of them individually, could possibly make substantial use of the continent's resources. For 50 years, indeed, Western Europe had been moving in the direction of economic nationalism. Countries competed with each other in intensifying trade restrictions, in raising tariffs and in imposing import quotas and exchange controls to protect home industries which were uneconomic and old-fashioned. These impediments to trade naturally made matters worse. They hindered Europe from taking advantage of modern techniques of large-scale, low-cost production which, during those same 50 years, largely accounted for the higher productivity of United States industry and the higher living standards of the American people. The reason is very simple. Large-scale, low-cost production is possible only in a sizable, unified, and unrestricted market area where goods can move freely from factory to consumer.

The harm done by trade barriers among the European nations is best illustrated by comparative production figures between Europe and the United States. In 1900 the per capita output of the European worker and the American worker was virtually the same. Both lived on about the same scale. Yet in 1950 the United States, with a population of 151,000,000, turned out a gross national product of $270,000,000,000 in contrast to the Marshall-plan countries which, with 274,000,000 people, turned out a gross national product of only $170,000,000,000.

The Narcotic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Lynn H. Fairfax, publicity director of Lodge No. 981 of the American Federation of Government Employees, which is, in effect, an experienced dissertation concerning the growth of narcotic addiction in the United States, and recommended congressional action:

The much publicized narcotic situation confronts us at a time when our country is bedeviled with pressing economic and national defense problems. From within, it poses too serious a threat to our teenagers and youth to permit any delayed action because of other problems.

If not checked immediately it also threatens an outburst of crime that will necessitate expanded municipal and State police forces in many sections of our country. New hospital facilities will have to be provided for prolonged treatment of the addicts and the safety of our streets will be endangered. Contrary to the belief held by many persons, there will be no individual isolation from the effects of this situation.

Much confusion exists relative to this problem. A calm study of the facts surrounding the problem will reveal the fact that the Congress and the President of the United States can take the most effective action to suppress it.

Past and present narcotic rings may have engineered this situation by the operation of recruiting services, seeking to expand this vile business through the recruitment of new users. It is significant that our country, with its greater individual monetary wealth, is the only country confronted with this problem.

All narcotics originate outside our boundaries. The very abundant supply in the possession of the countless thousands of individual peddlers throughout our land clearly indicates the necessity of closing more tightly the doors of entry of the illegal traffic from planes, ships, and across our borders.

It must be clear that it is more effective to deprive the individual peddler of his wares than it is to ferret out and arrest him. The Congress can do this.

Any person who brings merchandise or narcotics into the country illegally is a smuggler. The detection of, apprehension, and arrest of smugglers is a function of the Bureau of Customs, which operates the Port Patrol Division and did operate border patrols for many years. Very little publicity has been given this work or the conditions that adversely affect this work.

THE FACTS OF THE PORT PATROL DIVISION

The Port Patrol Division operates cooperatively with but not under the direction of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. It is an armed police force of approximately 1,000 men, carefully selected and screened through oral and written examination, and strategically stationed on docks, at air fields, and in some ports, in radio-equipped mobile cars. It searches vessels and enforces the many laws and regulations of the United States Government.

The individual officer bears the title of customs port patrol officer and is neither an agent nor an inspector.

During more than 40 years on our waterfront areas this Division, known for many years as Customs Guards, has acquired a specialized knowledge of the psychology and craftiness of smugglers, as well as the knowledge of ship construction and operation.

Of particular interest at this time is the narcotic control work performed by this group. Working alone, facing hazards and exposure and rubbing elbows daily with the underworld gangs that hide away on the docks of our larger ports, the individual officer seizes in single operations, at the source of entry into our country, quantities of illegal narcotics sufficient to supply four, five, and six thousand individual peddlers. The customs port patrol officer is the only officer regularly assigned to our docks on a 24-hour basis to apprehend and arrest the narcotic smuggler from the ships, arriving from foreign ports.

It should be noted, however, that other important public service is rendered by this group. High lights are the safeguarding of the public health from diseases which might be brought to us with parrots, monkeys, and other forms of animal life, the protection of agriculture from destructive insects which might accompany various forms of plant life, the protection to our wage earners and to industry through the enforcement of the tariff laws, the apprehension of stowaways who could be subversive subjects, the interception of subversive agents carrying messages to and from other agents employed on ships and the prevention of sabotage to our very important docks in times of war.

The public service it renders entitles it to recognition as one of our major law-enforcement groups, yet its classification under the civil service is lower and not

comparable to any other law-enforcement group.

The potential effectiveness of this group is boundless. Every dock used by freighters or passenger ships arriving from foreign countries is a possible door of entry for the illegal narcotic traffic. One thousand men, divided into three working shifts and with personnel reductions due to days off and illnesses does not permit the coverage of all such docks on our Atlantic and Pacific coasts and in the Gulf ports. The conditions under which the Port Patrol Division operates necessitates the removal of officers from docks where freight vessels are berthed to perform duties in the clearance of travelers through customs control, thereby increasing the number of unattended docks.

Your attention is directed to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 2, page 1921. Here is recorded a letter, written to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK by the Commissioner of Customs at that time concerning a reduction made by the Appropriations Committee to the Customs appropriation for the fiscal year of 1948. Three paragraphs in that letter are very significant and are as follows:

"Reference is made to your telephone request for immediate and detailed information concerning the effect the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in cutting by $3,500,000 the estimates for the appropriation, collecting the revenue from customs 1948, will have on the Customs Service if it stands.

"Careful examination of the possibilities for meeting this situation satisfies me that the only activity that can be discontinued without a substantial revision of statutory law is that directed toward the prevention of smuggling. While this is a clear statutory duty of the Customs Service, there is no statutory prescription as to how it shall be conducted and the effectiveness of our smuggling control has always depended upon the action of the Congress furnishing funds.

"Other functions of the Customs Service create bottlenecks through which all carriers, goods and travelers entering our country must pass. The treatment to be given these carriers, goods, and travelers is prescribed by law and the Customs Service must operate to permit their passage through the customs control, and to keep records and accounts required by law in connection with their movement and the collections of the revenue incident thereto."

The significance of these paragraphs is deepened when considered with a statement made by the Commissioner of Narcotics on April 14, 1947, and recorded in a public document concerning the hearings of the United States Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Excerpts of the question and answer testimony of the Commissioner of Narcotics as recorded on pages 73 and 74 of that document are as follows:

"Senator THYE. The customs officials stand down here at the dock, at the gangplank, watching the people coming in off the ships at the debarkation, and the narcotics agent is down there with the customs official; is he not?

"Mr. ANSLINGER. No, sir.

"Senator THYE. Who determines whether any individual is carrying any narcotics ashore from the ship?

"Mr. ANSLINGER. That is the customs patrol officer, the Customs Service.

"Senator THYE. Then they will apprehend the man if the customs official finds he has opium or any other type of narcotic in his possession, after they have examined his personal belongings in every conceivable manner? Then where do you function in this activity?

"Mr. ANSLINGER. The customs follow that case right to the courts. They tell us about it, and we find out whether the man has any connections. If he has, we work together on it. We work together on joint cases where there is smuggling.

"Senator THYE. You must spend an awful lot of time to figure out whose duty it is to take this case and whose duty it is to take that case.

"Mr. ANSLINGER. No, sir; not a bit. The line is so clear that we never have difficulty along that line.

"Senator THYE. The customs officials down in Norfolk or up in New York or any other port where a passenger vessel docks or a freight vessel docks, and where there is the possibility of an individual carrying narcotics across, do all the supervision?

"Mr. ANSLINGER. That is right."

Gentlemen of the Congress, think upon the facts. They are the same today as they were when the Commissioner of Customs wrote his letter and the Commissioner of Narcotics gave his testimony. The customs port patrol officer is the only obstacle to the unhampered flow of illegal narcotics from our docks. He is the only law-enforcement officer regularly assigned on a 24-hour basis to apprehend and arrest narcotic smugglers on our water-front areas.

The customs service has not had the appropriations or the men to operate their border patrol at all, and for this same reason so many of our docks are unattended as to make United States narcotic control nothing more than a sieve. Because of the statutory situation, customs port patrol officers are removed from docks to perform duties in the clearance of travelers. Can it be believed that the American people desire the apprehension and arrest of narcotic smugglers to be the only activity of the customs service that can be discontinued or curtailed without substantial revision of statutory law?

RECOMMENDED CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The Congress of the United States should recognize the port patrol division of the United States customs service as the major law-enforcement body that it is and should enact a statutory law that will assure that a customs port patrol officer is on every dock where any possibility of smuggling may exist, said assignments to continue without interruption as long as any cargo in which packages of narcotics may be hidden remains upon the pier. The same statutory law should reestablish the border patrol of the customs service upon a basis that will permit short and frequent patrols.

The customs port patrol officer should be classified under the civil service under the same classification held by other law-enforcement groups.

The Congress should appropriate, as a supplemental appropriation if necessary, sufficient funds to finance this.

Stiffer penalties should be enacted for those persons convicted of attempting to smuggle narcotics.

The cost of the recommended action will be returned to the Government, at least in part, through the collection of fines and will be relatively small as compared to the costs of expanded municipal police forces and the provision of hospitals and hospital care for addicts.

Many civic and parent organizations are alarmed by the increase of drug addiction among teen-age school children. The Queensboro Federation of Mothers Clubs of Queens County, N. Y., with a membership of 60,000 parents, has conducted an exhaustive investigation of the narcotic problem during the past 2 years. On January 20, 1951, the delegate assembly of this organization, meeting in the Hotel Statler in New York City, unanimously passed a resolution urging municipal and Federal officials to increase their respective staffs of law-enforcement officers to prevent the growth of narcotic addiction in our schools. This organization endorses the congressional action recommended in this thesis.

The New York City Federation of Womens Clubs, with a membership of 200,000, equally interested in the welfare of our youth and teen-age school children, has accepted the proposition submitted to their organization by the Queensboro Federation of Mothers Clubs urging the enactment of Federal legislation to assure the reestablishment of the United States Border Patrol of the United States Customs Service and for the assignment of port patrol officers at all airfields used by planes arriving from foreign lands; also for the uninterrupted assignment of such officers at all piers and docks where any ship arriving from any foreign port is berthed, and for the other recommendations contained in this thesis.

Reason Succeeds to Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been gratified by the change in tone of my mail since the joint meeting of the Congress to hear Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

In common with other Members, I received, in the 10-day period immediately following the general's relief from his commands in the Far East, a great deal of rather hysterical mail, terrifying in its implication that so many people in the United States could desire, emotionally, a military dictatorship and could almost deify a distinguished soldier who has not set foot in the United States in 14 years.

It would appear that I was more fortunate than other Members in receiving, at the same time, a considerable volume of very reasonable mail offering support to the position of the President, and that mail is continuing.

It is noteworthy that, almost without exception, the communications I received which indicated support of President Truman did not in any way deprecate General MacArthur's very real gifts and accomplishments; they were addressed rather to the crucial question of constitutional responsibilities and authority. Among these were a number of messages from substantial, recognized groups; under leave, I am inserting a number of these in the RECORD, as follows, together with three individual letters typical of scores of others:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 19, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New York Engineers, CIO, wishes you to know, that in regular meeting assembled April 18, 1951, a motion was passed without a dissenting voice completely supporting President Truman in his removal of General MacArthur for insubordination. Our organization wishes you to understand that we are opposed to any attempt by military forces to supersede civilian authority of the President and the peoples' representatives in Congress. We have great respect for General MacArthur's record but we feel the President must of necessity take the advice

of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in military matters rather than the advice of one individual general. We hope you will do nothing that may lead eventually to making our civilian government subordinate to the military as has happened in so many other countries.

EARL KING,
Business Manager, MEBA, No. 33.

NEW YORK STATE CIO COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., April 19, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are forwarding to you the enclosed copy of a statement adopted by this organization's executive board in meeting at the Hotel Statler, New York, April 18, 1951.

Copies of this expression of support for President Truman's action in the case of General MacArthur are also being sent to the President and to the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS HOLLANDER,
President.
HAROLD J. GARNO,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW YORK STATE CIO COUNCIL,
April 18, 1951.

STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT'S ACTION RE MACARTHUR

The executive board of the New York State CIO Council fully endorses President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur from his commands.

In reaffirming civilian control over the military, the President has strengthened a vital democratic principle. In making clear the determination of our country to use its fighting strength most effectively to advance the cause of peace and freedom, he has strengthened our leadership in the world.

The President's action was in the best interests of the Nation and its purposes in this time of world crisis. The artificial storms which are being whipped up by reactionary newspapers and politicians for selfish and unpatriotic purposes cannot obscure that fact.

We are certain that the overwhelming majority of the American people join with us in approval of the President's stand.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 20, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our organization consisting of over 20,000 members in the metropolitan area of New York City are squarely behind President Truman in connection with his removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. His action again reaffirms the basic American tradition that this country is governed and controlled by civilians and not by military. We are in full support of President Truman's position against aggression and for the prevention of World War III.

LAUNDRY WORKERS JOINT BOARD OF GREATER NEW YORK, ACWA,
LOUIS SIMON, *Manager.*

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
New York, N. Y., April 18, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You will find attached a statement of the New York City chapter of Americans for Democratic Action dealing with General MacArthur's removal by President Truman.

Inasmuch as this whole situation has become a problem of great debate and public concern, we should appreciate very much having your views on this matter for presentation to both our board of directors and our membership.

Sincerely,

EVELYN DUBROW,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT ON GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, ADOPTED BY THE NEW YORK CITY CHAPTER OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1951

The New York City Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action joins with other New Yorkers in extending a warm welcome home to General MacArthur, after his absence of 14 years. There are none who will deny his brilliant service to his country during World War II and his right to acclaim for it by the American people.

However, the traditional welcome to this celebrated military figure should not be confused with the partisan ends of cynical politicians seeking to make capital of the general's position. In the present acclaim of General MacArthur for his past achievements, it must not be forgotten that the implications of his publicly stated views are a serious threat to his own country. The points that should be borne in mind are:

1. The basis of our democracy is in the constitutional authority given civilian over military authority. A number of other nations have become military dictatorships because of the abrogation of this principle.

2. This country's foreign policy is based on the assumption that Europe is the crucial continent in our cold war with Russia. If Russia takes over the industrial centers of Europe with their potential production, her additional strength would far outweigh that of the United States. General MacArthur, with his publicly-stated opinion (political, not military) that Asia is more important, has flouted the policy of the United States. He has offended our Atlantic Pact allies by saying that "here (in Asia) we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight it with words." This implies that he believes that issues should be settled through war rather than through negotiations which is contrary to the stated objectives of the United Nations.

3. General MacArthur has disobeyed not only his Commander in Chief, President Truman, but also the Joint Chiefs of Staff, their Chairman, General Bradley, and Secretary of Defense Marshall. Would General MacArthur himself have tolerated such insubordination?

4. Disservice is being done this country both here and abroad by creating doubt as to what our foreign policy really is and as to how consistent we are in sustaining it. The President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are in a far better position to evaluate world issues and world strategy, and they are united in their opposition to General MacArthur's proposals.

The fate of free government continuously hangs upon the maintenance of basic principles: ADA believes that President Truman has built for America a significant milepost in our history by upholding our principles during this crisis.

Because of these facts, and because ADA agrees with President Truman that we are trying to prevent a world war, not start one, and the cause of world peace is more important than any individual, the New York City ADA commends President Truman for removing General MacArthur from office, doing his duty as prescribed in the Constitution and demonstrating to our allies and to the United Nations that they can rely on our good faith in the defense of the free world.

THE NEW YORK YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 18, 1951.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: At its last meeting on April 12, 1951, the board of directors of the New York Young Democratic Club passed the following resolution in approval of your recall of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur:

"*Resolved*, That—

"We congratulate you on your courageous reaffirmation of the constitutional principles of our democracy;

"You have carried out your clear-cut obligations as President in exercising civilian control over the military."

I take great pleasure in transmitting this resolution to you and in assuring you of our continued support on this matter.

Most respectfully yours,

RICHARD S. LANE,
Corresponding Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to record my strong approval of the action of President Truman in removing from his post a general officer who has left no doubt of his refusal to respect established lines of command or to accept our basic democratic principle subordinating the military to the civilian authority of the United States.

As an attorney, as a veteran of over 3 years of Army service, and as a citizen concerned with the maintenance of our democratic government and republican traditions, I have thought carefully about the issues reportedly involved in this matter. My considered opinion is that President Truman has acted with courage and high purpose to attain and maintain a concept of government that is of greater moment to our Nation than any political or strategic concepts regarding our policy in Korea, Asia, or perhaps anywhere else in the world.

Consequently, I urge that you give to our President the strongest possible support that your office, personal prestige, and superior abilities can muster.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KAPLAN,
Counselor at Law.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: I have just written President Truman and Senators Lehman and Ives stating my wholehearted support of Mr. Truman's actions in the MacArthur case. I want to put myself on the record to you, my Representative.

This is the first time I have ever been moved to write a President, Senator, or Representative, but I feel strongly that this MacArthur dismissal has had a profound effect on the American public and that your mail may not be an accurate barometer of public opinion.

You must be aware that in these cases the antis always write. You must further be aware that the supporters of General MacArthur, many of them of extreme right-wing persuasion, are much more likely to write than those who back the President.

Mr. Truman's strategy of confining the war to Korea, as Messrs. Lippmann and Reston have pointed out, is the only sane policy. The alternative is a disastrous, full-scale Pacific war.

I hope you will do your part to see, as General Eisenhower hopefully put it, that MacArthur will not be permitted to become a controversial figure. I do not see why a dismissed general should enjoy an audience before a joint session of Congress. The need today is for national unity and those who are rushing to the general's support are doing so in the hot flush of partisan politics.

Very truly yours,

BURTON R. BENJAMIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 18, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the MacArthur incident, it is my personal opinion that the President has acted wisely and with great courage.

We must never let the military authority take precedence in any way over our civil authority. I believe that General MacArthur has increased the area of tension for a third world war and, for that reason, I consider him ill-fit to represent the nations of the world as their commander.

As my Representative in Washington, I trust that you will express this opinion, if the need arises.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN R. ANDERSON.

Truman Will Go Down in History as the President Who Refused To Surrender the People's Trust to the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the removal of General MacArthur by the President was a matter of military discipline. No military man is bigger than the Department of Defense—most important, no military man is bigger than his country.

General MacArthur has served his Nation well. He deserves the great tribute a grateful Nation has been paying to him since his return to this country for the first time in 14 years, during which time he has been giving unselfishly of his time and efforts in the fulfillment of his duties.

But even General MacArthur with his great prestige cannot place himself above the Constitution of the United States. We have a civilian government. Civilians direct our foreign and domestic policy. President Truman's courageous action in removing such a popular military hero was a step toward continuing that great tradition of civilian control in America.

I feel, as does the writer of the following editorial which recently appeared in the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times of Thursday, April 12, 1951, that General MacArthur will go down as one of the greatest of all soldiers, not only in American history, but in world history, and that Harry Truman will go down in history as the President who refused to surrender the people's trust to the military. The editorial:

PRESERVATION OF CIVIL AUTHORITY

Last night President Harry Truman wisely used radio and television to explain to the American people just why he took the drastic step of removing General MacArthur from all of his four commands. The President put the matter on a plane above that of personalities, both General MacArthur's and his own. The core of his explanation was, "We do not want to see the conflict in Korea extended. We are trying to prevent a world war—not to start one." To bomb Manchuria and China and to assist Chinese Nationalist troops to land on the mainland of China would be "running a very grave risk of starting a general war. If that were to happen, we would have brought about the exact situation we are trying to prevent."

It is precisely this risk that General MacArthur wants the United States to take. To change foreign policy and broad military strategy the general made various utterances in direct violation of orders for him to clear his statements with Washington. After the latest warning given him in Tokyo on Monday by Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., MacArthur made it clear that he intended to continue leading public pressure and virtually dared his President and Commander in Chief to remove him.

Harry Truman took the dare. Acting as President and Commander in Chief, acting in behalf of the whole constitutional principle of the supremacy of the civil authority over the military, he removed General MacArthur from all his commands, as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief; United Nations Command; Command; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East.

Douglas MacArthur gave Harry Truman no other choice—except to remove him or to admit to the American people that not their elected civil leader but an appointed military leader was calling the tune.

General MacArthur was pressing for an extension of the war theater to include continental China. This would be the end of all hopes for a negotiated settlement. It would be a major gamble that the Soviet Union would not honor its treaty commitment to aid China in case of attack. If this major gamble was won, there would still be the minor but enormous gamble that Red China could be defeated by airpower, seapower and the landpower of the Nationalist government which were defeated on the mainland 18 months ago. If this major gamble were lost, then world war III would be underway in the area where the United States is least prepared to fight it—in the morasses of Asia, with its vast spaces and limitless manpower. Under all circumstances General MacArthur's policy would put Asia above Europe. It would put the United States in a war where many of the non-Communist nations would regard us as the aggressor. It would divide the United States sharply from its main allies, Great Britain, France, and Canada.

Harry Truman is being bitterly criticized on the grounds of both his policy and his action. But no one can accuse him of not having been patient with MacArthur.

A member of General MacArthur's staff is quoted as saying concerning Harry Truman, "He will lose the next election—and then some." That may be so. That is unimportant. The Presidency of the United States is an office that endures beyond the terms of the particular men who occupy it. The military authority of the United States is a power that endures beyond the men who wield it, even though they be as brilliant and strong as Douglas MacArthur. What is important is that the military remain an arm of the civil authority over which the people have control.

Harry Truman will go down in history as a President who made many mistakes. But at least he will not go down in history as the President who surrendered the people's trust to the military.

In spite of the tragic ending to his magnificent career, Gen. Douglas MacArthur will go down as one of the greatest of all soldiers, not only in American history, but in world history.

The American people are fortunate that to take General MacArthur's commands they have a replacement of the large stature and proven ability of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. The important thing now is to get on with the job—the job of winning or settling the war in Korea; the job of arming to prevent world war III or to win it if it is forced upon us, the job of constructing that stable and peaceful world for which humanity yearns.

General MacArthur has been invited by Republican leaders to address a joint session of Congress, and he has accepted the invitation. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in Europe expressed the hope that MacArthur will not return to the United States and become a controversial figure. This was perhaps too much for which to hope. General MacArthur is eager to be heard, and many people are eager to hear him. But it is not too much to hope that despite the debate the American people will close ranks and face up to the challenge of the times.

MacArthur's War Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the New Republic of April 23, 1951, speaks for itself. I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

MACARTHUR'S WAR PARTY

The uproar that has followed the removal of General MacArthur shows how necessary that removal was. The general had made himself the head of a political clique, mainly but not wholly inside the Republican Party. Only now does the public get a chance to realize how deep was his divisive effort, or how far it had gone.

MacArthur was not a mere soldier taking orders, as he has tried to picture himself. He was the head of an open conspiracy against the policy of the Government he was sworn to serve. Long before his dismissal by the President, his attitude and that of his supporters had done much to deepen the split in the American Government, to confuse and weaken our relations with the United Nations, and thereby to hamper the war effort in Korea.

The forceful action of President Truman has stripped the general of the power to interfere directly in the policies of his country any longer. MacArthur must now carry on his political activity in the open without benefit of the military disguise. The common sense of the American people will doubtless reject the undemocratic philosophy of militarism for which he stands when it is nakedly presented to them. However, the clique of which MacArthur is the mouthpiece will not be easily daunted. They are dangerous men, bound together by an evil design which they will be slow to relinquish. It is an incongruous crew made up partly of those who advocate an immediate world war in order to prevent one, and in part of isolationists at heart who support MacArthur on the theory that if he were given his way we could in a few months retire behind our own shores and pull them up over us. His domestic support is the Tory wing of journalism and of politics—the people who scream "Communist" at everyone who disagrees with them, the enemies of Roosevelt who are still fighting his spirit 6 years after he went to his grave.

Typical of the lost battalion who have found in the general their leader is James H. Rand who has announced that MacArthur will become an official of his Remington-Rand Corp. The ultra-conservative, ultra-isolationist Rand has admitted long-continued support, including gifts of at least

$5,200 to Merwin K. Hart's notorious National Economic Council, long known for its inveterate love of dictators and for its doctrines of "white, Nordic supremacy" here at home. Rand's company became famous in the 1930's for perfecting the Mohawk Valley plan for strikebreaking, widely adopted by antilabor employers. In his new job MacArthur will be associated with another ex-soldier, former Gen. Leslie R. Groves, now a vice president of Remington-Rand, who was also fired by Truman for attempting to put military authority above civilian control in development of atomic energy.

As his political manager, MacArthur will doubtless retain the services of Gen. Courtney Whitney, his aide in Tokyo, a lawyer who has always been a political rather than a military adviser. The cluster of international big-business men who frequent the Waldorf Towers and have followed the unglamorous star of Herbert Hoover in the past will be a ready-made court for the deposed general, as well as eager financiers of any political projects MacArthur may desire to launch.

There will be rich and unscrupulous men for MacArthur to command in his new role. It is important, therefore, to examine what would happen if the General actually got his way.

On purely military grounds, the MacArthur policy for immediate war against China would likely be disastrous.

MacArthur appears to believe that if we engage in total war with China, Russia would not come in. Russia and China have a mutual defense pact pledging each of them to go to war if the other is attacked by any third power. It is true that Russia has broken many pledges in recent years, but it is inconceivable that she could break this one except at a cost in prestige and power she could not afford to pay.

MacArthur believes we could win a quick victory over China; Japan made the same mistake in 1937. It is straining our military resources today to hold our own in the Korean Peninsula, with masses of South Korean troops engaged and with a dozen other UN nations giving support.

MacArthur believes that Chiang's army on Formosa could successfully invade the mainland without the use of American troops. This army of a few hundred thousand men is practically without equipment of the type needed for an invasion. Remember the long years it took the United States to prepare for the Normandy invasion, even with England as a base, and with supply lines thousands of miles shorter; multiply the difficulties of the Normandy landing by 10 and you may be somewhere near the problem a Nationalist invasion presents.

The MacArthur who makes these recommendations is certainly the one who let the entire air force in the Philippines be destroyed on the ground just after Pearl Harbor, the man who divided the army in Korea last November and let it be trapped in one of the worst military reverses in our history.

In the First and Second World Wars the United States had powerful allies who spilled their blood for us while we were making up our minds that it was our war, too. In the struggle in Korea we were able to persuade the United Nations to join us in putting down aggression; but there would be no such action if we now went to war with Communist China on MacArthur's terms. We would lose our most important ally, Great Britain. We would lose the support of the UN, and that body would be destroyed.

To repeat in words of one syllable what everyone knows except MacArthur and his followers:

The democratic world, and most of all the United States, is not yet strong enough in a military sense to fight the Communist bloc on one front, to say nothing of two. We will not be prepared to withstand attack for several years longer. The one overwhelming objective in the meantime is to try to prevent Russia from attacking in Europe, which, with its tremendous industrial installations, is the one great prize in the world struggle. If we can hold Europe, we have a good prospect of holding the world; if we lose, victory is against us.

It may be that Russia will strike before we are ready, no matter what we do or don't do. But if MacArthur's advice were followed if we plunged into the quagmire of China, Stalin would almost certainly strike in Europe, and the United States would be helpless to give the democracies of the west the aid they need and have been promised.

MacArthur's abortive "peace offer" to the Chinese Communists stopped a carefully thought-out proposal of the same character that the United Nations (with the general's knowledge) was about to make. Now that he is out of the way, efforts to end the war on an honorable basis can be pursued. The aggression against South Korea which prompted the UN to take up arms has been successfully checkmated; the invaders have been driven back across the line from which the attack was launched. The war is costing the North Koreans and the Chinese Communists a terrible price. This is the moment for a fresh, determined effort to end the war on terms which will discourage future aggression and strengthen the arm of the UN.

The antagonisms that now divide the world cannot be wiped out in short order. But the desire of peoples all over the world for peace has seldom in history been so great. Patience and steadfastness of purpose are what is called for. These qualities are among the hardest for democracies to develop, but they are nonetheless the essential ones for us to cultivate today. We must perfect the defenses of the free world, always with the objective of a future in which large armament will have no place. The presence of MacArthur in the explosive Far East was a constant danger. His removal permits the resumption of a resolute course toward peace.

Pius XII and World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article written by Rev. Edward A. Conway, S. J., which appeared in the April 28 issue of America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "Pius XII and World Federation":

PIUS XII AND WORLD FEDERATION

(By Edward A. Conway, S. J.)

("If winter comes, my Federalist friends exclaim, can spring be far behind?" Thus wrote Father Conway some 2 years ago in an America article on the world federalist movement. For American Catholics who believe in world federation it has been a bleak 2-years' winter since then. But the Holy Father's recent address to delegates of the World Federalist Congress at Rome gives promise of better days.)

The more I study the April 6 discourse of the Holy Father, in which he gave his approbation to the World Federalist movement, the warmer grows my sense of satisfaction. As I write, I have before me the text of his address in French and two unofficial English translations, neither of which can be considered definitive. I hope that we shall soon have an authorized English version, because the discourse, being the first formal papal pronouncement on world government, has profound significance for all students of world affairs. Scholars will be analyzing and interpreting it for months to come. They should have the authentic thought of the Holy Father to work on.

The original text richly repays detailed study. At the very first reading it was obvious to me that here was more than just another extempore greeting to a group of pilgrims. I thought, as I read, that the Holy Father must have worked over that address as carefully as he did over any of his famed Christmas allocutions. I have since been told that his holiness confided to one of his auditors afterward that he had stayed up late the night before to complete the text of his discourse, and that previously he had spent many hours in consultation about it. It seems obvious that the Holy Father had determined to make a major policy pronouncement, and just as obvious that he had determined to use the World Federalist Congress as the occasion for it.

Some of the satisfaction that warms me comes, I confess, from personal considerations. I have been hard pressed at times to defend my presence (with a Catholic bishop) on the national advisory board of United World Federalists, Inc. UWF is the largest membership group among the 70 constituent organizations in 27 countries which make up the world movement for world federal government. The unfortunate and, for me, embarrassing fact is that many American Catholics have been turned against world federalism, and specifically against United World Federalists, by the absurd charge that the entire federalist movement is a Communist conspiracy. Almost daily during the past 3 years I have received letters from Catholics—some inquiring, some indignant—about my part in the federalist movement. It would have been much easier for me to answer them if the Holy Father had ever made a clear-cut and quotable statement dealing directly with world federal government. Unfortunately for me and other Catholic federalists, up to April 6, 1951, he had not.

It was always possible, of course, to prove that a Catholic could be a Catholic and a federalist. But it was necessary to string together texts from the Pope's Christmas allocutions—a hint here and a hint there—sufficient, however, to prove to the unprejudiced that "the new world order" desired by the Pope was actually some form of world federal government. But it was an unsatisfactory business at best, complicated and prohibitively time consuming.

I tried another tack some time ago (America, December 4, 1948, Catholics and World Federation) by arguing not from textual but from circumstantial evidence. On November 11, 1948, the Holy Father had addressed 300 members of the European Union of Federalists at Castel Gandolfo. EUF is a federation of European federalist groups and is closely aligned with the world movement for world federal government. The Holy Father told the European federalists that it was high time to establish a European union. "Some," he added, "are even asking themselves whether it is not already too late."

My World Federalist friends, I reported, were much encouraged by the Holy Father's partial support:

"Even though the Holy Father, they reason, said nothing explicitly about world federation, his warm approval of European federation will surely give immense impetus to their movement and hasten thereby the larger development they desire."

I added—naively, I know now—that I was inclined to agree with my World Federalist friends. My article ended with the observation:

"American Catholics could make a distinctively Catholic and definitely valuable contribution to the World Federalist movement. It remains to be seen whether the Pope's Armistice Day address will inspire them to do so. At the very least we may expect the more perceptive among them to begin taking an interest in federalism, since it so obviously interests the Pope."

Earlier in the article I had warned the Federalists that "Catholics are curiously and often callously indifferent to noninfallible papal pronouncements." But I was totally unprepared for and correspondingly appalled by what followed. Most of the more perceptive Catholics remained indifferent to federalism, while the less perceptive began to take what I must call a violent interest in the destruction of the whole movement.

Catholic newspapers reprinted the misrepresentations of Merwin K. Hart's rabidly nationalistic economic council letter, and quoted approvingly from Joseph P. Kamp's We Must Abolish the United States, which asserts that the aims and objectives of the American Federalists add up to treason. Indeed treasonous, traitorous, and unpatriotic were among the milder epithets hurled at Catholic Federalists by fellow Catholics. For a time we dismissed these denunciations as being merely what Pius XII called in 1948 "the aberrations of an intransigent nationalism which denies or spurns the common bonds linking the nations together."

It was not long, however, before similar attacks came from more responsible Catholic quarters, based only too obviously on the same poisonous sources. Moreover, authorized representatives of respectable Catholic organizations began to appear before State legislatures demanding the repeal of long-standing world-government resolutions. Thanks to this Catholic intervention, some legislatures either repealed or modified them.

United World Federalists, chief beneficiary of this "Catholic interest in federalism," and much disturbed by it, asked its most prominent Catholic member to do something about it. He is Thomas H. Mahony, Boston attorney, former president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, now chairman of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs, and for 3 years chairman of the UWF policy committee. Mr. Mahony tried to lift the level of the debate by compiling Parallel Thinking, Catholic and Federalist, Upon the Organization of the World for Peace. Under five headings: Disarmament; Security and Preparedness; National Sovereignty and its Limitation; Amendments of the United Nations Charter; A Federated World, he compared Catholic statements from St. Augustine to Pius XII with corresponding UWF proposals. Eschewing all argument, Mr. Mahony simply asked his readers to "draw their own reasonable inferences from the comparison." The similarities were sensational.

The booklet was published last September (15 cents, Thomas H. Mahony, 10 State Street, Boston 9, Mass.). But it seems to have made little impression in some Catholic communities—Baltimore, for example. Catholic anti-Federalism reached its apogee there with the appearance of the Baltimore edition of the Catholic Review of February 16, 1951. Under a screaming headline: "Catholics backing anti-Federalist move," the diocesan weekly revealed—it must have had its own revelation—that "almost every Catholic in this archdiocese is expressing support of a resolution * * * up before the Maryland House of Delegates which voices strong objections to the idea of world government as proposed by the Federalists." The Maryland Action Guild, the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic War Veterans were "solidly lined up" with the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Daughters of the American Revolution, Children of the American Revolution, the Minute Women of Maryland, and the Daughters of 1812. The Federalist resolutions, said the Catholic spokesmen, "collided with Catholic patriotic principles." One Louis Carroll, "speaking for the Maryland Action Guild, said that World Federalists were most surely moving into the footsteps of Lenin and Stalin" (Catholic Review, Feb. 23, 1951, p. 3).

Do you wonder that I as a World Federalist, felt grateful relief and warm satisfaction when I read these words in the Holy Father's April 6 discourse:

"Your movement (the World Movement for a World Federal Government) dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the church, or better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate or illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances. It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race."

That solemn approbation should end once and for all the argument as to whether a Catholic can be a Federalist. Whether it inspires Catholics to work actively in the Federalist movement remains, as I remarked once before, "to be seen." For my part, I cannot recall a more forthright papal endorsement of any movement, either Catholic, or, as this happens to be, nonsectarian.

Some Catholics, of course, are already saying that the Pope approved only the general ideal of a far-in-the-future world state, not any concrete program for its proximate realization. None but nationalist die-hards would deny that he was talking on April 6 to a definite group with a definite, even though not detailed, program. The Pope implied clearly enough, it seems to me, that the world political organization must be realized as rapidly as possible "if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race"—the current race, not one in the problematical future.

The World Federal Government which W. M. W. F. G. proposes and which the Holy Father has endorsed is a strictly limited one. During its Roman Congress, its fourth, by the way, the movement outlined the powers of that government in its declaration to the foreign ministers of the four great powers, to all the governments of the nations, and to the world's war-weary peoples:

"The time has come when the nations and peoples of the world must create an all-inclusive world federal government which can guarantee to each nation security against attack by others. Such a government must have the power:

"1. To prohibit by law the right of nations to use force or the threat of force in international affairs.

"2. To make laws binding upon individuals and national governments prohibiting the construction or possession of armaments beyond that required for internal police purposes, and to administer an agreed schedule for universal disarmament.

"3. To maintain adequate and effective civilian inspection and police forces to assure that the world law affecting armaments is respected.

"4. To bring to trial in world courts any individuals and groups who conspire to build weapons of war in violation of world law."

Catholics who fear that a world state possessing those powers would swallow up their personal liberties overlook the world federalist proviso that—

"All powers not expressly delegated to the world federal government should be reserved to the nations and their peoples, thus leaving each nation its choice of its own domestic political, economic, social, and religious institutions."

In his Parallel Thinking, Thomas Mahony made it clear that "these proposals do not envisage a superstate in which nations would be merged and lose their identity and domestic autonomy—a unitary state or empire. They contemplate complete autonomy of each nation in its national or domestic field. They merely propose a limitation of the external authority or sovereignty of nations—the right to make war."

"Absolute sovereignty," of course, is the motto emblazoned on the banners of the embattled Catholic opponents of world government. I very much fear that a mistaken notion about sovereignty inspires their charge that world federalism is opposed to Catholic patriotic principles. To put it bluntly, I am afraid that they have never accepted that traditional doctrine of the church with which, according to the Holy Father, the world federalist movement is actually in accord. What is that traditional doctrine? Pius XII forcefully defined it in his Christmas message of 1945:

"The Catholic doctrine on the state and civil society has always been based on the principle that, in keeping with the will of God, the nations form together a community with a common aim and common duties. Even when the proclamation of this principle and its practical consequences gave rise to violent reactions, the church denied her assent to the erroneous concept of an absolutely autonomous sovereignty divested of all social obligations."

Is it too much to hope that the Holy Father's latest interpretation of that principle and its practical consequences—the ceding to a world government of enough national sovereignty to save the world from catastrophic war—will not "give rise to violent reactions"? My modest hope is that it will inspire all American Catholics to study this remarkable document. Every one of its paragraphs is pregnant with meaning. Almost every one of its lines reminds one of more extended treatment of the same topic in other papal pronouncements.

I hope, too, that the Holy Father's discourse will arouse new interest in Guido Gonella's A World to Reconstruct. Cardinal Stritch's Bishops' Committee on the Pope's Peace Plan published it in 1944 through Bruce of Milwaukee. My esteemed associate, Father LaFarge, predicted at the time (America, September 5, 1944) that the book would produce wide enlightenment. Would that it had. Signor Gonella, most authoritative interpreter of the mind of Pius XII on the problem of world order, may still be, in Father LaFarge's phrase, "strong medicine." But I question whether, in view of the Pope's recent pronouncement, he still is "much stronger medicine than most people in this country and most of our politicians are prepared to swallow." Is it too much to ask that a revised version of Gonella be published promptly?

In view of the widespread misapprehension that all World Federalists are Communist conspirators, it is unfortunate that in the story on the Pope's April 6 discourse distributed by the NC News Service his concluding remarks were omitted. I add them here to reassure and inspire all Catholic Federalists:

"Therein [solving the problem of a world political organization] lies a vast field of work, study, and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to you our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray God to grant you His light and His help in the performance of your task."

May thousands of American Catholics soon merit that benediction. May theirs be the mission of helping the World Federalists to skirt the pitfalls which His Holiness warned against in his cordial endorsement of their movement.

Clarify Our Far East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, April 23, 1951:

Greetings: The fat is in the fire.

President Truman's recall of General MacArthur has touched off one of the hottest issues of this century. At the moment tempers are running high. One is supposed to be for or against, with the few reasonable souls who stand in the middle exposed to a murderous cross-fire.

Where this chain reaction will lead to nobody knows.

The differing viewpoints dramatized by the firing of General MacArthur will have much to do with the outcome of the Presidential campaign of 1952. Much can happen within the next 18 months, both in the United States and in the much larger area of the world itself, to alter the present circumstances and the opinions we now hold.

It is strange that so many Americans have leaped to positive and emotional judgments, pro and con, without first considering the background facts.

I believe that most Americans approve of our policy in Europe. It is realistic and it can point to certain definite accomplishments. By extending vigorous help to Greece and Turkey, we prevented Communist imperialism from breaking out into the Mediterranean. Through the Marshall plan we helped to rebuild the war-shattered and discouraged nations of Europe, eliminating the despair on which communism thrives. By the Atlantic Pact we are starting to build up the collective military strength to resist aggression. This is a hard job and one that will take time. To manage it we have assigned one of our best men, General Eisenhower.

Other nations will have to pitch in and help because we do not possess the power to be equally strong in Europe and in Asia. A choice had to be made, and priority was given to Europe. The industrial plant and resources of Europe, much greater than those of the Far East, must not fall into the hands of Communist Russia. Stalin is deterred only by our head start in the development of atomic weapons and by our industrial might. If he could seize Europe and add its production to that of his empire, our advantage would be canceled and he would then feel confident to attack us. The President and the State Department, Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and Bradley, and many Republican Senators and Representatives from the Northeast recognize that Europe is the key to our survival and insist that we concentrate our efforts there.

We cannot, however, neglect Asia.

The main strength of our Navy, under Republican and Democratic administrations, has been stationed in the Pacific, and in that fact we have a clue to the importance of that region in our security planning. Pearl Harbor, in Hawaii, which is 2,000 miles west of San Francisco, was the first target of the Japanese attack. They understood its strategic value.

The Truman-MacArthur controversy can be dangerous if it is used for partisan advantage. On the other hand, it can be a wholesome challenge if it succeeds in bringing all the facts out into the open so that the American people can decide what our security requirements in the far Pacific should be, and then support that plan with unity. We do not believe in secret diplomacy that considers itself so superior that it does not take the American people into its confidence. We may be wrong in our suspicions, and we hope that we are. But there is a growing doubt in the American mind. Merely the possibility of appeasement in Asia fills us with dread. We cannot charge off our 60,000 casualties in Korea to sporting losses in the game of international chess. We do not relish diplomacy which becomes so involved in scheming that it ties itself up in knots at our expense. We went into Korea for a principle, and that was to defeat bare-faced aggression and to discourage future aggression. We carried the ball for the UN in order to establish that principle firmly, once and for all. Every small nation in the world thanked God for our courageous and unselfish leadership. Then Red China, stupidly playing Red Russia's game, renewed the aggression. Our allies began to hedge on us. Now we fear appeasement of principle so concealed with honeyed words that the American people will be duped into believing that surrender is victory.

What is American policy in the Far East?

Ask that question of the next 10 people you meet, and you will get 10 different answers.

A year from now as we start down the stretch toward a presidential election we hope that public opinion will have decided the best course for our country and that foreign policy will be governed by it, even before the test of the election itself. We cannot wait until November 1952, allowing those who threaten us to profit from our delay.

But first, what is going on in Asia that seems to be so far away?

I think we stand in need of the facts, and it is my purpose to bring some of them to you in broad outline, and as fairly as I can.

Across the wide Pacific ocean are the three most populous nations in the world: Russia, China, and India. In the last two countries, which are far behind in technical progress and where there is insufficient food for all, great political changes have taken place since the end of World War II. For many generations most of Asia in the Pacific had been subject to Western European imperialism. They were used as sources for raw materials, and their people were treated as second-class members of the human race. But the people of Asia are waking up and are growing up. The United States has given independence to the Philippines. Once-powerful Japan, reduced in size, is being reeducated to democratic ways under the American occupation which will end in the near future. India is now a sovereign nation, completely free from British control. The peoples of Indonesia have won freedom from the Dutch. Nationalist ferment is strong in French Indochina and in British Malaya. Burma, Pakistan, and Korea are new nation names on the map.

But, as western imperialism moves out, Russian imperialism moves in. Seizing opportunities created by the recent war, and the dislocations which followed, the U. S. S. R. is tying into its system such border areas as Korea, Manchuria, and Mongolia. Communist movements, directed from Moscow, have been set up in all Asiatic countries. Their job is to make trouble and to prevent the new governments from functioning properly. They cloak their true motives by posing as champions of popular demands for national independence, and for the redress of economic and social grievances. It matters nothing to them that their own native leaders are trying to eliminate poverty and ignorance. In the confusion that follows sudden freedom, the Commies sound off like patriots only to get into positions of power so that they can betray their own countries into Communist slavery.

The security of the United States depends on countering this move by encouraging peaceful and democratic growth, and by helping these new and struggling nations to raise the standard of living for their people.

We have already given several billion dollars in aid to establish a sound foundation for democratic progress in Japan, the Philippines, and in Southern Korea. We have maintained large occupation forces in Japan to discourage attack on that unarmed country. Japan is a progressive nation. It is densely populated and must have markets for trade in order to support its people. But if democracy catches on, it could be a strong ally against Soviet expansion. In Korea and the Philippines, the situation is different. The people have not had the technical and administrative training and experience to handle their own affairs. Inefficiency and corruption make for weakness which the Communists will exploit for the advantage of Russia. The Philippines are sure to receive further help from us. Furthermore, there is a strong bond of friendship between our two peoples, based on mutual help and fair dealing, that promises well for the future.

Next to Japan, China and India are the two most important countries in Asia, and how they go will determine whether Asia cooperates with us or turns against us.

The stark fact in regard to India is the grinding poverty of her teeming millions. Its government is struggling desperately to cope with this elemental and terrifying problem. It has stated that it will take no sides in the cold war. The leaders privately profess opposition to communism, but in the United Nations they are willing to make every concession to appease Red China. By grants of food and technical aid under the point 4 program, we may be able to strengthen India and inspire it to resist aggression, but right now India cannot be depended upon. And understandably. A hungry man needs more than a pep talk.

China is the nub of the situation.

The establishment of the Communist government as the de facto power in China on October 1, 1949, was not the end but the beginning of the Chinese Communist revolution. Although they defeated Chiang in the struggle, they are now rulers of a country that requires a tremendous reorganization. The Communists rose to power as the Nationalists declined. Russian influence is growing. The Chinese would never have invaded Korea in defiance of the United Nations unless directed to do so by Russia. Maybe Chiang was right in saying that we did not give him enough support to halt the Reds, but that question is now largely academic. In the minds of most Asiatics, Chiang is associated with the past, and they have no intention of going backward. For us to back discredited regimes, would play into the hands of Russian propaganda and alienate whatever good will we retain among the Chinese people. There is no other forward-looking group in sight that we can support, but there are several thinly possible developments that would be favorable to the United States. We could hope for the growth of moderating influences within the Chinese Communist Party, or for the breakaway from control by the Kremlin that is known as Titoism. But these are largely wait-and-see prospects, in deference to the cautious attitude that lets Russia call the plays. A policy of hands off and doing nothing could be worse than that of taking a positive calculated risk. We must display some initiative and leadership.

After the end of World War II, there were two schools of thought as to what our policy toward China should be. One maintained that the Chiang regime was hopelessly corrupt and incompetent and was bound to collapse of its own weight, and that the Chinese Communists were different from the Russian brand. Reckoning that the Chinese Reds would eventually come out on top, these advisers felt we should hop on the bandwagon by backing them early. The other group argued that Chinese governments are traditionally corrupt, and Chiang's was no worse than any other while it was undeniably pro-American. They went on to predict that the Chinese Communists would turn out to be controlled from Moscow and their policy would finally emerge as anti-American.

The first school prevailed.

And the result?

Americans and Chinese Reds are now locked in mortal combat.

Whether that policy will succeed over the long run, in spite of the present contradiction, is a matter of opinion.

As of the moment our foreign policy in Asia is being opened up to searching criticism.

Perhaps it should be revised.

But first, we must get both sides of the story, including any information we have a right to know but has not been divulged to this moment, so that we may decide the future course that is best for our Nation.

A policy that is reasonable and clear to which we will give our whole-hearted support.

Borough Rabbi's Retirement Just Gateway to New Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this week's choice by the Brooklyn Eagle of Brooklyn's man of the week is indeed an excellent one. Rabbi Max Reichler has long been a leader of men. I am glad to be able to set forth the article in full as it appeared in Sunday's edition, April 22, 1951:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—BOROUGH RABBI'S RETIREMENT JUST GATEWAY TO NEW FIELD

(By Bert Hochman)

The act of retirement means many things to different people. For most it is a welcome and hard-earned respite capping many years of industrious labor. To others it is a necessary withdrawal from active service due to advancement in years.

But the recent retirement of Rabbi Max Reichler from the pulpit of Beth Sholom-Peoples Temple at Bay Parkway and Benson Avenue has merely ushered in a new period of concentrated activity for the bespectacled clergyman—still a young man at 65 to all outward appearances.

"I've decided to declare a moratorium on all lectures and sermons," exclaimed the ruddy-complexioned gentleman, his blue eyes twinkling. This may have come as a jolt to members of the Bensonhurst congregation last fall, but they warmly responded by naming their spiritual leader for 29 years as rabbi emeritus.

"I've been an active rabbi for 45 years," he explained, "and now I want to devote my time to a little bit of writing I've been planning for many years."

The little bit of writing turns out to be quite an ambitious undertaking for even a youngster of 65. Rabbi Reichler has already started work on a series of five volumes analyzing the influence of the rabbinical period on Christ and the writings of the New Testament. He expects the initial book to be ready by January 1; the rest will take at least several years.

His living quarters at the Hotel St. George resemble a newspaper index department more than the abode of a retired theologian. In his study Rabbi Reichler sits behind a desk littered with assorted memoranda, correspondence, and reference books. Surrounding him on two sides are a set of large filing cabinets, tenanted by an exhaustive index of some 50,000 file cards personally compiled through the years on various religious subjects.

Rabbi Reichler doesn't underestimate the amount of work which will have to be poured into the five-volume undertaking. More than that, he is conscious that the self-appointed task would be a stiff challenge for even a much younger scholar.

"I'd rather try and fail, than fail to try," shrugs the energetic descendant of one of Europe's oldest rabbinical families, whose family line of rabbis goes back to his great-great-grandfather.

That same motto has placed Rabbi Reichler in good stead through many other ambitious challenges of the past.

In 1911 he was asked by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to organize Sinai Temple in the Bronx. He recalls how he started the congregation with seven members and no assets whatsoever. By the time he left in 1922 to take over the Bensonhurst leadership, Sinai Temple boasted more than 400 members, with more than 300 worshipers at its regular services and a new $200,000 edifice.

Similarly, when he came to Beth Sholom-Peoples Temple in February 1922, the newly amalgamated congregation had a membership of 160. Today there is a membership of over 400, its religious school has a paid staff of 15 workers, and close to 400 youngsters attend classes there.

Many of his innovations at the Bensonhurst temple have become standard order of procedure in reform synagogues throughout the country. Chief among these is the congregation taking part in every part of the service, especially the singing of the traditional Hebrew responses.

"I don't want just an audience, I want a participating congregation," says the man who has become known as the spiritual leader of Brooklyn's singing congregation.

Rabbi Reichler was born on November 27, 1885, in Presburg, then part of Hungary, now Czechoslovakia. His father, the late Rabbi Moses Reichler, came to America to take charge of a temple in Utica, N. Y. The family crossed the seas to join him a few years later in 1895.

Through his high-school days in Utica, a local editor sought to interest the youngster in journalism or teaching. But there was never much doubt in his mind; he was going to prepare himself for the Jewish ministry just like his father and grandfathers before him.

He received his B. A. from the University of Cincinnati in 1905, and a year later was ordained a rabbi by the Hebrew Union College. At 21, he was then one of America's youngest men to enter the rabbinical profession.

After pursuing some postgraduate studies at Chicago University, he ministered local congregations in Helena, Ark., and Schenectady, N. Y., before accepting the Bronx assignment. There he met the former Edith Maisner, a school teacher who applied for the principalship of his religious school. Suffice to say she got the job—and 4 years later the couple was married. Mrs. Reichler died in 1944. Their two children are David, 32, and Mrs. Vida Ruth Bial, 29, a speech instructor at Long Island University.

No newcomer to the fold of authors, Rabbi Reichler has always been a prolific writer. Among his works are: The Jewish Conception of Justice, What Is the Talmud?, and The Last Prayers of Jesus, in addition to many Hebrew textbooks. He speaks German, Hebrew, and English fluently, and can read Latin, Greek, Arabic, and Syriac.

During World War I, he was a chaplain at Camp Upton. He is former chaplain of Progress Lodge, F. & A. M., and past president of the Association of Reform Rabbis and the Brooklyn Board of Rabbis. World War II found him as Jewish representative on the Brooklyn Interfaith Committee.

On May 12 the Beth Sholom congregation will honor him at a testimonial dinner in the Hotel Pierre, Manhattan. The event will mark the forty-fifth anniversary of his ordination. Rabbi Reichler admitted he will probably have "a few words of thanks to say"—but definitely no lecture or sermon. They are ruled out for the duration of his "retirement."

Essentials of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the date of Saturday, April 14, 1951, it was my privilege to address a foreign policy conference held in the Ryan Hotel, St. Paul, Minn. This conference was sponsored by the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in the State of Minnesota. Chairman of the conference was Mr. York Langton, president of the Minnesota United Nations Association. This conference was attended by approximately 1,000 persons. Participants included Mr. George Demetriou, professor of political science, University of Minnesota, speaking on the subject You and the Communist Threat; Mr. O. Edmund Clubb, director of the Chinese Section, United States Department of State, on You and the Far East; and Dr. Capper Johnson, professor, International Relations, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., on the subject You and Western Europe. It was my privilege to give the concluding address of the conference. My subject was Essentials of American Foreign Policy.

I wish to pay tribute to the splendid educational program in the field of foreign relations conducted under the direction of the University of Minnesota International Relations Center. I pay particular tribute to the Minnesota United Nations Association, and the Foreign Policy Associations of Minneapolis and St. Paul. The theme of the foreign policy conference was You and the World.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address I delivered at the foreign policy conference be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESSENTIALS OF AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

America's foreign policy is not created in a vacuum. It results from the fact that we are a nation among nations and in constant

association with one another. In this association we must necessarily have a flexible policy to meet changing times and changing conditions. America's foreign policy can never be a predetermined, airtight program of inflexibility.

There are, however, important aspects of our foreign policy to which we are irrevocably dedicated:

1. The maintenance and guaranteeing of America's independence and freedom.

2. Working for and promoting the independence and freedom of peoples and nations everywhere.

3. A firm commitment to work through and with the United Nations. A policy of strengthening the United Nations in order to achieve a just and enduring peace, based upon sound principles of international law and social justice.

4. A well-planned program of political, economic, health, and cultural assistance to those nations and peoples who have dedicated their fortunes and their lives to the cause of freedom.

5. Promoting trade and friendly economic and political relations amongst the nations of the world.

6. A deep and sincere humanitarian concern and generosity for those who are underprivileged and suffering from the ravages of famine, disease, and poverty.

7. Honorably fulfilling all obligations and commitments entered into by treaties and compacts between ourselves and other nations.

8. The maintenance of our national defense military forces.

These principles are part of the glorious history of our Nation.

Let us never forget that we do not live in this world alone. We are not an island unto ourselves. The admonitions of Scripture which remind us that we are our "brother's keeper" need to be applied to the practical realities of international relations and foreign policy. In carrying out the above principles it has been the aim of our Government, first, to aid in the rehabilitation and relief of those who suffered so dearly from the ravages of World War II. This was exemplified by our generous gifts to UNRRA and the interim aid program in 1946 and 1947 to Western Europe.

Secondly, our Government's foreign policy has been directed toward strengthening those free nations that are resisting communism from within and without. This policy has taken shape in the adoption of the Marshall plan of economic aid; the North Atlantic Pact, a compact of the free nations of the Atlantic community dedicated to defense against aggression; aid now being considered for the Republic of India; the Greek-Turkish aid program which preserved freedom and independence for Turkey and Greece; the Voice of America; our program of defense mobilization; and military assistance to our allies.

Thirdly, the policy of our Government is to strike at the roots of Communist growth and infiltration by a broad program of economic, scientific, and technological assistance to the underprivileged and underdeveloped areas of the world. The point 4 program was a beginning. We are now preparing to move forward on a much broader and comprehensive program.

NATURE AND MENACE OF COMMUNISM

In shaping and carrying out our foreign policy, which must, above all, be based on our own self-preservation, it is imperative that every American understand the nature of the menace of communism—how it works, how it gains support, who and what are its natural allies. Communism is more than a military threat; it is destructive of the ideals and principles of our religious faith and of our political philosophy. Wherever communism has thrived, the individual has been enslaved; education has been corrupted and used for the selfish and greedy purposes of those in power; free institutions of business and labor have been destroyed; independent ownership of farms and property has been abolished; the very sanctity of the home and of the family has been jeopardized; freedom of worship has been restricted.

This is the menace of communism—a menace of military force and human slavery. Make no mistake about it—international communism will not satisfy its hungry appetite by enslaving and conquering Europe and Asia. Its ultimate objective and its final blow is directed against the United States, for here, in this great country, is to be found the heart and soul of freedom and democracy.

It is my sincere conviction that we cannot escape—nor, when we understand the issue, do I feel we would want to escape—from assuming the responsibility of leadership for the millions of people who are still dedicated to liberty; nor dare we minimize the threat of brutal power and force that confronts us. It will do us no good merely to hope for peace and security. I believe we must be willing to work and sacrifice for world peace and our own security. The Soviet Union has brought under its control millions of people—satellite nations. Today communism controls over 800,000,000 people. We in the United States, with slightly over 150,000,000 citizens, cannot meet this menace alone. We need friends. We need free allies if we are to preserve our own freedom.

It was the recognition of this obvious fact that prompted our Government to enter into the North Atlantic Pact—an alliance of 13 free nations for mutual defense and common effort in securing peace. The North Atlantic Pact was established within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations. It lends strength to the United Nations. Let it be clearly understood that there can be no United Nations if free and independent nations are conquered and absorbed by the Soviet Union. It is because of the military power and the aggressive actions of the Soviet Union and her satellites that it became necessary to implement the North Atlantic Pact by, first, the military assistance program and, secondly, the creation of a Western European defense system including American troops, air power, and naval forces.

TROOPS FOR EUROPE

The defense of Western Europe is essential to the defense of the United States. Western Europe and the United States represent the muscle, the fiber, and the tissue of the forces of freedom. Communist aggression looks upon the countries of Western Europe as but the steps—the gateway—to a frontal attack upon the citadel of liberty, the arsenal of democracy—the United States of America.

The question is simply this: Where do we defend freedom against the constant pressure and force of Communist totalitarianism? Shall 150,000,000 Americans undertake this task alone, or shall we join as a strong and participating partner with our friends and allies where the battle line has been drawn?

Let's make no mistake about it: The defense of Western Europe is the key to the security of the United States. With the people of Western Europe on our side, we have a combination that the Communists cannot beat. But with Western Europe dominated by Soviet Russia, its people enslaved, its resources exploited, its factories producing the materials of war for Russia, we will be faced with an overwhelming preponderance of power that may well spell our doom.

The reasons for this are perfectly clear. Military power consists of manpower, industrial production, natural resources, strategic bases, and the will to fight and resist. If Western Europe is lost to the Communists, the majority of the world's manpower goes to the Communist forces.

If Western Europe is conquered or dominated by the Soviet Union, the balance of industrial production goes to the Communists.

If we lose Western Europe, the overwhelming proportion of raw materials and critical supplies goes to the Communists.

If we lose Western Europe we lose the strategic bases, air and naval, from whence to defend ourselves against Soviet attack.

If Western Europe is controlled by the Communists, a spirit of defeatism and hopelessness will befall all of humanity.

A word about industrial production. There are three great industrial workshops in the world: First, Canada and the United States; second, Western Europe; third, Russia and her satellites. A striking way to illustrate this fact is to look at the world's steel capacity. For every 10 tons of steel we in the United States can produce, Western Europe can produce more than 6 tons. Russia and her satellites can turn out 4 tons. The significance of this is obvious. Add Russia's 4 tons to Europe's 6, and you wind up with a steel capacity equal to our own. On the other hand, combine free Europe and the United States, and the result is a 4 to 1 advantage in our favor.

There are dozens of other illustrations that can be shown, but they all lead back to the conclusion that the productive capacity of Western Europe and the United States combined tremendously exceeds that of Russia and her satellites. And they also lead to the conclusion that our margin of safety would be tremendously reduced if free Europe falls into Russian hands.

But productive capacity isn't the whole story. With Western Europe in their hands, the Communists would quickly take over all the resources of the Old World. The Mediterranean would become a Red Sea. Africa would be defenseless. The Middle East, India, the rest of southeast Asia, Australia, and the island areas of the Southwest Pacific would fall into the Red orbit.

With the loss of Africa would go the uranium supplies upon which our atomic weapons so largely depend. Manganese, an essential component of steel, reaches us today from India and Africa. Loss of those two regions would cripple our steel output. Much of our tin and all of our natural rubber comes from the Malay Straits and the island areas of the Southwest Pacific.

In short, the loss of Western Europe would mean that we were forced to defend ourselves with the resources and manpower of the Western Hemisphere alone and sharply reduced—and that is not a happy prospect.

There are 2,250,000,000 people on earth. About 300,000,000 of them live in the Western Hemisphere—about one-seventh of the world's population. I do not relish the prospect of living in the kind of world in which the Communists control 85 percent of the world's population. And that is exactly what we would face if we walked out on Europe.

We must send troops to Europe because our national self-interest demands that we save Europe from Communist aggression. To refuse to send troops is to serve notice to the Soviet Union that it can walk across the Continent.

And Europe can be saved. Our military experts, from General Eisenhower on down, tell us so, and this is a military question.

They tell us it can be done by building up the combined forces of land, sea, and air.

The second question is, should we limit troops to Europe? I say "No." If the security of Western Europe is basic to the security of the United States, then it would be sheer folly to limit that security by an act of Congress. World War II should have taught us the lesson of "too little and too late." The events leading to World War II should now be conclusive evidence of the futility of half-way measures. Let this be perfectly clear: Military assistance to Europe—troops for Europe—is in our own national interest. We do not know at any time what the next 24 hours may bring, and the lessons of Korea and Pearl Harbor should have taught us we must be thoroughly prepared.

How many troops belong in any one spot is a question which neither you nor I can decide. Congress and the President have decided, through the North Atlantic Pact and the military assistance program, the basic foreign and military policy. Military leaders must decide technical questions of military strength and troop movements. These decisions must then be finally approved and implemented by Executive direction, namely the President, who is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

MOBILIZATION FOR DEFENSE AND PEACE

There are those who are disturbed about our program of military mobilization and what appears to be the tendency toward war. I am sure that people everywhere are disturbed, confused, and emotionally upset. We live in dangerous times. We are faced with the possibility of war, and yet we are not a warlike nation. We desire peace. We have made an honest effort to preserve peace and will continue to make every effort humanly possible, but peace cannot be obtained without strength. Therefore, we are mobilizing our strength not for aggression, not for world power, but rather to impress upon the leaders of the Soviet Union that the free people of the world will resist aggression and force. At the same time, through the councils of the United Nations and through the normal diplomatic channels, we should let the world know that we stand ready at all times for real disarmament under international inspection.

It is our solemn duty to impress upon the people of the world the understanding that wars do not solve problems and that we in the United States have but one desire—peace, freedom, and security. We know that the answer to the aggression of international communism is not to be found in military preparedness and strength alone. Our major emphasis must be directed to creating and building the conditions of peace. Peace in Europe, peace in Asia will come only when injustice and exploitation have been removed; when people have the right of self-government; when economic and social opportunity is made available; when poverty, ignorance, and disease have been checked and rolled back. These are the objectives toward which we should dedicate our efforts.

THE CRISIS IN ASIA

Our world is changing. Whole areas in Asia and Africa are in revolution. Millions of people are seeking their independence and freedom. Some have obtained it—such as the people of Indonesia, India, Burma, and Ceylon; others are aspiring to it—such as the people of Indochina, north Africa, and Malaya. If there has been a weakness in our foreign policy it has been that we as a Nation have failed to identify ourselves with the legitimate desires of the people of Asia and Africa to attain their own independence and their own freedom. It is my considered judgment that we ought not to be resisting this revolution. We ought to give it leadership.

The tragedy of our time is that we have permitted the Communists to identify themselves with these liberation and emancipation movements in Asia and Africa. Yet communism by its very nature is counter-revolution, reaction, and subjugation. International communism's only purpose in joining with these people seeking their independence is to gain control and inflict on these people their vicious and brutal system of exploitation and oppression. Our job is to explain that to the world, not only in words but by setting an example through leadership, through guidance, through generous assistance.

INDIA

We must be patient and understanding—and we ought to be. We too, only a short time ago in human history, obtained our freedom. We rejected colonialism; we were sensitive and jealous of our liberty. And we were justly concerned with our own independence, trying to keep away from foreign entanglements. Let me give you a modern example. I refer to the Republic of India. Here is a nation of over 350,000,000 people that has just obtained its independence after 300 years of colonial exploitation. India is confronted with overwhelming problems within her own borders. She is new in the art of self-government. She is, in a sense, weak in military and economic power but potentially strong and rich.

Many Americans are disturbed, yes, angry because the Government of India does not see eye to eye with us on the problem of communism in China. But shouldn't Americans consider that India is consumed with the difficulties of her new independence and freedom? That she wishes to keep away from foreign entanglements? This is the natural and the historic pattern of new nations. It was our pattern, our experience of less than a hundred years ago. India is a country that is prodemocratic by its constitution, its government, and its philosophy. It has taken stern measures against totalitarian groups within its own borders. It is a part of the British Commonwealth, our major ally. It is without a doubt the leading free country in Asia. Yet, because India has not alined herself with us on the China question, even though she has supported the United Nations' resolution to resist aggression in Korea, she is today being criticized and condemned and is suffering at the hands of our own Government, which is withholding urgently needed food and wheat from India.

You will be interested in knowing that American policy with reference to the Republic of India has been a major concern of mine ever since my arrival in the United States Senate. I have realized the importance of cordial relations between our country and India. I have attempted to make an intensive study of American-Indian relationships, and in particular the political, economic, and social institutions of that great Asiatic power. On several occasions during the past 2 years I have spoken on the floor of the Senate on the subject of India and its position in world affairs. Not only have I brought these matters to the attention of the Senate, but I have also brought to the personal attention of the President and the Secretary of State America's policy with regard to India and the other areas of the Far East.

Better than a year ago I outlined to the President and the Secretary of State the urgent need of food for India if that country were to avert famine and all of the accompanying agony and confusion. Approximately 8 months ago I had the privilege of meeting one of our great Christian leaders from India, Bishop Pickett, of Delhi. I had Bishop Pickett discuss the Indian food shortage with Members of Congress, with the Secretary of State, and with Special Assistant to the President, Mr. Averill Harriman, as well as with Vice President Barkley. I accompanied Bishop Pickett to all of these meetings where he presented the very real need of food for the people of India. At a later date I arranged for the bishop to visit the President.

On December 16, 1950, the Indian Ambassador to the United States, Madam Pandit, made a formal request to our Government for 2,000,000 tons of cereal grains. Following this formal request, I joined with other Members of the Congress in preparing a letter to the President asking for an audience to discuss the food needs of India. Along with Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, I arranged for a congressional delegation to visit the President. We received from him assurances that he supported India's request for 2,000,000 tons of grain. The President, subsequently, sent a very strong message to the Congress in support of food for India.

Immediately following the President's message, I joined with three of my colleagues in the Senate in introducing a bill to authorize the Government of the United States to provide the grain that India needs.

It is imperative that there be congressional approval of legislation to provide a grant of 2,000,000 tons of food grain to the people of India. There are disturbing signs in India and in all of Asia—signs of great mistrust on the part of the people of that continent that the United States is not interested in their welfare. You and I know that the American people are a generous people; that by philosophy, tradition, and history we have always demonstrated a keen and abiding interest in the welfare of our fellow men. It is imperative that we use the strength of our abundance in our conflict with communism. Without any expansion of industrial capacity, without any further mobilization of manpower, we can strike deadly blows at international communism by lifting the standard of living and by aiding the sick, the hungry, and the exploited.

The people of Asia face starvation. Freedom loses its meaning if it is without bread. Our Nation, if it is to be effective in the struggle against communism, must respond to the appeal for food from the underprivileged peoples of Asia, Africa, and the other underdeveloped areas. Yes, the most effective way to oppose communism and fascism is to eliminate the causes of those malignant diseases. It is not idealistic to say that we must attack poverty in the world. This is practical realism in the twentieth century. The time to assist the democratic forces in India and in other parts of Asia is now. Every humanitarian consideration, every political and religious consideration, and every consideration of our national interest calls for the Congress to act immediately in support of legislation for food grain for the people of India.

Food for India is symbolic of an over-all comprehensive program that is desperately needed—a program striking at the roots of communistic growth—a program that had its beginning in the point 4 program, as announced by President Truman. We can be a partner in the self-help efforts of these new nations in the Asiatic area. The governments of these new nations are struggling to maintain their integrity and their freedom. These governments, as history has proven, can be destroyed from within. There need be no Communist military attack. The attack of poverty and economic distress can be just as ruinous and destructive as a military blow. Communism in Asia, particularly in the southern and southeastern portions, is growing because the economic conditions are favorable to its growth. The propaganda of communism offers bread and land to the

under-privileged and to the exploited. A bold and comprehensive program of economic assistance can prevent these areas from going communistic.

I point up the issue of India because I believe that if we are to build a world dedicated to a just and enduring peace, if we as Americans are to give leadership, we must not expect all of our friends and allies to agree with us all the time on every issue. Freedom means the right to disagree. We condemn the policy of the Soviet Union for having satellite or stooge nations that say "yes" at every command. Are we not expecting our friends and allies to be subservient to our every wish? This must not be. Free allies, free nations must be expected to have independent judgment, and that judgment must be respected for what it is.

KOREA

I fully realize the tragedy, bloodshed, and destruction that has come with our resistance of aggression in Korea. The attack of the North Koreans and the entrance of Communist China into the Korean conflict is clear and unadulterated aggression. Were we to let this aggression go unchecked, we would again see the pattern of conquest unfold itself with ever-increasing greed and power. Our struggle in Korea is a struggle for freedom, for independence, and for a world based on law and order. Like yourself, I am disappointed that the other members of the United Nations have not felt free to give us greater support. But those valiant men who have sacrificed their lives in Korea and those who are yet battling against tremendous odds, may well save this world from an all-out catastrophic World War III. While the battle is far away from our homeland, the aggressive attack of the Communists in the Korean area is a dagger pointed at our heart. Those who have given their lives in the Korean conflict have done as much to preserve and protect the freedom of America and the rest of the free world as the patriots at Valley Forge, the Argonne, and the Battle of the Bulge. They are fighting the fire of communism to prevent the conflagration from sweeping over our own homeland.

Aggression on the part of any nation against another is banditry and lawlessness. It needs to be challenged just as we in a local community take effective action against those who commit assault and battery or trespass against the private property of others. There isn't a shadow of a doubt that the North Korean action was a part of the over-all program of the Cominform and its aggressive tactics. I repeat, the fact that we met this aggression, despite the risks involved and despite the great sacrifice that it meant, has done a great deal to check the possibility of World War III.

I, for one, am convinced that if this attack had not been challenged, it would have been the "go ahead" signal for any nation in the world to move its troops against another. We know what happened in the Berlin air lift when Russia decided to blockade Berlin. We know that by firm and determined action on the part of our Government and that of Great Britain, the Soviets finally appealed for a settlement and the blockade was lifted. I think the facts of the last few years reveal conclusively that wherever nations refuse to resist Communist pressure, communism moves ahead, conquers, and controls. I think the facts reveal that wherever nations do resist Communist pressure, communism takes another look, sizes up the situation, and comes to an agreement that preserves the peace.

I know there has been a great deal of criticism about what has transpired in Korea. I am not prepared to defend every action that we have taken, but I do defend the moral validity—the righteous purpose of our resistance of aggression.

CHINESE RELATIONS

We Americans are worried and concerned over what has transpired in China. But let us get the record clear. Our Government has been generous with the Chiang Kai-shek Government of the Republic of China. Our Government extended to Chiang's Nationalist Government of China a grand total of $3,598,200 in economic and military aid. Our Government sent one of its most able public officials, Gen. George Marshall, to China in a desperate effort to save the situation. I do not know all of the reasons why the Chinese Communist movement conquered China and defeated the Nationalist Government. But I do know that it was through no fault of ours. The propaganda that has been let loose in America against our policy in China would lead many to believe that it was our responsibility, and ours alone, to save China. But no nation can be saved from the menace of communism if it refuses to save itself. Communism triumphed in Russia because corruption, exploitation, and injustice was rampant under the Czars, because the legitimate government ignored the social, economic, and political needs of the people. I am led to believe that communism triumphed in China, not because of what happened on the battlefields alone, but because of what did not happen in constructive action in the villages, on the farms, in the cities, and throughout the entire society.

The tragic conquest of China by the forces of communism threatens our own security and the security of the free world. There is no doubt but what this was a part of the master plan of the Kremlin. China, a historical friend of the United States, has been turned against us by the Communist leadership and the Communist propaganda. The attack of the Red Chinese armies upon the forces of the United Nations in Korea has clearly demonstrated the true intentions and purposes of Soviet imperialism. The Chinese Communist aggression has brought into sharp focus a fundamental issue of American foreign policy. This was recently dramatized by the President's dismissal of General MacArthur.

DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MAC ARTHUR

The real issue involved in the President's dismissal of General MacArthur is one basic to American Constitutional Government. The President, under the mandate of our Constitution, is Commander in Chief. The President, under the political tradition of our Republic, is responsible for foreign policy. It has been a basic principle of representative government that the military is subordinate to the civilian. The military officers and services are the servants of the Republic, not the master. The action of the President is within the tradition of American Constitutional Government.

The issue is: Shall military commanders dictate and formulate American policy or shall they carry out that policy. In this instance the issue was even more broad because the military action in Korea was not only an American action but one under the over-all supervision of the United Nations. President Truman, as all Presidents before him, demanded that foreign policy be established by the elected representatives of the people, not by any one or a few generals, able as they may be. Once we lose civilian control over foreign and military policy, then we lose the fabric of our democracy.

In dismissing General MacArthur President Truman had no other choice. The general—a brilliant and able military leader, a great man in his own right and by his own record—openly disagreed with our Government's policy and with that of the United Nations. He disagreed with the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. No government can exist so divided in policy since no government can be guided by two inconsistent foreign programs.

General MacArthur, as an individual, has a perfect right to disagree with our Government's foreign policy, but as a general subordinate to his Commander in Chief, he has neither the right nor the prerogative to formulate and attempt to carry out his own program and to disregard the program established by the Government. While I have a high regard for General MacArthur and his abilities, I am not prepared to accept his judgment over that of the President, the Secretary of State, the overwhelming majority of the representatives in the United Nations, the majority in the Congress, the Secretary of Defense, and the combined Chiefs of Staff. It should be clearly recognized that the bold statements of General MacArthur were causing great concern in other nations and among our allies.

THE NEED OF ALLIES

While it is true that we as a Nation have been bearing the major burden of the war in Korea, we do have allies there, and those allies stand with us in Western Europe. They are the only allies that we have. It is impossible to keep allies and to maintain a solid defense against Communist aggression if we as a Nation and a Government act in opposition to our allies and disregard their wishes, their policies, and their program. To put it quite bluntly, faced as we are by the Soviet Union and its satellites, with a total population of over 800,000,000, we cannot afford to stand alone. The Soviet Union is doing everything in its power to break us away from our allies. The old tactic of divide and conquer is again being utilized. We must not fall prey to this tactic. We must stand together and work together.

THE ISSUE AND THE RISKS

The issue of foreign policy which divides us today is primarily related to our country's relations with Red China. The issue, simply put, is whether or not, first, our Armed Forces should attack military bases on the Chinese mainland; and secondly, whether or not we should use and assist Chinese Nationalist troops in an attack on the Chinese mainland. This inevitably means extending and expanding the war in Korea.

It is the policy of our Government to do everything possible to limit the present Korean war to the Korean battlefield. It is the firm determination of our Government and our allies not to extend and expand the conflict to the mainland of Asia by any action of ours. The risk involved in a further expansion of the conflict is a possibility of World War III and the full-scale intervention of the Soviet Union. It should be remembered that the Soviet Union has a treaty of alliance and assistance with the Red Chinese Government. This treaty calls for Soviet military assistance in case China is attacked by Japan or any power associated with Japan. Today we are the prime occupiers of Japan. We are associated with Japan. We are now preparing to conclude a treaty with Japan. It is entirely possible that the Soviet Union, under the obligations of her treaty with Communist China, would take direct military action were we to advance to the Chinese mainland. The political policy of the United States Government and its allies is to bring the Korean War to a conclusion and to negotiate an honorable peace.

The position of General MacArthur was clearly and brilliantly stated in his address to the joint session of the Congress. Not only did he recommend economic sanctions against China and a blockade of the Chinese coast by our Navy, but also the use of Chinese Nationalist troops from the island of Formosa and the strategic bombing of Manchurian bases by our Air Force. As I have stated, we must take into consideration were this program to be adopted, the possibility of open Russian intervention and its consequent effect upon our military position both in the Far East and in Western Europe. We must take into consideration the present military strength of the United States and its allies as compared with the Soviet Union and its satellites. Our mobilization program is just getting under way. Our total military strength is approximately 3,000,000 men. We as yet have not been able to send the additional four divisions to Western Europe. We have had to call up reservists in order to meet the commitments in Korea.

Is it not possible that the strategy of the Soviet is to trick us into a major war in Asia so that an all-out attack can be launched in Western Europe? It is Western Europe that Russia needs. It is Western Europe that has the industrial production, the skilled manpower and the strategic positions that are needed to round out the Soviet military machine. Russia and her satellites have an overabundance of population. They lack in supplies and productive machinery.

Those who support General MacArthur's position state quite confidently that the Soviet Union would not intervene were we to attack the Chinese mainland. Of course, no one really knows what the Soviet will do. But, I call to your attention that General MacArthur clearly stated to the President on the occasion of the President's conference on Wake Island in October 1950, that the Red Chinese armies would not intervene in Korea. I call this to your attention because then as now a risk was being contemplated and a military decision was being made. The military decision was that of advancing to the Yalu River in order to destroy the North Koreans. The risk involved was whether or not the Chinese Communist armies would move into the Korean war. History now tells us the answer. The Chinese armies did come into the war and momentarily the forces of the United Nations suffered tragic losses. It is reasonable to expect that an attack upon the Chinese mainland could and would provoke open Soviet intervention. The questions that we must ask ourselves then are simply these: Do we wish to take that risk? Are we prepared at this time by military strength and mobilization to meet all-out attack by the Soviet? What would be the effect upon our Armed Forces in the area of such a Soviet attack? What would be the effect of a Soviet attack in Western Europe at this time?

It is not divulging any secret when we openly recognize that we are presently weaker in terms of military strength than our adversary. This position will change within a year but today the Soviet Union and its satellites have a much larger army and air force than the United States and its allies. It appears to me that Soviet strategy is based on trapping us into a war on the Asiatic mainland only to strike in Western Europe, destroy our allies, and overrun the Western European countries. If this should happen, we would lose the only allies we have. We would lose the productive power of European industry. We would lose the critical raw materials and the strategic bases that are now under the control and possession of our allies. We would find ourselves without friends or allies and without vitally needed raw materials.

INCONSISTENCIES IN CONGRESS

We must seriously consider the consequences involved in extending and expanding the present conflict when we know what a difficult assignment we now have in Korea alone. It seems contradictory and confusing that the very same Members of the Congress who did everything in their power to either defeat or weaken the North Atlantic Pact and the Marshall plan, to prevent shipment of arms to our allies in Western Europe, and finally to prevent sending American troops for the common defense of Western Europe are now advocating the extension and expansion of hostilities in the Asiatic area. Only a few months ago this same group in Congress was advocating that we get out of Korea; now they are advocating that we go into China. Some Members of the Congress, while advocating an expansion of the war in Asia, have only recently voted to limit our Armed Forces and to weaken the program for selective service and universal military training.

I point out these inconsistencies because they need to be understood. It is clear that you cannot expand a war from Korea to China without taking the risk of World War III. You cannot expand hostilities from Korea to China without having more manpower and a far greater military force. You cannot expand hostilities from Korea to China without risking loss of Western Europe by a Soviet attack. It is imperative that we face up to the facts of our present military strength and that we clearly understand that the Soviet threat is worldwide and not localized.

The logical and consistent outcome of the policy of extending military action to the Chinese mainland was pointedly brought to light by a recent resolution introduced in the Congress by Senator CAIN, of the State of Washington, who proposed that the Government of the United States declare war on Communist China. If this conflict is to grow, if it is to be extended, let it come only by the aggressive designs and tactics of the Soviet Union. If the Chinese Communist forces are assisted by Soviet air power, if our troops in Korea are attacked by concentrated air power—then we have but one choice, and that is to retaliate. This means that our efforts to limit this war in Korea have been checkmated by Soviet interference. The very survival and safety of our troops will demand that we attack the air bases and destroy this air power lest it destroy us. Let it be clear, however, that we would do this in defense. Up to now the Communists and North Korean forces have not had any major air power. Therefore, it has not been militarily necessary to attack the Manchurian air bases. If this new Communist offensive in Korea brings with it waves of airplanes, then we must attack the nests and the bases from whence these planes take off. Let us hope and pray that we can limit the conflict and bring this tragic Korean action to a speedy conclusion on the terms of a just and honorable peace.

International communism now fully understands that we will resist aggression. The policy of our Government has been one of firm and resolute resistance to Communist aggression and subversion. No partisan debate nor any beclouding of the issues can remove from the annals of history the clear and unmistakable fact that President Truman, the Secretary of State, and the Congress in the development of our foreign policy have delivered hammer blows against Communist imperialism.

I welcome General MacArthur's arrival in the United States and his address to the Congress. The debate over foreign policy in the Far East will serve to reaffirm our Far Eastern program and to make it clear and understandable to the American people. It is only fair and honorable that one should await the outcome of the congressional hearings before dogmatic conclusions are made. It is my hope that a basic sense of fair play will continue to permeate our attitude as we discuss and debate our foreign policy. Above all, we must be united as a Nation, for the dangers that we face are great.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE AND AMERICAN POLICY

The desire of our Government is to get out of Korea, but only when aggression has been stopped. We are not fighting the Chinese people. The Chinese people have been victims of corruption on one hand and now of a Communist police state on the other. It is the official policy of our Government, and it surely is my personal view, that at all times we should extend the hand of friendship and fellowship to the Chinese people, but to do this does not mean to embrace their masters or their dictators. In fact, if we have true affection for the Chinese people, we will not only want them free from Western domination, but also from Communist dictation. If one has real affection for the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and other countries, he should want, above all else, these people to be liberated from those who have defiled their government and their nation.

Recently I joined with several other Senators in offering a Senate resolution expressing friendship for the Russian people. It is the policy of our Government to disassociate the people from their Communist masters. Our whole program of information and truth must make it clear that our desire is for peace. We must appeal to the people of Russia and her satellites. That appeal must be directed over and beyond the government. There are many evidences of restlessness and of tension within the Soviet empire. It is thoroughly possible that one of the reasons that Russia has not precipitated conflict in Europe is because of the fear that the Communist leaders have of their own people and, particularly, of the people in the conquered countries. Our intelligence agencies report that the Communist leadership is having a difficult time keeping order in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries. The people of Poland and Czechoslovakia are a freedom-loving people. They are proud of their national history. We must appeal to them. We must give them assurance of our support when and if they attempt to throw off the yoke of Communist oppression. This is what is called psychological warfare, an area in which we have been very weak.

SUMMARY

Therefore, our foreign policy must have many parts: in some areas economic assistance, in other areas such as Western Europe, economic assistance plus a political and military alliance. Our policy toward the nations taken over by Russia should be that of encouraging their breaking away, such as happened in Yugoslavia. Once they have broken away, we should offer them whatever assistance is within our means.

Another part of our foreign policy is and must be military and economic strength here at home in the United States. It is for this reason that we are mobilizing our forces, expanding our production, and strengthening our economy. The real secret weapon that America has is the strength of its people, the strength of its government, the power of its industry, the over-all health of its economy. Whatever we do, we must constantly keep in mind that we, the people of the United States, have a great responsibility of leadership. The whole world looks to us for guidance, for inspiration—yes, for economic aid and military assistance. This is a tremendous burden for our people to bear, but, I submit, it is a burden much less crushing than war.

There are no easy answers to these difficult problems that face us today. There is no short cut to peace. We must be prepared for years of earnest endeavor and sacrifice. We must develop a sense of poise and strength that comes through understanding and a realization of the righteousness of our cause. I believe that Almighty God will crown our efforts with success. I join with you in seeking Divine guidance and inspiration, for there are some things man cannot do alone.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the foreign policy of the United States, delivered by me yesterday before the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs at their convention in the Shoreham Hotel in this city.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICA IN WORLD AFFAIRS

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY)

I am profoundly grateful for the opportunity to appear before this fine convention of women leaders of the great State of Virginia.

I was tremendously impressed in learning that the theme of your convention was "Enlarge the Place of Thy Tent—Lengthen Thy Cords, Strengthen Thy Stakes." Surely, these words from Isaiah could not have had great applicability today, than at any previous time in American history.

In the great tempest of our times, in the storm that has engulfed the world, it is up to each of us to lengthen the cords and strengthen the stakes of this constitutional Republic—the leader of nations. We can do that by sound thinking, not synthetic thinking, by rational action rather than by emotionalism and hysteria.

OUR PRAYERS GO OUT TO OUR FIGHTING SONS

At this very moment, as I speak to you this evening, thousands of miles away American boys and other United Nations troops are gripped in a life-and-death struggle with the onrushing Chinese Communist hordes. To a considerable extent, the outcome of that vast struggle in the bloody rice paddies and the rugged mountains—that outcome will serve more to determine the future of American foreign policy than virtually anything that is said or done here in Washington.

God bless our fighting sons and their allies. May they withstand the tremendous shock of that onrushing offensive. Though holes may open in the line, may the bulwark of liberty not be breached.

WOMEN AS LEADERS IN THOUGHT AND ACTION

To this fine audience tonight, I do want to express my congratulations for your taking the time out from your busy affairs as housewives, mothers, white collar workers and in every other task—in order to consider the problems of our Nation—yours and mine. When I see a splendid gathering of women leaders such as this, I wish that all of the women who so nobly dedicated their lives to securing the franchise for womankind—I wish that they might have lived to have witnessed inspiring occasions like this. They would be thrilled to see the extent to which women have emerged as leaders in all phases of public life—leaders in thought and action.

You will recall that great American humorist, Will Rogers. Once, he was speaking of the nineteenth amendment which gave the women the right to vote. Will Rogers said, facetiously, "Oh, yes, the nineteenth amendment, that was the law that made women human by act of Congress."

Well, in the years that have passed since women emerged to voting equality, they have proven anew that the deep humanity within every woman, within every mother, every sweetheart, every wife, can be expressed in constructive action in national and international affairs.

VIRGINIA IN THE VANGUARD OF STATES

It is most fitting at this solemn occasion in history that the women of Virginia should be playing so prominent a role. Virginia, the mother of Presidents, has contributed so much to the birth and development of this Republic that this Nation is eternally in its debt.

You will recall the words of a geat Virginian, a great President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence:

"The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time."

Virginia has contributed more than her share of martyrs and champions of liberty. In the spirit of Jefferson, in the spirit of Madison, in the spirit of Washington, let us consider the ways of maintaining the liberty for which so many sons and yes, daughters of Virginia throughout our history have given so much for so long a period of time.

THE THREE BASIC DOMESTIC CHALLENGES

If you and I were to ask ourselves what are the three great challenges of this day insofar as domestic affairs are concerned, we would answer:

1. Maintaining this constitutional Republic with its system of checks and balances between three equal and coordinate branches of Government.

2. Maintaining the American dollar which has already been badly depreciated by inflation's ravages.

3. Maintaining the American economic system, the system of private initiative and private profit, as contrasted with the alien concept of statism, of Government ownership of the means of production and distribution.

These, then, are the three basic challenges insofar as domestic affairs are concerned.

I need hardly tell you that the basic challenge on the foreign scene is that of seeking the path which will best give us peace and preserve the freedom of the world.

THE INSPIRATION OF ARTHUR VANDENBERG

Last week end, friends, there came to my colleagues and myself the sad duty of journeying to Grand Rapids, Mich., to pay our final respects to a great son of Michigan, the Honorable Arthur H. Vandenberg. It had been my pleasure to serve as highest ranking Republican with Arthur Vandenberg in 1947 and 1948 when he was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the Republican Eightieth Congress.

Then, in 1949, when the fortunes of politics were reversed, it had been my privilege to serve with him as his next ranking colleague on the minority on that committee. Now that he has gone—gone from the physical scene, but certainly not gone from our hearts and minds—I hope that all of us who have been his associates will carry on in the spirit that he so nobly displayed.

FOREIGN DEBATE SHOULD NOT DEGENERATE

I need not tell you that the American people are seriously divided today on many aspects of our foreign policy.

It is my earnest hope and prayer that this controversy will not, however, completely degenerate into a base partisan quarrel between the two political parties, each seeking partisan advantage over the other, irrespective of the consequences to our country. I know that the responsible elements in the Republican Party do not want to see the present situation of disunity intensified and aggravated. Rather, we want to find the common elements of understanding and agreement, so that to the greatest extent possible, we can heal the wounds in the body politic.

That does not mean, however, that the Republicans are willing to sacrifice certain basic principles, certain basic concepts with which you and I are familiar. We are not willing for example, to tolerate appeasement in the false name of "unity" and the sham name of "peace." We are willing and eager, however, to reason out differences in a spirit of judgment, in a spirit of calmness, and in a spirit of goodwill.

In turn, I trust that the Democratic Party—the majority party—will not misinterpret the Republicans' well-justified desire for a thorough investigation of foreign policy.

Whether the present administration were Democratic or Republican, I would speak forth very frankly and say that it has pursued a course of reckless conduct which has dealt severe blows to national unity.

For example, the arbitrary way in which Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a great hero, a great son of Wisconsin, was handled, has produced the largest flood of letter protests in my personal recollection and I believe in the recollection of any living member of the Congress. Why? Because the Administration violated the inherent sense of fair play, of righteous dealing, the inherent sense of gratitude for services well done—these inherent feelings of the American people.

PUBLIC WANTS STATE DEPARTMENT TO BE MORE FRANK

In addition, there is a solemn conviction of the American people that the administration has not been frank with it in presenting the full facts of the diplomatic and military situation, either in Asia or in Europe. There is the constant feeling among Members of Congress and among the American people that there is a covering up of crucial facts, that the administration only grudgingly reveals facts to the American public and then, only after the most intensive pressure has been put on it. There is the feeling that the American public is not taken into the confidence of the administration, but rather that it is spoon-fed single facts one at a time by the administration when it autocratically chooses to reveal such facts, rather than when the American people could use the facts to come to sound decisions.

It was a Virginian from Staunton, a great Democratic President—Woodrow Wilson—who pleaded for "open covenants openly arrived at." Well, let the present administration champion a policy of open agreement openly arrived at. Let us be done with the cloud of false secrecy, the phony cloud of "I can't tell you because everything is strictly hush-hush."

Now, none of us want to bridge security regulations on certain necessary data which is necessarily confidential. But the words "security," "confidential," "top-secret" have been so abused by the present Administration as to make a complete farce of affairs. It seems that the administration rubber-stamps everything "confidential," "top-secret," "super-hush-hush," whether or not it has the slightest justification to do so. What is it afraid of? Is it afraid of the common sense and intelligence of the American people?

FOREIGN, DOMESTIC POLICY COMPLETELY INTERTWINED

We all recognize that no longer is foreign policy a matter separate from domestic policy. Virtually every single action of major consequence in home affairs has repercussions—favorable or unfavorable—in most of the capitals of the world. Therefore the Congress has a tremendous role to play in foreign affairs. We recognize and respect the constitutional principle as stated by the Supreme Court in 1936 in the famous Curtiss-Wright case that it is the Executive Branch which is charged with initiating, formulating and spear-heading of foreign policy. But there also must be recognized these facts: (a) Congress' rightful control over the purse; (b) the Senate's advice-and-consent feature in the Constitution and (c) the interplay between foreign and domestic affairs. Because of all of these factors, the Administration must view the Congress as a partner, rather than as an inferior and a subordinate.

Now, my friends, what are some of the basic propositions of international affairs on which most, if not all of us can agree. Here they are as I see them:

AMERICA MUST BE A LEADER AMONG NATIONS

1. America is and must remain a leader among the nations of the earth, economically, politically, and morally. Whether she likes it or not, this is her role; this is her destiny at this crucial stage in the affairs of western civilization. She cannot retreat, she cannot shirk her duties, she cannot crawl into a shell. The earth has been contracted. Time and space have been virtually annihilated by man's inventiveness and ingenuity.

We believe that we have been precipitated to leadership in order that the great freedoms of which this Nation is the exponent may radiate to all the peoples of earth, and that from these shores, may flow that understanding that will eventuate in world peace. It is not our function to suppress or oppress; it is our function to inspire and enlighten.

We must ever bear in mind that as the leader, it is not our function to meddle in the minutest problems with which we have no legitimate relation, nor is it our intent to enforce our way of life upon those peoples who are not yet ready for it or who do not desire it. We are, however, ready to bring light that the other peoples may find their own way. Later, I shall mention some of our other positive obligations.

WE MUST MOVE ON A GLOBAL CHESSBOARD

2. America must recognize that the whole world is our chessboard and as in a good chess game, we must carefully move all of the figures on it, bearing in mind the total result. The Russians are master chess players. Every single move which they make is integrated into a total pattern. They are masters at creating diversions, masters at feinting, masters at taking our eyes off the point where they will next take the aggressive. Let us match their skills in this global chess game.

THE MAJOR DANGER SPOTS

I particularly point out these danger spots:

(a) Iran, where Russian provocators, spies, and agents are fanning the flames of nationalism into a fury which gravely threatens western oil supplies and which may imperil the whole troubled Near East.

(b) Yugoslavia, where Red and Red satellite divisions maneuver at the borders. They await but the Moscow green light which will signal an invasion for the complete destruction of what has been called in Marxist lingo the heresy of Titoist deviationism.

(c) Eastern Germany, where well-trained Communist police units and other semi-military and full military forces engage in maneuvers and in a war of nerves against virtually defenseless Western Germany.

And, of course, there are many other danger spots in addition to the Korean battlefront.

3. Now, before I leave the subject of Europe, let me point out that America must and will live up to her obligations under the United Nations Charter and the North Atlantic Pact. America must and will continue to set the example of keeping faith, but we must insist that keeping faith is a two-way street. We must provide the moral leadership that will bring about in those nations that we deal with a strengthening of will and purpose so as to carry out the policies—economic, military, political—mutually agreed upon. Let that be borne in mind when the omnibus aid bill comes to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee next month.

WE WANT NO MORE HISSES AND NO MORE YALTAS

American foreign policy must ever be based upon sound judgment. But there can be no sound judgment without consideration of all the facts, including facts as to the character and responsibility of those nations with which we deal.

The American representatives who shape our foreign policy must be sound—not wild—in their basic thinking and must not be inoculated with foreign isms. They must not be so foreign-minded that they have lost all sense of their basic American responsibility. We want no more Alger Hisses and no more Yaltas.

WE MUST IMPARTIALLY ANALYZE MAC ARTHUR SUGGESTIONS

4. Now, what about the Far East? Well, my friends, we on the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees must pursue our comprehensive and impartial investigation of the background of General MacArthur's dismissal. We must explore all the controversial points of the MacArthur program which, as you will recall, includes the following:

(a) Bombing of Manchurian bases, the nests where the rats propagate.

(b) Intensification of the economic blockade of Red China.

(c) Imposition of a full naval blockade of the Red Chinese coast.

(d) Removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of the Chinese and Manchurian coasts.

(e) Removal of the restrictions on the arming and use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops.

GOP IS NOT A WAR PARTY

5. Let me at this point state that I resent the slurs which have been cast against the Republican Party to the effect that it is allegedly a war party. I know that every patriotic Republican and for that matter, every patriotic Democrat, recognizes that American diplomats must move heaven and earth, so to speak, so as to prevent our involvement in a third world war.

You mothers, wives, and sweethearts know whereof I speak when I say that war will settle nothing, will solve nothing, will only bring on an endless train of more misery, more disease, more famine, more hatred which can only lead to more statism and still further war.

MOSCOW NOT PEIPING IS OUR REAL FOE

I believe that all segments of American society are agreed on the proposition that under no circumstances must we become involved in a perpetual land war on the Chinese mainland. We would be bled white by such a useless war but for that matter our life blood is being already drained right now in the Korean rice paddies—with no end to the bloodletting in sight.

Whether or not we can utilize Chinese Nationalist troops on the Korean Peninsula or on the mainland proper without further widening the war is the $64 question—the 154,000,000 American-life question.

We must never forget that Red China is not our basic foe; the Kremlin is our real antagonist. Let us keep our eye on the real ball.

I personally am very definitely inclined to feel, as does MacArthur, that Communist Russia will strike when she is good and ready; that is, when she is definitely convinced that victory lies within her grasp and not sooner.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that Russia's trigger finger may be "itching," as the old saying goes, and we certainly don't want the trigger to be pulled so as to explode into a third world war.

AMERICANS DISLIKE SMEARING OF MAC ARTHUR

Before I leave this general point on Asia, I want to say that the American people will tolerate no further smears of Douglas MacArthur. The American people resent the unjustified personal attacks which have been made upon this great hero. But at the same time the American people feel that this whole matter of indulging in personalities is unworthy of our position of leadership. MacArthur himself brilliantly set us an example of restraint and high principle.

Smearing of individuals may make headlines, but it doesn't make common sense and patriotism in a critical time like this or at any time.

SENATOR WILEY'S PROGRAM FOR A COUNTER-OFFENSIVE

One of the most important points of the MacArthur speech to the Congress was his thrilling appeal against a policy of defeatism. Basic in his whole approach was the concept that America cannot passively drift in the stormy seas of Asia. We must boldly seize the helm and direct the ship of state into a harbor of ultimate peace.

I should like to propose to you at this point elements in a program designed as a world-wide counteroffense. You and I know that the best defense is still a strong offense. We recall the words of a legendary general in World War I who said in effect that his right flank was bending, his left flank was routed, and so he was advancing in the center.

No, my friends, I am not urging a war counteroffensive. I am urging a counteroffensive for peace. Let me therefore suggest the following points:

UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE UP WITH UN PROPOSED OFFENSIVE AGAINST MANCHURIA

(a) I urge the diplomatic of our country to seize the offensive and boldly present to the United Nations, and in particular to our British ally, the reasons why so many of us feel that America cannot allow Manchuria to remain a "privileged sanctuary" which reinforces the Red offensive but which is immune to attack. Now, I do not feel that America can by herself initiate all of the policies which General MacArthur recommended. We went into Korea as but 1 of over 50 United Nations. The strategy which we adopt in Korea should be based on concurrence of those nations.

That definitely does not mean, however, that we should merely accept the doctrine of stalemate, which seems to be recommended by some of our allies—allies which incidentally have hardly done a proportionate share of the bleeding and the dying in Korea. On the contrary, let us boldly urge these hesitant allies to consider the need for strong action to bring the Korean fighting to a successful conclusion.

LET US FOSTER CHAOS BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

(b) I urge that we seize the counter offensive by boldly stirring up the peoples in Soviet Russia and back of the iron curtain. I urge that we utilize every instrumentality, from hand grenades to "silver bullets" (that is, money), in order to create such a diversion in Joe Stalin's own bailiwick that his fears as to home front trouble will make him hesitate to engage in foreign combat.

We all recognize that Russia is an amalgamation of many diverse nationalities, cultures, and tongues, which unlike our own, have not been assimilated successfully. So, she offers a golden opportunity for us to apply the old Hitlerian technique of "divide and conquer" behind the iron curtain. There are in Russia tens of millions of sullen, restless, strongly nationalist peoples eager to create trouble for their enslavers. I am not urging that we arm them for immediate revolution. But it is, however, time that we gave the Russians some of their own vile medicine.

Let us ship behind the iron curtain quantities of bullets, guns, shells, so that we can cause sporadic outbursts which tie down Soviet and satellite divisions, so that when and if the time comes, there can be widespread guerrilla warfare behind the iron curtain.

LET US SELL THE AMERICAN WAY

(c) Perhaps the greatest single front on which we must seize the counteroffensive is the psychological, the spiritual front. For some reason, we Americans who have the greatest doctrine, the greatest product in the world, have become the poorest salesmen. The world cannot match our merchandising of soap, perfume, or mousetraps but when it comes to selling values which practically all of the two and a half billion of earth could recognize as the highest in the world, somehow we seem to shrink back. And so, I urge that the Congress step up the Voice of America and related information programs. I personally am not one to seek the dissipation of the taxpayers' funds but I am firmly convinced that by sound investment of our appropriations in the overseas information and presentation programs, we can reap a tremendous harvest of good will for our way of life.

POINT 4 HOLDS GREAT CONSTRUCTIVE POSSIBILITIES

One of the greatest points in our counteroffensive is to be found in the point 4 program for aid to underdeveloped areas. But my concept of that program differs considerably from that which has been implied by some administration spokesmen. Some of them have conceived of it as a universal "do good" plan which ends up by giving milk for hottentots whether they like or want milk or not and which pours billions into foreign dams, plants, etc. I say, however, that what we must basically export is the American private enterprise genius which has given us the greatest living standards of the world. We must seek to inject into the politics of foreign peoples the private enterprise "virus" in contrast to the state socialistic concepts which prevail in so many lands.

Now, my friends, I am not recommending that we export the American system of private enterprise intact to every foreign country. Obviously, these various lands are in different stages of development. Obviously, they have different cultural backgrounds, different geographic and economic needs. Let them adapt our system, but basically let them grasp the concept of freedom of enterprise, the concept of profit and loss. Let them understand the dangers of state confiscation.

Our diplomats must sell to foreign governments and peoples the concept that if nationals of America are going to invest their hard-earned money in another nation, they must have equality of protection for their investment. Our nationals must not be harassed or deprived of their life, liberty, or property abroad. We are not, of course, seeking to exploit any people. As Douglas MacArthur pointed out, the day of colonial imperialism is gone, and we say good riddance to it.

CONCLUSION

These then, are a few of the positive planks in a counteroffensive.

Well, I want again to express to you, my friends, my appreciation for your courteous attention and my congratulations on your splendid civic spirit. Good luck and good-by.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Plain Talk Wins People," from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of April 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN TALK WINS PEOPLE

Everywhere Douglas MacArthur goes, the people, by their attendance and their cheers underscore the colossal error Mr. Truman made in his abrupt treatment of the general.

This cavalier dismissal has been followed by speeches and statements by Mr. Truman and many of his advisers. The net effect is that every time one of the administration steps up to undo MacArthur, the administration suffers another setback.

The people are just not interested in having MacArthur smeared. It would be a good thing if the administration could appreciate as much. Then it would be less likely to make silly mistakes of the kind it has been making.

Another thing the administration might take into consideration is that the people are not falling for double talk about MacArthur. The announcement that the Joint Chiefs of Staffs concurred in MacArthur's dismissal is not an answer to his statement that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were agreed on the military principles he followed in Korea.

In short, the old-fashioned Washington gobbledy-gook has about run its course. The people liked that plain exposition of facts General MacArthur gave them. Anyone who wants to discuss foreign policy now will have to use facts and use them honestly. The people are just not interested in listening to a smear campaign.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one from the Commonweal for April 20, 1951, and the other from America, the National Catholic Weekly Review, for April 20, 1951, on the subject of the MacArthur controversy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Commonweal of April 20, 1951]

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In March 1945, a few days before the death of President Roosevelt, Robert Sherwood returned to this country from the Pacific theater of operations where he had made an inspection tour for the President, having been especially instructed to get General MacArthur's views on our future Pacific policy. When Sherwood, who said he was "enormously impressed" with the range of MacArthur's views on the Orient, made his report to Roosevelt, the President remarked: "I wish that he [MacArthur] would sometimes tell some of these things to me." So deeply suspicious of the democratic administration were MacArthur and his staff, that Sherwood said he found the unmistakable signs of "a persecution complex at work" in the MacArthur entourage.

In recent months General MacArthur chose to impose his private views on his Commander in Chief by means of a message to a veterans' convention, an unauthorized message and implied challenge to the Chinese commander in Korea, and a letter to the minority leader of the House. All told, one can only judge these actions to have been the behavior pattern of a man who put himself above the laws of courtesy and country.

MacArthur's opinion on Pacific policy—which is, that Asia is the decisive battlefield to be defended against the Communists and that therefore we should extend and not limit the Korean war—is an opinion totally in opposition to American foreign policy; in holding this opinion, MacArthur was defying the judgment of the President, the State Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Eisenhower, the majority of the United Nations, and the majority of the Congress. One may, if he is an admirer of the general believe that the general was acting in a democratic manner, in deference to the will of the majority and in the best interests of the principle we fight for, the principle of the "democratic way of life." But the burden of the proof is on him. This, it seems to us, was the behavior of a man in defiance of the majority, a man with a will-to-power that was contemptuous of the prevailing reason of the majority; this, in short, was the behavior of the self-appointed genius who always thinks he knows what is best for the ignorant masses and whose actions are in the pattern of history's long chronicle of dictators.

Maybe MacArthur was right; maybe he was of those rare and enlightened leaders destined to show mankind the way. Certainly he had reason to be restive, since he had been in a most difficult military position ever since the United Nations was forced to defend itself on the distant and disadvantageous Korean Peninsula.

But in our judgment MacArthur was disastrously wrong and we are of the opinion that the mystique of his enlightened leadership was a cult too jealously guarded by a selected group of admirers to be genuine. We consider MacArthur's policy to have been wrong for the following reasons:

First, we believe that in order to wage war now against the west, the Soviets must have the steel-making capacity of the Ruhr, or Japan, or both. Therefore western policy should be to prohibit Russia from the Ruhr and Japan by building up a defensive position in the free world with all haste, in the hope of stalemating the threat of a world war.

Second, we believe that in order to give us time to build these defenses, every effort should be made to limit the Korean war to Korea, because to bomb Manchuria means to bomb the rest of China eventually, and this in turn means that Russia will be forced to come to the direct aid of Mao Tse-tung. Since the United States cannot hope to defeat the Communists through nonatomic air power alone (we could not destroy the North Korean Army with air power, nor can we destroy the Chinese Armies now, even though we have had absolute control of the air), we would, then, following MacArthur's strategy, have to send our armies into the futile and bloody trap of a land war in Asia. Were this to harpen, Russia would have accomplished her desire to spread and thin out our nonatomic air and land forces around the world to a point of such overextension that it is doubtful whether western arms could be supreme in any one theater of war.

Third, since it is possible that under such circumstances the great powers will resort to atomic warfare (especially if the rumored atomic artillery shells are a reality), we believe that it is the moral obligation of Christians first to exhaust every possible means of averting this unspeakable massacre, and one of those means right now is to limit the war to Korea, making every effort to discharge our moral obligation to defend the United Nations there without provoking further conflict.

Fourth, we believe that the present foreign policy of the Administration is essentially correct in its European emphasis and in its combined objective of defense and negotiation. This policy is by far a better hope for an honorable peace than the swaggering belligerency of MacArthur.

In his last attempts to dictate the far eastern foreign policy of this country and of the United Nations, General MacArthur clearly exceeded his authority and, in defying the normal processes of the democratic code, he placed himself outside the cause and the ideology we are trying to defend; he in fact brought on his own dismissal. Surely the President acted with sincere regret, as he has said. But certainly his decision was for the common good; it was, we believe, the only decision he could have taken in the interests of discharging his responsibility to the country and to all those throughout the world who look to us now for a reasonable example of leadership.

In a very real sense Mr. Truman could only afford to make this decision trusting in the ability of his countrymen to weigh the facts impartially; if the MacArthur partisans choose to attack Mr. Truman as wildly as we anticipate they will, then we believe that those who support the President in this matter have every good reason to stand by him now and thus vindicate the high trust he has placed in them.

[From the National Catholic Weekly Review of April 20, 1951]

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

From almost any angle you look at it, the storm now swirling around General MacArthur is deplorable. What remains of our national unity is in danger of being destroyed by the supercharged lightning flashes of emotion generated by personal and political partisanship. We discern but one hopeful ray in the lightning-riven clouds: if the controversy can be brought under control and carried on calmly on the basis of the issues involved, it may become the last great debate on United States foreign policy.

The one Herbert Hoover touched off 6 months ago, apparently settled by the Senate's troops-to-Europe resolution of April 4, dealt largely with our policy for Europe. Our far-eastern policy, or lack of it, was not formally debated in the Senate. The MacArthur incident, for better or worse, has made such a discussion inevitable. We can only hope that it will be productive of a renewed national unity.

Already, as Walter Lippmann observed in the curious case of Senator TAFT, there is confusion as to what General MacArthur meant in his now celebrated letter to Congressman MARTIN. The general, as the columnist pointed out, wanted more than permission to bomb Red China's Manchurian bases and to use the Formosa forces of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese mainland. The General wanted permission to wage all-out war against China. Contending that the global conflict with communism has already begun, the general argued that it could be won by defeating Red China. The way to save Europe, he wrote in effect, is to defeat communism in Asia.

That involves an almost complete reversal of our present policy. The United States and its allies have long since decided to concentrate on Europe while diverting the necessary minimum to prevent a Communist sweep in Asia. The fundamental issue is therefore clear-cut. Shall the United States abandon its present efforts to safeguard Europe and devote its resources chiefly to a full-scale war with Red China?

Those who join General MacArthur in an affirmative answer to this fateful question should not overlook these considerations:

1. If we decide to join the issue in Asia, we shall have to go it alone—our Atlantic allies, the Asian-Arab nations and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

2. Attacking China in the belief that the U. S. S. R. will not come to her aid is not a calculated risk—it is the wildest sort of gamble.

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the west, will be relatively ineffective in China. If we contemplate using them for atomic bombing, let us reflect that such bombing would have little military value, would infuriate all Asia and might invite Russian retaliation. Thus there is no hope of a short and cheap war.

4. Our long-neglected tactical Air Force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.

5. Even if Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take over an almost defenseless Europe, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. If we tempt Russia into a war for which we are still unprepared offensively, we shall expose our people to destruction, since our home defense system, both military and civil, is pitifully incomplete.

7. As the President emphasized in his address to the Nation on April 11, our present policy is designed to avoid world war III. Though it may fail, it furnishes a hope lacking in the MacArthur approach.

If these considerations are put forcibly to the American people, we believe that the last great debate will not be prolonged as its predecessor was, and that our people, finally satisfied that we are on the only course open to us, will then settle down to the supreme task of insuring their security.

Why Dispersal Was Shelved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Dispersal Was Shelved," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 24, 1951. The editorial gives a clear answer to why many Senators voted against the dispersal bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DISPERSAL WAS SHELVED

Defeat of the dispersal-decentralization program in the Senate cannot fairly be attributed to a head-in-the-sand attitude toward the atomic bomb on the part of opponents of the plan. If there was confusion in Congress over the real purpose of the bill, the blame rests largely on those who sponsored it. There was good cause for suspicion at the Capitol that the whole dispersal idea was related only indirectly to atomic security—that the primary object was to provide more space for new Government employees and agencies rather than to save the Government from destruction if A-bombs started to fall.

The suspicion was fed by the nature of the dispersal plan itself. It is true that several defense offices were scheduled to be moved to the satellite Federal office centers skirting the National Capital, but so were a number of agencies which would have little or no part in taking over the Government in event of an atomic catastrophe. And, as some senatorial critics of the plan pointed out, placing some Federal offices only 20 miles from the zero milestone would not guarantee safety—especially if the Russians should succeed in developing a hydrogen bomb. Moreover, the main centers of Federal activity, the really vital spots of the executive establishment, were to remain right inside the target zone in Washington.

Testimony during the hearings indicated that some Federal officials were more concerned with making room in the District of Columbia for the expanding Government than with preparing defenses against atomic attacks. One way of relieving the growing congestion, of course, would be to launch a genuine retrenchment program for nonessential activities, as Senator BYRD, the Hoover Commission, and others have urged. But that alternative does not seem to have been given very serious thought by Federal authorities.

Decentralization—the removal of some agencies to distant cities—was plainly at variance with the fundamental plan for establishing the seat of Government in the District of Columbia. Decentralization, as proposed in the shelved bill, was almost wholly a space-making expedient, not a security project. Decentralization for such a purpose should be a last resort. As the Star has said before, there are still Federal-owned sites within the District where new offices could be built.

The prospect of spending more than $100,000,000 on a program which would offer little assurance of security in event of all-out atomic warfare was not appealing at a time when the need for drastic economy is as urgent as it is today. This prospect, coupled with the understandable reluctance of nearby areas to having the Federal Government take more land off the tax rolls, had much to do with the scuttling of the plan by the Senate yesterday. Until the administration comes forward with more convincing evidence of the urgent need for dispersal and decentralization, and more proof of the defense value of so costly an enterprise, Congress may be excused for failing to show any enthusiasm for the program.

Statement by Erle Cocke, Jr., on the Sixth Anniversary of the Meeting of the Russian and United States Troops at the Elbe River, April 25, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, on the sixth anniversary of the meeting of the Russian and United States troops at the River Elbe on April 25, 1945.

I may add that this statement is being broadcast by the Voice of America in 87 different languages today. It seems a most excellent statement on the friendship of the people of America for the people of Russia.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. By a strange coincidence, and one which has some significance, it is also the anniversary of the

adoption of the United Nations charter at San Francisco.

Mr. BREWSTER. A very happy coincidence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY WILL COCKE, JR., NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON THE SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MEETING OF THE RUSSIAN AND UNITED STATES TROOPS AT THE ELBE RIVER, APRIL 25, 1945

Six years ago today two brave armies met at the Elbe River in Germany and in common cause, grasped hands in friendship.

Russian soldiers and American soldiers defeated nazism—the common enemy of 1945—but the high hopes of peace have been dashed since that memorable day.

In six short years the Stalinist regime, by its military and political aggression, has extended its control to the point where today, 87 out of every 100 people in the world are under the domination of the Soviet Politburo. The regime that rules one-fifth of the earth's surface controls one third of its living.

But the cause for which the Russian soldier fought—the extinction of Nazi-Fascism—has turned upon him, and today a cynical leadership would have him believe that western democracy and American ideals of freedom are even worse than Hitlerism.

Surely 6 years do not change the common man. Only the despot can twist facts to fit his warped mind.

The Russian soldier who clasped the hand of his American comrade-in-arms on the Elbe is, fundamentally the same soldier today.

The American soldier who returned that firm handclasp of friendship has not changed.

The ideology of the United States has not changed. It still calls for a free man in a free world.

But the Kremlin, having tasted victory—a victory that was won not by despotism, but by men who valued freedom, would now have those same friends turn about and declare that handclasp on the Elbe was an empty gesture.

Today in the United States, the friends of fighters for Russian freedom has dedicated itself to friendship for the Russian people in their long struggle against Stalinist slavery.

The American Legion welcomes this group and endorses its anti-Stalinist crusade.

The friends of fighters for Russian freedom has undertaken to tell the Russian people that we make a clear distinction between them and their slave-masters. They, like the American Legion, would have the truth permeate beyond the iron curtain and reach the minds of ordinary Russians.

Let no one think this cannot be done. It is part of Stalin's invincibility myth to say that one cannot reach the Russian people.

We know that the American people are, as they have been in the past, the steadfast friends of the Russian people. Our fight is with the despotic rulers now directing Soviet policy. That, too, is the aim of the friends of fighters for Russian freedom.

On behalf of millions of American veterans, the American Legion reaffirms its solidarity with former comrades-in-arms of the Soviet army who still look forward to the achievement in Russia of those basic freedoms and human rights without which there can be no peace and for which Americans and Russians died.

(Above statement endorsed by commander in chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars; national commander of AMVETS; and national commander of DAV.)

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to the Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Sixtieth Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in Constitution Hall in this city on April 18, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your great patriotic organization, during all its history, has exerted a powerful influence for sound Americanism.

You have always combated the godless ideologies which would destroy our country.

You have proudly proclaimed the glories of the flag and the greatness of our Republic.

You have been an unconquered bulwark in defense of the letter and the spirit of the Constitution.

While others slept, the Daughters of the American Revolution have kept the watch over the ramparts of freedom.

America has never been a country for an easy way of life. It is a land of opportunity, but it calls upon its sons and daughters for courage, self-reliance, hard work, and sacrifice.

Fortunately, those who settled America were sturdy, self-reliant men and women. They had stout hearts and deep convictions. They braved the perils and the hardships of the New World because they loved liberty.

They wanted freedom to worship in the manner which would bring them closest to God. They wanted the right to speak freely and without fear. They wanted the right to take part in their Government.

They didn't look to the Government for security. They did not demand grants, loans, subsidies, or hand-outs. All they asked was freedom and opportunity.

With faith founded upon deep religious convictions, they started to carve out of the wilderness the outlines of advancing civilization on the American Continent.

Their tools were the ax, the rifle, and the Bible—each a true symbol of the elements which have contributed to the greatness of our country.

The ax represents hard work and thrift.

The rifle symbolizes courage and sacrifice in the defense of our high ideals.

The Bible is the truth, the foundation of our Government, the inspiration and guide to justice, righteousness, and peace.

It is not necessary to go into the history of our growth and progress before this splendid audience.

You know the story of our colonial development, of the rising resistance to tyranny, culminating in the ringing declaration that these Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.

You have followed the fortunes of the patriots of our independence from Lexington and Concord to the discouragement and cruel suffering at Valley Forge and the final triumph at Yorktown.

The sacred ideals for which our forefathers fought were given expression in the Constitution of the United States, the oldest written Constitution in the world. The far-sighted statesmen who gathered in Independence Hall in the summer of 1787 wanted a form of government that recognized freedom of the individual as God's greatest gift to mankind.

Their whole plan of government was to give men opportunity. Under that system we have made marvelous progress in less than 200 years.

A trackless wilderness has been converted into fertile lands and splendid cities. Great transportation systems and giant industries have been created. Thousands of small businesses have been established, forming the strong backbone of our economy.

Hospitals, educational institutions, research foundations and centers of art and music have been established. More than 266,000 churches, cathedrals, synagogues, and temples have been erected, with a membership exceeding 77,000,000, free to worship as their conscience dictates.

In 200 years we have developed our skills and resources until we enjoy more of the good things of life than any other people on earth.

We have attained the highest cultural level and the highest living standards of any nation in the world.

We are now without question, because of our know-how and our mastery of science, the greatest Nation of all history.

Yet in spite of all these blessings we have reached a time of desperate challenge.

As you well know, our country is confronted, at this moment, with dangers that could destroy our system of free government and the American way of life.

I have no fear that destruction will be brought upon us at the hands of Communist aggressors. I do not fear that the power of a foreign foe will ever destroy this great Republic.

No, my fellow Americans, that is not the greatest danger.

I am convinced that the greatest danger is within our own borders. It lurks among our own people. It is the danger that Lincoln warned against when he said:

At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide.

Today we are confronted with the danger of unsound fiscal policies, unbalanced budgets, excessive taxation and a staggering burden of debt, produced by the waste and extravagance at all levels of government.

These are the real causes of inflation which has robbed the American dollar of its purchasing power.

They point the way to national bankruptcy, which means the destruction of all freedom of the individual.

We are threatened by Government paternalism, which would concentrate complete authority under the dictatorship of an all-powerful socialistic state.

We have the danger from the insidious infiltration of Communists and other subversive elements in our schools and colleges, labor organizations and churches and even into high places in the Government.

Yes, these are dangers that we must guard against, but in my humble opinion, the most pressing danger we face is the weakening of the moral fiber of our people.

That condition grows out of a lack of understanding that a strong moral and spiritual America is the source and foundation of all our national strength.

It has come upon us because too many of our people have neglected or ignored the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. They have forgotten that as Americans we share obligations as well as rights and privileges.

The result has been greatly increased law evasion, tax dodging, and racketeering. It has brought about corrupt partnerships between public officials and the criminal underworld.

The Kefauver committee has disclosed that organized gambling syndicates take $20,000,000,000 a year from the American people by their illegal operations. That is four times as much as we spend for education. It is seven times as much as we give to our churches.

That is a terrible situation. But a greater evil is the political power gained by racketeers and gangsters by corrupting public officials, sworn to support and enforce the law.

In some communities they have built up such powerful strength in both political parties, that they have become an invisible government in city halls and courthouses.

These are the termites that are undermining the foundations of free government.

The soldier cannot move forward effectively, the pilot cannot maneuver his plane as skillfully and the gunner on his ship cannot aim as well if they realize that men back home are evading the law, living easy lives through dishonesty and corruption.

Neither can the mechanic or the farmer produce as much if he knows that a part of his production goes to the listless, the profiteer, the grafter, and the traitor to our country.

In all the sordid story of crime and corruption the most shocking chapter reveals that men in high places in the Government have betrayed the responsibilities entrusted to them.

It tells of men who were morally blinded by selfishness and greed in their desire for quick riches. It describes how they abandoned all honorable standards and pursued a course dictated by political influence, favoritism, and bribery.

And most shameful of all, in my opinion, is the refusal of President Truman to drive out of the Government those whose questionable, if not illegal conduct, has shaken public confidence in his administration.

Perhaps the explanation can be found in the statement of former Democratic Governor M. E. Thompson, of Georgia, when he resigned a week ago as consultant in the Office of Price Stabilization.

Former Governor Thompson resigned in disgust because he had been on the payroll for 12 weeks at $53.46 a day, without having anything to do.

During that time he had plenty of opportunity to observe what was going on. Listen to what he said, and I quote:

"I refuse to be a parasite on the American taxpayers.

"Thousands of loyal Americans," he continued, "are giving unselfishly of their time to defense work, but their efforts are being nullified by the indecision, bungling, and interference of scheming politicians who are motivated solely by their desire to stay in power. The American people are being victimized by a national conspiracy of mediocrity.

"Conditions existing in the national administration are so deplorable today that loyalty to party and patriotism to country constitute a conflict."

Let me say now that when such conditions are created, whether by Republicans or Democrats, our Government is in danger. Party loyalty should cease and real Americanism should assert itself.

Yes, I repeat, the most pressing danger we face is the weakening of the moral fiber of our people.

What is responsible for the critical international situation facing the United States today?

Fundamentally it can be traced to the lack of moral leadership in our appeasement of Communist Russia.

The first fatal step was taken in 1933 when we recognized the Soviet gangster government.

In a speech at Chicago in 1941 ex-President Hoover denounced that action in the words which I now quote:

"Four American Presidents and four Secretaries of State, beginning with Woodrow Wilson, refused to have anything to do with Soviet Russia on the ground of morals and democratic ideals.

"They refused diplomatic recognition. They did so because here is one of the bloodiest tyrannies and terrors ever erected in history. It destroyed every semblance of human rights and human liberty; it is a militant destroyer of the worship of God. It brutally executes millions of innocent people without the semblance of justice. It has enslaved the rest. Moreover it has violated every international covenant, it has carried on a world conspiracy against all democracies, including the United States."

Following World War II the leaders of our Nation sat down with the cut-throats of Moscow and entered into secret conspiracies that enslaved millions of freedom-loving people who looked to the United States for liberty, justice, and the right of self-government.

One by one the small nations of Europe were swallowed up behind the iron curtain—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and part of Finland.

Then came the betrayal of China, loyal friend of the United States for a hundred years, who relied upon us to maintain her independence and national integrity.

Yes; it was the lack of moral leadership that permitted us to enter into these unholy agreements to betray the freedom-loving people of these countries. We abandoned the traditional and time-honored American principles of justice, freedom, and decency under the influence of such traitors as Alger Hiss.

The confused and irresponsible actions of the present administration have spread doubt and anxiety among the American people.

They are worried about the conflict in Korea, where we have already suffered nearly 60,000 casualties.

They are worried because we seem to have no plan.

They have no confidence in the judgment and the integrity of some of the men who have grave responsibilities and exercise great influence and power in our Government.

They have no confidence in the hasty midnight decision which ordered our soldiers into the so-called "police action" in Korea.

And the events of the past week have clearly demonstrated that they have no confidence in the hasty, midnight decision which dismissed that great soldier and patriotic American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Again I say it all stems from a lack of moral leadership at the head of our Government.

Regardless of whatever justification the President may have thought he had—it was a brutal, irresponsible and uncalled for procedure against one of the greatest Americans who has given a lifetime of distinguished, heroic, and patriotic service to his country.

When the history of our time is recorded General MacArthur will be remembered as more than a great soldier. He will be honored as much more than one of our most brilliant military leaders.

His fame will rest equally upon his greatness as a statesman and as a diplomat.

The highest praise will be accorded his wisdom and keen understanding which won the respect and confidence of a conquered people and was winning millions of people in the Far East to the American way of life.

The most ardent hope that fills the hearts of men and women today is the hope for peace in the world, with honor, justice, and freedom.

To achieve peace we must be strong—financially, militarily, industrially—and most important we must set an example to the world of clean, decent, honest living, based on the highest moral and spiritual standards.

We must obey the laws of God and man.

Each of us must do his or her share to make the world of tomorrow a better world, but we must begin by making ourselves better people.

If we put our own house in order we can overcome the forces of evil.

We can achieve victory if we stamp out selfishness and greed and return to the moral principles, the patriotism, the courage and the faith in God that guided your ancestors in their struggle for American independence.

The Age of Government Benevolence and Handouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 'Gimme' Age," published in the Meaford Express, of Meaford, Ontario, November 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "GIMME" AGE

(By Joseph Lister Rutledge)

This has become the age of "gimme," in which most issues are subordinated to the overwhelming importance of the hand-out. It has come to be that right and justice and integrity and intelligence must give way before the expanding demands of this group and that. Bit by bit, we are watching the deterioration of peoples whose great traditions have been independence and self-respect. But sadder than that is the fact that we are all active participants in the change. We must say "yes" to every insistent demand; offering in return for political advantage generous slices of that mythical pie from the sky. Anyone who stands up to protest that there is an end to all benevolence, and that end is where benevolence paralyzes the abilities and integrities of a people, is derided as a reactionary. But, thinking soberly, we know that we can't all have everything we want. We know we can't provide cradle to grave security, minimum work hours, soaring wages, and endless featherbedding, both political and social. Still we promise it, hoping that some miracle will save us. What happened to some of the promises already made? Nothing. They did not materialize, that is all. The advantage gained, they were forgotten, or the failure was blamed on someone else.

The sad point of all this is not so much that we have failed in some impossible benefactions. It is that we have come to believe that the great man, the great organization, the great government, is the one that would promise the most. Years ago the soldiers who gathered about the Italian patriot Garibaldi shouted at him: "What will you give us if we follow you?" The great leader faced them sternly. "I'll give you wounds and sickness and suffering and death. But I'll give you, with them, the freedom of Italy." But we—we offer nothing but the full stomach, the lax muscles, the stifled heart. We

have nothing to offer to the mind and the spirit that once led men to achievement; nothing to support the belief that any sacrifice is worth while that leaves us free, standing on our own feet, thinking our own thoughts and obligated to no one but ourselves. We talk of "the good life." But what we mean is the ample life—more free benefits, more free time, more free protection. And for what? That there may be better men and women, better education, better hearts, better homes? Nothing of the kind. Just material things. Not a word about wounds and suffering and the achievement of freedom. Only the slow attrition of hunger satisfied without effort, of security achieved without sacrifice, of production at the sweat of no man's brow. That was not the way that this or any country was born. That is not the way any free country survives.

Improvement in Business Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch entitled "Buying Spree Ended in March, Department of Commerce Reports." It calls attention to the fact that because of our large production and because of lessened consumer buying, conditions in the various industries of the country are much better.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUYING SPREE ENDED IN MARCH, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE REPORTS

The big consumer buying spree of early 1951 halted in March, the Commerce Department reported yesterday. But the Department warned that this "moderation of the inflationary movement" was offset by a rising threat of inflation from another quarter—business firms, plans to invest record sums in new plant and equipment this year.

The threat of a business spending spree was pictured by the agency as making further Government controls or other counter-inflationary action necessary, although some makers of autos and other consumer goods are now cutting output and laying off workers.

In its April Survey of Current Business, the Department commented:

"It is clear that further action—whether this takes the form of direct controls or monetary and fiscal measures, or both—will be required to insure the channeling of sufficient resources for defense purposes and to avoid inflationary excesses."

"In such a period," the Department publication continued, "Government policy must be directed toward curtailing that part of investment (by business in new buildings and machines) as well as consumption not essential to the mobilization effort."

Discussing the slow-down in consumer buying, the Department said March retail sales dropped 5 percent below the preceding month after allowance for seasonable factors. The decline centered in used cars, television sets, household appliances, clothing, and general merchandise.

Compared with March 1950, last month's sales were up 11 percent in dollar volume at a total of $12,620,000,000 but the Department declared the 11-percent rise was "practically all" accounted for by higher prices.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 15, 1951, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the junior Senator from Washington were guests of the Columbia Broadcasting System on its People's Platform program. This program was broadcast nationally, and apparently aroused a considerable amount of interest among those who listened. Many citizens from different areas in the Nation have written to me to say they heard some or all of the program. It was on this program that I suggested that consideration should be given by the Congress to legitimatizing the undeclared war in Korea by declaring war on those enemies who have been fighting against our free forces since June of 1950. A number of persons have written and wanted to know exactly what was said by the Senator from Connecticut and myself on the subject of war. In order to satisfy these requests, and in order that other Members of the Congress may have available to them what was said by the Senator from Connecticut and myself, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the program be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Once again the Columbia Broadcasting System presents the People's Platform with Dwight Cooke. "Is the President or General MACARTHUR right? Is our policy in China sound?" These are the provocative questions highlighting the discussion between two national leaders today on the People's Platform. They are United States Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, and United States Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington. Now for the informal debate on the Korean crisis, here is Chairman Dwight Cooke. Mr. Cooke.

Mr. COOKE. Usually on the People's Platform I start out by giving a slight summary and reiteration of the events which have led up to the subject we're going to discuss on given day. Certainly this is one day when there's no need to do any looking back; everybody remembers the dismissal of General MACARTHUR, the statement of the President in his speech to the country, various statements coming out of Tokyo, MACARTHUR's headquarters, and the President's political speech last night. So, sitting on my right and left here on the People's Platform, are two eminent Senators of the two parties, so we will get to work.

Senator BENTON, also a former assistant Secretary of State, I think I'll start with you. What is you opinion on the MACARTHUR controversy?

Senator BENTON. I'd like to take that question first on a highly personal standpoint. I learned yesterday that General MACARTHUR is going to become a resident of my State, Connecticut, he's going to settle in Stamford. I think I can safely say he becomes our most famous import. Indeed, Senator, he rivals in fame our most famous export, Secretary Acheson, or even Katherine Hepburn or Gene Tierney. In fact I think he can be said to rival the export of Fuller brushes for which my State is known throughout the country. Could you give me any information, because this will be important to me personally, on whether you think the Republican Party is going to view General MACARTHUR as an outstanding Presidential candidate.

Senator CAIN. BILL BENTON, I shall always, sir, like to help you personally——

Senator BENTON. Well, thank you.

Senator CAIN. With reference to General MACARTHUR. He is coming back not to talk politics but to talk with his country about what has and has not taken place in recent months in Korea.

Senator BENTON. It is wholly possible that this brilliant, able man against his great career however may interest himself, if not immediately in the question of politics; that the politicians of both parties will be exceedingly interested in hearing. You know, I'm running next year for the Senate in my State. The Republicans haven't selected a candidate yet to run against me. If you don't think he may loom and emerge as a Presidential candidate, my personal interest could be great; he might emerge as a candidate for the Senate and he would be a great ornament to the Senate.

Senator CAIN. Again, William, we have not come to New York today to talk about the personal fortunes of a personal friend of mine. Both parties will be interested in Gen. Douglas MACARTHUR. And the President of the United States has recently made of General MACARTHUR a free citizen to do as he wishes.

Senator BENTON. I welcome this distinguished new acquisition to Stamford, Conn. I think perhaps I will answer your question at a different level, Mr. Cooke. Perhaps the difference between Senator CAIN and me on this controversy can be best expressed after reading Senator CAIN's able speech on the floor of the Senate on Friday by my stating that I disagree with him and with General MACARTHUR on the proposed China policy. It seems to me that General MACARTHUR wants to get us in what he hopes will be a nice easy war with China and then perhaps into a quick war with Russia, which is a grave risk involved, in order to end the war in Korea.

Senator CAIN. Dwight Cooke, I deny that Gen. Douglas MACARTHUR has any interest whatsoever in getting this great Nation of ours and our allies into a larger war. Let us not forget that 9 months ago in June of 1950, 53 so-called free nations resolved to make of Korea a free, united, and self-controlled nation. Gen. Douglas MACARTHUR, first on November 28, following the avalanche of the Red hordes from the north, and secondly on March 7, 1951, merely said to America, to all of our allies and to the world that as yet the free nations of this world have not joined collectively together with power sufficient to carry out the mission which was imposed upon Gen. Douglas MACARTHUR in June of last year. As I read and listened and thought about our President's speech of Wednesday of last week, he was saying for all the world to hear, and we in this country must make up our minds to agree or disagree, that America's mission and the mission of the United Nations in Korea has changed tremendously and completely from what it was 9 months ago.

Senator BENTON. Senator CAIN, the big thing that we were after in Korea, it seems to me, has been achieved short of military victory. The first big thing we were after was to make out of the United Nations a strong, active, vital potential force in world affairs. If we had not moved into Korea as we did last June, I think the United Nations would have been relegated and in all possibility permanently into a kind of polite debating society or merely a platform for the Russian propaganda attacks upon us. Our action in Korea has demonstrated to the Russians and their allies or satellites the potential resistance any place in the world where aggression breaks out. That's the big thing that has so far been achieved in Korea. That in itself is a psychological victory.

Senator CAIN. Senator BENTON, that is not what we said we were going to Korea to attempt to accomplish. We were going to Korea to repel and chase out the enemy. We have done no such thing. The President of the United States, on Wednesday last, said that power sufficient to undertake and accomplish our mission are not to be given, first to General MACARTHUR, and now to his successor, Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway. Instead of repelling the aggressor as was our determination 9 months ago, we, through the words of the President, have decided to resist the aggressor, and it's this American's point of view that if all the collective forces of free men everywhere can only resist an aggressor in Korea, they are foredoomed to annihilation and to defeat and to just being wiped off this earth when it comes to a larger war against communism in other and large battle areas.

Senator BENTON. Senator CAIN, let me break in right there. I don't believe we're going to settle these grave and difficult problems and these grave political questions by military conquest alone. The military conquest——

Senator CAIN. I agree.

Senator BENTON. What we're after in Korea is a means to a larger end, which is the collective peace and security not only of the people of the United States but of the free nations of the world. Now you have an element of political judgment on General MACARTHUR's recommendations on the naval operation—the Chiang Kai-shek operation, the air bombing of the China coast. That is an important political decision as well as a military decision.

Senator CAIN. I agree.

Senator BENTON. Now, you have the four Joint Chiefs of Staff, who seem to differ with General MACARTHUR, you have the President, you have the leaders in England, in France, in other countries of the world. With all respect to the general's great military talent, at the political level the potential consequences of this Chinese action I would like to suggest that it looks as if everybody's out of step except General MACARTHUR, Senator CAIN, and Senator TAFT.

Senator CAIN. Senator BENTON, I think that is not a correct thing for you to say. What General MACARTHUR did on two occasions or more occasions in Korea was to raise some questions—he merely asked the United Nations to make some firm decisions either, to use a slang expression, to "put up" the forces they said last June they would put up or to "shut up" against their own inferred intention of doing nothing further in Korea to expel and repel the invader. I think that Gen. Douglas MACARTHUR did his Nation and the free world a great favor in asking all of us, Where are we headed? The President of the United States the other night said we are headed this way: "We are going to negotiate a peace in due time with the enemy." The presumption is on the enemy's terms. Korea, which we set out to make free, united, and self-controlled is to continue to be a battleground of frustration and futility because the great forces of freedom have decided they do not have strength sufficient to their undertaking.

Senator BENTON. There's nothing in the record of the evidence anywhere to indicate any thought of any negotiation making peace on the enemy's terms. You couldn't. It is that fear, it is that thought in the hearts of many of our fellow countrymen that lie at the root of part of our grave and deep disagreement——

Senator CAIN. That's quite right.

Senator BENTON. Today in the field of foreign policy.

Senator CAIN. Well, Senator——

Senator BENTON. And on behalf of the President and our leaders in the State Department and on behalf of our British allies, I would deny that thought. Now, to carry that a step further, we have got to reach a point when we try to get a general settlement with the Communists. There's no doubt. Churchill puts it by telling us, as you on the Military Affairs Committee know, to get strong and then negotiate. But there must be a time when we will negotiate if we're going to avoid this world war III.

Senator CAIN. Senator BILL BENTON, permit me to disagree with you for this fundamental reason: For approximately 9 months the mission of the United Nations was to repel and chase out the aggressor if they could while giving evidence always of a desire to sit down and negotiate a reasonable peace. On Wednesday of last week the President of the United States said we are only going to attempt to resist from now on. And against that new characterization or definition of what we're going to do in Korea, the enemy need be in no hurry; he knows our forces aren't going to attempt to go anywhere and the presumption is that we're not going to get enough power to go anywhere, and so that enemy can sit back, continue to fight a war of attrition, keep on nibbling at the peace table until we free powers are required to accept terms that we wouldn't have thought tenable or possible nine short months ago.

Senator BENTON. These are very complicated questions. Your high praise of General Ridgway on the floor of the Senate, Friday afternoon, and the great confidence you had in him, seem to me to be inconsistent with the certainty with which you now prophesy what his military movements are going to be in Korea.

Senator CAIN. Senator BENTON, there is no connection between the two. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, like his predecessor, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, are two of the great fighting generals this world has ever known. But Matthew Bunker Ridgway will have imposed upon him the same decisions of frustration and futility which led to the removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Senator BENTON. So your answer for that is, Let us start the big war right now.

Senator CAIN. I've said no such thing.

Mr. COOKE. Let's get this clear both ways, gentlemen. Senator CAIN, first what is your proposal from here on in the Korean War?

Senator CAIN. I think it is nothing short of this—the President of the United States, the large political leaders of all the free nations of the world collected as they are now at Lake Success, talk constantly and insistently about collective security. Fifty-three nations started out to win first the police action in Korea, and now the war—for the President called it a war the other day—but after 9 months of war 14 nations out of 53 nations have contributed as many as 1 foot soldier to that contest. Now we're not going anywhere for freedom, we're not going anywhere in the direction of victory unless we make collective security what it implies, a "large sacrifice and participation from each and every one of the 53 free nations of the world." That's my answer to the President's speech of the other night—let us do what we say and mean what we intended to do 9 months ago.

Mr. COOKE. And, in the meantime, Senator CAIN, when would you bomb in Manchuria or in China?

Senator CAIN. I would have given to the Supreme Commander—months ago, in November—the authority to bomb the enemy supply lines wherever he thought that tactically and strategically necessary in order to save American lives. I would place in the hands, were I the authority and I'm not, of General Ridgway that same authority. But I in part think the question is academic because if the President's prophecy of the other night comes true that the mass offensive, which the President said was being mobilized north of the Yalu River, is launched on our limited forces, then in self-defense General Ridgway and his men of all these nations must retaliate with everything they've got if they wish to live, and that can only come through bombing the supply and communication lines of the enemy in Manchuria.

Mr. COOKE. There, Senator BENTON, is one side of a foreign policy, what would be your proposal instead.

Senator BENTON. I share wholly Senator CAIN's desire to create a world where we can have collective—what he calls collective security; that, of course, is what we're after in our Korean action. The Korean action symbolizes the effort and hope of the United Nations to take a vast step forward toward collective security.

Now, I'm going to—this is very serious and difficult material we're discussing here. Most of our allies in the United Nations, most of our allies in Europe, disagree with the course of action advocated by General MacArthur and Senator CAIN; these are people not without experience with China and the Orient. I would like at the risk of perhaps some of our listeners thinking I am treating a serious, desperate subject where lives are at stake and where our boys are right today this very minute being killed in Korea, but even at the risk of some people thinking I'm treating it with levity, I would like to tell you and Senator CAIN a little story that perhaps illustrates why I think my policy is the policy of hope, why General MacArthur and Senator CAIN's policy is a policy that may precipitate us into the third war, which otherwise we can hope to avoid.

Senator CAIN. Please give us the story, William.

Mr. COOKE. May I interrupt. Before you give us the story, Senator BENTON, your policy—just a little more clarity on that; instead of an augumentation of the war in the Far East the center of your policy would be what?

Senator BENTON. Well, we have three other approaches to foreign policy as Senator CAIN knows full well out of his membership of the Armed Services Committee over and above military force. Mr. Paul Hoffman, recently retired as the head of the ECA, has written a very brilliant and able book, which is now running in the newspapers of the country, in installments, dealing in large part with these other approaches other than force to foreign policy. Mr. Hoffman's book points out that force alone cannot conquer, or when we have conquered, can't do the job for us. We must have strong economic policy, a good illustration of that is the Marshall plan and point 4; we must have a far stronger information and propaganda policy than ever created or conceived thus far by the State Department. And, of course, we must continue our diplomatic efforts and pressure at the highest level to strengthen the United Nations to achieve collective security.

Senator CAIN. Will you permit me to interject, Senator BILL BENTON, you just said

something very interesting—"We must continue our pressures at the highest level." What we, who are concerned with men who die now in Korea, want to do are to exert some powers at the foot of the ladder through men who were fighting. And let me draw to his attention, Senator BENTON's attention, and everybody else who is concerned—that, look, BILL BENTON——

Senator BENTON. Well, let me tell you my story——

Senator CAIN. I will. Your story comes next—on Korea—that after 9 months of war 52 free nations in terms of collective security about which you hope we're going to have some day, have not collectively contributed as many foot soldiers to the mud and the misery and the bloodshed of Korea as America has lost in casualties. That's why my eye is on that Yalu River in anticipation of the great tragedy which is likely to result from this mass offensive the President told us about the other night and for which, sir, we are not only not prepared today, we are giving no intention of becoming prepared, and I think it a great pity.

Senator BENTON. Senator CAIN, you may have been on the floor of the Senate at the time of the outbreak of the Korean invasion when I was the first to demand that soldiers from other nations be immediately sent into Korea to join our own boys in Korea. * * * that we do not have at this time greater forces but we've got to remember we sent General Eisenhower to Europe to build up the forces there.

Senator CAIN. Is there a war going on in Europe today?

Senator BENTON. We've got to remember that the British, in the Straits Settlements—you know the figures better than I do—the French in Indochina do have detachments of soldiers and the French fighting in Indochina as we are in Korea roughly comparable to our own detachments in Korea.

Senator CAIN. That's right.

Senator BENTON. Now, in other words, that again illustrates the fact that we are in an area where progress is not coming as rapidly as we want it to come and on that you and I agree.

I may say, Senator CAIN, in line with your suggestion and before your suggested approach to the China question and General MacArthur's before I tell my story, which I'm afraid I'm over-building, I wonder why you or some other distinguished Republican leader in the Senate doesn't introduce a resolution unto the floor of the Senate calling for this war against China instead of more or less keeping ourselves behind the brass or the leadership or the ideas of General MacArthur. We've been saying on the floor of the Senate that we in Congress have the power to declare war.

Senator CAIN. Right.

Senator BENTON. And not the President.

Senator CAIN. All right.

Senator BENTON. Well, if we want war with China, why don't you get it out in the open and put in a resolution and call for the declaration of war on China instead of going at it in this backward way through General MacArthur.

Senator CAIN. Look, nobody is going at anything in a backward way. It was only on Wednesday, a couple of nights ago, in the middle of last week, that the President of the United States for the first time ever said that the United States and the United Nations were involved in a war in Korea. After 60,000 Americans had been killed, injured, or lost in action, the President of the United States continued to characterize that amazingly large conflict as being a police action.

Now, this Senator, is giving thought to a question and he is not acting with the speed and the rapidity and without the authority with which the President acted last June. I think because of what the President said last week that there is good and sound reason on Tuesday of next week, which is after the week end is over and a lot of people have thought about it, for a resolution to be offered in the Senate of the United States declaring war in Korea against all of the enemies of the United Nations fighting either in Korea or using contiguous and adjacent territories from which to launch attacks against men who, because we've done nothing in 9 months to destroy the build-up of those attacks, are too defenseless—I intend to make such a resolution to move to focus again public opinion on this question to find out not only where we are, BILL BENTON, but where in God's name are we going.

Senator BENTON. In line with your view, Senator CAIN, that's the frank, courageous, candid approach and it gets it out in the open on the floor of the Senate. And if it means the big war and starting a big war now—I, of course, will oppose your resolution.

Now I'm going to tell you my story.

Senator CAIN. Ah, but before you do that——

Senator BENTON. No, no, no, no, * * * that I postponed this story too long, this is the story——

Senator CAIN. Well, keep this story on Korea and we're for it. All of us.

Senator BENTON. This is the story that illustrates why I think there is more hope in my policy than in General MacArthur's policy. It's a story about an Oriental despot. This Oriental despot, some hundreds of years ago, sentenced one of his courtiers to death. The courtier said to him, "O king,"—he said—"O king, before you kill me, give me a 30-day reprieve and in that 30 days I shall teach your favorite ass how to talk." So the king settled back and said, "Well," he said, "all right, what's 30 days?" and he sent the man to his jail and sent him his favorite ass and, of course, the courtier's friends came around and said, "Well, now, what are you up to anyway? What's the idea of this gag of yours?" And the courtier looked at him, and there's much Oriental wisdom now in what the courtier said——

Senator CAIN. We're dealing with the Orient.

Senator BENTON. Yes; we are. And the courtier said, "Well," he said, "you know in the next 30 days, a lot can happen." He said, "In the first place I might die. In the next place, the king might die. But in the third place, there's a bare chance that ass may learn how to talk."

Senator CAIN. Well, BILL, I found your story very interesting. Now through the point of the story, are you asking for patience in Korea? Is that what you're driving at?

Senator BENTON. The American people lack patience on these great issues—that's exactly the point I'm making; it is a characteristic and a grave handicap to us in the difficult problem of the conduct of our foreign policy. We do lack patience. That's precisely the point of the story.

Senator CAIN. Senator BENTON, I agree with you that I think many times we do not have the patience we ought to have, but the patience in this case goes back 9 months, for on the 27th day of June 1950 the President of the United States—without consultation or advice from anybody so far as I know and with totally no patience of any kind—started us off on a collective security effort which has not come to pass.

Senator BENTON. I disagree.

Senator CAIN. So we now are suggesting that in view of this build-up and this mass offensive, which we can anticipate, we must provide our fighting men and our allied friends with that authority sufficient to take care of themselves—that's a calculated risk, if it leads to greater danger in the future that to my way of thinking is a risk we must take or we ought to remove ourselves from Korea at the earliest possible minute.

Senator BENTON. Well, it wasn't the President who precipitated this problem last June, it was the invasion of the North Koreans; it was the Communist policy; it was the naked appearance of Communist policy of invasion which we could all then see and understand.

Senator CAIN. The Orient must have had some patience admittedly before they started the attack. But as soon as they started it, the President exercised none of the patience to which you refer and which got us into this business; some of us want to get us out of it.

Senator BENTON. Well, if I haul off right now and hit you as hard as I can you're not going to be very patient about it—that's what we were up against.

Senator CAIN. And that's what we're up against right now.

Senator BENTON. That's what we were up against in Korea last June. Even the slightest delay last June and those troops would have swept right down and taken over that peninsula if we'd been a week or two later, you know that would have——

Senator CAIN. After 9 months of war it looks as though that same thing is too likely to happen again if we sit in our box in Southern Korea and refuse to give our men, because they do not have power enough, the power to go ahead as free men always ought to do or they ought to back away, lick their wounds, and prepare for a greater conflict on a larger field.

Senator BENTON. I don't see that we have any choice but to put our confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and in the talented General Ridgway on these questions. We certainly can't settle them day to day in debates on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. COOKE. That's one area in this MacArthur controversy we haven't taken up, gentlemen, and fascinating as this all is, I would like to ask this kind of a double-barreled question. First you, Senator CAIN. Propriety and the purpose of the MacArthur statements which led up to his dismissal?

Senator CAIN. I have never met General MacArthur. I have never seen him outside of his pictures. He not only is the commanding general of our American forces in Korea, he has been our supreme commander of all allied forces representing the United Nations, which made of him not only a general in a fighting sense but a diplomat in a very high political sense and I conceive that Gen. Douglas MacArthur feeling as he did had no other course to pursue than to place his case as he did before those for whom he worked and by whom he was employed and for the good of civilization everywhere.

Mr. COOKE. Senator BENTON, what do you think Mr. MacArthur—General MacArthur's—purpose was?

Senator BENTON. Well, General MacArthur is one of our most brilliant, experienced and talented leaders has a high duty to the Constitution and to the American people. And I would not pass judgment against him in those high loyalties. Nor did the President. Over a long long period of time. But it is my opinion that finally at the end of this road, at the end of this sequence of decisions, interviews, statements of General MacArthur he knew perfectly well himself the end of the road was the inevitable choice of the President which I think he was seeking and wanted of his dismissal and recall. He gave the President and the joint chiefs of staff no choice. General MacArthur with his brilliance and background must have understood that perfectly well.

Senator CAIN. In October of 1950, 6 months ago, the President of the United States, in an effort to understand the conflict in Korea, where he admitted that Gen. Douglas MacArthur knew more militarily and politically than any man on the face of the earth, went half way around the world to Wake Island to confer with the general.

Six short months——

Senator BENTON. That certainly shows he was trying to do his best——

Senator CAIN. And the President at that time had some patience. Six months later because the same man whom he characterized—the President did—as a "great military, political figure" because he raised some figures and because the President had no patience, removed from office a man whose prestige is immeasurable in the eyes of the Orient and whose advice, I think should have been calmly considered before any such fantastic action was taken by the President.

Senator BENTON. Now, HARRY CAIN, you saw the telegram released by the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the time of General MacArthur's dismissal—they had wired General MacArthur proposing negotiations with the Chinese leaders—the Communist leaders—General MacArthur instead of answering that wire himself personally in the field went ahead and made his proposal.

Mr. COOKE. Gentleman, I'm afraid we will have to stop going ahead here and let our audience go ahead from here with the facts and with the very strong and frankly put convictions which each of you have put in front of our audience. Thank you very much for your service and clarity and understanding of the MacArthur controversy and our foreign policy.

ANNOUNCER. That was Dwight Cooke, concluding today's People's Platform discussion of General MacArthur and the Korean crisis.

Mr. Cooke's guests were—United States Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, and United States Senator HARRY P. CAIN, of Washington.

Appeasement in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Appeaser, No Firebrand," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of April 23, 1951, discussing appeasement in Korea.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO APPEASER, NO FIREBRAND

"Appeasement" is a word that is being thrown around carelessly these days. (Its original meaning has been lost since Neville Chamberlain used it at Munich, and we use it here in its new sense—making dishonorable concessions to an aggressor instead of fighting him.) It is nonsense to speak of appeasement in Korea, where America is fighting a war that has already cost 60,000 casualties; but some congressional critics charge that killing Communists without bombing Manchuria or signing a demand note for the politically and militarily bankrupt Chinese Nationalists is appeasement.

These same critics say—or imply—that to end the fighting in Korea on the basis of the status quo by mutual agreement would be appeasement. Others suggest that any and all efforts to avoid world war III without fighting are appeasement. They simply don't know the meaning of the word.

Nobody calls Winston Churchill an appeaser, and they hadn't better, within his hearing. His long, stern opposition to Communist totalitarianism is well known. It was he who shocked so many Americans in his prophetic Fulton, Mo., speech of March 1946. But since then he has written, in the Gathering Storm:

"Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. Religion and virtue alike lend their sanctions to meekness and humility, not only between men but between nations. How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands."

Sentiments like these are now called "appeasement" in some quarters. They are nothing of the kind. They are, as Churchill says, one horn of the "tormenting dilemma" that national leaders must face in times of great crisis.

United States Financial Assistance to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Come One, Come All," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on December 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COME ONE, COME ALL

Uncle Sam's Export-Import Bank has announced a loan of $21,000,000 will be made to Afghanistan for a dam development. A bank spokesman consider this might be called a point-4 project, which will increase food production. He added it would help the country improve its international financial position. That makes sense. The sum of $21,000,000 should improve anyone's finances.

We are also about to bolster the finances of Iran and India, from all accounts. Afghanistan is right in between. If we are all out for a chain of protective friendship clear across Europe, why chance a weak link for a paltry few millions?

Washington, the hand-out mecca, seems to be the world's sole contender for honors at the top of the hit-the-jack-pot parade. The stream of friendly dollar fanciers mills through the Capital like a stampede. It started with a sound desire to aid such war-battered allies as Britain and France. Now it is blossoming into a procession of devout adherents of western democracy, willing to have their national treasuries sugared in the anti-Communist campaign. They like the currency of American woo.

France, Britain, and Belgium, as might be expected, have not gone away empty handed. There have been emissaries from Italy, Brazil, other South American states; from India, Greece, Iran, even Tibet. We may confidently expect the trek to include Germany, Spain, Portugal, Turkey. So far we have not heard from Lapland or Tanganyika territory. But there is still time.

Some of the diplomatic visitors frankly say they intend to remain neutral in the cold war, pledging troth neither to Russia nor the west. They suggest loans while carrying water on both shoulders. And Uncle Sam holds the bag with both hands. Ah, well, the Crosesus fixation was never niggardly or too acute.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as dramatic evidence of the necessity to always maintain the integrity of the constitutional principle of the control of the military forces by the civilian authority of our Government, I ask that a paragraph appearing in the Annual Report of Chief of Staff Douglas MacArthur for the fiscal year 1932 be reprinted here, and I earnestly invite the attention of every American to this pertinent report on the national strategy of any war.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The national strategy of any war—that is, the selection of national objectives and the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in attaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war—are decisions that must be made by the head of the State, acting in conformity with the expressed will of the Congress. No single departmental head, no matter what his particular function or title, could or should be responsible for the formulation of such decisions. For example, in every war the United States has waged, the national objective to be attained has involved the Army in land attacks against areas held by the enemy. In every instance missions have been prescribed for the Navy that had in view the assisting and facilitating of the Army's efforts. Yet in no case could these missions and objectives have been properly prescribed by the Secretaries of War and Navy acting in unison or by a single supersecretary acting for both. The issues involved were so far-reaching in their effects, and so vital to the life of the Nation, that this phase of coordinating Army and Navy effort could not be delegated by the Commander in Chief to any subordinate authority. Any such attempt would not constitute delegation, but rather abdication.

Mr. KERR. Next, Mr. President, I wish to include a statement released by me to the press on Thursday, April 19, 1951, outlining the reasons for my stand on the MacArthur controversy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 19.—In the MacArthur controversy, we are confronted with two basic questions:

Do the American people want to risk an all-out war now, or do they want to combat aggression only and continue to push for peace? Do the American people want to

preserve their constitutional democracy, or submit to military dictatorship?

For me, as a Senator and a citizen, a veteran of World War I, the obvious answers can point to only one general course, but it was my deep concern for the immediate safety and welfare of Oklahoma's 45th Division which directly led to my first outspoken opposition to the MacArthur policies.

General MacArthur has made it plain, in defiance of our Government and all our allies, that he wants to risk all-out war against Red China which has a binding mutual aid pact with Russia. Without question, this could plunge our Nation into a terrible tragic world war III in distant Asia, and even worse, it could thus expose our own cities to atomic bombs.

I could not stand by in silence. That is why I stepped out in front on the criticism of General MacArthur.

Many people have inquired as to the background for my action. I will say this:

I had no advance indication concerning the dramatic order which came so soon thereafter from the White House. Neither was there any suggestion from any source in the administration that I speak out.

I made my own decision based on what I believed to be the best interests and the real desires of my own constituents and the rest of my country.

I know that the people of Oklahoma do not want a tragic and futile war in Red China. We know it would swallow up the 45th Division and cost many, many more precious American lives than are being lost in Korea.

The assignment of the 45th Division to Japan has brought the far eastern theater very close to home and given us all added concern for what is happening out there. I have received many sober messages from the relatives and friends of the men in the 45th.

In line with their urgent appeals and requests, I again had obtained assurance from the Secretary of the Army that "there is still no plan to use the 45th for other than occupational purposes in Japan," but he confirmed my belief that any plan is subject to change upon the decision of the theater commander.

I was dictating the announcement to my office secretary when this reference to the theater commander aroused my fears and touched off my original critical statement.

The issue was plain: to strive to prevent more war or to provoke more war—whether we wanted to permit General MacArthur to take risks which could easily plunge our Oklahoma and other American boys into the mire and jungle of Red China, or whether we wanted to try to restrict Korean action and continue to work for a peaceful settlement if it could possibly be achieved.

During the great debate in the Senate last week, Senator KNOWLAND from California, apparently without concern about the fate of his own boys in the 40th Division or those of my State, tauntingly asked me if I wanted a sanctuary for them in Japan.

I replied: "The sons of Oklahoma and California are in the Armed Forces of America. I do not seek any special favors for Oklahoma fighting men wherever they may be; neither would I permit, if I could prevent it, their being uselessly thrown into an incinerator which would result in destroying them and helping no one else."

All of us regretted the climactic developments which necessitated the removal of General MacArthur.

In my original statement, I did not call for the immediate ouster of MacArthur. I still hoped he would respond to reason and be persuaded to accept established procedure and policy. However, despite a personal appeal from Secretary of the Army Pace, General MacArthur again defied his own Government and the combined policies of all our allies.

Naturally, the sudden removal of a public figure has its dramatic impact. General MacArthur has many personal admirers in this country. However, the welfare of our country is bigger than any one man, and this is not a decision to be made on the basis of personalities.

America stands at the crossroads. This is a grave hour in the history of our country. We are in a life-and-death struggle with the godless forces of communism.

The action of the President is restoring unity among the United Nations. It has achieved unity in our Armed Forces in the Far East. Our country needs unity today as much as at any time in her history, and I believe that we can, must, and will find it.

We must face up to the issues that confront us. I think the Congress should engage in a full and free debate, and then, in the democratic way, we should make a decision, close ranks, and forge full speed ahead.

If MacArthur's supporters in Congress want to follow his policies, let them introduce specific legislation. He has urged our bombing of Manchurian bases. He has called for sufficient additional forces to take the troops of Chiang Kai-shek onto the mainland of China.

If their outcry for MacArthur is sincere, let his champions stand up and be counted. Let them support a resolution carrying out General MacArthur's two major proposals which would amount to a declaration of war on China.

At this writing, they have shown no inclination to take any such positive action. They know that the American people do not want an all-out war with Red China. They know that the American people do not want to set off an atomic war with Russia.

The American people want to avoid world war III, either with China or Russia or both, if it is humanly and honorably possible to do so—and I hope and pray that it is.

Mr. KERR. Following that statement, I wish to insert in the RECORD a statement issued by the senior Senator from Oklahoma concerning his reaction to the remarks of General MacArthur before a joint meeting of the Congress on April 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I listened earnestly and carefully to General MacArthur's speech. I looked for unity. I didn't find it. I watched for an acknowledgment of the necessity to maintain the integrity of civilian control of the military power. It was not there. I searched for language that would give hope of a limited conflict and a purpose to prevent the spread into world-wide conflagration. He did not provide it.

I listened for words which would promote cooperation between this Nation and our allies for collective security. Those words were not spoken. I expected him who had been in command of the United Nations forces to acknowledge and report on his stewardship and tell how to strengthen the common front. He did not even mention the United Nations or a single ally.

I hoped he would show the way to promote peace and prevent more or larger war. He was not looking in that direction.

Instead, if I understood him, he sounded a call for an expanded war, a second front for sure, and a third front, if it came. The general spoke sadly, but I was much sadder because I was convinced that his plan would not lead us upward to the goal of peace, but would hurl us downward to the awful road of total war.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as the result of the position taken by me on this issue, I received many communications from the people of Oklahoma expressing their reaction to the President's action in the case. I wish now to have inserted at this point another release by me, dated April 26, 1951, referring to this public opinion and expression.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Most of the MacArthur mail, at first, was in favor of the General, but the pro's and con's have been approaching a balance pretty fast. I firmly believe that the weight of public opinion soon will swing against the general's militant policies.

I have always known that "the folks" are just as good as "the people." Together, they have more sense than most anybody and when they think something through, they come up about 9 times out of 10 with the right answer.

I didn't get into the MacArthur fracas to win any popularity contest. I knew it would be hotter than a depot stove, and that it would get more so all the time. However, I figured somebody had to try to stop the flames of war from being spread even if he got a little singed in doing it.

I may wake up dead, but I know I'm right. So, anyway you look at it, that makes me "dead right." (And, I would a lot rather be dead right, than dead wrong.)

I know, the quicker the folks understand that MacArthur's policies would result in a second and far more terrible war in Asia, and an almost certain total war with Russia, the happier they will be that he was relieved of his command in time. Everybody knows the Chinese Reds may force a bigger war on us. If they do, we will meet them and beat them, but we will never be guilty of starting it, nor lacking in an all-out effort to prevent it, if possible.

A burst of mail in the last few days from Oklahoma folks confirms my expectations as to ultimate reaction, and it shows that the people of Oklahoma already are coming to grips with the vital issues. They are reasoning out their opposition to military dictatorship and the MacArthur program to expand the war.

These varied letters and telegrams represent all walks of life and almost every community in the State. But they follow the same general pattern of thought, assuring me that when emotions cool and feeling settles, the people will see the MacArthur policies for what they really are.

In my stand against these policies, I am most grateful to my friends for their confidence and good wishes. I will be eternally grateful to them for giving me so much comfort when the going was tough.

New York Times editorial of April 20, conclusion, keynotes my own position: "General MacArthur, himself, agrees that his proposals are based on two assumptions—namely, that the actions he advocates will crush Communist China, and that Soviet Russia will not necessarily join in the war. But, the general, himself, seems to have doubts about the latter all-important point. And if his assumptions should prove wrong, as they did in the case of Communist China, the actions he advocates could not only lead to the catastrophe of a new world war, they would also put the onus for that war upon us, even in the eyes of our friends. That would mean the destruction of the United Nations and the North Atlantic alliance, which would leave us to fight the war alone. That risk must be avoided, even at the cost of prolonging the war in Korea."

Mr. KERR. Finally, Mr. President, I should like to have printed an editorial from the Frederick (Okla.) Leader, captioned "The stand of Senator KERR."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STAND OF SENATOR KERR

The tirade loosed upon Senator ROBERT S. KERR by the Daily Oklahoman—a publication whose commitment to the old guard Republican Party has long been a matter of common knowledge—has so carefully obscured the real facts that some people are being grossly misled as to KERR's purposes.

Words flow easily from the pens of those who would mislead, and the beauty of adjectives can easily be used to distort.

Senator KERR, with full realization of gravity of the world situation, has fought selective service from one end of Washington to the other from the time Oklahoma's Forty-fifth Division Thunderbirds were federalized into active duty—seeking to get credit for the men so inducted against Oklahoma's draft quota. He seeks this in fairness and equity to prevent a double drain on Oklahoma's own, and his position deserves the praise and commendation of every Sooner citizen. Senator Bob's fight has been so strong, and so sustained in its effort, that he is about to win a victory on the basis of simple mathematical calculations to which selective service officials can find no further defensive answer. He has had assistance from Senator MIKE MONRONEY and others of the Oklahoma delegation.

Senator KERR, with a broad and first-hand knowledge of all the facts of international turmoil, finds Oklahoma's own Forty-fifth Division at sea, bound for the Far East, even before its divisional training was completed and before all its unit complements were properly filled. And this situation arose at a time when General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was increasing daily the tempo and tone of his one-man demand that the United States enter immediately on an aggressive pattern against continental China, more glibly described as preventive warfare.

Because of the size of the Forty-fifth and the naturally patriotic fervor of our citizens, no State in the Union has more at stake on a per capita basis in the present conflict in Korea than has Oklahoma. We have given our Thunderbird Division, and the flower of its manhood, and at the same time have met the full draft quota specified. We were already near top of the list on volunteers and reservists called.

Senator KERR has no objection, if it is the will of Congress, the State Department, the Secretary for Defense, Chiefs of Staff, and the people of the United States, to plunge this Nation into the first phases of a so-called preventive war against the Chinese mainland. Such a decision would be based upon unity of action by all our civilian and service people, upon proper preparation of the Military Establishment, and upon a squaring of the manpower situation to the end that those States with mustered National Guard units will not be asked to bear the brunt of an international engagement that could grow into great magnitude.

But Senator KERR does object—and strenuously—to such action being taken solely on the willful desire of one military leader, even if that person happens to be a man of the high caliber and distinguished ability of General MacArthur.

And regardless of the pressure to the contrary, the Nation will continue to hear his objections until more conclusive action is taken to achieve a balancing of contributions by States of manpower exposed to the dangers of conflict in the Far East.

When it dawns upon the people that Senator KERR's aim is cautious service to the people of Oklahoma, who he represents, and to the Nation as a whole, at a time when every step it takes must be morally right and physically possible, the caustic criticism now being heaped upon him in some quarters will sear the fingers of those who write for purpose instead of principle, for demagogery instead of democracy and for profits instead of peace.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 'Firing' of General MacArthur," published in the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle of April 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS—THE "FIRING" OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

The one thing Mr. Truman and his administration cannot stand is the truth.

He has not been able to stand it in connection with the sorry state of our Military Establishment at the outbreak of the Korean War, despite the expenditure of more than $50,000,000,000 the taxpayers thought were being used for defense purposes.

Facts revealed by a Senate committee in connection with the shameful operation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have made the White House and its close associates squirm uncomfortably.

Disclosures of the Kefauver crime investigating committee have reflected the worst kind of discredit on Truman appointees and Truman supporters.

The conviction of Alger Hiss, despite Truman calling the charges against him a "red herring" and Dean Acheson's protestations of friendship were but one of many instances in which the administration has tried to impede the truth in exposure of Communists who have infiltrated into the Government.

And, finally, we now have the summary dismissal of General MacArthur, one of the great soldier statesmen in American history, because he also chose to tell what he believed to be the truth to the embarrassment of Mr. Truman and our weak-kneed allies and the Communist-coddling State Department.

General MacArthur's only offense, as we see it was to speak out when the rules say a soldier must only do and die, but not talk. We think he did it in the best interests of his country and that he has been fully aware of the possible consequences. Soldier that he is, he refused to take the easy way out by keeping quiet.

Let us remember always that it was not General MacArthur, but Mr. Truman and the State Department who created the Korean situation in the first place by splitting the little country with Russia and then letting the Republic of South Korea shift for itself with only token assistance, while the Soviets were training a massive army across the border for many months.

Let us remember, too that it was Mr. Truman and the State Department and General Marshall who, by their insistence on admission of Communists into the Chinese Government and then their repudiation of Chiang Kai-shek, made it possible for the Reds to conquer all China.

And let us remember that General MacArthur has been right over the years while his superiors have been so wrong. While the Communists have been overrunning Europe and China, he has made his occupation of Japan an example for all time. He alone has refused to coddle Moscow and for that reason the island empire today constitutes one of our important bastions of defense.

What, then, has been his great offense? Simply to say that he thinks he is fighting a war without an objective so long as the United Nations refuses to permit him to bomb Communist concentrations in Manchuria; because he has advocated use of Nationalist Chinese troops on Formosa to create a diversionary attack against the Chinese mainland, just as the Russians are using their Chinese allies to tie down hundreds of thousands of American boys, and because he has expressed the opinion that the war against Communism must be won on the continent of Asia if it is to be won at all.

Who has he offended? Well, he has offended Messrs. Truman and Acheson and General Marshall who want to concentrate our strength in Europe. He has offended our vascillating allies in the United Nations who are perfectly willing to see American boys die in the mud of Korea without lifting any effective hand of their own to help. He has offended Great Britain whose Socialist government Mr. Truman has been keeping in business with American dollars because Britain wants to remain friendly with Communist China so that she can do business as usual with a people who are killing Americans every hour of the day and night.

And so a great soldier and a great American has been "fired" with about as much tact and diplomacy as would ordinarily be used in getting rid of an office boy who broke the rules once too often; "fired" with only a scant word of praise of one of the outstanding public careers in our history.

But, strangely enough, the outrageous incident has the effect of raising MacArthur's stature and diminishing that of his so-called superiors.

Perhaps he can now return to this country and speak his mind as a free citizen. That should be his right and the American people are entitled to know what he knows and thinks.

Meanwhile it will be a long time before this disgrace of this day is forgotten.

Waste in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs showing an average of over 300 employees at two hospitals for nearly 6 months with no doctors and no patients. This waste is why there is

not money to properly care for the veterans.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
San Francisco, Calif., April 21, 1951.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: This will acknowledge your letter of April 5, 1951 concerning the new Veterans Administration Hospitals located at Beckley and Clarksburg, W. Va.

The Beckley Hospital was accepted from the contractors on October 6, 1950, and the Clarksburg Hospital was accepted on October 24, 1950. Since the date of acceptance of these two hospitals the following employees have been on duty month by month as follows:

	Beckley	Clarksburg
Oct. 31, 1950	71	54
Nov. 30, 1950	144	113
Dec. 31, 1950	162	134
Jan. 31, 1951	160	144
Feb. 28, 1951	163	176
Mar. 31, 1951	181	195

The hospital at Beckley, W. Va., was opened and accepted its first patient on March 1, 1951, and the Clarksburg Hospital accepted its first patient on March 12, 1951. It was impossible to open these two hospitals earlier because of our inability to recruit the necessary professional staff.

Sincerely yours,
CARL R. GRAY, Jr., *Administrator.*

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "The Palace Guards Win—Or Do They?" published in the New Castle (Pa.) News of April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PALACE GUARDS WIN—OR DO THEY?

There must be merriment in Moscow today.

And somehow we imagine we can hear a sly British chuckle coming out of Number 10 Downing Street.

While in our own State Department Acheson and his boys are marking across the record of conspiracy against MacArthur "Mission Accomplished."

For after 6 years of sniping at Gen. Douglas MacArthur they have his scalp. But his scalp dangles from the chandeliers like the sword of Damocles.

For Douglas MacArthur, America's No. 1 soldier, if not indeed it's No. 1 citizen, has been fired ignominiously, fired just like a ditch digger might be fired by a straw boss.

Fired because he gave voice to the wonderings of millions of American minds, "If we have to fight the Communist why stop at some geographic line?"

MacArthur's crime was that he believed the lives of American boys should not be poured out on foreign lands unless there was some reason in logic at the end of the trail.

He believed that if the Communists were permitted to mass and group over the North Korean border, and strike again and again at the Americans then those nests of vipers should be wiped out. He believed the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa should be turned loose to fight against the Communists for their homeland. He believed it a futile thing to keep fighting within a restricted area in Korea unless a political peace could be consummated.

And so, because MacArthur is a great American, because his soldierly heart had a great sympathy for the fate of his men, because like Billy Mitchell he told the truth, he was fired.

This war, which Truman called a police action, has 250,000 American men in the field. Our casualties are over 60,000.

Great Britain has 13,000 men in the field. Great Britain continues to sell to the Communists. Great Britain wants to hold on to Hong Kong. Britain, therefore, had a reason to undermine MacArthur, a reason rooted in its own national selfishness. Ergo, our American policy must be cut according to the British design and if Dean Acheson is to remain in good standing with the Downing Street brand of diplomacy then MacArthur has to be fired.

And he was.

Acheson engineered the deal which got us out of China. MacArthur protested against such diplomacy. The blunders of Acheson brought on the Korean war and MacArthur was called on once more to lead troops against an enemy.

Because he could not stomach such backalley diplomacy as we have been getting, because he was outraged at the further slaughter of American boys, he spoke his mind.

Here is the soldier who carved victory out of defeat in the Pacific, who went into Japan as a conqueror and became the Japanese friend through his wise administration.

Here is a man whose record of Americanism shines with a golden glow for over 40 years. "The path of glory leads but to the grave."

As for President Truman's excuse for firing MacArthur—made last night—little can be said for it. The voice was the voice of Truman but the words were the words of Acheson.

Ship Named "O'Higgins"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article taken from the New York Times of April 22, 1951, entitled "Topics of the Times."

TOPICS OF THE TIMES

SHIP NAMED "O'HIGGINS"

Down at the Philadelphia Navy Yard a United States light cruiser, the *Brooklyn*, has been undergoing more than a sea change. She is 16 years old, 10,000 tons, and carries fifteen 6-inch guns. During the last war she helped with various amphibious landings in the Mediterranean. She has been a fighting ship, one for the sons of Brooklyn to be proud of.

Now she has been sold to Chile and is about to take off, staffed by a crew of Chilean sailors, for lands far from the Gowanus. She goes not as the *Brooklyn* but as the *General O'Higgins*. And let no one along Flatbush Avenue or around Borough Hall think that that name does not fit a ship once named the *Brooklyn*. For Bernardo O'Higgins was as fighting a man as ever Sands Street saw. He is the great Chilean national figure, the country's George Washington.

FROM COUNTY MEATH

Just how a fine broth of a boy with the old Irish name of O'Higgins could wind up as the scrappiest and best beloved man in Chilean history is something that only the sons of the Irish could explain fully. The O'Higgins story in Chile begins with Ambrose O'Higgins, from County Meath. An uncle, a Spanish priest, sent him to South America in the middle of the eighteenth century. For some years he was a trader and peddler in Buenos Aires. His Spanish, spoken with an Irish lilt, must have charmed many a customer. Later he went over the Andes to Chile. Frontier wars against the Indians were being fought and Ambrose, now Ambrosio, entered the Spanish Army. By 1788 he was Captain General of Chile.

THE BOY BERNARDO

His son, Bernardo, was born of a Chilean mother on August 20, 1776. From his father Bernardo inherited whatever it is that the sons of the Irish inherit. From his mother he got the charm that attracted everyone who met him and the compassion that he showed all whom he met. He was sent to England for his education. Radical ideas, nurtured by the French Revolution, were in the air. A young man who knew the misery of Spanish rule back home, the state-nurtured ignorance, the power and the selfishness of the privileged, could dream of a better world and of leading men toward it. The sons of the Irish have often dreamed that dream.

RETURN TO CHILE

He returned to Chile in 1802. The long-expected and long-overdue revolt against Spain broke out in 1810. In the front line of the rebels was Bernardo O'Higgins. In 1813 he took supreme command of the rebel army, but in his first attempt to beat the Spanish troops he met defeat. The sons of the Irish have often known that. He saw the Spanish rule restored, with its medieval ignorance and cruelty and disregard for any except the wealthy. In 1816 the great South American revolutionary San Martin was ready to come to the aid of Chile. O'Higgins went to Argentina to join him. They came back over the Andes in January 1817 with 3,000 infantry and 1,000 cavalry. They met the Spanish twice and beat them twice. The revolution in Chile was a reality. The Spanish were out forever and O'Higgins knew what a victory was. The sons of the Irish have sometimes known that, too.

AHEAD OF HIS TIME

Bernardo became the first director of the new state. He wrote the first constitution and aimed it right at the evils that had sickened him. He wanted land taken from the large estates and he advocated popular education. The people supported him; for the first time the nation had one of its own sons as ruler. But the forces against him, even among the Chileans, were strong and he underestimated their strength. The sons of the Irish have sometimes done that. The wealthy and the privileged were glad to be rid of Spanish rule but wanted no change in their traditional power and perquisites. Like other South American revolutionaries, O'Higgins was ahead of his time. The forces against him grew stronger and Bernardo's hopes for a decent world could not withstand them. He was forced to abdicate in 1823. Thereafter each ambitious man in the land tried to be his own political party; 10 different governments followed in quick order.

O'Higgins never again held power. He died in 1842.

AND FAIR SAILING

The *General O'Higgins* will sail shortly from Philadelphia. She is a fine ship. The sons of Brooklyn can wish her fair sailing. The sons of the Irish will take that for granted.

Emphasis on a Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News, April 25, 1951:

EMPHASIS ON A STATESMAN

The death of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, which under normal conditions would have attracted great national attention and brought to the dead statesman the full tribute and the evaluation which he so richly deserved, came at a moment, however, when another great American held the center of the stage. The accolade was for the living rather than for the dead; an elder statesman simply faded out in the garish demonstrations.

The irony which the turn of events took must be recognized, however, in calmer and more thoughtful retrospect. Senator Vandenberg had given the final years of his public life to the initiation and development of a bipartisan foreign policy, to the cause of unity among his fellow citizens and understanding among nations, to the strengthening and undergirding of democracy and its defenders wherever they might be. To him as much as to any other man should go credit for the North Atlantic Pact and for those cooperative measures which halted communism in its westward march and breathed economic life and a fighting spirit into Europe. There is unquestioned testimony that the effort which the Michigan statesman put into this cause contributed substantially to his ill health and even chopped many years from his life. Had he submitted to the operation from which he never recovered earlier, there is strong belief that he would be alive and perhaps back in the Senate today. He was told that he should have this operation before the Paris conference, but he insisted upon attending, regardless of the consequences, and then became involved in the congressional fight over approval of the peace and security structure of which he was a chief architect. His badly needed operation was indefinitely delayed, and the ultimate result has now been written by the cold hand of Death.

It was as this man faded away last week that disunity, partisanship, bitterness, an isolationism which strangely shifted to the side of a bigger war, reached a new crescendo in the National Capital where he so long served and spread out over the Nation. Quietly he slipped from this mortal scene while the outcry was for the forces, the influences and the policies which he sought to restrain and to recast. There was dramatics in the ensuing activities; but the Vandenberg drama was enacted in the silence of the wings. The center of the stage held and overflowed with the demolition crew of that which he gave his life to construct.

In our humble opinion, however, the final tribute, the final evaluation as statesman, the final record as architect and builder of a more secure and peaceful world will accrue to the dead Senator. When sober reason returns, when Americans look beneath the surface, when parades give way to meditation and reflection, when decisions are left to the mind rather than to the emotions, and when statesmanship, pray Heaven, supersedes partisanship, the genuine stature of the late Senator from Michigan will be fully recognized, his sacrificial effort justified, and his influence and his spirit will go marching on.

A great soldier has his day; a great statesman has his eternity.

How to Fight Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, how to fight inflation and to raise money needed for the defense program are two subjects in which all of us are interested.

The Wage Earner Forum survey published by McFadden Publications, Inc., directed by Edward Smith, has just published a survey made among 1,500 wage-earner families across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following article bearing on these subjects from the Wage Earner Forum, which I believe carries worth-while information:

DEFINITE OPINIONS ON VITAL MATTERS

How to fight inflation, and how to raise money needed for this country's armament program, are two subjects on which the wage earner husbands and wives have definite opinions.

While better than 6 in 10 suggest a freeze on prices as one effective means of fighting inflation, more than half as many also suggest a freeze on wages. Although husbands and wives agree rather closely on a freeze on prices, considerably fewer of the wives are in favor of a freeze on wages. Restrictions on buying are recommended by more than one-fourth of the panel.

Nonessential Government expenditures can be reduced and that is the best means of raising money for our armament program, in the opinion of 8 in 10 of the wage earners and their wives. Two-thirds of them, more husbands than wives, suggest increased corporation taxes. Suggestions of a national tax on the things we buy and an increased personal income tax, as other means of raising the needed money, were checked by about one-fourth in each case.

FAVOR PRICE AND WAGE FREEZES

A freeze on wages, as a means of fighting inflation, is favored by slightly more than half of the men. Union members are more in favor of a freeze on wages (59.9 percent) than those who are not union members. About two out of five of the wives disagree with the men on this point, and it is much less favored in the far West.

There is little variation by age or region (except for the far West) on a freeze on prices, favored by over 60 percent. More of the older men approve restriction on buying. While the percentage of men who favor increased personal income tax is small, it is larger among union men.

Failure to respond to this question was as little as 2.1 for men and women combined, and 0.9 for the men alone.

Of the voluntary comments made by the men and women of the panel, roll-back of prices was most frequent, except that among the men alone a slightly greater number suggested Government restrictions and controls.

In the tabulations which follow, the opinions of wives are not shown separately, but are indicated by comparison of the combined opinions of men and women with those of men alone.

Question. Which of the following do you approve as a means of fighting inflation, or further inflation? (Check one or more, as you see fit.)

Percent of total panel—men, women combined	
Freeze on wages	43.5
Freeze on prices	64.8
Restrictions on buying (enforced savings)	28.6
Increased personal income taxes (less spendable income)	3.5
Voluntary comment:	
Roll back prices	2.3
Stop farm aid	.2
Government restriction, control, action (outward)	1.7
Government economy, restriction (within Government)	.6
Miscellaneous	1.0

CUT GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

While 81.2 percent of the men favor reduction of nonessential governmental expenditures as a means of raising money for armament, this is somewhat lower among the union members (78.6 percent) and consequently higher among those not members of a union. It is also lower in the Northeastern States.

Next in number checked was to increase corporation taxes; the union men are a little stronger for that (78.2 percent), but it is less favored in the far West.

It will be noted that fewer of the wives checked any of the four most frequently mentioned means for raising money, except in the case of reduction of Government expenditures.

A tax on luxuries and unessentials, and elimination of subsidies were voluntary comments most frequently made. Elimination of subsidies and reduction of aid to Europe were suggested by a total of 4.6 percent of the men.

Of the means of armament financing, the wives checked fewer of the alternatives and made fewer voluntary comments.

Question. "Which of the following ways do you approve as a means of raising the money for the Nation's armament program?" (Check as many as necessary to give your complete opinion.)

Percent of total panel—men and women combined	
Increased personal income taxes	19.9
Increased corporation taxes	64.0
A national tax on the things you buy	24.7
Reduction of nonessential Government expenditures	80.2
None; don't think we should arm	1.3
Voluntary comment:	
Tax on luxuries, unessentials	3.2
Cut down on Government employees	.5
Legalize lotteries	.6
Eliminate subsidies, etc	2.9
Cut down aid to Europe, etc	.7
Miscellaneous	.7

Failure to respond to the above question was 0.3 percent of the total panel for the men alone, and 0.9 percent for men and women combined.

DRAFT 18-YEAR-OLDS

The wives are somewhat less in favor of the plan to draft and train 18-year-olds, although nearly two-thirds of them are in favor of it. Among the men the strongest approval and least disapproval is in the age group of those under 30, many of whom

have done their turn of duty in the recent war. Again, the far West is the one region which differs, markedly, from the country as a whole.

While slightly more than half oppose deferment of college students with special ability, this is slightly lower among the wives than the husbands, and also in the Midwest.

Percent of total panel, men, women combined

Question. Do you approve of the current plan to draft and train 18-year-olds?

Yes	67.8
No	29.6
Don't know	.5
Not reported	2.1

Percent of total panel, men, women combined

Question. Do you feel there is any justification for the plan which was proposed for deferment of college students with special ability so as to save them for training in other important fields, science, etc.?

Yes	42.8
No	53.0
Not reported	4.2

VOLUNTARY COMMENTS

Percent of total panel, men and women combined

Against deferment:	
Didn't in War II, why now?	
Can be trained in the Army just as well	1.8
Can resume study after service	.6
Favoring deferment:	
Don't eat all the grain—save some for seed	8.8
If it isn't taken advantage of; too much chance for conniving	5.1
If student was in War II, let him finish college	.2
Difficult getting back to study after war service	.2
Other miscellaneous pro and con	5.2

STAY IN KOREA

A majority of wage earners feel that the United Nations should stay in Korea and keep fighting as long as attack and aggression continue. There are nearly as many who feel they are unable to express an opinion (19.2 percent), as of those who think we should get out now (23.2 percent).

Again, the attitudes show a difference in the far West, where more feel that we should get out of Korea. But of the panel as a whole, considerably more of the men feel that we should stay and fight than do their wives, among whom is also a larger percentage who do not feel that they have a definite opinion to express.

Question. "There seems to be two schools of thought as to whether the United Nations should stay in Korea and keep fighting so long as there is attack and aggression there; or whether they should get out, now. What say you?"

Percent of total panel, men, women combined

Should stay and fight	55.3
Should get out now	23.2
Don't know	19.2
Not reported	2.3

Old-Age Assistance in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

WEST VIRGINIA OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE REPORT INDICATES NATION-WIDE TRAGEDY

TABLE 10.—*Number of cases opened during month by reason for opening, February 1951*

Reason for opening case	Total	Percent of total	Old-age assistance	Aid to the blind	Aid to dependent children	General assistance
Total	1,196	100.0	286	11	404	495
Supplementation of an old age assistance, aid to blind, or aid to dependent children grant	89	7.4	0	0	0	89
Discontinuance of unemployment benefits	2	.2	0	0	2	1
Loss of employment or decreased earnings because of—						
Illness or disablement	482	40.3	67	4	167	244
Lay-off, discharge, or other reason	44	3.7	16	0	15	13
Death or absence of wage earner	216	18.1	16	0	140	60
Loss of allowance or other military payment	10	.8	2	0	3	5
Depletion of savings or other resources	74	6.2	48	1	10	15
Loss or decrease of contribution from relatives	30	2.5	16	0	12	2
Discontinuance of UMW benefits	4	.3	1	0	2	1
Other change in economic circumstances	10	.8	5	1	3	1
Change in law or agency policy	8	.7	0	0	8	0
Attained technical eligibility	63	5.3	52	4	7	0
Discontinuance of other public or private aid	15	1.3	4	0	1	10
Other reasons	148	12.4	59	1	34	54

TABLE 11.—*Number of cases closed during month by reason for closing, February 1951*

Reason for closing case	Total	Percent of total	Old-age assistance	Aid to the blind	Aid to dependent children	General assistance
Total	1,853	100.0	483	10	538	832
Death of recipient	240	12.9	204	5	6	25
Employment of recipient	43	2.3	10	1	2	30
Employment of another person in home	120	6.5	16	0	96	8
Receipt of allowance or other military payment	30	1.6	2	0	22	6
Increased support from persons outside home	24	1.3	7	0	15	2
Increase in OASI benefits	67	3.6	47	0	15	5
Increase in other resources	118	6.4	49	0	36	33
Other material change in economic circumstances	8	.4	2	0	3	3
Absent parent returned or no longer incapacitated	80	4.3			80	
Support by remarriage of parent	24	1.3			24	
Child reached maximum age or not attending school	40	2.2			40	
Admitted to institution	33	1.8	19	0	5	9
Receipt of another type of public or private aid	55	3.0	0	0	5	50
Loss of residence in State or county	69	3.7	9	1	12	46
Change in law or agency policy	735	39.7	48	3	101	583
Other reasons	167	9.0	40	0	95	32

Source: Tables 10 and 11, February 1951 Public Assistance Report of West Virginia.

With all the talk about employing elderly people instead of providing for pensions, why not look at the above tables. They clearly show the hopelessness of such projects so far as most of the aged are concerned. See column No. 3.

Out of 286 new cases, 83 were due to loss of employment.

Out of 453 closed cases, only 10 resulted from employment of recipient.

Note that death accounted for nearly one-half of the closed cases, while employment accounted for less than 1 out of 45. In other words, there is only 1 chance in 22 of an old-age assistance recipient getting any job before he dies—to say nothing of earning a decent living.

General MacArthur's Address to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the address delivered by Gen. Douglas MacArthur on Thursday, April 19, last, was the most outstanding address I have heard delivered before Congress in my many years of service in the House. Words cannot express the deep impression it made upon all who heard it. Its clarity, logic, and sincerity made for it a place among the historic speeches of our country that will not be erased by the passing of time. Never have I seen any assemblage so deeply touched, nor where the deeper emotions were so plainly visible by moistened eyes.

The newspapers of the Nation have given unstinted praise to this memorable speech. The Courier-Post, of Camden, N. J., in its issue of Friday, April 20, 1951, has given its tribute in an analytical editorial entitled "MacArthur States His Case." I include it as part of my remarks in accordance with the unanimous consent granted. It reads as follows:

MACARTHUR STATES HIS CASE

General MacArthur's great speech before Congress was a masterpiece of clearness and logical reasoning.

He spoke, as had been predicted, in general terms. He did not seek to aggravate the controversy over Asiatic policies that his removal has inflamed.

On the other hand, he did not seek to duck controversial issues. He stated what they were, he gave his views on them in a clear and lucid manner, he stressed the fact that the issues are fundamental and global, and that they cannot be avoided. We must face them.

With "but one purpose in mind—to serve my country," the general expressed the opinion that communism is unappeasable. What is more, it cannot be appeased in one place, separately from another. To appease it in Asia is indirectly—and not too indirectly—appeasing it also in Europe.

The general has faith in America and in America's strength. In his opinion, there can be no greater expression of defeatism than to say that we cannot defend ourselves on both the Asiatic and European fronts.

As to the Asiatic front, the Pacific Ocean and the chain of islands we and the other free nations now hold make it a protective moat to America as long as we provide the necessary defenses for that moat. Sea and air power, he asserts, can defend the line from Vladivostok to Singapore.

But a breach of the line at one point opens the whole line to other breaches and collapse. That is why Formosa must not fall to the Reds. The fall of Formosa would instantly threaten the Philippines and Japan, and almost immediately would threaten our own Pacific coast.

We can and should hold the Pacific moat, MacArthur believes, against the aggressive imperialism of both Soviet Russia and a China newly alive with the spirit of nationalism, a new power in Asia now temporarily allied with Russia, but perhaps only temporarily so allied and perhaps only temporarily communistic.

To hold the moat, however, we must not let down the friends who help us hold it—a regenerated Japan which will not again fall the free world; the Philippines, and Chiang's forces on Formosa.

The decision to intervene in Korea, MacArthur feels, was sound from the military standpoint. Our victory there was complete when Red China suddenly intervened. This created a new war and a new situation not contemplated previously.

It called for new diplomatic decisions which have not, right up to this moment, been made.

MacArthur denounces as libel the reports that he favored a full-scale ground invasion of Red China. No one in his right mind could advocate such a thing, he says.

He did want a stronger economic and naval blockade of China. He wanted the removal of restrictions which tied his hands behind his back in Korea. He wanted the right to make air reconnaissance of the enemy bases behind Korea; the right to make air attacks beyond the Yalu River on enemy bases, to disrupt the enemy's logistics, and to make a real military decision possible.

He wanted and still wants these things, because under present restrictions we are fighting what can never be more than an indecisive campaign, one of terrible and constant attrition, one that the enemy can draw out indefinitely even though we may be able to hold a defensible line in Korea indefinitely.

"War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision," as MacArthur says.

"In war there is no substitute for victory."

But as we are fighting the Korean war now, he believes, like many others, there can be no victory.

The general says that criticism of his views comes largely from lay circles abroad.

He says that our own Joint Chiefs of Staff concur—at least largely—in his views. He is convinced that from the military standpoint they are right, and that if we now pursue a course of appeasement toward Red China it will only fail as appeasement has always failed.

He does not believe that the measures he proposes would backfire against us. Red China, he asserts, is already engaging its maximum power in Korea. He implies that our fear of "extending the war" if we follow his proposals is, in reality, a fear of winning it, ridiculous as that may sound.

And while we allow our fears to rule our actions, we are betraying the very people we took up arms to save—the Koreans who, alone of all the nations engaged in the war, are giving everything they have to preserve their own liberty and the cause of liberty throughout the world; who are risking and suffering death rather than enslavement.

They deserve better of us than that.

MacArthur has stated his case.

The decisions are up to others.

He retires from the stage after 52 years of service to his country with a prayer on his lips that mankind may soon find a better and more equitable system of settling its quarrels than war, whose increasing destructiveness to friend and foe alike has rendered it useless as a solution to them, if it ever was.

But till such a system is devised there will be wars.

And "war's very object is victory."

Have we lost sight of that object in Korea?

Will we realize that defeat, stalemate, or appeasement in Korea mean global defeat, stalemate, or appeasement?

Now holding a western frontier in the far Pacific, are we willing to surrender it; to withdraw to a frontier in California and the rest of our continent's western coast?

These are questions of the greatest importance and magnitude.

MacArthur has shown us what he thinks are the answers.

With a speech that is one of the most powerful and compelling of modern times, he probably has convinced many who were not previously aware of the facts and did not agree with him.

The opposition will offer its rebuttal.

It had better be good.

A Humiliating Spectacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted unanimously on Monday, April 16, by the Service Club of Indianapolis, an organization of 253 members, all of whom are veterans of either World War I or World War II, and sent to me by Frank K. Levinson, president, the Service Club of Indianapolis:

A HUMILIATING SPECTACLE

"And in every province, whithersoever the king's commandment and his decree came, there was great mourning among the people, and fasting, and weeping, and wailing; and many lay in sackcloth and ashes."

We would speak of General MacArthur. His head is turning silver with age, and long experience has made him sage. But that did not save him from the arrows of men who strut in pride and vaunt their empty claims. One who but for accident would today be a nameless man amidst the crowd, has allowed his perverse and stubborn will to cause him to strike at one of the greatest military leaders of all time.

Why are we in Korea? Our President told us we were there to preserve our own freedom by thwarting the advance of communism in the free world; and to prove to evil, willful men that aggressive war does not pay. MacArthur was told to lead. Fearlessly he organized his campaign, and began boldly to resist the powers of evil. To him the office and duties of a general were to bring victory to his arms and to preserve his men from needless slaughter and suffering.

Then confusion in our Nation's councils began to show itself. MacArthur was told to fight Communists but only up to an imaginary line. Beyond that line the Reds of China and the Kremlin were to be allowed to gather their strength and from these bases, in a privileged sanctuary, to move out to slaughter our soldiers and then return in safety to those bases for relaxation.

We had an air force that could in any period of 24 hours destroy those bases and choke off all supplies to our enemy then reaching them from Red China. One of our allies on Formosa had 500,000 excellently trained soldiers who were anxious to relieve the pressure on our own fighting men. Another ally had 100,000 men in addition to the great number it already had in the field, who were ready to fight with us if we would but equip them. Our Navy could have blockaded the ports of China and North Korea at any time and thus brought the "agrarian philosophers" of that area promptly to their knees. But these things must not be. Greedy men in Britain, where hope of gain allures, would save Hongkong and continue to deliver for a great profit war materials to our Red enemies. The Kremlin might be irritated; as if he who is bent on doing evil will ever be unable to find his own occasion for doing it.

These considerations were of the most vital military importance. MacArthur discussed them publicly. He had been expressly told he had a right to discuss all military matters which concerned the war he had been told to wage, and that he might discuss them publicly. He would have been negligent had he not attempted to arouse the nations he was supposed to be leading to the dangers involved in such an excess of stupidity.

But he is now returning to us straight from a faithful, unselfish, patient fight and the love and gratitude of a whole Nation go out to him; while men of low degree smugly smile and proudly cling to their faults and wither in their pride. If our forces are not in the Orient to conquer our enemies; if we are now to approve the aggressions of the "agrarian reformers" of Red China and the Kremlin, and allow them to retain all their material gains in China and Korea, let us in the name of God bring our soldiers home at the earliest possible moment consistent with their safety. Then, possibly, at some distant time the Kremlin will allow us to return long enough to care for the graves of our sons who have fallen there, so that future generations may know that they have not been entirely forgotten but that we do honor them who offered up their lives at their Nation's call to suffer needless, useless slaughter.

Mr. President, I move that this declaration be adopted by the Service Club of Indianapolis and that copies be sent to our two Senators, to our Congressmen, and to the daily papers of Indianapolis.

WILLIAM P. EVANS.

Mr. Acheson Said Chinese Communists Would Not Enter Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the White House has alleged that Mr. Truman was misled by General MacArthur's statement at Wake Island that the Chinese Communists would not enter the Korean war. It is implied that the President believed this statement to his great regret. In a cablegram

to the editors of the Freeman magazine General MacArthur was asked to confirm or deny the statement that he had so advised the President. The reply was as follows:

The statement quoted in your message of the 13th is entirely without foundation in fact.

MACARTHUR,
Tokyo, Japan.

Mr. Speaker, it seems, however, that the President was getting the kind of information he charges to MacArthur from the very man who has sabotaged the United States in Asia, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State. Members of this House will be interested in a news story that appeared in the New York Times on September 11, 1950, and which relates to the matter under discussion. At this point I am including part of that article. Once again the man who refused to turn his back on Alger Hiss was wrong:

ACHESON DOUBTS PEIPING WAR ENTRY—HOLDS MOVE IN KOREA WOULD BE MADNESS—ASSERTS MODERN WEAPONS WILL BEAT HORDES

(By Jay Walz)

WASHINGTON, September 10.—Secretary of State Acheson declared in a television broadcast tonight that numbers do not necessarily mean strength and offered "modern weapons and ingenuity" as opposition to "all sorts of hordes." He was alluding to hordes of Communist forces.

He also said it would be "sheer madness" for the Chinese Communist Government to enter the Korean war on the side opposing the "free nations of the world."

"The greater part of China to the north, which is made up of Sinkiang, Outer Mongolia, and Manchuria, is Chinese at the present moment only nominally," Mr. Acheson said. "That is where the great cloud from the north, Russian penetration, is operating and it is quite obvious that the plan is to absorb those northern areas of China under Soviet domination.

OWN DISMEMBERMENT

"I give the people in Peiping credit for being intelligent enough to see what is happening to them. Why they should want to further their own dismemberment and destruction by getting at cross purposes with all the free nations of the world who are inherently their friends and have always been friends of the Chinese as against this imperialism coming down from the Soviet Union I cannot see.

"And since there is nothing in it for them, I don't see why they should yield to what is undoubtedly pressures from the Communist movement to get into this Korean row."

The MacArthur Removal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Frankford (Pa.) Gazette of April 19, 1951:

A LETTER FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA

If there is anything the MacArthur removal proves all over again, it is that professional military men should confine their ambitions to the armed services. Unbiased historians will agree that Grant was one of the top United States generals in the field and a sorry spectacle as President of the United States. Professional military men for generations have taken a lesson from this. Black Jack Pershing could have had the Presidential nomination on a silver platter but he was almost rude to people who urged it.

A colorful and ofttimes brilliant military figure of high personal courage, MacArthur has much more than his share of the ham actor and exhibitionist about him. It is this very yen to sing tenor on all possible occasions that creates the compulsion to forever seek the Presidency. It impelled him to produce one of the most pathetic pictures of our time. The scene was the Republican national convention in our city on a stifling hot early morning in July 1948. Almost alone in the all but empty hall, emeciated loyal General Wainwright, hero of Bataan, was given this poor opportunity to place MacArthur's name in nomination. What makes his thirst for office particularly unfortunate is that MacArthur is probably the most disliked member of the brass among the rank and file, in our time. It is extremely unlikely that he could be elected to any national office in spite of the appreciation many of our people feel for some of his accomplishments.

It has been said that he has earned the right to disobey orders or to take violent conflict with them. Funny, he so agreeably followed the Hoover order to gas-bomb the Bonus Army out of Anacostia flats. This was made up of his buddies from World War I and their wives and kids. So MacArthur has had a mixed career which includes military brilliance, ever so much personal courage, a lot of play acting and some very sad decisions. It is ironic that a soldier who once served under him (and did not derive happiness from the connection) could have the very nomination that MacArthur craves. I refer to Dwight Eisenhower. It is unfortunate that some men do not quit their careers at the right time. All of us would have been gladdened if MacArthur had terminated his services before issuing that promise to have the boys back from Korea by Christmas. Too bad a once great pitcher has to be relieved. Good that the defense team has such a fine relief man.

Cordially yours,
WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Where Does Dean Acheson Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Bridgeport Post on April 24, 1951, reflecting a question being asked, I believe, by an overwhelming majority of the American people:

WHERE DOES ACHESON STAND?

Dean Acheson has reached such a degree of disfavor with the people, one cannot help wonder why it is that President Truman continues to back him up on major issues, as he does.

No matter what the Secretary of State does today, the people will still mistrust him. Almost everyone you talk with expresses strong opposition to him.

The repercussions of the MacArthur dismissal may, of course, make it even more difficult for Mr. Truman to retain him, for if ever there was a voice of opinion expressed in the Nation, it was done in the MacArthur case. And somehow or other, people are of the opinion that Acheson had a big hand in the summary dismissal of MacArthur, even though Mr. Truman would have us believe it was all his own idea.

Congressmen of both parties, from many States, are asking each other about Acheson. If MacArthur was a liability in our foreign policy, and was fired because of his proposals, how about Acheson? Many newspapers throughout the country which approved of the President's ouster of MacArthur, at the same time have urged the Executive to get a new Secretary of State. It sounds more than reasonable to us.

Mr. Acheson has been Secretary of State for a little more than 2 years. It is not a long time, and he has done nothing in that period to distinguish himself to such an extent that he should be retained.

Mr. Truman has set a record in making Cabinet changes, considering the length of respective administrations. Mr. Roosevelt made an average of 1.2 changes per year; Hoover made 0.8; Coolidge, 1.4; and back in the day of "Teddy" Roosevelt, the changes per year were 2.3. Changes under President Truman have been on the average of 3.2 per year. So, he would be right in form if he asked Mr. Acheson to return to his law books.

During the Acheson term we went to war in Korea, but that also is said to have been a Truman decision solely. As for opposition to Red China in the UN, Acheson has said that the United States would not try to use its veto power to bar such an admission. Acheson cannot take any credit for the Atlantic Pact, even though it was ratified while he was Secretary. The credit for that goes to the late distinguished Senator Vandenberg. It was proposed by Mr. Truman before Acheson was sworn in.

Many of his predecessors have been strong men, and distinctive policies still bear their names, such as Hay's "Open Door"; Knox's "Dollar Diplomacy"; Lansing's Japanese agreement; Hughes' naval limitation; Kellogg's treaty renouncing war; and, of course, the Marshall plan, developed by General Marshall.

Try to think of one great policy enunciated and perfected by Dean Acheson. Yes, there was one, when he said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss. That was enunciated, but not perfected in the manner which he expected. It is indeed time for Mr. Truman to add to his box score by naming a broad-minded, vigorous, clear-thinking, unselfish, wholly American Secretary of State.

Positive Catholic Action in the Life of the High School Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an address given by Mary Anne Green, of St. Paul's Academy, Washington, D. C., in the twentieth annual oratorical contest sponsored by the Catholic University Conference of Clerics and Religious held at the Catholic University Gymnasium on April 15:

POSITIVE CATHOLIC ACTION IN THE LIFE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT

(By Mary Anne Green, St. Paul's Academy, Washington, D. C.)

We as students of the Catholic Mission Crusade are faced this afternoon with a problem. In fact, the primary purpose for our assembly here is to determine who can best convince the average high-school student that he can change the world in which he is living through a positive, through a determining, and through a practical Catholic action.

If the world in which we live is in need of change, then something must be at fault with the conditions under which we live.

If the Catholic high-school student is being called upon to change this world through positive Catholic action, then he must be aware of the need for change. But even more, if the Catholic high-school student must do this job himself, he must not only be aware of the need for change, but he must also have an absolute, a living conviction that he must roll up his sleeves and get to work.

To this end, I conducted a poll, became an inquiring photographer, so to speak, and I asked 100 teenagers the following questions:

1. Are you satisfied with the conditions of the teen-age world in which you live?

2. Do you think that Catholic youth in general are outstanding in their efforts to influence toward good?

3. Do you actually believe that you are doing your part, or do you think you are indifferent?

4. Of the following obvious faults of modern youth, which do you think is the root of the greatest evil: Greed for money, love of ease and pleasure, disregard for authority, or laxity of morals in company-keeping?

The results were enlightening, assuring us that if Catholic youth must do this task of changing the world, he does have an absolute conviction that his world needs change. Only 16 percent were satisfied, proving that Catholic youth does realize the necessity for positive Catholic action. Now the percentage of those who considered Catholic students outstanding in their efforts to do good was greater, 30 percent, but 60 percent believed themselves to be indifferent on this score. Disregard for authority was considered by far the root of the greatest evil with 47 percent; love of ease and pleasure taking second place with 30 percent. Think of it. Sixty-seven percent admitted that they did not say the daily rosary, and 30 percent never made the first Saturdays for peace.

Further, I asked these same youths, whom I questioned at basketball games, at St. Martin's Sunday night dances, at the drug store, and even at a girls' slumber party: "What do you suggest that we can do?" And it was here that the virile quality that makes youth so attractive to those of every age came forth. Straightforwardly, courageously, recklessly (for they indicted themselves), the answers poured from the recreation rooms, from the Boys' Club rooms, down the bowling alleys, across the dance halls, and even from our living rooms like this:

Catholic youth does not pray enough. Catholic teen-agers do not frequent the sacraments enough. Catholic teen-agers could do better jobs of being missionaries in their own homes. Catholic teen-agers follow rather than lead. Catholic teen-agers are apologetic for their faith, instead of being proud, puffed up, that they are signed and sealed as the children whose father is a God, and whose birthright is not transient, but eternal happiness.

Catholic youth does not pray enough. His life is unbalanced. Finding time only for the so-called good times, his prayer life slips woefully into the background. There are many teen-agers here who fill every spare moment of the day with the latest disks, who cannot think, unless they have their favorite station turned on, drooling out the latest blues or be-bop. If only we could not think without tuning in with a short prayer, dedicating our actions to God, instead of to self. How often a day do your thoughts turn to God? Or are you one of the more than 50 percent of Catholic students who admit that they say no prayers but night prayers, unless they are said in school?

Catholic teen-agers do not frequent the sacraments enough. Just as the physical side of man cannot subsist without food, neither can his spiritual nature go without spiritual food. Are you one of the 47 percent who confess that they substitute the good times of Saturday nights for the reception of holy communion on Sunday mornings? Would you dare to start this Saturday night, and drop the A-bomb in your crowd? No Hot Shoppes for us, boys, we're going to communion tomorrow.

Catholic teen-agers could do better jobs of being missionaries in their own homes. Persuade a wayward member to make a mission, and make it with him. Remind the lukewarm of approaching fast days, and no meat sandwiches, yourself. Shock them all, when you ask naively, "Well, who's going to daily mass with me during May?" Sometimes at a meal, a comment like this sets others thinking. "You know what I learned in school today, Pop, that I never knew before? Our capacity for happiness in heaven depends upon the supernatural life we live on earth, and that is determined by the graces we receive through prayer and the sacraments. You know, Pop, for me, that's a greater incentitve to pray more."

Catholic teen-agers follow rather than lead. What a tragedy that this is so. Will you say "No," when your date suggests an objectionable movie? Will you refuse to listen to a conversation that is ruining another's good name? Or will you like a weak straw blown hither and thither in the wind, follow the crowd? If one-fifth of the United States is Catholic, out of every five leaders, is one a Catholic? Why not? How many potential leaders should there not be among our ranks—but where are they? Step up, Catholic youth, before it is too late. Take up the standard of catholicism. Cherish it, protect it. But above all, accept the challenge that rings from pole to pole. Be not hearers of the word, Catholic youth, but doers, also.

Time for the President to Recognize MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an editorial which appeared in the Bridgeport Post on April 23, 1951, containing a clear-headed and thoughtful analysis of the conflict between President Truman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

TIME FOR ACTION COMING

Now that his magnificent New York reception is over and General MacArthur is resting, it is about time for the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the secretariat and congressional leaders to get down to the business of deciding once and for all where we are going with the Korean war. They've had plenty of time for resting, up to now at least.

The outpouring of affection for the general has come spontaneously from the hearts of the American people. The tribute was one due a great man, a hero in every sense of the word. Eventually the cheers of the greatest throng in history will subside, and the political and military leaders of the Nation will have to be concerned with the practical aspects of the MacArthur proposals.

The general didn't make his historic address for glory or for fun. It was one of the most serious patriotic statements ever made by any man, and what he said must be so considered by Mr. Truman and all those who give him advice on policy matters.

If this group delays and fiddles, there will be another roar from the public demanding action. The Korean war, the Asian problem, the strategy to be applied in the war on communism, must be discussed and the answers given frankly and promptly to the American people. General MacArthur must not be excluded from those conferences because of the petty opposition of small and stubborn men.

MacArthur has at least given to the American people through his talk to Congress an aggressive positive program. For nearly a year President Truman's program has been negative and drifting, lacking any earmark of strong leadership.

It is impossible at the moment for any individual to say definitely who is right and who is wrong in the conflict of opinion between the man in the White House and the commander who passed the last 14 years in the field.

But it is possible to develop the right policy for us and the free world if the politicians and the military men will sit down together with the general and work long and hard until they can formulate a definite plan and agree to pursue it to the end. There is no sense in delaying any longer, until they become stalemated and bitter. Action for the good of the country is what the people want.

The next move, as we see it, is up to President Truman. Dinners and parties ought to be canceled, random speeches, sniping, and loose talk should be banned by Executive order, and nothing should be allowed to interfere with an honest, full-time endeavor to get this critical problem settled.

Has he the courage and the good sense to make such a strong move? Or maybe he didn't hear the people's demand for action which accompanied their cheers for the great general. We shall see.

Real Statesmanship Can Repair Blunders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest editorials on the subject of the dismissal of General MacArthur appeared in the Seattle Times on April 20, 1951. I insert it in the RECORD in order to bring it to the attention of the Members:

REAL STATESMANSHIP CAN REPAIR BLUNDERS

Now the American people have heard, from the mind and heart of a great soldier and a great statesman, the full story of the Truman administration's blunderings in the Far East.

When Gen. Douglas MacArthur was stripped of his commands last week, the Times counseled calm thinking and urged its readers to wait until all the facts were in before passing final judgment on this dramatic episode in American annals.

Since then, we have heard President Truman's defense of his action. Now we have General MacArthur's stateesmanlike analysis of the military problems posed by Communist aggression in Asia and across the globe. We are convinced that the dismissal of General MacArthur was the latest of a series of monumental mistakes.

MacArthur is right. The President and his advisers are wrong. Calm thinking, however, must still be the order of the day as the people of the United States insist that the Ship of State be squared once more upon the right course.

In his magnificent and convincing address before the Congress yesterday, MacArthur showed us clearly how far off that course the national administration has veered.

When Red China intervened in Korea, a new situation was created which called for new political and diplomatic decisions. These decisions have never been made. That was wrong.

It was wrong to ignore MacArthur's plea for intensified economic and naval blockade of the China coast. It was wrong to restrict air reconnaissance on that coast. It was wrong to prohibit MacArthur's air forces from crossing the Yalu River, thus providing sanctuary for Red planes.

It has been wrong to make no use of Chiang Kai-shek's idle army locked up on Formosa. It has been wrong to subordinate Asia to Europe in American defense plans.

It would be wrong to give Formosa to Red China, if President Truman is thinking of any such acquiescence in British demands. It would be wrong to join in any other form of appeasement of Communist aggressors in Asia, in Europe, or anywhere else.

Last of all, it was wrong to dismiss General MacArthur, and wrong not to summon him home before that step was taken for consultation. It will be wrong if he is not immediately restored to full authority in Korea and Japan.

Whether the Truman administration, after all this record of wrong judgment and ineptitude, can summon the courage and wisdom to repair such great damage is the question of the hour. Frankly, it seems too much to hope for. But Congress, by resolution, should at once point the way.

Now Let's Get Down to Debating Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Denver Post of April 20, 1951:

NOW LET'S GET DOWN TO DEBATING AGAIN

Gen. Douglas MacArthur received a tremendous ovation, one richly deserved, when he spoke before the Congress of the United States Thursday. He is a great soldier and a great orator. He made a great address.

The general ably reviewed the case for a stronger effort in the Korean war. He reiterated his previous call for blockade of the China coast, bombardment of Manchurian bases and use of Nationalist troops to start a second front in China proper.

General MacArthur gave Congress a great deal of ammunition for this Pacific phase of the great debate over foreign policy. He did not, however, make clear a number of issues of the utmost importance.

He did not say whether he wanted this action taken by the United Nations, or, failing that, if the action should be taken by the United States alone. He did say that all military commanders whom he knew, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, favor such action as the best military method of achieving victory in the Korean war. He did not say whether or not all military commanders favor this action in light of known and unknown political circumstances regarding Korea.

Neither did the general say at what stage he believed such actions should be taken. Should they be taken all together? Is the invasion of China by Chinese Nationalists, loosed, supplied, and perhaps transported by America, to be done first or last? If the Chinese Nationalists are routed and defeated, is the United States to send troops to succor them? Are we to supply them with guns? Are we to maintain a beachhead on the China coast to assure them of supplies?

These, of course, are vital questions. They determine the degree of involvement that the United States would accept in a new war of this kind.

General MacArthur is an advocate of the purely military viewpoint on the Korean War. He presented a convincing case. He lent great weight to the cause of those who would strengthen the effort in Korea at all costs.

Not living in a purely military world, the rest of us must pause for a moment to catch our breaths and consider the question from other aspects.

The Denver Post agrees with nearly all the principles laid down by General MacArthur. The editors of this newspaper believe China should be blockaded, Manchurian bases bombed, and even, in case of general war with Russia, that troops of Nationalist China or any other faction should be used to fight for our cause.

Yet there are more important matters in the world than these. If it meant break-up of the United Nations, this newspaper would oppose bombing of Manchurian bases and blockade of the China coast. Above all, we believe the fighting members of the United Nations must remain united.

If General MacArthur meant his measures should become United States policy to be pressed before the United Nations, we agree with him in all but the issue of Nationalist China's troops. We are even inclined to accept his judgment, though we know it lessens the possibility of political settlement, that Formosa must never fall into Communist hands—under any conditions now known.

But if General MacArthur meant that we, the people of the United States, should press the Korea war to this extent at the cost of losing support of our allies, then the Denver Post, for one, must disagree.

Assuming, for a moment, that the United Nations will agree to these measures, let us consider the dangers they pose.

Blockade of the China coast seems to pose little additional danger. It would have some good effect, notably on stopping trade in the area of Hong Kong and Macao.

Bombing of Manchurian bases poses more danger. Red China might well call for Russian entrance into the war, under the terms of the Sino-Soviet mutual assistance treaty.

Would Soviet Russia respond to that call? We do not know. That is a chance we would have to take.

One cannot say emphatically enough how foolish it would be for us to examine any of the measures for a stronger war without examining the possible consequences of them. Of all the measures, the use of Nationalist troops bears the most danger of bringing general war. To us it seems to lead directly into general war and it does not seem to be the best answer for victory in Korea.

On the other side, we must again examine the possible consequences of our present policy. Following that policy, it is hard to see how we can achieve better than military stalemate in Korea. Is there any reason to believe we can achieve a political settlement, without appeasing aggression, under present conditions? The chance seems small. We should take stronger action. General MacArthur has proposed strong action. Except for his proposal that we become involved in a Chinese civil war, this newspaper agrees with him. We would even go further in one way and advocate use of the A-bomb in Korea.

These are knotty problems General MacArthur has posed for the second half of the great debate. Let the gentlemen of Congress debate them now for us all to hear. Finally, let Congress, the people, and the administration decide what policy we will pursue in the United Nations, but let the decision be made on the ground of honest opinion, and not be guided by the expediency of party politics.

The Jennie Reed School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Jennie Reed is one of the best-known

and most highly regarded educators in my home city of Tacoma, Wash. She has merited her enviable reputation in the field of education by her unselfish and outstanding service to the people of our community in the public-school system. The Tacoma school directors and members of the educational staff paid just tribute to her in naming a new school the Jennie Reed School. She richly deserves this honor. Knowing her personally, I take pleasure in including with my remarks an editorial appearing in the Tacoma News-Tribune on April 13, 1951:

THE JENNIE REED SCHOOL

Friday night Tacoma school directors and members of the educational staff pay a great tribute to an associate. They are honoring a living educator at the dedication ceremonies for the Jennie Reed School. This is one of Tacoma's newest and most modern school buildings. Its designation is the greatest of compliments to a distinguished Tacoma woman.

Dr. Jennie Reed came to Tacoma in 1910. She was born in Corning, N. Y., and educated in New York and Pennsylvania. Until 1916 Dr. Reed taught at the Irving School, becoming principal of that institution in 1916. In turn, she served as principal of Jefferson School and Sheridan School. Then she was appointed director of the research and psychological clinic for the Tacoma public schools. Later she served as principal of the McCarver Junior High School and later as principal of the Mary Lyon School. She was then transferred to the central research department. The University of Washington honored her with a doctor's degree in 1933.

Her distinguished work for Tacoma schools is thus recognized by the school directors in the selection of the name. To her hundreds of friends in Tacoma and throughout the State this compliment to a living educator is approved as a tribute to an outstanding woman who has made a great reputation in the educational world.

Your Congressman Will Be There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Citizens' Committee to Oppose Flood Control Dams in the Unadilla and Butternut Valleys:

SOUTH NEW BERLIN, *N. Y., April 20, 1951.*
Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: On behalf of the citizens of our valley we wish to thank you for the letters we have received from your office. We also wish to express our appreciation for the stand you have taken regarding the matter.

While it is not our intention to advocate other measures, we wish you success in your flood wall bill.

It is our intention to hold a mass meeting during the latter part of May or early June and would like to have you as our principal speaker. Will you address the meeting? If so, would you pick a Saturday or Sunday afternoon during that time when you will be free and we will plan accordingly?

As you are also against the dams, perhaps you can advise other means that we could use to not only show the proper authorities that we are opposed to these projects but to secure assurance from them that the proposed area dams will not be built.

Very sincerely yours,
CITIZENS COMMITTEE,
WALTER BAGG,
President.

Pattern for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, because Miss Margaret K. Patterson has so eloquently stated a pattern for survival, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of her remarks made to the Burrall Class, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., Sunday morning, March 11, 1951. Miss Patterson is assistant teacher of Burrall Class and principal of the Lafayette School in the District of Columbia. I commend her lecture to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PATTERN FOR SURVIVAL

I attended a meeting of school people recently where the film Pattern for Survival was shown. Perhaps some of you have seen it.

The film first showed in simple terms the nature of the atom bomb, and then showed through the experiences of a family living in a city apartment house the steps to follow in seeking safety in case an atom bomb struck. Included also, in graphic form, were suggestions as to what to do in any number of situations in which a person might find himself—at work, walking in the street, driving a car, riding on a public conveyance, etc.

Pattern for survival. We all are interested in that pattern, are we not? Never before, in our lives certainly, have we been so conscious of the imminent danger of wholesale destruction. Do you find yourself started now and then by some unusual sound or phenomenon which suddenly appears? Life has suddenly become very precious and we look upon each day, each hour, with new eyes—new appreciation.

Did you see the article in the Star recently telling of the young woman who lost her eyesight last November? She had to undergo an operation on her eye for detached retina. For several weeks she had to lie motionless with 25-pound sandbags on each side of her head. She returned to work February 5.

"I'll never cease to thank God every day that I live that I can see sunlight again," said Mrs. Hemp. "I didn't know it could be so beautiful."

Our fears today seem more real than ever before, more grounded on facts, as through all the modern media—press, radio, television—we see and hear the terrible things that may befall us. War of nerves, germ war, atom bomb, hydrogen bomb. Surely it would seem to us that our world—the one in which we live—could not survive.

I heard General Hershey speak a short time ago. He emphasized the fact that each generation had had to face its problems of survival. He cited Lincoln's time—we had been thinking particularly of Lincoln around the 12th of February—and he spoke of the hazards that then threatened life on every hand. Physical comforts were at such a premium that Lincoln's family and the neighbors felt themselves fortunate if they had four sides of a shelter rather than a three-sided lean-to. The mortality rate was high. Many could not survive the rigors of the cold winters and the deprivations they suffered. Lincoln's own mother and sister were among these. Along the frontier areas of our country a man's life was constantly in danger. An Indian might let fly an arrow at any unexpected moment.

"You're no more dead with an A-bomb than you were with an arrow and you're probably a lot more comfortable," said General Hershey.

Pattern for survival. On what are many people relying in their thoughts nowadays?

Some are relying on rationalization for one thing. "Perhaps Russia, after all, will not drop A-bombs on Washington. She is well aware of the fact that we are all set—poised for retaliation. The first move on her part to destroy our cities and our people would lead to immediate destruction of her own cities and people. Not even the leaders, who seem to regard human life lightly, want mass destruction." Yes; rationalization does reassure a bit and contribute somewhat to one's peace of mind.

There are people who are pinning their hopes for survival on information.

"Let's bring our fears out in the open and talk about them. Let's learn more about the nature of the A-bomb—how it works—what it does—what we do in case we are alerted." There are specific things to do, as we are all learning, which will contribute to our safety, wherever we may be when the crisis occurs—seek a bomb shelter, a basement, a wall, a heavy piece of furniture, cover all exposed parts of one's body, keep covered until the all-clear signal is given.

Soon an illustrated pamphlet of instructions will be put into every classroom in the city, and teachers and children will study and learn together how they can help themselves and others when and if the emergency comes. Yes; knowledge does help. I must admit that after viewing the film Pattern for Survival, I felt a little less afraid, a little more assured, that by taking definite safety measures, one's chances for survival are fairly good. The unknown presents one of our outstanding causes of fear.

But are rationalization and knowledge, important as they may prove to be, sufficient to give us that peace of mind, that calm and courage, that will see us through any crisis?

We must have something more. We know that the only thing on which we can really rely is that which lies within our spiritual world—that which lies deep within ourselves—inner resources—"The Kingdom of God within you."

We believe in a God and believe that He lives within our hearts and minds. Not long ago a survey was made of the people of the United States to ascertain their religious beliefs. More than 90 percent said they believed in God. But the survey went on to point out that only about 20 percent showed by their actions that their belief had any governing power in their lives.

Can we get a pattern for survival for ourselves that will help govern our hearts and minds for whatever disaster may come to us?

I should like to suggest three things that might contribute toward building within ourselves a pattern for survival.

1. The first thing I would suggest is to seek—seek spiritual growth.

"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all these things shall be added unto you."

And what are these things? They are freedom from anxieties about our material needs as clothing, food and shelter—freedom from doubts and fears which assail us—they are confidence and assurance and faith in the goodness of God.

Let us think of what is implied in that word "seek." We might substitute the word search or study.

"Study to show thyself approved unto God."

Spiritual growth does not just take place automatically because we wish it to do so.

We read the papers, listen to the radio, see television, attend lectures—following definite plants to keep ourselves enlightened about what is going on in the world—all of which is desirable and good but how much time do we give to enlightening ourselves on matters pertaining to the spiritual—to strengthening the spirit?

We know, not just because we have been told or have read about it, but out of our personal experiences, that faith and prayer are creative forces for courage—and yet think of the minimum of time we give to strengthening these forces—we may crowd into a busy day perhaps a bare 5 minutes or so for study and meditation.

Through active seeking and study we grow into a realization of our inner resources—an identification of self with the God within—and only then can we come into a power that will build a pattern for ourselves capable of withstanding whatever may happen.

Back in Deuteronomy, Moses might well have been speaking to us when he said to his people:

"But if from thence thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find Him, if thou seek Him with all thy heart and with all thy soul."

Through daily study, prayer for guidance, search for enlightment and for truth, joyful thanks for what we have, and now and then, an actual listing of one's assets, problems, and plans in an attempt at personal evaluation—we can build for ourselves a strength and a peace that passeth understanding.

Louis B. Mayer, of MGM, writing in Dr. Peale's little magazine Guideposts tells of the influence throughout his life of his mother, a woman of strength and power, the source of which lay in her daily study and practice of faith and prayer.

2. The second suggestion for building a pattern for survival has to do with self-direction or self-discipline. This is necessary to the accomplishment of anything really worth while. The things that come easy with little effort on our part have little meaning or value for us.

Self-denial or self-discipline just for its own sake is neither virtuous nor wholesome. Only when it is exercised as a constructive measure, as a means to a desirable end can it really be justified.

This matter of self-discipline means standing by convictions, by values which we have had cause to believe are good and right, sometimes at the cost of popularity. It takes courage and action.

The article in the Reader's Digest for March by I. A. R. Wylie entitled "Strength for These Days," speaks of this matter of spiritual exercise. These inner reserves or resources, she calls it the inner citadel, enabling us to meet dangerous and difficult times can only be reached when we stand on the firm ground of moral integrity. It is closed, automatically, she says to the cheat, the liar, the tyrant, the self-seeker. It is closed to us whenever we waver from an absolute code of honor and decency.

Self-discipline (direction) implies choice and in every moment of our lives we are confronted with choices. Someone has said that character is the sum total of all of the choices we have made up to date.

Referring to Mr. Mayer again: He tells of an incident when, as a small boy, he got into a fight with another boy. And while he says that he believes the outcome was a draw, he was still muttering and making ugly threats when he reached home.

His mother seemed to be paying no attention to him but the next day they were out in the country on a family picnic. She called Louis aside, saying that she wanted to show him something. They were in a beautiful valley in Canada and mountains towered on all sides, perfect for echoes.

She asked Louis to repeat what he had said the day before. He pretended not to remember. She reminded him that he said, "Damn you." She then had him say it and he was astonished at the volume of the echo which came back. Then she told him to shout it as loud as he could. He didn't want to do it, but knowing his gentle but firm mother, he shouted the words and they thundered back at him like a voice from heaven denouncing him. Then his mother had him substitute the words "Bless you." When he shouted that, the echo came back a benediction.

"Which do you prefer, my son, "my mother said. "It's entirely up to you. That is the way life is. It always returns to us what we say to it. If you shout at it and at your fellow man, 'damn you,' life and your fellow man will shout it right back at you. If you say to life, to humanity, 'bless you,' then your life will be an echo of those words, 'bless you.'

"Choose ye whom ye shall serve, Louis. You have that choice. As long as you live you will have your choice. Every day, almost every hour, in some way a choice will be presented to you. It says in the Bible, that before you this day is the choice, blessing or cursing. I tell you now, my son, that life will echo back to you what you say to it as surely as you just heard this echo here, and the choice is yours what you shall say for it to echo."

Louis Mayer concludes by saying that like every human being, he had sneaked up on life several times and tried to break the echo, but he had never succeeded, not once. Through every trial that has arisen he has seemed to hear his mother say, "You will have your choice as long as you live."

In this matter of choices civilized man is distinguished from the savage by his willingness to endure present pain for the sake of future satisfactions, even though they are rather far distant.

Finally, we need not only to seek and search for truth to strengthen our inner selves, not only to exercise self-discipline and make the right choices but we need more than ever to go outside ourselves—to lose and find ourselves in meaningful helpfulness to others.

"He that is greatest among you must be servant of all."

As we get older there is a tendency to withdraw more to ourselves—a tendency we have to face. We like our physical comforts—again this matter of self-discipline comes in. It is easier to perform services for ourselves rather than for others.

Miss Wylie cites an instance of World War I of a young American officer who went to the home of an English family to spend his last few days before going to join his regiment in France. They welcomed him like a son. They gave gay parties for him and tried to make his stay with them a delightful memory. Only later did he learn that on the eve of his arrival their only son had been killed in action. The writer says she is sure that by their selfless concern for this young soldier these people had surmounted death and that any feeling of bitterness had been driven from their grief.

The English people were outstanding in this last war. Miss Wylie says that she flew to England in 1944 and to her astonishment she found the people living in hourly danger of violent death, their homes in ruins and with many discomforts and privations—strangely enough, almost gaily happy. And to her surprise, she became happier than she had ever been as she lived among them.

She found women, gently nurtured, often elderly, who gave up sleep and rest night after night to fight fire and help rescue neighbors for whom they had assumed responsibility. They were living and dying at their highest level—all barriers between them had been broken down. Their individual resources of strength had been pooled and had become a mighty torrent. As Paul says, they were members one of another and were a whole, happy, integrated people. There was no question that they had developed a pattern of survival through meeting the hardest challenge they had ever known.

Concerning us, I believe with this writer, and I quote, "If that dire hour should ever come, we shall find, perhaps to our astonishment, that it is also our finest hour—the revelations of our true quality. In all men of good will—all free men—is the inner strength, do they but call upon it, to affirm with Emily Brontë, dying, young, forlorn, her genius half expressed but exultantly undefeated:

" 'No coward soul is mine,
No trembler in the world's storm-troubled sphere;
I see Heaven's glories shine,
And Faith shines equal, arming me from Fear.' "

Maiden Voyage of the "Finntrader"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I had the pleasure and privilege to be among those invited to attend a reception aboard the new 414-foot ship, the *Finntrader*, which was anchored in the Alexandria, Va., harbor after its maiden voyage to America. This ocean vessel is owned by Finnlines, Ltd., a subsidiary of Enso-Gutzeit, the largest producer of pulp paper and wallboard in Finland. I was certainly impressed by this ship—it is a modern, streamlined freighter of 6,400 tons, and has fine quarters for 12 passengers.

The appearance of the *Finntrader* is symbolic of the rebirth of the Finnish merchant marine, and the reestablishment of international trade by the Finnish Republic. This vessel was launched early this year in Holland, where she was built according to Finnish plans, and was fitted out inside in Finland. I am told her owners will in the next year be launching three more sister ships to sail the seven seas and the five oceans.

These new units in an expanding Finnish merchant marine bring to light again the distinguished history of the Finns in maritime annals. For years the Finnish sailing vessels were among the finest on the seas. Used in the wheat trade primarily, they were trim and speedy. Joseph Conrad and Alan Villiers wrote their vital stories around the tales of the Finnish windjammers. Thus the Finns were friendly rivals of the Norwegians in maritime annals, and Finnish sea captains approached the feats of the famous Leif Erickson.

We in America are proud of Finland, and as Congressman from Minnesota's Eighth District which has a large Finnish-American population, I can say with authority that the Finns who migrated to America are like their brethren in the old country—hardworking, conscientious, and patriotic people who have great contributions to the public welfare.

The Finnish Republic is a young republic—it got its start as an independent nation when it divorced itself from the crumbling empire of the Czars. It set up a constitutional government dedicated to democratic principles, which has met its international obligations at all times. In this connection, it was a worthwhile act on the part of the United States Congress to enact legislation 2 years ago to divert future payments on Finland's World War I debt to this country into a fund for the education and interchange of students between Finland and the United States in order to promote better relations between the two countries. This program is operating in a satisfactory manner, and I am proud to have been among those who helped write the proposal into law.

The launching of the *Finntrader*, and its appearance in American ports, is a testament to the Finnish tradition of industry and initiative. The Finnish Republic has, by its own efforts and without Marshall plan aid, repaired the damages of World War II, and is now making great enonomic progress toward raising the living standards and providing the good life for its people. I join with other Americans in wishing Finland well in this undertaking.

The Truman-MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my home town paper, the Galveston News, there appeared on April 21, an exceptionally fine editorial on the subject of the Truman-MacArthur controversy.

It is an objective and level-headed approach and it provides some badly needed food for thought. Between the lines, it admonishes the reader to act without haste and certainly without passion and to consider the present controversy in the light of history.

I take pleasure in inserting the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that its influence may not be limited to my own people but may be felt by the Congress and the Nation:

HISTORY AND THE FEUD

How history will judge the Truman-MacArthur controversy is a matter for speculation. When time mellows judgment, and gives perspective which we lack in our time, it is not impossible that both men will have increased stature because of what has happened. History has a way of dealing kindly with men who feel strongly about important matters and who act positively.

If President Truman can act with dignity and avoid making political capital of the issue, he may someday be judged as a President forced to defy public sentiment by replacing a national hero for reasons he believed to be essential to the safety of the world and the Nation he guided.

If General MacArthur rejects a mantle of martyrdom and refuses to allow himself to be a political tool, he may find a place in the history books as a soldier who felt a sense of a more urgent duty than the soldierly duty of obedience.

History will have an advantage that today we have not had. All the scores will be in and the results will be recorded. Abraham Lincoln is a folk hero and yet Gen. Robert E. Lee has a place of dignity in our history. The ideological conflict between Lincoln and Lee, and the moral beliefs which compelled the latter to resign as an officer in the army commanded by Lincoln to lead the army which fought it, has not dimmed the memory of either in the hearts of their countrymen.

Only little men show up as little after a long time.

Skirmish Won, But War May Go On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of Thursday, April 19, 1951:

SKIRMISH WON, BUT WAR MAY GO ON

The vote of the House Interior Committee killing (for the time being) the central Arizona project is a victory for California, but not a secure enough one so that we can afford to relax vigilance. The committee voted, 16 to 8, to discontinue further hearings until either the Supreme Court defines the respective water rights of California and Arizona or the two States agree on a division of the Colorado.

But this does not mean the project may not be taken up again for Arizona has not dropped her fight.

The court action cannot be obtained until an enabling resolution is passed by Congress. Such a resolution is pending in the Judiciary Committees of both Houses, but Arizona has blocked consideration. As for agreement, the two States have been disputing for 30 years over this question and seem to have made no progress toward agreement.

The bill which the committee tabled was a proposal to authorize construction of extensive dams, pump lifts, and canals for the purpose of irrigating central Arizona, at a cost estimated at very nearly $800,000,000, but which was regarded as certain to run very much higher.

The committee has been having hearings on the bill which already have run more than 6 weeks. The vote stops the hearings.

Victory climaxed a steady fight by two California Congressmen, Representative POULSON, of Los Angeles, and Representative ENGLE, of Red Bluff, supported by Representative YORTY, of Los Angeles.

They contended that the 1,200,000 acre-feet the project would take from the Colorado was far more than Arizona's just share and would endanger the established rights of California to water; also that the project was impractical in that it could not possibly repay any substantial part of its cost as reclamation projects are supposed to do.

Obviously the costs would have to be paid by the general taxpayers, including those of California.

As to the rights of the two States in the waters of the river, that obviously is a question for the courts, but Arizona has resisted all efforts to take the matter to court.

Arizona's ostensible objection that a suit would take too long is obviously invalid. The defense effort would force postponement of construction for several years in any event and it probably would not take more than a year to get a court decision.

The action of the committee is sound and sensible and the thanks of California are due to its Representatives who fought and won the battle.

General MacArthur's Address to Congress Will Not Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, no one who heard the words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur when he spoke to the Congress of the United States will soon forget. His words spoken with deep conviction and restrained emotion made a profound impression upon those who listened.

General MacArthur reported on the situation in the Pacific Far East as he knows it from his long personal experience in that area as a soldier in the field and as an administrator in Japan. He outlined the history of the Far East, its culture and its aspirations against colonialism, and of the influence of this history upon present events.

And he warned in view of these facts that a defense line in the far Pacific—Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines—is essential to the defense of the western boundaries of the United States itself.

Here was a great American, a statesman and a soldier. As a man who has lived intimately with war and knows its degradation and horror, he deplored the use of war as a means of settling disputes. But he warned that a nation once in war cannot retreat, for "there is no substitute for victory."

General MacArthur received a deserved ovation upon the conclusion of his magnificent address. The following appraisal of his speech by David Lawrence high lights the essential points of the general's report to the Congress:

MAN FROM THE PAGES OF HISTORY—CONGRESS IMPRESSED BY GENERAL'S DRAMATIC APPEAL TO COUNTRYMEN FOR COURAGE AGAINST DEFEATISM

(By David Lawrence)

They came, they saw, and they heard. They—the Congress of the United States—went away profoundly impressed that here was no ordinary man, no ordinary soldier, no ordinary general. For here was a statesman

speaking, a man from the pages of history whose dramatic appeal to his countrymen for courage against defeatism, for boldness, and resoluteness against softness and appeasement will be recorded for all time as the appeal magnificent. Here was Douglas MacArthur closing 52 years of military service to his country.

Those partisans who came expecting a political dynamic or a petty complaint against the fate that deprived him of his command in such humiliating manner found an entirely different spokesman. His speech was the voice of the soldier caught in a trap in Korea but serving his flag and not asking the reason why. His speech was the voice of the America of yesteryears when Americans did not prate of defeat and speak with fear and trembling to the enemy that had despoiled a weaker nation and tortured or killed prisoners.

Members of the Senate and House—Republicans and Democrats—listened as if transfixed. They heard a man of deep conviction, talking with an emotion restrained with difficulty as he told of Asia, the far-off continent where revolutionary changes are in progress. He told of Japan, beaten 6 years ago, but now on the way to democracy. He spoke feelingly of the desperate effort of the Korean people to save their independence. He spoke sympathetically of the slow but sure evolution of government in the Philippines.

But the speech was not one of mere sentiment. It was the well-mobilized argument of a man who for a quarter of a century or more has studied the Far East—its culture and its aspirations against colonialism. He spoke as a liberal about the hopes of peoples as against tyrants. He did not fail to speak also of the great hopes of the world for peace by means of collective security.

All the ideals of America General MacArthur articulated with the measured phrases of a statesman. All the hopes of the world for an end to war as a means of settling disputes he championed with wholehearted devotion. But, he warned, once a nation enters a war, there is no time for retreat or appeasement, no time for compromise. He said with an emphasis that shook the Chamber with applause: "There is no substitute for victory."

The general built up point by point the case for a defense line in the far Pacific—Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines. He said if that line was broken, our own Pacific coast would not be safe. And then he emphasized why it was important to hold Formosa.

The statement that came as the highest surprise was his flat declaration that the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff in the past had agreed with this military strategy.

There will, of course, be controversy over various points in the speech. It will be debated and perhaps investigating committees of Congress will ask for the documents and evidence relating to it.

The general has notified Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, that, while he does not want to get into a controversy or pursue these matters, he will willingly cooperate with the committee should it desire him to amplify his views. So Senator RUSSELL plans next week to fix a time, possibly for the following week, when the Armed Services Committee will go into details, with General MacArthur as a witness.

Meanwhile, the National Capital still is shocked by the whole affair. The reception given General MacArthur was so striking that it could not but overwhelm for the time being almost every other activity of the Government. The welcome to the general was, of course, a tribute to a great soldier as well as to a soldier-statesman.

But it was also a human reaction to the summary way in which a great general had been instantly relieved of his command without even being given the opportunity to say farewell to his troops. No similar case is on record in all the history of the United States. Generals have been ordered to relinquish their commands but on none has such a sentence been imposed—without trial—with so abrupt a detachment from his command without a real word of explanation of what orders or instructions he had violated, if any. The conclusion is inescapable—General MacArthur was made the victim of the petty political spirit of our times.

The stature of General MacArthur, after his address to Congress, looms larger and makes an even deeper imprint on the pages of history. He was magnificent in his words of farewell. It was an hour of triumph in which the people, in effect, repudiated the sad implications of government by petty politics and raised their eyes with hope as they heard the first words of real leadership that have come from the National Capital in many a long year.

What a Soldier Boy Thinks When He Leaves His Homeland for War Service Abroad—Dedicated to the Hope for Everlasting Peace and Good Will Among Men—By 19-Year-Old James A. Fenton, Fortieth Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish Dean Acheson and some of his wild-eyed boys would read this letter:

DEAR GRANDPA: When we left Camp Cooke at 4:30 in the morning, we did not get to San Francisco until 5 that night. We left the dock at 6. It was still light when we went under the Oakland Bay Bridge. When we got about 3,000 yards away (beyond) from it, the ship stopped. They did that so we could practice the fire and boat drill before the men got sick. Then we pulled up anchor to start our long, and what seemed to us our trip to death, across the sea.

As we came closer to the Golden Gate Bridge, we passed the "Rock" (Alcatraz). The men and myself talked about it—then we got closer to that mighty span of steel that went from one side of the bay to the other, which to me represented a line. When inside this line, you were in the land of the free and the happy, and when looking out over this line into the darkness of night, it represented the danger and the fear of the unknown you might encounter.

When we came within 200 yards before passing under this work of art, there came a silence over the ship: a silence that is only experienced when men from different States are thinking to themselves, and trying to believe it is all true, that they are being taken from their loved ones, their friends, their homes, mothers and fathers, aunts and uncles, and all the things they believe in.

When we did pass under it, we all looked back. I knew that each and every one of us was thinking the same thing as the city and harbor lights began to fade away. It is difficult to tell you how the men and myself felt as we watched those lights grow dim, many of us wondering if perhaps this was to be our last look at what we loved so dearly. The facial expressions were varied; some of the young ones with the expressions of youthful eagerness and adventure. The veterans and older ones with the attitude of "well here we go again," or "it seems to me I've seen this before."

Until you have left behind all the things you have lived for, or wanted to live for and watched them disappear with the shoreline into the vastness of the sea, you can hardly conceive what being an American can mean.

You may think the men cried aloud as they watched this unbelievable thing happen—not aloud, but deep down inside where it hurts more, and makes you want to cry aloud.

I dream during the daytime more than I do at night. I dream of only one thing—that is to again be on the side of that line, where there is love, hope and happiness.

Well, I am 19 now, as of the 4th (April) a birthday sailing the high seas.

This letter will be mailed from Japan.

Love,

JIMMIE.

Basic Korea Issue Befuddled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

BASIC KOREA ISSUE BEFUDDLED—ADMINISTRATION BEGINNING TO SMEAR MACARTHUR AS WAY TO ANSWER FUNDAMENTAL ARGUMENTS

(By David Lawrence)

General MacArthur's renunciation of any political aspirations and his pointed request that his name should not be used in a political way certainly was a timely demolition of attempts to befuddle the basic issue—whether American boys in Korea are going to be killed day after day without a real chance to fight back at the air forces bombarding them.

The introduction of the political innuendo against General MacArthur was an administration tactic. Smarting under the evident disapproval by the country of the crude method of relieving a distinguished general of his command, the Truman supporters in Congress have hit a new low in politics. They have already begun to smear the general as if that's the way to answer his fundamental arguments.

But the conversation often turned at the Capitol Wednesday to the misuse of the office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to make political speeches for the President and the Truman administration.

General Bradley, as Chairman, does not have a vote in the Joint Chiefs, and it never was intended that he should be the spokesman of the administration when it got into hot water in a political combat on Capitol Hill. General Bradley implied that General MacArthur wants to fight a war on the mainland of China and favors a deliberate expansion of the area of the war. This charge isn't so and causes disappointment among those who had come to look on General Bradley as above the political game.

What the administration fails to see and what General Bradley failed in his speech to meet is the complaint of the mothers and fathers of the boys who are in Korea. These boys don't want to become the victims of giant air raids from Manchurian bases without an effective chance to strike back at those bases.

It is significant that Chairman VINSON (Democrat), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has switched from the firm position which he took in the case of the removal of Admiral Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations. The admiral testified before Mr. VINSON's committee and was punished as a reprisal for his testimony. General MacArthur was fired because he answered a question from a Member of Congress. Mr. VINSON now says, however, in a letter to a constituent that the whole MacArthur situation "is just this simple." He pointed out that it had been decided by the President that the war in Korea should be localized and that General MacArthur has been advocating that we should win the war by expanding it in Korea and the mainland of China. Mr. VINSON noted that the question was whether we were going to have a little war or a big one and that he wanted to be on the side of a little war.

But that has never been the issue and there isn't a bit of proof that it has ever been. The real issue is this: A decision by the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff that Korea was not to be defended was proclaimed officially in January 1950, by Secretary of State Acheson. Then in June 1950, the civilian authority—the President—decided to intervene in Korea, although no adequate military preparations had been made for it. It was a wise decision to make in June 1950, and a wrong decision in January 1950. It was wise in June 1950, because America has never been afraid to be bold when duty called. But if the United States had stationed Marines in the Far Pacific in ample numbers and had not put the bulk of its aircraft carriers "in moth balls," there might have been no war at all in Korea.

Today, however, the question is whether the forces in Korea shall be withdrawn as a consequence of a virtual surrender and appeasement or whether they shall fight to protect themselves against air attack. "Appeasement" is constantly denied but it is the administration's real plan—if the Communists will only come far enough away from their haughty pose to help the administration save face. As to big or little wars, Winston Churchill said in the House of Commons after the Munich appeasement:

"Gentlemen, you have chosen between war and dishonor. You have chosen dishonor. You shall have war."

The answer, as far as the next war is concerned, will come some day when appeasement or what is now euphemistically called a "political settlement" has been effected in Asia. General MacArthur stands as the symbol of opposition to that appeasement, because he honestly believes that a firm position will prevent world war III and that vacillation and phony "peace" talk will only invite world war III.

Airplane Mail and Passenger Service in the Tri-City Area of the Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Members of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

We, the Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas that area of the Columbia Basin known as the Tri-City area, comprising the cities of Pasco and Kennewick, the unincorporated area of Richland, and the rural area immediately adjacent thereto, now has a population of some 75,000; and

Whereas the importance of the Tri-City area as an atomic and national defense center makes it vital that rapid transportation facilities exist; and

Whereas the said Tri-City area now has no direct or convenient air communication with coastal cities of the Northwest; and

Whereas the public convenience and necessity of such air transportation service to the coast from the Tri-City area already has been proved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully petition the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board to act promptly to certificate regularly scheduled local airplane mail and passenger service from the Tri-City area to Seattle, via Yakima and Ellensburg; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution immediately to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, to the Honorable Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

World Communism and Its Ultimate Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tidings, Los Angeles, Calif., of March 23, 1951:

EL RODEO

As they parley in Paris, we renew our resolution that there must never again be misunderstanding among the free peoples of the world as to the nature of world communism and its ultimate aims. There must never again be misunderstanding above all by the people of the United States.

Along with the civilized world we were shocked with the horror of the Bolshevist seizure of Russia just as the unhappy land sighted deliverance in the allied trumph of the First World War. We made a feeble attempt to rid our gallant ally of the scourge but when the dauntless Poles cleared their land of the marauder and the valiant Magyars quelled the rising of Bela Kun, exhausted and sick of strife and combat, we felt the menace contained beyond the Vistula where, we vainly hoped, it would ultimately be cast aside by the fires of freedom that burned perenially in the breasts of the great Slavic peoples. We sadly underestimated the power and strength of brute force and cunning and cruelty.

For 15 years the regime in Russia was a pariah among the nations, ostracised from the councils of the nations, cut off from the normal channels of trade, denied the friendly hand of the free. As a people, as a nation, we especially seemed to recognize the menace of the upstart to all our glorious Christian traditions, the danger to all our cherished American freedoms. We shuddered at the planned massacre of the Ukraine, the endless liquidation of the flower of Russia, the rape and pillage of the innocent, the long trek of political dissidents to Siberian wastes, the wall of the purged—and we steeled ourselves in resolution that here was a godless tyranny bent on a new enslavement of humanity, insidiously planning world revolution, fomenting wars and rumors of wars—and our free choice was to stand steadfast against this new oriental despotism with all the faith and courage of those who in the past shielded us from the enemy without and made this Nation strong and great.

Then came the great change, the awful contrast. We wonder now how we could have been so deluded. But suddenly, over night, it became the fashionable thing to fawn upon and flatter this ugly thing. We were in one of those unfortunate periods of economic collapse when the Nation reeled in bewilderment, caught in the shackles it had forged. There were cold, empty larders, desolate firesides, and a litany of woes, a requiem of tears saddened the land and filled it with cries of deliverance. At the same time the moral bankruptcy of the lost generation reached a new high, and in our confusion we turned to traffic with this evil thing.

It will not harm to rehearse again the scene: Our technicians perfecting the industrial might of an enemy which despite protestations of friendship was vowed to our destruction; our professors heralding the excellence of this tyranny over our vaunted freedom; our journalists slanting and coloring the news to gloss over Communist excesses, deliberately confusing the issues, bewildering by silence and innuendo; our statesmen and diplomats in undignified social contact squandering the faith of freedom of Christian men over half the world for a mess of Soviet pottage, the collective lunacy of the land which failed to discern the web that was slowly being spun around it.

The fact that we were once uneasy comrades in arms against a common foe does not excuse us. We should still have known—because of our former understanding, because of the callous aggression on Finland, because of the cynical smile on the faces of Molotov and Von Ribbentrop as the pact sealed the mutual plunder of Poland and prepared Hitler's assault on the West. And the sell-out of our friends and our intrepid allies at Yalta and Teheran and Potsdam is something we have not yet had the conscience to disavow.

That is why we repeat that there must never again be misunderstanding among the free peoples of the world as to the nature of world communism and its ultimate aims. There must never again be misunderstanding above all by the people of the United States.

Continued Support for the International Children's Fund Is in Our National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my concern over the drastic cut in the third supplemental appropriation bill from $12,500,000 to $5,000,000 for United States participation in the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

As chairman of the only congressional committee to make an intensive study of

UNICEF, both in respect to the headquarters organization and the field program, I would like to report that I found this special activity for children far more significant for the United States than is generally recognized by this House. I visited headquarters in New York on two different occasions, the European regional office in Paris, and visited with chiefs of mission in Germany, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Yugoslavia, Italy, Greece, and the Middle East.

The practical character of this action operating at the community level, with its tangible results of improved child health and welfare, has a dynamic appeal to all governments and people. Beyond this human appeal, however, is the effective stimulus of the matching formula. The initiative of the United States Congress in establishing the matching principle for both contributing and recipient countries has proven to be the keystone of UNICEF success. Fifty-four governments have made voluntary contributions for UNICEF assisted programs outside their territories and approximately another $150,000,000 has been made available by recipient countries. I was surprised to find that governments on both sides of the iron curtain were contributing to UNICEF and freely permitting goods to cross usually closed borders. Obvious was the pride which officials in war-devastated countries, as well as those from more prosperous areas, attached to their contributions to this program.

I was impressed in almost every country visited by the magnitude of the UNICEF program in relation to the small sums available. This phenomenon in part stemmed from the strategic character of UNICEF assistance but was only made possible by the organization of hundreds of volunteer local committees composed primarily of parents and teachers who were responsible for the distribution of supplies at the community level. For example, we were informed that in Europe alone UNICEF food has been distributed through more than 50,000 feeding centers, manned by full- or part-time volunteers. Thus tens of thousands of persons are actively engaged in this United Nations program without remuneration.

It would be difficult to measure the extensive humanitarian result of this special assistance to children, but in one country, for example, I saw records of UNICEF-assisted programs which revealed that over a 1-year period, girls in the 12-year-old age group grew in height from 130.6 centimeters to 137.6 centimeters, and weight from 27.7 kilos to 31.6 kilos, as compared to the national average for the same period of 130.9 centimeters for height and 28.5 kilos for weight. Boys in the same age level, who received UNICEF supplies, increased in height 5.1 centimeters and in weight 2 kilos over and above the national average. Government officials and local administrators said that UNICEF imports of supplementary food were not only responsible for increased weight and generally improved child-health condition but were an influential factor in bringing the children back to school.

I felt the international exchange of supplies under this kind of a commodity organization a valuable aspect of the program. In Austria there was sugar from Poland, and cars from Czechoslovakia. In the Middle East, microscopes from Scandinavia and wheat from Yugoslavia, and in Yugoslavia the children were eating Italian rice.

Spot checks showed meticulous reporting and a careful check on the supplies by a staff experienced in the distribution of such commodities.

The fund holds a unique place in the structure of the United Nations as the only body charged with a world-wide supply operation financed on the basis of voluntary contributions from governments, people, and organizations. This aspect of financing by voluntary contributions distinguishes UNICEF from most of the regular United Nations work based on an assessed scale of contributions.

It is not an easy process. Apathy, changes in government, economic vicissitudes, currency and trade regulations combine to make it difficult for UNICEF to rely on sufficient funds for long-range planning. To meet this problem UNICEF has followed the principle of only making allocations when there are sufficient funds on hand to complete a given program. Thus this new cut in the supplemental appropriation will not completely stop operations programed through this fiscal year but will drastically curtail any extension of the present services for children which are just now getting under way in Latin America, the Middle East, and many of the Asian countries.

I was impressed with the high degree of economy and efficiency which characterized the administration of this international program for children, but there are even greater considerations for the benefit of this country which urge me to request the Representatives of this House to restore the full appropriation for the International Children's Fund. For, with many other Members of this body, I agree with General Marshall, when, as Secretary of State, he said:

> Children whose bodies have been starved and warped are likely to develop, if they survive, into a generation of embittered adults. Our national interest as well as our humanitarian instinct demands that we do not permit this to happen. If we fail to do our part for the nourishment and care and normal development today of the children with whom our children will have to live tomorrow, we shall have failed in statesmanship as well as in humanity.

MacArthur's Ouster a Danger to Defense of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan:

DANGER TO JAPAN'S DEFENSE SEEN AS RESULT OF MACARTHUR'S OUSTER—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS GENERAL WON NATION OVER TO COOPERATION FOR WORLD RECOVERY AND PEACE

(By Mark Sullivan)

President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur was not merely a disciplining of him on military grounds. Beyond that and vastly more important, it was expulsion of MacArthur from counsel, from any part in planning or advice. Actually, this had gone on before. During several years MacArthur has been flouted in the public eye and quietly sabotaged. But by Mr. Truman's action the flouting is made formal and whole, permanent and systematic, it is sensationally announced to the world. This has effects that cannot be overcome. The world struggle is, since last Wednesday, a fundamentally changed picture.

Basic in the changed picture is the absence from it of MacArthur, and the fact that his absence is enforced by the President of the United States. The picture now lacks what MacArthur symbolized, world restoration. By what MacArthur accomplished in Japan—changing the sullen bitterness of a conquered people to a spirit that was not merely friendship toward us but eagerness to adopt our ideals and cooperate with us in promoting them in the world—by this, MacArthur brought about perhaps the longest step toward world recovery that has taken place during the postwar period.

MACARTHUR'S CONTRIBUTION

World recovery includes hope of world peace, and progress toward it. To this, MacArthur's contribution has been larger than that of any other statesman. For not only did he bring a powerful and formerly militaristic nation to belief in peace and willingness to promote it in the world; further than that, what MacArthur did in Japan had effects on the thoughts and purposes and hopes of other peoples, especially Asiatic ones. None of these, nor Japan itself, can feel today the way it felt before last Wednesday. It would be an irony, if it were not associated with so somber a tragedy, that Mr. Truman, defending his dismissal of MacArthur, and stating his purpose as prevention of another world war, implies that MacArthur's course would have brought one about.

The changes that have taken place in the world picture include a detail especially ominous to us. Our defense line against advance of Russian communism toward us is potentially moved back some 5,000 miles toward our own shore. Potentially, this had already taken place some 2 years ago when Russian communism overran China and set up in that country the Communist government that now makes war on us. While that was taking place our interest called on us to support the then anti-Communist Republic of China headed by Chiang Kai-shek. But the Truman administration did not merely fail to support Chiang, it took affirmative steps that weakened him. There is abundant and concrete justification for the statement of Senator KNOWLAND of California last September "the State Department tried to bury the Republic of China a dozen times in the last 5 years."

If the dismissal of MacArthur is to become occasion for debate, it is not MacArthur that should be the issue; it is the policy the administration has followed about China during the past 6 years. Once China had fallen to communism, Korea was destined to follow. When Russian communism moved to seize South Korea, resistance to the aggression depended upon the United States. No other country was in a position to act effectively. Whether or not MacArthur was indispensable is not necessary to discuss. It can be assumed that some other commander would have been adequate, though, obviously, MacArthur, by his experience in the East and otherwise, had special qualifications.

JAPAN INDISPENSABLE

But Japan was indispensable. Without it as a base, resistance would have been logistically difficult to the point of impossibility, and the base was made more dependable by the fact that the Japanese people had come to feel affection for MacArthur and, through him, affection for the United States. Besides, they feared and hated Communist Russia and relied upon us to defend them against it.

The changes recently wrought in the world picture cannot avoid disquieting the Japanese people. It is not merely that they see a man whom they idolized removed from them. More or less simultaneously they see Britain propose that Communist China have a place in the making of the treaty of peace about to be made with Japan. They also see Britain propose that Communist China have a seat in the United Nations. They see Britain propose that Formosa be given to Communist China. That has ominous meaning, both for nearby Japan and for us. It would raise a question whether Japan could be defended. Though these proposals have been rejected by the United States, they leave disquiet in their trail.

Former Senator Frank P. Graham Pays Tribute to a Great Statesman and Southern Leader, Charles B. Aycock, in an Address to Joint Session of North Carolina Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest governors any State ever produced was Charles Brantley Aycock, of North Carolina. Recently a former Senator, the Honorable Frank P. Graham, paid an appropriate tribute to this distinguished American in an address to the North Carolina Legislature.

Dr. Graham presents a scholarly and eloquent statement on the contribution that Governor Aycock made to the South's progress in education. No one is better fitted to appraise the career of Governor Aycock than this distinguished and highly respected student of the South's history. It is an honor to be the medium by which the notable address by a beloved southerner is made available to Members of the House of Representatives.

Under leave to extend it, I include the following address by Dr. Graham at the unveiling of the Howard Chandler Christy portrait of Charles B. Aycock, April 9, 1951, in Raleigh, N. C.:

First of all, I wish to express a real sense of inadequacy for the responsibility and a deep sense of gratitude for the invitation of the North Carolina Art Society and the State legislature to interpret anew the enduring meaning of the life and services of Charles Brantley Aycock. It is good from time to time to recapture even fragmentary glimpses of a man whose influence is as ever fair and as ever young as the hopes of children for whose equal opportunity he gave his life. It is altogether fitting that the portrait of this tribune of the people should be painted by a master, distinguished for his noble portraits, and should be hung in this historic hall, famous as the forum of the representatives of the people of North Carolina. May his father, who, during the War Between the States, sat in this hall as a representative of Wayne County, and his mother, whose brow, transmitted to the son, is truly preserved in this portrait, both gather in spirit with us here tonight to share in the commemoration of their son, beloved by his generation above all the sons of North Carolina.

There are certain leaders in the story of our State, who embody in their life and service the meaning of an historic period. With loyalty to the old landmarks, they lay the foundations for the new struggles and hopes toward whose fulfillment the leaders who follow go forward from generation to generation. Such a leader was Charles B. Aycock. His robust heritage was from the rugged pioneer American stock of the early eighteenth century. His democratic idealism is the very stuff of the American dream of the equal opportunity of all children yet unfilled in the middle of the twentieth century.

I. IN THE HISTORICAL SUCCESSION OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE SOUTHERN STATES NORTH CAROLINA BECAME A LEADER OF THE RISEN SOUTH WHEN AYCOCK BECAME THE LEADER OF NORTH CAROLINA

To catch something of the meaning of the man and his leadership, as we see him come to life again in the frame of this portrait, we must see him in the setting of the age of which he was a gallant and venturesome, kind and simple, inspiring and creative part. The historian characteristically divides our country into sections, our history into periods, and sometimes distinguishes our leaders by regions and eras.

The historians agree that, in the colonial and formative periods of American history, Virginia and Massachusetts, with the cooperation of the original colonies and States, shared a great leadership in colonization, revolution, independence, and federation. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, George Mason, James Madison, John Marshall, and James Monroe have made authentic the primacy of Virginia in the Old South and the pre-eminence of the sons of Virginia in the liberation and organization of the new Nation.

William E. Dodd, my old teacher, in his history of the cotton kingdom gives to South Carolina the southern leadership of the lower South in the middle period. Through the eloquence of Robert Young Hayne, the militant governorship of James Hamilton, the fiery oratory of George McDuffie, and the relentless logic of John C. Calhoun, South Carolina assumed the leadership in our section in the championship of the principles of State sovereignty and the formulation of the creed of the economic, social, and political regionalism of southern rights and institutions. Though Andrew Jackson and James K. Polk and other great southerners as strong nationalists, placed Tennessee and other Southern States high in the council's leadership of the Nation, yet, through Robert Barnwell Rhett of Charleston, along with William L. Yancey of Alabama and Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, South Carolina took the leadership in the secession and confederation of the Southern States.

In the disunion and conflict which divided the North and the South and shattered for a time the Federal union, the greatness of the mind and the nobility of the character and spirit of Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee rose above conflict and bitterness to become the spiritual resource of the reunion of the States. The Midwestern Lincoln, the emancipator of the Negro slaves, nobly magnanimous in victory, and the Virginian Lee, one of the greatest commanders of all time, teacher of youth and reconciliation, sublimely dutiful in defeat, transcended with their immortal spirit both victory and defeat in the reunion and freedom of the United States of America upon whose united strength in support of the United Nations against division and tyranny depends today the freedom and peace of the world. The example of Lincoln and Lee became an inspiration to the youth of America, North and South. The spirit of the new South was soon to be heard, first in the matchless calls of Hill and Grady, of Georgia, a little later in the great educational crusade of Curry of Alabama and Aycock of North Carolina. To all four of these the guiding star of national reconciliation and southern recovery was the nobility of the character, the teaching, and the example of Robert E. Lee.

In the era of the rise of the South from the devastation of the war and the tragedies of reconstruction, Georgia, through the valiant recovery of Atlanta and the eloquent appeals of Benjamin H. Hill and Henry Woodfin Grady, expressive of the heroic spirit of a stricken but dauntless people, became the empire State and the leader in the resurrection of the South.

In the years just before and after the turn of the century and since, North Carolina through her educational, industrial, agricultural, and spiritual pioneers, then became the leader of the risen South. Aycock became the leader of North Carolina when he led the people up from ignorance, poverty, and racial strife through schoolhouse doors, opened to all the children of the people. North Carolina became the leader of the new South when Charles B. Aycock became the leader of North Carolina. The man who in himself preserved the best traditions of a great State, provided the brave and kindly leadership for a turbulent, transitional, and creative age, envisaged the whole commonwealth, all the people, all their industries and institutions, their fears and hopes, who understood and loved them all, beloved by them all, was Charles B. Aycock. Perhaps America's greatest educational governor.

II. THE HERITAGE AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHARLES BRANTLEY AYCOCK

Whence came this man? How did he get that way? In what soil did his rootage sustain the tall timber of his soul? We would know the stock of his heritage, robust in body, brilliant in mind, unyielding in moral power, patient and forward in his sympathies with the people in their common hopes for the equal chance of their children. Deep was his rootage in the soil of rural North Carolina. High was his faith in the people even when they reviled him. Reverent was his oneness with the moral sovereignty which undergirds the nature of man and the universe.

His heritage on both sides of the family was sturdy pioneer English stock, Baptist on his father's side and Quaker on his mother's side. The Baptist and Quaker strains were deep parts of his life and faith. Such God-fearing, self-reliant, farmer folk have long been the rugged democratic backbone of North Carolina. As pointed out by R. D. W. Connor and Clarence Poe in their authentic biography of Aycock, land grants were made to the Aycocks in Northampton County before the middle of the eighteenth century. Two of the east Carolina Aycocks were soldiers in the American Revolution. The first Federal census lists the paternal and maternal ancestors, Aycocks and Hooks, as freeholders of Wayne County lands in 1790.

His father, Benjamin Aycock, was the Wayne County clerk of the court and State legislator who stanchly supported the Confederacy in whose armies two of his sons were soldiers at the front. His mother, herself unlettered, especially inspired her youngest son with a love of learning and a championship of the equal chance for education

which the State had denied to her. Charles was the youngest of her seven boys and perhaps North Carolina's most gifted son in a generation of men great in the rebuilding of an old commonwealth.

Charles B. Aycock was born near Nahunta in Wayne County, November 1, 1859, more than a year before began the war, which shook a continent with its conflict of heroic peoples and its mighty social impacts whose aftermath of ruin and bitterness, struggles and hope, became the reference frame of young Aycock and his generation. This youngest son, with a high capacity for fine feeling, was plastic to the rugged molding of the privations and memories of war, the mistakes and bitterness of reconstruction, and the hopes for a better day. In the spirit of his great forerunner in the affections of the people, Zebulon B. Vance, he accepted with his characteristic good will the "duties of defeat," as enjoined and exemplified by Lee and Vance.

With the faults, frustrations, and hopes of a lively boyhood, young Aycock learned the lessons of a simple democracy in a farm family of 10 children. In the give and take of such a family he grew to respect with kindness the rights, feelings, and personalities of other people. He learned with sympathy the ways of dogs and horses. He tilled the soil and followed the plow. He hunted foxes, wrestled with other boys in the barnyard, tramped the fields and forests, had an ear for the songs of sweet-throated birds, and the melodies and cadenced grandeur of the poets. He learned from nature, from books, from people, and from the times. He learned from the household duties and simple piety of his mother who taught him a high reverence for women, for work, and sacred things.

When he and six brothers walked miles from the farm to a subscription school, it was borne upon him that there was no public school for them and countless thousands like them. His first school was in Nahunta, since named Fremont, where Aycocks still live to give historic association to the name and place. Then at the Wilson Collegiate Institute he sat at the feet of a remarkable teacher, the Elder Sylvester Hassell; "trapped" to the top of the class just ahead of young Josephus Daniels. There young Daniels, later at Chapel Hill and in print shops, got his preparation for his life as a tribune of the people, fighting editor in the cause of the people; as Secretary under Woodrow Wilson, builder of a powerful Navy; and as Ambassador to Mexico, the champion of inter-American good neighborhood. Charles B. Aycock and Josephus Daniels, schoolmates in Wilson, became comrades in arms in the later campaigns against special privilege, tariffs, and monopolies and together fought in the great crusades for the schools of the people. At Wilson, Aycock debated with other such schoolmates as Rudolph Duffy and Frank Daniels, who became his lifelong law partner and friend. In Kinston he was further prepared for the university by Joseph H. Foy, whose influence upon him was ever after one of the precious treasures of his life.

III. INFLUENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY ON AYCOCK

In the fall of 1877, 2 years after the reopening of the university and a few months after the withdrawal of the Federal troops from the Southern States, Charles B. Aycock, fresh from the cotton fields of Wayne County, alighted from a hack in front of the old Watson Hotel in Chapel Hill, to enter the University of North Carolina. Handsome, well proportioned, studious, and with self-reliant charm, he soon became a leader of a little band of remarkable students in the reopened university, which was to open their minds and kindle their hearts with the vision of rebuilding the life of a stricken but dauntless people.

One of these college mates of Aycock, Edwin A. Alderman, has said of the university of those days:

"There was no better place, I think, for the making of leaders in the world, than Chapel Hill in the late seventies. The note of life was simple, rugged, almost primitive. Our young hearts, aflame with the impulses of youth, were quietly conscious of the vicissitudes and sufferings through which our fathers had just passed. The conquered banner and the mournful threnodies of Father Ryan were yielding to songs of hope. A heroic tradition pervaded the place, while hope and struggle, rather than despair or repining, shone in the purpose of the resolute men who were rebuilding the famous old school."

Next to the Father of us all, his mother, and the two charming Woodard sisters of Wilson, N. C., who became the mothers of his eight children, Alma Mater and her sons were, by his own testament, deep and abiding influences in his life. Historic halls of the first State university buildings in America, with the hills and forests around, stirred his imagination with the traditions of the great past of the State and the hopes of the people for greater days to come. In these woods the veterans of the Revolution founded the university of the people. Here studied, played, and dreamed the youth who reached the highest offices and leadership of the State and Nation. The little group of professors, wisely gathered by President Battle carried on the high scholarly traditions of the university in which Charles Aycock, though weak in mathematics, soon excelled in the classics, political economy, and philosophy. He became under their inspiration a master of ideas, words, and logic. He was a match for all contenders in the Phi Society. He early became a leader of the student body and especially of a company of gallant souls who were soon intent upon the educational business of transforming an old State into a new commonwealth.

Unprecedented in the history of the university before or since, in protest at what was considered faculty interference with their elections, the insurgent students elected Charles Aycock the chief marshal during his first year. This story is graphically told by Judge Robert W. Winston, his college mate, life-long friend, and his partner in a great law firm, in his brilliant university day eulogy of Aycock. This turning to him by the students of the university for leadership in a muddled situation was prophetic of the call to him by the people of North Carolina for leadership in troublous times toward better days.

Along with James Y. Joyner and three score other students, Charles Aycock joined the Baptist Church at Chapel Hill under the influence of a young minister, A. C. Dixon, one of the legion of ministers, teachers, writers, governors, judges, legislators, and builders with whom Wake Forest College has blessed the North Carolina of Aycock's generation and since.

Under the wise and kindly President Battle he doubled his courses to study law in his senior year. He also came under the influence of the spirit of a brave woman whose unresting pen in letters to her boys had spurred former governors and countless alumni and legislators to reopen the university. It was the valiant Cornelia Phillips Spencer, who in 1875 climbed to the belfry in the South Building in which Aycock was later to room and rang the college bell which had not rung in Chapel Hill for 5 years. The woman who rang the bell thus announced in spirit to the generation of Charles Aycock that the university was reopened and that the historic institutions of the people were on the march again.

IV. COOPERATION OF ALL INSTITUTIONS

The momentum of the traditions, services, and hopes of almost a hundred years could not be ended by the turbulent times which had closed the university's doors. Noble colleges of the churches for men and for women, historic private academies, and a few public schools had kept the lamps of learning burning during those dark times.

May we, in the spirit of Aycock and in our gratitude, say for them all, both church related and privately endowed institutions, all hail for their great role through the years and all success in the campaigns for building nobler mansions of the mind and soul of youth. It was for this that the university was reopened in 1875, consolidated in renewed and reinforcing strength with the Women's College and the State College in 1931, both founded as products of the great democratic educational crusade. This University of Aycock, this university of the people is the cooperative partner of all the schools and colleges, public, denominational, and private, under the distinguished and devoted leadership of Gordon Gray in able cooperation with Controller W. D. Carmichael, Jr., and the chancelors, R. B. House, J. W. Harrelson, and E. K. Graham II, who has just succeeded the able and beloved Chancelor W. C. Jackson, teacher and biographer of the life and spirit of Aycock.

V. THE GREAT CRUSADE

In the year 1877, in which Charles Aycock entered the reopened university, there was a need for a democratic State-wide system of public schools to undergird all our colleges, industries, institutions, and enterprises of the common life and liberate great bodies of the people from poverty and privilege, prejudice and ignorance, into creative cooperation for a better life for all people.

With the coming to Chapel Hill in one student generation of Charles B. Aycock, Edwin A. Alderman, Charles D. McIver, James Y. Joyner, Locke Craig, M. C. Noble, W. J. Peele, Robert P. Pell, Francis D. Winston, Robert W. Winston, R. A. Doughton, James S. Manning, Robert S. Strange, Horace Williams, Frank Daniels, Charles R. Thomas, and other teachers, builders, and dreamers, something deep and creative happened in the history of North Carolina.

The night on which some of these graduated, two of them, Edwin A. Alderman and Charles D. McIver, later founder of the Woman's College, in the presence of the heritage of Archibald De Bow and Calvin H. Wiley and in the presence of the challenge of much ignorance and poverty in the general life, talked far through the night. As one of them later said in recalling this night that "toward morning 'by a light that was never seen on land or sea'," they had resolved to give their lives to educating the people to the need of education. It had become the stuff of their convictions, under God, that the public schools were the chief hope of a more creative and nobler commonwealth for which they had been preparing as they dreamed their dreams on the holy hill of their great dedication.

From the fires burning on that hill and in other schools and colleges of the State, the torches were lighted for the educational crusade which was to become the inspiring part of an industrial, agricultural, and cultural renaissance. Through dynamic interconnection with movements in other States, this crusade was beginning to stir the hopes of the people for a better day for their children.

Goldsboro, where Charles B. Aycock had been teacher and county superintendent and was now, as the rising attorney in eastern North Carolina, the chairman of the school board, became the front and center of the educational revival. Edward P. Moses, the superintendent, was brilliantly aflame

with the new evangelism and at the Chapel Hill summer school for teachers communicated the flames lighted there and at Goldsboro to the people of the State. Within a brief period there had come to Goldsboro E. P. Moses, from Tennessee; Aycock, Alderman, later president of three universities; Joyner, the extraordinary organizer of the fruits of the Aycock campaigns, and later president of the National Educational Association; Julius Foust, later president of the Woman's College; and Thomas Foust, all from Chapel Hill; Eugene C. Brooks, later the dynamic State superintendent of public instruction and able president of State College, from Trinity College with its great traditions of Braxton Craven and his Normal College at Old Trinity; and leaders and teachers from Wake Forest College, Davidson College, Guilford College, and especially from the woman's colleges in this capital and other strategic towns, and all the other colleges of the State. The State superintendents, Scarborough, Finger, and Mebane were pointing the way.

Goldsboro, under the chairmanship of Aycock, became one of the main proving grounds and the outpost, from which Aycock moved out to lead the bold and brilliant State-wide movement of the people for the education by public taxation of all the children of all the people.

Against the possibility of the fires burning out with sporadic bursts of popular zeal, the urgent need was the championship of laymen, businessmen, farmers, politicians, and parties. The popular crusade, bravely launched by wise and eloquent educators in the Southern States and aided by philanthropic funds in the North, needed the championship of a statesman who with clear analysis, homely illustration, simple logic, profound insight, and flaming zeal, could identify the values of the public schools with both the common work of the people's life and the noble vision of the people's hopes for the equal opportunity of all children, white and black, in the towns and on the farms. The need was for the commitment of a great leader and a great State to a great cause. The man, the place, the cause, and the opportunity came together in North Carolina in 1900 in Charles Brantley Aycock when he committed the people of North Carolina to public taxation for the education of all the children of all the people. The standard he carried through many campaigns and raised aloft at the turn of the century for the turning of this commonwealth has been carried forward by every Governor of North Carolina from the peerless son of Wayne, Charles B. Aycock, to the fighting son of Alamance, W. Kerr Scott.

Near the turn of the century, three stubborn barriers stood across the way up which Aycock would lead the people into the promised land of education and cooperation. The first barrier, as a part of the aftermath of the war, emancipation and reconstruction, was interracial strife and fears attended by the economic and political exploitation of the Negro. The second barrier was the traditional aversion of the people to taxation and especially the taxation of people of property for the education of the children of poor whites and Negroes, both of whom were considered shiftless and incapable of education. The third barrier was much public apathy and indifference to education based on too widespread illiteracy and poverty.

VI. THE THREEFOLD AYCOCK PROGRAM

Charles B. Aycock declared war on ignorance, poverty, privileged education, and the political exploitation of the illiterate Negroes. He became the successful and popular leader of the movement which had three parts: First, the immediate disfranchisement of the illiterate Negroes; second, the disfranchisement of both illiterate whites and illiterate Negroes after 1908; and, third, public taxation for the education of all children of both whites and Negroes as a basis for increasingly more equal opportunity of all people, white and black, to earn and to vote as the common rights of the citizens of the Commonwealth.

It was the first part of his threefold program which won for him a large majority. The second and third parts were the objects of terrific assaults. The wide popularity which had come to him from the first part was dedicated to the fulfillment of the second and third parts of the program. The suggestion to falter and halt in the fulfillment of the whole program was considered by him to be suggestions for the breaking of pledges given by his party and himself, violations of his personal honor, a failure in more equal opportunity for the poorer whites, a monstrous injustice to the defenseless Negroes and a prostitution of his party and his State.

He declared a new and indignant war on three such suggestions. He valiantly withstood the movement to postpone indefinitely the date of 1908 for the disfranchisement of the illiterate whites and was opposed to devices for the disfranchisement of illiterate Negroes after 1908. He met with hot scorn the suggestion to use the taxes paid by each race for the education of the children of that race. He refused to consider the suggestion for common taxation for the existing school terms and separate taxation of the races for any addition to the school terms.

Once when some friends told him that the movement was gathering strength for the separation of the taxes for the respective apportionment to the schools of the races, he answered simply in case that were done he would resign his office as Governor and retire to private life. He would thus have expressed his sense of personal dishonor and aroused the public indignation for the dishonor of the State whose people he respected and loved too much to betray for any office in their power to give.

Even his own county of Wayne joined many other counties in supporting separation of taxes. He was told not to speak his cause at the Democratic convention in Greensboro in 1904, because the mass of people gathered there would howl him down. With the great friend of education, former Gov. Thomas J. Jarvis, at his spiritual side, he made one of the great speeches of his life, unfaltering to the end in support of common taxation for the education of all children. The ovation given him that day was a landmark in the history of North Carolina and the South. On that day Aycock became the triumphant leader of North Carolina and North Carolina became the new leader of the South.

VII. FOUR PERIODS OF INTERRACIAL RELATIONS

We see him historically now, more clearly in the context of better relations between the races in the South. The relations of the races in the South have four main periods. First was the period of the institution of slavery, inherited from the ancient and medieval world, quickly found unprofitable in the North, and found for a time to be profitable in the South with the illusion of privileges which enslaved the blacks and disinherited millions of whites. Slavery could not endure without a denial of the teachings of our religion, without the renunciation of our democracy, and without the erosion of the economic foundations of the freedom, dignity, and enterprise of the human spirit.

The second period was the period of reconstruction based on the premature enfranchisement of the exploited freedmen and the disfranchisement of the conquered Confederate whites. This domination of the whites by the carpet bag regimes backed by Federal bayonets engendered and contributed to much southern fear, bitterness, and violence for a generation.

The third period was the period of intimidation of the blacks by the whites, the disfranchisement of the Negroes, and too much exploitation of the Negroes without the equal opportunity to learn the meaning of citizenship, to work with higher skills of hand and brain, and to vote as a citizen of our State and Nation.

The fourth period evolved from the tragedies and lessons of slavery and war, the carpetbag-freedmen domination of the whites and the white counterintimidation and exploitation of the then illiterate blacks. This fourth period was a period not of domination and counterintimidation but of education and cooperation. Booker T. Washington, who worked his way through Hampton Institute in Virginia and founded Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, preached the gospel of education, honest work, and personal worthiness as the basis of the new orientation for human progress in the relation of the races. The eloquent statesmanship of Booker T. Washington, J. L. M. Curry, Edgar Gardner Murphy, all of Alabama; the Peabody Board, the Southern Education Board, the Southern Education Conference, the Slater Fund, other private benefactions, and the long gathering momentum of the crusades of Alderman and McIver and their valiant cohorts in North Carolina, all contributed to this period of education and cooperation.

The head and front of this fourth period was the political leader who risked his vast popularity, staked his personal honor, committed his party and his State, and dedicated his vast powers of body, mind, and flaming spirit to the cause of common public taxation for the education of all children.

Aycock talked and preached education in every county in North Carolina and in States from Maine to Florida as a flaming evangel sent from God for the education and redemption of all the children of men. For every day of every year of his administration as Governor, a new schoolhouse arose in North Carolina. The last word he said on this earth as he dropped dead in Birmingham speaking to the teachers of Alabama, was the word "education." The last sentence of the last message to the people in which he was to have announced his candidacy for the United States Senate, published after his death, were these words:

"Equal! That is the word. On that word I plant myself and my party—the equal right of every child born on earth to have the opportunity to burgeon out all that there is within him."

VIII. PRESENT OPPORTUNITIES OF PEOPLES OF GOOD WILL OF BOTH RACES TO COOPERATE FOR FEASIBLE STEPS FOR NOBLER RELATIONS OF THE RACES IN AMERICA

Toward the fulfillment of the hopes of Aycock, the American dream of the founders of the Republic, and the teachings of our religion, the people of good will of both races in the North and the South need to get together for nobler relations of the races in America on some such feasible measures and ideas as the following:

1. In view of the origin, history, and power of the "mores" of peoples based on the universal consciousness of kind, an historic social heritage, the degree of the visibility of the difference between races, the largeness of the members of the groups involved and the economic competition of the low-income groups, there is needed a new emphasis on the influence of religion, education, personal kindness, decent respect for the human dignity of persons, and voluntary cooperation of people of good will for better relations in the local communities, in the long haul of the generations for justice on this earth. To our good northern friends, I emphasize the unwisdom of using Federal compulsions

and force at educational levels beyond the levels of acceptance by the people in the States. Such unwise compulsions cause bitter set-backs not enduring progress which mainly comes from within the minds and hearts of the majority of the people in the States.

2. Federal aid to education under State and local control for the more equal education of all the children in all the States.

3. Local-State-Federal cooperation for the prevention of even one lynching by a mob in the South or a gang in the North.

4. Abolition of the poll tax. If Senators and Congressmen pledge their support of prompt ratification in their States, then the most expeditious and feasible way would be by constitutional amendment, originally sponsored in the Senate by the distinguished Governor and lately lamented Senator from North Carolina, J. M. Broughton.

5. Admission of Negroes at the graduate and professional level where equal facilities are not provided in State institutions in acceptance of the established principles and spirit of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court as the supreme law of the land in the States as well as in the Nation. In case separate facilities are under State laws then provision for equal facilities in schools, libraries, extension services, roads, hospitals, sanitation, health, welfare, and equal justice under law. In cases where churches and private endowments have not provided equal facilities, the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has already pointed the voluntary way for denominational and private, professional and graduate schools.

6. The acceptance of the right of Negroes qualified by education to vote in primaries and general elections. The right to be taxed, to be drafted and to die for one's country carries the right to vote as a qualified citizen of our common country.

7. Voluntary cooperation of labor and management and of private and public facilities in the employment of workers, on the basis of competence, needed for maximum production and the national defense of the very human freedom and dignity now imperilled by denials of opportunity from within and by assaults of totalitarian tyranny from without.

8. Over-all and under-all, the dauntless recognition of the brotherhood of all men and the fatherhood of one God "Who made of one blood all the nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth."

By democratic logic, these are contemporary translations of the basic ideas and long range hopes of Thomas Jefferson and Charles B. Aycock.

IX. AYCOCK AND JEFFERSON

From the hill and shrine of Monticello near Charlottesville in the spring of his dauntless hopes there came down into the valleys of men's struggles, a tall, red-haired, sunny-faced young man to take up his battles for human freedom, national independence, religious liberty, public education, equal opportunity, and the abolition of the slave trade as a step in the ultimate abolition of human slavery. The history of America, with all its faults and frustrations, is humanely different because of the life, sufferings and battles of Thomas Jefferson in the cause of human liberty and equal opportunity for all.

From a historic hill in the woods of North Carolina there returned to his people a tall, blue-eyed, sandy-haired, brilliant, and eloquent young man to take up his life-long struggles for the freedom of the mind and the equality of opportunity through the schools of the people. The history of North Carolina, and the South, with all our faults and frustrations, is hopefully different because of the life, sufferings, and battles of Charles B. Aycock in the cause of the liberties of the people and the equal opportunities of their children.

CONCLUSION

The unveiling of this portrait is the symbol of the ever unfolding life of Charles B. Aycock in the life of this Commonwealth of his struggles and his dreams. In this hour we are desperately reminded that his ideas and hopes for the freedom of the human mind, the dignity of the human being, and the equal opportunity and enterprise of the human spirit are imperiled by the most monstrous threats of totalitarian tyranny. May the commemoration of the life and character of Charles Brantley Aycock mean the rededication of all to the ideas and struggles, carried forward by the United States of America, as the leader, under God, of the free peoples of the earth, in a stronger United Nations, as the best hope of human freedom, equal opportunity, and peace in the world.

Postage Stamps Commemorating Centennial of Territorial Government of the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington.

House Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial relating to the issuance of commemorative postage stamps commemorating the centennial of the Territorial government of the State of Washington

To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the Territorial government of the State of Washington was instituted and created in the year 1853; and

Whereas it is eminently fitting, proper and necessary that the centennial of the Territorial government be fittingly observed; and

Whereas it is necessary that proper and timely plans be made for the observance and celebration of said centennial; and

Whereas celebrations, educational meetings, pageants, exhibits, and exhibitions depicting the growth of Washington will be held and many books and publications will be published; and

Whereas services in honor of distinguished Washingtonians who have contributed to its growth and illustrious history will be held in commemoration; and

Whereas such celebration of our centennial should be noted and observed not alone by the proud citizens of the State of Washington but also by the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully petition the President and the Postmaster General of the United States that the Postmaster General issue suitable commemorative postage stamps recognizing and honoring the centennial of the institution of the Territorial government of the State of Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Washington.

Spencer A. Canary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the great editors of northwestern Ohio passed away on Wednesday last. His life was that of a pioneer editor with vast experiences in the everyday life of America. His editorials, including that of the day of his death, were an exposition of America.

From my first days in the Congress he graciously shared his vast experiences of a busy newspaper life and I shall be always grateful for that opportunity of learning the American way of life as lived and expressed by Spencer A. Canary.

I want to include the story from the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio, which he loved and served when "30" came:

S. A. CANARY'S LONG COMMUNITY SERVICE ENDED BY DEATH

Yesterday was "30" for Editor Spencer A. Canary, of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune. This symbol, used by all newspaper folk, means the end of the story or the final piece of copy for an edition of the paper.

Our editor passed away last night at 10 o'clock. His passing came with shocking swiftness while he and his wife were discussing plans for arising early this morning to start a motor trip through the Southern States. They were planning to be gone about a month and intended to let their whim and fancy choose their daily destinations.

His preparations for the trip were almost prophetic. He had cleared his desk late yesterday and had bid goodbyes to all the members of the editorial and business staffs.

In turning out the editorial which appeared in yesterday's paper he stated "This is my last editorial. I won't be writing any more after today." This naturally was understood by all to mean that he was not going to bother to write editorials during his extended vacation trip. The shocking truth of the statement came to us with frank reality today.

He was looking forward to the trip with great anticipation. He had just come in possession of a new automobile, the gift of one of his sons, and he had advised Mrs. Canary to pack sufficient clothing for at least a month of touring.

After his usual evening of reading and watching of a television program, he followed Mrs. Canary upstairs, carrying some freshly laundered clothes up to the top landing. On arriving there he sat on the edge of the cedar chest to chat about final plans with Mrs. Canary, advising her that they

would arise early in the morning and travel a while before eating breakfast somewhere along the way.

In the midst of their conversation he started to slump over and slowly slid to the floor without a cry or a sound. A doctor was summoned and he stated that Mr. Canary had died instantly of a stroke; that he had suffered no pain.

The news of his sudden death spread rapidly in spite of the lateness of the hour.

The final rites will be held Saturday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock at the Young Memorial with Rev. Murray Drysdale officiating. The interment will be in the Oak Grove Cemetery. Friends may call at the memorial Friday afternoon after 4 o'clock and during that evening as well as Saturday morning.

Spencer Andrews Canary was born in Bowling Green on May 13, 1874, to John W. and Celia E. (Duncan) Canary, the latter a niece of Gen. William H. Gibson. He was 76 years 11 months and 5 days old at the time of his death.

As a small boy Spence peddled onions in mornings before school and did all sorts of odd jobs for small fees. Starting at the age of 13 he worked on farms nearby during the summer months, his first job involving a daily 7-mile walk to and from the pasture to take care of the cows.

He was proud of the fact that his earliest newspaper experience came when he peddled the Toledo News Bee and Toledo Blade here. He continued to show his great industry by accepting employment as a house-to-house canvasser, one of his items being the standard dictionary when it first came out in 1895.

Spence was possessed of a very keen mind and very great perceptive powers and they were displayed in his school days at Bowling Green High School when he was the salutatorian of his senior class in 1894. In grammar school he won a scholarship in Tri-State Business College for the highest scholarship in the class and he accepted it to take a course in stenography there.

His experience then took him to the schools, first as a janitor and then as a teacher in the seventh grade in Bowling Green. Later he worked industrial life insurance for Metropolitan Life in Toledo.

The early days of photography invited his curiosity and he has often told how he "Huck Finned" on the old Miami canal with a tintype gallery man. One of his most exciting experiences came during a storm when Spence was playing the part of the tow-path mule and he saved his aged partner from death by preventing the ship from going over the old Independence Dam. Another time they experienced a tornado while tenting around Florida and Ridgeville Corners in that area of Ohio.

He enjoyed public debate and joined his brother, Russell, in Seneca County to participate in semimonthly debates in the country schoolhouse. This experience brought him in close touch with public problems and during that time he became the chairman of the first meeting in Bloom township, Seneca County, on a stone road proposal.

Nor was he afraid of hard labor for he worked for 6 months in the 22-foot France Stone Quarry near Bloomville and was always proud of the fact that he never bushed or quit because of fatigue or heat.

Before the turn of the century brought him into the newspaper business, Mr. Canary was stenographer for lawyers, a lumber company and the B. & O. commercial freight office in Toledo.

All of this vast human experience formed a very excellent background for this outstanding newspaperman who first became a reporter for the old Sentinel on November 5, 1900. He became its business manager on January 6, 1902, when he and John T. Hutchinson bought that paper and he served in that capacity until July 1, 1905, when he sold his interest and engaged in book selling before returning to the paper in December of that year.

In October 1907, he bought an interest in the Sentinel-Tribune when the two papers consolidated and he was associate editor until April 1909, when he became the editor of this paper. This month saw him completing his forty-second year as the head of the editorial department of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune.

During that time he covered every type of story possible to experience on a small-town paper. Spence was particularly proud of his prodigies, all reporters whom he had personally trained and had seen develop into able newspaper people.

His personal guidance and teaching formed the entire professional background of three members of the present editorial staff and to him they owe all the credit for what they know about reporting. These are our Society Editor Miss Minniebelle Conley, Neighborhood Editor Wayne R. Collier, and Managing Editor Ivan E. Lake.

Others who have benefited by his liberal advice and guidance include Ross Householder, a mining engineer now in Kingman, Ariz.; Larry Newman, associate editor of the American Weekly Magazine in New York City; Fred Beyerman, assistant city editor of the Chicago Daily News; Don Wolfe, State editor of the Toledo Blade; Homer L. Brady, executive secretary of the Sandusky Chamber of Commerce; Don Shafer, personnel manager with the Owen-Illinois Corp. in Toledo.

Spence was a highly skilled reporter and was recognized far and wide as one of the finest small-city editorial writers in the country. He did not care for the routine of copy desk work and after 1924 he left those tedious duties to others while he covered various beats as a reporter.

There was no better interviewer. No one probed a story to its finest point with any more fervor than he. Our editor was a living example of the energetic reporter who loved the people that he wrote about; who was was devoted to this community whose streets breathed their lives out in confidence to him; whose stores, homes, and institutions were living personalities who depended upon the press as their champion.

He began to relax his attentions to news coverage several years before World War II and to spend more time devoting care to his editorial column, the special part of the paper which was strictly his own. But when America became involved in the world conflict and there were no young men available for handling the routine reporting jobs at the courthouse and around the town, Spence again trod the streets to apply his skills to the task.

Mr. Canary unquestionably was a victim of the war. The rugged daily job eventually took its toll. On May 24, 1945, he was a victim of a stroke of paralysis. At that time no one thought that he would write again but his indomitable will, his marvelous courage and his supreme desire to continue his work brought him through.

After many months of convalescence he returned to the office to resume his place and he continued to write editorials with only brief let-ups for vacations until his sudden death last night.

Not many people knew it, but his first stroke took away his ability to manipulate his fingers on a typewriter and every editorial that he had written since that time was in longhand, produced after hours of reading and study of the innumerable problems of the present day.

His record of public service is one with which few persons are familiar because, in true modesty, his activities were never played up in the news of the day. Spence was forever a booster of Bowling Green and Wood County.

He was three times secretary of the Republican Executive Committee and was also secretary of the Central Committee.

In 1904 he and William M. Coen, now deceased, conceived and promoted the City Board of Trade, which was the forerunner of the old Commercial Club, now known as the Chamber of Commerce. When it became known as the Commercial Club in 1910, he was the first secretary and served for 12 years as a director.

It was early in the latter time that Bowling Green suddenly displayed a new growth, winning the fight to gain the Normal School (Bowling Green State University) and being successful in gaining the present armory and post office buildings. He was a very influential figure in every civic enterprise. He was always liberal in support of various enterprises which came to Bowling Green as the result of such community backing.

When the Parent-Teachers Association was organized in Bowling Green he was its first president and continued as a supporter of it always. He served as secretary and president of the Town and Gown Club before his resignation in 1937.

Fraternally he was a Mason, an Elk, a Knight of Pythias, being a past chancellor commander of the latter and was a member of the Royal Arcanum.

He was a member of the Presbyterian Church and had served as secretary of its board of trustees.

The very nature of his position as editor of this county's only daily paper brought him in close association with all types of enterprises and community endeavors. He was associated with J. R. Mann, of Lake Township, in promoting the Wood County Improvement Association of which J. S. Brigham was the temporary chairman and he (Canary) was the secretary until it could be organized among the active farmers. The association was later merged into the Wood County Farm Bureau, being the county nucleus.

Mr. Canary took a very great pride in the part that he played in the preservation to the public of the Maumee River road largely along the line of the old trail. He initiated the fight for its preservation editorially and served as secretary of the fighting organization of which the late George J. Munger, Jr., of Perrysburg, was president. He prepared, wrote, and read the arguments in favor of its preservation. This fight extended from 1917 but was particularly active from May 2, 1927, until the letting of the road improvement on August 30, 1928. That fight prevented the road from being thrown back from the river for the sake of private interests that urged it.

It was natural that this activity should find him also being interested in the history of the Maumee Valley, and so he was a member of the Maumee River Scenic and Historic Association and served as its vice president. This group secured the present park system along the Maumee River. Appointment came through Ohio's Governors George White and John W. Bricker.

An honorary membership in the Ohio Archeological Society evidenced the high esteem in which his work was held by that group. He was included among the editors of the Museum Echo, which is the periodical publication of that organization.

In his humility and belief that he could best serve the public in his editorial capacity rather than by being an active participant in many projects, he often declined official appointments by many of Ohio's governors to various other boards.

Twice he was offered opportunities to accept appointments to the board of trustees of Bowling Green State University, but he would not accept because he felt he could be of greater service in an editorial way if he was not involved officially with the university.

Spencer lived a full life and he loved it. There was very little in the world in which he was not interested. His hobby was human nature. He loved young people. He enjoyed studying all people in the light of phrenology. The Tope School of Phrenology once conferred the honorary title of doctor of phrenology on him in recognition of his knowledge of the subject.

Proper exercise to keep fit was another hobby he enjoyed. It was unquestionably to this that he could credit his remarkable recovery after the 1945 stroke. In sports he was interested especially in boxing, billiards, and scenic motoring.

One of his deepest disappointments in life was the fact that he never got into active service during the Spanish-American War. His father and his mother's brothers were in the Civil War and his ancestors had fought in the Revolutionary War. He did join two "paper" companies and served in two drill companies but was never accepted by Uncle Sam.

In World War I he served in bond campaigns, was a member of the executive committee for the county's war work social service organizations, assisted in Red Cross drives and various other patriotic endeavors.

On December 3, 1903, he was united in marriage to Lucy Lee Chaney, daughter of John and Sarah Chaney in Bowling Green, whose grandfather had served in Congress with John Quincy Adams. To this union were born three sons. Their home was an ideal one and they were most proud of the successful careers of the three boys.

His wife, whom he affectionately called "Duke," and the three sons survive. The latter are John Sumner, an attorney in Cleveland, Robert Barnhard, chief of the division of social administration in the State welfare department in Columbus, and Richard Lee, wholesale distributor of Kelly-Springfield tires of Columbus. Five grandchildren, a niece, Mrs. Celia Moores-Squires of San Diego, Calif., and a nephew, Wayne Canary, of Toleda, also survive.

He was the last of his immediate family. Preceding him were sisters Mrs. Irene Moores and Miss Helen Canary, and a brother Russell.

Loyalty of Americans of Rumanian Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by American Orthodox citizens of Rumanian descent in Detroit, Mich., on February 18, 1951, showing the loyalty and devotion of Americans of Rumanian descent to the principles of American democracy and their determination not to permit Communist-inspired interference with freedom of their religion:

RESOLUTION

Following the disturbance created among American Orthodox of Rumanian descent by the unauthorized elevation of the former Akron, Ohio, priest, Andrei Moldovan, to the rank of bishop for the Orthodox Rumanians of America an act sanctioned and promoted by the Communist Rumanian Government of Bucharest:

We, representatives and members of 21 religious, fraternal, cultural, and social organizations of Rumanian background, from Detroit, Mich., and Windsor, Ontario, called all American citizens of Rumanian descent to a mass meeting, held February 18, 1951, in the large hall of the Rumanian Home, 1423 Farnsworth Street, Detroit. At this meeting the following resolution was unanimously approved:

"Whereas the Communist government of Rumania, by its terroristic and antidemocratic actions, excluded itself from the respect and consideration of the civilized world;

"Whereas said government, imposed upon the freedom-loving Rumanian Nation by force, tyrannizes the nation from which we or our ancestors have come to this country;

"Whereas said Rumanian Communist Government's actions are wholly contrary to the aspirations, principles, and freedoms guaranteed by our American form of democratic government;

"Whereas said Communist Government of Rumania sanctioned and has caused the consecration into a bishop on November 12, 1950, in Sibiu, Rumania, of the former Rumanian Orthodox priest of Akron, Ohio, Andrei Moldovan;

"Whereas at the ceremony of Moldovan's consecration the Communist Rumanian Government was officially represented by its Minister of Religion, Stanciu Stoian;

Whereas said Andrei Moldovan was sent immediately by the Rumanian Communist authorities to the United States in order to impose him, illegally, and by force, as the head of the Rumanian Orthodox Church of America;

"Whereas the great majority of the members of our organization are of Orthodox faith;

"We resolve to reject with all possible contempt the unsolicited interference of the Rumanian Communist Government into our religious affairs in the United States;

"We categorically refuse to recognize Andrei Moldovan, appointed by a foreign Communist government, to be the bishop or head of the Rumanian Church of America."

DUMITRU VINTAN,
President of the Action Committee.
NICOLAE DRAGOS,
Chairman of the Meeting.
GEORGE ZAMFIR,
Secretary.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 18, 1951.*

Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Senate of the United States unanimously confirmed the nomination of Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming to be this Nation's Ambassador to Costa Rica. It was not the first time that General Fleming had been confirmed to a post of responsibility in the Government. He may even hold some sort of a record, because he has been confirmed as Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, Federal Works Administrator, member of the Maritime Commission—then designated Chairman—and as the first Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. So General Fleming's brilliant career as a civilian administrator is well known to all of us here in official Washington.

General Fleming was graduated from West Point at the head of his class just 40 years ago, in 1911, so this year's reunion of his class at the Academy will be the historic one for them. Just 20 years ago, however, the then Major Fleming had won the acclaim of the sports world for the job he had done in rehabilitating West Point's athletic program. Quentin Reynolds then, as now, one of the ablest writers of our times, told of Fleming's work in one of the last columns he wrote for the New York World before it was sold.

A copy of this clipping recently came to light, and so that it will not again be lost I have obtained permission to extend these remarks and include Quentin Reynolds' Looking 'Em Over column from the New York World of 1931 in the RECORD at this point:

LOOKIN 'EM OVER

(By Quentin Reynolds)

FLEMING OF WEST POINT OWNS TREASURE BEYOND PURSE OF MERE ROCKEFELLER

Philip B. Fleming gets the comparatively modest pay allowance of a major in the United States Army, but right now Philip B. Fleming comes very close to being the richest man in the world. No, Major Fleming hasn't been pyramiding that Auburn stock to dizzy profits; he hasn't been buying low and selling high; he has been involved in no get-rich-quick scheme. But on a table in his dining room at West Point, Major Fleming has a little bit of silver which must make him feel very wealthy, indeed. It is the only thing of its kind in the world. It is something which didn't cost the major a cent, but it's something that he wouldn't sell for anything. Now, if you own something which no one has money enough to buy, you certainly must be one of the world's richest men. That's how it is with Major Fleming.

It all started 4 years ago when Fleming was made graduate manager of athletics at West Point. Of course, it really started long before that. It was in 1907 that Fleming was appointed to West Point from Iowa. He was graduated from the Academy in 1911 at the head of his class. But he graduated as a private in his cadet regiment, not as a lieutenant. He had been reduced to the ranks for rather a heinous offense.

Fleming was manager of the football team then, and once, after a hard practice, he sat with the football team at dinner. Some gold-braided officer interrupted the meal to read a long list of orders. The players were all exhausted and hungry after 3 hours of hard scrimmage, and young Fleming, in charge of the training table, with a fine disregard for discipline, said to them: "Go on and eat, never mind that guy," or words to that effect. So the sounds of the gold-braided officer's speech were punctuated by the less-dignified noise of the clash of knife and fork as the hungry athletes went to work on the dinner.

Other officers, horrified at this act of lese majesty, came scurrying up to the table and began hurling imprecations on the heads of the tired football men.

Shows officers slighting place

"It wasn't their fault," Fleming said quietly. "I told them to go ahead and eat. They've had a tough day and they're hungry."

So Fleming took the rap. They demoted him to a private of cadets. Maybe Fleming has forgotten that story now. I heard it from one of his classmates who happened to be one of those hungry football players.

But he lived that episode down quickly enough. Fleming attracted attention right away, because he was a great engineer in the making, and the Army higher-ups didn't take long to discover the fact. He rose rapidly by virtue of excellent work in connection with the building of the Panama Canal and mapping and surveying the Philippine Islands. He was a captain now. In 1917 he was commissioned a major. During the war he commanded Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., with a garrison of 14,000 men. In 1916 he was transferred to West Point. In 1927 Fleming was made graduate manager of West Point, and that was the best break West Point ever received.

Now we're getting nearer to that bit of silver. Part of his job as graduate manager was to meet the writers who accompanied the Army team on trips. He was Major Fleming for a while, but it wasn't long before he was just Phil Fleming. He never realized it, but every time he sat around talking to sports writers he was doing a magnificent job of salesmanship. He was selling West Point. After a while Fleming and West Point became synonymous. When you thought of the Point you thought of Fleming.

At the Army-Notre Dame game in Chicago last fall we all had a lot of fun. Fleming was always with the writers. We all worked together. We played together. On the way home, in the Army special, Fleming casually mentioned that his time was about up at West Point and that he would be transferred very shortly. Why, the thought was incredible. West Point without Phil Fleming? Absurd. Why, how could the Point get along without this dapper little major with his smiling eyes? And how could we all get along without him? Consternation fell upon us.

Out to get even with Fleming

"We have to do something about Phil," someone said. "Let's give him a little something to remember us by."

Plans were made. This wasn't going to be a dinner honoring the Army or West Point. What did we care about West Point? We cared about this gallant friend of ours. So the other night Phil Fleming was guest of honor at a small dinner. Fleming has a host of Army friends in the city, but none of them were there. We didn't invite them. You see, this was just our way of slapping this fellow on the back and saying, "You are a pretty swell guy, Phil, and we're going to miss you." We didn't want a gang of Army officers there. That would have made it more or less formal and stereotyped. This was just a get-together like those we had in Chicago. It was no formal dinner. Why, there weren't even formal speeches. There were only about 20 present. All except four or five were sports writers. Lou Little of Columbia, Maj. Ralph Sasse of West Point, Tuss McLaughery of Brown, Hugo Bezdek of Penn State and Lou Young of Pennsylvania were present. They are all old friends of Phil.

There wasn't even a story written about the dinner. This wasn't something to be covered. We even had an orchestra. It was Grantland Rice who told the orchestra that this was a Navy party, so everyone entered the dining room to the strains of Anchors Aweigh. There was never a dinner like this one. No one present said a good word about Fleming. There were none of the usual sloppy sentimental speeches with which such affairs usually abound. You see, everything was on the level, and when you are really on the level, you don't spend a long time writing out eulogistic speeches which sound very pretty but don't mean very much.

Westbrook Pegler was at his satirical best castigating the guest of the evening. Bill Corum, George Daley, Paul Gallico, George Trevor, Bob Kelly and other football writers all told Fleming how glad they were that West Point had finally decided to get rid of him. Everything was off the record. The more we lambasted Fleming, the broader he smiled. He was storing up glorious memories. Then we gave him the little piece of silver.

Genuine silver in token at that

On it was engraved: "To the Hero of Major Engagements, 1927-31—From the War Correspondents." Now, I don't remember that ever happening before. I don't recall any graduate manager, football coach, boxer or ball player ever being singled out by a group of sports writers for such an honor. Phil Fleming gave a little talk at the windup. Ralph Sasse introduced him, and told him that he was going on last, like any acrobat.

Pegler corrected him. "They always put the star bout on last," he said.

Fleming tried to get serious and tell us how he felt about it. But we all knew how he felt, just as he knew how we felt, and we kidded him out of it. But he did hint that there is some chance that he won't be retired from West Point. This is a great chance for the Army to show a streak of real smartness. They ought to keep that guy there. He has quite an important job, because, although his actual task may be merely to supervise athletics and arrange and approve of schedules, his real job is bigger than that. His real job is to sell the Army to the rest of us and to maintain friendly relations with colleges and the public. That's not the easiest job in the world, for there are many who like to make the Army an object of attack. It's easy to attack the Army, because the Army is too big to hit back.

Well, anyhow, that's the story about the richest man in the world. And if you don't think he is, just try and buy that little piece of silver from him.

Senator Kilgore on the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the thoughtful editorial entitled "Senator KILGORE on the Far East," which was published in the Parkersburg Sentinel, Parkersburg, W. Va., on April 14, 1951:

SENATOR KILGORE ON THE FAR EAST

The statements of United States Senator HARLEY KILGORE, of Beckley, on the dismissal of General MacArthur and with reference to our situation in the Far East are worthy of serious consideration. They will be regarded in a much more serious light in West Virginia, we are certain, and given considerably more weight than the constant flow of blasts in Washington.

Senator KILGORE is not only West Virginia's senior Senator, and an extremely able one, but one of the outstanding Members of the greatest legislative body in the world—the United States Senate. He is avowedly an administration supporter, and he supports the administration policy both with reference to General MacArthur's dismissal and to our present policy of conduct in the Korean war.

What Senator KILGORE said in effect was that we should not carry the Korean war to Red China because of the danger of provoking a third world war. He also, and quite rightly, called attention to the constant policy of the United States of opposing aggression and its desire to avoid becoming an aggressor.

With reference to the dismissal of General MacArthur, Senator KILGORE expressed the firm belief that time will prove President Truman's action was right. Were it possible to strip away politics and emotion from consideration of the actual dismissal, there is no question that everyone would reach the same conclusion as stated by Senator KILGORE. No organization can continue to function effectively, much less the United States of America and its Armed Forces, if an important official or commander is constantly bucking the rest of the outfit.

In this connection, it is with considerable gratification that we see the appearance of MacArthur before a joint session of Congress receiving the happy blessings of President Truman and his administration. This is in thorough accordance with our democratic procedure, and a statesmanlike act on the part of the President. It also removes from many of our minds any doubt that the President dismissed the general from his command for good reasons and not out of pique, and that he did so upon the sound advice of his Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Certainly no one, no matter how partisan, can truthfully say that the President's action was an attempt to muzzle MacArthur. It now stands out for what it was, the simple removal of an officer who refused to obey the orders of his superiors—in other words, insubordination.

There Was Talk of Red China Entering Korean War as Early as August 1950, Statement of Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, Notwithstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed when I read in Sunday's newspapers that Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, aide to General MacArthur, had issued a statement to the press that at the time of the Wake Island conference of President Truman and MacArthur no one in the Government had the slightest idea Red China would intervene in Korea.

Where was Major General Whitney? Certainly he could never qualify as an intelligence officer. If he had been receiving mail from home he would have known that one of the main topics of conversation as early as August of 1950 was the fear Red China would enter the Korean fighting and prolong the struggle. Someone around General MacArthur's headquarters must have heard such reports, even if Major General Whitney did not—and it would be difficult to explain why he did not. We heard them over here—thousands of miles away.

The Wake Island conference was on October 15, 1950. Many weeks before I received a letter from a general officer under General MacArthur's command conveying the optimistic prediction fighting would end in late November. The exact message was:

The picture is much brighter the last couple of days. We are all quite optimistic. I believe this war should be over late in November.

Naturally, I was elated over such good news and I carried the general's letter with me for days showing it to different Members of the House. They were also pleased but more than one raised the direct question, "But does your friend take into consideration the Chinese Reds coming into the war?"

I promptly replied to the general's letter and I put to him the question so many Members of this House had raised. Shortly I received a reply from him, dated September 6, 1950, in which he said, referring to my lack of enthusiasm over his prediction in his letter dated August 24, 1950:

You said in your letter that you all weren't as optimistic as we were. We are still cheerful in this part of the world and I believe the date of late November is still good.

So I know that the intervention of Red China was considered likely long before the Wake Island conference—General Whitney notwithstanding. He should have known, too.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks a very timely article by Mr. Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. It seems to cover one of the points in the present controversy very well. Mr. Pearson's article:

MACARTHUR DOMINATED AT WAKE

(By Drew Pearson)

A highlight of the current Truman-MacArthur controversy is the New York Times story summarizing the conversations between the two men at Wake Island.

Because the New York Times story had the earmarks of being leaked out by the White House, some MacArthur proponents have challenged it, while MacArthur states that no records were made of the conversations on Wake Island.

In view of this controversy, the Washington Merry-Go-Round's account of the Wake Island conference, published on January 23, some months prior to the Times' April 21 account, may be significant. For the President can hardly be accused of any partiality toward this writer except in his choice of "cuss" words.

Writing at that time—3 months before the Truman-MacArthur controversy—I reported that:

1. MacArthur was so sure of victory he promised General Bradley that he would transfer one full division to Europe.

2. MacArthur assured the President the Chinese would not intervene.

3. MacArthur expected to get his troops back to Japan by Christmas.

4. Because of the certainty of victory, much of the conference was devoted to plans for reconstructing Korea.

5. Highlight of the Wake Island meeting was the brilliant conversation of one man. MacArthur completely dominated the conversation.

WHAT THEY SAID

Because the Wake Island conference now appears to be playing such an important part in the Truman-MacArthur controversy, the salient portions of my January 23 Wake Island column follow:

The President of the United States flew half way 'round the world to confer with General MacArthur, yet aside from a few conversational pleasantries reported by accompanying newsmen, nothing has been published regarding what happened on this mid-Pacific island.

However, I believe it is important that the American people know what took place at Wake Island; so herewith I shall report some of the recorded conversations.

Almost more time was given to a discussion of Korean rehabilitation than to military strategy. When it came to the latter, General MacArthur dominated the conversation.

"The North Koreans," he explained, "have about 15,000 guerrillas left in the south, but the winter will take care of most of them. The others are a beaten force. They are only fighting to save face. It goes against the grain to have to destroy them."

HOME BY CHRISTMAS

MacArthur assured Truman that he could "finish the job in North Korea" in a short time. According to the stenographic notes he said:

"I hope to be able to have the Eighth Army back in Japan by Christmas. I may be able to send a convoy into Pyongyang immediately."

At this point, President Truman asked: "What about Chinese intervention?"

MacArthur's reply was: "They could have intervened earlier when it would have been decisive, but that time has passed. We are no longer fearful of their intervention. Although there are several hundred thousand along the Yalu River, it is not likely that they could cause us much trouble."

He also implied that he could "take care" of the Chinese, even if they decided to cross the Yalu River.

At the same time MacArthur described his plans for completing the conquest of Korea, he also argued against keeping American troops in Korea.

Obviously this raised the question why march across the frozen North Korean wastes to the Yalu River if the plan was to march right back again in time to return the Eighth Army to Japan by Christmas. However, no one at the Wake Island conference seemed to challenge MacArthur regarding this risky move.

MacArthur's advice on the future of Korea was: "We should turn Korea over to the Koreans as quickly as we can and get out as quickly as we can.

"Korea is a poor country," he said, "and we cannot afford to impose an occupation on them * * * military occupations are always failures. I want to withdraw all our troops as soon as possible."

TROOPS TO EUROPE

At one point, Gen. Omar Bradley asked whether MacArthur could make any troops available for Europe in the next few months.

MacArthur replied: "Yes, I think a division can be made available early in 1951."

Bradley also remarked that he hoped MacArthur wouldn't have the same trouble he had with American pilots in Europe shooting up railroad bridges that were needed later for rehabilitation.

"I have had the same trouble," MacArthur replied. The stenographic notes show laughter at this point.

High lights of the Wake Island meeting was the brilliant exposition of one man. MacArthur completely dominated the conversation, and virtually no effort was made to challenge his opinions.

Perhaps also this was the most tragic part of the conference.

Japan's Farewell to General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Tablet for April 21, 1951:

JAPAN'S FAREWELL

The beginning of General MacArthur's return in triumph, not in humiliation, had an auspicious beginning which thrilled Americans. This was the farewell given in Tokyo.

When the general went to Japan less than 6 years ago, it was to preside over a defeated, despirited and embittered people. They received him sullenly and turned their backs upon his presence, the Oriental's demonstration of enmity.

But when the General left, millions bade him farewell in a manner that showed respect, gratitude, and friendship. He was cheered, saluted, prayed for, and almost venerated by the masses of the people, thousands of whom were up before dawn to witness his departure.

The Japanese Diet, in special session, passed the following resolution:

"General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, former Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, helped our country out of the confusion and poverty prevailing at the time the war ended, guided and assisted Japan in establishing democracy and toward a self-supporting economy, thus paving the way for the independence of our nation.

"The entire people of our country are deeply grateful over these excellent achievements of the general."

The Nippon Times, of Tokyo, in a lengthy and flowery editorial said: "Mere words can never describe adequately all that he has meant to this nation whose rebirth as a free, democratic nation the general guided through difficult days with sincerity, understanding, and benevolence. It is with genuine sorrow that the Japanese people will bid him farewell."

Nowhere in history can be found such an instance as that of the head of an army of occupation gaining the universal love and respect of the occupied people.

At the core of these and many other worthwhile reforms was the spirit of peace, democracy, and Christian brotherhood—which symbolized the general's every activity.

"We are sorry to see him leave. He will always hold a warm spot in our hearts. We wish him well wherever he may be. Our doors and hearts will always be open in welcome. History will long record General MacArthur's heroic stature as a soldier, statesman, and democracy's architect for the future."

And our own correspondent, Father Patrick O'Connor, in his article on page 1 of this issue of the Tablet, bespeaks in eloquent language General MacArthur's contribution to the Christian religion in Japan.

AMERICAN HERO

As we look at this great accomplishment in a few years, we thrill at the achievements of an outstanding American and religious-minded leader. He did much for Japan but he did far more for America in bringing about peace and making our country beloved among erstwhile enemies.

Where the general's critics placed their theories in practice, we have lost our good name and influence. This is particularly true in China and in Germany. As for Poland and the other countries of East and Central Europe, the general's critics have suffered defeat after defeat. In those nations we have little influence; we are treated with hatred, contempt, or suspicion. There is no peace.

In Japan this successful civilian administrator was the symbol of anticommunism as well as of Americanism and in this field, too, he made his critics look very bad. He left in an atmosphere of triumph; he accomplished great things and his popularity knew no bounds.

Leaving Tokyo the deposed, "dismissed for insubordination" general was given a hero's welcome in Honolulu, San Francisco, and Washington, while New York City, as this is being writen, is scheduled to outdo itself in a never-to-be-forgotten tribute.

What demonstration of friendship, gratitude, and affection the American people gave for a man who fought for 14 years for his country and its good name without once seeing his native land. And what a response to those who sought to humiliate him, who charged him with disobeying orders, who talked about the civil being above the military when he, as a civilian leader in Japan, brought order out of confusion while they brought confusion where there should be order both nationally and internationally.

The American people, this week, told the world what a towering figure they consider General MacArthur. He will live always in the hearts of his loyal countrymen.

NOW FOR THE "TENSION"

On March 4, 1923, the American people were informed that they were in an emergency. The emergency continued until 1940, when we were informed that the Nation was facing a crisis. The crisis has continued off and on until the present time. Recently Secretary of Defense Marshall informed the Nation that we were in "tension" and, he added, "The tension may continue for 10 years."

On the one hand, we have had the forgotten man, thousands of whose brothers have been sent abroad to die; then we had great fanfare over social security, while every American now suffers from a lack of security as officials broadcast direful warnings; then we had the Government insisting on health insurance while telling us to seek the nearest bomb shelter; the "welfare state" has been championed while the warfare state is being legislated.

Oh, for the good old days when to be an American meant to be a free person, one free of the fears of Government administrators, actions, controls, and false leaders, free of people who did not attempt to save you while engaging in wars, who thought of America and its people first, who did not nestle to their breast betrayers and confusionists, whose actions did not continually arouse apprehension, suspicion and enmity.

The Late Arthur H. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 21, 1951, burial services for Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg were held in his home town, Grand Rapids, Mich. His loss will be keenly felt. For posterity I deem it appropriate to include in my remarks editorials from the Grand Rapids Herald, the Grand Rapids Press, the Grand Haven Daily Tribune, and the Holland Evening Sentinel:

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald]

AS THE NATION MOURNS

East and West, North and South, the people's high regard for Arthur H. Vandenberg, United States Senator and world statesman, and their sorrow at his passing are reflected in the editorial columns of their newspapers.

He belonged to the Nation and to the world no less than to Grand Rapids and to Michigan.

A few typical expressions follow.

The New York Herald Tribune: "It is only once or twice in a generation that a single speech changes the course of history * * * but the speech Senator Vandenberg delivered in the Senate January 10, 1945, stands apart from all others, a turning point in his own career and a milestone of major significance for the Nation. * * * The memory of the man remains luminous in the minds of the generation that saw his works accomplished."

The New York Times: "Perhaps more than any other political figure of his time he typified America's capacity for change and growth, and symbolized our political conversion from a policy of isolation to world responsibility. * * * If America's adherence to the United Nations, its decision to oppose the expansion of Communist aggression, and its formulation of the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic Treaty are among the great events of our epoch, as unquestionably they are, then Senator Vandenberg must retain a central place in contemporary history. * * * The memory of his achievements is not likely to pass away for many years to come."

The New York World-Telegram and Sun: "He became the chief architect of the bipartisan foreign policy. * * * It is his country's great misfortune—but it was no fault of Senator Vandenberg's—that the policy has been limited in application. He protested vainly against the 'tragic failure' of the Truman administration to stand as firmly in Asia as in Europe against Communist domination and aggression. * * * His death is a tragic loss to the country he loved and served wonderfully well."

The Washington Evening Star: "The tyrants of our time have reason to remember him with bitterness and hate. But the rest of us must remember him with an abiding sense of gratitude—a gratitude that must be felt by all who cherish the true meaning of liberty, justice, truth and simple, ordinary decency. * * * If he could leave one admonition with us, it would be not to forget that we are in greater danger of destroying ourselves than of being destroyed from abroad."

The Washington Post: "In his day, he was a Titan in the Senate, and will live in its history along with Clay, Calhoun and Webster. We mourn him as a man who, above all others, has been responsible for the evolution of a sustained international policy in our country. The measure of Arthur Hendrick Vandenberg is the vacuum he leaves on the Republican side of the Senate. Vandenberg squared party and country with his belief that politics during the present crisis should stop at the water's edge."

The Boston Traveler: "There exists in his party no ready replacement for his job of peacemaker on essentials. For his selfless leadership in a critical policy area we owe him a great debt of gratitude."

The Boston Globe: "His career was of enormous assistance to the efforts of many Americans of both parties to make the world more secure against the threat of war. It is to be hoped that other Republicans of prominence will come forward to assume leadership comparable to that of this statesman from Michigan."

The Chicago Sun-Times: "Senator Vandenberg did more than any other Republican to change the course of American foreign policy after World War II. The former isolationist's formal conversion to the cause of international collective security was as historic as it was dramatic. * * * We shall miss his counsel all the more as we come to realize the tremendous debt we owe him."

The Chicago Daily News: "If the United Nations survives the strains of power grabbing that proved too much for its predecessor, the League of Nations, the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan will occupy a large place in the historical evaluation of these times."

The Atlanta Constitution: "While the Nation was paying tribute to a great military man, it was mourning the loss of another patriot of heroic stature—Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, editor and statesman, whose powerful voice was the deciding factor in many history-making policy battles on the Senate floor. * * * His objectives rose high above partisanship toward the kind of unified foreign policy which would enable us to stamp on the Communist aggressor anywhere he raised his ugly head."

The Atlanta Journal: "It was the last and relatively brief phase of his long career that marked the difference between a man of talent and one of creative vision. * * * On that high note ended the active career of a man whose mind and spirit were great enough to put truth above consistency, conscience above pride of opinion and country above party."

The Kansas City Star: "The refusal of Senator Vandenberg to submit to a necessary operation until he had seen two important measures through the Senate was characteristic of the man in his late great years. * * * His hold on general public confidence became so great he was able to keep his party in line and in the first critical years after the war he gave invaluable service to the Nation."

The Detroit News: "The loss to the Nation, more and more evident as his last illness settled upon him, is complete. * * * A capacity for growth was the distinguishing mark of the Vandenberg nature. * * * By a magnificent projection of moral force he swept his party out of isolationism into the new current of world thought and cooperative action for peace. * * * It has been remarked how often in the current great debate one unanswerable sentence from Vandenberg in his prime might have returned it swiftly to its proper course. * * * That Vandenberg was Presidential timber goes without saying, and that he never turned a hand to capitalize on that status is equally a matter of record. Thus his integrity as a free man was uncompromised to the end."

The Detroit Free Press: "The voice of Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg is stilled by death. The personal tragedy is that Senator Vandenberg died before the battle for bipartisanship which he led could be won. The national tragedy is that the structure of American unity in face of world perils which he devoted his life to build lies in ruins. * * * There was no other leader in either party able or willing to bridge the chasm opened by partisan approach to our foreign relations. There's none today. * * * Cannot we take from the life of Arthur H. Vandenberg a new dedication to carry on the work he began and bring to fruition the bipartisan approach to the world about us for which he pleaded? We are certain that he would have asked for no greater monument."

The Jackson Citizen Patriot: "Arthur Vandenberg belonged not alone to Michigan or

the Republican Party. He was a great American—perhaps the greatest of this day. In a time when small men grub for graft, when dishonesty, incompetence and greed are common attributes of public life, his integrity was never questioned, his wisdom was respected and his selfless patriotism was recognized. * * * His eyes were ever on the horizon which was his goal; the horizon of men's dreams and ideals and faiths."

The Flint Journal: "His going has left no bitterness, no recriminations, no enmity, but only a sense of irreparable loss. * * * His passing brings sadness, but there remains the memory of a completely honest, selfless, devoted statesman—an example for future leaders to emulate."

The Saginaw News: "Arthur H. Vandenberg's footprints on the sands of time will not soon be obliterated. * * * Another son of Michigan will in due course be appointed to sit in Senator Vandenberg's chair in the Senate Chamber, but it will be a difficult assignment for he will have ever before him the example of a career of national service which knows few parallels."

The Lansing State Journal: "Michigan's distinguished senior Senator was a statesman in the best sense of the word. * * * For the sake of this country and the causes to which he was devoted, it is to be fervently hoped that his great influence for integrity in Government, for unselfish public service, and for peace and justice will continue to be felt through the years to come. He has taken his place among the immortal great of the Nation's illustrious statesmen."

The Battle Creek Enquirer and News: "He never sought universal popularity as the required basis for his championship of causes. He fought that national preservation and human safety were more important than partisan rivalry. * * * In his younger days he had written a book, 'If Hamilton Were Here Today.' There will be many a speculation in the future—and anxiety will seek comfort thereby—as to how the responsibilities of future issues would be met if Vandenberg were here today."

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press]

ARCHITECT OF FREEDOM

The death of Arthur Hendrick Vandenberg will be mourned wherever freemen live and continue to fight for freedom. For no American of the last decade fought that fight more vigorously or contributed more importantly to its victories than Senator Vandenberg. Above all others, he was responsible for one of the most effective weapons the free world has had in that fight—American bipartisan foreign policy.

Until 1943, when Senator Vandenberg voted to extend the President's powers to make reciprocal trade agreements, this country's enemies had hoped that a split between Democrats and Republicans on foreign policy would play into their hands. But with that vote, Senator Vandenberg as the Republican Senate leader on foreign affairs signaled the birth of a foreign policy which was to doom the doctrine of isolation and remove the last sign of disunity within the Nation on the prosecution of the war and securing the peace to come.

The solid achievements of the bipartisan policy are to be noted throughout the western world. Wherever the cloud of communism has been lifted it has been largely because of the existence of that policy and the devoted leadership afforded it by Senator Vandenberg from 1943 to his very death. An early advocate of the United Nations, he was one of the key American figures in San Francisco when U. N. was established and its Charter was written. It was Senator Vandenberg who stepped forward at the critical moment to guarantee Britain's recovery when, in 1946, he spoke eloquently and successfully for the British loan. Greece and Turkey owe their present freedom from communism in large measure to the Michigan statesman, for it was his ceaseless efforts on behalf of the Truman doctrine which guaranteed American aid for those two countries. All Western Europe has cause to be grateful to him for the determined battle he put up for the Marshall plan. And if Western Europe's chances for survival are greater today than they were a year or two ago, they are better very largely because of the decisive part he played in the fashioning of these instruments of foreign policy and in the United States' adherence to the North Atlantic alliance.

Conceivably Congress would have adopted some, if not all, of these measures if Arthur H. Vandenberg had not been in the Senate. But these are stronger measures because of his vigorous fight for them. He, more than any other man, has stood as a symbol of national unity on foreign affairs.

In many ways, Senator Vandenberg's years in the Senate recalled the days of Clay, Calhoun, and Webster. One of the great debaters of our time, Arthur Vandenberg could deliver a speech reminiscent of the golden days of oratory. Yet he was unsurpassed in his ability to cut through to the core of an issue, to sum up the central problem in a few clear, crisp sentences and to outline a proper course of action.

He brought, then, to a consideration of modern problems the careful and prolonged analysis that characterized a more leisurely era in our history; but essentially he was a man of action. He was completely of our times. He was a man who had the courage and good sense to alter his views as the times and the background of facts changed; a man who often put aside personal ambition for the sake of his party and country. His voice, though silenced by illness for many months, continued to echo in Washington and international capitals, and his remembered opinions will continue to carry great weight throughout the world for years to come.

It is a heartening thought to the profession and the city which produced this remarkable man that his power of expression and his clear and patriotic thinking on foreign and domestic affairs were shaped and developed through newspaper work, editorial leadership and editorial writing in Grand Rapids, his home community. For many years before he left to become a force in the Nation's and world's history, the Press knew Arthur Vandenberg as a vigorous and brilliant competitor and as a kindly friend in the many contacts of civic life. Nowhere will he be missed more genuinely than in the city which gave him to the service of the world.

[From the Grand Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune]

SENATOR ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

One appraisal was missing after the dramatic appearance of General MacArthur before both Houses of Congress. Senator Arthur Vandenberg had already passed away. Even had he lingered for a few hours longer, he was much too ill to participate in the debate occasioned by the deposed general's address.

Senator Vandenberg's counsel on foreign affairs has been missing for months. Congressmen on both sides of the aisle—and foreign diplomats—have yearned at times for the Senator's recovery, that he might rescue the allies from their confused thinking. He seemed to be trying to oblige their wishes by a grim, heroic struggle to overcome his long sickness.

The cause of a bipartisan foreign policy has been badly crippled by Senator Vandenberg's illness and death. The business world has lost an eloquent spokesman in the Senate. The Republicans will miss one of their truly great leaders.

"What is a conservative?" the late Senator once asked. "At one point the dictionary says 'one who seeks to prevent loss, decay, or injury, and who protects and preserves.' In that sense I want my party to be conservative. * * * But at another point the dictionary says that a conservative is 'one opposed to change or progress.' In that sense I do not want my party to be conservative. If it is static, it will die. It will promote and not prevent decay for itself and country. This is not a static country nor a static age."

Arthur Vandenberg applied this philosophy to his own career. Men and women throughout western Michigan became familiar with his forceful political opinions long before he entered the Senate. He was a newspaperman who was inspired by the greatness of American traditions. His capacity to absorb the political thinking of his day was phenomenal.

Many people do not think of Senator Vandenberg as an author of books. Yet we have three good-sized volumes before us—all of which he wrote or compiled: The Greatest American; Alexander Hamilton (1921); If Hamilton Were Here Today (1923), and The Trail of a Tradition (1926).

There may be others. But these were gifts to another newspaperman who also has gone on. They all deal with the Senator's hero, an American pioneer who ranks with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln as individuals who gave to this country its remarkable form of government.

Some men are elected to public office because they belong to the groups capable of bringing out the largest totals of votes. Others win because they are popular personally. Senator Vandenberg was appointed the first time, then wrote his record by hard work and brilliance. He was—like Alexander Hamilton—a high-grade statesman.

The course of Senator Vandenberg's political fortunes might have been downward except for his willingness to turn away from a seasoned isolationism to all-out internationalism. His fateful decision was reached in 1945. He sensed that the free nations of the world would soon perish unless they banded together. The world had become too small for the Monroe Doctrine and aloof neutrality.

Our early impressions of Senator Vandenberg were mixed with both admiration and awe. Once he read critically a story we had written, while we watched tensely each movement of his big pencil. Michigan newsmen, while not always agreeing with Arthur Vandenberg, seemed to find few subjects on which the Herald's brilliant editor was uninformed. We heard his voice rasp out at political rallies and tried to remember some of the long words in his amazing vocabulary.

We felt we knew him best, however, when in 1941 he spoke before a group of newspapermen at the Spring Lake Country Club. Many said it was one of the finest speeches of his career. It was on this occasion—almost 10 years ago—that he expressed the longing to retire from public activity, loaf a bit, write a few more books, and look back upon a crowded life. These pleasures he was denied.

Senator Vandenberg was a true friend of this area of Michigan he called home. He was never too busy to look after the smallest detail in a request from a constituent. He used his political partisanship with a master's skill, and combined conservatism and progressivism according to the formula he had set up. "I want the Republican Party to be liberal enough to march with the times to dare new answers to new problems and to use the power and strength and initiative of Government to help citizens to help themselves," he once said. "I want the oak to stand. I want the branches to grow."

This is a lofty aim for an individual or country as well as a party.

Senator Vandenberg was of presidential caliber. Some will say that he missed not only this but also the opportunity of being on hand to straighten America out in its present indecision. Others will lament his chance to enjoy the peace in later life he so wanted. But he had mighty compensations—he was in some respects—again like Alexander Hamilton—the most outstanding American statesman of his time. Through his skill in guiding coalition movements, he achieved bipartisanship at crucial moments in history.

The branches of the tree he has planted are bound to grow.

[From the Holland (Mich.) Evening Sentinel]

GROWING TO NATIONAL STATURE

When Arthur H. Vandenberg left Grand Rapids some 20 years ago to fill a place in the United States Senate he was to all intents and purposes a local character. He was not known to any extent outside the bounds of Michigan, and even in this State his main reputation was concentrated in western Michigan, in the area where his newspaper had been circulating.

Now a score of years later, when he has come to the end of his earthly road, he is a national figure. The name of Michigan's senior Senator is as well known in all the 48 States as that of any Member of the upper House in Washington. It is not unreasonable to go further. His name is pretty well known in many of the countries of Europe. The propaganda machine of Soviet Russia took occasion from time to time to cover that name with special abuse. The Russians understood that the Michigan man had exerted a tremendous influence in building up America's defenses against the onsweeping tide of communism.

During those years in the Senate Mr. Vandenberg grew in political stature. When he began his career in Washington he was limited in his outlook, but he was big enough in his personal capacities so that he found it possible to grow into the bigness of that job. Slowly but consistently he kept pace in his political development with the unfolding exigencies of the Nation's history and the world's needs. He had the good fortune—it may have looked like bad fortune to him at the time—to serve in the Senate during a period when his party was out of office. As a member of the opposition minority during the New Deal days, he was faced constantly with the challenge of events.

There is a profound truth in the old saying that "the north wind made the Vikings." It was almost certainly the political north wind that this minority Senator had to brace himself against for years that developed the spiritual muscles which later came to be recognized by the Nation and indeed by the world.

During the past 10 years or so Senator Vandenberg stood above party in the same way in which every truly national leader has to rise above the narrow compromises of party regularity. He remained a Republican of course but he was strong enough to carry his own party along the path that seemed the highway to his country's true interests and highest honor. In the end he came to be recognized more as an American leader than a party strategist.

Like so many other great Americans, he grew up to the stature that the needs of his country demanded. Democracy does not usually breed supermen; nor does it need them. But it often does breed men who, even though they are of average stature, bear within them the power to grow to a size that matches the greatness of great occasions and times. Such a man was Senator Vandenberg.

Recognizing That Television Makes Report That Can't Be Matched, the NBC Sent Its Prize-Winning Cameramen to Critical Europe To Document Current History; Their Ace Commentator, Robert McCormick, Later Joined Them and Helped Prepare Several of These Special Battle Reports, Washington—Dr. John R. Steelman

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman, presents the weekly Battle Report, Washington, and it seems that with each succeeding issue the information conveyed not alone is of even greater interest but is more interestingly exhibited and disclosed.

In this, the thirty-second teledocumentary Battle Report, Washington, the American television audience was given a magnificent treat—first, by way of the splendid pictures photographed by National Broadcasting Co.'s cameramen, Charles and Eugene Jones; and second, through the narration by Lou Hazam. These, taken together with the commentaries by Robert McCormick, make for one of the most spectacular word and moving pictures ever released to the audio and video audience.

Additionally thereto, Dr. Steelman brought to the television screen, on Sunday, April 8, two distinguished visitors, Maj. Orville Muneon, of the United States Army, just returned from Korea where he served as liaison officer with the Turkish brigade, and Mr. John C. Dreier, Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

Major Munson's story of his experience in fighting alongside the Turkish troops, although a splendid story, is equalled, however, by a report of Mr. Dreier, who tells of the accomplishments made in building hemispheric solidarity and a Gibraltar of democracy, here in the Western Hemisphere.

I doubt very much if anyone could have seen and heard this program of the thirty-second Battle Report, Washington, without experiencing a sense of exultation in realizing just what our country is doing—for all mankind—in making this world a better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the Members of this House, as well as Americans everywhere, an opportunity to read this intensely human document of today's happenings, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I include therein this thirty-second Battle Report, Washington, which was as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. McCORMICK. From the thirty-eighth parallel, latest pictures of General MacArthur as he again visits our troops on the battlefront. And from the Nation's Capital on parallel 38-51, NBC television visits you again with Battle Report, Washington.

Washington, this week going about its defense business through streets abloom with cherry blossoms, and Korea, where the hills are ablaze with gunfire and rumors of an imminent Chinese offensive.

This is Robert McCormick, glad to be back on the job again. Today Battle Report brings you the fourth of its exclusive teledocumentaries on Europe, and reports on our Turkish allies in Korea and the meeting of the Latin-American foreign ministers in Washington. But first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. These days in Washington are busy ones for many thousands of workers. The other evening at approximately 9 o'clock I drove by several Government buildings. They were ablaze with light and people were moving about as if it were midday. There is, of course, only one reason for this activity and it can be summed up in one word—defense.

Once again our Nation is in peril. Everything we own, everything we hold sacred—even the life of every man, woman, and child in the United States is threatened. Our only chance of survival is to erect defenses which are so strong no one will dare attack us.

Surely every thinking person knows that the objective of Soviet policy is not the uplifting of the underprivileged. The brutal purging of nonconformists—the vicious denunciation of all who do not submit to the Kremlin yoke—is eloquent testimony to the real ambitions of the tyrants. The nature of Soviet terrorism is self-evident, and the prime targets for this terrorism are the men and women of the United States.

This afternoon we have two distinguished visitors who will report from two different sections of the world. Maj. Orville Munson, of the United States Army, has just returned from Korea where he was liaison officer with the Turkish Brigade. Mr. John C. Dreier, our Ambassador to the Organization of American States, will report on the meeting of the foreign ministers which has been in session here in Washington for the past 2 weeks.

Television at its best is a reporter that can't be matched. Recognizing this, NBC Television sent its prize-winning cameramen, the Jones brothers, to critical Europe to document it for you—country by country. Your narrator, Robert McCormick, later joined them and helped prepare the fourth of these special teledocumentaries. We invite you now to see Battle Report, Italy, and hear the story of that country from one who has just returned—Robert McCormick.

Mr. McCORMICK. I have a little girl about this age myself. Maybe she was on my mind as I traveled about Europe. Anyway, it seemed to me that nowhere was Italy better symbolized than in the picture of this babe among the ruins. A new and young Italy being born out of the ashes of the past.

Most of you remember that past. Only a few years ago—as shown in these actual shots of World War II at San Pietro—its terrible music echoes throughout the countryside in bombs bursting and gunfire. Italy inherited from the war, destruction. Such distruction as this, visited upon the famed abbey of Cassino, driving its monks away. But they have returned. And patiently stone by stone, I saw them rebuilding the abbey again, while below, in the one-time battlefield, now a graveyard, crosses mark where the soldiers lay who keep them company.

In the town of Frascati, 20 miles from Rome, I saw a cat sunning herself in a window.

And in the public square not far away, human beings following her example. Out

men without work—poverty-stricken and hungry—dozing over their shovel handles. Yes; to me the streets of Frascati alone spoke volumes on Italy's basic problem—overpopulation and unemployment—a high birth rate and thousands of people wandering the streets all day with nothing to do. All this for modern Italy to worry about, piled atop the debris of war.

For a place to live, thousands of war-tossed homeless have taken to caves like these, right in a downtown section of Rome. Many of these cave dwellers, 1951, are northern farmers, whose farms were destroyed by the war. Drifting southward, they burrowed these holes into the soft, wet clay of the hillsides of the city and are forced to call the cold damp shelters that resulted, home.

But most Italians pass them by with eyes calloused from long seeing the same sight in southern Italy. For here in Matava, at the heel of the boot, the cave dwellers have been around for 2,000 years.

Italy today, then, is Italy in transition, seeking to come out of the caves of its past into the light, seeking to overcome the problems to which fascism brought it and emerged a healthy member of the democratic family. This has called for American aid, and while in Italy I dropped by to see Mr. Leon Dayton, head of our Economic Cooperation Administration there, to ask him about that aid. This is his answer.

Mr. DAYTON. During the course of the last 2 or 3 years, we have had thousands of tourists here; a great many American businessmen, and others here just for the Italian sunshine, history, and art of Italy. Nearly all of them, at one time or another, have expressed that this work we are doing here is Operation Charity. Well, there is very little that could be further from the truth. I wish there was one way we could tell the American people that this is a real investment in the future. It is not the kind of investment, either, we have to wait 10 years to pay off. In fact, we can see some of the dividends today.

Mr. MCCORMICK. As we traveled the Italian peninsula, the Jones brothers turned their cameras for you on the dividends of American aid, of which Mr. Dayton speaks.

The truth of his remarks is rooted in brick and stone in the new city of Cassino. Rather than reconstruct the former blasted town site, Italy is preserving it as a memorial. The new town is rising in a fresh location a half-mile away. With American aid, new housing—such as this, the largest apartment project in Rome—is now taking shape. In four more months, it will be providing low-cost accommodations for hundreds of families. These balconies, of course, will be for the people, not dictators.

The busy fingers of throbbing machines are already beginning to spin the thread of a new industrial life. A whole new section of this textile factory—which will contain American looms and give work to over 200 people—is now under construction, thanks to American help. We found the workers fully aware of this, and grateful.

But one of the most amazing miracles of all is being worked with the help of these subterranean steam formations. Italy provided the geysers in Tuscany, where it is said that Dante wrote his Divine Comedy. America provided the engineering know-how. And somehow, in some way mysterious to a layman like myself, steam that bubbled from the earth was tapped by huge rigs. Huge stone condensing towers rise into the sky. Borax extracted as a byproduct, and power sent soaring across the land for miles—power to light the city—to keep the wheels of industry turning. But these pictures tell more than the story of the power of Italian-American cooperation. More reconstruction—the bay at Naples, which used to take any left-over bombs from the wartime bombing missions to the Rumanian oil fields.

And now you're leaving one of the world's largest railway stations on Italy's crack train running between Rome and Milan, running on time, we might add, without Mussolini's help. We rode this modern streamliner—further evidence of United States aid—as it sped along miles of new track, going up for a brief visit to the engineer's cabin, shining with the latest type of locomotive equipment. The interiors are as luxurious as anything we've seen in the States. Repairs to the line still go on, but we sped across this bridge at 70 miles an hour—a bridge that formerly could be crossed at only 5 miles an hour. Yes; more evidence that Italy is on the right track. And well might we take pride in its progress, for as ECA's Leon Dayton put it:

Mr. DAYTON. Probably the best example I can give you of the near miracle that is occurring here, and I think, an example of some of the short-term dividends we have gotten from the program, is by making a comparison between 1947 and now 1951. In 1947, the physical facilities of this country were badly destroyed. The people were poverty-stricken. There was a strong Communist minority here playing on these factors to get control of the people and of the Government. But in 1951, Italy has assumed full partnership with the United States. She is preparing to defend the ideals and principles which caused us to make them.

Gentlemen, I spoke to you earlier about some discussion of this work here being called Operation Charity. I think you will find we are getting our money's worth out of Operation Strength for the free world.

Mr. MCCORMICK. And so, as we draw to the close of this report, how best to sum up what our cameras saw and ears heard? Perhaps like this: The glories of which Mussolini boasted were the old glories, symbolized by the wonderful works of art in which Italy is rich, and for which it is deservedly famous. But today—today the Italian people are not so much concerned with this past as they are with the present. The monarchy is gone. Mussolini is gone. In their place is a new Republic whose leader we sought out in his simple office. He greeted us warmly, and said that while our cameras could record the physical evidence of our common effort toward recovery, it could not show what is in Italy's heart and mind. We asked Prime Minister de Gasperi to take this responsibility himself and here he is.

Prime Minister DE GASPERI. That is why I am here today to tell you the sentiments and motives that inspire my Italy. They are: (1) Gratitude for the generous cooperation of the American people; (2) renewed faith in liberty; (3) the firm resolve to defend democracy and to obtain social justice. May God speed us on our common way.

Mr. MCCORMICK. This firm resolve to defend democracy, which Premier de Gasperi pledges, has its strength in the Italian Army, now being born anew with American advice and assistance. We are reserving that portion of our report on Italy for next week. Instead, for our final word, we turn your attention next to our exclusive interview with the Foreign Minister of Italy, Count Carlos Sforza.

Count SFORZA. Now we are allies in the Atlantic Pact. That is why you are just as interested as we are in our rehabilitation and recovery. We will do our best and you may be assured of our loyalty because the Atlantic Pact has been created for peace, for freedom, and for saving our western civilization, and these are our deepest ideals and convictions.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Thus, with these assurances of Italian loyalty to the American cause, we close as we began, with this small babe against the ruins, symbolizing the new Italy, young as this child, struggling to live as a free person again in this new world. How well she succeeds will depend not only upon herself, but upon you.

As our infantry moves forward in Korea, they are faced with a new Chinese puzzle to solve. The Communist invaders have broken contact with our troops along much of the western front and pulled back in a surprise withdrawal. Yet, all expectations are of a major enemy counterattack perhaps when we reach the wider waist of the peninsula above the parallel. Our Air Force reports the Chinese massing—perhaps for just such an attack—in the central mountain area, as our soldiers advance cautiously. And here are some troops the Communists have already learned are bad medicine. Our Turkish allies in action around Seoul, teamed up with American tank forces. These Turks need no lesson on the menace of communism. Back home, Russia is on their border. For more information on how highly these troops are valued in Korea, we turn now to a man who can boast 5 campaign stars and some 20 citations, including the DSC. A man who helped train the Turks in Turkey and fought side by side with them in Korea as liaison officer until wounded. Ladies and gentlemen, the Army's Maj. Orville Munson.

Major MUNSON. I was assigned to Turkey in January 1950 as part of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey. On arrival I was sent to the Turkish engineering school in Istanbul. While there I taught infantry tactics. That is, I taught engineer units, which normally build bridges and such things, how to reorganize their companies and battalions to fight as infantry when necessary. I was given the job as liaison officer with the Turkish brigade.

Mr. MCCORMICK. How did the Turkish people feel about sending men to Korea, and how did the men themselves feel about going?

Major MUNSON. I can't answer for every individual, but I can say this—the majority of the unit that went to Korea were volunteers, officers and men. And I remember some of the women in Turkey saying that if they went to Korea, and that if they didn't come back as victors, they shouldn't come back at all.

One thing that impressed me so much was on the ship going from Turkey to Korea, the Turks big comment here was that they were afraid that they were not going to get there in time to help out. They actually wanted to spill some blood for the cause of the free world.

Mr. MCCORMICK. What kind of fighters are the Turks?

Major MUNSON. The Turks are a proud people and rightly so. You see the Republic of Turkey is only 27 years old. To gain their independence they fought for 2 years to drive the British, French, and Greeks from their soil. In doing this they had some divisions that fought until every man was killed. With a tradition like this to live up to, the Turks today have a real inspiration. We found that it was very hard to impress the Turks with the advantages of maneuver. The Turks want to just dig in and fight, and as we learned so often, to close in with his bayonet.

They are especially fond of our trucks, tanks, and weapons. The Turkish Army is still mostly horse-drawn, and, therefore, they haven't had too much of an opportunity to work with our equipment—and so at first they find it quite difficult to handle. Naturally, when they see some of the things that our boys can do with that very same equipment, they can't help but admire our ability. Seeing is believing.

They thought our weapons were wonderful. I remember the first comment that the engineer company commander made with regard to our infantry rifle. "Good. Everybody a machine gun."

Mr. MCCORMICK. Where were the Turks fighting when you were wounded, Major Munson?

Major MUNSON. You all remember when the Chinese Communists came across the Yalu River in their big offensive? We were trying to secure some high ground in one of the northernmost areas of the Eighth Army sector. I was at that time assigned to one of the infantry companies to assist them in organizing for the attack. There were some tanks assigned to us at that time and they were operated by American personnel, so there was quite a bit of liaison responsibility in interpreting.

The Turks at that time were protecting the right flank of the Eighth Army. They were to hold back the initial punch that was received from the Chinese. This was until the American divisions organized for an orderly withdrawal. Incidentally, there is little need of my having to add this, but the Turks did a swell job. Just ask the boys from the American Second and Twenty-fifth Divisions. They know what I mean.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Major, you think a good deal of these soldiers from Turkey, don't you?

Major MUNSON. The Turks know why they are in Korea—to stop aggression, now. They never forgot that their homeland borders on the Soviet Union. But still this fighting brigade was dispatched unhesitatingly to fight halfway around the world to show at considerable cost in life and money that the Turkish Republic considers itself a part of the free world and a spearhead of democracy in the east. The Turks are willing to resist aggression anywhere in the world when called upon by the United Nations to do so. I want to say here, that I consider it a privilege to have had the opportunity to serve with a country whose ideals and aspirations are so fundamentally like our own.

Mr. MCCORMICK. As these ground soldiers in the west plunged into North Korea for the deepest penetration, north of Yongpyong, and advanced toward the main enemy base at Kumwha, over their heads the air battle waged hotter than ever. Fifty United States Thunderjets, covering B-29's in a heavy raid on the Manchurian border bridges, ran into 40 Communist jet fighters and routed them. Put that down in your book as the biggest all-jet air battle in history.

Meanwhile, here in Washington, in a sweeping demonstration of cooperation, 21 American Republics signed a brass-tacks agreement to strengthen our own Western Hemisphere against the Communist plague. Conferring as our representative throughout the 2-week session, and credited with much of the success of this historic meeting is the State Department official on whom we next focus. He is our Ambassador to the Organization of American States, John C. Dreier.

Ambassador JOHN C. DREIER. Yesterday morning the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the 21 American Republics gathered in the great Hall of the Americas in the Pan American Union and signed the final act of their meeting of consultation. The first to sign was the ranking Foreign Minister, Dr. Manuel Tello, of Mexico. The 20 other Foreign Ministers followed in order, the last one being the host to the meeting, our Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson.

Two weeks ago the foreign ministers gathered in Washington at the invitation of Secretary Acheson to consider the common problems of our 21 countries in the present grave international situation. There were three big subjects on the agenda: Political and military cooperation, the problem of internal security against subversive activities, and emergency economic cooperation. Yesterday it was apparent that the determination of the foreign ministers to resolve these common problems and set forth the policy of our American family of nations in this crisis, had met with outstanding success.

Thirty-one resolutions were adopted as a result of the 2 days of work—and work it was in capital letters. On one of the last nights the group labored until 8 o'clock in the morning. And the next night they worked until 6 o'clock in the morning, in order to finish their task on time.

In the political and military field the American foreign ministers made clear that our 21 countries stand united today in the finest tradition of inter-American solidarity. Reaffirming their desire to live and work in peace, they nevertheless laid plans for more effective military preparation for the defense of our continent. They also again indentified their governments with the larger purpose of the United Nations to establish a rule of law and justice in the relations among nations throughout the world.

In dealing with the subject of subversive activities within the Americas, the foreign ministers set forth the main lines to be followed for the purpose of controlling fifth-column activities. They also agreed on the need for increased efforts to improve living standards and to strengthen fundamental human freedom in order to fortify the faith of our peoples in their democracy.

Economic questions occupied a large part of the discussions. It was recognized that the emergency in which we find ourselves imposes special problems of production and supply. The needs of defense programs must be met, while measures have to be taken to prevent any unnecessary dislocation of the economies of our 21 republics. The economic resolutions adopted by the Foreign Ministers deal with production of strategic materials, with the allocation of scarce goods, with measures to combat inflation, and a number of other related subjects. They embody the basic inter-American principle of fair treatment to all—the sharing of sacrifices so that all may share in the benefits to be achieved.

The decisions of the meeting of Foreign Ministers are in themselves important to the future of every one of us, uniting as they do the efforts of the 21 American Republics. However, as Secretary Acheson pointed out in his closing remarks, the manner in which decisions were reached there is also of great importance. For in this meeting, the American nations have again demonstrated the validity of their great system of cooperation based upon principles which commend the loyalty of every one of them.

The highly satisfactory results of this meeting of consultation are eloquent evidence of what can be accomplished by nations working in a sincere desire to merge their national interests in the larger goal of a world in which peace, freedom, and prosperity can be achieved.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another teledocumentary, this, then, against the background of Battle Front Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your thirty-second Battle Report, Washington.

John Alltucker, Educational Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I read with much regret in the Times Herald of Vallejo, Calif., of the retirement of John R. Alltucker as superintendent of schools of Vallejo.

For 24 years he served the Vallejo school district, the last 10 as superintendent. Vallejo is really a Federal city. The major industry is the Mare Island Navy Yard. In 1940 Vallejo had a population of 20,072. About that time Mare Island Navy Yard was being expanded rapidly until at the end of the war there were over 42,500 workers in the yard. The city of Vallejo grew to about 80,000, but the boundary of the city was not enlarged. The school population grew about like the population of the city. Vallejo had a staggering problem to handle the education of its enormously increased school population.

Lanham Act funds helped build some schoolhouses. Mr. Alltucker, loyally and vigorously supported by the board of education, handled the job of providing education for the increased school population. The intellect and the character of John Alltucker was impressed upon many a pupil of the Vallejo schools during the 10 years he was superintendent of schools. Somehow, under the administration of John Alltucker, they received as good training as they would had they lived in normal cities. Part of the reason was that the superintendent had undying faith in our public-school system, and his board of education had faith in the ability of their superintendent to give every child that came into the Vallejo schools during this wartime period an opportunity to get an education, the birthright of every American child.

I think the board and the superintendent still are wondering how the job was done, but it was accomplished.

Later the wartime pressure relaxed some, but not nearly as much as was expected when the war ended. A large population still remained in Vallejo. Some of us thought that since the schools had been built by the National Government to take care of an educational war emergency and, since Vallejo had done this magnificently, the sensible thing would be to turn the schools built with Federal money over to Vallejo and other similar cities, on the promise that they would continue to be used for education. With a group of my House colleagues I tried to bring this about and introduced a bill to accomplish such transfers. We submitted testimony on the matter to the Public Works Committee. I was fortunate in getting Mr. Alltucker to come before the committee and explain the situation in Vallejo, which was similar, but perhaps more aggravated, to what it was in many other war towns. He made a great witness. He thoroughly explained the problem; he was able to give answers to all the questions put to him and in every way he made an excellent showing. Naturally I was greatly pleased that Mr. Alltucker, my constituent and friend, had made such a good impression. However, the Public Works Committee took the view of the Public Works Agency, that these schools should be sold to the local school districts. Nevertheless, our hearings brought the price down to practically a nominal amount and the thanks for this result is due to Mr. Alltucker more than to any other person.

John R. Alltucker is a true educator. He is unassuming, frank, friendly, and modest. He is continually thinking of how he can improve the opportunity for education for the pupils under his jurisdiction. He never took the attitude that Vallejo was the only city that had an acute problem in education. He recognized that others had similar situations. His relations with his Congressman were most cordial and friendly. He never made any unreasonable requests. His conduct was such as to make his Representative in Congress want to "break his neck" to do something for John Alltucker. Vallejo is to be congratulated on getting and keeping a man like him for 24 years. The board, including all members of it while he was superintendent, are to be congratulated on working so cordially with Mr. Alltucker and supporting him so loyally in working out the problems presented to the board during the trying war and postwar years.

His administration of the schools, in a manner that gave every war worker in the Mare Island yard the feeling that his children were being properly educated, raised the morale of these fine workers. This may account for the many awards that Mare Island and its workers received for their fine accomplishments.

McNeil Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent article by Paul J. Squier, warden of McNeil Island Penitentiary, in the State of Washington. The article points up the very fine work being done at that institution:

MCNEIL ISLAND—EMERALD OF PUGET SOUND

(By Paul J. Squier, Warden, United States Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash.)

The oldest, the most far-flung outpost, the only prison in the continental United States for which a navy is a necessity. McNeil Island stands out as an unique institution.

Before the State of Washington had come into being; before the Bureau of Prisons was organized; McNeil Island was a facility of the Federal Government for housing offenders. It was the United States marshals' jail, serving the great Northwest Territory. It became a part of the Federal prison system in 1909.

In the early days, when law enforcement consisted of the simple expedient of hanging or shooting a culprit when caught, rehabilitation was but a word in the dictionary. Prevention by detention was the most progressive method and, as early as 1875, mutineers from the sea, outlaws, and malefactors involved in illicit Indian traffic, were taken in clinker-built dinghys across the cold, tide-driven waters of Puget Sound to the island, 3½ miles out, where 27 acres were purchased and the first buildings erected.

Conditions were primitive. According to old records, the bath line for many years, took place in a wooden barrel, in water heated over hot rocks. Wood was the only fuel. Weather conditions, however, were temperate, running from an average summer high of 71.8 to a mean low, in wintertime, of 35.4. There was much rain.

Today, situated about 15 miles from Olympia, Wash., to the south and an equidistance from Tacoma to the north, McNeil Island receives inmates from an area extending from the icy wastes of the Alaskan Territory to the hot Mexican borders of southern California.

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

From its original holdings, the Government institution has grown until today it encompasses the whole of McNeil Island, an area of about 7 square miles or 4,400 acres.

By 1924 a population of 400 had already cramped living conditions and made additional area necessary. In 1926, in return for Federal timberlands, a transfer of the local school section was made to the institution. In this region, located some 3 miles inland from the main buildings, the penitentiary farm came into being the following year.

Nearly a decade later, the Government purchased the complete island and today we have a main institution with a normal capacity of 900 men (but with a present population of around 1,040), a large hinterland being constantly developed, and a McNeil Island Camp with a normal capacity of 250. The island has become a complete world of its own, self-contained and slowly approaching self-sufficiency.

Living quarters for inmates at the main institution are provided by three cell blocks, an honor dormitory and an admission and orientation unit. The modern hospital has a capacity of 80 beds. A 700-seat auditorium, built by the inmates, is one of the finest in the prison service. There are administration offices, school units for both academic and vocational classes, chapels, cannery, powerhouse, laundry, library, shipyards, and shops of various kinds.

Efforts toward improvements and more efficient facilities are constant and continuous. For example, the main kitchen is now undergoing extensive renovations. A new air-conditioned bread-room will reduce stale bread to a minimum and allow for the proper cooling of breakfast rolls and other bakery goods which develop pan taste when handled without the proper facilities.

The power plant is being enlarged and modernized, eliminating the ever present danger of power failure from the mainland. A Diesel motor of 800 kilowatts has recently been installed, and preparations are now under way for the installation of a new 1,200-kilowatt turbine.

The old, inadequate system of securing water from deep wells and springs was discarded in 1937 when the Butterworth Dam and reservoir were completed and the pumping system put into operation. The water from Eden Creek is filtered and pumped either to the camp, which has two steel tanks with a total capacity of 550,000 gallons, or to the concrete reservoir above the main institution which has a capacity of 680,000 gallons.

A second dam is now in process of completion and will insure an adequate supply of water for the expanding domestic, institutional, irrigative, and industrial uses. In order to derive multiple benefits from one operation, 100 acres of now almost impenetrable swamp will be changed by the dam into a placid lake, nestling in tranquillity below the evergreen forests. Thus is utility served without the sacrifice of beauty.

THE M'NEIL FARM CAMP

Supplanting the penitentiary farm, the McNeil Island Camp came into being in 1943, coincident with the closing of the camps at Dupont, Wash., and Kooskia, Idaho, due to curtailment of activities brought by the war and need for conserving staff manpower.

About half of the commitments to McNeil Camp are short-termers from the courts, and half are received by formal transfer from the main McNeil institution. Population during the past year has ranged from 280 to 355. The two institutions are most closely integrated, and are, of necessity, complementary—the camp furnishing a large proportion of fresh food, and the main institution furnishing services not available at the camp.

Prior to the war, the penitentiary maintained a farm population of 90 to 150 inmates, who worked at the farm and were housed and fed there in a modern dormitory, consisting of three squad rooms, housing 50 men each. The original dormitory and culinary unit and office space comprise the heart of the present unit. There are now three additional cottages of the war-time surplus variety which house 50 men each. In most respects, policies and functioning are according to commonly approved camp practices. However, this camp is unique in the Federal Prison System in that the officer personnel and all funds are provided through the main institution. There is excellent cooperation between the farm group, the camp administration, and the main institution—administrative, custodial, mechanical, and culinary departments.

The future holds some very interesting possibilities for the camp at McNeil Island. Orchard and berry development will play an important part n the farm economy and should contribute substantially to the cannery operation as well. Continued land development as recommended by the Soil Conservation Service, will contribute to the self-sufficiency of the dairy through more abundant pasture and hay, and enable us to establish and operate an economical beef venture. Close cooperation with the cannery will enable us to conserve surpluses and meet more and more of the steward's off-season needs. Our timber operation will some day become so important that its value can scarcely be overemphasized. The various elements should blend into a closely woven program to give the balance and unity which a prison farm should have.

Out of a total of 4,409 acres, the farm has slightly less than 1,000 acres of cultivated land. Perhaps 2,000 acres can best be considered forest land, since a fine stand of young fir in general. A recent soil conservation survey indicates about 600 acres favorable for production may be cleared and put into cropland. Land clearing is a sizable job, with tremendous fir stumps to be uprooted and burned before plowing can be started. Land clearing does provide productive winter work for the inmates and is a stabilizing influence on the work program. Practically all the acreage yet to be reclaimed will be devoted to pasture, forage, and small grain production—three of our most pressing needs.

The orchard and berry program is quite ambitious, with 300 acres devoted to this feature. Two hundred acres of this total represents young orchard that will need several years to reach full productivity. At that time about 65 acres of old orchard, scattered about the island, will have passed their usefulness and will be removed. This will leave a solid block of over 200 acres of productive fruit to effect the maximum operating economy. This orchard can be irrigated with facilities now available and should give good production in a few more years. Tree fruits being grown include apples, peaches, prunes, sweet and sour cherries, pears, and apricots.

The garden operation is quite sizable, with up to 80 acres devoted to it. Most of this land is irrigated with portable equipment from permanent underground installations. The chief handicap to the garden operation is unfavorably contoured land, a condition to be improved by clearing and developing adjacent areas.

The hog and poultry features provide pork and eggs to fill institutional requirements. Yearly pork production is around 500 head.

The dairy unit on McNeil Island has developed from a mediocre beginning, with grade animals purchased from here and there, to a herd of 67 high-grade milking cows. The first bulls with any important background used in the herd were loaned by the Department of Agriculture and came from the Huntley, Mont., experiment station. In 1940, a bull was purchased from Carnation Farms, and since that time several others have been obtained from the same source. Then, too, three bulls were supplied from our own institutions: one from La Tuna, and two from Terre Haute.

In 1940 the herd reached its highest average production, and was at the top of the list for the institution dairy herds.

During the war years, and since, production has been declining, due to the feed situation and the shortage of money for purchase of feed. The only purchased animals in the herd have been the bulls, until recently, when, through the efforts of Director Bennett and Warden Squier, nine purebred heifers were bought from Carnation Farms.

INDUSTRIES

Our industries are presently composed of four units: a cannery, a furniture-repair shop, a pallet shop, and a shipyard. A year-round average of some 20 percent of the inmate population is employed in this work.

The largest of the industries is the cannery—both in number of employees and in investment. Approximately 67,000 cases of canned goods have been prepared during the past year. The major part of this pack has been for the Army, and the balance has gone to our own institutions and to other Government agencies. The dehydrator is in a semiseparate unit.

The cannery is in operation about 7½ months of the year, and work is maintained on two shifts for a considerable portion of that time. In off-season, only about one-fourth as many men are employed in maintenance, repair, and shipping.

The pallet shop, which is the second largest industry, is presently working on an Army contract. This is operated on a piecework basis and peak production is 685 pallets in 1 day. Twenty-five thousand, 4-foot by 6-foot heavy equipment pallets have been completed in the past 6 months, involving the using of over 2,000,000 board feet of lumber and a large quantity of hardware.

The furniture-repair shop is engaged in refinishing office desks and chairs for the Army and for other Federal offices.

The shipyard is probably the best known of the island's industries. During the war three tugs were built for the Army, and later a tender was built for Alcatraz. More recently, the yard has been used to repair boats for the Coast Guard, and boats and barges for the island's navy.

INMATES

The inmate population is a heterogeneous group. Ages vary from 17 to 80 years, and sentences from 1 month to life-plus-60-years. Analogous variance obtains with regard to degrees of intelligence and culture. For example, recently one inmate chose to sleep on the floor and apparently did not know what a pillow was for until he became acclimated. Practically all professions are represented; the most rare is that of school teacher. The Negro population has increased over 400 percent since 1941, due to the influx of military prisoners and to shifting population. Our Eskimo population is increasing, but they present fewer problems than any other racial group. Only five of our present N. M. V. T. A-law violators are other than white. Commitments are largely from Washington, Oregon, and California.

EVENING ACTIVITIES

The year 1941 marked the beginning of the first attempt at an organized recreational program. Prior to this time various cliques almost completely monopolized the playing areas and consequently the bulk of the population was left with no alternative but to walk around the yard. A softball and an outdoor basketball league were formed and eventually developed into the present-day set-up wherein two leagues are in play. These are: Major league of eight teams in basketball, softball, and volleyball. The minor league of four teams is comprised of those lesser-skilled individuals who thus are given an opportunity to play with men of their own ability.

The drill hall, previously utilized for officers' training, was renovated and made available for winter-months activities. Basketball standards, punching-bag platforms, standards for volleyball courts were installed and, over a 6-year period, have finally evolved into a complete 6-month winter-program period. This area is utilized by the inmates from 12 noon to 8:30 p. m. during the regular workweek, and from 12 noon until 4 p. m. on Saturdays and Sundays. The use of this indoor area has been a splendid morale booster for all types of inmates, as a well-balanced program for both active and nonactive men is carried on by the recreational division.

Inmate committees work with the recreational officer and the officials in charge of the institution and thus promote cordial, well-received programs.

Visitors have been very favorably impressed with the sportsmanship shown by both players and spectators. Inmate officials have received words of praise for their work and the combined efforts of both inmates and officials has left a pleasing impression on the outsider.

Next to radio, the library with its 10,000 volumes and 48 magazines has the greatest number of participants. Each inmate has the opportunity to avail himself of the library at least three times a week, since it is open for 8 hours each day. Magazines are mostly distributed by request, usually about 75 a day. Books taken out average 300 to 400 an evening. Vocational training is given in bookbinding and marbling. The second evening period is devoted to selected study groups, a great books discussion circle, and to the debating team. The actual debates with neighboring collegiate or high-school teams invoke a hearty interest and frequently attract an audience of several hundred inmates.

The auditorium is the scene of daily events such as church activities and the motion-picture shows (which make their appearance on every week end and on holiday occasions), as well as for vocational classes on Wednesdays, and for orchestra and choir practice; and on special occasions it is used for boxing matches or other activities such as outside lectures, debates, inmate shows, etc. It is also the usual meeting place for the personnel for regular or special lectures or discussion groups.

Evening school is likewise divided into two periods. Classes are conducted in the afternoon as well, but those are primarily for inmates with a full-time or half-time school assignment. The program is ambitious and entails academic, vocational, and avocational aspects. Most classes are held on alternate evenings, so a wider range may be offered. The supervisor states that less emphasis is being placed on the formal school-room type of class and that the trend is more toward vocational training and correspondence study. Correspondence study has more than tripled during the past 6 years. Some 8,000 lessons embracing more than 75 courses from 6 major sources have been completed during the past quarter.

The inmates have appreciated some innovations in the activity program. Our hinterland is especially fruitful in raising small colleges, and the education department has capitalized on their teacher-training and sociology departments to the extent that four of the students now take admission interviews, one teaches classes in sociology-psychology, and one compiled statistics for college credit.

Hobby-shop activities have rapidly increased in scope and number of participants. It is supervised by a custodial officer under direction of the education department. Twenty-one inmates are now engaged in fly-tying, 12 in leather work, 7 in weaving, 7 in woodwork, 1 in plastics, and 1 in art. The excellence of many of these products indicates that the avocations could be transformed into vocations and become the means of earning a good living.

PERSONNEL AND ORGANIZATION

Time is a commodity with which the administration is not too well supplied and, consequently, there is an ever-present emphasis on speed and efficiency. Organization is the keynote. Training and the time factor are under constant consideration.

For example—the McNeil Island fleet. Gone are the days of haphazard schedules, antiquated lapstreaks, and seagoing guards. Today, a highly trained group of maritime officers handles the 24-hour-a-day activities of passenger boats, freighters, tugs, power barges, and ferry service.

Boats arrive and leave in a steady stream: A freighter with a load of apples from eastern Washington or leaving with a cargo of canned goods for Alcatraz; a power barge loaded with lumber for the pallet crews; tugs bringing in scows piled high with Army salvage from Seattle; and, in between, the continuous clocklike runs of the passenger boats bringing in the shifts, business representatives, and new inmates.

These passenger boats alone excite the imagination. They must meet deadlines every hour of the day and most of the night. In spite of weather, unforeseen incidents, and other emergencies, they leave on the minute and return on time.

Boats have beached in heavy fogs and fast-running tides; bows have been smashed, striking submerged "deadheads" on stormy nights; there is the constant threat of broken log rafts and heavy Puget Sound traffic in high winds and rolling seas. Yet, to the credit of able and alert maritime crews, never has a boat been lost nor has a serious accident occurred in the thousands of McNeil Island runs.

The engineers and construction units are another example. Trucks, tractors, graders, bulldozers, and other heavy power equipment tune up every morning for another day of purposeful activity. Survey crews and office draftsmen work at top speed to keep ahead of the dam construction, the building, and the opening of new projects.

An intricate and strategic network of roads, guarding 14 miles of shoreline, must be kept in constant repair. Docks must be kept in first-class condition. To save time and money, the construction units have erected and run their own sawmill, organizing logging crews to keep them supplied with material from the island timberlands. A forestry unit has planted hundreds of young seedlings with the long view of a permanent forest crop.

All this business is run in close cooperation with the shops—the machine shops, which manufacture and supply new for old and broken parts; the auto shops, which keep the motor pool ready and running; the carpenter shops, which fill quick orders and needed repairs.

Over all this interlocking industry is a crack custodial force to see that the main purpose of the institution is not lost in the

press of business; and educational and classification groups to foster rehabilitation—to get the right man into the right place. Finally, under one administrative head an effort is made to see that these widespread activities function smoothly, without conflict or friction, synchronized into one smooth-running organization.

All this is accomplished with a personnel of 250 employees, 75 of whom live with their families in modern homes on the island, about 25 in an up-to-date officers' quarters. The rest commute from Steilacoom, Tacoma, or adjacent areas. On the side, the island residents find it expedient to maintain a cooperative store, a filling station, and a part-time garage. Local organizations sponsor a well-rounded religious, recreational, and social activities program for all ages.

And so McNeil Island continues to function down through the years, growing, experimenting, changing with the times in its attempt to meet the needs of the Nation, striving to be of service to society, a credit to the Bureau, and an important and purposeful part of the United States Government.

Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, President Samuel N. Stevens, of Grinnell College, has given a good deal of thought and study to the deferment of college students who pass the difficult aptitude tests, and his analysis of the matter is very worthwhile. I, therefore, ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include President Stevens' memoranda on the subject of protecting the national health and safety by permitting men to continue their education and not engage in military service until their program of study is completed. President Stevens' remarks follow:

1. This is not class legislation. A study was made with the cooperation of eight other colleges and universities of the economic backgrounds of the students in the colleges. These students come from families with incomes that range from $2,000 a year to over $100,000 a year. The median salaries fall within the range of between $3,600 and $5,000. Reports from the Department of Labor indicate that even in the field of industrial wages the averages today are within this range. Consequently, since the people in school involve economic backgrounds that are almost identical with the students in high school and the prospects generally it cannot be said that postponing military service of a college student is class legislation.

2. Education is not a luxury. It seems apparent from many of the discussions which have taken place that American people at times look upon higher education as a luxury which can be ignored or thrown out whenever an economic or political crisis arises which makes stresses and strains on our manpower. I am sure that you agree with me that there are no problems in our modern social economy which have remained as simple in structure or solution as they were in the early part of this century. It makes no difference how we deal with technicalities of production or distribution or with the problems of social control or with the problems of international policy. At every point the need for enlightened historically sound, scientifically accurate judgments is so pressing as to almost take on the nature of an emergency. We cannot expect to maintain world dominance economically or to give world leadership operating from an educational framework that is as obsolete as the horse and buggy is when seen in terms of whole plan.

We need in the national interest more and better leadership. We need men capable of arriving at sound social, political, moral and technical judgments. There is no substitute for processes of higher education. Russia recognizes this fact and systematically has her brightest and best men do intensive study at the university level. England recognizes this fact for England knows that her loss in world leadership is due in no small part to the thousands of her brightest men who were allowed to die on Flanders Fields. England today is poverty stricken for leadership because the men who might have reached the stature of national leaders in her economy are no longer alive. The loss was unnecessary. She no longer makes this mistake. Examine England's methods of deferring her men and you will find that she sees to it that her brightest and finest brains are not only given an opportunity to become educated before they enter the military service but are not permitted to enter military service at all. They serve the national interests by preparing themselves to carry great loads of great responsibility, after the present generation of old men has given up and passed out of the picture.

3. The national emergency does not require the sacrifice of educational growth and development for boys between 18 and 24 at the present time.

The Defense Department has consistently misled the American people in regard to this matter. I personally believe that the manner in which the American people have been misled by the Defense Department is almost immoral. I recognize the fact that the vast appropriations which have been asked for and freely given would never have been made possible had it not been for the induced crises stirred up by military leaders and encouraged by our executive department. It has yet to be demonstrated that any one of the services is in a position to adequately clothe, arm, and train the men now under their control.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF W. D. JOHNSON, VICE PRESIDENT AND NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, ORDER OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS, IN OPPOSITION TO THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

My name is W. D. Johnson. I am a vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America. I reside in Washington, D. C., and I maintain an office at 10 Independence Avenue. The general headquarters of the Order of Railway Conductors is located in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The Order of Railway Conductors was organized July 6, 1868, and is the second oldest railway labor organization in the United States.

As a representative of the Order of Railway Conductors, I am fully authorized to appear before this committee and file this statement in opposition to the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Our opposition to this project dates back for approximately 20 years.

We are not opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway project merely from the standpoint of railroad employees, regardless of the fact that if this project is constructed, many conductors will be adversely affected. In addition to our interest as railroad employees, we are very deeply concerned as taxpayers, both State and Federal. We are, therefore, at a loss to understand why the Federal Government should be urged by a few individuals to appropriate more than a billion dollars of Federal funds to be used to subsidize the construction of a water-transportation system that cannot in our judgment be justified by the widest stretch of imagination, particularly so from the standpoint of national defense.

The records show that our present transportation systems are fully adequate to meet present and future transportation needs even though there would be a substantial increase in both freight and passenger traffic. Therefore, the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway will simply mean taking away from present transportation systems tonnage that they are capable of handling and transferring it to another system. This is merely "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

In World War II, the proponents of the St. Lawrence project pleaded national defense, the same as they are doing at the present time. However, we have successfully fought two World Wars without the St. Lawrence project and I feel confident we will come out victorious in the present conflict without this added means of transportation.

It has been estimated that it will require from 7 to 10 years to construct this project. I am, therefore, wondering just how we will be able to carry on and meet the transportation needs during the interim period of construction. If we are able to carry on and meet the needs during the construction period, why can't we carry on after the project is constructed? In other words, if the future security of our great country is dependent upon the construction of a project that cannot be put into operation short of 8 or 10 years, I fear that our security will be destroyed long before the project is constructed, so why consider an expenditure of over a billion dollars of Federal funds for the construction of a nonessential project.

During World War II, the American railroads handled 97 percent of all organized military traffic and 90 percent of all war freight. Railroad management and employees were highly complimented by the President and other high-ranking officials for the efficient service rendered. It has been said many times by those in authority that if the railroads had failed to render prompt and efficient service, we would have suffered defeat in World War II. However, regardless of this outstanding transportation record, special effort is being put forth to deprive the railroads and the employees traffic that rightfully belongs to them.

I recall that General Eisenhower, on his return from his inspection tour abroad, stated in substance that our foreign allies are not inclined to give up, but on the contrary, they are eager to carry on provided they are supplied with the necessary implements of war. Therefore, it seems to me that it would be far more profitable and effective to use the vast sum of money that would be required to construct the St. Lawrence project to provide the necessary implements of war and get them in the hands of our allies at the earliest possible date.

I know that the engineers for the proponents have estimated the cost of construction of this project to be less than a billion dollars. However, past experience will show

that the cost of construction of water projects far exceeded the estimates submitted and I daresay that the St. Lawrence project if constructed will not be an exception to the rule.

Railway employees are deeply concerned with respect to our national defense. They have no desire whatsoever to do anything that would in any way retard our defense program. We, therefore, feel that our opposition to the St. Lawrence project is fully justified and will prove to be helpful instead of harmful.

Let me say in conclusion that our job as American citizens is to face realities and to strengthen and support our basic industries. This is no time to waste our money or efforts in the furtherance of experimental dreams. I, therefore, sincerely hope that this committee will render an unfavorable report on this project.

Military Careers of Former West Point Football Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article written by Walter Stewart, one of the country's recognized sports writers.

All of us watch with interest the progress of outstanding football players at West Point during the course of their preparation for service as officers in the regular Military Establishment. It is but natural that we lose sight of their excellent reputations as they leave West Point, because in the course of things others must take their places in the public eye.

Coach Blaik, in a conversation recently, gave me some very interesting figures about the military service of recent well-known graduates. I communicated that information to Mr. Stewart and indeed he has paid a great tribute to these fine soldiers. His article follows:

Anyone thoughtless enough to angle a sneer toward football at West Point will have to lick the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, a belligerent solon equipped with a built-in left hook and a grand pair of hands. We can't understand why anyone this side of the Kremlin would care to launch such a sneer, but our able and industrious lawmaker is prepared to kick in the teeth behind it.

Armed with the statistics of heroism, Congressman DAVIS strikes a deep bell tone from the heart of sporting America as he reports that.

1. Of the last nine captains of Army football teams, three have been killed in action. One of these three was our town's John Trent, the immortal warrior without fear and without reproach.

2. Since 1936 a total of 177 football lettermen have graduated and 95 percent have catapulted into service under fire.

3. Twenty percent have earned the Purple Heart for blood spilled in combat and 6 percent have been slain with faces set hard toward the enemy.

This is a record written in gore and guts and agony. It rates top brackets in football's hall of fame—in mankind's hall of fame. The backs and linemen of the United States Military Academy are a peculiar brand of tiger—a tireless and sacrificial type somewhat set apart from the average candidate for commission.

THE HARD WAY

Hours of practice are strictly limited and boiler-sized heads of steam must be jammed into these time capsules. Hard driven the cadets come out of the showers drained of energy and designed for an early rendezvous with the sack. But bed is a long way off—stiffly dug-in behind a rampart of textbooks. To reach it, the cadet must pierce an outpost line of higher mathematics—plow through a pulverizing fire blanket of bridge stresses before he crashes head-on into the final wall of resistance—the technique of fire control, English literature, and advanced Spanish.

Have you ever sought to concentrate upon a puddle of type when your brain sagged with your spine—when your shoulders quivered beneath the heavy anvils of fatigue? Well, we have—and no slight pressure is involved. Yet the football forces of West Point must keep in academic step with students who reach the study hour in comparative bright-eyed eagerness.

Of course football is nothing but war with the gloves on—the finest conditioner for a harsh and thankless profession. Yes, a cadet must flog his mind into stride when fatigue claws at his bowels—when cleated bruises freckle his hide and clean sheets wait a stride from the study table.

THE RUTHLESS PARALLEL

So the circumstances will be identical some fire-torn night when he crouches in the shifting shadows of a ruined cottage with a map spread across his knees and a flashlight quivering in his grubby paw. But this time the corporate life of a battalion, a division, an army is balanced upon the clarity of his thinking.

He is tired now—bone-tired and fighting back the tide of sleep which reaches out to engulf him. It is at this point that commanders strike with devastating skill, or see their units cut up and go back for reclassification. And the old fullback or tackle, toughened in heart and body and spirit, is the most likely candidate for success.

Yes, football is war with the gloves on—follows the same principles of tactics and strategy. As laid down by the military scientist, Von Klausewitz, one of these principles brings major attacking forces into contact with minor defensive units of the enemy. And what else is double teaming in football? On the defense, you seek to deploy and maneuver in such a manner that the foe will be unable to overwhelm you by massing at the critical point of assault.

Football offensives must blend air blows with ground power, and so must the winning general. You cannot advance the ball unless you are adept at feinting at one point and striking at another—building apparent strength at the flank and hitting up the center. The flag is pushed forward in the same intricate fashion.

Intelligence is equally vital on both fields. Scouting reports vary in detail, but the essentials are the same. What is the probable enemy intent and what are his capabilities? Where are the crevices of his defense? With these facts at his elbow, coach and commanding officer assess them endlessly and sketch flexible plans.

But men do not react precisely to the lines drawn upon a map or a blackboard. The foe has beefed up left tackle by overshifting, or moved artillery to saturate an area intelligence had described as a favorable avenue of approach to the jump-off. So one of the alternate plans must be adopted and put into immediate operation. The change must be made under full pressure and without losing momentum—a cruel task for a quarterback or regimental commander.

And for solid proof, read the roll call of glory—Army football men who moved on to the fire-swept slopes where games are played for deadly keeps. Eisenhower, Bradley, Stillwell, Neyland, Sultan, Patton, Gearhart, O'Donnell, Hobbs, O'Hare—a brilliant, surging listing.

So as long as we operate efficient and sharply striking football teams at West Point we'll have a hard corps of brilliant combat officers. Many of those who formed that doomed 6 percent failed to make the All-America while they played at the Academy. They waited a few years.

Sanctions Against Chinese Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FRANKFORD LIONS CLUB,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 18, 1951.

Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.,
Representative Sixth District, Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCOTT: Your news letter dated March 26, 1951, in which you advocate that sanctions be placed against the Chinese Communists unless they withdraw beyond the Korean borders, in which case our troops, Air Force and Navy, would assume a noncombatant status pending their replacement by other occupation forces from all the peace-loving nations of the world, was read at the last meeting of this club.

In the belief that this Nation should take a definite stand and adopt an understandable policy with respect to the Chinese Communists and the Korean situation, we wish to inform you that a resolution was unanimously adopted by 112 members of this club in support of House Resolution No. 173, providing for sanctions to be approved against the Chinese Reds, but before they are used, the United Nations is to call for a cease-fire, involving the withdrawal of the Chinese beyond the Yalu River, followed by the U. N. recommendation for guaranteeing an independent Korea within protected boundaries.

Sincerely yours,
LIONS CLUB OF FRANKFORD,
By JAMES E. EMBREY, *Secretary.*

America for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement sent to me by the

members of the Third Medical Battalion, Third Infantry Division, now in Korea:

AMERICA FOR AMERICANS

Frankly, we, the fighting men in Korea, are more worried about the Communists at home than the Chinese we are facing. At least here we are on even terms. We are both armed. But our families back home cannot defend themselves against the many sneaky tricks of the Communists in their midst. Further, we feel the sentences imposed on those Commies accused to date have been far too lenient, and in addition, we cannot see them enjoying the sanctity of our jails. The American taxpayer, including us over here in Korea, are getting fed up paying for trials and retrials and appeals and the upkeep of these undesirables in our jails.

We wish to offer to the American people a plan for ridding our country of those who don't seem to like our form of government at absolutely no cost to the taxpayers. Will all people at home insist that all those who don't like our Constitution, including the likes of Earl Browder, Eugene Dennis, Paul Robeson, Alger Hiss, Harry Gold, and the many others who have betrayed us, and those who always seem to be ridiculing the American way of life, insist again that these people be deported from the United States. We suggest these rodents be sent over to Korea and turned over to the military, who will see to it that they are given safe conduct to the thirty-eighth parallel and presented to their Chinese comrades. The cost of this project will be borne, and with great enthusiasm, by donations of the fighting men in Korea.

Send them over to us and we will do the rest. How about it, all you good people back home? Let us save and keep America for Americans.

MEMBERS OF THE THIRD MEDICAL BATTALION, THIRD INFANTRY DIVISION, APO, 468.

"A United States Air Force Mission With the Atomic Bomb, What It Looks Like, and How It Is Delivered"—Jim Berryman, Cartoonist-Illustrator, the Washington Star

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if anyone has ever successfully analyzed the elements of education in art, music, economics, scientific and technical subjects, commerce, labor, agriculture, trade, finance, law, medicine, the humanities, and other subjects which constitute some of the facets of an able, well-rounded and successful cartoonist.

I have seen men like Tad Dorgan, Cliff Berryman, John McCutcheon, and Herb Block, impart a more fluent, legible, understandable, and factual story with a few brush or pencil strokes—in a cartoon—than most persons are able to express in a 1-hour talk, and on almost any subject.

In addition to a thorough understanding of the classical arts and sciences, of the intricate problems of psychology, sociology, and the humanities, a good cartoonist must at the same time be endowed not alone with a lively imagination and well-developed, indefinable sense of humor, but an even deeper-seated realization of the most serious problems of life.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if this world has ever had two cartoonists endowed to a more marked degree than has characterized the internationally known and beloved Clifford Kennedy "Cliff" Berryman and his equally distinguished son, James T. "Jim" Berryman.

The work of the late Clifford K. Berryman intrigued this Nation for more than a half a century. The Berrymans—father and son—were not only both winners of the Pulitzer prize, but both were president of Washington's famed Gridiron Club of writers and cartoonists Jim Berryman is now the president of the famous Gridiron Club which satirizes public officials at two large dinners each year. He has long been both a magazine illustrator and a writer, specializing in the popular presentations of technical subjects, and made a considerable number of drawings, both for the United States Navy, Army, and the United States Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that every man, woman, and child, in these United States could read this splendid article by our good friend, Jim Berryman, entitled "A Mission With the Atomic Bomb, What It Looks Like, and How It Is Delivered," as reproduced in the Washington Star, last evening.

Mr. Speaker, it would be like painting the lily for me to try to explain the wonderful piece of writing and illustrations done by this great artist-writer.

At long last we have a factual report as to just what we might expect to happen when the United States Air Force B-36 or a B-50 travels alone to its target devoid of fighters and as a single, lonely package of destruction.

Jim Berryman said yesterday when I talked with him:

"Congressman, I wrote and illustrated this article simply to enlighten the average man, woman, and child—to give all of them faith and courage in what we in America have done and can do—to protect our American way of life if and when any eventuality arises that might make it necessary to protect these shores.

"After seeing what Gen. Curtis LeMay has in hand, I am satisfied that the American internal defenses are not going to be wrecked by a murderous attack from the heavens as they were at Pearl Harbor because General LeMay is not letting his Air Force be caught like a lot of sitting ducks."

Mr. Speaker, that Americans everywhere throughout the country and particularly the children in our rural sections, whose teachers daily read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, may gain an inkling of but one phase of what is being done by the United States Air Force to secure our lives, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I extend my remarks. I desire to include within my remarks a brief statement made by Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of the Strategic Air Command, United States Air Force, and a wonderfully illustrated article accompanying it, the same written by Jim Berryman, cartoonist and illustrator for Look magazine, as reproduced in the Washington Star, where we in Congress almost daily see and enjoy his work:

STATEMENT FOR LOOK BY LT. GEN. CURTIS LEMAY, CHIEF OF THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The primary objective of the military forces of the free world is peace. Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter has defined the mission of air power in this connection as being one of the most important means for preventing war and establishing a world of peace.

The role of Strategic Air in this is one which is very clear and seriously held by us in the Air Force Strategic Air Command. We feel that by having our strategic bombers in the highest possible state of readiness, we are serving as a most potent force to deter any aggressor. We also are serving as a force which can help win the victory should war come in spite of the most earnest efforts of the leaders of the free world.

The officers and airmen of the Strategic Air Command understand the terrific responsibility which is theirs. The ability to deliver atomic weapons gives us a power which is enormous, but we are firmly dedicated to using that power toward the preservation of the peace and security of the free world as we know it.

The news article was as follows:

FLYING AN ATOMIC BOMB MISSION WITH SELECT B-50 CREW—STAR CARTOONIST BERRYMAN MAKES THE FIRST SKETCHES AND WRITES THE FIRST STORY OF HOW AIR FORCE BOMBER DELIVERS WORLD'S MOST LETHAL WEAPON AND RETURNS

(By James T. Berryman)

They said it was a dry A-bomb run. But it seemed live enough to me in the pressurized B-50's forequarters at 30,000 feet altitude. For only a bulkhead door separated the navigator and me from the atomic bomb's cradle in the 60-degree below zero temperature of the bomb bay.

Man's most destructive weapon lies rigidly fixed in its launching position. At the attack unfolds, the navigator occasionally glances at the grotesque bulk of what he calls "The Thing" through a circular-glass peephole in the bulkhead. This is probably unnecessary, for the bomb is immovable until it is released automatically by the magic of electronics. This ghastly weapon is preset when the B-50 rises from the earth on its fateful mission.

I think I am one of the few civilians, and surely the only cartoonist-illustrator, to have flown on a simulated A-bomb mission. The security-conscious crew of the B-50 looked at me with goggle-eyed wonder when Lt. Col. Harry E. Stengele, wing commander of the Ninety-sixth Bombardment Squadron, announced to them that I was authorized to go on their mission, sketching pad, pencils, crayons, and all. This was at Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.

SEEKS TO SCOTCH RUMORS

I was there because Maj. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, deputy chief of staff on Operations for Atomic Energy—and once a cartoonist at West Point—thought a cartoonist illustrator could tell a big part of the A-bomb story without giving away any vital technical information to your enemies.

He said, "I believe it is high time some of the ridiculous stories circulated about the A-bomb be killed and buried once and for all. I've even heard rumors that hundreds of thousands of American people fearfully believe that an enemy agent could board a Hoboken ferry toting the bomb in a zipper bag and blow Manhattan clear over into Brooklyn."

An enemy agent about the size of the legendary Paul Bunyan, strong man of the north woods, would find it a strain to carry the A-bomb fitting into the B-50 (No. 8117) on which I flew as supercargo. I don't say there aren't smaller bombs. But this type, which is the standard 1951 model, is a whopper.

BOMBER LOWERED OVER CARGO

It is towed out by tractor to the waiting, fueled B-50, all 10,000 pounds of it shrouded under canvas like a bulbous corpse. The big, 99-foot-long bomber has been lifted by its nose by a crane and rests back almost on its tail at an 18- or 20-degree angle. Ground crews surround "the thing" like ants and shove it on its easy-riding dolly under the belly of the bomber, just below the gaping bomb-bay doors.

The shrouds come off as the bomber is slowly lowered over its cargo by the crane which has held up its nose. A hydraulic lift draws the bomb up into its launching position in a supporting nest of four triangular braces. Big set screws are turned down by hand until the bomb is rigid in its carriage. Then the bomb-bay doors snap shut with force enough to cut a man in two.

And there on the airfield's concrete apron, her wings spanning 141 feet, lies this ominous silver-gray lady, pregnant and ready to deliver.

While the specifications of the bomb are classified, it is possible to describe it in general terms. I do not, in fact, know the exact specifications.

APPROXIMATELY 20 FEET LONG

The bomb, I believe, is approximately 20 feet long and 9 or 10 feet in diameter. It is about the bulk of an average-sized living room.

Unlike conventional bombs, this weapon is bulbous, not tear-dropped.

The men call it "the thing," or "the panic," the "ostrich egg," or just "the bomb."

A drenching rain slapped our faces as we left the briefing room of the Ninety-sixth Bombardment Squadron to board the 8117.

JETS FAILED TO PIERCE WEATHER

Above the storm, a crewman said: "Boy, what a beautiful night. Those damned fighters never will find us now." That was my first news that fighters would be out after us as we winged toward target X. The jets never got up. They were locked in by weather, that wonderful, awful weather.

Target X is a city. I cannot say what city. It is one of a number of cities closely approximating the characteristics of a Russian city or cities earmarked for attack if the United States Strategic Air Command ever has to make its great strike. The crew of the No. 8117 know now where it will go if R-day ever comes. The B-50, work horse of the strategic air command, and heavily armed, can bomb at 30,000 feet, traveling at 350 miles per hour in all kinds of weather.

Each B-50, equipped with atomic bombs is a bomber force in itself, by World War II standards. It packs the punch of a 500-plane raid. Under typical conditions, the B-50 travels alone to its target.

There are hundreds of these SAC work horses. I believe there are hundreds of bombs. There are also a few hundred of the "select" type of crew with which I flew, and several more hundreds only a little less skillful.

Inside the 8117, as we clambered on, it was like a superelectronic workshop; a maze of dials and instruments beyond imagining. Every man of the 10-man crew had a steady, excruciatingly detailed task.

We headed for target X and it was all business. These atomic-bomber men are not kids. They are in their late twenties and early thirties, most of them family men, and they are deadly serious. There is little of the kidding over the plane's intercom, as among the bombers of the last war. That "Thing" in the rear compartment has a sobering influence.

Target X was roughly 1,800 miles from the take-off. Later I looked on the maps and found that there are many bases available to the United States Air Force less than 1,300 miles from vital points in, let's say, Russia.

It was, they said, a routine flight. To me it was magic journey through a nether world of gray-green haze interspersed with violent storms.

WAS AUTOMATIC OPERATION

Tension increased as we approached target A. This was a full dress radar automatic operation.

As the target was approached, control of the great B-50 passed out of the hands of its pilots into the hands of our radar navigator. He was Major Sharpe, of Moran, Tex., 33-year-old father of a 3-year-old son and a 6-year-old daughter.

Major Sharpe is known among the crew as a "bad boy" because he has to sit in a corner. Directly before his eyes is the radar scope. On his right hand in the little corner is a fantastic panel of dials and meters. The same on his left hand.

The radar scope is Major Sharpe's eyes. He sees on it the pattern of the terrain over which 8117 is traveling. Its center is round, like a pie, and two lines mark out a wedge of the pie. Radio beams bounce against any metallic objects on the ground, and reflect back through night and storm to make the pattern on the radar scope. The wedge is important. When the two lines, closing like a pair of shears, come together, the A-bomb plunges out of the bomber's belly and heads for the target through the darkness of night or the gloom of the overcast.

As target X spread its points of light on the radar scope, Navigator-Bombardier Capt. Milton Timothy, 32, announced into the intercom: "Approaching I. P." This meant that the plane was approaching the initial point from which the bomb run would be made.

"Aircraft on gyro," said Maj. Leslie R. McKee, 31-year-old atomic commander of the 8117. "Radar bombardier in control." Major Sharpe now had control of the plane. He had become "Mr. Atomic." His job was to make adjustments in the automatic gyro-pilot control which would bring together the closing scissors blades on the radar scope and put the plane on its target. He was checked over the intercom by Captain Timothy in the nose of the plane, and as Major Sharpe became "Mr. Atomic," the flight engineer, Lt. Merle Bare, already busy at his controls, now became a human rheostat. Under his skilled hands, the ship had to maintain the exact speed and altitude to coincide with Major Sharpe's electronic and radar calculations.

Major McKee and Lieutenant Colonel Stengele, in the pilot's seats, sat and waited, all the while checking and rechecking the instrument panels before them—the true air speed, functioning of the engines, wind velocity, etc.

The story of these hushed 4 minutes was being told on a time gage before the eyes of Radar Navigator Sharpe and on the radar scope as the two lines came together. The time gage ticked off its last second and the lines came together at the same instant.

This was the instant of the A-bomb's release. Something over 40 seconds later it would have exploded over its target at the exact height for which it was set.

DIRECT HIT INDICATED

In this case 8117's lethal cargo was not dropped. If it had been, the plane, rid of its 5-ton burden, would have lurched forward and up. It would have been 4 to 6 miles away when the atomic blast came.

Radar impulses showed that this test run of the A-bomb discharge technique had scored a direct hit.

"How accurate are bomb drops," I asked. "Well," said one of the officers, "suppose you were the manager of a big strategic warehouse in the Urals. Suppose you had a ground-to-plane short wave. You might hear the buzzer, and it would be on your wavelength." And we would say, "Here's that A-bomb you ordered, Mr. Voronovsky. Do you want it on the front step or in the back yard?"

After we wheeled away from the target we headed for our refueling point. I wasn't prepared for the huge air tanker which appeared over us. The connecting link between the planes was actually fired from a boom gun into our plane's opened refueling hatch. We took on thousands of gallons of gasoline in such a routine fashion that it seemed like pulling up to a ground pump.

This operation has changed the whole nature of our strategic air attack.

General LeMay and his boys carry a terrific wallop. I am convinced there are also a good many bombs tucked away in some very convenient spots.

We wheeled back to the air base over water. It was a comfort to see through one break of the clouds a tiny green island below us with wide, shining concrete runway covering the length of it. This could be home some day for a crippled B-50.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Is an Age-Old Scheme That Is Not New to the American People

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway is one of the several New Deal hobbies inherited by the Fair Deal spenders that cannot be masquerraded as a defense emergency project, according to the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune in its issue of February 20, 1951.

The editorial follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SCHEME AGAIN

The old St. Lawrence seaway scheme, which bobbed up again in Mr. Truman's legislative carryall, reappeared briefly before the Mississippi Valley Association at its St. Louis meeting. A proposal to endorse it "in the interest of the national defense emergency" was promptly rejected and the association thereafter reaffirmed its opposition for reasons frequently stated and considered sound and sufficient by the country and Congress over a long term.

The only new talking point of its advocates was that presented at the St. Louis meeting—that the project's adoption would be "in the interest of the national defense emergency." Since it would require years for completion, the present defense emergency would be long gone before any aid from the St. Lawrence project could be available. And since material and labor costs have winged their way to a new and fantastic "high" since the diameter of the hole this St. Lawrence business would make in the National Treasury has been estimated carefully, most Americans feel that total cost, condemned as excessive years ago, would be practically prohibitive now when our Federal debt has attained cloud-touching proportions and the essential needs for defense must be supplied at a cost so prodigious that it worries all intelligent folks.

The St. Lawrence seaway scheme is one of the several New Deal hobbies inherited by the Fair Deal spenders that cannot be masqueraded as a defense emergency project. Congress, wrestling with the hugely difficult problem of financing our defense necessities, should lighten the overload by deleting the nonemergency items camouflaged into the administration's emergency spending plan to give it the appearance of another "squander spree." The costly St. Lawrence scheme is one of the obvious deletables.

Dean Gooderham Acheson Shifts His Stance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last November the Secretary of State directed his scornful remarks against Senator TAFT, who had demanded a reexamination of our foreign policy. A gale of public wrath is blowing the Secretary now, and he is conveniently shifting his stance, as Mr. Felix Morley points out in Barron's this week. Members are invited to read this important article which I shall insert at this point:

REEXAMINATION IS HERE—AS THE MACARTHUR TRIUMPH MOUNTS, MR. ACHESON SHIFTS HIS STANCE

(By Felix Morley)

Even before General MacArthur reached Washington the Truman administration was reeling under the impact of his triumph.

Last Wednesday night, as the Bataan was winging east from San Francisco, Secretary of State Acheson sought to patch some crumbling sections of his foreign policy. Speaking to the Women's National Press Club, the Secretary tried to make it appear that he welcomes what he euphemistically called "discussions" of his leadership.

"These discussions," said Mr. Acheson, "make up the national mind and focus the national will." Out of them "comes a national agreement upon conclusions, produced by the innate common sense of the American people when they have heard all sides and have come to the point of decision."

Listening to these fine phrases, some of the Secretary's audience pinched themselves, to be sure they were awake. It was recalled that only 5 months ago, on November 17, Mr. Acheson made his sarcastic reexaminist speech, directed at Senator TAFT's post-election statement that our foreign policy must be reexamined.

On November 17 Mr. Acheson retorted: "We need to look at this reexaminist and see what kind of a person he really is." The Secretary then compared him with a farmer, "who pulls up all his crops to see how they have done during the night." Having "put our hand to the plow," concluded Mr. Acheson, "does it make sense to say, 'I want to reexamine our programs?'"

Now Mr. Acheson answers that question in the affirmative. He says we have not yet "come to the point of decision." He agrees—belatedly now—that there is a great debate on foreign policy and says that reexaminists play an invaluable role therein.

Like Hamlet before him, Dean Gooderham Acheson knows a hawk from a handsaw when the wind of popular sentiment veers sharply. When it is blowing as strongly against those in office as is the case in this country today politicians accept what they cannot prevent. Secretary Acheson's job is in jeopardy. A recantation could save it, at least temporarily. So he too is thumbing a ride on the bandwagon of reexamination.

With General MacArthur's address to both Houses of Congress last Thursday this bandwagon really began to roll. For that address, noble in conception and beautiful in delivery, was also a deeply controversial document.

The former Supreme Commander in the Pacific told Congress that "the whole epicenter of world affairs" is rotating back to Asia. State Department policy has been based on the assumption that Western Europe is of far greater importance to the United States.

General MacArthur asserted that Chinese imperialism, rather than communism, is the immediate problem in Asia. This does not accord with present thinking in the Department of State.

General MacArthur never once mentioned the United Nations, acclaimed as the foundation stone of State Department policy. But the general did pointedly emphasize "the malicious gossip" which undermined the strength of Chiang Kai-shek. Most of the criticism thus characterized has emanated from, or has been inspired by, the Far Eastern Division of the Department of State.

The general further says flatly that "decisions in the diplomatic sphere" necessary to achieve a Korean settlement have not been made, and that his appeals for such decisions were distorted. It is the duty of the Department of State to make diplomatic decisions, and General MacArthur's charge of distortion cannot, in simple justice, be left unanswered.

Finally, the general asserts that the Joint Chiefs of Staff shared his viewpoint about both the strategy and tactics of the Korean campaign. To this the Department of Defense, on Thursday night, gave a strangely evasive reply, saying merely that the Joint Chiefs of Staff concurred in President Truman's decision to relieve MacArthur of his command. That is no answer to the point the general makes.

The cumulative importance of General MacArthur's assertions are given great political substance by the character of the receptions given him in San Francisco, Washington and New York. The old soldier himself may conceivably fade away, though at the moment it looks as though the fade-out will be very gradual, and is far from imminent. Regardless of his future as an individual, however, the issues MacArthur raised before Congress must be explored by Congress. And, as Secretary Acheson has been prompt to realize, they involve reexamination of a very searching nature.

This scrutiny, in the first place, will be in executive session, probably before the Senate Armed Services Committee sitting jointly with the Foreign Relations Committee. The hearings will, of course, involve detailed testimony from General MacArthur himself, but others are certain to be called.

It is already apparent that the inquiry will go back of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, to examine both the basis and the direction of our postwar policy toward China. General Marshall will have to take the witness stand again, not only as present Secretary of Defense but also as President Truman's special envoy to China in 1945–47.

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, whose report on Korea has never been made public, will be another expert witness. So, in all probability, will be Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, who early in 1945 so strongly resisted the proposals to furnish the Chinese Communists with American arms and money. There are several former and present officials of the Department of State who are likely to be questioned in this connection.

If the Republican plans work out, former Defense Secretary Louis Johnson will be another star witness. And, of course, Mr. Acheson will eventually be summoned to answer the MacArthur charges, and to fill in some of the omissions which are so glaring in the white book on China compiled by the Department of State nearly 2 years ago.

The nature of the public response to General MacArthur, as much as the controversial nature of his address to Congress, insures a thorough and overdue inquiry into the conduct of our far-eastern policy, from Yalta on. It is even suggested that Alger Hiss, as one of the original architects, should be temporarily released from the penitentiary to give evidence.

That acid proposal is on the extreme side. But it helps to illustrate the temper of some Members of Congress following the MacArthur address. Administration spokesmen admit that they have no hope of choking off the comprehensive reexamination now shaping up. Their efforts will be to justify, rather than to conceal, a record of which so much is still brushed under the rug.

The decision to have the coming hearings secret is undeniably wise. For some of the disclosures promise to be sensational and some of the testimony is certain to be bitter. And while it is vital for the public to know the background of our present troubles, too much distraction from the confrontation of those troubles as they stand today would be deplorable.

After all, we have an army fighting against great odds in Korea, and many other hostages to fortune that demand concentrated attention all around the globe.

Deceiving the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, what the American people demand is not only justice to them but also fair play and justice to our fighting forces in Korea. There is a unanimous sentiment on the part of the people throughout the United States in favor of the position taken by General MacArthur with reference to affairs in the Far East.

The people are in no mood for political trickery with the security of our Nation involved, and especially with the lives of our fighting forces who are now paying a heavy death toll for the Truman fiasco.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of April 26, 1951:

John O'Donnell in the New York Daily News provides the information which explains General MacArthur's statement to Congress that the measures he proposed for ending the Korean war in the shortest time and with minimum loss of life were fully shared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Pentagon did not reply to that statement. It merely stated that the Joint Chiefs joined with Mr. Truman's civilian advisers in supporting the dismissal of MacArthur.

APPEASEMENT PLANNED

Mr. O'Donnell makes clear why no reply is possible. He states that last January 12 the Joint Chiefs formally approved the military measures urged by MacArthur for bringing the war to a conclusion. MacArthur's report, with their endorsement, went to Secretary of Defense Marshall, General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, was then united in support of the MacArthur recommendations with General Collins, Army Chief of Staff; General Vandenberg, Air Force commander, and Admiral Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations.

"Marshall, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and—on their advice—President Harry Truman embalmed that MacArthur dispatch in deep official secrecy back 3 months ago," O'Donnell states. "The shameful reason was that Acheson and Marshall during those days were discussing with the British and French the idea of appeasing the Commies by turning over Formosa to the Red China regime, kicking the Nationalist China representative out of the U. N. to make way for a Kremlin satellite, and so preserve by paying blackmail British trade with Communist China, the crown colony of Hong Kong, and the tottering French colonial empire in Indochina."

As O'Donnell observes, the only security involved in the suppression of these facts is the political security of the Truman administration. This is another instance in which the New Dealers have endeavored to deceive the American people. It is of the same pattern as the calculated confusion and deceit employed to mask administration moves which brought down the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor.

Many other examples of resort to subterfuge and deception readily come to mind.

There was the wartime suppression of the dramatic story provided by Lt. Col. William E. Dyess of the death march on Bataan, in which Dyess was threatened with court martial if the facts were published. The administration's fear was that an outraged American public would demand, with a single voice, that it prosecute the neglected war in the Pacific with utmost energy to effect the speedy rescue of suffering American prisoners, instead of using the American war machine to abet British imperialism in Africa and further British aims in Europe.

CONSPIRACY STILL EXISTS

The administration still is in conspiracy with England. It used to allot its favors impartially between the English and the Russian imperialists, as in the days when Alger Hiss was planted in Roosevelt's State Department, when Roosevelt himself was making fantastic concessions to Stalin, and, later, when the Achesons, Lattimores, and Services were joined with General Marshall in selling China into Communist hands.

British control of our State Department, through Acheson, is no disfavor to Stalin. England, placing its Asiatic possessions and trade above honor, leads the United Nations in the efforts to appease communism. General MacArthur was sacrificed to the English, but in Moscow the removal of the foremost antagonist of communism has caused rejoicing equal to that in London.

Any pretense that secrecy is justified in relation to the administration's scandalous treatment of General MacArthur is cockeyed. In an administration as hospitable to foreign influence as Truman's, and as leaky of secrets, both Russia and England have access to all of our information of every kind. Only Americans are kept in ignorance.

We Must Put Freedom First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, edited by an outstanding figure in American journalism, Maj. Frederick Sullens:

WE MUST PUT FREEDOM FIRST

Within very recent weeks the American people have taken some urgently needed steps to avert present danger; steps showing that as a Nation we now know, deep in our hearts, that we have never been in greater peril; steps showing that at long last we are facing up to the central fact of our time. We face the fact that the Soviet Union—in its drive for world conquest—threatens the security of our homes and even our very hopes for the future.

One proof that we are emerging from both our historic isolationism and from our complacency is that the Congress the other day passed an unprecedented measure authorizing the sending of American troops to Western Europe for the purpose of assisting the free nations of that area in their defense against any possible Soviet onslaught.

So much, then, to our credit. Yet it remains to be seen whether we recognize the full extent of our danger, how pressing it is, and how intense it is. Certainly we haven't yet made our position clear on three issues of transcendent importance.

First of all, while the Congress has made tremendous appropriations for preparedness, they have not yet leveled those extra taxes that will enable us to come close to a pay-as-we-go fiscal policy. Yet unless there is willingness on the part of the Congress to impose and willingness on our part as taxpayers to accept the hardship of those taxes today, we cannot expect that tomorrow we can control or even arrest a serious inflation—an inflation that would destroy our ability to build up our own military might, since it would sap the economic health and vitality upon which our military might be based.

The masters of the Kremlin would like nothing better than to see us wreck our economy through uncontrolled inflation. This would be for them the cheapest of all victories. Moreover, a serious inflation in the United States would swiftly make itself felt throughout the entire free world. It would, for example, nullify one of the Marshall plan's major accomplishments—the defeat of inflation in Western Europe. In 1948, financial chaos prevailed in most Marshall plan nations. Today they have reached financial stability. That stability would be shattered if American prices continued to climb. Further increases would threaten Europe's economic recovery and its own rearmament program. This would be another very cheap victory for the Communists. A conquest at no cost.

In the second place, if we are to act as if we were genuinely aware of our danger, we must have national unity not as a lip-service platitude but as a working reality. Lack of unity is an enemy within, a sixth column, sowing doubt and confusion and even paralysis. One practical test of our unity is the kind of backing we give to General Eisenhower in his immensely difficult and delicate job of unifying the military defenses of the Western World. And let's not forget that if he succeeds in his great task in Europe he will be helping immeasurably to bring us in America security and relief from crisis spending.

Another practical test is the backing we give to General Ridgway in his new post as commander in chief of the forces of the United Nations in Korea. His is a tough task and the fate of thousands, of tens of thousands of American boys, depends on how well he meets it. We must not let even honest differences of views as to the action in dismissing General MacArthur embarrass General Ridgway because if it does, if there is a let-down of morale on the fighting front because of quarreling on the home front the cost will be reckoned in blood.

Another practical test as to our unity is in the field of foreign policy. If our foreign policy is to be effective, the Republican and Democratic Parties must cooperate, must move forward together toward a common goal. When we Americans address ourselves to the world we must speak as the voice of the Nation and not as that of a single party. We must rise above partisanship. The vote of every Senator and Congressman should register his individual conception as an American rather than as a Republican or a Democrat. There should be no such thing as a Republican foreign policy or a Democratic foreign policy. There should be only an American foreign policy, which in turn must be in tune with the foreign policies of all of our friends and allies who are sharing with us the hard and difficult task of thrusting back Communist imperialism, whether in Europe, southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, or South America.

Central to that foreign policy is a recognition of the interdependence of the free world. In resources, material, intellectual and spiritual, the free nations as a group have an overwhelming advantage over the Soviets and their satellites. The problem is one of mobilizing of those resources. Some of the resources of the free world are located in underdeveloped areas. That is one reason why we should help the people in these areas to help themselves. But there is a more compelling reason. These people yearn for a life in which there is some dignity and some comfort. The Communists promise them such a life. They are not interested in communism as an ideology—only those things which communism falsely promises. Actually they ask for little and need little; better seeds for better crops; some fertilizer; a steel plow in place of a stick. If through a sensibly and economically operating program of the foreign aid we can continue to win friends and help strengthen the free world, we will have made an investment which will pay off magnificently. Benjamin Franklin said it a long time ago—but it is worth recalling now: "We must all hang together or assuredly we will all hang separately."

In the third place, if we are genuinely aware of the fact that the chips are really down in this conflict now going on between the free world and the Kremlin, we will again bring up for early consideration the enactment of a law establishing universal military service. It is the one move in the period immediately ahead that will insure not only an adequate pool of trained military manpower but also keep the cost of our defense establishment at a figure which we can live with. Right now the average American private is paid about $3.80 a day plus allowances for dental care and the like. Make no mistake about it. He needs it. He earns all of it. And as long as we keep on drafting men who are the sole support of young wives and other dependents, we should continue the present rate of pay.

But we won't have to draft men in their middle twenties, men who have already served their country, if universal military service is adopted. Not only that, but it is only through universal military service that we can build up a defensive strength so impregnable that it can hold off Communistic aggression. You know how it would work. At the age of about 18 all male Americans—meaning all regardless of their I. Q.—before they have assumed family obligations, would go into Armed Forces training establishments for, say, a 2-year hitch. They would be given good care and food and clothing, enough pay for incidental expenses, perhaps a dollar a day. By the way, a Turkish officer gets a dollar a month. At the end of the training period our men would be released from their boot camps or air bases or cantonments. They could return to their jobs or they could continue their schooling. At the same time they would become members of a well-trained Reserve whose very existence would eventually enable us to reduce

the size of our standing Army. This training for war in time of peace or even in time of a so-called localized war such as the one now going on in Korea does not come easily to us Americans. We are antimilitaristic by instinct. However, we can manage to survive only if we recognize the scope of the catastrophe that awaits us if we fail to do everything, no matter how unpleasant and painful, that we can do to make and keep ourselves strong.

We have always known that to win a war we had to wage war with boldness, vigor, and above all a sense of dedication, but we have not wrapped our minds around the fact that to win a peace we must wage peace with boldness, vigor, and above all a sense of dedication. If we are willing to take that fact to heart and wage peace in that manner and on the same four fronts—the military, political, economical, and psychological—the Kremlin is waging its cold war, the Soviets haven't a chance to win either a cold war or a hot war.

And we can be sure that if the Kremlin thinks it hasn't got a chance to win a hot war, it isn't going to start one. If we are mature enough and have stamina and staying power enough to go the entire course, we can confidently expect that—within the next decade or less—we will not only have thrust back the present danger, but also will have laid the groundwork for the first durable peace with freedom that men have ever known.

Press Misleads Public on Views of the Vatican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many pro-Trumanites in their desperate effort to justify the President's dismissal of General MacArthur tried to make the public believe that the Vatican endorsed the President's action.

The fact is that one Giorgio Luigi Bernucci, an Italian news columnist, merely expressed his own personal views about the President's action in a column which appeared in Osservatore Romano, a newspaper published in the Vatican City.

Little publicity, however, was given to the statement of the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service which explained this fact.

I include here the following article which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet, a Catholic weekly, April 21, 1951:

PRESS MISLEADS PUBLIC ON VIEWS OF THE VATICAN—QUOTES OSSERVATORE WRITER ON GENERAL MACARTHUR AND DRAWS FALSE CONCLUSION—HEADINGS PROVED HOAX—COLUMNIST DOES NOT REPRESENT PAPER'S VIEWS; NOR IS PAPER OFFICIAL

At least one press association, many daily newspapers and many broadcasting stations caused confusion among the public last Sunday. The issue related to President Truman's ousting of General MacArthur.

First page headlines in one daily asserted "Vatican paper backs Truman step in MacArthur case as aid to peace," another stated the Pope had decided against MacArthur, while some radio commentators—Drew Pearson, to mention one—said the Vatican backed the dismissal of the general.

The Associated Press was responsible for most of the misleading dispatch from Rome, which said that "the MacArthur case was removed from the international plane to one essentially domestic by the dismissal, said the Vatican newspaper, which usually reflects the opinion of Pope Pius XII. The newspaper noted that President Truman's decision might even be against his own popularity."

This first comment on the issue in Osservatore Romano was written by Giorgio Luigi Bernucci.

It then quoted Bernucci as stating the President was right and the general wrong. In the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune Bernucci was called an editorial writer, but in the Daily News and other papers he was referred to as a news commentator.

SERVES AS COLUMNIST

The facts in the case are that:

1. Neither the Pope, the Vatican, or Osservatore Romano expressed any opinion on the ousting of General MacArthur.

2. Count Bernucci is merely a columnist on Osservatore and his observations are only his own.

3. Osservatore is not the official organ of the Vatican save when it carries an official Vatican pronouncement which is labeled official.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service on Wednesday issued a brief statement on the misrepresentation. It follows:

"Over last week end there appeared in Osservatore Romano an article making reference to the removal of General MacArthur. The article expressed the opinion that the dismissal of the general could be regarded as a step indicating a desire for world peace.

"General press accounts said that Osservatore Romano itself had made these observations and reference was made to editorial comment by Osservatore Romano.

"Osservatore Romano, while published in Vatican City, is not the official organ of the Vatican, except to the extent that from time to time it runs a column containing official Vatican pronouncements, always under the same heading, so that those familiar with the paper know that unless the material appears under this heading, it is not official.

"Actually the MacArthur comment was contained in an article which appears regularly twice a week in Osservatore Romano and is written by Giorgio Luigi Bernucci.

"This regular article does not contain Vatican official views, but the views of the writer. It is headed Acta Diurna, and undertakes to review various news developments around the world. We are informed that in this instance, definitely the comment on the MacArthur case was the writer's own, and does not necessarily represent the views of Osservatore itself."

The Woolen and Worsted Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

BOSTON OFFICE,
TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass., April 18, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: Enclosed is copy of letter sent to Senator MAYBANK by our Research Director Solomon Barkin, which is self-explanatory. I believe that after you have had the opportunity of reading it, including the analyses of the machinery in the United States, you will agree that the granting of exemptions as mentioned is most discriminatory, especially in view of the present conditions prevailing in the woolen and worsted industry and, particularly, as it exists in Massachusetts at the present time.

I know you will be keenly interested in this matter because of the prominent position that woolen and worsted mills have in the Commonwealth.

May I hear from you regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

J. WILLIAM BELANGER,
Director.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., April 16, 1951.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Joint Committee on Defense Production,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: We are very much interested in the hearings now being held before your committee on the provision for accelerated depreciation privileges to industries. Our attention has been drawn to a grant of a certificate of necessity to manufacturers in the woolen and worsted industry, where we are sure this privilege should never have been extended. The granting of this exemption represents a violation of every principle announced hitherto as a guide for the review of applications for this special tax benefit.

It is reported that the Peerless Woolen Co., of Rossville, Ga., and the woolen plant of the Hardwick Woolen Mills, of Cleveland, Tenn., both owned by the Hutcheson family, have been granted tax benefits for the construction of plants valued at $4,213,000. The benefit is reported as 60 percent of the cost of these installations. These plants are reported as being designed for the production of melton, kersey, and flannel fabrics.

The benefit cannot be justified as necessary under the regulations issued by President Truman. While these woolen fabrics are required for national defense, there is no shortage of facilities for the production of these materials for national defense.

The woolen and worsted industry now has sufficient capacity to take care of all possible military and civilian needs. Most woolen mills in this industry are prepared to manufacture the three types of fabrics. The construction of these new facilities will only increase the degree of overcapacity in the industry and thereby reduce the opportunities for full and continued employment at existing facilities. The unevenness of employment at the present time, even with the available Government contracts, makes the construction of further facilities with Government aid of highly dubious value. It will undermine sound competition.

The degree of available capacity is illustrated by the attached table, representing the operations in the industry for the last 13 months. It indicates that only about 80 percent of the woolen-spinning spindles and 85 percent of the broadlooms for the weaving of the woolen fabrics are now actually operating. The operating woolen-spinning spindles are running 86 percent of a full 40-hour week. The operating woolen and

worsted broadlooms are now running 88 percent of a full 40-hour week on the first shift. The second-shift woolen spindles are only running three-quarters as well as the first shift and the third shift only one-third as much as the first shift. In the case of the looms, the second shift is running only 90 percent as well as the first shift and the third shift only 40 percent as well. The large unused capacity and the idle mills in the industry can be utilized for military production without the addition of new production capacity.

This exemption is ill-advised and injurious to the well-being of the woolen and worsted industry. It will cause further loss of opportunities of employment to the workers already in the industry and create a demand for new workers who may be more properly used for more urgent military production. Your committee should analyze this case immediately and seek to develop a policy wherein such ill-considered action by a governmental agency is not permitted to occur.

Sincerely yours,

SOLOMON BARKIN.

Machinery use in relation to capacity—woolen and worsted industry, January 1950 to January 1951

A. WOOLEN SPINNING SPINDLE—WOOLEN MILLS

Period	Spindles			Weekly hours machinery operated		
	In place	In operation	In operation percent of in place	Percent first shift operated of 40 hours	Percent hours operated of first shift	
					Second shift	Third shift
1950—January	1,157,095	887,022	76.7	83.4	70.0	33.2
February	1,155,159	876,183	75.8	87.5	71.4	34.0
March	1,147,311	876,372	76.4	83.2	76.6	34.5
April	1,144,829	871,322	76.1	87.8	76.0	36.7
May	1,144,057	866,773	75.8	91.2	76.9	36.2
June	1,139,057	919,512	80.7	88.0	73.8	38.6
July	1,137,531	930,120	81.8	80.8	73.0	36.9
August	1,122,225	925,704	82.8	97.7	75.1	39.6
September	1,121,576	916,097	81.1	90.3	73.5	40.1
October	1,098,819	895,264	81.5	95.4	76.0	43.4
November	1,095,360	870,332	80.1	84.1	73.0	34.8
December	1,076,776	842,116	78.2	85.7	72.4	34.3
1951—January	1,066,482	848,467	79.6	86.7	75.1	35.7

B. BROADLOOMS

Period	Looms			Weekly hours machinery operated		
	In place	In operation	In operation percent of in place	Percent first shift operated of 40 hours	Percent hours operated of first shift	
					Second shift	Third shift
1950—January	34,578	27,546	79.7	88.8	86.7	34.0
February	34,724	27,192	78.3	89.6	87.7	34.8
March	34,655	27,096	78.2	90.6	87.8	35.0
April	34,584	26,877	77.7	90.4	88.4	36.3
May	34,536	27,174	78.7	89.5	86.8	37.6
June	34,502	27,719	80.3	88.6	84.8	38.6
July	34,473	27,704	80.4	78.2	85.8	37.9
August	34,219	28,006	81.8	94.7	87.2	39.8
September	34,234	28,748	84.0	89.4	88.8	40.3
October	33,812	28,675	84.8	95.2	89.1	40.0
November	33,667	28,537	84.8	90.1	89.5	38.3
December	33,546	28,025	83.5	86.8	90.7	38.6
1951—January	33,165	27,870	84.0	87.7	90.3	39.7

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce; Facts for Industry—Wool Manufactures.

Tragic Disunity in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence in the Washington Star of Wednesday, April 25:

TRAGIC DISUNITY IN GOVERNMENT—LACK OF LEADERSHIP IS OBSTACLE TO COOPERATION EVEN BETWEEN ELEMENTS WHICH FAVOR SAME WORLD POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

The state of disorganization and disunity in the American Government today is indescribably tragic.

The lack of leadership is a manifest obstacle to cooperation even between those elements which favor the same international policy. The White House has failed signally to keep foreign policy out of politics and has accentuated a deep cleavage between the two major parties.

For, whether President Truman intended it or not, he has, in effect, decreed that the minority party in America must be prevented from knowing the facts about the Government and particularly the facts about our war operations.

Though it will be repeatedly denied, the truth is that the principal offense of General MacArthur was in answering a letter from Republican leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN. Apparently members of the armed services hereafter must not answer any letters from Congress except those from Democrats.

Two Democratic Senators—DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and LEHMAN, of New York—take the position that the letter which General MacArthur wrote in answer to one from Representative MARTIN was an act of military insubordination and was in disregard of the civil authority of the United States.

This is a strange view for two men to express who are supposed to be liberals and who spend a good deal of their time denouncing the Hitler and Stalin concept of a single political party. Evidently as Senator DOUGLAS told his constituents, General MacArthur had no right to reply to Mr. MARTIN'S request for his views. Senator LEHMAN cites the letter to MARTIN specifically as a ground for dismissal of MacArthur and says thus the "civil authority was challenged."

Evidently the Congress of the United States is not a civil authority—or at least the Republican Party isn't a part of it. Yet in Korea the sons of Republicans are being killed, just as are the sons of Democrats.

There is no hope for unity when two important Senators adopt the view that it is a violation of the military code of the United States to communicate with Members of Congress who happen to be in the minority party and for the latter to make public the letters they write—not on military details, but on broad policy questions.

The letter to Representative MARTIN was a routine answer to what appeared to be a routine inquiry. General MacArthur had said the same things publicly many times before and also in his official reports. But because the press emphasized the incident, President Truman chose to make an issue of it, though he could just as well have ignored the affair and sent for MacArthur so as to argue out the differences, if possible, in a personal conference.

What is more serious is that there are influential members of the Democratic Party who actually believe that America today is and must be governed by a single person. They include in the power of the Presidency the right to stifle discussion and they insist, in effect, that members of the armed services are not to be permitted to say anything publicly which is at variance with the party line as proclaimed by the President or his advisers.

If the minority party has any assertiveness at all, it will accept the challenge and bring the real issue to the attention of the country. It concerns the fundamental right of the American people to get the truth of what is happening in the making of public policy.

The American people do not even know how MacArthur was dismissed and by whose recommendation. An effort has been made to give the impression that the Joint Chiefs did it. Actually Messrs. Acheson, Rusk, and Harriman—the foreign-policy command—are primarily responsible for influencing the President to fire MacArthur forthwith. When the congressional committees put every member of the Joint Chiefs on the stand, as they inevitably must, they will learn that there is no record of military insubordination and that differences of policy alone led to the political decision by Mr. Truman to make a change in command in the Far East.

It is because the Democrats have insisted on distorting the issue and have continually tried to pin a warmonger label on General MacArthur—very much as the Communists do to most Americans nowadays—that the bitterness on Capitol Hill is increasing instead of diminishing.

The National School Lunch Program in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following letter and report from the Rt. Rev. Cornelius T. H. Sherlock, diocesan superintendent of schools, archdiocese of Boston, Mass.:

ARCHDIOCESE OF BOSTON,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Boston, Mass., April 23, 1951.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I am enclosing an opinion which has been issued by the attorney general's office here in Massachusetts and which, I believe, is of considerable importance. I shall be grateful if you find it convenient to read it, then perhaps file it for use when the occasion may arise.

With every best wish, I am

Yours most sincerely,
Rt. Rev. CORNELIUS T. H. SHERLOCK,
Diocesan Superintendent of Schools.

MARCH 26, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. DESMOND, Jr.,
Commissioner of Education.

DEAR SIR: You have requested my opinion as to whether the forty-sixth article of amendment of the Constitution of Massachusetts prohibits the board of education of the Commonwealth from entering into an agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States governing the operations of the national school-lunch program in Massachusetts.

You have asked two specific questions which are phrased as follows:

I. "Does the board of education have the authority to agree to section 5, of the proposed Federal-State agreement for the benefit of children attending nonprofit private schools as well as public schools in the Commonwealth?"

II. "Would it be permissible for the Commonwealth to expend moneys appropriated or authorized to be appropriated by the Commonwealth in providing lunches for children attending nonprofit private schools as well as public schools in accordance with the proposed Federal-State agreement, governing the operation of a school-lunch program in Massachusetts under the provisions of the National School Lunch Act?"

In answer to question number 1, it may be pointed out that section 5 of the proposed agreement follows the provisions of section 7 of the National School Lunch Act relating to the apportionment and payment of funds to the various States.

The authority of the board of education to represent the Commonwealth in carrying out the provisions of the act was delegated by the legislature by statute 1948, chapter 548, page 1, which reads as follows:

"The board of education is hereby designated as the 'State educational agency' to represent the Commonwealth in dealing with the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States in carrying out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act as enacted into law on June 4, 1946."

The National School Lunch Act clearly contemplates that the State educational agencies designated in the several States shall in general enter into such agreements not only for the benefit of children attending public schools, but also for the benefit of children attending nonprofit private schools within the States as well.

The question has previously been raised, however, whether the educational agency so designated in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts could in conformity with amendment XLVI of the Constitution of Massachusetts disburse Federal funds apportioned to the Commonwealth under the National School Lunch Act to nonprofit private schools as well as public schools within the Commonwealth.

This question was answered in the affirmative in 1947 Opinion Attorney General, page 17. See also 1943 Opinion Attorney General, page 74.

It would appear that no novel constitutional question is raised in question No. I. My answer to that question is in the affirmative.

In answer to question No. II, I submit the following:

The forty-sixth article of amendment of the Constitution of Massachusetts, section 2, reads as follows:

"All moneys raised by taxation in the towns and cities for the support of public schools, and all moneys which may be appropriated by the Commonwealth for the support of common schools shall be applied to, and expended in, no other schools than those which are conducted according to law, under the order and superintendence of the authorities of the town or city in which the money is expended; and no grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized by the Commonwealth or any political division thereof for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any school or institution of learning, whether under public control or otherwise, wherein any denominational doctrine is inculcated, or any other school, or any college, infirmary, hospital, institution, or educational, charitable, or religious undertaking, which is not publicly owned and under the exclusive control, order and superintendence of public officers or public agents authorized by the Commonwealth or Federal authority or both, except that appropriations may be made for the maintenance and support of the Soldiers' Home in Massachusetts and for free public libraries in any city or town, and to carry out legal obligations, if any, already entered into; and no such grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or society."

An analogous question arose heretofore in 1936 in Massachusetts under a proposed act entitled "An act providing that pupils in parochial schools shall be entitled to transportation to and from said schools in the same manner as pupils in public schools," and also under a proposed act entitled "An act providing for the transportation of parochial and private school pupils to and from school" in 1936. In an opinion given by the Attorney General at that time it was said:

"The intended benefit sought by the proposed legislation, upon which you seek my opinion, is a benefit intended for children attending parochial and other private schools, as distinguished from a benefit intended for the schools themselves. * * * The end sought by the legislation has no relation whatever to the founding, maintaining or supporting of private schools. * * *

"I am therefore of opinion that there is no constitutional objection to either." (1936 Op. Atty. Gen. 40).

With this opinion I agree.

Similar reasoning decided the almost identical problem when it was presented in *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (330 U. S. 1), decided February 10, 1947. That case dealt with a situation where a New Jersey statute authorized its local school districts to make rules and contracts for the transportation of children to and from schools by bus. The town acted pursuant to this statute, reimbursing certain parents for bus transportation of their children to parochial schools. It was contended that this violated both the State and Federal Constitutions. The New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals held that the statute violated neither the State nor Federal Constitution. On further appeal the United States Supreme Court, affirming, said of the practice of furnishing transportation to children attending religious schools, at page 17:

"Moreover, State-paid policemen, detailed to protect children going to and from church schools from the very real hazards of traffic, would serve much the same purpose and accomplish much the same result as State provisions intended to guarantee free transportation of a kind which the State deems to be best for the school children's welfare. And parents might refuse to risk their children to the serious danger of traffic accidents going to and from parochial schools, the approaches to which were not protected by policemen. Similarly, parents might be reluctant to permit their children to attend schools which the State had cut off from general government services as ordinary police and fire protection, connections for sewage disposal, public highways and sidewalks. Of course, cutting off church schools from these services, so separate and so indisputably marked off from the religious function, would make it far more difficult for the schools to operate. But such is obviously not the purpose of the first amendment. That amendment requires the State to be a neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and nonbelievers; it does not require the State to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them."

And further, the court said at page 18:

"The State contributes no money to the schools. It does not support them. Its legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools."

A similar matter arose in Louisiana where the issue was whether an act of the State of Louisiana which authorized the State to purchase books for school children, including private school students as well as those attending the public schools, was constitutional. In upholding the act the Louisiana court said:

"The appropriations were made of the specific purpose of purchasing school books for the use of the school children of the State, free of cost to them. It was for their benefit and the resulting benefit to the State that the appropriations were made. True, these children attend some school, public or private, the latter, sectarian or nonsectarian, and that the books are to be furnished them for their use, free of cost, whichever they attend. The schools, however, are not the beneficiaries of these appropriations. They obtain nothing from them, nor are they relieved of a single obligation, because of them. The school children and the State alone are the beneficiaries.

These words of the Louisiana court were set forth verbatim in the opinion of the United States Supreme Court in *Cochran* v. *Board of Education* (281 U. S. 370), which affirmed the Louisiana opinion that the purchase of school books for private school children out of State funds was not unconstitutional.

The cases above cited constitute a class of cases generally recognized today as matters incidental to the private-school education of children, with reference to which the State may exercise the appropriation power without violation of any constitutional mandate. Appropriations to insure the safety of school children in journeying to and from private as well as public schools are held to fall within the domain of the public safety; appropriations for the furnishing of adequate school books to school children in private schools as well as public schools are recognized as part and parcel of the public program of education. Inescapably it follows that the national school-lunch program, embracing private as well as public-school children, is a vital part of the Nation's public-health program. Private-school children, equally with public-school children, are entitled to share in the benefits of such programs designed to advance the public welfare.

The benefit is a benefit obtained by the children as distinguished from a benefit to the schools. The schools do not receive any aid or support. The fact that the money is paid to the school as reimbursement, after the school submits its vouchers and necessary papers for its expenditures, is of no consequence. The vital point is that the school is only a conduit of funds benefiting the pupil. Mere reimbursement of the school for funds expended in furnishing lunches to its pupils is not aid to the school itself as distinguished from the pupils. The school treasury is not benefited or increased in any way, nor is this in any manner support or maintenance of private educational institutions out of public moneys as prohibited by the Massachusetts Constitution, amendment XLVI.

I therefore answer your second question in the affirmative.

Very truly yours,
FRANCIS E. KELLY,
Attorney General.

The Late Arthur H. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as an extension of my remarks two editorials from outstanding Mississippi newspapers eulogizing the late great Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

They are A Statesman Gone, from the Greenville Delta Democrat-Times, and Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, United States Patriot and Statesman, from the Jackson Clarion-Ledger:

[From the Delta Democrat-Times, Greenville, Miss.]

A STATESMAN GONE

In the death of United States Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Michigan, Republican, the Nation is mourning the loss of one of its ablest and most efficient statesmen.

His death came when one of his dreams, the North Atlantic Pact, was becoming a reality, and another of his dreams, world amity lay shattered in the acrimonious debate over the MacArthur-Truman episode.

The 67-year-old GOP leader, who was revered by Democrats, too, died in his sleep from a malignant tumor which he had ignored in his intensive efforts in behalf of the Atlantic Pact.

Had his health not failed, he would have easily been the Republican candidate for the Presidency and belief is general that he would have won the election hands down, for none there was to dispute his ability as an outstanding statesman of modern times.

An Arthur Vandenberg as President of the United States would have advanced the cause of universal cooperation many decades, and raised the tobogganing prestige of this Nation many notches.

All the Nation, therefore, feels his loss keenly.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger]

SENATOR ARTHUR VANDENBERG, UNITED STATES PATRIOT AND STATESMAN

It is doubly tragic, and a double loss to the Nation, that Senator Arthur Vandenberg's death should have occurred at the height of a crisis and a controversy which show the Nation, both the people and their representatives in Washington, to be more evenly and more bitterly divided on foreign policy than ever before.

Senator Arthur Vandenberg had not been able to participate in Senate sessions for more than a year before he died Wednesday. But his voice could still be heard from his sickbed, and his wise and patriotic counsel was available to his colleagues and to the administration.

Death has silenced that voice. Death has blocked any further extension of that wise counsel. Death removes from the United States Senate one of the Nation's few veritable statesmen, and paves the way, perhaps, for the seating of one more partisan politician.

Senator Vandenberg's stature as a statesman was recognized by the Nation. It was recognized and respected by the leaders of his Republican Party, including those who conscientiously and consistently disagreed with him on many fundamental questions. Only the shallow-minded, the violently partisan, and the irresponsible ever ridiculed Senator Vandenberg's knowledge of foreign affairs, his opinions, or his abilities. And his sincerity was unquestioned.

Senator Vandenberg was almost entirely responsible for the degree to which bipartisan support of the Nation's foreign policy, and bipartisan participation in its shaping, was obtained during the past four critical years. He was, for example, largely responsible for Senate approval of the North Atlantic Pact, which would probably have been rejected but for his efforts and influence.

In this new and exceedingly grave crisis and controversy over global foreign policy in general and policy regarding the Far East in particular, the great Republican statesman's influence and counsel will be sorely missed. The Nation needs it more than ever before.

For it still is true, as he contended last January in urging essential unity in facing the Communist threat: "We cannot stand a deadlock in foreign policy until 1952. Many patriots hold divergent views, but we must strive for the greatest possible meeting of loyal minds as swiftly as possible. This is the way to stop a war, or win it."

We hope that this appeal and warning echoes often in the Senate, sounds clearly above the partisan clamor, above all the political fuss, and fustian, above the contentions of the extremists and the ranting of the demagogues, as the United States Senate debates the issues and reaches the decisions on which our Nation's survival may depend.

Meantime, the Nation honors and mourns a patriot and a statesman, Arthur Vandenberg, Michigan Republican, but an American first of all.

Did Truman-Acheson Pass Back to MacArthur?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann entitled "Agreement and Disclosure." In his searching analysis of the controversy between Truman and MacArthur he points out some interesting facts and raises important questions. I commend it to the attention of all Members:

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE

If, as the earlier reports indicate, the expected Communist offensive has now begun, it is reassuring to find that General MacArthur's view of the outcome is in agreement with that of the Pentagon. They are agreed in thinking that the offensive can be contained in the central region of Korea. "We could hold in Korea," said General MacArthur only last week in his address to Congress, "by constant maneuver and at an approximate area where our supply line advantages were in balance with the supply line disadvantages of the enemy. * * *"

There is agreement also, we may be sure, with his view that though the offensive can be contained we can "hope at best for only an indecisive campaign with its horrible and constant attrition upon our forces if the enemy utilized his full military potential."

The disagreement begins only after the general and the Pentagon have agreed that, while we can defeat the offensive, we cannot by limited war obtain a military victory. The Pentagon, as General Bradley has made clear, prefers a military stalemate to the risks of seeking victory by removing the limitations on the war. General MacArthur prefers the risks of an unlimited war to an indecisive campaign of attrition.

The disagreement is not, therefore, about the battle which is now being fought. Assuming, of course, that the Soviet Government does not intervene directly or indirectly in far greater force than it has thus far, all are agreed in believing that the present battle will be a defensive success, but that it can be no more than that. The generals could all be mistaken, but, if they are mistaken, all the generals will be mistaken together. There is no dispute among them about the present battle. All of them in a position of command—the Joint Chiefs, General MacArthur, General Ridgway, and General Van Fleet—are publicly on record that our main position in central Korea can be held and the offensive stopped, and that this can be done—unless the enemy is heavily reinforced by the Soviets—without taking controversial measures which would expand the war beyond Korea.

The story by Mr. Anthony Leviero, of the New York Times, about what happened at the Wake Island conference on October 15 is an extraordinary disclosure—all the more extraordinary because of what it reveals about the attitude of the President, who must have approved giving Mr. Leviero access to the highly classified documents. Its extraordinary disclosure, I submit, is that the President thinks he can hold General MacArthur responsible for our being surprised by the Chinese intervention in Korea.

Mr. Leviero's story says, "President Truman, as the 10 conferees sat in the aviation hut, asked General MacArthur about the possibilities of Chinese or Russian intervention. General MacArthur said he saw little chance of this." The serious aspect of this is not that General MacArthur was mistaken in his judgment about the intentions of two foreign powers. The serious thing is that the President relied on the judgment of the general in a matter which belongs squarely within the responsibility of the Department of State.

It was Secretary Acheson who was responsible for advising the President as to the intentions of China. It was Secretary Acheson who had daily contact with all the diplomats and with all the information services of this and the other governments that had any

access to Peiping and to Moscow. At Wake Island the President should not have been the one who asked General MacArthur to decide whether China would intervene. He should have been the one who told General MacArthur what his and his Secretary of State's judgment was on this critical point.

General MacArthur's comment on the matter is very interesting indeed. It was in the statement given out for him by his military secretary, General Whitney, on Saturday: "The question was basically a political one, involving decisions made in Peiping and quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's field intelligence * * * as far as I know neither the State Department nor higher intelligence agencies of the Government had the slightest evidence to warn of such a decision. Certainly no such warnings were given to MacArthur. To the contrary, all appeared to discount the possibility of such intervention at that stage."

If this charge can be sustained in the coming investigation, it will throw much light on the crack-up. For it will show how the President and his Secretary of State encouraged, indeed invited, General MacArthur to assume responsibilities which, though not his responsibilities, but their responsibilities they were failing to meet.

The investigation will also make clear that if at Wake Island in October the question of Chinese intervention was basically a political one and quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's field intelligence, then today the question of Soviet intervention and whether the general's recommendations to Congress would bring on world war III is also basically a political one and quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's field intelligence.

Truman Reaping the Whirlwind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some people are not disposed to be overcharitable toward Mr. Truman's removal of General MacArthur; note the following:

Mrs. Walter H. Jensen, of Sioux City, Iowa, unloaded her feelings on President Truman, and was kind enough to send along a copy of the telegram to me. Here it is:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since you believe in firing those who do not see eye to eye with you in the way to settle the Korean situation, please fire my son, Marine Pfc. W. I. Jensen, 667061, FPO, San Francisco, Calif.

"He is one of your so-called Marine policemen. He doesn't see any sense in going to Korea, maybe to die if the source of supply for the Commies is left intact. Out here in these parts we don't kill rattlesnakes by stepping on their tails. Maybe you think my loss and grief will be less if he dies in your 'contained' war than if he dies fighting an all-out war on the Commies.

"Please recall Walter at once as he doesn't believe in your and Dean Acheson's method of fighting Commies. Incidentally, my son was a Marine reservist in his second year of prelaw college when you called him up in October, with no delay for him to finish the semester, no tests to gain deferment. He just went in when he was called.

"If my only child dies, don't try to ease your conscience and send me any medals. Since you are an old artillery officer you know what you can do with them. And get Dean Acheson to help you.

"I send this with full knowledge that you are Commander in Chief, but also a vindictive man. But go ahead and dish it out. My son is a Marine and can take anything a former Army artillery officer can dish out. I just read a magazine article about what a good hater you are. I am a good hater, too. I wouldn't vote for you again for an $8,000 pastel-blue mink coat.

"Yours, until next election.

"P. S.: Margaret sings here Saturday night, April 21. I thought sacrifice like charity begins at home. Why isn't she in Korea singing for the GI's?

"If they don't like her long-haired singing she can carry bedpans. That doesn't require any special training. Neither does it bring in $1,500 per bedpan.

"Don't write me any nasty letters as I get riled up about my only kid, too, as well as all the other poor guys in Korea."

Crop Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Progressive Farmer of April 1951:

CROP INSURANCE: OUR NEXT GREAT FORWARD STEP

More and more this seems clear to us: Crop insurance is the next great forward step needed to put southern agriculture on a sounder business basis.

Any crop requires financing. The money may come from banks, PCA, FHA, or from one's own funds. Regardless of the source, one expects to get it back and a little bit more. If the funds are borrowed, there's interest to pay and usually extra collateral is required to protect the lender in the event of a crop failure. Why not have insurance against crop failure?

No lender would think of making a loan on a house unless it could be covered by fire insurance. Nobody would finance the purchase of an automobile unless it was covered by insurance. Yet most loans for crop production have been made without insurance protection even though the danger of crop failures is always serious.

Crop insurances gives liquid collateral in case of crop failure. That means it turns the crop loss into cash dollars. It pays off all or part of the crop loan. It makes it unnecessary for the lender to carry the farmer another year. It prevents the unscrupulous lender from selling out the farmer's implements or land to satisfy a debt. Crop insurance lessens risks to both borrower and lender alike. And as risks are lowered, interest rates and loan charges will drop accordingly.

Let's consider the four primary types of lenders on farm crops and how crop insurance works:

1. Landlord: Without insurance the landlord stands to lose both his interest in a crop and his advances. If both he and the tenant have insurance, he gets protection from both hazards.

2. Banks: Many banks require an endorser or cosigner for loans. But if general crop disaster hits a section, the endorser may not be able to pay the note. An insurance policy backed by the Government is better security.

3. PCA and FHA: These agencies take liens on crops, work stock, and implements as security. But in case of crop failure they must either carry the farmer another year or take away from him the very tools he needs to make another crop. These agencies now require crop insurance in disaster areas and urge it in others.

4. Time merchant: He usually makes part of his advances through open accounts on his books. When he has to borrow himself, banks usually allow him only about half credit for these accounts. Crop insurance policies are better collateral.

A good friend of ours is a peach grower. For years he carried hail insurance with one of the insurance companies in that line of business. Ordinarily he shipped about 55 carloads of peaches. But 1 year he decided he'd drop the insurance and spend that money for fertilizer for a young orchard. That's the year the hail struck. As a result he shipped only 5 carloads of poor peaches instead of 55 carloads of good peaches.

Tobacco is a costly crop to grow. But it's nothing uncommon to get $1,500 to $2,000 per acre and more from it. We've seen valuable fields of tobacco completely riddled by hail or drowned out by continuous rains. Much of it wasn't protected by insurance.

Cotton, too, is a costly crop to produce and getting more so. Chopping, hoeing, and picking costs take heavy toll. Then there's the all-season fight with its hosts of insect pests. The costly fight is continuous from the time the seed are treated to prevent damping-off until the defoliant is applied to make the leaves fall off and let the sun shine in to prevent the big green bolls from rotting and to facilitate picking.

The more costly a crop is to produce, the greater is the need for insurance.

Every subscriber lucky enough to live in a crop-insurance county,—and every renter who shares in an insurable crop—should contact his county PMA office this week. Act now and make your family safe from disaster or crop failure in 1951.

Effect of Recall of General MacArthur on the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Washington Star, dated April 12, 1951, by the brilliant columnist Constantine Brown. I should say to the Senate, Mr. President, that few, in my opinion, are more profound on foreign affairs than this distiguished columnist. In this colunm Mr. Brown calls to our attention facts which should be known to every American. I should say that when Mr. Brown writes, "not officially confirmed" he means that this fact is being kept secret from the public.

Constantine Brown, probably more than any other columnist, has warned the United States regarding the situation

of Japan for a long time. On January the 16th of this year he told us:

The possibility of Russia committing an aggression again Japan is more in the minds of responsible officials today than in the past—the Soviet has an impressive submarine fleet and an adequate air force which has not yet been in action.

I remember that on December 6, last, he wrote in his column that there were 15 Russian divisions on the Siberia-Manchuria border, four of which were airborne. At that time, as of now, the information that four Russian-trained Japanese divisions were in the perimeter of Japan was a frightening fact for the thinking of the American people. I feel that Columnist Brown has done a great service to the American people in keeping us advised of the facts in the far-eastern theater. I believe the Senate and America will enjoy reading this column.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYALTY OF JAPANESE SHAKEN—SMOULDERING INTRIGUES MAY FLARE OUT INTO OPEN NOW THAT MACARTHUR IS NOT ON PEDESTAL

(By Constantine Brown)

Nobody can challenge President Truman's constitutional authority to "break" General MacArthur. But the wisdom of the move can be seriously questioned. The repercussions of this latest decision of the President may have more far-reaching and worldwide consequences than he and his advisers seem to have anticipated.

There will be much partisan speaking and writing about the domestic political repercussions of General MacArthur's dismissal. They are of little importance as far as the security of the Nation is concerned. Whether Mr. Truman's action will further diminish the chances of his reelection 18 months from now is, in the present grave crisis, of only minor importance.

What is vitally important is the effect the summary dismissal may have on the Japanese people and on all the other nations of the Far East.

We are not yet at peace, technically, with Japan. General MacArthur, with his genius for a "show", has impressed the rank and file of Japanese people who, in their oriental way, placed him on an even higher level than they did their own Emperor before the war.

General MacArthur was infallible to them. He, and not the troops with him, represented America with all its power. The Japanese masses are hardly aware of the existence of President Truman, Congress, General Marshall, and Secretary of State Acheson. General MacArthur was it.

The unprecedented prestige of this one man permitted us to move practically all of our occupation forces from Japan when the Korean war broke out. The 75,000,000 Japanese remained quiet and orderly after our four divisions were sent to Korea, not because they were loyal to America, but on account of the veneration for the supreme commander.

The Communists failed in their few attempts to take advantage of the departure of the occupation forces. That was because the conqueror was still in Tokyo. Then suddenly, overnight, the Japanese people heard that their hero was made of clay, that somebody far away in Washington was able to fire him, just as if he were a mere official in a Japanese prefecture.

A peace treaty with Japan has been negotiated but has not been concluded. To all intent and purposes Japan is still an occupied country and must be kept in submission by the United States. All the passions and intrigues that have been smoldering but never came to the surface during General MacArthur's tenure may break into the open now.

There are reports—not officially confirmed but emanating from official sources—that some four Japanese divisions, organized from prisoners of the old Kwantung army and trained for the last 5 years in Siberia, have recently been placed in southern Sakhalin by the Soviet high command.

It is only a short hop from Sakhalin to Hokkaido. There are indications that these free Japanese may wish to liberate their country, Moscow style. So long as the Japanese people stood loyally by the United States, personified for them by General MacArthur, this threat might have been only military. But now that he has been toppled from his pedestal, the activities of Communist cells on the largest island, Honshu, may become a real threat.

There is no telling how much support the Communists, backed by a military force of their own kin, may now receive to make Japan into a satellite. Until a peace treaty has been formally signed the authority of the Tokyo government with its own people is only a reflection of the prestige of the Supreme Allied Commander.

Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, the new commander, is one of the ablest officers in the American Army. But in Japan he is not the symbol of America which General MacArthur used to be. Mr. Truman's impetuosity and feeling of frustration at the attitude of the former allied commander may destroy the careful and constructive work done by General MacArthur, a work which was near to completion.

Production and Marketing of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the pleasure of reading a radio address delivered by our colleague the Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama, over WSB, Atlanta, Ga., on Saturday, April 21, 1951.

In briefly summarizing the problems which now confront the cotton producers as a result of the unworkable ceiling established on the price of raw cotton, Mr. ROBERTS has pointed up one of the major problems facing our economy today. His address is a forceful example of the fine work he is doing on behalf of the farmers of the South and as such to the benefit of the entire economy of our Nation.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. ROBERTS' address as an extension of my remarks:

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to discuss briefly a matter which is close to all of us here in the South. I do not believe that there is a man, woman, or child in any of our Southern States who is not affected in one way or another by the production and marketing of cotton.

During recent years there has been a gradual change-over from cotton to dairying, beef cattle, and diversified farming. This has left our farmers less dependent on cotton production, but it is still one of our leading money crops. It is contemplated by Government officials that during the coming year there will be a demand for the largest cotton crop in the history of this country.

Despite this unprecedented demand the Office of Price Stabilization, under the direction of Mr. DiSalle, has seen fit to place a price ceiling on raw cotton. This order would mean that the maximum price that farmers would receive for their cotton would be 45.76 cents per pound.

This, of course, at first glance, seems like a fairly reasonable price for cotton. It must be remembered, however, that production costs have risen tremendously during the past few years. The price of fertilizer has advanced by leaps and bounds; there is an increasing scarcity of labor due to stepped-up industrial activity and new openings for jobs with national-defense installations. Recently insect infestation, mainly boll weevils, has drastically lowered cotton production and increased the cost by making it necessary for the farmers to spend large sums for poison and dusting equipment. Inflationary prices and high labor costs have advanced the price of farm machinery and equipment to an unreasonable level.

Thus, we see that what at first glance seemed like a good, substantial price for cotton does not look so enticing to the farmer who must make heavy investments and then gamble on favorable weather and a successful fight with the boll weevil. Let us assume, however, that by good management and good fortune, and despite high production costs, our farmers are able to produce a record-breaking crop. What assurance have they been given that the ceiling price of cotton will not be rolled back and despite their efforts they will end up losing money once again? This seems to be a little item that has been overlooked by the Office of Price Stabilization.

With this in mind action is being initiated to assure the farmers of a minimum price for their cotton in keeping with production costs. The Office of Price Stabilization has been requested to issue a statement to the effect that the prices will not be suddenly rolled back in the event that a heavy crop is harvested.

Further assurance of a reasonable price could be given by adopting a policy of stockpiling whatever amount may be produced over and above the present needs. The Government has embarked on a program of stockpiling strategic materials to cope with the increasing but uncertain demands of an expanding national-defense program. Certainly it cannot be denied that an ample supply of cotton is absolutely essential to our defense effort. A policy of this nature would not only insure the farmer a reasonable profit on his crop, but it would also make certain that our defense effort would not be hampered by a subsequent crop failure.

I feel that this is a sound policy and in keeping with the best interests of the southern farmers who made such a splendid contribution during World War II and who stand ready now to produce whatever is necessary to cope with any emergency.

Abandonment of National Security for Cheap Partisan Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming aware

now that President Truman has abandoned all responsibility for our national security and is playing the cheapest type of politics with the lives of our men on the battlefield in Korea.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting as a part of my remarks an article by David Lawrence which appears in the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1951:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

NEW SECURITY COUNCIL UNITS, WITH MILITARY EXPERTS ON IT

Is anybody in the Government really thinking about the over-all problems of security of the United States? There is no law on the statute books and no agency of the Government which can give an answer to this question and yet it concerns vitally the safety of the American people against attack and against defeat in war.

Theoretically, it is the military departments which have the job of protection—they have the instrumentality—but actually today in America the military cannot make policy or assure security.

Theoretically, the civilian authority is responsible—but there is no such institution in Washington today which is concerned exclusively with the task of safeguarding the security of the United States.

Theoretically, the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief, is looked upon as the man responsible for the Nation's security. But he does not and cannot give his whole time to the job. Indeed, there is no specific mandate of law which allows the military men to make the policies that are so closely related to military security.

This amazing defect in America's governmental structure was on the minds of some of our military men during the last war and they thought that, by establishing a National Security Council, the United States would at last have a board or agency which could make long-range plans for the security of the country. But the present law does not include any military men in the set-up of the Council.

The members are the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

JOINT CHIEFS LEFT OUT

Yet this all-important agency, with not a single member giving full-time attention to the work, has the tremendous duty of executing the following mandate as expressed in the National Security Act of 1949:

"It shall, subject to the direction of the President, be the duty of the Council—

"1. To assess and appraise the objectives, commitments and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and

"2. To consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith."

The National Security Council hardly ever met before the outbreak in Korea and has met only occasionally since then. Until just recently it didn't have a full-time director or a staff.

American policy, as it relates to our security, has been the subject of considerable debate in Congress these last few days but there is no evidence that an American long-range policy to safeguard national security was ever resolved by the National Security Council.

What is more distressing, moreover, is that the principal military advisers of the Government—the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—have no statutory connection with the very agency that is supposed to be responsible for safeguarding the security of the United States.

Apparently what has happened is that President Truman has abdicated his major responsibility for the security of the United States and has allowed the Department of State, under the vague heading "Foreign policy," to determine what ought really to be determined by the military officers of the Government. The safety of America is assured or endangered today only as the Department of State may decide an issue. The amount of military forces to be raised or the use of those forces, and even the weapons such forces shall use and whether they shall attack or stand still and allow our Armed Forces to be bombed are policies decided by the Department of State.

THE CIVILIAN AUTHORITY

This is the civilian authority which so many prominent Democrats in Congress are espousing today, but which they will not espouse very long when their constituents eventually learn that military men have really nothing to say under our statutes about the policies that mean protection or weakness in our security.

General MacArthur has raised some substantial issues. He is supposed to have been unable, according to Mr. Truman, to give wholehearted support ot the policies of the United States and the United Nations. Yet there is nobody in the White House or in the executive departments or in Congress today who can define those policies and show what they were or when they were approved by any statutory body charged with that responsibility. All that can be shown is that a few meetings of the National Security Council were held by members who gave incidental attention to it in connection with their numerous other duties.

What America needs is a National Security Council with military representation on it and one that will be above any one department of the Government. Three full-time civilian members of outstanding ability should be added. The Secretary of State should, of course, be on it and civilians should dominate it. The State Department, however, should not be the sole maker—as it is today—of important policies directly bearing on the future security and safety of the United States.

MacArthur's Strategy of Strength in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of April 20, 1951:

MACARTHUR'S STRATEGY OF STRENGTH IN ASIA

We think the American people will agree with the fundamental logic of General MacArthur's position, so far as it concerns the war in Korea. He summed it up in his dramatic address to Congress in these words: "War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision. In war there is no substitute for victory."

This is not to say that there need be complete acceptance of his five-point strategy to throw the Communists out of Korea. Certainly we need not subscribe wholeheartedly to his global policies, which include the division of our limited strength to counter the division of Communist strength all over the world. The grand strategy of the global campaign must remain in the hands of civilian authorities—the President, Congress, and the free countries in the United Nations.

There has been a diplomatic failure to avert and to end the Korean war. No one—not President Truman, who removed MacArthur from his commands, nor the U. N. diplomats who call him a warmonger while refusing their shares of men and munitions—has proposed an alternative to the military strategy advanced by MacArthur. Hence, his military advice will be carefully considered by the people, if not by the Truman administration. It is based on these facts:

War was forced on us when the Communists invaded South Korea, a United Nations protectorate. The United States already has suffered more than 60,000 casualties, and the nation we sought to liberate lies devastated. Red China refuses to negotiate a peace. Our casualties will go on without end if we continue to fight a limited, defensive campaign on the Korean Peninsula, while the enemy gathers his strength in his mainland sanctuary without hindrance by American air attack.

On behalf of the American and Allied soldiers fighting for a free world in Korea, with only a remote possibility of victory by Chinese withdrawal, General MacArthur proposes:

That the enemy's sanctuary in Manchuria be neutralized by aerial bombing; that our economic blockade against China, now ineffective, be intensified; that a naval blockade be imposed against the China coast; that restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal area and Manchuria be lifted; that the Formosan armies of the Nationalist exile, Chiang Kai-shek, be loosed against the Reds on the mainland with logistical support from the United States.

In the last recommendation the general goes beyond the boundary of military strategy and involves himself in American national policy in the Far East. In doing so he he is inconsistent. In the earlier part of his address MacArthur explained and clarified the causes of oriental unrest; the rejection of a dictatorial government; the striving for a better life which left the Chinese open to the rise of Communist control.

Then, in the name of Korean victory, he proposes American aid to Chiang Kai-shek to restore the old dictatorship in all of China. We cannot accept this as national policy, even if such action were not almost certain—despite MacArthur's denial—to involve the use of American ground forces in the military morass of continental China.

But General MacArthur, with masterful oratory and persuasive diction certain to make a terrific impact on American minds, basically advanced a policy of strength—a policy the Asiatics and the Kremlin would understand and respect—in contrast to the policy of weakness maintained by the United Nations and the Truman administration both before and after the start of the Korean war, and with the single exception of our intervention against the North Korean Reds. We come back to the question: Who has a better military program?

Without bitterness, but with the assurance of his great knowledge of the Orient and of war in all its phases, General MacArthur brought the challenge to the Presidency, the

Congress, and the American people. It is: Stand and die; or attack and win. Continued Chinese aggression in Korea—a spring offensive reported building—would leave no other course. And Congress gave him a standing ovation when he noted that his views have been fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, "including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff."

His powerful presentation of the Korean problem renews the hopes of the people for an early solution and the honorable achievement of our goal: The liberation of all Korea from Communist invasion and the restoration of free, elective government to the Korean people.

Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter I received from Dr. E. B. Norton, president of State Teachers College, Florence, Ala., containing a timely commentary, to which I invite the attention of the Members.

Dr. Norton is one of the outstanding educators of this country, and his vast experience makes his observation of even greater importance at this moment.

The letter follows:

STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Florence, Ala., April 13, 1951.

HON. ROBERT E. JONES,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: It seems unfortunate that so many editorial comments, so many of the pronouncements of columnists and of radio commentators, and so much of the public debate concerning proposals for deferring college students have centered around a false assumption and, indeed, an irrelevant point in the debate.

It does not seem fair either to the administration or to the Congress or, for that matter, to either the Armed Forces or the selective service, nor does it seem fair to either colleges or college students, to infer that the operation of proposed draft procedures for the deferment of college students would create an intellectual aristocracy by exempting college students from their military service obligations.

It shatters the morale of college students who are earnestly seeking to prepare themselves for life as well as for improved service to their country to know that they may be considered as dodging the draft, or as acting otherwise than in the national interest when they remain in college. It is especially obnoxious to them to be thought of as asking special exemptions, because of intellectual ability or economic fortune while less fortunate brothers and acquaintances will be required to don uniforms merely because they lack either the mental capacity to do college work or the financial ability to maintain themselves in college.

This does not seem to be a quick, positive, complete, all-out mobilization for prompt military victory in a declared war. This seems to be a long drawn-out, indefinite mobilization to meet many very critical situations in world affairs including possible military fronts not yet determined.

To take the necessary steps to insure an adequate, continuous flow of trained manpower for competent leadership in the Armed Forces and in all of the critical aspects of our highly complex national life should not be considered as simply showing favoritism to some particular group of young men who may have been fortunate enough to enter college and capable enough to do satisfactory work. If it is in the national interest, not only to permit but actually to encourage all potential college students to get as much college education as possible before entering the Armed Forces and then to perform their full military duty, then let us put the argument on that basis. If such is not in the national interest, then let's face the issue and induct students as promptly as they may be needed and place them where their services are most needed.

The red-blooded, patriotic young men whom I know as students in college will be willing to stay there to equip themselves more fully for better and greater service to their country if they are convinced that it is in the national interest as well as in their own personal interest to do so. They will be very unhapy over remaining in college if the general public gets the idea that by doing so they will be shirking their duty and pushing over onto someone else less fortunate and less capable the responsibility for meeting a military crisis.

In an enlightened country whose very form of government and way of life depend upon moral, intellectual, and spiritual foundations laid definitely by the processes of education, our people should consider what the disruption of educational institutions over a long-extended period of mobilization might mean, not just to those institutions but to the welfare of the country as a whole.

In the official debating and voting on the question of deferments of college students I hope that you will help to keep the issues clarified, and that, regardless of the decisions concerning the appropriate assignments for college students, there may not be involved any impugning of the motives of colleges or of college students regarding a patriotic desire to serve where most needed.

Yours sincerely,

E. B. NORTON, *President.*

A Study in Contrasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit quotations from General MacArthur's address to Congress, and quotations from President Truman, given to a writer for the New Yorker, for publications in that magazine. These quotations are for comparison and contrast:

A soldier's farewell (Gen. Douglas MacArthur): "The issues are fundamental and reach quite beyond the realm of partisan consideration. * * * You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our effort to halt its advance in Europe. * * * While I was not consulted prior to the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic of Korea, that decision, from a military standpoint, proved a sound one. * * * The above views have been fully shared in the past by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff. * * * I now close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty."

President Truman speaking: "There was one columnist who wrote some lie about my family when I was in the Senate, and instead of writing him a letter I called him on the phone, and I said: 'You so-and-so, if you say another word about my family, I'll come down to your office and shoot you.' He hasn't printed a whisper about them since. I'm saving up four or five good, hard punches on the nose, and when I'm out of this job, I'm going to run around and deliver them personally."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Project and United States Steel Needs," from the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch of March 10, 1951, and an editorial entitled "A Seaway and Mistaken Economics," from the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of March 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch of March 10, 1951]

ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT AND UNITED STATES STEEL NEEDS

The Nation's growing need for steel to match its defense effort may force the adoption of the controversial St. Lawrence waterway project. One of the oldest issues in Washington, it has been recommended by every President since Harding without result.

The project is making it possible for ocean ships to travel from the St. Lawrence River through all the Great Lakes and to construct a 2,200,000 horsepower electrical plant at Massena, N. Y. At present the system of rivers, canals, and lakes is too shallow and too narrow in places to allow the deeper draft ships to enter from the ocean.

Secretary of Interior Chapman has given the project a push in stating that the Nation needs a better transportation route to the iron ore fields in Labrador, situated on the St. Lawrence River at the eastern tip of Canada.

The Labrador ore has two attractive characteristics. It has a high content of iron and it lies close to the surface of the ground.

And Labrador's strategic position is appealing. If hostilities break open, the ore fields are within the continental limits of the Northern Hemisphere, and the ore could be transported through the chain without fear of submarines.

Proponents of the project, which include Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—feel that the additional electric power from the dams would stimulate the operation of aluminum and other industries in the Northeast.

And further, it is argued that the alternate water route will alleviate the approaching crisis in rail transportation.

How much would it cost? There is disagreement on that.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association says: "The project would cost only $556,000,000—$192,000,000 for power and $374,000,000 for navigation. All of this will be liquidated by power revenues and navigation tolls."

The Association of American Railroads says it would cost more than that and that the taxpayers of the United States and Canada would be underwriting the deal.

If the project fits into the emergency picture as Wilson says, then the gentlemen on Capitol Hill had best speed things up. The system won't be effected overnight, and we don't want to be in the midst of construction if and when Uncle Joe pulls the trigger.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of March 11, 1951]

A SEAWAY AND MISTAKEN ECONOMICS

A man who knows his way in the history of the world's supplies of minerals, ores, and how best to use them asks this newspaper a question it cannot answer. How, the engineer asks, will the United States maintain, in the longer future, its industrial supremacy if access to the vast Labrador deposits of high-grade ore is made difficult or practically impossible?

The questioner was thinking of the refusal of the American Congress to have any part in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. The problem, and it is one of vast economic importance to the American people, may roughly be summed up as follows:

In the late 1930's, American steel companies invested a good many millions in the iron-ore possibilities recently discovered in Labrador near the Quebec frontier. Now the 300 or more miles of railway is about completed from the mines to the Bay of St. Lawrence. The natural, reasonable method of transportation from that point southward is by the proposed seaway. Canada now seems determined to build this waterway, without United States aid if necessary, but if she does the Canadian Government thinks American importers should pay a toll for use of the canal. Such a charge would radically change the economic prospect apparently visible when the original plans were made.

United States iron ores, of high grade, are rapidly reaching the stage of exhaustion. The glories of Mesabi Range in the Northwest are becoming legends. Short sight could gravely injure the American steel industry and its related industries. Or a huge economic, social, and industrial project in ore and in water transportation could be at the least long delayed in fulfillment. And the prime cause would be the same apprehensions which mistakenly met the building of the Panama Canal with prophecies of doom for the railroads. Now it is power utilities and the railroads that join in helping to thwart the St. Lawrence seaway.

Dismissals From the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "State Department Ousts 55 as Security Risks," published this morning in the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT OUSTS 55 AS SECURITY RISKS

(By John Fisher)

Fifty-five persons were removed from the State Department as security risks last year, secret testimony to a congressional committee disclosed last night.

Of these, 54 were homosexuals and forced to resign, it was learned. The other was discharged as a security and loyalty risk. This brought the total removed during the 3 years ended December 31 to 144 homosexuals and 14 other risks.

In addition, four other sex perverts have been requested to resign this year.

M'CARTHY SUBSTANTIATED

This information, furnished the House Appropriations Committee in closed session and just released, substantiated charges by Senator McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, and other congressional critics last year that the State Department had been infiltrated by persons who may be tempted to betray national security, despite administration denials to the contrary.

The Tydings "whitewash" committee named to investigate McCARTHY's charge didn't even delve into the presence of homosexuals in the Department despite knowledge Soviet espionage has used such perversion as blackmail to extract secrets.

Members of the appropriations committee demanded data on loyalty and security risks in connection with the State Department's request for $283,566,476 in funds for the next fiscal year, an increase of $12,173,329 over the current year.

FOUR CASES PENDING

"We treat homosexuals as security risks," Carlisle H. Humelsine, Deputy Under Secretary, told the committee.

He said 4 cases are pending, an additional 11 persons are under investigation, and 2 individuals are under suspension on other grounds awaiting a final decision on dismissal.

Humelsine vigorously denied charges in a recent gossip book on Washington that State Department funds have been used to provide visiting dignitaries with immoral escorts.

Other testimony disclosed:

1. Intelligence had warned all concerned government agencies for a long time of the possibility of invasion by North Koreans, such as occurred last June 25.

MAC ARTHUR STAND SUPPORTED

2. Assistant Secretary Dean Rusk said "we are determined not to allow Communist aggression to succeed in Korea" and "our objective is to prevent Formosa from falling into the hands of a regime that is hostile to the United States." Strangely enough, these are objectives stated by General MacArthur and for which he was fired. Rusk praised MacArthur for his Japanese policy.

3. Rusk also admitted the fighting in Korea constitutes war, not the police action claimed by President Truman.

4. There are approximately 250,000 American ground, air, and Navy troops involved in Korea, including seven divisions of ground troops.

PROPAGANDA MAGAZINE FAILS

5. The Department spent $630,717 to send 50,000 copies of the propaganda magazine Amerika to Russia for distribution by the Soviet news agency under Government agreements, but the Russians returned 30,000 copies unsold. The Department even had difficulty giving them away free in other countries.

6. The Department requested $1,000,000 for entertainment allowances abroad, an increase of $325,000 over this year.

Conditions in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed by an article which appeared in the April 19 issue of the Democrat, of Flemington, N. J., embodying a letter to the editor from Theodore A. Marks. Mr. Marks forcefully reminds us in his thought-provoking observations that in the present crisis we can ill afford to neglect our responsibilities to agriculture.

In the hope that the letter will be read by every Member of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEES CALAMITY AHEAD FOR AGRICULTURE AND THE NATION

NEW MARKET, N. J., *April 12, 1951.*

To the EDITOR OF THE DEMOCRAT:

The following words are right out of the mouth of Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture:

"No other major segment of our economy went through such a severe economic setback. Net income realized by farm operators dropped from almost eighteen billion in 1947 to about sixteen and five-tenths billion in 1948; about fourteen billion in 1949 and about thirteen billion in 1950."

You will see from these figures that agriculture lost a net income (I say net) of over ten and one-half billions in 3 years. Who lost this ten and one-half billions in 3 years—the 4,500,000 farmers, small and large, in the United States, and you must not forget that during those 3 years every other branch of the economy of the United States increased every year.

Add to the above losses another two billions which might possibly cover the losses sustained by farmers in the November 25, 1950, windstorm, the loss of 10,000 beef cattle in Florida during the freeze of February 1951, together with tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, and frosts, and you will wonder how any farmer can continue in business.

Mr. Brannan also said:

"Prices of many farm commodities have very little relationship to consumer prices. Several examples give this picture clearly:

"The cotton in a shirt now selling for $3.50 to $4 probably did not bring the farmer more than 30 cents.

"A 16-cent can of tomatoes represents about 3 cents of gross income to the farmer.

"The corn in a can retailing at 19 cents brought less than 2¾ cents to the producer.

"Onions which were selling in stores in November for 5.7 cents a pound had been sold by the farmers for a little over 1 cent.

"When milk leaves the farm, it immediately goes into a distribution and processing system that almost doubles its price in a few hours.

"The wheat in a loaf of bread that sells for 15 to 16 cents brings the farmer only about 2⅔ cents. It is interesting to note that the retail price of bread has gone up 1.7 cents a loaf since June. If this were due entirely to a rise in the price of wheat, it would mean that wheat had gone up $1.12 a bushel. Actually, the farm price of wheat in January was only 16 cents a bushel higher than it was before the Korean outbreak."

In any other line of business when one man loses another gains, so all these losses must have been passed on to others. Did the nonfarm consumer receive any of it? The answer is very little. The middleman and big business received nearly all of it. If it were possible for all the farmers of the United States today to give away everything they produced the ultimate consumer would be benefited very little, and in time the result would be the same as mentioned above. But just as you never miss the sunshine until the shadows fall, so the time will come when—and come it will and very soon at that—when you, the consumers, will either have to pay a whole lot more for the food you buy, and some things you will not even be able to buy.

Farmers and their families are quitting the farms every year at the rate of a half million. The farm population today is 28,000,000 but the growth of the country is over 2,500,000 yearly. In 5 years the population will have increased 15,000,000—equivalent to the population of Canada. With fewer farmers and more mouths to feed you will see what is facing us.

For example take milk. The amount of milk now being produced has been dropping every month for the last year. Farmers are selling out and those who remain are decreasing their herds because they can get better prices, proportionately, for their cows than to feed them and produce milk. If we should have a drought and you can get milk next fall for 30 cents you will be lucky.

The carry-over of the stock of wheat in the United States at the present time will be the shortest we have had in years, and the new crop will be—from present estimates and my personal observation—less than it has been in a generation. In addition, farmers are showing a don't-care attitude because while prosperity exists all around they have never received any part of it.

It is true that farmers are getting today more than they did at the start of the Korean war in June 1950, but from November 1948 until May 1950, the price of all farm commodities had dropped, some as much as 33⅓ percent. Farm prices at that time in a good many instances were back to the level of 1939, whereas all other branches of industry had been increasing during that time, so when prices started to increase in June it found the farmers receiving very little for their products while industry being unionized never gave up anything, but in reality got more. Even at the present time farmers are not receiving as much as they did in November 1948 while industry has had six wage increases.

Notice the next time and you will see comparisons start from the Korean war in June 1950. Somebody is covering up something.

Now you may be tempted to ask how can any business like present-day farming continue to exist? Behind the answer to this question lies the greatest worry confronting the Nation today—in one word, "starvation."

At the present time, when farmers see they cannot make ends meet, they simply quit and go into industry. This they are doing by the thousands weekly. Our present head of the United States Department of Agriculture knows as much about farming as a mocking bird knows about law. He believes the cheaper he prices the farmers' products the better it will be for the nonfarm consumer, not figuring that what might be fun to him is death to others, and so the available supply of food decreases daily.

We have on hand at the present time only enough food to last us until the end of this year, and if we were ever to go to war with Russia, their saboteurs would see to it that nothing is harvested. So in our present emergency and with the same conditions hanging over our heads, possibly for all time, we should have national underground pantries bulging with storable food to last for at least 3 years instead of at the present time until December, and no chance of replenishment if a real emergency should overtake us.

Mr. Brannan has made a bankrupt of agriculture and would not be tolerated in the smallest business anywhere in the United States longer than the first year, according to the results accomplished by him. Why should 152,000,000 people see starvation staring them in the face and still continue with the source and cause of forthcoming disaster?

THEO. A. MARKS.

The Truman-MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me on the Truman-MacArthur controversy, broadcast from Station WWL in New Orleans, La., on Tuesday, April 24, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, since my last report to you over this station, General MacArthur has presented his views to a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives. It was a drama-packed session, the equal of which I cannot recall during my many years of public service. Senators and Congressmen, as well as scores of high-ranking Government officials and visitors in the galleries, listened intently to each word that fell from the lips of the general. Except for the frequent outbursts of applause, everyone remained quiet, almost breathless, and one could hear a pin drop during the entire proceeding. And as the veteran commander of our Asiatic forces brought his speech to a close, the audience was visibly moved—many a tear was shed as MacArthur announced that after 52 years of military service, he was now, like the old soldier in the Army ballad, ready to close his military career and just fade away.

Unquestionably, the general was at his best and delivered a most impressive speech. Many of you, I am sure, heard it over your radios, and have seen rebroadcasts over television. The immediate reaction in Washington to the Asiatic policy advocated by MacArthur was, as might be expected, fairly evenly divided. Many Republicans endorsed his proposal to carry the war to the Chinese mainland, while most Democrats advocated caution and a further exploration of the world political implications involved by such action.

For my own part, I have tried to view this problem objectively, without emotion, or bias or prejudice, but with a high sense of duty. From the very beginning, I have expressed the view that President Truman was clearly within his constitutional rights in removing MacArthur from the far eastern command. And further, that the General's insistent encroachment into the field of foreign policy, in advocacy of a program which was contrary to that laid down by his Commander in Chief, constituted an act of insubordination which should not be glossed over. It is my view that MacArthur deliberately precipitated his own dismissal in an attempt to bring to a showdown the deepseated divergence between his views on the far eastern policy and those held by the administration. In this he has been successful. His dramatic appearance before the Congress has touched off a spirited, and at times, heated debate that will reverberate through the halls of the Senate and House of Representatives for months to come. Forgotten are the "troops to Europe" issue, the "fortress America doctrine," as advocated by President Hoover, and other controversial issues. All interest is centered now on the one burning question: Should we carry the Korean war to the Manchurian and Chinese mainland in the hope of achieving a quick victory, or should we continue our present policy of endeavoring to limit the conflict to the Korean peninsula, and make every effort to attain a peaceful settlement without appeasement?

This question has weighed upon my mind for days and weeks, in fact for months. It has been uppermost in my thoughts ever since the Chinese stealthily marched into Korea and, by the commitment of a relatively small portion of their countless hordes of manpower, snatched from our forces a victory that was almost within grasp. My resentment at the actions of the Chinese Communists was just as strong and burning as that of every other loyal American. Our country has never before been placed in a position where it could not immediately strike back at any aggressor who attacked our soldiers. We have never been prone to present the other cheek when slapped in the face. It is but a typically American reaction that we should want to immediately press the battle home to our new foe. I confess that I have felt and still do entertain that desire. I am sure that most of you feel the same way. The wonder to me has been that the American public has been able to exercise restraint for so long a time.

Why, then, has not President Truman, who is as loyal and patriotic an American as any of us, taken action long ago to strike back at Manchurian and Chinese bases? Why have not our Joint Chiefs of Staff—all loyal, patriotic Americans, and every inch of them a soldier—precipitated long before now a showdown with the Chinese Communists? I do not profess to know what is in the minds of these able military men, but I am satisfied that all of them are guided solely by the one purpose as enunciated by President Truman in his radio address of last week: "To avert the tragedy of an all-out war with China, which in turn, would inevitably lead us into world war III."

This, then, is the basic point at which MacArthur and the President have parted ways. It is the point at which I, too, must part with MacArthur, irrespective of my admiration for him as a soldier and as an administrator. Whether or not our present policy in Korea will prevent another devastating world conflict remains for the future to decide, but I have made my decision to support the President and our Joint Chiefs of Staff at this crossroads in our history only after weighing dispassionately the present position of our Nation in the world political picture.

Militarily, and if we consider only the Asiatic theater, MacArthur may be right. Certainly many of his recommendations with respect to the Asiatic war coincide with my own. I have long contended that we should at all cost hold on to Formosa and not permit it to fall into enemy hands. It forms an integral part of our Pacific defense system, and as MacArthur points out, it completes the circle of military bases which make of the Pacific our outer line of defense. I believe that we should arm the Nationalist forces on Formosa, but unless and until the occasion presents itself and we are prepared

to wage all-out war with China, we cannot undertake to transport them to the Chinese mainland.

With respect to the proposed Chinese blockade, I have advocated for many months that our Government make more insistent demands upon our allies to cut off completely the flow of goods to the Chinese Communists. I can see no sense in some members of the United Nations fighting the Chinese in Korea, while trading with them through the back door. Along with this, we should take steps to make more effective our blockade of the Chinese coast, thereby reducing the war potentiality of the Chinese Reds' armies.

As for the fourth point mentioned by MacArthur—that we should remove restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal areas and of Manchuria—I believe that in view of the presence of Chinese troops in Korea, this might be done without provoking an all-out war with the Chinese Communist government.

These, then, are the four steps which MacArthur states he urged upon Washington and which, according to him, were agreed to by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. You will note that, with the exception of using Chinese Nationalist troops in an assault upon the Chinese mainland, the recommendations are confined to reconnaissance and blockade operations. I have long felt that we could undertake these steps without committing ourselves to open warfare with the Chinese on Chinese soil.

Although many commentators have stated that MacArthur in his speech charged that his advocacy of bombing Manchurian and Chinese bases had the prior approval of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, I find no basis for the statement. The general stated only that the four steps which I have just outlined, and which do not include the bombing of Manchurian and Chinese bases, "have been fully shared in the past by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff."

In a radio forum discussion of the Far East controversy in which I participated this week, one Member of Congress argued that by following MacArthur's recommendations we can put an end to the constant attrition of our manpower on the Korean battlefields. If I thought that carrying the air war to Manchurian and Chinese bases, plus the use of Chiang Kai-shek's Formosan troops, would accomplish that purpose, I would not hesitate to support such an undertaking. We would all welcome a relatively easy way out of our present dilemma. But what of the consequences if and when we take these bold steps? I believe that the American people should be fully appraised of the implications involved, and for that reason I shall welcome a full debate in Congress on the subject. I am confident that when all of the facts are before the public, and upon sober reflection of what such precipitate action might lead to, much of the mass hysteria that is evident today will disappear.

Let us examine more closely the possibilities—perhaps I should say probabilities—that will confront us should we assist the Chinese Nationalist forces in invading the Chinese mainland from Formosa. Chiang Kai-shek reputedly has some 600,000 men on that island. Assuming that we can equip them properly without depriving our own forces of much-needed arms and ammunition, and that we succeed in landing them on the Chinese mainland, or on Hainan Island, whichever is the objective, is there any guaranty that they can hold on after they have landed? What if the Chinese Red armies threaten to push them into the sea? Will we stand idly by and let them be annihilated, and thereby incur the eternal scorn and damnation of the Orient, or will we go to their rescue? All of you know the answer. We would throw every man, every ship, every plane that we could muster into a heroic effort to save our allies, and a bloody, never-ending struggle between our boys and the Chinese hordes will have been joined.

I well remember the historic statement of Winston Churchill on February 9, 1941. That was in the early part of World War II, when the United States was still neutral, but England had her back to the wall as a result of France's capitulation. On that occasion Churchill said to the United States: "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." Yes, we furnished the tools, but we also had to finish the job. Later, after Pearl Harbor, Churchill made another statement that will go down in history: "We have lost Singapore, but we have won the United States over to our side." We ended by not only sending tons of supplies, but more troops than all of our allies combined.

There is considerable similarity in our positions then and now. In effect, Chiang Kai-shek is saying to us, with MacArthur in accord, "Give my men the arms and land them on the Chinese coast, and we will do the rest." I cannot forget that this same leader, and these same men, supported by hundreds of thousands of other Chinese soldiers, were once before on the Chinese mainland. Although they started out with control of most of China, they eventually were cut to pieces by Red armies.

As I have stated, there can be no advance guaranty that a landing by Chiang Kai-shek's men on the Chinese coast will be successful, and in fact, its feasibility seems highly questionable. It is my firm belief that we would be courting disaster if we encouraged and participated in such a risky venture. In the long run, we would be drawn into the conflict on an all-out scale, and our casualty list would dwarf the present losses in Korea. We must remember that Stalin would like nothing better than to see us become embroiled in an interminable, costly war of attrition on the Chinese mainland, for then his plans for undermining the democratic nations of Western Europe and Asia could proceed with little fear of interference from us.

In weighing the relative advantages and disadvantages of enlarging the Korean conflict, we must take into consideration also our position in the United Nations Organization. Whether we like to admit it or not, our Nation is no longer a free agent in reaching major international political decisions. If we expect the cooperation and backing of the other free nations of the world, we must consult with them before reaching decisions, and our actions must be supported by a majority of the members, otherwise we will bring about the collapse of the entire structure for world peace that we have so patiently built up since World War II. And with the death of the United Nations will go our chances of preventing the spread of communism over the Eurasian, African, and Australian continents. We may as well face reality; we cannot do the job alone. While many point out that the major part of the burden in Korea is being borne by us, and for that reason we should have a free hand in dealing with the Chinese, still we cannot evade the fact that events in Asia profoundly affect all of Europe. Inescapably, our Western European allies will be drawn into the conflict should Russia come to China's aid, and they will bear the brunt of any fighting on the western front. MacArthur admitted in his speech to the Congress that events in Asia cannot be divorced from Europe, yet at no point did MacArthur mention the United Nations, or the possible repercussions that might develop among our European allies should his views about the Korean war prevail.

It is significant, too, that MacArthur hedged considerably in his statement regarding the possibility of Russia's entering the war should we follow his advice. He said, and I quote his exact words: "The Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves." He may think that the Russians will remain neutral, but he goes no further than that. No doubt he still remembers Red China's intervention in the Korean war. Had MacArthur anticipated that the Chinese Communists would intervene at that time, he certainly would not have permitted his troops to be caught like rats in a trap among the icy mountains of northern Korea, with tenuous supply lines and inadequate reserves. In simple words, MacArthur guessed wrong about the Chinese last fall, and there is a strong possibility that he is guessing wrong now about Russia.

I refuse to believe that any considerations other than the welfare and future safety of our country have influenced the President and his military advisers in resolving the current controversy. They alone have in their possession all of the facts regarding our own military strength, the strength of our allies, and—to the extent that our counterintelligence has been able to provide—the strength of our enemies and potential enemies. The course that they are following in Asia is not appeasement. It is no more than an honest, sincere effort to avert a death-struggle between ourselves and Soviet Russia. If we cannot avert this costly, devastating conflict, at least we must try to choose the time and place for it.

I have faith in Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley, Collins, Vandenberg, and Sherman. They are all mature, able, experienced military strategists and they alone are in a position to plan our Nation's military strategy. I shall follow closely the hearings now being conducted by the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, which are meeting jointly to hear testimony from our Defense Secretary and the Chiefs of Staff. A great deal of their testimony will of necessity be confidential. There will be much information of highly secret nature that they cannot even impart to the committee members. I am confident, however, that the two committees will bring to light the views of our military leaders on the MacArthur proposals. I shall present to you in subsequent broadcasts as much of this information as I am permitted to divulge, and in the meantime I urge all of you to be calm. Do not permit your emotions to stifle your better judgment on this vitally important question, but let us all be patient and await the development of the true facts before we reach definite conclusions.

Remember, I need your advice and counsel. Your constructive criticism is appreciated.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me to the people of Pennsylvania on April 23, 1951, entitled "Happenings in Washington, Program No. 39."

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 39)

(Text of broadcast by United States Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

Since I talked with you 2 weeks ago momentous events have taken place.

The American people have been shocked into realizing the grave dangers we face from a confused and uncertain foreign policy.

While the whole world awaits the final outcome of the sudden and shocking dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur I am confident that the United States will benefit from the investigation and open discussion of our policy in the Far East.

It is good to bring out into the open the many vital questions that have been worrying every one of us because we were denied full knowledge of the facts.

During all the developments which led us into armed conflict in Korea the people have been kept in the dark.

The Members of Congress have been kept in the dark, despite the pretense of the Truman administration that we were acting in accordance with a bipartisan policy.

Now, to some extent, the situation is being revealed.

General MacArthur's appearance before the joint meeting of Congress brought to a climax the most eventful week in many years.

In all my long experience in public affairs I have never witnessed a more spectacular uprising of resentment and indignation than that which followed the dismissal of General MacArthur.

Let me review briefly what transpired here in Washington when the news of President Truman's action was made public at 1 a. m. last Wednesday a week ago.

Most of the Members of Congress were unaware of what had happened until morning. But it didn't take long to find out that only one thing was being talked about.

There seemed to be a feeling that a great tragedy had occurred. As I traveled to the Senate Office Building I noticed small groups standing about, reading newspapers, obviously intent upon the one big news item of the day.

In the corridors of the Senate Office Building similar groups were discussing what had occurred. Many expressed their opinions in strong language. No one seemed able to get down to work. The atmosphere was thick with gloom.

When I stepped into my office all four telephone lines were busy. Calls were coming in, not only from all parts of Pennsylvania but also from distant points throughout the country. I had calls from military associates and civilians from San Francisco, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Calif., San Antonio, Tex., and several points in Florida.

Telegrams began pouring into my office. Practically all of them called for the impeachment of the President, the dismissal of Secretary Acheson, and the reinstatement of General MacArthur. Many demanded that General MacArthur be summoned home to report to Congress.

All day long the telegrams kept pouring in. They continued the next day and the next. As the flood of telegrams subsided letters were delivered to my office by the thousands. In all I received more than 1,500 telegrams and approximately 15,000 letters and post cards.

Out of all these 16,500 communications less than 100 approved the President's action in stripping General MacArthur of all his commands in the Far East.

At this point let me express my appreciation to those who have wired or written to me.

It is my custom to acknowledge promptly all communications from constituents. It will be difficult, however, with my limited staff, to make individual replies to the heavy volume of telegrams and letters I have received relative to the MacArthur dismissal. If you do not hear from me I am sure you will understand the reason.

The galleries of the Senate Chamber were jammed when the session was called to order. The corridors were filled with people. There was an air of suppressed excitement which broke into cheers and applause from the galleries when Senator JENNER, of Indiana, in a speech, denounced the President for his action and called for his impeachment. Vice President BARKLEY, who was presiding, rapped sharply for order and warned the galleries that applause is in violation of the rules of the Senate.

That evening President Truman went on the air in defense of his action.

On Friday the Senate Armed Services Committee, in executive session, voted to conduct an inquiry into the military situation in the Far East and the facts surrounding the dismissal of General MacArthur. The committee is made up of seven Democrats and six Republicans. The vote for the investigation was unanimous.

The next scene took place at the Jefferson-Jackson dinner where 5,300 of his faithful followers paid $100 each to hear President Truman charge that everyone who agrees with him is a patriot and those who disagree are playing politics. It was a highly profitable dinner. It brought over $400,000 into the campaign fund of the Democratic Party.

This was followed by the unanimous action of the House and Senate, inviting General MacArthur to address a joint meeting of the Congress.

The enthusiastic reception which greeted General MacArthur on his return to his native land after an absence of 14 years was a real tribute to his greatness as a soldier, statesman, and diplomat. The tremendous ovation he received here in Washington, from Republicans and Democrats alike, gave assurance that patriotic appreciation of our Nation's heroes still lives in the hearts of our people.

Those who have defended President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur contended that he was exercising his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

In my opinion there can be no question that the President has a legal right under the Constitution to do what he did. But when we talk about the constitutional authority let me point out that President Truman in his radio address abandoned the use of "police action" and frankly called the fighting in Korea a war.

Thus he officially acknowledged that a state of war exists between the United States and Communist China. Sixty thousand American casualties confirm that fact.

Mr. Truman knows that the Constitution specifically provides that Congress shall have the sole power to declare war. Yet he has not come before Congress to ask for such a declaration and the authority to prosecute the war.

In the same address the President said that we are ready at any time to negotiate for the restoration of peace in the Far East. He declared we will not engage in appeasement.

But while he was saying that Great Britain, through her foreign minister, was suggesting a negotiated peace by admitting Communist China into the family of the United Nations, turning over Formosa to the Communists, and recognizing the Chinese Communist Government as a partner in drafting the peace treaty with Japan.

Mr. Truman laid great stress on his aims for peace, declaring that the objective of his policy in the Far East was to repel attack and to restore peace.

But instead of helping in the cause of peace the military plans he outlined actually removed the greatest factors that might restrain further aggression.

In effect, he made it clear that the Communists in Manchuria and China need have no fear of attack on their home soil—that there would be no bombing raids to destroy their property, their supply lines, or bases. Mr. Truman gave assurance that there would be no invasion of China by the Nationalist forces now on Formosa.

With these assurances why should the Communists want to negotiate a peace? What kind of military strategy is it that tells an enemy that he can retreat safely behind a boundary line to reform, regroup, and resupply, while our boys wait for their return?

What kind of military strategy dictates that air power can be used only to defend troops but not to destroy the bases from which the enemy launches his attack?

Mr. Truman had high praise for what he called collective action among nations in Korea as a workable means of resisting aggression.

But the fact is that while we have 250,000 ground troops in Korea no other member of the United Nations has more than 5 percent of that number. Most of them have contributed no soldiers at all; some have given token help only.

Mr. Truman reported that there are signs that the Communists are building up their ground forces and air strength for a new mass offensive. He expressed the hope that this new attack would be turned back but he gave no indication that our troops are being reinforced to meet this attack.

I shall not discuss the President's speech at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner because that was purely political.

The question that is in the minds of many Americans is the extent to which the removal of General MacArthur was influenced by other nations.

They are wondering how much of Mr. Truman's foreign policy is dictated by secret commitments and demands from abroad.

It raises the question of whether the appeasement of those foreign countries was worth more than unity at home.

Five years and seven months ago General MacArthur took his place at the head of the Japanese Government as Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers.

He had absolute power over a conquered people, a proud people, who worshipped their Emperor as a god.

General MacArthur faced a difficult task but through his outstanding ability he succeeded in gaining the respect and confidence of the Japanese people and was winning them to a free way of life.

Previous experience in the Philippines prepared General MacArthur for his distinguished service in Japan. He not only developed the Filipino military force but he taught the people the ideals of the United States.

General MacArthur's fame will go down in history, not only as one of our most brilliant military leaders, but as a great statesman and diplomat.

Regardless of whatever justification the President may have thought he had, the dismissal of General MacArthur was a brutal, irresponsible, and uncalled for procedure against one of the greatest Americans who has given a lifetime of distinguished, heroic, and patriotic service to his country.

If we are to have peace in the world it will be established on strength, not on weakness.

It will not be achieved through appeasement. It cannot be bought through double-dealing or secret betrayal of innocent people in the hands of Soviet tyranny.

So long as communism conspires behind the iron curtain to enslave the world there can be no compromise with Moscow.

So long as the Red dictators look upon the United States as their ultimate target for destruction we must fight aggression with every weapon at our command.

To restore peace we must fight to win. Half-way measures will not preserve the American way of life.

If our objective in Korea is anything less than victory over the enemy we should bring our boys home before more precious lives are lost.

General MacArthur has been working for peace. Now a great wave of political propaganda has been started to picture him as a warmonger. But I know the American people will not be deceived. They realize from tragic experience that appeasement of aggressors is encouragement to war.

General MacArthur was building a road to peace. We must be resolute in our determination to complete that road.

This is Ed Martin, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Senator Blair Moody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, a freshman Senator has come to the Senate with the particular good wishes of the people of Rhode Island and of Brown University, where he studied and made a distinguished mark both in athletics and in scholarship for 4 years. I had the opportunity of making his friendship then because we were members of the same college fraternity. Since then we have always been friends. It is with particular gratification that I find that the Providence Journal on April 25, 1951, published an admirable editorial relating to Mr. MOODY's selection to be Senator from Michigan. I ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BLAIR MOODY

BLAIR MOODY was always a man to surprise his associates. A natural athlete, hefty, speedy, and a dangerous adversary, he won letters at Brown in three major sports. Since an athlete is not always noted for his skill with books and in the classroom, he caused a lifting of eyebrows when he was named a Phi Beta Kappa scholar for attainment in studies. It was presumed he would make a career in teaching, with coaching as a sideline, and his sojourn at Moses Brown seemed to bear this out. But again he surprised by showing up as a reporter—and a good one—for the Detroit News. He had not majored in English at Brown, which was then the gateway to newspaper work, and the English majors of his time at college were surprised at his choice of occupation. But the greatest surprise, even to his intimates in Washington newspaper work, was his appointment by the Governor of Michigan to succeed the late Arthur Vandenberg as United States Senator. If his past surprises are a criterion, he should make the Senate—and newspaper fellows—sit up and take notice in the eminent position he now enjoys. His many friends around this community wish him well—and more surprises.

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "MacArthur Practices an Adroit Deception," by Mr. Robert L. Riggs, of the Courier-Journal Washington bureau, which appeared in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of Sunday, April 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR PRACTICES AN ADROIT DECEPTION—WITHOUT REALLY SAYING IT, HE PLANTS THE IDEA THAT TRUMAN FORCED THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF TO GO AGAINST THEIR BETTER JUDGMENT IN KOREA

(By Robert L. Riggs)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—You get a measure of the political adroitness of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the success he has had in making it appear that President Truman has overruled the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

As a result of his speech to Congress, MacArthur has many people convinced that the Joint Chiefs and he are in complete agreement that the way to fight the Korean conflict is to help Chiang Kai-shek invade China and to bomb beyond the Yalu River in Manchuria.

He has created the belief that he and the four members of the Joint Chiefs all disagree with Truman; that the Joint Chiefs haved bowed their necks to the President in order to save their jobs, while only he is courageous enough to accept ouster from command in order to save his country.

A PICTURE CREATED

He has created a picture of Truman, under the domination of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, cracking the whip and forcing obedience from Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations.

It is a tribute to MacArthur's finesse that he has painted this picture of cringing military leaders without ever saying that they have been lashed into submission.

He has led the country to believe that the four staff chiefs are on his side and against Harry Truman—without ever saying that that is the situation. He has made it appear that, if they had his courage, they would be just as insubordinate as he has been.

Yet he has said no such thing. What he did say was that the Joint Chiefs share his thoughts on the best way—from a military point of view—to bring about victory in Korea.

FACT OVERLOOKED

What he failed to mention is that they reject completely his belief that to carry out his military proposals would not involve us in full-scale war with China, and probably with Russia.

In one degree or another, it is likely that most military people—as well as nonmilitary people—share some of MacArthur's views on the way to achieve victory in Korea.

Of course, it would help our fighting men in Korea if 600,000 of Chiang's men poured onto the Chinese mainland from Formosa and set up a second front. That is, it would help our soldiers in Korea if Chiang's people showed any greater disposition to fight the Communists than they showed when they were on the mainland before.

Of course, it would help our troops in Korea if our Air Force could drop bombs on Chinese troop concentrations across the Yalu River. That is, it would help our men unless it caused the Chinese and Russian Air Force, which has let our ground troops pretty much alone, to retaliate.

These questions of military movement undoubtedly find little disagreement between MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs. It would be reasonable to assume that both Truman and Acheson would agree that those proposed moves would—if certain other things didn't happen—bring quick victory.

THE CONTROVERSY'S NUB

But there is no reason whatever to believe that any of the Joint Chiefs agree with MacArthur that Chiang's invasion of the mainland and our dropping of bombs beyond the Yalu would fail to bring Russia into the war.

There you have the nub of the entire controversy between Acheson, Truman, and the Joint Chiefs on one side, and MacArthur, Herbert Hoover, Robert A. Taft, and Kenneth S. Wherry on the other side.

The conflict is over the political decision, as distinct from a military decision. Yet there are times when military factors are important parts of political decisions.

One small boy may decide, as a matter of tactics, that he can whip another lad. But it is a matter of strategic importance for him to know whether or not the other boy's big brother is going to appear and join in the fight.

It is equally important for him to know if his neighborhood gang will be behind him if the other lad's big brother appears.

MacArthur is virtually ready to give a guaranty that Red China's big brother in the Kremlin won't join the attack if we move against the Chinese mainland. As he puts it, the Soviet Union "will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves in Korea." In other words, Russia will not necessarily intervene if we join up with Chiang and send our bombers into Manchuria.

SHERMAN "MUTTERED"

It is well known, and probably will be emphasized before congressional hearings next week, that the Joint Chiefs have reached a different conclusion. They believe Russia may intervene if we take the course advocated by MacArthur, and thus set off a new world war.

On his political decisions, as opposed to strictly military theory, the Joint Chiefs have been out of sympathy with MacArthur for some months. It is an open secret that Navy Chief Sherman has muttered that had MacArthur been an admiral instead of a general, he would have been relieved of command long ago.

MacArthur's predictions as to what Russia and Red China will or won't do if we extend the fight come at a time when he is not in very good standing as a prophet.

He was a lot more positive, in October, about his prediction of what the Red Chinese would do in Korea than he was this week about what Russia would do.

He assured his superiors last fall that if he pushed the United Nations forces up to the Yalu River, his move would not bring the Chinese into Korea.

HENCE WAKE ISLAND

Washington knew, of course, that Chinese soldiers were concentrated by the thousands across the border in Manchuria. The Pentagon feared that a sweep of Allied forces from the 38th parallel to the Yalu would bring those hordes into Korea.

That was why Truman flew to Wake Island to confer with MacArthur.

It was at that conference that MacArthur assured the President the Chinese would not intervenue in Korea—just as he now is assuring the country Russia would not intervene.

It was, of course, a brief time after MacArthur gave Truman the Wake Island assurances that the Chinese troops were swarming into Korea.

On the question of helping Chiang Kai-shek invade the Chinese mainland, MacArthur told Congress—as TAFT and other followers of that school have been saying for a long time—that such a venture would not involve American ground troops.

As MacArthur himself phrases it, "no man in his right mind" would favor sending American troops to invade China. But what he does advocate is that we give them "logistical support."

COULD WE QUIT?

This means, presumably, that we not only would provide Chiang's men with guns and tanks, but that we also would ferry them from Formosa to the mainland.

It means, presumably, that we would keep the sea lanes open to Formosa by use of our surface fleet, and that we would provide the air cover needed to get the invaders onto the beach.

If we take the MacArthur thesis at its face value, this country would be expected to wash its hands of the enterprise, once we got the troops and their supplies ashore.

But, of course, having sunk millions of dollars in equipment, having committed a large part of our Air Force and a goodly portion of our Navy to that enterprise, it is hard to believe we could wash our hands of it without assuring it success.

If, as predicted by many, Chiang's soldiers should fold up in the face of the Communist armies, once they got to the mainland, there would be, so the argument goes, no way for us to avoid taking over the whole affair.

Having set out to put Chiang back in power, this country, the anti-MacArthurites declare, would have to see him through to the end, regardless of how many ground divisions of American troops the action would require.

THE BIG QUESTION

The Pentagon and the White House are convinced they have plenty of arguments to answer everything MacArthur said before Congress, though no one has any illusions the administration can put on so good a show as the general staged.

The administration—as well as the MacArthur-Taft-Wherry spokesmen—will have full opportunity to present arguments in hearings which begin next week.

The question, of course, is how well can the administration counteract the effect of MacArthur's dramatic appearance? Can it show the flaws which it insists are contained in the MacArthur theses?

If it hopes to do so, it will have to overcome the present tendency for military leaders to duck into executive sessions of committee hearings every time they discuss delicate matters.

If the country is to be swayed by Gen. George C. Marshall, by Bradley, by Vandenberg, and by Sherman, they will have to talk to the congressional committees with as little inhibition as MacArthur displayed before the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congres. And they will have to talk on—not off—the record.

Editorial From the St. Louis Star-Times on the Address of General MacArthur to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in all the mass of comment on General MacArthur's address to the Congress last week, an editorial in a great St. Louis newspaper, the Star-Times, is of special interest and merit because of its thoughtfulness and cool judgment in evaluing and analyzing what the general said. I commend this fine editorial to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS

All Americans, regardless of party or opinion, should feel gratitude to Douglas MacArthur for the elevated level upon which he kept his address to Congress yesterday. In the angry mood of the hour the general could have done incalculable harm by feeding the flames. In spite of the intensity of his feelings, which he communicated to his audience, he tried not to do so. He tried to stick to issues and to have them resolved on the highest plane of national interest.

The very dignity of his demeanor, however, makes it more difficult for the American people and their Congress to take the next step: to separate the issues from the personalities involved, the highly popular and dramatic martyr-hero and the President who fired him. Nevertheless, this must be done.

With much that General MacArthur said yesterday it is impossible to disagree, particularly his estimate of the present military situation. His confident and masterly presentation of the purely military situation was in sorry contrast to the administration's indecisive and confused handling of the political situation since the Korean involvement, though, of course, this does not mean that General MacArthur has the political answers either.

As he said, the military situation in Korea is now a stalemate. The American people share MacArthur's anguish and anxiety as the casualty lists grow longer. These now exceed 60,000 and no end is in sight.

MacArthur said, "While I was not consulted prior to the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic of Korea, that decision, from a military standpoint, proved a sound one." This statement is proof that Truman committed the United States to war in Asia without consulting the general in charge of that area, the man with the responsibility of winning the war. Perhaps, as MacArthur said, it turned out to be a correct military decision, at least until the Chinese Communists entered it. But MacArthur's testimony proves conclusively that Truman committed this Nation to a major war without full military consultation, just as he did so without a congressional declaration of war.

But the question is, what should be done now? The administration is taking the chance that a political settlement might be reached in Korea without enlarging the theater. It must be recognized frankly that this chance might not win. The Red Chinese have little hope of driving the U. N. forces out of Korea now unless they get considerable air support from Russia. If they get that air support and begin to advance, the U. N. forces may have no choice except to be driven out or to strike against the bases in China.

Douglas MacArthur doesn't want to continue taking that chance. He wants to take a different chance. He advocates four steps: "(1) The intensification of our economic blockade against China, (2) the imposition of a naval blockade against the China coast, (3) removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal area and of Manchuria, (4) removal of restrictions on the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa, with logistical support to contribute to their effective operations." An interesting omission is his former recommendation for bombing centers in China.

General MacArthur said that it was his understanding "that from a military standpoint the above views have been fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff." This amounts to a charge that the views for which MacArthur has been criticized were held also by the President's chief military advisers. The fact on this point should be made clear.

Military considerations, of course, must be balanced with other considerations. General MacArthur said yesterday, "War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision." True. But what is victory in the Korean war? Would victory in Korea have any meaning or value if it triggered off the general war it is being fought to prevent?

MacArthur mentioned this and dismissed it briefly. He said, "the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves." This is certainly true. But the assumption that the Soviet Union will not honor its obligations under the Sino-Russian mutual assistance treaty of 1950 is not one to be made lightly. General MacArthur does not know what the Russians will do. He may be guessing wrong, just as he did when he judged that Red China would not intervene in Korea. His statement that the Chinese Communist intervention was "not contemplated" is an admission that he guessed wrong, because President Truman implied that he relied upon MacArthur's assurance on this point.

Another huge question is whether the United States could use Nationalist troops on the mainland and limit its aid to what General MacArthur called logistical support. Such support would have to include sea transport with supply and air cover. What would happen if the Nationalist soldiers proved as ineffective as they did before being driven off the mainland? Could the United States then avoid doing what MacArthur said "no man in his right mind would advocate"—sending our ground forces into continental China?

This raises the question of the effectiveness of Chiang's forces on Formosa. MacArthur complimented the Nationalists' government of that island, a view which is not borne out by the reports of dispassionate observers. The failure of Chiang's government and armies on the continent cannot simply be attributed, as the general seemed to try to do, to malicious gossip. How many of Chiang's 600,000 men are well trained, fit, and even moderately well equipped? How much and how long would it take to prepare them for a continental invasion? After they landed, would the United States be committed to restore Chiang to rule over the half billion Chinese whose misery and discontent MacArthur described so well? These are just a few of the facets of the problem that must be considered.

After yesterday's drama loses some of its punch, the American people and their Congress should do a lot of hard-headed questioning of the assumptions and arguments of both General MacArthur and the administration. MacArthur ended his speech by saying that he, like the old soldier of a ballad, would now just fade away. This is one thing that one can say with confidence isn't likely to happen. But it would be good if much of the emotionalism of the past 10 days would fade away. It would be particularly helpful if two treacherous words would just fade away. One of them is "warmonger." The other is "appeaser." General MacArthur isn't a warmonger because he frets against the stalemate in Korea. President Truman isn't an appeaser because he is striving to avoid the expansion of the Korean war into a larger war.

General MacArthur Favors Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur reaffirmed his support of statehood for Hawaii again on April 17 upon leaving Honolulu for the mainland.

The general's reference to this subject came in the course of his farewell address.

Under unanimous consent, I incorporate in the RECORD an article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 17, telling of this occasion. It is as follows:

MACARTHUR FAVORS STATEHOOD; LEAVES FOR WELCOME AT SAN FRANCISCO

(By Moray Epstein)

Gen. Douglas MacArthur left Hawaii this morning with a warm farewell from 3,500 persons at Honolulu airport and his expressed hope to see the Territory become a State.

Rested and refreshed from their 33-hour stop-over, the general and his party took off in their plane *Bataan* at 9:30 a. m.

They are scheduled to arrive at San Francisco's municipal airport at 6 tonight, Hawaiian time.

Then will begin an expected tumultuous welcome from coast to coast.

All during the 10 minutes he was at the airport this morning, the general was genial and smiling.

As his car stopped on the runway about 15 feet from the visitors' enclosure, people behind the fence began to applaud.

He said his farewells to a line of top military officials—with a smile and a handshake for each—was introduce to Duke Kahanamoku, then was surrounded by newsmen.

General MacArthur looked around, allowed each radio announcer to identify himself for their broadcasts, then spoke.

HEART-WARMING WELCOME

"The welcome of Honolulu was heart-warming and marvelous in every way," he said. "In behalf of Mrs. MacArthur and all the members of the party, I thank you.

"We will not forget. When we meet again, I hope Hawaii will be a full-grown State of our beloved country. Aloha."

Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, close personal friend of General MacArthur, laughed, "I just want to say 'California, here we come.'"

The little group broke up and General MacArthur went to where his wife was standing. They turned to face the people behind the fence, and waved as a hundred camera shutters clicked.

WAVE FAREWELL

Everyone headed for the plane. The passengers went aboard with the MacArthurs last. There was a pause as the family stopped just outside the door to turn and wave a farewell.

Then they were inside and 2 minutes later the *Bataan* moved away to the east end of the field for its take-off.

An unexpected switch in plans Monday night moved the departure time ahead half an hour and shifted the point of take-off from Hickam Air Force Base.

A Navy spokesman today gave two official reasons for the airport change.

WANTED PUBLIC ADMITTED

1. The *Bataan* had to take off from Honolulu Airport because it requires a longer runway than is available at Hickam.

2. General MacArthur said he wanted the departure to be open to the public as much as possible.

Honolulu police officials assigned enough officers to the airport to maintain order and many compliments were heard from spectators, newsmen, and others for the way in which civil authorities handled the departure.

In addition to Mrs. MacArthur and their son Arthur, the *Bataan* carries as passengers seven military and personal friends of the general, all of whom arrived in the plane.

First stop is San Francisco. Arrival is scheduled in Washington, D. C., on Wednesday night to give General MacArthur time to get ready for his talk to Congress the following day.

THEN TO NEW YORK

Then after the congressional hearing, General MacArthur will leave for New York.

Advance reports of the receptions planned for the general tell of an exuberance of excitement in the big cities he will visit.

The general was received in Honolulu Monday with warm and sincere greetings.

There were rounds of applause along the route of his tour of Honolulu Monday afternoon.

There was flag waving and handkerchiefs, smiles were everywhere. But on the whole, it was a reserved welcome, more of an expression of respect than adoration.

Fourteen motorcycle policemen, 12 security police, 100 dismounted policemen—1 at each intersection on the route—and 10 transportation officers, made the tour go without a single hitch.

MORE THAN FOR PRESIDENT

More police officers were assigned to the tour detail than were used during President Truman's visit 6 months ago.

Everywhere along the road from Pearl Harbor to Punchbowl to the University of Hawaii and back to Pearl Harbor via Waikiki cars and busses were stopped to permit the procession to pass without delay.

Along Kapiolani Boulevard cars were stalled in a double row for a mile and a half.

MORE THAN ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND SEE

Police Capt. Alfred S. Harper estimated that close to half the population of Honolulu—more than 100,000 persons—lined the roads on which the general's party traveled.

The first stop after the nine-car caravan left from the Makalapa guest house where the MacArthurs stayed was in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl crater.

Army enlisted men stood at attention 50 feet apart along the entrance road to the cemetery.

The general's car stopped quickly in front of the cemetery flagpole. He pulled himself out, took a 4-foot orchid wreath from an Army aide, and stepped up on the raised platform around the base of the pole.

General MacArthur leaned the wreath against the pole, took a step backward, and stood stiffly in military salute.

For nearly a full minute he and other officers nearby held their salute.

When the general lowered his arm the several hundred persons watching the ceremony began to applaud.

TRIBUTE TO DEAD

General MacArthur stepped away from the pole, and, with a look of regret in his eyes, moved to the edge of the platform.

"I did not know the dignity of their dead," he said, slowly and deliberately to the newspapermen and photographers standing there.

"But I do know the glory of their death."

Then he walked to his dark green convertible with the five-star general's flag standing up from the front bumper. The caravan continued around the outer cemetery road up to the lookout pinnacle and back out of the crater.

Next stop was at the University of Hawaii, where more than 5,000 persons waited to see the general receive an honorary doctor of civil law degree.

But before the academic ceremony in Arthur L. Andrews Theater, the general went with University President Gregg M. Sinclair, Governor Stainback, Federal Judge J. Frank McLaughlin, and other dignitaries to the president's office.

ENROLLED AS SHRINER

There, Hosmer Rolph, potentate of the Aloha Shrine Temple, presented the general with an honorary life membership in the order.

He handed General MacArthur a red fez hat of the organization and the general put it on briefly.

After signing Dr. Sinclair's guest book the general and the group began to form the processional line to go into the stadium for the doctorate award.

Afterward, General MacArthur walked to his car, followed by the others in the tour party. And as his car moved out of the university gate, he turned to a group of Filipinos standing nearby.

"Mabuhay," he waved to them.

"Aloha," they shouted in return.

STOPS FOR SPECIAL LEI

There was only one more stop before the tour ended. On Kam highway just before Puuloa Road the caravan stopped for several minutes so that Mayor Wilson and members of the Honolulu Board of Supervisors could present the general with a lei wrapped in ti leaves.

As to the question of who provided the open car in which General MacArthur rode, the answer is that the Navy found it for him at the Waikiki U-Drive Co. It was a dark green 1951 Cadillac convertible.

The general—or the Navy—didn't pay any charge for it, incidentally. It was donated.

Gen. Charles G. Dawes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gen. Charles G. Dawes," published recently in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. CHARLES G. DAWES

A great many people will remember Charles G. Dawes as the man who blew up a congressional investigation by pounding the table and shouting "Hell 'n Maria."

The fact is that General Dawes was a public servant and a statesman of high order.

Long after he retired from public life, we sat in a little group where the discussion turned on international affairs and General Dawes spoke from the experience of having been Ambassador to Great Britain and the head of the American delegation which took part in the negotiation of the Dawes plan, one of the landmarks in the settlements after the First World War. We recall one of his statements.

"Successful international negotiations must begin," he said, "with the representatives of each nation having uppermost in mind the interest of their own nations. Along with that there must be the determination to adjust those interests to the common good of all."

We wondered then and we still wonder if the position of this country and of the world would not be better if some of our later day negotiators could have absorbed that advice.

Disaster in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, at the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, a prominent Chicago citizen and a veteran of World War II, now commanding the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade of the Illinois National Guard, answered the question, "Why MacArthur did not return." Having served under General MacArthur in the Pacific during World War II, and author of On the Eve of Victory With MacArthur, General Klein has time after time stressed MacArthur's great devotion to his country and his refusal to return until his job was done.

Now, after devoting a lifetime to the interests of his country, the great general and patriot, MacArthur, has been relieved of his command before his job was done.

General Klein aptly describes the feelings of all true Americans when he stated, upon being informed of General MacArthur's dismissal:

Not since Bataan has this Nation suffered a greater humiliation. We needed General MacArthur's leadership then—we need it now. The country is with him, and his vindication is assured.

The article written by General Klein entitled "Why MacArthur Did Not Return" follows:

WHY MACARTHUR DID NOT RETURN

Recent developments in Korea have solved the so-called mystery in connection with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's determination to remain at his post in Tokyo. In my report On the Eve of Victory dispatched by me in August 1945 from Manila to the War Department for publication in the Army and Navy Journal, I stated that MacArthur would come home only if and when his job in the Far East was finished.

Two things are obvious: One, that General MacArthur alone understood that his job was not finished; and two, that he alone foresaw today's events in Korea.

Now, at the impressive age of 70, the supreme commander is resolved to make sure that our men who gave their lives at Guadalcanal, Midway, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa, on the Normandy beachheads, at Anzio, and the Bulge, did not give their lives in vain.

Ever since the surrender of Japan, the American people have sought an answer to the question, "Why doesn't MacArthur come home?" He will return when his job is finished and when he is able to report to the American people, "mission completed."

A Faithful Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago an Oakland, Calif., volunteer Federal worker spent a few days in Washington. He is a sufficiently remarkable man that his activities merit comment. He will be 90 years old during the present month. His name is John A. Davis.

At the outbreak of World War II, Mr. Davis was 81 years of age. Although he was active and alert both mentally and physically, he could not find employment because of his age. Desiring to assist his Government, he volunteered to contribute his services to the Office of Price Administration. Because he had 15 years of experience as a village postmaster his services were gladly accepted and he was placed in charge of the mail room of the Price Administration office. At the conclusion of hostilities he continued to perform the same service for the rent-control office and is still working at that office daily at the age of 90.

During World War II and the postwar period he has contributed more than 15,000 hours of service to his Government without compensation therefor, notwithstanding the fact that he does not have an independent income and must live frugally.

In commenting on his work for the Government, Mr. Davis has stated:

I have been pleased to render this service because it has given me an active interest during the later years of life; it has shown that older men and women can render real service to the Government and to private enterprise in case they are given an opportunity to do so. I am glad that provision has been made to take care of the aged, sick, and destitute, and I am happy that they are no longer sent to poorhouses. I believe that the greatest service that could be rendered to older folks by the Government, State, and people of the communities in which they live would be that of giving them an opportunity to earn their own living. Through my contributed service, I have had an opportunity to use my head and my hands and I have an interest in life that has kept me healthy, happy, and active.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davis has been commended by many for his fine public service. I wish to add my commendations and thanks for the good work which Mr. Davis has done.

Veterans of Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team Told Good Citizenship First Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the text of a speech made at the eighth anniversary banquet of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team at Waikiki Lau Yee Chai, Honolulu, Hawaii, on April 7, by Masato Doi. It follows:

The years have flown, and it is 8 years now since the occasion arose out of which grew the bond which binds us today. The crisis called forth the man; the response was not wanting. We knew then that no man is an island unto himself.

In a few weeks, as we watch the film "Go for Broke," we shall relive those years which saw us in the thick of battle. To each of us will return the strenuous times in the dripping heat of Shelby and the rugged hills of Italy. Perhaps we shall even smell the acrid stench of death and powder. And we may feel again that sense of impending danger about us. Before each of us will rise the faces of those we can see no more.

And there will be happier memories. The spicy, rollicking adventures which belong only to a soldier on furlough, the sudden gleam which lights a ragged Italian infant's eyes at the sight of a candy bar, or the pleasant friendships made with simple French families.

Above all, there may swell within us a deep pride as we recall our part in the fierce and valiant struggle to maintain a free world.

But, for most of us, that day of combat in the field of screaming shells and chattering guns is past—at least for a time. What remains is the continuing obligation to realize that way of life which was so bravely defended.

We were then citizens rising to meet the call of duty; we are now citizens still, though with a record of achievement under fire. Though the character of our obligations may have changed, the fundamental duty remains the same—the duty to live up to the promise of America. True, for us there was the peculiar task of proving our right to unsullied citizenship; but let us not forget that proving that point was only a part of the larger fight to be able to return to a community where we can live a free and full life.

Battle is not, never was, never will be, an end in itself. It is the cause for which the sword is borne that counts. And what good the heroic deeds of war if the reason for those deeds turns out to be but a hollow dream?

Four years have now passed since the incorporation of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans Club. We were formed not only to preserve the memory of our fallen comrades and to keep intact the strong bond

forged in the heat of battle, but also to continue the high traditions of the combat team in our activities in the community. The first flush of exciting organizational work is done. The community has responded generously to our appeals; the memory of the war years was not forgotten by it. And the club is now on firm foundation.

But we stand at the threshold of a critical period. We are the decorated Captain Hero come home to his former life as Plain Joe. Other days are come, and other heroes are born. And as a club, this fact strikes us full in the face. This is not to say that the record of the war years is a useless shadow. There are none who would take away from the glory inscribed in blood by all the veterans from the islands. But the laurels of the past are sandy ground on which to rest the promise of the future.

The task before us individually lies in the difficult and oftentimes onerous job of active and voluntary participation in the life of the community. The only reward may be an inner satisfaction of a life richly and freely lived. But it was for this opportunity to so live that so many of our comrades gave their lives. And we are yet too young to pasture like an old war horse.

It needs but little thought to see that the distinctive mark of the American way of life to which we pledged ourselves is that it is built on choice. Indeed, it was to be able to return to a society of choices that we "shot the works." But what good the fight if the opportunity to choose be not grasped?

This past week has brought splendid and encouraging news that statehood for the Territory may not be far off. Though already great, then more than ever will the significance of the ballot come to the fore. Then more than ever will there rest upon us the duty to keep faith with the dead and wear the mantle of unlimited citizenship with the distinction with which we served in war. As individuals, let us shoot the ballot with the same unerring accuracy and vigor that we shot the bullet.

Our organization is pledged "to honor and esteem the supreme sacrifice made by the deceased comrades." What better way to realize this aim than to foster and encourage an active awareness among the members to all community processes. The Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans' Club is not and cannot be a partisan political group. This is far from saying that its hands are tied on vital issues of the day. To let them go unnoticed is to live outside the life stream of the community. Perhaps the mark of valor may not mean the wisdom of ages, but surely the badge of the veteran signifies a serious and mature mind. It is not only our privilege but our obligation to use this great asset for the benefit of the community.

The past week has also brought portents of gloom. High figures talk in terms of approaching war and wholesale destruction. Already we see more of Hawaii's youths don the apparel of combat, and once again we look into the face of sorrow bent over a hero's grave. But disaster may strike closer and strike harder. Who more fit to meet this consequence than he who has already braved the bursting bombs?

I repeat again from John Donne that "no man is an island unto himself." Words more apt could not have been spoken of a group such as ours. The very heritage we bear is grounded on that concept. And the heritage points the star to which we must cling. If the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team has gained the respect and admiration of the community from which it sprang, it has done so only because it served a cause with valor. If the Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans Club is to retain that respect, it can only do so by clinging to the high tradition of unselfish sacrifice set on the battlefield.

Of course, the life of the club is not that of the lighthouse which fails to shine on itself. It cannot be that if it is to have a strong and active membership. And a weak and crumbling structure serves no purpose—to itself or others. The intricacy of life today compels the individuals to look in unfamiliar nooks for answers. The club must hold its resources ready to aid the member to find them. No job can be too small, and none too big, for the club to tackle for its membership. In past years, the club has successfully carried on intensive athletic and social programs. A job referral system is in operation. Blood-bank benefits have and will continue to relieve the unfortunate. And contemplated activities include forums on practical matters of interest, and financial aid to members in need. These benefits, and others as the need arises, must be extended in order that the club remain a virile unit.

Thus the future of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans Club lies in "going for broke" both in extending tangible benefits to the membership and in participating in community affairs and serving community needs. Practical wisdom dictates the first; mature reflection compels the second.

I close with this parting word: We are pledged to uphold the high tradition of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team. Assuming the name Four Hundred and Forty-second in itself casts upon us a trust to live up to the record. Our heritage tells us that the key to the future lies in the realization that we are citizens first and veterans second.

Food for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent statements on the food-for-India proposal.

One of the statements has been issued by the committee on international policy of the National Planning Association, a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization, devoted to the study of public-interest questions. A list of the officers and sponsors of the organization subscribing to the statement on India is attached.

The second statement for insertion in the RECORD is addressed to the Rules Committee by the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, headed by Mr. Louis Heaton Pink, an outstanding and high-minded citizen of my State.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDIAN CRISIS

For the first time the Government of India has officially approached the United States for assistance in procuring grain needed for the food crisis in India. India's situation is precarious. The Government of India must prevent further deterioration of the standard of living if India is to maintain its economic and political stability.

India, a newly independent republic in Asia, remains noncommunist and antitotalitarian. Its per capita income is, however, desperately low—estimated at between $50 and $60 a year. Many of its 350,000,000 inhabitants are poor, underfed, ill-housed and inadequately clothed. Its standard of living has declined 16 percent from prewar levels. Aggravating this situation, the people of India are now faced with mass suffering and starvation due to the lack of food grains.

I

Food grains comprise the bulk of the Indian diet. The government of India has carried on a grow-more-food campaign designed to make India self-sufficient in food, to reduce the drain on its foreign exchange resources, and to free its limited resources for procurment abroad of goods needed for essential development to prevent further deterioration of its economy. Grain drawn from surplus producing areas in India is distributed through the rationing system to the deficit areas. The additional amount needed in the deficit areas is imported by the government of India. India's rationing system is one of the largest and most effective in the world. Ration prices are substantially below market prices. The ration system currently supplies additional food grains to 125,000,000 people, 45,000,000 of whom receive the "full" ration and the remainder a "partial" ration.

Last year the Government of India imported slightly more than 2,000,000 tons of food grains for distribution through its rationing system. It was hoped that import requirements would be less in 1951. In the summer of 1950, however, the prospects for good harvests which would be consumed in 1951 first dimmed and then vanished. Earthquakes, floods, droughts, and locust plagues cut domestic production of food grains by 6,000,000 tons. As the result, India was faced with a need for greatly increased imports of food grains from abroad. It is estimated that in 1951 over 9,500,000 tons of food grains are required to maintain the meager ration and to extend it temporarily to new areas. About 3,500,000 tons of food grains can be procured domestically for rationing purposes, leaving over 6,000,000 tons to be obtained from abroad.

India is purchasing 4,000,000 tons of food grains from countries all over the world, ranging from Pakistan and Burma to the United States. But it does not have the available foreign exchange for the remaining 2,000,000 tons. On December 16, 1950, Madame Pandit, the Indian Ambassador to the United States, officially requested aid in obtaining this amount from the United States Government.

II

Indian food consumption seems pitiably small by comparison with our standards. The average Indian caloric intake is put at 1,760, a figure lower than the internationally accepted subsistence level of 1,800; while the comparable figure in the United States is 3,244 and in Japan 2,050. For lack of grain in the ration-distribution system, grain rations were recently reduced from 12 ounces (approximately 900 calories).

Two million tons of food grains would be the ration requirement for 23,000,000 people for a year. In terms of the avarage caloric intake, 2,000,000 tons of food grains would represent the total food intake of about 15,000,000 people in India. If the 2,000,000 tons of food grains are not forthcoming, it will not mean that 15,000,000 people will be without food while all others receive the average amount, since the grain shortage will fall upon all recipients under the rationing system. Rather, it might be said that 15,000,000 units of starvation or deaths by starvation will be distributed over the total population, receiving food rations. The consequence of such action will be to weaken a larger part of the population by malnutrition. Resistance to disease will be less and a great number of people will die, indirectly if not directly from starvation.

The people of India have looked to the west—to the United States—for aid in their time of crisis. India's very existence as a democratic and independent country may well be dependent upon our response to this request. While the Government of India has been emphatic in its control of communism in that country, the Communists have taken advantage of every opportunity to play upon the poverty of the Indian people. They are not missing this opportunity presented by the hunger of the people.

III

India is expending its foreign exchange in the procurement of food grains. It has resumed trade with Pakistan and in so doing has advanced over 300,000 tons nearer the goal of 4,000,000 tons which it is purchasing from abroad for 1951. It proposes to pay the ocean freight charges on the additional 2,000,000 tons.

On February 12 the President addressed to the Congress a message proposing emergency food aid for India. In view of the urgent need for assistance, he proposed that funds be appropriated immediately for 1,000,000 tons, deferring appropriation of funds for the remaining 1,000,000 tons until the situation has been further clarified.

Careful consideration of the appropriate terms upon which aid should be extended would involve investigation of India's ability to pay for the additional 2,000,000 tons of food grain in terms of India's economic position in coming years. In considering terms of aid, it must be recognized that the grain would not generate foreign exchange which could be used to repay the aid.

Since World War II, India's foreign-exchange earnings have been inadequate to meet import requirements. This has been true, despite the fact that, over most of this period, India has exercised rigorous import controls and has held consumption to relatively austere levels. India's international balance of payments for 1951 will probably show a small deficit, allowing for trade with Pakistan and India's payment of ocean freight for an additional 2,000,000 tons of grain. While India has met past trade deficits by drawing upon accumulated foreign-exchange assets, totaling about $4,900,000,000 in 1946, these assets have shrunk to less than $1,800,000,000 as the result of trade deficits, devaluation, and the partition of what was British India. This sum includes an estimated minimum requirement of $1,000,000,000 for currency backing and working capital.

If India is to halt economic deterioration, it must carry out its present plan for essential economic development in the shortest possible time. India's program to prevent further economic deterioration calls for a 6-year effort from July 1, 1951. This basic program (under the so-called Colombo plan) requires a total expenditure of almost $4,000,000,000, or an average of about $650,000,000 a year. While this is large in absolute terms, it is scarcely more than enough to assure maintenance of present low standards of living. Approximately $1,700,000,000 (about $290,000,000 a year) of the programed expenditures must be in foreign exchange. Drawing against reserves and utilizing current savings will provide about $100,000,000 annually, leaving a gap of around $190,000,000 annually in foreign exchange, which will have to come from abroad in the form of loans.

Already India owes $100,000,000 to the International Monetary Fund and $62,500,000 to the International Bank. It is estimated that an additional $1,250,000,000 of foreign capital is invested in India, involving substantial annual service payments. Consequently, India will have great difficulty in servicing fully the annual increment of about $190,000,000 in foreign loans needed for the program. The cost of the additional 2,000,000 tons of food grains needed by India is placed at $150,000,000. It is obvious that if India has to borrow this amount in order to obtain the food aid, the burden of loan service which would be imposed would cut heavily into the size of the development program which India could undertake.

India's present need for emergency food aid is in addition to its need for a 6-year program. The former serves to emphasize the need for halting the downward trend in India's standard of living so that India will be able to withstand possible emergencies in the future. In view of the urgent need for a development program and the critical nature of the time, it is important that India's present plan not be deterred. A loan to purchase this emergency requirement of food grains would prejudice India's ability to carry out its 6-year program and, thus, would strike at the stability desperately needed by India if it is to remain democratic.

IV

It is the considered judgment of the Committee on International Policy that the American people should respond promptly and in a spirit of Christian charity to the appeal from India for grain to feed her starving people. We do not believe that the welfare of this country will be served in any way by conditioning our response to political objectives or to recent differences of opinion expressed in the United Nations. On the contrary, we feel that hundreds of millions of Asiatics, both inside and outside of India, will regard the action which we take on this matter as a sure sign of our future intentions in the Far East.

We averted starvation, unrest, and the rise of communism in Europe by our bold and generous actions under the Marshall plan. We cannot afford to ignore the threat of starvation, unrest, and communism in India. We cannot afford to fail to take those limited actions which are asked of us to help the Indian Government meet this tragic situation. And in providing the funds necessary for the grain requested, we cannot afford to ask India to accept a loan which will delay her desperately needed development program by 1 year.

It is recommended that receipts in India from the sale of grain given by this country should be set aside as counterpart funds. The United States Government can properly ask to have the equal voice in the expenditure of these funds that it now has in the use of the counterpart funds of European countries participating in the Marshall plan. In this way, we can, in effect, use twice our appropriations for food for India: First, to feed the starving and, second, to aid India in her much needed economic development program.

Members of the NPA Committee on International Policy adopting this statement are: Frank Altschul, chairman, chairman of the board, General American Investors Co.; Louis Brownlow, vice chairman, Washington, D. C.; Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America; John F. Chapman, vice president-publisher, McGraw-Hill International Corp.; Charles C. Colby, professor of geography, University of Chicago; George P. Delaney, international representative, American Federation of Labor; Alvin E. Dodd, honorary president, American Management Association; John Kenneth Galbraith, department of economics, Harvard University; Carter Goodrich, professor of economics, Columbia University; Luther H. Gulick, president, Institute of Public Administration; Joseph D. McGoldrick, McGoldrick-Baldwin; Philip E. Mosely, department of public law and government, Columbia University; Charlton Ogburn, New York City; Lithgow Osborne, president, the American-Scandinavian Foundation; Clarence E. Pickett, honorary secretary, American Friends Service Committee; Michael Ross, director, department of international affairs, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Theodore W. Schultz, professor of agricultural economics, University of Chicago; Wayne Chatfield Taylor, consultant, Economic Cooperation Administration; Robert West, special consultant to the Secretary on Migration, United States Department of State; David J. Winton, chairman of the board, Winton Lumber Co.

CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC UNION,
New York, N. Y., April 23, 1951.

To the Rules Committee, House of Representatives:

The Citizens Conference on International Economic Union earnestly urges that you release to Congress for action the bill providing 2,000,000 tons of grain for India, which has been before you since March 5.

We urge that the United States do the right and obvious thing by seeing that this grain gets where it is needed as promptly as possible. It is of prime importance that Congress does not weaken or destroy the virtue of our act by trying to make this assistance a matter of barter, or a loan instead of a grant, or subject to political conditions which would make it difficult or impossible for India to accept this needed help.

There is no question of the great need; much of the land of India which produces grain and rice has gone dry. Floods and earthquakes intensify the problem. No one questions that millions suffer from hunger. Informed sources report that the famine will probably equal if not exceed that of Bengal in 1943. It is admitted that we have sufficient grain in storage and can afford to send the 2,000,000 tons asked for without injury to our economy.

India has bought all she can get with the exchange which is available, from the United States, Australia, Canada, and other nations, but it is not enough. If India had the means or the dollar exchange she would undoubtedly prefer to buy grain, rather than ask for it on special terms. Prime Minister Nehru properly deprecates too much outside help since it means you do not strengthen yourself. But because India faces a crisis Nehru joins his people in asking for a grant from the United States.

Former President Hoover, experienced in aiding people in need, says that this is not politics, but Christianity. It is also an expression of our good-neighbor policy, to which we are rightly committed. Undoubtedly the majority of both parties in Congress will vote for this aid if given the chance.

It is intended that this grain be distributed by the ECA, experienced in such matters, under regulations similar to those used in Europe. There is no danger that our aid would be wasted or abused. The Government of India, while one of the newest in the world, has long years of British training behind it and has already demonstrated not only its interest in democracy but its capacity for administration.

The Committee on Rules will render a great service not only to India but to the United States, and to international cooperation and good will, if it promptly reports the bill before it, so that Congress can take action in the interest of India and of our relations with Asia and the rest of the world.

CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC UNION.
LOUIS H. PINK, *Chairman.*

More Information on India's Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto the text of an interview with Madame Pandit, India's Ambassador to the United States, regarding India's policy by the distinguished editor, Dr. Manfred George, published in the German-English newspaper, Aufbau, on Friday, March 30, 1951. This newspaper enjoys wide circulation and makes a distinct contribution to American democracy. It brings to bear upon our national and international problems the experience and intellect of many who have experienced the Nazi totalitarianism and lived through it, to help us to deal with modern-day Communists and other totalitarians:

The United States is rich, richer than many of its citizens know. India is poor, poorer than many people all over the world imagine. They think only of maharajahs and the luxury of their courts, of the legends and stories of rulers and princes.

This India has been disappearing; another India, slowly freeing herself from colonial rule, has taken her place. The new India is independent and proud, but poor, terribly poor.

Since the United States lost China, India is our most valuable remaining ally in Asia. We do not want to go into the problems of Asia in this connection, as they are very similar to those confronting us in Germany. India is a free country. Although close cooperation between two free and democratic countries such as the United States and India seems a matter of course, Congress has very ungraciously delayed the shipment of 2,000,000 tons of grain for India's starving population.

Certain circles in the United States have been disappointed by the attitude taken by Prime Minister Nehru. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH recently pointed out that although India repeatedly voted against us in the United Nations, she has voted more often for us. Yet, it is her latest vote that is being remembered. Senator SMITH, of course, is for India. But her statement reports the attitude that prevails among, unfortunately, certain Members of the House and Senate who advocate the policy of "do ut des"; they cannot tell humanitarian measures from political bargaining, and they feel that India must pay for 2,000,000 tons of grain by complete political subservience.

Close cooperation between the United States and India is one of the prerequisites of world peace; the jungle of misunderstandings between the two great nations must be cleared away. For this reason, I have asked the Indian Ambassador in Washington, Mme. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, to grant Aufbau the following interview.

In the waiting room of the Indian Embassy in Washington there is a picture which immediately attracts the attention of the visitor. It is the portrait of a man with intelligent and radiantly warm features—of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the Republic of India. Like Gandhi, Nehru, and the present mistress of the Embassy, he has shared the fate of those who fought for India's independence. He suffered privations, and he spent years in jail. But his face does not show any bitterness; it reveals warmth, clouded by worry, and kindliness, shaded by sorrow. It is the face of India.

Facing a petite, grey-haired woman with a warm smile in the Ambassador's office, we thought of the day when the sister and close collaborator of India's Prime Minister clashed with General Smuts in the United Nations.

"When you scored your great victory over the policy of discrimination in South Africa in your capacity as leader of the official Indian delegation to the United Nations," we reminded her, "you delivered a speech before the General Assembly in which you said: 'We move in spite of difficulties toward a closer cooperation and the building of a world commonwealth. * * * The peoples of the world look with satisfaction to their fulfillment. Let us realize that human emotions and the needs of the world will not wait for an indefinite period.'

"At that time, the entire world seemed to share these feelings. Yet it now looks as if the Governments of the United States and of India were much farther apart than their peoples would like to see. May I ask a few questions about the misunderstandings which apparently have caused this situation?"

Answer: "Certainly. But don't forget that I am speaking only as the Indian Ambassador, and not for Prime Minister Nehru."

Question: "Do you think that there has recently been a shift in Indian public opinion which is unfavorable to the United States?"

Answer: "There has been no shift of any appreciable scale in Indian public opinion unfavorable to the United States. India is a democratic country and has a free press. The opinions and criticisms expressed by Indian newspaper editors do not always represent either the views of the government or the sentiments of the people. Similarly, it may be agued that editorial comments in some United States newspapers do not represent the views of the Government or the sentiments of the American people. Nevertheless, it is true that in recent months there have been misunderstandings as a result of apparent divergencies in the policies of the respective governments in relation to specific issues; for instance, the recognition of the government of new China. But these misunderstandings are trivial when viewed against the basic identity of interests as well as aspirations of the two peoples. This misunderstanding is also partly due to lack of information on which sound judgment can be based. The efforts of the United States State Department to secure congressional approval for the grant of food to aid India constitute the most eloquent testimony to the underlying bond of friendship which characterizes the relations between the two governments."

Question. "When Prime Minister Nehru recently called for the support of South Korea, he stated that 'the West lacked in subtlety and took the wrong approach to the mind and hearts of Asia.' Do you also think so, and to what did the Prime Minister specifically refer?"

Answer. "I believe the Prime Minister's reference to the lack of subtlety in the West's approach to the minds and hearts of Asia was of a general nature and did not cover the entire ground of East-West relationships. The Prime Minister has often spoken about the vast changes that have taken place in Asian countries in recent years and are bound to take place in the future, and has often stressed the fact that the understanding of Asia is one of the major tasks that confront western statesmanship. I do not know if the Prime Minister had any specific issue in mind when he made the statement quoted by you, but if he did, the reference could be to American policy in regard to the recognition of the People's Government of China."

Question. "I understand that 'western imperialism' is one of the most hated ideologies in Asia. Given the fact that the so-called imperialistic nations are pulling out of Asia, is she not bound to come under the influence of Soviet imperialism, in transforming her colonial countries into independent states? Will the Asiatic countries be strong enough to uphold their newly won national independence through social reforms, or are the social revolutionary forces stronger than the national forces?"

Answer. "It is, in my view, wrong to assume that the gradual withdrawal of imperial control from Asia will create a political vacuum which can be filled by communism alone. In fact, nationalism is today a much stronger force in Asia than communism. But nationalism is a political idea, and it does not fill empty stomachs. Asian nationalism, therefore, requires to be fortified by economic aid provided by those who are in a position to do so. The bad economic situation in many Asian countries recently liberated from imperial control should not be ascribed entirely to the fault of the peoples of those countries. Centuries of exploitation have laid the economy of those countries prostrate and have grievously circumscribed their power of recovery. The leadership of these countries is genuinely interested in the economic welfare of their peoples in a democratic and peaceful manner. Only thus can the forces of social disruption and violent agitation be held permanently in check. It is the feeling of Asian peoples that the United States is in a position to fortify the forces of nationalism by rendering them material aid in their economic difficulties. A lasting alliance between American democracy and Asian nationalism can thus be forged."

Question. "Although communism is unpopular in India, there seems to be sometimes lack of apprehension that it could possibly endanger India, or any other Asiatic nation. Is this correct, and how will and can India protect herself against communism?"

Answer. "There is an awareness in India of the possible dangers of communism and it is for this reason that the government is straining its resources to the utmost to better the economic condition of the country and raise the living standards of the people."

Question. "Is there any other way in which you combat communism?"

Answer. "We fight the idea. While we do not suppress the Communist Party as such, we punish those individuals who abuse the freedom granted them under the new constitution."

Question. "Aside from India, are there any other Asiatic nations strong enough to develop so-called third forces and act as buffers against the two great world powers?"

Answer. "India does not look upon herself either as a third force or as a buffer state between America and Soviet Russia. India wishes to remain on the friendliest terms with the United States, as she does also with other countries."

Question. "Considering Korea which is of deep concern to the entire world—if morality has to choose between two evils—between war or appeasement—which in your opinion is the lesser evil?"

Answer. "The alternatives in my opinion are not between war and appeasement, but between war and peace through conciliation. If India believed in appeasement, she would not have voted in support of the U. N. resolution branding North Korea an aggressor."

Question. "Some western circles find it extremely difficult to correlate their views and recent developments in Asia. Let me just refer to some statements made by General MacArthur which I think rather controversial. He spoke of the necessity of a strong will in the approach to the oriental mind. Which, in your opinion, is the main difficulty that must be overcome in this respect?"

Answer. "I do not think there are any great difficulties. It seems to me that the West will have to give up its old concepts of Asia, and to acknowledge the fact that tremendous changes have taken place. One cannot look at the problems of Asia with the eyes of yesterday. New independent states have come into existence. What the west needs, is a fundamental change of attitude, a change of heart, so-to-speak. Mainly, however, it will have to deal with Asia on terms of equality."

Question. "To sum up with a basic question: Which, in your opinion, is the basic difference in the attitude toward world peace between the mentality of India, or rather, Asia, and that of the West? Which—if any—is the common ground on which the two can meet, and how can such a meeting pave the way for an understanding with Russia?"

Answer: "This is a difficult question to answer in categorical terms. I think India's sympathies in the East-West cold war lie fundamentally with the West. India is opposed to totalitarianism and dictatorship, but her approach to the problem has such wide social and economic implications that no satisfactory solution can come out of global atomic warfare. Ways and means must therefore be constantly sought for securing a meeting ground between the two hostile camps. It is the Indian view that this quest should not be given up under any circumstances, and we feel that it is not yet too late to achieve this seeming miracle."

We then discussed general problems of Asiatic policy. In particular, I referred to two resolutions now pending before the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives; one, submitted by Congressmen JAVITS and RESICOFF, suggests the foundation of an organization for far-eastern economic cooperation, a kind of Marshall plan for Asia; the other, which has the support of eight Republican and Democratic Representatives, advocates a Pacific pact for the common and mutual defense of far-eastern territories along the lines of the Atlantic Pact.

According to the Ambassador, India is deeply interested in any kind of cooperation; however, Madam Pandit feels that there are no prerequisites for the military side of such a pact, as the stature of the nations concerned is too unequal. She also pointed out that the ground for such close cooperation has been laid by history with the strong political, cultural, and philosophical ties between the peoples in question. Practical outlines were sketched at the India Relations Conference which was held in New Delhi several years ago. Similarly, the Colombo plan very actively contributes to the political and economic reorientation of Asia.

We left the Embassy with a feeling of deep satisfaction. This was a representative of a nation destined to play a leading role in world politics, who seemed to combine the wisdom of Asia with the liberal humanism of the west. This was a woman—with an entire nation standing behind her—so deeply concerned with the ideal of peace that she did not allow herself even the shadow of a doubt that peace could not be preserved.

Clarification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following item by the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service which appeared in the Tidings, Los Angeles, Calif., of Friday, April 20, 1951:

NO OBSERVATORE VIEW ON MACARTHUR GIVEN

Last weekend there appeared in Osservatore Romano an article making reference to the removal of General MacArthur. The article expressed the opinion that the dismissal of the general could be regarded as a step indicating a desire for world peace.

General press accounts said that Osservatore Romano itself had made these observations, and reference was made to editorial comment by Osservatore Romano.

Osservatore Romano, while published in Vatican City, is not the official organ of the Vatican, except to the extent that from time to time it runs a column containing official Vatican pronouncements, always under the same heading, so that those familiar with the paper know that unless the material appears under this heading, it is not official.

Actually, the MacArthur comment was contained in an article which appears regularly twice a week in Osservatore Romano and is written by Giorgio Luigi Bernucci.

This regular article does not contain Vatican official views, but the views of the writer. It is headed Acta Diurna, and undertakes to review various news developments around the world.

The NCWC news service has been informed that in this instance, definitely the comment on the MacArthur case was the writer's own, and does not necessarily represent the views of Osservatore itself.

Time for Americans To Speak Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tidings of April 13, 1951:

TIME FOR AMERICANS TO SPEAK UP

The time has come for every American to speak up and help save his country, Father Bernard J. Hubbard, S. J., said here Tuesday night.

Lecturing before 4,000 persons in Shrine Auditorium at the very moment when the news of General MacArthur's dismissal was breaking, Father Hubbard characterized the general as "the greatest living American today."

"More than external aggression I fear internal cancer," the 63-year-old Jesuit explorer told his audience in reviewing United States postwar policies.

He described Dean Acheson, George Marshall, Owen Lattimore, and Alger Hiss as "architects of disaster."

WORSE BLUNDER

These men, said the Alaska veteran, "have already made a worse blunder than losing Asia by becoming spiritually and mentally underprivileged" and refusing to admit their blunders.

"Marshall," he declared, "is now just part of a machine. He is neither physically nor mentally the man he was several years ago."

Included in the lecturer's criticism of what he termed the "internationalists" was Ambassador at Large Philip Jessup "who shouldn't be at large."

The Jesuit authority on Alaska and the Arctic declared that America's major postwar errors were:

1. Refusal by the administration to permit Gen. George Patton to accept the Nazi surrender on grounds that such a surrender was to be received by the Russians instead. "This was the first appeasement," said Father Hubbard.

2. The Marshall mission to China which attempted to force on Nationalist China a coalition to the Communists.

YALTA INCIDENT

Referring to Yalta, Father Hubbard alleged that General MacArthur had sent a personal emissary to President Roosevelt there with the recommendation that Russia under no condition be allowed to enter the Pacific war.

The emissary was prevented by Alger Hiss and others from seeing the President and delivering MacArthur's recommendation.

Further errors which the lecturer attributed to the State Department included its refusal to utilize a total of 27 divisions of European patriots in exile who have a stake to fight for. These include Hungarian, Czech, and Polish soldiers with their officers.

He assailed the Department's refusal to permit use of 22 Spanish divisions, soldiers who have defeated communism in battle. If use of this total of 49 divisions were permitted, many of our 18-year-olds would be saved.

CASUALTIES QUESTIONED

The Jesuit priest questioned the accuracy of official Korea casualty figures, citing a high-ranking but unnamed private source which held that as of December 29, 1950, American casualties were already 60,000.

Other straightforward observations by the gray-haired weather-tanned priest were:

"I do not fear world war III if we teach China a few lessons. After all, there are troubles behind the iron curtain too."

"If we started war tomorrow the Russian Army would revolt. I have good reason for saying so. * * * The Russians, further, do not have enough petroleum to undertake a war." Father Hubbard said Russia's Baku oil fields were going dry, new wells were not producing anything, and consequently the Soviets had taken to exploratory drilling in the Arctic tundra.

As for any Russian threat to Alaska, Father Hubbard said no military operations against the Territory have any chance of success because of the morass, vast wilderness, and impossible conditions.

The Present Administration and the War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "The Treason of 'Liberalism,'" written by Forrest Davis and published in the Freeman for February 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TREASON OF LIBERALISM

(By Forrest Davis)

The definitive word on the administration's funk over its unacknowledged war

was spoken the other day by a visiting cattleman. A plain man from the plains, unversed in the polemical subtleties of Capital shop talk, he found himself amidst statesmen from his own range country at a noggin party on Capitol Hill. What he heard caused this booted and usually self-contained man growing agitation. The company agreed that the President's attempt to smuggle Fair Deal socialism into his back-breaking defense budget was a piece of immature chicane. It was agreed that the administration's global military policy was so fantastically distorted that we could lose the war of the west before George Catlett Marshall discovers that Mao Tse-tung, not Chiang Kai-shek, is the enemy. It was suggested that the administration, by seconding Great Britain's ignominious project for a cease-fire parley with the enemy over Formosa and Japan, had betrayed an inner weakness signifying a profound malady of the spirit. At this point the cattleman broke into the practiced phraseology of his hosts, drawling with deadly earnestness:

"I reckon the time has come to take this Government away from the boys and hand it over to the men."

The cattleman could be forgiven for supposing that he had been whisked unaccountably to Lilliput. Events since last June have, in truth, dwarfed the chief men of the administration. Why, the visitor was asking, must a resolute people with its terrible swift sword still undrawn, immeasurably strong in field and factory, be so feebly yet so refractorily led? Why must our chief of state be so palpably unequal to his task, mistaking pugnacity for strength of character, mistaking Congress for the enemy, sheltering himself behind a timid, evasive United Nations; hearkening so uncritically to far-eastern defeatists and a London brazenly ready to violate the unity of the west to serve its abject appeasement of the common enemy in China? Why must the President still be advised on the highest levels by the friend of Alger Hiss and by the pessimistic, procrastinating septuagenarian General Marshall, sunk in reverie and failing to spur the arming of America as he had, when vigor and conviction were on him, in 1941?

Yet an inventory, no matter how explicit of our rulers' weaknesses and follies comes short of giving us a true understanding of what ails our Government in an hour of high destiny. The answer to the moral confusion, the flabby tone, the unwillingness to meet with a knightly spirit our appointed task of manning the marches of the west against the barbarian, lies deeper than personality. Should not the debilitating malaise which gives to life in Washington its sense of negation, empty of honor and dignity, be diagnosed as a failure of the liberal spirit? Is it not the prevailing political liberalism of the midcentury, that potpourri of indiscriminate do-goodism trending into statism and Marxism and blending so indistinguishably with treason, that is the deepest enemy of the traditional America and the west? It is this liberalism which, since World War I, has under the guise of welfare surrendered society after society into black reaction.

The unnerved, indecisive liberal socialism of Prince Lwow and Kerensky, instead of standing the implacably malign Lenin before a firing squad, allowed him to seize power and go on to blight a whole era with a senseless, murderous political adventurism known as communism. So it was with the liberalism of Weimar, shrinking from the decapitation of Hitler and the Communist traitors and ending in nazism. It is liberal socialism that has produced the unrecognizably neurotic Britain, disloyal to the West. Above all, it is liberalism which, motivated to whatever degree by treachery, has cost us China, has enfeebled our offensive spirit and blunted our strategical judgment about our vital interest in the western Pacific. That liberalism, preached with the fervor of a Byzantine heresy by glib intellectuals tired of the west, unequal to its overwhelming culture, eager to efface the masses whom they fear in the Leviathan state, is, I submit, behind our defensive faltering before the senior totalitarian state.

There is a deceptiveness about the facade of affairs in Washington. The administration calls men to the colors, it busies itself with a gradual, somewhat grudging mobilization of the economy. Intent on Europe first, it quarrels with its critics, evading the grim lesson that our No. 1 strategical problem is the western Pacific; that, if we lose Japan, we lose Alaska, and Europe. The administration still bristles at suggestions that it root out the fifth column that has demonstrably betrayed us. It hesitates to summon the people to make a cause out of the war that has been forced upon them. Where is our dedication, where our determination (as in the case of our determination to destroy Hitler) to rid the world of the wicked men in the Kremlin, to free the peoples, including their own, whom they have enslaved, so that the world may return to peaceful ways?

In a sense not too remote, the troubled observer may be reminded of the contrast between reality and semblance in the Petrograd of 1916. The ministers of the provisional government went through the motions of ruling mother Russia; they dispatched troops, they issued manifestoes, yet all they did was misdirected. And, while foreign diplomats reported the government secure, the conspirators at the Smolny convent forged their iron coup unmolested.

We are indebted to Leon Trotsky's History of the Russian Revolution for a description of the paradoxically normal scene as Russia drifted into ruin: the great bureaucracies of empire functioning, trams running through the dirty October snow, guards mounted at the winter palace, the ballet, the theater, the schools, the cafes, the shops pursuing their wonted course. The press, from Tsarist to Bolshevist, appeared as usual on the morning after Lenin had appropriated the strategic centers with no recognition of that cataclysmic occurrence. We do not face insurrection, our extremity is presumably less grave, yet it may be legitimately doubted that our rulers are nearer the core of reality than the uncomprehending statesmen and citizens of Petrograd in its final hours of freedom.

The great bureaucracies of Washington function, the trolleys run, but the somnambulism is broken only by strong, heartening utterances in Congress and an occasional lonely journalistic voice. For, if the behavior of the administration's chief men is definitely disturbing, the chorus of their journalistic mentors and spokesmen is downright frightening. The administration organ, the Washington Post, cravenly advises the Government to buy off Mao Tse-tung with Formosa. Walter Lippmann and Marquis Childs, Post columnists, warn their friends in the Government to accept Communist command of China as a fait accompli which must on no account be questioned.

True it is that the Post has invariably upheld the liberal abandonment of China, unfailingly sought to shield officials accused of subversion. In the voluminous lexicon of liberal journalism there is no word for treason. It is true also that Mr. Lippmann is an equivocal Mercury and Mr. Childs brings to world problems the dewy ardors of a sociology instructor or a Sri Nehru. Yet these journalists exercise enormous sway in the upper reaches of the administration and, with Drew Pearson and the fratres Alsop, are the chosen instruments through which the propaganda of Secretaries Acheson and Marshall reaches the public.

To top all this, the Alsops recently disclosed a state of mind amongst the administration's leaders so shocking that in ruder times it would have called out the fury of Congress and people. What they noted was the bitter fact that these highest functionaries were hoping that our beachhead in Korea will be untenable. The leading men of our Government, the Alsops were saying, hoped for the defeat, humiliation, and death of our forces and the forcible abandonment of our only position on mainland Asia. How defeatist, we are entitled to ask the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, can you get?

There is, of course, a direction to all this scuttle: the unwillingness to free MacArthur to wage war in the enemy's back areas, to take offensive action against Communist China, to arm our long-suffering friends, the Nationalist Chinese; to make the martial Japanese our allies, to face up to our grievous peril and our real opportunities in the Far East. To draw our strength and attention away from the western Pacific, mastery of which contains Soviet power on that flank, shielding Alaska and the homeland, is prima facie in Soviet interest.

The Kremlin knows, if the administration does not, that the loss of the western Pacific would be almost, if not quite, as calamitous for us as the loss of Western Europe. (See Why Stalin Needs Asia in the Freeman of January 22.) What has happened, among other things of lesser import, is that the "liberal" world, to which belong the administration, the British Socialists, Nehru, and much of the seaboard American press, long ago decreed that the Soviet world should have China and be undisturbed in possession. Worse than that in moral terms, under a hypocritical cloak of inconceivable impertinence, the "liberal" world pretended that the welfare of the Chinese masses would be somehow advanced under the murderous Soviet terror.

Where did this "liberal" commitment to Chinese communism cross the line into treason? How near does this corruption reach into the heart of the government? Where in all this sorry situation is the President? It is freely supposed in Washington that Mr. Truman is ruled in matters of high policy by Acheson and Marshall, as in domestic questions such professional "liberals" as Max Lowenthal instruct him. If the protractedly juvenile Louis XIII had his Cardinal Richelieu and Father Joseph, Mr. Truman, it is said, has his eminence rouge in Acheson, his eminence grise in Marshall. The character of Mr. Acheson's "liberal" statesmanship was exhaustively treated in the Freeman of last December 11. The stages by which the President's gray eminence advanced from professional soldier to "liberal" statesman merit an equally close study if he is to remain in public life. (The persistent reports that Marshall is to give up the Defense Department are often coupled with the prediction that the President is to place him in an even more intimate relationship to national policy as his personal chief of staff.)

Although General Marshall's attitudes to the major strategy of World War II earned him the "friendship" of Stalin and Voroshilov (see p. 783, "Roosevelt and Hopkins" by Robert E. Sherwood) and constitute a provocative pattern from the second-front agitation to the prolongation of the Japanese war, it is sufficient unto the day to remember that his postwar mission to China was perhaps the most disastrous piece of diplomacy ever undertaken by an American. When General Marshall went to China the Nationalists (as Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault reviewed the situation in his Way of a Fighter) were everywhere victorious and bade fair soon to end Communist military power in China. When General Marshall departed 15 months later, after imposing a truce, opening the Kalgan Pass, denying further military assistance to Chiang Kai-shek and demanding Communist inclusion in the government, it was apparent that the Reds were to have China. While it would be as bizarre to suggest that the general was actuated by improper motives as to accuse a most reverend archbishop of secretly practicing heresy, yet he must bear equally with the President and the red eminence the blame for the Chinese statecraft that has brought us face to face with Soviet power in Asia. If it is our fate to redeem China from Bolshevism, as I believe it to be, how can we ride that river with General Marshall?

Left to himself, Mr. Truman is without doubt as sincere and uncomplicated a patriot as the Midlands produce. Had he more acumen, more familiarity with dialectical mendacity, and greater self assurance in the field of ideas, he might very well have seen through the gigantic "liberal" imposture over China, the hoar of "liberal" agrarianism. The honest Missouri farmer in him, if unnetted in the "liberal" web, would have rooted the potential quislings from his administration and would have been affronted by the infamous Tydings investigation. Such a Truman would not have lost China.

If it is a national misfortune, it is no less a personal tragedy that the epochal issues of these times have been crowded upon Mr. Truman. If no man ever brought fewer gifts to the Presidency, no President ever less sought the office in the first instance. We recall with retrospective pathos the scene at the Chicago convention when, munching a hot dog, the unambitious Senator from Missouri heard with incredulity, aversion and, it may well be, foreboding that he had been chosen to run with the already stricken Roosevelt.

My own recollection goes back to a spring day in 1944 when, at the end of a lengthy private talk with President Roosevelt at the White House, he let it be known by indirection that he would run for a fourth term. His reasons, which strike us with a wry irony these days, were summed up in his candidly avowed belief that no other American was qualified to carry the country through the war and the coming peace. Mr. Roosevelt discoursed upon his own qualifications, his unique familiarity with the conduct of the war, with the great world of international affairs and, owing to frequent visits and many personal friendships there, with Europe. It was no secret that he was contrasting his competence with that of his prospective opponent, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, a rival whom he affected to hold in lighthearted scorn as a young upstart in world matters.

"We can't, you know," Mr. Roosevelt recapitulated, "we really can't have an ignoramus for President."

In his work, "Roosevelt and Hopkins," Mr. Sherwood recalls another painfully prophetic incident of the 1944 campaign. Helping Mr. Roosevelt write a speech, the author proposed that they use a recent observation of Winston Churchill's that the United States now stood "at the highest pinnacle of her power and fame." This the President vetoed, explaining, to Sherwood's mystification, "What Winston says may be true at the moment but I'd hate to say it because we may be headed before very long for the pinnacle of our weakness" (sic). We are all the losers because Mr. Sherwood, as he confesses, improvidently failed to inquire what lay behind the astonishing utterance. Mr. Roosevelt was an extraordinarily complex human being with deep intuitions. Did he at the moment possess second sight? Was he being clairvoyant about the inability of the "liberal" mentality to contain the Soviet menace? Did he apprehend that his own world policy would inevitably plunge us into confusion and decay? In a presentiment of his own approaching death, did he suffer a twinge of compunction over the succession? Or was there perhaps a premonition of the dire consequences recorded in "Lalla Rookh," when

"Treason, like a deadly blight
Comes o'er the councils of the brave
And blasts them in their hour of might?"

Mr. Roosevelt left the American people a number of legacies, among them Mr. Truman. Another is the United Nations, a typically frivolous liberal improvisation; a pretentious and, as it now turns out, a dangerous instrumentality of world order foredoomed, as was apparent to any penetrating mind in 1945, by the utter irreconcilability of the two worlds, free and slave. Still another Roosevelt inheritance is the policy of surrender to the Soviet Union in Asia. At Teheran and Yalta the President restored to Stalin what the Czars had lost in 1905, ascendancy in Manchuria.

It is true that Mr. Roosevelt, exemplifying the divorce between rhetoric and reality too frequent in his career, did not intend actually throwing China to the Communist wolves. Sumner Welles, writing in the current Foreign Affairs, quotes him as observing during a pre-Teheran conversation in 1943 that "a stable China, recognized as one of the great powers, would be a barrier to Soviet ambitions in the Far East and serve as a centripetal force in Asia." This would also, Mr. Roosevelt reasoned, be of the "utmost value in limiting the effects of the revolutionary tidal wave already looming in the Far East." If only Roosevelt the strategical thinker, not Roosevelt the suitor for the bloodstained Stalin's good opinion, had prevailed at Teheran and Yalta.

The late President had an easier time of it with his war than Truman with his. The "liberal" Roosevelt could prosecute a wholehearted war to spare the world nazism because "liberalism" single-mindedly hated nazism. The "liberal" Truman finds his reluctant will to wage war on the Bolshevik motherland hampered by all sorts of psychological reservations because toward nazism's hideous parent, bolshevism, the liberal is at least subconsciously of two minds. In practical terms, he thinks himself against bolsherism in Europe, while encouraging it in Asia.

The failure of the liberal to safeguard the towering edifice of the west at this stage is not so much because of vacillation, a crisis of nerves or bewilderment in his choice of values but because, in embracing the welfare state, he is compromised with evil. He has looked upon the face of evil and found it half good. How can he save a truly liberal, fluid, traditional society which he has sworn to destroy from Socialists, no matter how brutish, in whom he finds mirrored his own desire for the all-encompassing state that inevitably consumes the individual? If one fears for his country he scarcely dares contemplate the contrast between the clear-sighted, cunning, and remorseless stratagems of the thuggerel of the Kremlin and the shallow, halfhearted, and ambivalent statecraft of Washington and London.

So it is that at the pinnacle of our weakness so many distressed Americans have come deeply to mistrust their Presidential leadership. The unprecedented volume of their mail since early in December to the White House and the Hill bespeaks their conviction that there is something rotten in Washington. If the intelligentsia is baffled and distraught, the people are not. They are liberals in the old sense. For three and a half centuries they have been operating a welfare society—not a welfare state. If Mr. Truman will forgive a gratuitous piece of advice, it is this: Why not give up the unreliable liberal intellectuals and throw in with the people?

The introspective gray eminence revealed, while launching his Marshall plan at Harvard some time ago, that he was troubled by his reflections on the Peloponnesian wars wherein the democratic Athens went down before the totalitarian Sparta. In his musings on the fate of Athens he must have encountered the brilliant and perfidious Alcibiades, who betrayed his country. May I suggest that a fitter subject for the meditations of an old soldier—and of the President of a country entering a war of hemispheres—is that stern patriot Cato the Elder. If Alcibiades was a liberal, Cato was a Tory. Besides identifying the enemy of his country and his culture, Cato exhibited no patience with the liberal innovations being lugged into his society by the Greeks. (Read Russians for Greeks.) In a time of trouble there is something comforting about the simple patriotism of an upright Tory.

Behind the tumultous verbiage of these days there is one fundamental question for an American to answer: When this war is over do you want the writs to run from Washington, or Moscow, to the ends of the earth? It will be one way or other. The Tory answers that question without hesitation.

It was in the Cato vein that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas) spoke in mid-December in a speech far too little regarded. Senator JOHNSON is chairman of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee. He said:

"Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight, the last fading hour of light before an endless night shall envelop us and all the Western World? That is a question which we still have it in our power to answer. If we delay longer we can expect nothing but darkness and defeat and desolation. If we answer the challenge with courage and confidence, and with the ability of which we are capable, we can, I am sure, triumph over our foes."

At this hour, when we are experiencing history at its most intense, the Congress, on both sides of its aisles, is affording a leadership worthy of its best traditions. If the President cares to turn to and fight a war, he might profitably draw upon that source of strength. Why not draft Senator JOHNSON for Secretary of Defense? And if he wants a Secretary of State who understands the question of Asia, there is Senator PAUL F. DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois) who, although a practicing liberal, transcends that aberration when he allows the marine of his World War II days to take possession of him.

Privilege of Statehood Requested by Soldiers From Hawaii on Korean Battle Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to present a letter from Maj. Bert N. Nishimura, United States Infantry, that was written late in March while he was serving on the Korean battle front. The author of this letter is a native-born American citizen of the Territory of Hawaii who has served in the Korean action since the outset and also served in World War II.

The letter addressed to "Mrs. President" speaks for itself, and is as follows:

SOMEWHERE IN KOREA.

DEAR MRS. PRESIDENT: The other day a group of us was seated around a hutment

stove. We were discussing the inequalities and injustices surrounding some minor military matter. The icy wind sweeping down from the Manchurian wastes and the spasms of homesickness probably accounted for the universal agreement among us warriors now stranded in Korea. All of a sudden someone suggested we write our complaints to our various Congressmen. We thought that a capital idea, so we retired to our corners to begin our epistles.

While mentally arranging my thoughts so that my letter would not sound too incoherent I stumbled upon a gigantic blunder. I had no Congressmen to whom to write.

No Congressman to whom I could address my complaint.

No Congressman who could represent me and my gripes on the Senate or the House floor.

This was catastrophic.

This was more horrible than taxation without representation. This was downright un-American. This was discrimination.

I could write to our honorable Delegate from the Territory, who is a good personal friend, and he could take it to the floor of the House. When it comes time to vote, however, he will have to remain silent. He could tramp the Senate Chambers and speak informally to the elected representatives, but he cannot cast a vote. He can speak. He will be heard. But he cannot vote.

This is the reason I am addressing this letter to you, Mrs. President.

We, who were at Pearl Harbor when the first bombs fell that fateful December morning in 1941 and whose blood flowed red, are Americans who cannot write to our Congressmen because we have none. We who stormed hill 609 at north Africa and were repulsed at Cassino in Italy have no one to vote "aye" or "nay" in the congressional halls of our great Nation. We whose brothers are buried beneath neat white crosses in the National Cemetery at Punchbowl in Hawaii after having fallen forever in the lonely atolls of the Pacific and the wooded hills of France cannot cast a vote to help elect the chosen head of our great Nation.

Our parents came from the far corners of the world—the warm shores of the Azores, the islands of the Philippines, the Continent of China, the dimunitive land of Japan, the mountainous ranges of Korea, and are offsprings of the seekers of liberty from the tyrannies of Europe. We attended the schools of democracy. We early learned to pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States. We swatted a baseball on the diamond, chewed gum, and ate hotdogs in the bleachers, and we raced our hot rods on the streets of our native lands. We bowed our heads in reverent prayer, each free to worship the God of his own choosing. We are Americans, were taught Americanism, and are living as Americans.

In this far-off heretofore little-known peninsula of Korea our men are bearing arms in defense of American principles. The names belonging to these men represent Americans of all racial origins—Thurston, Medeiros, Kealoha, Smith, Torres, Takamura, Wong, Kim, Du Montier, and MacAllister. These men are a United Nations themselves.

Hawaii has been waiting for a long time to attain statehood. America was fighting against the principle of taxation without representation when the Sandwich Islands were discovered by Capt. James Cook in 1778. The traditions of Americanism, brought into the islands by the missionaries in 1820, were nurtured and given meaning in the years that followed. In 1900 the Territory of Hawaii became an integral part of the United States, by choice and election of the people. Fifty years have passed since Hawaii entered into apprenticeship for statehood. During that period two wars have been fought, the second so that nations may be permitted to choose their own form of government without undue influence and interference from without. Now, we are joined with other freedom-loving nations in stopping aggression which threatens to engulf the entire world.

Hawaii has made her choice. Hawaii has indicated her desire to become the forty-ninth State. She has fulfilled her obligations. Her citizens have demonstrated, beyond the shadow of a doubt, their capacity to discharge the full responsibilities of citizenship. They are entitled to the privileges of full membership in the Union of States.

Mrs. President, I could write to the honorable Delegate from Hawaii. He has reiterated these statements so often he knows them by heart. I could write to Mr. President, but he is engulfed with the problems of state, of the world, of civilization. That is why I am addressing this to you.

Write to my Congressman? I cannot. I have none.

As we were discussing, a group of us men now fighting in Korea * * *.

I have forgotten why we were going to write. It has become unimportant now. It is trivial. It has become another passing gripe of a war-weary lad. I was there on December 7. I was there in Italy and in France where I saw my comrades fall. I was there in Japan when the tenets of democracy were being preached during the occupation. Now, I am here in Korea.

Before this is over, may I, will I, have a Congressman to whom I can refer my silly little gripes?

BERT N. NISHIMURA,
Major, Infantry.

The $64 Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 23 issue of Freeman:

CAN WE ESCAPE FROM VICTORY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is a fact of tremendous historical irony that America's survival as an independent world power depends on the speed with which it can escape from the consequences of its victory in the late war. This victory has become a trap deadlier than the one which the Chinese Communist troops almost closed around the Marines in the wild hills of North Korea.

Never in history has a great war been fought for so many demonstrable illusions. Never has retribution for succumbing to illusions been so swift and so terrible.

It was an illusion that Chiang Kai-shek was worth backing to the limit against Japan—and not worth raising a finger for when he was threatened by the Kremlin-sponsored Chinese Communists. It was an illusion that these Communists were nice agrarian reformers, Jeffersonian democrats who scarcely knew there was such a place as Moscow. It was an illusion that the totalitarian threat to America could be banished by helping the oldest and largest totalitarian power in the world swell far beyond its legitimate ethnic and historical frontiers.

It was an illusion that a combination of appeasement and personal charm could melt away designs of conquest and domination that were deeply rooted in Russian history and Communist philosophy. It was an illusion to believe that a powerful Soviet Union would play the role of cooperative do-gooder in a shattered and impoverished Eurasia. It was an illusion that a curtain of dollars would be a counterweight to a curtain of iron. It was an illusion to believe that the balance of power could be destroyed in Europe and Asia without setting the stage for world war III.

The fruit that is harvested from seeds of illusion is always bitter. How bitter may be judged by one startling, simple, incontrovertible fact. Only if we succeed in reversing virtually every major aim and decision of Franklin D. Roosevelt, only if we make a rubbish heap of the assumptions of Teheran and Yalta, Cairo and Potsdam, is there a prospect that we may breathe free from the nightmare atmosphere of terror that has descended on us since the Korean debacle.

It has now become a commonplace for men in the highest and most responsible official positions to say that we are in a far more dangerous situation than we were at any time during the Second World War. Winston Churchill recognized this almost 3 years ago when he wrote in the introduction to his memoirs of the war: "We lie in the grip of even worse perils than those we have surmounted." (What a commentary on the hollowness of the victory that was celebrated in 1945.)

During the intervening 3 years the situation of the free world has deteriorated catastrophically. China has been lost to implacably hostile Communist rulers. The Soviet Union has broken the American monopoly of the atomic bomb. The Kremlin has felt strong enough to heat up the cold war appreciably. Until 1950 no army, in the postwar period, had marched across a clearly defined frontier. Soviet methods of aggression had been indirect: The support of an exhausting civil war in Greece, the blockade of the western sectors of Berlin. Along with these active steps went the methodical consolidation of Communist police-state terrorist methods of rule in the East European satellite states and the routine incitation to internal strife, sabotage, and treason in all non-Communist countries.

The Politburo in 1950 felt sufficiently confident to throw first its North Korean satellite, then its Chinese satellite, into open large-scale warfare. No one can know how long it will be before armadas of Soviet airplanes take off on missions of destruction, before Soviet tanks begin to roll into Western Europe, Yugoslavia, Turkey, or Iran. But the breathing space may be uncomfortably short, far shorter than the span of several years which has been comfortably reckoned with by our military and diplomatic planners.

The Korean crisis in a swift blinding flash showed a picture of appalling American national weakness. The greater part of the United States combat army suffered defeat, not at the hands of the Red Army, but from a Soviet dependency with a fraction of Soviet war potential.

By one of the ironies of the calendar the Red Chinese attack on American and other U. N. forces in Korea closely coincided with the ninth anniversary of Pearl Harbor. The toll of casualties was much heavier in Korea than at Pearl Harbor. The speech which Wu Hsiu-chuan delivered at the United Nations simultaneously with the unleashing of the offensive in Korea was more abusive, threatening, and truculent than the Japanese note which was delivered in Washington at the time when Pearl Harbor was bombed. But no Cordell Hull arose to tell him off.

After Pearl Harbor the most severe critics of Roosevelt's foreign policy recognized that there was no alternative except to fight back. The war service of such prominent isolationists as Charles A. Lindbergh, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Hanford MacNider, and Philip La Follette was outstanding.

But the reaction to Red China's Pearl Harbor was pitiful in its weakness. The United Nations, instead of promptly branding the Peiping regime as an aggressor and a war criminal, devoted all its energy to thinking up schemes of appeasement that could be passed off as something else.

The United States refrained from the most obvious effective measures of self-defense: Bombing of Chinese military, industrial, and communication centers, acceptance of Chinese Nationalist troops as full allies, prompt rearming of the Japanese. If the fiction of Chinese volunteers could be maintained, why not Japanese volunteers on the other side? And Korea is far more essential to the security of Japan than it is to the security of the United States.

Senator TOM CONNALLY, leading the fight to beat down Senator KNOWLAND's proposal to appropriate funds to aid Chiang Kai-shek, posed the strange question: "Do the Senators want an all-out war with Red China?"

Some of the hard-pressed men on the Hungnam beachhead might be pardoned for asking what the Senator's idea of an all-out war is. If throwing hundreds of thousands of men into a concerted offensive designed to destroy the U. N. forces is not all-out war, words would seem to have lost their meaning.

To appreciate the full measure of United States humiliation, imagine that, after Pearl Harbor, we had pleaded through an intermediary for a cease fire with Japan. Or suppose that Great Britain and France, after the fall of Poland, had asked Hitler for a cease fire. The French had a word for this last suggestion. They called it "le Munich sanglant," the bloody Munich. It is the immense political and moral disaster of a bloody Munich that the United States and the United Nations assumed when they failed to react promptly and decisively to the challenge of the Chinese Communist attack.

The most respectable excuse for this bloody Munich is an ominous confession of weakness in the face of dire peril. It is argued that the bombing of Chinese bases would provoke the intervention of Soviet air and naval forces and perhaps touch off undisguised war with the Soviet Union. Because our battered forces in Korea represent the greater part of our combat army, so the argument runs, we should try to buy time at almost any price. But there is a double edge to this argument.

If we must refrain from normal measures of self-defense in the face of Chinese Communist aggression, for fear of provoking Soviet attack, is not any move calculated to build up American national power likely to provoke such an attack? We have been blackmailed in the Far East. We are being blackmailed in Europe with the threat that the Soviet Union will not tolerate the long overdue rearmament of free Germany. Tomorrow this method of blackmail may be extended to the point of suggesting that any strengthening of our own Armed Forces will be regarded as provocative in the Kremlin and will not be tolerated. Once a nation starts down on the slippery slope of appeasement, or surrender to blackmail, it is hard to know where the process will stop.

The tragic irony of our present plight is that it stems directly from measures which the Roosevelt administration held up as goals of victory, to be achieved by the sacrifice of American blood and treasure. Eight of the more important of these measures, and their consequences, may be summarized briefly as follows:

1. The two chief characteristics of Roosevelt's policy toward Germany were the unconditional surrender slogan and the Morgenthau plan. Design of the first was annihilation of Germany as an independent power. Purpose of the second, even as watered down in the Potsdam Declaration and the early occupation regulations, was the economic strangulation of Germany by the destruction or drastic limitation of many of its important industries. It was assumed also that Germany would be completely and permanently disarmed.

But the conditions of 1950, only 5 years after the Carthaginian peace that was sketched in outline at Potsdam, forced the United States to plead with the Germans to consent to be rearmed, with some restrictions. I have never talked with a military expert who considered Western Europe defensible without the use of German ground forces.

However, after they have seen their military leaders indiscriminately branded as criminals, their war potential systematically destroyed, their country left defenseless, except for a thin screen of occupation troops, the Germans are understandably cool toward the idea of assuming the risks and burdens of rearmament except on a basis of full political and economic equality.

2. Another total victory that has worked out badly is the destruction of the Japanese Empire and of all Japanese armed force. The new Japanese constitution, written in General MacArthur's headquarters and translated back into Japanese, solemnly renounces the use of force in international relations. But so long as this admirable idea is not shared by the masters of the Soviet Union, and of Communist China, east Asia is as indefensible without the participation of Japan as Western Europe is without the full association of Germany.

A Japanese army, keeping the historic watch against Russia on the Yalu or, better yet, on the Amur, would be a godsend to the harassed military planners in the Pentagon today. Had Korea and Formosa been left in some form of association with Japan, with provision for more liberal administration, Japan, checked in its extravagant design of ruling all east Asia, could have resumed its useful role as an element of check and balance against Russian imperialism and Chinese communism. And the United States need never have been sucked into Korea at all.

Our peace plans, in Europe and in Asia, were sadly deficient in the cool horse sense of old-fashioned diplomats like Castlereagh and Metternich and Talleyrand. How these men would have laughed at the naive assumption that nations could be divided into aggressor goats and peace-loving sheep.

3. We are now trying to escape from one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter: The right of any of the Big Five powers to veto enforcement action. It soon became evident that the UN was condemned to futile impotence, because the Soviet veto could be and was used to mask aggression not only by Moscow, but by any of Moscow's satellites.

The most serious move toward checkmating Soviet aggression, the North Atlantic Pact, was made possible only by stretching to the limit elastic article 51 of the Charter, which affirms "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense." Action by the U. N. in the first phase of the Korean conflict was only possible because of the Soviet boycott of the Security Council at that time. This tactical error probably will not be repeated.

So an escape route from the rigid rules of the charter was provided by the Acheson plan. This permits the Assembly to make recommendations for action against aggression, in the event that the Council is unable to function because of the veto. Here again there is an attempt to get away from a false assumption of Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, and San Francisco: that the Soviet Union would be a reliable cooperator for peace.

4. The tangled confusion about the disposition of Formosa represents another attempt to escape from an ill-advised wartime decision. Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo in 1943 signed their names to a moralistic declaration that "all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

Despite the immense strategic and economic value of Formosa, Truman and Acheson, up to the outbreak of the Korean fighting, professed to feel bound, in the light of the Cairo Declaration, to let the Chinese Reds take over Formosa, if they could launch a successful invasion. This gave Wu Hsiu-chuan one of his best talking points, as one could judge from the amount of space devoted to this subject in his speech before the U. N.

How much better, from the standpoint of American interests, if the Cairo statement had never been made and the disposition of Formosa left over to the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan. Here again there has been an attempt, although a rather clumsy and half-hearted one, to back away from victory and toss Formosa into the lap of the United Nations.

5. A decision of Yalta and Potsdam which we certainly would wish undone was the arbitrary mutilation of the normal ethnic frontiers both of Poland and of Germany. By annexing the eastern half of Poland and then assigning German territory east of the Oder-Neisse frontier to Poland Stalin acquired several trump cards.

He gave the Polish people, oppressed and pillaged as they are in other respects, a stake in the maintenance of the status quo, for fear of losing the ethnically German lands which were assigned to Poland. And by thrusting some eight million destitute German refugees into bomb-wrecked, overcrowded West Germany the Soviet dictator created an enormous source of chronic social unrest and discontent, a serious handicap for the reconstruction of West Germany.

6. One of the many evil deeds of Yalta, the consequences of which are still plaguing us, was the agreement to hand over to Soviet vengeance Soviet citizens in western zones of occupation. General Vlasov, leader of the strongest anti-Communist movement which developed during the war, was the most conspicuous of many victims of this inhuman policy.

Some students of the Russian problem believe that the best hope of averting a third world war lies in a revolt of the Soviet peoples against their Communist rulers. This hope would be considerably brighter if from the beginning the western powers had given asylum and encouragement to anti-Communist refugees, instead of sending them back to death or concentration camps.

7. Inept negotiating by the late John G. Winant and General Eisenhower's failure to accept Churchill's suggestion and push on to Berlin in the last days of the war led to a most disadvantageous situation for the Western Powers in Berlin. The western sectors of the former German capital are an island in the sea of the surrounding Soviet zone. Both the occupation troops and the German population of west Berlin, which ranged itself courageously on the side of the west during the blockade, could be submerged overnight by a Soviet surprise attack.

8. Spain, from the beginning, was excluded from the United Nations and a Soviet-sponsored resolution in 1946 called for the withdrawal of ambassadors from Madrid. For this discriminatory attitude there was never any basis in morals or expediency.

A United Nations comprehensive enough to include Stalin's Soviet Union could scarcely exclude Franco's dictatorship, which is certainly preferable to a people's democracy on the Polish, Czechoslovak, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Hungarian, or Chinese model. It represents no threat to American security. It has been resolutely and consistently anti-Communist. It disposes of a substantial, if

poorly equipped army. It controls one of the most strategic positions on the Continent of Europe.

Yet it is only very recently that the inescapable logic of the cold war has been recognized and that some hesitant, tentative steps have been taken toward including Spain in a European defense picture.

So virtually every assumption on which the war was fought and the peace was shaped has been proved a fraud and a hoax. Almost every major decision taken during and after the war has turned out to be an extremely bad security risk. America's overriding problem today is to escape from the reckless misuse of victory.

One cannot reasonably attribute our present plight to any exceptional cunning of our enemies. The Communist design of world conquest is one of the most open conspiracies in history. How much better our position would be today if the men responsible for guiding our foreign policy during the last decade had believed Lenin when he wrote:

"It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable."

Or Stalin, when he pronounced the dogma:

"It is therefore the essential task of the victorious revolution in one country to develop and support the revolution in others."

Or William Z. Foster, when he told a congressional committee:

"When a Communist heads the Government of the United States (and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises) that government will be not a capitalistic government, but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Or Mao Tse-tung, when he declared as recently as July 1, 1949:

"To sit on the fence is impossible; a third road does not exist. * * * Not only in China, but also in the world, without exception, one either leans to the side of imperialism or to the side of socialism. Neutrality is a mere camouflage and a third road does not exist."

But during the war and for some time after the war the men in high places in Washington, with a very few honorable exceptions, preferred to hug illusions that were based on a compound of ignorance and wishful thinking. Maybe Lenin and Stalin didn't really mean what they said. Maybe Stalin was at heart an amiable character, handicapped by a somewhat unreasonble Politburo. Maybe the Chinese Communists were not really Communists at all. Maybe.

Then came the brutal shock of Korea. Now we are desperately trying to retreat, to escape from a victory that was so appallingly misused that it was becoming a deadly trap. But will we have time to repair the abysmal follies of Tehran and Cairo, Yalta, and Potsdam? Can we accomplish what the wise old Greeks said was impossible: to make the past as if it had never been?

No one can answer these questions with absolute assurance. But it is an imperative of American national survival to escape as fast as possible from this trap of an abused victory and a bungled peace, to get rid of the evil consequences of Roosevelt's foreign policy as fast as we can.

Toward the end of the Civil War a northern soldier, viewing the tomb of John C. Calhoun in Charleston, observed: "The whole South is the grave of Calhoun."

Perhaps a time will come when historians will write:

"The whole free world, including the United States, became the grave of the disastrous illusions of Franklin D. Roosevelt."

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Who Is Letting Our GI's Down?" written by Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, and published in the May 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO IS LETTING OUR GI'S DOWN?

(By Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander, the American Legion)

In the light of such distractions as basketball scandals and crime investigations, the public sems to be foregetting that we are engaged in a war. Not a "police action" as certain propagandists would have you believe, but a full-blown, bloody war in which we have a quarter million soldiers committed, and have already suffered close to 60,000 casualties.

Apart from the South Koreans themselves, most of the men fighting this war are Americans. We can kid ourselves all we want about this being a great United Nations offensive, but as usual in these vast international projects it's the American people who are carrying the burden, and, South Koreans again excepted, it's our boys who are doing most of the fighting and dying. I know because I've just seen much of the Korean battle front.

I've found out something else. The men overseas are beginning to get the idea that someone or something is selling them out. They feel they've been forced out on a limb and the limb is being sawed off.

KILL OR BE KILLED

Contrary to the notions of some of our heavy thinkers safe in the States, our men in Korea do know why they are fighting. In fact, they know it a lot better than some of our self-styled intellectuals at home. Since it is a matter of "kill or be killed," they are fighting for their lives. It's just as simple as that.

In this respect they're one up on the confused thinkers safe in the United States who are still arguing that we ought to give the murdering Chinese Reds a place in the United Nations, and who deplore any attempts made to curb the activities of traitorous Communists within our midst. Those stateside experts safe at home can't grasp the obvious fact that the Communist is out to kill Americans, individually and collectively. The GI has learned this the hard way.

The GI is a step ahead of these people in another way. Knowing that you can't argue with a Communist, and being well aware of the treachery of Reds generally, he is disgusted that so many of our leaders have permitted themselves and this mighty Nation of ours to be tied down by parliamentary Lilliputians in the United Nations.

Our present-day Benedict Arnolds may glibly argue that it is necessary to keep Chiang and his armies blockaded on Formosa, but these arguments make no sense to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who have to do the fighting and dying. They see in Chiang's vast armies a way of saving some of the 250 American lives that are being needlessly sacrificed each week because certain furtive people expound that Chiang isn't the right sort of person, and therefore we cannot accept his aid. Our fighting men are not impressed by these false prophets because they haven't forgotten that these same people not long ago were lauding Mao's murdering hordes as "agrarian reformers."

For the life of them—and life is meant in a very literal sense—they can't understand why our State Department and the United Nations make it necessary for them to be slaughtered by Red armies which swarm down on them from territory which our own heads of Government make sacrosanct. Our fighting men have the simple idea that in wartime when the enemy tries to kill you, you are entitled to pursue him till you've caught him and done away with him. The influential meddlers who keep maneuvering our men into untenable positions don't seem to understand this, possibly because they've never been required to face danger themselves. To them, this sort of impasse is something to be placed on the agenda of the United Nations, to be argued at leisure in comfortable surroundings.

Agents of the Kremlin, sitting in the councils of the United Nations, in Washington and elsewhere, must laugh up their sleeves at our utter idiocy. But you may be sure that our GI's are not amused. They see the picture as clearly as the Soviet agents do, but, unlike our stateside leaders, they see the results of this criminal skulduggery in the blood they shed and in the mangled corpses of their buddies.

What they cannot understand, though, is the strange apathy of the people back home. As they listen to radio reports of what is happening thousands of miles to the east of them, they are puzzled. Isn't the American public aware of what is going on? Don't they realize that their sons and husbands and sweethearts are fighting a ruthless enemy who has them at a terrible disadvantage, thanks to stupid or traitorous advisers and inept diplomacy?

MUST SHAKE OFF APATHY

In Korea I saw many caskets, waiting to be moved on the first lap of the long voyage home. Is this the only thing that will awaken America? Do thousands more boys have to lay down their lives needlessly, before an aroused public demands that our fighting men be given an even break?

It is high time that all America snapped out of its apathy. Certainly, it is deplorable that crooks are bribing basketball players; no one one wants to take the public's attention away from grafting politicians and syndicates of gangsters; and let's not overlook transactions involving pastel mink coats and fancy fees for influence. But let us not be diverted from the fact that our No. 1 problem today is a struggle for our existence.

Let's simplify it so we won't continue to be mixed up by those masters of confusion who got us into this mess. Regardless of diplomatic niceties, we are at war with Soviet Russia. The simple and undeniable proof of this is that the Kremlin could stop this bloodletting tomorrow, if it so desired. Russia is using the Chinese, the North Koreans, and others to do her fighting for her. In our own United States Stalin has thousands of stooges doing his bidding. These people are working as diligently for the murderers of the Kremlin as any units of the Red Army or the Soviet secret police.

Aiding these unspeakable traitors is a much larger group. Some of them are almost but not quite full-fledged Communists; others are poor, deluded people who fancy themselves as intellectuals, liberals, or what have you. Some of these characters maintain that they abhor communism, but by their confused thinking and acting they serve as the Communists' best friends. Indeed, in some ways they are even more dangerous than admitted Communists since at least we know where the Communists stand.

These are the people—the avowed Communists and their feather-headed friends—who have got us into the most dangerous predicament in the Nation's history. And not only have they got us into jeopardy, they keep making our position worse. Now anyone can understand why the out-and-out Communists do this—whether they be Mao's brutal "agrarian reformers" or the traitors who call themselves American Communists. But what few Americans can understand is why people who presumably are not Communists continue to peddle a line that has proved disastrous, and has sent thousands of Americans to their deaths. It is even harder to understand these people when it is considered that they have worked themselves up to high positions in Government, teach in our great universities, write for important publications, and have the facilities of great radio networks at their disposal.

CONFUSED THINKING

It would be foolish to say that all or even most of these people are Communists. But it would be equally fallacious to believe that, because they are burdened with Phi Beta Kappa keys and academic honors, they are equally loaded with honesty or common sense. In many cases they are befuddled folk who are educated far beyond their capacity, but they are looked up to as "experts" and "advisers" by others who should know better. In some cases these people have a fuzzy notion that the world's problems will be solved if we scrap our own system of government and turn ourselves over to an all-powerful world government. Others feel that we can make some sort of deal with Stalin, if only we let him have his way. Still others, and there is quite a school of this thought, are convinced that we should defer to the British Foreign Office in our dealings abroad, and ought to ape the British by establishing a socialistic government at home.

The best you can say for such people as this is that their patriotism is of a negative nature.

Years ago, in the time of our Revolution, another American gave his allegiance to a country overseas. The name of that man, Benedict Arnold, is now reviled and scorned by American patriots. But today, there are many among us who have injured this country far more than Benedict Arnold, and from segments of the soft-headed public these traitors actually get ovations when they make a smirking appearance before the very people they've sold out.

EXPOSE FALSE PROPHETS

Curiously, the mental make-up of such sell-out artists is such that they will never concede that they were wrong. So they keep bulling their way through, shamelessly trying to explain the unexplainable. But after all, it isn't their neck. Let more thousands of American soldiers, sailors and marines be sacrificed, so long as the ego of these unspeakable characters is not damaged.

Since these people haven't the sense or the grace to stop their meddling, I call on Americans generally to demand that they be thrown out of any place where they can exert any further influence on the conduct of the war. If they are in Government, or if they are still advising those in Government, the public must raise such an outcry that even the most apathetic politicians will have to take action to break their deathgrip on their jobs. If they are poisoning the press, the speakers' platform or the airwaves, they must at the least be answered, point for point, and those responsible for giving such people a forum must be held strictly accountable by the American people. The time is long since past when we can afford the luxury of listening to false prophets, fools or traitors.

The GI has been let down not just by those characters in high places, but by all the rest of us who have tolerated them and permitted them to become powerful. Now it is up to us. It is time to let the war be fought by our military people, not by politicians in Washington or the United Nations, or by others who have axes to grind and influence enough to get themselves an audience.

If we can keep these erstwhile experts out of the present war long enough for the United States to win it, we can consider ourselves lucky. That's the first job we have to tackle here at home. I can assure you that our military leaders know their job, and so long as they are allowed to fight the war without restrictions imposed by stupid people, traitors or politicians, they'll do all right. Further, they'll do the job with the least cost in American lives.

But so long as the stateside busybodies continue their meddling, the best we can expect is a stalemate. Maybe, for reasons of their own, our busybodies want it that way. But patriotic Americans ought to begin asking themselves what about it. Their sons and brothers in Korea are certainly asking themselves a lot of questions, and I for one would not want to have to answer to them at some future date.

Symington: A Faithful Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of bitter controversy, it is heartwarming to see the services of a good and faithful public servant recognized. I believe the appointment of W. Stuart Symington to head the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is such recognition of faithfulness, ability, and loyalty to the Nation.

Mr. Symington is a man of great personal integrity and unchallenged ability. His appointment is a guaranty that the tasks of the RFC will be carried out in the light of the highest public interest.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks, the following editorial from the Daily Metal Reporter of April 20, 1951:

SYMINGTON'S APPOINTMENT TO RFC AN EXCELLENT CHOICE

President Truman's appointment of W. Stuart Symington to head the Reconstruction Finance Corporation comes like a breath of spring into an atmosphere where the air has been none too pleasant or too healthy.

Symington's personal integrity, his keen business acumen, his record of achievements in the other executive positions that he has held in the Federal Government, have gained for him the admiration, the respect, and the confidence of businessmen, Congressmen, and Senators, irrespective of their political leanings. One thing is certain, that with Symington as the head, there will be no scandals in the RFC and the agency will function as a well organized and efficient business enterprise should.

One of Symington's greatest assets is that he has never carried political favor. Consequently he is under no obligations to return such favors. He has not sought office as a means of personal gain. On the contrary, during the years that he has held public office, he has made great personal sacrifices, and he has done so because of his strong sense of duty and patriotism. That Symington did not seek the new post to which President Truman has appointed him, is evident from his letter of acceptance in which he said that it has been his personal desire since 1949 to return to private life. However, "because of the grave world situation," he wrote the President, "if you believe I can serve you and the country in this new position, I would be most honored to accept the appointment."

If the public's confidence is to be restored in the RFC, if this agency is to render the services for which it was originally created, there is no one better qualified to be its chief than Mr. Symington. His appointment to the job is a natural. Before entering the Government's service, he was a successful manufacturer in St. Louis. As head of the War Assets Administration following World War II, as Secretary of the Air Force, and as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, he established and enviable record for himself and the departments he headed. Being a man of vision, a great organizer and as a practical businessman, he insists on all the facts before reaching a decision, and then stands ready to face anyone who may challenge his decision. He has done this in the past and he may be counted on doing so again in his new job.

Because the RFC has been mismanaged in the past is no reason for believing that it has outlived its usefulness. Symington is the man to breathe new life into the agency and make it a vital force in the economy of the Nation. The President is to be congratulated on his selection.

The Defense Production Act and Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the challenge to city consumers in food prices rising higher than prices generally is a real one. The prospective reenactment of the Defense Production Act must, if it be realistic, deal with this question. When the act was first considered, I sought to amend the very section which gave special consideration to agricultural commodities in the knowledge that the city consumers were bound to face food prices rising more than the general average as a result.

I hope very much that it will be possible to find a suitable solution which will not have a disastrous effect on the long-standing agricultural policy of our country and at the same time be cognizant of the fundamental problem of the families with moderate incomes who live in the cities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorials from the New York Times on the subject:

[From the New York Times of April 19, 1951]

NO ROOF FOR FARM PRICES

Officials of the National Farmers Union have announced their opposition to any change in the Defense Production Act which would place farm prices on the same basis as others for purposes of over-all price control. Headed by James G. Patton, their president, these officials called at the White House and

urged Mr. Truman to continue the provision in the emergency law which exempts farm commodities from ceilings if they are selling below either parity or the level prevailing just before Korea.

The arguments advanced by the Patton group, like most of those put forward to justify this inexcusable provision of the law, virtually answer themselves. "The freezing of farmers at subparity income levels," declared Mr. Patton, "might very easily make it impossible for them to produce needed increases in food and fiber supplies." Taking farm prices as a whole, there is nothing that is subparity about them. On the basis of 1910–14 as 100, farm prices in the aggregate had a purchasing power ratio in March of this year of 111.

In terms of comparative income the farmer is even better off. Mr. Patton points out that the net income of farm operators declined from $17,800,000,000 in 1947 to $13,000,000,000 in 1950. But in 1947 the head of the farmers union has, of course, selected a completely abnormal year. It was a year in which no more expansibility was left on the supply side in agriculture and when heavy domestic demands coincided with correspondingly heavy postwar relief demands from the rest of the world. We can best get a measure of the abnormality of 1947 by noting that the $17,800,000,000 net farm income figure to which Mr. Patton refers represented an increase of practically 300 percent over the last prewar year, 1940. In the same period, by comparison, the total national income rose by only 144 percent.

What Mr. Patton is arguing for is not parity of farm prices and farm income as a whole, but a guarantee of parity for each and every farm commodity before it becomes subject to the general application of the law. This attempt to extend the parity concept under cover of the defense emergency suffers from two transparent weaknesses. In the first place, its advocates, while urging parity for commodities selling below that figure, ignore the logical sequel of that proposal, which would be to demand a roll-back to parity of those commodities selling above parity. But even more important is the fact that this proposal ignores the whole function of price freezing, which is to break the continuity of the spiral of prices and wages. Obviously no such effect can be achieved by halting the rise in half the prices in the country while permitting the other half to continue their advance.

[From the New York Times of April 25, 1951]

THE FARM BLOC'S TURN

When does the taxpayer's turn come to stage a demonstration in Washington and threaten a walkout on the defense effort?

Union leaders—the United Labor Policy Committee—put on such a show 2 months ago, and it has paid off handsomely. Now the farm bloc in Congress apparently has decided that if a demonstration such as labor's can pay such a quick dividend it would be a good idea to put on a show of its own. The House Committee on Agriculture, therefore, has opened hearings which feature a parade of witnesses testifying in favor of that section of the Defense Production Act which provides that farm commodities be specifically exempted from the treatment accorded commodities in general under price controls.

Two things are especially worth noting about these hearings before the Agriculture Committee. The first is that they have no legislative function. They are strictly in the nature of a show. In an opening statement Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat of North Carolina, said that they had been prompted by "an avalanche of propaganda in the press and radio to the effect that farm prices are responsible for the unreasonable increase in the cost of living."

The second point is that the administration itself has provided the principal performer in this publicity performance in the person of the Secretary of Agriculture—and this despite reports that the President is going to send a message to Congress today on the subject of farm prices. Mr. Brannan was the first witness called by the committee, and he offered statistical support for the farm bloc's thesis.

Mr. Brannan's statistics add nothing to the controversy except to show that one can prove anything with figures if he is permitted to choose his own points of reference. When it is set up the parity concept Congress chose as normal, the period 1910–14, although the country had never in its history up to that time enjoyed any other 5-year period comparable pricewise to this, the golden era of American agriculture. Now, however, Mr. Brannan has decided that 1947, the peak of the explosive inflation that followed the war, was the real normal. Which is like saying that prices on the New York stock exchange were normal in the late summer of 1929.

In any event, the issue here is not a matter of statistics. It concerns the simple question of whether all prices are to be frozen under the defense emergency laws or all prices except farm prices, and it concerns the equally simple question of whom the administration represents in this inflation debate—the farm bloc or the Nation as a whole.

The Great Debate of MacArthur Versus the Constitution Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that few Members of the Congress missed the sparkling editorial in the New York Herald Tribune dated today, April 26; but to make sure that it has the full circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include the editorial, under leave, as a part of my remarks. I wish to emphasize that the Herald Tribune is a genuinely Republican newspaper, brilliantly edited, and reflecting the virtues of contemporary journalism and, if such there be, of the Republican Party.

The text of the editorial follows:

INDIRECT DISCOURSE

Since the President has a two-star general installed as military aide in the White House, it is perhaps natural that MacArthur should have installed a two-star general of his own to operate from the publicity office of the Waldorf-Astoria. Apparently, Major General Vaughan is more often seen than heard; Major General Whitney, on the other hand, is heard thunderously by millions who do not see him. It is still doubtful whether one officer is any more of an asset to his chieftain than the other.

While Olympian silence has reigned on the Waldorf's thirty-seventh floor, General Whitney, busily functioning as oracle in the publicity office, has been getting the foot in the mouthpiece with singular regularity. In a press statement on Saturday, insisting that to foresee Red China's intervention last fall was "quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's field intelligence," he cut the ground from under MacArthur's present contention that the Soviet Union will not intervene—a similarly political matter which must equally be beyond reach of MacArthur's information and responsibility. At Monday's press conference, the Whitney pronouncement that MacArthur had not the faintest idea of why he was relieved could serve only to put MacArthur in a ridiculous position. The Tuesday press conference not only brought the evasion of a question on the ground that "I am not going to expose General MacArthur's hand in its entirety"—with its inept implication that the general is engaged in some kind of hidden game or intrigue—but also the citation of the Biblical passage on Christ's reply to the doubting Thomas, which suggests implications so extraordinary that one hesitates to pursue the subject further.

In the far depths of the Pacific, the official spokesman, informed sources, authoritative quarters, were doubtless convenient media of contact between the general and his public. Here, in the rough-and-tumble of American public life, where the people are accustomed to get their leadership at first hand, one suspects that the general himself will soon come to question their utility. General Whitney's press conference yesterday seemed somewhat subdued.

LETTER TO MY CONSTITUENTS

Mr. Speaker, I am including also the rough draft of the letter I propose to send to my constituents who wrote to me on the subject of the great debate between General MacArthur and the Constitution. I include this, not out of vainglory, but at the urging of a highly placed official who felt, and very kindly said, that the message, subject as it is to final revision and condensation, was worthy of wider circulation than in the Nineteenth District of New York. I do want to be explicit in saying that before this letter actually goes in the mail it will be shorter and smoother.

With that qualification, the letter follows:

DEAR FRIEND: You are one of hundreds of residents of the Nineteenth Congressional District of New York who wrote to me regarding the relief of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his commands in the far-eastern theater of operations.

To those of you who approved of the President's wise, decisive, and courageous action in removing General MacArthur before he had done any further damage, I offer my congratulations. You demonstrated a sturdy devotion to the democratic principles of representative government; you showed your immunity to the temptation to follow the glamorous but false political gods of military dictatorship.

To those of you who wrote to me in support of General MacArthur, I speak in sorrow and disappointment.

I hope that you will review your words. I hope you will consider carefully and decide in mature deliberation if you really are ready to desert the Constitution of the United States and the democracy we all profess to love and defend.

Above all, I hope that you will think long and carefully of what it would mean to precipitate an offensive war against Communist China or Soviet Russia, or both. We are 150,000,000 people, already beginning to run short of our once bountiful supplies of natural resources.

Of our allies, we could scarcely count firmly on the support of more than an equal number of productive individuals, and somewhat less than an equal amount of natural resources and manufacturing facilities. We would be pitted against a foe capable of mustering 750,000,000 people, and deficient only in technological facilities.

That would mean unending years of total warfare, in which we would serve nothing but the war machinery. Our material comfort, our liberties, our politics, our religion would be sacrificed to destruction; our young men and young women would be under arms; our farms and factories would be manned by the very young and the very old; our toll of dead and wounded would be heartbreaking and suicidal.

General MacArthur's real accomplishments in a lifetime of military service speak for themselves; he needs no deification now, for he has proved himself an able soldier and an able administrator.

When, however, he arrogates to himself powers of policy making which are reserved by the Constitution to the responsible elected officials of our Federal Government—the President and the Congress—and to the President's Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense; and when, not content with this assumption of authority he openly flouts the directives of his Commander in Chief, his usefulness has ceased and he has laid himself open to suspicions of insubordination and disloyalty.

There are certain facts which must be remembered in attempting to judge the farflung struggle of the Western World for the minds of men.

The first fact is that this is the year 1951; for better or for worse, we cannot turn back the clock, nor can the United States evade the responsibilities and duties which accompany power and authority.

The second fact is that we are governed by a written Constitution which has guarded us against civil or military tyranny over a period of nearly two centuries; and the constitutional reservations have been strengthened by statutory enactments. The struggle for freedom can never end, for when there is no conflict there is no freedom.

The third fact is that the free world is fighting every kind of political enslavement. It is as pointless to oppose the authoritarianism of communism and accept fascism (by any name) as to fight fascism and accept communism. Ideological chains of political or economic slavery are made no lighter by changing their names.

The wisdom, the propriety, and the necessity of President Truman's action are attested by the approval of the world's greatest leaders in every field: by prime ministers of other countries, by national delegations to the United Nations, by the Pope, by our own most distinguished national leaders, and great independent newspapers.

I am certain that upon mature reflection those of you who have offered support to General MacArthur in terms running all the way from mild criticism of the administration to vicious and libelous attacks on President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and Secretary Acheson will realize that no other course lay open to the President as far as General MacArthur's overt actions were concerned.

This does not by any means close debate on the foreign policies of the United States. These issues are and must be open to unending review and debate. Of all the alternatives which our Government might choose, it seems to me, on the record, it has followed that which is most realistic and tenable in Asia. I continue critical of the appeasement of fascism in Europe and Africa.

I hope you will always feel free to write to me on any subject relevant to the public business. When I am forced to use a form letter, bear in mind it is only so that I can carry on the duties you have given me, and that I read your letters with attention and with gratitude for giving me the benefit of your views.

Fruits of "Unity"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Garet Garrett, Fruits of "Unity," which appeared in the January 22 issue of the Freeman:

FRUITS OF "UNITY"

(By Garet Garrett)

"Let there be unity," says the voice of panic. "In unity there is strength." But there is the voice of danger saying, "Many are the strong that have perished before us. There may be unity for national suicide."

Unity has no gift of seeing. It may be blind. It has no wisdom in itself. It may be both valorous and stupid.

We have had unity, seldom entire, of course, but to a degree never before imagined in a democratic republic. There was unity enough for measures short of war, reinforced by the image of Hitler stepping across the Atlantic to conquer the Americans, although as it turned out he could not pass 30 miles of English Channel to finish the British when they were prone after Dunkerque.

Then for fear of disunity there was complete unity for the war itself. And whatever may have been one's suppressed thoughts at the time, or the afterthoughts since of revisionists like Beard, victory was its own justification. It was much more than physical victory. The torch of civilization had passed to the hands of a romantic people who dreamed of universal peace and brotherhood and wanted nothing else for themselves from their day at Armageddon.

At the end of the war the United States was incomparably the great military, economic, and moral power in the world. Its word was final. It had only to say no, and there could not take place anywhere in the earth an act of aggression. To whatever it said yes, that was a gilded thing and people held forth their hands to receive it, unable at first to comprehend such generosity and yet in a little while taking it for granted and demanding it as a right, because the Americans were so rich, the British Socialists saying that as capitalists the Americans were under a necessity to give their surplus away to save themselves from drowning in it. Reporting to the President in 1945 the Chief of Staff said: "The security of the United States now is in our own hands."

How long ago was that? Five years.

Has it been for want of unity that in 5 years we have lost not only our authority in the world but control of our own destiny? Has it been for want of unity that terror now gripes the entrails of our cities, fear is the theme of Government propaganda, and we talk of survival?

Think back a little. Was it in the first place for fear of disunity that Roosevelt reversed American foreign policy and recognized the Soviet dictatorship, and then permitted Stalin's agents to create cells of treason in the executive agencies of Government? That was in time of what we believed to be peace, and although it was very embarrassing when Stalin went over to Hitler, his agents nevertheless continued to sit in the councils of American Government, up to policy-making levels. All embarrassment ceased when Hitler turned on the Russians. Then Stalin became our preferred ally, with priorities in lend-lease dictated by Harry Hopkins, who, in the words of President Roosevelt, got along with Stalin like a house afire. Those who knew better wrote books about it afterward, but while it was going on there was silent unity. To criticize Stalin was an offense against unity.

So then later it was not want of unity that obliged the Roosevelt government, nor the Truman government that succeeded it, to embrace Stalin as a peace-loving collaborator in the postwar world, to betray into his hands our ally China, to give him all that part of Europe that lies now behind the iron curtain, and to put the American neck into a noose at Berlin. For 2 years more Stalin was Mr. Truman's good old Joe, who sometimes behaved badly because he was the prisoner of wicked men in the Kremlin; and as for Stalin's agents in the executive agencies of Government, people who kept talking about that were hysterical, to say the least of them, and at the worst they were enemies of unity and played a game with red herrings. He was not worried about communism. Let nobody else worry about it.

Since there was nothing to worry about, it would be safe to disembowel the Military Establishment, which was done, to make more funds for the welfare state. The Navy went into mothballs, the Army was demobilized, the Air Force was wrecked—and there was unity for all of that.

Then Mr. Truman's official economic advisers turned the people's attention to the fascinating bauble of perpetual boom, to be maintained by scientific inflation; and there was unity for that.

Meanwhile our efforts to save Europe from chaos had been frustrated. The Socialist Government of Great Britain had devoured a loan of $4,800,000,000, with no benefit but an increase of appetite. It was perhaps wrong to try doing this thing piecemeal. So the Truman government invented the Marshall plan to do it all at once. If the countries of Europe would get together, add up their estimated deficits for a series of years, and send us the bill, we would pay it.

And in this at first there was no thought of filling peoples' bellies to keep them from going Communist. That came later. At first Russia was expected to come in, like everybody else; she was invited. But the Kremlin declined to come in and forbade her satellites to come in, for no reason given at the time.

For all of that there was unity. We lived with the hypnotic fiction that the conduct of American affairs abroad was above politics. Was there not a bipartisan foreign policy?

Thus the country was conditioned and prepared to lose the cold war. Although we did not know it, the cold war was already lost when in 1947 the Truman doctrine was announced, by the President alone. The immediate occasion for it was that the British Government had suddenly thrown Greece in our lap, fairly sure that we would not let it roll on the floor. And they were right. This might have been handled as a limited commitment to help Greece repel Communist aggression, and it might have included also Turkey; but no. It had to be done with a grand gesture. It had to be something bold and brave, and something at the same time that would shrewdly serve a political end. Apparently by that time Mr. Truman had become aware of Communist aggression in the world as a fact; but that was not all. He was aware also that softness toward Soviet Russia had become a serious political liability. Now, therefore, he would do it properly. That is how it happened that what might have

been a limited adventure in the Mediterranean world came to be clothed in the Truman doctrine.

In his message to Congress asking for the means to aid Greece and Turkey he declared that the United States hereafter would act to stop totalitarian aggression anywhere in the world. He did not explicitly say Russian aggression, but there was no mistaking what he meant; there was no other kind of aggression to stop.

Well, there was unity for the Truman doctrine, too. Its terrific total implications were almost entirely ignored. Mr. Truman himself could hardly have been aware of them. One of the few who saw them clearly was Dr. Virgil Jordan. This, he said, was in fact a declaration of war upon Soviet Russia. The Russians would so understand it. Therefore, go on with it. Say to the Russians, "You go home, and we will come home and let people alone"—and say it at once while we still had sole possession of the atomic bomb. He said these things before a dinner of distinguished persons at the Waldorf, and his words were received with horrified and unbelieving silence.

The consequences of the Truman doctrine were these:

1. For the first time in history a sane nation had assumed unlimited political, economic, and military obligations in the world—and it had done this with no premeditation whatever and no appraisal of the possible cost in terms of its own resources. However, if you ask, "How shall you weigh your resources against an unlimited liability?" the answer is that you cannot do it. And that's the point.

2. In a world at war, or about to be at war, a nation had abolished its frontiers—for if you are going to stop aggression everywhere, where is your frontier?

3. We had thrown away the first prerogative of a militant nation, which is to choose its battleground—to say where, when, and on what terms it will fight. The power of initiative was delivered to the enemy. The aggressor would be able to name the time, the place, and the conditions, as we were to find out later to our sorrow.

4. The Atlantic Pact, by which we undertake to put both equipment and fighting manpower into Western Europe for the defense of countries that have not really made up their minds to defend themselves, and might sooner appease the Russians than become the battleground of a Russo-American war.

Our one incurable weakness is manpower. We are only 150,000,000 people. We are 100,000,000 fewer than the combined people of those European countries that expect us to defend them against the Russians. Therefore, as any tenth-grade boy would know, we should avoid meeting Stalin's Asian and Eurasian hordes on the ground. Nevertheless, at last the Truman government was maneuvered into accepting war on the worst terrain in the world—as in the tube of a funnel, with the Chinese hordes pouring themselves in at the top.

As we may now recall, there was unity behind Mr. Truman when he made the decision to enter Korea. He expected the country to be thrilled, and it was. The decision was consistent with the Truman doctrine, morally obligatory thereunder; but people were as vague about what it was going to mean as Mr. Truman was, or as they had been about the implications of the Truman doctrine in the first place.

What Mr. Truman thought was going to be a "police action" turned into a war that in 6 months had already cost us half as much as the cost of our total exertions in World War I; it turned into a war that dangerously stripped the home base of its defenses, leaving the country, in the words of Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, without the strength to defend itself against attack; a war in which we found ourselves swapping American lives for Asiatic lives; precisely the kind of war we could never win, said Hanson W. Baldwin—"a land struggle on the Asiatic Continent in a theater where no decision is possible against the hordes of Asia."

The enemy had picked the place, had chosen his own time, had named the conditions.

Now mobilization: There must be unity for that. Certainly there will be unity for that. It is the sequel, and imperative. And yet the people may be permitted to ask, What is this mobilization for? The President says it is in order "that the full moral and material strength of the Nation may be readied for the dangers which threaten us."

Everybody perceives the dangers that threaten us, including one that Mr. Truman cannot see, namely, the self-admiring, grimacing incompetence of that same leadership which has cost us the world and our authority in it, which has involved us in these perils, which continues never to doubt its own rightwiseness, and still demands of the people unity.

How shall these dangers be met? It is no answer to say, as Mr. Truman says, that we must make ourselves strong enough to meet them. Five years ago we were strong enough. As we build up our military strength again, what shall we do with it? Mr. Truman does not say. So far as the people know, there is no plan. Therefore, they are asking: Shall we go on in Asia, swapping American for Asiatic lives; and if so, to where? Shall we come home; and if so, to what? Shall we forget Asia, or appease the enemy there, and put our strength in Europe, as the Europeans say we should, trusting that if it comes to final war with Russia our boughten European allies will not go out from under us?

In any event, how shall this country recover the power of initiative, so that it will be able to say where and when and whom it will fight? Is there a plan for doing that? If we cannot do that, then we shall not get back control of our own destiny. The Kremlin will deploy our manpower and dispose of our resources; the Kremlin will determine the size of our military budget and the condition of our internal economy.

We know the taste of humiliation. It is strange and exceedingly bitter. But worse than anything else that has happened to us is something that now we are doing to ourselves. We are talking of survival. A nation with a world of its own, supreme custodian of a hemisphere embraced by oceans, having an industrial power of its own roughly equal to that of all other peoples combined, so rich that the next richest country is by comparison poor—that Nation talks of survival.

A Senator asks: "Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight, the last fading hour of light before an endless night shall envelop us and all the Western World?" These sickly words, hag-ridden by fear, so perfectly expressed the mood of the Senate that everybody forgot how they would sound, echoing around the world, in the ears of both our allies and the enemy.

Survival is a false and craven word. There may be many questions in the crucible but survival is not one of them, except we put it there ourselves. This Nation, said Lincoln, must endure forever unless it commits suicide.

Let the supreme question be one of alternatives, such as, for example, the alternative to create in this hemisphere a military power the like of which the world has never seen—dedicated to American defense, with assistance only to other nations who may be going our way, and only to these upon lines definitely demarked, which we mean to hold by our own strength.

The strength of a giant is in his own loins. Yet the mightiest giant may be bled to death by many unrequited wounds, not one of which by itself would be mortal. This American giant, for all his wonderful armor, may be dangerously bled by Asiatics who climb on his tanks and tear at the doors with their bare hands. He may be bled in another way by allies who take more than they give and want even more. He has already wasted more blood than he could afford to lose by walking backward into traps and fighting the bear where the bear is not.

The compulsion to this folly is the tragic theme song of our foreign policy. Everywhere we must go on doing it, and in order that we may go on doing it we must make blood faster and faster.

If only we were trading blood with the enemy, that would make a kind of heroic sense. But the enemy, with much more blood to spare than we have, is saving it. Fighting the enemy in Asia, we kill Koreans and Chinese—no Russians. As we help the French fight him in Indochina, or the British to fight him in Malaya, we help them to kill natives—no Russians. Recently the country shuddered at the thought that to meet a Russian-prepared Communist demonstration in Berlin we might be obliged to kill teen-age Germans. Again, no Russians. What did the Berlin air lift cost the Russians? Nothing. In 6 months the war in Korea cost us more than $10,000,000,000. What did it cost the Russians?

Even yet we but dimly comprehend the nature of the intelligence that is acting against us. It is perhaps the first absolutely free principle of evil that was ever set free in the world—free because it is bound by nothing, not by its word, not by conscience, not by its own people, not by any moral sense whatever, not by its own ideology, which is a weapon, nor by superstitions such as did once somewhat restrain the barbaric horde. This intelligence has outthought us, outwitted us, outmaneuvered us, in both diplomacy and battle. With Machiavellian cynicism it has exploited our fundamental faith in the decency of all people.

Yet voices are heard among us intoning the intellectual idiocy that this is a struggle for the heart and mind of mankind. There is an ancient proverb which says that people may be so stupid as to baffle their own gods.

The Court Rules on the Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the California State District Court of Appeals has found unconstitutional the so-called anti-Communist affirmation required by the University of California regents.

The order of the regents of the University of California requiring members of the faculty to take an oath or make an affirmation that they were not connected with Communist Party or Communist-front organizations rocked the State of California.

I think the Alameda Times-Star editorial is an excellent one and expresses the thought of a great number of the people of California. The editorial follows:

THE COURT RULES ON THE LOYALTY OATH

It is a pleasure to see that the State district court of appeals has found unconstitutional the so-called anti-Communist affirmation, required by the University of California regents.

Wholly aside from the matters of academic rights, constitutionality and allied questions, the ruling is important because it strikes hard at the affirmation which would have been of direct benefit to any Communists who wished to infiltrate the university.

Though it has been said countless times by this paper and many others, we say again that a prime weapon of the Communists is the lie. It is a mandatory weapon or instrument for them whenever the situation demands. And when they can lie under oath it is all the better in their eyes for the simple reason that a lie under oath is obviously an egregious lie, and, because of the conditions surrounding it—the solemnity and all—it is consequently much more likely to go undetected.

But the ruling of the court yesterday will unfortunately not be enough. The matter may very well go to the State supreme court.

And even if that body upholds the lower court, there is still the matter of the constitutional amendment demanding a loyalty oath which has been passed by the legislature for submission to the voters in the general election of 1952.

Don't Throw the Baby Out With the Bath Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pamphlet on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:

THE RFC MAKES MONEY

Because of the publicity attendant on the present investigation many people have received the impression that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation through the years has not been a sound banking institution. The record, however, refutes this impression. The record of the RFC, over the years, is a good one. The RFC has made over 600,000 loans averaging $35,000 each. The total sum which has been loaned is about $21,000,000,000. The above figures include the financing of mortgages on veterans' houses carried out after the war. Losses and reserves for losses amount to some $200,000,000. The RFC has earned in interest and other income $1,400,000,000. Of this amount over $300,000,000 has been paid to the Treasury as dividends and the remainder is being utilized in RFC's lending activities. The taxpayer has thus profited by $600,000,000 from the operations of the RFC.

It should also be particularly noted that over 90 percent of the business loans made by RFC are to small business enterprises in amounts of less than $100,000. In 1950, a total of 5,506 of these small loans were granted. Of this number, 4,904 were for under $100,000. Almost 3,000 were for under $25,000. This is a record not to be disregarded.

THE RFC AND THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

1. Defense lending program under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

2. Defense-related lending program under the RFC Act, as amended.

3. The entire Government synthetic rubber program under the Rubber Act of 1948.

4. The entire Government tin program under Public Law 126, Eightieth Congress.

5. The entire Government abacá program under Public Law 603, Eighty-first Congress.

Draft Deferment Policy for College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by President Ralph Cooper Hutchison, of Lafayette College, which was made in defense of President Truman's Executive order establishing a college student draft-deferment policy based on high scholarships:

THE DRAFT DEFERMENT POLICY FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

(A reply to President James B. Conant, Harvard University, and President Harold W. Dodds, Princeton University, by Ralph Cooper Hutchison, president, Lafayette College)

Despite the well-reasoned statements of the President and General Hershey, the distinguished university presidents Dodds and Conant still insist that "a system of calling up all members of an age group who are physically fit is in accord with American ideals of democracy." They deplore the deferment of college men with high qualifications, a deferment which is only to prepare these men for more effective service in the Armed Forces. This insistence is distressing because these university presidents are taken by the public to speak for American education. They themselves make no such claim but their very eminence and distinction serve to create that impression.

American democracy has never claimed that all men should be regimented in the same pattern, do the same thing at the same time, assume the same precise responsibilities in an emergency, or be enslaved by equalitarian socialism. American democracy has, on the other hand, insisted that each man should do his part, that part for which he is best fitted, and in the time and manner which best serves the needs of our Nation and our society.

We are in what is either an all-out war or a protracted mobilization calculated to prevent world war. For the winning of either and the establishment of world peace, we know we must have unprecedented industrial production. This conflict may be won by the nations achieving the greatest scientific progress based upon the soundest and most extensive research. The fire power so produced and the transportation to be developed will require the finest and most mature skills for their strategic use. Moreover, it is clear that the ideological aspects for this conflict may be the dominant force and the determining factor. As none before, this will be a contest of production, science, research, skill, and leadership in action and ideas.

This means that any immediate expedient which cuts off the development of such skills and leadership is suicidal. First and primary consideration in planning for victory and for the successful preservation of our freedom should have been the unhampered and uninterrupted training of scientists, production men, medical men, engineers, and qualified leaders for the Armed Forces and for the civilian programs. First measures on the part of politicians, militarists, citizens, and educators should have preserved that thin red line of training of the best students available. First compulsion should have been that these men be required, not permitted, to continue their preparation for maximum service in this war.

The statement of these university presidents to the effect that the colleges and the college students do not want preferential treatment is correct. But it should make no difference to us what the colleges or the college students want. This mobilization economy should be planned intelligently for the attainment of victory for the forces of freedom. Students qualified and able to study should be prepared for their greatest ultimate usefulness to the Armed Forces. When they are ready, they should be put where they are most needed. This is more nearly the true ideal of American democracy.

To insist, for example, that a brilliant medical student should delay his training for 3 years or more to carry a gun when he might otherwise go on to the completion of his medical and surgical skills is a stupid interference with the sound prosecution of war itself. It will not hurt the student concerned, but it hurts the Nation. And it is unfair to the men who will be in the front lines, deprived thus of one more desperately needed surgeon.

The confusion in Congress and in the colleges is due to the fact that there has been no clear recognition of the primacy of education for the winning of the war. Apparently university presidents are afraid of their own truth, for they, above all others, have failed to enunciate this need for trained men in a great national emergency. Devices for popularity with the voters, the public, the labor unions, the newspapers, and with Government officials have obscured our national vision.

It is time that everyone lay aside political considerations and concern for popular acclaim and think straight through to the defeat of our enemies and the enemies of free nations. It is time that we insist on the immediate, uninterrupted, and increased training of doctors, surgeons, engineers, scientists, researchers, and leaders for all phases of military and civilian activity.

This can be done without impeding the mobilization for the present conflict. Let's get away from this silly debate over socialistic equalitarianism, turn every man to his own task—even the student—let us push ahead, win this war, beat down this surge of human enslavement, and so establish peace on the earth. Such a program is much nearer to the true meaning of American democracy.

Ex Male, Bonum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pilot, Boston, Mass., of Saturday, April 14, 1951:

EX MALO, BONUM

Now that the quite understandable emotional crisis has passed in regard to the dismissal of General MacArthur it is possible to approach the subject with something like

equanimity. There are, of course, many more questions involved than any quick survey can possibly consider and the somewhat various reactions to the news has made it plain that in some minds at least the separate issues are quite inextricably commingled. This has not contributed noticeably to either clarity or rationality.

The two principal questions to be considered deal, first, with the matter of the general's dismissal and then, secondly, the consideration of his policy for the Far East. While they concern, to be sure, the same man, the questions are nonetheless quite distinct and deserve separate comment.

Concerning the actual dismissal, political analysts had long since understood that a situation in which a commander in the field saw fit to argue and publicly with the general policy of his superiors was an utterly intolerable one. Very few who consider this question in its single self can come to any conclusion save the one that actually resulted—the subordinate would be forced to capitulate. It is to the credit of the Chief Executive that he had the courage to perform, however reluctantly or belatedly, an action which was to be so obviously an unpopular one. The simple and unavoidable conclusion about the dismissal of General MacArthur is that it was inevitable.

The second question which concerns the general's policy for the Far East is quite another matter. It is clear at once that his theories on what is best for America in the Asian area are distinctly different from those of the administration and the State Department; it is equally clear that he is dissatisfied with the present American (and U. N.) policies there which he considers at the very least to be inadequate. Since General MacArthur is an experienced observer of the Asian picture his observations are worth more than passing consideration. All the more true is this when we reflect on the most unfortunate history our present planners and their predecessors have had in understanding that part of the world. Mr. Marshall's unhappy visit to China and his present prominence in administration planning allow the thought that we may still be following a policy which events themselves have discredited. If our Asian policy needs revamping it will best be accomplished by experts (of which General MacArthur is one) and not by field commanders under orders from their superiors (of which the general was so lately one). While the general can be easily, and rightly, dismissed (or relieved), his ideas on the Far East must be studied and critically analyzed.

It is more than likely that the general's return to the United States will permit the first full-dress discussion of American foreign policy in Asia and for the first time, too, allow administration officials as well as the general to present their views on the formation of a sound policy for the future. What seemed at first to be high-handed politics, or just simple tragedy, may in the end prove to be the beginnings of rationality.

Budgeting and Accounting Problems of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an article by Herman C. Loeffler, a member of the staff of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on budgeting and accounting problems of the Federal Government. The article was published in the Quarterly National Tax Journal of March 1951.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALICE IN BUDGET LAND

(By Herman C. Loeffler)[1]

Federal budget and appropriation practices have long since developed Alice-in-Wonderland overtones of unreality and confusion. They are badly in need of basic reforms. * * *

DEFECTS IN CURRENT PRACTICES

Appropriations based on obligations

The initial and traditional stages of preparation by the departments and agencies of their annual spending requests make good sense. The organization units formulate their desired work programs in the light of social, economic, political, and many other developments and needs. Wherever possible these programs are divided into proper work units. The work units are then multiplied by estimated costs per unit, thus developing proposed expenditures relative to the budget year.

But from here on, the Alice-in-Wonderland conditions start. The controlling financial statutes require that proposed expenditures be translated into so-called obligations, which [are] the total dollar amounts required to make the arrangements which are necessary as a practical matter to accomplish a work program. They consist of the full commitments to obtain desired services by hiring people and to obtain commodities and other objects by the letting of short- or long-term contracts, usually limited by statute to a maximum life of 3 years.

The result of this requirement is that although the proposed work programs of a Federal agency may be identical for two successive years, the obligations requested of Congress as proposed appropriations to accomplish these programs may be quite different. Why? Assume that in the first of two identical annual work programs of a Federal agency for successive years, obligations were incurred to cover a relatively large number of 2-year contracts in their entirety, and that in the following year few multiyear contracts were included because the expiring contracts were available from the prior year to supply required goods and services. Under this assumption the agency might have the same $10,000,000 work programs in both fiscal years 1949 and 1950, although requiring an appropriation of $12,000,000 for the first year as contrasted with an appropriation of only $8,000,000 for the second year. Under these circumstances, appropriations of course cease to indicate the scope of agency work programs.

This example is much simpler than the conditions existing in practice, particularly in those departments and agencies which carry on many construction projects for which 3-year building contracts are frequent. In these cases computation of an annual appropriation requires that two deductions must first be made from the estimated amount of the actual annual construction to be accomplished, in order to adjust for those expenditures in the budget year which will be met from the unused portions of multiyear contracts awarded in the two prior years (unliquidated obligations carried forward) and still available for expenditure. Further, the appropriation for the proposed construction program must be increased by two additions in order to provide for expenditures occurring in the two subsequent years under the long-term contracts which are to be let in the budget year.

The upshot of these adjustments is that in determining the size of the appropriation for a given construction program, consideration must be given to work involved during a total period of 5 years. The amount of the appropriation may therefore give no indication whatever of the actual amount of work to be done in the fiscal year.

Expenditures not comparable with appropriations

This Alice-in-Wonderland confusion is of course equally bad in connection with the actual expenditures under annual appropriations. As has been indicated, annual appropriations include, in addition to adjustments for carry-overs between years, the total contracts to be awarded in the fiscal year, without regard to the longer period over which expenditures under those contracts may be spread before they are completed. The annual expenditure reported by an agency therefore has no relation to the year when the contracts were let or other obligations were incurred to obtain the necessary current deliveries.

Imagine trying to exercise sound judgment in preparing budgets under this theoretical background. Using the simple example already given, the agency would report expenditures of $10,000,000 each in fiscal years 1949 and 1950. Since $12,000,000 was the first year's appropriation, the agency had presumably been very economical and had underspent its allowance. In the second year, however, it had supposedly broken the law and seriously overspent by the same amount. Of course, both of these conclusions are entirely incorrect.

In many agencies, annual appropriations provide only the annual salaries of those employed, plus quarters and small amounts for travel and the like, so that there is practically no carry-over between years. The above difficulties are therefore either nonexistent or relatively inconsequential. In other agencies, however, notably those letting contracts for big building operations, the reverse will be true; very heavy carry-over will occur between years because of the multiyear contracts in effect. Other agencies will lie between these two extremes. The difficulty is that one never knows to what degree the annual expenditures reported for an agency are comparable with the appropriations voted for it.

Lack of cohesion in budget document

As to this never-never land of fiscal planning and control under practical operating conditions, let me comment very briefly on the resultant serious problems for the annual Federal budget document. That huge tome of telephone-directory size contains an immense amount of valuable data laboriously prepared after much discussion and planning by the Federal agencies and then gathered and reshaped by the Bureau of the Budget to fit into the President's program.

It is a fact of great importance to the whole democratic process that this large collection of very important financial material scares off many interested persons. Some of this negative reaction undoubtedly stems from the fact that the basic design of the budget document is so faulty. It starts with some 200 pages of Presidential budget message and summary tables, prepared quite exclusively on an expenditure basis so that the programs proposed in the budget may be fitted into economic and financial developments in national affairs of the present and near future.

Incredible as it may sound, that material is supported—of necessity under existing law—by over 1,000 pages of densely packed and unrelated detail on the obligation basis which must be used for appropriations. The result is that the document has an unbelievable lack of internal cohesion.[2]

* * * * *

Accounting controls a factor

The reader may wonder why responsible officials have so long clung to the present confused procedure. In part that hesitation is probably due to a myriad of technical and perplexing details which departures from traditional methods would raise in the far-flung and complicated operations of the Federal Government.

More important, however, is undoubtedly the fact that the present system lends itself to easy accounting controls to prevent overspending of appropriations. Thus, each appropriation is set up as a control figure over an account when it is voted. The account is then cumulatively charged with a variable mixture of expenditures as they occur—of current expenditures such as the regular payroll and of the full amounts of multiyear contracts as awarded, regardless of their expiration dates beyond the close of the fiscal year.

At the end of the fiscal year, the residual unobligated amount is by law then no longer available for further obligation. But the obligated balance is carried forward, usually for 2 years,[3] so that as the unfinished contracts and other obligations are completed, expenditures are cumulated against the original obligations which were entered in the accounts to provide for each full contract to maturity.

In this simple fashion eventual overspending of any appropriation is prevented regardless of the mixed sequence of long-term and short-term transactions with either slow or rapid subsequent rates of liquidation * * *.[4]

---

[1] The ideas expressed in this article by Mr. Loeffler are his own and not to be construed as those of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with which he became associated as a professional staff member in early 1949. For years he was active in research work on problems of local government in New York, St. Louis, Boston, and other cities. Starting in 1941 he served 8 years with the U. S. Bureau of the Budget, mostly as one of the Assistant Chiefs of its Fiscal Division.

[2] The budget document transmitted to the Congress on January 15, 1951, considerably modifies a former important summary table in an effort to bridge the gap between the expenditure approach of the budget message and the immense supporting obligation detail required by law. To that end the modified table continues the usual six columns of both appropriation and expenditure figures for the three fiscal years covered, then adds eight new columns to trace the degree to which annual expenditures are based on the later liquidation of obligations incurred against prior year appropriations. This painstaking exercise is of doubtful usefulness and unfortunately falls short of meeting the criticisms which motivate the action program proposed in this article.

[3] Actually, under a 1949 statute, unused parts of appropriations are continued as available for paying claims and judgments approved by the General Accounting Office until the statute of limitations takes effect.

[4] It is a great pleasure to indicate a recent basic change promulgated for agency accounting by the General Accounting Office on June 1, 1950 (Accounting Systems Memorandum No. 7, May 2, 1950). The new system permits relegating present accounting for commitments and obligations to memorandum accounts, so that the primary basis of accounting may be the expenditure controls which this article argues would have many beneficial effects in Federal operations. This development has possibilities of far-reaching significance.

PROPOSED THREE-WAY PROGRAM

Many laws control Federal transactions and finance * * *. One of these, dating from 1874 * * * requires that "the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause all unexpended balances which shall have remained upon the books of the Treasury for two fiscal years, to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury."[5]

The second statute, the so-called Antideficiency Act of 1905, provides that "no executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expand, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by the Congress for the fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriation. * * *"[6]

These two statutes are primarily responsible for the confusion which has been briefly discussed. It is proposed that they be modified by three statutory amendments. These amendments are by no means the original ideas of the author. They also reflect the findings of various writers on this subject who have developed different aspects of the thesis underlying this article. Moreover, the proposed statutory changes are in line with the fiscal methods successfully used in Canada and Great Britain.

The following three-way program would replace the present loose and inadequate annual control by Congress over the operations of Federal agencies through appropriations based on obligations, with a proposed annual control which bases appropriations on expenditures. From such an "annuality" concept would arise many benefits of better budgeting, of a cohesive budget document, and of reports which the public can understand and which the Congress can really use for controlling the annual expenditures of the executive agencies.

* * * * *

I. LAPSING APPROPRIATIONS AND OBLIGATIONS

On each June 30, lapse all annual appropriations and all unfulfilled obligations against them, thus, without exception, limiting the availability of each annual appropriation to those goods which are actually delivered and those services which are actually rendered up to the end of the fiscal year. As to permanent appropriations (which are undesirable because they escape fresh budget consideration and readjustment each year), it is proposed that the amounts thereby made available in successive fiscal years be treated as if they were individual annual appropriations. * * *

* * * * *

The essence of budget planning should be the translation of the proposed actual work program of each agency for the budget year into estimated dollars of expenditure. Once approved or modified by the Congress, these dollar amounts ought then to become the simple, understandable basis of control for each annual appropriation.

Instead, as has been indicated, there must now first be deducted from such amounts the obligations of the two prior years which it is estimated will be liquidated as expenditures in the current year. Then there must be added the "extra" amounts of long-term new obligations to be incurred against current appropriations although they will not be liquidated until the two subsequent fiscal years. The comprehensibility of such a process is obscure, to put it mildly.

In past years the Budget Bureau has prepared at the request of the House Appropriations Committee, but has not printed for general public circulation, a complicated and extended tabulation which bridges the gap between the disparate part I expenditure and part II obligation bases of the budget document. It shows for each proposed appropriation the proposed expenditures for the budget year ahead and the carry-overs at the beginning and end of that year. * * *[7]

The proposed lapsing provision would have the very great advantage of giving Congress direct control over both the amount and purpose of spending within each fiscal year, through appropriations based on expenditures. As things now stand, the carry-over to a later year of part of the obligations incurred against prior years' appropriations makes it possible for an agency to use up more of those obligations carried forward than had been anticipated, and therefore for the agency to spend at a more rapid rate than Congress had in mind when the relevant appropriation was considered and enacted.

Prevent wasteful last-minute obligations

Of importance also is the fact that since appropriations are based on obligations, unobligated balances of an unexpected size will arise in some agencies as the end of the year approaches. These balances should become savings. Instead, they are a source of possible waste and extravagance. The agencies are now prone to use them to incur last-minute obligations for delivery over future months of rugs, typewriters, motor equipment, and other items which were not part of the original budget plan.

Such abuse is also possible but probably would be of much smaller scope under the proposed expenditure basis of appropriations. The reason is that the unobligated surplus to be used up as the fiscal year matures would usually be revealed too late to permit entering purchase orders and also obtaining delivery thereunder of these last-minute purchases by June 30.

Other benefits of annuality

If the proposed lapsing provision is adopted, the question of obligations will drop out of part II of the budget document because both parts will then be on an expenditure basis. Cohesion will be introduced between parts I and II by standard tables which will present a simple, uniform comparison, first in summary and then in detail. This simple, standard, 3-year comparison will show actual expenditures for the last completed fiscal year, estimated expenditures for the year underway, and proposed appropriations (that is, proposed expenditures) for the budget year ahead.

The new basis would permit easy follow-up and control of the financial aspects of a work program as presented in successive budget documents. Thus, the actual 1950 expenditures for each agency's program, as reported in the 1952 budget document, could be directly compared with (figures for the same year in earlier documents). * * *

This proposal would also make possible an important start toward budgeting Federal capital expenditures. For that purpose, simple tables would be feasible showing (a) actual expenditures, by years and cumulatively, from the annual appropriations voted in prior years to implement each multiyear contract authorization (see point III below); (b) the estimated expenditure during the current year; (c) the proposed expenditure during the budget year; and (d) the residual amounts required to carry contract authorizations to completion, for which annual appropriations must still be voted.

Such capital-budget data would show how far "Uncle Sam has incurred and paid off outstanding mortgages." This very important information is now inextricably mixed in with current appropriations. Surely the financial deliberations of the Congress on new projects would be greatly improved by this much more adequate progress data on authorized projects underway.

---

[5] 18 Stat. 110.

[6] 31 U. S. C. 665.

[7] See footnote 2.

The proposed expenditure approach would make possible for the first time the legislative budget stipulated under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That act was designed to control total expenditures during the year ahead, but the obligation basis of appropriation makes it impossible really to limit expenditures specifically * * *

Likewise, appropriation controls on an expenditure basis would for the first time permit the making of a meaningful table of receipts from and payments to the public. Increasing importance is being placed on this approach in various quarters. * * *

II. NINETY-DAY RESERVES, ETC., TO PAY CLAIMS AND TARDY BILLS

Authorize each department to set up temporary reserves from expiring annual appropriations to pay tardy bills for goods and services actually provided up to the end of the fiscal year, which are rendered within 90 days after June 30. Use special single appropriation to pay billings delayed more than 90 days.

Many Federal agencies operate over huge areas and distances—on a world-wide basis in the case of the State and Military Departments in particular. Even under normal peacetime conditions, therefore, creditors cannot always render bills promptly for goods which have been delivered or services which have been rendered in the closing days of each fiscal year. After the bills are received, some time is required to prepare checks in payment. Finally, further time elapses while the checks are being cashed and cleared by the banks.

It has been testified by experts that the printing process of the Government Printing Office involves up to 90 days of delay in billing; travel, communications, supplies, rents, and utilities introduce delays ranging up to 75 days, and transportation items up to as much as 140 days. In the latter cases, the railroads must not only assemble all freight bills but must then work out the amounts due each participating railroad. * * *

It is suggested that early in July, 90-day reserves be set up in departmental accounts from expiring appropriations to pay anticipated tardy bills submitted for goods actually delivered and services actually rendered before July 1. This length of period seems adequate to meet anticipated tardiness of all except a very small proportion of the bills for the year's transactions. At the same time this period leaves another 90 days before early January during which (a) the Treasury Department can assemble final figures on total actual departmental expenditures for the year ending June 30, and (b) the Budget Bureau can incorporate the actual data in various comparisons in the budget document before it is transmitted to the Congress.

* * * * *

Treatment of bills over 90 days late

After the conclusion of the above 90-day period, there arises the problem of what shall be done with tardy bills received thereafter, including the judgments and claims certified by the General Accounting Office.[1] * * *

The departments might be allowed to absorb some or all of items below $500 each from their appropriations for the following year, or a simple solution would be to vote a single annual appropriation to a central account in the Treasury Department to pay all amounts billed more than 90 days late. * * *

* * * * *

Where accrual accounts are installed in the departments, adjustment can be made for * * * changes in inventories during each year. The exact role of accrual accounts in the Federal scene must be worked out, however. On the revenue side they cannot follow State and local practice too closely because the Federal tax liabilities of individuals, unlike individual tax liabilities on local real estate, are usually not known in advance. As to expenditures, the accrual accounts will be open to serious basic criticism if they weaken or obscure clear, simple congressional control through annual appropriations in the current year for goods actually delivered and services actually rendered in that current year.

* * * * *

III. CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS SUPPORTED BY APPROPRIATIONS

Use contract authorizations exclusively rather than only occasionally, as at present, to provide for multiyear programs. Require that each multiyear contract which is awarded shall contain a clause specifying that until the work is completed annual amounts of expenditure thereunder are to be wholly contingent on the size of the successive annual appropriations voted by Congress.

The latter provision has long been followed in the important construction contracts of both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Present construction contracts may cover 2 or 3 years of work, thus permitting more labor-saving devices to be used by contractors for the large projects and thereby bringing about lower bids. Large multiyear contracts are equally feasible under the proposed system, but Congress may subsequently reduce annual appropriations, and it is to be expected that contractors will submit higher bids to take care of this eventuality. It is felt that this loss is justified in order to give flexibility to Congress to adjust construction programs to impending booms or depressions. Flexibility could also be achieved by specifying in each contract the amount of work to be done in each of the years covered as specified in the original work plan. * * *

Under present multiyear contract awards, the public benefits if favorable weather conditions or other good luck permits a contractor to make the new facility available sooner than was anticipated. But there is a natural sequence of operations in the erection of a large building, for example, and but little speeding up is feasible as the work moves from excavation to construction of foundation, floors, and walls, to installation of internal equipment. Steel, concrete, and other supplies arrive on prearranged schedules from their separate places of manufacture, perhaps over limited railroad or highway facilities. The employment of different types of skilled and expensive labor must also be planned in advance.

Under such circumstances any great speeding up of the completion of large contracts because of favorable conditions seems improbable. To the extent, however, that there is early completion of contract work, supplementary appropriations could be voted between January and July if a project is moving ahead more rapidly than had been anticipated. Or the annual appropriation might actually be designed to provide for completion of work under contract in the shortest possible time, assuming the most favorable conditions. In the latter case, the Bureau of the Budget would be directed to hold back in nonexpendable reserves any amounts not spent because of delays.

The latter proposal is also a solution for the difficulty of estimating construction and other multiyear costs far in advance. The problem here is * * * one of reducing the amount available * * * by appropriating for average or good conditions, and then holding back proper amounts in reserves if poor conditions develop.

* * * * *

JOINT ACCOUNTING PROJECT

Good work has been done in recent years to improve Federal accounts through the joint voluntary accounting project of the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department. It does not seem, however, that those agencies are well-advised in compromising with adaptation via accrual accounting to adjust to an obligation basis of appropriations, rather than supporting an expenditure basis of appropriations to bring about adequate reform of budget and accounting procedures.

* * * * *

The members of the joint accounting project can render a great service to the Nation by urging Congress to adopt the three-way program here proposed to meet the difficult problems which arise. Anything short of this fundamental approach will fail to clear up the Alice-in-Wonderland conditions prevailing in Federal budgeting and other fiscal practices.

[1] See 63 Stat. 407, of 1949.

Legislation To Protect Members of Armed Services and Government Employees From Reprisals Because of Congressional Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have this date introduced a bill designed to assure members of the Armed Forces and other officers or employees of the Government who can offer pertinent and constructive testimony that they can speak the truth without suffering the fate of Admiral Denfeld on account of such testimony before congressional committees.

This bill would make it a violation of law for any officer of the Federal Government to dismiss or otherwise discipline a Government employee for testifying before a committee of Congress.

Next week Congress will begin hearings on our far-eastern policy, the conduct of the Korean war, and the dismissal of General MacArthur by the President. As we look into these vitally important issues, it is essential that every witness testifying before these committees have complete freedom from reprisals when he is given an opportunity to tell what he knows. The issues to be discussed at these hearings vitally affect the lives of all of our people and are essential to the security of the Nation.

We have too much at stake to permit foreign policy and military strategy to be established on the basis of half-truths and the suppression of testimony.

We must provide protection to witnesses who are members of the armed services or employees of the Government. Unless we provide such protection, the scheduled hearings will amount to no more than a whitewash for administration policies—past, present, and future.

Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate by the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and others.

I hope that all of the Members of the Congress will give careful attention to this important legislation which will help to assure us of obtaining all of the facts necessary to reach crucial decisions on the important matters now affecting the security of this country.

The Importance of Individual Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, over the past week end there was held at Hood College in Frederick, Md., a convocation which not only was a notable occasion in the long and splendid history of this fine institution, but which deserves to be ranked among the important educational contributions to security and democracy in this critical area.

With the defense of democracy as its theme, the convocation presented in impressive fashion the religious, moral, and social concepts of democracy, as we are privileged to know it in this country, to a degree that undoubtedly will leave a lasting impression upon all who had the opportunity to participate. The entire program was under the excellent direction of Dr. Andrew G. Truxal, the learned president of Hood College.

The addresses made during the convocation exercises were noteworthy, indeed. Among the speakers was the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH], whose topic, the Importance of Individual Thinking, was developed intelligently and convincingly. The excellent address of the Senator from Maine was in thorough accord with the scholastic atmosphere in which it was delivered.

Another who contributed to the importance and the success of the convocation was Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, whom I had the privilege of presenting to the gathering.

It is very much in order, I believe, to offer sincere congratulations to the general chairman of the convocation committee, Mr. R. Paul Smith, of Hagerstown, one of the leading and most respected businessmen of the western part of our State. To say that the convocation, under Mr. Smith's able direction, gave evidence of outstanding vision with regard to the educational and moral needs of the moment, and that it was a complete success, is to state but a simple truth. He and all those who constituted with him the convocation committee deserve the utmost recognition and the thanks of the people of that whole area for a job well done.

Because the thoughts expressed in the address of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine are so pertinent to present-day educational conditions that they deserve to be brought to the attention of our people in all sections, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUAL THINKING

You young women are on the threshold of the finest years of your life. Make the best of those years—not only for yourselves, but for your families, your friends, and your country as well. Make better use of those years than has the generation preceding you.

Give the young women who follow you a heritage of peace instead of the world of suspicion, aggression, treason, character assassination, and moral delinquency that has been thrust upon you by the older generation that has preceded you.

Show them the way to think—the way to control emotions instead of being controlled by emotions. Lead them away from the emotional idolatry of personalities that so becloud our national thinking today. Lead them away from bitter cynicism and hatred of those with whom they differ in opinion. Show them how to disagree agreeably and with constructive respect.

Help them to realize that this wonderful country of ours is greater than any individual woman or man—and that its fate, destiny, and security should not be made a political football to be kicked around by clashing personalities greedy and envious of political power.

Your generation can do this. It is your destiny—the greatest challenge with which you are faced. You can meet that challenge—you can fulfill your destiny—regardless of what individual role you play in the years to come, whether in the home, in the church, in business or in public office.

There is an old slogan that you can well respect and ever keep before you. It is the slogan of "Stop, look, and listen." But I want to add something new to that slogan and I propose to you the slogan of "Stop, look, listen, and think." If you ever think you have been wrong and want to change your mind—do it and admit it. That's the sign of a big person.

One of the basic causes for all the trouble in the world today is that people talk too much and think too little. They act too impulsively without thinking. I always try to think before I talk.

Don't misunderstand me. I'm not advocating in the slightest that we become mutes with our voices stilled because of fear of criticism of what we might say. That is moral cowardice. And moral cowardice that keeps us from speaking our minds is as dangerous to this country as irresponsible talk. The right way is not always the popular and easy way. Standing for right when it is unpopular is a true test of moral character.

In short, I urge you to think well and deeply before you talk—but once you have made up your mind, don't hesitate to speak your mind. As long as you speak your minds, dictators and demagogues will never take control of this country.

There will always be demagogues—and there must always be people with enough moral courage to stand up and speak out against such demagogues and expose and defeat them, before they get so many unthinking people swallowing their untruthful propaganda that our country is surrendered to them because we were too lazy to do our own thinking and too cowardly to speak our minds.

Instead of making a speech to you today, I would rather think with you. Instead of saying just so many words in catchy phrases and consuming so much time, I would rather just "think out loud" with you, try to get my simple points across as briefly as possible and stop. I would rather say fewer words more slowly so that they can sink in mentally than to try to crowd in the maximum number of words in any lengthy speech.

And I fully acknowledge that what I say is nothing new to you nor anything that you couldn't say yourself. But it is well for all of us to review the fundamentals that are so basic and obvious that too often too many of us take them for granted.

The importance of individual thinking to the preservation of our democracy and our freedom cannot be overemphasized. It is too often overlooked and neglected.

But when we use the word "think" just what do we mean? To think is to exercise the faculties of judgment, conception, or inference—to put our common sense into action. When the German people defaulted their thinking to Hitler, they surrendered their freedom. When the Russian people defaulted their thinking to Lenin and Stalin, they surrendered their freedom.

Too few people in this country realize that too many people in this country are defaulting their thinking to demagogues and that we are closer to surrendering our freedom than most of us are willing to recognize and admit. When we accept the statements and proposals of demagogues because we are too lazy to think and test their statements and proposals, we can blame no one but ourselves for subsequent events.

But thoughts, to be effective, must be disclosed. We must have confidence in our opinions and cherish the belief that they will guide others as well as ourselves. We should so proceed as to merit leadership and then not be timid about accepting it.

It is the articulate majority that rules a democracy. But the articulate majority does not always represent the real majority. Quite often the real minority by thinking and loud makes itself the practical, effective articulate majority. For proof of this one need only look at the presidential elections figures where he or she will find that usually the victorious candidate and party not only have small margins of victory but poll considerably less than 51 percent of the eligible electorate.

There is too great a tendency to regard elections as just a lot of politics and a popularity contest in which candidates and political parties indulge in name-calling that they themselves do not believe and forget just as soon as the election campaign is over.

Elections are more than just intense politics and popularity contests. In elections we should vote for policies on vital issues, for the candidates are merely symbols and media of action.

Elections are times when we establish a policy of Government for the next 2 or 4 years—a policy that public officials whom we have elected are to follow. Therein lies the importance of maximum voting, for in our two-party system maximum voting is the greatest possible assurance of effecting the will of the majority, of giving full vitality to democracy.

There is a tendency to set women off separate from men when we think about these aspects. I don't like that—I don't like it simply because women are citizens just like men and have the same responsibilities of citizenship as men do. The simplest and most direct way to state my attitude is in three words—women are people.

So that, I am inclined to accept the theme of woman's role in the defense of democracy with the reservation that the broad role of women in the defense of democracy is no different from that of men.

Women, just like men, have the role of voting, of thinking, of articulating—of taking a stand and expressing their beliefs. They can play that role in participating in forums and public discussions. They can organize or affiliate themselves with articulate groups that represent their views. They can help get out the vote.

The articulate action of a citizen, whether man or woman, must be constructive—must seek to improve—to build instead of tear down and destroy—must be preceded by serious and responsible thinking. Criticism unaccompanied by positive proposals of substitutes for that criticized indicates lack of informed thinking on the part of the critic.

The broader sense of the concept of the role of women in the defense of democracy is that of the citizen doing her most for the preservation of democracy and peace by (1) independent thinking, (2) making that thinking articulate by translating it into action at the ballot boxes, in the forums, and in everyday life, and (3) being constructive and positive in that thinking and articulation.

In the more narrow sense of the concept—the concept that makes a distinction on the basis of sex—the most important role of the woman in defense of democracy is her traditional role as homemaker.

I wish that there were more women holding top positions in our democracy. I wish there were more women in Congress—more women in top positions in the executive and judicial branches of our Government.

But in that vein I regard the role of homemaker for women as being far more important than the role in public office. For surely the very backbone of our democracy is the family and the home in which the family lives. As long as the family home structure of our Nation is firm and sound, our democracy will be firm and sound and well defended.

Since woman is the homemaker—the keeper of the home—she is the key individual of our democracy at the "grass roots" level. In that respect woman is the primary and basic governor of our democracy, for our governing starts right in the home. Woman molds the citizens of tomorrow in the rearing that she gives the children.

Yes; the first and original governor in our democracy is the woman. Woman administers the home. She sets the rules. She enforces the rules. She metes out the discipline and the justice for violations of those rules.

In other words, women, in their own way, like Congress, legislate the rules—in their own way, like the executive branch, enforce and administer the rules—in their own way, like the courts, interpret the rules of the home.

Some of you, I hope, will enter public service. I hope that more women do inject themselves into their Government, for certainly our Government needs more of the home put into it and less of the Government in the home.

But whether you enter public service or not, there is no finer role that you can play in the defense of democracy and our American way of life than that of wife, mother, and homemaker. Run your homes and raise your children in the very best traditions and fundamentals of our American way of life.

But don't restrict yourself to the home to the extent of exclusion of any interest or participation in public affairs and your Government. For if you do that, your indifference to your Government and to your full citizenship will be reflected in your children who grow up imitating you.

In short, in the years that you are about to enter you can do far more than you realize to make this a better country—to keep it the wonderful democracy that it is, to preserve our American way of life.

You don't have to ask anybody but yourself how to do it. And there is no one who can do it for you. It is your individual responsibility. More important, it is your free and cherished right. Don't let that right die for lack of exercise.

The most precious thing that democracy gives to us is freedom. You and I cannot escape the fact that the ultimate responsibility for freedom is personal. Our freedoms today are not so much in danger because people are consciously trying to take them away from us as they are in danger because we forget to use them.

Freedom may be an intangible, but, like most everything else, it can die because of lack of use. Freedom unexercised may become freedom forfeited. The preservation of freedom is in the hands of the people themselves now, not the Government.

Prolonging Korea Stalemate Laid to Democratic Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Prolonging Korea Stalemate Laid to Democratic Leaders," written by David Lawrence and published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 27, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

PROLONGING KOREA STALEMATE LAID TO DEMOCRATIC LEADERS

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Is anybody here really thinking about the 350,000 American boys in Korea? Speeches galore are being made in Congress, but so far as the Democratic Party is concerned, there isn't the slightest evidence of any policy on the part of its leadership in Congress or the White House to bring the Korean war to a successful conclusion.

Instead, the idea of a stalemate which shall keep American troops engaged indefinitely seems to be accepted as the policy of the administration. There is to be no effort to strike back at the enemy by air or to require that allies who are members of the U. N. should cease giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

It was the Democratic administration which ordered the troops into Korea without ever asking for a resolution of ratification by Congress. It is the same administration which now is committing the American forces to an indefinite period of fighting without a chance of using maximum force against the enemy.

So far as the American forces in Korea are concerned, they have been deprived of the opportunity to use the customary tactics or rules of war.

It is one of the oldest rules of international law that when an enemy force makes an attack, it can be pursued to the bases from which it came.

The Democratic Party in Congress, however, takes the position that these rules must be ignored and that the American forces must continue to take punishment day after day for fear of offending our U. N. allies or Russia.

United States entitled to leadership

The American people have a right to expect leadership from the Democratic Party, which is in control not only of the White House but of both Houses of Congress as well as the Department of State.

Yet, today the United States Government sits idly by and allows one of its allies—Great Britain—to ship through Hong Kong munitions of war that are being used by the Communist Chinese.

The United States also sits idly by and maintains friendly relations with and even appropriates money to governments, such as India, which are doing everything they can to oppose American policy. Not a single regiment of Indian troops has gone to the aid of American forces in Korea.

The Congress is asked to be humane and furnish wheat to India, but is the Government of Nehru humane? Hasn't the Government of India done everything it could to take the side of Communist China—an enemy of the United States—and isn't it the Indian Government that is really responsible for the privations of the Indian people rather than those who decline to send funds or food?

The United States sits idly by, too, and allows the legal fiction to be spread that this is a war between the United Nations and the Communists when, in fact, Britain and other U. N. governments maintain friendly relations with governments actually engaged in war against us.

Fear wins no wars

One Government which is a member of the United Nations—namely, Nationalist China—is prevented from aiding our troops in Korea. Within the last few days it has been announced that a military mission is going from America to help the Nationalists to defend Formosa against attack. If American munitions and military personnel can do this, they can help the Nationalists to reach the mainland, as General MacArthur recommended.

But how does the American Government justify its own course in arranging now for the defense of Formosa when the British Government and other U. N. governments do not concur at all in the American policy toward Formosa?

What kind of U. N. policy is it which forbids one of its own members to obey the call for reinforcements in Korea? And what kind of U. N. policy is it which permits its principal members to trade with the enemy and to carry on diplomatic relations with the enemy government?

These factors make it logical to expect that the Democratic Party will have to explain its position and record on all this some day. It cannot pose as the "peace party" when in fact it has become the party that has allowed the Korean war to be prolonged instead of being brought to a quick conclusion, as could be done if General MacArthur's recommendations were followed.

Fear never won a war and public expressions of fear recently by Democratic Party spokesmen may well invite further attacks from the enemy, just as the ill-fated pronouncement in January 1950 by our Secretary of State that Korea wouldn't be defended may have encouraged the Communist aggression in June 1950.

How To End Korean War Yet Win Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial entitled "How To End Korean War Yet Win Peace," which was published in the Johnstown Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., on Tuesday, April 24, 1951:

HOW TO END KOREAN WAR YET WIN PEACE

As key Senate committees prepare to take up an inquiry into United States foreign policy, these vital factors stand out as conditioning aspects of the search for a wise and sound global program:

1. Because of tragic errors of the past, we are limited in our efforts for the future. It is not so much a matter now of agreeing on the best course. Unfortunately, there is no such course. So we must content ourselves with determining the least objectionable of a number of faulty courses.

2. The towering and heroic figure of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, together with the cavalier manner in which this military genius was dismissed has threatened to put an unfortunate emphasis upon the emotional plane and to make difficult a dispassionate, logical approach to the problem.

This has not been the general's fault. The summary way in which he was shorn of his duties provided the spark which lit this Nation-wide display of hero worshipfulness. And the administration, in what has come pretty close to being a smear campaign directed against the general, has succeeded in fanning the blaze.

Part of the blame for this hobby-soxer approach to the matter at hand must also be attributed to some Republicans, who have sought to capitalize upon the genuine and deep-seated respect the people have for this great American.

3. The administration, having failed to anticipate accurately the depth of the public's feeling in the matter, has been placed in the uncomfortable position of fighting, with its back to the wall, an unpopular engagement in which personalities rather than issues are getting far too much attention.

Such an uneasiness over being at bay is not conducive to logical presentation of facts, and encourages excessive use of tactics unworthy of the serious issues at hand.

4. Finally, the administration, if it is to avoid a public confession of its earlier fundamental errors, may choose to commit new and equally grave mistakes out of the necessity of preserving partisan strength, or at least of hedging against a too severe breaching of party armor.

In this respect, the President and his advisers have inexpertly boxed themselves in. They cannot very well go forward along lines advocated by General MacArthur, for they have fired him for pressing this course. They cannot go back along the road of appeasement, as advocated by Great Britain, for they themselves have foresworn this retreat, in their efforts to breast the wave of public adoration of MacArthur the hero.

That leaves them only the sad choice of trying to stand still, an alternative in which we expect the Chinese and the Russian Communists will be extremely uncooperative.

Indeed, the weakness of the United States politico-military position in the Far East today is that it cannot be characterized as a policy at all—but rather as the lack of one. Like Charles Dickens' Mr. Micawber, we are "waiting for something to turn up." And that, short of surrender, is no way to win a war—or a peace, either.

Despite these four very real and very unfortunate difficulties, the way must be found to a positive policy which is the least faulty, to a policy by which the war in Korea can be brought to an honorable and speedy conclusion, to a policy which gives the greatest hope of restoring peace, to a policy which can lead eventually to a logical program for insuring the security of the Western World while at the same time coming to an understanding with the Soviet world which will permit the two halves to live together, if not in complete harmony, at least outside the shadow of imminent war.

Admittedly, that's a mighty big order. And it, too, has a major flaw, just as has President Truman's idea of a "limited war" in Korea. That flaw is the refusal of the Communist world earnestly to seek peace, or a reasonable facsimile thereof.

It takes two to make war. It also takes two to make peace. And we only kid ourselves, and do our noble cause a major disservice, if we conclude that our cold-war-hot-war enemy desires real and lasting peace in Asia, in the Middle East or in Europe.

We have contended that the Truman-Acheson policy vacuum in Korea is faulty. We hasten to add that the program General MacArthur favors is more or less faulty, too. That's what we're trying to get at. Nothing we can do will be completely right. Some things will be less wrong than others.

Much was made by an administration source over the week end about the entry of the Chinese Communists into the Korean "police action." General MacArthur is quoted as having assured President Truman at the Wake Island conference that the Chinese Reds would not enter the conflict, that he could wind up the Korean campaign about Thanksgiving time and that at least a division of United States troops in Korea could be spared for European duty by early January.

We have yet to hear General MacArthur's version of this historic meeting last October 15 and we shall withhold comment on it until that time.

But this fact remains, and it cannot be controverted:

When we entered Korea militarily after the surprise attack by the North Koreans across the thirty-eighth parallel—a move that was made, incidentally, without consultation with Congress, which constitutionally has exclusive power to declare war—we took a calculated risk.

It might be added here, parenthetically, that the President ordered troops into Korea without prior consultation with General MacArthur, whose job it would be as a military man to fight the campaign decided upon by the diplomats.

Once we committed troops to Korea, we rank the risk that Communist China would enter the fray. There may have been good reason at the time to doubt that the Chinese Reds would get mixed up in it. But we didn't know for sure. We did know—or should have realized—that if Mao decided to get in we couldn't keep him out.

As it developed, Mao did move into Korea. Whether he intended to do that all along, or changed his mind when it became obvious that we would lick the North Koreans, we don't know. He's there now, at any rate.

If we follow General MacArthur's program, we may wind up fighting Russia, too, not only in the Far East but in Europe and the Middle East as well. Nobody knows.

Saying Russia necessarily won't move in, as General MacArthur told Congress, is nothing more than a guess. Russia might get into it—and we might as well face that possibility. Russia might get in even though we don't smack Red China by air.

In a very real sense Russian involvement has been a possibility ever since we went to the South Koreans' aid, just as Red China's involvement was. The Truman-Acheson policy vacuum in Korea is no guaranty either that the Kremlin won't strike.

The basic weakness of the MacArthur viewpoint is this: What do we do with Korea—or that piece of it we finally capture—once we win?

We may even force the Chinese to pull back across the Yalu. We might even be able to achieve the United Nations original goal in Korea—to unify the country and to restore it to the Koreans under a democratic form of government.

But unless the U. N. keeps thousands of men in Korea for a long time to come, and arms that defense army to the teeth, there will be nothing to prevent the Chinese from repeating the whole sorry aggression after our boys go home.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson was right (although there are some things a government can't and shouldn't say officially) when he observed that Korea was a military liability. It still is. It will continue to be, even if we kick Mao out of that tragic land.

We went into Korea in the first place because of a high moral principle, to conquer aggression and to halt Red imperialism by force of arms. That was a noble sentiment, and it was supported generally in this country.

But the United Nations has abandoned that goal. The U. N. membership has quietly but firmly failed to provide enough military stuff, just as the U. N. has failed to supply the diplomatic and political guts, to do what it set out to do in Korea.

In a very real sense, our allies have let us down. As a result, we have concocted this senseless Truman-Acheson formula for seeking to limit the war. You can't limit war. You either win wars, or you lose them.

You can commit your men to a criminal meat-grinder proposition in which you trade one pint of American blood for 20 pints of Communist blood. But in the end you succeed in doing nothing but spilling blood.

Furthermore, under such a program, which requires a willingness to see the Korean campaign seesaw across the narrow peninsula for months, years, maybe, you make it inevitable that the folks back home eventually will demand that the whole sorry mess be ended, one way or the other.

General MacArthur wanted to try to end the war, in what looked to him to be the shortest possible time and with the least additional loss of American lives. He was fired, because that isn't the way the Truman-Acheson script calls for things to go.

But there is one other way. It won't be popular immediately. It won't be strictly moral, from the standpoint of high principle. It won't be totally right. But we think it offers the greatest percentage of rightness and the lowest percentage of wrongness. It's the least of a number of larger evils.

Here's a rough outline we toss out as the basis for discussion—intelligent, unemotional discussion, we hope.

1. Get out of Korea. Announce in advance that we are laying down a broad radioactive belt behind which our forces can stage an orderly withdrawal and through which the Commies cannot advance to prevent evacuation of our men, our equipment, and our allies.

2. Take with us South Koreans, military and civilian, who don't want to stay behind. (We don't know where we could put them, but that could be worked out through the U. N.; it's a U. N. baby.)

3. Proclaim a Monroe Doctrine for the far Pacific. Draw a line and say to the Commies, in Peiping as well as in Moscow, cross that line and atomic eggs begin to fall on you, brother—but fast.

4. Make certain the Commies clearly understand this line, among other places, specifically protects the Philippines, Formosa, Japan, New Zealand, Australia. Work out defense pacts at once with the people of these areas.

5. Announce boldly that, by their aggressive tactics, both Red China and Red Russia have forfeited any right to expect to help write the Japanese peace treaty. We trusted them when we agreed to let them in on the peace with the Japs. They (the Commies) have violated that trust. Therefore, those bets are off—but good.

6. Let it be known that we will veto Red China's admission to the United Nations Security Council, until Peiping proves by her deeds, not by mere words, that she is capable of taking her place with civilized countries of the world, that she can be trusted not to fracture the peace in ruthless aggressive imperialism.

7. Admit that we have failed to do what we set out to do in Korea—primarily because the United Nations got cold feet and would not face the risk of world war III that have been part of the Korean affair from the very beginning. Say that we are pulling out of Korea because we aren't willing—alone—to shoulder the blame of bringing on world war III, if it should start over our moves to win an indecisive victory in Korea—indecisive, that is, in terms of our global determination to keep the free world free.

This is a positive program. It is aggressive. It is one on which we could achieve unity among ourselves here at home. It is one on which we could achieve unity among a vast majority of the 60 nations of the United Nations. It is a policy that says what we mean—for the first time in months.

Admittedly, there are major flaws inherent in a policy which pretends to be positive, yet starts out being negative. But, we submit, in light of the mistakes of the past, the program is less faulty than the present Truman-Acheson policy vacuum.

Finally, this get-out-of-Korea plan is not appeasement. It is frankly admitting temporary defeat, yes. On the other hand, the only other way to get out of Korea—short of military victory over Communist China, and perhaps Russia, too—requires real appeasement: The promise of giving the Commies something (Formosa, a voice in the Jap Peace Treaty, a seat in the U. N.) to buy them into agreeing to a cease-fire and a phony peace.

Under this proposal, we lay down the terms, not the Commies. And those terms would be tougher than we could extract from Mao in anything short of licking him on the mainland of China.

We seriously recommend careful study of this get-out-of-Korea suggestion as the least evil way out of this mess. For by it, we could preserve permanently the peace and security of the Western World in the Pacific—and in the Atlantic community of nations as well.

Conference To Fight High Prices and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on inflation and mobilization adopted at a special conference of the Liberal Party on April 19. This conference was attended by 925 delegates representing labor, veterans, civic, consumers, community, and liberal organizations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON POLICY ADOPTED AT CONFERENCE TO FIGHT HIGH PRICES AND INFLATION HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LIBERAL PARTY, CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL OF NEEDLE TRADES, THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1951

World peace depends upon the maintenance of economic, military, and moral strength in the free world. The backbone of such strength is the United States.

America's ability to fulfill its world mission is seriously threatened by the growing price inflation. Inflation adds unnecessary billions to the cost of military defense. Inflation imposes unbearable costs on the people of Europe and Asia in their efforts to obtain American goods. Inflation undermines the living standards of the American people, thereby weakening the working and fighting morale of the Nation. Inflation is an ally of communism.

The rapid inflation, since the beginning of the conflict in Korea, is based on an artificial scarcity, created by scare buying, speculation, stockpiling, accumulation of inventories. Although this artificial price boost is now leveling off, the long range impact of our mobilization needs must create real scarcities. Uncontrolled, this scarcity will mean new and great price rises, a prolonged period of steady inflation.

The immediate effect of this inflation has been bloated profits for a few at one end, and endangered living standards for the millions at the other end. Corporate profits in the fourth quarter of 1951 stood 75 percent above the previous year. Select corporations, producing basic commodities, topped even this unprecedented high in profits.

For the consumer, the threat to his savings and his living standards was reflected in the rising price indexes:

The cost of living has gone up more than 8 percent.

The price of food has gone up more than 11 percent.

The price of semimanufactured wholesale goods has gone up 24.7 percent.

In the same period, more than half the nonagricultural workers in America received no pay increases. Of those who did get any increase in 1951, the majority were between 6 to 8 percent.

These inequities have been multiplied by the inequities of the tax structure. Corporate profits, after taxes, have risen 50 percent since last year. Loopholes in the present law cost Uncle Sam billions of dollars annually. The salaried and wage worker faces increased income taxes and new sales taxes.

The basic responsibility for the failure to control inflation lies in the presently inadequate Defense Production Act, passed by a business-minded Congress.

The act exempts food prices from controls.

The act provides no means for rent controls.

The act exempts manufactured products from quality control.

The weakness of the act has been aggravated by the weak and lop-sided use of the powers bestowed on the President and the mobilization agencies. At present the core of the control regulations is a retail percentage mark-up on a climbing wholesale price level. This is merely a legislation of inflation.

While prices rise rapidly and profits rise even more rapidly, the mobilization agencies have sought to freeze wages, leaving the great mass of Americans no means of catching up with the inflationary trend.

The present Defense Production Act expires on June 30, simultaneously with the expiration of the present almost meaningless rent-control legislation.

This conference, representing delegates of consumer, civic labor, community, fraternal, veterans, and liberal organizations, calls upon the citizens of New York City to rally for a new Defense Production Act to halt inflation.

This means power to impose tight rent controls.

This means power to control farm prices, while guaranteeing farm income through proper subsidies.

This means dollar-and-cents ceilings on manufactured goods, with provisions for quality control.

Simultaneously, the tax structure must be revised to place the burden upon those best able to bear them. This means absolute opposition to any national sales tax. This means stepped-up corporate and excess-profits taxes, both as a means of financing necessary Government expenditures and as a way of cutting down on huge slush funds now engaged in speculative enterprise. To curb speculation we propose credit controls.

Until such time as a new act is written, this conference calls upon the mobilization agencies to establish dollar-and-cents ceilings and to roll back prices in basic industries and distributive trades now showing superprofits.

To enforce this program, this conference calls upon the administration to reorganize the mobilization agencies so that a full and equal voice be granted to labor, the farmer, and the consuming public, along with business, right through the entire mobilization structure.

To realize this program, this conference calls upon its assembled delegates, through their organizations, to communicate with their elected representatives and the President of the United States for the above program to check inflation and to establish an equality of sacrifice in America's great effort to maintain peace and freedom in the world.

RESOLUTION ON PLAN OF ACTION ADOPTED AT CONFERENCE TO FIGHT HIGH PRICES AND INFLATION HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LIBERAL PARTY, CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL OF NEEDLE TRADES, THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1951

In order to effect real price control, tight rent control, and a vigorous check in profiteering, we recommend the following plan of action:

1. Adoption of appropriate resolutions by the various organizations represented at this conference.

2. Sending of such resolutions to President Truman, Senators Lehman and Ives, all New York Congressmen, majority and minority leaders in both Houses of Congress, to Charles Wilson, Eric Johnston, and Michael DiSalle and to the United Labor Committee.

3. Initiation of a card-writing campaign by the members of the various organizations, to be addressed to their local representatives in the National Government, as well as to the various appropriate Federal agencies.

4. Sending of delegations by the various organizations to legislators and administrators in order to urge adoption of the measures and actions recommended by the conference.

5. Wide distribution of the four-page folder leaflet prepared by the committee that arranged the conference against high prices and inflation, or of similar leaflets, in order to educate and arouse public opinion.

6. Organization of neighborhood rallies by the organizations represented in this conference, cooperatively, if possible, and singly, if necessary.

7. Writing of letters to the press by the delegates as individuals in order further to arouse and organize public opinion.

8. Stimulation of public opinion by the use of radio and other channels of communication.

9. Encouragement and organization of consumers' boycotts by housewives against flagrant abuses or profiteering with regard to prices and profits.

10. Publicizing by the various organizations of actions taken by them for real price control, tight rent control, and against profiteering.

11. Sending of an appropriate communication to the United Labor Committee solidarizing this conference with their efforts to stem the tide of inflation.

Motion that in order to carry out more effectively the plan of action outlined above and to correlate the separate activities of the participating organizations it is urged that each organization, wherever appropriate, identify itself with this conference.

Motion that this conference against high prices and inflation call upon the government of the city of New York to utilize the department of markets to keep prices down and to serve as a pacemaker in pushing control over prices.

Motion: Be it

Resolved, That this conference against high prices calls upon the city of New York to reinstitute the bureau formerly existent in the department of markets for the purpose of utilizing the radio, newspapers, and other media of communications to disseminate information to make price control more effective and to combat inflation.

An Emergency Federal Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD specific recommendations of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce. These recommendations are the result of the considered thinking of the most qualified men in Kansas on Federal taxation. The Kansas State Chamber of Commerce believes that the recommendations contained in the enclosed emergency Federal tax program are realistic and sound in every respect. I submit them to the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EMERGENCY FEDERAL TAX PROGRAM—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE KANSAS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FORMULATED BY THE FEDERAL TAXATION COUNCIL, REVIEWED AND ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS APRIL 13, 1951

INTRODUCTION

The Nation's program for defense is threefold: First, organizing and training an extensive military establishment; second, developing our industrial potential to maintain our superiority in arms; and third, protecting our national economy against the inflationary pressures which are a concomitant of a rearmament program. To fail in either phase would mean the loss of freedom and our American way of life.

We must guard ourselves against two major dangers in our defense effort: First, our defense needs should be carefully studied and should not be of excessive scope; second, once the required scope is determined, the program should be carried out with efficiency and minimum waste.

To build the effective military establishment required, without incurring colossal waste, will call for the most careful study and planning. To outproduce the Communist aggressors will demand the full use of available capital and the cooperation of all our people. To defeat inflation will require austere self-denial on the part of every citizen and the various echelons of our Government, Federal, State, and local as well.

GENERAL POLICIES

Therefore, we believe that the following eight points should be laid down as general policies:

1. The President's recommended spending budget of $71,600,000,000 for the Federal fiscal year 1952 should be critically examined by the Congress. Substantial reductions in nondefense expenditures should be made. Among the areas in which large savings should be effected are public works, foreign aid, subsidies, grants-in-aid, and loan programs; and there are others. Where necessary, amendatory legislation to achieve these objectives should be enacted promptly. All new domestic spending programs must be scrutinized with especial care.

2. Appropriations and authorizations for those purposes deemed essential, including defense, must be subjected to scrutiny with a view to eliminating waste, inefficiency, and duplication. It must also be borne in mind that many governmental services that might be construed as essential in peacetime are entirely unnecessary or are considerably less essential in time of national emergency.

3. It is fundamental that the budget be balanced immediately. If, after eliminating all nonessential expenditures and reducing less essential ones, the 1952 budget is not balanced, then—and only then—additional revenue in an amount sufficient to attain this objective should be raised.

4. In framing such tax legislation as may be found necessary to balance the 1952 budget, consideration should be given to levying those taxes which will least impair the productive capacity of the country. Individual income and corporation taxes have already been increased to meet the emergency. Excise taxes, in marked contrast to individual and corporation income taxes, have not been increased in the last few years. Excise taxes are traditionally a major feature of our revenue system. Excise taxes, if wisely levied, are much less inflationary than other types. They can be made a temporary source of large revenue without being oppressive. Therefore, we believe that excise taxes should be expanded as the major, if not the only, source of such additional revenue as may be required.

5. If expansion of the field of excise taxation should not suffice to balance the 1952 budget, then the yield of the individual income taxes should be increased.

6. The Congress should, however, complete the program, well started in the Revenue Act of 1950, of subjecting to the corporation tax the incomes of all organizations which engage in business in competition with those which are taxed. Government-financed enterprises, cooperatives, and others still enjoy unfair tax advantages which should be eliminated without injury to the legitimate purposes of such enterprises.

7. By economies in operation and by increasing postal rates in those classifications which now show operating losses, the Post Office Department should be made self-sustaining; also, all franking privileges should be discontinued.

8. While Congress has carried out some of the recommendations of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch (popularly known as the Hoover Commission), it has still before it the majority of those recommendations whose enactment will result in the greatest economies and efficiencies. Congress should tolerate no further delay in translating these recommendations into law.

SPECIFIC MEASURES

Excises: The present selective types of excise taxes should be extended and expanded so as to place the burden insofar as possible on those best able to pay and on such products as are most competitive with the defense program. Any increases in tax under this proposal should not be levied on any items which, before the effective date of the imposition of such taxes, have left the possession of the person obligated to pay the tax.

The imposition of a Federal general-sales tax or defense-excise tax, either at the retail or the manufacturer's level is opposed, even if food products were to be exempted. Such general sales taxes would hit hardest those least able to pay; would be inflationary in application, particularly so if applied at the manufacturer's level; would greatly burden millions of retailers in their accounting procedures if applied at the retail level; if once adopted, would likely become permanent in the Federal revenue scheme and thus in future years impinge upon sources of revenue available to the various States governments; and would not create a sufficient tax consciousness in the mind of the taxpayer, particularly if imposed at the manufacturer's level.

THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

In seeking increased revenue from income taxation, we recommend first that the enforcement powers of the Bureau of Internal Revenue be strengthened by providing stiffer penalties for deliberate and negligent underreporting of incomes.

If expansion and extension of selective-excise taxes, increased income from more rigid enforcement of income-tax laws, and decreased Government expenditures for nondefense functions, wherever possible, do not produce sufficient revenue to meet prospective Federal budgets, we recommend across-the-board increases in individual income-tax rates as will be least discriminatory and most feasible for the general economy.

Ayer Award Came Through Teamwork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Johnstown Democrat, a newspaper in my congressional district, has been awarded first honorable mention for excellence in typography, presswork, and makeup by the judges of the twenty-first annual exhibition of newspaper typography. The Johnstown Democrat won its award in the classification for newspapers of the 10,000 to 50,000 circulation class. Judges were Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania; Merle Armitage, art director of Look and Quick and president of the American Institute of the Graphic Arts; and J. L. Frazier, editor of Inland Printer.

With the receipt of this national honor the Democrat has rounded out a complete cycle of best of all accomplishments in newspaper circles. They have received previous recognition in such fields as photography, editorial writing, features, public service, and general news content.

I congratulate John James, the editor; Walter W. Krebs, the owner and publisher; and L. W. Barnes, general manager; together with all of the heads of the other departments, all of the employees and personnel working for this newspaper. They all deserve a "well done."

The editor, John James, has written the following editorial, which I believe expresses fully the sentiments of the newspaper and the people employed by it:

AYER AWARD CAME THROUGH TEAMWORK

The Democrat shares with its readers today a pardonable pride in achievement.

This newspaper is fortunate to have won first honorable mention in the annual F. Wayland Ayer competition for excellence in typography, presswork, and make-up, in the 10,000–50,000 circulation classification.

Every newspaper in the Nation was eligible to enter the competition. Eight hundred did.

The Ayer cup went to the Daily News-Tribune of La Salle, Ill. To the News-Tribune go our sincere congratulations.

In the 10,000–50,000 class, the Democrat took first place. We share honors with the New York Herald Tribune, which captured similar recognition in the over-50,000 classification.

Through the years the Democrat has won its share of recognition—for excellence in news reporting and photography, for outstanding coverage in the mining and aviation fields. Some judges have found that the Democrat's editorial page merits a second look.

But these are departmental honors, and as such they represent only one facet of any newspaper's excellence.

The Ayer recognition, one the other hand, represents teamwork in which every department has shared—from the topside to the apprentice who one day may head this organization.

The recognition the Democrat won this week represents the appreciation of skills that no one man, not even one department, could ever hope to master.

Purely for the purpose of the record, let's tick off a few of the credits that are due.

Before any award for excellence could be won by any newspaper in any community there must be a willingness to risk capital in a venture that history has shown to be one of the most uncertain. That capital has been provided—to the tune of several million dollars as represented in the investment in the Democrat, one of a group of enterprises serving this community with distinction.

Behind that must be executive and administrative ability to translate the dollars and cents of the investors into a product of community service. Theirs is the job of bringing into clear focus the contribution each department makes to the end product. In the case of the Democrat, they are Walter W. Krebs, publisher, and L. W. Barnes, general manager.

In the production departments, where ideas and know-how find their way onto the copy paper from which the cold type is set, credit goes to Pat Malloy, managing editor, and Carl M. Gillespie, advertising manager. Sharing the spotlight in the news department are Saul W. Spiegel, city editor; Newton Georg, telegraph editor; James H. Torr, sports editor; Glenn Sease, mine editor.

The contributions of the mechanical departments in the production of a prize-winning newspaper are major. Chief of the Democrat's composing room is Aloysius Karcher. In charge of the Democrat's pressroom is John H. Mock. Head of the engraving department is R. Wayne Schrott.

But these department heads alone could not have produced an Ayer prize-winning newspaper. They have been supported all along the line by loyal and conscientious workers who as a well-coordinated team have enabled the Democrat to achieve such national recognition.

Finally, full credit must be paid to the hundreds of advertisers and the more than 26,000 readers who have found this newspaper to be a profitable and informative meeting place that has come to represent an important phase of the American way of life.

We of the Democrat thank the Ayer people for the recognition they have given us.

We recognize the high standards the future imposes upon us, if we are to meet the challenge of 1951.

All of us hope to be able to produce in the coming years the kind of a newspaper our readers have a right to expect.

Predicting and Interpreting the 1950 Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Louis H. Bean is recognized as one of this Nation's foremost authorities in the field of election statistics. He gained Nation-wide recognition in his 1948 prediction that President Truman would be reelected. Dr. Bean is always willing to have his predictions reviewed following an election.

Following is an abstract of a talk given by Dr. Bean regarding the 1950 elections:

The 1950 congressional election offers an excellent example for discussing my part of this series of lectures, How To Predict and Interpret Elections. But it should be looked upon only as an example. In applying the art of statistical analysis, expectation and interpretation to past and future elections, it should be borne in mind that every election is dominated by different problems and features.

Some of you may recall my statistical analyses of past congressional elections, made before the Korean war and published many weeks before the election of November 7. These studies were intended to show how the two major parties appeared to be lined up in the spring and summer of 1950 before the big guns of the political campaign opened up.

They pointed to certain possible results if one assumed no major abnormal developments in domestic or international affairs; that is, if one assumed a normal midterm election. They indicated what might normally be expected if the two major parties conducted their campaigns as usual.

What were these norms or standards as I laid them out in my book the Mid-Term Battle? How do the actual results differ from those of a normal midterm election?

For the House of Representatives, I pointed out that normally the Democrats, as the party in power, stood to lose 25 to 30 seats. They actually lost 27. We are, therefore, justified in looking upon the over-all results in the House as about in line with normal expectations. This means that as far as the 435 congressional races are concerned, they were not much influenced by the new political climate that the Korean war brought on after June, or that such new influences as did develop managed to cancel out in the aggregate.

The make-up of the Eighty-second Congress is 54 percent Democratic compared with 60 percent in the Eighty-first Congress. The 235 Democrats elected in 1950 should be compared with the results in other midterm elections, if one wants to see where the Democrats stand in the political tide that turned up after 1936. Here are the comparable numbers of Democratic Congressmen elected in other years:

1934	322
1938	262
1942	222
1946	188
1950	235

The Democrats in 1950 came out statistically stronger than in 1946 and 1942, but not as strong as in 1938. In some States, such as Connecticut and Pennsylvania, the Democrats actually succeeded in preventing the traditional midterm decline in their percentages of the votes cast. In these two States the Democrats on a midterm basis are stronger today than they have been since 1934, and if the Pennsylvania vote had been as near to normal as the Connecticut vote turned out to be, the Pennsylvania Democrats might have reelected their Senator.

There were two other major facts I pointed to in connection with the 1950 midterm election of Congressmen. One had to do with the region where most of the losses were likely to occur, the other had to do with the size of the vote—with political apathy as a factor in the probable outcome.

Since most Democratic losses in 1946 occurred in the Northeast—in the States stretching from Massachusetts to Missouri—and since most of the 1948 gains also occurred in this industrial area, I suggested that this would again be the main battleground, with the center of losses in the Pennsylvania and Ohio districts. And so it was, except that the center of losses turned out to be Ohio-Indiana instead of Pennsylvania-Ohio.

With regard to the size of the vote, I emphasized the fact that in 1948 there were about 10,000,000 "lost" voters—those who had failed to vote. This is just on the basis of the voting trend of the 1920's and 1930's and not on the basis of the total of over 93,000,000 eligible voters. (On the latter basis, the total of "lost" voters was over 45,000,000.)

The point of these turn-out figures is to show that with the Democrats as the party in power, the larger the turnout the larger the number of victorious Democratic candidates. Specifically, I pointed out that had the total vote in 1948 been 10,000,000 greater, it would have meant 20 more Democratic seats in the House.

The 1950 results sustain this view. It is now possible to say that had the national turnout in 1950 been normal, the Democrats might have minimized their losses and possibly have come through with an actual gain in control instead of the normal shrinkage. This may surprise those who were misled by the many stories about the large vote in this year's election. It was not large—only fair.

The standard I laid out for a normal midterm vote in 1950 was around 48,000,000 (2,000,000 greater than in the 1948 Presidential election). The latest count gave the total as 40,000,000. This is not quite the apathy of 1946, but it is apathy enough and, as usual, it is mostly apathy on the Democratic side. Here is the simplest illustration I can offer:

Year	Total vote	Democrats elected
1946	34,000,000	188
1950	40,000,000	235
1948	46,000,000	262

A larger total vote still means a larger number of Democratic Congressmen, and if the 1950 vote had been not midway between the very low total of 1946 and the low total of 1948 but had reached forty-seven to forty-eight million, the Eighty-second Congress would have larger Democratic majorities in both the House and Senate.

For the Senate, my analysis pointed to a normal midterm loss of 3 or 4 Democratic seats, accompanying the loss of 25 to 30 seats in the House. As you know, the loss was five. While not far from the expected, based on a normal midterm election, actually, it is the result of several surprises.

Judged largely on a statistical, traditional mid-term-voting basis, with little consideration given to personalities and issues, the Republican senatorial opportunities in 1950 seemed to be in Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Idaho, and Nevada. The Republicans were checked by a fairly large vote in Connecticut; they failed to capitalize on their statistical opportunities in Nevada, but won in Idaho, Pennsylvania, and Illinois. In the last two States the Republican victories may be traced to Democratic apathy among metropolitan voters—look at Pittsburgh and Chicago as examples.

The Democratic opportunities for senatorial gains were fewer. They were limited to Missouri and possibly Colorado and Ohio. The Democrats won in Missouri, succeeded in narrowing the Republican margin in Colorado, but missed in Ohio by a mile—again, in part, because many Democratic metropolitan voters stayed away from the polls. The real senatorial surprises, of course, were in the Democratic defeats in Maryland and Utah, and to a lesser degree in California. Except for these two or three, even the over-all senatorial results would be normal for a midterm election.

The reasons for the surprises in the senatorial races have yet to be fully analyzed statistically. The same, incidentally, may be said also for the gubernatorial surprises of the Southwest—where three Republican governors were elected in addition to the two in Connecticut and Maryland. The task is not a simple one if you do not care to—and you shouldn't—accept the usual and ready generalizations. For full understanding it is necessary to actually probe far below the surface for what was done and what actually happened in such key States as Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Utah, and California. That calls for some rather close analytical work in unscrambling the complexities and interrelationships in our political body. This is essential if we are to see the way the great amount of information and misinformation was made to flow through our social and economic nerves, veins, and arteries, and actually influenced voting last November, particularly in metropolitan areas.

Even before the reasons for these senatorial surprises have been satisfactorily analyzed, the question is being asked: "What do they mean for 1952?" At this stage, obviously, it is anybody's guess. With the world full of diplomatic and military uncertainties, it is foolish to assume that things political and economic will remain as they are until 1952. But, by way of summarizing the two central features of the 1950 election (the normal midterm character of the results in the House and the few surprises in the senatorial races), it can be said that had we had a Presidential as well as a congressional election last November 7, we would have seen another Democratic victory of the proportions of 1948.

The 1952 outcome will, of course, depend on the domestic and international issues that prevail 18 months from now, on the business and agricultural conditions then, on the candidates chosen at the national conventions, on campaign strategy, and on turn-out or voting interest. How these factors will shape up is not too clear this far in advance. They serve to give a cloudy appearance to the so-called statistical crystal ball. But I expect this cloud of uncertainty to lift as we approach 1952, so I would suggest that you preserve for future use some of the lessons you may have learned from the political statistical analysis I have presented to you.

Turkey's Place in Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ankara Government Worried," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Evening Star of April 27, 1951, dealing with the place of Turkey in the defense program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANKARA GOVERNMENT WORRIED—AMBASSADOR ERKIN CALLED HOME FOR CONSULTATION AS UNITED STATES FAILS TO INCLUDE TURKEY IN DEFENSE PLANS

(By Constantine Brown)

The slowness of the State Department to include Turkey in any kind of formal defense program has led to Ankara's order to its Ambassador here, Feridun Cemal Erkin, to return immediately for consultations.

The Turkish Government is worried. It borders Russia on the east and Moscow's satellite, Bulgaria, on the west. Thus, Turkey is more directly threatened by Kremlin aggressiveness than any North Atlantic Pact nation.

In spite of that immediate threat the Ankara Government has rushed to Korea 10,000 of its best soldiers, whose fighting ability has won the praise of General MacArthur and all top-ranking American officers who have been in Korea.

The Turkish Government has drawn the attention of Secretary of State Acheson to the fact that the country is exposed to Soviet aggression and has suggested that it be included in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This was turned down by the French and British Governments. Since the veto power exists in the NATO, there was nothing that the State Department could do. The refusals by London and Paris were final.

The Ankara Government since last October has proposed a mutual assistance pact between the United States and Turkey on the pattern of those which that country has had with France and Britain since 1939. Ankara stressed the fact that the Turkish people—and Turkey is a democracy where the government cannot ignore public sentiment—while determined to fight to the last ditch, are concerned over the reluctance of America to pledge all-out assistance in the event of Soviet aggression.

In a speech at Philadelphia last Thursday, Ambassador Erkin expressed his government's views by saying: "The Western European Union has been based on an artificial separation of free Europe into two distinct segments. Consequently, one part of free Europe only has been extended the privilege of being admitted to the pact, whereas the other part has been left outside of the arrangement."

Ankara's many representations to the State Department have remained without positive results. The top officials of our Government have been considering the situation sympathetically for several months, but that was all.

Meanwhile, the threat of a third world war has been increasing and Turkey is in the first line of fire. Since French and British opposition to inclusion of Turkey in NATO could not be overcome, Ankara insists that a regional pact between America and Turkey be concluded at the earliest possible moment.

The Russian propagandists already are trying to take advantage of the reluctance of our Government to commit itself to a mutual assistance pact by telling the Turkish people that the United States wants their manpower as cannon fodder, but is not interested in any actual commitments for her defense.

Ambassador Erkin stated in Philadelphia that: "Turkey is the vital key to the whole Mediterranean area; the solid wall which stops the armies of aggression from descending toward the Arab countries and the Mediterranean, the plug which stops communism from rolling toward the south. The collapse of Turkey would mean the loss of the Mediterranean and would affect adversely American security."

These views have been expressed even more forcefully by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in executive hearings before the Armed Services Committees of Congress.

"Only a strong free Europe supported by the United States can secure peace," the spokesman of the Turkish Government added. "But today free Europe is not strong and free Europe is not complete."

Besides this vital political angle, Turkey is worried about the little support it receives from us in the economic field. Because of her strategic position Turkey has been forced to spend since 1939 as much as 55 percent of her budget for national defense. Until 1950 she was able to meet the deficit by domestic and foreign loans and by increased taxation.

The assistance given Turkey by the Truman military aid program and by the ECA has helped to some extent. But as the international situation deteriorated Turkey had to make greater sacrifices for her military program.

Victory in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a column by Walter Lippmann, distinguished Washington journalist, which appeared in the April 22 issue of the Washington Post. Mr. Lippmann warns:

Great victories can never be won cheaply, but only by sweat, blood, and tears. The great wars which must be waged in order to win great victories should not be begun in the illusion or under the pretense that they are little and easy wars.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

PROGRAM FOR A VICTORY

The crucial portion of General MacArthur's speech came, of course, when he talked about Korea. He had recommended, he said, six measures which were designed to support our forces committed to Korea and to bring hostilities to an end with the least possible delay and at a saving of countless American and allied lives. These six measures, he told the Congress, would bring victory and in war there is no substitute for victory.

General MacArthur's program for a victory arrived at with the least possible delay and at a saving of countless lives is strenuously opposed by all our fighting allies in Korea and it has been rejected by the President and his civilian and military advisers. That is not because the opposition consists of people who would not like to have a victory and to save lives and to end the hostilities as quickly as possible. The opposition comes from those who do not believe that General MacArthur's program will do what he told Congress it would do. They do not believe that the six measures he named can bring about that victory over China which he talked about.

The six measures for victory are to bomb Manchuria, to do air reconnaissance of China's coastal area and Manchuria, to intensify the economic blockade which is already partially in effect, to impose a naval blockade of the China coast, to send reinforcements to Korea, and to give logistical support to Chiang for operations against the Chinese mainland. General MacArthur argued that these measures would defeat China. Why? Because "China is already engaging with the maximum power it can commit." General MacArthur thinks that these measures may not bring Soviet Russia into the war because the "Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves."

Thus General MacArthur is assuming that the Air Force can bomb China, that the Navy can blockade China against Soviet and other ships, that the Navy and Air Force can organize and support invasions or raids by Chinese infantry from Formosa, but that Red China can do no more in reply than she is now doing, and that Soviet Russia will not necessarily do more than she is now doing.

This is a remarkable series of assumptions to make. Severally and jointly these assumptions amount to saying that the United States can wage war against China, which in another passage he described as "a new and dominant power in Asia," and that nothing more will happen to us, indeed that less will happen to us, than is already happening to us in Korea.

If the general is right in his estimates and calculations as he gave them to the Congress, then this would be the cheapest and easiest victory over a great power in the history of warfare. No wonder Senator TAFT is enchanted with the prospect of so big a victory with such a little war.

At each stage since June 25 we have done what General MacArthur wishes to do once more: We have promised ourselves big and glittering results with what, as the event showed, were quite inadequate military means. On June 27 the President committed "air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support." On June 30 he authorized the use of "certain supporting ground units." The supporting ground units soon became most of the American Army as it then existed. On October 8, having defeated the aggressor south of the thirty-eighth parallel, we entered North Korea and began the march to the Chinese and Soviet frontiers. This we said to ourselves was the end of the war—nothing would happen while we mopped up the defeated army in North Korea.

Now we are being told that nothing will happen, except that we shall of course be victorious in Korea, if we bomb and blockade and invade China. Each time it was going to take only a little more military action to obtain great and glorious results. Only sea and air power, then merely some supporting ground units, then nothing but a mopping up action against a defeated enemy, and now no war, and not many casualties, but only some bombing and some blockading and some transporting and arming of Chinamen. Then victory, for which there is no substitute in war, will be ours.

Great victories can never be won cheaply but only by blood and sweat and tears. The great wars which must be waged in order to win great victories should not be begun in the illusion or under the pretense that they are little and easy wars.

It is not fair to the American people to permit them to think that one of the famous generals of our age believes that the wretched war in Korea can be ended victoriously and soon by a few measures which, it would seem, would cost the American people very little.

MacArthur Removal Indicates Internal Ailment in American Foreign Policy, Says Legion Commander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a statement by Jerome E. Host, department commander, the American Legion of Wisconsin, which appeared in the May issue of Badger Legionnaire.

Mr. Speaker, both General MacArthur and Commander Host are members of the Alonzo Cudworth Post of the American Legion, in Milwaukee, where today MacArthur is a distinguished guest. Mr. Host speaks the sentiments of most Wisconsin Legionnaires, and his statement is a great tribute to the deposed Supreme Commander in the Pacific, Wisconsin's outstanding citizen.

MACARTHUR REMOVED—HOST MAKES STATEMENT

Following the announcement of President Truman's removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from all of his Far East commands, Department Commander Jerome E. Host issued the following statement:

"In my mind the removal of General MacArthur, shocking as it is, is merely the ugly visible blemish that indicates the internal ailment in American foreign policy. It proves tragically that we are in grave danger of losing our sovereignty as a Nation, since seemingly the theory of appeasement and subjugation of United States interests to the interests of Britain and France has permeated the entire thinking of the State Department.

"I believe that the removal of General MacArthur will strike a mortal blow to our prestige in Asia, and will certainly make no contribution to what the American Legion supposed was our ultimate goal in Korea—the containment of the advance of communism. Weighing the benefits of the President's action against the irrevocable harm, my only conclusion is that the United States and the United States interests must inevitably suffer greatly.

"It is my fervent hope that public opinion will rise in a great swell to decry the mockery of sacrificing American lives and American self-respect in an effort to meekly follow the bidding of Britain to the detriment of our own welfare.

"Britain's amazing proposition that Formosa be given to the Chinese Reds as a free gift, and that the Chinese Reds be given a voice in the Japanese peace treaty is part of the same pattern that led to General MacArthur's removal. His principal crime, as I see it, is that the general chooses to resist the attempts to make the United States subservient to a group of alleged allies who eagerly accept billions of American dollars but refuse any substantial military assistance. It is tragic that this fierce protection of American values should result in his dismissal.

"Equally tragic is the fact that reaction to the President's decision has descended to the political arena, where one political party blindly accepts his action and the other bitterly opposes it. Surely the significance of the removal of General MacArthur is a matter above partisan politics."

Alaska Feels Pinch of Its Winged Heels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

N THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, air service in Alaska is the lifeline of that country and of such importance that I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues articles by Louis R. Huber, noted and authoritative writer on Alaskan problems. Mr. Huber, a special correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, reports in these articles certain facts and statements that I believe have not had publication elsewhere:

SAFETY DEVICES AID FLIGHTS IN NORTHLAND

SEWARD, ALASKA.—In the early days of flying in Alaska, a bush pilot was carrying a passenger from Seward to Anchorage.

"The pilot picked the wrong passage through the Chugach Mountains and, instead of flying through, we found ourselves headed straight for the end of a blind-alley canyon," related the passenger afterward.

Crash?

No, the pilot merely performed an Immelman—zoomed his plane straight up, back in the direction he had been coming from, and winged over.

"We flew back out of the canyon, found the right passage, and flew on to Anchorage," said the passenger.

Tales of derring-do have long been told of Alaska's intrepid bush pilots. Bob Reeve, who is now head of his own scheduled airline flying from Anchorage out over the Aleutian Islands, once was sitting on a glacier in his Fairchild—engine running, luckily—when a williwaw whipped down, picked him and his craft up, and dumped them over a 5,000-foot ledge.

"I managed to gun the engine and get the plane out of a spin when it was only 200 feet from the rocks below. Then I flew out as if nothing had happened," he says.

Hairbreadth escapes occur less frequently today. Forty-four Civil Aeronautics Administration stations are scattered over the entire territory. Their emergency landing fields, communication services, radio beams, and weather-reporting facilities enable all aircraft to fly with as much safety as in the States.

An added safeguard to Alaska flying is the work of the United States Air Force's Tenth Air Rescue Squadron.

Activated in 1946, it had, up to the end of September 1950, flown a total of more than 1,000,000 "million miles" and nearly 10,000 mission hours.

More than 1,500 individuals were rescued or received assistance from the Tenth during this period.

Its base is Elmendorf Air Force Base near Anchorage. Its equipment includes helicopters, liaison-type planes, C-47's, gliders, C-54's, B-17's with lifeboat-dropping facilities, bush airplanes, and a variety of land- and snow-traveling vehicles.

Col. Bernt Balchen, famed Arctic flier, was the Tenth's commanding officer during the period in which it grew to its present efficiency.

Though now reassigned to other duty, Colonel Balchen is one of the strongest boosters for Alaska as the air crossroads of the world.

With Maj. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., then commanding general of the Alaskan Air Command, he flew nonstop across the North Pole in 1949 in a C-54 to Norway, and then back via the Pole to Washington, D. C.

AIR SERVICE CALLED INADEQUATE

(By Louis R. Huber)

SEATTLE.—Ever since barnstormers junked their Jennies and began flying with a serious purpose, Alaska has been the land of the airplane—but now the Territory's winged heels are pinching.

The northland's great attachment to aviation is not an accident. Distances greater than those of the West, mountains higher than any others on the continent, impassable summer tundra, and lung-freezing cold make it so.

Because of these, Alaskans fly at least 15 times as much as people in the States, and depend on airplanes for a large share of their freight needs.

Civilian landings and take-offs at Anchorage, the central air hub, stand about tenth in the Nation, and rival those of New York City, Chicago, St. Louis, and Los Angeles.

FLOATPLANE SYSTEM

Southeastern Alaska, with its Norway-like fjords and rugged coast line, has a floatplane system unequaled elsewhere in the entire world.

Three scheduled and a varying number of nonscheduled airlines link the northland with the States and the Orient. Sixteen internal scheduled airlines and about 80 bush pilots fly daily in the Territory.

The internal operators—Alaska's very own—fly everything from Cubs and helicopters through Bellancas, Stinsons, Norsemen, DC-3's, C-46's, and DC-4's. The total of these commercial aircraft operating entirely within Alaska is well above 200.

For Alaska's 126,000 people, this is (not counting privately owned, military, and naval planes) about 1 aircraft for every 50 people. None of it is luxury flying, either; it's serious business.

COMPLAINTS CITED

"If you took airplanes away from Alaska," one veteran northern airman told me last summer, "the place would fold up in 30 days."

He was right, of course. The hauling of people, mail, and freight by air is the most important activity in the northland. Nevertheless, Alaskans feel that aviation is falling short of its capabilities.

Here are samples of their complaints:

Golden North Airways of Seattle and General Airways of Portland—both nonscheduled outfits—recently were ordered to stop flying because their trips were too regular and too frequent.

FOUR PARTS LISTED

Alaskans say this doesn't make sense. The nonscheduled airlines springing up after World War II, they point out, brought Alaskan air-freight rates down from 90 to 15 cents a pound, and passenger fares, Seattle to Fairbanks, or Anchorage, from $185 to $60.

Sitka, the first capital of Alaska, wants a direct airline connection with Seattle. Sitka had such a connection when Totem Air Service, a nonscheduled outfit, flew between the two cities. But when Totem applied for scheduled certification no action was taken.

Last January in the Eskimo settlement of Kotzebue on the Arctic Ocean, Judith Bailey, of Noatak, waited 5 weeks for transportation to White Mountain, where she was to enter school.

She had cash fare ready to pay, but a local bush pilot could not carry her. It was illegal for him to do so because a scheduled airline served White Mountain—but only when it was profitable for it to fly a DC-3 there.

NO GENERAL TRANSPORT

Alaskan aviation is divided into four parts: (1) Bush pilots, smallest of northern operators but nonetheless important; (2) internal scheduled (certificated) airlines, most of them made up of former bush pilots; (3) nonscheduled or irregular States-to-Alaska carriers, 90 percent of them World War II Air Force veterans competing intensely using war-surplus transport aircraft; and (4) the scheduled States-to-Alaska operators.

Two of the four are not complaining about anything: they are the scheduled operators, both internal and States-to-Alaska.

The other two, however—the bush pilots and the "nonsked" States-to-Alaska flyers—exist in constant concern either of being gradually choked out by Government restrictions, or of being suddenly ordered to stop flying because they are held in violation of regulations.

"It wouldn't be so bad if Alaska had other means of transportation, such as are available in the States—railroads, busses, and highways," says Alaska's Gov. Ernest Gruening.

"But in Alaska there is, for all practical purposes, only one mode of transportation—the airplane. The Civil Aeronautics Board never has taken this into consideration, and keeps on trying to regulate Alaska flying as if were in the States."

Alaska's Delegate to Congress, E. L. BARTLETT, questions the entire philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Act, passed originally in 1934 by Congress as a reform from abuses of those days.

As to safety, the present nonscheduled airlines flying to Alaska have never had a fatal accident; the scheduled airlines have had several bad crashes.

REPORT ASSAILED

For its part, the CAB maintains it has had the best interests of Alaska and Alaskans at heart.

"The Board has been fully aware of what aviation means to Alaska," says Edward E. Slattery, CAB's public-information chief in Washington, D. C. "The Board has expressly recognized the Territory's dependence on the bush pilot, frequently making special provisions to permit the continuance of their services."

When it comes to the nonscheduled carriers, however, Mr. Slattery points to the Alaska Service case—the CAB's own study of air service from the States to Alaska—and says, "That is the answer to a great portion of the problem."

The Alaska Service case began with hearings in Alaska in the fall of 1948. Late in 1949 William F. Cusick, a CAB examiner, submitted a 118-page report on it, recommending that two scheduled airlines be allowed to provide passenger, cargo, and mail service to Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks.

Alaskans at once attacked Mr. Cusick's report as utterly unrealistic, and inadequate for dealing with Alaska's air problems.

The final decision on the Alaska Service case, meanwhile, still is awaited. It must have the approval, before issuance, of President Truman. This is a hopeful circumstance for the irregular carriers.

"EVERYTHING BY AIR"

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA.—"Up in Alaska, full loads of eggs, fresh meat, produce—things moving from distributor to market—have been going by air as the normal method of transportation.

"It is the first large-scale true air-freight service to be established anywhere in the world. In the States, we may move expedited packages by air freight; in Alaska we carry everything that way."

That was the statement of Amos E. Heacock, president of Air Transport Associates, a nonscheduled States-to-Alaska airline, before a congressional committee last year.

He appeared as spokesman for the Independent Air Carrier Conference of America—the association of nonscheduled airlines—in hearings on bills providing for separation of subsidy from air-mail pay to the scheduled airlines.

Manufacturing Opportunities in the Southeast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Southeast is growing rapidly as a market for all kinds of manufactured products.

Alabama is rapidly becoming a cattle country. No State is better suited to livestock. No State has greater potential markets for livestock and dairy products than that afforded by Alabama cities.

The same factors that make Alabama a great livestock State—abundant acreage suitable for grazing, 50 inches of annual rainfall, and a 10-month growing season—also ideally suit it to the production of livestock feed.

The production of feed requires lime, fertilizers, high-quality seeds, and feed-mixing equipment.

The expanding livestock production is leading to the establishment of those manufacturing plants that process livestock products. The market for such products is at home.

As a part of my remarks, I include a recent article by Robert W. Kincey, published in the Birmingham News:

SOUTHEAST MANUFACTURING SURVEY DISCLOSES THERE IS READILY AVAILABLE MARKET IN AREA

(By Robert W. Kincey)

The men who buy the goods point this out in the first of a series of surveys on what the Southeast needs to manufacture or produce to more nearly supply its own needs:

"The one fact we find repeated over and over in making this survey of manufacturing opportunities in the Southeast is the readily available market here for great quantities of all kinds of manufactured goods."

In the first current survey, which deals with agricultural and dairy products, the significant statement is made early in the report that urban centers in the Territory consume far greater quantities of these goods than are produced within the area.

And that fact, probably to be pointed out again and again as the committee takes up other commodities, is the peg upon which it hangs the need for further output in a program to build and sustain regional economy.

Of the total of agricultural production in the Southeast, it is reported, nearly one-third is consumed on the farm for various human and animal needs.

Says the survey in part:

"Industrial research in the South, expanding as never before, is at work on projects in cotton, cottonseed products, tobacco, peanuts, citrus fruits and other agricultural products.

"Such efforts will bring forth new goods, new services and new industries and do much to improve the standard of living and to provide jobs at good wages."

Placing new emphasis upon a point now generally recognized in the South, the committee lists livestock as one of the most important sources of total farm income, and as one of the region's fastest growing industries.

Value of livestock on the farms in the Southeast in 1949 was listed at $1,298,000,000. The section is listed as a natural livestock area by virtue of its abundant acreage suitable for grazing, ample rainfall, and the long growing season.

And by the same token, production of livestock feed is ideally suited to the Southeast.

"The trend in recent years has been upward with respects to both quality and quantity of livestock. This is a significant fact and represents definite progress in a most desirable direction," the report says.

The purchasing agents whose business it is to buy most advantageously while taking into account regional economy and the opportunities involved to build that economy, find:

"In addition to the spendable income it (the livestock industry) creates, and the effect of that income on local markets for a variety of end goods, it also creates an activity which supplies a long list of materials for further processing into end goods.

"As an indication of one of the ways in which markets and raw materials are involved, the following may be of interest:

"Development of permanent pastures requires the use of lime, fertilizers, and high-quality seeds. Production of hay offers unusual opportunities for artificial drying equipment of both the semicommercial and individual farm type.

"This involves the moving of large quantities of air and therefore represents a substantial market for forced-air motor-driven equipment in medium to large sizes.

"In addition, there is a market for milling equipment used in the preparation of mixed feeds. Locally produced ingredients can be converted into animal and poultry feeds for nearby markets and those markets have all the appearance of exceptional enlargement in the years ahead."

The report lists a partial number of manufacturing operations whose principal raw materials are livestock products.

They include:

Locker plants and other dressed-poultry operations, incubator and brooder operations, egg-grading and packing plants, albumen glue for bottle caps and egg shells for feeds, pillow, cushion, and comforter stuffing, whole milk, cream, butter, ice cream, evaporated milk, and products of cheese plants, tanning plants, soap factories, and many others.

Covered also are field crops, nurseries, and related subjects.

The report emphasizes that the drying, freezing, and canning of fresh fruits and vegetables in the Southeast has never been fully developed.

Specific information is available from planning boards, departments of commerce, power companies, railroads, chambers of commerce, banks, and elsewhere throughout the region.

Truman Policy Vacuum Springs a Leak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial entitled "Truman Policy Vacuum Springs a Leak" which was published in the Johnstown Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., on Wednesday, April 25, 1951:

TRUMAN POLICY VACUUM SPRINGS A LEAK

The Communist hordes of Asia—better than half a million strong—have for the third time poured across the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea.

This new offensive, which Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway says "may well prove decisive," apparently is designed, again in General Ridgway's words, "to drive United Nations forces from Korea, or to destroy them, regardless of the further destruction of his own troops."

This is what we have been waiting for. Strange to say, the enemy offensive is part of the Truman-Acheson policy vacuum in which we are fighting in Korea a "limited war" that in its first 9 months cost America more battle casualties than the first full year of World War II.

Speaking to the Nation by radio and television April 11, the same day President Truman announced the discharge of General MacArthur, the Chief Executive announced this negative program for Korea:

"The United Nations forces have put up a tremendous fight in Korea and have inflicted very heavy casualties on the enemy. Our forces are stronger now than they have been before. These are plain facts which may discourage the Chinese Communists from continuing their attack.

"* * * The free world as a whole is growing in military strength every day. In the United States, in Western Europe, and throughout the world, freemen are alert to the Soviet threat and are building their defenses. This may discourage the Communist rulers from continuing the war in Korea—and from undertaking new acts of aggression elsewhere.

"If the Communist authorities realize they cannot defeat us in Korea, if they realize it would be foolhardy to widen the hostilities beyond Korea, then they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression.

"A peaceful settlement may then be possible. The door is always open.

"Then we may achieve a settlement in Korea which will not compromise the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

"* * * Defeat of aggression in Korea may be the turning point in the world's search for a practical way of achieving peace and security."

Well, the Chinese Commies have not been discouraged from continuing the war in Korea. They are hitting our boys with everything they have. The Truman-Acheson policy vacuum already has sprung a leak.

So now the second step in Mr. Truman's may-if policy goes into effect—if they (the Chinese Reds) realize they cannot defeat us in Korea * * * they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression."

Then—on the basis of that great big if—the third step—"a peaceful settlement may then be possible * * *."

We submit, this is no foreign policy. It is the total absence of one. Furthermore, already it has started to fall apart. For it was predicated on the pious hope that the Commies may have been discouraged, a hope they proved false this week with their new offensive.

Is there any greater chance that the remaining may-if hopes in the Truman-Acheson policy vacuum will come to pass?

But General Ridgway doesn't seem to share his commander's naive faith. General Ridgway only yesterday said the new offensive seems to be "another major effort by our Communist enemy to drive United Nations forces from Korea, or to destroy them." That does not sound like a peaceful future for Korea—now or for some time to come.

Faced with that kind of a determined enemy, common sense condemns President Truman's Pollyanna approach, hedged in between the words "may" and "if." Either we must fight back with everything we have—even at the risk that the war will spread, a risk we took in the beginning—or we must get out of Korea, draw an atom-bomb line and tell the Commies they'd better not cross it—or else.

Export of America's Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of an address I delivered last Saturday afternoon by transcription for broadcast from Station WGN in Chicago. The subject of the address was America's Exportation of Her Great Enterprise Genius. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORT OF AMERICA'S FREEDOMS

How can we—you and I—as citizens help to contribute to the future peace of the world?

That is a vital question, as I'm sure you'll agree, particularly in this critical stage of world affairs—with war or peace hanging in the balance.

One answer to that question which I am proposing to my listeners today is this: Let us all help to export America's great freedoms, her great values—political, economic, and moral—throughout the world.

RELATION OF THIS THEME TO CURRENT CRISIS

Now, what do I mean by export and by the term value?

And just how does this whole idea fit in with the current crisis? How does it fit in, from a general standpoint, with the approach that has been suggested by our great American hero, Douglas MacArthur, of whom we of Wisconsin and of all America have shown ourselves to be so rightly proud? Yes, just how will this idea of exporting our values be of real help in the cause of peace?

Well, my friends, you will recall that in the early days of America's history, the nations of Europe exported to this new continent manpower in the form of waves of immigration. Europe also sent us goods and materials with which we built homes, stores, factories and so forth.

With the passage of the years, the American people grew until the twentieth century they had attained leadership in every phase of international relations: economic, military, political, and basically spiritual.

With the twentieth century, America became the greatest exporter in the world. You could find America's sewing machines deep in the heart of darkest Africa. You could see American mousetraps throughout the world. But, unfortunately, while we had done a superlative job of exporting our physical goods, we had not shipped abroad the great spiritual concepts which have made America the Nation that she is. Now, what are those concepts?

BASIC SPIRITUAL IDEALS

1. The concept of man's individual dignity, the concept of the sacredness of man as a child of God.

2. The concept of freedom to take one's chances, to gain profit or to experience loss, without Government intervention.

3. The concept of faithfulness to one's spoken and written word of fidelity to one's contracts.

4. The concept of a government of limited rather than of unlimited power; a government divided among three coequal and coordinating branches: Legislative, executive, and judicial.

Now, my friends, as we look about the world today, we can see that the world desperately needs, and in many instances, hungers for these concepts. I don't mean to say that we want to make the world over in our own image. We recognize that every nation has its unique background, its history, its culture, its tongue which it prides. Every nation wants to be sovereign and independent. The day of imperialism is ended.

But we have learned in times past that if we do a good salesmanship job of selling American values, we can create good will and friendship among all peoples. We can help them to help themselves. They can raise their economic standards, they can achieve the home front cooperation which we have enjoyed. There can be an end to the bitter civil disturbances which have played havoc in so many countries.

NATURE OF EXPORT CRUSADE

What I am proposing today, therefore, is a great export crusade, a crusade for spiritual achievement, rather than mere material progress. Who do I propose to embark on this crusade? I suggest not the Federal Government nor State and local governments, but the genius of American private-enterprise system. I mean the genius of our companies, our unions, our clubs, our associations; I mean everyone of us.

For example, I would like to see private business organizations, through the International Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, intensify their effort to help sell American concepts abroad.

I should like to see the great organized labor unions—the CIO, the AFL, and the independent unions—sell American concepts to foreign labor unions, to a greater degree than they ever have before.

I should like to see America's churches intensify their efforts in cooperation with their brother denominations abroad and through the great interdenominational church channels.

I should like to see the veterans' organizations of America, the farm groups of America, and so on down the line intensify their efforts to sell the American concepts of freedom, initiative, enterprise, fair dealing.

Lastly, I should like to see the American people carry on a great letter-writing crusade, a crusade such as many of them embarked on prior to the crucial Italian election several years ago, which ended in a great victory over communism.

Now, my friends, all of us know that there are a great number of active international organizations—church, veterans, labor, and business groups—now underway. But I say that these organizations have not realized their fullest potentialities.

Of course, I don't want the American members of those international groups to assume that they can "take these organizations over." On the contrary, as in our experience in the United Nations, I think that we must act as equals and as partners in each of these groups.

However, I do want Americans to recognize their mission, a mission to inject the virus of free enterprise in the body politic and economic of foreign countries.

WORLD HAS WRONG PICTURE OF US

It is important that this be done? Why? Because the world conceives of America as materialistic in its approach, as exclusively interested in the almighty dollar. To be sure, the Voice of America has done and can do a constructive job to show foreign peoples that Soviet Russia has painted false pictures of us. Nevertheless, it will take a great export crusade if we are to change the world's basic view of the typical American.

EXAMPLE OF PHILIPPINE UNREST

Even in a country like the Philippines, which has been America's ward and which on a July 4 similar to our own Independence Day we freed—even in a country like the Philippines there is apparently considerable misinterpretation of America's basic approach. As a result there is today in the Philippines a force known as the Huks, a tightly disciplined, well indoctrinated military force whose units considerably envelop the capital city of Manila. Those Huk units are responsible for a whole wave of assassinations, terrorism, destruction of towns, etc.

If, however, we were to export to the Philippines American concepts in a better way than we have done before, I think that we could help change the conditions which have bred hatred and discontent, and which the Huks have fanned into active rebellion.

Now, I do not want anyone to think that we cannot learn in turn from foreign peoples. On the contrary, the American people have constantly signified that they can learn and are eager to learn about the best values of foreign lands. Exports must be a two-way street, with imports also.

If you believe in this idea of an export crusade, I hope that in your organization, whether it be labor, business, fraternal, veterans, church, etc., you will speak to your officers and your fellow members.

DON'T OVEREMPHASIZE MATERIAL VALUES

I do want to stress one word of caution in our contacts with foreign peoples. Let us be careful that we are not boastful about our material values to a world two-thirds of those people are barely subsisting on a poverty diet. It is completely inappropriate for us to boast about our refrigerators and deep freezers to people living on the edge of starvation. Moreover, many of our concepts are such as not to be capable of being understood by the average foreign man in the street, unless we convey our concepts in terms that each people will understand, based on its own language and culture. In other words, we shall have to become so familiar with the backgrounds of each people, that we will know how best to speak to them.

The great common denominator which every people can understand is the concept of America's faith in a divine creator. The spiritual plane is in fact the most effective plane on which we can contact foreign peoples, and at the same time it is the most powerful plane on which we ourselves can realize our birthright. Material remedies for spiritual problems will not be adequate to the challenge of this age. We need a spiritual answer to the basic spiritual problem of our times.

American genius has helped to create the atomic bomb, the jet plane, the supersonic missile, and a thousand other modern devices. Let our great genius harness itself to the task of creating spiritual bonds between peoples. Let us give light that each people will find its own way. Let's radiate that light through the Communist darkness. Let us keep the American lighthouse burning through the night so that it can be seen by every ship in the storm-tossed sea.

Right now, America is watching with great anxiety reports from the battlefront in Korea, as our own and allied forces meet the shock of the onrushing Chinese offensive. But you and I know that if, perhaps in past years, America had been able to better sell her concepts in China, in Korea, and elsewhere in Asia, we might to a considerable extent have avoided the critical situation which now faces us.

MACARTHUR REPRESENTED GREAT VALUES

When Douglas MacArthur originally entered Japan, after the surrender, he came not just as a conqueror, but as a superb exponent of American character, American integrity, American spiritual devotion, American fair dealing. Douglas MacArthur in turn sold those virtues brilliantly to the 83,000,000 Japanese people and to most of Asia. Such personal and national salesmanship abroad is what is so needed today. Men like Douglas MacArthur can and must be earnestly urged to continue to help us in this great task of leadership.

But remember, my friends, you and I can't sell a product unless you and I have three things:

(a) Knowledge of the value of our product.

(b) Confidence in ourself and the institution we represent.

(c) Knowledge of our customer.

Well, folks, if you believe in this export crusade become active in the organization of your choice. Emphasize the importance of their international work. Emphasize the

need for more foreign contact through letters, through personal meetings, through conventions so that we can get to know the world better and so that the world can get to know us better.

WE NEED DYNAMIC ENTHUSIASM

First, however, let each of us seek a better understanding of our own way of life so that we will really know the commodity that we are trying to sell. Let us become reinvigorated with the great values of the American scene, the values of this constitutional Republic. Let us gain enthusiasm for our salesmanship job so that we can do the sort of job that is characteristic of a dynamic America.

Let's get busy on this export crusade because on it, in considerable part, may depend the future peace and freedom of the world. This doesn't mean that we should forget our other obligations. We must, of course, be adequately prepared in a military way. We must get to the bottom of the facts insofar as the far eastern controversy is concerned. We must hear America's great Gen. Douglas MacArthur testify regarding the series of events which led up to the President's ill-advised action in dismissing him. But we must also be active on this spiritual front.

CONCLUSION

Thank you for your kind attention to this broadcast. I hope that each of us may carry on his responsibility as I have humbly submitted it to you today. Let's export America's great values. Thank you.

MacArthur Insists Issues Are Global

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Issues Are Global, MacArthur Insists," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer, April 20, 1951. The editorial is based on General MacArthur's address to the Congress on April 19 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUES ARE GLOBAL, MACARTHUR INSISTS

In his dramatic appearance before the Congress of the United States yesterday, Gen. Douglas MacArthur insisted that the fight against communism is of global scope and that Asia is just as important as Europe.

MacArthur declared:

"You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe."

Relative to the fighting in Korea, General MacArthur said he was not consulted by the President previous to the decision that sent American troops into that conflict, but "that decision, from a military viewpoint, proved a sound one."

General MacArthur denied very emphatically that the course he proposed for continuing the war against the Communists called for the use of "our ground forces" in metropolitan China, stating:

"While no man in his right mind would advocate sending ground forces into continental China, and such was never given thought, the new situation (participation of the Chinese Reds in the war in Korea) did urgently demand a drastic revision of strategic planning if our political aim was to defeat this new enemy as we had defeated the old one."

That decision, he asserted, was not forthcoming.

The general then reiterated the four points he has voiced before:

Economic blockade against Chinese to halt shipments by Great Britain and even the United States of needed materials into that country.

Imposition of a naval blockade on the Chinese coast.

Removal of restrictions preventing the bombing of bases of the Chinese Reds.

Use of the troops of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, about 600,000 strong now stationed on Formosa.

President Truman and Secretary Acheson have opposed such procedure.

Meanwhile, General MacArthur said our forces are being depleted by attrition in an aimless war.

Victory is the goal of war at all times, he asserted.

The appearance of General MacArthur before Congress was one of the most dramatic in the history of the Nation. Admittedly a great military leader and statesman, he had been stripped of his commands in the Far East.

With the courage of a true soldier, he appeared before Congress to give an accounting of his brilliant leadership in the Far East. He did it with dignity and without rancor or bitterness. Despite his 71 years and the stress and strain of recent days, he stood erect and resolute.

One admirer declared he symbolized "The American Eagle."

No leader of recent history has displayed similar courage. He refused to abandon his conscientious beliefs and the course he believed right. He chose to sacrifice position, a truly heroic gesture in this era of expediency, appeasement, and lust for power and material gain.

General MacArthur has increased in stature and esteem by the manner in which he has conducted himself in a crisis so important to the Nation and its people.

American Policy Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Times-Herald this morning, April 30, comes the following:

A SUPINE CONGRESS

Senator TAFT stated the plain truth when he said that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by their conduct in the MacArthur affair, had proved themselves politically subservient to the administration. His implication that the Joint Chiefs are political stooges was disputed by Senator FULBRIGHT, the Arkansas Rhodes scholar, who gave the usual proof that he is more English than American.

General MacArthur, in his Chicago speech, made it plain that the English and the United Nations are running America's foreign policy. FULBRIGHT, as an American Laster, is of course, for both. It is no help to the country that such a man should be in the Senate.

Senator TAFT said that the recent address of General Bradley, challenging MacArthur's recommendations for Korea, had been "written, in effect, by the State Department." It is certain that the speech was submitted for inspection there, and that Secretary Acheson, who is at least as loyal as FULBRIGHT to England, found it to his satisfaction.

The British, as is now established, were instrumental in getting MacArthur fired, fearing that the positive military measures he advocated would alienate Communist China to the detriment of British colonial and trade interests. It has also been said that the British hope to exploit MacArthur's removal as chief of the occupation of Japan so that they could disrupt the Japanese economy and kill off a trade rival.

In these devious moves, it might be expected that Acheson, with his empire parentage, would follow the British line. It is equally clear why FULBRIGHT should do so, for as the recipient of an English education through the largess of Cecil Rhodes he was subjected to those influences which Rhodes deliberately set about using his fortune to create.

In his will, written at the age of 24, and repeated four more times within 20 years, Rhodes directed that his fortune be used to establish "a secret society, the true aim and object whereof shall be the extension of British rule throughout the world, * * * and * * * the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British empire."

While services to England are to be expected from Acheson and FULBRIGHT, it is more surprising that the principal body of American military leaders should become a mere political appendage of the administration, in the advancement of British policy. It is even more surprising that a Congress grown supine should barely voice a protest.

Instead of rebuking these anti-American forces, Congress has given the Pentagon everything that it has asked—divisions for an army to be placed in Europe for England's protection, a 24-month draft, and now, through House approval, an additional $6,400,000,000 in military appropriations, raising the total so far this year to almost fifty billion.

Meanwhile, as General MacArthur asserts, the "slaughter of America's sons" continues in Korea. As in World War II, when he commanded in the Pacific, that area has been relegated to the position of a neglected front, while all efforts again are designed to carry out the same basic program laid down in concert with the British for that war: "To give strong support to the United Kingdom in Europe."

Minority Leader MARTIN's recent stalwart actions in the MacArthur affair provide Americans with a ray of hope. He realizes, it is plain, that the function of an opposition is to oppose. Under his leadership less resolute Republicans may recover their courage.

The Government's Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an address delivered by me before the Pennsylvania Greeters Association, Chapter No. 41, at the George Washington Hotel, Washington, Pa., on April 28, 1951, discussing General MacArthur's address to Congress on April 19, and our Government's policy in Asia.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure to meet with your fine group.

The splendid hotels of our country are a typical product of the American system of free enterprise.

You have developed the highest standards of hospitality and good will through competition in providing the kind of service the people appreciate.

Fair competition, operating under freedom of the individual, is the American way. It has made the United States the greatest country in the world.

Today we are engaged in a great struggle to maintain the greatness of our Republic. Heroic young Americans are giving their precious lives to preserve our freedom and to safeguard the American way of life.

The tragic and desperate situation in Korea overshadows everything else in the hearts and minds of the American people.

Make no mistake about it. The people are aroused as never before. They realize that the dangers we face today will grow ever more menacing unless the leaders of our Nation adopt a course of action that will insure victory.

When I left Washington, D. C., yesterday I had received more than 30,000 telegrams and letters, and hundreds of telephone calls, denouncing the Truman administration for the dismissal of General MacArthur.

Many of the messages demanded that President Truman be impeached, and that Secretary Acheson be dismissed.

The letters and telegrams began arriving immediately after the President's midnight decision was announced removing General MacArthur from all his Pacific commands.

General MacArthur's magnificent address before the joint meeting of Congress touched off another barrage of telegrams and letters. They are still pouring in. Almost unanimously they express strong support of General MacArthur's program in the Far East.

In all my long experience in public life I have never witnessed such a tremendous outburst of public indignation.

To my mind General MacArthur voiced the sentiments of the American people when he said:

"In war, there is no substitute for victory."

But, my fellow Americans, those who influenced the President in his action against General MacArthur, offering their substitute for victory.

They offer appeasement.

They propose to buy off the enemy.

They would pay the price imposed by the Communist dictators.

They would surrender Formosa to Red China.

They would invite the Communist government of China into the family of nations.

And finally, they would admit representatives of Chinese aggression to the conference formulating the peace treaty with Japan.

That is what socialistic Great Britain wants.

It is what Communist China wants.

It is what Moscow wants.

It is not what the American people want.

These are the disgraceful, un-American proposals against which General MacArthur is making such a valiant protest.

It may be fortunate for the United States and the world that his clash with the Truman-Acheson policies have brought the issues out into the open.

For the first time in his brilliant career as a military leader MacArthur was fighting a war without hope of defeating the enemy.

Why was he bound and shackled by restrictions contrary to all sound military strategy?

Why was he forbidden to bomb and destroy the supply lines, troop concentrations, and air bases north of the Yalu River?

Why were the Communist forces given all the advantages of military initiative?

Why were they left free to withdraw to a safe sanctuary—to reinforce and resupply—and to renew the attack any time they saw fit?

One answer was given by President Truman in his radio address of April 11. He said, and I quote:

"So far, by fighting a limited war in Korea we have prevented aggression from succeeding and bringing on a general war."

No longer does he call it police action in support of the United Nations. Oh, no; now it is a limited war—an undeclared war—a war without action by Congress—the only branch of our Government which, under the Constitution, has the power to declare war.

Early last week the Chinese Reds, armed, equipped, and trained by Communist Russia, launched their most massive offensive of the Korean conflict.

They hurled 700,000 men against our forces on a front of almost 100 miles.

Why were they able to do this?

Only because they had complete assurance that they would not be molested while they built up their strength in the safety of Manchuria.

The attack was not unexpected. On the contrary, every military observer knew it was coming. President Truman knew it was coming.

In the radio speech to which I have referred he used these words, and I quote:

"In Korea itself, there are signs that the enemy is building up his ground forces for a new mass offensive. We also know that there have been large increases in the enemy's available air forces. If a new attack comes I feel confident it will be turned back."

But he did not say that our troops were being reinforced to meet the attack or how it would be turned back.

Our fighting forces could do nothing but wait until they were hit by the first shock of the enemy's onslaught.

How many American boys must die before we can achieve the so-called negotiated peace that Mr. Truman so earnestly hopes for?

So far as I am concerned I place more confidence in the position taken by that great soldier and diplomat, General MacArthur, whose words I quoted earlier and now repeat:

"In war there is no substitute for victory."

One of the high lights of General MacArthur's address was his statement that his military views have been fully shared, in the past, by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff.

More than a week has passed since General MacArthur made that statement. But so far no one in the Pentagon, no one in the State Department, no one in the White House, has challenged or even questioned its accuracy.

Instead, the whole power of the administration has been directed toward an attempt to smear and discredit the great soldier who has given 52 years of distinguished service to his country.

Directed by the White House, scores of investigators have been turned loose to search the records for every single bit of material that might be used to discredit General MacArthur.

In all our history no military leader has ever been given such shabby treatment by any President—not even given the customary opportunity to bid farewell to his troops. But his high place in the love and esteem of the American people was enthusiastically demonstrated by the tremendous ovations he received wherever he appeared.

Five years and seven months ago General MacArthur took his place at the head of the Japanese Government as supreme commander of the Allied Powers.

He had absolute power over a conquered people, a proud people, who worshipped their emperor as a god.

General MacArthur faced a difficult task but through his outstanding ability he succeeded in gaining the respect and confidence of the Japanese people and was winning them to a free way of life.

Previous experience in the Philippines prepared General MacArthur for his distinguished service in Japan. He not only developed the Filipino military force but he taught the people the ideals of the United States.

General MacArthur's fame will go down in history, not only as one of our most brilliant military leaders, but as a great statesmen and diplomat.

You will recall that General MacArthur in closing his address to Congress said:

"I now close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty."

That statement brings out what I consider one of the finest qualities of General MacArthur. He lives and works with an abiding faith in God.

It is not generally known that after he assumed control as supreme allied commander he made numerous requests upon various religious denominations in the United States to furnish him with more and more Bibles for distribution among the Japanese people.

He knew that if they were to rebuild their nation upon American ideals they would find guidance in the eternal truths of the Holy Bible—the source and inspiration of American freedom and independence.

Suggestion by Hon. Harold E. Stassen for Reconciliation Between the President and General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a couple of days ago Hon. Harold E. Stassen addressed a letter to the President of the United States suggesting a reconciliation between him and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stassen's letter and an editorial on the same subject from the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, April 30, 1951, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 28, 1951.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: For the good of America please permit me to respectfully suggest that a reconciliation be brought about between you and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. If the disagreement runs its bitter course to the end, whatever its outcome may be, it can do no good for our country. The grave world situation requires above all the building of greater strength for America with which to face the world-wide threat

of Communist imperialism. In this you are both agreed. The issue of peace and war must be above personalities or partisanship if America is to exercise constructive leadership among the free nations.

I therefore ask with humility that you consider extending an invitation to General MacArthur to meet and confer with you. I have not spoken to him but I am certain from my knowledge of him for many years that he would at once respond.

Regardless of past differences, I think you would agree that his advice would be very helpful now and in the months ahead on the problems relating to Japan, to Asia in general, and in the building of American armed strength.

Sincerely,

HAROLD E. STASSEN.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 30, 1951]

TO HEAL THE BREACH

The significance of Mr. Harold E. Stassen's appeal to President Truman and General MacArthur to meet and reconcile their differences does not lie wholly in its effect upon the two principals. The reaction to Mr. Stassen's proposal, interspersed though it was with some of the intransigent bitterness that marked the first stages of the controversy over General MacArthur's dismissal, shows how broad and deep is the desire to remit the Nation's frayed unity and to resolve differences rationally and as Americans.

The differences are real and they are very important. They will be thrashed out in the forthcoming congressional hearings and in public debates; it is too much to expect that the discussion will not be attended by further confusions and further exasperations. No one would wish to see the dispute pushed out of sight, or a pretense of unity used to obscure it. The main question is whether the subject is to be dealt with in terms of blind emotion as a head-on clash of irreconcilable elements or as a serious problem over which Americans disagree in good faith but in respect to which they have a common objective and a common will to attain that objective.

If Mr. Stassen's suggestion could be carried into effect, it would do much to contribute to a lessening of tensions. It would be reassuring to the many Americans who were less perturbed by the President's exercise of his power in dismissing General MacArthur than by the manner in which it was done and who found it difficult to understand why the friendliness of the meeting on Wake Island should be succeeded by the curt message to Tokyo and the chilly separation in Washington. It would appeal, too, to the growing sentiment which Representative DWIGHT SIKES expressed when he said, "We must stop fighting one another and fight the common enemy."

Whether or not a meeting between the President and the general is possible, a meeting of minds in America is imperative. There must be a delimitation of the precise areas over which there is a genuine dispute and a recognition of the dangers of permitting the controversy to become entangled in nonessentials or allowing it to become a ragbag of all the discontents of a troubled generation. If the real questions are allowed to emerge clearly, if they are studied calmly and with a single eye to the welfare of the Nation, many of the divisions which now plague America will vanish. Every citizen, whether he is thinking out the issues in the White House, the Capitol, the Pentagon, or while riding in the subway to his job, shares the responsibility for achieving that goal.

Acheson and MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial entitled "Acheson and MacArthur," which appeared in last Saturday's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON AND MACARTHUR

The President fairly bounced with self-confidence when he faced the reporters Thursday at his first post-MacArthur press conference. It was probably his most successful parley. Without a doubt he has shared the fears of the Allies lest General MacArthur take action bringing on a general conflagration. The relief he now feels after cutting the Gordian knot was unmistakable. Whether the dismissal was wiser than recall—and then, in case of disagreement, dismissal—will continue to be argued. But the MacArthur speeches, coupled with the antic performances of General Whitney, General MacArthur's press secretary, appear to have justified the summary dismissal in many minds that thought differently a couple of weeks ago.

With that over, the President reaffirmed his confidence in Secretary Acheson, and in the process seemed to be echoing the die-hard Republican line that in regard to China, Acheson represents the opposite policy to MacArthur's. Not for a moment can we admit any such view. To imply that if you are against MacArthur you are for Acheson is totally to distort the intrinsic situation. Secretary Acheson, contrary to the current propaganda on both sides of the debate, is more parallel than antithetical to MacArthur on China, and, we might add, much less candid and forthright. In Chicago, General MacArthur, in the intoxication of his welcome, moved sensibly closer to an all-out war position; Acheson's policy is to get this country into the same kind of sticky involvement with mainland China, only by the back door.

This was shown on Wednesday in the State Department announcement of the Chase mission to Formosa—so reminiscent of the fatal Barr mission to Nanking in 1945, which blew up so badly in the administration's face. The event marks the officially acknowledged end of the neutralization of Formosa policy. That policy has shaded into the initial MacArthur policy of defense of Formosa which got MacArthur originally in hot water. But there is something more significant in the administration's conversion. All the indications up to and including the Wednesday notice are that the administration's Formosa policy is also shading, as MacArthur's did before it, into an interventionist policy in behalf of the guerrillas on the assumption that they are Chiang Kai-shek's supporters. In other words, MacArthurism is continuing to drag the Achesons on its coattails. It is important to get the distinction and the implications straight.

The blunt fact is that the most important post in Mr. Truman's administration is filled by a man who does not enjoy general or congressional confidence. This, in view of the foreign business about to be put up to Congress, in view of the rival leadership that MacArthur is unmasking, is a serious matter to the administration and to the country alike. It stems, of course, from Mr. Acheson's public expressions about Alger Hiss, especially his public citation of a compassionate passage from the Bible which, in the light of Alger Hiss' refusal to come clean, was singularly inappropriate. Since then, whether because of the criticism he then invited or not, Secretary Acheson has seemed to be striving to appease the most vociferous of his critics, that is, the most reactionary of MacArthur elements in the Republican Party. All, of course, to no avail. On the contrary, the appeasement has had serious results. First, it has produced almost an abdication of civilian leadership which has permitted MacArthurism to thrive. It has put the administration, secondly, in a position where it has the same difficulty of explaining its policy as the people have of understanding it.

The metamorphosis of Mr. Acheson in this aspect (as in other aspects) of foreign policy has alienated a segment of Mr. Acheson's party. They see no prospect of any far eastern settlement under his auspices. They see him hogtied by popular suspicion. At home as well as abroad he is a political deadweight. Foreign policy in his regime has become merely a carbon copy of Pentagon strategy without regard to policy or principle. A military man has to think in terms of war tomorrow, but not the diplomat. Otherwise a nation would be condemned to close all avenues to a self-enforcing peace, and to stop thinking in terms of reconstruction as well as preparedness. We are convinced that the two preoccupations can go together, but we see no sign that Secretary Acheson feels the same way.

Secretary Acheson seems to be aware that his stock is badly depressed throughout the country. At any rate, he is said on at least half a dozen occasions to have submitted his resignation to the President, only to have him reject it. For the good of the country, as well as to enable the administration to make a fresh start in effectuating a contra-MacArthur policy on China, he should insist on his own retirement, or his transfer to a useful field of endeavor. The President should have at his elbow a Secretary who can capitalize his own influence as well as one with a topnotch mind. It is unfair to the President's overburdened office that he should shoulder the embarrassment of having a Secretary who, far from being an influence, is a drag. For, apart from his own need for relief, there is the country to consider, a country which is constantly frustrated in the quest for basic unity by the President's unwillingness to put his own house in order.

General MacArthur's Pronouncements on the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alternatives in Korea," published in the Oil City Derrick on April 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALTERNATIVES IN KOREA

Right or wrong from a diplomatic and political point of view, General MacArthur's pronouncements on the Korean war have served to emphasize once again the utter confusion that marks the views of the Washington administration and the United Nations Assembly regarding a firm and resolute far eastern policy.

In advocating the bombing of Communist bases in Manchuria and use of Chinese Nationalist troops stationed on Formosa to open a second front against Red China, MacArthur has brought a storm of protest upon his shoulders from capitals throughout the western world.

Now the hatchet men of the Truman administration and those of other nations, particularly England and France, are out to scalp the general or at least to subject him to public reprimand.

Perhaps the general is out of bounds in issuing pronouncements on questions that are preeminently political. Perhaps he has overstepped his authority as a military commander in public presentation of his views without the consent of his superiors.

But let it not be forgotten that General MacArthur has been cast in a difficult role. His is perhaps the toughest military job in the history of modern warfare. He has been forced to fight a war that is strictly limited for him and his United Nations forces, but is not limited for the enemy who enjoys the advantage of superior numbers and a privileged sanctuary in Manchuria. He literally has one hand tied behind his back while his foe is permitted to swing freely with both mailed fists.

And now the general faces the added grim outlook of a massive spring offensive by the Chinese and North Korean Reds, this time with the possible benefit of a considerable power in the air provided by Soviet-supplied planes now massing in Manchuria. What could happen to a vastly outnumbered United Nations Army which lacked undisputed control of the air is grounds for grave fear.

MacArthur repeatedly has warned that unless United Nations policy is changed, the Korean war undoubtedly will settle into a costly stalemate. He takes the position that the conflict can be brought to a successful end only by removal of the restrictions on the forces under his command.

The United Nations, on the other hand, has opposed any extension of the conflict for fear of Soviet involvement and loosening of the forces that would ignite the spark of world war III. The U. N. has worked incessantly for a cease fire in Korea and an end of the conflict by negotiation. But every effort to halt the fighting has been turned down by Red China and it is hard to visualize any change in the stand of the Peiping government so long as U. N. forces are restricted in their operations.

Common sense dictates that no sane American can favor steps that arbitrarily would plunge the Nation into another world war. Likewise, it is hard to crystallize sentiment in favor of continuing the conflict on the present basis with the steady whittling away of American lives. Already the casualties of United States forces in a conflict which Mr. Truman still refers to as a police action are nearing the 60,000 mark.

There must be no let-up in the efforts of this Nation and all free nations to bring about an early end to the hostilities in Korea. But in event of failure to achieve a settlement through a negotiated peace, it would appear that the only alternative to a long and costly stalemate is a decision by the United Nations either to get off the peninsula or to undertake the effort necessary to achieve victory and the goal of a unified and free Korea.

War in Korea Profitable for United States "Partners"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "War in Korea Profitable for United States 'Partners,'" written by Larry Rue, and published in the April 22 issue of the Chicago Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR IN KOREA PROFITABLE FOR UNITED STATES "PARTNERS"—ATLANTIC PACT NATIONS SELLING TO RUSSIA

(By Larry Rue)

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, April 21.—The Korean war has been quite profitable to Britain France, and other Atlantic Pact nations which have been doing business with Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain.

Statistics compiled here show that the British have more than doubled their exports of tooling machines and other strategic material to the Soviet Union. These machines are important for the armament industry and few here doubt that they are now producing weapons for use against American soldiers in Korea.

France, too, has been doing a thriving business, particularly with Czechoslovakia. In a last-minute effort to curry favor with this satellite state, France resumed dismantling of critical electrotechnical and tooling machines in the French zone of occupation. The machines are being turned over to Czechoslovakia.

BIGGEST IN EASTERN EUROPE

The biggest armament plant in all of Eastern Europe is in Czechoslovakia. It is the Skoda works, now turning out all types of heavy war weapons on Russian account. The machinery, which has been removed from German plants around Baden-Baden, can be used to make accessories for war machines Skoda is now producing for the Communist armies.

Dismantling of 41 German tooling machines was ordered by the Czech restitution mission in Baden-Baden on the ground that this equipment originally was taken from Czechoslovakia. Despite the fact that most of the factories from which the machines were taken were damaged heavily in the war, the owners were able to produce receipts showing that the machines had been paid for in full and never had been subject to requisition by the Wehrmacht.

BLOW AT SCHUMAN PLAN

The French by allowing the Czech Communists to weaken the economy of West Germany in order to strengthen their own war potential have aroused suspicion as to where their hearts are in the struggle between communism and the western world.

The dismantling also has strengthened the already formidable Socialist opposition to the Schuman plan, calling for the integration of the coal and steel industries of the Western European countries, on which United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy has based his chief hopes as a basic solution to the age-old difficulties between the French and the Germans.

Moreover, it throws a monkey wrench in the Atlantic Pact plans for Western European defense by building up resistance to West German participation.

SWISS FIRMS BIG BUYERS

Besides the British and the French, other Atlantic Pact nations have made huge profits since the Korean war by selling to the Soviet Union all kinds of raw materials needed by the armament industry. This business picked up tremendously everywhere after war started in Korea. The material sometimes goes through two or three hands before reaching Russia.

Swiss firms have been big buyers for Russian account; so have Dutch and Belgian firms. This is one of the reasons why it has been so difficult to break up the increasing illegal trade between East and West.

In Bonn it was announced recently that Britain in 1948 sold tooling machines worth $240,000,000 to Russia. In 1949 this trade was stepped up to $460,000,000, while in 1950 tooling machines worth $1,350,000,000 were delivered to the Soviet Union by England.

AUSTRIAN A KEY SMUGGLER

France has been getting large orders for special electric technical equipment from Czechoslovakia. It was in order to keep this trade that the French agreed to take machines the Czechs want out of German plants.

The American licensed Der Tagesspiegel of Berlin recently published nearly four columns of details about smuggling transactions involving war plants in East Germany and Russia. The Tagesspiegel reported that Swiss, Swedish, Belgium, and Dutch firms have been doing business with an Austrian named Johann Haselgruber, said to be the key person in a huge smuggling ring which operates entirely for the Soviet Union.

The Tagesspiegel also wrote that annually at least 100,000 tons of steel being shipped to West Berlin firms disappears behind the iron curtain. South of Helmstedt, the official check point between East and West Germany, at least 3,000 tons of tooling machines, special steel, tools, and high frequency motors have been smuggled into the Soviet zone every night, this paper asserted.

SEND BARS FOR GUNS

Cockerill, a Belgium concern, is said to have delivered 7,400 round steel bars for making machine gun barrels as well as 2,500 large steel bars for big artillery barrels. Other ammunition from Belgium, which was shipped to Russia, included 6,200 pistols with 200 rounds of ammunition for each one. The Swiss firm of Oerlikon, manufacturer of an automatic machine gun, delivered a big order of such guns to Haselgruber, the Tagesspiegel reported.

The paper deplores that steel rails, made in West Germany and delivered to Rotterdam, were sent to Russia and were used to connect the three Soviet atomic centers in the republic of Tanna Tuva, north of Mongolia; that special Belgian steel flows into Soviet armament centers and ready-made German guns have appeared on the Korean front; that Belgian and Swiss made weapons, German and Belgian tools, and German, Swiss, and Swedish machines are strengthening the Soviet armament potential.

"That West German steel is illegally exported to the Soviet zone while the West German Volkswagen plant cannot operate for lack of steel is a scandal," the paper concludes.

Foreign Policy and Domestic Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Republican 21 Club of Massachusetts, at Worcester, Mass., on April 28, in which I discussed the foreign policy and domestic administration of the United States Government.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., REPUBLICAN 21 CLUB OF MASSACHUSETTS, WORCESTER, MASS., APRIL 28, 1951

HIGH LIGHTS OF THE SPEECH

1. The administration has made tragic errors in foreign policy, notably in neglecting our own defenses and in not developing enough truly effective allies to relieve our men of carrying such a major part of the load of combat.

2. In contemplating the dismissal of General MacArthur, we are struck by the unbelievably summary manner in which it was achieved. No one seriously denies that the civil power in a democracy must be supreme, but I feel strongly that the showdown need never have come and that, when it did come, it was dealt with in a way which was utterly uncalled for. It seems to me inexcusable that the President never called General MacArthur to Washington for consultation. Actions which are so crude and so impulsive shake one's confidence profoundly, for how can one have faith in a Commander in Chief who so obviously cannot command himself? It is for this reason, I think, that the reactions which I have had from the public in Massachusetts have been so overwhelming. Of all the hundreds of telegrams and letters which I have received some spoke of the far eastern question and some spoke about the civil power being supreme over the military. But none endorsed or praised the bungling and lack of foresight which has characterized this administration. In my experience in public life, I have seen nothing like it. The President has allowed the foundation of confidence on which his great office rests to be eaten away by the political termites who surround him. The President should promptly arrange for the United States Government to have the benefit of General MacArthur's wise counsel and should invite the general to render this added service.

3. Trade in war materials with Red China or Soviet Russia is nefarious and must be stopped.

4. Republicans should draw the issue on the administration's poor judgment and low moral tone, concentrating their attack on inflation, on the RFC, and the crime scandals and not mix up the success of the Republican Party with American military security.

TEXT OF THE SPEECH

Mr. Chairman, fellow Republicans—and fellow Americans, for I speak to you tonight in both capacities.

We meet tonight as citizens who are thoroughly aroused by the lack of foresight and general incompetence of our national leadership; who are determined decisively to rid ourselves of this administration in the coming year, and who are also determined that until the time comes that we can throw them out, we will surmount our problems here at home and present a united front to our Communist opponents.

Looking back over the past:

We have seen the national leadership in 1945 fail in its duty to proclaim the need of Armed Forces strong enough to give us influence for peace, thus countenancing the disintegration of our Armed Forces and losing the chance to organize the peace.

We have seen the negligence which permitted the destruction of billions of dollars worth of equipment which we badly need today.

We remember the Yalta Conference, from which so much tragedy has flowed, particularly for the valiant people of Poland.

We point to the stupid decisions such as that which made the city of Berlin an island completely surrounded by Soviet territory.

We remind our fellow citizens of the mental lethargy, amounting virtually to a betrayal of trust, which resulted in the Soviet empire growing after World War II until it encompassed about one-third of the world's total area and population before we finally started to wake up.

We think with bitter emotion of June 1949 when we withdrew our two divisions from Korea and announced that the United States defense line ran from the Aleutian Islands through Japan and the Philippines, inferring that the line of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea was not essential to our defense. This was the action which created the vacuum and thus encouraged the Communist invaders to step into the vacuum. I cannot rid myself of the idea that it did not have the approval of our military authorities. There is no doubt in my mind that if these two divisions had stayed there, 6,000 miles from home and close to the Soviet border as they were, that there would have been no aggression in Korea. But we hauled down our flag, and it is hard to avoid the conclusion that we have paid a heavy price in blood and treasure for this miscalculation. It is one mistake which we must not repeat in other parts of the world—notably in Europe—in the future.

We who are Republican Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee said last summer with the approval of the late great Senator Arthur Vandenberg:

"In the Far East, we were persistently led to believe that Chinese communism was only a great agrarian reform movement. After half a century of cordial relations in the Far East, and especially with China, with all its troubles and difficulties, in about 1945 we were suddenly faced with a change of policy which is difficult to understand unless we evaluate the subtle betrayals of China at the Yalta Conference.

"This conference sabotaged the assurances given to China at the Cairo Conference of 1943, where also the future freedom of Korea was pledged. The Yalta agreement turned over to Stalin the control of Manchuria and Outer Mongolia and the ports of Dairen and Port Arthur. This was part of the price we paid for the unnecessary token participation of Soviet Russia in the war against Japan, one of the consequences of which was the division of Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel.

"Our far-eastern policy, growing out of these events, consistently temporized with and capitulated to the ruthless demands of the Communists, dominated by Moscow. Under it the Kremlin was, in effect, given a green light to grab whatever it could in China, Korea, and Formosa. This was never a bipartisan policy. It was solely an administration policy."

To this statement we added these words: "Never again must we allow ourselves to be caught, as we were when Korea was invaded, in a position where our failure to foresee the possible implications of our basic foreign policy will result in our being inadequately prepared to carry out that policy in time of crisis."

We concluded with the statement: "In this crisis there can be no politics as usual." But it is glaringly clear today that our advice was not taken.

Then we think of the disloyalty, foreign penetration and betrayal of trust which existed in 1945 when several thousand secret documents were stolen by the Communist editors of a so-called magazine named Amerasia, which resulted in a mere slap on the wrist to the parties who were thus guilty of aiding the Communists at a time when our men were still in combat in the Pacific. We condemn the fact that several thousand unscreened persons came into the State Department at the stroke of a pen in late 1945 and early 1946. All these things must be ruthlessly investigated and the disloyal persons cleaned out and punished.

The aim of foreign policy can be simply stated: it is to preserve peace and, if the struggle against communism should turn to war, to have effective allies—for the tragically simple reason that the sons of American mothers must not be forced to bear the full load of combat alone. On both counts the administration does not deserve a high mark. We have not organized peace nor do we have allies which are as effective as they should be—and could have been—if foresight had been shown after the end of hostilities in World War II. In Korea in particular we should certainly take advantage of whatever help we can get—among others, effective non-Communist Chinese from whom we ought to be able to obtain help without loss of American manpower or without entangling political alliances. In Europe it means that in addition to the help of the North Atlantic Treaty countries and former neutrals such as Spain and former enemy nations such as Germany, we should organize the help of the many non-Communist stateless men whom we would like to have on our side. All of these young men would help our soldiers to bear the load of combat so that American men would not have to do it alone.

As the Senator who introduced the first bill on this subject in 1947, I said on the floor of the Senate last year that if we had embarked on this policy at the end of hostilities in World War II: "there would be today both in Europe and the Far East foreign troops of great combat effectiveness." And I added: "Unfortunately the Soviets interested themselves in the possibility of using alien soldiers long before we did and we are paying a big price for this in Korea at this moment." And I said in July, the day of the Korean aggression, "we must not do this job alone. We must galvanize our allies and make sure that they work with us in building military strength."

Certainly the administration record in this respect has been a grave disappointment. Not only was there great resistance to the legislation which I sponsored to authorize the enlistment of these stateless young men in our services; but even when the bill had become law last June, providing for a modest total of 2,500 aliens, the administration dragged its feet in carrying out the law. I heard only recently of a man who had been a captain in the Polish Army, a professional soldier with 12 years' service, an expert artilleryman and a man with a wife and two children, who offered his services at one of our embassies abroad, saying that he was willing to join the United States Army as a private soldier in order to fight against communism in Korea. He offered his services and received a mimeographed letter saying that he could not be accepted because he did not have a visa to enter the United States. In the first place, this response was illegal because the new law which the administration was ignoring specifically authorized the United States to accept the services of a man like that. In the second place, he did not want to come to the United States. He wanted to go directly to Korea to take part in the fighting. In the third place, the reply was stupid and is all too typical of the lack of understanding and lack of imagination about the world situation which characterizes so much of official Washington today.

Yes, the administration record has been a disappointment and so—I say to you frankly—has been the record of many—though by no means all—of the member nations of the United Nations. There are nations which do not hesitate to remind Americans that it is fair for the United States to make a large financial contribution to the United Nations because we have more dollars per capita than any other nation. But to this argument must be added the far more poignant truth that our manpower per capita is no greater than that of other nations of the world. This is undoubtedly the rock on which the United Nations is most likely to founder. When an aggression occurs and the rank and file of members of the United Nations fail to put up military manpower in proportion to their population, the faith of the American people in the United Nations collapses. All honor, therefore, to the nations which have, by their manpower, eased the load of combat for us in Korea. Other nations should follow their example.

Another step which would shake confidence in the United Nations to its foundation would be the admission of Red China. The United Nations is founded for the purpose of resisting aggression. If a government can be admitted to membership in the United Nations simply by committing aggression, then the whole concept becomes an immense and tragic absurdity.

Let me say that equally tragic are the thoughts which come to mind at reports of shipments of war materials to Red China and the Soviet Union. Whether these shipments come from American or other sources, they help the enemies of our soldiers and of our allies. I speak as a long-time friend of the North Atlantic Pact and the Marshall plan when I say to the nations of Europe that there is nothing which can more surely jeopardize American enthusiasm for the North Atlantic alliance than reports of this nefarious trade with the enemy, than the shouts of delight coming from abroad over General MacArthur's dismissal, and the recent dispatches which speak of making Red China a party to the Japanese treaty and of handing Formosa over to the Communists.

In contemplating the dismissal of General MacArthur, we are struck by the unbelievably summary manner in which it was achieved. No one seriously denies that the civil power in a democracy must be supreme, but I feel strongly that the showdown need never have come and that, when it did come, it was dealt with in a way which was utterly uncalled for. It seems to me inexcusable that the President never called General MacArthur to Washington for consultation. Actions which are so crude and so impulsive shake one's confidence profoundly, for how can one have faith in a Commander in Chief who so obviously cannot command himself? It is for this reason, I think, that the reactions which I have had from the public in Massachusetts have been so overwhelming. Of all the hundreds of telegrams and letters which I have received some spoke of the far-eastern question and some spoke about the civil power being supreme over the military. But none endorsed or praised the bungling and lack of foresight which has characterized this administration. In my experience in public life, I have seen nothing like it. The President has allowed the foundation of confidence on which his great office rests to be eaten away by the political termites who surround him. The President should promptly arrange for the United States Government to have the benefit of General MacArthur's wise counsel and should invite the general to render this added service.

The tragic past is, therefore, clear. Although by no means desperate, the future is grim. General MacArthur's departure adds enormously to the difficulty of getting any kind of an agreement to end the Korean war. We are placed in an unhappy situation in Korea—and elsewhere—because in 1945 we gave up our own military strength and the strength of others who could help us. Until we regain the initiative which we threw away in 1945, we cannot expect a satisfactory solution in Korea or anywhere else. This takes time. We must demand increased efforts at building military strength, both for the sake of our men in Korea and for the sake of durable peace.

In the meantime, we must remember that many of the problems which we will have to confront are not as simple as they look the first time.

For example:

We must challenge those who demand an "all-out aggressive war" against any country by asking them the question, "What with?" The answer to that question is that our preparedness has been so neglected for so long that we are not now in a position to undertake sustained and general aggressive war against anyone.

While Asia is critically important, the greatest concentration of industrial power outside of the United States and the U. S. S. R. is in Western Europe—and the possession of industrial power wins wars. As General MacArthur so wisely inferred, we have two fronts—a western front in Korea and an eastern front in Europe. We as citizens must always look at American security as a whole. Europe and Japan are two ends of one Soviet empire. The Soviet military threat, as General MacArthur said, is a global threat. We must not meet it by piecemealing and frittering away our strength, notably our knock-out punch—the strategic air force. We must not wear out and use up our first team against their second team. We have done this too much already insofar as our Army is concerned. We must not commit our main force until the Kremlin commits its main force.

Our effort at one end of the Soviet Empire should help our effort at the other. Certainly one of the many great things accomplished by the heroic service of our men in Korea is that it has furnished the foundation of confidence on which military strength is being built all over the world. Their action gives us time to get ready—just as the forces of General MacArthur brought us precious time at Bataan 9 years ago. We should make maximum use of this precious time, just as we did in 1942. The action of our men in Korea is like that of the heroic boy in the story who kept his finger in the dyke.

In the field of foreign policy Republicans have a good record of achievement in the Eightieth Congress, about which so many untrue things have been said by the leaders of the party now in power. It was the Eightieth Congress which enacted: the law which set up the Marshall plan, which has saved Western Europe from communism; the Greek and Turkish aid bills which have been such a magnificent investment in human courage and fighting ability; and the Vandenberg resolution which resulted in the North Atlantic Pact which is now being so effectively implemented under the able leadership of General Eisenhower. This is a record of Republican foresight and intelligence in foreign policy which should be an inspiration.

Fellow Republicans, there never was a time when the American people needed the two-party system more than they need it today. There never was a time when there was a greater usefulness for that wonderful system which enables the citizen to draw the issue, fix the responsibility, and get a change in his government.

Our duty as active Republicans is to try to draw the issue where it ought to be drawn. That issue ought not to be drawn on the question of whether we should or should not put the Chinese Nationalists ashore in China; we need not get involved in technical questions of strategy and tactics in order to discharge our duty as active members of the opposition party. The issue should not be drawn on the question of whether we should keep our strategic air command together as a unit or whether we should divide it up and piecemeal it all over the world. We should not base our campaign on an argument as to whether the civil power should or should not be supreme over the military or whether Europe is more important than Asia. I was glad to hear General MacArthur say that these strategical issues "reach quite beyond the realm of partisan consideration." We must, therefore, not seek to mix up the success of the Republican Party with the security of our country.

The issue should be drawn on questions which are both less technical and much more fundamental—to wit: The judgment and the moral tone of those at the head of our Government. We as active Republicans must not seek to make foreign policy the issue. In fact, it is a pity that already the legitimate political issue arising from the scandal, corruption, and low moral tone of this administration has been somewhat beclouded by arguments on world strategy which do not belong in politics.

We can point to so much: Not only to all these blunders in the field of foreign policy and national defense, but particularly to the crisis which faces so many American families caused by the fact that the dollar you get today can't buy as much as the dollar you got a little while ago—to the oldest of political tricks which pretends that you are giving everybody a raise in pay and then, by monkeying with the value of the dollar, causes all the prices to go up much faster than the citizen's income is rising.

We can point to the timidity in Washington today in dealing with certain politically influential lobbies who want to support the prices of certain products regardless of what happens to the consumer.

We declare that a farm policy ought to try to increase the production of the food which you and I like to eat and like to get at a reasonable price, but that there has never been any bill pass Congress which made it more attractive or cheaper for a man to produce steak.

We can point to the disorderly floundering which is going on in Washington now so far as price control is concerned and to the need for intelligent and courageous leadership which can mete out justice to all elements of the American community and which can end the present atmosphere of every man for himself. Who in high office today appears to be thinking about the interests of the general public? I have written to Eric Johnston and to Price Administrator DiSalle calling attention to what is happening to the cost of living in this country, but all I have had so far is words. All the news that comes out of the Economic Stabilization Agency is political talk. There is plenty of talk that nobody is going to dare to step on the toes of certain selfish lobbies. There is a good deal of talk about who is going to have the say in appointing all the different job holders who are supposed to enforce the Economic Stabilization orders throughout the country. There are stories of disagreement between various administration politicians as to who is going to have a chance to put his friend on the payroll. I have even heard it said in Massachusetts that they are using

the Economic Stabilization Agency to construct a political machine for the 1952 election. But I have heard nothing which leads me to believe that the consumer in Massachusetts is going to get a real break insofar as food and clothing and fuel is concerned.

Then we must denounce:

The waste of the taxpayer's money by the RFC.

The low moral tone which exists in official circles, only the surface of which has been scratched by the famous mink coat incident.

The whole idea that there should be Government banking operations at all, if these consist chiefly in helping somebody who can't get along in ordinary business or of lending money to make votes for a party or an officeholder or of helping some cheap chiseler who manages to ingratiate himself with a few politicians.

We can recall what the Hoover Commission task force said about this—something which interests me because I was the author of the bill which created the Hoover Commission. That report said "direct lending is not normally a proper function of the Federal Government," and said that the best way to get rid of these scandals was to get the Government out of private enterprise.

It was this same Hoover Commission which set up the first far-reaching attempt at Government economy ever undertaken. That was done in the Eightieth Congress which, you may remember, was so much maligned—the Eightieth Congress which saw the Federal budget balanced for the first time in 17 years—and not balanced at the expense of anyone needing help.

In addition to the bungling and lack of foresight which has distinguished our foreign policy, we should point to:

The revelations of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee which proved so eloquently the urgent need for an utterly ruthless housecleaning; and the unholy alliance between politics and crime which has resulted in an intolerable condition in which law-abiding citzens who are struggling to make both ends meet must pay heavy taxes while racketeers make huge sums in illegal ways.

All of it—crime, scandal, inflation, and foreign policy—are symptoms of the same disease—the disease of incompetence in government.

Fellow Republicans, this is perhaps the most fateful moment in our history since the dreadful division in the Civil War. We must not whip ourselves into such a state of frenzy and anger at each other that we have no indignation left with which to face our Communist opponent. While resolving to remove this administration let us never forget that today, tomorrow, and next week we will be living in dangerous times. We must, therefore, hope that the administration, weak and inadequate though it is, will do at least some things right and that when they do we, as patriotic Americans, will cooperate. If ever there was a time when we needed a Nation united on its attitude toward Communist imperialism it is now.

There is nothing fundamentally the matter with America. In fact, there is nothing so bad in this country that a thoroughgoing housecleaning in Washington won't solve. We are a strong Nation. We have great industries. We have strong and resolute people. We have great military leaders of proven worth. We have inspiring institutions and ideals. We can still avoid total war. We can only be defeated if we decide to defeat ourselves. If we are united behind a competent leadership there is nothing that can stop us.

On the Republican Party next year will descend the solemn responsibility of providing the leadership behind which the American people can in the future unite for victory and peace. As active Republicans, you and I have a special responsibility to nominate worthy candidates and then to work hard to elect them in November 1952. As American citizens we have, between now and election day, the duty to work with all our fellow citizens for a strong America. Thus will we best deserve their confidence.

Factors Affecting Farm Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial written by Paul C. Johnson, and published in the Prairie Farmer of April 21, 1951, under the caption "This business of farming—Washington is worried." The editorial relates to the farm-labor shortage and other factors entering into a possible decrease in agricultural production.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS BUSINESS OF FARMING—WASHINGTON IS WORRIED

There is real alarm in Washington that Corn Belt farmers may not be able to turn out the production in 1951 that the Nation's planners had hoped for. The recent pep meeting in Des Moines is a result of this alarm.

PMA committeemen are really put on the spot by this Washington pressure. They are expected to go down the road for more production. This comes on the heels of instructions to reorganize the old USDA councils as county mobilization committees and induce draft boards to see that there is at least one able-bodied man on every family farm.

The draft is a hot potato in any community. PMA chairmen in some counties have chosen to ignore the Washington instructions and keep their hands completely off draft matters. Many draft boards are very sensitive about interference.

But when committeemen go down the road to talk more acreage and bigger plantings, they will find labor shortage is the bottleneck. The draft has already cut deep. The attraction of high city wages will cut deeper. Our productive capacity on Midwest farms has already been hurt.

Prairie Farmer has pointed this out repeatedly ever since last summer, but people who should carry responsibility in these matters have chosen to believe that nothing can happen to farm production.

Anyway, greet your committeeman with a smile. His is a tough job. Representing the Government is not always peaches and cream. Anything you can do to increase production is definitely to the good. That is, if you do not upset your soil conservation plan.

As this is written the Washington battle over price ceilings on farm products is really tough. Price stabilizers have been trying to establish ceilings below parity, but farm organizations have been equally determined to defend the parity principle. There may be a compromise that would set parity levels once a year instead of letting them creep upward with each increase in farm costs.

The seesawing back and forth on livestock price ceilings may have settled down by the time you read this. It looks now like a flat ceiling on hogs, with the ceilings on carcass beef by grades. This would prevent packers from bidding up cheap cattle, as usually happens when there is a beef shortage.

A lot of signs point to a shortage of milk in the next year or two. Many dairymen are throwing in the towel and turning to easier kinds of farming. Too much grief getting labor.

The bureaucrats' medicine for such a situation is, of course, to pay a subsidy instead of letting a scarce product seek its own price level and thereby correct its own scarcity. This patent medicine will probably be tried again to stimulate dairying.

The live-poultry market in the Chicago area has been in a stew because WLS has sought to revise price quotations in cooperation with the USDA reporting service. It has been alleged the trade is in the habit of publicly proclaiming one price and then paying poultry buyers a premium over and above that price. WLS is insisting on quoting a price which includes the premium to give a fairer idea of what the birds are bringing in Chicago.

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a special dispatch to the Hartford Times, which enjoys the largest circulation of any newspaper in Connecticut, from Mr. Joseph P. Lyford, the Hartford Times European correspondent. In this article we have a penetrating analysis of our problems here in the United States as they were seen in Rome, Italy, on April 12, 1951. Mr. Lyford has a long and remarkable background as journalist and political analyst upon which to base his observations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Joseph P. Lyford)

ROME, ITALY.—During the past week, the United States dollar skidded from 670 to 650 lire. By way of explanation, the proprietor of the money exchange on the Piazza di Spagna simply shrugged his shoulders and said "MacArthur."

His reaction is one of many indications of the tremendous interest with which politically minded Italians are following developments in the MacArthur case. A more substantial evidence of this preoccupation are Rome's dozen newspapers, which have devoted heavy type and several columns of front-page space daily to the general's recall.

This pronounced reaction to the MacArthur affair is somewhat of a departure from Italy's ordinarily brief and comparatively unexcited treatment of political events which frequently cause severe public agitation in the United States. This is partly because the Italian, by the very nature of his multi-party government, has had a greater opportunity than an American to become bored with the average political eruption.

But the removal of General MacArthur has stirred the Italian public as few United States political events have since the war. It has also brought forth some interpretations from Italians which should be illuminating to Americans who are perhaps too close to the sound and fury in Washington to comprehend fully the impact of the MacArthur dismissal on other parts of the world.

The chief reason for Italian interest in the matter is the fact that Italy is analyzing the MacArthur controversy primarily in terms of its bearing on United States policy toward Russia in Europe.

The feeling here, as expressed by Premier de Gasperi, who has strongly supported President Truman's step, and by Italian newspaper correspondents, is that a MacArthur plan for an all-out war in China would mean that Europe—and Italy in particular—would become secondary considerations in the United States world campaign to stop communism.

Thus General Eisenhower's effort to build a strong European defense could not but suffer seriously. A two-front war in Asia, it is felt, would simply amount to a positive and irrevocable declaration by the United States that it has chosen China, rather than Europe, as the place to resist Russia. Certainly MacArthur's two-front statement was a shocking revelation to those who are trying to rally the Western European nations into a mutual defense bloc.

Neither Italy nor any of the other Western European countries now looking to Eisenhower for leadership consider that Russia would follow the United States lead and commit itself to a show-down in China. Rather, the Soviet Union—if it has decided on war this year—would allow the United States to deploy itself against Red China, and then Soviet tanks would get their orders to roll into Yugoslavia, Iran, Germany, or Italy—or all, simultaneously.

This helps to explain why General MacArthur is regarded with considerable fear in Italy, although his military accomplishments are given their just due. MacArthur, who has no record of military or diplomatic dealings with Europeans since World War I, is considered as looking at the world crisis solely in terms of his own theater of operations, without regard to the effect of his policies on the fate of anti-Communist nations on this side of the iron curtain.

There is a historical background, too, for Italian distrust of the general and for the generally favorable comment which President Truman's action has received here. Italy has had considerable reason to fear the power of military men who embark on political voyages. The lessons which Sulla and Caesar taught the Romans and the more recent example of Marshal Badoglio have deeply imbedded themselves in the mind of the educated Italian.

It is no surprise, therefore, that Italian journals of all political complexions have nicknamed MacArthur the "proconsul." The sobriquet conveys a great deal to the Italian public. Subsequent developments in the MacArthur case, particularly his invitation to appear before the combined Houses of Congress, and the plans for an elaborate homecoming supplement the Italian conviction that here may be a modern Roman triumph in the making.

It is not a distrust of generals per se that has colored Italian opinion about General MacArthur. It is, rather, the fact that, in contrast to other United States military leaders, MacArthur has spoken at increasingly frequent intervals on important matters of public policy in advance of Washington's decision on such matters. Suspicion also stems from the belief that MacArthur, as Japan's supreme ruler for several years, has given many indications of an arbitrary and dictatorial temperament.

The Italian attitude toward General Eisenhower is in significant contrast. With the obvious exception of the Communists, who have attacked him continuously since January, the Italians regard Eisenhower with affection and admiration. The reasons for his popularity are the direct opposites of the reasons for the distrust of MacArthur: Eisenhower has always been identified with Europe's destiny, he has kept aloof from politics, and he has achieved results by obtaining the cooperation of his allies rather than by dictation.

These factors explain in large part why Italian public opinion is with President Truman. The domestic political tempest in the United States over MacArthur's recall does not seem to be regarded seriously here. To quote the conservative newspaper Il Momento, the affair is "simply a new opportunity for the Republican Party to attack the White House."

Actually the President has established himself more firmly here by his action. For one thing, he has singlehandedly thrown the left-wing press into confusion. The political observer for the right-wing newspaper Il Messagero writes from Switzerland that, in hailing MacArthur's removal as a "victory of the popular movement for peace," the Soviet propagandists have "for the first time been forced to give President Truman credit for at least one peaceable intention."

This same correspondent notes that the MacArthur case has given rise in Communist countries to "an insidious suspicion that the United States Government wants peace."

Whatever the troubles of the Soviet propagandists, however, General MacArthur's removal has been a source of profound relief in Italy. The question remains, however, whether or not the "proconsul" may not be an even more potent influence in the United States now that he has been freed from the military service which nominally restricted his right to make public political utterances. The answer to this question is being anxiously awaited in Italy as elsewhere in Europe.

Proposed Increase in the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two very important documents recently placed before the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on S. 677, a bill to increase the strength of the Marine Corps and to make the Commandant a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These are the statements of Hon. John Nicholas Brown, former Navy Assistant Secretary for Air, in favor of enactment of S. 677, and a letter from the former Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. A. A. Vandegrift.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN

My name is John Nicholas Brown and I come from Rhode Island. I served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air from November 1946 to March 1949. I appreciate this opportunity of offering testimony in behalf of Senate bill 677, which has two sections and, if I may, I shall make brief comments upon each.

The first section is intended to give statutory authorization for increasing the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps to include 4 divisions together with 4 supporting air wings and to place a ceiling of 400,000. At this point I could well discuss the percentages and proportions between the various armed services. Important as these mathematical computations are, I shall, if I may, confine my remarks to the underlying philosophy which I presume motivated the introduction of this legislation.

Let me state at the outset that in my opinion he United States Marine Corps must never be thought of as a second army. Not only would this be unnecessary duplication but would be completely contrary to the basic function and purpose of the Marine Corps itself. When, then, is this peculiar function which the Marine Corps is called upon to assume in the total of our national defense? I need only cite here the statements contained in the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 79th Cong.), as amended by the Eighty-first Congress in Public Law 216. Outside of the minor functions of providing security detachments for the protection of naval property and for similar service on naval vessels, the traditional and fundamental function of the Marine Corps is to organize, train, equip, and maintain "fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. * * * In addition, the Marine Corps * * * shall perform such other duties as the President shall direct." The purpose, therefore, of the Marine Corps is to provide amphibious forces and, in so doing, to represent within the whole complex of America's armed defenses that component which at all times shall have the highest degree of readiness.

Since we are an island power and since the continental land mass is in fact limited by the two major ocean areas of the globe, our first contact with an enemy presumably must be across a sea. It is this margin between sea and land that is the special province in warfare of the Marine Corps. Amphibious operations, therefore, become of peculiar importance to the United States. Indeed we have received witness to this fact in Korea. Furthermore, it is highly desirable that a corps of specialists in this all-important first phase of warfare be sufficiently large so that it can provide the maximum effectiveness.

It is unnecessary for me to explain to this committee the difficulties involved in amphibious operations. Indeed, I do not feel myself competent to discuss the technical aspects. I know, however, that in the United States Marine Corps we have the most highly integrated component because their specialty is that warfare which must be undertaken at the junction of land, sea, and air. It happens also that throughout our history this force of specialists in amphibious warfare has developed to the highest degree a special morale factor which is the pride and the glory of the United States Marine Corps. I cannot explain exactly how this has been achieved. The long line of heroic exploits, the burning faith in the importance of the Marine Corps itself, and the voluntary submission to rigorous discipline have produced a devotion to duty which through the years has lead to the display of a type of courage which makes all of us who are not marines very humble.

It is, therefore, this highly integrated force which has traditionally been the first to get under way when a police action has been called for. Of how many men should this specialized fighting force consist?

Numbers are relative. In times of peace naturally the Military Establishment is diminished. I submit, however, that the American people need the service of a relatively large Marine Corps and should not be bound by any false relationship with the numbers in other branches of the armed services when the question of placing ceilings upon their number arises. The Marine Corps today is limited to 204,029. The ceiling for fiscal 1952 will be limited to 175,516. I submit, gentlemen, that America can well use 400,000 marines without in any way creating

a second army or without transgressing the bounds set by law or by any agreement as to the function of the Marine Corps itself.

Furthermore, it so happens that in the creation of what might be looked at as a larger readiness force the taxpayer will be purchasing initial defense at its cheapest for over the years the Marine Corps has cost the taxpayer the least of any of the service branches. To put this idea in another way, let me say that the percentage of fighting marines, compared to those in units for their support, is far higher than in the Army. I say this with no intention to make invidious comparisons but rather to point out that the Navy supplies in large measure the Marine Corps' logistic support. Therefore, the taxpayer obtains the maximum fighting force for initial operations with the minimum of expense. I understand Senator DOUGLAS has placed in the RECORD of last Friday figures to substantiate this point.

I should like to comment for a moment upon the administrative aspects of the Marine Corps and the Navy Department.

During my service as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air the Marine Corps came directly under the Secretary of the Navy. As you know, it maintains a separate headquarters; its procurement is arranged for by its using mostly the Army for equipment and the Navy for medical and legal services, as well as the Navy Bureaus for other items. But my point is that, except in the person of the Secretary of the Navy himself, since the Marine Corps is within the Department of the Navy but not of it, there is no one whose day to day duty it is to supervise and also to represent the Marine Corps. It happens, therefore, that in the vast complex of the Department of Defense, the Marine Corps plays a lonely role.

Let me state quickly that this has certain advantages. The very smallness of the Marine Corps in relation to the other services has been in some measure its strength. I do not believe the increase proposed in this legislation, namely, approximately doubling the present size of the Corps—would, however, affect this point. Indeed when in World War I the Marine Corps was 486,000 men, it in no way suffered loss of its splendid fighting morale. But I do think that, offsetting the advantages the Marine Corps enjoyed in this particular, there are also disadvantages and for this reason I have come to support section II of this legislation which places the Commandant of the Marine Corps on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Certainly one of the sound principles of administration is to have committees as small as possible. A three-man board, consisting of the chief military officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, would, therefore, seem logical yet under the amendment passed by the last Congress there is now a chairman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, making a total of four. Actually in number the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not been increased over their original number due to the fact that during the war and after the President exercised his right to appoint his own Chief of Staff. You will remember of course that Admiral Leahy made a fourth member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff originally. I do not consider that adding a fifth member should disturb us from the point of view of making unwieldy this most important of our military boards.

But there are other and more compelling reasons which lead me to favor this scheme. Up to this time I have not mentioned interservice rivalries because I believe that, by and large, these so-called rivalries have received far too much attention in the public press. Actually, the differences between the armed services stem from wholly sincere convictions on controversial points. Certainly dead uniformity we do not want. Yet the balance of judgment, the ability to see the over-all picture, the wisdom which comes from knowledge of problems of the individual services are very difficult to obtain from those who are representing what they sincerely believe to be the interests of the Nation as represented by their respective services. It seems to me, therefore, that the inclusion as a member of the top level of a man whose specialty is that margin where land, sea, and air meet would greatly strengthen our military counsels. The Commandant of the Marine Corps could provide a kind of balance, since he combines in his special knowledge naval doctrine, the initial stages of land warfare doctrine, and tactical air support doctrine.

In closing, let me summarize by saying that readiness, the capacity to move anywhere immediately, and become effective, is always needed, and at the present juncture of events is especially necessary. This is the daily bread of the Marine Corps. It does not seem to me too much to insist by legislation that the United States Marine Corps be doubled in size and its Commandant given added responsibility in the highest military circles.

Let me express to you again, gentlemen, my thanks for giving me this opportunity to testify.

LETTER TO SENATOR DOUGLAS FROM GENERAL VANDEGRIFT, FORMER COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS, IN SUPPORT OF S. 677

LYNCHBURG, VA., *April 16, 1951.*

DEAR MR. DOUGLAS: It is with pleasure and interest that, in response to your request, I send you my views on your bill (S. 677). As you know, I have only been prevented from appearing personally, because of the pressure of private affairs. I am pleased, however, that you had an opportunity to hear, in person, the views of my friend and predecessor, General Holcomb.

Of the two sections of your bill, section 1 (which seeks to provide an effective present-day organization for the Marine Corps), seems almost beyond argument as to its objectives. Those who remember the six excellent Marine divisions of World War II—created from a far smaller mobilization base (17,000 enlisted in 1939) than we possessed last June—will hardly feel that the four Marine divisions and four air wings provided by this legislation will unduly tax the Marine Corps or result in watering down the quality which, after all, is our priceless ingredient.

And the ceiling of 400,000 marines which section 1 contains should effectively dispel any though or rumor that the Marine Corps seeks to constitute itself "a second land army." We have never at any time entertained such designs, and I can think of nothing more disastrous for the Corps than to attempt to exceed its natural limits. These limits, I think, we determined empirically in World War II, and I should look with apprehension on any plan even for an ultimate Marine Corps larger than six divisions.

It is on section 2, which would seat the Commandant as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that I imagine debate will center.

During my term as Commandant, I gave deep and frequent consideration to this question. During the anxious days which preceded passage of the National Security Act of 1947, it was sometimes suggested to me by friends in Congress that I should seek to have included in that act a provision which would seat me on the Joint Chiefs. I knew from General Holcomb that President Roosevelt, whose judgment in naval and military matters was unsurpassed, offered to nominate the Commandant of Marines as a JCS member; I knew also, of course, that the war President had been thwarted in his wish by the then Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It was intimated by Members of Congress that the Commandant should be seated on the Joint Chiefs by provision of the National Security Act. My relationships within the Navy Department, both with the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, and with the Chief of Naval Operations, my old friend, Admiral Nimitz, were of the highest type. I then enjoyed, as 17 Commandants had enjoyed before me, unrestricted access to the Secretary of the Navy, and the thought was unheard of that any officer within the Department could question that the Commandant was directly responsible to the Secretary of the Navy for our administration and efficiency. So it seemed to me, working closely with high officials who recognized the historic status and authority of the Commandant's office, that no extensive benefits would derive from a seat on the JCS at that time and, conversely, that additional burdens might result.

Since that decision, I have had many occasions, both in and out of office to regret it.

Under the process of unification, it has become inevitable that the powers of the individual departments have withered as those of the Defense Department have increased. Where it was once satisfactory that the Commandant enjoy direct access to the top of the Navy Department when important decisions affecting Marine Corps matters were shaped, he now finds, increasingly, that vital policy measures affecting the Marine Corps reach decision not in the Navy Department but one level higher, in the Defense Department. Most of these stem from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and it now seems clear to me that the Marine Corps cannot carry out its statutory functions under the Unification Act without representation at that level when matters of Marine Corps interest are discussed. In this connection, I find it illogical—considering how our unified defense machine has evolved—that, of all the four services entrusted with statutory functions in the National Security Act, the Marine Corps alone does not enjoy a voice to speak for those functions in the councils of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I cannot in any way agree with the view advanced before your committee that sufficient matters of Marine Corps interest do not come before that body to warrant the presence of the Commandant. One has only to look through the statutory functions of the Joint Chiefs to refute such a statement.

Thus, I find myself in complete agreement with this legislation. I endorse its organizational provisions not so much because they would aggrandize the Marine Corps, but because I believe that in these distracted times the country can use four marine divisions, just as one of our two divisions—my old division, and yours—is now being so well used in Korea.

I endorse the Joint Chiefs of Staff provision for two reasons. First, it provides insurance to the country that an effective Marine Corps can continue in existence. Second, and more important, it makes available in our highest military councils the professional skill, the cross-service experience, and the cojoint talents of the Corps of Marines.

Faithfully yours,

A. A. VANDEGRIFT,
General, United States Marine Corps (Retired).

Treatment of West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Germany Treated Like Stepchild," by Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY TREATED LIKE STEPCHILD—MOST NATIONS IN EUROPE TODAY ARE ENGAGED IN TRADE WITH RED CHINA AND ITS MOSCOW MASTERS

(By Constantine Brown)

Chancelor Konrad Adenauer is a shrewd man. He announced at Bonn last Sunday that the West German Federal Republic was willing to join all other Western European nations in a plan to stop all western trade with Communist China. He feels himself on safe grounds since there is hardly a nation in Europe today which is not engaged in a relatively remunerative trade with the far eastern aggressor and its Moscow masters.

Hong Kong and Singapore are doing a land-office business with the Chinese. West Germany is not doing badly either. Last week the German freighter *Mai Rickmers* was intercepted by Nationalist gunboats while en route to Shanghai with a cargo of vitally needed radio equipment, medical supplies, and other strategic materials. The ship's cargo had been cleared from Hamburg by the Allied High Commissioners' deputies. Consequently, insofar as the Bonn Government was concerned, the shipments were legal. But while the Nationalist destroyers and gunboats dare to interfere with a German vessel, they would run into real trouble if they challenged the rights of ships flying Allied flags.

Moscow is now wooing Western Germany. It ignores the Bonn Government which is being described as a stooge of the western capitalists. It is appealing directly to the German masses and industrialists.

Soviet-financed corporations have been organized in Western Germany. They make possible a thriving export business with the iron-curtain countries. German goods are being shipped in transit to Allied or neutral countries whence they are transshipped to the east.

The Soviet propagandists' bid for a free reunion of Eastern and Western Germany is not based on ideological arguments. They point out to the German industrialists and the millions of workers that while the industrial west will never permit a genuine revival of the Reich's industrial power, Russia needs it. The Soviet-European satellite countries cannot supply the great needs of half a billion people in China, they say. These markets can be Germany's for the asking. The industrial west, the propagandists say, is afraid of Germany's potential competition. The west, they say, seeks only Germany's manpower as cannon fodder against the U. S. S. R. They refuse even in this emergency to grant Germany full sovereignty. In one of the many pamphlets which are being distributed by the million in the west, the spokesman for the Kremlin state: "The British and the French Governments have denied the American proposal that Germany organize an army of her own. They still insist that millions of young Germans serve in small units in their own armies under the command of the conquerors."

Thus with appeals to the nationalistic feelings of the German people and at the same time declarations that the German workers can find lasting employment in industries which will have much of the Far East at their disposal, the West Germans are urged to shake the western yoke and join their free brethren in the east. The Red agitators say that Russia will then see that a new Germany is given ample opportunity to develop herself nationally and economically. It also will guarantee that Germany would be spared the destruction of a third world war.

The Bonn Government is fully aware of the trickery of this propaganda and is doing its best to offset it. But unfortunately neither London nor Paris has done anything constructive in recent months to deny by deeds the contentions of Soviet propaganda. In spite of the military arguments of General Eisenhower to equitably stabilize the situation in Western Germany, the British and the French Governments, confronted with a difficult internal situation, have maintained their previous position of treating Germany as a stepchild in the European-defense set-up.

Cheap Politics and False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter from Walter R. Mybeck, director of the Division of Public Works and Supply of Indiana. He reveals in this letter an example of the short-sighted and blind economy which we have witnessed in some of the reductions on appropriations which in the end will cost the American public far more money than the apparent saving in this year's budget.

The Appropriations Committee had already reduced the $300,000 item for surplus property utilization in the Federal Security Agency before the House, and the Committee of the Whole reduced it by $200,000, which will practically eliminate the department's program of utilizing surplus property.

This so-called economy cut was cheap politics, not economy. Indiana is only one of 48 States penalized by practically abolishing this Government department on surplus property.

STATE OF INDIANA,
DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SUPPLY,
Indianapolis, April 26, 1951.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Member, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: We have just received word that an amendment to the appropriation bill which reduces an item of $300,000 for surplus utilization in the Federal Security Agency to the amount of $100,000 has passed the House with a very close vote and that the full committee of the Senate will report the bill the first of the week for action by the Senate.

Indiana participated in this program to the benefit of tax-exempt educational institutions as well as hospitals and other local agencies. This participation has not only benefited these agencies in securing needed articles for the continuance of the schools, but has meant a great savings from the dollar-and-cents point of view. The agencies receiving these articles were able to secure much-needed equipment.

The general thought in the average citizen's mind, during a discussion of surplus property, is that the article in question is surplus from World War II. This idea is not correct as the United States Government has at all times a surplus of items either in the salvage category or in a usable condition, although obsolete for use by the armed services.

Large quantities of these items occupy valuable warehouse space that might be utilized to better advantage in providing proper storage for more current items now useable by the Armed Forces.

We have had participating in Indiana 840 elementary schools, 720 high schools, and 22 colleges. Since 1946, these various participating agencies have received property valued in excess of $5,000,000, cost to them being only the handling charges which represents according to our records the total value of the article. While we could have given you complete detail of the amount each of these institutions received, we feel that it would be too voluminous, requiring too much time for you to study.

We would like to point out that our State schools and universities, which include Indiana University, Purdue University, Indiana State Teachers College, and Ball State Teachers College, have been the recipients of these benefits. Taylor University, a tax-exempt school located at Upland, Ind., was able to equip a complete scientific laboratory. Had this program not been in effect this school, due to scarcity of funds, could not have equipped this laboratory.

Anything you may be able to do with respect to restoring this cut in appropriation, I feel sure, will be to the benefit of all our schools, colleges, and hospitals in Indiana.

Respectfully submitted.

WALTER R. MYBECK,
Director, Public Works and Supply.

Public Assistance Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have expressed my unequivocal opposition to the Truman administration's program for the socialization of our free productive American way of life. However much they may try to conceal it, there should be no doubt that the real purpose of those who advocate such programs as compulsory health insurance, such as advanced by Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing, is to convert this country into a socialized state.

It has come to light that the Federal Security Agency continues to circulate a pamphlet, first printed in 1945 and reprinted in 1949, which advocates the un-American tenet: "Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state." That statement clearly discloses the concealed purpose of the Administration. It is an objective with which we cannot compromise. It is an objective the administration disclaims publicly but which it continues to pursue.

In order that our people may know exactly what has been taking place and be constantly alert in preserving their rights, I am inserting in the RECORD certain correspondence between the American Medical Association and Federal Security Administrator Ewing. It speaks for itself. I am hopeful that the American people will not allow themselves to

be lulled into a feeling of assurance that this fight against a socialized medicine and a socialized state has been won. It has only begun. The same program will be revived in other forms and by various means. The objective remains the same.

The correspondence follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 3, 1951.*

EDITOR, JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago:

My attention has been called to the president's page in March 31 issue Journal American Medical Association. It quotes sentence from what you mistakenly call a current pamphlet, describing it as Mr. Ewing's directive. Any reputable scientific periodical verifies statements before publication. Elementary check would have revealed that pamphlet was written and issued in 1945, some 2 years before I became Federal Security Administrator. Checking would also have revealed that this pamphlet is not being currently distributed by Federal Security Agency, and has never had remotest authority as directive. Since you profess to be a scientific magazine interested in truth I suggest you retract the statement as publicly as it was made in the first place.

OSCAR R. EWING,
Federal Security Administrator,
Federal Security Agency.

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association of March 31, 1951]

THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE

A MONTHLY MESSAGE

Imitation, they say, is the sincerest form of flattery, and the medical profession can accept as a tribute to its campaign against compulsory health insurance the fact that so many members of the opposition have taken up the cry that they, too, are opposed to socialized medicine. Perhaps the gentlemen protest too much. Certainly not many persons take them seriously. Millions did not during last fall's elections, and today some of the most outspoken socializers are sitting on the sidelines. The public's magnificent response to medicine's crusade against socialistic legislation has forced those who would regiment us all under Federal bureaucracy to attempt concealment of their real purpose.

I think you will be interested, therefore, in a bit of light, cast from Oscar Ewing's Federal Security Agency, which illuminates his true aims. The following directive appears on page 7, chapter 4, of a current pamphlet issued by Mr. Ewing's "Bureau of Public Assistance," titled "Common Human Needs," and subtitled "An interpretation for the staff in public assistance agencies: Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure. Further comment, I think, hardly is necessary.

Mr. Ewing's directive, however, does emphasize the fact that our task has not been completed—that socialism remains a basic tenet of the administration program, despite grave and far-reaching implications of the international situation. Despite the fact that millions of Americans, through more than 10,000 National, State, and local organizations have publicly and officially repudiated them, bills calling for a Federal program of compulsory health insurance have been reintroduced in Congress. What is needed now is a continuing flow of resolutions from groups of all sorts and sizes, giving Congress unequivocal evidence that the people back home do not want any part of socialism. To achieve this, we are accelerating action on the local, the grass-roots level. We know, from the results of last October's advertising campaign, that the people of Main Street will respond. There is great work—and a great deal of it—to be done, and I am completely confident that the State and county societies and auxiliaries, and physicians acting individually, will do it well.

In this connection, I am deeply gratified to see how many State and county medical societies are employing professional public relations men, or setting up their own public relations departments. Already, 23 State State societies employ full-time public relations men. Many, in addition to their own staff, employ professional counsel for the larger tasks that arise periodically. The development of better public relations at the local level is one of the finest moves medicine could possibly make.

Physicians did not seek their present prominent position in the public eye. It was forced on them by the planners of the welfare state, who saw in the medical profession the first victim of their program of socialization. But like the boy who didn't intend to fall into the creek, we physicians have profited by the experience.

We have learned to swim, so to speak. We have seen demonstrated in dramatic fashion the basic assumption of our democracy—that when the people are given the facts, they decide wisely. Wherever the effort has been made to keep the public informed, the rewards in better understanding and increased cooperation have been great. Our enemies still may hate us, but our friends know us better and like us more.

In this third year of our National Education campaign we have reached a point where a little constructive, personal evangelism is called for. We all know the therapeutic value of mutual understanding and confidence between physician and patient. Just the other day a letter came to compaign headquarters from a physician in Minnesota. That letter outlined a thoughtful and thorough plan for enlightening the public as to just what it means to be a physician. It would be of immeasurable value to the medical profession if that sort of initiative and creative thinking about our relationship with our patients and our fellow citizens could become an integral part of all our lives.

ELMER L. HENDERSON, M. D.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

CHICAGO, *April 11, 1951.*

The Honorable OSCAR R. EWING,
Federal Security Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.:

We have your telegram of April 3, protesting a reference in the Journal of the American Medical Association, to a pamphlet issued by your office titled, "Common Human Needs, an Interpretation for the Staff in Public Assistance Agencies," from which I quoted the following passage, "Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in a democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

We note your denial of responsibility for the pamphlet on the grounds that it was published in 1945 before your tenure as Administrator of that office. This denial, as you request, will be duly reported in the Journal. You are correct in assuming that as a reputable scientific periodical it is the habit of this Journal to verify statements before publication. The facts concerning my reference are these.

The pamphlet in question was reprinted for distribution by your office in 1949, when the public record indicates you were in charge of the Federal Security Agency, its publication and its directives to employees. Five copies were received in the mail here last week, which indicates certain currency still. These all carry the imprint, "Government Printing Office, 1949." The fact that the report was first printed in 1945 would not seem to alter the further fact that you apparently have thought well enough of it to have it reprinted in 1949.

We would suggest that if you wish at this time to disavow the principles expressed in the pamphlet, you will wish to do so in a formal statement to Congress, for as recently as February 26, this year, it was protested on the floor of Congress as a grave misuse of taxpayers' money to disseminate wholly un-American philosophies.

In case it was without your knowledge that your office was reprinting and distributing such un-American directives during your tenure, you may wish to issue a public statement disclaiming responsibility for the material. If so, we shall certainly be glad to be helpful in giving such a statement further distribution through the Journal, for the medical profession will be sincerely interested in any such action.

ELMER L. HENDERSON, M. D.
President, American Medical Association.

CHICAGO, *April 10, 1951.*

The EDITOR, THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION:

Dr. Henderson's answer to my telegram of April 3 is merely a continuation of the misleading statements contained in the President's page of the March 31 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. Pamphlet in question was not reprinted for distribution by my office in 1949 or at any other, time. Federal Security Agency has made only one distribution which was in 1945. Since then, occasional copies have been mailed out by Agency in response to specific requests. Learned for first time from Dr. Henderson's answer that pamphlet has been reprinted by Government Printing Office for sale by Superintendent of Documents. I refuse to be held responsible for actions of Federal Security Agency taken before I became Administrator, or for actions taken by Government Printing Office, or other Government employees without my knowledge. The statement to which you refer is as objectionable to me as it can possibly be to Dr. Henderson, and his attempt to make me responsible for it is a blow below the belt for which you and he should apologize.

OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency.

APRIL 13, 1951.

The Honorable OSCAR R. EWING,
Federal Security Administrator,
Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.:

I have in hand your wire concerning my recent reference to a Federal security agency pamphlet which carries the statement: "Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state et cetera."

You say that occasional copies of the pamphlet have been mailed out by your office since your tenure there but that you refuse to be responsible for such distribution.

You state also that you refuse to be held responsible for actions of the Federal Security Agency before you became Administrator, or for actions taken by Government Printing Office or other Government employees without your knowledge.

As you know, the pamphlet carrying this viciously un-American pronouncement is being distributed currently under the imprint of your office, and carrying the printing date 1949 when you were in charge there. As you state in your wire your own office mails these pamphlets out on request.

You state however that the pronouncement concerning the socialized state is wholly objectionable to you. If this is the case, I would suggest in all kindliness that the reasonable manner in which to clarify your own position would not be in telegrams to the Journal of the AMA but first by asking the Government Printing Office to cease reprinting and distributing the material attributed to your office.

Second that since it is without your knowledge that your office is distributing the material, your staff be instructed accordingly.

Third that since your office's circulation of these socialistic principles first came to light in the United States Congress, that your responsibility for it be denied there, in order that your true position be clear not just to the medical profession but to the lawmakers of the Nation.

We do appreciate your difficult position and are gratified to be advised that such a malevolently un-American pronouncement is not subscribed to by you. This correspondence will be published in the Journal.

ELMER L. HENDERSON, M. D.,
President, American Medical Association.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 16, 1951]

PRINTED ORIGINALLY IN 1945—FSA PAMPHLET TEACHING SOCIALISM ORDERED DESTROYED

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing has ordered destroyed all copies of an FSA pamphlet assailed by the American Medical Association as malevolently and viciously un-American.

Dr. Elmer L. Henderson, president of AMA, charged in a telegram to Mr. Ewing that a passage in the pamphlet advocated state socialism. Mr. Ewing disclaimed responsibility for the pamphlet and disavowed the passage to which the AMA objected.

The 132-page pamphlet was a manual for social workers written and first circulated by the Federal Security Administration in 1945 before Mr. Ewing became administrator.

After Mr. Ewing took over, the Government Printing Office was authorized by FSA in 1949 to print another 5,000 or so. They were for sale by GPO at 25 cents each and Mr. Ewing's office occasionally sent them to persons who asked for copies.

The offensive material spotted by Members of Congress and the American Medical Association appeared in a discussion of the "rights" of adults to relief and social security assistance. It read:

"Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in a democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

Mr. Ewing telegraphed a protest to the AMA on April 3, stating that the pamphlet had been printed in 1945 and no longer was being circulated.

On April 11, Dr. Henderson replied to Mr. Ewing that he was mistaken because the AMA had received in the mails within a few days 5 copies of the pamphlet all dated as having been printed in 1949.

FSA said the author of the pamphlet was Charlotte Towle, temporarily employed by the agency when she wrote the pamphlet. Miss Towle was connected with the University of Chicago School of Social Work.

Jane M. Hoey, director, FSA bureau of public assistance, wrote the pamphlet foreword. She continues in that position under Ewing's administration of FSA.

The Indian Bureau Has No Constructive Over-All Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that every Member of this House appreciates the great responsibility we have in deciding how far to go in approving the budget proposals of the thousand and one governmental departments, bureaus, and agencies. The grand totals are staggering, and I must admit that I am greatly confused as I try to fathom requests for funds to carry on their duties. Indeed, I feel strongly that I also have a duty to the taxpayers who after all must foot the bill. The fact is that "authority and responsibility are inseparable." As the elected representatives of our people we have the authority to consider and then to pass judgment upon the budget proposals of the various departments and agencies. Likewise, we are responsible to the public from whom the taxes must come to pay the bills which make up the proposed budget.

It is very hard for me to act intelligently upon the issues before us without more information as to the real necessity for the enormous demands of the Indian Bureau, which totals some $71,000,000. I note that according to the committee's report, they have approved $65,000,000. To my way of thinking, our job is similar to that of the renowned physician who, when called upon to operate upon a patient, stated that he would first have to make a complete study of the ailments of the patient, and thus learn the basic cause of his condition. Only after such study could he decide upon the wisdom of an operation. This Congress is again called upon to approve the annual budget from the Public Treasury for this Federal agency, the Indian Bureau, and yet, we do not have sufficient facts on which we can intelligently make a logical decision. I have examined the Committee Report No. 339 just released, and also the hearings just made available, and I am confused about approving this Indian Bureau Budget. The hearings on the Bureau budget start on page 223, part 1, and end on page 300. The hearings are concluded in part 2, pages 1227 and end on page 1268. To me, it was interesting to note that the House Committee on Appropriations—on Interior and Indian Bureau—appointed special investigators to study and review "the entire subject of Indian affairs." That report is dealt with at length in the hearings, starting on page 225, part 1. Commissioner Myer was asked numerous questions regarding the wide scope of criticism directed by this special committee against the whole basic Indian Bureau management. To be more specific, the whole report constitutes a severe indictment against the Indian Bureau as such.

Yes; Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the physician or surgeon who is now called upon to perform the far-reaching "operation," if we will but examine this report and its recommendations, is pretty well equipped as to where to operate. When we go to the taxpayers and call their attention to the fact that we have fixed their taxes at a certain figure; that they, yes, every man and woman, must pay to the Government what we set out to sustain our hundreds of bureaus and agencies for the coming year—and the grand total runs into scores of billions—we find the average citizen asking us, Just why are these taxes necessary? And our answer is that the Indian Bureau wants $71,000,000 for the coming year. You and I know of the adverse criticism that has come from practically every committee of Congress and from scores of clubs and individuals who have made it their business to study and examine this Indian problem. We also have listened to some of the Indians who have come here to voice their criticism of their intimate experiences under this Bureau. And I feel that we should call upon other Indians to give us first-hand what they recommend should be done to "save the patient." Our hearings are too one-sided; for this year, I understand, we have heard directly from no Indian. I recall that last year, a delegation of upstanding Indians, from California, I believe, got a hearing and protested about giving the Indian Service any funds to keep it going in that State. Their arguments have been most convincing, because our subcommittee completely agreed with those Indians and eliminated the more than $2,000,000 asked by the Bureau, which would have liquidated it in that State. However, the Senate reinstated most of the Bureau's demands and it is now even asking us to allow the Bureau to carry on for another 3 to 5 years.

THE INDIAN BUREAU HAS NO CONSTRUCTIVE OVER-ALL PROGRAM

No modern business firm would approve the confusing and headless plan in its management such as we have had across the years under the guise of helping the Indian to qualify for citizenship responsibility. One has to but read the report of this special committee to appreciate the frightful and wasteful program of the Indian Bureau. For instance, one of our able committee members, in discussing this special report with Commissioner Myer at the hearings starting February 19, 1951, commented that there appeared to be "no real policy in mind by top-level management" and that "it indicates that apparently there is no place in the entire organization, including the people in the field, where they are able to handle, or are interested in handling, many of these problems." These are the comments of a member of our Committee on Appropriations made to Commissioner Myer after he had examined the special report. Changes have been made for many years that the Bureau spends a great share of the funds provided in carrying on duplicate agencies of the States and counties where Indians reside.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN'S RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN 1947

Numerous comments have been made in the RECORD about the testimony of the then Acting Commissioner, Mr. William Zimmerman, made under oath before a Senate committee in February 1947, about his answer to an appeal by certain Indians when they demanded immediate release from Bureau wardship. Acting Commissioner Zimmerman responded by agreeing that some 10 prominent groups of Indians should be released from such wardship control. Mr. Zimmerman had been Assistant Indian Commissioner for 15 years at the time, and surely must have known considerable about the Indian problem. Although that recommendation was clear-cut, and made some 4 years ago, I do not see any definite program coming from the present Commissioner that he agrees that those 10 groups of Indians should be removed from Bureau control at this time. No; he speaks of "gradual independence of Indians from the supervision from the Bureau of Indian Affairs." The maze of plans and of directives and studies and similar excuses coming from the office of the Commissioner further confuses the problem. I am of the firm opinion that the time is ripe to perform that operation.

THE JOHNSON-O'MALLEY ACT OF 1934—A DEFINITE PROGRAM

After many years of careful study by leading authorities and students of Indian conditions, the Congress passed the Johnson-O'Malley Act on April 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 596), under which authority the three major Indian problems could have been solved. The Indian Service has apparently failed to become enthusiastic about the law, for it has not in my opinion in the 16 years it has been a law, taken advantage of its possibilities. Its original supporters claimed that it meant the end of the Indian Bureau as such, for all the main problems of the Indian—education, welfare, and hospitalization—would be taken over by the States. The act provided that the Secretary could make contracts with the various States under which they would assume full responsibility in these specific fields of Indian services, and the Congress would appropriate whatever funds were found to be necessary. Such grants by Congress were to be made to the States, not to the Indian Bureau. If this act had been followed as intended, the present Indian problems would have been solved. For further information on this matter, I recommend the reading of an article appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Eighty-first Congress by Senator HUGH BUTLER, May 15, 1950, under extension of remarks.

THE WHEELER-HOWARD ACT OF 1934

It has been my opinion for several years that the Wheeler-Howard Act sponsored by John Collier, who became Commissioner in 1933, and somehow approved by the Congress, has undoubtedly done more to set our Indians back than has any other one act in Indian history. Today, I believe, it is universally condemned; it has not helped the Indian as it was claimed by its sponsors. It actually sets up a separate government of the area where Indians resided on their reservations and instead of Indians being assimilated into American citizenship as we all must agree is the solution of their problems, such Indians who could not remove themselves from its control, now find themselves depending on the Bureau—they actually surrendered their real liberties as citizens when they accepted the advice of the Bureau and approved the act. I commend the words of my colleague, Mrs. BOLTON, for her remarks on this matter.

INDIAN BUREAU ACCOUNTING—A "STEPCHILD"

In the field of accounting, the special investigating committee, also made a careful study, and likewise censured the lack of sound planning in this important field. Like all investigations into the activities of public officials, when one touches the finances, the manner in which public funds are spent, the most important problem is discovered. This is especially true, in my observation, regarding this Indian Bureau. On page 234 of the House subcommittee hearings on Indian Bureau budget requests, a member of the committee, commenting on the investigators' findings, stated:

They point out that the Bureau has given lip service to the principle that its activities were pointed toward the eventual withdrawal of Federal supervision over Indian activities, but that the accomplishments have been nil. They are somewhat inconsistent toward the end of the report when they get down to California, where they seem to go along with the thought that that they are trying to get out of California.

At no place do I find any constructive program showing the Commissioner is now ready to recommend the immediate removal of Bureau control over any of the groups or bands of Indians in the list recommended by Acting Commissioner Zimmerman 4 years ago. I am ready to act now, leaving the so-called land and related questions to a special committee. Let us release the Indian immediately from this nightmare of wardship, and every one of his other problems can and will be solved.

The Man They Call a Warmonger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as General MacArthur noted in his address before Congress, there are those who have attempted to brand him as a warmonger. In connection with that infamous accusation, I reread with interest an old newspaper clipping of an Associated Press report dated June 18, 1942. Under permission to extend my remarks, I insert the item in its entirety:

"I am a soldier * * * but I am prouder to be a father."—Douglas MacArthur.

NEW YORK, June 18.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur cabled the National Father's Day Committee today that while he was proud to be a soldier "I am prouder, infinitely prouder, to be a father."

Chosen by the committee as "Outstanding American Father of 1942" MacArthur replied:

"Nothing has touched me more deeply than the act of the National Father's Day Committee. By profession I am a soldier and take pride in that fact, but I am prouder, infinitely prouder, to be a father. A soldier destroys in order to build. The father only builds, never destroys. The one has the potentialities of death, the other embodies creation and life. And while the hordes of death are mighty, the battles of life are mightier still. My hope is that my son, when I am gone, will remember me not from the battle but in the home repeating with him our simple daily prayer, 'Our Father Who Art in Heaven.'"

Father of American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Saturday, April 28, 1951:

HORACE MANN

While Moscow is preparing to honor their national hero, Lenin, on May 1, American schools and colleges are making ready to celebrate the birthday of Horace Mann, father of American education, on May 4. The comparison between the beliefs and ideals of these two men is exceedingly great, for the first of the two opposed free thinking and free speech, while the other opened the door of learning for countless American boys and girls.

Born in humble circumstances at Franklin, Mass., on May 4, 1796, Horace Mann's life story reads like that of an Alger hero. How he rose above material handicaps to secure his own schooling, finally graduating from Brown University in 1819, has been an inspiration to many.

Realizing the shortcomings of the schools of his time, he sold his law books, locked his office door, and set out to improve the schools of the Commonwealth. As the first secretary of the board of education, in 1837, he began to pioneer for a more democratic form of education than had hitherto been enjoyed. Horace Mann regarded education as a preparation for life and believed that no education was complete without art, music, physical education, and hygiene, in addition to the traditional formal subjects taught at that period in American history. Believing that "common schools cannot prosper without normal schools," he established the first normal school in America for the training of those who wished to teach. Today we realize that we cannot have an adequate supply of well-trained teachers without teacher-training institutions.

Schools throughout the country are putting into operation those principles of education which Horace Mann set forth over a century ago, many of which we take for granted today. Just as Horace Mann believed "that teachers not only be better paid but also that they receive higher social considerations," so teachers today are working for professional salaries and prestige which becomes the dignity of the profession.

Those who are fortunate enough to live in Massachusetts can avail themselves of the privilege of visiting Horace Mann's birthplace at Franklin and those places which he frequented while he was actively engaged in education in this State. It is fitting that the statue of a man who established the ideals of education for an entire nation should stand at the entrance of our statehouse in Boston and to serve as a reminder that educated thinking should govern the principles and actions of those who operate the government of the Commonwealth.

May we hope that some day the teachings of Horace Mann supplant those of Marx in those parts of the world where liberal education and teaching is suppressed.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Case for the Seaway," published in the Miami News of March 26, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE FOR THE SEAWAY

Congress at this session should stop dwadling on the St. Lawrence seaway and authorize this project which has suddenly become critical to the national defense.

In the past years there was ample economic and diplomatic justification for the project. It would increase the output of power. It would make a navigation channel from the Atlantic to the Great Lake ports. It would strengthen the economic and political bonds that tie us to Canada, our peaceful, useful, and cooperative neighbor to the north. We have been letting an important resource lie fallow, and there is no excuse for that.

If one scratches the surface of the arguments that have kept Congress immobilized on the seaway since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the objections amount to this:

The seaway, if built, would create competition for the railroads. It would create competition, or the threat of Government competition, with the power companies. It would divert some sea traffic from New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and a few other Atlantic deep-water ports. It is the mobilization of private interests, interests that run counter to the national interests, that has blocked the seaway up to now.

But now the national interest in the building of the seaway is stronger than ever, for the seaway bears heavily on the needs of national survival.

Social Security Versus Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three tables entitled "Exhibits A, B, and C," making certain comparisons between tax rates and benefits under the social security and railroad retirement systems, and showing the gross discrimination existing against railroad employees as compared with their friends who are under the social-security system.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A.—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement tax payments—a comparison*

Year	Social security tax rate on $250 maximum earnings per month or $3,000 per year and total cost		Railroad retirement tax rate on $350 maximum earnings per month or $4,200 per year and total cost		Rail workers paid—		
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Times more	Dollars more	Percent more
1937	1	$30	2¼	$90	2.30	$60	230
1938	1	30	2¼	90	2.30	60	230
1939	1	30	2¾	99	2.30	69	230
1940	1	30	3	108	3.60	78	260
1941	1	30	3	108	3.60	78	260
1942	1	30	3	108	3.60	78	260
1943	1	30	3¼	117	3.90	87	290
1944	1	30	3¼	117	3.90	87	290
1945	1	30	3¼	117	3.90	87	290
1946	1	30	3½	126	4.20	96	320
1947	1	30	5¾	207	6.90	177	590
1948	1	30	5¾	207	6.90	177	590
1949	1	30	6	216	7.20	186	620
1950	1½	45	6	216	4.80	171	380
14 years [1]		435		1,944	4.47	1,509	347

PRESENT TAX RATE ON $300 MAXIMUM PER MONTH OR $3,600 PER YEAR

1951	1½	$54	6	$216	4.00	$162	300
1952	1½	54	6½	234	4.33	171	316
1953	1½	54	6½	234	4.33	171	316
1954	2	72	6½	234	3.25	162	225
1955	2	72	6½	234	3.25	162	225
1956	2	72	6½	234	3.25	162	225
1957	2	72	6½	234	3.25	162	225
1958	2	72	6½	234	3.25	162	225
1959	2	72	6½	234	3.25	162	225
1960	2½	90	6½	234	2.60	144	160
1961	2½	90	6½	234	2.60	144	160
1962	2½	90	6½	234	2.60	144	160
1963	2½	90	6½	234	2.60	144	160
1964	2½	90	6½	234	2.60	144	160
1965	3	108	6½	234	2.16	126	120
1966	3	108	6½	234	2.16	126	120
1967	3	108	6½	234	2.16	126	120
1968	3	108	6½	234	2.16	126	120
1969	3	108	6½	234	2.16	126	120
1970 (and after)	3¼	117	6½	234	1.92	105	93
20 years [2]		1,701		4,491	2.64	2,790	164
34 years [3]		2,196		6,435	3.01	4,239	201

COMPARED WITH SOCIAL SECURITY—RAIL WORKERS PAID

[1] From 1937 through 1950, 4½ times more.

[2] From 1951 through 1970, 2⅝ times more.

[3] From 1937 through 1970, 3 times more.

NOTE.—Tax rates and maximum earnings used in this exhibit were taken from subch. A (social security sec. 1,400); and subch. B (Railroad Retirement sec. 1,500); of ch. 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, from 1937 through 1950.

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT B.—*Social-security versus railroad retirement benefits—a comparison*

Year	Social security, maximum possible	Railroad retirement, maximum possible	Rail workers received—		
			Times more	Dollars more	Percent more
1937	(1)	$1,440	0	$1,440	0
1938	(1)	1,440	0	1,440	0
1939	$1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1940	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1941	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1942	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1943	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1944	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1945	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1946	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1947	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1948	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1949	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1950	[1] 1,200	1,740	1.30	440	35.0
14 years [4]	13,320	20,460	1.57	8,340	57.0
			Times less	Dollars less	Percent less
1951	1,800	1,740	0.[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1952	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1953	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1954	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1955	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1956	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1957	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1958	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1959	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1960	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1961	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1962	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1963	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1964	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1965	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
1966	1,800	1,740	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.0
16 years [5]	28,800	27,840	[illegible]	1,440	4.0
			Times more	Dollars more	Percent more
1967	1,800	2,016	1.12	216	12.0
1968	1,800	2,016	1.12	216	12.0
1969	1,800	2,016	1.12	216	12.0
1970	1,800	2,016	1.12	216	12.0
4 years [6]	7,200	8,064	1.12	864	12.0
34 years [7]	65,520	96,720	1.48	31,200	48.0

[1] No benefits until 1939.

[2] 20-percent increase, July 1, 1948—before, $720; after, $864; total, $1,204.

[3] 70½-percent increase, Sept. 1, 1949—before, $600; after, $1,020; total, $1,200.

COMPARED WITH SOCIAL SECURITY—RAIL WORKERS RECEIVED

[4] From 1937 through 1950, two-thirds more.

[5] From 1951 through 1966, 4-percent less.

[6] From 1967 through 1970, one-eighth more.

[7] From 1937 through 1970, one-sixth more.

NOTE.—Maximum benefits used in this exhibit were taken from the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act—both, as amended, from 1937 through 1950.

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, research director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT C—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly benefits—a comparison*

	Social security 1939	Social security 1951	Railroad retirement 1951
Maximum retirement benefits possible:			
For old age	$43.80	$85.10	$144.60
Wives	22.80	34.20	[2]
Husband and wife	65.40	98.75	0
Dependent child	22.80	[1] 31.35	0
Total	88.20	154.10	144.60
Maximum	65.40	105.00	144.60

[1] 75 percent of the primary insurance amount for first child, and parents.

EXHIBIT C—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly benefits—a comparison*—Continued

	Social security 1950	Social security 1951	Railroad retirement 1951
Average retirement benefits:			
For old age	$26.60	$48.20	$82.73
Wives	13.00	24.15	0
Husband and wife	39.60	72.45	0
Dependent child	13.00	24.15	0
Total	52.60	96.60	82.73
Maximum survivor benefits possible:			
Aged widows	34.20	51.38	40.97
Widows with children	34.20	51.38	40.97
Children	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32
Total	57.00	102.76	68.29
Maximum	85.00	150.00	109.28
Parents	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32
Average survivor benefits:			
Aged widows	20.62	36.58	28.63
Widows with children	30.83	34.59	27.63
Children	13.03	27.82	17.05
Parents	13.64	36.71	16.68
Maximum lump-sum death benefit	273.60	205.80	437.04
Credit for military service performed (World War II)	None	160.00	160.00
Disability insurance benefits	None	None	(2)
Amount a beneficiary may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits	14.99	30.00	35.00
Old-age retirement benefits to a husband	None	(3)	None
Survivor benefits:			
To a widower	None	(3)	None
To the widow, and every former wife divorced, of the individual	None	(3)	None
Retirement wage credits after age 65	(4)	(4)	None
Maximum monthly retirement annuity awarded at age 65:			
After 5 years of coverage	42.00	65.50	24.00
After 1½ years of coverage	40.50	(5)	7.20

[1] 75 percent of the primary insurance amount for first child, and parents.
[2] Occupational and total disability.
[3] Effective Sept. 1, 1950.
[4] Wages count toward benefits regardless of the worker's age.
[5] $80 (after Jan. 1, 1951 and not before June 30, 1952).

NOTE.—Benefits used in this exhibit were taken from the Social Security Bulletin (December 1950 and February 1951), and the Railroad Retirement Board Monthly Review (March 1951).

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

Social Security Versus Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four tables entitled "Exhibits D, E, F, and G," giving additional comparisons between the social security and railroad systems, indicating that railroad employees do not receive as much for the money they pay in taxes, as do those working in jobs covered by the social security system.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

Dependents' benefits are more important than retirement benefits. So long as a man is still alive, he may be able to continue working and support his family, or if he has been successful he may have been able to accumulate something to help him out when he retires. Dependents' benefits are primarily intended to take care of cases where the breadwinner dies relatively young and there must be some provision to take care of his wife and children.

Social security versus railroad retirement monthly survivor benefits—a comparison

	Social security		Railroad retirement, 1951
	1950	1951	
MAXIMUM SURVIVOR BENEFITS POSSIBLE			
Aged widows	$34.20	$51.38	$40.97
Widow with children	34.20	51.38	40.97
Children	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32
Widow and 1 child	57.00	102.76	68.29
Widow	34.20	51.38	40.97
And 2 children	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32
	22.80	34.25	27.32
Total	79.80	137.01	95.61
Widow and 3 or more children or 4 or more children	21.25	37.50	27.32
	21.25	37.50	27.32
	21.25	37.50	27.32
	21.25	37.50	27.32
Total (prorated equally)	85.00	150.00	109.28
Maximum	85.00	150.00	109.28
Parents	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32

[1] 75 percent of the primary insurance amount for first child, and parents.

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT E. FOUR TIMES 1½ PERCENT EQUALS 6 PERCENT

One rail worker pays 6-percent railroad-retirement tax. One industrial worker pays 1½-percent social-security tax. Therefore, one rail worker pays as much tax as the combined tax of four industrial workers.

Social security provides four industrial workers and their families with retirement and survivor benefits as compared to railroad-retirement benefits received by one rail worker, for whom there are no family benefits until after his death.

Social-security versus railroad-retirement tax rates and monthly benefits, by fiscal year, 1950–52

	Social Security		Railroad Retirement
	1950	1951–52	1950–52
Tax rate (percent)	[1] 1½	[2] 1½	[1] 6
Cost per month	$3.75	$4.50	$18.00
Cost per year	45.00	54.00	216.00

[1] On $250 maximum earnings per month.
[2] On $300 maximum earnings per month.

Social-security versus railroad-retirement tax rates and monthly benefits, by fiscal year, 1950–52—Continued

	Social Security			Railroad Retirement
	January to August, 1950	September 1950 to June 1952	July 1952 and after	1950–52
Maximum retirement benefits possible to 1 worker and his family:				
Old age	$45.60	$68.50	$80.00	
Wife	22.80	34.25	40.00	
Husband and wife	68.40	102.75	120.00	
Dependent children	[1] 16.60	[2] 47.25	[2] 30.00	
Total	85.00	150.00	150.00	$144.00
Maximum retirement benefits possible to 4 workers and their families	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
Total	340.00	600.00	600.00	
Maximum survivor benefits possible: Widow and 3 or more children	85.00	150.00	150.00	
Or 4 or more children of 1 deceased worker				
Maximum survivor benefits possible to 4 families of 4 deceased workers [4]	85.00	150.00	150.00	[3] 109.28
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
Total	340.00	600.00	600.00	

[1] Prorated equally.
[2] 4 widows and 12 or more children, or 16 or more children.
[3] 1951 ($108.32 in 1950; $110.24 in 1952).

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT F

Under the Social Security Act, recently revised, the average monthly earnings of a qualified individual is all that is necessary to quickly determine the amount of retirement and survivor benefits.

Under the Railroad Retirement Act, the formulas used appear complicated and difficult to remember. The average rail employee seldom knows the amount of his retirement annuity until after receiving his first check. Similarly, his wife and/or children, have little or no knowledge of the amount of survivor annuities due them, until after his death.

Basically, the social security simplified formula (determined by taking 50 percent of the first $100 of total earnings, and 15 percent of the balance, up to $300 per month) could be adopted and applied to figuring benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Because the average rail employee today has a vague knowledge of benefits due him and/or his family, the social security simplified formula could appear on the reverse side of employee's stub (Form BA6) annually received by each rail employee, showing total months of service and wages from 1937 to date. This could keep him constantly informed as to benefits he and/or his family may receive.

Social-security versus railroad-retirement annuity formulas—A comparison based on $200 average monthly earnings, after 20 years of service

	Social security, 1951		Railroad retirement, 1951	
	Retirement annuity formula			
Credit for service prior to 1937	(1)		(2)	
			2.4 percent of the first $50	$1.20
			1.6 percent of the next $100	1.60
			1.2 percent of the balance ($50)	.60
	50 percent of the first $100	$50.00	Total	3.40
	15 percent of the balance ($400)	15.00	Years of service	×20
Old age	Primary benefit	65.00	Annuity	72.00
Wife or husband	1/2	32.50	None.	
Dependent child	1/2	32.50	None.	
Total		130.00		
	Survivor annuity formula			
			40 percent of the first $75	$30.00
			10 percent of the balance ($125)	12.50
			Total	42.50
			Add 1 percent for each year after 1936 in which employee was paid at least $200, 15×42½ cents	6.375
			Basic amount	48.88
Widow	3/4	$48.75	3/4	36.66
Widower	3/4	48.75	0	0
Parent	3/4	48.75	1/2	24.44
First child	3/4	48.75	1/2	24.44
Other children	1/2	32.50	1/2	24.44

[1] None. Average monthly wages are counted from 1937 to time employee reaches age 65.
[2] In addition to average monthly wages from 1937 to time employee reaches age 65, service before 1937 may also be counted. Average monthly wages for the years 1934 through 1936 are used for each month of service before 1937. Total years of service cannot be more than 30 until after Jan. 1, 1957, when prior service credit will be discontinued.

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT G. DO RAILROAD DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS JUSTIFY A COST OF FOUR TIMES MORE THAN SOCIAL SECURITY?

The total cost of railroad retirement (including disability insurance), 200 percent more; (without including disability insurance), 300 percent more than the total cost of all benefits provided under the Social Security Act.[1]

Social-security versus railroad-retirement benefit distribution and cost analysis per $100 of earnings—a comparison

Railroad retirement, 1951	Benefit distribution [1]	Cost	
		Percent	Per $100 of earnings
Pensions and retirement annuities	$0.49	(x6)	$2.94
Disability annuities	.25	(x6)	1.50
Survivor annuities	.25	(x6)	1.50
Administration	.01	(x6)	.06
Total	1.00	6	6.00
Social security 1951		1½	1.50
Dollars more paid by rail employees			4.50

[1] Source: P. 6, file FRM-1-1, Feb. 17, 1947, mimeo bulletin issued by Office of the Director of Research, Railroad Retirement Board.

NOTE.—Of each $6 paid by rail employees, $1.50 (total cost of all social-security benefits) is allocated to disability annuities. By comparison to social security, rail employees pay 3 times (200 percent) more taxes for pensions, retirement, and survivor annuities, and 4 times (300 percent) more taxes when disability annuities are included.

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

[1] No disability insurance benefits provided under social security.

Confidence in the Chiefs of Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article written by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. The article discusses the danger of the publication of secret papers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

In view of what appears to be coming in the great inquiry which begins on Thursday we must ask ourselves what is going to happen to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They face the fact that there is now to be published an only somewhat expurgated version of their most secret papers. When they wrote or approved these papers they believed that these papers would not be published—that they would be confidential for themselves, their lawful superiors, and the commanders in the field to whom they issued instructions.

There is no need to guess now about what the publication of these papers is going to prove about the best way to conduct the Korean war. But one does not have to be a prophet to see what the precedent now being set is going to do to the conduct of the United States Government.

We, that is to say the administration and the opposition and everyone else so far as I can see except a few stray dissenters, have accepted the theory that an officer, who disagrees with his orders, may by challenging the integrity of his lawful superiors compel them to open up all their files to the inspection of Congress. According to this theory the congressional investigators are the judges of what shall or shall not be published. What they decide to publish is to be treated as the evidence in a popular debate which is to pass upon the integrity and the competence of the men responsible for the defense of the Nation.

This is the theory which we are about to make into a precedent. It is being done, some say, in the name of the sacred right of the people to know all the facts. They are, I believe, profoundly mistaken. If this theory goes unchallenged, if what is about to be done is accepted as a precedent, as one of the legitimate usages of our constitutional system, the effect will not be to give the people access to the truth. The effect will be to conceal, to disguise, to falsify the truth that is given to the President, and to the Congress, and to the people.

Once the precedent is set, it will mean that no paper in the files of the Government can be considered truly confidential. Today, the arbiter of what is and of what is not confidential happens to be Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL of Georgia, an able and judicious man. But if Senator RUSSELL can browse around in the papers of the Chiefs of Staff and be the arbiter as to whether they have a right to say that this paper is too secret to be published, then his successors will also be the arbiters.

Senator RUSSELL is a Democrat who will not wish to injure fatally a Democratic administration. But his successor might be one who did wish to do just that, and he might insist, therefore, upon publishing the very documents which Senator RUSSELL has not published. Thus all the Chiefs of Staff, and I might add all other responsible officials, are on notice from here on out that some time or other any document they sign may be published in whole or in part, in its context or out of its context.

What will this do to the Chiefs of Staff? Approximately what it would do to a boy writing to his girl, to a husband writing to his wife, to a business man writing to his partner, or to Senator TAFT writing to Senator WHERRY, if they felt sure that their letters were going to be published—most probably at the moment when they would cause the maximum embarrassment. Letters written with a knowledge that they may be published will be the kind of letters that are written for publication. They will be phonies in that they will say what will look as well as possible in print. The effect will be to make the formal papers of the Government a false front which does not reveal, which in fact is designed to conceal, the truth. This is already the character of some of the paper work in the Government; it is written with an eye to the headlines which will be used when and if it is published, and what the official really thinks has to be ascertained by calling him on the telephone or asking him to lunch. But this kind of disintegration has not presumably become characteristic as yet of the papers that deal with the issues of life and death, with the military security and the high policy of the United States.

But if this evil precedent is set, that is just what will happen to these papers. They will be written for publication and they will

be addressed not to the vital interests of the United States in the long run but to the passions and the prejudices and the ignorance of the moment. The papers will not be worth reading if they are written for publication. In fact they will be worse than useless in that they will not be honest.

Those who think that the right of the people to know can be met by destroying the rules of confidence and publishing anything and everything should ask themselves why they think it right, why they believe it to be part of the very substance of liberty, that some relations shall be privileged and not opened to publicity; the relations of husband and wife, of lawyer and client, of doctor and patient, of priest and his charges. Why do we protect these relationships? Is it not in order to protect our liberties? In Government the relationship between the civil power and the military, between the President and his lawful military advisers, the Joint Chiefs, is as sensitive and as critical as any of the private relations that we protect. On the integrity of the relation between the President and his advisers may depend the life of the Nation. That relation must be destroyed, it will be destroyed, if the privilege of confidence is taken away.

Proposed Investigation of State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American Legion Executive Committee of the Department of Indiana, together with the opening remarks of Department Commander Jack McIntyre at the emergency meeting on April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The American Legion executive committee of the Department of Indiana in a special meeting on Thursday, April 12, after hearing a full report of Don Wilson, Clarksburg, W. Va., chairman of the foreign relations committee of the national organization of the American Legion, adopted the following recommendations as a matter of policy of the Department of Indiana:

1. Insist that an impartial committee of the Senate or House conduct a careful and impassionate investigation of the State Department and that Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, be immediately replaced, so as to give the American people a feeling of confidence in their Government's foreign policy.

2. That a demand be made upon Congress to enact laws that this Nation will make no export or loan to any other nation who sells war materials directly or indirectly to any nation who directly or indirectly is engaged in combat against American troops, or who threatens violence by word or deed in its dealings.

3. To request of the Congress, action to prevent our State Department and/or the President from giving Formosa to the Red Chinese.

4. To request of Congress that it make appropriations of moneys for Nationalist China, so that they can continue to build a strong military force and to discourage Soviet and Red Chinese aggression, and provide by such action safeguards of administration that will insure that this money will be spent wisely and economically.

5. To request that Congress enact a law providing penalties, by fine or imprisonment, for any officer in Government charged with carrying out Congress' will, who intentionally failed to do so, and urge strict enforcement of present statutes.

6. To request of our Congress that Gen. Douglas MacArthur be invited to make a public report to the joint sessions of the Congress of the United States for the benefit of those bodies and all American citizens. The Department of Indiana deplores the fact that partisan politics has been injected in the issuance of the present invitation.

7. To request of Congress that they instruct the United States delegation to the United Nations to emphatically oppose the admission of Red China to the United Nations, and to use the veto power, if necessary, to prevent such admission. That the people of this country request of the United Nations that it immediately take steps to become a United Nations in actuality and stop the Communist aggression fast spreading over the free countries of the world.

8. To request of Congress that it refuse to appropriate any money to carry out any treaty obligation, the terms of which have not been approved by the Senate as provided by the Constitution of the United States.

9. To enact a program of universal military training and insist that Congress desist from the political bickering which to this date had delayed and impeded its passage.

In addition to the above recommendations, the committee endorsed the following statement of National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., in which he urged the following:

1. Use of the Chinese Nationalist troops to fight the invading Communists.

2. Bombing of Red jump-off bases in Manchuria.

3. Blockading of Chinese ports to cut off flow of supplies.

"These measures are necessary to save American lives. They are military decisions, not political. * * * Unless General Ridgway is permitted to do the things MacArthur was forbidden to do, there can be no genuine United Nations victory in Korea."

OPENING REMARKS OF INDIANA DEPARTMENT COMMANDER JACK MCINTYRE AT THE EMERGENCY MEETING OF THE DEPARTMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WHICH WAS HELD THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1951, AT DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS

Members of the executive committee, first I would like to state the purpose of this meeting. It has been called for the reason that a policy of the Department of Indiana must be formulated in regard to the present crisis. I regret the use of the term "MacArthur Crisis" in the news releases. This meeting shall be for the purpose only of establishing our policy for the guidance of the department and the various posts of the department.

The American Legion must never be labeled as a group used for political purposes. I remind you that our constitution specifically states that the American Legion shall be absolutely nonpolitical, and shall not be for the dissemination of partisan principles. I trust that you will govern yourselves accordingly in any discussion which may follow. The demand for a statement of policy of this department comes from the people of the State, from the rank and file members of our organization, and from the various posts of the department. The American Legion has long been looked to as one of the leading organizations of this country. The people of this State desire to know our policy. Under trying days that we are now facing, we should definitely state our attitude. The unity of this country must be one of the chief purposes of our organization.

Our organization has long advocated strong national defense. Such a defense must be supplemented by a proper and understanding foreign policy. It is our duty as a part of the national organization to express our feelings and our recommendations to the national organization for consideration.

In the past few days, too many people have made hasty statements without due consideration of the problems involved. There is a great need for a constructive and an understanding expression of the problems facing the United States today.

We are fortunate in having with us tonight Donald Wilson, chairman of the National Foreign Relations Committee of the American Legion, to review and explain many of the problems facing us as a country, and to review action taken in the past by the American Legion regarding foreign policy.

The question of the right of the President to discharge General MacArthur is entirely without the province of our department. That question need not arise at this meeting. I would class it as being of a political nature and would feel justified in ruling such discussion out of order.

Our purpose here tonight must of necessity be to develop a clear understandable statement of policy and recommendations to the people of the State of Indiana and to all others concerned. The demand for our answer has been great, and it being a matter of policy, I felt justified in calling this special meeting.

You are the representatives of the Legion in your area, and I know that you speak for the Legionnaires you so represent. May the discussions and the decisions reached from such discussion be solely for God and country.

The Soldier and the Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Soldier and the Statesman"; I also ask to have printed in connection with this editorial another under the subhead "The great debate," both being published in the April 28 issue of America. The second editorial discusses the controversy over the removal of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOLDIER AND THE STATESMAN

All professions have their dangers, all general truths have their fallacies, all spheres of action have their limits, and are liable to improper extension or alteration. Every professional man has rightly a zeal for his profession, and he would not do his duty towards it without that zeal. And that zeal soon becomes exclusive, or rather necessarily involves a sort of exclusiveness. A zealous professional man soon comes to think that his profession is all in all, and that the world would not go on without it.

We have heard, for instance, a great deal lately in regard to the war in India, of political views suggesting one plan of campaign, and military views suggesting another. How hard it must be for the military man to forego his own strategical dispositions, not on the ground that they are not the best—not that they are not acknowledged by

those who nevertheless put them aside to be the best for the object of military success—but because military success is not the highest of objects, and the end of ends—because it is not the sovereign science, but must ever be subordinate to political considerations or maxims of government, which is a higher science with higher objects—and that therefore his sure success on the field must be relinquished because the interests of the council and the cabinet require the sacrifice, that the war must yield to the statesman's craft, the commander in chief to the governor general.

Yet what the soldier feels is natural, and what the statesman does is just. This collision, this desire on the part of every profession to be supreme—this necessary, though reluctant, subordination of the one to the other—is a process ever going on, ever acted out before our eyes. The civilian is in rivalry with the soldier, the soldier with the civilian. The diplomatist, the lawyer, the political economist, the merchant, each wishes to usurp the powers of the state, and to mold society upon the principles of his own pursuit. (From an address to the students of medicine of the Catholic University of Ireland by John Henry Newman, rector of the university, November 1858.)

THE GREAT DEBATE

If anything were needed to prove beyond all question that the discussion of public issues has reached a low ebb in the United States, it is the furor over the removal of General MacArthur. Emotion, half-truths, unsubstantiated reports, and extremely fragmentary information have been fused in the fire of smoldering recentments and frustrations into a strange alloy that passes for public opinion.

In the first place, it is hard to see how the President of the United States can allow a military commander in one theater to preempt executive control over our foreign policy. As Cardinal Newman wrote nearly a century ago, military policy must remain subservient to political control. Political control must remain in the hands of civilians elected through established procedures of popular control of our Government. The President of the United States, in conjunction with Congress, is responsible to the people of this country for our foreign policy. When a military commander, no matter how skillful or successful, attempts to usurp the authority of the President and of Congress, the only possible course for the President is to remove him. Otherwise we would have anarchy.

General MacArthur, after all, is not the only military figure who might exploit his popularity to try to wrest from the President control of our foreign policy in its military aspects. General Eisenhower, for one, has just as much right to try to assume the driver's seat. On hearing of MacArthur's removal, Ike said that a man accepts certain inhibitions when he dons a uniform. General MacArthur apparently found it impossible to accept such inhibitions. In that case he should have resigned instead of precipitating the present confusion. After resigning he could have had his say.

All informed observers readily admit that the President certainly acted within his constitutional authority in removing General MacArthur, and acted with good reason. They add, however, that the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of MacArthur's policy, as contrasted with the one we have adopted, is still debatable. This is true. But the reasons for sticking to our present policy, instead of making substantial changes in it, have not been sufficiently set forth.

Foreign policy demands continuity. No policy will work if we spend several years laying its groundwork, spend billions and billions of dollars to put it, so to speak, within scoring distance, and then drop it for a new policy—a new policy for which no similar groundwork has been laid and for which, quite possibly, no similar groundwork could be laid.

We have a foreign policy, one which was summarized in these pages ("United States foreign policy: 1945–50," America, January 27, 1951). This policy was set by our elected officials. It embraces the United Nations, the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact. The United Nations is important chiefly because the Charter enunciates principles accepted by almost the whole world (at least verbally) and accepted in reality by the vast preponderance of the peoples of the world. A United States foreign policy based on the Charter has the maximum support from other nations which any United States foreign policy can have.

The Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact are, generally speaking, United States-sponsored policies originated to make up for the inespacity of the UN to achieve international security. They were all adopted and implemented over a period of 4 years, after our political, economic, and military authorities had decided that our national security depended on keeping the nations of Western Europe free and strong.

This we have done. Militarily, Europe is only beginning to produce the divisions needed to ward off a Russian attack. But the economic and political strength necessary for a military build-up has been achieved. It has been achieved in accordance with a well-thought-out plan and at heavy expense to the United States.

Let's stop a moment to consider what we have in Europe. First of all, some 200,000,000 people—people whose traditions of political freedom and culture are similar to our own. Secondly, an industrial capacity so great that if we can keep it on our side we can outmatch Russia's capacity to produce the armaments essential to military victory. Thirdly, an enormous military potential, now being activated, plus air bases from which we can strike to stem a Soviet attack.

Contrast this situation with Asia. For one reason or another, we have built up next to nothing out there. It is extremely doubtful whether we could ever have built up much. Despite its teeming populations, Asia lacks effective political organization. It lacks industrial development. Its primitive and sprawling economics and political societies—with the exception, perhaps, of Japan—defy any attempt on our part to make reliable allies of its peoples. No nation in the Orient today can be built into a formidable military power within the next few years. From no terrain in Asia can we knock out Russia, if it comes to that. We could knock out the cities of Red China, but this would not destroy Red China. It would leave a mass of rural Chinese able to carry on guerrilla warfare endlessly.

Our present military armament is limited. We cannot pour much more of it into the Far East without weakening our ability to operate effectively in Europe. If we conquered the cities of Red China, where would that leave us? Russia would still be intact. It could probably move into Western Europe with ease. We would have lost allies who can play an extremely important part in the eventual defeat of Russia, and we would have gained practically nothing of value in the Far East. We are already punishing the Red Chinese in Korea so severely that they are shooting their seriously wounded. All available buildings are being requisitioned in the cities of China to care for the thousands of other casualties. The chances of our causing dissension and perhaps revolution on the mainland are improving daily.

We have nothing to fear from Red China. Soviet Russia is the foe we have to fear. Russia would probably like nothing better than to see us divert our at present limited power into an all-out war with China. It may be true that we could bomb Manchurian bases without getting into an all-out war with either Red China or Soviet Russia, but the odds are against it. The time may come when we shall have to take the chance. But the longer this decision can be postponed, the better.

We have nothing to lose by building up our military power and that of our allies so that we can use it where we, and not our enemies, think it ought to be expended. The impatience of a commander to be allowed to destroy the enemy facing him in the field is understandable. But the over-all decisions have to be made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Hearst and other Hon-baiting press can scream as loudly as they want. If we are careful not to alienate our European allies, the reason is that our military leaders, as well as our political leaders, are convinced that a quick victory in Korea can come too high.

Robert's Rules of Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, some 75 years ago Maj. Henry Martyn Robert, of the United States Corps of Engineers, published a book which has been of the utmost significance ever since in the public and civic life and activities of our country. His work, Robert's Rules of Order, has been the stand-by of legislators and citizens alike during three-quarters of a century, in their efforts to conduct public and civic gatherings in accordance with orderly procedures.

At the time this splendid publication was first issued, the author presented 1,000 copies to leaders in various activities of national life. Now, in connection with the issuance of the seventy-fifth anniversary edition of the Rules of Order, and in recognition of the fact that all of Major—later General—Robert's children have at one time or another lived in Maryland, it has been my very good fortune to receive a copy of this new edition, with the compliments of Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Jr., daughter-in-law of the author, and a woman of outstanding attainments.

Appropriately termed, in a New York Herald Tribune editorial of recent date as "Democracy's Best Seller," the publication has been purchased by citizens and organizations to a total of 1,500,000 copies since its publication in 1876.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Herald Tribune be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY'S BEST SELLER

A New England town meeting has often been called the best exemplification of democracy in action. And town meetings or other deliberative assemblies where the will of the majority rules and the right of a minority to be heard is respected owe their

orderly procedures to a book which Maj. Henry Martyn Robert, of the United States Corps of Engineers, began to think about in 1863, worked over 14 years and finally published on February 19, 1876. The Library of Congress has recently held an exhibit celebrating the seventy-fifth anniversary of what might be called democracy's best seller. For Robert's Rules of Order has sold 1,500,000 copies since its publication date.

Brigadier General Robert died in 1925. His interest in the purpose and accomplishment of his book was fond and lifelong. He saw it become a classic of parliamentary procedure. In accepting last April from his widow manuscripts and other papers showing the growth of the "rules," Librarian of Congress Evans spoke of the way in which the work of General Robert had helped "democracy express itself in terms of decision, action, and result." It was accurate appraisal and just praise. Wherever men gather in large or small numbers to practice their faith in the right of free men to discuss in large or small degree community decision and action, they owe their rules of harmonious debate to the pages of Henry Martyn Robert's genuinely monumental manual. The copyright on Robert's Rules of Order runs until 1971. But the claim to fame of a young Army engineer will last much longer in the democracy whose orderly expression and just bounds he did so much to establish.

Foreign Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, of the American Legion, of Marion, Ind., regarding the Asiatic policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion pledges this organization to foster and perpetuate 100-percent Americanism, and through its national department and district leaders, schools, contests, and distribution of educational literature, and the zeal of its members the American Legion has been waging a constant fight against communism; and

Whereas in the course of events, there has been a trend in the foreign policy of the United States Government toward appeasement and recognition of world Communist elements as evidenced by recent congressional investigations, the United States Government's foreign policy toward China, and the refusal of our Government to allow blockading of Communist Chinese ports or the bombing of Communist Manchurian bases in the war in Korea; and

Whereas these aforesaid events exemplify a foreign policy pursued by the United States Government in direct opposition to the spirit of the preamble of the constitution of the American Legion by appeasing and recognizing Communist elements whose admitted purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States by force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, of the American Legion, Department of Indiana, declare that the spirit and creed of the American Legion can best be promoted by demanding that the foreign policy of the United States embody the following directives:

1. That the United States Government not recognize the communistic Chinese Government.

2. That the United States Delegates to the United Nations work against and vote against admission of Communist China to the United Nations, and in the event it shall become necessary that the Delegates of the United States to the United Nations exercise the veto power of the United States for the purpose of preventing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

3. That the island of Formosa never be turned over to Communist China.

4. That the Manchurian bases of Communist China be bombed by the United Nations forces fighting in Korea if deemed necessary by the Far Eastern Command.

5. That Nationalist China manpower be utilized in the war against the Communists.

6. That Communist China not be permitted to take part in the Japanese peace treaty.

7. That the United Nations forces in the Far East be permitted to blockade the Chinese Communist ports; be it further

Resolved, That Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, American Legion, Department of Indiana, demand the resignation of the present Secretary of State of the United States Government and his aides and counselors responsible for the present United States foreign policy; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting of Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, American Legion, Department of Indiana, and that copies thereof be forwarded to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, Representative JOHN V. BEAMER, National, Department, and District Headquarters of the American Legion, and to the members of the press.

Approved and adopted by special meeting of Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, American Legion, Department of Indiana at Marion, Ind., this 13th day of April 1951.

WILLIAM IRELAND,
Post Commander.

Attest:

RAYMOND HEVNER,
Post Adjutant.

General MacArthur Underestimates Fanatical Faith of Chinese Communists, Says Marquis Childs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post of Friday, April 27, 1951. The article entitled "The Error of Easy War," follows:

THE ERROR OF EASY WAR

(By Marquis Childs)

EXAMPLES IN HISTORY

Confronted with the dynamic of communism since 1917, the West has reacted with a series of errors that add up to something close to disaster. Those errors seems to me to have grown primarily out of repeated underestimation of the force of communism as an ideology, as a godless religion, as a system of capturing the hopes and imagination of millions.

In the long tragedy of errors two stand out with glaring conspicuousness. And what is more they suggest that a third blunder arising from this same underestimation will be made if some powerful people have their way.

The first error lay in the effort of the British with a little help from the other allies, to put down the Bolshevik revolution after the end of World War I. Intelligence reports indicated widespread disaffection in Russia directed at the little band of conspirators who were beginning to apply the techniques of a new tyranny.

These reports, which were substantially correct, led the British to believe that by backing certain Cossack generals and sending in an expeditionary force the revolution could be put down and the threat to the stability of all Europe brought to an end. But the means used for this objective were pathetically small. The expedition sent to Archangel was a mere handful of men and the Cossack generals were so discredited that they rallied little or no support behind them.

If the western allies had been prepared to send in a force of several hundred thousand trained and experienced men, the response of the Russian people might have been different and the shaky Bolshevik regime overthrown. In the war-weary west a force of that size and cost was out of the question. So the net result of the feeble and futile intervention was to leave a heritage of resentment and suspicion among the Bolsheviks and disillusion among those who had hoped to see the regime toppled over.

The second fundamental error was also, in my opinion, due to underestimating the force of communism as an ideology fanatically bent on world conquest. The mistakes of Yalta and Potsdam at the end of World War II derived from Roosevelt's belief that Soviet Russia would be willing to live side by side with the western powers in a peaceful world. It was in the hope of gaining Soviet confidence and cooperation that concessions were offered the Russians both in Europe and in Asia.

Roosevelt sincerely believed that he would win them around and only at the very end of his life was he at least partly brought to a sense of the realities by certain insulting messages from Stalin. The only small gain in this was that the rest of the world could not help but be convinced that America had done everything possible to get peaceful cooperation with the Soviet Union and that therefore the blame must be on the Russian side.

In his speech to Congress, General MacArthur included a review of developments in China in the past 50 years in which, incidentally, he made no mention at all of Sun Yat-sen, who was the principal leader of the revolution against the feudal regime of the Manchus. Then he said:

"There is little of the ideological concept either one way or another in the Chinese make-up. The standard of living is so low and the capital accumulation has been so thoroughly dissipated by war that the masses are desperate and eager to follow any leadership which seems to promise the alleviation of woeful stringencies."

This once again, it seems to me, underestimates the fanatical faith of the Communists in China who are seeking to weld an iron grip on the Chinese masses. Consequently, it encourages a serious underestimation of the task to be accomplished if communism is to be overthrown in China.

The long-term national interests of this country and of Asia may well coincide with such a goal regardless of its cost. But it

cannot be won on the cheap and easy. It would call for military preparation far in advance of anything now planned and would in turn mean a resolution and determination on the part of the American people which would persuade us to accept continuing sacrifices and restrictions.

To try to do it on the cheap and easy could be expected to produce the results that came out of the feeble, half-hearted efforts to suppress the Bolshevik revolution in 1919 and 1920. America's friends in China, and they are undoubtedly numbered in the millions, would be made disillusioned and resentful. The Communist regime in Peiping would be strengthened.

It is revealing that many of the Republicans who have flocked around MacArthur's banner are those who have sought to curtail the draft, to put a ceiling on military manpower, to impede plans for the defense of Europe, and to cut military appropriations. They are seizing on what they think is a cheap and easy way to bring the war to an end with a sudden and miraculous victory.

General MacArthur has held out no such promise. Since he has advocated strength everywhere, it must be deeply disturbing that his words should give aid and comfort to men who seem to want to scuttle America's position in the world.

Decoration of Paul W. Ward by President Auriol, of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in connection with the recent visit to Washington of President Vincent Auriol, of France, a distinguished honor was conferred upon Paul W. Ward, a member of the Baltimore Sun Washington bureau, who has specialized for a number of years in international affairs.

By authority of President Auriol, Mr. Ward was designated as a Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor, the citation listing it as a token of appreciation for an outstanding service to the cause of freedom and peace in the journalistic field.

Other newspapermen well known to Members of the Senate and to the people of this area generally who were accorded a like honor by President Auriol were James B. Reston, of the New York Times, and Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr., of the Washington Post.

The people of Maryland were particularly pleased at the designation of Mr. Ward. Although still comparatively young, he has covered many of the world's important political developments here and abroad during the past critical 10 years.

The account of his award which appeared in an article in the Baltimore Sun suggests in all-too-brief fashion many of the important matters throughout the world which Mr. Ward has recorded for the Baltimore Sun. His excellence in the field of international reporting won for him in 1948 a Pulitzer Prize for a distinguished example of reporting of international affairs.

In these days when proper dissemination of information throughout the world is so important to the attainment and preservation of peace, objective reporting of international affairs is of the highest importance, and Mr. Ward and the other gentlemen mentioned are to be highly congratulated on the recognition that has been accorded them in this important field.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Baltimore Morning Sun of March 31 be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL WARD MADE CHEVALIER OF FRENCH LEGION OF HONOR

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Paul W. Ward, member of the Sun's Washington bureau and specialist in international affairs, was notified today of his designation as a chevalier of the French Legion of Honor.

The award was bestowed by authority of President Vincent Auriol, of France, now visiting in Washington, "as a token of appreciation for your outstanding services to the cause of freedom and peace in the journalistic field."

Mr. Ward is in Paris covering meetings of the Deputies who are trying to arrange a conference of Big Four Foreign Ministers—Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States. He received notice of his decoration in a cablegram from Henri Bonnet, French Ambassador to the United States.

TEXT OF MESSAGE

The notification message stated:

"The President of the French Republic has instructed me to inform you that you have been named chevalier in our national order of the Legion of Honor. This award is granted to you on the occasion of President Auriol's visit to the United States as a token of appreciation for your outstanding services to the cause of freedom and peace in the journalistic field."

Similar honors were awarded to James B. Reston, of the New York Times, and Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr., of the Washington Post.

A member of the Sun staff since 1930, Mr. Ward, 45, has devoted more than half of that time to writing of world politics in Washington and abroad. In 1948 he was awarded a Pulitzer Prize for a distinguished example of reporting of international affairs.

The Pulitzer award was given in recognition of a series of articles on life in the Soviet Union, written in 1947 as a result of inquiries made by Mr. Ward while he was covering extended sessions of a foreign ministers' conference in Moscow that year.

Although nominally attached to the Sun's Washington Bureau since 1933, Mr. Ward has spent a great deal of his time abroad. From 1937 to 1939 he was the paper's London correspondent and was at that post when the Nazis started their sweep across Europe.

RETURNS IN 1940

After the British and French declarations of war he spent considerable time in France, reporting the progress of the conflict from various vantage points. He returned to the United States in 1940.

In Washington Mr. Ward makes the State Department his base of operations. He covered the Dumbarton Oaks Conference of 1944, where the ground work of the United Nations was laid, and in 1945 followed through with coverage of the San Francisco Conference where the world organization actually was born.

Mr. Ward covered the meetings of foreign ministers in Paris in the summer of 1946, and in New York in December of the same year. In 1948 he spent 2 months in Italy, reporting the parliamentary elections of that year. He was on that assignment when notified of his Pulitzer prize award.

REPORTED ON UN

In 1949, Mr. Ward was back in Paris again to report a meeting of Big Four foreign ministers, and in 1950 he was in the French capital for North Atlantic Treaty discussions. Through the years since the United Nations began to function he has spent much of his time at United Nations deliberations in Lake Success and Flushing Meadows, N. Y.

Mr. Ward is a native of Lorain, Ohio; a graduate of Middlebury College, and lives with his wife and their two children in Chevy Chase, Md.

Secrecy in MacArthur Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Secrecy Is Blunderers' Refuge," by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRECY IS BLUNDERERS' REFUGE—ADMINISTRATION SEEKS ONLY ITS OWN SECURITY BY CLOSED HEARINGS IN MACARTHUR CASE

Secrecy and suppression are the refuge of the incompetent and the blunderers in government. Publicity, with everything put on the table, is the enemy of scandal and abuse of power.

These principles apply equally to military and civilian affairs.

The Kefauver hearings proved the point conclusively.

The decision to carry on in secret the investigation touched off by the President's arbitrary removal of General MacArthur is, therefore, serious error which can only increase the distrust that the American people feel now about the administration and the Democratic Party, which is in control of the Government.

It is a curious thing that the Democrats voted solidly for secrecy and the Republicans voted for open sessions of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The only excuse for closed sessions which has a semblance of logic is the claim that there are secret directives of a military nature, the texts of which ought not to be revealed for security reasons.

The principal security reason, of course, is the security of the democratic administration. It is doubtful if there is a single document now in the records really needed for the hearings which could give military aid to the enemy if made public. The habit of recent years in Washington is to put the "top secret" or "classified information" label on anything or everything that might cause a bureaucrat annoyance or put him on the defensive.

The ends of a legitimate safeguard or secret information can be served by paraphrasing the documents so that the enemy will not be able to decode anything they may have picked up heretofore of our secret messages. Once this paraphrasing is done—and it is being done nearly every week in some form with respect to diplomatic exchanges—there is no real danger in the publication of the information.

But in the event that a document emerges or is referred to in the open hearings which could be the source of military information, all the presiding officer at the hearings has to do is close the hearings for an interval at that point until that particular document is examined in secret. Whereupon the open hearings could be resumed.

The procedure decided on by the Democratic majority in the Senate Armed Services Committee will be to hold secret hearings and then allow a transcript to be edited and the edited version will be issued to the public.

The newspapermen will have to buy the transcript from stenographers, paying about 40 cents for every 150 or 200 words of testimony. The press will have no opportunity to observe the demeanor of witnesses. The delay between the time the testimony is given and the time the transcript will be available for publication may be hours, if not days. Meanwhile, the reporters will ask both the witnesses and the members of the committee what happened, and will get paraphrases and condensed versions which may or may not be influenced by the prejudice of the Senators who give out the information.

The press does not as a rule reproduce an exact copy of what has previously been paraphrased in the first dispatches. The end result is that a hearing of profound importance to the safety of the American people, involving past actions and the evolution of our foreign policy as well as our military policy, will get to the public for the most part in fragmentary and confusing form.

General MacArthur himself declined to specify how he wished the hearings to be held—whether they should be open or closed. He took the position that he, as a witness, really should not express an opinion and that it should be left to the committee to decide. This was a wise approach because the committee intended to vote for closed sessions anyway. The pressure from the Pentagon is to keep from the public as much information as possible would should that the military men concur even in part with General MacArthur. There is such fear in the Pentagon of getting in bad with the civilian or political side of the Government that officers prefer not even to discuss the MacArthur affair.

So it all boils down to the fact that, while America is suffering casualties in Korea due to a policy of limitation which General MacArthur has questioned, the American people are not going to get the full story of the reasons why the civilian authority in Government has substituted its own opinions for the judgment of competent military men in the field.

The Plasterer's Glee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article taken from the March 1951 issue of the Plasterer and Cement Mason, an official organ of the Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons International Association of the United States and Canada. The poem follows:

THE PLASTERER'S GLEE

We are a band of plasterers,
We beautify man's home;
Without our magic art
Oh, say, what would be Greece or Rome?

It was Hiram Brave, a widow's son,
God's temple did adorn,
And the plasterer's trowel
Made it seem as though of beauty born.

The Sistine and the Vatican,
St. Peter's majestic dome,
Were by the plasterer's trowel
Prepared for the grand cartoons of Rome,
Until a Titian, a Raphael, and an Angelo in glorious frescoes shine
That might be said to be born of the brain of Jove Divine.

The splendors of our Capitol,
And of the Taj Mahal,
The Parisian's pride—fair Notre Dame,
And London's grand St. Paul,
Are to the plasterers' art accredited.

The plastic art by God to man was given that so might man's enlightened heart cemented be to heaven.
Then glory be to the plasterer art,
So beautiful and bright;
It cheers both man and woman's heart,
With life, with love, with light.

We meet upon the level,
We part upon the square;
In union sweet our true hearts beat,
And joys and sorrows share.

We are a band of plasterers,
By love's cement united;
By the trowel and not the sword
Our brotherhood is knighted.

National Defense Requires Full Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, April 29, 1951, I was privileged to address a very fine group of citizens in Brooklyn organized as the Committee of Brooklyn Gaglianese, which is headed by our distinguished colleague the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO. This organization is presently engaged in furthering a very laudable project, the construction of an orphanage for the homeless and orphaned children of the Sicilian community Gagliano Castelferrato, in Italy.

Among the prominent guests at the dinner arranged by this organization, which took place in the Hotel Towers in Brooklyn, were the following: the Very Reverend John A. Flynn, president of St. John's University, who delivered a very inspiring and thought-provoking address regarding the international situation; Rev. Cyril F. Mayer, vice president of St. John's University; Rev. Giuseppe Grippaldi, director of the orphanage in Sicily; the Honorable James Amadei, member of the New York Workmen's Compensation Board; the Honorable Austin G. Cocuzza, former assistant district attorney for Kings County, who was general chairman; and Mr. and Mrs. Charles L'Episcopo, Angelo Manno, Joseph Di Stefano, Salvatore Abramo, Domenico A. Abrama, Mariano Fiorenza, Anthony Fagone, Guiseppe Muscolino, and many other prominent citizens of Brooklyn.

Since the greater part of my address was devoted to a discussion of international affairs and is, therefore, of general interest, I am placing it in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, my colleague, Congressman ANFUSO, who as a freshman in the House of Representatives in Washington is doing such a masterful job, has indeed been very kind and gracious in his introductory remarks about me. I appreciate the opportunity to address my many friends who have foregathered here. I know of the magnificent work you are doing for the orphans in Italy, a humanitarian endeavor which is very close to my heart.

I love children, as we all do. I love their carefree laughter. I love their innocence and their simple approach to life and its problems. My only regret is that we have not been able to build a happier world for them where they could grow up as dignified citizens and healthy human beings. In this country, however, we are fortunate that we have made considerable progress in this respect, and we have been able to help people in other countries.

It is for this reason that I admire the work you are doing in raising funds for the construction of an orphanage in Italy, modeled somewhat along the lines of our own famous Boys Town, in Nebraska. A project of this nature is, in my opinion, truly laudable, not only in terms of the humanitarian motives which inspire them but also in terms of the reservoir of international good will and understanding which they are bound to make manifest between the people of this country and the people of Italy.

What is particularly pleasing to me is that my very good friend, the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO, is taking such an active part and is doing such splendid work toward the realization of this worthy project. I think this is a very fitting occasion to pay tribute to him for his untiring efforts in furthering the cause of this project. Congressman ANFUSO deserves the highest commendation for his endeavors to establish a home for underprivileged children in this Sicilian community, which is located in one of the less developed areas of Sicily where housing and educational facilities are inadequate and the standard of living is low, despite the fact that the people there are hard-working and industrious.

Besides performing a humanitarian service, the establishment of this orphanage in Sicily, with the help of private American funds, can make a real contribution to the cause of the promotion of friendly relations between the people of the United States and the people of Italy. In these trying and tragic days, when it has become necessary to supplement formal methods of international relations with the informal amenities of human relations, the proposed orphanage will serve to foster good will and a constant reminder to the young and old of Italy that their hopes and aspirations are ours, too.

I should like to turn now for a brief discussion of international affairs, since these affairs affect us as citizens of the United States. Our country is faced today with problems which are greater in scope and significance than any it has encountered in the 175 years of its existence. It is difficult for us to evaluate the historical importance of the times, because we are living in this era

which for us is still very much a reality, and also because of the lasting tension which threatens the peace of the world. We are very likely heading into a period of greater tension and new crises which threaten not only to disrupt world peace, but to enslave the whole free world, perhaps for decades to come.

It is extremely important for us, therefore, as peace-loving and freedom-loving citizens, to be fully informed and thoroughly acquainted with these problems. The decisions we are called upon the make during this tense period and the plans we are formulating will determine the sort of world our children and grandchildren will inherit. What we do today will determine whether future generations will be able to live in peace and freedom tomorrow.

The history of mankind is sometimes described as a history of continuous welfare. Although this statement has the element of truth in it, it is a cynical way of interpreting human history and the progress of civilization. During the last two centuries peoples and nations have not been fighting wars for the mere glory of it, rather can we say that the conflict of ideologices has often developed beyond its bounds and resulted in warfare and bloodshed. Basically, the struggle of mankind has developed into a struggle between two irreconcilable ways of life: Freedom and human dignity versus enslavement and the oppression of humanity. We can also put it another way: Are we to be Governed by justice or enslaved by force?

We can find many notable examples in history to illustrate this point. The French Revolution and the American Revolution were milestones in the struggle of freedom against enslavement. The Civil War in this country about 90 years ago was a struggle against slavery. The First and Second World Wars were a struggle of the forces of freedom and democracy against the forces of evil and human oppression.

After experiencing two devastating wars in our lifetime, we are faced with the prospect of a third world war which threatens to engulf all humanity. Sometimes we have the feeling that we stand helpless in the face of events and decisions over which we have no control. Actually, however, this is not a new experience in American history. Nearly a century and a half ago, when the United States became embroiled in the War of 1812 against its wishes, Thomas Jefferson made this very timely observation: "Experience has shown that continued peace depends not merely on our own justice and prudence, but on that of others also." Jefferson also voiced some very keen comment on the question of war which, in my estimation, deserves to be brought to the attention of all Americans as the message of one of the founders of this Republic and the father of American democracy. In discussing war and the alternative of war, this is what Jefferson said:

"All men know that war is a losing game to both parties. But they know also that if they do not resist encroachment at some point, all will be taken from them, and that more would then be lost * * * by submission than resistance. It is the case of giving a part to save the whole, a limb to save life. It is the melancholy law of human societies to be compelled sometimes to choose a great evil in order to ward off a greater."

Robert A. Vogeler, the American businessman who was released yesterday from a Hungarian prison after being confined by the Communist regime of that country for 17 months, put it this way: "You will never know what freedom is until you lose it."

Unfortunately, the path to peace and freedom is not easy to travel, because we live in an age of great happenings and equally great controversies, which keep us in a continual state of anxiety and worry. Witness all the fire and fury around the MacArthur issue, the turning of citizen against citizen, the denunciation of our leadership by people who have lost their heads, and the condemnation of our foreign policy by people who are not acquainted with the facts and have thrown all logic to the winds, not realizing that the fate of our Nation and the future of western civilization are more important than the fate of an individual.

It is the old problem of getting an informed citizenry which will seek the facts and evaluate the truth. Free and open discussion of our national problems are imperative in a democracy. Only by understanding these problems and clearly realizing our aims can we hope for democracy to survive; otherwise, we shall become quivering reeds in every storm of emotional controversy in which, in these trying times, we are caught so often.

I have reached the conclusion that one of the most important contributions that you and I, as individuals, can make to preserve freedom and safeguard peace is to help develop an informed and enlightened public opinion in this country. The whole world is looking to us for guidance toward a peaceful world of law and order. But if our own ranks are rent asunder by confusion and controversy, how can we expect our allies and the bulk of freedom-loving humanity to have confidence in us and to help us preserve peace and freedom? We must rely upon our allies for all that they can offer in the common defense, and we must in turn give them complete assurance that the United States will be ready to defend the free world, should such an emergency arise.

The question of world peace is a task for whole nations. Harsh criticism of our Government and impatience with the workings of the democratic process of government only contribute to the confusion in the public mind and result in great disunity of our people and loss of American prestige in the eyes of the world. This is one luxury we can easily forego in times such as these.

In the great conflict of ideologies which is now raging throughout the world, it is not enough for us merely to be against something, but to indicate to the world in unmistakable terms what we are for. At the time of the American revolution the people of this country were struggling for freedom, for equality, and for the inalienable rights of man. These ideals are still timely today, only we would add also the preservation of American values, the safeguarding of the democratic way of life, the dignity of the individual, and the maintenance of human rights.

This is not a time for bickering and fighting among ourselves. This is not a time for shirking our responsibilities and obligations. We must have sincere and full cooperation in our national life. We must work together as a team, and not at counterpurposes; otherwise, we shall be lost. We must continue to build the defenses of our country, but at the same time we must also continue our best efforts in the great endeavor to build a free and peaceful world in which we and our neighbors may live in contentment and security.

The defense of our country depends on the whole American people. In the long run, it is the people that count—all the 150,000,000 people of the United States—to champion the cause of peace, freedom, human progress, and a safer world for us and our children.

If there is any admonition or advice the people of this country need at this time, it is contained in the words of advice which Hamlet received from his mother in that great Shakespearean tragedy, when she said to him: "O gentle son, upon the heat and flame of thy distemper sprinkle cool patience."

If we could only remain calm and discuss our problems with more light and less heat, we shall find that we can achieve greater unity of purpose and better results for our country and ourselves.

"Fighting in Korea Is for the Preservation of Life, Liberty, and the Right to the Pursuit of Happiness for All Freemen"—General Van Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Saturday, April 28, 1951, entitled "Van Fleet's Inspiration":

VAN FLEET'S INSPIRATION

Courage, faith, humility—these are the qualities that stand out in General Van Fleet's first message to his troops. In simple language the new commander of the Eighth Army in Korea has brought encouragement to his soldiers in the face of the Chinese onslaught. He has done more, however, than praise the skill and determination of the United Nations forces and cite their superiority in all but numbers. With a directness which gains additional eloquence by the fact that it comes from the battlefield, he has summarized the larger issues in the fighting:

"You are fighting to stop armed aggression and maintain peace not only in Korea but in your respective homelands. This renewed battle is for the preservation of life, liberty, and the right to the pursuit of happiness of all freemen. These are fundamental in the rights of man—the rock upon which our civilization is founded—and they are the first rights which communism denies its own people.

"The time has come when all men of the free and decent world must steel their souls to face the desperate, bitter, and uncompromising battle with armed Communist aggression. Our strength rests on the solid foundation of belief in God and the rights of man rather than on the will of dictators, imposed through cruelty and complete disregard of human rights."

Even in the grimness of war, these words are inspiring to those who hear them, the more so because, as the troops must know, they spring from a deeply religious nature. They tell a lot about the character of a man who uttered them, and they carry a conviction borne of fighting experience and spiritual toughness which must show to the soldiers in Korea that their commander has the quality of leadership.

One Hundred and Sixth Birthday of Mrs. Martha Hiatt, of Moravia, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the vast strides made in medical science during the last century, together with higher living standards, have contributed in making the life expectancy of an individual longer. However, even in these

times, few live to be much older than "three score years and ten." So I am sure all Members of the House will be interested to learn of the recent one hundred and sixth birthday of Mrs. Martha Hiatt, of Moravia, Iowa. She has lived in Appanoose County, which is in my congressional district, for 99 years. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to mention these facts:

Mrs. Hiatt was born in Randolph County, N. C., April 26, 1845, and in 1852 moved to Iowa with her parents, a journey by covered wagon which required 3 months. In 1864 she was married to Mr. Oren Hiatt and she is the mother of 11 children, 5 of whom are still living. Her oldest son is 84 years of age.

All of her life Mrs. Hiatt has been active, and while she is in frail health at this time, she is looking forward to enjoying the spring weather when she can be outdoors and she even has made plans to visit relatives this summer.

Through the years Mrs. Hiatt has kept up an interest in world affairs and has voted in nearly every election since women's suffrage. She voted last fall.

Mrs. Hiatt's life has not only been long but also useful, and she is proud of the wonderful family she has reared. She enjoys talking about her children and grandchildren and has 47 direct descendants.

So unusual is it for one to live to the 106 years of age that Mrs. Hiatt's picture appeared yesterday on television on the Ted Mack show, the American Family Hour.

MacArthur Ouster May Alter Military Concepts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky from the New York Journal-American of April 22, 1951:

MACARTHUR OUSTER MAY ALTER MILITARY CONCEPTS

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

The dramatic dismissal of General MacArthur from the supreme command in the Far East, though momentarily bewildering, may prove a blessing in disguise. Its most important result may be to bring about a bold reappraisal of our country's military concepts and leadership in line with its true strategic position.

Certainly such a reappraisal is desperately needed and cannot be much longer evaded if we are to head off catastrophe. The demand for it is implied in every one of the General's controversial pronouncements.

There is reason to surmise that he deliberately risked his personal status in order to force some grim facts upon the public mind.

The Korean tragedy is the product of confused foreign policies, which in turn rest on an unrealistic estimate of our military capabilities. MacArthur knew this better than anyone, for he had been compelled to fight an old-style land war in a limited and primitive theater of operation against overwhelming odds.

CHANCED RECALL

He is far too intelligent not to have foreseen the possibility of his own recall for talking out of turn. But he chanced it as a patriotic duty. He had to choose between this deep sense of obligation to the men in Korea and the Nation, and the consequences of overstepping the bounds of protocol.

As commander in the field, MacArthur saw the likelihood of a military debacle unless his hands were untied to strike at the privileged sanctuary of the enemy. He saw the critical value of imposing a second front on the Chinese Communists by unloosing a Nationalist offensive.

The debacle, in his view, would have been due to decisions in Washington and Lake Success, but the major blame would have been loaded on his shoulders. The brilliant record of a great soldier would have been tarnished.

CAN JOIN GREAT DEBATE

In a sense he is fortunate that the recall came in time to prevent this. More important, however, is the fact that he can now join the great debate on national strategy. He can do his share in helping to lead America out of the blind alley of archaic thinking in the Pentagon.

MacArthur, of course, is not the first military leader to stake his career in opposition to official policy in the interests of national security as he saw it.

There was Gen. Billy Mitchell in the twenties; there was Admiral Louis E. Denfeld in 1949. Whether they were right or wrong—and I think the admiral was wholly wrong—these men acted out of patriotic convictions.

FOUGHT FOR AIR POWER

Mitchell believed our military set-up would be calamitous unless air power was recognized as a service on a par with the Army and the Navy. He provoked a court martial by openly challenging his superiors.

It was said at the time—as now in the MacArthur imbroglio—that he should have resigned first and spoken out afterward. But we know that in our country an issue must be dramatized; that a resignation does not focus public attention like defiance and punishment.

Mitchell, Denfeld, now MacArthur prove that our military leaders are Americans first, officers second. When sincerely convinced that the country is in danger they do not hesitate to stick out their military necks.

THE PEOPLE DECIDE

This is all to the good. In a democracy basic strategic decisions are ultimately made by the people through their elected representatives. Individual acts of technical insubordination are sometimes essential as an appeal to the highest authority—the American people.

MacArthur has learned through the bitter experience of the last 9 months that a fundamental reorientation in military thought is essential. His recall obliges all Americans to take part in the process.

Unhappily, peace still has to be guaranteed by force. But if it is force of the wrong kind it cannot perform this job. On the contrary, fallacious strategy—the acceptance of an enemy challenge in the wrong place with the wrong forces—can only lead to war.

At best it brings a stalemate from which there is then no way out except humiliating retreat or a full-scale conflict.

IDEOLOGICAL BATTLE

The world is today in the throes of an ideological struggle on a global scale. Orthodox military concepts, in which the conquest of a piece of territory by foot soldiers is the goal, no longer apply.

Different strategy and tactics, revolutionary application of forces and weapons, are called for. But military minds steeped in traditional warfare are unable to grasp these new conditions.

MacArthur is a unique exception. My personal contacts with him in Tokyo on several occasions have convinced me that, compared to other ground generals, he has the broadest understanding of the implications of air power. Whether his successors will be able to deal with the new military equation remains to be seen.

AIR FORCE VITAL

In Asia the odds on the ground are so tremendous against us that our success depends on the effective use of air forces. Though the brunt of the casualties have been borne by soldiers, Asia—in any conflict involving the United States—can only be an arena of air operations if we are to win.

We can never hope to overcome the astronomic superiority of enemy numbers on the surface unless we obtain and exploit freedom of air navigation. But when we obtain such command of the air we can impose our will upon the enemy without the use of ground forces.

If a change had to be made in the Far East command, the supreme post should have gone to an airman. Now that the Communists are throwing air force into the scales, the air phase must become increasingly decisive.

INSURES GROUND-WAR BIAS

The ability to smoke an enemy out of fox holes will hardly tell the story. Generals Ridgway and Van Fleet, gallant soldiers both, are of the Marshall school, and their promotion is almost a guaranty of ground-warfare bias, with air power held more and more to an auxiliary role.

MacArthur's deeper appreciation of the air factor was indicated in a recent informal interview which did not get the attention it merited. Speaking to British Lt. Gen. H. G. Martin, he said that the Chinese lacked an industrial potential—oil, rubber, food.

Consequently, "the United Nations forces had only to blockade their coasts and smash their tenuous railway system to reduce them quickly to impotence."

To airmen this view makes strategic sense, of course. It comes close to what they urged in reference to Korea as the one effective alternative to mile-by-mile ground war to which generals of the balanced-forces school were committing us.

AIR-NAVAL BLOCKADE

Though MacArthur referred to "bombing," his proposal, if carried out by airmen, would amount to a combination of air siege and naval blockade—the strategic use of air and sea power as a strangulating application of military force.

That sort of blockade and siege can be made effective without use of ground forces, except perhaps in occupational roles after the enemy's will to resist has been broken. It is the strategy that could and should have been employed in Korea from the outset.

That a ground general of MacArthur's age is able to come close to such a revolutionary proposal seems to me a striking measure of his stature. Fortunately, his views will be even more sharply stated now that he has been relieved of his command.

The Real Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on Tuesday, April 24, 1951, entitled "The Real Threat," which follows:

THE REAL THREAT

General MacArthur touched on the possibility of Soviet intervention only briefly in his speech to the Congress. While it was lucid on the problem of Red China, the address nearly overlooked the crucial Soviet question.

MacArthur believes, according to his speech, that the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its action with our moves like a cobra—our moves, in this case, being the bombing of Manchuria and blockades as proposed by the general.

"Any new enemy will more likely strike whenever it feels that the relativity on military and other potentials is in its favor on a world-wide basis," General MacArthur says. All of which means that only the enemy knows when he will strike.

At one time General MacArthur was confident that the Red Chinese would not intervene in the Korean affair. Other leaders thought so, too, but they were proved wrong. MacArthur now admits that China is engaging with the maximum power it can commit.

Either General MacArthur is so confident that the Soviet Union would not intervene that he passes lightly over the subject, or he is uncertain of the possibility and stays away from the subject. Whatever his situation, the prospect of Soviet intervention is, at the moment, the most important issue, and it cannot be passed over.

Were we certain the Soviet is not yet ready, we doubtless could do as MacArthur suggests and bomb Red China. But if we do, we must be prepared for the very likely prospect that the Soviet will change its passiveness to a terrible activeness, even as did the Red Chinese. In his intense concentration on the problem at hand—Conflict with the Red Chinese—General MacArthur may have overlooked the possibility of Soviet intervention that is the real threat in the Far East.

Brooklyn's Welcome to Senator Estes Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Borough of Brooklyn was host to a very distinguished visitor on Monday, April 23, 1951, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, United States Senator from Tennessee and chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. Senator KEFAUVER addressed the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the eastern district of New York at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, which is located in the district I represent. Some 1,500 persons attended this meeting. Later that same evening Senator KEFAUVER addressed another 1,000 persons at Midwood High School at a meeting under the auspices of the Brooklyn Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee.

It was truly a memorable and eventful evening for all those who attended either of these two meetings and heard the distinguished Senator speak. I was privileged to spend the whole evening with him from the time of his arrival and to accompany him to the various gatherings which the citizens of Brooklyn arranged for him. I met Senator KEFAUVER at the airport, and we proceeded from there to the Brooklyn Club, where a dinner was given in his honor by the Federal Grand Jurors' Association.

Present at the dinner were the following honored guests: Federal Judge Edward A. Conger, of the southern district of New York; Frank J. Parker, United States district attorney of the eastern district; Irving H. Saypol, United States district attorney of the southern district; Brooklyn Borough President John Cashmore; District Attorney Miles F. McDonald, of Kings County; District Attorney Frank S. Hogan, of Manhattan; Morris J. Solomon, commissioner of jurors; and United States Marshal Eugene J. Smith. They were singled out for special greetings and introduction at the annual meeting later.

Anthony W. Fitzgerald, counsel for the association, then presented a general report on the importance of the association in the life of the community and the work of the various committees. During the course of his address, Mr. Fitzgerald made the following interesting observations:

Under our American system of justice, the grand jury is the bulwark of the ordinary citizen, the honest law-abiding citizen, against an unjust or unfounded accusation of a crime. Under our American system, I repeat, no man can be dragged into court on a trumped-up charge—or without cause; nor can any man be brought to trial capriciously by an overzealous or venal prosecutor.

The distinguished aggregation of Federal and district attorneys on my right must bear witness to the statement that no man can be tried for a capital or other infamous crime without having first been indicted by a grand jury. A majority of our States—and all our Federal courts—require that 23 fellow-citizens of an accused must first hear and weigh the evidence against him before he can be brought into a trial court for any serious crime.

How different our American justice from the so-called justice—better, mockery of justice—in Communist and Communist-dominated countries, where judge, jury, prosecutor—and even the defense attorney have only one purpose, to convict the accused, or—as they put it, to make him "confess."

Those 23 persons constitute what is known as a grand jury and their qualifications illustrate the fairness of our American system, for they are required to be an intelligent cross section of American citizens, not chosen by fear or favoritism but subject to a very solemn oath by which they acknowledge the existence of God and swear to hear and weigh evidence without prejudice, without hope or political favor—without fear.

Of such is the grand jury composed; of such individuals is our Federal Grand Jurors' Association composed. Our members are, in all truth, a cross section of average intelligent America. Permit me to quote to you a short excerpt from the preamble to our association constitution as revealing clearly our goals:

"To impress upon all persons that it is the duty of grand jurors to weigh all facts and evidence presented to them; That they must inquire into all facts, whether or not clearly brought out by the prosecution, so as to judge fairly the person brought before the grand jury for indictment; That they should accept their choice as grand jurors as an honor and a patriotic duty."

Those stirring and sincere words, ladies and gentlemen, reveal better than any halting expressions of mine, the heart and soul of this association, the credo which governs our every action, our every effort.

This association—and its component committees—is not an aggregation of busybodies, of do gooders, of pests who plague busy public officials. Rather, like the grand jury itself, it is a group which wishes to learn and then to teach to others those essentials of citizenship and patriotism which today, more than at any other crucial time in the history of our Republic, are so necessary if we are to continue to exist as a free Nation under God.

Raymond A. Young, president of the association, delivered the annual report of the president, from which I quote the following timely remarks:

One thought crosses my mind as I look upon this vast throng; and that thought is how wonderful it is to live in America, with our right to such freedom of assemblage as we have here tonight, without compulsion, without the dictatorship of some bureaucrat forcing us to come here, without fear.

As our counsel has remarked, this association is in a sense the extension, the complement, of the grand jury itself. Our ideals, our goals, our standards are identical with those which every grand juror learns and adopts when he first enters the grand-jury room (in our Federal building)—loyalty to country, devotion to the cause of justice, protection of the innocent, punishment of the guilty.

Out of almost 100 Federal districts in this country, there are only 2 which have associations such as ours. We have been told the value of the grand jury itself; the FBI or other agencies may bring in evidence; a competent district attorney may prepare the case, but it is the grand jury who must hear and weigh the evidence against an accused and bring him to trial.

Since associations such as ours extend the work of the grand jury itself in educating the public, surely there is a crying need throughout our country for many more Federal grand jurors' associations, extending from coast to coast, and carrying out the same purposes as we here in the eastern district strive to do.

We pledge ourselves here tonight to aid any Federal grand jurors' group in the formation of an association so that they, too, may become a strong factor in their own communities. For it is our sincere belief that the grand jury and grand jury associations are a powerful weapon against crime and communism in this country.

The oath of office and the induction of the board of governors and the officers for 1951 were administered very ably and in a most charming manner by Chief Judge Robert A. Inch of the eastern district. Appointed to the United States district court in 1923, Judge Inch is one of the most beloved jurists that has ever graced the Federal bench and in every sense a judge in word and deed.

Inducted as members of the board of governors of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association were: Calvin A. Davis, Howard G. Launsbach, Erik Marcussen, Marshall L. Ong, Cornelius S. Zeuner, Vincent F. Donohue, James J. Gannon, H. D. McKeige, David M. Newman, S. Thomas Pearson, William E. Breul, Jr., Robert W. Drummond, Robert Elliott, Jr., Edward F. Hannigan, and Samuel C. Sander. The association's new officers for 1951 are: Raymond A. Young, president; Walter Davidson, first vice president; George Devoy, second vice president; Charles A. Barkie, third vice president; Byron D. Forster, secretary; Harry J. Smith, treasurer.

A special word of commendation is due to Charles A. Barkie, chairman of the program committee, and to the members of his committee, for a well-planned and most successful evening.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who was the principal speaker of the evening, made an excellent impression on the capacity audience at the Brooklyn Academy of Music. He paid public tribute to District Attorneys Miles F. McDonald, Frank S. Hogan, Frank J. Parker, Irving H. Saypol, and to me as the representative of this district in Congress.

From the Academy of Music we drove to the Midwood High School, where Senator KEFAUVER delivered his second address of the evening, this time discussing the international scene and the Atlantic Union. Our very able colleague, Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana, also addressed this gathering and acquitted himself with eloquence and distinction. The meeting at Midwood School was presided over by the well-known County Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, and County Judge Louis Goldstein also spoke.

Brooklyn will long remember the visit of Senator KEFAUVER. He made a great many friends among our citizens and left a lasting impression on Brooklyn. In order to fully complete my account of his visit, I am placing in the RECORD a news item and an editorial on the subject which appeared in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, April 24, 1951:

RACKETEERS RUN 76 LEGAL BUSINESSES, SAYS KEFAUVER—SEES COLOSSAL TAKE FROM UNITED STATES CITIZENS

United States Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, here in Brooklyn last night for a doubleheader speaking engagement, termed colossal the amount of money taken from United States citizens by racketeers with legitimate business connections.

Addressing the annual meeting of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association of New York's eastern district, KEFAUVER declared that the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, headed by him, has compiled a list of 76 legitimate enterprises operated by such figures.

"Everything you wear or eat costs extra," he said, in a situation where racketeers bring with them into business "methods of intimidation and coercion which give them unfair advantage over their competitors."

The Senator told the capacity audience gathered in the Academy of Music that the people of Brooklyn "have much to be thankful for. One of the most outstanding jobs of turning the spotlight on crime and corruption has been done right here in Kings County by your grand jury and District Attorney McDonald."

PRAISE FOR M'DONALD

He said he wanted to pay the people of Brooklyn "the highest compliment" for supporting McDonald during the early days of the rackets probe when the district attorney was under critical fire.

He also paid tribute to Manhattan District Attorney Frank S. Hogan and United States Attorneys Irving Saypol of the southern district and Frank J. Parker of the eastern district. Saypol and Parker were present on the dais.

Senator KEFAUVER said he saw "very positive signs that America is undergoing a moral awakening. I do believe something has been started to give us a cleaner and more decent government."

Hailing the institution of citizens' crime committees, such as the one recently established in New York, KEFAUVER announced that similar organizations have been created in "35 or 40 States during the past few months."

The Senator outlined some of the recommendations his committee will make in an effort to minimize crime on a national scale. He said the group will recommend prohibiting the transmission of gambling information. A tightening of deportation regulations will also be urged in order that the heads of certain gangs can be deported.

The committee will also recommend improved income-tax laws, he asserted, to force racketeers to report the sources of their income and file statements of net worth. A further recommendation will be improvements in the laws covering the sale of alcohol.

He also said the committee will suggest securities and exchange regulations whereby owners and directors of large corporations will be required to make their names a matter of public knowledge.

More than 1,500 persons attended the meeting, which was preceded by a supper at the Brooklyn Club. Presiding at the meeting was Raymond A. Young, president of the association.

Among those on the dais were Federal Judge Edward A. Conger of the southern district, United States Commissioner of Jurors Morris J. Solomon and United States Marshal Eugene J. Smith, both the eastern district, Borough President Cashmore and Representative LOUIS B. HELLER.

OFFICERS INSTALLED

Senior Judge Robert A. Inch of the eastern district installed Young and the other officers for 1951. They were Walter Davidson, first vice presedent; George Devoy, second vice president; Charles A. Barkie, third vice president; Byron D. Forster, secretary, and Harry J. Smith, treasurer.

From the academy, Senator KEFAUVER was driven, with motorcycle escort, to Midwood High School, Bedford Avenue and Glenwood Road, where he addressed almost 1,000 persons attending a meeting of the Brooklyn chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee.

Presiding over the meeting was County Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, who introduced the Senator as a "homefront general."

Senator KEFAUVER said he could see no way of preventing a third world war, a "push-button affair," other than through international cooperation. He warned, however, that the United States would have to give up its "piecemeal system of alliances."

Asserting his belief that the people of the country are in favor of international cooperation, he suggested that if the United States had been more active in world cooperation at the time of the League of Nations it might have helped avert World War II.

"We can't go on fighting aggression by ourselves in a haphazard fashion," the Senator said. "We can't beat aggression if we are fighting the Chinese in Korea while our friends are doing business with them in Hong Kong."

Senator KEFAUVER said "Stalin has a federation of nations on his side which he can call upon when he needs them. This federation, formed by force, would not have the moral strength of a volunteer federation among free nations of the world."

Among those on the dais were County Judge Louis Goldstein, Representative HELLER and Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana.

The Senator made joking comment on the big "KEFAUVER for President" sign which hung from the balcony of the school auditorium with a Confederate flag.

KEFAUVER, HERE, MAKES STRONG CASE FOR FEDERAL UNION IN CURRENT CRISIS

Senator KEFAUVER came to Brooklyn last night for a much different reason from what he had during his last stay in this city. However, there was a similarity between the two visits—each was aimed at a form of crime.

His first visit attacked the criminal element in this Nation and did much to instruct the country as to the extent and seriousness of the danger.

His visit last night was concerned with international crime—the crime of allowing a disunited free world to face the organized menace of the communistic bloc of nations. Senator KEFAUVER spoke in behalf of the Atlantic Union resolution, which he introduced in the Senate some months ago.

He urged once again the passage of this resolution, which calls upon the President to convene the nations which signed the Atlantic Pact to explore the possibility of forming an even greater amalgamation—a federal union.

The Senator asked this Nation to continue the orderly revolution begun by our founding fathers when they created the first and most successful federal union by joining the Original Thirteen States. This is a great and far-reaching goal and worthy of exploration, as we have said in the past.

Only a few days ago, General MacArthur recalled for Congress a passage from his address on the occasion of the surrender of the Japanese:

"Various methods through the ages have been attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned, but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, our Armageddon will be at our door."

This is the prophetic consideration upon which Senator KEFAUVER bases his adherence to the hope for an Atlantic Union. When the world is in such great danger, again it becomes reasonable to state that the Atlantic Union venture is worth exploring. We hope that the Senate will not disband this year without giving the proposal its most serious study.

Trade and Service Unions Protest Freeze on Low-Wage Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative statement by Hugo Ernst, general president of the Bartenders and Hotel Employees International Union, recently appearing in the Catering Industry Employee publication:

TRADE AND SERVICE UNIONS PROTEST FREEZE ON LOW-WAGE WORKERS

(At the suggestion of Hugo Ernst, general president, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, a conference of A. F. of L. international unions in the trade and service industries, was convened in Washington, D. C., March 19, 1951, to consider the impact of wage controls on the 15,000,000 workers in trade and service industries and to work out a joint program for the defense of the living standards of these workers. General President Ernst, who served as chairman of the conference, made the following statement as a basis for discussion. The statement was unanimously endorsed by the conference.—EDITOR.)

In proposing this conference of unions in the trade and service industries I did so because I have become increasingly convinced that the millions of workers in our industries are being totally disregarded in the discussions and developments since the beginning of wage stabilization.

There is cumulative evidence for this conclusion. Since the January 25 freeze there have been several modifications of the original freeze order—all designed to meet the needs of unions and employers in the basic industries, none providing relief for the millions of workers in service and trade.

MINE, AUTO RAISES O. K.'D

Thus the first modification, General Regulation 2, extended the freeze date from January 25 to February 9 to legalize the mine workers' wage increase.

Another basic modification, General Regulation 8, relaxed the 10-percent formula under General Regulation 6 to legalize cost-of-living escalator clauses only in those cases where such clauses were already in effect on January 25. Obviously General Regulation 8 was designed to satisfy the CIO auto workers, since, with few exceptions, this was the only large union with contracts containing cost-of-living escalator clauses.

Two subsequent modifications—General Regulations 9 and 10—were also designed to meet certain special needs in basic industry.

NO RELIEF FOR SUBSTANDARDS

Although the United Labor Policy Committee on January 11 raised the basic question of substandard wages with the Economic Stabilization Agency, nothing has been done on this point, except that:

1. General Regulation 3 was issued to legalize adjustments under existing Federal or State minimum-wage legislation. For workers in service and trade, who are outside the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, this regulation means that all they can hope for to eliminate substandards are existing State minimum laws, which provide such wages as 55 cents an hour for non-tip hotel and restaurant workers in a State like Ohio, or 55 cents for building service workers in a State like Massachusetts. There are many other examples of what General Regulation 3 means in practical effect.

2. General Regulation 6, which holds wage increases down to a maximum of 10 percent above the January 1950 base, obviously perpetuates the low, substandard wages which now exist in the service and trade industries.

I repeat, nothing, absolutely nothing, has been done to get at the problem of substandard wages which exist in our industries. And these low wages will become more and more substandard as living costs rise while the National Wage Stabilization Board gives its attention exclusively to the problems in basic industry.

FIFTEEN MILLION OUT IN COLD

The problem of workers in service and trade is of major importance. First, because of the number of workers in these industries, and, second, because of the grievously low wage levels which now exist.

There are 15,000,000 workers in all branches of service and trade—as many workers as there are in all manufacturing industries combined. These 15,000,000 workers account for one-third of the total employment in all industry outside of agriculture. Most of these 15,000,000 workers are unorganized—which is one of the reasons for the low wages which exist.

WE'RE NOT EXPENDABLES

Whereas manufacturing industry is 80 to 100 percent organized, whereas coal mining, construction, railroads, etc., are almost completely organized—the service trades are only 20 to 39 percent organized. This, perhaps, is one reason why the National Wage Stabilization Board has paid so little attention to our problems. But this is a major reason for the problem of substandard wages—to which the Board must pay attention. Fifteen million workers with their families are a lot of people—their living standards are important. These people are not to be considered expendable in the current mobilization drive.

Contrast the wage levels of workers in other industries with those of workers in service and trade, and you get some idea of the problem of wage substandards:

Average hourly earnings in manufacturing are $1.51 an hour; in coal mining, $2.01 an hour; in railroading, $1.54 an hour; in construction, $2.04 an hour. (Labor Department figures for November 1950.)

But in service and trade—the average for all branches of retail trade combined is $1.20, and in such service industries as hotels, laundries, and cleaning plants only 80 cents, 88 cents, and $1.03 an hour, respectively.

But even these averages are misleading. Whereas under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act a 75-cent minimum is in effect, in service and trade workers are dependent on State legal minimums as low as 40, 50, and 60 cents an hour, and in some States no legal minimums exist at all.

TEN PERCENT ON 40 CENTS AN HOUR

Of what good is a 10-percent cost-of-living adjustment to a trade or service worker now getting a 40-cent rate? Such an adjustment does not even begin to correct for substandards. Obviously the Wage Board must set some figure as the dividing line between what is, and is not, substandard, perhaps $1 an hour, up to which wage increases should be legal without prior Board approval and without reference to other stabilization formulas.

OUR WAGES LAG FAR BEHIND

No flat percentage adjustment is enough in itself to cope with the wage problem in our industries. Service and trade workers have fallen behind other workers so far as their wage levels and living standards are concerned. For example:

According to Labor Department figures for November 1950, laundry workers averaged $35.82 a week. Expressed in purchasing power of 1939 dollars after adjustment for price inflation, the average laundry worker earned $20.28 a week compared with $17.89 in 1939, a net increase in real earnings of only $2.39 a week in 11 years, without allowing for the effect of taxes.

Manufacturing workers, on the other hand, earned $62.38 a week, or $35.31 in 1939 purchasing power, compared with earnings of $23.86 in 1939. Thus their real earnings have increased $11.45 a week. While real earnings of coal miners even before their last wage increase have risen $17.76 a week.

What is true of the way laundry workers have fallen behind workers in basic industry is true also of hotel workers, and of service and trade workers generally. Their earnings simply have not kept pace with the rise in over-all American productivity, with the result that millions of workers in our industries today are barely able to subsist.

SUBSISTENCE WAGES

At today's costs, the Labor Department estimates that a worker's family of four persons needs $75.50 a week to live on a minimum standard of decency in Washington, D. C.; $70.17 in New York; $67.76 a week in Midwestern Kansas City; $73.23 in San Francisco.

But in November 1950 the average American hotel worker made $34.66 a week; the average laundry worker, $35.82; the average worker in a cleaning and dyeing plant, $42.68; and the average worker in retail trade, $47.84.

This shocking disparity between what workers in trade and service now earn and need to have to live decently, the shocking disparities between wages of workers in our industries and in the rest of the American economy—must be narrowed. Substandards of living must be eliminated. We cannot have a healthy economy able to meet the demands of defense if one-third of all nonagricultural workers live perilously close to, or below, the level of subsistence.

We are faced with other problems, to which the Wage Board has given no attention, beyond freezing us entirely out of the picture. Take the 40-hour-week question, for example.

WE NEED 40-HOUR WEEK

Under normal collective bargaining, service and trade workers in unions like ours have slowly been negotiating contracts providing time and one-half for the sixth day. Most of these workers today still get straight time for the sixth day. Now comes the Wage Board. Its regulations bar us from getting time and one-half for the sixth day—except as an offset against the 10-percent cost-of-living formula under General Regulation 6.

This is a gross inequity, when we consider that most other workers—even on the railroads—now get time and one-half for the sixth day. During the last war Presidential Executive Order 9240 permitted the negotiation of new contracts allowing time and one-half after 40 hours. Today no such provision has been made under wage stabilization.

LOW WAGE WORKERS HURT MOST

Taken as a whole, the wage stabilization program is plainly discriminatory against the 15,000,000 workers in service and trade. It discriminates against the very workers whose wages are lowest, whose living standards are being most hurt by rising living costs.

Pressed between rising living costs and substandard wages in our industries, workers will look actively for employment elsewhere. They will be drawn out of service and

trade to plants where higher wages are paid, to the favored industries. Our employers will be unable to compete with these industries in holding their labor. Service and trade employers may want to raise wages and grant other economic inducements to their workers, but the character of the stabilization program is such that they will not be able to pay enough to hold their people. Unable to hold their workers, and to get replacements because of substandard wages, many of our employers face bankruptcy.

In effect the stabilization program discriminates against small business for the benefit of big business monopoly, because service and trade are made up of relatively small employers, and workers will be drawn away from these employers to the corporation giants in basic industry.

BLOW AT SMALL BUSINESS

Is it the purpose of the mobilization program to put small enterprise entirely out of business? Small business is at the basis of the free, competitive enterprise system. Is that system to be destroyed at the direction of the big business monopolists now running the stabilization program to suit themselves?

This is a serious question. That same question is being raised by many small-business men, was in fact raised just recently before the manpower subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee. Many small-business men have complained to that committee that present policies are forcing them to the wall by driving their key personnel to big business with its higher wage rates and defense contracts.

$1 MINIMUM DEMANDED

Obviously one answer is to end the discrimination against the trade and service industries by allowing them more freedom in raising wages. A high enough minimum—$1 or more—to eliminate substandards would help hold workers in these industries.

I don't know what all the answers are, but I do think that we in the service and trade unions need to think about these problems. I submit no one is going to bother about our needs, our problems, unless we make ourselves heard. And as a basis for further discussion this morning, I therefore make the following recommendations:

PROGRAM FOR JOINT ACTION

1. That the service and trade unions represented here today appoint a special committee to present our special problems to the National Wage Stabilization Board;

2. That the United Labor Policy Committee be requested to accept on that committee two representatives of the service and trade unions to participate in all policy discussions with the National Wage Stabilization Board, the Economic Stabilization Agency, and the Office of Defense Mobilization;

3. That the National Wage Stabilization Board be requested to create within the Board, on both the national and regional levels, a special tripartite Trade and Service Stabilization Commission to provide proper consideration for workers in our industries;

4. That, on the initiative of the internationals here represented, regional and area interunion conferences of local unions in trade and service be called to discuss ways and means of protecting the rights and living standards of workers in our industries before the regional wage stabilization boards. We must not forget that policy questions decided on the national level must be applied on the local level, in the cities and regions, and it is here that flexibility in the wage program on a case-by-case basis can be secured if our local unions are coordinated through appropriate machinery to get that flexibility out of the regional wage boards.

New Price Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, April 27, on the new price order:

NEW PRICE ORDER

The manufacturers' general ceiling price regulation is designed to correct the inequities of the January 26 price freeze. It applies to about 75,000 manufacturing concerns, some of which have raised their prices excessively—that is, increased them to an extent not justified by the post-Korean rise in labor and materials costs. Their ceiling prices will have to be lowered. On the other hand, in cases where prices have lagged behind post-Korean cost increases and the freeze order has prevented profitable operations, ceiling prices will be raised. The ceiling price in each case is the highest base-period price of a commodity (the base period being April 1 through June 24 or any one of the three preceding quarters), with adjustments for subsequent increases in the cost of labor and materials.

Wholesalers and retailers will also be required to reflect changes in manufacturers' prices. Similar regulations covering manufacturers' prices, applicable to various industries having special problems, will soon be issued and calculations required under the present order will be repeated in the near future to allow for the impact on costs of the regulation itself and other OPS regulations. For it is not practicable, as the price-control officials explain, for each producer to postpone calculations until other ceiling prices down the line have been determined.

Price control is a slow process, necessitating extensive preliminary study and involving a mass of paper work for the concerns affected. But so far as a layman can judge, the OPS is going about its herculean task in a systematic way and doing its best to correct the unavoidable inequities of the price freeze. The result will not be spectacular, although Price Stabilizer DiSalle thinks the new regulation will result in a reduction or roll-back in the general level of manufacturers' prices. At any rate, it will curb profiteering price increases, and pave the way for eventual replacement of general ceiling price regulations by specific dollars and cents price ceilings, thus making the task of enforcement much easier.

A Time for Reflection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rocky Mountain News of April 25, 1951:

A TIME FOR REFLECTION

It would be well if there could be at least a 48-hour moratorium on public statements incident to the MacArthur controversy—a period that could be devoted to serious study and reflection by everyone concerned.

This country is at war, and let's not forget it.

This is grave and awful business.

The present is not a time for hysteria, smear campaigns, or personal recrimination.

General MacArthur has stated his case, and he did it with dignity and restraint, abusing no one.

The questions he raised are not issues in a political campaign but matters of vital concern to the American people. They should be regarded in that light—and not as an attack on the Democrats or as political ammunition for the Republicans.

President Truman has been temperate in what he has had to say on the subject, and his side of the controversy deserves thoughtful consideration.

The overriding question with which we are concerned is Communist aggression—and whether the measures we have adopted are adequate to meet the challenge.

This demands a searching examination of the American position in all parts of the world, by the appropriate committees of Congress.

One of the MacArthur critics says the general will be asked why he believes Russia would not move elsewhere—say in Iran or Europe—if the Korean war were expanded by bombing the Red supply bases in Manchuria.

What could be more ridiculous than to pose such a question, that only the Kremlin can answer?

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, who knows the Russians better than most people, believes Russia will go to war "only in accord with the program which has been developed by its leaders, and even then only if conditions are propitious."

It also is his opinion that our present superiority in atomic weapons may suffice to prevent war with Russia for the time being.

That is an informed guess, based on sound military considerations. But mere guessing isn't going to help us.

The immediate problem is how best to get out of the war in Korea in which we are presently involved, and then how to prepare against the larger war which threatens.

Quickening events on the Korean front may decide the issue there. Bullets speak louder than words, and bullets may determine whether the advocates of limited war were right or wrong.

Meanwhile there must be no lag in the preparations to meet a bigger war.

Those who say we will be ready to meet a Soviet attack by 1953 offer small comfort in face of the possibility that it may come sooner than that.

Instead of talking in terms of 1953, or even 1952, we should be asking ourselves how much more can we do right now, and during the remainder of 1951.

General MacArthur knows war as few Americans do. His views can be of great service to his country in this emergency, if the Democrats and Republicans will forget their differences long enough to hear him out.

Our other military leaders also should be heard, particularly those who know Asia and the Pacific area.

But the emphasis throughout should be on the immediate situation and the war which may come—not on past mistakes which cannot be recalled.

Asia has been the neglected front, to be sure. But what can be done now to make the best of a bad situation?

What areas can be saved that are vital to American security, either because of their geographic position or their natural resources? What manpower is available to support an anti-Communist position? Would our resources be spread too thin by attempting to defend both oceans?

These are among the questions to be examined, in the search for a balanced, adequate defense program. What has been done belongs to history.

Houston American Legion Post Supports MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted at a special meeting of Houston Post, No. 52, American Legion, supporting the position of General MacArthur on far-eastern military policy and calling for an investigation of the State Department and the removal of Secretary Acheson:

"Be it remembered that pursuant to the request of the commander, Department of Texas, that each Legion post determine its opinion on the following questions, to establish a policy of the Department of Texas on foreign affairs, Houston Post, No. 52, at a special meeting of 300 of its members, on Thursday, April 19, 1951, at 8 p. m., did answer as follows:

"(a) Should the United States continue the delaying war confined to Korea only? Answer: No.

"(b) Should we blockade the China coast with our Navy? Answer: Yes.

"(c) Should we furnish equipment to Chiang Kai-shek for an invasion on the mainland of China? Answer: Yes.

"(d) Should we bomb the Manchurian bases? Answer: Yes.

"(e) Do we believe in the foreign policy as outlined by General MacArthur or do we believe in the foreign policy as outlined by the President in his radio broadcast, April 11? Answer: MacArthur; and further

"Whereas the State commander additionally points out that an undeniable crisis, perhaps the most ominous in the history of the United States does exist; and

"Whereas this crisis has been occasioned by the continued muddling in the field of foreign affairs by President Truman and Secretary Dean Acheson, culminating in the firing of General of the Armies MacArthur; and

"Whereas General MacArthur has proved in the highest possible measure a full and complete knowledge of Asiatic problems as evidenced by the success of his military and civil administration of Japan and other assignments handed him involving the Far East, in contrast to the innumerable mistakes in the European theater: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by this post that in addition to the above answers to questions submitted by the department commander, That it is the sense of this post that the Department of Texas should reaffirm the resolution passed by the national convention of 1950 calling for an investigation of the activities of the State Department and of the Secretary of State and calling for the removal of Dean Acheson from that office. And further, in recognition of the fact that food and certain materials of war which we believe are being utilized to the detriment of our efforts in Korea, are reaching the Chinese Communists via several foreign nations which are receiving the same from us through various agencies of our Government that the recommended blockade of the China coast include all ports of entry irrespective of nationality or interests; and be it further

"Resolved in expansion of question 4 submitted by the department commander, That General MacArthur's recommendation No. 4 involving logistical support to Nationalist China's efforts should be complied with strictly; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the department commander in compliance with his instructions as contained in his directive and that a copy be sent to each of our Senators in Washington, to the Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, and to General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur."

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolutions adopted by unanimous vote at special meeting of American Legion Post, No. 52, Department of Texas, on Thursday, April 19, 1951.

JOHN L. COMPTON,
Post Commander.

Attest:

D. G. DAVIDSON,
Adjutant.

Communist Rule in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to protest Communist rule in Poland

Whereas the people of Poland are being deprived of religious and political freedom and are being subjected to indirect coercive methods of government and are the victims of Communist subjugation by an outside power, namely, Soviet Russia; and

Whereas these people in the vast majority are thoroughly imbued with democratic ideals and are opposed to totalitarianism; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to protest the present communistic rule in Poland and the subjugation of the Polish people by an outside power, namely, Soviet Russia; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted April 5, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 10, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Future of Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a memorandum to the President and the Congress of the United States prepared and accepted by the executive committee of the Slovak League of America on April 25, 1951:

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

As Americans of Slovak descent, we are naturally interested in, and vitally concerned about the future of Slovakia, the land which our forefathers and the succeeding generations of Slovaks have inhabited for the past 1,500 years.

The recognition of the inherent and God-given right of the Slovak nation to freedom and independence cannot concern us less than the recognition by the United States of this came right granted other nations of the civilized world.

The United States, we have been told over and over again, has never opposed the aspirations of any people in Europe to determine by their own free choice the state of form of political organization under which they wished to live. On the contrary, we have been repeatedly advised by responsible people in Government that self-determination has been a fundamental principle of President Woodrow Wilson, and that our Government has not departed from that policy even in the case of the Slovaks.

But the fact is that the principle of self-determination for all practical purposes, never did apply to the Slovak nation, and its inherent right to freedom and independence was not and still is not recognized or respected by the United States Government.

The Slovak League of America, the civic and cultural institution of Americans of Slovak descent and outspoken champion of the rights and liberties of the Slovak Nation, again strongly urges the Government of the United States to recognize and respect the right of the Slovak Nation to freedom and independence and to offer such moral, political, and material support to patriotic representatives of the Slovak people in exile, namely to the Slovak National Council Abroad, as is offered to other representative nationality groups of the nations behind the iron curtain.

The Slovak Nation is not a young or a new nation. It is in fact one of the oldest nations of central Europe, and it is a Christian nation.

As Americans, we firmly believe in the principle of the inalienable right of all men and all nations without exception to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If that is the belief of the people representing the United States Government at this time, they must manifest it clearly and concretely without fear of equivocation in all departments and agencies of Government. The United States must make it unmistakably clear that it does not and shall not recognize and favor any representatives of the Czech or Slovak nations who do not recognize and respect the inherent right of the Slovak people to freedom and independence.

The Slovak Nation, forced behind the iron curtain by Dr. Edward Benes and the victorious United Nations, and its representatives in exile are not willing to toil and sweat, to suffer and die to regain positions for bankrupt, professional politicians, even

though they are favored by the United States Government and the governments of other democratic countries. But they are most willing to suffer and sacrifice their lives for the ideals of real democracy and freedom.

The Slovak people at home and in exile are anxiously waiting to hear the Government of the United States tell them clearly and unequivocally whether America intends to recognise and respect their right to freedom and independence.

For the past 10 centuries the Slovak people were dominated by nations and political systems that tended to destroy the foundations of their national structure, nay their very national existence. The Slovaks have been and still are persecuted and exploited by aliens who are hostile to their national and religious traditions. Today they are enslaved by the proponents of the ruinous ideology of godless communism which they had consistently rejected and resisted openly for over a hundred years. The Slovaks find themselves in this terrible predicament through no fault of their own. They had no choice in the matter. The irony of all this predicament still seems to be favored by the United States Government and other democratic governments.

The Slovak Nation has had its fill of the political system represented by Czechoslovakia and, presently, by the Czech National Socialists, other Czech groups, and the so-called Czechoslovaks in exile. The Slovak nation has had enough of Zenkl and Papánek, Ripka, and Lettrich and their ilk, who reminds it so much of Gottwald and his followers.

We state most emphatically that we consider it immoral and undemocratic to give moral, political, and material help to people who have in the past denied the right of self-determination to the Slovak nation and who, even today, proclaim that the Slovaks have no right to freedom and independence. They are the so-styled Czechoslovaks, the pseudo-democrats, who have used and abused—and are still using and abusing—American democracy for their own interests and are compromising the good name of the United States.

We strongly urge the resolution of the Czechoslovak question for once and for all time. American interests and the interests of the democratic world at large are ill-served by supporting bankrupt Czech politicians and former Red collaborators who propagate the fiction of a united Czechoslovak Nation. The Government of the United States and all other democratic governments of the world must recognize the fact that has been so apparent to both the Slovak and the Czech peoples for quite some time—the Czechs are not and do not want to be Slovaks, and the Slovaks are not and do not want to be Czechs.

If it is the policy of our Government to refuse to recognize the Slovak Nation and its patriotic representatives in exile; if our State Department is determined to continue a policy which threatens the very existence of the Slovak Nation; if the persons in the United States Government are determined to force the Slovaks under the rule of the Czechs, then we believe the Government of the United States should in justice inform the American public accordingly.

As Americans, united in the Slovak League of America, we plead for the recognition of the fundamental rights of the people we are descended from. Those rights are predicated in the elementary principle that all peoples, wherever they may be found and however few their numbers, are morally entitled to speak in the council of nations, there to defend their rights to survival and self-fulfillment. The right of self-determination cannot be exercised vicariously; liberty is not exercised by proxy. In the peaceful and orderly reconstruction of the world, all peoples must have a voice in the determination of their futures, their destinies. The Slovak Nation must not be excepted. A just and lasting peace can become a reality only if the fundamentals of democracy, the principles of right and justice, are applied to all nations and denied to none.

The Slovak League of America, representing an overwhelming majority of organized Americans of Slovak descent, earnestly appeals to the President and the Congress of the United States of America not to fail the Slovak Nation in this hour of peril and persecution. The recognition of the inherent and God-given right of the Slovak Nation to freedom and independence will give aid and comfort and hope to the oppressed millions behind the iron curtain in Slovakia and added initiative to thousands of her patriotic sons in exile. The recognition would also serve the best interests of America and the rest of the democratic world. The Slovaks have fought against the plague of communism for over a hundred years and today are determined to resist and fight it more than ever before.

The Slovaks, however, need encouragement in this their darkest hour from the United States and the other democracies. They are in the fight against communism primarily because they still firmly believe that godless communism is the greatest evil humanity has ever been exposed to, but the Slovaks are also vitally interested in their own freedom and independence.

To tell the people of Slovakia that they must resist communism in the name of Czechoslovak democracy, or in the name of the Czechoslovak Republic, or in the name of Dr. Edward Benes—such propaganda is all wrong. Nay, it is immoral and undemocratic. Such propaganda only tends to drive the Slovaks into despair and, therefore, into the arms of Stalin, whose agents are ever on the alert to use such propaganda to their own advantage against the United States and the other democracies by telling the Slovaks that western democracies are not interested in Slovak freedom and independence. It is no secret that Moscow is ever ready to have her agents in Slovakia proclaim the independence of Slovakia and incorporate her into the U. S. S. R.

The Slovak League of America strongly urges the United States Government not to abandon the principle of nationality—the ethnic principle—in the case of the Slovak Nation. We sincerely believe it is a more effective weapon against communism and all totalitarian systems than the A-bomb. The United States and the other western democracies must not fail the Slovak Nation in its darkest hour.

APRIL 25, 1951.

For the Slovak League of America:

P. A. HROBAK, *President.*
FRANCIS HRUSOVSKY, *Secretary.*
FRANK J. GURCAK, *Treasurer.*
MICHAEL REHAK,
JOSEPH G. PRUSA,
PAUL JAMRISKA,
Dr. PETER P. HLETKO,
Executive Committee.

As Reason Replaces Emotionalism Opposition To Starting Big War Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an excerpt from Frank Edwards' broadcast of April 30, 1951, over Mutual Broadcasting System, which follows:

About 2 weeks ago I asked you folks a question: Should we invade the Chinese mainland? Some irate listeners wrote to tell me that no one was even thinking about such a thing—a statement which has been disproved by subsequent events. One general and several Senators have all advocated the use of American fliers and sailors as our contribution to taking part in an invasion of China by Nationalist troops. Senator CAIN, Washington Republican, presented a resolution asking Congress to declare war on China.

My listeners sent in more than 96,000 replies to the question: Should we invade the Chinese mainland?

The first 16,000 ran about 5 to 1 against invasion. By the time we had reached the 60,000 mark the score was running 7½ to 1 against invasion of the Chinese mainland.

And we noticed this very interesting aspect of the poll: After Senator CAIN's pronouncement asking for war with China—the cards postmarked after that date ran heavily in opposition to CAIN's proposal—the final 30,000 cards ran 30 to 1 against invading China.

The count showed that the tide of opinion among my listeners gained momentum as time went on. As reason began to replace emotionalism, perhaps we might say, the flood of cards showed an increasingly heavy opposition to starting a big war to get out of a little one.

To all those who so kindly took time and trouble to cast their votes by postal on this very important issue, my sincere thanks. It is a rare privilege in our times to be able to express your opinions with complete freedom and without fear. Most of the people of the world do not have that privilege—others who have had it have lost it because they never used it. Freedom is strongest and healthiest when it is kept in action.

Proposed Legislation Relative to Persons and Corporations Doing Business With Communist Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to publish the names of all persons, firms, and corporations who are doing business with Communist countries and to bar them from doing business with the United States Government or with any agency thereof

Whereas the Government of the United States is in the process of preparing itself against aggression by Communist countries; and

Whereas there are certain persons, firms, and corporations which continue to do business with such Communist countries and to provide them with essential materials of war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take such actions as may be necessary to publish the names of all persons, firms, and corporations which are doing business with Communist countries and to enact legislation barring such persons, firms, and corporations from doing business with or entering into contracts with the United States Government or with any agency thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth send forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted April 5, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 10, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN, *Secretary of the Commonwealth.*

Ten Honest Politicians—Liberty Awards, Eighty-second Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, recently 10 Members of Congress were honored by awards from Liberty magazine. It gives me real pleasure to include the tributes paid to these outstanding citizens and legislators in Liberty:

TEN HONEST POLITICIANS—LIBERTY AWARDS, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Today Congress legislates more, spends more, and has greater influence on the fate of people the world over than any similar body in history. How worthy are the 531 Representatives and Senators who have so much power?

Liberty spotlights 10 outstanding, honest politicians in the Eighty-second Congress. There are others who merit inclusion, but these 10 are leading examples. They are not just politicians who keep out of trouble and in office; they are dynamic and outspoken. They are not the hacks who have made the words phony and politician interchangeable.

These lawmakers were picked because Liberty believes they all sincerely try to serve the people—though they represent varied, conflicting viewpoints. The 10 deserve respect because they have risked their political necks for principles, and have been able enough politicians to win elections without selling their souls. They are in the tradition of Teddy Roosevelt, Al Smith, FDR, and LaGuardia. Some are straight party men, some are independents, but be they regulars or mavericks no boss casts their vote and the only strings are to their conscience.

Here are sound reasons why these meet the test—and why some others failed to qualify:

They refuse to be errand boys for pressure groups or front for special interests.

By investigation and study they know issues and know why they vote the way they do. By becoming experts in special fields they provide leadership for the rest of Congress.

They are not fanatics nor are they troubadours for funny money, pie-in-the-sky, panaceas and give-away programs. Serious and sane, they put in twice as many hours as most of their constituents.

You never find them wrapped in a sanctimonious cloud while hatchet men run around doing dirty political chores for them. Their left hand knows what their right hand does, and both hands are clean. They don't "yes" the little people privately and vote against them on the floor.

They never use congressional immunity to say anything they wouldn't repeat to your face.

They are not glamour politicians wracked by lust for publicity. Surrounded by prima donnas they are team workers, ready to act even if a colleague gets the credit.

They would rather be right than President—and it is entirely possible that some of them may be both. All are good material.

Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, of New York, has won more political successes than any living American. After a brilliant record as governor, he refused to regard the Senate as retirement. Serving a 1-year term in 1949, LEHMAN became a "young Turk," rallied less energetic Democrats to the Fair Deal, and helped put over the DP bill. When a crude measure to control subversives (McCarran Act) was introduced shortly before election LEHMAN waged a hard, lonely fight. The majority, convinced it was suicidal to object, shamefacedly passed it. Last fall LEHMAN diligently explained to the voters that the real issue was the bill of rights. He ran a million votes ahead of his party. "When you take a risky stand to defend a principle," he says, "you may lose votes temporarily but you establish a reputation for independence. If you're building a political career, it's reputation and the general impression that count most."

Representative HUGH MITCHELL has, at 43, an elder statesman's distinction of having been Democratic Senator from Washington and now serving the House. Had he not championed necessary but unpopular price controls in 1946, he could have saved his Senate seat. Today the voters say they are tired of big real estate and banking influences and would like MITCHELL back in the Senate. Either MITCHELL or his colleague, HENRY JACKSON, will run in 1952.

First to propose a Columbia Valley Authority (similar to TVA), a champion of middle income housing, MITCHELL is respected as a leader with a long view. He will win his finest laurels in the international field if he can put through his plan for a Pacific Marshall plan. "Democracy must become a shattering force in raising the hopes of millions in Asia," he declares. A Mitchell plan might avert a war by removing the cause. He intends to fight for it.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, in his sweeping campaign for reelection last fall, closed each speech with these words: "I don't want anybody to vote for me who doesn't want me back to Congress a free man—absolutely free to exercise my judgment on the merits of an issue in accordance with the facts as I find them. Also, I don't want a single isolationist vote; isolationism offers you a war you can't win."

A skilled tactician, MORSE piloted the world court measure through the Senate, generaled the fight against Taft-Hartley, and now keeps a sharp eye on power-greedy brass hats.

MORSE believes his party has a genius for snatching defeat from the jaws of victory. In 1947 he warned Republican bosses that if they neglected public demands, they would wake up the morning after the 1948 election to find the Democrats in. Which is exactly what happened.

Representative CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, though warned by old-timers to let sleeping dogs lie, insisted on making his maiden congressional speech a challenge to JOHN RANKIN's anti-Negro anti-Jewish tirades. A Republican, CASE firmly believes "people will never join our party in the South until we Republicans offer an alternative." CASE works "for a party that keeps its doors open to all groups; we must avoid being a class party."

Labor is enthusiastic over his stanch fight against antiunion curbs. His conservative Republican constituents, a little breathless keeping up, respect and reelect him solidly. Weekly he discusses issues with them, currently emphasizing practical steps for international cooperation. Should his party ever switch to CASE's brand of Republicanism it might win some astonishing victories and CASE would rise as a national personality.

Senator JAMES DUFF, of Pennsylvania, explains why his political obituary keeps reappearing: "Because I play table stakes." He'll gamble everything rather than trim or compromise. This independence dates to his service as a Bull Moose elector for Teddy Roosevelt. His first act as Pennsylvania's Governor was to throw the manufacturer's association "fix" man out of his office, and set up a vast water project "cleansing the filthy cesspools so that now you can see a silver dollar 5 feet down." Trying to purify the Republican Party, DUFF was crushed when the Grundy machine steamrollered Dewey's nomination in '48. He took the issue of Grundyism to the people and humiliated the bosses. He feels his party can talk Presidential candidates only "after developing a sound political philosophy." DUFF, who fights TAFT's isolationism and regards Dewey as a "lip-service liberal," might be the man.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, looks back to 1921 "when I introduced a law in the State legislature making it an offense to wear disguises for the purpose of terrifying anybody." He thinks this blow against the KKK the proudest risk of a career packed with battles against predatory bullies.

As co-author of the Robinson-Patman Act his name is a milestone in antitrust law. Last year he led an aggressive fight against "basing points," a device by big steel companies to raise steel prices by charging customers for nonexistent freight.

Few Congressmen are equipped to deal with the lawyer lobbyists of corporations and cartels. The public must rely on wise WRIGHT PATMAN to protect it, and keep small business and free competition alive. Had he made a deal with the oil companies the political escalator was waiting for him—but PATMAN would rather be right.

Representative HENRY JACKSON, 38-year-old Democrat, of Washington, has spent 10 impatient years in Congress struggling for more electric power, more production, more industrial development, more things for more people at less cost.

As a congressional watchdog on atomic energy he stoutly defended civilian director Lilienthal against efforts to smear his efficient administration. JACKSON angrily labeled Senator BICKENLOOPER's bumbling charges "a carnival of confusion" and insisted this vital project be free of political and military interference.

A keen constitutional lawyer, JACKSON fights Communists without destroying individual liberties. A great champion of labor, he wants resources exploited, not people. In Washington State they would like him as governor, or to send him to the Senate if his colleague HUGH MITCHELL isn't the candidate. Wherever he serves, he'll be doing a job for the people.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, is the voice of the South. Called an unreconstructed Georgian by liberals he likes to point to free lunches for United States school children and the farm security program as proof that he has political know-how while others talk.

He was the southern bloc's choice against Truman in 1948. The Dixiecrats bolted to hold a separate convention, but RUSSELL refused their nomination, preferring to remain a regular Democrat, thereby saving his party from collapse. He may be compared to Henry Clay.

A popular orator he refuses "to play Dixie on the heartstrings." In 1936 he trounced

Gene Talmadge in an acrid campaign and today at 53 he is the Senate's master parliamentarian, an adroit and powerful lawmaker. While RUSSELL gallantly shields old traditions he also champions profound measures which hasten the day when Southern attitudes will be extinct.

Representative JACK JAVITS, Republican, of New York, keeps winning in Tammany's bailiwick. He thinks his party could win everywhere if it adopted his zealous strategy of "the feasible alternative. Not just opposition but come up with some positive answers." He is one of the few Congressmen who has not wavered on civil liberties at home and who opposes alliances with Fascists abroad. While working to speed wheat to India he said "fighting communism must involve economic and spiritual forces as well as military."

JAVITS feels he makes his real impact speaking. On countless TV, radio programs and forums he explains issues and answers questions. Appearing outside his district he often sparks a community to make demands which help put something through Congress that no amount of debate or politicking could do. He says "the public really holds the whip."

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, but for her enemies, would merely be known as the first woman to enter the Senate strictly on her own merit. Last year she issued a "declaration of conscience"—a clarion call for Congress to make a stand for decency. Leveling fire on Senator MCCARTHY, she denounced efforts to turn Congress into a forum of hate. Those who hoped to ride to a Republican victory through the selfish political exploitation of fear, bigotry, ignorance and intolerance winced under her seething indictment. The MCCARTHY bloc is now sharpening knives for vengeance against Mrs. SMITH.

With her New England conscience the Senator combines a sincere human approach which has given Maine an effective Washington advocate. She likes to have major issues thoroughly discussed at home before voting on them. In Maine, frankness is a political asset.

Banks' 1950 Profits Are Greatest Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, April 30, 1951:

BANKS' 1950 PROFITS ARE GREATEST EVER

Bank profits in 1950 were the greatest in history, Maple T. Harl, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), said yesterday.

Reports from the 13,446 FDIC-insured commercial banks showed net profits after taxes amounted to $937,000,000, a 13-percent gain over 1949, he said, adding:

"Stockholders of the banks shared directly in this prosperity, with record dividends of $391,000,000, or 42 percent of net profits after taxes."

The profits after taxes, Harl said, represented "an average of 27.72 percent on basic common capital and 8.51 percent on total capital accounts, the highest rate of profits since 1946."

The FDIC Chairman described dividend payments to common stockholders as equivalent to "a direct return of 11.45 percent on this stock, the highest dividend payment in the history of the Corporation (FDIC)."

"On May 12," Harl said, "we will cross the threshold of the eighth year in which there has been no receivership of an insured bank, nor a penny's loss to any depositor in an insured bank. This represents an all-time record for depositors' safety in this Nation."

He declared that loans—which the Government has lately been trying to stem for anti-inflation purposes—reached at the end of 1950 the highest point ever up to that time.

The loan rise accounted for most of the gain in bank earnings—gross current operating earnings were an unprecedented $3,931,000,000—as the average rate of return on loans advanced slightly to 4.34 percent.

Total income from loans rose 14 percent over 1949 to a $2,008,000,000 total, while interest on United States Government securities was practically unchanged at $1,015,000,000.

Address of Justice William O. Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT SUTTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, very graciously accepted an invitation to address the general assembly, in joint session, of the State of Tennessee. Under permission heretofore granted, I insert Justice Douglas' remarks in the RECORD. His observations are very interesting and most enlightening indeed. I am sure that the Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will greatly enjoy the expressions of our eminent jurist:

ADDRESS OF MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 22, 1951

TENNESSEE ACROSS THE WORLD

The invitation to address the Tennessee Legislature is an honor I will always cherish. The distinction has special value to me because of the ties I have to this Commonwealth. They are not ties of birth or residence. They are in part ties of friendship with members of this body, with Tennessee lawyers, with Tennessee fishermen and hunters, and with a long and illustrious line of Senators and Representatives to the Congress. The list is too long to mention; but you will appreciate the quality of these friends and their enduring nature when I say that the Dean of them all is Cordell Hull, of Carthage.

By reason of her distinguished sons, Tennessee had a hold on me long before I ever walked her ridges or explored her lakes. Tennessee so far has given the Nation three Presidents—Andrew Jackson, James Polk, and Andrew Johnson. These were special heroes of mine. Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson were men of tough fiber who believed in democracy and would fight its opponents to the death. Polk too had a special claim to my affections. It was Polk who saved the Pacific Northwest (and the special part of the old Oregon Territory which is my home) for the United States.

In later years I came to identify Tennessee with distinguished lawyers and jurists. I knew Grafton Green, the late Chief Justice, and was privileged to call him a friend. Five Tennessee lawyers have served on the Supreme Court of the United States: John Catron (1837–65), Howell E. Jackson (1893–95), Horace T. Lurton (1909–14), Edward T. Sanford (1923–30), James C. McReynolds (1914–41).

Each of these men, true to the character of his State, was a strong individualist with values to which he was as devoted as Andrew Jackson was to his. These men helped give the Court the quality of independence which has distinguished its long history.

Recorded history could produce many more examples that are illustrative of the strength which Tennessee has given the Nation. During the journeys I made the last two summers into the villages of Asia I learned what hope Tennessee has given the world.

It may come as a surprise even to Tennesseans to learn that the word "Tennessee" is well known all the way across from the Mediterranean to the Pacific. To millions of people in that area the word is, indeed, the symbol of a new order, a new way of life—security and independence for themselves and their children.

They know about Tennessee because they have heard of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is the Tennessee Valley Authority that fits their needs and will solve many of their basic problems. The TVA can also be utilized as one of the major influence to turn back the tide of communism which today threatens to engulf Asia.

The country I speak of is the vast underbelly of Russia that extends from Lebanon and Syria on the west through India on the east. Its geography tells in part the interest of the people of the region in the TVA. The Lebanon Mountains rise from the Mediterranean and form a high barricade where moisture collects. This range once covered with juniper, pine, and the famous cedars of Lebanon is now mostly bare. The Lebanon Mountains extend south and become geologically the Mountains of Judea where Jerusalem sits. Judea too has long been shorn of trees.

East of the Lebanon Mountains some 20 miles is the Anti-Lebanon range guarded over by Mount Hermon of Biblical fame. This range is also mostly deforested. The Anti-Lebanon runs south to form the Mountains of Moab, where Moses is buried. Moab like Judea has been scrubbed clean of trees. In between Moab and Judea runs the Jordan.

East of the Anti-Lebanon is Damascus, an oasis that sits on the edge of a vast desertic steppe running 461 miles to Baghdad, Iraq. It is an empty domain where anyone but a Bedouin would get lost and die of thirst.

Baghdad sits in between the Tigris and Euphrates and not far north of their confluence. It is the center of the ancient Mesopotamia. Beyond it to the east 200 miles are the Zagros Mountains which form the western border of Persia. These are high mountains, rising 15,000 feet. On their east are high plateaus and basins broken by minor ridges that run to Afghanistan and Pakistan and finally to India.

All of this vast domain is practically treeless. In ancient days the interior was rich in oak and juniper. Now one can ride horseback for days on end and see no trees except date orchards in Iraq or peaches and apricots in Persia or such poplars as may have been planted in a village. The region is treeless because of the goat. But for the goat new forests would have grown when the old ones were cut for lumber and charcoal. The goat, however, ate the seedlings. Unrestricted grazing and uncontrolled cutting of trees produced erosion the like of which Americans have never seen. The trees are all gone; the grass is going; hundreds of thousands of acres have been despoiled.

The result is that rains and snow water run off in torrents, washing top soil away. Some parts of this inland empire get only 20 inches of rain a year; and it is mostly wasted. Other sections, such as portions of India, are heavy with rain; but it too comes and goes in a roar. There may be 40 to 60 inches a year; and yet no water is left for the growing season.

To the people of this area TVA means the harnessing of floods, the storing of rain water and the installation of modern irrigation systems. Everywhere I went people asked, "Why can't we have a TVA?"

A Druse chieftain south of Damascus inquired about it. I was asked about it many times as I traveled the length of the Tigris and Euphrates. Below Baghdad I saw 50,000 people homeless by reason of a flood. They, too, had heard of the TVA and wanted one for themselves.

In Persia I traveled the length of the Zagros Range—from the Russian border in the north to the Persian Gulf on the south. In practically every valley I heard the same plea, "We need a TVA."

In New Delhi, Nehru, Prasad, and other high officials of India spoke enthusiastically about their many projects or reform. Yet their eyes lighted up the most when they mentioned India's four new TVA's that come into operation in 1951 and the great TVA on the Kosi River (still in blueprint) that will overshadow anything we in America have ever known.

Yes, the Tennessee Valley Authority has caught the imagination of all the people across this broad belt of Asia. They think of it as a device for insuring crops in a land where crop failures mean death from starvation. TVA also means to them increased productivity of the land, new forests, the end of erosion, modern methods of farming.

TVA means more than this. The Middle East and southeast Asia are areas which have long been exploited. Huge profits have been taken out of the region; few profits have ever been left for the social and economic development of these countries. Some foreign power has for centuries bled those nations white. The TVA is a community project whereby the benefits accrue to all the people, not to a few promoters. Some call this socialism. But the people of Asia are not bothered by labels. It is the result that counts; and one thing they like about TVA is that it is a device which avoids exploitation of the many by the few.

The TVA is even more than that. It represents an idea that at this juncture of history can be utilized on behalf of civilization against the threat of totalitarian communism.

If we are bold enough to make this device an instrument of our Asiatic foreign policy, we can take the political initiative away from Soviet Russia, turn the tide, and win country after country for the democratic cause. The reason the TVA can have that profound and revolutionary effect is due to the character of the problem that confronts Asia.

We in America are apt to think of Asia in terms of teeming millions who live in squalor and who are doomed to stay there. Poverty, lack of medical care, and illiteracy are, indeed, the first to meet the eye of the newcomer to that area. But the future of Asia is bright if we will only study its potential. And the alliance of Asia to the democratic front can be steadfast, if we heed the warnings and sponsor liberal political groups rather than reactionary ones.

The rock bottom of Asia's problem is landlordism. By and large the governments of Asia are of the landlords, by the landlords, and for the landlords. India under Nehru is an exception, for Nehru is splitting up the huge estates and distributing the land on an installment basis to the peasants. Persia under Razmara can easily be another exception. The recent announcement by the Shah of Persia of the sale of the Royal lands to the peasants points the way.

In this part of the world the land for centuries has been owned by a few. The rent is usually on shares. It runs as high as 80 percent of the crop. The tenant is customarily in debt to the landlord on loans paying interest of 20, 40, and even 100 percent. So his actual share of the crop is often much less than 20 percent. He is bound to the landlord throughout all time. His grandsons will be serfs just as he is and just as his great-grandfather was.

A few men may own a whole nation. It is not uncommon to find one man owning 100, 200, 600 villages. The profits are exported abroad or at least not reinvested in the villages; the life of the villages goes on as it did centuries ago; men and women live in squalor under an extortionate tenancy. There are no schools, no doctors, no first-aid centers. The peasant has about concluded he has no escape from his tenancy except by revolution.

There are grumblings in every village I have visited across this broad belt. Revolution is brewing. It's the kind of revolution the stalwart sons of Tennessee once brewed. If we in America knew the facts and appreciated what was at stake, we would be on the side of these miserable tenants. We would help them make their revolutions. We would help them make their revolutions in the pattern of our own American Revolution.

Unfortunately, we do not do that. As a result of a combination or circumstances, we are mostly signed up on the side of the landlords. In Asia change is certain; but it is not necessarily a change to communism. To Asiatics we appear to be against change. We strive for stability in governments when there can be no stability. We aline ourselves with the status quo; and as a consequence America becomes identified in the eyes of the peasants of Asia with the forces that hold them in their eternal serfdom. Soviet propaganda about America, these peasants often told me, is proved to be correct. We talk democracy and peace and in our foreign policies support persons and governments and policies that make democracy and peace impossible in Asia.

This criticism of America is not fair; we intend no such consequences. It is, however, a product of our wholly negative attitude. In our foreign policy we are merely anti-Communist. We have not become identified in the eyes of the peasants of Asia with their aspirations. The opposite has in fact been the case. We have been so violently and relentlessly anti-Communist that we have rushed to the support of every group that opposes Soviet communism. That has put us in partnership with the corrupt and reactionary groups whose policies breed the discontent on which Soviet communism feeds and spreads. Thus we have ended up as allies of some of the worst foes of the peoples of Asia.

It is easy to reverse the trend. We can begin by utilizing the idea of the TVA as the political instrument for remodeling the economy of Asia. Take the Tigris and Euphrates as an example. Today 200 men own and control Iraq. Three million five hundred thousand people are the poverty-ridden, diseased, and illiterate employees of this group. A TVA on the Tigris and Euphrates could rather quickly alter this condition. If a TVA were constructed, it could provide the conditions which would transform this poverty belt into a prosperous area. It could create an economy based on a democratic rather than a communistic foundation. If a TVA is built, American capital will largely build it. We therefore can attach conditions to it—conditions similar to the ones that settled our own West and that prevented for all time the ancient problem of landlordism from haunting this Nation. The basic condition is that every man who works the land shall own it and that no man shall own more than say, 30 acres.

This undertaking would have profound effects on both the problem of the standard of living in this area and on the problem of population. It would at once spread the dividends of increased production among the broad base of the peasants and lay the foundation for medical care, schools, and all of the other necessities of healthy village life. It would, moreover, supply the largest part of the answer to the population problem. Iraq today has 3,500,000 people; Persia, 16,000,000. With proper land utilization Iraq could support 40,000,000; Persia, 100,000,000. We think of India as overpopulated. Her 400,000,000, located on tired and saturated land, seem to us to create an insoluble problem. Nehru, however, is convinced that India is underpopulated; and after seeing India's potential I am inclined to agree. India's TVA's can greatly increase the fertility and productivity of the earth. India's TVA's can start vast industrial projects. India's future is bright. Her natural resources are great. She has, for example, richer iron deposits than we ever knew in America. Her electric power potential is unequaled. There is no reason why India cannot enjoy as high a standard of living as our own.

If America sponsored the kind of TVA in Asia that we sponsor at home, the political tide would soon turn our way. Deep in the hearts of each of Asia's peasants is the desire to own land. He wants to be able to fence it, to call it his own. Land ownership is a real passion. The Soviets know it. In the propaganda which they beam to Asia or spread by word of mouth, they do not talk of collective farms. Instead they promise every tenant his own farm. While the Soviets are talking, we of the Western World can promote actual projects. We can be the promoters of living TVA's in this entire area which will make the farmers the landowners.

Today the peasants in these countries have little to fight for. Today they will not form armies of strength and determination against Soviet communism. They will not rise up and fight for their landlords. They have been too long exploited. They cannot be expected to form reliable armies in defense of the system which has held them in their lowly estate. They must have ideas of freedom for which to fight. Those ideas must be concrete and specific. For example, once the Communists in China changed from Marxist slogans to agrarian projects that caught the imagination of the peasants; they began to march to victories. People are the same the world over. Armies that fight to the bitter end are armies that fight for ideas. The aim of the Soviet influence is to produce native armies that will fight for the projects of Soviet Russia. There is no reason why the democratic world cannot do the same. Our task is in many respects easier than Russia's. For in Asia, Russia is the much-suspected neighbor whose Marxist philosophy has precious little appeal even to the masses.

If the peasants of Asia are given personal stakes in their countries, they will rally in defense. While they will not rise up and fight for their landlords, they will rise up and fight for their own. Only when those conditions exist can we build security in that area.

We of the Western World have sacrificed our strength in Asia because we have been purely on the defensive. We let China go communistic, because we attached no conditions to the $2,000,000,000 we advanced to Chiang Kai-shek. If we had insisted on reforms as a condition of our help and supervised the expenditure of the great wealth we poured into China, the chances are China would not be Communist today.

To date most of the funds we have spent in Asia have been wasted. In spite of our expenditures the democratic world has been

growing smaller and smaller. The truth is that we cannot save the world from communism by dollars. We can, however, save it from communism by a liberal, aggressive, positive program of reform.

The TVA is a great political invention of the century. It has made Tennessee a word with revolutionary overtones the world around. Tennessee is today a word that inspires millions of Asiatics to the hope of a better life. The concept of water control and land utilization which the TVA embodies can become the solvent of the main problems of Asia. The idea of the TVA can become even more than that. It can be made the major influence for obtaining in Asia a verdict against communism and for civilization.

Appearance of General MacArthur Before House Committee on Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES T. PATTERSON IN CONNECTION WITH HIS INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE APPEARANCE OF GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN PUBLIC HEARING

The awful enormity of military operations in Korea has strengthened my conviction that it is the duty of Congress to determine that American lives shall not be lost needlessly in this conflict.

A half-informed Congress can accomplish little more than an uninformed Congress. It is ridiculous to assume that the scheduled hearings before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate will resolve the extreme doubt which many Members of Congress have as to the wisdom of the present course of action in Korea. Further, executive sessions will serve to increase that doubt beyond reasonable proportions.

Feeling that now is the time to take the American people into our confidence, I have proposed by resolution that the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives shall, upon completion of the Senate hearings, conduct a full, open public inquiry to which General MacArthur and Defense Department representatives will be invited to testify. It is expected that invitations would be issued to Secretary Marshall, Secretary Acheson, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as to others with special knowledge of our policies, both diplomatic and military, in Korea and on the continent of Asia.

The future security of the world depends upon the wisdom of our decisions. Personalities have no place in those decisions. The Congress is desirous of being fully informed and acting upon the information obtained.

Vehement attacks upon the President of the United States and upon General MacArthur, both in and beyond the confines of the Congress, make it mandatory that we hear both views as to the conduct of military and diplomatic operations in the Far East. The American people have split terribly over recent events, and despair instead of hope has pervaded our Nation. The people sincerely want to believe in the principles which brought our forces to Korea. They sincerely want to have us, as a nation, resist aggression. And, above all, they want to secure a just peace and an enduring one so that their children and their children's children shall not have to make war with despots.

I trust that my resolution will be adopted by the House and that the Armed Services Committee will conduct such an inquiry in the same nonpartisan manner in which all other deliberations of the committee have been held.

The Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by John S. Coleman, president of the Burroughs Adding Machine Co., at the annual Michigan congressional dinner, held in this city on April 30 last. The address was on the subject of the free-enterprise system.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Detroit is about to celebrate its anniversary of 250 years. But, let no one say the city is old. Look at the headlines. They tell of the need for strength. And to whom does the Nation turn?—to young and dynamic Detroit. In World War II, without partisan interest, we fulfilled our commission, and we will fulfill it today.

Upon all of us, gentlemen, now rest new and grave obligations. There was a time when the typical company president was totally absorbed in the single purpose of running his own business. He had no extra curricular activities. He did not preside at community chest luncheons. He did not appear on television. He did not mount the rostrum at this association meeting or that convention. He was not an airline commuter. He could be found in town and at his desk. And patient vice presidents had no reason to remind him that the company was in business to make a profit.

Why do we leave our desks and apply ourselves to problems outside the immediate commission of our boards of directors? In a free society, there is no escape from social responsibilities. And this is true for all of us, whatever our job. The citizen who will not dirty his hands with politics soon gets a brand of politics which is plenty dirty. He gets what he deserves and it may be he gets dictatorship.

Similarly, corporations ignore at their peril the world beyond their board rooms. For the problems of the world certainly will not pass the corporation by. The impact of taxation, social security, labor legislation, and banking policy on our daily business is clear and direct. But in the broader issues of foreign trade, of peace and war, of the ideals and purposes of a free society—in all of these too, the corporation as the representative unit of our economic system is inextricably mixed.

It may be right to call a corporation a legal fiction; but within its gates, millions of Americans spend most of their waking hours. To them, it is far from fiction. It touches intimately their homes and families. It is a factor in local affairs. Its representatives spread its influence across the country, and often, through subsidiaries or agents, to the world overseas.

The corporation is not an organ of the state, but surely it is an organ of society. On Government rests a broad jurisdiction. But the corporation, too, has rights. It, too, has its appropriate sphere of action and its indispensable functions. These two, Government and industry, are not contestants in a struggle. They are partners in a common cause; that of the fulfillment of the individual man. And if this purpose is not pursued in harmony, it cannot be achieved at all. Tonight, therefore, here in Washington, before my colleagues of Michigan industry, I am encouraged to make a few remarks on our part in that elusive harmony.

Let me begin, gentlemen, by saying that we must first be aware of our own place in society. To determine this is not as easy as it seems. If we manage to snatch a few moments to look up some things people may have written on this subject, we meet with violently contradictory assertions. The Wall Street Journal and the writings of a Sinclair Lewis; the publications of the Chamber of Commerce and various professors of social science bear witness to a mutual dislike.

As someone has suggested, if one were to take one's opinion of American business enterprise from the Broadway stage, one could only conclude that it is a noxious form of skullduggery practiced by offensive heels. Though this unfortunate picture may be discounted as perhaps the normal relationship between "creative artists" and those doing the housekeeping, nevertheless, there is one fact which deserves some thought. Beyond its own journals, American business has a bad press. I am concerned with the bitter critics to be found in the highly influential academic and literary fields. And I am concerned with the ineffective response we have been making to this threat.

I use the word "threat" carefully. For if capitalism is to survive, it must do more than produce a greater and greater flow of goods and services. It must also win the acceptance and more, the loyalty, of the broad community. Unless the average citizen is convinced that our system is compatible with and encourages personal expression and fulfillment, he will search for alternatives. People may vote us success by buying our products, but that is small consolation if they then go to the polls and vote us out of business. Capitalism is the means to abundance; but if it is ideologically inadequate, it will die.

It is true that businessmen have not all become angels. Some are still battling the tide. But undoubtedly we have reached a large measure of industrial democracy. And our urgent task is to show the connection between these contemporary facts of business and the purposes of a free society—not by platitudes, far less by slogans and commercials; but by consistent, cogent, and tireless demonstration.

I am not going to attempt to draw a syllabus for an educational program. But this is perhaps an appropriate place to indicate certain prerequisites. Surely, the first is to understand those to whom we speak. Neither a thousand full-page spreads nor a torrent of after-dinner speeches will have the slightest effect unless we know what interests the listener. And of one thing I am sure, as Fortune magazine recently reminded us, abstract apologetic ads for free enterprise leave Joe Doakes cold.

The louder we proclaim its virtues, possibly the more suspicious he gets. Unctuous generalities about the corner drug store and Abraham Lincoln do not add up to the individual American dream. And over-simplified readings of economic history do not come within a mile of the desires and aspirations

of the average man in the shop. It is time we gave a much-needed rest to the vague and negative words "free enterprise." I am not always sure I know what they mean, and I am sure that even after a million dollar advertising campaign, Joe Doakes doesn't.

Free enterprise in the sense of a broad freedom to buy and sell without a complicated apparatus of controls, certainly existed once. In this freedom America grew rich and great. But an elementary course in history is enough to show that, in this growth, great achievements were associated with grave abuses. And these abuses were bound to bring decisive modifications in the system.

So free enterprise has given way to a mixed economy in which management is to a large degree limited by public policies—and as we know only too well, this system has also developed its crops of ills.

The average American is not interested in business apologies. He does not want a course in the American system. * * * Interpretations of the past may be interesting enough, but he will ask what do they do for him now. Whatever free enterprise was, he will judge the system by how it works today; not in the ads, but in the machine shop and at the desk. Frustrations or suspicions in the factory or the office will not be resolved by offering the contemplation of abstractions. It is an elementary truth that the worker is interested first in his own welfare—and understandably so. Hence, I am inclined to agree with Governor Dewey that he does a poor service to his party who uses welfare as a term of abuse.

I am trying to be frank, gentlemen. For we must face the fact that the influence of businessmen in the community has been slowly declining. The great majority of people have looked elsewhere, to the Government or the labor unions, for the fulfillment of their aspirations to a better life.

As one piece of legislation has followed another, limiting the discretion of management, we have retreated to our associations and committees. And from them—at least it seems to the onlooker—we have looked out to fire broadsides at each successive project that others may put forward.

Inevitably, we have created the impression that we are obstructive and negative. Others have their inventory of proposals for reform; but we, it seems to many, do not even admit the problems.

It is time for us all to look at the problems of the Nation—not as management or labor, farmers or professional men; but as citizens. Perhaps this is easier said than done. But God knows that our society—and I speak of government, business, labor, and every segment of that society—will perish unless we recapture a capacity for disinterested action. I am not suggesting, then, a bigger and better lobby. But I am proposing that we participate to a greater extent in the formation of public policies; not just as watchdogs or critics of other proposals, but as the sponsors of practical measures to meet the problems of the day.

Indiscriminate opposition to programs, which to the average man appear to be designed for his benefit, is a sure way to lose public confidence. And yet we must admit that this has sometimes been the business attitude to major pieces of legislation.

Important acts affecting business are placed on the statute book without business participation and over business opposition. And those individual enactments in the end add up to the transformation of the economy.

It might have been better in some cases, and I am thinking of such examples as the Federal Reserve Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, and the Social Security Act, if we had accepted the need and participated fully in the writing of legislation.

We are not opposed to the aspirations of the common man. We are all common men, and we believe with all our hearts that a thriving capitalism is the best and greatest means to personal fulfillment. We do not believe that our system is perfect. But we must be sure that we are taking the initiative in the ceaseless search for development and improvement.

Here perhaps the greatest difficulty is the assumption that these aspirations can all be satisfied tomorrow. If all or even a majority of the unexecuted proposals for social welfare were in a brief period implemented by corporations or governments, our system would certainly collapse under the burden.

The great discovery of Socialist governments abroad has been that national resources are limited, and that for even nationalized undertakings, profits are desirable and even essential. Meanwhile, we are confronted with the tasks of reconciling these deeply established expectations with the requirements of the engine of production.

At Burroughs, we plan for efficient production; but we also endeavor to make a better place to work. And, indeed, the two objectives are inseparable. We must recover a lost intellectual initiative. We must make our proper contribution to the problems of the community and the State. We must get back into the stream of history.

The American economy remains the most productive in the world. It still has the stimulus of individual intiative. It is sparked by vigorous competion. It is dynamic. In it, new ideas are born and can rapidly become great industries.

We are not surprised that such vigor should bring its problems. Industrial relations, full employment, balanced international trade, the clash of progress and security, are but a few. But in the final analysis, the American economy meets the test. It is the envy of the entire world. Hardly a worker in Naples or Belgrade but would exchange his dwelling in Europe for a tent in Bay City. A Sears-Roebuck catalog is a book of wonders in Yugoslavia.

America has provided wide opportunities and reasonable security, and it is built on a concept of individual human dignity. If we have failed in communication, if we have encouraged suspicions, if we have not related our efforts to larger social purposes, then, in the words of the proverb—rather than abuse the darkness, let us light a candle.

Is Red China or Red Russia the Main Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of the House to the following article by Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times. Mr. Reston is one of our most excellent writers. His article merits careful study.

IS RED CHINA OR RED RUSSIA THE MAIN ISSUE?—"GREATER DEBATE" HAS POSED A QUESTION WHICH THE NATION MUST DECIDE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Next week's foreign policy debate on Capitol Hill is likely to center around two statements made this week, one in the Senate by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican of Ohio, and the other in Chicago by Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

1. The United States, said the Senator on Thursday, "mustn't be stopped" from adopting General MacArthur's program "by any possibility that the Russians may come into the war."

2. "However great the effort," said General MacArthur, "to distract attention from the main issues by introducing into public discussion extraneous and irrelevant matters, the fundamental question still remains the same: What is the policy for Korea?"

Last month, in the troops-to-Europe debate, Senator TAFT was arguing against sending large American forces to Europe on the ground that might provoke the Russians to make war.

His argument now, however, is that the United States can adopt the MacArthur program of bombing Manchuria, blockading the the China coast, and opening a second front in South China with Chiang Kai-shek's troops without worrying about the possibility that the Russians would retaliate.

MAC ARTHUR'S POSITION

General MacArthur implies much the same thing. In his first speech, he at least considered the possibility that the Russians might come in if we followed his policy. He also conceded that our strategic problem was global, and that to consider the problems of one area without considering the problems of all other areas was to court disaster for the whole.

Since then, however, while the general atmosphere has become less tense, the attack by President Truman's opposition has become no less severe. "Our objective," said the general in Chicago without clarifying whether he meant Communist China or Russia, "is victory over the nation and men who, without provocation or justification, have warred against us."

"What," he kept asking, "is the policy in Korea?" That, he said, is the "fundamental question."

The administration, of course, does not believe at all that Korea is the fundamental question, or that the defeat of Communist China is the fundamental question, or that victory in the Far East can be achieved by defeating China, or that such a big victory can be achieved cheaper than under the present policy.

It believes the Soviet Union is the fundamental question. It believes the survival of the United States and its principal allies in Europe and Asia is involved in that question. It believes Korea is an important but secondary part of that question. It does not want to risk a war of survival with 20 divisions against Russia's 300, and it does not want to risk that war in Manchuria.

The paradox of the present situation is that General MacArthur and, to a surprising extent, Senator TAFT are now urging President Truman to adopt a literal interpretation of the Truman doctrine while Mr. Truman, having learned a little more geography and suffered a little more from history in the last 4 years, is now insisting that that doctrine must be interpreted rather carefully.

The general is saying that we should block the expansion of communism wherever it occurs, and especially in Asia, for if we don't, he argues, its expansion in one area will weaken our defense against it everywhere. the administration, however, now rejects so simple a strategy and argues more or less as follows:

1. The United States must do what it can to block the expansion of communism throughout the world, but it must risk an atomic war to do so only when areas vital to the security of the United States are at stake, and only when it is strong enough to wage such a war with the support of dependable allies.

2. A Soviet conquest of Western Europe, Japan, or the Middle East would directly

jeopardize the security of the Western Hemisphere. It would tip the whole world balance of power in Russia's favor if any one of these things were to happen, and particularly if the industrial and brain-power resources of the Ruhr and the rest of Western Europe were at Moscow's disposal.

CAUTION NECESSARY

3. Therefore, in allocating our limited forces, and in planning our strategy in Korea, we should do nothing that would threaten our defenses in more vital areas, or bring about a world war which neither we nor our allies are prepared to wage.

This is not an easy policy to follow, or even to explain, but the administration is prepared to defend its present limited-war policy in Korea and its rejection of the MacArthur policy on a number of different grounds. Including the following:

(a) The limited-war policy gives the United States and its allies time to rebuild their defenses.

(b) The limited-war policy not only uses up men and material slower than a bigger war, but it gives us time to develop a whole range of atomic weapons for use on the battlefield, and a variety of important antitank weapons as well. There was a lot of talk about these weapons just a year ago—far too much talk, as officials here now agree—but important developments have taken place in the last year toward the production of atomic artillery, atomic-guided missiles, and various other weapons.

(c) The limited war in Korea has been far more damaging to the enemy than it has been to the United Nations.

(d) The Communists started out to seize South Korea. It has been denied to them. They started out to test our will to resist, and they have discovered that we will fight them, 6,000 miles from our home base if necessary. Moreover, if, as both General MacArthur and the administration believe, Korea was merely the first step in a campaign of Communist imperial expansion, the limited war there has denied them, not only South Korea, but the much more fruitful conquests of Southeast Asia.

COALITION HELD TOGETHER

(e) The limited-war policy has held the Allied coalition together, maintained our treaty obligations both to the North Atlantic nations and to the United Nations itself.

(f) Moreover, the limited-war policy enables the Allies to retain the initiative in the deployment of their armed forces. So long as the demands of the Korean war do not greatly exceed present requirements, the Allies can slowly build the defenses of key areas such as Western Europe, Japan, and the Middle East, but once the Red army is committed to battle, then the initiative in the deployment of forces rests, not with the Allies, but with the far larger forces of the enemy.

The administration does not, and cannot promise victory as a result of this limited war. The most it has been willing to imply is that if the UN forces can contain the present Chinese Communist offensive, then it may be possible to negotiate an honorable settlement. And even this hope is probably not so real as officials here make out.

Thus, a limited war for an unlimited time is not an easy thesis to argue. It is against the tradition and temperament of the country. It is complicated. It rests, at least partly, on the necessity of maintaining common cause with the British, the French, the Canadians, and others, who have not done as much to defend the common cause in Korea as they could have done.

Moreover, the thesis is being put forward by an administration which has made grave miscalculations of Soviet intentions in the past and which is now again at a low ebb in its popularity.

Finally, the opposition, in contrast, has a simple thesis and a glittering and eloquent hero to present it. He cannot prove that he is right, but the administration cannot prove that he is wrong, either, and it merely has a casualty list to place against his promises of relief.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ADVANTAGE

Thus, the general has retained a psychological advantage in the argument so far. He is the one illustrious American public figure of his time who has been relieved for over 10 years of the embarrassment of having to answer questions in public. He has been free to attack and retreat, either into his embassy in Tokyo or the "privileged sanctuary" of the Waldorf towers.

For the past 10 days, too, he has been favored not only by his simple and plausible argument, but by the natural and proper adulation of a grateful populace for a great soldier.

Now, however, he must not only assert his eloquent themes from a platform, but he must answer the questions he himself has raised:

What makes you think that the Russians will not retaliate if we do as you propose?

What sources of information do you have about Soviet intentions?

How would you carry on the battle against communism in Asia or Europe without allies and their bases?

Since you guessed wrong about the Chinese Communists coming into the war, isn't it fair to question your judgment about what the Russians will or will not do?

How could we defend Japan or Western Europe with our present forces if they were attacked in retaliation for our attacks on Manchuria?

How can you stop the slaughter of America's sons by making the war bigger?

Is Korea really the main issue, or Red China—or is it not the Soviet Union?

When these questions have been answered, then the people to whom he has appealed will be in a better position to judge whether they wish to adopt his proposals or reject them.

Resolutions Adopted by Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this critical period of our Nation's history, it is gratifying and heartening to note that the women of our Nation have not lost sight of the need for good citizenship, law observance, and law enforcement.

They realize, as we all realize, that particularly in this period of stress and danger, the country cannot afford to give ground in the slightest degree to the criminal element and to those who would for financial gain debauch the character, morals, and decency of our people, particularly the younger generation.

As an evidence of the concern of the women of our country over these important matters, I insert herewith two resolutions adopted on April 4, 1951, by the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled. These resolutions were officially certified to me by Mrs. T. A. Maxwell, president, and Mrs. Gartha Peterson, chairman of the federation's department of legislation.

The above-mentioned resolutions follow:

Whereas the increase in narcotic addicts among young people has become a matter of deep concern to many parents over the Nation and to the United States Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics; and

Whereas the Bureau of Narcotics has only 200 men to cover the entire United States; and

Whereas the Bureau gives as the main reason for narcotic trafficking and the resultant addiction to narcotic habits, the light prison sentences given to dope peddlers, and is urging a minimum sentence of 5 years for any second offense, and at least 10 years for a third offense; and

Whereas young addicts tend to associate with criminals and become active criminals through the need to secure narcotics: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled go on record as approving a strengthening of the narcotic law through increasing the penalties for persons convicted of selling narcotics; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the members of the Georgia delegation in Congress, and to the Governor of the State of Georgia.

This 4th day of April 1951.

Mrs. T. A. Maxwell,
President.

Gartha Peterson,
Chairman, Department of Legislation.

Whereas the revelations of the Senate Crime Investigation Committee have shocked the whole country and have shown all too clearly that graft, gambling, bribery, and organized crime are eating at the very foundation of this Nation's democracy; and

Whereas such conditions could not have come into existence but for the condoning of disrespect for law for the moral callousness of too large a segment of our population nor without the knowledge and, at least, the tacit consent of the authorities and the law enforcement officers; and

Whereas our Government and our way of life are threatened unless there is a return to honesty, decency, and respect for law, and to the once high moral standards which made this country great; and

Whereas we recognize that adequate laws are necessary but not the sole answer to the problem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled this 4th day of April 1951 call upon our Federal, State, county, and municipal governments to see that such additional laws as are needed to cope with the underworld be speedily enacted, that the guilty be brought to the bar of justice and punishment be meted out; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the authorities and law-enforcement officers to see without fear or favor, that the laws are observed; be it further

Resolved, That the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs pledge its cooperation and best efforts to a program of improving moral conditions by improving people, ourselves first; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the members of the Georgia delegation in Congress, to the Governor of the State of Georgia.

Mrs. T. A. Maxwell,
President.

Gartha Peterson,
Chairman, Department of Legislation.

An Historic Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record, an editorial entitled "An Historic Address," which appeared in the Arizona Daily Star, under date of April 24, 1951. In my opinion, it is an excellent evaluation of General MacArthur's speech:

An Historic Address

While praise cannot be too lavish about the historic address that General MacArthur made last week in Washington, the wonderful thing about it is the way it demonstrated so dramatically the perfect functioning of the American democratic process.

Since in nearly every American there is a bit of the rebel, General MacArthur's conduct in challenging Presidential policy is something that is bound to happen from time to time. Correctly the President disciplined him; but correctly also, Congress invited him to speak before its two Houses in a joint meeting.

There on the one hand we saw that President acting to restrain a military commander of widespread popularity. On the other hand we saw the Congress, which is the legislative branch of our Government, acting on its own initiative, not only to honor one of our great military leaders, but to allow the country to be informed fully from the lips of a man whom the President disciplined.

The lesson in that process is one in which all of us, admirers as well as critics, can take pride. Each person, or office, has its power checked; yet out of all the differences of opinion that process permits to be expressed, our Government goes on, and each of us from the lowest to the most exalted is free to have his say, too.

What more can we ask of life than such a privilege?

That is freedom, despite its defects, performing successfully before a world where during the past 20 years freedom has been steadily losing out.

Behind the eloquence of General MacArthur's address was the experience of a lifetime, and thoughts which he had been resolving for many years. Although he spoke only from notes, he had been writing that talk for years in his mind.

Those who have talked with him in recent years heard numerous familiar words. His anxiety over the destructiveness of modern war; his love for the Philippines and admiration of his work there; his pride in the reconstruction of Japan; his hatred of communism; his military estimate of what our new frontiers are; his opinion on Formosa and the role of Chiang Kai-shek represent an expression of his soul as well as his mind.

But so did he reveal some of his weaknesses. When he said that the object of war was victory, the soldier in him was speaking. He did not realize that we Americans have won two great world wars, but have failed to win the political successes, as distinguished from victories, for which wars should be waged.

His exasperation over the apparent stalemate in Korea, and the failure to use Chinese Nationalist troops, again represent the soldier speaking, and an unjustifiable contempt for the slower and more laborious processes of political methods.

His call for what would amount to a world military campaign against communism—in China as well as in Europe—brushes aside too hastily the possible wisdom of keeping our commitments within the limits of our strength and limiting the scope of the present war in Korea.

Fortunately, now that General MacArthur has had his say, the public debate will move with more speed toward a decision. Whatever is done now will have an open public record behind it and therefore a united country. We have that much faith in the democratic process, which has been so dramatically staged before our own eyes and those of the world.

Spencer A. Canary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to include two editorials on the life of Spencer A. Canary, former editor of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio; one from his good neighbor, the Defiance Crescent-News, of Defiance, Ohio; and one from his beloved paper, the Daily Sentinel-Tribune:

[From the Bowling Green (Ohio) Daily Sentinel-Tribune]

Good Night, Sweet Prince

Those among us whose lives have spanned the last five to eight decades will probably agree with our late editor, S. A. Canary, that it has been a privilege to have been a part of life during the era in which he lived, baffling though so often the social, economic, and industrial changes have been.

To keep pace with those changes and to accept the responsibility of editorial leadership in this community during the last 43 years required the complete loyalty of a man who spent his life in the interest of others.

"He was a man, take him for all in all, I shall not look upon his like again."

Whether readers agreed with his editorials or not, they held a deep respect for his opinion because no word was written without long study and consideration of a problem or without comprehensive reading.

The expression that an institution is but the length and breadth of the shadow of one man is very true in the case of the policies of the editorial staff of the Sentinel-Tribune.

The late editor loved this community and this paper as though they were his children. His guiding motto in editorial work and in contact with people was Charles Reade's "Put yourself in his place," "Very little matters very much."

He often voiced a philosophy of "Don't take yourself too seriously—the world will go on without you." Along with that was a self-restraint practiced daily in which he tried not to criticize anyone before 9 o'clock in the morning because of a desire to be better adjusted to the problems of the day by that time.

Bowling Green has been most fortunate in the kind of men who have lived here during the past 75 years. Spence was one of many whose sacrifices of time, money, and effort have made this city the outstanding community that it is today. It is not possible to name them all without omitting many who deserve places in the community hall of fame.

But those men, whose vision, self-abnegation, industry, and community ambition gained for this city the Bowling Green State University, the H. J. Heinz Co. plant, and other industrial, cultural, and civic benefits that have helped Bowling Green to grow from a village into a city of 12,000 people, performed services for which the people will be eternally indebted.

No little part of this constant change for the better was influenced by the late editor. He was the confidant of leaders of both political parties, although his pen spoke with strong Republican convictions. His opinions were respected by Members of Congress and were often printed in the Congressional Record.

His advice was sought and gladly offered in countless problems on local, State, national, and world-wide scale.

Above all, Spence practiced love and charity toward his fellow men. His benevolences, tendered always in deep humility and tenderness without even his closest friends being aware of them, were countless.

Yes; the world will go on without him. The Daily Sentinel-Tribune continues to progress forward with plans for greater service and improvements ahead, but the philosophy he developed will continue to characterize its columns and the community is better for his having passed this way.

"Good night, sweet prince, and flights of angels sing thee to thy rest."

[From the Defiance (Ohio) Crescent-News]

Maumee Valley Loses a Valued Leader

Death of Spencer A. Canary, of Bowling Green, takes from the northwestern Ohio scene a man whose influence in behalf of constructive enterprises will long be felt in this region. As editor of the Bowling Green Sentinel-Tribune, he played an effective part in promoting the best interests not only of his home community but the entire Maumee Valley.

Mr. Canary probably was known personally to few people in Defiance, but he was a sincere friend of this city. In his more active days he was a frequent visitor here, and one of the most ardent advocates of giving proper recognition to Fort Defiance and all other ground hallowed by the achievements of Gen. "Mad Anthony" Wayne and his illustrious colleagues.

A keen student of history, Mr. Canary never could be accused of living in the past. He did contend that youth can never properly appreciate the American heritage of freedom and opportunity without a knowledge of the forefathers' hardships and sacrifices. The Maumee Valley is blessed as are few regions with important materials of American pioneer history. Spencer Canary insisted that those materials be employed by the schools, the press, and every avenue of communication to teach the basic lessons of Americanism and democracy.

Mr. Canary never tired of emphasizing the fact that without the campaign of Gen. Anthony Wayne, the history of Ohio and the entire Northwest Territory, comprising six present States, probably would have been far different—a barrier State under Great Britain with the western boundary of our country at the Allegheny Mountains. And in support of one project for which he was an effective champion, he once wrote:

"What greater appreciation of what General Wayne did for America could the United States show, and what more useful, enduring, and patriotism-inspiring memorial to him could it devise than a parkway along the trail which he and his men so wearily trod and which countless motorists would traverse in the years to come?"

The Anthony Wayne Parkway in its eventual development will be the fruition of one of his most cherished objectives.

Nearly two decades ago, Spencer Canary's work and influence were powerful factors in preserving for the public rather than for private benefit important stretches of Maumee River frontage. He served as president of the Maumee River Scenic and Historic

Highway Association and for many years was a member of the Fort Meigs Memorial Commission. He was a member of the editorial board of the Northwestern Ohio Historical Society. He was the moving spirit in creation of the Wood County Park Board which has accomplished much of value to this entire area. Even after physical disability forced curtailment of his former strenuous activity, he responded without hesitation to many calls for help in projects of area-wide interest.

Spencer Canary will be missed not only by his fellow townsmen but by a host of others who regarded him as a first citizen of the Maumee Valley.

Formula for History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following editorials which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News.

The first, Formula for History, which appeared in the April 13, 1951, edition; the second, MacArthur Pleads a Potent Case, which appeared in the April 20, 1951, edition; and the third, Internal Security at a Snail's Pace, which appeared in the April 25, 1951, edition.

The editorials follow:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of April 13, 1951]

FORMULA FOR HISTORY

Two highly skilled American generals were maneuvered into false positions in the history of World War II by inept and eccentric decisions made in the State Department and, presumably, approved by the White House.

In a ruuning battle with the politicians, which has been climaxed by his dismissal from the Far East command, General MacArthur has made certain the same thing won't happen to him. When the chronicle of this war is written in perspective, his obdurate resistance to administration Asiatic policy—whether it turns out that he was right or wrong—will not be a clouded issue. It is on the record that he felt so forcefully that he was executing a bankrupt policy he exceeded military proprieties in political statements and courted banishment as his dissent.

The first example of an able military man being enchred into an untenable position by the diplomats, which General MacArthur may have had in mind, is that of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, commander of Allied troops in Europe in the last war and now Supreme Commander of North Atlantic Treaty forces there. Headed full-tilt for Berlin in the closing days of the war against Hitler, the Eisenhower forces were brought to an abrupt halt by orders from Washington. General Eisenhower was to allow our stanch allies, the Russians, the glory of entering the conquered capital first and without provision for an allied corridor into the city. He was resigned and laconic about it. "A political decision," he said.

The result of that snap political decision is that when Germany was carved up and Berlin zoned, the Allies found themselves isolated in an island in the city with no communications corridor connecting with the outside. When the Soviets choked off supply routes through their sector, the expensive airlift was brought into being to keep residents in the free zone alive. It would never have been necessary if the Russians hadn't been handed every concession they asked for by the State Department politicians in an expansive mood.

Second victim of similar murky decisions at the political level was Gen. Mark Clark when he was American High Commissioner in Austria. He hasn't been as reticent about it as General Eisenhower and recounts his troubles in his book, Calculated Risk. His first taste of devious diplomatic maneuvering, which impaired his command of the area, was when the zones of influence were being defined. In the original plans, agreed to by Russia, he maintained full command of a vital transport route along the north bank of the Danube. "A grevious error," said the Soviet to Washington, which appeared horrified that this important territory was under American aegis. Without a syllable of consultation with General Clark as commissioner, Washington agreed to extend the Russian zone to include the critical strip and a part of upper Austria.

General Clark cites another instance of bizarre State Department usurpation of his authority—the case of the captured Yugoslav barges. He had orders to keep them for bargaining purposes. The Secretary of State's office wired him, as he writes, "Return those barges to the Yugoslavs or else." He did. Everywhere he turned in an effort to administer his command effectively he was hobbled by similar arbitrary orders, execution of which played into the hands of Soviet Russia.

General Eisenhower kept quiet and didn't hit back. General Clark sat out his mission but took out his frustation in print. With their experiences in mind—and what American military man isn't aware of them?—the less inhibited General MacArthur has taken good care that if United States and UN policies bring disaster in Asia he has lodged his protests and advanced alternatives, though it cost him one of the greatest military commands in warfare's history.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of April 20, 1951]

MACARTHUR PLEADS A POTENT CASE

Gen. Douglas MacArthur used the magnificent forum at his disposal Thursday not to take a bow, but to plead a case. He pleaded it eloquently, dramatically, and effectively. He left the issue sharper, the debate angrier, and the Nation decidedly more impressed than when he arrived. On all counts, it was one of the most moving and historic speeches it has been this generation's privilege to hear—and see.

It was a soldier's report, but with tremendous political overtones. Confining himself to a "military estimate" of the Asiatic conflict he had just left under curt dismissal orders from his Commander in Chief, General MacArthur pulled no punches and wasted no words in pressing his view of what it will take to salvage military victory out of the Korean stalemate.

Nor was the Capital's emotional tension eased when he bluntly hinted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would fully share his "military estimate" if they were politically free to do so. It was that one bombshell remark, perhaps more than all the rest he said, that threatens to put his dismissal—indeed, the whole question of what to do about Asia—in a startlingly different light.

Until then, it had been represented that this was not merely MacArthur versus Truman, but MacArthur versus the Joint Chiefs—not only a field commander's difference with his civilian Commander in Chief but one respected soldier's opinion against that of other soldiers, having perhaps a broader, more global responsibility. But if it must now be accepted that the MacArthur view of how "to bring hostilities to an end with the least possible delay and at a saving of lives" has been "fully shared" by "practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff—then we do indeed have a case calling for the sternest congressional scrutiny of a civilian executive authority that would dare to ignore and to silence such counsel.

General MacArthur's reference to the Joint Chiefs was qualified in only two particulars—that they shared his view "in the past" and "from a military standpoint." Possibly they have since rejected it on other counts, perhaps that the world political repercussions would more than offset the military advantages. This is the implication of the hasty retort Thursday night that the Joint Chiefs had all advised his dismissal.

Be that as it may, the MacArthur speech has unquestionably put the Joint Chiefs on the hottest political spot of their lives, and we may be sure they will be haled before the congressional military committees to explain precisely where, how, and why they would modify the MacArthur prescription for waging the Korean war.

Close rereading of General Bradley's Chicago speech on behalf of the Joint Chiefs of Staff last Tuesday shows, significantly, that he did not directly contradict the MacArthur viewpoint. He gave the closest thing yet to a military justification for the strategy of stalemate; he made strong answer to those who would abandon Korea, and he said, without elaborating, that action which would enlarge the war is "contrary to our best interests." But as to waging that war more effectively, he said only that it should be limited "if at all possible" and that "the confinement or extension of the area of combat is in the realm of diplomacy and international politics."

General MacArthur does not disagree. What he had asked repeatedly was new decisions "in the diplomatic sphere." He has flatly disavowed any idea of all-out war in Asia, but felt that military necessity made these measures essential once the Chinese Reds committed their full strength: (1) Intensification of our economic blockade; (2) imposition of a naval blockade; (3) removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance, and (4) removal of restrictions on the Chiang Kai-shek forces on Formosa "with logistical support to contribute to their effective operations." Without such measures—and with reinforcements denied him—General MacArthur told Congress he had made it clear to his superiors that the military position of his command "forbade victory." At best "we can hope for only an indecisive campaign with its terrible and constant attrition upon our forces."

This, to be sure, is not the first time a field commander has been under such frustrating wraps. MacArthur himself was in that condition during most of the Pacific war, when that theater was purposely subordinated to the European. But that was in truth a strategic decision by military men waging a global war. This one, by contrast, appears to be a strategic decision imposed on the military on the basis of international politics. If General MacArthur's understanding of the Joint Chiefs' military views is correct, it means that these have been changed or overruled for political or other reasons about which the bewildered public can only guess. When Congress brings them to light—as it now most surely will—the explanations had better be good. General MacArthur has raised an issue that will not be downed by dismissals, deceit, or double talk.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of April 25, 1951]

INTERNAL SECURITY AT A SNAIL'S PACE

Remember the McCarran Communist Control Bill—and the great urgency about getting it on the statute books?

That was last summer, and the fifth column would have us by the throat if Congress didn't act at once. There was an election coming up and everybody had to be more anti-Communist that everybody else.

So the McCarran bill went roaring through over a Presidential veto, and with scarcely a handful of dissenting votes. If there were flaws in it, they could be fixed later, but time was of the essence. Or at least so it was represented then.

That, as we say, was late last summer. The bill became a law 7 months ago. It gave every Communist-action and Communist-front organization 30 days to register voluntarily. The month went by. Nothing happened. Another month went by. Then the President appointed the Subversive Activities Control Board, which the law created to compel reluctant Red outfits to register if they don't do it on their own initiative. At the same time, the administration formally petitioned the new board to require the Communist Party, U. S. A., to register as a Communist-action organization.

That was 5 months ago. Chairman Seth Richardson of the Subversive Control Board promised there would be no hysteria, no undue haste. He indicated the hearings would be protracted. How right he has been.

This week—7 months after the law was passed; 5 months after the petition was filed—the hearing on the first case finally began. But the Communists promptly challenged the whole proceedings. Their grounds: the Richardson board hasn't even been confirmed yet. The point has dubious legal merit.

But it's a fact that these nominations have been before the Senate since November—and there has been no action, either confirming or rejecting them. That's how big a hurry the Senate is in to get this law properly implemented—the Senate that just couldn't wait to perfect the law last September, because time was of the essence.

And what of the board? Confirmed or unconfirmed, is it now at last going to give the Commies their day in court, and make its ruling?

Not on your life. This is just the beginning of the hearing. It will continue, board sources indicate, for probably 3 months if not longer. After that, there presumably will have to be time for consideration before it is determined whether the Communist Party is a Communist-action organization and thus compelled to register.

Why? you may well ask. Is there some question about the Communists being Communists? Well, the law defines a "Communist-action" organization as one which "is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign * * * organization controlling the world Communist movement * * * and operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement."

So, you may wonder, isn't it pretty obvious that the description fits the Communist Party, United States of America, on all counts? When it comes to singling out one of the devious Communist fronts or other hidden organizations, maybe the proof will be harder to come by. But this petition is directed against the Communist Party itself. Why should it be so complicated?

Why, indeed? If this was the urgent piece of internal-security legislation it was represented as being last fall, why has the Senate waited 5 months to consider the nominations of the board named to implement it—and why has the board waited 5 months to begin a drawn-out hearing on so elementary a question as whether the Communist Party is in fact a Communist organization?

The only answer that suggests itself is that both Congress and the administration were playing tawdry politics with the fifth-column problem last fall—and they still are. The law contains a lot of unrealistic "monkey-business," particularly in its registration procedures. It needs to be rewritten in a forthright manner so that it will be, in truth, an internal security law. Instead, it is being sabotaged by delay and by buck-passing efforts in both Congress and the administration to lay the blame on each other.

Wedge of Despotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 25 entitled from the "Wedge of Despotism":

WEDGE OF DESPOTISM

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer and the officials who have been supporting him in his defiance of the United States Court of Appeals have been given additional time to show why they should not be punished for contempt. The court has proved to be lenient. Obviously it is reluctant to penalize high officials of the Government—except as a last resort. Yet the court has made unmistakably plain its grave concern over the course the administration has followed in the Dollar case, and everyone who believes in law and order may well share that concern.

The inescapable fact is that Secretary Sawyer and his associates have continued to exercise control over the stock of the American President Lines in spite of the court's order that it should be returned to R. Stanley Dollar and his associates. Various aspects of the case have been before the Supreme Court three times and it is now before the Court of Appeals for the fourth time. The courts have held in unmistakable terms that the stock in controversy belongs to the Dollar interests—that the old Maritime Commission which took it as a pledge had no authority to acquire outright ownership. Yet the executive arm is still resisting this judicial decision. The fact that the Commerce and Justice Departments are acting in this matter under direct orders from the President only makes their defiance of the courts the more outrageous.

"We have the spectacle of a Government which proclaims its adherence to law as the governing force among men," said the latest opinion by Judge Prettyman, "not only refusing for 6 years to submit to its own courts its own claim to private property derived from a purely commercial transaction, but endeavoring by every device to thwart and defeat the judgment of those courts after it has been rendered." The question is not, as the court says, one of high policy. It concerns merely the ownership of a commercial property. The Government should be the first to acquiesce in the judgment of its courts in such a matter even though officials may continue to believe that an injustice has been done. Instead, it has continued its defiance by means of instigating an unseemly conflict between two courts."

The only ground on which the administration has to stand is the fact that the United States in its sovereign capacity was not a party to the case that the courts have decided. After the claim of its agent holding the stock failed, the Government asserted in effect that the stock belonged not to the Dollar interests or the Maritime Commission, but to the United States. But the stock has never been in the Government's name. How could the Government have gotten legal possession of it if the Maritime Commission had no authority to acquire it? The present claim is obviously a quibble designed to frustrate the settled judgment of the court. We do not see how it could be upheld by the courts without making a mockery of the processes of justice.

Undoubtedly the Department of Justice is entitled to pursue its flimsy claim in another court, if it wishes to do so. What is inexcusable is that it used its "quiet title" suit to obtain from a Federal judge in San Francisco an injunction preventing transfer of the stock on the company books and preventing the Dollar interests from voting it. In reply to this, Judge Prettyman says that the injunction could be properly used to prevent Mr. Dollar from selling or transferring the stock (now adjudged to be rightly his) until the Government's claim has been finally settled. But it would be a strange distortion of justice to give a mere unadjudicated claim pressed in a lower court precedence over a finally adjudicated right in a higher court. Such a holding, Judge Prettyman cogently says, "Would mean chaos and the complete collapse of every semblance of orderly judicial process, a consummation to the irreparable damage of the public interest."

Regardless of whether the officials responsible for carrying out the President's law-flouting orders are punished for contempt, the administration ought to get itself off this hook. The first step obviously should be to ask the San Francisco court to modify its injunction so that it would in no way clash with the judgment of the court of appeals here. The second should be the surrender to the Dollar interests of all the rights incident to their ownership of the stock as already finally determined by the courts. Then the administration could pursue its flimsy claim without placing itself in the position of a trickster or pretending to be above the law. The big issue here is respect for the judicial system and that ought to transcend the financial gains or losses involved even in the minds of disappointed official litigants.

The American Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 1870 for the protection of the bald eagle in Alaska. A great deal of interest has been shown in this legislation from individuals and organizations interested in the conservation of wild life and particularly in this bird which is immortalized on our great seal.

Mrs. Inez E. Moore, of Valdez, Alaska, has shown particular interest in H. R.

1870 and, pursuant to leave granted, I am including as part of these remarks, her poem entitled "The American Eagle," as follows:

THE AMERICAN EAGLE

I'm the bald eagle, a bird of prey.
I forage for food, God made me that way.
I try not to kill any more than I need,
For unlike human beings, I've never learned greed.
My only weapons are beak and claws
While man is protected by all sorts of laws.
Just lately he placed a price on my head
Two fifty for those who would bring me in dead.
He calls me a predator, a bird of prey,
But what about man, just any old day
With traps, guns, and dogs, he uses no reason,
Takes more than the limit and oft out of season.
In liberty's name and the sake of fair play,
Get busy and pass some protection today.

—*Inez E. Moore.*

Admiral Badger: His Ships Come Out of Moth Balls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, entitled "Admiral Badger: His Ships Come Out of Moth Balls," which appeared in Newsweek magazine on April 16, 1951.

I believe that the following article is adequate testimony to the very excellent job that Admiral Badger has done in reactivating the naval defenses of our eastern sea frontier. He has taken a difficult task by the horns and has successfully completed a job, not only in the best interests of our national defense but in the interests of the taxpaying public as well. Congress should take its hat off to Admiral Badger and his staff.

The article follows:

ADMIRAL BADGER: HIS SHIPS COME OUT OF MOTH BALLS

A phantom fleet, more than 2,000 naval vessels of all types, rode at anchor at 8 bases. Victory-flushed veterans of the Second World War, they were moored in long gray lines at Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf ports, robbed of their crews in the great scramble to disarm and demobilize which followed the end of hostilities.

It was not America's first phantom fleet. After the first war, another United States fleet had been tied up. Its crews had been cut to 10 percent, carrying on a losing battle against the greatest enemy of ships—rust. Low Navy budgets and the elements had done a good job of decimating this fleet. Much of what remained had been scrapped by international agreement.

But as the last war drew to a close, Admiral Ernest J. King and the Navy looked for a way to avoid the mistakes of 1918. Their answer was the Atlantic and Pacific reserve fleets—a great armada slippered away in rustproof cocoons against the evil day of a future war.

Double trouble: For Navy scientists, the problem was twofold: (1) To develop a technique which would vanquish rust; and (2) to make the process such that the reactivation of the laid-up vessels could be accomplished in an absolute minimum of time. To make seaworthy the overage destroyers which President Roosevelt traded for British bases in 1940 had taken months. The Navy realized that this margin of time might not be ours in any future hostilities.

The solution was at once simple and effective, a combination of plastics and moth balls. In order not to dismantle the ships, practically everything topside was left intact, sheathed in plastic or aluminum cocoons and blisters. Below decks, each reserve vessel was made airtight. An artificial lung was installed which pulled the damp air from the ship, passed it over the "moth ball"—silica gel, a crystalline substance which removed most of the moisture—and pumped dehumidified air into the ship's interior spaces. A mixture called thin film was applied to nonpainted surfaces.

Good buy: For moth balling the 2,036 vessels in the reserve fleet, and for maintaining it between 1946 and 1951 while it lay inactive, the taxpayers shelled out $213,000,000. It was money well spent. The original cost of these vessels was $12,863,500,000. To replace them today would have cost $26,994,500,000. In fact, maintenance cost 60 cents per $1,000 of material—one-half percent of the naval budget—"the cheapest insurance policy in history," the Navy boasts.

When the Korean war exploded on the world last June 25, the mothball fleet was ready. Vice Adm. Oscar Charles Badger, who holds the dual command of the Atlantic Reserve Fleet and the eastern sea frontier (covering 40 States and the coastline from Maine to Texas), was ordered to begin reactivating his ships.

As the wheels went into motion, ships to be demothballed were designated. In days, new skippers, other officers, the chiefs, petty officers, and seamen were reporting for duty. Dehumidifiers were removed, ventilating systems put into operation; quarters for officers and men were opened up. So well had the mothballs worked that in many cases even mattresses were ready for immediate use.

A "history ticket" had been attached to every piece of equipment, describing exactly what it required before it could be put into use again. In 30 days' time per unit—"activation time is 30 days, whether it's an LST or a carrier like the *Tarawa*," says Admiral Badger—the ships began coming to life again.

Fast action: Returning ships to service at a steady clip of about 2 a day, the Navy could point last week to 381 reactivations since Korea: 13 aircraft carriers, 2 battleships (the U. S. S. *New Jersey* and the U. S. S. *Wisconsin*), 2 heavy cruisers, 77 destroyers, and destroyer escorts, 13 submarines, 31 minesweepers, 7 patrol vessels, 236 amphibious, and auxiliary types.

So efficiently did the job proceed that many of the landing craft used at Inchon by the Marines had come from a mothball base in Texas. In the case of noncombat vessels—transports, tenders, and so forth very little was needed to put them in shape. Some aircraft carriers needed deck bracing to accommodate heavier planes and jets.

"Most of these ships require only minor modifications to bring them up to date," says Admiral Badger, "and in general these involve electronics."

Back to action: The cost for this mammoth job will total $120,000,000—less than 2.5 percent of the replacement cost. The individual cost per ship depends on its size and on its state of repair at the time of mothballing.

The cost of improving demothballed ships varies greatly. An *Essex*-class carrier the most obsolescent of all ships being reactivated, requires almost as much work as building a new ship and costs almost half what a new carrier would. The battleship *New Jersey*, on the other hand, came out in 37,000 man-days, where it took 2,500,000 man-days to build. This speed has permitted the Navy to increase its fleet strength by over 75 percent in a few months.

Because the United States has built only one submarine, the *K-1* "killer," since the last war, all the new strength in these critical, long-range eyes and ears of the Atlantic Fleet must come from the mothball fleet at New London, Conn. There, huddled in gray, tent-caterpillar-like clusters on the Thames River, some forty-odd sealed submarines have been returning to service.

At the rate of one a month, Rear Adm. S. S. Murray, commander of the Atlantic Submarine Fleet, has stepped aboard the revitalized subs to welcome them back to duty. When, in the 12-above-zero weather last February, the U. S. S. *Bang's* long-dormant engines were started up, they caught the first time.

Energy in person: When the time came to demothball the phantom fleet, the job fell to Admiral Badger, who had been responsible for maintaining the ships and keeping a scrupulous guard against invading rust and decomposition. Energetic and incisive, Badger in appearance belies his 60 years.

In the last 11 years of peace, war, and cold war, Badger has taken exactly 16 days of leave. He works long hours and keeps two staffs—one for the Atlantic Reserve Fleet, the other for the eastern-sea frontier—going constantly. Pacing both staffs, he is apt to explode over anyone who falls behind.

Admiral Badger believes the moth-ball fleet to be one of the greatest contributions to the security of the country that the Navy has ever made. In any future war, he feels, the country will face critical material shortages. The key to victory will be in what he calls the "true economy," the economy not of dollars but of labor and materials.

Badger realizes that comparisons between the $200,000,000 it would cost to replace the U. S. S. *New Jersey* and the $300,000 it cost to reactivate it emphasizes dramatically the work he has been doing. But the real worth of the moth-ball fleet, he insists, is in conservation. The ships he has been caretaking represent 7,500,000 man-years in terms of labor. The saving in steel, now in critical supply, is also astronomical—21,864 tons of carbon steel and 4,033 of alloy steel for an *Essex* carrier alone.

(In addition to these savings, other metals in short supply are liberated for other defense purposes. These are, according to Rear Adm. Homer N. Wallin, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, aluminum, nickel, lead, zinc, and copper. Wallin points out, too, that since Korea it would have been impossible to build up from scratch the reinforcements contributed by the moth-ball fleet even if the Nation's entire productive capacity had been put to the task.)

Problem solver: Badger notes that hundreds of plants, untold tons of steel, vitally needed radar equipment, and armies of workers would have been diverted from other production had the moth-balling process failed.

Although the job of reinforcing and supplying the fleet may be difficult, Admiral Badger is accustomed to tough assignments. He had plenty of them during the war. In 1942, he was largely responsible for the Navy's antisubmarine campaign at the height of the U-boat attacks on the convoy lanes. Later, as director of the logistic plans division of the Navy, he helped solve the complex supply problems of the Navy's two-ocean offensive. As the last war drew to a close, he was back in actual combat commanding the heavy striking forces of the Third Fleet.

In 1944, when every one of his bases and drydocks was working around the clock to get the fleet ready for the Palau campaign, the U. S. S. *Tennessee* and the U. S. S. *California* rammed each other in mid-Pacific.

Stateside shipyards estimated that it would take 4 months to repair the vessels. With characteristic energy, Badger flew in welders, ship fitters, and mechanics from all over the Pacific area. In 3 weeks, the two ships were back in operation.

Never say No: Today, Admiral Badger runs the vast eastern sea frontier and the Atlantic Reserve Fleet with the drive and precision of a fighting commander afloat. "We have a great naval base here that can do any damn thing," he says, pointing to the map which delimits the 2,000,000 square miles of his command. "The personnel is wonderful. There's just one thing I insist on. When the fleet at sea wants something, no one says 'No.'"

Last week, as the hibernating ships continued to be ripped out of cocoons in Philadelphia, Portsmouth, Charleston, Green Cove Springs, and New London, Admiral Badger's command was living up to his word. From Maine to Texas, no one was saying "No."

Chelsea Housing Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered at the dedication of the Chelsea housing project, Chelsea, Mass., on Saturday, April 28, 1951:

After a day's work, it is so good to go home.

When all is said and done, that is what we live for.

The privacy, comfort, and conveniences of a home that is the center of family life—this is the greatest of all incentives.

When a young man and a young woman start going together it is not long before they are planning to marry and set up housekeeping and create a family of their own.

Not in a dark, unsanitary and broken down tenement, but in a clean, bright housing unit constructed to meet the needs of modern life and designed to please and encourage those who dwell within it.

There are a few landlords and tenants who seem to think that any shelter will do as long as it keeps out the rain and the cold. They forget that houses grow old just as people do. If the house is not cared for, it will suffer from the wear and tear of living and become a burden to its occupants. An aging house that is allowed to fall into disrepair and is not renovated over the years to keep pace with the rising standard of living will degenerate into a fire trap and become a menace to health. And the woman who has to live in it most of the day knows better than anyone else that the roof and the walls and the floors do not make a house. It must be constructed in such a way as to make her housekeeping easy so that her husband and children will be glad to come home to the sanctuary that shows the results of her loving care. In that she finds one of her real fulfillments.

In the world of today where many confused and tired people have surrendered their initiative to an all-powerful state, the United States remains as the one, sure rallying point for those who believe that men can adjust their differences. We are lucky to live in a society that is flexible enough to overcome any social or economic problem without sacrificing human rights.

Housing is one of these problems.

It was a problem that was ignored during the first third of this century.

As towns and cities grew the dwellings in the center of communities began to decay. Private owners failed to reinvest part of their profits to maintain these properties. In some cases they were getting a diminishing income in relation to raising taxes. Broken-down tenements became the breeding place of disease and crime and social tensions.

It was too late then for private builders or realtors to do anything about it. We could not expect them to exhaust their money in tearing down old rental units and erecting new ones for the low-income groups that could not pay the rents necessary to cover such an investment.

We had neglected the spreading slums to such an extent that small and private groups could not cope with the menace. Only the Government was big enough to tackle it. Which it is doing, proving that under our system we can devise new techniques to overcome our difficulties without concentrating too much power in the Federal Government.

This local project is proof of that fact. The city of Chelsea, like any other American city, did not have the financial means to undertake such a responsibility in addition to its other burdens. Through the medium of the State government, which, in turn, receives grants-in-aid from Washington, there was engineered a team-work approach to the problem. The blueprint has become a reality. The costs of building and maintaining this development are well in hand. And the people of Chelsea, through their own housing authority, retain control of it in a wholesome and democratic manner.

Private enterprise, aided by local, State, and National agencies, is reducing the overall housing deficit. When we look back to the shocking conditions of a few years ago, we may be proud of the progress that we have made. Recalling those conditions which still prevail, especially in the larger cities, we should redouble our efforts until all slums are torn down and in their place are built the dwellings that are fit for Americans. After that, we must adopt a long-range plan of maintenance and replacement to prevent the slums from ever befouling our cities again.

In 1933 the country was faced not only with the problem of stopping wholesale foreclosures on homes and farms but with a great volume of unemployment. The construction industry almost came to a standstill because so many people either had no income or very little income. In 1933 total dwelling units under construction declined to a level as low as 10 percent of the peak year, which was 1925. The population was increasing, but we were falling far behind in providing adequate shelter for the growing number of families.

By 1940 the census revealed that out of 37,000,000 dwelling units in the United States 16,000,000 required extensive rehabilitation or outright replacement. Even though more houses were built and necessary repairs completed since then, the situation is still not as good as it should be. The 1949 Senate Banking and Currency Committee computed the United States housing need, and concluded that we would have to produce between sixteen and one-half and seventeen and one-half million dwelling units by 1960 in order to keep up with the demand.

At the end of World War II the Nation was confronted with a very serious housing shortage. The low pulse of building activity during the 1930's, the curtailment of residential building in order to conserve critical materials that were needed for the weapons of war, and the war's impact upon the rise in marriages and new families caused a serious gap between the supply and demand of housing.

Prices of homes rose 50 to 100 percent above 1941 levels, with the greatest increases in low- and medium-priced dwellings. Those who occupied rental units were spared sharp price hikes because of the Rent Control Act, even though this worked a hardship upon some landlords. Preparatory to the homecoming of millions of veterans, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was passed, authorizing, among other things, the guaranty of GI loans to veterans to purchase, build, or improve homes.

Meanwhile there was increasing concern that in the attempt to meet one emergency after another—a deep depression, a great war, and an acute housing shortage—fundamental long-term considerations affecting the housing of the American people were likely to be ignored. After many hearings on the matter the Federal Housing Act was passed in 1949. It established new forms of Federal financial assistance to help cities eliminate slum and blighted areas, it extended Federal financial aid to private enterprise, and it set up a research program seeking to improve methods of construction. Inspired by this direct attack upon the problem, many States established cooperating programs to extend the gains, and Massachusetts was a leader among them.

The public agencies had to step into the breach because the failure to provide for all segments of the population has been a long-standing fault of the housing industry. They provided for some, but neglected others until the neglect overwhelmed them. The slums which exist in every city are proof that private enterprise alone cannot meet the needs of the lower-income families. Even the middle-income group is having its troubles. Nearly 70 percent of American families had incomes below $4,000 a year as of June last year. And this was the minimum needed to buy the cheapest of housing. Even adjusting for fluctuations, building costs have been rising over a long period of time. In 1948 they were 129 percent higher than in 1939, while the general cost of living for the same period had gone up only 75 percent. And all costs have gone up still more since the outbreak of war in Korea.

Under these compelling circumstances, public housing was the only answer. And what are its purposes? (1) It wants to make sure that every family can obtain the minimum requirements for decent, safe, and sanitary housing; (2) to work toward the goal where as many families as possible get better than the minimum requirements; (3) to develop the housing program as a definite contribution to a higher United States standard of living. We have the necessary physical capacity, and now we need the planning that in spite of temporary defense priorities will never lose sight of the fact that we must constantly improve housing for the middle- and lower-income groups. For this contributes to the morale and the general welfare that is basic to our national progress. And it is the duty of government—whether it be local, State, or Federal, or by the cooperation of all three—to promote that general welfare.

Public housing, even in its young record, is doing just that.

What kind of dwellings did American families escape from thanks to public housing? Let's look at those who were first liberated in 1946.

Fifty-eight percent of their former habitations were structurally a menace to health and safety.

Sixty-two percent had no inside private toilets.

Sixty-nine percent had no private bath.

Forty percent had dangerous or inadequate cooking facilities.

Sixty-four percent had dangerous or inadequate heating.

Forty-nine percent had inadequate daylight or ventilation.

Furthermore each former dwelling failed to meet at least four of the nine minimum standards for passable housing.

Where these good people would be living, if they had not been rescued by a government determined to eliminate the slums, is not hard to imagine.

They would be back in the substandard dwellings that would be 5 years older and a greater danger to their health and their safety. And their sons, many of whom are now fighting for all of us in Korea, would not have the fine faith and courage that is animating them today.

They know that their Government will not let them down in those areas where private enterprise cannot do the job.

Which brings us to that quality of balance wherein a free society demonstrates its genius in meeting and solving hard problems.

We must provide every freedom and every opportunity for private enterprise to build enough safe, healthy, and efficient living quarters for all Americans. The postwar building boom is catching up with the housing demands of most people.

But when it fails to produce for those folks who do not make enough money to buy or rent privately constructed dwellings then the people through their government must get on with the job.

You and your fellow citizens, both in this city and in the larger community of our Nation, are working out the balance between free enterprise and government that will protect our society from the mistakes of the past and the extremes that may threaten us in the future.

May I congratulate your city fathers and your representatives in the State government for the foresight and sound leadership responsible for this 128-apartment unit which is a credit to your city.

The Chelsea housing project that we dedicate at these exercises is clear evidence that we as a people are continuing our progress.

How Hard It Must Be for the Military Man To Forego His Own Strategical Dispositions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the national Catholic weekly review, America, dated April 28, 1951, contains a very timely reprint of a portion of an address by His Eminence the late Cardinal John Henry Newman nearly a hundred years ago on the supremacy of civilian authority over the military:

THE SOLDIER AND THE STATESMEN

All professions have their dangers, all general truths have their fallacies, all spheres of action have their limits, and are liable to improper extension or alteration. Every professional man has rightly a zeal for his profession, and he would not do his duty toward it without that zeal. And that zeal soon becomes exclusive, or rather necessarily involves a sort of exclusiveness. A zealous professional man soon comes to think that his profession is all in all, and that the world would not go on without it.

We have heard, for instance, a great deal lately in regard to the war in India, of political views suggesting one plan of campaign, and military views suggesting another. How hard it must be for the military man to forego his own strategical dispositions, not on the ground that they are not the best—not that they are not acknowledged by those who nevertheless put them aside to be the best of the object of military success—but because military success is not the highest of objects, and the ends of ends—because it is not the sovereign science, but must ever be subordinate to political considerations or maxims of government, which is a higher science with higher objects—and that, therefore, his sure success on the field must be relinquished because the interests of the council and the cabinet require the sacrifice, that the war must yield to the statesman's craft, the commander in chief to the governor-general.

The Mysteries of the Van Vliet Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

THE MYSTERIES OF THE VAN VLIET REPORT—A CASE HISTORY

(By Julius Epstein)

On July 3 and 4, 1949, the New York Herald Tribune published two articles by this author on the massacre of Katyn. Katyn is a little hamlet, west of Smolensk, U. S. S. R., where more than 4,000 Polish officers, prisoners of war on Soviet soil, were killed during World War II.

The two articles analyzed the massacre and gave a brief summary of all the circumstantial evidence available at that time. The evidence produced, clearly points to the Soviets as the perpetrators of the crime.

Among the letters the author received was one from Mr. Harry Thomas Schultz of Hanover, N. H. Mr. Schultz' letter contained the following two paragraphs:

"I am curious about one omission in your excellent discussion of the subject. You make no mention of the American and British officers who were flown from prison camps by the Germans to the scene of the killing in April or early May of 1943.

"I am sorry to be vague about dates and names, but we all resisted German pressure so strongly at the time that I have no records of the incident and must depend upon my memory. In April 1943, I was held at Oflag IX A/Z, Rothenburg-on-Fulda, when two Americans, Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet and Captain Stewart, and at least one British officer, Lieutenant Colonel Stevenson, R. A. M. C., were taken to Katyn. After their return they refused to answer any questions from any one for fear of playing into the hands of the Germans, but they might now have some valuable information to give."

Mr. Schultz' mention of Van Vliet's name turned out to be an invaluable help in the search for truth about Katyn. Immediately, a thorough search was launched to locate Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. At last the American committee for the investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc. (which was formed under the chairmanship of Arthur Bliss Lane, former Ambassador to Poland, as a result of the two articles in the New York Herald Tribune) succeeded in locating Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. A letter was sent to Van Vliet. He answered briefly, saying that he was in no position to give any information about his visit to Katyn in 1943. It was evident that Van Vliet acted under instructions from the Pentagon. Therefore, the Katyn committee asked one of its friends in Congress, Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, to get in touch with the Pentagon. DONDERO complied with the committee's request. On October 6, 1949, he wrote the following letter to the Director of Military Intelligence:

"Gentlemen: Some time ago I inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the murder of several thousand Polish officers, probably by the Russians.

"It has recently come to my attention that certain British and American officers were taken to the scene of the execution of these men while such officers were prisoners of the Germans.

"It has been rumored that at least two of the American officers were Lt. Col. John Van Vliet, Jr., now stationed at Fort Lewis, Wash., and a captain Stewart, otherwise unidentified.

"It is quite possible that a committee will be formed to investigate the matter officially (the committee which had already been in existence at that time was officially incorporated on November 15, 1949.—J. E.) and the purpose of this letter is to inquire whether or not the above-named officers have made a report on this matter and, if so, whether such report is available. If so, I would be very much pleased to receive a copy of the same."

It was not before October 19, that the Pentagon answered. On that day Maj. Gen. S. LeRoy Irwin, Director of Intelligence, United States Army, and a member of the General Staff, wrote the following letter:

"DEAR MR. DONDERO: Reference is made to your letter of October 6, 1949, in which you request information on a report of the Katyn massacre. The Intelligence Division has recently acquired a report on this subject, which was partially based on Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's observations of the German exhumation of the Polish graves at Katyn in 1943. The report is classified and therefore cannot be released at this time.

"In the event this report is declassified, it will be a pleasure to furnish you a copy.

"Sincerely yours,

"S. LEROY IRWIN,
"Major General, GSC, Director of Intelligence."

Representative DONDERO answered on October 31. He wrote General Irwin: "For the life of me I cannot conceive why Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's report on the Katyn affair should be classified." He asked the Pentagon for an explanation of the reasons that impelled the Department to classify the report, 6 years after the event.

On November 8, 1949, General Irwin answered DONDERO's letter. He wrote that "the report contains certain highly sensitive information the premature disclosure of which would be extremely unwise in view of the current international situation. The Department of the Army believes it inadvisable to release the report."

This rather evasive and, as we shall see later, untrue and silly answer caused the indefatigable DONDERO to write to the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson.

On January 9, 1950, DONDERO wrote to Johnson. The Secretary responded on January 18. I quote from his letter:

"Of the two documents you mention, the only one which we have in the Department of Defense is a report, prepared in the Army General Staff. This report is an accumulation of information from various sources and, although its preparation has been commonly attributed to Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet, he collaborated in its preparation only to the extent of reviewing its contents.

"It is my understanding that you have previously requested the Army to release this report to you and you were informed that since it contained highly sensitive information, its release by the Army was considered unwise. However, shortly before I received your letter, Secretary of the Army Gray raised with me the question of its release. No decision has been reached as yet concerning this matter but I hope to be able to give a definite answer to your request at an early date.

"With kindest personal regards,

"Sincerely yours,

"LOUIS JOHNSON."

From this moment on, it took the Defense Department exactly 8 months to release the Van Vliet report together with a memorandum to the press which reveals that everything General Irwin and Louis Johnson have written was absolutely untrue and that a hardly imaginable confusion and know-nothing about the well-established basic facts about Katyn existed—and probably still exists—in the Pentagon. The documents will tell the whole story.

The Department of Defense released a whole dossier on September 18, 1950. The dossier was composed of a memorandum to the press, the proper report written by Van Vliet, and some letters pertaining to the report as well as of a memorandum by Stanley S. B. Gilder, captain, EAMC.

It is important to notice that on September 18, 1950, neither Louis Johnson nor General Irwin were in office in their respective positions as Secretary of Defense and Director of Military Intelligence, United States Army.

The Van Vliet report itself is of utmost importance in various respects. First of all, because Van Vliet bluntly states: "I believe that the Russians did it. The rest of the group that visited the site stated to me that they believed that the Russians did it." And he adds: "Captain, now Major, Donald Stewart, EA, can be asked to verify this. I don't know his present address. He is Regular Army."

Second, with the release of this report, our Government indicates for the first time that it does not any longer believe in Stalin's lies about the German guilt. This is of tremendous importance in view of the fact that the Government, through its Office of War Information, disseminated for years Stalin's lies about Katyn, and our present Voice of America has always rejected to tell the world the truth about Katyn. This persistence in not telling the truth about Katyn went so far that the Voice even forced Count Joseph Czapski, one of the few survivors of the Russian massacre of Polish officers, to omit any mention of the word and the facts of Katyn when he was invited to broadcast in Polish to his Polish brethren.

It is not the purpose of this article to deal with the special merits of Van Vliet's report, but to reveal the mystery and confusion which surrounds this document as far as the Defense Department is concerned.

As the memorandum to the press reveals, the Van Vliet report released on September 18, 1950, is not at all the Van Vliet report as it was written on May 22, 1945. This original report mysteriously disappeared, notwithstanding the fact that it was classified "top secret" and locked up in a safe in the Pentagon. The report now released is a second one, written exactly 5 years after the first one was dictated in General Bissell's Pentagon office.

This second Van Vliet report, addressed to Maj. Gen. F. L. Parks, Chief of Information, United States of America, starts with the following two paragraphs:

"1. Pursuant to your letter of 26 April, 1950, I am personally typing this report of my recollections concerning the Katyn case. I am retaining one carbon copy for my personal file.

"2. Since 5 years have elapsed since I made the first report to Major General Bissell, this report will have to omit some details such as names which I have forgotten. In order to assist in locating my original report here are the circumstances under which it was made:

"On 22 May, 1945, General Bissell discussed the case with me alone in his private office in the Pentagon for about 20 minutes. He decided that it was important and directed his civilian female assistant (secretary? stenographer?) to go with me to a closed room across the hall and take dictation. I dictated my report, she typed it up and we added the photographs as inclosures. The general read the finished report, directed that it be marked "Top Secret" and filed. He then dictated the letter directing me to silence, and had me sign a copy of it in his presence. He explained the importance of my remaining silent, gave me my copy of the letter and thanked me."

PENTAGON VERSION

The Memorandum to the Press, not written by Van Vliet but by an official in the Pentagon, states the following:

"A memorandum written by an American officer concerning a visit which he made to the scene of a World War II atrocity involving the massacre of thousands of Polish Army officers in Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, in western Russia, has been declassified by the Department of the Army and is herewith made available for public dissemination.

"Decision to declassify the memorandum was made after numerous congressional and press inquiries as to its availability were directed to the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense.

"The memorandum was written by Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., who, while a prisoner of war of the Germans during World War II, was taken to Katyn by his captors and shown the corpses and graves at the site of the massacre.

"Shortly after he was liberated in 1945 Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet dictated a memorandum on this incident for the Department of the Army. Inquiries concerning this memorandum, which was classified, were made to the Department starting in the late months of 1949 and continuing through last week. In answering the first queries, the Department of the Army mistakenly indicated that it was in possession of a report which had been based in part on the observation of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. Such was not the case, this fact being discovered after the original requests had been answered.

"When this error was discovered, a search was instituted for the Van Vliet memorandum, so that consideration could be given to the question of whether it could be declassified and released to inquirers.

"When it became apparent that the memorandum could not be found immediately, the Chief of Information of the Department of the Army wrote to Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet, on April 26, 1950, requesting him to submit a second memorandum on his visit to the Katyn graves. Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet submitted a detailed second memorandum on the same subject dated May 11, 1950, which has now been declassified and is being released.

"Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet is at present on duty in the Far East Command.

"The Secretary of the Army, after having had a thorough search made for the original memorandum by the Department counselor, has directed the Inspector General to continue the search and to report any findings of the investigation to him.

"Should the original report be found it, too, will be released.

"The search for the original memorandum up to now has disclosed that on August 21, 1945, Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell, then Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, of the War Department, wrote the following letter to Mr. Frederick B. Lyon, then Acting Director of the Office of Controls of the Department of State.

"'DEAR MR. LYON: Transmitted for the information and file of the State Department is Report on Katyn, by Stanley S. B. Gilder, captain, EAMC, British medical officer. This report supplements statement of Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., forwarded to General Holmes, May 25, 1945, and generally substantiates all material facts in Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's report.

"'Sincerely,

"'CLAYTON BISSELL,
"'*Major General, GSC,*
"'*Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2.*

"('One enclosure: Report on Katyn by Stanley S. B. Gilder, captain, EAMC.')

"The General Holmes referred to in this letter is Brig. Gen. Julius C. Holmes, who at that time was an Assistant Secretary at the Department of State and who is presently the Minister attached to the United States Embassy in London.

"The Department of State has no record of having received the memorandum of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet on May 25, 1945, and the Department of the Army has so far found no receipt for it and no covering letter of transmittal. The only letter sent on May 25, 1945, from General Bissell to General Holmes was on another phase of this subject, and it contains no reference to transmitting the Van Vliet memorandum. General Holmes has been reached with reference to the matter and does not recall ever having seen Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's memorandum, though General Bissell remembers having sent it to him.

"Maj. Donald B. Stewart, who is mentioned in Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's memorandum, and who was the other United States Army officer present on the visit to Katyn in 1943, concurs generally with Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. Major Stewart is now stationed at St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Tex., in connection with ROTC training.

"The memorandum of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet and enclosures thereto follow, together with the memorandum of Captain Gilder, British medical officer, which was enclosed in the letter of August 21, 1945, from General Bissell to Mr. Lyon and the distribution of which the British have authorized following their declassification of the paper."

THE ESTABLISHED FACTS

Therefore, the following facts are well established beyond the shadow of any doubt. (They all follow from the Government's own press release):

1. That Van Vliet dictated his report on May 22, 1945, in General Bissell's office in the Pentagon.

2. Van Vliet dictated the report to a female assistant to General Bissell.

3. There was obviously not a single carbon copy or photostat of the report made.

4. The report was immediately marked "top secret" by General Bissell.

5. The report was filed as a "top secret" document and locked up in a safe.

6. The report was forwarded on May 25, 1945, to General Holmes, Assistant Secretary in the Department of State.

7. The Department of State has no record of having received the report.

8. The Department of Defense has not found any receipt from the State Department nor any copy of a letter of transmittal.

9. The report disappeared completely and mysteriously.

10. The report was not in the possession of General Irwin, Director of Military Intelligence, when he wrote on October 19, 1949, to Representative DONDERO that his department had it.

11. The report was not in possession of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, nor has

he ever seen it on January 18, 1950, when he wrote to DONDERO that the Department had a report reviewed by Van Vliet.

But this list of horrifying facts does not at all exhaust the list of mystifying confusions in the Pentagon. When they became known through the Government's own press release, Representative DONDERO was shocked and wrote to the new Secretary of Defense, General Marshall. General Marshall referred DONDERO's letter to Mr. F. Shackelford, Department counselor, who answered DONDERO in a letter of October 6, 1950. In view of the importance of this letter which reveals another series of facts, characterizing the mess in the Army's intelligence department, Mr. Shackelford's letter is produced in full:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Secretary of Defense Marshall, as you know from his acknowledgment of October 5, 1950, to your letter of September 28, 1950, has referred to our attention the matter you raised concerning Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr.'s first memorandum on the Katyn massacre.

Gen. S. LeRoy Irwin in his reply on October 19, 1949, to your letter of October 6, 1949, referred to a Katyn massacre "report * * * which was partially based on Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's observations." In making this statement he erroneously thought that a study entitled "Supplementary Report on Facts and Documents Concerning the Katyn Massacre" was based in part on information supplied by Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. This was not so. Instead the supplementary report was an independent and detailed study made by a Polish committee which at no time has consulted or conferred with Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. This study, dated October 1947, supplemented an earlier more extensive report prepared by the same committee entitled "Facts and Documents Concerning Polish Prisoners of War Captured by the U. S. S. R. During the 1939 Campaign," dated February 1946.

The mistake in concluding that the supplementary report was in any way based upon Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's observations was not discovered until some time after General Irwin's letter to you of October 19, 1949. In the course of carefully examining the supplementary report, which was not clearly labeled as to its origin, for the purpose of determining whether or not to disseminate it, it became apparent that it was a report of a Polish committee prepared entirely independently of any observations of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. Upon this discovery the files of both the Army and the State Departments were exhaustively searched for Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's memorandum dictated on May 22, 1945. When it could not be found the Army's Chief of Information asked Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet to prepare another report. The lieutenant colonel's eight-page memorandum dated May 11, 1950, was declassified and distributed along with a press memorandum of the Department of Defense on September 18, 1950. We furnished you with a copy of that memorandum, together with enclosures, on that date, and for your convenience are enclosing an additional copy with this letter.

The two very detailed reports entitled "Facts and Documents Concerning Polish Prisoners of War Captured by the U. S. S. R. During the 1939 Campaign" and a "Supplementary Report on Facts and Documents Concerning the Katyn Massacre" were marked "For private circulation only" and have not been publicly distributed.

Sincerely yours,

F. SHACKELFORD,
Department Counselor.

(One enclosure. Press release of September 18, 1950.)

ADDITIONAL FACTS AND A FEW QUESTIONS

From this letter the following additional facts evolve:

12. Gen. LeRoy Irwin mistook the Supplementary Report on Facts and Documents Concerning the Katyn Massacre with the Van Vliet report.

13. General Irwin believed that this supplementary report was made by a Polish committee.

14. General Irwin, Director of Intelligence of the United States Army, believed that another study, entitled "Facts and Documents Concerning Polish Prisoners of War Captured by the U. S. S. R. During the 1939 Campaign" and dated February 1946, was prepared by the same committee to which he ascribed the supplementary report.

15. General Irwin did not know that both documents were released not by a Polish committee but by the Polish Government in Exile (London) in 1946.

16. General Irwin did not know that both documents, prepared by the London Poles, represent the basic material on Katyn and that they were edited by Professor Heitzman, an eminent Polish scholar and the greatest living authority on Katyn, now living in this country.

17. General Irwin did not know that both documents have been used again and again by many writers who wrote on Katyn and that therefore it was utmost folly to classify them as "top secret" as was done according to Irwin's letters to Dondero.

These are the facts.

The following questions arise:

1. Who was the "female assistant" to General Bissell who took dictation from Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet on May 22, 1945?

2. Why was not a single carbon copy or photostatic copy made of the report?

3. Who locked up the report marked, "top secret"?

4. Who forwarded it to General Holmes, Assistant Secretary of State in the Department of State? By what means?

5. Why did the forwarder not ask the State Department for a receipt?

6. Where is a copy of the letter of transmittal, or was there no letter of transmittal? If not why?

7. How is it possible that the Department of Defense has the memoranda on Katyn, released by the Polish Government in Exile in London, and does not know what they are? How did they get those documents, well known to many hundreds if not thousands of writers, journalists, and scholars all over the world, without ever knowing who sent them to the Intelligence Department?

8. How did it come about that the Military Intelligence Department obviously classified those reports from the London Poles already in 1946 as "top secret," while it is a fact, that everybody interested in them could obtain them from the London Poles?

9. Who is responsible for this mess in the Department of Defense as revealed by the mysterious disappearance of the original Van Vliet report and the unbelievable confusion concerning the memoranda issued by the Polish Government in Exile?

10. What is our Military Intelligence, financed with millions of dollars from the taxpayers' pockets worth, when such a situation can prevail?

11. Who got fired?

These are some of the questions which must be answered.

To get the answers, a congressional investigation should start immediately. The Senate Armed Services Committee, under its new chairman, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, should do the job—and a thorough one.

Anglo-American Amity Faces Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bill Cunningham from the Boston Sunday Herald of April 29, 1951:

ANGLO-AMERICAN AMITY FACES TEST

(By Bill Cunningham)

Careless writing and radio news handling recently made it appear that Winston Churchill had endorsed the MacArthur side of the Truman-MacArthur controversy. That doesn't chance to be the fact, and in view of what Britain's great war leader really was driving at; his words need to be examined and his intent understood.

His flattering reference to General MacArthur, the first made in public by any Briton, was incidental to one of his characteristic slaps at the British Labor Government. His chief concern wasn't the fate of MacArthur, but the deterioration of Anglo-American relations, which he blamed on the British party in power.

This occasion was a brief 8-minute address he delivered at a meeting of the Primrose League in Albert Hall. So far as taking sides in the MacArthur controversy is concerned, Mr. Churchill explained that's exactly what he doesn't want to do. Scheduled for some while now to deliver an address at the University of Pennsylvania a week from Tuesday, the former British Prime Minister announced he was canceling the address for two reasons. The first is because of the current crisis in the affairs of the British Labor Government, which may give the Churchill-led Conservatives their long, eagerly awaited chance to bring it down.

The other reason, he said, is because he feels he "should not become involved in the MacArthur controversy on United States soil." His main target in the short address was "the mismanagement and incompetence" of Prime Minister Attlee's Labor government, and he said one of the worst effects has been the loss of intimate contacts between Mr. Attlee and President Truman.

REFERENCE TO GENERAL MACARTHUR

From that, he went on to say: "A wave of irritation is passing across the United States, and the isolationist forces there are glad to turn it upon Great Britain." Then came the reference to General MacArthur.

"The reproaches," he said, "against General MacArthur—that great soldier and great statesman, as his settlement of the difficulties with Japan after the war have proved—indulged in by Mr. Shinwell (British Minister of Defense), and even so staid a Minister as Mr. Chyter Ede (Deputy Prime Minister) enable those who do not like us in the United States to suggest that His Majesty's Government have had something to do with the General MacArthur dismissal.

"I cannot believe there is the slightest truth in this. Mr. Truman is not only the President of the United States, he is also the Commander in Chief, and no one outside the great Republic, now bearing nineteen-twentieths of the whole weight of the war in Korea, has the slightest right to interfere between him and his officers."

This really could be interpreted as an endorsement of President Truman. Calling General MacArthur "that great soldier" is

only acknowledging history, and the former British Prime Minister qualified his use of "great statesman" by citing the resurrection of Japan as his principal proof.

More interesting than his estimation of MacArthur is his statement that the United States is carrying nineteen-twentieths of the Korean burden and therefore no outsider has any business trying to pass judgment on what the United States Commander in Chief does to any of his officers. This seems to be another way of saying the Korean action is strictly an American affair, in fact if not in terminology, and that whatever the United States wants to do about it is the United States exclusive business.

That's probably the bald facts of the case, too; but we over here have been told and have been trying to believe that it was and is United Nations business.

If that's not the case, why fire MacArthur? What he wanted to do was fight it out with no holds barred and get it over with. So far as the record goes he was fired because the other member nations were afraid to, and because our own administration agreed with them. Now, in the words of Mr. Churchill, at least, we're told it's really our business and nobody else's.

NO WAVE OF IRRITATION IN UNITED STATES

His main point, however, is the wave of irritation passing across the United States and being turned upon Great Britain by the isolationist forces there. It's to be doubted very much that that's a fair statement of the facts. There's no wave of irritation being turned by any isolationists. There is blank inability of the average American to understand the British position, if Britain has a position.

Britain endorsed the general United Nations program of trying to oppose the spread of communism wherever it moved, yet Britain was the first to extend formal recognition to the Red Chinese, and while British soldiers are dying beside ours in Korea, the British Government has openly sponsored the seating of the Chinese Reds in the United Nations, and the cession to them of the island of Formosa.

While officially denouncing Russia, Britain has continued to do business with Russia, and while actually fighting the Red Chinese, a whopping business in rubber, tungsten, and other strategic materials is being done through the British port of Hong Kong with the Red Chinese, and probably Russia herself. This is disguised and denied in various ways, but all one needs do to get the real information is to talk with returning missionaries, businessmen, etc., who have been thrown out of Red China by way of Hong Kong.

One said to me the other day, "Business in Hong Kong and Singapore has never been so booming. Even the coolies now wear leather shoes." I gathered that latter was the ultimate in general prosperity.

Added in with all this has been the British abuse of MacArthur as a war leader, who was was leading too hard. This is no wave of irritation. It's simply a wonder that's been growing for months—wonder as to where the British stand what they're trying to do, whether they're with us or against us, and what kind of people they can be when they freely commit their sons to die while doing business with the enemy those sons are supposed to be, and are, fighting.

For all this, there are no open evidences of strong and general anti-British feeling here. On the contrary, from a strong evidence coming the other way, the anti-American feeling in Britain seems to be at its highest, at least since the mid-twenties when the British were disavowing their first World War loans. Anti-Americanism has been so general in Britain that some of the British themselves have now undertaken to fight it. That even goes for some of the British newspapers.

If there isn't strong anti-American feeling in the country, how else are we to account for a specimen such as this? It's a copy of the Sunday Mail of April 15, featuring a, for British papers, long article entitled "Stop Envying America." This was written by a professor of political science at Peterhouse, Cambridge, named Denis William Brogan, and since the gentleman studied at Harvard sometime during his career, he apparently has set up as an authority upon America. At least the blurb says "he has published a number of books on America."

TIME SOME HONESTY WAS INTRODUCED

But one of the most interesting things about the article is what amounts to an editorial set above it in heavy type. Officially this is an ed, set five columns wide above the piece to call the reader's attention to it, but behold its content. Its heavy headline says, "It's Time We Had Some Honesty."

Then it proceeds, "It is time some honesty was introduced into our attitude to the Americans. It is time we realize there are only two powers in the world nowadays capable of taking independent action. One is Russia, the other is America.

"To this new and humiliating thought, many British people have failed to make any proper adjustment. They detest Russia, but they are only reluctantly enthusiastic about America. There may be reasons for the reluctance, but, with some people, the reason is no more than an old-fashioned confusion of envy and malice.

"The confusion can only become worse if it is not brought out into the open. On their side, the Americans are weighing up our worth in plenty of penetrating argument, some of it of the chip-on-the-shoulder variety. It is time we had some argument on our own side of the Atlantic. The writer of the article below is a man who has spent the best part of his lifetime studying America and the American people. He provides a starting point for some candid thought."

That last seems to be a fair enough statement. Professor Brogan begins by saying it's obvious, since the recent British budget message, that Britons "are going to be forced to give up some of our hard-earned gains of the past 5 years." They'll be lucky, he says, if they can keep from going backwards economically "and this suspension of progress is due to a world situation that is not of our making."

Other than Russia, he says, the only power now capable of independent action is the United States, and while, he says, it is easy to say, "A plague on both your houses," in practice that means a plague on the American house. If the British want a whipping boy, he says, America is far more available than distant and currently little known Russia.

Of America, he says, they know a great deal because "no people was ever less adept at keeping a secret, nor had more passion for washing dirty linen in public and so providing 'neutralists' with the opportunity of saying it is six of one and half a dozen of the other."

If the British want a scapegoat, he says, America is a natural.

MORE PERMANENT CAUSE OF RESENTMENT

But, says he, there is another and more permanent cause of resentment. He boils this down to the fact that we are richer. It is possible, and perhaps probable, that we can stand the cost of rearmament without lowering our standard of living, whereas the British cannot, "and we naturally resent that."

But resentment, he says, is not argument and it is not a policy. It is not an argument, he says, "to think that America owes us money or goods because 'we fought for her' while she was neutral. We didn't. We fought for ourselves."

While it is true, he says, that they fought for a world in which America would be safer, "if that entitles us to send in a bill to the United States of America, what about the bill to Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal, and Ireland?"

"The money," he says, "the Americans are spending on armaments, nylons, cars, and chewing gum, even on 2-pound steaks, is their money. They earned it and they have been extremely generous spenders of it. But envy is a very human emotion and some envy must be allowed for."

He says the "more respectable emotion which can feed anti-American feeling is alarm. It is not only that Americans love washing their dirty linen in public—they love talking loudly."

Then he goes into trouble loud-mouths have caused, recalling the rantings of Hitler and Mussolini. This is all by way of winding up to take a swing at General MacArthur, whom he hereby inferentially places in their class. The British are not "totally comforted," he says, "when American politicians and, still more, American generals conduct high policy by loudspeaker plus television.

"It is not merely a matter of taste," he continues. "When something has been shouted, it is hard to return to more moderate policies and more subdued voices. Too much American policy seems to be made for the headlines, to be designed to compete for public attention with Danny Kaye or the latest arrests in the world of amateur sport."

And then he really gives it to the general. "Of course," he says "of all talkers, the one who alarms us most is General MacArthur * * * Piano, viano, as they say in music, and one may assume the former professor of moral philosophy in the University of Glasgow, His Majesty's Ambassador in Washington, would say that, too, if he had a free hand.

"It's not merely a question of noise. Behind the noise there is, on the American side, the conviction that, on any showdown, the United States will have its way." Then he says he feels if there is a showdown the rulers of the Soviet Union will have every reason to regret "having, like the Messrs. Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, underestimated the power of the United States of America."

COLD COMFORT FOR THE SURVIVORS

That, however, he says, will be cold comfort "for such of us as survive the lesson." He thinks, he says, "we are going to live for a long time in a world of cold war." The power of independent action of the British Government is limited, he says, and it will stay limited. The British economic level will remain below that of the United States. Americans will continue to talk loud.

But, for all this, he says, it will continue to be to the interests of the Soviet Union to divide the British and American peoples. There'll be ups and downs, he says, but "it would be a mistake to take too seriously any given incident, even the appointment of an American admiral to the command of the NATO fleets * * *"

Thereafter he trails off into a humorous effort concerning "the sinking of the Oxford boat under American direction," referring to the recent swamping of the Oxford shell in a race with an American crewmen in command. It doesn't seem to have much to do with the rest of his message * * * but why such a theme as this if our classic allies aren't quietly, but actively hating our guts? And what do we do now, such being the case?

Day in and day out, I read as many different newspapers as anybody and I haven't seen anything to match this in any American journal.

Mr. Churchill seems to have his antibiotics the other way round. This entire subject of great importance—who's really with

us and how far—may shortly be subjected to terrific strain. Specifically, the subject of our British relations may get its hardest test.

The MacArthur interrogation before the various congressional committees are about to begin. Political maneuvering of the Pearl Harbor investigation variety may succeed in clouding the facts and blanking the record. I chance to know, however, one fact those pressing the investigation are going to try to prove.

They're going to try to prove that Britain forced the firing of MacArthur, and the eventual appeasement of the Red Chinese with the threat to wreck the North Atlantic Defense Pact unless these things were done. I don't know that it can be proved, but unless the signals are changed, that's the way the play will go. Bitter insiders claim that's what happened, and that's what Mr. Churchill was trying to scotch with his remarks in Albert Hall.

Information of that nature, seemingly, would have to be wrung from Mr. Acheson if information there is General MacArthur possibly knew nothing about it. He was simply doing his best to get a military conclusion out of a war which was handed him, as he said, without his being consulted. The sell-out, if any, took place behind his back.

If that fact is established, Mr. Churchill had better hurry on over. Possibly the keenest of the Britons, he's already worried, as his recent words clearly attest. His passing praise of MacArthur may not have been too incidental either. He may figure that, in the long run, he might be doing business with the general. Mr. Churchill is probably one man who could. He and MacArthur have much in common, including the ways they've been treated.

The Tuna Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, recently certain newspapers in Washington have ridiculed certain budget requests by the State Department for funds to be utilized in connection with the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. I am sure that this action is the result of a misunderstanding concerning the purpose of this commission, which was established by convention between the United States and the Republic of Costa Rica, which on August 17, 1949, received the ratification of the United States Senate and came into force on March 3, 1950.

This convention had the unanimous support of the Pacific Coast States and all factions of the United States tuna industry, including labor, management, and vessel owners.

The convention and the establishment of the joint international commission are considered to be strong and essential steps forward in promoting the peaceful development of the tuna industry by reducing the international friction which has been occasioned from time to time during the expansion of the industry into the high seas off the coasts of nine Latin-American countries.

The United States industry not only fishes tuna in the high seas off the coasts of these several countries; it takes the live bait, which it requires for its fishing, within the territorial waters of these countries. Each vessel does this under individual permit from these countries, paying about $2,000,000 a year for bait-taking permits.

The Latin-American countries have been understandably worried lest such an intense fishery for bait in their territorial waters would exhaust resources which they do not use themselves now, but may wish to use in the future. These worries have also extended to the possibilities of exhausting the supplies of tuna off of their respective coasts.

These worries have been concretely expressed in the form of regulations, policies, and inhibitions in several countries, which are inimical to the development of the tuna industry. These regulations, policies, and inhibitions are not based on scientific research because none of these countries have trained fisheries scientists to survey the situation. Consequently, their regulatory steps have been related to local political action and not to scientific necessities.

All of this has, in the past, contributed to incidents involving United States fishermen and officials of these countries, creating irritations in the relationship between the United States and the Latin-American countries involved.

Until the signing of this convention, these irritating incidents were increasing in number as the tuna fleet and its activities expanded. Upon the signing of this convention and establishment of the Commission, the international tensions surrounding the tuna fishery relaxed markedly because the Latin-American countries believed that there was now to be established a vehicle for the determination of scientific facts upon which regulations can be based in order to prevent an exhaustion of the bait and tuna fisheries.

The function of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission is to determine scientifically if there is, in fact overfishing, with consequent waste in either the bait fishing or the tuna fishing and to determine when and where it occurs and to recommend to the governments involved measures to be taken to prevent overfishing wherever it may occur.

Under the convention each country agreed to pay its share of the joint expenses of the Commission in proportion to each country's use of the resources involved.

The industry itself is prevented from financing the costs of the Commission's work for the following reasons:

First. The Commission is an intergovernmental undertaking. There is no legal way by which its work can be privately financed.

Second. The research must be done by perfectly impartial scientists or its results will not be accepted by the Latin-American countries. If it is done by scientists in the employ of the industry, no amount of persuasion will convince the Latin Americans that the research is being conducted impartially.

Third. The recommendations for regulations, if any are required, will have to be joined in by representatives of the countries through whose waters the resources migrate. Regulations which do not cover the entire range of the resource are useless. None of these countries are apt to adopt recommendations made solely by the United States industry, by the United States, or by one of its neighboring countries. If they do not have an equal hand in directing the research, the analyzing of its results, and the framing of any regulations resulting therefrom, they will be suspicious that the research, analysis, and regulations are biased in favor of the framers. The bait fisheries, all lying within the territorial waters of these countries, can be studied and regulated only by the country in which it lies or by an intergovernmental body to which has been delegated such power.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Dr. Donald P. Loker, general manager, High Seas Packing Co., San Diego, Calif., taking issue with the Washington newspapers ridiculing the request for appropriations for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. I believe his discussion of the Commission and its purposes will be enlightening to my colleagues:

HIGH SEAS TUNA PACKING CO., INC.,
San Diego, Calif., April 27, 1951.

Hon. CECIL R. KING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KING: I am informed that the Washington newspapers of yesterday carried articles based on hearings of the House Appropriations Committee which referred to the study of the "love life of the tuna" in a manner designed to poke fun at the tuna industry.

I would appreciate it if you would call to the attention of your fellow Congressmen that this great industry is not a proper subject for ridicule. The tuna fishery is the most valuable fishery that the United States possesses, and it makes the fishing industry the fourth most valuable industry of the sovereign State of California.

The many thousands of men and women in California, Oregon, and Washington who are gaining their entire livelihood from the catching and processing of this nutritious food, and the additional thousands scattered through every State in the Union who make a living by wholesaling, retailing, and distributing this food to the Nation will not appreciate the levity with which these newspapers, and possibly some Members of the Congress, are treating the serious problems of this vital food industry.

This industry has grown by its own efforts without soliciting or getting one cent of Federal aid. The $125,000,000 which we have invested in the vessels, canneries, etc., which produce tuna, we have taken out of the sea itself and plowed back into the industry. It has not come out of the Federal Treasury.

If the vast subsidizing structure of the Department of Agriculture were taken from under the beef and pork industry of this Nation, that industry would collapse overnight. If the United States Fish and Wildlife Service were to cease operating tomorrow it would make no noticeable difference to the tuna industry. Yet, last year we produced $100,000,000 worth of food and marketed 11,000,000 cases of delicious, nutritious, boneless, skinless tuna meat in this country—enough to provide three and one-half cans for every man, woman, and child in the

Nation. This is not an effort which should be held up to ridicule.

We have not heretofore asked aid from the Federal Government and we would not do so now if there were any way in which we could handle our international problems by our own efforts.

Nearly our entire production comes from the high seas south of the United States border. We fish off the coast of nine Latin-American Republics. We fish for bait, in the territorial waters of most of these countries, under permits which we have to buy from these countries, and for which we pay high prices.

For 15 years we entreated our Department of State to negotiate treaties such as the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Convention. It was not until the accumulation of our problems in several countries began to threaten the friendly relations between the United States and these countries that we could get the Department of State to act. When they did we gave every cooperation. We aided in the negotiation of the treaty; we urged the ratification of the treaty by the United States Senate; we pushed for the passage of implementing legislation through the Congress; we have thrown open the confidential records of our vessel operations and cannery operations to the Commission's staff; we have provided an advisory board from the industry to aid the Commission in its serious tasks; we have given largely of our time and money to aiding this most worth-while project; and now we find that we are being held up to ridicule before the Congress and the Latin-American Republics.

The treaty received the unanimous consent to ratification by the United States Senate. The implementing legislation passed the Congress last fall without a dissenting vote. We understand the Department of State was authorized, because of the urgency of the problems, to use funds already appropriated to its international contingency fund to get this Commission's work under way pending the approval of regular appropriations this year.

The Commission held one meeting in California and a second one in Costa Rica. A plan of research was prepared and approved; a budget to cover these activities was approved by both Governments. The Government of tiny Costa Rica sent its check for its complete share of the Commission's joint expenses to the Commission. The United States sent a check for $12,000 as a first installment of its $59,000 share of the Commission's joint expenses.

The Commission hired a top-notch scientist to direct its investigation. The Director hired a secretary and one assistant and made plans to hire other scientists to carry out the investigations which are so urgently needed.

But no more money of the United States share of the expenses was forthcoming. Through some hanky-panky between the Department of State and the House Appropriations Committee these funds have been held up. We cannot understand why this has been so. The President and his Bureau of the Budget have given their approval to the urgent nature of this work. So has the Department of State. So, we thought, had the Congress to a man.

But now the Commission has run out of money even before it has been able really to get its work started. And in 2 weeks' time it will have to fire its skeleton staff for lack of funds to pay their wages. We have been held up to ridicule before the Latin American Republics, and so has the entire Congress.

The treaty which the entire United States Senate approved is being vetoed by lack of funds. The Commission which the entire United States Congress approved is being strangled for lack of funds. Solemn international commitments made by this Nation to a sister republic are being welched on. No action that the United States could take would be more damaging to this industry than that which it is now doing: to make a bargain with one of our sister republics and then fail to keep it.

Other Latin American nations are closely watching this situation and already the repercussions have begun to set in. Two weeks ago, Panama refused two of our vessels permits to take bait during the regular bait season, and these two vessels, after going 800 miles out of their way to get this bait, have to wander off elsewhere to some other country. Panama does not want its bait resources damaged; Panama has no scientists to determine whether damage is being done or not. Therefore, Panama is just closing its bait grounds to us until impartial investigations are made.

The Nation cries for meat; the Navy wants our ships; the Navy is using our vessels and crews to help guard the Pacific approaches of the Panama Canal from Ecuador to Mexico. Yet the great puissant United States cannot find the paltry $47,000 remaining of its committed share to keep this Commission running and help this industry keep afloat.

I hope—and that hope is shared by the entire tuna industry—that you will bend every effort to see what is holding this money up and to investigate why this industry is being ridiculed instead of aided in the Nation's Capital.

From the standpoint of our international problems, it would have been much better that the treaty had never been negotiated than that it should be allowed to fail. But now that the treaty has been put in force, the Commission activated, and the research started, it is disastrous to us to have the whole thing cast aside. The repercussions on our industry of this welshing by the United States Government is going to be that we will be hurled back into a welter of diplomatic engagements damaging to us and to United States relations with those governments, and which we cannot handle.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD P. LOKER,
General Manager, High Seas Packing Co.

Wide Support Given to World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following public-opinion release from George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion. The poll which he conducted shows that the world-government idea has wide public support.

In analyzing the results of Gallup's poll, there might be some critics of world government who will try and make capital of the fact that only a minority had a clear-cut idea about the meaning of world government before being polled. I think that the answer to this objection is the fact that a poll on the familiarity with the Marshall plan revealed that while two-thirds knew it had something to do with aid to Europe, only 14 percent could define its objectives. This is true of virtually any specific foreign-policy measure, and probably will be in the forseeable future. This poll does not, of course, indicate that the people are crying for or demanding world government, but it does seem reasonable to conclude that they will accept the first steps in that direction.

Being one of the sponsors in this year's Congress of the world-government resolution, I am more than gratified to see the results of Gallup's poll. I might call attention to the fact that this year I sent my annual legislative questionnaire to about 25,000 constituents in which was the following question: "Would you be in favor of our Government taking the lead in the further development of the U. N. into a world federation capable of enforcing world law?" I have tabulated the first 1,000 returns on this question and the results show that 82 percent of those answering the question are for the idea as compared to 18 percent against.

Dr. Gallup's poll follows:

PRINCETON, N. J., May 1.—The world government resolution which has been introduced in Congress has considerable popular backing throughout the country, judging by interviews on the subject, with a balanced cross section of the Nation's voters.

Those better informed about the world government movement are more in favor of it. But even among persons not previously familiar with it, Gallup poll interviewers found considerable support for the idea of strengthening the United Nations to make it a world government.

Approximately two-thirds (64 percent) of all voters questioned by the American Institute of Public Opinion had some idea about the meaning of the term "world government." However, only a minority could explain the term with any precision.

Thirty-six percent were unable to give any meaningful definition.

All persons, whether they had previously heard of the term or not, were then asked: "Do you think the United Nations should or should not be strengthened to make it a world government with power to control the armed forces of all nations, including the United States?"

Yes, it should, answered 49 percent.
No, it should not, declared 36 percent.
The others, 15 percent, were undecided.

When compared with a survey on a similar question conducted in 1946, the above results indicate no great change of sentiment on the world-government issue.

INFORMED APPROVE

Those better informed in today's survey—the ones who were able to give a reasonably correct definition of the term "world government"—approve the idea by the following vote:

Make U. N. a world government, said 53 percent.

Leave it as it is, answered 37 percent.

The remainder, 10 percent, were undecided.

In the last session of Congress approximately 110 Members of the House of Representatives pledged themselves in favor of the resolution.

RESOLUTION TEXT

The resolution introduced in Congress by a number of representatives and supported by the World Federalists reads as follows:

"That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into an organization of such defined and limited powers as are essential to the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law to prevent aggression and to maintain peace."

Another group, the Atlantic Union Committee, favors a more limited type of world government made up of the Atlantic Powers, whereas the world federalists would open the door to all countries.

The National Home Garden and Home Food Preservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, just a word in behalf of the National Home Garden and Home Food Preservation Program, sponsored by the Department of Agriculture. Gardening in any year is one of the most useful and satisfying of human avocations. It is to be regretted that so many American citizens are deprived of the opportunity to learn by experience more about the soil and the plants from which they derive their daily food. It is good to think that millions of us have space on farm or in back yard where we can cultivate some vegetables and fruits, good for our bodies, and some grass and flowers and shade trees which renew our spirits and our faith in those simple beautiful things which are not too expensive for most of us to own or create with our own hands. We all recognize that the home is the very center of the American way of life. That it should be attractive outside as well as in, goes without saying. And when a garden also makes a contribution in wholesome food it adds to the sense of permanence, security and justifiable pride in American citizenship.

There is particular need for emphasizing home gardening and home food preservation this year arising out of the uncertainties of the time. No one knows how great or how small the food supply will be at the end of the crop year in 1951. No one can predict with certainty the character of the demand and the distribution of fruits and vegetables as they might be affected by military needs and transportation exigencies. Gardens and pantries are very practical storages of food against emergencies. Modern techniques of preservation, including home freezers, low temperature locker storages, pressure cookers, improved home canning instructions and equipment, and the storage of several kinds of fresh vegetables and fruits in cool basements and earth pits, are good ways to insure against possible shortage.

Home gardens, intelligently handled on good soil are important money savers, for low-income families particularly. Naturally, the advantages increase with the size of the family. Some impressive figures showing possible returns from home gardens recently appeared in the March and April numbers of two of the largest nationally circulated magazines—Better Homes and Gardens, and McCall's.

At least five other national magazines with a tremendous total circulation have featured home gardening with very important articles—House and Garden, Life, Look, Country Gentleman, and American Home. The Saturday Evening Post and Life also gave prominent space recently to the achievements of prominent seed concerns in the world of flower growing. All these things reflect the tremendous and growing interest of Americans in the art of gardening both for food and for beauty.

During World War II, the Union Pacific Railroad surveyed some 20,000 employee gardens in each of 2 years and concluded that if the vegetables grown and used had been purchased in the Kansas City wholesale markets they would have cost between $100 and $120 per garden.

It has come to my attention that there is a disposition in some quarters to play down the importance and value of a home-garden program and to regard home gardening as it now stands as adequate for our needs. At the height of the victory garden program the country had 20,000,000, perhaps as much as 22,000,000, gardens—Gallup polls. Extension workers and garden leaders think the number was not over 55 percent as many in 1950; some think about 50 percent. There is no justification for officials or civilian organizations to be complacent with the effectiveness of their programs in the fact of such a steadily falling home-garden effort. In the face of a sadly decreased wheat crop and widespread unfavorable weather conditions this is no time to relax our efforts to produce food on either farm or garden.

Higher food production goals have been set for 1951 in the interest of national defense for such essential cereals as corn and spring wheat and for tomatoes, peas, and sweet corn for canning. In view of the fact that home gardening labor is voluntary and takes no manpower from industry, that it is good for those who engage in it from about every angle one can think of, and that it cultivates a taste for vegetables which reflects itself in larger sales of commercial vegetables, there should be nothing but enthusiastic support for such a program.

I like the emphasis which the program lays on food preservation and use because it encourages many people in cities and towns who have no opportunity to make gardens, to freeze or can vegetables and fruits, and thus become participants, to their own advantage, in the effort.

Many of our political and military leaders think the world will live in a state of tension for several years. A continuing program of self-reliance on our individual production and conservation powers is in the national interest, a program that teaches school children and adults alike the fundamentals of food production, the essentials of sturdy independence of character and intelligent application of heart and hand to winning their daily bread, if necessary, in the event that disaster ever requires them to do so as a matter of survival.

The Menace and Challenge of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Charles Malik, the distinguished author of the following timely discourse, has just succeeded Eleanor Roosevelt as chairman of the United Nations Committee on Human Relations, of which she was chairman for five consecutive years.

Newspaper reports recently related that the Soviet Union member of said Commission was the only member who did not vote for Mr. Malik to succeed Mrs. Roosevelt.

A reading of the following, by Dr. Malik, will make clear why the Soviet spokesman did not care to have Dr. Malik head up this very, very important United Nations Commission.

I commend to your attention the utmost consideration of the article and due emphasis by every Congressman of its analysis and conclusions.

It follows:

CONCERNING COMMUNISM: THE MENACE AND THE CHALLENGE

(By Dr. Charles Malik, Minister of Lebanon in the United States, delivered July 26, 1950)

I

Communism is orginally a doctrine about reality, an ideal, and a call to action. Today, however, it has transported itself into the domain of concrete reality. For communism is now the principle of being of a great power and of a solidly organized group of nations under its hegemony. It is also the ideal and cause of a world-wide movement. It controls the life of about one-third of the globe, formally and directly. At least another one-third of the world determines its ultimate policies in terms of communism, albeit negatively and by way of reaction. Thus between themselves, the Communist and the non-Communist camps—both equally, though in opposite ways, functions of communism—constitute the totality of the effective agents of today's world.

What a difference, then, between the reality of communism today, which affects the life of the whole world, and the reality of communism a hundred years ago, when it was, to all appearance, no more than a bold cry in the wilderness. When Marx and Engels launched their wild attack on all known and existing patterns of life, the opening words of their Manifesto—"A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of communism"—were by no means a description of an existing situation; but today, exactly a century later, these same words are more than completely fulfilled. It may indeed have been only a spectre then; but today the spectre has taken on formidable concretion.

And yet, the dangers latent in communism need not have awaited the developments of this whole century to be fully realized; they were already there, in the pages of the Manifesto, for the whole world to read, decades before communism had at its disposal the world's most organized war machinery.

At the outset of the two half centuries that have just elapsed, men failed to realize the full character and magnitude of the challenge of communism mainly because their sight was concentrated on the political and the quantitative. Due to its infinitesimal physical dimensions, the spiritual significance of communism simply eluded men's vision. Those who did read aright the signs of the times—and they were very rare—solitary and suffering figures like Kierkegaard and Dostoyevsky—did so because their visions penetrated beyond the outward dimensions of events and grasped their inner spiritual and intellectual significance. Today, however, those who see only the political, social, economic, and military threat of communism miss its true challenge as pathetically as did their predecessors. For both see out of focus; both are so impressed by the physical weakness or strength of what is essentially a spiritual revolution that they lose sight of its real character.

II

Communism is a thoroughly consistent system of thought. From its basic and initial metaphysical premises, its all-comprehensive materialistic conception of reality, to its interpretation of human-social-historical reality, dominated by historical economic determinism, to its amoral view of human action, determined in its motives, directions, and worth only by its serviceability to the cause of world revolution—communism presents the spectacle of a tightly knit, rigid system of thought, permeated through and through, in its presuppositions, structure, and conclusions, by the spirit of metaphysical monism, ethical and axiological relativism, self-centered, autonomous humanism, impersonalist collectivism, historical dynamism, and militant atheism.

Communism is predicated on the emphatic rejection of God. The whole order of the spirit is rejected; self-subsistent spiritual beings are denied, while the spirituality of corporeal beings, like man, is reduced to a function of their physical existence. The Communist denial of God and the spirit is militant. Communism goes beyond agnosticism, beyond passive atheism; it assumes the form of aggressive and militant atheism. For God is not merely an illusion, but a harmful illusion, ingeniously utilized by priests and bourgeoisie for their own interests, and therefore combated by communism in the name of the class interests of the proletariat.

With the abolition of God goes the abolition of the absolute in any form. There is no absolute truth which man seeks and knows. There is no absolute good which man strives for, which eternally judges of man's actions and intentions and very being. Everything is relative—in its origin, being but a product of the material conditions of human existence, as well as in its form and function, being always subordinate to the interests and desires of classes. The good, the true, the beautiful, thus relativized, are ruthlessly subjectivized beyond any hope at a healthy, corrective relation to an objective order above the whims and interests of man.

The conception of man in communism is accordingly disfigured. Severed from his divine origin and divine destiny; denied the spiritual principle which gives his reason access to the truth, which endows his conscience and will with the craving for the good, which empowers his heart to love; imprisoned hopelessly in this world of strife and frustration, here to center all his hopes and here to erect his paradise—Communist man, thus despiritualized and depersonalized to the highest degree, is pathetically dehumanized. He is but a passing shadow of no duration, a fragment of no intrinsic or ultimate worth, a function of the striving of his generation for a more productive existence. Man's natural and inalienable rights are thus superseded by privileges bestowed by the collective; man's personal, intrinsic dignity is made to rest upon and emanate from his status in and contributions to the community; man's freedom—freedom of thought, freedom of being, freedom of self-achievement—is rendered conditional upon and utterly subservient to the whims and the interests of society.

From the point of view of world peace what is important about this doctrine is its entrenchment as the official monolithic philosophy of one of the two great powers of the world today. This power, whose capital is Moscow, has inherited the vast realms of the former Russian Empire, including its autocratic totalitarian organization. It has annexed to itself further millions of square miles and further hundreds of millions of human beings. Marx and his followers gloried in the fact that they were not only describing history—they were determined to take history into their hands and change it. Next to the bourgeoisie, it was the philosophers who mainly described events from the outside who were the targets of the Communists' sharpest shafts of ridicule. From the very beginning communism was one of the crassest lusts for power the world has ever known.

The actual, historical, political enshrinement of communism in the Russian-Soviet state meant a total concentration of all origination in the hands of the government. Everything flows from and is licensed by the government. Thus there are no independent free sources of thought, creation, activity; the assumption being, as Mr. Acheson remarked not long ago, that the government, which is the source of everything, is made up of gods or demigods, or at least supermen who know the truth and can never err.

Thus communism is not only a total doctrine which is at absolute variance with the deepest persuasions of the West; it is—and this is its importance from the viewpoint of war and peace—a total state. Nor is it just a total state living by itself; it is an aggressive state, absolutely determined to spread its outlook, its system, its power, throughout the world, not indeed under conditions of fair and free competition with other systems and outlooks (this very concept of fair and free competition would of course be the object of vitriolic sarcasm by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin), but by force and subversion and every conceivable subtlety.

Communists usually offer one aspect of their teachings to a group or an individual, that aspect which appeals to the interests of the group or the temperament of the individual in question; to the underprivileged masses, it is equality and security and what they call economic justice; to the peoples fighting against colonialisms, it is emancipation from their imperialist masters; to soft pacifists, it is attacks against warmongers and petitions for world peace; to oppressed races, it is racial equality; to the cosmopolitans, it is the supra-national world-scope of communism; to the intellectuals it is the lure of the ideal of equality and justice; to the liberals, it is what they call the struggle against fascism. Now, so far as they go, these partial emphases of communism have each a germ of truth. But they are not the whole truth about communism; they are not the essence of communism. Nor can the abstract good in them stand up, white and radiant, outside the dark shadow of the whole system.

These various aspects of communism are offered as a bait, cunningly prepared to suit the victim, to be followed gradually but steadily by larger and larger doses of the whole system and to be consummated, once the victim is well on his way toward complete capture, by rigid discipline. This seems to be in the general pattern of Communist infiltration: one-sided appeal to all-round subjugation. But communism is in reality a compact totality of spirit and values and premises, every one of which essentially partakes of the character of the whole. The greatest danger inherent in communism is not its total evil and falsehood which is likely, once communism is viewed as a whole, to be rejected even by common sense, but rather the isolated streaks of good and truth which enter into the fabric of the whole and which, viewed in abstraction, may ensnare the weak and innocent.

III

Superficially, communism is a revolt against the capitalist system, an antithesis to the bourgeoise civilization of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, characterized as it has been by nationalism, individualism, imperialism, politico-economic liberalism, free economic enterprise, private ownership of property and of the means of production, representative government, and the rule of law.

This is, of course, partly true, although it can be shown that the Soviets are absolutely imperialistic, that in the United Nations they have insisted on nothing more than on the principle of national sovereignty, and that so far as the private ownership of property and of the means of production are concerned, the passage of these things from the private ownership of a few individuals—subject always to the inevitable correctives of free competition and to the social and economic scrutiny of the public and the government—to the monopoly of the state, which is subject to no judgment whatsoever above itself, this passage is not a sure mark of progress.

Be that as it may, the point I want to make now is that communism has much more in common with its antitheses than it realizes. Though a revolt against what it ambiguously calls capitalism, communism is more profoundly a completion, a culmination, a passage to its logical conclusion, of that movement of European secularism and self-estrangement of which the age and civilization of capitalism is but a product, in fact perhaps an intermediate and transitory stage. Their opposition takes place on common grounds. For behind the opposition between their respective systems of organizing the modes of production and exchange, behind the difference in their patterns of social and political organization, behind the antitheses of their conceptions of social dynamics, there lies a basic disturbing kinship of outlook. It is the kinship of their common underlying economism, their common worship of the economic man: half-hearted and perhaps unconscious, yet, nevertheless, all-pervading, in the one case, and militant and elevated to the level of a creed in the other case. It is the similarity of their common autonomous humanism: their preoccupation with human affairs, their concentration on man's life here below, where material interests are uppermost and material prosperity the supreme good—a concentration which in the one case overshadows and in the other case entirely supersedes the eternal, the spiritual, the transcendent. It is finally the similarity of their common impersonalism: in the one case, within the context of an atomistic, self-seeking, closed and windowless individualism, in itself opaque to love and suffering and sacrifice and responsibility and social solidarity; and, in the other case, within the context of an absolutely soulless collectivism in which the person's independent existence is denied, his freedom, his dignity, his worth being all made derivative from the leviathan which is his state.

IV

This then is the theory and actuality of communism in general and this is the character of its dialectic within the secularism of the present western epoch.

The question therefore arises: Can there be real peace, with communism so entrenched and so determined? Can the West get along

with this sort of thing? Is the oft-repeated notion of peaceful coexistence a real possibility?

My answer to all these questions is categorically in the negative. Obviously I cannot get along with one whose whole being not only contradicts mine, but is bent on destroying mine. Therefore, when anybody in the West says or has said simply, "we can get along with communism," then one of four propositions is true: (1) Either he is a Communist himself; (2) or he is an appeaser; (3) or he does not know what he is talking about, namely he does not know the nature of the thing with which he says he can get along; (4) or—and this is the most grievous thing—he does not know the supreme values of his own heritage which communism has radically rebelled against and desires to extirpate.

For I assure you it isn't only your soldiers in Korea who are embattled today: It is the highest attainments of mind, spirit, and being of the last 4,000 years.

The question therefore is not "Can we get along with communism? Can we arrange a modus vivendi between the two worlds? Can we bring about a peaceful coexistence between them?" This question, in my opinion, is perfectly stupid. For the West, if it knows itself and if it knows communism, must come to the obvious conclusion that it is absolutely impossible to get along with communism.

What then is the question?

The question is: Whether it is possible to induce, and how to induce, the necessary modification in Communist theory and practice whereby the West then can get along, not indeed with communism as such, but with the Russians. This is the supreme question of the present generation.

The answer to this question as to the ways and means of inducing in communism the necessary changes which will enable Russia and the rest of the world to live together in peace is, in my opinion, the following:

1. The non-Communist world must feverishly look after its own defenses. It is absolutely stupid of the West or of anybody in the West to assume that where communism could intervene and could get away with it, it would not intervene. Therefore the non-Communist world must be strong enough to counteract any possible Communist intervention. Communism will never be induced to change its nature so long as it only passes from success to success. This is an absolutely necessary condition; but it is purely negative.

2. The West must stand, energetically and consistently, precisely for those political and economic conditions whose absence has been a contributing factor to the spread of communism and to the growth of the other corrosives of western civilization.

This means promoting real democracy, at home and abroad, where the people can freely and actively determine their own government. A situation in which the west preaches and practices democracy at home, while at the same time allying itself with autocratic reactionary regimes abroad, where there is no freedom or participation of the people in their own government, is at once unhappy and unstable.

It means further that the West must share the material goods of the earth with the rest of the world in greater liberality. It is impossible for western civilization to defend itself against communism so long as between Moscow and Washington there are teeming billions of human beings who have never known anything except poverty, privation, and the ever-present menace of starvation, and to whom Moscow means, truly or falsely, that an end will be put to their eternal misery. It is impossible for western civilization to defend itself against the onslaught of communism so long as the standard of living in the United States is ten to a hundred times higher than what it is throughout Asia, and so long as the United States and the rest of the West do nothing effective about it. In my opinion, the present financial implications of point 4 must be multiplied literally a hundred times before anywhere near the preliminary conditions for counteracting the Communist challenge on the material plane can be fulfilled. This is no sentimental act of philanthropy; this is a genuine feeling of human solidarity in a magically contracted world. There is no getting away from the fundamental spiritual law: to retain the enjoyment of your liberties and goods, you must liberally share them with others. In that way alone can you pentrate and overcome that penumbra of neutrality which seems today to be encasing the Soviet world.

3. But the penetration must go further: it must reach the Russian mind, Senator BENTON's program toward this end is of the utmost importance. But, frankly, here again the outlay must be multiplied at least by 10, and the propaganda used must not only aim at the truth in the narrower sense of conveying to the Russian mind a true picture of the real conditions in the Communist and the non-Communist worlds, but in the deeper sense of eliciting the common humanity and the common spirituality which subsist between Russia and the West. In this connection it is tragic that the importance of Greek Orthodoxy has not been sufficiently appreciated in the West. But Orthodoxy has molded the Russian spirit for a thousand years, and the stupid veneer of Marxist materialism will never displace it. This does not mean that the faithful will in an emergency turn against their government: no, the Russian will always die in defense of holy Russia. But it does mean that looking beyond the emergency, Greek Orthodoxy is the only existing community of spirit between Russia and the West. This is a fact of the greatest possible significance for the future. I must add that Western Christianity must approach the Eastern Orthodox Church in a spirit of contrition and Christian charity. I assure you you can learn a lot from the wonderful riches of the Orthodox Church.

4. Unless a civilization is sure of its ultimate values, its military, economic and political defenses will sooner or later be weighed and found utterly wanting. Civilizations have perished not so much because they have been materially weak, as because they lost their soul and ceased to have a fighting faith in themselves as bearers of light and being to the entire world.

The absolute necessity for military, political, and economic preparedness at the present time cannot be overemphasized. But precisely because the needs in these fields are so incontestably overpowering, there is a grave danger that the great requirements of the spirit will be unduly lost sight of.

The greatest task of the Western World at the present moment is, concurrently with its military, economic, and political preparedness, to articulate adequately what it ultimately stands for. The basic values of western civilization must be brought out and proclaimed in all clarity, conviction, and boldness.

It is not true that men fight best in self-preservation. This may be true of animals, but certainly it is not true of men. Men are primarily moved by ideas. Grant them a certain vision of the truth, and they will rise to pinnacles of heroism utterly unattainable by those who live and die only to preserve themselves. Men live by faith. Grant them a fighting faith whereby they are sure that the values they believe in are supreme, and they will move mountains.

Communism provides a fighting faith. But the Western World has a fighting faith that is infinitely deeper and truer than this primitive faith of communism. Only this western faith must be rediscovered, reactivated and reaffirmed. The greatest service that can be done to western society today is to reawaken it to the positive faith of its fathers.

The West, with the Atlantic community as the central core, is the integral heir of the Graeco-Roman-Hebrew-Christian-Mediterranean-European humane tradition. For 4,000 years profound and sustained interaction between diverse peoples and cultures resulted in this wonderful synthesis. There is no similar cumulative richness of spirit, no comparable internal conscious reflection, anywhere else in the world. Communism has cut itself away from, and rebelled against this tradition, and all in the name of material progress; and it is this act of self-separation and rebellion that is going to mean its undoing in the end. Once this residue of faith is reactivated and proclaimed, once the deposit of the ages is known and loved and believed in, then western man will realize what is at stake in the great spiritual contest of the moment, and there will be no limit to the level of joyful sacrifice and quiet self-confidence to which he will rise.

I shall therefore now suggest in barest outline what I believe to be the elements of the western faith, the basic findings of the last 4,000 years, findings which mankind can overlook or rebel against only at its supreme peril.

1. There is an objective truth to be sought and found, a truth about nature, man, society, history and the final things.

2. There is thus a natural law and order to which we must submit if we are to be happy.

3. There is an hierarchy of being, an order of values, a higher and a lower in the scale of things. Good consists of rejoicing in and obeying this order; evil, in trying to subvert it.

4. Human reason, thoroughly disciplined in the cumulative positive tradition, is perfectly adequate, by free and critical inquiry, to discover this truth, this law, and this hierarchy.

5. Man is free to be or not to be in the truth. He is free to rebel against nature. But as surely as the night follows the day, if he rebels, he will have to pay a heavy price by way of suffering and death, even unto the third and fourth generations.

6. Our freedom of thought, conscience, and decision is something absolutely sacred. It is by this freedom that we share in the perpetual act of creation. Take this freedom away from man, and he is immediately dehumanized.

7. The other person is never a means only, but always also an end. Therefore his humanity must be respected.

8. The human person does not exist for the sake of society and the state: on the contrary, society and the state exist for the sake of the human person.

9. History is not all in vain; we do not start all over again. There is a real, positive heritage accumulating itself for 4,000 years. This heritage of truth and being is the most precious thing in the world.

10. There is a God. He is a living person. He created heaven and earth and has authentically revealed Himself in history. His essence is love, and therefore He both suffers and has suffered for our sins, and always forgives.

11. The intellectual and spiritual principles in man are supreme over any other principle. Thus our primary duty is to seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness. The material is derivative from the spiritual.

12. Man—you and I in the first person—is destined to eternal life. Our present life is a mockery and a hopeless unintelligibility without reference to the next.

This body of doctrine is the soul of the West. It is what has made the West to be itself. It is a permanent acquisition of the human spirit. I believe heaven and earth will perish, but this deposit of truth and certainty will never pass away. This is the fighting faith of the West, this is the standard under which alone the West can be true to itself. And if a life-or-death struggle is forced upon western civilization, this is the ensign of truth in whose name alone it can fight and conquer.

People must realize the ultimate things that are in the balance. For what is ultimately in the balance is not this or that government, not this or that economic system, not this or that person who happens to be in power today, not the home and the hearth and the children, but the dearest persuasions and certainties of the last 4,000 years. What is under ruthless attack is nothing short of reason, order, nature, truth, freedom, human dignity, history, God, love, and the higher things. It is these matters, without which there would never be light and culture in Europe and America today, that are systematically undermined, ridiculed, denied, conspired against. There is a determined attempt to see that they are eradicated from the surface of the earth. When people take in the concrete significance of their beleaguered heritage, it is impossible for them to remain any more in doubt: They will rise to the highest pitch of certainty and resolve.

The tragedy of the present moment is that many people have lost faith in this priceless intellectual and spiritual heritage of the west. They worship alien gods. The present crisis is fundamentally one of faith, faith in the abiding values which have been culled from the sweat and tears of the ages. And, therefore, the battle is as much against this widespread loss of faith within the Western World itself, as against the foreign enemies. In fact, there would be today no foreign enemies at all if faith in the spirit and the mind had not weakened. The fundamental battle is against cynicism, uprootedness, self-estrangement, and despair.

VI

I do not believe the real issue of the second half of the twentieth century to be either communism or the rising East; I believe the real issue of our times is whether America, having completed the tremendous century-old task of taming and integrating a whole continent, will now turn, with the same zeal which characterized her material adventure, to the intellectual and spiritual foundations of her own life, to the end that, rediscovering and reaffirming them, she might mediate them to the whole world. I also believe America could not in reality perform this task except by being absolutely faithful to her Christian tradition, without which she herself would have been impossible in the first place.

I think, therefore, there is a prayer which one—whether an American or a non-American—must utter today:

May the United States accept with boldness, but also with humility, the role of leadership which God has assigned to her;

May she discharge this role with honor, determination, humor, fairness, and absolute good will;

And may she draw from her deep Christian heritage the necessary strength, the necessary vision, the necessary sense of destiny, the necessary joy, for the wonderful task of the moment.

A Polish Volunteer Freedom Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a timely article written by Dr. Karol Ripa that appeared in the Polish Daily News of Chicago, on April 7, 1951:

A POLISH VOLUNTEER FREEDOM CORPS

Whereas one can with all probability foretell, that Soviet Russia will not, for many reasons, provoke a world war in the current year, one can affirm, that—unless with a great loss to the West—to avoid war—will be impossible.

Gigantic rearmaments with the exclusive purpose of a maintenance of peace must lead to a general tension and—according to many examples taught us by history—end in war. Unfortunately now there is no other issue out of the situation, if the Soviet danger is to be averted. It is a bloody revenge for the errors and failures of the past, when the West had been in a position under the shelter of the American monopoly of the atomic bomb and by way of a firm and decisive policy—to force Moscow to concessions and to save the peace of the world. It is too late now. It is time to realize this and to disperse the illusions, that by some miracle we shall be spared the decisive contest with the aggressive camp. "We are arming to defend to the last man the imperiled freedom of the world." This is what should be proclaimed by the authorities of the Western World. Meanwhile the people continue to be told that "we are arming, since this is the only way to defend peace." The hour is sure to come when the world will suddenly be placed face to face with a dreadful reality it was trying to escape from, and it will not at that moment be sufficiently and psychically prepared to sustain the colossal sacrifices, tribulations and sufferings, the new war must bring to humanity.

There are in Eastern Central Europe over 100,000,000 of people, who, against their will, have been subordinated to pro-Soviet regimes. They are the natural allies of the West. But what has been done to win them for the cause to explain to them, that the mistakes of Yalta belong to an irreparable past, but that the Western Powers will help them to regain their freedom? Nothing positive has been done in this respect. To the contrary, some of the responsible western politicians have been suggesting now and again, that peace could be saved by provoking revolts in those countries (so much affected by the fate already) in order to keep the future enemy occupied in quashing those revolts. It is to be expected then, that the eastern-central European nations will have to sacrifice themselves once again and expose themselves to bloody reprisals by the Bolsheviks, in order to save for the West a peace, which for themselves would mean stabilization of their slavery.

News came to this station from Poland of the adverse impression which was caused there by an article of the Times of January 29, 1951—adequately interpreted by the Soviet propaganda—which contained the following declaration of Mr. Jackson, president of Free Europe, an organization intended to help the people beyond the iron curtain: "If we keep the Russians busy with the people they have already conquered by holding out a genuine hope of freedom, we can perhaps prevent the march across Western Europe." The harm done in Poland by declarations of this kind excels by much all a most intensive Soviet propaganda could achieve there. Nothing that could be said later could adjust it. There arises a very harmful atmosphere of mistrust and disbelief, to change which will be extremely difficult.

Within the past few weeks there has been much news and rumors in this country and in Europe as well, about a plan to create out of the Central European refugees a volunteer freedom corps, to form part of the European army.

This station made inquiries among many Polish ex-servicemen and among the members of the Polish Combatants Association in Great Britain. This, in general lines, is what WFJL has gathered in this matter:

The majority of the Polish refugees abroad consider themselves as political émigrés who, in token of a protest against the subordination of their country to the rule of pro-Soviet agents, refused—after the war—to return to Poland. They are all impatiently waiting for the moment when it will become possible for them to take an active share in the liberation of their country from her present yoke.

On the other hand, the experience of past years, the appeasement, which since 1943 has been displayed by the Western Powers with regard to the Polish problem, the lack of any sign in the present period of international tension, for a change of their policy, all this has been causing among the Polish refugees a feeling of uncertainty and of a mistrust for the policy of the West. These feelings have been accentuated by the favorization of Germany to the detriment of Polish interests by the United States and Great Britain.

The problem of the Polish western frontiers on the rivers Oder and Neisse is, irrespective of the political character of the Warsaw Government, most vital to all the nations, and there is not and cannot be any division of opinions in this matter.

This is the reason, why a great part of Poles living abroad—in spite of their hostility with regard to the Soviets and their desire to fight against them—make political guarantees a condition of their active share in the military preparations for the creation of a European army. The Poles have been demanding an official guaranty: that there will be no other Tehran or Yalta, i. e., a forsaking of the interests of Poland, to save those of the great powers and affirmation by the American and British authorities, that Poland would be given necessary help to regain her freedom and independence. The Polish emigrees, who could set up quite an imposing corps, would prefer to fight in their own army units and are definitely against any schemes of foreign legions. There will evidently be volunteers for military service in any form, but such offers will come rather from individuals, than from the emigration as an organized whole. The very existence of Polish divisions at the side of the Western Powers would have a great psychological bearing on the youth in Poland and cause mass desertions from the Rokossowsky's army.

There is still another problem, of which Washington should be reminded. The Polish legal government-in-exile had in wartime been recognized by all the Allies and even Soviet Russia (1941–1943). In July 1945, the Western Powers withdrew their recognition of the London Government and proclaimed the Warsaw administration imposed on the country by Moscow, as the legal government of Poland. Up until now the great Western Powers continue to recognize the Warsaw regime, completely ignoring the Polish Government-in-exile, residing in London. (The

latter is still officially recognized by the Vatican, Spain, Ireland, and Lebanon, and semi-officially by a number of South American states.) When it comes to an armed conflict with the Soviet bloc, Washington and London will have to withdraw their recognition of the Warsaw regime and the question will arise then: Whom will they consider as the official representative of the Polish nation? The problem of the Polish Government-in-exile will automatically come to fore then. It was one of the problems which General Anders had discussed during his recent visit to the United States.

If the project for the creation of a Volunteer Freedom Corps is not to become another source of disillusionment for the Western Powers, it is imperative to let it remain pending until the settlement by America, Great Britain, and France of all political matters connected with the latter. Otherwise, it will meet with the same fate, as did the plan for the rearmament of Germany. When all preparations are complete, it will prove, that one item has been overlooked, i. e., who are to be volunteers of the "Freedom Corps"?

This is not, however, the only matter requiring a prompt settlement. It will be necessary, at the moment of the outbreak of war in Europe, to provoke in the countries of Eastern-Central Europe some risings, which would paralyze the Red army's lines of communications in the rear. According to reliable news from behind the iron curtain, the organization at the moment of Soviet aggression against Western Europe of a wide scale guerrillas, will also be made dependent on a previous settlement by the Western Powers of the fundamental political problems. In regard to Poland the most fundamental problems concern Poland's future and her frontiers.

All plans concerning an organization now of an armed rising against the Communist regime have been categorically rejected by the Poles, who are certain, that no positive results could be achieved by it, except cruel reprisals of the regime against the youth.

And so, to sum up: The problem of the Volunteer Freedom Corps needs, in the case of Poland, some political preparation and a definition of the Western Powers' program, concerning the future of the east central European countries in case of war—and concerning the future frontiers of Poland.

Briefly speaking, the refugees are ready to do all they can to help liberate their countries, but they refuse to be considered as mere "Kanonenfutter" as the Germans used to say years ago in regard to conquered nations.

The first step of the Western Powers, which would help tremendously to the organization of a Polish Volunteer Freedom Corps—should be an immediate withdrawing of their recognition of the Warsaw Rokossovski's Regime, demanded by the Polish-American Congress and by 98 percent of Americans of Polish descent. The so-called consulates of that regime are nothing but agencies of the Soviet Russian Politburo. The sooner they disappear from this country, the better for the common cause.

Mrs. Carolyn L. Bull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I pay tribute to Mrs. Carolyn L. Bull, a lovely lady in our community, who has just celebrated her one-hundredth birthday, and include the following news items from the Press-Review regarding her:

SHE HAS SEEN AND DONE ENOUGH TO FILL MANY ORDINARY LIFETIMES SINCE 1851

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

Carolyn L. Bull, who has been keeping company with Father Time for the past century, is a sprightly little woman with a boundless sense of humor and an unlimited capacity for concocting epicurean delights.

The humor inherent in Mrs. Bull admittedly blossoms from her take-it-easy philosophy for longevity, which she is eminently qualified to expound. Her flair for creating savory recipes stems from an 80-year practice, dating back to the days of open hearths and potbelly stoves.

Last Friday, when Mrs. Bull became a centenarian, she welcomed relatives and friends to her modest home at 3354 Country Club Road. She indicated that neither her radiant disposition nor her love for the kitchen would diminish in the next 100 years.

LIVED THROUGH CIVIL WAR

Mrs. Bull, who was born in Philadelphia in 1851, 75 years after her great grandfather, Richard Stockton, signed the Declaration of Independence, has experienced and accomplished enough to fill many ordinary lifetimes. She lived through the Civil War, witnessed the blizzard of 1888, saw the first electric light, the first horseless carriage, the first motion picture, and the first radio.

One of the first residents in the Country Club area to bring television into her home, Mrs. Bull today is an ardent televiewer, staying up each night until 11 o'clock to watch the wrestling matches.

"The wrestlers give me ideas on how to handle the men around this house," states Mrs. Bull, flexing the muscles of her 70 pounds. The men she refers to are her 80-year-old husband, Henry, a retired post office official, and her "adopted" son, Stanley T. Bell, a retired shipping lines executive, who came to live with the Bulls 35 years ago.

NEIGHBOR OF GENERAL SHERMAN

Mrs. Bull, who was a next-door neighbor of the Sherman brothers, William T. and John, when her family moved to Ohio in 1862, knew both the General and the Senator very well. She also knew General Ulysses S. Grant, and when he later became President, Mrs. Bull visited him in the White House.

Her acquaintance with the famous figures of history doesn't end with these. Mrs. Bull, a lover of music all her life, particularly opera, had known Melba, Adelini, Patti, Caruso, Tetrazzini, and other greats.

For more than 75 years Mrs. Bull has tried her own hand at accomplishments on the piano in her living room, and her influence and encouragement have prompted her husband to write a number of songs. One of these, "The Letter Carriers Waltz," is being arranged presently for the Post Office Department 75-piece band.

WON RECIPE PRIZE

Mrs. Bull's favorite subject of course, is recipes. Last year, at 99, she won first prize of $100 in a Nation-wide contest sponsored by the Campbell Soup Co. for her tomato sauce recipe. The president of the company paid a personal visit to Mrs. Bull's home to present her with the award, which had been doubled by the company when they found out her age.

At the time she received the award, Mrs. Bull said, "When I started cooking, people ate much heavier meals than they do today. But even then, flavor was very important, especially with men."

Another thing that was very important with men years ago was the unwritten law that a woman's place was in the home. But Mrs. Bull would have none of that bullheadedness.

She studied stenography, mastered the subject, and at 17 got a job as the first woman reporter in the Ohio State Legislature. She was a Republican then, and she is a Republican now. But last year Mrs. Bull accidentally voted for a Democrat for the first time in her life. The candidate was young James J. O'Brien who was elected to the State Assembly from the ninth assembly district.

POSED WITH CANDIDATE

Mrs. Bull was persuaded by Francis W. Murphy, the leader of the district, to pose for a picture with O'Brien during his campaign, and the photo appeared in a daily newspaper. The candidate appealed to Mrs. Bull, and she exercised her constitutional right at the poles in what she terms "the proper fashion."

Besides her interests in cooking, music, and politics, Mrs. Bull has an exceptional fascination for travel. Though she was born too late to have been a passenger aboard her cousin Robert Fulton's steamboat *Clermont* in its trial run on the Hudson in 1807, Mrs. Bull has done a lot of traveling on steamboats and has toured Europe extensively.

Her journeys in the United States have also been widespread. Among her most memorable trips was the one on which she rode the first sleeping car, a three-decker equipped with kerosene lamps and upholstered in red plush. Mrs. Bull's present mode of travel is by automobile, which she enjoys tremendously.

COUNTS DAYS TO SUMMER

Right now she is counting the days to summer when she will be riding again on the scenic Merritt Parkway to Woodbury, Conn., to the country home of her niece, Miss Elizabeth Grimes, a daughter of Mrs. Bull's youngest sister.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Bull will be kept busy answering the hundreds of telegrams and letters of congratulations heaped on her by friends and well-wishers on her birthday. Commenting about the heartening messages contained in these dispatches, Mrs. Bull says, "This encouragement is wonderful, and it boosts me along. But I'm not going to get unduly elated about it."

Mrs. Bull is restraining her emotions because no sooner will the fanfare surrounding her own birthday diminish, she will be plunged into preparations for another birthday celebration. "Thaddy," a brown-hued male Dachshund, who is described by his owner as a "man of action," will be celebrating his fourth birthday this week.

Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in these days of bitter debate and disunity, marked more by their revelation of how quickly too many people jump to conclusions without thinking, and how eagerly some try to advance selfish interest to the detriment of national security, it is most refreshing to find an example of thoughtful, objective reporting.

Much public hysteria has been generated, deliberately I believe, by some speakers, politicians, columnists, and commentators. But a great public service is being rendered by others in these

fields who have refused to be swayed by temper or prejudice.

One of the best examples of this most commendable type of comment and reporting has been given by Edward R. Murrow, of the Columbia Broadcasting System staff. I repeat here a part of a radio newscast he made on CBS at 7:45 o'clock on the evening of April 24, 1951. These statements are so important and well made that I feel they deserve to be made a part of the permanent record in the great debate known as the MacArthur-Truman case. The excerpts are as follows:

General MacArthur returned home a week ago tonight. I don't suppose anyone will ever bother to count or weigh the millions of words spoken since then. (Many of the words, on both sides, wouldn't weigh very much anyhow.) If you will study the list of Senators who have been sounding off on both sides, you will find that with few exceptions those who have rushed so eagerly into this fray, armed with such meagre facts, have been those Senators whose terms have 4 or 5 years still to run. Also, I think you can count on half of one finger the number of elected Representatives who have said publicly that they have changed their minds as a result of the debate. To a considerable extent the seconds have occupied the ring, with the principals—the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the State Department and General MacArthur—remaining in the background, occasionally passing to the seconds a document, or a hint of future disclosures, with which to belabor the opposition.

It may be interesting to recall or prove that General MacArthur was wrong about the Chinese coming into the war if we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel. It is altogether proper for the general's spokesman to point out as he did today, that this was a decision that had to be taken in Peiping, beyond the range of the general's field intelligence. And that the State Department and the Joint Chiefs should have been better able to assess the possibility of Chinese intervention. It adds a little fuel to the fire for administration spokesmen to reply that if Peiping and Chinese intentions were beyond the realm of the general's intelligence, then maybe Moscow and Russian intentions are even more obscure to the general and his advisors.

But all this doesn't get us much forwarder.

A week from Thursday hearings will begin before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Spokesmen of both parties appear to believe that the hearings should be public, insofar as that can be done without jeopardizing real military security. Public or secret probably doesn't matter very much, since secret testimony has a habit of leaking, and being distorted in the process. Maybe our best hope of maintaining security is that the Russians will be confused, as most of us will be, as to what actually transpires. The Joint Chiefs of Staff will present a document setting forth their differences with General MacArthur. The general's spokesman hints that he, too, has documents. And no doubt a lot of unofficial documents will be drifting about like the waste paper during General MacArthur's parade here in New York. (And, incidentally, who was responsible for the disaster at Pearl Harbor?)

I would like to suggest that this debate isn't really about whether or when the Joint Chiefs agreed with certain of the general's purely military recommendations. It doesn't really have anything to do with whether the general was fired in a summary, unfair fashion, or whether he is a genius, or merely an arrogant and insubordinate commander. At bottom the argument doesn't revolve around Acheson's qualities of judgment and leadership, or lack of them, or whether the Republicans are to be labeled warmongers or the Democrats appeasers. All of these arguments and labels may well be trampled underfoot by the march of events. For this argument is really a very simple thing that generally goes under the name of survival, and how we are best, or most likely, to secure it. We are fighting a bitter defensive action in Korea right now. The outcome is still in doubt. We are on the defensive against aggressive world communism everywhere. We have allies that may well one day become powerful. We sought those allies, not because we loved them, but because we needed them. They would not go with us in an extension of the war into China. Maybe they were wrong. But that is the fact.

We and our allies are trying desperately to rearm—to recover the ground we lost in our folly at the end of the late war, when we misjudged the nature and the imminence of the Communist threat. We and our allies are not yet prepared to meet and repel that threat by force of arms. It has been the assumption of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that a stalemate in Korea might make negotiations with the Chinese possible. It has likewise been the assumption of our Government that our increasing power, and that of our European allies, might eventually make some world-wide accommodations with the Soviet Union possible. Both assumptions may be false. But if they are, then surely it is to our advantage to fight with allies rather than without them, and on ground and with weapons of our own choosing. I know of no military man who would advocate that the mainland of Asia is the ideal ground for such a conflict. And if it comes it will not be fought for the reputation of Harry Truman or the glory of Douglas MacArthur or the justification of Dean Acheson—it will be fought for survival.

This widespread, frantic questioning of our policy and our leadership is inevitable, and probably healthy, for as Euripides said: "Nothing is of more service to mankind than a prudent mistrust." But as the debate lengthens and tempers shorten we might remember the words of John Collins, who said: "Half our mistakes in life arise from feeling where we ought to think, and, thinking, where we ought to feel."

Protest Against Roll-Backs by American National Cattlemen's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the American National Cattlemen's Association regarding the beef roll-back order recently announced by the Office of Price Stabilization, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding this order.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I have just received a telegram from the American National Cattlemen's Association which I would like to read to the Senate:

"The promises which Eric Johnston gave you a few weeks ago that no serious roll-backs were contemplated are now proven false. I hope you and other Senators interested in the cattle industry will hound Johnston and DiSalle to rescind the orders just issued which are extremely discriminatory as no other industry has been subjected to similar treatment. If DiSalle by a stroke of the pen can write off $700,000,000 worth of the inventory value of cattle in this country, the figure he himself had used, then truly we have a police state. This is not price control it is confiscation of property and the Senate should refuse to extend title IV of the Defense Production Act beyond its expiration date June 30. There will be an entirely chaotic situation in the meat industry if the DiSalle orders are not rescinded."

That telegram is signed by Mr. F. E. Mollin, executive secretary of the organization.

I would like to call particular attention to this statement in the telegram: "This is not price control—it is confiscation of property." That statement is absolutely correct. The price-control authority given to Mr. DiSalle has been deliberately used to destroy millions of dollars in values of the inventory of the livestock men of this country. Evidently this authority is being used to confiscate the wealth that has been created by one group of the population and devote that wealth to the benefit of another group.

Mr. President, on the basis of this beef roll-back order, I am about convinced that Mr. DiSalle does not understand the elementary facts about how the American economic system operates. He does not even seem to realize that the price received for something must cover costs of producing it. Thousands of farmers and livestock men in my State will suffer a heavy out-of-pocket loss on every head of cattle they had on feed today unless this order is rescinded. Many of them who are carrying their stock on borrowed money are likely to be bankrupt. That is the practical result of this order.

This order indicates that the Price Administrator does not realize that no producer can continue to operate at a loss. By issuing this order, Mr. DiSalle has made it absolutely certain that there will not be enough meat for consumers. The telegram that I read stated: "There will be an entirely chaotic situation in the meat industry if the DiSalle orders are not rescinded." That statement is not exaggerated in the slightest. I believe we can be sure that unless these orders are changed drastically and sharply, we will have meat rationing within a few months.

Just yesterday I had a phone call from a cattle feeder in Nebraska, who told me that feeling was running so high against the order that a thousand farmers from just one county were ready to conduct a protest march on Washington. He asked me what I thought of the idea, and I believe I persuaded him to put off any such action until Congress had had a chance to take a hand in the matter. But I can fully understand the sentiments of those farmers when they are told that they must take an actual out-of-pocket loss on every head of cattle that they have on feed.

Mr. President, I am sure the people of my State realize the necessity for sacrifices, but they are not willing to take it lying down when they see Government agencies used and misused to give advantages to other economic groups at their expense. They have come to realize that farmers have been made the target for a movement to push farm prices down, freeze parity, and inflict roll-backs on livestock producers—at the very time when other groups are receiving increases of 10 percent or more. They expect their representatives in Congress to see to it that they get fair treatment, and I believe they are perfectly justified in expecting fair treatment.

Mr. President, the price-control authority expires in less than 2 months, and I suggest that Congress take a good long look at the manner in which this power has been exercised before voting any extension.

Labor's United Approach Toward World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, announcement by the Honorable Maurice J. Tobin, our distinguished Secretary of Labor, that the CIO will join with the A. F. of L. this year for the first time since 1946 in designating labor representatives on the United States delegation to the annual international labor conference, will be of interest, I feel sure, not only to Members of the Senate, but to every citizen interested in the progress of labor.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Department of Labor regarding the aims and activities of the International Labor Organization toward the improvement of conditions throughout the world be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIO TO PARTICIPATE IN ILO CONFERENCE

The CIO will participate with the A. F. of L. as labor representatives on the United States delegation to the annual International Labor Conference, for the first time since 1946, Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin announced today. The conference will meet this year in Geneva on June 6.

The A. F. of L. will nominate the worker delegate, the Secretary said, and the CIO will join the A. F. of L. in nominating advisers to the delegate. Each organization will have an equal number of advisers.

The ILO, the oldest major international organization, was established in 1919 by the Treaty of Versailles to raise the standards of workers throughout the world. Samuel Gompers was a leading figure in founding the organization. It has 62 member nations including every major country except the Soviet Union. The United States joined in 1934.

"This is another significant step," the Secretary said, "In American labor's united approach toward world affairs. In 1949, the A. F. of L. and CIO were prime movers in forming the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, free labor's answer to the Communist-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions.

"Through the ICFTU the United American Labor movement is cooperating with its democratic counterparts in 59 countries to raise standards of living and promote the legitimate interests of free trade unions everywhere, in an all out effort to defeat the forces of communism.

"This agreement to work together in the ILO is another milestone on the road toward international labor cooperation. The ILO is one of the most effective international instruments for building the economic and social foundations of world peace."

The ILO is unique among international organizations in that employers and workers participate in the activities of the organization on an equal footing with governments.

Each member nation is required to select employer and worker representatives in agreement with the national organizations of workers and employers, and in the conference they speak and vote in accordance with the views of their respective organizations.

Two delegates, representing governments and one each representing employers and workers are authorized from each country.

In emphasizing the vital role of the ILO in the world today, Secretary Tobin stated, "communism feeds on conditions of poverty and misery. In attacking the source of such conditions and helping eliminate them, the ILO is making a direct contribution toward the strengthening of democracy and freedom. It has become one of the most important international instruments for achieving the social and economic objectives of free peoples everywhere. These objectives are the necessary foundation of a durable and lasting peace. Anything we do to strengthen the ILO and our participation in it is in the interests of the United States."

Recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial entitled "General MacArthur," which appeared in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal on Saturday, April 14. This Journal has been one of the most conservative in our country. It was established during the War Between the States. Personally, I have read it for over a third of a century, and I believe its calm discussion of the case of General MacArthur deserves to be read and studied by all the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR

After more than half a century of military service, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has been relieved of his command. President Truman is not one to countenance opposition placidly and it cannot be denied that he has been provoked by his far-eastern commander. General MacArthur, on his part, has not been one to acquiesce quietly in policies he believed prejudicial to his country. There are ample evidences of this in General MacArthur's long public service. In the thirties when the administration's early economy program sought to reduce the strength of our pitifully small Army, General MacArthur, while Chief of Staff, defied both President Roosevelt and Budget Director Lewis Douglas and worked successfully for the retention of what he considered the irreducible minimum of personnel strength. President Roosevelt doubtless was irked, but the result was to the benefit of the United States. When General MacArthur subsequently was assigned to the Philippine Government as a military adviser, he welcomed the duty as an opportunity to build a strong bastion for our civilization in the Far East. Two years later, with his task just getting underway, President Roosevelt ordered him to take command of the Second Corps Area, then considered the senior Army troop command. Again, the General thwarted his superiors by applying for retirement. Because he had completed 32 years of active service since his graduation from the United States Military Academy, he had a legal right to retirement, so orders to that effect were issued and his recall nullified. He continued with his task in the Philippines in the service of the Philippine Commonwealth. Events justified his efforts to build up the defenses of those islands and to give the new nation the organization with which to fight. With the outbreak of war in the Far East and his recall to active duty in command of the Allied forces there, he never ceased to attack aggressively the enemy, whose tactics, characteristics, and capacities he knew so well, nor did he cease to urge upon Washington, to their visible irritation, the necessity of strengthening his small forces. Again, so great was his progress that his theater, though it had been given consideration secondary to Europe, combined with Admiral Nimitz's central Pacific forces and drove the Japanese to defeat only a few months after the fall of Germany and before the planned diversion of strength from Europe had reached the Far East.

In the general's continued insistence upon what he considers the best policy, he is doing what he thinks best for his country. He has a superb knowledge of people and politics and it cannot be said that he did not foresee the outcome of his course of action. He may well have pursued it to produce a result he felt preferable to acquiescence.

The President said that "full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of our free democracy." By his action he has boldly opened the way for just such a vigorous discussion. He has laid his case before the people in his statements and his radio address (reported in full text in this issue of the Journal). General MacArthur will return to the States and plead the wisdom of his course. There can be no question as to the sincerity of either. President Truman is perfectly honest in expressing his admiration and respect for General MacArthur's outstanding services to the Nation. He would like to have MacArthur continue but he is more determined that his policies be accepted and respected. General MacArthur is equally adamant in his determination that if there must be a war its conduct should be governed by military concepts. In the final analysis the people, through their elected representatives and by the weight of their expression of public opinion, will decide the ultimate course.

It would appear that the President could have achieved his objective by measures less extreme than relieving General MacArthur of his commands. More precise and complete directives might have been issued to him months ago. A firmer attitude could have been taken earlier and efforts made to reach a clear personal understanding. Even at this late date the President might, for example, have ordered his field commander to Washington for a conference, which would have had the effect of demonstrating to the world the President's authority as Commander in Chief and have emphasized his determination that his policies be pursued.

While the loss of MacArthur's active service is serious and cannot be discounted, the Nation is fortunate in the knowledge that there is no dearth of strong and able leadership in our Armed Forces. Through peace and war, at home and overseas, Generals Ridgway and Van Fleet have demonstrated their capacities for the new responsibilities which have come to them.

There is and will be no relaxation of our pressure upon the enemy in the field nor will any dissent weaken our forces. This may surprise and puzzle the peoples behind the iron curtain, but it is the way and strength of American democracy.

Keeping Faith With Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Keeping Faith With Thrift," which appeared recently in the Topeka State Journal.

One barometer of economic weather is how much money people try to save. It is encouraging to note that in Kansas thousands of our citizens are participating in the purchasing of United States Savings Bonds.

Savings bonds purchased in Kansas totaled over eight and one-half million dollars in the month of March, and approximately twenty-three and one-fourth million in the first quarter of this year.

It is most encouraging to note that there are still some people who believe in thrift and industry. This is especially true at a time when the world seems to be punch drunk in a period of inflation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING FAITH WITH THRIFT

One barometer of economic weather is how much money people try to save. One index of savings is the continuing purchase of United States savings bonds. It is interesting to see what Kansas counties are doing.

For the month of March, if we take the counties with total sales of series E, F, and G bonds topping one-quarter of a million dollars, the ranking is in this order: Sedgwick, Shawnee, Wyandotte, Cowley, and Reno. Series E bonds are the big item, accounting for approximately 80 percent of March sales (70 percent in the first quarter of 1951). Savings bonds purchases in Kansas totaled over $8,500,000 in March, and approximately $23,250,000 in the first quarter.

Although total sales for the first quarter are down from a year ago, one significant development is noted. According to State savings bonds headquarters here, there is a continued gain in payroll savings participation nationally. "This is reflected in a sharp rise in the number of $25 and $50 series E bonds purchased," says the latest report. "For example, the number of $25 bonds purchased in January increased 18 percent over January last year, and $50 denominations gained 9 percent."

The continuing emphasis seems to be on bond purchases through payroll savings arrangements, through which wage earners set aside regular amounts for savings out of paychecks.

What does that mean?

Regular and rising purchases especially of low denomination E bonds must mean the wage earner's impulse to save is strong and determined, despite rising taxes and living costs which make saving more difficult. He is still bent on saving something, even if this may mean buying more of the smaller $25 and $50 bonds and fewer of the larger denominations. His saving through purchases of United States savings bonds also must represent his continuing financial support of his country.

As one leading Topeka banker said to us recently, the wage earner deserves more credit than he generally gets for this financial support of his Government through payroll savings. We agree. And we agree with the thought that if the worker thus keeps faith both with his Government and with the ideal of thrift, his Government owes him a great deal more than it is doing to preserve the value of saved dollars.

In these trying days, with inflation's hand in his pocketbook, the wage earner is able to save only by virtue of the most careful management of his finances. He makes an effort. If that saving helps his Government while it helps him to build a degree of self-started security, his Government owes the same careful management of its finances. Even more, it owes a constant, conscientious vigilance to keep inflation from defeating the very purpose of careful management.

The saver, the worker, has not only a right to expect but a right to demand those considerations from his Government. The Federal Establishment can best support its necessary pleas to the people to invest in United States savings bonds by supporting the necessary worth of United States dollars.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Congress has not declared war. We are not legally at war anywhere on the globe. President Truman has not declared war. He is the guardian and protector of world peace.

I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a dispatch by Jim G. Lucas, correspondent of the Washington Daily News, which describes the "peace" our foreign policy has achieved in Asia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON CENTRAL KOREAN FRONT, May 1.—This is the kind of story no man enjoys writing. Maybe it shouldn't be written.

You see, I spent the day in front of our lines helping pick up our dead. They told me I shouldn't go. They said I'd be shot at and there'd be mortars, and they were right. I didn't want to go.

But I went because I wanted to know more about war's pay-off—about those who don't come back until someone goes after them.

TRY TO FIND 'EM

Bill Leblanc, Graves Registration sergeant from New Orleans, said he didn't know what to expect when we started out.

"One of the worst things about retreating," he said, "is that you can't bring back your dead. We try to find 'em."

Soldiers shy away from Graves Registration people. They call its men grave diggers. Every man in the unit has the same nickname, "digger." The soldiers make the Graves Registration the butt of all sorts of crude jokes.

"That's because they're scared; because they know it's this way all the time," Sergeant Leblanc said.

HIGH INTO SMOKE

For the first 8 miles nothing happened. Pvt. Antonio Pantohin, of Honolulu, at the wheel pushed steadily ahead. The road was jammed with trucks, tanks, artillery, and kitchens. Twice we were edged into a ditch.

After a while traffic thinned. At mile No. 11 mortar shells dropped behind us.

At mile 19 we arrived at a battalion command post. Our truck moved off the road into a rice paddy. Three blanket-wrapped bodies lay beside another truck.

LETTER STILL UNOPENED

We jumped out and quickly went to work. The first was a thin-faced, good-looking boy of 20 or 21. He'd been shot through the side, bled a lot. We emptied his pockets. A lighter, a package of Camels, a Gruen Curvex bracelet, and a letter from home—still unopened.

You do what you can—and find yourself getting sick inside. Here a kid who was alive when you ate dinner last night; a kid who picked up a package of Camels intending to smoke 'em and never got to break the seal; a kid who probably wanted to wait until he could read that letter where no one could see how much it meant.

The next wasn't more than 18. He still looked like a choir boy. Maybe he used the cuss words soldiers use because it made him feel like a man, but if he did they must have come awkwardly.

A mortar did it to him. If he'd lived he'd have been a quadruple amputee. His legs and arms were gone. The body was still warm.

SAME ODS AND ENDS

His pockets produced the same odds and ends—a package of Lucky Strikes, another of Old Golds, a lighter, a ridiculously decorated wallet with a 10, a 5, and 3 ones, a package of Star razor blades. And the inevitable letters from home.

The third was an older man, who obviously died in pain. His right arm was thrown over his head. Froze there.

Our work was just begun. The Chinese had ambushed an aid station 7 miles up the road less than an hour ago. They killed the doctor and grenaded the wounded. One ambulance had escaped but after moving a mile toward safety it had been machine gunned.

The driver was killed. A wounded man sitting beside him pushed the body from the cab and came on in.

FOUND DRIVER

There was no traffic. For more than a mile we ran a gantlet of mortar and rifle fire. But we kept going.

After 6 miles we found the driver. There was no time to go through his pockets. We put him in back of the truck and kept going.

"Keep your eyes peeled for that aid station," Sergeant Leblanc said. "It's just off the road."

We found it. Every man began loading dead. Time was precious.

DEAD DON'T SCARE

"Fifteen," the sergeant said finally. "That's our load."

We turned and headed back. A rifle bullet tore into our truck. Fortunately it hit a dead man. The dead were the only ones who weren't scared.

Five hours after we left we got back. A dozen or more soldiers—silent, grim-faced, tight-lipped—stood and watched as we unloaded. They seemed angry, almost as if they blamed us for what they saw.

"You get used to it," Sergeant Leblanc said. "We know they hate us at times like this. Can't blame them. We stick pretty much to ourselves. We don't worry about that. What worries us is that there are still

more up there. Want to go again this afternoon?"

I still don't know whether this story should be written. It isn't pretty. But this much I do know: until you've seen it you don't know very much about war. Because this is the payoff.

Tribute to the Minnesota Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have written to the president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, expressing my confidence in the farm people of my State who are members of that organization.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 2, 1951.

Mr. EDWIN CHRISTIANSON,
President, Minnesota Farmers Union,
Willmar, Minn.

DEAR MR. CHRISTIANSON: It has come to my attention that wide circulation is being given in Minnesota to statements reflecting upon membership of the Farmers Union.

I consider this to be unfair. There is simply no doubt but that the rank-and-file membership of the Minnesota Farmers Union consists of patriotic citizens. Minnesota farmers are good Americans and I want you to know that I resent any reflection upon them.

To farmers, communism has no appeal. Minnesota farmers, well aware of what has been done in Russia and the satellite countries to those engaged in agriculture, see no attractions in the Communist program.

I think the Farmers Union of Minnesota is doing an excellent job in promoting better farming practices and improved conditions for farm families. This attests to the truly American character of your purposes.

I want to repeat the public statement which I made on September 16, 1950, as follows: "Many of our finest and best citizens of Minnesota are members of the Farmers Union."

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

Questions for MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as the Senate Armed Services Committee begins the hearings on those questions which led to the removal of General MacArthur from his position in Korea, many questions will occur to citizens which they would like to see asked.

Among others there has been a splendid letter to the Washington Post suggesting certain questions for General MacArthur. It was written by Elton Atwater, associate professor of political science at Pennsylvania State College. I think the questions are worth preserving, and I trust that during the hearing when General MacArthur appears they may be presented to him in the hope that a complete answer on these questions may be given to the American people.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS FOR MACARTHUR

General MacArthur's belief that his objectives for the Far East can be achieved by only a limited war with Communist China and by relatively little additional cost to the United States seems to overlook many pertinent factors. Before anyone accepts this theory, he would do well to consider the following questions. Members of Congress, in particular, who are concerned lest their role in foreign policy be further diminished, should seek answers to them.

1. The general said in his message to Congress, "In war there is no substitute for victory." Does he mean by victory a settlement of the Korean problem along the lines recommended by the United Nations last fall? Or does he mean the destruction of communism in China or in Asia as a whole?

2. If one assumes, for the sake of the discussion, that he means the settlement of the Korean problem, what then is his purpose in recommending the invasion of the Chinese mainland by Chinese Nationalist forces with logistical support from the United States?

3. If the second question is answered by saying that the invasion of the Chinese mainland would create a second front and thereby increase the likelihood of a Communist defeat in Korea, it at once poses the following question: If these operations should succeed in forcing the Peiping regime to accept a Korean settlement along United Nations lines, what do we then do about Chiang Kai-shek's forces which are fighting on the Chinese mainland with our support? Do we abandon them after a Korean settlement is achieved, or do we continue supporting them?

4. Would Chiang Kai-shek ever start his troops on an invasion of the mainland if he thought we would abandon him as soon as the Korean war ended? Could we afford politically to abandon him once we had helped him start his operations?

5. If, as would seem likely, the answers to question four are "No," then does not General MacArthur's program actually commit us to a virtually unlimited intervention in a renewed Chinese civil war?

6. How many allies could we count upon for such a program? What would be the political effects of such a program upon the peoples of Asia? Is not Chiang Kai-shek generally discredited in their eyes?

7. Could the Chinese Nationalist forces now on Formosa gain a complete victory over the Chinese Communist forces with only naval and air support from United States?

8. Would the Soviet Union be able to permit such a victory over communism in China without intervening? In this connection, one might recall that when General MacArthur's "victory" in Korea was almost complete last November, the Chinese Communists entered the war.

9. Is it not reasonable to assume that if the United States or the United Nations undertake "limited war" against Communist China, the Soviet Union, which has an alliance with Peiping, will extend "limited aid" to that regime?

10. If the Soviet Union should give "limited aid" to the Peiping regime, would we not find that our hands were still "tied behind our back" because we would have no authority to bomb Soviet supply bases in Siberia, just as we now are tied by lack of authority to bomb north of the Yalu River?

11. How, therefore, can General MacArthur's concept of victory be achieved without ultimately involving the Soviet Union in the conflict and precipitating a third world war?

12. General MacArthur appears to see no alternative between complete victory and what he terms "appeasement." What does he mean by appeasement? Does he use it synonymously with the term, "negotiation"? Does he rule out all possibility of some form of settlement in which both sides get something and give something?

ELTON ATWATER.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.

Gratitude to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very excellent editorial written by R. F. MacPherson, editor of the Wyoming Eagle, and published in the April 20 edition of that paper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few years ago we saw one of the guys who won the war. We were down at the Union Pacific station when a train came in. The usual crowd was around the station when he arrived. His father and mother were there to meet him.

He didn't look like a hero and he didn't make a big fuss like he was one. He was on crutches and he wasn't used to them. He had some difficulty getting around.

One leg was missing.

He acted sort of embarrassed, like he didn't want to be noticed or fussed with. After the first greetings he seemed anxious to get out of there, to get away from the crowd, to get in the car and go home.

No brass bands, no flags, no fireworks.

After all, Cheyenne was his home town. He had to begin to figure out ways and means of getting on in the world, to face the fact that it might not be so easy—with a leg missing. As he left the station a man many of you know remarked: "There goes the guy who won the war."

They may be seen everywhere—these guys who won the war. They're not all like the veteran we saw on Seventeenth Street in Denver a while back. He had a child by the hand and a young woman, undoubtedly his wife, was leading him by the arm.

He had on colored glasses. He was blind.

But he was smiling and able to be happy. Not much to be happy about, according to normal standards. But he was alive and surrounded by loved ones, and if he felt that life had been cruel to him, he didn't show it. He'd make out. Ovations meant nothing to him.

They're not all like that, thank heaven. Out of the thousands upon thousands who shipped out to foreign battlefields, not many came back crippled. Not many, comparatively speaking, lost arms and legs and eyes, or were otherwise shot up.

So many bore wounds that could not be seen, and of which they do not speak. They do not like to talk about the emergency treatment in first-aid stations, the agonizing trips to base hospitals, the careful probing by skilled surgeons, the constant care of top-flight doctors. These men who won the war don't talk about the blackness of the darkness that hung over their pain-ridden beds, the despair, the uncertainty, and of the long weeks or months that would elapse until they could return home.

Then there is the multitude whose bodies do not show a scratch, but whose minds are filled with memories that are as painful as wounds. It may have been a plunge through the waters to the beach under a hail of bullets. It may be memories of a bayonet charge, of hand-to-hand combat, of flame throwers and bursting bombs.

It may be thoughts of a crouching prowl up a dirty street, with enemy snipers in windows or on housetops. Or it may be memories of endless time spent in dugouts, in muddy ditches, in endless rain, in freezing weather, and of the nights on the front lines when a machine gun might spit death and a hand grenade would explode and blow a head off.

They are the men who knew how to take orders, even if it led to death.

It's hard to describe a thing a person has never seen or felt, a thing which those who won the war refuse to talk about. News dispatches tell of an encounter here or there, and photographers have picked out some of the more gory scenes that portray the horror—and the glory—of war. But not one-thousandth of 1 percent of the individual acts of heroism, of bravery beyond the line of duty, of fear and agony and hopelessness will ever be described or photographed or recorded.

And when it was over and the men returned, it was singly or in groups. Rarely, and then only momentarily, was the return a matter of public recognition. They came back and picked up the threads of their broken lives, nursed their wounds, and carried on in the best way they could.

Occasionally one would wear a pin or possess a bit of ribbon to indicate that he was one of those who won the war. But he didn't brag. Most of them dropped off the train and were swallowed up by the crowd. That was their triumph.

We see by the papers that they're been having monstrous celebrations in San Francisco and New York. They were celebrating victory in a war that never has ended, celebrating a peace that never has been attained. No doubt they were magnificent spectacles. The salutes, the bands, the flags and bunting, the cheers, the crowds.

Somehow we wish the armless, the legless, sightless, and otherwise injured veterans had been there to participate—to receive the plaudits of the multitude. Somehow, we wish the maimed veterans in the many Army, Navy, and veterans' hospitals could have been transported to Market Street and to Broadway to be so signally honored. Those whose return had been barely noticed.

But perhaps these men who won the war did not want it that way. They know that taps have not been sounded for the war in which they fought. They know their sons and brothers are in Korea today, enduring the same terrors of mind, the same agonies of body, the same hopelessness which they and their comrades endured. They know, that but for the grace of God, other millions will tread the same lonely, miserable, discouraging path they trod. Some of them who are in hospitals may be fearing the day when a boy from Korea will come in and say, "Move over, let me lie down."

Perhaps they choose to wait until peace is won and life is made secure for all. Some may think all this celebrating is premature, out of time, inappropriate, when we appear to be on the verge of an even more bloody massacre. How, they may figure, can there be a triumph when there has been no real triumph?

One of these days, whether you live in Chugwater, Hanna, Pine Bluffs, or some other Wyoming community, you will have an opportunity to put on a one-man celebration. Go down to the station when a veteran is to arrive from Korea. He may not be decked out with gold braid, brass hat, or ribbons. He may not be minus a leg, an arm, or an eye. But if he's from the front lines he's had it.

Meet him and greet him. He is an American fighting man—the man who has won all of America's wars. You won't have to go out of town to see him.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from a young American Army officer in Korea. There is nothing I can add to the picture it gives of the disillusionment of our men fighting in the "peace" in Korea.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOKYO, JAPAN, *April 10, 1951.*

MY DEAR MOM AND DAD: You may think it peculiar that I should take precious leave time to write such a letter as I intend to write, but I've wanted to do so for some time and feel strongly enough about it to give up time even more precious than these 5 days. I write these things to you because I know they could never be published and I know that you can quote your son-in-law's personal letters to anyone you please. Of course, what I feel and what I say may never make a particle of difference, but I wouldn't be a true American if I didn't feel and say these things.

Let me precede my remarks by saying that I'm on 5-day leave. About 2 weeks before I came over here and the day before we began our big push to the parallel, several of my men came to me and asked me what they were fighting for in Korea. As a company commander, I thought it my responsibility to give them cause, so I tried. But I became hopelessly involved. I became involved because the reason wasn't clear cut to me. Then they asked me, "If I'm going to fight Chinese tomorrow, why can't we bomb their Manchurian bases tonight?" Again, I had no answer and yet these same men were expected to face Chinese bullets the next day.

We are told that there is no end in sight to the war. No new troops have been committed since the Chinese entered. Are we fighting for time to rearm? If so, why can't we be told. That is incentive. American soldiers won't buy an endless war, not even with rotation. They may see their buddy taken prisoner one day and realize there is no hope for his recapture. American soldiers don't understand that and yet they are expected to give their utmost.

When I first came over here, I wrote that I had no cause. I'm yet to find one. Of course, I'm a professional soldier. I'll fight because I'm ordered to do so, but our Army is not a professional one and it has to be told why.

About 3 days before I left to come over here we began an offensive which carried us about 3,000 yards across the parallel. In 3 days my regiment suffered 180 casualties which is a very high percentage. Men asked me, "Why are we crossing the parallel? We can't bomb China so we can go just so far and then we'll be pushed back." They're right. Sometimes, even I get so hopelessly muddled that I cannot see a clear path. Of course, I realize that it has to be done and by doing my darndest I may prevent some casualties.

Rotation will help. It will give a man something to look forward to. But it isn't the something which makes him the best possible soldier. Selfishly, I'm looking forward to rotation much more so than I am to engaging or killing Commies, because it means relative safety and reunion with my family. (This lad has been in Korea since September 1950.) Now, if I, an officer, look at it that way, how does Private Doaks see it? You can see what you've got. Maybe I'm different, but I doubt it.

How strong my will would be if I felt I were fighting for the U. S. A. How strong would be the will of the average GI if he felt the United States and not the United Nations were controlling the military operations.

We keep hoping our politicians and newspapers voice hope that the Chinese will negotiate. How can they be so stupid? How can they negotiate when Russia is behind them and why would Russia want them to negotiate? It's all so plain and so foolish. How? Please tell me how Truman can talk of maintaining the peace when there is no peace? How can they talk of preventing a war when there is already a war?

The MacArthur Phenomenon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The MacArthur Phenomenon," written by Frank Hanighen and published in Human Events. Mr. Hanighen warns us:

The MacArthur phenomenon poses the question: Can a leader so warmly acclaimed by the masses continue to confound the machine?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MACARTHUR PHENOMENON

What is the meaning of this extraordinary phenomenon—MacArthur's capture of the American people? For that is obviously what has happened: The populace, spurning the elected leader, turns enthusiastically—in this strange sort of democratic imperium of ours—to the homecoming proconsul. But why? Is the popular vision romantic, beholding the general as Ariel descending to displace what for some time has been Caliban? Perhaps. But it is probably much more complex than that.

The times are troubled. A combination of angry discontents—about taxes, controls, mismanagement at home and abroad—have been distilled by the advent of MacArthur into a resounding protest against the incumbent administration and is alchemized suddenly into cheers for the general. Possibly,

at first, MacArthur had little to do with it. Four months ago his stock was low. But—almost like a law of physics—as the prestige of Truman descended, MacArthur's mounted. Something like that happened. We are not sure—for this historic phenomenon is difficult to analyze and may provide arguments for historians for years to come.

There is another way of looking at it. About two decades ago, the ruling business class was ousted and a revolution begun. For nigh on two decades, the new ruling class, the intelligentsia and their allies among the politicians, has shaped foreign as well as domestic policies. By skillful techniques of thought control, and by juggling the two balls of "security" and "foreign danger," the intelligentsia have held the masses and maintained themselves in power. So skillfully have they moved, indeed, that the masses have been lulled to accept the most incredible foreign adventures. But, finally, Korea—the ultimate of these adventures—arrived. And, through its tragic futility, the people have come to see it for what is is: the reductio ad absurdum of our foreign policy.

But how was the protecting shield of thought control pierced? Well, some 250,000 "press agents" in uniform in Korea wrote home and told their story. Meanwhile some magnificent crusades in portions of the press helped, to which were added some persuasive voices from Capitol Hill; and finally plain common sense among the people struggled to the top. Thus was the propaganda web of lies broken. In short something like that helped create the extraordinary phenomenon of the hero's return.

But where is all this going? Will it "fade away"? It is not likely to fade soon. It may set off another revolution to replace that of the last two decades. Or, on the other hand, the highly organized machine of idea control of the intelligentsia might capture, or at least alter it. That machine has beaten the business class for 20 years and may do it again. Its greatest advantage is that the business class has failed to create its own intelligentsia, its own ideas and its own machinery for propagation. Why that is so—is quite another story. Meanwhile, the MacArthur phenomenon poses the question—can a leader so warmly acclaimed by the masses continue to confound the machine?

Enhancement of Ship Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ship Enhancement," which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. I hope the Members of the Senate will heed the warning contained in the editorial, and restore the House amendment when the third supplemental appropriation bill comes before the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIP ENHANCEMENT

The Senate Appropriations Committee has lost a chance to prevent a recurrence of the outrageous mulcting of the Government that took place in the artificial enhancement of ship values during the Second World War. The committee has stricken out of the third supplemental appropriation bill an essential clause suggested by the Maritime Administration and approved by the House. This clause would forbid the payment of sums in excess of the price originally paid to the Government, plus depreciated capital improvements, for vessels sold by the Government and later repurchased or requisitioned. The purpose is to prevent the Government from being stuck for emergency-inflated values of ships which in many instances had been sold to private operators in the first place at absurdly low rates.

A particularly flagrant example of the kind of enhancement the clause is designed to prevent took place during the war. One vessel built by the Government during World War I at a cost of $1,966,000 was sold to a private operator in 1932 for $49,000, or approximately $5 a deadweight ton. Before the Second World War the owner collected mail pay and later an outright operating subsidy of some $139,000. In 1941 the vessel made one lend-lease voyage under Government charter for which the owner collected $326,000. Subsequently the ship was lost at sea, and the Government paid the owner as total loss insurance no less than $727,000, or approximately $75 a deadweight ton. In other words, the owner's profit from the charter and the insurance payment, exclusive of subsidies, was $1,005,000 on a single antiquated ship.

The Comptroller General has spoken out repeatedly against this kind of abuse, and the Maritime Administration deserves full credit for promoting a reform to safeguard the taxpayers' interests. What good reason can there be for depriving the Government of this check against profiteering? We hope that the full Senate will take a close look at the issues and restore this necessary protection.

The War in Korea and the MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two reprints published as a public service by the International Latex Corp. One reprint published in the Washington Post for Friday, April 27, 1951, includes an editorial entitled "Get the Facts" which was originally printed in the Christian Science Monitor, and an editorial entitled "General Dawes," which was originally printed in the Wall Street Journal. The other reprint, published in the New York Times for Tuesday, May 1, 1951, contains an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Van Fleet's Inspiration," and an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Today's Global Struggle."

All of these editorials share a common timeliness, and it is, in my opinion, a distinct public service on the part of International Latex Corp. to bring to the attention of the American people these expressions of informed opinion on current issues.

There being no objection, the reprints were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET THE FACTS

(An editorial in the Christian Science Monitor)

Isn't it time to call a halt to the guerrilla war over the MacArthur dismissal? We are thinking not only of debate between inflamed and half-informed partisans of the President and the general but of publicity raids by their aides. The unofficial release of official information that at Wake Island the Korean commander was sure China wouldn't come in was, in our opinion, offside. So, too, it seems to us, was General Whitney's complaint that his chief still hasn't the faintest idea why he was dismissed.

The two principals in this unfortunate controversy have stated their positions frankly. Mr. Truman said he had come to the conclusion that the general could not give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States and the United Nations. He further defined these policies as bent on restricting the war if possible to Korea. General MacArthur had publicly objected months ago to orders which barred the bombing of Chinese bases. Before Congress he pleaded eloquently for more aggressive measures, indicating that he considered present policies appeasement.

The two cases have thus been laid out. The next step should be a show-down before a congressional committee where the whole background of the dispute can be bared. These hearings should be aimed primarily at hammering out a firm policy in the Far East. It will apparently be necessary to go into the reasons for the dismissal, but we trust there will be no smearing on either side.

The hearings should be held as soon as possible, for until they are held there is danger that partisan, biased, inflammatory statements will keep the guerrilla war going. Smearing will be less easy before a committee where smearers can be questioned and exposed. Certainly more satisfactory explanations of the basic differences between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur are urgently needed.

The situation calls imperatively for less heat and more light. The light may come from committee hearings or from events in Korea. Until it comes, violent partisans on either side may well reflect that new facts or events might change their position. If the Communists should switch from the defensive to the offensive in the air, there would be few advocates of continued restrictions on U. N. air forces. If trouble should break out elsewhere, particularly in Iran or Yugoslavia, there would be few advocates of extensive war in China.

GENERAL DAWES

(An editorial in the Wall Street Journal)

A great many people will remember Charles G. Dawes as the man who blew up a congressional investigation by pounding the table and shouting "Hell 'n Maria."

The fact is that General Dawes was a public servant and a statesman of high order.

Long after he retired from public life we sat in a little group where the discussion turned on international affairs, and General Dawes spoke from the experience of having been Ambassador to Great Britain and the head of the American delegation which took part in the negotiation of the Dawes plan, one of the landmarks in the settlements after the First World War. We recall one of his statements:

"Successful international negotiations must begin," he said, "with the representatives of each nation having uppermost in mind the interest of their own nations. Along with that there must be the determination to adjust those interests to the common good of all."

We wondered then and we still wonder if the position of this country and of the world would not be better if some of our later-day negotiators could have absorbed that advice.

VAN FLEET'S INSPIRATION

(An editorial from the Washington Post)

Courage, faith, humility—these are the qualities that stand out in General Van Fleet's first message to his troops. In simple language the new commander of the Eighth Army in Korea has brought encouragement to his soldiers in the face of the Chinese onslaught. He has done more, however, than praise the skill and determination of the United Nations forces and cite their superiority in all but numbers. With a directness which gains additional eloquence by the fact that it comes from the battlefield, he has summarized the larger issues in the fighting:

"You are fighting to stop armed aggression and maintain peace not only in Korea but in your respective homelands. This renewed battle is for the preservation of life, liberty, and the right to the pursuit of happiness of all free men. These are fundamental in the rights of man—the rock upon which our civilization is founded—and they are the first rights which communism denies its own people.

"The time has come when all men of the free and decent world must steel their souls to face the desperate, bitter, and uncompromising battle with armed Communist aggression. Our strength rests on the solid foundation of belief in God and the rights of man rather than on the will of dictators, imposed through cruelty and complete disregard of human rights."

Even in the grimness of war, these words are inspiring to those who hear them, the more so because, as the troops must know, they spring from a deeply religious nature. They tell a lot about the character of a man who uttered them, and they carry a conviction borne of fighting experience and spiritual toughness which must show to the soldiers in Korea that their commander has the quality of leadership.

TODAY'S GLOBAL STRUGGLE

(An editorial from the Christian Science Monitor)

The United States could use another Charles G. Dawes in his prime right now—perhaps a score of him.

Not because he was an unusually able businessman and banker and a generous and perceptive philanthropist. The country has a number of men like that.

Not altogether because he was a public servant of versatility and caliber. Although not many men in any period have filled so many posts so capably: comptroller of the currency under McKinley, chief purchasing officer for the AEF under General Pershing, coauthor with Owen D. Young of the "Dawes plan" for German reparations and European recovery, Vice President with Calvin Coolidge, and ambassador to Great Britain under Warren Harding.

The country could use him because with the strength of all these qualifications he brought to American political life a vigorous independence of thought and speech and a lively partisanship which through a whole-souled forthrightness carried himself and others above the level of the petty. He was never the weak but always the generous adversary.

He broke with the Republican organization in 1919 to support the League of Nations. Fed up with "Monday morning quarterbacks" in Congress, he charged them with trying to show how they could have won the war against the Central Powers "at a 20 percent discount." In answer to a hostile question he blasted at his inquisitors, "I'd have paid horse prices for sheep if the sheep could have hauled artillery."

"This," said he, "was not a Republican or a Democratic war; it was an American war"—a truism which should be obvious enough to everybody (but apparently isn't) as applied to today's global struggle.

Farm Price Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Parity on Trial," written by Alfred D. Stedman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARITY ON TRIAL

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Fortune magazine now adds a new target to the familiar one of communism. The new target is farm-price parity, or equality with general price-cost levels. Fortune fumes that Congress should knock out the legal principle and let Federal Government power be used to hold farm-price ceilings below parity. It rages that parity is "one of the most shameless samples of special privilege ever written into United States law."

Fortune, when it cools off, might condescend a fresh look at the new versus the old target. For parity and communism are distant strangers. As targets, they're much too far apart to be hit by even a Fortune broadside.

This is especially interesting right now when across the Pacific the land-hungry folk of China, aflame with revolution, are tools and victims in the hands of Communist dictators.

For by contrast, among American farmers who are protected by parity and doing well, the trends are in a deep and true sense conservative. But in the troubled 1920's and stormy 1930's, when farm prices and banks were crashing and farm foreclosures soaring, the trends ran enough the other way to give the jumpier ones of Fortune's readers the heebie-jeebies.

Then, along with farm credits and other aids, the much-maligned principle of farm-price parity was written into law. And things on the farm have been different than before. After World War II, farm prices sagged but didn't crash. Speculators didn't get rich quite so easily buying farm stuff for the rise after slumps. Farm tenancy and foreclosures stopped increasing and waned. Farm living improved. Sure, parity was just one of many factors in this. And sure, its legal definition needs bringing up to date. But if parity were really so awful as Fortune says, this country would have gone to the dogs long ago, instead of getting better.

And now in the presence of our farm prosperity, communism does not thrive here. It won't take root and won't grow in American farm soil. Among our farmers, Communists are as scarce as white blackbirds. They're a foundation of democracy. Why shouldn't they be? After all, the democratic principle of parity and equality is still part of the law of this land.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Last Decoration," written by Judge Kenneth E. Shaw, and published in the Newport Guardian of April 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST DECORATION

Shortly after midnight on April 11, 1951, America's most distinguished soldier, statesman, and citizen received his final decoration. He had previously received every military honor, ribbon, and medal possible for a grateful Nation to bestow. His had been a lifetime of devotion to the Nation he loved. For his measureless service and limitless love of country he was now about to be further honored by those whom he had served so well. Thus it was that at 1 p. m. he was awarded the medal of coup de grâce as America's grateful tribute for faithful services rendered to his country beyond duty and beyond price.

No Shakespearian tragedy could have rivaled this event for stark-naked realism. It is midnight, a time when human endurance and intelligence are at the lowest of levels. The potion is prepared. The debate is short. The vote is taken. One by one little black balls fall into the box on the table. The deed is done. The award is voted. It is announced to the press so as to reach American homes at dawn, traditional hour for execution of a hero. Thus the anchor rock against which the Communist hordes have beaten in vain has been torn loose from our Asiatic defenses. The man who would not turn his back on Alger Hiss had turned the knife in the back of one of the greatest living Americans.

The award was made by President Truman who had devoted his career to giving away things. Having presented our wealth to Europe, our manhood to the United Nations, and our leadership to Acheson, President Truman presented to Gen. Douglas MacArthur the coup de grâce, as a fitting climax to his long series of tragic and pathetic Presidential blunders. The little man had finally written another letter.

What was the general's crime that he should die at dawn? Was it his unparalleled service to his Nation in three world wars? Was it his immortal defense of the Philippines? Was it his matchless civil administration of postwar Japan that through sheer excellence of execution stands without parallel in more than a thousand years of recorded history? Was it the reverence and respect for America he had instilled into the hearts of all Japanese and other still free Asiatic peoples? Was it his deep concern for the welfare of the sons of his country who were fighting and dying in a nameless conflict 10,000 miles from home?

It could be because his voice, resonant with years of experience in Asia, dared to differ with the architects of Munich and Yalta. It could be because he wished to end the spectacle of American youth dying in the mud and ice of Korea in a conflict which, if the United Nations could prevail, would last as long as America had sons to die. It could be

because he felt the overwhelming responsibility for the 10,000 American youth who would never return to their homeland and the hundreds of thousands more who might be left in Korea as a sacrifice to the gods of appeasement.

This attempt to still the voice of Douglas MacArthur recalls the familiar vision of Hitler burning books in an attempt to bury truth by destroying the means of disseminating it.

The boiling fury and rage in the hearts and minds of Americans is not spontaneous emotionalism. It is a measured hatred of an act perpetrated against one, who, more than any American now living, represents the fiber and core of a free and independent Nation.

The removal of General MacArthur has shaken the very cornerstones of this democracy. It has shaken morale as no other event in American history. His voice was a signal beacon of hope and courage shining through the dark recesses of confusion and despair in Washington. We may have lost a great general in the field, but we have gained a great champion at home.

The Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from Señor M. Mora Doldan, leader of the exiled youth of Paraguay. This young Latin American is shocked at the dismissal of General MacArthur for expressing his opinions to his fellow citizens in a country where, he had believed, principles were respected more than high office. He believes our Latin-American friends will not send more soldiers to Korea because they do not trust our foreign policy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUENOS AIRES, *April 12, 1951.*

SIR: I regret very much that I cannot express to you my ideas, which I share with many other Latin Americans, in your language, thus putting you to the inconvenience of procuring a translation. I realize that the time which you are able to give to this translation is very limited, but I think it is necessary that you receive the thoughts of a Latin American.

In the Senate you so valiantly pointed out the possibility of the existence of "Communist infiltration." That I believe and so do many others, because otherwise the continuous breakdown of North American foreign policy could not be explained. The Russians have imposed their standard on Berlin. In the United Nations they do as they please, and they withdraw and return and enter and leave. Nobody is able to stump them. So many mistakes have been made that the nations of South America—the North American reserves—refuse to send soldiers to Korea. This in itself means an important warning to you, and the adoption of a policy of isolation would be even worse as it would present the Russians with an opportunity to spread communism that much faster in these countries. North America must go to our part of the world today as a loyal friend and not as someone who is interested (in getting something out of us). The delaying tactics of the Russians ought to be energetically curbed. It ought to be clearly shown that democracy, that is to say, freedom and justice, are what is being fought for. In nowise and in no place ought the American vestpocket-size tyrants to be aided, and loans to the governments which do not respect the norms of those freedom-bringing principles must be refused.

This is the only way in which the people will go to the defense (of others) in whatever corner of the world. The bad governments will be able to send people, that is to say, soldiers; but they will never be able to send men. North America must never enter into pacts with Russia when such action might impair the principles of her democratic doctrine, and must at all times consider first whether or not, if she takes a certain decision, she will thereby affect the others. Your foreign policy ought to be zealously guided by moral principles, not giving in an inch.

Thus, those of us who defend the democratic way of life will be able to say: "Here is the example." Examples have at all times triumphed over nonapplied theory.

Mr. Truman's decision to depose General MacArthur is the most unfortunate decision of our time. Without considering the damage to the morale of the soldiers in the Korean war, it will affect world sentiment, serve as a powerful weapon for people of Communist belief since it has already become impossible to voice views against the President, in a country where facts of this sort ought to serve in order to show that principles are respected rather than offices (posts). General MacArthur still has as a citizen the right to think along with or against the President, as, although he is a military man, he is now fighting not merely soldiers but a whole system which affects not only his troops but the entire world.

I believe that whoever may be in charge of foreign policy of the war ought to permit at all times the "total application" of the western way of life; that is to say, life within a democracy without strings attached. Sooner or later, total war will come, and it is better for North America to depend on men than on unconvinced soldiers. In order to bring this about, the whole western world must lead the democratic way of life as planned. The leaders of the democratic world must be a living example, day by day, acting with sincerity and unselfishness.

The European war was fought to give the people freedom—however, where is freedom today?

Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, etc., to be sure, watch the steps of North America and Russia with keen interest. They, as we, will vote for the side which shows the trait of humanity. They will vote for the policy which is based on facts. For that reason, North America must watch her foreign and domestic policies more than ever.

As an example, I wish to cite my own country, the Republic of Paraguay. There are 700,000 Paraguayans outside of the country and 600,000 within the country. Can you believe that that is good government? I guess you will say "No." However, North America has been siding and will continue to aid that government. Can you believe that we Paraguayans, not yet Communists, will go to the defense of North America? To be sure, very few will go convinced that they are fighting for an ideal. Furthermore, I must add that in Paraguay there are five women to each man. This brings up a number of social problems of which the Russians are glad to avail themselves.

Do you remember China? No one thought that she would be Communist today. She was not aided; support was withdrawn from her. The same thing is happening in South and Central America.

Mr. Senator, the writer of these lines is a Liberal, a member of the Liberal Party of Paraguay, and today a candidate for the presidency of the Liberal Youth in exile here in Buenos Aires, Republic of Argentina. I gave you these data so that you may have an idea that this opinion is not merely a personal one but the result of close contact with the men in the street, with the misery and grief of many Paraguayan families.

Please accept, dear Mr. Senator of the United States, my best wishes and hopes for seeing more men such as General MacArthur in places of leadership of North American affairs, for the good of your country and of the world.

Sincerely yours,

M. MORA DOLDAN.

Wedemeyer Demoted for Being Right by Those Who Were Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Daily News:

PROPHET SANS HONOR

In July 1947, President Truman sent Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer to the Far East with orders to appraise the political, economic, psychological, and military situations—current and projected—in China and Korea.

This was designed as a fact-finding mission to provide a base for future American policy in that area.

General Wedemeyer was instructed to report "your estimate of the character, extent, and probable consequences of assistance which you may recommend, and the probable consequences in the event that assistance is not given."

The requested reports and recommendations were made to the President in September 1947. Subsequent events have revealed their accuracy and foresight. But it is one of the tragedies of history that these reports were suppressed until they were no longer of value in determining American policy.

And, instead of being rewarded for distinguished public service of the highest degree, General Wedemeyer was demoted from his position on the Army General Staff to a relatively less important field command.

The Wedemeyer reports, which presented plans to save China and Manchuria from communism, were suppressed until July 1949. The report on Korea was denied to the public until yesterday. It contained this warning:

"The Soviet-equipped and trained North Korean people's (Communist) army of approximately 125,000 is vastly superior to the United States-organized constabulary of 16,000 Koreans equipped with Japanese small arms. * * * The withdrawal of American military forces from Korea would * * * result in the occupation of South Korea either by Soviet troops, or, as seems more likely, by the Korean military units trained under Soviet auspices." Those units, General Wedemeyer said, maintained active liaison "with the Chinese Communists in Manchuria."

This was written nearly 4 years ago.

To meet this threat, General Wedemeyer recommended a native force in South Korea, "sufficent in strength to cope with the threat from the North," to prevent the "forcible establishment of a Communist government."

Since 70 percent of the Korean population was in the American occupation zone south of the thirty-eighth parallel, the manpower advantage was in our favor, if we had used it. But the sound Wedemeyer proposal was ignored, and, when the predicted invasion began, American troops had to be rushed to the scene because sufficient South Korean troops were not available.

The State Department was responsible for this decision.

Because of its private war with Chiang Kai-shek, the Department had decided to abandon China to the Reds. To be consistent in that position, it also chose to abandon Korea. When that decision was reversed, Americans had to do the fighting. This was the pay-off on the State Department's disastrous flirtation with Mao Tse-tung's "agrarian reformers."

Government Agencies Have Altered Their Estimates of Potential Traffic and Revenue on the St. Lawrence Seaway To Promote Their Arguments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the arguments of proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway are so contradictory as to make the proposal appear absurd according to the following article appearing in the April 30 issue of the New York Times:

SHIFT IN ESTIMATES ON SEAWAY IS SEEN—LOCAL GROUPS ATTACK FIGURES OFFERED AS TO PROBABLE REVENUES AND TONNAGE

Government agencies in the forefront of a decades-old campaign for the St. Lawrence seaway have "arbitrarily" altered their estimates of potential traffic and revenue on the seaway to promote their arguments, it is charged in a comprehensive brief on the subject filed yesterday.

The West Side Association of Commerce, Inc., in a 7,000-word study endorsed by 10 other civic associations and chambers of commerce in this State, declared that the arguments of proponents were "so contradictory as to make the proposal appear absurd." The brief was filed with the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, which has conducted hearings on the project in recent weeks.

The New York Board of Trade joined these groups in voicing its opposition to the proposed project. In a 300-word statement also filed with the House committee, the board declared that to proceed with the seaway would be pouring "incalculable sums of American dollars down the world's most enormous drain."

Maintenance of the Port of New York since last May, the statement read, has cost $500,000,000. In comparison, it continued, ultimate costs of the St. Lawrence seaway would run into the "tens of billions." In New York alone 10 percent of the population would be directly and adversely affected should the project be completed, the report asserted.

STUDY REQUIRED 2 MONTHS

James W. Danahy, vice president of the association, said the study took 2 months and involved research through 2,600 pages of testimony before Congress. It is in the form of rebuttal testimony, employing figures used by the Department of Commerce and other agencies and groups that have pressed for the seaway channel.

Analyzing alleged inconsistencies in seaway traffic estimates, the association said that the Department of Commerce's own figures on seaway business started out at 25,000,000 tons annually, as of 1941 computations, and that the Department, as the debate progressed, had "raised its sights" steadily to the point where Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer offered an "indicated" potential traffic from 57,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons a year.

The latter estimate came after a tolls-paying and self-supporting feature was added in 1947, and it "became obvious to the Department of Commerce that the seaway could not be made to appear self-supporting" on the old tonnage estimates, the brief declares.

CAPACITY ESTIMATE RECALLED

Mr. Danahy said that the 25,000,000-ton estimate had been made originally by the Corps of Engineers, as a full-capacity figure, based on the Welland Canal lock system.

On the question of revenue from tolls, the brief "speaks of the amazing spread in the estimates of proponents" on grain and ore traffic. Toll revenue estimates by grain experts have ranged from $4,000,000 to $15,000,000 annually.

"The Department of Commerce gives an estimated potential traffic of iron ore as 30,000,000 to 37,500,000 tons, but George M. Humphrey, president of the M. A. Hanna Co., and also president of Iron Ore Co. of Canada, which controls the Labrador ore, stated that the first ore shipments from Labrador would start in 1956 and would reach 10,000,000 tons in 8 years," the brief continues. "He made no estimate of any subsequent increase. From what source will the other 20,000,000 to 27,500,000 tons come? Certainly not from Venezuela, whose ore is being shipped to Philadelphia and Baltimore for eastern steel plants."

The association brief also attacks the seaway project as needed for national defense, quoting a number of military experts on the high requirements of men and material to defend the sea route and on the ease with which it could be attacked.

On the effect of the seaway on United States shipping the association reminded Congress of authoritative figures showing that only 364 or 365 United States vessels with full loads could use the project and of a Maritime Commission report that 5,194 foreign-flag vessels had a draft of sufficient shallowness to permit passage.

Another antiseaway review to be filed with the congressional committee was made public in New York yesterday by Ira U. Cobleigh, representing the New York Towboat Exchange and the Harbor Carriers of the Port of New York, comprising more than 100 small business concerns providing vital towing and barge services in the port of New York.

Mr. Cobleigh called the project a billion-dollar boondoggle and a king-sized Passamaquoddy. New York, with 400 deepwater piers, 600 miles of water front, 3 railway terminals, efficient labor forces, and billions of dollars in water-front improvements and highways, handled 70 percent of the American military cargo in World War I and 60 percent of Europe-bound war goods in World War II, he declared.

Under the St. Lawrence seaway plan, he warned, New York would be expected to "slow down and stand by" for 7 months of the year when the seaway would operate ice-free, and then "resume full blast" for the 5 months when ice closed the St. Lawrence. No port could operate under such impossible conditions, he added.

A Southerner at Heart, of Good Old Southern Stock, Tom Heflin Was Born After the War Between the States and at a Time When the Clashing of Sabers, the Rattle of Musketry, and the Roar of Cannons Had Hardly Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the people of our great Southland in particular and the American people in general were advised Sunday of the passing of one of the most beloved men that ever served this Nation in the Halls of Congress.

The Honorable Senator James Thomas Heflin, who served with us here in Congress for more than 20 years, has now gone to that bourne from which no traveler ever returns.

Mr. Speaker, howsoever we may differ in our creeds, be they religious or political; howsoever we may differ in our race, the country of our origin, or the color of our skins, the heritage of our birth, or whether we be rich or whether we be poor, all contemplative-minded men will agree that Tom Heflin spoke from the book of life as it was given him to see and as he saw it.

Of a certainty, I did not agree with everything that Tom Heflin said or did any more than does any Member of this Congress sitting on either end of the Capitol necessarily agree in toto with what any other man says, or believes, or does, in the Halls of Congress.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there were times in which I felt a wide divergence of thought between myself and my almost life-long friend, the announcement of whose demise was dispatched to me as the dean of the Alabama delegation to Congress from the little town of Lafayette in Alabama.

Permit me to reiterate that while I did not agree in toto with what Tom Heflin or any of you all might say, I loved him as a friend, respected him as a great American citizen, and would fight to my death for his right to speak what he held to be the truth.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Heflin was a southerner at heart, born of good old southern stock in Randolph County, Ala., in 1869, after the War Between the States, and at a time when the clashing of sabers, the rattle of musketry, and the roar of cannons had hardly died.

A great student of history, Tom Heflin was an educated and cultured man.

He was a graduate of the Southern University at Greensboro, Ala., as well as of the Agricultural and Mechanical College, at Auburn, Ala., and was admitted to the practice of law when but 24 years of age.

One needs no lively imagination to understand the experiences of a young man of 24 living in that era while serving as mayor of the little town of Lafayette in which he died.

His was a long and an honorable career. Mayor of Lafayette in 1893 and 1894, register in chancery from 1894 to 1896, he resigned as chancellor to become a member of the Democratic State executive committee, on which he served from 1896 to 1902. He then became a member of the State constitutional convention in 1901, was elected secretary of State in Alabama in 1902, and then elected as a Democrat to the Fifty-eighth Congress in 1904, wherein he served in eight succeeding Congresses, or until 1920.

Mr. Speaker, I need not recall to you the day that Tom Heflin quit his seat here in this House, and announced himself as candidate for the United States Senate, to fill the place vacated by another great son of Alabama, the never-to-be-forgotten and beloved John H. Bankhead, the first.

In a special article written by Edward T. Folliard, special correspondent of the Washington Post, Mr. Folliard said, in part:

For years the tourists who came to Washington asked to see Senator Tom Heflin just as surely as they asked to see the White House, the Washington Monument, or the Lincoln Memorial.

A big fellow, 6 feet 2 inches tall, with amazingly blue eyes, he presented the appearance of an old-school southern colonel, wearing a starched shirt, stiff collar with flowing tie, a white vest, a cutaway coat, and striped trousers.

Never at a loss for words, he could talk for hours, and often did. As a story-teller, he was without a peer on Capitol Hill. It was this gift that did much to keep Tom in Congress for nearly 40 years. * * *

One of his most important economic crusades gave rise to Senator Tom's fight against W. P. G. Harding, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. The Senator charged that Harding's policies had caused a depression among the cotton farmers. Starting this fight when he was a Member of the House, he continued it when he went to the Senate in 1920, and while he did not succeed in having Harding removed, nevertheless, Harding was not renominated to the Board when his term expired.

From one of the oldest and most respected newspapers in Alabama, my own home-town paper, the Mobile Register, I quote below an editorial appearing in the April 24 issue:

FORMER SENATOR HEFLIN

In his long career in public life, former United States Senator J. Thomas Heflin, who died Sunday at the age of 82 years, attracted many ardent followers and created many severe critics.

Whatever history's ultimate appraisal of his career, he was one of the most picturesque figures who ever served in Congress. This characteristic and his rich gift of oratory gave him a bearing in debate which few colleagues equaled.

When "Cotton Tom," as he came to be widely known, was in the height of form as a debater on Capitol Hill in Washington or a stump speaker in politics back home, he was a spellbinder. Whether one warmly agreed or violently disagreed with what he said, none must have denied that he was a picturesque orator of ability.

Although not an active political factor in Alabama for a number of years, a figure as colorful as he was, who served in Congress as long as he did and became the political storm center that he did is not soon forgotten. Death itself will not cause such a man to be soon forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I can see Tom Heflin now as I saw him more than 40 years ago—huge, friendly, helpful—a good friend and a foeman worthy of any man's steel.

The memory of Tom Heflin, his service to his congressional district as well as to the State of Alabama in the Senate of the United States, will live forever enshrined in the hearts and memories of all southerners as long as our South survives.

Difference Between MacArthur's Views on China and Those of His Republican Supporters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 26, 1951, which points out that the views expressed by General MacArthur on China are not in conformity with those of any of the self-proclaimed Republican authorities on the Far East:

STATE OF THE NATION—MACARTHUR'S VIEWS ON CHINA

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—All of us have been so quick to see General MacArthur's differences with the administration over foreign policy that we have overlooked two places where he startled his Republican supporters by agreeing with the administration.

One place was where he said that "the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic of Korea * * * proved a sound one."

Far more startling was General MacArthur's estimate of the why and wherefore of what is happening in China.

It has been Republican doctrine for some time now that Communist China is a Russian puppet; that we must look to Moscow to find the hand which pulls the strings in Peiping; that we are dealing in China with another manifestation of Russian communism.

It has been State Department theory for an even longer period of time that the new regime in China is more the product of native forces than of Russian manipulators and that there is a chance worth preserving for future possible exploitation that the leaders in Communist China are more Chinese than they are Communist.

Note what General MacArthur said on this subject:

"At the turn of the century under the regime of Chang Tso-lin efforts toward greater homogeneity produced the spark of a nationalist urge. This was further and more successfully developed under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, but has been brought to its greatest fruition under the present regime to the point that it has now taken on the character of a united nationalism of increasingly dominant, aggressive tendencies.

"This has produced a new and dominant power in Asia which, for its own purposes, is allied with Soviet Russia but which in its own concepts and methods has become aggressively imperialistic. * * *

"There is little of the ideological concept one way or another in the Chinese make-up."

General MacArthur did not proceed from this basic theory to the same conclusions which State Department policy makers have drawn from it, but the theory is close to that of the State Department. In fact, General MacArthur's words go further than the State Department ever has gone in identifying the political complexion of today's China as being native nationalism rather than international communism.

In State Department doctrine nationalism is only an important element which might at some time become dominant. In MacArthur theory nationalism is the dominant element and Red China's leaders are associated with Soviet Russia momentarily only because "their interests are at present parallel with those of the Soviet."

I think it is accurate to say that the MacArthur view as expressed in these passages is closer to the Owen Lattimore view than is that of the State Department. The MacArthur view is certainly poles apart from the theory formulated by Dr. Walter Judd, by Alfred Kohlberg, by Senator Knowland, of California, by the Henry Luce publications, and by such others of like persuasion who have molded Republican thinking on the subject.

The question left behind by the MacArthur theory is whether it is sound strategy for the United States to expand the area of its war with China. If China is a Russian puppet, then making more war on China would in theory weaken Russia. But if Red China is a vital independent nationalism, then does it follow that it is wise for the United States to engage an increasing amount of its own military strength in war with China while Russia sits on the sidelines growing relatively stronger as the United States grows relatively weaker?

General MacArthur appears to regard nationalism in China as a reason for more war with China. The State and Defense Departments incline to think that the MacArthur theories are in themselves reasons for avoiding more war with China and attempting, rather, to drive wedges between Chinese nationalism and Russian imperialism.

But the political fact remains that General MacArthur has taken two positions which run counter to the recent trend of Republican thinking and give the administration more comfort than it had expected from the general.

The Far Eastern Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Provo Sunday Herald and an article by Frank C. Robertson, both of April 22, 1951:

KNOWN FACTS FAIL TO SHOW CHIANG COULD BE MUCH HELP

Another great debate, this time over far-eastern policy, is getting under way. Calm reason and respect for fact ought to play a larger role in this public discussion than was true in the troops-for-Europe argument.

As an example, take the case of Chiang Kai-shek, leader of the Chinese Nationalist forces based on Formosa. The notion exists among many Americans that he commands

a large, fairly well-equipped army which is in a fighting mood and needs only a signal from the West to jump into Korea or invade mainland China to help us bring the Korean war to a speedy end.

It is virtually suggested that American lives are being wasted through failure to tap this reservoir of trained military manpower close to the fighting scene.

What are the known facts?

First, though some estimates of Chiang's army run as high as 800,000 men, most military observers put the figure closer to 400,000. This is not a big army, but it is larger than the American force now in the field in Korea.

The Nationalist Army is not well equipped. Chiang's chief American adviser, Admiral Charles Cooke, retired, former Seventh Fleet commander, several months ago guessed it would take $250,000,000 in equipment to outfit this force for combat. With prices still spiraling, the cost unquestionably would be higher today. It might hit $300,000,000.

The morale of Chiang's troops is pretty much an unknown quantity. Though supplied with a lot of American equipment, his forces fighting on the mainland right after World War II did not acquit themselves well against the Chinese Reds. The present army has been held together on Formosa with difficulty over a 2-year span. It is not battle-tested.

It is wholly possible that with adequate equipment this army might give a good account of itself. But there is no way of knowing that in advance. Those who assure us the Nationalists would fight successfully are guessing, since no facts exist on the matter.

Let's suppose we should give the word to Chiang to invade China proper. He has no air force worthy of the name and no fleet of consequence. Only the United States could provide the necessary sea-air cover to protect a mainland landing. And since air operations would necessarily involve bombing shore installations, troop concentrations, communications, and other facilities, it is hard to see how such assistance could do anything but immerse this country in a wider war with China.

Russia, of course, has a mutual defense pact with China. No one not inside the Kremlin knows whether she would honor the obligation to assist Mao Tse-tung if we gave Chiang the sea-air cover for a mainland assault.

Senator TAFT says such an attack would not bring in Russia and lead to general war. One wonders how he can know what the Soviet reaction would be, unless he is privy to Stalin's secrets. Obviously, since the defense pact exists, a very grave risk would be taken of precipitating a big war.

This is not an attempt to decide whether we ought to take that risk. That is for the American people to decide, acting through their elected representatives. But at least they should make their judgment in full knowledge of what is involved, and in full appreciation of what sort of instrument Chiang's army might be in a wider fight against communism.

Nothing known up to this moment suggests that Chiang would be ready to fight quickly, or guarantees that his forces would fight well, or assures us that his entry would shorten the far eastern war rather than lengthen and broaden it. It is the facts, and the facts alone, that lead to this conclusion.

THE CHOPPING BLOCK

(By Frank C. Robertson)

General MacArthur has long been accused of having an "emperor" complex. If true, the fawning adulation of the multitudes whipped up by the little stirrup bearers of press and radio must confirm him in his belief that he is bigger than the President of the United States, the Constitution, and the United Nations together.

The cleverly worded broadcasts and columns by the MacArthur worshipers contrive to make the charge, without actually saying so, that MacArthur was discharged because he wouldn't play ball with the Communists, and the innuendo is that the President and the State Department are in sympathy with communism. Millions of unthinking people have accepted that, with the result that this Nation is torn by more internal bitterness than at any time since the Civil War.

If the stirrup bearers want to divide this Nation to make way for a dictator, the "man on a white horse," and end forevermore our democratic form of government they have done their job well. They have said without qualm that President Truman, the State Department, and the General Staff should have resigned their authority under the Constitution, and allowed the policies of this Government to be shaped by General MacArthur alone.

They have ignored the fact that MacArthur's discharge was recommended by such men as Generals Marshall, Bradley, Collins, and Admiral Sherman. They have ignored the fact that MacArthur's views run counter to those of another great popular hero, General Eisenhower. They have scoffed at the idea that we would have anything to lose if the other nations in the United Nations turn against us because they cannot swallow MacArthur's determination to force another world war.

Is it that they really think MacArthur is infallible and indispensable, or are they using him to build hate against the administration so that their lords and masters can come to political power? The little stirrup bearers, the columnists, and radio commentators who are whipping the public into frenzy would not even be noticed if it were not for the cynical figures of TAFT, MARTIN, and WHERRY, and a few others behind them.

Nothing like it has been seen in this country since the days of Andrew Johnson. Yet time has proved that Andrew Johnson was right and his traducers wrong. Time and history may say the same thing for Harry Truman.

What about this man MacArthur? No one denies that he has been a great soldier. No one denies that he has done a good job in Japan. But that does not make a demigod. So, too, have Marshall, Bradley, and Eisenhower been great soldiers. MacArthur had no more to do with winning the war against Japan than did Admiral Nimitz, yet he got all the glory by the simple means of maintaining a staff of press agents to glorify MacArthur, and a rigid censorship to suppress anything unfavorable to him. You read of many brilliant officers and their achievements in the European theater of war, but how many can you remember who fought under MacArthur? Had Eisenhower adopted MacArthur's tactics you wouldn't have known of the generals under him either. The simple truth is the man has glorified and dramatized himself all through his career until he has come to believe that he is indeed greater than his Government. We are asked to forget or deny that he ever made a mistake, and to believe that we have only to believe in MacArthur to be saved.

Americans have always fought shy of a military government. Now the threat is upon us. We have a great military machine, whose officers are accustomed to obedience without question. If we get universal military training taking all our young men at their most impressionable age they can be easily indoctrinated just as was the youth of Germany. Our FBI could, without too much trouble, be made into a gestapo. Did you, for instance, happen to read about the way the reporters and photographers were pushed around by the military in Honolulu the day MacArthur arrived? That was not MacArthur's fault, but it is a small wind showing what could happen once we establish the doctrine that a general is superior to a president.

It boils down to the question of who is wiser: George Washington, or Fulton Lewis, Jr.?

Two years from now some Republican will likely be elected President—unless MacArthur is installed as emperor before then; and if the same tactics being followed by certain influential Republicans now are adopted then we may all find ourselves being asked this question: "Did you ever vote for Harry S. Truman, or did you ever have any affiliation with the Democratic Party?" If the answer is "Yes," we shall probably be shot or imprisoned for treason.

Hon. Stuart Symington Has Earned the Respect of Congress and the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently nominated and the Senate has unanimously confirmed the nomination of Mr. Stuart Symington as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I can think of no citizen who would take with him to such a new position more public confidence than Mr. Symington, whose record of public service has been almost without parallel in recent history. Mr. Symington's service to the Government and the public has included, among other positions, the secretaryship of the Department of the Air Force and the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Development Board, and in each capacity his native ability and high devotion to duty has been most evident and apparent. His newest appointment will result in a great restoration of public confidence in the RFC as an important Government agency which, of late, has suffered from the exposure of certain malpractices. It is expected that Mr. Symington will restore to the RFC the full public confidence of this great agency of our Government.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent column by Mr. Bascom Timmons, which appeared in the April 21, 1951, issue of the Nashville Tennesseean. This article is a succinct biographical sketch of Mr. Symington's accomplishments, and is also a tribute to him as a capable Government official.

The article is as follows:

SYMINGTON EARNS RESPECT IN CAPITAL—ST. LOUIS INDUSTRIALIST FORGES AHEAD AFTER HE WAS PROBED IN 1943

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

WASHINGTON—Some men step off the witness stands of congressional committees embarrassed, criticized, and frequently condemned, but W. Stuart Symington, new head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, not only took the quizzing in stride—he walked away smiling, warmed by the praise of the investigating group, which happened

to be a subcommittee of the old House Military Affairs Committee.

That was back in 1943, when the House committee was following the lead of the special Truman war investigating committee in the Senate in turning up war profiteers. Investigators for the House committee thought they had found something in the operations of the Emerson Electric Co. of St. Louis, working on huge contracts for Navy plane turrets, which looked like profiteering. So Symington, president of the company, was called to Washington for investigation.

By the time the committee finished with him, he had made such an impression that committee members congratulated him and apologized for any aspersion which might have been cast on Emerson's operations by the investigator's erroneous report.

FOR A TOUGH SPOT

That seems to have given "Stu" Symington his entry into official circles. When Missourians came into special favor under President Truman, he tabbed Symington for one of the really tough spots—chairmanship of the Surplus Property Board, where it was charged that political influence was playing a big part in the disposal of war left-overs. When the board became the Surplus Property Administration, Symington's friends hailed him as "the first man in history to run a hundred billion dollar second-hand store."

His experience there in bringing some order out of the previous chaos offers a possible parallel to his RFC job, where he is asked to straighten out the Government loan agency after a sorry exhibition of political finagling.

He is principally remembered as Surplus Property Administrator for his opposition to acquisition by big business of surplus war plants. He tied into other steel companies on the operation of west coast plants by Henry J. Kaiser, a newcomer to the field, and ruled that Aluminum Corp. of America should not have the $700,000,000 worth of Government war built aluminum plants, because that would give Alcoa a monopoly. The force of this gesture was diminished when some of the small competitors said they could not compete with Alcoa without Government subsidy, and the big corporation got about what it wanted.

HEADS RESOURCES BOARD

Symington also gave veterans' emergency housing a postwar start by authorizing the transfer of surplus land, materials, and equipment which could be used in housing projects to State and local governments undertaking such construction. When the War Assets Administration pushed SPA aside, Symington moved up to become Assistant Secretary and later Secretary of the Air Force. He is now Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, an agency in which he has not shown to best advantage because most of its functions were transferred elsewhere.

Born to wealth, handsome, athletic, and extremely personable, Symington seems to have been unusual for his independence, which resulted in his being fired from jobs twice by members of his own family because he criticized their business methods, and his ability to combine good business management with excellent labor relations.

He took over Emerson Electric when it was in financial straits, and entangled in labor troubles. When he had straightened out the financial situation, he took up the labor side, where he was dealing with the Communist-ridden CIO United Electrical and Radio Machine Workers of America—since reorganized by CIO, with expulsion of the Communist officers. The St. Louis organizer for the union was a Communist named William Sentner. They managed to get along well enough that the Emerson plant was described as "the only war plant in St. Louis that has had no labor trouble." Emerson went from a small business to a fairly big one, employing as many as 7,000 wartime workers.

In the conservative industrial atmosphere of St. Louis, his profit-sharing plan, which he called "a balanced industrial democracy that works," proved startling at first, but it gave him a high production record. During the war he was tapped for governmental missions abroad as an observer for the Office of Production Management, which moved him another step toward Government officialdom.

JOHNNY-COME-LATELY

Old time Democrats call him a Johnny-come-lately, recalling that he supported Thomas E. Dewey for the GOP nomination in 1940, and later voted for Wendell Willkie. His first Democratic vote was for Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1944. In 1924 he married into the arch-Republican Wadsworth family, of New York. His wife, Eve, daughter of long-time Senator and Representative James W. Wadsworth, Jr., took up night-club singing for a time back in the twenties—they called her a "society chanteuse."

"Stu" Symington's public career was temporarily held up several years ago by a severe attack of hypertension, necessitating extensive surgery. But now he shoots golf regularly in the low seventies. His autobiography lists two widely separated alma maters—Yale, where he was a big man on the campus, and International Correspondence Schools, from which he took business courses.

If the St. Lawrence Seaway Should Become a Reality It Will Strike at the Very Heart of Our Industrial Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, continuing my opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, I appeared before the House Committee on Public Works on April 30 and made the following remarks:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank this committee for giving me the opportunity to appear before you to express my opposition to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

I am sure that every member of this committee knows of my opposition to the project, not alone this year, but dating back to the late thirties when I became a Member of Congress. I have left no stone unturned to arouse opposition to the St. Lawrence project because I feel it is not in the best interest of the country from any standpoint.

As a Representative in Congress from the central Pennsylvania area, I am conscious that not only is the great State of Pennsylvania adversely affected by the St. Lawrence project, but the neighboring Middle Atlantic and seaboard States are affected likewise. In a few words, if the proposed project should become a reality it will strike at the very heart of our industrial economy and in addition destroy the jobs of thousands upon thousands of good American citizens.

It is needless for me to consume the time of this committee by rehashing the testimony that has been presented in support of or against the St. Lawrence project. For years it has been before Congress and experts have testified on every conceivable phase of the proposal. The results are that you have volumes of past testimony as well as the arguments for and against the proposed waterway during the present hearings.

I have followed the hearings very closely, and in my opinion, the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway have not justified its construction. In a few words, I base my convictions on the fact that—

1. With our country staggering from the effects of a huge national debt and taxes at a point where they are proving punitive, this is no time to attempt to saddle the American taxpayers with an expenditure that may run from millions to billions of dollars.

2. Recognizing that we are in the midst of an emergency that may throw us into a third world war and with our national resources being strained to build an adequate national defense, this is no time to divert manpower and materials for a project that cannot possibly be completed within a period of from 5 to 7 years. Our energies should be applied in the preservation of our national economy.

3. The proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway are taking a selfish viewpoint when they seek to establish a waterway and power project that will benefit Canada in particular, and only 15 percent of our own population at the expense of 85 percent of the American taxpayers. These advocates of this international ditch and Government-subsidized power project have completely turned their backs on literally millions of Americans who will be affected adversely by this twin project.

4. The assertion that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is vital to our national defense is without foundation. When I make this statement I have in mind the question of iron ore, hydro power, shipbuilding facilities, etc., etc.

To the contrary, instead of this project being necessary to national defense, the twin proposal would create a project that could not be defended in the event of an all-out war. Therefore it will not strengthen our national defense, but in fact will add to the job of defending ourselves.

Gentlemen, those are my convictions, and to supplement my views I should like your kind permission to insert at this point copies of my several radio speeches and other statements that I have made in outlining my opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. In conclusion I wish to express again my appreciation for the privilege of appearing before you and of stressing the sincerity of my views. I hope that when you vote on the proposed legislation that your decision will be of a negative nature.

The MacArthur Controversy, and Tribute to the Late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent editorials from the May 5 issue of America, national Catholic weekly review. I congratulate the editor for his brilliant analysis in the editorial entitled "An Unbalanced Strategy," which discusses the MacArthur case. I congratulate him further for his penetrating insight, in his editorial entitled "Senator Vandenberg's Greatness," into Senator Vandenberg's crucial role in the development of our foreign policy from January of 1945 onward.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNBALANCED STRATEGY

When General MacArthur delivered his eloquent address before the joint meeting of both Houses of Congress on April 19, he opened with this plea:

"I do not stand here as advocate for any partisan cause * * * I trust, therefore, that you will do me the justice of receiving that which I have to say as solely expressing the considered viewpoint of a fellow American."

This was certainly the least the general could ask of a country he had always loyally, and through long periods even gloriously, served during 52 years in the United States Army.

From the point of view of the editors of America, it seems to us that our readers should also do us the justice of receiving what we have to say about the general's report in the same nonpartisan spirit. Let us say immediately that here, as in most matters of public policy, we are not trying to express the views of anybody but ourselves. The only contribution we can make is to try to analyze the question, on which all our editors are agreed, in the light of the world-wide political, economic, social, military, moral, and religious factors to which we devote, week by week, whatever abilities and knowledge we may possess.

1. General MacArthur argued that if we knocked out Red China, we would effectively thwart the threat of world communism. He did not show how this strategy would provide a defense for this country against Soviet Russia. We have ourselves published a great deal on communism in the Far East, and do not, we think, underestimate the importance of that vast area. But we cannot see, from what the general said, how Soviet Russia itself can be defeated in the Far East.

The fact remains that there are other areas whose importance must at least be discussed before a reasonable judgment can be rendered on the delicate balance of our foreign policy. The first of these is Western Europe. The nations of Western Europe, as Paul Hoffman, former administrator of the Marshall plan, declared in Chicago on April 20, outproduce Russia in coal, steel, and electrical power. At least since 1947, and even since 1940, our foreign policy, studiously designed after a careful canvass of all the areas of the world, has been hinged on Europe. We won a smashing victory in the last war by putting Europe first, over the objections, it will be recalled, of General MacArthur. We lost China after the war, partly through our own mismanagement, partly through the unmanageableness of that ocean of humanity.

Then there is the Middle East, the source of 75 percent of the oil Europe needs and of 20 to 30 percent of the oil this hemisphere uses. Anyone who reads the newspapers knows that Soviet Russia may try to pluck that prize any day now.

2. General MacArthur made no attempt whatsoever to prove that we could at present wage a full-scale war in both the Far East and in the European-Middle East theater. Labeling as "defeatism" the opinions of those who think we cannot is hardly an argument. If we cannot, we must make a choice, and make it in full view of all the factors involved in both areas.

3. As for Korea itself, very great doubt exists, which he did nothing to dispel, that the steps the General suggests would bring the early "victory" there which he seemed to promise. His whole case depends on his statement: "and the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves" on the Korean front. That is the nub of the problem—not to expose ourselves anywhere to Russian intervention that will catch or throw us off balance.

If Russia has any sense it would "mesh its actions with our moves," though not "necessarily" in the Far East. If it did, the bottom would drop out of the MacArthur strategy, and of our whole strategy of national security.

"In war there is no substitute for victory." How true. But the Korean war, or even a full-scale Red-Chinese war, is not the real war we must make sure to win. We might better pull out of Korea, were that necessary, than jeopardize our defense against our real enemy—the Soviet Union—who cannot be defeated in Asia. Of course, if he can, we are wrong.

As in the last war, if we can first take care of our major foe wherever he applies his full strength, we can thereafter take care of our lesser foe anytime we choose. The only fatal mistake we could make would be to try to reverse this strategy.

SENATOR VANDENBERG'S GREATNESS

Tributes to Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Republican, of Michigan, who passed away in his sleep on April 18, were spread over 16 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They attest to a bipartisan conviction that a truly great statesman had passed from the United States Senate.

Senator Vandenberg's claim to greatness rests upon a long succession of truly notable contributions packed into five critical years, from 1945 to 1950. If ever we win through to an enduring peace, we shall owe our good fortune in no small measure to the unremitting and laborious statesmanship he lavished on its foundations.

That labor began with his celebrated Senate address of January 10, 1945. Convinced that "world war III would open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate," he courageously renounced what he had called his insulationism. He called for maximum American cooperation to make the basic idea of Dumbarton Oaks [the proposed world-security organization] succeed. President Roosevelt promptly appointed him to the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference on the U. N. Charter. On October 4, 1948, the Senator ascribed to Republican initiative what had been "a reality his own personal accomplishments in 1945:

"The word 'justice' never once appeared in the main body of the original draft. The idea of justice as the only basis of lasting peace was written into the Charter—and repeatedly—on Republican initiative."

But this was not all:

"So was article 14, without which the Charter would freeze a static world without hope of overtaking the mistakes of yesterday. So was article 51, which makes possible effective 'regional arrangements' which are of such vital current importance."

The Senator early developed, and later sold to Secretary of State Byrnes, his "get tough with Russia" attitude. He sold one of our editors that at San Francisco, where he engaged in an 8-day duel with Molotov over article 14: "I pounded the table as hard as Molotov did, and he seemed to respect me for it."

As soon as it became clearly evident that the U. N. could not attain its collective-security purposes, the Senator devised his famous Vandenberg resolution of June 11, 1948. When approved by the Senate by a decisive vote of 64–4, it paved the way for the Atlantic pact, which was signed just a year later.

Another contribution he made, again in line with his principle of regional arrangements as supplementary to the U. N., was his support of the Rio Pact for Hemispheric Defense in 1947. Sumner Welles has credited him with saving the Inter-American system.

The bipartisan foreign program which has succeeded best—the Marshall plan—owes a great deal to Senator Vandenberg. In the spring of 1948 the strongest opposition came from those who would not accept the Administration's proposal that it be administered by the Secretary of State, a political official whose economic wisdom Congress doubted. Vandenberg had the Brookings Institution devise the plan which Paul Hoffman, an exceptionally able businessman of free enterprise convictions, has administered with almost sensational success.

Arthur H. Vandenberg's patriotism, indeed, was heroic. He deferred too long, out of zeal for his country's welfare, submitting to surgery. Grieved as we are at the loss of this spirit who soared high above partisan considerations, we thank God for his greatness and pray for the repose of his great soul.

Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Saginaw (Mich.) News of April 25, 1951:

HANDLING OF POINT 4 CAN BE DONE SENSIBLY

Representative GEORGE MEADER, Michigan Republican from Ann Arbor, has proposed a bipartisan commission to study and investigate the problem of aiding underdeveloped areas under President Truman's point 4 program and to formulate plans and recommendations from time to time. It would be a continuing commission, composed of 10 members named by the President, six from private life and four from the executive branch of the Government, two Senators named by the Vice President, and two Representatives named by the Speaker of the House. In each category, not more than half could be from the same political party.

Representative MEADER would apply point 4 money in the traditional American way—to help the peoples of the underdeveloped areas to help themselves, rather than to try to do it for them. He makes a strong argument for such treatment of point 4 funds:

"Let us reaffirm our faith in the economic and political philosophy upon which this Republic was founded. Let us believe that the liberation of the forces of the human soul which conquered our own wilderness and harnessed the forces of nature for the benefit of ourselves and our posterity can likewise be employed for the benefit of peoples who only now are emerging from the shackles of feudalism and slavery. Let us act in that faith. With humility and anxious to absorb the many advantages of the culture of the peoples whose material lot is less pleasant than ours, let us offer to contribute the pioneering, courageous, enterprising spirit which is our inheritance. But let it be the voluntary and spontaneous contribution of the American people in a self-sustaining, mutually beneficial economic movement.

Let us not admit decadence and impotence in the free enterprise system through engaging in state-owned, tax-supported proprietary activities reminiscent of the totalitarian socialism we abhor."

Representative MEADER's plan calls for the creation of conditions in the underdeveloped areas that will attract private investment, not merely the hand-out of American public money, at the expense of American taxpayers. It is opposed to the practice of making loans to foreign governments, which tend to put those governments into private business, in competition with private businessmen, and to drive away private investments.

Willis H. Hall, secretary of the Detroit Board of Commerce, pointed up the danger in loans to foreign governments when, on his return from a trip to South America; he urged the United States to sell more machinery to South American countries. He quoted President Peron of Argentina as saying that the United States is giving too much money to foreign governments. Peron was quoted as saying, "When this is done, the money is used mainly for political purposes." Dictator Juan Peron certainly should know what he is talking about when he talks of this matter.

Administration reaction to Representative MEADER's proposal will be interesting to watch. If the administration is sincerely anxious to help underdeveloped areas, it is difficult to figure a better way.

But if the administration is more anxious just to spend American money, keeping control of that money for use where it feels it will do the most political good, and promoting socialistic development in those areas, rather than the American enterprise system, it will hardly show any interest in a bipartisan commission.

If that is the administration's idea of point four, it will prefer to turn its administration over to Dean Acheson, as President Truman recently announced his intention of doing.

Defense Minerals Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, as you know, during the past months the importance of our own strategic minerals has been greatly emphasized by world conditions. Recently I was appointed chairman of a special Subcommittee To Investigate Strategic Minerals, and largely attended hearings were conducted at Ely, Nev., and Phoenix, Ariz. I am submitting my opening statement made at the Ely, Nev., hearings to the Members of Congress for their perusal:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WALTER S. BARING, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., CHAIRMAN

It is a great pleasure to be in Ely, the center of so many small mine activities, and I hope to make many friends here.

As you all know, I am a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, formerly known as the Public Lands Committee. Among other things within our jurisdiction is mining legislation and to some extent, through special subcommittees, the policing of the Government agencies dealing with mining and the defense minerals program.

A flood of mail in both the House and the Senate indicates dissatisfaction with the way the defense agencies and especially the Defense Production Administration is handling the emergency program. Small and marginal miners particularly are complaining. Certain programs which operated with reasonable satisfaction during the last war have been ignored and the Government has launched out on a completely new track which does not seem to be getting results. We want to know from the miners themselves; why.

Chairman JOHN R. MURDOCK of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, knowing my long-standing interest in mining and especially in the small and marginal miner, has appointed me chairman of a special subcommittee to investigate the emergency minerals program and to devise legislation to supplement that of the Defense Production Act which now does not seem to be getting results.

The subcommittee wants you to tell your story for the record so that it may be taken back to Washington and the brass hats responsible confronted with what you miners think of what I call the do-nothing program.

I want to point out that our committee has discussed this matter with the Interior Department since 1948 and has made what we consider to be constructive suggestions based upon the experience of the last war. Our suggestions not only have gone unheeded but have been ignored. The Defense Production Act was signed early last September. We thought that the agencies would be all ready for D-day. Congress shelled out $600,000,000 as a little capital to start them in business, of which mining should have a share.

A new agency, the Defense Minerals Administration, was set up within the Interior Department. The resources and personnel of the Bureau of Mines and the USGS was put at its disposal. The staff estimate for DMA through to June of this year is 134 people plus, mind you, the available staffs of the Bureau of Mines and USGS. It is estimated that the overhead of DMA to March 31 will have been over half a million dollars. In the fiscal year 1951 it will spend money for overhead at the rate of more than a million dollars a year of which something over $900,000 will be for salaries.

It is nearly 7 months since the program was authorized by the Congress and, although I could go into the results in detail, I have not the time here—we came to hear you, not me; I will give you a few figures: Already there have been piled up in Washington about 850 applications for various kinds of aid, of which perhaps 600 are for financial aid. The balance are for procurement contracts and certificates of amortization.

To date—and the Government representatives can correct me if I am wrong—no application has been certified by DMA for a loan and not 1 penny has been disbursed.

DMA has certified to the Defense Production Administration 11 purchase contracts and to date, according to a letter from Administrator Boyd to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, only one contract has been signed by the General Services Administration of those certified and that one is for tungsten. Clearly, something is wrong. Where the fault lies within the agencies is up to us to discover by means of hearings in Washington. What we want to know now is how you are faring, how you like the program, and what you think should be done about it.

Senator MURRAY, who has had a vast experience with Government mineral and metal programs, thinks there is a reasonably clean-cut solution. That entails new legislation. I have joined with Senator MURRAY in the so-called Murray-Baring bill, copies of which you have.

I am glad to have with me Bill Broadgate, for many years technical consultant to the Senate Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals Industry and a director of your own small-mines organization. Bill was with Senator Scrugham when Jim headed a similar subcommittee, and he participated in past hearings all over the country on this subject.

Dr. Boyd tells us, "Although there has been agency discussion with respect to a premium bonus or incentive-payment system, such a system is not authorized under Public Law 774 (Defense Production Act) and consequently the DMA has not been in a position to recommend specific changes in this direction."

We feel, therefore, that now is the time to fill that deficiency, hence the Murray-Baring bill.

The so-called fifty-fifty exploration program now has been O. K.'d by Secretary Chapman, but the Bureau of the Budget has not as yet furnished the funds. I do not like this program. I wonder if you do? I like the program which we had under the 1946 act and this, with modifications to bring it up to date, has been incorporated in my bill, H. R. 2862. The old program showed real results and this one should do better.

I have one piece of good news: A special application form for mining has been approved and is at the printers, so you will not have to bother with the present 12-page monstrosity.

I do not believe in the present DMA policies in certifying procurement contracts. I think if we want the ores and minerals we should be willing to pay the price to get them out and buy them in any quantity, however small, at a figure within which each mine can live, but without giving windfalls to low-cost producers. The small and marginal miner is the backbone of the West and it is time we started him digging.

There is no reason why, 30 days after the Murray-Baring bill is signed into law, Nevada mining should not be buzzing with life and activity.

Tell the subcommittee your story in your own words, frankly, and let us have your suggestions as to how the small and marginal miner can best contribute to the emergency effort—if the Government will let you. Later, if you wish, I shall explain the working of the Murray-Baring bill if there are any parts you do not understand.

We are fortunate enough to have with us today from the Government, Mr. J. L. Hoffund, chief counsel of Defense Minerals Administration to represent Dr. Boyd, the Administrator.

Also Capt. H. C. Maull, Jr., who spends all the stockpile money for the Government. Captain Maull is Acting Director of the Purchase Division of EPS, the Emergency Procurement Services of the General Services Administration, which does most of the Government buying. All mineral and metal contracts have to pass his scrutiny. Incidentally, he was a lifelong friend of our beloved Jim Scrugham. Captain Maull is a red-tape cutter from way back and I have heard it said that if he had 20 brothers like him in the Government, things would really hum.

With Captain Maull is Mr. Robert Bradford, of this GSA region; Mr. Otto Kline, of the Denver GSA region; and Mr. Thurtell, who is liaison man between GSA and DMA.

If there are any other Government officials present, please identify yourself for the record.

These gentlemen are here to answer your questions and I ask that they stay a few minutes after the hearing so that any of you who wish to discuss your problems with them may do so. I may call some of them to the stand later to discuss their programs.

I would now like to make special commendation to my good friends of the White

Pine Chamber of Commerce and Mines. They have always stood by me in all mining situations. A year ago they held another meeting for us here, which was a very fine meeting. We got some very good testimony, and I certainly want to thank you gentlemen of the White Pine Chamber of Commerce and Mines, and in particular Cecil E. Geraghty, for the very good work which they have always done.

I have already said plenty at this time, and I don't have a thing more to say except that I really believe that you have been doing a swell job. There is one thing that I do know. I know that whenever we call on you to testify, you are always ready to answer. I want you to know that that is something that we really appreciate out here in Ely.

Smash the Trojan Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New Leader. The article deals with Red fifth column operating in democratic countries, particularly France. The author, E. V. Yourievsky, is a veteran Russian Socialist who was employed by the Soviet Government as an economist and was one of the authors of the first Soviet 5-year plan. He has been a refugee in Western Europe for many years.

The article follows:

SMASH THE TROJAN HORSE

(By E. V. Yourievsky)

The United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia have taken a number of measures against the Communist fifth column. In England, the general secretary of the transport-workers union, Arthur Deakin, spoke of the necessity of banning the Communist Party, which is not a party, like other parties, but an organized conspiracy against the country and the English people. And Prime Minister Attlee commented on the Sheffield congress of the so-called Partisans of Peace: "There are limits to our patience. The time will come when we must slam the door in the face of those who wish to burn our house down."

Sentiment in favor of restricting the Kremlin party's freedom of action has finally manifested itself in France, too. At the last congress of the Radical Party, even Edouard Herriot burst out: "There is plenty of room in Russia. Let the Communists go there before we declare war on them." The idea of restricting the Communists is also evident in the proposals to change the French electoral system, now based on proportional representation. The changes might well reduce Moscow's delegation of 167 deputies in the French Assembly. But even if the Communists only had 90, or 50, delegates, the basic question of their party's freedom of action would remain.

A weak-willed democratic credo prevailing in this country has made the Communist Party sacrosanct, at least till recently. Take Le Monde, for example, the best democratic paper in France, which categorically rejects any restrictions upon the freedom of the Communist Party. Even though it is well aware of the party's character and aims, Le Monde wrote:

"The essence of democracy lies in the fact that it grants liberty even to those who, like the Communists, make use of liberty in order to destroy it. This conviction is neither naiveté nor weakness, but an expression of the most profound faith in man. It is the faith that, if good and evil, truth and falsehood, contend with the same weapons (i. e., with equal freedom) good will triumph in the end."

The philosophy expressed in this formula leads straight to the religion of Leo Tolstoy, the idea of nonresistance to evil. Asked once what he would do if thugs broke into his house to murder his children, Tolstoy replied: "All I could do would be to try to convince them that it would serve no purpose and was wrong." The Russian religious philosopher Nicholas Berdayev has commented that it is quite easy to show that if one does not oppose evil with force, evil always triumphs, but Tolstoy rested his hope on a historic miracle and, in the name of faith in the miracle of God's direct intervention, proposed to risk the destruction of society, the state, civilization, the destruction of the world which was based on falsehood and violence.

Obviously, Le Monde does not believe in such salvation by the intervention of providence. Even the devout François Mauriac does not believe in it. But if one does not equate the risk of the destruction of society with the risk of losing a game of poker, then the democratic credo of Le Monde's editors—and others like them in the west—is wretched counsel for these days. A man who sings the abstract tune that the Communists, even though they are dedicated to murdering freedom, must be granted complete freedom, is, subjectively, in his own estimation, a gallant knight of democracy. Objectively, he may be its gravedigger.

THE DAY-TO-DAY ISSUES

What are the real questions which arise today in democratic countries subjected to Communist pressure, like France? Here are several:

1. Can a democratic government admit to its ranks officials who, as Communist Party members, must promote by every possible means the disintegration of democratic order?

2. Can democratic nations tolerate judges who are so frightened by the thought of possible Communist accession to power that they either acquit Communist lawbreakers or else pass ridiculously small sentences?

3. Must a democracy concerned with its defense tolerate propagation of the doctrine of military insubordination? At the trial of the saboteurs who tried to wreck the aircraft carrier *Dixmude*, the theory was advanced that soldiers and sailors are subject only to the dictates of their own convictions, not to any requirements of military discipline. The Communist Party expounds this doctrine quite effectively in Toulon—an arsenal and naval base.

4. Communist detachments have converted nationalized enterprises into virtual party bastions. Injecting unrelated political demands into economic demands calculated to produce inflation, the Communists use them to maintain pressure on the Government at every pretext. Strikes in the gas and electric stations, for example, to say nothing of the water-supply system, create a tremendous impression. Must a democratic government unconditionally recognize the unlimited right to strike in the most vital public service industries?

5. France has placed a detachment of volunteers at the disposal of the U. N. in Korea. The Communist press urged the crews of the steamers *Tafna*, *Athos*, and *Pasteur* not to transport them. Can a democratic government tolerate an atmosphere of terror so great that such volunteers beg that their names be kept secret lest their families be subjected to attacks and threats by the Communists?

6. French troops are fighting in Indochina against Stalin's protégé, Ho Chi Minh. A French Communist Party representative goes to see the Vietminh dictator, travels all over his territory, and then returns to write articles in the French Communist press extolling the achievements of Ho's troops, who, happily, are now capable of mauling a considerable number of French.

Since French Communist leaders have made it plain that they will aid the Soviet aggressor in every way in the event of war, the French Government has been setting up a civilian defense organization to protect public buildings, railroads and highways, combat sabotage, and aid in tracking down parachutists. No one will dare join this organization—we will kill these "militiamen," the Communist press hints broadly. It elaborates this point with a cartoon showing Defense Minister Jules Moch (who proposed the militia) trembling with fear before the corpses of Laval and other "militiamen" dangling from scaffolds.

Is this sort of freedom of the press tolerable?

7. The Government knows full well the location of the Communist Party "center" which receives orders from Moscow, spreads lies on a grand scale, and prescribes techniques for subversive activities. Protected by the parliamentary immunity of the deputies who make it up and enjoying complete freedom, this center expands and reinforces its power with every passing day. Must the Government confine itself to punishing underlings (like the port workers who refuse to unload war matériel) while timidly bypassing the center itself?

WHAT OF SOCIAL REVOLUTION?

These are the questions which arise daily in France. Yet when it comes to actively fighting the Communists, a misconception of the nature of the struggle often prevents many western politicians from generating effective action. This misconception was well illustrated by two recent articles in the weekly Populaire-Dimanche. The author, a secretary of the French Socialist Party, calls the Communist Party an organization of lies, espionage, treason, sabotage, and tyranny—but is opposed to banning it. He says, first, that the existing laws are adequate; second, that suppression would martyr the Communist Party and finally, that the chief weapon against Stalinism is not repression but political, social, and economic reforms which, so to speak, immunize the people against the Soviet virus. The realization of the aggregate of major socio-economic reforms is called by this writer the social revolution. "The struggle against the Stalinist fifth column," he insists, "requires this social revolution."

Undoubtedly, reforms carried out boldly and in time—not in Syngman Rhee style or in the anemic liberal fashion observed in Italy—can undermine the chances of some dictators, although it must be observed that it will not undermine those who arrive in Soviet tanks. But when one speaks of "revolution," one should remember that the entire world is caught up in a whirl of technical, cultural, social, economic, and political changes. To the leadership of this world-wide revolution, two systems, two world outlooks lay claim.

It is a great mistake to think that the struggle for such leadership is between a moderate, social reformist, liberal-socialist philosophy and another which is moving in the same direction, but is genuinely revolutionary, broader and bolder, and does not hesitate to use coarse, plebeian methods. It is a mistake to think that the difference between them can to any degree be compared with that which once separated Aristide Briand and Eduard Bernstein from Karl Liebknecht and Jules Guesde.

The division between the two systems actually springs from the fact that Lenin's attempt to create socialism by force led to the complete, nightmarish degeneration of the entire undertaking and to the establishment of the system we now call totalitarian. The difference does not lie in the contract between "moderation" and "revolutionary spirit," or in the fact that they destroy private property and plan their economy ruthlessly while we do it differently, but in a basic difference in attitude toward the individual, toward human life.

SHAW SAW THE DIFFERENCE

Bernard Shaw was one of the first to understand this. After a visit to Russia, he rapturously wrote that "she has turned upside down the most important established and fixed standards." She had banished, as a superstitious prejudice, the utterly worthless, false idea of the supposedly sacred value of human life and the human personality, replacing it with a purely "utilitarian" approach to man. The right to life by no means belongs to every person, but only to those who can "justify" their existence to the state and its rulers. And the latter, Shaw explained with obvious approval, are chosen by nobody in Russia; they choose themselves, finding themselves the most worthy to be the power group.

When it appears that an individual cannot "justify" his existence to this power group of supermen, displeases them, is superfluous and useless to them, annoys, frightens, or upsets them, "he must be rooted out of society like a weed." And the judgment "must be swift."

Without the slightest revulsion, Shaw described how an agent of the Cheka comes to the doomed man, claps him on the shoulder and says: "This way, citizen." And the "weed" is rooted out.

"A considerable part of the secret of Russian communism's success," Shaw concluded, "is explained by the fact that, henceforth, every Russian knows that, if he doesn't make his life a paying proposition (from the point of view of the state, that is) he will lose it."

Shaw's article, printed in a British Communist organ in 1932, was later translated and published in Pravda. One Soviet journalist has recounted that Maxim Gorky, upon reading the manuscript, became terrified and "started to groan," but Stalin ordered it published without any editorial remarks. This is understandable. Shaw, who was not a nonconformist for nothing, clearly understood what "the immortality of the developing Stalinist revolution" consisted of, what it had "turned upside down," what was the basis for the dark gospel of Stalin. The Stalinist revolution, as it moves onward and develops dialectically, must lead to something similar to Orwell's ghastly Nineteen Eighty-four.

Some of the features of the other revolution can be seen in Scandinavia, America, France, and the British Commonwealth—sometimes only in fragmentary form or in blueprint, in various spheres and in variant forms. What underlies all of these variants is the attempt to develop the idea of the value of the individual. At first inculcated by religion but later secularizing itself, this idea has established itself as an incontrovertible categorical imperative. No one who repudiates it can call himself a democrat.

While revolution of the Stalinist type, overturning the entire social structure of nations, is, of course, social revolution, it is in its essence counterrevolutionary. Spiritually and politically, it is a throw-back to centuries ago, reversing the clearly charted direction of development. At the bottom of every act of the Kremlin and its minions abroad lies—both consciously and unconsciously—a monstrous view of man. This is the abyss dividing the two types of world-wide revolution.

Lenin considered the peaceful coexistence of capitalism and socialism impossible. He was mistaken, as the close harmony between not completely capitalist America and not completely Socialist Britain indicates. But what is truly difficult to imagine is the peaceful coexistence of Ahriman and Ormazd, good and evil, a system which exalts the individual and a system which denies the individual. With totalitarian despotism aspiring to world mastery, a clash between it and democracy is inevitable. One or the other antagonist must disappear. And the victor will not be he who is morally superior, but—to tell the sad truth—he who proves physically stronger.

Our French writer says: Let us carry out reforms and social revolution, and we shall triumph. But he shuts his eyes to the fact that the projected Atlantic armies cannot halt the enemy if, in their rear, on the territory of the democracies, the Communist fifth columns are permitted to operate freely. To supplement the Atlantic military pact, there must be an Atlantic political pact by which the democracies concertedly paralyze the Communist parties. Democracy that is not dying, that believes in itself, that wishes to live and to fight for its ideals, must eliminate the Communists before it is too late. In the interest of our self-preservation, the Communists must be deprived of the freedom to murder freedom. We must destroy the Trojan horse before it destroys us.

A Few Samples of Letters From Constituents re General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting just a few copies of letters received from constituents, all dealing with the firing of General MacArthur. The people are aroused and indignant.

DELAVAN, WIS., *April 11, 1951.*

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAWRENCE SMITH: This small town today has the hush of deep and unspeakable grief. The knowledge that our one and only American hope, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been fired, leaves us shocked, void of hope, of patriotism, of a future for our sons and their sons.

All the fine, the good things we have taught our children to be, stand for naught. We American mothers and fathers must now admit to them that courage, decency, education, and honesty are of little use in the America of today.

We must now teach them to use their wits, seek gold and power above all else, and always say "Yes" to the man higher up whether he be a Costello, an Alger Hiss, or a pajama-clad President.

My father wrote a song when I was small called Land of the Free. My brother and son were brought up on it. The chorus went like this:

"America, fair land of mine, home of the
just and true,
All hail to thee, land of the free, the red,
the white, the blue."

What has happened to this wonderful country?

May God help you in your office. May He help us all from this dark day forward.

Very sincerely.

KENOSHA, WIS., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I must finally break my long silence. Are you going to keep still to the firing of our great and honorable General MacArthur, a general we admired so much for his work, his work in Japan in getting the wheels going again without much slaughtering? I will never forget the slaughtering of all the German generals that only had to do what their Government asked them to do.

Why must England and France come and tell the Americans what to do, and who is doing the bleeding in Korea? The French or English? The confidence in our Government is going to go if you, the Congress, don't do something about it. The boys are dying on the battlefields, and in Washington they steal and betray our country. What a crime. Why fight the dictators if we have one ourselves in Washington? Oh, if God only would clear out that rat hole.

Yours very truly.

JANESVILLE, WIS., *April 11, 1951.*

The Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: The list of people signing this letter are all voters, and they represent mothers who have sons in Korea and Japan, sweethearts and sisters of boys in Korea and Japan, mothers of boys who will be called in the near future, and last but not least, women who have lost their sons and husbands in the Korean war.

We feel there are no adjectives strong enough to express our dismay and agitation at the dismissal of General MacArthur, a man who has always thought first of his country and not of politics.

We wish to protest his dismissal and ask that you, as a Representative of the people of Wisconsin, protest it and that you urge Congress to invite General MacArthur to appear before that body and give his views. It is time the American people had something to say about the Korean affair; the boys are dying, but still, according to our President, we are not at war. If that is so, then let's bring the boys back home, as life is anything but pleasant in Korea.

Our Congressmen and Senators have hearts, but if they do, how can they talk politics, play politics, and fritter away not only the minutes but the hours, while poor American boys die, and, as a crowning affront, dismiss the man upon whom they relied? It is time the State Department is cleaned up and if, as we read in the papers, the majority of Members of Congress do not approve of the way the State Department is handling matters, then let's do something about it. Now.

General MacArthur has served his country long and well, and we wish him to continue; we have confidence in him. We are relying upon you to help us put MacArthur back at the helm, and we believe our faith and trust in you is not misplaced.

Sincerely,

(Signed by 31 women.)

RACINE, WIS.,
April 12, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I am very much oppressed at the removal of General MacArthur from his command in Korea by a very incapable man like Mr. Truman. It has brought great tragedy to our country. I salute General MacArthur as the greatest military leader. I have always had great faith in him as a Christian leader working

daily between his conscience and his God. I am looking forward to some truthful words from his lips which we do not get from the New Dealers in Washington. My greatest desire is for you to do your best for the impeachment of Acheson and Marshall along with Truman.

Very truly yours.

KENOSHA, WIS.,
April 15, 1951.

To Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH:

We, the undersigned American voters and taxpayers of the First District of Wisconsin, demand the reinstatement of MacArthur and impeachment of Truman and Acheson. Truman got us into the Korean war without first talking things over with the highest military officials.

He makes more fuss over a critic who does not like his daughter than he does over a war he started. He wants to send troops to Europe where there is no war instead of to Korea where they are badly needed.

We don't care what the British like or want. They are not running this country. They would have been lost if not for our help. They don't care about us, all they want is our money. Beggars can't be choosers.

In Truman's 6 years of office he never once fired a crook but our best general was removed and given a dirty rotten deal. We resent the manner in which it was done. It is a shame to lose a man of the ability of MacArthur.

I have a brother in Korea who has been wounded and my husband is in the Navy in Korean waters. Let Truman and Acheson take their places and send our men back.

We don't want a long, dragged-out war for the next 20 years. We want an end to all this and MacArthur had the right idea to end it for us.

Our only hope now lies in Congress. If the majority of Members of Congress betray their country then we are lost indeed.

Thank you.

KENOSHA, WIS., *April 11, 1951.*

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In keeping with my avowed policy of liberalism, I have waited before communicating with you until President Truman spoke tonight to see if he could convice me that he was acting correctly. After listening to him and following reaction around the world and in our own country, particularly that of the Communist Party here, I now feel more qualified and justified in writing.

To use the President's own terminology, I believe we should impeach the "——— ——— ———" for "asinine" actions and decisions.

Top level policy (?) has too long been formed by men like Acheson and Marshall whose judgment, particularly on far eastern affairs, has long since been repudiated. A thorough house cleaning is imperative.

The present question is not who will control who—military or civilian—but who is right and who is wrong.

Impeachment of Truman will not solve all our problems but the people's voice will have been heard and much benefit will result.

Yours very truly.

WALWORTH, WIS., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The persons in our Government have exposed themselves. Now is the time for us as Americans to stand and fight against these forces that are ruling our country, that are slowly undermining our security and jeopardizing our American way of life.

I feel that MacArthur should be reinstated and that those in Government positions should be exposed and replaced, including Dean Acheson and President Truman. This tragedy should not be overlooked, but it must be used as an opportunity for exposure and removal of all those who are Communists or those sympathetic to communistic ideas or any form of corrupt government.

Don't fail us in this hour of need. Let's have a shake-down in all Government offices.

Sincerely.

RACINE, WIS., *April 11, 1951.*

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the infamous action of Harry S. Truman in discharging General MacArthur, I urge and pray that you as our representative will take such action as will bring about the impeachment of Harry S. Truman and Dean Acheson.

If you could of been in Racine today and heard the voice of the people you would feel that any action taken by you would be sanctioned by your constituents.

Very truly.

MacArthur, the Christian Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Dr. Dale Crowley, Washington's radio minister, over Stations WOL and WEAM, April 20, 1951:

MACARTHUR, THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

(Address by Dr. Dale Crowley, Washington's radio minister, over Stations WOL and WEAM, April 20, 1951)

"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." (Proverbs 14:34.)

On getting a close-up of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and being held spellbound by the matchless eloquence of his classic and challenging address before the joint meeting of Congress and to all America and the world by radio and television, I find myself increasingly proud to be an American. And since General MacArthur is one of the greatest living exponents of true Christianity, I am more grateful than ever to be numbered among the people called Christians.

For the stupendous tribute being paid this outstanding hero we are devoutly thankful, not merely because he is so eminently worthy of the same, but because General MacArthur is indeed the living symbol of the highest and best in American manhood and in sturdy Christian character. Through the years this soldier-statesman has occupied a lofty place in the esteem of his fellowmen. Today he occupies an even more exalted place in our esteem.

This fact I desire to emphasize: The qualities of character which make Douglas MacArthur the man that he is are Christian qualities. In his personality certain traits of character are prominently displayed. In the first place, we see the spirit of modesty and humility. Not once have we seen a spirit of boastfulness or braggadocio in this great man and, yet, there are few men on the world horizon today who would have as much to boast about in terms of sheer achievement as Douglas MacArthur. He is indeed a worthy exponent of the Christ whom he worships, who emphasized that the first mark of discipleship and of Christian leadership is that of humility.

Then, too, we think of the quality of Christian charity so prominent in the life of this distinguished citizen. Charity toward all men, even his persecutors. If there would be justification for a spirit of vindictiveness toward those who had wronged him, we think it would be in this case. But not one note of rancor or bitterness or harshness or abusiveness or unkindness proceeded from the lips of General MacArthur. There has been manifested a refreshing air of gentleness, a spirit of total charity and brotherliness, not only in his words, but in his very manner.

The spirit of compassion, also, shines out in the life of this man. One could almost feel his heartbeat of sympathy and love for the soldiers, sailors, and marines under his previous command, now left behind to carry on in Korea. In his love for the Korean people, also, General MacArthur expressed his deep feeling of sorrow and compassion. We were reminded of the statement concerning Jesus, of whom it was said "He was moved with compassion on them." In living touch with Christ, this beloved general possesses, in a very marked degree, this spirit of compassion.

Fidelity is another magnificent quality so pronounced in the life of this soldier-statesman—fidelity to duty. A true Christian will ever be faithful to the task at hand. To every assignment given General MacArthur through the years, he has set his hand to the plow, and his face toward the goal of accomplishing that task, however huge and however impossible those tasks have seemed to be. His faithfulness to his country in a service rendered at a time when he might have elected to retire to private life in comfort and ease, is indeed one of the crowning examples of loyalty to be written into the biography of this great citizen. And when we think of his faithfulness to the Japanese during his six epoch-making postwar years as their counselor-champion, our sense of appreciation of this man soars to new heights. "Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee the crown of life." Truly General MacArthur, the Christian, has won the right to that crown.

Righteousness is the principle on which this towering citizen established his life. Many years ago he became an humble follower of Christ and since that time he has sought sincerely to follow only the course of right. He hates iniquity and hypocrisy. He believes that truth is the criterion, the standard by which all things must be tested. He deplores cheap political chicanery, dishonesty, and duplicity in dealings. General MacArthur is ever forthright, candid, sincere. This is indeed a rare quality nowadays; but it is a character trait belonging to those who walk and talk with God. As with individuals, so with nations, the inspired words of King Solomon may be repeated with renewed accent: "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." May God in heaven restore to the leadership of America this much-needed moral and spiritual quality.

Other peerless qualities we could mention in the symmetrically developed character of this great American. Time fails us to comment on his matchless courage, his patience, his graciousness, his Christian dignity, and other traits. But what we are saying is that this great personality is what he is because, first of all, he is a Christian. We prefer to exalt Christ rather than to exalt the man,

MacArthur. We desire to emphasize that Christ is the true standard of manhood. It is because General MacArthur is a Christian and because he believes the Bible and walks in the light of its precepts that he is the moral giant that he is.

We need, my friends, as never before in this country, the type of Christian statesmanship and leadership as that which is exemplified in the person of this five-star American general—Douglas MacArthur.

Amendment of Reorganization Act of 1949 To Permit Rejection of Presidential Reorganization Plans by a Simple Rather Than a Constitutional Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1951, I introduced H. R. 3261, to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that reorganization plans could be rejected by either House of Congress by a simple majority vote rather than a constitutional majority.

A former member of this body, Clarence F. Lea, now director of governmental relations for the Transportation Association of America, has contacted me indicating his support, and that of his association, of the provisions of H. R. 3261. I believe the views of former Congressman Lea, and the resolution of the Transportation Association of America, should be called to the attention of the entire Congress in connection with its consideration of H. R. 3261.

For that reason, I have asked leave to insert in the RECORD Mr. Lea's letter to me of April 26, 1951, and the accompanying statement of the Transportation Association of America:

TRANSPORTATION
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1951.

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: Thanks for your note of the 11th.

I commend your presentation of your proposal to require only a constitutional majority for the disapproval of a proposed reorganization plan. The provisions of the Reorganization Act in effect count deceased Members, in case of vacancies, and absentees as voting in support of the Executive order. This, of course, is an absolutely untenable provision.

Our association has committed itself to support the repeal of this provision of the Reorganization Act.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE F. LEA.

ARGUMENT IN BEHALF OF THE PROPOSAL OF TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA TO AMEND THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The Hoover Commission made a commendable effort to perform a real service for the country. It proposed worth-while reforms to avoid duplication, increase efficiency, and streamline the many departments within the executive branch of the Government. The Reorganization Act of 1949 provided the implementing legislation.

On March 13, 1950, the President submitted 21 plans to Congress under the procedures set forth in this act. Under the terms thereof all 21 plans would automatically become effective in 60 days unless rejected by either one of the two Houses of Congress through veto of a majority of its authorized membership.

Before a branch of Congress can act on a reorganization proposal, it is necessary that a Senator or Congressman introduce a resolution to veto. Regardless of the subject matter of the plan, all such resolutions to veto are heard by the same committee of either the House or Senate—the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments. After hearings, this committee may or may not report the resolutions, either in the affirmative or negative. Then, still within the 60-day period, either the House or Senate must act or the plans become law.

The authorized membership of the House is 435. Therefore, a minimum of 218 Members must be present, and if a plan is to be rejected not less than this number must personally cast their votes for veto.

The authorized membership of the Senate is 96. It would be necessary that at least 49 Members be personally present and all voting to sustain a veto.

THE CONSTITUTION

Under section 5, article 1 of the Constitution, a majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business. A majority vote of the quorum present is sufficient to pass the most important laws enacted by Congress.

Under section 6 (A) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, a plan transmitted to Congress goes into effect by the very nonaction of that body, as above described. Under this provision, if 51 Members were present in the Senate and 48 of them voted to disapprove a plan, it would nevertheless be sustained. It would become the law of the land. Yet, if the content of a plan were presented as a bill, it would, under the Constitution, become law after approval by a majority vote (of a quorum) of each House—or would be defeated by a majority of the quorum present.

CONGRESS ABDICATES

Under the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1949, Congress not only denies its regular committees the jurisdiction over the problems for which they are established, but it abdicates the most fundamental of all powers—the duty, under the Constitution, to legislate by rule of the majority. The act invites greater centralization of power in the hands of the President, which is the path to totalitarian government.

ACTUAL EXAMPLE

On May 22, 1950, the Senate voted 37 to 36 in favor of a resolution to veto plan 9—relating to the Federal Power Commission. A quorum was present and a majority of one voted to disapprove the plan. Nevertheless it became law, because of the failure to secure 49 votes. Actually, there were 73 Members of the Senate present and voting.

In effect, the absentees—and deceased Members of Congress—are computed as if voting in favor of a Presidential recommendation—without any actual vote whatever on their part. If a Member of either House wishes to avoid taking issue with the President, all that he would have to do is to stay home or take a trip.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE

Plan 21 provided for the transfer of the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce—and for its reorganization. It was maneuvered through Congress because little defense of the Commission was possible, yet in principle and effect the plan was the same as plan 7 referring to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Because plan 21 was the most difficult to defeat, an appendix was attached thereto settling up an Under Secretray of Commerce to deal with all transportation—creating a new activity and new executive control of transportation. Of course, if this appendix had been attached to plan 7, which was defeated, we would not now be burdened with still another bureaucratic agency dipping into the supervision and control of transportation.

While the association has not yet reached its conclusions as to whether the promotional phases of transportation rightly belong in the executive branch, certainly if it found such to be in the public interest, it is questionable whether transportation—now the largest segment of the economy—should be subordinated to a division of some governmental department.

DANGEROUS CENTRALIZATION

Let us quote from a statement submitted by the Honorable Clarence F. Lea, director of government relations of this association, when he appeared before the Senate in opposition to Reorganization Plan 7, which was vetoed in May 1950, by a vote of 66 to 13.

"In 32 years of service in the House, under six different Presidents, I have observed a constantly increasing centralization of power in the Federal Government. One Executive after another has sought increased powers under claim of more effectually discharging his duties. In fact, this tendency of Congress to place accumulated powers under the control of the executive department is an evolution of 120 years. Today, the President of the United States has more power than any other executive in the world, with the sole exception of Stalin.

"I recognize that in the main this increasing accumulation of power has not been solicited by the executive departments for what they regarded as illegitimate purposes. It represents just a natural inclination of nearly all men to crave more power."

SUMMARY

Under the Reorganization Act of 1949, Congress abdicates its powers to legislate for and in behalf of the people of this country on matters of government organization.

The established committees of the House and Senate are bypassed with no opportunity for hearing before these groups which are constituted, under normal procedures, to deal with the subjects covered by reorganization plans.

In view of the association's experience in connection with the 21 plans submitted to Congress by the President in 1950, we submit that the Reorganization Act of 1949 is a grave threat to economic freedom and our democratic processes. Amendment of this act, as set forth in the resolution on page 4, should be given first consideration by all leaders and by the two political parties. In its present form, the act should never be tolerated in a popular form of government.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

The Hoover Commission, after long and painstaking study, submitted important recommendations designed to improve efficiency and economy in government. The board of directors of the Transportation Association of America commends and supports these aims.

Subsequent to that report, Congress enacted the Reorganization Act of 1949, abdicating to the Executive much of its affirmative responsibility for legislation, and setting up procedures which establish dangerous precedents in the democratic process.

The Transportation Association of America is concerned in these procedures because several of the reorganization plans already submitted, and the likelihood of others in the future, affect directly national policies of transportation and its regulation. The association is concerned also because numerous proposals being submitted to Congress bear little or no relationship to the Hoover Commission proposals.

The board of directors of the Transportation Association of America deplores the unfair procedures and dangerous precedents of the Reorganization Act of 1949, and declares that—

Whereas under the terms of this act, such Presidential plans, when submitted to Congress, automatically become law within 60 legislative days unless disapproved by a resolution supported by the votes of a majority of the authorized membership of either House of the Congress; and

Whereas this act fails to require the consideration of such plans by the committees of Congress which ordinarily have jurisdiction over the problems embraced in the proposals; and

Whereas such procedures require that absentees and deceased Members of Congress, where there are vacancies, be counted as in favor of such Presidential plans, thereby circumventing the majority rule of democratic government; and

Whereas the board of directors deplores practices which permit the enactment of legislation by Executive decree: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Transportation Association of America urges the Reorganization Act of 1949 be amended to provide that:

(a) Any Presidential plan shall be referred for consideration to the regular committees of Congress which have jurisdiction over the basic laws affected by the proposed changes; that such committees shall have the right to propose amendments thereto in accordance with the established practices of Congress;

(b) Full opportunity shall be offered to the public to understand the issues involved through regularly scheduled hearings by the several committees to which such reorganization plan or plans may be referred;

(c) The time limit of 60 legislative days shall be increased; and that

(d) The adoption or rejection of any Presidential plan shall be subject to established rules of Congress by which a majority vote of a quorum present shall govern.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly disturbed concerning the grain-for-India bill, particularly some recent implications.

The recent speech of Premier Nehru, as reported in the New York Times of May 2, which I have made a part of my remarks, touched upon the question of help from this country in the form of grain and other foodstuffs to alleviate anticipated famine. The Indian Premier indicated very plainly that his country would not accept food from any country if it had "any political strings attached to it." While I do not understand what he means by "political strings," it is clear from the tone of his address, as well as from contemporary news articles from New Delhi, that Indian opinion regards certain conditions in the proposed relief bill as so obnoxious that the Government of India had decided not to rely any longer on 2,000,000 tons of United States grain and was recasting its food-importing policy.

According to this special article in the Times, direct from the Indian capital, a large section of parliamentary opinion favors rejection of American help if it materializes ultimately, although the government is not yet committed to a policy of outright rejection of United States help.

It would seem clear that India objects particularly to the conditions in the pending bill, which would require India to distribute American grain without discrimination as to caste, color, or creed, those provisions which require full and continuous publicity in India for American assistance and those which permit unrestricted inspection of distribution by officials of the United States Government.

Communist China, despite its present war commitments, has agreed to supply India with additional rice and grain. Negotiations are underway with the Soviet Union for 500,000 tons of wheat in exchange for shipments of jute from India.

I can well understand the position of the Indian Premier, who does not wish to bind his nation politically or render it subservient to nations which may furnish economic relief. But, from the American viewpoint, it would be desirable, I think, that we attach certain conditions to any assistance we render.

First, we should want to be assured of the friendliness of the nations we help and their willingness not to exhibit actual enmity in international relations, or bind themselves to the policies of hostile, or potentially hostile, countries.

Secondly, we should insist upon careful official inspection to insure proper and equitable distribution and appropriate publicity respecting the origin of the food shipments. In the past, the Soviet has made a practice of relabeling shipments of food and other commodities from the United States of America and then distributing them in various countries giving the people to understand that they are benefactions from the Soviet Union.

Thirdly, we should always keep in mind our own needs for essential foodstuffs and necessities, as well as existing requirements of the Korean war, the Atlantic Pact military program, and ECA for shipping and transportation.

Fourthly, and this point should be first, we must always keep before us the principle of extending meritorious and emergent help and assistance to impoverished, suffering and afflicted peoples whenever we can, responsive to the Christian doctrine of furnishing charity and succor within our own means and capacity.

It may well be that grain to India at this time, while commendable from the humanitarian viewpoint, would lay down a precedent upon which other afflicted or economically weak nations might well rely. It should be recognized by the Congress, as it is by the American people, and as the dictates of prudence and common sense so amply justify, that this Nation, great and powerful as it is, cannot, under any circumstances, assume the burden of feeding the whole world or any considerable part of it. There are definite limits to our humanitarianism and our charity and we of the Congress must make sure that, in our understandable and most commendable zeal to help other nations, we are not, by our lavish gifts and benefactions, weakening our own Nation and economy. Such action would conform to the Soviet master blueprint.

If I were to support the Indian grain bill, in any respect, I should, for the above stated reasons, do so with utmost reluctance and certainly under safeguards and conditions already written into the bill. However, Premier Nehru's speech has certainly done much to clarify my viewpoint because I certainly do not intend to vote for any measure that will put my country in the position of forcing charity and relief upon nations which would label generosity as intrusion and implied bribery and cause resentment and misunderstanding abroad.

If these nations wish to take up the Soviet cry of imperialism and reaction and dictatorship against the United States, it is their privilege but I have no intention of condoning or yielding to such an attitude and I certainly will insist upon voting in the Chamber to uphold the prestige, self-respect, greatness, and security of our own beloved Nation.

[From the New York Times of May 2, 1951]

NEHRU BARS FOOD WITH ANY "STRINGS"—SAYS INDIA WILL NOT BARTER FREEDOM OF ACTION—UNITED STATES BILL IS CAUSING RESENTMENT

NEW DELHI, India, May 1.—Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru declared today that India, though grateful for help, would not accept food from any country if it had "any political strings attached to it."

Reviewing the food situation in a nationwide broadcast, he added: "We would be unworthy of the high responsibilities with which we have been charged if we bartered away in the slightest degree our country's self-respect or freedom of action even for something which we need so badly."

Indian opinion strongly supports Nehru's view. Every important newspaper published today official and parliamentary reactions to the speech by Mr. Nehru on Sunday in which he expressed a similar view.

FOOD POLICY BEING RESHAPED

According to the newspapers, the general reaction was that the conditions in the United States Senate bill on aid to India were so obnoxious that the Government of India had decided not to rely any longer on 2,000,000 tons of United States grain and that the food importing policy was being recast. A large section of parliamentary opinion, according to reports, favored rejection of American help even if it materialized ultimately.

An official of the Food Ministry said these reports were rather speculative and that Government was not committed to any policy of outright rejection of United States help.

Strong exception has been taken to three conditions in the Senate bill. These would require India to distribute supplies obtained

locally or imported without discrimination as to caste, color, or creed, give full and continuous publicity in India for American assistance and permit unrestricted observation of distribution by Americans.

Officials here expressed the view that all three conditions in the Senate bill were being voluntarily observed, but that writing them into an agreement was objectionable. Meanwhile the food problem has been placed on a "war footing" and is being dealt with by a special Cabinet subcommittee that meets every day.

AIMS AT SELF-SUFFICIENCY

In his broadcast the Prime Minister warned his countrymen of the "dangerous consequences inherent in constant dependance upon outside help for food."

"We have sought help from abroad and we shall continue to do so under pressure of necessity," he said.

"But we can never function with the freedom that we desire if we are always dependent in this matter on others. It is only when we obtain self-sufficiency in food that we can progress and develop our politics."

Famine as it is understood by the people does not exist to any wide extent at this stage, he said, adding, "but the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land." He said he emphasized the need for intensification of internal procurement measures and for starting urgently a number of public works to increase the purchasing power of the poor.

Communist China has agreed to supply India immediately with 50,000 tons more of rice, according to information received from Peiping, an official of the Food Ministry said today. This is the second agreement concluded with China within the last 4 days. Last week it was announced that Peiping had agreed to supply 50,000 tons of milo sorghum grain.

At the same time the Chinese Government has made arrangements to ship the 100,000 tons of grain as speedily as possible and officials here expect consignment by early July—when the crucial period for Sihar starts. Both transactions, officials said, form part of a deal with China for 1,000,000 tons of food grains for which negotiations are being carried on in Peiping.

The Indian Government will shortly resume negotiations with the Soviet Embassy here for 500,000 tons of wheat offered by Moscow in exchange for jute.

Marines Plugged Gap in Allied Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times for May 2, 1951:

MARINES PLUGGED GAP IN ALLIED LINE—RESERVE UNIT RUSHED INTO THE BREACH STAVED OFF DISASTER WHEN CHINESE STRUCK

EUSAN, April 27.—Now it can be told that the Marines staved off disaster when the Chinese ripped a 10-mile gap in the Allied line.

A United States Infantry division held on one side of the gap while the Marines held on the other. And the British Twenty-seventh Brigade absorbed the frontal impact of the break-through drive, and halted it.

But when the Communists unleashed their offensive, it was the Marines who were rushed up.

When the Chinese aimed the Sunday punch of their April 22 offensive at the middle of the Allied line the South Korean Sixth Division collapsed. Through the gap south of Kumwha the Chinese poured units of three full-strength corps toward Kapyong and the Seoul-Chunchon Highway.

THREAT TO BIG PART OF ARMY

Had they reached it they could have sliced southwestward toward Seoul and cut off a big part of the United States Eighth Army or forced it into a hasty and costly retreat. But they failed.

The marines, with the South Koreans on their left, were advancing slowly northwest of Hwachon when the Chinese struck. The South Korean cave-in left the marines with their left flank flapping in the wind.

The first battalion of the First Regiment, which was in reserve, was routed out of sleeping bags in the middle of the night and sped by trucks up the bumpy roads to stem the Chinese onrush.

The first of the first of the first, as the men of the battalion call themselves, pulled up to Horseshoe Ridge late Monday. The advance elements of the Chinese hit before the marines were in position. A little way back down the road the "red devils" of the artillery set up shop.

The Communists struck straight up Horseshoe Ridge, but were beaten back. Then they swirled around the flanks and cut off the battalion. All night the enemy machine guns on higher positions around the ridge raked the hill. Mortars dropped like rain. Sometimes the Chinese wedged into the marine positions. When they did, they died there from marine grenades and pistols and bayonets.

FIRE AT RANGE OF 5 YARDS

After a lull the Chinese attacked again.

"Ready on the left, ready on the right, range 5 yards, commence firing" a marine shouted.

Failing to break through, the Chinese dropped into trenches a few yards in front of the marine positions and threw grenades. The "red devils" fired their 105's point blank at Chinese reinforcements moving up.

Finally the first battalion got orders to break out. The marines loaded their dead and wounded in the jeeps and trailers, and started out. The battalion permitted the Fifth and Seventh Regiments to pull back to safety. Then the first and the two other battalions of the First Regiment took up protective positions to the south along the Chunchon-Hwachon road.

While they were blunting the main drive, the two other regiments fought gradual withdrawals under constant pressure. Later in the week, the marines withdrew toward Chunchon because of the threat to the west and of the line, and to break off contact with the Chinese in order to set up a new defense line.

Repudiate Yalta and Potsdam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin from Human Events:

REPUDIATE YALTA AND POTSDAM

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The private arrangements between the leaders of the Big Three powers are the nearest equivalent of a peace settlement after the Second World War. These arrangements were concluded between Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill at Teheran and Yalta, between Stalin, Truman, and Attlee at Potsdam. And no major peace settlement in recorded history has broken down so completely so fast.

Any American who would advocate today that this country carry out the agreements of Yalta and Potsdam would reveal himself as either a sympathizer with the Kremlin or an incurable ignoramus in foreign affairs. Almost every important decision at these conferences now stands revealed as a major national security risk. We find ourselves in the position, at once tragic and ridiculous, of trying to escape from the trap which we helped to set for ourselves by acquiescing in a peace settlement that was both a denial of all the ideals for which the war was professedly being fought and an abandonment of some very vital considerations of American national security.

There have been many cases when nations endeavored, with more or less success, to escape from the consequences of defeat. The United States for several years now has been presenting a less familiar spectacle: a nation trying to escape from the consequences of a military victory so badly botched and bungled politically that it has been little less disastrous than a defeat. It is a saddening proof of the power of the standardized cliché thinking and unwillingness to consider questions on their factual merits that the legend of Franklin D. Roosevelt as a wise, farsighted statesman should persist, in the face of the visible collapse of the peace settlement on which he staked his political reputation.

It is interesting to consider what our prospects would be in the global struggle, hot and cold, with the Kremlin, if the specific provisions and the spirit of the Yalta-Potsdam agreements continued to dominate our foreign policy. The United Nations, of course, would be completely stymied by the veto power conceded to its charter members.

We should be committed to maintaining the disarmament of Germany and Japan, thereby destroying any chance of creating effective counterweights to Soviet power in Europe and in Asia. We should be obliged to keep the German economy in an unprecedented strait-jacket, with the alternatives of starvation for some and dire poverty for almost all Germans or huge subsidies from America to maintain a tolerable living standard, in view of the restrictions which Potsdam prescribed for German industry and trade.

We should be required to return fugitives to the Soviet Union, thereby ending any possibility of a political and psychological warfare aimed at driving a wedge between the Soviet peoples and their Communist rulers. We should be committed to trying to overthrow the Franco regime in Spain, while accepting as permanent allies the more sanguinary Communist dictatorships in Eastern Europe.

II

The Yalta Conference between Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill took place in this Soviet Crimean resort from February 2 to February 11, 1945. It represented the high-water mark in the Roosevelt administration's policy of trying to get along with Stalin by giving him everything he asked for and throwing in a few additional concessions for good measure. Alger Hiss, the only member of the American delegation at Yalta who received punishment after participating in the signing of an instrument that is at the root of many of America's present difficulties,

must have been satisfied with the results of Yalta.

For the chief of these results was the confirmation of Stalin's domination both of Eastern Europe and of east Asia. Held without the presence of any Polish representative, this conference sanctioned a grotesque mutilation of Poland's natural boundaries. Almost half of Poland's prewar territory and about one-third of the Polish population were transferred to the Soviet Union. Supposedly as compensation Poland was promised substantial additions of German territory, inhabited by a population that was ethnically solidly German.

Although the communiqué which was issued after the end of the Yalta meeting was full of pious professions of respect for the Atlantic Charter, the ideal of national self-determination which is implicit in the first three clauses of the Charter was trampled underfoot. There was no semblance of a free plebiscite of the people concerned about the transfer of Polish territory to the Soviet Union, of German territory to Poland. These unprincipled annexations were accompanied by a mass uprooting of people from their homes—an act of singular inhumanity which will poison the atmosphere of Europe for an indefinite future.

The betrayal of Poland at Yalta was matched by the betrayal of China. Without consulting or even informing any representative of the Chinese Nationalist Government, Roosevelt fatuously bribed Stalin to intervene in the war against Japan by promising that the Soviet Union should receive the Kurile Islands, South Sakhalin, Outer Mongolia, and, most important of all, a preferred position in Manchuria, richest and most industrialized area of China. The Soviet Government was given the naval base of Port Arthur at the southern tip of Manchuria, a right of joint operation of the Manchurian railways, and a special position in the trade of the largest Manchurian port, Dairen. The Russian imperialist position which existed before the Russo-Japanese War was restored.

It was no accident that Manchuria, overrun and occupied by Soviet troops, became the assembly point and main military base for the Chinese Communist conquest of China. One can hardly measure the ultimate prospective cost of this development in American lives and resources.

Yalta authorized the dismemberment of Germany, the use of German slave labor as reparations, and made the United States party to a twentieth-century fugitive-slave act. It was agreed that the United States should undertake to repatriate Soviet citizens in its zone of occupation. For some time this ignoble agreement was carried out and Soviet political refugees were handed back to death and concentration camps.

III

The Potsdam Conference, held from July 17 until August 2, 1945, was a sequel to Yalta in its contempt for the Atlantic Charter and its abandonment of the American interest in an economically stable and viable Europe. It authorized "the transfer to Germany of German populations or elements thereof remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary." This placed a final seal of approval on an operation comparable with the worst Nazi atrocities in its cruelty and its far-reaching disastrous social and economic consequences.

This was the driving from their homes, without compensation or any opportunity to remove their property, of some 14,000,000 Germans and people of German ethnic origin. About two-thirds of these unfortunate human beings lived in the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse frontier line. The others were people of German stock whose ancestors had, for the most part, lived for centuries in the Sudetenland region of Czechoslovakia, in Poland, Hungary, and other countries of eastern and southeastern Europe.

The mass deportations were carried out so brutally that most students of the subject believe that as many as 2,000,000 human beings perished in the process, and, as every visitor to postwar Germany knows, the presence of many millions of embittered, destitute, uprooted people creates a political, economic, and social problem of the first magnitude.

Besides sanctioning these ruthless deportations, the Potsdam Conference drew up an elaborate blueprint for the economic vivisection of Germany. It called for the complete prohibition of many industries in Germany and prescribed arbitrary sharp restrictions on the output of others essential both to the reconstruction of Europe and to Germany's capacity to earn its national livelihood. It authorized the dismantling of many German industrial plants.

While the Potsdam Declaration did not embody all the vengeful folly of the Morgenthau plan, it did create many roadblocks for German recovery, which only started after the decisions of Potsdam in the western zone were scrapped or drastically modified.

IV

There would be several advantages if the Senate, or both Houses of Congress, would pass a resolution formally repudiating both the Yalta and the Potsdam Agreements. There would be every justification for such a step because the Soviet Government has consistently disregarded the pledges (in these declarations) which it found inconvenient to keep.

The Yalta communiqué, for instance, promised "free and unfettered elections in Poland," and it was agreed at Potsdam that Germany should be treated as an economic unit and that democratic parties should be encouraged. But the only national election held in Poland, in 1947, was a fraudulent farce, in the opinion of all the foreign correspondents who witnessed it, except the representatives of Tass, the official Soviet news agency, and the now defunct PM. The Soviet zone from the beginning was sealed off from the rest of Germany, and democratic parties have long been completely suppressed there.

Both Yalta and Potsdam were horrible examples of irresponsible secret diplomacy. Formal repudiation of both these instruments, with their immoral and inexpedient provisions, would be an insurance against any relapse into a policy of appeasement. It would be a tardy atonement to the pro-western Poles. It would give the Germans a much stronger reason for siding decisively with the west by showing that America does not accept the morality or the legality or the finality of the Oder-Neisse frontier. It would be a useful move in the necessary effort to escape from a victory so appallingly misused as to be almost indistinguishable, in some of its consequences, from defeat.

Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s, Recent Nation-Wide Radio Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the following is a tabulation of answers to the 16 questions on Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s, recent Nation-wide radio poll. These answers were received in my office by telegram, letters, and postcards from my constituents in the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois. I am happy to present this tabulation as a part of the RECORD:

1. As of today, would you vote for Harry Truman for President? Yes, 4; no, 1,274.

2. Should President Truman be allowed to continue to receive the $50,000 tax-exempt salary recently voted him by Congress? Yes, 22; no, 1,257.

3. Do you believe that Congress should continue investigations such as the one into RFC loans and the Kefauver crime hearings and extend those investigations into other activities of the Government? Yes, 1,268; no, 12.

4. Are you in favor of keeping Dean Acheson as Secretary of State? Yes, 11; no, 1,264.

5. Do you favor the United Nations being in final control of United States troops in Korea or elsewhere? Yes, 56; no, 1,229.

6. Should Chiang Kai-shek be permitted to send his Nationalist armies against the Chinese Communists? Yes, 1,261; no, 19.

7. Do you feel confident that Europe will fight to the end against communism? Yes, 55; no, 1,222.

8. Do you approve of the proposed continuation of economic, along with military, aid to North Atlantic Pact nations? Yes, 161; no, 1,131.

9. Would you favor a requirement that nations receiving military or economic aid from us must agree to stop trading with Russia, Communist China, or any other iron-curtain country? Yes, 1,266; no, 20.

10. Do you believe President Truman's statement that all Communists and Communist sympathizers have been weeded out of the Government? Yes, 8; no, 1,271.

11. Are you in favor of a permanent peace-time program of universal military training? Yes, 465; no, 805.

12. Do you believe President Truman is making a sincere effort to cut out unnecessary Government spending? Yes, 6; no, 1,272.

13. Should wages be controlled along with prices? Yes, 1,191; no, 92.

14. Should the Government prevent strikes in time of war emergency? Yes, 1,219; no, 58.

15. Are you in favor of calling General MacArthur home for a report to Congress on the far eastern situation? Yes, 1,[illegible]; no, 81.

16. Are you in favor of impeaching President Truman? Yes, 1,256; no, 20.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that my constituents generally are shown to be inherently opposed to the policies of the Truman administration. While this possibly is not an entirely true picture of the sentiments of the people in my congressional district, it does show the thinking of an average constituency at the present time.

So many American citizens have asked for impeachment proceedings to be brought against President Truman and Dean Acheson that I feel obligated to make a few remarks regarding this question.

First, we must consider that impeachment proceedings would be very difficult to accomplish, if not impossible, due to the political composition of the present Congress.

Secondly, if impeachment proceedings were possible against either President Truman or Secretary of State Dean Acheson, would the state of the Nation

be improved by bringing such proceedings? I think not. Even though executive officers are removed from office, we have been shown that the same old deal remains in existence. In some cases where New Dealers have been removed from office, we have gotten more leftish individuals to replace them.

It appears to me that the only way we will ever effect a return to the high standard of government established and promulgated by our forefathers is through each and every citizen exercising his or her right to vote.

Now is the time for every eligible voter in the United States to firmly resolve to use that precious right of suffrage at each opportunity which presents itself in the future.

NATO in Cross-Currents in the Mediterranean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from today's New York Times:

ABROAD—NATO IN CROSS-CURRENTS OF THE MEDITERRANEAN

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The question of Mediterranean defense—who shall command it, how far it will extend—has become a matter of great concern and controversy among the members of the Atlantic coalition. When Foreign Minister Schuman was in this country with President Auriol he complained to Secretary Acheson that France had been left out of British-American discussions of an area in which the French have a paramount interest. The United States, we were politely reminded, should be well aware of the stake of France in the Mediterranean since we depend on her territories in north Africa for air bases.

The British and Americans, in their turn, are arguing about whether the supreme command in the Mediterranean should be given to a Briton or an American. After the uproar over the appointment of an American to the Atlantic command it was thought that the southern post would go to a British admiral. But a great many other claims and considerations must be weighed before the choice is made. The nations living in the Mediterranean—France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, not to mention Spain—are factors in a problem even more complex than the North Atlantic organization.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The decision on the Mediterranean command hangs on many unanswered questions: Shall the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which already takes in two Mediterranean powers, France and Italy, be extended to the whole area? Or shall it be supplemented by a Mediterranean Pact, linked to NATO by an over-all strategic plan? Yugoslavia wants aid, and in addition to grants for military materials is about to have her budget deficit underwritten by the United States, Britain, and France. But Tito is dead set against joining any alliance. Turkey and Greece, on the contrary, strongly desire to be admitted into NATO. They know they have armies stronger than those of many western nations to contribute to the defense of Europe, and they are dissatisfied to have no voice in strategic decisions they are expected to carry out.

One thing is beyond question: "No war with Russia could be won," says the London Economist, "without the Western Powers controlling the Mediterranean." As soon as the strategists began to plan on a practical basis it was inevitable that they should recognize that defense on the Elbe or the Rhine is another Maginot line unless a strong guard is placed on the Mediterranean flank.

At present Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia have the strongest forces in being this side of the iron curtain. The Turks argue, with reason, that Russia would not invade their country merely to subdue Turkey or control the Dardanelles. The strait, they point out, is merely an entrance to another sea as closed and landlocked as the Black Sea. Thus, since an attack on Turkey would be an overt move in the war for the world, the Turks must be regarded as front-line soldiers and treated as part of the general defense force. Both Turkey and Greece are convinced they should be in NATO, and the opposition to their inclusion they attribute to Western Powers who fear they will receive less military aid if the arms are spread too thin.

These fears, if they exist, touch the heart of the western dilemma. Foreign critics of our racing productivity in arms protest that it is eating up raw materials to the detriment of the production systems of our allies. Critics at home of our "extravagant" build-up of NATO demand more men, supplies, and arms for the Asiatic front. Both sets of critics want the impossible—more delivered at different places, with less dislocation of the normal economy.

But if the United States is speeding production, perhaps too regardless of the economic consequences to other nations, it is because there is not enough military equipment to go around and the front is too long to be covered by any available force. To distribute guns and planes and tanks as widely and quickly as possible, they have to be produced as rapidly as possible.

A POSSIBLE SOLUTION

The best way to create a global defense against a global danger is to organize all free peoples into a common front against Soviet aggression. This is what the United Nations tries to do, but cannot do effectively while the aggressor is a member. The alternative is a regional defense system like NATO, which is already so important that its first problem is whether to limit or widen its scope. The question raised by the powers in the eastern Mediterranean—powers directly on the line of march and actually better prepared to fight than their western neighbors—is hard to answer. It is evident that the defense of Europe depends on the Mediterranean as well as the Atlantic States. But what of the weak and imperiled nations of the Middle East? Would they have to be included, too?

One solution of the immediate problem would be to set up two Mediterranean commands and to form a Mediterranean pact closely associated with the Atlantic Pact under an over-all board of strategy. It goes without saying, in any case, that the tough and willing soldiers of Greece and Turkey should receive their full share of arms and that their leaders should participate in planning on the top level. As the difficulties and complexities of integrating a multinational defense effort emerge into the light of day we begin to see that NATO is only the core of an economic, political, geographical, and moral structure of measureless dimensions.

A Call to Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A CALL TO PATRIOTS

Americanism.

People who have forgotten what real Americanism is have rediscovered it with an almost holy frenzy since the return of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to this country.

For General MacArthur speaks in the style of the old-time orators; he speaks in the American way, with a genuine and sincere Americanism as the basis of his talks.

Since the inception of the New Deal in 1932 and its subsequent and continuing interest in foreign affairs, Americans have, by and large, forgotten what a proud thing it is to be an American.

We have all of us become, to a greater or lesser extent, internationalists. Our thinking has been tinctured with considerations of England, and Russia, and France, and China, and Italy, and Germany. How will Argentina react? What will Tito think? Will this irritate the Kremlin?

Now comes a man onto the stage of American life with the strides of a giant, and he brings Americanism back to us. He who has been away from this Nation for 14 years comes home and gives us elementary lessons in American patriotism. He tells us things we never should have forgotten. He explains for us the American point of view—a point of view that we have had colored with the dim and uncertain light of internationalism for lo, these many years.

General MacArthur is so obviously right that we, the people, are surprised that we did not see the world the clear way he sees it, for so many years. For he looks at it simply, as an American.

These are Americans fighting and dying in Korea, he reminds us. The other nations with token forces are willing to let the Korean war continue its indecisive way—but who is paying the heavy penalty, the terrible price? Americans are. We are paying in the lives of our young men, in crushing tax burdens, in a disrupted civilian economy.

Americans, decide what is best for America—and then let your Government know that that is what you want done. This is the message brought home by General MacArthur.

He has reminded us that thinking of America first is not treazon to the rest of the world. He has reminded us that as Americans we have a glorious heritage of freedom and independence which we must retain. He has reminded us that when Americans are dying in a war being fought by American men and with American dollars, it is up to America to decide how that war shall be terminated.

He has reminded us that our first duty is to our country, our country—not the rest of the world.

He shouldn't have had to remind us of these things. We should have remembered them and kept them alive and shining in our national life.

But as a result of General MacArthur's return, as a result of his recalling us to our native Americanism, there has been a tremendous reawakening of the American

spirit; of the American tradition; of the American ideal; of Americanism.

General MacArthur has done his country the greatest service within his power. He has awakened it to its own glory.

Sinclair Weeks Sees MacArthur in "Sacrifice Bunt" for United States Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an article by Sinclair Weeks which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald of April 15, 1951:

SINCLAIR WEEKS SEES MACARTHUR IN "SACRIFICE BUNT" FOR UNITED STATES GOOD

(By W. E. Playfair)

President Truman's action in "firing" General MacArthur has given Russian communism a big boost—for the moment.

But the removal by the President of the man who knows the most about the Far East problems may have collateral benefits in that it may force the development of a policy with respect to Asia "that makes some sense." It may thus have a boomerang effect on Truman.

This is the opinion of former United States Senator Sinclair Weeks, who makes the suggestion that MacArthur may have made a "sacrifice bunt" for the good of the Nation.

CALCULATED RISK

"I believe it possible," he says, "that the General, wiser than most men, particularly insofar as the Far East is concerned, may very well have taken a calculated risk to the end that this country and the American boys fighting and dying in Korea might still have a chance."

"As far as the actual removal of MacArthur is concerned," Weeks says, "no one questions the right of the President of the United States to remove a general officer from his command. But it seems to me that people who stop here miss the point.

"As president of a business organization I can discharge half my vice presidents, but if I take such action capriciously I am not doing the company, its owners, or employees any good. And my hasty, ill-considered action must be taken into account when any judgment is formed as to my own capacity. So we must look at President Truman's action with respect to all its implications.

"When you consider the power vested in the Commander in Chief, you have to admit that possibly MacArthur, having strong views and deep-seated convictions on the Far East problem, might have done better to hand in his resignation, and come home to express these. Presumably he will do that now, anyway.

"But, in the meantime, great damage has been done to American prestige and the boys on the firing line in Korea have not been and are not now being, well served.

SEES NO COMPARISON

"Some people have, and I think thoughtlessly, compared the removal of MacArthur with that of McClellan by Lincoln. There is no comparison. MacArthur was in no sense a field general. To be sure, he was charged with responsibility for the Korean operation, but in essence he was a great pro-consul, the administrator of the former Japanese Empire, concerned with matters of high policy and over-all strategy, concerned most of all with arresting the progress of communism in Asia.

"And what a job he has done. We have spent billions to build up Europe to stop the advance of communism in the west. MacArthur had only a fraction of that amount, yet he arrested communism in Japan, and he would have done so in China had his views been taken into consideration."

At no time in history, Weeks says, has a commander faced a task such as has confronted MacArthur and his field commanders, Walker and Ridgway, in Korea.

REDS UNIMPEDED

"When before," he asks, "have any military operations been conducted in such a manner that your enemy has been given free play to bring up men, material, ammunition, and supplies without any sort of interference until he had crossed a certain line?

"How many American boys have been killed or wounded because the Truman-Acheson leadership has forced them to fight a powerful enemy with one hand tied behind their backs?

"And how much longer are we to carry on the fiction that we are not at war with Communist China? The 9,000 dead, 60,000 wounded, and the 250,000 Americans still fighting in Korea—these are on-the-ground witnesses. Who do they think they are fighting if not Communist China, and they are fighting with two strikes on them and in a manner in which no troops were ever before asked to do battle."

SOCIALISTS AT WORK

I have suggested that the Russian Communists must be very happy over this incident. MacArthur's official body was hardly cold before our Socialist friends in Great Britain proposed that Communist Russia be brought in to help negotiate the peace treaty with Japan, and proposed that Formosa be handed over to Mao—while 13,000 of their fellow countrymen are fighting in Korea.

"How must the British soldier feel standing up to the hordes of Chinese Communists thrown at him and witnessing the spectacle of his government playing on the side of the enemy?"

Weeks does not agree with MacArthur's detractors, who charge that he deliberately disobeyed orders. His view is that MacArthur obeyed orders "but put on them his own interpretation as to their effect." If the entire incident results "at long last" in a constructive approach to the Far East problem, it may be a blessing in disguise.

"Meantime," Weeks says, "I deplore any political approach to this incident, this tragic result of the mishandling of a situation which never should have been allowed to come to such a stage. This is of truly national concern and of very vital interest to every American, regardless of party."

Communication From Naval Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of this House, and particularly those who have served in the Armed Forces, will read the naval communication printed below. If you had received such a notice, would you not believe you were no longer associated with the Organized Naval Reserve, active or inactive?

The sailor was recalled in September 1950 and has been unsuccessful in his attempt to receive another discharge. His wife, two children, and mother-in-law who depend on him for support are very confused. Can you blame them?

UNITED STATES NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER,
Akron, Ohio, June 20, 1950.

From commanding officer, Division 9-15.
To Reinhart Klingenstein, Akron, Ohio.
Subject: Naval Reserve clothing issue; return of.
References: (a) BuPers Manual, article H-8706; (b) NRMAL No. 5-50 of January 6, 1950.
Enclosures: (1) Clothing list; (2) page 9 entry.

1. Your association with the Organized Naval Reserve is being terminated for non-attendance at drills.

2. By authority of references (a) and (b), you are hereby informed that you are required to return to this activity all Government property now in your possession. Enclosure (1) indicates the Government property in your possession.

3. You are hereby ordered to return said property or its monetary value to this activity at once. Your attention is called to enclosure (2), which is a copy of the page 9 entry to be made in your record (by authority of reference 2), should you fail to comply with this letter.

J. M. GERARLO,
Lieutenant Commander, Commanding Officer, Org. Surf. Division 9-15.

A. Lincoln and H. Truman—Two Views on Bossing Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an interesting article by Mr. Leslie Gould, comparing President Lincoln's high respect for the dignity of the courts with President Truman's flouting of them.

Comparisons are always odious, and this comparison is odious to our present Chief Executive.

[From the New York Journal-American of April 30, 1951]

A. LINCOLN AND H. TRUMAN—TWO VIEWS ON BOSSING COURTS

(By Leslie Gould)

Here's the way two Presidents of the United States have acted when asked to exert the power of their office to overrule decisions of the courts. Abraham Lincoln and Harry Truman.

Lincoln's views were expressed in a letter involving a court decision on California land titles. He wrote on June 1, 1863:

"I must repeat now in writing what I have told Mr. (George Fox) Kelly (agent for California settlers) verbally, that the courts, and not the President, must decide questions of land titles.

"There may be some questions in regard to preemptions, which, by law, are to be decided through the Department, with appeal to me, and when such a case shall come regularly to me, I shall hear it. But I must now say, once and for all, that mere vague assertions that the decisions of the courts are fraudulent, with appeals to me to reverse them, cannot be entertained.

"A. LINCOLN."

Now, we come down to the present and Harry Truman. The courts have ruled stock control of the former Dollar Line, turned over to the Maritime Commission at the time of a $7,500,000 loan, was only pledged and should be returned to the former owners—the Stanley Dollar interests—since the loan has been repaid with interest.

The Supreme Court has refused to review this decision, which in effect affirms the lower court position—that the stock belongs to Stanley Dollar.

Instead of accepting this decision of the courts Harry Truman wrote his Secretary of Commerce, Charles Sawyer:

"Accordingly, you are directed to continue to hold this stock on behalf of the United States. All appropriate action should be taken to assert and maintain the Government's rights as owner of this stock.

"Very sincerely yours,

"HARRY TRUMAN."

For defying the court, as directed by the President, Secretary Sawyer, some of his subordinates and attorneys in the Justice Department are facing contempt citations.

Charles Eberstadt, who specializes in old and rare books with his brother, Lindley, sent this reporter the Lincoln quotations, saying:

"The answer of Abraham Lincoln to this question (a President's right to overrule the courts) is so forthright and truly American in spirit that I am happy to give you permission to print it in full if you should wish to do so."

Interior Department Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, May 1, when I was addressing this body in regard to the Gary amendment which strikes out the appropriation to build a transmission power line between Buggs Island Dam and Langley Field, I quoted certain statements made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] when he addressed this body on April 24. Inadvertently, there was left out of the RECORD one statement which was made by the gentleman from Virginia. The statement is on page 4400 of the RECORD of April 24, 1951, and is as follows:

Mr. GARY. Well, I made a proposition right here on the floor that has never been made and that is that the company will accept the cheapest contract that is in existence in the entire United States that has been approved by the United States Government.

This statement was made during Mr. GARY's discussion of his amendment and was an assurance to the Members of this body that VEPCO would wheel power from Buggs Island Dam in accordance with his statement above and I knew that the Members would want to know this before voting on this bill and I want to have this statement of Mr. GARY's called to their attention again before voting on the bill now up for consideration.

Keep Our Party System As Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a speech I delivered over radio station WHAS, Louisville, Ky., last Sunday night:

KEEP OUR PARTY SYSTEM AS IS

I am very grateful for this opportunity to discuss a most timely question. Ever since the beginning of our country's history, the problem of political parties has been with us. George Washington disliked the entire idea. He believed that partisanship was dangerous. There have been others who shared his views. But the political system grew up in our country because it is a vital part of any free republic. We must have strong political parties because we must have a vigorous opposition in any free society. The only way to crystallize this kind of opposition is through well-organized criticism. The constant knowledge that national leadership is always subject to change prevents tyranny and protects freedom.

I am sure that all Americas agree to these fundamentals. But ever since 1948 there has been a great deal of talk about realining our political system. When the Dixiecrats took their walk out of the Democratic Party, there were loud cries of fear. Many folks believed that this defection would lead to the possibility of electing a minority President, at that time or in the future. We have had many third-party movements before. In fact, we have had elections with many more than three parties on the ballot in a large number of States. But by and large, there have been only two parties of importance since the first election in our history.

If we go about the process of realining our political parties, it would probably be along the line of a so-called conservative and a so-called liberal division. Nothing would be worse for the country. In the first place, we would be involved in an unrealistic and meaningless quarrel over definitions. Who are liberals? Who are conservatives? Are the left-wingers who want our Government to take over and run everything liberals? They like to call themselves by this name, but there are many of us who regard every extension of Government authority into private fields as an approach to the same forms of tyrannical government that our ancestors came here to escape. And what do we mean by conservative? There are people in both political parties who regard themselves as seeking to conserve the American tradition. Others label the same folks by other names, and not all of them are friendly.

As our political parties are established today, there is room inside each of them for disagreement. I regard this disagreement as healthy. It is true that now and then we grow confused because we do not share completely the views of our fellow Republicans or our fellow Democrats, but it is a healthy form of intellectual confusion. Inside the Democratic Party there are men whose ideas vary tremendously on everything from civil rights to foreign policy. We have similar variations in the Republican Party. But it is just this kind of flexibility within the political organization that makes it possible for our Government to govern.

If we had completely opposite points of view, whenever we had a change of administration, we would be staging a revolution. Nothing would be more disastrous. In the long run, a realinement of our parties would lead inevitably to the same kind of splinter parties that have made stable government almost impossible in France. For there would be hundreds of thousands of Americans who could not find their views represented by either a right-wing or a left-wing group. They would not be able to resist the temptation to form shaded organizations to speak for themselves. Today they find it possible to join within the Republican or Democratic Parties in an effort to influence the decisions of these major organizations. I believe that this is good for the country.

We have seen how this works in practice. Basically, each political party is a temporary coalition of many different viewpoints. In 1948, the Republican Party named as its candidate the man regarded as most capable of welding their coalition into a victorious unit. The Democrats, torn by conflicts inside their organization, did the same. We lost; they won. But in each case it was a blending of opinions. Not everyone was satisfied with the choice at either convention. But the choices were in each case a compromise of many conflicting viewpoints.

This represents our form of political organization and our form of government at its best. The two-party system as we know it is a flexible, workable device. Far from being a liability, its ability to absorb many viewpoints is an asset.

When we look back over the history of our country, we see that time after time, the political parties have adopted views which would have been regarded as unthinkable only a generation earlier. This kind of adaptability would be retarded by any effort to reshape the parties.

At this stage in world affairs, I say, "Don't start rocking the boat." If we think there is confusion now, imagine what would happen if we began to play games with our political organizations.

We have had the world's most effective Government because responsibility has been easy to fix in a two-party system. If we begin to monkey with the machinery, we run the risk of dumping the passengers into the drink.

Let's keep the Democratic mule and the Republican elephant. They may be stubborn; they may never forget; but they've pulled us out of many a world crisis. I'm for keeping them in harness. They sometimes get out of the traces, but they're good and strong and they're pulling our way.

Medal of Freedom Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Claire Phillips, the second woman in the United States to be awarded a Medal of Freedom, is a resident of my congressional district. She is now visiting Washington for the first time to attend the premiere of the picture based on her experiences in World War II and upon her book, Manila Espionage.

I include as a part of these remarks an article which appeared in the Evening Star, May 1, discussing Mrs. Phillips' record of outstanding achievements in behalf of our country during World War II. The article follows:

WOMAN, ONCE DOOMED AS SPY, SPENT $50,000 IN PRISON AID

Claire Phillips, World War II American spy, hopes Congress and the Supreme Court will reimburse her for $50,000 she spent in medicine and food for American prisoners in the Philippines. Meantime, she has been selling cosmetics door to door to make a living.

The former spy, who used her theatrical background to good advantage to get information from high Japanese officials in Manila, was rescued by American forces after she had been condemned to death.

When she arrived in Washington yesterday, she had her first reunion with Lt. Col. Charles C. Young, who carried Mrs. Phillips, too weak to walk, out of the Japanese prison in Manila.

At that time Colonel Young was with the First Brigade Cavalry Division. He now is Chairman of the Board of Review in the Judge Advocate General's office.

Mrs. Phillips posed as an Italian national and operated a night club patronized by Japanese officers. She sent information out to guerrilla and American forces, and smuggled food and medicine to American prisoners.

This is her first visit to Washington, and she said she plans to appeal personally to Congress for reimbursement for the money she spent. She has written a book, Manila Espionage. The premiere of a movie based on her experiences is scheduled at Keith's Theater May 16.

Mrs. Phillips is a native of Portland, Oreg. She is the second woman in the United States to be awarded the Medal of Freedom, presented for her spy work in the Philippines. Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Defense Secretary, was the first.

Cheap Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is currently considering a rule for H. R. 3293—the migratory agricultural labor bill—the House will be called upon to consider this legislation soon. This problem of migratory farm workers is the most pressing domestic social problem in the United States. I urge the Members of the House to secure copies of the recently published report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor by calling the White House and also to read this editorial from the Washington Post of today:

CHEAP FARM LABOR

The Senate is now about ready, after 3 days of debate, to come to a vote on Senator ELLENDER's bill for the recruitment and admission to the United States of Mexican agricultural workers. The bill was framed and studied by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry before the recently issued report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor became available. It ignores, or flouts, the most important recommendations of that Commission. Indeed, Senator ELLENDER's bill, if enacted, would serve merely to perpetuate shocking conditions in the agriculture of the Southwest that do grave injury to American and to Mexican farm laborers alike. Senators CHAVEZ, HUMPHREY, and LEHMAN have rendered valuable service in exposing the evils and inadequacies of this legislation. We hope that the amendments they have urged will prevail.

Senator CHAVEZ's action on the measure merits special commendation. Many of the big growers in his home State of New Mexico want to see it enacted without any changes—because they want the Mexican peons who can be brought in under contract to harvest crops and then sent back where they came from. The justification for bringing them in is that an adequate supply of American farm workers is not available. But the fact is, as the President's Commission made clear, that there are plenty of domestic workers available if the growers would only give them decent wages and decent working conditions. The importation of poverty-stricken Mexican peons in years past has operated to drive down farm wages and to reduce a million American farm workers to a state of homeless, rootless migrancy.

The Mexican Government now insists—altogether properly, in our judgment—that certain minimum conditions be met by the growers for the care of contract workers brought in from Mexico. Equivalent conditions, and priority in consideration, should be given to domestic workers. In addition to this, responsibility for determining whether foreign workers are actually needed should be vested directly in the Secretary of Labor and not left to the discretion of State and regional directors of employment security; the latter are simply too susceptible to the pressure of the big growers. And, finally, there ought to be a stringent prohibition against the employment of so-called wetbacks—Mexicans who came into the country illegally. Without such safeguards, the Ellender bill would serve, as Senator CHAVEZ charged, to "bring back the things which Lincoln did away with" and to "bring about peonage in my State and in certain other areas of the United States."

The demand that such safeguards be included in the bill implies no hostility to Mexican immigrants and no desire to keep American growers from obtaining all the labor they need. But the misery of the Mexicans must no longer be exploited to the disadvantage of themselves and of hungry workers on this side of the border.

America's International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the South Central Business Association, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., April 24, 1951:

Amidst the tumult and shouting on the Potomac, the outpouring of the spirit that General MacArthur has inspired from the mountains to the seas, the powerful presentation he made of a specific determined policy for America, the unescapable fact remains that the decision is not in our hands alone.

The first step in the solution of the problems confronting us is the selling of our partners in the United Nations—and now particularly Great Britain—on the full dimensions of the issues involved. We are in a situation where the action, if it is strong, must be concerted.

In the First World War, Woodrow Wilson had a definite end in view in developing the League of Nations.

Ultimately his objective was destroyed because Great Britain believed it was still possible to go it alone and to maintain the British Empire by her traditional balance-of-power diplomacy—when she no longer had the power to exert the balance.

The outstanding example of that was Great Britain's neutral position when Japan seized Manchuria in 1931. The League of Nations branded Japan an aggressor. President Hoover was willing to support the League by joining in imposing economic sanctions. Great Britain refused to join up in any attempt to give validity to the first great challenge to collective security in maintaining peace in the world. As a result the League of Nations failed to follow up its resolution branding Japan as the aggressor by imposing economic sanctions and thereby laid the ground work for World War II.

History is repeating itself with the British Foreign Minister Morrison's statement urging unconditional surrender to the Red Chinese after the United Nations had branded them as the aggressor. Only this time instead of the Japanese killing Chinese in Manchuria the Red Chinese are killing American soldiers in Korea.

As long as Foreign Minister Morrison's statement stands uncorrected by Prime Minister Attlee, the British Government is in the position of giving aid and comfort to our enemies to continue the fight in the belief that in the end they can win.

By his statement the Foreign Minister has made a negotiated peace more difficult. Instead of enhancing the prospect of peace, Minister Morrison has enhanced the spread of war.

I can't believe that Minister Morrison reflects the true views of the British people in proposing unconditional surrender in Korea. After all, because the Foreign Minister went haywire, we ought not to brand a whole people as stupid. I believe the worst thing that could happen to the free peoples of the world would be a complete split between England and America.

Certainly the English—who have had one tragic experience with the results of appeasement in 1931—on the record will realize the dangers inherent in such a policy.

In World War II, Franklin Roosevelt did not have a well-defined end in view. As a result the only victor was Russia.

I see very little evidence of thinking ahead of the Korean war. No one knows what our foreign policy is—except it is to marshal the free peoples of the world in stopping aggression wherever that occurs. But the national administration is not doing a good job of selling that policy either at home or abroad.

The United Nations' army in Korea—composed almost entirely of Americans—under the military genius of General MacArthur—has twice fought its way back to the thirty-eighth parallel.

While that army—outnumbered 4 or 5 to 1—was winning victory after victory on the field of battle—our State Department was losing round after round to the Kremlin.

I applauded the President's courage in deciding to stop the Red aggression in Korea.

Although I pointed out that he had practically invited the Communist invasion by his previous statements and those of the

Secretary of State that Korea was beyond our defense perimeter.

As I have repeatedly said, I believe he was right in reversing himself in stopping the evil of aggression where it broke out again. I believe that with vigorous and prompt support from the United Nations it will save the world from a third world war. But we must have that support.

British Foreign Minister Morrison's proposal for unconditional surrender to the Red Chinese completely and fundamentally changes the international situation—if that is to be the policy of Great Britain. That has to be cleared up forthwith. It is not enough for our State Department to announce our disagreement with the British. We must know if Minister Morrison has stated their future policy.

We are at the present time going it too much alone. We are being stabbed in the back by our fearful friends desiring a temporary profit at our expense.

We are confronted with the serious fact that other members of the United Nations—besides England—are too much in sympathy with the Red Chinese.

We are confronted with the tragic fact that our supposedly allies in the United Nations are making profits hand over fist supplying the Communist satellites with rubber, steel, and petroleum, while accepting from America economic and military gifts.

They are playing the old game of both ends against the middle and we are in the middle.

The United Nations refuses to act on the economic sanctions resolution thus making its action branding the Red Chinese as the aggressor a mere gesture—as did the League of Nations in the case of Japan in 1931.

But that does not mean that the United Nations should be abandoned as a complete failure.

It means that we have a problem there in public relations. It is the same problem in its essence that the President has with his fellow citizens—or a governor has with the people of this State—or the leaders of the countries making up the United Nations have with the peoples of their countries—most of whom, after all, are in a more exposed position than we are.

The United Nations in theory was in the nature of a partnership to maintain peace. The fact that it is not working out that way does not mean we should break up the partnership.

It does mean that we have got to do a better job in public relations.

I said last July:

"The President might well consider setting up a bipartisan policy advisory committee—with real Republican representation from the Congress—to draft a statement of our over-all, long-range foreign policy. The trouble is that a large part of the world does not understand what we are trying to do—and that is equally true of American citizens."

We have assumed the role the Soviet spokesmen were playing in the United Nations was obstruction.

It is time to wake up that it is more than that. Partly because of the skill of the Soviet representatives in the United Nations and partly because of the ineptness of our Secretary of State and our representatives in the United Nations, the Soviet has gained a sympathetic ear in many free countries—among people not yet lined up—to its fantastic plea that America is the real aggressor by interfering in a civil war in Korea.

I know of only one way to judge a man in any line of endeavor and that is by the results.

No one can deny that under Secretary of State Acheson's political leadership, the Soviet has been steadily gaining in support from non-Communist sources for its grotesque arguments that America does not want a diplomatic settlement in Korea or elsewhere—but is working for a show-down with Russia in world war III.

America has consistently lost in the diplomatic area under the inept leadership of Secretary of State Acheson.

To the peoples of the world, the firing of General MacArthur had a greater range of significance than it did to the American people.

The world put two interpretations on General MacArthur's dismissal.

1. It meant that we were going to concentrate all our strength in defense of Europe.

2. It remained for British Foreign Minister Morrison to "let the cat out of the bag." He interpreted the President's sudden move as meaning at last we were ready to publicly accept the British policy of unconditional surrender in Korea.

Coming in the midst of the furor following General MacArthur's dismissal, Foreign Minister Morrison's proposal was most disturbing. He said that peace should be made in Korea based on the admission of the Red Chinese to the United Nations—that the Red Chinese participate in the writing of the peace treaty with Japan—and that we turn Formosa over to the Red Chinese. Our State Department disavowed the Foreign Minister's sensational proposal. But that does not go far enough or deep enough. If Minister Morrison's statement stands, it would be unrealistic to ignore its dangerous implications.

Heretofore England has refused to endorse our decision to defend Formosa. But she has carefully avoided an open split with America over that issue.

But now there is an open break between the American and English Governments.

Despite the immense sacrifices we are making, the unescapable fact is the political situation is progressively worsening.

All this makes the dissension over troops to Europe just a beginning of the great debate over our foreign policies instead of the end.

We must realize that, like it or not, America's international policy will, in the end, be determined by the support or nonsupport their receive from other countries. For the first time in all our experience we have got to "sell" not only our policies but ourselves to other peoples. That is a new situation for America. The quicker we all understand it, the better it will be for us.

To understand our situation involves some knowledge of the theories which the Stalinists use in determining their foreign policies.

In the first place they are following the ideas and policies of Lenin and the Communist International on tactics for world conquest.

When Lenin realized that he could not overcome without force the resistance to bolshevism in Western Europe, he turned attention to the Far East and the colonial countries of the Near East and Africa.

He decided that the free countries could best be undermined by attacking their weakest link—the colonies—by exploiting the racial and national aspirations of peoples.

He believed that once the rulers of the Kremlin succeeded in gaining control of the millions who inhabit Asia, the world would be ripe for conquest.

The rulers of Russia have closely followed that international policy.

The conquest of China by the Communists is, therefore, a factor of the greatest magnitude to all the peoples of the world.

We share responsibility, as do other countries, for the success of the Stalinists in China.

Our failures in Asia have piled up and threaten us now because those responsible for American policies were ignorant of, or ignored, the universal nature of communism, and minimized the outlook and objectives of the Kremlin rulers.

The Kremlin rejects the ethical and legal codes we believe in. The rulers of the Soviet repeatedly have said that war between their system and the free peoples of the world is inevitable.

The rulers of the Kremlin, therefore, have kept Russia on a war footing ever since they seized power.

In other words, the Stalinists think they know where they are headed; while in the United Nations there is disunity, friction, and no singleness of purpose.

The Stalinists boast that that situation tips the scale in favor of their eventual victory.

To accept the inevitable failure of the United Nations is to accept the Stalinists' views. If we do that, it would be like walking off the field and allowing the game to go by default.

The free peoples of the world are too much inclined to accept the Stalinists propaganda that in their camp alone is unity and singleness of purpose.

As a matter of fact, the Stalinists fundamentally are more divided than the free peoples of the world. The annual "purges"—a soft word for murder and assassination—are the proof of the greatest opposition to the rulers of the Kremlin within their satellite countries, and even Russia itself.

The rulers of the Kremlin may know where they are headed. But they are having great difficulty in persuading a lot of the people in their areas to follow them.

Disunity among the free peoples of the world does not begin to approach such magnitude that it must be suppressed by slave camps and the assassin—which are the bases of Stalin-the-cruel rule.

I repeat what I have said elsewhere—that by reason of the great difficulties both of material and disunity, Stalin is not in a position to wage an all-out world war against a united free peoples of the world headed by such a formidable foe as the United States of America. It is too much of a gamble at this time. They hope to cash in on their efforts to weaken the opposition by division.

The policy of communism is built on gaining by fishing in muddy waters.

The Stalinists are past masters in the art of economic and psychological warfare.

Stalin hopes to win by attrition. But also he hopes to make us pick the field of decision now. Then he can make his plans accordingly.

I believe it is a great mistake to give too much emphasis to either Asia or Europe as the seat of the vital fight—when it's global. Of course, as of today, it is Asia, for the simple reason that is where the first armed aggression on a large scale has occurred since the organization of the United Nations.

I do not believe the pending full-scale investigation by the congressional committees of our military policies should mean that even in executive sessions—which are never secret—the general staff officers should be expected to telegraph—as it were—their punch to the enemy by revealing all their military plans.

In conclusion, I quote once more from my July speech:

"Cooperation for the sake of the Nation is a two-way street. As our national leader, the President should initiate it. In this critical world situation he should call the Republican leaders in for consultation, not after a policy is decided but as a cogent factor in its decision."

I do not believe the President is doing a good job of setting the right example. I believe there is too much ham acting by both Republican and Democratic leaders.

We need desperately by those in high authority just plain common patriotism—the kind of patriotism of our boys in Korea.

You can call that trite and sappy if you want to. This—if ever—is a time when genuine, unselfish, farsighted leadership is desperately needed.

The American people yearn for a resurgence of the faith of their fathers in government—by men of integrity and principle who, like MacArthur, are willing to be thrown on the junkpile for their convictions.

Bombing of Manchurian Air Bases Has Always Been Contemplated in the Event of Use of Enemy Air Power From Those Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an article entitled "China Bomb 'Trigger' Set—JCS To Act if Necessary," from the Christian Science Monitor of April 26, 1951, which makes clear that the bombing of Manchurian air bases "always has been contemplated under several possible contingencies, one of which would be the use of enemy air power from those bases against United Nations ground troops":

CHINA BOMB "TRIGGER" SET—JCS TO ACT IF NECESSARY

WASHINGTON.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal does not rule out the bombing of enemy air bases in Manchuria under several possible contingencies which might develop in Korea.

On the contrary, the bombing of such bases always has been contemplated under several possible contingencies one of which would be the use of enemy air power from those bases against United Nations ground troops.

There are other possible circumstances which would cause the United States to change "the ground rules" now operating by tacit agreement of both sides in the Korean War. Under those tacit rules the UN air forces do not bomb beyond the Yalu River and the Chinese do not bomb Allied troop concentration, Allied supply lines, or Allied air bases.

ENEMY MUST CHOOSE

That the door is open to such a change in the ground rules is something the Government here, particularly the military high command, wants everyone to understand fully. That is the reason why President Truman was asked to read at his April 26 press conference a paragraph taken from his own radio speech of April 11. The paragraph reads:

"The Communist side must now choose its course of action. The Communist rulers may press the attack against us. They may take further action which will spread the conflict. They have that choice, and with it the awful responsibility for what may follow. The Communists also have the choice of a peaceful settlement which could lead to a general relaxation of tensions in the Far East. The decision is theirs, because the forces of the United Nations will strive to limit the conflict if possible."

The most important phrase in the above paragraph is "if possible."

So long as it is "possible" the United States Government has no intention of taking any steps which would expand the war in Korea. But there could come a time when a number of different events would combine to make it no longer "possible" for this Government to exercise the restraint which it has shown to date.

READY TO RETALIATE

It is axiomatic, and has been so all along, that enemy bombing of our bases in Korea, Japan, and Okinawa would bring immediate retaliation against Chinese air bases in Manchuria. The same goes for the safety of our troops. Until the present there has been no significant enemy air attack on our ground forces. If at any moment the enemy does use his air power against our ground forces, the retaliation would follow automatically.

One of the causes of friction with General MacArthur was that the general was not given the power of discretion to decide at what moment the ground rules had changed. Washington always insisted on keeping the trigger here. It would be pulled under certain conditions, but the Pentagon reserved the right to do the pulling.

The general had asked for authority to make such decisions himself in February. It is known now that on February 28 the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff gave him detailed instructions governing his actions which specifically reserved to Washington the power of final decision on any extension of hostilities. He was told precisely what type of defensive action he would take under every conceivable set of circumstances. After taking such defensive action, he was to report to Washington. The JCS then would tell him what to do.

LIMIT TO RESTRAINT

The phrase "if possible" is bounded by circumstances other than just enemy air action against our forces in Korea. The details are secret. The Pentagon has no intention of telling the enemy the conditions under which certain measures might be taken. But it can be surmised that one of the limits on American restraint is time.

There is a major offensive under way now against our troops. This is the third time the Chinese Communists have put large forces into battle in Korea. This is the third time that the United States has met Chinese Communist intervention without striking back at China directly. The purpose of restraint is to avoid expanding the war. But there comes a time when the repetition of such enemy action becomes intolerable.

The American Government could not possibly resist the pressure of public opinion for retaliation if the process were to continue indefinitely. The Chinese Communists should understand that this third major offensive of theirs is probably the last that will take place under the present ground rules. At the end of this one there must either be a peaceful settlement of the Korean problem or the scope of the war will of necessity expand.

A Saint on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an extremely interesting and learned article bearing the provocative title "A Saint on Capitol Hill." This article was written by Brother Leonard Farina and was published in the Lamp, November 1950.

Brother Leonard is now studying at the Catholic University and is a member of the Society of the Atonement. The article follows:

A SAINT ON CAPITOL HILL?

(By Leonard Farina, S. A.)

In Statuary Hall of the Nation's Capitol there stands a bronze statue of a Franciscan friar, Junipero Serra. Of all the excellent monuments in that impressive hall, there is none more eloquent than that of the fiery little apostle of California. The sculptor, Ettore Cadorin, captured the all-consuming spirit of the missionary in this bronze life-size work. In one quick glance, Serra's life and works are exposed. Firmly grasped in his right hand, raised as in peaceful benediction, is a rough wooden cross, his guide and his light; gently cradled in his left hand is a miniature of the Mission San Carlos Borromeo, his headquarters and final resting place. To both Catholics and non-Catholics it comes as a surprise to discover the statue of a religious there amidst flaming orators, dignified statesmen, and brilliant military men. It is almost out of place; yet, it is not.

Statuary Hall was created by the act of July 2, 1864. A place was set aside, the old Hall of Representatives, wherein each and all States were invited to place "Statues in marble or bronze, not exceeding two in number for each State, of deceased persons who have been citizens thereof, and illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military service such as each State may deem worthy of national commemoration."

California had not taken any action on this until in 1927 the legislature of the State set up a commission to select the two Californians to be thus honored. It was no surprise when Junipero Serra was nominated. He had always been respected and esteemed as the pioneer of Californian history. The centennial of his death was observed as a legal holiday. Memorials had been erected in his honor throughout the State; a heroic-size one in Golden Gate Park and another at Monterey, this by Mrs. Leland Stanford. There was no doubt of his historic renown. El Camino Real, marked today with the mission bells which sang of Christ, readily testifies to this fact.

It was on July 16, 1769, when the victory of freedom was coming to a close along the Atlantic seaboard, that the 55-year-old friar established the first mission, San Diego de Alcala. In the 15 years that followed, of the 21 Franciscan missions, which have become as sun-bleached adobe gems in the green coronet of the California countryside, Serra himself established 9 of them. Their Spanish names are like a lyrical litany of favorite saints. There is San Diego de Alcala, founded on July 16, 1769. San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo, Junipero's headquarters and the mission closest to his heart, was erected on June 3, 1770. On July 14, 1771, in an oak-covered valley of the Santa Lucia Mountains, Padre Junipero blessed the large cross which was to be the beginning of the Mission San Antonio de Padua. The fourth station was set near the Rio de Santa Ana on September 8, 1771, and was was dedicated to San Gabriel Arcangel. A year later San Luis Obispo de Tolosa was established in the Valley of the Bears. Then came two more in 1776: San Francisco de Assisi on October 9; San Juan Capistrano on November 1. Santa Clara de Assisi, the now famous college of Santa Ana occupies the site, was founded on January 12, 1777. The last mission of the administration of Serra was that of San Buenaventura on March 31, 1782. It was left to his confreres to complete the remaining 11 stepping stones of Christ the King in His journey to the Indians.

One minor problem before Serra's statue could be placed in Statuary Hall in accordance with the act of July 2, 1864, was that of citizenship. Born in the tiny village of Petra on the picturesque Island of Majorca on November 24, 1713, and baptised on the same day Miguel Jose—the young Serra in accordance with Franciscan custom changed his name upon the day of profession of vows, September 15, 1734, to Junipero—was Spanish through and through. He had come to California with a military expedition in the name of the King of Spain and his missions were sponsored by his Spanish brethren. At best, he was only an adopted citizen of the State. A similar problem had faced the State of Wisconsin when they wished to place a memorial to Pere Marquette in Statuary Hall and it required an act of Congress to solve both, legally both priests were considered citizens of the States they had unwittingly helped build.

Long before his death on August 28, 1784, at the Mission San Carlos Borromeo, a short distance south of the city, overlooking the beautiful Rio Carnelo, Serra was regarded as a saint. Fray Junipero's love for the Indians burst forth from his love of Christ and like his Master, the lowly and miserable were his precious ones. He had little care for his physical person, but was only eager to spread the word of Christ as he had been commissioned to do. Weary and burdened with age, after performing the prodigious task of administering the sacrament of confirmation to 5,307 persons, special faculties being granted for that purpose, Serra had to fight against the encroachment of the civil authorities upon the rights of the church. Undaunted, he continued his fight until the very day of his death.

While California was in the midst of the celebration of the sesquicentennial of his death, Father Augustine Hobrecht, O. F. M., was named vice postulator for the cause of the humble friar. He was succeeded by Father Eric O'Brien, O. F. M., who completed the opening phase of the investigation and armed with 7,500 documents, most faded and in Spanish, in August 1950, went to Rome, there to continue the work for the long hoped for and prayed for canonization of Fray Junipero Serra, "Apostle of California."

Thus it is, while Serra spent himself in toil for His sake, he helped to clear the ground for a great State; while California reveres him as a fervent pioneer, perhaps they have placed the statue of a saint on Capitol Hill.

Leva's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

LEVA'S SERVICE

Assistant Secretary of Defense Marx Leva has exhibited a rare combination of enthusiasm, patience, and skill which will be a challenge to his successor. Mr. Leva, who left the Government yesterday to enter private law practice, was in a sense the engineer of unification. A close friend and adviser of the late Secretary Forrestal, he became special assistant to the Secretary of Defense when Mr. Forrestal assumed that responsibility in 1947. In his capacity as general counsel of the Defense Department, Mr. Leva framed the first unified legislative program, and it was under his expert guidance that the necessary strengthening of the Unification Act was accomplished in 1949. He continued to give meaning to unification during his service as Assistant Secretary, first under Secretary Johnson and then under Secretary Marshall, and it was this high caliber of work which the junior chamber of commerce recognized when it named him the outstanding young man in Government for 1949. In the words of one of his Pentagon associates, "He is going to leave a big hole in this building."

Segregation in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, dealing further with developments in respect of the Executive order of the President, the directive of the Secretary of Defense, and the directives of the respective armed services for equality of opportunity and treatment, there is appended hereto a report received from the Assistant Secretary of Defense on advances in the utilization of Negro manpower in the Army. The appended report follows an inspection made at Fort Dix, N. J., on March 2, 1951, by me in company with Hon. CHARLES R. HOWELL in whose district Fort Dix is located. We found—and so advised—that the integration of white and Negro troops for training which had recently taken place at Fort Dix had had excellent morale effects and had not involved any of the difficulties and problems which it had always been claimed would arise from such integration:

SUMMARY OF ADVANCES IN THE UTILIZATION OF NEGRO MANPOWER IN THE ARMY

GENERAL

Since the close of World War II the Army has continuously and vigorously implemented principles of equality of opportunity and treatment for Negro personnel. It has endeavored conscientiously to carry forward the principles laid down by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense for the efficient utilization of all military manpower. Policies have been reviewed and modified as experience warranted, with a view to developing a broader base of trained personnel, both officer and enlisted, than existed in the past. The information contained herein is intended to represent a résumé of progressive advances made as a result of experiences pointing toward greater efficiency of the Army.

SUMMARY OF ADVANCES

Recreational facilities

(a) Clubs and messes: The Army has adopted policies which assure the full use of any club, mess, or recreational facility located in public buildings to all eligible military personnel without regard to race. This applies to all recreational facilities including officer and enlisted clubs.

(b) Post exchanges: Exchanges and branch exchanges may no longer be designated for the exclusive use of any particular race. While exchanges and branches may be allotted to some specific areas or units, personnel are not restricted to their use but may use any other exchange or branch on the post.

(c) Theaters: Negro personnel are permitted the use of any theater on the post. Army motion picture theaters may be allocated to serve certain areas or units but no theater or performance in any theater is denied any group or individual because of race.

(d) Transportation: Busses, trucks, or other transportation owned and operated by the Government or by a governmental instrumentality are available to all military personnel regardless of race. Restriction of personnel to certain sections of such transportation because of race is not permitted either on or off the post regardless of local customs.

Enlistment and reenlistment without restrictions

Enlistments and reenlistments: Qualified Negroes may now enlist in the Regular Army under requirements equally applicable to all races without restrictive quota limitations. Individuals satisfactorily completing a period of enlistment may reenlist under procedures applicable to all eligible personnel regardless of race.

Equal opportunities for promotion without regard to race

Enlisted: Negro enlisted men hold a percentage of non-commissioned-officer ranks which compares most favorably with the over-all grade spread of Army command enlisted personnel. Among Negro personnel on December 31, 1950, approximately 1.8 percent were master sergeants, 3 percent were sergeants, first class, 8.1 percent were sergeants, and 19.2 percent were corporals.

Officers: The selection of Regular and non-Regular Army officers for promotion has operated without racial consideration. Prior to June 1950 there was only one Negro colonel in the Army. Today there are four. In addition, 17.5 percent of all Negro majors and 10.5 percent of all Negro captains on active duty have been selected for promotion to the next higher grade since September 1950.

Selection to attend schools without racial consideration

Enlisted: From the basis of restrictive quotas allotted to a limited number of schools, the Army has gradually opened up every segment of its military schooling system to Negroes. It has abolished racial quotas for school selection and prescribed selection of qualified personnel without regard to race or color. In early 1948 it commenced the selection of qualified Negroes for attendance at Army school courses, producing skills in which Negroes had not previously been utilized. Today of all enlisted students receiving military schooling, Negroes represent approximately 8 percent. This compares with 3.4 percent of a year ago.

Officers: Enrollment of Negro officers in schools has steadily increased. For example, Negro enrollment in comparison with total enrollments was 1.9 percent in 1947, 2.26 percent in 1948, 3 percent in 1949, and approximately 4 percent in 1950.

Training divisions and schools operate on an integrated basis

Training Divisions: In 1949 Negro enlistees were assigned to segregated units at Fort Dix, N. J., and at Fort Knox, Ky. In little more than 1 year the Army has completely changed this picture so that today the training divisions located at Fort Jackson, S. C., Camp Breckinridge, Ky., Ft. Riley, Kans., Ft. Ord, Calif., Camp Chaffee, Ark., Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., and Camp Roberts, Calif., are operated on an integrated basis where Negro personnel work, eat, and are quartered together with white personnel. The training divisions at Fort Dix, N. J., and Fort Knox, Ky., are in the process of a change-over from partial segregation to nonsegregation. This change is presently nearing completion.

Schools: The training, housing, and messing of all enlisted and officer personnel in attendance at Army schools are accomplished without regard to race or color.

Negro units are organic parts of larger white units

In January 1947 the Army assigned an infantry regiment, a field artillery battalion, an engineer combat company and a medical collecting company, each comprised of Negro enlisted personnel, as organic elements of the Twenty-fifth Infantry Division. This was the first step toward integrating Negro units with larger white units. Unit integration has vastly increased and today Negro units are organic elements of the following larger white units:

Second Infantry Division: An infantry battalion, a medical platoon, and a medium artillery battalion.

Third Infantry Division: An infantry battalion, an armored artillery battalion, a heavy tank battalion, and a medium artillery battalion.

Fourth Infantry Division: An infantry battalion, and an AAA AW battalion.

Twenty-fifth Infantry Division: An infantry regiment, a medium artillery battalion, and an engineer combat company.

Eleventh Airborne Division: A medium tank battalion, an airborne infantry battalion, and a medical platoon.

Eighty-second Airborne Division: An airborne infantry battalion, an airborne AAA battalion, and a medium artillery battalion.

Second Armored Division: A heavy tank battalion, an armored artillery battalion, and an engineer bridge company.

First Armored Division: An armored artillery battalion, an armored infantry battalion, and an engineer bridge company.

Third Armored Cavalry Regiment: An armored cavalry battalion.

Negro National Guardsmen are not removed from units

Negro members of National Guard units ordered into active military service from States with laws precluding segregation in the State militia are not removed from the units in which they have enlisted and trained, unless they possess specialities urgently required in other Army units. Similarly white personnel in such units are retained therein.

"All of Us Know the Aggressors in the Kremlin Would Glory in a Depression in the United States, Then They Could Lure the Unemployed With Fantastic Promises—Inflation Can Precipitate a Depression, Therefore, It Must Be Defeated"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, once again the National Broadcasting Co. in its program Battle Report, Washington, turns its cameras upon Dr. John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, and such of his "guests" with whom he made arrangements to make televised reports to the American people.

Among those whom Dr. Steelman brought to the television screen was the Honorable Dean Rusk, of the United States Department of State, who discussed, frankly and candidly, some of the problems present in the Korean situation, as seen from the viewpoint of those charged with the administration of the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, Dean Rusk was very factual in his approach to the question. While admitting there are several methods of attack which might be followed in order to bring the Korean war to a close, at the same time he pointed out the hazards that would attend the pursuit of some of the methods that have heretofore been indicated.

In his talk, Dean Rusk said, in part:

Those who make the decision to extend hostilities beyond Korea would be completely irresponsible if they did not take into full account the element of general war, with all the destruction and loss of life which would be involved.

A second easy thing to think about is an immediate withdrawal from Korea. That, too, would lead to disaster. Korea is not the only object of the appetities and ambitions of Communists' conspiracy. We could not solve anything by abandoning Korea. Who would be the next victim? And the next? And the next? Have we so soon forgotten Adolf Hitler? Each bite was to be the last. Do you remember the trail which led from Manchuria and Ethiopia to Pearl Harbor? To abandon Korea would be to abandon the United States.

In closing his statement on the television last Sunday, Dean Rusk said:

We do not serve our cause if, in this great democracy, we destroy our unity and undermine our strength, or if we lack the patience and the maturity we shall need as we move to meet the tests ahead.

The brillant talk made by Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor on the military training program certainly gave one a tremendous fund of knowledge with respect to the training that is afforded all members of the Armed Forces in order to successfully contest with the enemy in the field—bring victory to our standards while incurring a minimum exposure to hazard on the part of those who are fighting for our cause.

This, the thirty-third Battle Report, Washington, was particularly marked, as Dr. Steelman stated, by the picture painted by Mr. Robert McCormick, one of NBC's ace commentaries, who had just returned from Europe.

Mr. McCormick's narration was pictorialized by the marvelous photographs taken by the Jones brothers, and brought a living picture of conditions in Italy to the television screen with great fidelity, which made one feel he had looked upon the actual scenes himself.

Mr. McCormick's description of the spring military maneuvers in Italy gives concrete evidence that it will profit the free nations of the world to have Italy on their side in any possible struggle against the communistic hordes. He told, incidentally, of the Italian Air Force, of their armored tanks, and particularly of the manpower as expressed by the work of the Alpini battalion supported by their mountain artillery batteries.

Mr. Speaker, altogether it was as lively, enlightening, and as educational a program as was ever presented. Again, in order to bring the thirty-third Battle Report, Washington, to the attention of every Member of this House, under unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I insert the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The thirty-third Battle Report, Washington, as produced by Ted Ayers, was as follows:

President Harry S. Truman: "The change in the commands of the Far East means no change whatever in the policy of the United States. We will carry on the fight in Korea with vigor and determination in an effort to bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion."

Mr. MCCORMICK. Washington, where President Truman this past week sent out the orders that relieved General MacArthur of his military command, and Korea, where despite the change, the same troops battle against the same enemy in the same way.

Today, Battle Report brings you our sixth exclusive teledocumentary on Europe, the voice of General Ridgway, a report from the G-3 of our Army, and a top-official statement from the State Department on our policy in Korea. But first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, during the past week, the controversy about the change in the military command in the Far East has been blazoned in headlines all over the world. Denunciations have been bitter. Praise has been lavish. There have been charges and countercharges. But, in spite of all the clamor, there is one point upon which every man, woman and child in the United States is in agreement. We do not want war. We seek a world of peace in which men everywhere are free to seek happiness in their own way.

But, the task of building such a world cannot be done by government alone. It is a task in which every one of us must share.

As an example, let us consider the battle against inflation. All of us know that the aggressors in the Kremlin would glory in a depression in the United States so they lure the unemployed with fantastic promises. And, inflation can precipitate a depression. Therefore, it must be defeated.

Every one of us has a well-defined job in this battle. All of us are consumers. We have the final decision on prices. If the consumer says "No" there can be no sale. He keeps his money and by so doing he helps to reduce prices and thus to increase the purchasing power of his dollar. This is not the time for keeping up with the Joneses.

This afternoon we have with us the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Dean Rusk. In the light of the developments during the past week, Mr. Rusk's report will be of vital interest. Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, so-called G-3 of the Army, has recorded the story of how our forces all over the world are kept supplied with the tools of war.

Last week we brought you what was undoubtedly the latest film report on the Italian Nation to be seen in this country. Documented by NBC cameramen, the Jones brothers, and narrated by Robert McCormick, who made a special trip to Europe and has just returned, it reported to you on the Italian people, economy, and government. Today we continue that teledocumentary. We present now part II of Battle Report, Italy, an exclusive report on Italy's armed forces, again narrated by one who has seen it all with his own eyes, Robert McCormick.

Mr. MCCORMICK. "Restricted," that's the word for this dock area in the bay at Naples. For it is here that American ships unload weapons from the United States to strengthen the Italian armed forces. Yes; though Italy's over-all armed might is limited by

treaty with the postwar Allies (including Russia), it is, nevertheless, getting this help from us up to the treaty limit as a partner in our North Atlantic Treaty Organization and codgher in our fight against communism. This is the steamship *Charlotte Lykes*, out of New Orleans, with a cargo of 40 millimeter AA guns for the Italian Army. And on hand with Italian officers to see it unloaded are representatives of our Military Assistance Advisory Group—MAAF, as it it known in Naples—the American organization charged with helping the Italians to put this equipment to proper use. I invite you now to trace, as I did, how such United States military aid runs like a power-giving bloodstream through the Italian armed forces.

At the Italian air forces base at Naples, we saw 18 United States F-51 fighter planes turned over to the Italian air force. On hand to inspect the planes (and seen here chatting with the Italian commanding officer) was Col. Zeth McKee, of our own Air Force, one of several MAAG air force officers now on duty in Italy. Commander of an F-51 group himself in the war, McKee helps the pilots don their chutes, gives them a few knowing last-minute instructions, and then, wishing them luck, stands back to watch them take off in the new American planes that spell a mightier Italian air force.

Not only the Italian air force but also the Italian Navy is being buttressed with American help. Here at Tarranto we saw a navy ship being rebuilt with United States equipment—these seamen are installing fire-control devices. This month, to add to the strength of their fleet, three American destroyers sailed into this same harbor.

At the Ministry of Defense in Rome, United States officers sit frequently with Italian officers to discuss how best Italy might be rearmed to defend herself and the free world.

This is the first time such a conference was ever open to newsmen or the camera, and we of Battle Report were impressed with the frank discussion of all problems. The spirit we found at work here was strictly "let's do it."

One of the most heartening evidences that it will pay to have Italy on our side in any future encounter came when we visited Italy's famed Bersaglieri in the midst of their spring training program. Brigadier General Berti, who commands the brigade we saw, explains the problem of the day to United States Army Col. Phillip Pope, a MAAG officer on an inspection trip. Once squared away, the mock battle begins.

F-51's, born of United States aid, roar over the field to strafe "enemy" positions. Then, as the Bersaglieri open up far to the rear with American artillery, we saw them give a convincing demonstration of the meaning of their name—"sharpshooter"—as well as their unique tactics, for the Bersaglieri function as a mobile infantry and are famous for moving on the run in or out of formation.

These are General Sherman M-4 tanks, all from America. To give the battle realism, the tanks are "buttoned up" with their crews protected inside. Guns fire air bursts over them as they advance to simulate enemy fire. Behind the tanks advance the armored artillery firing, followed by Bersaglieri foot troops.

About that distinctive headgear: I asked about that; in fact tried to get one with no success. It's a type of priest's hat—black, with a black cock's plumage on top. No one knew very much about its exact origin. But they did tell me that the first unit of the Bersaglieri was formed in the Piedmont region in 1836 under the Savoy regime. War may have changed radically since 1846, but you may be sure that the Bersaglieri are prepared to give as good account of themselves today, in 1951, as they were famous for over a hundred years ago.

More maneuvers. This time, an Italian artillery regiment we found at Bracciano in north Italy. This one is using all United States equipment, including these huge United States-made 115-millimeter guns.

We sent them these "spotter" planes, too. They are being introduced for the first time to the Italian Army, for liaison and observation work. Here they're on a spotting mission for the Italian artillery. The "spotters" have done their duty, the artillery opens up with everything they have, "just like United States of America."

But it was high up in the Alps where we got our biggest thrill. Yes, filming the world-famous Alpini, the troops that fight on skis. The Alpini were organized in 1872 for the mountain defense of the Italian Alpine frontier. And you can take it from me, they're still leaving tracks in the snow that spell top-notch power. No common soldiers, these. To get men who know the mountains, these troops are recruited from the hardy frontiersmen of the mountainous areas. Tradition says these are the sons of fathers who were Alpinis before them.

An Alpini battalion is generally supported by a mountain artillery battery. Under our military-assistance program, they're being provided with our modern infantry weapons and taught how to use them. Yes; here in the scenic mountains of northern Italy near Odessa we saw, I think, the Italian Army at its best. The crack Alpini—spirit and moral high—among the finest of the world's mountain troops.

Before we left Italy we sought a professional appraisal of how well our military-aid program is arming that country against our common enemy. We found it when we turned our cameras on Brig. Gen. Norman H. Schwarzkopf, Director of MAAG in Italy, and Gen. Efisio Marras, Chief of Staff for the defense of Italy. We leave our last words on Italy to them.

General MARRAS. General, I express again our gratitude to the American people and I thank you personally—you, General—for your cooperation and our gratitude for our officers for what you do for our army.

General SCHWARZKOPF. General, you mentioned that another ship is unloading. This will be additional equipment for the Alpini and Bersaglieri and the Arietta brigade. I'm very glad to see this equipment coming in. Thank you for your friendly expressions, General. We find it a great pleasure to work with you and I feel that the work that we are doing here is cementing again the friendship between Italy and America. I hope that our assistance in this military-aid program will do a great deal to bring Italy up to the point it deserves and desires in the family of nations.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Seven months ago, Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who succeeds General MacArthur, appeared here with us in this studio on Battle Report. Fortunately, we have a recording of the talk he made then—words that are even more important now than they ever were. As he assumes his new command, we bring you once again—against the background of the conflict in Korea—the voice of General Ridgway.

Lieutenant General RIDGWAY. This period of our history is critical—critical, not just for days or months—critical not as we have been accustomed to view crisis—a situation, however, acute, to which by sudden emotional upsurges we can rise, and by sudden bursts of extraordinary energy, surmount. This is not that sort of crisis. It is one which may long continue, presenting us through the years, as it presents us at this moment, with problems of decision as basic and far-reaching in nature as any a free society has yet encountered. We do not know how long we shall be compelled to live as Soviet enemy No. 1, marked for attack by war or subversion at times of his choosing. We do know now—Korea ripped one mask aside—that there will be no quick and easy solution, no short-cut to our objective.

Mr. MCCORMICK. General Ridgway on the choice that faces us all.

Lieutenant General RIDGWAY. We need superior numbers and types of weapons as we never needed them before. We can't have them and unlimited luxuries too. We must choose between differing values. We need men and women in our ranks. We cannot have them, and an undisturbed economy too. We must make that choice through the years ahead.

Mr. MCCORMICK. General Ridgway, on the need of the men he led in battle in Korea, for support from home.

Lieutenant General RIDGWAY. They see (our troops), as they pray you see, that only so can we hope to attain the goal for which we fight—an honorable and lasting peace.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Thus, the words of General Ridgway. And as he prepares to turn his troops over to Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, the war goes on. In the west-central sector the Hantan River is bridged; two full Chinese divisions, which had been opposing its crossing by American and Turkish troops, suddenly pull out. And the battle grows even more furious in the air as our troops on the ground continue to advance slowly behind tremendous fire power. To rigorous training like this, you can give thanks for every mile of our advance in Korea. Charged with the over-all responsibility of seeing to this training is a man to whom responsibility is certainly no stranger. Commanding general in World War II of the One Hundred and First Airborne, which he led in the invasion of France—the DSC for his heroism there—he later became our military commander in critical Berlin. He serves now as Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3. Ladies and gentlemen, Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.

Maj. Gen. M. D. TAYLOR. I would like to say a few words about the military training program which is being conducted throughout the country. If I had a title for what I am about to say, I think it would be "More sweat—less blood." The surest way to be impressed with the seriousness of the military training, I believe, is to talk to some of the trainees whom you find in our camps and stations. I think that a few words with them would assure you how seriously they regard this business of preparing for war.

These young soldiers can tell you better than I can of the long hours spent on the target range, on the combat course, and the marches across country, for the purpose of conditioning their bodies. To them this is a deadly serious school, because they know that before too long they may be called upon to deliver on the battlefield. I don't have to say that war is a complex business and becoming more so year by year. As we give bigger and better machines and equipment to our troops, it requires better men to manipulate them successfully.

It is the tremendous importance of the human factor in warfare that makes it so necessary that our modern training be tough and realistic. We must begin with the individual soldier and make him a competent member of the fighting team. Then we must weld him into the smaller unit, the squad, the platoon, the company, those units which really bring victory or defeat. Finally, we must then fix the smaller units and put them into the regiment and divisions where we have the entire team of weapons which reaches from the large cannon to the emblem of the infantrymen. Now we know also that psychological aspects of preparation for battle are fully as important as the mechanical. It is another thing to create a man who can carry that weapon into action and continue through the hazards of the campaign. I would say that the objective of our training from a psychological view is to make the individual soldier feel in battle that he has been there before. If our training brings our military units into their first action without the feeling of strangeness which engenders panic, then we are sure that we will soon have a battle-hard unit. I have seen many detachments in their first engagement and it is always easy to spot the unit that is adequately trained. The men fall into position readily without hurry but with a briskness which indicates the confidence they have in themselves and in their comrades. Our weapons fall into action without delay and soon the formidable battery which they are able to create through their fire is leveled against the enemy. It is just like football teams. You do not see, however, the long hours of work, the weeks of sweat that have preceded that successful engagement. So I would say that we must have more sweat on the training fields to have less blood on the battlefields.

Mr. MCCORMICK. While the biggest jet battles in air combat history took over the Korean news headlines this week end, the patient foot soldier pushed persistently ahead. Enemy resistance along the entire front ranged from light to heavy. In Yongpyong flame throwers were brought into play to flush the Communists from their bunker-type emplacements. On the central front light gains were reported. And all was comparatively quiet on the eastern front, where the Republic of Korea troops are holding the line. And so until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another "teledocumentary," including a special report on our jet patrol over the east-west frontier in Europe, this, then, against the background of Battle Front, Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your thirty-third Battle Report, Washington.

Disloyalty in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by Frank Kirkpatrick from Station WMAW on April 10, 1951, regarding an investigation into disloyalty in the State Department.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I SEE IT

(By Frank Kirkpatrick)

On the front page of your newspaper tonight is the story that one of Senator Tydings' innocent people has been suspended from duty under the loyalty procedure of the Navy Department. His name is Brunauer.

You will recall that Senator Tydings headed a committee last year which was supposed to investigate the loyalty of State Department employees. Mrs. Brunauer is employed in the State Department and before that was an official of the American Association of University Women. Both Mrs. Brunauer and her husband loudly cried to Tydings that they were being smeared by JOE MCCARTHY.

And, in this connection, I just cannot get excited over the fact that somebody printed a composite photograph of Senator Tydings and Earl Browder. And I'm beginning to wonder why so many editorial tears are being shed in Milwaukee over Tydings and the cookies he whitewashed. Maybe tonight would be a good time for us to take a look at the record of the Tydings investigation. Here's a page that looks interesting.

In the witness chair is the former Director of Investigations of the Office of Strategic Services of the Army. He is telling about how he entered the offices of the notorious Amerasia magazine and found the evidence against an espionage agent. Keep in mind that this was early 1945, during the war, and before we knew there was an atomic bomb. I quote Mr. Bielaski's sworn testimony.

"Mr. BIELASKI. I went on back to the two rear rooms—the one on the right was the office of Phillip Jaffe.

"All over the top of his desk were documents that had been photocopied and were drying. There must have been—oh, I will say roughly 15 or 20 documents.

"About the time I started to look at these things, Oleson came in. He had been assigned to the library, which is a large room, and he said, 'I think you had better come in the library. I have something to show you in here.'

"So, I went in the library. Their table, as big as this, was covered with documents [and] an envelope in the middle of the table was there, and written across the top of it cater-cornered was the name 'John Hersey.'

"Senator TYDINGS. John——

"Mr. BIELASKI. H-e-r-s-e-y. The author, I presume.

"Senator TYDINGS. At least the name is right.

"Mr. BIELASKI. The names are identical, and it was not an envelope, to my mind, that was addressed to him, but as you might write your name on an envelope belonging to you.

"The envelope was open on the table, and there were quite a few of these documents that had John Hersey's name written on them, too.

"I was, of course, nonplussed after seeing all this stuff. Oleson said to me, 'You haven't seen anything yet. Let me show you what's in the envelope.'

"So, he opened the envelope and pulled out about, I would say, a dozen or 15 documents. When I started to look at them, he said, 'Wait a minute—you are looking at the wrong place; look in between them'; and here in between these documents we found six typewritten documents—and all six of them were marked 'top secret.' Before I went back I looked these documents over in the Hersey envelope and of the six, I remember only two, remembering the meaning of the titles and one of which I have a general recollection. The first one that I recall was a document, as I say, marked 'top secret,' which dealt with the units of the Japanese Navy, subsequent to the Battle of Leyte——

"Senator TYDINGS (interrupting). And it showed the disposition——

"Mr. BIELASKI. It showed them by name and the ports where they were hiding and if they were disabled—that was the general tenor of it. The other documents——

"Senator TYDINGS (interrupting). Was that in the brown envelope in the center of the table?

"Mr. BIELASKI. That was in the envelope, mixed in between these other documents.

"Senator MCMAHON. Do you know what Hersey was doing at that time?

"Mr. BIELASKI. I do not.

"Senator MCMAHON. You don't know what occupation he had?

"Mr. BIELASKI. No. I know what he had shortly after that. He went on a trip to the Far East, but I don't know where he went.

"The second document was one which was headed, to the best of my knowledge, the bombing program, or strategic bombing program for Japan; and, it said in effect that the targets would be the principal industrial cities of Japan.

"The third document which I remember, and of which I do not remember as much as I wish I did, had to do with a new bomb, which I thought at the time was merely a piece of ordnance. I recall that it was marked "A" bomb, but was merely a capital A with quotation marks on each side, and it didn't say atomic, and as I had no knowledge of the atomic bomb, it meant very little to me and didn't mean anything to me until several months later.

"Senator GREEN. What was the nature of the memorandum about the A bomb?

"Mr. BIELASKI. That I don't know, sir. I have racked my memory time and again to produce more. I don't know whether it was a progress report or a plan report or what. I remember my reaction to it because it seemed to me just a bomb, an A bomb as compared to a B bomb or a C bomb or a D bomb.

"About that time we happened to pull the office door back and I discovered behind that door a very large bellows suitcase. I had the lockman immediately open that, and that was stuffed so full of documents that we just dropped everything. I have tried to estimate since, with the help of the men who were with me, how many documents we saw there, and at luncheon the other day we agreed it was a conservative number to say there were 400. I didn't believe that anybody would believe me if I made a written report on what we saw and what we did, so I decided to take enough with me to show them what we had found, and then there would be no possibility of their denying it.

"We had documents there from every department of the Government except the FBI. Every document I saw was stamped with the mail receipt stamp of the Department of State. All those that I saw, also, were marked with a paragraph. I cannot read it exactly to you, but it was to the effect that 'The possession of these documents by an unauthorized person constituted a violation of the Espionage Act,' and it quoted the paragraph and so forth of the act.

"Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Bielaski, as I get it now, these documents, many of them originated in different departments of the Government, but they had been received at the State Department?"

"Mr. BIELASKI. Yes, sir."

That's the end of my quotes of the testimony of an investigation which Senator Tydings and Senator McMahon and Senator Green said did not show any evidence of disloyalty in the State Department. And, since Senator LODGE has been put on the United Nations delegation, he, too, seems to have recovered from any indignation he once felt.

And John Service, who was involved in this Amerasia case and who confessed to giving documents to Jaffe, the confessed espionage agent, he has been promoted and is today a foreign officer in the State Department.

And, now, do you remember the name John Hersey in Mr. Bielaski's testimony? Are you curious as to what has happened to him? Well, I don't know what happened to him, but last Saturday night I was reading a current story on President Truman. It is the kind of story that any reporter in America would give his right eye to get permission to write. It is the kind of story that involves going for walks with the President, going swimming with the President, talking confidentially with the President—it is the kind of story that seldom can be written about a President until after he is dead, because in allowing the story to be written, the President has to show favoritism to the man who writes it.

And the man who goes walking and swimming with the President—and who is favored to write this story? His name? John Hersey.

And the three little monkeys who speak no evil, see no evil, and hear no evil about Communists, reign supreme.

Premise of Our Global Strategy: Strong Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the illuminating piece by Mr. James Reston in last Sunday's New York Times, entitled "Premise of Our Global Strategy: Strong Allies." May I suggest that this premise is largely overlooked by General MacArthur in his presentation of his own viewpoint to the American people?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREMISE OF OUR GLOBAL STRATEGY: STRONG ALLIES—ADMINISTRATION IS BOUND TO CONSIDER FACTS WHICH MACARTHUR IGNORES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—The big questions raised by General MacArthur's speech in Congress are not whether we want what the general wants but whether we are prepared to risk what he is prepared to risk and whether we are prepared to risk it alone.

Almost everybody wants the advantages of total victory over the Chinese Communists without the disadvantages of total war, but is this possible or even probable?

General MacArthur thinks it is. He believes that if we bomb the enemy's supply bases in Manchuria, impose a sharp naval blockade of the China coast, use Chiang Kai-shek's manpower in the struggle, and send major reinforcements of our own to Korea, we can knock Communist China out of the war without too much risk of the Soviet Union coming in.

This part of the argument is a question of judgment, or rather of guesswork, about how the Russians would react. General MacArthur was wrong about what the Chinese Communists would do, but in this case he may be entirely right. It might be possible merely to launch this policy and get away with it. It could be that, if the Russians were told explicitly that we were going to end the Korean War, and that if they intervened we would hit them with everything we had, they would stay out.

RISK IS REJECTED

The administration concedes that this is possible. It puts the odds at about fifty-fifty on the success of such a policy, but it does not think these odds are good enough, for if the bet goes wrong the result is the third world war.

The Government here is not ready for any such risk. Despite all the talk about mobilization and rearmament the United States has barely been able to meet the requirements of the limited war in Korea; it is just beginning to get enough manpower to relieve some of the Army foot soldiers there. Our own "privileged sanctuary" in Japan, to say nothing of this "sanctuary" of the privileged, is still wide open to attack, and the four divisions promised for Europe are still not ready.

If the Russians cooperated, of course, everything might be all right. They might not retaliate. They might recognize our blockade of China and not try to run their ships through it; they might not retaliate by bombing our souces of supply in Japan or the United States, and in that event the MacArthur thesis would be a triumph, like Inchon. The trouble is that if it failed it would be a disaster far worse than the miscalculation of last November.

The feeling here is that no one government has the right to take such a risk in such circumstances, even in the name of its own people, let alone in the name of a whole coalition of nations.

OTHER NATIONS CONSIDERED

As long as there is any reasonable question about any policy of ours leading to a third world war that would hit many other nations as well as our own, officials here have been bound to ask themselves, first, whether we were prepared to take the gamble ourselves, and second, whether our allies were prepared to gamble with us.

In the case of the MacArthur thesis, the answer has been "no" in both cases. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are undoubtedly willing to increase the risk in Korea a little, and some officers in the Pentagon undoubtedly approve the MacArthur thesis 100 percent. But the Government as a whole rejects it, and our Allies will not even discuss anything more than economic sanctions, and probably won't agree to much of that.

Thus if the forthcoming debate is to avoid what General MacArthur called the "pitfalls of unrealism" it must deal with the hard fact that if we follow the MacArthur policy we shall have to do it before this Government thinks we are ready, and we shall have to do it without the approval, and probably without the support of our allies.

There is no effective way to fight an all-out war against the Soviet Union without the approval and support of our allies. There is no way to retain the support of Japan, or to complete the defense of the Pacific, or to align ourselves with the rising peoples of Asia and its islands without these allies.

UNITED NATIONS IGNORED

The general himself illustrated these facts, though he managed to get all the way through his speech without ever mentioning the United Nations. He spoke warmly of the cooperation of the Japanese people, but how long would that cooperation last if the Japanese thought we were seriously considering a policy which would bring about retaliatory bombing of the Japanese islands?

The General wants a peace treaty for Japan. He wants us to retain permanent military installations there, but we cannot implement a peace treaty for Japan without the cooperation of Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, and we cannot maintain effective military installations in Japan against a hostile population.

Nobody knows better than the Japanese how few soldiers we have in their islands today, or how vulnerable our present Japanese installations are to attack from the Russian bases in Sakhalin. In these circumstances would the Japanese favor a policy of extending the war to Manchuria before we are even in a position to defend our own planes on the Japanese air strips, let alone the Japanese people?

Similarly, the General wants us to maintain a global policy. "To consider the problems of one sector oblivious to the problems of another is to court disaster for the whole," he told the Congress.

To maintain a global policy, however, it is necessary for us to have bases in north Africa, in France, in Britain, and in various other places around the globe. In fact, even to protect the ocean approaches to the United States, it is necessary to have bases in such places as Iceland, Greenland, and the Azores, which do not belong to us.

LACK OF EXPLANATION

General MacArthur did not explain how these things were to be done without the cooperation of a large number of allies. He did not tell the Congress how it was possible to use our strategic air power against the Soviet Union without the help of these allies, yet he developed a thesis which he knew to be unacceptable, not only to his own Government, but to the entire allied coalition.

Moreover, his strategy for fighting the Chinese Communists was strangely at variance with his analysis of the political and social developments of the Orient. Prime Minister Nehru of India would agree almost entirely with what the General said about the profound nationalistic feelings of the Asian peoples, and so would the British Foreign Office, but they could not possibly be farther apart from him on how to deal with this new nationalism.

There is widespread approval of General MacArthur's statement that the Chinese Communists are not mere puppets of Moscow, but are playing along for the time being for their own selfish purpose. But most people who think Peiping is not a satellite of Moscow, as General MacArthur clearly indicated it was not, believe that the thing to do is to limit the war against Peiping as much as possible. The general, however, argued that on the one hand there was a vital new force of nationalism afoot in Asia, and that we had to adjust our policies to this important fact, but he said this in a speech designed to bring about a major air and naval war against the very power that is the most obvious symbol of that new oriental nationalism.

MINIMUM OF GROUND TROOPS

Finally, the general implied that we must try to develop our defenses with a minimum of ground troops and expense—and in his speech before the DAR, he added a minimum of regulation, too. But how are we to keep our ground troops and our defense budget at a minimum without the cooperative defense effort of the French, the British, the Canadians, and the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty?

All our present strategic calculations are based upon their contributions, not only of bases, but of many more trained and equipped men than we are planning to throw into the pool. Their contributions are certainly not going to be made, however, in support of policies which they do not approve.

The fact that General MacArthur is opposed by his own Government and the governments of the whole free world does not, of course, prove that he is wrong.

The definition of objectives is easy but reaching decisions on the means, when the fate of the Republic and the whole free world is at stake, is something else again.

Maybe the country wants to send major reinforcements to Korea, as the general has requested. Maybe it really is fed up with the untidiness of this half war, and would rather risk the total clash. But the price of the battle has to be weighed as well as the rewards of victory.

For just as the general could not answer when his troops asked him why surrender military advantages to the enemy in Korea, so the Government will have to answer for the consequences of its acts.

The government that extends the war and produces a world-wide clash is in a much more serious position that the government that moves cautiously in concert with its allies. For if the Government is wrong now in its limited-war policy, it must merely answer to General MacArthur and its other critics at home. But if it adopts the MacArthur policy and fails, then it must answer to the whole world and to history.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by Frank Kirkpatrick, on April 16, 1951, regarding the dismissal of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS I SEE IT

Good evening.

Let's talk about the issues back of the dismissal of General MacArthur. To fully understand the far-eastern situation you need to look at a map of Asia. As you look at the islands which make up the Japanese Empire, you will see that the peninsula of Korea is like a spearhead pointed at Japan. To the north is the island of Sakhalin. To the south is another large island called Formosa. And a little southeast of Formosa are the Philippine Islands.

Japan, as a nation, fought China late in the nineteenth century to protect herself against the dangers of attack from Korea, or from Formosa. She acquired these territories. She was still threatened by the island of Sakhalin and threatened by Russia, through Russia's control of certain ports in China. So, in 1905 Japan fought and defeated Russia. Japan got the ports and she got the south half of the island of Sakhalin. If you will look at a map you will see why Japan had to do this, because if unfriendly powers held Sakhalin, Korea, and Formosa, Japan would have enemies on every side of her, except the east.

When we defeated Japan in 1945, General MacArthur was made the administrator of 84,000,000 of people. One of his jobs was the reformation of Japan, but another of his jobs was to defend Japan, since we had disarmed her, leaving her unable to defend herself. Even a school boy looking at a map would understand that our policy must be to make Japan into a nation friendly to America, so that our Pacific defense line would lie across the Pacific, not on our own west coast. And that was MacArthur's job. How successfully he has done this job was shown yesterday when 2,000,000 of Japanese stood in tears while their conqueror took off to answer to a ward heeler from Kansas City.

MacArthur's job had been made difficult for him even before he took over. Sahkalin on the north secretly had been given to Russia at Yalta. Manchuria, for all practical purposes, was also given to Russia at Yalta, and so were the Chinese ports of Darien and Port Arthur. That weakening of our defense line was done even before we defeated Japan.

Now, keep in mind that our State Department destroyed a friendly government in China and aided the coming to power of the Communists. In early 1950, this was our situation in the Far East: We had Russia occupying all of Sakhalin; we had a Russian satellite government, armed by Russia and directed by Russians, occupying the northern part of Korea. To the west of Japan the Red Chinese, our enemies, held the mainland. Also to the west, holding the ports of Darien and Port Arthur, were the Russians. To the south of Japan, the island of Formosa was occupied by the friendly forces of the National Chinese Government.

So, the State Department, following its policy of betraying American interests to create a Communist world, announced that South Korea could fall to the Communist North Koreans. The State Department would approve no arms for South Korea and even when Congress voted aid, the State Department held up the shipment of the supplies. Chiang Kai-shek, on Formosa, was fighting the Red Chinese on the mainland; but he was also having to fight the State Department. Acheson formally objected to the blockade which Chiang Kai-shek was enforcing against the mainland of Red China; and the Secretary of State made it clear that we would not defend Korea and that we would not help in the defense of Formosa. Perhaps I can recall this to you locally by suggesting that you may remember an editorial of the Milwaukee Journal. In discussing this the Journal sarcastically asked the people of Milwaukee if they wanted to go to war for Formosa.

Then, following the Communist line, the State Department, the spring of 1950, began propagandizing the American people to sell us the idea of seating Red China in the United Nations and in the Security Council.

As Assistant Secretary of State, McDermott, put it to me and I quote him, "Yes, it is our policy to seat the Red Chinese, but we cannot announce it until the American people are ready for it."

To military men, however, the actions of our State Department were most serious. They realized that this meant the complete destruction of our Pacific defense line. If Korea and Formosa fell it meant that we could not hold Japan, and an unarmed Japan could not defend herself. So, in quick succession we would lose Korea, then Formosa, probably the Philippines next, and, last of all, Japan. This would destroy our Pacific defense line and give the Communists an additional 125,000,000 people. Most important it would give the Communists the great industrial plant and manpower of Japan.

Standing in the way of the Reds and their State Department collaborators was only one man—Douglas MacArthur.

In June 1950, Defense Secretary Louis Johnson and some of our military men visited the Far East. They returned on June 24. They went to the White House to make their report and it is generally understood that they convinced the President of the dangers to America in the policy of the State Department. The American people were not told what took place at this meeting; but the Communists knew what happened, as the Communists have known every detail of what happens in our Government and particularly the White House since 1945. So, the Communists moved to take by force what they had expected to get by default. This was too raw for even the President. He thereupon ordered a token defense of South Korea. But, he was careful to tie the hands of the commander in chief of our forces in the Far East, General MacArthur. And to reassure the Red Chinese he sent an American fleet to protect the Reds from the anti-Communist Chinese on Formosa. Since then, the State Department has sought a new formula to surrender our defense line, a formula by which it can keep faith with the Reds.

Louis Johnson, our Secretary of Defense, was fired, and hatchet man Marshall took over.

Then, our State Department manufactured a lot of excitement about Europe. This has worked before. Our minds were kept on the Berlin blockade while the rug was pulled from under Chiang Kai-shek. Don't forget that.

It has continued to be State Department policy to give Korea and Formosa—and eventually Japan—to the Reds.

It was and still is State Department policy to seat Red China in the Security Council.

It was and is State Department and Russian policy to give control of the Security Council to the Communists. There are just five permanent seats in the Council: Russia holds one; France, which is more than 50 percent Communist controlled, holds one; Britain, which has a Communist for Minister of War, holds one; China holds one; and we hold the fifth. Add it up, and figure what happens when the Red Chinese are seated.

But the State Department and the Communists have had one man who has foreseen and blocked several of their moves. That man is MacArthur.

MacArthur knows that the boogyman of a powerful Red China is just State Department hokum. He knows that if Chiang Kai-shek is given aid; that, together, we can finish off this Far East mess—with the probability that the anti-Communist Chinese can regain control of their country.

So, the State Department early this year tried to put together an appeasing peace. You surely remember. Mr. Truman repeated most of the terms just the other night. But this was rejected by the Reds. At the time I did not understand why the Reds refused to accept as a gift from Mr. Acheson what they were fighting to gain. Now, I understand—like Hitler, their terms become harsher. Their new price includes the man they most fear in all the world—Douglas MacArthur.

I repeat what I've said before. This is not an issue of a general versus a President. It is not an issue of more war or less. It is not an issue of Republican versus Democrat as the President tried to make it Saturday night. The issue is the security of America versus its betrayers.

Good night.

Jewett, Ohio, Welcomes New Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the progressive villages in my district is Jewett in Harrison County, Ohio. Some weeks ago I met with the Jewett Chamber of Commerce to discuss with them the possibility of obtaining industries to locate in this village. I am inserting with these remarks a short outline of some of the advantages the village of Jewett could offer to industries which might desire to locate there:

The Jewett Chamber of Commerce wishes to advise industries that we have available sites suitable for industrial location.

Jewett is well serviced by the main lines of both the Pennsylvania and the Nickel Plate Railroads. We are located on State Routes 9 and 151, and within 4 miles of United States Routr 22.

There is available an unlimited supply of coal. Electrical power is supplied by the Ohio Power Co. Gas is supplied by the Natural Gas Co. of West Virginia. We have also an excellent supply of good water.

Jewett also has available excellent fire protection facilities, fine churches, and a superior school system. We have a large community park with a baseball diamond, tennis courts, and a community building for public meetings.

There is also available a reservoir of unskilled labor both male and female within the immediate vicinity.

Interested parties please contact George Telfer, industrial development committee, Jewett Chamber of Commerce.

United States Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by Frank Kirkpatrick on April 15, 1951, regarding United States policy in Asia.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good afternoon, since last Wednesday morning, most of us have not thought or talked about anything except the tragic situation which has been exposed by the dismissal of General MacArthur. And, of course, I have talked on this subject during the past week. There have been many requests that I repeat Friday's night's broadcast for persons who did not hear it. So, here it is:

I refer again to the MacArthur dismissal. This is not a conflict between a great, but subordinate, military man and the President of the United States. This is a conflict between a great servant of the American people who happens to be a soldier, and a conspiracy within our Government to help advance world communism.

If the American people fail to recognize this, and fail to understand the shocking truth of what their Government has been and is being used for, their present anger will be expended on superficialities. Make no mistake, this involves the dismissal of a general who stood in the way of surrender of our Pacific defense line—a dismissal demanded by the Soviets and their British collaborators, as evidence that Acheson and Truman can deliver their pledged aid for world communism. Already, today, the British have demanded that the Red Chinese move into Japan.

Tragically, one of the great sources of our national strength is also our greatest weakness—that is, our supreme faith in our two-party system.

For generations our political dissatisfactions have found expression in throwing out one party and putting another in power. We have done this periodically with the complete confidence—amounting to smugness—of a people who know that both parties are basically American, differing only in superficial details as to how to approach a given problem. We have correctly been indifferent to the occasional third-party movements. But, this supreme confidence in our two-party system has blinded us to the possible dangers of an infiltration of one or both of those parties. And, much of our press on which we depend for news is so organized that it is largely an unwitting instrument for continuing the fiction that we have only Republicans and Democrats.

The fact is that there are men in positions of influence in both our major parties whose aim is the use of those parties to accomplish world communism. For the most part these political Trojan horses have operated in the Democratic Party, because it has been the party in power; and because it has shown a greater willingness to accept plausible arguments for both real and fake social reforms. But, the Republican Party has not been without its wolves in sheeps' clothing. In fact, Wendell Wilkie was pretty well captured by the same kind of people who control Truman.

If this is true, we must be on our guard against letting anyone fool us into thinking this MacArthur episode is a partisan political fight. Both Republicans and Democrats must understand exactly what this action means, and the Democrats, particularly, should understand the issue. If the Democrats fail to do so, their great party can be wrecked; or, what would be worse, completely captured and used as the instrument to keep pro-Soviets in power.

Whether you usually vote Democratic or Republican is immaterial; you must know that what I am saying is true. Your reason will tell you it is true. Don't accept my opinion, and don't accept others' opinion either; but look at the factual record and apply your ordinary common sense.

Here are the high spots of that record:

1. The people and the governments of China have been our great Asiatic friends for a hundred years.

2. This friendship was and is so strong that even a pro-Communist State Department official, writing from China in 1944, was forced to say: "No government can survive in China without the blessing of the United States."

3. Earl Browder, the one-time Communist leader in the United States, testified under oath last summer that State Department policy and the Communist Party policy on China became the same in 1942 and that he—Earl Browder—was called to the State Department and given the message confirming this change, to transmit to the Red Chinese that this would be future policy.

4. The American people were not told about this change in policy however; and even our Ambassador to China was not so informed. Patrick Hurley, the United States Ambassador, was allowed to keep up the fiction of cooperation with the legal government of China, but his pro-Soviet staff had their own secret orders.

5. At Yalta, in February 1945, Mr. Hiss, Mr. Acheson, and Mr. Stettinius, with Mr. Roosevelt, secretly sold out the Chinese Government to the Communists. They betrayed Poland at the same time; and this betrayal was made public, because Stalin wanted Poland right away. But Stalin did not move on China until he was sure Japan had been knocked out. So, the betrayal of China was kept secret. The part of the Yalta agreement which betrayed China was kept secret for 2 years.

6. Up to this point, Mr. Truman was not responsible for betraying China. But, don't think Mr. Truman didn't know about the policy of betraying China to the Reds. Maybe he didn't know about Yalta, but he did know the rest, because Patrick Hurley told him so. When Hurley resigned on November 26, 1945, his resignation contained these warning and prophetic words—I quote: "We finished the war in the Far East furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professionals openly advised the Communists' armed party to decline unification * * * unless the Chinese Communists were given control. The weakness of the American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. There is a third world war in the making. * * * The war that is now in the making is not even intended to defend or establish democratic ideals. * * * A considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support communism generally, as well as specifically, in China. * * * Make no mistake, Mr. President, America's economic strength has been used all over the world to defeat American policies and interest."

That was said to Mr. Truman in November 1945, by a man who could not conceivably have any political or personal reason for speaking anything but the truth. And, the men he named as betrayers of this country are still in our State Department.

7. What did Mr. Truman do? On December 15, 1945, less than 3 weeks after he had been given the facts by Ambassador Hurley, Truman issued a statement on policy toward China, practically ordering the National Government to take in the Communists. And, to make sure the Government of China understood him, he said, "United States support will not extend to United States military intervention to influence the course of any Chinese internal strife."

8. Not content with telling the President of China to bring the Chinese Reds into his Government, Truman sent Gen. George Marshall to China to bring the Red Chinese into power. When Chiang Kai-shek resisted and told Marshall that he was betraying China to the Reds, Marshall stopped all aid to China—and on December 18, 1946, President Truman made it clear to the Red world that it could take over. Said appeaser Truman, "No weapons which could be used in fighting a civil war were made available."

9. Thereafter, Mr. Truman was repeatedly warned of the dangers he had brought to America by his China policy, so, on July 9, 1947, Mr. Truman sent Lieutenant General Wedemeyer to China to make an appraisal of the situation. He instructed General Wedemeyer to recommend to him what action he, President Truman, should take.

Wedemeyer was not sent by General MacArthur. He was not sent by the Republicans in the Congress. General Wedemeyer was a man selected and sent to China by President Truman. Now, let's see what President Truman's own emissary had to say to him after his survey.

Wedemeyer reported, among other things, "The bulk of the Chinese are not disposed to communism and they are not concerned with ideologies. * * * Although the Japanese offered increasingly favorable surrender terms during the course of the war, China elected to remain steadfast with her allies. * * * (This fact should be considered in any criticism of the Government of China.) * * * Indirectly, the United States facilitated the Soviet program in the Far East by agreeing at the Yalta Conference to Russian reentry into Manchuria and later by withholding aid from the National Government. * * * Prompt action is necessary to prevent Manchuria from becoming a Soviet satellite. * * * Gradually, it has become apparent that there remains a world power presenting even greater dangers to world peace than did the Nazi militarists and the Japanese jingoists. * * * It may be said that the American mediation effort (that is, Marshall's mission) has been to the advantage of the Chinese Communists and conversely to the disadvantage of the National Government. * * * At this time a policy of no assistance to China would be equivalent to cutting the ground from under the feet of the Chinese Government. Removal of American assistance without removal of Soviet assistance would certainly lay the country open to eventual Communist domination, it would have repercussions in other parts of Asia, would lower American prestige in the Far East and make easier the spread of Soviet influence and Soviet political expansion—not only in Asia, but in other areas of the world.

That report was made to the President on the 19th of September 1947, by his own observant adviser. And what happened to this report? It was forbidden to be made public. And who forbade it to be made public? George Marshall, Acheson's stooge Secretary of Defense, testified under oath late last year, "I ordered it suppressed."

10. But Mr. Truman had still other warnings of what would happen. On November 9, 1948, the President of China pointed out to the President that China had signed a treaty with Russia on the advice of the United States and that Soviet aid given to the Chinese Communists was wrecking his country. Within the same week the Ambassador to China, Mr. Stuart, sent to the State Department a warning from the President of China, which said in part, "In case China should be subjugated by the Communists the third world war would surely follow, and mankind would once again be precipitated into a tragic disaster."

But within the same week General Marshall now became the Secretary of State, with Acheson and Jessup as his advisers, said that to help China would be, and I quote his exact words, "To embark upon a quixotic venture."

Thereafter it was announced by Acheson, in early 1950, that we would not defend those parts of our Pacific defense line made up of the Korean Peninsula and Formosa. But our military leaders saw that this also meant the eventual abandonment of Japan and the Philippines to the Reds and our withdrawal to Hawaii and our Pacific coast. Less than 12 hours before the attack on South Korea last June these military men evidently convinced the President of this fact. This secret leaked out, and the North Koreans marched. The rest is history.

There are the highlights of the record of the creation of Red China—not as I see it, but as it is. Red China is a creation of Hiss, Acheson, Stettinius, Marshall, and Truman. And when their creation and their betrayals threatened to destroy America's defense line of Japan, Korea, Formosa, and the Philippines, MacArthur stood firm against further betrayals. Thereupon the Reds in and out of Government demanded his head. Mr. Truman delivered—because, in my opinion, he was pledged to deliver.

Good afternoon.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The MacArthur Week, by George E. Sokolsky, broadcast on April 22, 1951, over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President technically disgraced Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He dismissed a general in the field in the course of battle. He dismissed the general suddenly, in the dark of night. He dismissed him without hearing or trial. He dismissed him for insubordination.

Then a phenomenon occurred which requires keen study and analysis. Let me put it to you this way:

We speak of this country as a democracy which, of course, politically it is not. It is a representative republic, in which the people control their Government through five elected officials, the President, the Vice President, two United States Senators, and one Member of the House of Representatives. To these are given specific duties, obligations, responsibilities, and authorities by the Constitution. What is not designated to them is reserved to the States and the people thereof. Limitations upon government are clearly stated in the Constitution.

In a true democracy, the people directly set the policies of government; in a representative republic the people control the government indirectly by stated elections.

Various steps have heretofore been recommended to make our system of government more democratic, such as the referendum and recall. Some of these have been tried locally, but they have in no manner altered the basic character of our representative government.

Therefore the MacArthur Week, starting at 1 a. m. on Wednesday morning, April 11, and lasting until about 5 p. m. on Friday, April 20, represents an important political phenomenon. It is democracy at work.

I shall take you through this process step by step:

On Wednesday, when the public rose to read their newspapers, they read that the President had suddenly and with finality dismissed Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The politicians of both parties felt that it was too bad. The Republicans were more angry that the President had dismissed General MacArthur in disgrace than that he had been recalled. The Democrats formed ranks because they realized that the President had pulled a boner, that he had acted the boor.

All this had nothing to do with whether General MacArthur was right or wrong, whether he had been insubordinate or had obeyed the instructions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whether his program for Asia would or would not extend the war.

It was a normal response of decent human beings to a crude procedure against a man who had devoted 52 years of his 71 to the service of his country.

So the people acted. The President, every Senator, every Congressman, every newspaper editor, every columnist and commentator suddenly found himself snowed under a mass of letters and telegrams on the subject of MacArthur.

This was a spontaneous, unorganized popular response. For instance, I was awakened to the news during the night; throughout the morning of Wednesday my telephone was tied up to answer the simple question: "What can we do?" I began to receive checks—which we are, of course, returning—from persons who wanted to contribute to a fund to honor MacArthur. There was no committee, no organization, no leadership; there was only action by the people.

Even by Wednesday night it was clear that the people were in some manner overruling the Government.

Many politicians believed that it would pass over quickly; that it would be a single shout and die down.

The demand by Thursday had grown into a terrific ground swell and it centered on MacArthur appearing before a joint meeting of the Congress to state his case.

This the Democrats, under pressure from the President, rejected. Their first compromise was that he would appear before a senatorial committee in secret session. This Representative JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, who took the lead in the matter in Congress, rejected as not good enough.

By Thursday the ground swell was so great that it was no longer a question of MacArthur's disgrace, it was rather a question of defending the President and the Democratic Party.

President Truman immediately took to the radio to defend his course—that is, on Wednesday night—but he could not stem the tide.

It was then that the Republicans and Democrats tangled over the question of the forum that would be afforded the general. MacArthur himself was no part of this quarrel. He maintained a dignified aloofness. The Democrats then offered a meeting in the Library of Congress, which JOE MARTIN rejected as not good enough. He threatened to hire a stadium for a forum.

Thursday, Friday, Saturday, the people spoke as they had never before done in this country. The popular emotion was a response to many things: to the Communists and homosexuals in the State Department, to the shame of our cities as evidenced by the Kefauver committee, to the mink coats and deep freezes, to the corruption in the RFC, to the Fulbright committee's investigations, to the President's letters, and to the President's intimate friends, to the coterie of Missouri fixers that surround him.

In a way, these questions overshadowed the MacArthur dismissal. But nothing overshadowed the fact that more than 10,000 Americans had been killed in the stalemated Korean War.

On Sunday, General MacArthur left Japan on the *Bataan* with his wife and son. It was reminiscent of his departure from Bataan in an open boat, with his wife and son. The Japanese wept at his departure. Even the Emperor broke all precedents and called on MacArthur to bid him farewell. America responded with an unmistakable demand for a hero's welcome. The rest, you have witnessed.

This should be understood by the delegates to the United Nations, by the Russians, and the British, and the Indians: The stupendous reception given to General MacArthur by the American people is democracy at work in this country.

The American people overruled their Government. President Truman could dismiss General MacArthur; he could not disgrace General MacArthur. The citizens demonstrated that in this country the authority of government rests with the people; that it is for the people to decide who is to be honored and who is to be disgraced. And they decided.

There is a further point to be made concerning all this:

We have for many years now become accustomed to regarding the President as more than he is in our system of government. This was due to three causes:

1. The personal charm of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

2. The despair of the depression and the fright of the war.

3. A propaganda build-up, which has cost the American taxpayer an enormous amount of money, designed to publicize favorably the Executive and reduce the authority of the congressional branch of Government.

The effect of it has been that we have been getting government by experts, working in secrecy and facing Congress and the people with the results of their private actions which would no longer be undone. Most Americans now realize that the secret agreements at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and other conferences brought on the Korean War, forced upon us rehabilitation of our industries and of our sons, and a wartime budget in what the politicians call peace.

The people regard their country as in peril.

This, then, is what the demonstration for Gen. Douglas MacArthur means in its broadest and impersonal aspects.

Recognizing the high regard of our people for MacArthur, they nevertheless spontaneously sensed that this is a way to emphasize to the President that the people are displeased, frightened, and angered and that they want a change from the policies pursued and the methods employed by the administration not only in our foreign relations but in domestic affairs.

And it is also a warning to Great Britain—to Great Britain more than to any other country.

Most Americans believe that the prime factor in the removal of General MacArthur has been the constant and unseemly British opposition to him.

From now on we shall have an American policy in the Far East. The British can do

what their interests require them to do—but so shall the American people. Anybody, the President or the Secretary of State, who thinks otherwise, will find an American public opinion that has rediscovered its power and authority.

This is democracy at work.

The political issue that Douglas MacArthur raised is: Who is telling the truth—the President or Douglas MacArthur? The President says that MacArthur acted without authority; MacArthur says that his program was approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Up to this moment, General Bradley has not denied that the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved MacArthur's program for Asia.

Until this is cleared up, it remains a controversial and troublesome question in American life. Our people dislike liars—they need to know who lied in this vital matter.

Soviet Cultural Influence in North Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, Dr. Harvie Branscomb, the chancelor of Vanderbilt University, who is Chairman of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, has been kind enough to send me a copy of the fifth semiannual report of the Commission, dated April 6, 1951. The Commission was created under the Smith-Mundt Act to advise both the Congress and the Department of State on the progress of our international educational exchanges.

I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD one section of Dr. Branscomb's latest report, a section dealing with Soviet cultural activities in North Korea.

Last summer, testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee on my Resolution No. 243, I asked how the Soviet Union had been able to whip up the emotions of the people of North Korea to the point where tens of thousands of their boys were flinging themselves against our machine guns. I cited as at least a partial answer the power of the Pyongyang radio, and other instruments of Communist-controlled propaganda. Now Dr. Branscomb assembles the evidence on the enormous scale of Soviet cultural penetration in North Korea, as distinct from its activities in radio, pamphleteering, posters, and the handling of the news.

I am not introducing Dr. Branscomb's material because of its retrospective value. The North Korean instance is a test case on how Soviet propaganda works, and as such is applicable to many areas of the world. It is a warning to us of the nature and scale of the Soviet thrust which we must counter and overcome.

Think of it, by 1949, 1,300,000 North Koreans, out of a total of 8,000,000, were enrolled in Korean-Soviet culture societies, in 105 branches. One hundred and nine special Russian-language schools were established. In 1949 alone some 500 Soviet books were translated into Korean, 2 of them attaining distribution totaling 537,000 copies. During 1949, 209 Soviet films were imported into North Korea. In 1948, 70,000 lectures and concerts were given by Soviet artists, writers, and other cultural representatives in Korea, and an even greater number were given in 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTACHMENT

SOVIET CULTURAL INFLUENCE IN NORTH KOREA

The predominant role of the Soviet Union in North Korea is reflected in North Korean education and culture. During the period of Japanese rule, mass education of the Koreans was neglected, artistic creativity was repressed, and literature, drama, and art were limited to a select few, mainly Koreans educated in Japan. The educational and cultural void enabled first the Soviet occupation forces and then the North Korean regime to foster Soviet culture among the mass Korean people through the educational system and through the encouragement of mass appreciation of Soviet literature, drama, and art. Until the past year, however, lack of facilities limited the scope of the educational and cultural program. Since then there has been increased activity in both programs.

Most aspects of Soviet cultural imperialism are carried out through official channels. The programs are facilitated by the Economic and Cultural Agreement of March 17, 1949, which states:

"The contracting parties shall in every way develop and consolidate the relations which have been established between them in the spheres of culture, science, and art."

The objectives of the Soviet educational and cultural programs are publicly supported by the North Korean Government leaders, who have avowed the superiority of Soviet culture and have encouraged the spread of training in the Russian language, the influx of Soviet educators into the schools, the translation, publication, and reading of Soviet literature and the cultivation of Soviet artistic works.[1]

The educational and cultural programs projected to encourage assimilation of Soviet culture are implemented mainly by the Ministries of Education and Propaganda. In addition, there are special organizations charged with the responsibility for the propagation of Soviet culture. The Korean-Soviet Culture Society is the indigenous agency primarily responsible for the Soviet cultural program. In the fall of 1945 the society had a membership of about 3,700, with only 20 branches. By May 1949 the membership of the society was over 1,300,000, with 105 branches and 20,000 units. Among the activities of the society are the translation and publication of books, the publication of a newspaper and a magazine, and the making of arrangements for lecture tours, concerts, theatrical performances, etc.

There are, moreover, certain Soviet organizations that direct the flow of materials and Soviet representatives to the Korean-Soviet Culture Society and to other indigenous organizations. Among these are the Soviet culture houses and several propaganda outlets under the Soviet Embassy; the Soviet Information Bureau and Soviet libraries; the Soviet Motion Picture Export and Import Society (a branch of the Soviet Ministry of Cinema Industry); and the TASS News Agency.

Soviet influence on the educational system

A primary objective of Soviet educational policy is the teaching of Russian as the second language in North Korean schools. The Ministry of Education has reportedly decreed that Russian will be the only required foreign language in Korean schools. In order to train middle school teachers and Government employees, 109 special Russian-language schools have been established. There are reported to be 1,580 graduates of these special schools already. A Russian Language College has been established in Pyongyang. Reliable reports indicate that the Russian language has been added to the curriculum of other colleges and universities. In addition to Russian training, courses on Marxism, Soviet history, literature, art, and other aspects of the Soviet civilization are offered in North Korean schools.

Soviet influence over the educational system is further manifested through the assignment of Soviet scholars and professors to teach in North Korean colleges and universities, short visits of other Soviet academic personnel, and the provision of Soviet textbooks, teaching and training manuals, experimental apparatus, and literary works on both an advanced and an elementary level. It is reported that 13 of the original members of the teaching staff of Kim Il Sung University were Russians. Since July 1948, more than 30 well-known Soviet scholars have visited the various Korean institutions of higher learning to assist in their educational programs. Soviet engineers also visited Korea to provide similar assistance in industrial and agricultural fields.

The Soviet Union has also brought Korean students to the U. S. S. R. for educational training in the natural sciences, humanities, public administration, engineering, and other technical fields. More than 600 such students, both men and women, are currently in the Soviet Union, and recent reports indicate that many more students are expected to go to the U. S. S. R. These students, upon their return, are expected to assume positions of responsibility in the Government and political organizations and to form a nucleus for the Communist intelligentsia in North Korea.

Cultural assimilation

Assimilation of Soviet culture is sought not only through Soviet influence over the educational system but also through dissemination to the general public of a wide variety of translated Soviet publications; the performance of Soviet motion pictures, plays, music, ballet, and the like; the exhibition of Soviet creative works; and the visits and lectures of Soviet writers, artists, and other cultural representatives. In the field of publications, from the time of the Soviet "liberation" up to 1948, 72 books (with a total of 770,000 copies) were published in North Korea, most of them translations of Soviet literature and technical books. In 1949, some 500 books were translated; copies of the History of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the U. S. S. R. and Stalin's Collected Works alone totaled 537,000. In addition, two daily newspapers are devoted primarily to Soviet writings; one published by the Korean-Soviet Culture Society and the other by the Soviet Foreign Culture Association. Finally, there is also a weekly publication of the Soviet Foreign Culture Association and a magazine published by the Korean-Soviet Culture Society.

In the nonpublication fields, there are numerous examples of Soviet cultural penetration. During 1949 more than 209 Soviet films were imported into North Korea and shown in both urban and rural areas. The State Theater at Pyongyang, established on January 9, 1947, is reserved for the performance of Soviet plays and for concerts by Soviet musicians and dancers. Its limited facilities, however, permitted the production of only eight plays in 1950. Finally, almost 70,000 lectures and concerts were given by Soviet artists, writers, and other cultural representatives in 1949, and an even greater number were given in 1949.

[1] Typical statements propounding Soviet cultural superiority are:

"In order to develop the important educational culture, it is the most pressing popular aspiration to study and absorb broadly the advanced Soviet educational science, and to consolidate more than ever the everlasting imperishable good will between Korea and the Soviet Union. * * * Soviet educational science occupies the highest place in the world as the means to develop culture and the weapon for the realization of a Communist society." (Pyongyang radio broadcast on October 26, 1949, of a speech by Paik Nam Un, Minister of Education.)

"Only by absorbing the advanced Soviet culture will we be able to develop our national culture further. Therefore we must intensify our efforts to absorb more vigorously the advanced Soviet culture so that we may develop our national culture to a higher level and make ours a rich, powerful country." (Pyongyang radio broadcast on October 19, 1949, of a speech by Pae Chong Son, Vice Minister of Culture and Propaganda, on the necessity for the absorption of Soviet culture.)

Comments on MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Arthur Bliss Lane, dated April 17, 1951, and published in the New York Times on April 19, 1951, regarding the dismissal of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON MACARTHUR

AWAKENED NATION SEES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the universally general discussions which are taking place on General MacArthur's dismissal there is too much emphasis on the personal note (i. e., who is right, Truman or MacArthur?) and too little attention to the basic problem involved, our national security.

In evaluating the situation we should keep in mind the events not only since June 1950, but since 1943, when General Marshall as Chief of Staff argued in favor of bringing the Soviet Union into the war against Japan. On good authority I learn that MacArthur then opposed bringing the Soviets or Great Britain into the far-eastern phase of the war on the correct ground that we were capable of winning it alone and that our allies would undoubtedly wish to impose conditions when the victory was won. (I do not need to remind your readers that MacArthur has in the recent crisis been pilloried by both the British and Soviet press.)

The Marshall mission to China, which had as its aim and result the introduction of Communists into the Nationalist Chinese Government, the suppression of the Wedemeyer report, the Acheson statement of January 1950, setting forth the policy of the administration on Formosa, were all steps leading to the inevitable: the elimination of the man who consistently stood for the protection of American interests and prestige and who reportedly was not consulted on the Korean adventure.

It would indeed be presumptuous on my part to pretend to read General MacArthur's thoughts or motives which led to his dismissal. But I feel sure many of us believe that his dramatic separation from his command, damaging though it may be to our standing in the Far East, will accomplish something which even General MacArthur could not have accomplished had he remained in a position subordinate to his Commander in Chief: the awakening of the American people to the enormity of the danger in which we now lie.

Fortunately there are democratic and constitutional steps by which the disaster lurking behind the danger can still be averted.

ARTHUR BLISS LANE.

WASHINGTON, *April 17, 1951.*

To Halt Inflation, the Genuine Remedy Is the Gold Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Maj. Hamilton A. Long, that was reprinted in the February 1946 issue of Great Lakes Banker, Journal of Illinois Bankers Association, explaining in nontechnical language the decisive importance of restoration of the gold standard:

NO THERMOMETER, THEREFORE NO FEVER?

(By Maj. Hamilton A. Long)

INVITING TROUBLE

If a patient with a fever should smash his thermometer, he would thereby neither reduce his fever nor protect himself against fever and illness in the future. He would only be asking for trouble.

Those who blamed the gold standard for our economic ills and considered it an agent for evil are like the patient who blames a thermometer for his fever. The gold standard is essentially a device for testing the state of a country's financial health by measuring public confidence in the credit of the government—paper money and government bonds, in the credit of banks, bank deposits, and notes—and in credit conditions in general. The gold standard is like a thermometer. It is a device which cannot do any harm and can be very useful to all the people of a country—of our country.

HOW THE GOLD STANDARD WORKS

When a country is on the gold standard, its government promises to keep on hand, as security behind its paper money, an amount of gold equal to a stated percentage of that paper money. The government also promises that it will exchange a specified amount of gold on demand for each unit of its paper money. If the gold standard were functioning in this country today, anyone could exchange paper dollars for gold dollars at any time.

When this public confidence is shaken, the people demand gold in exchange for paper money. By doing this they show their disapproval of the conditions which created lack of confidence. It is a warning to their public servants to take corrective action. On the other hand, when the people allow the gold to remain in the government's possession, it is tangible proof of their confidence. This is the way the people use a functioning gold standard to safeguard their country's financial health and their own welfare.

When the people demand gold in exchange for paper money, the government usually takes corrective action in an effort to restore confidence before its gold supply is seriously reduced. If, however, the conditions which created lack of confidence cannot be readily corrected, and the people continue to demand gold, the government usually goes off the gold standard. It stops redeeming paper money in gold. By such action the government officially acknowledges the existence of these conditions and the difficulty of correcting them. This focuses attention upon these conditions and puts public officials under pressure to take corrective action. When these conditions are finally corrected and public confidence is restored, the government can then return to the gold standard by again redeeming paper money in gold upon demand.

The gold standard works the same way in every country, regardless of the amount of gold exchangeable for a unit of paper money, regardless of the fact that this amount may be changed by the government from time to time.

NOT A "CROSS OF GOLD AND CROWN OF THORNS"

As the gold standard is simply a device for measuring public confidence in the soundness of Government credit, bank credit, and credit conditions in general, it cannot be held responsible for the state of these factors. Under no circumstances is it sensible to blame the gold standard for our economic ills. The old political slogan that the gold standard is a "cross of gold and crown of thorns" for the people is as absurd as it would be to say that a thermometer is a cross of mercury and a crown of thorns for a patient.

COMPARATIVELY LITTLE GOLD IS ENOUGH

When a country is on the gold standard, all bank depositors cannot at the same time withdraw their deposits and exchange their paper money for gold. There is never enough gold available to make this possible. For example, in 1929, when this country was on the gold standard, our total bank deposits were over 12 times the amount of our gold supply. This great excess of deposits over gold supply always exists. In the case of a great country like ours, total bank deposits far exceed the entire world's gold supply. The fact that the function of the gold held by the Government is simply to serve as tangible evidence of public confidence is a basic reason why it is not necessary for a country to have an amount of gold equal to its bank deposits in order to be on the gold standard.

A THERMOMETER TAKEN APART

The basic elements of a functioning gold standard are (1) a law fixing the gold content of the standard currency unit; (2) a supply of gold; (3) the practice, sanctioned by law, of redeeming paper money in gold upon demand. When a Government stops redeeming paper money in gold the other two elements become useless in measuring public confidence in credit conditions—just as a thermometer taken apart becomes merely mercury and glass which are useless in detecting fever. Since our Government will not now redeem paper money in gold upon demand, our present enormous gold supply is useless in testing the state of our country's financial health.

NO SIN OR CRIME

No sensible person would assume that he has no fever just because he has no thermometer. Likewise, no sensible person should assume that our country is in good health financially just because we have no functioning gold standard.

It is, of course, no sin or crime for this country not to be on the gold standard with a standard gold dollar like the one in use in 1932, or with a standard gold dollar containing a different amount of gold. However, this is only part of the completely accurate proposition.

JUST COMMON SENSE

The other and more important part is this: It is equally true that it is not absolutely necessary for a patient to have a thermometer, but if he has one he is likely to be better off because it will help him to know his condition and act to safeguard his health.

A country which does not take advantage of the proved usefulness of the gold standard is at best following a highly dangerous course. It is only common sense to learn by experience; and we in this country have had enough and experiences to provide us with ample lessons.

NOT WORTH A CONTINENTAL

Take one example alone. In the early days of our country, a type of paper money called Continentals was in use. This money was not redeemable in gold, so there was no limit upon the amount that could be issued. There was a great depression then; and more and more of these Continentals were printed to help pay Government expenses in order to avoid facing the unpleasant and unpopular task of heavily taxing the people to balance the budget. Finally, so many of them were issued that the public lost faith in their value; and Continentals became practically worthless. Today, over a century and a half later, "Not worth a Continental" is still a popular synonym for worthlessness.

CONTINENTALS, GREENBACKS, AND OTHER DEFICIT FINANCING

If a country is not on the gold standard in a time of economic depression and government expenditures far exceed tax collections, there is an almost irresistible temptation for the government to use its credit to finance its deficits instead of collecting enough taxes for this purpose. This is done by printing and issuing paper money which is not redeemable in gold (whether greenbacks or paper money of some other color makes no difference); or by adding to the public debt through printing and issuing government promises (bonds and notes) payable in future years; or by both methods. The first method is currency inflation; the second, credit inflation.

This deficit financing is easy to start, easy to carry to excess, and extremely hard to stop. Stopping it becomes increasingly unpopular the longer it is practiced. Gradually such an easy-money, easy-borrowing policy wins wider and wider popular acceptance, even among those who utterly condemned it at the beginning. The situation is aggravated by the fact that it is impossible to know with certainty just when such inflation must be stopped if financial collapse is to be avoided. In such a situation, political leaders are tempted to spend more and more freely and to create larger and larger deficits when they are being met—temporarily—simply by using the printing press.

TODAY'S BILLIONS UPON BILLIONS

Consider our own case today. A billion dollars now sounds commonplace. The prewar doubling of the national debt, as a result of a succession of annual deficits of billions of dollars, was viewed by most people and public officials without alarm, even with indifference. A few years previously, however, when deficits began to occur, even a hundred million dollars sounded like a huge amount of money. Everyone would have been shocked then to know that the subsequent astronomical deficits were to be incurred. This illustrates the chief danger of deficit financing through inflation—the readiness with which the people and their public servants gradually come to view, with growing complacency, its increasing use—the readiness with which they again and again invent new excuses for it and repeatedly revise their definition of the danger point in their eagerness to follow the temporarily easy path just a little while longer.

The public debt's wartime jump from $45,000,000,000 to about six times that figure, with multibillion deficits still continuing despite the war's end, makes this matter one of critical importance to the people as a whole.

The fact that a country is on the gold standard does not prevent the Government from meeting its deficits for a while by inflation of credit or of currency or both; but it does keep the people and their public servants keenly and continuously aware of the dangers involved. A functioning gold standard provides the people with an effective instrument for calling a halt to such deficit financing. It is the best safeguard the people can have against the evils of inflation. As a practical matter, it seems to be their only dependable safeguard.

AN EASY, SAFE STEP

Other countries could not withdraw enough of our gold to force us off the gold standard, because today we have over $20,000,000,000 in gold, several times as much as we need. When on the gold standard we never had over five billions in gold and usually much less. Other countries could withdraw two-thirds of our gold and still leave us far more than we ever had when on the gold standard—much more than we need now for this purpose.

In fact, we have far too much of the world's gold supply for our own good. It is greatly to our interest that other countries have sound stable currencies based upon gold. Our real problem, therefore, is how to help them get a large part of our gold for this purpose.

All that is needed to return this country to the gold standard is an act of Congress requiring the Treasury to redeem paper money in gold upon demand and specifying the amount of gold to be exchanged for each paper dollar. When this has been done, the people of our country will again have a functioning gold thermometer.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Public Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a testimonial statement on the occasion of the approaching fifteenth anniversary of the Public Affairs Committee, which is also being celebrated by the publication, in conjunction with the American Red Cross, of the pamphlet Blood—Your Gift of Life. I am glad to pay this tribute to the significant contribution this committee has made to our democracy by its publication of 175 different pamphlets which have now run into a circulation of nearly 17,000,000 copies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE'S FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY AND ON RELEASE OF ITS ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH PAMPHLET, BLOOD—YOUR GIFT OF LIFE, IN COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

In a few weeks one of the country's most unusual publishing ventures celebrates its fifteenth birthday. Fittingly enough its anniversary publication will be issued in conjunction with the American National Red Cross blood program. I would like to call the attention of the Congress to this venture because it typifies all that is best in the American tradition.

The organization is the Public Affairs Committee which this month will begin distribution of its seventeen millionth pamphlet; pamphlets which have come to be recognized as giving reliable, simply stated, down-to-earth facts on important subjects, and which people can use in their homes, schools, churches, clubs, and forums.

As its anniversary pamphlet the committee is publishing Blood—Your Gift of Life, and in a foreword to this anniversary pamphlet E. Roland Harriman, president of the American National Red Cross, pays tribute to its timeliness and calls for the full support of every American for the blood donor program "in the interest of better national health and greater national security." This is the one hundred and seventy-fifth pamphlet to be published at a price people can afford to pay by the Public Affairs Committee, a nonprofit educational organization that stands alone in the field of popular education in important subjects.

The Public Affairs Committee was born in the midst of the depression when everybody was talking about America's social and economic problems, but very few knew the facts. A great deal of research was being done, but for the most part results were buried in the technical journals and were not finding their way to community leaders. How to bridge that gap, how to bring vital information to all Americans in readable form without dogma was a problem met by a group of outstanding economists, political scientists, and educators. Chiefly responsible for the organization of the Public Affairs Committee was the late Raymond Leslie Buell, then president of the Foreign Policy Association, who became its first chairman. Other founders included Luther Gulick, director of the Institute of Public Administration; Harold G. Moulton, of Brookings Institution; Evans Clark, of the Twentieth Century Fund; Lyman Bryson, of Columbia University; and the late William Trufant Foster.

In the spring of 1936 the committee began printing its widely recognized and accepted 32-page pamphlet. The first year the committee congratulated itself on having distributed 100,000 pamphlets at the cost price of 10 cents each. Now more than a million pamphlets a year go out to the public even though costs have increased to 20 cents apiece.

Today, the 175 titles dealing with health and family problems, education, and social studies are available in libraries, bookstores, and schools. They are used by organizations to obtain the latest information about subjects in their field of interest. The pamphlets have been carefully chosen to meet the needs of the times. A year or so ago, when the threat to the American way of life became a paramount national issue, the committee published a pamphlet, What About Communism? by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., the Pulitzer prize historian. Immediately after the war it published Rebuilding Europe—After Victory by Hiram Motherwell of the Columbia Broadcasting Co. During the war, when the Armed Forces were in need of a basic pamphlet dealing with race and inter-group relations, the committee published The Races of Mankind, by Ruth Benedict of Columbia University, which itself sold almost one million copies and has since become a little classic in this country with movies, books, scientific exhibits, filmstrip slides, musical comedy, Sunday school programs, and even popular songs and recordings based on its simple story of social anthropology.

A number of distinguished pamphlets on personal economic and social problems have also been issued by the committee. Pamphlets like Facts and Tips for Servicemen, Building Your Marriage, Loan Sharks and Their Victims, and How to Adopt a Baby have been read by hundreds of thousands of people. In the field of health and science, pamphlets on polio, heart, cancer, diabetes, TB, cerebral palsy, arthritis and rheumatism, teeth and alcoholism have brought to millions the latest scientific information in a form easily understood.

The success of the pamphlets can be measured by the high opinion in which they are held. Universities, churches, civic groups, educators, statesmen, industrialists and publishers have paid tribute, at various times, to these objective and informative pamphlets.

Testimonials have been received by Public Affairs Pamphlets from universities as far apart geographically as Columbia in New York, Stanford in California, Xavier University in the East and Occidental College in the West. Church groups ranging from the Protestant Episcopal Church to the Southern Baptist Convention have extolled these pamphlets.

The American Jewish Committee, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Kiwanis International, the National Urban League and the Garden Club of America have all made enthusiastic comments about the pamphlets issued by this remarkable educational committee. The very diversity of the groups cited shows the wide scope of material covered by these inexpensive yet informative publications.

One of our former, beloved and respected colleagues, the Hon. Arthur Capper, once wrote:

"I have just received the complete set of copies of Public Affairs Pamphlets issued by you. You have rendered a great service to agriculture and to our country. I intend to keep these pamphlets on file in my office for future reference."

Ernest Minor Patterson, president of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, wrote:

"One of the most valuable media of public education in America today is the pamphlets published by the Public Affairs Committee. To all students of social science they are a most effective supplement to the ponderous presentations of the specialists for the specialists. The Public Affairs Committee is to be congratulated upon the vivid and effective manner in which the topics in successive issues are being treated."

Robert Sutherland, director of the Hogg Foundation in Texas, wrote:

"Your committee is rendering such an excellent service that we want to cooperate fully, calling it to the attention of everyone with whom we work."

J. L. Blair Buck, coordinator of teacher education, Virginia State Board of Education, wrote:

"We make effective use of your pamphlets in our schools, and we value their objectivity."

The Reverend Edward A. Cahill, executive secretary, World Churches Organization, said:

"It is pamphlets such as yours which must be given widespread circulation if American democracy is to be cleaned up here on the home front and the basis laid for a full-fledged American participation in the building of the new world of the future."

Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, whose valued help and wisdom is known and appreciated by all of us, is on record as stating:

"The Legislative Reference Service receives your pamphlets regularly and we find them very useful."

Testimonials have been received from eminent leaders of business and industry who read and use these valuable pamphlets. Among them are Thomas J. Watson, president of International Business Machines; Eli Lilly, chairman of the board of the famous pharmaceutical house bearing his name, and Alfred P. Sloan, chairman of the board of General Motors (one of the world's greatest industrial corporations) and founder of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

What kind of committee is the Public Affairs Committee? Who decides what shall be published? How reliable are its pamphlets? The answers are worth noting. The small group of economists, educators, and political scientists who first formed the committee in the mid-1930's have since grown to 26 eminent members. Included among them are doctors of medicine, representatives of universities, the churches, business and organized labor, as well as social sciences. As a committee they have no program of their own to promote, no one school of thought. In fact, their constitution specifically says: "The sole purpose of the committee is educational. It has no economic or social program of its own to promote."

WHO SELECTS THE TOPICS OF THE PAMPHLETS?

The first step in publishing a Public Affairs pamphlet is to select a topic. I have learned that the original suggestion for this may come from a member of the committee or from its staff, from organizations initiating the research, or from users of the pamphlets. These recommendations are studied and are turned over to the organization's board of directors at its bimonthly meetings. The board of directors of this committee is in itself an unusual group in the sense that it has not been drawn from big names to impress people, or because of organizational connection or financial standing. The board consists of people who are informed about the best social and economic research going on in the country and who are competent to judge it. They are definitely not of any one school of thought. But this one thing they do have in common, a great interest in seeing that important social and economic facts reach the largest number of people. The board weighs each proposal for a pamphlet. It decides its present-day importance and relevance to the committee's program. It is the board that decides what subjects should be dealt with.

HOW RELIABLE ARE THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS PAMPHLETS?

From the information I have about the committee, I believe the editorial work on each pamphlet is as careful as it can be. The author selected is recognized as an authority in his field, whose work shows his ability to write analytically and objectively on important issues. To make certain that all of its pamphlets are accurate in fact and reflect the high standards of scholarship in their interpretation, a careful system of checks and balances has been set up. All the manuscripts are submitted to a panel of from 15 to 25 experts chosen by the board to represent a diversity of opinion. On the basis of comments from these experts the manuscripts are thoroughly revised to eliminate doubtful or inaccurate statements, and to present controversial issues adequately, honestly, and objectively.

Before publication the revised manuscripts are again reviewed, first by a subcommittee and then by the Public Affairs Committee as a whole. From these comments final revisions are made. The success of this procedure has been demonstrated in the 15 years that Maxwell Stewart has served as editor. From its first pamphlet to the present, the accuracy of none of the factual statements in a Public Affairs Pamphlet have been challenged by specialists in the subject matter. In subsequent editions, of course, full advantage has always been taken of new knowledge. Pamphlets on current issues in which there is interest are usually brought up to date.

A good many of the Public Affairs Pamphlets are cooperative ventures, with the committee seeking out as many as possible of the groups working successfully in a particular field for advice and criticism in the preparation of the pamphlets. For example, the anniversary pamphlet Blood—Your Gift of Life is prepared in cooperation with the American National Red Cross. A recent pamphlet on heart disease was prepared in cooperation with the American Heart Association. Other pamphlets have been done with the American Genetics Society, the National Association for Mental Health, the Conservation Foundation, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Conference of Christians and Jews. In fact most pamphlets are prepared in close cooperation with the national agencies most directly concerned.

WHO SUPPORTS THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE?

The committee's money, I understand, has come from two sources: grants from educational foundations and sales of the Public Affairs Pamphlets. The initial organizing grants were made by the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation, and beginning in 1937 the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation made grants annually for more than 10 years. Since 1946 aid has been received from the Carnegie Corp., Marshall Field Foundation, and the Twentieth Century Fund. The great bulk of its support, however, remains with the people who have bought 17,000,000 copies of the committee's publications.

In surveying the work of this outstanding organization, it is worth noting that pamphleteering has always held a high place in the American tradition, starting with the birth of our Nation and coming down to the present.

As our means of communication expanded, as national publications tended to dominate the field of written thought, as books became a major force in the intellectual life of our country, the place of the pamphlet tended to become obscured. It is difficult to think of another organization which can approach the inspiring record of the Public Affairs Committee in keeping alive the tradition of the American pamphlet—the forceful, intelligent, informative approach to vital subjects at a price so low as to be within the reach of virtually every person.

On this fifteenth anniversary, it is proper to extend to the Public Affairs Committee, its board of directors who have so wisely guided its policies, its staff and its readers the well wishes of all who believe that informed discussion is a cornerstone of successful democracy. I am appending a list of its members to indicate the broadly representative character of this committee.

May it continue its job of popular education in the democratic spirit for many years to come.

THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mark Starr,[1] chairman; director of education, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, New York City.

F. Ernest Johnson,[1] vice chairman; executive director of the central department of research and survey of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York City.

Erling M. Hunt,[1] acting secretary; professor of history (and head of the department of the teaching of social science), Teachers College, Columbia University.

Beulah Amidon,[1] treasurer; associate editor of Survey magazine.

Ethel J. Alpenfels, associate professor of education, School of Education, New York University.

---

[1] Board members.

Eleanor C. Anderson,[1] formerly industrial secretary with the Young Women's Christian Association.

C. Ward Crampton, M. D., a prominent physician.

Robert E. Cushman, Goldwin Smith professor of government and head of department of government, Cornell University.

Thomas D. Dublin, M. D.,[1] director, National Health Council.

Samuel H. Flowerman,[1] director, department of scientific research, American Jewish Committee.

Roma Gans,[1] professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Sidonie M. Gruenberg, adviser on children's books, Doubleday & Co.

George T. Guernsey, associate director of education, department of education and research, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Howard Henderson,[1] vice president, J. Walter Thompson Co.

William L. Holland,[1] secretary-general, Institute of Pacific Relations.

S. M. Keeny, formerly director of association press, YMCA, and now on leave with the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund.

Harry W. Laidler, executive director, League for Industrial Democracy.

Robert P. Lane, executive director, community chest of Allegheny County, Pa.

Alfred McClung Lee,[1] department of sociology, Brooklyn College.

Kay W. Levin, labor educator.

Robert M. MacIver, chairman, department of sociology, Barnard College.

John Godfrey Morris, picture editor, Ladies' Home Journal.

Walter E. Myer, director, Civic Education Service.

Ernest G. Osborne,[1] professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Robert H. Reid, executive assistant, National Education Association.

Walter E. Sharp,[1] chairman, department of government, City College of New York.

[1] Board members.

Counterattack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 16 I called the attention of the House to the attempt of Fascist-minded groups in behalf of that monstrosity in the field of taxation, which seeks to repeal the sixteenth amendment—the income-tax amendment to the Constitution of the United States—and supplant in its place the obnoxious millionaire's amendment limiting taxes under our Federal laws to 25 percent on incomes, gifts, and inheritances. At the time I spoke to the House, I had been reasonably assured that the attempt to cram Senate Joint Resolution 7 through the Ohio Legislature petitioning the Congress to call a convention to submit this utterly indefensible proposal to the States for ratification had been definitely defeated. I am now informed that the resolution is still under consideration at Columbus, although the legislators have indicated they are not in sympathy with the objectives of this resolution.

We must ever be watchful, if we on the ramparts are to steer the Nation through the mine fields of financial and economic chaos. During these dark days, we must ever keep lit the sacred torch of liberty. The ratification of the millionaire's amendment would be a major calamity. It would with one fell stroke destroy our financial and economic system. The savings bonds bought by the little people would be so much papier mâché, and in the ensuing disorder, the money barons, like the robber barons of old, would be in the driver's seat, and representative government, as we know it, would disappear like the dying embers of a forest fire. All that we hold dear, all that we have worked for, and our boys have died for, would become a cruel mirage and the hopes and dreams of all our good, solid American citizens would wither and perish.

We must defeat this foul thing, this millionaire's amendment, if we are to survive as a nation. Twenty-two States have passed this resolution which, if approved by 32 States, will force this Congress to call a convention for the submission of this outrageous proposal to the States for ratification. It is, therefore very encouraging, Mr. Speaker, that an attempt is now being made in the New Jersey Legislature to repeal the action of that body taken in 1944, petitioning the Congress to submit the millionaire's amendment to the States for ratification. Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8 presently before the New Jersey Legislature would rescind the action taken by New Jersey 7 years ago. All liberty-loving groups are supporting this resolution, and I hope it will be passed so this stepping stone to disaster will be removed in this fight to preserve our economic order and our sacred liberties.

College Education Put Within Reach of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Wilmington College News, Wilmington, Ohio:

COLLEGE EDUCATION PUT WITHIN REACH OF ALL

WILMINGTON, OHIO, May 2.—A small Ohio college here has provided an answer for critics of college student draft deferment policies which have been called unfair to young men from families of limited means, because a qualified boy may be deferred only if he can afford the expense of a college education.

While the Nation has been debating the issue, Wilmington College has been busy setting up a new kind of work-study program which will enable students to earn virtually all of their college expenses. Under this earn-while-you-learn plan, a college education is available to every qualified young man regardless of his financial resources.

Established to help insure the Nation a supply of trained leaders for tomorrow, the program opens up an untapped source of potential leadership by putting higher education within reach of all who are willing to help themselves.

In announcing this program, Dr. Samuel D. Marble, visionary young president of Wilmington College, explained that the plan was inaugurated on an experimental basis last fall, and that the results have been more than gratifying. Approximately 100 students are now participating in this project and are getting invaluable employment experience as well as an income sufficient to cover their basic costs of tuition, room, and board.

Now that the idea has proven itself to both the college and the cooperating industries and business firms, it will be expanded this summer and fall with opening for 200 more young men and women, Dr. Marble said.

In operation, the plan provides that two students hold down one full-time job. One does the work on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday and attends classes on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, while the other student paired on the job has just the alternating schedule. The students are paid by the cooperating firms at the same rate as full-time workers, and have the advantage of living in dormitories on the campus and enjoying all the privileges of full-time resident students. While the majority are employed in industry, the student is free to select any course of his choice.

Students in the program can complete degree requirements in four calendar years and graduate with their classes holding not only a college degree, but in addition the equivalent of two full years of work experience.

Far-Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Not Much Help" appearing in the Park City Daily News of Bowling Green, Ky., on April 23, 1951:

Another great debate, this time over far-eastern policy, is under way. Calm reason and respect for fact ought to play a larger role in this public discussion than was true in the troops-for-Europe argument.

As an example, take the case of Chiang Kai-shek, leader of the Chinese Nationalist forces based on Formosa. The notion exists among many Americans that he commands a large, fairly well-equipped army which is in a fighting mood and needs only a signal from the West to jump into Korea or invade mainland China to help us bring the Korean war to a speedy end.

It is virtually suggested that American lives are being wasted through failure to tap this reservoir of trained military manpower close to the fighting scene.

What are the known facts?

First, though some estimates of Chiang's army run as high as 800,000 men, most military observers put the figure closer to 400,000. This is not a big army, but it is larger than the American forces now in the field in Korea.

The Nationalist army is not well equipped. Chiang's chief American adviser, Adm. Charles Cooke (retired) former Seventh Fleet commander, several months ago guessed it would take $250,000,000 in equipment to outfit this force for combat. With prices still spiraling, the cost unquestionably would be higher today. It might hit $300,000,000.

The morale of Chiang's troops is pretty much an unknown quantity. Though supplied with a lot of American equipment, his forces fighting on the mainland right after World War II did not acquit themselves well against the Chinese Reds. The present army has been held together on Formosa with difficulty over a 2-year span. It is not battle-tested.

It is wholly possible that with adequate equipment this army might give a good account of itself. But there is no way of knowing that in advance. Those who assure us the Nationalists would fight successfully are guessing since no facts exist on the matter.

Let's suppose we should give the word to Chiang to invade China proper. He has no air force worthy of the name and no fleet of consequence. Only the United States could provide the necessary sea-air cover to protect a mainland landing. And since air operations would necessarily involve bombing shore installations, troop concentrations, communications, and other facilities, it is hard to see how such assistance could do anything but immerse this country in a wider war with China.

Russia of course has a mutual defense pact with China. No one not inside the Kremlin knows whether she would honor the obligation to assist Mao Tse-tung if we gave Chiang the sea-air cover for a mainland assault.

Senator TAFT says such an attack would not bring in Russia and lead to general war. One wonders how he can know what the Soviet reaction would be, unless he is privy to Stalin's secrets. Obviously, since the defense pact exists, a very grave risk would be taken of precipitating a big war.

This is not an attempt to decide whether we ought to take that risk. That is for the American people to decide, acting through their elected representatives. But at least they should make their judgment in full knowledge of what is involved and in full appreciation of what sort of instrument Chiang's army might be in a wider fight against communism.

Nothing known up to this moment suggests that Chiang would be ready to fight quickly, or guarantees that his forces would fight well, or assures us that his entry would shorten the far-eastern war rather than lengthen and broaden it. It is the facts, and the facts alone, that lead to this conclusion.

Who Said There Is a Shortage of Iron Ore?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial taken from the Buffalo (N. Y.) News of February 27, 1951, reveals a possible 4,000,000 tons of iron-ore deposits available at the Steep Rock mines in Canada.

The railroads are there and so are the ships to transport the ore to the mills, which means that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is unnecessary.

The editorial follows:

WHAT OF STEEP ROCK ORE?

The New York Herald Tribune appears to have done a little surveying of its own regarding the North American iron-ore outlook, a matter which the Truman administration has stressed as of the greatest concern in connection with the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. Cabinet members and others under influence of the administration represent that unless a seaway is constructed for transportation of Labrador-Quebec ore the steel mills on the Great Lakes won't be able to continue operations for many years more. They say that the ore of the Mesabi Range is running out and there are no near deposits on which these mills can draw. But the Herald Tribune tells a different story. Here is what it said in an article Monday:

"The little town of Atikokan in Ontario bids fair to become the seat of one of North America's greatest iron-ore-mining operations. The Steep Rock mines, 6 miles from Atikokan, may be developing into another Mesabi right before the eyes of this ore-hungry country. Prominent Canadian mining engineers, who recently made an exhaustive study of the new Step Rock potential, believe the ore in this area may extend to a depth of 4,000 feet. They maintain that the immensity of this discovery—a possible 4,000,000,000 tons of iron deposits—is not realized even in Canadian mining circles. This would compare with Mesabi deposits (reserves and used) of 2,500,000,000 tons."

Ore is now coming out of Steep Rock at the rate of 1,200,000 tons a year, and the company operating there "has under active development a new mine which will raise annual output to 4,000,000 tons. The Canadian National Railway has a 147-mile line running from the deposits to Port Arthur at the head of Lake Superior. "The ore-loading dock there may be tripled," says the Herald Tribune, "and 25 new ore-carrying ships may become necessary." Thus the delivery of Steep Rock ore to steel mills on the Great Lakes would be a matter of a few hundred miles. On the other hand, ore from the Labrador-Quebec region would have to be transported 360 miles by rail to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and more than 1,000 miles by water to reach these same mines.

The spokesmen for the Truman administration have chosen to ignore the Steep Rock deposits, but these ought to be taken into account by Congress as it considers the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project, one which cost more than $1,000,000. Remember it will be necessary to deepen every harbor on the Great Lakes to accommodate the ships which are expected to provide service through the seaway.

Mitbestimmungsrecht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared in Fortune magazine of April 1951:

MITBESTIMMUNGSRECHT

On January 25 American industry discovered the specter of mitbestimmungsrecht. It was the day that West German Chancelor Adenauer yielded to the threat of a general strike in the Ruhr Valley and agreed to a proposed law granting the workers codetermination or, legally, a 50-percent share in the management of the steel and coal industries of the country—the largest in Europe. The National Association of Manufacturers, in a letter to the German consul general in New York, condemned the plan and warned that "American investors are watching the developing situation with increasing concern." Editorial voices were also raised in opposition.

In actual fact, however, the issue was settled 4 years ago when the British military occupation established codetermination in 80 percent of the west German steel companies. Given the history of German cartel machinations, such a move was almost inevitable. It was the price that ossified European capitalism was paying for a long series of mistakes. The question raised at Bonn on January 25 was whether this established system would be written into German law. In the decision the unions won a 30-year battle.

In 1919 German labor won the right, under the Weimer Constitution, to establish "works councils" in which employees had a voice in setting wages and plant working conditions. After Hitler fell, the occupation authorities in the three western zones revived these works councils (law No. 22) as the basic labor law of military occupation. However, this was now too pale for German unions. Pointing to the fact that many of the Ruhr industrialists had financed Hitler and other reactionary political groups, the late Hans Boeckler, Socialist head of the West German Trade Union Federation, declared that "money must not be allowed to become the basis of political power and to cause another disaster." Codetermination was a move to end this power.

In the British area the old steel cartels were decentralized and 24 new companies created in their stead. The occupation authorities acted as trustees for the stockholders. In 1947 the Iron and Steel Control, as the trusteeship was called, agreed to a codetermination scheme.

In Hesse, within the American zone, the state passed a codetermination law for industry in that area. Similar steps were taken in Württemberg-Baden and Bavaria. But these actions were nullified by General Clay, who ruled that they went far beyond the intent of law No. 22. Clay suspended the new laws until the federal constitution of the new German Republic should be promulgated. Later (April 1950), however, United States occupation authorities relented, and in Hesse and Württemberg-Baden codetermination was allowed.

The parliamentary situation in January arose when the Allied High Commission ended further control of the coal and steel industries and announced that the companies were being returned to the owners. In the absence of a law providing for codetermination, the trade-unions feared these gains would be abolished. Hence the threat of the general strike.

But why did Adenauer capitulate? The singular political fact is that codetermination is not only a Socialist demand. (Some Socialists, in fact, oppose it, fearing that the scheme will be a barrier against full socialization of industry.) Much of the backing for codetermination has come from Catholic labor and from the left wing of Adenauer's Christian Democratic Party. Codetermination is for them a cardinal element in Catholic social theory. In September 1949, the Seventy-third Catholic Social Conference, held in Westphalia, declared, in startling language:

"Catholic workers and employers are agreed that the right of co-determination for all workers in social, personal, and economic questions is a natural right in the order intended by God, to which right corresponds the obligation of coresponsibility

for all. We demand that this right be established by law." This statement by a quasi-official Catholic body has been cited throughout Western Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

Catholic labor, which today accounts for roughly 40 percent of the German Federation of Unions (a merger of the pre-Hitler Christian and Socialist unions dictated by the occupation authorities), is solidly behind codetermination, and this pressure was an important force on Adenauer.

The codetermination scheme, as presented by the Adenauer government, calls for more than equal participation by labor in plant management. It provides, virtually, for the syndicalist organization of industry. At the head of the steel and coal industries is a senate of six members, appointed by the government, three on the suggestion of the trade unions and three by those members of company boards who represent stockholders. The senate acts as umpire in any deadlock over the selection of managers in individual companies.

Each individual company is ruled by an 11-man board of directors. Five men (one of whom must be a "public" person) are nominated by the stockholders. Five are nominated by the union. The eleventh is chosen by the other ten, but he must be approved by at least three members each from the labor and stockholder groups. Under the board of directors are three operating officials, two for production and sales, nominated by the stockholders' bloc, and the labor manager, nominated by the unions. However, a two-thirds vote of the board is necessary for confirmation of each official; hence the labor group maintains an effective veto on all three. Production plans are drafted by the board and the three-man managerial staff. But all policy decisions—allocations between dividends and wages, plant expansion, sales methods, and so forth—are decided by the board.

The codetermination scheme, as blueprinted by Bonn, gives tremendous power to the top union leaders. Under the law, only two of the labor directors come from the plant, one is a "public" person, and the other two are named by the national union. Such a system will strengthen the move to industry-wide bargaining.

The German codetermination scheme may arouse an appetite in American unions for similar plans here. The CIO has long favored "industry councils," which in conception, if not in detail, resemble the German version. Its convention endorsements written by an ardent socialistic Catholic, John Brophy, have been applauded by many Catholic prelates. Archbishop William Walsh devoted his invocation sermon at the 1948 CIO convention to this theme. Catholic labor papers, in fact, citing Socialist regard for British nationalization as extreme, are claiming codetermination as their own.

What the Jews Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, appended are two reviews, one from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle and one from the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, of the recently published book What the Jews Believe, by a distinguished clergyman, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Temple B'rith Kodesh, Rochester, N. Y. This essay has aroused such deep interest that I trust a reference to its purport and content will be of interest to the Members and encourage reading of the whole book.

The above-mentioned reviews follow:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of April 15, 1951]

RABBI BERNSTEIN'S NEW BOOK REVEALS KINSHIP OF FAITHS

One of the little books that seem certain to exert a profound influence on American thought, if not on the thinking of the remainer of the world, is What the Jews Believe, by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Temple B'rith Kodesh, Rochester.

Published this week by Farrar, Straus & Co., of New York, the little volume of only 100 pages contains within its covers a summary of the basic facts concerning that religion which, by sheer spiritual power, has enabled the Jews to survive through thousands of years of misunderstanding and persecution by more numerous neighbors. Readers familiar with the Bible will recognize at once the close religious kinship between Judaism and Christianity. Indeed, it is evident, from the interest created by the condensed summary which appeared in Life magazine, that already a great deal of misunderstanding has been swept away through Rabbi Bernstein's presentation of the principles and practices of the Jewish people.

With the appearance of the new book, which is a more complete statement of the case than was possible in magazine space limitations Rabbi Bernstein's interpretation of the Jewish faith becomes available, in handy, popular form at a price ($1.25) within the reach of the average reader.

Without question, What the Jews Believe is one of the most significant books of this era, of the greatest importance to both Jew and Christian, enabling each to understand not only the other, but themselves as well.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of April 1, 1951]

CLEAR, INFORMATIVE

WHAT THE JEWS BELIEVE, BY RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN

A modified draft of this book appeared some weeks ago in the magazine Life and is said to have caused more comment and resulted in the receipt of more mail than had occurred since the magazine was founded.

It is not surprising that it should have attracted so much interest among people of the Jewish faith, and of other faiths as well. It is as clear, informative, and impressive a statement of the religious beliefs of the Jewish people as has ever been compiled. Certainly there is nothing in modern times that approaches it in the graphic, succinct, and memorable way in which it states the basis of the religious convictions of a great and religious people.

Each of the Jewish holidays and festivals is taken up in order and there is a clear exposition of all of them that should be most helpful to anyone who reads this volume.

There are chapters on the holy days, the Jewish year, Succos, Chanukah, Purim, Passover, Shavous, and Am Yisrael Chai which make it clear why people of the Jewish race throughout so many hundreds of years have observed them and treasured them as a racial and spiritual heritage of supreme value and comfort.

C. M. S.

Baby Chick Industry Faces Serious Economic Dislocation If S. 1335 Is Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Parks, of Altoona, Pa., chairman of the transportation committee of the International Baby Chick Association appeared before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on May 2, 1951, in opposition to Senate bill 1335.

Mr. Parks, speaking for the baby-chick industry, made a strong statement in opposition to S. 1335 and warned of the evil effects that will follow should the proposed legislation be approved.

Mr. Parks' statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Robert Parks. I am general manager and part owner of the Parks Barred Rock Farm, Altoona, Pa. Our farm has specialized in the breeding and hatching of poultry for more than 5 decades. We produce approximately 500,000 chicks annually, 90 percent of which are shipped to farmers and hatchery-men via parcel post.

I am here today in behalf of 5,000-plus poultry hatcherymen and breeders who are fellow members in the International Baby Chick Association. Bulk of the membership of our association resides and operates within the United States. I am chairman of the transportation committee.

We estimate that association members produced approximately 75 percent of the 1,250,000,000 chickens hatched in this country last year. Over 92 percent of all the chickens raised in this country today are purchased as day-old chicks from commercial breeders or hatchers.

Of this total, we estimate that 50 percent moves from the hatchery to the farm via parcel post. Another 40 percent is delivered locally by the hatchery or picked up at the hatchery by the farmer. The remaining 10 percent moves via railway express and air cargo.

It is the opinion of our members that S. 1335 fails to improve upon postal service, will add to its already large deficit, and will serve no purpose other than to force the cream of the less than carload parcel business away from the post office and into the hands of the Railway Express Agency. The facilities of the Railway Express Agency are not considered adequate for general use by our industry.

While there are provisions in S. 1335 which will enable our industry to continue to ship chicks in much the same manner as we are now doing, S. 1335 is looked upon by us as an opening wedge in a drive to drastically impair the parcel-post service.

Our industry would find itself undergoing a serious economic dislocation in such an eventuality.

The development of the commercial poultry hatchery industry can be traced to 1916 when the Post Office Department first accepted chicks for mailing via parcel post. The economy of the industry has been based on this service.

The benefits have not been one-sided. In addition to the regular parcel-post rates, we pay a special handling fee of 25 cents on every parcel shipped. This fee is estimated

to account for 50 to 75 percent of the Post Office Department's total income from special handling fees.

The ability of the farmer to order chicks for delivery via parcel post has enabled him to obtain breeding stock from the Nation's outstanding flocks. It has been a tremendous factor in boosting the average annual production per layer from only 90 eggs in World War I to more than 162 eggs now.

Taking into consideration the many changes that have taken place in our transportation system in the last 10 years, including the elimination of numerous local trains and local stops, our industry still considers parcel-post service to be generally satisfactory. There are rough spots occasionally, but we usually can smooth these out in conferences with postal officials.

It should be apparent to all that S. 1335 spells reduced service, less efficiency, and higher shipping costs for business in general. It means inefficiency, more clerical detail, and less income for the Post Office Department.

S. 1335 means hatcheries served by first- or second-class post offices, for example, must carefully check the type of postal service accorded each customer in preparing his order for shipment. Shipments going to customers served by first- and second-class offices but not on RFD or star routes, must travel in single unit boxes of 100 chicks each.

As a matter of fact, the safety-type boxes with over-all dimensions of 73 to 78 inches could not be used at all in filling such orders. The standard winter-size chick box measures 72 inches. The larger sizes, however, enable us to ship chicks with greater freedom from over-heating or smothering en route, the principal travel hazard.

The employees at the first- and second-class post offices will face added clerical duties, too, for they in turn must recheck what the hatchery shipping department has done with respect to determining whether the customer is served by a first- or second-class post office.

All of this adds up to a tremendously inefficient operation. Delays will surely occur. A missed train often means a 24-hour delay, and a 24-hour delay frequently means a bad loss.

The damage does not make itself known, in many cases, until after the chicks have been fed for several weeks. Thus, everyone stands to lose—the hatcheryman, the Post Office Department, and the farmer.

Insofar as we have been able to determine there is nothing in S. 1335 that will help the Post Office Department overcome its deficit. It probably will aggravate the problem. Denied the right to carry packages weighing in excess of 20 pounds beyond the second zone, it will lose a lucrative portion of its volume. It doesn't cost the Post Office much more to carry a 40-pound parcel for which it receives $3 into the sixth zone than it does to handle a 5-pound parcel for which it earns about 50 cents.

If S. 1335 is enacted, postal facilities will remain unchanged. There will be about the same number of post offices and terminal facilities. The number of employees will hold at or above the present level, but the utilization of these facilities and personnel will decline. The per-unit cost of handling parcels will go up.

It doesn't take a crystalgazer to see the end result—higher and higher rates on all remaining parcel-post business.

This is exactly what has happened on railway-express business. Rates have been shoved higher and higher, and the good customers still using the service find themselves penalized for doing so as they are called on to absorb a larger portion of the operating expense.

Once again the International Baby Chick Association wishes to voice its opposition to S. 1335 and any other measure which threatens to curtail our use of the parcel-post service.

The economy of our entire industry has been tied in with our ability to deliver chicks via parcel post almost since the very start of the service. Our industry is not a Johnnie-come-lately using the service as a temporary expedient.

We are one of the oldest, largest, and most consistent users of parcel post. It's a life line for us. We see in S. 1335 something that tends to upset the pattern of service in the immediate future.

Of even more concern is the feeling that it is a forerunner of greater curtailments and restrictions in years to come.

Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, those of you who have been receiving letters opposing the Echo Dam project in Utah will find information of interest to you in two items which I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. The first is a letter which I have received from Mr. Frank Ward, secretary of the Colorado River Development Association, which points out a number of errors in the Interior Department project planning report on the Colorado storage project and participating projects. Echo Dam is one of the key dams in the Colorado storage project.

I should like also to place in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Ernest Untermann, director of the Utah Field House of Natural History, to Dale E. Doty, an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. In this letter Dr. Untermann seeks to correct certain erroneous reports which have been published about the pending destruction of geological values by the proposed dams.

And finally, I should like to place in the RECORD a clipping from the Salt Lake Tribune which tells how the Utah Federated Artists, at first opposed to the Echo Dam project because they feared it would endanger scenic values in the area, found after a first-hand study of a special committee that this was not true, and voted to approve the project.

The above-mentioned follows:

COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, April 14, 1951.

Hon. REVA BECK BOSONE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOSONE: The Colorado River Development Association has carefully considered the Colorado River storage project and participating project, upper Colorado River Basin, more clearly identified as Project Planning Report No. 4-8a.81-1.

We respectfully submit herewith the comments of said association.

As to the details of the construction of the 10 storage projects, we highly commend the Bureau of Reclamation Director of Region 4, Mr. E. O. Larson, for the magnificent manner in which he has presented this report. We also highly commend Commissioner Michael W. Straus for his visionary recommendation to the Secretary. We approve the order of construction, via, Echo Park Dam, Flaming Gorge Unit, Glen Canyon Dam, Navajo Unit, and the White Water Unit.

The recommendation that the Secretary of the Interior be granted authority to operate recreational facilities at the project sites is approved and highly recommended by this association.

The recommendation that the projects be built and operated in conjunction with State water conservancy districts is highly commended.

We take the following exceptions to statements made by the National Park Service:

1. The request of the National Park Service for $25,000 per annum for 3 years to excavate "important dinosaur sites within Echo Park and Split Mountain Canyon" should not be allowed for the reason that there are no such sites within this area. Mr. Ernest Untermann, Director of the Utah Field House of Natural History (the only man who has completely geologized the monument) emphatically states there are no dinosaur remains in this area, due to the fact that the formations of the area are a hundred million years younger than that of the formation wherein the dinosaur remains are normally located.

2. The statement by the National Park Service that "Utah State Highway No. 44 runs from Vernal while unimproved roads lead southward from Greenriver, Wyo." is an indication of the National Park Service lack of information of this region. The road leading south from Wyoming is a greatly improved road over half of which is paved, the other half of which will be paved this year to the Utah border.

3. The National Park statement that "It is surmised that the reservoir and construction activities would destroy or damage a number of archeological sites," is another indication of the Service's lack of information and this paragraph should be removed from the report because the Park Service themselves have stated in another portion of the report "It is not known whether an archeological survey of the site has been made."

4. The National Park statement paragraphs 1, subparagraph 1, and subparagraph 3 on page 39 are misleading for the reason that they tend to impart the information that the National Park Service has restored the Dinosaur National Monument to its original state as far as grazing and agriculture pursuits are concerned. This is not so. They have not interfered with either. The statement in subparagraph 2 is misleading because it established facilities in the area for proper recreational use and administration of the area. The buildings in the area were constructed by the CCC boys. There has been no new construction since that time. The so-called museum is lined with a material resembling gunny sacks upon which hang crudely painted signs.

5. On page 44 of the National Park Service statement it states that U. S. No. 30 runs through Vernal, Utah, while Highway 30 runs through Greenriver, Wyo. This is a transposition and should be changed.

6. In the report of the Fish and Wildlife Service, last paragraph on page 10 and first and second paragraphs on page 11, we take exception to the following statement, that the reservoir would create more rough fish than could be taken for sport. Representatives of the Colorado Fish and Game Commission and the Utah Fish and Game Commission believe that the Echo Park Reservoir will become a great sport-fishing area, second only to Lake Mead, and that the river below the dam, because it will become a clear stream of water, will become an excellent trout-fishing area for as much as 50 miles below the dam site.

The statement that the reservoir would seriously reduce the deer wintering area and

that it is doubtful if the remaining range could maintain the present deer herds is pure imagination and is not based upon any facts. The director and other members of the Colorado Fish and Game Commission, representatives of the Utah Fish and Game Commission, sportsmen of the area, Mr. Ernest Untermann, director of the Utah Field House of Natural History, all concur that the reservoir will not have any adverse effects upon the present deer herd, but that a benefit will actually arise in that the water will rise in the canyon so that the deer will be able to secure drinking water without climbing down the sheer side of the canyon walls.

We sincerely urge that the above statements be carefully analyzed and corrected.

This association unanimously supports the project plan and urges the immediate construction there.

Very truly yours,

COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
B. FRANK WARD, *Secretary*.

Approved:

B. H. STRINGHAM, *President*.

UTAH FIELD HOUSE
OF NATURAL HISTORY,
VERNAL STATE PARK,
Vernal, Utah, April 15, 1951.

DALE E. DUTT,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DUTT: Thank you for your letter of April 6 in which you inform us that item (a) which appears on page 47 of the National Park Service portion of the project planning report, Colorado River storage project and participating projects, Upper Colorado River Basin, December 1950, should have read: "To excavate two important fossil sites in Echo Park and Split Mountain, respectively, * * *," instead of dinosaur fossils.

With your kind indulgence and without, I hope, appearing difficult and cantankerous, may I clarify something for the record?

My sole interest in this controversy and in the controversy over the proposed dams in Dinosaur National Monument is to give factual data and, insofar as possible, to avoid any ambiguous statements which might confuse or mislead the public, or be seized upon by any group for the purpose of misrepresenting the true facts. For these reasons I feel that the above mentioned item (a) represents an unfortunate choice of language and would have better been stated as invertebrate fossils instead of merely fossils. This is particularly true when item (a), in the full report, requests $25,000 annually for 2 years of study, plus an additional $20,000 for a museum in which to exhibit the fossil material. This makes the fossils of Echo Park and Split Mountain look very important indeed, in the eyes of the lay public, an importance which facts certainly do not warrant.

I readily concede that the planning studies of the National Park Service in Dinosaur National Monument are none of my affair. I am again only concerned with giving exaggerated importance to an area which does not warrant such special attention, and which infers a value which does not exist. Item (a) creates the impression that great values may be inundated by the dams in Dinosaur National Monument and gives the opponents of the dams new fuel with which to create a smoke screen of bias and misrepresentation.

Let me give you the facts concerning the Split Mountain and Echo Park invertebrate fossil areas:

At the Dinosaur National Monument hearing of April 3, 1950, in discussing the fossils of the area, I said, in part, "A few marine invertebrates will be covered in Carboniferous (Paleozoic) formations in Split Mountain, Whirlpool, Lodore, and Yampa Canyons, but are abundantly represented in the canyon walls, rims, and elsewhere in the monument and on the outside." The abundance of this invertebrate material, in identically the same formations with identically the same members present as in the canyons, is adequately illustrated by the fine Paleozoic fossil localities in other areas of the monument. Some of the more outstanding of these are: Round Top, Martha Peak, Tanks Peak, Bear Valley, Thanksgiving Gorge, East Cactus Flat, Douglas Mountain, Zenobia Peak, Wild Mountain, Harpers Corner, and Jones Hole. To single out Split Mountain and Echo Park for special study, as though some great scientific values were about to be lost, seems to us, utterly ridiculous. In the immediate vicinity of Dinosaur National Monument, but outside its boundaries, are other excellent Paleozoic fossil localities. Diamond Mountain, Lena Peak, Brush Creek Mountain, and Taylor Mountain are but a few of these. All these areas, both inside the monument and outside its boundaries, are far from any river beds and are wholly unaffected by any dams in the canyons of the monument.

In addition to having mapped the geology of the entire monument, Mrs. Untermann and I have made special studies of certain areas and have publications covering this work. The first of these, Geology of Green and Yampa River Canyons and Vicinity, Dinosaur National Monument, Utah and Colorado, G. E. and B. R. Untermann, appeared in the May 1949 issue of the Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. It deals with the stratigraphy and fossils of the area. The Morgan Formation of Whirlpool Canyon, Green River Dinosaur National Monument, Uintah County, Utah, G. E. and B. R. Untermann, appeared in the December 1949 edition of the Oil and Gas Possibilities of Utah, issued by the Utah Geological and Mineralogical Survey. This paper is a comprehensive study of the Morgan Pennsylvanian beds giving a detailed description of its 104 members and the marine invertebrate fossils they contain. Fossil identifications were made by Drs. Lloyd G. Henbest and James Steele Williams, of the United States Geological Survey, with headquarters in the National Museum. Drs. Henbest, Williams, and John B. Reeside, Jr., all of the United States Geological Survey, and Dr. G. Arthur Cooper, of the United States National Museum, as well as Dr. Christina Lochman, a Cambrian specialist, all contributed to the fossil determinations of the first paper mentioned above. Stratigraphy of the Split Mountain Area, G. E. and B. R. Untermann, appeared in the Guidebook to the Geology of Utah, No. 5, which was published by the Utah Geological and Mineralogical Survey in 1950.

I mention the above publications to show that studies have already been made of the areas which item (a) of the National Park Service report lists as worthy of special consideration. Also that the diagnostic fossils are known to the scientists of the United States Geological Survey and the National Museum and that geologic determinations have already been made on a basis of these identifications. Also that the same formations and beds are present in rank profusion throughout the entire area. Paleozoic exposures are so common that threatened inundation in a limited area need be no cause for concern.

Very sincerely yours,

G. E. UNTERMANN.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of March 21, 1951]

ARTISTS GROUP TO SUPPORT DAM PROJECT—ECHO PARK'S BEAUTY, VALUE ENHANCED, CLOSE STUDY SHOWS

A proposal that the Utah Federated Artists join other aesthetic and conservationist organizations in opposing construction of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument Friday resulted in a report strongly endorsing the project.

Lynn Fausett, president of the federation of art societies of the State, said a special committee had been named to investigate the project as a result of a motion at the last convention by Miss Mabel Fraser, associate professor of art at the University of Utah, that the federation go on record opposing the project.

HEADED COMMITTEE

Instead of taking action at that time, Miss Fraser was made chairman of a committee to investigate the proposed project, which has been subjected to a barrage of criticism from groups in the East interested in preserving aesthetic, scientific, and scenic values. But after a first-hand study, the committee submitted a report to the executive officers which prompted them to approve the project. Highlights of the report follow:

1. Fossils: Not affected. Are miles away from the project.

2. Geology: Well represented in other canyon walls.

ARCHAEOLOGY STUDIED

3. Archaeology: Area to be flooded already studied and explored.

4. Biotic values: Well represented throughout monument area.

5. Economic values: No minerals or oil occur in monument.

6. Inspirational values: No inspirational values will be lost, since principal trout streams and majestic canyon walls are outside the area to be flooded. The area will be opened to public observation by the project.

7. Ice jams: Ice jams, which have proved so dangerous to bridges and holdings along the stream, can be regulated by the dam.

8. Economic security: Water power would unlock many of Utah's natural resources and enable more of her people to find employment at home. The water is badly needed.

The Parson Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper article entitled "The Parson Speaks Up," by Rev. John A. Bolen, pastor of the Methodist Church, Van Buren, Mo., which was taken from the Current Local, of Van Buren, Mo.:

THE PARSON SPEAKS UP

(By John A. Bolen)

I am never worried very much about public opinion among people who will do some thinking for themselves. People who allow somebody else to do their thinking for them are the people who stir up the most trouble in society. Some people, thriving on prejudices and excited by hullabaloo, are always ready to climb up on somebody's band wagon. More often than not, it is the wrong wagon.

Take, for instance, the big fuss about General MacArthur. In this instance there are two band wagons. Of course, in the interest of the best citizenship, each of us should sooner or later come to have a definite opinion or set of opinions in this matter.

However, I believe that we ought to be willing to wait until all the excitement is over. If we could clear all the political hogwash out of the way of our thinking, that would be a distinct advantage. Granting that this may have elements of both right and wrong in it, the fact remains that it is largely a matter of partisan politics, and I hope that all of us have the gumption to know that partisan politics may stink to high heaven.

As a parson, I have always prayed that I might be blessed with an intelligent congregation. That sort of congregation is infinitely more pleasant to work with than a crowd of people who are lacking in intelligence. So far, with the very least exceptions, I have been fortunate in this respect. People do not necessarily have to have college degrees in order to be intelligent. In fact, all of us know many intelligent people who did not finish high school and many other intelligent persons who did not get through grammar school. However, academic training provides intelligent folk with some real advantages.

The core of my argument is: We should do our own thinking and not be stampeded by somebody else's bush beating and flag waving.

A Bit of Hard Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, cold analysis eventually breaks through and always survives emotionalism. Walter Lippmann has been doing an excellent job on that score in the so-called MacArthur-Truman controversy. Another of his down to earth, unemotional, but factual, contributions appears in today's Washington Post in his syndicated column, as follows:

A BIT OF HARD FACT

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is a bit of hard fact, in no sense a military secret, which is not often mentioned though it is of the greatest possible importance to an understanding of the real issues.

That bit of hard fact is that American strategic airpower cannot be brought to bear effectively against the vital centers of the Soviet Union except with the consent and active collaboration of Great Britain and France. I do not believe that anyone can dispute the truth of this statement. The bomber fleet does not now exist, and could not be constructed in any near future, which can attack in force the Soviet heart-land from bases which are under American sovereign control.

Strategic air war against the Soviet Union cannot be conducted with any prospect of being decisive from the Pacific side, that is to say from Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and Alaska. The distances are prohibitive for any sustained assault. To the nearest and by no means the most important industrial area the round trip from Japan is about 5,000 miles. The vital centers of Russia are in the Urals and in European Russia. They cannot be attacked seriously from the Pacific side. They cannot be attacked seriously across the polar ice. They can be attacked seriously only from the European side. But that attack cannot be delivered now, or in the foreseeable future, except from bases under Britain and French sovereignty.

This is the hard fact which has to be taken into full account by anyone who wishes to judge responsibly the issues that are now being debated.

The use of the British and French bases, though it would be indispensable if we were at war with the Soviet Union, cannot be taken for granted under any and all circumstances. The bases do not belong to us; the bases in both British and French territory could not be used unless and until Britain and France had declared war. It is by no means certain, it cannot at all be taken for granted, that they would or could declare war against the Soviet Union in Europe if the Soviet Union confined its action to the Far East. We must remember that the North Atlantic Pact has nothing to do with the Far East.

I am not suggesting or implying that our British and French Allies would not stand by us if we ourselves were the victims of plain aggression in the Far East. I believe they would stand by us. But I mean to say that we must not count upon their support if, against their strong objections, we involve ourselves in a general Asian war. They are bound to hesitate to involve themselves in such a war. For if the war is in Asia and if the Soviet Union does not attack in Europe, how sure can we be, how sure have we a right to be, that the French Parliament would vote for a war that invited an invasion, or that Britain would choose to begin a war in which she might receive the first atomic blow from the Russian side. How would Senator TAFT vote if he were an Englishman and a member of the House of Commons, how would he vote if he were a Frenchman and a member of the French Assembly? We shall be prudent and wise if we assume that the instinct of survival will act very powerfully in Western Europe; and that the people of Western Europe are not likely to stake their very existence on the soundness of General MacArthur's ideas.

We must not deceive ourselves about the genuineness of this condition of affairs, and shrug it off by ascribing it to leftism, to fellow travelerism, to defeatism, and to neutralism. The recent French governments have been as cooperative as it is possible for any French Government to be. Yet they have had to cut down on the facilities they intended to open up to us. At that one can make a very good surmise about what is really happening among the French people by looking at the position now taken by General de Gaulle in his bid for power. His slogan is "Security against the adversary (Russia), independence with regard to the Allies (America)." And then to make it sure that no Frenchman misunderstands him, General de Gaulle has demanded "an alliance and not a subordination" and he has denounced "the encroachments (that is, our bases and facilities in France and in north Africa) now incurred through the weakness of our regime."

Thus General de Gaulle, who leads the French nationalist and fiercely anti-Communist movement, is making it plain as he runs for office that he does not regard the Atlantic Treaty in its present form as finally a settled matter.

Our alliances in Europe are not yet consolidated, and what is going on here these days is subjecting them to a fearful strain. Perhaps the agitation would become subdued, perhaps the discussion would become more temperate, if more people understood that the crack-up of the alliance would be tantamount, or very nearly so, to the neutralization of our strategic air power as a global force. Were the European bases to be closed to us, our air power would be reduced to a regional instrument incapable of being deterrent or decisive.

CARE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News of April 21, 1951:

WE DO CARE

When Americans face that eternal question, "What can I do to make this a better world?" they might take a look at the statistics on CARE and behind the figures see a heart-warming picture of good neighbor policies at work.

CARE recently marked the shipment of the ten millionth package abroad. In 5 years the American people, through this agency (Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.) have sent the equivalent of 26,000 head of cattle, 100,000 pigs, 32,000,000 cups of sugar, flour for 33,000,000 loaves of bread, 360,000,000 cups of coffee, 56,000,000 quarts of milk. They have added new items, such as coal, seeds, plows, toys, medical equipment, and most recently a tool package for gardening in India and Pakistan.

From countries all over the world grateful praise has come for lives saved, burdens eased, children given a decent chance. CARE packages have been delivered by camel and airplane, on foot, and on elephants. Each package has been a tangible bit of American generosity, a practical proof that the people of this country are kin with the peoples of all the world.

More directly personal than Marshall plan aid, more workable than point 4 programs, CARE has been since the war perhaps the most potent instrument for building up American prestige, for counteracting the propaganda designed to show us as selfish, unfriendly penny pinchers. Here is aid freely given and directly to the point of need, with no questions asked, no strings attached.

The need continues urgent. America, having started this unique humanitarian agency, cannot let up now. Packages are still being made up at CARE's great storehouse in Philadelphia. Information will be given gladly by CARE headquarters at 20 Broad Street, New York City.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Cincinnati Enquirer, an analysis of the results of a poll of that newspaper's readers on the subject of the MacArthur dismissal:

MISTRUST IS SHOWN TOWARD PRESIDENT IN POLL OF READERS—FIVE THOUSAND VOTE ON MACARTHUR ISSUE AND ALMOST ALL SAY TRUMAN BUNGLED

(By Donald Urban)

Cincinnati area Enquirer readers once again have expressed their disapproval of the

Truman administration. In the second of two readers' views polls taken by The Enquirer, persons returning ballots showed unmistakable mistrust in their President's policies.

Unlike the survey of a month ago which covered a number of important questions of the times, such as the troops-to-Europe issue and wage and price control, last week's poll was limited to but one subject—the MacArthur dismissal.

So intense was the public interest in this controversy that some 5,000 people took the time and went to the trouble of filling out and mailing in the questionnaire ballots which were printed for 3 days in the Enquirer. In the previous general survey, which also ran for 3 days, the number responding was 1,610.

Statistically, the returns showed some interesting trends.

Most astonishing of these trends, of course, were the answers to the first question—"Did President Truman do the proper thing in removing MacArthur?" Only one reader in every 11 answered this query with a "Yes," while 92 percent said, "No; the President did not do the proper thing."

FIRST QUESTION DRAWS "NO'S"

The first question was the only one on which the "No" answers outweighed the "Yes." On No. 2 through 4, the "Yes's" had it.

Question No. 2 read, "Did General MacArthur have a right to express a personal opinion on our military policy in Asia?" Coincidentally, the percentages on this question were numerically equal to those of question 1. The difference arises in that they were reverse; 92 percent of the Enquirer readers returning ballots saying "Yes." Hence, 11 said the general had a right to express an opinion for every 1 who said he didn't.

Only 6 percent of Enquirer readers are willing to trust President Truman's judgment on Asiatic policy. Ninty-four percent, however, would go along with General MacArthur on far eastern policy in answer to the third question on the public opinion survey, "Would you be more willing to trust MacArthur's judgment on Asiatic policy than Truman's?"

"Has President Truman hurt our position in Asia by this move?" It was believed that he did by 98 percent of readers returning ballots. This means that only one person in 13 felt that the status of United States prestige in the Far East remains unchanged following the General's removal.

OVERWHELMINGLY FOR MAC ARTHUR

General MacArthur received overwhelming majorities on each question. The first and second by 11 to 1, the third by 15 to 1 and the last by 13 to 1. But by digging deeper into the statistics, other interesting facts can be uncovered.

Twenty-nine percent of the people who voted "Yes" on the first question, favoring President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur, said "Yes" to the second question, too. In other words, this 29 percent felt that President Truman did the right thing but that the general had a right to express a personal opinion.

Equally paradoxical are the 29 percent answers to the third and fourth questions. Of that group sanctioning the administration's action, 28 percent said they would rather trust General MacArthur's judgment on Asiatic policy than Mr. Truman's. An interesting fact—they approve of Mr. Truman's removal of General MacArthur, but they would feel safer if General MacArthur were back at his old post.

Possibly the most astonishing is the 17 percent who approved of President Truman's action yet feel that the Chief Executive hurt our position in Asia by this move. Seventeen percent of the people voting "Yes" on the first question voted "Yes" on the last one, too. It would be interesting to see how this group reconciles their two answers.

CONVERSE BALLOTING IS SLIGHT

For the benefit of the skeptics who feel that by the clever use of statistics any argument may be proved, we show that the converse of the above calculations is infinitely smaller.

Only 2 percent of those voting "no" on the first question voted similarly on the second. Only one person in every 49 felt that Mr. Truman did not do the right thing and that General MacArthur did not have a right to express an opinion.

"No's" to both one and three would have given, "No, Truman did not do the right thing, but I would trust Truman's judgment more than MacArthur's on Asiatic policy." The people who said this amounted to 0.7 percent.

The smallest statistic figured was 0.03 percent. This applied to those who voted "No" on both questions 1 and 4. The 0.03 percent said, "No, Truman did not do the right thing, but he hasn't hurt our position in Asia by this move."

What this survey proves, this writer does not attempt to say, and refers readers to today's editorial page. The survey was not conducted by scientific pollsters or based on the so-called random sampling method. It was, however, an effective and interesting poll of public opinion in the Cincinnati area and Ohio Valley Members of Congress will receive copies of this newspaper.

Influence Here Enables British To Ship War Goods to the Soviet and Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been calling the attention of Congress and the country to the action of Great Britain in shipping strategic war materials to China and the Soviet.

Congress passed an act in September 1950 prohibiting economic and financial assistance to any country whose trade with Russia, including Red China, is found contrary to the security of the United States.

Arthur Sears Henning, in a news item published April 30 in the Times-Herald newspaper, of Washington, D. C., says upon this subject:

INFLUENCE HERE ENABLES BRITISH TO SHIP WAR GOODS TO SOVIET—CONTACTS THAT CAUSED MACARTHUR FIRING PAVE WAY TO EVASION OF TRADE LAW

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

British Government influence in Washington, which brought about the dismissal of General MacArthur, is being manifested in numerous other matters, according to congressional investigators.

One is the shipment of war materials by Great Britain and other Atlantic Pact countries to Russia and Russian satellites, which has reached gigantic proportions.

PAID FOR BY UNITED STATES

In many cases, the materials have been furnished to the exporting European countries by the United States under the Marshall plan. As a result, American taxpayers are paying for the materials and equipment being used to shoot down American soldiers in Korea and to prepare Russia to do likewise if world war III should come.

To British influence is ascribed the failure of the administration to enforce the act of last September 27 forbidding economic or financial assistance to any country whose trade with Russia or her satellites, including Red China, is found contrary to the security of the United States. Senator KEM, Republican, of Missouri, urged President Truman in a letter on March 9 to enforce this law. The President made no reply.

BRITAIN SELLS TO RUSSIA

In his letter, the Senator said he had been informed by the Commerce Department that Britain sold nearly $330,000,000 worth of machine tools to Russia last January alone.

KEM also cited the report that Italian factories aided by the Marshall plan were speeding products for Russia and that a Soviet economic party was in Genoa to expedite delivery of electric cranes and thermal-power stations from two factories that were Marshall-plan beneficiaries to the extent of $1,625,000.

The scandal of the arming of our actual and potential enemies by our allies was aired in the Senate with repercussions in the British Parliament.

A member of the British Government stated that there would be no cessation of the trade to which the Americans objected. The agitation did result, however, in a British announcement last week that the export of steel and other potential war materials from Hong Kong to Red China is being embargoed. This is only a trickle compared with the flood of shipments of war materials by Britain to the Soviets through Western Europe and other points on the vast Russian perimeter.

TO RUSSIA VIA CHINA

Russian imports of natural rubber before World War II averaged 35,000 tons a year. In 1950 they bought directly about 85,000 tons, most of it from British Malaya. In addition, 38,000 tons of Malayan rubber went to China, and 44,000 tons to British Hong Kong to be transshipped to the Soviet Union. Another 22,000 tons went to Eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

China has no way of using rubber in manufacturing, so for 1950, 189,000 tons went to Russian industries as against 35,000 tons in a normal prewar year.

Russia also took 42,500,000 pounds of wool in 1950 and 2,000,000 pounds of cotton, 700 tons of tin. Practically all this from British and Commonwealth sources.

Little Czechoslovakia got 13,127 tons of copper from Belgian Congo in 1950, 7,000 tons of zinc, 1,100 tons of lead, all from Belgium.

The Belgians sold Russia more than $8,000,000 worth of machinery and machine tools and equipment in 1950.

The British shipped $28,000,000 of machinery and machine tools to the Soviet Union in 1950.

Mr. Speaker, just what is the administration trying to do? Knowing that Great Britain is engaged in feeding Red China and Russia with war materials, why do we not follow the law and end all economic and financial assistance to Great Britain?

Are we not permitting our relations to continue with a country which is giving aid and comfort to our enemies? Soon Congress will be asked to make more appropriations available to Great Britain and if any Member of Congress votes for this kind of appropriation, are they not guilty of treason? We can give aid and comfort to the enemies of this country, but if we do we are guilty of treason. Is it not just as much a treasonable act to give money to a country that will at once use it to give aid and comfort to our enemies, when we know that country is trading with our enemies?

This is the third time I have presented this matter of trade with our enemies to the Congress. At this moment, the matter of that trade is heated argument in Parliament. The charge that I have made against Great Britain of trading in strategic war materials with our enemies is now admitted in Parliament.

The September law referred to reads as follows:

SEC. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country whose trade with the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea) is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interest of the United States.

This act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951."

There is one loophole in this law and that is that this trading must be found by the National Security Council of this country to be contrary to the security of the United States. Under this law we cannot make the finding that trade is being carried on with our enemies—the Security Council must make the finding, and unless that body does that, are we to sit here with our arms folded while Great Britain supplies Red China and the Soviets with rubber and steel? This law clearly forbids our giving any economic or financial assistance to those countries so trading with our enemies. Now when more appropriations are asked for for Great Britain, are we to extend that assistance in face of the admitted fact that Great Britain is so trading with our enemies? For one, I am not going to wait until the National Security Council finds that such trading is contrary to the security interests of the United States, but I will act now—with all this evidence before us—and not vote one nickel to Great Britain.

No Member of Congress can find the least possible excuse for extending aid economically or financially to Great Britain. To now extend this aid in the face of the admission of Great Britain would come within the definition of treason against the United States.

The Victory We Seek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the speech made by Ambassador Warren R. Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, at the New York State convention of the Grand Masters of the Masonic Order, Hotel Statler, on Tuesday, May 1, 1951, entitled "The Victory We Seek":

THE VICTORY WE SEEK

(By Ambassador Warren R. Austin)

"Come now, and let us reason together." (Isaiah 1: 18.)

Our friends around the free world who want to rely on our leadership are listening.

Our adversaries whose totalitarian tactic is divide and conquer are watching.

Let us not conceal our fundamental unity by a smoke screen of explosive dissensions. Let us reason together as Americans sharing a common purpose—peace and freedom—for ourselves and for others.

In that spirit, I want to discuss with you two questions underlying the global struggle for peace with freedom. That struggle the free world is determined to win. What, then, is the victory we seek? What will it take to win it?

Our country is now performing as a member of the United Nations a leading role in the first collective use of force to repel an armed attack.

On June 25 the Communist attack on Korea required the United States and the United Nations to choose between resisting the aggressor or submitting to aggression. There was no other choice.

The Security Council acted promptly and with unity. It called for an immediate cessation of hostilities and for the aggressor to return to the line from whence he began his invasion. At the same time, it called upon all members to support the United Nations policy and to refrain from assisting the North Korean authorities.

If the invader had heeded the Security Council, the victory we seek over aggression would have been won then and there. But Communist imperialism continued to activate its first step through puppet armies. The Communists were seeking far more than the capture of the Republic of Korea. Their objective was conquest by force of country after country. Therefore, their strategy flaunted the Security Council. They could not advance their plan without discrediting the United Nations.

The decision of the Security Council that collective action ought to be taken by member states marked the departure of civilization from the way of Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Sudetenland, and Munich.

The risk of acting had to be weighed against the consequence of not acting. Experience warned us that it would not be peace, but a series of new aggressions, capitulations of the weak before the mere threat of attack, disintegration of free world collaboration, and death to the idea of collective security. We could foresee the fatal miscalculation by Communist imperialism leading to the step that would be resisted, whatever the cost. And, then, the cost in lives and destruction would be astronomical.

The free world hailed the decision to act in Korea. Today there is wide agreement that it was a sound decision from every standpoint.

Let us keep clear what that decision was, and why it was taken. Fifty-three governments, members of the United Nations, voluntarily and spontaneously supported it; 15 nations quickly put forces into the field and Ethiopian troops are now arriving; 41 states contributed supplies and material aid.

These contributions have not been poured into a vacuum of policy. Every one of the nations who have declared their allegiance to the United Nations' action have given that allegiance to a policy they have carefully examined and then determined to support.

The policy of the United Nations in regard to Korea is clear, positive, and consistent.

The political objectives of the United Nations in Korea have been set forth for all the world to see since 1947. Those objectives have been repeated and reaffirmed at each annual session of the General Assembly—in 1948, in 1949, and again, on October 7, 1950.

The military objectives of the United Nations were declared in the Security Council resolutions of June 25, June 27, and July 7, 1950.

Always, until the end, protection of the lives of the people of the Republic of Korea and aid to them in the preservation of their liberty inspires the United Nations.

The intervention of the Chinese Communists in Korea has not been ignored by the United Nations. The additional policy required by this new fact was set forth by the General Assembly in its resolution of February 1 this year.

All these resolutions represent United Nations policy. Because that policy has been consistent from the very beginning, the essence of these resolutions can be summarized and stated briefly.

Militarily, the objective is to repel the aggression and restore international peace and security in the area.

Politically, the objective is to establish a unified, independent, and democratic government in the sovereign state of Korea.

We will adhere to both these purposes.

The United Nations has not declared, nor has it ever been asked to declare, that the political objective must be achieved by military means. In fact, the emphasis has been quite the contrary. The policy of the United Nations has been—and should always be—to achieve its political objectives by pacific settlements.

The United Nations does not exist to conduct war, but to stop it—by peaceful means, if possible; by united force, if necessary. In our allegiance to the United Nations, this is a fact we must never forget.

Even in branding the Chinese Communists as aggressors, the United Nations, in a resolution sponsored by the United States, held open the door to peaceful settlement.

That resolution of February 1, 1951—a resolution which is today exactly 3 months old—expressed both United States and United Nations policy. I think it is worth recalling today.

It affirmed the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression.

It called upon all states and authorities to lend every assistance to the United Nations action in Korea.

And it affirmed that it continues to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea, and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means.

Those are policies—clear, definite, and positive policies—which we need to keep in mind in judging developments in Korea.

In October, the forces of the original aggressor were, in large part, defeated and destroyed. This was a major triumph over aggression. It was and remains a triumph for the free members of the United Nations.

Then, the Chinese Communist leaders launched a new aggression in a last minute effort to prevent such an overwhelming triumph for peace. We defeated the first aggression. We will defeat the second.

Up to tonight the two aggressions by Communist imperialism have failed to achieve either of their immediate objectives: (1) The North Korean puppets to occupy the Republic of Korea; (2) the Chinese puppets to drive United Nations forces off the peninsula.

The gallant action of our boys and their comrades in Korea has done more than deprive the Communists of their immediate

objectives. It has served notice that Communist imperialism will encounter collective resistance wherever it attacks.

This same notice was given by the General Assembly in its resolution of November 17, 1950, entitled "Peace Through Deeds," in which 50 nations formally determined that for the realization of lasting peace and security it is indispensable that prompt, united action be taken to meet aggression wherever it arises.

While we continue the struggle to fulfill our objectives, let us not devaluate the glory of the sacrifices already made by our men in Korea by discounting what they have gained. Their achievements have inflicted calamities upon the Soviet grasp for empire and world dominion.

The Korean conflict has unmasked the Soviet's phony world-wide peace offensive.

It has exposed the Soviet designs for conquest on the installment plan.

It has upset the Soviet timetable for new conquests on the Korean pattern.

The Korean conflict has rallied the first collective force and action behind United Nations principles.

It has stimulated the United Nations to develop new machinery and better methods for meeting future threats.

It has brought the free world to a new peak of unity in the United Nations.

But, most important of all:

The Korean conflict has alerted people all over the world to the imminent dangers of Soviet aggression.

It has strengthened the will of nations to stand together and resist aggression.

It has aroused the free peoples to the necessity of mobilizing their strength for defense, and may thus have saved civilization.

These accomplishments make the stakes in Korea very high, and the need for sober and responsible weighing of policy very great. We must not be panicked into making a fatal error at this crucial stage, an error which might lose all that we have gained and precipitate the world war we are trying to prevent.

The Chinese Reds and their supporters are taking tremendous risks in a desperate attempt to blast the collective barricade from the path of aggression.

The hope of dividing the councils of the defenders gave the Communists their only chance of eventual success. The growing controversy over tactics stimulates their hope of destroying the United Nations. Their present offensive seems to be timed for its impact on a state of confusion and dissension in the ranks of the free.

The victory they seek is the breaking of our unity in this country and in the free world. They hope to isolate the United States from its friends and allies. They hope by persistent pressure to split us asunder over questions of tactics to counter their maneuvers, and make us lose sight of our global strategy.

The victory we seek is possible. It will not be easy, but it will be infinitely less costly than general war. It depends on strength, unity, and cooperation.

If these are the essential elements for victory, let us determine to close ranks and present an unshakable world front to the forces of aggression. Let us reason together to find the best way of acting together.

Certainly we can disagree and try to persuade each other of the soundness of our opinions. This can be done in perfect freedom of discussion. We do it all the time at the United Nations. But we must not arm our arguments with canes to beat the rightness of our views into each other's heads; or engage in battles of invective and denunciation. The Soviets have tried it for 5 years with this result: They have convinced nobody and isolated themselves from everybody. Let us not follow that bad example.

I have not talked tactics in this short discussion. Rather, I have tried to keep my eye on the grand strategy by which we hope to stop aggression where it started, discourage its attempt elsewhere, prevent the spread of war, restore peace where it is broken, and make the free world secure by collective action. These are the terms of the victory we seek.

We know from the bitter experience of the past 5 years that victory involves far more than the defeat of an enemy. Therefore, I repeat that the fight to stop aggression in Korea is a fight to prevent it everywhere else in the world. The aim is not to settle political issues by force, but to prevent the aggressor from imposing a settlement by force.

The aim is not conflict without limit, but peace without appeasement. That is the victory we seek.

City Folks and Meat Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "City Folks and Meat Prices," which appeared in the Bozeman Daily Chronicle of April 27 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY FOLKS AND MEAT PRICES

City folk in the East seem to have a strong impression that they could be eating steak dinners for a dollar a throw if those greedy ranchers out in the West weren't gouging them.

Every day or so some urban commentator waxes indignant over the high cost of food. And nearly always his little tirade winds up in a blast at the farm bloc, which he pictures as a sinister gang of congressional bumpkins busily conspiring to woo the hayshaker vote.

These lambasters of the sunburned Shylocks, when they talk about food costs, usually think in terms of animal products. They seldom are outraged by what they have to put out for a good mess of diced carrots or cornmeal mush. What concerns them mostly is meat.

It's a pity, they point out, that a farmer can't be content to set a humane price on his livestock, so city people who aren't situated so they can keep their own sheep will be able to buy lamb chops without mortgaging their cars.

All this only goes to show how little some people know about the processes that bring them their daily nourishment. The truth is that the farmer doesn't set the price on his livestock. He takes what he can get for it. There is nothing that would please him more than to be able to sit down and figure out how much money, labor, and talent he has invested in his sheep and then decide that he will charge so much a pound for them.

But that isn't the way it works. The farmer is engaged in a colossal gambling enterprise that makes the underworld syndicate racket look like Sunday school turkey raffles. And the percentages are by no means rigged in his favor. He risks his chips in the open market and backs his own judgment against the whims of consumers the world over as well as the weather.

No law compels anybody to pay him what he thinks he ought to get for his sheep or hogs. The consumers decide how much they are willing to pay for lamb or pork chops, and that sets the price of sheep and hogs. If the consumers can't get pork chops for what they are willing to pay, they can always decide to buy hominy or something instead. But if the farmer isn't willing to sell his hogs for the offered price, he can't decide to sell corn instead. He decided to raise hogs months before, and it's too late to back out now. If he doesn't want to take what he can get for them, all he can do is keep them for pets. And hogs make very expensive pets.

If good steaks cost so much that only those on Government expense accounts can afford them, why cuss the farmers? He is one of the few who are doing something sensible to hold food costs down. He works by the sun, not the whistle—sometimes two 40-hour weeks a week. He is producing lots more meat now than he did before the war, with less help.

That would bring prices down if we weren't eating 10 pounds more per head this year than we were then.

Training of Airmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Critical Situation," written by Mr. Charles A. Parker, and published in the Civil Air Patrol News of April 23.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CRITICAL SITUATION

That the fixed-base and/or flying service and school end of the flying industry is being torn to pieces is evident on every hand and that definite need exists to replenish the airman pool through federally sponsored training is shown in the following:

THE MILITARY AND DRAFT

Recall to active duty has already depleted the ranks of other-than-airline aviation to a serious extent in the pilot category alone. The draft is also making serious inroads in all classes of personnel.

THE AIRLINES

Air carriers are looking for pilots; also for mechanics. They are reaching for the fixed-base operator and his personnel, with this end of the industry being robbed of personnel. Their advertisements are on airport bulletin boards. Their hiring agents are at operator meetings. Their advertisements appear in aviation publications.

EXECUTIVE AIRCRAFT USERS

According to a statement by a key member of an association involved with this category, they are looking for skilled multiengined and instrument-rated pilots. Vital defense and mobilization transportation by these people is facing a curb.

AERIAL DUSTING AND SPRAYING

Reports are received that this activity has been cut into seriously by both the military and the draft. Such pilots cannot be trained or replaced overnight. The California Legislature recently found the situation so acute that they passed a resolution directed to Selective Service and the military ecouraging every consideration of pilots in this category. Vast acreages and food supplies will be jeopardized if this continues.

DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

These industries are attracting all classes of personnel from fixed-base aviation with expanded activity and high pay scales. Persons with mechanical skills in particular are being drawn into defense work. Who will replace them? Airports are closing. The sponge is being thrown in by the operators.

AIR FORCE CADET CONTRACT SCHOOLS

Contracts with only four schools so far exist, yet these schools are already experiencing difficulty in obtaining qualified instructors. What of the additional contracts to come? In addition, public funds are being wasted on cadets in such schools who start training on T-6 aircraft—$1 out of every $3 thrown away, as per Gen. George Kenney, USAF. Prescreening of such cadet material is positively needed to save the biggest part of this dollar, as well as to help preserve existing civil training resources.

THERE WILL BE NO AIRMAN POOL LEFT

Fixed-base aviation is fast melting away. With this are going many airports. This means that civil defense resources are going—the training resource is going—vital fast direct taxi and company transportation service is melting—agriculture will suffer.

Here are the things that civil aviation schools should be doing immediately irrespective of the still greater basic need for a widespread program of aviation and flight indoctrination among the youth of the country in the lower age levels.

1. Refresher courses created for airline and executive user needs, instrument and multiengine ratings or development of such ratings from existing or former commercial pilots.

2. Refresher and development courses for aerial applicator pilots.

3. Refresher and finishing courses for instructors for the AF Contract Cadet Schools and for the civil school facility as well. Note that the expansion of ROTC to include flight training with civil schools that appears certain to come will create a new demand in this category alone. Notable is the fact that in World War II the first shortages developed in the instructor category.

4. Prescreening of AF flying cadets for economy.

5. Development of mechanic skills to feed all phases of activity through the aviation trade school.

If the airman training legislation now pending, which is designed to meet the civil and military needs of the country, were law, the above situations could be met by cooperative planning, evaluation of shortages, and estimates of future requirements, by CAA in connection with appropriate agencies of Government, industry and the military. Necessary training programs could then be established.

The question is heard, where are the GI trainees? This is easy to answer. Some have become established in other activities. Others have returned to military service. Many have already lost ratings and proficiency or were never able to obtain instructor, multi-engine, or instrument ratings under arbitrary and crippling VA restrictions. Neither did they have, nor do they now have, the money with which to purchase such ratings or obtain refreshers. Many could be brought back to replenish the civil pool through the program pointed out here under an airman training act if it were law.

If these are the conditions at a stage no further along than mobilization is at the present, what will be the situation as the tempo of mobilization increases or should we ever reach a fateful "M" day?

Principal conclusion from all this is that early hearings on the airman training legislation, S. 507 and/or the House version, H. R. 1521, must be held by the House and Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees and every effort be made to create this legislation as law.

Ships Aiding Reds Mortgaged to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ships Aiding Reds Under United States Mortgage," written by Helen Delich, and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPS AIDING REDS MORTGAGED TO UNITED STATES—CHINESE COMMUNIST PRODUCTS CARRIED TO WEST EUROPE

(By Helen Delich)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Eight ships currently involved in a single movement of grain and grain products from Communist China to Western Europe are under mortgage to the United States Maritime Commission.

Seven other identified vessels engaged in this transaction were purchased from the United States for cash by Greek-Panamanian and South African interests.

The remaining 12 freighters named in the consignment are registered as British and Russian.

LOSS PUT NEAR THREE BILLION

Since the 15 American-built Liberty-type ships were sold under the Ship Sales Act of 1946, they were embraced in a scathing attack made Wednesday by Senator WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, on the legislation. At that time, he pointed out that this Nation had lost nearly $2,800,000,000 in these sales.

Then the Senator noted that the British had permitted seven Nationalist Chinese ships under mortgage to the United States to be taken over by the Communists in Hong Kong and Singapore, and added:

"It would be interesting to know how many more of the ships which have been sold to foreign operators are today being utilized to transport goods in trade with Communist countries."

ARRANGED BY HUNGARIANS

The vast single transaction of approximately 380,000 tons of soybeans, maize, wheat, beans, etc., from China to Europe was arranged by Hungarians in London.

Shipping circles hint that these same freighters are carrying strategic general cargo to Dalny, Taku Bar, Taingtao, and Chinwangtao—all Red China ports—to discharge before loading grain.

It is believed that the general cargo or the income derived from it is being used to pay Communist China for the grain. Informed sources here state that the exact nature of the general cargo cannot be determined, but presume it contains items sorely needed by the Asiatic countries battling United Nations troops in Korea.

GRAIN FLOWS IN FROM UNITED STATES

At the same time, grain and its products from the United States are flowing into the same Western European ports under the Marshall plan and other aid programs without any cost to these countries.

The freight rates on the grain from China to Antwerp, Rotterdam, Hamburg, or Gdynia range from $25.50 up per ton, considered favorable for the shipowner or charterer.

Exporters and importers assert that this particular transaction typifies cargo movements and the use of ship-sales vessels in the over-all international trading picture.

The 8 ships under mortgage are part of 100 Liberty freighters sold on credit to 75 individuals and firms with the backing of the Greek Government in 1947. These ships specifically were to be used in Greek foreign commerce to help rehabilitate that nation.

Many of the owners live in New York and are associated with various shipping firms under as many varied foreign flags.

The mortgaged ships are the steamship *Costantis* (formerly *Harry Leon Wilson*), sold to the Pateras Bros.; *Nicolas* (*William N. Byers*), sold to A. & J. Ch. Mavrophillippas & Ch. N. Pateras; *Pintos* (*Robert L. Hague*), Athena Maritime Co., Ltd.; *Themistocles* (*Frances S. Barton*), Ionion Steamship Co., Ltd.; *Nicolaou Georgious* (*Frederick Tresca*), Mrs. Z. Nicolaou and family; *Konistra* (*Edwin L. Kodkin*), Thomas N. Ephiphaniades; *Annastassios Pateras* (*Betty Zane*), Dimitris Annastassios Pateras; *Panaghia K.* (*Albert A. Michelson*), Andreas G. Caravais.

CASH-PURCHASED SHIPS

The cash-purchased Liberty carriers are the *Atlantic Seamen* (*Samuel W. Williston*) and *Atlantic Wind* (*Henry M. Robert*) to the Atlantic Maritime Co., of Panama; *Liberator* (*James B. Aswell*), to Compania Naviera Pan-Americana; *Enterprise* (*Charles Dauray*), Cia Naviera Pomeroan, of Panama.

The Northern Steamship (Pty.) Ltd., of Johannesburg, South Africa, paid cash for the *President Pretorius* (*James B. Hickok*), *President Steyn* (*John G. Nicolay*) and *President Kruger* (*John M. Palmer*).

Instruction of Young People in Affairs of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a good

idea expressed to me from Charles Kress, of Binghamton, N. Y. On a voluntary basis, Mr. Kress was of much help in the Senate Crime Investigating Committee's work. He suggests that some arrangements should be made, preferably through a voluntary patriotic association, to make available to the splendid young men and women who are visiting our Capitol a short talk about the meaning of some of the things which they see here as it relates to better citizenship.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 15, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: I believe we could do much more in this country than we have been doing in the schools, churches, and homes to build character and citizenship in the boys and girls who will be the men and women of tomorrow. I believe tremendously in the youth of this Nation; that they mean well, that their hearts are right, that they want to be fine, good citizens of a fine, good country. The great and serious interest displayed by young people throughout the Nation in the Senate Crime Investigating Committee hearings was to me a very encouraging indication of the fundamental integrity of our young folks.

The question in my mind is whether we older people, we who call ourselves the leaders of this Nation, are doing all we can, and are fully meeting our responsibilities to give our boys and girls the leadership, guidance, and assistance necessary to help them in their honest desires to become good citizens and real Americans.

Right here in Washington are we doing all we can in this direction? Everyday now, and for all the rest of this month, the corridors of this Capitol are overflowing with boys and girls from all over the country—bright young students at perhaps their most impressionable age. They come to Washington, visit points of interest, and leave. But our Government neither takes them by the hand nor speaks to them.

Couldn't we do something better than this? Couldn't we have a speaker from the Government, or from the American Legion or some other patriotic organization, meet each group of these junior citizens as they visit the Capitol, speak to them briefly, explain to them what good citizenship means, and how it, and it alone, has made this great country possible? A speaker to give them a few inspiring words and thoughts which they will keep in their hearts always, associated with the memories of their visit here—a speaker to tell them that Washington is really theirs, that tomorrow they will inherit it from their fathers and mothers—that here in Washington, despite the sensationalism of headlines from time to time, there are good, honest, sincere, hard-working Government officials, Congressmen, Senators, and judges working faithfully and earnestly as true Americans to keep and protect that priceless heritage of American citizenship safe and secure until these young Americans are ready to take over the grave responsibilities of carrying on.

Couldn't we arrange to do something like this, so that all these fine, intelligent boys and girls who are flocking through the Capitol corridors every day now, do not go away empty-handed, without any message of welcome, encouragement, or inspiration?

Can we say we are fully doing our part here in Washington if we miss this opportunity to help in the job of building good citizenship in the youth of today?

Sincerely,

CHARLES KRESS.

OPS Roll-Back of Beef Prices Unfair, Unworkable, and Confiscatory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent given me by the House today, I am including a copy of a telegram from the members of the Flint Hills Farmers and Livestock Growers Emergency Association, expressing opposition to the roll-back of meat prices ordered by the Office of Price Stabilization.

This message was sent as the result of a meeting of approximately 800 farmers and livestock men in my immediate vicinity. Nearly all of these people are farmers who handle comparatively small herds of cattle, and who depend upon the farm and livestock for their living. These people are, after all, the backbone of our country. They are among our best citizens. They do feel that the order of the OPS is not an order of stabilization, but of discrimination, demanding that they accept a lower price on the market for their product than what it is really worth. The telegram reads as follows:

EMPORIA, KANS., *May 4, 1951.*

Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This evening in Emporia at the initial meeting of the Flint Hills Farmers and Livestock Growers Emergency Association, the 815 members present gave their unanimous approval to the following resolutions. You are urged to give them your most vigorous support.

1. *Be it resolved,* That the roll-back of beef prices as ordered by Office of Price Stabilization be reconsidered since it is unfair, unworkable, and confiscatory for the farmers, livestock growers, and businessmen of this important cattle-producing area. We submit that it is also detrimental to agricultural and related industries of the United States.

2. *Be it resolved,* That you use your utmost efforts to see that in the forthcoming discussion of the Defense Production and Mobilization Act, and especially article IV of that act, the interest of labor, agriculture, and industry are fairly and fully discussed; that, if it be considered necessary to extend or rewrite this act, you are urged to see that an equitable and workable agreement in which the time element necessary to carry on the normal livestock program, which in this community is from 9 to 15 months, is arrived at. This group would like specifically for you to see that should it be considered necessary, after due consideration by the Congress, to impose controls on any one segment of the economy that they be applied to all groups of industry, labor, and agriculture and not any one segment by itself.

MEMBERS OF FLINT HILLS FARMERS AND LIVESTOCK GROWERS EMERGENCY ASSOCIATION.

The Federal Government's Part in Airport Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given by me before a meeting of the American Association of Airport Executives in Minneapolis, Minn., on Monday, April 23, 1951:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S PART IN AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak to you who bear the day-to-day responsibilities and headaches of managing the Nation's airport facilities. As a member, for some years past, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives—which committee, as you may know, among its other duties considers Federal legislative matters pertaining to aviation—I believe that I have gained some appreciation of your problems and of the importance of our airport facilities to the successful functioning of air operations as a whole, particularly in these difficult times when increasingly greater demands upon aviation facilities are being made.

While I am going to center my comments this evening [afternoon] on the Federal Government's part in airport developments, I fully recognize, as you do also I am sure, that the Federal Government is and can be only one of the partners in expanding and improving the Nation's aggregate of available airport facilities. The part of the local community sponsors, and of you as the operating executives actively on the job, determines more than anything else how well the airports function as an indispensible arm of aviation. To you must go much of the credit for what has been and is being accomplished.

ESSENTIALITY OF AIRPORTS

It has aptly been said that an adequate system of airports is the essential "taproot of all aeronautical activity." Obviously, the finest and swiftest aircraft which man has been able to devise can serve no useful purpose, aids to safe navigation in the air are by themselves pointless, and the most expertly trained flying personnel is helpless and futile unless the port facilities are available which enable the planes to take off and to reach safe landings at their appointed destinations. It is only by means of adequate airport facilities that any community can become a significant part of the stream of air commerce.

These altogether self-evident observations would require no particular mention were it not for the notable fact that throughout most of the history of aviation up to the present the development of adequate airport facilities has tended rather persistently to lag behind improvements in other aspects of aviation's growth and progress. If this be true, as it has been recognized to be by many who are interested in the sound and balanced growth of aviation and air commerce, it becomes important to consider how existing and prospective airport deficiencies can be overcome and how the responsibilities, financial and otherwise, for the necessary improvements should appropriately be divided among those who are concerned.

EMERGENCY PROGRAMS

It may be helpful to note very briefly the background of airport developments in this country. For more than a decade prior to World War II, the Federal Government, under various work-relief programs, had provided the greater part of the funds spent for the construction of airport facilities. The local communities and sponsors were required, however, to provide the sites as well as to assume the costs of airport maintenance and operation. Considering the lack of experience in airport planning and design in that early period, and also the fact that these airport projects were more often than not hurriedly conceived and carried out as emergency measures to provide employment, it is not surprising that many of the facilities proved to be poorly located, designed, and constructed. To a large extent it may well be true that, under the circumstances then existing, future airport needs could not have been very clearly foreseen. But at least we do know by hindsight that a large part of the airport expenditures made in the decade of the thirties failed to produce facilities of lasting value. In any event, the mistakes that were made provided some needed lessons to guide subsequent developments.

Beginning in 1941 and continuing through the war period, airport construction had to be geared into the war effort, with priorities limited strictly to those facilities which would contribute most to military requirements and the national defense. Under the DLA (defense landing area) program in World War II a total of 535 municipal airports were constructed with Federal funds. As before, the municipal sponsors were expected to furnish the sites and, except for direct military operations, to bear the continuing costs of operation and maintenance. Thus, throughout the first 15 years of Federal participation in airport development, emergency conditions prevailed which dictated the essentials of the programs which were undertaken.

THE POSTWAR PROGRAM AND LEGISLATION

After the conflict, wherever possible these war-built facilities were converted to civilian use, even though in many instances they were not wholly suited for such purposes. Nevertheless, the war undoubtedly accelerated the growth of airport facilities, even as it stimulated the advancement of aviation generally.

At the present time there are some 2,100 municipal airports in this country. Counting all types of landing areas and strips there are, of course, many more than this—altogether about 6,500—but most of this total number are suitable only for the smaller aircraft, local operations, and emergency landings when circumstances require. Many of these existing airports have been established since the close of the war and most of them have been substantially improved or enlarged in recent years.

In 1946 the Federal Airport Act was adopted (Public Law No. 377, 79th Cong.). For the first time under this act provision was made for a sustained program of airport construction directed primarily toward the development of a national system of airports designed to meet the needs of civil aviation. Prior to that time, as I have mentioned, Federal airport aid had been extended mainly in connection with emergency programs, first of depression and then of war.

The 1946 act authorized the appropriation of $520,000,000 to be spread over a 7-year period on the basis of matching grants to sponsors of public airports in the States and certain of the Territories. No restrictions as to the classes of airports eligible for Federal assistance were specified, apportionments as between larger and smaller airports being left broadly to the discretion of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The act did provide that the funds be spent in accordance with a national airport plan to be formulated and revised as necessary by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Good airports do not spring into being overnight. They require, as you well know, careful planning and working out of financial problems. For these reasons, and also because the initiative in airport development still must come from the local community sponsors, the program envisaged by the 1946 act started and gathered momentum rather slowly. Even so, appropriations for the first 4 years totalled $157,000,000 through the fiscal year 1950, or at the rate of nearly $40,000,000 a year.

At this point I should like to refer briefly to amendatory legislation affecting the airport program which Congress has enacted in recent months. The first of these amendments, which became effective on September 27, 1950 (Public Law No. 846, 81st Cong.) extends for five additional years beyond June 30, 1953, the period during which the $520,000,000 authorized by the 1946 act may be expended. This extension should enable the public airport sponsors to proceed carefully with their plans under assurance of continuity in the availability of the Federal funds which are provided.

The second airport amendment to which I refer became effective on January 9, 1951, under Public Law No. 912, Eighty-first Congress. Heretofore, the Federal Government has borne only 25 percent of the site-acquisition costs for airports, whereas usually the Federal share in other respects has been 50 percent of construction costs. This restriction as to the financing of sites apparently hampered some communities in getting desirable airport projects under way and, perhaps more important, was contributing in some instances to the selection of poor locations and the building of airports on too small an acreage. On the other hand, communities which were farsighted in selecting the best available sites, even though more costly as to the required original outlay, were in effect being penalized by the 25 percent restriction. It was widely felt that, because of the basic importance of suitable location and adequate size, the Federal Government should not weigh the scales against sound long-run airport economy. Consequently, under Public Law 912, the Federal Government now bears the same portion (50 percent) of land costs as it can pay of other developmental costs. As I understand it, many administrative and legal difficulties in distinguishing between land-acquisition costs and other costs have also been eliminated by this change.

NEED FOR INTEGRATED AVIATION FACILITIES

One of the greatest aviation needs now, it seems to be agreed, is for more deliberately considered integration of aviation facilities. By such integration I mean, for example, that sound airport planning requires account to be taken of associated changes which are occurring or are in prospect with respect to flying equipment and air-navigation facilities. This problem is of particular importance to you as airport managers because it is the airports in many instances which are now, and threaten increasingly to become, the limiting bottlenecks to further aviation advances.

Especially from the standpoint of safety and dependability of flying, we can all of us heartily applaud the great strides which have been made recently in the development of an improved all-weather common system of air-traffic control under the so-called SC-31 program, which was initiated on the basis of the report in 1948 by the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics and which is planned for completion by 1963. Already it is apparent, however, that this common system of air-traffic control, which is expected to cost the Federal Government considerably more than $1,000,000,000, cannot yield its full potential of benefits to aviation unless there are geared with it corresponding improvements of airport facilities.

The importance of this integrated airport problem is high lighted with emphasis and clarity in the report of the Air Coordinating Committee on Air Traffic Control and the National Security, published last December. That report states that under the common system of air-traffic control now coming into being the terminal area traffic capacities per instrument runway will be approximately doubled and that this increased traffic capacity, when compared with anticipated increases in traffic demand, will eliminate the delays, cancellations, and bad weather unreliability that currently cost the airlines alone millions of dollars annually. Military traffic also will be enabled to move into civil airports or civil traffic to operate into military bases with equal ease, since simplified common procedures will be in use.

It is not at all difficult to see what this means with respect to the adequacy of airport facilities on the ground. The stepped-up activity and greater traffic flow potential into the terminal area will shift the bottleneck to the surface of the airport itself, whereas in the past the major bottle neck in the movement of air traffic was in the air because of cumbersome procedures of navigation which made it possible for only a few aircraft to complete approaches and to land at an airport in an hour.

The report of the Air Coordinating Committee finds that even today, with present traffic-control capacity, many of our airports have reached the saturation point and cannot handle the increased traffic which the common system will make possible. Unless the advantages of this improved navigation system are to be nullified in large part, therefore, airport design and development must keep pace and airports must be recognized for what they are—integral parts of the air-traffic-control system.

FEDERAL ROLE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Airports, I don't need to tell you, cost money and often the necessary funds for improvements are not easy to come by. This raises directly the question of what are the relative shares and areas of appropriate responsibility for the financing of airports as between the Federal Government and the local sponsors. Is the present arrangement satisfactory, as provided under the Federal Airport Act of 1946, or should there be some shifting or realinement of burdens in one direction or the other? Is there need for a classification of airports which would limit eligibility for Federal assistance to certain categories?

To these important questions I have no pat answer or conclusion, but I do think that it is both possible and desirable to indicate certain existing conditions which have a bearing on those questions. As in so many other ways the requirements of national defense and security must have first consideration with respect to airport developments and their financial support, and for all that we are able to see now this is likely to be so for an indefinitely long period.

I mentioned earlier that under the terms of the 1946 Federal Airport Act no limitations were placed upon the kinds or classes of airports which could be assisted with Federal funds. The Federal Government, under this program, has been providing about 50 percent of the cost of the smaller, as well as the larger, airports. Generally, the airports of class sub-1, class 1, and class 2 are suitable only for private-owner aircraft and

small transport planes. Under the airport program launced in 1946 and down to June 30, 1949, such small airport projects accounted for almost one-half of the projects for which grants had been committed, and they accounted for approximately 14 percent of the allotted Federal airport funds.

According to the national airport plan—1950—as projected last year by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for a 3-year period, there were found to be 5,093 locations at which airports should be constructed or improved in order to meet existing or anticipated demands. The estimated costs of this 3-year program were $928,900,000, of which the Federal share would be $445,700,000 and the sponsors' share $482,300,000. Of the 5,093 airport projects covered by this survey, more than 75 percent pertained to class 2 or smaller airports, and they would account for over one-third of the projected Federal expenditures.

It seems more likely now, however, that many of these contemplated smaller airport projects will have to give way on grounds of essentiality to requirements of the national defense, insofar at least as financial assistance from the Federal Government is concerned. Since the 1950 national airport plan was first announced, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has reviewed its entire airport program and has eliminated nearly all of the small projects. The aim now is to concentrate on those larger projects which are most essential from the standpoint of the defense effort in the emergency.[1]

Whether this may represent a permanent shift of emphasis with respect to the scope of Federal airport aid is not yet clear, but it does indicate an awareness that in the present circumstances, at least, Federal funds for airports should not be spread so widely or thinly as to defeat the essential purpose of the Federal Airport Act—to develop a system of airports having real national significance.

There appears to be considerable sentiment favoring such limitation as a matter of permanent Federal policy. This does not mean, of course, that the smaller airports of more localized significance are not important or should not be built. In emergencies, they may, like nearly all of the Nation's facilities and resources, be called upon to serve a defense purpose as well as to provide local community service. It seems true, nevertheless, as the Aviation Development Advisory Committee has well emphasized in its report on America's Civil Air Power, dated August 28, 1950, that many small airports will suffer attrition in the coming years unless these airports have the full support of the communities they serve.

The issue then is where to set the limits of appropriate Federal financial responsibility in terms of the interest of the Nation as a whole. Unless the Federal Government were to assume a greater and greater share of the financial burden of airport development—both large and small and those of more localized as well as national significance, we must continue to rely mainly upon the initiative and financial responsibility of the local community sponsors.

As a final word, I should like to stress the importance of increasing airport revenues in order to realize in greater measure their financial self-support. This objective is of prime importance, it seems to me, with respect to all airports whether large or small, and it is in the real interest not only of the local community sponsors and the Federal taxpayers, but of the airline companies and other users of the airports as well.

[1] Federal Airport Act, hearings on S. 1281 and S. 2875 before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 81st Cong., 2d sess., August 29, 1950, p. 33.

Economic Stabilization and the Attitude of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Does Labor Act That Way?" by Edwin A. Lahey, who has specialized in the field of labor. The editorial appeared in the April issue of Extension magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DOES LABOR ACT THAT WAY?

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

(In the present confusion over the wage-price controls, it is difficult for the layman to clearly understand the issues. We have asked Mr. Lahey who, in his long writing career, has specialized in the field of labor, to tell us how things look to him as we go to press.)

Labor leaders have hopped from one crisis to another since the economic-control agencies began to take shape in Washington.

It would be easy to gather the impression, as one reads the crisis bulletins, that labor leaders are screaming for special advantages for their members before the cement sets.

This is far from the truth. As we slip into a controlled economy in this country, an analysis of the basic fears of the labor leaders would seem to be in order.

The protests of A. F. of L., CIO, and independent union leaders against the more popular blueprints for control stem from a real concern for the family welfare of workers in every strata. Only time can tell whether their fears are justified, but the union leaders are apprehensive because they see a long period of economic controls ahead of us, with two grave dangers looming up.

1. That under a rigged waged control, social benefits separate from wage rates will be whittled down, or arrested in their normal development.

2. That under the stress of the mobilization fever, Congress may be stampeded by control officials into passing a universal service act for civilians; which will end voluntary society as we know it.

The restlessness of the labor-union officials is firmly rooted in their own experience. They all served on committees and boards that administered Government controls in World War II. They know on the basis of their own experience that if they were in the seats of the mighty, they could devise a wage-control machine full of loopholes, and a price-control machine with no loopholes.

But labor leaders are not in power. President Truman has vested the vast powers of the National Defense Production Act in the hands of business executives, industrialists, and financiers.

A trade-unionist does not assume that a business executive, an industrialist, or a financier is any less patriotic than himself. Neither does he assume that any of these types is less human than himself.

Consequently, the labor leaders have viewed the whole development of the control agencies with the suspicion that the men in charge were rigging up price-control machinery with loopholes, and wage-control machinery with no loopholes, the opposite of what labor leaders might be tempted to do if they had the vast powers of the Federal administrators.

The first draft of a wage-control rule by the Wage Stabilization Board headed by Cyrus Ching confirmed these suspicions and produced a real revolt, in which the three labor members of the nine-man Board walked out.

The three public members and three industry members of the Wage Stabilization Board had determined, over the running opposition of the labor members, that wage increases of 10 percent above the rates prevailing on January 1, 1950, would be permitted to compensate workers for the increased cost of living.

The Board also voted that "fringe benefits" would be frozen, pending "further study." Meanwhile, any "fringe benefits" would have to come out of the 10 percent general wage increase permitted in the order.

The freeze of "fringe benefits" was the thing that induced the labor revolt.

This term is a misnomer and for this reason the unrest of the labor leaders has not been clearly understood.

A "fringe benefit" is anything outside the basic wage structure. In recent years of collective bargaining, the area of "fringe benefits" has been expanded to new horizons, so that today the "fringe" on the economic rug is very wide and runs all the way around, instead of just at the ends.

Pensions, health, welfare, and hospital plans, paid holidays, vacation time, regional wage differentials—these are some of the vastly important aspirations of labor that come under the innocuous head of "fringe benefits."

If the southern wage differential were eliminated tomorrow, such action would cause an economic earthquake, but it would come under the title of a "fringe benefit."

If the workers in auto and steel negotiated a pension increase to a minimum of $200 per month at 65, it would be a "fringe benefit" of tremendous cost to industry, and a tremendous blessing to older workers.

Similarly, it would be a "fringe benefit" if private industry pensions were "vested." The "vesting" of existing pensions is the next great hurdle for the unions in the mass-production industries. When a worker in a noncontributory pension plan leaves his employment today, he generally leaves his pension rights behind him. When these pension plans are "vested," the payments made by a company into his pension account will remain credited to him when he changes employers.

This specific issue of the pension rights of a worker who shifts employment will soon assume major proportions, as the flow of defense orders brings about the involuntary transfer of many workers from one plant to another.

Quite naturally, labor leaders are not willing to stand by and see this and other "fringe issues" dropped into the deep freeze of economic controls "pending further study."

Labor economists are quite willing to concede that a worker's hourly wage rate should be subject to control in an inflationary period, assuming that there is some relation of wage rates to price movements.

But they will not admit the justice of completely freezing "fringe benefits," or of the suggested method of taking these "fringe benefits" out of an allowable increase in wage rates.

On their behalf, it should be said that it is difficult to see the inflationary effect of slight increases in pension and hospital insurance payments, or an increase in paid holidays or vacation time, such as labor might be able to negotiate in collective bargaining with employers.

The second fear of the labor leaders, over the development of manpower mobilization policies inimical to the family welfare of union members, is perhaps remote, but none the less real.

The A. F. of L., and CIO, and the nonaffiliated unions strongly urged in the beginning of the mobilization effort that Secretary of Labor Tobin remain in charge of all manpower policies, as orginally intended by President Truman.

But, over the vigorous protests of his labor friends, the President reassigned the manpower authority of the National Defense Production Act to Charles E. Wilson, the over-all boss of the mobilization effort, who, it can be reasonably assumed, did not give up his post as president of General Electric until he was assured by Mr. Truman that he would have complete powers to mobilize the industrial and civilian manpower resources of the Nation.

The labor leaders fear not Mr. Wilson, but his manpower advisor, Gen. Lucius Clay, whom they regard as an exponent of universal service idea, a concept that comes naturally to a military man.

The frightened union officials feel that in the black despair of another Pearl Harbor Day, it would take only a suggestion from General Clay to Mr. Wilson and then to Congress to clamp this Nation under the regimentation of universal service, in which men, women, and children would be told when and where to report for work.

Mr. Wilson tried manfully to quiet the apprehension and stem the revolt of the labor leaders in Washington.

While his deputy, Economic Stabilization Director Eric Johnston, sought a way to woo back the labor members of the Wage Stabilization Board, Wilson himself sent a mollifying letter to the United Labor Policy Committee, offering to accept one of their members as his own counsellor in mobilization work, and reminding the labor leaders that the "effective employment of manpower in the mobilization program is not solely a labor problem."

Maybe the labor leaders are seeing things under the bed, we can't say for sure. But as we pointed out in the beginning of this editorial, the labor boys had plenty of experience in economic mobilization in World War II, and ought to be able to recognize a cold deal when they're getting one.

Letter Written by a Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, when we hear one story from our Speaker telling us about the imminence of war and, at the same time, in the other body we find Senator CONNALLY stating that war is not likely this year, you can see how we in Congress think that most information is put out for propaganda purposes. The people throughout the country are subject to the same thoughts, and many of us doubt the stories being released from the battle front. Therefore, letters written by the boys to members of their families really give us the best picture of what is going on in Korea.

I am inserting a letter written by a marine to his brother-in-law, which not only gives us an idea of what the boys are thinking but graphically describes what they are going through:

MARINE FIGHTER SQUADRON, *April 14, 1951.*

DEAR STEW AND BETS: We are all so upset about this MacA. deal we are sick. Hope the American people have the gumption and good sense to do something about it. MacA. is the only leader in the United States in my mind with guts. The only thing in the world the Commies respect is force, and he is the only leader we have who threatens them with it. It is apparent to us out here that this Commie deal is a war to the finish. I'm sure it must be to those in the States—except our State Department people. Why don't the people do something about it? Why should we not utilize the CN troops and why not bomb the Manchurian bases and MSR? They are worrying about getting in an all-out war with China and we are already in one. We are just leaving the time of the knockout blow to the Reds. Their build-up in North Korea is fabulous and in Manchuria it's undoubtedly greater. We could stop it if they'd let us, but they won't. That means they will annihilate us here, or we'll give them everything over a treaty table that our people have suffered and died to protect. During the last 3 weeks the AA has gotten so bad we have had to completely change our tactics. All this build-up could have been prevented if we'd opened up on the Manchurian borders and we have had to sit idly by and watch it happen. Don't believe what you read in the papers. This situation is far worse than our position in the Philippines, etc., in 1941. Certainly our leaders have access to our intelligence reports, and I cannot understand their thinking. I hope MacA. blows the lid off when he hits Uncle Sugar—and I believe he will. I'll stop sounding off. It's just that we all have a very hopeless feeling about the future of our country.

I did some flying while we were in Yokosuka. I took some boys to Itami and we picked up four replacement aircraft. Boy, are they junk heaps. We are flying equipment now, Stew, that you wouldn't fly in the States. Our mechanics and ordnance men are working around the clock to keep our planes in good enough repair to maintain a schedule. They are doing a bang-up job. After we got to Tokyo with our planes we still had a little time to play. Tokyo is really State-side, only cheaper. I had 2 days there and it was really fine. The people stationed there are fat as a goose—scotch and sodas 18 cents at the Australian officers' club, and everything else on the same scale. Seems funny to see automobiles, etc., again. No wonder our occupation forces went to hell. Anyhow, we had a couple first-class parties and everyone was relaxed, hung over, etc., when we pulled out for the zone again. We had been hit very hard the last couple of days of operation prior to going to Tokyo, so everyone was ready. I've virtually been on the wagon out here so far, but most of the boys were on their butts. We went back to our regular operating area on the west coast and only operated 3 days. Boy, the activity had stepped up. We all got shot up—I got shot up two hops of there and we had three planes shot down. Two of the boys were picked up O. K. and our skipper was killed. His plane was hit and he tried to make the coast, but it started burning. He jumped and was picked up later that night by helicopter, but he was dead. It was a great loss to our squadron and to the Marine Corps—he was a wonderful C. O. and we all felt very bad. We had so many planes beat up we couldn't make the flight schedule and we returned to Yosiho. We stayed there 1 day, had the skipper's services and I got drunk along with everyone else in the squadron. The services were over at 1500 and I was aboard ship at 1800 to assume the duty and was loaded enough to be sick all the next day on the way to the east coast. We've been operating with an English carrier and they have a good bunch of boys. They've had some bad luck—lost a pilot a day since we came back out here. The first day we operated out here we had 12 planes shot up out of 30 launched and 1 shot down. Sumner went in the water off of Wonsan and was picked up by a helicopter off a cruiser. When he got aboard he found Jeff Harp (a pilot who was in our squadron before we went carrier-based). He's been picked up the day before for the second time. One boy was hit in the cockpit and had superficial wounds in the back.

We finally decided that the Chinks had successfully countered our tactics to the extent we'd have to change ours. We did change and we've been doing O. K. since—pick up a few holes, but nothing too rough. We are getting a few replacements, but they are just about keeping up with our natural attrition. We've had three boys relieved this month that had been shot down and were through flying for a while, and we've picked up five replacements. They say, however, that there are a couple large replacement drafts coming out the next 2 months, so we are still hoping to get relieved in June. The squadron morale hit a low point a while back, but with encouraging news about relief, it seems to be getting pretty high again. I'll have a hundred missions by the end of this month, so you can see some of the boys are getting sort of tired. I was high man last quarter and I'm not tired, but some of them are.

The only thing that upsets me is I'm afraid we are doing all this for nothing and that Truman and Acheson and the others will give away everything we are fighting for. We've all just been sitting here talking about it and I guess that's why I can't get it out of my mind.

We are getting up at 3:30 a. m. every morning and next cruise we'll probably get up at 3 a. m. I slept all afternoon yesterday and 'til 8 a. m. this morning because we are replenishing this morning. I really feel rested. This carrier life is so much better than land based that every time I feel low I just think about Kimpo, Wonsan, Yonpo, etc., and I feel real good.

Surely miss Janet and the kids. Surely is going to be fun to see them again. Lord but the kids must be growing up. We've got some new 21-year-old replacements that really make us feel old. Let's face it, we aren't getting any younger. Sure hope I can get back to work soon, but I doubt if we'll make it. Surely wish I had a house and was settled in one place, but I guess that's out—probably get tired of it anyway. Janet is happily settled in her house and I'm very happy about that. For the first time in my life I'm anxious to be home and help around the house, etc. I want to take Janet on a nice vacation—nothing fancy, just to get away. Then try and be a little more help around with the house and kids. I've always used all my energies toward my vocation and getting ahead as a breadwinner, but that doesn't seem as important to me anymore. Our lives are fouled up and will probably continue to be fouled up to the extent that long-range planning, etc. is sort of a waste of time I'm afraid.

If we could just get a change in administration I'd feel a lot different. If I had the money I'd feel like being a politician—I guess I sound like one today.

Dorothy and Jack undoubtedly had a nice trip. I hope it wasn't all business with Jack. Just at the time when he should be able to start relaxing a little, it looks as if he will be busier than he's ever been before. We've got a lot of building to do all over the world, and it's going to have to be done pronto. I can't help but worry Janet and kids a little, being in Los Angeles, but I'll be home soon. She has a lot of friends around there and seems to be having a pretty fair time. Clem is about to go into business for himself, and apparently has a pretty good deal set up. He wants me to try and get out of the Marine

Corps when I get home to go into it with him. Three of my old bosses have written me offering me jobs, and they all sound swell, but I just wonder what's the use of working my butt off again, just to be called back in the service in a year or two again. If I'd gotten further along in construction I'd be worth more to the country in that capacity, but, unfortunately, the best I can offer them is an aircraft jockey. Life, I guess.

Please pardon the B. S. Sometimes it helps just to blow off a little. We've had a swell cruise, and I haven't a kick in the world. My family's well and happy, and I'll be home soon.

I loved your pictures and letters. Lots of love.

BERT.

Test Comes Now on Asia Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles A. Merrill from the Boston Sunday Globe of April 29, 1951:

THEY COMES NOW ON ASIA POLICY—RESULT OF DESPERATE FIGHTING IN KOREA MAY HELP SHAPE UNITED STATES COURSE AS MACARTHUR AND DEFENSE CHIEFS PRESENT VIEWS TO SENATE COMMITTEE

(By Charles A. Merrill)

Gradually the trumult and the shouting dies. The renowned "old soldier" who has come back from the wars may not fade away, but henceforth he will play a more normal role on the American scene, and will be accorded more rational treatment by the public. The mass hysteria honoring the general, so fascinating on the television screen for the millions unable to be present, already seems like a dream dimly etched on our memories. Our attention has shifted back to that corner of the world whence the general flew home to us. TV does not yet reach that far. But the headlines spotlight events in Korea of more importance than the career of any individual. Our seasoned young soldiers on the Asiatic front—our few to whom so many Americans are debtors—together with their UN allies, have again been struggling against a Red tidal wave. Lieutenant General Ridgway, the new supreme commander, warns us that this battle may prove decisive.

If the latest attack by Chinese Communists, shall turn out to be the long-anticipated Red offensive, it could settle the argument here at home over American policy in the Far East.

NO TV DRAMA

As emotion subsides, the issue is being clarified in the public mind. The MacArthur idea is that an effort should be made to end the Korean conflict quickly. He thinks he might have accomplished this if (1) he had been permitted to bomb the Manchurian supply bases; (2) if American planes were dispatched to bombard coastal areas on the Chinese mainland; and (3) if our Government had sent aid and given the go-ahead to Nationalist leader Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa for an attack on Communists in China. This, says the general, plus reinforcements in Korea, might turn the trick. He thinks it improbable that Soviet Russia would involve her forces in retaliation. The administration replies that, quite aside from its determination to keep the civil authorities in control of foreign policy, it considers the MacArthur program too great a risk. Presumably, this is the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They do not believe it wise to commit our forces to a full-scale Asiatic war. They hope to limit the Korean conflict. We are playing for time to build up our defenses in Western Europe. Furthermore, have our Allies not made it clear that they will not support any such plan as MacArthur urged? Are we ready alone to take on Red China and Soviet Russia, plus her European satellites?

Within a few days, according to present plans, the conflict of views will be aired before a combined Senate committee. Presumably, General MacArthur will outline his ideas in detail, and answer questions. Defense Secretary Marshall and General Bradley, our top military planners, are expected to follow. Out of the huddle something definite should emerge. The American people should be kept informed on the proceedings. But it is to be hoped that the Senators will not be tempted to stage a full-dress TV drama. This was highly useful in the Kefauver crusade which sought to rouse public opinion against corruption. But histrionics will hardly help our foreign policy makers in framing a defense policy. The committee should be concerned with the past only insofar as it helps illuminate the road ahead. And surely, great caution will be in order for security reasons.

MAN WITH PLAN

The acclaim for General MacArthur, almost as ardent in Chicago and Milwaukee in the past week as it had previously been in Washington and New York, is typically American. He rated it on his record. His long absence from the country added to the glamor. But there was more to it than this. Though the whole episode was made to order for certain political master minds, there has up to the present hour been nothing in the general's conduct to encourage those few reckless followers whose attitude seems to imply: "Who does i' the wars more than his captain can, becomes his captain's captain." In large part, the story seems to be that the appearance of this vivid personality, under rebuke by his superiors, offered an opportunity for a growing public mood of discontent, frustration, uneasiness, and resentment to express itself. Only a few years after the end of World War II, the American people are again in trouble. The casualty lists are coming in. The planning of youth for peacetime careers is once more interrupted. Prices soar, and so do taxes. Worst of all, this time the objective seems obscure, nor does there seem to be any end in sight. A magnetic radio voice or TV personality is lacking to rally the people. Even if there were such it might not prove persuasive in a period when we are neither wholly at peace nor fully at war. To appreciate this, we have only to recall that, even under the vibrant leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the lower House of Congress fell only one vote short on a motion to empty our training camps a few months before Pearl Harbor. Now, in this hour of perplexity, appears a picturesque figure, experienced in war and postwar maneuvering. He not only has charm. He has a program, and he is articulate.

This may be the explanation of the public reaction to General MacArthur. But it does not supply the answer to the complex problem of security for our country and the preservation of our common heritage, western civilization.

MASS KILLING

It may lift our spirits to remind ourselves of the substantial agreement among us that our quest is for peace. There is little dissent from that. Any other idea, now that science has removed all physical barriers on the earth and placed in the hands of man instruments for mass slaughter, would be sheer madness.

There are many reputable observers who believe that we can avoid an all-out war. Speaking in London, President Conant, of Harvard, though warning that Western Europe must be made defensible as a deterrent to possible rashness in the Kremlin, sees hope, perhaps a decade hence, of disarmament and peace—"a free world secure in its own frontiers, a Soviet with vastly diminished ambitions and pretensions." Mr. Paul Hoffman, former ECA Director, expresses similar views in an article, just published in book form, captioned "Blueprint for peace."

President Truman says the major aim of his administration is to avoid another global war. And though he may differ on the method best calculated to bring peace, General MacArthur himself evidently believes full-scale war would be suicidal. As he reminded Congress, he has not on the record been a warmonger. About a year ago, shortly before the Korean outbreak, the general told C. L. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, in an interview in Tokyo, "The scientists of the world have developed to such an extraordinary degree the processes and ways of accomplishing mass killing that war is no longer rationally a means of settling international problems. Its destruction has become so great that there can be no victor. * * * The public realizes all too well in the terms of the last war that there can be no real victor in a future war. The Russian masses are probably just as opposed to a shooting war as are the people in the western countries.

BIG WARS NOW

We sometimes forget that until relatively modern times, war did not touch the lives of the majority of the people, except in the region where it was fought. In both ancient Rome and medieval Europe, dependence upon citizen soldiers became impractical, and professional armies were raised to fight wars which, measured in modern terms, were restricted. The first compulsory military service law in history was promulgated by leaders of the French Revolution. The Prussian militarists introduced universal peacetime training, and converted Europe into an armed camp. Thus it has remained since 1870, and as we have learned to our sorrow, an explosion over there is a chain reaction from which there is no escape for us.

Wars no longer have their origin in the struggle of capitalist states for markets and sources of raw materials. Civilization has evolved beyond that. Two aggressive, totalitarian revolutions, first the Fascist, now the Communist, the later worldwide, have disturbed the peace.

The western countries—and if the truth were known, probably the people of Soviet Russia, after 16,000,000 casualties in World War II—have no stomach for an atomic conflict. In the first flush of revolutionary triumph, Red Chinese leaders have perhaps indoctrinated their armies with martial fanaticism for Asiatic conquest. But this can hardly be true of mankind generally. If the Russian desertions to the Nazis in the last war mean anything, the Soviet rulers will hesitate to lead their people into another conflict.

The danger signals are up. We cannot ignore them. Another flareup, like the Korean struggle, might spread. But our best chance would seem to be to play for time, to build strength and use it for peace.

Results of the fighting in Korea may well shape our course. If the Red attack is stalled, the hour should be propitious for the UN to find out if the Chinese Reds have had enough. To have checked Communist aggression in that area might prove a turning point in the midcentury struggle to save the peace of the world.

The Navajos' Problem as They See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE NAVAJOS' PROBLEM AS THEY SEE IT

DEAR FRIEND OF THE NAVAJOS: The following comments and sentiments of the Navajos are given you at the request of their leaders, so you may better understand their feelings, desires, and needs at this time.

Our organization is endeavoring to assist them in their many problems toward the goal of attaining their rightful place in American life and citizenship.

We bespeak your continued interest and assistance in this undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,

NAVAJO ASSISTANCE, INC.,
BERT POUSMA,
Managing Director.

Before we were taken captive by the United States in 1864 we lived on the land which lays between four of our sacred mountains, namely, Mount Taylor, near Grants, N. Mex.; San Francisco Peaks, near Flagstaff, Ariz.; Laplata Mountains, in southwestern Colorado; and Mount Baldy, near Alamosa.

This was a large land and a good land, containing open plains, mountains, valleys, and meadows. There was grass and trees, lakes, springs, streams, and water holes. We had our farms, orchards, sheep, goats, and horses. We had a good living.

About 200 years ago the Spanish came to our country and said that we would have to obey them. Then in 1823 Mexico said they were our boss. In 1846 the United States took our land from the Mexicans and told us we belonged to them. Why these nations, which had so much land of their own, had to fight about our land and take it way from us is hard for us to understand.

When the United States soldiers came, they said we would have to stop fighting and stealing. Most of our people did not believe we had to obey these strangers so kept on doing the same as they did before. Then the soldiers burned our fields and orchards and killed our animals. When we finally didn't have anything to eat, we were forced to bring our women and children to the white man's fort, so that we wouldn't starve. That was in the spring of 1864.

Then they took all our people on a long march of about 400 miles from our homeland to Fort Sumner, N. Mex. Our women, children, and old people suffered much on the way, and we all reached Fort Sumner practically naked. We were hungry and cold, tired and sick.

While we were in exile at Fort Sumner, Washington appropriated $100,000 for our relief, but we didn't get much relief. Some of our white friends heard about this and there was an investigation. This revealed that we were given only $30,000 of relief supplies, and that some bad white men got away with $70,000. We realized that dishonest people were taking things that were intended for us. Sometimes they would walk us around a building and count us twice, so they would get more supplies for us, but we didn't get it. Then we tried to fool them by raising the number of persons shown on our ration tickets so our families could get enough to eat, but they found out about it and made different kind of ration tickets that we couldn't change.

We had old tents to live in. There wasn't enough wood to keep us warm, and, because we didn't have enough blankets or clothes, we suffered from the cold. However, we worked hard and willingly did what we were told to do, constructing buildings, unloading freight, and so forth. The soldiers and officers reported that we were very good workmen.

In our homeland we were used to a roving life, but at Fort Sumner they made us live in 12 small villages and work on little farms. The bad water and poison weeds killed our livestock. The water also made us sick. Dry weather and bugs killed our crops. Many people died.

We were hungry, sick, weak, and discouraged, and then a worse thing happened. In the winter of 1866–67 smallpox came and killed many of our people. The dead were quickly buried, but the graves were not made deep enough. We saw coyotes come and dig up the bodies of our loved ones, and we were too sick and weak to do anything about it. We believe the coyote brings evil. That made us feel doubly unhappy and afraid. We wanted to get away from that place. Many of our people escaped and went back to our homeland. Some of our girls, in order to get enough to eat and warm clothing, ran away to little towns and lived with white men or Mexicans. We longed for our homeland where we could keep our families together and provide food and clothing for them.

We begged for permission to go back to our own country. We were willing to agree to anything, just so they would allow us to leave that awful place where everything went wrong during the 4 years that we were compelled to stay there.

Then in 1868, a treaty was made. We were permitted to leave Fort Sumner, but not yet permitted to go to our former homes. We were instructed to go to Fort Wingate (near Gallup, N. Mex.).

After the long walk from Fort Sumner to Fort Wingate, we were again naked and hungry, but they didn't give us enough to eat. The treaty authorized purchase of 500 beef cattle and 1,000,000 pounds of corn for our sustenance in the winter of 1868–69. Some of that cattle and corn was not given to us. We never got enough food and clothing. We ate prairie dogs, rats, and field mice, roots, wild plants, seeds, and tree bark.

When it became too crowded at Fort Wingate, they took some of our people to Fort Defiance, Ariz., but we weren't yet permitted to go to our former homes. We had to loaf around and wait for the 15,000 sheep and goats which the treaty said we would receive, but which were late in coming.

The animals finally came in the winter of 1869–70. We were given about three sheep for each member of the family, also some seed and a few tools. We were sure glad to get them. Now we could leave and go to work. We took good care of the sheep and goats. We worked hard and did all we could to eke out a living so that the Government wouldn't have to help us. In 1887 an investigator said that $700,000 was due our people for appropriations made by Congress for implements, seed, and stock, which we never received.

Our sheep and goats increased. Our people increased. We soon realized that we needed more land for our animals and that we were shut out from most of the land that we had before we were taken into exile. The best of our old streams, springs, and lakes were excluded. We needed all the land and water back again that was our homeland between our four sacred mountains.

As early as 1875 some of our head men went to Washington and pleaded for more land for our people. We did not understand that the treaty cut us down to such a small area.

In 1886, when the Apache Indians were on the warpath and the United States soldiers had difficulty in subduing them, our people were asked to help. While Indian troops were being formed, our chiefs met with the commanding officer. They said: "We are willing to help you. Our men will go to fight for you. They will leave their homes and loved ones. They will leave their people. They may not come back. They would like to have their children provided for by giving them our old homeland east of here that was taken from us. That is the heart of our country. That is where our heart is. That is what our children should have." The commanding officer replied: "We will do that." But that promise was not kept, and our children still have no land.

Small parts of our original homeland were given to us from time to time, but not nearly enough for our increasing people and animals. Some of our land was taken for the railroad. They were given a lot of land on both sides of the track which was built in the early 1890's. They leased that land to white cattlemen, and we were chased off. White and Mexican homesteaders came on our land, threatened us with guns and burned our hogans. Our best farm land is now occupied by white men and Mexicans. Our best grazing land is now controlled by white cattlemen. The good things were taken away from us, and evil brought into our country by bootleggers, gamblers, and prostitutes. We obeyed the treaty in not harming others, but no protection was given us against others harming us. We were commanded not to scalp anyone, but it seemed that no one cared if outsiders came in and skinned us alive.

In spite of disappointments, we did the best we could with what land and water we were allowed, and increased our sheep from 3 per person to an average of over 30 per person. It takes 50 per person to make a decent living, such as the white people call a minimum living standard. We had visions of the time when we would reach that standard and could afford a home, proper food, and clothing, and all the other things we saw the white people have, and which we wanted for our wives and children, to make them well and happy.

But then, just when we were getting along pretty good, the Government said there was too much sand from our reservation going into the Colorado River, and would fill up Hoover Dam. We said, "Give us more land and water like we have been asking for. Give us back all of our old homeland. Then there will not be soil erosion from overgrazing." But they would not do that. Instead of giving us more land and water, they came to our homes and first took away our goats, which we needed for milk for our children and for meat to eat. Then they kept on cutting and cutting our goats and horses and sheep until we now have an average of only about seven per person. Many families have none at all.

When this treaty was made in 1868, the Government told us: "Take good care of your sheep. Then they will increase, and sometime in the future you will have enough to take good care of your families." We did just what they told us, but then, when we were getting enough sheep to take care of our families, they made us get rid of them. It made us angry and discouraged for them to treat us like that. We hadn't done anything wrong. We obeyed the treaty. We followed their instructions. We worked hard and saved. Sheep are our heart. They are our life. They took our heart out of us. They took our life away from us. We were helpless, disillusioned, and discouraged. Hunger and sickness increased. Many of our people, especially the babies and little children, died. Tuberculosis increased rapidly on account of undernourishment.

The Government said they would give us plenty of work on the reservation that would more than offset our loss of income from

the sheep. They made flowery promises of giving us work building schools, dams, wells, and irrigation projects. But those promises were not fulfilled. Some families had to eat the few sheep they had left and were then dependent upon relatives. Mothers, too sick or weak to bear more children, died and left many orphans.

The Government said they would give our needy people relief but, even though there were thousands needing help, they gave small checks and a few supplies to only a small number. The relief supplies lasted only a few days, and sometimes they skipped a month or two. Then the needy were again dependent upon their relatives and friends and consequently all were undernourished, as there was not enough to go around.

Three thousand six hundred of our boys were in the Second World War. They were good soldiers. Their families received allotment checks and could buy baby food, canned milk, and other necessities for their babies and small children, but when the war stopped and they didn't get those checks any more the children had to go back to their old poor diet, and many are undernourished and sickly. More than half of our children die before they reach school age.

Our people need assistance. What we would like best of all is the fulfillment of promises made us. Then we would have more land and water, so that we could have more sheep and goats and farms. Now, instead of that, we are compelled to leave our homeland to go to work in beet and vegetable fields and on railroads far away from home and kin. We appreciate the efforts to help us get work, but they do not seem to realize that this is breaking up our families, as in many cases we cannot take our little children along; also crippled and sick and old and blind persons, who need our help, must be left behind. The railroads will not take families, so fathers must leave home for months. Sometimes the wife or baby dies, and he does not know about it until he comes home many days later. Many of our men who go away to work are taught bad things by the white, black, and Mexican men and women, who take advantage of their innocence and ignorance. As a result, disease and drunkenness is increasing. Some of our girls working far from home are learning to lead bad lives. When the fathers are away for a long time the mothers, children, sick and aged are not properly protected and cared for. The off-reservation work is seasonal and menial, and there is no future for us in that class of work. The breaking of families is contrary to all American and religious principles. It is having a very serious effect upon our children as well as the parents, and especially upon the older unmarried boys and girls.

We need the kind of work that will make it possible for us to keep our families together and support them, have a decent home for them to live, dress our children properly when they go to school, buy proper food for our babies and little children, take care of the sick and crippled and old people, become respected American citizens. When they decreased our sheep, they promised us much work, building schools, roads, irrigation projects, dams and wells, and thus providing those desirable improvements which we so badly need. Those betterments will make it possible for us to again become self-supporting. Although their cost might be considered high, it is only a small percentage of the value of the land and the income which was taken from us.

We need education. In the treaty of 1868 the Government promised us a school and teacher for every 30 children of school age, but today there is school room for only 8,000 of the 24,000 children of school age. Sixteen thousand of our children cannot go to school. As there is not enough good land for them to make a living on the reservation, and as they are not being given an education so that they can take care of themselves off the reservation, what will become of them?

In 1933 the Government promised, in addition to improving the seven boarding schools in existence at that time, to build seventy community-day schools with laundries and shower rooms, a doctor and nurse, and agents who would be ready to help us in our many problems. That made us very happy, as we wanted our children to be given an education without being sent far away from home and kin. We also needed the health and home-making services promised. But it was just another promise that was not fulfilled. At present we have a total of 60 schools, of which 9 are closed, and several others cut to 1-room capacity. Actually we are getting less than half of the school benefits promised, and the doctors, nurses, and agents promised have not been provided.

The schools are not operated for full term. Reservation schools are kept closed until off-reservation schools are sent their quota, and are closed before the school season ends. We would like to have all our own schools filled to capacity and operated full term before sending our children hundreds of miles away from home. Many parents wonder whether it isn't useless to give their children the present irregular education. We see public schools and mission schools on and adjoining our reservation where children are given full-term standard course of education, and cannot understand why this is denied our children in Government schools.

We need hospitals. Sickness and death rate is extremely high on our reservation, but six of our hospitals are closed and others not fully utilized. All the hospitals should be opened and operated to full capacity. More hospitals are badly needed; also tuberculosis sanitaria.

We need doctors and nurses who have our health and welfare at heart. There is never enough medical help to take care of our sick people. For many years we have been asking that our girls be given nurses' training in Navajo service hospitals. Then we would have our own nurses. But this request was not granted and now the need is more acute than ever, and our people suffer.

We need homes. There is much sickness and suffering on the reservation because our people can afford only log and mud hogans to live in. We would like to improve our living quarters for the health and welfare of our wives and children.

We need water wells. In many cases we must haul water in barrels on wagons many miles, from unsanitary sources.

We need dams and irrigation projects. Good farm land was taken away from us, and, as it is apparent that it will not be returned to us, the best possible use should be developed on what we have. Besides the many desirable small projects, there is a large San Juan River project which would give work to thousands of people and bring lasting benefits to our country. We hope Congress will appropriate the money for these improvements as soon as possible.

We need police protection. For years we have been pleading for law and order on our reservation; also for protection against unscrupulous outsiders. Bootleggers, gamblers, prostitutes, and other evil persons take advantage of the ignorance and innocence of our people, but very little protection is afforded us either on or off the reservation. We may not defend ourselves as we are treaty-bound never to do white men any harm.

We need the advice, encouragement, and assistance of all who have our welfare at heart. So many promises have been made and broken that we don't know who or what to believe. We need true friends who try to understand our condition and will help us to help ourselves.

We greatly appreciate all the fine assistance given us by our friends over the country and hope that you will continue to help us until we reach the goal of finally providing for our children the opportunities and privileges which we so ardently crave for them.

Approved:

SAM AHKEAH,
Chairman,
ZHEALY TSO,
Vice Chairman,
Navajo Tribal Council.

New York State Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include for the RECORD a summary of the report of the committee on Federal legislation of the New York State Bar Association, adopted at its seventy-fourth annual meeting, January 26, 27, 1951, as follows:

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION

To the New York State Bar Association:

Said Huey Long: "When fascism comes to this country it will come disguised as anti-fascism."

Instead of fascism, socialism has been creeping up on us under various names and guises. It is being administered to us in small sugar-coated doses. It is always camouflaged as being something for the "public welfare." The result has very aptly been called socialism by default.

Former President Herbert Hoover says we are now on the "last mile" toward complete socialism in America.

This report will deal mainly with just one camouflaged proposal that is before the Congress, seeking to socialize medicine in our country. It has become the fashion in Washington never to call a measure by its true name. Ugly things are given pretty names to catch the votes of the unwary.

Now, the regimentation of the great medical profession in America (and let us not forget that we are next on the program) the extension of the clammy hand of Federal bureaucracy into every sick room in this Republic, most certainly is a major step in the direction of the Socialist state as they have it in England; and most certainly is an ugly thing and a vicious thing. Yet, one of its sponsors calls it a health measure and a Congressman calls it health insurance. One may well wonder whose political health they are trying to insure at the expense of the public.

Now let us take off the mask camouflaging this measure so that we may see it for what it really is.

In order that we may recognize the measure as socialistic we should define socialism. According to Karl Marx, socialism, very briefly and simply put, is government management or ownership of a nation's economics and the refusal by the government to the individual the right to manage his own affairs. Socialists, Communists, and fellow travelers always think in terms of compulsion. They abhor the American brand of constitutional liberty.

So now they want to impose upon us, through this measure before Congress, compulsory medical insurance.

At the very outset let us analyze the so-called reasons given by them for this proposed measure. Only then we shall see how unfounded and shallow these "reasons" are;

and if the reasons advanced for the proposed legislation fail, then the proposed legislation fails with them.

It seems that suddenly the state of the Nation's health becomes a matter of grave concern to the authors of the measure. Is there really an emergency confronting us? How serious is the condition of the Nation's health that it should evoke such drastic socializing of medicine and the medical profession? Let us see.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.'s statistical bureau is one of the most authoritative sources of information on the Nation's health. We are going to let the bulletin issued by the bureau answer these questions.

Four of the most common and dangerous diseases that afflict children are whooping cough, measles, scarlet fever, and diphtheria. The bulletin gives us two comparable 5-year periods, 1931–35 and 1944–48, both years inclusive. How eloquently they speak for free medicine.

During that period whooping cough declined 77 percent, scarlet fever dropped 92 percent, and diphtheria and measles fell 73 percent. Says Dr. Willford T. King, economics professor emeritus of New York University:

"That is, in the last 5 years the chances that your child might die from one of these ailments was only one-fifth as great as in the first half of the 1930's. Does this marvelous improvement show that there is something radically wrong with the existing medical system?"

Now, let us see what has happened to expectancy of life of the new-born babe. Fifty years ago the average expectancy of life of a baby girl was 51 years; a baby girl born now has a life expectancy of 70 years.

To the contention that the poorer elements have not received the benefits in health improvement as have the more well to do groups, that being the main argument for socialized medicine, the bulletin gives a still more eloquent answer. It shows that while 50 years ago a colored girl baby's expectancy of life was 35 years, in 1946 it was 61 years. Here it may be pointed out that the colored baby's gain in expectancy was 7 years more than that of her white sister. Such are the disadvantages to the poor under private medicine.

But they say that the poorer States do not have good medical care as the larger States. As that great American, Al Smith, used to say: "Let us look at the record."

The poorest State in the country probably is Mississippi and the richest is New York. Government figures show that the death rate in Mississippi in 1919 was 12.3 but it declined to 9.2 in 1946, a drop of 3.1 points. During the same period the death rate in New York dropped from 12.9 to 11.1, a decline of only 2.8 points. Much less than the decline in the poorest State in the Union.

But, one may ask, by what process of reasoning does one conclude that socialized, political, bureaucratic medicine can serve the people more efficiently than private medicine, spark-plugged by private enterprise.

The experience of 5,000 years of human history is against this contention. So is the experience of England. Sir William Y. Darling, a member of the Parliament of Great Britain, while in this country, warned us against the socialism of England. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Some of the nostrums of my home country have been freely discussed, and some have been practiced in the United States here and in Canada, and elsewhere. They are to the effect that the State can do something better for you than you can do it for yourself.

"Before I go back to my country with its shilling's worth of meat a week, its declining standards of life, its business desperately entangled, please let me tell you, my friends in the United States and Canada, that the road Great Britain is traveling is the road you should not travel. The experience is not worth while. It is a road which has led to the degradation and lowering of our human standards in which you and we believe.

"There is an old saying that few people in the world can learn anything except from their own experience. It is hoped that the American people will learn from this experience without having to pass through a similar ordeal."

Now, let us take a glance at what this so-called health measure bill is proposing to do.

It is not insurance in the real meaning of the word. It proposes a new tax to support a Government regulated and politically controlled medical system, with doctors, dentists, nurses, drugs, hospitals, and, last but not least, patients, goose-stepping under it. This vast Bureau will collect the tax, control the money, set the rules, determine the nature, quality, and quantity of medical services, direct doctor and patient participation, thus dominating every citizen's medical affairs, even the most intimate doctor-patient relationships. Whether one needs or even gets medical care or not will depend entirely upon the whim or pleasure of some bureaucrat. Thus the American people are not even having their cherished privacy in the matter of their medical affairs, with the local administrative boards, patterned after the British system, in possession of all the records. Recently the British Housewives League protested bitterly the resulting local gossip over family medical records. Do the American people want that sort of thing in America?

Nor is this thing new. It is an importation from Europe. Most certainly, it is not native to America. The original author of the bill, Senator Wagner, was still a child in Germany when Prince Von Bismarck originated the thing which the social planners are pleased to call "health insurance." But the great Iron Chancelor of Germany was more frank about it. He said it was a method of subduing the people, so he called it a golden chain around the necks of the workers. Look at the German worker today. He gave up liberty for the promise of security. Now he has neither. The Italian and Russian workers have had the same experience. We are also beginning to hear the rumbling from the workers of England.

It was Benjamin Franklin who said that "those who give up essential liberties to gain temporary security deserve neither liberty nor security." Here we may add that history shows that they invariably get neither.

This compulsory health insurance measure will put the "golden chain" (fool's gold) of Bismarck around the necks of the workers of America.

We doubt very much that the American people want to go à la Bismarck. However that may be, one thing is certain: It is a cruel fraud upon the people to attempt to put over this costly socialistic cradle-to-the-grave scheme at a time when they are too preoccupied to look at the price tag, both in treasure and loss of liberty—especially when the Nation is already burdened with an indebtedness and incurred obligations, direct or indirect, of over $300,000,000,000.

In private voluntary insurance companies the worker can obtain real health insurance at much less cost and at the same time remain free. If at any time he wants to cancel it, he can. But he cannot cancel this cradle-to-the-grave insurance. Like all socialistic schemes, it is compulsory. It is here where he exchanges his liberties for the mere promise of security. He gives up his liberty to spend his money as he sees fit. Under this measure, he will give to the politicians a lifetime check-off on his pay envelope. They will control the moneys which he otherwise would have used for medical care, and with this control will come the inevitable graft, followed by third-rate medical service. Not only that, but he will lose the right to choose his own family physician. Some politician will do that for him. That is the record.

Also note this: The great insurance companies of America weathered the last depression just about 99 percent. This in contrast with about 2,000 municipalities and 1 State that defaulted on their government obligations. Even Uncle Sam repudiated his solemn obligation to pay his creditors in gold. Says former Congressman Sam Pettingill:

"If the worker goes in for this womb-to-the-tomb insurance, he not only handcuffs himself for the rest of his life; he doesn't even leave his boy or girl a free choice. They, too, when they begin to work, will have to cough over to the State. The worker of today would vote Government check-off against the bread and butter of his unborn children at a time when conditions may have totally changed."

Besides the destruction of personal liberty the material cost of the measure will be staggering.

The best estimates of tax economists range from 5 to 15 billion dollars. No one knows exactly. Its sponsors say they do not know. It is a step in the dark. Only a babe in arms would want to go in the dark, especially in matters of expenditures.

Tax estimates range from 6 percent to 10 percent on every pay check up to $4,800.00, half paid by the employee and half by the employer. The self-employed would pay the whole amount. Here is exorbitantly high price for low quality medical service. For instance, no American would tolerate the low quality of medical service available to the average Englishman under compulsory health insurance. Yet, the British system went in the red over $300,000,000 in 9 months of operation. It will take many millions in new taxes, not only in Britain but also here in America, to make up the deficit. For let us not forget that the American taxpayers have been underwriting socialistic England since its inception.

Statistics show that it would require 1,500,000 clerks, bookkeepers, administrators, collectors, and so forth, on the Federal payrolls to administer compulsory insurance. What a waste of medical dollars.

There is no need for this waste. Over 55,000,000 Americans now have voluntary health insurance in private insurance companies and organizations such as the Blue Cross plan. This guaranteed medical, surgical, and hospital care costs about on the average of $2.50 a month for the individual and $5.50 for a family, irrespective of size.

Thus the evidence is clear that compulsory insurance proposal is economically unsound in that it entails staggering burdens financially, politically vicious in its implication of regimentation of the most intimate personal affairs of the citizen and replete with freedom-destroying potentialities. What then, is the real objective of this socialized medical program, especially since our great insurance companies are well able to supply all needed insurance? We shall let Mr. King tell it:

"Clearly the aim is the same as that of communistic programs everywhere. Namely, to make the diligent and the competent pay for the care of the lazy and shiftless. The thrifty, efficient, hard-working man who has about two children and earns $5,000 per year, is asked to pay into the health fund twice as much as his happy-go-lucky, ne'er-do-well neighbor who has six children and earns only $2,500 per year. This is the crux of the whole matter. The proposed program is the very antithesis of the basic principle of a free society—namely that every tub should stand on its own bottom. It is obvious Marxism in a new disguise."

The whole social-insurance scheme is based upon the morally indefensible Socialist theory that individuals are entitled to things that they themselves have not earned and

on the politically vicious expedient which teaches that society owes everyone a comfortable living whether or not he repays society by doing his fair share of the world's work.

The American people should get clear in their thinking one simple truth: That a social planner in Washington does not in any way differ from one in Moscow or London. They are Socialists at heart and therefore enemies of the basic liberties of man.

Have the opponents of this socialistic measure an American program more efficient? They have. Exactly as owners of cars once proved negligent are required to take accident insurance, the American plan is to require health-insurance policies in a similar way. We shall again let Mr. King explain it:

"Since President Truman and the American Medical Association agree on objectives it is a pity that they do not unite to back the most logical and least expensive procedure for assuring that everyone will be properly protected, and that the ne'er-do-wells will not be allowed to sponge their care from the diligent. Let Government require every income recipient to purchase from one of the numerous private organizations in the field a policy giving himself and dependents adequate coverage. Let it be the function of Government to see that premiums are paid when due—when necessary compelling deductions from wages and salaries—and let Government stop there. This program would call for no elaborate new machinery, would interfere but little with individual freedom, and would preserve American competitive enterprise. When this road is open, why take the trail running down into the co-collectivist bog?"

If the supporters of this bill were really sincere in their concern for the "little fellow" as they say they are, here is a real program which will not cost the taxpayers a penny. Under the pretense of doing him good they are taxing him to death. The real picture shows that the Federal Government is making this little fellow, the small man, smaller every day. To quote the words of Hon. James F. Byrnes, former Supreme Court Justice and Secretary of State.

"If the 'little fellow' sends a message by telephone or telegraph he pays a tax. If he travels by railroad or bus he pays a tax. If he buys an automobile, the sale price includes a tax. When he buys gasoline or oil he pays a tax. If he buys cigarettes, he pays a tax. If he goes to a football game or baseball game, he pays a tax. If his wife buys a pocketbook or cosmetics, she pays a tax, and if his children go to a movie, they pay a tax.

"The average working man must work 47 days a year to earn the money necessary to pay his taxes to the Federal Government. That is almost 1 day out of every week. If the new programs now seriously proposed should be adopted he will have to pay in taxes the equivalent of his wages for an additional 20 days, making 67 days he will work each year for the Government instead of for himself and his family. That is what the Federal Government is doing to the little fellow.

"If the spenders really want to help the little fellow, they should allow him to keep more of the money he gets for his labor to spend as he pleases, instead of having it taken from him and sent to Washington, to let bureaucrats spend as they think it should please him.

"Men intoxicated with power will never voluntarily surrender the power to spend the money of other people. Human nature does not change. The Government will not repeal a single war tax now being collected unless forced to do so by public sentiment."

This is what the social planners in Washington are doing to the little fellow. Will the little fellow ever wake up?

There is something else they are doing to the little fellow. Let us quote their patron saint, whose doctrines they are following, as to the inevitable result of the policy of taxation sponsored by them. Said Karl Marx:

"There is only one way to kill capitalism * * * by taxes, taxes, and more taxes."

Can it be possible that these social planners may, after all, be deliberate in their taxing policies? Perish the thought.

Your committee feels this fight for liberty is peculiarly the function of the bar. Former President Holman, of the American Bar Association, recently subscribed to the same view. He said:

"No movement in the history of the world for the improvement of man's conditions and the establishment of justice among men has ever succeeded without the influence and leadership of great and courageous lawyers. Yet lawyers generally are likely to devote themselves to the championship of individual freedoms and private rights and are not inclined to act together against trends in law and government, which actually imperil individual liberty and private rights. They often fear that group action on their part may be interpreted as political—as taking a position for or against a program of a particular political party."

Your committee has no such fears and in this fight it is simply standing by the philosophy stated by Theodore Roosevelt:

"There is no sport in life so rewarding as a hard fight for the right."

In closing may we leave this one thought with you. The question before us transcends in importance every other question now before the American people. It is the question of liberty. It is a challenge to the bar to summon the people to again hear and heed the thundering voice of Patrick Henry that there is something much sweeter and infinitely more important than life itself, that there is something much dearer and more fundamental than peace, and may we add, there is something much safer than security, and that something is liberty. The liberty of the individual, as a citizen of a free country and a free child of the eternal God.

It is therefore recommended that the New York State Bar Association adopt the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the New York State Bar Association hereby approves and adopts the report of its committee on Federal legislation; it is further

"Resolved, That the proposal of socialized medicine would be destructive of the essential liberties of the American people and should be defeated; it is further

"Resolved, That the officers of this association, its executive committee, its committee on Federal legislation or any subcommittee thereof, be and they hereby are authorized on behalf of the association to do and cause to be done all things necessary or appropriate in pursuance of these resolutions.

Respectfully submitted.

RICHARD MARLOWE,
Chairman.

What Should Our Message Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to call to the attention of all Members of Congress and all policy makers in our Government who are directly or indirectly affiliated with the United States information and educational programs, the following statement, "What Should Our Message Be?"

This statement, which was prepared by several leading social scientists, consists of notes on a positive program for United States Information Services abroad. In my opinion, this statement represents one of the clearest, most concise, and constructive analyses of our propaganda problem that has ever been written.

As such, it deserves the special attention of Congress and all public officials:

WHAT SHOULD OUR MESSAGE BE?

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The purpose of this memorandum is to help policy makers and those responsible for United States information and educational programs, both domestic and foreign, to clarify the fundamental, long-range goals of their programs, to specify our positive purposes, and thus to have some consistent basis for our day-to-day activities.

While we believe that improved facilities for getting this country's message to the people of the world are badly needed, we believe it is even more important to be clear as to what this message should be. It must, among other things, be so designed that it will put the Soviets on the defensive. It must also ring with a practical idealism.

In preparing this memorandum, we have tried to take into account the most modern scientific interpretation of "human nature," the philosophical basis of communism, the current Soviet practices, and the full implications of democracy as a concept to which this country subscribes.

The statement here puts the problem of what our message should be in general terms. Obviously the specific context to be used in different cultures and with different population groups at different times should be worked out with area specialists and could, as suggested in the strategy notes at the end, be guided by protests of various appeals.

A. WHAT IS THE REAL DANGER TODAY?

Today, more than at any other time in the world's history, the most important thing in the world is in danger—the human being, you, us—whoever you are, wherever you may live.

Men and women everywhere are threatened by conditions which make it difficult or impossible to work out their own destiny.

The threats to human beings assume various forms in different parts of the world; millions of people, especially in Asia, are faced with the age-old problems of survival which they are eager to solve—the problems of food, shelter, clothing, and prevention of disease. Millions of people are thwarted in their struggles for self-improvement; attaining higher standards for living from the soil, the forests, the mines, the shops, and factories; reducing illiteracy; wiping out corruption and exploitation; attaining a greater participation in social and political life.

Men and women everywhere are being denied the chance to develop as human beings should develop. People don't want to be pushed around like toy soldiers. Man is a living, human, joyful, and suffering being. He has his own problems, and he solves them in his own way.

Men know they are not equal, but they believe they deserve equal consideration. They deserve the right to be different, the right to be themselves. These are fundamental, inalienable rights that are biologically determined, not mere political slogans.

Human beings have the capacity to choose. The opportunity to exercise this capacity of choice characteristic of man cannot be denied him without violating his very nature. This inviolable freedom of personality is the foundation for the structure of individual rights and social obligations.

Furthermore, we know that human beings are value seeking. Men strive for order

and dignity, for worth and goodness, for beauty and truth. While none of us ever has or ever will see these values, they are still more real to us in our experience than the things we do see. They constitute our most gratifying experiences. The basic asset of values is that you can take them with you. And it is characteristic of man that he is never satisfied with his lot, that he has the capacity and the desire to emerge to higher, more satisfying levels of choice and experience.

What is in danger today is not only man's physical survival but the hopes and aspirations of men in all parts of the world. Their plans and dreams of a better life are in danger, their chances of attaining greater security, their chance to participate in directing their own destiny, their opportunity to develop according to their own talents and interests. The meaning of life is going to pieces.

In short, what is in danger is the concept of man. Our goal should be to uphold the integrity of the human being at any cost. For the human being is the building stone cast away by some of the architects of our time. Yet human beings are the very cornerstone of a well-founded structure of humanity.

B. WHY IS MAN IN DANGER?

A new and powerful enemy is out to destroy the dignity of man, to destroy those values of man's spirit that make him human.

Here are a few of the basic tenets of communism and some of the practices of the present Soviet regime which we must keep in mind as targets.

1. The individual is not important. The human being like you, like us, just isn't important at all in the mind of our new enemy. The human being's choices are restricted, someone is spying on him from morning till night. If he is suspected of having an idea of his own, he is likely to be torn from his home, never to return.

In those areas of the world dominated by the Soviet regime, we find men living under a system which is frozen in a set of words they are forced to believe. The Soviet regime claims that its system is dynamic. In reality it is static, stifling real change and progress. This system is ruthlessly on the defensive, afraid of its own people unless they all fit the same mold, unless they all sell their souls to the state and its rulers. The Soviet regime is afraid to let its people believe in God.

Under this regime no differences of opinion are tolerated. Any person, any idea contrary to those of the regime must be exterminated. There is no compromise, no pity, and any means are used to achieve the fixed and invariable ideas of the ruler.

This Soviet regime has created a fiction of the mass man. People are turned into groups or social molecules whose shape is determined by their number. The life of the individual in all its manifestations is subordinated to a low common denominator of a class interest.

This mass man is mechanically united only by external interests with all others. Because the inner life of man is so infinitely differentiated, it is merely a stumbling block for the realization of mass man. In order to turn individual man into mass man, it is imperative to exterminate the individual soul, the individual personality, which is the root of the unique human being. For the mass man needs no personal thought, no personal feelings, no personal judgments.

Hence man is called upon by the Soviets to give up his individuality so that he can be turned into a spare part, an interchangeable screw, a "social machine." The supreme goal is a purely quantitative combination of mass particles, a mechanized world which is to contain nothing but soulless machines obedient to the will of a few. Man is simply a number in a mass of statistics.

But we know it is a travesty of human life to regard man as an automaton. It is scientifically wrong. Modern astrophysics and physics, with giant telescopes and ultramicroscopes, have discovered that from the biggest star to the smallest atom every particle that constitutes matter has an individuality of its own. Modern biologists and physiologists have proved that each living cell leads its own individual self-centered life, that the principle of individuation is the basic trait in organic nature.

Since the mass man created by the Soviet regime cannot tolerate individuality, a whole system of devices has been created to destroy individuality. What is labeled "justice" is secret and arbitrary. There is a network of political espionage, even high officials and the commissars of the people are kept under constant observation.

In every respect the secret police of the Soviet regime constitutes a continuation of the last relics of medieval despotism. It is difficult for those who live in a free society to understand what this means, sometimes even to believe it. Some honest progressives who know nothing of Soviet conditions or Soviet politics may still hail Communism as a gospel of salvation containing a promise of a freer and better future for mankind. Such people must remember that Soviet citizens are not even allowed to ask what their efforts are for, are not allowed to ask why this or that policy is imperative.

2. The concept of materialism: The present Soviet regime is putting into practice the idea of Marx that material conditions completely determine man's ideas, beliefs, and hopes. Ideas are viewed only as reflections of what is outside man himself. Thus human life becomes a mechanical process, in turn determined by the mechanical processes of economic life. For the Marxists and the present Soviet regime, all science, art, religion, and ethics are forced to obey the law of economics.

All of this is scientifically outmoded, is old fashioned in terms of modern scientific knowledge. For modern science in all fields—in physics, in chemistry, astrophysics, psychology, biology—agrees that the individual organism does not follow mechanical laws blindly but seems to play an active role in shaping its own destiny. Modern science regards materialism as an outmoded superstition. The Soviet regime denies the fact of individual creativeness which all modern science confirms.

3. Destruction as a method: The present Soviet regime believes that any means or methods are good if they accomplish the ends the regime has in view. This separation of means and ends can only be justified in a society if the individual human being is not taken into account. For if the individual personality is taken into account, if we ask what life is for, then our means and ends are inseparable, are a part of each other, and no means are justifiable which thwart the development of personality and the attainment of human values. Only by leaving out the welfare of the human being can the means of destruction be justified.

The present Soviet regime follows Marx' dictum that "the hope of the spirit is its alliance with violence." To be sure, violence and destruction are always excused by appealing to some higher principles. Class warfare is a fundamental law. Enemies must be ruthlessly annihilated. Individuals must be destroyed if there is even the slightest suspicion that they will not follow blindly the regime's demands.

This tyranny of destruction is maintained at a high level in all those vast areas of the world which our new enemy now controls. Tyranny is enforced with the most modern weapons so that a mere handful of people can keep millions of other human beings under complete subjugation and terror.

Such is the doctrine of destruction. But we know from the history of revolutions that they destroy one set of static ideas only to replace them with other static ideas. We know from modern biological research that if we try to change the course of genetic development by force, we do not get constructive changes which lead to a new higher order species, but we get, rather, freaks and misfits.

Both history and science show that if we completely destroy existing forms of cellular or social life, we destroy the possibility of flowing in any direction. We destroy our base line.

The arbitrary destruction of any class of individuals, of original or deviating personalities, destroys along with it the possibility of more rapid advancement for all people.

4. The new Soviet imperialism: During the last hundred years, nationalism has gained a powerful place in the ideas of man. The idea of nationalism has become almost a religion. The Soviet regime is exploiting the national self-interest of people to lure them into its own sphere of influence and eventually to dominate and exploit them for Soviet ends.

The Soviets have grasped the implications and quickly realized that they could be successful only if they took into account the new strong nationalistic tendencies, especially in Asia. And so, as often before, they have shifted their international party line for reasons of expediency and have now come out as champions of "revolutionary nationalism." Temporarily they are soft-pedaling Marx's idea that the words "national" and "bourgeois" are synonymous. And they will continue to soft pedal this idea until the Communists in these newly formed nations are strong enough to hold and maintain their power in all parts of Asia.

Furthermore, the Communists are smart enough to realize that in these countries progress can come about only in step-by-step fashion. They realize that after people in a given colonial area have shaken off their former lords, the next step for them is the feeling of national pride. Thus we see that the present Communist regime in China is even more nationalistic than the Nationalists they replaced. The Communists in these areas proclaim that national and social liberation are two aspects of the same process.

5. State capitalism and its consequences: While there is much that can be said against competitive capitalism of the United States brand, there is even more that can be said against state capitalism as practiced by the present Soviet regime. For the Soviet brand of capitalism is much more sweeping than the United States variety. In modern Russia an all-powerful state machine is the instrument of capitalism. Hence all the evils of capitalism are magnified. The state is able to exploit manpower to a much higher degree than the most capitalistic trust in the United States could even dream of.

It is important, therefore, that people everywhere be shown that the destruction of private capital does not abolish capital itself but only funnels it into fewer and fewer hands with greater exploitation possible if the people lose control of the government.

6. The fate of working people: The present Soviet regime claims that it holds the key to the salvation of the working class, the toiling masses. It must be stressed that the Soviet authorization collectivism has resulted in a monopoly of power where there is no freedom left for the individual worker—no freedom to choose his work, no freedom to quit his work, no freedom to bargain for better wages or working conditions. The worker has become a tool, a cog in the great state machine.

7. Soviet education: The aim of education in a Soviet-dominated area is the creation of useful Soviet citizens who believe what they are taught and do what they are told. Once the basic tenets of the Soviet regime are

accepted, there are ready-made answers for everything.

All education is so organized that no one may exceed a state-approved amount of knowledge. Soviet rulers do not want to run the risk of speculation and doubt about the wisdom of the state. They do not want personal opinions. Even personal criticism of capitalist warmongers, Wall Street imperialism, etc., are undesirable. For all that is to be said about the evils of capitalism has already been said by the gods Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. Personal argument or elaboration of their themes is considered heresy.

Therefore teachers are expected to preach, not to teach. They preach a new religion which they present as a science.

8. Destruction of human values: In the Soviet regime, personal values must become party property. The party decides what experiences constitute the good, the true, the beautiful, the decent, the worth while.

In the past, the center of life was religion. The word religion comes from "religio" meaning to be related to something higher. In the Soviet regime, an individual belongs to a party, and "party" derives from "part." To belong to a party means to believe in a certain part or aspect. It is partiality instead of totality.

Under the Soviet regime, the party is the state. This means that the part has swallowed the whole. To follow the party line, means to align oneself with the party that has usurped the whole. The totalitarian doctrine of the Soviet regime demands that man and human freedoms become State property. In the Soviet regime, the ideal of totality has deteriorated into totalitarianism. This means an enforced totality instead of one freely adopted.

In this enforced absence of conflicting ideas and loyalties, an individual under the Soviet regime may gradually develop an emotional security. But his emotional security is that of a robot equipped by the State with a synthetic outlook on life. The State trains him with some skill and imbues him with the faith that he is doing his part to bring about a Communist paradise everywhere.

This robot security has the effect of chaining people down instead of pulling them up. It is based on blind faith; it makes for the suicide of man's characteristics through freedom from freedom, through relieving man of the burden of choice and the responsibilities and satisfactions that come with choice. It creates a spiritual vacuum, an inability to meet new situations. Under the Soviet regime the only measure of man is his working capacity. Ethics and morality are completely subordinated to what the leaders think is in the interest of the class struggle. Lenin wrote, "We deduce our morality from the facts and needs of the class struggle of the proletariat."

We might well compare the attitude and pronouncements of Soviet leaders with the convictions and statements of the great teachers and leaders of all ages.

Lao-tse and Confucius proclaimed charity as the basic rule of life. Christ said: "Love your enemies, bless them that persecute you." But Lenin declared: "It does not matter if three quarters of mankind is destroyed; all that counts is that ultimately the last quarter should become Communist."

Buddha proclaimed: "Man shall conquer anger by love, evil by good, avarice by generosity, and the liar by truth." Lenin preached that the only means of dealing with opponents was to smash them. Gandhi declared: "The duty of a human being is to diminish hatred and to promote love." Stalin on the other hand pronounced: "You cannot defeat an enemy without learning to hate him with all your soul."

Tolstoy considered love as "the highest and only law for human life." Lenin decreed: "The hate-laden cry of rage is our only delight."

Jefferson said: "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." And Emerson concurred: "For what avail the plough or sail, or land or life, if freedom fail." But to Lenin "Freedom is a bourgeois prejudice." It is rather doubtful whether men like Jefferson, Paine, and Lincoln, who came out for freedom, can be termed as bourgeois.

9. The fiction of "scientific socialism" as used by the Soviet regime: All Soviet goals and Soviet practices are masked under the cloak of the modern god science. The principles under which the regime operates are called laws—dialectical laws. Hence the Soviet citizen is made to feel that if things are happening according to a scientific law, there can be no argument. But the judgment of modern science denies the validity of the laws these Soviets label as scientific.

C. WHAT ARE WE INTERESTED IN?

All of our information programs should be permeated with the sincerity of our realization that the United States is one of the few areas in the world where the struggle for physical survival and economic reconstruction are not now the paramount issue. Furthermore, people in this country have the opportunity to participate in the formation of national policy.

As a consequence, we see that it is largely up to us to do what we can to rescue the concept of man—offering help and holding out hope.

Since we are not primarily burdened with problems of survival and reconstruction, it is up to us to remind men and women everywhere of the standards of value associated with a good life. These standards must be universal enough to appeal to all men and to win all: Chinese, Indians, Hungarians, Brazilians; merchants, fishermen, mothers, clerks, scientists, etc.

These standards should serve as a compass which could direct men in any culture toward those goals that are common to human beings as such from whatever position they may be in now, from whatever basis, whatever system of government, whatever level of culture or political development they may have now.

Our job is, then, to provide faith in the possibility of achieving these universal standards—a faith that people can feel sure enough about so they can use it as a basis for evaluating political leadership and not blindly follow idols. Our standards must give them an answer to the question of "what for?"

We have pointed out that values are things people can take with them. Man's greatest security comes from faith in his values. What people ought to expect of their political leaders, then, is that they keep governments as living and growing organizations for the realization of human values.

If we can help people everywhere clarify the goals of human living, we can then point out to them that the job we are trying to do and the job we must all work together on, is much more than the job of saving any particular system or form of government that any of us happen to have at the moment. Systems of government, whether they be capitalism, communism, or socialism, must be viewed as methods of living together which have been worked out and accepted by different people at different times for reasons which are historically clear.

The solution of man's problem now, that of saving himself from an enemy who would destroy his very nature, will not be achieved merely by substituting one system for another system. What is needed is a clear statement of the goals for which all people are striving. Then people can choose and develop whatever social techniques, public or private, appear best suited to the achievement of these goals.

We must constantly recall to people and to ourselves, all the great values which were created in the past in order to establish and defend the value of man. We must show that those who bid us forget the past, rob us of our spiritual heritage. What we know about the meaning of life is not a modern discovery, it is not the new look of a passing vogue. The values of life have been established by experiences that reach back thousands of years. They are the net profit of the accumulated wisdom of innumerable cultures. No individual, no group, no nation, no system has a monopoly on wisdom.

We must point out that different freedoms are needed in different cultures today, and that we must not try to impose on people one set of freedoms they do not want for other sets of freedoms they do want.

People in different parts of the world have learned to want different freedoms. What means a lot to some doesn't mean much to others. Instead of trying to convert other nations to adopt fully our point of view, our "way of life," we must rather attempt to avail ourselves of the specific national genius of each country in order to fit our concepts to the needs of that individual country, without in the least compromising with our goals.

We must show that freedom is not an end in itself, but that the quality of freedom is measured by what a person does with it.

We must make it clear that freedom involves great personal responsibility, that there is no such thing as freedom from freedom if men are to be themselves and to develop as nature has prescribed. Freedom is not license but the responsibility for the realization of human values.

We must recall that men in western democracies have evolved codes of laws, including the protection of personal freedoms through the right of trial by jury, to guard themselves against arbitrary rules that might be set up by the state or other self-constituted authority.

The fact of man's increasing interdependence on other men, because of our technological development, exchange of goods and ideas, etc., must be emphasized and the consequences made clear. We see that suddenly in the course of history we have all been made neighbors. We see that many of the things we need for an abundant life are produced and manufactured by others, just as the things we produce and manufacture are needed by them. It must become apparent that each individual can achieve his own purposes only insofar as he takes into account and respects the purposes and goals of other people whom his behavior affects.

In the long run, no one individual can do what he wants to do unless other people are allowed to do what they want to do. Hence the necessity of international laws, internationally enforced. The very fact that we have established personal contact with the people of all nations, cultures, colors, and creeds has changed the vague notion of "mankind" and has confronted people everywhere with attitudes which call for wide horizons, understanding, and charity. This we all have to learn and practice if the idea of one world is to become a reality.

Among other things, we must show that our loyalty to our own country does not make us disloyal to our fellowmen in other countries. We should work for the common use of the world's resources, for a common flag to fly with our own.

We must constantly emphasize our interest in the Russian people and the people of the satellite countries, clearly and constantly distinguishing between the Soviet regime and the dictatorships in satellite countries on the one hand, and the people who live in those areas and their national symbols on the other hand. We must indicate to

them that all of us share common purposes as human beings. We must show them that we are willing to make sacrifices to help them concretely.

We should make it clear that this position of ours is not a trumped-up idealism for propaganda purposes. It is, rather, the most hard-headed, yet the most enlightened, kind of realism. We know that in helping them we help ourselves. It turns out that this hard-headed realism is one which can only be achieved by practicing the Golden Rule.

Since we believe that individuals are the most important things in the world, and since we see that individuals are now in danger, we unhesitatingly accept the ideals of democracy. We do this because democracy pledges itself to regard the individual as sacred. That is its keystone. That is why nations everywhere say, "We stand for democracy." That is why the Soviet regime is exploiting the slogan "democracy" for its perverted and distorted aims.

D. WHY OUR DEFENSE PREPARATIONS?

People want peace. Grasping this better than we have, Russia has beat us to the peace offensive. It strengthens her position not only behind the iron curtain but also abroad, especially in Germany, our first and unwilling line of defense in Europe. The Russian peace offensive has trapped many honest people everywhere.

We can recognize that while we still have to defend ourselves against those who do not yet see what is best for them, for us, for everybody, that huge armaments and defense preparations are not goals in themselves. Instruments of war are old-fashioned, outmoded instruments which most men never want to use.

We must make it clear that we know war is wrong. We know it is wrong to kill people, to hurt them, to starve them, to destroy their homes and their factories. We must make it clear that we oppose the trend by which war is in danger of becoming an end in itself.

And yet we know there are some things worse than war—the slavery of bondage of our bodies, our minds, our souls. Hence we must resist all threats of Soviet imperialism and domination wherever they may be found. For, as Daniel Webster said: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."

What we are fighting for, then, is time for people to see in their own experience that if we will act together we can raise our levels of security, can increase the range of our satisfactions in peaceful ways. We are fighting for time so that we can show people that ideas and institutions should be judged according to the way they affect individuals, that every happening must be judged from an individual point of view.

We must stress that the time we are fighting for is also a time which we feel must be used by the genius of each national group to work toward the common goal of humanity in its particular way according to its customs and its own traditions. Otherwise there can be no lasting success and progress for them or for us.

We also want time to demonstrate to the people in Soviet-dominated areas that the so-called scientific foundations on which the Soviet regime bases its policy are essentially unscientific and reactionary.

We want time to demonstrate the falsity of the assumptions on which the Soviet regime operates—assumptions which they have taught people to believe by refusing them the right to complete information. Among the wrong assumptions now expressed by the Soviet regime are:

1. The assumption that the contradiction between capital and labor is bound to grow. (Precisely the opposite seems to be the trend in the United States.)

2. The assumption that the proletariat will be increasingly oppressed and that monopoly capitalism will attain increasingly greater profit. (Again, exactly the reverse trend is found in the United States.)

3. The assumption that capitalism will become increasingly more imperialistic. (This is belied by recent events such as the British withdrawal from India, the Marshall plan, etc.)

4. Ever-increased rivalry between capitalistic states for colonial areas. (Witness the role of the United Nations here.)

5. The assumption that the proletariat will revolt spontaneously in increasing measure. (This is not occurring in western countries.)

6. The assumption that there will be an increase in the hatred of capitalistic countries for Socialism in any form. (But note our basically good relations with England, with the Scandinavian countries, and with Yugoslavia.)

7. The assumption that there will be an increase in the resentment of the proletariat of preparations for defense or war against Soviet socialism. (This is belied by the fact that the workingman in the United States is just as cognizant of the threat the Soviet regime has for him as anyone else.)

We must constantly show that the Soviet regime has not kept promises to workers but has only made them slaves; it has not kept its promises to peasants and farmers; its appeals to intellectuals, scientists, and artists have been tricks which have stifled their talents and creativity and forced a complete disregard of scientific truth and of universal human values.

We must also stress that our defense preparations are to give us time to work out some of our own problems. We must be frank in acknowledging that in spite of the high standards we have so far achieved, there is still a good deal of housecleaning to be done in our own country, i. e., slum clearance, racial discrimination, etc., and that we are engaged in this housecleaning. We should also indicate that through the United Nations we are concerned with methods of banishing vestiges of capitalistic imperialism at the same time we try to keep colonial peoples from Soviet enslavement.

We must make it clear that our whole point 4 program is one designed to help people help themselves. We must make it clear by our deeds as well as our words that we refuse to say to anyone, "Here is bread if you will think the way I do—if you will do as I say."

These are the fundamental reasons why we are determined to defend ourselves and other people who are still free of Soviet domination from the new enemy that confronts man.

The time we are fighting for is time to prevent world war III altogether. It is not merely time to postpone the day of its outbreak. If we can make this point clear, it should provide people with hope, replacing the current despair of those who wonder what's the use of all their effort anyway.

E. WHAT WE OUGHT TO REMEMBER

We must make it clear that we do not want to impose; we do not want to destroy. We oppose only those who would impose and who would destroy to achieve their ends.

We must make it clear that neither we, nor any other nation or group, have a patent on democracy. We should make it clear that whatever has proved good in socialism can be adopted by men without at the same time selling their souls and forfeiting their individuality. We must make it clear that whatever has proved good in capitalism can be accepted by men without sacrificing their security and destroying their own chances for self-development.

We must make it clear that we are not out to save any particular form of capitalism or any particular form of society, but that we are concerned only with the rescue of man who stands in mortal danger. We do not want to force on people anywhere what the people in any one country happen to think is best. For we know that change is the rule of nature and human nature and we have faith that in the distant future man will create social and political organizations which will better provide for the lot of the individual and for lasting peace than any system devised to date.

We should try to point out that we do not regard democracy as an end in itself. To consider democrac, as an end in itself is to kill human life by reducing it to a single dimension. This is the mistake the Nazis made, the mistake the Soviets are making today.

It is what we do with our democracy that matters; it is what we do with our freedom that matters.

If we are to avoid blunders, to avoid insulting people, we must make every effort to understand the national and cultural bases within which these people operate and take these fully into account, capitalizing with complete sincerity and without any condescension on the national genius and the cultural pride found in almost every land.

To remember about Europe: An information program for European countries can only be successful if it takes into account the European concept of the United States. While this concept may strike us as wrong, the assumptions behind it are there, and we must do what we can to change them before we can make any headway.

We must understand that, while Europe is battered, it is not defeated. The people in Europe feel that they are caught in a vise, and they are likely to resent imposition by the United States just as they resent sovietization.

The European outlook on life is basically different from that of the United States. Europeans see the United States as a utilitarian country where everything is measured by practical success. This concept is foreign to most Europeans, who are likely to regard man primarily as an individual who thinks, feels, and lives, not as a person who merely produces. Thus the European has a relatively disinterested attitude in the material luxuries of life.

The stress in Europe is laid more on culture than it is on civilization. Europeans know from experience that culture creates civilization, while civilization never creates culture. Europeans view the United States as a civilized country in a technological sense, but are likely to feel that the United States is lacking in the cultural values necessary for spiritual leadership. Therefore, it is most important to convey to Europeans information concerning our cultural values, showing them that we believe in such values, and that efficiency, productive capacity, and "success" are not our only yardsticks.

Europe is also unsympathetic to the tenseness of the United States pace, to our hustle and bustle. For example, Europeans enjoy "wasting" their time in "idle talk." For they believe that the time isn't wasted and that the talk isn't idle. The replacement of Viennese coffee houses by snack bars is symbolic of our "eat and run" attitude and is likely to go against the grain of the Austrian spirit.

We must reexamine what we are offering to the people of Europe. Are we offering liberalism and democracy wrapped in an optimistic package? This approach would be doomed to failure. For Europe has been disillusioned. The ideas we are offering Europe were born in Europe in the eighteenth century and then transplanted to the United States. Now we are bringing these same ideas back as a new promise of hope to Europe, without regard for the fact that the experiences of the European people in the

last 200 years have steeped them in skepticism. Europe has seen the perversion of Socialist promises of equality into dictatorship, of global promises being broken and perverted into global wars fought on European soil. The United States has escaped these historical disappointments, and therefore retains the optimistic faith which most people in Europe have lost. While we believe in our promises, Europe is doubtful.

When we deal with Europe we ought to realize that Europeans are not children who can take only sugar-coated pills. Europeans have come to accept struggle and suffering as an essential part of life. This is doubtless one reason why Marxism had a certain appeal to many Europeans since Marxism does not promise any easy evolutionary progress.

We must not promise peace and ask for rearmament, for Europeans will doubt our honesty. We must not promise free enterprise and stress the necessity of a war economy, for Europeans will doubt our sincerity. We must not ask for sacrifices and then try to disguise them as favors. We must choose our words carefully, for Europeans are wary.

We must take into account the virility of European nationalism and remember that there are still relatively few people in Europe who can conceive of a United States of Europe. The strength of nationalism in Europe may be illustrated with reference to what happened to the concept of socialism which started out as an international concept. Almost immediately the idea was monopolized by nationalistic tendencies: in Italy socialism was perverted by Mussolini to fascism, in Nazi Germany to national socialism, in the Soviet Union into nationalist bolshevism. The present Titoism and recent splitting off of French and Italian Communist leaders who are motived by nationalism and who resent Soviet imperialism further indicates the trend.

At this time, therefore, the wise course of action would seem to be to bolster nationalism rather than to weaken it. For if communism can be broken up into various national brands its danger to the world as a whole will be considerably decreased.

In short, if we want to deal successfully with Europe, we must see her the way she is and the way she sees herself—not the way we want her to be. We must know each country's history, its prides and prejudices, and we must act on this knowledge.

What to remember about Asia: If we want to deal successfully with Asia, we must realize, as the Soviets have, that the main driving force in Asia is an upsurge of nationalism. The Asiatic approach to the world and its problems is a consciously nationalistic one.

And we must realize, as the Soviets have done, that if we want to win the people of Asia as our friends, we must help them on their level, not on ours. There is no use sending machinery which the people of Asia do not know how to use. If we send machinery, we must send along experts who speak the language and who understand the minds and the problems of the people they are going to work with. What we send and how it is to be used must be decided with their full participation and initiative. If we can do this and make them feel that we are trying to help them to help themselves, we will dispel their present distrust of us and of foreign intervention and we will thereby debunk the falsehood of the Soviet-inspired myth of United States imperialism.

People in Asia believe that we are trying to impose a form of government and a culture without regard to their own needs.

People in Asia believe that we think they are an inferior race and that their cultures are below our own. Educated Asiatics tend to look on western culture as young, immature.

Since the people of Asia are struggling for survival, they are not ready to appreciate our emphasis upon mechanization, on mass production, and so forth. For example, in those areas of Asia where fertility of the soil makes the going easier, people still do not believe in working for more than is needed.

People in Asia have seen the United States talk democracy and then actively aid imperialism and dictatorship.

People in Asia have seen the United States talk private enterprise and at the same time exploit Asiatics.

If we want to deal successfully with the people of Asia, then we must not only understand them as they are, but understand how they see us.

F. WHY THIS MESSAGE; WHY ALL OUR MESSAGES?

People everywhere are being deluged by propaganda. They are being asked to believe certain claims, to support certain ideas, to rally around certain slogans.

We are simply trying to tell other people how we see things. We, as a people, are trying to coinmunicate with other people as individuals, as fellow human beings. We are trying to present a point of view as we honestly see it now—a point of view we honestly believe, a point of view we are trying to work out in actual practice.

The people in our own country and in all areas not dominated by the Soviet Union have free access to information, to facts, to current events. If we distorted these in any way for propaganda purposes we would destroy the confidence of the millions of people in our own land and abroad who are concerned with communicating with each other and working out better ways of living. We are not so stupid as to resort to the technique of the big lie, which may prove temporarily successful for the dictator, but which history shows eventually ends in disaster for him and his followers. We believe with Lincoln that "truth is generally the best vindication against slander."

We realize that the people in our own land and in other lands will be willing to make personal sacrifices only if they believe in the goals they are trying to attain. Above all, we realize that these goals must be goals for individuals themselves, not meaningless abstractions. Men everywhere will sacrifice comfort and material security if they believe this will preserve their integrity and their inner security, or if by such sacrifice they can attain the integrity and security they do not have now.

We believe that people everywhere are trying to do their best as they see it, and that all of us can do better for ourselves and for each other if we can communicate to each other our needs and aspirations, our hopes and fears, and work peacefully together for those goals common to all men.

The goals we subscribe to have not been arrived at hastily. We have consulted the most advanced scientific men in all countries where men can think honestly. We have also studied what the great religious prophets and the wise men of different ages and countries have said, and we find that they, too, support what we believe to be the goals of life.

With these goals in mind, it is up to each individual, each group, each nation, to decide what is best; to decide what is right. The decisions men everywhere make today are terribly important—maybe more important than the decisions men have had to make anywhere, anytime.

We realize that there are millions of people in Soviet dominated areas who are not free to choose, who cannot do what they really think is best and right without losing their lives. We want them to remember that even if their own rulers may be against them, against anyone who wants to develop as an individual and be himself, that there are millions of people, millions of fellow human beings and fellow citizens of the world outside Soviet dominated areas, who are ready to work with those people inside the Soviet areas whenever the opportunity permits. We want to hold out hope to those who are helpless and persecuted.

Our chief difficulty in communicating with people in Soviet dominated areas is not one of geographical boundaries. The greatest obstacle is not the iron curtain which tries to shut out truthful information about the rest of the world. The greatest difficulty is rather to pierce the iron mold into which the minds of Soviet citizens have been cast for the last 33 years through no fault of their own.

For this reason, our message must have maximum plausibility. And we must repeat our message over and over again if we are to break this iron mold.

None of us can sit back and indulge in mental speculations about what we should do. Leisurely times have passed. The hour has struck and it is time for action.

What we are trying to do in our communications is to show people everywhere why we feel that the purposes of the Soviet regime are completely inimical to the purposes of human beings as such, and why we uphold the dignity of the individual, the freedom of people to choose and make decisions for themselves. Our communications must show the possibility of self-development at the same time the physical needs and standards of living of people everywhere are raised as they should and must be.

While it is important to act, it is even more important to know why we are acting, what we are acting for. The quality of our action depends upon the quality of our purposes.

G. WHAT, IN BRIEF, IS OUR MESSAGE; OUR CREDO?

We believe that human beings everywhere are born with common needs and aspirations; that chief among the characteristics of man is his ceaseless desire to improve the quality of living; that this requires freedom from want and freedom from fear, together with freedom to choose and freedom to help shape his own destiny; that any group, nation, or ideology which attempts to impose a fixed way of life on other individuals is committing a crime against human nature and the spirit of man; that it is the responsibility of all people everywhere to help their fellow human beings create whatever conditions they feel hold out the possibility of making their living more abundant according to their own cultural heritage.

We believe in the perfectibility of man.

We believe that we and others will achieve a better society only when we and they become better men.

We believe that if action is kindled by charity and love, it can never be wrong.

All this we believe.

Only by acting on these beliefs will we be able to live more abundant lives ourselves. In a world where each of us depends on so many others, the chance for any of us to be increasingly free of want, free of fear, free to choose, free to be ourselves, depends on the chance of others to be equally free.

STATEGY NOTES

1. To solidify our position, concentrate especially on the people of the world whose minds are not already in iron molds, i. e., those who share some of our traditions, goals, assumptions, and hope.

2. A criterion for each message used by the United States Information Service (whether broadcast, leaflet, etc.) should be: If someone asked a person who had heard a VOA broadcast, and so forth, the question "What did it say?" could the listener tell him? That is, was the message clear, unambiguous, simple, pointed, plausible, not easily distorted?

3. It is possible by means of pre-tests on small samples of a population to determine in advance what particular context for our information and education programs will be most plausible and most effective. Such tests are relatively simple to conduct on people not now living within the Soviet sphere of influence and some information concerning the best arguments to use with persons who are in iron curtain countries might be obtained by careful interviewing of displaced persons, etc. The use of this method can greatly aid us in pointing up our message to specific cultures and in no way implies that we are being artificial or untruthful. It means essentially that, like a good general, we are trying to determine weak spots before we put on our major offensive.

4. Use irony where possible. Don't pay the tribute of taking everything the U. S. S. R. says and does seriously. Make use of cartoons.

5. Seek slogans, watch for phrases that catch hold, repeat them often. But choose slogans with great care since people have been deluged with them.

6. Avoid words spoiled by Soviets. Describe what the names are naming.

7. Accompany, supplementally, Voice of America, etc., abroad with a Voice for America at home. This should be a short, 15 to 20 minute weekly report to the people telling them how things stand, giving the "what for's" along with the "how-to-do's." If possible, this should be done by the President. If not, possibly by a neutral voice with State or Cabinet backing, etc.

(NOTE.—The ideas expressed in this memorandum can be documented with evidence from many sources. We could, for example, give the opinions of outstanding scientists that the Soviet conception of "materialism" is now regarded only as a superstition. We could cite the views of leading scientists concerning the importance of values in human life. There is ample evidence that Soviet totalitarianism is contrary to the development of the individual personality. This statement was written in the hope that it would prove useful. Since the writers believe it should stand on its own feet, they feel that the addition of their names is irrelevant. If you can use it in any way, they will be happy to have you use it. It is common property.)

The Need for a United States Medical Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention and consideration of my colleagues in this House a bill which I introduced on May 2. I want to explain this bill as briefly as possible. I am hopeful enough to believe that the proposal it contains will arouse widespread interest in this legislative chamber, as well as in the country at large, to warrant prompt and early adoption of the proposal.

My bill, H. R. 3931, calls for the establishment of a United States Medical Academy, along the lines of the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The purpose of this bill is to increase the number of physicians and dentists who would be available for our Armed Forces, for the United States Public Health Service, and for other governmental activities requiring medical service.

Through the establishment of this medical academy we shall not only help to eliminate the shortage of doctors which exists in the Federal Government, but we shall also help to remedy the serious shortage in the country as a whole. At the same time, the creation of such an institution would insure a new source of specially-trained and readily available nucleus of medical men in Government services around which the necessary expansions could be undertaken in times of emergency, without straining and draining the supply of medical men.

All of us are acutely aware of the doctor shortage today, which was serious enough before the outbreak of the war in Korea, but which has grown considerably worse since then due to the crying need for doctors in the Armed Forces. Nearly a year ago, in June 1950, the Army called for 2,167 doctors who were needed immediately to help meet the new emergency resulting from the Korean crisis. Since then Congress has found it necessary to provide for a draft of doctors. The Department of Defense has set a new and increased goal for men in uniform, which will require an additional 4,000 doctors to meet the needs of our expanding Armed Forces for proper medical care. Less than 10 days ago, on April 23, the Defense Department asked selective service authorities to draft 1,202 physicians during the months of July, August, and September. If it continues at this rate, how can we avert a disruption of our civilian medical services?

Needless to say, that we are determined our Armed Forces should have the best possible medical care. But we should be equally concerned that the families of men in the service, their parents, wives, and children, are not deprived of the medical attention which they must have. It must also be remembered that our cities may someday become enemy targets and be exposed to enemy attacks from the air. In the event of such attacks, or in the case of serious epidemics or other emergencies, we must be fully prepared to render medical care to the civilian population over and above the normal civilian needs for such care.

Only a short while ago, Dr. Howard Rusk, Chairman of the Health Resources Advisory Committee in the National Security Resources Board, warned that we can expect a shortage of 22,000 doctors in this country by 1954, only 3 years from now. A year ago we knew we needed more doctors. Today we are faced with the stark reality of desperately trying to stretch inadequate manpower to meet the needs in a time of national crisis. Must we wait until it is too late or until the health situation in the United States is dangerously impaired before we take any effective action?

I submit that even without the urgent need brought about by the present crisis, it is necessary for our Government to establish as soon as possible a United States Medical Academy. Let me emphasize that this proposal is not one arising entirely or solely out of the present emergency. On the contrary, the emergency merely accents the need for action which we should have taken long ago.

Throughout our history medical officers in the armed services—unlike the military officers who have been graduated from West Point or Annapolis—had to subsidize their own medical education and training. Why should it not be possible for the Federal Government to train the doctors it requires for its medical services at Government expense, in the same manner it trains a nucleus for our military staffs? Indeed, a medical academy would add a new complement of doctors each year to meet Government needs. It would also, I am convinced, enable military medicine to acquire a professional career status which it deserves, and it would unquestionably serve as a very encouraging factor in the development of new fields of medical knowledge.

Military medicine, as we all know, has some special problems. It must be concerned with the human factors inherent in military service in the Arctic region and in the tropics. It must study physical problems which arise from jet-propelled planes, or in submarines. It is concerned with mass training, global war, and the use of unconventional weapons. Moreover, it has another important distinguishing feature which is sometimes overlooked, namely, preventive medicine—the problem of keeping men and women fit for service and of maintaining adequate health and sanitation measures. Most medical schools today properly put major emphasis upon diagnosis and cure of disease, frequently at the expense of courses in preventive methods and techniques.

These special medical problems of the military are merely noted here without specific recommendations as to the proposed Academy's curriculum, of course. Clearly, they represent fields of specialization. Just as clearly, the basic courses offered in the Medical Academy would duplicate the courses given in every good medical school in the country. Graduates of the Academy would be trained first as doctors and then as specialists.

Mr. Speaker, we should have built such a medical academy a long time ago, because the Armed Forces need it, the Government health services need it, and the country needs it. Today we must be moved by extremity and urgency to establish such a school so that the Federal Government can, in the future, assume its fair share and responsibility in helping to supply the doctors it must have for its own services, in peace as well as in war.

The proposed legislation contains the following major provisions:

First. It creates the United States Medical Academy along lines similar to the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy.

Second. Appointments to this Academy would be made from all congressional districts, Territories, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, 8 from each State at large, and 132 from the United States at large.

Third. Candidates for admission would be at least 20 years of age but less than 25, graduates of a college or university or the equivalent, citizens of the United States, and of good moral character.

Fourth. The course of study would include the following subjects: anatomy, physiology, chemistry, hygiene, surgery, obstetrics and gynecology, pathology, bacteriology, and diagnosis.

Fifth. Graduates from the Academy would remain in Government service for 5 years.

Sixth. All employees of the Academy would be paid in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 and would be subject to the provisions of the civil-service retirement laws.

Seventh. The Academy would have a Superintendent appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 10 years, and a Board of Visitors with prescribed pay and minimum duties.

I am hopeful this bill will receive due consideration and early approval of the committee to which it was referred and the subsequent approval of Congress.

American Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the period May 12 through May 19 is being observed once more as National Defense Week, at the conclusion of which will be celebrated Armed Forces Day, on May 19. This year, as in several past years, it has been my pleasure to contribute for this occasion an article to the official magazine of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States. This article is published in the May 1951 issue of the Reserve Officer. Its subject is a long-range program for American preparedness.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article by printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREPAREDNESS: TEMPORARY FLURRY OR LONG-RANGE STRATEGY

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, senior United States Senator from Wisconsin)

What is one of the greatest psychological handicaps to adequate American defense—to a comprehensive reserve program, to thorough preparedness?

The answer is the tendency of our people to fluctuate between the two mental extremes of optimism on the one hand and pessimism on the other hand in our attitude toward international relations and the problem of peace. Because of that tendency, we swing like a pendulum from the extreme direction of pacifism to the extreme direction of militarism. We are an "off-again, on-again, in-again, out-again" people in this respect.

Observers looking at America's history have long noted that after every war in which we have been engaged, there has been a tremendous psychological let-down, a frantic effort to demilitarize, to be done with the messy and costly business of preparation for future possible war. It is only natural, perhaps, that we should be guilty, if you can call it that, of overhasty demobilization after war.

The average American boy is not raised with the idea that he should spend his days perpetually lying in filthy foxholes with insects biting him, with rain pouring down, with the accumulation of weeks' dirt on his body, with shells (live or dummy) bursting around him, and an instrument of death in his hand. The American boy is raised for baseball, football, 4-H Clubs, Boy Scouts, and the peaceful pursuit of happiness.

We have always regarded war as an occasional detestable operation which a nation should get over with as quickly as possible and then promptly forget about in the interest of everybody making a good living in civilian life and enjoying the better things. We, with our unsurpassed standard of living, with our superb comforts and conveniences, with freedoms unknown anywhere else in the world, naturally do not like to think about the possibility of a permanent state of mobilization, of continual tension and preparedness.

KOREA FLUCTUATIONS

But every once in awhile some dramatic event occurs which serves to awaken us out of our lethargy. In 1941 it was the Japanese dive bombers blasting Pearl Harbor. In 1950 it was the North Korean troops pouring down over the thirty-eighth parallel. Each of these sharp events has served to reverse our total thinking. In the instance of Korea, there was a temporary state of near panic and hysteria. It was believed that the firing of North Korean artillery was but the prelude to a deafening roar of Russian guns in the near future and so frantically we started to build up our armed forces and to undo much of what we had done in the rosy all-well-with-the-world period following September 1945.

In the ensuing months, the fortunes of the Korean war fluctuated back and forth. Every time it loked as though we were "out of the woods," so to speak, and as though American fighting men had once more triumphed, there was a feeling of let-down and an itch to bring the boys home and forget the whole dismal experience. Then, some bad news would come from Pyongyang or from the Kremlin or from Lake Success or from a satellite state or from Iran, and once more we would be plunged into an extreme state of near panic. Back and forth, we would go from optimism as to a bright, peaceful future to blackest pessimism as to the inevitability of a third world war.

Always, when the war clouds seemed to disappear, we would start to wonder why we were spending so much money for training men in destruction and for armaments, when obviously the same outpouring could build schools, hospitals, playgrounds, and a thousand other types of community improvements all over this land. Then, when the war clouds would start to regather, we would hastily appropriate billions to make up for lost time.

We as a people have been historically guilty of this "blow hot, blow cold" attitude of being down in the dumps one day, and riding high in the sky the next day.

STRATEGY OF COMMUNISM

Yet you and I and all thinking Amc.. ..s should recognize today that what we need instead of these extreme variations is a steady determination to be prepared for every emergency. We need National Defense Weeks and a national defense psychology 52 weeks a year. What we need is a firm recognition that the strategy of Russian communism in the long run is committed to the downfall of the American way of life. So, whether or not Soviet diplomats smile at us one day, whether or not they figuratively pat us on the back of the head and whisper sweet lullabies to us, whether or not Joe Stalin comes out with one of his "peace is definitely possible" talks should make comparatively little difference. We need to recognize that so long as Russia is controlled by a handful of men committed to a fanatical, godless creed and to the whole cult of ruthless power, we have no alternative but to arm wisely, soundly, and on a continuing basis. I do not mean that we should not observe closely changing trends; but I do mean that we must perceive the total pattern, not merely the day-to-day changes.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING

We need to lay the firmest foundations for a broader reserve system, founded on justice, fairness, equitable compensation, decent rights and benefits. The Reserve is still the backbone of America's defense. We need, moreover, to pursue other elements of a long-range strategy. Let me suggest several points in such a program.

1. We must continue to follow an intense policy of all-around penetration of the Soviet Union and its satellites. This means making more effective an expanded Voice of America program. It means OSS—like shipment of considerable quantities of saboteurs, arms, and ammunition to dissident elements behind the iron curtain. It means stirring up so much trouble on a continuing basis for the Politburo that it will not be so sure of its home front so as to commit troops to a foreign war. It means exploiting every weakness within the internal fabric of Russian society—economic, political, and social. A recent Foreign Relations Committee print which I helped arrange for spells out quite clearly the areas of internal Russian tension on which America can capitalize.

2. On a long-range basis, we must adequately train our manpower. The Senate has wisely laid the basis for universal military training to take effect when world conditions will permit the present Selective Service System to be replaced. I am hoping that the House of Representatives will follow suit.

I can understand deeply the contrary feelings of countless educators, clergymen, Parent-Teacher Association leaders who question the advisability of UMT. To them I have said and have written this: One of the greatest sins that we can commit is to some day send American boys into battle unprepared. There is not a single Reserve officer or enlisted man who reads these words who does not know one or even a dozen instances where wonderful buddies died in the opening stages of battle because they did not have the most elementary idea of how to survive in modern combat. It is incredible that with all our magnificent American training techniques we should find our boys engaging North Korean or Chinese peasants who know how to use modern weapons better, who are more expert in infiltration tactics, who are better night fighters, than are our own modern youths.

3. A third element of long-range strategy is a broader integration between the Armed Forces and the industrial genius of the American free-enterprise system. By that, I mean that there must be a continuous closer collaboration between every phase of American industry and experts of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, so that the latest inventions can be fully utilized for improvements in technological warfare.

We have been so concerned about developing better refrigerators, better automobiles, better washing machines that we have not produced the vastly improved tanks, mortars, jets of which we are capable. I am not saying that we cannot be proud of some of our improved weapons, but you and I know that it is a fact that the Korean war found us with pretty much the same weapons as we used in World War II, often with comparatively few important improvements.

4. The Armed Forces themselves figure in this long-range strategy insofar as their own attitude is concerned. Having suffered from periods of appropriations "feasts" and then "famines," they have not always demonstrated a continuing awareness of their own responsibility in the use of the funds allocated to them. Every once in a while some dramatic instances come before the public view in which there has been a shocking extravagance on the part of one of the services. Such instances merely serve to sour the public on pouring more and more billions into the hands of our military, naval, and air chieftains. This is a most unfortunate situation, because it is important that the people and the Congress have the highest faith in our military leaders. But they, in turn, must justify that faith.

5. We must talk "cold turkey" among ourselves and to the Russian insofar as our negotiations with them are concerned. There is no use of our vacillating like a weather vane in dealing with fellows like Gromyko and Vishinsky. We must impress upon them of course that we definitely do not desire war and do not think war is inevitable between our two peoples. But at the same time, we must acquaint them with the fact that appeasement is definitely out. We must indicate that we, too, have a long-range strategy in terms of winning the world for the free way of life through our point 4 program, through the Voice of America and through every other instrumentality available to us. The Russians have seen how inconstant we are and they are trying to steer us away from a long-range program of steady, stern actions and talks.

6. Since Russia respresents the greatest single problem insofar as the future peace of the world is concerned, I urge that we mobilize our finest brains in terms of a complete mastery of the Russia dilemma. I want us to have experts in every phase of Russian and satellite life—in their languages, in their cultures, in their military science, in their economics, in population, in geography. We have seen how Hitler during his regime had great masses of specialists become intensely familiar with every single area of the world. We should do likewise in both military and civilian spheres, encouraging private industry to fully cooperate. After all, American salesmanship has spread American products throughout the world, and it is only natural that we should make the fullest possible use of the great body of knowledge that has been built up by businesses throughout the world and by their salesmen and other representatives.

It is incredible that we have so few language experts, for example, who even understand the diverse foreign tongues, much less the varying foreign cultures and peoples.

By these and other methods I trust that we can lay the firm basis for a long-range strategy for victory of the free and peaceful way of life. It will cost money and energy, but far less money and energy in the long run than the "now you see it, now you don't" approach.

We want neither extreme optimism nor pessimism—but realism. We want neither pacifism nor militarism—but strength, courage, and justice. We want preparedness not as a temporary flurry but as a part of well-planned, permanent strategy.

Resolution Passed by the New York City Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a copy of a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of New York, which was introduced by the Honorable Edward Vogel, who represents the councilmanic district which is coterminous with my own district. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution 402

Resolution urging the New York congressional delegation and the New York Senators, IRVING M. IVES and HERBERT H. LEHMAN, to request the proper agencies of the Federal Government to issue top priorities for construction of school buildings now and during the immediate future of this emergency

Whereas as it appears from a report in the New York Times, March 19, 1951, that, "Because of a shortage of construction materials this country's huge school-building program is in danger of bogging down. School systems everywhere are finding it increasingly difficult to continue with their building plans.

"The situation is especially acute in New York, where a $100,000,000 building program is endangered. Officials do not know whether they will be able to complete the 34 schools now under construction, or whether they can continue with the 31 scheduled to get under way this year. A school that burned down 2 months ago will not be rebuilt for some time to come because contractors cannot get the necessary steel for another 10 months.

"A Nation-wide survey conducted by the New York Times indicates that educators are convinced that unless the schools receive some form of priorities for steel and other needed materials, the construction will slow down or come to a virtual standstill"; and

Whereas the survey conducted by the New York Times reports:

"According to educational authorities, the amount of steel required for school construction is only a fraction of the total used in defense industries. Dr. J. L. McCaskill, coordinator of the National Conference for Mobilization of Education, consisting of leading educational organizations, estimates that construction for schools would take about 175,000 tons of steel a year. This is two-tenths of 1 percent of the total steel produced in the country"; and

Whereas Dr. J. L. McCaskill, coordinator of the National Conference for Mobilization of Education reports:

"It is quite possible that many children will not be able to enter school simply because there will be no available classroom space for them. The damage to the educational program will unquestionably increase the inequality of educational opportunity in America to alarming proportions"; and

Whereas of the situation in New York City, Charles J. Bensley, chairman of the board of education's building committee, said that unless the Federal Government provided the needed priorities to continue with construction, the city's huge program would be completely lost. He warned that "unless we put our school-building program on a par with munitions, democracy will be undermined."

"In recent months," he said, "contractors have begun to shy away from making bids. Of the 34 buildings under construction from the 1948–50 program, some are almost ready to open, while others still have a long way to go. These buildings are estimated to cost $50,000,000, and will seat 36,000 children.

"The 1950–51 building program, calling for 31 projects at a cost of $70,000,000, would supply an estimated 30,000 seats.

"Educationally speaking, this will be a lost generation unless the appropriate authorities wake up and immediately grant the priorities needed to build our schools," Mr. Bensley declared.

A similar warning came from Dr. William Jansen, New York superintendant of schools. Dr. Jansen said the effect of the sheel shortage was already being felt in the school system. About 2 months ago, he said, when public school 11 in Woodside, Queens, burned down, its 750 children were placed in nearby schools. The school cannot be rebuilt because the contractors cannot get the necessary steel for at least 8 to 10 months.

"Unless we can get the steel, our building program will bog down completely," Dr. Jansen warned. "It doesn't seem wise to have such conditions at this time. Our schools should not be left to fend for themselves without some priority rating": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of New York, hereby strongly urges Hon. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization and the Defense Mobilization Board, to grant a top priority rating immediately for school construction, and it is further

Resolved, That the Council of the City of New York, urges the New York Congressional Delegation and the New York Senators IRVING M. IVES and HERBERT H. LEHMAN to request the proper agencies of the Federal Government to issue top priorities for construction of school buildings now and during the immediate future of this emergency.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the city of New York are indebted to Councilman Vogel and his colleagues for this action on their part.

Prime Question Unanswered: How Do We End the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, certainly history will record the dramatic events of the past 2 weeks among the most far-reaching since the close of World War II in their effect on the survival of the United States of America and the cause of freedom everywhere.

In all the emotional outburst of a nation shocked by a tragic turn of events, we must not lose sight of the fundamental questions involved if we are to salvage what we can from the error-strewn policies of the Truman administration and ultimately set a proper course toward peace and victory.

This constructive procedure is supported with clarity of expression in an

editorial published last week by the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News, the largest newspaper in our congressional district. Under permission granted by the House, I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of every Member of Congress. It follows:

PRIME QUESTION UNANSWERED: HOW DO WE END THE WAR?

The thrills and excitement of General MacArthur's great day in the East have shifted to the Middle West to be continued in Chicago Thursday and Milwaukee Friday.

As the fury of the fighting mounts in Korea, however, we are still faced with the cold realization that we still have a war on our hands.

President Truman's and Secretary Acheson's speeches have sought to make what they call a limited war appear akin to peace. But American troops are still being killed in Korea.

To the 10,000 Americans who have been killed, to the 250,000 men still there, to their families, and especially the Koreans themselves whose homes and country have been ravaged, the war now raging is as unlimited as war ever gets.

The risks of extending the war first to Red China and later to Red China's ally, the Soviet Union, were just as great on June 25, 1950, when Mr. Truman began the war.

Since that time, the choice between a little war and a big war has depended upon the Communist powers solely, not upon the United States. The same is true today.

The fact of the war's existence and that it has to be disposed of one way or another cannot be brushed aside by talk of peace when there is no peace.

General MacArthur's proposals for ending it by military means are based on two beliefs:

1. Red China is already engaging the maximum power it can commit, and,

2. The Soviet Union will more likely strike only when it feels that it has military and productive preponderance on a world-wide scale. He does not believe Russia thinks it possesses that preponderance now.

He advocated:

(a) A more intensive economic blockade of China.

(b) A naval blockade of the Red China coast.

(c) Unrestricted aerial reconnaissance—he did not specify unrestricted bombing—of China's coast and Manchuria.

(d) Removal of the blockade of Nationalist Chinese on Formosa and supporting them with arms and supplies if they attacked the mainland.

The State Department blocked these. General MacArthur was informed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the State Department was ready to announce that with the clearing of South Korea of Red Chinese, the United Nations was ready to discuss a settlement. He was ordered to mark time at the thirty-eighth parallel, without any advance beyond that point by major forces, until State Department had had time to negotiate for a settlement.

The few weeks sought for negotiations have passed and nothing has happened. No new proposals have been made. Reports are that Peiping has even refused to receive neutral diplomats eager to find a basis of settlement.

So the questions that cost General MacArthur his leadership are still unanswered. His removal has settled nothing. We still have a war on our hands and the initiative remains, because of restrictions on our forces, with Red China and the Kremlin. It is clearly up to Mr. Truman and Acheson to produce a workable solution.

Mr. Speaker, when General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur spoke from the rostrum in this House, he spoke from the heart of a great American to the heart of a great America. His counsel, if considered, may become his greatest contribution in a lifetime of distinguished service and military triumph.

The men—and the events—precipitating the sudden turn of events that brought America's last great living military hero home from the wars should be forgotten for the moment in order to restore a unity of purpose for this Nation still engaged in a bitter war thousands of miles away and threatened by a ruthless enemy entrenched on a global front.

This must be done for the reasons cited by the General himself when he told the Congress and the country:

The issues are fundamental and reach quite beyond the realm of partisan consideration. They must be resolved on the highest plane of national interest. I trust you will do me the justice of receiving that which I have to say as expressing the considered viewpoint of a fellow American. I address you with neither rancor nor bitterness in the fading twilight of life with but one purpose in mind, to serve my country.

None who heard him, and none who read his words, could doubt the deep sincerity of the man who until little more than 2 weeks ago stood as the very embodiment of American opposition to forces of communism arrayed against his country. It is not necessary to attempt comment at length on the text of his report to the people he has served with such distinction. His words received earnest attention, and they should be subjected to careful study. The petty issues raised by petty men should not be permitted to cloud the larger issues at stake.

It has been argued, and conceded, that the President can remove his military commander in the field. It is argued, and admitted, that in the twin fields of civilian and military authority, the civilian power is supreme. But these are not the principal issues at stake. To look at the matter in that light is to miss the larger question.

This is the question which disturbs the minds and lies close to the hearts of millions of Americans. Are the present policies of this Government policies which really serve the best interests of the Nation? In the face of actual war, and the mounting threat of even greater conflict, are we adhering to a course which serves the dual purpose of contributing most to the prevention of war and to our survival if total war should come? General MacArthur disagrees with the policies and he believes the policies which we have adopted, and which the President says will not be changed, can lead us only to disaster.

This is not a conflict that can be resolved by petty sniping at General MacArthur, by smear campaigns generated in the discredited State Department, or by calculated snubs from the General Vaughns and others of like stature. Neither can it be solved by the country-wide emotional outburst against President Truman. The orderly processes of representative government must be followed, and preserved, or the freedom we are fighting for abroad will be lost in dissension at home.

No one understands this better than General MacArthur. So it is not surprising that he addresses himself solely to the task of presenting his views, views that should have been sought and obtained long ago. It was in perfect keeping with his character that he prefaced his views with the flat assertion that he did not serve the purposes of politics or political parties, and that he entertained no political ambitions.

Now the people have heard the general's views. Let the political pygmies chip away at this marble shaft of faith if they must. Now it is for the people themselves to make the decision. Now it is for them, through their Government, to answer the questions raised by present events and future potentialities.

Personalities are not important. Only the issues are. The general himself endorsed this in his moving farewell by recalling this soldier ballad of the day he entered the military service of his country over 50 years ago: Old Soldiers Do Not Die, They Simply Fade Away.

General MacArthur is very much alive. The Nation—and the free world—trusts he will not fade away. But what must not fade away is American determination and American faith in the fundamental principles on which this country was founded and grew to power. It was founded as a Christian Nation devoted to the preservation of human freedom, with authority—and strength—stemming from the people themselves. Has time robbed us of that devotion to principles and devotion to God? If it has not, the people themselves will fix the proper course. And that course will lead to victory for the men still locked in battle. It can lead to a preservation of the peace they will win. That is the hope that must never "simply fade away." If it does, the hope of this Nation—the cause of freedom everywhere—will fade with it.

Poland's Constitution Day Has Lesson for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this is Poland's Constitution Day—the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the free constitutional government which Poland no longer enjoys.

For the people of that unhappy land it is a day of sorrow. For the people of the United States it should be a day of shame.

The European war against Nazi Germany was precipitated over the issue of the independence and territorial integrity of Poland.

The Pacific war against Japan was precipitated over the issue of the independence and territorial integrity of China.

America contributed mightily and decisively to victory against both enemies.

Yet, today both Poland and China are enslaved by communism, their independence is destroyed, their territorial integrity is violated, and their liberties are ruthlessly denied.

Most incredible of all is the guilt which American leadership shares in this double betrayal of human freedom.

At Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, as well as by subsequent policies and actions, American leadership sought to buy Stalin's favor at the price of the independence and integrity of both Poland and China, and at the price of our own honor. Such promises as we received, in return, from Soviet Russia were broken almost as soon as they were given.

True, none of the international commitments and agreements which accomplished this double betrayal has ever been ratified by constitutional processes. At the same time, however, it must be acknowledged that none of those commitments and agreements has even been repudiated by constitutional processes.

Meanwhile the United States today finds itself inextricably involved in the consequences of these betrayals of freedom.

Today we should reread, with penitence and foreboding, the grim words of Abraham Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address:

Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said: "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

This may be too stern a doctrine for a generation which has come to put more faith in opportunism, expediency, cleverness, and appeasement than in the simple moralities which underlie freedom.

Yet this is the lesson of Poland's Constitution Day for Americans, tardy though we may be in heeding it.

It is the lesson that there can be no hope for peace, or for the preservation even of our own liberties, so long as we permit our leaders to barter away other people's freedom, whether they are the peoples of Poland or China or Formosa.

It is the lesson that truly "nothing can bring us peace but the triumph of principle."

The Great Alliance of Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject the Great Alliance of Free Men, by Hon. W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, at a banquet of the regional conference sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations, Inc., in Los Angeles, Calif., on April 30, 1951. In his address Mr. Harriman urges support of the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty, and cooperation with other nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT ALLIANCE OF FREEMEN

(By Hon. W. Averell Harriman)

During the past months our country has been engaged in a series of debates. All kinds of things have been said on all sides of every question. Some would even have us believe that we are all in a state of confusion. Some contend that we have no policies, that we are drifting aimlessly. Some are attempting to distort the true purpose of our policies. Much of what is said is irrelevant; much is even irresponsible.

Of course, in our democratic way we should debate all issues, but at a time when our country is in grave danger we should conduct these debates for the sole purpose of gaining a clearer understanding of the issues.

Tonight I want to try to cut through the fog of unreality. I want to talk about the things we face and how we are dealing with them.

I spent a good deal of time in Russia during the war and I had an unusual chance to learn something about the Russian people and their rulers in the Kremlin.

When I came home 5 years ago, I was gravely concerned over the dangers that were developing from the Kremlin, and I was afraid that we would not face up to them until it was too late.

Well, we have faced up to them. I think the American people have been magnificent during the past 5 years. They have supported unprecedented measures. Never in the history of our country, or in the history of any country, has a nation in peacetime taken such wise and effective steps in dealing with so many varied and complex problems.

In 1945 I had come back for a brief visit, just after the death of President Roosevelt, and I vividly remember the first encouragement I got. It came from President Truman. It was the first time I had met him. I found that he was already alive to the indication of the trouble ahead with the Soviet Union. He had carefully studied the records of President Roosevelt and his last messages to Stalin. He was already much concerned by the duplicity of the Kremlin and was determined to stand firm against the Kremlin schemes. As a result, he has been prepared to take prompt and vigorous steps in dealing with the Kremlin threat. No President has in peacetime initiated so many unprecedented and far-sighted measures and actions for our national security as has President Truman.

In our wartime relations with the Soviet Union we had two fundamental objectives. Of first importance was to keep Russia as an effective fighting ally. We also wanted to use this new relationship to find a way of working together for peace on a live-and-let-live basis. People in this country and all over the world had hopes that this could be accomplished. The British and American Governments were well aware of the difficulties in attaining this objective.

During the war, Roosevelt and Churchill made every effort to talk things out with Stalin in order to arrive at some workable understanding on the basis of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

When I was in Moscow there were indications that the Kremlin had two approaches to their postwar policies. In the many talks that I had with Stalin I felt that he himself was of two minds; one emphasized internal reconstruction and the other external expansion.

On the one hand they were discussing possible understandings with us which might result in increased trade with and loans from the West for the reconstruction of the terrible devastation left in the wake of the war. This would mean soft-pedaling for a time at least the Communist designs for world domination—much along the lines of the policies they had pursued between the two World Wars.

On the other hand, they were treating us in many ways as potential enemies. There were indications that they would take advantage of the Red army occupation of neighboring countries to maintain control, and they were supporting Communist parties in other countries to be in a position to seize control in the postwar turmoil.

The men of the Kremlin chose the second course.

In October of 1945, I went to see Stalin at his country place in Sochi in the Caucasus. After two long nights of arguments over the disagreements we were then having, he as much as told me in a moment of anger that he had decided to go his own way. As time went on, the imperialist plans of the men of the Kremlin became increasingly aggressive. They broke the agreements they had entered into. If they had carried out these agreements the world would be a different place today. They used the occupation of the Red Army to set up puppet governments. They established a network of subversion all over the world, inciting disorders and insurrections and exploiting weakness wherever it exists.

The one great thing, however, accomplished by our constant efforts during and since the war to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union was that they establish our moral position before the people of the world. Had these efforts not been made, many people would still be wondering whether we and not the Kremlin were to blame for the tensions that have developed.

The United Nations has provided the forum through which the designs and the duplicity of the Kremlin have been made crystal clear. The United Nations has been the medium through which the free nations have been drawn together. It is the medium through which the United States has been able to give leadership. And when it came to shameless aggression against the Republic of Korea, it was the medium through which we rallied 58 nations, all of the free nations, to face together this attempt to use force for conquest. We had built better than we knew. Never before in the history has there been such unanimity of world understanding and world opinion.

This was no accident. Step by step our policies had built strength and confidence among the free nations. As the Kremlin plan of action unfolded, we had helped other countries to resist and turn back aggression. We helped Greece put down Kremlin-inspired civil war. We have helped Western Europe to rebuild its economic life and suppress Communist subversion.

We took leadership in the organization of the North Atlantic Treaty. In a manner unprecedented, we have gone out to deal with the threat to our security at its source; we have not waited until it came to us. And let no man think it would not have come to us. Western Europe would not have survived Kremlin domination if it had not been for our prompt and imaginative action. With control of Europe the industrial capacity available to the Kremlin would have practically equaled ours. We might have faced an unmanageable situation. Instead today we are combining the potential of the North Atlantic community in the development of collective defense forces under our great Gen. Dwight Eisenhower.

In Korea we have faced force with force. We have learned from the bitter experience of the events which led to World War II

that aggression must be dealt with at the very beginning or it will encourage further aggression. We are showing the Kremlin that the free world will not tolerate the use of force for conquest, that freemen have the will and ability to resist. Our action in Korea is giving confidence to other peoples who are under pressure that they can maintain their independence. We are destroying the myth that the Chinese Red armies are invincible. We are upsetting their timetable of attack in other areas of Asia.

But it is not our aim to bring on another world war. Our aim is to limit the conflict if we possibly can and deal with it successfully within Korea. In the meantime, we are converting our tremendous economic resources into military strength and are helping our friends and allies do the same. Before long, the free world will have the military strength to meet any threat with confidence. When we are strong enough, the Kremlin will not dare undertake further aggression.

As I say, we are using every means at our command to prevent another world war. No man with any understanding of history can say that there can be victory in a general war. There can be nothing but chaos and disaster. But there can be victory—and glorious victory—in preventing another world conflict. And that is the clear aim of American policy. Every step we have taken has this objective. Let no man take us off this course.

I want to discuss some of the alternatives that are being put forward with respect to Korea.

Some would have us abandon Korea. This would be an invitation to further aggression and we would soon find ourselves fighting elsewhere. Or, any idea that we can obtain a solution by buying off the Chinese Communists through appeasement and giving any reward whatsoever for aggression is unthinkable. In view of the misrepresentations and false statements that are being made about the policies of our Government, I want to state in the most emphatic terms that President Truman will never engage in appeasement or reward aggression. He rejects any such idea and so do all his advisers. This has been said time and time again. Thirdly, there are those who would involve us in a wider war in order to end the present conflict in Korea. Yet they have not explained how, when, and at what cost this wider conflict could be brought to a successful conclusion. They are ready to have us lose our allies with all of the world-wide consequences that would result. And they are ready to risk a total war. They say this is the necessary way to solve the Korean situation.

You remember the talk during the Greek civil war. People said that we were bogged down in Greece—there could be nothing but a stalemate. "How could the fighting be brought to a successful conclusion within Greece?" "We should either abandon Greece or carry the fight across the borders and attack the Communist bases in Yugoslavia." And yet the struggle was won on Greek soil. And don't let us overlook the fact that now Yugoslavia is joining the ranks of those who are resisting the Kremlin. We heard the same sort of thing during the Berlin airlift. There were those who could see no end to it. We were told either to get out or have a show-down.

In these cases, we pursued the same kind of determined and yet restrained policies that we are now pursuing. We must always remember that although the menace of war comes from the Kremlin, hasty and ill-conceived action on our part can lead to grave consequences. I would like to recall to you the words of Winston Churchill from his recent war memoirs:

"Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to * * * seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. * * * How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands."

No one can foresee the future. Our men are joined in desperate battle in Korea. They are inflicting frightful casualties, estimated at the equivalent of the better part of a Chinese division a day. They are fighting to force the Chinese Reds to abandon the aggression. They are fighting to prevent the untold horrors to us and all mankind of another world war. Let all Americans give them their support. Let us pray for their success. It is shocking that some question the good faith of our allies who are fighting with us.

Let us think back a few years.

In 1940, the Greeks refused to appease, and faced alone invasion against overwhelming odds. The British came to their assistance with the small forces they had available in the Middle East. I was in Cairo in the spring of 1941 when the British troops returned from this honorable but unsuccessful expedition. I know the risks they took and the sacrifice they made to support their ally. Threatened as the Greek people still are, they have sent a token force to Korea. It is a token of their determination to stand with the free nations against aggression. It is a token of honor.

The Turks, under a similar threat of aggression at home, have sent a brigade which has won the respect of all.

The French have been fighting Communist aggression in Indochina for 4 years and have now 150,000 troops engaged in that conflict. Yet they have sent a small force to join us.

The British were quick to send their Pacific fleet and then troops, although they too are engaged against the Communists in Malaya.

A total of 13 nations have sent forces according to their situation and others are preparing to join. Although the preponderance of the forces is ours, we are not fighting alone in Korea. There have been times when other nations have fought alone. I was in England during the year when the British stood alone against the full force of Nazi power. The men and women of Britain stood firm with courage and determination. They took pride in the feeling that they were fighting not only for themselves, but for the freedom of other nations as well. Korea is a vital part, but only a part, of the world-wide struggle in which all free nations are engaged.

Let no man try to tell us that there are any safe or easy short cuts. The years ahead will be difficult. To achieve our objectives we must do many things that will mean many sacrifices. Military strength alone is not enough. Neither military strength nor political stability can be attained without an expanding economy in the free world. America has been the exponent of the concept of an expanding economy with increased productivity. It requires know-how and capital—these we must help to provide. We are all interdependent. The industrial countries need adequate food and increasing quantities of raw materials. The new nations of the east will need the know-how and economic assistance to expand production and to give promise for a decent life for their people. It is only on this basis that there can be political stability.

The resources of the free world are today vastly greater than those of the Soviet Union and its satellites. The Atlantic community alone has about three quarters of the heavy industry of the world, and over 400,000,000 of the most inventive, skillful, and productive people. But the life of the free world cannot survive if it is dismembered limb by limb. We Americans understand this. Strong as we are, we cannot survive alone. But we must use our strength to cement the unity and strength of the free nations.

We are engaged in a great enterprise—the building of a great alliance of freemen for human welfare and mutual security. With the success already achieved, we can have faith that the free nations working together can build the necessary strength and stability to withstand external aggression and internal subversion alike.

Don't let us either underrate or overrate the Soviet capabilities. Don't let us underrate their ruthlessness and determination; their skill in the techniques of subversion and in creating and exploiting weakness; their conviction that they are destined to dominate the world. They believe that freemen cannot stand together; that freemen cannot rule themselves; that free nations cannot be united, but will fight among themselves.

But we should not overrate the strength of Russia on which their operations are based. They are maintaining vast military forces by imposing a terrific burden on their economy and their people. You really have to go to Russia to understand how backward it is. The people have never known what we would consider a decent life. Men and women have to work hard and long hours for very little. But their equipment and organization are so poor that the productivity of industry and agriculture is far behind that of the West. After 35 years of rule, the Kremlin has not been able to gain the loyalty of the people. Stalin himself once admitted this when he told me during the war that the people were "fighting for their motherland, not for us." By "us" he meant, of course, the Kremlin. Russia is ruled by fear. The Kremlin fears the people, and the people fear the Kremlin. Whenever we hear of purges, it is an indication of internal tension. The unhappy people of the satellites crave only to be freed from the iron hand.

As the free world grows stronger, pressures will increase behind the iron curtain. The defection of Yugoslavia was primarily caused by the success of the Marshall plan. Tito saw that there was nothing to hope for but exploitation from the Kremlin in his alliance with Russia. With the improvement of conditions in Western Europe, he wanted economic association with the West. As the free countries become stronger and stronger, their very strength will act as a magnet on the enslaved peoples. There is a brittleness in any dictatorship, but one can never know when it will be strained to the breaking point.

The policies which we must follow have been laid out. We must pursue them unflinchingly.

Our men are fighting in Korea tonight to do their part in preventing another world war and to preserve our freedom. We must face the future, and the long future, with the same courage, determination, and perseverance. I am convinced that we can succeed, and I believe we will succeed.

As I have said, the American people have been magnificent during the past 5 years. It is inconceivable to me that anyone can deflect us from our course. The job ahead is even more difficult. But the success we have already achieved in our endeavors gives promise for the future.

Let us not be confused by men of little faith in America's capabilities who say that we can't afford to do the things we clearly must to safeguard our security. Let us not be confused by those who are impatient and would lead us to take reckless steps. Let us not be confused by those who have no understanding of the strength of the great association of free nations that we are building. Let us closely examine what is being said so that we will not be misled by those who are distorting and falsifying the facts.

The wise statesmen of both our political parties have laid out the road to follow: Support the United Nations and its action in Korea; support the North Atlantic Treaty; vigorous and rapid action to rearm; aid to our friends and allies to equip adequately their military forces; work with other nations for an expanding world economy; help the new nations of the east to attain political and economic stability; and strive with all our strength to prevent another world war.

Of first importance is to attain unity of purpose at home for the world-wide struggle. We can then give effective inspiration and leadership for unity in the free world. In the great alliance of freemen we are building, we can have faith that we will rid the world of tyranny, that we can maintain peace, and that freedom will prevail.

First Anniversary of Frank Pace, Jr., as Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recently we passed an anniversary which I believe should be noted in the RECORD. April 12 marked the end of the first year of Frank Pace's service as Secretary of the Army. To my mind, it was a year of accomplishment of the highest order.

When Secretary Pace took over his duties in April 1950, the Army was still suffering from an era in which the Nation believed it could safely reduce its armed strength. All of the services suffered from that false belief, but the ground forces were hit the hardest of the three.

Mr. Pace gave the Army the type of leadership that was needed to launch the expansion program. During his year in office, the ground forces have doubled in strength, and a gigantic procurement program has been launched smoothly and efficiently.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Secretary Pace's Year," from the April 7 issue of the highly respected Army-Navy-Air Force Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY PACE'S YEAR

When Frank Pace, Jr., took the oath of office as Secretary of the Army, on April 12, 1950, it cannot be said that the service was overly enthusiastic. In his previous position as Director of the Bureau of the Budget, during a period of economy, his diligent pursuit of those duties often conflicted with the interests of the forces of national defense. Happily for the country, however, both Mr. Pace's attitude toward the Army and the Army's regard for him have been modified greatly during the year he has been in office. In fact, there is now a great admiration, one for the other. Although Mr. Pace took over his position at a time when the Army's strength had suffered from an era of penny-pinching, he gave it real leadership and skilled administration through the Korean crisis precipitated only 2 months after he took over. During his year the Army has doubled in strength. A huge expansion and procurement program has been put under way smoothly and capably. Those who have worked closely with Mr. Pace admire particularly his ability not only to organize, but to use an organization efficiently. He is not an independent executive sternly running affairs his own way—he is part of his own organization, guiding it and using it. It is a recognition of this capacity of Mr. Pace's that has led the other Secretaries to choose him, even though he is not the senior member in service or years, as their chairman in the Joint Secretaries Organization, which he played a part in creating and which has quietly accomplished a great deal toward making unification work more smoothly and effectively. Mr. Pace is keenly aware that the success of an organization depends upon the individuals composing it. It is not unusual for him to call an officer informally and tell him that his Secretary is aware of a job well done and appreciates it. The fighting men should know that the project to establish a schedule of combat pay has had his earnest and diligent backing and that the delays which have beset it have not been of his making. Because he is modest and self-effacing, the country at large is probably not conscious of the part he has played in our defense build-up. But the service knows and has come to regard him highly for it.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the administration is naive indeed if it entertains delusions that the people are not aware of the real issues involved in the firing of General MacArthur.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Frank W. Ahrens, of St. Louis, to the editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which appeared in the April 29 issue of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPAGANDA FED FOLK

To the EDITOR:

I, too, have read your recent editorials on the MacArthur, Asiatic, European situations, et al., and have read your editorials over a long period of years; also those of other papers. I wonder why editors and columnists seem to think it necessary to speak patronizingly to their readers.

No one, I think, may question the President's prerogative to dismiss MacArthur; one may question the wisdom of it.

MacArthur has not said he advocates the United States engaging in a war in China. The people of this Nation are being fed the same type of propaganda in behalf of England that they were fed in World War II in behalf of Russia. Some of us were far ahead of Roosevelt and his entourage then, as we are of Truman and his now.

We are not hysterical; we have pondered policies of recent administrations at length; we have reared our children to be loyal, upstanding, useful citizens, and we are sickened by the continuing stupid blunderings of our State Department in foreign policies—policies that bring about situations, as in Korea, where our sons are set up like tenpins to be bowled down by unnumbered Asiatic hordes, with nothing but stalemate in view, unless we seek the ultimate end of war—victory.

We agree with MacArthur, that Russia will go to war when and where she thinks it opportune; further, we think she does not now desire to do so, with the many internal problems she has on her hands. Regardless, though, we feel it better to meet the issue squarely now, and that we should have done so long since.

It would be interesting, indeed, to know percentagewise, the number of men that we have in this Korean mess, as compared separately by nations with the number of those of our "friendly" associates in the United Nations, and likewise, as to casualties, including deaths separately.

There comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue—that time is long since passed.

FRANK W. AHRENS.

Thought Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks, a timely editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 1. We are rapidly indoctrinating this country to the Hitler-Goebbels techniques of controlling public opinion. Just this week I listened to a Government employee up in the military service remark that local civic organizations were being used to direct public thinking. What possible purpose can the Government have in the direction of public thought except as a means of supporting New Deal projects on a socialistic basis. The editorial follows:

THOUGHT CONTROL

A committee of Congress, established for the avowed purpose and investigating and, if possible, discrediting persons and organizations opposed to the administration's socialistic program, demanded that the Committee for Constitutional Government reveal the names of those who had purchased quantities of its books for subsequent distribution.

The committee, which was headed by the late Representative Frank Buchanan, was particularly anxious to find out who had purchased copies of the Road Ahead in which the author, John T. Flynn, exposes the socialistic influences which are behind the so-called Fair Deal's domestic program.

Quite properly, we believe, the request for this information was refused by the Committee for Constitutional Government through its executive secretary, Edward A. Rumely. Any citizen can walk into a store and buy a book without having some Government snooper asking him why he bought it and what he intends to do with it. So why should a citizen who buys 10 or 100 copies of the same book for distribution to his friends, employees, or mere acquaintances be subject to such harassment?

The Buchanan committee, however, cited, Rumely for contempt of Congress. He was recently convicted before a Federal court in the District of Columbia.

Rumely based his refusal to produce the records on constitutional grounds, namely, the guaranties of freedom of speech and press and of freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. Moreover, he held it was not within the province of the committee, which was presumably investigating lobbying, to demand the names of the purchasers of books published by his organization.

But the Buchanan committee defined lobbying as "any attempt by individuals or group to influence Government decision." This prompted Editor and Publisher to ask: "If the court declares publication of a book is lobbying, then how long before magazine and newspaper articles are included?

"Here is an organization that happened to be registered as a lobbyist. Is the court going to declare because of that, it cannot publish opinions on legislation without revealing who else might subscribe to those views by buying the book? Are then other publishers of similar views in books, magazines, and newspapers going to be required to register as lobbyists?"

The Rumely conviction is to be appealed. The higher courts, we hope, will take a broader view of the implications in this case. For if the conviction were sustaned, the way would surely be opened to the imposition of thought control regulations under which some Government agency would assert the right to harass and intimidate persons who read literature opposing Government programs.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two articles by Mr. George Sokolsky.

One, under date line of May 3, explaining England's stand in Asia; the other, under the date line of May 4, showing how the simple methods employed by both England and Russia have never been seen through or understood by those in charge of our foreign policy:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 3, 1951]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

A byproduct of the MacArthur situation must be an investigation and restudy of our relations with Great Britain. For no matter how it is sliced, Gen. Douglas MacArthur is a victim of the constant pressure of the British upon our State Department and President to have him recalled. Now that he has been officially humiliated, his program is being officially adopted, even to the extent of giving Chiang Kai-shek $60,000,000.

The British attitude toward General MacArthur was in no manner a personal antipathy. MacArthur's attitude toward the Korean war ran counter to the British attitude, and they got their man.

But the American people have never had, from their own officials or the British, an explanation of precisely what the British position toward Asia is and why. Lewis W. Douglas, who is the foremost protagonist of British policy in this country, tried to explain it at the recent Associated Press luncheon. But what he said clarified nothing except that the British sought to keep India within the Commonwealth and, therefore, sacrificed both China and the United States to that purpose.

Mr. Douglas gave no explanation as to the morality of such a position nor did he quiver that such a course has already cost the lives of 10,500 of our sons.

This also appears in the picture and cannot be ignored: British policy in China since 1842 has always been to recognize the de facto ruler of an area, even if that ruler was in rebellion against the established and recognized government. The theory was that trade must go on.

This was one reason why the British rather than the Japanese and Russians were the most disliked foreigners in China for a century. The Chinese assumption was that the British were always seeking to keep China divided and weak. In the great boycott of 1925, the object of the Chinese was to bring the British to heel, and when by 1927 they could show an appreciable success in that enterprise, the authority of the British Empire was damaged, its prestige in Asia was demolished.

British policy in China has been and is mercantile policy. It is dominated by the great firms, Jardine, Matheson, the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corp., the Chartered Bank, the P & O, the British-American Tobacco Co., and the shipping lines. These and other firms and the manufacturers who supply them have, in recent years, in effect been a cartel headed by Jardine's. They represent a huge investment and are paramount in empire trade.

They are willing to trade with anyone who can pay. This is, granted, a short-sighted policy, for when the Chinese Communists no longer need them, they will cast them aside. But who, on the other hand, can guarantee how long Soviet China will last and what its policies will be 10 years from now? Therefore, why not go forward with trade as long as possible and wherever it is available?

If the British can hold their east Asian trade profitably, great losses elsewhere may be offset. But this is to be observed, namely, that the British will never be able to trade in areas held by Chiang Kai-shek, for he will know how to impose a boycott on British goods, similar to the one he imposed between 1925 and 1927. Therefore, if Chiang Kai-shek is restored anywhere to the mainland, it will be American traders who will benefit.

Throughout World War II and thereafter, it has been British policy to keep American traders out of Asia. They regarded that as their sphere and even took the position that if the United States wanted to restore Great Britain, we ought to be sympathetic to their trading aspirations. Our State Department has on the whole been sympathetic to this British point of view, as I have pointed out on several occasions, particularly in connection with such products as pottery and chinaware.

The British therefore have been pursuing an advantage in the Communist antagonism to the United States and in stimulating the antagonism of the Indians toward us.

This is not altogether speculative because events and forces clarified since June 25, 1950, have established this pattern of activity. Even to this day, British trade has continued with the Chinese Communists, British military goods being delivered to them for use in Korea, not only against Americans but against the British contingents there.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 4, 1951]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Alfred Kohlberg has a wicked, almost a sardonic sense of humor. He is the China lobby that the State Department talks so much about. But he is not registered as a lobbyist because he represents only himself, American citizen, and merchant, who gives of his time and money to good causes, one of them being a constant fight against communism.

So, Kohlberg noticed that the large foundations, looking for ways to expend inherited money, have been setting up institutes and such in our universities with the object of fixing it so that Americans will understand the Russians. He had not noticed that anybody was spending a dime on getting the Russians to understand the Americans. Apparently, that is unnecessary as Americans need not be understood by anybody. In fact, nobody is making any particularly significant effort in that direction.

So, Kohlberg got the idea that he might go to Russia to see for himself and also maybe to tell a couple of Russians what goes here in the United States. Having no official position, being just a little American who pays his taxes and votes at elections, Kohlberg applied to the Russian Embassy for a blank on which to apply for a visa to the Soviet Union.

He got an answer, which I herewith quote in full:

"DEAR SIR: Your letter regarding your trip to the Soviet Union has been received. Although we comprehend the importance of this visit we regret to inform you that we are not in a position to assist you in this matter. Persons desiring to visit our country for private purposes have normally to enter the Soviet Union as tourists through the travel agency 'Intourist.' During the war this organization discontinued its work and has not resumed it up to the present time. Thus, your trip to the Soviet Union will become possible after the Intourist agency resumes its functions.

"Very truly yours,

"N. SAVCHENKO,

"Chief, Consular Division."

As there is no Intourist agency nobody can go to Russia except an official. Now, all these people who say there is no iron curtain have been made liars by Mr. N. Savchenko, who says there is one. It was pulled down for Americans when the Intourist travel agency left the United States.

Incidentally, that is a new dodge in international relations, the use of a travel agency to control the visits to a country. Soon, nobody will be able to visit China because there is no Chinese travel agency here, or Poland or Czechoslovakia for the same reason.

Kohlberg thinks the Russians are hard to understand. I do not think so. They do things simply. It is their simplicity which is confusing.

For instance, take their war in Korea. They direct it. They provide the arms, munitions, and experts. They arrange for the Chinese to come in after the Koreans are defeated, and for the Mongols and Buriats to come in after the Chinese are defeated. But Russian troops stay out. Therefore, the Russians are not in the war and Americans are warmongers. Nothing could be simpler.

Had we used Chiang Kai-shek's army of 600,000 as they used Mao Tse-tung's army, we would have been able to say that we are not at war but Chiang Kai-shek is at war. Could anything be simpler?

Similarly, the Russians wanted to get rid of MacArthur. Did they do anything about it? Not at all. That would have been too

obvious. They stirred up the Indians, who stirred up the British. The Indians made an issue of MacArthur, and the British did not want to offend the Indians as Lewis Douglas told us at the Associated Press luncheon. He seemed to think that nothing mattered but keeping India in the British Commonwealth, not even our more than 10,500 dead sons. So the British put the pressure on Acheson, who put it on Marshall, who put it on Truman, who gave MacArthur the skids.

Could anything be simpler than that? Russians are not hard to understand. Anyone who has had a small girl in his household who knows how to play daddy off against mama ought to be able to understand a Russian. It is as childish as that—but it always works because papa loves Baby Snooks.

Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and testimony of Thomas Stack at hearings on railroad-retirement bills:

My name is Thomas Stack. I reside at 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. I am president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., a chartered organization under the laws of the State of Illinois, as a nonprofit educational group comprised of union and nonunion employees subject to the Railroad Retirement Act. We are the largest pension group in the country, with membership on 312 railroads and affiliated bureaus; 90 percent of our organization being members of the various crafts of the brotherhood.

I will try to cite the need for congressional action to remedy an act known as the Railroad Retirement Act that has become obsolete under present economic conditions; it has completely broken down. When the act was created in 1936 to become effective January 1, 1937, it was strictly a retirement system that was looked upon with pride by workers on the railroad, as it promised them security in old age. The tax rate was only 2¾ percent on payrolls up to $300 per month. This tax rate has now increased to 6 percent, and under the present planning will reach 6¼ percent of the payrolls up to $300 per month next January. This is matched by a similar amount by the carriers, so that there is paid for the account of each employee 12 percent monthly by payroll deductions to a system from which they will receive little or no benefits. Those who reach the age of 65 years, which is at present the retirement age, will not and cannot afford to retire on the meager pension they would receive, which would not suffice to give them subsistence during their declining years when medical care and sufferings attributed to age cause an added burden and strain on their financial conditions.

Recently the retirement board concluded their 1950 annual survey and attempted to show with charts and figures that the retirement system was still a success—giving the helping hand to a large segment of our population.

The average annuity or pension received today by the railroad employee is $83.38 per month, with less than 1 percent of the employees receiving the present maximum of $144 per month.

Now let us take a look at the survivor benefits carried under the same report. There are 72,700 aged widows who average $29.53 per month; there are 18,500 widowed mothers who average $27.41 per month; 44,900 children of deceased employees who average $16.93 per month; and 1,100 parents of deceased employees who average $16.53 per month. Are these figures anything to brag about when we have a 50-cent buying power on the present dollar?

In 1938, 1 year after the act went into effect, there were 38,000 employees over the age of 65 years who still continued to work; in 1950 we have 38,800 employees—or an increase of over 50,000—who are over the retirement age and still cannot afford to retire under present meager pensions they would receive, and if you will refer to page 14 of the said report you will find that 843 annuitants returned to work on the railroads as they could not meet their obligations on the small annuity they received. You gentlemen are familiar with the increased cost of living, but let me cite for the record a report from the United States Bureau of Labor statistics regarding the increase in cost of necessities of life between 1937 and November 15, 1950—released on January 12, 1951:

	1937	Nov. 15, 1950	Percent increase
Food	105.3	209.5	99.0
Wearing apparel	102.8	195.0	89.7
Fuel, electricity, and refrigeration	100.2	143.7	43.5
House furnishings	104.3	202.3	94.0
Miscellaneous	101.0	190.5	88.9

Those figures show an increase in living costs of at least 71 percent between 1937, when our act was formulated, and November 15, 1950.

Now, the retirement board always advise that they work on actuarial basis to protect the solvency of the fund. When the act originated it was based on a $3,500,000,000 payroll, which was the maximum payroll in 1937, and it was on this payroll that future obligations were figured. Last year the payrolls on the railroads were $5,030,000,000, and with the increase in salaries early in 1951 the payroll may reach $6,000,000,000 in 1951, so not alone has the tax which averaged 3 percent on the employee and 3 percent on the railroad during the first 10 years of operation doubled at the present time, but the payrolls of the railroads also have doubled which is prima facie evidence that the money or revenue taken in by the retirement board has also materially increased without additional obligation other than the 20-percent increase in pensions given to our employees under the Eightieth Congress, which was the first pension adjustment ever made under the system.

The retirement board still points out that they took on some 48,555 pensioners who paid nothing into the fund and gave them a pension. The average age of these men when taken over from the corporate payrolls was 74 years. There are some 6,900 still living with an average age of 86, but death is rapidly taking its toll and some 2,000 are dying each year, which satisfies the retirement board with the obligation they assumed; there is no longer a drain on the fund.

The railroad employee justly feels that he is either paying too much for what he receives, or is not getting sufficient benefits for what he pays. This Congress must do one of two things—either increase benefits and streamline the act to be useful and operated in the interest of those who pay the freight, or materially reduce the cost more appropriately with the small benefits derived from its operation.

In my capacity I have my hand at all times on the pulse of the rail worker. I have spent some 38 years with the industry myself. I receive thousands of letters on this subject of retirement from every State in the Union and possibly every railroad center of the country. My interests are not selfish and I do not recommend an exhorbitant increase for the widows or survivors when I know that the employee pays the bill and should receive first consideration. The retired worker should be our first consideration.

Two Great Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial entitled "Two Great Leaders," which was published in the Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown, Pa., on Monday, April 30, 1951:

TWO GREAT LEADERS

Last week, in London, Winston Churchill said:

"We meet in a grave hour for our country. I cannot recall any period in my long life when mismanagement and incompetence have brought us into greater danger."

That statement was made by the man who took over the direction of Britain's affairs at the time of the Dunkerque evacuation, when Britain's fortunes were at their lowest ebb in the long history of that country. Now Churchill implies that even greater dangers may confront the British people.

"At home," said Churchill, "prices and taxes go up and up, abroad the influence of Britain goes down and down. In every quarter of the world we are regarded by our friends with anxiety, with wonder and pity; and by our enemies, including some of those countries we have helped most in the past like Egypt and Persia, we are regarded or treated with hostility or even contempt.

"Not one of them is so weak they cannot spare a quip or even a taunt for Britain. It is hard to believe that we are the same Nation that emerged from the great war respected and admired throughout the grand alliance for all that part we played, for a long time alone, in the defense of the cause of freedom."

We can well understand Churchill's complaint, for to a great degree it echoes our own. Less than 6 years ago the United States was the most powerful and respected nation in the world. Now it is daily insulted by the Soviet Union, which it saved from disaster in the world war; nations, like India, demand gratuities from us as the price of toleration, but trade respectfully with Red China and Red Russia; Europe declines to move in its own defense unless we provide the arms and many of the men; and in Korea we are hard pressed to turn back the assault of a country with incomparably fewer resources—aside from manpower—than our own.

What has brought this about in so few years? Our productive power is even greater than it was at the end of World War II. The courage of our citizenry is surely no less. Our ingenuity in every field has not deteriorated. We possess a preponderance in the most destructive weapon the mind of

man ever conceived. The moral justification of the war we are fighting in Korea has been attested by half a hundred nations. Yet we have somehow lost the respect of the world.

It is full time for those who speak for America to speak firmly, as our Government should. They have been so bewitched by the plausible word "peace" that they neglect other words like dignity and courage and self-respect. There will be no peace in the world, we think, until those in charge of our affairs understand that peace cannot be bought by Marshall plans and point 4 programs and weak yielding to the bluster of the Kremlin tyrants.

That is the message MacArthur has brought to America. And the response show: conclusively that it is the message the United States has been waiting to hear. MacArthur and Churchill reflect the ancient traditions of their respective countries, and speak to the deepest feelings of their people. It would be well for the governments of both lands to listen attentively.

President Mistaken Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of April 28, 1951, one of the largest papers published in Michigan.

It is evident that the President is completely in error and uninformed. Although the mistake is small, it further shakes the confidence and faith of the people in the President. The editorial mentioned above follows:

WHITE HOUSE INTELLECTUAL

President Truman's press agents have created a role of scholar and historian for him. This provides no end of fun for the country's professors of history and others who know better.

They are aware that no man, much less Harry Truman, can have such a letter-perfect familiarity with the manifold subjects on which he has latterly taken to holding forth. His performance, which has been impressive of the more google-eyed among Presidential biographers, obviously calls for a concentrated, specific briefing just before he erupts a new load of false erudition.

But whoever looks up the President's material ought to be a little more legible when writing out the notes. Still likening his misadventures with those of Presidents of the past, Mr. Truman told reporters they should read Lincoln Fires a General. The only book anyone can discover with a title something like that is Lincoln Finds a General.

From that he passed to the squabble between President Polk and Gen. Winfield Scott. Here his intellectual ghost didn't read far enough when picking material with which Mr. Truman could dazzle reporters. The whole text makes Scott out a man who had done a large work and merited large treatment. Whereas in dealing with the Polk administration, which Mr. Truman apparently was pointing to as paralleling his, the book says "there was nothing large about the administration * * * the confines of mediocrity hemmed it in."

It is contemptibly cheap pretending to be a profound scholar and lecturing to others as an authority. What the gag is we do not know but it makes the President increasingly ridiculous.

CARE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus of March 27, 1951:

CARE

Any American who ever received a letter of thanks from a recipient of a CARE package in Europe will understand something of the meaning of this splendid nonprofit organization which has completed more than 5 years of service. Ten Million Ambassadors is the title of a new booklet about CARE; that's the number of CARE packages sent abroad in the 5 years.

During the years following 1945 when the World War ended CARE brought food, clothing, books and other supplies to millions in Europe who not only suffered extreme privations but lacked hope and morale so essential in rebuilding broken economies. A major force behind this voluntary good will movement was that people's minds and spirits in war-shattered areas had to be revived and given new life. They very thought that someone cared, someone across the ocean, did as much for the recipients as the food and clothing. Letters received from countless families breathed that message of thankfulness that someone did care.

While the economic situation in many European areas is notably better in 1951 than in 1945, there is a wide field in which CARE and other voluntary assistance groups can and must continue to function. As Director French, of CARE, writes there are still millions of "homeless, hungry, and bitter children all over the world" and "millions of sick and despairing men and women who need our help." CARE is only a drop in the proverbial bucket in meeting the need in areas where most of the population goes from the cradle to the grave without knowing the experience of a full stomach, but it is a factor and an important factor in holding back the flood of hunger and despair.

It is and has been entirely voluntary. People who send their money to CARE do so out of the fullness of their hearts, because they have compassion on their fellow man. Their gifts are gestures of good will which register among people of any race, color, or creed.

Rhode Island Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, May 4 is a great day in the history of Rhode Island.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago today Rhode Island took a bold and very courageous step when it adopted its declaration of independence of England.

Under leave already granted me by the House, I include as a part of my remarks two articles on Rhode Island Independence Day which were written by members of my staff. They follow:

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Naneen M. Wendler)

This year marks the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the independence of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. On this day, May 4, all Rhode Islanders within the State and those throughout the country will join publicly or within their hearts to realize once again the full significance of Rhode Island Independence Day in this year, 1951.

We invite all of our friends to unite with us in voicing anew our esteem of those forefathers who valiantly brought into existence the Rhode Island declaration of independence.

We of Rhode Island are proud to observe our State's independence 2 months ahead of the date of our Nation's adoption of self-government, on July 4, because we can enjoy a twofold opportunity to promulgate our respect to the leaders of the American Revolution and to Roger Williams, our own champion of religious liberty and the true democratic government.

While in Massachusetts, Roger Williams' profound thinking and his determination to establish and fulfill his principle of separation of the church and State brought threats of his deportation to England and he fled to the nearby shores of Rhode Island, founding Providence, the capital city of our State, and becoming the first settler of Rhode Island.

Roger Williams is a man to remember among many men who fought against immense odds for their freedom and ours, and imbued their descendants with an intense regard for those achieved privileges that have kept us strong and enduring against many enemies.

This earnest man's resolute spirit and his love for his fellowman, English or Indian, had a pronounced effect on his contemporaries. These men sought to establish in Rhode Island a colony based upon civil and religious liberties, a doctrine foreign to the laws integrated in the charters of other colonies under English rule.

One of the heroic patriots of that era was Jonathan Arnold who, as the author of the Rhode Island declaration of independence, is worthy of our admiration as one who served zealously in the cause of freedom of thought in politics. Jonathan Arnold distinguished himself as a great statesman in the general assembly of the colony of Rhode Island. An eminent descendant of Arnold, now a United States Senator from Rhode Island, is the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, a great-great-grandson, to whom Rhode Island is very much indebted.

After various intercolonial wars and conflicts with royal authority, the decisive step came on May 4, 1776. On that historic day the people of Rhode Island through their general assembly, and in opposition to the majority of the Thirteen Colonies, adopted this formal resolution renouncing allegiance to the British crown.

The general assembly by adopting the Rhode Island declaration of independence truly represented the people of that great State. This step was but the beginning of what has proven to be a government free from the control of others assuring the protection, safety, and happiness of the people.

Thus our people from the very first stage of the State's existence believed in representative government and in the exemplification of faith in the common man.

The wishes of the people of this colony for self-expression and self-control far exceeded the one concession—protection of religious beliefs—granted them in 1663 by King Charles of England. This royal charter, however, proved a primary victory for the colony and is the oldest constitutional charter in existence.

The Rhode Island declaration of independence was accepted by the Continental Congress 2 months after its inception as a model for our National Declaration of Independence.

The same qualities of courage and perseverance that have upheld the tenets of both of these illustrious documents are synonymous with the fortitude displayed today by the people of this Nation in the present crisis and will remain enduring for whatever other crises we may meet.

Rhode Island's generation of today is fully aware of the magnificent traditions that continue as valuable inspirations to us and we are especially honored each year to invite one and all to join us in our annual declaration in memoriam.

Let us keep in mind the impressive words contained in article I of the Constitution of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations:

"In order effectually to secure the religious and political freedom established by our venerated ancestors, and to preserve the same for our posterity, we do declare that the essential and unquestionable rights and principles hereinafter mentioned shall be established, maintained, and preserved, and shall be of paramount obligation in all legislative, judicial, and executive proceedings.

"SECTION 1. In the words of the Father of his Country, we declare that 'the basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and alter their constitutions of government; but that the constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all.'"

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Edward W. Heroux)

On the 4th of May 1776 the Rhode Island Assembly was truly the representative of the people, and the members of the legislature that adopted the resolution renouncing allegiance to the British King proved themselves faithful followers of Roger Williams. Like him, they were not afraid to take the initiative in leading the way to freedom.

Since that time Rhode Island has grown and progressed in historic achievements, in wealth, and in people. Though the State is small in area, its people are most hospitable.

Roger Williams was a believer in democratic government and rule by the people. He beckoned the spirit of freedom of thought in all things, religious and civil, and out of his ideas there developed a proud sovereign State. The stern puritanic spirit of New England never penetrated the State of Rhode Island. Rather, the dominating spirit is one of congeniality and resourcefulness. The beliefs and hopes of Roger Williams that "no person shall be in any way molested for any difference in matters of religion and every person may have and enjoy his own judgment and conveniences in matters of personal concernments" are still alive in our hearts.

Rhode Island still maintains the original principles of its founder, Roger Williams, in faith, in freedom of speech, in religious liberties, and in a democratic form of government.

In all the educational institutions of our country today there are evidences of the principles and rules that Roger Williams entertained and introduced to his followers.

American boys this very day are giving their lives to preserve the freedom and liberty that fills the heart of every American.

Ten Million Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ten Million Ambassadors," which appeared recently in the New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier.

The editorial calls attention to the great variety of assistance CARE has sent to Europe during the past 5 years and the significance of these gifts as ambassadors of good will:

TEN MILLION AMBASSADORS

Not many of us, probably, could say if asked that CARE stands for Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., but in the past 5 years the American people have sent 10,000,000 CARE packages to relieve suffering in all parts of the world. These gifts, we may be sure, have been eloquent ambassadors of good will. The CARE organization has signalized the fifth birthday by issuing an illustrated report.

General MacArthur says: "All the world knows the work of CARE in Europe where millions of life-giving packages have been distributed since the end of the war. The work of CARE in Japan, and now in the Philippines and Korea, may not be as well known in America, but this work, too, is a matter of gravest import if we are to continue to live in a free and democratic world. I highly recommend the work of CARE and urge its continued support by all Americans."

After World War I, Herbert Hoover's relief service had operated a type of package service to individuals abroad. CARE was born on November 27, 1945, as the child of 21 American organizations working in foreign relief after World War II.

CARE packages have contained not only food and clothing, but a great variety of other supplies, according to the most acute needs at various times and places. As a special measure to save the children of Europe, three new CARE packages—infant food, baby food and baby layettes—were early introductions and single-content packages of flour and lard were set up. Knitting wool, household linen, milk powder, textiles, seeds and many other necessaries followed. To help food production in the East, even plows and hand tools were sent. A Princess Elizabeth wedding gift campaign brought $30,000 in CARE packages distributed to needy widows in Britain. In recent years, CARE in cooperation with UNESCO has provided more than a million dollars worth of books and scientific equipment to more than 400 universities, medical schools, libraries and other institutions in 25 countries. These institutions are training doctors, engineers, farmers and others to help their own people.

Have we crossed the divide and is CARE no longer needed? The executive director reminds us that peace is not yet here. "There are still homeless, hungry and bitter children all over the world. There are still millions of sick and despairing men and women who need our help.

As President Truman has said, "The bridge which you, with the support of the American people, have forged across the two oceans needs to be maintained not only for the purpose of succoring human life but also for interpreting the American role in the world community."

A Couple of Questions for the Probers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial entitled "A Couple of Questions for the Probers," which was published in the Johnstown Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., on Wednesday, May 2, 1951:

A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS FOR THE PROBERS

Senate committee hearings on United States foreign policy—with special emphasis on the Far East—get going tomorrow with Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the first witness.

Unless General MacArthur specifically requests it, Thursday's session will be closed. Subsequent hearings, at which members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other Government officials will testify, likewise will be conducted behind closed doors.

That is just as well. If the members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, sitting jointly, are to learn anything significant, it would seem to be obvious that precautions must be taken to avoid spilling all our secrets to the Commies.

The public, obviously, has a big stake in what goes on behind those closed doors. But the public has a bigger stake in the tragic consequences of the wholesale disclosure of military and diplomatic secrets—because they vitally affect the security not only of our fighting men, but of the Nation as a whole.

In an attempt to balance these considerations, a plan has been worked out whereby a transcript of the proceedings will be released to the press at the close of each session. That transcript will have been combed for information which properly must remain classified.

We sincerely hope that neither political party will regard these hearings in any narrow, partisan sense. These are matters which rise above political considerations. As we go into this inquiry, we should regard ourselves as Americans first and as Democrats and Republicans second.

We hope, however, that the necessary precaution of censorship will not be used as the vehicle for a white-wash or a cover-up, designed to protect either side. Both parties are represented on the investigating committees. Each must regard itself, in a sense, as the watchdog of the public interest.

It would be a mistake, moreover, to funnel this inquiry into the narrow confines of a MacArthur against Truman-Acheson valley. Personalities are the least important of the many vital problems that must be gone into.

In this connection, David Lawrence, editor of the United States News and World Report, has drawn up a number of challenging questions for which answers conscientiously ought to be sought.

"Let us have all the truth about the Attlee-Truman conference," suggests Mr. Lawrence, writing in the current issue of his magazine. He continues:

"Why did our President agree to allow Great Britain to continue to give aid and comfort to Red China?

"What kind of an alliance have we with Great Britain which permits her to ship war supplies to Red China while American boys are being killed with those munitions of war by the Red Chinese? [EDITOR'S NOTE: It was disclosed this week in the British House of Commons that Great Britain had exported goods worth more than $3,500,000 to Communist China during the past 3 months. The

president of the British Board of Trade said there is 'no generally accepted definition of strategic materials,' but among the exports listed were such items as iron and steel manufacturers, vehicles (including locomotives, ships, and aircraft), electrical goods and apparatus, and chemicals, drugs, dyes, and colors.]

"What kind of support has India or the Arab countries given to the recent U. N. resolution that brands Red China as an aggressor?

"What has British diplomacy been doing to frustrate United States policies in the Far East?

"Is the dismissal of MacArthur at the behest of foreign governments an evidence that membership in the U. N. means submission by the United States to the dictation of other governments without so much as a formal vote in the U. N. to put each nation on record?

"What U. N. policies * * * did General MacArthur fail to support? When and where were those policies adopted? Can we find anywhere in the public record a statement of those policies of the U. N.? And, if done in secret, by what authority has the President of the United States made such agreements with foreign governments without submitting them to Congress?

"Why has the U. N. become a hotbed of collective treason to its own resolutions? Great Britain, by continuing her recognition of the Government of Red China, has made a scrap of paper of the resolution of the U. N. which branded Red China as an aggressor. Why does Great Britain continually propose that the aggressor be rewarded with a seat in the U. N.?

"Why did the United Nations call upon its members to supply troops to aid Korea and yet refuse to accept the troops of the Nationalist Government of China which has a seat in the U. N. and is a lawful member of that organization? Is that U. N. policy?

"Why do Great Britain, India, and other U. N. members disassociate themselves from our President's order of last June to the United States Navy to defend Formosa?

"Why, when our Government now sends a military mission to Formosa to train troops of the Nationalist Government for defense of the island, is there no U. N. support for that move or any proposal from America that our U. N. allies join in that mission? What kind of a U. N. policy is this?"

These additional questions come to mind:

"Did the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff ever agree with General MacArthur in his recommendations for the military conduct of the campaign in Korea? If so, when did the Joint Chiefs of Staff shift its ground? What considerations prompted the change of view?

Does Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg still believe, as he wrote in the Saturday Evening Post last February, that "isolating the battlefield from reinforcements is the prime function of tactical air, and I am simply stating the military fact that air power was rendered practically inoperative when the U. N., in an effort to avoid a diplomatic rupture with the Chinese Communists, halted offensive action at the Yalu River. * * *"?

What is the record of protests—through official channels—from General MacArthur to the American State Department's abandonment of Chiang Kai-shek while the Generalissimo still was fighting the Communists on the mainland of China?

What is the record of the United States State Department's moves which would have strengthened Russia's hand in Japan during the period General MacArthur so successfully administered the affairs of that enemy land? In the light of what has happened in China since then, is it logical to conclude that the situation in Japan might have been tipped against us, as it was in China, had not General MacArthur largely nullified State Department policy by virtually ignoring Russian demands for an important voice in administration of the islands?

Despite General MacArthur's admitted success in his role of United States proconsul in Japan, why was he removed from that post (which easily could have been divorced from his Korean duties) at the very time arrangements were being pressed for a peace treaty with Japan?

The Pentagon has announced that the President, in relieving General MacArthur, acted on the unanimous recommendations of his civilian and military advisers—including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Was this unanimous consent the result of a formal meeting, or did the White House call the President's advisers one by one and ask, "You think General MacArthur ought to be fired, don't you?"

The summary dismissal of General MacArthur—without precedent in military history for one who had served so long and so faithfully—deprived him of the right to take formal leave of his troops, or to address a message to the Japanese people. Was this method of dismissal also approved by the President's civilian and military advisers—including the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

What circumstances surrounded the declassification of the top-secret report of the Wake Island meeting between President Truman and General MacArthur? By whose authority was the document released to the New York Times? In that report General MacArthur is said to have assured the President that the Chinese Communists would not enter the war. Did not Secretary of State Acheson express a similar view only a few weeks previously? What did State Department intelligence reports indicate concerning the possibility of Chinese Red intervention?

Was Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, asked by the White House to make his Chicago address a day or two before General MacArthur arrived to speak before Congress? Was that Bradley speech cleared by the State and Defense Departments?

What is the whole story of the report of Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, who recommended 5 years ago that we give Chiang military aid and direction—a policy that now, belatedly, is being followed on Formosa? Why did the administration ignore General Wedemeyer's warning that Korea was threatened with Communist invasion?

On January 5, 1950, President Truman said in an official statement: "The United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa." What has led to the change in the administration's policy?

On January 12, 1950, Secretary Acheson said, in a speech at the National Press Club: "[The United States] defense perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus * * * from the Ryukyus to the Philippine Islands. So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack." This line of defense did not include Korea. What is the Joint Chiefs of Staff's judgment as to the probability of this Acheson statement having encouraged Communist aggression against Korea?

In June 1949, at a congressional hearing, the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were asked individually whether the Chiefs of Staff advise the "withdrawal of troops from Korea at this time." Each answered affirmatively. Thirteen months later, when President Truman ordered United States troops back into Korea, were the Joint Chiefs of Staff consulted prior to the move? If so, what was their recommendation? If they urged a return to Korea, how do they justify that position with their earlier recommendation that we get out?

On March 20, 1947, Secretary Acheson testified at a congressional hearing: "The Chinese [Nationalist] Government * * * is not approaching collapse. It is not threatened by defeat by the Communists. The war with the Communists is going on much as it has for the last 20 years." How was it possible that our State Department could have been so ill-informed? How does Secretary of State Acheson account for his own overconfidence of the Nationalists' military might in light of his later insistence that Chiang's collapse was inevitable, and that United States policy must be to seek to force a coalition of Chiang's forces with those of the Chinese Communists?

What is the full story of General Marshall's mission to China? Is it true that he originally agreed with a Military Establishment recommendation that we should aid Chiang with arms, and that he later ditched this assessment of the situation and swung around to support the State Department's view that Chiang should take the Communists into his government?

Has the full story of Yalta, Tehran, Cairo, and Potsdam been told? Are there any secret agreements which have not yet been made public?

Have we made any secret commitments not to use the atom bomb or atomic shells or projectiles without prior approval from the United Nations or the military missions of nations with troops in Korea?

How far are the Joint Chiefs of Staff permitted to press, in foreign policy conferences at the White House level, the military realities involved in politico-military decisions? At what point are they forced to surrender to the view of the diplomatic branch?

Would it not be wise to have United States Marine Corps represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

What assurances have the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they will not be subjected to reprisals if they tell the investigating committee the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Is it possible that the example set in the ouster of Admiral Denfeld might not serve to seal the lips of the military men?

How can Secretary Acheson account for the fact that virtually every move we have made in the Far East in the last 5 years has resulted in a strengthening of the Communist cause? Is Secretary Acheson completely satisfied that some of our fatal steps have not been engineered by pro-Communists within the Department? There was one Alger Hiss, against whom Mr. Acheson refused to turn his back. Would Mr. Acheson care to state categorically that there are not others?

Out of Our Abundance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, all too often we hear the hackneyed phrase "What can I do?" as an excuse for doing little or nothing. All too seldom we hear the phrase, "Well done, thy good and faithful servant," which stands at the opposite pole. I should like to call to the attention of the Members a procedure which dissolves this paradox, and commits the heart to its charge of doing good. We are all aware of the simple letters "CARE" which shall be writ large in the annals of man when we all have gone to our last reward. We are all aware of the great humanitarian uplift of civilization involved in the 21 different organizations which have done so much in the name of Christian charity. Below is an editorial accounting of this organization and the inestimable contribution which it has made to the alleviation of the ills of man and his suffering. I add my "well done" to CARE and to the many peoples who originated this Christian idea and brought it to function. I commend the Daily Sentinel, of Grand Junction, Colo., for bringing it so concisely to the fore, and recommend it to all as proof of living our religious heritage which has had so much to do with the progress we have made in this world.

The editorial from the Daily Sentinel of April 15, 1951, follows:

OUT OF OUR ABUNDANCE

Ever since World War II came to an end, in fact before its close, Americans have been contributing to different organizations dedicated to the relief of misery in war-torn nations. One of the most well-known of these organized Good-Samaritan groups has become familiar to Americans under the name of CARE (representing 21 different organizations working for relief).

Because so many of us have been contributors to it we believe our readers will be interested in some portions of a CARE report recently released. Herein we find that our dollars have helped send 10,000,000 packages abroad—ten million ambassadors of good will, they may rightly be called. Through this package service Americans have shipped the meat equivalent of 26,000 head of cattle, 100,000 pigs, 230,000 canned whole turkeys and 230,000 plum puddings; 32,000,000 cups of sugar; flour for 33,000,000 loaves of bread; 23,000,000 pounds of butter, margarine, lard and cooking oil; coffee enough for 360,000,000 cups; 45,000,000 cups of tea and equal number of cups of cocoa; 56,000,000 quarts of milk; 26,000,000 bowls of rice; 1,680,000 cans of baby food and chocolate equaling 220,000,000 candy bars.

To this almost fabulous list of food supplies may be added great amounts of soap, blankets, shoe soles, towels, buttons, coal, plows, tools, books, nursing bottles and medical supplies. On the clothing side, we note that 426 miles (not yards) of woolen cloth, and 204,000 sweaters, scarves and pairs of socks have gone to warm the cold in many nations around the world.

Tragically, the need for such services as CARE has been rendering does not lessen. Each year since its organization more countries have been added to its lists, until now boxes with the welcome word CARE on their sides go to every continent. Korea is the latest war-victim beneficiary—but we fear it will not be the last.

Americans have a right to be proud of their postwar record of giving to the foreign needy. They would, on the other hand, have cause for deepest shame had they not shared their abundance with all these unfortunates. And the extent of the abundance with which our land is blessed may be realized from the fact that in all this giving we have actually deprived ourselves of nothing, but gained intangible rewards that cannot be measured.

Catholic Action Follows the Way of the Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the prize-winning oration for girls by Miss Nancy Jones, of the Academy of the Holy Cross, in the twentieth annual oratorial contest sponsored by the Catholic University Conference of Clerics and Religious held at the Catholic University gymnasium on April 15:

CATHOLIC ACTION FOLLOWS THE WAY OF THE CROSS

(By Miss Nancy Jones)

Scientific progress, outward evidence of social advancement, and the calendar mark the year 1951. Yes, centuries of time have altered the material scene, but time can never affect the spiritual. It is the atomic age, an era of jet-propelled speed reflected in the minds and bodies of men. The physical and mental make-up of the man of 1951 would be an improvement over that of Neolithic man, but the spiritual capacity is still the same—its purpose is still to know and love God. The accelerated pace of the twentieth century, perhaps, attempts to omit that part of man's construction which cannot be improved by experiment. Only a privileged few have the power to realize that the most important part of man—the soul—is immortal—it has always been—it will always be. It is the task of this privileged group to find the key to slowing down those absorbed in the atomic age for a picture of what they are missing. Finding this key is a continual search and it takes the spiritual scientist centuries back into history. The hope of this age lies in the kingdom of Jerusalem in the eyes of a carpenter from Nazareth. His life story offers abundant examples to those who desire lessons in Catholic action. His life is a tragedy that can never be equaled, but it is a tragedy that ends in a glorious triumph of Easter. His way—the way of the Cross—is the only way for those who would change the world!

It begins in a garden and the agony is at first not from physical pain, but from mental torture—it is the ever haunting suggestion of the "easy way out." It is a familiar story to you when faced with obstacles, ridicule, suffering. "Let this chalice pass from me."

You find it hard to face failure—you find it hard to forego a passion—you find it hard to accept humiliation. Is your answer one of hatred, bitterness, or despair, or is your answer as His was—"Not My will, but Thine be done"—accompanied by a ready acceptance of whatever the Father sees fit to send?

The poor, lacerated, thorn-crowned Christ looks with pleading, tear-dimmed eyes over the whole world. Are you he who condemns Him? Is it your denial of legitimate authority that crushes His as you seek to gain control of power, satisfaction of selfish whims, or the admiration of a fickle populace?

Or are you another Simon of Cyrene whose shoulder helps to bear the weight of the Cross? Is it your strength that lessens the ponderous weight of sin? Catholic action speaks louder than words. Your individual movements to give a hand to that which is all good can effect a united effort in your home, in your school, and your community.

In your home by the cheerful acceptance of tasks, by the avoidance of arguments, by contributing your share of all that makes for the happiness of every member, by encouraging family prayer, and family participation in the sacraments.

In your school are you another Simon by encouraging faithful observance of rules, by earnest and concentrated study, by participation and wholehearted support of every project, by helping those less gifted intellectual and social pursuits?

And in your community do you lead others by word and example to a fuller share of the mystical body of Christ by advancing parish activity, by strictly abiding by community laws?

As you follow Christ on His way to Calvary, your good example may attract a number of the on-looking crowd to the eternal riches of Catholicism.

Jesus falls—one, twice, thrice, and yet He rejects the warmth of the earth, slowly and deliberately returning to His feet. Is your battle of the spiritual over the material so perseveringly fought—the struggle against the warmth of earthly possessions? Can you rise as determinately above the intolerance of race and creed; can you place your feet in the bloodstained steps of the Divine Leader and put away the allurements of the world to accept the wood of the Cross that leads to eternal salvation?

Jesus encounters the minority of the passionate mob who believe. Again always ready to meet those who ask His help, He stops to comfort the weeping women. He who has been dragged through the very depths of humiliation and anguish; He who bears the crucifying weight of our sins, stops to think of others. "Weep not for Me, but for yourselves and for your children."

Perhaps you are having a hard time, perhaps everyone is against you, perhaps your allowance or income is small—so long as there is anyone in need, you have a divine responsibility to care for him, to pray for him, to comfort him, to contribute to his relief, directly or indirectly. The lay apostle must put the interests of God before those of his most earnest desires.

Or are you one of the jeering throng? Spineless, weak, unable to say "no" to the taunts of many? Your singular "no" echoing in the hearts of those attracted to good could initiate a positive stand against the jeers and outrages of communism. Your Catholic action could be and should be a shield against the words that drive the nails into the hands of the Saviour. Your "no" could be the Catholic's ringing answer to the iron curtain.

Patience, humility, fortitude, love—the very essence of these as He hangs from the cross. His arms outstretched to encircle and forgive. All powerful, omniscient, and yet He perseveres in the complete injustice of it. He died that you might live. Each one of us must die to himself that Christ might live and war beautiful in the lives of others. Catholic action is in your hands, the responsibility is yours to accept as did the good thief; singular among many. The good thief found the truth. He was shown it by Him who is the way, the truth, the life. He found it because he stood alone. Can you stand alone in the face of immodest dress, drinking, and sinful conversation? Can you by the purity of your life influence others to recognize the true Christ and claim a remembrance in Paradise?

The road to Calvary is long—it is the span of a lifetime—your lifetime. It is a road that has been traveled down through the years, every minute, every second by those

who have pledged themselves to take up Christ's work and to win all to His standards.

In the very first years of Boys Town, one evening Father Flanagan stood watching the setting autumn sun radiate the sky, and as he did so, he saw a sturdy young lad carrying a crippled boy in his arms. "Isn't he heavy, son?" he called. "He ain't heavy, Father, he's my brother."

This story, I think, is the twentieth century's reality of the cross. It is inspiration for all of us—individuals, families, communities, and nations. You as Simon must look to all as your brother and in reaching out a helping hand, lift the burden of your fellow men regardless of creed, color, or social standing. The way of the cross—your way—is the way of Catholic action.

Pennsylvania Federation of Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 28, 1951, the southwest regional conference of the Pennsylvania Federation of Young Republicans was held at Johnstown, Pa. This conference was attended by over 300 delegates, representing a 22-county area of southwestern Pennsylvania. These young people, the leaders of the future, heard an inspiring address by the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Representative in Congress from the Second District of Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of his address:

My fellow Americans, it is a particular pleasure for me to be with you here in Johnstown tonight. The honor of being able to share in this Southwest regional conference of Pennsylvania Young Republicans is one which I deeply appreciate.

As a former State chairman of the Connecticut Young Republicans, it is certainly inspiring for me to see you in action. I congratulate you for the effective way in which you maintain your organization, not just in the heat of the campaign, but in the long "between times" when the most valuable political work must be done.

I am especially happy to come to an area which is so well represented in the Congress of the United States. I can speak with both affection and pride of my Pennsylvania colleagues JIM VAN ZANDT, of the Altoona district; JOHN SAYLOR, of the Johnstown district; LOUIS GRAHAM, of the Beaver Falls, Butler County district; JIM FULTON, of the South Hills district; BOB CORBETT, of the North Borough district; HARMAR DENNY, of the East End Wilkinsburg district; CARROLL KEARNS, of the Erie-Sharon district; LEON GAVIN, of the Oil City district; ED SITTLER, of the Uniontown-Somerset district; and AL BUSH, of the Fifteenth Pennsylvania District.

Their splendid record as representatives of the people furnishes the opportunity for all of us to take a mead of pride in them as products of an active, hard-hitting, Young Republican organization.

Nor can I pass by the opportunity to say a word of the admiration which forward-looking Connecticut Republicans have, as have Republicans throughout the Nation, for your own vigorous, dauntless, and, above all, sound and sincere Senators ED MARTIN and JIM DUFF.

I come from a district where the election of a Congressman has been a nip-and-tuck proposition for most of the past 50 years. During the last 18 years only one Congressman from my district has ever been elected to succeed himself, and then only once, although three of us have been elected for two terms, but not consecutively.

You will appreciate, therefore, that my own campaign for reelection necessarily begins on the very day after I am first elected. There isn't any "me too" formula that works in the Second District of Connecticut. I must also add, that the people are too smart to go along with any blind and unreasoning opposition that is merely the outs against the ins.

I personally do not rely too much on political rallies, although, naturally, along with all political candidates, we have to take them in stride. I believe that as a party we must carry our Republican message more directly to the people.

During the past campaign, I called personally on thousands of men and women. I talked with them individually and in small groups.

I called upon housewives in their homes, and arranged for some of them to hold small informal meetings at which I talked in a conversational way, not a speech-making way, about their many problems. I learned, first-hand, of many of the things they were thinking about, of many of the things that were bothering them. Incidentally, each housewife received a Seely-Brown potholder as a reminder of our visit. I gave away 15,000 of these holders in person. Election night proved that my friends had taken heed of the slogan printed on each holder, "Make a note, remember to vote for SEELY-BROWN for Congress."

I am telling you these things about my own district, only because I am sure that you are greatly concerned about making the Republican Party the party of the majority of the people, and in making 1952 a Republican victory year. I believe my own experience as a candidate and as a Congressman may be of some help in this effort.

I am firmly convinced that, without the voting support of the women in my district, I would not have been elected. I believe that in every district, if we are going to elect a Republican Congress and a Republican President, we must convince the women that our Republican Party has the program and the candidates who are best qualified to give them that which they seek most from their Government—some assurance of peace and prosperity, and an aggressive regard for the lives and the livelihood of their families.

Right along this line, while we are talking about getting the voting support of the women, I would like to make an additional comment. I think we have been giving more lip service than sincere effort when it comes to admitting women to full partnership in the day-to-day activities of the Republican Party on every level. I fear we have been too backward about recognizing their qualifications and availability for many more positions in the party and in the Government than they are filling today. And I can say that, with no fear of being misunderstood, because my opponent last fall happended to be the only woman on the congressional ticket of any party in the last election in Connecticut.

Do you remember back to the election campaign of 1946? The Republican Party made a big mistake that time. Not about the slogan that summarized the thinking of so many thousands of people: "Have you had enough?" The votes on that election day told that most of the people believed that they had "had enough" of the Truman administration. So they elected a Republican Congress. Unfortunately, too many Republicans considered that election as a mandate to order a detour from the pathway of progress.

That attitude was a grievous mistake, a fatal error from the standpoint of the immediate fortunes of the Republican Party—worse, indeed, than the feeble and futile "me-too's" to which the people have so emphatically turned deaf ears in the last three presidential elections. So that when the 1948 election rolled around, the electorate did a little mental arithmetic saying nothing from nothing leaves—nothing—and returned Truman to office with a Democratic Congress. You ask—but why dwell on that?

We had better dwell on it. We had better give careful thought and make a careful analysis of the detailed returns of at least the last three elections. If we do, surely we can learn some things that will help us in the next one.

During my house-to-house campaign last fall—and I use the phrase literally—I found that the people without exception were sorely distressed about the way things were going in our Government. The war in Korea, into which we blundered, the threat of world war III, the inflation that always keeps rising prices several steps ahead of wage increases, the squandering of the billions that had been appropriated to provide the military preparedness that, when the need came, we didn't have—all these aroused the fury of the people, made them lose confidence in the Democratic administration; but at the same time, they had their doubts about the ability of the Republicans to do any better.

Well, for those who are in office, it is up to us to prove that the Republican Party does have the leadership and the program that will give to our Nation strength and unity and the opportunity to enjoy our freedom. I can say very truthfully that we have many good men and women on the Republican side, both in the Senate and in the House. We have powerful voices and able leaders outside of Congress. We need the help of all of them to make everyone in the party realize that the problems we must deal with are problems of 1951 not of 1898; that the war we must try to prevent is world war III, not the Spanish-American War. We've got to get rid of those whose great weakness is that for them the past has never stopped being the present.

So far as I am concerned, I consider my own best campaign procedure for election to the Eighty-third Congress, and the way in which I can serve my country and my party best, is to be just the best Congressman from the Second Connecticut District that I know how to be.

I don't consider that this means spending all of my time with my ear to the ground. Of course, I want to know at all times what the people of my district are thinking about. I want to know what's bothering them, what their problems are; and, if the last 2 weeks are any indication, I am certainly sure they'll continue to let me know, by letter and by telegram, and frequently by personal contact, how they feel about matters of current attention in the Government.

So that this won't be a one-way proposition, I propose to let them know, just as directly and as simply as I can, what I am doing in Washington, and why. For that purpose, we are publishing, from my office, the Seely-Brown Newsletter, which goes out every 4 or 5 weeks thus far, although soon it may be more frequently, to explain the

matters of current debate, or of administrative action; to report how I voted upon each item of legislation, and a detailed explanation as to why I voted as I did; and to furnish, in the same style that those syndicated columns do, short tidbits of news to give the inside story on some items of interest.

These days of the Eighty-second Congress have been exciting times in Washington. In spite of the clashes of tempers and of emotions, that have attracted so much attention the country over, it is my opinion that we are closer to national unity to meet the crisis we are in, than presently appears. We have lost a great statesman and a great Republican, in Senator Vandenberg, who, in his days of strength, was an instrument in proposing and trying to bring about, without very much cooperation from the White House and the State Department, I might add, a real nonpartisan foreign policy. I use the term "nonpartisan" advisedly. Too many, when you speak of a bipartisan foreign policy, think it has to mean saying "Yes" to a bad administration program, with the formulating of which they have had nothing to say. By nonpartisan, I mean the product of the best judgment of the best minds of those in both parties, in the interest of national unity and the best interests of our country. Our policy abroad, whether for Asia or Europe, must be nonpartisan in conception, direction, and implementation.

This is one of the most pressing needs in Washington today. We could learn something valuable from our British allies on this point. Churchill and Morrison, Tory and Laborite, may fight savagely in Commons on the muddy footprints of socialism as it affects the lives of every Britisher; but when it comes to foreign affairs, they speak in unison as Englishmen.

The $100-a-plate Democratic speakers sent out from Washington are calling the Republicans "the war party" now. They're evidently adopting the old strategy of the prize ring: A good attack is the best defense.

We must face the uncertainties of the future without bitterness and without rancor, as General MacArthur so well said in his historic address at the joint meeting of Congress. He summarized for the Congress and for the people of this Nation, the facts, most of which were well known, about the decision which we must make regarding the situation in Asia. The President makes the foreign policy, and he is responsible for the political situation; and he is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and thus is in full charge of the military situation, as has become painfully apparent, not only by the exercising of his authority by the removal of MacArthur, but also by his making a political stooge out of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley.

How, then, can the Republicans be "the war party," for going along with the recommendations of MacArthur, for steps to end the fighting in Korea with victory for the arms of the United Nations?

Need I remind you that the war started under a Democratic administration—as did World War I and World War II. But then it wasn't supposed to be a war, but only a police action; and perhaps that is why the President, as General MacArthur said in his speech to Congress, didn't consider it necessary to consult the supreme commander in the area affected, when military intervention to repel aggression was decided upon.

Except for the removal of our military strength in Southern Korea beginning in January 1950, the aggression of June 1950 couldn't have taken place, and no police action with 60,000 casualties would have been necessary.

Except for the mothballing of our aircraft carriers, and the practical dismantling of our Armed Forces under Secretary Louis Johnson's idea of economy, we could have stopped the aggression in Korea, before Red China could get into the picture. You will remember that another great commander was removed—Admiral Denfeld—because he told Congress he thought it was a mistake not to build the superaircraft carrier that Truman and Johnson had scrapped after the keel was laid. They broke Denfeld, but the carrier is being built now. We could have used it to good advantage, if we had it now.

They removed MacArthur, called him a warmonger, but it looks already as though at least two of the four steps that he recommended in Asia are about to be carried out—the strengthening of the Chinese Nationalists in Formosa and an economic blockade of Communist China. The Army is sending a military mission of 100 high-ranking officers to help the Chinese Nationalists, which may be just the beginning—and the British, so a dispatch from London says, are ready to needle the United Nations to invoke economic sanctions against Red China.

The point I would like to make, especially in the situation pertaining to war or peace which we face in the world today, is that no event—no act—stands by itself. Each is a part of a chain. Most of the troubles that we in the United States face today—the overhanging threat of world war III; the indecisiveness when thousands of lives are at stake—are part of a chain that began with bungling in high places in the administration in Washington.

In closing, let me say that our unfortunate policies of the past have brought us now to the brink of world-wide disaster. We are entering a long period in which we must subject ourselves to many restrictions which we as a people would not tolerate in more peaceful times.

All of us in every walk of life—in every profession or calling—must ask this question: "Am I going to lead in the scramble for the self-protection of my own special interest, or shall I stand up and dedicate my thinking, my action, and my prayers to the protection of my country?"

Stern policies lie ahead. As a legislator, it is my responsibility to insist that these policies be considered carefully in committee and the issues debated freely, fully, and without partisanship on the floor of the House.

Stern policies can be effective only if the public understands fully the reasons why these policies are needed. The people of our Republic have never been afraid of the truth.

The time is now. Our very survival is at stake.

I Want Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by a former Member of the House of Representatives and former Ambassador, the Honorable Herbert Pell:

I WANT PEACE

(By Herbert C. Pell)

(I know how easy it is for an ignorant politician to yell "Communist" when he is at a loss for an answer or desirous of covering himself with a smoke screen. That is why I write this personal note. I should be among the first to be destroyed by communism. I am nearly 70 and have never been in business. I have lived all my life on invested property as did my father and mother and my grandparents and most of my greatgrandparents before me. Economically I represent everything to which communism is hostile. I am one of the comparatively few Americans every one of whose ancestors became a citizen of the United States on July 4, 1776. I have always loved and enjoyed liberty. Since the day of my first effort in politics I have worked for personal freedom for all. I have lived in totalitarian countries and loath what I saw there. I know that a Communist government will inevitably degenerate into a totalitarian autocracy which is the opposite and the implacable enemy of everything I have enjoyed, of every material policy that has served me, of everything I have respected and of everything I have loved.)

I am for peace. I am for minding our own business. I am particularly opposed to a policy which boils down to an effort to impose American ideas and customs on other nations. This does not mean that we should not recognize the duties and responsibilities of our position.

We must properly understand the situation of the United States. This country is the leader of the free world which is a very different thing from being the free leader of the world. We are the first of a group of associates. We cannot act as the owner of slaves, as the paymaster of hirelings or as the dominator of satellites. The nations on our side are weaker and poorer than we are either because they are smaller or because they have suffered more, but they are not slaves, servants, or sycophants; they are free nations and can be led by their willing consent or not at all. We cannot treat them as tools to be broken in our interest. When we assume the burden of leadership, we assume at the same time a responsibility for the interest of those whom we lead. We cannot offend their conscience or sacrifice them for our own gain.

Are we to rush by ourselves all alone on a course of military adventure without the assistance, without even the sympathy of other nations which might have supported us in a less dashing policy. It is, of course, true that a leader must lead but another essential of leadership is to have followers. We cannot wisely ask the world to look to us for guidance if we obviously intend to consider no counsel but our own. The career of the Kaiser and of Hitler, as well as the example of Stalin should have taught us to consider the inevitable end of the largest and strongest lone wolf.

Intelligently we must recognize that the United States cannot be alone in the world. It cannot long remain prosperous in a company of ruined nations. So much is obvious. For a good many years to come, the core of individualist economy—if that economy is to survive at all—must be a prosperous United States. It is manifest that we cannot as a Nation continue as the leader and the bulwark of a civilization based on the assumption that peace is the normal condition of mankind if we persist in a policy of military adventure or turn ourselves into an armed camp.

If the United States is to be the first Nation of the future, if we are entering on the American century, let us hope—and do what we can to make it so—that the period of our leadership will be a period of peace, amity, and prosperity rather than a time of subordination for the world under the rule of a people themselves oppressed by the tools of their dominance.

Peace is not always easy to maintain: At the present moment its maintenance is and will be for sometime extremely difficult. As Governor Dewey once said, "We must wage peace."

Twice in our time we have seen that total war (and there is really no other kind possible) decides nothing, settles nothing, answers nothing, and leads to nothing. Winner and loser, both are vanquished. Is there a single nation on earth that got, by any imaginable system of accounting, a net gain out of either of the two wars we have lived through?

War is not a natural thing. It is the bankruptcy of leadership. It is the final and glaring proof that the governors of the world are not fit for their positions. Hatred of a foreign and unknown country is a drummed-up thing, and above all it is no essential part of patriotism, any more than hatred of your neighbors is an essential part of family love.

Peace is the only possible base for our civilization. It was built on peace and without peace it will die. War will ineluctably end the customs and the outlook and the way of life, the ideals and the national purposes which we inherited from our fathers to be held as a sacred trust for our children.

The inevitable result of war will be the complete destruction of everything that we value and the cutting of the taproots of democracy in the world. Manifestly with the effective end of prosperous democracy in the United States all freedom on earth must inevitably perish.

Can we afford to antagonize all other countries which normally would support us?

I have lived in totalitarian countries; I have seen independent nations lose their spiritual strength. I suggest an illustration which may at first appear unimportant. When I was a boy I traveled a great deal in Italy before the first war. I remember going to cafes in the summer, where the people sat around in groups up to a dozen at a table, all talking freely. I don't suppose 1 conversation in 20 had anything to do with politics. In 1938, I drove my son from Naples to Vintimiglia. The people still sat outside of cafes in summer, but they were at tables of two or three and their conversation was in whispers. Again, I believe that only a small proportion of these conversations were political, but the habit of fear controlled the minds of the people.

War will certainly destroy many forms of private property and of private investment and will practically annihilate all private business. From five to ten million at least of the best and most effective workers will be withdrawn from peaceful production. From fifteen to twenty more will be forced to devote their energies to the manufacture of articles of war. This will come pretty near to cutting our productive labor force in two. War priorities will reduce the manufacture of automobiles, houses, electric goods, roads, schools, hospitals, and everything else that we consume to the lowest possible level.

I have lived in countries where just this thing happened. I have gone through cities which I remembered as prosperous and active and found them like ghost towns with empty shops, hungry people, no traffic and above all, no hope and no liberty.

Another war with its crushing taxes will certainly mark the end of capitalism. Private capitalism depends on private investments and private investments depend on the willingness of people to forego present pleasures for future security and income. When my father forewent the expenditure of $100, he thought he was getting $5 a year for the rest of his life and $5 a year to be divided among his descendants for an indefinite time. Today the Government takes a great part of this return for income taxes and a lot of the capital in inheritance taxes. The result is that people will be less willing to save; less willing to give up present enjoyment for a much smaller ultimate gain. In the meanwhile factories must be erected; houses must be built; electricity and water supplied to new developing districts. Where is the money to come from? As these are necessities of life, it must obviously come from the State, which means socialism, and the administration of an increasing part of our economic structure by the Government.

It is quite certain that the Government will be obliged willy-nilly to do much more than this. It must direct the energies of the people into the canals which it will select. A man will not be able to build a hotdog stand or toy shop unless he can get materials allocated to him by the Government which practically means permission to go into the business, and he will not be allowed to do so, if the Government believes that a drug store or a fountain pen factory are more needed. With this extension of Government control of the economic lives of the community, there will inevitably come a system of censorship and the loss of all freedom of expression. We will be further and further from that idea of American liberty once expressed by an unknown cowboy, who said that he wanted to be able to look any man in the eye and tell him to go to hell.

Shortages inevitably mean rationing and rationing means Government control. But things will, and everybody knows it, go much further than that. With insufficiencies everywhere, the allocation of every short supply must be—or at least certainly will be—in the hands of the Government. Officials—wise or unwise—probably good men but not all-knowing, will have to decide what buildings shall be erected and what goods are to be produced. This is so obvious that no one can suggest any other policy. If there should be, as in the case of war there certainly will be, not enough steel to go around it would be obscenely indecent to allow one man to build himself a yacht merely because he could outbid the community.

There will be no field day for labor. There will be no overtime and no holidays taken at will when pockets get full, no shopping around for pleasant profitable or interesting jobs. Labor will be drafted in an all-out war and the workman will have no more freedom than the soldier. He will go where he is sent and do what he is told and get what the Government chooses to pay him and whatever that may be, it will not buy him very much.

All the improvements in labor conditions which I have seen coming in the last 50 years—many of which I fought for during the course of my career—will fall like trees in a hurricane. Strikes of laborers in factories will be as impossible as strikes of soldiers at the front. Anyone who is willing to think for 5 minutes must know all this and nobody thinking for a month can suggest anything else. I have seen this in other countries and I do not want to see it here.

Independent thought, independent expression will be crushed. The self-respect of free and thoughtful citizens will be destroyed by the continued knowledge that it is only at their own risk that they dare whisper any criticism of the elected officials of the Government. These would be the consequences of a great war.

Today, does any sane person believe that a conflict with Russia will mean anything but mutual destruction and ruin? Do we hope to overrun Russia as Germany was overrun and occupy it as Germany was occupied, and then build it again, as we are doing Germany and Japan into something very like what it was before? What do we plan to do with a victory?

It is manifest that a war with Russia will end in a collapse of common exhaustion. The representatives of a shattered Russia will meet the emissaries of a worn and exhausted United States and devise a means by which both can survive without continuing mutual slaughter and destruction. Is there any person in the world who imagines any other result possible?

Thirty years ago we tried to establish a democracy in Germany. The Germans are an educated and industrious people, accustomed to cooperation, but having had no experience in the workings of a democratic government, they were unable to maintain the structure of freedom and found themselves like the man in the Bible whose devil left him and returned with seven other spirits worse than himself. Are we going to make this same mistake again in dealing with Russia?

We are often told that we cannot negotiate with Russia. The Russian Government will not keep its word. Its guarantees and solemn promises mean little or nothing. Does any sane person believe that after wrecking the Russian Army, destroying the structure of the Russian Government, there will emerge from Russia a group of negotiators of greater integrity who will be more desirous of keeping their agreements and, what is equally important, will have the power to enforce them at home?

It would be absurd to imagine that such a negotiation would be an easy or routine affair.

Russia has experienced enormous changes in the last 30 years; it is certain that the course of change is not yet run. The centers of political power and economic interest are far from fixed. We cannot expect a treaty with the government of such a country to endure very long—the best that can be sensibly hoped is imperfect and temporary, but even a temporary calm will allow the billows raised by the earthquake of war to subside a little, and every bit of calm makes stronger the settlement and integralization which can be the foundation of something more solid.

Our negotiators will be in the position of Eliza crossing the river. Pursued by bloodhounds, she arrived at the Ohio. She jumped on a floating piece of ice which could give her no prolonged footing, but was at least solid enough to provide a place from which she could leap to a second and a third, hoping that a fourth would drift along and that eventually she would arrive on hard ground. The temporary security of a cake of ice, even though it only deferred ultimate disaster, kept open the possibility of at last reaching land. It was better than bloodhounds or cold water. She would of course have preferred to cross by a bridge or ferry boat, but no boat or bridge presenting itself, she took a poor chance rather than accept inevitable failure.

I am perfectly certain that our system—the American system which everybody knows and which no one can accurately define—is, of all social structures existing today, the one which is most capable of development; most able to maintain itself; and especially that it can with the fewest and least dangerous repercussions alter its course to meet the strains of changes in the social and economic balance. After all, it has lasted without fundamental alteration for a century and a half, which is more than can be said of any government in the history of the world—even those which like the British have accepted basic changes in time to avert bloody revolution.

One of the things which we have most certainly learned from history and from our own observation of Mussolini and of Hitler is that dictatorships are impermanent affairs. The only possible opposition to an autocrat is revolution. Therefore, it does not take long for every criticism to be suppressed as revolutionary. In a short time we hear of such absurdities as "capitalistic biology"—a recent Russian contribution, which shows that truth can always outrun satire.

Germany, in 1930, was as far ahead of the world in the study of atomic fission as is the United States today. After only 8 years of Hitler's government, the old and well integrated scientific world of Germany was shattered, and when called on to develop the atomic bomb, its disorganization was such that no effective progress could be made.

No dictatorship has ever been able to provide for an orderly succession of power. A dictator does not dare to make use of the best and strongest men. He fears that they will be intriguing for his place; that is why every dictatorship is weakened by sycophancy, nepotism, and bureaucracy.

Bodies can be enslaved; intellect can only be suppressed.

That is why I believe that time is on our side. In spite of crises and economic waves, which Communists believe will overwhelm us, it seems to me that if we hold firmly to real liberty and strive to extend it, it will be we, and not the worshippers of organization, who will most thrive. In the long run a people which controls its government will outlast a government which owns its people.

Our only peril comes from within ourselves; we may forget that our strength is liberty, and liberty is our strength. Thirty years ago I put into a Democratic State platform this phrase: "If the rights of the meanest and the most unpopular are traversed, the rights of all are in danger." Liberty cannot be a private possession, nor can it long be partial. It is universal and entire, or it will soon be nothing.

The real difficulty lies in the fact that the negotiators on both sides fear disapproval by the politicians at home. You can't buy a second-hand bicycle without some bargaining. The offers gradually come together, but there will never be any agreement if the seller fears he will be hanged as a traitor if he accepts a dime less than the original demand, and the buyer knows that he will be pilloried as an appeaser if he raises the bid by a quarter.

I do not know how it is in Russia, but in the United States today every person who dares to express the obvious fact that compromise is better than the best conceivable result of any possible war—which is the real belief of thinking Americans—finds himself attacked and stabbed on all sides by men sitting safely in public offices, who know very well that come what may, they will be safe from any enemy. Here, there, and everywhere you hear them shouting against compromise, calling the world to witness that their only desire is to shoulder a musket and face the wicked foe. It is only the superior quality of their patriotism that prevents them from selfishly indulging this wish. They must for the good of the Nation remain in public office while they cheer on the envied heroes.

Every radio blares hatred for the simple reason that it is profitable to do so. A radio commentator is paid according to the number of people who will listen to him, and particularly according to the number of hearers he can attract who are stupid enough to believe that Thing-a-bob Soap, or Somebody's Toothpaste, or What's-his-name's Breakfast Food is better than any other on the market, simply because it hires a brighter comedian or a more exciting commentator.

As such people obviously will not think clearly in their own interest when buying soap, toothpaste or breakfast food, it is extremely doubtful if they will be willing to devote any serious thought to the public interest. They prefer phrases like "the best wash by gosh," or "hustle builds muscle" as guides to spending their own money, and want very little more for the formulation of their opinions. It is manifestly easier to excite such an audience than it is to force it to comprehend the simplest of reasoning.

This is why so many of the widely-heard commentators devote themselves to exaggeration and fear, and as far as I know, not one of them to advising calm consideration and certainly not one who dares to suggest asking the community to think for itself and answer the question—what we expect to do with a victory when we get one at enormous cost.

They have the effrontery to attack as cowards all who disagree with anything they shout.

The whole thing is contemptible. How much courage does it take for a Congressman or a Senator to yell for blood? Does a district attorney show a high quality of bravery when he howls against compromise? Right or wrong, no question of courage is involved. How much courage does anyone think it would take for me, 67 years old, living on an ample income quietly in the country, to clamor for gore, to demand the sacrifice of a million men 40 years younger than I am and then end my heroic address with a bitter note of regret that my years or my grapevines prevent me from joining the brave boys whom I envy. Such words do not come from the mouths of heroes or of patriots, but from the lips of self-seeking politicians hoping to ride into office on a wave of excitement that will conceal their own shortcomings. I have been in politics for 40 years. I was a Member of Congress 10 years before the oldest soldier drafted was born, and I know.

Most of the political shouters think they are backing a winning horse—that's all. Loathsome insects gather round anything that is rotten. Twenty-five years ago thousands of American politicians attacked the Catholics to get the Klan vote. Today they follow McCarthy. Twenty years ago they said as they drank their bootleg liquor, "There's one more election in prohibition." Today safe behind desks they think that war and hatred will keep their snouts in the public trough in 1952. It's as simple as that.

I am not one of those who appeal to fear, fear, fear. I say hope, hope, hope. In a speech which President Franklin Roosevelt prepared just before his death, he referred to "the impractical, unrealistic settlement of the differences between governments by the mass killings of peoples." We must hold to the old principles of our country which do not include fear of change, or mass terror, or dread of the future, or looking back to a golden age which is past forever. The people of this country need calmness and courage—not excitement and terror drummed into them by self-seeking politicians.

This is certainly a time for thought and not for emotion. In the most literal sense of the words I ask you for God's sake—for the sake of God, for the sake of your country if not for your own—to think.

I am for peace. I am on the side of the angels of God who sang "Peace on earth, good will to men." They were not popular with those who filled the inn and crowded Mary into the stables, but they were right all the same.

Why not negotiate now, while the young men are still alive?

Make It Easier on Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in that we cannot forget that the world goes on even when we are having dramatic and important debates on policy overseas and, to some extent, policies at home, I should like to call attention to an editorial from the Durango Herald-Democrat, of Durango, Colo. This editorial brings into sharp focus a current maneuver or move which has as its purpose the realinement of political affiliations within our country. After many years, conservative Republicans are wooing the lady they not only scorned but cast out in the brash period of their youth; or, simply stated, some northern Republicans are making advances, apparently with consent, toward some southern Democrats. For the moment, no comment seems necessary as to the chance of success nor to the devious chain of casual factors which have led to the establishment of relations on an official level between the grandsons and granddaughters of one-time Hatfields and McCoys. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a clear expression of the essentials of this courtship:

MAKE IT EASIER ON VOTERS

Senator KARL MUNDT, South Dakota, Republican, and a handful of his party colleagues are trying to promote a new political alinement. They want the GOP and southern Democrats to join forces for the 1952 Presidential campaign.

The main ideas behind this move are these:

1. On most domestic issues, and even on some foreign ones, the Republicans and southern Democrats are kindred conservative spirits. The evidence of that is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which reveals that the two groups vote together frequently in a sort of loose, informal coalition.

2. The promoters of a more formal tie-up believe that without it the election of a Republican as President will continue to be extremely difficult, if not impossible. They reason that a Democratic nominee who starts with the solid South in his pocket has an almost decisive advantage these days.

MUNDT and his friends have stirred up a complex question. It's as important to the Democrats as it is to the Republicans. With their southern strength, the Democrats have been able in recent elections to retain the Presidency, and in all but 1946-48 to keep their hold on Congress.

Yet the existence of the division between the southerners and the northern Truman Democrats prevents the victorious party from carrying out the program of the administration. Domestically the President gets very little of what he wants. In the foreign field, he has the southerners with him on his most vital demands, but more and more they are veering away from him here, too.

What it amounts to is that the Democratic Party functions as a real unit only in campaign periods. In 1948, of course, even that wasn't true, for the Dixiecrat revolt brought considerable defection from the regular party ranks.

At all other times, the Democrats break into two distinct segments. And the administration wing of the party is, practically speaking, a minority which can get programs enacted only at the sufferance of its opposition.

It's an accepted fact that the Republicans and the southern Democrats rule Congress. They have the votes to block anything they wish, or to put across any legislation. They fail only when their coalition weakens.

Thus for the most part the conservatives are in the saddle, and yet they do not govern. That is, they do not control the White House.

A political realinement which would draw battle lines more clearly might seem highly desirable if it promised to end this virtual impasse in government. But there are many angles to the problem—too many for brief discussion here. More than a few United States political experts think it's really best that America's major parties remain as they are—a mixture of conservatives and liberals on both sides.

Whatever comes of MUNDT's coalition plan, the ordinary citizen has a right to hope for two things in the campaign of 1952. He ought to be given a clear choice between two reasonable alternatives in policy. And he should be able to feel that the winning party has the strength in Congress to enact into law the program it offers the people.

Truman-MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am including as a part of these remarks an editorial entitled "Truman-MacArthur" written by the editor of the Mount Vernon Daily Herald, published in Mount Vernon, Wash., in its issue of May 1, 1951. The editorial follows:

TRUMAN-MACARTHUR

The Truman-MacArthur controversy over far-eastern political and military policies, brought suddenly to a head by the recent firing of the five-star general by a President who is regarded by countless millions of Americans as a far lesser light despite his high office, is steadily heading into deeper waters. Casting personalities aside, which should be done in justice to both aggressive men but which is extremely difficult to do, it is clear that MacArthur's return home and his historic address to Congress, bluntly criticizing the administration's foreign policies, and President Truman's stubborn determination to force his own views on the country, are swiftly driving us toward climactic national decisions. Public opinion may demonstrate as it is doing in no uncertain terms but Congress, as the parliamentary branch of our Government, will do the deciding.

Naturally, the Democrats, with some notable exceptions are rallying to a partisan defense of the head of their party in order to retain political power. Leaders who have opposed Truman politically again and again in Congress, now sensing danger of a complete party upset at the next election, are defending the President, Secretary of State Acheson, General Marshall, and other high brass, regardless of their own personal conscientious views. This is of course the danger and hazard of all representative government. General MacArthur is a Republican and his great influence and popularity constitute a menace to Democratic control, hence the Democrats have trained every party leader gun possible against him. In his speech before Congress and on different occasions since his return, he has told his audiences that he is not in politics and he has sought to appeal to the country on a non-partisan basis.

War is a common leveler. Foreign and military policies, vitally affecting the lives and fortunes of every one of us, should not be debased by political arguments and objectives. We do not all agree on governmental policies but most of us would rest content, if we were reasonably confident that Government were honest, fair, efficient, and devoted to the general welfare. In grave emergencies and national crises, involving bloodshed, painful sacrifices, high taxation, our country's future, we have a right to expect and demand bipartisan control of Government. The Truman government has given us none of it but has relied on small majorities in both Houses of Congress to force through whatever policies it chose.

President Truman is not entitled to public confidence on his record. He and his State Department and other advisers have bungled our Asiatic policies, brought us into a bloody war that gets us nowhere, turned over our diplomacy and military control to United Nations, involved us in a plan to finance and protect all of Western Europe and other large sections of the world, bled us white with excessive taxation, and finally kicked out our greatest military leader in the Pacific and the only tested statesman we have there. Winston Churchill, who doesn't pass opinions loosely, on his arrival here last week, proclaimed MacArthur as a "great soldier and a great statesman," the latter based on MacArthur's remarkable handling and restoration of Japan. Certainly President Truman cannot substitute for him or replace him with a man of equal caliber.

Senator TAFT, naturally a conservative, party leader of the 46 Republican Senators, last Friday launched a full-scale drive against the Truman conduct of our foreign affairs and military policies in a fiery 2-hour speech. He laid it on the line without mincing words and appealed to his fellow Senators to drop their politics and vote as they think best for the general welfare of their country. He wasn't seriously interrupted either because TAFT is undeniably one of the ablest and soundest Americans in Congress and usually knows exactly what he is talking about and is competent to back up his statements. Again yesterday he crossed bats with Secretary of State Acheson, whose removal he demands. We are headed toward the valley of decisions and the test in Congress is not far off. The field of argument is narrowing down to facts and proof of facts.

MacArthur is scheduled to appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee Thursday. The Democrats are still moving heaven and earth to hear MacArthur behind closed doors and using the customary excuse that information of benefit to the enemy might result from a public session. The real reason is that they fear MacArthur's blunt, independent statements and opinions and want to edit and censor the testimony before it is given to the American people. MacArthur is not a moron or a child. He knows better than any member of the committee what information should remain secret for military reasons. He is willing to testify at a public session and has so stated, but he also acknowledged that the committee's course is up to the committee.

What MacArthur says is of vital, if not tragic, importance to every citizen. He has been gagged once by our President, who should never try it again; neither should Congress. In view of General MacArthur's remarkable popularity, as shown by the vast demonstrations for him from coast to coast, nothing could sound the death knell of the Democratic Party under President Truman any more decisively than efforts to belittle and suppress MacArthur's statements and opinions. He bears a message to us from across the Pacific, where he has just concluded 14 years of brilliant service as a soldier and a statesman. We want to hear every bit of it and reach our own conclusions as free Americans.

Peace Rally of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Daily Globe, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, May 2, 1951:

FIVE THOUSAND CATHOLIC WOMEN OF STATE STAGE PEACE RALLY OF PRAYER

In a stirring peace rally of prayers as a counterdemonstration to the Communist May day show of force, more than 5,000 members of the State Catholic Daughters of America lifted their voices at Mechanics Building last night in a recitation of the centuries-old rosary.

The large main hall of the building became a flower-bedecked cathedral as the ancient solemn Latin phrases of the benediction, and prayers and hymns resounded through the hall.

Archbishop Cushing, principal speaker, urged the women, who came from as far as Springfield, Provincetown, and Pittsfield, to pray for peace and to explore "some of the legal means by which peace may yet be organized on the face of the earth."

The services opened with a procession of more than 50 clergymen in white and black vestments, with 8 monsignori and Archbishop Cushing in the rich purple of their office.

The platform, backed by gray and yellow curtains, was banked with flowers, and a large white altar stood in the center.

Following the procession and the singing of hymns, Rt. Rev. Charles D. McInnis, pastor of the Church of the Presentation, Brighton, led the women in the recitation of the rosary.

Helen McGillvray, chairman of the rally, escorted by presidents of junior courts, crowned the statue of the Blessed Mother. Catherine Ann Dwyer, State regent, led the women in the act of consecration and dedication.

The rally ended with a pontifical benediction. The Massachusetts Catholic Daughters of America senior and junior choirs sang, under the direction of Rev. James J. Keating.

URGES WORK FOR PEACE

Archbishop Cushing, in his sermon, declared, "it is time that we respond to the call of the Holy Father for courage and clear thinking in the cause of peace; courage to break with outmoded patterns of the past, clear thinking to choose among the proposals for fashioning the future.

"To this end I urge that peace plans be made the principal subjects of your study and discussions in round tables, reading circles, study clubs for the months, perhaps the years that are ahead," he told the women.

Speaking of the efforts of Pope Pius XII for peace, and his clear leadership in proclaiming God's will and the church's prayer for peace, the archbishop said:

"Small wonder, then, that within the month the Holy Father has praised with warm and pointed tribute a group of people who have braved frequently intemperate criticism in order to explore, valiantly and with eager vision, some of the alternatives to war, some of the legal means by which peace may yet be organized on the face of the earth."

ONLY WAR HAD BUDGETS

He pointed out that hitherto only war had been organized; only war had budgets behind it; peace has been left to fend for itself—and even honorable efforts to organize peace were held suspect.

"I myself have frequently felt bound to speak in warning against excessive zeal or impractical dreams in the direction of too hasty acceptance of certain peace schemes," he continued.

"We have all been vigilant against the exploitation of human desires for peace by the disloyal or the anarchist. No one has been more vigilant in this respect than the Pope himself, and all right-thinking men must be grateful for the resolute, clean-cut manner in which the Holy See repudiated the dishonest Stockholm peace pledge and like pretended pleas for peace which are really invitations to the chaos that is communism.

"But we must be no less grateful for the clear foresight and forthright courage with which the Holy Father commends honest persons who dare depart from old familiar ways in order to discover, if God permits, whether new ways of world organization may not bring us the peace of which we have been defrauded to date."

In time of war, he said, prepare for peace. "Then is the time to direct all the alertness of our minds and the energies of our hearts toward the consideration of better ways than war—of higher levels than the battlefields—of more permanent methods than military campaigns as the means of securing our defense for the future and promoting prosperity in peace. These, as the Pope reminds us, will not come in a day and may not come in a lifetime, but come they will, nonetheless."

CUSTODIANS OF MORAL CODE

No group on earth has a greater stake in the achievement of a just and lasting peace than the Catholic Daughters of America, he said.

"As Catholics you are custodians of a dogmatic creed and a moral code which comprises the very heart of western civilization.

"As Daughters of America you are heirs of a way of life which, however imperfect, however open to healthy criticism and deserved rebuke on occasion, still represents the fairest and most enviable combination of spiritual riches and civic advantages.

"Both Christian civilization and the American way of life are in danger. And there is nothing that a devastating war would destroy which is more precious to you than these blessings to which you are bound by the twin virtues of religion and patriotism, the Catholic civilization and the American civil tradition."

The Catholic Daughters of America, he continued, "demand of their political and military leaders that they make common cause in the work of achieving peace, that they put aside armament races, universal permanent peacetime military conscription programs, balances of brutal power, and all the other age-old instruments of war.

"They demand a chance to venture, with caution, of course, but above all, with courage into new roads and new ways which God's providence is opening before us; ways of charity, of prudence, prosperity, and peace."

The cynic is wrong, he said. "Peace is possible. Peace under law is practical. The organization of the world for peace is as feasible as the organization for the peace of a city, a commonwealth, a nation, or a continent—provided only the same moral motives be operative; the same good will be present; the same graces receive the same cooperation. Peace will come because Christ has promised it."

American Mother of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the article from the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., under date of May 1, 1951, setting forth the signal honor that has been bestowed upon Mrs. Mary Martin Sloop, of Crossnore, N. C., a most intelligent and splendid citizen of my district, by the American Mothers Committee of the Golden Rule Foundation, an organization devoted to the welfare of mothers and children. This most worthy organization has designated her as the American Mother of 1951.

The article is as follows:

Mrs. Mary Martin Sloop, of Crossnore, N. C., a 77-year-old doctor known as the Grand Lady of the Blue Ridge for her work with mountain children, was named today the American Mother of 1951.

Dr. Sloop was picked by the American Mothers Committee of the Golden Rule Foundation, an organization devoted to the welfare of mothers and children.

She is the wife of a country doctor, Dr. Eustace H. Sloop, and since 1911 has been practicing medicine with her husband.

She also founded Crossnore School for Underprivileged Children and has been credited with bringing good roads, modern farming methods, religious tolerance, a hospital and dental clinic, and vocational instruction to Avery County, N. C.

She has two children, both doctors. Dr. Emma Sloop Fink, herself a mother of three children, practices at Crossnore School, and Dr. William Martin Sloop runs a dental clinic for charity cases in the county.

The American Mothers Committee for North Carolina, which nominated Dr. Sloop for the national honor, wrote to the national committee: "She is considered by thousands of friends as the first citizen of North Carolina."

The North Carolina committee said more thn 5,000 letters were written in her behalf, including letters from governors, Senators, and other leaders outside North Carolina.

Dr. Sloop was 1 of 52 mothers nominated by committees in every State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, may I add to this brief presentation on the very worthy career of Dr. Mary Martin Sloop that she is recognized by the people of North Carolina and especially the mountain people as having made a masterful contribution to the development of the education and general improvement of the living conditions throughout a wide section of North Carolina.

I have had the privilege of visiting Dr. and Mrs. Sloop at their home in Crossnore, and found by personal acquaintance that their life's work was ideal and that they were unsurpassed by any two people within my acquaintance in the high type of Christian service they are rendering our State and especially the western part of North Carolina. Their influence among the mountain people was most impressive and the school that they established was perfectly remarkable in the advanced progress it had made in a comparatively short period of time. I had the privilege of attending the sessions of the classes in the school and can bear personal witness to the fact that the young people of the mountains were being given a type of vocational instruction that is unsurpassed anywhere in the Nation.

It is most encouraging that in the selection of Mrs. Sloop as the American Mother of 1951, that the fine organization making the selection has continued to follow the rule that this honor should go only to those who have served their community or Nation in some outstanding way or through some outstanding service.

Mrs. Sloop, by her remarks when she was notified that she had been so signally honored, showed the high character of the person upon whom the distinction was bestowed. Her accepting words being:

I appreciate it more than I can say. I feel tremendously humble. My work was made possible through the wonderful help I had, the type of children—mountain children—that I had to deal with.

Squall or Tidal Wave?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, There is no doubt in the mind of any patriotic citizen that instead of the MacArthur "squall," there has been a "tidal wave of patriotism" which has already swept the country.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Felix Morley entitled "Squall or Tidal Wave?"

SQUALL OR TIDAL WAVE?

(By Felix Morley)

Though startled by the public response to General MacArthur, the more important henchmen of President Truman are not yet deeply disturbed.

They think that the popular manifestations are just a flash in the pan. They think this storm will quickly pass, and that summer skies will smile again on Harry and all his mink-coat entourage.

Some go further. Here in Washington they argue that by giving a good show, MacArthur is really helping the President. The demonstrations are seen as a safety valve, through which the mob blows off steam that might be explosive if bottled up.

That judgment, based on a wholly cynical view of human nature, could be correct. It may be that Americans, like the Romans in the days of their decadence, are now primarily interested in bread and circuses. It may be that millions of jobholders will never really bite the hand that feeds them and

that MacArthur's return, in retrospect, will seem what the French call a divertissement.

Such a conclusion comes naturally to those who for over 18 years have increasingly assumed that the American people will meekly acept whatever the White House orders. When one considers how Americans have been cosened during these years—"again, and again, and again"—it would not be surprising if they should now once more slip back into that apathetic acceptance of guileful promises on which executive tyranny has ever based its Machiavellian build-up.

Yet there is something about the reception of MacArthur that really worries the bureaucrats, the Fair Deal columnists, the "intellectuals" and all those who cluster round the fringes of the welfare state.

There is anxiety in Washington because MacArthur promises nothing. He does not even ask to lead us to a promised land. He gives no assurance of peace, and even less of prosperity. He merely says that we are in a desperate fix—and people cheer him to the echo in response.

Here is a political anomaly, by current American standards. Washington at Valley Forge could call upon his ragged soldiers for ever greater sacrifice; Lincoln, with the Union tottering, could face up nobly to disaster; Churchill, with Britain's back against the wall, could call for blood and sweat and tears. But that is not the Democratic way of winning votes; that is not the Truman and the CIO technique.

Could it be that Americans are not really as interested in personal security as Mr. Truman thinks? Could it be that they are really ready to make sacrifices for the ideals that President Roosevelt put in mothballs 18 years ago? Could it be that Douglas MacArthur with his natural dignity and unaffected eloquence, really comes closer to the common man than all the condescending duplicity of the State Department?

Those are the questions that have been raised by the return of the general whom this administration has vainly sought to humiliate. He cannot give the answers. But the people will. It is for us to decide whether this is all just an emotional outburst, as the White House hopes, or actually the beginning of an American renaissance.

Periodically, in history, great waves of moral regeneration originate among the common people of this earth. If the conditions are right, and the provocation serious, these waves build up, roll on and eventually sweep the beaches clear of the garbage and refuse with which political tourists have littered the clean, white sand. And then, as after a squall, the sun comes out again.

The White House is betting that MacArthur has not launched a tidal wave. In this, as in other estimates of the American character, it could be wrong.

Price Controls on Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include some resolutions passed by the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, at their regional meeting held in North Platte, Nebr., April 26, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, the OPS order imposing ceiling prices on beef just will not work. It will penalize the livestock industry, dry up the source of supply, and cause black markets to flourish. The wisecracking DiSalle, who is the Price Stabilizer, may have the order working on paper, but there will be little or no meat at the counters.

It is my opinion the proper committee in the House ought to consider the resolution which was unanimously adopted in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry May 2. It reads as follows:

Whereas the promulgation by the Office of Price Stabilization of ceiling price regulation 24, imposing ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale, to become effective May 9, 1951, has resulted in livestock producers rushing their cattle to market before they are finished to their best marketable weights; and

Whereas such premature marketing will result in a loss of meat for consumers; and

Whereas the feeders who produce much of the meat supply will suffer severe losses; and

Whereas the announcement of further roll-backs in beef prices will have the effect of continued early marketing of meat animals; and

Whereas such continued early marketing and the resulting reduction in meat production will cause a severe famine leading to early rationing in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, That said ceiling price regulation 24 establishing the proposed ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale be rescinded without delay.

Mr. Speaker, if the DiSalle order is permitted to stand, it will mean rationing, and perhaps an attempt by the administration to go out on the ranges and bring the cattle in to market. That was suggested during the OPA days. Some of these orders coming out of the Office of Price Stabilization sound more and more like the orders devised by Moscow.

The resolutions adopted by the Nebraska Stock Growers Association follow:

RESOLUTION No. 1—DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PROGRAM

To the fundamental American principles of democracy, as expressed in our two great declarations of American principles—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America—we enthusiastically give our eternal allegiance. Those principles are America. They brought about the development of this country to the greatness that has been hers.

We abhor all efforts to take from us any one of the principles that make our country. We condemn every one and every effort to destroy or injure any one of these principles.

The current international crisis and the national emergency resulting therefrom is being felt by every individual and every home in the country. This serious problem confronting every American must be met with foresight, with fearlessness and with sound common sense.

Our Nation is preparing for a state of total mobilization for war; American boys are giving their lives on the battlefields of Korea. Yet with international diplomatic negotiations in full swing, a stalemate of power, politics appears to have been reached which may continue for years to come. Such a situation, if prolonged indefinitely, may tax the strength of this Nation beyond endurance unless a definite long-range policy is established by our Federal Government which will set up a sound and practical goal for which we must strive.

The productive ability of America under the free-enterprise system in all fields of endeavor stands today as the real bulwark against the aggression threatening our freedom. The American people can maintain this position only so long as the economy of this Nation remains strong. We cannot continue to make other nations strong by programs which will make our Nation weak.

On the home front we condemn waste and extravagance in our Federal Government; we oppose the principles of price controls, subsidy payments and other governmental regulations not compatible with our American way of life.

We, therefore, petition the Congress and the President of the United States to outline a policy and to establish certain definite principles indicating the extent to which this Nation will attempt to control through military influence: (1) The protection of this Nation and the hemisphere against aggression; (2) to prevent the growth of communistic influence throughout the world; and (3) a program consistent with the economic stability of the United States over a long period of time.

We believe this will contribute to the complete support of our citizenship and to the lasting protection of our freedom.

Attest: This is a true copy of a resolution adopted unanimously at the regional meeting of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association in session at North Platte, Nebr., April 26, 1951.

THE NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
W. A. JOHNSON, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

RESOLUTION No. 2—CONTROLS

Whereas this country has, during the past few months, again entered upon a period of governmental controls over civilian life and economy; and

Whereas the experiences undergone during the similar period of controls throughout the wartime are still fresh in our minds, we now express our beliefs and our position upon these questions injected into our lives by the system of controls; and

Whereas we know, as we have always known and as experience has demonstrated, that the livestock industry is one element of our economy that is not susceptible to Government controls because they are neither practicable nor enforceable. And we further know that such efforts to control will certainly result in disruption of supplies and a disgraceful black-market conditions; and

Whereas, we know that not only is it impractical to establish or attempt to enforce ceiling prices on live animals but any effort to follow such a route would inevitably injure and retard production—and increased production is one of the two principal answers to the major questions; and

Whereas the other principal answer is economy in Government. To stabilize our economy, unnecessary expenditure of public funds by the Government must be stopped; and

Whereas, foolish regulation, such as the contemplated prohibition of calf slaughter, allocations and the threat or inspiration of rumors and threats of such regulations must be stopped. Every such regulation or threat is an obstacle to increased production and an influence toward reduced production when the opposite is the desired goal: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association is opposed to Government controls on our industry, as they are not only completely unenforceable but lead to confusion and shortages.

Attest: This is a true copy of a resolution adopted unanimously at the regional meeting in session at North Platte, Nebr., April 26, 1951, of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association.

THE NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
W. A. JOHNSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION No. 3—RANCH AND FARM LABOR

Whereas it is an obvious fact that the production of livestock is an essential industry because from livestock comes meat, leather, pharmaceutical supplies, and other strategic materials requisite to the success of the vast programs being undertaken by our country and the essential character of our industry must be recognized by the Government just as is every other industry engaged in the production of strategic materials; and

Whereas the adoption by this country of a program of military training and the mobilization of men for such military service creates a serious question affecting the ability of our industry to produce livestock in quantities required by the Nation; and

Whereas although we do not request or expect any special or particular treatment or consideration, we do request and expect treatment of our labor problems on the same basis as is accorded all other strategic industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association respectfully requests the Federal Government, the State, and the Selective Service Board, in its administration of the laws, present and to be adopted, relating to military service, give due consideration to the character of the work being done by men in our industry and that essential key men be not withdrawn from their important, strategic work for military service, just as such consideration is given to similar men in other strategic industries.

Attest: This is a true copy of a resolution adopted unanimously at the regional meeting in session at North Platte, Nebr., April 26, 1951, of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association.

THE NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
W. A. JOHNSON, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

The Last Phase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Edna Lonigan from the last issue of Human Events.

This article shows what sinister forces are at work in our Government and poses the question: Can the citizens themselves overcome these highly organized forces of evil?

The article follows:

THE LAST PHASE

(By Edna Lonigan)

I

General MacArthur's triumphant journey from Tokyo to the Halls of Congress is a political earthquake. But the line of cleavage is not between Republicans and Democrats. It is between the people and the mysterious entity called the Fair Deal.

The Truman administration started out as an era of good feeling. Those who did not like the New Deal were glad we had a homespun Missouri Democrat in place of Roosevelt. They liked his looks, his midwestern accent, his unexpected dignity in dealing with Congress, with the press, and with the chiefs of foreign nations.

The new President took up the task of international conferences where Roosevelt dropped it, and then, after Potsdam, said what most Americans wanted to hear, that he would go to no more such meetings.

But it soon became apparent that he followed Roosevelt's policies, and he clashed with Congress over price control.

Disillusionment with Soviet Russia set in and, when England announced that she could no longer support her commitments in Greece, we took over, under the Truman doctrine, promising to oppose military force with force, if any nation was threatened by the U. S. S. R.

The Greek-Turkish program changed rather suddenly into the Marshall plan for economic—not military—aid to all Europe. That evolved into a military alliance, then into arms for Europe, and finally into the plan to send troops to garrison duty there. But though we spent billions, Europe remained helpless against Communist assault.

Meanwhile China fell. We evacuated Korea, and announced that Formosa was not important to our defense line in the Pacific. Plans were made instead to extend the Marshall plan to a billion people in Asia and Africa. Then the Communists moved in to fill the military vacuum we had left.

The President decided to enter the war. After bloody fighting the general who had snatched victory from defeat was summarily dismissed. An outraged people bore him in triumphal procession half-way round the world. The President was booed in a Washington ball park.

It does not make sense.

II

Obviously something is needed to explain this strange performance—something more than mink coats, deep-freezers, or Pendergast politics.

There is a simple explanation. It is to be found in a speech of Earl Browder's which is reprinted in a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities in March 1944.

Browder told the American Communist movement it was to abandon the Communist Party and set to work, especially through the trade-unions, to form a mass organization with members throughout the United States.

The PAC under Sidney Hillman carried out the plan laid down by Browder. Of course, 98 percent of the trade-union members did not suspect that the Soviet Government had planned their organization, their policies, and even their publications.

The purpose of forming this mass organization was to build national unity, to preserve the gains of Tehran. It was to unite everyone—workers, farmers, managers, even financiers—in a drive on the Fascists and defeatists, those who doubted that the alliance with Soviet Russia could continue into peacetime.

Stalin and his advisers realized at Tehran that Roosevelt was dying, and that they must choose his successor, and get him elected, or they would lose all the gains the Hisses and others had won. The Soviet leaders also knew that Roosevelt had smashed the Democratic Party, and that whoever mustered the strongest political power could take it over and run it, under the old symbols.

The Communists then built up a network of local political machines in each congressional district, formed first about the labor unions, but gradually drawing in intellectuals, farmers, women, and religious groups. This was the familiar Popular Front, with which the Communists had softened up France under Blum, before the Nazi-Communist attack.

Truman was chosen as candidate for Vice President by Sidney Hillman, at the suggestion (according to Jonathan Daniels in his recent book A Man of Independence) of Max Lowenthal, who had known the Senator from Missouri for years through congressional investigations of the finances of the railroads.

The organizers of this coalition were ordered to abandon their revolutionary slogans and to concentrate on uniting all groups except the reactionaries, in order to better destroy the enemies of unity with the U. S. S. R. Their particular hates were Hoover, Farley, Byrnes, Forrestal, and—MacArthur.

William Z. Foster reported to the Cominform early in 1950 that this plan had succeeded far beyond all expectations. Its followers included members of all religions, all social classes.

This pattern of the popular front is the only concept that will explain the strange history of the Truman administration. If you examine our foreign policy, our unusual military ineptitude, each of our Presidential and congressional campaigns, the vagaries of our labor leaders, and the spread of defeatism and enervation in our literature, the pieces all fit. They fit the military needs of the Soviet Union, to divide us, to sow defeatism, and to make us spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

III

The American people have not had a government of their own since 1945. They could not get anything constructive accomplished in foreign or military affairs because they had no government to do it for them.

Their Government has been captured from within, by a few secret agents in key positions, as Norway was captured by a few Nazi agents placed in key positions by Hitler before his armies struck.

It is time we stopped talking of our present Government with words that apply only to an American Government. We need a new language to describe the Government we have today.

We do not have a President in the American sense, because there is no longer a balance between executive and legislative power. The office has grown until it doth bestride the narrow world like a colossus. We do not have departments or bureaus in the American sense, because Congress does not define their duties or set limits on their power. In a government by law, it is essential that the legislature, which does not benefit by adding bureaus or extending their power, should create and define all government agencies, as Madison pointed out in the Federalist Papers. We do not have a budget or appropriations in the American sense. When money is managed by the Government, all figures are lies.

Our present-day Government is like a great banyan tree, towering high above everything, and sending arms out to start new roots in organizations we still think of as private—the labor unions, colleges, women's clubs, churches, foundations, and business associations. This combine of public and private agencies, directed by a small inner group, now has almost complete control over the flow of news, ideas, and discussion in the press, movies, radio, and moving pictures, and the press of private organizations. It does not crudely forbid freedom of discussion. It merely jams the press and other media with banalities written or whispered by its hired ministry of enlightenment.

The American people never thought about how to manage such a combine. They did not know it was operating under the outward signs of their own kind of government. The Soviet leaders knew. They knew in 1943 they must take it over before we woke up.

IV

Defeat and total eradication of the Popular Front party in the United States is the first condition for any hope of peace, or of survival of the United States as a nation.

The opposition party so far has suffered only heartbreaking defeats. They are like Thor in the German fable, who put forth prodigious efforts to eat all the meat in the trough faster than his opponent, only to find his opponent consumed meat and bones and the trough itself. Thor did not know he was fighting not a mortal, but Loki, God of Fire.

The Popular Front in the United States cannot be defeated by any normal political strategy or party policy. It is a military organization to be defeated only as any usurping government is defeated by organizing the resistance.

Until a few weeks ago, the people were apathetic or cynical, there were no visible leaders, and all communication was blurred by the Government's propaganda skill.

Suddenly the President dismissed our foremost general; the people poured a tidal wave of letters and telegrams upon Congress. MacArthur's course led straight as an arrow to the Waldorf Towers, from which Herbert Hoover had been valiantly trying to arouse opposition to the sell-out of our country. Now we have an aroused nation and potential leadership.

The line of political cleavage is now clear—between a foreign policy that fits Soviet military needs and one that puts American security uppermost. At home the same cleavage runs between a governmental pyramid the Soviet agents can penetrate, and the simple American Government that foreign agents cannot manage. Congress has in the power of the purse the means to tear down the Bastille.

The Truman administration will use every ounce of its tremendous power to discredit MacArthur. They will try to break his heart as they did Forrestal's. Will they win? As Not Merely Gossip asked last week, Can leaders and the people together defeat the machine?

The answer turns on one fact. In the resistance every fighter counts. No one else counts. Every editor, every reporter, every clergyman, every club officer, every man in the street, must take his place in the ranks and do what is nearest him to win this battle.

If we fail—.

Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am privileged to include therewith an address by Brig. Gen. C. S. Meloy, Jr., delivered before the Sumter Guards, Charleston, S. C., on April 21, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, there is no military organization in this Nation with a more illustrious background than that of the Sumter Guards. Named for the distinguished Thomas Sumter, this organization has proudly and with honor lived up to the tradition of this hero's name. The Sumter Guards have borne the scars of every war in which our country has been involved, and today some of its membership are fighting beside other Americans in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, it was justly fitting that a hero of the Korean campaign address the guards on the occasion of their recent anniversary—an illustrious soldier, a great leader of men, and one bearing the scars of the Korean conflict, General Meloy. The general knows of the conditions existing over there, he knows of the thoughts in the minds of the soldiers and officers alike of this war. He shed his blood in Korea. Mr. Speaker, he has spoken with distinction, with authority, and as a great representative of a member of the greatest fighting team in the world. I take pleasure, therefore, in inserting his remarks, as follows:

KOREA

It is with many misgivings that I take on a job of trying to pinch-hit for Congressman RIVERS. I know you are disappointed that he is not here and he is sincerely sorry he is unable to come and asked me personally to express his regrets and apologies for having to fall out so suddenly.

As you know, public servants cannot always have a choice of appearances. Congressman RIVERS' job right now demands his presence in Washington, and he knows you prefer to have him perform his duty where he is most needed and will therefore excuse his absence.

In a talk like this I am always puzzled as to exactly what a particular audience is primarily interested in about Korea. Are they interested in a straight-out discussion of the various phases of military action; are they interested in what Korea itself is like, or are they interested primarily in how their own particular sons, brothers, husbands, or sweethearts get along in Korea? What is he up against? Questions that have been asked in previous talks seem to indicate that there is more interest in Korea and what it is like, and what our Army is like, and how our soldiers and sailors and airmen are existing in Korea than a straight-out military discussion, so I will try to discuss these last items. I shall, however, be glad to try to answer such questions as I may if you want to ask them at the end of the talk.

Taking these items in order the outstanding feature of Korea is its misery. It is hard to describe, and I guess these people have been living in misery, by our standards, for so long now that they probably do not know their misery. They run around barefooted in weather that would freeze us and I often wonder if they knew before we arrived that they should be cold. This misery is everywhere. The country is poor. The bare necessities of life are on a submarginal basis. Tomorrow's food is a problem that faces each individual in Korea each day. This misery has a direct bearing on the morale of the troops. If it were not for the inherent ability of the American soldier to accept hardships in his stride and even joke about it on occasion, the effect on the morale of the soldier would be pronounced. Just as a sample of what I mean, even in the rare instances when a soldier can avail himself of a rest period and get out from under fire he has no comfortable, pleasant place to go and relax. There is no place in Korea he can escape this national misery.

The Korean Peninsula is about 500 miles long and, roughly, about 150 miles wide, about the size of Florida. The comparison ends there. It is chuck-full of mountains. There are a few places which may not be truly mountainous, but even in these so-called flat places the flatness is relative, since here there are small abrupt hills which have a decisive influence on the tactical situation. Each of them can and do become critical tactical features. You have probably heard enough about how grave an obstacle the mountains are; how they influence the capabilities of our fighting forces and confine our maneuvers. One example shows how decided this is. Many a company attack in Korea is on a one-man front, due to the limitations imposed by the terrain.

Communications in Korea as far as roads and railroads are concerned are surprisingly good, although in very limited supply. They were built by the Japanese during their years of occupancy and have a definite military pattern, which, unfortunately, the Chinese and North Koreans have seen fit to avoid where they can. They could make this fighting a lot more convenient for our team if they wanted to.

Some of these roads and railroads are engineering marvels. The defiles and passes through which these roads and railroads go are challenges to the best engineering talent. As an outstanding example of railroad engineering, there is one place near Wonju where the railroad bed goes through a complete 360° spiral tunnel in order to climb over a pass.

Climate: You probably have some rough idea of the extremes of climate in Korea. You read about heat prostrations last summer. It was real heat, make no mistake. Salt tablets were a must in this humid, muggy heat. Suddenly our armies were thrust into a bitter winter condition. Fortunately, advanced planning gave them clothing and equipment to withstand this weather. Even so, the first subzero temperatures was almost as tough to face as the enemy night Banzai attacks.

Along with the new disadvantages of fighting in Korean winter came certain advantages. The rice paddies were frozen solid. Tanks, artillery, and trucks could get off the roads for better employment. Snow on the ground made it a lot more difficult for the Chinese Communists and North Korean Communists to take advantage of their natural ability at camouflage. Our planes could spot them with more facility, particularly the light planes from the artillery. Enemy casualties were inflicted in greater numbers.

The enemy's clothing was not satisfactory for the damp, wet cold of Korea. When it became wet it froze, and on occasions they had to break off the fight due to this one thing. Of course, winter brought disadvantages and hardships to us too. Daylight was at a premium. The nights were long and afforded the enemy greater opportunity to execute his characteristic night attacks. You could count on good visibility only from about 8 a. m. to 4:30 p. m. It became habitual for our forces to kill all possible during daylight hours and button up in tight perimeter for a fight for survival during darkness.

Medical care: Proper medical care became increasingly difficult. Wounded individuals who under normal conditions could be easily evacuated would die of shock in the severe cold before they could be evacuated to a warm-up tent. Other minor wounded cases would become severe cases from frostbite just because they couldn't give themselves the little extra care needed to prevent such a calamity.

What about this Eighth United States Army we have in Korea? You undoubtedly have read or heard repeated sensational stories as to cowardice, panic, abandonment of wounded, etc., by our forces. I want to say right now that these stories are the rare exceptions just as in the other wars the United States has fought. One of the greatest points of honor with a soldier is never to abandon his wounded if humanly possible.

As a matter of fact, I think when you consider the fighting conditions and adversities, the strangeness of the enemy, his unexpected battlefield diversions, the difficulty of identifying him and separating him from friends and refugees on many occasions, your Army has earned and merits all the praise you can bestow upon it. Individual and collective heroism has been an outstanding feature of your fighting forces ever since the Korean conflict started. Members of my old regiment, for instance, by the first part of November had earned 12 DSC's and 1 Medal of Honor. Eight were posthumous. That doesn't bespeak cowardice. I could go on at great length refuting these sensational reports which I feel are doing a disservice to home front morale. I know these stories are destructive to the soldiers' morale primarily because they don't understand them nor do they understand what they may have done to cause the remarks. Taken alone they are destructive and not constructive reporting. I do not advocate concealment of human frailties which have always existed. I ask only credit where credit is due and criticism of an objective and constructive kind.

The Second Division has come in for its share of unfortunate criticism and yet facts show that the heroic stand the Second Division has made on two different occasions has made possible the extrication of the Eighth Army from two desperate situations. The Twenty-third Infantry of the Second Division in one fight near Wonju was credited with the destruction of two Chinese divisions. This doesn't bespeak cowardice.

Your Eighth Army in Korea now is probably the finest combat force the United States has ever had. Lest you think I am prejudiced—I am—I would like to read a little statement about the army by Mr. S. L. A. Marshall. Here is what he says about it:

"I am frank to say that in my 34 years of knowledge of the American Army, I have never seen men who used their weapons as efficiently, who go into battle as nonchalantly, who take their losses as magnificently and who develop as much fire-power as the troops that we've got today in Korea. They are the best I have ever seen and I don't think we'll ever have anything better under the sun. I just wish that our people as a whole could begin to understand the resurrection of the old American fighting spirit under the conditions of the Korean battlefield."

The Eighth United States Army now fighting is stronger than it has ever been. It is better grouped, better supplied, and better equipped than ever before. The current fighting of the Eighth Army is as nearly a conventional offensive as the terrain permits. The offensive is a deliberate, cautious, forward movement with the avowed determination to destroy the enemy and at the same time maintain maximum security and minimum casualties for our own forces. The Eighth Army's morale is high, its confidence is high, and its battle wisdom is superior.

Morale as you know fluctuates with the tides of battle. Even at low ebb the morale of our soldier is an inspiring thing. He has questions even as you have questions. Back in late December and early January his big question was, What is the score? General Ridgway gave him the best answer I have ever heard and since you probably have some of those questions in your mind I would like to read parts of his answer to his troops to you:

"The real issues are whether or not the power of western civilization, as God has permitted it to flower in our own beloved lands, shall defy and defeat communism; whether the rule of men who shoot their prisoners, enslave their citizens, and deride the dignity of man shall displace the rule of those to whom the individual and his individual right are sacred whether we are to survive with God's hand to guide and lead us, or to perish in the dead existence of a Godless world.

"If these be true, and to me they are, beyond any possibility of challenge, then this has long since ceased to be a fight for freedom for our Korean Allies alone, and for their national survival. It has become, and it continues to be, a fight for our own freedom, for our own survival, in an honorable, independent national existence.

"In the final analysis, the issue now joined right here in Korea is whether communism or individual freedom shall prevail, and, make no mistake, whether the next flight of fear-driven people we have just witnessed across the Han River, and continue to witness in other areas, shall be checked and defeated overseas or permitted, step by step, to close in on our own homelands and at some future time, however distant, to engulf our own loved ones in all its misery and despair."

As I said, the morale and esprit of the American soldier under the adversities and hardships of combat is inspiring. I will never cease to get stimulation and inspiration from it. The further forward you go in battle the higher that morale is, and the guy right up under the guns catching all kinds of hell probably has the firmest, strongest, and highest type of morale. He is a comfort and a tower of strength to his commander. I have never seen him have anything but an optimistic view, regardless of the situation, and when you have one of those boys say to you, "Quit worrying, colonel, we can take care of these ———," the biggest worry of the commander is: Am I doing right by that fellow; are my judgments and decisions to his best interest. You can't help but feel humble in the face of your responsibilities to this American soldier.

Naturally, his world is a small world. He is constantly faced with hardships and adversities and death, but he isn't tormented by the added worries imposed on a higher commander. He accepts with understanding these hardships; he jokes about them; he kids and rags his buddies about them. A new unit coming in is always told they better send a battalion in to take over a job a platoon has just been doing. His battle testing has proven that he can take it; that he can dish it out and that the pal on his right and left can do the same. There exists a perfect comradeship; a mutual confidence in each other; a respect and team play that you will find no place else except on the battle front. That comrade lasts forever.

I know I am fumbling for words to express my admiration and heartfelt respect for this American fighting man. I can't describe it, but I know in my heart and I want to assure you that he has got what it takes, and don't worry about his ability to dish it out. His worm's-eye view of the battlefield is best illustrated by a story from the One Hundred and First Airborne Division after their heroic stand at Bastogne.

That, in brief, is the picture of the morale of this Eighth Army, and I don't think it will ever come apart at the seams so don't worry about it.

The third item you would like to know is how that brother, son, husband, or sweetheart of yours lives. Well, he is living a rugged life, outdoors, good weather and bad, hot or cold, rain, snow, or sunshine, and he has good clothing, and he has it with him, but he doesn't carry any more with him than is absolutely necessary. He knows that his own individual mobility and the amount of ammunition that he carries means more to his continued livelihood and well-being than anything else. By choice, he frequently carries extra ammunition rather than a blanket.

It is surprising, not surprising either, considering the fact that he is an American, but his ingenuity in providing himself such personal comforts as he can is outstanding. He can dig a hole in the ground and put a roof over it and line it and live in it and keep warm and dry where you wouldn't believe it possible.

He is being well fed—hot meals, chicken in the foxholes, is not unusual. When he doesn't have hot food he knows why, but he has this excellent food with surprising regularity under the most difficult terrain conditions. In fact, he almost has too much food.

He has the finest medical care in the world. Our medical record in Korea is outstanding. Statistics indicate that 98 out of every 100 men who reach hospital care are saved. This would be an outstanding record even with the superior communication facilities which exist in the United States, much less under the communication hazards which exist in Korea.

A bath unit is always available someplace in the regional areas. Since we as a Nation take more baths than any other people in the world you can see what a fine morale factor this is. The American soldier doesn't like to stay dirty, and he will take a bath if he can even with the enemy shooting at him.

Mail service is excellent. Only once, to my knowledge, has it broken down and that was during the evacuation from Hungnam. You can probably give me an individual case where the mail service seemed unsatisfactory. But I can probably show you that the individual concerned had moved around so frequently that in spite of all efforts delivery of mail to him has been difficult.

I hope I have covered some of the things you would like to know about Korea, and what it is like; what our troops are like, and how they live. As I said if there are particular questions unanswered I will be glad to answer them either from the floor or individually later on.

There is one final thought, admonition, or whatever you choose to call it, I want to leave with you. Having recently returned from the Far East Command, I perhaps am overly conscious of a complacency and apathy that seems to exist here at home toward the grave peril which threatens the United States. Our blood pressure seems to fluctuate with the military situation in Korea. Stalin and the other leaders in the Kremlin would like nothing better than to see us fall back into a business-as-usual attitude. One of his many offensives against our democratic way of life is to lull us into a false sense of security so that at a time and place of his own choosing he can really clobber us. Make no mistakes—we are communism's No. 1 enemy.

America is in grave peril. It is immediate and it is real, and the danger comes from a single source—communism. This threat from communism is insidious because in so many ways it is not obvious, and because its fighting threat right now is so many miles away that the great gravity of our peril is not immediately before us. We can't afford to lower our guard for a minute, and we should all be praying to our God that the shooting war will stay a long ways from our borders, and that never will any of you people sitting right here be forced to flee as terrified refugees down the roads of our country pursued by a ruthless Communist enemy. The privileges we enjoy here in the United States must be guarded and defended to be preserved. We can lose all we cherish by default if we aren't careful.

The records show the Sumter Guards have never defaulted in their duty to their country.

Stop Rising Prices and Black Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing fear throughout the entire country that the price-control situation is getting out of hand. Millions of families, particularly in the low-income group, are clamoring for decisive action and effective control of the cost of food and other essentials of life. We must give our people the fullest measure of economic protection before it is too late. We cannot allow our economic system to become undermined.

The problem of price control has been of great and continued concern to me ever since the start of the Korean war. I had hoped that legislation would be enacted whereby the price line would be held firmly, but by now it is common knowledge that the price and wage-control law enacted last year is seriously defective in many respects. I have waited patiently for genuinely effective legislation which would serve as a real weapon against the steadily rising cost of living. I thought it would be no more than fair to give the new agency, entrusted with price stabilization, an opportunity to get itself organized and show what it can do.

Frankly, I was dissatisfied with the legislation enacted last year and I am still dissatisfied with it today. I did not believe then that it was strong enough to stem the tide of rising prices, and I do not believe so today. The fact remains that due to the restrictions and limitations of the law, particularly where it concerns the problem of food prices, the price stabilization agency has not been able to obtain concrete results in the way of controlling the situation, let alone a rollback in prices to pre-Korean levels. Generally, I am in accord with the program of broad controls proposed by President Truman on April 26, except in certain respects where I believe the President's program does not go far enough in trying to check high prices.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are for the most part wage-earners. They are hard-working, law-abiding citizens. I have talked with a goodly number of them in recent weeks and found that only in a few rare cases have they received any wage increases during the past year. On one occasion, I asked my wife to invite about 15 housewives, representing a fair cross-section of the district, for a chat at my home concerning the problem of the high cost of living. I found that all of them bitterly complained of the situation and of the difficulties they encounter in coping with this problem.

A check of statistics on the cost of living and wages, as measured by official Government agencies, will show that the cost of living index has been increasing more rapidly than the wage index. But we must not also overlook the fact that there are millions of people whose incomes are fixed in the form of set salaries, pensions, or annuities, and that these people are being seriously affected and their standard of living is being cut down considerably. In fact, one need not make a lengthy study of price and wage statistics to become convinced of the continued rise in prices and the diminishing quantity of goods we are able to purchase for our dollars these days. Just speak to any housewife, any shopper in the grocery store, any wage-earner paying the family bills.

As prices continue to creep steadily upward, we are being told that by midsummer or fall it is hoped that prices may become "stabilized." Even if this should prove to be so, it will be of small comfort to the housewife struggling to make ends meet because it merely means that prices will be stabilized at existing or higher levels. Actually, what the country needs is a rollback of prices to the level existing in June of 1950.

I am firmly convinced that the time is ripe—in fact, long overdue—to correct past mistakes by enacting and maintaining a system of price control that would serve as a real economic protection for the people of this country. We talk about helping people all over the world attain a certain degree of economic independence and happiness—a cause with which I heartily agree—but let us not ignore the economic interests and problems of our people as well.

Much as we dislike controls, whether political or economic, in our democratic way of life, it is clear, however, that under the present emergency we cannot escape controls entirely. In times of great peril to our Nation, we would be derelict in our duty if we failed to do everything in our power to insure the safety of our country and the security of its citizens. Economic dislocations of a serious nature are as detrimental in their effects on ultimate victory, as are losses on the field of battle. When an entire economy is adversely affected, as is the situation now, the Government must use its authority to keep prices down in order not to sap our economic strength, our vitality, and our well-being. The future economic stability of this country and, for that matter, the future of the entire free world, depends upon our ability to successfully stop the march of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I am today introducing a resolution to roll back prices to the level of June 1950. There is too much profiteering going on now, which, in turn, is leading to a revival of the black market. Let us take the necessary precautions before it gets entirely out of hand. It is high time that we make it clear to those engaging in such nefarious acts that the public-be-damned attitude of quick profits and black-marketing are unsound economically, morally, or patriotically. Such acts are immoral and repulsive to our innate sense of decency and to our American way of life.

We have an obligation to the people whom we represent here. It is our responsibility to enable the people of this country to live a healthy and secure life in a free society—free also from economic chaos and instability. Through the establishment of effective price controls we shall afford our citizenry the fullest measure of economic protection against greedy chiselers and profiteering parasites. Delay only helps the hoarders, the black-marketers, and all those who stand to benefit by weakening the most valuable asset this country possesses—the people of the United States.

"Reds Win Greatest Victory," Representative Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a statement by Congressman RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, of the Tenth District of Illinois, which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American of April 12:

REDS WIN GREATEST VICTORY

(By Hon. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—At 1 a. m. yesterday Russia and Communist China, after failing to break America's defense line in Korea, scored their greatest victory of the Korean campaign right here in Washington.

This crushing defeat, that hits all Americans alike, is the result of the President's action in removing Gen. Douglas MacArthur from command in the Pacific and relieving him of all active military duties.

There is no question what the reaction of our people will be after the initial shock of Mr. Truman's announcement.

Neither they nor Congress will stand idly by while the most tragic mistake in American military policy since the cashiering of Gen. Billy Mitchell takes place. Communists here and abroad will be delighted.

The removal of General MacArthur from Japan, where he has won the affection and respect of our recent enemies, seriously jeopardizes hope for an early and effective peace with the Japanese and at the same time removes from Tokyo the greatest enemy of Soviet encroachment in the Far East.

European chancelleries will be pleased, because the ouster of our great military strategist, whose exploits in the Pacific in World War II can never be forgotten, plays into the hands of England's Labor Government's foreign policy.

There will be temporary joy in the inner clique at the White House, where Dean Acheson now apparently has cinched the role of President in chief and dictates every move of the nominal Commander in Chief who used his authority to retire the heroic commander of our forces in the Orient.

While there is no question of the President's right to retire General MacArthur, under the strict interpretation of the law, his action is as serious as if President Lincoln had removed Grant while the Union troops were in front of Richmond or if the Continental Congress had ordered George Washington to turn in his sword during the tragic winter at Valley Forge.

America's enemies, including many of its so-called allies, are having their hour of triumph right now. They are warned to enjoy it to the utmost while they can because the wrath of the American people is certain to make itself felt in world-shaking terms that will show the present administration that this time it has overstepped all the bounds of decency and common sense in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

No Time Should Be Lost in Amending the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, I appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in support of amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, first, let me express my appreciation for the opportunity of appearing before you this morning.

As some of you know, I represent a heavily populated railroad district in central Pennsylvania. Without fear of contradiction, on a percentage basis, it is my belief that I have more active and retired railroaders in my congressional district than any other Member of Congress. In the city of Altoona, Pa., alone, out of a population of about 85,000, it is common knowledge that a great percentage of the wage earners are employed by the Pennsylvania Railroad.

With the convening of the Eighty-second Congress I, like many other Members of Congress, introduced bills designed to liberalize the Railroad Retirement Act and to increase benefits to not only annuitants and pensioners but also to widows and other survivors. These bills were among some fifty similar measures that had been pending in the Eighty-first Congress and which have been reintroduced in the present session.

It may surprise you when I say that I have retired employees and survivors of deceased employees in my congressional district who are actually hungry and living under conditions that you and I would find repugnant to the American way of life. These people are the victims of a frozen income over which they have no control. Congress, as custodian of the Railroad Retirement Fund is obligated to provide relief to these people through sound amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board, the average age of the disabled and retired annuitant is 70.2 years and the pensioner 81.9 years; while the average of the widow is 72.8 years. The average monthly benefit received by the annuitant is $82.81 monthly; the pensioner $70.80 monthly; and the widow $29.50 monthly.

Keeping in mind the present scale of benefits, it may be well to look at the cost-of-living figures as furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor. As of November 15, 1950, or about 6 months ago, the cost of living had increased 71 percent over the cost of living in 1937, the year the Railroad Retirement Act became effective.

For an illustration, food had increased 99 percent, wearing apparel 89.7 percent, rent 24.3 percent, fuel, electricity, etc., 43.4 percent, house furnishings 94 percent, and miscellaneous 58.9 percent. As I stated, prices of every-day commodities have increased during that period.

While these increases in the cost of living were mounting during the period from 1937 to 1951, the recipients of railroad-retirement benefits received but one increase—the 20 percent granted by the Eightieth Congress. The widows, however, received no increase.

It may be well for me to remind you at this point that the 1937 or 1939 dollar is not the same dollar in value that these retired railroaders or their survivors receive today. It can truthfully be said that they are the victims of not only the high cost of living, but an inflated dollar.

I am fully familiar with the actuarial studies made from time to time regarding the solvency of the railroad retirement fund. While conflicting information has been received as to the ability of the fund to stand an increase in benefits, it is the general opinion that the fund is capable of absorbing a reasonable increase when you take into consideration the increased income of the fund, resulting from increased wages and high employment in the railroad industry.

In appearing before you this morning, I am mindful of the fact that you are surrounded by experts who have given and will give testimony on every phase of the Railroad Retirement Act. I am not here in behalf of any particular bill, because I have no pride of authorship, but am only interested in amending the Railroad Retirement Act so as to relieve the distress that prevails today among annuitants, pensioners, widows, and survivors of retired railroad employees.

No time should be lost by Congress in taking action to relieve the plight of these deserving Americans. Therefore, I hope that you will report favorably the best possible bill liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act, and at the same time maintaining the solvency of the retirement fund.

In conclusion, the eyes of thousands of retired railroaders and their survivors residing in my congressional district, are focused on the Congress of the United States, hopeful that we, the representatives of the American people, as custodian of the railroad retirement fund financed solely by the employer and employee, will take prompt action in amending the existing law.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

PATERSON, N. J., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GORDON: These must be busy days for you. Enclosed is a copy of a letter to the President of the United States. This is the first time I have ever written to any President, but I hope that millions of Americans will do so and that you will have a part in organizing such an effort so that the ideas of the people will be registered with the President.

I believe that the Congress should give General MacArthur a hearing and do everything possible to restore him to his command in Tokyo where he has done such a marvelous job.

Very best wishes to you.

Yours very truly,

JACOB STAM,
Counselor at Law.

APRIL 12, 1951.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my humble opinion, Gen. Douglas MacArthur should be restored to his command in Tokyo. I cannot help but compare the situation in Germany and in Japan. There comes to mind years of bickering with the Soviets in Germany; constant advantage to them; the Berlin airlift; poor progress; unsettled conditions. By contrast General MacArthur has wonderfully controlled Soviet and Communist attempts to take charge in Japan. In my opinion, he has done a masterly job, both in Japan and in Korea. He should be restored; he should be given a free hand, not only by the United Nations, but especially by our Government.

That authority should include the right to encourage and help Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and to direct the activities of our long-time Chinese Nationalist friends against the Chinese Reds.

My brother and his wife were put to death by the sword wielded by young Communist bandits in China in December 1934. I volunteered for service and served in the First World War for almost a year. Our oldest son served in the United States Navy for 2 years and was badly burned and wounded on a destroyer off Okinawa. Even as you, Mr. President, we know something of the cost of war, and because we live in a God-blessed, free land feel it right to urge this course of action upon you.

I would not close, Mr. President, without assuring you of my prayers for you and to say that I frequently asked my family, associates, and friends to pray for you in accordance with Paul's word to Timothy as it is written down at I Timothy 2: 1-4:

"I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

With best wishes for your health and happiness, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JACOB STAM.

Vermont State Legislature Opposes St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently the Vermont State Legislature defeated a resolution in favor of immediate construction of the St. Lawrence

seaway. In doing so Vermont joins the long list of State legislatures who have refused to sanction the construction of this international ditch commonly called the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The action of the Vermont Legislature is described in the April 19 edition of the Enterprise and Vermonter published at Vergennes, Vt. The editorial follows:

VERMONT NOT ALONE

The real purpose of the resolution favoring the St. Lawrence seaway, which the Vermont House defeated last week, has not been widely publicized. According to reports current around the State House, this resolution was designed as political ammunition to be used by Senator AIKEN in the fight to enact legislation authorizing this billion-dollar project in the United States Senate.

If the resolution had passed, Senator AIKEN could have said that his State through its legislature approved the project. Now he will be in the position of a Senator advocating a project which his State, through its representatives has refused to approve. The result is bound to weaken the Senator's influence on the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

It is interesting to note that Vermont is not the only State, whose legislature has acted on this highly controversial project. On February 28 of this year, the House of Delegates of Maryland passed and sent to both Houses of Congress a resolution requesting the United States Congress "not to enact any legislation or make any appropriations for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway."

Can the Traffic in Strategic War Materials With Our Enemies Be Stopped?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker—

SEC. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any fund appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country whose trade with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea) is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States.

This act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951." (Approved September 27, 1950.)

The above law provides that power to say whether or not these transactions with our enemies are detrimental to the security of the United States rests with the National Security Council. That Council is composed of Harry Truman, President; Alben Barkley, Vice President; Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; and George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense.

As soon as it was definitely known in this country that Great Britain was trading in strategic materials with the Soviet Union or Red China, this Board, headed by the President, should have acted. That it has been known for months is common knowledge in this country and now Great Britain admits it in Parliament. But still no announcement that this action is detrimental to the security of the United States has been made by this National Security Council. The law passed September 27, 1950, is meaningless unless this Council acts. The blame for this unlawful action on the part of Great Britain is now definitely fixed on the shoulders of our own National Security Council.

The President says he wants to end the war in Korea, but if Great Britain can trade in strategic war materials like rubber and steel, with the apparent consent of the United States, this war will not end and the materials now going to Red China will be shot right back at us and thousands more of our boys will die. What reason can this Council give for this stupid action against the security of the United States?

The administration pleads for unity—they say our people must not be divided, but the people of the United States are not dumb and they never can be united behind a bunch of administrators who can see nothing wrong with England's selling rubber and steel to Red China.

MacArthur's plan of blockading the China coast was rejected by the President and it seems clear now that if any such blockade had been inaugurated, England would be the first nation caught in the net. Apparently Acheson could not stand to see England held up to the nations of the world as a nation of perfidy and dishonor, and the only out was to fire MacArthur.

The United Nations is showing signs of putting an embargo on this material to Red China, but it is shameful to see the top officers of this Government fail to put a stop to this criminal business, when they have the power to make a declaration.

Under these circumstances, does the President think he can get more appropriations from Congress to assist Great Britain? If he can, this Congress is as dumb as many people think it is.

State Aid Frauds Total 1 Out of 15—Two Thousand in Illinois Surveyed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following article taken from the Chicago Daily News of April 30, 1951, which points up the need for a prompt enactment of H. R. 2738, that I introduced February 19, or one of the identical bills, H. R. 3341, by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON], or H. R. 3768, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]:

STATE AID FRAUDS TOTAL 1 OUT OF 15—TWO THOUSAND IN ILLINOIS SURVEYED—THREE-MILLION-DOLLAR LOSS YEARLY INDICATED

(By Jay McMullen)

One of every fifteen cases on the State's aid-to-children and general relief rolls was found to be a definite fraud, a survey by the A. C. Nielsen Co. indicated Monday.

The Nielsen Co., market research firm, found in a survey of 2,032 sample cases that—

State-wide ineligibility in the $36,000,000-a-year general relief program amounted to 6.7 percent.

In the $23,000,000 annual aid-to-dependent children program, ineligibility was 6.4 percent.

These figures include only clear-cut cases of total ineligibility, according to Art Nielsen, Jr., administrative vice president of the firm.

They do not include many cases where recipients were obviously receiving more money than they were entitled to under their relief budget.

Nor do they include those in which the level of spending indicated income not reported to welfare officials, said Nielsen.

"Even if we suspected that the case was ineligible, we did not class it that way unless we had some definite proof," Nielsen added.

"The ineligibility figure would have been somewhat higher if we had counted these," he continued.

"We found it a common circumstance where we suspected something but couldn't prove it."

However, Nielsen said, "we feel the program is well administered, even if we did find places where it has slipped."

Nielsen pointed out that the Illinois Public Aid Commission already had removed some of the ineligible cases involved by the time the Nielsen Co. investigators started their job.

The survey covered cases on the relief rolls in January.

Nielsen and Warren Cordell, also a vice president, conducted the survey on behalf of the public aid commission.

They will submit a report on their findings to the commission by Monday, May 7. It will include the following major reasons for ineligibility: No evidence of need; unreported resources, primarily from employment; relatives living in the home who should contribute to the support of the family.

Cordell said the firm's 75 investigators who made the 2-month survey found many welfare recipients were making no attempts to support themselves.

"Their level of ambition is so low they get by on their public assistance," he said. "Many are living in filth."

On the other hand, Cordell emphasized that many of those on the rolls are really in dire circumstances. He cited the case of a man who draws a $12-13-a-month food order and who was found living in a piano box on a dump heap.

Projection of the survey figures would indicate that the taxpayers lose around $3,000,000 each year in definite ineligibility in the two programs.

The aid-to-dependent-children program is run by county welfare offices under supervision of the public aid commission.

General relief is administered in Chicago by the Chicago welfare department and down-State by the township supervisors.

Nielsen reported that after the survey started in Chicago it "caused a flurry of housecleaning" down-State by the township supervisors.

"They had already knocked some off the rolls," he said.

"Investigators found that more often than not the case worker had been around to see the recipient just ahead of them."

However, Nielsen explained that cases on the rolls in January of this year were investigated and included in the statistics whether they had been cut off the rolls or not after that time.

The township supervisors came in for special criticism from investigators.

Many were found to be carrying their "relief offices" in their hats. Many so-called records on clients were mere slips of paper.

"Some had no records," Nielsen said.

Nielsen praised both the Cook County welfare department and the Chicago welfare department for their administrative methods.

"Records in Cook County were thorough," he said. "We think they're doing a conscientious job."

"General relief rolls in the Chicago welfare department were complete, if not as up-to-date as the county's," he said. "Case workers had the information, but for economy reasons only make official notations every 6 months."

"We saw no signs of any more leniency among Cook County workers than among those down-State," he added.

Figures on ineligibility varied little between down-State and Chicago.

General relief, down-State, 7.1 percent; Chicago and Cook County, 6.5 percent. Aid to children, down-State, 7.1 percent; Chicago and Cook County, 5.9 percent.

There were 36,000 general relief cases in the State, involving an estimated $1,000 persons; and 23,600 ADC cases with 84,300 persons.

Cordell said "investigators learned one of the great difficulties in the way of proper administration of relief is the impossibility of setting up a clear-cut definition of need."

Cordell found that some of the families surveyed had been on relief most of their adult lives.

"They don't know anything else," he said.

In one general relief case a crippled woman had been on the rolls 19 years, another woman 14 years.

RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me previously, I should like to insert into the RECORD the following article by Mr. J. Webb Saffold:

RFC

(By J. Webb Saffold)

Judging from the evidence brought out by the Fulbright committee of Congress investigating the RFC loan mess, those initials now stands for rackets for conspirators, and have so stood for some years behind the backs of the people where money was wasted or stolen. The RFC should have been abolished after the depression of the thirties which spawned it, but no emergency agency of the Federal Government that offers opportunity for juicy jobs and free access to the people's pocketbook is ever abolished except by laws especially passed for that purpose. Just try and get such a law passed through Congress under the "Snare Deal" bureaucracy.

The RFC was created by—then—President Herbert Hoover for the one purpose of loaning money to banks that would otherwise fail. It was a temporary expedient and served its purpose, but it was never intended to be misused as a free-for-bingo racket. No banks are failing now, on the contrary, they are bulging with money to loan all over the country, so much so that the Government has had to tighten credit rules in an alleged gesture to prevent more inflation. The one business of Government is to govern, not to horn in on the legitimate field of private business, and one thing is certain as death and taxes; if your Government stays in the loan business you will have corruption in both Government and business.

A former member of the "Snare Deal" Justice (?) Department has organized a committee to fight the abolition of the RFC because he says it will be a death blow to thousands of small-business enterprises. Why should it? If these small-business enterprises cannot negotiate loans on their merits from private banks only too willing to loan them money, why should all the people of this racket-ridden Nation loan money on unsound propositions? What sort of hand-out "Snare Deal" socialism is that? As long as you have a Government loan pool you will have a long list standing in line waiting to get in on the gravy. That means you will have the 5 percenters and the influence peddlers doing a land-office business for lush fees and you will be a party to more corruption paid for with your money.

Three balls, hanging over a Government doorway, look very bad to the people who are taxed unmercifully to pay for the plunder. A total of the multimillions lost for us by the RFC might shock you especially in the face of mounting taxes. In fact a grand total of the people's money wasted regularly by Government spending would stagger you if you could know it, but there is little chance that you ever will. And all this slimy sludge is red meat for the Russian propaganda mill.

It isn't only the loan seekers or suckers who walk into the clutches of the Washington fixers who get rooked for $100,000 fees. From where I sit it looks as if this entire Nation is in a Washington fix to the tune of one hundred billions and much worse. When this flying-saucer inflation crashes in a "Snare Deal" superdepression, we the people will lose our American way of life and our freedom, and that is no fantastic impossibility. Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilizer, says: "Inflation is as great a threat to us as Russia."

In theory, ours is a Government by, for, and of the people, but this is only in vote-getting election oratory. In factual practice, it is a Government, by, for, and of the socialistic "Snare Deal" politicians and you do not have one word to say about how your money will be squandered after it has been extracted from you in ever-rising taxes. Things like this RFC mink stink are the handwriting on the walls of our political Babylon on the Potomac. They mean that unless the people of this Nation clean house in Washington from top to bottom and do it now there will be no house left to clean, and Stalin will move in and take over the site.

Then the initials RFC will stand for "resigned for communism."

Put Freedom First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUTH THOMPSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address given by Otto A. Seyferth, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the first general session of that great body on April 30.

It has been a great honor for the Ninth District of Michigan and especially the city of Muskegon to have the national Chamber of Commerce select as its President one of our own residents. We are especially proud of the able and effective manner in which Otto Seyferth has fulfilled his duties in that post. I have known and respected him for over 25 years and my high regard for his integrity was confirmed by the great speech which he delivered last Monday. As a forthright appraisal of our way of life, it can be read by all Americans with real benefit.

The speech follows:

The dramatic scene with which we have opened this convention served to emphasize two things. Two things of importance to us at this moment.

First, that our institutions, our prosperity, and our whole way of life are based upon the fundamental concept of human freedom.

Second, that these concepts were fostered and dreamed about and written into our fundamental documents by men of affairs—by businessmen.

In late years there has developed a tendency, fostered by so-called intellectuals, to ascribe to men of business only low and sordid motives. The falsity of this superficial attitude is attested daily by the public service and the self-sacrifice which businessmen make in defense of freedom. Historically, it is also attested by the fact that it was busy men of affairs who laid the foundations for our freedom.

It was Franklin, a printer, a capitalist, a man of many commercial interests; it was John Hancock, merchant on a large scale; it was George Washington, a busy planter and dealer in real estate; it was Alexander Hamilton, a brilliant banker and financial genius; it was Livingston, and Gerry, and Mason—and so on and on through a long list of men who were busily engaged in large affairs of trade and commerce and industry.

It was these men who were not only motivated by lofty ideals but who set forth those ideals in practical forms for you and me in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

And, finally, it was these same men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor so that you and I might enjoy the priceless boon of freedom.

It has been my privilege to serve as your president during a year of stress and uncertainty. I came to this moment, grateful for the privilege of serving, and inspired anew by a belief in this institution, and by a strengthened devotion to the cause of freedom.

It is fitting that our theme for this assembly should be put freedom first. That strikes to the heart of all our efforts, and goes to the fundamental matter of the attitude each of us has toward freedom, the conviction each of us holds as to the place of freedom in our lives.

Is it first—or is it secondary to other things? If it is secondary, then we are not free.

Every person in this great Nation would choose wisely, you and I would choose wisely, if we knew we were faced with the choice between freedom and slavery. If we knew. But this we often do not know. Day by day we make decisions which vitally affect our freedom—without knowing or understanding that it is freedom truly that is at stake.

We take freedom for granted, because we were born free.

Indeed, we are so free that we scarcely understand the meaning of freedom. It is our natural habitat. We accept it as we do the air we breathe, the water we drink. We do

not marvel at the air—until through some accident we face suffocation. We take water for granted—until we are perishing of thirst.

And so with freedom. We accept it, we enjoy it, we waste it—and sometimes we lose it.

Freedom cannot be taken for granted. It must first of all be earned. Then it must be zealously guarded. It must be held high in our hearts, as a sacred thing. It must be worked for; it must be sacrificed for.

And it must never be translated into terms of privilege or benefit. When a people begin to ask "What does freedom get me? What can I get out of it? What does my government do for me?"—then that people is on the way to losing its freedom.

We read much these days of crime and corruption. Some of it is due, no doubt, to normal human depravity—to greed, to ruthless disregard for the rights of others. But some of it stems from our widespread modern adoption of an ancient fallacy—namely that somebody, some undefined force or power—the world or the government—owes us something.

The world owes us a living; the government owes us an education, or medical care, or free insurance, or special privilege.

So we phrase a new and degrading philosophy. The old adventurous desire for opportunity becomes dormant. The pioneer spirit that raised this country generation by generation to higher and higher levels—the spirit of git up and git—is being replaced by the new, regressive philosophy of lie down and take.

Where in all the present confusion and clamor is there one clear, confident voice, reiterating the age-old doctrines of thrift, and work, and pride of craftmanship?

And yet over and over again the annals of human experience have shown that freedom is not what people get; it is what they give. To receive one must first give.

When people demand and accept material considerations at the hands of the State, their freedom is reduced in proportion to the so-called benefits conferred.

A bread-and-the-circus concept of Government leads finally to bankruptcy of freedom and to the eclipse of human rights within the black shadow of dictatorship.

But "you can't eat freedom." So goes a current cynicism, uttered by those who believe that it is a function of the State to insure the economic welfare of every citizen.

You can't eat freedom, they say—and by the same token you can't eat faith and honor and decency; you can't eat the consolations of religion; you can't eat beautiful music; you can't eat the glory of a sunset; you can't eat belief in the goodness of God.

You can't eat most of those deep promptings of the spirit which are the real mainsprings of human endeavor and progress. But life would be a bleak and sorry thing without them.

As a practical matter, in passing, let it be noted that as to the question of eating, always and everywhere men have eaten best in countries and epochs where they had the greatest freedom, and worst when they were most governed and least free. Sooner or later the bread of the state is the bread of bitterness.

I am thinking, however, not of the actual hunger that arises from want or privation, but of the false hungers that beset us—the hunger for special privilege, for so-called benefits, for synthetic honors, for inside information that may lead to gain, all secured, not through normal creative and competitive processes, but by special legislation or bureaucratic dispensation, often obtained through pressure, which favors one group, one class or one section, more than others.

And whether that group be labor or agriculture or business or any other, the principle is wrong, the practice is dangerous.

When government becomes a mere focal point for a struggle between mutually antagonistic elements of the economic and social structure of a nation; when the test of political success is not, what can I do for my country but rather, what can I wrangle for myself—then the safety of the Nation is insecure; and the foundations of freedom are weakened.

For the essence of freedom is, first of all, solvency, and second, equal treatment, equal justice, for all. To the extent these are impaired or disregarded, the strength of a nation is lessened and freedom itself is rendered less secure.

Solvency. When the free and riotous spenders of other people's money hear anyone speak of governmental solvency they are apt to scorn him as a mere money grubber who is concerned only with keeping down taxes.

A case can be made, of course—a good, sound, defensible case—for keeping taxes in a proper relationship to our ability to pay and the ability of the economy to absorb their impact. But that is not my concern at the moment.

I'm speaking of solvency now as an emblem and a guaranty of freedom. My concern is that the people of this country be brought to realize that continued deficits lead either to bankruptcy or inflation, and that in either case the dollars they have worked to earn and save will shrink in value or become worthless.

When that happens, liberty will also shrink, for freedom is tied to solvency, and solvency is tied to the value of our money.

There once was a man named Lenin. He would qualify, I suppose, as an expert on the technique of destroying governments. He once wrote out a formula for the overthrow of a government like ours—and the very first step, he said, is to debase its currency.

Keep that in mind, please: If you want to destroy a nation, first destroy the value of its money.

Lenin knew the relationship between solvency and freedom. Dictatorships are simply receiverships. When a government is insolvent, then like any other institution that is dependent upon fiscal management, it is ripe for receivership. But among governments receivership takes the form of dictatorship.

Freedom therefore, we can clearly see, is tied to solvency. If we put freedom first we will be concerned about the state of our finances and the value of our currency—not merely as fiscal affairs, not merely as a matter of higher taxes, or of profit and loss, but because they are the very emblem and the foundation of freedom itself.

But do we really place freedom first? Or are we more concerned about other things?

Businessmen who run to Washington for help when they are in trouble, who expect the Government to make loans at lower rates and upon security private bankers would not dare to accept because of the very restrictions that have been placed upon them by the Government—are they concerned first with freedom?

Industrialists who hire Washington lawyers of alleged inside influence, and let them expend extravagant sums, or "loan" thousands of dollars to purchase mink coats for the White House employed wives of supposed insiders, all for the purpose of wangling Government money for private—do such men put freedom first?

The labor leader who says that government is merely a mechanism for getting things done, and who uses political power and political pressure to secure advantages, not necessarily for those who labor, but for himself as a labor manipulator—does he put freedom first?

The agricultural groups who demand that their industry be treated as a perpetual charity case, with prices artificially supported at arbitrary levels through subsidies that are paid for out of the Public Treasury—do they put freedom first?

The school teacher or superintendent or college president or professional agitator who aids the States in shirking their duty by working for Federal hand-outs to education; hand-outs that can result only in the long run in ruinous Federal controls upon academic freedom—do such people put freedom first?

The very large number of people who seek and accept subsidies from the Federal Government, either directly or indirectly, thus helping to add to the burden of debt and insecurity—do they put freedom first?

The politicians who see in a national emergency not an occasion for the exercise of statesmanship, but only an opportunity for making political capital for themselves or their party—do they put freedom first?

All these questions, ladies and gentlemen, lead to another one—a deeper one. I refer to the question of national morality.

The indifferent attitude we exhibit toward freedom is but an outgrowth of our attitude toward one of the essential ingredients of freedom, which is the integrity and honor and elemental decency of the citizens of a country.

What has happened to us? That we still possess the valor of our revolutionary fathers, our fighting men are demonstrating daily in the hills of Korea. But what of our moral fiber?

Of course it has for many years been set the worst possible kind of high-level example. When we elect men to high office, we realize that they are still men, subject to human frailties and prone to error, like all the rest of us.

But we expect, and we have a right to expect, that such men will honor their office. We expect, and we have a right to expect, that they and their employees and their families will set for the Nation an example of decency and dignity and devotion.

When that fails, when grabbing for the fast dollar becomes standard procedure in high places through the formative years of a whole generation, something happens to the moral tone, to the ethical sensibilities, of a people.

When people are taught that the world owes them a living, that if they do not succeed it is somehow not their fault but some one else's, and that some one else must be punished and have his property taken away from him in order to compensate the unsuccessful—when this happens, all under the guise of legality, another nick has been hacked into the fine edge of our moral perceptions.

All this, and more, has been happening. What is the result?

The result is that we seem as a people to have grown callous to moral issues.

If scandalous revelations are made regarding one of the Government's top financial agencies, indicating the use of improper influence by persons closely connected with high authorities, it is shrugged off without condemnation.

If there is revelation of the wholesale and shameless protection of racketeering in many of our larger cities, the country shrugs its shoulders at another amusing bit of political villainy.

In the name of heaven, how much longer shall we go on at this moral level?

If we are to put freedom first we must start by putting first those elements of character upon which freedom rests—and these are decency, and honor, and integrity, and faith.

We need, and need desperately, a new moral awakening. We condemn the Russians for their materialism—and yet we ourselves have for many years now been living in a largely materialistic atmosphere.

To be an American citizen was once a cherished end in itself. Now we measure the value of that citizenship in terms of material advantage—in terms of so-called social benefits, in terms of subsidies, in terms of hand-outs, in terms of special privilege.

This is not to decry social benefits, nor to discount physical comforts. Indeed, it is of the essence and nature of our political and economic system that it supplies more of the good things of life—the material things, I mean—to more people, and at less cost, than any other system in the world, now or heretofore, through all recorded history.

The fruits of freedom and of production prove that statement. Men fix their own levels under our system, in accordance with their endowments and their willingness to work. The opportunities are wider, the rewards greater, and life is more free and full here under our system than under any other system or in any other country known to man.

My quarrel in what I am here saying is not with those who would better the physical lot of mankind, but with those who would make of material things the be-all and end-all, the touchstone, so to speak, of political and economic life.

They forget that it was written: Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

I want to assert solemnly, here at the inaugural session of this great convention of businessmen, that what this country needs desperately in this hour of its history is to get back to God.

This Nation was founded upon moral and religious principles. The literature of our revolution was no hodgepodge of dialectic materialism. It abounds in sincere and eloquent professions of faith.

Our deepest convictions with respect to political freedom and economic opportunity have always gone hand in hand with a profound sense of dependence upon the divine will.

Our deep-held concept of man's brotherhood under the Stars and Stripes of freedom has always been part and parcel of our belief in God's fatherhood and the mystic symbolism of Calvary.

Now we have drifted away from that standard. Faced with a materialistic philosophy that opposes ours, we have ended by adopting many clichés out of the very doctrines we detest.

For many years now the professional cynics and the self-professed sophisticates, terms which usually mean simply men without principle, for many years such people have been working to instill a breakdown in the moral values of a dubious and frightened generation.

And as a result we are reaping the whirlwind of indifference and disregard when the very foundations of our national safety are threatened.

But despite all this I am not an apostle of despair. There is too much latent decency and common sense in the American people for us to allow ourselves to be submerged in what can be, what must be, only a temporary wave of materialism.

Already there are hopeful signs of a moral awakening. Some people are shocked and angry and morally aroused. The pendulum of cynic indifference may well have swung so far that it needs but a touch to send it swinging the other way. Here at the mid-century we may well be at a pivot point in time that will mark the lasting, spiritual rebirth of a great nation.

May heaven grant it. If ever there is to be peace and stability in the world, there must be a mighty America, an evil-hating, God-fearing America, clothed in the armor of decency and righteousness, and holding the sword of faith. There can be no peace without a vision of the Eternal.

American freedom is a spiritual tradition—born, nurtured, disciplined, and sustained not alone by economic systems, not alone by political parties, not alone by the devotion of good citizenship, but by God himself, working through the hearts of men seeking truth.

As a keynote to this convention, and as a call to our deepest moral convictions, I hold up to you the twin ideal, one and inseparable, of God and human freedom.

In our moral attitudes, in our judgments upon ourselves, in our aims at human progress in a troubled world, let us get back to God.

In our political concepts, in our great task of keeping and preserving the finest set of values ever vouchsafed a people under self-government, let us put freedom first.

Dilatory Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following for insertion in the RECORD:

DILATORY DEFENSE

(By M. A. Hollengreen, chairman, Committee on Government Relations, president, Landis Tool Co., before the forty-ninth spring meeting of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Ill., May 3, 1951)

It is hardly necessary for me to remind any machine-tool builder of the fact that a modern war or defense program requires an enormous number of new metalworking machines of all types.

The record of World War II, still fresh in our memories, amply substantiates that statement. In 1940 the United States had installed in all of its vast metalworking industry, 1,247,000 power-driven metalworking tools. These figures, as it happens, do not include presses, shears, and brakes.

In the 6 years from 1940 to 1945, inclusive, beginning with our own defense program in 1940 and the needs of the war program in late '41 and subsequent years, the United States machine-tool industry produced 1,693,000 metal-cutting machine tools. In other words, the Nation practically doubled the number of machines in its metalworking plants in order to produce the weapons that were necessary to win World War II.

If we take into account the fact that the machines produced during the war were far more productive than those already installed in American industry, it is clear that we actually more than doubled the metal-cutting capacity of this Nation in order to win the war.

The industry met this enormous demand by practically doubling its output from year to year. Thus in 1939 the output was $200,000,000, which was the best year the industry had had to that date. This production was required by the expansion of airplane engine builders at home, in France, and England. In 1940 with the impetus of the American defense program, the industry more than doubled its output to $440,000,000.

This first expansion is not too difficult to attain, as you know. It means instituting a second shift on the bottleneck machines in the plant; it means working full time and it means diluting the skilled labor force with some learners.

In 1941 the industry almost doubled its output again, going to $775,000,000. We were beginning to subcontract then, to run two full shifts, each operating overtime, and to add substantially to the machine tools and plant capacity in the industry itself.

In 1942 we reached the amazing output of $1,330,000,000 and in 1943 almost duplicated the performance with $1,180,000,000. By that time the greatest demand of the war program had been met and in 1944, output fell off to about $497,000,000. Note, however, that this is still more than twice the output of any peacetime year.

Even in 1945 the industry was called on for a production of $423,700,00.

At no time during the war period, due to the fact that our industry actually went to war almost 3 years before Pearl Harbor, did the backlog of unfilled orders of the industry exceed 12 months' production. As the demand increased, the capacity of the industry kept step with it. Nevertheless, even in those days we were subjected to some very savage criticism as being the bottleneck of the defense program.

In view of this tremendous need for metalworking machines as part of a program of national defense, it should be perfectly obvious to anyone, whether inside or outside of the machine-tool industry, that the production of machine tools is literally the foundation of a defense effort.

But we do not need to go back to the experience of World War II. This industry now has a backlog of unfilled orders equivalent to 18 months' production at the present rate of output. Practically all of this is for the defense program. Firm orders that are being held by machine tool builders, who are afraid to accept them, probably amount to another 5 months' production. And machine tools for many defense projects are still to be ordered.

Unfortunately, this industry dwindled in size after World War II. The demand for machine tools fell off steadily from 1946 to a low in 1949. In 1947 we produced $305,000,000 worth of metal cutting machine tools. The competition of the enormous Government surplus dumped on the market at 15 cents on the dollar began to be severely felt by the industry and output went off to $268,000,000 in 1948. In 1949 it was only $249,150,000.

If we correct this figure for the increased cost of materials and consequently the higher price of machine tools, it will be seen that we produced about the same number of machine tools in 1949 as we had in the depression year of 1939.

The first few months of 1950 were better for those of us who were getting orders for the new designs of the automobile industry. Yet in June 1950, many machine-tool builders were working 30 or 40 hours a week and had laid off all of their men up to the veterans of 13 and 14 years' experience. The situation had been highly competitive, with over 40 companies changing hands and over 20 of them going completely out of existence. This represents an extremely serious loss of capacity in the industry. Employment in June 1950 was only 37,700 wage earners.

The industry is now shipping at the rate of about $540,000,000 per year. But if we correct for the value of the dollar, we find that this represents about half of the number of machines we shipped in 1940—the year before Pearl Harbor.

The inability of the machine-tool industry to meet the needs of the present defense programs is not only due to loss of capacity but due to the following obstacles:

1. Difficulty in holding trained men—and in employing new men.

2. Difficulty in getting materials and components without a blanket priority.

3. Great delay in securing certificates of necessity to permit the 5-year amortization of investment in additional facilities.

4. Lack of money to finance a larger inventory and increased manufacturing facilities.

5. Worst of all; uncertainty as to the price ceiling on machine tools.

The first thing the machine-tool builder needed was to increase his hours and then to hire more manpower. I need hardly tell you what he found. He found himself in competition with the producers of civilian goods who were expanding their plants, with

new defense plants that were starting up in various parts of the country where machine-tool builders are located, and he found that they were in position to pay wage rates 50 percent or 100 percent higher than those that he can pay. In many cases his utmost efforts resulted in his hiring fewer people than he was losing, so that instead of gaining manpower he lost manpower week by week and month by month. The men he loses are trained men, the only men or women he can hire are untrained. That situation still persists.

The second thing the machine-tool builder needed was material. He had for 4 years been depleting his inventory, because of declining demand, and because of the highly competitive conditions within the industry. As a consequence, your Government relations committee consulted Mr. Harrison on October 2, shortly after he was appointed Administrator of the National Production Authority. Mr. Harrison felt that the priority regulation No. 2, which was about to issue, would amply meet the needs of the industry. In that he was mistaken.

The priority order provided that the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission could authorize the use of a DO (defense order) rating and that their sources might extend that rating, but for production materials only. As an afterthought, the order did provide that with the permission of the contracting officer the contractor or subcontractor might apply this rating to machine tools, but only to an order for a machine tool which threatened to become the bottleneck of the entire program, and this was restricted to a certain maximum dollar value of purchases. This dollar limitation was quickly exhausted by the Defense Department and its prime contractors, and as a consequence the orders placed by the sub and sub-subcontractors of every degree came to us unrated, although they were for the defense program.

The industry had civilian unrated orders which had to be completed because they were already in the process of manufacture. It had unrated orders for the defense program. It also had a rapidly growing number of rated defense orders. According to regulations it could buy material with a rating only for part of its production.

This, as we pointed out to Mr. Harrison and his associates repeatedly, just does not work in a machine tool plant. A machine tool builder, for the most part, builds his machines in lots. He buys a quantity of material and fabricates it in the best quantities for production efficiency to reduce his costs. He does not know on whose machine this part of a steel bar will eventually be used as a shaft. He cannot go to a steel warehouse and say "send me a ton of steel, 60 percent rated and 40 percent unrated."

Your committee made the obvious suggestion that machine tool builders should be given a blanket priority for the purchase of materials as they were in the defense program that preceded World War II. Actually, a blanket priority was made available to us in September 1940—over a year before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Harrison stated that machine tools are no more essential than pots and kettles and pans. He said that if machine tool builders got a blanket priority everyone would want it.

He later expressed the opinion that as a Nation we have more machine tool capacity to cut up materials than we have materials to cut up.

The refusal of the National Production Authority to give this essential industry a rating is especially hard to understand in view of the fact that the industry only uses about two-tenths of one percent of the Nation's steel production, a little over 1 percent of the antifriction bearing production, and even smaller portions of other scarce materials. Giving the industry a blanket priority would have no visible effect on the materials shortages in the Nation.

Your committee then persuaded Mr. Harrison to appoint a Machine Tool Industry Advisory Committee, which would submit a report on the condition of the industry. This advisory committee first met on October 25 under the chairmanship of Mr. H. B. McCoy, Assistant Administrator for Industry Operations of NPA. The advisory committee was asked to confirm its verbal recommendations to Mr. McCoy in writing and submitted a formal report on November 8 to Mr. Harrison and Mr. McCoy. The subcommittee or task committee had further meetings with Mr. McCoy on October 20 and December 13. The full committee met with Mr. Harrison and Mr. McCoy on December 28.

About the only outcome of these discussions was the decision to reinstate pool orders like those which we knew during World War II and of which I shall speak at greater length later on.

Your Government Relations Committee then tried to bring a clear understanding of this emergency to the Armed Services, to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, to Lt. Gen. Lucius Clay, who was at that time associated with him, both of whom we saw on February 22 of this year. Mr. Wilson commented that the machine-tool industry is only one of about 7,000 that are having trouble.

Only in some of the uniformed services did we find any conception of what this Nation has to do in the way of machine-tool production to make its defense program a reality.

The machine-tool builder still does not have a blanket priority with which to buy materials for the great expansion of his inventory and of his output. He is in competition for scarce materials with some of the largest industries on the face of the earth, and he has frequently held dozens of finished machines on his assembly floor, unable to ship them because on one he lacked a limit switch, on another he had no hydraulic pump, and on another no sheet-steel guards, etc.

Let it be clearly stated, as all of you know, that a machine-tool builder who buys raw materials for a lot of machines, cannot possibly successfully operate under the priority system that has been set up and which is now in force. He cannot place purchase orders that are partly rated and partly unrated because his sources can readily deliver all of their production to customers whose orders are entirely rated. Yet under Order M-1, 30 percent of the machine tool builder's output is for unrated civilian and foreign orders. He will be expected to continue the shipment of machines on unrated orders.

The controlled materials plan will help him only in his purchase of steel plate, bars, castings, and forgings. On all his other purchases he still has this jumbled priority situation.

The combination of manpower shortages and the absence of a blanket priority for raw materials has effectively checked the expansion of this industry and these difficulties still persist. How about expansion of plant?

Congress has made provision for certificates of necessity which are to be issued to those industries who must expand in order to play their proper part in the defense program, but for some reason the application of machine-tool builders have received very scant attention at the hands of the gentlemen in charge of this procedure. An application filed on November 16 finally issued on April 12, 5 months later, and even as recently as the beginning of April we were informed that Mr. Manly Fleischmann, the present Administrator of the National Production Authority, was making a study to decide whether or not the machine-tool industry is essential in the defense program.

For the most part these certificates permit the 5-year amortization of only a fraction of the facility, that is from 65 percent to 85 percent, on the theory that the facility will have a residual value after the defense program is over. You can readily understand why the incentive hardly makes a strong appeal to a machine-tool builder when there is so great a delay in getting constructive action from Washington. Certainly no machine-tool builder is safe in going ahead if he is using his own money in the expansion of his facilities until the certificate of necessity has actually been issued to him. In November 1940—over a year before we entered the Second World War—certificates of necessity were available for 100 percent of the capital invested in the expansion of machine-tool facilities.

The next thing the industry needed was money. After this highly competitive period, machine-tool builders who experienced the exactions of the excess-profits tax and renegotiation during World War II had very little financial strength with which to face these new and greater responsibilities. The answer to that problem has not yet been found, except to the extent that every machine-tool builder can borrow from his own commercial bank. The pool contracts that have been issued do not give him 30 percent cash with order as was the case in World War II. The Comptroller General has ruled that a commercial bank that loans money on the proceeds of a Government contract as security, will be responsible for any arrears in which the borrower might fall with regard to the United States Treasury in future years. So the banks are refusing to make such loans. Your committee has discussed this problem with officials of the Federal Reserve System, who are sponsoring legislation to eliminate this recourse against the commercial bank. This legislation is still pending.

The General Services Administration has offered its cooperation in guaranteeing loans made by commercial banks, but when a machine-tool builder has borrowed money from a bank and then wants to make a second loan guaranteed by the Government, the banker refuses it for the simple reason that the guaranteed loan would then take precedence over the original loan, and the banker's own unsecured loan would become a junior obligation.

One thing has been accomplished and that is to start the process of sending pool contracts to machine-tool builders. Unfortunately, the RFC being in disfavor, the matter was referred to the General Services Administration. This department of the Government had no funds in its budget for this activity and got $100,000,000 from the emergency funds of the President. But the General Accounting Office insists that they must have on hand funds equal to the face value of the pool contracts issued. So they can issue contracts only to a total value of $100,000,000, unless an appropriation now pending in Congress is passed.

It is hoped that eventually 75 percent of the machine-tool industry will have pool orders. The General Services Administration has said quite frankly that it is not their policy to pay cash with the pool contract.

In World War II the Defense Plant Corporation of the RFC advanced 30 percent cash with pool orders. Failure to do so at this time will make the pool order of very little value to machine-tool builders. In many cases they cannot finance the increased inventory needed to expand their production.

Our friend, Mr. Marshall Smith, Director of the Machinery Division of the National Production Authority, who will report to you at this meeting, can give you additional information with regard to pool contracts.

The nature of a pool contract is widely misunderstood. In fact, even Mr. Jesse Larson, Administrator of the General Services

Administration, does not understand it. In a news release issued when the first pool contracts were mailed he said that these contracts will result in a pool or reserve of machine tools that can be drawn on by contractors when they need machine tools instead of waiting for the machine to be built. As all of us know, the pool contract will be cut back if substitute customers are not found for the machines.

Very few machines were actually taken by the Defense Plant Corporation under the pool orders of World War II. Those pool contracts cost only a fraction of 1 percent of their total face value.

It is not intended to build up a pool or reserve of finished machines.

A pool order is an underwriting of a certain number of machines. You put them out at the end of your production schedule, which for most of us would be about 20 months out. They may then be assigned to rated or unrated orders received after April 1, 1951, or the date of the pool contract, whichever is later. To the extent that unrated orders may be given machines from the pool, they acquire a priority, which means that by the time you start work on your pool order machines, about 18 to 24 months from now, you can buy all of your materials with a priority. It is nice to know that your worst problem will be solved a year and a half from now, if you are not particularly concerned about the defense of the Nation.

Pool contracts do have the advantage that if the bottom drops out of the defense program and some of these machines are in process of manufacture and have not yet been assigned to substitute customers, you will not suffer any serious loss as your manufacturing costs will be defrayed by the General Services Administration.

The industry will appreciate pool contracts—when they are finally issued to the companies that will get them—but be it clearly stated that they do not solve the industry's material problem. Giving a machine-tool builder a pool contract that will help him 2 years from now is like giving a drowning man a towel.

One serious problem connected with the pool contract is the fact that appendix A, which lists the machine tools to be built, puts the machine-tool builder in the embarrassing position of being offered a very large order for machines at a price which is to be controlled by the Office of Price Stabilization, since no machine can be billed to the Government at a higher price than the legal ceiling. In other words, he undertakes to make the machines but he doesn't know what the price is going to be and he is not going to be allowed to set the price himself; someone else is going to do that for him.

This leads me to another great problem of the industry—and that is price. The general price ceiling announced on January 26, 1951, provides that your ceiling price is the price at which you delivered a machine between December 19, 1950, and January 25, 1951. Unfortunately, the machine-tool builder delivers a machine very long after he quotes on it. Some of these machines were quoted on in early 1950, some in late 1949. These quotations may have been based on price lists established in 1947, 1948, or 1949. This general price ceiling therefore constituted a roll back of from 3 month to 3 years, depending on the period of delivery in that plant on that particular type of machine and what the date of the price list was when the quotation was made, or the order taken.

Your Government relations committee has had meetings with Office of Price Stabilization on January 9, March 21, March 29, and April 13, and we are still working hard to try to arrive at a price ceiling which may reasonably be applied to the machine-tool industry. It is expected that an order like the OPA Regulation 136 covering all machinery will be issued next and that this will have a 30-day period of grace. In other words, the machine-tool builder will not be compelled to conform to that order for 30 days after the date on which it issues. Within that period of time, it is our hope that a regulation applying only to machine tools, like OPA 67, can be written.

The great difficulty is that the Office of Price Stabilization insists that we must begin in all of these orders with the basic principle of rolling back prices to pre-Korea, that is to June 1950. This plunges the machine-tool builder back into an obsolete cost-price ratio which guarantees substantial losses.

However, the Office of Price Stabilization will permit the addition to these prices of actual dollar increases in costs, but only of certain items of cost. You must understand that other items of cost may not be included, for reasons that I do not understand. For instance the following increases in items of cost may not be considered: Added insurance; duplication of jigs, fixtures, and patterns in order to increase output; increased clerical help, except as included in factory labor, campaigns for bond sales, Red Cross, etc.; multiple shift operations; training new help.

Overtime premiums, shift premiums, and the much higher costs that result from subcontracting, may eventually be allowed. These items are under discussion. There will probably be restrictions on them. There seems to be a feeling in Washington that they might be indulged in to an excessive extent, thus increasing over-all costs and the resultant prices.

As you know, the industry cannot produce the machine tools needed in a reasonable time without subcontracting. The distribution of part of the load to many small metal-working plants that can make parts, or subassemblies, or complete machine tools, is definitely in the national interest. It will not only increase machine-tool production, it will lessen the number of men laid off in American industry because of the defense program.

In May 1941 machine-tool builders had already closed subcontracts to build 44 types of complete machine tools, to say nothing of the hundreds of subcontracts to make parts and subassemblies.

Yet the Office of Price Stabilization is trying to find some basis for restricting the extent of our subcontracting.

Under the impact of this price philosophy machine-tool builders, to an ever-widening extent, feel unable to accept orders, because they already have an average 18 months' backlog of unfilled firm orders and they realize that they do not know today at what prices these orders must be delivered. Due to the philosophy the Office of Price Stabilization is trying to apply to the machine-tool industry, practically every company in this industry could be subjected to heavy potential losses if not outright bankruptcy.

Machine-tool builders to an ever-widening extent are reluctant to quote for exactly the same reason, and to an ever-growing extent are telling their customers, "I will give you this price for estimating purposes, but I will have to confirm or amend it later on when I know what my ceiling price is going to be."

Above all, gentlemen, let me point out to you that the importance of this appalling situation is not that it inflicts a hardship on the machine-tool industry.

The importance of this situation is that we are engaging in a colossal bluff and trying to threaten Russia with a defense program that is little more than words. The very foundation of that defense program is not being laid.

The importance of this situation lies in the fact that our failure to increase the output of machine tools is jeopardizing the very safety of the United States and its future survival as a free Nation.

Government Requisition or Purchase of Privately Owned Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr.:

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP. BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS RE H. R. 3880, INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1952

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., assistant general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., of Mobile, Ala. This statement is being submitted for your consideration in connection with H. R. 3880, the independent offices appropriations bill for 1952.

Waterman Steamship Corp. was organized in 1919 under the laws of the State of Alabama. Waterman and its affiliates own at the present time 45 dry-cargo, C-2 type, war-built vessels purchased from the United States Maritime Commission under the provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. Most of these vessels were purchased from the Maritime Commission approximately 5 years ago. They are operated in both the domestic and foreign trades of the United States. Waterman does not have an operating-differential subsidy, nor does it have any vessels that were built with the aid of a construction-differential subsidy.

The purpose of this statement is to express our views with respect to a provision in H. R. 3880 which, if passed by the House and concurred in by the Senate, we respectfully submit would result in a serious and unfair economic injury, not only to our corporation, but to the entire American merchant marine.

Commencing on line 5, page 49, and running through line 13, page 50, the House bill includes a provision which would limit the amount which may be paid by the United States to the owner of any vessel which was previously sold by the United States, in the event the United States should at any time in the future requisition or purchase the title to such vessel, or charter it for Government use. The amount which the United States would be permitted to pay for any such vessel is restricted to the owner's depreciated book value thereof. If the cost of the vessel should be fully depreciated, this could result in the owner receiving absolutely no compensation for the requisition or use of his vessel.

Our company respectfully submits that it is extremely unfair and unreasonable for the Congress to enact any legislation which would attempt to direct and limit the payment for privately owned property taken for public use by any agency of the United States, particularly in the manner proposed by the provision of H. R. 3880 referred to above.

The Ship Sales Act of 1946 became law on March 8, 1946, more than 5 years ago, and after the Congress had deliberated and carefully considered such legislation for many months. Hundreds of vessels have been sold under the provisions of that act to both citizens of the United States and to foreigners, upon equal terms and conditions, and at the same prices. The Ship Sales Act, under which all Government-owned, war-built, surplus vessels were sold,

contains no provision similar to that proposed by the House in H. R. 3880. Such a limitation as proposed in the House bill was considered by both Houses of Congress at the time of the enactment of the Ship Sales Act and was rejected. Waterman Steamship Corp., in reliance on the provisions of the Ship Sales Act, has invested almost $50,000,000 in vessels sold thereunder and have, naturally, assumed all the ordinary business risks inherent in the investment of so large a sum of money. Most of our ships were purchased shortly after the enactment of the Ship Sales Act, and it seems grossly unfair and unreasonable at this time, 5 years later, to impose an arbitrary provision such as is proposed in the House bill, which is bound to have the effect of beclouding the title to all vessels sold to citizens under that act.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, provides in section 902 for the payment of just compensation to any citizen whose privately owned vessels are requisitioned by the Government. This section of the 1936 act has been law for more than 15 years and has stood the test of World War II and the scrutiny of the courts of the land in those instances where resort to the courts has been necessary. Certainly there should be no such radical change in that provision of the law by writing into an appropriation act legislation of the nature included in H. R. 3880. The "just compensation" referred to in section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is in accord with the requirement of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides that citizens shall be paid just compensation for any private property taken for public use. There is a serious question as to whether or not the provision in H. R. 3880, here discussed, does not contravene this requirement of the Constitution, and if this provision is enacted into law, it can only result in inviting inordinate litigation in the courts of the United States.

It is true that section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provides that in those cases where vessels are built with a construction-differential subsidy, the owner or purchaser thereof shall be paid therefor, in the event the United States requisitions or purchases such vessels, the depreciated construction cost thereof. However, this is a provision of law that is a contractual prerequisite to the construction of a new vessel whereby the Government pays part of the construction cost. It is not at all applicable to the situation intended to be covered by the Ship Sales Act of 1946 whereby large numbers of war-built vessels built for specific wartime uses were to be disposed of, and which vessels were not designed in accordance with the desires of any particular operator or for any particular use other than war use. As pointed out, one who purchases a vessel with a construction-differential subsidy enters into an agreement at the time the sales contract is executed, agreeing that in consideration of receiving a subsidy, that if the United States requisition the vessel at some later date, the owner will receive only his depreciated cost as just compensation therefor. But, in that situation the purchaser obtains title to a new vessel and one that is designed especially for his particular needs. Furthermore, the vessel would not come into existence at all but for such a contract. The Ship Sales Act was entirely different, as it was intended, among other things, to establish an orderly manner for the disposition of an extremely large number of war-built surplus vessels.

The latter act does not impose a condition that the purchasers of vessels thereunder must agree to terms similar to those required by section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, and those who purchased vessels under the Ship Sales Act are entitled to rely on the good faith of the Government that the terms and conditions under which those vessels were purchased shall not now be changed or modified.

As already pointed out, in addition to the many hundreds of war-built surplus vessels sold by the Government under the Ship Sales Act to American citizens, many other hundreds of the same type vessels were sold under that act to foreigners at the same prices and upon the same terms. Vessels which have been sold to foreigners cannot now be made subject to the provision incorporated in H. R. 3880 with respect to the compensation to be paid citizens for vessels, if requisitioned for title or use, inasmuch as the vessels of foreigners are not subject to requisition by the United States—and hence, the enactment of this legislation would seriously and unjustly discriminate against United States citizens as opposed to foreigners who purchased the same type vessels under the same circumstances. In this connection, it should be noted that section 6 (b) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 provides:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no war-built vessel shall be sold to any person not a citizen of the United States, except in accordance with subsection (a), or upon terms or conditions more favorable than those at which such war-built vessel is offered to a citizen of the United States."

It is obvious that if the provision of the House bill here discussed is enacted, the result will be that vessels sold under the Ship Sales Act to foreigners will have been sold on terms and conditions considerably more favorable than were similar vessels sold by our Government to its own citizens.

To our company it is grossly unfair for the Congress to attempt by ex post facto legislation to change the terms and conditions under which surplus property was purchased from the Government in good faith by its citizens and with the risk of large capital investments.

Risking a large capital investment in the purchase of vessels, the purchaser thereof is entitled to enjoy the benefits of any appreciation in value to the same extent that he takes a risk in the depreciation of the market value thereof.

If the provision in the House bill becomes law, it is bound to result in placing a cloud on the title of every vessel sold under the provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to United States citizens, and, even though the United States never finds it necessary to requisition or purchase such vessels, the sales price thereof on the open market will be greatly affected by the shadow which will follow the vessel constantly thereafter.

It seems palpable that if the proviso under discussion be enacted into law the whole fundamental theory of just compensation will be emasculated in this instance. The effect of the provision attempts to deny to the courts the inherent constitutional duty to determine just compensation in accordance with settled principles of law, and will eliminate from consideration all of the factors involved in measuring just compensation, save one. With due respect, this company submits that the courts must of necessity conclude any such legislation runs counter to the Constitution.

The Senate Appropriations Committee on April 30, 1951, reported out H. R. 3587 (third supplemental appropriation bill for 1951). An identical provision to that included in H. R. 3880 and here discussed was provided in H. R. 3587 as passed by the House, however, the Senate committee, after hearings thereon, deleted the same provision from H. R. 3587. It is hoped this committee will take the same consistent action and delete the language in H. R. 3880 commencing in line 5, page 49, and continuing through line 13 on page 50.

Address of Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, delivered a startling speech last evening to the Washington Chapter of the Providence College Alumni at the Wardman Park Hotel. It was on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the independence of Rhode Island and, in my opinion, was one of the finest addresses touching on Rhode Island history that it has ever been my privilege to listen to. His address follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN AT A DINNER OF PROVIDENCE COLLEGE CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 3, 1951

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Attorney General, Senator PASTORE, Congressman FORAND, Congressman FOGARTY, reverend fathers, distinguished guests, and fellow alumni of Providence College, it is a great satisfactoion to be able to address you in this fashion and I thank you in behalf of myself and my colleagues in the Congress for the honor you do us in giving this dinner here tonight. It is good to be with you again as I have been on a number of other occasions. I have many friends whom I highly respect to whose mental and moral development Providence College has contributed greatly. I follow with interest new developments at the college. There seem to follow in quick succession something new every year. Now we all look forward to many Providence College men going to the defense of their country as officers because of the training they will receive under the ROTC unit which will be established at the college next September.

Tomorrow, May 4, will be a great anniversary, of significance not to Rhode Island alone, but to this whole country of ours. In fact, if we stay here after midnight, we then can say today is that anniversary. I hasten to assure you that I shall not keep you here that long, though it is an anniversary worthy of a hearty and prolonged celebration.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago on May 4, 1776, a declaration of independence from the British Empire was officially adopted by the legislature of its smallest colony, with the longest name, the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. This was just 2 months before the Federal Declaration of Independence, and, since Rhode Island is still very much alive, constitutes it the oldest sovereign State in the Western Hemisphere. Think of the audacity of that little colony which thus single-handed defied the greatest power then on earth. Its courage was rewarded in that the defiance was successful.

This was the crowning act of a series of events which also give Rhode Island a unique place in the American Revolution. Rhode Island contributed one of her sons, Esek Hopkins, as the first commander in chief of the American Navy and another of her sons, Nathanael Greene, as the major general who, next to Washington, commanded the American Army. It is, therefore, with State pride that we celebrate this anniversary of the declaration of independence, and perhaps I may be pardoned if I

add with personal pride that it was my great-great-grandfather Jonathan Arnold who drafted that courageous and historic document and moved its adoption in the General Assembly.

It will help us to understand better the significance of this action if we look back for a short while on the founding of our State, which in itself has a place in the immortal experiments of mankind. As we look around our troubled world today, we find added reason for paying homage to Roger Williams who carried on that lively experiment. The experiment has been, if not entirely successful, at least successful beyond the dreams of any of his contemporaries.

He lit a beacon which needs to be kept lighted to guide the erring steps of nations, some of which are wandering far from the principles our founder laid down as the true essentials of good government.

In a sense, Roger Williams himself produced America. Where but in Williams' concept of government and society do we find expressed the fundamentals on which our democracy is based? It was Williams, and he alone who, of all the leaders in colonial America, envisioned the ideal society which we should seek here—which, in truth, has been sought ever since.

In establishing Rhode Island, Williams created a community not to be confused with its neighbors. Rhode Island never was on the same basis as its fellow Colonies. Some of those Colonies were founded in the interest of business. Others were founded merely because of religious differences. Only in Rhode Island was there a forthright attempt to establish a new kind of religious and governmental society—one which rejected European political systems and all the remnants of them which persisted in all the other Colonies.

Williams was directly responsible for this establishment of a true democracy. He was the first to clarify, and the first to incorporate in fact, the principles of a democratic government. Here men were regarded as equal; here the "natural rights" of man were recognized; here the consent of the governed was essential to the government; and here, not least of all, authority recognized the right of rebellion.

All of these principles are challened today, not only passively by those who do not agree fully with them, but actively by those who set up a form of government in direct denial of these rights. These rights are challenged actively now more than at any time since they were enunciated by Williams. That spirit of Williams was the spirit of Rhode Island and became the spirit of America. It is for America, this land of the free, to keep that beacon shining. It calls for many sacrifices in the future. It is worth all of those sacrifices. Unless we are ready to make them, we renounce our heritage; we are faithless to our glorious past. Let us therefore gird up our loins to fight if necessary for the fundamental principles on which the State of Rhode Island was founded. Roger Williams not only proclaimed these principles. He was the first who put them into practice in an actual human experiment. The experiment was at the time called a "lively experiment." Let us resolve not to abandon it as dead, but to carry it on to its complete fulfillment.

The principles of Roger Williams on which our State was founded distinguished it from all the other Colonies and gradually became an American tradition, which had spread far and wide through America by the time of the American Revolution.

The years leading up to that revolution were troubled times for the little Colony of Rhode Island. The break became wider and wider between the mother country and the various Colonies, but nowhere did the love of civil liberty manifest itself more clearly, and nowhere was it incorporated into deeds earlier than in Rhode Island the birthplace of religious liberty. It was our general assembly which adopted the first resolution denying the right of any other power to levy taxes upon the colony. Our Governor was the only one who refused to take oath to support the Stamp Act. Our citizens committed the first overt act of violence by destroying the British sloop *Liberty*, at Newport. Our citizens occasioned the first bloodshed when burning the British schooner *Gaspee* at Providence.

It must be remembered that all the Colonies did not favor independence so early as Rhode Island did. It must also be remembered that all the people of Rhode Island itself did not act in unison in supporting the leaders whom we now revere. There were seven of the Colonies who protested against independence as late as March 1776, namely, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey, compactly situated together, North Carolina in the South, and New Hampshire in the North. It must also be remembered that this declaration of independence by Rhode Island was not the first indication of her desire for independence. The resolution the Rhode Island General Assembly passed on the Stamp Act on December 16, 1765, was nearly equivalent to a declaration of independence. It refused adherence to any tax laws but its own. In fact, this independence as to tax laws dated back to the year 1732–33 when the colony in its petition to the English House of Commons first proclaimed the principle "no taxation without representation," and this as you remember became the war cry of the Revolution.

The attack on the *St. John* in 1764, the burning of the Maidstones boat on Newport Common in 1765, the capture and destruction of the sloop *Liberty* in Newport Harbor in 1769 all were indications of the growing popular feeling against England.

Between these dates Governor Ward in a letter to his son wrote, "These Colonies are destined to an early independence and you will live to see my words verified." He was the Governor, alone of all the governors of American Colonies, who refused to take oath to support the Stamp Act. These and many other acts against the authority of England were far in advance of what occurred in any of the other Colonies, and the declaration of independence was a climax of a whole series of statesman-like moves toward the Revolution which Rhode Island helped to bring about.

Some 2 years before this Declaration of Independence, Rhode Island made the first unofficial suggestion for a permanent Congress of American Colonies, and the first official call for a Continental Congress was voted at a Providence town meeting 3 days later.

About a year later, Commodore Abraham Whipple was placed in command of the first colonial Navy and in a sharp action defeated the British frigate *Rose*. This was the first naval action of the Revolution and the origin of the Continental Navy. There were so many privateers who sailed out from Narragansett Bay that Providence was given in England the nickname of Hornets' Nest.

Rhode Island contributed in every way to the Revolution both in men any money. As a matter of cold fact, there were only 4 States which contributed as much as Rhode Island in spite of her small size, and in proportion to population none could compare with her. Look at the States bordering on this city of Washington: Maryland, with four times as large a population as Rhode Island, contributed only two-thirds as much; Virginia, with eight times as large a population, contributed only one-half as much.

I might go on and on with a number of honorable firsts which can be claimed by Rhode Island, but I shall only mention one more. Rhode Island not only gave the Continental Navy its first commander in chief, but also gave the Continental Army its greatest leader under Washington, namely, Nathanael Greene, who served with him continuously for the 8 years of the war a glorious record of winning campaigns though losing battles.

Traditions connected with the founding of our State and later with its Declaration of Independence are a moving force in themselves. It is important for us to keep alive the remembrance of days such as this, to recur to their incidents and to draw inspiration from their example. The value of tradition to the citizens of a community like ours is real. The influence of tradition is good. Especially now, when the character of the population in our community is changing, it is important to emphasize our traditions, and a special duty devolves upon the descendants of the original stock to transmit to newcomers that patriotic enthusiasm which helps us all to live up to the obligations of citizenship. Those who have bidden goodby to the old home in the old country should realize, now that they have chosen here a new and lasting home and country, that here also land and sea are haunted by traditions no less picturesque than those of the old world. There is a work-a-day Rhine and there is a legendary Rhine. So there is a Narragansett Bay churned by the paddle wheels of excursion boats and there is a Narragansett Bay lapping the dream shores of happy-hunting grounds. Tales of heroism and daring can be found in our picturesque Rhode Island history to match any in the annals of old England. There should be awakened in Providence a civic pride comparable to that in antique Athens, or in medieval Florence or Nuremburg, or in modern Paris. They make an appeal to the eye of the lover of beauty. But the city of Providence, the home of Providence College, makes an even greater appeal to the heart of the lover of freedom. And it is as true now as in the day of Alcaeus that stones and wood cannot be fashioned by artisans to form a state, but where there are men who know how to take care of themselves, there is a state, even without cities or walls.

The Decisive Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Wednesday, May 2, 1951:

COMMUNISTS PAY PRICE

For the Communists the current price of Korean real estate is 1,875 casualties per mile.

The deepest Red penetration in the current offensive is 40 miles. The United Nations high command in Tokyo figures the enemy has suffered 75,000 men killed, wounded, and captured since the start of the attack. That figures out to 1,875 casualties per mile.

A United Press dispatch from Tokyo says there is far more at stake in this battle than appears on the surface. The Communists struck the U. N. lines on April 22 with a "first wave" of about 300,000 men. One out of every four of those men now is out of action, and the battle is not over.

"If the expected second attack by a fresh 300,000 men is repulsed as bloodily," writes

UP War Correspondent Peter Kalischer, "It may well dislocate the entire Communist plan for the conquest of Asia. It will also give the Russians something to think about in Europe. The terrible punishment suffered in the last 9 days has brought the Chinese up against the hard facts of military life."

There is a general feeling that if the Russians decided to start world war III in Europe they would sweep to the English Channel in a couple of weeks. It is understood Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower dissents from that viewpoint provided he has enough weapons and airplanes. He thinks a sturdy delaying action could be fought and that it might be possible, with a comparatively small force, to hold a bridgehead in western France from which the allied powers could reconquer the continent.

The same principle would be applied in that battle as is being applied today in Korea—firepower versus manpower—with the difference that the Russians would have more and better equipment than the Chinese Communists.

That is why Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway said that the present battle may well be the decisive one in Korea. He did not explain his reasons, but they are obvious in the face of the Communist casualty rate. A stunning defeat for the Chinese Reds would cause plenty of thinking in Peiping and, more important, Moscow.

Peiping would ask itself whether there was any point in sacrificing any more men when the over-all objective—driving the U. N. army out of Korea—was becoming more distant by the day.

Moscow would ask itself whether it was worth while to pour any more guns and planes down the drain.

If those two questions arise, there might be a negotiated peace.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from Mr. John T. Jones, director of Labor's Non-Partisan League. This letter deals with the universal military training bill and presents a viewpoint that is generally overlooked today in the hysteria and confusion that has been engendered over the building up of our Armed Forces. It is well that we should stop, look, and listen before we adopt a measure which is so far-reaching and runs counter to all of our American concepts.

The letter follows:

LABOR'S NONPARTISAN LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1951.

To all the officers and members United Mine Workers of America, Greetings:

Your attention is called to the passage of Senate bill No. 1, the universal military training and draft bill, passed by the Eighty-second Congress. It is now in conference between committees of the two Houses and will be returned for final vote in the near future.

This bill is a momentous one. It deals with the individual life of every young American. It decides who shall be obligated by law to give up a normal life as a free man, don a military uniform and obey without question the commands of a military caste, who will possess the power of life and death over each inducted citizen. It takes the 18-year-old boy away from the influence of the home, the church, and the school. He will be trained to kill and destroy during a period of life when his character is being molded. He will cease to till the land, man the mines and mills, go to school. For six formative years, he will be under military control. He will be unable to enter business, accept a permanent job, marry, raise a family or build a home, except at the risk of having his plans disrupted, his home life broken up, and his business ruined by the orders of a dominant, ruthless military caste who, until now, has had no place in the peacetime American way of life. This bill will form "a poor man's army" since every prospective college student will take an examination prepared by the military and be exempt from service by the local draft board, at their option.

This law cannot go into effect until a period of peace and tranquillity settles upon the land. Experts predict 10 years of unsettled existence for this Nation. So why the great rush for universal military training? Because the ruthless military mind behind this totally foreign legislation is taking advantage of the average citizen, his worry, his feeling of insecurity and general lack of knowledge, to jam down his throat this despotic, totalitarian power. This power can be exercised at any moment to sweep away every vestige of individual liberty and put every young man in America at the arbitrary disposal of the military Mussolinis who rule with an iron hand.

The United Mine Workers of America have opposed universal military training ever since our union was formed. The sons and grandsons of those pioneers in the labor movement are surely no less determined to defend their precious liberties than their forefathers. One by one we are losing our freedoms in the name of expediency. We are forgetting that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

The House bill provides that 6 months hence, a universal military training bill written by a commission, shall be studied and approved by the Armed Services Committee and submitted to the House for consideration and debate. Every local union and every member of the United Mine Workers of America is asked to write their Congressman requesting him to oppose any conference report which contains universal military training legislation.

Fraternally yours,
JOHN T. JONES, *Director.*

Henry Wallace Advised China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, how large a part, I wonder, did Henry Wallace play in the disastrous American policy decisions regarding China—particularly those made by President Truman late in 1945?

I believe it would be highly enlightening to the American people, and entirely relevant to the broad issues of the present far eastern situation, to have the answer to that question.

In his testimony on the opening day of the current hearings being conducted by the other body, General MacArthur testified that as far as any consultation on the future of China by Washington authorities, outside of the legislative branch, the answer is in the negative; my views have never been required.

More specifically, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] asked:

Has the State Department ever consulted with you when they were sending General Marshall or General Hurley, or sending the others over there?

General MacArthur's answer was:

None whatsoever.

Questioned by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, General MacArthur offered these views:

It is my own personal opinion that the greatest political mistake we made in a hundred years in the Pacific, was in allowing the Communists to grow in power in China.

I think, at one stroke, we undid everything, starting from John Hay, through Taft, Leonard Wood, Woodrow Wilson, Henry Stimson, and all those great architects of our Pacific policy.

I believe it was fundamental, and I believe we will pay for it for a century.

Asked what he would have done or advised under the circumstances that existed back there in 1945, General MacArthur replied:

I would have given such assistance to the conservative government of China as to have checked the growing tide of communism. A very little help and assistance, in my belief, at that time, would have accomplished the purpose.

Thereupon the senior Senator from Wisconsin asked specifically about the efforts, launched in 1945, to effect a coalition of the Chinese Nationalist Government and the Chinese Communists. He asked General MacArthur:

Would you have sought to have gotten those two forces together? Would you have amalgamated the Commies and Nationalists, have gotten them together?

General MacArthur's response was as emphatic as it was brief:

Just about as much chance as getting them together as that oil and water will mix.

As I reminded the House in an address on April 16, 1951, General MacArthur "is no Johnny-come-lately so far as recognizing the menace in the Far East," or so far as his views on the coalition policy adopted in 1945 is concerned.

I recalled that in 1947 General MacArthur had said to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], during the latter's visit to Tokyo:

Our failure to help the government of China effectively at the end of the war, with its otherwise insuperable problems, particularly the Communist rebellion, will turn out, I fear, to be the single greatest blunder in the history of the United States. For the first time in our relations with Asia, we confused the paramount strategic interests of the United States in that area with an internal purification problem in China.

In his current testimony General MacArthur recalled that he had also given his views, in written form, to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the spring of 1948 at the committee's invitation. I quoted this statement at length in my April 16 address. I now repeat just one

paragraph, since it is the crux of his appraisal of the American blunder in the Far East:

The international aspect of the Chinese problem unfortunately has become somewhat clouded by demands for internal reform. Desirable as such reform may be, its importance is but secondary to the issue of civil strife now enguifing the land, and the two issues are as impossible of synchronization as it would be to alter the structural design of a house while the same was being consumed by flame. Friendly and searching as our interest may be in the reformation of China's institutions and practices to bring them closer into line with our own concept of liberty and justice, and right and wrong, the maintenance of China's integrity against destructive forces which threaten her engulfment is of infinitely more immediate concern. For with the firm maintenance of such integrity, reform will gradually take place in the evolutionary processes of China's future.

This is the counsel of General MacArthur, in 1947 and 1948, given when it was solicited by a Member and a committee of this House. But what about the executive branch and the Department of State late in 1945, when the fatal policy of attempted coalition of Nationalists and Communists was being forged? We know that they did not solicit General MacArthur's counsel. Whose counsel was sought?

You will recall that Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley resigned late in 1945 in indignation, charging that—

The professional Foreign Service men—

That is of our own State Department—

sided with the Chinese Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the Nationalist Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professionals openly advised the Communist armed party to decline unification with the National Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

In the interim between the resignation of General Hurley and the assignment of General Marshall to China to work for "unification" in that country—including in that unification the Chinese Communists who were specifically mentioned in the President's instructions to General Marshall—to whom did the President of the United States turn for counsel? Not to General MacArthur, certainly. The identity of all of his advisers at this critical, interim stage of policy making is obscure, but here is one significant clue:

At that very time a responsible national news magazine reported:

Commerce Secretary Wallace, who went on a special mission to China in 1944 for the late President Roosevelt, has been a constant adviser to President Truman on Chinese relations since the Hurley explosion. It was Wallace who first tried to get Chungking and the Communists together.

Now precisely what were Henry Wallace's qualifications for this role of "constant adviser to President Truman on Chinese relations"?

Well, as already indicated, he had gone to China in 1944 on a special mission for President Roosevelt.

Henry Wallace was in China exactly 4 days on that trip. Thereupon he became an expert on Chinese relations.

Mr. Wallace was accompanied on this 4-day study of wartime China's problems by John Carter Vincent, director of the Far Eastern Office of the State Department.

We have no record of the counsel which Mr. Wallace gave President Truman in those crucial decision-shaping days of late 1945. But from two sources we do know something of Henry Wallace's views and conclusions—or confirmed preconceptions—regarding his trip to China.

In January 1950, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] made public a summary of the Wallace report which he had received from Mr. Wallace.

Here are a few noteworthy extracts.

Mr. Wallace said that principal topics discussed with President Chiang Kai-shek included:

Chinese Government-Communist relations, in regard to which Chiang showed himself so prejudiced against the Communists that there seemed little prospect of satisfactory or enduring settlement as a result of the negotiations now under way in Chungking.

Need for reform in China, particularly agrarian reform, to which Chiang agreed without much indication of personal interest.

Mr. Wallace drew some conclusions:

Chiang, at best, is a short-term investment. It is not believed that he has the intelligence or political strength to run postwar China. The leaders of postwar China will be brought forward by evolution or revolution, and it now seems more likely the latter.

Our policy at the present time should not be limited to support of Chiang. * * *

We can, as an alternative, support those elements which are capable of forming a new coalition, better able to carry the war to a conclusion and better qualified for the postwar needs of China.

Then Mr. Wallace made a recommendation which unquestionably is the germ of tactic which President Truman, a year and one-half later, in December 1945, incorporated in his instructions to General Marshall. Wallace wrote in his 1944 summary of his report:

The emergence of such a coalition could be aided by the manner of alloting both American military aid and economic aid, and by the formulation and statement of American political aims and sympathies, both in China and in regions adjacent to China. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 1, page 599.)

Compare this with the following from President Truman's letter—December 15, 1945—of instruction to General Marshall upon his appointment as special representative of the President to China:

I desire that you endeavor to persuade the Chinese Government to call a national conference of representatives of the major political elements to bring about the unification of China. * * *

It is my understanding that there is now in session in Chungking a Peoples' Consultative Council made up of representatives of the various political elements, including the Chinese Communists. The meeting of this council should furnish you with a convenient opportunity for discussions with the various political leaders.

* * * Particularly you may state (to Chiang Kai-shek and other Chinese leaders) in connection with the Chinese desire for credits, technical assistance in the economic field, and military assistance (I have in mind the proposed U. S. military advisory group which I have approved in principle), that a China disunited and torn by civil strife could not be considered realistically as a proper place for American assistance along the lines enumerated. (United States Relations With China, pp. 605–606.)

There is another, and in some respects more revealing, source of insight into the "realistic" qualifications which Henry Wallace possessed as an adviser to President Truman, particularly so far as his estimate of communism in China was concerned. This source is the "Summary Notes of Conversations" between Mr. Wallace and President Chiang, June 21–24, 1944, found in pages 549–559 of the China White Paper of August 1949.

Here are some of the more enlightening excerpts:

He—

Chiang—

said that the Chinese people did not regard the Communists as Chinese, but regarded them as internationalists, subject to the orders of the Third International. Mr. Wallace mentioned the fact that the Third International had been dissolved but President Chiang indicated that the situation had not been altered by that fact (pp. 552–553).

He—

Chiang—

said that the Communists desired a breakdown of Chinese resistance against the Japanese because this would strengthen their own position. Mr. Wallace expressed amazement at this statement. President Chiang admitted that the Communists desire the defeat of Japan but that they were now convinced that this defeat could be accomplished without Chinese resistance. They therefore hoped for the collapse of the Kuomintang prior to the end of the war because such a collapse would enable them to seize power, whereas, if the Kuomintang continued in power until peace the Communists would have no opportunity to supplant it. President Chiang referred to the clever Communist propaganda to the effect that they were not tied to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that they were in fact nothing more than agrarian democrats. As a mattter of fact, the Communists follow the orders of the Third International. The Chinese Government cannot openly criticize the Communists for their connection with the Third International because it is afraid of offending the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Mr. Wallace referred to the patriotic attitude of the Communists in the United States and said that he could not understand the attitude of the Chinese Communists, as described by President Chiang. President Chiang said that this difference in the attitude of the American and Chinese Communists might be explained by the fact that there was no possibility of the American Communists seizing power, whereas the Chinese Communists definitely desired to do so in China (p. 553).

Thus did the hard-headed battler of the Communists since the 1920's try to lead the visionary Wallace by the hand to a better acquaintance with the facts of life. He did not get far. Wallace commented, later in the same conversation, and "if, as President Chiang stated, the Chinese Communists were linked

with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, then there was even greater need for settlement" (p. 554).

The following day, according to Vincent's notes, Wallace took the tack with Chiang that "we are not interested in 'Chinese Communists' but are interested in the prosecution of the war." In that connection, Vincent adds a significant parenthetical note:

He—

Wallace—

and Mr. Vincent had decided upon this line of approach the night before in order to avoid further lengthy discussion of the Communists per se.

Even so, Mr. Wallace did not keep Chiang entirely away from the subject. The Generalissimo complained with obvious justification:

Much pressure has been brought to bear by the United States Government to have the Chinese Government reach a settlement with the Communists but the United States Government has exerted no pressure upon the Communists (p. 555).

To which I might add that Chiang, in 1944, "hadn't seen anything yet," along that line.

Mr. Wallace offered the gratuitous advice to Chiang that "there should be no situation in China which might lead to conflict with the U. S. S. R." At the same time he explained that the United States could not be expected to be a party to negotiations between China and the USSR, which takes on the character of a masterpiece of irony in view of what President Roosevelt subsequently agreed to, in the way of the betrayal of China, less than a year later at Yalta.

Mr. Wallace also gave Chiang the benefit of his wisdom on the subject of communism. He said, according to Mr. Vincent's notes, that "insofar as the Communists have power and influence it is due to economic conditions," and Mr. Vincent chimed in that "the best defense against communism in China was agrarian reform."

On the way to the airport to see Mr. Wallace off, President Chiang gave him his estimate of the Communists:

He—

Chiang—

feels that the Chinese Communists are not men of good faith. Their signature is no good. He would not like to see the President blamed for Communist failure to carry out commitments. The Generalissimo is a true friend who knows the Chinese Communists through and through and thinks that no matter what the Communists say they will do, it will not be carried out in which case the President's prestige would suffer a great loss. The Generalissimo wants the President to know that the conflict between the Communists and the Central Government is not like that between capitalism and labor in the United States—the situations are not analogous (p. 559).

The President then, of course, was Franklin D. Roosevelt. Judging from the decisions made by his successor, President Truman, and by the policy of appeasement toward the Chinese Communists carried out on Truman's instructions by General Marshall, Mr. Wallace, as constant adviser to President Truman in those critical decision days of late 1945 did not convince Mr. Truman of the soundness of Chiang Kai-shek's counsel. We know, of course, that Mr. Wallace wasn't convinced himself.

It is a curious sequel to this ill-fated relationship between Mr. Wallace and Mr. Truman in the China-policy-shaping days of late 1945, that when, as Chiang had predicted, his prestige began to suffer loss through the faithlessness of the Chinese Communists, Mr. Truman undertook to pretend that he had never favored including Chinese Communists in the Chinese Government.

The New York Times for March 12, 1948, quoted the President as saying, at a press conference, in answer to the direct question that if it was or had been American policy to favor inclusion of Communists in the Chinese Government "it was news to him." Yet the day before the same newspaper quoted Secretary of State Marshall as saying that the United States Government still favored broadening the base of the Chinese Government to include Communists.

Of such confusion and contradictions, was born our present tragic situation in the Far East. How lamentable that Wallace-Marshall-Truman shaped the decisive policy in 1945, when no one in the administration thought to consult General MacArthur.

Polish Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting article that appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., on May 3, 1951:

POLISH INDEPENDENCE DAY

May 3, 1791, is a date comparable in Polish history to July 4, 1776, in American annals. Just 160 years ago today Poland's Constitution was reformed by men of vigor, character, and capacity in its Diet who took advantage of favorable international developments to do away with its old, out-moded government.

The death of Frederick the Great in 1786 loosened the bonds of the alliance between Prussia and Russia. Russia undertook with Austria a war against Turkey, and Russia at the same time was attacked by Sweden. Prussia invited Poland to forsake her Russian alliance and offered to place 40,000 at her disposal.

But these advantageous external developments were useless so long as Poland was hampered by her anarchical constitution. The strong men in the Diet, taking advantage of an Easter recess when the malcontents were out of town, demanded reforms. King Stanislaus exhorted the deputies to accept the new constitution, and a brand-new era dawned for the Poles.

The change converted Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy. Invidious class distinctions were abolished. The towns got full administrative and judicial autonomy and a certain measure of parliamentary representation. The peasants were placed under the protection of the law, and their serfdom mitigated. Absolute religious toleration was established.

While Poland has seen many sorrowful days in the years which have intervened, 1791 stands out as a red-letter year in her history. Here in Lynn residents of Polish birth or descent will celebrate the anniversary Sunday with appropriate ceremonies. Their fellow citizens of good will will join with them in their prayers for a brighter day for their valiant homeland.

Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay written by George Kosciusko Weaver, who resides at 621 North Main Street, Louisburg, N. C., and is a member of the senior class of the W. R. Mills School, Louisburg, N. C. This essay is entitled "Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped," and it won second prize in the contest conducted by the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped. This contest was entered into by representatives of the high school students in 34 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and there were five awards. Each of the other four awards were won by young ladies, but the second award, which consisted of a trip to Washington and $400, was won by Mr. Weaver, the splendid high school student of Louisburg, N. C. These students visited Washington on Friday, May 4, 1951, and received the awards at the United States Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

(By George Kosciusko Weaver)

Listen, America. May we have a moment of your time? A moment is all we ask, but it is truly a crucial one. Interrupt your daily routine, and listen to what we have to say. We assure you, you will not regret it. We are the voices of the physically handicapped. We speak in many tongues; we abide in many locales, and we ask for but one thing: To be given a chance—a chance to prove our worthiness and capabilities. We will do the rest.

You might ask, "Who are the physically handicapped? How can I help them if I do not know who they are?" You have only to look around to see us. Some of us are war casualties. Some have been disabled in accidents, some because of illness. The young man down the street who lost a leg in the war is one of use. The pretty but crippled young girl who had infantile paralysis is, too. We are at least 7,000,000 strong, and day by day we are increasing the working force of the United States to new heights. Rehabilitation agencies and groups are going a long way in enabling us to become competent and skilled workers, but much still remains to be done. A little encouragement and reassurance from you can go a long way in reinstating our pride and helping us to find the position that is congruent to our abilities.

Many of us are bewildered and fearful because of indifferent reactions on the part of our fellowman upon learning that we are handicapped in some manner. You can show your faith in us by giving us a chance for equal employment. This would help in giving us release from mental anguish, from an acquired feeling of inferiority, and from being called the "tin cup" brigade. To refuse us this may mean total destruction of our very life, for we will remain broken in body and spirit. Give us a chance at this thing called happiness. If you are interested at all in the welfare of our country, the well-being of its citizens, you are interested in the employment of us, the physically handicapped.

Some of us have been given this chance. Have we not proved our proficiency in many walks of life far better than expected? Our high output and efficiency records have equaled that of the unimpaired and excelled it in many places. We ask only that you take our records and study them carefully. Study them closely so that you may realize that we are just as capable of turning out excellent work as the nonhandicapped worker. After all, we are actually disabled only when our disabilities hamper us in performing the duties of a certain job. Analysis of our problems can easily determine which jobs we are capable of handling and which we are not. You must realize that in order to utilize the full potentiality of the Nation's working population, our talents and abilities must not be lost because of prejudiced and biased opinions on the part of the employers and employees. When we can do a job well, we are no longer considered handicapped as far as that job is concerned.

You have no doubt seen our slogan: Hire the Handicapped, It's Good Business, and have probably asked, Why should I hire the handicapped, when I can get all the employees I need from the ranks of the unimpaired? The answer to this question is obvious. Take another close look at our records. You will see that we have proved outstanding in the ability to adapt ourselves to existing requirements. We have an excellent record in carefulness and safety. We have demonstrated our proficiency in productiveness; our reliability and regularity record equals that of any working force in the Nation. These facts substantiate beyond the shadow of a doubt that it is good business to hire the handicapped.

If you are still a bit incredulous about our records as a whole, why not look at the individual ones? Your local rehabilitation agency will be more than glad to supply you with countless case histories of successful restitution which later led to profitable employment and happiness. Among our forefathers, you will find many notables who had some serious physical handicap but who overcame it to leave their footprints on the sands of time. Was not Milton blind, Edison and Beethoven deaf? As for our contemporaries, the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, one of the greatest leaders our country has ever had, was crippled by infantile paralysis. Helen Keller, one of the greatest among women, became deaf and blind at a very early age. In overcoming her handicap, she has inspired many who otherwise probably would have never tried.

Many of us do not realize what is being done for our benefit. In this respect, it is the duty of the community to show those who are discouraged and disillusioned that a genuine effort is being made by the ones who understand our problems to locate a job adapted to our specific talent and ability. There are an estimated 6,000,000 of us who are employed while there is an estimated million who are not, but who are willing and who could be added to the working force of the Nation through better training and rehabilitation facilities, suited to the individual. Open the door of opportunity to us, and do unto us as you would have us do unto you were the tables turned and you were physically handicapped.

Why not give us this chance? Take our interests at heart and grant us the privilege of taking our rightful place in the community, State, and Nation. It is the people's way. It is the American way, the democratic way; and most important of all, it is God's way.

The Basic Pay of Commissioned and Enlisted Personnel of Our Armed Forces Should Be Regulated in Accordance With the Cost-of-Living Index

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced House bill 3991 to provide that the basic pay of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of our Armed Forces should be regulated in accordance with the cost-of-living index compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

The bill provides that the President shall examine annually on May 15 the status of the cost-of-living index in relation to the pay scale as established by Congress October 1, 1949. Whenever the President finds that the cost-of-living index has risen above or fallen below the cost-of-living index of October 1, 1949, in excess of 3 percent, an adjustment in the basic pay of all members of the armed services shall be made as of July 1 of the calendar year in which such determination is made. In other words, the adjustment in pay scales is not retroactive.

When Congress passed the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and made it effective October 1, 1949, it represented the results of a comprehensive study by Congress and a similar study by an all-civilian commission appointed by the Secretary of Defense in 1947 and commonly called the Hook Commission.

It was found by the Hook commission after an exhaustive research into wages paid by industry of comparable jobs and taking into consideration the economic condition of the country during the summer of 1949 that the pay scales for ranks and grades of our Armed Forces were away out of line and needed adjustment. As a result, the Hook Commission presented to Congress pay scales that it felt were fair and equitable to all concerned. In submitting its recommendations the Hook Commission informed Congress that it felt that the spread of the pay scale was as sound at that time as it was possible to make it. At the same time, it was pointed out that as the country's economic condition changed from time to time, a flat percentage increase or decrease across the board to all concerned should be applied to pay and allowances so as not to upset the spread of pay scales as finally agreed upon.

Before Congress enacted into law the recommendations of the Hook Commission, it followed the cost-of-living index and reduced the proposed officers base pay 5 percent and enlisted personnel's base pay by 2 percent. Subsistence allowance was also reduced by $3. In other words, before the recommendations could be written into law the cost of living dropped with the result that the proposed pay scales were adjusted accordingly.

Since the Career Compensation Act of 1949 was approved by Congress, there has been a considerable change in the economic condition of the country. The cost-of-living index published monthly by the Department of Labor shows a decided upward swing since the fall of 1949. The following comparison between the index of August 1949 and February 1951 plainly shows the status of the take-home pay of the members of the military services in regard to the economic position of the country:

Table (furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U. S. Department of Labor)

	Over-all	Food	Apparel	Rent	Fuel, electricity, refrigeration	House furnishings	Miscellaneous
August 1949	168.8	202.6	187.4	170.8	155.3	194.8	154.8
February 1951	183.8	228.0	202.0	184.0	143.9	209.7	169.3
Percentage rise	11.0	7.6	11.0	6.0	11.5	10.5	10.5

A study of the above table reveals that since the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, the over-all average cost of living increase is 9 percent according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

Keeping in mind that military personnel are located by and large in congested areas the cost of living percentages would reflect even greater changes for them because of shortages of housing, and so forth, which tend to increase rates due to the congested area conditions. Then, too, frequent moves of the service family tend to cause their expenses for house furnishings to be greater than the average, when they have to more frequently set up housekeeping in new locations. This factor also influences the miscellaneous category which shows an increase of 10.5 percent.

When taking into consideration these additional factors one can readily see that the over-all cost-of-living increase for service personnel could be estimated in the neighborhood of 10 percent to 12 percent for the categories listed above.

Practically all forms of transportation, both local and national, have increased a great deal in cost during this period. A major point the Hook Commission took into consideration in their study was the Armed Forces income-tax exemption which was repealed effective

January 1, 1949. The Commission took this loss of exemption into account so that no member of the Armed Forces actually took a cut in his over-all salary. Since the enactment of the Career Compensation Act, the withholding tax rate for Federal income tax has been increased from 15 to 18 percent. This results in a decrease in the take-home pay not contemplated by the Hook Commission, while at the same time the cost of living has steadily increased.

It is common knowledge that the cost-of-living index is used as a pattern for the pay of personnel in private industry and on that basis several pay increases have been granted since 1949. Yet, to date no consideration has been given to living expenses of military personnel.

I hope that my bill, H. R. 3991, will receive immediate consideration by Congress so that those men and women who serve in our Armed Forces will be given the same consideration as accorded those who work in private industry.

The American Pretzel

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to your attention that Wednesday of this week will mark an important anniversary in the industrial and social life of my district and, in fact, of the entire Nation.

May 9 marks the celebration of the creation of what has virtually become a national institution—the American pretzel, which is 90 years old this month.

Actually, I might point out, the pretzel is many centuries old, dating back to earliest religious rites. But the commercial pretzel, a tribute to the heralded American ingenuity and business acumen, was born in the tiny town of Lititz, Pa., in the Ninth Congressional District in 1861.

Like so many things American, the pretzel has its roots in many cultures. In ancient Rome, the pretzel symbolized victory in battle; while in the early monasteries it meant the crossed arms of prayer. To us it is a symbol of our ability to synthesize basic ingredients into a product vastly superior to its ancestors. Incidentally your early pretzel was known in Italy as "brazitella" and in Germany as "brezel."

But all these early pretzels had a life span of only one day. They were baked in the corner bake shop, and were eaten only by people close to the bakery. It remained for an American to invent a formula which would keep pretzels fresh for days and weeks and even months. And it took American businessmen to carry the pretzel to every home, to establish the pretzel as a part of our everyday lives.

Never sneer at the pretzel, nor discount its impact on the economy of the Nation. Munch instead for a moment on the fact that approximately 100,000,000 pounds of pretzels are made and consumed in the United States each year. One hundred million pounds of pretzels, more than the total displacement of our largest battleship, the *Mighty Mo*, the U. S. S. *Missouri*.

A plaque will be unveiled on the N. D. Sturgis pretzel plant, where, in 1861, an itinerant baker revealed a secret formula he had devised to make commercial pretzels. Almost like a symbol of American resourcefulness, like a Johnny Appleseed, this unknown baker planted the seed of the American pretzel at Lititz, and then quietly moved on.

From that seed grew the international pretzel industry, which has carried the pretzel to us all.

As a supplement to these remarks, I would call to your attention the following chronological account of the development of the pretzel to its present culinary perfection. And for more tangible evidence concerning this Pennsylvania Dutch delicacy I would invite you to help yourself to the pretzels which will be placed in the cloak rooms and on the tables in the House dining rooms through the courtesy of the National Pretzel Bakers Institute. You will find them to be a delightful version of an old twist. The above-mentioned follows:

FACTS ABOUT THE NINETIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PRETZEL

The inhabitants of the hamlet of Lititz, Pa. (population 5,500), will devote May 9, 1951, to the American pretzel. On that date Lititz will step back to the year 1861, when the first commercial pretzel was baked in a Lititz oven.

Schoolchildren, businessmen and other burghers of Lititz will participate in the holiday. Gov. John S. Fine and other State dignitaries, and show-business figures, will join descendants of the first pretzel baker in the observance of the humble start of an international industry.

As the culmination of the ceremonies, a plaque, dedicated by the National Pretzel Bakers Institute, will be unveiled on the N. D. Sturgis pretzel factory, site of the first commercial pretzel. The marker will be unveiled by Linda Herr, 6, and Robert Spickler, 8, great grandchild, and great-great grandchild respectively, of the first pretzel baker.

Following is the Lititz legend: The first skirmishes of the Civil War were being waged when a wanderer strolled into the tranquillity of the picturesque Pennsylvania Dutch community of Lititz. The vagabond, his sack slung to a stick over his shoulder, stopped at the tiny shop of baker William H. Rauch, and requested a temporary job. "I'm a wandering man," he explained, "I don't know how long I'll stay." Baker Rauch wiped his flour-covered hands on the apron that covered his round belly, and smiled, "Stay as long as you like."

And so, the itinerant baker went to work for Rauch, making, among other delicacies, the light, flavorful pretzels for which the Pennsylvania Dutch were famous. But, as wonderful as they were, these pretzels became stale after 24 hours.

Baker Rauch fed his transient employee the good, wholesome upstate Dutch dishes. Most of all, Rauch offered his hobo baker the warmth and hospitality of his home. Finally, however, the urge to move on forced the wanderer to leave. In gratitude, the vagabond baker showed old man Rauch a formula he had invented to make pretzels that would stay fresh; pretzels that could be made in quantity and sold days later.

But Baker Rauch did not appreciate the value of the secret formula. He gave the formula to his apprentice, Julius Sturgis. Sturgis then established the first pretzel factory in the world on Main Street in Lititz. This historic plant is still in operation producing the pretzel that made Lititz famous.

From this inauspicious beginning, from the gratitude of a vagabond baker, grew the pretzel industry. Today almost 100,000,000 pounds of pretzels are baked each year, baked with the secret formula presented to Baker Rauch 90 years ago.

The origin of the humble pretzel is shrouded in antiquity; it has been traced back through prereligious associations to basic life symbolism. The first neopretzels were made to celebrate the worship of wheat as a giver of life.

In an approximation of chronological order: the pretzel is believed to be a descendant of the Hebrew bagel; it was a symbol of victory in battle to the ancient Romans; used for healing and in burial ceremonies; as a symbol of prayer to the medieval church, and for the observance of the New Year in middle Europe.

In the ancient monasteries, the pretzel, representing the crossed arms of prayer, was given to children as a reward for the successful completion of their catechism.

It was used by the medieval bakers guilds as the honored badge of their trade. And it was proudly emblazoned by Emperor Frederick of Prussia after the bakers rescued his armies from a major defeat in battle.

There are two derivations suggested for the name pretzel. One begins with the Latin "bracellus," meaning "armlet"—to the Italian "bracciella"—to old high German "brazitella"—to the middle high German "brezel"—to dialect "bretzel"—to the current word "pretzel."

Another source traces the name back to the Latin "pretiola" meaning "small gift," which the monks would offer to worthy child students.

The pretzel, at one time, was so integral a part of the church procedure that a Roman Catholic ban once prohibited its usage in any other connection.

However, after many centuries, the pretzel became even more inextricably associated with the Bavarian beer hall. Beer and pretzels were a pair rivaling ham and eggs, or mocha and June.

It was the Germans who brought the pretzel to the new continent. As early as 1613 pretzels came to America, to the new community of Germantown, in Pennsylvania.

From 1613 to 1861 pretzels were almost exclusive to the Pennsylvania German communities. The major reason for their restricted usage was their impermanence. Pretzels had to be hand-rolled and twisted, and baked either in a home oven or at the corner bake shop. They had a freshness span of only 1 day.

But then, the tramp visited Lititz, and devised the formula which made pretzels available to the world.

From the original pretzel factory belonging to Julius Sturgis, apprentices carried the pretzel formula throughout up-State Pennsylvania, where some 70 percent of all pretzels are still made; and thence to Ohio, Michigan, and other States.

Still, pretzels were associated chiefly with beer, until the appearance on the pretzel panorama of Harold H. Moss.

An ex-clergyman turned pretzel publicist, silver-haired, blond-browed Moss devoted himself with truly religious zeal to the homely pretzel. Single-handedly, Moss carried the pretzel out of the beer hall.

Moss sold the nation on pretzels and ice cream. He invented pretzel variations like the pretzel stick, chocolate-covered and peppermint flavored pretzels. He foraged through the kitchens of the Pennsylvania Dutch communities and came up with pretzel soups, pretzel salads, pretzel soufflés and pancakes.

Another great stimulus to pretzel sales was the advent of the pretzel-twisting machine. A serious shortage of pretzel-benders was imminent in 1938 when the mechanical twister made its welcome appearance.

From a poundage in 1938 of 52,000,000, Moss and the machine twister lifted pretzel sales to the present figure of almost 100,000,000 pounds.

In addition, 92.2 percent of all pretzels are now sold in groceries, delicatessens and school cafeterias.

After a long, long journey, the pretzel has finally found its way home.

Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1952

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks during general debate on the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1952, I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the fine cooperation of the other members of the subcommittee in conducting the hearings, in writing the bill, and passing it through the House. Mr. GORE, of Tennessee, and Mr. ANDREWS, of Alabama, are veteran members of the Appropriations Committee and have had much experience as members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee. Their assistance has been indispensable. Their service to the Nation and to their districts is outstanding. Their judgment is always excellent; their sense of fairness is always present. On the minority side, we have such outstanding old timers, so to speak, as Mr. PHILLIPS, of California, and Mr. COUDERT, of New York. Mr. PHILLIPS is the ranking Republican member and he does an outstanding job. He is always courteous, polite, and at all times knows all the facts and figures in every proceeding. His district and the entire State of California and the Nation can well be proud of him. In this subcommittee which deals largely with bipartisan commissions, very little partisan politics is indulged in. Mr. COUDERT brings a wealth of business experience to the committee. His ideas and good judgment always carry great weight with the other members. We have for the first time on our subcommittee, even though they are old members of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. YATES, of Illinois, and Mr. NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire. Mr. YATES is brilliant and hard-working. He has taken a most active part in conducting hearings and writing the bill. He has added much balance to the committee. Mr. COTTON, of New Hampshire, has a wealth of what we Texans call common horse sense and is an outstanding credit to all of New England and to the great State of New Hampshire which he so ably represents. All of us like him and admire him.

Much has been said on the floor of this House today about the provision on pages 49 and 50 of the bill under "Maritime activities" relating to payments by the United States on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss of vessels.

The tabulation which follows shows for a small number of ships chosen at random by the Maritime Administration the acquisition cost to the owner, the amount paid by the Maritime Commission for charter hire, and the amount paid the owner when the ship was sunk. It should be noted that more than 750 such ships were lost during the war. Following this tabulation is a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dealing with the same subject matter.

[T/c—Time charter. B/b—Bare boat]

Owner and ship	From WSA charter	To WSA charter	Rate per month	Total charter hire paid	Year built	Year acquired by owner	Estimated cost to owner	Date lost	Amount paid for loss
Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc., *Alcoa Leader:*									
MC	Dec. 13, 1941	May 13, 1942	$37,560.00						
WSA T/c	May 13, 1942	May 16, 1942	32,800.00						
T/c	May 16, 1942	Dec. 1, 1943	34,800.00	$1,048,469.73	1919	1940	$210,000	June 30, 1944	$436,907
T/c	Dec. 1, 1943	June 10, 1944	33,040.00						
T/c	June 10, 1944	June 30, 1944	27,600.00						
American Hawaiian Steamship Co., *Pennsylvanian:*									
T/c	Feb. 2, 1942	May 16, 1942	40,191.25						
T/c	May 16, 1942	July 13, 1943	42,785.00	826,192.77	1913	1913	715,786	June 30, 1944	505,000
B/b	July 13, 1943	June 30, 1944	13,339.25						
American South African Line, *Lancaster:*									
T/c	Feb. 17, 1942	May 16, 1942	43,425.00						
T/c	May 16, 1942	Dec. 30, 1942	46,230.00	507,563.93	1918	1940	365,888	Dec. 30, 1942	362,396
American West African Line, West Kebar: T/c	May 25, 1942	Oct. 29, 1942	37,149.00	226,767.60	1920	1928	231,808	Oct. 29, 1942	640,000
Grace Lines, Tachira: T/c	June 8, 1942	July 12, 1942	21,411.00	47,865.98	1920	1937	45,600	July 12, 1942	256,200
Isthmian Steamship Co., Chickasaw City: T/c	May 30, 1942	Oct. 7, 1942	46,000.00	195,297.71	1920	1939	384,473	Oct. 7, 1942	734,260
Luckenbach Steamship Co., Lena Luckenbach:									
T/c	Feb. 4, 1942	May 16, 1942	40,671.35						
T/c	May 16, 1942	Dec. 1, 1943	43,239.10	1,217,402.98	1920	1922	332,865	June 30, 1944	662,429
T/c	Dec. 1, 1943	June 30, 1944	40,987.85						
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., *Louise Lykes:*									
T/c	May 2, 1942	May 16, 1942	43,424.00	301,607.42	1941	1941	1,263,304	Jan. 9, 1943	1,191,582
T/c	May 16, 1942	Jan. 9, 1943	45,784.00						
Matson Navigation Co., *Honomu:*									
T/c	Mar. 22, 1942	May 16, 1942	38,400.00	120,615.45	1919	1937	127,562	July 5, 1942	765,000
T/c	May 16, 1942	July 5, 1942	40,960.00						
Waterman Steamship Corp., *Animous:*									
T/c	Apr. 14, 1942	May 16, 1942	38,600.00	233,164.08	1920	1931	86,436	Sept. 24, 1942	772,000
T/c	May 16, 1942	Sept. 24, 1942	41,000.00						

	Built	Dead-weight tons	Year acquired	Estimated construction cost	Estimated cost to owner	Charter hire— From—	Charter hire— To—	Rate of hire per month	Total charter paid
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.: Volunteer:									
Dry cargo, MC	1918	11,880	1937	$2,151,388.67	$101,049.42	Nov. 26, 1941	Aug. 5, 1942	$62,225.00	
WSA T/c						Sept. 6, 1942	Dec. 1, 1943	47,400.00	$1,760,845.00
T/c						Dec. 1, 1943	Aug. 29, 1944	44,160.00	
B/b						Aug. 29, 1944	Apr. 10, 1946	14,812.80	

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 4, 1951.

Hon. ALBERT THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of today requests my comments on the following provision carried in the appropriation for maritime activities of the Department of Commerce on pages 49 and 50 of the Independent Offices appropriation bill, 1952, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations:

"No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as

amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 per centum per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions."

An identical provision was included in the third supplemental appropriation bill, 1951, H. R. 3587, as passed by the House, but was stricken from the bill when reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. That provision was submitted by the Maritime Administrator at the request of your subcommittee in order to apply to all cases of vessels sold by the United States, and later reacquired by the Government, the principles of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, limiting the amount to be paid by the United States through purchase or requisition for vessels on which a construction-differential subsidy was paid. I am aware that the provisions of section 802 require the limitation on the price to be paid by the United States in event of reacquisitions to be written into contracts executed by the former Maritime Commission, whereas many of the vessels to which the presently proposed limitation might apply were acquired from the Government without such provisions in the contracts. Thus, the present limitation represents a belated attempt to remedy what I have felt was a basic defect in the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Notwithstanding the potential legal and constitutional questions which might be raised, it is a laudable effort to conserve the taxpayers' funds in a field where past history has shown that the interests of the Government have suffered in transactions involving the disposal of ships by the Government at depressed prices and the later payment by the Government for acquisition, charter, or loss of the same vessels at much higher prices.

Time does not permit the ascertainment of the aggregate amounts involved in such cases. Certain of those cases were referred to by you on the floor of the House yesterday. Others have been the subject of reports to the Congress by the General Accounting Office incident to its examinations of the accounts and records of the former Maritime Commission.

The following two cases are representative of what has happened in the past and what will happen again unless some limitation can be established on the amounts to be paid by the Government upon reacquisition of vessels previously disposed of by it:

The first company purchased 23 vessels built by the Government during 1919, 1920, and 1921, at an estimated cost to the Government of $41,421,000. The company's cost of acquisition was $1,570,000. The book value of the vessels at December 31, 1941, was $962,000, and the former Maritime Commission's estimated world market value at December 31, 1938, was $2,170,000. The Commission chartered all these vessels for varying periods during World War II and paid effective bareboat charter hire of $7,162,000. Ten of the vessels were sunk, and for those 10 vessels the owner received insurance of approximately $4,910,000, most of which was paid by the Government. Two of the vessels were requisitioned for title in 1945 for $640,000. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $1,570,000, was $12,712,000.

Following World War II, the same company bought 26 vessels, most of which were built in 1944. The cost to the Government was $74,835,000, of which $3,434,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $24,720,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,056,000, leaving a net recovery to the Government of $23,664,000.

The second company acquired nine vessels built in 1919 and 1920, at a cost to the Government of $13,739,000. Those vessels cost the company $529,000. Their book value at December 31, 1941, was $343,000, and the former Maritime Commission's world market value December 31, 1938, was $755,000. All nine vessels were chartered to the Government during World War II and effective bare-boat charter hire of $1,707,000 was paid by the Government. In addition, the owner collected insurance of $2,852,000, most of which was paid by the Government, for five of the vessels which were sunk, and $789,000 for two of the vessels requisitioned for title by the Government in 1944 and 1945. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $529,000, was $5,348,000.

This second company after World War II bought 7 vessels built in 1944 and 1945, at a cost to the Government of $32,034,000, of which $10,276,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $7,513,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,797,000, leaving a net recovery by the Government of $5,716,000.

It should be emphasized that the foregoing cases are not isolated ones. However, they should be sufficient to indicate that the Government, which inevitably sells its vessels in a buyer's market and buys them in a seller's market, needs every legitimate means to minimize the resulting financial disadvantages.

Naturally, representatives of those interests which would be affected by the operation of the proposed limitation have argued strongly against it. They have raised doubts in the minds of conscientious legislators who have expressed those doubts in debate. It is fully recognized that the provision, while binding on the Maritime Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the General Accounting Office, would be open to construction in court actions. Concerning the constitutional point of just compensation, I can only restate the traditional position of the General Accounting Office—and to my mind the only sound position that can be taken by the Office—that it does not exist to question the constitutionality, but to carry out faithfully the mandates of legislation enacted by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Wholesale Price Index Reveals Inflationary Trend Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news bulletin for May 3, 1951:

WHOLESALE PRICE INDEX REVEALS INFLATIONARY TREND CONTINUES

The damage being done to the whole domestic economy by the continuing inflation, and the consequent loss in purchasing power of the dollar is clearly revealed by a study of the fluctuation in the wholesale-price index for commodities in general, all considered necessary to the proper and efficient functioning of our economy.

The respective price index for selected years based upon 1926 equals 100 and the relative purchasing power of $1 is shown by the table which follows:

	Wholesale price index	Purchasing power of dollar
1890	56.2	$1.779
1896	46.5	2.150
1900	56.1	1.782
1904	59.7	1.675
1908	62.9	1.590
1912	69.1	1.447
1916	85.1	1.175
1920	154.4	.668
1924	98.1	1.019
1928	96.7	1.033
1932	64.8	1.543
1936	88.8	1.237
1937	86.3	1.158
1938	78.6	1.272
1939	77.1	1.297
1940	78.6	1.272
1941	87.3	1.145
1942	98.8	1.012
1943	103.1	.970
1944	104.0	.961
1945	105.8	.945
1946	121.1	.825
1947	152.1	.657
1948	165.0	.606
1949	155.0	.645
1950:		
June	157.3	.636
July	162.9	.613
August	166.4	.601
September	169.5	.590
December	175.3	.570
1951: March	184.0	.543

Government deficit spending appears to be the largest contributing factor to the continued inflationary rise in wholesale prices.

Submerged Lands, House Joint Resolution 131 and Senate Joint Resolution 20—Remarks No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Members of this House, that I be permitted so to do, I am privileged to present to your attention very important information with reference to the tideland oil or submerged lands and some of the situation as relates to my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.

Now there is pending before the Senate Interim Committee Senate Joint Resolution 20 by the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. This measure is commonly known as the interim tidelands bill and its companion measure in the same text, in the House is House Joint Resolution 131. It is by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of Judiciary.

It is well known that former United States Senator Sheridan Downey, of California, was several weeks ago retained by the city of Long Beach to represent its position in the tidelands matter to those interested and to Congress. On April 30, 1951, this distinguished citizen, representing Long Beach City, brought to me the following text of a proposed amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20, which text I personally delivered the same day to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interim Committee, presently considering Senate Joint Resolution 20. The text is as follows:

It is hereby provided that all the area off the coast of California in San Pedro Bay landward from the Federal breakwater and landward from a line extending from the eastern end of said breakwater due east to the shore line is hereby recognized as and declared to be inland waters.

My extemporaneous statement made before the O'Mahoney Senate committee on February 21, 1951, contains my discussion there made, but in addition thereto, I confirmed the fact that the city of Long Beach did not then and does not now claim anything seaward beyond the corporate limits of the city of Long Beach. Here is the text taken from the Senate committee hearings:

STATEMENT OF HON. CLYDE DOYLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, certainly I would be remiss if I did not state briefly that I very much appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of this committee and members of the committee in inviting me to sit at the committee table during these hearings. You did so at the last session of Congress at similar hearings, and I appreciate your repeating the courtesy.

There are here in the room, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, certain distinguished citizens from my home city of Long Beach that have been sent by my city across the continent to appear at these hearings to add weight, at least by their presence, to the position of my home city on this important subject, and I would like the privilege of just presenting them to the committee. It will only take about 30 seconds, and I am sure they would be honored by being so presented, and I am sure the committee would be glad to see them personally.

So if I may have that privilege, first I have the honor to introduce the Honorable Councilman Keller, chairman of the oil petroleum committee of the city council of my city, and also a petroleum engineer.

Emmet H. Sullivan, a member of the harbor board of my home city of Long Beach, and Mr. Amar, harbor manager of my city, and we think the best harbor manager of one of the greatest harbors in the country.

I will be very brief. I feel that the record is fairly well complete, as the chairman has said, on most of the material points that could be presented at such a hearing as this. Furthermore, our very able city attorney is here again, and I will yield what time I might otherwise take in his favor and in favor of the deputy attorney general of my State, who is also to testify this afternoon.

As a member of the Seventy-ninth Congress I filed for the State a quitclaim bill representing the State theory of ownership of tidelands. I believe the record will show that I filed my bill before the Attorney General filed his suit against the State of California. I filed only after conference with the then Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, and with the then Attorney General, Mr. Biddle.

At that time before the suit was filed, I registered objection to the proposed suit, and I urged that no accounting be asked of my State or of my city of any oil royalties received by either the State or the city on the grounds that my city had received its tideland grants in good faith from my native State of California in 1911; the State of California dealt in good faith when it made the grants and when it made the oil leases; and also that when my home city had contracted its oil wells on tidelands for production purposes that it had dealt in good faith.

We passed a quitclaim bill in the House of Representatives in that Seventy-ninth Congress. I think there were only 11 votes against it. I was one of the Members of Congress who voted to override the veto of the President of the United States of that bill.

Again in the Eighty-first Congress I again filed what we term, what this committee terms, the quitclaim theory for the State of California and other States, and I again supported that theory by appearing before the House committee, and then by appearing before this committee during your important hearings in the month of August 1950.

I also appeared in the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress in behalf of passage of the quitclaim theory bill for the State of California and the city of Long Beach.

And now in this session of Congress I again filed the same bill that had been approved in the last session of Congress by the House Judiciary Committee and for which a rule was granted by the House of Representatives. The text of that bill was the same as the Walters bill of the last session of Congress and the same as the Walters bill this session of Congress.

My resolution was H. R. 58, filed January 3, 1951, and I believe was the first bill filed in the House of Representatives, at least numerically, representing that theory.

I, of course, am in support of the Walters bill in the House of Representatives.

The City Council of Long Beach, the city harbor board, the city of Long Beach, forwarded to me recently under certification of the city clerk, copies of Resolution No. C-12838, dated February 6, 1951, registering opposition to Senate Resolution 20 and House Joint Resolution 131.

I, therefore, and because I also as Congressman feel that that was the consistent position for the city of Long Beach to take under the circumstances, oppose the two resolutions just named by me.

As I said, the city attorney will register the arguments. I will not take time so to do.

I do wish to say that I have here Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3 by the Assembly of the State of California registering objection to Senate Resolution 20. I wish to file that with the committee, and also Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4.

The CHAIRMAN. This material may be received and made part of the record.

(The following resolutions are those referred to.)

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the coastal States

"Whereas until recently it was generally recognized that all of the coastal States owned a belt of land beneath navigable waters adjacent to their coasts; and

"Whereas in 1947 the Supreme Court of the United States held that those lands were not owned by the States and that the Federal Government rather than the States has paramount rights in and power over the 3-mile belt of land; and

"Whereas the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court was to divest the States of valuable oil rights; and

"Whereas State ownership of the 3-mile land is not inconsistent with the Federal control necessary in the conduct of international affairs and Coast Guard activities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact such legislation as will be necessary to restore the ownership of the 3-mile belt of land beneath navigable waters adjacent to the coasts of the coastal States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of a coastal State in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to lands beneath the navigable waters adjacent to the coasts of coastal States

"Whereas a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States refutes a long recognized claim of the coastal States to the 3-mile belt of land beneath the navigable waters adjacent to their coasts; and

"Whereas the effect of this decision was to divest those States of valuable oil rights; and

"Whereas ownership of such land by the coastal States would in no way interfere with Federal control necessary in the conduct of international affairs and Coast Guard activities; and

"Whereas if it is possible for the Federal Government to secure the ownership of such lands on the basis of its contentions before the Supreme Court, there is a danger that the ownership of all State lands in other States as well as in the coastal States will be jeopardized; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California, has, by resolution, memorialized the Congress of the United States to enact legislation necessary to restore this land to the State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the legislatures of each of the States are urged to adopt a resolution similar to that of the California Legislature; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the legislature of each of the States is requested to transmit to the Legislature of California copies of any resolutions adopted or notice of any taken relative to the subject matter of this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the legislative bodies of each of the States."

Mr. DOYLE. In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I reserve the right to file a short statement in addition to this brief by me?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed. The committee will be very glad to receive it.

(NOTE.—The supplemental statement filed by Congressman DOYLE appears in the Appendixes.)

Mr. DOYLE. The resolution by the City Council of Long Beach, referred to, and the

harbor board, referred to, on February 6, 1951, was incorporated by me with appropriate remarks by myself on February 13, 1951, at page A748 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix.

I wish again to renew my appreciation for the courtesy of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman DOYLE, as physical proof of the fact that your presentation to us last year has not been forgotten, I hold in my hand a copy of a photograph of Long Beach which you were good enough to present to the committee at the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 195 last year.

This photograph, an enlargement of which we also received and which I have sent for in order to be exhibited here, contains a representation of the line of demarcation fixed in the stipulation between the State of California and the Government of the United States. It also shows the limit of the bay as defined for the purposes of the cases of *United States v. Carillo* (13 Federal Supplement 121). It shows also a third line much farther seaward running from Point Fermin to Newport Beach. This line cuts off a part of the city of Long Beach itself, and from my way of thinking would be utterly and completely unfair to the city of Long Beach.

I want the record to be clear, however, that nothing in this bill curtails, or fixes, I should probably say, the boundary of the inland navigable waters. The greatest care was taken in drafting the bill to make certain that it would not in any way fix that line. The fixing of the line will be made either by way of the decision of the Supreme Court after the master's report has been received or in permanent legislation eventually passed by the Congress.

I am sorry that the enlarged map is not present in the room, but I will hand this down the line so all the members of the committee may see it.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to thank the chairman for that statement. I know, Mr. Chairman, you made a similar statement at the hearings before this committee last session of Congress when I questioned the propriety of that proposed line.

Mr. Speaker, I have also made further extensions to remarks on this same important subject at other points in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I respectfully call your attention thereto; including part of the testimony by City Attorney Irving Smith, to whom I yielded some of my time.

Submerged Lands—House Joint Resolution 131 and Senate Joint Resolution 20—Remarks No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present more of my testimony before the Senate interim committee, presided over by the distinguished Senator of Wyoming in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 20, on February 21, 1951. This and other extensions of remarks in this RECORD by me should be read together. The text is as follows:

SUBMERGED LANDS

Senator LONG. Could I ask the witness whether the line here on the picture outside the proposed Government line——

Mr. DOYLE. That, Senator LONG, is the Federal breakwater.

Senator LONG. And I take it that the proposed line proposes to take for the Federal Government approximately half the land inside the breakwater—in fact possibly more than half.

Mr. DOYLE. More than half, Senator. Further, the fact is that the corporate limits of my city, which is a municipality under our State law and a city of first class, extend out at every point at least as far as the Federal breakwater and in two or three places slightly beyond the Federal breakwater; in other words, approximately 3 miles out.

With reference to what the chairman said, I call your attention to the fact that the Government proposed line here [indicating] is at Gaviola Avenue. That is the landward end, and leaves 3 miles and almost 4 miles of municipal beach and municipal water which could be leased by the Secretary of the Interior if he wanted to under this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Congressman, you are mistaken about that on two grounds. First, this line which is denominated the "proposed line" is only the line of the stipulation.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Government has never proposed any such line. No person has made any representation to this committee to the effect that that should be the boundary line. It is not a proposed line. That line, according to all of the information I have received, was drawn in the stipulation merely for the purpose of putting on the landward side all of the wells that have been drilled there. It is my information that there is no well in the Long Beach Harbor on the seaward side of that line. But I have tried to make it clear that so far as the chairman of this committee is concerned, and I would judge from the expression of other members of the committee, there is nobody on this committe who even dreams that that line of the stipulation should be regarded as the boundary of the inland navigable waters. The boundary in my judgment must be much farther seaward. It certainly should not be permitted to cut off any part of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I just urge to your attention very briefly two points on that.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you agree with that or not?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, Mr. Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. What the chairman has just said?

Mr. DOYLE. I do. As far as I know, that is a fact.

Senator ANDERSON. Then why is it called the Government-proposed line?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, that is the farthest south line, or the line out the farthest in our harbor which the Government is willing to accept.

Senator ANDERSON. As part of the stipulation?

The CHAIRMAN. As part of the stipulation?

Mr. DOYLE. Manifestly, Mr. Chairman, at least the whole corporate limits of my city was an inland bay, and all these years——

The CHAIRMAN. My understanding about it, sir, was that that line was drawn not for the purpose of fixing a boundary but for the purpose of defining the line on the landward side of which were all of the wells that have been drilled. It was a line of convenience and not a line of determination of boundaries?

Senator SMATHERS. May I ask a question?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Senator SMATHERS. Did the people of California propose that line there?

Mr. DOYLE. We did not.

Senator SMATHERS. Who proposed that line?

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask the city attorney?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. IRVING W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I believe I should clarify this because of the lack of information. That is a Government proposed line. The Justice Department petitioned the Supreme Court in the California case that they fix this segment of the California coast line as the final line of the inland waters at San Pedro Bay and ocean front at Long Beach. And the Attorney General for California, Mr. Mattoon, I am sure will bear out and supplement that with documents.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, let the Chair interrupt so as to clarify again. Mr. Smith is testifying with respect to the lawsuit. Now what he says about the lawsuit is correct. I am talking about the legislation, and I want to make it as clear as clear can be that, so far as the sponsors of this legislation are concerned and according to my judgment as far as the committee is concerned, that line has never been drawn. It means nothing to us, and nothing in this bill is intended to fix that line or to control the right of the city of Long Beach to areas seaward of that line. We are taking nothing away from it in this legislation.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I make one brief observation though? Of course, the fact that that was proposed by the Government in the lawsuit as the permanent line is the cause of fear on the part of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. Naturally. I can understand that and I am doing my best to allay that feeling.

Mr. DOYLE. One further point so that you realize that the city council and the harbor board have more than just ordinary causes of fear, and that is this: That within the last year the harbor department of my city asked the right of the Federal Government to dredge just adjacent to this proposed line, outside, for the purpose of getting land to fill a pier inside the proposed line, and the Federal Government refused the right of my city to dredge in our own municipal harbor contiguous to the Government proposed line to get land to fill a pier area within my corporate limits on the ground, Mr. Chairman, that the dredging would take place outside the Government proposed line in this lawsuit. And now, therefore, we come before you, as you realize, with the real ground, we feel, of fear. Furthermore, we are dead anxious to have that point clarified at the earliest possible date, and Senate Joint Resolution 20 doesn't, as the distinguished chairman said it couldn't, because it is an engineering problem.

But we again insist—and this will be my last statement—we again insist that the least that can be done, and I think the chairman has made it clear for the committee that there certainly should be no opposition to all the corporate limits in the city of Long Beach being understood to be exempted from any inclusion of less than an inland bay. Clearly it is an inland bay and should be exempted for purposes of legislation.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if it is the chairman's interpretation that the bill before us is broad enough in its terms to support the claim of these gentlemen?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not deny the claim, not at all. And I say for myself, and I know Senator Anderson agrees with me, that nothing in this bill is intended to divide the city of Long Beach.

It is obvious from looking at this photograph that the line of the stipulation, here called the Government Proposed Line because it was so proposed in the lawsuit, touches the shore at a point which is apparently well within the corporate limits of the city. There are houses which run right down to the beach on the seaward side of that line. I think it would be absurd to hold that those houses on the seaward side of that line were actually on the open sea. They are not on the open sea, they are on a bay.

Senator MILLIKIN. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether these gentlemen have proposed an amendment that would skirt the controversy but broaden this particular situation?

The CHAIRMAN. Not yet.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement in favor of my time going to the city attorney unless there are some questions.

Senator LONG. May I suggest to the witness, Mr. Congressman, and I believe you will agree with me, that there is nothing particularly wrong about the Federal Government or the Solicitor for the Federal Government claiming everything he can for the Government. I believe his statement yesterday was to that effect, that it was his duty to claim for the Government everything he could claim to which the Government might have some claim. That does not necessarily mean it is just or belongs to the Government just because the Solicitor claims it for the Government.

Mr. DOYLE. Senator, granting that is true, I am not willing to grant that even the Solicitor of the United States shall make a claim that has no basis in fact or merit, and that is what he did when in this lawsuit he claimed this Government-proposed line, manifestly the whole corporate limits of my city, of the bay. And the least he could have offered to stipulate to, in my judgment—and I am a lawyer, too—is the corporate limits of my city.

Senator ANDERSON. You have done pretty well in the Supreme Court so far, have you not?

Mr. DOYLE. No, not with regard to my city.

Senator ANDERSON. But you are saying he had no merit behind anything he is contending on this thing.

Mr. DOYLE. I didn't say that, Senator. I said he had no basis in fact or merit so far as my city is concerned in my judgment.

Senator ANDERSON. Let me ask this: Your city and other groups worked hard to defeat the legislation in August of 1950. Do you think the position of your city and these other States was improved by the defeat of that legislation and the subsequent act of the Supreme Court?

Mr. DOYLE. Senator, it is a long look ahead, and I do not feel qualified.

Senator ANDERSON. I am wondering if you improved your position and if you will improve your position by defeating this bill. You are quite obviously determined to defeat this resolution as well, and that means the impounding of money has to go on, and the taking of money and putting it away in a fund; whereas under the terms of this Texas and Louisiana could get some use out of it. What do you really hope to get by the defeat of this legislation?

Mr. DOYLE. Let me answer it this way: Suppose the master in chancery comes out as to my city and reaffirms the Government-proposed line, as a permanent line.

Senator ANDERSON. Then it will be too late for legislation, will it not?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you think it will stop litigation?

Mr. DOYLE. It will not stop litigation. We will go on with litigation for years if the master in chancery comes out with that.

Senator ANDERSON. If somebody else is getting the money, litigation will not help you too much, will it? I mean from a practical standpoint?

Mr. DOYLE. No, if our private interests drill up against our Long Beach city limits and drain our oil pool, within our city limits.

Senator ANDERSON. You would concede under this resolution you have a chance for fair treatment; do you or not?

Mr. DOYLE. It depends on how it might be amended.

Senator ANDERSON. You do not believe, as it stands, there is a possibility of fair treatment?

Mr. DOYLE. My city attorney and the harbor board and the city council have objected to it; they have so informed me.

Senator ANDERSON. I understand they have objected to it. They objected to the resolution of August 1950. But you do not believe that under the terms of this, without amendment, there is a chance for the city of Long Beach to be fairly treated?

Mr. DOYLE. Not a fair chance; no. I would rather have it in writing to be reasonably sure.

Senator ANDERSON. Anybody would, but you are in the midst of a controversy; are you not? You are now tied up in court. Here is a way that says in the interim we can proceed and try to protect each other's interests. Do you think it better to stand back and say, "We don't want anything in the interim"?

Mr. DOYLE. I think we can get something better than this, Senator Anderson.

Senator ANDERSON. Through what?

Mr. DOYLE. We can get quitclaim legislation.

Senator ANDERSON. You tried to pass it in the Seventy-ninth, Eighty-first, and now in the Eighty-second. Do you honestly believe it will pass in the Eighty-second?

Mr. DOYLE. I believe it is worth trying in preference to having the uncertainty of this legislation.

Senator ANDERSON. There are bookmakers who have been down before the Kefauver crime committee who will give you odds.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not a good gambler, but I am willing to take a chance.

Submerged Lands, House Joint Resolution 131 and Senate Joint Resolution 20—Remarks No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present more of my testimony before the Senate interim committee, presided over by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 20, on February 21, 1951. At other points in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this day, I have also inserted testimony by myself and City Attorney Smith. These four extensions of remarks, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, by me, should be read together. The text follows:

SUBMERGED LANDS

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. May I first, Senator MILLIKIN, say to Congressman DOYLE, who has made a very excellent presentation here, both last year and again today, that no authority is given by this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior to lease one single acre of submerged land to which the city of Long Beach lays claim without the consent of the city of Long Beach. We sought to make this as clear as printed language could make it.

In response to Senator ANDERSON, you said you would like to have it in writing. We have offered it to you in printing. The Secretary of the Interior cannot, under this bill, lease any lands which are beneath inland navigable waters without the consent of the city of Long Beach if there is a controversy about it.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I will defer that to my able city attorney, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the intent, and I hope you will accept it as the statement of the sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. DOYLE. I will accept it on that basis.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MILLIKIN.

Senator MILLIKIN. Would it be opening up a Pandora box of difficulties in other directions if this thing were made clear so far as this particular point is concerned?

The CHAIRMAN. No; there is nothing sacred about this language.

Senator MILLIKIN. Printed words on paper do not mean anything sacred, and these gentlemen say they are not satisfied, and if we could satisfy them without opening up everything else all along the line——

The CHAIRMAN. I know there is no possibility of that.

Senator MILLIKIN (continuing). Let's satisfy them.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had been in here when the hearing started, you would have heard the statement of the chairman. I am merely trying to allay fears which are expressed upon the basis of nothing contained in this bill. I am trying to make it clear that this so-called proposed line set forth in that photograph means nothing to the sponsors of this bill; and, so far as I know, there is no member of the committee who regards that as the seaward boundary of the inland navigable waters of Long Beach.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, I simply repeat that if, without destroying the essential symmetry of what we are trying to do here, you can put some language in to allay the fears of these gentlemen, let's do it. That is what we are here for.

The CHAIRMAN. Why, of course. The Senator has worked with the chairman of this committee for many years, and he knows certainly that nobody is more willing to accept amendment than is the chairman.

Senator MILLIKIN. To that I heartily subscribe. I am not posing any point of resistance to the chairman at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Good.

Senator MILLIKIN. It is only because the chairman made it so clear that these gentlemen were not intended to be restricted by this composite line in this photograph that it occurred to me we could make it additionally clear with perhaps some happy language.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Congressman DOYLE.

Mr. Matoon.

Senator MALONE. Are you through with this witness now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator MALONE. Could I ask a couple of questions?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Senator MALONE. I am glad to see you here, Congressman.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Senator MALONE. What was the condition as far as the leasing and the rentals before the Supreme Court decision in relation to Long Beach?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, the city of Long Beach—and perhaps my city attorney, who will testify, can give you more of the technicalities of it—but the city of Long Beach does not lease its wells. It contracts its wells, which is quite different than most municipalities in most States. The royalties by reputation—and the city attorney can give you the exact figures.

Senator MALONE. I am not asking for the exact condition but just generally.

Mr. DOYLE. They are very high, probably the highest in the country by reputation. The harbor board of my city is under our charter rated as an independent, semi-independent municipal body, with power to lease any oil properties for the city, as a department of the city. In other words, our city council does not even have to approve the contract and the activity of the harbor board.

I am sure that is correct. If I am incorrect in any detail, I want the city attorney to correct me.

Senator MALONE. It does not matter much about the detail. Just give me the general picture.

Mr. DOYLE. The general picture is that under the charter the city harbor board, representing the city, has power to lease or contract and develop the wells, and it has adopted the policy of contracting the wells at the very handsome royalty figures. That was the condition, Senator MALONE, before the Supreme Court decision.

Senator MALONE. In other words, the oil was considered an asset of the city, primarily?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. And in making contracts with the contractors you had worked out a system so that the royalties secured by the city were very high; is that true?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. About how high did it run at the maximum or minimum? Just generally speaking, then we can get the details.

Mr. SMITH. Our net is more than 60 percent.

Senator MALONE. More than 60 percent. That is a little higher than it runs almost anywhere else.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. Where did the Supreme Court decision as it is now leave you?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, as I understand it, we are going ahead. We are still operating on the same basis; but, on the advice of our able city attorney and action of the board of harbor commissioners, the royalties are being impounded. We have, I believe, approximately $100,000,000 in escrow at this time.

Senator MALONE. That is a good deal of money for any city; is it not? Now, Mr. Doyle, what happens under this bill? Could you just generally give me what happens now if this bill passes as it is now written?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Senator, I would yield in favor of my city attorney who has come thoroughly prepared after studying it exhaustively to give briefly an answer to that question.

Senator MALONE. Well, Mr. Doyle, do not try to be accurate, and allow anything to stand corrected in detail; but, generally speaking, what is the picture?

Mr. DOYLE. All right. Of course, in the first place, it is very obvious that if this bill passes in its present form, it still will be necessary to have a permanent line fixed so far as the city of Long Beach is concerned. The present line leaves approximately 4 miles of our beach and 9,800 acres of our corporate water within our own municipality uncertain as to who will take jurisdiction—whether or not the Federal Government will or whether or not it will leave all or any portion of that in the corporate limits for control by the municipality. That, of course, is a continuing hazard in our judgment.

The other thing is this: That under our procedure in the State of California, unless the municipality has fee title to all the land within its corporate limits, it definitely limits the functioning of our municipality in all matters. We naturally cannot issue, for instance, a bond issue, I take it, that would be passed by bond attorneys unless we have fee title to all the land within our corporate limits.

Now, this resolution still gives to the Federal Government the paramount right, whatever that means, within a portion of our corporate limits unless the municipality and the Interior Department get together. I mean it leaves the Supreme Court decision right where it is so far as part of our corporate limits are concerned.

Senator MALONE. Now what would be the condition if the so-called quitclaim bill that has been proposed a couple of times—and we did pass it but could not muster enough votes to pass it over a veto—if that were passed, what position would you then be in?

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, that, I presume, if the quitclaim was adequate, would put the city of Long Beach within its corporate limits in its original position of undisputed ownership, domination, and control and paramount right, whatever that is, within our corporate limits for all purposes. It would permit, for instance, our harbor department and our city council to build out into this water area more docks and wharves.

Our harbor board has proposed, I am informed, as will show on this map, a harbor development contiguous to the Government's proposed line of approximately $65,000,000, and we have the money to do it, because our municipal treasury has the money.

So, a quitclaim would clarify the whole title subject so we could issue bonds; we could build substantial facilities any place within our corporate limits. Now we cannot, of course; we would not dare to.

Senator MALONE. In other words, if I get your explanation correctly, Mr. Doyle, it would put you back where you thought you were in the first place?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. And you could continue your normal operations?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Senator MALONE. This is in the field of conjecture, and one man's guess is as good as another's. But you are in a position now that I used to be when I came from Nevada. I had to kind of guess what the Congress was likely to do. What change do you think a quitclaim bill would have to pass after this bill has passed and is sort of on the way and taken for granted and deals are made under it? Do you think we are very likely to pass another bill?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I do not know, assuming that this resolution did pass, whether the psychology of the members would be such as to realize it was only intended as an interim bill and there were major decisions that still had to be made or not.

I would say this, Senator Malone: If an interim bill passes without making dead sure that all of the corporate limits of the city of Long Beach were turned back to it for full domination and control, naturally we would have to oppose anything less than that.

Senator MALONE. You oppose this bill. But suppose it were passed. Let's just take it for granted it would pass for the moment for that purpose. Then what chance do you think we would have of later legislation restoring your original position?

Mr. DOYLE. I think it would reduce the chances of passage. I would assume, unless it was made very, very clear to all the Members that I am thinking of in the House of Representatives, that this interim did not take care of the total problem.

Senator MALONE. We have precedents here. We are still operating under interim or temporary legislation, temporary Executive powers, that were passed 10 years ago. I am a little bit disturbed about passing a bill called an interim bill. We still have the temporary buildings that were built for World War I down there, had them for World War II, and still have them for world war III. This interim thing gets me down sometimes.

Mr. DOYLE. You see, Senator, the thing that causes us to have great mental hazards is that ever since the appointment of the master in chancery, or the referee, on lines out in California, there has been virtually no action. I mean the referee has not yet made any report as to Long Beach, and so we are held up as an important municipality in everything that municipality should be free to do in its harbor or beach front. Even now I understand that he has passed out the information that it may be a considerable time yet before he is able to give a report as to Long Beach.

So, I would say, answering your question very frankly, that I would think that, unless the Members of the House, especially as I know some of them, had it very clear to their attention that this interim bill, if it passes, did not meet the total problem, psychologically it would limit the possibilities of passing a quitclaim.

Senator MALONE. Thank you very much for a frank statement. I remember you very well and your red-headed district attorney. I am looking forward to him taking the stand. Thank you.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, if someone can answer it, what was the vote in the Senate and what was the vote in the House the last time we had a quitclaim vote?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not recall. We will check it and put that in the RECORD.

Mr. MATTOON. The voting in the House was 257 to 29, almost 10 to 1. The vote in the Senate was never reached on the floor for the reason that it was voted with a favorable recommendation out of the Senate Judiciary Committee just 2 days before the adjournment, when the convention in Philadelphia was held, at which convention there was a resolution favoring its adoption.

Senator MILLIKIN. There were two conventions there. [Laughter.]

Submerged Lands, House Joint Resolution 131 and Senate Joint Resolution 20—Remarks No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I am this day offering four extensions of remarks on this same important subject. Nos. 1 to 3 include my testimony before the Senate interim committee. No. 4 includes certain questions directed by committee members and certain answers to said questions by City Attorney Irving Smith, of Long Beach, Calif. These four extensions of remarks all relate to the same important subject and should all be read and studied in order for you to obtain a balanced picture of how very meritorious it is that all of the inland waters of Long Beach within the Federal breakwater lines be declared as inland waters in any legislation dealing with this important submerged or tidelands question.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF IRVING M. SMITH, CITY ATTORNEY OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no reason to apprehend that the State of California would attempt to exercise any authority that it does not now exercise with respect to the operation of lands that are clearly the property of the city of Long Beach?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You have none?

Mr. SMITH. We have no difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN. With respect to wells which are landward of the line on this map, which you have presented to the committee,

is there anything in this bill which takes away from the city of Long Beach the right to operate as it has been operating the lands landward or the areas landward of this so-called Government-proposed line?

Mr. SMITH. Not as I read the bill. I believe not.

The CHAIRMAN. That accords with my own belief. So then it is your testimony to this committee that if this bill were enacted into law the city of Long Beach would have all of the rights that it now possesses and exercises with respect to every well which has thus far been drilled for or on behalf of the city of Long Beach?

Mr. SMITH. That is right. That is my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. So the only question, then, is with respect to possible wells on the seaward line, first of the so-called Government-proposed line, and then, secondly, on the seaward line, seaward of the exterior boundary of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the city of Long Beach assert any claim whatsoever to any area beyond the exterior seaward boundaries of the city of Long Beach?

Mr. SMITH. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it is your testimony to this committee that, so far as the city of Long Beach is concerned, it will be perfectly content to have its title confirmed first to all lands landward, all areas landward of the Government-proposed line, and, secondly, all areas landward of the exterior seaward limits of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that will completely protect the city, as far as the city's direct interest in this issue is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the city of Long Beach set up any claim to the pot of gold that is seaward of this area?

Mr. SMITH. The city of Long Beach has no interest other than the general interest as a city of the State and as citizens of the State, of course, but aside from that the city has no interest other than that in this 13,000 acres that the State conveyed to us within our corporate limits, as shown upon this map. Of course, we have no claim to any deposits or anything else outside those boundaries.

The CHAIRMAN. I am very glad to have that testimony; I think it is explicit, it is direct, it is clear, and nobody can have the slightest doubt of what the position of the city of Long Beach is.

I will say again, so that it may be clear in the record, that my own opinion is from the examination of the photograph which was presented to this committee last year and from the examination of this map that the so-called Government-proposed line is too narrow in the sense that it is too far landward.

In my judgment, it does not accurately define the exterior boundaries of the inland navigable waters of this bay. In my judgment, the line should be very much farther seaward, and unless there is information of which I am not aware, which has not yet been presented to me, I am ready to say now that so far as I am concerned, it seems to me to be clear that the boundary of the inland navigable waters must of necessity under all of the facts of the case include all of the area within the city limits of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. SMITH. Senator, you make us very happy.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will convey that information to those who represent the State of California, perhaps you can make us all happy and perhaps we can get a settlement of this controversy.

Mr. SMITH. We wish that that could be put into law. We appreciate your statement, Senator. We would like to have it put into something of finality that we can act upon.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that the committee will be very glad to consider the adoption of appropriate language to do precisely that thing. So that there may be no doubt now of the accuracy of the testimony which was given here at the outset on behalf of the Government by the Solicitor General and the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, I want to read from the stipulation which was filed in the California case in the Supreme Court, which was signed by and on behalf of the Government by the then Attorney General Tom C. Clark, and by J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, and by and on behalf of the State of California by the then attorney general, Fred N. Howser.

This stipulation says, appearing on page 21 of the Hearings on Submerged Lands, held by this committee under Senate Joint Resolution 195, during the month of August, last—and I read from the stipulation:

"Whereas the precise location of the '3-mile marginal belt' has not yet been determined, and it is the belief of the parties that further proceedings may be necessary in order to determine the line of demarcation between the '3-mile marginal belt,' and the tidelands and the inland waters of California (including ports, bays, and harbors) not claimed by plaintiff in this case; and

"Whereas the court has not yet entered a decree in the above-entitled case; and

"Whereas the immediate situation can be clarified and further conduct of this litigation expedited if a number of inland waters can be specifically excluded from the claims of the plaintiff in this suit;

"Now, therefore, it is stipulated and agreed by the parties through their respective counsel as follows:

"1. The following areas are not claimed by the plaintiff in this litigation:

"(a) That part of San Francisco Bay landward of a line drawn from Point Diablo, Marin County, Calif., to Fort Point, city and county of San Francisco, Calif.

(b) That part of San Diego Bay landward of a line drawn from Point Loma to Zuniga Point, on the southwestern end of North Island, San Diego County, Calif."

This next affects the city of Long Beach:

"(c) That part of San Pedro Bay landward of a line drawn from Point Fermin in a northeasterly direction through a point 300 feet due south of the southeasterly extension of the Navy mole and breakwater to the line of ordinary low tide in the city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.

"2. It is understood that the lines described in this stipulation are approximate only and do not represent surveyed lines.

"3. The foregoing descriptions of San Francisco, San Pedro, and San Diego Bays are without prejudice to the right of California to claim that the lines separating said bays from the '3-mile marginal belt' lie farther seaward than the lines herein described and that said bays include larger water areas than herein described.

"4. It is further stipulated that this stipulation is without prejudice to the rights of either party to claim that any other waters within the State boundaries of California constitute bays, ports, harbors, or inland water or marginal sea, as the case may be."

Mr. Smith, do you agree with my interpretation of that stipulation, that by it the Government of the United States bound itself not to claim any of these wells on the landward side of that line?

Mr. SMITH. I believe that is the effect of this; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that it also confirmed to the State of California the right to claim any areas on the seaward side of that line?

Mr. SMITH. That was reserved to the State.

The CHAIRMAN. That was reserved. So that the position of the Government of the United States in this California case was clearly intended to confirm to the city of Long Beach every well that has been drilled by or on behalf of that and to confirm to the State of California the right to claim that the boundary of the inland navigable waters was much further seaward than this so-called Government-proposed line?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it was not a Government-proposed line, was it?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, in my statement that the line drawn here deviates a small bit at one end from the stipulated line you read, since that was not a surveyed line. This line is the line proposed by the Department of Justice in proceedings before the master.

The stipulated line is an unsurveyed line, as stated in the stipulation, whereas the Government-proposed line is a surveyed line which ran 300 yards due east of the Point Fermin lighthouse instead of the Point Fermin lighthouse, as was the case with the stipulated line, through the same axis of 300 feet due south of the southeasterly extension of the Navy mole and breakwater to the low-tide mark in the city of Long Beach, there being that variation turning on that axis by reason of the beginning point change.

This brings us in closer inshore at Long Beach at Gaviota Avenue instead of the line shown in the stipulated line, and that is why I requested our engineers to put on this map the proposed line instead of the stipulated line, because that would not have been so correct.

The CHAIRMAN. By the use of the phrase "proposed line," you meant to indicate the line which has been presented to the master?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no hesitation in saying that for my part again that line, whether presented to the master or whether the line described in this stipulation, is altogether too close to the beach of Long Beach, and because it almost cuts the beach line of the city of Long Beach in two, it seems to me to be obviously unfair to the city of Long Beach. Does that make you any happier?

Mr. SMITH. Well, if that could be put into something, Senator—we appreciate your remarks—if it could be finally wrapped up into something that we could act upon; yes. I would merely like to say this in conclusion.

Senator MILLIKIN. May I ask whether San Diego has submitted any proposed amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. San Diego?

Senator MILLIKIN. Long Beach.

The CHAIRMAN. No; they have not.

Senator MILLIKIN. Why don't you give us something you think should be put in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. There has been some discussion, Senator, of amendments which would attempt to confirm the line set out in the stipulation.

Senator MILLIKIN. I heard the chairman make some suggestions, but it occurred to me that we could crystallize the whole thing from the standpoint of Long Beach if they will offer something they think will do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the bill should be clearly amended so as to obviate any confusion that might exist. The bill was drawn for the purpose of protecting the city of Long Beach and any other city that might be engaged in controversy over the actual line of boundary of a bay or inland navigable waters. There is no doubt in the mind of the chairman—and it has been expressed to him over and over again on behalf of the Government—that the Government does not and will not claim inland waters anyway, and certainly will not claim inland waters in any bay. The problem is to define the boundary, the seaward boundary of those bays. This committee has not had an opportunity to do that.

Senator MILLIKIN. I may ask whether the Solicitor General or his representative is here this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't believe that a representative is. If there is a representative of the Solicitor General here, will he rise?

Senator MILLIKIN. I would like to ask: Is there any objection to the theory expressed by the chairman of this committee of amending this thing so as to make it clear that the city of Long Beach continues its past jurisdiction over its own areas?

Mr. VAUGHAN (Robert H. Vaughan, Department of Justice). Senator, I am not sure that I can speak for the Solicitor General as to the entirety of the proposal here. The chairman correctly stated the position of the executive branch as set forth by us before the court. We do not claim inland waters. There is before the court the problem of defining what is the seaward limit of those inland waters right in this area.

Senator MILLIKIN. But is there a problem of defining the limits of the city of Long Beach?

Mr. VAUGHAN. The problem of defining the limits of the city of Long Beach is not before the court; but when the court draws the line separating the inland waters of San Pedro Bay from the open waters of the Pacific Ocean, that may or may not affect the limits of the city of Long Beach.

Senator MILLIKIN. Would there be an objection from the Solicitor General if this committee were to make amendments to the pending bill to clarify the situation of Long Beach along the lines suggested by the distinguished chairman? Would there be any objection to that?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MILLIKIN, perhaps Mr. Vaughan is not authorized to testify with respect to that.

Senator MILLIKIN. I don't want you to exceed your authority.

The CHAIRMAN. Without consulting the Solicitor General.

Senator MILLIKIN. We can make inquiry of the Solicitor General. I do think the observation is in order—and I say this most respectfully—that the Government made other claims and has taken other positions which in the course of time it has reversed in this very subject matter with which we are dealing.

I have complete sympathy, therefore, with the position of these gentlemen from Long Beach and with the chairman's position that the rights of Long Beach, if we can do so, should be set out explicitly to protect against a possible further change of direction by the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course. The fact that the chairman and the Senator from New Mexico joined in presenting this bill is in itself testimony of the desire of the two sponsors of this bill to do precisely that thing. What I have been endeavoring to do this morning has been to clear away a fog of confusion which has been raised about the effect of the legislation as it now stands.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think the distinguished chairman has given what should be some very heartening statements to the city of Long Beach, and I gathered from what the Senator said he would have no objection if appropriate language can be found to make that explicit in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I am searching for appropriate language: yes, indeed.

A Letter Answering Farmer's Requests for Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

DEAR FRIEND: I know that you're working hard on the farm these days, and we're working hard in Washington, too.

I wish I had the time to tell you everything that's going on here and discuss all the problems we're facing every day. But I've been so busy I haven't been able to write to you for over a month. From now on I'll try to let you know every 2 weeks or so about the things happening here that affect you.

If you've checked into buying a car lately, or had a friend do so, you've probably found out that the fifth tire—the all-important spare—wasn't included in the deal. The reason for this is the rubber shortage, since most of the raw rubber lately has been channeled into war production.

Last week, however, the National Production Authority, one of the new defense agencies here in the Government, and a busy one, too, I might add, cut by 10 percent the amount of rubber available for passenger car tires. But at the same time, the amount for truck, trailer and farm equipment tires was increased by 10 percent.

So you won't have to worry about getting a new tire for that tractor or truck or other farm vehicle. NPA announced too that we will continue to have 100-percent production of trucks.

You know, the wheels are really turning at the synthetic rubber plant at Institute. If we can get them going all over the country like the plant in West Virginia we can have a fifth tire even on passenger cars.

The Labor Department here has issued a new list of "critical occupations." These are the jobs your local draft board is advised to consider eligible for deferment. The new list includes farm operators.

Did you know, too, how much the value of your farm has probably gone up in the past year? An Agriculture Department report that just came into my office says that farms in West Virginia went up 11.5 percent in value between March 1950 and March 1951. A survey of real estate reporters showed that a third of them expect the prices to keep climbing, while only 5 percent expect them to go down.

The Suppression of the Wedemeyer Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, military security, of course, frequently requires that the public be denied access to the contents of official reports. The political security of a party in power or, more accurately, of the inner clique in control of a party in power, should never be made the excuse for suppressing a document prepared with great care by an able and distinguished expert in his field and submitted in sincerity and good faith to his superiors.

If heed had been paid to the recommendations of General Wedemeyer, it now appears almost certain that the Korean conflict would have been avoided without surrender of any of our basic principles, but with a saving of thousands of lives and untold suffering and sacrifice.

Like so many of the other horrible mistakes of the past, we can constructively use them now only as object lessons for the future to prevent a repetition of blunders and to force a more thorough study by those in authority of proposals advanced by experienced and qualified experts who are completely without political or partisan motive and are actuated only by a genuine desire to see that the country they love steers a sensible course in the conduct of its military and foreign policies.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a penetrating editorial on the suppression of the Wedemeyer report from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle.

The editorial follows:

THE WEDEMEYER REPORT, UNHAPPY SUPPRESSION

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer told his Government in 1947 exactly what would happen in China and Korea if we withdrew troops from those areas. The report was suppressed, its recommendations overridden by diplomatic decisions. We wrote off China to the Reds, we got ourselves involved in a seemingly endless war in Korea. Had we continued occupation of southern Korea, the Reds in the north probably would not have attacked.

Even now only a portion of the Wedemeyer report's content is revealed. To us the incident throws light on two issues—secrecy in Government, the fallibility of diplomacy.

Above all it raises this question: Having flouted Wedemeyer's prophetic report, will the Government be safe in flouting the recommendations of General MacArthur for prosecuting the war in the Orient? The State Department is shown to have erred sadly in its judgments as to China and Korea. It could be just as far off base in its toying with current crises.

Had Wedemeyer's advice been followed, the Russians would have known from the start that they would have had to fight Americans if they violated the thirty-eighth parallel. We would have been spared many casualties and would not now be waging a war of indecision.

In Europe we have a similar situation. Russia proposes that all foreign troops leave Germany. To us that would mean taking the troops home. To Russia it would mean piling forces up on a nearby border, ready for an attack as soon as the way was clear. Fortunately, we have shown no sign as yet of acceding to Russia's scheme. But the Wedemeyer incident certainly points to our need of building up strength and so placing that strength that Russia will have no doubt as to whom she will have to fight if she breaks over the line.

As to secrecy in Government, haven't we had enough? It is quite clear that much of the smoke-screening is set up to protect individuals and the administration rather than the Nation as a whole. We see no reason for the early suppression of the Wedemeyer report. Our security was not threatened by it. But our security certainly is threatened right now because the report was not accepted at face value. Had the public known what the general recommended, it might have forced the administration into more forthright action.

Lives, property, and freedom are the stakes today. It is not pleasant to think of them as being tossed around in a giant poker game in a locked and heavily curtained room. Obviously some items in the Wedemeyer report might require secrecy—items such as quantity and disposition of soldiery. But those are technicalities. With or without them, this report if opened for the world to read, might have served to keep the peace.

Increase of Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include there in a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Toledo memorializing the Congress to initiate and support legislation giving to employees of the Post Office Department a cost-of-living increase in their pay. I am in agreement with this resolution which is as follows:

Whereas one of the most efficient departments of the Federal Government has always been the United States Post Office; and

Whereas the loyal and industrious employees of this Department have not the usual means for the enforcement of demands for higher wages; and

Whereas it is universally recognized that the cost of living has increased tremendously: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Toledo, That it is the sense of the Council of the City of Toledo that post-office employees are entitled to a cost of living increase and that the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, the Honorable JOHN W. BRICKER, the Honorable FRAZIER REAMS, and the Honorable GEORGE BENDER should be and they are hereby respectfully urged to initiate and support legislation in the Congress of the United States to grant post-office employees a cost-of-living increase in their pay.

Adopted: April 30, 1951.

OLLIE CZELUSTA,
Mayor.

Attest:

CARL F. DIEFENBACH,
Clerk of Council.

Congressman Doyle Urges Constituents To Communicate Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, since my extension of remarks dated March 7, 1951, beginning on page 1319 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have received a number of communications to the effect that the information therein set forth, and the manner in which it was related, is considered of real value. Also some Members of this great legislative body have thanked me for reducing the important subject matter to that compact and convenient form.

Mr. Speaker, the development in our domestic and international situation ever since March 7, 1951, together with the importance that constituents know to whom to write and where their communication should be addressed, has made me conclude that I should emphasize my objective by sending out a goodly number of my extension of remarks of March 7, 1951, to constituents. I believe we in Congress, should always emphasize to the attention of the thousands of Americans whom we have the honor and responsibility of representing, the fact that their considered opinions are not only important, but that we seek such considered opinions, and the facts supporting them. I think we ought to emphasize the fact that considered, clear, analysis and clear thinking of folks at the local level of American citizenship, is very important and is an integral and powerful part of the functioning of our democratic processes through our representative form of government.

It is often said, that most Members of Congress do not personally read their daily mail, but I know so many Members who do take the time and patience to personally read their mail, that I am sure that the impression that letters written to Congressmen are ineffectual or unnoticed is not really a fact. For myself, Mr. Speaker, these more than 5 years that I have now been Representative from the Eighteenth District of California, I have habitually read the first-class mail and letters which have come to my office. Nor do they have to be addressed "personal" or "private" in order to have my personal reading. I have found my personal reading of all these letters a great source of contact with the thinking and problems of the citizens at home. We should encourage the folks to think things through—clear through. We should encourage them to transmit the benefit of their patriotic thinking to us, as their Representatives.

Unequal Cost Cutting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, despite the excellent work which the House did last week in reducing many of the items in the independent offices appropriation bill, it is submitted that even more drastic action must be taken, if we are to meet the challenge of maintaining a sound economy in the face of unprecedented expenditures for military purposes. One approach to this problem is suggested by the bill, which 10 of my Republican colleagues have joined me in introducing, to reestablish the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union urging action on this proposal.

The editorial follows:

UNEQUAL COST CUTTING

Funds for 27 Federal agencies covered by one appropriations bill were cut 10 percent by the House Appropriations Committee.

This is a saving—on paper—of $685,000,000.

Much as we applaud the saving, we can neither defend the percentage method of reducing Federal spending nor see in it more than a bird-shot attack on the swollen budget.

A flat percentage cut in agencies penalizes the most thrifty to the same extent as the most wasteful. By cutting the fat off one, it may starve those on a lean diet. Continued year after year, the net effect would be that budget requests would not be honest estimates of true cost, but cost plus the percentage the bureau chief guesses will be cut off.

Further, cutting Federal spending on the scale necessary to get us safely through the present emergency requires more than paring here and there. It requires lopping off of whole agencies and abandonment by the Federal Government of many wasteful functions.

The problem is to decide which ones. Representative KENNETH KEATING's bill offers the most hopeful means of deciding. He proposes that the Hoover Commission be recalled to list nonessential functions and agencies. This is the right means of significant and real Federal economy.

What Is Appeasement?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the word "appeasement" is being used rather carelessly these days. Those who are interested in trying to avoid another devastating war run the risk of being called appeasers or isolationists. It is reassuring to those in Congress who have supported a program to strengthen forces not only for peace but also for preparedness to read the following editorial from the Charlotte News, an outstanding newspaper, under date of May 5, 1951, which, under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks:

THE CHARGE OF APPEASEMENT

The word "appeasement" has been bandied about so loosely that it now means just about what the user chooses it to mean. As The New York Times sagely observes:

"If we do not immediately bomb troop concentration points in Manchuria, it is appeasement. If we do not immediately set up a blockade of Chinese ports (and presumably fire on British and Russian ships attempting to enter those ports), it is appeasement. If we do not provide air cover for an (probably preventive) invasion of continental China by Nationalist Chinese troops, it is appeasement."

In its strict sense, the verb appease means to reduce to a state of peace, to pacify, to make quiet or calm. Since Munich it has taken on a much less pleasant connotation. It has come to mean the abject surrender to an aggressor's demands, thus increasing the probability of new and bigger demands.

Now the appeasement label is being hurled against the administration that bolstered the military power of a Soviet-threatened Turkey; that aided Greece to fight off the Communist guerrillas; that stood up to Russia with the Berlin blockade; that used the Marshall plan to save Italy and France from Communist election victory and to restore Western Europe's productive capacity; that initiated and brought to fruit the Atlantic Pact; that appointed General Eisenhower to head the European army and gave him air, naval, and ground troops; that has just negotiated for long-term bases in Greenland;

that met the challenge of the North Korean invasion with all the limited forces this Nation then had at its demand; that put through a plan to enable the United Nations General Assembly to act when the Security Council was blocked by the Soviet veto; that isolated Formosa and kept it out of Communist hands; that poured materials and military advisers into Indochina when that nation was threatened; that launched a tremendous preparedness program in this Nation; that has tried to send grain to India to prevent those starving millions from turning to Moscow for aid in their hour of grave need.

Paradoxically, the label—uttered with scorn and derision as an epithet—is being used most blatantly by those in the Congress who have fought, at almost every step, the administration's program for meeting the world-wide challenge of communism—who opposed the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, who fought against troops for Europe, who called the Korean decision "Truman's war" (until General MacArthur pronounced it a sound military decision).

The Truman administration may be guilty of many sins and many errors. It has not, in the past 5 years, been guilty of appeasement, and no volume of vituperation by the Johnny-come-latelies of the United States Congress can make that charge stick.

Notable Anniversaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the month of May by tradition and observance is the outstanding month of the year for labor. With this in mind, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Brooklyn Tablet. The editorial explains itself and serves to bring to mind the valiant and splendid efforts of the Catholic Church to bring social justice to the workingman. It follows:

NOTABLE ANNIVERSARIES

May 15 will be the sixtieth anniversary of Pope Leo XIII's famous encyclical on the condition of the workingmen and the twentieth anniversary of the encyclical of Pope Pius XI, Forty Years After, which supplemented and reviewed the teaching of Pope Leo XIII. A public forum, over which Archbishop Molloy will preside, will be held in our diocese on May 6, to commemorate these anniversaries. The speakers for this occasion will be Rev. R. A. McGowan, director of the social action department, NCWC, and Hon. Maurice Tobin, United States Secretary of Labor. In many dioceses throughout the country similar observances will be held.

Properly attention should be given in a significant public manner to the commemoration of two of the most notable historic documents which have influenced modern thinking in the direction of the betterment of the lot of the working classes. Communists, liberals, Socialists, and left-wingers have for so long held themselves up as the champions of the working people that the profound and lasting influence of these papal pronouncements has been ignored and neglected. The truth that the Popes have been far in advance of their times in the championship of the rights of the workingman and the parallel truth that the Popes have laid the ground work for the advances made by the laboring masses in recent years should be proclaimed from the housetops.

No document, secular or religious, in modern times, can match the concentration of thought, the sweep of vision, the vigor of expression and the clarity of enunciation of basic sociological principles contained in the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. The later encyclical of Pope Pius XI is a brilliant confirmation of the doctrines of Leo XIII and a perfect development and complement of the Aerum Novarum.

With rare foresight and courage, Pope Leo XIII and his successor, Pope Pius XI, fearlessly opposed the ideas and the practices of the new liberalism which dominated the thinking in the industrial field before the turn of the century and down to the present time. The changeless principles of Christian morality were adapted, explained and applied by Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI to the new conditions which the industrial development and expansion of modern times produced. Through these documents Catholic social teaching has become a very important part of the heritage of the entire human race.

Under the inspiration of these documents, priests, teachers, and laymen, both employers and employees, have been inspired to take an active part in the restoration of the social order. For all the growth of materialism, the spiritual idealism of these encyclicals has not diminished. Actually the turbulence of our times has only served the more strikingly to emphasize the bankruptcy of materialistic solution of social problems and to enhance the value of Christian social principles in practice.

Today the slave labor of Soviet Russia and her satellites, the decline in the general standard of living in the Communist and Communist-dominated countries, the general deplorable lot of the working masses under Communist rule is the best proof of the utter incapacity of materialism to solve basic social problems. On the other hand, wherever, to any degree under the inspiration of the principles enunciated by Pope Leo and Pope Pius, Christian social teaching has been put into practice, the condition of the masses has been bettered immeasurably.

The celebration of these twin anniversaries should be the signal for renewed effort on the part of all Christians in the industrial field to put into practice the teachings of these two major encyclicals. Only through Christian social justice as proclaimed by Pope Leo and Pope Pius is there hope for industrial peace, harmony, and prosperity. Only in Christian social justice is there real hope for the working masses and for the solution of the vexatious problems which keep our present world in constant turmoil.

Resolution of the Goodfellow Sunday School Class of the First Baptist Church, San Angelo, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution which is both timely and significant. If a sufficient number of the people would but follow the example of the sponsors of this resolution, there would indeed be peace on earth and good will among men. The resolution with its preamble follows:

Realizing that God holds in his hands the destiny of men and nations, and believing that God's message to his people of old, when he said, "If my people which are called by My name, shall humble themselves and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from Heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land," can be relied upon today as an inviolate promise just as when it was given to the Hebrew people: Therefore be it

Resolved, as follows:

1. We, the members of the Goodfellow Class, pledge anew our faith in God and our allegiance to His cause.

2. We pledge ourselves, each individually, to pray each remaining day of this year, 1951, for a revival of a deep Christian spirit in our church and in all Christian churches of the United States.

3. Believing that if our Nation and the world are to be spared the terrors of a destructive world war, it must be by God's intervention, we pledge ourselves, and call upon all Christians to join us in praying each remaining day of this year, for our political leaders that they may be guided by God's spirit to do the things that would lessen and not increase the terrible confusion now existing in international affairs, and in praying for all Christians in all countries dominated by atheistic communism, and for the non-Christian citizens of those countries, to the end that there may be a great Christian awakening in those countries and around the world, so that men of all nations can live together on this earth as friends without war or threat of war.

Alaska's Scenic Grandeurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, attention is called to the fact that that season of year most popular for viewing Alaska's scenic grandeurs is at hand. By steamship, by airplane, and by automobile, Americans will again turn northwest this year to have their first, second, or third looks at our great northern Territory. For Alaska has so much to offer that many find one trip all too short. The fact that Alaska is a defense outpost will not cause anyone to defer a vacation journey. This is the subject of an editorial which appeared in the Alaska Weekly for April 20 and which is reprinted here:

SAFEST AND MORE INVITING

Nothing said in this editorial should be construed as antagonistic to the development of adequate civilian defense measures in Alaska nor as belittling Alaska from the standpoint of an extremely valuable defense outpost. Civilian defense organization and training are as important to Alaska communities as they are to any and all communities of the United States * * * no more so, and no less. And, we might add that even after reading the excellent article recently appearing in Colliers over the signature of Father Hubbard in which the "Glacier Priest" characterized the idea that Russia might attack Alaska as stupid we continue to believe that adequate defense of Alaska is vital to national security.

But what we do not believe is that there is any possibility of Russian attack on Alaska in the immediate, nor even in the foreseeable, future. Russia is far from ready to start a war of aggression by invasion of United States territory. No authority on the subject, military or diplomatic, has voiced the slightest apprehension of such action on the part of the Soviet, in the near future.

She is very busy in the Far East and with the withdrawal of General MacArthur will be still more busy. She has some uneasy satellite nations on her hands in Eastern Europe, Tito is making things uncomfortable for her and daily causing her to lose face in that quarter, her eyes are on the rich oil fields of Iran, and if the master minds of the Kremlin should feel strong enough to start an all-out war with the United States by a surprise invasion their precious bombs would not be wasted on Nome or Anchorage but on the industrial centers of the Atlantic seaboard.

All of which is inspired by the fact that we do not subscribe to the scareheads and the thoughtless chatter which could, and will, if not checked, rob Alaska of the annual tourist traffic so vital to the economy of the Territory.

There won't be any black-out in Alaska this summer and there won't be any atomic bombs dropped on Alaska cities nor any submarines in the gorgeous waterways, nor any Russian sharpshooters on the forest-clad mountainsides that skirt those waterways.

The thousands of lakes and fishing streams which make Alaska a sportsman's paradise will not be Red-infested because there are very few, indeed, of the home-grown variety.

No Territory under the American flag offers more to attract the tourist and no Territory under the flag is safer for that vacation trip you are thinking about for this summer.

As we indicated at the outset of this editorial common sense dictates the organizing of civilian defense and the further strengthening of the Armed Forces. The people of the Territory are taking care of the one and the military of the other, and no one we have heard of in Alaska, either in civilian or military circles, is at all panicky.

We therefore suggest that there be considerably less war-scare ballyhoo and a great deal more constructive effort to convince the traveling public that Alaska is still the most inviting summer playground in the land and as safe, if not a bit more safer, than Atlantic City or Miami Beach.

General MacArthur's Appearance Before Senate Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Good Beginning," which appeared this morning in the Washington Post, which commends the conduct of the hearings before the joint meeting of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I call particular attention to and join in the deserved tribute paid to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is presiding at the hearings.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD BEGINNING

At the end of the third grueling day of hearing testimony from General MacArthur, Senator RUSSELL complimented the general and every Member of the committee on the fact that these exhausting interrogations have been conducted in complete courtesy and in the highest dignity. The sessions were long. The atmosphere of the hearing room was intense. Issues of the most vital concern to the Nation were combed over—issues that have become deeply entangled in politics. Yet both questions and answers have been kept on a plane of temperate pursuit of facts and opinions. And we have Senator KNOWLAND's word that very little of what was said behind closed doors was censored from the record released to the public.

While Senator RUSSELL generously praises General MacArthur and members of the committee for this performance, a large share of the credit should obviously be laid at his door. As chairman, he has presided with tact, dignity, and restraint that were a good example to his fellow committee members. It now remains to be seen whether he and his fellow committeemen can keep the remainder of the hearings—in which controversial figures in the Government service will appear—on the same high plane.

Mexican Labor in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is absent on official business, that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What About Slave Labor in United States?" published in the United Mine Workers Journal on April 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT SLAVE LABOR IN UNITED STATES?

Some of our Senators and Congressmen, as well as alleged social leaders, go into raptures every now and then about slave labor in Russia and other geographical areas of the world—some of which are controlled by our allies.

Occasionally the staleness and sameness of the news reported by our metropolitan newspapers prompts an editor to rediscover slave labor on our home front.

A three-column story by Gladwin Hill in the March 25 issue of the New York Times rehashes the illegal entry of Mexicans across our southwestern State borders for employment in agriculture and other hard-labor tasks. Hill estimates the annual trek at 1,500,000, with an undetermined number of "Commies" included.

While the story is a rehash of factual information of long standing—known to our Government agencies for 30 years or more—it, nevertheless, pictures anew the seemingly deliberate blinking at the slave trade by our State and Federal Governments to serve large agricultural interests which have, in turn, been faithful contributors and supporters to the political forces which blink the illegal entries.

It is nothing new for a columnist to point out that this slave Mexican labor "depresses the general standards of wages and working conditions below the accepted American levels. Instead of supplementing the domestic labor force they undercut it, taking jobs from tens of thousands of native citizens, farm and urban workers alike."

The recruited Mexican slave labor, working long hours and living in hovels, is contracted to big employers in sizable numbers—the contractor receiving from one-fourth to one-half of the measly contracted wage.

Conservative estimates place the minimum at 2,500,000 Mexicans in partial or full slave-labor status in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, and as many more to be furnished as desired.

It is for the exploiters of this slave-labor horde that southwestern Congressmen and Senators fight all price fixing and controls which would result in a reasonable price for raw cotton.

Yet, year after year, at planting and harvesting time, the Departments of Agriculture—State and Federal—heed the pleas of the slave-labor employers to permit more and more alleged limited migration, which the agricultural interests insist is necessary to crop growing and harvesting, and which, in turn, multiplies the illegal immigrants who become permanents.

We have had all kinds of investigations during the last 25 years to ferret out the guilty ones in this illegal traffic, but nothing ever seems to really be done about it.

The Rockefeller interests utilized about 15,000 Mexican laborers in the southern Colorado coal fields from 1912 to the successful unionization of Colorado coal mines.

Other mining interests employed slave-labor Mexicans in New Mexico and Arizona.

During the Colorado coal strike of 1913–14 UMWA officials discovered that 50 percent of the heads of Mexican families involved had made illegal entry into the United States—all planned and supervised by labor agents of mining companies.

Nearly all of the big-shot industrialists and economic writers are harping on slave labor around the world—and, at last, the UN has agreed to take up the study.

We doubt it, but if there is any basis of fact in the belief that the UN is capable of bringing about an end to slave labor, we suggest that our United States bureaucrats—who seem to have such unlimited faith in the UN—insist upon our Mexican slave-labor problem being added to the agenda.

Letter to a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MAY 15, 1951.

DEAR FRIEND: While we strive for victory in Korea, we must also make ourselves strong on the home front.

Will you therefore join me in the battle against the high cost of living and against the enemies of the people?

We must keep the Stars and Stripes flying and our economic ship of state out of troubled waters.

Let me know whenever you wish to express your views and opinions.

I pledge to you my strength to help the folks back home, your boys in service, our veterans and older people.

Don't be afraid of the Commies. Write me any time I can do you a favor.

With kindest regards, I remain

Your Congressman,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Basic Issues Obscured," written by Hanson W. Baldwin and published in the New York Times of Monday, May 7, 1951.

Mr. Baldwin points out, now that we have had a second look at General MacArthur's position on our far eastern policy, that "the man must be separated from the issues, and emotion from logic," factors which in many instances obscured the heart of the debate. Mr. Baldwin indicates that General MacArthur recognizes that the problem is global, but so far has declined to assume any responsibility for its global aspects. Instead, he concentrates solely on our position in Korea and the Far East.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "The Basic Disagreements," published in the New York Times of May 5, 1951, and an editorial entitled "Who Is the Enemy?" published in the Washington Post of May 7, 1951, which bear on the same basic problem.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 7, 1951]

BASIC ISSUES OBSCURED—SWEEPING STATEMENTS BY MACARTHUR KEPT SENATORS FROM RESOLVING POLICY DISPUTE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's testimony before Congress last week produced few facts that were not already known, and again tended—largely because of the general's own statements—to confuse the man and the issues and to obscure logic by emotion.

This was, perhaps, inevitable—given the manner of man that General MacArthur is. Accustomed to sweeping generalities and exalted phrases, he rarely speaks in precise terms or in exact definitions; he issues edicts.

Moreover, although some of the questioning was fairly searching, the basic issue of whether or not General MacArthur's prescription for victory in Korea would tend to bring about that victory and would promote the security and welfare of the United States was not by any means resolved.

In part this was true because of General MacArthur's own personality; a man of unlimited ambition and unlimited ego, he brushed aside some questions of major import to concentrate only upon the one aspect that interested him, and that he knew would have the most emotional appeal to the country.

Again and again throughout his testimony he reiterated, with all the skill that William Jennings Bryan once used in his famous cross-of-gold speech, that it is "not only the dust that is settling in Korea; it is American blood." The blood of American boys was the general's final argument, and even the hostile questioners knew it was a potent one.

AN EMOTIONAL ARGUMENT

Yet the weakness of this argument was that it was emotional; no American wants the bloodshed to continue. Yet nowhere in the testimony was there any careful, detailed, and logical evaluation of whether or not—from both the military and political viewpoint—we would save blood and lives by following the policy advocated by General MacArthur, or whether more blood of more Americans would be shed by taking such a course.

And General MacArthur himself, who so aptly pointed out in his speech to Congress that the problem was global, refused to assume the responsibility even of an opinion as to what effect the policies he advocated would have throughout the world.

"My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I don't pretend to be an authority on these things," the general said. And yet, inescapably, by his own actions, and by the emotional reaction of the American people that role—the role of global authority—has been assumed by General MacArthur.

If a careful and precise analysis of the issues raised by General MacArthur is to be made—and particularly if the court of public opinion, where General MacArthur has made his appeal is to judge adequately—the man must be separated from the issues and emotion from logic.

This will be difficult, for many of the American people, indignant at weak leadership, frustrated by administration mistakes, have conceived an almost idolatrous worship for General MacArthur and have reacted to his propsals with an emotional hysteria rare in our history. Letters received by this correspondent indicate a great emotional involvement by many Americans in the present dispute.

NOTES TOCSIN FOR VICTORY

One writer—Albert J. Bates, head of a real estate and insurance business in Hazleton, Pa.—writes, for instance, that General MacArthur sounded a tocsin for victory:

"Let us cleanse ourselves. Let us rededicate ourselves. And cleansed, let us remember we are a great race, that we give orders, that we do not take orders. And if any power anywhere will challenge us, let us sweep them before us like chaff! Forward! I lead you to death and to victory! What greater privilege have you than to die for your country. * *

"Ah yes, neatly suppressed was a call like that of Napoleon to his army—'Soldiers of France! I lead you to glory'"

Mrs. Thomas D. Rambaut, of Wyckoff, N. J., writes that since "I heard the terrible news (of General MacArthur's relief) on the radio, General MacArthur has been enshrined in my heart along with George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Winston Churchill.

"Nothing can dethrone him, not even the horrible smear campaign that Truman and Acheson and Marshall and Bradley will instigate. Not even when they refer to his ego and call him god. For he does indeed have the attributes of God; he is kind and merciful and firm and just. That is my idea of God."

And Frederick S. Hammett of Provincetown, Mass., writes:

"Why don't the 'big brass' (the Joint Chiefs of Staff) be American, be loyal to their colleague (General MacArthur) and defy the bankrupt haberdasher and the traitorous State Department who and which would sell us down the river to Great Britain, Europe, and the Communists?"

Letters such as these, which are typical of many that Americans have written to their newspapers in the last few weeks, illustrate the degree of emotion and hysteria that have obscured the issues. It is well for such Americans—among them, General MacArthur himself—to remember that he is, after all, just a man. As Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia, recalled in a speech in the Senate last week, Scipio—who also had great power and adulation—kept a slave at his shoulder to remind him constantly:

"Remember, O Scipio, thou art but human."

Separation, therefore, of the man from the issues and of emotion from logic is essential if any careful appraisal is to result from the present hearings. The principal topics and subtopics which have been and should be discussed at the hearings can be grouped under the following general headings or issues:

1. The circumstances surrounding General MacArthur's relief; the reasons for it; the manner and timing of it.

2. The issue of civilian versus military control in peace and in war.

3. The objectives of war; the issue of limited war versus unlimited war, etc.

4. The past history of, and facts concerning, the Korean war.

5. The present military-political situation in Korea and the Orient, and its relationship to the world picture.

6. The alternative courses of action we might follow in the future in Korea and in the Orient, and the effects of these alternative courses upon the world situation and the safety and security of the United States.

This examination—like any attempt to examine the future—obviously involves to some extent speculative judgments, and therefore this topic also must include a subtopic—an examination of the validity and wisdom of the past judgments (both military and political) of General MacArthur and of his opponents.

Each of these topics should be fully explored, but obviously the second and third, and the fifth and sixth topics are, by far, the most important to the future of the United States and the world.

[From the New York Times of May 5, 1951]

THE BASIC DISAGREEMENT

Out of the flood of words produced by the Senate hearings on the dismissal of General MacArthur there emerge three basic differences of opinion which are at the bottom of the controversy and from which other differences derive. These basic differences, which for the moment obscure the wide area of agreement between General MacArthur and the administration—on such vital points as the necessity of resisting Communist aggression everywhere, preserving the United Nations, and giving "the fullest protection and assistance" to Europe—may be summarized as follows:

1. General MacArthur, by his own repeated declarations, undertakes to speak only as a former commander in a local theater of war concerned solely with the means of ending this particular conflict and therefore willing to take the risks of a general war in order to win a speedy victory; the administration, on the other hand, is compelled to take into account all the military, political, and moral factors of a global struggle which we still hope to win without a general war. General MacArthur admits the global nature of the struggle, and he likewise admits that the decisions on how to wage it must be made by the Government, which alone has the authority and the necessary information to make such decisions—authority and information that are beyond the reach of a local commander. But he insists on the measures he proposes while disclaiming responsibility for their consequences on either the global struggle itself or even the future of the countries directly affected by his proposed measures.

2. General MacArthur advances the thesis that once war has broken out the "balance of control" must be put in the hands of the military, and that no political considerations should handicap the latter in winning such a war, while the administration holds that in peace or war the civil government remains supreme.

3. General MacArthur maintains that, while all soldiers should carry out orders, they have the right to disagree, and in such cases have the right and the duty not only to submit their own views to their superior officers but also to take the issue to the public for ultimate decision. Anything less than that, he says, would be "gag rule." The administration holds the contrary view.

It is on the basis of such considerations that General MacArthur now proposes that the American Government issue an ultimatum to Communist China to come to terms on a cease fire and the cessation of aggression in Korea—with refusal to comply with such an ultimatum to be regarded as a declaration of war. What is more, while expressing the hope that the United Nations would endorse such a step, he urges that, if necessary, the United States act alone.

In making these proposals General MacArthur assumes that Communist China is militarily and economically weak and can be easily defeated, and that Soviet Russia will stand idly by while the biggest of all Communist conquests is snatched from her hands. But while he is rather positive about the first assumption, he is not so certain about the latter and admits that a wrong guess regarding it might lead to a larger war than the one he is seeking to end. Moreover, he is less than precise as to what the ultimatum would imply. In one passage of his testimony he urges action in accordance with the January recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who proposed an economic blockade of China, preparations for a naval blockade, air reconnaissance over Manchuria and the Chinese coast, and use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops, about whom General MacArthur is more optimistic than the Chinese themselves. In another passage he demands bombing of enemy bases in Manchuria. And in still another he speaks of putting pressure on Red China's distributive system, which one Senator interpreted without contradiction as meaning the smashing of the tenuous Chinese railway system, carrying the war to the Soviet border.

We believe that the hazards of such proposals become evident from the mere recital of them. That there have been grievous mistakes in American policy in the Far East in recent years is equally evident. But, despite this mistake, we cannot afford to risk a break with our allies by pursuing a course of action which might well bog us down in an unlimited war in Asia.

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1951]

WHO IS THE ENEMY?

In most of his testimony before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees General MacArthur, in spite of his prior insistence upon his global view, has been careful not to step out of his role as a theater commander in the Far East. For example, he persistently resisted Senator FULBRIGHT's efforts to draw him into a discussion of the wisdom of aiding Yugoslavia. At one point he declared, "The last impression that I would want to give is that I pose as an expert on world affairs." To Senator MCMAHON he said, "Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area." Yet some of his testimony extended not only beyond the confines of the Far East where he has been stationed for the last 14 years, but also reached into the sphere of political policy-making. We have in mind especially his definition of communism as the enemy against which we are arming and fighting.

Senator MCMAHON remarked, "It is obvious that we agree they are our main enemy—that the Soviet Union is." General MacArthur replied, "I didn't agree to it. I said that communism throughout the world was our main enemy." Later on Senator FULBRIGHT asked the general what he meant by communism and evoked this exchange:

"General MACARTHUR. Communism has many various factors. The great threat in what is called present communism is the imperialistic tendency or the lust of power beyond their own geographical confines. It is their effort to enslave the individual to the concept of the state. It is the establishment of autocracy that squeezes out every one of the freedoms which we value so greatly.

"Senator FULBRIGHT. I had not myself thought of our enemy as being communism: I thought of it as primarily being Russia, an imperialist Russia. That is what interests me.

"General MACARTHUR. In that concept, Senator, I disagree with you completely.

"Senator FULBRIGHT. Well * * * it seemed to me, you do not fight communism with a gun. It is sort of like sin, we are all against sin; you do not fight sin with anything tangible. Communism is an idea, but what really bothers us is when people start to shoot.

"General MACARTHUR. I think you do fight sin with very practical weapons, and I think we are fighting communism with very practical weapons."

If our enemy were merely communism we could abandon the rearmament program and embark upon a world-wide effort of peace, freedom, and economic and social rehabilitation. We should have only the communistic idea to combat and it could best be met by the spread of progressive democratic ideas. The tragedy of the present day is that the power-drunk men of the Kremlin are not willing to engage in such a bloodless contest. When persuasion has failed, they have resorted to terror and military force to impose communistic dictatorships upon unwilling peoples. Obviously it is the warmongers in the communistic movement that are our enemy.

The weakness of General MacArthur's position is that he draws no distinction between the aggressors who are in control of Russia and China and the wider areas of the world where communistic ideas prevail. Such a policy would be a mistake if for no other reason than that it would tend to drive Tito, with his thirty-odd Yugoslav divisions, back into the arms of the Kremlin. But there is also a more important reason for keeping the distinction clear. Any designation of communism as our enemy would carry with it an implication that we intend to try to wipe out communism by force of arms. Such a crusade would cost millions of lives and inestimable treasure and in the end would probably stimulate communism instead of suppressing it. General MacArthur has emphatically ruled out from his military proposals in the Far East any such American campaign. His emphasis has been upon a decisive blow against Communist China to compel that regime to give up its aggressive course in Korea. Obviously no such limited objective squares with the definition of communism in general as our enemy.

Because of his notable influence in Congress and the country, we think General MacArthur should not let this conflict in his testimony stand. People and legislators must think clearly about who our enemy is before they can hope to achieve a meeting of minds as to how the enemy shall be met. It is not merely a question of semantics. Rather it goes to the heart of the world problem of preserving freedom of thought and of economic and social organization on one hand and of suppressing aggression on the other.

Necessity of Faith in God in Nation's Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the ladies of the Sunday school class of the Nicholasville, Ky., Baptist Church, emphasizing the power of faith in solving the problems of our country. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NICHOLASVILLE, KY., *April 30, 1951.*

The Honorable THOMAS UNDERWOOD,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday the ladies of the Sunday school class in the Nicholasville Baptist Church, 42 in number, compared the conditions existing at the time the children of Israel were commanded to enter the Promised Land with conditions as they exist today. When the Israelites came up from Egypt under Moses they sent 12 men to spy out the land. Ten of these men were cowards and said that the cities were walled and the inhabitants were giants and they could never overcome them. Two of the spies, Joshua and Caleb, reported that the cities were walled and the people were giants, but they had faith that the land could be taken at God's command.

The Israelites had a democratic government, so the majority ruled, and the result was that they wandered in the wilderness for 38 years—because they did not trust God.

Now the United States was founded by Christian, God-fearing people, and God is depending on us to destroy His enemies, the Communists, so that His people can obey and worship Him. We have been to the thirty-eighth parallel twice and now we are wandering back again, losing our boys and the boys of other nations. It could be that we will be in the wilderness for 38 years, because of lack of faith. David did not have all the planes and other war material that we have when he went out to meet Goliath, only a small rock and God. Jericho fell at the blowing of trumpets because the people obeyed and had faith. They had no war material.

We have the same God today that the Israelites had, and we are asking you to read this letter to the Senate, and to use your leadership to have this Nation go forward and destroy the enemy of God's people and restore to this country the sacredness of our motto, "In God we trust."

Very truly yours,

SALLIE STEELE TAYLOR

Mrs. Sallie Steele Taylor.

Appearance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur Before Senate Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles relating to the recent appearance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur before the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, the first entitled "MacArthur and the True Picture," by David Lawrence; the second entitled "Shows No Signs of Fading Away," by Constantine Brown, both published in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1951]

MACARTHUR AND THE TRUE PICTURE—GENERAL DECLARED TO HAVE PUT UNITED STATES POLICY IN PROPER FOCUS; SUGGESTION OFFERED THAT TRUMAN SHOULD MAKE AMENDS

(By David Lawrence)

A breath of fresh air has swept across the country in the person of a man who, without bitterness or rancor, rises above the petty and the irrelevant to state honestly his convictions on a highly controversial subject of national policy.

What General MacArthur has accomplished by his 3 days of testimony and by his ready submission to cross-examination is to put the whole question of our military policy in a true perspective.

Not a word of resentment did he express against the President or anyone else. He brushed aside with a simple statement of facts the many misrepresentations of his position which critics have flung at him.

Nobody can truly claim the right to state General MacArthur's position hereafter unless he has read the 150,000 words of testimony covering the 3 days of hearings.

This correspondent has read every word of it and is amazed at the number of things that have been written about the general or his proposals which simply are not true. The atmosphere here is so surcharged with political tactics and with the polemics of partisanship that it is refreshing to find a spokesman who, without regard to how his remarks jibe with the speeches of Republican or Democratic leaders in the "great debate" of recent weeks, states with candor and frankness what he really believes.

People may differ as to whether he has the right proposals and whether they should be adopted but, after reading the testimony, one is more puzzled than ever that the President should have listened to the smears of the "palace guard" and tried to destroy the reputation of one of the world's greatest soldiers, if not one of her most dynamic statesmen.

The same man who wrote out in longhand on his plane the historic speech to Congress and then read it without glasses, the same man who, though 71 years of age, sat for 9 hours a day for three successive days and faced a barrage of questions from the Senate's best interrogators, won spontaneous praise from Republicans and Democrats in the committee. The tribute by Senator RUSSELL of Georgia, Democrat, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, at the end of the final session on Saturday is significant. He said:

"General MacArthur, I wish to state to you that the 3 days that you have been here with us are without parallel in my legislative experience. I have never seen a man subjected to such a barrage of questions in so many fields and on so many varied subjects. I marvel at your physical endurance. More than that, I have been profoundly impressed by the vastness of your patience and the thoroughness and the frankness with which you have answered all of the questions that have been propounded.

"We have certainly drawn freely on your vast reservoir of knowledge and experience, not only as a great military captain, but as a civilian administrator of 80,000,000 people."

One wonders how such a man could have been summarily dismissed. One finds nowhere in the official record the slightest evidence that he disobeyed a military command or failed to fulfill the highest traditions of our military service. One wonders if President Truman will not be inspired when he has read all the testimony to show the same courage that he showed when he apologized to the Marines for an intemperate remark. For the instinct to redress a wrong is the mark of courage and spiritual understanding. General MacArthur cannot be restored to his command, of course, but the unworthy manner by which he was abruptly relieved can still be expunged from the record by an act of Christian atonement.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1951]

SHOWS NO SIGNS OF FADING AWAY—MACARTHUR'S EXHIBITION OF VITALITY DURING LONG QUESTIONING GIVES LIE TO REPORTS THAT HE WAS TOO OLD TO CARRY ON

(By Constantine Brown)

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was only a headline name to the man in the street until he showed himself in person to the American people. He was a controversial figure with as many fans as critics in this country. His detractors spread the word during the last 2 or 3 years that whatever he had been in the past he no longer is today. He was freely described as a man who was actually fading away mentally and physically. Only last July a high official told this reporter that General MacArthur should be replaced by a younger man as commander of the forces in Korea.

"He is not able at 71 to take an active part in the campaign; moreover, when you have a 'God complex' in your younger days, you actually believe in it when you reach MacArthur's age. And that is dangerous for the prosecution of the campaign."

Since the five-star general arrived in this country and particularly since he testified without interruption before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees all these rumors have been belied. While much younger men were exhausted at the end of the long continuous hearings, General MacArthur was rested and fresh and bore unflinchingly the brunt of questioning by 26 Senators—a number of whom were set on trapping or embarrassing him.

He brushed off some of the "political" questions as having no relation to the scope of the hearings, and answered unhesitatingly the pertinent queries. There has been no debate in the memory of man which gripped the country more than the MacArthur investigation. The ousted supreme commander has gained a greater stature since he returned than his most ardent admirers ever anticipated.

One inescapable fact is that we are at war with the Chinese Communists in Korea. The other, which General MacArthur has brought out forcefully, is that we are fighting a half-hearted defensive war which costs us tens of thousands of casualties because we don't dare throw all our available might against the enemy.

He has been pressed to answer whether an all-out attack on the enemy's bases in Manchuria whence the Reds feed their armies in Korea with manpower, arms, and ammunition would not precipitate a third world war for which some legislators maintained we are nearly prepared. General MacArthur replied that if Russia is determined to fight us, it is immaterial what pretext she will use—if she needs any pretext at all. But his considered guess is that Russia is not prepared for an all-out war in the Far East because of logistic consideration. It is more difficult for her to transport men and weapons overland over deficient railways and bad roads than it is for us who are carrying them in ships across the great expanse of the Pacific.

When we entered the war in Korea last June our strategists in Washington realized that we were taking a calculated risk. It may have been a minor risk, but the elements of involvement with China and the U. S. S. R. must have been in their minds. Yet the decision was made to accept that risk. But when General MacArthur urged, after the Chinese Reds entered the war last November, that they should also be defeated with the means available in the Far East, the military and the political planners in Washington and at Lake Success refused to expand that calculated risk in the face of the general's arguments that victory was within our reach if his recommendations were followed. The military planners at home are said by General MacArthur to have bowed to the political arguments of the diplomats.

For reasons of security some parts of General MacArthur's testimony were deleted. But there are reasons to believe that the former supreme commander is not particularly impressed with the war potential of China. Besides the fact that the Chinese industries are not capable of a sustained effort and the losses of their best trained armies have been very great, China is actually in a state of near civil war at the present time.

According to the admission of the Peiping government itself upwards of 1,500,000 active guerrillas are fighting the Peiping administration throughout that vast territory. There is a lack of food which verges on general famine; some of the trusted provincial officials are about ready to become "warlords" on their own, under the Communist mask.

So long as China fights on one front alone, she will be able to continue the war of attrition against us. But the day her forces are harassed by the Nationalists from Formosa and she is subjected to aerial attacks from the Allied air forces, the situation may change radically and Russia is unlikely to do much about it.

H. R. 88 for Safety in Gas Transmission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 29 I placed in the Appendix information which had been assembled at my request by the Federal Power Commission with reference to the history of explosions of gas transmission lines. It was noted at that time that this information was not accurate or complete. Since then I have been attempting to secure accurate information from the several companies, and now I am in a position to furnish certain corrected data. I am glad to make this available to the membership at this time, particularly since the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Commerce have filed favorable reports on H. R. 88.

The information available at this time follows:

Information received concerning line breaks on interstate pipelines as of May 7, 1951

Pipeline company	Location of line break	Date of line break	Number of persons— Injured	Number of persons— Killed	Size of line (inches)	Comments
Atlantic Seaboard Corp.	Rug River, W. Va.	Feb. 21, 1947			20	Coupling failure and emergency sleeve failure due to strip-mining operations.
	Various locations	Nov. 21, 1949 to Dec. 30, 1949			26	7 pipeline weld failures out of 28,000 welds in the line; and 1 fracture in buckled joint of pipe while testing after construction.
Colorado Interstate Gas Co.	Northeastern New Mexico	Apr. 18, 1942			22	Wash-out caused by floods. No fire.
	Pueblo County, Colo.	Aug. 19, 1946			22	Pressure test. No fire.
	do	Sept. 1, 1946			22	Do.
	Lincoln County, Colo.	Sept. 30, 1948			20	Do.
	Las Animas County, Colo.	July 16, 1948			22	Defective pipe. No fire.
	Haskell County, Kans.	May 7, 1950		1	16	Pipe ruptured by bulldozer by outside party leveling land. Bad fire.
	Arapahoe County, Colo.	Dec. 30, 1950			10	Pipe ruptured by bulldozer by outside party leveling land. No fire.
Interstate Natural Gas Co.	Near Ferriday, La.	Feb. 20, 1942			22	2 joints blew out.
	Near Foules, La.	Mar. 14, 1942			22	Leak at coupling.
	Near Ferriday, La.	Dec. 27, 1943			22	
	do	Mar. 19, 1944			22	
	Natchez, Miss.	Dec. 19, 1944			10	No. 2 line pulled apart by anchor of Coast Guard cutter.
	Near Ferriday, La.	Jan. 5, 1945			22	
	Near Wilkinson, Miss.	Feb. 22, 1945			22	
	do	Feb. 11, 1946			22	
	Near Ferriday, La.	Mar. 1, 1946			22	2 joints blew out.
	do	Mar. 10, 1946			22	
	Near Swartz, La.	Jan. 21, 1947			22	Do.
	Near Wilkinson, Miss.	Jan. 28, 1948			22	Pipe became separated at coupling.
	Near Swartz, La.	Mar. 22, 1948			22	Pipe raised and separated at coupling.
	Natchez, Miss.	Aug. 12, 1948			10	No. 4 line.
	Near Wilkinson, Miss.	Nov. 19, 1948			10	No. 2 line. Washed out.
	do	July 3, 1949			10	No. 3 line. Washed out.
	Natchez, Miss.	May 8, 1950			10	No. 8 line. Washed out.
	Near Foules, La.	Jan. 3, 1951			22	Pipe separated at coupling.
Michigan Gas Storage Co.	Marion, Mich.	Nov. 30, 1947	(1)	(1)	(2)	Explosion during construction at compressor station. Weld broke. Gas ignited. Considerable damage to station.
Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America.	Near Knoxville, Iowa	July 4, 1936	(1)	(1)	24	Severe lamination in steel plate.
	Near Sheffield, Ill.	Feb. 13, 1938	(1)	(1)	24	High water table—peat and unstable soil—wash out at coupling.
	Near Red Oak, Iowa	Aug. 20, 1938	(1)	(1)	24	Lightning collapsed pipe 5 feet west of girth weld. A 60-foot section pulled out of couplings at each end.
	Indian Creek, Nebr.	Sept. 15, 1941	(1)	(1)	24	Flood—washed out 80-foot section between 2 couplings.
	Near Washington, Iowa	Jan. 13, 1943	(1)	(1)	.....	Cross-over No. 79. External groove cut in wall of 8-inch bypass riser by contractor's equipment.
	Near Corning, Iowa	May 3, 1944	(1)	(1)	24	Excessive strain on pipe due to soil stress. Pipe pulled out at coupling.
	Near Pringle, Tex.	Aug. 30, 1945	(1)	(1)	26	Break occurred due to groove in inside surface of pipe parallel to longitudinal weld.
	Near Station No. 22	Jan. 26, 1950	(1)	(1)	26	Electrolysis caused by nearby oil well.
Northern Natural Gas Co.	Louisville, Nebr.	Oct. 23, 1940			8	Road grader struck line.
	Ellinwood, Kans.	Apr. 30, 1942			26	Flood.
	Wascca, Minn.	July 15, 1945			18	Line split under pressure test.
	Ventura, Iowa	Aug. 10, 1946			16	Do.
	Raeslie, Nebr.	Dec. 10, 1947			16	Line failed under pressure test.
	Bushton, Kans.	Mar. 18, 1949			26	Break due to corrosion.
	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Apr. 26, 1949			14	Defective weld.
	Clifton, Kans.	May 10, 1950			26	Failure due to corrosion.
	do	July 2, 1950			26	Do.
	Hooper, Nebr.	July 11, 1950			20	Do.
	Fremont, Nebr.	Mar. 8, 1950			16	Break due to flood.
Ohio Fuel Gas Co.	Portage Township, Wood County	June 12, 1946			10	Weak joint of pipe blew out.
	Laurel Township Hocking County	Aug. 12, 1946			12	Line blew out 3 times during stress test to operate at higher pressure.
	Good Hope Township, Hocking County.	Aug. 17, 1946			12	Defective joint of pipe.
	Alexander Township, Athens County.	Sept. 1, 1946			18	Faulty pipe.
	Marseilles Township, Wyandot County.	Nov. 23, 1946			10	External corrosion weakened a joint of pipe.
	Berne Township, Fairfield County.	June 23, 1947			10	Road contractor tore hole in line.
	Washington Township, Jackson County.	Sept. 5, 1947			12	Faulty joint of pipe.
	Range Township, Madison County	Nov. 25, 1947			12	Weak joint failed.
	Madison Township, Franklin County.	Feb. 4, 1948			16	Faulty weld in a joint of reconditioned pipe.
	Mifflin Township, Wyandot County.	Feb. 8, 1948			10	Faulty pipe.
	Good Hope Township, Hocking County.	Feb. 13, 1948			12	External corrosion weakened pipe.
	Berne Township, Fairfield County	Aug. 13, 1948			20	New construction, blew out while under stress test.
	Mifflin Township, Wyandot County.	Aug. 16, 1948			10	Split in pipe opened.
	Benton Township, Hocking County.	Aug. 29, 1948			13	External corrosion caused a joint to fail.
	Good Hope Township, Hocking County.	Sept. 9, 1948			20	New construction, blew out in a defective wrinkle bend while under stress test.
	Monroe Township, Richland County.	Sept. 27, 1948			12	Joint of pipe failed while under stress test.
	Mount Gilead Township, Morrow County.	Oct. 14, 1948			16	New construction under stress test. Top half of 1 joint blew out.
	Clear Creek Township, Warren County.	Oct. 19, 1948			18	New construction of reconditioned pipe being stress-tested, blew out 6 times.
	do	Nov. 4, 1948			18	New construction of reconditioned pipe under hydrostatic test, blew out 7 times.
	Jackson Township, Richland County.	Nov. 24, 1948			16	Contractor laying new 20-inch parallel line.
	Chester Township, Meigs County	Nov. 27, 1948			18	Landslide pulled line apart.
	Benton Township, Hocking County.	Dec. 1, 1948			12	Faulty piston gate between high- and low-pressure systems opened and blew out the lower-pressure line.
	Waterloo Township, Athens County.	Feb. 20, 1949			18	External corrosion at a coal blossom weakened pipe.
	Green Township, Clark County	Sept. 27, 1949			16	Stress testing new construction—defective pipe ruptured. Reconditioned pipe used.
	do	Sept. 29, 1949			16	Stress testing new construction—break occurred in an overbend. Reconditioned pipe used.

[1] No details available.
[2] Compressor station.

Information received concerning line breaks on interstate pipelines as of May 7, 1951—Continued

Pipeline company	Location of line break	Date of line break	Number of persons— Injured	Number of persons— Killed	Size of line (inches)	Comments
Ohio Fuel Gas Co.—Con.	Mifflin Township, Ashland County	Jan. 25, 1950			18	Contractor's heavy bulldozer damaged line prior to stress test, causing line to fall under pressure.
	Amanda Township, Fairfield County	Oct. 31, 1950			18	Pipe ruptured at 3 locations during stress test to operate at higher pressures.
	Chester Township, Meigs County	Nov. 12, 1950			18	Landslide caused coupling failure.
	Wilson Township, Clinton County	Nov. 21, 1950			8	Stress testing new construction before placing line in service.
	Troy Township, Wood County	Dec. 10, 1950			16	Contractor's back-hoe excavation ditch skidded in soft ballast, weakening line, and causing it to pull out of couplings.
Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.	Centralia, Mo	Dec. 8, 1949	(1)	(1)	(2)	Break in "tee" fabricated at time of original installation in 1930.
Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.	Union County, Ark	May 8, 1947			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Grant County, Ark	Jan. 11, 1948			20	Do.
	White County, Ark	Jan. 17, 1948			20	Do.
	Pike County, Ind	Mar. 18, 1948			20	Damage to buildings settled for $18,000; due to defective pipe.
	Pulaski County, Ark	May 9, 1948			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Near Seymour, Ind	Nov. 19, 1948	18		(2)	Explosion in compressor station causing $1,000,000 damages.
	Near Batesville, Ind	Jan. 18, 1949	2		(2)	Power failure caused fire in compressor station with $200,000 damages.
	Adams County, Pa	Feb. 9, 1949			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Jennings County, Ind	Mar. 4, 1949	1		20	Defective pipe caused property damages of $25,000.
	Crainhead County, Ark	Apr. 2, 1949			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Noble County, Ohio	May 6, 1949			20	Do.
	Butler County, Mo	May 18, 1949			20	Do.
	Do	May 24, 1949			20	Do.
	Grant County, Ark	June 26, 1949			20	Do.
	West Chester, Pa	July 15, 1949	1	2	24	Explosion blew up cover plate where men were working.
	Johnson County, Ill	Oct. 5, 1949			20	Nominal damages caused by defective pipe.
	Montgomery County, Pa	Dec. 14, 1949			20	5-inch crack in field weld.
	El Dorado, Ark	Nov. 25, 1948			(2)	Valve failure. No damage.
	Noble County, Ohio	Jan. 20, 1950			20	Defective pipe caused explosion with $12,000 property damages
	Pulaski County, Ark	May 17, 1950			24	River eroded causing pipe to pull apart.
	Perry County, Ohio	May 18, 1950			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Near Beallsville, Ohio	July 1, 1950			20	Explosion ripped up 24 feet of pipeline.
	Near Jasper, Ind	July 10, 1950				Nominal damages.
	Butler County, Mo	July 15, 1950				Do.
	Nevada County, Ark	Aug. 8, 1950			24	Corrosion leak. Nominal damage.
	Adams County, Pa	Sept. 12, 1950			20	Explosion occurred after hydrostatic testing.
	Near Colonia, N. J	Spring, 1950			20	Line breaks occurred during testing section of pipe between Raritan and Rahway Rivers.
	Oran, Mo	Jan. 13, 1951	5		(2)	Failure of drip-trap. $30,000 damages.
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line.	Wadley, Ala	Sept. 20, 1950	(2) 3		30	Serious fires, some people injured, caused by explosions during testing. Property damage inconsequential.
	Chatham, Va	Nov. 2, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Do.
	Little Rocky Hill, N. J	Nov. 25, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Do.
	Culpeper, Va	Nov. 22, 1950	2		30	Explosion during line testing caused great property damage.
	Norristown, Pa	Nov. 23, 1950	2		30	Do.
United Fuel Gas Co.	Near Charleston, W. Va	May 9, 1946			10	Line blew out.
	Near Glenville, W. Va	Dec. 2, 1946			16	Check valve blew out.
	Near Harold, Ky	Jan. 15, 1948			20	Cap blew off a header on river crossing.
	Near Kenova, W. Va	Feb. 15, 1948			10	Line blew out in Big Sandy River.
	Near Peach Orchard, Ky	Apr. 10, 1948			20	Line blew out between Peach Orchard and Chestnut Gate.
	Near Clendenin, W. Va	Sept. 3, 1948			20	Line blew out during pressure test; 1 joint of pipe. Blew out again during test; 1 joint of pipe.
	Near Beaver Creek, Ky	Dec. 24, 1948			20	Line blew out between Beaver Creek, Boldman, and Betsy Lane Hollow.
	Near Laynesville, Ky	Dec. 26, 1948			20	Line blew out in Arkansas Branch.
	Near Charleston, W. Va	do			10	Line blew out above Bream Bridge.
	Near Nitro, W. Va	do			20	Suction header at Kanawha compressor station blew out.
	do	do			20	Discharge header at Kanawha compressor station blew out.
	Near Clendenin, W. Va	Nov. 4, 1950			20	Line blew out between Uler and Walnut.
United Gas Pipe Line Co.	Dallas County, Tex	Dec. 18, 1944			18	Break caused by split in pipe; nominal property damage.
Virginia Gas Transmission Corp.	Hazel River, Va	Jan. 14, 1948			20	Header failure caused by defective pipe.
	Upperville, Va	Oct. 16, 1950			26	Failure of pipe during testing; split 20 feet long.
	do	Oct. 17, 1950			26	Failure of pipe during testing; 40 feet blown out of ground.

[1] No details available.
[2] Compressor station.

Message of Frazar B. Wilde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a message sent by Frazar B. Wilde, president of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn., to that company's policyholders. I am so impressed by Mr. Wilde's grasp of the problems facing our Nation and his commonsense analysis of these problems that I would like to have his views receive wider circulation. The letter follows:

In a discussion of the year's results at Connecticut General, it seems not inappropriate to give you our thoughts on the serious and important problems of our world situation which mean so much to all of us in so many different ways.

The threat to peace and freedom which is facing free nations throughout the world is without parallel in modern history. The long period of peace hoped for after World War II has not been realized, and the situation has deteriorated to the point where the United States and other members of the United Nations are involved in undeclared war to suppress Communist-inspired aggression.

This confronts us with a most difficult problem. Our aim must be to try to localize the conflict and, simultaneously, to pursue every possibility of accomplishing a fair international understanding through peaceful means. Diplomacy alone, without adequate force behind it, will inevitably be ineffective. Dictatorships feed on aggression; they respect only armed power and then only if they are sure such power will be used. To promise that we will use the atomic bomb only if the enemy first uses it against us would put all of us, military and civilians, at a great disadvantage for which there seems no justification. If we are to preserve our way of life, we must be prepared to fight for it without hesitancy.

National unity of purpose and action is essential. To reach national conclusions we do have to have full discussion. Fair and informed criticism is helpful. Unfair and ill-considered criticism of those charged with the operation of our Government will only serve to weaken us internally and promote a lack of confidence in us on the part of other free nations throughout the world. We should all be prepared to face the inevitable fact that, whether or not there is total war, the steps we must take will be costly ones and will have to be paid for. The success we anticipate in securing peace does not have to be gained at the expense of losing our way of life by permitting it to be destroyed through inflation. Inflation is a danger which we can control through our actions as individuals and by supporting positive action on the part of our Government.

Because the basic cause of inflation lies in the existence of more effective buying power than the normal value of goods available for purchase, the problem has to be attacked on both sides. There must be restraints imposed upon buying power and there must be an increase in supply. Wage and price controls may be of some temporary help, but they cannot do the job by themselves. They are attacking the effects of inflation, not the underlying cause.

The most effective answer to inflation is more production. This answer cannot be made immediately available and therefore it must be viewed as a deferred solution. Until we have increased our plant and put the increased plant in operation, we simply cannot have both guns and butter. Therefore, civilian goods must for a while shrink in supply.

We can restrict spending by a severe program of tax increases. This is a vary unpalatable remedy for all of us. There is, however, no escape from it if we wish to control inflation. If we don't control it, we will pay much more in the end through inflated prices.

We can ask our Government to curtail its expenditures, particularly those items in the budget which may properly be postponed. There are always large sums representing projects which might be desirable in times of peace but which we don't absolutely need now. We can even ask our representatives to scrutinize the military budgets. We do not care to take any undue risk of lacking the most modern equipment and enough of it. The facts of life are, however, that it is frequently found that the procurement policies of the Armed Forces are not so efficient that we can relax our scrutiny in that area. There is a tendency to overbuy many items, which adds nothing to present effectiveness. While we want to be completely armed, there is nothing sacrosanct in the military budgets.

Credit extended by lending institutions should be restricted because one of the primary causes of inflationary pressure is the expansion of buying ability created through credit.

There are other steps which should be taken, such as scrutiny of the country's agricultural program. Overemphasis on agricultural aid, such as excessive parity prices and loan values, can be highly inflationary because they affect the prices of groceries in the cities which in turn leads to demand for higher wages.

We as individuals can help the situation to a greater extent than many realize. We can avoid buying anything which we do not actually need now, and resist temptations to buy beyond current income through borrowing and through other credit means. All of us who have a hand in production of goods can strive for maximum output, and those of us who manage businesses can resist price increases. We can remember that demands for increased wages without increased output or subsidy from Government will hurt all of us—there are no "other people" in our Nation.

Very importantly, we should all attempt to add to our savings programs. When we put money into United States savings bonds, savings bank deposits and life insurance, just that much less money will go into the market in competition for the limited supply of goods presently available. The money saved becomes available for financing defense production.

These steps attack inflation at the source. If they were taken, in sufficient degree, the danger would be eliminated, and the disastrous inflation spiral would be stopped.

There are, of course, those areas which we cannot directly control as individuals, such as Government programs, spending, and monetary policies. Some are Federal. Others are State and local. We can, however, in our democratic form of government, control these areas through government if enough of us want to do so. Senators and Congressmen often maintain offices in their constituencies for the purpose of finding out how the people they represent feel on current issues. If this is the case where you live, go to see them. If you can't contact them personally, write them a letter. State and local officials are almost always available, or letters can be written to them. Our representatives in Government can carry out our wishes only if we let them know what those wishes are. They will know they have our backing in carrying out strong, positive measures to combat inflation only if we tell them so.

F. B. WILDE,
President.

MacArthur Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by Rolland Peters, editor of the Pratt Daily Tribune, entitled "MacArthur Before Congress." While the editorial was written previous to the general's testimony before the Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees, I think it is most timely.

The Nation is fortunate in having a man of knowledge, integrity, and sincerity at a time when we need leadership with courage, character, and conviction.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR BEFORE CONGRESS

History will have to record whether America was right or wrong in whatever direction she moves today in her war in Korea and her disputes with Russia. General MacArthur has his own definite ideas of what should be done; President Truman and Alger Hiss' friend, Secretary Acheson, have theirs. And Britain has hers. So do the European countries. The White House and the State Department have, as before, sided with Europe. They sided in with Europe against their own general in Korea, the most experienced military leader of the age. Because General MacArthur persisted in airing his views the five-star general of 52 years' experience in military work was fired by a former World War I infantry captain.

Yesterday the general went before Congress and once again told the country what he thought should be done in Asia. Right or wrong, he deserved the attention of all of the American people because he was speaking then as an American and not as head of the Korean forces. But the man who fired him was observed to walk to lunch during the time General MacArthur was speaking. This was the height of discourtesy on the part of Mr. Truman toward a man who has done so much for the country of which Mr. Truman is President.

The general was most gracious and gentlemanly throughout his talk. He said what he had to say. He struck a couple of severe blows at the Truman crowd, and yet he did so like the gentleman that he is. One of the most significant things that he said was that his program had had the approval of practically every military person including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Bradley is Chairman of that Staff. Only 3 days ago General Bradley publicly sided with the Truman administration in the dismissal of General MacArthur in a way that was intended from all indications to humiliate the general.

Perhaps General Bradley can explain why he shared the deposed general's views and then turned over to the Truman side. He owes this explanation to the American people. Two points outstand in the MacArthur talk. First, it was the speech of a man sincere in everything that he said, and second, it was the speech of a man who knows far more about the Far East and the military than many Harry Trumans and Dean Achesons put together.

The welcome to America that is being accorded General MacArthur surpasses anything that has ever before been accorded to any one. Back of all this is the American people's appreciation for what he has done for America and faith in his sincerity and integrity and an expression of disgust over the manner in which his brilliant career was ended by a politician who listened to other politicians and to foreigners in Europe. If the American people had today the faith in their administration that they have shown in General MacArthur, we would not be as confused as we are and we would not be as apprehensive as we are. The Trumans of Washington have cried "emergency" and "crisis" so long and so often that people generally have come to look upon their cries like the boy who cried "wolf" when there was no wolf. When the wolf appeared no one paid any attention to him and the wolf killed the sheep. The greatest thing that could happen to America today would be for the people of America to have an administration which they could look to for sound and sensible leadership and an administration in which they could place their faith. We do not have this under Harry Truman.

Protecting the Bald Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I am including as part of these remarks a letter written by Bernice Marshall, chairman of conservation, New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, and president of the National Life Conservation Society, which was published in the New York Times under date April 23, 1951. The letter follows:

PROTECTING THE BALD EAGLE—PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION ADVOCATED TO SAVE BIRD FROM EXTINCTION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Many fine organizations in this area have sent letters to Congress endorsing H. R. 1870 to extend protection to the bald eagle in Alaska, which bill was introduced by Representative HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon, in the House.

Among them was the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs with a membership of approximately 200,000. The supporting resolution was passed at a large convention of the federation.

The National Life Conservation Society has conducted an active campaign in favor of this needed legislation. So also have Sorosis, mother of women's clubs; Daughters of Ohio, Congress of States, Natural History Club, Bronx Women's Clubs, Washington Heights Club, and many other clubs. This shows

that a large number of thinking people are alarmed over the awful slaughter our national emblem in Alaska.

What small damage the bird may do is certainly not enough to justify the bounty of $2 on every bird killed. The Fish and Wildlife Service office in Alaska reports that bounties were paid on 4,320 eagles during the calendar year 1950, almost double the number for 1949. The bald eagle is not a prolific bird. How long does anyone think it can survive this slaughter?

Alaska wants statehood. She should therefore show some respect for our national emblem; as we do here in the States, though I must confess we were much too slow in getting protective measures established. Every patriotic citizen, every conservationist who cares about its survival should get behind this legislation and tell our representatives in no uncertain terms that the shameful killing of the bald eagle must stop.

Do we Americans want to see our splendid country represented on our great seal by an extinct bird, that we ourselves have exterminated?

BERNICE MARSHALL,
Chairman of Conservation, New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, and President of the National Life Conservation Society.

NEW YORK, *April 23, 1951.*

Minnesota's Ore Reserves Still Ample

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, all of the phony propaganda being dished out by the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway to the effect that Minnesota's iron-ore reserves will be depleted in a few years is debunked by the following article written by Lewis S. Patterson for a St. Paul, Minn., newspaper on March 18, 1951.

The article by Mr. Patterson follows:

MINNESOTA'S ORE RESERVES STILL AMPLE

(By Lewis S. Patterson)

Just what is the status of the iron-ore mining industry in Minnesota?

Is the old champion, which for 50 years has supplied the Nation's steel mills with as high as 80 percent of their raw materials, really on her last legs?

What is the meaning of Friday's announcement that in 15 days 55,000 tons of 54-percent ore had been taken out of a new open pit near Camp Ripley.

To answer these questions it is necessary to examine the testimony over the last 6 years of the experts and of others possibly more interested than expert.

When it was announced at the end of World War II that the State had dug up more than a third of a billion tons of ore for guns and tanks, there were those who said it was best that the people realize the old champion was about through. And that future plans be based on this realization.

Examination today, however, of testimony given in a committee meeting here and a Federal or State commission there—though not decrying the desirability of planning—does not bear out the pessimists.

The facts are that Minnesota today can spot any other known ore area in the world a billion tons and still walk off with the steel crown of the champion.

In a freight-rate hearing conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission in Duluth in June 1947, it was brought out that the Lake Superior region still had 2,000,000,000 long tons of ore—1,500,000,000 of it in Minnesota, the rest in Wisconsin and Michigan. And that 1,500,000,000 tons was said to be in the Mesabi, Vermillion, and Cuyuna ranges.

Shortly after that Dr. G. M. Schwartz, director of the Minnesota Geological Survey, began flying over the northern part of the State, with his "doodlebug" detector. When he had put all the charts and figures together, he announced on separate occasions that the magnetometer indicated vast new ranges west of the Mississippi never explored. He cautioned that drilling and digging should be undertaken to determine the exact richness.

The Pacific Isle Mining Co. of Hibbing announced Friday that it had made such an exploration in open pit digging between Randall and the border of Camp Ripley. Below 50 feet of top earth it ran into ore running 54 percent in content, comparable in richness to the famed Mesabi, which runs to 60 percent in its best ore.

Below the 54 percent ore at Randall, mining company spokesmen said, are millions of tons of 40 percent ore. Mixed with the higher grade after washing operations to bring up content percentage, they believe, it will yield 50 percent ore such as is shipped from the Mesabi pits.

Now back to that 1,500,000,000-ton estimate in 1947. As has been pointed out, that was for the three explored ranges—the Mesabi, Vermillion, and Cuyuna.

The estimators weren't thinking of the unknown quantity west of the Mississippi then or of taconite.

Yet today Reserve Mining Co. plans to sink $7,000,000 this summer in a taconite plant at Babbitt, Minn., up in the Superior National Forest.

So there you have 1947's 1,500,000,000 tons, plus vast new ranges west of the Mississippi plus taconite.

How, then, does Minnesota compare with the much-talked-of fields in Labrador and Venezuela? When the excitement of the new discoveries there had cooled, it was estimated each area had about one billion tons of ore.

Do mining companies expect to rush there for ore? Yes, they say. Do they expect to drop Minnesota? No.

What is the plan, then? This:

The mining companies have indicated they expect to take some ore from Labrador, some from Venezuela, some taconite, to mix with Minnesota's rich ores. In that way the heavy drain on the latter will be cut down. For this reason: If there's a war, it might be difficult to ship from Venezuela and it will be nice to know there's plenty at home.

Thus, the experts indicate Minnesota likely will still be wearing the crown in the year 2000.

The MacArthur Ouster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 12 I stated in a speech to the Congress that the MacArthur ouster reflects the people's worry about our foreign policy. I might add that the MacArthur ouster also reflects the growing conviction in the people's minds that the acts of many of those in the executive branch of the Government have aroused resentment, not because these acts have been illegal, but because of their immorality.

This latter thesis has been very ably presented by Mr. Hal O'Flaherty, director of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, in an article published on April 27, 1951. The article is as follows:

BEHIND THE CHEERS—MACARTHUR FRENZY CALLED ANSWER TO MINK COAT MORALS—ANGER AT GOVERNMENT DECAY COMES OUT IN PUBLIC ACTS

(By Hal O'Flaherty)

General MacArthur's homecoming has created an emotional disturbance across the Nation that requires analysis and, if possible, rational explanation.

Newsreels now showing give a connected story of the general's departure from Japan, his arrival at San Francisco and his appearance before Congress. The dramatic quality of this warrior's return is unique.

Public frenzy such as MacArthur's return created cannot be explained simply as a nation's love for a war hero.

Nor can it be attributed to revulsion against the President, who acted wholly within his constitutional rights in firing the general.

Around the desks where news is handled a conviction is growing that the abrupt dismissal of MacArthur is connected in the public mind with other acts by the executive branch of government that have aroused resentment not because they were illegal but because they were immoral.

MacArthur's dismissal followed closely upon the heels of the great debate on the sending of new divisions to Europe.

The President unquestionably has the right to order American troops to any place in the world, but Congress asked whether he had the moral right to do so.

According to a decision of the United States Supreme Court in the famous case of devaluation of the dollar, the American Government, which includes the executive branch, has the sovereign power to commit an immoral act. The devaluation was labeled as immoral but not illegal.

Fresh in the public mind are the revelations of many other acts closely related to the executive branch of Government, that were immoral but not illegal.

The $9,000 mink coat deal was immoral, perhaps, but not illegal.

It was immoral, but not illegal to harbor 5-percenters in the White House; to appoint incompetents to high public office; to try to force Congress to ratify any wish or whim of the Executive.

Public memory is not so short that it has forgotten other Executive acts that were plainly immoral but not illegal.

The attempt to pack the Supreme Court; the subsidizing of masses of the population; the substitution of a sham security in place of individual freedom.

More recently, the executive branch of Government has been engaged in the broad decisions regarding the conduct of the war in Korea.

From June 1950 up to the present moment, these decisions have been taken by the President.

It was he who ordered MacArthur into Korea before the United Nations had voted permission.

Today, it is the President with perfunctory reference to the United Nations who is directing the war in Korea on strategic lines that General MacArthur asserts cannot bring victory.

Again, the question arises as to whether it is immoral but not illegal to send American forces backward and forward across Korea with only stalemate as the end result.

Back of the plaudits for General MacArthur may be the desire of common people for some degree of participation in the decisions of Government through a Congress that is a reality and not the relic of American democracy.

Senator Kefauver's Stature and Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean of May 2 under the caption "He meets the challenge." The editorial, which is reprinted from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Evening Sun, pays just tribute to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for the magnificent work done by him in connection with the so-called crime committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE MEETS THE CHALLENGE

The Binghamton Sun modestly claims to be the only up-State Republican newspaper. In politics we have always been stanchly Republican. But of late years we have been greatly troubled by a challenge which has arisen in this Nation—an ugly, formidable challenge which transcends party politics.

This challenge is whether clean, honest, decent government shall survive, or whether big-time crime, big-time corruption, and unscrupulous uses of public office—aided by public apathy—shall go on poisoning the lifeblood of America until it is too late for help.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, a Democrat, of Tennessee, has courageously and resolutely stepped forth to meet that challenge. In this great fight he deserves the grateful support of every newspaper and every decent citizen, regardless of Democrat or Republican Party affiliation.

Throughout the Nation there has been of late a growing public uneasiness, and feeling of disgust and distrust, over the many startling revelations of "boodle" politics in Washington—of immoral use of high public office, of the "legal" plundering of public funds, of a cynical lack of frankness (even good faith) by the Government toward the people, even in such important matters as foreign policy. The public is beginning to feel that it has not been told the truth by the Government—that the Government today holds too many men of low principle in high places. When the people lose their faith in the integrity of their Government it becomes indeed a grave and dangerous situation for democracy.

Amid the whole sickening mess of broken public trust, of big-time crime and its hideous partner, corruption, Senator KEFAUVER stands out like the highest peak of his own Tennessee mountains—not just as an able, fearless, determined Senator, but also as a symbol of the hopes and best ideals of all good citizens who want to save America.

The Senator has dramatically shown the country that something must be done, and can be done. He is furnishing the necessary leadership. By intelligent and skillful use of publicity, radio, and television he has successfully dramatized the sordid picture of big-time crime and corruption, and driven the shocking lesson home to the decent citizens of every community.

Senator KEFAUVER has proven to the American people that clean, honest, decent government can be had—but only if public opinion demands and insists on it. By his own resolute courage and honest effort Senator KEFAUVER has performed a great public service not only for the people, but also for the United States Senate because he has so forcefully demonstrated that the citizens of this country can still have faith that the Senate can be relied on to rise above party ties and political expediency to fight such an internal national menace as we now face.

Senator KEFAUVER is a great American, a great Senator, and a great man. We wish we could add also that he is a great Republican. But Tennessee being what it is politically, he probably would not be in the Senate if he were Republican—which would be something of a national calamity. So New York and all the other States, Republican or Democratic, are mighty grateful to Tennessee for giving ESTES KEFAUVER to the United States Senate.

We fervently hope to hear more and more of Senator KEFAUVER taking a leading part in national affairs in the future. He is young, able, strong, honest, and fearless. God knows that is the kind of leadership America—and the world—needs today.

Shall We Bomb Manchuria?—View of a Top Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, realizing that the ultimate decision regarding war in Asia may well affect the lives of seven or eight million American boys and reach into practically every home in the country, I am including with this extension of my remarks the views of Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger. General Eichelberger was commander of the Eighth Army from 1944 to 1948 and participated in the New Guinea, New Britain, and Philippine campaigns in the Pacific. In addition, he was commander of occupied forces in Japan during 1946–48. General Eichelberger, who was born in Urbana, Ohio, was one of the thousands of sons of the Buckeye State who made an indelible mark for themselves in the Pacific theater during the last war.

His article in Newsweek magazine follows:

SHALL WE BOMB MANCHURIA?—VIEW OF A TOP AUTHORITY

(By Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, U. S. Army, retired)

Since the Chinese intervention in Korea last fall, it has been my fixed conviction that Mao Tse-tung must have received certain promises from Stalin before committing his troops against the United Nations in Korea. In the last analysis, Mao was entering an undeclared war against the United States. It is hard to believe that he would have taken such a step unless assured of Russian support should the conflict be broadened beyond Korea.

We don't know what commitments the Soviets have made to Mao. But we do know that they are in a position to give the Chinese support—disguised or otherwise—with air power, with submarine, and with troops. And we do know that the treaty of mutual support between China and Russia can be invoked to provide a legal basis for such support. So far, however, the Russians seem to have been reluctant to supply much aid to the Chinese, except for the Soviet-built planes which dart across the Yalu and back again. The Chinese ground forces apparently have little or no Soviet equipment. But the appearance of Russian tanks in the ground fighting could make a great difference and the intervention of Red planes over the battlefield and of Red submarines against our supply lines could be decisive.

What action on our part would bring about Russian intervention? It is my belief that bombing the Red bases in the privileged sanctuary of Manchuria would cause the Soviets to enter the war in Korea and that this would also probably herald the beginning of the third world war. Certainly preparations are being made, not only for defending Manchurian bases but also for putting a Red air force in Korea. This is proved by the construction and improvement of airfields all over Northern Korea.

What would be the effect of Soviet air intervention only (leaving out of consideration the submarines and ground forces)? First, take the lads doing the fighting. No doubt they resent the fact that we are not able to bomb across the Yalu and hit the enemy where he comes from. But, at the same time, these lads have been spared being bombed and strafed as they fight against superior numbers. Since December our battle losses have been consistently lower than those of the enemy with consequent improvement in all ranks in immediate battle contact. All this might be reversed if the enemy had air support.

Second, take the effect of Soviet intervention against our own privileged sanctuary—Japan. Throughout the Korean war the Japanese have realized all too well that we have been fighting their fight across the Sea of Japan. They have natural fears inspired by the presence of powerful Red forces on the island of Sakhalin and on the Asiatic mainland. Most Japanese now hope for an early peace treaty, including the right of rearming ground forces for the defense of their own shores. The Japanese need time, above all, to build their defenses on land and to coordinate them with the air and sea defenses which we will provide.

Third, take the matter of time itself. Is it on our side? A few days ago it was my privilege to visit the plant where the world's fastest global bomber is made. I left with the hope that we can hold off the third world war by every legitimate means until that assembly line and a hundred others can produce the war material which will deter the gentlemen of the Kremlin from total war or spell defeat for them if they force war upon us.

Was the Decartelization Program in Germany Sabotaged?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the failure of decartelization of cartels and combines in Germany, I include a short statement and article

showing how our own representatives have failed to carry out the provisions of the Potsdam agreement in effecting decartelization. There is no doubt in my mind but that certain of our big corporations have connections and are interwoven with these cartels and are responsible for the failure of the decartelization program. Not only will the failure of the program cost our country millions and millions of dollars, but I also feel that within a few short years these cartels will be directed against the best interest of our country. I respectfully urge that the membership read my statement and the article which I have included.

The reservoir of world-wide good will toward the United States is now being gravely threatened during these days of international crisis. To conserve that good will and to strengthen our ties with our most reliable friends abroad, is the surest way to enhance freedom's battle against totalitarianism.

While it is my firm conviction that the democracies must be strong militarily, the American people would be misreading the lessons of history if they laid undue stress on the military factor without giving prime consideration to moral and economic factors which must in the long run determine the future of the free world. Are we applying these lessons of history as regards Germany?

Powerful voices have placed a premium on the rebuilding of Germany's military potential as though this were the key to peace and the strengthening of the free world. How else can one explain the complete failure to thoroughly denazify Germany? The retreat from the original policy to root out those aggressive elements that caused so much ruin and misery to the world was recently dramatized by the decision of the American High Commissioner to commute the sentences of 89 leading German war criminals including that merchant of death, Alfred Krupp. All of these criminals had received fair trials. Their cases had been reviewed by General Clay. He found no reason to grant clemency. Yet the American High Commissioner helped pave the way for the return to power of these powerful Hitlerite forces.

Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, who was chief American prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials, in denouncing the McCloy commutations said:

> We are engaged today in a mortal struggle to suppress the menace of communism in the west and undermine its freezing grip on the east. By these commutations we have added a powerful new weapon to the Kremlin's propaganda arsenal and it will not be long before we feel the sharpness of its edge and the power of its thrust.

Among those whose sentences were commuted were the criminals responsible for the Malmedy massacre where hundreds of American GI's were murdered though they had been taken as prisoners of war during the Battle of the Bulge. In the cases of Maj. Gen. Otto Ohlendorf and Lt. Gen. Oswald Pohl, who, together with their henchmen, were responsible for the extermination of millions of people, the American High Commissioner, while lenient in some instances, admitted that Pohl and Ohlendorf could not receive any special treatment. Their guilt was too patent. Yet these murderers, through legal ruses, are endeavoring to thwart justice.

American leadership in world affairs cannot rest on political expediency. We cannot bargain with the former enemy by whitewashing their crimes and restoring the alleged honor of the German soldier without at the same time forfeiting our right to speak for the free world. Indeed, it is my considered judgment that political bargaining with the Germans can only increase their contempt of the Allies and in particular of the United States. It is sheer folly to believe that the Germans are wedded to the west as opposed to the east. There is nothing in German history which proves that the Germans have been a bulwark of western civilization. On the contrary, they have been the instigators of all recent wars. They are completely dedicated to the Pan-German dream of Deutschland Ueber Alles.

They will gladly bargain with the west as they are doing today and extract one concession after another, but when the chips are down who will dare to say that we will find them as a bulwark against communism? The Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939 should be a stern reminder to those who play fast and loose with America's security. To strengthen Germany's war potential and to enable her to regain economic mastery over Europe, would seriously undermine our position in the world.

The peoples living on the periphery of Germany including our allies, have a deep-rooted fear and suspicion of Germany. These attitudes are not transitory. They are rooted in the history of the past 100 years. Shall we sacrifice our most reliable friends in Europe for short-term expediency? This is the question that must be answered by the American people.

The sharp deterioration of our position in Germany and the consequent strengthening of Communist propaganda is seen by the abysmal blunders with regard to the smashing of the German cartels and trusts. Everyone in Europe knows the predatory character of these huge giants which provided the bone and sinew of Hitler's war-making power and tried in every way to hamper American production during World War II. They were slated to be broken up and their rulers were to be prevented from ever again holding positions of economic power. But as with denazification and the war crimes trials, powerful influences have succeeded in sabotaging the decartelization program. As early as 1948 former Secretary of the Army Royall assured the American people that the pernicious cartels in Germany had been abolished. But as late as October 14, 1950, the United Press reported as follows:

> The retiring chief of the United States Marshall plan for Germany said today that the Western Allies have failed to break up the huge cartels that helped Hitler wage war.
>
> "The program of decartelizing and deconcentrating West German industry has not been successful so far," Robert M. Hanes said in an interview. "Practically no German industry has been decartelized or deconcentrated. * * *
>
> "Cartel-smashing has been attacked bitterly by West German industrial and governmental leaders, including Chancelor Adenauer." (From UP, Frankfurt, October 14, 1950.)

How can one explain the fact that the huge trusts and cartels in Germany are still thriving? Was it by sheer chance or ignorance on the part of those who were responsible for decartelization? The record shows this not to be true. It is in this connection that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, an article entitled "Was the Decartellization Program Sabotaged?" This article appeared in Prevent World War III, a bimonthly magazine published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III—Part I, November-December 1950. This article cites personalities and goes into great detail with regard to the decartelization debacle.

Anyone who reads this article cannot help but come to the conclusion that the decartelization program was sabotaged by a preconceived plan foisted upon our military government by powerful cartel figures in the United States. The failure in decartelization is a clear mirror reflecting how far we have traveled away from our original policies in Germany. It is a warning to all Americans that the sacrifices of World War II were in vain. In inserting this article I want to say that I have every confidence in the work of the Society for the Prevention of World War III which is sponsored by men and women motivated by the highest sense of patriotism. The society's work in keeping the American people informed is a tribute to their understanding of the issues and the grave responsibilities facing our Nation today.

Only last week I read reliable reports of the ever-growing power of the Nazis. Then, this morning, came press dispatches of two elections held yesterday, one in Germany and the other in Austria. In both, Nazi-like parties gained large numbers of votes, 11 percent in one election and almost 20 percent in the other. Our failure to press the decartelization program has encouraged rather than discouraged the enemies of democracy to return to power. The article follows:

WAS THE DECARTELIZATION PROGRAM SABOTAGED?

PROFILE NO. 1: RICHARDSON BRONSON

Richardson Bronson became chief of the decartelization branch of military government in 1947. During the war he was an Army colonel ferrying troops across to Europe.

He began his military government work as deputy I. G. Farben control officer, in which position he was subordinate and responsible to James S. Martin, chief of decartelization. Bronson had no training in antitrust work, although he was a lawyer; and was very frank in stating to his subordinates that his background had been with big business and that his sympathies were there too.

Bronson became I. G. Farben control officer in which position he developed a plan for turning over the various units set up under I. G. Farben breakup plans to German trustees who would administer and run the properties until finally disposed of to new and independent owners. The series of "independent" units which Bronson set up were legal fictions, since they were in fact neither units nor independents. The scheme was a temporary stop-gap to take the pressure off the persistent demand for positive action.

Although Bronson was administratively responsible to Martin, in reality he took his orders from his superiors in the Economics Division, Lawrence Wilkinson, Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., and eventually Phillips Hawkins. In common with his superiors, he was unalterably opposed to breaking up and deconcentrating German coinbines, and never concealed his antagonism to the program of the decartelization branch. While still subordinate to Martin, Bronson told Johnston Avery and Creighton Coleman, assistant chiefs of the branch, that he was glad he had nothing to do with decartelization, since he had always been on the side of big business and did not believe in breaking up German combines.

The principle behind the establishment of "independent" units to replace the Farben combine was the policy that these units should not be bigger than were absolutely necessary to carry out efficient production. It would appear that this principle was not adhered to. Actually, the biggest plants of Farben were grouped into one unit under a single trustee. All of the plants in Hoechst, for example, were placed under one trustee and operated as a unit. The Hoechst complex constitutes one of the biggest pieces of Farben property. The aim was not efficient production, but to safeguard the interests of the former owners of Farben who, through their influence, both on the Americans and on the German trustees, were able to prevent any dismemberment of the cartel. The trustees of these units were trusted functionaries of the company, many of them former high Nazis, who were retained in their positions because of their alleged know-how. These trustees knew how to cater to American occupation authorities in order to accomplish their aims of safeguarding their property from liquidation.

Bronson conducted long conferences with various officials in search of a formula which would circumvent the Allied Control Council Law 9 seizing I. G. Farben property. This concerned the method whereby ownership would be transferred to new owners. It was a convenient piece of juridical maneuvering to which Bronson offered no opposition. The whole history of the liquidation of Farben clearly shows that the top officials did very little to carry out United States policies. And this also applies to Bronson.

The net result of Bronson's tenure as I. G. Farben control officer was the gradual emergence of the old power of the Farben cartel, with production policies under nominal direction of the American officials, but actually in the hands of the same crowd which guided Farben throughout its nefarious history.

The turning over of the German chemical industry by John J. McCloy to the Germans was only the logical consequence of an existing state of fact.

The fact that former Nazis were back in control of Farben was admitted by Bronson's colleague, Myron S. Maupin, who was appointed by Bronson to succeed him as Farben control officer when Bronson moved up to the position of decartelization chief.

Maupin was little concerned with the breaking up of the Farben empire. Testifying before the Ferguson committee, Maupin admitted that many of the present officials of Farben were former Nazis and justified their employment on the grounds that all he was interested in was production, and those Nazis knew how to produce.

With the announcement that the "independent" units of Farben would not be sold to the public as originally planned, the final step was taken by the American occupation in abandoning plans for the elimination of this source of resurgent economic power of the German cartels.

When Phillips Hawkins moved up from assistant chief to chief of decartelization he picked Bronson to succeed him. Bronson and Hawkins were close personal friends—Bronson was best man at the latter's wedding—and the fact that Hawkins was the son-in-law of Draper, the military-government economic adviser, was particularly attractive to Bronson.

Hawkins selected Bronson for the job of decartelization chief, because he could rely on Bronson to follow his orders and hew the line. As an administrator of the program, Bronson showed a lack of interest in breaking the cartels. The promises made to his staff to undertake any particular action were never kept. He always sought reasons for his lack of action. Bronson would call for the submission of proposals against a particular combine, but after receiving them would completely ignore them, while the staff would be involved in some internal reorganization or shifting of responsibility. A favorite technique for avoiding action would be the shifting of the responsibility for recommendations from one staff member to another. Projects such as the Bosch and Siemens deconcentration orders went through innumerable individuals, each obliged to review the data and come up with some new recommendation. Proposals for deconcentrating the Siemenswerke, the giant electrical trust, for example, were ready as far back as 1946. Yet more than 2 years later, Bronson assigned an entirely new set of individuals who did not know the material to undertake a new study of the combine.

Bronson never fought for any part of the decartelization program, and when he was publicly accused in March 1948 by 19 members of his own staff of revising basic United States policy, he failed to justify his position. Nor did he try to defend United States policies before his superiors who used him to promulgate this arbitrary change of policy without any explanation whatsoever. Quite the contrary, Bronson told the staff to be "good soldiers" and obey their superiors. Martin, however, fought back and defended the United States interests.

Bronson's testimony before the Ferguson committee shows his true character. He affirmed to the committee the possibility of deconcentrating the Henschel locomotive combine although he himself earlier had informed the staff that Henschel was not to be deconcentrated.

Bronson's performance before the Ferguson committee is an example of the man's ability. As described by Francis Laurent, one of the assistant chiefs of the branch, Bronson, "because of his poor memory and lack of understanding of the issues was not well qualified for the conduct of negotiations, and was unwilling to compensate for his shortcomings. While work on the Henschel case was in progress he undertook to conduct negotiations with his British opposite but did not ask the persons who were familiar with the case to accompany him. On two occasions he brought back reports of agreements which were at variance with reports which came to us from the British side. The resulting disagreements were extremely embarrassing."

In testifying before the Ferguson committee, Bronson gave a misleading picture of the results of the work of the decartelization branch. Thus, in December 1948, he told the committee that the decartelization program had reached a point "where it could go in either direction," that no fait accompli had been put over. He made these assertions in the face of known facts that back in March 1948, General Clay had already jettisoned the whole decartelization program with his famous "rule of reason" theory under which heavy German industry was practically exempted from any decartelization action.

In a letter to the Ferguson committee, dated March 31, 1949, Bronson attempted to defend his record and told the committee that hearings on Bosch, the great auto accessory combine, were being finalized. The record of the Bosch case does not bear this out. Under orders of Clay, he had removed from the Bosch recommendations its vital parts dealing with the planned severance of the Eisemann Co., which was Bosch's chief competitor before it was swallowed up by Bosch in 1924. Bronson ordered Eisemann to remain a part of the Bosch combine. In addition, Bronson, acting under Hawkins' instructions, changed other sections of the Bosch determination order, particularly the patent and foreign subsidiaries parts. The net effect of these changes was to allow Bosch to retain control over its patents and to permit Bosch to reestablish itself as an international cartel.

In connection with Bosch's efforts to regain its international cartel position, Bronson, unofficially, conducted many private conversations with a General Wilson, who was acting as Bosch's representative in Germany, and who was the head of the International Products Trading Co., which the Bosch combine established in Switzerland for the purpose of building up Bosch's foreign exchange, without the embarrassment of submitting their dealings to the scrutiny of military government. The contract signed with Bosch by the IPTC was executed with Bronson's approval after consultation with Hawkins. The Bosch-IPTC contract was a clear violation of military government law 56 of decartelization. It is typical of Bronson's conduct that in discussing this deal between Bosch and Wilson before the Ferguson committee, Bronson expressed annoyance at Wilson for "barging" into his office at all times and "interfering" with the work of the decartelization branch. Notwithstanding the illegality of Bronson's action in pushing through the contract, notwithstanding all of the actions involved in watering down and making the Bosch decartelization ineffective, Bronson informed the Ferguson committee in March 1949, that everything was getting along fine with regard to the decartelization of Bosch.

Bronson's role in furthering the contract between the International Products Trading Corp. and Bosch was prejudicial to United States interests.

In the case of the Siemenswerke, Bronson told the committee that the whole Siemens question was being examined by the United States-United Kingdom Bipartite Board. He accused other witnesses before the committee of not knowing the latest achievements of the Decartelization Branch.

He didn't tell the committee that this was the nth time the deconcentration of Siemens, the electrical combine, was being considered and that nothing would come out of this consideration, for the simple reason that he knew that no action against Siemens would be undertaken.

In his statement to the committee, Bronson pointed to the abolition of the business licensing laws of the German State Government as one of his major achievements, but he did not tell the committee that the enforcement of the regulations abolishing licensing was practically nonexistent and that the slight criticism leveled against the German officials was hardly calculated to force these officials to carry out the Military Government policy on licensing.

He pointed to the fact that the Germans were considering fair-trade legislation. Such legislation has yet to be passed. Nowhere does Bronson point to the major failures of military occupation in carrying out the decartelization program. He says nothing about the Henschel case even though he himself had told the committee several months earlier that some action on Henschel was contemplated.

Or take the case of the United Ball Bearing Works—the VKF combine. This was a

Swedish affiliate of SKF and represented a virtual monopoly in Germany, with the exception of a small independent concern—Kugellager Fischer. Since the United Ball Bearing Works was a foreign-owned company, Military Government dismantled the Fischer plant as part of the reparations program, thus creating a complete monopoly for VKF.

The decartelization staff, therefore, prepared a series of recommendations for deconcentrating VKF. Under pressure of the Economics Division headed by Wilkinson, all action on VKF was suspended and a solution was offered which consisted of having VKF turn over to Kugellager Fischer some of its obsolete machinery for the production of ball bearings. On specific instructions of Wilkinson, Bronson held off all action to deconcentrate VKF, although this firm would have remained a monopoly within the meaning of law 56 even after the turning over of machines to Fischer. Subsequently, General Clay killed all action on VKF.

The same pattern of action can be discerned in relation to other combines. Bronson would tell his staff one thing and proceed to act in another way behind their backs.

Notwithstanding this record, Bronson had no compunction in telling Creighton Coleman, a member of the decartelization branch, that he knew more about decartelization than anyone else.

The above record speaks for itself. Let the reader judge for himself, too.

More About the Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein copy of a letter from F. Shackelford, Department Counselor, Department of the Army, to Gov. John Lodge, of Connecticut.

This letter, written on April 21, 1951, deals with a subject which is something of a mystery to the American people. It follows:

APRIL 21, 1951.

Hon. JOHN LODGE,
Governor of Connecticut,
Hartford, Conn.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR LODGE: Your letter of March 12, 1951, to the Secretary of State has been forwarded to the Department of the Army so that we may give you the Army's comments on those portions of the article by Julius Epstein, enclosed with your original letter, which primarily concern the Army.

The Army has been unable to uncover any evidence which indicates the specific person who "locked up" or had custody of this document. I should prefer not to reveal the name of the stenographer to whom Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet dictated his report since she is naturally upset by the publicity which had been accorded this episode with which she had no connection aside from transcribing the report. However, if you think her name will serve any useful purpose, I shall be glad to furnish it to you, preferably on a confidential basis.

No copies were made or retained of the report apparently for the reason that it was believed to be of primary interest to the State Department alone.

General Bissell has stated as his best recollection that the report was informally passed to Mr. Lyons or Mr. Holmes of the State Department. There is, however, no record of this transaction and if a record was made or if there was a letter of transmittal or a receipt, none of these can be found.

With reference to the documents entitled, "Facts and Documents concerning Polish Prisoners of War Captured by the U. S. S. R. During the 1939 Campaign" and "Supplementary Report on Facts and Documents Concerning the Katyn Massacre," they were given to General Bissell when he was attaché in London by Lieutenant General Kukiel, a member of the Polish Government in London. General Bissell forwarded them by letter dated December 1, 1947 to Gen. Telford Taylor, who at that time was in Europe as Chief of Counsel for War Crimes. General Taylor in turn sent these documents to G-2 on August 4, 1949, just prior to his relief from active duty. These documents were not and never have been classified by the Army, but have been handled on a classified basis because they were labeled "For private circulation only" when received from the Polish Government in London. The confusion in the identity of these documents resulted from careless research and improper labeling of these Polish documents by two civilian employees of the Department of the Army, who have been reprimanded for this carelessness.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in connection with this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

F. SHACKELFORD,
Department Counselor.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I was greatly interested to see that two great and influential Catholic periodicals of national circulation, Commonweal and America, have come out in support of the President's policies in the controversy with General MacArthur. The reasoning of these two publications on the MacArthur issue is very cogent, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "The MacArthur Ouster," from the April 21 issue of America, and the editorial entitled "No End in Sight?" from the April 27 issue of the Commonweal.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From America of April 21, 1951]

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

From almost any angle you look at it, the storm now swirling around General MacArthur is deplorable. What remains of our national unity is in danger of being destroyed by the supercharged lightning flashes of emotion generated by personal and political partisanship. We discern but one hopeful ray in the lightning-riven clouds: if the controversy can be brought under control and carried on calmly on the basis of the issues involved, it may become the last great debate on United States foreign policy.

The one Herbert Hoover touched off 6 months ago, apparently settled by the Senate's troops-to-Europe resolution of April 4, dealt largely with our policy for Europe. Our far-eastern policy, or lack of it, was not formally debated in the Senate. The MacArthur incident, for better or worse, has made such a discussion inevitable. We can only hope that it will be productive of a renewed national unity.

Already, as Walter Lippmann observed in the curious case of Senator TAFT, there is confusion as to what General MacArthur meant in his now celebrated letter to Congressman MARTIN. The General, as the columnist pointed out, wanted more than permission to bomb Red China's Manchurian bases and to use the Formosa forces of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese mainland. The General wanted permission to wage all-out war against China. Contending that the global conflict with communism has already begun, the General argued that it could be won by defeating Red China. The way to save Europe, he wrote in effect, is to defeat communism in Asia.

That involves an almost complete reversal of our present policy. The United States and its allies have long since decided to concentrate on Europe while diverting the necessary minimum to prevent a Communist sweep in Asia. The fundamental issue is therefore clear-cut. Shall the United States abandon its present efforts to safeguard Europe and devote its resources chiefly to a full-scale war with Red China?

Those who join General MacArthur in an affirmative answer to this fateful question should not overlook these considerations:

1. If we decide to join the issue in Asia, we shall have to go it alone—our Atlantic allies, the Asian-Arab nations and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

2. Attacking China in the belief that the USSR will not come to her aid is not a calculated risk—it is the wildest sort of gamble.

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the West, will be relatively ineffective in China. If we contemplate using them for atomic bombing, let us reflect that such bombing would have little military value, would infuriate all Asia and might invite Russian retaliation. Thus there is no hope of a short and cheap war.

4. Our long-neglected tactical air force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.

5. Even if Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take over an almost defenseless Europe, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. If we tempt Russia into a war for which we are still unprepared offensively, we shall expose our people to destruction, since our home-defense system, both military and civil, is pitifully incomplete.

7. As the President emphasized in his address to the Nation on April 11, our present policy is designed to avoid world war III. Though it may fail, it furnishes a hope lacking in the MacArthur approach.

If these considerations are put forcibly to the American people, we believe that the last great debate will not be prolonged as its predecessor was, and that our people, finally satisfied that we are on the only course open to us, will then settle down to the supreme task of ensuring their security.

[From the Commonweal of April 27, 1951]

NO END IN SIGHT?

Shortly after General MacArthur was dispossessed of his Pacific command, and while the resulting uproar was still running at high tide throughout the country, the general's supporters gave vent to their anger by badgering the President, demanding to know what he planned to do next in Korea now that he had removed MacArthur, who had become, in the eyes of many American newspaper readers, the paternal and protective figure of anti-Communist law and order in the Far East. It was a troublesome question to ask Mr. Truman because, as everyone knew, there appeared to be no end in sight for the war in Korea. It seemed then, as it still does, that things might go on there forever as they are now, with the Chinese feeding battalions of Asiatic manpower to the waiting muzzles of UN guns and with neither side able to accomplish its objective; under these conditions the United Nations would be unable to restore order and establish the conditions of political independence throughout the whole of Korea, while the Chinese would be unable to push us off the peninsula. General MacArthur, so his followers argued, at least had an end in view; he was willing to extend the Korean War to the rest of Asia and fight the showdown battle there.

Behind the general's reasoning in this matter was his opinion that "the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest" on the battlefields of Asia, and we should, therefore, "join the issue thus raised" in Asia. To the President and his military advisers this advice of MacArthur's was, and is, highly questionable because they feel that at this time Asia is really the secondary front and is being used by Russia as a deliberate decoy; an examination of the broader issues involved in the Korean war leads one to understand the very sound reasoning which compelled the President to reject MacArthur's view.

Like the Berlin blockade and the recent war in Greece, the Korean war has, of course, to be looked at as a local incident in a geographic sense only; in every other way it is an international affair, one episode in the over-all struggle between the Soviets and the free world. There is, really, no permanent solution to the Korean war on a local level; there may be a local victory or a stalemate, as there was in Berlin and in Greece, but the underlying and all-pervading world tension will not be dissolved by this local decision alone, any more than it was dissolved by what happened in Berlin and in Greece.

CORE OF HOPE

It is necessary, then, to keep an over-all strategy in mind at all times and not to let any one local incident get out of hand and distract attention from that strategy. Our over-all plan, worked out over the past 5 years, is largely based on a serious weakness in Russia's ability to wage a world war against the West: That weakness is her lack of sufficient supplies of two of the most vital raw materials of war—steel and oil. The western plan is to do everything possible to keep Russia weak in those commodities as long as we can and to build up our strength in the meantime to such a point that the Soviets will not risk a world war.

Now Russia can get both oil and steel when she wants them in neighboring countries, and it so happens that to do this the Soviet military machine will have to face westward, because the oil is in Iran and the steel is in the German Ruhr. But here the West holds the trump cards at the moment. Because of the Atlantic Treaty alliance of nations, we have—or we will have in coming months, if the Atlantic preparations go forward speedily—air bases in Europe and in the Mediterranean from which we could, in the event of a world war, blast the oil fields, the Ruhr, and, most important of all, the faulty lines of rail and road communications between these points and Russia, thus denying the Soviets the very steel and oil supplies they would be seeking.

Since it is quite obvious that what the Soviets need and want most of all at this time lies in the European sphere and not in the Far East, the administration, in the interests of concentrating our defensive strength in the West where it is needed most, has based its foreign policy primarily on the Atlantic Treaty, hoping to preserve the hard core of our defense and of our striking power in Europe and in the Near East, and hoping at the same time to cripple Russia's ability, in terms of oil and steel, to wage a world war. Our intention is in this way to forestall a world war altogether by making it too great a risk for Russia to take.

THE GREAT DECISION

We know now that General MacArthur did not approve of this strategic plan; under his command, the local aspect of the Korean war was getting out of hand, so far, at least, as our over-all strategy was concerned. MacArthur's policy would have meant diverting much more of our power to Asia, a diversion which, in the minds of the President's military advisers, would have left us desperately weak in Europe and in the Mediterranean, consequently making it immeasurably easier for Russia to move against Iran and Germany in quest of the oil and steel with which she might eventually wage total war against us. Russia would then have won the great advantage of having secured the resources she needs while spreading our defenses thin around the world, and we in turn would have committed the blunder of not having concentrated our power in the one most decisive theater of war.

Such, in its broadest scope, is the background of the present dispute between General MacArthur and the Government; this is also the background of the recent foreign-policy debate, set off by the Republicans, on the question of whether or not to make Europe the first line of defense. In Korea, the administration itself created the foreign-policy issue anew for the Republicans because it had a hard but necessary decision to make: It had to limit the war to Korea, whatever the military disadvantages, in order to preserve our over-all strategic plan for resisting Russian world conquest.

It was a hard decision to make because in local terms there is no end to the fighting in sight. But that does not mean that we are not working toward any end at all; as in Berlin and Greece, if we hold on resolutely in Korea, we may very well force the Soviets and the Chinese to come to terms, because where global strategy is concerned we will have held tight to our bargaining advantages. We will, in other words, have forced the Soviets to negotiate or to give up the fight, as they have done before, because they will have been maneuvered into too dangerous a position, as they have been before.

NOT INEVITABLE

If, as an end to the war in Korea, we look on this prospect as a distant end indeed, it is only because we have forgotten, or never fully realized, what we have given lip service to, which is, that the struggle against Soviet communism will be a long and terribly hard thing for all of us, whether we believe in the insanity of an aggressive, atomic massacre or a steady and strong resistance combining all the spiritual, military and material resources we have, in the hope that a nonviolent solution can in time be found.

It may be that our hope of averting world war III by limiting the war in Korea will not prove successful. That is something that is not entirely up to us. After all, what we are trying to do in Korea is an extraordinarily difficult and delicate job; we are trying to defend the moral principle of collective security against unlawful aggression without provoking an atomic war. In this regard we believe it is utterly misleading to say, as Senator TAFT said the other day, that [Mr. Truman] "has involved us in a major war which today has no purpose whatsoever." We do not agree with the Senator that an inviolable moral right—the right of collective security—can be worth fighting for in June but is not worth fighting for in April.

The war in Korea must, then, be seen as part of our over-all foreign policy, which is designed with a very definite end in mind: and that is, to forestall world war III, without abandoning our moral rights and without appeasing Russia; we are trying to do this by concentrating our power at the point of maximum effectiveness in Europe, while at the same time upholding the moral framework in the United Nations in Korea.

No one can absolutely guarantee the success of this or any other foreign policy in meeting the complex and crushing situation facing us now, but certainly the present policy is the most reasonable one open to us and the best hope of maintaining the peace; as Pius XII said only recently, we need to remember that "nothing is lost by peace, everything can be lost by war."

And that, in the last analysis, is what all the MacArthur controversy comes down to. To have taken the general's advice about using "maximum counterforce" in China would have led almost inevitably to world war III, whatever he may say now about limited measures and limited risk. To Mr. Truman and his advisers, world war III is not inevitable and so they have decided to limit the war in Asia, hoping to limit war everywhere while we still have the chance to do so by following resolutely the strategy decided upon.

We support the President wholeheartedly.

Four Hundred Reds Needle Vets To Stir Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement appearing in the Detroit Times, Detroit, Mich., of August 29, 1949, showing conclusively the design and technique of the Communists to destroy our country and way of life. Here a former Communist, John T. Pace, tells the story in unmistakable language which everyone can understand:

HOW 7,000 BONUS MARCHERS WERE DUPED: 400 REDS NEEDLE VETS TO STIR RIOTS

(By Howard Rushmore)

CENTERVILLE, TENN., August 29.—Hoping for bloodshed and violence, the Communist Party agents working within the ranks of the bonus marchers used every Red Fascist trick to get President Hoover to call out the army in 1932.

And when he did and General MacArthur put down the Communist bid for revolution without firing a shot, Red Fascist wrath was directed against these two great Americans—a raging "smear" campaign that has lasted for almost two decades.

John T. Pace, now a deputy sheriff in this quiet Tennessee town, but in 1932 a Communist leader of the left-wing section of the bonus march, said:

"I was told over and over again how much Stalin was interested in this campaign."

The ex-Communist, after recalling he arrived in Washington in June as leader of 1,000 veterans from the Middle West, said:

"Although I had been named by the Communist Party as leader of the left-wing group, I did not make a move without consulting Emmanuel Levine.

"Even before I lead the marchers into Washington, I had been told by my Communist superiors that Levine was the boss.

"The first day I arrived in the Capital, I was told to report to Levine in a secret office he kept in the city. I was given ample funds for cabs and other expenses."

REVOLUTION THE AIM

"Levine, a veteran Communist agitator, told me Moscow regarded this bonus march as a real propaganda opportunity to bring about revolt and hatred against President Hoover.

"Levine said the 'veterans have some Fascist misleaders who don't want violence—your job is to keep them stirred up and our party must take over.'"

Pace said a Communist International representative in New York was in daily touch with Levine and that Levine told Pace:

"Here's your chance of making a name for yourself with Stalin."

According to Pace, Levine kept a scrapbook of newspaper stories and photographs of all Communist rioting. Said Pace:

"The scrapbook was a record of our agitation and was sent to Moscow to show Stalin what we had done.

"We had only about 400 Communists among 7,000 veterans, but we controlled every action.

"Two hundred Communist from New York, some veterans, joined us. At Levine's command, I led a delegation of several hundred Reds down Pennsylvania Avenue to seize an abandoned Government building near the Capitol."

PROVOKE THE COPS

"Under Levine's direction, we planned this seizure carefully. We knew that it was illegal but, when I brought up this point, Levine said 'we'll provoke the cops and get some action.'"

"What kind of action?" I asked.

"He looked at me sternly and said, 'Comrade Pace, in every revolution some workers must die.'

"Levine said the 'CI rep' (meaning the Moscow agent in New York) wanted violence because President Hoover would then be forced to call out the Army.

"Once the Army steps in, we'll have a full-scale revolution going," Levine told me. "That will provide excellent propaganda against Hoover and we can agitate from coast to coast and recruit thousands of veterans to the party."

After Pace's group had seized the Government building, Levine told Pace to lead marchers into areas which had been ruled "out of bounds" by police.

These areas invaded by the Reds included the White House.

Pace continued:

"Levine instructed me: 'Keep picket lines around the White House. Make speeches denouncing Hoover. Get yourself arrested. It will all make good publicity.'"

INSPIRED VIOLENCE

Meanwhile, Pace kept in touch with his subordinates in the ranks of the Red section of the "Bonus Expeditionary Force," as it was called. He said:

"We sent Communists into Anacostia flats where several thousand legitimate veterans, led by W. W. Waters, an anti-Red, were camped.

"They did not want violence, so Levine told me to provoke it. I sent Communists into their ranks with orders to throw bricks at cops and even at our own Red marchers to provoke trouble.

"Waters didn't fall for our Communist tactics, but we did succeed in bringing over several hundred of the legitimate veterans to our building. We recruited some of them into the party."

Pace said Levine also ordered continuous propaganda among the veterans "about the Soviet rule and how the Red army was the best army in the world."

Parades, demonstrations, and minor riots were organized each day, Pace said, and added:

AT WHITE HOUSE

"The Communists drew up a program that ran like clockwork. So many were to be arrested each day. We were to defy police efforts to evict us from the buildings we had seized.

"I led demonstrators in front of the White House and, after the police had warned me a dozen times, I was arrested.

"Levine had told me such an arrest could also be utilized for propaganda. I spent 6 weeks in jail and the Communists stirred up a national campaign of martyrdom on my behalf.

"I was in jail when General MacArthur drove the Reds out of the Government buildings, but word was sent to me through Communist agents that the Moscow 'rep' was proud of me and would meet me in New York when I was released."

MacArthur's Forthright Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every patriotic American can fully agree with the views expressed by David Lawrence in the New York Herald Tribune of May 7, 1951. Under leave to extend, I am inserting Mr. Lawrence's remarks:

MACARTHUR TESTIMONY CALLED ANSWER TO CHARGES OF CRITICS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—A breath of fresh air has swept across the country in the person of a man who, without bitterness or rancor, rises above the petty and the irrelevant to state honestly his convictions on a highly controversial subject of national policy.

What General MacArthur has accomplished by his 3 days of testimony and by his ready submission to cross-examination is to put the whole question of our military policy in a true perspective.

Not a word of resentment did he express against the President or any one else. He brushed aside with a simple statement of facts the many misrepresentations of his position which critics have flung at him.

Nobody can truly claim the right to state General MacArthur's position hereafter unless he has read the 150,000 words of testimony covering the three days of hearings.

STATES WHAT HE BELIEVES

This correspondent has read every word of it and is amazed at the number of things that have been written about the general or his proposals which simply are not true. The atmosphere here is so surcharged with political tactics and with the polemics of partisanship that it is refreshing to find a spokesman who, without regard to how his remarks jibe with the speeches of Republican or Democratic leaders, in the "great debate" of recent weeks, states with candor and frankness what he really believes.

People may differ as to whether he has the right proposals and whether they should be adopted but, after reading the testimony, one is more puzzled than ever that the President should have listened to the smears of the "palace guard" and tried to destroy the reputation of one of the world's greatest soldiers, if not one of her most dynamic statesmen.

The same man who wrote out in longhand on his plane the historic speech to Congress and then read it without glasses, the same man who, though 71 years of age, sat for 9 hours a day for three successive days and faced a barrage of questions from the Senate's best interrogators won spontaneous praise from Republicans and Democrats in the committee. The tribute by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, Democrat, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, at the end of the final session on Saturday, is significant. He said:

"General MacArthur, I wish to state to you that the 3 days that you have been here with us are without parallel in my legislative experience. I have never seen a man subjected to such a barrage of questions in so many fields and on so many varied subjects. I marvel at your physical endurance. More than that, I have been profoundly impressed by the vastness of your patience and the thoroughness and the frankness with which you have answered all of the questions that have been propounded."

TRIBUTE TO MAC ARTHUR

"We have certainly drawn freely on your vast reservoir of knowledge and experience, not only as a great military captain, but as a civilian administrator of 80,000,000 people."

One wonders how such a man could have been summarily dismissed. One finds nowhere in the official record the slightest evidence that he disobeyed a military command or failed to fulfill the highest traditions of our military service. One wonders if President Truman will not be inspired when he has read all the testimony to show the same courage that he showed when he apologized to the Marines for an intemperate remark. For the instinct to redress a wrong is the mark of courage and spiritual understanding. General MacArthur cannot be restored to his command, of course, but the unworthy manner by which he was abruptly relieved can still be expunged from the record by an act of Christian atonement.

Communist Smear of General MacArthur Bonus March—Leader Exposes Red Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein excerpts from the Detroit Times, Detroit, Mich., of August 29, 1949, containing a statement of the deliberate and well-planned smear by the Communists of former President Hoover and General MacArthur.

Every American should read the Communist technique used to divide and conquer America.

The excerpts follow:

BONUS MARCH LEADER EXPOSES RED SMEAR OF HOOVER

(By Howard Rushmore)

CENTERVILLE, TENN., August 27.—A 17-year-old smear campaign against former President Hoover and General MacArthur today was branded a Communist plot by the

one man in the United States who knows the complete inside story.

He is John T. Pace, soft-spoken native of Tennessee hill country who was commended by the Communist International for his revolutionary leadership of the bonus march on Washington in 1932. He was a Detroiter at the time.

It was Pace, a secret Communist Party member, who was assigned by Moscow to whip up a propaganda campaign of hatred against Mr. Hoover and General MacArthur after the march had ended.

Using the technique of the "big lie" long before Hitler and Goebels copied the device for Nazi purposes, the Communists accused Mr. Hoover, our only living ex-President, and General MacArthur of killing World War I veterans.

Pace, a wiry little man who twice was arrested for his inciting to riot during the days of the bonus expeditionary force, is now a solid citizen of this drowsy little community.

NOW DEPUTY SHERIFF

He is a deputy sheriff, hard-working farmer, and chairman of the Americanism department of the American Legion in the county.

Pace is no longer a Communist. He quit communism 3 years after the bonus march and since that time has battled the Reds as zealously as he once served their cause. He says:

"I feel responsible, in part, for this often-repeated lie about Hoover and General MacArthur.

"I've never told this story before, but I think it's about time, and the only reward I want is the knowledge all veterans and everyone will know the truth about two great Americans.

"I led the left-wing or Communist section of the bonus march.

"It was ordered by my Red superiors to provoke riots.

WANTED BLOODSHED

"I was told to use every trick to bring about bloodshed in the hopes that Hoover would be forced to call out the Army.

"The Communists didn't care how many veterans were killed.

"I was told Moscow had ordered riots and bloodshed in hopes that this might set off the revolution.

"My Communist bosses were jumping for joy on July 28 when Washington police killed one veteran.

"The Army was called out the next day by President Hoover and didn't fire a shot or kill a man. General MacArthur put down a Moscow-directed revolution without bloodshed and that's why the Communists hate him even today."

Before Pace and the Communists moved in on the "BEF" at Anacostia Flats along the Potomac, the "bonus march" was an effort by American veterans to win what they considered just and reasonable demands.

Later Pace continues:

"When the bonus march first started, the Communist Party's official line was to ignore it."

IN DETROIT THEN

"I was in Detroit when the movement first spread. I had moved there a few years before from Tennessee and joined the Communist Party in 1931.

"In those years, the party's national membership was about 3,000, most of them aliens.

"Because I was a native American of old southern stock, the Reds jumped at recruiting me when I fell for their line about the Communists being able to solve the depression problems.

"Early in 1932 when veterans started their demands for a bonus, the Communists sneered at them and called them reactionary.

"However, when the veterans in Wayne County scheduled a bonus march on city hall, the district committee of the Communist party called an emergency meeting to discuss the situation.

"I was a member of the district committee and I agreed the Communists should infiltrate the veterans and take over the campaign.

"Some of the other Reds were against this plan, arguing that the veterans were 'Fascists.'"

REDS LEAD MARCH

"However, five of us were given permission to take part in the legitimate veterans' demonstration at city hall.

"We five Communists took over the march and I made a speech at city hall, urging all veterans to register for a bonus march on Washington.

"More than 400 signed up. I was named the commander of the march.

"The Detroit Communists were jubilant at my success and wired national headquarters in New York for further orders.

"The answer came back for me to lead the veterans to Cleveland where the party would have other delegations ready.

"I was to report by long distance phone to a secret number in Washington to 'Comrade Levine.'

"I was given a pocketful of money and told to go ahead.

"So about 500 Michigan veterans under the leadership of five well-heeled Communists took over a freight train and headed East.

"The Communist Trojan horse of the bonus march was on the move."

MACARTHUR CITES SERVICE IN EXPOSE OF SMEAR

Informed that The Detroit Times was exposing the 17-year-old Communist "smear" directed against him, Gen. MacArthur today cabled from his Tokyo headquarters:

"I shall read the projected articles with much interest. Any action taken to tear down the facade of communistic hypocrisy and expose the insidiousness of its smear technique and viciously false propaganda is a distinct service to the American people.

"GENERAL MACARTHUR,
"*Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers.*"

A Man's Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there are times in the history of any people when their security, survival, and actual existence are tested in every phase of their lives. The strength of a nation is determined by the true characteristics of its people. The moral and ethical code is recognized as the characteristic which gives strength to us as a Nation and people.

In these trying and troublesome days, it is only appropriate that we as a Nation and people strengthen our moral and spiritual life as we emphasize more and more the importance of the character of our people and the high standards we must maintain as a Nation. We are reminded more and more that our basis of strength and existence had its origin with those qualities of the founders of this Nation.

A striking and impressive discussion on one of these truly traditional characteristics was given by Col. T. H. Barton, chairman of the board of the Lion Oil Co., in a recent issue of that company's monthly publication. As this message is so appropriate and realistic in our personal and national life, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

A MAN'S WORD

"His word is as good as his bond." Back in grandpa's day that was an oft-heard phrase. It described a man of good reputation—a man whose integrity and moral rectitude were unquestioned—a man of stature in the matter of personal ethics.

It was not unusual in grandpa's day for two men of good reputation to close an important business deal on the strength of a clearly stated, verbal understanding of each man's responsibilities. In those days a firm handshake and the momentary meeting of two pairs of level eyes cemented a contract more firmly than any written document ever devised.

How often do we hear that phrase applied today? Seldom, if ever, I daresay. It seems that the "positive" phrase, affirming man's integrity, has given way to a "negative" phrase of admonition. Who, today, has not been advised always to "read the small print" in a legal paper?

I deem this trend from "positive" affirmation to "negative" admonition as significant and dangerous. The trend is significant because it denotes a departure from the sound ethical standards of grandpa's time which indicates, in turn, a weakening of our individual sense of moral code.

Such a change is dangerous because the weakening or dissolution of the moral or ethical fiber of a man or a nation can lead only to destruction. Read your history books and learn for yourselves what happened to the Roman, Greek, and other great civilizations when the people of those nations became morally corrupt.

We are living in an age of great confusion and uncertainty, but there have been many such eras in the world's history. Wars and economic upsets have come and gone and will come and go again and again. New wonders of science will continue to alter the pattern of our lives, as they have in the past. These things are not too important in the over-all scheme of things. It is important that we realize this one fact: If we, the people of America, hope to survive and to maintain our position as the most advanced nation in all history, we must never for any reason permit a degeneration of our individual integrity or a weakening in any manner of our standard of national ethics. Our standard of ethics, based on Christian morality, and as practiced individually and collectively, is the strong fiber from which all of our success as a nation and as a people has been woven.

Let the ethical standard—our morality—deteriorate and our Nation will come apart at the seams just as surely as the Kingdom of Judah disintegrated thousands of years ago when it failed to heed the same warning that rings in our ears today.

Let each of us cast from our mind the idea that success depends on "reading the small print" and return again to grandpa's standard of judging our fellow man and of living our lives on the basis of a man "whose word is his bond."

Let us resolve collectively, that the ethical stature of our Nation shall be strong and sound in the eyes of the rest of the world, to the end that, through our Nation and its example, peace and happiness shall prevail on this earth.

Moscow Thanks Bonuseer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement appearing in the Detroit Times, Detroit, Mich., of August 30, 1949.

For the first time in two decades a former Communist, who was a leader in the bonus march on Washington, tells the inside story of this Moscow-inspired incident.

Let every American read this confession of this former Communist leader of the delegation from Detroit, Mich., which made up a part of the bonus march. After doing so, he will understand the design of Russia, even before we recognized that government, to divide and destroy the United States.

The article follows:

MOSCOW THANKS BONUSEER

(By Howard Rushmore)

CENTERVILLE, TENN., August 30.—The current Communist "smear" of former President Hoover and General MacArthur—an attack echoed by New Dealers, pinks, and Russia-firsters for 17 years—originated in a secret Red meeting near Union Square in New York City in August 1932.

At that meeting, the leader of the left-wing section of the bonus march was complimented for his successful "revolutionary activities" by the representatives of the Communist International.

And this veterans' leader was then sent by Stalin's agent on a well-financed national tour to spread hatred against Hoover and General MacArthur.

IN JAIL DURING RIOT

John T. Pace, now a deputy sheriff and a violent foe of the Communist Party since he quit the subversive group in 1935, tells for the first time of this Moscow-directed smear.

In an exclusive interview, the former Communist said:

"I was in jail when the other Communists deliberately led a riot against the Washington police who attempted to evict them from a Government building they had seized.

"From other Communists I learned that the Reds had thrown bricks at the cops, used clubs on them and, in self-defense, the police fired, killing one veteran who, ironically, wasn't a Communist.

"Then President Hoover ordered out the Army and told General MacArthur to drive the Reds out of the building and back to Anacostia Flats."

Pace said that before he had been arrested, Emmanuel Levine, his Red boss, had declared:

"We want the President to call out the Army—then we'll have a real revolution going."

PLANS ARE UPSET

"But MacArthur did the job without firing a shot and, acting under Mr. Hoover's instructions, prevented any violence," Pace recalled.

"That sent the Communists at each other's throats, for our orders had been to provoke all the violence possible."

Pace, immediately after he was freed, was ordered to New York. He said:

"I was told to come to an address near Union Square. It was a highly secret meeting and plenty of the big-shot Communists were there, including Browder, Foster, and Stachel."

(Earl Browder, former secretary of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Reds; and Jacob Stachel, now educational director of the Communist Party.)

PRAISED BY HIGHER UP

"Levine and I made reports on the bonus march and our work in Washington," Pace continued.

"Then a squat, dark-haired man was introduced to us as the 'CI rep' (Communist international representative).

"This man complimented me for my work. Speaking with a thick Russian accent, he said Moscow was pleased with my working-class leadership.

"He told me that CI wanted me to make a national tour, speaking in every State to agitate against President Hoover and General MacArthur.

"This Moscow agent said I was to refer to Mr. Hoover as 'the murderer of American veterans' and MacArthur as 'the tool of the Fascists.'"

Pace said he had no doubt of the "CI rep's" influence, for Foster, Browder, and the rest of the big shots were scared to death of him and kept saying "Yes; comrade" and almost bowed to him.

The Moscow agent, Pace added, told him to stress the fact that the troops had been responsible for killing veterans.

"I knew that MacArthur's men didn't fire a shot, but I had at least one commissar with me during all my speaking tour to see that I followed instructions," Pace said.

"The 'CI rep' also told the party leaders to arrange my speaking tour under the auspices of the Workers' Ex-Servicemen's League, a Communist front group."

CLEVELAND MEETING

Pace said he made the tour and arranged for a convention of Red veterans in Cleveland that fall. He continued:

"Almost every day I received instructions from New York to call Mr. Hoover and General MacArthur every name in the book.

"The list of names ranged from 'Fascist murderers' to 'Wall Street butchers' and some unprintable ones.

"The Communist press joined in the campaign. Hundreds of thousands of pieces of literature against President Hoover and MacArthur echoed the line of the 'CI rep.'

"I have never seen such an active smear and even at the time a devoted Communist, I got a little sick of the lies that appeared in this propaganda."

ORGANIZES NEW MARCH

At party orders, Pace called a convention of the league in Cleveland that fall and organized a second bonus march on Washington, under complete Communist control.

"This failed miserably but it carried out the smear of Mr. Hoover and MacArthur," Pace said.

"However, Communist leaders told me the campaign was successful.

"They were happy when the parlor pinks took up the smear against the two great Americans and even today the Reds boast that the propaganda drive of 1932 carried on by the Communists turned the Nation against Mr. Hoover."

BACKS HOOVER ACTION

Now active in the American Legion and a speaker before dozens of patriotic groups, Pace said:

"On the basis of my personal experience, I want to repeat again and again that Mr. Hoover took the only step he could have taken to avert a bloody revolution right here in Washington.

"And General MacArthur, by evicting the Reds without firing a shot, took the wind out of the Red propagandists who had ordered me to provoke bloodshed and violence.

"Even today we find such prominent persons as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt echoing the old Communist propaganda against these two great Americans.

OUTSMARTED REDS

"It's about time Americans examined the facts. And the facts are that both President Hoover and General MacArthur outsmarted the Communists and the Reds have never forgiven them."

Pace, who quit the Communist Party in 1935 while living in Detroit, said he was "willing at any time to repeat my story" to any "group of Americans who value truth above character assassination."

"And don't forget," he added, "Lenin, leader of the Russian revolution, told Communists 30 years ago to use the lie whenever necessary as long as it helped the Red cause.

"Mr. Hoover and General MacArthur have been victims of a highly organized, well financed Communist lie for 17 years.

"I hope my story gives them benefit of the truth."

Constitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a group of political-science teachers who reside in Berkeley, Calif., have had the courage to speak out on the subject of General MacArthur's removal.

Their joint statement makes sense. I urge my colleagues to read it and ponder over what they have to say.

CONSTITUTIONAL

EDITOR: It is General MacArthur, not President Truman, whose actions have imperiled the basis of our constitutional system. The Declaration of Independence, in listing its complaints against George III, contains these words: "He has affected to make the military independent of and superior to the civil power." That was one of the issues which made our forefathers decide to create a new Nation and organize a new system of government. The Constitution of the United States, over whose drafting George Washington presided, declares with unmistakable clarity that the President is Commander in Chief. All military officers swear an oath of allegiance to the Constitution, which automatically requires their obedience to the directives of the President. To argue for or to act upon any other view is to be subversive of the Constitution. Policy in international relations is determined in our country by the officials whom the people elect and send to the Congress and to the White House. It is not to be determined by Army, Navy, or Air Force commanders.

This principle holds good irrespective of the party in power for the time being. It would apply with the same force if the President were a Republican and a military field commander were a partisan of the Democrats. Indeed, it was precisely this situation which confronted Abraham Lincoln, and he met it in precisely the same manner. To hold otherwise is to lay this Republic open to the dangers of Caesarism, and to discard 25 centuries of political experience in the Western World. We, the undersigned

teachers of political science, including both Republicans and Democrats, stand by this fundamental principle of democracy and of the Constitution: that civilian authority must always be paramount over military authority. Considering the facts that are of public record, we think that the President, who has sworn in his oath of office to uphold the Constitution, was left with no alternative but to dismiss General MacArthur.

Peter H. Odegard, Frank M. Russell, Charles Aikin, Victor G. Rosenblum, Joseph P. Harris, T. A. Bisson, Julian Towster, Joseph D. Lubin, Henry L. Janssen, Glenn Tinder, Jr., George A. Lipsky, Dwight Waldo, Yosal Rogat, Samuel C. May, John W. Baker, Rogers Hoffman, Robert Hayton, Hans Kelsen, Rhoten A. Smith, Ivan M. Ponedel, Christopher Dyer-Bennet, Lloyd Fisher, Leslie Lipson, Robert Scalapino.

BERKELEY.

Korean Policies Must Be Reckoned in the Lives and Shattered Bodies of Our Young Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star on Saturday, May 5, presented a strong editorial on the General MacArthur case. I commend it to all Members:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S CASE

Two days of testimony by General MacArthur point to one conclusion—the hearings are not going to end in a clear-cut decision, one way or the other, in the dispute over our Korean policy.

The controversy has boiled down to a difference of opinion. And the conflict of opinion revolves primarily around the question of Soviet intentions. Since the parties to the dispute do not know what the Russians intend to do, the prospect is that the Senate hearings will be inconclusive. When they are over the people will not know a great deal more than they did before, and there is little likelihood that many minds will have been changed by the arguments, pro or con.

This is not to say, however, that the hearings have accomplished nothing. They have served to clarify General MacArthur's real position, and as they progress it is to be expected that other points of view, notably that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will be brought into sharper focus. This, at least, will be some gain.

General MacArthur has effectively disposed of the petty snipers who have been taking pot shots at him. He is not the comic-opera strategist that they have tried to picture him as being.

General MacArthur begins with one central, undeniable fact: We are at war in Korea. American boys, and boys of other nationalities, are being killed and wounded there every day. If the fighting is to drag on inconclusively many thousands more will forfeit their lives. So General MacArthur wants to try to end the fighting. He wants to use all, not just a fraction, of the military power at our command to this end.

The risks? He agrees that there are risks. He thinks that Red China is already fully committed in Korea, and can do no more damage there. He concedes that to attack bases in Manchuria, or to blockade Chinese ports, might bring the Russians into the war. But that risk, as he correctly points out, was inherent in our decision to go into Korea. We assumed that risk then, and General MacArthur believes it is both morally and militarily wrong to sacrifice the lives of thousands of young men in an effort to avoid that risk, or to minimize it, now.

He thinks we are faced with one of two situations. If the Russians have not decided upon war with the west, a full-scale effort to win the Korean war is not going to bring them into the conflict. On the other hand, if the Russians have decided upon war, an attack on Chinese bases might speed up the Soviet timetable and bring them openly into the struggle a little sooner. General MacArthur balances the risks, and says he would take that gamble in an effort—which he believes would be successful—to bring the Korean war to a speedy conclusion. In summary, he does not believe we should let the fear of a possible bigger war keep us from fighting and winning the savage, bloody war that we are already in. That is an attitude which makes sense.

General MacArthur also disposed of some of the ridiculous charges that his armchair critics have brought against him.

His objective in using all of the means at our disposal to end the Korean war would be to drive the aggressor from Korea and discourage him from renewing his aggression. He believes that we have the military power now to do this—that by bombing, blockade, etc., we can so cripple the Chinese capacity to wage war in Korea that the Communists will have to get out of that country and stay out. He emphatically repudiates any thought of invading and conquering China. That is the bugaboo that is raised by his critics whenever an attack on Manchurian bases is proposed. But there is all the difference in the world between ending the aggression in Korea and conquering China. And General MacArthur has made it clear that what he advocates is the former; that he is wholly opposed to any such scatter-brained undertaking as the latter. And why is not that position sound? If we can fight a limited war to hold a bloody line somewhere in Korea, why can we not fight a limited war to make it impossible for the enemy to stay anywhere in Korea? Because the Russians might come in? Which is better—to take that risk, or to accept the certainty of scores of thousands of additional casualties in an indefinite stalemate?

General MacArthur then amplified his views with respect to the use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops on Formosa. His use of this force would be a limited one. He thinks it would serve as a threat to the enemy, and that it might be used for diversionary purposes—to take pressure off the UN troops in Korea. He does not contend that it could defeat the Communists if put ashore on the mainland, and he thinks the Nationalist Chinese commanders should decide in what ways their troops can be most effectively employed. But if General MacArthur had his way, they would be used. In one way or another, the troops on Formosa would contribute what they can to the common fight against the common enemy. And why not?

The general, in his 2 days on the witness stand, has not gone unchallenged. For the most part he successfully met the critical questions. He has disavowed any intention of slighting Europe to fight in Asia. Instead, he says that we must be prepared to meet and turn back the threat of communism wherever it appears.

It was in this connection that Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, asked the $64 question—the only critical question that makes much sense. Senator MCMAHON's view is that we are not ready for war with Russia, but that by 1953 we will be ready. The Senator thinks that if the Russians should attack soon, our casualties—both military and civilian—would greatly exceed any losses which may be incurred in a continuing limited war in Korea. And he wanted to know whether General MacArthur believes that continuance of the Korean war on its present scale is justified as a means of buying time.

In substance, General MacArthur's answer was that he would accept that risk, that the urgency of winning the war in Korea and stopping the slaughter there—a slaughter that otherwise is certain to go on—justifies us in assuming the risk that the Russians may attack, although he does not think they would do so merely because we stepped up the scale of the Korean fight.

This doctrine of buying time by pulling our punches in Korea is one that should be given a little thought.

The big hole in it is the assumption that the Russians, if they have decided that war must be the eventual arbiter, would let us have the necessary time even if we were to abandon Korea entirely. But assuming for the sake of discussion that the Russians have not decided upon war, or that they might be foolish enough to wait until we are armed to the teeth in 1953, there still is something to be said about this doctrine.

If we actually are buying time in Korea, we are paying a terrible price for that time. It is a price that must be reckoned, not in dollars, but in the lives and shattered bodies of our young men. Perhaps it is necessary to pay this price. Because we have been fools in recent years, because we have recklessly neglected our military arm despite the clearly revealed hostile intentions of the Russians, it may be necessary to ask American boys to give up their lives in Korea while we retrieve our blunders. But if this is the case, if this is true, we should be striving day and night to close the gap, to make up the lost ground in the arms race. But we are not doing that. Nobody in this country is being required to sacrifice much, if anything. Labor walks out on the mobilization program, and does not come back until it gets what it wants. Businessmen gather their record-breaking profits. The politicians continue to play the political game—if anything, with a greater vengeance than before. If we are really buying time with the Korean war, we are not using that time to the best advantage. We are wasting the precious hours that are being bought with the lives of the young men on the firing line. And that, in the simplest language, is a crime—a crime that should lie heavily upon our conscience.

Increases in Natural-Gas Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to the increased rates for natural gas in Wisconsin and two editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I have before me two editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the critical subject of

the reckless increases in natural-gas rates which have been imposed on the people of Wisconsin. I have previously commented on this matter on the Senate floor, pointing out the possibility that it may be necessary to introduce a resolution for a thorough investigation of this whole situation in order to prevent a further price gouging of the people.

This week, numerous distinguished officials of the State of Wisconsin, including our Governor, the Honorable Walter Kohler, Jr., and the mayor of Milwaukee, the Honorable Frank Zeidler, will be in town to confer with Chairman Wallgren, of the FPC. It is my earnest hope that out of that discussion may come a mutual agreement on ways and means of protecting the public interest, instead of allowing it to be further damaged.

I send the two editorials to the desk for printing in the RECORD.

I want to emphasize that I do not feel that we should allow our preoccupation with foreign affairs to divert our attention from the fact that millions upon millions of Americans in the low and middle income brackets right here at home are practically at wits and trying to make ends meet. Each day my office is literally flooded with appeals from these hard-pressed folks who set out in great detail their family budgets and who ask how they can be expected to pay the rent, buy clothing for the children, buy nutritious food for the family, and still meet rising prices.

Bureau of Labor Statistics data shows Milwaukee to be the highest cost of living area in this country, and the Phillips Petroleum Co. is apparently determined to help keep Milwaukee in that spot.

It seems to me that the Congress has an obligation to fulfill its promises particularly to the families of men fighting in Korea.

I ask my colleagues to think about the plight of a typical wife with one or two youngsters whose husband is fighting abroad and who finds that the serviceman's allotment barely covers subsistence needs. But whether or not our people have boys or relatives fighting in Korea, they are entitled to protection from being gouged.

The State of Wisconsin has a great tradition of preventing the arbitrary use of power in either public or private hands. If the Phillips Petroleum Co. expects to run riot without the public officials of Wisconsin taking remedial action, it has another think coming.

I have sent my comments as printed in a previous issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to Mr. Eric Johnston of OES and Mr. Michael DiSalle of OPS, asking them to reply as soon as possible on what they and their staffs propose to do about this aspect of the stabilization problem. I have also brought my comments to the attention of Chairman Johnson of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, whom I may ask to launch an investigation of this situation. Such an investigation has been widely urged throughout Wisconsin; but I hope it may not prove to be necessary, in view of all the other staggering responsibilities on the Congress. But if we must have such a probe, I for one will strongly demand it.

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

IS THE FPC PLAYING FOOTSY?

Senator WILEY has told the Senate that the Federal Power Commission "is playing footsy with certain private interests" in the Phillips Petroleum Co. natural gas rate case.

No other conclusion could be drawn from the FPC refusal to end almost 3 years of delay in giving Wisconsin a hearing on charges that Phillips is charging too much for gas at the wellhead.

The FPC has opened itself further to the charge of playing footsy by granting Phillips a hearing on whether the commission has jurisdiction over Phillips' rates, jurisdiction spelled out in law and court rulings.

Senator WILEY made two appeals in the interest of Wisconsin consumers. First he asked the FPC, for the umpteenth time, to reconsider its refusal to hear Wisconsin's pleas. Then he asked Eric Johnston, director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, to have his staff investigate the effects of the drastic increase in natural gas rates on the inflationary spiral.

These requests are worth making, but the record of the FPC in the Phillips case does not promise much hope for action.

There would appear to be more hope in another step Senator WILEY is considering. If something isn't done to give Wisconsin a hearing, the Senator will ask that a Senate Interstate Commerce Committee subcommittee "investigate the background of the Phillips company's dealings with the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., as well as related natural gas operations."

If the FPC doesn't move quickly to give Wisconsin its hearing we recommend the Senator's proposal for an investigation. Wisconsin consumers, in the words of Senator WILEY, "are being gouged." An investigation seems to be their only recourse against the game of footsy the FPC is playing with the natural gas producers.

WHAT'S THE COURT DECISION FOR?

Mon C. Wallgren, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, has helped verify the Wisconsin and Milwaukee contention that the FPC is giving consumers the run-around in the Phillips Petroleum Co. natural-gas-rate case.

The FPC has stalled hearing Wisconsin's claim that Phillips charges too much for natural gas. The FPC first wants to decide whether it has jurisdiction over Phillips' rates—jurisdiction Wisconsin insists the FPC has by law and precedent. Wallgren, in a letter to Governor Kohler, gives substance to Wisconsin's position. He writes:

"The Supreme Court decision in the interstate case (331 U. S. 682) indicates that the Commission does have such jurisdiction."

But, he adds, Phillips doesn't think so, so the Commission will give Phillips a hearing.

Why? What good are law and court decisions if the Commission is going to start the jurisdictional fight from scratch in each case that comes before it?

The rate case has already been delayed 2½ years. Is Phillips to be allowed to delay it further? Is the FPC going to carry out its job of protecting consumers or continue to give in to natural-gas interests on an issue that even the FPC admits was settled long ago?

Let's Televise Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the question of the broadcasting and televising of House sessions is currently under considerable discussion. I have proposed this in a resolution, House Resolution 62, which is the subject of Discharge Petition No. 3. Appended is an article from the May 6 issue of the Sunday magazine Parade, found in the Washington Post and other papers throughout the country, considering this subject:

LET'S TELEVISE CONGRESS

(By Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, Twenty-first Congressional District, New York)

A leading newspaper told its readers the other day that I was in favor of removing Congress from the closet and placing it in a goldfish bowl.

That's an excellent summary of my bill (H. Res. 62) which proposed the televising of debates in the House of Representatives. Radio broadcasts would be authorized, too.

I got the idea from the enormously successful televising of United Nations debates. The face-to-face arguments between the Western leaders and the Soviets have been the greatest lesson in foreign affairs our people have ever had.

To clinch any question of doubt about the impact of television, along came the hearings of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee under Senators KEFAUVER, TOBEY, and their colleagues. For the first time in history, such hearings were brought into millions of homes.

There are about 10,000,000 television sets in the United States today and new ones are being installed at a rate of 750,000 a month. With this potential audience there seems to be no good reason why we should not televise Congress. Not the day-to-day proceedings, which are often dull, but the big battles over important national issues.

There is a lot of opposition to my bill in Congress, however. Arguments that have been made against it are: (1) It might develop a snooping camera; (2) it might emphasize absence of Members from the floor when they are elsewhere doing necessary work on committees; (3) it might cause debate to deteriorate into "ham acting" and demagoguery, with senior Members "hogging the floor."

But when I introduced my resolution last January 12, I said I was seeking the maximum amount of public information—not a snooping camera to catch Members off guard. Under House rule 35, televising and broadcasting of House debates would be at the discretion, and under the control, of the Speaker.

LEGISLATORS WOULD BE ON THEIR TOES

As for "ham acting," Senator TOBEY feels with me that TV would, on the contrary, cause Members to choose their words and concentrate their efforts with even greater care—knowing that they were being televised.

My own opinion is that debate will become more concise and clear—so that it will be understandable to the vast audience.

And as for absences, I think citizens would pretty soon be able to judge general performance. They would learn for the first time the vast amount of work Congressmen have to do both on and off the floor. They would discover, too, that it is whether, and how, Congressmen vote that really counts.

Perhaps one of the strongest arguments made against my bill is that under congressional immunity, unfair charges made against groups or individuals get immediate and enormous circulation. However, it seems to me that it might work the other way around to protect the rights and reputations of citizens.

Members who take advantage of their congressional immunity from libel would be judged on the spot for their unfairness. Senator WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, suggests a code of fair play to protect persons mentioned unfairly on TV or radio.

Suggestions already advanced in Congress for self-discipline—perhaps even opening the courts to aggrieved individuals by permitting damage suits—will get greater consideration.

Public knowledge of the details of congressional business, and of the personalities involved, can be a great force toward raising the level of competence among Congressmen and the decisions they make.

The overwhelming argument in favor of televising Congress is this: pepole will take a far greater interest in their Government—and have a far greater understanding of public issues.

Did you know that the total number of eligible citizens who vote today in congressional elections (between Presidential years) is only about 40 percent of the voting population?

COULD BRING OUT THE VOTE

In the 1950 congressional elections, only 42,324,232 out of 98,641,000 voted. Even Presidential elections bring out only a little over 50 percent. A recent survey showed why: 62 percent of all nonvoters complained they did not know the candidates well enough to make a choice.

But our 100 television stations and 3,000 radio stations could bring Congress t practically every one of our 45,000,000 families.

One wise political columnist says that the next President of the United States will be the man whom the public judges best fit—after watching him on TV.

For the first time in our history, every American may soon have a chance to watch or hear his Government at work. A whole nation may sit in the galleries of its own Congress.

Third Anniversary of the Founding of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of two addresses delivered last night by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself at the celebration of the third anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel, at Carnegie Hall, in New York City, May 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR IRVING M. IVES

It is an honor to be with you at this celebration of the third anniversary of the State of Israel. I was also privileged to be with you at the first and second commemorations. I no longer consider myself a guest, but rather a confirmed participant in a historic event, in the shaping and bringing to life of which I took part.

Americans feel a deep kinship with Israel. It is true that many States have gained their independence in recent years with the moral and material assistance of the United States. Even now American soldiers are shedding their blood to protect one of these states from aggression and to preserve its independence. Yet, none of these new nations is so intimately related to America in common ideals as is Israel.

The dream of restoring the ancient land of Israel to the dispersed, homeless, and persecuted Jews had challenged the imagination of Americans for many generations. Our statesmen, reflecting the mind of America, advocated the restoration of the Jewish Nation and encouraged those who toiled for the realization of that great dream. American diplomacy and American technology and American resources contributed a major share to the mighty task of creating and developing the proud Republic of Israel. It is only natural, therefore, that we look with keen satisfaction upon the amazing progress achieved by the Jewish people in the cherished land of their fathers.

When we think of Israel, our minds turn to the Holy Bible and to the prophets of that ancient land which provided the world with the never-failing bulwarks of faith and morality. The Jewish religion which is based on the dignity and equality of man was the forerunner of the modern doctrine of the inalienability of human rights and indeed of liberty itself.

Today these great spiritual fountainheads from which spring the common purposes of all free men are under attack. The lamps of culture and freedom throughout the world are being snuffed out one by one. It is therefore fitting on this occasion to turn our thoughts once more to the land of Israel to find in its symbolic resurgence the new faith that is needed to meet the new and greater obstacles that lie in the path of freedom.

It is significant that Israel was reborn in the pangs of a world struggle against a marching conqueror who is striving for world dominion and the extinction of human liberty. We defeated the tyrants in a war which cost the Jewish people one-third of their total number; and we thought peace was assured with the destruction of nazism. We were mistaken.

Once more the world is threatened by aggression and a brutal marching dictatorship. Another flood of aggression has been let loose upon humanity. A new totalitarian religion, not unlike that of vanquished nazism, is again threatening to engulf the world in darkness and in servitude. Again free nations are compelled to man their ramparts in defense of their independence, and indeed their very survival.

Under these chaotic conditions, when fear and suspicion stalk the streets, it is imperative that we keep proper perspective and do not lose sight of the basic aim of our struggle, which is the preservation of the essential dignity of the individual and the corrollaries of justice, freedom, and equality that emanate from that great Hebraic religious concept.

We must beware of becoming entangled in the ideological net of the cynical Soviet philosophy that the end justifies any means. We must guard our basic liberties and our religious concepts of right and wrong. We must avoid the easy temptations and the ephemeral benefits of appeasement. Careful in the choice of partners in this struggle for democratic survival, we must not permit the wolves to don sheep's clothing and surreptitiously to sneak into our ranks as codefenders of liberty. We should have learned our lesson by the sad experiences of the last war. I refer to the tragedies of Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam.

The incipient resurgence of nazism is a matter of grave concern to every American. Our policy toward Germany must be scrutinized and reexamined constantly, lest we too fall victims to Soviet cynicism.

Democratic statesmanship must possess the capacity of penetrating analysis, of farsightedness, and of broad realism. Unfortunately, our State Department is not blessed with these qualities and its patent failure fully to appraise the critical importance of the Middle East, and particularly the role Israel can play in that area, is indeed disturbing.

Our chief exertions very properly have been directed toward Europe and toward the Far East. Yet, it would be a grave mistake to minimize the Middle East and to rule it out as a potential danger zone. For it is the Middle East where our defenses may be threatened and outflanked. The danger signals from Iran are ominous and must be heeded by our Government.

The Middle East with its vast natural resources can well become the critical nerve center in the conflict between the East and the West. It is the gateway to three continents. The strategic lines of communication which link together the continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia cannot be held unless that region is protected from attack. Last, but not least, the godless Communist rulers must never be allowed to conquer and rule the land which was the cradle of religion and the source of faith to humanity. As a great moral principle, the Holy Land must be stoutly defended from Soviet aggression. We have little time to lose in mending our Middle East defenses.

The Soviet Union cunningly strives to undermine our position in that part of the world by creating disturbance and chaos. It is utilizing the internal weaknesses of the social order and the backwardness of the region to create an atmosphere of hostility toward the democracies and to gain allies among the native population for its sinister plots of conquest and enslavement. The Kremlin is also manipulating the inner conflicts of nationalist groups to retard the political and economic integration of that area and to prevent it from becoming a barrier to Soviet designs.

Our Government's point 4 program aims to remedy the social and economic ailments of the Near East. Though a just and wise policy, there may not be sufficient time to put it into effective operation before the Kremlin may strike.

There is only one country in the Middle East which has demonstrated its readiness and willingness and ability to serve as a spearhead for the defense of the western democracies in that part of the world. That country is Israel. Israel by its history and the character of its people is a natural ally of America and of the Western World. Israel, through its technique and industrial know-how and the zeal of its people, can serve as an effective base for the western armies in time of war. Israel does not suffer from the fatalism and the social and economic maladjustments with which other Middle East states are afflicted. Already the Kremlin agitators have found it futile to attempt to disrupt the national life of the Jewish state and thereby to weaken its resistance to their schemes. The love of the Israelites for their land and their devotion to freedom make them a natural and reliable ally in any crisis. The thrilling military performance of the young Israelite Army, which recently astounded the world, is assuredly a calculated deterrent for any aggressor. Israel, then, is the only pillar of reliance in that critical sector of the world and it should be fully utilized by the United States and our allies.

It is for this reason that I am sponsoring the grant-in-aid bill to give Israel $150,000,000 for the purpose of strengthening her economy. The Israelite state is now performing the miraculous task of receiving, housing, feeding, and integrating hundreds of thousands of uprooted Jews who, but for the advent of Jewish statehood, would have been sentenced to political death. The fulfillment of this program and its daring projection is truly a great historic achievement; and while it has saved human lives and fortified the security of the Jewish state, it has also served the interests of America and the entire free world. For every Jew brought to the shores of Israel, however weakened his physical condition, is nonetheless a potential soldier and defender of the west.

The $150,000,000 which we propose to grant to Israel will be devoted to a great humanitarian and national endeavor. At the same

time, it will serve as an investment in the security of the United States and of those who follow our leadership in the fight for freedom.

I am most hopeful that the grant-in-aid bill will pass as submitted to the Congress and I pledge you I shall do my utmost to see that it does pass.

I should also like to emphasize that I do not consider the granting of this money as the limit of our assistance in making Israel strong. Wise statesmanship and sound strategy dictate a closer link between the preparedness of America and Israel for the defense of our common heritage of freedom. In fulfilling this necessity I suggest that our Government approach the State of Israel diplomatically for consultations relative to the defense of the Middle East against Soviet aggression. The American military position would seem to dictate the granting of military aid to the Israeli Army in the form of modern weapons so as to make it a real and formidable force for securing peace and tranquillity.

We have reached a dangerous position where anything can happen. We cannot leave the security of Israel to chance. We must not, through our negligence, invite a second Pearl Harbor or a second Korea. The wise course is to be prepared; for only preparedness can halt the hand of aggressor.

The first step in preparing the defense of the Middle East is to move decisively for the conclusion of a formal peace between the Arab States and Israel. The present unsteady armed truce between Israel and the Arab States is fraught with danger, for the slightest spark may start a conflagration to the detriment of our own interests. The Kremlin agents hope for a renewal of the war between Israel and the Arabs and for an opportunity to intervene. The Kremlin is intent on preventing the economic stabilization of the Near East. The Arab boycott of Israel and the Egyptian blockade of the Suez Canal preventing the flow of oil to Israel are already causing serious dislocations to the economy of the whole region and are playing directly into the hands of the Soviets. Who, I ask, shall take the leadership in correcting these conditions that lead to strife instead of peace, if not the United States?

The Government of the United States is confronted with a mighty challenge. Will it assume the leadership to defend the Holy Land, dear alike to Christian and Jew, from the godless hand of communism. It is my ardent hope and prayer that we shall meet that challenge and I pledge my unstinting support of every effort to meet it.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO

ISRAEL THE HOPE OF A MAD WORLD

It is indeed a very great privilege to celebrate with you the third anniversary of the rebirth of the world's oldest and yet youngest nation. Someone has said there are three Israels, the Israel of the past, the Israel of the present, and the Israel of the future. Historically that may be true, but spiritually there has been and there can be but one Israel. Measured in things spiritual, and things spiritual alone are endowed with everlasting continuity, Israel stands foremost in the family of nations. The most beautiful and enduring religion was revealed to man in this very old and this very new state. In my very early childhood my Christian mother taught me that one day, known only to God, the exiled Jew would be returned to his ancient home. I rejoice that in our time this spiritually important event was destined to take place. I shall not attempt to analyze the deeply religious implications of the formal return of Judiasm to the ancient scene of its sacred and glorious triumphs.

Suffice to say the burning desire for tranquillity and justice and the unshakable courage and faith in God which inspired the noble men and women who have pioneered in this return to the ancestral-home movement, had to succeed. They are building a new and better society of freemen, and in doing so they are using as their yardstick the ideals of the Jewish Bible. To me it is unique and praiseworthy that this program is being carried out voluntarily and through the democratic processes and not under the whiplash of any of the arbitrary or tyrannical processes so common to crusades. Accordingly, this great and noble experiment deserves the full support of people the world over. I commend and congratulate the Zionists for their vision, their faith, and their perseverance.

Birthdays are excellent occasions for taking stock of situations; of looking back to see where we have been; of acknowledging one's failures; and of dreaming and planning for the days ahead.

The inspiring story of Israel offers new proof of the powers of the creative spirit of a people who hold fast to deep religious conviction. All who are familiar with past and present Israeli history must believe it to be the prologue of a resplendent record of prophecy endowed achievement. Victor Hugo once said that no army can withstand the strength of an idea whose time has come. It is only 3 years since the State of Israel proclaimed its independence thus ending the British mandatory regime. In these 3 years Israel has striven successfully to earn a place of leadership among the other States in the Middle East. Today, few will question the fact that she will continue to play a significant political role in this backward but vital region.

In 1948, when Israel's independence was proclaimed, almost its entire southern half, neglected for thousands of years, was a sunbeaten waterless desert and wasteland. There was not a pound of coal, not a drop of oil, not an ounce of available iron in all Israel. Forests were cut down centuries ago, and practically every stick of wood had to be imported.

When the British left the state was without a government, without an army, without a police force, without trained civilians to run the country. Temporary officials to exercise what authority was necessary were literally recruited from the streets.

This was the grim picture that greeted the people of Israel on their day of independence. It would be hard indeed to imagine a more formidable challenge than that which faced this community.

But inspired and sustained by the promise of Jehovah to the faithful, they did survive this initial chaos. Instead of contemplating failure they rolled up their sleeves and they proceeded to put into effect and to carry out a constructive program of restoration and rehabilitation.

Thirty years previously, when the victorious nations at the Versailles Peace Conference pledged their support in the establishment of a Jewish state, Palestine had a Jewish population of only 65,000. On independence day in 1948 the Jewish population had swelled tenfold to 650,000.

Successive and continuous waves of immigration have boosted this total, until today there are more than 1,200,000 Jews and some 175,000 Arabs in the State of Israel. It is a tiny land of only 8,100 square miles, not larger than New Jersey. Newcomers are arriving at the rate of nearly 20,000 a month, an influx which will add another half million people by 1953. This would be a phenomenal population growth even in a much larger, better established, and more productive community.

These home seekers come by boat and chartered plane and from every corner of the globe, and from every walk of life; craftsmen, merchants, artists, scientists, peddlers, or just plain misfits. Most of them are penniless, and many have undergone such harrowing experiences that their health and spirits are broken. Some 63 countries are represented by them. In small packages and bundles they brought their pitifully few world belongings. They have a common religious faith, but not a common language. Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion well said: "Israel is not a melting pot; it is a pressure cooker."

Israel has taken "the world's tired and poor and huddled masses yearning to be free" and has given them a home. In this "in gathering of the exiles," she faces the task of the transformation of an overwhelming urban population into one properly balanced between towns and villages. A largely unproductive society must be trained to be productive, and peoples from all countries of the world must be integrated into one nationalized and cooperative enterprise. The problem of blending these pitiful and persecuted remnants of the Jewish people into a homogeneous community is indeed difficult. But the spirit of the leadership in the new Israel is strong. With a faith that man with God can do the impossible, they have entered into their almost hopeless task with great enthusiasm and full assurance.

Along with the other almost insurmountable problems must be added the jealousy and hostility of unfriendly neighboring states. Indeed, the first year was characterized by a military struggle for sheer physical survival. Israel was considered defenseless against neighboring armies trained and equipped by a European power, yet the newborn State with an undying faith in its right to live and to pursue its life according to its own dictates rallied fiercely against superior armed forces, drove them from her borders, and, God be praised, did survive.

With the challenge of aggression behind her, the central theme became the struggle for international recognition. Membership in the UN was important because this young state wholeheartedly believed in the principle of collective security and international cooperation. All of us rejoiced when Israel became the fifty-ninth member of the United Nations. Too, it is a source of great pride to all of us that the United States was the first to grant official recognition to Israel as an independent nation.

The real riddle of Israel's future, however, is whether her political and military victories can now be crowned with economic success. It would be folly to underestimate the grievous problems which remain unsolved before the spiritual aspirations of the Jewish people will be fully realized.

Israel's big headache is to reduce the tension existing in its relationship with the various neighboring Arab states. Tension is perhaps inevitable in the wake of the war which Israel was compelled to fight against aggression to assure its independence. The current border incidents between Syria and Israel cause concern in many quarters because of the explosive nature of world conditions. We must give her every assistance within our means to resolve these differences with justice, firmness, and dignity. At a time when the world is badgered with actual and potential military and political crises, few things could be worse than the outbreak of hostilities between Israel and its neighbors. The only gainers from such a catastrophe which well might set the entire Middle East aflame would be the men of the Kremlin and their forces of international subversion and aggression.

It is important to the world that Israel remain a free and independent democracy. The Middle East today is the fever spot. Without any question, this whole area is of incalculabe importance to the Allied Powers. When world war III comes, and may God grant it may never come—but if it does come in spite our tears and our prayers, one of its primary objectives will be the control of the Near East. The tremendous oil resources and the strategic military location of that area dictate such a conclusion.

The progress and stability of the entire Middle East is what the United States desires. Thinking men generally concede that the best way to protect its wide areas of backwardness and dearth from chaos and decay is to encourage there the development of industry and agriculture through the modern methods which have been applied so successfully in the United States. Furthermore, repeatedly we have assured the Arab States that we want to promote friendly relations with them. We know that by helping Israel to help herself we are assisting all of the Near East.

In these circumstances one can hardly estimate the advantage to the United States to have a close and dependable friend in the Middle East. In America's crusade to establish and maintain world-wide peace we need to nurture this strategically determined friendly little country.

The Arabs as fellow Semites, claiming Abraham as a common ancestor, must reconcile their differences with the Israeli people. In fact, since our common enemy sits by like a deadly cobra ready to strike, all freedom-loving people must band together and put aside their relatively petty differences. Israel can become the workshop for the common defense of the Middle East. Israel, because of its fast-increasing industrial capacity, can become the cornerstone of their common interest to move forward in war or in peace.

Most unfortunately Israel's neighbors look upon her rehabilitation as a heterogeneous element disturbing the Arab unity. They have two major fears: political expansion and economic expansion. They fear that sooner or later Israel is bound to burst out of its existing frontiers. They support this view by pointing to the great immigration program predicted for the future.

Since most of the Arab countries are mainly agricultural, having a rural population and using out-of-date methods of production resulting in an appallingly low standard of living, they are worried on the economic front that Israel will dominate the Middle East through her awakened industries. A broader and more realistic outlook would develop a far different conclusion. Israel with her westernized modern industrial and agricultural economy which can only subsist by finding new markets for its products through the adoption of improved standards of living in the whole Mediterranean area must be regarded as the friend and not the enemy of that impoverished land. The political leaders of the Arab States are making a serious blunder if they think the Middle East is destined to continue forever its role of destitution and human misery. The hour of awakening for a sleeping giant has arrived.

Temporarily Israel has had to import heavily but her economy has touched bottom and slowly she is on the way up. In 1949, for example, all fertilizer had to be imported; in 1950, production was begun from imported raw materials; in 1951 Israel will produce all the fertilizer she needs; and in 1953 she will be an exporter of fertilizer.

The same encouraging picture is reflected in other fields. Her agricultural program is moving forward rapidly—desert, swampland, and rocky hillside are being reclaimed. In their traditionally bold spirit of adopting scientific methods the Jews have expanded their farming operations with emphasis on diversified crops and the growing of citrus fruit, an important export item. As a result, agricultural production while not keeping pace with the rapid increase in population is making important headway and will continue to improve as irrigation water is brought to the sun-parched lands and barren wastes. Something like 18 percent of the Jewish working population is engaged in agriculture, forestry and fishing. Here in the United States approximately 14 percent of our gainfully employed are found in these pursuits.

Industry too has taken a great spurt since independence day 3 years ago. Foreign industrialists have been encouraged to build branch plants there. Notable among these is the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. which has constructed an automobile plant in Haifa, and Philco Corp. which is turning out 40 to 60 refrigerators in an 8-hour shift. The entrance of General Tire & Rubber, and the Ford Co. is further evidence of this salutary trend. Recently our Government concluded its point 4 program agreement with Israel which will permit the setting up of specific projects for the training of Israeli technicians.

The plain fact remains, however, that the economy of Israel has been subjected to such a severe strain by reason of the vast influx of immigrants that its productive capacity has not been able to keep pace with consumption. Its financial burden has been heavy. Additional capital is urgently needed to strengthen its economy. That is why I joined with my distinguished friend and colleague, New York's fearless and forward looking leader, Senator IVES, and 34 other Senators, in the sponsorship of Senate bill 1247 which provides for financial grants to Israel. That legislation is in response to the formal request submitted to our State Department by the Government of Israel. If we are successful in securing its enactment, it will make possible the purchase of materials for desperately needed housing units, grains, cotton, petroleum, hides, and other raw supplies required by the mills and factories which when processed into consumer goods will halt the dangerous inflationary pressures which are arising there. The $500,000,000 bond issue soon to be floated in the United States is a mighty sound investment for Americans and will give Israeli industry the financial support it must have to get under way. The conception of this bond issue is one of the boldest and most constructive things which has happened to the Near East in recent years. Every cent of it is dedicated to production because its sponsors realize that through production only can Israel remain free and prosperous.

Since Israel's capacity to produce has not kept pace with its vast increase in population, its imports far outstrip its exports. Its foreign trade deficit is huge. In 1950 exports paid for only a little more than one-seventh of the imports. Although agriculture increased its output by 75 percent in two and one-half years, the import food bill alone ran up to $70,000,000. As a result the people have been compelled to accept an austerity program that is much more severe than that experienced in Great Britain.

Nevertheless the State of Israel has come a long way in 3 years. I extend my heartiest congratulations to all who have helped to make this possible. The Jewish people, with their indomitable courage, faith in Jehovah's far-seeing vision, and tenacity of purpose, these people who have the Holy Bible and Christianity to the world, have built a citadel of freedom and have staked out a claim for democracy and right living in the very cradle of civilization. The democracy which the American Zionist wants to preserve there had its birth with the tribe of Abraham and Isaac.

We should not expect the ills which beset the human race to be cured over night. There will be heartaches and suffering. But in spite of the bewildering complexities that engulf us and the darkness of despair which hangs over the world, if we are patient and use the intelligence which the Creator has bestowed upon us, everything will work out all right. It is fortunate for the world that the rebirth of Israel came when it did.

The new Jewish state has emerged from its cocoon of long preparation the tragic time in history when the world is undergoing cataclysmic changes. Life is intricate and insecure. Every nation on this earth is in more or less of a general turmoil. World problems are so baffling that some despair that we shall ever solve them. Through the creative genius of our great scientists and engineers we have developed and harnessed forces which have great power for good or for evil. But these forces have not been brought into focus and balance with the world's slower economic progress. Science has outrun the social and political processes.

Nevertheless in these trying days, especially when we recall that entire nations are being ground to bits under the iron heel of a godless dictatorship, it is comforting to have a people happy at work building a strong vibrant democratic society on nineteen centuries of ashes and futility.

An inspired citizen of Israel and world statesman David Ben-Gurion, uttered these symbolic words of noble purpose: "In assuming its place within the family of free nations after so many centuries of aggression and exile, Israel is determined to support to the best of its capacity every measure which strengthens world peace, promotes understanding among peoples and insures the rights of men and equality of nations."

It is with this noble expression and broad, sensible and realistic outlook with which I associate myself tonight when I extend my warmest greetings and heartiest commendation to the Zionists of America and the world and to the peoples of Israel; and repeat my conviction that this free-thinking, cooperative and independent state will prove to be a tremendous factor in restoring sanity to a mad world and in preserving world peace through many, many generations.

The Defense of the Farm Against Biological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, if and when the possibility of biological warfare becomes a reality, it will probably be directed in a coordinated pattern with poisons and germs against people in the centers of population on the one hand and with pests and diseases aimed at the crops and livestock of the farmers on the other hand.

Biological warfare can be considered as a special weapon of war, and it is well to presume that our potential enemies know quite as much about it as we do.

Also it is well to realize that a strong defense can be built against it.

I include as a part of my remarks the following article from the April 1951 issue of Farm Journal, written by Richard Gerstell and Claude Gifford, entitled "It Could Hit Your Farm Tonight":

IT COULD HIT YOUR FARM TONIGHT

(Our farms would be a prime target for attack in the event of biological war. This accurate and realistic article prepared by the Farm Journal should be read carefully

by every farmer"—Millard Caldwell, Federal Civil Defense Administrator.)

(By Richard Gerstell and Claude Gifford)

Let's suppose that some morning this year, or maybe next, you go out to the barn and find one or two of your cows drooling at the mouth and looking strangely sick. You call the veterinarian, who takes one look and says: "Foot-and-mouth disease."

How could that be? How could foot-and-mouth germs possibly get to your place? The answer is that agents of an enemy government may have brought them in. And on that day—if it ever happens—biological war will have come to your farm.

Let's hope that it never happens. But let's not think that it can't.

Biological warfare—sometimes called germ warfare, or BW for short—could start tonight. Not just in cities, with poisons and germs directed against the people crowded together there, but on farms, with pests and diseases aimed at our crops and livestock.

The enemy might try to sneak in foreign pests and diseases long before a shooting war—in hopes that he could whittle down our food supply, and undermine our strength for a long struggle. So don't think that BW has to wait for the shooting to begin.

This is not something to become hysterical about. It's true that there has been wild talk about wiping out whole cities and entire crops with poisons, insects, and diseases. But the facts are, BW is just another special weapon of war—and not a new one by any means. There's a defense against it.

Our best defense is to be prepared to detect any new insects or foreign diseases quickly, and be ready to stamp them out fast. And the better prepared we are, the less likely the enemy is to try biological warfare, or to make much headway with it.

Actually, nature is constantly waging her own biological warfare against our crops and animals. And to fight back, we have built up a tremendous arsenal—bigger and better than anywhere else in the world—of insecticides and medicines for use against bugs and diseases. Our farmers have more skill and know-how in using them, and more equipment for doing it. We have more and better veterinarians, entomologists, crop-disease men, and other scientists.

Because of our better defenses, an enemy would think twice before he started BW, and invited us to strike back. We could wage a pretty terrible biological war ourselves if we had to.

Fortunately, farm people aren't likely targets for germ attacks on human beings. They are too scattered. Germ raids, and possible insect attacks, on farms would be directed mostly against livestock and crops.

Where would raids likely begin? Probably in hatcheries, stockyards, sales barns, feed-mixing plants, railroad terminals, and other centers where large numbers of animals pass through on their way to farms. That's more likely than attacks against single farms.

Other possible targets are commercial laboratories where serums, vaccines, and other medicines are made.

On the crops front, the targets would include seed houses, fertilizer-mixing plants, and places where spray materials are made.

You may think that we have about every imaginable livestock disease now. If so, you were never more wrong. Some of the worst animal plagues on the face of the earth are still outside this country. They might be brought in any time. For instance:

Rinderpest, an Asiatic cattle plague that kills nearly 100 percent of the animals it strikes. Foot-and-mouth disease, an infection that spreads like wildfire. (It's a miracle it hasn't crossed the Mexican border.)

Glanders, an Old World disease of horses and mules that is highly fatal to humans unless it is recognized early.

Fowl pest and foreign strains of Newcastle disease, probably the two most destructive poultry diseases in the world.

Accidental outbreaks could be serious, too. Look what happened in 1914 when foot-and-mouth disease got a month's start in Michigan. It spread to the Chicago stockyards, and went out to 22 States before it was halted. More than 3,500 herds had to be slaughtered—172,222 animals in all—at a cost of nearly $6,000,000 for indemnities to owners—and those were 1914 dollars.

In Mexico we've spent $90,000,000, and fought the disease with hundreds of inspectors and veterinarians for 4 years, and still haven't completely stamped out the disease.

We've had fowl pest in this country once (in New Jersey), and just last March Asiatic Newcastle got into a California establishment through a shipment of game birds from Hong Kong.

Want to know what that disease was like? It killed 41 of the 42 chickens on that place. Thanks to a quick diagnosis, it was stamped out before it spread to other farms.

These experiences show that spotting a dangerous disease or a new insect early is the key to a strong defense. Scientists believe that the Japanese beetle got at least a year's start on us; even then we probably could have wiped it out completely by spending $50,000. We didn't and we've got the beetle in 28 States today. Very likely we could have backed the gypsy moth off our map with a few thousand dollars if we'd got at it when we discovered the pest. Now it has spread all over the northeastern United States.

Here's what biological warfare could mean to growing crops. Government entomologists say that there are literally hundreds of crop pests and diseases that have never reached our shores. Some are as bad as any we now have, or worse.

How could these diseases or pests be brought in? By smuggling them across our borders; by dropping them from enemy planes; by setting loose foreign rusts, scales, and blights in our fields, and by scattering over larger areas the diseases and pests we already have. It wouldn't be too hard to do.

One man with a few test tubes full of rust like the new 15B which attacks wheat could spread a little all the way from Mexico to Canada, and within a year or two we could have a new scourge all over the Great Plains.

Some of the more serious insect pests which might be used against us in biological warfare are the Mediterranean fruitfly, the citrus blackfly (just across the border in Mexico—see the September 1950 Farm Journal, p. 34), the Oriental fruitfly, and seed weevils that attack legume seeds. There are many others.

What is our Government doing to protect us against BW?

They have been working on it since the beginning of World War II. You didn't know it, but at the peak of that war 4,000 men—including some of the Nation's top scientists—were investigating ways to protect us against germ and pest attacks.

From that work came a new toxoid that will protect you from botulism, the deadliest type of food poisoning; a vaccine that gives animals reasonable protection against rinderpest; and a wealth of information about "plant growth regulators," some of which has been put to use in peacetime.

Our present line of defense is this:

It's up to the Armed Forces to cut off attacks by planes or germ-filled missiles or shells.

The FBI is on the look-out for sabotage and undercover raids.

The USDA watches for foreign diseases and pests at our borders, ports of entry, and our international airports. That work is still pretty much on a peacetime basis.

The rest is up to civil defense. There we are making a start—but only a start. We are still largely in the "we've got to do something" stage.

Special courses in trouble-making animal diseases that the enemy might use have been given to 25 USDA veterinarians by the Bureau of Animal Industry. These vets are located in key spots around the country—one could get to your farm or ranch in a matter of hours if needed. But we need to train a lot more veterinarians and pathologists—25 are not many. And we need to do it right now.

And consider this: With foot-and-mouth disease within a day's drive of the Mexican border, we've fiddled around for 3 years about establishing a foot-and-mouth laboratory. We need such a place, under our control, where we can study foot-and-mouth and other virus diseases—a place where we can develop and produce vaccines if necessary.

(Contrary to public belief, we haven't even settled on a location for such a laboratory. The whole thing was snugly bottled up by the Appropriations Committee in the House—and has stopped there.—Editor.)

Meanwhile, the rinderpest vaccine that we and the Canadians developed during World War II probably has been lost. The BAI admits to that.

What else could we expect? We and the Canadians developed the vaccine on an island in the St. Lawrence River. Then we pulled out after the war. With no place close at hand to continue studying the disease, and with no control over the way the vaccine was made or protected in other parts of the world, this valuable vaccine strain—as far as anyone knows—was frittered away and eventually disappeared.

The SDA could do a more thorough job of inspecting materials coming in from foreign countries—if it had the money. But it hasn't. In the year ending this July, the Bureau of Animal Industry will have spent about $373,653 for inspection and quarantine of animals and animal products—less than half a million dollars to protect a $15,000,000,000 livestock industry. With this the BAI must watch all our ports and borders except the Mexican border. The regular budget for this same work for the next year, starting in July, is only $100 more than last year.

Wouldn't it be good insurance to use some of our huge defense sums for strengthening this work—and for building an animal disease laboratory?

Also, we need a disease and pest reporting system that can work quickly. We've needed it for a long time. Last summer when the hog-cholera variant broke out across the corn belt, Farm Journal tried to find out how many cases there were, and where they were. No one knew. Veterinarians and officials—including those in the Bureau of Animal Industry—could only guess.

In all probability we need more men looking for sabotage in centers where livestock, feeds, seeds, medicines, insecticides, fertilizers, and the like are either being manufactured or on their way to farms.

Those are some of the problems confronting the civil defense people and the United States Department of Agriculture as they plan for better defenses against bacterial war. They are planning to set up State organizations, which in turn will help to organize units in your local community. Their jobs will be to pin down raids and stamp them out.

You have a part to play, too. Local government defense agencies may call on you to (1) help spot and stamp out accidental outbreaks or possible bacterial war raids in your neighborhood; and (2) help prevent attacks or accidental epidemics by keeping raid-proof conditions on your farm. Here's what they may ask you to do:

If you notice anything of importance that's out-of-the-ordinary in your fields or garden, notify your county agent, or phone the local civil defense office. If members of your family get sick from what you believe may have been polluted water, food, or milk, report it to your doctor. If any of your poultry or livestock get suspiciously or seriously sick with a strang disease, call in the veterinarian.

It will be up to you not to get excited over little things—too many calls would put too big a load on local defense officials. Ask your local defense people to find out, then tell you, the sort of thing they want you to look for—then if you have good reason to suspect a germ raid, act quickly.

Sometimes you may be called on to give an animal, or some of its blood, for laboratory examination. This might save you and your neighbors big losses by detecting a disease early before it has a chance to spread.

In case of an emergency, you might be called on to help out with inspection, quarantine, vaccination, and possibly with slaughtering infected animals. Also with cleaning and disinfecting contaminated areas.

The second big task the Government may ask of you is to keep your place "raidproof." This is nothing more than using good everyday farm practices that will make it hard for disease to take hold and spread. How? Well, local defense officials may suggest this:

Ask strangers to keep away from your flocks and buildings; select your part-time help carefully; keep handy the phone numbers of your veterinarian, county agent, local civil defense officials, and State police. Get all the "shots" suggested by your local health authorities; keep prepared feeds in ratfree, covered bins that can be locked at night; do as good a job as you can of killing off rats, mice, fleas, lice, stray pigeons, and flies. Don't let dead animals and poultry lie around; watch everything for first signs of illness; feed cattle away from public roads if possible; in emergencies, keep wells covered and the pump house locked.

They also might suggest that you buy poultry and livestock only from definitely reliable sources; buy animals that have been immunized against the more common diseases; keep new stock separated from old stock until diseases have had time to show up. Disinfect pieces of equipment that come with, or have been used by, new stock; disinfect shoes and boots when leaving quarantine pens; buy only recognized medicines and feed stuffs, and these from trusted places of business with a good name; and keep yourself in good health.

That is the story on biological warfare. It is entirely possible. It might start tonight, this year or next, or it might never start. The possibilities are frightening only if we get panicky; and only if we do not understand what might happen and what to do. If we do understand, and are well organized, we can meet any attacks successfully and bottle them up. Just putting the damper on accidental outbreaks will be worth every ounce of effort.

One thing is sure: we need far better protection than we have, and we need it now. See that your local, State, and national defense set-ups get moving.

Remembrance of Richard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, many of our young men are being killed in Korea in this terrible war. Every now and then, it strikes close to our home districts, emphasizing the awful tragedy of death.

Mr. William McManus, of Owego, N. Y., is the grandfather of the late Sgt. Richard McManus, son of Mr. and Mrs. Maurice McManus, of Vestal Center, in my district.

Sergeant McManus was killed in action in Korea on February 12 of this year.

I am including a poem written by Sergeant McManus' grandfather in memory of him:

REMEMBRANCE OF RICHARD

The sun was sinking in the west
Where fell its lingering ray
Upon a Korean battlefield
Where a dead soldier lay
Wrap the flag around him boys
And gently lay him down
Where the sun will shine next day
So coldly on that mound.
Gather all around him boys
And offer up a prayer
For his dear old Mother and Father far away over there.
We know he did his duty: and did his duty well,
Alas, in the saving of a comrade, poor Richard fell.
No more will he see his native land
He'll roam its hills no more
So gently wrap the flag around him boys
For our hearts are heavy and sore.
Now gather all around him boys
And offer up a prayer
For all of his beloved ones far away over there.

VA Letter Hits Bottom on Readability Meter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the May 5, 1951, issue of the Vet-Times, a national newspaper of veterans' affairs published in Washington, D. C.:

VA LETTER HITS BOTTOM ON READABILITY METER

WASHINGTON.—Gobbledygook?

The Veterans' Administration has it—and bad. Don't take our word for it. Ask Dr. Rudolph Flesch, readability expert, labeled "Mr. Fix-it of Writing" by Time magazine.

Dr. Flesch came to town last week with a VA letter in hand. After reading that horrible example of gobbledygook, he had a Department of Agriculture seminar audience rolling in the aisles.

Here's Dr. Flesch's story: Several months ago a GI in Korea wrote VA about possible GI bill training after discharge. He got a 2-page reply that was (1) completely unintelligible, and (2) did not answer the question.

The GI appealed to Dr. Flesch, believing the readability expert could surely decipher it. No soap. Dr. Flesch couldn't make head nor tail of the letter. He wrote VA seeking the answer to the GI's question. He got virtually the same answer. Neither he nor the GI to this day know what VA meant.

Dr. Flesch, Associated Press consultant for 3 years, devised a measurement yardstick to test readability. A newspaper story will generally test between 60-70. The VA letter—hold your breath—tested minus 13.

You can't go much lower, or at least Dr. Flesch hopes not. He declined to reveal the specific gobbledygook, feeling a confidence would be violated. He said, however, that it would have been much better had VA merely replied, "so sorry." The GI would then have a clearer idea than he now does, holding VA's gobbledygook letter.

Dr. Flesch, a New York University professor, believes the country is being drowned in gobbledygook. The cost to the taxpayers is staggering, he asserts.

He speaks with somewhat more authority than an observer. Dr. Flesch had the painful duty of translating OPA price directives into readable language 5 years ago. That service convinced him that the Government was a huge structure of paper.

His booklet, How Does Your Writing Read, published through the Civil Service Commission, has helped. But he believes the 83,000 copies distributed is just a drop in the bucket.

The real solution, he believes, can be achieved through establishment of basic writing standards. Such standards—properly tested and adhered to—could sizably dent United States gobbledygook, Dr. Flesch claims.

He pointed out that the Agriculture Department's extension service has made the most strides. A readability unit is helping the Department improve its letters and publications.

Dr. Flesch maintains not only written letters, but reports, bulletins, and memorandums need improvement. And he had a word to say about Government press agents. He said that while the press had made great strides in improving readability, Government PRO's hadn't kept up.

He is the author of The Art of Plain Talk, which has sold over 90,000 copies. A new book, How To Test Readability (Harper & Bros., $1) went on sale recently. He also wrote the Associated Press writing handbook.

While serving as consultant for AP he told writers not to use more than 19 words to the sentence. He told a Vet-Times reporter the same thing.

We don't know about AP, but this story meets his standards.

Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Admiral Ross T McIntire, Chairman of the President's Commission on National Employment of the Physically Handicapped, on behalf of this organization recently sponsored a Nation-wide essay contest open to all high school students in the States and Territories. Thirty-four States and Territories responded.

Miss Sylvia Doyle, a senior in the Colorado Springs High School, was the Colorado winner, and went on to win fourth

place in the nationwide contest, the subject of the contest being "Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped."

Because of the excellence of the essay written by Miss Doyle, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where Members of Congress may have opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

(Essay by Miss Sylvia Doyle, of Colorado Springs, Colo.)

Fifty years ago the handicapped individual had little opportunity to lead a normal, self-supporting life. He knew he would always be a burden either to his family or to society. In more recent times, possibly as a result of two wars which left many veterans disabled, we are becoming increasingly aware of the problems confronting the physically handicapped, and are making attempts to help them find a useful, productive place in the business world. Now that society realizes there should be equal opportunity in employment for the physically handicapped, it is necessary to establish the meaning of the word "equal" in this connection. One who has lost an arm cannot plan to become a musician or a surgeon, nor can a blind man expect to succeed as an accountant. Obviously there cannot be equal opportunities in all types of employment, but in this case is meant equal opportunities for positions where the physical defect can be ignored or overlooked in consideration of other more important qualities. Naturally the field of employment is limited for the handicapped, depending on the nature of the disability, but no one can be qualified to fit every job, and some compatible position can now be found for almost every disabled worker.

Today there are many veterans' agencies, trade and State schools that can teach the physically handicapped to succeed in the jobs for which they apply. A person will compensate for a physical defect by developing himself in other ways. For instance, most blind people have their senses of hearing and feeling sharpened to an unusual degree; a person paralyzed below the waist or without lower limbs will develop powerfully strong arm and shoulder muscles, while one without arms or hands often becomes adept at using his feet for writing, painting, or various kinds of manipulation. Therefore in the field requiring specialized skills for which he has been trained, the handicapped are sometimes physically better qualified to handle the job than most people would be. In order to compete with the normally fit they may have to do more intensive practice and persevere harder to achieve their goals, but as a result they are usually better workers; their records in ability and efficiency are high. A firm employing handicapped workers is not necessarily being philanthropic. The slogan "Hire the Handicapped—It's Good Business," makes sense.

In order to help the physically handicapped and to make employers realize they are good business prospects, National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week has been established. Its aim is to advance the cause of these disabled people, who don't want charity or pity, who don't want to be coddled, but simply desire an equal chance to work on a competitive basis in the industrial world.

These physically handicapped people are equipped with courage, stamina, and alertness. They often develop talents that would have lain dormant if they had not been disabled. Recently in a veterans' rehabilitation hospital a group of partially paralyzed boys staged a combination circus and vaudeville for their fellow patients. Because they had such a wonderful time practicing and presenting it, and because the show was such a grand success, the boys put it on for other hospitals. Although they had no previous experience in entertaining, they have now made it a career. It is fascinating to watch the way they maneuver their wheel chairs through formations similar to the complicated dance routines of a musical comedy as they sing appropriate songs. There is a separate act in which a man rides his wheel chair over a high wire. With wit, courage, and hard work these boys have made a worth-while place for themselves despite their handicaps.

Of course few can belong to such a troop, but for those handicapped people who simply want to enter the business world, many more fields are open than is commonly supposed, as additional firms are learning that these people make dependable employees. Various departments of our Government also take on qualified handicapped persons when possible. The deaf may be used in shoe shops, restaurants, dry cleaning establishments, and printing offices. When jobs for the blind are mentioned, most people think of broom making or of conducting concessions in post offices, but there are numerous other opportunities open for the sightless. Those with musical ability may become piano tuners or play in bands and orchestras. Like the deaf, the blind can work successfully at printing and run certain types of machines in manufacturing plants. For a time two different blind couples ran grocery stores in a Colorado town which also boasts a successful blind lawyer. Handicapped people with artistic ability can compete easily with others in most fields of art, either free lancing or in connection with industry. Lame and crippled workers can take many kinds of jobs not requiring much moving about. These few positions mentioned are picked at random from the many to show the broad scope of opportunity for these people.

Finding good employment prospects is naturally a harder task for the handicapped than for the able bodied, but it is by no means too great an obstacle. Prejudices against hiring them are being overcome as business takes on more and more such employees.

The physically handicapped labor under many problems that the great majority of people do not. They are often sensitive and bitter about their condition. We owe it to them not to give them too much sympathy, not to give them work simply because they are unfortunate. They deserve the American right to get ahead on their own initiative; they should accept the competition of the rest of the world just as others do. Only in this way will they have a chance to lead normal, happy lives, as they surely have an equal right to do. It is to the advantage of all to keep these people self supporting in jobs won on a competitive basis. Business should take an interest in them because of their ability, not because of compassion. Handicapped people who are self supporting are, for all practical purposes, no longer handicapped.

These people don't want pity—they want only the same chance others have to make something of themselves. They aren't asking for a handout—they're asking for a chance to handle a job for which they are qualified. They would like to be tested as others are; it is their privilege by right of birth as human beings. Surely we owe this much to the physically handicapped as well as to all mankind.

Proposed Shipment of Wheat to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives have both taken affirmative action on a proposal to provide 2,000,000 tons of wheat for the people and the Government of the Republic of India. These measures await favorable action on the part of both the House and the Senate. The hour is late. The specter of mass starvation hangs like a cloud over the land of India. The Government of India has appealed to our Nation for assistance. It is fitting and appropriate that we should quickly respond in a spirit of American generosity, Christian compassion, and fraternity.

When the wheat-for-India bills are debated in the respective Houses of the Congress the arguments in favor of the proposed legislation will be documented and clearly outlined. During the past weeks throughout all areas of America voices have been raised in support of wheat for India. Religious leaders of all denominations have challenged Protestant, Catholic, and Jew to join in this crusade against hunger.

The Reverend Leland Stark, rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, April 29, 1951, delivered a sermon entitled "Lazarus at America's Gate." Within the confines of this splendid sermon are to be found the summation of all arguments in support of this proposal. We are deeply indebted to the Reverend Stark for his understanding, his brilliant presentation, and his challenge to Christian action. I ask unanimous consent that his sermon of April 29, 1951, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAZARUS AT AMERICA'S GATE

"There was a rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and who feasted sumptuously every day. And at his gate lay a poor man named Lazarus, full of sores, who desired to be fed with what fell from the rich man's table; moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. The poor man died."

So says Jesus in His telling of the story of Lazarus, the poor man, and Dives, the rich man, and everything indicates that Lazarus died of starvation within sight of the sumptuous tables of Dives, the rich man. The sores on the body of Lazarus, of which Jesus speaks, were probably those ulcers which frequently spread over a starving body, and Our Lord's reference to the dogs who came and licked the sores on Lazarus' body suggests that he was too weak to beat off the unclean beasts of the street, who, far from being like our dogs, were ferocious, unclean mongrels who may well have been waiting for Lazarus to die so that they could attack his body. That sort of thing frequently happens in famine-ridden areas of the world.

It wasn't that Lazarus was asking Dives, the rich man, to go hungry on his account; all that Lazarus wanted were those bits of bread on which well-fed orientals, in lieu of using napkins, wiped their fingers. But this rather meager and uncertain diet evidently did not contain enough calories, and Lazarus died.

Before I come to the application of this scripture to a contemporary situation, I feel constrained to intrude a personal observation. Those of you who have known me these nearly 3 years I have been your rector know that not once before in that period have I used the privilege of the pulpit to speak directly on impending congressional legislature. Normally it is out of place in the pulpit. But occasionally there comes before America an issue to which the Christian gospel has so direct and obvious an application that the pulpit remains silent only if it is cowardly evasive. So I speak to you now as a Christian minister to Christian people on a matter to which the Christian gospel directly applies.

Come back now to the words of Jesus. "There was a rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen and who feasted sumptuously every day. And at his gate lay a poor man named Lazarus, full of sores, who desired to be fed with what fell from the rich man's table."

My friends, I say to you that Lazarus lies today at America's gate—a Lazarus in the person of millions of people of India who are threatened with starvation, and this very week there come before Congress bills providing for a loan, or half-grant and half-loan, of 2,000,000 tons of wheat for India in order to stave off that famine which otherwise may take the lives of millions of people.

The general facts of the matter are so well known I shall mention them but briefly. India has high hopes of becoming self-sufficient in its food supply by next year, but last fall a series of natural calamities—drought in this area, torrential rains in another, locuts, and crop disease, and even earthquake—resulted in such a decimation of India's food supply that millions of people are now threatened with famine. The Government of India has already imported as much gain and rice as it can from elsewhere, but life or death for millions is now directly dependent upon the 2,000,000 tons of wheat provided for in the wheat-for-India bills that are scheduled to come before both Houses of Congress this very week.

As everyone knows, America can lay hands on that much wheat and can spare it without any American going hungry. We always raise more than we can eat in this country. Out in the breadbasket of the Middle West, I myself have seen grain and corn actually heaped on the ground and exposed to all weather simply because the granaries and elevators were already choked to capacity.

Why don't we see to it that India gets the grain, then? Well, in a less complex period of history we probably would, purely on the basis of Christian humanitarianism, but today every move on the international scale carries political connotations and must be made with reference to the global struggle between communism and the free world so that if India is going to get these 2,000,000 tons of wheat from us—either by grant or by loan or by half-grant and half-loan—we must satisfy ourselves that this move meets our humanitarian and political conditions.

And that is a valid consideration. If, for instance, it were the people of China whose Government was applying for 2,000,000 tons of wheat, we would have to let political considerations override humanitarian ones because China unhappily is now our enemy.

And here we come to the nub of the matter. From our point of view, India's political position is suspect. In the struggle between communism and the free world, India is politically on the fence, in some cases for us and in other cases against us. Many Americans therefore, not a few of them in the Halls of Congress, feel that unless India comes into this struggle wholeheartedly on our side, we ought not to help them with the food they need. Other objections are also raised along that line, and the upshot of it is that there is likely to be a real battle in Congress over whether India gets the needed wheat for her people, and the opposition to India is so sizable and so strong that America, through its Congress, may actually say no to India's starving millions.

Let us for the moment put aside any considerations of Christian compassionateness and look at this problem purely on the basis of American self-interest. Admittedly, India is trying to straddle the international political fence, but that being the case, ought not we to do everything we can to get India to come down on our side of the fence rather than to push India over into the Communist side? China with its 450,000,000 people is already on the Communist side—are we not interested in keeping the next largest Asiatic power—India with its 280,000,000—from going Communist too? Isn't that just elementary common sense?

If you thought for months of some way by which India's friendship could be won, could you think of a better way than to save millions of her people from starvation? And if you thought for months of some way by which India could best be alienated from us, could you think of a better way of alienating that nation from us than to say in effect, "Let them starve to death for all we care." Suppose Congress by saying "No" to this bill were to say that very thing in effect—what would the result be?

Well, suppose all of us lived in the south of India, and we were caught in the famine. Day by day we would be growing weaker, gradually passing that invisible line between malnutrition into actual slow starvation. As average, simple, poorly educated Indian people, we would not know much about political issues between communism and the free world. By this time we wouldn't know much more than that we were hungry—desperately, gnawingly hungry—and even worse would be to watch our children with their bloated, empty bellies. We have been told America has more food than it needs and that the American Congress is considering sending some to us. But then week after week after week drags past without the matter even coming up to the American Congress. Then when it finally does, week after week passes of seemingly endless debate, and those among us who can read the newspapers tell that those debates are seldom relieved by any note of compassion. We find this hard to understand from a country that has prided itself on being a follower of the One who taught His followers to feed the hungry. Then the blow falls—America through its chosen representatives says "No" to us.

Somehow—let us say—some of us survive. All of us have seen loved ones die terrible deaths, and we could do nothing for them. What is now our feeling toward America? Is it now one of affection? Do we now feel attracted to its ideals? Do we look upon America now as the champion of the right, as the proponent of the doctrine of the brotherhood of man? The moment you and I put ourselves in the place of the Indian people, we know what their reaction will be if America, with the power of death or life for millions in its tongue, says "No" to the starving.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that the Communists are already shrewdly exploiting the advantages we have yielded to them by our unconscionable delays. Right now—so an official of the Indian Embassy admitted to me last Friday—representatives of India, probably frantic by now (as well they may be) that we may turn down their pleas for wheat, are in Moscow and Peiping. Already Red China has sent them some rice in exchange for India jute, and they are negotiating now for a million tons of grain from Red China. As yet no decision has been made in Moscow. Believe me, it will be one of the turning points of history if Red China and Soviet Russia were to come forward with offers of the needed grain so that India, rightfully anxious that we may say "no" to her, could then withdraw her request for our wheat—then there won't be much question as to which side of the fence India would come down on, is there?

Some folks say that there is no danger of Red China and Soviet Russia giving India the needed grain because neither country has any surplus. That is very true. But don't we know enough about the wily ways of totalitarianism to know that they would not hesitate to take it from their own people if they felt that India could then be captured for communism? Furthermore, they would capitalize on it. I can almost hear what they would say: "America," (they would say to India) "that home of bloated capitalists, with such surpluses of grain they don't even know what to do with it all, wouldn't even loan you food—much less give it to you—out of their surplus. They were going to let you starve until we Communists came along" (they would say). "But Communists really practice the brotherhood of man, and poor as we are, with no surplus of food in our lands, we sacrificed in order to share with you what little we had because we could not stand by callous and indifferent and watch you starve. America has proved by its heartlessness that they care nothing for you; we have proved our friendship for you by our self-sacrifice." So the Communists would say of us.

And what could we say? How could we answer that? If we say "no" to India now and if someday the 280,000,000 Indian people fall like China into the Communist net, then we know that we can write all of Asia off as lost. And if that happens, the awful truth will be that in large measure we shall have carved the calamity out for ourselves by our own heartlessness and by our incredible short-sightedness in the face of the most elemental demand of the Christian gospel, to feed the hungry.

Don't anyone think but that America is this moment under the judgment of God. They are looking at us—new look into their faces if you can. Men who once stood straight with self-respect now looking at you out of eyes that burn with the haunted look of cornered beasts; women stretching out bony claws that once were smooth and soft like the hands of your women; children with fearfully distended stomachs gazing uncomprehendingly out of pinched and tiny faces.

"I was hungry and ye gave no food," said the Lord Jesus Christ in His account of the great judgment. And those to whom He said it, looked at Him in amazement: "When saw we thee an hungered * * * and did not minister unto Thee?" they protested. "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." And then Jesus Christ uttered the most awful words that can ever be uttered, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment."

I can claim no special knowledge of history, but I can think of no other time in history when our national self-interest and the call of Christian compassion have so closely coincided as in this matter. To be sure, in the complex of global problems, this particular one is a relatively small one. But a small key can unlock a huge door, and sometimes the solution of a small problem is the key that unlocks the door to the solution of a great problem, and it could even be that providence is proffering us the key to the very heart of Asia. Certainly, at the very least,

seldom if ever have our own national self-interest and Christian compassion so cordially walked hand in hand.

There may be those in this congregation who, believing that what has been outlined does represent the Christian position, are now asking the question, "What can I personally do about it?" Let me give two quick answers to that question.

First, as indeed some of you have already expressed yourselves to me, if you feel that you wish to do something over and above what—pray God—our Government may ultimately be doing, you may then welcome the knowledge that you can send monetary gifts to the Indian Ambassador for the purchase of wheat. Or, of course, the clergy of this church, as we often do in one cause or another, will be glad to see that anything handed or sent to us will reach the right place.

Second, while most of us in Washington are disenfranchised citizens, most of us personally know Congressmen, and it will be worth any amount of trouble to talk to them or write to them or telegraph to them to bring the knowledge of our deep concern. That knowledge may help them reach a Christian decision.

"There was a rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and who feasted sumptuously every day. And at his gate lay a poor man named Lazarus."

America, in the name of Jesus Christ, don't let him die.

H. R. 88, a Bill To Prescribe Safety Requirements for Natural-Gas Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with consideration of H. R. 88, I am glad to make available to the membership the following reports of the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Commerce:

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION ON H. R. 88, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, A BILL TO AMEND THE NATURAL GAS ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO PRESCRIBE SAFETY REQUIREMENTS FOR NATURAL-GAS COMPANIES

The Federal Power Commission is of the opinion that enactment of H. R. 88 would be in the public interest. This bill would authorize the Commission to prescribe such requirements, restrictions, and conditions with respect to the construction, extension, operation, and maintenance of facilities for the interstate transmission of natural gas as in its opinion are necessary to the promotion of safety.

Natural gas is a highly inflammable and fugacious commodity. Unless the gas is closely contained and properly handled in transmission, it becomes an agent which may endanger both life and property. This fact has been illustrated by the damaging explosions which have occurred on interstate natural-gas transmission lines in recent years.

At the present time there are no Federal or general regulations governing the construction or operation of interstate natural-gas transmission facilities. Some States have enacted rules and regulations, in the nature of police regulations applicable to interstate pipelines. But scattered and nonuniform regulation of segments of large-scale interstate operations cannot be effectual or satisfactory. Comprehensive and uniform regulations are required.

The only standard guide now generally available for construction and operation of natural-gas transmission facilities is the Code of Pressure Piping which was published in 1942 under the sponsorship of American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and approved by the American Standards Association. Although there have been several minor revisions of that code since 1942, it does not provide adequate standards for modern high-pressure transmission pipelines. Nor is its observance compulsory.

The natural-gas industry in the last few years has been engaged in a tremendous expansion program. Most of the pipelines constructed during this period—as well as those now proposed—are designed to operate at high pressures ranging up to 970 pounds per square inch, and more. And some of such pipeline mileage has been, or will be, constructed through densely populated areas in close proximity to homes and other buildings. This construction is being performed without adequate safety standards, including rules such as those which would prescribe the depth of the pipeline in inhabited areas, its proximity to homes or other buildings, and the media to be used in testing pipelines. There are no provisions of this nature in the above-mentioned ASME Code of Pressure Piping. There should be such regulations to provide the maximum of protection to the public.

Regulations governing the operation of pipeline facilities also are needed to provide minimum safety standards which would serve as a guide to operating companies.

The Commission believes that substantial benefit will result if it is delegated specific authority to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies, as provided by H. R. 88.

The Commission does think, however, that it should not also be made responsible for the enforcement of safety regulations. The inspection of the thousands of miles of natural-gas pipelines which are constructed yearly would present a project of such magnitude as to require manpower wholly disproportionate to the benefits which probably would result and the continued policing of the operations of all natural-gas companies would be an insuperable task. Furthermore, if reasonable regulations are promulgated, there is every reason to believe that companies would adhere to them in their own interests.

The Commission recommends that H. R. 88 be enacted.

Respectfully submitted.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
MON C. WALLGREN, *Chairman.*

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 2, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in further reply to your request of January 5, 1951, for our comments concerning H. R. 88, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies.

H. R. 88 would amend section 7 of the Natural Gas Act by adding thereto a new subsection which would authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements with respects to the transportation facilities of natural-gas companies.

In view of the rapid increase in mileage of interstate natural-gas pipelines, and in view of the public-utility nature of natural-gas transportation facilities we would have no objection to the enactment of this bill. This new authority would appear to be consistent with the regulatory powers exercised by the Federal Power Commission in the natural-gas field, and would appear to be desirable from the standpoint of protecting the public.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report. If we can be of further assistance, please call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS W. S. DAVIS,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

General MacArthur Opposes a Decision Now on Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, our greatest general, Douglas MacArthur, made it plain last week before the Senate committee that he believes it unwise to pass a universal military training bill at this time.

General MacArthur declares this scheme needs more study. He also urges that a decision be delayed until the present emergency is over.

Americans everywhere are hoping that Congress will heed his message on this vital matter.

The following excerpt from the Senate hearings carries most of his testimony on UMT:

Question. Since we are living now, and will continue to live for years to come, in a world of uncertainties, I wonder if you do not think that some system of universal military training which would guarantee that all of our young men would be made available for service, and they would be trained young men, should be invoked so that when the Nation was threatened we would be prepared?

MACARTHUR. As I said, Senator, I am for preparedness, and the maximum preparedness, and the maximum utilization of all our resource.

Now, whether universal military training accomplishes that fact would have to be pretty carefully considered by me.

There are other demands upon our manpower. Whether the total effort to train these great masses of millions of men, whether in actual combat those men would go into the niches for which they have been trained, I don't know. I have not studied the bill. I have not studied the potentialities of it.

WAR BASED ON INDUSTRY

It is not a question, I think, that can be settled by merely whether you are for or whether your are not for it. I am for the utilization of the total manpower that we have.

But whether the program of universal military training all youths along practically the same line, which I understand is the point considered, whether that will reduce and produce (sic) the greatest military effectiveness, I would not attempt to say until I had studied the problem very, very thoroughly.

I believe the greatest possible consideration has got to be given to the demands of industry. I believe that if you are going to prepare the youth, that you have got to understand that modern warfare has as its basis industry.

I believe that you have got to understand that the money that is involved is not limitless; that you have got to get the maximum efficiency for every penny you spend.

WOULD DEFER DECISION

Now, I would not have the slightest hesitation in completely approving that, if I thought that was the best way to get the effectiveness.

Now, at the present moment, of course, this is a future plan you are working on; at the present moment, as I understand it, it is not applicable. There are other and more acute demands.

I should advise most seriously, if I were considering the problem, that I would wait and get through with the emergency that faces us now, and then on what has resulted and what exists then, I would sum up the facts, and make my decision.

If universal military training is the best way to do it, I would unhesitatingly advocate it. The question is the survival of the Nation, and I believe it is every citizen's duty to give that need in time of necessity that is required by the Nation.

JOHNSON. General, do you have any recollection of ever having recommended or advocated universal training of our young men?

MACARTHUR. Oh, yes. I not only many years ago when I went to the Philippines requested the Philippine Government to try to organize it for the blow that was manifestly certain to come, but the first thing I did was to introduce universal military service as far as I was able to accomplish it.

JOHNSON. I mean, as it applied to this Nation.

MACARTHUR. I am quite sure that 25 years ago had we had universal military service, the whole situation would have been different.

It is my belief that had we been prepared before either of these World Wars, there was a very excellent chance that they would not have taken place.

The only thing I address myself to, any doubts that I would have, is as to the efficacy on the military potential that the country could produce.

PHILIPPINE SITUATION DIFFERENT

Now, over in the Philippines, the situation was entirely different. They didn't produce anything; everything was supplied to them.

What was necessary there was to get the manpower to use what was supplied to them; so, there was no question there that universal military service was the proper thing.

Before the First World War, and the Second World War for that matter, industry hadn't assumed such an important part as it has now.

I believe that thing should be carefully studied, Senator, after we get over this present crisis that exists; and, if the best method at that time is for universal military service, as producing the maximum efficiency—like Abou Ben Adhem, my name would lead all the rest.

Endorsement of H. R. 88

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H. R. 88, on which I have requested an early hearing by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have received the following letter. It is most encouraging to receive the support of Transcontinental, which has the biggest single natural-gas pipeline installation in the country.

TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE CORP.,
Houston, Tex., May 3, 1951.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: Thank you for your letter of April 30, together with the Federal Power Commission report on your H. R. 88.

Transcontinental favors this legislation. While I do not want to be specific about other companies, I know that there are other natural-gas transmission systems that likewise favor what you are attempting to do.

We would like to have your committee set hearings on this bill as early as possible and get the ball rolling.

With all good wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CURTIS MORRIS,
Vice President.

Let's Do Our Own Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include, and commend to the attention of the membership of this august body, an editorial by J. J. Jachowicz which appeared in Local 1344 News, published by and for members of local 1344, USA–CIO.

This editorial is entitled "Let's Do Our Own Thinking," and the recommendations which it contains are very appropriate at this time when so many persons throughout the land have been neglecting to use their reasoning faculties. If our Nation is to remain strong, and cope with the challenge which history has thrust at us, we cannot allow emotionalism to rule our actions. The times are perilous, and require steady nerves and calm thinking. The enemy who faces us has given much time to planning the course which he is pursuing. We cannot hope to thwart his plans through actions motivated by emotions alone—our course must be based on reason and experience.

A nation is only as strong as its people. If the people become irrational in their actions, the nation is doomed. Let us think before we speak, and think before we act—let us do our own thinking.

The editorial follows:

LET'S DO OUR OWN THINKING

(By J. J. Jachowicz)

The importance of individual thinking to the preservation of our democracy and our freedom cannot be over emphasized. Too often we let the others do our thinking. Just what do we mean by thinking? To think is to exercise the facilities of good judgment, conception, or inference—to put our good common sense into action.

Any one person who first acts or speaks before he thinks is this country's worst enemy—he is as bad as the person that has other people do his thinking. * * * When the German people defaulted their thinking to Hitler, they surrendered their freedom. When the Russian people defaulted their thinking to Lenin and Stalin, they surrendered their freedom. We must learn to control emotions instead of being controlled by emotions. We must stay away from emotional idolatry of personalities that so beclouds our national thinking today. We must keep far away from bitter cynicism and hatred of those with whom we differ in opinion, we must disagree agreeably and with constructive respect.

We must realize that this wonderful country of ours is greater than any individual woman or man—that its fate and security should not be made a political football to be kicked around by clashing personalities greedy and envious of political power. Too few people in this country realize that too many people in this country are defaulting their thinking to demagogs and that we today are closer to surrendering our freedom than most of us are willing to recognize and admit. When we accept the statements and proposals of demagogs because we are too lazy to think and test their statements and proposals, we can blame no one but ourselves for subsequent events.

The articulate action of a citizen must be constructive, must seek to improve, to build instead of tear down and destroy—must be preceded by serious and responsible thinking. We must do our utmost to preserve our democracy and peace by: (1) Independent thinking; (2) making that thinking articulate by translating it into action at the ballot boxes and in everyday life; and (3) being constructive and positive in that thinking.

Is It Un-American To Be Fair?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a little article from Newsweek magazine of May 7, 1951. While I hold no special brief for the British, I do believe in being fair, and I do not think the families of the 900 dead and missing men from the Gloucestershire Regiment could be much comforted by some of the unfair criticism that has been thrown at the British. This criticism is largely by American politicians who care not what happens to their country or its friends so long as they can gain political advantage. I, too, have criticized British politicians in the past and may do so if I think it warranted in the future, but I have never deliberately distorted the truth and said the British will not fight. I think the following article will show that they will:

ONLY THE GLOUCESTERS

The Chinese "threw everything at us except dragons," one Briton of the Twenty-ninth Brigade gibed last week, when the Reds waded the waist-deep Imjin River on the moonlit night of April 22. By dawn the Gloucestershire Regiment's 257-year-old First Battalion, nicknamed The Slashers, which stormed Quebec for General Wolfe and wears the Sphinx for battling Napoleon at the Nile, was trapped atop Hill 235.

For 90 harrowing hours the Gloucesters battled against 10-to-1 odds, against gnawing hunger, against burning thirst, against

sleeplessness, killing a dozen Chinese for every Briton. They ran out of ammunition, but they waved away Flying Boxcars lest any airdrop by mistake fall to the Chinese only 35 yards away. Their radio remained reassuring up to the last message. "Batteries running down. Still holding out." Only after the United Nations withdrawal from the Imjin had been made good did their commander, Lt. Col. J. P. Carne, order his companies to break out to safety, while he, a chaplain, and a doctor, stayed with the wounded.

As the 100-odd survivors of the 1,000-man battalion trickled back to the U. N. lines, Brig. Tom Brodie, commanding the Twenty-ninth Brigade, wrote in the records of the Gloucesters: "Only the Gloucesters could have done it."

Great Debate Is Marked by Many Paradoxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the following article by Mr. James Reston, special correspondent of the New York Times:

GREAT DEBATE IS MARKED BY MANY PARADOXES—MACARTHUR IMPRESSES MANY OF HIS FOES AND RAISES QUESTIONS FOR FRIENDS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 5.—General of the Army Douglas MacArthur succeeded in doing one thing this week that nobody thought was possible—he managed to shake some of the prejudices of both his supporters and his detractors in the Senate, and he left most of the Senators both a little more impressed and a little more perplexed than they were when he arrived.

He disappointed and yet impressed his detractors because he proved to be a skillful witness—quick, clear, eloquent, and independent in his judgments, sometimes bitterly opposing the administration's views and then again supporting the administration.

At the same time, he both wowed and depressed his most rabid supporters because, while he hit the administration hard, he often used arguments which contradicted the pet themes of Senators TAFT and WHERRY, and once even refused to confess dark suspicions about Secretary of State Acheson.

AGAINST THE RULES

This, of course, is against the union rules in Washington. If a man is against the administration he is expected to be against everything it supports, except the Constitution. Also, he is expected to be loyal to, or at least considerate of not only his own prejudices, but the prejudices of his supporters.

The general, however, probably because he has been away so long, did not always comply, and in the process he illustrated both the emotional appeal of his arguments and the element of paradox in the whole controversy.

Two arguments ran through his voluminous testimony, both expressed with great passion, both having great emotional and political appeal for Senators: First, that nobody had any right to buy time in Korea with the blood of his young fellow-countrymen, and, second, that if it was victory the Senators wanted, he could get it for them wholesale.

Since the devil you know is always worse than the devil you don't know, this argument won powerful support, particularly since the general testified to the weakness of the Soviet transportation system and the vulnerability of Red China to economic, naval, and air blockade. But the element of paradox kept coming into his argument as the hours went along, and this element disturbed many of his most faithful supporters. For example:

(1) The general said it was the responsibility of the administration to decide last year on whether Communist China was going to intervene in the Korean war. A theater commander, such as himself, had only limited opportunities to make an estimate of any such decision, he testified. Yet he did not hesitate to base his proposal for the bombardment of Manchuria on his own estimate that the Russians would not intervene—an estimate not shared by the administration.

(2) The general proposed a strategy in the Far East which he conceded might bring about a major war, though he guessed that it would not, but at the same time he conceded that global strategy was not his responsibility, that he did not know the details of United States or allied preparedness, of Soviet strength in Europe, of the Soviet atomic bomb stockpile, or even of our own atomic development.

NO ATTACK ON RUSSIA

(3) It was imperative, the general said, that once you get into a war, you destroy the enemy's capacity to make war upon you, but he shied away on various occasions from any suggestions that we should attack the Soviet Union, which is the source of the enemy's effective war-making capacity.

(4) He bitterly criticized the administration's limited war policy in Korea, yet he proposed a limited war of his own: No United States land battles in Asia, no attacks on the Soviet supply routes, etc. Nor did he explain what he would do if by attacking Manchuria the war were merely pushed deeper into Asia, with Soviet territory instead of Chinese territory being used as the Communists' privileged sanctuary.

(5) Communism, he said, was the enemy, but he refused yesterday to identify the Soviet Union as the center of that world conspiracy. Indeed, he based a great part of his argument on the thesis that, while the Soviet Union and Red China were in a limited partnership for the present, the center and decisive enemy in Korea was the Peiping regime.

(6) The center of Soviet industrial strength, he testified, was in European Russia, and it was important to have bases from which that strength could, if necessary, be attacked. Indeed, allies, he agreed, were useful, but he outlined a policy for the Far East which he agreed was opposed by all our principal allies.

(7) Moreover, one of his main complaints, shared by the whole committee, was that the allies were not doing enough to help us in Korea. Yet he insisted that if we expanded the war in the Far East, our allies would go along just as they did when the Korean war broke out. Leadership was what they needed, he observed.

(8) Finally, though he has repeatedly testified in the past that the President and only the President could make great decisions of policy involving the military, he rested his argument on the thesis that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were in "substantial" agreement with him (though they disagreed on bombing Manchuria and did not pass judgment on the political questions involved in the President's decision to oppose the MacArthur strategy).

This element of paradox runs through many other aspects of the debate as well. The general was dismissed, not because he differed with the administration's strategy, but because he carried his differences over the head of his Commander in Chief to the people. Yet this aspect of the matter was minimized in the Senate hearings.

The general has been noted in the past for the discipline of his command, though he insisted this week that all officers should have the right, if they disagreed with their commanding officers, to carry their disagreements to the public.

STRIKING PARADOX

As a matter of fact, the most striking paradox of all is that the general comes out of this week's testimony as the most enthusiastic supporter of the most ambitious interpretation of the Truman doctrine and is being opposed by President Truman for doing so.

Communism is the enemy and wherever it shows its face we should attempt to meet it, he testified. Moreover, he insisted (while still protesting that he did not know the details of our preparedness or our allies' or the Soviet Union's) that we should meet it in Korea in accordance with his strategy, without the Western Allies, if necessary.

One ally we would have in that event, he felt sure, was Chiang Kai-shek and his Chinese Nationalists, and between us, he concluded, "victory" in the Far East could be won.

The general would not be drawn into discussion of the cost in manpower and dollars of opposing Communist aggression everywhere in the world. All he would say was that he was for adequate preparedness.

Thus, the general left many of his supporters with the unhappy feeling that he was more internationalist than the Truman administration, more willing to take risks, more ready to place the country on a war footing than many of his backers are.

At the same time, the administration was equally disturbed by the end of the week because of the personal impression the general had made and the emotional appeal of his proposals to end the slaughter.

Early this week there was a tendency among administration supporters here to dismiss the general's great popular successes in New York and Chicago. Wait, they said, until he has to submit to the hard give-and-take of questions and answers on the Hill. Now that the questions and answers have taken place, however, the administration is not so sure.

PERSONALITY VERSUS LOGIC

In any conflict between a great personality and a logical argument the outcome here is never very sure. General MacArthur was an impressive witness. The members of the Foreign Relations and the Military Affairs Committees, with the outstanding exception of Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, hesitated to go much beyond the 832 questions. They found many vague areas in the general's thinking and developed various inconsistencies in his testimony, but they had no answer to his persistent references to the casualty lists in Korea.

Moreover, the contacts between the State Department and Capitol Hill have been so poor now for so long that the administration's case for the limited war is not even understood by most of its own supporters in the Senate.

General MacArthur thus moved into something of a vacuum himself. He is benefiting not only from his own illustrious record as a soldier and proconsul in Japan but from the decline in the prestige of the civilian branch of the Government, and particularly of the Department of State.

Thus, the final paradox of the situation is that, while this started out as a debate on the civilian control of the military, the administration will now depend, in its rebuttal, not on the first civilian Cabinet officer, Secretary of State Acheson, but on the military: General Marshall, Gen. Omar Bradley, and, if the going gets too tough, on General MacArthur's former aide, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Address of Hon. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have from time to time been troubled by the distinctions, if any, between treaties and executive agreements. Many of us have also been concerned by the implications of article 9 of the North Atlantic Pact. Indeed, there has been in another body a great debate about constitutional rights and duties under this treaty. In a fairly wide reading on this subject, I have seen nothing so informative as the address delivered on April 26, 1951, by my friend and colleague, the Honorable CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts, before the American Society of International Law. The text follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER TO THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, APRIL 26, 1951

Three years ago you did me the honor of inviting me to appear before you to discuss the relationship of the House of Representatives to some of the more pressing international problems then pending before Congress. At that time I pointed out the increasing importance of the role which the House was inevitably called upon to play in the international scene chiefly because of the many economic or fiscal matters being dealt with by international agreement which could only be implemented under our Constitution through legislation initiated in the House. At that time I was concerned by the problem of educating the House to deal appropriately with such matters when at best only 6 percent of the Members, namely, those serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, could be expected to sit through the long, intricate hearings upon which final decisions had to be made. That problem is no less acute today than it was 3 years ago. If anything, it is more acute. Prior to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, fiscal and military matters in the international field were assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee and the Military Affairs Committee, respectively. These are now referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

All of you are of course conscious of the fact that our economic and our military participation in international affairs is becoming increasingly important. This means that the House of Representatives must more and more be consulted and counted upon for informed action to implement and make effective the international agreements which may be entered into by the Executive. What then should be the role of the House with respect to responsibility for approving of those agreements in the first instance?

It is my contention that any international agreement entered into by the Executive which requires ultimate implementation by the Congress as a whole should, in the first instance, be approved by the Congress as a whole. To call such an agreement a treaty and submit it to the Senate alone as a treaty gives effect to the constitutional safeguard of requiring a two-thirds affirmative vote by the Senate, but completely overlooks the fact that the House of Representatives has withheld from it the educational process which must inevitably accompany any form of approval of that treaty, and likewise places upon the House of Representatives the burden of responsibility of initiating necessary legislation for implementation, with no initial voice in its approval.

The question as to whether or not an agreement should be submitted to the Congress in the form of a treaty or of an Executive agreement requiring congressional action by joint resolution or as an Executive agreement entered into without approval of the Congress is a matter of Executive judgment. In my opinion, however, that Executive action, in the absence of any constitutional change with respect to the approval of international agreements, should follow very simple lines. First, any international agreement which does not require any implementation but which provides for a departure from the existing status quo as between our country and any other country or countries should be submitted to the Senate alone as a treaty. Second, any international agreement which merely clarifies existing agreements without altering their substance should properly be considered Executive agreements requiring no approval by the Congress. Third, all international agreements which require implementation on the part of the Congress to become effective should be submitted to the Congress as Executive agreements requiring formal approval of both branches by joint resolution. I specifically suggest a joint resolution rather than a concurrent resolution because a joint resolution has the force of law, having been signed by the President after the action of the Congress, whereas a concurrent resolution is an act of the Congress alone.

The executive branch of the Government has, to a certain extent, followed the course which I have suggested in a number of international agreements which required implementation. As I recall it, the original UNRRA legislation (Public Law 267, 78th Cong.) is an excellent case in point. Before submission, administration leaders discussed with legislative leaders in the Congress the question of submitting our ratification of United States participation in UNRRA in the form of a treaty or a joint resolution to be approved by both Houses of Congress. The latter method was decided upon, in view of the fact that ratification by the United States in the form of a treaty would have still required implementation by both Houses of the Congress. The matter of financial contribution to UNRRA could, of course, not be made effective by treaty, but had to be dealt with by both houses of Congress. During the Eightieth Congress, the United States became a member of, and assumed international responsibility in, the International Refugee Organization (Public Law 146, 80th Cong.), the World Health Organization (Public Law 643, 80th Cong.), the revised International Labor Organization, the ILO instrument of amendment (Public Law 843, 80th Cong.), the Caribbean Commission (Public Law 431, 80th Cong.), the South Pacific Commission (Public Law 403, 80th Cong.). In addition, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Congress, through both Houses, exercised its power to bring about United States membership in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank (Public Law 171, 79th Cong.) and in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (Public Law 174, 79th Cong.)

However, there has been a notable exception to the practice followed by the executive with respect to agreements which require implementation. I refer to the North Atlantic Treaty. That treaty was never given consideration by the House until the question of its implementation arose, and in that implementation there are still certain gaps to be filled on which I personally believe that the House should take action. I refer specifically to the very controversial one with respect to the sending of troops to Europe to be placed under the command of the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

The North Atlantic Treaty in its major provisions is clearly not a self-executing treaty. Whereas certain general pledges are made in articles 3 and 5, article 9 is the article which makes provision for the manner in which the implementation of those pledges shall be furthered. In order to refresh your recollection, the text of article 9 is as follows:

"The parties hereby establish a council, on which each of them shall be represented to consider matters concerning the implementation of this treaty. The council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of articles 3 and 5."

You will note that the council set up in the article merely has the power to consult, and that the defense committee provided for can only make recommendations. Thereafter, each contracting nation must take action under its constitutional system upon the specific recommendations.

There is only one specific recommendation which has been made public and then been acted upon by the United States. That is the recommendation with respect to the appointment of the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe. Although the same recommendation provided in some detail for the organization, command structure, and general operational procedure for an integrated NATO force, for security reasons, this document is secret. But the President's letter to General Eisenhower designating him as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, as well as operational commander of all of the United States forces in Europe, the Eastern Atlantic, and the Mediterranean was made public on December 19, 1950. That letter made it clear that General Eisenhower would serve in two capacities. It likewise provided in the third paragraph, and I quote:

"Subject to overriding requirements of the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, the mission's routine employment, training, and administration of these forces will continue to be handled through command channels heretofore existing."

That paragraph makes it clear that General Eisenhower, as the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, can in his own discretion override General Eisenhower as commander of the American forces in Europe and hence, in his capacity as a commander on behalf of the 12 participating nations under the North Atlantic Treaty operate under certain circumstances free from the chain of command which leads to our own Commander in Chief, namely, the President of the United States.

I do not want to stress this point unduly, but I think that an objective consideration of it will indicate that a serious constitutional question may be posed as to the right of the President to alienate American troops from his own command without congressional approval. In view of this doubt, it would appear to me to be important that both branches of the Congress should specifically give their approval to whatever assignment of troops may be made to this command.

I am reinforced in this belief by the steps which have already been taken by the Congress in implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty. In October of 1949, the Congress passed Public Law 329 of the Eighty-first Congress, known as the Mutual Defense

Assistance Act of 1949. Let me read you the first section of that act:

"SEC. 101. In view of the coming into force of the North Atlantic Treaty and the establishment thereunder of the Council and the Defense Committee which will recommend measures for the common defense of the North Atlantic area, and in view of the fact that the task of the Council and the Defense Committee can be facilitated by immediate steps to increase the integrated defensive armed strength of the parties to the treaty, the President is hereby authorized to furnish military assistance in the form of equipment, materials, and services to such nations as are parties to the treaty and have heretofore requested such assistance. Any such assistance furnished under this title shall be subject to agreements, further referred to in section 402, designed to assure that the assistance will be used to promote an integrated defense of the North Atlantic area and to facilitate the development of defense plans by the Council and the Defense Committee under article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty and to realize unified direction and effort; and after the agreement by the Government of the United States with defense plans as recommended by the Council and the Defense Committee, military assistance hereunder shall be furnished only in accordance therewith."

This section anticipated the development of defense plans by the Council and the Defense Committee under article 9 by making certain goods and services available to the nations party to the North Atlantic Treaty even before specific recommendations had been made by the Defense Committee. The act then went on to detail the amount of money that was authorized, the purposes for which that money should be spent, the areas in which it was to be spent, and the types of equipment and services which could be furnished. Under section 406, it specifically gave authority to the President to assign civilian personnel of the Armed Forces to any agency or nation for the purpose of enabling the President to furnish assistance under the act, and authorized the employment of technical experts and engineering consultants not to exceed 15 persons at any one time, also to implement the act. Furthermore, section 405 went so far as to permit the Congress by concurrent resolution of the two Houses to terminate assistance to any nation under the act. Public Law 621 of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, which was passed in July of 1950, reiterated the principal provisions of the 1949 act, but made provisions for further detailed implementation.

My point in referring specifically to these two acts is that both of them were initiated in the House of Representatives and that both of them went into meticulous detail with respect to the method by which, under article 9, matériel of war of all kinds including civilian personnel and technical experts could be furnished by the President in implementation of article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty. However, no reference whatever was made in these acts with respect to the assignment of troops by the President, and it certainly appears to me to be an absurdity that the Congress should be called upon for detailed authorization with respect to inanimate objects and specialized personnel, but should not be called upon to take action with respect to combat manpower.

It is true that the Senate has passed both a Senate resolution and a concurrent resolution approving of the sending of four divisions to Europe to be placed under General Eisenhower's command, but from present indications, it would appear as if the executive does not feel it necessary to get House approval to such a resolution. The concurrent resolution was passed by the Senate on April 6, sent to the House, and referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. No hearings have yet been held on it, nor is there any indication that any such hearings will be held. In my opinion, this is a serious mistake. A mistake which may lead to serious difficulties.

No one can deny that the House of Representatives has a constitutional duty to initiate appropriation bills and must participate with the Senate in passing legislation to raise troops. Ten days ago, when the bill for the raising of additional troops through selective service and universal military training was before the House, an amendment to prevent the use of the troops raised under that bill from serving in the European theater was defeated by the small margin of five votes. It was an amendment which could, of course, only apply to men hereafter raised under the terms of that particular bill. However, an appropriation bill making an appropriation for the Armed Forces for the coming year will soon be before us. Without any question an amendment will be offered to that appropriation bill which would limit the use of the men provided for therein to the military service in such a way as to prevent the sending of troops to Europe without the specific consent of the Congress. There is, in my opinion, a very real possibility that such an amendment will be adopted. And if it should be adopted and concurred in by the Senate, the whole question as to the sending of troops to Europe would remain unresolved and would have to be considered de novo by the Congress. For this reason, it would seem to me to be a much wiser procedure for the House to be called upon to act on the Senate concurrent resolution at the soonest possible moment in order that this issue may be resolved.

While I have spent considerable time in examining the relationship of the House to the North Atlantic Treaty, I have done so only for the purpose of reemphasizing my original contention that the North Atlantic Treaty, as well as any other treaty which requires implementation, should be submitted to the Congress as an agreement requiring joint action by the two branches. Too many uncertainties with respect to the action which the House might take arise if the latter is not called upon to act when policy is first made. If I am correct in this conclusion, then I believe that unless executive procedures consistently follow the course outlined, it would be wise to consider seriously a constitutional amendment making such procedure mandatory.

The Marvel House Mother's Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent statement by Mrs. C. E. B. (Blanche) Ward, organizer of the League for the American Home and Marvel House, Inc., whose address is 1214 Carnegie Hall, New York City:

MOTHER'S DAY MESSAGE

The French skeptic, Voltaire, emphasized the mother's dominant place as the source of spiritual life when he said, "My mother made it impossible for me to be a Christian but Wesley's mother made it impossible for him to be anything else."

Dr. Henry C. Link, of the New York Psychological Center, similarly stresses the mother's conspicuous function as guide in the child's development of faith. He declares, "The strategic time is when the child is too young to understand but not too young to accept." That malleable period when he unconsciously absorbs everything around him, and subconsciously tucks it away for conscious adult use.

If modern psychology can be trusted in its assertion that the permanent bent of a child's life is determined before it is 2 years of age, then the early home atmosphere and training provided by the mother with her sympathetic insight, is a nation's most priceless possession.

Mrs. Compton, having received the degree of doctor of laws for her successful motherhood in the rearing of her four famous children, when besieged by reporters for her formula, laughed, "Formula? Just the Bible and common sense."

The American heritage of freedom and Christian civilization hang upon the acceptance and practice of this fundamental conviction. Napoleon when asked by his advisers, "What can we do to make a stronger, more invincible France," replied, "Train French women to be good mothers."

We should pray that our legislators may consider these ponderous facts when determining their most pregnant, far-reaching policies, and make their approximations accordingly. All any nation needs is men and women with good hearts and minds. For nothing can ever go so ill with a nation that character cannot cure it.

Universal Military Training Fails in England—Generals Are Cursing It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, before this Congress goes further toward the goal of the militarists, UMT, it should study the record of conscription in England.

In England now, as in France, Germany, Italy, and Japan in past decades, UMT is a one-way street to disaster and national decline.

Military conscription was initiated in England in 1947.

Already it has become a millstone around her neck, threatening to sink her both militarily and economically.

This judgment, Mr. Speaker, is not mine. It is the expert appraisal of B. H. Liddell Hart, famous British military analyst.

Captain Hart is described by General Guderian, chief of German armored forces as "the best analytical brain in the world."

Gen. George Patton declared, "I have been nourished on his books for 20 years."

I urge Members who want America to be effectively defended to read Hart's latest book, Defense of the West.

In the following passage from that work, Hart sums up the colossal failure in England of universal military training:

When the National Service bill was introduced in 1947, almost all the generals welcomed it and gave it their blessing. Now

they are cursing it. The way that expert opinion has swung around is most remarkable.

It was natural that they should favor it in principle, since it promised a larger army than could possibly be raised by the voluntary system, and seemed likely to remove many of the problems of recruiting and organization that had been a worry in the past.

But the experience of peacetime conscription has changed their views, and led them to see that it produces more problems than it solves—and worse ones. The now common note of condemnation is testimony to the common sense of present-day generals.

Whatever the theoretical advantages of conscription, in practice it is ruining the efficiency of the army, and proving fatal to its readiness to meet an emergency.

The attempt to work a mixed system, combining short-term conscripts with long-term regulars, is failing in both ways.

Conscripts cannot be trained in 18 months, or 2 years, to the high grade of skill required for modern warfare. By the time they are trained even to an employable level, so little of their period of service remains that their employment is bad economy.

It swells the bill for transportation out of all proportion to the service they render—the estimated cost of movements is $51,600,000 for 1950–51 compared with $5,600,000 before the war.

At the same time the mixture heavily handicaps the training of the regulars and their effective utilization. A very large proportion of them are absorbed directly or indirectly in the training machine for the conscripts and in caretaker jobs at home and overseas.

The enlarged size of the army has much increased the scale of administrative duties, and regulars are naturally called on to undertake these. In sum, far fewer than before the war are available for incorporation in fighting formations.

That means Britain has, in effect, a much smaller force available to meet an emergency than she had in 1939. With so few formations, commanders and staffs cannot get adequate practice in exercises with troops—so that even the force Britain has cannot be properly trained. Worse still, it cannot be adequately equipped—because the money that is needed for new weapons is swallowed up in paying for useless mouths.

Pay alone absorbs $238,000,000 of the money that is being spent on the army. In 1939 it absorbed only $83,600,000, yet pay rates were proving more attractive to recruits than they are now.

As the value of money has depreciated, however, it is fairer to put the contrast in terms of percentages of the total cost of the army. Pay now absorbs nearly 30 percent of the army's budget, compared with 8 percent in 1939. But pay is only part of the ordinary cost of maintaining a soldier, irrespective of the army's operative equipment and more permanent requirements.

This mere man-maintenace cost (pay, food, clothing, carriage, and other supplies) absorbs nearly 60 percent of the army's budget, compared with 30 percent before the war. On the other hand, scarcely more than 10 percent is now given to the provision of warlike equipment, whereas in 1939 nearly 40 percent was devoted to it.

These figures show how little security value Britain is getting for the present immense outlay. They make it clear that Britain is maintaining the most uneconomic kind of army.

If the number of men were cut down, a much larger percentage of the money could be devoted to military equipment without any increase in the budget. That would also release more manpower for industry, and thus help Britain's industrial effort. With a smaller number of men, if they were all regulars, a large number of fighting formations could be produced, ready for action.

Conscription is a millstone round Britain's neck—threatening to sink her both militarily and economically.

Mr. Speaker, will America learn the lesson before it is too late?

France, Germany, Italy, Japan—and now England—have become victims of universal military training.

Again I challenge the proponents of UMT to present some credible evidence that its evil consequences elsewhere will not follow in America.

The Truth Will Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a timely editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, May 6, 1951:

THE AWFUL MYSTERY THAT EXPLAINS ITSELF

Piece by piece, clue by clue, the most terrible and suspenseful detective story of all time continues to unravel before our eyes.

The latest chapter in this blood-spattered tale is, of course, the case of MacArthur now coming to the light in spite of all frauds and maneuvers.

THE RAW DEAL HAS CRASHED

When the President fired the general in the dead of night those short few weeks ago, the whole world was shocked to an alert. A President does not suddenly, at 1 a. m., send for the newspapers and announce that he has cut himself off from the ablest man he has ever met.

That is, no President in a sound condition does such a thing.

The firing of MacArthur, taken with the manner of his firing, made a basic fact plain to everybody from the Politburo in the Kremlin, to the boys in the back room of the late Charley Binaggio's Democratic vote-stealing emporium in Kansas City.

Vast and profoundly important internal explosions are shaking the Truman gang loose from its grip on the governmental power.

The Raw Deal's pitch for the moment after Mr. Truman's midnight brainstorm was the smear that MacArthur had been relieved of duty because he was not only insubordinate, but incompetent.

That foul effort was hardly begun before the Congress, in response to national demand, invited the supposedly disgraced and broken insubordinate to come before it and say something.

THE POWER OF HONESTY

And so he came and spoke and told his story in words that brought tears. Why? Because dignity and candor and honesty of spirit are so rare in this city at this time that men cannot bear their presence without emotional anguish.

We are so long, now, poisoned by the press agent's flash and the phrase maker's twisted version, that for a citizen of powerful character and powerful mind merely to rise and speak the truth as he sees it, is to dislocate everybody's system of behavior.

When MacArthur had finished his address to Congress, that would have seemed enough in itself to jar the last sleeper awake.

But now following has come his smashing point-by-point in the Senate testimony that has been forced out into the light—once more against all the artistry of men long skilled at smothering the truth that hurts.

Thus, we have the running record of the general's testimony and with it, too, the cheap and narrow, penny ante attempts of such cross-examiners as Senators MCMAHON, FULBRIGHT, and KEFAUVER, the Chattanooga goo goo.

It is a devastating exposure. For it does happen, now and then, in spite of all the snide denials of shallow minds, that a human being turns up who fits the title, "hero."

MacArthur's calm, unhurried, unshaken fidelity to the truth in the record tells all who read it why he is one who fits the title. Heroism is not mere insensibility to whipping bullets.

Heroism is also the power of the soul to stand calm against every dog in the pack snapping at your heels, for that which you can show to be the right.

Thus, the MacArthur text is worth the reading, to help you understand a hero.

But even more than that, it helps you understand the burden of death, desolation, and ruin the United States of America, of 1951, is brought to carry because three Presidents of the United States have been failures.

THREE PRESIDENTS WHO HAVE FAILED

The historic fact is that Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, each in his hour of decision, did not understand his job or would not live up to it.

Karl Marx was an insane political adventurer of the nineteenth century Europe who preached that all the world must be destroyed so it could be rebuilt in the image of nothing human. The short title for this was called communism.

Marx was a triviality in the politics of the world until Woodrow Wilson, with the help of like-minded men in Britain and France, failed the moment of power after the war of 1914–18. That let communism come to world significance in Russia.

In 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt saved world communism from collapse first by recognizing the Soviet Government of Russia and then by allowing Communists to penetrate the Government of the United States so far that even yet we do not know all. Alger Hiss is but a surface symbol of the hidden total.

Again, in the war of 1939–45, Roosevelt let communism harvest victory at Tehran and Yalta.

Truman, as soon as he took office, began at Potsdam the unrelieved succession of blunders that now has Americans dying in Korea and the best American soldier of our time, with relentless courage, dynamiting the truth out into the light at last, here in Washington.

The truth is coming out. And it is awful to behold.

Penalty for Hiring Wetbacks Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD two articles from the New York Times, on Sunday, May 6, 1951, the first by Mr. Gladwin Hill, who is doing much to arouse the Nation to the need for a

better farm-labor policy, and the second by the North American Newspaper Alliance:

PENALTY FOR HIRING WETBACKS HAILED—EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES GIVE QUALIFIED BACKING—POLICY WOULD REVOKE CONTRACTS

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, May 5.—The inauguration this week by Federal officials of a get-tough policy in regard to the employment of illegal Mexican aliens on western farms received hopefully favorable, although qualified, responses from both employer and labor quarters.

The employment of the Mexican wetbacks who cross the border illegally in numbers responsibly estimated at upward of 1,000,000 a year, although generally tantamount, to harboring a fugitive from justice, has been held to be not a prosecutable offense under present law. But such employment by farmers who also use legally contracted labor from Mexico is a violation of the United States-Mexico agreement covering the temporary importation of Mexican nationals.

However, the practice of employing low-paid wetbacks (so called because they wade across the Rio Grande), often alongside of legally contracted Mexican labor, is widespread in the Southwest. Up to now it has been ignored officially as far as the international agreement was concerned.

CAMPAIGN OF ENFORCEMENT

This week the United States Employment Service announced its intention of starting, in collaboration with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, a vigorous campaign to enforce the agreement and penalize farmers employing wetbacks by revoking their contracting privileges. Mexican labor is hired under contract to make up for purported shortages of domestic citizen farm labor.

B. A. Harrigan, secretary of the Imperial Valley Farmers Association at El Centro, 15 miles north of the border, said, "We'll have to watch and see how effective the new program is."

Although the association has a nominal policy against wetbacks employment, it has been one of the principal targets of recent complaints on this score.

"If they can get this program on a workable basis, we'd prefer legal labor any time," Mr. Harrigan said. "We've always been for a legal labor program, but the processing has been too slow to fill our requirements."

PROCESSING OF APPLICATION

He said it had taken from early January to mid-April to process a recent application of the association for legal contract labor, by the end of which time the need for it had passed.

"We've made up our minds," he said, "to sacrifice crops rather than go out and scream about this."

Dr. Ernesto Galarza, vice president of the National Farm Labor Union, AFL, which has been campaigning against wetback employment as discriminatory against citizen labor, said:

"The union expects that the new policy of law enforcement on violations of the Mexico-United States farm labor agreement will begin here and now in the Imperial Valley.

"The record shows that the Federal agencies responsible for these obligations have exercised very loose discretion as to how much they would let the corporation farmers get away with."

Glenn Brockway, United States Employment Service regional director in San Francisco, said the rigorous inspection of farms to be launched immediately would constitute a formal investigation of complaints made last February against the concern of O'Dwyer & Mets, a leading vegetable company. Keith Mets is president of the Imperial Valley Farmers Association, and Frank O'Dwyer, his partner, is a brother of William O'Dwyer, United States Ambassador to Mexico. About 300 wetbacks were apprehended on their ranch, and the Farm Labor Union demanded that, under the international agreement, their contracting privilege be revoked immediately.

This was not done, the ensuing interval having been taken up with a preliminary investigation by the Employment Service. Details of the investigation have not been made public.

Dr. Galarza indicated this week end that the Employment Service's apparent intention of dealing with the O'Dwyer & Mets concern only on the basis of current employment conditions would not be considered satisfactory by his union.

DEPORTATIONS RISE TO 580,000 A YEAR—RATE IS 50 TIMES THAT OF 10 YEARS AGO—DRIVE ON ILLEGAL ENTRIES ALSO STEPPED UP

WASHINGTON, May 5.—The United States is yearly deporting 50 times as many aliens as was the case 10 years ago. In the drive to bolster internal security it is also stopping a record number seeking to enter the country illegally, the ratio being six times that of 5 years ago.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, according to A. R. Mackey, Acting Immigration Commissioner, deported in the past year nearly 580,000 aliens, roughly double the total of the previous year. He stated that arrests of those seeking entry totaled another 470,000, which also was almost double the total of the preceding year.

In addition, he said, 154 aliens were free under bond pending court determination of their deportability on subversive charges. About 200 others were under arrest on similar charges, he added.

Smuggling of aliens went on along the seacoasts and along the Mexican and Canadian borders, he declared. The Mexican border, he added, was the avenue for thousands of European aliens being smuggled in as Mexicans seeking migratory farm work.

European aliens inevitably succeeded when they sought to cross the Mexican border, he asserted, factors being a thin border patrol and illegal entry of Mexicans that had reached such proportions that it is now comparable to an invasion.

The Commissioner said that the crush of those seeking entry, legally or illegally, had been terrific since the end of the war and that the trend was still upward.

He stated that, in the past year, immigration officers had boarded 60,000 arriving ships and 87,000 airplanes in the drive to cull out the undesirables and the ineligible.

"All indications point to an anticipated increase in the number of attempted smuggling operations," he warned.

Korean Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD the following article by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin. Mr. Baldwin is known throughout the world as one of our best-informed writers on military affairs. The article appeared in the New York Times yesterday. It is an excellent analysis of the Korean campaign. Many persons have alleged that we were guilty of faulty troop dispositions last fall when the enemy forced us into a rapid retreat. I note that Mr. Baldwin is of the opinion that the enemy's success at that time was due in part to our mistakes, including our faulty troop dispositions.

The article follows:

CHINESE ARE REPULSED BUT BATTLE ISN'T OVER—ENEMY IN KOREA SHOWN TO BE UNABLE TO CARRY ON A SUSTAINED OFFENSIVE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Communist spring offensive in Korea took a breather last week as the enemy regrouped his forces, possibly for a resumption of the defensive, or a second blow.

The balance sheet of battle after the first round in the long-anticipated drive was, so far, in our favor, but there was unending fighting ahead, and the enemy had scored some gains. The enemy accomplishments in the first 2 weeks of attack were:

1. Maximum advances at points of deepest penetration of 30 to 35 miles. In part our retreat was clearly attributable to enemy breakthrough, or enemy pressure, but in part it represented a planned rolling with the punch.

2. Clearance of all UN forces, except in a small sector near the east coast, from North Korea. This retreat south of the thirty-eighth parallel—though unimportant militarily—is of potential significance psychologically and politically if the enemy should soon prove willing to negotiate an end to the war on the basis of the status quo in Korea prior to last June—something that seems unlikely.

3. Severance by the enemy of the Seoul-Chunchon lateral road—not by any means vital to our defense but useful for supply purposes—and capture of Chunchon, important road junction and pivot in central Korea, for possible further offensive operations.

PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

4. Emphatic reassertion of the Chinese Communist combat and psychological superiority over the South Koreans. The breakthrough of the enemy on the central front was against a South Korean division. As an officer puts it: "A very unusual thing is happening in Korea. The South Koreans now fight very well, indeed, when they are opposing North Koreans. But just let one lone Chinese come at them, with possibly the intention of surrendering, and the South Koreans break and run like hell. I suppose this is a throwback to the centuries of oppression which the Koreans suffered under the Chinese. Also they know that the Chinese have no mercy on anyone, themselves included."

5. The imposition of fairly heavy casualties—killed, wounded, prisoners, and missing—on two South Korean divisions, the Fifth and Sixth, and on one British battalion and a few American smaller units.

UNITED STATES-UN ACCOMPLISHMENTS

These enemy gains to date were, however, in no sense decisive and they were more than balanced by United States and UN accomplishments:

1. Seoul, unimportant militarily, but of some significance logistically and of considerable importance politically and psychologically if the enemy should contemplate cease-fire negotiations, was still in our hands at the end of the first phase of the enemy's offensive.

2. More important, our Army was still intact, it had fought a canny retirement; the enemy had failed to trap or destroy any portions of it.

3. The enemy offensive was still far short of what might have been its ultimate goal—the ejection of UN forces from Korea; in fact, this goal at the week end was not even in sight.

4. For limited and indecisive territorial gains, the enemy's losses had been very large—possibly between 40,000 and 70,000 total casualties since the attack began 2 weeks ago. Although casualties in some South Korean and a few small UN units were high, the over-all casualties of United States and UN forces were small; the ratio was probably at least 10 to 1 in our favor.

From this balance sheet to date of the results of the enemy's spring offensive certain conclusions can be drawn.

A NEW UNITED STATES ARMY

Perhaps the first and most important one, which has been increasingly obvious ever since Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway assumed command in Korea in January, but which deserves restatement, is that the United States troops now fighting in Korea are a far call, indeed, from the inexperienced, undisciplined units that were first committed to Korea last summer. We now have an army in Korea of which Americans can be proud. It has two great factors of superiority to the enemy—superior firepower and superior mobility—and, of course, an element inherent to both these factors—a far more ample supply system. This has enabled us to meet and, so far, defeat, the enemy's numerical superiority of about 2½ to 1.

Our superior firepower is primarily attributable to our artillery and airpower; our superior mobility is due to our far more complete motorization, and to the fact that we are no longer road-bound as we once were, but have now developed the "goat-legs" necessary for the cross-country mobility essential to Korea. We still, of course, have weaknesses and some units are superior to others. One of the weaknesses is our failure to exploit or utilize adequately all intelligence sources; our combat intelligence still leaves much to be desired.

The greatest weakness is still the South Korean army, an army now 10 divisions strong (about six of them at or near the front), which must be used, despite its weaknesses, if a line across the Korean peninsula is to be held.

IMPORTANCE OF MORALE

Another potential weakness, which may be magnified by time, is United States troop morale. Excellent now, after a low point in December and January, it cannot be expected to remain at the same high level if the war drags on indefinitely, if the front—as it eventually will be—is affected by the dissensions at home, and if the rotation system, which has been started, does not progress rapidly. The difficulty will be, as far as the latter point is concerned, that Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, new commander of the Eighth Army, is in a damned-if-he-does-and-damned-if-he-doesn't position. To keep morale up, rotation is important, but if rotation is practiced on the scale projected—the replacement of some 500 veterans a day by men from the United States—the combat efficiency of the Eighth Army is likely to decline, at least temporarily.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from the spring offensive to date is that the enemy is unable, even after a long period of preparations, to mount and maintain a sustained major offensive in the face of our superior firepower and mobility. The attack at the end of April was the heaviest yet delivered against the UN forces in Korea and the first major all-out offensive since the Communists struck us in late November and early December.

The enemy successes last fall, it is now apparent, were due not only to their superiority in numbers, but also to our faulty troop dispositions and to our own mistakes; and our retreat on the west coast was more precipitate and extensive than it need have been. It may well be that the enemy will commence a second phase of his spring offensive at any time, but on the other hand his defensive and cautious attitude last week indicated the possibility that he has temporarily shot his bolt.

AIR FORCE HELD BACK

As a possible corrolary to this conclusion, one may also reason that the enemy today is no more anxious to extend the war in Korea than our administration is. His failure, so far, to commit the 800-odd planes of the Chinese Communist Air Force to unlimited support of his attack indicates (a) awareness that this air force is still weak and not prepared to support adequately (without direct Soviet help) Communist ground troops; (b) understanding that an all-out air attack upon our ground troops or bases would eliminate the "privileged sanctuaries," which both sides—due to mutual air restraint—have enjoyed; (c) comprehension that such air attacks would provoke a less limited war and might lead to unpredictable consequences; and (d) a possible decision to keep us fighting indefinitely in Korea but not to try to expel us.

STRATEGY OF ATTRITION

These last conclusions, however, are purely tentative and, of course, subject to future change. There long has been general agreement that about the most damaging strategy the Communists could undertake would be a strategy of attrition, rather than an attempt, at unlimited cost, to push us out of Korea altogether. However, the enemy probably realizes that if his spring offensive fails to accomplish more decisive results than it has yet done, and if the fighting settles down to unending attrition, a reconsideration of our entire strategy in Korea and of the means we might take to bring the war to an end, is inevitable, particularly in view of the MacArthur attacks upon the administration's policy.

General Viewed as the Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD this article by Dorothy Thompson, which is very cryptic but right to the point. I even suggest you read the current issue of the American Mercury:

GENERAL VIEWED AS THE FATHER—PEOPLE DESPERATELY FEEL THE NEED FOR PROTECTION—LEADERSHIP LACKING IN WORST CRISIS OF HISTORY

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The current American Mercury has an article on the business career of President Truman, which if it is not true is sizzlingly libelous, and which, if it is true, is a further terrifying revelation of the state of the Union and its leadership during the worst crisis in the history of this Nation, and of western civilization.

Like others, we have speculated on the reasons for the extraordinary, even hysterical, popular demonstration accompanying the return of General MacArthur.

We do not know, but we doubt that this demonstration has much to do with the obvious controversy. Every poll has shown that the Korean war is profoundly unpopular. On the direct issue—that of extending the war or restricting it—we would guess that the people want less, rather than more war, and anyhow, on the ostensible issue the quarrel between the President and the general is, in our opinion, more apparent than real. But the ostensible issue does not account for the emotional upsurge greeting the general. It is a more complicated mass phenomenon.

The American people feel that there is "something rotten in the State of Denmark." They have had unrolled before their eyes and ears revelations of errors and misdemeanors unique in American history: Of secret international agreements whose deadly seeds now bear their poison fruits; of spies, native and alien, who have penetrated into state secrets with the utmost ease and sometimes with the collusion of high officials of Government; of brazen collusions between gangsters and police officers; of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds to reward political henchmen—scandals reaching right into the White House.

There is an immeasurable crisis of confidence. The people are outraged in every moral instinct, and wounded in their pride, at a moment of great reverses in a war they never sought.

Into this crisis comes a man about whom there has never been a hint of corruption. While all this has been going on, he has been serving his country, with bravery and honor. He had no part in any of the conferences that have produced the poisoned fruits. Among all the victors he was the most magnanimous; of all the postwar administrators the most admirable. For 14 years he has not set foot in America, but wherever he stood has been America—and many cannot find America at home. He exudes independence—the most traditional American characteristic. He looks the way Americans picture the ideal American man. He bears himself with ease and dignity. He is aloof among backslappers, but without supercilousness. In his speech there is an echo of the old schoolbook texts that have formed part of the American subconscious. As he rides through the streets, with his young son at his side, shy but poised, he is the picture of a father who neither unfairly punishes nor spoils.

I submit that in terms of public response, the matter of whether his opinions are right or wrong is negligible. The throngs cheering themselves hoarse are not responding to an opinion but to a personality. They hold him responsible for no ills; his life has not been devoted to money; they are confident that he would never betray, nor cheat, nor lie, nor behave dishonorably. They cannot imagine him surrounded by crooks and 5 percenters. In the Augean Stables he appears godly and clean. They feel him to be morally admirable, at a time when they feel morally debased, in a collective sense of shame.

He is, to use a psychological term, the perfect father image to a people who have begun to feel that they are not the legitimate sons of their present political fathers—and who desperately feel the need for protection.

New York Times Disagrees With General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, let me call attention of the Members to a very interesting editorial which appeared in the

great New York Times on Monday, May 7, 1951:

DEBATE IN WASHINGTON

Quite apart from any personal or partisan issues, the opening sessions of the Senate hearings and General MacArthur's testimony have paved the way for a searching debate on our policies in the Far East. The atmosphere in the Senate committee room has been grave, as it should be. Momentous questions are being posed. General MacArthur has made a substantial contribution to the tone of the hearings by his sense of decorum and his forthrightness. Similarly, his questioners thus far have kept the hearings on a high plane and have reflected the temper of the thoughtful public in an earnest search for truth and judgment.

The general has repeatedly made plain his preoccupation with the events of the Korean battlefield. Those events themselves give additional significance to the testimony that is presented. During the past week the first phase of the present Chinese Communist offensive has spent itself. The character of the attritional defensive war that is our official policy has been admirably illustrated. In a limited sense, as General Van Fleet has pointed out, this phase of the operations has been victorious. That does not mean, unfortunately, that there is in sight any early end to the hostilities.

The debate, whose groundwork has been laid by General MacArthur, must necessarily resolve about the ways and means by which such an end can be achieved. General MacArthur makes it quite clear that he believes that a limited extension of operations will bring that early end. This belief is based on the willingness to accept the risk of formal Soviet intervention and the conviction that such intervention is less likely than many persons fear.

We are unable to concur in these basic beliefs and assumptions. It has not been made convincingly clear, as far as we are concerned, that extended air operations and a naval blockade of Communist China would materially shorten the war or reduce to any appreciable extent our grievous casualties. Likewise, the possibility of formal Soviet intervention is, in our judgment, a graver risk than it appears to be in General MacArthur's calculation.

Similarly, we cannot accept a course of action that would almost certainly estrange us from our major allies. To accept the Korean struggle as a United States operation rather than as an operation of the United Nations would be to destroy all the advance that has been made toward the concept of real collective security. It is quite true that we bear the brunt of the collective action but we dare not, unilaterally, deny its collective character.

With General MacArthur's appeal for tightening the economic ring on Communist China through the imposition of embargoes we are in entire sympathy. There is no excuse for strengthening an enemy that is making war on us, even if our military action in return is limited in scope. So long as we are being shot at it is common prudence to provide no bullets to the enemy.

The Senate hearings are clarifying the question of the equipment, training, and use of the Chinese Nationalist force on Formosa. This force has been organized thus far for essentially defensive purposes, and it is our present policy, wisely, to aid in this effort. It is not seriously argued that the Chinese Nationalists are now in a position to undertake an invasion of the Chinese mainland. The issue in the present debate is whether this force could and should be used for diversionary purposes.

The very sharpness with which the testimony has pointed up real differences in opinion and judgment has also made it possible to see clearly that what is really being debated is tactics rather than grand strategy. There has been no suggestion in these hearings of a retreat to any insular American "fortress." There is no hint of abandonment of our vital obligations in Europe and elsewhere in the world. There is agreement that we must resist Communist aggression. There is, on the other hand, sharp disagreement as to the best means to employ in that resistance in one specific theater of operations. That disagreement can be the means of bringing about the broad exploration of our policy, the correction of some mistakes and the building up of closer integration and greater strength.

What's Ahead: Peace or War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very enlightening debate on the American Forum of the Air on Sunday, April 6, 1951, between the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. The subject was What's Ahead: Peace or War?

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S AHEAD: PEACE OR WAR?

ANNOUNCER. Good afternoon, it's time again to join the American Forum of the Air. Today the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion on the vital topic What's Ahead: Peace or War? Here with us today to discuss this problem is Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who says: "Peace can only be achieved through bipartisan unity at home and cooperation with other free nations." And Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington State, who says: "The indecisive and futile course of action in Korea could lead to a global war."

And now, here is your moderator, who 23 years ago, founded the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. General MacArthur's dramatic and exciting testimony before the United States Senate has focused the spotlight of world attention on American foreign and military policy.

The great debate is on again—in the Congress, in the homes, in the schools, and on every street corner. Everyone asks, "What's ahead: Peace or war?" We pose this vital question to our two distinguished guests, Senator KERR, who has been one of the administration's leading spokesmen on the MacArthur issue, and Senator CAIN, who is the author of two opposing Senate resolutions—one calling for a declaration of war against Communist China, and the other calling for withdrawal of all American troops in Korea.

Now, gentlemen, I would like to open today's discussion with a quote from an article by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Point of No Return," appearing in the May issue of Reader's Digest, America's leading magazine. He says, "World war III can be fought. There is no prospect whatsoever that it could be finished. Nothing is so certain, no prophecy is so sure, as that once world war III started it would spread like a prairie fire and would become an uncontrollable, inconclusive, interminable complex of civil and international wars."

Senator CAIN, would you care to comment on Mr. Lippmann's views?

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, the first public statement I ever made when I left the Army at the end of World War II was that if civilization was to live, war must be abolished. I could not agree with Mr. Lippmann's contention more, but I am completely convinced our present national policy and international policy in Korea can but lead to more war, to more blood, to more death, to more futility and frustration, to more tragedy, and, finally, to complete appeasement.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR.

Senator KERR. Mr. Lippmann has said that world war III can be fought. There is no doubt about that, but I think world war III can be avoided and I think that we are following the policy which has the best chance, first, to avoid world war III; second, to win it, if it is forced upon us. I do not agree with Mr. Lippmann that if world war III is forced upon us, it will mean the end of our country, or of our civilization. Nor can I agree with my distinguished friend here that the present policies of our Government, which in the main have been worked out on a bipartisan basis, lead to confusion and appeasement. On the contrary, they lead to the suppression and prevention of aggression, and that alone—that alone—is what will prevent world war III.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN.

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, there are a number of things that I want to say in my own right with reference to my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma. I want to ask him, What is the administration's policy in Korea?

Senator KERR. I will be glad to give that to the Senator.

Senator CAIN. Please do.

Senator KERR. The administration policy in Korea: First, to punish the aggressor, to limit the conflict, to prevent its spread, to bring an honorable settlement as soon as possible, to remember that Russia is our No. 1 enemy, that the prevention of world war III is our No. 1 objective, and that the passage of each 24 hours is another victory, first, in the avoidance of world war III; second, in the building of greater strength.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN.

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, I think it was on the 27th day of June 1950, more than 10 months ago, that the United States of America and 52 other free nations of this world, members all of the United Nations, signed a solemn resolution that their mission in Korea was to be that of expelling the enemy, whoever that enemy might be, from Korea, and making of Korea a free, a united, and a self-controlled nation. That mission to which the United States lent its name, its power, its prestige, and its courage, has never to this minute been changed, but I will tell you what has been changed: Our administration in the middle of a war has changed its policy. No longer are we Americans together with our Allied friends determined to repel and expel an enemy from Korea, as was our initial determination; but now we have decided to resist aggression. Aggression is bent and determined to destroy freedom in its entirety from the face of the earth, and now we free people, according to what Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, has just said, are content and satisfied to resist an aggressor who is determined to overrun us;

and I say, from my point of view, I think it is an impossible attainment to undertake.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR.

Senator KERR. In resisting and stopping and punishing the aggressor, we do not undertake nor must we ever permit ourselves to be forced into the posture of bringing on a bigger war and a greater conflict in the name of achieving victory in the lesser conflict. Our purpose is to restore peace. Our purpose is to punish aggression. Our purpose is to prevent aggression. And that we can best do on the basis we now operate, rather than on the basis either as proposed by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Washington, to declare war on China, on the one hand, or pull out and abandon Korea on the other.

Moderator GRANIK. Which of those resolutions do you want to comment on, Senator CAIN?

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, at the moment I want to say that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has not told the American audience why the administration seeks to change its mission in the middle of the war. The answer to that is relatively simple—there is no answer for it. ROBERT S. KERR has said that we set out now to punish the aggressor.

Senator KERR. I said, "We set out first to do that." We still seek that. That was our objective and that is our objective.

Senator CAIN. These good people here are entitled to all of the facts in this tragic bloodbath in which we are now engaged in Korea. Admittedly, we punish the enemy, and we punish many badly with what we have and under the restrictions which are imposed upon men, many of whom today are dying because they do not have a proper chance to die for themselves. But the testimony in the last 3 days before the joint committee of the United States Senate is that already there have been suffered in 10 months a million battle casualties and more than a million casualties among civilians, a total of more than 2,000,000 casualties in ten short months on a narrow corridor and peninsula known as Korea. I ask anybody to point out to me, if they can, where, in the annals of all history, there has ever been so much bloodshed, and can they give me one simple, solid answer as to how we are ever going, in high moral and principle terms, if you please, to carry out our mission of making Korea free again if now our sole determination is to keep from being thrown back in the sea by resisting on or about the thirty-eighth parallel. History has no parallel to this fantastic situation.

Senator KERR. If this is a one-man discussion, say so; otherwise let me give the people the facts. There has been terrible tragedy in Korea. There is terrible tragedy in Korea. But what, I ask the Senator from Washington, would it be if this Nation became involved in an all-out war in the mire and the jungle of China. Certainly, there is tragedy in Korea. Certainly, there is bloodshed. But its purpose is to prevent a greater conflict. Its purpose is to punish the aggressor, repel the aggressor, and restore peace. That is the reason why today the Koreans support this effort with fanatical loyalty and devotion. That is the reason that they pray God that the United Nations will not leave there until they have restored peace and unity in Korea, and that is the reason that the people around the world hope that that awful bloodbath will not be visited on the rest of the world. One atomic bomb, one atomic bomb raid in this country, which could easily come about by reason of our pushing the war into China, as advocated by General MacArthur, or the Senator from Washington in his resolution to declare war on China—one atomic bomb attack—could bring to our own country and our own citizens 10 times the bloodshed that has taken place in Korea, and it is to prevent that, Mr. Granik, that we are punishing the aggressor; it is to prevent that that we refuse to permit the spread of the conflict if we can prevent it; that is the reason that we oppose those who would provoke a greater more terrible war.

Senator CAIN. Ten months ago in June the administration was very brave and very bold. It set out to repel an aggressor from Korea. Ten months later that aggressor, many Americans, and many of our allied friends throughout the world are scared to death. They say if we carry the war on to our enemy, all kinds of possibilities may happen. Why, if that is their present decision, did they not take the time to think 10 months ago, when every risk and every hazard to which they make reference today was clearly and apparently and obviously present in front of all of us? The Senator from Oklahoma says that we seek to carry war to the jungle, and I think his words were "in the mire of China." He can find no scrap of testimony or evidence from any authoritative source that that is the desire of any among us, who seek only to defeat the enemy in Korea and carry out our declared intentions last June.

Senator KERR. I would not know what else would be in the mind of one who seeks to declare war in China. I could not know what else would be in the mind of General MacArthur when he said, "I would issue an ultimatum to China that if she did not cease fire we would regard it as a declaration of war." I would not know what else was in the mind of General MacArthur when he seeks to send the troops of Chiang Kai-shek on to the continent to open up a second front. I would not know what else was in the mind of General MacArthur when he said, "Let us bomb the bases of interior China." We must not lose sight of the fact that our objective is peace—not war. We must not lose sight of the fact that to win the peace we must limit the conflict as much as possible and fail and refuse to provoke the conflict into that global structure, which is the thing we all fear and dread and are determined to prevent.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN, would you care to comment on your resolution?

Senator CAIN. Senator ROBERT KERR and I are both very serious and very sincere in our contrary points of view and the American people ought to listen to everybody they have a chance to these days. I feel that to continue to fail to carry out our mission in Korea is to provide the greatest incitement and the greatest likelihood I could possibly define of the coming of world war III because do not fail to bear in mind that 53 nations 10 months ago said that collectively we are going to stamp out the fire of aggression wherever it may crop up, and now our first incitement, our initial undertaking, is taking place in Korea.

Moderator GRANIK. Would you declare war on China? How far would you go?

Senator CAIN. Speaking for myself, we have been heavily engaged in one of the greatest major wars in all history, and particularly with Red China since November of last year. If a man wants to recognize the obvious, certainly, I think if he is a Member of the Congress of the United States, he ought to be willing to declare war in order that as a Member of Congress he can have something to do with the management of that war. I am a sturdy Republican, a very positive one, but I do not criticize the President of the United States for what I sometimes think is mismanagement when I, as a Member of the Senate, have not had an opportunity to assume any responsibility for the management of those undertakings. Of course, I would declare war.

Senator KERR. Not even Senator CAIN would say we went to Korea to declare war on China. We went to Korea to avoid war with Russia. The only way I know of to carry out an objective is to carry it out, and the only way to do that is to know what it is, and not what it is not, and therefore we must not lose sight of the limited objective in Korea by casting the god of war out yonder to another and different and violently opposed objective, which would be not only becoming involved in a world-wide struggle, but deliberately provoking it ourselves.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN.

Senator CAIN. We did not go to Korea to declare war, as Senator ROBERT KERR says.

Senator KERR. On Red China.

Senator CAIN. Wait a minute. We went to Korea to get rid of our enemy at that time. On, I think it was the 26th day of November, Red China entered that war against us and our allies, and since that time they crossed the Yalu River, the United States has been opposed, and our allies in Korea, by two enemies—the North Koreans and the Red Chinese—and we still have our initial mission of repelling that enemy and restoring freedom, and the greatest people who suffer today, sad as our tragedy today is in America, and Great Britain, France, and Turkey, and the rest, are the Koreans. More than a million of them have died in this accordion war that not only has gone up and down that peninsula four or five times, but Senator ROBERT KERR is the last man to tell me how many more times. It is going to go up and down until the Chinese either give up, or until they offer terms at the peace table unrelated to the conflict in Korea and out of which comes appeasement on the part of free people.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. No matter how many Red Chinese are in Korea—and I remember back yonder about the last of November MacArthur said that before they struck us there were about 60,000 of them, and after they struck us he said there were a million of them. He was just as badly in error in the second instance as he was in the first. But, regardless of how many there are, it is not 2 percent of their available manpower, and if we went into China, if we carried the war to China, if we declared war on China, if we issued the ultimatum to China, then we ourselves would be deliberately provoking the all-out war with all the manpower of China, not 2 percent of it, as we now have in Korea and where we have the opportunity to punish them sufficiently to where they themselves will either seek or accept responsible peace and refrain from aggression, but if we ourselves carried it to them we would open up that which Walter Lippmann described so dramatically. While I do not agree with its pessimistic finality, I do realize that it would be terrible beyond all description.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to answer that?

Senator CAIN. Mr. KERR knows there are many answers for some of what he has said just now and he knows that I have them. He talks of intelligence and by inference condemns General MacArthur when we know that intelligence to be effective cannot be collected by the commander on his immediate front but comes out of the chancelleries of the world and through our Central Intelligence Agency over here. It is for those who are in authority to send intelligence to the commander, and Bob KERR ought to know that.

Senator KERR. Those who would expect that from MacArthur do not know MacArthur.

Moderator GRANIK. The first question? Go ahead, sir.

Colonel SMITH. I am J. R. Smith, a retired Army colonel. My question is addressed to Senator KERR.

Ever since 1933 there has been constant appeasement of Soviet Russia by our administration and State Department. Now Socialist Britain is also favoring it. Do you believe such tactics insure future peace for the United States?

Senator KERR. I do not believe either statement. I am positive that appeasement is destined to failure, whoever practices it. But anybody who thinks that we are appeasing in Korea certainly does not know what is going on and, as I said awhile ago, I do not agree with the man's premise. I deny and I defy and I decry appeasement by this Government at any time, at any place, for any purpose.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN?

Senator CAIN. You want me to answer that?

Moderator GRANIK. Yes.

Senator CAIN. I could not agree more with Colonel Smith, who made that statement. All we have to do, in other words, is to look at statistics, which are important occasionally. How many Communists were there on the face of the earth in 1945? How many more are there today in the Far East than there were in 1945? How many have been added since the Secretary of State went out into the Far East to force and require a coalition government between the Communists and the Nationalists? You could no more do that than you would make oil and water mix. Of course, I think there has been appeasement.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. I am amused at the statement of the Senator from Washington that by reason of the fact that there are more Communists today it necessarily follows that we have appeased them. I want to say that the farmers in Oklahoma have been fighting the green bugs all my life and there are more of them this spring than I have ever known.

Senator CAIN. Then that is just as little a compliment to the management that you exercise in Oklahoma as there is in the State Department.

Senator KERR. That is a recognition of the fact that green bugs are like Communists.

Senator CAIN. Please talk about China.

Senator KERR. That was not what the question was.

Moderator GRANIK. Another question?

Mr. GETTELSOHN. My name is Bernard B. Gettelsohn, a manufacturer. My question is to Senator CAIN.

If your resolution on declaring war on Red China is adopted, will we have the full support of the members of the United Nations?

Senator CAIN. That matter must be decided in the future. So far, there has been an unusual—I find it difficult to understand why, because I think they, collectively, and that includes us, too, are likely to commit collective suicide. But the free nations of the world, those who are supposed to be engaged with us in Korea, have either been very reluctant in their contributions or, thus far, have not contributed anything at all. I believe in working with all the free nations of the world, but it is a two-way street, and if we seek and want to live, the time has come when there must be equal contributions from equal partners.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR.

Senator KERR. We know that we would not have our allies, we would not have the American people. They do not want to declare a war on China. That would be the way first not to commit collective suicide, because our allies would refuse to join us in that self-imposed hara-kiri.

Moderator GRANIK. We will take another question.

Mr. HAWVER. My name is Carl F. Hawver. I am employed in the Capitol, and I have spent some time in Russia. This question is addressed to Senator KERR.

Can we reasonably expect true peace under any conditions short of defeat of the communistic stronghold in Russia?

Senator KERR. We can expect true peace when we and our allies have reached that stage of collective strength that Russia recognizes that to attack us is suicide for her. When we have achieved that unity and that collective strength we can compel the Soviet before the bar of world judgment. We can compel peace with responsible guaranties, and only, however, from the position and foundation of that united strength that will enable us to be in position to back up what we say and compel them to back up what they say.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN?

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, I think there is a chance for peace with Russia, and on the face of the earth in the future, but that peace can only come when the aggressors, imperialist Communists everywhere in the world become totally convinced that the collective forces and determination and spirit and courage of the free people are sufficiently strong to make any war undertaking unlikely. It is for that reason I keep my chief preoccupation on the initial undertaking of freedom to stamp out the fire of aggression on the basis of the way in which we are presently and have been going for 10 months. I think that world war III is very, very likely, and I am sad about it.

Senator KERR. I am glad Senator CAIN based his hope for peace on that collective strength when the collective forces are strong enough because that is the structure that we now have in a small way; that is the structure we must build; that is the structure we must keep.

Moderator GRANIK. Another question?

Mr. LEVY. My name is Warren Levy, New York City.

Senator CAIN, you have asked for a declaration of war against Communist China.

Senator CAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEVY. Are you actually willing to risk a war with Soviet Russia through such a declaration?

Senator CAIN. I am much more interested in winning the war, young man, in which we are engaged as an individual citizen of this Republic. As an individual Member of the United States Senate, I think we ought to declare war, but, what is much more important, for that imparts a moral question, we ought to get on with winning the war in which we have, and now are, engaged in and in which more than 2,000,000 people in 10 short months have been destroyed in one way or another.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for summaries. Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. In answer to the question, What is ahead: peace or war? I believe that if the American people will truly work, it can be peace. However, this cannot result from wishful thinking. It will not come about by accident. Bernard Baruch has said, "To win the peace, we must wage the peace." Paul G. Hoffman has said, "I contend that we still have the opportunity to avoid a general war, if we begin at once to wage the peace with imagination, boldness, and a sense of dedication."

The late Senator Vandenberg, who made one of the most heroic efforts for peace of all times, said, "Pearl Harbor ended one era. Hiroshima began another. Therefore, none of us can face the facts of life and deny that a nation hereafter can defend its peace alone. The peaceful nations of the world must defend their peace together. They must covenant in advance against the aggressor of tomorrow."

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, Senator KERR.

Senator CAIN, may we have your summary, please?

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, 53 United Nations began a crusade of faith and hope last June, 10 months ago. They announced to the world that they would restore freedom to free men and women and children in Korea. This declaration electrified and gave new hope and faith to enslaved people everywhere. In 10 long, bloody months that hope and faith has largely turned to doubt and fear because the United Nations have failed to carry out their stated determination in Korea. I believe down deep inside that if we fail to restore freedom in Korea that freedom everywhere throughout the universe will stand in peril of being completely destroyed in my own lifetime. The challenge of the future lies in the present, which is today, in Korea, where we must do so much more, and our allies too, than we have undertaken to grapple with in 10 long months of war.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on What's ahead: peace or war? Our speakers have been Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington.

General MacArthur's Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to the New York Times for an excellent summation and analysis of the testimony of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. The following article appeared in the Times on Sunday, May 6, 1951:

SEVEN ISSUES—MACARTHUR RAISES THEM

At 10:18 last Thursday morning General of the Army Douglas MacArthur strode into the Senate caucus room on Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C. After a few preliminaries, Senate guards cleared the room of all outsiders. Members of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees took seats at a long walnut table. Other Senators crowded around. Then, in answer to a question by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, General MacArthur began to testify.

What followed on Thursday and through Friday and yesterday added up to one of the most extraordinary episodes in American history—an episode fraught with grave meaning for the United States and much of the world. In those 3 days General MacArthur spelled out a bill of particulars against his Commander in Chief, President Truman, against his military superiors, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and against the structure and execution of American foreign policy. His testimony—and the heat and emotion that his personality generates—made the other great debate over troops to Europe seem like a minor political disagreement.

By late yesterday, most of General MacArthur's testimony was in. The administration—through the questioning by Senators who support its point of view—had developed the main lines of the administration rebuttal. That rebuttal will be fully developed this week when the Joint Chiefs of Staff give their testimony.

The dramatic hearings in Washington took place against a grim background in Korea.

There, the Chinese Communists—whose intervention in the Korean war was the touchstone that set off the debate in Washington—brought their spring offensive to a climax. The offensive was beaten back and at the week end the front was stabilized, but all signs pointed to another bitter-end effort by the Chinese to throw the UN forces out of Korea.

THE SETTING

The roots of the MacArthur debate run deep. The controversy ranges over the entire conduct of America's far-eastern policy since World War II. Its bitterness has mounted rapidly in the 10 months since the outbreak, in Korea, of actual warfare in the Far East.

The fundamental argument of the Republicans in the debate is this: The administration's far-eastern policy has been weak all along. The State Department's softness toward communism paved the way for the Communist conquest of China and encouraged the Communist aggression in Korea. Now the administration is making victory in Korea impossible by shying away from strong countermeasures against the Chinese Communists.

The fundamental position of the administration is this: The Communist gains in the Far East are the outgrowth of historic forces which the United States could not entirely control. Communist aggression must be resisted, but if possible the Korean war must be limited, lest the west's capacity to defend the more vital theater of Western Europe be imperiled. Enlargement of the Korean conflict might lead to world war III, for which the United States and its allies are not yet prepared.

This was the context in which the controversy came to a head 25 days ago, with President Truman's abrupt dismissal of General MacArthur from the Korean command for publicly attacking administration policy.

The formal arena of debate is an investigation of the MacArthur affair by the Senate's combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees—altogether 25 men, 14 of them Democrats, 11 Republicans. In preliminaries to the hearings last week there was maneuvering for advantage by both sides in the debate.

MAC ARTHUR'S SUPPORTERS

On the MacArthur side Senator ROBERT A. TAFT threw his full support behind the general's policies. The general's aide, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, said General MacArthur intended to take his case to the country by making "as many public appearances as possible." On the administration side Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Warren Austin, Republican and chief American delegate to the UN, entered strong defenses of the President. Mr. Truman said he was confident the people would support him when all the facts were known.

From the combined committees there came the first of the many documents that are expected to figure in the controversy. On Tuesday the committee released a report, held secret for nearly 4 years, on a 1947 mission to Korea by Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer. The Republicans say the report supports their case, since General Wedemeyer warned in 1947 of North Korean aggression. On Wednesday the committee released a record of the talks between General MacArthur and Mr. Truman at Wake Island last October. The administration says the record supports its case, since General MacArthur predicted at Wake that the Chinese Communists would not intervene in Korea.

When the hearings opened Thursday the atmosphere in the caucus room was solemn. The Senators were elaborately polite with the general and with each other. Most of the questioners began with tributes to his record. The general, smoking his pipe, was calm and dignified. He frequently made little speeches, with flashes of the MacArthur rhetoric. Occasionally he displayed emotion, as when he spoke of the bloodshed in Korea.

The line of questioning was clearly partisan. On the whole the Republicans—ALEXANDER WILEY, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, HARRY P. CAIN—put questions which brought out General MacArthur's long service in the Far East, the abruptness of his dismissal, the difficulties of his assignment in Korea. The Democrats—BRIEN MCMAHON, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, ESTES KEFAUVER—questioned him searchingly. Mr. KEFAUVER was soft-spoken but insistent, in the manner that became familiar during his recent crime investigation. Mr. MCMAHON was on the offensive. His terse questions seemed to nettle the general. Mr. MCMAHON, on his own initiative but with the administration's good wishes, had worked 4 days with his staff drawing up his line of attack.

In this atmosphere the Senate inquiry floated back and forth over the entire range of issues in debate.

THE ISSUES

Out of the mass of testimony—well in excess of 100,000 words by late yesterday—there emerged seven great issues between General MacArthur and the administration. General MacArthur threw down the challenge on those issues; the line of questioning by Senators supporting the administration indicated the essentials of what the reply to the general will be. These are the issues, and the indicated answers:

1. General MacArthur took the position firmly that his responsibility was that of a theater commander and that responsibility for decisions on global matters was not his.

Despite the general's disavowal of the global view, he recommended stern measures be taken against China. This program was based on two assumptions: First, that the policy he recommended would bring quick victory in Korea, and, second, that it would not necessarily bring Russia into the war. These assumptions underlie the second and third issues.

2. General MacArthur argued that the present stalemate is intolerable, and that steps toward decisive victory in Korea must be taken now. The indicated answer is this: That the program might not bring victory at all, but instead might embroil us in a long and major war with China.

3. General MacArthur argues that Russia would not shape her decisions on whether to make war against the West on the basis of what happens in the Korean war. The indicated answer is this: That we must not take any risk of precipitating world war III in which Russia would strike at the European bastion.

The question of the risk of Russian intervention led to the exploration of the fourth issue:

4. General MacArthur said that the enemy was communism all over the world and not Soviet Russia. The indicated answer is this: That the main enemy is the Kremlin, and that all action must be determined on the basis of the best way to resist that enemy.

THE OTHER ISSUES

These fundamental differences lay behind the other issues that came out sharply in the testimony:

5. The general said that his proposals should be adopted even if our allies objected, though that might mean we would have to act on our own. The indicated answer is this: That a prime Russian objective is to isolate us from our allies and that we must not allow that to happen.

6. General MacArthur said that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Nation's highest military authorities, agreed in essentials with his program. The indicated answer is this: That the Joint Chiefs, taking the Korean war in the context of the global political and military considerations, disagree strongly.

7. General MacArthur said that he had the right to go over the head of his military and civilian superiors and appeal to the judgment of the people. The indicated answer is this: In the nature of military duty an officer must carry out the orders from his superiors to the best of his ability.

Here in detail are the background and the high lights of the testimony on these seven basic issues:

1. GLOBAL STRATEGY

The background: Administration policy is to combat communism by concentrating defenses in key areas. The administration's position is that in carrying out its policy it must plan and act on a world-wide basis, that any move in one part of the world must be considered in the light of its effects on other parts.

In his speech to Congress on April 19 General MacArthur said "the issues are global, and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector oblivious to those of another is to court disaster for the whole." Nevertheless, in the remainder of his speech, he laid all his emphasis on Asia, and did not once refer to other areas threatened by Communist aggression.

The testimony: Democratic Senators, particularly Senators MCMAHON and KEFAUVER, doggedly pursued the question of allocating America's strength on a global basis. This exchange took place with Senator MCMAHON:

Question. "General, * * * I am thinking, if this war (against Russia) has to be fought, about the total and complete victory * * *. Now, general, do you think that we are ready to withstand the Russian attack in Western Europe today?"

Answer. "Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area. My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I don't pretend to be an authority on those things."

About the bomb

Senator MCMAHON, who is chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, directed this line of questioning to the atomic bomb:

Question. "Have you any intelligence * * * about Russian potentialities in * * * atomic weapons?"

Answer. "Very little."

Question. "Have you sought to get that information."

Answer. "Not at all."

Pursuing the question, Senator MCMAHON asked:

Question. "I want to find out how you propose in your own mind to defend the American Nation * * *."

Answer. "That doesn't happen to be my responsibility, Senator * * * the Joint Chiefs of Staff * * * are working day and night for an over-all solution to the global problem. * * *"

Question. "Have you thought about the possibility of the Russians launching a surreptitious attack on the United States and its vital production centers through atomic sabotage?"

Answer. "In a general way only. Once again, that isn't my theater of responsibility, Senator."

2. KOREAN STRATEGY

The background: From the beginning of the war the administration position has been that the Communists' aggression must be fought within Korea. The policy is to exploit the UN's great advantage in fire power, inflict a bloody toll from the Communist forces, blunt their will to fight, and thus hold open the possibility of a peaceful settlement. The administration stands firmly against what General Bradley calls the proposals of dissatisfied and impatient strategists.

All during the war General MacArthur has protested these policies. In his speech before Congress he spelled out his demands. They

are: To destroy by bombing the Communist bases in the Manchurian sanctuary; to lift the restrictions on use of the Nationalist troops on Formosa; to throw an economic and naval blockade along the China coast. In his testimony last week he made an important addition. He said he would have served Peiping with an ultimatum saying that if the Communists did not promptly accept a cease-fire they would put themselves at war with the UN.

The testimony: As to bombing Manchuria, this exchange took place:

Question. "You said if you had been permitted to bomb [the Chinese Communists] before they crossed the Yalu"——

Answer. "If I had been permitted to bomb them before they crossed the Yalu, Senator, they would never have crossed. * * *"

As to Chiang's troops, this was part of the General's testimony:

Question. "What [do] you think is the real strength of the Generalissimo's forces on Formosa?

Answer. "The Generalissimo has probably in the neighborhood of a half million troops. The personnel is excellent. * * * Their material equipment is spotty. They lack artillery. They lack trucks. * * * My own estimate would be [that] after the material [American aid] was there, that those troops would be in very good shape * * * within 4 months."

Question. "How should Chiang's troops be used?"

Answer. "Such a decision should be left to their commander [Chiang]. The possibility of a huge amphibious force landing all that crowd on the mainland might not be feasible."

As to a blockade of China, the General's testimony included this exchange:

Question. "Isn't your proposal * * * the same strategy by which Americans achieved victory over the Japanese in the Pacific?"

Answer. "Yes, sir. In the Pacific we bypassed them. We closed in. * * * The supplies for the maintenance of the Japanese armed forces ceased to reach Japan. * * * Now, the problem with China is quite similar. * * * It is an economy of poverty, and the minute you disrupt it you will turn great segments of its population into disorder and discontent."

Again and again General MacArthur stressed that his proposals would end the Korean "stalemate" and the "slaughter" of American soldiers. He said: "Where does the responsibility of that blood rest? This I am sure—it is not going to rest on my shoulders. * * * I shrink * * * at this continuous slaughter of men in Korea. * * * If you go on indefinitely, you are perpetuating a slaughter such as I have never heard of in the history of mankind." He denounced the "inhibitions" on American air and sea power as "appeasement."

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts Republican, raised the question of whether General MacArthur's proposals would work. This was the exchange:

Question. "If the * * * steps which you recommended do not bring the action in Korea to a successful conclusion, what do you recommend should be done next?"

Answer. "Senator, I would wait and see."

Strong challenges to General MacArthur's specific proposals for Korea policy are expected this week, when Secretary Marshall, General Bradley and the Joint Chiefs state the administration's case.

3. RUSSIA'S COURSE

The background: The Truman administration feels there is a grave risk that the Soviet Union might enter the war if the strong measures against her Chinese ally, particularly the bombing of Chinese bases, are taken. The fear is that such action might bring the Moscow-Peiping alliance of 1950 into play. That alliance says that if Japan or any country allied with her attacks either treaty member the other party will immediately render military or other aid with all means at its disposal. General MacArthur in his speech before Congress on April 19 said that the "Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves."

The testimony: The questioning of General MacArthur at first concerned Russia's capabilities. In answer to a question by Chairman RUSSELL, General MacArthur said: "The Soviet in the Far East * * * is dependent for * * * support almost entirely from European Russia. * * * [The Tran-Siberian Railway] line is strained to the very utmost now to maintain on a normal peace basis the forces which the Soviet maintains in Siberia."

What would Moscow do?

Senator MCMAHON pressed questions about how Russia might react if the MacArthur policy were carried out:

Question. "I am to understand * * * that you discount the danger of Russia coming into the war * * * if we should bomb bases in Manchuria?"

Answer. "There is no certainty that Russia will come in. There is no certainty that she will not come in. There is no certainty that anything that happens in Korea will influence her. * * * You have to take a certain degree of risk."

There was discussion of a statement by General MacArthur, as it appeared in the documents on the Wake Island conference between the President and the general that, "We are no longer fearful of their (Peiping's) intervention."

Question. "You did not believe at one time that the Communists of China would come into the conflict in Korea?"

Answer. "I doubted it."

Question. "They did. You now doubt that the Soviets (will enter the war if we attack China). If you happen to be wrong this time and we get into all-out war, I want to find out how you propose in your own mind to defend the American Nation against the war?"

Answer. "That doesn't happen to be my responsibility, Senator."

4. THE MAIN ENEMY

The background: The administration regards the Soviet Union as the chief menace. The argument is that Russia, with its combination of nationalist expansionism and military power, poses the immediate danger of the fall of Western Europe, whose industrial strength would turn the world balance against the free world. In this view, Peiping is closely allied with Moscow at the moment but there remains at least a hope that a wedge can be driven between the two Communist allies.

The MacArthur view is that the danger is communism, wherever it is. In his view communism breeds imperialism in any country, and therefore the Russian threat does not take precedence over the Chinese threat.

Testimony: Senator MCMAHON had this exchange with the general:

Question. "Who is overwhelmingly the main enemy * * *?"

Answer. "Communism—in my opinion."

Question. "General, where is the source and brains of this conspiracy?"

Answer. "How would I know?"

Question. "Would you think that the Kremlin was the place that might be the loci?"

Answer. "I might say that it is one. * * *"

Question. "Would you say it was * * * the main place?"

Answer. "I think world opinion would so locate it."

In questioning by Senator FULBRIGHT there arose the question of Yugoslavia, Communist but anti-Russian, which is getting American aid. This was the exchange:

Question. "I thought of (the main enemy) as being Russian, an imperialist Russia. * * *"

Answer. "I disagree with you completely."

Question. "If the country. * * * in fact is antagonistic to (Russia), then I do not see why, such as in the case of Yugoslavia, it is not to our benefit to assist them. * * *"

Answer. "I have expressed my belief, Senator."

5. OUR ALLIES

The background: This issue of our relation with our allies arises out of a fundamental tenet of the administration's foreign policy: that world peace and American security depend upon collective security. The State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe the United States needs the manpower and the industrial strength of our allies to help contain Communist agression, and therefore we must seek to preserve—if possible—a united policy front with those nations fighting with us in Korea and our partners in the Atlantic Pact.

Some opposition leaders strongly dissent from this policy. Many Republicans have also been critical of the U. N. role in Korea, charging that while the United States did most of the fighting, other U. N. members were ready to appease the Chinese Communists. They resented the strong representation our U. N. allies have made against any bombing of China, and opposition to our Formosa policy.

It has been widely believed that General MacArthur shared these views. In his address to the joint meeting of Congress, he made no mention of the United Nations; and in the letter to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, which led to his recall, he complained that here we fight Europe's war with arms, while the diplomats there still fight it with words.

The testimony: Administration supporters closely questioned General MacArthur on this issue. This exchange took place with Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island.

Question: "[Your] theory that we could win a quick victory * * * simply by * * * bombarding the [China] coast cities and in establishing blockade would * * * indicate we would proceed alone and not with any help from the other United Nations?"

Answer: "I can give you no testimony about the United Nations, Senator."

Question: "What would be your expectation?"

Answer: "My hope would be * * * that the United Nations would see the wisdom * * * of that course, but if they did not, I still believe that the interest of the United States * * * would require our action."

Question: "Alone?"

Answer: "Alone if necessary."

On Friday, when Senator MCMAHON pressed this line of inquiry, the General modified his position somewhat:

Question: "I am sure, General, that you do not underrate the importance of having our allies with us."

Answer: "I would say indubitably it is advantageous for us to have all of the allies that we can get. * * * We have plenty of allies, but the numbers of them do not contribute in the same generous and noble way in which we do."

6. THE JOINT CHIEFS

The background is that the administration maintains that all of the actions taken by President Truman—including the dismissal of General MacArthur—had the full support of the Chiefs of Staff of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and their chairman, Gen. Omar Bradley. On April 17, General Bradley stated: "Any recommended course of action which would enlarge the present war is contrary to our best interests and, by jeopardizing world peace, ultimately would threaten our security."

General MacArthur told the joint meeting of Congress on April 19: "From a military standpoint, [my] views have been shared fully in the past by practically every military leader concerned in the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff." Senator TAFT has said, "The Joint Chiefs are absolutely under the control of the administration and their recommendations are what the administration demanded that they make."

The testimony: The key document introduced to support General MacArthur's contention was an extract from a report dated January 12, 1951, which the Joint Chiefs of Staff had sent to the Secretary of Defense. This was how the report was introduced at the hearings:

Question "(Senator RUSSELL). Every member of the committee wishes to develop just how the controversy (over your recommendations) arose, whether it was through a formal request or through discussion with (the Joint Chiefs) * * *."

Answer. "The position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and my own, so far as I know, were practically identical. On January 12 the Joint Chiefs of Staff presented a study to the Secretary of Defense embodying these conditions."

General MacArthur then read out of a four-paragraph extract from that report in which the Joint Chiefs proposed: An economic blockade of China, a naval blockade depending upon circumstances, and removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance over China and on operations of the Chinese Nationalist forces.

Senators RUSSELL and MACMAHON apparently did not agree that the extract from the report proved that the Joint Chiefs supported MacArthur. Senator RUSSELL pointed out that the General had recommended bombing the Manchurian bases. It was also noted that the UN forces were badly battered last January and evacuation was being discussed. This exchange took place:

Question. "There is quite a difference between reconnaissance and attack, is there not? * * * Did the Joint Chiefs ever suggest that [the Chinese] bases be attacked?"

Answer. "Not that I know of."

Senator MCMAHON implied that the report contained conditions which have not yet been disclosed.

Question: "There is certainly the possibility that [the J. C. S. report] was based upon the contingency of a forced evacuation of Korea. That possibility existed, didn't it, General?"

Answer. "That possibility existed; yes, sir."

7. A SOLDIER'S DUTY

The background: The Administration contends that General MacArthur, as a subordinate, was required to carry out the orders of the Joint Chiefs and of his Commander in Chief without public protest, and that he openly and repeatedly violated his orders. For example, the General was twice ordered not to make any public foreign and military policy statements until they had been cleared by Washington. Yet last March he wrote a letter to House Republican JOSEPH W. MARTIN which called for a reorientation of U. S. military policy—a letter which was made public by Mr. MARTIN without objection from General MacArthur.

General MacArthur maintains that he has always followed orders to the letter. Through his aide, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, he has said the President gave him carte blanche to say "anything he wished" about the Korean war and that he did not have the "faintest idea" why he was dismissed.

The testimony: Senator MACMAHON tried to draw out General MacArthur on whether or not it was his place to challenge his military superiors.

Question: "Assuming for the sake of discussion that subsequent testimony brings out real differences between you and the Joint Chiefs * * * would you then be prepared to admit that the Joint Chiefs' judgment is better than yours and that the American people would be well advised to follow the judgment of the Joint Chiefs? * * *"

Answer. "If [my recommendations] disagreed with those of higher authority, the question of the judgment of that higher authority is not within my hands. * * * That is a matter for public opinion."

Question. "Do you consider, General, that it comes within the province of a theater commander to register publicly with persons in political life, or out of it, for that matter, his differences of opinion while he is still in active charge of the theater?"

Answer. "I believe the theater commander has the responsibility of registering his views as he might see fit, if they are honest views and not in contradiction to any implementing directives that he may have received. * * *"

Question. "Do I take it that you would defend the right of a brigadier general on your staff to give his opinions as to the policy that was proceeding or that was being proceeded with by the Government of the United States?"

Answer. "I wouldn't have a brigadier general or anyone else on my staff that didn't freely and frankly give me his opinions. * * *"

Question. "No, General, we are not talking about the same thing, I don't think. * * *. What I was raising was the question of advisability, if not the propriety, of any subordinate military officer to take his differences of opinion, on a Government policy, when he is in the military chain of command, to people in political life. * * * [For example, your] letter to Mr. MARTIN."

Answer. "It seems to me that the American people are entitled to certain basic facts. * * * I do not believe in the gag rule, if that is what you are talking about. * * *"

Question. "General, you are not going to, by that statement, without a mild dissent from me, place in this record that I am in favor of what you choose to denominate as 'the gag rule.' "

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the House recently reduced funds for the Voice of America. As evidence of the fact the funds should be reduced, the following article by Fulton Lewis, appearing in the Times-Herald, May 3, 1951, is presented:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

It may come as a surprise to you, but as taxpayers you have been investing millions of dollars in an organization that breaks laws, violates all the basic principles of good business operation, and is bossed by individuals with no previous experience in handling large numbers of people or huge sums of money.

Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State, and his aide, C. M. Hulten, appeared before the House Appropriations Committee recently and presented a picture of ineptness, mismanagement and disregard of congressional instructions. They run the Voice of America, successor to Elmer Davis' weird wartime office of war information.

Barrett and Hulten are angling for something like $115,000,000 so they can convince the rest of the world that the United States is kindly toward it.

In private business both would be cashiered in 6 months if they wasted stockholders' money the way they toss our tax dollars around.

For instance, despite explicit orders from Congress, they hired 116 additional employees for the management branch of the Voice at a time when an efficiency report labeled the office overstaffed. They wasted $70,000.

In August the Voice started to film a two-reeler called U. N. Aids the Republic of Korea. Seven months later the film was still incomplete, despite the expenditure of thousands of dollars and the use of hundreds of people who apparently just shuffled the film from department to department. By the time the so-called propaganda experts, Barrett and Hulten, got through with it the war in Korea had moved so fast the two-reeler was obsolete.

The Voice is supposed to sell the United States to Russian and iron-curtain country citizens. There is no positive evidence that the Voice ever actually reaches any of these individuals, although there are schemes afoot to put radio propaganda transmitters aboard merchant ships and on remote mountain peaks. The main trouble seems to be that the Russian peasants not only lack radios, but also lack electricity to run them if they were made available.

Actually, broadcasts to iron-curtain citizens are secondary to the Voice. Most of the talking has been to Americans. This baffled House Members, and they quizzed Barrett and Hulten in detail.

They found out that from July 1, 1949 to January 30, 1951, a total of 364 speeches were made in 29 States, including Washington, D. C., by Voice people.

This led Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, New York Democrat, to remark to Barrett: "So far as your problem is concerned, I had no idea that you were in the speech-making business to Americans at a time when there should be a lot of speeches and broadcasting directed to those outside the country and behind the iron curtain."

In all, 114 people took part in propagandizing the United States about the Voice, some speaking more than once. Of course, those on the Federal payroll got paid for their gabbing and most, although Barrett was vague about it, got travel pay while touring the United States to convince citizens that peace is impossible unless we fill the foreign air waves with gabble.

Besides diverting funds to pay unauthorized help, the Voice managers diverted cash for building projects. Such activities are violations of authorized Government procedures, to say nothing of being contrary to sensible business practices.

Both Barrett and Hulten are full of imaginative plans for the Voice. Yet neither one, according to their own admissions, has any idea what is going on in their agency. They set up regulations and issue orders calling for progress reports on multi-million-dollar construction projects, but field managers simply ignore them. This failed to trouble either Barrett or Hulten.

On the basis of their own testimony, a conservative estimate is that in private business practice Barrett and Hulten would shove a normal corporation into bankruptcy in 6 months. If we really want to fix the Russians, we ought to lend Barrett and Hulten

to them. In 6 months the Kremlin propaganda machine would be off the air, and we'd all enjoy the silence.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the subcommittee now studying the 1952 appropriations for the State Department will consider these facts, and take all steps necessary to stop these highly improper acts.

Witch Doctors in the Upper Colorado River Basin States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, since the timely demise of the central Arizona project bill, certain figures in the upper Colorado River Basin States have carried on a wailing bee over the casket, and have conducted themselves in a manner that leaves their professed sorrow open to grave suspicion.

The Arizona bill (H. R. 1500) was mercifully exterminated in the House Interior Committee by a vote of 16 to 8. The large majority of committee members believed that the legislation contained legal questions that should be answered through litigation before further consideration by the committee of the proposed project.

During the coma in which the Arizona bill lingered, not a single upper basin State doctor appeared at its bedside to minister to it. Yet, immediately after its death, at least two upper basin doctors rushed into print with cries of horror and remorse.

The licenses of these upper basin medicine men should, therefore, be examined with a critical eye. Do they represent the true attitude and policy of all the people of the upper basin States?

Let us consider this situation.

The bill's corpse was not cold before Arizona apostles, in the guise of Attorney Charles A. Carson and Gov. Howard Pyle, scurried up to Denver, calling loudly for aid and comfort. They found it in the hogans of John Geoffrey Will, secretary of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and Judge Clifford H. Stone, the Colorado member of the commission.

For years these two star-gazers of the upper basin waterways—Will and Stone—have built ill-advised careers on a hate-California platform. Now they saw another fine opportunity to cry out despairingly that California had dealt upper basin progress a mortal blow by leading the successful fight against the fantastic Arizona project.

Shortly thereafter Arizona and Colorado newspapers were carrying headlines stating that four upper basin States had decided to back the defunct Arizona project, and would join in a fight against California.

Aside from the fact that this story was a falsehood, the question must be asked: "What have the upper basin States to gain in a hate-California campaign inspired by professional fanatics like Will and Stone?"

California is not seeking a fight with the upper basin States. California sincerely seeks to make friends in the upper basin, and wishes to formulate a program that will benefit all States of the Colorado River Basin.

The assertions made by Will and Stone that California has designs on a share of Colorado River water belonging to the upper basin States are utterly idiotic and are completely refuted by California's long-established record. These untrue statements are issued only for the purpose of deceiving the people of the upper basin. I feel certain that the upper basin States will not be hoodwinked into believing something that is not only utterly false but could not possibly be accomplished under the law.

The fact is that four upper basin States did not agree to back the deceased Arizona project. Contrary to the stories issued by Will and Stone, the representatives of Wyoming at the Denver conclave refused to endorse a resolution approving the Arizona project.

Wyoming's State engineer, L. C. Bishop, pointed out that approval of the Will-Stone resolution "would be at the request of Arizona for use in its fight against California."

Mr. Bishop stated, as reported in the Wyoming State Tribune of April 29:

> We have consistently avoided taking sides in this controversy and especially so in this instance where only Arizona was heard.
>
> It was my opinion then, and I am still of the opinion, that a resolution such as this only adds fuel to the fire and in the long run accomplishes no good purpose and, in fact, might prove detrimental to Wyoming's interests.

Attorney General Harnsberger, my legal adviser, and Austin P. Russell, my engineering adviser, were in full agreement with the action taken (by Wyoming) at the Denver meeting.

Will and Stone sought to conceal Wyoming's attitude from the press. Nor did they tell their listeners that the Tax Foundation in Washington, D. C., the New York Tax Foundation, the Wyoming Taxpayers Association, the Oklahoma Public Expenditure Council, the National Grange, the American Federation of Labor, and countless other important national and State organizations, including the Nation's leading industrialists, bankers, and manufacturers have exposed the Arizona scheme to mulct the taxpayers of this country of billions of dollars to aid a few selfish landowners in central Arizona.

I believe the true statesmen of the upper basin, and in all reclamation States, will look with suspicion on men who advise them to bet on a scratched horse. Witch Doctor Carson and Radio Crooner Pyle enlisted the aid of Will and Stone because they knew that Will and Stone would tub thump for any proposition, regardless of its truthfulness, aimed at California.

These Arizona promoters are the mouthpieces of big landowners who despoiled Arizona's water resources, and now as the economic bloodhounds close in on them, want the Nation's taxpayers to bail them out with gifts of billions of dollars.

I feel sure that the upper-basin States will beware of charlatans who are among them, mouthing false propaganda that would lead all western reclamation into a sickness from which it might never recover.

Marshall Gives Aid and Comfort to the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in Monday's testimony before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the other body, the following colloquy occurred between Chairman RUSSELL and Secretary Marshall:

> Senator RUSSELL. Now, General, as a military man with distinguished service to your country over a long period of years, I would like to get your professional opinion as well as your views as Secretary of Defense as to whether or not the Chinese Reds can be driven out of Korea and Korea pacified without the implementing General MacArthur recommends?
>
> General MARSHALL. When you use the expression "driven out of Korea," I assume you mean all of Korea, both north and south.
>
> Senator RUSSELL. Yes, sir; I mean to carry out the original directive of the United Nations.
>
> General MARSHALL. I should say that if the Chinese Communists continue in force in North Korea with the potential of additional reinforcements that might be made available, and with our situation where we visualize no considerable reinforcement of the United Nations army, that they could not be driven out of North Korea, and I have my own doubts as to whether the actions recommended by General MacArthur would bring the conflict to a victorious end.
>
> I am afraid, in my own opinion, that it might result in a great increase in casualties without a decisive finish, but that is his view to the contrary as the theater commander * * * [10 lines deleted].
>
> Senator RUSSELL. Wait a minute, do you mean to say, in your opinion, there is doubt even if we do bomb them whether they could be driven from there?
>
> General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator RUSSELL. Is that what you wanted to state?
>
> General MARSHALL. That is what I wanted to state. You can get into the details of this with the Chiefs of Staff. * * * [Thirteen lines deleted.]
>
> Senator LODGE. But you have no objection to having your belief stated that in your judgment the bombing of the Chinese bases would not bring victory?
>
> General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir.

Subsequently this testimony was given:

> Senator RUSSELL. I understand, then, that you recommend a continuation of the present policy in Korea rather than adopting General MacArthur's proposal?
>
> General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir. I must add to that, of course, that if the Chinese Communists with at least equipment support from the Soviets and maybe more support carry the war to us outside of Korea [deleted], then we have to retaliate.

Mr. Speaker, I again call attention to one particular sentence in the testimony of Secretary Marshall quoted above:

> I should say that if the Chinese Communists continue in force in North Korea with the potential of additional reinforcements that might be made available, and with our situation where we visualize no considerable reinforcement of the United Nations Army, that they could not be driven out of North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, ordinarily the proper thing would seem to be to reserve comment on this testimony until it was all in, until the record was complete.

But this is no ordinary situation.

This is not merely a reaffirmation of the purpose and intent to conduct a limited war in Korea, dubious as such a purpose and intent—and dubious as the public statement of such a purpose and intent—seems to me to be.

This is an announcement and an acknowledgment of defeat.

This is an announcement and an acknowledgment of failure to accomplish the mission assumed and undertaken when American forces moved into Korea.

This is an announcement and an acknowledgment of the impossibility of accomplishing that mission.

This is the bald admission that the enemy—the Chinese Communists—"could not be driven out of North Korea."

Moreover, this is not an announcement and acknowledgment of failure and defeat made in the secret councils of state, but an open proclamation of that determination and conclusion by the head of the Department of Defense of the United States.

By this incredible statement, Secretary Marshall proclaims from the housetops the inevitability of defeat and the impossibility of victory.

He proclaims it not only to the Congress of the United States and to the people of the United States, and not only to the people of Korea and to our allies—for whose continued support he professes to be so solicitous—but he proclaims it to our enemies, in North Korea, in Communist China, and in the Kremlin.

Most appalling of all, Secretary Marshall proclaims the inevitability of defeat and the impossibility of victory to the brave American men fighting in Korea while, at the same time, offering them no promise of respite from their deadly stalemate.

The crime goes even farther. Marshall's statement details for the benefit of the enemy the specifications for his victory when it says "if the Chinese Communists continue in force in North Korea with the potential of additional reinforcements that might be made available." Thus succinctly is mapped out for him—the enemy—the sure path to his own triumph.

This is incredible. It defies comprehension. It staggers the imagination.

But there it is. The record is clear and unmistakable.

Think of the psychological, military, and diplomatic implications of that statement. The aid and comfort thereby given the enemy in North Korea, in Communist China, and in the Kremlin is beyond computation.

Now, at least, the American people can understand in some small measure the sense of betrayal experienced by the Chinese Nationalists when this same Marshall, along with Acheson, Wallace, and Truman, and others, stabbed them in the back.

Now, at least, the American people can understand in some small measure the sense of betrayal experienced by the people of South Korea more than a year ago when American officials publicly proclaimed that Korea was outside of this country's perimeter of defense.

Now, at least, the American people can understand in some small measure the sense of betrayal experienced by the people of Formosa when Mr. Acheson publicly announced in December 1949, that this island had no strategic importance and that the American people should be prepared for its surrender.

This time it is the American people themselves who are betrayed by the public proclamation of the counsel of despair and defeat.

How farcical becomes the administration charge that General MacArthur was the offender by reason of his public statements.

How farcical—how tragically farcical—becomes the professed anxiety over the possible betrayal to the enemy of military secrets in the course of the current testimony—for what graver, more fatal military or diplomatic secret is there than this alleged fact of impotence, failure, and dismal defeat?

What more tragic example could there be of straining at gnats and swallowing camels?

This is not appeasement.

This is abject abasement, abandonment, and abdication.

This is confirmation of the fact that continued silence and acquiescence on the part of General MacArthur would have meant his acceptance and identification with the cause and course of treason.

Whatever else may be developed in the course of the present hearings now becomes mere trivia. Except as it may serve to expose the assent of others to this same counsel of despair and defeat, any additional testimony becomes an inconsequential and unimportant detail.

Whether or not we consent to talk with Communist China about diplomatic recognition is of little significance against the background of General Marshall's statement. What could diplomatic recognition add to the recognition which Marshall has so gratuitously extended to Communist China by his incredible acknowledgment of Communist China's assured victory in North Korea? And in the face of this acknowledgment, what strength or firmness of position remains for America in any future bargainings with her enemies?

The choice before the American people and the Congress is clear-cut and unmistakable.

The choice is supine acceptance of this counsel of defeatism, and of the right openly to proclaim such counsel, or the impeachment and removal of General Marshall and of all others in Government who subscribe to and share in this counsel.

God give the Congress of the United States the courage to do its clear and inescapable duty.

Address by Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, to the National Society Magna Charta Dames

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of addressing the members of the National Society Magna Charta Dames at their annual meeting here in Washington. That organization has the noble purpose of keeping forever alive and maintaining the principles of human freedom set forth in the Magna Charta, principles which have meant so much to mankind since the year 1215. I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I was invited to address this distinguished group at your luncheon meeting today, I did not know, of course, that the date would coincide with the appearance of General MacArthur before the joint meeting of the Congress. I am sure, however, that in view of this later development, you will forgive my tardy arrival here.

When my esteemed and dear friend, Mrs. J. Hamilton Lewis honored me by extending such a cordial invitation to be with you today, I was most complimented and was happy to tell her that I would be glad to try to make a small contribution by coming here today and saying a few words on a subject to which I cannot do full justice, so broad and far reaching is its substance and so myriad its implications. Mrs. Lewis contributed immeasurably, in the tradition of so many fine American women, to the distinction and achievements of her husband, the late Senator J. Hamilton Lewis, one of the few men to represent two great States of the Union in the Congress of the United States.

When I received your gracious invitation, I went back and reread the 63 chapters of the Magna Charta, that memorable document wrested by the barons from King John on the plains of Runnymede. Your society is one of few which is dedicated to that great charter of human rights and liberties. Your membership is drawn from women who are the real leaders in the civic, governmental, and social activities of our Nation. It must be a source of real inspiration to all of you gathered here today in common purpose to know that you are helping to further and preserve in the American tradition the concepts of individual rights and human dignity which were set forth so fully and so clearly in that brave declaration.

It is perhaps axiomatic that great leaders and great concepts somehow arise in times of urgent need to preserve civilization as we know it and to reestablish decency in the world. Certainly the Magna Charta was such a concept. It arose out of the hearts of a

people bowed under tyrannical and unendurable oppression, but this final revolt might well have remained for generations a seething resentment without open rebellion had it not been for the flagrant and arbitrary flaunting of individual worth by King John.

Similarly, our American Bill of Rights, the cornerstone of our democracy, was born out of revolt against tyranny and abuses foisted upon the colonies by the King. It was the final sense of outrage and the insurrection of the colonists which led to the establishment of a free nation.

Neither the principles of the Magna Charta nor those of the Bill of Rights were easily obtained merely because they had been proclaimed. Nor were those principles easily won in other parts of the world or in other periods of man's history. Indeed not. From the time of the ancient Greeks, men have fought and died, sacrificed, and suffered for the convictions which they held dear.

This is something which we Americans frequently forget. We have become so accustomed to taking for granted our guaranties of personal liberty that we often overlook their devious and difficult development over the centuries. We forget, too, that freedom as we know it, is unheard of in many parts of the world—lands where the people have always lived in the shadow of oppression and dictatorship. Perhaps this gift of freedom which we Americans hold so lightly would be more precious to us if we paused now and again to remember these things. Perhaps we would guard more carefully against hypocrisy and discrimination and suppression and other abuses committed in the name of freedom if we would stop to recall how dearly it was won.

The founding fathers of our country were only too familiar with the burdens of tyranny down through the ages. They had not forgotten how they suffered and fought against the injustices and absolutism of the monarch, and it was their resolve to establish a set of rules for government by the majority, but which also should provide safeguards for the welfare of the minority. With struggle and privation and death still fresh in their minds, they drew up and adopted the first ten amendments to our Constitution known as the Bill of Rights, which guaranteed to all people the fundamental freedoms on which our democracy is based, and which have been strengthened and reaffirmed over the years in the Halls of Congress and in our courts of justice.

The first attempt to violate this constitutional guaranty came in 1798 when the newly established United States was expecting war with France. The Federalist government, encouraged by public indignation over the XYZ affair, passed a number of repressive bills including the Sedition Act. The resentment of the general public to such legislation was one of the prime causes for the fall of the Federalist Party in 1800, and for its disappearance from national politics.

Although numerous prosecutions were made under the act, and although its constitutionality was challenged, none of the cases ever actually reached the Supreme Court for final determination. Fortunately, the act expired with the party that adopted it. When Thomas Jefferson was elected President of the United States, he pardoned those who had been convicted under the Act and were still imprisoned, and some years later Congress appropriated funds for the families of men who had been incarcerated.

The challenge to the Bill of Rights which was met successfully by the people of this country in 1800 has been repeated at other times during our history as a Nation. The guaranties contained in article I, freedom of speech and of the press, have been threatened repeatedly by repressive legislation, but the American system has always stood fast, a mighty citadel, a shining example to the rest of the world.

Today a new threat hangs over the free world. The threat of Soviet imperialism is more than a dark cloud. It is a real and powerful menace to the liberty which we Americans—we who are privileged to live in this blessed and challenging twentieth century—have taken for granted. We must guard this boon of freedom even more zealously, confronted as we are with this real and present danger, lest the lights go out all over the world and mark a swift return to the Middle Ages and to the tyranny—and oppression—and darkness—that held mankind in bitter bondage and arrested all progress and striving and hope.

In our democracy the dignity and worth of each human being is supreme. Our society strives to afford each individual the greatest possible opportunity to reach his highest fulfillment. The forces of totalitarianism despise and hold for naught each of us as individuals of worth and integrity, and deny that we are endowed by our Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In their concept the state is supreme. Human beings are expendable and must serve the state as it directs.

Freedom of religion, freedom to seek truth, no arrest without a warrant, no arbitrary search and seizure, trial by an impartial jury, free elections, government by law, right of contract—all of these guaranties contained in our Bill of Rights are part of the American tradition. But the evil and fanatical forces of totalitarianism deny the existence of God and the rights of man. Theirs is a government by edict and decree, without consent of the governed. Theirs is a government of state controls. Everyone is subservient to the state and information is distorted to serve the purposes of state propaganda. The Politburo dictators who guide the destinies of this international banditry believe in their own infallibility and must be obeyed, not only in act but in thought, under penalty of death without the right of trial.

This malignant cancer of communism, spreading insidiously over the free world, must be met with all the resourcefulness and courage and determination of which we are capable. Our industrial potential and our military might are daily growing more powerful, but our greatest strength lies in our resolve to defend our freedom with all the vigor at our command and to help others to attain it.

To do this we must be united in fact as well as in purpose. We must strive for nonpartisanship in our international policies. Assuredly there will be differences of opinion, but in America, thank God, these differences can be resolved by hammering them out on the anvil of free and open debate and discussion. Ours is a common goal. We must not only fight for it abroad, we must cherish it and work for it at home.

The threat of the Soviet Union is a menace to our liberty, but here in our own country we have a menace to our livelihood. I refer to the growing danger of inflation. If our national economy is not kept sound and healthy we shall be faced with a serious break in our armor as we face the foreign forces that would enslave us. It is everybody's business to stop inflation, for if the value of the dollar is permitted to decline and decline, the future worth of our savings, our insurance policies, our pensions, and much more is at stake.

Before inflation can be stopped, there must be sacrifices—the same kind of sacrifices that we are so willing to make in a fight for the human rights which have been held so dear down through the centuries. All of us will have to make sacrifices in meeting the bill for higher taxes—an inevitable burden in our mobilization for national defense, but those who work for a living must also have a firm assurance that their goods and services are not to become a source of enrichment for profiteers.

Inflation is a thing about which all of us must do something—something more than just talk. It is up to the leaders of Government, industry, and finance to pull together in a patriotic, economic program that will make sense to the millions who must be called upon for voluntary cooperation and national devotion.

In our patriotic zeal, we must not lose sight of the fact that any act that threatens to cut across our constitutional guaranties of civil liberties threatens the basic premise of our democracy—that in the average individual man and woman resides the security and the hope for the greatest experiment ever conceived in the mind of man. If we relinquish the fundamental concepts set forth by the Magna Charta and guaranteed by our Constitution, even though we dominate the world militarily, we will have lost the heart, the essence of liberty, freedom, and justice under law.

It has been a high privilege for me to come here today and to join with you in the renewal of your dedication and fidelity to the Magna Charta. Animated as all of you are by the highest and most lofty principles, I know that you are determined to do your full share as mothers, wives, and daughters to maintain our freedom and security, not only by words but by setting examples of citizenship in your daily lives. Our free Government was not built by lip service alone and will not survive by it. There must repose in the hearts and souls of all of our people the conviction and determination to sustain it and to live up to our highest principles of unselfish service, honor, and integrity under God.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles relating to the war in Korea, the first entitled "China Reds Have Not Shot Wad," by Constantine Brown; the second entitled "United States Surrendered Independence," by David Lawrence, both published in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA REDS HAVE NOT SHOT WAD—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS IN KOREA, FROM GENERAL RIDGWAY DOWN, KNOW ENEMY STILL CAN DELIVER MAJOR BLOWS

(By Constantine Brown)

While our strategists and policy makers debate with a wealth of arguments whether the administration's policy of containing the enemy in Korea or the MacArthur plan of dealing the enemy a determined blow would be our best course, the men in Korea wonder what the enemy will do in the near future.

Everybody from Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway down to the buck privates is convinced that the enemy has not shot his wad yet. They know that he has the capability to deliver major blows with his reserve power. Many officers in Korea believe that the recent spring offensive was nothing more than a probing attack in force, to find out what we have and what we are up to.

In the last 10 days the Reds themselves have broken off contact, after engaging less than half the force at their disposal. All these military actions raise a number of questions in the minds of our commanders in Korea. Those responsible for the security of our forces are concerned as to where and in what force the Chinese will use the sizable air forces which they now have available.

There are many conjectures on this score. Is the Red high command planning, by any chance, a new Pearl Harbor in Japan, while our Air Force is intent on supporting the ground forces? Will that air force be used to protect the supply lines after the renewed offensive succeeds in pushing southward? Will it be used for an all-out assault when the ground force attacks are stalled? Or are the Russian-trained Chinese generals planning a sizable airborne operation in our rear?

All these are puzzling questions. The intelligence services report large concentrations of troops behind the present lines. They also report a continuous build-up of war materials and there is sufficient information that the Reds do have an air force which, while unable to maintain a sustained effort, could do much damage in one surprise blow.

Where that blow may fall is anybody's guess. What seems certain, however, is that there is no more idea in Peiping of an equitable settlement of the Korean problem now than there was a few months ago. It is still all or nothing as far as the Chinese puppets are concerned. By that is meant the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea, the admission of Red China to the United Nations; surrender of Formosa to the Peiping government; and participation of the Reds in the Japanese peace treaty. Unless these conditions are met, there is no disposition on the part of the Mao Tse-tung government to listen to the soft voices from Lake Success.

We talk glibly about the punishment we are inflicting on the Reds. It is true that they have suffered about 750,000 casualties so far. But China has a population of nearly a half billion people and China is fighting on only one front—Korea.

So long as our present strategy continues Red China needs only a thin curtain of police troops on her long coast line. The support which Peiping is reported to have promised Ho Chi Minh, the Indochinese Red leader, can be delayed. It is far more important for Chinese-Soviet plans that they make a serious effort to defeat the U. N. forces in Korea than to help the Viet Minh win a victory over the French. Defeat of the United Nations forces would settle the question of Asia, regardless of what western forces remain in Malaya and Indochina.

The Chinese know as well as we do that in view of our commitments elsewhere there are few American forces available to reinforce the allied armies in Korea. Our casualty list amounts to about 6,500 men a month, or the equivalent of four divisions since the outbreak of hostilities last June. They know that of the available forces in the United States, four divisions are in process of being sent to Europe.

The offensive-defensive strategy, which was used frequently during the last war in the Pacific, seems to have become a permanent line of action. The Chinese realize that so long as that military concept is forced on General Ridgway in Korea, their chances of success are unimpaired.

The war of attrition can hurt us more than it hurts them.

UNITED STATES SURRENDERED INDEPENDENCE—GENERAL MARSHALL'S TESTIMONY SHOWS 350,000 SOLDIERS WERE ABANDONED TO WHIM OF FOREIGN CABINETS

(By David Lawrence)

Secretary Marshall's testimony is in many respects even more sensational than that of General MacArthur.

For it tells the American people for the first time that they have completely lost their independence of military action in the midst of a war in which 350,000 American boys are engaged.

It tells that decisions made by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are vetoed in secret by other governments without an opportunity for the public opinion of the United States or of the world to be apprised of the facts.

It tells that, although the United States has contributed the bulk of the troops in Korea, the 13 governments which have contributed token forces decided to deny us the right to apply the military doctrine of pursuing the enemy—known as hot pursuit.

It tells that the United Nations has appointed the United States as agent to conduct the military operations but that the agent cannot perform those military operations without continuously obtaining the consent of these allies.

It tells that the United States, though conscious of the importance of an economic blockade to stop strategic materials and munitions from getting to the enemy, has not succeeded in persuading the principal U. N. countries now involved in that trade to stop it, even though 10 months of war in Korea have elapsed.

It tells that all these troubles and friction between the United States and its allies were never communicated to General MacArthur except in the vaguest terms.

It tells, by implication, that the famous 13-nation declaration which was supposed to bring about a negotiation of a cease fire was never sent to General MacArthur and that only a brief message saying some such announcement was planned went to him on March 20 last.

It tells that the United States Government at present opposes the entry of Red China into the U. N. and opposes turning Formosa over to Communist China but that the United States Government is nevertheless willing to discuss these subjects as matters for negotiation with the Red Chinese when they agree to a cease fire.

It tells that the United States will adhere to that policy but it doesn't tell whether the United States will use its veto to turn down such a reward for aggression or will merely bow to the will of the U. N. countries eventually, as it has done on some of the military measures proposed to the U. N.

It tells that General MacArthur carried out his military instructions as Far East commander and did not violate any military orders but that his public statements—his letter answering a Member of Congress, Representative MARTIN, and his interviews answering questions that were asked by the press concerning military operations—were distasteful to the President and his advisers and really caused his dismissal.

It tells that only four men sat in with President Truman and recommended summary dismissal of General MacArthur—Messrs. Acheson, Harriman, Bradley, and Marshall.

It tells that the Joint Chiefs favored a replacement but did not have anything to do with the form of dismissal. It doesn't tell whether the Joint Chiefs were told that the President was displeased with General MacArthur's statements and was considering a change in command.

It tells that the summary dismissal was decided on suddenly as a means of preventing General MacArthur from making any further statements to the press and from developing a sort of "cumulative affair" of publicity. This has since come about anyway with probably more cumulative statements and hearings than anybody ever imagined.

It tells that the Secretary of Defense of the United States does not believe the enemy can be driven out of Korea, but he hopes they will withdraw after their offensives fail. He doesn't think bombardment of Manchurian bases will chase them out either, though he concedes that diversionary operations such as a blockade and other military efforts in southeast Asia may cause them to tire of their effort to stay in Korea.

It tells that in a moment of great crisis—when MacArthur's troops were being pushed back last December after Red China entered the war—the U. N. allies became frightened and began to limit the operations of the U. N. troops, especially in fighting back in the air.

It tells that instructions went to General MacArthur forbidding him to bomb even two big distributing centers in North Korea which were 35 miles below the northern border of the country and well within Korea itself.

It tells that, despite General MacArthur's titles as supreme commander in Japan and U. N. commander and commander in chief of the far eastern forces, Secretary Marshall regarded General MacArthur as just another "local theater commander," without the latitude of expression to comment on military events that General Eisenhower had or Admiral Nimitz had or General MacArthur himself had during the last war, and without even the right to engage in psychological warfare in his own theater of action because it might offend U. N. allies.

There are many more things revealed, the significance of which will become apparent as the hearings continue. But none is more vital than the revelation that America, although contributing the bulk of the military forces and the supplies, has surrendered her independence of action and her leadership and has abandoned 350,000 American boys to the whim of foreign cabinets.

Committee Draft of the Republican Platform for Current Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the draft of the Republican platform of New Jersey for the current year which I obtained permission to have printed in the RECORD today is as follows:

To Delegates of the 1951 Republican State Convention:

Pursuant to the provisions of R. S. 19: 5-6, the resolutions committee of the Republican State convention herewith submits its tentative platform.

This is a preliminary draft subject to amendment at the next session of the convention on May 10.

TENTATIVE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, 1951

The Republican Party of New Jersey offers its candidates for the State legislature against a background of solid accomplishments without equal in the history of our State.

Under the leadership of Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, the Republican Party for the past 4 years has carried forward a program of sound, prudent, progressive legislation so ably begun in 1944 by the Republican administration of Gov. Walter E. Edge.

It is a record of pledges kept, of cooperation between executive and legislature, and of full emphasis at all times upon the welfare of all of the people.

Two years ago, by reason of the adoption of the new State constitution, the citizens of New Jersey were afforded the opportunity to approve the Republican administration then in office. Such approval was voted by the people despite a campaign of misrepresentation by the Democratic Party without precedent in this State. We call attention to the fact that the Democratic Party has given evidence that it intends, once again, to wage a similar campaign in an effort to wrest control from those who have served our State so well.

The Democratic Party is now directing criticism to some legislation of the past few years in complete disregard of the fact that its members voted for much of what they now condemn. In the true fashion of political opportunism, the Democratic Party now, as in the past, seeks to be all things to all persons. It has proposed vast new spending programs while criticizing present State appropriations, yet all the while it is compelled to admit that New Jersey, under Republican administration, has the lowest per capita State tax collection in the Nation.

It is proper to ask how the Democratic Party proposes to carry out its many and varied spending proposals without foisting a State income tax or a consumers' sales tax, or both, on the people of New Jersey.

The Democratic Party has revealed itself to be a party without responsibility, and must be judged accordingly.

In contrast, the candidates of the Republican Party go before the people with this record and program:

1. Civil defense: Under Republican leadership, New Jersey has taken first place among the States in establishing a civil defense program. This has been attested to by the award of Freedom's Foundation, by the Federal Director of Civil Defense, and by the Council of State Governments.

Our compacts with neighboring States are an outstanding example of mutual assistance in this vital matter.

We pledge our efforts to continue and expand this program.

2. Taxes: We shall seek to maintain New Jersey's advantageous tax position. To that end we shall continue to resist the imposition of an income or sales tax.

3. Highways: No State has faced greater problems of highway transportation than has New Jersey, not alone because of its areas of dense population but also because of its unique position as a corridor between two of the Nation's greatest cities, and none has moved more swiftly to meet this challenge.

For the past several years, under Republican administrations, New Jersey has carried on the greatest highway program in its history.

The New Jersey Turnpike, one of the great engineering achievements of our day, was conceived and is being built by a Republican administration, and will soon be in operation.

A major part of route 4 parkway has been opened; others are under construction.

Traffic relief for our cities, such as the Trenton Freeway, has been a prime objective.

Nevertheless, the need for even more immediate relief is apparent. We must approach with courage the solution of the terrible traffic problem which, particularly in our urban areas, threatens the economic strangulation of the State.

Therefore, we urge thorough study of various proposals for highway construction beyond the extent of present appropriations from current revenues.

4. Law enforcement: We pledge our continuing support to the further development of law enforcement in all its aspects.

Establishment of the department of law and public safety, under provisions of the new State constitution, has resulted in the strengthening of law enforcement in all our counties.

Where defects have become apparent, they are being swiftly corrected on the initiative of the attorney general.

5. School aid: (a) State aid for schools is now at an all-time high. Since 1946, under Republican administrations, it has increased 548 percent.

(b) This record has been achieved despite repeal of the annual $16,000,000 State school tax on real estate and the turning over of $5,000,000 in annual railroad taxes to the municipalities.

(c) Under successive Republican administrations, minimum salaries of school teachers have been increased from $1,200 annually to $2,500 annually.

(d) We shall continue to improve the school system and, within the limits of available State revenues, give additional aid to school districts.

6. New industry: (a) During the past 4 years, more than 3,500 new industries have located in New Jersey. This year, more than one-third of all money expended in the Nation for industrial and other research is being spent in New Jersey.

(b) We shall continue to improve the economic climate of our State so as to attract additional industries to New Jersey.

(c) We have recognized the need for additional water supplies for New Jersey and shall continue our efforts toward that objective.

7. Agriculture: New Jersey farms enjoy the highest cash income per farm-acre in the Nation. We shall continue to assist agriculture by our support of research at the agricultural experiment station at the State University and by the development of our State road system.

8. Labor and employment security: Under Republican administrations, New Jersey has set the pace among all States in legislation beneficial to the employee. Our employment security insurance programs should be revised upward to offset the burdens of an inflationary cost of living. Our mediation service continues to function with unsurpassed success to the benefit of both labor and management.

We pledge our continuing support of these and related programs.

9. Institutions, welfare, and health: (a) A $25,000,000 institutional building program, initiated by a Republican administration, is under way. We have achieved great progress in improving the condition of the unfortunate wards of the State. We pledge our continuing efforts in their behalf.

(b) We pledge a thorough study of our many welfare systems to the end that they may be carried on with maximum efficiency and economy.

(c) Great strides have been made in the development of our State health services, as most recently exemplified by legislation for the creation of consolidated health districts. Efficient administration of the State department of health has achieved striking economies which have permitted creation of many new long-needed services. We pledge our support to the improvement of our health program.

10. Medical college: We favor and will support the establishment of a State medical college.

11. Pension and public funds: Our Republican administration, through creation of a division of investment in the department of the treasury, has greatly strengthened the State's investment procedure, with substantial gain to the State's treasury, pension, and other funds. We shall continue to support this program.

12. Civil-service and State employees: Development of our civil-service system has been a major objective of Republican administrations. We shall continue our efforts to adjust the salaries of State employees to meet rising living costs.

13. Conservation and recreation: The Republican Party has consistently supported programs for the conservation of the State's natural resources, the development of its resort areas, and the needs of sportsmen. We shall continue to do so.

14. Motor vehicles: During the past year the Republican administration sponsored legislation for a much-needed revision of the State traffic code, including a realistic revision of the speed laws. Further development of safety programs to reduce the death toll on the State's highways will have our support.

15. Legislative procedure: We recommend the immediate adoption, in the legislative process, of the committee system whereby frequent public hearings will be held, bills reported either favorably or unfavorably, and the committees' reasons therefor made a matter of public record.

16. Economy and efficiency: Adoption of the new State constitution now recognized as a model for all States, has made possible annual savings of more than $2,000,000 in the operation of State agencies. By maintaining the lowest State budget of any comparable State, the Republican Party has demonstrated that prudent, progressive government without loss of essential services can be attained.

17. The courts: An antiquated judicial system has been transformed under Republican leadership into what today is admittedly the Nation's best system, founded upon sound principles, swift in its operations, bipartisan in nature (in contrast to the partisan Federal system), and free of political interference.

18. Civil liberties: Under Republican leadership laws have been enacted guaranteeing to the people of New Jersey greater civil liberties than those enjoyed in any other State.

19. Veterans: Under Republican guidance New Jersey has been first and foremost in providing benefits of housing, rehabilitation, and employment and business opportunities for its war veterans. This program has already been extended to veterans of the present national emergency.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

The present Democratic administration in Washington stands condemned as completely lacking the capacity for leadership necessary to meet the grave problems confronting us at home and abroad. Through its tragic performance, it has jeopardized the security and freedom of all our people.

The present Democratic administration has countenanced, and indeed encouraged, the destruction of morality in public affairs almost beyond precedent.

The present Democratic administration has sought to impose upon the American people vast new spending proposals, with a resultant increase in the tax burden, at a time when necessary expenditures for national defense require prudence in the everyday affairs of government.

We condemn particularly the refusal of the present Democratic administration to extend the bipartisan foreign policy to the Far East, with tragic results. We seek peace, not war. Toward that end we must strengthen, rather than weaken, our association with the forces of freedom; and we shall not sanction the appeasement of the Communist forces which seek to destroy freedom.

In the conduct of our national affairs, we stand for these basic principles:

1. Reduce the size of the National Government.

2. Reduce the cost of the National Government.

3. Restore to the individual States their proper sovereignty over taxes and territory.

4. Restore a sense of decency and integrity in Washington.

CONCLUSION

No citizen today can escape responsibility for government—be it at the National, State, county, or municipal level. Wise, honest, economical government is the concern of all. For the past 7 years New Jersey, under Republican administrations, has enjoyed that kind of government.

The Republican record is clear. On the basis of that record, and on the principles set forth in this platform, the Republican candidates for the legislature merit the confidence, support, and votes of the people of New Jersey.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID VAN ALSTYNE, Jr.,
Chairman,
ALFRED C. CLAPP,
GERALDINE L. THOMPSON,
FRANK W. SHERSHIN,
WAYNE DUMONT, Jr.

MAY 3, 1951.

The Stake in the Future of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me Sunday, May 6, 1951, Ellenville, N. Y., under the auspices of the American Financial Development Corp. for Israel—State of Israel bonds:

THE STAKE IN THE FUTURE OF ISRAEL

I think that if all speeches I made on Israel were put end to end, we would have enough for a kite to fly all of us to Jerusalem.

Long before I visited Israel the principles of Zionism had caught my imagination. The dynamic force which was to lead the children of Zion home again was to me one of the most stirring dramas of our time.

When the State of Israel was proclaimed 3 years ago—less 1 week—it was as if the sparks of a star were shooting out in all directions to bring the news to the world. I was at the Israeli Embassy—then the Jewish Agency—in Washington when the news came that President Truman had recognized de facto the Government of Israel. I shall remember forever the cries of joy that spontaneously burst forth, the tears that spilled uninhibitedly from all who were there, and then the silence as eyes, eloquent with the vision of a promise fulfilled, watched the raising of the Israeli flag over the building on Massachusetts Avenue in our Nation's Capital.

Then I visited Israel in October 1948, during the time of the second truce. What I saw there fed the fuel of my excitement. What I saw there was not propaganda, was not the effusions of a public relations writer. This was it. This little country, no bigger than our own State of New Jersey, of some 600,000 population, was battling a coalition of seven Arab countries, was forming a government, filling posts from that of Prime Minister all the way down the line to that of customs official. They were building the Burma Road which saved the people of the new city of Jerusalem from destruction. Reception and rehabilitation centers for the immigrants arriving at the rate of 25,000 a month dotted the countryside. At the same time they were building houses, irrigating the soil, exploring the Negev, and with it all they were writing books, singing songs, performing opera, and making music. I had never experienced its like. Here were a people beset with every hardship you can name, and yet here were people fighting, working, singing, marching, building, creating, and telling jokes.

Amazing and incredulous. Had I not seen it, I would not believe it were possible. Hope, courage, ingenuity, and sacrifice resided in every person I talked with from the newly arrived Yemenite to the military commander. And enthusiasm. They had not yet themselves absorbed the fact that the State of Israel is a State in its own right, independent and free to work out its destiny. Greater than the enthusiasm of a bride in her new home, here was the joy of living I had never encountered before.

So I have talked and talked throughout this country, trying to tell what I saw. I talked to American officials again and again and again pointing to Israel as a triumph of American principles. Was it not wonderful for us that democracy facing the foes of totalitarianism should find its expression in a region of the world which had never even heard the word before, let alone understood what it meant?

I have talked at fund-raising campaigns for the Jewish national fund, for the United Jewish appeal, for Hadassah, for Youth Aliyah, reciting the hardships in Israel, reciting the plight of the immigrants trying to reach the heart of American Jewry.

But today I speak on a different plane. Today I speak not of the infancy of the state, but of its maturity, its coming of age. Today I speak of Israel's first bond issue, its independence issue in the sum of $500,000,000. It is this issue which marks the dignity of Israel. It is this issue which will ultimately release Israel from the status of being looked upon as a philanthropic venture. The dollars with which you buy Israeli bonds will be your dollars, returned to you in dollars plus interest.

This will be the dollar of production. The bond issue has one purpose and one purpose only; that is, the economic consolidation of Israel. It will not be used for food, for clothing, and the like. It will be used for industry and power, for agriculture, for transportation, and it is this production which will bridge the gap between imports and exports. The dollar which brought the immigrants out of the DP camp and from the ghettos of North Africa is not what the bankers call the productive dollar. This is the dollar which has its return in human satisfactions, but what Israel needs now is the dollar to build up her production in terms of industry and agriculture so as to satisfy her domestic and her foreign markets.

For example, presently Israel pays vast sums of moneys for food which is the greatest single item of import to Israel. Through these borrowed dollars of the bond issue, Israel will create a state of agricultural self-sufficiency within a period of 3 years so that the tremendous sums paid for imported food can be subtracted from the debit side of her trade ledger.

Israel can and will do it. Mind you, 275 new agricultural settlements have been established in the last 13 months as against 225 which were established over the previous 60 years. This ability to achieve agricultural self-sufficiency was recently understood by the loan of $135,000,000 from our own Export-Import Bank to Israel.

In the industrial field Israel will expand her existing industries and create new ones. Already a network of commercial treaties, markets, and contacts exist with Turkey, with Greece, Italy, and Western Europe. It is an indisputable economic fact that Israel has no scarcity of markets. It is rather of problem in limitations of production.

Let it be remembered that Israel has one of the most favorable geographical positions in the world. Her ports and airfields are at a point where three continents meet. It is both a center of world commerce and an ideal warehouse and assembly plant for Asia. With the availability of technical skill which only Israel has in the Middle East, firms like Kaiser-Frazer, Philco, and others have invested heavily in establishment of factories in Israel. Today Israel is engaged in such industries as diamond cutting and polishing, the manufacture of precision instruments, machines, tools, munitions, agricultural machinery, and automotive parts, chemicals, and pharmaceutics, textiles, and clothing, printing, leather—to name a few.

In July of 1950, 65,024 were employed in industry, exclusive of handicrafts and the number of industrial enterprises reaching a peak of 300,355—an increase of 42 percent since May 14, 1948. The wool and leather industries particularly expanded into mass production operation.

Let us look at a few of its other developments. Since the establishment of the State of Israel, its merchant marine has grown from 6 ships to 30 ships; from 14,000 gross tonnage to 95,000 gross tonnage. Israel has its own airline—El-Al—which maintains regular flights between Israel and England, France, and other countries. Twelve international airlines use the Israeli airport's facilities.

Israel has a growing tourist industry. In 1949, 22,000 tourists visited Israel. This number increased by 50 percent in 1950.

Today Israel exports citrus fruits, and byproducts, diamonds, woolen products, apparel, chocolates and sweets, cotton products, pharmaceutical products, wine and liquors, essential oil, and other industrial products.

Let me quote a few words from the Honorable John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, who in referring to Israel's achievements in the economic field, said:

"This record of progress in agriculture and industry is particularly noteworthy in view of the complex and difficult problems which Israel has had to face during this period. The very fact that domestic output of needed commodities has been steadily increasing has had a stabilizing effect on the economy of the new nation. The citizens of Israel have confidence that their growing national production will effectively safeguard the economic integrity of their state. And we who have watched the achievements which have been made to date can share in that confidence."

Israel's development in 3 years has been an amazing and exciting record. If you go back far enough in the history of our own United States, you will find that people of Europe questioned whether finance should send money into the wilderness that was then the United States. Surely we can say safely that those who did had no regrets. If we look at other countries which are small in area, but which have utilized the skill and wit of their people together with their geographical situation, the size of the country, you will find, was no barrier to stability and security.

I cite the example of Switzerland, a country with few raw materials, Holland and the Scandinavian countries. Here small populations within small areas have secured for themselves economic strength which far, far larger countries have been unable to achieve.

Israel has absorbed over 500,000 people within 2½ years. If we use the same proportion with the United States in terms of population, it would be as if the United States had absorbed 120,000,000 destitute refugees in 2 years. In fact, the United States never in any single year increased its population by more than 3 percent. Yet Israel at the end of 1954 will have increased its population by 200 percent within a period

of 5 years of unrestricted immigration. And Israel was able to do this with its political, economic, and social institutions still standing firm and expanding.

The source of Israel's pride in maintaining her open-door immigration policy is also the reason for the dollar gap which purchase of the moneys realized from the sale of bonds will bridge. This mass immigration to Israel is the most unique in history. World Jewry has sent tens of thousands of immigrants to Israel. I don't believe it is as well known a fact as it should be that out of the total sums which have been spent on the direct cost of the immigration of Jews from outside to Israel, the Israeli community itself has furnished two-thirds of the cost. Only one-third of the financial means for the transportation and absorption of immigration has been provided by the entire Jewish people of the world, including the Jewish community in the United States.

There have been those who questioned this open-door policy. Yet that is the central theme of Israel's national life, the object for which it was founded.

As Ambassador Eban so eloquently put it: "The doors must remain open. The people of Israel who once had to stand by, passive and inert, while millions of their kinsmen were consigned to the slaughter house and the crematorium, while they had no power to intervene or to rescue through lack of any prerogatives of statehood, will never allow that situation to recur, now that the capacity of liberation lies in their hands. Whatever the burden and whatever the cost, however cruel the encroachments upon existing standards of life—in all conditions and in all circumstances, the policy of unrestricted immigration must be maintained. Israel dares not accept the responsibility for whatever may befall Jews who seek immigration and are denied it."

International tensions increase. The iron-curtain countries play a cat-and-mouse game with Jewish inhabitants who seek to go to Israel. Now the passport is granted. Now it is withheld. Dangers increase daily for Jews residing in the Arab countries. If Israel's doors were to be shut against them, she will have failed in her pledge to the Jewish people the world over. From Yemen and Iraq, from North Africa and Iran, the Jews have come in wave upon wave, choosing freely the life in Israel which to them spells out an escape from the discrimination and the degradation in which they and their past generations have lived in Israel. They are irresistibly drawn to Israel as the homing pigeon to its final destination.

No other country in the world has ever undertaken a project of this magnitude, and Israel has carried on, as I said before, developing the country in all its aspects despite the staggering problems the immigrants have brought with them.

This should be the source of greatest pride to Jews—Israel is an ideal in action, combining vision and practicability. Israel has given the world a new definition in the meaning of absorptive capacity of the country and elasticity of its borders. Physically the boundary lines are set, but within these boundaries the expansion is limited only as the will of its people is limited—only as science and planning are limited.

If there are any of us skeptical of the final redemption of the bond issue, let me point out that Israel cannot afford not to pay its debts. Israel, by its bond issue, is on trial before the world, a world not entirely friendly to Israel. If she fails to repay her indebtedness, her standing as a nation among nations will be shattered. This Israel knows, but she also knows that all the factors are in her favor, not in her imagination alone but actually and factually.

Israel desperately needs these dollars, but Israel does not come abegging. She asks that you lend your dollar to be repaid to you with interest in 12 or 15 years, according to which type of bond you buy. Nor does she ask that you lend your dollar and deprive yourself of its earning power. Israel wants the dollar to go to work for her and for you.

There are two impelling reasons for those of us here tonight to invest in Israeli bonds. At no cost to ourselves and with profit, actual money profit, we serve ourselves as Americans and as Jews. As Americans we cannot for one single moment lose sight of the fact that a democracy wherever it exists sustains and strengthens democracy everywhere. A democracy in the Middle East—a democracy alive with skills, techniques, machinery—is a vital part in securing world peace. Only one such democracy exists in the Middle East, and that is Israel. If Israel fails, then the enemies of democracy will point to its failure as conclusive proof that the principle of democracy as expressed in a democratic form of government cannot bring security to itself and to its people. If Israel fails, it is that much more grist to the Communist propaganda mill.

Let us not underrate the significance of Israel in the clash of ideas. The failure of Israel will be one of the biggest blows against democracy.

As Jews, Israel's failure will endanger the stature of Jews wherever they may be. The accomplishments of Israel, socially, economically, and on the battlefield, have raised the stature of Jews everywhere. It has been put this way: The world will look at the Jewish people, and every single non-Jew will look at every single Jew, in accordance with the success or failure, the credit or the deficiency of the State of Israel, which is the only collective expression of the Jewish genius in modern times.

Whether we will it or not, whether it suits our individual preference or not—the fact still remains that the judgment of the world in favor or against the Jewish people will derive from the success or the failure of Israel.

The investment in Israel is an investment without risk. Your collateral is the existence of the state of Israel—her people, her resources, her ingenuity, her skills, and her unbelievable accomplishments in the three short years of her life as a nation. Your return counted out in interest-bearing dollars can be accurately measured, but your return in the expansion and security of democracy and in the security and the dignity of Jews all over the world cannot be measured. Your investment is your stake in the future for yourself, for your children, and your children's children, and for Israel, and her children, and her children's children.

Recent Soviet Pressures on Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is a background summary issued by the State Department on this subject. It shows the vital importance that the Kremlin attaches to Germany and explains why the Communist representative at the conference of the four-power deputies in Paris to prepare an agenda for a four-power conference is emphasizing so much the German issue.

At a time when our foreign policy is being reappraised it is also important to note what the Communists are after in Europe as a clue to their general designs on the free peoples.

The State Department summary follows:

RECENT SOVIET PRESSURES ON GERMANY

The people of the United States and of many other countries are awaiting the outcome of recent correspondence between the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, on one hand and the U. S. S. R. on the other. This correspondence, initiated by the Kremlin on November 3, 1950, is concerned with proposals for a four-power conference. The original Soviet proposal would have confined discussions to the question of German demilitarization, with the Prague declaration of October as basis for negotiations. The Allied Powers rejected the Prague declaration as a suitable basis for negotiations and have maintained throughout the exchange of notes that the issue is not Germany, but the underlying causes of international tensions throughout the world, and that to limit the discussions to German affairs would be inadequate and unrealistic. In its most recent note, of February 5, the Kremlin conceded that the Prague declaration did not necessarily have to be accepted as the basis of discussion but repeated its former statement that the first and foremost consideration of the conference should be the total demilitarization of Germany; it considers possible the discussion of other questions—on certain conditions—and has no objections to a preliminary meeting in Paris to arrange an agenda.

Without agreement on the agenda, there would be little point in having a conference. Even with agreement on the subjects to be discussed, it would be an extraordinary conference that could resolve such differences as have already produced a war in Asia. By their very nature, the Soviet notes have aroused serious doubts that the Kremlin actually wants a conference. Why, if the Kremlin sincerely wants to resolve differences and improve east-west relations, does it use the diplomatic note as a medium for recriminations and charges that have no factual basis? Past experience and current intelligence have made the United States skeptical of the Kremlin's good faith.

KOREA: A CASE IN POINT

Recent history offers Korea as a case in point. In June 1949, in accordance with a proposal from the Kremlin, the United States withdrew its occupation troops from the southern Republic of Korea; the United Nations checked on the fact of the withdrawal. In December the Kremlin announced that it had withdrawn Soviet troops from the northern People's Republic but refused to permit the United Nations to verify the statement. Six months later the Communist North Koreans invaded the Republic of Korea. From the sidelines, the U. S. S. R., officially a member of the United Nations, consistently supported the aggressors, and, by virtue of Soviet manipulation, the Communist North's invasion of South Korea became overnight United States-inspired aggression by South Korea against the Soviet-dominated People's Republic.

SOVIET TACTICS IN GERMANY

The German people were quick to perceive analogy between their position and that of the Koreans. In the event that they might overlook the resemblance, the U. S. S. R., from the very beginning of the Korean war, linked Germany with Korea. By June 27, 1950, 2 days after the invasion of South Korea, Soviet propaganda media were informing the German people that Korea was a test case for the planned American attack

upon the German democratic republic. Within a few days, Soviet-controlled press and radio had built up the legend that the United States had planned a new world war and that American intervention in Korea was a part of a design to establish a ring of military bases around Asia as a preliminary to attacking Manchuria, China, and the U. S. S. R.

Since the early days of the occupation of Germany, the U. S. S. R. has sought to discredit the western powers—the United States in particular—with the German people. In July 1946, the U. S. S. R. charged the United States with having reduced German reparations with intent to rearm Western Germany. Since that time, Soviet propaganda has reiterated periodically and with ever-increasing volume the accusation that the United States is remilitarizing Germany. While hurling these charges at the United States, and occasionally at France and Britain, the U. S. S. R., under pretense of forming a "people's police," has been engaged in training substantial paramilitary forces in East Germany.

Last August, Moscow-trained Deputy Minister-President Walter Ulbricht, of the East German Government, speaking before an East Berlin convention of the SED (Socialist Unity Party, the Communist Party of East Germany), uttered a clear call to sabotage in Western Germany, exploiting the beating that U. N. forces were currently taking in Korea as prophetic of what would happen to them and their puppets in Western Germany in the near future. To be precise, he instructed West Germans to hinder militarization, boycott goods and food imported from the United States, defy all Bonn and Allied High Commission orders, find out where armament production was planned and then foment strikes among the workers, fight attempts to create a West German army, prevent showing of American films, and introduction of American dances, oppose all steps favoring the Schuman plan, the Marshall plan, the Council of Europe, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, support the East Zone German Democratic Republic, and be ready to take up arms for the Soviet Union.

Throughout the summer preceding the fixed October elections in the east zone, Soviet fear-propaganda burgeoned. An industrial police force attached to the United States Army in the American zone to perform service functions became "the core of a new and powerful West German army." From unkown sources came the figure of 287,000 for the existing man strength of such units and 30 for the number of divisions planned. For Communist propaganda purposes, a listing by the Federal German Republic of war materials subject to import control by the Military Security Board became a list of weapons that the Federal Republic had agreed to import at the expense of West German economy. West Germany, so the Soviet warning went, was clearly going to become a battleground for warmongering, imperialistic America and her satellites, the hour was later than the Western Germans thought, and the only hope of escaping such a fate lay in joining forces with the peace-loving U. S. S. R.

The September 19 communiqué of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, calling an end to a state of war with Germany, removing a number of restrictions, and approving a mobile Federal police force of 30,000 for Western Germany, raised protests in the U. S. S. R. and a few questions in the minds of the German people. To some of the latter the authorization of a Federal police smacked of militarism. Some considered it a sensible precaution in view of the frequent forays by east zone rioters into the west; many feared that the formation of a Federal police would provoke attack from the east. Talk of remilitarization and participation in the West European army increased nervousness. Western guaranties of defense in the event of attack from the east had a somewhat hollow ring in view of the disparity between the 175 divisions that the U. S. S. R. was reported to have on tap behind the iron curtain and the scant half dozen divisions immediately available to the western nations if the U. S. S. R. should suddenly decide to move into the west.

Once the "Unity" SED ballot had been endorsed by all East Germans who wished to avoid the charge of being "uncooperative," the U. S. S. R. held an East bloc conference of foreign ministers in Prague under Molotov's chairmanship in October 21 and 22. Out of this conference came a four-point communiqué that blasted the rearmament of Western Germany as if it were an accomplished fact and called for an all-German "peace" industry, a peace treaty plus withdrawal of all occupation troops, and the formation of an all-German council to prepare a provisional government for a reunited Germany. Five months earlier, on May 26, the Allied High Commissioners had forwarded to General Chuikov, their counterpart in the Soviet Zone, proposals of the three foreign ministers for achieving German unity. The proposals were for free all-German elections for a national assembly empowered to frame an all-German constitution, the elections to be held under international supervision and on the basis of an electoral law embodying bona fide democratic principles. To date General Chuikov has made no reply, and the Prague conference ignored the fact that such proposals had been made. The program developed at Prague was just about what West Germany had been predicting as a follow-up of the fraudulent October elections. The pattern emerging bore an unpleasant resemblance to the Korean pattern: "unity list" elections under Soviet supervision; proposal for the withdrawal of occupation troops. Would Communist invasion of the non-Communist zone come next?

Moscow followed up the Prague ultimatum with rejection of the much earlier British, French, and United States protest against the formation of the East Zone paramilitary forces. It was at this point that the Kremlin asked for a four-power conference on the demilitarization of Germany, just in time, so the free German press suggested, to influence the American November elections.

While awaiting the response to the proposal for a conference "to bring peace to the world," Soviet propaganda played up the Prague program for all it was worth, painting in lurid colors the fate of Western Germany should it fail to support the program; West Germany would become a wasteland; brother would kill brother; taxes would soar; German families would be thrown into the streets to provide housing for McCloy's new divisions; American gangsters would loose upon Germany the same horrors that they were currently visiting upon Korea; peace-loving German men, women, and children would be shot, hanged, or crucified, and such German youth as escaped that fate would deteriorate rapidly under the influence of American jam and Coca-Cola. The triumph of the SPD (Social Democratic Party) in the November elections in the Laender of Western Germany, even though the elections cost American-zone Communists their seats in Parliament, was hailed by the National Front (a Communist-cover organization developed in the east zone and designed to appeal to West Germans, to promote unification on Soviet terms) as proof that the West Germans were wholeheartedly behind the Prague program and unification according to Soviet ideas. The timing of the arrival of American troop reinforcements and some British tanks for the Allied sectors of Berlin inspired the Soviet slogan of "tank elections" for the free elections held in west Berlin on December 3.

In response to the edict of the Second World Peace Congress, held in Warsaw in November, the East German puppet government issued a so-called Law for the Protection of Peace providing penalties of 5 years to life imprisonment for any German—East or West—who spoke or wrote war propaganda, and the death penalty for any guilty person who worked for the benefit of other governments. It was a handy law under which any German—wherever he might live—who opposed the National Front could, if apprehended, be gotten out of the way. In some instances West Germans were kidnaped in broad daylight on the streets of the west sectors of Berlin and spirited away into the Soviet sector. Following closely upon the prohibition of freedom of speech and press were measures compelling East German families to send their children to the state schools and charging the Labor Ministry with supervision and control of all out-of-school activities of the young, thus making absolute the control of the Communist Party over East German youth.

After the Brussels meeting of the North Atlantic Council on December 18 and 19, the National Front did not fail to exploit the fact that the Chinese Communists had the UN forces on the run in Korea to prophesy that West Germans, should they accept the Brussels decisions, would be inviting the same fate as the Koreans were currently suffering—the fate that the Germans themselves had suffered in 1945 as a consequence of Nazi leadership.

FACTORS TO BE REMEMBERED

The North Atlantic Council agreed at Brussels that there should be one German division for every five non-German divisions in the unified European defense force if the people of Western Germany were willing to participate. As yet the Western Germans have not indicated their willingness. Since the U. S. S. R. insists that the Western Powers are rearming Western Germany when they are not and that the Soviet Union is not arming Eastern Germany when it is, the idea of limiting a conference with the Western Powers to the subject of demilitarizing Germany—or even making this issue the principal subject—is absurd. For purposes of the conference, Russia prefers to ignore the fact that there is a war in Korea and another in Indochina and that those wars and the tensions created by them are related to Communist versus democratic differences.

Reliable reports indicate that Russia's satellites have increased their armed strength since the outbreak of war in Korea and that the U. S. S. R. has 36 fully armored or mechanized divisions in East Germany and Poland alone and virtually limitless manpower within its own borders. Reports reveal also that the Russians have now restored the rail lines which they had dug up and taken away from Eastern Germany shortly after the surrender. These railways, in the event of war with the Western Powers, would be the supply line from Russia proper through the Soviet zone of Germany.

On January 15 of this year, the SED in Eastern Germany launched a large-scale purge of its overseas membership. Party cards have been called in, and every holder is obliged to submit to a personal and comprehensive examination on the fine points of doctrine. In accordance with the promises of Deputy Minister-President Ulbricht, the weak links in the Soviet chain are being eliminated and the Communist-trained Free German Youth (FGY) will be used to replace questionable fellow travelers and opportunists.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on May 3 I had hoped to be able to make a few remarks in honor of Poland's Constitution Day, but the hearings before the combined Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services prevented me from being on the floor to make this statement. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement which I planned to make on May 3 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

As we fittingly observe once again the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, we recall that the Polish people, first defenders of the Christian faith against the Mohammedan Turk and the first defenders of Christian freedom against the totalitarian Nazi, symbolize for freemen everywhere the spirit of noble resistance against the godless forces of evil.

We Americans revere and cherish our Constitution, but no less so do the Polish people, and it is therefore fitting that we ever keep sharply separate in our minds the very fundamental differences existing between the freedom-loving Polish people and the government that purports to represent them. During my service as a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations last autumn, I saw at first hand those who call themselves the representatives of the Polish people. I heard these so-called representatives of the people of Poland day after day heap insults on the forces of decency, sneer at democracy, and mouth their robotlike echoes of the Kremlin party line. Knowing the Polish people as I do, it came forcibly home to me how very important it is that we keep reminding ourselves how utterly unrepresentative are these cynical and insincere puppets of the true Poland and the principles of the true Polish Constitution, whose anniversary we observe here today.

"Polonia Restituta"—the inspiring words which adorn the medal with which the Polish people honor their friends—are words which recall to the masters of the Kremlin that although they may have temporary political dominance over Poland, they will never be the masters of the soul of Poland. The words "Polonia Restituta" are both a warning and a hope for the future.

Crime, Corruption, and the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night, Monday, May 7, it was my pleasure to deliver an address at a banquet given by the Citizens' Union of New York. The theme of the dinner was Crime, Corruption, and the Community.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address I delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS IN COMBATING CRIME

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY)

Mark Twain used to say that everyone complains about the weather, but no one does anything about it. So, too, for a long time in this country, a lot of people have complained about crime, worried and moaned about crime. But, very few people have bothered to do anything constructive to eliminate it.

SALUTE TO CITIZENS' UNION

Among the exceptions have been outstanding civic organizations like your own Citizens' Union. I salute every individual who has been associated with this and similar civic organizations—for example, with voluntary citizen crime commissions from coast to coast. You can and should feel a deep sense of pride in the fine job which you have been performing.

TODAY'S CRIME IS BUSINESSLIKE

In Washington our Kefauver crime committee is now 1 year old.

What have we learned? A lot of things. One of them is that the gangster of 1951 uses the most up-to-the-minute, streamlined methods of 1951. The "tommy gun" of the 1920's and 1930's has largely been replaced by less deadly "typewriters" and by adding machines. Modern crime is a scientific, skilled business, operating with machine-like efficiency.

ANTICRIME GROUPS VITAL

Well, what are we going to do about it? I say: Organize further against it. In politics, there is an old saying that "it takes an organization to defeat an organization." It takes an organization devoted to crime prevention and crime curbing to smash organizations devoted to spreading crime. It takes an organization—consisting of men and women of the highest integrity, men and women who have no political axes to grind—to help smash crime.

GREAT CRUSADE NEEDED TO ROUT TERMITES

I have been with the crime committee across the length and breadth of this country, from Washington, D. C., to Kansas City, to Las Vegas to Los Angeles. The more I see of crime and corruption, the more I recognize that it has been so effective in undermining the very foundations of our society that it will take an overwhelming drive to rout out these termites.

THE FORCES WE OPPOSE

When you and I fight organized gangsterdom today, we are not simply fighting ruthless, power-seeking criminals—some of whom possess very keen intellects. We are fighting their high-powered lawyers and shrewd certified public accountants as well. We are fighting their "public relations" experts who have spread about the criminals an aura of respectability and even a romantic charm.

In addition, we are fighting other forces that are even stronger, the force of public apathy, of indifference and cynicism. Let me amplify that point.

CYNICISM—A DANGEROUS TRAIT

Sometimes the man in the street reads newspaper stories on the existence of crime, and he says to himself: "Oh, well, all those politicians are crooked. There is nothing that can be done about it. The criminals control everything. What's the use of voting?"

Well, I say that if the average man in the streets has that unsound approach it is the worst possible thing that can happen. Cynicism never got any man anywhere.

There is an old Chinese proverb that says "It is better to light a single candle than it is to curse the darkness." You people of the citizens union have been lighting candles, shedding light on crime and corruption. Elsewhere in America other civic organizations have been doing likewise.

TYPES OF CRIME STUDIED

Now, in spite of all of the instances of evil which I have found, I am certainly not discouraged. But make no mistake, I have seen plenty of instances. I have seen the story of mobsters infiltrating into legitimate business—auto companies, laundries, vending-machine businesses, hotels.

I have seen the sickening narcotics situation—particularly as it affects teen-age youth—one of the most dastardly conditions conceivable.

I have seen evidences of the dreaded Mafia, the sinister organization whose terror binds together the eastern and western crime syndicates. I have seen evidences of this infiltration of criminals into basketball and boxing.

HOODLUMS WITH FINANCIAL INTEREST IN PRIZE RING

I might, incidentally, say that we have only touched the surface dirt, insofar as the infiltration of hoodlums into prize-fight management and promotion are concerned. There simply are too many criminals owning this or that percentage of too many boxers—some of whom are presumably the ablest fighters in their weight division. The situation is enough to give a very bad aroma to professional prize fighting, even though only a very small number of criminal individuals is involved.

I say it is a shame that sports or any other legitimate field should have become poisoned to such a tremendous extent with the criminal influence. I am indeed hoping that the various types of business and sports activity which have been infiltrated by the mobsters, if only in part, will do their best to help clean up their own shop.

Yes; I have seen these and other evidences of organized crime. I have seen public officials whose salaries were $5,000 or $7,500 a year, but who suddenly blossomed out with net worths of $100,000 and more. I have seen, as you have, evidences of pay-offs being reported everywhere from the cops on the beat to city hall.

I HAVE FAITH IN MEN

And yet, as I have said, in the face of all this, I am not discouraged, and not disheartened. I am not one of those who believe that man is fundamentally evil. I am not one of those who think that sin must go on and on. I believe that man spiritually is a child of God and was meant for joy, abundance, for beauty, for cleanliness, and not for their opposites.

NEW YORK HAS TREMENDOUS CHALLENGE

To be sure, the great city of New York, the great jewel in the Empire State has a tremendous problem. We of the Crime Committee have only shown in the limited time available a tiny percentage of the crime and corruption here, that could have been exposed, based upon the extensive leads in our files.

It is a fact of course that our Crime Committee could not continue investigating indefinitely either in New York or in any other single community. Our aim has been to show the pattern of crime, on the basis of which we would recommend constructive legislation. We are a legislative committee, and legislation, rather than criminal chasing, as such, is our job.

FAIR NAME OF NEW YORK MUST NOT BE SMEARED

I am firmly convinced that just as New York has bred a good many criminals, so New York will develop in turn, and has already developed outstanding leaders of law enforcement who will curb the criminal element. The distinguished folks who are on the platform with me tonight are men of that caliber. As a matter of fact, it was a New Yorker, Mr. Rudolph Halley, who performed so brilliantly as our chief counsel for so long.

Yes, from out of the loins of the great city of New York will come the solution of New York's problems.

Great jurists of the caliber of Sam Liebowitz on the Kings County Court or Harold Medina and Irving Kaufman on the Federal district bench—great judges like these—will do their part.

And so I say to you, there is absolutly no justification for anyone's smearing or vilification of the fair name of the great city of New York.

DON'T PASS THE BUCK

Friends, we of the Federal Government are eager to help you meet your own problem. But remember, you yourselves have the basic job to do. Don't pass the whole buck to Uncle Sam in Washington.

The real answer to crime is not in the next fellow or in the next level of government. The attitude of "Let George do it" is not the answer to crime. The real answer is in your action and mine, as citizens in our communities; in your heart and mine.

OUR JUDAIC-CHRISTIAN TRADITION

Yes; the basic answer to crime is a spiritual rededication on the part of all men, a reawakening to the basic principles that made this Nation great—to the principles of honesty and integrity and fair dealing.

It is up to you and to me to help cleanse the great temple of America. The entire tradition of our country beckons us to the task. After all, practically all of us are heirs to the Judaic-Christian religion which teaches that man is sacred, that all men are brothers and God is their Father.

CRUSADE MUST NOT TARRY

I repeat, as I began, the subject of crime should not be like the subject of the weather. We can and must do something about crime. And what we do must be on a local and on a continuing basis.

I emphasize "continuing."

I urge you not to become smug and complacent when you read that this hoodlum or that one has been deposed and has been thrown in jail, or that an income tax lien has been slapped on him.

Don't become smug or complacent when you read that such and such a number of arrests have occurred, or that such and such a number of indictments have been handed down. These statistics may not tell the whole story.

They may be very encouraging, as I believe they truly are in New York. But in many areas such news is not only inconclusive, but sometimes is even misleading.

There can be arrests without convictions or substantial counts. Criminals guilty of the worst offenses often get away with an equivalent of a $5 parking ticket.

There can be indictments, but they may not necessarily end in the people's triumph in the highest courts.

The point I am making is that it is a long, long battle—this war against crime. Let's not quit in the second or third inning. Let's not allow apparent victories in early skirmishes to puff us up with complacency.

GANGSTERS EXPERT AT LYING LOW

Remember that the gangsters of this country have learned to weather many previous "reform storms." Let's prove to them that we are not going to allow this great reform wave, this moral crusade to die down. It is your continuing job and mine, because it is your country and mine.

CONCLUSION

As I conclude, there comes to mind the words of a poet who prayed "God give us men." And, so I say to you "God give us men with the fire of patriotism in their souls; men eager to burn out the dross and leave the gold.

"God give us men, eager to serve their fellow men, eager to cleanse the body politic and economic of our society—to cleanse away those who have defiled it. God give us men."

Thank you.

Employ the Physically Handicapped—Essay Contest Won by Miss Mary Ann Owen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, Miss Mary Ann Owen, high-school student of Bridgeton, N. J., has been selected the top winner in the national Employ the Physically Handicapped essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Miss Owen, whose entry was adjudged best among those submitted by high-school students from 34 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, will receive a $1,000 cash award and a trip to Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, a copy of Miss Owen's superb article entitled "Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped."

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

2315 MAIN STREET,
Randolph, N. J., January 13, 1951.

Mr. JAMES A. WILSON,
843 Tenth Street, Randolph, N. J.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I understand that there is a vacancy in your establishment for a linotypist. If you have not employed anyone, I should like to be considered for the position.

In 1948 I was graduated at the age of 17 from the Kenmore High School, where I was trained for working in the printing shop. Immediately after graduation I was employed by the Daily Times as a linotypist, working there for 13 months. Then seeking adventure and wanting to serve my country, I enlisted in the Navy. In July 1950 an experience I like not to think about caused the amputation of both my legs. While recuperating in the hospital I took bedside lessons in English. I concentrated in punctuation, spelling, and word breakage, all of which would be beneficial to me in my work. Having mastered the use of my artificial limbs and knowing your establishment has the new mixer-type machine, I feel I am capable of filling your vacancy. If no galley boy were available to change magazines, I would be willing to do straight body type work.

If you would be so kind as to grant me an interview, you can reach me at my parents' home, 2315 Main Street, Phone Rlt. 6-3843.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS R. MOSS.

Mr. Wilson placed the letter on a pile with others to be filed away. No handicapped in his business. Oddly enough, he found that the next letter contained literature from the United States Department of Labor concerning the physically handicapped. A quick glance and that too was put aside. A caption on one of the pamphlets caught his eye, "Consider their abilities, not their disabilities."

That evening when Mr. Wilson arrived home for dinner he found an unexpected guest. It was a lifelong friend of the family whom he had never considered handicapped though she had had to use crutches since she was 11 years old. She shared with her host and hostess the good news that she had been asked to head the mathematics department in her school. Here was a woman who reached her goal through perseverance. Her 100-percent attendance record for a period of 20 years was enviable. She had earned respect and admiration from all who knew her and had become a light to others because of her continuous courage and self-reliance. Mr. Wilson realized this visit was certainly a coincidence, having received that application just that day. Those words, "Consider their abilities, not their disabilities." "No, no," he thought, "I can't have a handicapped man in my business."

After their friend had gone, Mr. Wilson picked up the evening newspaper and read of a dinner that had been given for a man who was retiring after 40 years of faithful service at the Fisher Dye Co. During his youth an illness had caused the loss of his right arm. He had adapted himself quickly to the situation and went on working with all the vim and vigor of an unimpaired. He had been the best dyer and never had had an accident in all the years on the job. "Handicapped workers are more careful; therefore safer workers," he read.

Mr. Wilson put down the paper. "Consider their abilities, not their disabilities." Sweat began to form on his brow. No, no, he never could employ a handicapped in his business. Greatly puzzled and disturbed, he went to bed.

Restless and bothered, he thought of his friend Sam, who, in spite of having injured his back, was not discouraged. His business flourished, and it became one of the most prosperous establishments in town. Why? Because he had been eager to prove that his impairment was not a handicap.

"Consider their abilities, not their disabilities." Then through his mind like a parade came all of the people he had ever known who were handicapped, nagging, gnawing at him. All the qualities which the unimpaired worker presented flashed across his mind. "Consider their abilities, not their disabilities—consider their abilities—." Only from exhaustion he dropped off to sleep.

Waking early in the morning, Mr. Wilson left for the office. He immediately had to find that literature he had received yesterday. Surely facts would back him up why he should not employ the physically handicapped.

Workmen's compensation insurance rates? No; an impaired worker did not raise the rates. Facts proved that these handicapped persons were more productive, careful, adaptable, regular, steady, and capable if placed in their proper classification. The Selective Placement Bureau properly placed handicaps. No, handicaps couldn't be placed haphazardly, but with thought and understanding they could be and should be placed where they were fitted. Why, it even costs less to rehabilitate an injured worker than it does to support him; thus, taxes would be less.

"Consider their abilities, not their disabilities." Suddenly Mr. Wilson saw the light. As though a great weight were lifted from his mind, he called Miss Cole, his secretary, "Please get Mr. Thomas Moss on the phone for me. His number is Rlt. 6-3843."

What Should Be Our International Economic Policy in a Period of Rearmament?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a speech by George A. Sloan, chairman of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., March 26, 1951:

It is indeed an honor to appear before this distinguished group and to explore with you some of today's economic problems with particular reference to international trade and policy in a period of rearmament.

* * * * *

The free world is faced with a grave crisis and perhaps its greatest challenge to survival. We must develop—and we have made a good beginning—the strength of the free nations to counteract the aggressive moves of communism.

A foreign economic policy, by definition, should be the true reflector of the world we live in. Let us for a moment, therefore, examine the world at midcentury.

The paramount objective of our foreign policy should be the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace. It should include friendly cultural intercourse among nations as well as mutually advantageous trade among nations.

* * * * *

Today, more than ever before, we Americans are called upon for an expression of national unity, for a sense of purpose and for a decisive spirit. Unity must start at home in our foreign dealings, especially our international economic relations.

Nearly 6 years ago the United States was at its prime of strength as a world power. No one doubted this strength. Today there are doubts about our leadership and policy in many capitals of the free world, in London, in Paris, in Rome. Actually, the power of the United States has not diminished to warrant such doubts.

The Soviets have made two major gains. They have swung China into their orbit and they are said to have the atom bomb. On the other hand, the United States has made tremendous gains. Since Korea there is more of a spirit of unity. Production, economic growth have been our determining factors. Korea has awakened many of those who did not previously visualize the antagonism in the Soviet system.

The Western World, especially Western Europe, is better off today than in any period since the end of World War II. Western Europe has turned from an area disorganized by the effects of war into a smoother-flowing economic and political community. While not completely recovered from devastations and dislocations, the most difficult part of the Western European reconstruction task has been achieved.

* * * * *

The world continues to consist of the "haves" and the "have nots." You may ask, "have or have not what?" And my answer is have or have not freedom of access to the world's raw materials (as promised in the Atlantic Charter to victor and vanquished alike)—have or have not the freedom to own, to use, and to risk the mechanical means of production—have or have not the right to the just rewards of their honest labor—have or have not the right to determine and to control their own destiny as free men—because they are denied their rightful opportunity to utilize nature's endless bounty for their own well-being and individual happiness.

Human misery in the Western World is certainly much smaller now than it was in the nineteenth century. That this was possible in spite of two World Wars is sufficient answer to those who claim western civilization is in decay. Notwithstanding the postwar poverty of Europe and the rest of the world, the West as a whole is richer in kind and in spirit than ever. But the situation in many friendly countries still presents a challenge to the United States if the spread of communism is to be held in check.

* * * * *

A transformation so swift as that of the last 10 years cannot be experienced by a relatively young nation without mistakes in action and without moments of doubt. It should be most reassuring to all of us who believe in the freedom of the individual that our system of democracy always induces self-doubt. The current congressional debate on foreign policy is a true indicator of this.

Surely, America's future depends on how widely and how wisely it carries out the responsibilities of leadership. The central point must be the unification of the free world in the face of aggression and threats of aggression. Each member of the free world acting alone is too weak to counteract these threats or to resist attack. Not even the United States standing alone can be powerful enough for self-defense. Acting together, the free nations by moral standards and productive achievements will bring about the currently lacking balance of power. In all these endeavors our basic aim must always remain the same: The maintenance of peace but without sacrifice of freedom.

The fear of what the next moves of the Soviets and their satellites will be is inherent in the policies and the thinking of free peoples everywhere. Hearings before congressional committees, debates before the House of Commons, discussions in the French Parliament—all are influenced by the foremost consideration of what the next moves of the Soviets may be.

With the free world in a twilight of war (which we hope will brighten rather than darken in due course by our own actions) the challenge is even greater. We have to superimpose a military economy on a civilian economy in the hope that the least amount of belt-tightening will be necessary. This situation brings with it an inflationary tendency.

Actually, the foremost enemy of the Western World, at the present, is inflation. We must stop putting fuel on the flame, while, at the same time, feebly trying to put out inflation's flame with a sprinkling can. Either we all—and I mean all—make the necessary sacrifices now to stop inflation or we will be faced later with the reality of making much bigger, if not total, sacrifices.

* * * * *

Inflation is Stalin's best ally. Next to Soviet imperialism this is the most difficult problem facing America and our friends abroad.

This then is a bird's-eye view of the world we live in. It is the setting on which we must apply our foreign economic policy.

The first question that now arises is: What should be our short-range, our immediate, international economic policy?

Development of strength at a rapid pace to offset the military power of the nations in the Soviet orbit is, I should think, objective No. 1. The plans are becoming better defined. They are being carried out by the Office of Defense Mobilization in Washington on the American level and the Defense Production Board under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Businessmen are and should be the prime policy movers of these efforts. And, industrial operations, as can be witnessed so well in Detroit, are carrying the production effort.

I am confident that rapid rearmament of the non-Soviet world will—within a short period—create superiority of political, economic, and military strength on our part. Such a state of conditions would make the Kremlin stop, look, and listen before embarking on other diversionary invasion movements. The Western World must concentrate its efforts for the next 2 or 3 years on harnessing its resources for defense.

In the process of rearmament, some distortions in production, prices, and trade already have become apparent. Resources that would otherwise be available to civil consumption and investment in the promotion of freer trade and raising standards of living have been transferred to military needs.

* * * * *

The free world cannot go on focusing exclusively on being strong enough to wipe out aggression before it actually occurs. At some point, whenever the Kremlin will decide, there has to come a break in the international tension. At some point the success of the free world will be measured not by self-preservation efforts, but by our ability to expand economic capacity to such an extent that we can offer to both our own people and the people in the underdeveloped areas increased standards, both material and moral, that dictatorships of any kind are in no position to provide.

In the knowledge of this important factor, it stands to reason that the free world must move forward to expand its productive facilities, its economic strength, its scientific knowledge. So we therefore come to objective No. 2:

We cannot withdraw behind a protective curtain of isolation because for many vital commodities the United States is dependent on external resources. Of the 15 basic minerals, the United States is relatively self-sufficient in only 6: coal, petroleum, iron, sulfur, phosphate, and potash. In the case of iron, various ferro-alloys must be imported before steel can be made. The automobile industry in Detroit is well aware of the fact that 100 percent of tin, chrome, and cordage fibers are imported. Ninety-two percent of our manganese and cobalt, 73 percent of tungsten, and 34 percent of our yearly requirements for lead are mined outside of the United States. Our foreign economic policy must be based on a full realization of these facts. In order to make their economies most productive, the countries of the Western World need an adequate and equitable supply of required raw materials together with a flow of essential consumer goods.

To assure an adequate supply of strategic raw materials for all countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), and the other non-Soviet nations it is necessary to have in permanent operation joint allocation boards, eliminating thereby the inflationary effects of free market competition for scarce material. The price effects of such an uncontrolled rush for materials is imposing severe strains on the economy of some countries, including our own.

It is gratifying to know that a start in the direction of international allocation and procurement of materials is now being made.

The current sessions of the raw material commodity groups in Washington are one way of controlling this weakness. It is essential, however, that private channels be assigned, wherever possible, the responsibility to carry out this raw material goal. Also, an international arrangement like this should be maintained only for the period of the emergency. Then it is imperative that free market competition must be reinstituted.

* * * * *

The United States Government should immediately clarify the raw-material situation so that there will be an end to the kind of vacuum that seems to persist in Washington. Instead of the many overlapping agencies in the field now, there should be one Government agency—possibly ECA—in sole charge of the temporary allocation and procurement of raw materials.

* * * * *

Three notable and informed sources lately have proposed that the proper exercise of our foreign economic policy demands the consolidation of all the scattered efforts within a single governmental agency. Headed by a man of outstanding ability with public acceptance, this agency should have the equivalent of Cabinet status.

First, there was the Gordon Gray report, rather outdated at this time because it was originally conceived before Korea. Then, the speeches and writings of our own United States Council Executive Committee member Paul Hoffman (who certainly knows this problem first-hand and can speak with feeling about administrative foul-ups in the Government). And finally, we are confronted with the recent report of Nelson Rockefeller's International Development Advisory Board. (This report, though its other recommendations require careful study before we can determine whether businessmen should endorse them is unqualifiedly correct on the demand for a single agency.)

The Hoover Commission in many other fields has pointed out the waste and inefficiency and stupid duplication of much of our administrative structure in Washington and abroad. Here, in the field of foreign economic policy, is a situation ripe for a Hoover Commission approach.

These then are some factors that make up our short-range foreign economic policy.

* * * * *

If the free nations of the world do not succeed in avoiding economic maladjustments—if they fail to establish an environment in which communities can advance materially and spiritually—there is always the danger that the people will be driven into communism. Only by our performance can we hope to contain the advances of communism. Take the example of the Chinese. The Chinese farmer who has accepted or even welcomed communism as relief from the misery, oppression, and corruption of his lot will learn in time that the promises of the Communists are hollow. Collectivism will soon take back the land made available to him. The cancellation of debts, which was made possible through liquidation of the money lender, will be replaced by oppressive taxes. Communism will soon become a yoke.

But, communism has never yet been eliminated in any country where a Communist regime obtained power. We must act, therefore, before the cancerous growth of communism can spread.

An economic strategy for peace should certainly include a drive to reform traditional modes of production and distribution and increase sharply the productivity of men and machines. This is one way to meet threats of foreign aggression and international collapse. One of the major steps in that direction is to demonstrate the adaptability and flexibility of the American productive system to our European friends. Fortune magazine, in its February 1951 issue, made quite an essential point in this respect: "United States business is the best-qualified group in all the world for getting the American idea across to European top management. It is hardly necessary," said Fortune, "to suggest the means: there could be seminars and international conventions—organizations such as the International Chamber of Commerce are ready-made for this—trips and private exchanges of all sorts."

* * * * *

In the United States the living standards and working conditions of the average citizen have shown constant and remarkable improvement. In Europe this has not been true. There are many reasons for this, including the trend to socialism and the emphasis which European capitalism places on an out-moded cartel system. Many European businessmen dislike competition. I think there is great danger in this state of mind. We must distinguish between capitalism which works for the few and capitalism which works for the many. The trend of European capitalism has been away from a sense of responsibility to the community. I am sure the morale of people of Europe would rise if they could identify European capitalism with a positive rather than a negative policy.

Today many ardent anti-Communists abroad are suspicious of the motives of American capitalism. By explaining the true contribution of American capitalism to the world in terms of the gains of the individual working men and women I am sure we as businessmen will develop our most successful weapon against Soviet propaganda. This should be a major component of our foreign economic policy.

We must win people as well as diplomatic and military battles if we hope to stop communism. Communism has been making progress in other countries under oppression and poverty. Our long-range international economic policy must keep in mind that a removal of these conditions is an obligation. The Communists have imagination, boldness, and courage—all couched in a fanatical devotion to a cause. We can reply with far more effective boldness and courage.

It is significant that I am speaking to you on the same day that in Washington the foreign ministers of the 21 American Republics are opening their deliberations on, among other things, how the raw material and productive resources of the Western Hemisphere can be stepped up.

Point 3 on the agenda of the sessions is the following:

"Emergency economic cooperation: (a) Production and distribution for defense purposes; and (b) production and distribution of products in short supply and utilization of necessary services to meet requirements of the American Republics and measures to facilitate insofar as possible the carrying out of programs of economic development."

As we understand it, the Latin American countries are asking such questions as: Can a reasonable market be guaranteed after the emergency for expanded Latin American production? Will we (Latin Americanos) be able to obtain sufficient technological know-how from the United States to expand production and increase standards of living? The question of additional American capital investment will also be on the minds of our friends from below our southern borders.

We are asking the Latin Americans to expand raw material production for the current defense program. And the Latin Americans are determined, as we understand it, to bargain for a position where the gains made during the emergency would be of benefit after the emergency is over.

As part of our long-range foreign economic policy, there should be an expansion in the investment of private companies abroad. Many American companies that have invested in subsidiaries and affiliates abroad have had satisfactory experience with the exception of transferring earnings to the United States. Naturally, we must do all in our power to convince the Government that the obstacles to foreign investments, such as double-taxation, lack of convertibility and other similar controls, be corrected so that American business will have incentives to take its dollars abroad.

Private investment going abroad is a desirable way to fortify the economies and raise the standards of living of foreign countries. It is a most effective countermove to the conditions that breed poverty and oppression. Private foreign investment would also relieve the taxpayer of the burden of providing through his Government direct assistance and grants to other nations. When private capital goes abroad it brings with it American know-how and managerial skill and thus directly contributes to the welfare of the recipient nations.

But we must be realistic: Congress should provide much of the necessary encouragement by passing legislation deferring taxation of earnings on foreign activities of American companies until they are brought home. At the same time bilateral treaties must be concluded to assure the transfer of earnings to corporations in capital exporting countries and to eliminate double taxation.

* * * * *

In summary, our foreign economic policy, both short-range and long-range, should embrace the following:

1. Establishment and maintenance of just and lasting peace as our paramount objective.
2. All-out drive to stop inflation in every part of the free world.
3. Increase of efforts to develop, procure, and allocate raw materials internationally—to be maintained for period of emergency only.
4. Development of non-Soviet world's strength at rapid rate.
5. Administration of all United States aid efforts under a single agency.
6. Enlightened and active United States world economic leadership.
7. Planning by business today beyond emergency period.
8. Fulfillment of business' role with enlightened cooperation by governments in making possible an extensive flow of foreign investment abroad.

These ideas reflect the discussions at the International Chamber of Commerce and the United States Council; they also reflect discussions with government leaders in many parts of the world.

In the past the United States has followed a short-sighted course in our foreign economic relations. We sought and rejoiced in the expansion of our foreign trade. But we were reluctant to accept the fact that it lacked a healthy balance and that it was being sustained by loans and grants that in the end would be too great a burden on foreign debtors, not to mention our own taxpayers.

We claimed repayment of war debts which prejudiced prospects of solvency of private industrial development which we ourselves were encouraging.

It is a challenge to the American business community to learn from our mistakes and to act accordingly.

We would be right in risking much on the faith that economic improvement and development, widely shared and achieved by cooperative efforts, will make it more likely that the free nations will stand together. The ultimate result would be that at some day in the future, the Soviets will realize the futility of their efforts in undermining the free nations and suspend their struggle for world domination. We must be ready to work in this direction and to rise above the problems of the day and plan as businessmen statesmen.

The Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the testimony given by the Honorable Sidney McMath, Governor of Arkansas, before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Saturday, April 21. Governor McMath's testimony is so illuminating that I am taking this means of calling it to the attention of the House of Representatives for study and consideration. Governor McMath's record both as a Marine veteran and as the head of his State administration is ample proof of his integrity and his devotion to his State, his country, and the Marine Corps. I also would like to say that I have requested Chairman VINSON to call for a hearing on the bill introduced by some 70 Members to raise the strength of Marine Corps to not to exceed 400,000 and to place the Commandant on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is my hope that Governor McMath will again testify at that time.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. SIDNEY MCMATH, GOVERNOR OF ARKANSAS, BEFORE SENATE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE, SATURDAY, APRIL 21

I appreciate the courtesy of this committee in permitting me to appear and express my opinion in favor of Senate bill 677 which would increase the strength of the Marine Corps to four combat divisions and four combat wings and give this branch of the service representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

You can imagine how humble I feel testifying here following the testimony of military experts and taking issue with them on a matter involving military policy. It is comforting to know that in this country a citizen can entertain a difference of opinion with that of our generals on military policy. (I understand that there is sometimes a division among the generals themselves on policies affecting the safety of our country and the conduct of the war.)

I hasten to state, however, that I do not appear here purporting to be in any sense an authority on military affairs. I am here as a private citizen who has a natural interest in any measure that bears upon the security of this country and affects our ability to meet our commitments and responsibilities as a member of the United Nations.

Naturally, having had the privilege of serving as a marine, I have a strong attachment to the Marine Corps and share that sense of loyalty to the organization that is characteristic of all marines.

It is not necessary for me to review the glories and triumphs and traditions of the Marine Corps. Their battle performance is known and respected by every citizen. The accomplishments of the Marine Corps (on the battlefield) in no way detracts from the heroic deeds of the other services.

Historically the Marine Corps has had a mission in protecting the interests and defending the security of the United States. It has never failed in its assigned task. Frequently, however, its job has been made more difficult—unnecessarily difficult by restrictive policies limiting the size and strength and organization of its combative force.

The Marine Corps continuously, so it seems, has had to fight for the privilege of fighting. One would expect that some day it would be recognized (by those who formulate military policy) that the Marine Corps has a definite role in our military operations and that it would be strengthened accordingly. But this is not the case.

During the early 1930's, an effort was made to abolish the Marine Corps. This effort failed and the Marine Corps was able to continue its existence and by 1939 reached a strength of 17,000 officers and men. These officers and men were skilled, experienced, professional soldiers. It was from these officers and men that cadres were formed and the Marine Corps expanded to six hard-hitting and extremely effective divisions that performed so valiantly and skillfully and with such devastating results to the enemy during the Second World War.

I for one was confident that it had been established beyond any doubt that the Marines had a military function and purpose that justified a strength of at least four permanent divisions. The shooting had hardly stopped, however, until the old movement to abolish the Corps was revived with renewed determination and vigor. The advocates of this policy denied that they wanted to destroy the Marine Corps, but had their decisions been carried to their natural conclusions, this would have been the result. To reduce the Marine Corps to a few battalions organized into landing teams would be to destroy the combative force of this branch of our fighting service. The natural and ultimate result of this action would be to reduce the Marine Corps to ship's detachments and shore patrols.

Those of our leaders who have advanced this policy are imminently qualified and honorable men. Some of them rank among the greatest military men of our history. In fact, history will rank some of them with such illustrious names as Stonewall Jackson and Robert E. Lee. But because of their training and background and experience, they have the traditional Army view of the Marine Corps. They say, in so many words, that we do not need a second Army, and that is very true. But what we do need (and it seems to me that this has been so clearly established that I hesitate to mention it)—what we do need is a combative force organized, trained, equipped, indoctrinated, and steeled for amphibious operations, and for crushing comparatively small, aggressive forces, that if left undefeated would grow and expand their conquest.

The Marine Corps has traditionally been organized, trained, and indoctrinated for the difficult and specialized task of executing amphibious operations. The history of the Pacific operations in the Second World War relates how, in a number of instances, the Marines attained killing efficiency in this field. The Navy-Marine amphibious team has been used effectively in the Korean campaign. I would suggest to this honorable committee that the views of Gen. Douglas MacArthur be obtained on this question. General MacArthur (more than any other Army officer) during the Second World War and in Korea, has had opportunities to use Marines on the ground and in the air in landing operations. I dare say that General MacArthur would have welcomed even two Marine divisions supported by a corresponding number of air wings during the initial phases of the Korean conflict.

If the Marines had consisted of a ship's detachment and a corporal's guard, there would have been no Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Okinawa, or a Peleliu, nor a number of other battles that brought our air arm within effective striking distance of Japan and provided advanced bases for the fleet.

On the other hand, if the Marine Corps had consisted in the beginning of the Second World War of four combat divisions supported by four air wings, the decision at Guadalcanal would never have been in doubt. The movement up the Solomons and through the Gilberts and other Pacific islands would have been greatly accelerated.

If at the outbreak of the Korean conflict the Marine Corps had been a combat force of four divisions (with four air wings in support), the tactical situation would have no doubt been different from the beginning. The Army would not have been placed in a position of having to send most of its trained personnel to fight a comparatively small war at the expense of its build-up for a possible major conflict. I dare say that today the trained officers and men in the Army now committed in Korea are still badly needed as cadres for expanding our Army ground forces to the size and strength required to meet the principal threat to our security which lies in the European theater.

Amphibious operations, limited landing operations, acting as a police force for the U. N., these should be the primary missions of the Marine Corps. Present world conditions, our operations and commitments to check aggression and preserve the peace compel us to prepare for the day when there may be other Guadalcanals, Bougainvilles, Pelelius, Okinawas, and Koreas. In such an event it would be most comforting if we had in the field ready for immediate action four Marine divisions supported by four air wings. This would be a combative force more equal to the mission that belongs to the Marines. At the same time, the Army ground force could for the most part, at least, husband its strength in the build-up for the main event.

To insure that the Marine Corps is organized and strengthened and trained for its specialized task, it is necessary to have the Commandant of the Marines, who is in direct command of the Marine Corps, as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I have heard it said that no one favors Senate bill 677 except Congress and the people. Certainly the people with whom I have discussed the question are heartily in favor of a strong Marine Corps which asks only the right to fight and the right to help plan the campaigns to which they will be committed.

I am confident that Congress will reflect the will of the majority of the people by taking favorable action upon this bill.

War Not Inevitable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that war is not inevitable, that we should not always live in an atmosphere of fear, created to make successful some political maneuver, is emphasized by an editorial in last night's Washington Evening Star which reads as follows:

MACARTHUR ON WAR AND PEACE

However debatable may be the stern military course advocated by General MacArthur to drive the Chinese Communists from Korea, his views on war itself are plainly the views of a man of peace. More than that, as set forth in his congressional testimony, they constitute an eloquent appeal to the reason and sanity of governments everywhere—an appeal that ought certainly to be pondered long and hard by the responsible authorities in all the capitals of the world, particularly in Moscow.

To begin with, General MacArthur has emphatically dissociated himself from that bleak and potentially dangerous school of thought—it exists in many lands—that is resigned to the inevitability of a titanic, world-engulfing armed struggle revolving around Russia and the United States as the prime antagonists. He rejects such a notion as defeatism of the worst kind—a despairing acceptance of the pernicious fallacy that peoples and governments are helpless before the so-called wave of the future, instead of being themselves endowed with the means and power to make and shape history according to their own free will. In his judgment, another global war is very definitely not inevitable. Indeed, he seems almost optimistic in suggesting that the realities of our age promise to compel mankind to move—no matter how haltingly or argumentatively—toward the establishment of a permanent peace.

General MacArthur's optimism—if it may be called that—is based chiefly on the sound belief that the great masses of the world, including the Russian masses, are invincibly against war. They are against it because, as he says, it has been developed to a point where it places every man, woman, and child in the front line of battle, exposing them to horrors beyond the limits of human endurance. Science has revolutionized the meaning of space and time. It has wiped out the former protective value of land distances and ocean barriers. It has compressed the whole earth into a relatively small neighborhood, and the various peoples living in that neighborhood, being well aware of the change, are as one in their desire for peace. In that respect, according to General MacArthur, they are far ahead of their leaders, and their massed opposition to war offers the greatest possible hope that there shall be no war.

Moreover, wholly apart from the way the masses feel in all countries, General MacArthur has drawn some encouragement from this fact: That every government—even the Soviet dictatorship—must be profoundly sobered by the realization that atomic weapons and similar scientific developments are so appalling in their potentialities that there is good reason to believe that was "is inherently a failure now" as an instrument for the settlement of international disputes. It ought therefore to be done away with entirely. No power really can profit from it. On the contrary, another global conflict (which would be much worse than the last one) would very probably result in catastrophe for victors and vanquished alike—the "suicide of modern civilization." In sum, as General MacArthur has put it, there would be such an abomination of destruction and annihilation, such a desolate aftermath of woe and upheaval, such sorrow and revulsion everywhere, that the only happy people would be the dead people.

Accordingly, assuming that the men of the Kremlin are sane, assuming that the leaders of other nations are sane, and assuming also that no government anywhere can ignore a mass public opinion that is fervently anxious for peace, General MacArthur has taken the affirmative view that it is still possible, and perhaps even probable, that the world can "establish the mechanics to carry out the will of the common people that war shall be nonexistent" from here on out, permanently.

So speaks the soldier and great commander who has been maligned on both sides of the iron curtain as a "warmonger." His chief message to the Nation and the world is that peace, not war, should be inevitable. Moscow papers please copy. General MacArthur's views on this point reflect the most urgent hopes of all humanity—a humanity that realizes, along with him, that time is running out on civilization's last chance to avert a cataclysm that only mad men can welcome.

Hail the President on His Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer respectfully my congratulations to President Truman on the occasion of his sixty-seventh birthday which was celebrated yesterday.

The crises which have followed so rapidly in the past years up to this very day would have been sufficient to shatter a man of lesser breed. His are not the weak knees which buckle under the storm of oppression. His is the conviction that ultimately the right will prevail. And so it has been with each occasion which has tested the mettle of our President.

Let it not be denied that he is a man of intense courage; and, as has been so well said, "a man with courage is a majority." With resiliency of well-tempered steel, he springs back into act each time he is put to test. Because of his humanity, because of his very humaness, because of his courage, long after others have "faded away" our President, President Truman, will have taken his place in American and world history as a man in the service of his country who withstood the tempest of the times with integrity, unyielding determination, and courage. He is not the man to be turned around with each new wind. As Jefferson, as Jackson, and as Lincoln, Presidents who had to stand firmly before the unwarranted blasts of criticism living in an era of great emotion tension, so history will deliver the final judgment in his favor.

We offer our congratulations to the President and wish him well, indeed.

Seven Decisions by the Truman Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Seven Great Decisions," by Ralph McGill, which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on May 6 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN GREAT DECISIONS

(By Ralph McGill)

These be times when the national voice is all but drowned out by the Tower of Babel at Washington. It is a time when some even seem to think its subversive to support the Government of the United States, surely a strange and dangerous doctrine.

In the vacuum of leadership there is, unfortunately for the sake of balance, only the voice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. And the more he talks the more it becomes clear that, while he is without doubt a great military man, there is grave doubt that he knows how wisely to use that greatness.

Yet, the whole panorama of the great debate serves to point up one of the most ironic features of it—namely, that the chief failure of the Truman administration is not failure of its foreign policies of the present or the past, but a painful and embarrassing inability to state the amazing success of those policies in terms the people will understand.

Let us begin by recalling the patriot Arthur Vandenberg, who grew out of isolationism to statesmanship and whose life is best illustrated by some of his last words. "I want very much to live," he said, shortly before his death, "so that I may come back to the Congress and try to do something for the next generation, not the next election." He made possible a bipartisan foreign policy. It has been this policy, agreed to by a majority of the House and Senate, a fact the people and even the Congress forget, which has been, and is, the Truman or administration policy.

SEVEN DECISIONS

The Truman administration, carrying out a bipartisan foreign policy, has made seven great decisions. They have changed the course of history. They have thus far avoided war. They have kept communism outside the great industrial regions of Europe and of Asia.

Let us take them one by one and ask of ourselves what would be the state of the world if a single one of them had not been initiated and pursued.

1. Russia was strongly opposed in 1946 when she had troops in the northern area of Iran, and proclaimed the Republic of Azerbaijan, forcing her to withdraw from the drive on middle-eastern oil fields—a drive which was tied in with the political surge into Italy and France.

2. We saved Greece and thereby Turkey when the Truman doctrine was proclaimed for Greece and when General Van Fleet, now commanding in Korea, put down the Communist armies there in a long and bloody campaign which was for years a stalemate without any seeming end. Imagine if the Communists now held Greece and Turkey.

3. The Marshall plan, without any doubt, stabilized the economy of Western Europe and prevented Communist political victories.

4. The Atlantic Pact added to this strength.

5. We did not evacuate Berlin, but endured strong pressure and by Gen. Lucius Clay's drama of the airlift, forced the Russians to abandon a blockade they never meant to lift.

6. We intervened in South Korea—an intervention even General MacArthur called sound.

7. We made good our promises on the Atlantic Pact by providing General Eisenhower's leadership to organize.

RESULTS

Each of these decisions was of vital importance, and they have produced tangible results which have been of enormous benefit. But, since the Truman administration is unable to state its case, and because it has allowed the shoddiness and petty cheapness, test illustrated by Gen. Harry Vaughan, to tar and discredit it, all this really magnificent accomplishment is ignored.

Its success is hidden by that query: "How will we end the costly stalemate in Korea and save the lives of our men?"

The Korean war is but another attempt by the Soviets to test us, to find the weakness in our armor. It follows the test in Greece, in Italy, France, in Yugoslavia, and Berlin. The war in Korea is not like any

other we have fought. The end there is not necessarily military victory, but to show the Soviets we will fight and oppose them, if fighting is required. In other tests they have retreated when they were sure of that.

We must not allow the MacArthur issue to disunite us from that purpose. He may be right. He may be wrong. But, the fact is we have nothing for which to apologize in our bipartisan policy.

Tribute to the United States Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tribute to the Marines," which appeared in the New York Times of May 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE MARINES

There was not a dissenting vote cast on Friday when the Senate authorized an increase in the Marine Corps to 400,000 men. This singular unanimity makes it plain that the vote was more a tribute to the corps than a precise estimate of needed combat strength. The level set in the measure is permissive, not mandatory, and the actual size of the corps will be determined later on when the required appropriations are made.

There have been some strong technical objections to a large increase in the Marine Corps numbers. It is an elite body of troops, kept so by its selectivity and its unusually rigorous training. It ought not to be just another army. In this connection, the Senate has acted wisely in taking out the original proposal to place a Marine Corps representative on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and putting Joint Chiefs representation on a purely consultative basis.

Support for the measure, with the exception of this Joint Chiefs matter, indicates the feeling that these technical objections are not overriding if the corps is raised merely to the level of four full divisions and four air wings. In addition, there was the obvious desire to give the Marine Corps a sense of security as against possible future whittling down at the behest of other services or of a civilian agencies not entirely in sympathy with some of its activities. Such a sense of security within the branch of service is valuable to morale.

Beyond these factors, however, is the simple fact that the Marine Corps has given a magnificent account of itself on occasions whose number is beyond memory. If it has been boastful at times, it has had a fixed habit of making its boast good. The very toughness of its training has played a part in keeping up a great tradition of intrepidity. There is no denial that its esprit de corps is unrivaled. The Senators found an agreeable way to recognize that fact when they cast their ballots.

There is a further consideration. The nature of possible warfare, with its global emphasis, has changed. There will be, in the event of general hostilities, large assignments that the Marine Corps is uniquely trained to fulfill. The demands upon it will necessarily be heavy and we have been taught by experience to believe that it will not fail them. It has seemed prudent, therefore, to make provision for an expansion that can be vitally valuable.

No Entangling Alliances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigar. Mr. Speaker, last night's Washington Evening Star points out editorially that when General MacArthur testified before the joint Senate committees he had no entangling alliances with any politician or statesman; praised him for his patriotic, independent stand.

The editorial reads as follows:

NO ENTANGLING ALLIANCES

As General MacArthur leaves the witness stand, it is perfectly clear that he is not serving as a front man for anyone. Whether one agrees with him or disagrees, the General has called the shots as he saw them.

When he conferred privately with Senator TAFT and Herbert Hoover in his hotel quarters there was the usual flurry of excitement in the more excitable circles in Washington. The suggestion was put forth that General MacArthur was conniving with these Republican opponents of administration policy that he could be expected to carry the ball for them when he appeared before the Senate committee.

But General MacArthur has done nothing of the sort. He described the continental defense theory of Mr. Hoover as the gravest possible mistake. And he said that any legislative limitation on the size of forces to be used overseas, for which Senator TAFT fought hard during the troops-for-Europe debate, as "silly."

General MacArthur did not dispute the power of Congress to prescribe any policy it wishes. But he spoke out strongly against the wisdom of attempting to substitute a legislative or political judgment for military judgment in military matters. "I should say," he told the committee, "that the advice of professional experts should be weighed carefully indeed, and, unless there are specific reasons to the contrary that can be elucidated with reason, that their advice should be accepted."

This, as applied to military questions, is sound counsel. It will be a good thing for the country if General MacArthur's Republican admirers take it to heart.

Mr. Speaker, would it not be well for the Nation to follow in his footsteps and avoid involvement in the affairs of other nations, followed the course chartered by our Constitution?

Threat of a War With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Warning Taken Lightly," by Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Evening Star of May 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN WARNING TAKEN LIGHTLY—PRESIDENT HAS ERRED BEFORE IN MANY STATEMENTS DUE TO LAPSE OF MEMORY OR POOR BRIEFING

(By Constantine Brown)

President Truman, referring in his speech last Monday to the possibility of an all-out war with Russia, pronounced the ominous words "even if we win."

This doubt of victory would strike the Nation hard if it were not for the fact that in the past the Chief Executive has made other questionable statements, due probably to poor briefing.

Thus, on December 18, 1946, when asked at a press conference if he were urging the Chinese Nationalist Government to accept Communists in the cabinet, he replied that this had been our policy all along.

On March 11, 1948, at a similar conference Mr. Truman was asked whether it was still the policy of this Government to include the Communists in the Chinese Government. This time he replied that he did not know that that was ever the policy of the Government and added that if it was it was news to him.

These conflicting answers unquestionably were due to a lapse of memory or to poor briefing. Similarly, on June 1, 1950, the Chief Executive, who has at his disposal the most complete intelligence reports, said that the world was closer to peace than at any time in the last 5 years.

This statement was made only 3 weeks before the North Koreans began their aggression. Warnings about their impending action were reaching Washington from all quarters. And it appears certain that the Central Intelligence Agency, which submits to the Commander in Chief daily top-secret reports about world developments, had fully reported the ominous situation in Korea.

Last July Rear Adm. Roscoe Hillenkoetter, then Director of that Agency, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee that his organization had kept pace with the growing danger of the Communist attack in Korea since the previous fall and had been so informing the responsible top officials of the Government. There is no doubt that the President was among the first to receive that substantiated information.

These errors would give us cause to wonder whether the Chief Executive was correct last Monday night when he defended the administration's refusal to accept General MacArthur's solution of ending the war in Korea with every military means at our disposal.

There seems to be no doubt that the U. S. S. R. could bomb American cities. But the question raised by the ousted Supreme Allied Commander in the Pacific was whether Moscow is determined to start a world war now or in the more distant future.

If the Russian leaders have decided to strike now—and only the 14 men in the Kremlin know what they intend to do—it is immaterial, according to General MacArthur, whether we make a full offensive in Korea or whether we continue the present strategy of containment and attrition.

They will choose their own theater of operations wherever they believe the most effective success can be attained. If in the evaluation of America's strength they consider that a sneak air attack would prove advantageous, they will carry it out, regardless of whether we give them an excuse.

If the Red general staff feels that our retaliatory powers would make victory doubtful, they will adopt toward China the same policy which they adopted toward the Greek guerrillas after Mr. Truman ordered full support of the legitimate Greek Government.

Treaties and pledges are meaningless to the Kremlin unless they can be turned to the advantage of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Truman, who appears to have decided to take over even more active command of the Armed Forces than President Roosevelt did, must have overlooked the one and only strategic axiom of war; victory cannot be won on the defensive.

Military strategy has changed frequently through the ages. New weapons and new methods of war, involving not professional soldiers but all the inhabitants of belligerent countries, have necessitated these changes. But the age-old axiom, that you cannot win on the defensive never has changed.

Shoe Worker Protests Government Grab of His Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *May 6, 1951.*

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please read this clipping, and what do you think of this smart trick? Most of us shoe workers don't make enough money to live on the way work is now.

We try to buy bonds, but if anything like this happens we won't be able to buy bonds. If some of those "big brains" down there get more money than they need, let them save it. Well, there are a lot of us that can't just make it go any more.

Let them think up an idea to force rent and coal prices down. They are the highest in history and still going up.

When one has to pay $60 a month for an attic room and heat them yourself, you can't save on the salary we get.

Let Mr. DiSalle try to do something about that instead of some of his other jokes.

Respectfully,

A. B. J.

Shall We Have Allies or Face Reds Alone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Shall We Have Allies or Face Reds Alone?" written by Carroll Binder, which appeared in the May 6, 1951, issue of the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE HAVE ALLIES OR FACE REDS ALONE?

(By Carroll Binder)

There are just two ways in which the United States can face its Communist foes during the critical years ahead. It can line up a maximum number of allies or it can stand alone.

If the United States is prepared to fight Russia, China, and their satellites without the help of other nations or the use of overseas air and sea bases, which alone would enable it to strike effectively at the principal sources of Soviet power, it does not need to take account of the views of other nations.

If the United States expects to have access to bases and strategic materials controlled by Britain, France, and other free countries and if it expects their armed forces to fight alongside its armed forces in case of war with the Communists, it must take account of their views in the conduct of its foreign relations and its military policy.

President Truman, the State and Defense Departments and a majority in Congress have been following a policy of cooperation with other free nations to safeguard our peace and security. In conformity to that policy the United States threw in its lot with the United Nations, financed the Marshall plan, promoted the North Atlantic defense pact, and the hemispheric defense pact.

That is still United States policy. Since General Douglas MacArthur indicated last week that he "very definitely expects to come out in the open" to win public support for a fundamentally different policy it is imperative that the American people understand the true import of the opposing policies.

A brief article can touch upon only a few aspects of the complex issues involved in the MacArthur proposals. This article will deal with aspects which until last Thursday had been played down in MacArthur's presentations but which should figure largely in attempts to calculate what would be in the true national interest. That is the attitudes of other free nations toward the MacArthur concept and proposals.

No government except the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa and perhaps the Philippines credits MacArthur with the political and military wisdom with which he is credited by a considerable section of the United States Congress and people. Virtually no other government except Chiang's is prepared to risk its peace and security on the gamble MacArthur urges the American people to take in the hope of achieving a quick and relatively inexpensive victory over the Communists.

Some of these governments respect MacArthur's military brilliance. Many pay tribute to his contributions to allied victory. But they do not trust MacArthur's guesses about what would ensue from adoption of his policies for extending the war in Korea with a view to thereby ending it more quickly. Moreover, some of these governments show disquieting signs of beginning to lose trust in the Government and people of the United States as they see how much support MacArthur's proposals are apparently gaining here.

These foreign reactions may be repugnant to a great many Americans. It is more important to note that they exist than to register resentment at the rest of the free world's unwillingness to share American hero worship or blindly entrust its peace and security to us.

Most of the countries we would like to have stand with us have had their own political generals. They have been rocked by enthusiasms and antagonisms such as now rock the United States. The countries we care most about do not now believe that national policies should be shaped by political generals, least of all by a general who is so bent on going his own independent way as MacArthur appears to them to be.

MacArthur's stock in these countries declined sharply when he failed to take any notice of their contributions to the war in Korea in either his address to Congress or his Chicago address. The former United Nations commander used to speak glowingly of the U. N, but he made no reference to it in his first major pronouncements on his return to the United States. In his testimony before congressional committees on May 3 MacArthur said, in answer to a question, that the U. N. and various nations which contributed their troops to Korea, were splendid in every respect, but that tribute came late and was lost sight of in the 55,000 words of questions and answers.

MacArthur had previously offended many U. N. members by his visit to Chiang Kai-shek, his remarks on Formosa to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, his disregard of British and Indian information and advice about the intentions of the Chinese Reds and his persistent campaign to obtain a free hand to enlarge operations against the Communists. Earlier MacArthur had annoyed some of those countries by the arbitrary manner in which he conducted the occupation of Japan. They felt they had a right to be consulted about basic policies because of their contributions to the defeat of Japan and their interests in that part of the world.

MacArthur's great contributions to the defeat and rehabilitation of Japan and to the conduct of operations against the Communists in Korea may entitle him, in the opinion of many Americans, to greater acceptance than he enjoys among our allies. The limited contributions of other countries to the operations in Korea may dispose many Americans to believe that American views, particularly MacArthur's views, should be accepted by other countries.

The fact remains that other countries do not accept MacArthur's views about how best to resist communism and are beginning to fear that the United States may accept MacArthur's views.

The corollary of this fact is that the United States cannot count upon any government except the Chiang Kai-shek regime to help it cope with what may ensue from abandoning the policy of dealing with the Korean and other crises in cooperation with the U. N. Perhaps the Philippines and a few other small countries would go wherever MacArthur policies may take the United States if those policies should be adopted.

But a large part of the free world would consider any enlargement of the war which might ensue from adoption of MacArthur's policies solely an American responsibility. The same countries which told us an approach to the Yalu River by MacArthur's forces would bring Red China into the war tell us extension of the war as MacArthur proposes would bring Russia into the war.

Any free countries which would try to remain neutral while the United States and Russia and Red China fought such a war would risk subsequent domination by Russia. Some countries seem disposed to consider that risk less than the risk of becoming involved in hostilities which might arise out of adoption of the MacArthur plans.

It would be a tremendous gain for the Communists if the free world should ever be brought to the verge of having a make such a terrible choice. It would be a tremendous gain for the Communists if the United States becomes sharply divided over whether to follow the MacArthur policies or continue working through the U. N. for ending the hostilities in Korea and achieving collective security.

Yet this is what the issues raised by MacArthur seem to be heading us toward. It is possible, of course, that things would work out as MacArthur believes they would if his

policies are substituted for the present policies. If Red China caved in under American attacks and if Russia defaulted on its treaty obligation to go to the aid of Red China, the United States perhaps could get along without help from allies. It could afford to be isolated as MacArthur said Thursday he is prepared to see it isolated in pursuit of his aims.

But that is a far bigger gamble, in my opinion, than is involved in the present policy of trying to achieve peace without appeasement in Korea and in seeking security in collaboration with other freedom-loving nations. If a general war breaks out despite our efforts to avoid it, we will have the help of potent allies in fighting it. We will be able to bomb vital centers in Russia from bases in Europe and Africa which would permit maximum use of our strategic air power. For these and other reasons I hope the United States will reject the MacArthur proposals and continue to seek peace and security in collaboration with like-minded countries.

U. N.'s Lack of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Traveler, Tuesday, May 8, 1951:

POLICY VERSUS NO POLICY

One thing has become crystal clear even at this early stage in the MacArthur hearings—the United Nations did not provide that degree of support for the Korean war which was morally and practically required by its own undertaking.

From first to last since November 9, 1950, when the Red Chinese invaded, the U. N. has been in moral rout. Infected with the suicidal impulse that killed the old League of Nations, it has shrunk back from its own assertion of legal and moral principle.

Before aggression, the U. N. has withdrawn further and further into its own framework of timidity. It wasn't until February 1 that the General Assembly voted to name Red China an aggressor.

Having uttered the word, the U. N. has failed even to embargo the shipment of strategic war materials to the Red Chinese. Here is an action that could have been taken with no risk of extending the war. It is an action that each U. N. member of the free world should have taken on its own authority. Britain just yesterday acted to cut off this trade.

Yet it was the clear duty of the U. N. to enforce such an embargo upon its members. The United States has submitted such a proposal to the U. N.'s "Additional Measures Committee." And there it lies, unacted upon.

General MacArthur cited figures from the United States Consul General in Hong Kong showing that in three short weeks war materials to the value of $40,000,000 cleared that port for Red China.

The U. N. has seemed to be stampeding for a Dunkirk of its own at such a craven pace that its forces were forgotten in the field. It is precisely in such a vacuum that bold proposals like those of General MacArthur are conceived and find acceptance. It is in such a vacuum that death becomes bitter, disgust rises, and we find converts to such an extreme view as that of MacArthur when he urged that if necessary we go it without allies.

If the American people were following MacArthur toward what many believe to be a dangerous abyss, it was because other leadership was silent. We have rejected an able general, and one of the paramount reasons was to retain our allies. MacArthur's policies were too risky for them and, perhaps, for us. But it should now be made emphatic that we do not intend to turn from one of our own leaders who was ready to assume maximum risks to tolerate allied policies that will not even halt trade that is killing our soldiers.

One thing upon which MacArthur and administration spokesmen now agree is that we are in mortal danger too pervasive for trade-as-usual, business-as-usual, or politics-as-usual.

The U. N., as a major contributor to American confusion, had now better clamber back out of its storm cellar and demonstrate that it can rekindle the flame of effective collective action. We can't reject MacArthur's policy for the U. N.'s lack of policy.

What kind of an alliance have we with Great Britain which permits her to ship war supplies to Red China while American boys are being killed with those munitions of war by the Red Chinese?

What kind of support has India or the Arab countries given to the recent U. N. resolution that brands Red China as an aggressor?

What has British diplomacy been doing to frustrate United States policies in the Far East?

Is the dismissal of MacArthur at the behest of foreign governments an evidence that membership in the U. N. means submission by the United States to the dictation of other governments without so much as a formal vote in the U. N. to put each nation on record?

What U. N. policies, Mr. President, did General MacArthur fail to support? When and where were those policies adopted? Can we find anywhere in the public record a statement of those policies of the U. N.? And, if done in secret, by what authority has the President of the United States made such agreements with foreign governments without submitting them to Congress?

Why has the U. N. become a hotbed of collective treason to its own resolutions? Great Britain, by continuing her recognition of the Government of Red China, has made a scrap of paper of the resolution of the U. N. which branded Red China as an aggressor. Why does Great Britain continually propose that the aggressor be rewarded with a seat in the U. N.?

Why did the United Nations call upon its members to supply troops to aid in Korea and yet refuse to accept the troops of the Nationalist Government of China which has a seat in the U. N. and is a lawful member of that organization? Is that a U. N. policy?

Why do Great Britain, India, and other U. N. members disassociate themselves from our President's order of last June to the United States Navy to defend Formosa?

Why, when our Government now sends a military mission to Formosa to train troops of the Nationalist Government for defense of the island, is there no U. N. support for that move or any proposal from America that our U. N. allies join in that mission? What kind of a U. N. policy is this?

Mr. Truman cannot have it both ways—he cannot claim that the civilian authority was disregarded by General MacArthur and at the same time fail to define for the other branch of the civilian authority—the Congress—what are the policies that have supposedly been ignored.

Let us be done with the smokescreens raised by politicians in Congress who have come to the superficial conclusion that the MacArthur episode is just a case of military insubordination. That's an explanation which will not satisfy the mothers and fathers and other relatives of the 60,000 American boys who have been killed or wounded in Korea, and of the many more yet to be added to the casualty list.

There must be an American concept in the Democratic Party. It cannot condone the perfidy of our allies and yet make it a crime for the military commander of the U. N. to plead for orders to permit him to strike back with maximum force at the enemy in the field.

If the Democratic Party in Congress cannot forget its partisanship while American blood is being spilled in Korea, if its leaders and spokesmen insist on ignoring the blunders of an administration which has played politics with the rules of war governing the pursuit of an enemy, then the Democratic Party is doomed to extinction. It will then become known in history as the "peace at any price" party—the party that ordered American youth into Korea and then forsook them.

What U. N. Policies, Mr. President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the United States News and World Report for May 4, 1951:

WHAT U. N. POLICIES, MR. PRESIDENT?

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman gave as his public reason for dismissing General MacArthur an alleged failure on the part of the general to give wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations in matters pertaining to his official duties.

What policies? What official duties?

The Nation today is in an inquiring mood. So is Congress. The President, in the interest of truth, should make available every piece of information on the subject and should himself break precedent and go before committees of Congress and testify.

For only by interrogating the Commander in Chief and the head of our civilian authority can we get at the truth authoritatively. He alone is responsible. Embarrassed or incompetent subordinates cannot answer. This is not the time to hide behind the precedents of a horse-and-buggy age which say that a President never goes before a committee of Congress.

If, however, Mr. Truman declines to testify in person before a committee, he has no valid reason for withholding from the American people answers to the questions Congress may ask in writing in order to get the facts about his policies and U. N. policies.

Let us have all the truth about the Attlee-Truman conference.

Why did our President agree to allow Great Britain to continue to give aid and comfort to Red China?

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me entitled "Happenings in Washington—Program No. 40." This broadcast was made on Monday of this week.

There being no objection the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 40)

TEXT OF BROADCAST BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

One of the best things that has happened in our country in a long time is new, active, and vigorous awakening of interest in public affairs.

In many ways the people have been brought closer to their Government. It has been proven beyond any doubt that when the people are informed they will swing into action. They will demand good, honest, decent government. They will fight to preserve the ideals which are the foundation of the American way of life.

In recent broadcasts I have discussed the Kefauver committee investigation into organized crime, racketeering, and the corruption of law-enforcement officials. I have discussed the Fulbright committee hearings into favoritism and political influence in RFC loans, leading right into the White House.

I have told you about the overwhelming wave of public indignation over the dismissal of General MacArthur and the widespread condemnation of the Acheson appeasement policy in the Far East.

Today I want to talk to you about another investigation that is going on. It has been pushed into the background by the MacArthur controversy and the other Senate hearings.

But it deals with the most evil and most dangerous thing in the world today—communism.

As you know I have fought communism hard whenever and wherever I found it. I was in this fight back in those complacent years when it was exceedingly unpopular. We who warned against the dangers of communism in those days were ridiculed and smeared as crackpots, alarmists, and Red-baiters.

Today the American people are better informed. They recognize communism as a godless conspiracy to destroy freedom in the whole world—including the United States.

There is need for still more information. Some startling facts have been coming out here in Washington. But they have not received the attention they deserve.

You know, of course, that the House Committee on Un-American activities has resumed its probe of communism in Hollywood. I want to help get these hearings into the limelight of public attention where they belong.

Some big names in motion pictures have appeared as witnesses.

Some have given remarkable testimony. Others have defied the committee. They have refused to answer its questions on the ground that to do so would be self-incriminating. They have claimed the protection of the fifth amendment of our Constitution against self-incrimination.

Well, I trust to the good sense of the American people. They know how to evaluate a man who refuses on ground of self-incrimination to say whether he was ever a Communist. They know how to evaluate witnesses who refuse to say whether they would bear arms for this country in case of war with Russia.

I want to call your attention now to some of the witnesses who did cooperate.

I refer to the screen stars, Larry Parks and Sterling Hayden; the director, Edward Dmytryk; and the screen writer, Richard Collins. Others, of course, will come forward at future hearings.

Each of the four I have mentioned admitted he was formerly a Communist in Hollywood. Each of them told how they came to their senses. They awakened to the menace of communism and quit the party. Each came before the committee and made a clean breast of it. They gave all the information they could to arouse the American public. And they named other leading writers, actors, and directors in Hollywood as Communists or former Communists.

Some people in Pennsylvania may ask: "Well, what about it? What harm can a few Communists do out there in Hollywood?"

That is what I want to explain to you.

But, first, I want to make one thing very clear. Although the Communist high command made a definite drive to control the movies for its own wicked purposes, that drive failed. The vast majority of our motion-picture workers in Hollywood have always been decent, patriotic, anti-Communist Americans.

Unfortunately, not all of them understood the real nature of communism. Without realizing what they were doing some followed the lead of Communists in certain activities.

Some joined Communist-front organizations, without realizing they were becoming cat's-paws for Moscow. Some in Hollywood joined the party itself. They were tricked by that false label called liberalism.

About 30 years ago, Lenin—then the Russian dictator and the head of the world Communist movement—laid down an interesting policy statement. He said that the movies were perhaps the most important of all mediums for propaganda. He pointed out that millions of people in every country go to the movies regularly and could be influenced by what they saw on the screen.

So he set up the principle that the Communists must control what appeared on the motion-picture screen.

In this country a drive got under way. In the late 1920's and the early 1930's, Communist organizers moved into Hollywood and started the first party cells there. They recruited both creative workers and skilled labor in the studios.

They were out to get control of American movies so that they could sneak Communist propaganda into pictures and keep anti-Communist material out of pictures. The basic and ultimate purpose was to poison the minds of 150,000,000 Americans who buy 90,000,000 movie tickets every week.

There was a second purpose. Many people in Hollywood earn very large salaries. They could be good sources of funds for the party.

A third purpose was to gain prestige for their various organizations, drives and causes, by using the names of popular film stars.

For a considerable period, the Communists made progress on all three fronts. And all this time the American public was completely unaware of what was going on. Commissars ran the party in Hollywood. They got their orders from the national headquarters in New York which, in turn, took its orders from Moscow.

Mind you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, this is information that now comes from former active members of the party in Hollywood.

For 15 years the Communists dominated the Screen Writers Guild. This is the closed shop union to which every man and woman who writes movie scripts must belong.

One of these writers admitted before the committee that he paid Communist Party assessments of about $100 a month for several years. That's just one individual. Multiply that many times and you get some idea of the financial support that came out of Hollywood for communism all over the United States.

Witnesses disclosed that the grip of communism on this union was not broken until it was exposed by the House Un-American Activities Committee in October 1947.

You may remember how that committee was smeared and attacked at the time. Many honest, self-styled liberals joined in those attacks. Yet, witnesses today admit the attacks were all secretly directed by Communists. And they admit that if it hadn't been for that investigation, the Reds might still control this important union.

The truth is coming out now. It is important to know the real facts.

You may not recall it, but in 1945 and 1946, Hollywood was torn by a terrible series of strikes in the studios. It appeared to be a jurisdictional row between two groups of unions. Now former Communists, appearing before the committee, have admitted that those strikes were Communist-dominated and conceived. This, it turns out, was the secret drive of the Communists to get control of the studio labor unions.

The attempt failed—but it was a close call.

In order to smuggle Communist messages into pictures, the party needed a solid chain of control of the unions—the skilled labor, the writers, and the artists. It never got that control. But you can see how important it was and the effort that was made.

Today the danger has been removed. The motion-picture industry is on its guard to prevent any Communist taint.

The attempt to influence American thinking by motion-picture propaganda was only one step in the Communist program. The same objective was behind their infiltration into labor unions, schools and colleges, professional organizations, minority groups, youth movements, and even the churches.

You know how deeply they penetrated into the organized labor movement, gaining complete control of some unions. Fortunately, under the leadership of such men as William Green and Philip Murray, the patriotic spirit of the American workingman was aroused. The danger was recognized, and, with some exceptions, Communists no longer hold important positions in organized labor.

Communist agitators have been active on every college campus, spreading their poisonous lies among our young people. They have misled some teachers and writers of textbooks into accepting the Red party line.

There are Communist groups among lawyers, doctors, and the clergy.

The Communist philosophy has attracted many who regard themselves as intellectuals. It has gained support among some people who have inherited wealth and lead an easy way of life.

Worst of all has been the infiltration of Reds, pinks, and fellow travelers into places of trust and importance in the Government.

Some of you listening to me may have knowledge of communism in your own community. Some of you may be former members who quit when you realized that it was

a vicious conspiracy to overthrow our country and make the United States a vassal state of the Soviet Union.

You can prove your patriotism and good Americanism if you will go to the nearest FBI office and supply all the information you have. Our Government needs every bit of information that will help protect the safety and security of the United States.

You may know something that the FBI is not yet aware of. If so, you should come forward. The Red conspiracy against our land goes on night and day.

Remember it goes on not only in Hollywood. In our Government it caused men like Alger Hiss to turn over secret documents to the Russians. It transformed scientists into traitors and caused them to betray atom bomb secrets to the Reds.

Americans cannot sit back and relax. We must be constantly vigilant against the Red menace in our own midst.

We must sell Americanism.

An understanding American soldier sold it to the people of the Philippines and when America was in serious trouble the Philippines stood loyally by us.

Five and a half years ago he went into Japan as a conqueror. Immediately he started to preach American ideals.

In this discussion we should remember that Japan is an old and proud country. They worshiped their Emperor as a God. In the very short period of 5½ years they were accepting the ideals of our country.

When that great American left that country a few weeks ago, 2,000,000 people turned out to pay him tribute.

If General MacArthur could do such a marvelous job, we Americans here at home should do even a better job.

We can sell America. Let us all get busy and do it.

This is Ed Martin, speaking to you from the Nation's capitol. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

The Opportunity for Christian Leadership in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Ambassador from Australia, Mr. Norman J. O. Makin, at the international Christian leadership luncheon held in the Vandenberg room, Senate restaurant, on the 29th of March last. The subject of the address was The Opportunity for Christian Leadership in the World Today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator FLANDERS and Christian friends, it is fitting that we should meet in the room named after a man who has shown such great leadership and fine qualities of statesmanship. At this time he is to be especially remembered with earnest sympathy and appreciation. Our prayers would be that he should be afforded progressive renewal to good health.

The subject which I have been asked to introduce to your notice is The Opportunity for Christian Leadership in the World Today. The opportunities are so obvious that really no persuasive powers of mine need to be employed in establishing the truth as it stands.

I suppose every age and period has its moments of accounting and of feeling that the present is not as good a time as those that have passed, and that there is a certain moral deterioration and lack of what is nothing more than downright common honesty. Yes; that is true of the world today, but I think that the present period is no worse than any former time. The reason why at times possibly we think it is is because we are nearer to current happenings and are consequently more susceptible to their effect, whereas when we read of similar incidents as a part of history we do not give them the same attention.

I should like to emphasize that until the end of time we shall always be confronted with the great problem of good and evil—of choosing the good and fighting against the evil. There were some truly terrifying conditions that men of Christian faith had to meet in past times—persecutions, inhumanities, conditions of slavery, the evils and terrors of misjudgments and their penalties. One could continue on with an indefinite list which, when compared with conditions of the present day, would show that we must not be in despair.

Nevertheless, I recognize there are situations at the present time which present a grave challenge to those of us who cherish the faith and living ideals of Christianity. There is a feeling of bewilderment at the tide of events. This is where we must—as did the Apostle Paul—challenge the evils of the day. We must convince men—no matter of what degree or state—that there is but one answer to the world's problems—and that is Christ.

God's salvation, which was made possible to men through those solemn incidents which we have but recently commemorated over this Eastertime, is such that the world must learn that it is through Christ alone that the right way is found. All our problems become clear, all our bewilderments and fears melt away, in the light of the divine message.

The Apostle John reveals a remarkable phenomenon about light. It is not comprehended by the darkness. He said, "The light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not." There is a loneliness about darkness. How tragic that men should prefer to walk in darkness when they could have the light. I have been greatly attracted by the words of a citizen of Virginia, Mr. J. J. Rives, who has said: "I will not stagger in darkness when it is my privilege to walk in the light of God."

So that the Apostle John could say: "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men." There is a light in the darkness, and the opportunity is there for us of Christian faith to lead men to that light. This is true leadership, but I warn you, it is not popular.

My own observations after a lifetime of experience and association with the highest offices of the world constrain me to say that Christ is the way, the truth, and the life, but men generally do not recognise this. Whatever light we may have is desperately needed.

As we look around we are amazed at how few there are who can take up the responsibilities of leadership. Responsibility and onerous duties are shunned today. I was reading only a few days ago of a prime minister on the other side of the Atlantic who was having the greatest difficulty in finding men with the essential qualities for the responsibilities of administration. It is all too rare a gift in the make-up of man. We are so apt to evade responsibilities and to steer clear of making vital decisions. What we need is some of the impelling, dynamic, evangelistic force of Christianity, which will convert an unholy world to a righteous cause.

All too long have men of evil been allowed to exercise their powers and assume authorities of which they are undeserving—and quite unfitted to take up. They seem to hold millions of people in a servile subjection of one form or another.

Let those of us of Christian faith leave a mark of equal intensity upon this period of our own time. Let future generations observe that in the midst of sorely distressing conditions there sprang up a revival of Christian leadership to a purer and better way of life. That, gentlemen, is the central theme of our mission here today. To give Christian leadership will not be easy; it has never been easy; it has never appeared successful. You may recall that contemporary historians barely mention the name of Christ, our leader, but His power has been felt by millions, and it is available for us today. There is no lack of opportunity. The opportunity is there. Where are the men to take it up?

I would just briefly refer to an incident of the last war, when Mr. Churchill, who personified the great leadership of a great people, could calmly paint a picture of light without shade. What a wonderful example of faith and courage in adversity.

Let us remember the period when the people of Israel lost their leader, Moses. A young man named Joshua rose to the leadership. One of his first statements was: "Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest."

The Wedemeyer Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "A Ghastly Mistake," published in the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., on May 2, 1951. It has reference to the delay in publication of the report by Lieutenant General Wedemeyer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GHASTLY MISTAKE

There is no longer need for anybody to wonder why President Truman and the State Department fought so hard to prevent the publication of the report which Lt. Gen. Wedemeyer made in 1947 on conditions in Korea. The theory that the document was top secret and should therefore be kept from the people now turns out to have been all bosh. The real reason for the official attitude is to be found in the fact that once again the administration is revealed as having ignored the opinion of experts and as having listened instead to the voices of those who for their own purposes wanted the country to play ball with the Communists.

As the contents of the report are now made public it is shown that General Wedemeyer 4 years ago predicted with uncanny accuracy what was going to happen in Korea. He warned the Government that the Soviet Union was training the Communist North Koreans and that it would send those forces against the South just as soon as the United States could be induced to withdraw its own troops. He also urged this country to create an American-led and American-equipped army of South Koreans that would be strong enough to cope with the potential invaders.

Inasmuch as General Wedemeyer made this report after his return from a special mission under the President's direction it passes all understanding that it was promptly and permanently pigeonholed. The only logical explanation is that the friends of the Soviet were on the march in the State Department at the time and prevailed upon Mr. Truman to forget the whole thing. Those were the days, you know, when Stalin was "good old Joe."

That the administration's refusal to follow the advice it received in 1947 was a ghastly mistake is all too evident. It is a failure that has cost thousands of American lives and embroiled us in a situation out of which there is no foreseeable road.

Northwest Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a very interesting letter from Mr. Ed Craney, of the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters, and also the expressed opinions of Members of Congress and the public from the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. I am sure that the House will find this material of great interest.

The letter follows:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST BROADCASTERS,
Spokane, Wash., April 27, 1951.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Representative From Montana, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MANSFIELD: During February, Mr. Clay Osborne secured from you on our behalf a personal, tape-recorded interview expressing your conclusions about six of the basic international and domestic questions of this year.

Additional interviews exploring the identical questions were secured from 17 other cooperative Senators and Representatives from Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana.

At the same time staff interviewers in our station-cities of Portland, Spokane, Missoula, Butte, Bozeman, Great Falls, and Helena obtained recorded sidewalk interviews from average Americans expressing their opinions about these same questions.

The answers from Washington and from the Pacific Northwest Main Streets were then incorporated in a series of 6-day-per-week quarter-hour public-service programs generally titled "Do You Agree?" This continued throughout 6 weeks, the entire 6 days of each week being devoted to a single one of the six questions asked.

The schedules of release by stations and times were as follows: KXL, Portland (10 kilowatts), beginning March 26, 5:45–6 p. m., Pacific standard time; KXLY, Spokane (5 kilowatts), beginning March 19, 11–11:15 p. m., Pacific standard time; Z Bar Network, Montana (five stations), beginning March 19, 10:45–11 p. m., Mountain standard time.

Additionally, we offered the complete series of the programs to Stations KIDO, Boise; and KRNR, Roseburg, Oreg., for release to the areas of their coverage at their discretion.

The standard opening and closing used for each of the Do You Agree? programs is enclosed for your information.

Question by question, the following is the weekly tabulation of answers for members of Congress and the public:

QUESTION

Do you believe that communism and capitalism can coexist in the same world?

ANSWERS	Congress	The public
No	4	68
Yes	3	15
Possible but not probable	6	--
No opinion	1	2

QUESTION

In your opinion should the United States be committed to police actions like Korea anywhere in the world at the discretion of the President?

ANSWERS	Congress	The public
No	16	57
Yes	2	30
No opinion	--	2

QUESTION

In your judgment should Japan be allowed to rearm?

ANSWERS	Congress	The public
No	2	29
Yes	16	70
No opinion	--	7

QUESTION

Do you believe that emergency legislation, restrictions and regulations threaten Americans with the loss of traditional freedoms and forms of constitutional government?

ANSWERS	Congress	The public
No	8	44
Yes	10	33
No opinion	--	13

QUESTION

Do you consider the United Nations a success or a failure, and should the United States stay in or get out?

ANSWERS	Congress	The public
U. N. a success	10	48
Failure	8	14
No opinion	--	15
United States stay in	17	62
Get out	1	7
No opinion	--	8

QUESTION

How do you think inflation ought to be halted and controlled?

ANSWERS	Congress	The public
Remove controls	1	1
Increase controls	6	16
Roll back prices-wages	5	9
Increase taxes	4	3
Sounder fiscal policies	11	6
Increase production	4	1
Stop buying	--	7
Cut taxes	--	1
Stop hoarding	--	1
Cut labor costs	--	1
Less foreign spending	--	1
No opinion	--	21

To the best of our knowledge, this survey of feeling and opinion is the first of its kind ever undertaken in the spirit of genuine public service and information by American broadcasters.

We believe that you may find the final results most interesting and informative.

It was your willing assistance and fine cooperation that was most responsible for the excellence of the programs, and you have the gratitude of the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters for enabling us to provide a service both unique and informative.

And you and your cooperating colleagues have my personal thanks as well.

Sincerely,

ED CRANEY.

DO YOU AGREE?

Standard opening: "Do you agree?"

Do you agree with your elected Representatives in Congress on the vital issues confronting the Nation and the world?

The Pacific Northwest Broadcasters' stations believe that you, the general public, would like to know the answers. To do this, the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters have interviewed people in all walks of life in the cities represented by the "XL" stations: Portland, Oreg.; Spokane, Wash.; and in Montana: Missoula, Helena, Great Falls, Butte, and Bozeman.

In Washington, D. C., the "XL" reporter asked the Representatives and Senators of the four Pacific Northwest States—Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana—the same set of questions as those answered by the public.

The first voice you hear will be that of our reporter speaking to you transcribed from the Nation's Capitol in Washington, D. C.

Standard closing: "Do you agree?"

Do you agree with your Senators and Representatives in Congress on the vital issues and questions of today?

This program is designed to find the answer. To do that, the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters have interviewed people in all walks of life in the cities represented by the "XL" stations, and have also asked identical questions of the Senators and Representatives from the four Pacific Northwest States: Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana.

The question asked on today's program was

Heard transcribed from Washington were Senators ——— ——— and Representatives ——— ———.

Listen tomorrow at this same time for the next in the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters' special public service series:

Do you agree?

Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this House a new book entitled "The Communist Trail in America," by Jacob Spolansky.

In the book, the author points out that the Communists in the United States conducted an organized campaign against newspapermen and commentators and that Mr. Walter Winchell was the only one against whom the Communists carried out a systematic attack for a period of years. The excerpts from the book, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are a fine tribute to Mr. Winchell and show

that the Communists consider him a formidable enemy.

It is gratifying to learn that Walter Winchell's ceaseless efforts in the battle against communism are recognized. During the past months, some of my colleagues and I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of articles written by Mr. Winchell. However, very little has been said about him up to this time. I am pleased to have this opportunity to describe him to you as an eminent writer, columnist, and champion of human rights. Yesterday, he was named as winner of one of the "Michael" awards of the Academy of Radio and Television Arts and Sciences, as "best consistent radio news commentator." Also, we must not overlook his sincere and unselfish endeavors in the interest of the public good. The May 22, 1951, issue of Look, which reached the public stands on May 8, 1951, carried a story about Walter Winchell and his interest in the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund Crusade, and I am also inserting that story in the RECORD.

Because he is so widely read and heard, Walter Winchell's thoughts, words, ideals, and campaigns for the right, are brought to the attention of millions. In these dark days when we face the reality that our enemies would destroy us from without and within our Nation, Walter Winchell stands out as the No. 1 enemy of communism. His fearlessness, his attacks upon those who would undermine our democracy, arouse our admiration. I consider him a great fighter for liberty, freedom, and Americanism.

Walter Winchell, patriot, is performing a splendid service for our Nation, and I am happy publicly to acknowledge that service.

From pages 81–83 of the Communist Trail in America:

In his Sunday night broadcasts, Walter Winchell told of the secret Communist gatherings at which strike strategy was laid out. Because he had excellent sources of information, he was able to startle the Communists by quoting, nearly verbatim, just what was transpiring at these secret sessions. Winchell described the minute doings of the conspirators and even reported the way in which they boasted of their success in particular plants then gripped by strikes.

Writers and commentators who exposed them were given the slander treatment. Literary gentry, friendly to the Communist cause would be enlisted in the all-out effort to blacken and defame him. To squelch Walter Winchell, however, colossal preparations were needed—Winchell was a formidable enemy. Not only had he mercilessly pummeled them through the years, but he was rubbing salt into their wounds by reporting every word and gesture at their clandestine sessions. The time had come for vengeance.

To erase Walter Winchell and his diatribes, a special conference was called in an obscure Chicago meeting room on April 8, 1941.

Extra precautions were taken to insure that absolutely no one except the trusted hierarchy was admitted to that room. Credentials were checked and double-checked to prevent any intruder from slipping in. Yet an undercover operator did manage to sneak in. The Communists, we learned from him, were furious over Walter Winchell's success in pointing his accusing finger at them and were determined to punish him.

The meeting, called at the insistence of Robert Minor, national secretary of the Communist Party, was presided over by Pat Toohey, then State organizer for Illinois. Toohey got to the point immediately. "We've got instructions," he said, "to start a campaign to take Winchell off the air. Nobody needs to be reminded how important that job is." This was the plan: Hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of letters were to deluge the radio network and Winchell's sponsor, all protesting his attacks upon an innocent political party. Organizations, thousands of them, some real but most of them fictitious, were to join to fight Walter Winchell's persecution.

"Above all," Toohey warned, "the name of the Communist Party must be kept out.

"The protests should seem spontaneous and real."

The scheme elaborately drawn up, was doomed to failure because Winchell exposed it before it got under way. His information about the Communists was accurate to the last detail—powerful ammunition.

Following is the article which appeared in Look magazine:

WALTER WINCHELL FOR THE DAMON RUNYON CANCER FUND CRUSADE—HE'S USING HIS UNIQUE INFLUENCE OVER A VAST AUDIENCE AS OFTEN FOR PUBLIC GOOD AS FOR PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT

Twenty-seven years ago, a brash young ex-vaudeville actor named Walter Winchell began to write a daily newspaper column in New York. He delved into fascinating but oft-neglected corners of the big city, mined its night clubs, theaters, and Broadway hangouts. He had a flair for colorful language, unique skill at coining catchy phrases, and an unerring eye for the interesting and unusual. His paragraphs, an instant hit in New York, were syndicated across the Nation.

In 1932, Winchell started an uninterruped series of Sunday-night news broadcasts with the same fresh, breathless approach which marked his column. Skillful use of the techniques of reporting and showmanship has won for him an audience now estimated at 25,000,000 readers and 35,000,000 listeners.

Through the years Winchell never has forgotten that his public wants to hear about the basic things of life—call it gossip if you insist. Births and marriages, for example, and divorces and romance brawls, hi-jinks in society, the red feather in a lady's hat, wisecracks in Lindy's. He has given the American language such words and phrases as "communazi," "infanticipating," "everynitem," "Reno-vated," "scrumunist," and "New Yorchids"—and his fascinated readers love it.

While covering his Broadway beat, he has invaded a wider field with notable success. Six months before Munich, he reported that Hitler would get away with his bloodless coup. Fifteen months before the announcement, he predicted F. D. R., long a Winchell hero, would seek a third term as President. He wrote in 1941 that Russia would fight Hitler to a standstill; in 1944 that a second front would come that year; in 1945 (at the San Francisco Conference which set up the U. N.) that a vast and perhaps unabridgable chasm had developed between the United States and Russia. Eighteen months before Washington announced the Russians had an atom bomb, he said they would develop it—and when.

Winchell did not stop at reporting but came up with vigorous policy opinions. He lashed out at the Nazis long before World War II and was scolded in Washington for realistic opinions about the Russians as that war came to a close. Two years ago, he shouted that 70 air groups were necessary for the safety of the Nation, even while administration spokesmen said we needed only 42.

On December 10, 1946, Winchell found a new cause, one which has absorbed much of his interest and boundless enthusiasm. On that day his friend, Damon Runyon, died of cancer. The following Sunday, Walter went on the radio and asked for "a few bucks to help fight cancer." The result was startling. Money began to pour in and Winchell was forced to set up the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund, which has, to date, received $4,700,000 in contributions and disbursed $3,748,170 in grants to hospitals and institutions for cancer research. The Runyon Fund is unique in that not one dollar goes for expenses of any kind. Winchell, the fund treasurer, and columnist Dan Parker and Leonard Lyons, president and vice president, pay all their own expenses. Office space and help are donated.

Walter Winchell says now of the Runyon Fund, "It's the only real thing."

Peace Bid MacArthur Upset Held Foredoomed Anyway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by James Reston, appearing in the New York Times of May 9, 1951, which points up the injustice done to General MacArthur in holding him responsible for the failure of the efforts, undertaken in March by the administration and the United Nations, to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict. In fairness to General MacArthur, as the article well points out, it should be said that his offer to negotiate with the enemy directly in the field "did not really lose a very hopeful chance of negotiating peace."

The article follows:

WASHINGTON, May 8.—The testimony of Secretary of Defense Marshall has created one impression that is regarded here by persons familiar with the circumstances as unfair to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

This impression, induced in large measure by the headlines in this morning's papers, was that General MacArthur last March had spoiled a good chance to make peace with the Chinese Communists.

The facts of General Marshall's statement were as follows. He testified that President Truman had planned last March to make a public appeal to the Chinese Reds for peace in Korea. He said that the terms of this appeal were being negotiated with the other nations having troops in Korea, and that, on March 20, General MacArthur had been advised of these facts.

General Marshall then recalled that, after General MacArthur received the notification from the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the forthcoming peace appeal by the President, he (MacArthur) had issued a much tougher peace appeal of his own, minimizing the power of Red China and implying that if Peiping did not make peace the United Nations could bring about Red China's military collapse.

ABANDONMENT OF EFFORT CITED

"At the time the foregoing statement [MacArthur's] was issued," General Marshall said yesterday, "the clearance of the proposed

Presidential declaration with the other 13 nations having forces in Korea had very nearly been completed. In view of the serious impact of General MacArthur's statement on the negotiations with these nations, it became necessary to abandon the effort, thus losing whatever chance there may have been at that time to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict."

This last paragraph was the source of almost all the news leads in this morning's papers. Thus the New York Times headline this morning was: "Marshall says MacArthur upset peace move." The Herald Tribune's: "Marshall says MacArthur upset peace plan." The Washington Post's: "MacArthur's bid to Reds hurt peace chances, Marshall says."

As a matter of fact, however, there was very little confidence in this Government or among the representatives of the other nations who were discussing the President's peace appeal that it would do any good. The negotiations on the peace appeal went on here. They were based on a draft paper presented to the 13 other nations fighting in Korea by Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and the general attitude among the negotiators was that the peace appeal probably ought to be made but probably wouldn't impress Peiping.

GENERAL CRITICIZED FOR ACTION

General MacArthur's own peace appeal, coming in the middle of the negotiations for the Presidential appeal, was a great embarrassment to the United States Government, no doubt. The negotiators of the other governments concerned did not understand how it could happen that the State Department would enter into protracted negotiations with them on the precise words to be used in the Presidential appeal and then find its own military commander beating the gun with a totally different proclamation without even asking his own Government, let alone the United Nations.

Moreover, there was some feeling within the 14-nation committee here that, in his peace appeal, General MacArthur had scoffed at the Chinese Reds, demanded their unconditional surrender and thus placed the Peiping regime in an unreceptive mood to negotiate.

The point is, however, that, while he embarrassed his Government and angered his allies, General MacArthur did not precisely ruin a good chance to make peace because nobody here really believed there was a good chance to make peace. He "upset a peace move," all right, as the headlines this morning properly said, but it wasn't much of a move, and the negotiators knew it at the time.

There were two reasons why the negotiators were not inclined to believe that the President's appeal would get anywhere: first, the Chinese Communist offensive was pretty well organized by that time, and second, the draft of the President's statement actually offered the Chinese Communists less than the terms that Peiping had rejected in January.

For example, the five principles contained in the January peace appeal of the United Nations, which were supported by the United States, specifically mentioned a willingness on the part of the United Nations and the United States to discuss the question of the future of Formosa and the question of the representation of China in the United Nations.

NOT IN RUSK MEMORANDUM

The Rusk memorandum, which was to be the basis of the President's peace appeal, did not, however, mention these two points. It was a most general statement of war aims, ending with a vague statement that an end of the war in Korea would lessen the tension in the Far East and facilitate discussion of other far eastern questions.

Indeed, in their observations on the Rusk memorandum, some representatives of the 13 nations concerned noted the absence of the references to the future of Formosa and China's representation in the United Nations and observed that the proposed Presidential statement seemed to be something of a retreat from the January peace offer, and therefore less likely to be acceptable to Peiping.

In fairness to General Marshall, he merely said that the MacArthur peace appeal had lost "whatever chance there may have been at that time to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict."

But in fairness to General MacArthur, it ought also to be said that, while his appeal of March 24 was generally regarded as perhaps his most flagrant assumption of civilian authority, it did not really lose a very hopeful chance of negotiating peace.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Will Waste Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, should the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project be authorized 23,600 men will be needed for the construction of the proposed navigation and power works in the International Rapids section of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway project alone.

The figure of 23,600 men does not include the number required for work on the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, the deepening of the harbors, or the Thousand Islands section or the all-Canadian part of the St. Lawrence River.

In addition a much larger number of men would be involved in the transportation of material and equipment for the project.

Converting the 23,600 men into work days we find that to construct the International Rapids section alone it would require 111,355 man-years of work.

To support these estimates the following information was submitted to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on June 13, 1947, by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

EMPLOYMENT

It is estimated by the Labor Department that the International Rapids section project would create the following man-hours of employment:

At site:	
Skilled	36,207,000
Semiskilled	13,774,000
Unskilled	32,495,000
Total	82,476,000
Off site:	
Skilled	46,415,000
Semiskilled	60,717,000
Unskilled	33,093,000
Total	140,235,000

If completed in 4 years the Labor Department estimates the average number of employees at the site as 11,150, carrying from 5,400 a month in the winter season to 23,600 a month in the summer season.

If completed in 6 years the Labor Department estimates the average number of employees at the site as 7,440, varying from 3,000 to 16,900 a month.

It should be noted that these figures apply only to the International Rapids section of the project. They do not touch the big all-Canadian job between the International Rapids and Montreal. They do not touch any of the work in the Great Lakes region.

Presumably, the figures labeled "off site" include the production of construction materials and equipment and their shipment to the site.

If figured at 2,000 working hours per year per man, the above figures are equivalent to the following:

	Man-years
At site	41,238
Off site	70,117
Total	111,355

And this is only a piece of the job, not the whole "seaway."

(NOTE.—From p. 395, record of hearings, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on the St. Lawrence Seaway Project, 80th Cong., 1st sess., S. J. Res. 111.)

Artificial Limbs

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain a little to the House the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs, which will take charge of the demonstration in the caucus room of the old House Office Building at 10 o'clock, Thursday, May 10. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and I have spoken of it several times. The group has coordinated the efforts at research work on artificial limbs performed at the laboratories of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and the contractors of the Veterans' Administration. I might add the list of some of the laboratories currently participating in the program, because some of the Members have little laboratories in their districts. Again, I want to remind the House that civilians who need prosthetic appliances will benefit by this research work as well as the veterans—and there are thousands of them in the United States also.

In April 1945 the National Research Council established the Committee on Prosthetic Devices for the purpose of administering a research and development program in the field of artificial limbs.

This committee conducted a very extensive program until June 1947 when it felt that sufficient work had been accomplished to permit the workers to concentrate on certain avenues of approach. At its own recommendation, the Committee on Prosthetic Devices was dissolved and the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs was formed to continue the work.

Accordingly, the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs was formed and since

July 1, 1947, this group has coordinated the efforts of the research work on artificial limbs performed at the laboratories of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and contractors of the Veterans' Administration.

The laboratories currently participating in the program are located at Army Prosthetics Research Laboratory, Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C.; Oakland Naval Hospital Limb Shop, Oakland, Calif.; Army Air Forces Aero-Medical Laboratory, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio; University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.; New York University, New York City; International Business Machines Corp., New York City; Vickers, Inc., Detroit, Mich.; Prosthetics Testing and Development Laboratory, Veterans' Administration, New York City; Sierra Engineering Co., Sierra Madre, Calif.

Many other firms such as Northrop Aircraft, Inc., and the Goodyear Rubber Co. have contributed much to the program.

The Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs also acts as a review committee which indicates to the Veterans' Administration when, in its opinion, a new device or technique has been sufficiently developed for distribution to veteran beneficiaries.

In addition, it serves as a consulting body to the VA in reviewing proposed contracts, projects, and budgets, concerning artificial limbs and related subjects.

The one individual who deserves more credit than anyone else for the progress made to date is Gen. F. S. Strong, Jr., who has acted as the Executive Director of the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs since July 1947.

General Strong, upon returning from World War II where he served in the Alaskan, European, and China-Burma-India theaters, had intended to take a well-deserved rest, but instead has devoted his energies to directing this program to its present point of success.

Col. Robert L. Allen, Gen. Edward Greenbaum, Judge Robert Patterson, Mr. Tracy Voorhees, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, Dr. Paul Klopsteg, Dr. Robert R. McMath, Dr. Roy McClure—who passed away several weeks ago—and Dr. Philip Wilson, have all given a great deal of assistance to the program.

World Assembly for the Moral Rearmament of the Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, an unusually significant conference of world proportions is to be held in our country next month. I refer to the World Assembly for the Moral Rearmament of the Nations which will take place at the Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, Mich., June 1 to 12, 1951.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Information of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe that the Mackinac conference will play an important role in helping us to clarify the global objectives of democracy and in finding effective means for telling democracy's story compellingly and winning the hearts and minds of the peoples of the world.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three documents in connection with this Mackinac conference. They are a statement by the chairman and ranking members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs sent to leaders prominent in public life abroad; a statement of welcome issued by all the members of the Michigan delegation in Congress; and a message from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to labor leaders abroad.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 1, 1951.*

As members of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, we wish to add our support to the invitation extended you to attend the World Assembly for the Moral Rearmament of the Nations at Mackinac Island, Mich., June 1 to 12, and to the welcome already issued by our Michigan colleagues in Congress.

Your presence in the United States, together with other distinguished leaders from Europe and Asia, can do much to focus the attention of the American people at this time on the positive steps that can be taken everywhere to answer the ideological threat of world communism. We need such a demonstration of united strength in the field of inspired moral leadership, without which our common military, political, and economic efforts to save the free world will certainly be less effective.

We are impressed with the practical evidence of what such active moral leadership has accomplished to establish democracy as a working force in danger areas that affect the future of your country and ours. We recognize the opportunity this assembly offers to proclaim to the world an inspired experience of democracy based on moral standards and the guidance of God which is the greatest bulwark of freedom.

We look forward to welcoming you on the occasion of your visit.

Senator TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.
Representative JOHN KEE,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee.
Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS.
Representative CHARLES A. EATON.

WELCOME BY MICHIGAN CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Michigan Members of Congress have joined in welcoming top-ranking political, military, industrial, and labor leaders from five continents to a world assembly for the moral rearmament of the nations to be held at the Grand Hotel at Mackinac Island, Mich., from June 1 to 12. Representatives from Western Europe and the Far East will join with delegates from South Africa, South America, Australia, Canada, and the United States to consider the steps necessary to give democracy the strength to win in both the east and the west at the same time.

"The event looms as one of major significance," said Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, and other members of Michigan's congressional delegation in a joint statement issued from the Senator's office in Washington today welcoming the assembly to their State. "Michigan is honored to be linked with a global struggle to reassert the effective strength of moral standards and the worth of every man under God's guidance. Our spiritual strength as well as our material strength must be mobilized to meet the universal threat of godless Communist materialism."

Headed by Representative ROY WOODRUFF, of Bay City; dean of the Michigan delegation in the House, congressional signatories to the statement include: JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Port Huron; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Royal Oak; JOHN D. DINGELL, Detroit; FRED L. CRAWFORD, Saginaw; CHARLES E. POTTER, Cheboygan; CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Allegan; PAUL W. SHAFER, Battle Creek; WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, Flint; JOHN B. BENNETT, Ontonagon; GERALD R. FORD, JR., Grand Rapids; GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, Detroit; LOUIS C. RABAUT, Grosse Pointe Park; JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Dearborn; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Hamtramck; GEORGE MEADER, Ann Arbor; RUTH THOMPSON, Whitehall and Muskegon.

Following his appointment to succeed Senator Vandenberg, Senator BLAIR MOODY stated on the Senate floor, "I am delighted to make it unanimous by adding my own warm support to this welcome."

A number of Cabinet Ministers from Europe are expected at the Mackinac assembly. Both Chancelor Konrad Adenauer, of Germany, and Foreign Minister Robert Schuman, of France, have credited moral rearmament with a major contribution to Franco-German unity. The Danish Foreign Minister, Ole Bjorn Kraft, said at a recent meeting in Copenhagen, "This is a world movement with a world answer which will play its part in shaping the future." Consultations with these men and other Cabinet Members in Italy, Belgium, and the Scandinavian countries have pointed to the value of a gathering in America at which evidence can be massed and developed of how MRA is "turning the tide of communism."

Delegations from the Far East, including a delegation of 65 Japanese leaders and others from Nationalist China, Burma, and India are preparing to come. The head of the All-India Posts and Telegraphs is already on his way. Gen. Ho Ying-chin, from Formosa, and Mr. Sisato Ichimada, the governor of the Bank of Japan, have expressed the desire to attend.

The intensive work of moral rearmament following the assembly at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington in January has led to important developments which make this world assembly of special timeliness. British leaders have noted the successful averting of Communist efforts to tie up London and Scottish docks in a general strike last month. The Red strategy was frustrated, according to the Communists themselves, by MRA-trained dock workers from London and Glasgow, who took part in the Washington conference.

French workers from the Red Belt factory area of Paris who were present in Washington, played a similar role in preventing a general strike in Paris at the time of General Eisenhower's visit this winter.

Large-scale national campaigns have been held after conferences with government leaders in France, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, Holland, and Belgium in connection with the launching of the book The World Rebuilt, by Peter Howard. This book reporting "the true story of Frank Buchman and the men and women of moral rearmament" has already sold 200,000 copies and a further 150,000 are in printing.

June 4 is Dr. Buchman's seventy-third birthday, and in this year of his nomination for the Nobel prize will be a special focus for world-wide interest in moral rearmament.

In addition to the delegations from overseas, there will be strong American representations, especially from those industries in which, as in National Airlines, MRA has been the means of bringing a new era of understanding and of saving millions of dollars.

The full text of the statement by Senator FERGUSON and the Michigan delegation in the House of Representatives follows:

"We of the Michigan congressional delegation take great pleasure in directing the attention of our fellow citizens to the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament, which is to be held in Michigan, at the Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, June 1–12, 1951.

"Moral rearmament has been described as 'a world force having as its principal objective adequate preparedness of free nations for the ideological conflicts in which the world is now engaged.'

"That is an objective which challenges the interest and imagination of all of us who believe in the strength and guidance of God. We believe that material forces alone cannot assure permanent peace, security, and tranquillity among nations and among people. We who believe in God see that our spiritual strength, as well as our material strength, must be mobilized to meet the universal threat of godless Communist materialism.

"Every nation of the world is being invited to send representatives to the Mackinac conference. The event looms as one of major significance, and Michigan is honored to be its host, as the name of our State is thereby to be linked in the eyes and minds of leaders in many lands with a global struggle to reassert the effective strength of moral standards and the worth of every man under God's guidance."

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GREEN TO LABOR LEADERS IN EUROPE AND ASIA

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 4, 1951.*

The chairmen and ranking members of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the United States Congress, and the Michigan congressional delegation have joined in welcoming national leaders from abroad to the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament, at Mackinac Island, Mich., June 1–12, 1951. The American labor movement warmly supports this welcome and expresses the hope that you and others of our trade-union brothers from Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and the Americas will attend this gathering and so contribute to the new world of liberty and justice we all desire.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

The Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Home Town Reporter in Washington, Walter Shead, WNU correspondent, which was taken from the May 4, 1951, issue of the Thayer News, Thayer, Mo.:

THE HOME TOWN REPORTER IN WASHINGTON

(By Walter Shead)

GREAT DEBATE NOT OVER

It seems that the great debate in Congress over foreign policy is not over; it is just getting started.

But what is hard to understand is this: During more than 3 months of debate, the Republican leadership in Congress opposed sending troops to Europe on the theory that to do so would arouse the Russian bear to the point of war, that it was a calculated risk that should not be taken and that our main line of defense should be the Western Hemisphere.

And almost overnight this same band of leadership has switched from a Western Hemisphere defense to demands for an aggressive war on Red China which would take a million American boys and all the planes and ships and guns we could muster to send across the Pacific.

The rhyme or reason in this thinking is certainly not clear, and the only interpretation which can be placed on such a metamorphosis is politics, pure and simple. The Democratic administration was for sending an army to serve under General Eisenhower in continental Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact, so politically the Republican leadership must oppose, and they did, but lost. The Democratic administration was opposed to making any aggressive war on Red China, seeking to confine the fighting in Korea, so the political thing for Republican leadership to do was to oppose it, so they are opposing, some going even as far as asking for an immediate declaration of war.

What has happened to the proposal of ex-President Hoover, to withdraw behind our two oceans? What General MacArthur thinks about this is not even important insofar as this Congress is concerned, for the simple reason that what he says before a joint session or before any congressional committee will not change a vote one way or another. Minds already are made up beforehand. Does any one believe for a minute that anything General MacArthur might say would change the minds of such Senators as TAFT, WHERRY, JENNER, CAIN, and KEM? Nor do you think they will heed for one instant whatever General Collins, or Admiral Sherman, or General Bradley, or General Marshall will say, or what General Vandenberg or Admiral Nimitz or even General Eisenhower might say on the subject in these committees?

What has happened is unfortunate, particularly for General MacArthur, and it is unfortunate for the country, for it is having the effect of driving deeper and deeper the wedge of disunity into the marrow of the Nation, and it is permitting politicians to make a scapegoat of MacArthur, when the general's return should mean only a tribute to his military feats of valor.

MacArthur deserved honors

General MacArthur, setting foot on United States soil for the first time in 14 years deserved all the adulation and honors heaped upon him by the American people. A lot of it was overdone, but that is the characteristic American way—do it up brown if you do it at all.

But after all the shouting dies down and the emotional hysteria has worn off, remember the man who withstood most, and who exhibited the most personal courage and just plain guts in this whole affair, was the present occupant of the White House, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States.

Truman clears the way

And it was the President who cleared the way for MacArthur's formal congressional appearance, and it was the President who canceled his own public appearances so there would be no counterattraction to MacArthur's day in court in Washington, and permitted Government offices, the schools, the whole town to turn out to greet the general on his return after 14 years abroad in the service of his country.

President Truman is now at his lowest ebb of popularity. If you are interested, however, watch his popularity barometer start climbing. His two most recent talks to the American people were more forceful and contained more plain common American horse sense than any in many months.

Shades of Nuremberg—How Blindly Must Generals Follow the Leader?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Felix Morley in Barrons for May 7 indicates that our military leaders are concerned about the effect of the Nuremberg trials and the principles enunciated there in the event we are engaged in another full-time all-out war. On several occasions I have taken the floor to condemn the Nuremberg trials and as time marches on, these views are corroborated by events. I commend this article to all Members of this body:

A NICE POINT—HOW BLINDLY MUST GENERALS FOLLOW THE LEADER?

(By Felix Morley)

(The Sphere of Obedience: "With the doctrine of immunity of a head of state usually is coupled another, that orders from an official superior protect one who obeys them. It will be noticed that the combination of these two doctrines means that nobody is responsible. Society as modernly organized cannot tolerate so broad an area of official irresponsibility. There is doubtless a sphere in which the defense of obedience to superior orders should prevail. If a conscripted or enlisted soldier is put on a firing squad, he should not be held responsible for the validity of the sentence he carries out. But the case may be greatly altered where one has discretion because of rank or the latitude of his orders." Statement of Mr. Justice Jackson, approved by President Truman, June 7, 1945.)

Although nobody likes to emphasize the subject, it is apparent that the shadow of the Nuremberg trials overhangs and darkens the momentous inquiry into the Korean war which opened in Washington last Thursday.

The Nuremberg trials, it will be recalled, were prosecuted under the terms of an agreement signed in London on August 8, 1945, by representatives of the United States, France, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia. This charter established an international military tribunal empowered to try enemy officials and officers defined as war criminals. It was on the basis of this and subsequent four-power agreements that many German and Japanese military men were later executed, or given drastic prison sentences.

Article 8 of this London charter established a wholly new principle in international law. It said: "The fact that the defendant acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior shall not free him from responsibility."

Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson was the chief American architect of

this charter. In his first report to President Truman, before affixing his signature in London, Mr. Jackson sharply criticised the obsolete doctrine that orders from an official superior protect one who obeys them. He said that officers of the German general staff could claim no immunity on the grounds of having obeyed governmental orders.

Since then, many jurists have called that conclusion fallacious both in law and logic. Lord Hankey, the distinguished British Privy Councillor, has perhaps been especially critical of the Nuremberg theory that military officers are legally responsible for wrongful acts by their civilian superiors.

Speaking in the House of Lords, on May 5, 1949, Lord Hankey said that Mr. Jackson's argument confronts the individual with an impossible dilemma between duty and conscience.

Lord Hankey added that the precedent established at Nuremberg troubles the (British) fighting services considerably. One has only to talk confidentially with high ranking American officers now in Washington to realize that it is troubling them today, perhaps far more than their British colleagues.

Placed in an impossible dilemma between duty and conscience, General MacArthur chose the path of the latter. It can be effectively argued, as administration spokesmen are asserting, that it was not the general's privilege to reason why. It was his duty to fight the undeclared war in Korea in whatever manner the President of the United States, acting in concert with the United Nations, might decree.

But this same President had earlier endorsed and proclaimed as national policy the theory of Justice Jackson that a military officer should be brought to trial if he obeys civilian orders which can later be characterized as criminal. In his opening statement as chief of counsel for the United States, at the Nuremberg trials, Mr. Jackson said:

"None of these men before you acted in minor parts. Each of them was entrusted with broad discretion and exercised great power. Their responsibility is correspondingly great and may not be shifted to that fictional being, 'the state,' which cannot be produced for trial, cannot testify, and cannot be sentenced."

During the course of the Nuremberg trials, Mr. Jackson went a good deal further than this generality.

In cross-examination of Marshal Goering, former Commander in Chief of the German Air Force, Mr. Jackson obtained the admission that the German people were not consulted when Hitler decided to make war on Soviet Russia. This was to emphasize the criminal irresponsibility of the Nazi leadership, and the consequent culpability of individual German generals in following that leadership.

In his book on The Nuremberg Case, Mr. Jackson quotes and emphasizes the key admission made by Goering under cross-examination: "The German people were not asked. They were notified of the fact and of the reasons for that fact" (war against Russia).

Republican Senators have been digging into this testimony recently, because of a certain analogy with our undeclared war on Korea, in which the American people also were notified of the fact and of the reasons for that fact after and not before hostilities.

There is a growing disposition to summon Justice Jackson to testify at the Senate inquiry, to determine whether his theory of individual responsibility for questioning dubious executive orders would not wholly justify every pronouncement and action by General MacArthur. It may be added that nobody is more anxious to have this point clarified than the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The sentences passed on German and Japanese generals, for blindly obeying orders from their governments, are not being recalled to justify these cruel and ruthless men, nor out of any desire to take a partisan advantage in the present congressional inquiry.

Some of our most important military leaders believe that this issue of the limits to military loyalty underlies the whole rumpus that has followed General MacArthur's dismissal. It is argued that whatever else the investigation may accomplish it must definitely determine whether the traditional loyalty of the military to civilian leadership is still binding. At Nuremberg the Truman administration, through the agency of Justice Jackson, went far to argue the contrary.

There is no question that the Republicans have a very important point here, and not less important because in the planning of the hearings it has so far been held in reserve. But where there seems to be a disposition to overplay the cards is in the Republican anxiety to have these hearings public.

The demand that the testimony be on the record is understandable, in view of the great public interest, the pervading anxiety as to our foreign policy, and the vital importance of the investigation. But this last factor also provides the conclusive argument for the approved procedure of taking the testimony in executive session, then releasing everything not held back by a competent security check.

For the security of the Nation is literally at stake, not only in respect to confidential military information, but even more as to such vital questions as the responsibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the President, of the President and Secretary of State to the Congress, and of individual generals and their subordinates to the Chiefs of Staff. These are not issues that can properly or profitably be discussed in open forum, under the strain of television and partial quotation.

Except for the secrecy of its deliberations the Constitutional Convention of 1787 would certainly have broken down. Today, it is a question of saving the Constitution then so carefully and skillfully designed. The complete frankness incompatible with klieglight publicity is no less necessary now.

United States Policy in the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Korean Policy Doesn't Add Up to Appeasement," which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of Sunday, May 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN POLICY DOESN'T ADD UP TO APPEASEMENT

To persuade Congress and the American people to adopt his far eastern policies Gen. Douglas MacArthur is seeking to create the impression that the United States and the United Nations have no policies.

MacArthur further endeavors to create prejudice against present United States and U. N. policies by characterizing them as "appeasement"—a word which has evil connotations when correctly used. The deposed far eastern commander tells the bereaved and those who fear their loved ones may become casualties that lives are being squandered by present attempts to limit and end hostilities. He implies that if he has his way lives will be saved and victory will be assured.

MacArthur utters his criticisms and offers his solutions with such an air of absolute authority that many are disposed to accept them as gospel truths.

Whatever a man of MacArthur's brilliance and long experience says is worth considering carefully. He is, however, a human being and all humans, MacArthur and the Tribune's editors not excepted, are subject to error. His views and ours need to be checked against other views just like everyone else's.

The risks are too great to warrant taking chances by hasty adoption of any policies, however categorically and persuasively propounded.

Now United States and U. N. policies may be less wise than they should be. But they are carefully considered policies even though MacArthur says he does not know what they are and that they do not exist.

The United States and the U. N. do not accept the proposition that all-out war with Russia is inevitable or that if such a war comes it would necessarily result in a quick and total victory for the United States and its allies.

MacArthur may be of a different opinion but he cannot rightly argue that this does not constitute a basis for a policy.

The United States and the U. N. believe that more lives would have to be expended and free institutions will be more jeopardized by deliberately enlarging hostilities in the Far East than by trying to bring existing hostilities to an early honorable conclusion. We know that limited hostilities are costly. MacArthur contends that his "positive plan" would be less costly but he cannot prove that contention. Others equally well situated to make such calculations believe the contrary.

It is an abuse of the word "appeasement" to apply it to an unwillingness to bomb troop concentration points in Manchuria so long as the Communists do not use their air or submarine power against U. N. forces in Korea. Who can say how many lives have been saved by such limitation of hostilities? Who can say how many would be expended by our deliberate enlargement of hostilities? Who can say whether prospects for a negotiated peace are enhanced or diminished by such a policy?

Is it "appeasement" if we do not immediately set up a blockade of Chinese ports? Is it "appeasement" if we do not facilitate an invasion of continental China from Formosa which many experts at least as well acquainted with China as MacArthur believe could not succeed without large-scale American participation?

The real test, as the New York Times points out, is the effectiveness of given measures. "Will they, if taken, actually shorten the war in Korea? Or will they broaden and prolong the war by bringing Russia openly into the fighting? Will they alienate us from our allies in other parts of the world? And, if so, will they cost us more than they will profit us? These questions involve deep political and military judgments. It is not 'appeasement' to choose the area in which we wish, if necessary, to employ our maximum military effort."

Under questioning by Senators last week MacArthur indicated that he had not taken very much account of the global aspects of the problem of surviving in freedom in advancing his proposals for victory in the Far East. The President, the State and the Defense Departments have given careful consideration to global aspects in deciding what should and should not be attempted in Korea so long as the enemy does not enlarge the hostilities.

Before abandoning those carefully formulated policies for MacArthur's policies the Nation should at least weigh carefully what others think it stands to lose as well as what MacArthur thinks it stands to gain.

And, as is pointed out elsewhere on this page, we had better be prepared to go it alone if we abandon the collective approach to security and elect to seek security by MacArthur's methods.

An Awakening America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received on April 27 from Mr. Lloyd Osborn Coulter, of Fitzwilliam Depot, N. H. It is an unusually penetrating analysis of the situation which confronts America. He has given me permission to make his views available to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FITZWILLIAM DEPOT, N. H., *April 25, 1951.*

Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate,
Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There comes a time in the life of every citizen when he is impelled to write pro bono publico to his Senator. In my case it is a sort of emotional prophylaxis which may well prevent apoplexy or assault with intent to inflict bodily harm on the nearest Democrat.

Since opinions are likely to be mere intellectual accidents if reached outside of experience, I will explain my right to mine in a sentence or two at the end of this letter. But first, the proposition I wish to put to you.

The American people have one right which transcends all others—to achieve their own destiny. The great debate is really whether that right should be thwarted, perverted, and abandoned.

The stiff breeze stirred up by the Kefauver hearings and the hurricane sowed by the MacArthur firing are clearly and simply protests by an awakened electorate against the cynical, wasteful, and morally atrophied domestic administration, on the one hand, and its stubborn "Wrong Way Corrigan" foreign flight, on the other.

Since we have survived, and will survive, worse corruption than the posthumous Pendergast rash of deep-freezes, mink coats, RFC loans, and municipal party roots fertilized by the Mafia, we can leave this domestic problem to be dealt with by the evolution of public conscience. Our foreign orientation is the graver problem; immediate and critical.

The governments of Europe—and I am not speaking of the refugees from its political, economic, and social system who pioneered and developed this country—have looked upon this country as a milch cow from 1492 to 1951. The earliest came for gold and silver and the later for colonial trade. All ruthlessly exploited the natives, Indians or colonists, and quarreled with each other over the spoils until the founding fathers, led by Washington, Bolivar, and the resolute rest threw them out.

Until the discovery of America, Europe faced east whence a trickle of wealth seeped into the coffers of its feudal bandit-rulers and a small class of city bankers and merchants, without touching the calloused palms of the peasants. England was a negligible island of six or eight million sheepherders whose royal treasurer sat on a sack of wool. After Columbus, when the galleons, heavy with American plunder, rolled to Iberia, Drake and his successors changed all that. From that time forward American wealth, directly or indirectly, voluntarily or reluctantly, underwrote the development of European nationalism, mercantilism, and imperialism and financed all of its major wars from that of the Spanish Succession to World War II.

Our founders recognized the venality and chronic quarrelsomeness of Europe and counseled against all entangling alliances with it. Monroe and others, down to Wilson, held the course. The American people, trustees of a great new concept of freedom and justice and humanity, faced westward and carried the banner of western civilization to the Pacific and beyond assimilating Louisiana, California, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippines by purchase or easy conquest from their European masters in the process. Nowhere have we been guilty of predatory colonialism. After removing the senile clutch of Spain from Cuba and the Philippines we contributed heavily to their sanitation, education, and economy and voluntarily withdrew. After the Boxer Rebellion we alone, of the nations involved, exacted no extraterritorial grants or concessions. We canceled most of the reparations debt after World War I, and plowed back into Germany and Austria in the way of public and private loans more than the undefaulted tithe we collected. Through the Red Cross and the Hoover Commission we fed and clothed them and, unlike our allies, divided no territorial spoils.

After the last war in which victory was purchased with American blood and American resources, we undertook to rehabilitate our late enemies and support our late allies through a thousand private and public methods ranging from United Polish Relief to CARE and the European recovery program. All this while we were being hypnotized into underwriting a new imperialism and a new war in the making at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

Never in history have any people contributed so much of their substance to avert famine, disease, and disaster everywhere in the world as the Americans. Never has a people dealt so fairly with their neighbors or so generously and constructively with their foes. Yet we have won no solid friendship, no deep respect in Europe. That is, of course, except as a source of profit to her traders and a prop to her wobbly governments, always threatened with some new conqueror. Nine out of ten Europeans, including the British, secretly resent and despise us as a nation, though they may like some of us well enough as individuals. They suspect our motives and impugn our methods except where these parallel their own immediate and selfish interests. They will even use our tax dollars and the products of our industry to trade with, and appease, the common foe, as the British are doing with the Chinese Communists in Hong Kong and Singapore and with steel shipments to Russia, while they demand that our first line of defense shall be their bankrupt homelands, not the area where we are already engaged in a life-and-death shooting war with communism.

You would think that after Churchill (as his memoirs all but brag) and Stalin had conned us into practically turning our back on the Pacific enemy who had attacked us in 1941 and, for the next 2 years throwing most of our weight against the European enemy who had attacked them, we would be more than a little critical of their blandishments. But Truman and Acheson seem to be even more easily hypnotized than Roosevelt and Hull.

One man—MacArthur—has had the courage to try and restore the American people to their destiny; to turn their backs on Europe and to continue to march toward the Orient where now the crucial battle against the Communist despotism is being waged and where a great and new civilization is stirring and with our help and friendship will arise. Lattimore, Hiss, the Amerasia cabal, the eastern bankers, and the Groton tradition abetted by the lobbying of Washington's European embassies have hog-tied Acheson and the big-city foreign language vote has subverted Truman and a lot of the northern Democrats. But there are encouraging signs that the American people may, through the great debate, once more become the arbiters of their own destiny rather than go broke trying to revive Europe's.

I hope and believe that you will support our Government's return to sanity with all means at your disposal. You could render our country no greater service.

Yours sincerely,

L. O. COULTER.

P. S.—Oh yes; about my bona fides: I fought with the French, British, and Americans in World War I, spent 13 years in France, Germany, north Africa, and England between 1921 and 1935. Though not a Son of the American Revolution my grandpappy was one of Sherman's Bummers.

L. O. C.

Twentieth Annual Americanization Day Celebration in Jersey City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, VFW, initiated Americanization Day in Jersey City, N. J. Ever since 1931 it has continued to sponsor and support the Americanization Day celebration in that city. From small beginnings, the celebration has grown to be one of the largest and most inspiring of its kind in the United States.

On Sunday, April 29, under sunny skies, 30,000 people, most of them veterans of wars of the United States, members of various veterans' organizations and their ladies' auxiliaries, marched before tens of thousands of others who gathered along the route for the purpose of witnessing the stirring parade.

The reviewing stand was, as usual, located in Pershing Field, where the parade terminated.

Prior to the arrival of the marchers at Pershing Field, a speaking program was carried on and concluded. The speakers, who addressed the thousands assembled before the stand in Pershing Field, included Hon. John V. Kenny, mayor of Jersey City; Hon. William Flanagan, deputy mayor of Jersey City;

Hon. Alexander F. Ormsby, former common pleas judge and past national commandant Marine Corps League; Commander Raymond Clyons, Hudson County American Legion, Department of New Jersey; Rev. Phillip E. Dobson, S. J., director, St. Peter's College of Industrial Relations; "Smokey" Graves, supreme commander, Military Order of Cooties; Mrs. Florence Stark, past national president of VFW Auxiliary; Mrs. Carrie Brady, president, VFW Auxiliary, Department of New Jersey, and myself. The principal speech of the day was delivered by the honored guest, Charles C. Ralls, national commander in chief of VFW of the United States.

Guests included Admiral Leland P. Lovett, USN, retired; Maj. Gen. I. V. White, chief of staff of First Army; Capt. T. S. Dunston Conde, USNR; and Hon. Alfred D. Sieminski, Representative of the Thirteenth District of New Jersey.

The general chairman of the great celebration who has served in the same capacity for many years was Mr. George A. Thornton, Sr., of the Clinton E. Fisk Post. The grand marshal was Commander August Hanniball, Jr., Department of New Jersey, VFW of the United States. Among the aides of the grand marshal were Capt. Francis X. Burke; Lt. Stephen R. Gregg; Sgt. John W. Meagher and Sgt. Nicholas Oresko, all wearers of the Congressional Medal of Honor. The parade chairman was Donald D. Kemp, Sr.; Angelo "Pat" Menendez, past commander of Fisk Post and public relations director for the parade, was master of ceremonies at the reviewing stand announcing the arrival of and identifying each unit of the parade as it passed the stand.

The audience was held in rapt attention during the splendid address of Commander in Chief Charles C. Ralls, which is appended herewith:

ADDRESS BY COMMANDER IN CHIEF CHARLES C. RALLS, JERSEY CITY, N. J., SUNDAY, APRIL 29, 1951

This afternoon is the VFW's finest hour. The mammoth parade today, under the sponsorship of Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, is the culmination of a patriotic ideal—the perfect expression of true loyalty to our Nation and our flag. It is the twentieth annual Americanization Day celebration in Jersey City.

The members of Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post and all VFW members in this outstanding city can be justly proud of their patriotic contribution to this historic observance. As commander in chief of the VFW, I can assure them that their comrades throughout the country recognize and appreciate the importance of Americanization Day. As a privileged spectator at this year's observance in Jersey City, I can testify to the esteem and admiration which they have earned for the Veterans of Foreign Wars among their fellow citizens.

The Americanism program established 20 years ago by the VFW in Jersey City as a simple, practical demonstration of loyalty to the ideals which are the foundation and strength of our country has developed into a national loyalty-day celebration. Proof of the inspiring character of this program—if such be needed—is recorded for history in the appearance yesterday of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur on the reviewing stand for the loyalty parade in New York City. This was a tremendous tribute to the farsighted, unselfish determination of VFW members in Jersey City during the past 20 years to acclaim publicly their proud heritage as Americans.

It is encouraging and gratifying that this demonstration of sincere devotion to our Nation and the freedoms it offers which began as a local ceremony here has now been accepted by all of our citizens. At the same time, the need for such a public rededication of faith in our Nation, our form of government, and our fellow citizens has never been greater.

In this period of national crisis, loyalty should above all else mean unity. The Veterans of Foreign Wars established Loyalty Day as a visible means of opposing Communist May Day demonstrations. We wanted to show that a free people are just as willing to stand up and be counted as the subversive force of communism and its fellow traveler elements. We wanted to prove that Americanism and loyalty to our Nation and our flag are more than an ideal. They are a living reality that gives strength to our Nation and courage to our people.

This year, however, moral strength and physical courage to meet and repulse the naked assault of Communist military aggression are not enough. For the war in Korea has produced a byproduct of dissension that threatens the security of our Nation. The singleness of purpose and determination that characterized our national defense program after the outbreak of hostilities in Korea has been shattered by the dismissal of General MacArthur. America has been split into two foreign-policy camps. The division of our people is one of the most serious in the history of our country because it transcends the normal, necessary two-party political system. It has solidified the seemingly all-out convictions of patriotic Americans who sincerely believe that their conflicting courses of action are each best designed to protect the security of our Nation.

Loyalty does not mean the blind, unquestioned acceptance of a political philosophy. It does demand that we stop acting as martinets controlled by irrational, unintelligent emotionalism. Loyalty this year must imply hard-headed intelligence and patience.

Americans pride themselves on being the world's foremost realists in the field of business. We're giants of industry and infants in international relations. Whether we like it or not, the United States is the leader of the freedom-loving people and democratic nations of the world. We must point the way toward freedom, prosperity, and peace. But we can't do the job alone.

I don't think there is any question of the loyalty of Americans in our life and death struggle against the godless forces of barbaric communism. All of us recognize the threat to our own democratic way of life which this tyrannical force poses. All of us are determined to defend our freedoms against aggression. But the fight can be lost while we battle among ourselves as to the best means of guaranteeing the security of our Nation.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars does not expect that the serious military and international policy differences represented by President Truman and General MacArthur will be immediately reconciled. We do not ask that the basic conflicts be forgotten. But we do demand that the American people, through their elected representatives in Congress, stop viewing these differences in terms of political expediency, and evaluate the conflicting policies with only one common thought in mind; the security of our beloved country.

At this very moment your comrades and mine are fighting and dying in Korea in an heroic defense against the most savage Communist onslaught of the entire war. Their actions will be recorded in history as the most inspiring expression of loyalty, the most perfect example of Americanism. To them, however, this afternoon's parade and other loyalty demonstrations throughout the country this week end will seem a hollow mockery unless they can help bring from division and chaos the unity and direction which our Nation so desperately needs.

For 20 years the members of Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post and other Veterans of Foreign Wars posts in Jersey City have led the way in proving to their fellow citizens and to the rest of the world that Americanism is an unselfish, intensely practical way of life. They have demonstrated by actions that regardless of race, color, creed, or political beliefs Americans are united in their love of our country, loyalty to our Government, and gratitude for the blessings of freedom we all enjoy.

It is appropriate, therefore, that the 1,200,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars look to their comrades in Jersey City for inspiration and guidance in this hour of national crisis. We have always been strengthened and inspired by the resurgence of patriotism that follows your Americanization Day celebration. Today we seek from this observance a rebirth of faith in the inherent intelligence, courage, and determination of our people—a return of confidence in the willingness of our elected Government leaders to put aside personal, political differences, and to work for the common objective of adequate national security.

This essential objective cannot be achieved within the Federal Government if the American people continue to isolate themselves in a vacuum of personal opinion and refuse to study and understand sincere conflicting views of their fellow citizens. A bipartisan foreign policy is the byproduct of legislative give and take. But it is directly dependent on the unselfish, objective actions and expressions of each American. A truly effective national defense program is predicated on the willingness of our citizens to suffer the inconveniences and sacrifices which will be demanded for the welfare of all our people.

Loyalty to your Nation is like loyalty to your closest friend. It does not shrink or falter in adversity. It is unyielding and unquestioning. This analogy is entirely proper today, I think, in view of the fair-weather attitude of many Americans concerning our military, economic, and political international operations.

Last June congressional leaders, veteran and civic organization officials—indeed, virtually all responsible individuals in America—hailed the action of President Truman in sending United States forces to the defense of Korea. Today many of these same forgetful individuals are charging that the President had no constitutional authority to effect this action and are even urging that American forces pull out of Korea. Confusion and conflict, if permitted to continue, may also jeopardize the North Atlantic Pact, our economic-assistance program, and other aspects of our total military, political, and economic fight against Communist aggression.

I am not for a minute arguing that any or all of these programs are infallible, that they constitute an absolute guaranty of the security of our Nation, or the preservation of peace. However, I would point out that the North Atlantic Pact, the military assistance program, and ECA were approved by a majority of our elected representatives, that they constitute the official policy of our Government, that they need and deserve our loyal support.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is humbly proud of the opportunity it has had to sponsor such inspiring loyalty programs as the twentieth annual Americanization Day celebration here in Jersey City. We are sincerely grateful to the thousands of patriotic Americans who unselfishly participated in this program. This example of complete, unhesitating cooperation for a common ideal can be prophetic. It proves that Americans are united in their love of our country.

I pray that this bond of unity can be forged throughout the length and breadth of our land as a lifeline to which each of us can turn when the emotional, political storm of confusion and conflict, of indecision and hostility threatens to engulf us.

Americanization Day 1951 can be a turning point in our Nation's history. At the very least it can remind us that we are first and always Americans—and incidentally Democrats or Republicans, internationalists, or isolationists. If the Veterans of Foreign Wars can accomplish this essential objective, then our highest purpose will have been achieved. For we desire only to instill in the hearts of all Americans a deep, abiding devotion to their Nation, respect for their Government, and faith in their fellow man.

We are confident that if these ideals prevail, the future of America as a free Nation under God will be secure.

What's An Appeaser?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of May 5, 1951:

WHAT'S AN APPEASER?

Heard all too frequently in these troubled times is the epithet "appeaser" hurled bitterly in the heat of the great debate, and in its very bitterness giving a new and scornful meaning to the word.

The scornful meaning stems from the pathetic efforts made by British and French statesmen to gain time in which to rearm their countries to meet the belligerent threats of a dictatorship. The word was then twisted to mean indulgence in abject conciliation which proved ineffective and only served to sacrifice and betray the interests of other and weaker nations.

It may be found profitable if unpleasant for every good and patriotic American, regardless of their convictions or snap judgments, to practice complete self-appraisal and make an honest confession of principles and viewpoints. Most important is the primary concern of approaching the MacArthur controversy with an open mind.

These are the questions: Are the American people prepared to carry through the extraordinary sacrifices in men and money they know we must make if we become involved now in an all-out war? If they are so prepared to jump into an all-out war in Asia do they feel that their efforts should be redoubled if the Soviet attack is launched against Europe as well as Asia?

Do they believe that the United States should "go it alone" in Asia if the other members of United Nations decline to share in a tougher American policy? Do they believe that Red China is acting on its own initiative or that the Soviet Union is directing the campaign in the Far East?

Alternatively, do they believe that aerial reconnaissance of Manchuria and China, economic blockade of Red China, assistance to enable Chiang Kai-shek to invade the Chinese mainland, and an ultimatum to the Chinese Reds will not involve us in an all-out war in Asia, or that, if these measures do bring on an all-out war we can still emerge victorious?

On the other hand, do they believe that while the ebb and flow of battle near the thirty-eighth parallel gains time for the nation to rearm and for Europe to rearm, that national policy should be bent to delay involvement in a total war effort?

Remember that all these considerations have been propounded and positive opinions given by men who are taking unyielding stands on both sides of the controversy. Remember that the individual citizen will be committed to either moral bankruptcy or to a supreme war effort on a scale undreamed of if the wrong answers are given. Remember that all the men of high rank involved in this controversy are patriotic Americans whose convictions have the motivation of doing what they believe best for our country, and that if extreme peril faced the Nation they would discard their private ambitions to serve their country as best they can.

And now—finally—the definition of appeaser will take on yet another meaning, that of one too cowardly to undertake to do the right thing for this Nation because it involves sacrifices of one kind or another. It is the individual citizen who must decide what is an appeaser.

A Letter From Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper column written by me:

[From the Ford Gazette and Frankford Dispatch of May 4, 1951]

A LETTER FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

No mere Congressman, serving by your say-so and returnable at your will every 2 years, can assume a superior air even if he could. But all the MacArthur to-do shows a large segment of your America and mine on an emotional binge that had better burn out or else. Or else we can scrap the military judgments of men like Generals Marshall, Bradley, and Eisenhower, whose decisions really did far more to achieve victory in World War II than did those of the military figure who has recently been taking the bows. Meantime we hear there will be a searching through into Yalta and past. Again FDR is being disinterred. In the mad thirst for power, it is forgotten that Mussolini and Hitler ever strode the peacock path of history's stage.

It does not matter that MacArthur alone of the top brass has always had an eye on political possibilities. At this crossroads of civilization it is not of great concern which political party and certainly not which candidate wins what election. In this field day of politics we can jolly well debate ourselves out of existence. MacArthur is not worth that. Let us parade him and forget him as the man who made the problems of good people like Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and Bradley infinitely more difficult as he concluded his military career. If you do not believe there is a lot of screwball thinking in this emotional binge, get a load of the opinions of some people that the speech MacArthur made before Congress was "epoch making, finest in our time," etc. No political figure could get away with the blatant baloney which concluded his speech. It was about his West Point days and the then current barrack-room ballad, An Old Soldier Never Dies; He Just Fades Away—"so I will just fade away," said the general, as though he were the soul of humility. He just fades away to the accompaniment of the joint meeting of Congress and endless luncheons in his honor, together with parades and miles of ticker tape. This gave the emotional drunk just the comedy relief it required for many of us.

Now, let us get a lot of first things first, including the American tradition that we do not want any general pushing around our civil authorities. Meantime we must face the fact that the war potential of Europe and its steel plants are more important than Asia; also, that the aging general has been cooped up on an island to a degree where he did not even get around Japan and left headquarters only for a few visits to the Korean sector. Whatever his worth in World War I, we have a brand-new military crisis coming up and a lot of responsible people do not believe the MacArthur policy should direct our operations in it. Now, let us rid ourselves of this hang-over and get back to work. Until we face the problem of our survival realistically, we are not entitled to the foolishness which recently took place.

Cordially, your Congressman,

WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Congressman GREEN expresses his own views, which are not necessarily those of this paper.)

MacArthur's Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of May 7, 1951:

MACARTHUR'S OPINIONS

Although the evidence is incomplete in the case presented by General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur, his main theme is developed and is subject to valid criticism. The thoughtful citizen is left with a distinct sense of unease and a feeling that the distinguished general has not produced the facts to back up what he believes to be best in our present situation and strength for the Nation.

His seven main contentions, although affirmed with sincerity and obvious ability, are in conflict and assailable as opinions or theories not supported by solid and irrefutable facts. He has repeatedly said that he was a theater commander, concerned with direction of operations in this theater and not well enough informed on global and international affairs to give an opinion.

He finds the stalemate in Korea intolerable and advocates steps to hurl the Red Chinese forces out of Korea, but he argues that such steps would not impel the Soviet Union to take an active part in the struggle and precipitate world war III. In his view the enemy is not the Soviet Union, but communism all over the world.

Even over our allies' objections the United States should go ahead with his proposed plan for dealing with Red China, the general says, and, in his own defense says that the Joint Chiefs of Staff considered an identical plan early this year. Finally, he says he has the right to go over the heads of his superiors and take his case directly to the American people.

To these conclusions and opinions he has every right—but the troubled citizenry, looking for absolute and convincing facts do not find in his brilliant arguments, his masterful duelling with words in the Senate hearings or his conclusions, the conviction they must have if the MacArthur views are to prevail.

While disavowing expertness in global strategy he has undertaken to give global advice. He has offered no convincing proof that the Soviet Union would not attack and launch us into world war III. Indeed, his opinion does not seem to justify even the taking of even a calculated risk. Many wonder, as well, at his statement that the Soviet Union is not the enemy, but that world communism is the foe. The two seem to be synonymous to the average citizen.

Going it alone and ignoring the views of our allies may very well achieve what the Soviet Union has been striving for all along—splitting the United States away from its Western European allies. Obviously the Joint Chiefs of Staff, weighing all the possibilities on a global scale, have considered a variety of plans in the past, but it is also obvious that the kind of improvised military planning which our unpreparedness has made necessary cannot be welded to any particular plan until we are strong enough to plan for victory.

As to going over the heads of his superiors even the doughty general has admitted that President Truman had the right to relieve him of his duties. Moreover, he is too much the professional soldier to come our flatly in opposition to the chains of command without which there can be no discipline. General MacArthur seems to have accepted in his own mind that in taking his case to the people he had destroyed his usefulness to the Nation as a military commander, and now undertakes to persuade the Nation out of patriotism that we are embarked on the wrong course.

The tragic consequences of this rift in public opinion and solidarity of effort is yet to be reckoned.

Lying Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following came to my desk just as I was coming over to the House. Drew Pearson seems to be running true to form, still venting his spite.

The release follows:

[Special bulletin, southern California Republican women, Los Angeles, Calif.]

LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

"Herbert Hoover supports Earl Warren," says Drew Pearson, but what does Herbert Hoover say to southern California Republican women?

Drew Pearson, long noted for his peculiar interest in California politics and political figures, particularly in Republicans, has done it again.

In his column, published locally on April 30, Drew Pearson first devotes a couple of paragraphs to describing his version of Republican leaders playing hide-and-seek with Gen. Douglas MacArthur through the corridors and telephone booths of the Waldorf-Astoria. But, according to Pearson, the only Republican who "caught up" with the general was Herbert Hoover.

And, says Pearson, this is what Herbert Hoover seriously whispered into the ear of MacArthur: "Are you interested in politics, General?" And MacArthur, says Pearson, told our ex-President: "No."

Now, quoting directly from the Pearson column:

"Hoover then gave MacArthur his own ideas about the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1952 and went all out for Gov. Earl Warren, of California. Hoover unhesitatingly described Warren as the best qualified man on the entire GOP horizon. Not given much to enthusiasm, Hoover almost waxed enthusiastic about Governor Warren."

Pearson then adds a postscript to this astonishing new twist to the old "smoke-filled hotel room" type of Presidential nomination by pointing out the fact that the California Governor will be remembered by the voters as having "run" on the Dewey ticket back in 1948, and "that he (Earl Warren) has been almost as popular with the Democrats as with the Republicans in California."

Then came the parting-and-typical "Pearson" touch. He said: "And unlike TAFT, he (meaning Earl Warren) would probably get some labor backing in a national election." Well.

We southern California Republican women don't believe all we read, or in these days, even see or hear, and especially not Drew Pearson's reporting, so we did the logical thing and sent a wire to the office of Herbert Hoover. The reply speaks for itself.

"MAY 2, 1951.

"SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN WOMEN:

"I have your inquiry as to some statement of Drew Pearson that Mr. Hoover is supporting a particular man for President. Mr. Hoover has taken no part in such politics for some years and obviously any statement of this kind is untrue. Mr. Hoover does not believe this source should be credited by anybody.

"BERNICE MILLER,
"Secretary to Mr. Hoover."

Here you see a dramatic and very personal example of the vicious tactics of a certain school of reporters and radio commentators who thus diabolically contrive to confuse and mislead the unaware and uninformed Republicans among us by sly innuendoes, half truths, and implied guilt by association.

Here you see in vivid action this technique which has been, is, and will continue to be used in attacks upon the honorable men—the real American statesmen of our Nation. The one who has been with us, patient, wise, giving his beloved Nation and his party well-considered advice when called upon to counsel or to serve, and the one who also has been with us, fighting in the United States Senate—sometimes almost alone—for the preservation of each and every truly American and Republican Party principle and ideal, and the other who has just come back home to us after years spent in honorable and gallant service in the military force of America and in the administrative office which he handled and conducted so well that he left a once-enemy nation in tears at his departure.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Mayfair Times of April 26, 1951:

[From the Mayfair Times of April 26, 1951]

A LETTER FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

Most of the professional soldiers I know do not vote and neither do their families, if they live with the officer. In this way they hold to the tradition that we do not want a political Army or Navy. With the former co-Emperor of Japan it is different. Douglas MacArthur has always cherished the idea of being president. That's what makes his return to this country exceedingly amusing when we watch the behavior of those coy potential candidates among the Republicans. Stassen, the great educator, has been ever voluble on all possible occasions and concerning everything. But he maintains a silence about MacArthur on television and just smiles a rather sickly smile through his well-known teeth. Dewey suddenly needs a rest in Bermuda and TAFT, whose getaway is not so easily accomplished, is a match for the FBI in his elusiveness. Only JOE MARTIN, who has no Presidential ambitions, is left to stage-manage the appearance.

Somewhere along the line I hope to ask questions in the Armed Services Committee of the House, of which I am a member. Among these queries would be the following: Why was it so easy to follow a directive to gas-bomb veterans, their wives and children at Anacostia Flats upon order of President Herbert Hoover or Secretary of War Patrick Hurley, and yet so difficult to follow Pentagon orders? What would you have done to a subordinate when you were Chief of Staff if he violated or ignored the spirit of one of your orders?

When you were flown out of the Philippines and you said "I will be back." Your walking through the surf at Leyte was front page in every newspaper in the world. Is it not true that you had practically nothing to do about paving the way for your return? I would like you to say it because a lot of Americans do not properly realize Admirals Nimitz and Halsey, the Marine Corps in its capturing of key islands, and Hap Arnold's Air Force accomplished the job for which you took the bows. Admit it openly so that brave and competent leaders, living and dead, can at long last receive a credit they deserved and which you do not. Is it not also true that the only reason you received the Japanese surrender was that you were senior officer in the theater? Are you aware that here, too, some quick thinkers among Americans might get the notion that you brought about that surrender aboard the mighty *Mo*, whereas, you contributed practically nothing to it?

What means did you take to keep informed on a possible Korean situation before it broke and do you think that you handled it well? What caused you to issue the boys "home by Christmas" statement, and do you realize it has been the most seriously damaging event to the morale of the free world? Do you realize that if the military situation had not been corrected by General Ridgway that history could well have recorded you as one of the colossal military false alarms of all times? As former superintendent of the Military Academy at West Point, you were once a specialist in training young men. Why were those poor kids in Japan left so untrained that they threw down their arms and ran? Was there not as much room for training in Japan as in the Academy on the Hudson? Finally, what makes you think you were as qualified to judge the relative importance of the European and Asiatic theaters to American defense and that of the free world as the White House and the Pentagon which are constantly getting up-to-the-minute news reports and spot news?

These are asked as I doff my hat to a great division commander of World War I. If we could only judge some men by one inning instead of the whole game.

Cordially, your Congressman,

WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Congressman GREEN expresses his own views, which are not necessarily those of this paper.)

Trading With Aggressor Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, 72 Republican Congressmen joined in a letter to W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President on foreign affairs. The letter sought answers to questions in connection with the United States and members of the United Nations continuing to trade and do business with aggressor nations and their supporters. The Congressmen also inquired if economic sanctions were being considered.

The text of the letter follows:

JULY 31, 1950.

Mr. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,
Special Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRIMAN: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, all are deeply conscious of the critical situation that currently confronts our country. We are well aware of the realities that compelled the administration to draw a line and demand that the series of aggressive acts that threaten the world peace be met with force.

The United States, and most of the member states in the United Nations, are today committed to repelling an act of aggression that seriously threatens the world peace, not merely in Korea, but in other sections of the world. We have considered, and support in principle, the steps recommended for mobilizing our country against these contingencies.

We have noted with a great deal of concern that while we have acted to resist the aggression in the case of North Korea, and are preparing to resist similiar acts of aggression and threats to the world peace in other quarters of the world, we still continue to trade and do business with the "seconds" or supporters of these same aggressors or potential aggressors. Why?

Cannot this trading with these countries be stopped under existing legislation and authority granted to the President?

Has the question of economic sanctions been considered?

It is our feeling that it is not enough to merely offer armed resistance to the aggression of North Korea and her supporters. We suggest that there exists no justification for continued trade on a business-as-usual basis with governments supporting the North Koreans.

Does the President at the moment have the authority to apply economic sanctions against these countries?

Will a request for legislation to provide the necessary authority be made?

Has the administration considered submission to the United Nations of a request for economic sanctions against the aggressor, future aggressors, and their supporters? The United Nations Charter, article 41, specifically authorizes complete or partial interruption of economic relations.

We would greatly appreciate your acknowledgement and reply to this letter and the questions contained therein.

Sincerely,

ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; BEN GUILL, Texas; DONALD L. JACKSON, California; KENNETH B. KEATING, New York; CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan; JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., California; GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; WALTER NORBLAD, Oregon; DONALD W. NICHOLSON, Massachusetts; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; JOHN PHILLIPS, California; JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; FRANCIS P. BOLTON, Ohio; MERLIN HULL, Wisconsin; WESLEY A. D'EWART, Montana; JACK Z. ANDERSON, California; JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin; J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland; FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming; FRANK FELLOWS, Maine; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota; FRED L. CRAWFORD, Michigan; HOMER D. ANGELL, Oregon; PAUL W. SHAFER, Michigan; HAL HOLMES, Washington; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado; WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; CLARENCE E. KILBURN, New York; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan; HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Washington; CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois; CHARLES A. HALLECK, Indiana; JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Massachusetts; CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey; HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., Pennsylvania; CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Kansas; AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Oregon; JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii; LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois; J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware; NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire; ROBERT HALE, Maine; GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Michigan; DANIEL A. REED, New York; NORRIS POULSON, California; LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon; CECIL M. HARDEN, Indiana; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Iowa; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts; JOHN TABER, New York; W. STERLING COLE, New York; ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, California; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; WALT HORAN, Washington; JOHN W. HESELTON, Massachusetts; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Massachusetts; WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; RALPH A. GAMBLE, New York; JOHN B. BENNETT, Michigan; ROBERT F. RICH, Pennsylvania; HAROLD O. LOVRE, South Dakota; THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa.

Cross Road in Eternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Robert L. Lang, Jr., pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, Altoona, Pa., in his sermon of April 29, 1951, provides much food for thought in our quest for a solution to the problems confronting this Nation.

Reverend Lang's sermon follows:

CROSS ROAD IN ETERNITY

It is time for Americans to come down from their comfortable but unreal dream world, and to face reality. The text is written in the first chapter of James, the twenty-second and the twenty-fifth verses: "But be ye doers of the Word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. Whosoever looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed."

Several years ago Dr. Charles A. Beard coined a number of laws of history. Perhaps the truest of them all was this: "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad with power." There have been numerous examples of the truth of this law in modern times. Napoleon, Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, all were destroyed because of their intoxication with power. But Beard's great law of history applies not only to individuals. It applies to nations, too. I am going to tell you about Rome.

When the city of Rome expanded her power, 2400 years ago, to include the whole Italian peninsula, her people believed in and practiced the highest ideals of citizenship. They were devout in their observance of the religion of their day. They were honest, morally unimpeachable, noble in their thinking. Politics was a thing of highest honor. Rome's star shone like a beacon over a world of discouragement and defeatism. And the strong assurance and moral strength of Rome's citizens were reflected in Rome's armies, for her soldiers, living up to the high ideals of the home folks, were as fine as any warriors the ancient world ever knew.

Those soldiers brought Rome glory, and the greatest empire of antiquity. In their stalwart strength, resting upon a home base of sincere and noble citizens, they added to the Roman crown jewels such as Egypt, Carthage, Tunis, Tripoli, Spain, Syria, Judea, Galilee, Germany, Gaul, and Britain. Victory was sweet. Caesar, Pompey, Antony, and Brutus returned from battle to receive the plaudits of the Roman throngs. Rome was strong, and growing stronger every day. Ah, yes; but whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad with power.

And so it was with Rome. Victory and power did something to the Roman citizen. We see it first in the members of the Roman government, who became selfish, and jealous, and corrupt, and crude. But we see it soon enough in almost every citizen who tramped the Roman pavements. For the wine of national success and prestige intoxicated the soul of the everyday Roman. He neglected his gods. He forgot the arts, the good, the beautiful, the true. He buried his morals, personal, political, and international. He became a creature who did only one thing well, and that was to live off the bounty of the state. His chief delight came to be gladiatorial bloodshed. He loved every vice, and flaunted every virtue. Mad with power, the home base of the Roman armies became a great center of private and public corruption.

And the inevitable happened. The spirit of Rome's citizens invaded her armies. What was the use of fighting when no one any longer knew or cared what they were fighting for? Why obey discipline, when all discipline was dissipated at home? Discontent, disheartened because the foundation was cut out from under them back home, the Roman armies lost their fighting spirit. And so it was not long before Attila, the Hun, the scourge of the north from out the steppes of Russia, had cut the empire to ribbons, and the barbarian Goths had captured, sacked, and burned the very capitol of the Caesars, Rome, once the sapphire of antiquity. "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad with power." When the citizens of a nation become intoxicated by the spirit of success and invincibility, the days of that nation are numbered.

I declare unto you today that it is time for Americans to do some serious thinking. You need only read history to see that in America history is repeating itself. Only a relatively few years ago the representatives of thirteen little colonies pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to a venture of freedom. Because those men and the citizens they represented lived by their sacred honor, America became a great Nation. Her people were religious. They believed in Almighty God, and they tried to live it. Politics carried a heavy and an accepted responsibility. Men and women were concerned that their Government carry out their own high ideals. The cause of righteousness and decency inspired every fighting man from Bunker Hill to Iwo Jima. And America emerged from the Second World War the strongest Nation on the face of the earth.

In the few years which followed, America properly became the warehouse of those whom she had supported in battle. Britain, France, Turkey, Greece were able to remain free, and some of them able to survive, only because of the life lines from American fields and factories. America also became the blood bank, and again properly so, of her former enemies, as Japan, Italy, and Western Germany were given transfusions and set on their economic and political feet, and were taught for once the truths of simple decency which make for great nations.

Yet in those last few years, something was happening in America herself. Something which did not need to happen. Something which should not have happened. Something which has brought this Nation to a great crossroad. For the common citizens of this Nation drank the wine of military victory and economic plenty. Our people feasted on the meat of prestige. They imbibed the potions of wartime morality, and easy-money luxury. In short, Americans became mad with power. And it is still true, "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad with power." Oh, we have said, "That doesn't mean us. It can't happen to America." But it does mean us, and it is near enough to happening right now that we simply must be aware of what is going on.

The corruption of our society, of our integrity, and of our officialdom has not yet, thank God, cut the foundation out from under our forces fighting for righteousness and freedom. It was grand to hear 10 days ago from the general of the army that they are still fine in every way. But we here at home simply must face the facts which the last month has thrown flatly in our faces. The home country and the home people, people like you and me, have gone mad, and no army can long continue to fight for righteousness and freedom when righteousness and freedom are dead symbols in the heart of the common man and of his government.

Let us frankly face the picture we have seen of ourselves in recent weeks—and it will be our fault alone if we fail to see the picture, and therefore fail to learn its lessons, and if we therefore have to bear the consequences. The picture is not nice. Americans have come to be a dishonest people. We have read and heard and seen some of the events unearthed by the Kefauver investigation. If you paid any attention to those events at all, and you should have, you were shocked by the vice, the graft, the dishonesty, the immorality which extend from the czars of the underworld down not only into our colleges and universities—and you ask, "Why support Christian education?"—but which send their tentacles into every town and hamlet, including our town, and in many, many of our homes, including some of yours.

Yet we need not have been surprised by those revelations. We have known those things were happening on a local scale for years, and we never paid any attention. We never insisted that our officials act. We all did some of the same things ourselves. We tried our best to beat the rationing system during the war. We still seize every opportunity to get something for nothing. We are delighted when our pony wins, or when we can find a punchboard or slot machine, and it pays off. Our clubs raise their money by raffles, and we send our children out on the street to sell chances for the school, and we have made ourselves believe it is all right because, as we put it, "It's all for a good cause," which means almost any cause must be good. And some of us would even like to bring that sort of thing into the church. We all try to get to know somebody who knows somebody, so we can get our piece of the pie a little cheaper. And we have tried to justify ourselves by saying, "All of life's a gamble, so why not live like it?" Well, perhaps for you life is a gamble, and if so, I'm sorry—but it's true, life just can't be otherwise, unless, of course, you really believe in God. But the everyday honesty and integrity and sacred honor of the American people is dead. And the big-time gamblers didn't kill it. You did, and I did. We everyday Americans did. And if it wasn't for us the big shots would never have had their chance. The real blame for these horrible conditions rests on our town, and on our homes, and on our souls, and on us.

We could speak of morals. They are lousy, with everything which that crude word suggests. But again it was not the house of ill-fame, which get sometimes into our papers and are a must for every really popular novel, which sabotaged America's morals. It was the deeds done in the dark not only by America's boys and girls, but also by America's fathers and mothers. And when startling revelations of American immorality blow across the news, and when your children have difficulty finding decent magazines with decent pictures at the store, just remember where the blame really falls. It falls on your town, and on your street, and perhaps on your house, and on you.

The last weeks have also brought a terrific indictment against our Government. As I told you almost a year ago, at the very outset of the Korean war, if Christianity is to be preserved in our world, our Nation must preserve it, for no other country has either the power or the will to do so. It has just been made plain that our Government does not have the will to do so, either.

I do not pretend to know who is right in the current dispute over the Far East. The facts are too confused, and we have not been told enough of enough of them. But I do know we are in a war, and you people who have sons and husbands in training camps and in Korea know that we are in a war. And I also know that no army in the field can successfully wage war unless its government back home is sure of what it intends to do, and has sharp ideas as to how it is going to do it. It was proved by the Duke of Wellington, and by Marshall Foch, as well as by General MacArthur, that when the home government is unable to understand the situation with which it is faced, then the military commander is absolutely forced to make his own decisions—and if George Washington had waited for the Continental Congress to act, there never would have been an America in the first place. At least the Continental Congress remembered its sacred honor, and didn't act like a spoiled child.

Our present Government, and most other Americans, never have understood the seriousness of what has been going on in the world the last 20 and more years. It does not believe the truth history proves, and of which the Russians boast, that we are dealing with an enemy who is completely pagan, and who therefore will use, and is using, any means at all, including lies, double-talk, two-facedness, and atomic war to gain control of the whole world; an enemy who is keenly aware that if he conquers the United States he has conquered the one nation which is holding the rest of the free countries of the world together. In that ignorance, General Marshall delivered China deliberately to the Communists, in his report on China 2 years or so ago. In that ignorance, and in questionable innocence, Dean Acheson supported Alger Hiss. In that ignorance President Truman recalled the only man who, regardless of where he is right or where he is wrong, is the only American who both knows what is actually going on in the Far East, and whom the Russians definitely fear. In that ignorance we would follow our pink-tinged allies and appease the enemy still further by betraying unto him Formosa, and presenting him with still another seat in the United Nations from which more swiftly he may cut our throat. And appeasement is merely capitulation without a battle, and making oneself even weaker for the battle which is sure to come anyway. We should have learned about 13 years ago that we can't win wars with umbrellas.

But it is all too easy to blame the Government. We cannot blame the Government for not facing reality when we citizens, who actually are the Government, have persistently refused to face reality ourselves. We were the ones who didn't care to have our dreams shattered by reality. We screamed for disarmament in 1945–46, in spite of the warnings of Eisenhower and others. We urged the dismantling of our national defenses and the dismembering of our Armed Forces. We were the ones who did not want to pay taxes, and who scoffed at the idea that anyone would dare oppose us. We were the ones who enjoyed ourselves in the postwar world, and who spent recklessly, and who lived recklessly, and who refused to be serious about anything. We were the ones who took the goings-on in Moscow and Washington as a joke. Instead of standing in our watchtower looking out to protect our freedoms, we exploited and abused them. We have been mad with our power. Corruption, immorality, dishonesty, the will to appease and the unwillingness to meet reality have reached up from almost every home on every street of every town, and that's how they got into the Capitol of the land. And whom the gods of history would destroy, they first make mad. Rome lives again, here. The forces among the citizenry which undermined Rome's armies and efforts are all too surely present in the hearts and lives of our own people. And the power of the godless barbarian from the north is already quivering to be unleashed. And until and unless we Americans in our homes and in our hearts get back to the sacred honor of Americans, no power on earth can stop that pagan horde.

I wonder how we came to be this way? James tells us in his old Epistle. He said long, long ago, "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." There is how we came to be so dishonest, so immoral, so uncaring, so mad. We were content to be hearers, not just our officials, for they would have to do, if we did. But you, and I, and millions like us all over America have come to our churches on Sunday mornings—yes, 1 hour a week was all we could give to it—and we have heard God's word, on which our Nation and our souls are founded, and then we have gone out and promptly forgotten about it and lived in our lives as if neither God nor His word existed. James even tells us just how we have done it: Like a man seeing his face in a mirror, seeing the promise reflected there, the fine character, the noble features, and concluding therefore he was successful and fine and

noble, yet only deceiving himself, because he went out into life and forgot the promise, the character, and the nobility to live like a scum. Just so, we have heard God's words of life. God has told us how to live alertly, cleanly, purely, honestly, truly, eternally. But merely having heard, we have thought we had already accomplished God's requests, and thereby we deceived ourselves. For having heard, we have forgotten all, and become mad with the spirit of our time. Well, we have had our warning. "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

But far more important to us is this question: How do we escape from this situation, before our moral and spiritual disease infects our Army, as it has our Government; before, in our intoxication we, like Rome, fall before the pagan from the north? Do not snort at that question. Those who laugh at reality live only to die in their folly. We stand today at a crossroad in eternity. Either we give ourselves to be used by God as His instruments for the preservation of freedom, of decency, of Christianity, or else God will let us die in our insanity and raise up in some other land another people to be His servants. How do we find the right road? How do we escape from our current madness?

James tells us. It is all in God's Word, you see, if we will only hear, and do. James says, "Who so looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and lives in it, and is not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed." Now the law of liberty is merely the law of God, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. James is right. If we will look for once earnestly into that law, and accept its truth; if we will not just hear and forget it, but hear it and live it, in honesty, in strictness, in purity, in alertness, beginning with the little things of everyday life, if we will be doers who actually live the law of God, we shall be blessed. We shall be blessed because God never forsakes those who give their hearts and lives to Him. He who is on the Lord's side, by the power of the God within him is victorious.

The desperate situation in which we stand today won't be solved by seeking a complicated solution. The right road to the kindom of God on earth won't be found in the halls of legislative debate and investigation. The situation will be solved and the road to the kingdom found first of all by you, in your church pew, in your heart, in your life, in your home, in your city, and at last in your country as you become a doer of God's Word, and actually begin to live in God's purity and alertness and honesty and truth. And the solution can be found and the road to the kingdom chosen no other way.

We have had our warning. God has given it to us, perhaps for the last time, in March and April 1951. This is no word of doom. It is a word of challenge. We are on the verge of dissipating it in the mere madness of hero worship. Heroes do fade away. They even die. God never does. Only those die who hear His Word and forget it. But those, even at the very crossroad, who look again to God's perfect law of liberty and live in it, and are not forgetful hearers, but doers of God's work, they and their Nation shall be blessed. The way to the right roads to peace, security, and eternity begins with the most simple thing in all the world—obedience to the Word of God. In our current madness it will be difficult for us to take the simple road. But it is the only road which doesn't lead to obliteration. The decision must be made and made today. Tomorrow may be too late. The decision is America's to make, and you, my people, are America. The making of the decision begins with you. Be ye doers of God's Word.

Non-Russian People of Soviet Union Our Potent Ally in the Overthrow of the Stalin Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, about half the people in the Soviet Union are non-Russian. They include 40,000,000 Ukrainians, 10,000,000 Byelorussians, and more than 50,000,000 other peoples—such as Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Georgians, Tartars, Armenians, and Turkestanians.

Both the Russian and the non-Russian people in the Soviet Union suffer from the Communist terrorism, but in addition the non-Russian peoples suffer as minority groups trod upon by the aggressive and imperialistic policies of the Communists in the Kremlin.

The underground Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Georgian, and other resistance groups are already an active force against the Communists. Other groups are most eager to strike a blow for freedom when the time is opportune. It is these groups that can be in the vanguard of the fight against imperialistic Soviet communism.

The American people have always been ready to assist the downtrodden and oppressed. To set forth more clearly these feelings of the American people and in order to give a new direction to our foreign policy, I introduced into the House on April 17, 1951, House Concurrent Resolution 94—a resolution to assist the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union in their struggle for liberation from their present Communist enslavement.

The resolution expresses the friendship of the American people with the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, and their conviction as to the rights of these peoples to their basic freedoms and to self-determination. The resolution expresses the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the non-Russian peoples and requests the President to make no further agreements with the present Soviet regime which in any way strengthens or maintains its power and to explore methods whereby the American people and the United States Government can assist the non-Russian people in their struggle for liberation.

If the United States properly takes advantage of this basic Soviet weakness by strongly encouraging these nationalities in opposition to the Communist imperialist regime, we may well be able to avert world war III.

If, nonetheless, total war should be precipitated by Communist recklessness, our victory may depend on the support of these non-Russian peoples living along the vulnerable edges of the Soviet empire.

In formulating a practical program of assistance to these oppressed peoples, America is in a potentially fortunate position since we already have within our borders various American political groups which can offer advice and assistance, such as the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the Lithuanian-American Council, The American Latvian Association, The Estonian World Alliance, and the National Committee of the Byelorussians, Georgians, and others.

In formulating this resolution, I have been greatly assisted by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, who is president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and executive vice president of the Federation of Americans of Central and East European Descent.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 94, which was referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, is as follows:

Whereas the American people have long accepted the basic principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 in the following words: "* * * that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men—deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness"; and

Whereas the American people believe these principles are universal and apply to all men everywhere, at all times, and under all forms of government; and

Whereas these principles flow from certain essential truths, among which are—

That the Creator is the Author of every human being and the Source of his rights and that neither the state nor any other human agency has jurisdiction to exploit any human being or violate his rights;

That the state is a servant to mankind and not its master and may not pervert its administrative and police powers so as to make of them a weapon to violate human rights or to terrorize the people;

That there is a brotherhood of all men but only under the Fatherhood of God; and

Whereas communism wears a humanitarian cloak and poses as the messiah of social justice but in reality has given rise to the most reactionary regime of our time based on barbarism and slavery as a result of its immoral doctrine founded in malice setting man against man, class against class, and all men against God; and

Whereas communism thrusts itself beyond civil government and political philosophy, claiming the whole man, denying all spiritual values, denying his inalienable rights, and seeking to transform all human beings created by God in His image into soulless biological units, to be fitted into a military and economic machine designed for world revolution; and

Whereas communism, although not native to Russia, was adopted by a small, ruthless Bolshevik minority which by treachery, deceit, brutal force, and terror subverted and destroyed the freedom gained by the Russian people in their democratic revolution of February 1917; and

Whereas imperialist communism, from the base of its dictatorship in Russia proper,

did later occupy by brutal military aggression the proclaimed Democratic National Republics of the independent Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Kuban Cossack, Georgian, Armenian, Azerbaijanian, North Caucasian, Finno-Karelian, Tatar, and Turkestanian peoples; and

Whereas imperialist communism has in crass disregard of the wills of these peoples enforced on them the unnatural structure of the Soviet Union, as later on the Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Moldavian, West and Carpatho-Ukrainian peoples, and tyrannizes all of the afore-mentioned peoples, together with the Bashkirs, Uzbeks, Kirgizes, Buryat Mongols, Chuvashes, Dagestans, Kabardinians, Komis, Maris, Mordovians, North Ossetians, Tatars (Volga), Udmurts, Yakuts, Abkhases, and Kara-Kalpaks, under a regime of colonialism and inhuman exploitation; and

Whereas imperialist communism, during and after World War II, applied genocide on the peoples rebelling against its dictatorship and annihilated the Volga German Republic, the Crimean Tatar Republic, the Chechen Republic, and the autonomous region of Karachev, scattering their population over the Asiatic Arctic; and

Whereas imperialist communism is systematically applying to all the non-Russian nationalities, both within the Soviet Union and without the Soviet Union, Stalin's Russification program, aiming at the destruction of all national organisms and their cultural peculiarities by creating one Soviet nationality, with one Soviet language and one Soviet culture; and

Whereas communism after consolidating its imperialist gains succeeded until recently by means of false propaganda, deceit, police-state methods, and hermetically sealed frontiers, in keeping the non-Soviet world largely ignorant of the plight of these non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union and, in turn, keeping the peoples within the Soviet Union in ignorance of the true nature of conditions existing outside its borders and particularly of conditions in the democratic world; and

Whereas communism has taken the lives of tens of millions of human beings in the Soviet Union (notably the liquidation of about five million Ukrainian peasants in 1932–33 and the Lidice-like massacre of Ukrainians in Vinnitsia in 1937–38) including a vast number of the members of its own armed forces (other than in the late war), and has enslaved the peoples—

By robbing them of their farms and transforming them into landless agricultural robots;

By chaining workers to their factories and transforming them into homeless industrial robots;

By depriving intellectuals of freedom of creative work and thought and transforming them into voiceless ideological robots;

By submitting vast numbers from all classes, both men and women, old and young workers (industrial and white collar), peasants, and intellectuals, to the subhuman conditions of concentration camps in uninhabitable areas and transforming them into a nameless host of more than fifteen million state slaves;

By the uprooting and dispersal of minority groups;

By practicing genocide upon national groups, including the Jewish population, within the Soviet Union and making the Soviet Union a burial ground of nations; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying the institution of the family in the Soviet Union by an enforced collective way of life, by incordinate control and indoctrination of the children, and by setting members of the same family against one another through fear and terror; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying religion in the Soviet Union by fostering atheism, by ridiculing and persecuting the sincere religious expression of the people, by perverting religious instincts in the hearts of the young, by murdering the representatives of religion, by destruction of places of worship and the abolition of religious institutions (as the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the 1920's and the Ukrainian Catholic Church in 1945), by tolerating only religious services subservient to the state, and by deifying the leader of the Red regime; and

Whereas imperialist communism has by force and deceit conscripted into the Soviet Army overwhelming numbers of peace-loving non-Russian peasants, workers, and intellectuals whose genuine anticommunist and anti-imperialist sentiments have been amply demonstrated by numerous acts of self-determination, revolts, and resistances (such as: 1918–20—the courageous defense of the independent Ukrainian National Republic against Trotsky's Red Army; 1926—the Georgian revolt for independence; 1928–30—the upsurge of Ukrainian "Titoism" led by Skripnik and others; 1937—the plan to overthrow the imperialist Communist regime led by Marshal Tukhachevsky, General Yakir, Colonels Prymakiv and Kryvoruchko; 1938—the spontaneous creation of the independent Carpatho-Ukraine; 1941—the heralded declarations of Ukrainian independence in both Lviv and Kiev at the outbreak of the Red-Nazi conflict; 1941–42—the willful mass surrender of over 2,000,000 Soviet Ukrainian troops to fight for the independence of their homeland; 1943–present—the extensive underground resistance of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, cooperating with the Lithuanian, Slovak, and Polish undergrounds, against the Nazi invaders and now against the Communist imperialists, achieving a deep infiltration into the multinational Soviet Army); and

Whereas communism by making false and appealing promises, in an atmosphere of ideological black-out in the Soviet Union, perverts the patriotic fervor of a certain number of young idealists, who have a genuine desire to serve their respective peoples, and exploits it for an antihuman conspiracy; and

Whereas communism in order to extend still further its tyranny concentrates its efforts on promoting artificial hostile feelings between the friendly and peace-loving peoples within the Soviet Union and the people of the United States and of other free nations whose basic aspirations as human beings are identical, and who have no real conflicting interests; and

Whereas imperialist communism not satisfied with the early subjugation and exploitation of these millions of people in the Soviet Union has already forced Marxist-Stalinist tyranny on the more recently free and independent nations of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and initially Yugoslavia which still follows the Communist ideology, and in the words of the United States Supreme Court Justice Jackson in the recent case of *American Communications Association* vs. *Douds* (339 U. S. at p. 429), "the international police state has crept over Eastern Europe by deception, coercion, coup d'état, and terrorism and assassination."; and communism has conquered China and is in the process of attempting to subjugate Korea, Tibet, Viet Nam, and Malaya, and seeks eventually to enslave free men everywhere with the openly professed aim of establishing the World Soviet Union; and

Whereas agreements made by any one or more of the free nations with the Communist regime that now enslaves the peoples within the Soviet Union strengthen materially and morally the position of said regime, weaken the resistance to Communist tyranny, and dim the hopes of these peoples for liberation; such agreements with said regime being used by it only to its advantage for the purposes of accumulating additional strength and to the disadvantage of every other country seeking honorably to compose differences with it; it being one of the prime techniques of communism to disregard truth and honor and to ignore agreements whenever opportune; and

Whereas, in contrast to the treacherous fifth columns that operate in the free countries of the world to enslave them to imperialistic communism, there exists among these non-Russian peoples, who constitute about one-half of the population of the Soviet Union, an active and extensive underground system led by the Ukranian Insurgent Army, which, if offered the encouragement and positive aid of the free peoples of the world, will enable them to liberate themselves and overthrow the imperialistic Communist tyranny and help place mankind on the path of peace instead of plunging it into the holocaust of a third world war; and

Whereas past tragic mistakes in the policies of certain of the free nations, including that of the United States, toward the Communist regime in the Soviet Union and a failure fully to understand the true nature, extent, and the enormity of its aggressive designs have substantially contributed toward placing said Communist regime in a position where it now is a clear and present danger to world peace and the free progress of mankind compelling the United States and other free nations again to undertake a vast program of armament expenditures; and

Whereas, while we rearm with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peace, we are determined to defend our freedom; and

Whereas rearmament alone coupled with an attempt to compose differences with the Communist regime by treaties and agreements leaving undisturbed said regime and its present enormous conquests of aggression will, over a period of years, place a crushing burden of armaments upon the free world that eventually could well, of itself, destroy freedom; and such agreements and treaties would tend to stabilize said regime in its conquests and give a benediction to a way of life that has declared war on all human nature under its control; and

Whereas the world cannot long continue to exist half slave and half free: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby reaffirms the historic friendship of the American people with the different peoples within the Soviet Union—the millions of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Georgians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, and the other non-Russian peoples between whom and the American people there are innumerable ties of kinship, and concerning whose mutual aspirations for democracy, liberty, and justice there has always been an alliance; that the American motives for these aspirations and this alliance lie deep because the United States of America was founded and has been built largely by the oppressed peoples from all countries.

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States, on behalf of the American people, solemnly pledges that the common struggle against imperialist communism in which this Nation, together with other free nations, is now engaged is not directed against those who have been misled by communism through no fault of their own but against those who have misled them; that those who have unwittingly served the small clique in control of the Communist regime or in countries captive to it should not fear vengeance, provided they break off with communism; and that the American people recognize the right of the non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union and of the countries now held captive by said Communist regime to bring to justice their oppressors who are leading them into another world war that will mean destruction of many more millions of lives and of many cities, homes, and the countryside within the Soviet Union.

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress of the United States hereby expresses the firm conviction of the American people that the non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union have the right of self-determination (including the right of any of the nations within the Soviet Union to determine its own form of government and also the right to form a free federation of whatever choosing), based on the free and effective expression of popular will, namely, that no nation can be deprived of territory by force and that no nation can keep territory by force, and, by free election, to be governed by their own consent.

(b) It is further expressed to be the firm conviction of the American people that these non-Russian peoples as well as the Russian people within the Soviet Union have the right to the basic freedoms for which they have long struggled and for which in World War II they together with other people, shed their blood, among which freedoms are—

(1) the right of peasants to their own land, to work it as they see fit, and to dispose of the fruits of their labor as they see fit;

(2) the right of workers to select freely the type and place of their employment, and to obtain equitable wages and decent working hours and conditions through the organization of their own truly independent trade unions;

(3) the right of intellectuals to freedom of scientific and artistic creation, to freedom of cultural intercourse with the whole world, and to the establishment of educational, scientific, and cultural institutions, independent of state control;

(4) the right of political prisoners of all classes to immediate liberation and aid in rehabilitation;

(5) the freedom of religion, of speech, of thought, and of the press, and freedom of each national group to use its own language and kind of alphabet;

(6) the right of the people peaceably to assemble, to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures;

(7) the right of the people to life, liberty, and private ownership of property; the right of an accused to a speedy and public trial in accordance with principles of law and justice;

(8) the freedom of movement within the country and of travel abroad and upon the high seas, together with the freedom to engage in commerce and pursuits of private enterprise and in all peaceful activities;

(9) the freedom of families from the Communist way of life and from undue state interference and control, and of parents in the education of their children;

(10) the freedom of the armed forces to defend the legitimate interests of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and other peoples within the Soviet Union, the right and obligation of the armed forces to protect the people from the Communist tyranny, and the freedom of the armed forces from being used and augmented by the Communist tyranny into an aggressive force both against its own people and against peaceful nations.

SEC. 4. To give meaning to their historic friendship for the multiple national peoples within the Soviet Union, the Congress of the United States hereby expresses the strong hope of the American people for an early liberation of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and other peoples within the Soviet Union from their Communist enslavement. To assist in bringing about that liberation at the earliest possible date, the President of the United States is hereby requested—

(1) to make no further agreement and no commitments to the present Soviet regime that would tend in any way to maintain, stabilize, or further extend its power over the enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union;

(2) to formulate a new and stronger foreign policy which, among other things, recognizes the essentially evil nature of the Communist regime bent on the destruction of the United States and of the free world and takes cognizance of the paramount imperialist character of said regime in its enslavement of over 80,000,000 non-Russian peoples occupying the broad peripheral area of the Soviet Union from the Baltic to the Black Sea to the Far East Pacific.

(3) to explore the methods whereby our representatives in the United Nations may urge that body to assist the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, and other peoples within the Soviet Union who resist serving as cannon fodder in the imperialist ventures of the Kremlin, to obtain liberation from their present enslavement and exchange for their present representation in the United Nations a true representation that can work for, rather than obstruct and undermine the efforts of all peoples of the world, for the first time in human history effectively to lay down a true foundation for lasting peace and the undisturbed permanent coexistence of peoples;

(4) to explore methods whereby the American people through their Government, and by private means with Government assistance and otherwise may offer material aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and other peoples within the Soviet Union and people in the Communist-dominated countries.

Letter From a Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including a copy of a letter received by a mother who has a son fighting with the marines in Korea. I have deliberately omitted the names for fear of reprisal.

Mr. Speaker, after reading this letter, Members of Congress will wonder how we can possibly justify the administration's policies in Korea today. MacArthur is right, but his voice is like one crying out in the wilderness, all at the expense of our boys who are dying in Korea:

"LIKE A HERD OF SHEEP BEING LED TO SLAUGHTER," MARINE WRITES

From the pen of a marine comes the best first-hand description of the Korean war the reporter sees. The young marine returned to the front April 13, according to the latest word from Korea, fully recovered from a leg wound suffered in earlier action.

Around Mason, Korea was, in early April, the prettiest John had ever seen it. Rice fields made it green, and cherry blossoms were in full bloom. But of the war he penned:

SAW MASSACRED CONVOY

"If you could see some of the massacres that have taken place over here. At one place, about 20 miles south of the thirty-eighth, I saw the remains of a whole convoy of American soldiers. Evidently attacked by overwhelming forces, they didn't have a chance. Many were killed in their trucks and jeeps. Such scenes are common in Korea, but the worst is yet to come.

"Our intelligence reports the North Koreans and Chinese have 63 divisions in North Korea, with an unlimited supply of replacements. How hopeless it all seems. Our forces are but a fraction of that.

"[The politicians] say the men are fighting and dying over here to prevent world war III. What in h—— do they think is going on right now?"

SACRIFICE IN VAIN?

"Every time I see a replacement come in, in my mind I compare them to a herd of sheep being led to the slaughter—or a truckload of hogs being taken to the stockyards. For a man to sacrifice his life for such a cause makes life itself seem quite in vain."

Earlier, while still aboard the hospital ship, he wrote:

"I am listening to hillbilly music. Eddie Arnold is singing Tomorrow Never Comes. Isn't it the truth? They'll send me back to the States tomorrow—but tomorrow is always just beyond reach.

"The situation here doesn't look too good. The Commies are preparing to pour everything within their reach into the spring offensive. Suppose by the time I get back up front it will be hell. Hope I get hit soon after I get up there. You see with two Purple Hearts (or a still one) we get back to the States. For my next wound I'd even settle for a loss of a leg. It would be worth it to get out of here.

"You know, mom, a person has many more lives than a cat. A cat has only nine; I died many, many times up in those mountains. For example: One afternoon our squad was crossing a ledge. There was a sheer rock wall on one side of us, a 2,000-foot drop on the other. The enemy, on another mountain 200 yards away, opened up on us with machine guns. We had no place to go."

UNITED STATES MACHINE GUNNERS TOOK OVER

"Then, for about 5 minutes (until our own machine guns found them) they fired steadily at us. Shells chipped rock all around us. I remember how I turned my right side toward them, to give more protection to my heart. Some of the darndest things run through a mind. You tell yourself, 'This is it.' It's funny how a man prepares himself to die.

"On another afternoon mortar shells were hitting all around us. We all thought our numbers were up. I looked about to see how the rest were taking it. All were lying around. Some had their arms over their heads, as if that would protect them, but most were lying face down. I imagine each was praying in his own way, for we had no protection whatsoever.

"I said to myself, 'Well, John, this is the end of the line!' Suddenly I sat up, calm as hell, and pulled out some poems I had been working on, and read them over. It seemed to give me courage of some kind. I don't know what made me do it, but evidently a person will do strange things under such circumstances.

"I am reading a book, 'Return To Religion'—a very good book, in my opinion. You know, Mom, sometimes I get to feeling that I'll never get back home. I've been away so long and so many things have happened that it just seems as if God didn't intend I should come back.

"Life gets pretty dreary here aboard the hospital ship. Saw the sun yesterday, for

the first time in 3 weeks. Spring is in the air. In the distance mountainsides, with their rice fields, are starting to get green. Makes me sort of homesick. Suppose fields back there are getting green, too. Won't be long before farmers will be working in the field.

"Will try to write the State Line Country Club. Have received their package. I think it was really nice of them. Seems the package followed me from the Philippines, to Japan, then on to Korea. I kept moving around so much it was a long time before it caught up to me.

"My Sharon Reporter is taking a long time to reach me. I am now receiving last December's issues. Even letters seem to take longer than they should. Yours are taking a month to get to me. Hope to be seeing you before Christmas."

Nurses Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of May 7, 1951:

NURSES ARE NEEDED

In almost every occupation the law of supply and demand determines the income possibilities. If many persons are qualified to engage in it, the demand for their services slacks off. If, however, it is the other way, would-be employers crowd one another in the effort to engage someone who can carry out their wishes. Such a situation is likely to raise the compensation.

A condition of this sort is met with in boom times in most of the trades. When the number of carpenters is decidedly less than the demand, it is likely to cost more to build a house or even to repair a fence. The same is true of many other skilled trades. There are labor unions which limit sharply the number of young men admitted as apprentices.

In two of the learned professions, the law and medicine, it looks very much to the outsider as if those actively engaged are disposed to narrow admissions. There are many law schools in the country, but, when it comes to receiving graduates as members of the bar the way is straight and narrow and few there be who manage to get through it.

As for medicine, the number of schools, where young men or young women are trained to deal with the ills of the flesh, show small disposition to increase, although it is common knowledge that there are many persons in this country, rather close to half of them, beyond the reach of prompt and modern medical service. There are some few physicians who worry about this, but most of the profession seem undisturbed by the shortage.

It might be supposed that nurses would have an attitude similar to that of doctors of medicine, but that is not so. Instead, the organized trained nurses of the United States, and also of many other countries, are so deeply disturbed about the lack of competent members of their profession that they are seeking to commend their calling to others so that this shortage will be in the way of disappearing.

Here in Boston the National League of Nursing Education is holding its fifty-fifth assembly this year on the theme, Education for Nursing Service. Last November a committee representing six national nursing organizations reported a shortage of 65,000 professional nurses below the minimum requirements for civilian nursing service. In this estimate, no allowance was made for urgent military and civil defense needs.

During World War II there were at one time 65,216 nurses in military service. To meet all the needs and to take care of normal population growth 58,000 nurse students must be admitted annually to basic nursing schools. In the year 1950 only 44,200 new ones enrolled.

Meeting this week in Boston there are to be about 2,000 nurses, educators, and students, deeply concerned that this serious gap between supply and demand be closed. Of course they are eager about recruiting for their profession, but in addition they are bent on having good education for those interested in enrolling in schools where nursing is taught. They want both more nurses and better nurses.

One matter that interests them exceedingly is a measure now before Congress, the Bolton bill (H. R. 190). Like many other forms of training the cost of giving adequate nursing education has advanced decidedly. Endowments do not yield so much as formerly. Construction of new buildings and their proper equipment has become more expensive. Leaders of the profession are convinced that Federal aid is necessary to guard and maintain the health of the people of this country.

The measure was introduced by Representative FRANCES BOLTON of Ohio, who is herself the founder of a school of nursing and is now serving her sixth term in Congress. She has the confidence of the nursing organizations. Her plan would supplement existing income and the resources of nursing schools, to help with the cost of instruction and to build new schools. Scholarships for qualified students in need of assistance, to aid research and to promote recruitment, would be included. An annual appropriation of $5,000,000 is asked for construction and equipment. The amount for scholarships would be determined annually by Congress. There is more to the proposal, but the essential purpose is to begin to relieve the shortage in order that the rest of us may be properly cared for when our health needs it. Good nursing is quite as important as proper care by physicians.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the May 7, 1951, issue of Newsweek concerning the great St. Lawrence seaway and power development, entitled "Canada Wants Action":

SEAWAY—CANADA WANTS ACTION

Like spring, the long-delayed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project was busting out all over Canada last week. Unlike spring, it brought no smiles to Canadian faces.

In London, Ontario, former Ontario Premier Gordon Conant said it was time to put the seaway on an "or else" basis, that Canadian newsprint, nickel, iron, and defense cooperation should be horse-traded for United States approval of the seaway. In Winnipeg, United States Ambassador Stanley Woodward salved Canada's slow burn with assurances of congressional approval and an early start. In Toronto, Ontario, Hydro Commission Chairman Robert Saunders suggested Woodward was talking through his hat. He disclosed that he had received discouraging news indicating no approval from Congress until 1952 at least.

History: For almost 20 years now, United States congressional committees have annually dragged a bill providing for the deep waterway and power development from its pigeonhole, blown the dust off, and exposed it to the public eye and the attacks of Washington's powerful antiseaway lobby of eastern United States railroad, canal, barge, port, and shallow-draft shipping interests. The bill then goes back into the pigeonhole.

As the House Public Works Committee closed hearings on the seaway this week, history seemed ready to repeat itself, and Canadians, who have been talking the project for half a century, were fed to the teeth. The seaway now promised to be the biggest break in Canadian-American relations since the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

Proponents of the seaway call it essential both for power and navigation; opponents call it boondoggling. New York State, Ontario, and Quebec—the three largest industrial basins on the continent—face power shortages. In Ontario, demand is running a phenomenal 25 percent higher than last year. For it and New York, the 2,200,000-horsepower potential of the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence is the only block of undeveloped power left.

Ore route: As for navigation: The last war was fought off Lake Superior's Mesabi Range—iron ore moved from the open-pit mines along a submarine-free route into Pittsburgh. But the Mesabi is drying up. The nearest new source is Ungava in northern Quebec. Deepening the present 14-foot ship channels in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence to 27 feet would see millions of tons of iron ore laid down cheaply in Pittsburgh within 5 years.

United States Commerce Secretary Charles Sawyer, Charles Wilson, Dean Acheson, George C. Marshall, and Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman paraded these facts before the House committee without visible effect. Seaway opponents were more impressed with a statement from Chapman that Canada was preparing to proceed with an all-Canadian route, for which the United States would pay in tolls. The antiseaway lobby countered that Canada was bluffing. Saunders flew to Washington last week to assure committee members this was not the case.

Naval Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 8, marked the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of naval aviation.

On May 8, 1911, the Navy Department, at the direction of the then Secretary of the Navy George von L. Meyer, of Boston,

placed an order for the Navy's first two aircraft with the Curtiss Co., Hammondsport, N. Y. The date of that significant event has been chosen as the official birthdate of naval aviation.

How unimpressive a start for so important an element of our national defense. During World War II Navy aircraft flying from our mobile, fast-moving carriers were hammering at the Japanese homeland while our ground troops were still many hundreds of miles away. Our fast carrier task forces were able to hit the enemy from one spot and hit him again within 24 hours from another spot 800 miles away.

During World War II naval aircraft accounted for more than 2,333,597 tons of enemy shipping, including 172 Jap combat vessels, 62 German subs, and 447 merchant vessels. Our naval aircraft destroyed 15,401 enemy aircraft.

Naval aviation has given new mobility and new potency to sea power. Along with radar, aircraft have become the "eyes" of the fleet as well as its Sunday punch.

Mr. Speaker, time does not allow me to enumerate the heroes of naval aviation. They are too numerous. Their deeds of technical achievement and heroism are well known to a grateful citizenry. I hope that we may never become unmindful of them.

Naval aviation has many facets. Perhaps the feats of Navy land-based operations and the operations of flying boats at sea are not so well known as the achievements of carrier-based aircraft. But all are important. On this day we honor all naval aviators—whether they fly single-engine or multiengine aircraft, whether they fly from the deck of a carrier, from a land strip, or from the surface of the ocean itself.

Because of the ever-increasing size of multiengine, long-range bombers, the role of the seaplane or flying boat becomes more important. In order for them to operate against the enemy's homeland or in an enemy's home waters, it is not necessary first to build long and costly landing strips at advance bases. Seven-tenths of the earth's surface is water. The flying boat operates from water.

Then, too, there is the all-important job of protecting our shores and our shipping from enemy submarines. This is one of the jobs of naval aviation—both carrier-based and shore-based.

To the credit of naval aviation is a long list of technical accomplishments in aircraft development, operating techniques, and mechanical research. The Nation is incomparably stronger and the aviation industry more efficient because of naval aviation. And yet there are those who would have scuttled naval aviation. It was not so long ago that steps which would ultimately have had that effect were initiated. Fortunately for our national safety they were never consummated.

Once again in Korea naval aviation has proved its versatility and indispensability. Many of our ground troops fighting there are alive today because of the advanced techniques of close ground support developed, perfected, and practiced by Navy and Marine Corps pilots flying from Navy carriers.

Of particular pride to the Navy today is the efficiency of the air group attached to the carrier U. S. S. *Boxer* in Korean waters, flying daily strikes against the enemy. This unique air group is composed entirely of Naval Reserve aviators who, only a few weeks ago, were civilians. Most of the men are veterans of World War II who, after discharge, retained flight proficiency while members of the Navy's famed Weekend Warriors, flying with Reserve squadrons near their homes. Thus, when the Navy again needed their services, it took but a short period of indoctrination and the entire carrier air group was ready for combat.

In one branch of national defense we are paramount. No potential enemy or combination of potential enemies can at present challenge us in this proven and indispensible element of modern warfare: Naval aviation. Russia has a larger army than we have. China has more manpower. The nations behind the iron curtain are alleged to have an air force which equals ours. But no nation on the face of the earth possesses the versatile, effective, and proven weapon which is ours in naval aviation and the fast carrier task force. Our security as a nation demands that we retain that superiority. To diminish or dissipate it would not only be foolhardy; it would be fatal to our national defense.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it fitting that we pause briefly today to pay a much-deserved tribute to the men of naval aviation, to the aircraft they fly and maintain, and to the ships they sail. Their achievements are legion and their heroism and ability second to none. To them and to their service, I say: Well done. Good sailing and happy landings.

The Late Honorable Thomas J. Halsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, may I call respectful attention of the House of Representatives to the passing from mortal life of a former Member of this body, the Honorable Thomas J. Halsey, who represented the Sixth District of Missouri in the Seventy-first Congress. Mr. Halsey departed this life on March 17 at the home of his son, Herbert Halsey, at Westfield, N. J.

I am sure that Members of this body with whom the late Mr. Halsey served, will remember him as an industrious, kindly man. He was particularly interested in the problem of the farmers, since he was reared on a farm southeast of Holden, Mo. For most of his active life he was a merchant and businessman in Holden. For about 25 years he was associated with the Holden Mill & Elevator Co.

Congressman Halsey, whether in his brief public service or as a private citizen, had the respect and esteem of all his neighbors, his friends, and the wide circle of citizens who knew him.

A Star Descends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of May 6, 1951:

A STAR DESCENDS

The MacArthur debate has revealed a contradictory and confusing side of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT that neither his admirers nor detractors believed he possessed.

The Ohio Senator was riding a high tide of public and political esteem before the general's dismissal. In the early stages of the tumult about MacArthur everyone generally overlooked and discounted thoughtless remarks made in the heat of the event. This included the "impeachment" cries which went up from the Republicans who look to TAFT for leadership.

No doubt Senator TAFT would have been the choice of a good many anti-Truman Democrats in 1948 had the Republicans chosen to nominate him instead of Dewey. TAFT's firmness of position in the past, his outspoken but usually fair views and his unimpeachable personal reputation were the kind of solid things all thinking Americans admire.

We have the suspicion that many Democrats outside of his home State of Ohio were secretly hoping that he would win reelection to the Senate in 1950. It seems a great many Democrats inside the State held the same opinions and voted that way judging by his great victory margin in that election. This he accomplished against great opposition.

In view of his former record, it is doubly strange to witness Senator TAFT's performance in the past several weeks.

Senator TAFT baldly declared that he opposed the United States entrance into Korea. He made the statement before the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington a little more than 10 days ago.

This is much in variance with what he publicly stated a few days after President Truman's decision to send aid to South Korea.

On June 30, 1950, the Associated Press reported that "Senator TAFT offered unqualified support for the President's move." TAFT's own words in the news report were: "Once you are into anything like this, you must go all the way."

What has caused TAFT to change his mind? The answer is obvious. Senator TAFT has clutched the publicity appeal of the MacArthur furor and is hanging on for the political popularity ascent which he thinks it will bring him. How unlike the TAFT of former days.

Another backfire hit the Senator when he attempted to single out Secretary of State Acheson for sole blame in the MacArthur removal. While swinging that cudgel, Senator TAFT took a swipe at General Bradley in the process, alleging that Bradley and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were stooges of Acheson but that the whole debate resolved itself into an Acheson versus MacArthur fuss.

General MacArthur chilled that one by telling the Senate hearing, "I have never attributed to him (Acheson) in the slightest degree the decision of the President to replace me."

As to the Bradley angle, we can see nothing wrong with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Acheson being in agreement on their global military and political policies. It would be a sad state of affairs if they were not.

Senator TAFT advocates full support of all of MacArthur's policies, including the use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops. Yet, the Senator in floor debate last week brought out the point that the Communists found Chiang's armies as soft as mush when Red Chinese forces invaded. Is there any reason to believe that the same troops aren't still soft as mush?

But the most hopeless sidestepping and backfilling was TAFT's demand that the mobilization budget be cut by $20,000,000 and draft target lowered by 500,000, while at the same time embarking the United States on all-out aggressive tactics against China. These steps Senator TAFT advocates while maintaining that we cannot be deterred by "any possibility that the Russians might come in."

This kind of thinking and these public utterances force us to recall Senator TAFT's foresight on August 1, 1941. On that day he said:

"I cannot understand that the situation is more perilous today than it was a year ago."

Four months later we were in World War II.

Problems of Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address that I made on the evening of May 7, 1951, at the Civil Defense Conference in Washington, D. C., relating to the multitude of problems facing governors and mayors relating to putting into operation adequate civil-defense programs.

At that time I pledged my wholehearted support for further legislation and appropriations designed to make civil defense a sound and strong copartner with our military defense effort, and that so far as legislation and appropriations are concerned, the Federal Government should take the lead.

In an interview with the representatives of the American Municipal Association I further said:

That while its success starts with the individual and thus through our local and State government up to the Federal level, the Governors of our States and mayors of our cities are justified in looking to the Congress for leadership in this important field of defense of our national security and that they should depend upon my support in the Congress of the United States for any further legislation and additional appropriations necessary to protect our citizens against possible atomic attack.

My address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, MAJORITY LEADER, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT CIVIL DEFENSE CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 7, 1951

Congress has paid close attention to the grave and complex problems of civil defense which confront us as individuals and as a Nation.

Early in 1950 the Congress began its series of intensive hearings to get to the heart of the civil-defense problem that America must face if it is to survive in the event of another war in which atomic, biological, and chemical weapons may be used against us. During the course of these extended hearings by both the House and the Senate, a great deal of testimony was heard from many sources. The mayors and the Governors of several States gave us the best of their thinking on the problem as they see it. Representatives of the general public, atomic scientists, military experts, and the working staff of the executive branch of the Government on civil defense each contributed their share of testimony.

Once the Congress had grasped the magnitude of the problem that faces us in civil defense, it drew up a comprehensive law to meet the situation and our present danger. At the close of the last session of Congress, the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 was passed by both Houses of the Congress with but a single dissenting vote. This act granted wide powers to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator and his agency and established a basic formula for civil-defense operation from the Federal to the State and finally to the local governments. The almost unanimous passage of that act was unusually significant. It was firm evidence that the Congress recognized the great challenge of civil defense and its place in our security structure. But that recognition must be carried into active effect.

This Congress and the one preceding it have voted wisely many billions of dollars for military-defense purposes, primarily to carry on the undeclared war that resulted from the acts of aggression in Korea.

Congress has met the challenge that faces us by passing laws which place a number of restrictions on the people of the country and our economy. There will probably be more. You can be certain that such action as authority for price control, rationing, stockpiling, higher taxes, and all the rest would never have been passed by Congress unless it recognized the serious need for these actions. In the main these actions are directed at building up our state of military preparedness.

I would like to emphasize that all such actions and the billions we are spending for military defense are not complete, in fact, will be seriously impaired, unless we have civil defense as a coequal partner of the military in the security program.

Primarily, civil defense as it is planned and operated today is the preparedness program of the home front and for the home front as a link with our military services. It is a necessary part of our national defense, and of the self-preservation of our people and of our Nation.

It must be painfully evident that it would be incomplete to have the finest Army, Navy, and Air Force in the world and no adequate civil-defense program.

Since our cities will be the primary targets in an atomic war, they must be protected to the limits of our ability. We could lose a war in a hurry if the home front crumbled under the weight of an atomic attack. In any event, a sudden successful attack would place us at a serious disadvantage.

We must face the fact that totalitarian governments carry out the surprise attack; democracies do not.

For these reasons civil defense must take its place quickly in the minds of all of us as a sound and strong copartner with our military defense effort. If that fails to happen, we can pay a sorry price for it should war come again.

The American people should realize that the price we pay for preparedness, heavy as it may be, is the premium we pay for defense and protection in the event of war. It could be the premium we pay to avert war and to bring about peace.

We should pray and hope for the best, but prepare for the worst.

The attack, as we hope, may never come, but who can tell. Only Stalin.

It therefore follows as a matter of logic and necessity that we should prepare ourselves now.

Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend his remarks, the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] has inserted in the RECORD untruths, which he could not make, and did not make, on the floor of the House. I would most certainly rise to a point of personal privilege except for the fact that to do so would take up the time of the House for a personal matter, thereby delaying for that long the important legislation now scheduled for consideration. His remarks might be libelous if made without the cloak of official privilege, and I defy him to waive that privilege.

He has taken parts of articles and even parts of sentences out of context, thus distorting them by omission and innuendo—a device frequently employed by those who have no regard for truth. The remarks he made on the floor were full of untruths, but by using the privilege of revising and extending his remarks, he avoided the objection that every Member would have felt had such added and changed remarks been made in the presence of Members.

I would move to expunge the remarks of the gentleman, if it were not for the fact that I believe that they should remain in the RECORD as evidence of his manner of thinking and of his tactics. These tactics are becoming all too prevalent. But I can assure the gentleman they will not deter me from fighting for what I concede to be right, or against what I concede to be wrong. During the many years that I have been one of the primary targets of the Communists and other subversive elements in California, I have become accustomed to the type of "smear" now being attempted by the gentleman from California, who has no doubt had expert assistance in drafting his personal attack on me.

Every Member will note the gentleman has even stooped to the belittling of my military record, which includes 2 years in New Guinea in the Philippines, although he himself entered a political office for

the first time in 1943, when to do so provided him with an exemption from the draft and the privilege of devoting almost all of his time to the practice of law, which we all know was exceptionally profitable during the war years when so many of us who were lawyers had voluntarily entered the Armed Forces. This is the gentleman who now heaps abuse upon our military leaders and those of us who served honorably under them.

In 1939 and 1940, while I was heading the California Legislature's investigation into subversive activities, and while the Communists and Nazis and their cohorts were using their smear tactics against me, and even holding threatening mass demonstrations in front of my home, I would like to inquire of the gentleman just what he was doing to stop the subversive forces in California. Did he fight as hard then as he did when he fought our enemies during the war from his sanctuary in the California Legislature?

Mr. Speaker, I have neither the time nor inclination to devote my energies to an explanation of what I think of the gentleman, who has obviously devoted much time and energy in an effort to personally vilify me, because of my exposé of the tactics he employed against our military leaders and our proposed national security training program, which has since been approved by our Committee on Armed Services and a majority of the Members of this House. I will simply say that the gentleman has resorted to untruths, and to demonstrate my point, I am asking that we include in our RECORD parts of an official report on Communist activities, which I wrote and filed with the California Legislature in 1940. I was, of course, flattered, as I believe anyone under the circumstances would be, when the Republican controlled 1950 legislature ordered my report reprinted for redistribution. The report, which I wrote 11 years ago, is the best refutation I know of to the untruths spoken by the gentleman. I ask that the following excerpts be included at this point:

REPORT OF ASSEMBLY RELIEF INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE ON SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES, HON. SAMUEL WILLIAM YORTY, CHAIRMAN

Mr. Speaker, your committee authorized and empowered by House Resolutions 9 and 29 to investigate subversive activities in the State relief administration respectfully reports as follows:

SECTION I

Fifth columns

The world has recently been shocked by the deadly effectiveness of subversive organizations working within such nations as Czechoslovakia, Austria, Poland, Spain, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium. Organizations of foreign-directed termites, commonly called fifth columns have demonstrated their ability to paralyze the defenses of victimized nations while cooperating with outside aggressors. It is evident that a relatively small organized force can render a whole nation helpless by coordinating its activities with forces driving from the outside.

The great masses of the people are always completely unarmed and unorganized. When confronted with an organized and disciplined group, they find themselves helpless. The Communist, or Bolshevik Party, has already demonstrated the ability of a small organized group to overthrow a government when that government is in a state of crisis resulting from either internal conditions, or the necessity of defending itself against outside forces. It is difficult to realize that the Russian branch of the Communist Party had a membership that included only an infinitesimal part of the population of Russia, when it successfully captured control of the government of that country and commenced its dictatorial domination over millions of Russian people. Those who scoff at the dangers of Communist activity in this country unknowingly befriend persons engaged in a treasonable conspiracy, because such scoffing tends to lull the populace into a state of false security which hinders effective work calculated to stop the march of fifth columns.

Communism versus Americanism

The Communist Party is bent upon overthrowing the American Government in order to substitute a dictatorship for our democracy. These traitors probably do not have the power to accomplish this objective today without outside assistance. But they are preparing to strike whenever we face a crisis of sufficient gravity to weaken our resistance. As part of our national defense we must stop them before they are able to attain sufficient strength to accomplish their objectives.

Stalin and Hitler

Protected on the east by an alliance with Stalin, Hitler's hordes have been freed to concentrate on the destruction of once peaceful and independent republics. If Hitler and Stalin can destroy the democracies of Europe, there is grave danger that their lust for power may soon attempt to span the Atlantic. In this event, it is imperative that we face these hordes free from the treachery of traitorous Nazi and Communist termites who would not hesitate to stab us in the back and our defenses from the inside. The fate of nations like Norway and Denmark should teach us the necessity of curbing treasonable conspiracies existing within our country.

Duty of Americans

Those who believe in democracy have a right, and it is their duty, to defend that democracy from enemies both within and without. Those who believe in the Constitution of the United States have a right, and a duty, to see to it that subversive groups are not permitted to subvert constitutional rights, in order to bring about their destruction. The Communists and Nazis, who are today screaming for protection of their constitutional rights are at the same time completely ignoring the obligations which such rights entail; namely, the duty of protecting and upholding the Government provided for in the Constitution. Those who demand protection under the Constitution in good faith should be willing to support the entire Constitution, rather than to pick out and support only the provisions of which they approve, and under which they claim privileges.

In the SRA

Your committee has been amazed at the extent of Communist infiltration into the State relief administration. Under the cloak of this branch of State government, Communists have found their way into widely separated areas of the State. In these areas, they are engaged in carrying out a well-planned scheme to undermine State government. Some of the strategy employed by them is quite apparent. It follows very closely the pattern laid down by the founders of the Communist Party and it parallels to a great degree the strategy of the Communist Party in Russia—with allowances made for the differences in the problems faced by the party because of the differences in the two nations.

In the Communist Party Manual on Organization, hereafter referred to as the Manual, Comrade J. Peters said:

"As the leader and organizer of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the United States of America leads the working class in the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of a socialistic Soviet republic in the United States, for the complete abolition of classes, for the establishment of socialism, the first stage of the classless Communist society. * * * Our party realizes that certain conditions must exist before the outworn capitalistic system can be overthrown. What are the conditions? Comrade Lenin answers this question, '* * * for revolution it is essential, first, that a majority of the workers (or at least a majority of the class-conscious, thinking, politically active workers) should fully understand the necessity for revolution and be ready to sacrifice their lives for it; secondly, that the ruling classes be in a state of governmental crisis which draws even the most backward masses into politics, * * * weakens the government and makes it possible for the revolutionaries to overthrow it rapidly'."

Crisis awaited

The Communist Party is simply awaiting a crisis. Through its efforts in the State relief administration, it is endeavoring to aggravate the present conditions brought about by unemployment in California and in the Nation. It is attempting to do this by maliciously endeavoring to increase relief costs to such an extent that taxpayers will be unable to carry the burden, and all relief will thereby be jeopardized. Under the guise of aiding the needy, the Communists are actually carrying out this program calculated to eventually deny relief to the destitute. They want to cause unbearable suffering. Such suffering is useful to them in their revolutionary agitation.

Dominated by Russia

It is evident that the Communist Party is not endeavoring to engage merely in the advocacy of the theories of socialism or communism. It is rather determined to force its will upon a majority of the people of the United States, whether or not they are ever willing to accept it. Instead of being an advocate of mere theories, the Communist Party is part of an international organization dominated by Russia, and bound to carry on activity beneficial to that nation, irrespective of the effects such activity may have upon the nation in which the party members live, and to which they pretend to give allegiance.

The International character of the Communist Party is well outlined in a Communist Party membership book for the year 1933. The first paragraph in said book reads as follows:

"A member of the party can be every person from the age of 18 up who accepts the program and statutes of the Communist International and the Communist Party of the United States of America, who becomes a member of a basic organization of the party, who is active in this organization, who subordinates himself to all decisions of the Comintern and of the party, and regularly pays his membership dues."

This official party book demonstrates very well the fact that the Communist Party is not an ordinary political organization. It is, rather, a disciplined army of "termites." In describing the principles upon which the party is founded, the book says:

"Acceptance and carrying out of the decisions of the higher party committees by the lower, strict party discipline, and immediate and exact applications of the decisions of executive committee of the Communist International and of the central committee of the party. * * *"

"After a decision has been adopted at the congress of the Comintern, the party convention, or by the leading party committee it must be carried out unconditionally, even if some of the members or some of the local organizations are not in agreement with the decision. * * *

"The strictest party discipline is the most solemn duty of all party members and all party organizations. * * *

"He who weakens, no matter how little, the iron discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during the period of dictatorship), effectively helps the bourgeoisie against the proletariat" (Lenin).

In this same official book under the heading, "What is the Communist Party?" appears the following:

"It incorporates the whole body of experience of the proletarian struggle, basing itself upon the revolutionary theory of Marxism and representing the general and lasting interests of the whole of the working class, the party personifies the unity of proletarian principles, of proletarian will, and of proletarian revolutionary action." (From the program of the Communist International.)

An army on the march

The party manual referred to above also discusses discipline under the heading, "Why do the Communists attach so much importance to discipline?" It says:

"How can an army fight against the army of the enemy if every soldier in the army is allowed to question and even disobey orders of his superior officers? What would happen in a war if, for example, the general staff orders an attack and one section of the army decides to obey and goes into battle; another thinks it is wrong to attack the enemy at the time and stays away from the battle; and a third section decides to quit the trenches and retreat to another position instead of going forward?

"Let us take an example from the class struggle. The district committee decided that a demonstration should be held against police terror and gives directions to the sections to mobilize the whole membership to get the greatest possible number of workers to the demonstration. The date and place of the demonstration are set by the district committee. One section, after receiving the decisions, works out plans to mobilize the masses, and activizes the whole section to work for the demonstration. Another section does not think the issue is very important and neglects to mobilize the membership; a third section decides that the time set by the committee is not the best one and instructs its members to mobilize at a later hour; and a fourth section decides to come at an earlier hour. What kind of a demonstration would it be? What would workers think and say about such a party?

"Our party cannot lead the masses if there is not unity in action. Unity of will and action can be achieved only if all of the members of the party act as one—are disciplined. If each party member should decide which decision of the party he wanted to carry out; if each member would carry out only those decisions which he liked and ignored those with which he disagreed, it would be impossible to lead the masses in a struggle against capitalism. An army with that kind of leadership would be defeated."

Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the fact that the Communist Party describes itself as a disciplined army bound to follow the program given to it by the Communist International irrespective of the nature of that program. This is completely unlike the American concept of political parties. It explains the meaning of the term "fifth column," which accurately describes the fact that the disciplined army working within a nation, is an integral part of that army of invasion, with whom it is bound to cooperate when directed to do so.

This Communist discipline, when understood, explains the success of the Communist Party in organizing demonstrations such as that fostered by Labor's Non-Partisan League and the Workers Alliance in Sacramento on February 25, 1940.

Workers Alliance demonstration

There is no doubt that the so-called Workers Alliance march on the State capitol was, in reality, a Communist political demonstration, of the type used by the Communists, as part of the revolutionary training of the masses. Evidence adduced before the committee establishes the fact that letters directing Workers Alliance members to march on the capitol were sent out from the State office and signed by the State president of the Workers Alliance, Mr. Alex Noral, who not only admitted his membership in the Communist Party, but also exhibited his official membership book. This is only one concrete example of the disciplined activity of many similar Communist-organized and directed demonstrations, which have been prevalent in California in recent years. It is worthy of note here, that similar demonstrations were employed to protest lay-offs of unnecessary SRA personnel, by the Communist-controlled union to which many members of the relief staff belong.

Deception used

The Communist Party is today endeavoring to deceive the American people into believing that the party is not international in character, foreign directed, or planning to overthrow the American Government by force and violence. The Communists are afraid that legislation may be passed by the National Congress outlawing all political groups advocating force and violence as a means for bringing about changes in government. Therefore, the deceptive strategy of the Communist Party is aimed toward making it appear that the Communist Party does not fall within that classification.

Many fooled

Many people have been fooled by this Communist scheme because of their failure to realize that the party is a disciplined army of termites. This army, at any given time, may not advocate immediate revolution, because its whole strategy is directed toward building organizations from undercover until sufficient strength is attained, to make success of forcible action practically certain. The fundamental principles of the Communist Party are not always divulged to new recruits, unless they have responded to discipline and Communist education to such an extent, that they can be trusted to keep concealed the revolutionary intent of the Party. Your committee has heard the testimony of former Communists, some of whom were in the party only a short time, and never fully understood its true purposes. Others were heard who ranked high enough in the Party to be informed relative to its real, underlying, revolutionary character.

The whole history of the Communists proves that they would never hesitate to lie in stating their immediate or ultimate objectives, just as the termites in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Belgium pretended to give allegiance to their governments before the day for open betrayal arrived. Such termites in America are lying and hiding their real intent. They are awaiting an opportune moment to execute their nefarious schemes by sabotaging our defenses, or seizing control of our Government.

The "History of the Communist Party, of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)," edited by a Commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and authorized by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, shows very clearly that the Bolsheviks have never hesitated to make use of illegal methods or any manner of deception. It should be remembered that the Communist Party is part of the same international group which called itself the Bolsheviks when plotting the Russian Revolution.

In the official history, the following quotation makes this point clear:

"Lenin proposed that the Party of the Bolsheviks should be called the Communist Party, which was the name given by Marx and Engels to their party. This name was scientifically correct, for it was the ultimate aim of the Bolshevik Party to achieve communism."

Even the present Communist Party constitution in which much deceptive working is employed to set forth the ostensible intent of the Communist Party reads as follows:

"That is, by the establishment of socialism according to the scientific principles enunciated by the greatest teachers of mankind, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, embodied in the Communist International."

Some parts of this constitution can only be understood by one who has studied Communist strategy. For instance, in the constitution of the Communist Party, the preamble says:

"It is devoted to defense of the immediate interests of workers, farmers, and all toilers against capitalist exploitation and the preparation of the working class for its historic mission to unite and lead the American people to extend these democratic principles to their necessary and logical conclusions."

To understand this language one would have to know that the Communists teach that the historic mission of the working class is to lead a revolution for the purpose of establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat. Such dictatorship is to the Communists, "the necessary and logical conclusion."

Vigilance needed

During this period of world crisis, it is most important that the American people be not lulled into a tolerance of Communist organizations by their false claims of devotion to American democracy. America is a capitalist country in which citizens have a right to own their own homes and other property which they may acquire legally and hold subject to the right of Government to levy taxes upon such property, or to take it for public purposes by paying compensation therefor. The Communist Party advocates the destruction of all capitalist countries. In order to destroy capitalism, they feel justified in setting up a dictatorship and in ruthlessly stamping out all persons who disagree with them by murderous purges or otherwise.

Communist theory

The official history of the party referred to above and hereafter referred to as the official history, discusses the Communist attitude toward revolution in the following language:

"Marx and Engels discovered the laws of development of capitalist society and proved scientifically that the development of capitalist society and the class struggle going on within it, must inevitably lead to the fall of capitalism, to the victory of the proletariat, to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Marx and Engels taught that it was impossible to get rid of the power of capital and to convert capitalist property into public property by peaceful means and the working class could achieve this only by revolutionary violence against the bourgeoisie by a proletarian revolution, by establishing its own political rule—the dictatorship of the proletariat—which must crush the resistance of the exploiters and create a new, classless, Communist society."

This is the theory upon which the Russian dictatorship was established and upon which the Communists justify the total destruction of all rights of free speech, press, assemblage, and religion in Russia.

Would destroy Constitution

Today we find the Communist termites in America demanding the right to use privileges guaranteed by the American Constitution, in order to work for the destruction of our Constitution and the right that it gives all of us, to disagree at all times with our Government, so long as we express our disagreement in a manner within the framework of the Constitution. The Communists yell loudly for their constitutional rights. They completely ignore the fact that exercise of these rights necessarily places upon one the duty of defending the Constitution, and the American Government against its enemies—both within and without the Nation.

The Communists in Russia tolerate no difference of opinion and they would tolerate no difference here, if allowed to seize power. They justify such intolerance on the grounds that they know they are right. But our American form of government is based upon the tolerance of disagreements, that are expressed peaceably in campaigns calculated to win the support of a majority of the people. Those successful in attaining power in our Government are nevertheless bound to defend the rights of others to differ with them, so long as no forcible effort is made by those who disagree, to impose their will upon the majority in the manner advocated by the Communist Party.

In the official history, the following quotation illustrated the Communist attitude in Russia toward the liberties which they demand in America:

"In order to consolidate the Soviet power, the old, bourgeois state machine had to be shattered and destroyed and a new, Soviet state machine set up in its place. Further, it was necessary to destroy the survivals of this division of society into estates and the regime of national oppression, to abolish the privileges of the church, to suppress the counterrevolutionary press, and counterrevolutionary organizations of all kinds, legal and illegal, and to dissolve the bourgeois constituent assembly."

In the above quotation, the term "counterrevolutionary," referred to the activity of those who opposed the Bolshevik Revolution.

Under Communist government where the state is everything, and the individual nothing, government is not restrained by the necessity of collecting taxes from the population in order to carry on its activities. There is no balance between public and private ownership.

There is no right to strike under Communist government because strikes are considered acts against the government. This fact is completely ignored and concealed by the Communists who work within the American labor movement telling workers that a Communist government would be beneficial to them. Political demonstrations such as those organized by Communists in this country would not be tolerated by a Communist government. Such demonstrations would be classed as counterrevolutionary, and persons found engaging in them would be promptly and effectively liquidated.

Communist hypocrisy

These examples of the destruction of individual rights under the Communist government of Russia, are set forth here to direct attention to the hypocrisy of the Communists and their accomplices in this country, who set themselves up as the guardians of American civil liberties and constitutional rights. The framers of the Constitution never intended that it be interpreted, so as to grant a license to destroy the Government, to tools of foreign aggressors. The right to rely on the Constitution for protection should include the obligation to use the privileges granted by it in good faith—and good faith is something the Communists cannot honestly claim.

The sugar-coated program of progressive reforms openly advocated by the Communist Party is simply a flypaper calculated to win support from the unwary in order to lead them down the road of desecration and destruction which is communism. The same tactics were used in Russia by the Bolsheviks. Their official history says at one point:

"The petition was discussed at workers' meetings where amendments were made. Bolsheviks spoke at these meetings without openly announcing themselves as such. Under their influence, the petition was supplemented by demands for freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of association for workers * * * an 8-hour day."

Of course, these demands were made before the Communists seized control over the government and stamped out all of the rights of others which they had so vociferously demanded for themselves.

Fear of reprisals

Few persons who have left the Communist Party have had the courage to speak out against it. This results from fear of reprisals by the comrades who have no respect for laws. This results also, from the fact that persons who have left the Communist Party are often so ashamed of ever having been part of it, that they fear exposure. In this regard it is interesting to note that the Communists, themselves, hold the threat of exposure over their members at all times, as a matter of discipline. The Communist constitution says on this point, "or members whose actions are detrimental to the party and the working class, shall be summarily dismissed from positions of responsibility, expelled from the party and exposed before the general public."

Communists in the State relief administration have used as a smoke screen for their activities a CIO union called the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. Such use of legal organizations is an old tactic of the Communist Party. By hiding behind what appears to be a labor organization, and by using as "fronts" non-Communists led into such an organization, they are able to screen their activities. The Communists then endeavor to make it appear that attacks on them are attacks on a labor union.

Communists control SCMWA

Your committee knows that the leadership of this SRA group is communistic. In order to deny this fact, when questioned before the committee, these leaders would have to perjure themselves. For this reason, they devised the strategy of hiring attorneys, in every case either Communists or known sympathizers, who in purporting to represent the best interests of all members of the so-called union, made it clear to all of them that they should not answer questions relative to communism. This meant that Communists and non-Communists alike, who were members of the so-called union, would refuse to answer questions relative to communism. This saved the Communists from the necessity of being the only ones forced to refuse to answer in order to escape exposure or possible prosecution for perjury. Non-Communists were thus used as a screen.

The record shows that your committee constantly advised members of this Communist-controlled organization, that if they were not Communists they should answer the questions frankly and not be dupes for Communist hoodlums. But the typical Communist discipline was already so well inculcated into the minds of the members of this organization, that only a few had the courage to defy their leaders by stating to the committee that they were not Communists, and they did not believe in communism. Those who did testify were dismissed from the union for so doing. In contrast to the attitude of the disciplined members of this so-called union were all of the other witnesses who came before the committee, in every case without attorneys, and in every case with a willingness to answer questions put by the committee relative to communism.

* * * * *

Communist infiltration

This analysis of the Communist tactics employed in Russia when their status was comparable to their current status in the United States, explains the presence of Communists in so many American legal organizations formed to foster progressive reforms. This shows, also, that the interest of the Communists in these organizations is not an honest interest in the things for which the organizations stand, but rather, a desire to use the opportunity afforded by work within such groups, to establish contacts helpful in the dissemination of agitational propaganda, used by the Communists in preparation for the overthrow of our Government.

In a further discussion of this tactic, the official history says:

"In this difficult period, the Bolsheviks set an example of how legal work should be combined with illegal work.

"It is evident that that example is being followed by the Communist gangsters in the United States today through their activities in the SCMWA and similar groups."

The official history said further:

"The Bolsheviks wanted to create a new party, a Bolshevik party, which would serve as a model for all who wanted to have a real revolutionary Marxist party."

It is also evident that this model is now being copied by the Stalinists in the United States. At another point in the official history in describing illegal activity the following appears:

"The conference noted that the most important rule of Bolshevik tactics in periods of retreat, namely, to combine illegal work with legal work within the various legally existing workers societies and unions, was being observed in all localities."

Communist newspaper

One of the important phases of Communist activity is the publication of a newspaper for purposes other than mere dissemination of news. The confidential Communist Party Guide issued from the State headquarters in California described the People's World as the Communist newspaper of California. The official history quotes Lenin as saying:

"A newspaper is not only a collective propagandist and collective agitator, but also a collective organizer."

In publishing the People's World the California Communists demonstrate once more the fact that they are simply following the pattern laid down by Lenin and others, and successfully followed by the Bolsheviks in Russia. As a matter of agitation the People's World often writes articles describing suicides by the unemployed. Of course, it always blames lack of work for these actions, whether or not the actual facts so indicate. Just as you would expect, the official history in describing the work of the Bolshevik paper, Pravda, said:

"Pravda often reported cases of suicide of unemployed and starving workers who had lost all hope of ever finding jobs again."

Another statement by the Communists in their official history showing the importance they attach to a newspaper and the uses they can make of it is very interesting:

"Pravda helped to organize the mass actions of the proletariat at the time of a big lock-out in St. Petersburg in the spring of 1914. When it was expedient to declare a mass strike, Pravda called upon the workers to resort to other forms of struggle such as mass meetings in the factories and demonstrations in the states. This could not be stated openly in the newspaper, but the cause was understood by class-conscious

workers when they read an article by Lenin bearing the modest title, 'Forms of the Working Class Movement,' and stating at the given moment strikes should yield place to a higher form of working-class movement * * * which meant a call to organize meetings and demonstrations.

"In this way, the illegal revolutionary activities of the Bolsheviks were combined with legal forms of agitation and organization of the masses of the workers through Pravda. * * *

"Pravda stood in the center of the struggle for the party principle, for the building up of a mass working-class revolutionary party. Pravda rallied all the legally existing organizations around the illegal centers of the Bolshevik Party and directed the working-class movement toward one definite aim * * * preparation for revolution * * * In the Pravda editorial office was concentrated a large share of the organizational work of the party; here meetings were arranged with representatives from party nuclei; here reports were received of party work in the mills and factories; and from here were transmitted the instructions of the St. Petersburg committee and the central committee of the party."

Pravda of California

Evidence adduced before your committee together with an analysis of articles appearing in the People's World shows conclusively that this Communist propaganda organ is simply the Pravda of the California Communists. It is doing the identical work here that Pravda did in the preparation for the Russian revolution. Communist Party members are constantly admonished to support and obtain subscriptions for this Communist propaganda paper.

The People's World was much in evidence around the offices of the State relief administration investigated by your committee. Members of the SRA staff openly solicited subscriptions for it during working hours. It was posted on the bulletin board daily in some offices, and in others, copies were left on tables where they could be conveniently picked up by members of the staff.

During the hearings of your committee, this Communist paper printed scurrilous attacks upon members of the committee. It consistently distorted the facts and resorted to deliberate lies. The committee found that a large percentage of the members of the SRA Communist-controlled union subscribed to this paper. Some of them testified before the committee that they considered it the only truthful paper in California—and this in spite of the fact that the People's World acclaimed the Russian invasion of Finland. It clumsily changed its policy to pro-Hitlerism when the Stalin-Hitler alliance was made, although before the alliance it was loud in its condemnation of the Nazis.

Attack preparedness

The People's World has recently devoted much space to attacks on the American preparedness program and the work of J. Edgar Hoover. To find such a subversive newspaper openly and widely supported by members of the State relief administration staff affiliated with the SCMWA is shocking and disgusting. No one not sympathetic with the Communists could read this propaganda sheet without resenting the rank distortion to which it stoops. It is not a newspaper in the American sense at all. It is the central organ in California of the international gangsters in the Communist Party.

Subversive organizations have been greatly aided in carrying out their international conspiracy in this country by the laxity of our laws, designed to curb treason and foreign espionage. Law-enforcement agencies are the hated enemy of subversive groups. They constantly carry on a campaign for the purpose of discrediting all agencies of Government created to check on subversive groups.

The successful sabotage of European democracies by these international gangsters has caused our National Government to invoke the services of the G-men in the Department of Justice, in order to ascertain the extent of plans for sabotage or overthrow of the American Government. The FBI under Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is a department of which every American is proud. Nothing could be more reassuring to patriotic Americans than knowing that the G-men are on the trail of the international gangsters working here in America. On the other hand, nothing could strike more fear into the hearts of subversive elements than being cognizant of surveillance by Mr. Hoover's G-men. In view of these facts, it is not surprising that in recent months the Communists have embarked upon a scurrilous smear campaign, intended to discredit J. Edgar Hoover and the Department of Justice.

Smear methods

As is usual with these despicable vermin, they are not attacking Mr. Hoover on the grounds that he is checking on subversive activities, but rather they are pretending to see in his work an attack on labor unions. In other words, the subversive groups are once more attempting to hide behind American labor, once more proclaiming that their civil liberties are in jeopardy, once more screaming that constitutional rights are being violated, once more conducting a typical scheming, underhanded smear campaign, all of which is planned to do just one thing—that is to carry out the Communist program of smearing everyone, and every organization that conducts a fight against their subversive machinations.

Naturally the Communist-controlled SRA union has been called upon to do its part in the "smear Hoover" campaign. The fact that this campaign originated with the Communist Party is not open to doubt. Every piece of Communist literature published in recent months has carried analogous attacks on the FBI. For instance, a May Day pamphlet recently issued from the National Communist Party office in New York said:

"The Bill of Rights is being trampled under foot by the Dies Committee and FBI. Attempts are made to curb and cripple the trade unions. Antiwar fighters, especially the Communists, are being persecuted and jailed."

Another Communist May Day pamphlet written by Louis Budenz says:

"In Detroit the plug-uglies of J. Edgar Hoover—who learned his lessons from the strike-breaker and labor spy, William J. Burns—have shown their true, hideous faces."

* * * * *

False peace stand

In recent months, the Communists have endeavored to maintain connections with the masses by setting themselves up as the champions for peace. Any thinking person should easily see through this smoke screen. The Communists are yelling for peace because this offers a convenient method for carrying on propaganda against the Allies and in favor of the Hitler-Stalin Alliance.

They have hit upon a clever slogan, "The Yanks are not coming." This slogan is being publicized in practically all Communist literature just as is the attack on the FBI. Under the guise of a demand for peace, the Communists are fighting the American preparedness program which has the support of all informed and patriotic Americans. The subversive groups want to keep America weak. They would like to see us fall prey to the Hitler or Stalin war machines. They would like to see us unable to defend ourselves if attacked by their international gangster cohorts. They would like to keep us unable to prevent sabotage perpetrated from the inside. They would like to see America make the same mistake, that many nations of Europe made, when they sought peace through unpreparedness.

Unfortunately many Americans are today being fooled by the fake peace propaganda of the Communists. As part of their program the Communists are carrying on a vicious attack against President Roosevelt in which they condemn him for being more friendly to the Allies than to Hitler. As usual, the Communists pretend to see in the realistic and necessary American preparedness program, an attack on labor unions. In fact, this subversive group, which has reduced lying and deception to a fine art, can be expected to find an attack on labor unions in most anything. So the "Yanks are not coming" and "Stop Roosevelt's war policies" are being added to the current slogans of the international gangsters.

In the People's World handbill favoring the Patterson slate referred to above, among the charges against the New Deal are the following:

"Tremendous boost in war appropriations; sale of military secrets and airplanes to Allies; Roosevelt administration no longer neutral—assists Allies."

If Stalin and Hitler were being assisted they would not complain.

Cripple legitimate unions

An official Communist May Day circular offers a fine example of propaganda condemning American aid to Finland, and showing the utilization of the slogan, "The Yanks are not coming" by this group:

"Under the hypocritical slogans of neutrality and aid to the democracies by methods short of war, big business and the Roosevelt government have lifted the arms embargo, and turned America into an arms factory for the Allies, opposing the ending of war, and doing everything in their power to spread it. Through this and similar measures such as loans to Finland and the Scandinavian countries, through diplomatic intervention and other aid to the Finnish White Guards, American imperialism has already taken a long step toward dragging the American people into war. * * * Attempts are being made to curb and cripple the trade-unions. Antiwar fighters, especially the Communists, are being persecuted and jailed. * * * The workers organized in the CIO, AFL, and railroad brotherhoods, the young people through the American Youth Congress, the toiling farmers, and the Negro people through the militant organizations, are daily expressing their opposition to the war and hunger program. The slogan, 'The Yanks are not coming' has become the rallying cry of millions."

A strikingly similar combination of the slogan "The Yanks are not coming" with the anti-Finnish propaganda is contained in a SCMWA bulletin. This bulletin also contains the typical Communist propaganda against the Allies. It says:

"'The Yanks are not coming' was the slogan selected by the 117 official delegates from 53 counties. * * * Britain and France's encouragement of the invasions of China, Ethiopia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and their nonintervention in Spain, indicates that the ruling classes are not particularly interested in maintaining democracy. The recent great amount of propaganda about Finland and the contributions of Italy, England, and other nations, of planes and credits to that nation, did not stem from love of democracy but from the desire of capitalist nations to provoke a war against the Soviet Union, a Socialist nation."

SRA Communists

The Communist group in SRA has flooded the State offices with propaganda following

the Communist Party line. In fact, the State relief administration has apparently become a spearhead of the entire Communist propaganda campaign in California. This phase of the so-called union's activity will be considered again below.

SECTION II

The chameleonic Communist Party line oftttimes results in a change of immediate policy, but the long time objective, namely, the setting up of a dictatorship, never changes. The necessity of making changes to coordinate with new policies of Soviet Russia is a great handicap to the Communist Party consistency. During the years when the Communists regarded the Nazis as enemies of Soviet Russia, they propagandized against the Nazis and organized groups such as the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League through which to carry on such activity. The People's World and other organs of the party during this period could not think of vile enough names to call Adolf Hitler. In an official Los Angeles County Communist publication issued in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Los Angeles County Communist organization, and written before the Hitler-Stalin pact, the following statement appears:

"In the name of the Communist Party of the United States, Earl Browder and William C. Foster, general secretary and chairman, respectively, have written to President Roosevelt and to all Members of the Congress of the United States, pledging the party support of President Roosevelt's peace policies as approved by the majority of the American people."

At another point in the same publication, it says:

"In this period of war crisis, when Hitler and the Munichmen are spreading their hideous destruction, the military defense of our country becomes a key factor for national security."

The program of the Communists as set forth in this publication listed as its twelfth plank the following:

"Full official city and county support of President Roosevelt's peace policy of collective security, cooperation of all local law-enforcement bodies with Federal services for detection and prosecution of all agents and spies of Nazi, Japanese, and other Fascist governments in local aircraft and fishing industries."

The ink was hardly dry on this publication when the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed. During their campaign against the Nazis, the Communists had believed that Soviet Russia would conclude a pact with the Allies against Hitler. When the world was stunned by the agreement between Hitler and Stalin, the Communists fumbled for several days without knowing how to explain the unexpected turn of events calling for the formulation of an entirely new party line.

Stalin-Nazi switch

Stalin had given Hitler the assurance he needed against attacks from the east, in order to make it possible for him to start his campaign of destruction against the Scandinavian countries and the small republics to the west. In explaining their change of attitude toward the Nazis, after the pact was signed, the Communists reached the zenith of hypocrisy. The Russian Commissar of Foreign Affairs in addressing the supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., said:

"It is our duty to think of the interests of the Soviet people, the interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics * * *. Only when it became clear to us that the German Government desired to change its foreign policy so as to secure an improvement in the relations with the U. S. S. R. was the basis found for the conclusion of a Soviet-German nonaggressive pact. Everybody knows that during the last 6 years, ever since the Nationalist Socialists (Nazis) came into power, political relations between Germany and the U. S. S. R. have been strained * * *. Exposing the hullabaloo raised in the British, French, and American press about Germany's plans for the seizure of the Soviet Ukraine, Stalin said, 'It looks as if the purpose of this suspicious hullabaloo was to increase the Soviet Union against Germany, to poison the atmosphere and to provoke a conflict with Germany without any visible ground.' * * * We have always stood for amity between the peoples of U. S. S. R. and Germany for the growth and development of friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the German people. * * * Is it really difficult to understand that the U. S. S. R. is pursuing and will continue to pursue its own independent policy, based upon the interests of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. and only their interests? * * * This pact not only eliminates the menace of a war with Germany, narrows down the zone of possible hostilities in Europe, and serves thereby the cause of universal peace; it must open to us new possibilities of increasing our strength."

No greater batch of lies was ever concocted by the Stalinists than those used in their attempt to justify the Hitler-Stalin pact, and the changes in their propaganda and policies, made necessary thereby. It is difficult to imagine such a brazen liar as was Stalin when he accused Americans of trying to provoke war between Russia and Germany. The fact of the matter was, that his gangsters in this country were busy conducting Nazi campaigns because they feared a possible plan of Adolf Hitler to drive to the east, which drive was described, by Hitler, in his book, Mein Kampf, and which was most certainly not an invention of the American press, as claimed by Stalin.

Molotov's lies

Hypocrisy, Communist style, bristles also in Molotov's claim that the Communists always stood for friendship between Germany and Russia. Molotov told the truth when he mentioned the previously existing strained relations between Russia and Germany. It was obviously these strained relations that caused the Stalinists in this country to carry on an anti-Nazi campaign in the interests of the Soviet Union. It was the end of these strained relations, and the Hitler-Stalin Pact, that caused the Stalinists in America to completely change their position by commencing attacks against American preparedness measures, and also by condemning as "unneutral," those who continued to denounce Hitler, just as the Stalinists did before the pact. This change of policy on their part was brought about solely in the interest of the Stalinist dictatorship even though such interest is directly adverse to the national safety of this country. Molotov lied again when he said the pact was in the interest of universal peace. He knew that the real purpose of the pact was to give Hitler the protection he needed in the east, to permit him to turn his destructive efforts in another direction.

The awkward change of the Communist policy in this country brought about by the Hitler-Stalin Pact is also exemplified in their change of heart relative to Federal investigation of Nazi and Fascist spies. Since the pact has made the Communist and Nazi termites in this country part of the same "fifth column," they now stand together in a campaign to smear the counterespionage work of the FBI which the Communists themselves advocated before the pact. All of these examples add to the abundance of evidence, showing that the allegiance of the Communist Party members is not to the United States. They demonstrate the danger and the foolishness involved in permitting such foreign directed agents to carry on their poison propaganda under the cloak of official positions in the State relief administration. They show the impossibility of relying upon their stated or pretended intentions in determining the real nature of their program.

Not long ago, the Communists carried on an extensive campaign in favor of lifting the embargo on the shipment of arms to Loyalist Spain, giving as their reason the fact that a small nation was being invaded by outside forces. But when the United States proposed to help Finland and to lift the embargo on shipments of arms to the Allies, the Communists scurried to form peace councils for the purpose of denouncing everyone as "unneutral" who advocated the same changes in the statutes which the Communists advocated before the Hitler-Stalin Pact.

Compulsory military training

Another example of Communist hypocrisy is their attitude toward compulsory military training in the United States. In the official history of the party, referred to above, describing some of the measures taken by the Bolsheviks in Russia after they seized power, the following appears:

"Therefore the Congress considered it the fundamental task of the party (Communist) to adopt the most energetic and resolute measures to strengthen the self-discipline and discipline of the workers and peasants, to prepare the masses for self-sacrificing defense of the Socialist country, to organize the Red army and to introduce universal military training."

It is quite apparent that the Communists advocate military training for Russians because they want Russia to be strong. They denounce military training in America because they want America to be weak.

The Communists are now condemning American foreign policy as imperialistic. The proposal of some United States Senators that we purchase certain islands near the Canal Zone is labeled "an imperialistic scheme" by the Stalinists. The sale of arms to the Allies is condemned as a program of the American imperialists. The United States is placed on their list of hated imperialistic nations. As an indication of what might be expected from Communists in this country in case we were compelled to defend ourselves against Stalin or his pal, Hitler, one needs only to turn again to the official history of the Communist Party for a statement of its attitude toward what it terms, "an imperialistic country." It should also be borne in mind that the United States is classed as a bourgeois nation in Communist terminology.

The official history says:

"In opposition to the Menshevik and Socialist revolutionary policy of defending the bourgeois fatherland, the Bolsheviks (Stalinists) advanced a policy of 'the defeat of one's own government in the imperialist war.' This meant voting against war credits, forming illegal revolutionary organizations in the armed forces, supporting fraternization among the soldiers at the front, organizing revolutionary actions of the workers and peasants against the war, and turning these actions into an uprising against one's own imperialist government. * * * Lenin held that the policy of working for the defeat of one's own imperialist government must be pursued not only by the Russian revolutionaries, but by the revolutionary parties of the working class in all the belligerent countries. * * * The Bolshevik Party (Communist) was the only proletarian party which remained faithful to the cause of socialism and internationalism and which organized civil war against its own imperialist government."

Since the United States is now called imperialistic, these quotations may be the basis for determining what the Communist policy might be in case this country faced a crisis. Along this line, the following quotation from the official history is also indicative:

"Lenin always taught that without a revolution of the working class, capitalism cannot be overthrown; therefore, while defining

imperialism as moribund capitalism, Lenin at the same time showed that 'imperialism is the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat.'"

Let persons who scoff at and ridicule the fight against communism in America consider well these expressions of policy recommended for Communists engaged in sabotaging their own nations. The Communists in America, with their dreams of themselves at the head of a Communist dictatorship in America, may be laughed at now by persons who fail to comprehend their insidiousness, but in case of a crisis in America, those who today ridicule anti-Communist activities will find that their apathy to duty has actually aided the activities of traitorous international gangsters.

Army, Navy threatened

It is well known that Stalinists in America are today attempting to extend vicious activity into our Army and Navy. Some of this terniting is on the west coast. The legislature will remember that William J. Plunkert was appointed by Governor Olson to a position as Deputy State Relief Administrator immediately after the Olson administration came into power. Plunkert then commenced a Communist program in the State relief administration and only a storm of protests caused the Governor to dismiss him from the State service. Almost immediately after this dismissal, Plunkert became field representative for an organization similar to the SRA union. It is called the United Federal Workers of America. Its purpose is to organize Federal employees. In a bulletin issued by this organization on November 29, 1939, the Communist activities of Mr. Plunkert are made apparent under the heading "Field representatives report," where it is stated:

"W. J. Plunkert just came back from a trip to Oregon and Washington (State). In Oregon, the WPA State Administrator sent out official notices that he was in town and would speak. The same thing happened at Bonneville Dam and in Seattle. Organization is proceeding at Bremerton Navy Yard, where there are 7,000 Federal employees."

Here we have a known Communist reporting on organizing work among our Armed Forces. This Stalinist, during the period he was with the State, was able to start much of the SRA infiltration that still exists. He offers a good example of the type of official that this administration had permitted to find a place in the State relief administration. The interest of this man in gaining a place in the SRA should be apparent from his present activities. Although he is gone, the SRA is still loaded with Bill Plunkerts. They are effectively carrying on the work in which he was so interested.

Communist gangsters

It cannot be emphasized too often that the Stalinists in America are a disciplined army of international gangsters. Their immediate policies change in accordance with desires of Dictator Stalin. Their plans do not call for actual seizure of power until they are prepared, and assured of a fair chance of success. This strategy also is outlined in the official history where they say:

"The Bolshevik Party was opposed to armed action at that time, for it considered that the revolutionary crisis had not yet matured, that the army and the provinces were not yet prepared to support an uprising in the capital, and that an isolated and premature rising might only make it easier for the counterrevolutionaries to crush the vanguard of the revolution."

Let no one suppose that because the Communists are not uprising now, that they are not planning, preparing, and awaiting the opportune moment to strike at the foundations of American liberty.

* * * * *

Communists direct strategy

The Communist-devised strategy followed by members of the so-called union who appeared before your committee and refused to testify, placed them in a very definite class by themselves. All other SRA employees appeared before the committee without counsel; made no complaints about the questions asked by the committee; and all answered the questions frankly and easily. In some cases the Communists failed to tell those whom they influenced, that refusal to testify constituted a crime under the California penal code. In cases where they did so advise their group, they assured them that the committee would never cause any of the recalcitrants to be prosecuted. But the Communists were wrong in this. After enduring the defiance of the Communist-influenced staff members with patience through an entire hearing in Alameda, only to find the same defiance in Visalia, the committee felt compelled to take action. Your committee felt called upon to defend the dignity of government against this typical Communist tactic of displaying contempt for that which they would destroy. Charges were brought against one of the SRA Communists in Tulare County. They were based upon his refusal to produce records of the Communist group when ordered to do so by the committee. The committee had evidence that outside money had been obtained to subsidize the activities of the SRA Communists who formed the so-called union in order to screen their activities. The financial records of this group might show the extent to which outside subversive groups contributed to its support. For this reason, the records were subpenaed by the committee. The Communist financial secretary of the Tulare local of the Sendo union was convicted on the charges brought against him by a jury in Visalia. His case is now on appeal. Other charges are pending in Stockton and more will probably be brought in the near future.

The committee feels, that it is necessary to deal firmly with the Communists and their followers in the SRA, in order to uphold the laws of the State of California and also to force these subversive gangsters to respect the Government which they despise. Since the prosecution in Visalia, the SRA Communists have apparently decided to revert to the strategy they first employed in testifying before your committee, namely, that which called for the denying of all Communist affiliations, even in the face of incontrovertible evidence.

Gangsters in Workers Alliance

Proof of same as previously pointed out, this Communist group has not limited its propaganda activities to the SRA offices. It is carrying its poison propaganda to the unemployed in accordance with directions of the international gangsters seeking destruction of American democracy. There is much evidence to show that the Communist staff members cooperate with the Communist-controlled Workers Alliance by encouraging relief applicants to join the alliance. Sometimes this was done openly and sometimes by the dropping of an easily understood hint.

The agents of Joe Stalin, czar of all the Communists, have constructed a propaganda network reaching out to the unfortunate and discontented throughout California, reaching out for the purpose of luring them into Communist organizations where the Communists hope to influence them to follow revolutionary leadership. As an example of the propaganda fed to the unemployed by the Communists, the following quotation from a widely distributed Communist pamphlet is notable. Under the heading, "What will a workers' revolution achieve?" a glowing picture is painted in these words:

"With the overthrow of capitalism and the introduction of a new social system, a classless society, there would be tremendous changes and almost unlimited possibilities for advancing the welfare of all. While we cannot give details in advance of this development, the approximate results would be as follows: (1) The abolition of poverty; (2) the abolition of the mass murder known as war; (3) tremendous expansion of production through the removal of the obstruction of profit making, the workers having the opportunity of consuming the bulk of what they produce; (4) the disappearance of panics and unemployment, as in the event of overproduction, the people would simply cut working hours, or take a holiday until consumption overtook production, at least until the surplus was greatly reduced; (5) the elimination of the costs of armies and navies (the burden now paid by the capitalists out of the surplus values exploited from the workers); (6) enormous reduction in crime through the removal of its main cause, poverty, and consequently a reduction or elimination of police, judges, jailers, and other present expenditure; (7) reduction in general waste such as competitive advertising and other nonessentials."

These are but a part of the many promises held out by Communist agents to the people whom they hope to recruit into their army of destruction. The fact that these promises would never be kept is unimportant to the international gangsters who make them, since once they have seized power, they can proceed as they have in Russia, to stamp out all of the liberties of the people, and to liquidate anyone who dares to object to their tyranny. Americans are unwise who laugh at such promises, underestimating their effect on those who find themselves in unfortunate circumstances, due either to inability or economic conditions. It is foolish to fail to recognize the ability of Communists to attract the discontented, by holding out to them promises which they would never attempt to fulfill even if given the opportunity. By such promises followers are gained. As the Communists themselves say in their twentieth anniversary booklet:

"The Communist Party of the United States, although a relatively small minority party * * * exerts an influence upon public thought far beyond the confines of its membership."

In this publication they described some of their activity in Los Angeles in the following words:

"By 1929, the party had gained a great deal of experience in various forms of mass work. In 1930, in the midst of the crisis, the party, together with the trade-union unity league, organized a huge mass meeting of over 40,000 people at the city hall on the question of adequate aid to the unemployed. The demonstrators carrying slogans demanding 'work or wages' were met by more than the usual array of police and although the demonstration was finally broken up, the prestige of the party was lifted immeasurably in the eyes of the working people of Los Angeles."

This latter statement bears testimony to the ability of the Communists to take advantage of a crisis in order to enflame masses of people, and to induce them to follow Communist leadership, even though in most cases, the followers do not know whom they are following.

Trained to smear

Communists are trained in the uses of propaganda. They are experts at "smear" campaigns. In attacking an individual, no lie is too vicious if it serves their purpose. Their "smear" campaign against J. Edgar Hoover; their "smear" campaign against Martin Dies; their "smear" campaign against the members of your committee—all of these and others serve to reveal the web of powerful propaganda contacts which they have spun throughout the United States by a series of steps following the identical pattern now being used in the State relief administration.

* * * * *

Nonpartisan League

Labor's Nonpartisan League was one of the leaders in the third term movement until the Communists turned against Roosevelt. When this happened, it hurriedly rescinded its endorsement of the third term, denounced Roosevelt, termed his supporters reactionaries, and placed itself squarely behind the Patterson slate of Democratic convention delegates. Use of Labor's Nonpartisan League for the launching of a third party, based upon a coalition of groups recommended by the Communist Party, is described in another section of this report.

* * * * *

Charges have been preferred against those witnesses who defied your committee by refusing to answer its questions during the Stockton inquiry. In referring to this, a SCMWA bulletin issued May 10, demonstrates the old strategy of the Communists who can always be counted upon to yell "persecution" and to see their lie factories in motion the minute their activities run afoul of the law. The bulletin says:

"Like a tiger who has tasted blood, the Yorty committee caused the arrests of 19 Stockton union members on charges of contempt of a legislative committee. They were paraded through the waiting room and promptly whisked away in the 'Black Maria' to the local bastille, where they were held pending bail. During the 24 hours required to raise bail, eight of the men were held in the infamous 'Tank No. 1,' forced to sleep on the floor because of lack of beds and denied the right to receive visitors or receive food and smokes sent in by friends.

"Within one-half hour of this incident, the State office of the SRA fired every member cited. The local director, Fred Le Fevre, promptly rehired them. Needless to say, the heat on him has increased as a result of this courageous action. * * *

"The notorious labor-hating police judge, E. R. Breitenbucher, asked the total bail of $9,500 cash or $36,000 property bail.

"Due to intense intimidation by the American Legion, it took some time to raise this fabulous sum. * * * The city of Stockton is preparing to spend thousands of dollars for individual persecution of each union member by jury trial."

Once again in this bulletin, the old Communist gag of hiding behind union membership is in evidence. The fact that the persons who violated the law were members of the Communist-controlled union is used by the Communists to claim that a union is being persecuted. The plain fact of the matter is that a section of the Penal Code is being invoked against all those who violated it without any regard to their membership or nonmembership in any labor union.

* * * * *

Liberties threatened

American liberties and freedom were won at the sacrifice of the lives of many of our forefathers. Subversive elements working in the United States today would destroy the liberties and freedom guaranteed by our Constitution. They would place us under the iron heel of dictatorship along with the other millions of human beings now suffering from oppression. To fight against this is the present duty of every American.

We must not permit ourselves to be fooled by the Communist Party into thinking that it is anything else than a part of a lying, scheming, pernicious army of international gangsters, determined to destroy and desecrate human dignity and civilization. The American people have already been fed with so much propaganda, ridiculing and smearing those who have endeavored to expose the fifth columns that it is difficult for anyone to describe the unbelievable extent to which subversive activities have been carried on in this country without being accused by the uninformed of being either an alarmist or guilty of exaggeration. But real, shocking facts of the situation must be brought home to the people of the United States. Only an aroused and patriotic America can in the last analysis end the march of the fifth column through this Nation. The fight against the fifth column must be carried on with firm and unswerving determination.

Your committee recommends:

1. That a thorough investigation of all subversive activities in California be undertaken as soon as possible.

2. That laws be enacted both by the United States and by the State to force the fifth-column propagandists to march out in the open where their promises and proposals can be judged with full knowledge of what is back of them. Laws must also be enacted to strengthen our defense against those columns of the international army of gangsters which are assigned to duties calling for actual physical sabotage.

3. That constant vigilance must be maintained to detect, expose, and bring an end to, every new phase of subversive activity devised by the marauding international gangsters.

4. That a complete analysis of our educational system be undertaken to determine the cause of its failure to inculcate students with a true appreciation of American democracy.

* * * * *

7. And that most important of all, a sound constructive program of reemployment be determined upon and executed through the cooperation of Government, business, and labor. This is a necessary defense measure. Subversive groups feed the fires of discontent created by economic break-down. Their lying propaganda and promises are doubled in effectiveness during periods of economic uncertainty. The combined intelligence and patriotism of all Americans must cause them to support whatever equitable economic adjustments are necessary to put an end to this scourge of unemployment. Doles are not the answer. Doles and demoralization go hand in hand. The great morale that has always characterized the American people must be safeguarded. The calamity howlers must be met by a deafening roar of American industrial activity.

* * * * *

ASSEMBLY RELIEF INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE,
SAMUEL WILLIAM YORTY,
Chairman.

Call Mr. Truman, He Did The Trick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very timely and thoughtful editorial from the Port Jervis Union-Gazette in my district:

CALL MR. TRUMAN, HE DID THE TRICK

Today the Senate gets another earful of the case of Truman against MacArthur. General Marshall is slated to tell the Senate just what the five-star general has done that merits his firing by the President so suddenly, mysteriously, and unexplainedly. But getting General Marshall in the limelight as question-answerer will not answer the $64 question, which is, and will be, until answered: Why did Truman fire MacArthur so peremptorily and without explanation?

Only the President knows why he took such summary action, jeopardizing the entire international and U. N. activity in the Far East as well as Europe. So far Mr. Truman has kept silent, which is evidently something very difficult for him to do. He is sidestepping the entire matter and leaving General Marshall and others to bear the onus of an act that has brought down the wrath of millions upon his head. Maybe Truman was right—he says to hold our decision until all the facts have been given—but will we get all of them?

So far the facts as divulged by the President and General MacArthur have cast an awfully suspicious cloud upon the administration and its Hiss-Acheson-Marshall-Truman actions. Mr. Acheson said that he stood by Hiss as he had always done; perhaps Alger was a great help to him in his plans; evidently he was, for as the Acheson Man Friday he surely put something over and is still in good repute in the office of Secretary of State. So far we have not heard anything about whether Mr. Hiss' valuable aid is still possible from behind the bars. Hiss suits Acheson, Acheson suits Truman, Truman suits—well, he is helping Big Joe a lot just at present.

Mr. Truman, so quick to answer anyone on any subject from flat notes to smashed noses, is strangely silent. Let's hear from him on the MacArthur matter.

The United States Still Offers Opportunities for Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, a very dear and personal friend of mine, Mr. Charles Simonelli, has just been promoted by the Universal Pictures Co. as manager of its eastern advertising and publicity department, whose offices are in New York. His career is another example that opportunities for success in this great country of ours and under our system of free enterprise are still open and available to young people.

I have known Mr. Simonelli for many years; I have occasion to see him frequently and I cherish his friendship. I had the pleasure of meeting him through another very distinguished and fine gentleman, the Honorable James V. Mangano, who made his mark in public life. I note with particular pride the heights to which Mr. Simonelli has risen, knowing the humble origin from which he stems and the fact that he was raised in a neighborhood where the ratio of crime has been a matter of deep concern to many people.

Despite many handicaps, Mr. Simonelli continued in his march toward a successful business career. Unfortunately, not all young people are possessed of such strong character and they fall prey to environmental influences. For them the success of Charles Simonelli should serve as an example and a guide.

At this time I am placing in the RECORD a brief article on the subject which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle May 3, 1951, and which reads as follows:

CHARLES SIMONELLI HEAD OF UNIVERSAL'S AD DEPARTMENT

The promotion of Charles Simonelli to the post of manager of the eastern advertising and publicity department of Universal Pictures Co., Inc., is announced by David A. Lipton, vice president in charge of advertising and publicity.

Mr. Simonelli, still on the sunny side of 30 (by a couple of years), is the south Brooklyn ex-newsboy who rose from office boy at Universal to his current position in a scant 10 years. As a youngster he played stickball on Hicks Street, later went to Manual Training High School.

In his new post as head of the New York office of the Universal Pictures advertising and publicity department, Simonelli will continue to serve as executive in charge of national exploitation, the post he held at the time of his promotion.

The eastern advertising and publicity executive staff under Simonelli will consist of Philip Gerard, eastern publicity manager, and Jeff Livingston, eastern advertising manager.

The promotion of Simonelli is in line with the policy of Universal Pictures of promotion from within the ranks. Simonelli joined Universal in 1942. In March 1943, 6 months after he joined the advertising and publicity department, he was promoted to cooperative advertising work. In the fall of 1943 he was placed in charge of all commercial tie-ups for the company. Subsequently, he became a field exploitation representative and was eventually placed in charge of out-of-town openings. In 1945 he handled radio promotion and exploitation in connection with the openings of pictures. In May 1948 he was appointed eastern exploitation manager and in June 1949 he was named executive in charge of national exploitation.

How We Gave China to the Commies on a Silver Platter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the New York Times of September 15, 1950. The facts set forth in the editorial have a favorable, pertinent bearing upon present-day controversy over our Asiatic policies. The Marshall mission to China was a failure and it paved the way for the undermining of our great ally in the Far East. The responsibility is upon Truman, Marshall, and Acheson. The people of the United States should have these important facts.

The editorial is as follows:

HOW WE GAVE CHINA TO THE COMMIES ON A SILVER PLATTER

MARSHALL IN CHINA

General Marshall was called from the height of his successful military career on November 27, 1945, to act as a special emissary of President Truman to China. He was instructed by the President to bring to bear the influence of the United States to effect "the unification of China by peaceful, democratic methods." He was also instructed to work for a cessation of hostilities in North China. His role was conceived as that of pacificator and mediator in a domestic political dispute that had assumed military proportions.

The exact character of the instructions and their precise origin have not been revealed. They had, however, the approval of the State Department and the specific endorsement of the President. General Marshall was also instructed by the President to use the pressure of a possible withholding of American assistance to enforce a mediation effort. The President's letter is quoted in the State Department White Paper as having stated that "General Marshall was authorized to speak to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and other Chinese leaders 'with the utmost frankness' and to state that 'a China disunited and torn by civil strife' was not a proper place for American economic assistance in the form of credits or technical assistance nor for American military aid."

It was presumably in pursuance of this instruction that the previously recommended credits for China were not issued and that eventually the virtual embargo on military aid to Chiang was set up. General Marshall did not institute this policy, although his office carried it out after he became Secretary of State.

It should be remembered that this idea of bringing pressure to enforce a coalition of Nationalist and Communist Chinese was put forth at a time when it was still official policy to believe that it was quite possible to do "business as usual" with any Communists—Russian, Chinese or other. Indeed, in the case of the Chinese Communists it was the official thesis that they were not Communists primarily, but merely Chinese reformers who would gladly join a truly "liberal" government. General Marshall appears to have accepted this doctrine, since he confessed rather ruefully in his public report on his mission to China, January 7, 1947, that the Communists whom he had found to be "irreconcilable" did not appear to be so in the preceding February.

In carrying out the pacification mission General Marshall was able to bring about a military truce with incredible ease. It was announced as early as January 10, 1946. Truce teams were put into the field and after each flare-up a new cease-fire was negotiated. What General Marshall apparently did not realize, and what his superiors who gave him his instructions obviously did not take into account, was that this truce played directly into the hands of the Communists and seriously weakened the Chinese Government. The white paper itself records how strategic points such as Chihfeng, the gateway to Manchuria, and Telun, the gateway to Mongolia, were yielded to the Communists upon General Marshall's appeal to promote mediation.

Similarly, General Marshall offered a plan of integration of all military forces into one national army. The Chinese Government agreed to a reduction of its forces from 151 to 57 divisions and disbanded 160,000 officers and 400,000 men on the presumption that the Communists would do likewise. General Marshall eventually discovered that the Chinese Communists had no intention of giving up any military formations, and it was primarily on this ground that his mission met its ultimate total defeat.

General Marshall left China on March 11, 1946, to report to the President and returned to his mediation on April 18. The efforts at coalition continued to be fruitless, and General Marshall finally reported that they had broken down on the rock of the Chinese Communist walk-out from any further meetings. The President issued his hands-off statement of American policy on China on December 18 and announced General Marshall's recall on January 6, 1947. General Marshall was named to the Secretaryship of State the following day.

The mission to China was based on a total misconception of the Chinese Communists. The mission and the policies that followed it undoubtedly weakened the Government of China and gave substantial assistance to the Communists in preparing them for their ultimate conquest.

Address of His Excellency David Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to hear yesterday a dynamic speech delivered by His Excellency David Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister and Minister of Defense of the State of Israel. In order not to detract from its beauty and clarity, I set it forth in full without comment, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY DAVID BEN-GURION, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 8, 1951

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, I am grateful for the cordial welcome extended to me by this distinguished assembly of the National Press Club, representing the free press and free opinion of the United States. I do not doubt that the rightful object of your tribute is the people of Israel, whose rise to independence, within the past 3 years, constitutes a unique event in the history of nations.

The modern age has witnessed the rise of many new states, both in the Old World and in the new. Many, such as the states of the American hemisphere and some of the dominions of the commonwealth, were formed through the migration of peoples to newly discovered countries. Once these new communities were conscious of their mature strength, they broke loose from their dependence on the countries from which they had come, or to which they had been subject, and stood on their own feet as free nations. Another category includes those countries which led an independent existence in previous times, but later lost their independence for long periods until they became liberated eventually as free nations, either by their own revolt, or as a result of foreign wars leading to the downfall of their previous conquerors. Such is the modern history of several nations in Central Europe and the Balkans.

The rebirth of the State of Israel is quite unlike either of these two historic processes. The land of Israel is not a newly discovered country; it is one of the most ancient lands on earth. Its history covers a period of 4,000 years, during part of which time it occupied a central place on the scene of world history. The great events which unfolded within its borders live on in the memory of the Jewish people and have also become the heritage of the Christian world.

Nor does Israel belong to the second category of liberated states, which regained their previous independence after long centuries of subjection. Indeed, the people which established our new state had been cut off from the country for 2,000 years. They had been scattered amongst all the peoples of the world, wandering from land to land. Although there was never a time when the land of Israel was without a Jewish community, the great movement of immigration and settlement which led to the rise of the State of Israel took place in relatively recent times.

The unique character of the rise of Israel is a direct result of the uniqueness of the people of Israel. At the dawn of its history, more than 3,000 years ago, two events occurred which were to mold its character and destiny for all time. The first decisive event was the exodus from ancient Egypt, from slavery to freedom. To this day all Jews in the new world and in the old continue after the lapse of 3,300 years to celebrate that event every year as the festival of Jewish freedom.

The second event was the revelation of the Torah on Mount Sinai, on Israel's journey to the promised land. No book has ever played a role in the history of any people similar to that of the Bible in the life of the Jewish people and, through it, in the life of the Christian and Moslem worlds. For that book transmitted to mankind the supreme moral principles which have still not found their full realization and which mark the only sure road to human survival.

Another factor which molded the character and destiny of the people of Israel was the promised land. This small country which was formerly called Palestine but which the Jews for more than 3,000 years have called the land of Israel is characterized by a geographical position which makes it a bridge between the three continents of the ancient world, and by a topographical structure which combines within a limited area a remarkably wide range of climatic and geographical diversity.

This Book and this country were united in the life of the Jewish people in a way that no book and country were ever joined in the life of any other people. This unity sustained the Jewish people throughout the long days of its exile. The Babylonians and the Romans successively severed the Jews from their country, and the second exile continued for more than 1,800 years; but the Book, which accompanied the people throughout all its wanderings, preserved in its heart the memory of its land and the hope of restoration. They put their faith in the words of the Prophet "I shall gather you together from amongst the peoples and shall assemble you from the countries in which you are scattered, and shall give you the land of Israel." It was this Book which taught the Jewish people not to submit to physical strength based not on justice but on preponderant power alone. It taught them not to despair of the prospect of national redemption, even in times of most acute tribulation.

Few countries in the world have seen as many foreign conquerors as the land of Israel: Egypt and Syria, Babylon and Persia, Greece and Rome, Byzantium and Arabia, Crusaders and Ottoman Turks have fought each other for domination of the Holy Land. But not one of those peoples ever linked its historic destiny with the land of Israel.

Although for many centuries they had been city dwellers, the Jews returning to their ancestral land after 1,800 years devoted themselves first to tilling the soil. They built villages and cities with the sweat of their brow. In place of the many tongues which they had adopted in the lands of their wanderings, they returned to their ancient Hebrew tongue, the language of the Bible. This transformation of an ancient language, not spoken for centuries, into a living vernacular, is another of the unique characteristics of the rise of Israel.

These are some of the features of the State of Israel whose independence we celebrate this week—one of the youngest states, 3 years old, but reestablished by one of the oldest peoples of the world.

Ninety years before the establishment of the State of Israel, a great American Jew, born immediately after your War of Independence, Maj. Mordecai Emanuel Noah, declared, "We will return to Zion as we went forth, bringing back the faith we carried with us." This was said in the year 1834. Eight years previously, in 1816, a hundred years before the Balfour Declaration envisaged the establishment of a Jewish national home, the second President of the United States, John Adams, wrote: "I really wish the Jews again in Judea, an independent nation restored to an independent government."

There is no doubt that the echoes of Biblical prophecy reverberated both in the words of the first Jewish major in the American Army and in those of the second President of the United States. For these early American pioneers, building up their vast country, were permeated by the spirit of the prophets of Israel and the sacred Hebrew writings, by the love of freedom and by the impulse to render aid to all oppressed and suffering peoples.

This tradition of American sympathy for the restoration of Israel was never broken. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 was issued with the active cooperation of President Wilson. In 1922, the American Congress unanimously expressed its sympathy for the aspiration of the Jewish people to reconstitute its national home. When the State of Israel was founded on May 14, 1948, President Truman, on behalf of the United States, was the first to accord it recognition.

As the man who had the privilege 3 years ago to proclaim the independence of the State of Israel, I am happy to take the opportunity of my visit to this country, my first visit as Prime Minister of Israel to any country outside Israel, to convey through you, the representatives of the press of the country, the profound gratitude which the people of Israel feel toward the American Nation for the constant aid which it has given to us in our struggle for national independence. This support has deep roots in a common spiritual tradition, as well as in the character of your pioneering struggle to build your great country—an enterprise similar in its essence to the pioneering effort whereby we are establishing our small ancient country anew. It is further strengthened today by our common belief in the cause of democracy—a cause that America so strongly sustains by the strength of its own institutions, by its efforts to help defend it wherever it may be threatened, and by its farsighted readiness to render aid to other democratic lands that need such aid to preserve their way of life.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in the 3 years of existence of the State of Israel we have won a war, forced upon us by our neighbors; we have established the structure of our State; and we have brought home nearly 600,000 immigrants. Those are our main achievements. They have been effected by a constructive revolution never equaled, I believe, in so short a period by any country of comparable size.

Our immigration record in these 3 years would, on the American scale, represent an equivalent influx of 120,000,000 people. Great areas of barrenness have been restored to cultivation. Water has been brought to areas where none existed before. Nearly 300 new agricultural villages have sprung up. Foundations of new cities have been laid, and existing cities and townships extended to new dimensions. Our industrial production has risen by nearly 50 percent. Building construction, transportation and all the other branches of our economy have advanced with similar strides.

Our policy is not guided by economic considerations alone. My Government has given deep attention to the social, educational and cultural advancement of our people. The result has been a remarkable transformation of the country and a corresponding revolution in the life of its people. We are welding a people drawn from all the corners of the world into the free unity of a newly revived culture.

We have had massive financial assistance from our brethren overseas, above all, in America, not only to help us absorb our immigrants, but also in the form of investments. We have had the assistance of $135,000,000 in credits from the United States Export-Import Bank for the purchase of machinery and equipment and for agricultural development. We value that not only in itself, but also as a token of confidence in Israel's economic future, and as an indication of Israel's investment potentialities.

Our tasks have not been accomplished without severe difficulties. The effort has made tremendous demands on our people. They have not flinched before them. They have shown a readiness to assume heavy burdens and a severe regime of austerity in their personal living. They have done so in the knowledge that the absorption of immigrants, or, as it is termed in Hebrew, the ingathering of the exiles, is the main object for which the State of Israel has been created and the supreme test by which it will be judged. The hope of the return to the homeland has for thousands of years been kept alive in the heart of our nation. When a third of the Jewish people was exterminated by Nazi barbarity in the most fearful ordeal of Jewish history, that hope was a beacon to the survivors. From that hope the people already in the land drew strength amidst bitter disappointment and, when the time came, the courage to set their lives in the balance against powerful foes.

Today a sharpened sense of insecurity amongst Jewish remnants in Europe, a renewal of persecution in Iraq, and continued indignity in other lands of the Near East and north Africa have strengthened the irresistible force of the tide. As long as there are Jews who are fearful of their future, who lack freedom and dignity in the lands in which they live, or who wish to throw in their lot with their fellow Jews in their ancient homeland, our gates will remain open. In the coming 3 years we anticipate the arrival of a further 500,000 people.

The problems involved in a population movement of such dimensions will be readily appreciated. Few, if any, bring any means of their own. They come from over 50 countries. Most of them bear the recent scars of suffering and humiliation. They must not only be integrated economically, but also merged into the revived national and social life of our people.

To absorb them, all the waste land of Israel must be restored. The great desolation of the Negev, which comprises over half of our territory, the naked, rocky hills of Judea, the swamps of the Huleh, must be reclaimed. Our economy must be expanded and stabilized. We must embark on new irrigation and power projects; and all the natural and mineral resources of our country must be discovered and developed.

While we do all this, we must continue to look to our security, to the continued strengthening of our defense potential. Here our great asset is the spirit of our people. But in the present situation of the world, we must prepare them for any contingency. We have done much in this respect, and are at least twice as strong as we were 3 years ago. But this has necessitated the diversion of heavy financial and other resources from constructive purposes.

In the coming 4 years our plans envisage a total population of 2,000,000; 300 new agricultural villages; 250,000 more housing units.

Toward this end my government has elaborated a development program that calls for the mobilization of about $500,000,000

for each of the next few years. At the close of 3 years we hope and believe that the full stream of immigration will have been productively absorbed and the economy of our land firmly established.

Israel has set itself a target of providing one-third of the required annual amount. But it cannot meet its problems without increased help, in different forms, in aid, in investment, and in technical skill, from its friends and well-wishers.

In the significant area of which Israel is a central part, on the bridehead between three continents and at the gateway between the Occident and the Orient, the future of our young state is an issue of direct moment to the cause of world democracy. For in a region whose peoples for the most part only imperfectly understand the ways and goals of democracy, the progress, in their midst of a people devoted to democracy and scientific effort, will prove to them the inherent capacity of democracy to fulfill their need for a fuller, freer, and happier life. Thus our contribution to democracy, to the defense of freedom, and to social progress lies in the first place in the vigor and success of our own undertaking.

We have always been a small nation. But a people's capacity for moral advancement, the influence it exerts on human thought and achievement, have never been attributes of its mere size. Witness Israel and Greece of old.

Today, after thousands of years of wandering and suffering, we are restored at last to the land of our fathers. We are resolved to be faithful to the ideals that are our heritage. We shall support, to the utmost of our capacity, every measure which strengthens world peace and opposes aggression; which promotes understanding among the peoples, and insures the equality of nations. Our policies, as a free and sovereign people, will be inspired by the universal aims of the United Nations. We shall cooperate untiringly with all who set their faces against enslavement of the souls of men; and with all who cherish the ultimate vision of peace as conceived by the prophets of Israel, that men shall beat their swords into plowshares and "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Santayana Sees Europe as Beyond Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a short editorial that appeared in the Christian Century of May 9, 1951:

SANTAYANA SEES EUROPE AS BEYOND HELP

George Santayana thinks that the United States would simply be throwing away the lives of any of its young men it might send to Europe to defend that continent against communism. From his retreat in a Rome hospice maintained by a Catholic order of nuns where he has lived for years, Harvard's famous philosopher has replied to a series of questions propounded by his publishers, Charles Scribner's Sons. "Europe," he says, "is already a wreck." It would be folly to waste American lives trying to help a weakling. If the Russians should occupy Western Europe, that would not endanger either the United States or the free way of life. Russia, with Europe, Asia, and Africa to handle, would have its hands more than full. As for the Atlantic Pact, it is only a scrap of paper. The military policies based on it do not represent the right way to deal with the epidemic communism now sweeping across Europe. "I think," said Santayana, "that epidemic communism may be left to wither or rather to rot away, leaving genuine communism to be practiced in monasteries and religious fraternities." That final remark opens up an interesting line of speculation. Does it imply that, in Santayana's view, genuine communism and high religion—meaning Christianity—are essentially one? And that the only place in which either, in its pure form, can be put into practice is in a community withdrawn from the hurly-burly of life?

The Area of Agreement With Respect to Foreign Policy in Asia and Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it is traditional in our country that a great debate like that dealing with the circumstances surrounding General MacArthur's being relieved from his commands in the Far East results in a crystallization of public opinion and leads toward a greater merge of views than before, regardless of which side prevails. The appended editorials show that exactly this is happening. In this situation the best result would be to enable us to go forward with a bipartisan foreign policy in the Far East, a policy which has had such enormous benefits for the country in respect of the United Nations, the European recovery program, the Greek-Turkish aid program, and the mutual defense assistance program.

The above-mentioned editorials from the New York Times of May 9, 1951, follow:

THE AREA OF AGREEMENT

Now that both General MacArthur and the administration have presented the main outlines of their respective arguments in the debate precipitated by the general's dismissal, it is increasingly evident that the areas of agreement between them are far greater than the areas of disagreement. The disagreements cannot be minimized, because they involve not only the problem of how to end the Korean war and the role of the military in determining our policies, but also the critical issue of whether we should gamble on taking action which might split the free world and lead to an atomic war. But on the broader aspects of the whole global struggle against Communist imperialism the agreements between the administration and General MacArthur are much more complete and far reaching than is generally realized. In fact, they are much more fundamental than are the arguments between General MacArthur and many of his most ardent supporters.

This is convincingly demonstrated by a comparison of the views and policies of the administration with the testimony of General MacArthur at the Senate hearings. Like the administration, General MacArthur holds that "the issues are global and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector oblivious to those of another is but to court disaster for the whole." Like the administration, he believes that we should attempt to meet aggression "wherever it shows its face," because "you can't let one-half of the world slide into slavery and just confine yourself to defending the other." Like the administration, he believes that "we should make every possible effort to assist Western Europe in her defense," and that we should do so not only with air and naval forces but also with ground forces, because he believes "that it is the gravest possible mistake in the use of the armed forces of a nation to try to draw the lines of demarcation between ground troops, air troops, and Navy troops," which "are an integrated team."

In keeping with this thesis, General MacArthur warns Congress not to impose "academic or strait-jacket formulas" on the disposition of our Armed Forces, but rather to provide for "elasticity" and to trust the professional advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in whom he has "complete confidence."

There is, again, a wide area of agreement on the fundamentals of the Korean conflict. With the administration, General MacArthur holds that we acted wisely in taking action in Korea, because this action not only restored at one stroke the enormous prestige of the United States but also confirmed to the peoples of the Far East that we are not going to let them slide into slavery. He likewise agrees that the psychological effect [now] of withdrawing from Korea would collapse the confidence, not only of the Far East, in our strength to carry out an obligation we have assumed, but throughout the world. "If we don't go on, I believe we will go under," is his summary of the situation.

There are further important and significant areas of agreement on such questions as the Japanese peace treaty, the necessity of providing economic help to Asia as contemplated by the point 4 program, the need for an economic blockade of China, and finally on the necessity of security provisions in the Pacific, in line with the Truman doctrine. There is even agreement that in view of the global nature of the struggle it is not up to a local theater commander to make global decisions, but that this is rather the function of the higher authorities, who must take into account many military and political factors beyond the realm of a local commander.

Certainly, in the light of all this, it must be clear that there is little support in anything that General MacArthur has said for the neoisolationist elements of the Republican Party who counsel simultaneously economy in armaments with deeper involvement in Asia and retreat from Europe. When the acrimony and the arguments over the detailed issues of the present controversy begin to subside it is more than likely that the broader agreements established by the present debate will prove to be both the lasting results and the justification of it.

NO REWARD FOR AGGRESSION

From General Marshall's testimony before the Senate committees we quote this passage:

"At the time I became Secretary of Defense last September, the established policy of the United States was to deny Formosa to Communist China and to oppose the seating of the Communist Chinese in the United Nations. There has been no deviation from that policy whatsoever. * * * I am confident that the United States will continue to adhere to its present position, namely, that it will oppose any settlement of the Korean conflict which would reward the aggressor in any manner whatever, and it will oppose the attempt of any nation or regime to shoot its way into the United Nations."

To this we say, "Bravo." And we trust, and expect, that when it becomes the turn of Secretary of State Acheson to appear before the Senate committees we shall have, on both these points, a declaration of policy just as clear, just as specific, and just as unequivocal as Secretary Marshall's.

No World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address given by Col. Albert G. Hulett to the annual meeting of the New Jersey Society Sons of the American Revolution at East Orange, N. J., on the 21st of April. Colonel Hulett is national surgeon of the National Sojourners Association and has been active in bringing to the attention of the people all over this country the fallacies of world government.

The address by Colonel Hulett follows:

Fellow patriots and friends, I feel somewhat apologetic in addressing you today because my remarks come so soon after Gen. Douglas MacArthur's superlative address to the Congress, a composition which, I firmly believe, will go down in history, not only as a remarkable analysis of the factual world situation and of the futility of the present mode of approach thereto, but as one of the finest examples of English prose ever to have been written.

Creation moves in cycles, and so does the history of mankind. When anyone looks about him in today's world, he fails to find mankind being guided by outstanding thinkers, statesmen, and leaders (as was true a generation and more ago), but observes that we are in an era of little men wherein the few now living who do qualify to greatness are turned upon, discredited, and cast aside. In my humble judgment, the basic difficulty of today's world and of these United States is the woeful lack of competent leadership, and the horrible fact that we have mistaken astute partisan politicians for statesmen, propagandists for prophets, ignorant folk for wise men, puppets for leaders, and that we appear to be unable at this juncture to correct our errors.

The Bible says, "Where there is no vision the people perish." It is well to keep this formula in mind as we watch events unfold. Perhaps it were better that my topic for today had been world chaos rather than world government, for it is chaos or despotism and slavery which we shall have and not any democratic, voluntary, and orderly government—either at home or abroad in the world—if present trends continue and we shall continue to hearken to the Judases who, for personal gain or the satisfaction of ambitions or of crackpot theories (if not for truly treasonable reasons) would destroy our Government and ourselves and usher our children into that which will be far worse than any crucifixion.

Complete as it may seem to most Christians, I believe another section should be added to the Litany, which should read:

"From zealots, charlatans, and crackpots, and from 'dealers'—new, fair, or double—and their machinations, good Lord deliver us."

Quackery has been a problem of mankind since the dawn of history, although we sometimes mistakenly assume it to be a fairly modern development, stemming from the patent-medicine men, Carter's Little Liver Pills, and Lydia Pinkham. Thus we wholly forget the Tower of Babel, the taboos of witchcraft, the graven images of past civilizations, the worship of Baal, the Greek and Roman gods, and the messianic pretenses of countless charlatans, crackpots, zealots, and power-seekers. Rarely does one such arise who does not attract a considerable following, for all such movements take advantage of a basic human weakness which yearns for quick solutions and painless cures for the woes of mankind, most of which agonies could have been prevented by a little common sense and foresight.

Thus the United States (through its then leaders) committed the tremendously grave errors of (1) the recognition of Soviet Russia and (2) of the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements, from which have stemmed most of our current political agonies. But rather than to admit our mistakes, rectify them by disavowal, and start afresh upon the right premise and along a safe road, we frantically grasp at the nostrum of United Nations in the foolish assumption that, the such hasty attempts at international collaboration have always failed in the past, this will succeed. And now many of our people are, like the Israelites who prostrated themselves before Baal, putting their whole faith in the concept of an immediate and single world government. Such are the antidotes and quack remedies we grasp for the poison we swallowed.

Too late did we return to the bottle and, by rereading the label, discover that it was a deadly and insidious poison we gulped down in our desire for prompt relief from agony. An emetic or cathartic, by extruding that poison, might solve our dilemma—late as it now is—but these are harsh and unpleasant measures, so, despite the foolishness of the attempt, we swallow one quack antidote after another until the treatment becomes more deadly than the original ailment.

What you and I must recognize is that the project for world government, presently advocated and promoted by UWF, is but one of a myriad of remedies now being foisted upon us, any one of which by itself can be lethal to our Government and to ourselves. If we unwisely center our attention wholly upon resistance to any one of them, we shall find that some other has crept upon us and we shall be lost. Happily, the menace of that UWF project is somewhat less acute than it was some 2 years ago when certain patriotic societies, the SAR in the van, awakened to that nefarious and treasonable attack. How the score now stands in that battle may best be gleaned from an article in the current issue of the Bulletin of the Friends of the Public Schools of America from which I now quote:

"It is time that all parents looked carefully into the subject of world government, world federalism, and world citizenship that is being dished up to their children (in schools and colleges). The leading educators, through their organizations, are demanding that world citizenship should be taught from the first grade up through high school and colleges. The proponents of world government are still active throughout the Nation. They are financed with large grants from educational foundations which, in the aggregate, have over a billion dollars, tax free, large sums going to help finance world government.

"Out of 23 States that accepted world government originally, only 10 are left that still stand for it. Those which now stand against world government by having rescinded their former resolutions through efforts of real Americans are: Georgia, California, Rhode Island, Alabama, Louisiana, Tennessee, Missouri, Massachusetts, Colorado, Oklahoma, Oregon, Maryland, and Kentucky—13. The States in which world government resolutions were passed and which have not rescinded are: Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, New Jersey, Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Arkansas, Utah, and Washington—10. And since this tabulation was made the Assemblies of New Hampshire and of New Jersey have passed rescinding resolutions by huge majorities. Those wherein the proposals were rejected in the legislatures are: Vermont, New Mexico, Iowa, Delaware, New York, Michigan, and Nebraska.

"Thus there is work to do in your schools and in your legislatures if you do not care to become one cog in a world organization where you will have only one vote per million inhabitants; the same as the wild tribes of Africa will have."

(Food for serious thought, is it not?)

This UWF project, and all similar undertakings, are but facets in an over-all conspiracy to undermine us and terminate the very existence of our country and of its privileges and possibilities, the one remaining hope for the whole world, for only the United States stands between the Kremlin and the world conquest it must have to endure. In today's world, mankind cannot exist half free and half slave; it must be all the one or all the other. In the past 2 years wherein I have spoken far and wide and have written extensively thereon, I have frequently been made aware of the growing fear of Moscow which seems to motivate the thinking and planning of governments and of individuals in those countries not yet enslaved. I would stress to you that fears are wise but the present object of those fears erroneous.

What we should fear, what we should "do something about," is ourselves and our own people. No world government proponent, no United Nations zealot, no appeaser, no socialistic schemer, could have gained the ear of the American patriots of 1776, and why? Because they had experienced tyranny; they were of one mind; and they had proven that appeasement, compromise, or surrender to despotism did not work and could not avert disaster.

And, so long as the people of these United States continued to have full faith in, to solidly support, and to practice Americanism, our country and they remained secure. Then, spellbound by the vociferations of internationalists and of aspirants for personal prestige within our midst—and I need not name them for you to know whom I mean—we forgot ourselves and our own security in a foolish and vain endeavor to save the entire world in one fell swoop. The basic philosophy of the Bible was forgotten, wherein it says: "First pick the mote out of thine own eyes ere thou attempt that which is in thy neighbor's eye." That basic formula cannot be bypassed, as our agencies of this date amply prove.

Actually, we are centuries away from the day when the world will be ready for a single world government of voluntary type and democratic form, because that day will not dawn unless and until the races, peoples, and cultures have found a common denominator in their concepts of life, of individual rights, of morals, and of behavior. To attempt world government now is like feeding a table d'hote dinner to a newborn baby, and as certain to precipitate disaster. Yet thousands of supposedly sane Americans, celebrating like morons, are persuaded that now is the time, and that by surrendering our national sovereignty and thus losing our rights, liberties, and advantages, we can change all the world overnight and achieve Utopia.

We might, with profit, recall the admonition that: "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad," for I am constrained to infer that a segment of mankind has gone stark, raving mad within the past decade.

What humanity really needs, and especially in these United States, is not world government but sanity. And such is to be achieved not by four-power conferences, not by strengthening United Nations, nor by more agreements, commitments, conventions, bargainings, or police actions, but by being taught to think clearly and logically, and thus to avoid the mass insanity and mob-psychology which prevail today.

For this we do not need psychiatrists nor psychologists, for the disease is not an affliction of individuals but an ailment of the whole body politic. What is needed is clear thinking, courageous and honest leaders whom our people can and will follow along the path of right and of promise. Such do not exist, either in Washington, or Downing Street, in Paris, or in Lake Success, in any appreciable number, and, if existent, they are not in power. Such must be found at grass-roots level for this fateful affliction of the human mind must be met and conquered there. Such is the challenge to you and to me, as patriotic Americans and acknowledged leaders in our communities.

Too often, in current times, when a problem arises, we cry that there should be a law, an agency, or a society, to handle it—thus seeking to excuse ourselves from the endeavor and have the work done for us. The present menace, whose complexities and ramifications I know so well and could outline to you did time permit, cannot be defeated in that manner. It will take the aroused and combined citizenry of this country to preserve these United States; no other means will succeed. The battle has only begun though there are those who—substituting emotions for logic—fondly imagine that peace is just around the corner.

I wonder betimes if the United States Senate would have ratified the Charter of United Nations had it comprehended all that lay ahead? I wonder if either that Senate or you or I then realized that, under article 6 of the United States Constitution, such ratification actually vitiated that Constitution whenever and wherever the dictates of UN might conflict therewith, and made that Charter, with its complex, tricky, and unexplored provisions, the supreme determinator of our destiny? So, herein again, we see that our main fear, our chief menace, resides within ourselves, not in Moscow or in any schemes or projects sponsored by the Kremlin.

A United States peopled by real Americans, firmly resolved to remain Americans, can withstand and repel any attack upon it by any foreign power or ideology. But a United States, divided against itself, and betrayed by Judases or misled by crackpots, is an easy prey for the Communists, and they know it full well. Such is the challenge you and I face today. If we get out and work amongst our own citizens, we need not fear the outcome, as the successive rescindings of the world government resolutions by 13 States and their nonadoption in 6 others clearly demonstrates. But, as surely as tomorrow will follow tonight, another threat—another Trojan Horse—will appear upon the scene, and we must destroy each in its turn.

No war was ever won by purely defensive tactics. We must wage a constructive and aggressive campaign of action if we are to preserve this Nation; and the place to wage that warfare is right at home, not in Korea, or Europe, or Lake Success, but in our homes, our schools, our churches, our civic, patriotic, fraternal, and social organizations, and in our political thinking, voting, and acting.

If all patriots will do this, we shall win and the United States will survive. If we be not willing to do this, then let us, who are about to be enslaved by Moscow, join in a final salute to George Washington, and then set about preparing for our mutual doom.

"We Thrill When We See a Jet Interceptor Fighter Thunder Through the Skies—It Was Probably on the Drawing Boards 5 Years Before It Was Produced, and Its Engine Perhaps Not Even a Reality When the Plane Was Envisioned"—Eugene M. Zuckert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, the United States Chamber of Commerce closed its thirty-ninth annual meeting in Washington last week, and my own busy week was made both busier and happier due to the presence in Washington, D. C., of Mr. John Ward, executive vice president of the Alabama State chamber of commerce, as well as other Alabamians, here in attendance at that convention.

One of the principal speakers on the Chamber's program last evening was the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the United States Air Force. In his address of last night, Mr. Zuckert was altogether in character. His talk was interestingly larded with cold financial and statistical facts given with respect to the military cost as well as problems. He pointed out that current developments were, as he said, "made necessary by the world-wide objectives of imperialistic communism and the maturity and ever-growing capability of air power."

Mr. Zuckert not alone evaluated all aspects of a 48-group Air Force as compared to the 95-group—now in the making—but he told of the problems surrounding the training of the increased personnel necessary to the operation of a 95-group Air Force which can only be accomplished by raising the present strength of 411,000 men to a force of nearly 1,060,000 men and fully training them in the use and care of the new and increasingly complicated aeronautical equipment.

Continuing, Mr. Zuckert stated:

We all get a thrill when we see a jet interceptor fighter thunder out of the sky and yet, quite naturally but few know all the miracles that were required to put it there. It was probably on the drawing boards 5 years before the first of its kind was produced—the engine which powers it was possibly not even a reality when the plane was first envisioned—the radar which would permit it to direct its fire to knock down an unseen enemy aircraft was still little more than a dream when the plane began to figure in our planning ahead.

And, in conclusion, Mr. Zuckert said:

Obviously, a significant financial inroad is made because a modern fighting force coupled with American standards of living for our fighting men is a fearfully costly procedure—this is the price we must pay in order to fulfill the basic objectives of our military forces in peace. Further, if war comes in spite of our efforts, we must be strong enough to win the victory.

Mr. Speaker, whenever Eugene Zuckert speaks, every Member of this House can well afford to listen. It was of this distinguished young Assistant Secretary of the Air Force that the Honorable Leo E. Allen, himself a top-flight policy-making Republican Member of this House and ranking member of the Rules Committee, was speaking when he said:

There might be other men in public life who elected to undergo such training and follow such a career as did Eugene M. Zuckert. There is none, however, who has made greater sacrifice of his personal time and fortune in order to translate his learning into action programs that looked to the eventual introduction into Government of the same high standards of business administration that characterize our multibillion-dollar corporations.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the timeliness of this talk by the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert before the United States Chamber of Commerce, and because of its tremendous interest to the Members who sit on both sides of the aisle in this Congress, that under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein the speech which Mr. Zuckert made on May 1 before the United States Chamber of Commerce.

That talk was as follows:

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, BEFORE THE ORGANIZATION NIGHT DINNER OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1951

I have been with the Air Force 5 years and in that time have learned the effectiveness of the local chamber of commerce organizations in reflecting local opinion and, in many instances, serving as the focal point for the direction of community thinking.

For a long time, I was responsible for the Air Force policy on our airfields and other installations. In 1946 and 1947, we were closing bases, and that is difficult to explain to the communities affected. More recently we have been opening bases as part of our expansion program. In an effort to make sure that we have had community backing and that we would get the best for our people in terms of housing conditions, recreation, etc., we have tried to make sure that we were really wanted by the local community. In this effort, the local and regional chamber organizations have played a helpful role. Even when we were closing bases—taking out an industry whose annual payroll was several million a year, these organizations were helpful in explaining the necessities of our situation to the community.

I am indeed impressed with the program which has been developed for your meeting. I am impressed with not only its range and quality, but also the aural stamina it implies.

It seems to me that the most important thing that can be said about our present military job is to realize the complexity of the task that we have undertaken, and some of the significant consequences of the fact that we have started this job and the fact that it is so complex.

Naturally, we cannot regard our military endeavor as some phenomenon isolated from other phases of our national life.

Our military task today is made necessary by the world-wide objectives of imperialistic communism and the maturity and ever-growing capability of air power. The capability of Russian air power is readily apparent from our Korean experience, and, although it is difficult, I know, to think of Russia as having the technical "know how" to match a country such as ours, in the air alone from our observation of the performance of their jet aircraft, for example, we know that they have devised and produced jet engines which are the equal in performance of any of those produced in this country today.

With that cold fact apparent to us, we cannot afford to hope that they may not have been equally as successful in many other lines of modern warfare. Our military program is our response to the disappearance of geographical security. It is one of the measures that we must take—and look forward to continuing—into an indefinite future.

I wonder whether there is real appreciation of the complexity of building the modern military machine that we believe is a minimum requirement for our protection. Let's, for my benefit, limit our consideration to the Air Force alone. Stated even in bare statistical terms, the size of the job is impressive.

On June 30 of last year we had 48 combat groups and aircraft production insufficient to continue them as modern. We had 411,000 people in uniform and the base structure to support them. Within approximately 2 years from that date, we are expected to raise those groups from 48 to 95, substantially increase our degree of combat readiness, raise our military personnel figure to about 1,060,000 and not only have on our payroll that number of people, but train them on new and increasingly complicated equipment.

As I said, even stated in bare statistical terms—48 groups to 95, 411,000 people to nearly 1,060,000—the job sounds impressive. Actually the job calls for a series of miraculous accomplishments of scientific research, American production genius, and an intricate job of coordination by our military that unites into an effective fighting machinery a vast complex of equipment and trained people and to do this through an organization that has a character and personality which breeds the morale without which the most modern equipment and training would be so much irrelevant effort.

We all get a thrill when we see a jet interceptor fighter thunder through the sky and yet, quite naturally, we forget all the miracles that were required to put it there. It was probably on the drawing boards 5 years before the first of its kind was produced. The engine which powers it was not even a reality when the plane was first envisioned. The radar which would permit it to direct our fire to knock down unseen enemy aircraft was still little more than a dream when the plane began to figure in our planning ahead.

The miracles of production are impressive enough—power plant manufactured perhaps in Massachusetts, some of the radar in Maryland, some of the amazing number of delicate instruments in Michigan, parts of the airframe all over the west coast, all brought together by the manufacturer in California.

Even then the plane would be a useless marvel without a structure of training—pilots to fly it, mechanics for its engines, its radar, and its guns. Some of the training periods take as long as 2 years.

All this is why I say that our modern plane in the air seems to demand a combination of miracles of achievement. Multiply this by the thousands of planes we require for our strategic right arm and our air defense and the full measure of our task—just the Air Force task—begins to achieve its true proportions. And we are just one member of the team.

What does all this mean? Obviously, a significant financial inroad because a modern fighting force coupled with American standards of living for our fighting men is costly.

The true measure of this financial inroad was brought home to us yesterday when the President sent over his budget message to the Congress. This represents a program of approximately $60,000,000,000 for the three services, and it is significant that just under 25 percent of this will be spent for the production of new aircraft. You don't have to do anything more but state these figures and comprehend their relationship to the national economy to realize the seriousness of the world situation today. This is the price we must pay in order to fulfill the basic objective of our military forces—peace. Further, if war comes in spite of our efforts, we must be strong enough to win the victory.

Obviously, also, an endless series of personal sacrifices will be required in order to man the size of establishment we must have, and the reserves to meet the demands of war should it come. We will have to mnintain a large force in being at all times because, otherwise, the machinery could not be effectively operated when the need arose.

There are many more consequences of our program for military security but one above all seems to me to stand out. And that is the need for perseverance in our intentions to see this thing through on a sustained basis. I barely sketched the complexity of our military machine, but even from that, it is apparent why we can't turn on and off our support for it like a faucet. The time involved in getting modern equipment and training makes it imperative for our safety that sustained military strength be a part of our national life.

This will become increasingly difficult as the costs become reflected in taxes and inroads into our civilian economy. It will become more difficult if we run into quiet waters in world affairs when the need for a strong right arm becomes less apparent. Sustained support of that right arm is a price demanded by the narrowed world in which we live. If we meet this demand with sustained courage, our allies will be immeasurably strengthened; the plans of those who are counting on us to fail will be shaken. Only with this calm, persevering faith and stern course of action can we hope to realize that dream we all have—peace and a free world.

More About Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial reflects a point of view of the city consumer which farm people and their representatives should know about. City consumers feel keenly the pressure of the present food price situation. I believe that they are very anxious to cooperate in finding a solution, but to stand pat is not cooperation in this instance. The editorial, previously mentioned, is from the New York Herald Tribune of May 9, 1951:

THE FARM BLOC'S OFFER

Anyone who had to do the family's shopping for meat during OPA days must be tempted to think that the farm bloc may be right in asserting that price controls on meat will lead to black marketing. There may even be a temptation to suppose that it is able to offer some alternative anti-inflationary program of its own, a program that would assure the town and city consumer of something better than the pressure of controls or the inequities of secret dealing. For how, the reasonable man must ask, can farm pressure groups so righteously and categorically demand that they alone be exempted from price controls unless they can prove that in their unique case price controls would violate the national interest? The kindest answer that can be made to that question thus far is that if the farm bloc has an alternative program to restrain farm price rises, they have not disclosed it.

What has the farm bloc offered? Free us of price controls, they say, let farm prices rise still more, and we shall give you more meat and other food products. Cancel the ordered rollbacks in beef, they say, and beef will be plentiful. But, we may ask, how high do farm prices have to go before food output catches up with demand? How much higher than 152 percent of parity do beef prices have to go before we get more beef? To these questions the farm bloc gives no answer.

What will happen if we do not accept this bland offer of higher prices? Use price ceilings, they say, and your food supplies will be held back. Do they mean that individual livestock producers will not see profit in making individual sales at prices at least 25 percent above the so-called fair parity price, or do they mean that all elements in the farm-products industry will concert their action in tight coalition to withhold supplies? Retain your regulations on slaughtering, they say, and farmers will kill their cattle behind a tree. Is this a threat of wholesale law violation? If it is not a flagrant challenge to stabilization officials who would attempt to enforce control laws on farming as they are bound to enforce them on industry and labor, what is it? The charitable answer is that it just reflects pessimism about the efficacy of economic controls. But the proper response to pessimism is not a throwing up of hands. It is an exercise of will and ingenuity. Mr. Michael V. DiSalle has tried to meet this test with his slaughtering regulations, rollback orders, and ceilings. Let the farm bloc meet the test, if they can, by devising some practicable alternative. Let us have some better offer than uncertain production and guaranteed price boosts.

Our Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, last year at the annual encampment of the United Spanish-American War Veterans, held at Atlantic City, N. J., the department commander of Iowa, Hon. Lloyd Thurston, was appointed to draft resolutions concerning the domestic and foreign policies of our Government. Mr. Thurston, who formerly represented the congressional district in Iowa which I now have the honor to serve, is an especially able department commander, and he prepared the resolutions that I wish to include in the RECORD, and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the resolutions that were adopted by the encampment by an almost unanimous vote. It is thought that these resolutions will prove of particular interest at this time.

Mr. Thurston served as a volunteer in the Spanish War, Philippine Insurrection, and World War I. He served as a distinguished Member of the House of

Representatives for 14 years and was successively a member of the Rules, Appropriations, and Ways and Means Committees.

The resolutions follow:

OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Whereas innumerable persons employed by the Federal Government have been found to be disloyal, some having been guilty of furnishing confidential information concerning the atomic bomb and highly important defense plans to foreign agents; and

Whereas official sources have indicated that there are many thousands of persons, members of communistic or other subversive groups, all to the impairment of the security and defense of our Nation; and

Whereas loyal citizens are greatly concerned about the existence of such disloyal groups and their apparent increasing numbers: Therefore, the following resolutions are adopted for the purpose of emphasizing the importance of this danger to our Nation:

(a) It is with a high degree of satisfaction that this organization commends the recent action of the Congress in laying the foundation to register and segregate Communists and persons who have been shown to be disloyal to our Government. All real Americans applaud the action of these public officials who have placed patriotism above left-wing support;

(b) Likewise, the Un-American Activities Committee in the House of Representatives pioneered in ferreting out traitors and subversives, and, although the executive branch used its great power and patronage time and again to destroy this investigating group, the highest degree of true Americanism is awarded to this fearless group;

(c) Loyalty oaths have been altered by many high officials in the different departments at Washington. Such persons should be dismissed from service. If the appointing power fails to act, the House of Representatives should give attention to this dereliction of duty;

(d) It is with a deep sense of pride that we endorse the courageous attitude of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and American Veterans of World War II in their demand to have the Acheson-Hiss group removed from control of the Department of State. The betrayal at Yalta was and is a scourge to civilization. Giving control to the Russians of all the land around Berlin is another evidence of the perfidy or incompetence of those in charge of this branch of our Government;

(e) Impractical dreamers and radicals have reached such a position of power and influence in Washington that two members of the United States Supreme Court take the stand in behalf of persons who would aid our enemies, thereby disqualifying themselves to sit on appeal of that criminal case which involved disloyalty to our Government, a precedent which may have far-reaching implications and consequences in the many cases of this nature which will likely be presented to this high Court. We assert that the Congress and the American Bar Association should take appropriate action in matters of this character;

(f) The American people were amazed when they learned that the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces asserted that the United States Marine Corps had a propaganda machine almost equal to that of Josef Stalin, probably the most despicable person in current world affairs. We hold that it is a prime duty of everyone having official connection with our Armed Forces to build up the morale and esprit de corps rather than to bring discord and disunity to those who have and who are now serving with distinction and pride to all loyal Americans. In contrast, no marine has ever used the phrase, "Dear old Uncle Joe."

SALUTE TO GENERAL MACARTHUR

Whereas the sudden and unprovoked attack upon South Korea, where our Government only had a small force with light equipment to meet 10 times their number supported by heavy tanks, it was evident that our troops would be obliged to retire until reinforcements could be brought from over the seas; and

Whereas the limited forces of this small army were so skillfully deployed, shifted from sector to sector, to hold back the hordes pouring in from three directions, so that finally the flood was stayed although only a small beachhead remained to prevent another Dunkerque: Therefore be it

Resolved by the national encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans in convention assembled at Atlantic City, N. J., September 24 to 28, 1950, That they salute that master of military strategy, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and the gallant foot and air soldiers, the marines and sailors, who under such adverse conditions finally reestablished their lines, and then in true American military precision marched forward, and by their determination, their courage and valor, fully and completely upheld the finest traditions of the American soldier and sailor. Thus again the Republic of the United States and the free nations of the world have been reassured that American genius, civilian and military, when joined and coordinated, can be depended upon to prevent world slavery.

Personal Combat on Korean Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter to the editor, printed in the Indianapolis Star on Saturday, May 5, 1951. This letter, it seems to me, uses the age-old method of telling a story effectively by parable, and points up the present discussion of the U. N. and the United States lack of policy in Korea:

PERSONAL COMBAT ON KOREAN PLAN

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

A few days ago Lum Lynne, a neighbor of mine, a big, flabby, awkward, overbearing scoundrel, made an unexpected and unprovoked attack on me. While he was slugging me furiously and rather effectively with both fists, I was doing very well with one hand—my right hand—behind my back. Once in a while I was even able to gain some ground, although I lost as often as I gained.

Finally Arthur, a meddlesome, insubordinate member of my household, shouted from the window, "Use both hands, Sam. If you do you'll win, and the fight will soon be over."

"Hold your tongue," I shot back. "I'm doing this. If I use both hands he'll get mad and we're liable to get into a fight." "You're already in a fight," shouted the voice from the window.

"Mind your own business," I retorted, "Can't you see it's only a half fight? That's the way I want to keep it. If I use both fists we're liable to get into a whole fight, an all-out fight, and somebody might get hurt. Besides, I don't need any of your advice."

RUSSELL E. TUCKER.

TERRE HAUTE.

P. S.—I did finally use both fists, and I won, but that wasn't in any way a concession to Arthur's advice or point of view, as I was already considering using this plan before he butted in with his asinine suggestion.

Let's Look at Their Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, a Pacific coast weekly, the Argonaut, published at San Francisco, in its April 20, 1951, issue made an interesting and appropriate presentation of the records of President Truman and General MacArthur, as follows:

LET'S LOOK AT THEIR RECORDS

(To avoid rash judgments born of hysteria, it is best to look at the records of the Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces and of the subordinate whom he fired. Conclusions reached after such a search are basically sound. With this in mind, we briefly review the careers of Harry S. Truman and Douglas MacArthur, setting their histories side by side so that they can be compared and weighed fairly.)

PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Born April 8, 1884, Lamar, Mo.

Attended public schools in Independence, Mo. Worked for Kansas City Star, 1901; was a railroad timekeeper and bank clerk to 1905.

Rejected by West Point Military Academy for poor eyesight.

Worked on his father's farm from 1906 to 1917.

Entered field artillery school at Fort Sill, Okla., 1917; became a captain of Thirty-fifth Division, AEF, in World War I; discharged a major in 1919 and is now a colonel in the Field Artilley Reserve.

He went into the haberdashery business in Independence after the war. Failed.

He became judge of Jackson County court with the support of Boss Tom Pendergast; attended Kansas City School of Law, 1923–25 (then 39). Did not graduate.

Although still supported by Tom Pendergast machine, was defeated for reelection as judge.

Through the support of the notorious Pendergast machine, was elected United States Senator November 6, 1934; and through support of same Boss Pendergast, was reelected November 5, 1940. Was little heard of except during brief term as chairman of an investigating committee of war expenditures.

In 1944 he ran for Vice President with Franklin D. Roosevelt, being a substitute for Henry Wallace, and only after his name was screened by Sidney Hillman, labor leader.

As Vice President, flew to Kansas City to attend the funeral of Boss Tom Pendergast, ex-convict, in United States Army bomber, saying at the time, "He was my friend, and I stick by my friends."

Became President on the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, April 12, 1945, and, among first official acts, attended meeting at Potsdam, where he charmed Joseph Stalin with his piano playing. On his return he was quoted as saying, "I like good old Joe (Stalin)."

February 1946, nominated Edwin Pauley, California oil man, for Under Secretary of Navy in part payment of a political debt, but nomination was defeated.

August 5, 1948, Truman denounced congressional investigation into Soviet spy ring as a "red herring," renewing his charge even after startling revelations of Whittaker Chambers of "pumpkin patch" files and Alger Hiss' treachery.

Reelected in November 1948, he nominated Dean Acheson in January 1949, a known appeaser of communism and friend of Alger Hiss, to succeed Gen. George C. Marshall as Secretary of State. Then appointed Louis A. Johnson as head of joint Armed Forces, who proceeded to scuttle plans for bigger Navy. But Truman's choice of Senator Mon Wallgren (a discredited, defeated Governor of Washington) as head of National Security Resources Board was rejected by the Senate.

May 9, 1949, remarked "There are too many Byrds" in Congress.

August 11, 1949, Albert Gross testified at Senate 5-percenter hearings that he had sent deep freeze to Truman's Independence home.

Called a Washington correspondent an s. o. b. for his revelations about his aide's (Gen. Harry Vaughan) dealings with 5-percenters.

Threatened to "punch a half dozen newspapermen in the nose" after his retirement.

Sent note to music critic threatening to kick him in a tender and unprintable spot for his criticism of Truman's daughter's singing.

Called Senator FULBRIGHT's investigation of RFC loans "asinine."

Fired his subordinate, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, because he "failed to support the Government's [foreign] policy," which is a deep mystery to allies and foe alike.

GEN. DOUGLAS MAC ARTHUR

This is the man Commander in Chief Truman fired.

Born January 26, 1880, Arkansas. His father was Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur.

Entering West Point Military Academy, he graduated with highest honors in the school for 50 years in 1903, and since has received honorary degrees from the University of Maryland, University of Pittsburgh, University of Philippines, University of Wisconsin, Harvard, Seoul University of Korea, University of Hawaii, Columbia University, and University of Queensland (Australia) among others.

Starting as a second lieutenant in 1903, he climbed rapidly to the rank of brigadier general in June 1918, and to that of full general on November 21, 1930. In World War I he commanded the famous Rainbow Division (Forty-second).

During First World War he participated in the battles of Luneville, Baccarat, Champagne, Marne, Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, Essey, Meuse-Argonne, and Sedan. He was twice wounded in action in 1918, and was with the army of occupation in Germany from 1918 to 1919.

Returning to the United States, he was made Superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point.

Two years later he was sent to the Philippines.

He became Chief of Staff of the United States Army in 1930, remaining until 1935, when he became military adviser to the Commonwealth Government of the Philippines.

Retiring from active duty on December 31, 1937, he was brought back into service on July 26, 1941, when he was named commander of Armed Forces in the Far East with the rank of general.

Before Bataan fell, he was ordered to Australia, and managed to sneak through the net of Japanese warships to that country in a PT boat. It was upon landing in Australia that he made his famous promise "I will return" to the Philippines, something he subsequently did in a brilliant series of maneuvers which included island hopping.

In 1942, he was made supreme commander of all air, land, and sea forces of the Allies in the far Pacific.

As supreme Allied commander, he accepted the Japanese surrender on the battleship *Missouri* in August 1945, and he has remained in Japan as its administrator since that time.

Among the many honors he has received are the DSC (with two oak leaf clusters), DSM (three oak leaf clusters), Purple Heart, Silver Star, Navy Distinguished Service Medal, Bronze Star, Air Medal, Grand Officer of the Legion of Honor, Croix de Guerre with four palms, Legion of Honor, Commander Order of the Crown (Belgium); War Cross (Italy); Grand Cross Order of the White Lion (Czechoslovakia); Grand Cross Military Merit (Mexico); Distinguished Service Star (Philippines), and a host of other honors, enough, in fact, to fill this page.

As supreme commander of the Allied Powers in Japan, General MacArthur has hung up an amazing record. About the people, he said: "Of the Japanese people, I can pay no higher tribute than to repeat that they have fully and faithfully fulfilled their surrender commitments and have well earned the freedom and dignity and opportunity which alone can come with a restoration of a formal peace."

If the Japanese people have made this extraordinary progress, it is because of the sympathy and understanding and efficient administration of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Little wonder that they shed tears upon hearing the tragic news of his dismissal.

Can Our Republic Live on a Doctrine of False Information?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Evening Star of May 9, 1951. The doctrine enunciated by Secretary of Defense Marshall in the first paragraph of the article, if it be true, is Russian policy and philosophy, not that of a representative republic such as our forebears established:

AS WAR OF ATTRITION DRAGS ON—MARSHALL ENUNCIATES DOCTRINE THAT THE MILITARY MUST BE LOYAL TO DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION

(By David Lawrence)

Secretary of Defense George Marshall has enunciated in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee the astounding doctrine that the minority party in Congress is not entitled to full and truthful answers from officers in the armed services and that, in answering letters of inquiry, officers must be guided by their first loyalty to the Democratic administration, which he calls the "constituted authority."

Under such circumstances, it seems improbable that any testimony from the Joint Chiefs of Staff or any other military officers hereafter could contain a single word of information which could possibly reflect on the Democratic administration.

Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, Republican, endeavored to pin Secretary Marshall down to whether an officer's first loyalty is to his country or to the administration in power, and the Secretary insisted that the only way an officer could express himself when he felt the interests of his country were at stake was to resign from the military service. A man must sacrifice his career if he wants to tell his views to Members of Congress. This will not be good news to men in the fighting services who thought that party politics was not to be considered in relations with their Government—and who had been taught to consider Congress a civilian branch of the Government, coordinate with the executive branch.

More significant, however, in Mr. Marshall's testimony was his revelation of what critics in Congress already are saying is the administration's appeasement plan in the Far East. The Secretary stated that the unification of North and South Korea has been set up as a political rather than a military objective of the U. N.

The same phrasing was used by Secretary of State Acheson in a speech a few days ago to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and, by instruction of the State Department, the same wording also was uttered recently in an address by Warren Austin, American Ambassador to the U. N.

It means that while the United States Government will continue to oppose recognition of Red China and also the turning over of Formosa to Red China, the other members of the U. N. will have to decide the issue. The United States Government, through Secretary Acheson, has already made it clear that no veto power will be used and that America will abide by what the majority of other members of the United Nations wish to do. If they want to reward the aggressor and ease the sacrifices of American troops in Korea, the United States will accept the appeasement.

This means that the 38th parallel may again be the boundary between North and South Korea and that the U. N. will try by diplomacy to get unification but that, if Russia and China refuse to accept it, then, assuming a cease fire has occurred, the fighting will not be resumed. This is because the U. N. feels it is not committed to accomplish the objectives in Korea by military means.

The Marshall testimony has produced a wave of questioning and criticism in the Senate committee. He will be on the stand for several days. He has not yet satisfactorily explained how the administration intends to end the war in Korea or why it now sets up the bogey of Russian intervention in the war when it had no such fear last June at the time the orders went to General MacArthur to land forces in Korea.

President Truman, on the other hand, has, through his latest speech, notified Russia that America is so afraid of having its cities bombed that it will not take maximum steps to stop the aggression in the Far East. Mr. Truman says that, if the United States were to widen the conflict in Asia, "we might well have to go it alone."

Yet that's what has been happening, in effect, since last June. The United States alone—outside of the South Koreans—has been supplying virtually all the troops. The U. N. has refused to send reinforcements. The principal U. N. members have only token representation on the firing line. Instead of winning allies, America has, as a practical matter, been deserted already by its allies with respect to Korea.

The President's speech might be construed to mean that he has lost faith in the willingness of our allies to support our troops in the Far East. As a consequence, the question of withdrawing American troops from Korea is bound to be raised. For, as one Senator said, it doesn't help to point out how many Red Chinese are being killed—what's important is how many American boys are being killed and wounded while the so-called war of attrition drags on.

Pay of Postal Employees

REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the problem that is confronting the postal employees today. Since the start of the war in Korea on June 25, 1950, the cost of living has increased by some 14 points. This has created a very serious situation for employees on a fixed salary basis. Price Stabilization Director Michael DiSalle has pointed out that the cost of living will probably increase another five or six points before it is finally checked. The wholesale price index has increased 17.2 since the Korean war started. This is a very reliable index as to what will happen to the general price index.

Congressman GEORGE MILLER, of California, has introduced H. R. 244, and a number of our other colleagues in the House have introduced similar bills. I hope that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will start hearings on these bills in the immediate future, and that we will be given an opportunity to take action on them without delay.

The mail I am receiving from my district from postal employees points up the harsh fact that their pay checks no longer cover the necessary living costs. This situation is particularly acute for employees in the lower salary grades. When Public Law 134 was passed in 1945, the five pay grades then in existence were increased to 11. While the employees then in the postal service were given a $400 increase, the entrance salary for those who entered after the effective date of that act remained at $1,700. Due to the many increases in the cost of living since that time, we have passed several other pay bills. The group of employees in the lower pay grades, however remain far behind in their struggle to maintain an adequate standard of living.

As my postal friends know, I have been working for some time to abolish inequities, particularly in the lower salary bracket, by eliminating the first four grades. We were able to get some of the objectives of my bill, H. R. 138, of the Eighty-first Congress, incorporated into Public Law 428, which eliminated the first two grades and allowed a much needed increase in salaries. This does not go far enough to solve the problem.

When Public Law 134 was passed, it was assumed that the recruiting of personnel in the postal service would come largely from youngsters just out of high school. Since World War II, the vast majority of employees entering the postal service have been veterans of World War II. They are men with family obligations. They cannot cope with present prices on the salaries they are now receiving. We must recognize the fact that employees with a fixed salary have suffered greatly. The postal employees are loyal citizens and efficient public servants.

I do hope that we will have an early opportunity to vote on this much needed upward adjustment in salaries for postal employees, particularly for those in the lower grades.

Salary of General Motors President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 26, 1951:

GENERAL MOTORS PRESIDENT IS PAID $626,300 IN 1950, RAISE OF $40,200—WILSON'S REMUNERATION TOPS 62 DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS OF BIGGEST UNITED STATES AUTO CONCERN, PROXY STATEMENT TO STOCKHOLDERS SHOWS

Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corp., earned a total of $626,300 in salary, director's fees and bonus last year from the Nation's largest automotive company. This was $40,200 more than his compensation in 1949.

Mr. Wilson's compensation topped the remuneration list of sixty-two directors and officers of General Motors, which was shown in the proxy statement for the company's annual meeting mailed yesterday to more than 450,000 stockholders. The meeting will be held on May 25 in Wilmington, Del.

The aggregate salary, fees and bonus for the group of directors and officers last year was $11,748,172. This compares with $11,154,454 in 1949, when the group numbered sixty-one.

The 1950 remuneration for Mr. Wilson consisted of $201,300 salary and fees; 1,358 shares of the corporation's common stock at an award value of $45.07 a share, for a total of $61,205, and a cash bonus of $363,795. The bonus of the shares and cash is payable in five equal annual installments.

The remuneration last year for the 62 directors and officers, including Mr. Wilson, amounted to $3,643,672 in salaries and fees; 33,995 shares of common stock at an award value totaling $1,532,155 and $6,572,345 in cash bonuses. Their bonus awards also will be paid over a 5-year period.

According to the proxy statement, the first installment of the 1950 bonus awards was delivered on February 23, 1951, when the closing market price of the common stock on the New York Stock Exchange was $50 a share. The remaining four installments will be paid in the next four Januarys.

The salaries paid by General Motors to its 12 top directors last year ranged from $36,100 for Charles F. Kettering to the $201,300 paid to Mr. Wilson. The Internal Revenue Bureau requires payment of $17,060 in taxes on a net income of $36,100 and approximately $157,000 on an income of $201,300 for a single person with no dependents.

Other top-paid directors, their salaries and bonus awards, are:

Albert Bradley, $161,425 salary and $360,000 bonus; Francis Burke, $101,100 salary and $100,000 bonus; Marvin E. Coyle and Harlowe H. Curtice, each $151,000 salary and $375,000 bonus; Frederic G. Donner, $121,070 salary and $320,000 bonus; Ronald K. Evans, $126,825 and $320,000; Louis C. Goad, $121,000 and $320,000; Edward R. Godfrey, $101,300 and $245,000; John J. Schumann, Jr., $91,200 and $180,000; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., $48,600. Mr. Sloan and Mr. Kettering get no bonus.

The proxy statement showed that a proposal will be submitted at the annual meeting to limit salaries and bonuses of each of the corporation's top executives to a total of not more than $200,000 a year. This proposal will be offered by three shareholders owning a total of 162 shares.

In recommending to the stockholders that they defeat this proposal, the General Motors board of directors said that good management is hard to find, and that able executives are entitled to sufficient recompense to offset higher Federal income taxes.

Another proposal to be submitted is that the place of the meeting be rotated among Wilmington, New York City, and Detroit. The board also indicated opposition to this proposal.

A Life Devoted to the Service of Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Durham (N. C.) Morning Herald of May 5, 1951:

A LIFE DEVOTED TO THE SERVICE OF OTHERS

Perhaps one of the hardest things a human being can do is to maintain over a long period of time a record of unselfish service to others. The light of the ideal is difficult to follow. But some do follow it, undeviatingly and gloriously to the rich benefit of those they serve.

Such a person is Dr. Mary Sloop, of Crossnore, Avery County, whose selection as American Mother of 1951 was announced in the papers Wednesday. For 40 years, now, she and her husband have devoted their lives to what was when they went to it an underprivileged area. She and her husband have brought healing in their medical practice to people who live in a remote area. They have lighted the lamp of learning in the now widely known Crossnore School. They have led in bringing about economic improvement, in finding vocational opportunities suited to the community, and in reforming farming practices.

Choice as American Mother of 1951 is deserved recognition of a devoted woman—devoted to the people for whom she has labored these four decades. Mrs. Sloop has a daughter, a physician who practices at Crossnore, and a son who maintains a dental clinic for the needy in Avery County. In her own life, and in the inspiration she has given others, may be found the qualities which make her indeed a mother to all that region.

One of the secrets of Dr. Sloop's success is revealed in her reaction to the news of this recognition. She is unconcerned about credit for herself—she finds others to whom she gives it for the achievements at Crossnore. In that unselfishness is the basis for cooperation which makes communities and nations great. An unselfish leader is the greatest of community and national assets. Dr. Mary Sloop is such a leader.

Don't Let It Fool You, Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very fine and timely editorial, Don't Let It Fool You, Joe, from the Decatur Daily of May 6, 1951:

DON'T LET IT FOOL YOU, JOE

There are certainly two distinct classes of thought in the United States when it comes to the war in Korea. There are those who believe we are following the wise course in heading off the Communists in Korea. There are those who believe with equal sincerity that we have no purpose in Korea, that that ill-fated country is no place to stop the Communists. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

There are those who believe taxes should be raised so that preparedness can be paid for as we go. There are others who, with equal sincerity, think taxes are high enough and that more should not be piled upon the people regardless of the purpose. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

When it comes to Federal spending, there are great numbers who think the Federal Government could do a much better job of cutting down on expenses. There are those who are in favor of reducing Federal spending so long as it doesn't hit home. they would like to see the reduction made but prefer the reduction to be made in some other part of the country. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

Then this is the day in which everybody is a fair catch when it comes to investigations, anything from big time crime to the fellow who is "probed" to see if he paid the just amount of income tax. Many are in favor of investigations, so long as the investigations are made in the other fellow's safety deposit box. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

What a mighty debate you can get up over aid to Europe, or Asia, or anywhere else outside the country. Some folks have the idea that so long as aid is going in any direction overseas that the folks over there will sit around and wait for Uncle Sam to show up with a hand-out. Then there is the other side of the debating society, showing with equal clarity that the recovery of Europe is absolutely essential to American well-being. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

Louder than the MacArthur ruckus is the great debate about prices and wages. Every pot is calling the kettle black. It's like the old story, which came first, the chicken or the egg. Everybody is quite certain that his theory for controling inflation is correct, that wages went up first and caused the spiral. And there's the other crowd, certain that prices went up first and caused the tightening of the pocketbook. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

Republicans, Democrats, Dixiecrats, the din of debate is terrific, the front pages are loaded every day, for in this country, Joe, everybody has the privilege of shooting off his mouth. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

You see, you head a mysterious crowd of 200,000,000 more or less intelligent people. At least you have been credited with being a mysterious set, but you'll find, if you'll look hard enough, that you're dealing with a mysterious set. That is, mysterious to you and your way of doing things, Joe.

You should be a politician over here in this country for about a year, or a newspaper editor for a while, or a public servant in any capacity. You would find out just how mysterious are the ways of the American people. But until then, Joe, don't let it fool you.

For the American people enjoy fighting among themselves, they have been doing it a mighty long time for that is the democratic way of getting one thing settled in time to start on another. And when they start on you, Joe, they'll settle you, too. So don't let it fool you, Joe.

You may catch them unprepared in the sense that your ignorant millions are prepared, but Joe, the American people have been prepared ever since this Nation was founded. Their love of freedom prepares them to hold you off, and all your millions, and though they may not have as many guns as you have when the thing starts, they'll have more than you have when it ends and they'll beat your brains out because they love freedom and the right to investigate and debate and disagree with each other.

And if you ever take a punch at them, you'll find out that they have forgotten all about debating and investigating and whether the President is a Republican or a Democrat and whether he plays a piano or a bass horn, and that they have one purpose and for that purpose they will give their sons and daughters and all they possess, just to beat your brains out.

So, Joe Stalin, before it is too late, don't let it fool you, for if you do you and your people will regret it to the end of time, all time.

William H. Fitzpatrick Wins Pulitzer Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Pulitzer prize is the highest award in journalism. It is particularly significant when it is awarded for editorial writing, because it is in this field where the journalist expresses the highest art of his calling and where the fourth estate interprets and analyzes events and happenings in the light of our republican institutions.

Louisiana was signally honored several days ago when Mr. William H. Fitzpatrick, the editor of the New Orleans States, was named as recipient of the Pulitzer prize of 1950 for editorial writing. Mr. Fitzpatrick was so honored because of a comprehensive series of editorials which he wrote on the so-called genocide convention.

In this series which among other things was incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the editor of the States pointed out the far-reaching effect of such a convention upon our own great Bill of Rights and upon our domestic laws, as well as the division of power between our States and the Federal Government.

This series succinctly analyzes the effect of the proposed covenant and indicates that the editor had spent many hours on research and study; and, while Mr. Fitzpatrick is not a lawyer, he handled the subject with the clarity and the comprehension of one well versed in our constitutional processes.

Mr. Fitzpatrick thus takes his place with a long line of distinguished American writers.

I personally am very proud that he has received this award. Mr. Fitzpatrick is a young man. It was my privilege to attend Tulane University with him, and I am certain that all of his friends are not only proud of the award which has come to him but are equally gratified at the great service that he and the States have performed for our country.

Before I learned of his award, I was reading in the Times-Picayune for Sunday, May 6, his column entitled, "Rights and Lefts," in which he told about the visit to New Orleans of last week of Sir Oliver Franks, the British Ambassador. I was much impressed with his column and had intended to incorporate it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD then. I am doubly pleased to do it now, as one will understand upon reading it his clarity of writing, as well as his forcefulness of expression:

STATES RIGHTS AND LEFTS
(By W. H. Fitzpatrick)

Sir Oliver Franks, the tall, gentle, shy, friendly intellectual who is British Ambassador to the United States, last week put Britain's foreign policy—long range and short—in one clear sentence.

His speeches here in New Orleans were the most important and timely pronouncements any ambassador has made in relation to present-day world events.

And in one of them came this capsule definition of why Britain has suggested the return of Formosa to China and the admission of Red China to the UN:

"Britain recognized Red China because of a fact and not a value."

That, I believe, is the measure of all foreign policy in Britain; it has been the measure for centuries.

Values, moral, philosophical, ethical, must be considered, of course; but facts, the facts as they are and not as they ought to be, are the final decisive factor in the foreign policy of an important ally and friend.

It is necessary, the ambassador believes, that we differentiate between what he called the small sector of disagreement with Great Britain in the whole area of agreement, and in large measure it is talks here were a plea for understanding.

He spoke from his experience as ambassador, a professor of moral philosophy, and permanent secretary of the Ministry of Supply. He left the cloistered quiet of an educator's life to enter government service when World War II began. He knew intimately the charts of the shipping lanes when U-boats were slashing at England's jugular; he was there when lend-lease went in and Bundles for Britain, and when the British loan and the Marshall plan were enacted he was named British Ambassador, the most important gift in his country's giving.

Much of the professor of moral philosophy and much of the secretary of the ministry of supply was apparent in his speeches here. We can accept or reject the British foreign policy in the Far East, but what we cannot reject is his plea for understanding.

The British do not want a war now; it is not that they fear war, but only that they fear the ultimate effects of a war; they fear what it will do to them and to their country.

They know what World Wars I and II cost them: An empire.

The British Empire was a magnificent balance for peace and prosperity for more than two centuries. There was a time when their outposts were safe because the vast power of England was their guaranty. That is no longer the case. Singapore fell in a matter of weeks, and Hong Kong in days during World War II.

I guess it was in 1933 when I first became aware, in a sort of personal way, of the might and spread of England. As an ordinary seaman aboard the *Steel Seafarer*, I went around the world. And every strategic spot we passed, every tip of land that guarded the dropoff of a continent or the entry to a waterway, except the Panama Canal, was owned by or leased to or controlled by the British.

There was a very good reason for this. You can take three United Kingdoms and fit them into Texas and have room enough for Glen McCarthy too. With a kingdom this small, they had to depend upon trade. To keep trade going steadily, peace was necessary. To keep peace, strategic spots were necessary. England did rather successfully for 200 years what we are trying to do in Korea: Control trouble and keep it from spreading.

Britain has been criticized for Sir Oliver's note to our Government suggesting that Formosa be given to China, and that Red China be allowed a seat in the U. N. It has been suggested that England ought to offer Red China Hong Kong, but England needs Hong Kong. England knows she must have trade to survive.

More than 50 percent of its food and goods is imported. Trade is the United Kingdom's lifeblood and the source of its strength. That is a fact that we must realize in our attempts to compare facts with values.

The professor of moral philosophy may have had some qualms about the Formosa note, but the former minister of supply could not have, from the point of view of Great Britain. There is much talk about understanding our enemies; we had better try to understand our friends, too.

Food for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a special press release dated May 10, 1951, by the Government of India, Information Service. This is with reference to the proposed emergency assistance by the United States Government to India in the shape of food grains to relieve the famine victims. Since the report of this release in some of the newspapers omits pertinent parts of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's statement, I ask that it be printed in full:

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
INFORMATION SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1951.

Replying to a question in Indian Parliament, May 10, regarding the terms and conditions of the proposed United States food aid to India, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement:

"There are two United States bills to give emergency assistance in the shape of food grains to India; one was introduced in the Senate and the other in the House of Representatives. Both bills have undergone considerable change since they were originally introduced. One of these revised bills has been proposed by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the other by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

"The Senate bill allots $95,000,000 for grain purchase in the current year, that is, the year ending June 30, 1951, and authorizes the appropriation of an additional sum of $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. This second part of the aid, however, shall not be made available until after further action by the Congress.

"Both parts are divided on a 50-50 basis, half being a grant and half on credit terms as provided in section III (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 as amended.

"Assistance in terms of the bill will be available only after an agreement is entered into between India and the United States. It proposes that this agreement should contain certain undertakings insuring distribution of food without discrimination, publicity to the assistance furnished by the United States, and permission for persons designated by the United States to observe the distribution of supplies in India.

"The House committee bill provides emergency food relief on credit terms only in accordance with the provisions of section III (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 as amended. It authorizes provision of a sum not exceeding $190,000,000 for the fiscal years 1951 and 1952. Repayment of this loan includes payment in goods under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the ECA Administrator and the Government of India. ECA loans are generally for a period of 33 to 35 years at an interest rate of 2½ percent on unpaid principal with semiannual interest payment. In the present case, it is proposed that the interest payment will begin on June 30, 1952, and the payment on principal some years later, which may be from 5 to 8 years.

"Such conditions as are attached to either of these bills are the usual terms embodied in the United States of America legislation providing for economic assistance to foreign countries. In the Senate bill there are certain conditions which do not find a place in the House bill and much would depend upon manner of implementation of these conditions.

"There is a reference to our supplying various kinds of materials to the United States of America in part payment for the grain supplied. We shall gladly supply such materials as are available in India and can be spared by us. But I should like to make it clear that it is a fundamental part of our foreign policy that such material as is particularly related to the production of atomic or like weapons should not be supplied by us to foreign countries.

"In our view there are no political or discriminatory conditions attached to these two bills and therefore there can be no objection on these grounds to our acceptance of either of them. While the form in which assistance is given to India is a matter for the United States of America to decide, we would prefer the terms embodied in the House bill which are simpler.

"I should like to express our gratitude to the Government of United States of America for the efforts they have made to send food grains to India. I should also like to express our deep appreciation of the messages as well as offers of material help unofficially received from many citizens of the United States."

Proposed Roll-Back on Price of Beef

REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the 10 percent roll-back which has been imposed on the packing houses in order to reduce the price of beef, and the proposals which we understand are about to be made to roll back beef prices another 9 percent before October 1, have brought about a condition among the cattle feeders of the Nation which does not warrant those people feeding cattle so long as this roll-back is in effect. Naturally, the production of beef will be reduced to a great degree and food prices, instead of being lessened, will be increased.

The following letters and telegrams will explain some of the reasons why:

RED OAK, IOWA, *May 9, 1951.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Am taking 185 cattle off grain today. Unable to feed grain under controls considering present costs and crop conditions. Do something.

H. V. FELT.

NODAWAY, IOWA.

GRISWOLD, IOWA, *May 8, 1951.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

This price roll-back on beef has rolled me back $6,000 on 140 head of cattle. In order not getting rolled again I quit. It seems very unfair. Industry with their roll ahead and cutting quality is getting along very well. The beef producer cannot reduce quality. Demands are of this beef be loaded with corn.

B. F. ANDERSON.

FRED SIEVERS & SON,
Audubon, Iowa, May 5, 1951.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: In view of the events which have occurred the past week, I feel that it is my duty, as well as my privilege, to write you as the Congressman from my district. When an order as severe and discriminatory as the price roll-back on beef is issued, it is bound to have opposition from the enormous industry it affects. Considering none of the other phases of beef production, with their added restrictions and problems, I'd like to present my side, as a cattle feeder whose only occupation and source of income is producing pounds of beef for the consumer. It is my opinion that this occupation involves considerable know-how and risk of investment and deserves just consideration.

It is difficult to understand how the OPS economists figure that any industry can stand a price roll-back of 18 percent, which is proposed for beef by October 1, without losing money. The beef producer has not been making excess profits, and unless his costs are reduced proportionately this will bankrupt him. For example, I just purchased, in March, 300 head of high-quality feeder steers at a cost of 36¼ cents per pound. These cattle will not be finished for market for 6 or 8 months, at least, at which time, under the present set-up, they will be worth about 33 cents top price. If I am forced to market them before this time to escape the lower roll-backs I will be cut down because of the lack of finish and consequently lose money there, too. Cattle of this type are fed for prime meat and are not profitable as short-feds. You can easily see how the many cattle feeders, such as myself, in Audubon County and elsewhere, will be affected. The feeders on every farm have been purchased at record prices, are being fed, and will continue to be fed at high cost.

It looks as if the only result can be a reduced incentive to produce and fatten beef and the marketing of light, unfinished cattle. This in turn means less meat for the consumer, possible rationing, and the return of the old black-market profiteering for some. This is exactly opposite to the purpose of the roll-back, which is more, lower-priced meat.

I shall appreciate your consideration of this matter, and I know you will act as you see fit.

Very respectively,

FRED SIEVERS, Jr.,

MASSENA, IOWA, *May 6, 1951.*

Congressman BEN F. JENSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: I am writing to you in regard to the price roll-back on cattle which means the difference between a fair price for our grain and labor and a loss at the roll-back price.

We operate 400 acres of good Iowa land and feed twice as much grain as we produce to cattle and hogs.

If we have to take a loss on these cattle that are in the feed lot, we will assure you that we will not replace them until the freeze is lifted.

We are reducing our corn acreage and our hired labor and plan to feed only what grain we raise which will greatly reduce our operating expenses.

This will produce about 40 percent the tonnage of meat we usually produce.

If a meat shortage occurs, we will not consider a subsidy payment to produce more.

Please use your influence to revoke this freeze order.

Yours very truly,

DANIEL E. BOWER.

P. S.—This roll-back in production also means a roll-back in the demand for manufactured goods.

SHENANDOAH, IOWA, *May 8, 1951.*

Congressman BEN JENSEN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN JENSEN: I feel it is my duty, as a citizen and taxpayer, to write you with reference to the Office of Price Stabilization's new directive, forcing a roll-back on prices of live cattle and dressed meats; also, proposed ceilings.

First, let me state, having spent a lifetime in the production, feeding, and marketing of livestock in a most extensive way, I believe I have acquired a far greater knowledge of the livestock industry than most of the politicians and bureaucrats in Washington. This program, outlined by Mr. DiSalle, will definitely sabotage the production of our livestock industry at a time when production is most essential. The facts are such an act is definitely unworkable and un-American.

Congressman JENSEN, I ask of you, as a Representative of the people of this district, to oppose the reenactment of article 4 of the Defense Production Act, which provides for price and wage control, as it is of the most vital importance that this Nation, the greatest on earth, shall continue to progress with free enterprise and not to have our welfare dictated by any one man or group of men who are seeking control of the entire Nation.

Yours very respectfully,

IOWA FEEDING CO.
By F. L. KELLY.

LIVESTOCK FOUNDATION OF OMAHA,
Omaha, Nebr., May 8, 1951.

Congressman BEN JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENSEN: In my work here at the Omaha market, I talk each day to 40 to 50 livestock growers and feeders—in the course of a year, to thousands.

In 11 years of this work, first at Sioux City and the past 4 years at Omaha, I have never seen so vast a majority of Midwestern farmers and feeders as resentful and embittered over a Government edict as they currently are over Price Administrator DiSalle's beef cattle and beef price order of April 30.

They are angry and alarmed. They've sent to market many animals not yet ready for slaughter and will send more unless the order is rescinded.

In its May 7 issue, Newsweek magazine carried an inaccurate story on the livestock and meat situation. Enclosed is copy of rebuttal I wired them.

Meanwhile, for the good of the industry and meat consumers as well, please do not renew President Truman's control powers come June 30. He has demonstrated the inability or an unwillingness to use them wisely.

Yours very truly,

HART JORGENSEN

RICHARD M. RUTTER,
Business News Editor,
Newsweek Magazine,
New York, N. Y.:

For a magazine that prides itself on accurate, informative reporting, and which features straight thinkers like Moley and Lindley, your piece on "Slicing the Meat Bill," (p. 63, May 7) is terrifically substandard.

It would appear the author thereof imbibed too deeply of an unlabeled jug containing OPS propaganda. Such as: The Nation's meat industry was in chaos (before the control order). Meat supplies heading for new low. Now a chance to thwart black market. End jag.

For a chaser, try these facts:

1. Prior to first controls on meat prices in January, no channels were short; distribution was normal. And cattle population and cattle-on-feed numbers were at near-record levels and headed higher.

2. Real confusion in the industry did not come till after DiSalle's order of April 28.

3. This week alone (week of April 30–May 4) thousands of unfinished cattle have been rushed to market. Consumers are out millions of pounds in future meat supplies. Packers and feeders alike up in arms over order and holding protest meetings (Washington and Omaha). Consumers not cheering, either, over chance to buy choice sirloin steak come May 20 at $1.14 that last week was advertised in Omaha World-Herald at 89 cents.

4. Shortages of meat, rationing, and black markets now a real prospect—thanks to DiSalle order.

HART JORGENSEN,
Executive Director,
Livestock Foundation of Omaha.

OMAHA, NEBR.

Time Is Running Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News, Tuesday, May 8, 1951:

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

In the mass of discussion of how to wage war and how not to wage ware against communism, there is danger of losing sight of our prime national objective, which is not to wage war at all. It is to secure a firm international peace.

There is war in Korea, in defense of a principle, out of which, in some manner not now evident, it is hoped peace in that tortured region will emerge. There is the rearmament of Western Europe, part of the growing strength of the free world, designed to convince the Soviet Union that negotiation among equals is in the general interest.

"We are not engaged in a struggle without end. We are engaged in a struggle which has the definite goal of peace," said President Truman in an address last night on civil defense. That it will be a prolonged struggle is obvious. It is a struggle beset with hazards and hard choices, for example, whether or not to limit the war in the Far East to Korea and, if to limit it, then how to end it; whether the maintenance of a high level of armaments is not, of itself, dangerous to peace.

The answers to such questions as these, which affect the survival of the free world and the future of mankind, cannot be given sound, dogmatic expression. Yet peace is larger in scope than the contrivances erected to capture it. It has often been said since the end of World War II that what the world needs is some supreme act of imagination, of statesmanship, of faith that will tear the chains of war from men's feet and permit their best spirits once more to soar.

General MacArthur, a professional soldier, was never more impressive in his appearances before the Senate hearing than when, at the final session, he argued for the abolition of war. Amidst so much of immediate, current importance, the moving eloquence of what he said has escaped general attention.

Effective disarmament is not enough, said General MacArthur. If war is abolished, no armaments will be needed—nothing except arms for police in given geographical areas.

But let General MacArthur himself speak:

"There was great evidence of that in Japan. You spoke of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Japanese people, more than any other people in the world, understand what atomic warfare means. It wasn't academic with them. They counted their dead and they buried them.

"They, of their own volition, wrote into their constitution a provision outlawing war.

"When their Prime Minister, Mr. Shidehara, came to me he said, 'I have long contemplated and believed'—and he was a very wise old man; he died recently—'long contemplated and believed that the only solution to this problem is to do away with war.'

"He said: 'With great reluctance, I advanced the subject to you, as a military man, because I am convinced you would not accept it; but,' he said, 'I would like to endeavor,

in the constitution we are drawing up, to put in such a provision.'

"I couldn't help getting up and shaking hands with the old man, and telling him that I thought that was one of the greatest constructive steps that possibly could be taken.

"I told him that it was quite possible that the world would mock him—this is a debunking age, a cynical age, as you know—that they would not accept it; that it would be an object of derision, which it was, that it would take great moral stamina to go through with it, and in the end they might not be able to hold the line, but I encouraged him, and the Japanese wrote that provision in.

"If there was any provision in that constitution which appealed to the popular sentiment of the people of Japan, it was that provision. There was a warrior tribe which, for centuries, had pursued war, and successful war; but the great concept, the losses, the great lessons the bomb had taught them, had been understood. They were trying to apply them.

"The world should have common sense enough, when it surveys the losses of two wars, to understand that war has become a method of suicide for modern civilization.

"I therefore believe that time is running out on us. I said at the end of the Second World War that we have had our last chance. I believe it and I believe that 99 percent of the people of the world believe it."

The mechanics of abolishing war, as General MacArthur well realizes, are difficult. Through the United Nations, or some other forum, General MacArthur would attempt to get an agreement. The great nations would set the norm for if the four or five great powers should agree to abolish war, it would be impossible for others to start one.

General MacArthur would have the United States exercise its moral leadership through a conditional legislative fiat to abolish war, challenging others to follow. Here is a project on which American opinion ought to express itself, for if war is ever to be abolished, the impulse must come from the hearts of the people. Given that kind of demand, perhaps statesmanship, in a supreme act of imagination, could penetrate even behind the iron curtain and into the darkest places in the world.

John Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 9, 1951:

JOHN KEE

In March 1949 when he succeeded the late Sol Bloom as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative JOHN KEE, of West Virginia, was known to few Americans outside Congress or beyond the borders of his own State. And when death struck him down during yesterday's committee session he was still pretty much of a stranger to the public at large. Yet this quiet, self-effacing man—an excellent lawyer with a keen analytical mind and a gentle spirit that abhorred noisy headline-hunting—was one of the Nation's most devoted servants, a hard-working legislator whose contribution in the international field will surely live on after him as a kind of monument to his name.

For Mr. KEE—a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee throughout all of his 18 years in the House—was an American acutely aware of the dangerous nature of these times and of the problems that the United States had to meet to serve its own best interests. In a unique respect, therefore, he dedicated himself, with a sense of duty and urgency, to international matters. Wholly apart from what he did in the Seventy-ninth Congress to bring about a much-needed reorganization of the Foreign Service, he played a highly constructive wartime and postwar role in helping to persuade his colleagues to enact such historic measures as lend-lease, aid to Greece and Turkey, and the Marshall plan for European recovery.

Although he gave his attention to domestic issues on which he invariably voted in support of the administration, Mr. KEE's overriding and consuming interest was in the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Consistently, both before and after he became the committee's chairman, he strove diligently for united, bipartisan action, and he was in no small part responsible for the fact that it was achieved on some of the most far-reaching international legislation in the history of the United States. No fanfare ever marked his efforts, but he has left behind him a genuinely distinguished record in the service of his country.

Standard Oil Sets Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 26, 1951:

STANDARD OIL SETS RECORD IN QUARTER—NEW JERSEY COMPANY EARNS NET OF $118,000,000, AGAINST $65,000,000 YEAR BEFORE—MEETING AGAIN AT LINDEN—TO TAKE PLACE JUNE 8—SHELL OIL SALES AT NEW PEAK IN PERIOD—OTHER CORPORATE REPORTS

The Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) achieved a new high record in the first quarter, with estimated consolidated net earnings of $118,000,000 after taxes and all charges, according to the report announced yesterday.

In the preceding quarter, ended with December, the company showed earnings of $134,000,000, or $4.42 a share, while $65,000,000, or $2.15 a share, was made in the initial 3 months of last year.

The parent company's stockholders' annual meeting on June 8 will be held again in the boiler shop at the Bayway refinery of the Esso Standard Oil Co. in Linden, N. J. Formal notice of the meeting place was given in the proxy statement mailed yesterday to 220,000 Jersey Standard stockholders. The Bayway building first was used as a meeting place last year, when 1,600 stockholders attended. Shareholders will be invited to inspect the Esso research center, a short distance from the refinery. The latter facility was not yet fully in operation when last year's meeting was held.

Among the various proposals to be presented for action by stockholders at the meeting are a two-for-one stock split, previously announced, an inactive stock option plan whereby up to 300,000 shares could be sold to designated executives of the company and subsidiaries.

Shareholders also will be asked to vote on a proposal under which future meetings could be held either in New Jersey or in New York City. The proxy statement says the board does not contemplate at present any change in the practice of holding stockholder meetings in New Jersey, but merely seeks "greater flexibility."

Address of Hon. Y. T. Pyun, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered at the CARE fifth-anniversary luncheon by Y. T. Pyun, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, May 9, 1951:

You all know that Korea has been unfortunately caught in the global conflict between the world-conquest-dreaming communism and the survival-seeking democracy. She has been caught in the vortex of world disturbance of violence and destruction, quite helpless and unprepared—unprepared except in her indomitable spirit and unswerving determination to die fighting on the side of human freedom. Sometimes I quite dispassionately ask: Had there existed no Korea, would this conflict have been averted? It would have broken out somewhere else, say, in Iran or in Viet-nam or in Burma, or even in India. No matter where the aggression appeared, its nature would have been the same—of Communist global conquest. Any meaningful action on the part of the free world to counteract an aggression of this nature must, therefore, be designed on a global level. No matter where it appears, the aggression must be met firmly and thoroughly with the total weight of the free world. Nothing should stand in our way to a swift and complete military victory. All military half measures should be carefully eschewed, for they are bound to invite further aggression.

We Koreans do not pretend to understand the position so far taken either by England or by India. They look to us like a patient insisting on a "head first" treatment when his hand has been invaded by germs of a deadly disease. We are now fighting England's as well as India's battle in Korea. If we are defeated, the struggle will be carried to their own homes. If we come out victorious, they will have no war at home.

The Soviet Union has deliberately chosen Asia as its first object of conquest. Its very first stroke has been deliberately planted on Korea, a long-coveted strategic point, from which naval operations can be launched to tear up the Pacific traffic of the free world and which will prove an ideal watchtower to keep the whole Orient, including China and Japan, under the domineering glance of the Soviet Union.

To the cool, calculating mind of the Kremlin, the conquest of Western Europe is unthinkable until the vast resources of Asia are consolidated under its domination. The conquest of Asia alone will condition the Kremlin to launch an all-out global conquest. The formula of remedy should appear to be: Balk the Kremlin in the attainment of this prerequisite, and the dreaded thing

will never come off. There is every reason that England, doing away with her local-mindedness, should send more troops to Korea now and that India, too, should start sending them. The weak-jointed dinosaur will recede before nothing but a drawn sword. In an indecision-vacuumed atmosphere alone, the Soviet balloon of threat will wax larger.

The level-headed Stalin knows that he lacks oil fuel, that he lacks such mobility as is known in the United States, and that he lacks even the loyalty of his own people and of those of his satellites. Above all, he is well aware that he will have to go without the American lend-lease this time, which played such a decisive role in his successful struggle against Germany. Nothing short of the fear of provoking the United States-led free world into a general war will stop the Stalinist aggression in Asia. That Iran is now confronted with very much the same situation as has developed in Korea may be said to be the direct result of the restricted and therefore indecisive military action in Korea.

Before I end this general survey of the world situation of which the present Korean war is a local manifestation, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that the one unchanging motive behind all the Soviet tactics of playing hot and cold, fast and loose, with the free world, getting it on crisis after crisis and letting it off as often at will is, through series of serious economic dislocations, to create within free nations situations where the Soviet Union can more easily take them over from within. My advice is, therefore, this: Don't you be let down this time; see that the international criminal does not get away unpunished this once, whatever happens.

Now I am coming to relief, at last. Except the few towns of considerable size, located in the area which, from the beginning of the war, has never been harried by the enemy, and which, in area, is not more than one-thirtieth of entire Korea, most of the towns in the bulk of South Korea and the entire North Korea have been taken and retaken by both contending forces and a large number of them have been completely laid waste beyond recognition. Because the United Nations forces have been forbidden to cross the Manchurian border and blow up enemy supply centers, all they have been doing is to pound away to smithereens all buildings and houses that are likely to give shelter to the enemy. Except the few millions who either have remained protected behind the U. N. defense line or have been fortunate enough to filter through it from beyond, the bulk of the Korean people, rendered homeless and uprooted, as it were, out of the soil, wander like clouds over areas made desolate by war and vanish like clouds, exposed to hunger, cold, and man-made demolition. Just think of a full-fledged modern war of hitherto unheard of power of destruction again and again sweeping over such a narrow strip of land like Korea for the last 10 months. Just think of scores of thousands of tons of high explosives smashing up nothing but Koreans. Neither Germany nor Japan, war-torn as they were, can approach the present Korea in stark devastation. The Korean case, in which her allies, in terms of practicalities, seem to have joined hands with her enemies in her own destruction, partly out of regard for her deadly foes, is something tragically unique and unparalleled in human history.

This bleak past lies unrelieved by any immediate bright future. The spring sowing season finds the bulk of agricultural soil untilled and unsowed for lack of work beasts or of farm laborers or of huts that shelter them, or even of seed.

The problems of relief thus posed by a Nation-wide destruction and by an entire nation turned refugees are overwhelming. The united command has been doing all that was humanly possible, but the number of refugees it reached and saved is a mere fraction of the masses who roam homeless and perish as they roam and who perish unseen and unsuccored in remote outlying places. The united command ought not to be expected to attempt relief to the extent of military insecurity. It cannot safely make an outlay sufficient to meet relief demands, either in personnel or in transportation or otherwise. The inexorable demands of military operations, to which the united command is duty bound to give priorities, are apt to make its hands too full for anything like adequate relief for civilians. The need has long been felt for fuller and more active cooperation of all available civilian relief agencies of the free world with the united command and of creation of a far wider opening admitting these civilian agencies more freely into Korea. It is indeed gratifying that CARE plans to make a Nation-wide appeal for Korean relief and spearhead civilian relief activities for the suffering millions in Korea.

In view of the overtaxed military transportation, overtaxed even for military purposes alone, Korean relief, in order to be extensive and Nation-widely penetrating, must be provided with a minimum transportation of its own, both land and sea. Under the circumstances, certain main arteries of land traffic and main harbor facilities are bound to remain exclusive to military purposes. But byways and small ports should be available for relief activities. The civilian relief personnel may need to be men of as much valor as combat teams, very probably of a higher order. They may be irked by the necessary screening exercised by the appropriate authorities. But I do not doubt that the American public once when roused to a very pressing need, will not fail, as it never did in the past, to rise to meet it like one man, sweeping every obstacle or inconvenience before it.

The Korean people are now undergoing a virtual genocide, which should not be unnecessarily complete. The present humanitarian movement you are now setting your hands to, if given momentum promptly enough, will save millions of Koreans who otherwise are doomed to perish. As the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Korea, I feel I must pay tribute also at this time to the American Red Cross, which so instantly responded to my President's plea for help soon after the invasion of June 1950. I am gratified to learn that the American Relief for Korea Committee is actively engaged in this humanitarian effort to relieve the suffering of the Korean people. I will always remember you in my prayers that God may speed your worthy efforts to instantaneous fruition.

I started out to give you a general view of the Korean situation, and it may not be out of place here to suggest to you the outstanding needs other than that of relief. I will briefly enumerate four more needs without troubling you as to their order in importance.

Korea is badly in need of financial aid, distinct from economic aid, that will go to stabilize her now fast-crumbling finance. It is true that she has a balanced budget, but balanced on paper only. All sound budgets are based on assured national revenues. Almost all the Korean sources of revenue lie shattered and disrupted by the war. A complete measure of rehabilitation alone will restore them, but that is not forthcoming under the circumstances. What was opportunely done for Greece to bolster its finance must be done now for Korea.

Another need for Korea is more arms for the pending military expansion program. We do not object to rearming Japan, so long as Japanese are not brought over to Korea to fight in our place. To say the least, it will help Korean Communists strut as patriots fighting the age-long Korean enemy, and, at the same time, dishearten the ROK forces so as to lower their fighting morale. Nor do we relish the idea of having the Chinese Nationalist troops among the U. N. forces now fighting in Korea, for we know that they can be more profitably used elsewhere, when the occasion arises. What we lack is arms, not manpower. It will be a grievance to Korea, if she is denied the chance of contributing more manpower to the cause of human freedom—the only contribution she can make as far as circumstances allow her now.

The fourth need is for technically training as many intelligent young Koreans as possible. In view of the fact that what scanty trained Korean personnel we had before have been mostly captured, killed, or incapacitated during the present war, any long-range plan for Korea cannot overlook the crying need of an extensive training program, without which any rehabilitation of an enduring nature is impossible. It is wrong to keep them all in Korea. There are not arms enough to go around. Nor are there any munition factories to absorb their energies and make them contribute to war efforts. I personally do not see the sense of letting them rot by slamming the door upon them that leads them abroad for qualifying them for services of no less value to the nation than fighting. Anyway, they cannot all fight.

Against the thousands of Japanese receiving technical training in this country, there are an ever-dwindling number of Korean youths given the same academic benefits, mere dozens for the year. Considering the disparity of technical attainment existing between the two peoples under discussion, the reverse of the ratio would seem fair. The training of Korean industrial personnel should be given more candid consideration. I regard it to be one of the obligations of the free world to train and conserve an adequate number of Korean young men in the industrial way.

Lastly, I call your attention to the peremptory need of perpetuating in the proposed Japanese peace treaty in clear terms the present high seas demarcation between Korea and Japan, known as the MacArthur line. The line was instituted for sound reasons which will grow sounder as Japan gets out of the occupation status. From the immemorial times up to the opening up of Korea for world trade, it was the Japanese fishing boats that incessantly harried and plundered hamlets and towns on the Korean coast, which eventually paved the way for the Hideyoshi invasion, the greatest national calamity known in our history. In future, Japanese fishing boats will probably find it advisable to refrain from downright vandalism, but, if allowed to come close enough to Korean territorial waters, they might easily turn into moving bases for smuggling so as to nip the viability of Korean economy in the bud.

I do personally know of cases where large Japanese fishing boats, infringing the MacArthur line, attempted to butt Korean naval patrols into the sea. It is the established practice with the small Korean fishing vessels to scurry away into safety whenever powerful Japanese ships are sighted on their side of the demarcation, for they know there is always the trescherous sea to bear the Japanese blame of foundering them unseen by law. The abolishment of the line would mean not only stymying the nascent Korean fishing enterprise but also placing entire Korean economy at the mercy of Japanese commercial aggression. While Korea is quite prepared to see Japan restored to its rightful place among the family of nations, she cannot afford to consent to any agreement or nonagreement, for that matter, that leaves open an avenue, through which Japan can

dictate the very subsistence of Korea. Korea cannot be persuaded to forego the only and real safeguard she has against the possible Japanese economic aggression.

To sum up, penetrating relief, economic aid designed to bolster her finance, ample arms for her military expansion, candid training program for her industrial personnel and eternal high-seas safeguard stipulated in an international instrument will certainly help lay the foundation for peace in the Far East.

In Bataan, people from two different races fought their common foe, interlocked in comradeship and common ideals. In the world Bataan called Korea the brave sons of numerous free nations blend their honored ashes in an everlasting covenant of cooperation for one single end—the preservation of free ways of life—which, we fervently hope, will be strengthened with time. Remember that, in this case, there is no world Australia for a military comeback. The free world cannot afford a retreat from this world Bataan.

Korea is a unique exception. Of all small peoples, she is the only one that boldly threw her lot with the free nations, under most unimaginable circumstances of adversity. Proportionately in terms of sacrifice, she has contributed most of all to the cause of human freedom. It may be no more than the widow's mite. But it is also true that she has dedicated all to the cause which she can call her own.

Whether Korea was wise in putting up a heroic fight against communism, alias decivilization, or the now Soviet satellites were comparatively wiser in succumbing to communism unresisting will be eventually decided by the part played by the free world in the wartime relief as well as in the postwar rehabilitation of Korea. If the direction now being pointed to by CARE is persistently and intensively pursued, Korea, I am certain, will stand, not a battered tomb of freedom, but a proud monument eternally bearing witness to the triumph of free human will.

Address of Hon. Lewis Preston Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the address of Hon. Lewis Preston Collins, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, at the Virginia Day Luncheon of the Women's National Democratic Club, Washington, D. C., April 5, 1951:

Madame President, Madame Toastmistress, and my friend Mrs. Killinger, you have been very gracious and kind to Mrs. Collins and me; and first, I should like to express our gratitude to you for the kindness and courtesy which you have shown us; and then to this club and to its guests, may I say that the invitation to speak to you today is an extremely flattering one and affords a privilege which I shall long remember, challenging as it is.

What is a Virginian to say on Virginia Day to the Woman's National Democratic Club in the city of Washington which would not be applauded by these, misunderstood and misinterpreted by those, or classed as immodest and egocentric by the others. It is a challenging privilege under such circumstances to be your guest speaker and the temerity with which to proceed arises only out of a consciousness of the broad mind, generous spirit, tolerance and good will of every true Democrat, especially the beautiful, attractive and tender individualistic feminine Democrat. Your speaker feels at home here in this detached part of Virginia, with the kindred democratic spirits assembled here, regardless of the varying and vacillating interpretations of our democratic tenets and of the political and economic philosophy of the party. Such, however, are permitted to Democrats under our unwritten rules and by tacit understanding, in proportion of the number of members comprising the Democratic Party. The privilege so to vary and vacillate and fully to discuss these variables and vacillations is one of the virtues of our party and may prove to be its salvation. It would be a wonderful renaissance if each of us here and now would simply accept the Jeffersonian interpretation of democracy which constitutes the basic concepts striven for in Virginia; pledge eternal allegiance thereto; support a Democratic Party movement to find a nationally prominent Democrat of kindred views—our Virginia views—make him our leader and win against our traditional rival in the conflict now brewing, and which lies just ahead. This would be in keeping with the Democratic way of leadership, its history, precedents, and tradition. Is this provincial egotism—or is it humorous—or is it the product of wisdom? The true evaluation lies with each of you as a Democrat.

A lady from my town moved to western Texas and had resided there for 32 years; finally at one of the clubs, she met a fellow townslady of 40 years' residence; said the Texas lady: "How long have you been here?" The Virginian replied: "For 32 years." The Texan related the 40-year duration of her residence, implying that such duration was required in this city in order socially to qualify for the finals—and flashed a well arched eyebrow for punctuation. The Texan daughter-in-law of the Virginian interposed: "Well, she is just visiting here." So, you see Virginians are expected to remain Virginians always; we can emigrate; and yet we must remain native; this is a congenital propensity, and is so accepted."

Someone has written a book titled "Virginia Is a State of Mind." It is just that. You must not judge us too harshly because we enjoy blackeyed peas and hog jowl on New Year's Day for it is really a splendid delicacy for regular diet and is growing in popularity, and then it augurs good luck as well; the very best is sometimes confusing for a long while and its significance misunderstood; but ultimately the crucible of time will assize truth; for this is the way under an ever-broadening capacity to participate in democratic government; truth is eternal, and so are blackeyed peas and hog jowl.

You should not get angry with us if we still insist that Robert E. Lee did not surrender at Appomattox on April 9, 1865; for we in Virginia yet believe that the individual and his progress and liberty are the supreme considerations of government, and must be protected against ultracentralization and the tyrannies which follow in its wake to destroy individual liberty and opportunity. In this relation we believe in a division of powers, as a fundamental and enduring counterpoise against tyranny, regardless of interruptions due to political and economic expediency, in liberty's eternal struggle to dignify the individual. We in Virginia flatter ourselves, not unduly I hope, in the belief that Jefferson, Madison, Washington, and other Virginians played a bit of a part in the establishment of our representative democracy under a constitution for a wise purpose. We believe that this purpose was and is the perpetuation of a government with which to insure the largest measure of opportunity and happiness to the individual, free from social, economic, political and religious tyranny. Tyranny has never failed in the long course of history to flow from all forms of government. Thus the founders devised safeguards, under a constitution of limitation and division of power, delegated authority and of insured basic liberties; these considerations are indigenous to Virginia and Virginia clings to these principles which are so much a part of her heritage—and thus a part of herself.

Yes, we in Virginia are old fashioned just like the Virginia lady way out in Texas; even a Texan knew she would ever remain Virginian; and while our Democratic Party may stray far from home for a political visit, we in Virginia have the faith to believe that our party—the party of each and every one of us—will come back home to imperishable, everlasting and immutable political truth, instead of pursuing the easy, expedient and politic way which deludes, deceives and insidiously destroys.

Each of us has the challenge as a Democrat within the Democratic Party itself to regenerate, rededicate and resuscitate the fundamental truths of the Democratic way. Republicans could not do this. Such truths not only constitute the basic philosophy of our Government but embody the yearning of the individual as well, regardless of his or her social, political, ethnological, economic or religious status.

In Virginia we believe in freedom from debt; we believe that government must be run as a private business is run; we believe in buying only that for which we can pay, however enticing the purchase may be. We believe in hard, not soft, dollars; we believe that the life, health and safety of the private individual are above the greed of either management or labor and that public utilities related to the life, health and safety of the individual should be required under State sovereignty to protect life, health and safety of the individual; we believe in honesty in government, and that public office is in fact a public trust demanding morality, personal honesty, ethics and legal responsibility.

The Democratic Party has forever been the party of leadership in the hours of national travail and international crisis; we have had in the past the capacity somehow to preserve the fundamentals of government and yet meet the economic and social trends and tensions which have threatened us. So, today we as a great national party have got to meet our challenge and make the decision whether or not we are going to lead down the road to socialism with destruction of the individual, private enterprise, and the capitalistic system in an effort to equalize material enjoyment under government; or are going to accept the basic philosophy—unchanging and enduring as it is, that the function of government is to guarantee to the individual and private business the fullest opportunity to evolve upward socially, financially and otherwise. This decision is ours to make as a great national party; and if our country is to survive and if we as a party are to survive and remain dominant, I believe in my heart that we shall have to go back to the faith of our fathers some of whom at least came from just south of the Potomac; and there perhaps a modern disciple of these fundamentals and a national leader within our party might be found who could lead us not only to victory but to a Jeffersonian renaissance as well. Thus we as Democrats can again lead in a sorely needed national regeneration.

The pendulum is swinging; and wise political decision and true statemanship indicate and demand our course as a great national party. Shall we accept the challenge?

Will We Forget Iran?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, many of us are greatly disturbed about the apparent lack of any coordinated effort to prevent the Soviet from placing Iran inside the Communist curtain.

I am inserting, under unanimous consent, the following article from the Charlotte News and Observer on our Middle East policy:

THE POT BOILS OVER WHILE CHEFS WATCH OTHER COOKING

(By Joseph Alsop)

ATHENS.—It is easy to sum up the impression of American policy making that is left by a tour in the Middle East and eastern Mediterranean. Evidently the men who make our national policy are like distracted cooks confronting an enormous stove covered with dozens of different pots, all bubbling away simultaneously. The cooks only watch the most conspicuous pots—Western Europe, for example. The other pots get no attention until they either scorch or boil over.

Even from the perspective of Athens, it is all too clear that Iran must now be placed in the category of pots that have boiled over, like China in the past. When this reporter left Tehran, the American and British motto was that "time would cure all things, and that in time an agreed settlement of the oil nationalization issue could be arranged with the Iranian Government." Even then, it seemed that time was more likely to produce an explosion than a settlement, unless the Foreign Office and State Department could concert strong preventive measures.

The explosion has now occurred with the political triumph of the National Front leader, Dr. Mohammed Mussadegh, an aged extremist who lives in a private world of violent dreams. With Dr. Mussadegh as Prime Minister, it is pretty safe to predict that one of two things will have happened in Iran within the next few days. Either the British will have moved troops into southern Iran (presumably flying them from Suez) in order to protect their oil properties, or the Iranian extremists will have seized the British oil properties by main force.

In addition, there are signs that Dr. Mussadegh is contemplating a deal with the Soviet Union, and that the Shah, the only relatively stable element in Iranian politics, is again planning to flee. Certainly it is childishly unrealistic to talk about negotiating with Dr. Mussadegh, as Foreign Secretary Morrison has been talking. A minor disaster is the best result that can now be hoped for from the long-neglected Iranian situation; a major disaster, engulfing all the vital region of the Middle East, is all too possible.

Moreover, there is the crucial problem of the Mediterranean command. Until recently, it was thoroughly taken for granted that Admiral Robert Carney would be the Mediterranean commander of the future. Carney even journeyed to Ankara and Athens to discuss liaison arrangements. If Admiral Carney were given the Mediterranean command, he could easily tie in the NATO area in the Western Mediterranean with this area in the Eastern Mediterranean. A British commander, for various local reasons of prejudice and sentiment, cannot possibly wield the same authority.

But the American Chiefs of Staff with unparalleled short-sightedness, accepted the Atlantic command for Admiral William Fechteler. As the British Chiefs of Staff must have realized at the time, this made it inevitable that a British appointment would be regarded as only fair here in the Mediterranean. And it is also troublesome to disentangle this silly mess, and name a British commander in the Atlantic and an American commander in the Mediterranean.

Because of the search for an easy way out, the command problem is fumbled; the Turkish and Greek requests for guarantees are met with empty words; and the Yugoslavs are aided in driblets. Thus, the opportunity here is passing. If suspicion and disgust increase much further at Belgrade; if neutralism gains much more ground at Ankara, the opportunity will simply cease to exist.

On the surface, this sort of missed chance may not seem very grave. In fact, however, the Turks, Greeks, and Yugoslavs represent a potential of 70 fighting divisions. These divisions are in being, and are located on the most sensitive Soviet flank, the flank of the always distrusted satellites. With resonable equipment and good air support the Turks, Greeks, and Yugoslavs could, in case of trouble, drive to the Danube, threatening the whole satellite area.

In short, throwing away this splendid opportunity in the Eastern Mediterranean will be like passively accepting a gigantic defeat in war. Equally, if the western world loses control of the vital oil resource and strategic positions in the Middle East, this will also amount to a staggering military defeat. And so improvidence, negligence, and the search for the easy way will lead us, by a succession of such defeats, over the brink of final disaster.

Post Office Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

MAY 7, 1951.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MURRAY: I am transmitting for the information of the Committee a signed statement prepared for me by a group of Post Office employes in my District.

In addition to the statement and other communications I have received, I had a personal interview with a number of the letter carriers and clerks when I visited Jackson, Mich., recently. It certainly is clear that these postal employees are a very much aroused over conditions in the Post Office Department, both as it affects them personally in their livelihoods, and in the quality of the postal service at the present time, in which they seem to have a sincere and understandable interest.

As you will note, the authors pull no punches in the description of conditions, and I thought it might be useful to your Committee to have such a frank and forcefully-expressed commentary on the postal service from the point of view of the employees themselves.

Because it seems to me that this statement should have the attention of the entire Congress, I intend to ask leave to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

POST OFFICE CURTAILMENT

A drastic unnecessary step taken by the Postmaster General to blackjack Congress. A public poll on this uncalled-for reduction in service would find many people opposed to it. A service that the country, the Post Office Department, and the employees could well be proud of has deteriorated to the point where we the employees are ashamed of it. The public used to be able to set their watches by the regular approach of the mailman. Under the curtailment service one wouldn't be able to determine the day of the week. Magazines that used to be delivered on Thursday and Friday, are delivered at late as Monday and Tuesday of the following week. Circular advertisements of concerts, and so forth, occasionally delivered after the date the event took place. Political advertisements have been delivered a few days after the election was held. Ads for special sales delivered after the sale was over. Church, fraternal, lodge, and sales meeting announcements delivered after the meeting day had passed. A letter mailed Thursday p. m., in Detroit, delivered in Jackson at 1:30 the following Monday. Result—two people for Sunday dinner that weren't expected.

DIRECTORY SERVICE DISCONTINUED

Letters returned to the sender 1,000 miles away when directory service would have saved time and money. Also would have kept two taxpayers happy instead of disgruntled. A penny-wise and pound-foolish measure.

WINDOW SERVICE CURTAILED

The windows of the post office open at 8 a. m. and close at 5 p. m.—12 noon on Saturday—when do working people have an opportunity to mail their packages, buy money orders, or transact postal savings business?

SECOND-CLASS POSTAGE RATES

The large magazine companies have our school children selling their subscriptions (practically for free) and the Post Office Department delivering them almost for nothing. The amount they pay per pound probably wouldn't pay the transportation expense. On the other hand they have more than doubled the selling price of their magazines and raised the rates on advertisement space. Any mention of raising the postal rates is met by a howl of protest. The loads of magazines has increased to the extent that we aren't letter carriers any more—we are just two-legged pack mules. The public is buying magazines that they don't want and don't read simply to help some school child win a prize. The same public, as taxpayers, complain about the large postal deficit. Mail carriers are burdened down with a load that the public shouldn't have to pay a subsidy on. Let the publishers pay a legitimate rate of postage or deliver their own magazines.

SPECIAL BOOK RATE ON BOOKS THAT ARE NEITHER EDUCATIONAL OR ENTERTAINING

How low can this literature get and still be offered for sale and transported through the mails? Tax money for prisons to house sex degenerates that were inspired to commit rape or murder by this type of Government subsidized reading material

26 DAYS VACATION AND 15 DAYS SICK LEAVE

That amount for some Government employees, but 15 days vacation and 10 days sick leave for postal employees. The argument that the first group needs the additional time because they are working great distances from home doesn't hold water,

Many of these people working in their own home town receive the same as those working thousands of miles from their homes. Perhaps the extra 5 days sick leave are given so they may return home to be sick.

COST OF UNIFORMS

Letter carriers are the only uniformed Government employees that have to pay for their own uniforms. With the price of wool skyrocketing this is, indeed, quite an item on the letter carriers' budget. Letter carriers are the Government's only employee group that contacts all of the public, in fact they are the only contact for a portion of the population. Shabbily dressed, poorly paid, and discontented employees make poor representatives for the United States Government.

EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT BOARD

Representatives of the various employee organizations are only tolerated at the present time. Postmasters and top Government officials can cooperate or not as they see fit. A law should be passed that would create a compulsory employee-management board. Employee morale has been lowered to a great extent by politically appointed postmasters disregarding existing labor relations practices and seniority rules.

Substitute employees are classified Federal employees yet they are not granted the benefit of the 40-hour workweek law, neither do they receive pay for the eight legal holidays as the other employees. (The Government of the United States enforces the 40-hour workweek on private industry.) Our substitutes work as high as 16 hours a day and more than 100 hours a week and never get paid overtime rates.

Employees starting to learn the plumbing, carpenter, machinist, etc., trades have to work 4 years before they earn top wages. Postal employees have to work 23 years before they earn top wages. We are in favor of the three longevity or meritorious grades but feel that 23 years is too long a time to reach the top grade.

Revision of the wording and carrying out of directives in bulletins to the field service from Washington, D. C. Numerous items issued in the Official Bulletin aren't definite, or plainly worded, and the officials in the various offices interpret them differently.

On trip service under the curtailment order have worked hardships on the carrier force. Carriers used to return to the post-office at noon, but now many of them eat their lunch on a street corner or in business places; some of them have to stop at a private home for toilet facilities. Occupational illnesses such as heart trouble and varicose veins have increased. Carriers comprise only 4 percent of the Government employees but they have 18 percent of disability cases. The amount of personnel turnover is reaching a new high in postal history.

POSTAL DEFICIT

The Post Office Department is a service organization and always has been. Out of 42,000 offices only about 6,000 pay their own way. Would anyone advocate closing the other 36,000 offices? Compare the final cost to the taxpayers of running the Post Office Department with some of the non-revenue-producing departments, such as: Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Labor. The postal deficit shouldn't enter into the picture when considering wage increases:

TRUCK INSURANCE

The Government does not carry liability insurance protecting the drivers. In case of an accident the carrier driving the truck can be sued. All the Government offers is legal assistance.

EMPLOYEE MORALE

Postmaster General Donaldson once stated that he would make working conditions so that the employees would look forward to each working day in a happy state of mind. He has accomplished just the opposite. Most postal employees face each new day with a gloomy outlook on things in general. Working conditions, under the curtailment order; poor service, causing the public to complain verbally; and an inadequate wage all combined are enough to keep one in an unfriendly mood. Good pay for an honest day's work—serving a satisfied public—under favorable working conditions will put a smile again on the face of the employees and restore the Post Office Department again to the top level as a truly great service organization.

Tribute to a Great Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Philip Slomovitz, editor and publisher of the Detroit Jewish News, from the issue of April 20, 1951:

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT STATESMAN

(By Philip Slomovitz)

Arthur H. Vandenberg was one of the outstanding personalities of our time. Scholarly, well-informed, an excellent speaker, a brilliant organizer, he was held in high regard even by his severest critics. Few men in the United States Senate measured up to him in stature in the last 25 years. It is no wonder that as late as November 1948 President Truman was quoted as stating that he regarded him as the ablest Republican in the Senate.

From his background as a newspaper editor and publisher—a position to which he rose from the coveted beginning as a good reporter for his Grand Rapids paper—he acquired a passion for information on every subject with which he was deeply concerned. As a result, he never committed himself on any issue unless he possessed all available facts in order to be in position to speak with a measure of authority. He was a voluminous correspondent. He never failed to respond to communications—whether they were from critics or supporters.

More than one biography could be written of his life. Every issue he was involved in offers material for a study of his attitudes, his character, his ability to cope with situations. In most cases he rose to great heights in dealing with situations affecting our country.

This commentator knew him intimately and is in position to say that a full-length biography could be written to describe Senator Vandenberg's relationships with Jews and Jewish issues, with particular reference to Zionism, Palestine, and Israel. Our first acquaintance with him was at a meeting of the Men's Club of Temple Beth El at which he captured the hearts of his Detroit audience with his eloquence and forthright expressions on matters of state. It was in the late 1920's. A friendship began in 1930 when we first interested him in the Zionist cause. At that time the Pro-Palestine Federation of America was the active Christian philo-Zionist movement in this country which functioned under the brilliant leadership of the eminent socialist, the late Charles Edward Russell.

Out of the friendship for Zionism grew Senator Vandenberg's interest in other matters—his anti-Nazi stand, his aid in efforts to liberalize legislation for the admission of displaced persons, the leading role he played in securing the ratification of the appointment of David Lilienthal as head of the Atomic Energy Commission in opposition to forces which he believed were anti-Semitic, his help in individual cases involving people who sought refuge in this country, his sponsorship of a resolution in support of Jewish aspirations in Palestine.

In its entirety, the Vandenberg story vis-à-vis Zionism and Israel was not always rosy. There were times when we were impatient about his attitudes. Tense situations arose from time to time. Most of the time his hesitancy in acting in our behalf, as a member (later chairman) of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, were due to pressure from the White House, the State and War Departments. When President Truman gave speedy recognition to the Jewish state, he was the first to commend it as the logical and proper step to take.

It would take volumes to describe our experiences with the great Michigan Senator. For more than 15 years it was our duty, at time on an hour's notice, to go to Washington to consult him on Zionist matters. It became necessary for this commentator to keep in touch with him on the Palestinian issue at San Francisco, in 1945, during the formative stages of the international world organization whose charter he helped frame; to keep in touch with him when he represented the United States in Paris, at the sessions of the United Nations, in January of 1946, and constantly to keep him informed about the Jewish position in matters involving the future of our harrassed people in Europe and in Arabic countries and the development of the State of Israel.

The historian will be amazed at the mass of information that came to us from his desks, wherever he may have been—in Washington, in San Francisco, in Paris, in Grand Rapids. There is an especially interesting note describing his conference at his Washington office with David Ben-Gurion on November 21, 1946. Even Ben-Gurion was wrong in an important matter involving the Arabs at that time. There are messages describing his reactions to Zionist leaders. And there are reports about the progress of his efforts in behalf of a Jewish Palestine in the United States Senate. A wire dated December 12, 1945, informed us that the "Foreign Relations Committee this morning ordered favorable report on Palestine resolution which seems to be in satisfactory form," to which was appended the information that "only opposing vote was that of Chairman CONNALLY."

Since it is impossible, in one column, even to scratch the surface in commenting upon the brilliant career of Senator Vandenberg, with special reference to his Jewish attitudes, your commentator desires to make note of only one other matter, involving a local item:

Less than 2 years ago the Morris Schavers, desiring to bring to this country the sole survivor of an entire family, 5-year-old Itzhak, who now is their adopted son, met with obstacles. Itzhak could have been considered Polish-born. In that case he would have to wait 12 years to be admitted to this country from Canada, where he was brought by the Schavers. Senator Vandenberg promptly introduced a bill to declare Itzhak of French origin. Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL introduced a similar measure in the House of Representatives. Both bills were adopted by the two Houses of Congress and were signed by President Truman. That act is on record to the credit of Senator Vandenberg and Congressman DINGELL as an indication of their humanitarian interests.

The good acts of Senator Vandenberg were multiplied a thousand times by his kindly intercessions. He was, indeed, a conservative Republican, especially from the Democrats' point of view. But when he was faced with issues that called for human considerations he rose above party politics. In all the years that we conferred with him he never—not once—showed the slightest interest in this commentator's political preferences. We were concerned with grave matters involving the security of the Jewish people, and we stuck to this point. On this score he was unselfish and always honorable. If only for this reason alone—which is one of many—we honor his memory as we honored and respected him in his lifetime.

Letter of Col. S. L. A. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Col. S. L. A. Marshall, military analyst for the Detroit News. Colonel Marshall was formerly chief historian in the European theater during World War II, and more recently was attached to a special Army mission in Korea, from whence he has recently returned.

Colonel Marshall's letter to me is self-explanatory, and is intended to clarify the record as regards the attack upon the Army by the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] as having a Prussianized general staff. In the interest of fairness I believe the RECORD should contain the viewpoint expressed by Colonel Marshall as directed to me in his letter of April 12, 1951.

APRIL 12, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: During a House discussion of aspects of our defense policy on April 3, 1951, Congressman WERDEL of California, attacked the Army for having a Prussianized general staff. He then extended his remarks in the RECORD, introducing certain exhibits not alluded to in his speech.

I have that report. I am taking the trouble to make a part way reply to it because, while I doubt that any Member of the House would out of sinister motive attempt to undermine confidence in any part of the Armed Forces, it is altogether possible that the effect might be produced through unsullied ignorance.

It is not my business to defend the Army or its General Staff system. However, in the course of his remarks Mr. WERDEL quoted "an Army officer, Col. S. L. A. Marshall" and turned my words against the Army and the General Staff, by using them out of their historical and written context. I, therefore, feel it a duty to say what I know.

That I am not an Army officer but a reservist is well known to you and could have been ascertained by anyone taking the trouble to examine the Army Register, or for that matter, Who's Who. That simple fact has some relation to the truth or falsity of Mr. WERDEL's general charge against the Army. It is hardly a mark of Prussianism in a General Staff that it will call a civilian colonel to temporary active duty for the express purpose of reviewing Army processes from the inside, saying where they might be modified or corrected toward more perfectly serving national policy and the common interest, and making specific recommendations toward these ends. To my mind, this self-critical attitude within the Army and its acute sensitiveness to the public weal in part answer whether Mr. WERDEL knows whereof he speaks.

The paper from which Mr. WERDEL quoted was classified "Confidential." I don't know how he got it. But being so classified, it cannot be quoted by me, though Mr. WERDEL put parts of it directly into the RECORD. The question of the ethics of his procedure aside, I would again ask about the validity of his judgment. He said with respect to it that the paper "was so startling to them (the General Staff) that they promptly had the report marked 'Confidential' and ordered it locked up." Nothing of the kind happened. I personally had the paper so stamped. Mr. WERDEL knows the nature of the paper; he himself says that he cannot quote it in full because its contents have international implications. Therefore classifying it "Confidential" was routine; I so classified it before others read it. Far from conspiring to suppress the paper, the General Staff gave it more than normal circulation, considering the classification. A second edition was published by the General Staff so that there would be more jogging of thought all down the line. Else, Mr. WERDEL would never have procured a copy. He says the handling of this paper is proof of the Staff's Prussianism; I submit that to any reasonable mind, it is proof of the exact opposite.

But further, Mr. WERDEL says that the paper is a criticism of "present Army doctrine," adding that it challenges the doctrine "as being defeatist in character." To use the most polite phrase which occurs, he is guilty of a terminological inexactitude. The paper was written in April 1948; nothing said by way of criticism within that paper applies to Army doctrine today. Moreover, had the whole paper been quoted by Mr. WERDEL, it would have been recognized not as an indictment of the Army but as an analysis of the extraordinary difficulty in which the whole Defense Establishment was then placed because of indecision elsewhere in the Nation. We then had the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine. But we had made no move to league with Western Europe for mutual defense or to arm our friends or even to get our own military house in order. Rejecting isolationism, we had not yet accepted its only possible strategic alternative—collective security with strength suited to the need. True, I discussed the confusions in our military policy, but only as a reflection of the doubts and contradictions elsewhere in the national landscape which thwarted military planning on any grander scale than we had known in the past. It was argued that if military men could begin to ponder the national problem from its center to the circumference, informing themselves more fully on foreign policy, the better to fashion a military policy in harmony with it, they might assist the Nation to a sound course. The Army had about two divisions in being in this country at that writing. If Mr. WERDEL does not think there was good cause for it to be concerned about its position, his reasoning is not like mine. Again, if he believes that a plea for open-mindedness and sober thought is the mark of Prussianism within an army, his reasoning is not like mine; nor is his knowledge of the German general staff.

In what the press quoted of what Mr. WERDEL said about the Army, the emphasis was placed upon his statement relating to the circulating of a paper written by Gen. Heinz Guderian, of the German army. This is a paper called Unification or Coordination. Mr. WERDEL says that the prime motive behind the publication of this paper is to indoctrinate officers toward the day when the military can take over the control of this Republic; it is difficult to understand how any man can strain his imagination that far. The paper is a simple treatise on military organizational problems as experienced in Germany. It would read as that to anyone save perhaps the character Humpty-Dumpty, who used the word "glory" to mean a "nice, knock-down argument," saying, "When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean." In seeking to prove perfidy where none exists, Mr. WERDEL says, "I am advised these studies by the German generals are basic references by those in the Pentagon who believe that the only thing wrong with the supreme Prussian staff was the people who ran it." It happens that, as chief historian of the European theater, I initiated the series of studies among the German generals, though I had nothing to do with the Guderian studies. The policy was promoted simply for the knowledge that it would produce. That is the main way for soldiers to further their education. For the same reasons, whatever we can learn about Russian methods in warfare, Japanese principles of command, or Chinese military indoctrination is to the advantage of the Army. To Mr. WERDEL it might seem better that we keep soldiers as ignorant as Parsifal. I would prefer to believe that the words of Mirabeau Lamar, "Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy," apply to men in military suits, as well as to Congressmen.

No general staff is ever perfect; nor is any other group of individuals. In the Army, now and then, you will meet a potential man on horseback. Occasionally one may get onto the General Staff. But men of the same sort—driven by vainglory and inordinate appetite for power—also get to Congress occasionally. I know of no way under the sun that our society, or any important part thereof, can be purged of such people. The main question is whether thought and motivation are reasonably sound among the majority of those in control. Having had a long and intimate experience with our Army General Staff, I simply wish to add my witness that they are as deeply devoted to their country and as fully committed to the preservation of our fundamental liberties as any body of men in my experience.

Faithfully yours,

S. L. A. MARSHALL.

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Tuscaloosa, (Ala.) News carried in its issue of Saturday, May 5, 1951, a letter written by Dr. Clanton W. Williams, professor of history at the University of Alabama to his brother-in-law, Lt. Richard McDonald Payne, serving with the American forces in Korea. The letter is an exceptionally able, enlightening, and challenging statement on the world situation and the danger which faces our country. The Tuscaloosa News captions it "The MacArthur case in light of Marshall's grand strategy."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD. I strongly commend it to Senators, irrespective of what their views may be.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the letter will make approximately three pages of the RECORD at a cost of $246.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MACARTHUR CASE IN LIGHT OF MARSHALL'S GRAND STRATEGY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Within recent weeks Dr. Clanton W. Williams, professor of history at the University of Alabama, has addressed several groups in Tuscaloosa and elsewhere, treating the general world war picture brought most directly into focus by the MacArthur dismissal. There has been much demand for the text of this address, by school officials, civic club members, and others. The Tuscaloosa News asked Dr. Williams to prepare a text, and he has done so, in the form of a letter to his 25-year-old brother-in-law, a lieutenant in Korea. As a public service, the News is printing this entire text herewith.)

UNIVERSITY, ALA.,
April 29, 1951.

Lt. RICHARD MCDONALD PAYNE,
Company E, Ninth RCT, APO 248,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MAC: You asked in your last letter what people back here were thinking about Harry Truman's removal of General MacArthur. You said that it came as quite a surprise to you men in Korea. I think it came as a real shock to most of the people throughout the United States of America. Surely the deluge of anti-Truman-pro-MacArthur letters which flooded Washington during the first 2 weeks indicates that the people of the Nation as a whole were deeply disturbed and seemed to be convinced that a great man was being eliminated from a confused scene by a man of relatively small stature.

Deep resentment across the Nation greeted the news. One small indication of that was a poll of my first class (second half of English history) for a show of hands as to whether or not Truman had done right. Only 1 student said "yes"; 6 would not commit themselves; 36 were vehemently pro-MacArthur.

GENERAL RECEIVES WILD WELCOME

We listened to the radio broadcasts of the wild welcomes given the general in Hawaii and San Francisco. I was at Maxwell Field taking a physical examination (which I passed for recall June 1) when the general was making his speech to Congress, but I heard rebroadcasts far into the night. Then the general went on to New York, where 7,500,000 screaming humans cheered him to the skies. Chicago went wild; and last Friday Milwaukee followed suit.

It was extremely interesting to read the various comments about the whole affair, and also to note the inconsistency of the pro-isolationists in Congress whereby they had suddenly thrown all isolation to the winds in the emotional confusion of the hour. Republican DEWEY SHORT, after MacArthur's speech to Congress said, "We have just heard the voice of God." Former President Hoover, who has been advocating desertion of all our allies except Japan and "perhaps" Britain (but not appeasement) said that MacArthur was St. Paul reincarnate. Of course Senator MCCARTHY was given fresh ammunition for labeling as pro-Communists Dean Acheson and others who said MacArthur should have been removed. Senator DIRKSEN admitted in a TV interview that the Republicans were going to use this affair to the fullest. You can imagine how Fulton Lewis, Jr., and other Chicago Tribune people have been going to town. I don't know what a Gallup Poll would show right now, but it is reasonable to assume that Truman's stock is at its lowest. In fact, I doubt that any President since Andrew Jackson, has enjoyed such universal unpopularity as Truman did last week. You may have heard how he was "booed" at Griffith Field.

Regardless of what one may think of Truman and Acheson, surely any objective approach toward trying to evaluate the mess we are in must not stem from personal likes or dislikes or emotion. It must stem from several facts: Fact No. 1: the Communist crusade was going to proceed regardless of who were President and Secretary of State of the United States of America. Fact No. 2: At least 90 percent of the people of this country approved of our action on June 25, 1950, when the Russians sent the Korean Reds across the thirty-eighth parallel. Fact No. 3: Now that the Chinese Reds have made a new war out of the Korean affair, and we can't see where we are going, the Nation has become highly exasperated.

Fact No. 4: The natural reaction was to look for scapegoats. (Here the "outs" struck oil.) Fact No. 5: MacArthur, as any field commander with an immediate military problem before him would do, screams loud and long about the restrictions placed upon him. Fact No. 6: People like me who have loved ones like you caught on a firing line with no immediate goal in view, had a natural impulse to yell to Truman, "Give MacArthur everything he wants." Instead, (Fact No. 7) Truman tells MacArthur to "shut up"; MacArthur refuses and, trying to go over the heads of his military superiors, appeals to the people through the anti-Truman forces in Congress (whether they be isolationists, McCarthyites (Anglophobes, reactionary southern Democrats, or just office-hungry Republicans). Fact No. 8: Harry, whom no one may accuse of lacking guts, fires the General and gives him an opportunity to step forth into the blazing spotlight with all stops pulled. The General takes his cue and little Harry's stock sinks.

And now you face a renewed Communist drive.

OTHER DRAMAS ARE UNFOLDING

All the while there are other dramas being unfolded elsewhere. The MacArthur show is drama No. 1. Yours is drama No. 2. The others are:

Drama No. 3: In Paris Gromyko is stalling around at a conference which is a preliminary conference to a big conference to bring together the Big Four Foreign Ministers. They are supposed eventually to work out a peace treaty for Germany and otherwise settle issues in Europe. We are supposed to enter into a contract with the Russians—a contract which we westerners are expected by Moscow to accept in good faith (like Yalta and Potsdam), when we know that the Russians have no tradition for honoring contractual arrangements, indeed have damned contracts as a bourgeois institution. Still Gromyko has found that our Philip Jessup and the British and French deputies this time are not going to be bullied. They know full well what the Russian game is and they are not going to let the Communists take over the German military and technological potential through diplomatic default. And Gromyko isn't even making much propaganda capital out of this one. Our patient presence there is denying him this.

Drama No. 4: Also in Paris and across Western Europe, General Eisenhower is working feverishly to build a military machine capable of stopping the Russian hordes from taking Western Europe. Whether or not he will succeed is at this moment hanging in the balance. Several things are decidedly in his favor—giving him precious time. One is what you are doing in Asia (see below); another is the Russian knowledge of our growing stockpile of atom bombs and United States strategic air power. Still a third is the Russian hope that the Kremlin may yet take Western Europe by diplomacy and trickery.

Drama No. 5: Meantime, the Communists are busy elsewhere—still trying to sabotage the rearmament of Western Europe—still rattling the sword at Yugoslavia and the Mediterranean—working in Iran to deny the British their middle-eastern oil—working in Africa toward denying us the uranium deposits of the Congo—and continuing to build up their own military machine and those of the satellite countries, including the East German police.

Drama No. 6 lies in what we are doing at home. Despite all the bickering and emotional confusion of the moment, plus the usual amount of cheating and jockeying of certain tunnel-visioned Americans, this Nation is getting stronger by the hour. Given time, we shall have built enough matériel for ourselves, for Europe, and for Asiatics, and all other potential allies. Time is the great factor—time which you and your fellows are helping to provide—time to mobilize our manpower and that of Europe—time to give our scientists those last precious moments before the word is given: "Freeze models. Standardize. Proceed with mass production."

Drama No. 7 is offstage. It is being enacted in the field of atomic fission—the increasing plant capacity—the coming Eniwetok experiments with new A or maybe H bombs—and the continuing feverish research in university and Government labs.

You have to see all of these dramas at once to be able to appreciate fully the one in which you are a participant. And you must see them all against the backdrop of our day in history.

RECALLING A PROPHECY OF 1939

Mind if your old professor repeats some of what you learned in current world history? Do you remember the broadcast I made in December 1939 in which attention was called to the fact that there were three great ideologies abroad in the world: Democracy, communism, and fascism—each a deadly enemy of the other two? I had stuck my neck out then and had ventured to predict that:

"Before this Second World War is over fascism, unable to triumph over democracy, will turn on communism. Consequently, democracy and communism will be erstwhile allies, and shall destroy the power of fascism. Then arising out of the gore will be the remaining two ideologies staring at each other with eyes of suspicion and hatred. * * * Before this century has run its course, one or the other, the Communist International or international democracy, shall triumph. Whether or not it will be the latter will depend in large measure, perhaps wholly, upon whether or not the people of this great democracy shall in the immediate postwar period understand the complex issues it will face and whether or not it will seize its wonted position of intelligent and dynamic leadership in the building of a powerful world government—an international democracy, or return to the self-centered isolationism from which it has not yet emerged."

The only reason, Mac, for harping back to the way things seemed to be shaping up 11½ years ago is by way of getting a long-range view of where we stand as we are moving into the second half of the twentieth century. Some of the predictions then may have been quite presumptuous, but I do not believe it was presuming too much for a historian to express conviction that man would go right on fighting unless there were created a powerful world government (international democracy) with a powerful police force (of which, right now, you are a part).

And it was not presumptuous to accept at face value the pronouncements of intent in the Communist scriptures. You remember that Josef Stalin had written in his Vaprosy Leninisma (Problems of Leninism) in 1924:

"The struggle between these two systems will fill up the history of the development of the world revolution."

We could not afford to ignore Stalin's well-written, clear-cut, almost scholarly book (which was being written at the very time that Hitler was writing his rambling Mein Kampf). There in this new testament (Marx and Lenin had written the old testament), Stalin had set forth his doctrine and part of his program of action:

"The goal is (to use the Russian dictatorship of the proletariat) as the base for the overthrowal of imperialism (sic) in all countries. The epoch of world revolution has begun. The faster this country is transformed into a base for the further unfolding of world revolution, into a lever for the further disintegration of imperialism, the development of world revolution will be the more rapid and thorough. * * * The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist powers for a long time is unthinkable. In the end, one or the other will conquer; and until that end comes, a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

STALIN'S VOW TO LENIN'S MEMORY

I doubt that Franklin D. Roosevelt, or Cordell Hull, or Stettinius ever discovered that book, though Alger Hiss may have. I doubt that BOBBY TAFT or KENNETH WHERRY or BRICKER even now know of its existence and if they do, they may be able to shrug it off with some good McCormick statement. But the Great Vow of Fidelity taken by Stalin at the burial of Nicholai Lenin they must know. As late as 1947 it was set forth in bold-faced type in one of Stalin's books:

"In departing from us, Comrad Lenin bequeathed to us fidelity to the principles of the Communist international. We swear to you, Comrad Lenin, that we will not spare our lives in order to strengthen and expand the union of toilers of the whole world—the Communist international."

I can't leave this subject, Mac, without referring to two more quotations from the Communist new testament. The first is from Vaprosy Leninisma. It is the famous Doctrine of Ebb and Flow:

"The epoch of world revolution is a whole strategic period, embracing a whole series of years, and, I dare say, even a number of decades. In the course of this period there can be ebbings and flowings."

All of the above is at the highest echelon—the plane of doctrine and grand strategy.

It is in his second book, the History of the All Union Communist Party, 1936, that Stalin sets forth his tactics (direct and evasive). After discussing the role of the leading detachments (such as the Korean and Chinese Reds) he talks about the strategic reserves, the Red army of the U. S. S. R. itself. He says that he does not intend to throw in his reserves until absolutely required to do so—just when or where he could not then say. Then he adds this significant statement: "A great deal depends upon whether we (the U. S. S. R. itself) succeed in delaying war with the capitalistic countries which is inevitable." (There's that "inevitable" again.)

In this second book also Stalin stated that in the process of world revolution there must be brought under the Kremlin's dictates Germany, China, and India, but he could not then (1936) say in which order their acquisition should occur.

Well, I hardly need tell you what success Stalin has had to date—of how he took all of central Europe—of how in 34 years since 1917, some 750,000,000 humans have been dragged behind the iron curtain—of how well his leading detachments in Asia are doing.

This brings us sharply back to the present MacArthur controversy—back to the rampaging academic and emotional stew of the moment—back to the mess wherein partisan politics for politics' sake, tear-jerking theatricals, exasperation, and latent desire to drop the atom bomb on somebody—that most of us just can't or won't think this thing coolly.

It's something like a football team which through a large part of the game has been on the defensive—just can't move over to the offense. The other team is lining up for the next play and our side is in a defensive huddle, arguing and bickering with the quarterback and the captain. (Our ex-captain (Hoover) is yelling from the sidelines for us to pull back for a grand and glorious goal-line stand—that is, he was until St. Paul came back to us reincarnate.) Of course, though, this is too simple an analogy, for football teams can always look forward to next Saturday or next season. Democracy may have no next Saturday, for this is a game to the death in an atomic age.

CAPTAIN TRUMAN CANNOT INSPIRE

But I must make one more reference to the captain and quarterback analogy. Captain Truman is not an inspiring leader. That's his one big fault: he just cannot inspire the people to full unstinted action. Nevertheless, we did elect him and that's that. Dean Acheson is quarterback in name. He, too, is uninspiring to the masses and he can't handle himself in the rough and tumble of politics. I say he is quarterback in name. By that I mean that the real strategy maker—the coach, who is in position to see the whole game, is none other than George C. Marshall. For my part I have large trust in him and his judgment, and I thank God that he is there and that only a few brickbats are being hurled at him. Only the most partisan politician, only the mose vehement and academically unhonorable, dare to cast aspersions at him.

Secretary Marshall, a voracious reader, has proved himself fully appreciative of the conflict of ideologies—of the marriage of Russian nationalism and Marxist-Leninist-Stalinism. He thoroughly understands the objectives of Joseph Stalin and the Politburo. And Marshall has a well-organized mind, fully capable of seeing the trees fitting into the whole forest. We must remember that he was the leader of the Combined Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the time when communism and Democracy were "erstwhile allies." We must remember that he was Secretary of State when this Nation made its first real defensive moves. He set the grand strategy to which Dean Acheson fell heir. As our current Secretary of Defense he is not completely out of the line of fire of the McCarthyites and others, nevertheless as Captain Harry's and Quarterback Dean's coach he is in fact the nation's leader whose grand strategy is prevailing.

In his diagnosing the strategy and tactics of the Kremlin, one all important fact stands out in his mind. It is so simple in itself, so clear to anyone who can lift his head above the ground mist, that it is really amazing that everyone doesn't see it. It lies in the answers to these questions: "How can the Kremlin ever accomplish its World Revolution without defeating the United States?" "How can the technological power of the United States be matched and overwhelmed?" The answer: "Only by regimenting under communism the technological power of Germany and the rest of Western Europe." "And how can that be done before the threat of United States strategic air and a stockpile of atom bombs."

The Politburo right there reaches a quandary. Some of the Kremlin Bolsheviks must be arguing: "We must move now regardless of the consequences." But at that point they run into the Marxian-Lenin doctrine of "historical determinism" (just wait and the bourgeois institutions will inevitably fall because of their "contradictions.") And they remember Stalin's doctrine of Ebb and Flow; and his determination that Russia, the "base for the further unfolding of world revolution" shall not be endangered; and they perhaps still hear him warning that the Russian "strategic reserves" must not be committed until absolutly necessary. And so we have Dramas No. 3 and No. 5 above.

But suppose Stalin dies and hotter heads take over the World Revolution. Or suppose he decides that now is the time to take Western Europe? After all, hasn't he also said that war between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalistic nations is inevitable? Where does that leave the United States of America at this moment? Where would it leave the world if at the "inevitable" moment the United States of America finds its military strength bogged down in an Asiatic conflict from which it could not extricate itself for bigger things?

MARSHALL'S ADDRESS OF 1948

Do you remember Mr. Marshall's 1948 address at Berkeley, Calif.? There he made a most significant statement. Let me quote it for you. I dug it out of the New York Times files this afternoon. It's in the March 20 issue, page 4, columns 3 and 4:

"Our means are not unlimited—we must not spend our efforts unwisely.

"As a matter of fact, I find the present situation disturbingly similar to that with which I labored as Chief of Staff. * * * For several years I had to withstand heavy pressure from various theaters of operation in the world for assistance, support in the form of matériel, without regard to our then extremely limited resources available in the United States.

"Later, after our entry into the war, these pressures greatly increased in the demand for support to an extent which if met would have rendered us ineffective, I think, on almost every field of action (including) the Western Pacific.

"I find myself in virtually the same position today as I was during those war years and the decisions are just as difficult and equally important. Rich and powerful as we are, we cannot afford to disperse our efforts to a degree which would render all ineffective. Every region has its claims and its proponents and it is therefore necessary to decide on general strategy to be employed, having in mind the entire world situation."

This is the key to the whole confused situation right now. Too bad, I think that the whole American people can't reread that statement. It should clarify many minds and wipe away much of the emotional confusion now pervading the atmosphere. If Mr. Marshall were in position to do so—and he is not—he would repeat this and be even more specific He would tell of the exasperating story of how MacArthur kept up a continuous stream of cables to the Pentagon during 1942-44, wherein the Pacific commander was demanding every day more men, more planes, more ships. Marshall would doubtless admit that it was but natural for General MacArthur to want to get on with his own war. But he would have to say quietly, dispassionately, that it was the Chief of Staff's painful duty to continue to reply that the Pacific Ocean area would have to wait, for the European war held No. 1 priority. MacArthur's magnificent public-relations outfit did not prevail over Marshall and the grand strategy here was fully justified by the course of events.

THE CRISIS OF JANUARY 1947

When Marshall became Secretary of State in January 1947, he fell heir to a bad, bad situation. The Yalta and Potsdam contracts had been made and were already being cast aside as "dirty, bourgeois, capitalistic, imperialistic instruments." The United Nations (embryonic International Democracy) had been born crippled and was being used by the Soviet Union for one purpose—to prevent it from becoming an international police power and otherwise the Soviet policy was to divide and confuse the opponents of totalitarian tyranny. When Mr. Marshall became Secretery of State, Iran and Turkey and Greece stood on the verge of Communist conquest; and Italy and France seemed ready to capitulate. Nearly every nation in Western Europe lay economically destitute—begging for bread. The Communists were rubbing their hands in glee.

Well, I won't review all the facts relative to the Truman (really Marshall) doctrine; the Marshall plan and the wonderful work of ECA; of how the Berlin airlift saved Germany; or how Marshall succeeded in getting a reluctant Congress to make it possible to revitalize all of Western Europe and then to awaken a desire among those cultured peoples to live again and to march on toward freedom; of how the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was finally brought into existence, the United States of America becoming not only a vital part of it, but, through General Eisenhower, the real leader of it.

The vast difference between Europe of just 3 years ago—flat broke, starving, disconsolate, indigent, lying naked before the rapacious minions of Moscow—and the Europe of today since the Marshall strategy went into effect—back on its feet, unsteady still, but at last regaining its strength, becoming increasingly defiant of Moscow, now fired with hope and determination—the vast differences brought about in these years comprise a wonderful chapter in the history of international democracy in action. It is perhaps the proudest chapter in American history.

Given two more years of continued progress, Europe, with its mighty technological potential and still backed up by the young giant across the Atlantic, the new Europe will not fall into the Kremlin orbit and the world revolution shall not materalize; and perhaps—perhaps even yet—world war III shall not reach the full fury we can envisage.

But again, will the Politburo give the West those 2 years? No one now knows the answer—doubtless not even the Kremlin masters themselves. But they must know that without the technocracy of Europe regimented to their own ends, Marx' historical determinism will one day prove to have been a false doctrine.

And so history at this moment is hanging in the balance. Somehow—in some way—the Politburo must divert American attention and American military strength from the No. 1 priority.

Then, too, Russia as a nation has something else worrying her. The past 50 years have seen the giant China arising as a nation—a people with national ambitions. The one biggest problem the Chinese Nation faces is overpopulation. Eighty-five percent of the people live off the "Good Earth" and there is not enough of it for 450,000,000 unscientific people to eat well from its produce—and the population is growing at an increasing rate. China must some day expand. Where? In which direction? There is but one answer: Into sparsely settled and fertile Siberia.

Russia then must control the government of China. She must try to send China southward. And something else, if possible. What finer boon could befall Russia and communism than to have the United States of America locked for a long time in strength-sapping war with China?

MAC ARTHUR SAW OWN MILITARY PROBLEM

Whether or not MacArthur saw all of this, I do not know. He did see some of it. But he also saw his own military problem and that was absolutely paramount—that and the St. Paul reincarnate factor. And he is entitled to the deep sympathy and admiration of this Nation. And that he is surely getting.

And I would say to him "You should have your every demand fulfilled—but not now—not while there is an all-important No. 1 priority."

But you, Lieutenant, have been asking all through this long letter, the $64 question, "Where does all this leave us guys out here in Korea?" And that is what the Nation is asking of President Truman and Secretary Acheson; and they are not able to answer. I say "not able," not because of their uninspiring personalities, but because of the grand stategy involved, because of the possibility of giving away strategic information, because what they might say could be the very thing which would cause the Kremlin to throw in the strategic reserves—and we simply are not ready to meet that eventuality.

I think I can list a few things for you that might help a little to answer that question:

No. 1: The big conflict between international democracy and the Communist International required that somewhere at some place we had to use physical strength to deter the Communist crusade (or Russian territorial expansion, if you choose). Stalin had decreed it. Korea was it.

No. 2: The fate of the United Nations, the one positive good that came out of World War II in which 22,000,000 humans died—millions of them to win the peace—was hanging in the balance. Had it not acted positively in June 1950, it would quickly have gone the way of the League of Nations which had no police power; and international democracy would have made a terrible capitulation before the Communist International.

No. 3: The whole honor of this Nation was at stake. We had pledged our support to the embryonic democracy of Korea. The eyes of the various peoples, large and small, were fiercely focused upon Uncle Sam in June 1950. And they are still so focused. Would this one-time self-centered, irresponsible giant of the west who had become in recent years the epitome of all that nations aspired to—this arsenal of democracy, the one hope of mankind against an engulfing totalitarian tyranny—would the powerful United States of America act in the interest of morality and justice and freedom and, yes, even in its own long-range interest? Or would he prove indeed to be Uncle Shylock, a cowardly, money-mad, short-visioned egotist? The world got its answer—and it still has that answer. And you are giving that answer in person.

No. 4 is a tough one, but you are big enough to take it. I hate to have to write it, for in so doing I have to castigate my own American people as lacking in statesmanship. It lies in a historical fact: This country has to have its face physically slapped before it will bound into unified action. Woodrow Wilson was a great leader but it took a series of *Lusitanias* to end the great debate of 1914–17. F. D. R. was a great leader but it took a Pearl Harbor to end the great debate of 1939–41. The Korean war—the sacrifices of you guys out there now—is the prerequisite face-slapping we have to have.

MARSHALL'S GRAND STRATEGY PREVAILS

Has the great debate of 1946–51 come to a close? Yes, in fact it has, Mac. Not so decisively as those did in 1917 and 1941. The press is calling this MacArthur controversy the great debate; a month ago they were calling the four divisions to Europe the great debate; 2 years ago they were calling the North Atlantic Treaty controversy the great debate; and 3 years ago there was a great debate over the Marshall plan. But every time our Congress, after giving us a scare, has come through. But the big reason I say the great debate is over is because Marshall's grand strategy still prevails; Europe is still No. 1 priority; we did act decisively last June; we have no intention of appeasing the Asiatic Reds and welshing on our moral obligation to the Koreans and other little democracies; we finally did bolster the wavering United Nations even though our action was left-handed; our face—your face—is being slapped; Truman finally did declare a state of emergency; Congress has voted huge appropriations and is going to vote some sixty billions more soon; the military ranks are being filled as fast as matériel is being provided for them; and while most of that matériel is now going to you and replacements are on the way, we are moving into high gear on the production front.

Given time—time you are helping to provide in Korea—time provided by the Kremlin's indecision in the face of our atomic power—given time, we shall have manufactured the matériel for ourselves, for Europe, and for anti-Communists everywhere, even including the men on Formosa (whether under Chiang Kai-shek and his Kuomintang or some Third Movement—Democracy, I hope).

Let the Reds sing as loudly as they care, to their stirring strain, the Internationale:

"'Tis the final conflict.
Let each stand in his place.
The International Party
Shall be the human race."

What you are doing—you and your men—is in fact one grand reply: "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Well, Mac, old boy, this has been a long epistle. I hope it hasn't confused you still more. Maybe, if you are now pulled back for another few days' rest, you can find time to glance over this again. I've written at such length to you, a college graduate, because I believe that you must require some academic reappraisal now and then against which your personal courage is braced—not that you haven't got all the fortitude traditional in Young America, plus pride in your world-famous fighting outfit.

You know that mother and Claudine and kids, and your gallant little wife and precious baby are hoping and praying with me that that long-looked-for rotation gets you back to us the same old Mac we love—and soon.

Your fond old brother-in-law,

CLANTON.

The Constitution in Our Everyday Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of my State held an oratorical contest for Negroes. Elnora Sanders, a student of the Manual Training High School, Muskogee, Okla., was the winner.

The subject of her oration was The Constitution in our Everyday Life. Believing the oration worthy of perpetuation, I include it here as part of my remarks:

THE CONSTITUTION IN OUR EVERDAY LIFE

One hundred and sixty-four years ago, there emerged an idea and an ideal, from the minds, the hearts, and the souls of great men, striving to establish an even greater nation. One hundred and sixty-four years ago on May 25, 1787, 55 men of great wisdom and prudence met in Philadelphia, Pa., and drew up the document upon which rests the government of this, the greatest nation on earth today.

These great men of foresight threw out the outmoded Articles of Confederation and started anew. They provided for a legislative body to make the laws, a judicial group to interpret the laws, and an executive department to enforce the laws—three distinct branches of government, all equal in power and all working together, yet, so planned that no one of them could gain supremacy over the others.

These great men had faith and foresight. They had faith to believe that America and its Constitution would stand. They had foresight to see that as America grew and changed, its Constitution would have to be changed also. Thus, they provided that their charter might be amended. There have been amendments to this Constitution—22 to be exact—and there has been great progress mad under this document. At the time our Constitution was written, America was a small nation with an area of only 850,000 square miles; with a population of 3,500,000 people. America stands today a giant Nation of 4,000,000 square miles, and 150,000,000 people of all races, creeds, and colors, rich in every aspect by which a nation's wealth can be measured. But, my friends, all this has not been easily accomplished.

This great document has been tried and tested time and again—during periods of war, inflationary periods and periods of depression, and has inevitably remained the guiding beacon which has led us triumphantly through each crisis. The War of 1812 was one of the first tests of our Constitution. This war strengthened American independence in the eyes of the world. Then there was the War Between the States, the outcome of which proved that this Government, outlined by the Constitution, was far stronger then that of any one State. It made the United States an indestructible union of indestructible States. Later World War I, which was to have made the world safe for democracy, and of course World War II. Three times, since the War Between the States, we have demonstrated to the world that we are a united people and that there is no North nor South, no East nor West, whenever freedom and our beloved land is threatened by foreign forces. My friends, if these principles have proved themselves sound during our many great crises, does it not seem logical that they should be practiced in our daily life?

At no time in our Nation's history have we been so gravely challenged as we are today, to safeguard the principles of human freedom that have made our Nation great.

In a world that is far from settled, where peace is a hope, but not yet a reality, we must understand and renew our faith in our fundamental beliefs; make sure that in our daily living we do not adopt policies which violate these fundamental principles laid down to us in our constitution. What a much better place in which to live this land of ours would be if these same principles were practiced in our daily contact with our fellow men: No North nor South, no East nor West, but freedom and democracy for all. With unfaltering faith we look forward to the day when America's progress will no longer be obstructed by racial and religious prejudice and intolerance.

Our forefathers came to this country for social, economic, and religious freedom. They believed in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They believed in equality and justice of humanity. Those things came down to us from heaven and are inherent in us from birth. The framers of the Constitution realized these things and wove them into the fabric of our Government. As the Preamble states: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." The flower of American manhood has died in all parts of the world to uphold the ideals of that Constitution.

Upon us, the living, falls the sacred duty to preserve them in our everyday life. Let us keep faith with those American boys of all colors who gave their lives that those principles might live. They would tell us in the words of Lieutenant Colonel McGrae, who died in France during World War I. He said:

"Take up our quarrel with the foe
To you from failing hands we throw the torch;
Be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow In Flanders Field."

Let us, in our everyday living and dealings with our fellow man, be able to give those heroes "The American's Answer" in the words of Rev. R. W. Lillard, who said:

"Fear not that ye have died for naught,
The torch he threw to us we caught,
Ten million hands will hold it high,
And freedom's light shall never die.
We've learned the lesson that ye taught,
In Flanders Field."

America stands today in dire need of men with dogged determinations who have courage to uphold those glorious ideals of our revered Constitution.

Democracy is not a completed thing. The key to democracy is the persistent struggle to keep alive this idea of freedom and justice, to uphold it and to expand it against every force which would seek to destroy or restrict it. That struggle has never ended, each rising generation of Americans must protect the hard-won gains of the past. We must also move forward by making freedom and justice vital realities in our every-day life. If America is to indoctrinate the rest of the world with democracy, it is only logical for America to indoctrinate itself first. Democracy must mean equal employment opportunities; opportunities to learn and use technical skills and to advance according to the mastery of them. Democracy must mean equal educational opportunities; it must mean justice in the courts of the land. Democracy must mean simply the opportunity for all Americans to share to the full extent of their capacities in the defense of America in war, and in the development of America in peace.

All of this can be accomplished only, if the mandates of our Constitution are enforced.

For it provides as now written, every guaranty of liberty and freedom and of civil rights that any American could desire.

American democracy must not be debased, ridiculed, and laughed to scorn in derision by the rest of the world. This Nation, "conceived in liberty," must rid itself of those infamous practices which are such blatant blemishes on our constitutional concepts of liberty.

The American Constitution is our heritage. It is ours to keep its spirit alive, to put teeth into its mandates, to uphold its ideals daily in our attitudes and all our acts; in all our contacts with our fellow men of all colors—all creeds; in the very thoughts we think, in the very sentiments we express, and in the very air we breathe. It is ours to cherish—ours to defend—ours to preserve in our everyday lives—the Constitution of the United States of America.

Threat to Our Free Press in Today's World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable address on the threat to our free press in today's world, delivered by Columnist Marquis Childs, at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., on May 4, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have honored me in asking me to speak on this occasion which in the long tradition of the School of Journalism has come to have such great significance. I know that in the past it has customarily been an occasion when you have fittingly marked the achievements of American journalism. For these achievements the school and Dean Mott and his predecessors and the men associated with him may take no small credit. With their dedication to the highest ideals of journalism they have contributed much.

But with your permission this evening, I shall make my assignment rather a different one than counting the triumphs of the free press in America today. The time has come when we must examine the base on which all the achievements and the triumphs of a free press inevitably rest. That base is the right of independent opinion for a newspaper, for an editor, and, yes, for the individual in our society who elects to stand alone.

That is at the heart of the concept of a free press. It is no stronger and no weaker than that right. And when it begins to go, when the views of the lowliest individual are suppressed or when he is silenced by intimidation, then all is in danger. If there is one thing we should have learned in the recent past, it is that freedom cannot be denied to some and preserved for others. Even the most powerful newspaper cannot save itself by merely acquiescing in the power of the suppressor.

The reaction of the United States to the death of La Prensa has been a healthy one. The death of that newspaper was like a lightning flash revealing that the sky over this hemisphere, too, was darkened by the menace to freedom that has spread so far across Europe and Asia. There has come the realization and the bell that tolled for La Prensa conveyed a deep and solemn warning for all of us. In John Donne's phrase, "Never ask for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee."

La Prensa was a great and free newspaper. Its destruction at the hands of the dictator, Juan Peron, diminishes by that much the heritage of freedom of all of us.

But, if I may say so, there was in some of the comment on the extinction of this great Argentine newspaper, the assumption that this was an isolated event; that this was the evil consequence of the wrong-doing of one man; an unhappy accident in a world otherwise virtuous. I think if we examine honestly the phenomena of La Prensa, we shall find that this is not in fact true. We shall find that it is part of an ominous pattern that goes a considerable way back into the past and that has now extended to this part of the world which had its origins in a desire to escape the tyrannies of the past and to build a new society dedicated to freedom.

It was in August of 1914 that Lord Edward Grey made that fatefully symbolic remark about the lights going out everywhere. Lord Grey was looking out of the windows of 10 Downing Street as London slowly darkened under the shadow of war; a shadow that was to grow deeper and darker even in the intervals when the illusion of peace lulled most of mankind.

We cannot deny here tonight as we look back that the light of freedom as reflected in the free press has grown steadily and consistently dimmer. Even in Russia before 1917 there were periods when sections of the press enjoyed freedom of a kind. And the control of that simpler and less efficient absolutism of the Czars often tolerated opinion that was comparatively independent of the interests of the state. Ironically enough it was through these small chinks that the conspirators were helped, in part at least, in plotting the downfall of that autocracy. These plotters brought into being a far more terrible and ruthless and efficient absolutism which, as we know so well today, compels every human expression to serve slavishly and totally the apparatus of tyranny.

We who have lived under the all too easy conviction coming out of the nineteenth century of inevitable progress extending to infinity through free research and free science can hardly conceive the extent to which the denial of these freedoms has gone. In Russia the tyranny blankets not merely genetics and biochemistry but music criticism, music itself, literature, philosophy. The totality of the human spirit has been bound to the wheel of Soviet communism in a kind of slavery hitherto undreamed of.

All this has been made painfully and frighteningly obvious in recent years. What has not been so obvious are the losses suffered on our side of the iron curtain. We mourned La Prensa, but I wonder if we remember the Frankfurter Zeitung. That too was a great and free newspaper. It, too, was murdered by a dictator far more savage and ruthless than the bumbling Peron.

There have been a whole series of such murders in our time. That is the pattern. It is a spreading darkness and while it may not yet be darkness at noon we can hardly afford any illusions here in the United States about what o'clock it is. For we are not immune from this spreading paralysis.

The potential threat to the freedom of the press at home is very real. And that is above all what I want to talk about tonight. The threat that we confront may not seem to be in the same ominous pattern that has now spread to the Western Hemisphere. But what we should remember is that murder is the final stage and we can see here at home the hatreds, frustrations, conflicts, and confusions that may lead to murder.

The threat to the freedom of our press seems to me to fall into three separate departments. First, there is the insidious and pervasive threat of inflation which has already cut so deeply into the economic base on which the press rests. It is not alone the press but all of our free institutions which may be undermined if the inflationary trend continues unchecked.

Here again history is useful in providing a dire warning. Germany's runaway inflation, wiping out the middle class, prepared the way for Hitler and the Nazis. A great artist, Thomas Mann, in a long short story called "Disorder and Early Sorrow" has shown as only an artist can show how the very foundations of stable existence were taken to pieces.

But the pressure of inflation in the field of politics and morals is shown with special sharpness in connection with the press. The squeeze of rapidly rising costs is being felt particularly by what are sometimes called marginal newspapers. More often than not, these are the newspapers that occasionally express unorthodox or unpopular views. They are the newspapers which may at times support unpopular political candidates. They may occasionally oppose powerful vested interests in the community or in the Nation. If too many of these marginal newspapers are forced out of existence, and we have seen that happen in this country in recent years for a variety of reasons, then we shall come that much closer to a conformist press; we shall come that much closer to a monolithic press resembling in some degree at least the monolithic press that we loathe in totalitarian Russia. The competition of ideas in a free market will be narrowed by that much greater a margin. The whole sense of representation of varying and conflicting views, which is one of the responsibilities of the press, will have been dwarfed.

There are other ways, of course, in which inflationary pressures work toward a narrowing conformism. Survival may be at the cost of surrender; surrendering, that is, independence of opinion in conformity with the fears, the desires, the prejudices, of one minority group or another.

If we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that we can see such forces at work today. There are individual newspapers that resist them and I do not need to name them to this audience. But there are other instances in which the pressure has been too great.

It should not be forgotten that the method used for the final destruction of La Prensa was the unreasonable and arbitrary demand of a labor union, a labor union entirely subverted to the purposes of a dictator. Here, too, is an ominous pattern. A press that succumbs to an oligarchy of labor or an oligarchy of industry is no longer a free press.

Let me add, at the risk of repeating what I have said before, that I am not here talking about the virtues of a particular point of view, "liberal," "conservative," or whatever. I am talking about a variety of opinion and its representation in the free press of America. I found myself rarely in agreement with the New York Sun which expressed the extreme conservative point of view. Yet when it went under, its loss was a loss to each and to all of us. As it was put at the time, a voice in the chorus had gone and therefore the chorus was thinner and weaker.

The second form that the threat to a free press takes in this country is more difficult to define and more difficult to discuss. Broadly it may be designated the political threat as compared to the economic threat. In concrete form, this threat has found comparatively little direct expression. Yet nevertheless there are signs beneath the surface that its potentiality is greater than most of us have realized.

Certain direct political attacks on the freedom of the press—on newspapers and on individuals in such a way as to show that the attack was in reality aimed at the concept of freedom itself—indicate the direction in which this danger lies.

* * * * *

This is an attitude that you are either for us or against us and if you are against us, then we do not believe in your right to survive. If this does indeed become a widespread attitude of politicians in this country the free press is gravely threatened. For it is directly contrary to the right of independent opinion.

There is another attitude current among politicians which is also unhealthy from the point of view of a free and independent press. That is the feeling that their views are not given fair representation in the metropolitan press. This, too, is an ancient complaint. But it seems to me to have taken a new and somewhat more active form.

Since the election in November of 1950, I have heard politicians from several States speak bitterly of what they call a "paper curtain." Their complaint is directed not at the editorial page but at the news columns of the newspaper. They maintain that they could get no expression whatsoever of their views, or scarcely any expression, into the news columns. By contrast favored candidates were treated with such generosity that their every word and every publicity release found space in one form or another. One candidate told me that he had counted 27 references to his opponent in one edition of a large metropolitan newspaper which did not refer to him in any way even though he was then actively campaigning for office.

Now I have not investigated these reports. They may reflect merely the disgruntlement and rancor of politicians. But if there is any real truth in them, then the press is in some instances failing in its function of giving fair representation to major political and social groups in the community. And insofar as it fails in this function, the way is opened for political reprisals.

The politician who has grounds for believing that a "paper curtain" was pulled down on him will think in terms of revenge. Or in any event he will scarcely be an eager defender of the rights of a free press. If such resentments grow and are multiplied, the ground is prepared psychologically for radical action that can undermine the relationship between the estates. After all, the fourth estate must exist in balance with the other three estates, each in terms of its own powers and responsibilities.

I do not believe that these are imaginary fears. In my opinion, they go to the root of the relationship of freedom on the one hand and responsibility on the other hand; between the privileges enjoyed by the press and the service to society which is inherent in the very nature of the franchise it enjoys.

This brings me to what I believe to be the third great threat to the existence of a free and independent press. It might be called the threat from within. It is the threat implied in the irresponsibility of a section of the press. Fortunately, this is a small section of the press, although from its vociferousness one would sometimes assume that it is larger than it actually is.

This irresponsibility takes many forms. News is deliberately falsified, distorted, and suppressed. Irresponsible emphasis is given in exaggerated headlines to crimes of violence. No effort is made to give representation to varying views in the community. Under editing that is technically skillful, and even brilliant, some such newspapers present a monolithic front not unlike the face that Pravda and Izvestia present to the world from their privileged sanctuary in Moscow.

Fortunately, as I have said, such irresponsibility is limited to a comparatively few newspapers. But I believe that in their arrogance and in their disregard for the broader interests of community and nation, they do great harm. They tend to feed a popular prejudice that newspaper control and ownership are beyond the restraints that apply to ordinary institutions and ordinary citizens. It contributes to what one hears from time to time about such newspapers to the effect that, "Oh, you can't believe what you see in the paper. It prints only what X or Y or Z wants it to print."

If we are candid we must admit that such prejudices are not uncommon. That kind of prejudice can grow. It can corrode the position in popular esteem of the responsible as well as the irresponsible press.

No institution wielding as great power as the American press wields can long exist if it does not accept responsibility at least somewhat commensurate with its power. It was popular at one time to point to the fact that 80 percent or more of all newspapers opposed the reelection of Franklin Roosevelt in several of his campaigns, and yet, in spite of that opposition, Roosevelt was elected to an unprecedented fourth term in the White House. From this it was deduced that the press of America had no power. This seemed to me then, as it seems to me now, to have been specious reasoning. Roosevelt was a unique phenomena in American politics. All rules went overboard where he was concerned.

The American press does have a very great power. To be sure that that power is used wisely and that it is not dissipated in a time of grave crisis when all our values seem to be crumbling away, it is in my opinion necessary for the press as a whole to take definite and positive steps for its own self-preservation. Let me say frankly that, in my opinion, if it does not do so, then we may see the freedom of an independent press abridged or submerged here in the United States as it has been abridged and destroyed elsewhere. I would like to talk in closing about three fields in which it seems to me most important for constructive action.

First, I believe that some sort of group action will be necessary if the press is to stand up to the political threats and intimidations that seem certain to grow. The moment that a politician sets out to destroy an independent newspaper, that should be the signal for a collective response from the press in America. That response should be overwhelming and forceful not alone on the defensive but also in the offensive. It should be made perfectly clear to the public, not in one community or in one State but in the Nation, that a threat to the freedom of all is intended. That has long been the way of the dictator—to single out individuals to be struck down alone. The example of the individual destroyed intimidates others into caution. In this way a chain reaction is started that means the death of freedom.

In my opinion, some form of group solidarity will be necessary to protect the independence not alone of individual newspapers but of individual newspapermen and women. There must be ever present vigilance to detect the signs of creeping paralysis in threat and reprisal. The press association reporter is told by the politician that he will find a way to link him to communism; that he will report him to his superiors; that he will get his job. So the news report that goes out across the Nation is softened and modified. And the picture of the predatory politician is not put in its proper perspective. That is happening today. If it is not apprehended and resisted by the American press banded together to protect and preserve freedom, freedom may be lost, if not by direct assault then by attrition.

Secondly, it seems to me that some sort of group action is necessary to meet the economic threat to at least a part of the press. Sources of newsprint are being absorbed and monopolized by the more powerful economic units. An independent newspaper suddenly finds that one-third or one-half of its supply has been arbitrarily cut off by the acquisition of the mill that had been a source of newsprint. If this process continues unchecked, we shall see a still further reduction in the number of newspapers and therefore, also, in the variety of viewpoints given expression. Whether any sort of group action can help to insure a more equitable distribution of the available supply of newsprint, I do not presume to say. But obviously if the inequities grow and continue, then the result is not merely a blow to individual newspapers, but to the institution of the press as well.

This matter of the availability of newsprint is, of course, only one of the economic problems which confront all newspapers and particularly those papers that are less prosperous than some. The vise of ever-rising fixed costs is working serious harm on the press today. It is impossible to see where the pressures will stop. But surely one could hope for added strength in meeting these pressures from cooperative action by the press itself.

A third field in which it seems to me essential for some kind of group action raises even more difficult and delicate problems. For many years we have heard discussion of codes of ethics and standards of conduct for newspapers and newspapermen. From time to time these have embodied the finest ideals of both the journalist and teacher of journalism. But they have remained in the realm of the ideal. Any effort to enforce such standards has always seemed to encroach on the fundamental concept of freedom of expression and the right of independent opinion. Perhaps this must always remain a matter for idealistic hope rather than for day to day practice. Yet so long as a section of the press is conspicuously and flagrantly irresponsible, to that degree will there be a grave and obvious weakness opening the way to reprisals directed against all the press by the enemies of freedom.

I have said little about the direct encroachments of Government on freedom of the press. That is not because these encroachments are not very real but because the press itself seems so thoroughly alert to this danger. It was emphasized in the recent meetings of both the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the American Newspaper Publishers Association. I have chosen to speak of other dangers that constitute at least as great a threat, in my opinion, not just to one section of the press or to a few newspapers, but to the institution itself.

To ignore the weaknesses that exist today, to pretend that freedom is license, to prefer anarchy over reasonable self-restraint, is to invite disaster. The role of Cassandra is not a happy one and I apologize to you for it. But I have tried to speak tonight out of a deep and heartfelt concern for an institution that has been one of the great bulwarks of free thought in America. It is inconceivable to me that free thought could continue to exist if this institution were to be undermined or destroyed. That is why I want to say once again that it seems to me we dare not ignore the present threat to this institution that we here tonight love.

I do not presume to know whether the press is today organized to carry out or to begin to carry out some of the steps which seem to me necessary to self-preservation. There are great and important organizations of newspaper publishers and newspaper editors. Perhaps within this framework, the requisite responsibility, the vital obligation, may be vested. But I say to you most earnestly that merely to ignore the signs of threat and intimidation, of decline and decay, is to ignore a peril that I believe to be both imminent and deadly.

Caesar Has Gone Mad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following sermon delivered by R. W. Jablonowski, Jr., minister, St. Stephen Presbyterian Church, Fort Worth, Tex., on April 15, 1951:

CAESAR HAS GONE MAD

In discussing the attitude which Christian people should bear toward their rulers, St. Paul admonished: "Render therefore to all men their dues. Tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."[1]

That this has always been the custom in Presbyterianism no one can deny. In observing the belief that the separation of church and state is our time-honored way of life and should be preserved for the welfare of both these institutions, Presbyterian ministers learn early that their calling is to preach the Gospel from the pulpit, and to leave matters political alone. This does not mean that the individual Christian has no obligation to take his religious belief into the political arena, it rather means that he must use his religious conscience and knowledge in the exercise of the political franchise which is his as a citizen.

But the Church cannot afford to remain silent forever. There comes a time in the life of a nation when it is necessary to say with the poet: "There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and miseries."[2] In the sixteenth century, when it seemed that all progress in Scotland was destined to be lost in the various schemes and manipulations and crimes of Mary Stuart, John Knox did not hesitate to stand in the pulpit of St. Giles' and sound the warning to a confused and uncertain people, and throughout that long and historical controversy the nation reverberated with the voice of the Church speaking out against wrong and corruption in high places and low in the government. So must it be with the Church in our day.

Last Wednesday, and even Thursday, people seemed to be living in a state of suspended animation; existing in a state of mental shock. Something had happened which could not possibly occur. A man whose greatest success has been in machined politics—but whose success in that field has brought him the highest honor which this Nation can bestow, even though he is without question the most diminutive in presidential stature ever to occupy that exalted position—that man had sacrificed the greatest living American military commander to administrative spleen and stupidity. Those who could find voice to speak would say in despairing tone: "What can we do about it?" "Isn't there something we can do?" Somehow, there was little at the moment anyone could do. The man who had acted was completely within his legal rights, he violated no known statute, he had acted entirely in a constitutional capacity by removing from his position of command a general who refused to carry out orders to cease expressing opinions at variance with those held in Washington. The general was determined to act in what he considered the best interests of his country, regardless of the personal consequences involved, a

[1] Romans 13: 7.

[2] Julius Caesar, act IV, scene 3.

proven statesman and administrator who had forgotten more knowledge about the area in which he was working that most people would ever know.

"O judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason."[3]

But, really, the American people have no cause for shock, or surprise, or alarm. No new pattern has been set by the action of this week. For a number of months, now, the basic blueprint has been in complete evidence: A government of passion, of intemperance, of instability and irresponsibility has wended its way through shoals that have wrecked many a lesser ship. For month after month, as the garbage of corrupt administration has been slowly brought to the outer air, people have laughed or lamented, denounced or evaded, condoned or lied. This paralysis of governmental morality which has gripped the Nation is a stench in the nostrils of right-thinking people, utterly repugnant to Christian men and women.

No one can say where it all began. Mink coats for White House secretaries, deep-freeze units for presidential aides; 5 percenters; Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to bankrupt corporations on the urging of presidential secretaries; the disgraceful episode of the Australasian immigrant and Harry Vaughan, who, I am ashamed to say, is an ordained Presbyterian elder; domination of politics across the land by gambling interests gnawing at the vitals of the Nation in Miami, in New Orleans, in Los Angeles, in Chicago, in Cleveland, in New York—yes, and in Fort Worth; vile, vitriolic letters on White House stationery and in presidential handwriting directed to people who have exercised constitutional rights in expressing an opinion; epithets worthy of a roughneck hurled in all directions against critics. But these are only symptoms of the disease. They on!; throw spots of light in the darkness which has settled over the land to corrupt, to corrode, to coerce the moral fiber of a great Nation.

"But yesterday the word of Caesar might have stood against the world; now lies he there, and none so poor to do him reverence."[4]

Internationally, we are only beginning to reap the harvest which we have sown. Harken back if you will to the last days of Israel, a once-proud nation with all the world paying tribute at the feet of its rulers, those last days in which it was felt that any kind of alliance was justified in order to preserve its way of life. Israel made an alliance with Assyria, forgetting God in the interests of materialism and a vague, shadowy, uneasy peace—and an intercharge of ideas began to take place between the two nations. Imported into Israel were strange individuals who began to speak knowingly of the might of Assyria and the benefits which might be derived from the whole world being placed under her rule; new methods of dealing with their fellow Jews were adopted by Israel's people, contrary to the way they had done things since the days of Moses; their Lord God Jehovah was forgotten in the rush to the newer and more exciting Assyrian gods and goddesses; and even a few Jews were found in high places who would push the cause of Assyria to the detriment of the national interests of Israel. Ere many years had passed, Israel had been laid waste by the conquering Assyrian armies under Sennacherib, helped not a little by those same Jews who had been fostering the cause of Assyria in the councils of the government.

Our leaders felt that way, too, in fighting the Axis in World War II, so we spent many hours of radio time and many columns of journalistic lines informing the American people of the wonderful allies which we had acquired and the then President of the United States even told us that religious freedom really existed in Russia. The tragic results of that alliance are only too evident to men and women who have sons and brothers and friends in Korea. Now, in the great global conflict with the communism we fostered—and foster it we did; at Yalta we gave to Stalin territories in Asia which did not even belong to us to give, and rights of occupation over peoples who have been enslaved in the toils of the very communism we seek today to eradicate—now, we seek other allies. We appease Peron in Argentina, as evil a regime in the suppression of its people as Mussolini ever established. We woo Franco in Spain, the worst example of a clerical, reactionary dictatorship. These countries now receive the aid which the United States doles out to all whom it calls its allies in these days of peril; on the rather flimsy ground that any aid we can obtain in fighting Soviet Russia is justified. Now we are acting on the long-discredited principle, at least from the Christian point of view that "the end justifies the means." How long will it take for men to learn that wrong means always leads to a wrong end?

We seem to be traveling down the road to appeasement. We are told that the removal of Douglas MacArthur was to prevent world war III. There are some things worse than war, some things less preferable than death. Somehow, it is inconceivable that any man would still believe in 1951 that it is possible to make a real peace with the Communists, who has no intention of abiding by a treaty any longer than that treaty can serve his nefarious ends. It is certainly an admission of mental retrogression when we consider the China of Mao Tse-tung preferable to the China of Chiang Kai-shek, especially when any school child now knows that Mao's Communists no more represent the people of China than did the corrupt officials of Chiang's Kuomintang. Personally, I would much prefer to trust Chiang who professes Jesus Christ as Lord than a Mao whose god is Stalin.

Rather than live in a world half slave and half free, this speaker's choice is war. Rather than live under communism, this speaker's choice is death. Let me hasten to say that I do not believe for one moment that the principles of communism can ever triumph in a world that is ruled by Almighty God, but that is no guaranty that the United States of America will be the instrument of God to eradicate that system which denies God. God's nation has to abide by God's principles. God's people must be dedicated to the accomplishment of building His Kingdom through the church, as He has commanded. To avert world war III is not to achieve the Kingdom of God, nor will it bring even the achievement of a political Utopia.

"Ye gods, it doth amaze me, a man of such feeble temper should so get the start of the majestic world and bear the palm alone. Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed, that he has grown so great?"[5]

The controversy, however, is not between a general and a President, even though this be the immediate issue. This administration has proved itself to be incompetent, impotent, inept, and insensible to the high demands of the offices entrusted to them by the people. One cannot long condone actions which protect the official family at the expense of national righteousness, nor the making of appointments with little thought as to the competence of the appointees to handle the position, but thinking only of the political consequences involved. But, as the administration's actions symbolize the lack of its qualifications, so the administration symbolizes the lack on the part of the people of the United States to claim anything at the hands of a righteous God.

Under our system, the administration is not Caesar—the citizens are. To them belongs the ultimate franchise, and they choose the government they want at the polls.

All our disgust and revulsion in these days can be traced back to ourselves, simply because we have been indifferent, we have been careless, we have cherished tradition at the expense of right, we have been content to ignore a lack of public morality so long as we were not immediately concerned, we have talked one way and voted another, we have failed to insist upon the maintenance of the standards which brought us to our present powerful position in the affairs of men. Could the proven corruption in New York under the administration of William O'Dwyer, now the ambassador of the national administration to Mexico, have existed without the vote of the people putting him in office? Could the present corruption exist in Washington had not the people approved the return of Jackson County, Mo., political hacks to power in 1948? Could the present corruption exist in Tarrant County, Tex., had the people demanded good, clean, honest, efficient, and progressive government from its county and city officials?

We cannot expect to have deals on all sides in local affairs and not have those same tactics which have worked so well on a local basis transferred to higher councils of government, especially when we elect to higher office men who have been trained in that sort of political thinking. We have only ourselves to blame.

Now, back to the questions everyone was asking Wednesday and Thursday. "What can we do about it?" "Isn't there something we can do?" The answer is a ringing and positive affirmative—not to do anything for Douglas MacArthur. That is not necessary. The position of Douglas MacArthur in history is secure. This question will have to be asked in return: "Are you willing to pay the price of good government?" If you are a Christian, your answer must be: "Yes." How, then?

First, this situation demands prayer—prayer of confession, of penitence, asking God to forgive us our selfishness, our shortsightedness, our waywardness, our greed—prayer for guidance in this hour, asking God to lead those of us who exercise the political franchise to use the minds which He has given us to decide between principles and political parties, between statesmen and political timesavers, between right and wrong, and, once the decision is made for political righteousness, to maintain that direction regardless of the wind which may blow from popular opinion.

Second, this situation demands action—positive, constructive thinking; honest and intelligent opposition to the cancer that is eating away at our body politic in the courthouse and in the Nation's Capital; renunciation of the very human tendency to get our share of the largess of public moneys being wasted on every hand; refusal to accept any compromise with the forces of darkness represented in international, atheistic communism no matter where it rears its head, recognizing that global conflict may come as a result, but wisely acknowledging that destruction is the ultimate aim of the Politburo if necessary to achieve its ends; demanding proper use of public offices and insisting upon honest men to occupy them, never acceding for a moment to the pagan belief that "every man has his price."

Third, this situation demands a return of the individual to God and to the things of God—for, after all, the Nation's morality is the sum of the morality of its citizens. When we renounce individual greed, national greed will disappear. When we put personality above personal gain, the Nation will also. When we stop abusing principles for some immediate, practical goal, it will disappear also on the national level. When we really believe in the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ concerning personal daily living, as the church always has taught them—and act on those teachings—the Nation then can claim the blessing of God.

In this darkest and most desperate hour of her history, America needs you—you, with your prayers, your actions for righteousness, your individual return to God and the things of God. God can save America. God can save America through you.

[3] Ibid., act III, scene 2.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., act I, scene 2.

Program of Economic Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on April 27 by Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson. In my humble opinion, this is an address worthy of the close attention of every Member of Congress, for it outlines clearly and concisely this Nation's program of economic preparation. He sets out clearly the necessity for belt tightening on the part of the American people, the necessity for a continuous fight on inflation, and then he shows the answer to efforts which are being made by us and the other free nations of the world, when he states that by 1953 this Nation can be so strong that no other nation in the world would dare to either attack us or continue imperialistic aggressions.

In my opinion, Mr. Charles E. Wilson is rendering magnificent patriotic service to this Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 27, 1951]

TEXT OF WILSON'S DEFENSE PLEA TO THE PEOPLE THROUGH THE PRESS OF THE NATION

(Following is the text of an address delivered by Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilization Director, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel last night at the annual dinner of the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association:)

I am particularly glad to address this distinguished audience because the burdens of my job are related to the burdens of yours. This is not just a case of misery loving company.

I have been charged by the President of the United States to mobilize the Nation's economy. But it cannot be done without the support of public opinion, which is largely formed by the free press. Therefore, your job is far more basic than mine.

In the past few years, you have printed millions of words laying down the premise for the mobilization program that now lies before us. That premise is that the free world is in mortal danger, but that it is still possible to save it.

If the people were not convinced of that, it would be impossible for Congress to vote the vast sums now being spent to avert that danger. It would be impossible to reorganize our industrial plants, to conserve scarce metals, to establish wage and price controls, to place restrictions upon credit, and to do all the other things necessary to safeguard our country and the free world in general from the deadly menace that now confronts it.

With the support of public opinion, as marshaled by the press, we are off to a good start. But the mobilization job cannot be completed unless such support is continuous. If the enemy had attacked in New York instead of Korea, there would be no problem. The trouble is that people's imaginations are sharpened only by the immediacy of danger and too often only by brutal disaster. It is our job—yours and mine—to keep our people convinced that the only way to keep disaster away from our shores is to build America's might.

This is not an easy thing to do. When the effects of mobilization are brought home to the average citizen in terms of the price of eggs, or the amount of take-home pay, he is likely to wonder why world affairs should invade the privacy of his own life.

The fact is the relationship is an intimate one and this will become increasingly apparent as time goes on.

NATIONAL FUSION TO AVERT WAR

The problem of public morale is complicated by the activities of some members of the so-called pressure groups. In the long run, such groups—industry, labor, agriculture—tend to balance one another. But in times like the present, when the whole economy is being reshaped, the only pressure that should be exerted is pressure to get the job done, and to make the Nation strong.

I hope the country is beginning to realize that defense mobilization does not mean a choice between big business or big labor, small business or agriculture, but rather a fusing of all the segments of our population in a great national effort to prevent a third world war.

I am hopeful that the new National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy, created by the President, of which I am chairman, will be a helpful means of advancing the mobilization program. This board is made up of eminent men who, I am convinced, will place the needs of the country ahead of the desires of any group.

One of labor's principal demands has been that it should have a man at top policy-making levels in the Office of Defense Mobilization. That was a reasonable demand and I agreed to it. Many weeks ago I laid out the welcome mat.

That welcome mat is still waiting. The door is wide open. The only qualification is the same one observed by my associates and me, namely, that any man who walks through that door must put on a Government hat, with all that that implies.

I don't ask that the labor representative resign from his post in his union, but I do ask that he serve the people as a whole. Acting in that capacity, such a representative could make a valuable contribution to the mobilization program, and I would be glad to have him working with me.

The charge has been made that the mobilization effort is being dominated by a big business conspiracy.

This charge, of course, was leveled against me and some of my associates who have been summoned to Washington to take defense posts.

As for me, I am from big business and I am proud of it. With the exception of time out in World War II, I spent half a century in one industry. When the President hired me for the job, he knew where I came from. I did not come under false pretenses nor did others of the mobilization staff.

A BIG BUSINESS TO BE COMPLETED

I think I know why the President, who himself has never worn such a label, invited some members of big business to come to Washington to help out in the mobilization effort. It is because preparation for war is, to a large extent, big business.

No one expects tanks, planes, and guns to be produced and assembled in little machine shops scattered throughout the country. No, these things come from the mass production lines of huge industries, although we are willing and eager, and are going far out of our way, to have the full participation of small business in this effort. Even Stalin after the last war paid tribute to our mass production methods.

So it is only natural that the President should draw upon the experience, training, and know-how of big business to play a part—but only a part—in the mobilization program.

This is not, of course, to minimize the part small business is playing in the mobilization program. Everything possible is being done to take advantage of the facilities of small business.

For example, National Production Authority's Office of Small Business makes available a regular listing of contracts to 5,000 cooperating offices in the country, such as chambers of commerce, trade organizations, and the like. We seek to strike a proper balance in contracts between small business and big business, with each contributing what it is best equipped to produce.

When I came to Washington I took off my big business hat and put on a Government hat, and so did my associates. We are working for Uncle Sam wholeheartedly and completely, and if we are not, we should and will be fired.

I should like to set at rest another canard—that I reached out and grabbed hold of a huge fistful of power for myself. The fact is that when the President called for me I went to see him and asked him what he wanted me to do. He told me.

I asked for nothing more, but in the interests of good executive practice, I suggested that an Executive order be prepared by the President to cover the job he had outlined, specifically setting forth its responsibilities and authority. He did so. And that's that.

And while I am slaying canards I might as well kill still another one. I read the other day in a New York financial daily an article quoting some gossip or scuttlebutt to the effect that I am going to quit.

There is nothing to this. I have no intention of quitting, and certainly not at the instance of the gossipers. There is a big job to be done, and I mean to see it through as well as I am able.

ROOSEVELT "MIRACLES" RECALLED

As you gentlemen well know, the plan for defense mobilization is to spend $50,000,000,000 a year for 3 years for defense purposes with the least possible interference with the civilian economy.

And we are already well on our way. Since the first of this year orders have been placed at a rate of $1,000,000,000 a week and more. At the end of 1951 these orders will be translated into volumes of end items needed for the war; 1952 will be a year of continuing accumulation. As of 1953 we will be able to meet the demands of all-out war, if need be, out of our production lines.

Then, if any aggressor wants to tangle with us, he would have to be crazy to do so.

I confess I am an incurable optimist—but I think a realistic one—as to America's might and capacity to produce.

My optimism is based upon the production miracles that were worked under our eyes in the last war. When President Roosevelt, early in the conflict, called for the production of 50,000 airplanes a year it looked as if he were asking for the impossible.

Yet it wasn't long before the goal of 50,000 planes had not only been reached, but greatly surpassed. Then the President raised the sights and by 1944 we were actually producing planes at a rate of more than 100,000 a year—nearly 8,500 a month. We at that time had so many that the program had to be cut back.

A similar story can be told with regard to ships. We produced so many ships that,

when the war ended, there were scarcely enough harbors to anchor them in.

And what is true as to planes and ships was also true of many other products needed for war.

Two days ago I had a memorable experience. With a number of others I flew out to Wright Field, near Dayton, Ohio. There I saw some of our newest planes and other weapons and equipment in action. I got an up-to-the-minute account of the development of our airplane production program, both as to quantity and as to quality.

My publisher friends, I can only wish that you had been with me to share with me the warm glow of pride I felt in our American genius of design, development and production.

I can only wish, too, that a certain mustachioed gentleman from Moscow had been with us. Perhaps he might then begin to cut his ambitions down to size.

A COMPARISON OF ECONOMIES

What we did in World War II, we can now double in spades, if we have to. Production of steel in March exceeded 9,000,000 tons a month for the first time in history. Output of 25,700,000 tons for the first quarter was the largest ever attained during a comparable period.

Only last week Moscow reported jubilantly that it had attained an annual steel production of 27,200,000 tons and it was shooting for a goal of 60,000,000 tons by 1960. By comparison, the United States is now producing at the annual rate of 108,000,000 and is aiming for a production of 117,000,000 tons in the next 2 years.

Russia was delighted to say that its 5-year plan resulted in electric power production of 90,000,000,000 kilowatt hours in 1950. Our production of electricity in the same year approached 400,000,000,000. And this country enjoyed similarly favorable margins in many other fields of production. That's our great strength.

As a sign of what is to come, I am happy to say that the Walker bulldog tank—the first production-built tank of this nature—rolled off the line at the Cadillac plant in Cleveland on March 27. This was three months ahead of schedule. Last December, the factory that produced that tank was filled to the rafters with millions of pounds of surplus beans owned by the Department of Agriculture.

OUR PROMISE OF PROGRESSION

Less than 20 years ago the remark was often heard that our economy had reached the stage of maturity. In the light of what has happened since, that idea has been shown to be preposterous.

I do not refer alone to the huge power of expansion that was witnessed under the impact of war. I refer also to the continued expansion in the postwar period. Instead of the recession that was freely predicted, our economy rose to greater and greater heights.

A few figures tell the story. In 1933, our gross national product amounted to about $56,000,000,000. It was thought then that if we could ever reach $100,000,000,000 we would be in clover. That figure was reached in 1940 and it rose to a wartime peak of $215,000,000,000 in 1945.

By postwar 1949 it was $255,000,000,000 and, at the end of 1950 we were producing at a rate of $300,000,000,000 a year.

In the next 8 years, the gross national product should rise to $345,000,000,000, a figure high enough to provide for all the needs of defense mobilization while, at the same time, preserving a civilian economy at or near pre-Korean levels.

I am often asked what we will do with all our productive capacity say, after 1959, if all-out war does not occur. My answer is that I believe we are still in the pioneering stage, that we are on the threshold of a new phase of the industrial revolution.

Just as no real let-down occurred after the last war, I do not believe a let-down need occur when our mobilization is complete. I believe we can confidently look forward to the use of a very substantial part of these great new facilities that are now being provided.

I think they may be the greatest insurance policy that we could have if the worst happens. If it doesn't, then I believe confidently that we can use them for a better economy, for a better standard of living—indeed, I think for a better America.

So much for the production side of the mobilization picture. I wish I could speak with the same kind of optimism concerning stabilization. Here is where someone should begin passing out the aspirin.

I do not know a finer service to America for the press to perform than in continuing to bring home to the people the dangers of inflation. I do not think it is too strong to say that the country has been attacked by a cancerous growth which will prove fatal unless it is quickly cut out.

I have already referred to the need for putting an end to the price-wage spiral. We all understand why that must be done, but we also understand it cannot be done by one edict in 1 day. The so-called price-wage freeze of January 26 admittedly had many imperfections.

As has been aptly said, it was only the first application of the brakes to a car going 75 miles an hour. It was impossible to bring the car to a dead stop.

It became necessary almost at once to thaw out the order of January 26 to cure many inequities both in prices and wages. But we are attempting to hold the broad general line.

The general manufacturers' order just published establishing new ceiling prices for some 75,000 industrial firms should have a positive, favorable effect. This order requires manufacturers who increased their prices excessively after Korea to roll them back. At the same time, it gives a degree of relief to those who did not apply heavy increases. And it should restore more normal cost-price relationships in industry.

A basic price policy has also been formulated forbidding price increases so long as profits are above the level set in the excess profits tax law, namely 85 percent of profits of the best 3 years in the 4-year period 1946–49. If an industry's profits are higher than this 85 percent, it will have to absorb cost increases and will not be able to raise prices.

We intend to proceed on the basis of the principle that no manufacturer with excess profits will be entitled to an increase in prices.

BASIC LEVERAGE OF TAX RISE

Since last fall, the Federal Reserve Board has taken a series of steps designed to curb inflation. It has restricted housing and consumer credit, increased bank-reserve requirements to the limit of the law, raised margins on stocks to 75 percent of value and it has issued a new type of long-term nonmarketable bond—to yield 2.75 percent—for the purpose of decreasing the amount of money in circulation.

Voluntary committees have been set up to restrict credit. No doubt the board will take further action as time goes on.

It has been correctly said that direct price and wage controls treat the symptoms of inflation rather than its basic cause, which can be simply stated as an excess of demand over supply. A more direct form of attack, therefore, is to drain off excess purchasing power by higher taxes.

As a group of economists points out, in a recently published book entitled "Defense Without Inflation":

"Direct controls are not a substitute for adequate taxation.

"A tax system appropriate for the present emergency must absorb a larger part of the total annual income than did the World War II tax system."

The President has asked Congress to impose additional taxes in the sum of $10,000,000,000, an action which will not only contribute to the pay-as-you-go principle but will help enormously to relieve inflationary pressures.

So, on a variety of fronts, the Government is moving to protect the country from internal inflationary disaster. In recent weeks, there have been some hopeful signs that the rising tide of prices has been checked, but it would be folly if we relaxed for a single instant the battle against this domestic enemy.

I have said that it is planned to spend $50,000,000,000 a year for the next 3 years for defense purposes. But if prices continue to rise, this figure, enormous as it is, will not be enough.

CASUALTY RATE IN WAR POTENTIAL

Inflation is an enemy which wipes out our tanks, our guns, our planes, as ruthlessly as any Chinese or North Korean army wipes them out. Already our casualties inflicted by this dread enemy can be numbered in the thousands of tanks, guns, and planes.

For every $10,000,000,000 appropriated by Congress for rearmament, we have lost $2,000,000,000 worth of weapons of defense through inflation of costs. That is a casualty loss of 20 percent.

Any commander in the field will tell you that a 20 percent loss of his equipment in any engagement is dangerous. It will keep him up many a sleepless night until he can get that loss restored.

I can tell you that, as your defense mobilization commander, I have spent many a sleepless night worrying over the high casualty loss already exacted by that dread enemy, inflation.

In one way this domestic enemy is even more effective than our foreign enemy. You can be sure that our gallant and effective soldiers in Korea don't suffer a loss as high as 20 percent of their equipment in any engagement without putting out of action a much larger amount of enemy equipment and men.

But if we suffer a loss of 20 percent in equipment through inflation, we just suffer that loss ourselves without inflicting any corresponding loss—any loss at all—on the enemy.

Suppose we let that kind of thing go unchecked. Very soon the defense program would become too expensive for us to bear or it would have inflated our whole system and destroyed our economic strength.

The people of the United States might well get discouraged under such circumstances and want to call a halt, far short of the minimum readiness for defense that would deter aggression.

And—don't forget—anything short of strength enough to deter Moscow's aggression is catastrophic waste. Better a little more than necessary instead of that tragic too little too late.

In times like these, when most of us can still eat and sleep in safety in our homes and go to regular jobs, how can we get people to act steadily and in time to create the strength we need?

Is it possible really to educate people in advance of hard experience? We must hope that it is, and act with every conviction of that hope.

A DECISION FOR EVERY CITIZEN

In the final analysis, the battle against inflation must be won by the attitude of the individual citizen. He must decide whether he is to do his part grudgingly or magnificently. He must decide whether the Nation will be greatly patriotic or narrowly selfish.

History shows that the vision of one single individual has often accomplished wonderful things. If a vision of America's destiny and of the sacrifices needed to achieve it can be glimpsed by 150,000,000 Americans, the country faces a glorious future.

I ask Americans to have faith in the program upon which the Government has embarked. I ask them to follow its lead, not blindly, of course, but with a constant awareness of its objectives.

I ask my fellow citizens to do their jobs as well as they know how, to be content with reasonable profits, to be content with reasonable wages and to understand the need for higher taxes and the other measures being taken to stem inflation.

I ask them not to hoard, not to throw money away on things that are not needed, not to patronize black markets.

I ask my fellow citizens to keep in mind always that the sacrifices they are being asked to make to control inflation are small indeed with the suffering—yes, the disaster—that uncontrolled inflation would follow in its wake. It would leave its blight on every doorstep.

But if the Nation can count upon the understanding and cooperation of individual citizens, we can all look to the future confidently and serenely.

The President has just sent a message to Congress asking it to extend the Defense Production Act, which expires June 30, and to strengthen the act in various respects. This law passed following the invasion of Korea provides the basic authority both for the channeling of scarce materials into defense production and for the stabilization of the economy against inflationary pressures brought about by the defense effort.

STEPS FOR EQUALITY IN SACRIFICE

The Presidential message contains a comprehensive analysis of the international situation and what has to be done to prepare America for any eventuality.

In addition to continuance of the provisions of the present act, the President is asking for authority to construct and operate defense plants, to finance essential production at home and abroad, without having to increase price ceilings; to improve administration of price control on food products; to control rents, both residential and commercial, and to restrict credit, curb speculation and increase bank reserve requirements.

It is the central purpose of the President's message to distribute the sacrifices fairly and equitably among all segments of our production.

I hope Congress will give the most careful attention to the President's recommendations, which are designed to give defense mobilization agencies the legal means to carry out their tasks.

I believe the changes suggested in the Defense Production Act will go far toward solidifying popular support of the mobilization program and toward bringing about national unity in the crisis that confronts us.

On the whole, as I look back to what has been accomplished since last June, when the Communists showed their hands in Korea, I am optimistic—realistically so, I trust.

We have already come a long way toward preparing the country against the Moscow menace, and our plans for the immediate future are moving rapidly from the blueprint stage to volume production.

God willing, in 3 years we shall have built America's might and cooperated with our allies to increase the might of the freedom-loving nations, to the point that world peace should be assured.

The job before us is beset with many pitfalls.

It will take restraint and sacrifice, toil and sweat to avert blood and tears.

It will require vision and understanding from every citizen.

But I am confident that the American people have an appreciation of our God-given blessings; that they will do the job demanded by this time of crisis; so that they will live splendidly with liberty and freedom—that they will preserve and extend these blessings for our children.

These things we Americans can do—and will do.

What Are We Building?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was in Daytona Beach, Fla., not so long ago to make a speech on a Sunday afternoon. On that Sunday morning, I attended the interdenominational church known as the Tourist Church of Daytona Beach, Fla.; and while there I observed and listened to the ceremonies in connection with the laying of a cornerstone of a new church building.

The principal address on that occasion was delivered by an old law-school colleague of mine, now a practicing lawyer in Daytona Beach, Fla., Mr. Paul E. Raymond. It was my privilege to have him serve as a member of my staff at the University of Oregon, some years ago. I had not seen him for a considerable length of time prior to my recent visit to Daytona Beach. At that time he gave an address which I found so moving and so keen in its analysis of some of the problems which confront us as a free people, that I now ask unanimous consent to have his address published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE WE BUILDING?

(By Paul E. Raymond)

As we lay this cornerstone, we might reflect for a moment on what we are building. Is it simply an object of brick, stone, mortar, steel, and wood? Or is it something vaster and more enduring?

We are rather smug about our civilization and our culture, yet in this Nation 1 out of every 20 adults is illiterate. One out of every fifteen is a syphilitic. One out of three belongs to church, but only 1 out of 10 goes to church on Sunday. In 1 year we bought 1,000,000 copies of the Beer Barrel Polka, but we bought only 127 copies of Beethoven's great C-minor symphony. And while we pay 7 of our 10 highest salaries to men in the amusement industry, we have one-half of all of the families in the South needing to be rehoused. People are dying for want of medical attention who ought not to die, and little children are weak and undernourished who ought not to be hungry in this great land of plenty.

To admit of our defects is not weakness. To recognize them and then to remedy them is to become really strong. This is where we need to build. Our basic need for building is well pointed up in a letter written about a year ago by a veteran of World War II. This is what he had to say:

"My name is John Crown. I am a paraplegic at Halloran General Hospital. My physical wounds are very small in comparison with my spiritual wounds. I have come back from death to a world that I no longer care for. I, who have been engaged in the great struggle to save the world from tyranny, and having seen my comrades die for this cause, can now find no peace in the world or in my country.

"Having lived close to death for 2 years, the reasons why there is no peace seem infinitesimally flimsy. Russia wants the Dardanelles, Yugoslavia wants Trieste, the Moslems want India, labor wants more wages, capital wants more profits, Smith wants to pass the car in front of him, Junior wants more spending money. To these I say, Is it necessary to kill and cripple human beings for these petty gains? Anyone who thinks a human body is so cheap that it can be traded for a tract of land, a piece of silver, or a few minutes of time should be forced to listen to the moans of the dying night and day for the rest of his life.

"All the troubles of the world originate in the common man. The selfish and greedy ways of nations are just the ways of each individual man multiplied a hundredfold. When the morals of the common man drop, so do the morals of the nations of the world. As long as our individual morals remain at a low ebb, so will be the world. Until each of us stops 'hogging the road' with his car, stops fighting over the seat on the bus, stops arguing over who is going to cut the grass, there will be no peace in the world.

"If man wishes peace again, he must remember the great commandment, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God.'"

A peaceful world and a free democracy are dependent, then, upon the building of better men and better women. They cannot be evolved through political sophistry or any magic formula.

During the past half century we have observed two tendencies which indicate that we are not building better people. In the first place, we have witnessed a softening of character. Life has become too easy for too many. Those for whom life is easier have tended to forget their less fortunate brothers. World War II was a joyride for altogether too many people in this country. Pioneer life was hard, but the pioneer was self-dependent; he was charitable; and he had unbounded faith in the values of democracy and religion. He would unhesitatingly sacrifice his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor in their behalf. Where is this spirit today? Where is the spirit of sacrifice? Where is the spirit of giving rather than getting? What has become of our proud spirit of independence and self-dependence? Not long ago Walter Lippmann summed it up in these words:

"Without order and authority in the spirit of man the free way of life leads through weakness, disorganization, self-indulgence and moral indifference to the destruction of freedom itself. The tragic ordeal through which the Western World is passing was prepared in the long period of easy liberty during which men * * * forgot that their freedom was achieved by heroic sacrifice. * * * They forgot that their rights were founded on their duties * * * they thought it clever to be cynical, and enlightened to be unbelieving, and sensible to be soft."

Something has gone out of American character, and we must put it back by building better men and women.

The second tendency we have observed and one which makes our task of building more difficult, is the full sway of materialism. We have much to point to in the way of

material accomplishments which have made life easier and more comfortable. We have electricity and television and air conditioning, streamlined trains and automobiles and superhighways, airplanes and air-foam mattresses. But these conveniences and comforts have led us to assign a primary place to pleasure and comfort and have allowed us to forget the great values of democracy such as religious freedom, freedom of the press, freedom of speech. Where do we derive our pleasures from today? From love of home and family, good literature, great music, and public service well rendered? Or from the racetrack and the cocktail bar?

Our need, then, is not the building of material things, but building to assure the survival of the great intangible values of a Christian democracy. The work of building better people must begin with our youth—our children and our young people. We must set them a better example and instill in them a love and enthusiasm for these priceless principles. We are erecting here a building for the better training of the youth of this community. Through them we shall build better men and better women. We shall build a better citizenship. This is what we are really building as we lay this cornerstone.

Hail, South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in response to requests from several persons, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement containing the words of the song, Hail, South Dakota, adopted March 5, 1943, by the State legislature as the official song of South Dakota.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hail, South Dakota, was written by Deecort Hammitt, a native of the Sunshine State, who was born at Spencer, S. Dak., January 6, 1893. Mr. Hammitt was a pianist, band director, and composer. He directed an orchestra and the Alcester community band for 25 years.

This band played at the World's Fair in Chicago 2 years, the Belle Fourche round-up 2 years, the South Dakota State Fair 2 years, and at the Mitchell Corn Palace, and many other important engagements.

At the Belle Fourche round-up this song was first introduced to President and Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, who had established their summer White House in South Dakota in 1927. Mr. Hammitt received a personal letter of praise from President Coolidge for the composition.

Here are the words of—

HAIL, SOUTH DAKOTA

Hail, South Dakota, a great State of the land,
Health, wealth, and beauty, that's what makes her grand;
She has her Black Hills, and mines with gold so rare,
And with her scenery, no State can compare.
Come where the sun shines, and where life's worth your while,
You won't be here long, 'till you'll wear a smile;
No State's so healthy, and no folk quite so true,
To South Dakota, we all welcome you.
Hail, South Dakota, the State we love the best,
Land of our fathers, builders of the West;
Home of the Badlands, and Rushmore's ageless shrine,
Black Hills and prairies, farm land and sunshine (hills, farms, and prairies, blessed with bright sunshine).

General MacArthur's Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "General MacArthur's Case," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on April 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S CASE

General MacArthur, before Congress, evoked in support of his views on Korean policy all the emotions aroused by his homecoming and the admiration due to a distinguished military career. He played upon the Nation's feelings. In effect, he asked the Nation, because it sympathized with him, to agree with him. He used his dramatic talents to seek a verdict from a jury gripped by tempestuous passions.

The jury's duty, however, is to reach its verdict the hard way—by reason, by a measured judgment of the national interest. As the passions ebb, it becomes increasingly clear that General MacArthur gave his own answer to himself.

In describing the consequences of China's intervention in Korea, he said a new situation had been created which "called for new decisions in the diplomatic sphere." In recounting his advocacy of military policies to expand the war, he said "I have constantly called for the new political decisions essential to a solution."

General MacArthur said these decisions have not been forthcoming. It would have been more accurate to say that the decisions have been made, in the political and diplomatic sphere where they must be made, and that they have gone against him.

The basic decision was, as President Truman expressed it last week, that "we do not want to see the conflict in Korea extended. We are trying to prevent a world war, not to start one."

The decision was, as General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, expressed it this week, that "any recommended course of action which would enlarge the present war is contrary to our best interests, and, by jeopardizing world peace, ultimately would threaten our security."

As he appeared before Congress, General MacArthur was appealing from that verdict of his civilian and military superiors. There had been much speculation that he would disprove the charge of insubordination, but he did not even try. Unlike General Bradley, who said "conduct of foreign affairs is a civilian responsibility," General MacArthur summoned all his prestige to support his own view of how those affairs should be conducted.

Essentially, his view is that the Nation is at war and that "in war there is no substitute for victory." President Truman, General Bradley, and the other responsible architects of policy would agree that in war there is no substitute for victory, but they would deny that the Nation is at war. Rather the Nation is trying to avoid war; it is fighting a defensive battle on behalf of the United Nations, not an offensive war for the total destruction of an enemy. What would be an appropriate military policy for the latter situation is not an appropriate political policy for the former.

General MacArthur sought to give the impression that from a military standpoint the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree with him that Manchuria should be bombed, Chiang Kai-shek landed on the mainland, and China blockaded. Perhaps they would agree if the only considerations were military, but General Bradley has made it more than clear that on a higher plane our foreign policy and our military policy are united on the course of containing rather than expanding the war.

As a soldier, General MacArthur loathes a military stalemate. He wants no less than total victory in Korea. All of us would prefer that, but a Korean victory purchased at the cost of deep military involvement on the Chinese mainland would be no victory. And when it comes to General MacArthur's belief that we could expand the war just enough to suit our own purposes without entangling ourselves in an endless Asiatic conflict, all he really offers in support of that belief is his personal hunch that the Chinese are already fully engaged, and that the Russians would not choose to intervene directly.

It cannot be forgotten that last fall General MacArthur also had a hunch that the Chinese would not intervene. As he was unable then to limit the war just short of the Yalu, why should it be supposed that he could limit it now just on the other side?

General MacArthur has had his day—a colorful, dramatic, emotion-charged day. Now the Nation's task is to get on with the job of building peace. For that we need reason, prudence, thoughtful assessment of the total world problem, and loyalty to a firm purpose that if war comes it shall not be our doing.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that the hundreds of thousands of people throughout the country who are in need of homes view the action of this body on May 4. The vote of 181 to 113, which cut the number of public housing units from 50,000 to 5,000, was a blow to each and every one of these families. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that I cast my vote against that reduction.

The position of the distinguished mayor of the city of New York, and my former classmate, the Honorable Vincent R. Impellitteri, is best expressed in the telegram which I have received from him today:

The drastic cut in the construction of public housing units to 5,000 for the entire country during the fiscal year 1952 and subsequent years, voted by the House of Representatives in the independent offices appropriation bill on May 4, will virtually halt all public housing construction in New York City under the Federal program. If the bill is not amended, it will delay indefinitely about 15,000 vitally needed apartments in the first 2-year program and 30,000 additional apartments now in preliminary planning stages. The machinery for relating housing construction to the Nation's materials problem exists in the National Production Authority, and we shall accept willingly all cut-backs determined by them to be necessary to defense. The action of the House of Representatives is unnecessary, and we urge that the bill be amended to eliminate the limitations on public housing.

VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor of the City of New York.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will not only restore the 50,000 units but greatly increase the number, and that the conferees of the House will agree to an amendment.

General MacArthur's Effect on United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial entitled "Effect of MacArthur," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal this morning, written by W. H. Grimes, the editor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF MACARTHUR

WASHINGTON.—This is an attempt to estimate the effect General MacArthur has had on the policy in Korea and on this country's longer-range foreign policy.

The estimate is based on interviews with men of long experience in official life, who are thoroughly in formed on both foreign and military policy, whose attitude will influence their congressional colleagues and who are neither violently pro-MacArthur nor anti-MacArthur.

For the present the administration will not make any important change in its policy toward Korea; that is, it will continue to try to fight a limited war.

As to the future the prospects are different. If the stalemate in Korea continues, or if the United Nations forces suffer reverses the administration will be under pressure to adopt General MacArthur's advice.

Regardless of the course in Korea, General MacArthur has influenced foreign policy. There will have to be stronger emphasis on Asia, or at least the appearance of it. And if the nations of Western Europe hold back or seem reluctant to cooperate fully, there may be difficulty in getting Congress to appropriate funds for economic aid to those nations.

Those trends will develop because of the pressure of a public sentiment, which is a surprise to most Members of Congress and which the administration has appeared to underestimate.

The telegrams and letters which followed General MacArthur's recall broke all records for numbers and for candor of expression. So much might have been expected. The unexpected feature is that the communications continue in large volume. And the reaction that usually follows such an emotional surge—and which President Truman predicted—has not appeared.

Two things might change the present prospects.

One would be a favorable military development in Korea or some arrangement for the cessation of fighting.

The other would be the dismissal of Secretary of State Acheson; there would be disposition in Congress and on the part of the public to give a new foreign policy spokesman a chance to prove himself and, for a period, criticism would be withheld or tempered.

Neither development is considered very likely.

It would be distinctly on the side of optimism to look for any early decisive change in Korea.

Mr. Truman apparently intends to keep Mr. Acheson and apparently Mr. Acheson intends to stay. Despite that determination there is an almost unanimous opinion that finally Mr. Acheson must go. But the probabilities are that he will go only after the damage to the administration's policy is well beyond repair.

General MacArthur convinced most of the Senators who heard his testimony that his recall was not necessary. He carried out fully all military orders; no one claims otherwise. He expressed publicly differences with political and diplomatic policy. But there is very good reason to believe that if General MacArthur had been fully informed as to the background and the reasons for decisions, if he had been told of the difficulties under which President Truman was operating, particularly those difficulties raised by the doubts of European nations, General MacArthur would have gone along and probably could have assisted the President. As it was he operated under orders the reasons for which he had only a vague notion.

The other impression that General MacArthur left was that of a man of unusual mental and physical qualifications.

For 3 days he sat continuously from midmorning until evening answering all the questions thrown at him. At no time was he at a loss for an answer and the answer was always clothed in precise language. Never was he led into an inadvertent statement. If all the questions asked of General MacArthur had been given to him 2 weeks in advance of the hearings so that he could have prepared his answers, the answers could have been no more precise than they were.

Only a well-organized mental machine is capable of doing what General MacArthur did and his precision of language stems from ability to think precisely. He asked for no recess of the long hearings and at their end the interrogators were more tired than General MacArthur.

Nevertheless General MacArthur did not entirely convince his senatorial audience that his advice should be followed.

One of the weaknesses of his case was that he conceded that he had the information to pass judgment only on his own theater in Asia. But the advice he offered would, if followed, be likely to have repercussions in places other than Asia. Faced with that, General MacArthur could not offer advice.

The second weakness was the impression of the better informed Senators that the general minimized the capabilities of the Russians in Asia.

General MacArthur's estimate of Russia was based on the judgment that Russian supply lines to the Pacific are not adequate to supply a major military campaign and that the campaign would grow weaker from the day it started. That may be true but it left unanswered to many Senators the situation that would result from a Russian decision to strike a quick sharp blow in anticipation of a quick victory.

Russia has considerable manpower close to Korea. Presumably the supplies and equipment for quick action by that manpower already are there. If Russia should strike in Korea with the aid of air power and submarines and at the same time invade Japan, the Russians and their allies conceivably could trap the entire United Nations army, destroying its base, cutting off its avenue of retreat by sea and leaving it no place to which to retreat.

It was surprising that Senator MCMAHON, who questioned General MacArthur most closely, did not emphasize this possibility, but instead chose to dwell on the possibility of a Russian atomic attack on this continent. In his replies to General MacArthur, President Truman has emphasized that same point of the danger of atomic attack.

No one can say that such a danger does not exist but to many it appears a more remote possibility than the possibility of Russian action in Korea.

Russia, it is argued, might hesitate to start a war with an atomic attack for two reasons. She is inferior in the number and development of atomic weapons. Such an attack would result in the whole non-Communist world immediately uniting against her and cooperating in a retaliatory attack.

But if the Russians judged that they could make a quick and successful grab in Asia without bringing the European nations into the conflict, they might try the gamble. If the Allied Nations were split the United States would not have European bases from which to launch attacks on Russia's vital industries. It could bomb from Pacific bases but the vital industries and installations of Russia would be far distant from those bases.

Whether the Russians really believe they can do this or whether they will attempt it no one outside Russia knows or pretends to know.

But to a great many it seems a more immediate consideration than the danger of an atomic attack.

The testimony of General Marshall has touched this point and very probably the parts of his testimony not made public have developed the point to a greater degree than appears in the parts made public.

W. H. G.

A Report on New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., president of the New England Council and also president of Pitney-Bowes, Inc., of Stamford, Conn., delivered at the annual New England congressional dinner, held on April 30, 1951, in Washington.

Mr. Wheeler calls attention to the continued good health of the New England economy and its remarkable record of production during World War II and in the current crisis. That is good news for New England, and certainly bad news for its critics, who claim our economy is slipping.

May I, at this time, thank Mr. Wheeler for calling attention to the beneficial nature of the Senate small business clinics

which I recently conducted in Connecticut, at Stamford and Norwich. I started the first of these clinics at Bridgeport last summer, and also last year held others at Hartford and New Haven. As a result, some 60 other small business clinics, attended by 40,000 small, independent businessmen, have been held throughout the country, all sponsored by the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am a member.

I would also like to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the New England Council on securing Mr. Wheeler as its president, and may I congratulate also its other four top executives for what many of my friends, constituents, and business acquaintances say has been a remarkable job in promoting the development of our industries and over-all economy. These men are, in addition to Mr. Wheeler, Robert P. Tibolt, treasurer; H. Ladd Smith, secretary; and Dudley Harmon, executive vice president.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT ON NEW ENGLAND

(By W. H. Wheeler, Jr.)

When I realized that I was expected to make a report on New England at this dinner, I had mixed feelings. It's an honor to be addressing the members of New England's distinguished delegation to the Eighty-second Congress. But it takes a lot of courage to speak for New England. There is nothing presumptuous about a Texan speaking for Texas, or a Californian speaking for California, or a southerner speaking for the South. But let a man attempt to speak loudly for New England, and he is likely to be disowned, if not dismembered.

New England is a region consisting of six States, and nine-million-odd inhabitants. I use that word "odd" advisedly. Webster, an old New Englander, defines "odd" as meaning unusual, singular, strange. Since we are all New Englanders here tonight, let us agree that we are unusual, certainly; singular, always, and strange—well, by the standards of that minority which populates the rest of the country, I suppose we are that, too.

I want to report tonight on New England's current health and problems. And if I happen to slip my small frame into the report from time to time, I trust no one will know the difference.

The present health of our New England economy is good. Our industrial employment exceeds the 1948 peak, and it is continuing to rise. Nonmanufacturing employment likewise has increased. Building contracts for the first quarter of this year are 13 percent greater than for the same period last year, and department store sales are also higher.

New England so far has been awarded about 10 percent of all the publicly announced defense contracts placed since Korea. This is a shade better than our record for World War II, but it must be noted that a good portion of these contracts is accounted for by textile orders—which aren't likely to continue at the same rate for the duration of the defense program.

Many of our smaller industries are suffering from materials shortages for civilian production, resulting from the requirements of the defense production program. We realize, of course, that these shortages are inevitable, and that there is not a great deal the Government can do about many of them. However, all of us can and are doing all possible to bring together the large prime contractors and those small manufacturers who must have subcontracts if they are to maintain normal employment.

The council and other New England organizations have been glad to cooperate with your House of Representatives Select Committee on Small Business in its schedule of hearings recently held in New England. And we have also been encouraged by the work done by the Senate Small Business Committee, which held hearings in Connecticut 2 weeks ago. The efforts of these committees are deeply appreciated by your constituents, I can assure you.

New England appreciated the action of the joint committee of the New England delegation in convening last March 2 a 1-day conference with spokesmen for defense and other agencies of the Federal Government, in which the New England Governors and the New England council were invited to participate. This is exactly the sort of initiative and cooperative action badly needed if our region is to make its maximum contribution in the defense emergency and if it is to thrive and grow in peace time. We hope such meetings may be continued.

One of New England's most serious problems is the number of antiquated plants and equipment in the region. New England needs a production face-lifting more than any other section of the country. For more than 25 years, the council has hammered away at this problem, encouraging industries to modernize and expand their facilities and install new equipment. We have made some progress, but it is a long and slow job.

During the last war I can remember how proud we were of the fact that New England, with only 6 percent of the population, turned out almost 9 percent of the Nation's war production, and did this with less than half of what might have been its expected share of new defense plants. We were proud of this record, and with some justification, since every bit of material and labor spent on plant expansion detracted from weapons of war immediately needed. In a typical Yankee way, we did much with little.

The present situation is different, however. We are trying to lift our national productive capacity for a long pull, even at some sacrifice of the immediate availability of armament. If we fail to expand our productive capacity when encouraged by tax relief from accelerated amortization, we will suffer a great disadvantage in years to come.

To date, 55 certificates of necessity granting such accelerated amortization have been given to New England concerns, covering new plant and equipment in the amount of about $96,000,000. The Government has granted, all told, about 1,000 certificates totaling $4,500,000,000. The $96,000,000 we have in New England is only about 2 percent of this total. Considering that we have over 8 percent of the industrial production, it is apparent we aren't going after and getting what we should by a long margin.

Even if we include the steel mill certificate—and the mill is hardly an ordinary project, nor can we be sure it will be built—the proportion is only a little over 7 percent of the total awarded, and is still far short of what we should be getting. We have got to be more aggressive, all of us, in taking advantage of the opportunity to serve ourselves, and at the same time, serve our Nation.

Last year, you will recall, Mr. Joseph Erickson, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, brought to your attention in his able address certain features of Federal legislation which, on the whole, did not help New England. Among these were the farm price-support programs, which has since been modified by the withdrawal of price supports from eggs, poultry, and potatoes. But the price-support policy on other farm products still works to the disadvantage of New England, by keeping food prices artificially high.

I don't have to point out to you the vital interest our region has in the importation of petroleum products. Any tariff or other restriction on their importation places and added burden on our economy. Venezuela is now the only source of foreign oil open to us at the lower tariff rate of one-fourth cent per gallon. Doubtless that rate also will be increased eventually, and New England, distant from domestic oil supply, will pay a good part of the bill.

Similarly, the reimposition of the duty on foreign copper, suspended during the war, was an act of Congress distinctly not helpful to New England and its thousands of metal-working industries. The recent action of the House and Senate in approving a bill which once more would suspend the copper duty for a period of 22½ months was gratifying, in spite of the fact that it compromises what we would have preferred.

We have been greatly heartened by the progress made during the last 12 months in getting natural gas to our area. New England is the last important industrial area of the country to be served by this fuel. There have been disturbing rumors that it may be difficult to get the steel for completing the necessary pipelines. I am sure we can count on your help to obtain our fair share after military requirements are cared for.

New England transportation interests have appealed the decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission refusing to lower the export rail rates on grain from the Great Lakes to North Atlantic ports, and from New York to Portland. If we are successful in this grain case we may also be able to secure reduction of export rail rates on other commodities and hence encourage the use of our port facilities. In 1950 import tonnage at Boston was 20 times the export tonnage. Lack of export tonnage discourages sailings from Boston and other New England ports.

Our woolen-textile industries are currently facing a difficult situation. Confronted with the fantastic rise in the price of wool, plus the lack of a Government price order adjusted to the realities of the situation, some of our woolen mills have found it impossible to continue to operate and have closed their doors. It is to be hoped that the price-control authorities will not delay further in affording relief to this essential industry, on which so many of our people depend for employment.

Our most serious problem is our need for the basic raw materials which our industries use, but which for the most part are available in New England only at high transportation costs. I have mentioned petroleum, copper, and natural gas, but there are two metals which have fundamental significance, I believe. They are steel and aluminum. Our industries are large users of both metals.

There seems to be no real prospect for New England to acquire an aluminum ore reduction mill because we lack large quantities of very low cost power. But that does not mean we could not have an aluminum rolling mill, provided we can import the raw material at competitive prices. I believe investigation should be made to determine what degree of reduction of the tariff on aluminum imported from eastern Canada would be necessary to bring this about.

I think most of you are familiar with the effort to get a steel mill located in New England, started by the New England council in 1946. On April 20 our New England Steel Development Corp. received the long-awaited Coverdale & Colpitts report on the feasibility of a mill located in New London. The report, paid for by the State of Connecticut, fully justifies our efforts by stating that our market would support a mill in the upper 25 percent of the industry in size, and that there is no inherent reason why it should not operate at New London as successfully as a new mill built anywhere.

The one obstacle is the high capital cost of any new mill, as related to possible earnings at prevailing steel prices. For this reason and this reason only, the report points out that the mill is impractical as a venture by a new and independent company. But the report suggests that it may well be practical for a large existing company against whose excess-profits taxes, at the 77 percent rate, the investment in the mill might be written down in 6 years from $220,000,000 to $85,000,000. This would be possible, of course, only by reason of the accelerated amortization allowed by the certificate of necessity we have obtained. Thus, under these conditions the investment would become comparable to that in competing mills.

There is an interesting point to be made here, I think. The Federal Government in recent years believes it has been following a policy of encouraging and helping small business. It certainly has been keeping big business constantly on the defensive. While there is a strong American tradition for helping small business, the attack on big business, merely because it is big, frequently has unanticipated results, hurting small business. Steel is a case in point. The steel industry, which is big, has been subject to Government attack for a long time, with the result that in the opinion of many it hasn't charged as much for steel as the enormous capital investment requires. Steel expansion, therefore, has been slow, because the capital cost couldn't be justified by the profits to be expected.

So when national survival requires that we get more steel production fast, the Government must grant certificates of necessity, which amount to tax rebate subsidies, in order to encourage new investment. And these, of course, favor the big companies because they are only advantageous if a company has large earnings subject to excess-profits taxes. Even with certificates, the building of a new mill involves considerable gambling on the future tax structure.

This whole problem is worth objective study, I think, because it is obviously one that works to the disadvantage of everyone. It works against small companies who depend on steel, as well as new small steel companies which might be starting; and it makes it difficult for the large steel-producing companies to build mills in areas like New England, where they are badly needed.

We have not, by any means, given up hope of interesting an existing company, and we may well be successful. I can assure you we will leave no opportunity unexplored. We have asked for an extension of our certificate, which expires May 12, and I am hopeful it will be granted—probably for 60 days.

In conclusion, I should like to pay a very sincere tribute to all of you who serve New England in Congress. We men in business sometimes fall into a loose habit of talking about politics as though it were a profession to take a dim and cynical view of. Often I think it would do some of us a lot of good to do a stint of a year or two in Government ourselves. I'm sure it would heighten our respect for you who have the courage to step into the klieg-lighted public arena to represent your constituents and to serve the Nation.

It's a tough job. Every pressure to which you are subjected has its parallel in business life. I'm sure our New England business record of objectivity, courage and unselfishness would do well to equal the outstanding record of the New England congressional delegation. We can pay you no greater compliment than to say to you: You ably represent an area which prides itself on character as its greatest natural resource; and character is needed by the Nation in these days when freedom is on trial.

Necessity of Return to Fundamental Principles of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Presbyterian Historical Society of the Upper Ohio Valley, meeting in the Bethel Presbyterian Church, near Pittsburgh, on its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, May 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE PRESBYTERIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF THE UPPER OHIO VALLEY, MEETING IN BETHEL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, NEAR PITTSBURGH, MAY 7, 1951

I deeply appreciate the honor and privilege of addressing this fine assembly in these beautiful and historic surroundings.

It is a real inspiration to come here on this notable occasion, marking the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Old Bethel Church.

It would be most inappropriate for me to make a historical address in the presence of such outstanding scholars as Dr. Slosser and Dr. Anderson. They have given a lifetime of study to the history of southwestern Pennsylvania and of our church. They know the subject so much better than I do.

I am happy to be present at the inauguration of such an important project as the publication of a history of Presbyterianism west of the Alleghenies.

There is fascinating reading in the records of the early church organizations of this section. They form part of the glorious story of American growth and progress.

Here history was made by sturdy, courageous God-fearing men and women. They planted and cultivated the seeds of liberty and freedom of the individual. They strengthened the moral and spiritual foundation of our Nation's greatness.

Faith in God sustained them in their lives of toil, hardship, and sacrifice.

The pioneers who came into southwestern Pennsylvania in search of freedom and opportunity encountered high mountains, deep forests, wild beasts, and savage Indians.

Let us look back at those early days. There were no roads or bridges. There were no methods of communication, no utilities, no labor-saving devices, no public schools. There were no housing authorities, no social security, no loans, grants, or subsidies from the Government.

But the deeply religious men and women of all denominations braved the dangers of the savage wilderness with real courage. They were hard working and self reliant. They depended upon their own efforts to build security for themselves and their children.

The large number of churches organized in southwestern Pennsylvania in the late years of the seventeen hundreds was evidence of the vitality of religion in this pioneer area.

To hear the word of God the pioneer worshipers traveled long distances over the narrow frontier trails and forded the streams.

They had faith, vision and confidence. They worked hard and fought bravely, but they worshiped humbly and sincerely.

Their surroundings were simple and rough but the spirit of religion was just as strong as though they worshiped in a great cathedral.

How fortunate we are today that there has come down to us the teachings of the great Presbyterian leaders of those days—Dr. Thaddeus Dodd, Dr. Joseph Smith and Dr. John McMillan. They were men of high courage, deep religious conviction and fine educational attainments.

They dedicated their lives to the service of God but also they were imbued with the spirit of individual freedom. They believed in the sacred ideals which were given expression in the Declaration of Independence. They recognized that the freedoms set forth in the Bill of Rights are not privileges granted by the Government but are bestowed by God upon all mankind.

They knew that no government can long endure without a strong church. They supported the American principle that the church and state must be separate if individual freedom and religious liberty are to be preserved.

But let me point out now that the church and state are bound together wherever there is freedom. No one can read the pages of history without coming to the inevitable conclusion that free religion is dependent upon free government, and free government is dependent upon religion.

Loss of freedom has always resulted wherever neglect of religion has caused a breakdown of morals and decency. Civic duty and religious duty are interwoven. It must be remembered that the moral standards of government cannot rise above the spiritual and cultural strength of the individual citizens.

We take great pride, here in America, that the sacred principles of tolerant religion are the foundation of our form of government.

In this struggle for independence the founding fathers placed "firm reliance on the protection of divine providence."

The ideals of our Republic are based on the eternal truths of the Holy Bible.

Nevertheless we have reached a time of great peril to American freedom. We are threatened by enemies abroad and by moral deterioration at home.

Evil influences have grown up amongst us that are undermining the moral structure of the United States.

In all walks of life there are men whose lives are ruled by selfishness and greed.

In its report last week the Kefauver Crime Committee revealed a sordid story of Nationwide law evasion, racketeering, chiseling, and other corrupt products of an unholy desire for an easy way of life.

Organized crime syndicates operate across State lines and are taking from the people an estimated $20,000,000,000 a year.

Sinister alliances between the criminal element and some law-enforcement officers, endanger the lives and safety of our citizens.

Political power wielded by racketeers and gamblers has forced invisible government upon some cities and towns by influencing the election of corrupt officials.

Millions and millions of dollars—taken largely from families who can least afford to lose it, are being used by racketeers and gamblers to purchase political control of many American communities.

Corrupt officials in these towns and cities, bought by tainted millions, have put aside their sacred oaths and submit to the dictates of underworld gangsters.

And the most tragic situation confronting us is that so many of our people accept these dishonest practices as necessary evils—a form of wickedness that we cannot escape.

What is responsible for this attitude?

I think the answer lies in a lack of appreciation of our civic duties and failure to recognize the responsibilities of Christian citizenship.

Too many of our people have forgotten that the true greatness of America is not our material wealth but the spiritual strength and character of our people.

Many of our citizens, who are thoroughly honest in their private lives, are so indifferent to matters affecting the public welfare.

They forget that bad public officials are elected by good citizens who ignore or neglect the basic obligation of citizenship and do not even take the trouble to vote on election day.

Two hundred years ago Edmund Burke, the great English statesman, declared: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Yes; today, as in the time of Edmund Burke, evil will triumph when good men do nothing.

Good men like Dr. Dodd, Dr. Smith, and Dr. McMillan were cast in a different mold. They were not men who could stand idly by and do nothing when government became unclean.

They put all their strength and vigor into the fight for good government. They preached obedience to the laws of God and man. They did not hesitate to become active in politics in order to elect men of upright moral character to public office.

They realized that cleaning up crime and upholding a high moral standard was the job of the local community—not the Federal Government.

They recognized that clean, decent government could not be maintained without adherence to the fundamental principles of religion.

You will recall that during the Whisky Insurrection the farmers of southwestern Pennsylvania banded together to defy the power of the new Federal Government to levy a tax on distilled spirits.

Dr. McMillan took a courageous stand, not only in his pulpit but also in public meetings. He battled on the side of law and order, even though that position was extremely unpopular with the majority of his congregation.

To hold the line for righteousness—in and out of government—we need an army of preachers and active laymen with the courage of Dr. McMillan.

Unless the moral forces of our communities arouse themselves to drive out racketeers and grafters there can be no hope of clean, decent, honest government.

The most effective leadership in that direction should and must come from the pulpit and from the great body of laymen who hold official positions in our church organizations.

The ills from which our Nation suffers today can be overcome if we have a strong, militant church, battling day in and day out, for good, sound, clean, economical government.

I repeat—the church is the foundation upon which our form of government rests. It is the basis of our character as a Nation. It is our hope for a future of national integrity, honor, and justice.

That is why I say that every good citizen, every churchgoer, should take an intelligent, patriotic, and militant part in government.

That means taking part in politics. It means working for the election of men of integrity and high character. It means working to drive out of office every politician whose objective is personal gain and personal power, rather than public service.

It means taking an active interest in community affairs, in State, National, and world problems.

It means arousing public opinion to a higher standard of morality, to inspire deeper respect for the law and to assure confidence in the integrity of our officials and our courts.

An informed and aroused electorate could overnight transform corruption into sound government by turning grafting officials out of office.

Immoral practices which enrich criminals and corrupt officials are cancers on the body politic. They should be removed by criminal prosecutions and ballot-box surgery before the disease spreads further, whether it is found in the Republican or the Democratic Party.

Victory over the racketeers and grafters can be won only if every right-thinking, law-abiding citizen takes an interest in government.

And good government, in our Republic, is the greatest safeguard of individual freedom, including the most precious of all—freedom of religion.

The crying need of the hour is for a great spiritual rearmament, not only in America but all over the world.

If we are to save America and preserve our sacred freedoms we must crusade for a return to the fundamental principles of religion.

With faith, we can strengthen the historic mission of the United States—to lead the world in progress under God for justice, freedom, and peace.

The Voice of America: Echo of "the Voice"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, as a minor but interesting piece of testimony of the value of the Voice of America broadcasts, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled "Echo of 'the Voice'" in last Sunday's New York Times magazine section. May I suggest that this points up the need for the stronger radio facilities requested by the President and the State Department? Unhappily the request for needed funds has recently been refused by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHO OF "THE VOICE"

(An anonymous word from behind Hungary's iron curtain reaches this country now and then. Such was the letter postmarked Budapest, signed "A Hungarian who is obliged to conceal his name," recently received here in response to a Voice of America message of good will. Mrs. Margaret Szatmar, of New York, a Hungarian-born American, later read it back over the air in a broadcast expressing the solicitude of Americans for their unknown friends in Hungary.)

DEAR MADAM: At the moment when I am writing this letter I do not yet know how shall I be able to smuggle it out from behind the iron curtain. I would not trust the Hungarian postal service, and the letterbox of the American Legation in Budapest is being constantly watched by the "shock workers of freedom of expression and news gathering." Tonight, as every night, we were listening to the Voice of America. I felt that I must write you because your letter sounded to us as the word of real peace that stems from a human heart. We, here, are hearing all day long of peace. We know it, however, better than anybody else that the loud noises they make are only for the purpose of muffling the clatter of the wolf's teeth.

I am working in a Budapest factory. Many people are working in this factory, and we are having a lot of conversation among ourselves. I can therefore truthfully say that this letter could have been written by any one of my overworked fellow workers. We all feel exactly the same way and hate our oppressors. We all have our hopes in your great and free country. Your freedom-loving people is the last hope of the people of our small country, which has been, in the past, many times betrayed and abandoned by its friends.

You, dear madam, write in your letter that your son soon will become a soldier. Your eyes in motherly anxiety see tragedy ahead. You foresee that your son will be forced to fight our sons. We, too, see this coming. God will forgive us the sin of having prayed that war should come. Our present peace, however, is no peace at all. We cannot speak of peace in this world of hate, fear, tyranny, work for starvation wages under inhuman pressure, without the peace of souls.

Your son must change his home for the military training camp and give up his peaceful constructive life in order to save you and your loved ones and your whole people from the fate that overtook us.

Madam, do tell your son, your acquaintances, and everybody that we, here behind the iron curtain, shall not fight your sons. We don't want to fight at all. We want peace, but not such a peace as we are now having. We want a peace that is similar to that you are having, and not the phony peace of godlessness, of slave-driving, of fear and lies. We see with rejoicing that your country is assembling all the forces of the whole free world against those who are trying to menace the world's peace.

We are unable to do much at the present time. We have no voice. Anyone who dares to raise a single dissenting sound against the prevailing tyranny will forever disappear and will be swallowed up in one of the forced-labor camps of the oriental tyranny that doesn't tolerate opposition. Madam, you cannot exactly judge life as it exists here. The distance between us dulls the sad voice of the oppressed millions. You cannot have full conception of the kind of life our life really is. It is proper and good that you mustn't get a real taste of this kind of life.

We are praying for your sons who are fighting also for our liberty in far-away Korea. We hope that the great strength of your country will banish the reign of tyranny from all over the world. I pray God's blessing for your people, and am sending my love from behind the iron curtain.

Israel's Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, the rebirth of the State of Israel is a unique event in world history. We, in this country, take note of this event with a great deal of pride because it was the United States which played such an important part in the rebirth of modern Israel as an independent state and in helping it during these few short years since its creation.

Israel is now celebrating 3 years of independent existence. It has proved to the world that within this brief space of 3 years it has reached political maturity and it is possessed of an indomitable spirit for the good of all mankind. I am particularly proud of the friendly relations existing between the people of our own country and the people of Israel which is an important factor in helping to make their nation strong and free.

Although the world in which Israel has taken its rightful place as a sovereign state is far from peaceful, the citizens of the new state along the shores of the eastern Mediterranean should feel most deeply the great friendship which is directed toward them by the nations and the peoples of the free world who are encouraged by their achievements in the last 3 years. On this occasion it is worth remembering that these achievements were obtained after much suffering and sacrifice on the part of the Jewish people.

It is for this reason that freedom-loving people everywhere join with the Jews in this country and with the people of Israel in celebrating this memorable event—the third anniversary of the reestablishment of the centuries-old dream of a Jewish national homeland.

The MacArthur Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Another 'Pearl Harbor Inquiry'," by David Lawrence, published in the Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER "PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY"—ADMINISTRATION MUST HAVE THOUGHT MACARTHUR WAS MIND READER 10,000 MILES AWAY

(By David Lawrence)

It's just another Pearl Harbor investigation all over again.

Back in December 1941, General Marshall and Admiral Stark thought that someone had told General Short and Admiral Kimmel what Washington knew about the forthcoming attack through breaking the Japanese code—but nobody did tell them.

Today, it comes out that the President and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and Special Assistant Averell Harriman and General Bradley, who advised that General MacArthur be summarily dismissed, never told him that any of the public statements he had made during the preceding 4 weeks were violative of military orders or any other orders relating to policy statements.

The administration may have thought that General MacArthur, at a distance of 10,000 miles, was a mind reader and as well informed about the state of mind of persons in Washington as were the five men who fired him, but there is not a single bit of evidence in the record after 3 days of testimony to support that point.

In fact, the official record gets worse and worse for the administration in revealing the same kind of bad liaison in the last few months with Tokyo as the War and Navy Departments had with Pearl Harbor 10 years ago.

Not a single word of disapproval went to General MacArthur on December 6 last, when a general directive was issued advising all departments and all persons in the field as well as in Washington to clear policy statements with the departments back home. Although General Marshall now testifies that the administration didn't like General MacArthur's answers to the questions of the press prior to December 6—even though they primarily concerned military matters in his theater of action—not a word of such criticism was ever relayed to General MacArthur. He could as easily have inferred that there were no complaints here.

Not a single word of criticism or of any other kind went to General MacArthur specifically referring to his own statements or pointing out any deviation from policy to him between December 6, 1950, when the general directive was issued, and the day he was dismissed—April 11, 1951.

The now famous letter which General MacArthur wrote in routine fashion, answering an inquiry from Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, was dated March 20, at Tokyo. Although he had written letters to Members of Congress and had talked with them in Tokyo during a period of nearly 6 years and they had made public the views which the general gave them, not a single word of criticism of his relations with Members of Congress had ever been conveyed to him by his superiors in Washington.

When, on March 24 last, General MacArthur addressed a plea to the Chinese commander to agree to a "cease fire," not a single word of the statement or declaration being planned by the Government here—and which it says it was circulating among 13 governments—had been sent to General MacArthur for his information. Actually it is reliably reported that he had prepared his communication to the Chinese commander 10 days before and was waiting for an opportune moment to release it. Likewise, Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the U. N., has since stated publicly that a military commander in the field has a right to address the enemy commander on armistice terms at any time.

The message that was sent to General MacArthur saying the State Department was "planning" some kind of a peace offer to the Red Chinese did not give him any details. It was a speculative message and failed to instruct him not to make any communication on this or any other subject related to it. The home-office manager who failed to keep a branch manager better informed than that on company policy would be the one dismissed in American business today.

Even when the MacArthur statement to the Chinese commander was published, the Joint Chiefs merely asked him a day afterward to be sure and report if any request for armistice came from the enemy commander. There was not a word of criticism or of approval or disapproval sent General MacArthur concerning that statement to the Red Chinese commander.

Secretary Marshall has testified, moreover, that it was an "accumulation" of things that caused the dismissal, but what it looks like is an accumulation of hostile thoughts pent up somewhere in the Pentagon and the White House which came to a head when General MacArthur answered a letter that Representative MARTIN, on his own initiative, made public.

Some Foreign Policy Successes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, even at the expense of repeating the facts which should be well-known to all by this time, I would like to call to the attention of the membership of this House an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of May 7, 1951, which clearly and concisely recapitulates some of the main points and achievements of our foreign policy in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I would particularly like to call this article—which requires mere 3 minutes' time to read—to the attention of those Members who are repeatedly shouting about the vacuum which is supposed to exist in our foreign policy. It may prove of special interest to them, and the record will show, to those who are interested, just how did these Members vote and support the measures and actions summarized in the following editorial:

SOME FOREIGN POLICY SUCCESSES

It is being charged with increasing irresponsibility that the United States has no foreign policy, that our military and diplomatic leaders are "drifting" that we have failed to take a strong stand against communism.

What is the record?

Was the decision to aid Greece a program that stopped Communist aggression in southeast Europe, a policy of "drift"?

Was there lack of action and determination in the Turkish aid program which made that nation a southern bastion against Russia?

Was there lack of imagination and inaction in the Marshall plan, which saved Europe from economic collapse?

Was the North Atlantic defense pact softness toward communism?

Did the Berlin airlift, which blocked the Russian plan to squeeze us out, show lack of courage and determination?

Is our sending American troops to Europe in peacetime a passive subjection to Russia?

Was our decision to stand against Communist aggression in Korea in company with the United Nations appeasement of communism?

Of course not.

All of these program and the decisions which led to them were courageous, bold, imaginative, and clear warnings to the Communist world. Each was the opposite of appeasement. Each hurt communism and hobbled Russia's program for expansion and aggression. Each saved a part of the free world and strengthened the whole of the free world.

Each has had the support of most Americans and the approval of the majority of Congress.

Who made these decisions and took these actions which have no peacetime parallel in American history? The administration—the political, military, and diplomatic leaders of both parties who are still directing our foreign and military policies.

By what logic does anyone believe that men who were capable of such successful and realistic programs and policies should suddenly become inept drifters, appeasers and not deserving of confidence?

These men—again, men who represent both parties—have been a winning combination. They have made errors, of course. But does a baseball manager break up a winning team every time a shortstop overthrows first base or an infielder misjudges a fly ball? Does he throw mud at his no-hit pitchers because somebody suddenly shouts, for no reason at all, that they are winning only in an attempt to lose the pennant?

Of course not. It doesn't make sense, either in baseball or in what today are the most important problems of our lives—military and foreign affairs.

The Lights of Freedom Are Flickering Out, Even in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in Canada, a young man at 18 remains free. He can go to school, get a job, farm a piece of land, join the army, and so forth. He has freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity. When World War II ended, conscription was dropped in Canada.

In America a young man at 18 loses freedom. His life is at the disposal of the Government at Washington. Aside from forced military service overseas, our borders become a prison wall. He cannot even leave this country as a permanent emigrant—to seek freedom and his future elsewhere. No passport will be issued to him until he is discharged from conscript army service.

How serious to America is this blackout of freedom? However it may be explained, it is a sobering fact. Millions of our ancestors came to America for one primary reason—to escape from the evils of conscript army service in Europe.

The explanation of conscript military service, known by the sugary title of selective service, is that it is necessary for our national defense. But what is national defense? I have tried to find out what it embraces.

I submitted this question to the Department of Defense: "What area of the earth's surface do the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe United States guns must defend, if our national safety is to be preserved?"

Here is their answer of April 4:

Thank you very much for your letter of March 27 and for the interest you have shown in the problems of our national security.

The question propounded in your letter is one which could not be answered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff since it deals with matters outside the scope of their jurisdiction. As I know you will understand, the task of the Joint Chiefs is a professional one involving all phases of military preparation and strategy. It does not include the making of foreign policy with which your question more or less deals. Once the appropriate governmental authorities have decided that an area of the earth's surface is to be defended by United States forces, it is then that the task of the Joint Chiefs of Staff begins; it would be up to them to decide how that particular area would be defended.

It would appear that your question is one that could be answered only by the Chief Executive in conjunction with officials of the Department of State and the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. HOUSER,
Rear Admiral, USN, Director, Office of Legislative Liaison.

MacArthur Knows Asiatic Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "MacArthur Knows Asiatic Mind," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR KNOWS ASIATIC MIND—GENERAL WAS CONVINCED PRESENCE OF RUSSIAN FORCES WOULD NOT UPSET STRATEGY HE WAS ADVOCATING

(By Constantine Brown)

Administration spokesmen have contended that the strategy advocated by General MacArthur, of hitting the Chinese bases in Manchuria, would be disastrous because it might bring us into a shooting war with Russia. They based their arguments on the existence of a mutual assistance pact between Moscow and her far eastern satellites.

The treaty was concluded in January 1950, at Moscow. The alliance was signed not only by representatives of the U. S. S. R. and China, but also by North Korea. It provides, among other things, for reciprocal help in the event of an aggression by Japan or any other nation allied with Japan.

If Russia had intended to make an issue of the present conflict and intervene, she could have taken the mutual assistance pact as the basis for extending the Korean local war into a global conflict.

Although the Korean armies were smashed and the United Nations forces occupied almost all of North Korean territory last fall, the Soviet forces did not enter the fight. Instead, the Chinese Communists were pushed in, without helping invoking the January 1950 alliance, however.

Similarly, it is said now by the supporters of the MacArthur win-the-war strategy, there is little likelihood that the mutual assistance agreement would be brought into play by Russia, if our Air Force were to strike at the Manchurian concentrations and air bases, unless she already has decided that the time is ripe to unleash world war III.

In his testimony before the Joint Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committee this week, Defense Secretary Marshall pointed out specifically that the knowledge of the existence of that alliance between Russia and her two Asiatic satellites was considered when the decision was made against using Japanese troops in the Korean war, even as auxiliaries for supply in the rear.

If this mutual assistance pact, it can be argued now, were not used when the allies occupied most of the territory of one of the signatories, why would the bombardment of bases in Manchuria be the cause for direct Soviet intervention in the war?

Russia remained nominally neutral when the North Korean forces were being destroyed. Is there any reason to believe that she would act differently if Allied planes performed a logical strategic operation in Manchuria? Insofar as Moscow is concerned, the territory of its North Korean ally should be as inviolable as that of her Chinese puppet.

General Marshall disclosed the fact that the Russians have a large ground and air force in Siberia and on the Chinese-Korean border. This has been known, unofficially, for the last 3 months. Last April the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, made some significant allusions to that situation.

But even before Mr. RAYBURN took the floor to announce ominously the concentration of forces "which were not Chinese," this column had reported that some 17 Soviet divisions were massed in that area; that a strong Soviet air force was being assembled for potential support; that among the 17 divisions were at least four paratroop divisions; and that approximately three Japanese divisions, with men carefully picked from the Japanese Kwantung army, had been placed in Southern Sakhalin, a Japanese possession handed over to the U. S. S. R. at Yalta, for a possible attack on Hokkaido, the largest of the northern Japanese islands.

This intelligence reached Washington early this year from General MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo.

There is no question that the ousted commander had considered that situation when he urged that this country and the United Nations take off their gloves in the Korean war.

It appears that General MacArthur, who unquestionably knows the Asiatic mentality and the capabilities of those forces better than do high officials in Washington, did not think that the presence of the Russian forces could be fatal to the strategy he was advocating.

The Crime Problem in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, like other members of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I have noted with tremendous interest an avalanche of editorial comments throughout the country based on Senate Report 307, the third interim report filed by our group.

As one of the authors of the Wiley-Tobey resolution—Senate Resolution 129—extending the life of this committee until September 1, 1951, I have naturally been particularly delighted to note the heartwarming reactions from all over our country to this matter of additional time for the forces of law and order at the Federal level to help local law enforcement groups throughout our country.

ARTICLES ON CRIME PROBLEM

At this time, I have in my hand a miscellaneous variety of comments from the Nation's press both as regards the work of our crime committee and on the general subject of crime itself.

The initial item is an editorial from the Thursday, May 3, issue of the Washington Evening Star. One of the features of this editorial is a presentation of the reasons for my opposition to the idea of a Federal Crime Commission—an approach which has been shared with me by our leading law enforcement officials, including J. Edgar Hoover.

MARQUIS CHILDS' COLUMN

I have in my hand as a second item an article written by Mr. Marquis Childs, Washington columnist, with regard to this third interim report. Mr. Childs' hard-hitting and controversial comments refer initially to the unfortunate leaks and advance publication of committee statements. He has also commented on other phases of the problem including the internal revenue laws, immigration recommendations, and finally he has taken up the matter of a Federal crime commission which he, too, opposes in the interest of American civil liberties.

The third item I have is an editorial from the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette which kindly points up the comments which I made regarding the role of the individual citizen in combating crime.

The fourth item is a very provocative column by Mr. Ivan H. Peterman as published in the Friday, March 23, 1951, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer. This article incidentally was reprinted and sent to me by Mr. Moriz Dreyfus, of Philadelphia, as his contribution to greater public understanding of the problem of crime.

ARTICLE FROM FRONT PAGE DETECTIVE

The fifth item that I have is an editorial entitled "How to Get Rid of the Crooks," by the distinguished former chairman of the California Commission on Organized Crime, Admiral William H. Standley. When I was in California with the Crime Committee, in both Los Angeles and San Francisco I heard tremendously fine reactions on the work which had been performed by this California Crime Commission.

We are proud that its former chief investigator, Mr. Harold G. Robinson, was also our chief investigator from the inception of the committee. Today Mr. Robinson is an assistant to Mr. Pat Brown, the attorney general of the State of California. This editorial by Admiral Standley is from the July 1951 issue of the magazine Front Page Detective, issued by the Dell Publishing Co., of New York.

Mr. President, taken together, these articles and editorials furnish an interesting commentary regarding the reactions of the American people to the crime problem. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 3, 1951]

NO NEED FOR UNITED STATES CRIME COMMISSION

The Kefauver committee placed the blame for the "crisis of law enforcement" in America where the responsibility properly rests—on State, county, and municipal governments. Any breakdown of local law enforcement is an invitation to racketeers, hoodlums, and criminals generally to set up shop and take over. There is little that the Federal Government can do about such conditions. The committee is right in contending that the job of cleaning up crime must be done largely by local prosecuting agencies, police departments, and courts. It is surprising, therefore, to find a majority of the committee advocating, somewhat inconsistently, the establishment of a Federal crime commission to make a "continuing study and surveillance of operations of interstate criminal organizations throughout the country."

That is a large order for a three-man commission of the type suggested. The commission also would be required to maintain "files and records as a national clearing house of information respecting criminal activities in interstate commerce." That is even a larger order. Other duties, including liaison between Federal and State anticrime groups, would be assigned to the commission. The crime-commission plan was the only proposal on which there was disagreement in the committee. Senator WILEY dissented from the commission idea for the following sound reasons: (1) A Federal commission might form "the basis for a national-type police force which is contrary to America's traditions and which has been vigorously opposed by all outstanding Federal law-enforcement agencies"; (2) it would result in "unnecessary harassment and interference with Federal investigative agencies"; (3) it would be an "unnecessary and costly superstructure imposed upon the present operating agencies," and (4) it would result in "dissipation of the function on the part of the legislative branch."

A Federal crime commission would encounter difficulties in pursuing interstate crime investigations not met by a congressional investigating committee. State authorities might understandably regard its inquiries as a presumptuous invasion of local law enforcement by the Federal Government.

The Federal crime commission proposal bears a striking resemblance to an ill-advised plan drawn up some years ago for a Federal crime "institute," which, like the commission, would have been an independent agency. That plan was vigorously opposed by FBI Director Hoover for the same reasons that he and Attorney General McGrath have objected to the crime-commission suggestion, namely, that it would tend to establish the Federal Government as an over-all watchdog on crime and might encourage growth of an undemocratic Federal police agency. There is too much tendency now to pass the buck to the Federal Government for crime problems that ought to be handled at the local level. A Federal crime commission would be a convenient vehicle onto which to unload State and city responsibilities.

EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF PRESENT LAWS WOULD GO FAR IN CRIME WAVE

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—So much of the Kefauver crime report has leaked out in one way or another in the days preceding its official release that its contents come as something of an anticlimax. The fact of the innumerable leaks is, incidentally, a sad commentary on a committee created to expose the moral delinquency that enables organized crime to exist in community after community throughout the Nation.

The criminal conspiracy revealed by the committee is a cancer that threatens the body politic. To make it the basis for competitive revelations—a means of building up somebody's political Hooper rating—is to put it on a vaudeville level where we can take it or leave it as just another form of entertainment.

The same thing applies, let it be said here, to the Communist conspiracy. Either it is a thing of deadly seriousness menacing our whole way of life, or it is just another sensation for the television cameras with some birdbrain from Hollywood confessing that at some point he or she was a member of the Communist Party.

The moral indignation generated by the crime hearings should now make it possible to bring about adoption of legislation, most of which has long been recommended. This applies particularly in several fields of Federal law.

Tax laws enforced by the Bureau of Internal Revenue can be strengthened so that gangsters and racketeers cannot with the aid of unscrupulous lawyers, find ways to evade taxes on their huge incomes. The report points out that the Treasury has already moved to tighten regulations to stop some of the raw stuff that the hearings revealed.

Long an urgent need, as the report shows, is increased personnel to enforce both tax and narcotic laws. The Bureau of Internal Revenue as of a year ago had a total of 3,416 suspected tax fraud cases either under or scheduled for investigation with a total backlog of 9,110 cases. Many of the pending cases involve gangsters and racketeers.

The Bureau's staff is inadequate, both in size and skills, to meet this problem. False economy beginning in the Eightieth Congress reduced the Bureau's personnel at the very time when it was obvious that in the wake of the scandals war always brings there would be need for far greater investigation and prosecution than ever before. An effective agent more than pays his own way in ferreting out tax chiselers. As the Kefauver report says, there should be a larger staff and the salary scale should be increased so that agents with greater skill and training can be hired to run down the artful dodgers and their lawyers.

Similarly, immigration laws can be tightened to facilitate deportations of criminal aliens who originally got into this country through fraud and deception. Changes have been recommended by the Commissioner of Immigration and are now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Of the broader proposals involving brand-new legislation, the committee's most important recommendation is to bar the transmission of bets or wagers in interstate communication or transportation. The Federal law now outlawing the transportation of slot machines should be extended, in the committee's view, "to include other gambling devices which are susceptible to gangster or racketeer control, such as punchboards, roulette wheels, etc." But the law on slot machines is of debatable value in view of a provision, insisted on by Senator MALONEY, of Nevada, permitting any State to receive slot machines if State law allows them to be legally received and employed in the State.

All such laws are difficult to enforce so long as local communities tolerate gambling on a wide scale. The oversize Federal policeman might have as frustrating a time on the gaming beat as on the liquor beat in the roaring twenties.

The implication in these proposals is that the Federal policeman must grow bigger and bigger. The committee proposes a permanent Federal Crime Commission with a variety of duties. But it seems to me that Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, has most of the arguments on his side in this dissent from the other members of the committee on that recommendation. WILEY suggests that this would be just another costly and unnecessary superstructure imposed on present operating agencies, with the possibility that it might be the nucleus of a national

police force contrary to basic American tradition.

Too often in the recent past administrative defects have been covered up by naming a big-name commission. One may ask here what has been done about all the witnesses who so obviously perjured themselves and showed their open contempt for the committee during the hearings. The Department of Justice reports that of 22 witnesses cited for contempt, 12 have been indicted. Two have been indicted for perjury.

With overcrowded courts and overworked legal staffs perhaps this a fairly good score. But new laws are hardly the answer when so many present laws—local, State, and Federal—are enforced, if they are enforced at all, ineffectively and inefficiently.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette]

WILEY BLAMES CRIME ON CITIZENS' INDIFFERENCE

After listening to big and little racketeers as a member of the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY says the principal handicap to law enforcement is the "don't care" attitude of the citizens.

WILEY's judgment strikes home wherever we live. In his radio address Saturday, he said, "The whole structure of our home front is being undermined by criminal termites gnawing at the foundations of our economy." He points to the failure of many persons to vote and to a shrugging-off of crimes that do not directly touch them.

"The habit of making a 'fast buck,' regardless of moral scruples, has become a habit throughout the Nation," he warned. "Our whole younger generation has unfortunately been impacted by a widely held cynicism," he added. "It consists largely in a rush for success and for wealth, regardless of consequences to self and to society, a rush for thrills, for pick-ups, for wild jags."

It is to the home as an institution that WILEY points for the answer—the grass roots of America, not in Washington, D. C.

We need only look around us and in our own homes, schools, and churches to see what is happening. It is too late when these cases get into the courts.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 23, 1951]

RICH-QUICK RACKETEERS DEGRADE NATION'S YOUTH

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

Senator CHARLES TOBEY, "the voice of American conscience" raised indignantly against certain Kefauver committee witnesses, has summarized in a question, the wide public resentment against the lush living, easy pickings, and unseemly influence of our big-shot racketeers.

Glaring at Frank Costello during the latter's closing testimony, TOBEY demanded of this one-time immigrant:

"What did you ever do for your country as a good citizen?"

Costello paused, then wheezed: "I paid my taxes."

The hearing room off New York's Foley Square rattled with laughter. It echoed across Manhattan over to Brooklyn and the Bronx, where many have contributed in a small way to Costello's affluence, and it spread across this great, indulgent Nation. That feeble defense of the extralegal millionaire Costello, will go down as a joke of the first half century.

Perhaps we should ponder such things on this Good Friday, which in all Christendom is a time for sober reflection on the greatest sacrifice. It is a time to scrutinize those who never serve, much less sacrifice. And to compare their arrogant records with those who do their duty.

Costello, Adonis, Erickson, Cohen, Guzik, the whole gallery, who have grown rich in one way or another on the American urge to take a chance, must answer one question above all: "What have they done to repay this country?"

It is certainly no boost to discover their sticky collusion with police and politicians, or with such as Charles (Lucky) Luciano, who was bounced out of the country, most unsavory of them all.

It is revolting to discover that through racketeers' contracts, international dope smugglers flourish again, and have invaded our city schools to establish a wide new demand.

It is disgusting to see the names of such swaggering bums constantly mentioned by our chit-chat literati who, despite their limited culture, ought to ignore them on the dictates of simple taste.

It is shocking to see the influence such men have on younger people, who admire their ability to make a pile in a hurry. We have the recent basketball briberies to illustrate. Or kid car-theft gangs now flourishing.

It is bewildering when principals, teachers, even parents confess they cannot guide headstrong youth, who in one way or another are also chasing the fast buck. Youngsters are not particular whether it's by racket or politics, or both, legal or otherwise. The lazier use easy-rich arguments against working or study, declaring if they cannot do likewise there's always Government relief.

It is shocking, moreover, to note the bawdy sympathy, again more evident among the young, for the accused, without much condemnation for evils attached, or the ultimate decadence they've set in motion. Racket riches inspire the urge to live elegantly and at ease, without thought for those to come.

It is this last indictment which seems the worst. It's lubrication on the skid to ruin. It speeds the grand collapse.

Do not think, however, this persuasion is all prevading. By no means. There is a great, silent majority in this country which this Holy Week is finding voice.

They comprise the law-abiding, the dutiful, hard-working, patriotic, and God-fearing. They also happen to be in all sections, coast-to-coast, with roots deep in this America they love. They didn't jump ship and gain citizenship by lying and evasion, then slug their way to unearned wealth without a thought for the new flag and country. This quiet majority lives by brighter ideals, if not the bright lights.

The protests of these have been growing, but until Messrs. Kefauver, Tobey, and Halley turned on the televised report, the call for better living and higher morals was drowned in the applause for jerks. I have said, and repeat again, the period 1945–50 has shamefully disregarded the fundamental decencies, from international levels down to forgetful fools who have ignored the sacrifices of the Second World War.

It is the contrast to those who serve, therefore, which makes today's racket kings seem small. They are shabby in their gaudy eminence, disreputable amid phony glamor. Who are these lush-living tramps? What did they do in the crisis? What contribution to the common good, or to insure the security and happiness of those to come?

The boy plodding toward the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea with a machine gun over his shoulder, he should be rewarded. But who thinks of him, when Virginia Hill is telling how she spent gangster-given thousands? The GI bereft of legs or sight, recuperating in some Army hospital, can answer Senator TOBEY's question with something that should stick. But those who chase a crooked rainbow have no time to listen. Who wants to hear of Korea now?

Do you wonder that heroes grow cynical? That black markets already are rising in the wake of U. N.'s liberators? That heartbroken first of kin read War Department telegrams, and cry out, "Why?"

To protect the likes of Costello, Adonis, Anastasia, and Gross? Whose answer is not even all the truth, when they mutter:

"I paid taxes."

Don't we all? There is more responsibility to it than that.

[From Front Page Detective of July 1951]

HOW TO GET RID OF THE CROOKS

(By Admiral W. H. Standley, USN, retired)

I spent two and a half years behind the iron curtain of California crime.

The lessons I learned as the head of the State Commission on Organized Crime are being applied with tremendous success in the former playground of mobster Bugsy Siegel.

California is no longer a resort for underworld big wigs. Our gangsters are going broke, and they're leaving our State like a bunch of fire-frightened deer.

Ont of the outstanding examples is Mickey Cohen. He's packing his bags in preparation for a trip to Tucson, Ariz. Mickey says he wants to go there to sell cigars. The truth is that he wants to escape the rigid surveillance of the Los Angeles Police Department.

The startling disclosures of the Kefauver committee have confirmed my belief that crime is organized on a national basis, that the tactics of gangland kingpins are basically the same regardless of geography.

What has been done in California can be done in your community. Our State has provided all America with a blueprint for action, a blueprint which can spell bankruptcy for every racket in the Nation.

Would you like to see your gangsters hop aboard the next train? You can use a very simple persuader that has been around for ages, taxation. We used this method, and it worked.

Have you heard of the mobster who knocked off a stool pigeon and then credited himself with an income tax deduction for the depreciation of his machine gun?

That's just a fable, of course, but it's not as fantastic as it sounds. Every year our State and Federal Treasuries are fleeced of millions of tax dollars by the bigshots of America's crime syndicates. They award themselves liberal deductions for the wear and tear of roulette wheels and swank brothels.

One of our high-class crooks saved himself half a million dollars that way. For 10 years he made other taxpayers bear the cost of hiring the goons that guarded his gambling casino in Gardena.

Racketeers dupe the tax collector by weeping about the high cost of maintaining a legitimate front for their criminal industries. In effect, they have asked the Government to subsidize their crimes. And the most fantastic thing of all is that their request is often granted.

But California is cracking down on the gangsters, hitting them where it hurts most—in the pocketbook. Our State legislature is plugging the loopholes in our income tax laws, and it is sparing no expense in its search for criminal tax evaders.

We took the mothballs out of an old conspiracy statute and made it a felony to be a bookie, gambler, or slot machine king. These boys usually were handled in the courts where we fined people for swearing and spitting.

One of the slimy fish caught in this net was Wiley Caddel. He was sent to San Quentin for attempting to organize a slot machine protection racket in Mendocino County.

The Kefauver committee has dramatically confirmed our discovery that slot machines siphon off $2,000,000,000 of our national income each year, that a large part of this money was used to close the eyes of law enforcement authorities.

Want that money to go back where it belongs, to homes and parks and schools? Try the law. It works.

The mere possession of a one-armed bandit is now unlawful in our State. Four years ago a group of slot machine racketeers arrived in California, in a limousine. Six months ago they left, in a bus.

Bookmaking was once the biggest and best organized racket in California. But that was before our Public Utilities Commission stepped into the picture. It clamped down on telephone and telegraph companies who furnished the services for these racing wires. The Continental Press wire, the major bookmaking service, was virtually driven out of business.

Today the monopolistic aspect of bookmaking has all but disappeared in California. And many of our bookies are now reading the help-wanted columns.

What we have discovered about bookmaking, slot machines, and other allied rackets also applies in such fields as prostitution, abortion, bootlegging, and dope peddling. It's the same story all over America, and the weapons available to the side of justice are ready and waiting.

The boys behind the scenes are running for cover, searching desperately for some place to avoid the national spotlight.

We Californians have made sure they won't find a haven in our State. Can you say the same?

Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the responsibilities that devolves upon all citizens is assistance to the physically handicapped, many of whom have suffered their disabilities in the defense of our rights and freedoms. To keep before our people their duties and opportunities in this respect there are held each year essay contests on the local and national level, in which high-school students are participants, and in which the opportunities for the physically handicapped are stressed.

It was my pleasure and privilege to greet the Maryland winner of the prize offered by the Governor's committee to promote employment of the physically handicapped, Miss Margaret Ann Dilfer, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ferdinand Dilfer, of Lonaconing, Md., and a student at Central High School there.

Her prize-winning entry was submitted in the national contest, where it had the distinction of being favorably considered. Inasmuch as this year's contest attracted entries from all the States in the Union, Miss Dilfer deserves a great deal of commendation and congratulations for her success on the national as well as the State level.

In this connection let me pay tribute also to the cochairmen of the Maryland Governor's Committee To Promote Employment of the Physically Handicapped, Mr. L. B. Fringer and Mr. R. C. Thompson, who, together with their committee of outstanding Marylanders, did so much to make the essay contest the success that it was.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay by Miss Dilfer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

(By Margaret Ann Dilfer)

America's greatest assurance of progress is its people—their abilities, their ingenuity, their free procedures for attacking problems, and their mental capacities. All of these human resources must be utilized if we are to maintain the superior standards of our great democratic country. If our wells of mental resources and skills should be left undeveloped. Our country would not reach the highest ideals of living which may be enjoyed by a progressive and democratic country. The handicapped are an undeniable part of this society with any number of diverse skills and abilities to be utilized as part of America's progress.

Hundreds of thousands of workers are unemployed because they have physical handicaps which do not entirely prevent them from doing some type of good work. The problem is—the physically handicapped are not given enough opportunities to prove their abilities to do good work, and as a result many remain as dependent citizens. These Americans have as much right to be independent and self-supporting to their fullest capacities as they have to freedom of speech and freedom of worship.

History shows there have been many famous persons who have overcome their handicaps and climbed the ladder to success. For example, when Franklin Roosevelt learned that he was stricken with infantile paralysis, he dauntlessly said, "I'll fight this thing." Today, the world remembers his achievements, not his physical handicap. There are also other remarkable examples. Helen Keller was able to combat her handicap as she toured the country making speeches to a world she never saw or heard. Theodore Roosevelt had poor health as a youth, but he overcame this handicap and rose to the height of President of the United States. Of course, all the disabled cannot make such remarkable achievements, but many of them could make their mark if only they would be given the opportunities to work to the best of their abilities. If these people could express themselves as a group, I am sure they would reecho the words of Churchill, who said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job."

How, then, can we awaken the workshop of our Nation to recognize the fact that our handicapped are a source of economic wealth, not a liability? An undeniable fact must be faced—national strength is the sum of individual strength. Increased individual production means increased national strength. This cannot be accomplished unless we hire the handicaped. It must be remembered that America will benefit best by the productive power and skill of all, as she grows and prospers. Therefore, the work of the handicapped cannot and must not be disregarded.

Many handicaps, after all, do not permanently affect the individual's skills, intelligence, or initiative—it may increase one's drive for success. True, natural skills are sometimes impaired, or slowed down for a time, and may necessitate a particular type of employment—but their needs are answered by rehabilitation programs which help rebuild impaired capabilities to their maximum usefulness. Then, too, many skills which remain unaltered are discovered and developed to their fullest extent of usefulness. The patience of both the instructor and the handicapped student usually results in a skilled employee who frequently outdistances his normal competitors. Employers can learn this fact only through the experience of hiring the handicapped. They must give these people with impaired capabilities the chance to say, "I accept this job to prove my skill, to earn my way, and to be an active citizen of this great country of ours."

A study made by the Department of Labor surveyed actual work records in 109 plants of 11,000 physically handicapped workers and 18,000 able-bodied workers. It was proven that the handicapped are just as efficient, just as reliable, just as careful, and just as versatile as the able-bodied workers. These records offer substantial evidence to demonstrate that men and women with a history of some handicap can work, and do it efficiently.

It is expensive to deny jobs to millions of handicapped Americans. The cost to maintain a disabled person in dependency must be paid year after year. Thus, the United States citizens are burdened with these expenses because the handicapped are left unemployed. It is estimated that for every single dollar spent to rehabilitate a handicapped individual, the Treasury of the United States gets back a ten-fold return in Federal-income taxes alone. To give jobs to the handicapped, thus will lessen the expenses of the United States citizens. Helping handicapped persons to pay their own way is beneficial, not only to us, but to the handicapped themselves; for it is necessary for them to be equipped with a sense of security which can be obtained only through living productive, independent lives. There are no financial yardsticks to measure the difference between a self-reliant, happy worker carrying his own responsibilities, and a glum, depressed citizen depending on others for everyday needs. Those differences mean more than dollars and cents; they mean happiness, good citizenship, and social usefulness.

Hiring the handicapped need not be an act of charity. Employers may hire the handicapped for the same reasons they hire able-bodied personnel—for their ability—not their disability. The yardstick for measuring the efficiency of the workers is results. It is the results that count.

The key to successful employment is proper placement in jobs which match their abilities. Hiring the handicapped can be likened to the making of a suit to measure. Each disabled person presents distinct problems, the solution of which requires understanding, imagination, patience, and ingenuity. The proper placement of the handicapped in jobs will give the employer as much assurance of results as he may expect from any employee who is placed to match his abilities.

The first half of the twentieth century witnessed the growth of the United States from a debtor to a creditor Nation, from a productive child to an industrial giant, from a world observer to a world leader—an evolvement made possible by the blending of natural resources, unusual spirit, initiative, special industrial skills, and great vision. If our vision and hopes for the future are to be fulfilled, we must utilize wisely every possible material resource—our citizens, our democracy, and our land. Hire the handicapped—they, too, must share in the promise which is America. Hire the handicapped—they, too, are part of America's assurance of progress.

Healdsburg's Adopted Battalion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to have printed three items appearing in the Healdsburg Tribune of recent date. One calls attention to the formation of a Citizens Club in adopting the First Battalion, Seventh Infantry Regiment, of the Third Division; an editorial on the same subject matter; and an article including a letter from Lt. Col. Fred C. Weyand and a letter from the First Battalion in response to the interest of the citizens of Healdsburg.

CITIZENS' CLUBS RESPOND TO FIRST BATTALION WEEK

Adhering to the proclamation of acting Mayor Roy Henderson proclaiming March 25 to March 31 "First Battalion Week" private citizens, clubs, schools, and various organizations responded wholeheartedly in making First Battalion Week a success.

According to Mrs. Fred C. Weyand, chairman of the First Battalion Committee, 24 cartons have already been shipped off to the adopted battalion in Korea and 10 more are packed and ready to go.

During the week various clubs and organizations requested their members to bring specific needed items to their regular meetings. The Healdsburg Women's Golf Club donated pocket-size mirrors, the 20-30 Club sewing kits, the Kiwanis Club towels and wash cloths, the Lions Club handkerchiefs.

The Business and Professional Women's Club have adopted an entire company, approximately 180 men, to whom they will send needed items.

The students at the Healdsburg Elementary School also responded wholeheartedly by bringing to school magazines, pencils, stationery, soap, towels, and wash cloths.

The Healdsburg High School students, as their project, will send news letters to the fighting battalion. Collection date for the letters will be decided shortly.

In addition three battery radios have been donated. One by Edna Walker, another by G. F. Graham, Hollydale Park and the third by Smith Robinson. Tanner Bros., West Street, repaired the radio given by Edna Walker.

Cash donations from Bill Wendt, Harold Vanderhurst, Mrs. Della Lovell, Mrs. R. B. Stevens, students of Lambert School, and Women's Golf Club have also been received.

The American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary and the War Mothers Club will make plans at their next meetings for collection of various articles.

The First Battalion adopted at a membership meeting of the chamber of commerce, March 13 is a part of the Seventh Infantry Regiment, Third Division. The regiment, referred to as the Cotton Balers for the use they made of cotton bales in the battle for New Orleans during the war with Great Britain, 1812-14, were first organized in 1796, mustered out in 1800, and reorganized in 1808, with continuous service dating from that time. As such they are the second oldest regiment in the United States Army.

OUR ADOPTED BATTALION

On March 13 at the general membership dinner of the Healdsburg Chamber of Commerce, a resolution was passed unanimously adopting the First Battalion, Seventh Infantry Regiment, Third Division. This resolution was subsequently sanctioned at the city council meeting of March 19, the acting mayor issuing a pr clamation naming this week First Battalion Week.

The chamber of commerce was chiefly responsible for spearheading and corraling to a focal point the adoption as presented to them by Mrs. Arline Weyand, wife of the commander of the First Battalion.

The adoption of the battalion was indeed a fine gesture on the part of the citizens of Healdsburg and much praise for the action taken has been forthcoming. In fact, Nation-wide publicity has been received and a vote of thanks should go to all those who have made the adoption possible. During time of duress, such as now, we believe, it is a faith renewer to have such gestures take place.

However, the work in maintaining and supplying a battalion has only begun. To make this promotional activity the success it deserves, everybody in Healdsburg will have to do their share.

According to Mrs. Fred Weyand, the men who are fighting in Korea need many small items to make them just a little comfortable. Magazines, books, stationery, envelopes, lead pencils, cameras, film, sewing kits, battery radios, billfolds, towels, handkerchiefs, and "snack" items are just a few of the needed articles.

Get those needed articles now and bring them to the firehouse where they will be wrapped and shipped.

Do it now and help make First Battalion Week a rousing success.

DEAR CITIZEN—A LETTER FROM YOUR ADOPTED BATTALION

(Just received is the following letter and brief history of Healdsburg's adopted battalion written in the battalion's own words addressed to the citizens of our town. We are reprinting it here for all to read for the First Battalion is your battalion.—EDITOR.)

MARCH 20, 1951.

DEAR CITIZENS OF HEALDSBURG: I was in the process of writing a formal history of the infantry battalion you've taken as your own but I've discarded the idea. I found, not to my surprise, that this battalion has a mind and heart of its own. It has taken matters into its own hands by writing you a letter which I am enclosing.

On behalf of the men, I thank you for your kindness and generosity. The knowledge of your support has made better soldiers of them—they're trying just that much harder to live up to your expectations.

I only wish you could know each of the men personally, as I do, so you could be as proud of them as I am.

Thank you for your thoughts and prayers.

Sincerely,

FRED C. WEYAND,
Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry.

I'm an old fighting battalion, the oldest one in the Army. I had my first big fight under Andy Jackson at New Orleans and I've fought in every scuffle Uncle Sam has had since then. I'm proud of it, darn proud. I've been many places since 1812 and I don't guess I've ever had a place I can call home. It has usually been some spot in the world where there's trouble brewing or a lonely post somewhere in the ZI. I don't guess I've had any parents either, 'cause as far back as I can remember my Uncle has taken care of me.

Today I feel like a new-born babe, even as old as I am, because today I found one spot in this world which I can call home and acquired a lot of good people as foster parents. I've been adopted.

I know there's not much use telling you about my past because most of that is written in history books. Sometimes I fight alone but usually with a couple of battalions and together we compose the Seventh Infantry Regiment. We're part of the Third Division and have been since World War II.

I guess I had better bring you up to date about what I've been doing since I first landed in Japan last September. I had only bout 200 GI's then and I was plenty worried. General Mac (Gen. Douglas MacArthur) sent about 1,000 Korean recruits and I trained them like mad for 6 weeks. I kept about half of them, received 200 more GI's, and then I shipped out for Korea along with the regiment.

I went ashore at Wonsan on the 17th of November and proceeded north to Hamhung by myself. The war with the North Koreans looked like it might be just about to wind up but many bypassed soldiers were escaping to the north through the mountains. I was sent to a little place about 60 miles up in the mountains called Saachang to block this movement. I'll tell you frankly, I never did see a North Korean up there but brother, on the 28th of November I saw plenty of Chinese! I was sure surprised because I didn't even know they were in the war until then.

Their Eighty-ninth Division was headed down the valley and I was sitting right in its way. They hit me with everything they had and I guess they did "bloody" my nose a bit, but I stayed and fought them off by myself until December 2, 1950. I found out later that this division was on its way to help cut off the Seventh Infantry Division and First Marine Division. It arrived too late.

I'm mighty proud of that fight but I had to break it off and get out before they cut me off in those mountains. They nipped at my tail getting out but I made it all right. I fought a delaying action on out of the mountains and down to Yongpo Airfield. I held it long enough for the Air Corps to fly the wounded out and then themselves. My job from there on was to protect the left flank of the Hungnam beachhead along the ocean. It was a good fight and I sure rocked the Chinese back on their heels.

On the 24th of December, I too was evacuated from the beach. I didn't like it, but I had my orders. My troops were the last to leave.

I spent Christmas as a guest of the Navy, and I made the most of it. It was good to be clean and warm again, but that didn't last long. Some new guy over named Ridgway (Lt. Gen. Matthew Ridgway) wanted my punch and wanted it bad. The Navy put me back ashore at Pusan and headed north and back into the line above Chonan. Things were rough over here about then, and the guy calling the plays didn't waste any time finding me a fight.

I'm a "low lander" by preference, and I like the flat plains with the long fields of fire and unlimited observation. Did I get that? No! They put me to work in mountains where no self-respecting mountain goat would be caught.

My fight was for one big hill after another. I ran the Chinese off of them by day, and they came back by night, but I beat him every time. It was rough on my troops, but they never weakened. I didn't stop till I had chased the Chinese across the Han River, and that's where I am now, just south of Seoul. I'm ready to go again, and I like river crossing. The last big one I crossed was in Italy.

Yep! I'm an old fighting battalion, but I've lost a lot of good young Americans over here. They will never march with me again, will never fight with me again, but I know that their fighting spirit will be with me whenever the going gets rough again.

That's the special thing about me, the spirit of my men. Nothing gets them down. They have fought in weather that was 30 degrees below zero over terrain that is the worst in the world; it never fazed them. They have been constantly outnumbered 10 to 1; they don't care. They have been shot and shot at night and day; they never flinch. This fighting spirit of my men is the thing that makes me the best darn battalion in the world.

Well, it is getting late and time for me to dig in for the night. I'll most likely have visitors before morning. I feel a lot better now, because I know I have a whole city at home that's thinking of me and praying for me. I'll hit 'em an extra lick or two tonight, especially for you.

Sincerely,

FIRST BATTALION, SEVENTH INFANTRY REGIMENT.

The Wake Island Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by George Sokolsky and published in the Washington Times-Herald today, dealing with the report by Miss Vernice Anderson of a conversation between President Truman and General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

It used to be said of the fire horse that when he heard a gong he just automatically went to the wagon to be hitched.

Automatic responses should be studied carefully by child psychologists, perhaps to make humans more like the obsolete fire horse. A good way to start the training would perhaps be a course in eavesdropping with Miss Vernice Anderson as the teacher, she having scooped the world in doing automatically what parents used to tell children they should not do at all, namely, eavesdrop.

Miss Anderson makes the point when she stood behind a door and listened to the conversation between General MacArthur and President Truman, she did it automatically. She also took down her stenographic notes automatically. She did not destroy the notes automatically but kept them, typed them, and gave them to her boss, Dr. Philip Jessup, of the State Department and the Institute of Pacific Relations, automatically.

That is an awful lot of automatic action for a young lady and represents a high degree of aptitude in the field. She was brought on from Washington to Wake Island apparently to serve orange juice and other liquids, the others not being specified in any of the accounts given, but it might be presumed that automatic bourbon was included. However, that is a matter of speculation and not pertinent to automatic responses, which is the subject of this course of study.

I also would include keyhole peeping in this course for the young. There is nothing in the record to show that Miss Anderson has any aptitude for that. She apparently has cultivated her ears rather than her eyes and is able to hear through walls and closed doors. The peepholers will have to be found elsewhere in the State Department or in Central Intelligence.

Children would gain great knowledge quickly if they could only peep through keyholes, particularly after they had been ordered to bed. It might improve them more effectively than television, which is in the open and therefore evokes no special skills. Automatic peepholing could be developed into a fine art with prizes given each year by the freedoms foundation for those who never fail.

Microphone-placing in flower pots might also help the next generations. They could automatically hear papa and mamma discussing family affairs, but better still, it would build the ambitions of a young man. He could perhaps write on his application for a job in the State Department that he placed microphones in his sister's boudoir when he was 10 and tapped the telephone wires in the house by the time he was 14. That ought to fit him to be an expert on the Far East, to say nothing of the Middle East and Germany.

These things can, of course, become automatic, or what we used to call, second nature. For instance, it used to be second nature for small boys to peephole through the ball park fence. That was second nature, like jumping into a swimming hole or putting a garter snake in a bottle or putting a little girl's hair in the inkwell. Second nature can be something awful if you fail to curb it. Automatic responses possess an additional quality because they require training in some such place as the State Department.

And that automatically leads to some observations concerning Miss Vernice Anderson's boss, Philip Jessup, who is one of the high mucky-mucks in the State Department. He seems to be involved in everything, having come to that department from a professorship of international law at Columbia University and the Institute of Pacific Relations. He has been active in helping the country run its foreign relations, on and off, since 1924, but really did not mature until 1945, since when he has really been a big factor, second only in influence and prestige to Dean Acheson.

He goes to all the conferences and makes speeches on great matters. He has never had any far-eastern experience but purports to be an expert on the subject through his connections with the Institute of Pacific Relations whose files the McCarran committee is now studying. He has generally been identified with those other far-eastern experts whose predilections brought us to our present dismay.

Curious that the eavesdropping Miss Anderson, whose automatic responses led her to take down an off-the-cuff, unrecorded conversation between the President and General MacArthur, should be working for Dr. Philip Jessup.

Paul Wooton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for May 9, paying fitting tribute to a fine reporter:

SEVENTY YEARS YOUNG

There is nothing unique about a lawyers' lawyer or even a doctors' doctor, but there seems to be only one newspapermen's newspaperman in Washington, and that is Paul Wooton. We can think of few offices connected with associations of newspapermen in Washington that he has not held. For three terms he was chairman of the board of governors of the National Press Club, and later president of the club. In addition, he has been president of the Overseas Writers and the White House Correspondents' Association and for many terms was president of the National Conference of Business Paper Editors. For at least 30 years he appears to have had a finger in almost every journalistic pie that has been baked in Washington.

Since the first term of Woodrow Wilson as President, Mr. Wooton has been Washington correspondent for the New Orleans Times-Picayune. For many years he also represented the McGraw-Hill publications and more recently has written a business column. His fellow news writers marvel at how he finds time to turn out his copy between stints of organizing his fellow scribes' chores. We suspect that he has done more than any other person to give the press of this city a sense of corporality. As his friends celebrate his seventieth birthday, we join in saluting him for his good work, which he always does with a smile.

The Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith an editorial carried in a recent issue of the Hastings Banner, a newspaper published at Hastings, Mich., in the Fourth Congressional District, by Richard Cook. The editorial is well worth reading. It follows:

The dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from the Far East command is a stunning defeat for the forces of democracy both on the military and diplomatic fronts. It comes as sort of supercolossal Munich that must have "Uncle Joe" chuckling contentedly into his whiskers. It is notice to the world that more appeasement is to be the order of the day in dealing with threat of Communist imperialism.

Neville Chamberlain's house of cards came tumbling down about his umbrella soon after Munich with a reverberation that shook the world. Unfortunately for us, the forces with which our administration is dealing with so little effect are much more tremendous and threatening than Nazi Germany under Hitler.

Does it make sense to remove from duty one of the great military men of our time (and about the only major American statesman to achieve a glowing record in the bleak era of postwar diplomacy) in an effort to bolster the sagging prestige of our Department of State? Why not keep MacArthur and inject some much-needed new blood into State Department leadership? But maybe that is so obviously logical that it just doesn't make sense in present-day Washington.

Consider the record. General MacArthur suddenly thrust into military leadership in Korea under conditions that were almost fantastically impossible, performed brilliantly. In the field of statesmanship, he has made great progress in winning over Japan to the American point of view. A former

deadly enemy has been changed into a possible strong ally in the Far East—a region where we need friends badly. In fact, Japan is about the only major area where United States diplomacy has been outstandingly successful.

Secretary of State Acheson, on the other hand, has been a consistent wrong guesser. The present "police action" in Korea can be attributed directly to his misjudgment of Soviet intentions. American diplomacy in Europe has produced few strong ties (the only reliable ones, at present are Turkey and Greece) despite billions of dollars spent abroad for "reconstruction." Mr. Acheson, despite the theoretically strong position of the United States, has never been influential with foreign diplomats and has not been able to forge sound or desirable alliances. Even the Atlantic nations loosely grouped together for mutual protection do not seem to be greatly impressed by our Secretary of State. Under Mr. Acheson our foreign policy has been vacillating and puzzling both to people abroad and those of us here at home. We have been weak in an era when firmness and strength are needed as never before.

Technically, MacArthur may have been playing tag with insubordination in voicing opinions that verge closely on matters of foreign policy despite warnings from President Truman and frantic pleas from our jittery Department of State. However, the line where politics ends and military responsibility begins can never be clearly defined.

The entire situation in the Far East is very confused and, as the general states, without parallel in military history.

Technically, for example, General MacArthur was serving under the United Nations, not directly under command of the United States, and thus, in theory, even represented Soviet Russia, a member in good standing of the U. N. despite the fact that she is the real power backing the North Korean and Red China armies that the United Nations forces are battling.

Although American casualties have been higher during 9 months of the Korean fighting than during the first full year of our participation in World War II, neither the State Department nor President Truman will admit we are fighting a war—it is merely a "police action" and our enemies, or rather, the lawbreakers with whom we are involved, are permitted to maintain a sanctuary just across the North Korean border where they can, in perfect safety, build up reserves of men, munitions, and supplies to support their armies in the field.

The United Nations are directly involved with Mao's troops. Red China is not a member of the U. N. However, Nationalist China which is a member in good standing hasn't been permitted to supply soldiers even though additional battle-tested ground troops are desperately needed.

Why are we in Korea? Only a little more than a year ago, Secretary of State Acheson declared that the United States was not concerned with Korea. That nation had nothing to do with our security. Our troops were withdrawn. This, of course, amounted to an open invitation to the Communists to move in. But when they did, Korea of a sudden became important. Mr. Truman and the State Department decided to resist under circumstances that couldn't have been much worse for defense forces. Once again we were caught unprepared. The unsound policies of Louis Johnson and the old Department of Defense were quickly brought to light.

Green troops had to fight a type of war for which they had not been trained. Somehow they managed to keep from being pushed back into the sea and then rallied splendidly. The intervention of Chinese troops in substantial masses prevented the close of what might have been "the Korean incident."

Where to now? Are we to fight an indecisive action back and forth across the thirty-eighth parallel—killing and getting killed in the process? Are we to withdraw? Are we to be given sufficient strength for decisive action?

The above paragraphs, we believe, should be given consideration in judging General MacArthur's action.

Some dismiss him as an egotist; some claim he has a weakness for flowery phrases and hunting out the headlines; some believe he is making a bold bid for public acclaim.

Maybe these criticisms are true in whole or in part.

However, General MacArthur is no fool. As a military man he knew the consequences of insubordination; as an individual he was aware of the tendency of Americans to dismiss public idols who have been caught "off base."

Therefore, our own guess is that the general had so much faith in his own analysis of the Korean situation and was so gravely concerned with the indecision and lack of policy at Washington that he felt it his responsibility as a top-flight soldier to disregard normal channels and go directly to the real source of authority—the people of the United States—the "body politic" to which even presidents owe allegiance.

General Ridgway, close-mouthed, brilliant field commander of our forces in Korea, recently issued a guarded statment that backed MacArthur's point of view. Will he, too, be sacrificed to "strengthen the hand" of our State Department.

In our opinion MacArthur is of much greater value to the United States and the cause of the democratic nations than Acheson and Truman combined.

Go It Alone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur has testified that if other nations refuse to accept his recommendations, we should "go it alone." I should like to call attention to two analyses of this phase of the general's argument. The first is a recent editorial from the Washington Post, and the other a column by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Evening Star. They follow:

[From the Washington Post]

GOING IT ALONE

The President rose to the occasion last night in his defense of a limited war in Korea fought by the United Nations. His task was to show that this strategy is superior to General MacArthur's—a broadened war in the Far East fought by the United States and Chiang Kai-shek in alliance. The President, in our opinion, demolished the case in behalf of that kind of nationalistic war. When he said the MacArthur policy would "unite the Chinese people behind their Communist rulers," he spoke in words that both history and common sense attest.

As in other countries, communism, it is reported, is on the defensive in China, but the way to strengthen Peiping's hold on China is the very intervention that General MacArthur proposes. Leave aside the possibility of limiting support for Chiang. The mere fact that this country was actively alined with Chiang would evoke an intense anti-Americanism throughout China. The Chinese are notoriously antiforeign, anyway. They celebrate a round dozen days of humiliation at the hands of foreign invaders or interventionists.

Not only that. After so many years of incessant warfare, they must blanch at the prospect of more and yet more American bombs hurled into their country. More American than Soviet armament is still being fired at our American boys in Korea—American armament that was originally conveyed to the Communists by surrendering Nationalists. It was conveyed in such quantity that the Communists called Chiang Kai-shek during the high point of the surrenders, their "supply sergeant." Yet General MacArthur is proposing, and the administration has given way in part to him, to restore Chiang to that role. It must be bitter tea to the Chinese farmer as he tries to plow his war-soaked fields in intervals of oppression and extortion. If Communist China is as weakened as General MacArthur says, why interfere with the disintegration, and give the Communists a rallying point in American intervention?

It is the past help to the Communist supply sergeant that should have been pondered before new help was sent. It is this past help, and the tribulations of our boys in Korea arising from its impact, that should be pondered before we loose hot words as well as criticism upon our allies for supplying our enemies with strategic materials. Our allies are struggling to their feet after two grueling contests in a generation with a world aggressor. Their full recovery is inhibited by the partition of Europe. In the old days the industrial west traded with the agricultural east in a system which gave Europe a high standard of living. The division has shattered this system, and an all-out blockade in the Far East would deal Western Europe another blow at its economy which it will certainly not sustain as an ally of the blockaders. Western Europe would suffer far more than a self-contained China (when not Russian-contained) from a complete blockade, and so, incidentally, would Japan and every other Asian country. Moreover, Western Europe, seeing the diversion of American naval power, would see their military security jeopardized as well as their economic security.

The President took for granted a knowledge of some of these repercussions of the MacArthur policy. He concentrated mainly upon the assertion of his belief in the policy of going along with the United Nations. He rested his case upon a common policy with our allies. "We cannot go it alone in Asia," he declared, "and go it in company in Europe." He is abundantly right. If there were a break in Asia, there would be a break in Europe, and Europe's bases and industrial resources would then be denied to American arms. To be sure, a coalition policy in waging a limited war in Korea requires patience. But any other policy would, as the President said, be playing the Kremlin game, which is "to drive a wedge between us and the other free nations," as well as to see us get bogged down in Asia.

[From the Washington Star]

GENERAL MACARTHUR AND THE U. N.—FAILURE TO MENTION UNITED NATIONS SEEN AS CLUE TO CURRENT DISPUTE; CAN UNITED STATES GO IT ALONE?

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Sometimes a simple clue will open up a seemingly complex mystery.

As, for instance, the failure of Gen. Douglas MacArthur even to mention the United Nations in his recent speech to Congress.

And now, reinforcing this clue, his colloquy with the 83-year-old Senator GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, which lights up, like a star shell, the whole mass of testimony before the combined Senate Armed Services-Foreign Relations Committees relating to Korea and Far East policy.

Senator GREEN wanted to know if the United States wouldn't be going alone, without the other United Nations, if we adopted the general's program for lending support to General Chiang Kai-shek's troops to invade China and for bombarding Chinese coast cities and establishing a blockade. The general said he could not testify about the United Nations. When asked about his own expectations, he replied:

"My hope would be, of course, that the United Nations would see the wisdom and utility of that course, but if they did not I still believe that the interest of the United States being the predominant one in Korea, would require our action."

"Alone?" asked the Senator.

"Alone, if necessary," the general replied. "If the other nations of the world haven't got enough sense to see where appeasement leads after the appeasement which led to the Second World War in Europe, if they can't see exactly the road that they are following in Asia, why then, we had better protect ourselves and go it alone."

Alone? In the hard and cruel sort of world today. Alone?

The general, certainly a great military strategist, here seems to reveal a lack of understanding of over-all political considerations, of the essential meaning of the United Nations, itself, which is the reason for our being in Korea, and of the world-wide calculations upon which our policy necessarily must be based if we are to win a world-wide struggle. These include the adherence and support of friends and allies without whose help we could not possibly sustain ourselves.

This common front, which from time to time may require policy adjustments and compromises, is the very essence of collective security. Nor does that mean "appeasement," a word bandied around too loosely of late.

It is not necessary for a general in the field to understand all of this to win battles, and General MacArthur has won battles. But, by the same token, a general who can win battles is not thereby qualified to set himself up to direct policy which must, perforce, go far beyond the area in which he operates. That is what General MacArthur sought to do, and still is assuming to do, without portfolio, so to speak.

The policy-making job is the function of the civilian government which must operate on all fronts in such a world-wide contest as that in which we are engaged. It must take account of the needs and requirements of those fronts, including the political, and meet them in the manner best adapted to the whole problem at hand.

Unwittingly, the general, himself, has confessed publicly to the indictment upon which he was removed and has, simultaneously, offered the final, clinching argument for supremacy of the civilian government over the military. That not only has been our tradition, but in sustaining it, in the past, Presidents have had to confront military figures as popular in their day as the general is in this, and weather the same sort of public uproar.

In other similar episodes in the past, too, there have been Members of Congress who joined in the procession and the outcry to promote political interests, and congressional committees investigating, and efforts to give Congress the reins. But always, in the end, this all has passed.

Now, as to practical considerations of today. What would happen under the MacArthur "go it alone" policy to the stability and energy we have helped to pump into the United Nations so that it stood up and met the first open challenge of aggression? To the friendships we have so carefully built up through the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact which, at the same time have brought economic and military strength to our side? And what would be the effect on the people of China, with whom we always have been friends, if the United States should "go it alone" in all-out war on their teeming cities?

Alone?

Hardly.

Excise Tax on Cigarettes and Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been aroused by the proposal to increase the excise tax on cigarettes and tobacco generally. Tobacco is taxed more than any other commodity with the possible exception of alcohol. Tobacco has been one of the principal agricultural commodities exported from the United States since colonial days. Presently it is the main source of income for more than 800,000 farm families in the United States and Puerto Rico. Tobacco is the product primarily of the labor required to produce it. It is estimated that about 480 man-hours are required to produce an acre of tobacco.

Dr. J. L. Maxton, extension agricultural ecoonmist at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, has made a study recently on cigarette costs and tobacco taxation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an analysis of this study made by Dr. Maxton, which I think is indeed revealing and which I hope will be helpful to the Members of the House in dealing with the proposed increase in tax on cigarettes and tobacco, as in my opinion any further increase in the excise tax on cigarettes will result in decreasing consumption which will disrupt our economy.

The analysis follows:

A recent statistical release by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics gives a general breakdown of the cost of cigarettes from 1926 to 1950, inclusive.

In 1926 the average retail price of a package of 20 cigarettes was 14.6 cents. Of this sum the farmer receives 1.30 cents, the manufacturer and leaf dealer 4.0 cents, distributor 3.2 cents, and Federal and State governments for taxes 6.1 cents.

By 1950 the average retail price of a package of 20 cigarettes was 20.1 cents. Of this sum the farmer received 2.9 cents, the manufacturer and leaf dealer 4.0 cents, the distributor 3.9 cents, and Federal and State governments for taxes 9.3 cents.

In 1950 the manufacturer, leaf dealer, and distributor received 40 percent of the retail price of cigarettes, Federal and State governments received 46 percent of the retail price of cigarettes and the farmer-producer received only 14 percent.

Any further increase in the excise taxes on cigarettes by Federal or State governments may be expected to result in decreases in consumption with bad effects to our economy.

The price mechanism is exceedingly delicate. With controls on acreage in the form of acreage allotments and controls on marketing in the form of marketing quotas both the tobacco growers' hands are effectively tied. It hardly seems fair then, with the producers' hands tied by controls, that Federal and State governments should take turns slapping his face with increased taxes on the manufactured product. It is accepted as sound economics that price increases not accompanied by corresponding income increases result in consumption decreases. Many of the cigarette smokers are white-collar workers (not members of any labor union), whose incomes have not been increased in the last year in proportion to their increases in living costs. The only alternative for this group is to go into debt or decrease their tobacco consumption. Since the Federal policy for controlling inflation has been to tighten credit controls their only recourse is to smoke fewer cigarettes or switch to consumption of some cheaper alternative such as smoking tobacco.

Tobacco somehow in the past has become considered as a luxury item. ECA however, considers it a necessity as an incentive good and has shipped hundreds of millions of dollars worth to European, Asiatic, and other countries under its rehabilitation program. In most foreign lands it is a better trading item than food or money itself, therefore is considered a necessity. Frankly, the time is at hand to approach this matter realistically with a full and open discussion on the matter of justification for the taxation of tobacco.

It is a product that lends itself to taxation because of ease of collection. But surely ease of collection of taxes is no justification of itself for taxation. Taxation should be based on income or ability to pay to be fair. The taxes collected from many users of cigarettes are collected from people who are in the lowest-income classes. It would appear that an open airing of the whole matter of tobacco taxes, their justification, the effect on consumption and on tobacco producers and similar considerations is in order. We owe such action to ourselves in the name of progress.

Central Intelligence Agency Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ex-Head Asserts CIA Reports Should Have Gone to MacArthur," from the Washington Star of today. The article deals with a statement by Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, head of the CIA from June 1946 to October 1, 1950, regarding reports by the Central Intelligence Agency on conditions in Korea.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EX-HEAD ASSERTS CIA REPORTS SHOULD HAVE GONE TO MACARTHUR

HONOLULU, May 10.—The man who once headed the Central Intelligence Agency said yesterday he believed it was Washington's responsibility to supply General MacArthur any available evidence on Chinese Red mobilization in Manchuria.

CIA operations have figured in the hearings now in progress in Washington over the removal of General MacArthur from his commands.

General MacArthur has said Washington failed to report to him on the shift of the Chinese Third and Fourth Field Armies from China into Manchuria.

Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, head of CIA from June, 1946 to October 1, 1950, said in an interview that CIA was responsible for reporting such strategic intelligence as Chinese troop movements to Manchuria.

NORMAL PROCEDURE

Normal procedure, he said, was for CIA to report to the President, the National Security Council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It would be normal for the Joint Chiefs to advise General MacArthur, he added.

Admiral Hillenkoetter said he did not remember prior to October 1 any reports of Chinese troop shifts into Manchuria. And he added he knew nothing of CIA operations since Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, the present CIA chief, replaced him.

The Chinese Reds intervened in Korea in late October.

Admiral Hillenkoetter said CIA had cordial and effective relations with General MacArthur's Far East command up to the time he left the intelligence post.

CAN'T PREDICT INTENTIONS

President Truman told a news conference last week that General MacArthur had denied CIA operations in Tokyo until persuaded by General Smith. General MacArthur, in New York, called that "tommy-rot."

Admiral Hillenkoetter said CIA could not be called on to report more than the location and estimate of the capabilities of any Chinese troops in Manchuria.

"To predict the intentions of the enemy, real or potential, you would need a crystal ball," he added.

Free Trade Marches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of May 9, 1951:

TARIFF TRADE—UNITED STATES WILL SLASH DUTY 25 TO 50 PERCENT ON TENTH OF IMPORTS NOW TAXED—IN RETURN, 15 NATIONS WILL MAKE MINOR CUTS ON TWENTIETH OF UNITED STATES EXPORTS—TV, TULIPS, AND TAXIMETERS

(By Ray Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam has agreed on a new "horse trade."

The United States will cut tariffs on a sizable chunk of our imports from all countries—heavily.

In return, nine countries will reduce their tariffs on United States goods—modestly. Six others agreed to minor concessions.

It figures out this way:

The United States will cut tariffs from 25 to 50 percent on a tenth of all the goods on which we now charge import duties.

In return, the United States will get tariff cuts from the 15 foreign countries on less than one-twentieth of United States exports. Most of these cuts will be trivial.

THIRTY-COUNTRY CONFAB

That in a nutshell is the result of the 30-country tariff conference just ended at Torquay, England, after 8 months of discussions.

One conference paradox: The United States tariff talks with Britain broke down—because the British were unwilling to make any important concessions to us. Yet Britain will be one of the big gainers from United States tariff cuts.

"That's because the cuts we give to one country, we automatically give to every country, even to those countries that won't cooperate," says one official.

Another conference paradox: 16 countries at Torquay announced they were raising some of their tariffs. France, for example, said she was raising duties on 38 types of goods.

Theoretically, these 16 countries made new tariff cuts to make up for the ones they raised. Mostly, though, the concessions they renounced were greater than the new cuts they offered in exchange.

United States tariff cuts will have a mixed effect here.

Consumers will get many goods cheaper, if price hikes don't wipe out the effects of lowered duties. United States producers face hotter foreign competition on the American market.

Cuts by the United States cover thousands of goods across the board. They will range from mop cloths and clothing through raisins and figs to lead, aluminum, machinery, and tobacco. Even the opium duty was cut in half.

DELIGHT FOR TOPERS

Party goers should be delighted. Champagnes will get in a little cheaper. So will French and Italian wines. Also, French laces and perfumes. Canadian whiskeys are included, too—but not Scotch.

If you're a teetotaler, you get in on this too—with a cut on grape-juice duties.

The levy on Canadian caviar was cut in half; on imported orchids also. The foreign-made gold or platium jewelry you might want for a party dress—if you can afford it—will be taxed a little less as it comes in. Metal users from war manufacturers to auto and refrigerator makers will get a little relief.

Duties on key metals and minerals like lead, bismuth, chrome, zirconium, vanadium, and barium will be cut squarely in half. So will tariffs on boron, strontium, thorium, and silicon. Tariffs on titanium, pig iron, ferromanganese, zinc, and aluminum will be cut from 20 percent to 30 percent.

If you're a smoker, these new tariffs may help you, too. The duties on cigars and cheroots will be sliced in half. Unstemmed cigarette leaf tobacco duties will be reduced a quarter.

PISTOLS AND HORSERADISH

If you're more interested in what your wife puts on the table, there are reductions in duties on cheeses, frozen blackberries, grapes, bananas, horseradish, and candied apricots and peaches.

If you're a gardener and like Holland tulips, or narcissuses, tariffs on imported bulbs will be reduced a little.

Then there are cuts on cocoa and chocolate, on Italian matches, on tanning extract, French garters, drawing ink, Korean iodine, lampblack, white lead, mica, German razors, telescopes, swords, and sewing machines—to say nothing of Swedish taximeters, German pistols and revolvers, Turkish licorice. Brazilian plywood, Canadian cream, French post cards, Norwegian fish cakes and acetic acids. Musical instruments and radios and television are included, too, along with a host of other goods, important and trivial.

Many American businessmen are going to be worried by these tariff cuts. There are 50-percent lower duties on many types of clocks and clock movements and parts, for example.

American canners won't be happy about the 40-percent cut which United States diplomats promised on imported canned salmon.

EARTHENWARE AND FILBERTS

American makers may be miffed by the lowered rates in store for Italian earthenware.

American nut growers—who have been complaining about tariffs being too low—won't be happy that United States negotiators promised not to raise duties on imported filberts. American fig, grape, and raisin growers will be bothered about the new low rates on these imported fruits.

American manufacturers are going to be bothered by growing competition from West German exporters. A key to what's coming shows up in the United States tariff cuts won by German negotiators.

The Germans argued for and won lowered United States duties on china, chinaware, drawing instruments, clocks, and on wool yarns and a wide variety of toys. Harmonica tariffs were slashed in half; camera duties a quarter. Duties on some coal-tar chemicals were cut in half. A wide range of German machinery will also get in cheaper.

United States exporters will reap some benefits from these tariff cuts.

If you are an American fruit exporter you'll get a number of breaks. Several countries cut tariffs on typewriters and other office machinery and equipment. Some concessions were made to United States exports of tires, passenger cars, and trucks.

Canada cut tariffs on many types of machinery, and on many iron and steel products. Brazil reduced levies on electric motors and dynamos. Peru cut duties on some electrical equipment. Korea cut tariffs on wheat flour, Norway on some kinds of tractors and grinding, boring, and drilling machinery.

State Department officials say the Americans who export to Canada and Western Germany will be the biggest beneficiaries. Canada seemingly made the biggest concessions of any country on the list—except for the United States, of course.

Officials here say it's not certain when these new tariff rates will take effect. Some will start in June. Others will be put into effect gradually between June and November this year as the conference countries ratify the Torquay agreements. Each of the 147 separate Torquay agreements will go into effect 1 month after the countries concerned ratify.

Letter of Jack Allen, of Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, although I have never had the privilege of visiting the great State of California I have enjoyed making the acquaintance of many California Members in the House of Representatives. I have what I believe to be a rather startling story of interest to all the Members of the House.

I own a small heating company in Akron, Ohio, and am listed in Dun & Bradstreet as its president. I am known to be a successful small-business man and have never been known to be a sucker for fast operators. Nor am I a racetrack fan in any sense of the word.

The letter printed below was received in my office in Akron and as stated the writer called collect on the morning of April 26. My efficient secretary there answered the phone and informed Jack Allen that although I was the president of William H. Ayres, Inc., he would have to call me in Washington as I was now a Member of Congress. Mr. Allen replied: "What, he's a Congressman!" and hung up. No doubt he had heard of the Kefauver committee.

I think the Members of the House will be interested in this letter:

ALLEN LEWIS CO. ENTERPRISES,
Los Angeles, April 17, 1951.

Mr. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Akron, Ohio.

DEAR Mr. AYRES: On Thursday, April 26, 1951, at Jamaica, Long Island, racetrack in New York, there will be a horse entered which, I have every reason to believe, will be of great interest to you. It is my sincere belief that this horse will win at good odds.

Relative to the above-mentioned transaction, I will take the liberty of calling you on that date collect. If you are interested, kindly accept my call.

Should you desire any further information, feel free to contact me at your earliest convenience.

Looking forward to our conversation.

Yours truly,

JACK ALLEN.

MacArthur Controversy and American Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Lippmann has, in the following article, posed some questions which are certainly worthy of our attention:

THE QUESTION OF AMERICAN DESTINY

(By Walter Lippmann)

This must surely be the first time in all human experience that a people has conducted a council of war in the presence of its actual and possible enemies.

The hearings, to be sure, are not open to television and the transcript of the testimony is being subjected to a certain amount of censorship. But what is being censored must be of little interest, let us say to Moscow and to Peiping, as compared with what is being brought out.

The censor is deleting certain military facts and estimates which, assuming that they are not known, would enable our adversaries to measure more accurately the efficiency of our intelligence services and of their own. The censor is not deleting the conflicting war plans and conflicting political ideals over which this country, and even its professional military leaders, are so bitterly divided. Whatever the outcome of this public council of war—this farthest north in superpublicity, this unique case of open strategy openly arrived at—Moscow and Peiping will know it as soon as we do.

They know what General MacArthur and the Republicans would do if they could get the better of President Truman and the Democrats. They have weeks, perhaps months, to work out their reply in case the MacArthur policy wins out. They know also, more or less accurately, what President Truman intends not to do, if he can rebut the MacArthur party. They can choose to make it hard or easy for the Truman policy; they can play the war to get whatever result they think is desirable, to entangle us more or to entangle us less, knowing at all times as much about our intentions as we know ourselves.

The controversy itself covers a lot of ground and turns on a series of great issues. Some of them are deep and far-reaching. When the general was speaking it seemed at times that there was at issue the very conception of the American destiny. Is the American destiny now an imperial destiny? Or is it the American destiny to be the protector and the promoter of the Atlantic community and of the western civilization which is at home within it?

At the bottom of the whole controversy, which did not begin this year, or last year, but has smoldered on since long before the World War, there is a profound conflict of view about what is the American destiny.

This conflict is older than MacArthur and Marshall and Truman, not to speak of TAFT and KNOWLAND and WHERRY. It goes back at least as far as the Spanish-American War and the conquest of the Philippines. It is not going to be settled soon, and we shall be arguing it for a long time to come.

As we argue it we should realize that it is a great, indeed a noble, controversy. It turns upon whether, like all our predecessors in the days when they rose to power, we must become, and wish to become, the masters of an empire which we rule for our glory and for its benefit—or whether we wish to be the first servants of a community of free nations, all of them the big and the small alike, the heirs with us and the custodians with us of the western civilization which originated in the Mediterranean and has expanded about the Atlantic Ocean.

But though this controversy—the truly great and enduring American debate—cannot be settled and concluded in these hearings, or in the next election, it is, I believe, the necessary context for understanding General MacArthur's views and the opposition to them.

The incalculable risks—incalculable by his own admission—which General MacArthur wishes to accept by making war on China are simply incomprehensible if nothing more is at stake than to bring about a cease-fire in Korea and the withdrawal from Korea of the Chinese—and presumably also the American—armies. The risks that General MacArthur wishes to take become comprehensible only in the context of the general's vision—his vision of the Pacific Ocean as an American lake and of Japan as lying within the sphere of American power and of China, with Chiang restored, brought within the American sphere of influence.

The general's proposal to risk a third world war in order to end war in Korea sounds, when one first hears it, like a case of wishing to burn down the barn to roast the pig. The risks are fantastically greater than any advantage that could be got out of taking them.

But his proposals take on a different look if we recognize that his objective is American paramountcy in the Far East—in Japan, Korea, and China. That would be, that has often been, the kind of objective worth a world war, which empire builders have worked for. But there will be many of us, most of us I truly believe, who think the prospect of such an empire a dreary one, likely to destroy not only American freedom, as we have known it, but also the desire to use power generously, which is so very American.

United States Occupation Policy in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in February General Eisenhower addressed a joint meeting of Members of Congress and established his now famous position on Germany, stating:

I personally think that there has to be a political platform achieved, an understanding that will contemplate an eventual and an earned equality on the part of that nation before we should start to talk about including units of Germans in any kind of army.

Shortly thereafter, I compared the occupation policy in Germany under High Commissioner McCloy with this position in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives raising the subjects of the decartelization and denazification programs and the Nazi war criminals, and again suggested an investigation of our occupation policy in Western Germany as part of our foreign policy. In response to this expression of views I have now received a detailed letter from High Commissioner McCloy, which should be of great interest to all who are concerned about our occupation policy there. The seriousness of the situation is underscored and the dangers evidenced by the success of ultra-Nationalist and neo-Nazi parties in recent elections in lower Saxony and Austria. A firm and knowledgeable occupation policy in Western Germany was never more necessary than now. High Commissioner McCloy has given me his permission to release these parts of his letter and I append them hereto:

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY,
APO 757-A, Frankfurt, April 18, 1951.

The Honorable J. K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JAVITS: Thank you for your letter of February 8, 1951. Although I have replied to a later letter from you, which reply in part covers some of the material in this letter, I have thought it wise to go over the field covered in your earlier letter in some detail. I am sorry of the delay in answering, but these letters take time to prepare and the pressures have been particularly heavy in the past few months.

On the matter of a congressional investigation, I have already given my views. I still believe that such an investigation would not be in the American interest in the present situation.

Most of the specific points raised in your resolution will be fully reported on at the appropriation hearings in Congress in the next few weeks. They are all fair and important questions, but I think they can be satisfactorily answered either at that time or found in the carefully prepared reports which this office makes quarterly in Germany. As I have said before, it is of the greatest importance in Germany and Europe today that the United States avoid giving the impression of disagreement and lack of clarity about its foreign policy—and this I

believe would be the inevitable effect of the investigation you propose. However, should it be decided to hold such an investigation, this office will naturally do everything to cooperate with you.

Before I go into details of your letter and the speech which you enclose, I should like to make a few general observations regarding the problem of Germany. I have now been fairly directly concerned with United States policy in this country since 1941 when I became Assistant Secretary of War. I think I have gained some understanding of the problems we have to contend with, and I have had some share in the development of the policy to meet those problems. Though in one or another respect there have been changes in policy, there has been no change regarding our over-all objective regarding the extirpation of nazism and the fostering of democracy in Germany. It has been very clearly realized that stamping out nazism is not only a matter of defeating it in a war—it means changing the social and cultural conditions out of which it developed, and creating conditions which will lead to democratic developments.

This I take to be our major objective still. Any policy which forgot what our stake in a democratic Germany is, or which assumed that our democratic objective could be sacrificed to other more expedient aims, would be criminally negligent and dangerous.

This brings me to your letter, in which you place great emphasis on General Eisenhower's report on Germany. You apparently believe that the policy as stated by General Eisenhower is different from the policy of HICOG in Germany. On this, as I indicated in my earlier letter, I am unable to agree with you. The policy of the United States in Germany, as I have understood and carried it out, has from the days of General Clay had as one of its aims what General Eisenhower admirably summed up in the words "eventual and earned equality." The London Conference of 1948, that at New York, and then at Brussels, have all dealt with a Germany progressively regaining her place in the family of nations. The policy expressed by the Foreign Ministers at all these meetings has each time made clear that the progress which Germany makes toward equality depends upon the German people themselves.

The present discussions concerning German participation in western defense are wholly consistent with this policy. It is still our objective to prevent a militaristic Germany from coming into being. It is still a matter of grave concern to us that Germany be a peaceful and democratic nation. We have no need to sacrifice these objectives by proposing that Germany contribute to the defense of the west.

It is true that in some quarters, both American and German, there has arisen a feeling that the present situation is such that the United States is now inclined to "buy" or bid for German participation in European defense at the cost of our democratic objectives. I have taken every occasion to combat this notion in public statements and in practice. By this time, it is not a widespread notion any longer in Germany, though it still seems to be held in the United States, since even the Landsberg decisions were treated in this light by a section of the American press.

I should like to say a few words on this subject too, because in your press release of February 2 you refer to the decisions as though they were related to the political situation in Germany, and the issue of German participation in particular.

The fact is that I appointed the Clemency Board in March 1950, long before there was any thought of German participation. I appointed the Board because I considered it a fundamental principle of American justice that persons accused shall have a right of appeal. I call your attention to the fact that unlike criminal cases in the United States or England, there was no provision for these cases to have further court review for possible errors of law or fact after they had been passed on by the court of first instance.

The Board's report and my own examination of the cases were made entirely in the context of "justice American style," as you put it, and without regard to political pressures of any kind. I am sending you a copy of a pamphlet which we have prepared on the Landsberg decisions. I hope you will look through it. I recommend especially to your attention the introduction to the Clemency Board's report which begins on page 13. I also call your attention to the fact that the Board submitted its report in August 1950, a month before the matter German participation was first raised at the New York Conference of Foreign Ministers.

As for the particular case of Alfried Krupp, I find it difficult to understand the reaction on any other basis than the effect of a notorious name. After a detailed study of this case, I was convinced that Alfried Krupp deserved clemency. Certainly there was reasonable doubt that he was responsible for the policies of the Krupp Co., in which he occupied a rather junior position. I also found it very doubtful that he had any responsibility for the use of slave labor in the Krupp plant. It is true that the name of Krupp stands as a symbol of evil, of the German armaments industry. I was not concerned with a symbol. Instead, I had to decide on the extent of the guilt of a specific individual, Alfried Krupp. Others whose responsibility was greater than his had been given lighter sentences (and had been released) for the same crimes for which he was convicted. Moreover, it was this man's father, not the defendant, who helped finance Hitler and who was the directing force of the Krupp works. I am inclined to think that the son took his place in the dock largely because his father was on his death bed at the time. Certainly he would not have occupied as prominent a place if his father had likewise been tried.

Finally, I should like to say that by reason of the Landsberg decisions, I believe that the true nature of the Nazi crimes, their depth and extent and their motivation, are better known and understood today in Germany than they have ever been. We have sent out 780,000 copies of this pamphlet in Germany. More people have read and thought about the Nazi crimes than ever was the case during the trials, and the latter can no longer be dismissed as merely the law of the victor over the vanquished.

Germany is progressing. It has yet to meet the great tests of its final status. They may not come for 10 or 15 years. The new Government has been in existence for little more than 1 year. Nazis do not control the Government. It is controlled by resistance people, former Weimar people, large representations of labor, Socialists, and Conservatives, but they are far from Nazis and just as fine people as the Liberals. There are on the outer fringes some Communists and some old Nazis. That is the present order of the German Government.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. MCCLOY.

School Safety Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, this week end the Nation's Capital will be the scene of an invasion by 23,000 of America's finest young citizens.

The young people of whom I speak are members of school safety patrol units throughout the United States.

These boys and girls are carrying out in magnificent fashion a very vital task—the task of guarding the safety of their schoolmates en route to and from school.

They receive no pay. They are at their posts early in the morning and stay until the last each evening. Their noon hours are seldom their own, and they remain on duty even in the most inclement weather.

Therein lies the foundation of good citizenship. Devotion to service to their fellow students without thought of compensation brands these boys and girls as citizens from whom we can expect leadership in the years to come.

I am happy to pay tribute to all these fine young people. I am particularly pleased to do so since 112 of these attending the fifteenth national assembly here this week end are from my own Sixteenth Ohio District.

It is especially fitting that a group from Canton, Ohio, should be here for this assembly, for Mr. Harry Staley, of Canton, was one of the originators of the school safety patrol program.

Mr. Staley, a member of the Canton Automobile Club and the Canton Board of Education, became aware of the need for some type of safety program.

In 1924 he established a system which was widely adopted, and which became one of the primary bases for the School Safety Patrol system in use throughout the Nation today.

I know that Mr. Staley would be very pleased and very proud if he were able to be in this city this week end, for the school safety patrol program has developed into the fine organization which he must have envisioned.

Congress Should Extend Hospitalization, Medical Care, Compensation, and Other Benefits to Korean Veterans on Same Basis as Has Been Provided for World War II Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the House will see fit to take immediate action upon this resolution, House Joint Resolution 257, which the leadership is today proposing in order to extend to our new veterans—the veterans of the Korean conflict—the rights and benefits allowed to veterans of World War II. This is long overdue and certainly to delay further would only multiply the instances of inconvenience and injustice which have inevitably developed.

This resolution would grant to veterans of the Korean war the same rights

and benefits as have heretofore been provided under the law to the veterans of World War II—including hospitalization, medical care and other benefits and entitlements including compensation and pensions, but not including veterans education and training benefits. This latter veterans benefit program is yet to be enacted.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore introduced in this Congress bills to provide Korean veterans with hospitalization and medical care and also compensation and pensions—benefits similar to those provisions of law affecting World War II veterans. I had hoped that action might have been obtained in this regard long before now. Such action has been incumbent upon us for a long period of time and I am most pleased that the sentiment has developed for taking such action and passing this meritorious legislation for the protection of our new veterans. Certainly no debate or long discussion is needed or necessary—this is a case of simple justice to our men fighting in Korea, our new veterans and our future veterans. I commend the leadership of the House in proposing action in this particular. So let us act now.

Should Give Priority to Perjury Prosecutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the May 6 issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger:

SHOULD GIVE PRIORITY TO PERJURY PROSECUTIONS

Mississippians, with a decent concern and consideration for their State's good name and that of the Democratic Party in Mississippi, welcome the Washington announcement that the records compiled by the Senate committee which investigated charges of sales of Federal jobs in the State are to be turned over to the Justice Department for possible criminal prosecutions of persons involved.

Many of these Mississippians may share the attitude expressed by Postmaster General Donaldson as a witness in Washington when he said: "If I were sitting as judge, I would be inclined to quit those who were forced to buy the jobs and prosecute to the limit those who forced them to make the contributions."

Much of the testimony made it very clear, however, that fair and effective prosecution of any job sellers would be seriously handicapped, if not made impossible, unless preceded by perjury prosecutions to bring out the facts, to determine who lied and who told the truth, who can be believed under oath and who cannot.

Two of the three Senators who conducted the hearings in Jackson declared at their conclusion that much perjury had been committed.

"There is bound to have been some perjury committed," Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, a Democrat, declared.

"There was a lot of perjured testimony," Senator KARL MUNDT, North Dakota Republican, bluntly stated. And he added, "This will be referred to the Department of Justice."

The briefer hearings held since then in Washington have produced more sworn testimony directly contradicting some of that given here in Jackson.

For example: Postmaster General Donaldson is quoted as denouncing as pure falsehood, sworn testimony by Clarence E. Hood, given in Jackson, quoting the Postmaster General as saying that he wasn't taking the job-selling charges seriously because they were made by Mississippi Congressmen trying to regain control of patronage.

"I want to be as forceful as possible," Mr. Donaldson was quoted as saying about Hood's testimony, "but all I can say is that it is pure falsehood."

Washington testimony by Robert M. Moore, assistant to Democratic National Chairman Boyle, also denied sworn testimony by Jackson witnesses.

He denied that he has ever told leaders of the pro-Truman Mississippi Democratic group that it was all right for them to accept contributions for the national committee.

He denied that Curtis Rogers had offered to share with the national committee the proceeds of the Mississippi Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner sponsored by that group.

He denied telling Mrs. C. B. Murphy, of Winona, that she would be reimbursed for refunds to purchasers of Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner tickets.

Mr. Moore, in brief, swore that he had no knowledge that contributions were being made by Mississippi job applicants.

The Washington testimony thus contradicts much of the testimony offered at the hearings in Jackson, and much of the latter testimony was so contradictory that the presiding Senators declared that perjury was obvious.

Mississippians would like to see any and all job sellers prosecuted. But just and effective prosecution requires that the truth, the whole truth, be brought out. And that cannot be done until juries in perjury trials decide who lied and who cannot be believed under oath.

Old Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.:

SONG REVIVED—OLD SOLDIERS' COMPOSER FOUND TO BE LYNN WOMAN

The Library of Congress has discovered that the barracks ballad resurrected to fame by Gen. Douglas MacArthur—Old Soldiers Never Die, They Just Fade Away—originated in a semisacred song composed in 1858 by one of the Singing Hutchinsons of Lynn.

According to a reference librarian in the Library of Congress music division, the ballad that General MacArthur paraphrased in his address before Congress April 19, was originally entitled "Kind Words Can Never Die." It was composed by Abigail Jemima (Abby Hutchinson) Patton.

She was a member of the famous family of troubadours who lived on High Rock. Three generations of the Singing Hutchinsons returned to High Rock after concert tours which took them from Boston's Faneuil Hall to the California gold field. Pioneers of family group singing, they performed for Lincoln in the White House and for McClellan's troops.

John Hutchinson, "the Bard of Lynn," gave the city the land on which High Rock Tower was erected.

It is not known just when the Kind Words song evolved into the Old Soldiers' version. Perhaps during the Civil War, for the Old Soldier song was a favorite with Civil War veterans.

"It is curious," said the Government librarian, "how the chorus has survived without the original verses." Except for a note or two, the chorus of Old Soldiers is the same as when Sister Abby composed Kind Words.

MacArthur—Ridgway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call attention of the House to the following very interesting article by Marquis Childs:

LEADERSHIP BY RIDGWAY

(By Marquis Childs)

HEALING THE SPLIT

The civil war in Washington has pushed the Korean war off the front page. Unfortunately this has obscured the achievement of a general who has proved that he was right by the only test that counts—success in meeting and stopping the enemy.

While he has now transferred his headquarters to Tokyo, the successes in Korea owe a lot to the leadership of Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. To understand this is only necessary to recall the situation prevailing when Ridgway took over last December 26.

The retreat from North Korea had not been halted. There was still talk of disaster. Tentative plans were approved in the Pentagon to fall back to the old Pusan beachhead in the south and then to evacuate American troops from there to Japan, with the remnants of the South Korean army going to Okinawa.

Ridgway was flown out to take over after Lt. Gen. Walton Walker was killed in a jeep accident on December 23. It was one of the darkest periods in the Korean war.

In 5 months the new commander reassembled and regrouped the United Nations forces. He put new morale and new conviction into an army that was pretty well demoralized. As a consequence, the latest Chinese Communist offensive has been held according to plan.

The enemy, in the opinion of Lt. Gen. James Van Fleet, now in command in the field, is preparing another attack. But the same confidence prevails that this time, too, the Red drive will fail. Here is an achievement of the first magnitude, and it should not be lost sight of in the midst of this snarling mess at home.

What General Ridgway has done is further obscured by the stand that General MacArthur takes in his testimony in the Senate

inquiry. MacArthur denies that his forces were dangerously split in the drive into North Korea. He goes so far as to insist that they were deployed exactly right and that he would not change his orders if he had to do it again.

He insists in the same connection that there was no rout, no disorder, as the Eighth Army fell back. This, says General MacArthur, was a planned retreat.

News stories written by combat correspondents on the scene at the time were almost directly contrary to this. Some of these correspondents have since returned to America and in their writings and speeches they repeat that the U. N. forces in Korea were divided in such a way as to invite the enemy into a vacuum in the middle. They say that the liaison between the divided forces was almost nonexistent and they reaffirm what they wrote at the time about the rout that followed the intervention of a comparatively small force of Communist Chinese.

Some correspondents go so far as to say that the initial intervention may have been by a mere reconnaissance force of four to five divisions. After these divisions discovered the true situation, the invasion in mass took place. These same correspondents say that when the orders were issued from MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo to push to the Yalu River, Chinese prisoners were already being taken and that fact reported to Tokyo.

In the light of this contradiction, I should like to make a most earnest recommendation to the Senate committee. Call before the committee under oath some of the able combat correspondents who have seen the Korean war at first hand. I am thinking of newsmen like Stan Swinton of the Associated Press, Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News, and Homer Bigart of the New York Herald Tribune. Other names will occur and it should not be difficult to compile a list of a half dozen who have seen more of the fighting than any general and who have heard at first hand more about the war than any general.

If the committee does this, it will, in my opinion, have a better chance of getting some objective facts than in any other way. The testimony of the newsmen will have nothing of self-interest in it. Most of these men covered World War II or they fought in it. They are as much military experts—for my money, much more so—than the desk generals who too often are surplusage at Army headquarters far in the rear of the fighting front.

These veteran correspondents need not be called on for their conclusions if there is any apprehension lest the prejudice most of them share against MacArthur's headquarters should enter in, although I, for one, would like to hear their conclusions. But let them be asked about what they saw and heard.

If this is an inquiry to get at the truth, here are eyewitnesses who also happen to be trained observers. The committee has a chance to give the public something besides partisanship.

Murder of a Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to invite the attention of the membership of the House to an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times of Tuesday, May 8, entitled "Murder of a Program."

Today we are concerned with preventing the spread of communism and increasing our preparedness effort. The slums are the most fertile breeding places for communism. A man does not care about ideologies when he cannot keep a roof over himself and his family.

The preparedness effort will result in the influx of large numbers of people to the urban industrial centers. They are necessary in order to man the machines which are once again turning out the weapons of war. Unless we have the manpower we cannot make the guns, the ships, or the planes. But how can you induce a man to move to a place where he cannot find a decent dwelling for his family? I say, Mr. Speaker, that those who contend that because of the world situation we cannot afford a program of public housing distort the facts. Now of all times we must push forward with such a program.

The editorial is as follows:

MURDER OF A PROGRAM

Economy, like charity, it becomes increasingly obvious, can be used to cover a multitude of sins. It has just been used by the House to excuse an action that would practically kill off the public-housing program in this Nation.

With more than a third of the Representatives absent or not voting, the House decided no more than 5,000 public-housing units should be built in the Nation this year. That would mean, on an equitable distribution, only 104 units for each of the 48 States. Construction on such a microscopic scale would be senseless. It would be more honest simply to kill off the program and let it go at that.

St. Louis alone has plans for more than 8,000 units of public low-income housing. And the briefest of tours of St. Louis' slums will show that the plans are not overambitious. The cancerous tenements are eating away the very life of the city. They must be replaced, and with housing that the present slum dwellers can afford. Only Government aid, it has been abundantly established, can provide such housing.

It will not do to say that the Nation is in a military crisis and so cannot now afford the "luxury" of adequate housing. This is no luxury. It is at any time a necessity of sound national living. That is even more forcibly true now, when defense production must of necessity depend in large part on provision of good housing for defense workers.

President Truman already had made in his budget allowance for the pressures of military spending. Instead of recommending construction of the 350,000 public housing units that previous congressional action had authorized, he asked for only 75,000 units. So much was a sensible cut. That which the House has made was outright murder of a whole program.

Fortunately public reaction to the House maneuver has been prompt and vigorous. Mayor Darst already has taken the lead in rallying forces from other municipalities to impress on Congress the need for a good housing program. Since the third of the House that was silent on the first vote can still be induced to force reconsideration, his campaign stands a good chance of success.

Certainly it should attain that success. This Nation will be immensely the poorer if it does not.

"Air Force Pilots, Navigators, Bombardiers, Air and Ground Crews, Drilled Relentlessly in Their Jobs, Are Approaching a Readiness for Any Emergency"—Benjamin Welles

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, there have been times in recent months when it seemed that the survival of the free nations of the world was altogether dependent upon the readiness with which the Armed Forces of the United States could successfully repulse sudden assault. It is still conceded that the United States Air Force B-36 and the atom bomb have long been the sole deterrent against attack by communistic Russia in her lust for power.

It was because of these facts that I was particularly intrigued by an article which I found in the New York Times—carrying a London date line and written by Benjamin Welles, special correspondent of that great metropolitan daily.

The article, headed "United States Air Force in Britain Nearing State of Readiness for Emergency," discloses but a small glimpse at the global defenses being developed by the United States Air Force to take care of every foreseeable emergency.

Mr. Speaker, it was indeed heartening to read just how effectively our Air Force is on the forefront of the fighting lines throughout the world—readied as far as is possible for every emergency—not alone here at home—but abroad as well.

Pilots, navigators, bombardiers, air and ground crews, are drilled relentlessly in their jobs. In the language of Benjamin Welles:

In case of war, United States air fleets could be in action in a mere matter of hours.

Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in this House and the people in general might have a fuller appreciation of the splendid work being done by our Air Force, I include herein the article entitled "United States Air Force in Britain Nearing State of Readiness for Emergency," as reproduced in the New York Times.

That article is as follows:

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE IN BRITAIN NEARING STATE OF READINESS FOR EMERGENCY

(By Benjamin Welles)

LONDON, May 6.—An unpublicized but significant build-up in United States air strength in Europe lies behind the transformation of the United States Third Air Division here into the Third Air Force. The new designation was announced from General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower's headquarters a few days ago.

There are now more than 20,000 United States airmen, ground crewmen, engineers, and antiaircraft artillerymen stationed in

Britain as part of the Western World's defense against sudden aggression.

The promotion of Maj. Gen. Leon W. Johnson's Third Air Division to a full-fledged air force means that the air installations here are approaching a readiness for any emergency.

It is not so much the number of planes as the facilities for those planes that are being increased. Vast runways are being rebuilt to take the landing shock of B-36 or B-50 bombers, gasoline and lubricants are being stored, a radio communications network installed, spare parts stocked, and pilots, navigators, bombardiers, air and ground crews drilled relentlessly in their jobs.

In case of war, say those who know, the United States air fleets could be in action in a matter of hours. The units in Britain could fly from here, while other units could pass through. To handle such traffic, months of intensive preparation are necessary. Such preparations are well advanced.

A "gentleman's agreement" between the United States and Britain makes it possible for United States planes to train on British territory in peacetime. The United States pays for some facilities it uses, the British Government donates others. The basic accord between the two Governments is virtually unwritten.

The vanguard of United States air units came here in 1948 under command of General Johnson, holder of the Medal of Honor and veteran of the raid on the Ploesti oil field of Rumania in August 1943. General Johnson's main task here was to train bomber wings sent over in rotation by the Strategic Air Command. These wings, of forty-five bombers each, spend 90 days or more here, return home for leave, then do another training tour in the Caribbean, Labrador, or Alaska.

GENERAL OLD TO HEAD TRAINING

From now on, the bomber wings in training here will be supervised by Maj. Gen. Archie Old, head of the Seventh Air Division, which has just been set up under General Johnson's Third Air Force. General Johnson is expected to devote most of his time to overseeing completion of installations at a dozen United States air bases throughout the United Kingdom, leaving General Old free to carry out the training.

At present, United States air power in Britain consists of 1 bomb wing (45 to 50 bombers); 1 fighter wing (a similar number of F-84E Thunderjet escort fighters); 20 converted B-29 refueling planes, and a half dozen RB-45 four-jet reconnaissance bombers that will be replaced soon by British twin-jet Canberras.

For the first months of the Korean war the Far East Air Forces and the Strategic Air Force had top priority for United States Air Force planes, men, and materials. Now more men and especially base equipment are arriving here as the United States defenses in Europe grow under the North Atlantic Treaty program.

RELIEVE RAF UNITS

As United States airmen arrive in greater numbers, the Royal Air Force airmen who have been on loan in thousands for the last 3 years to maintain and service the United States bases are going back to their own units. The newly arrived United States Thirty-second Antiaircraft Artillery Group is relieving British brigades from the responsibility of protecting United States bases.

"Without British help in the past 3 years, I don't know what we would have done," a United States air officer said recently. "I know we have been helping to protect Britain by being here—but they have gone out of their way to help us, even when it meant sharing their own limited facilities."

In the coming months, it is expected, United States bomb wings in training may participate in Atlantic Pact air exercises. The Third Air Force is under Lieut. Gen. Lauris Norstad, General Eisenhower's top American air aide, who commands also the Twelfth Air Force on the Continent and will head a still undesignated air force to be set up along the north African coast.

"We don't have so many planes in Europe as the Russians," a highly informed source said recently. "But we're building facilities that will give us a terrific punch if trouble comes. It took months before ground facilities were ready for us in the last war; this time we've learned our lesson."

General MacArthur Would Rather Be Right Than Commander of Korea and Japan

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, at long last one great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, has placed devotion to his country ahead of personal considerations. When the General spoke his honest convictions he sacrificed his career as a soldier. Because he dared to disagree with the President, he was removed from his command.

The American people have been aroused by the action by the President in taking immediate reprisal against General MacArthur. They do not approve of the method which the President used even if they agree to his right to remove the General. And the administration is well aware of the temper of the people.

As usual when the administration blunders, the smoke screen is speedily set up. Once again we are warned of the horrors of atomic bombing, a danger of which every American is well aware. And once again the President takes to the air to try to sell himself as the people's champion for peace.

It is ironic to listen to the President as he warns of the results of an atomic war, and hear his words uttered apparently in all seriousness, "I do not want to be responsible for bringing that about."

But who started the Korean war? A review of the facts discloses that it was Mr. Truman who ordered American intervention in Korea, and after that order was issued called upon the United Nations to join the United States in that action. Did Mr. Truman on that occasion have any assurance that Russia would not move? Was not our initial action in Korea a calculated risk, a gamble which has already cost us more than 60,000 casualties?

Mr. Truman hopes that the American people will forget such trivial facts and will accept him as the great proponent for peace. He hopes they will forget that it was his decision that the atom bomb first be used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki thereby setting the precedent for the use of this monstrous weapon of destruction against unarmed noncombatant civilian population.

It is tragic that in this time of national crisis the administration places partisan and personal interests before national concerns. The past blunders of the administration have contributed to the serious situation which we face today, and a look at the record proves this fact.

The following editorial from a recent issue of the Los Angeles Tidings reviews the dismissal of General MacArthur and the facts behind administration policy, and I recommend it for your attention:

THE GENERAL PROTESTS SLOW SURRENDER POLICY

(By Richard L. Stokes)

It seems a pity that a great soldier must sacrifice his career if he wishes to express an opinion on public affairs contrary to that of this Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

At the Yalta conference, Admiral William D. Leahy, President Roosevelt's Chief of Staff, was struck with misgivings over the deliverance of Catholic Poland into the hands of atheist communism, and the creation of a military vacuum in Europe which the Red Army would be tempted to occupy.

Leahy protested to Roosevelt, who replied feebly that it was the best he could do. It never occurred to the admiral to carry his opposition to the American people. He waited to publish it until he had retired from service and was at liberty to write his memoirs.

AMERICA'S WORST DEFEAT

Thus there was no obstacle to that ghastly scene in which Mr. Roosevelt reported to Congress as a triumph what was actually the worst defeat in American diplomacy.

The surrender of Czechoslovakia was offered to Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., by the Nazi commander in Prague. He was forbidden to accept it by General Eisenhower, acting under instructions from Mr. Roosevelt and General Marshall.

Against military advice, the late John G. Winant, Ambassador to Great Britain and American representative on the European Advisory Committee, refused in 1943 to ask from Russia guaranties of free access to Berlin by land and water.

"We can't do that to our gallant Soviet ally," said the Ambassador, with tears in his eyes. But he drove a hard bargain with England for right of passage through its zone from Hamburg to Berlin. He, too, acted under instructions from Washington. Winant took his life after the Berlin blockade revealed the harm he had done to his own country.

General MacArthur had the patriotism to break the tradition, at immense personal cost, in order to bring home to the American public what he considered the fatal policy of the Truman administration in the Orient.

The President and his advisers, MacArthur charged, refused to admit that they had blundered into an all-out war with Red China, and insisted on stalling in Korea at the price of more than 1,000 American casualties a week.

CHARGES BOOMERANG

The Government promptly branded the general a "warmonger," and exalted Truman as a champion of peace. But who started the Korean war? Certainly not General MacArthur. By his own admission, President Truman began it, at the insistence of Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson.

The general was then accused of violating the Constitution, under which the President a civilian, is made Commander in Chief of the Nation's Armed Forces. But the Constitution also limits to Congress the power of making war.

On his sole authority, President Roosevelt waged an undeclared war against Germany,

in the Atlantic, months before Pearl Harbor. Truman followed in his footsteps by initiating a one-man war in Korea which may well prove the prelude to world war III.

What the authors of the Constitution had in mind with regard to the Presidency may be proved from the document itself. Election to the Presidency was withheld from popular vote. The legislatures of each State were to choose their ablest and most patriotic citizens as members of an electoral college which in turn would pick as President the best qualified man in all the Nation.

Not for a moment did they suspect that the party system would enable a President to make himself master of Congress and the Supreme Court; to make treaties, under the guise of agreements, without the advice and consent of the Senate; and to plunge the Nation into war without advice.

PARTISAN INTERESTS PREVAIL

It was not anticipated that Presidents would come to put partisan and personal interests invariably before national concerns; and that in time a soldier, without political bonds, might have the only voice capable of speaking for the country as a whole.

It was that accent of devotion to the national welfare, uttered in simple sincerity for the first time in years, that made General MacArthur's address to the Congress so moving and memorable.

Strange also, to American ears, as coming from a public man, was General MacArthur's stress on religion. Not for a long time had a statesman dared say that our soldiers are "in my prayers always" and that our defenses "must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Quoting from his own address following Japan's surrender, the general recalled that every secular means—including military alliances, balances of power, and leagues of nations—has failed as an alternative to war. He concluded with the truth, familiar to all Catholics, that salvation is to be found only in the regeneration of the individual.

"Basically," he had the courage to declare, "the problem is theological, and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character."

But the pious soldier has been overthrown by the very men who destroyed the missionary movement in China. Through their appeasement of communism, President Truman, General Marshall, and Secretary Acheson surrendered Christianity in the Orient to an ideology which has sworn the death of all religions.

Farmers Again Slapped Hard by Administration Hirelings and Price-Control Antics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, farmers of Iowa and the Nation are now being forced to pay the penalty for some of the procrastination and stupidity that has been all too evident in the price-control set-up.

This latest move to force farmers to take a roll-back in the price of beef cattle is one of the most discriminatory actions yet taken. What other important industry in this country has been ordered to take a roll-back?

Failure of administration hirelings to take action months ago has resulted in empty feed lots in Iowa. This, together with the present wholly unfair control action will result in less rather than more beef on the dinner tables of America. The real chaos in the beef situation is just beginning.

To illustrate, I quote from the following letter received May 5, 1951, from a farmer in the Third Iowa District, who extends permission to use his letter but asks that his name not be used:

Hon. H. R. GROSS,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GROSS: We have a 260-acre farm in Tama County on which there is a mortgage.

We have fed cattle for years but last fall they were talking ceilings or roll-backs and feeder cattle were so high. We were not in a position to lose money on cattle so therefore we didn't purchase any feeders.

We have hay and corn on hand, 48 acres of pasture plus clover and we still cannot see our way clear to pay the price for feeders when we know there will be nothing in feeding them out.

We have two boys, one is married. We want to do our part, but this situation is most unfair. We have the help, feeding equipment, hay, corn, rough feed, but our yards have been empty all winter and the way this price situation is being handled the grass in the pasture will grow up and fall over this summer.

Can you help get this across to those who are responsible?

Possibilities of Fuel Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two most significant articles recently appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce. The first is an item from Houston, Tex., reporting upon the concern expressed by Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, senior member of the Texas Railroad Commission and a man eminently qualified to appraise the possibilities in this field, and also by Mr. William J. Murray, Jr., junior member of that commission. It is as follows:

FEAR IRAN OIL LOSS WOULD DRAIN UNITED STATES RESERVE CAPACITY

HOUSTON, May 6.—Loss of Iranian oil by the Western World would drain off the little rapidly dwindling reserve producing capacity in the United States, according to Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, senior member of the Texas Railroad Commission.

"Our reserve producing capacity would drop to around 130,000 barrels daily if we are called on to supply Western Europe with the 300,000 barrels daily of petroleum products it now gets from Iran," he warned at a Texas Railroad Association meeting here.

William J. Murray, Jr., junior member of the commission, deplored the fact Iranian oil seemed to be slipping away and said he feared gasoline rationing might result in this country if the United States is required to supply Western Europe requirements that have been met by Iran.

Thompson said that United States reserve capacity has already dwindled to 430,000 barrels daily, "the lowest I've ever known it."

In contrast, last August after the Korean fighting was under way reserve producing capacity of the United States—most of which is in Texas—stood at an estimated 1,113,000 barrels daily, Thompson said. Accelerated output since then has brought the sharp reduction.

Reserve capacity is the amount of additional oil it is estimated could be produced from wells already drilled without causing harm to the wells, he explained.

ABADAN OUTPUT LAGGING

Thompson noted Iran's Abadan refinery, largest in the world with a capacity of 550,000 barrels daily, now is supplying only a comparatively small amount of Western Europe's needs due to recent strife over nationalization.

Eventually, Iranian oil output under nationalization probably will get back to normal, Thompson said. But, he hinted, it would be easily possible Russia might wrest part of the country's petroleum supply through trade agreements without starting a world war.

Thompson said this country would have to continue its feverish search for oil to prevent shortages in the future.

The second is a dispatch from Dallas, Tex., reporting on a recent speech made by the Honorable Bruce K. Brown, Deputy Administrator of the Petroleum Administration for Defense. He, too, is in an excellent position to appraise the complete situation with reference to natural gas and his warning is timely, even though it is an unhappy one. Certainly the responsible committees in Congress should consider carefully both these dispaches and leave nothing undone which might contribute to the creation of a disastrous condition in this country. The second dispatch is as follows:

PAD SEES EXTREMELY SHORT NATURAL GAS SUPPLY LOOMING

DALLAS, May 8.—A high Government official warned today that the country faces the "unfortunate prospect" that natural gas "is likely to be in extremely short supply next winter and in the next few years.

"It may be expected that shortages will occur in a number of important industrial centers and in such a way as may adversely affect defense production," Bruce K. Brown, Deputy Administrator of the Petroleum Administration for Defense, told the natural gas division meeting of the American Gas Association. His speech was delivered by William S. Tarver, PAD assistant general counsel.

PAD, which has authority over natural gas, will have to take steps to assure that the best possible use is made at all times of available gas supply, he said.

PIPE SUPPLY LESS THAN HALF

Brown told the group that the total supply of line pipe available for the months immediately ahead is likely to equal less than two-thirds of the planned usage by gas and oil companies.

"After deducting certain 'must' uses of small-diameter line pipe," he declared, "it appears impossible that the supply of large-diameter pipe for gas and oil transmission lines will add up to more than half of the amount needed before winter to finish pipe lines already under construction."

"We can only hope," he continued, "that increased steel production, further cutbacks in less essential uses, and better definition of needs through the application of a controlled materials plan, will improve the situation later." (J. E. Goble, president of the National Tube Co., told the meeting yesterday that steel allocations for natural gas transmission lines this year and in 1952 would exceed last year's 2,425,000 tons.)

Brown declared that the availability of materials to produce, process, transport and distribute gas and oil is "small indeed" in relation to the need—"in spite of a most vigorous attempt on the part of experienced gas and oil men in PAD to convince the Governmental authorities holding the materials purse strings of the reality of the demand."

Commodity Credit Corporation Administration Expense Limitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, since the section of the agriculture appropriation bill containing the Commodity Credit Corporation administrative expense limitation has not been reached, I want to submit for the consideration of my colleagues certain basic and fundamental facts with reference to this item.

In the RECORD of May 9, at pages 5139 and 5140, I submitted data I had been able to assemble at that time from the committee hearings and report and from the monthly reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation, particularly that for the month ending March 31, 1951, which was made public on Monday.

I am completely convinced that the amount recommended by the committee, $15,000,000, can and should be reduced substantially without any actual possibility of injury to the necessary operations of this agency.

As I said on Wednesday, the committee is to be commended for having reduced the amount requested from $20,200,000 to $15,000,000, and it is on entirely sound ground when it reported that "this reduction is believed justified in view of the current outlook for agriculture and the probable changes from surpluses to shortages in many of the commodities normally handled by the Corporation."

This positive fact, that the Corporation will not be called upon to incur in the coming fiscal year anything remotely resembling the costs resulting from the purchase, storage, handling, and sale of many of the commodities it has dealt with during the current fiscal year, is proven beyond any possible question by two kinds of evidence.

First, the committee members and, in particular, the able chairman of the subcommittee, brought this out forcibly in their questioning of this Agency's witnesses. I want to quote portions of this evidence from seven parts of the hearings. They are as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Trigg, last year I asked about the employees who do not have any work to do. We were told that you attempt to keep all the folks busy and find something for them to do. Now that we have reached a problem in manpower, why not let some of them go instead of trying to find some made work for them. You are asking here for the same number of employees, the same amount of money to operate the CCC that you had last year when it is evident there is going to be a decrease in the operations carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation. How can we justify a request of that kind to the Congress? (p. 117).

Let me repeat for emphasis the words of our colleague, "when it is evident there is going to be a decrease in the operations carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation."

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, let us just get down to brass tacks. I think you will admit, under the present outlook, that you will not have one-half the volume of commodities for the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you have had this year, will you not?

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot see where the CCC will be called upon to handle a volume this year anything like it had last year, and yet your estimate for personnel and for administrative funds for next year is the same as for this year. I think you ought to reconsider that.

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. Whether you can or cannot agree is not the point. I am asking you whether you think the estimate is one that we can justify before the Congress. If it happens to be out of line just a little bit, you can come back and ask for additional funds (p. 118).

This latter suggestion is entirely sound and, as I see it, does not run counter to the provisions of the Antideficiency Appropriation Act. In any event, it is a practice which has certainly been followed, and only recently by this very agency.

I call your attention to the estimate by the chairman of the subcommittee that the volume of commodities would be reduced by at least one-half. This has a definite bearing upon the amendment which I intend to offer when this section of the bill is reached.

Mr. WHITTEN. But, as I was pointing out, you will not be handling as big a volume of commodities for one thing.

Mr. TRIGG. Of course, we will not. * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. We should set these figures of administrative expense knowing today that there is every probability that you will handle less volume. If the situation gets out of hand later, you could then come back and ask for more employees for the CCC (p. 119).

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. Again, I am not suggesting a major reduction in expenses. I am just discussing the difference between $17,000,000 and $20,000,000 or $15,000,000 for that purpose. I think your figures can stand a lot of study for the next fiscal year (p. 119).

Mr. HOBAN. I just want to point out that we have revised our thinking, too, up here in Congress, and the Korean war and the defense effort has caused that. The average cost has gone up, and I think that you as taxpayers are looking to us to do what we can to hold down costs wherever we can, to see that any of these items are justified in reality, and I am disturbed about the size and the shape of this particular item. I do not want to do anything to hurt the Commodity Credit Corporation. I realize what it means, but along with the chairman and the rest of this subcommittee, we need your cooperation on this. We want to do what we are supposed to do, but frankly I am still at a loss as to why this item should be increased (p. 132).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. HOBAN, I think you have proven our case. The testimony up to this point is that last May and June the Commodity Credit Corporation made a survey and arrived at how much manpower it would take to handle a given volume on a per unit basis. Then they multiplied that by the volume, and they came up with this $30,200,000, which includes the $3,850,000 they are asking for now. They cannot sustain that because they will not have that volume.

Mr. BEACH. It appears that way.

Mr. WHITTEN. You just said it was that. You said last May and June you worked up the unit cost, coming up with $30,000,000. Now, you come up with the same number of dollars, so you are bound to have used the same volume. You may have some difference from one program to another but you are using approximately the same volume in total. You cannot justify it.

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. If you handle much less in commodities you will not have as much work to do as in handling a big volume of the commodities. You have arrived at your total demand for funds by multiplying the unit cost times the volume (pp. 132-133).

May I call attention to the undeniable truth of the statement by the chairman of the subcommittee, that this budget estimate was completely unrealistic, and that it could not be justified. I submit that that in itself properly raises in the minds of those of us who are not members of the Appropriations Committee substantial doubt as to whether the Agency furnished the subcommittee with any kind of yardstick or formula upon which a definite recommendation could be made and defended.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities—you cannot have anything like the volume of work through the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you had this year (p. 534).

The second class of evidence is from the records of the agency itself.

In the data I inserted in the RECORD for May 9 at page 5139 I pointed out that between June 30, 1950, and March 31, 1951, this agency's holdings in butter, cheese, dried milk, and dried eggs had dropped from 677,401,610 pounds to 171,701,878 pounds. I also submitted figures for 16 other commodities showing very heavy decreases in inventories, which is true of the trend of all such holdings. It bears out clearly the truth of the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee when he brought out the inherent weakness in the justifications presented by this agency.

Finally, I would like to call attention to the record of the administration expense limitations for this agency between 1938 and 1949, inclusive. In terms of millions of dollars, it is as follows:

1938	0.5
1939	.7
1940	2.0
1941	2.3
1942	3.5
1943	4.4
1944	5.4
1945	7.2
1946	8.9
1947	8.8
1949	8.1
1950	15.4
1951	20.2
Estimated, 1952	20.2

I call attention to the 1949 item of $8,100,000. In terms of the postwar period, and particularly in terms of the excessively large 1948 crops, it might be fairly argued that such a figure could well be used as a measuring rod as against the request made by this agency for the next fiscal year. In any event, surely somewhere between that figure and the $15,000,000 contained in the bill is the clear area within which this House should reach its determination.

The amendment which I intend to propose will be submitted on the basis of these facts and any others that I may be able to develop between now and the time when this section of the bill is reached.

Migratory Farm Labor—H. R. 3283, the Poage Bill, Compared With the Recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3283 is an amendment to the Agriculture Act of 1949, adding Title V—Agricultural workers. Although the President's Commission on Migratory Labor had been holding hearings and investigations for some 6 or 7 months previously and its report was completed early this year, our committee has apparently ignored the work of this Commission and the recommendations it has made. Where it deals with the same matters, this bill is contrary to the recommendations of the Commission.

RECRUITMENT OF MEXICAN WORKERS

Section 501 provides for the recruiting of agricultural workers from Mexico pursuant to arrangements made between the United States and Mexico; for the establishment and operation of reception centers near places of actual entry of such workers into the United States; the provision of transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the United States to reception centers, and transportation from such reception centers to recruitment centers at the termination of employment. It further provides for subsistence, emergency medical care and limited burial expenses as may become necessary during such transportation or while such workers are at reception centers. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to assist the free and voluntary negotiation of contracts between such workers and employers and to guarantee the performance by employers of the provisions of such contracts.

Section 502 provides that no workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts, and to reimburse the United States for essential expenses incurred for transportation and subsistence.

Section 503 provides that no workers recruited under this title shall be available for any employment in any area unless the regional director of Employment Security of the United States Department of Labor in such area has determined and certified that sufficient domestic workers who are qualified for such work are not available at the time and place when needed and that the employment of such Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

The foregoing interrelated provisions are sharply in contrast with the recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor. The report of the President's Commission places the greatest emphasis on the use of migratory American farm labor. The report says that—

> First reliance [should] be placed on using our domestic labor force more effectively.

They then recommend that no special measures be adopted to increase the number of alien contract laborers above the number admitted in 1950. They recognize that there might be some need for additional agricultural labor than can be recruited within the borders of the United States and recommend that preference be given to citizens of the offshore areas of the United States such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Their fourth recommendation under this heading is that future efforts be directed toward supplying agricultural labor needs with American workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

DISCRIMINATES AGAINST AMERICAN WORKERS

The Poage bill provides for the payment of transportation costs and maintenance during travel of foreign workers from recruitment to reception centers; but there is no such provision for domestic workers. It is left unclear in the bill whether the employer will pay the cost of transportation from the reception center to the place of employment or whether such cost can be deducted from wages; but it is expected that the employer will pay the cost. American migratory workers are not given equal treatment with imported Mexican workers. They do not receive travel expenses and subsistence and medical care of any kind. This prejudices the opportunity to use domestic labor more effectively. The Department of Labor testified that the provision of transportation for American workers would increase the mobility of the farm labor supply and provide more American workers for farm employment.

H. R. 3283 is essentially a bill dealing with the import of Mexican farm labor with some guaranty of fair treatment backed up by the United States. It omits consideration of the problems of mobilization and full utilization of domestic agricultural labor, while the recruitment of American citizens of the offshore areas of the United States is also disregarded. Giving to the regional director of the Bureau of Employment Security the specific authority to certify that domestic workers are not available is not the way to utilize the full manpower resources of the United States because the regional director in an independent status is in no position to determine the availability of workers outside his region, because there should be interregional clearance of available workers, and also because even the most upright men located in particular localities are greatly influenced by the surrounding pressures. The Mexican Government has already stated that it will not deal with numerous separate State authorities. Added to this is the drawback that the low wages paid Mexican imports and wetbacks decreases the attractiveness of these jobs to American workers in many localities.

Regarding the actual recruitment of alien contract labor in American agriculture, the President's Commission recommended that no employer, employer's representative, or association of employers or labor contractor should be permitted to contract directly with foreign workers for employment in the United States, although they may participate in the selection of qualified workers when all other requirements of legal importation are fulfilled. The Commission was so much impressed with the abuses of foreign-labor recruiting and contracting that it recommended that the Immigration and Naturalization Service be the principal contracting agency and that private employers should secure their foreign workers exclusively from the Immigration and Naturalization Service. They specified that, after certifying the need for foreign workers, the United States Employment Service should have no administrative responsibilities in connection with any foreign labor program. The Immigration and Naturalization Service would deliver the imported workers to the farm employers who have submitted the necessary applications and bonds and who have signed individual work agreements. They recommended that in its general supervision of employment of foreign workers the Immigration and Naturalization Service should be authorized to terminate any contract of employment and remove the workers or to refuse to supply any foreign workers to any employer when there has been repeated or willful violation of previous agreements, or when there is reasonable doubt that the terms of the current agreement are being observed.

WAGES

The Poage bill provides for the guaranty by the United States of the amounts owed by employers under the individual contracts for wages and transportation; but it makes no general provision for the amount of wages which must be paid for work performed. The agreement with the Mexican Government is supposed to provide for the payment of wages prevailing in the community for work of a similar nature paid American workers. There is, however, no machinery provided under this bill for determining prevailing wages or to make certain that they will not reflect the miserable wages being paid wetbacks, and, as a result of the individual bargaining between large-farm operators and unlettered Mexican laborers, any wage agreed upon becomes the prevailing wage.

The President's Commission was keenly aware of these abuses and it recomended that Congress enact minimum-wage legislation to include farm laborers, including migratory laborers, that State legislatures give serious consideration to the protection of agricultural workers, including migratory farm workers, by minimum-wage legislation, that minimum housing standards be established for foreign workers with a simplified agency for administration and enforcement of such minimum standards on the basis of periodic inspections, and that collective bargaining be required on the larger farms.

The Commission's report was very skeptical about the method employed in determining "prevailing wages," which experience shows has been a unilateral employers' agreement of a rate initially offered, which proves too low to attract the needed number of workers. The "labor shortage" might well be the consequence of the low wages fixed before the season opened and the effective going rate had an opportunity to equate the supply of labor with the demand. The Commission stated: "The wage practice in agriculture and the demand for alien labor are directly associated. Alien labor importation cannot be divorced from the practice of fixing an arbitrary wage which does not attract a sufficient number of workers. The wage at which we declare a farm labor shortage to exist is the result of a one-sided wage bargain made by associations of farm employers."

It would seem that at the very least the determination of prevailing wages should be determined by public authority after public hearings and that these determinations be widely publicized to give American migratory workers the knowledge and assurance which would assist in making more American workers available. This much should be required by amendment to the present bill, while some of the other recommendations of the President's Commission would require more extensive legislation.

WETBACKS

Section 504 of the Poage bill provides that Mexican nationals already within the borders of the United States may be permitted to remain and that no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability on any person for the failure of such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment. This provision would legalize the status of Mexicans now illegally in the United States. In contrast, the President's Commission on Migratory Labor recommended that legislation be enacted making it unlawful to employ aliens illegally in the United States. The report recommended that the Immigration and Naturalization Service be strengthened by clear statutory authority to determine if illegal aliens are employed and that statutory penalties for harboring, concealing, or transporting illegal aliens be imposed. They recommended the imposition of a variety of sanctions against the employment of aliens illegally in the United States. The Department of Labor in its testimony submitted before a congressional committee warned that if illegal Mexican workers are employed under this provision, this would ignore Mexico's economic interest, would be incompatible with the international agreement, and would serve as an open invitation to Mexican nationals to enter the United States illegally. A similar provision in the Ellender bill was amended to limit employment to those who entered the United States legally.

H. R. 3283 really does nothing effective about the wetback problem. As recommended by the President's Commission, there should be a clear provision in the bill which would prohibit the use of Mexican labor illegally in the United States, with penalties imposed on American employers who knowingly employ them.

USE OF MEXICAN LABOR IN NONAGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT

Section 508 defines "agricultural employment" to include not only the activities so defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Social Security Act but also such activities as cotton ginning and compressing, crushing of oilseeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonable products.

These latter activities, when not within the area of production as defined by the Administrator of the Fair Labor Standards Act, are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Some of these activities, when within the area of production, are exempt from both the minimum wage and overtime provisions, while other activities are exempt from overtime but not from the statutory minimum wage.

Two consequences grow out of this broadened definition of agricultural employment:

First. Some Mexican workers will be employed in activities which heretofore have not been regarded as agriculture.

Second. Where they are so employed, many of them must be paid at least 75 cents per hour and overtime payments must be made where applicable, for it must be understood that broadening the definition of agricultural employment under this bill can have no influence on determining the coverage and applicability of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Thus a small proportion of the imported Mexican workers will be paid on a different basis than the great bulk of the workers engaged in agriculture as defined under the Fair Labor Standards Act. This provision was amended in the Senate to restrict the employment of imported Mexican labor to agriculture, which is exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Need for Safety Codes for Natural-Gas Pipelines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with consideration of H. R. 88, which would authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies, I am including the first of a series of articles by Hartley W. Barclay, appearing in the New York Times, on the general subject of the need for safety codes for natural-gas pipelines.

PIPELINE DANGERS STIR WIDE CONCERN—REGULATION OF GROWING NATURAL GAS NET IS INADEQUATE AND HAPHAZARD, STUDY SHOWS—SAFETY CODES CALLED FOR—CITIZENS IN MANY AREAS SEEK STATE AND LOCAL ACTION AS UNITED STATES POWER IS LIMITED

(By Hartley W. Barclay)

Communities in Westchester and other counties near New York have no adequate official safeguards against hazards of new high-pressure interstate natural-gas pipelines now authorized and due for construction soon. Similar conditions exist up-State and in Connecticut and throughout much of the entire country, it was learned in a canvass of safety conditions.

There is no national code enforced by law for assuring safe construction and operation on the $1,000,000,000 natural-gas pipeline industry expansion program, involving more than 40,000 miles of new pipelines in which it is expected that 6,000,000 tons of steel will be used.

In an extensive study of safety aspects of these projects, it was estimated that 28,875 miles of new natural-gas pipelines were authorized for construction up to January 1, while for 15,866 additional miles there were applications pending approval at that time.

CONTROL DEEMED INADEQUATE

Only limited control of the lines is held by the Federal Power Commission. While State public service commissions may have jurisdiction, safety codes do not exist in most eastern States. Budgets, enforcement personnel, inspectors, technical consultants, and requirements for filing plans, specifications, and reports are generally lacking.

To check on current conditions regarding official supervision and legal enforcement of safety rules in interest natural gas pipeline construction and operation, more than 12 National, State, or local regulatory bodies were consulted in the last 3 weeks. Reports from individual pipeline companies were studied, engineers were interviewed, trade and engineering society codes that lack legal standing for enforcement were studied, and officials of communities were questioned.

It was generally conceded by these sources that the safety of high-pressure natural gas pipelines in interstate commerce is not strictly regulated under a national code. In contrast, the construction and operation of less dangerous local gas lines is strictly regulated in most regions, largely by local authorities. In interstate commerce the handling of explosive materials and containers comparable in hazard to high-pressure gas and shipped by railroads is strictly safeguarded by a complex variety of legally enforced rules.

It also was generally conceded that building codes in most municipalities outside New York are obsolete so far as covering construction requirements for high-pressure interstate natural gas pipelines.

A number of locally sponsored "citizens' movements" to press for Federal, State or local safety laws to control interstate high-pressure natural gas pipeline companies are rapidly getting under way in Eastern States and New England.

Engineers interviewed stressed that safety rules for high-pressure interstate lines are not to be confused with safety practices used by local, intrastate gas companies.

SOME OF THE BIG PROJECTS

Some big pipeline companies now holding Federal Power Commission certificates of public convenience and necessity authorizing high-pressure pipeline construction projects in Eastern States include the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Northeastern Gas Transmission Co., Algonquin Gas Transmission Co., Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp., New York State Natural Gas Corp., and Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.

Among officials of governmental agencies, those of the Federal Power Commission said that agency had no statutory authority to rule upon safety hazards to local communities resulting from these projects.

At State regulatory levels safety codes are not written out in New York and Connecticut to require regulation by strict standards and codes. Technical employees of the New York Public Service Commission said they thought the commission had no authority over interstate companies.

Cities near New York have just awakened to the fact that they need to enact promptly new safety codes for such purposes. Connecticut has just started to strengthen safety regulatory powers.

There is one important precedent that is considered by engineers as adequate to prove that strict licensing, safety control and regulation by permits can work successfully in protecting public safety. Under the Federal law known as the River and Harbor Act of 1899, builders of structures of all kinds put in navigable streams are required to file plans and obtain permits from the Secretary of the Army. Defiance of a ruling under this law is punishable by fine or imprisonment.

America in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is included a well-expressed editorial on America in the Far East by the Erie County Reporter of Huron, Ohio:

IN MEMORIAM TO THE DEATH OF AMERICAN PRESTIGE IN THE FAR EAST

President Harry Truman, through his action in stripping Gen. Douglas MacArthur of all his commands in the Far East, has made himself a place in history, but we fear it will be an unenviable one. Judas Iscariot also has a place.

This act was the result of demands made on the President by Dean Acheson, George Marshall, and others of their ilk, who should also receive credit for the loss of China to the Communists.

Thus the betrayal of America, which has progressed through Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam has reached another milestone.

The lives of many fine American boys will be the price to be paid for Tuesday's action. But they won't be the lives of sons of the Trumans, Achesons, and Marshalls.

We trust there will be rejoicing in England and Russia. The English will be happy because they can continue their blood-money trade with the Chinese Commies and the Russians can now see ultimate victory in their campaign to take over the entire far eastern theater.

Teamwork in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Tuesday, May 8, 1951:

EMPHASIS ON COOPERATION

Korea has provided a gripping laboratory test of the whole concept of collective security. For the first time in history 50 nations have joined in a tremendous experiment in cooperation to keep the peace. In the midst of current controversies Americans can gain perspective by recognizing the importance of success in this noble endeavor.

Indeed, the people in each member country of the United Nations may well take counsel with themselves to see whether they are in any respect failing to relate national purposes to this vast international peace project. In much of the debate over General MacArthur's recall Americans have given woefully little attention to the value of keeping U. N. action united. The general says that if necessary the United States should go it alone. This, it seems to us, is a perilous course, but other members of the U. N. should recognize that they have a real responsibility for a situation which has brought such a proposal into serious consideration.

One basic trouble in Korea has been that in the actual hostilities the United States has been so largely going it alone. More than 50 nations voted against aggression; only 15 have sent forces against it in battle. There were extenuating circumstances. Some countries were still too weak and war-torn. Others were heavily engaged against communism on other fronts. Some offers were turned down because of the difficulties in transport, training, equipment, and coordination—particularly in the early months.

But this last reason no longer holds, and General MacArthur is quite right in urging other U. N. nations to supply forces or increase those they have sent. The arrival in the Far East of troops from little and remote Ethiopia (which the League of Nations failed to save) should shame and awaken larger and nearer nations. Several countries far from any immediate necessity to defend themselves should take a good second look at their professed allegiance to U. N. One Colombian gunboat is the sole Latin-American fighting representative in Korea.

From the start this newspaper has emphasized the value of having more nations actively represented in Korea. Every additional U. N. member represented there strengthens by so much the effort to make the operation there not only militarily but morally successful. The Asian peoples are particularly susceptible to the Red propaganda that this is just another arrogant drive by western imperialism. Fifty nations have said in words that it is police action to keep the peace. To be fully persuasive they should join the force visibly.

Aside from the faults in the U. N. Charter which complicate any enforcement action; aside from failures of tact or worse by the United States which alienated certain members, particularly the Arab bloc; aside from confusions which have held most of the Asian nations back; aside from fears of General MacArthur's strategy; aside from honest anti-Communist opinion that the Chinese were thinking of Korea as Americans would of Mexico—the fact remains that U. N. has taken a stand against aggression. The majority of members still are not backing that stand in the field.

Even the United States, while furnishing the bulk of the forces, is not thinking of Korea primarily as a U. N. enterprise. There are ample grounds for disagreement with progress for attacking the Chinese at home, but there can be little ground for failing to support the U. N. in Korea. The world's aspirations are fixed on the possibility of outlawing war—as General MacArthur so eloquently urged. But everyone recognizes that it cannot be done by one nation—that it requires teamwork. Korea offers the practical opportunity.

New York Gets 5½ Cents in Aid for Tax Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if Members of Congress from New York State occasionally seem unenthusiastic about programs of Federal aid for this, that, or the other activities, inherently commendable, it becomes more understandable when such facts are borne in mind as are revealed in the accompanying analysis by Mr. Kermit Hill, of the Gannett News Bureau, published in the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union, set forth below under leave to extend my remarks.

We must not, of course, lose sight of the fact that the best interests of the country as a whole must be considered in our appraisal of the merit or demerit of legislation providing for contributions on the part of the Federal Government. Let those Members from such States as Mississippi, however, which receive benefits from Uncle Sam far in excess of the amounts paid by their citizens to keep the Government running, remember the importance of maintaining national solvency just as they expect Members from States like New York and Delaware, who pay into the Federal Treasury many times what they take out, to view with sympathy the needs of the States making modest tax contributions.

Pay-envelope deductions for taxes have just about reached the breaking point for many people. One of the places where we should make substantial reductions at this time is in many of the so-called grant-in-aid programs which are nearly all designed to siphon funds from individual taxpayers, wage earners, and business enterprises of States like

New York and send them, via the Washington route involving the usual shrinkage along the way, to benefit individuals and business concerns in other parts of the country.

The inequality of this situation is drastically illustrated herewith:

NEW YORK GETS 5½ CENTS IN AID FOR TAX DOLLAR

(By Kermit Hill)

WASHINGTON.—New York State got back in Federal grants-in-aid only 5½ cents on the dollar from 7.2 billion dollars in Federal taxes collected there in 1950.

This State consistently gets back one of the smallest returns of any in the Nation, according to official Treasury Department figures.

New York taxpayers paid a grand total of $7,218,467,000 into the United States Treasury last year. The State got back only $399,759,026 through the 76 Federal grant-in-aid programs, which include such things as highway aid, farm payments, research grants, payments to veterans under the GI bill of rights, school-lunch programs, and old-age assistance.

The return figures out at slightly more than 5.5 percent on the tax dollar.

These figures don't include the millions of dollars spent to run the white-collar agencies of the Federal Government in the State.

New York's slim return from its Federal tax payments is in sharp contrast to returns from the Treasury received by some other States.

Those States got Federal funds for gigantic construction projects such as the TVA and similar power developments, irrigation reservoirs, etc., heavily outweighing Federal allotment for public works in this State.

Mississippi, for example, received $1.93 in 1950 for each dollar in Federal taxes collected in that State last year, according to Treasury Department figures. Mississippi taxpayers paid 68.8 million dollars in Federal taxes last year, and got back 117.3 millions through the various Federal aid programs.

Arkansas paid in 105.4 millions in Federal taxes in 1950, and received aid grants from the Treasury totaling 97.6 millions—a 93-cent return on each dollar.

North Dakota received 58 percent of its money back through the Federal aid program. North Dakota taxpayers paid in 52 millions in Federal taxes. The State got back 29.6 millions last year in Federal aid.

Although New York's 5½-cent return on the dollar was almost the lowest in the Nation, it might have been worse.

Delaware paid the Federal Treasury 360 millions last year, but Uncle Sam paid back only 9 millions—a 2½-cent return from each of Delaware's tax dollars.

Strange News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the British Socialist administration has been financed by billions of dollars by our New Deal regime, and in repayment the American citizen-taxpayers are subjected to abuse and ridicule. The British are furnishing Red China with the material to slaughter our fighting forces in Korea. How long will the American people tolerate this scandalous betrayal by our alleged ally?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial which was published in the Evening Observer of May 8, 1951, as follows:

STRANGE NEWS

Quoting three items in the same column of another newspaper:

1. "Despite MacArthur's removal, boos and hisses are still greeting newsreels of his stateside appearances when they're shown in British movie houses." The same item says, "MacArthur's ouster leaves Britain and the United States no nearer an agreed far-eastern policy."

2. "London goes Yankee to encourage American tourists to come to the festival of Britain." Just how the British will make the Yankees feel at home in such a postwar attitude of hostility we do not know and cannot guess.

3. A Frenchman predicts: "People will have had enough of Britain after a couple of days. Then they'll scoot over to France."

All of which leads us to the general observation that Uncle Sam's largesse never deprives anyone of any self-respect. The more we give to those in need the more those in need strive to impress us with how much they hold us in contempt.

Or, as some weary American remarked, "Suppose we go to war with Russia, will we be expected to continue to give them lend-lease in order to enable them to fight us? And if not from us, where will Russia get the lend-lease with which to fight?"

Times change. Remember when Churchill said: "Give us the tools and we'll finish the job." He implied that our manpower would not be needed. As we approach world war III we find ourselves providing all the cash and virtually all the casualties. In spite of this some of our recent allies and lend-lease beneficiaries are striving to frustrate and belittle our policies. It is a strange world in which generosity and gratitude are never in balance. The latter diminishes as the former expands. Just let the hard-pressed taxpayers pony up with another billion or two and everyone will hate us, if, indeed, they do not do so already.

State Aid to Defense Production and Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address, State Aid to Defense Production and Procurement, delivered by Sidney A. Edwards, managing director, Connecticut Development Commission, Hartford, Conn., in Miami Beach, Fla., April 16, 1951.

The Connecticut State Development Commission has been designated by Governor Lodge, a former Member of this House, as the State agency to aid small business in every proper possible manner.

Those of us who live in Connecticut recognize the forthright manner in which the development commission has tackled this difficult problem.

Connecticut's 10-point program of industrial mobilization provides a pattern of action that many other States may well wish to adopt and follow:

STATE AID TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION AND PROCUREMENT

(Address by Sidney A. Edwards, managing director, Connecticut Development Commission, Hartford, Conn., at sixth annual conference, Association of State Planning and Development Agencies, Miami Beach, Fla., April 16, 1951)

I feel highly honored to have been selected to discuss this subject which is of such compelling interest to so many of our State planning and development agencies at this particular time.

Unless all signs fail, the matter of defense production and procurement will be with us for many years, even though we may be spared the need for all-out war production.

Many of the agencies represented at this meeting went through the experience of events leading up to our participation in World War II, the war itself, and the period of readjustment to civilian production preceding the present emergency.

Many lessons were learned as a result of that experience, especially the effects of a controlled economy on the operations of the so-called small-business man. Some people seem to think that the small-business man is some rare individual who is different in many respects from the ordinary run of businessman or manufacturer. He may be different, but he most certainly is not rare.

If we take the definition of small business as prescribed by the Federal Government, namely, any concern employing 500 persons or less, and apply this to a small but highly industrial State like Connecticut, what do we find? We discover that rather than being rare small business constitutes 96 percent of all manufacturers in our State, and collectively this 96 percent of Connecticut's manufacturing establishments employ 43 percent of those engaged in industry.

Consequently, if we are to design a program of industrial mobilization for defense production which will aid the greatest number of our manufacturing concerns, we must necessarily give particular consideration to the problems of small business.

It has been our observation that the large manufacturer or the one employing more than 500 persons is generally able to solve his own problems without any great assistance from State development agencies. As a matter of fact, he can usually help us more than we can help him, and part of our job is to secure his cooperation in helping the little fellow.

With all of the talk about helping small business in connection with Federal procurement, and with Congress insisting that the little fellow be taken care of, many small-business men unfortunately have concluded that all they have to do is just sit back and wait for orders to roll in.

Those of us who have seen this work before and recognize the complicated procedures associated with Federal purchasing during an emergency realize only too well how futile any such conclusion can be.

We have all experienced the so-called invitation-to-bid method of Government buying and the discouraging aspects of such transactions. There has probably been more disillusionment attached to that method than is generally known or admitted. The expense involved, as well as the difficulty in securing complete specifications, blue prints, and other information in time to submit an intelligent bid within the period of grace, has been such as to discourage most small manufacturers from even making the attempt.

Federal procurement agencies in general greatly dislike that method of buying

because of its uncertainties and the tremendous amount of red tape involved. As related to the usual size of order placed. Some branches of the Government have abandoned this method completely and others are inclined to do so. It is a safe prediction that within a short time most Federal procurement will be conducted on a negotiated basis.

If that assumption is correct, where does this leave the little fellow? His chances of competing successfully with the large manufacturer who is thoroughly schooled in this method of dealing with the Government and has his representatives in Washington; Wright Field at Dayton, Ohio; Philadelphia; or at other buying centers are very slim indeed, and he would be well advised to save his time and money.

The Government purchasing agencies which are held responsible for the delivery of a vast variety of material within a specified period of time cannot afford to and if they can help it will not distribute those orders among hundreds of inexperienced suppliers. Furthermore, it is not in the best interests of our national defense effort that they be compelled to do so.

In spite of any statements to the contrary, the principal interest and activity of such agencies stops at the door of the large prime contractor. To be sure, there are many specialized shops employing less than 500 persons who will and should serve as prime contractors, but in general the average small manufacturer will be well advised to forget about securing prime contracts and concentrate his major attention on making his facilities and capabilities for defense production known to as many prime and potential contractors as possible.

This, in my opinion, is where the State planning and development commissions can render their greatest service to the greatest number. Because of their familiarity with the personnel, character, equipment, and capabilities of the hundreds of small manufacturing plants within their respective States, they are in a better position than any other agency, Federal or State, to make a major contribution to the defense effort and supplement the work of the Federal procurement agencies in getting the over-all job done in the shortest possible time.

I know from experience that the Federal procurement agencies as well as the large prime contractors will greatly appreciate this type of assistance and will cooperate once an effective program is set up.

I also know that many States like Connecticut are hard at work developing such programs and, although these State programs may differ in some details, their objectives are quite similar.

At the risk of repeating some of the points already discussed, I will list here the objectives of Connecticut's 10-point program of industrial mobilization which were adopted by the Connecticut Development Commission last September and briefly describe the procedures and reasons applying to each point.

Please note that this program represents our concept of how our particular agency can render greatest assistance to small business during the present emergency.

1. To prepare Connecticut industry for the unusual challenge of making the greatest possible contribution toward national defense and at the same time meet the present and future demands for consumer goods—consistent with such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Federal Government: The approach which we have used or will use includes the holding of State-wide and regional defense production clinics in cooperation with the various Federal agencies dealing with defense procurement, the issuance of press and radio releases and special bulletins and news letters to all manufacturers, chambers of commerce, and manufacturers' associations.

2. To establish a central clearinghouse for information concerning Connecticut's various and widely distributed production facilities and make such information available to all Federal procurement agencies: To accomplish this we conducted a State-wide survey of all manufacturing plants last September in order to secure the necessary basic information regarding their capabilities for civilian as well as defense production. The Register of War Production Facilities in Connecticut, now in the process of being published, will comprise approximately 450 pages, 8½ by 11 inches in size. It will contain essential information regarding 2,900 companies which jointly employ 87 percent of all industrial workers in Connecticut. In the metal-working industries, 92 percent of the total employment will be covered. This directory will be distributed to all Federal procurement agencies and the more important prime contractors located in the Northeast.

3. To explore fully the subcontracting possibilities to be found in Connecticut's hundreds of smaller industries and make such information available to present and potential prime contractors, both in Connecticut and nearby States: This calls for a separate survey covering machines, equipment and idle capacity as well as space for expansion. Such a survey is now in progress. The essential information will be transferred to a card index and will be kept currently up to date because such a file will enable our industrial engineers to select all qualified subcontractors who can handle each specific job and convey this information promptly to prime contractors in search of potential subcontractors.

4. To inform Connecticut manufacturers where they may secure advance information regarding Federal procurement contracts to be placed, as well as those recently placed in Connecticut and nearby States: The technique used here is constantly subject to change depending upon such information as may be released by the Federal Government. It is not our purpose to duplicate but rather to supplement any information services which may be available to manufacturers through various sources. We will have no hesitancy in directing interested manufacturers to any such sources, public or private, which we consider reliable.

5. To assemble and make available to Connecticut manufacturers necessary blueprints, specifications, and regulations associated with bidding on and completing Government defense contracts: The assembly of constantly changing regulations is comparatively simple. The procurement of necessary blueprints and specifications is more difficult, especially from Federal agencies. The best source of such information is the prime contractor who is interested in sharing this work with subcontractors. We anticipate no particular difficulty here once the Federal procurement program is stepped up and the demand for subcontractors is increased.

6. To assist Connecticut manufacturers in the location of essential materials or substitute materials through the operation of a central information service: Here again much will depend upon the restrictions placed by the Federal Government and the issuance of priorities or DO orders in connection with essential materials. Such priorities issued to the prime contractor will be passed along to the subcontractor and supplier. At present, manufacturers who have plenty of defense orders are not particularly troubled regarding shortages of essential materials, but those whose principal output is for civilian use will need to study all possibilities of using substitute materials. Such information as can be secured along this line will be assembled and made available to interested manufacturers.

7. To assist manufacturers and potential manufacturers in the location of manufacturing space or industrial building sites: Such information and service is the stock in trade of any industrial development agency. However, unless a special effort is made it can easily become obsolete or incomplete. During the emergency the need for accurate information of this type and having it readily available when needed is particularly acute. Any extra work that can be done to give such assurance will pay real dividends.

8. To fully explore and make available to Connecticut manufacturers information regarding production and/or construction financing: Here again we are introducing nothing new in the way of a service but are attempting to make sure that we are not overlooking any of a wide variety of possibilities which can be passed along to interested manufacturers. Some State and local governments go much further than others in this respect. But even in those States which are fairly well restricted some very ingenious methods of financing have been developed. We propose to keep ourselves well informed regarding any Federal aid which may be available to stimulate defense production and to publicize such possibilities among our manufacturers.

9. To assist Connecticut manufacturers in securing various types of technical or professional guidance incident to more economical and/or more efficient production and distribution: This may be approached in a number of ways but in Connecticut we have compiled a technical-professional roster containing the names of more than 350 engineers and technicians, including members of college faculties, private consultants, those who have been retired because of age, and many presently employed who would be available for part-time work to assist small manufacturers facing technical problems. Applications for such assistance are made through the local office of the State employment service and wherever possible the talents available locally are explored fully before calling on the central office in Hartford. To the best of our knowledge this represents an entirely new approach in helping to meet the manpower shortage, especially in the professional or technical field. Arrangements for reimbursement are left entirely to the mutual satisfaction of the two interested parties.

10. To fully utilize the services and assistance of local public officials, chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, local offices of the State employment service, newspapers, radio stations, and any other agencies or organizations which might contribute to the success of the program: In any program of this type we have always made a special effort to enlist the cooperation of such public or private agencies as we feel have a mutual interest in the success of the program. We are quite willing to share the responsibility as well as the glory if we can get widespread participation in any program of State-wide interest. We are quite willing to be regarded as a stimulating and coordinating agency and if we convince people that our program is their program we shall be satisfied with our performance.

I am sure many of you will recognize in the previous list of objectives and methods several services which are regularly performed by such agencies as ours under normal conditions. This only serves to emphasize their true worth and shows that as reliable working tools under any circumstances they should be kept well sharpened.

When it was learned that Dr. Alfred C. Neal of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, who is an associate member of ASPDA and a good friend of many of us, would be unable to appear on our program this afternoon, I suggested to our president, Don Davenport, that the remaining time be reserved for hearing statements from the several States' representatives as to what they are doing to render aid to defense production and procurement in their respective States.

I am quite sure that we do not have all the answers in Connecticut and we should like the benefit of your ideas and experience.

In closing, I should like to add that in Connecticut we feel that the State development commission is not only the most logical but the best equipped State agency to deal effectively with current problems which are plaguing the small-business men of our State and that our ability to help solve those problems can well determine our real value to the State in a time of need.

The World's Gain—Our Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me previously, I should like to insert into the RECORD the following speech by Mr. Charles M. White, president of the Republic Steel Corp., which was delivered before the Transportation Association of America in Cleveland, Ohio:

On July 4, 1776, a New England merchant took a quill pen firmly in hand and inscribed his signature on a document. He wrote it large enough, he said, so that "John Bull can read my name without spectacles and may now double his reward of 500 pounds for my head. That is my defiance."

His act was the climax of months of debate, discussion and argument.

As President of the Continental Congress, John Hancock signed the Declaration of Independence and formally gave birth to a new Nation.

Few more scathing indictments have ever been drawn than were the charges directed against England by the Colonists as they recited the freedoms thay had been denied. Point by point the crimes of the mother country against her harassed colonies were detailed.

But at the very beginning of the Declaration the Congress wrote these words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

The signers of the Declaration of Independence wrote revolutionary principles in this paragraph—principles that are too much taken for granted today. They declared boldly that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were not the gift or grant of a sovereign but inalienable rights endowed by the Creator.

Under this philosophy, the individual, you and I, became important in his own right. He was not the puppet of a glorified bureaucrat or subject to the whim or caprice of any ruler.

Eleven years later, again in Philadelphia, the delegates from 12 States adopted the Constitution. In the preamble are these significant words: "and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

All of our rights and freedoms stem from this great document and its amendments. In it the pattern of our Government was blueprinted. The powers of the Federal Government were defined and limited and all powers not specifically delegated were reserved to the States. The first 10 amendments were quickly added and specifically detailed freedoms inherent to the individual, freedoms not to be taken away or denied by any branch of government. These 10 amendments—our Bill of Rights—are so taken for granted that few even in this audience remember all the provisions which must be kept constantly before us.

Is it any wonder that these two documents became beacons for the liberty-loving peoples of the world? Is it surprising that they furnish the seed from which the tree of freedom grew in many lands?

In Europe, in North and South America, crusaders for freedom risked their security, their very lives to further the cause of liberty. Few of these efforts succeeded at first, but many of them became the foundations on which later and successful efforts were built.

Freedom and liberty became inspiring watchwords as men and women struggled and died for the rights accorded the individual in our Declaration of Independence and in our Constitution.

Yet, though the Constitution proclaimed liberty as one of the rights of man, there were those among its authors who foresaw the ease with which liberty could also be lost.

In the first Federalist paper, Alexander Hamilton warned that the danger to our new form of government lay in the demagogs who would attempt to steal away the liberties of the people under the pretext of helping them. Mr. Hamilton said: "A dangerous ambition more often lurks behind the specious mask of zeal for the rights of the people than under the forbidding appearance of the zeal for firmness and efficiency of government. History will show us that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism than the latter, and that of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics, the greatest number have begun their career by paying obsequious court to the people; commencing demagogues and ending tyrants."

There are those who disagree with the political philosophy of Hamilton, but no one can deny his keen insight into human nature.

Look around the world today. On every hand are the proofs of his penetrating wisdom.

In Russia, in the countries behind the iron curtain, men began as demogogs and ended as tyrants. In England other men began their careers by paying obsequious court to the people. Or, in today's less polished but more forceful language, the people were promised pie in the sky, security without effort, a Santa Claus pack full of presents, with the Government wearing the white whiskers.

But the people of Russia, of England, were not told that they would pay a price—a staggering price—for this tinsel. They were not told that the price was Government interference in the everyday life of the individual; that the price was the loss of liberty and freedom, as sure as the devastating course of a cancer; that the price in Russia was slave-labor camps; that the price was ever higher and more confiscatory taxes.

It is of great concern to us that in our own country recently the symptoms of this same grasping for power have been distressingly evident. Here, too, we find the present Government paying obsequious court to the people.

Here, too, we find the Government trying to be all things to all men. Here, too, we have seen vote-catching plans, dishonest in their design, ballyhooed as the panacea for all our ills.

We have seen group set against group, race against race, one section of the country against another. But recently the people have begun to smell a rat.

Some of you may think that this is not the time to criticize our Government, that in this time of great crisis there should be unity and we should skip politics.

Of course, we must be a united Nation intent on a single purpose—that of becoming militarily strong again.

But we must not let our effort to preserve the freedoms of others result in the loss of our own. We need not accept edicts from on high without debate. We must not export so much freedom that there is little left for home consumption.

We must be vigilant in seeing that temporary suspension of freedom and liberty during this emergency does not become a permanent loss. Even as we fight for freedom abroad we must preserve freedom at home. Let us never say that the operation was successful but the patient died.

As almost the last nation dedicated to the freedom of the individual—certainly the strongest nation supporting that ideal—we have a responsibility not only to ourselves but to those who love freedom throughout the world. We have an obligation to hold high the torch of freedom that we may serve as a rallying point for those who have lost their freedom and want desperately to regain it. But it won't be easy.

We must realistically appraise the entire world picture and weigh the possible results of action—or of inaction—for it seems to be our responsibility to lead.

Whether we like it or not, our foreign relations have become so intertwined with our domestic affairs that in almost every decision we make we remember that one field impinges upon the other.

We are faced with revolutionary communism in Asia, in Europe, in some spots in the Southern Hemisphere, and even in our own midst. The decisions we as a people, we as a government, make to meet this threat will largely determine whether we retain or lose our precious freedoms.

If we do not do enough to stop the worldwide menace of communism, we may find our own Nation engulfed. If we do too much, we may find that we have accomplished that which Stalin long ago predicted—the internal destruction of our form of government by spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

Today perhaps our foremost obligation is that each of us personally understand to the best of our ability the forces that are moving to destroy freedom.

We cannot afford the luxury of being arbitrary in the face of those who differ with us, for I doubt that any single person is either entirely right or entirely wrong in his conclusions on our foreign affairs.

And, even were we right today, what Moscow does tomorrow might demand a complete revaluation.

We all have grave questions in our minds as debate rages in Washington over our foreign policy. Were we right in throwing our ground troops into Korea in the first place? Should we have gone beyond the thirty-eighth parallel? Should we have withdrawn when we found ourselves confronted by hordes of Chinese Communists? If we should finally be successful, will our victory be significant and important, or worth the price of American boys dead and wounded? Similar momentous questions confront us in connection with China and Formosa.

The ramifications of every move we are called upon to make on the European front are so enormous that any sane person hesitates to assume either complete knowledge or complete certainty as to the answers.

This we do know, however: The most sacred trust that we have is to preserve the freedom of our people, of our Government. We can never lay this freedom on the bargain counter. We must forever protect it in our own self-interest, and as an eternal beacon light for enslaved people of other lands as it has been for more than a century and a half.

I have but three conclusions, based upon broad, fundamental principles, as an approach to our problems:

First, I know that each and every attempt to short circuit the Congress as representative of the people in arriving at our decisions is a primary blow at the constitutional safeguards of the United States.

Second, every step that we take must conserve this country's resources and manpower.

Third, those who seek to label as an isolationist any person in or out of Government who dares to challenge the policies of the State Department are also attacking our liberty of discussion.

World responsibilities face us on every hand. We cannot dodge or duck our assignment. But we must keep constantly before us the need for protecting our freedoms here at home.

It is so easy to lose freedom and so hard to regain it.

And what are those freedoms at home that we must guard? Let me mention a few.

We must see that the basic structure of our Government is preserved so that temporary abridgments of our freedoms—the controls and restrictions—can be quickly and easily removed as soon as the need for them has passed.

We must be sure that all such restrictions are spelled out as emergency measures and that new emergencies are not created to prolong these restrictions just for the sake of politics and power.

We must resist restrictions on our rights to express ourselves freely, forcefully, and clearly.

In my estimation, the recent Buchanan committee was an attempt to hamper free speech and action. Its very demand on business for copies of advertisements, booklets, speeches, etc., has thrown a scare into timid businessmen.

If Republic or any other company believes that a Government policy is contrary to public and/or company interest, there should be no hesitation to say so. We may be wrong in our interpretation, but no Government pressure—no real or implied threat—should discourage us from expressing our ideas.

If anything, business should speak more frequently, more forcefully. Business is an important segment of our economic life on which the success of our rearmament program depends, and it has a duty to present its views. No threats of legislation should interfere with this right.

Though this is perhaps not the best time to discuss taxation, I still believe the Government should preserve to the individual the right to spend his own money to the fullest possible degree.

No one is stupid enough to believe that we can fight a war in Korea and at the same time vastly increase our armament program without a heavy increase in Government expense. But as yet the Government has shown no disposition to cut back on nonmilitary expense. We should raise every penny necessary to rearm. Our dollars would have little value if we should lose our fight with communism. But ordinary Government operation can and should be cut sharply. We can't afford pork barrels today. We can't afford to start Fair Deal programs that will cost hundreds of millions. We should declare a moratorium on free pamphlets and services, on construction for nonmilitary purposes, on bureaus which have outlived their usefulness, on subsidies, boondoggling, and chairwarming. Economy in Government is never popular with those who get the ax, but it would reassure the taxpayers tremendously, and might help solve some of our manpower problems. More money for guns, tanks, and planes and less for forms, reports, and red tape—that makes sense.

We must use to the fullest our freedom of expression through the ballot box. Every election in a free country is important, whether it be local, State, or national. By majority vote we citizens set the policies for those who hold office. If they choose to disregard our wishes, we can and should turn them out.

I am not one who believes that only Republicans can intelligently run the United States Government. There are plenty of patriotic and able Democrats, some of whom are in office today. When we vote we should vote for ability first. Unfortunately we have had too many second-raters in office, whose ability to promise exceeds their ability to perform. We need more able men to offer themselves for office in both parties. That gives us freedom of choice—one of the most important freedoms we have.

We must also, and this is important, preserve our freedom of opportunity.

This country became great because the individual American had the opportunity to make the most of his abilities and talents. He could venture his capital or labor and keep his gains, if any.

He could engage in work of his choice and change it whenever he wished.

Because he could profit from his efforts, he was willing to take chances. The result was an expansion such as no other nation has ever seen.

Any encroachment on a man's freedom of opportunity destroys in some part man's progress.

We must fight against bureaucratic red tape and restrictions which discourage men of imagination, courage, and willingness who are willing to work and create opportunities.

The constant warfare carried on by Government against business is far from encouraging. The impression has been given that all businessmen are enemies of society. This is obviously nonsense.

Another freedom we must retain is the freedom to paddle our own canoe.

We have only to look at England to realize how governmental interference in private affairs destroys individual initiative.

When Government takes upon itself a cradle-to-grave program (financed by ourselves), it is too easy to set back and wait for hand-outs instead of making our own way. This cannot produce a strong, self-assured, independent people. We don't help the weak by pulling down the strong.

I do not close my mind to the fact that some must be given help by Government, but this help should be local in nature and be reserved for those who really need it, who are really entitled to it, and not for those who merely ask for it or would like to have it.

These are some of the freedoms we must preserve and cherish.

But freedoms also means obligations. We must continually earn our freedoms, work for them.

What are some of these obligations?

First, there is the obligation to be informed. Too many of us form our opinions haphazardly or repeat someone else's opinion without thought or study.

I grant we can't all be experts in every field but in those which most closely concern us we can and must inform ourselves.

We should study both sides of a question, weigh it, think of the pluses and minuses involved. We should make up our own minds and not let other people make them up for us.

No, we won't always be right but we'll have a much better chance of being right if we do a little homework ourselves. This means a lot of reading, listening, and thinking. Thinking is hard work but in these days of rapid and far-reaching communication both sides of every question are always available if we only look. Take the trouble to look at both sides on the basis of what you have thought out. Don't follow the herd.

We also have an obligation to take an active part in the political life of our country. By that I mean that you must do more than vote and/or send a check to a political party. No, it's a lot more than that.

You must lend your help and counsel. Get in and pitch.

Take part in precinct and ward politics and encourage your employees to do likewise. That's where votes are made. Show by your example how to fight against corrupt and misguided government and support honest and intelligent government. Your government is what you make it and in the end you get what you deserve.

There are many other freedoms and obligations which I might detail to you tonight. But there is a time factor which must be considered.

So let me close with this thought.

Most of us in this audience are well past our youth. Most of us have children. Many of us have grandchildren.

We've had a fine country in which to grow up. Under our system of individual opportunity we have done pretty well.

But will our children and grandchildren do as well? Will they have the same opportunities we had? Not unless we do a better job of thinking and selling our ideas.

Gentlemen, it's up to us. We can't afford to fail. We must fight and win the battle for the preservation of freedom for the next generation.

We must win back what we have lost and carry freedom's banner to new heights.

We must protect and preserve the freedom of this great land of ours so that we can "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

That, gentlemen, is our task. We can do it if we work.

Sequoyah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, my attention was recently called to an article appearing in the April issue of the magazine the New Yorker entitled "Talking Leaves."

This article dealt with an American Indian named Sequoyah, a full-blood Cherokee, and whose statue is one of Oklahoma's contributions to the Hall of Fame in Statuary Hall.

Sequoyah accomplished a feat which no other living human had done when he invented a Cherokee alphabet which adapted the English alphabet to the Cherokee language. In 1821 he announced that his task was finished and the entire Cherokee Nation, living in Indian Territory, which is now Oklahoma, was swept by excitement.

Mr. Speaker, the article is a valuable contribution to our history, and I include it as a part of my remarks:

TALKING LEAVES

Word that the bulk of Bernard Shaw's fortune is to be used to further the spread of an expanded English alphabet of his invention has prompted us to look up a few facts about an American Indian named Sequoyah who, without the help of a fortune or, for that matter, of any schooling, worked out the written language of the Cherokee Nation. As far as we know, he is the only man in history ever to have done such a thing singlehanded. Starting from scratch, with no knowledge of English or any European language—with, in fact, no knowledge of any language other than Cherokee—he devised an entire, and entirely workable, system of writing, a feat that some philologists regard as one of the most sublime acts of intellection of all time. It's one that might have abashed even Shaw.

Take him for all in all, Sequoyah seems to be one of the most inspiring and attractive figures in our history. He was born in 1770, or a few years earlier, in the village of Taskigi, in what is now Tennessee and was then the land of the Cherokee Nation. His mother was part Cherokee and part Shawnee, his father was a white man who has never been definitely identified but is popularly believed to have been a Virginian named Nathaniel Gist, a friend of Washington's. Sequoyah's English name was George Guess, sometimes spelled Gist or Guest. He was brought up as a Cherokee and, as a young man, became an accomplished silversmith and an excellent painter of animal subjects—two skills theretofore not developed among his people—and is said to have made paint brushes of animal hair without ever knowing that there were already such things in the world. He saw and was deeply impressed by books, which the Indians called "talking leaves," and, refusing to go along with the prevailing Indian notion that the ability to put speech into written form was a divinely ordained perquisite of the white man, determined, along about 1809, to invent a written language for the Cherokees. (He was unaware that a number of missionaries had tried their hands at adapting the English alphabet to the Cherokee language, had found its 26 characters insufficient to represent Cherokee sounds, many of which are made largely with the nose and throat, and had given up the job.) Sequoyah first set out to draw a different picture for each word, but soon realized that more pictures would be required than anyone could possibly hope to remember. After several years, he hit on the idea of using a different symbol for each Cherokee syllable. Copying from an English book, he used most of the letters of the Roman alphabet as symbols and then designed a much larger number himself. He had no interest in how the Roman letters were pronounced; the Roman "D" became the Cherokee "A," the Roman "R" the Cherokee "Tso."

Sequoyah listened diligently to conversations among his fellow Cherokees, and every time he detected a new sound, he made a note of it, scratching his symbols on bark with a knife or a sliver of wood. Eventually, he compiled around 140 syllables. These he winnowed down to 85, which he found the minimum necessary. What he had done was devise a system of notation known technically as a syllabary, which requires more symbols than an alphabet but much less writing, provided the language is low in multiple consonants, as the Cherokee language is.

In 1821 Sequoyah announced that his task was finished, and when he was able to demonstrate that his brand of talking leaves worked just as well as the white man's, the Cherokee Nation was swept by excitement. It took only 3 or 4 days for the average Cherokee to master Sequoyah's syllabary, and within a few months practically the entire nation had become literate.

In 1825, a Cherokee preacher named David Brown, probably a convert to the Moravian faith, completed a translation of the New Testament into Cherokee, and scores of manuscript copies of it were put in circulation. Then the Cherokees decided that it would be fine to have their own newspaper, and in 1827 a Boston firm cast a font of type in Cherokee characters. This, together with a font of Roman type and a press, was shipped to New Echota, the capital of the Cherokee Nation, and soon the paper appeared. It was called the Cherokee Phoenix, and, later, the Cherokee Phoenix and Indian's Advocate. Sequoyah was honored both by his own people and by the white man. He went to Washington in 1828 as a member of the delegation that negotiated the treaty that moved the Cherokee Nation west to what is now Oklahoma—or, rather, had the treaty rammed down their throats. He and the other delegates signed the treaty in Cherokee, instead of merely making their marks, as all other Indians had always done. The treaty noted that the Government was to make Sequoyah a grant of $500. It took 6 years for the grant to arrive, and when it came, it consisted of $150 in cash, plus 22 kettles of salt, 3 saddles, and a small quantity of other merchandise. Sequoyah died in 1843 in Mexico, where he had gone in search of a group of Cherokees who had left the nation years before. In 1907 the Indian Territory voted that it was to be called Sequoyah when it attained statehood. To its chagrin, it got combined with the Oklahoma Territory, and was called Oklahoma instead. The people kept faith as best they could. They saw to it that an Oklahoma county was named for Sequoyah. Furthermore, the giant redwoods of the West were named sequoias in his honor, which is probably better than having a State named after you.

Nerve Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would be valuable for the people of this country to know of the development of chemical warfare in recent years and particularly of new gasses which have been discovered. I, therefore, include the following article by the dean of the Florida delegation, my able colleague, Congressman ROBERT L. F. SIKES, printed in Saga magazine:

THE INSIDE STORY OF THE INCREDIBLE WEAPON NERVE GAS

(By Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Member of Congress)

This is the story of the incredible weapon. The weapon whose effect is deadlier than the sting of a hooded cobra. The weapon whose presence cannot be detected by the human senses.

A drop of liquid the size of a dime on exposed skin brings death in a matter of minutes; its vapor inhaled for a few seconds may be fatal. It has no color, odor, or taste; so insidious is its action that laboratory findings after death reveal no trace of it in the body.

Its story is being told now because its war potential, properly applied, may prove greater than the atom or hydrogen bomb.

This is neither fantasy nor science fiction, but cold, hard fact for 1951.

Even its technical name is a secret—we may only refer to it as a nerve gas.

I will never forget seeing the captured German films which showed the gas in action. Tethered goats, munching wisps of hay, were blinking in the sunlight. There was a slight hissing on the sound track. For a moment the goats seemed unaware of the shapeless cloud that was rolling toward them. Suddenly it struck. The goats reacted as though they had touched a charged wire. They plunged blindly, trying to butt their invisible foe. Their backs arched, their legs twitched convulsively. Before they could bleat they dropped to the ground. They were dying in a matter of seconds.

After the war, as a member of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, I visited the United States Army Chemical Center in Maryland. Here I had a close-up view of the liquid gas—its most lethal state. Except for the slight oily trace around the neck of the two-gallon jar, it might have been so much distilled water. It was hard to reconcile its harmless appearance with its tremendous destructive power.

Since nerve gas is the only chemical weapon which offers a potential enemy a chance for an effective long-range attack on the United States, the wraps of secrecy are now being lifted in part. The public must know what this gas is, what it can do, and what can be done in the way of defense against it. Otherwise panic might result from its surprise use against our cities.

We must also begin to grasp the meaning of what this weapon can do for us, and how it can work a military revolution on any future battlefield.

Nerve gas is revolutionary because, being odorless, tasteless, and colorless, it strikes with little warning. It may achieve its deadly effect before the victim can make a move to protect himself.

It is revolutionary because unlike other gases which strike at the respiratory system, or raise poisonous blisters on the skin, it attacks an essential ingredient of the nerve process itself, interfering with the body's communication lines. Far more toxic than any chemical agent hitherto known, it gains entry to the body not only by being breathed, but through the skin, the eyes, and through the mucous membranes of the respiratory and digestive tracts.

It packs a triple wallop, having some of the effects that would be characteristic of a poison brewed from toadstools (muscarine), cigar butts (nicotine) and curare, the lethal stuff that South American jungle Indians use on darts and arrowheads.

Since various types of nerve gases were developed by the Germans, and huge stocks were confiscated after World War II, their characteristics are now well-known to both our allies and potential enemies. For that reason they are a factor to be reckoned with in the lives of every one of us. Their action is swift—there is little time lag after initial contact. One whiff of high concentration, and you've had it.

In 1937, two German scientists discovered that a certain chemical compound is an essential factor in transmitting impulses between nerve endings, and that once this chemical is destroyed, nerve action becomes inhibited. The brain is no longer able to transmit its messages clearly, physical processes become confused and disorganized, and life becomes a welter of erratic responses. To create a gas which would destroy this vital

nerve chemical became a top-secret, high-priority objective of Hitler's war machine.

The first rumors that something mysterious was afoot began to trickle back to this country in 1940. Various German refugees hinted that the Nazis were in possession of an invisible gas that had no odor and which could penetrate any known gas mask. Lacking supporting data, such rumors sounded like the usual Goebbels propaganda myth.

As time went by and the rumor persisted, Allied intelligence authorities began to take more notice, particularly after an agent delivered a strange-looking German mask to British intelligence in the fall of 1943. This mask covered not only the eyes and mouth, but also the ears. The agent reported that it was being worn in a chemical plant where a mysterious new gas was being manufactured. With this, intelligence officers hastened to put the new gas at the head of their target list, up with the buzz-bomb and the V-2 rocket.

By 1944, the reports were more specific—the gas was two to four times more toxic than anything previously known and was persistent enough to contaminate low ground and woods for weeks at a time. Reports of German experiments revealed that during the initial stages it caused congestion of the chest, severe headaches, nausea, blindness, convulsions and cramps. It was also reported—exaggeratedly, as it turned out—that degeneration of the brain cells took place, and that its victims became raving maniacs.

That the Germans should possess such a weapon, without any counterthreat on the part of the Allies, was of course a serious situation. It was essential, therefore, that the same gas, or a better one, be developed to perfect a defense against it, and to be held in reserve for retaliation.

How we came to develop a counterpart which proved even more deadly than the original is a story as fascinating and as complex as the development of the atomic bomb.

Although many of the details are still secret, it can be stated that Allied intelligence sources not only obtained the German formula but also samples of the mysterious new substance. Only the manufacturing process remained elusive, but in a race against time, our efforts to solve this problem proved successful. So successful that today experts consider the German gas the Model T of a more fully developed chemical arsenal. Without going into any of the secret technical characteristics of the latest types, this is how nerve gas acts:

If only traces of the vapor are encountered there is difficulty in breathing, accompanied by coughing, shortness of breath and a watery discharge from the nose. The eye pupils narrow to pin points, there is a flushed face, rapid pulse and a sensation similar to muscarine (toadstool) and nicotine (tobacco) poisonings. This, the mildest of all exposures—a whiff or two of an extremely low concentration—can be relieved by small doses of atropine. These effects, similar to an asthma attack, we are told, will last "only a few days."

With a slightly larger dose, there is a painful tightening of the focusing muscles of the eye, a drawing pain in the back of the eyeballs, and painful sensitivity to bright light. In other words—a migraine headache plus partial blindness. If larger doses of vapor are breathed, or the liquid absorbed through the eyes, skin, or saliva, the involuntary muscles of the diaphragm begin an aimless flutter, and the victim, be it man or beast, can neither inhale nor exhale, becomes confused and falls unconscious. Blood pressure drops to shock levels, the heart slows to a death march rhythm, and death itself is not far off. Nevertheless, severe as these symptoms are, they can still be counteracted if the victim can be given medical assistance before breathing has stopped. Heavy, prolonged intravenous or intramuscular doses of atropine may completely reverse the clinical picture. As the antidote is administered, breathing becomes relaxed, the stalled heart resumes its regular beat, blood pressure rises, and if massive doses can be continued every few hours for at least several days, the chances of recovery are good.

Even with recovery, however, the central nervous system may be not quite the same, and involuntary spasms of muscle fibers, ranging from facial tics to grand-mal epileptic seizures, may persist.

In mild cases, giddiness, tension, anxiety, sleeplessness, and excessive dreaming continue, while in severe exposures, depression, restlessness, tremor, emotional instability, and irrational behavior may occur. Thus, under certain conditions, the gas may destroy sanity.

Such are the grim facts about nerve gas and what it is known to accomplish.

How can we defend ourselves against it?

Since the gas is colorless and odorless, the only way we can get an early warning of its presence is by a physical or chemical means of detection. An indicator that gives a striking color change, or that registers an electrical alarm would do the trick. Such devices, we are told, have been discovered. Pending their manufacture and distribution in sufficient quantities, however, civil defense will have to rely on the ability to recognize nerve gas symptoms after the attack has occurred. That is why I have spelled them out in such clinical detail.

If there is only vapor in the air, gas masks will suffice. But if the liquid is present, any contact against skin or clothing becomes extremely hazardous. Those who enter affected areas must wear, in addition to a mask, impermeable clothing, gloves, and boots. Rubber gloves and rubber boots will be safe for a half hour if the contamination is light. If heavy, their protection will last only 15 minutes.

Against the nonpersistent type of gas, where the effects last less than 10 minutes, a fair amount of protection is afforded by breathing through a towel or handkerchief soaked in an alkaline solution—such as baking soda or soapy water.

Since the gas strikes with such swiftness, medical treatment must be geared accordingly. Disaster plans call for the injection of atropine as soon as possible, deep into the muscles of the thigh, buttocks, or shoulders of every victim who has serious difficulty in breathing, who is unconscious, or who is in convulsions. Artificial respiration will need to be given in some cases.

From what we know about the stability of nerve gas it can dangerously contaminate exposed foods which have a high water or fat content, especially milk. Dry foods such as sugar, flour, and cereals are relatively little affected. Food in airtight packages is not harmed by vapors, but only sealed glass or metal containers are safe from the liquid.

As for our water supplies, tests show that while the vapors will not seriously affect such large bodies as reservoirs or lakes, the liquid gas is capable of dangerous and persistent contamination of water.

That a determined enemy using such a gas might be able to reduce substantially United States atomic production without ever dropping a bomb or firing a shot is now an ever-present possibility. That the same enemy might paralyze any strategic center is implicit in the very nature of the weapon.

Eighteen years ago, headlines in the New York Times read: "Gas bombs shut stock exchange—Gasping brokers flee knock-out fumes in cooling system."

What happened on that day, August 4, 1933, may be worth reviewing.

The New York Stock Exchange is housed in a large office building at the corner of Broad and Wall Streets. Some 2,000 brokers and employees have access to its trading floor, the size of a college gymnasium. At 12:05 p. m., a slight haze was noticed near the air conditioned grille on the ceiling, near the Broad Street side. Those who looked up saw a thin bluish wisp of smoke shimmering in the light rays coming through the arched windows. It looked like cigarette smoke, but unlike cigarette smoke, which rises off the floor, this smoke was descending.

The employees at the quotation machine on the Broad Street side were the first to sense something wrong. They waited until the haze enveloped them. Then they ran, gasping to the center of the floor. Almost immediately fumes covered the entire area. Brokers and clerks, alike, made a rush for the doors. By the time someone rang the gong for trading to cease, there was no one left to hear it.

As one of the most sensitive trading spots in the Nation's financial structure, the sudden cessation of stock exchange activities threw most of the country's marketplaces into confusion.

Wall Street itself was in a near panic, reminiscent of the bomb explosion of 1920, as the noon-day crowds watched the floor traders burst through the exits into the street, coughing, choking, gasping for breath, with handkerchiefs to their eyes.

A half hour later police discovered that two tear-gas bombs had been released next to the fifth-floor inlet of the ventilating system. The gas, normally used to subdue prison riots, was fortunately nontoxic. The incident itself had been staged as a publicity stunt for an obscure and short-lived one-man political party.

Change tear gas to nerve gas, the perpetrator from an eccentric to a skilled saboteur, the locale from the stock exchange to the Pentagon, Oak Ridge, or any other strategic installation whose crippling is deemed worth the risk, and you can appreciate why, in any future war, chemical weapons may be more decisive than the atomic bomb.

Realistic, not wishful, thinking is imperative for survival. Dare we suppose that a weapon potentially so destructive would be completely ignored by a determined enemy, particularly when its principal attribute is surprise? Make no mistake about it—if and when a nerve gas attack is launched, it will come with great speed and on a scale never before witnessed. We know, for example, that the Soviet Union came into possession of German stockpiles of nerve gas, as well as German technical personnel who had worked on its development and manufacture. We know that the principal German nerve gas producing plants lay within what is now the Soviet zone. So we must assume that as a minimum the Soviets can reproduce the German gases, with the probability that they, too, have engaged in further development and improvement.

The facts about nerve gas are grim enough without indulging in any flights of fancy. There is no need, for example, for anyone to assume that the stratosphere over our cities could be saturated with infinitesimal particles of the new poison which would filter down and kill every living thing. If in the future you read of entire cities being wiped out overnight by this silent weapon, just pass it off as the work of an overheated imagination. After all, there are limits to what this, or any other, unconventional weapon can achieve, and mass annihilation is one of them.

Tests show that nerve gas may be effective up to a half-mile radius from the point of the releasing explosion, but this does not mean that death will come to all within the zone. Ground winds will vary in intensity, and since gas is heavier than air and its flow is downward, those who are above the second floor of any building have less chance of coming into contact with the vapors, although a great deal depends on local air currents inside as well as outside any tall building. Gas masks, of course, will give some protection.

The gas may also be placed on its target from the air. It is capable of being dispersed from a high altitude as a spray or mist, and the atomized particles, drifting for miles with the wind, will cause at least mild reactions to those who breathe the vapors. But until a potential enemy acquires an air fleet, or sufficient guided missiles to support a long-range massive attack on the United States, there is only a slim chance of this occurring. However, we cannot overlook the possibility that an enemy might consider the use of nerve gas in conjunction with other ultra-destructive weapons in order to cause the maximum confusion and disruption to the strategic target. The threat of such an attack, causing tens of thousands of living casualties requiring immediate medical attention, must never be underestimated.

It would be dangerous to assume that because World War II saw no use of chemical warfare, any future conflict would be bound by similar considerations. In World War II we adopted a policy that we would not use chemical weapons offensively unless they were used against us—a threat of instantaneous and overwhelming retaliation which we were prepared to make good. United States policy in this respect was voiced by President Roosevelt in 1943, in the following statement:

"I have been loathe to believe that any nation, even our present enemies, could or would be willing to loose upon mankind such terrible and inhumane weapons * * *.

"Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we will never be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies."

Nevertheless, the United States is not signatory to any international covenant restricting the use of poison gas. As recently as 1926, at the Disarmament Conference, the same prohibition was advanced, and the United States Senate refused to ratify the Geneva gas protocol.

Since June of 1950, one of the grimmest battles in American history has been fought in Korea. Greatly outnumbered, attacked by a foe that has thrown in masses of men regardless of losses, our troops have undergone the most bitter trials of war. From this struggle, one aspect now stands clear—namely, our forces, using every conventional weapon, suffered heavy casualties whenever the enemy amassed the manpower to take an objective regardless of losses imposed by our normal ground, air, and naval weapons.

Despite the fact that chemicals, including nerve gas, are better suited to defense than to attack—(one does not contaminate the area into which one proposes to advance)—these weapons were not used, yet they may hold the answer to the still-unsolved problem of the Communists' "human sea" tactics.

Granted that there is a deep-seated repugnance to the use of chemical weapons. Nevertheless, the time has come for the fullest public discussion of the pros and cons of these, or any other weapons which will aid our forces in dealing with an enemy, stronger only in numbers, but numbers capable of winning a decision in a battle limited to conventional arms.

Korea may be the proving ground of a future conflict, just as Spain was in 1936.

If world war III becomes a reality, we may have to throw away the book of rules and use every weapon in our arsenal. It probably will be total war. One day this issue will have to be met. The time to get our thinking in order is now.

Gas warfare has been condemned as horrible and inhumane. The underlying reality is that no warfare is humane. Before rejecting gas as too cruel for use by a civilized nation, let us look at the casualties and suffering inflicted by an accepted weapon—an air bombardment for example.

Consider for a moment what happened in Hamburg, Germany, on the night of July 27-28, 1943, when 16,000 buildings were set aflame, when the air temperature in some city blocks registered 1,472 degrees F., and when between 60,000 and 100,000 civilians perished. I quote from the United States Strategic Bombing Survey's report on the Effect of Bombing on Health and Medical Care in Germany. If you are squeamish, stop right here.

"Soon after the sirens had sounded—a little before midnight on a clear night—the first bombs dropped. The warning was adequate for everyone to go to his shelter or bunker, and thereby evacuate the streets. * * * Incendiary bombs started fires which spread particularly in thickly inhabited parts of the town. In several minutes whole blocks were on fire and streets made impassable by flames. The heat increased rapidly and produced a wind which was soon the power and strength of a typhoon.

"This typhoon first moved in the direction of the fires, later spreading in all directions. * * *

"The heat turned whole city blocks into a flaming hell. * * *

"Literally hundreds of people were seen leaving the shelters after the heat became intense. They ran across the streets and were seen to collapse very slowly like people who were utterly exhausted. They could not get up. Many thus killed were found to be naked. Two explanations have been offered for this phenomenon; that the flames spurted across the street with the speed of a tornado and consumed the victims' clothing, singeing their skins; or that the intense heat made the clothes dissolve without actual fire. The shoes were usually the only covering left on the bodies.

"Most of these people were not burnt to ashes when recovered, but dry and shrunken, resembling mummies. * * *

"In the course of hours the air in the shelters became increasingly worse. Matches or candles did not burn. People lay on the floor because the air was better there and they could breathe easier. Some vomited. Some became tired and went to sleep. Wherever the ventilators were still working they brought in hot smoky air instead of cool fresh air and had to be turned off. Filters proved insufficient to keep out smoke. The apparent safety of many shelters was only temporary as the approaching fire increased heat and smoke.

"Thus the picture changed from hour to hour. Whoever was still able to make his own decision had one of two alternatives—to stay or escape. Many looked into the streets, saw that everything was on fire, decided they could not get through and withdrew to the corners of the shelters. Some tried to get out, and for them it was a race with death among explosions, fire bombs, machine guns, and falling flak. Beside all this, flame spurted through the streets and the wind caught up with many and threw them to the ground. There were screams from victims all around. Many stated that 'the air just didn't come anymore' and breathing became very difficult. Otherwise they did not feel anything, and the rest went on over those who had fallen. One man was observed to fall. He was about to pull himself up with his hands when flames were seen to envelop his back and he turned within 5 minutes without changing his position.

"Only a few reached safety in areas which had not been hit. Some found safety in the bottom of a bomb crater, others found death by drowning in water-filled craters. The only safe refuge in all this time was the water of the canals and the port. Most of those who got there were entirely exhausted. Lips, mouth, and throat were dry. They were blistered on the nose and ears, on the hands and face, and their eyes burned with pain and could hardly be opened after having been exposed to so much smoke. Many collapsed, then lost consciousness and died. Many jumped into the water. Even here the heat was hardly bearable. They took blankets and handkerchiefs and soaked them in the water and then protected their heads and the uncovered parts of their bodies with the wet cloths. But the water evaporated so quickly that this procedure had to be repeated every few minutes.

"In the meantime the burned-out houses caved in. The rubble and debris lying in the street prevented many from escaping. Many of the bodies were lying in the street half-clothed or nude. After a few hours the bodies shrunk to small objects with hard brownish black skin, and frequently to ashes and complete disappearance.

"Carbon monoxide as the major cause of death from aerial bombing was a possibility which few had expected before the war. It is now recognized as a typical 'shelter or cellar death.' Carbon-monoxide death assumed such importance that the high command of the Luftwaffe issued an order to procure statistical evidence. * * * Concentrations up to 96 percent were found in many of the 'shelter dead.' It was stressed at the conference in Jueterborg that the public should not be informed as to the danger of carbon monoxide originating in large-scale fires. In view of the inadequacy of preventive measures only, unrest and even panic would be caused."

After reading the foregoing, I think all will agree that war is inhumane in all its aspects, no matter what the weapons. In the future the employment by our enemies of chemical weapons to achieve a military objective is very likely to be judged solely on the grounds of its military applicability. Our own survival may depend upon our recognition of this hard fact.

There is no point in minimizing the horror of fire raids or of gas. Either can produce widespread death in a matter of minutes unless effective countermeasures are at hand. Yet if we are forced to fight, we may also be forced to use the most effective weapon at our command.

Modern war reveals a trend toward the concentration of immense destructive power in increasingly smaller packages—packages which cost less than the vastly greater number of older weapons needed to achieve equal potency. Experts call this the ABC pattern of warfare—atomic, biological, chemical. Up to now we have concentrated almost exclusively on atomic potentials—in attack and defense. But such a narrow view may not long be sustained. Warfare is more than a matter of cold steel, hot atoms and jet-propelled gun-platforms, especially when we are confronted by the problem of Communist mass infantry attack—the tactic which broke the back of the German army in Russia, and which twice produced a near-debacle in Korea. What happened in Korea is only a foretaste of what may happen in Western Europe should our military leaders continue to ignore the one weapon which may be best suited to defense against hordes.

For whether we realize it or not, nerve gas is capable of permeating the air envelope in which the armed horde moves and breathes. Nerve gas can shoot around corners, creep into foxholes, and ooze into otherwise impregnable strongpoints. The damaging power of high explosive ends when the shell bursts. When a chemical shell explodes, its damaging power only begins—its lethal quality can remain for minutes, days, weeks, or even months.

When a rifle bullet reaches the end of its trajectory and is spent without hitting anything, it is wasted and useless. Combat analysis shows that a great percentage of small arms fire misses its target. Nerve gas, spread out over a far greater area than either shell or bullet, would just be starting its effect. Its deadly molecule remains alive and kicking, moving with bullet-like speed to penetrate the tiniest pores. Gas is like a machine gun that fires a million bullets a second.

Since we have no offensive intentions, the fact that a chemical weapon is often more suited to the defense rather than the offense, is a very important point to be considered. Contaminated ground is denied to the enemy, and his attack is forced into narrow channels which can be covered by rapid fire supporting weapons.

In Western Europe, as in the United States, prevailing winds are from west to east. Any enemy facing us, would have gas clouds blown in his face, including any gas which he released. This is one reason why the Germans were at a disadvantage in using gas, and the same problem will confront any similar army which looks into the west wind.

Furthermore, war demands that we think beyond the moment of conflict to the time when facilities of the war zone must be restored to productive living. The principle of economy of force demands that every unnecessary act of physical destruction be avoided, as the smaller the loss, the greater the victory. This is something which we lost sight of during World War II, when we smashed into rubble the very facilities which, in order to maintain the peace, our taxpayers have paid millions to restore. Chemical weapons subdue personnel without destroying property.

No one can deny the ultra-destructive character of atomic weapons—in that sphere they have no equal. But one may well quarrel with any glib assumption that they can win a war, if by winning, one means the enforcement of a nation's policy with physical destruction held to the minimum, instead of being maximized to the point where war has no victors, only losers. Nor should we assume, because we are fascinated with the atomic weapon, that Soviet war planners fall into a similar error. In fact, knowing that their primary interest lies in the conquest of the physical assets of the world intact, we must assume that they are giving increasingly greater consideration to the use of chemical means to obtain their objectives.

The ideal weapon may be a gas which temporarily destroys the will to fight but does no lasting harm. Such a weapon might make short shrift of any aggressor, and render his defense powerless. Such a weapon properly used, would free the world from fear of destruction and might well save civilization itself from collapse.

This, however, is a glimpse into a future which may be unpredictable. The present demands that we face reality. Nerve gas may never be used against our country; that at least is what we can hope. But no one can be sure. If a nerve gas attack does come, what you have read here will enable you to sense when it is occurring, and may help save your life.

That is why this story is being told.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article that appeared in the weekly bulletin of the Department of External Affairs of Ireland on April 23, 1951:

IRELAND AND WESTERN DEFENSE

In a letter to the British Catholic weekly, the Tablet, Mr. Sean MacBride, minister for external affairs, answers recent criticisms of Ireland's attitude toward western defense contained in a Tablet editorial entitled "Ireland and the Atlantic Pact." The Tablet had commented critically on extracts from Mr. MacBride's speech to the National Press Club in Washington on March 31.

Mr. MacBride writes:

"After quoting my remarks as to the impact on Ireland of Russian and British policies, and my remark that 'both are powers with imperial traditions, and to imperial powers the partition of small nations has always seemed expedient and therefore just', you go on to say that the Communists are addicted to 'a similar line of argument' when they defend their acts of religious oppression by reference to the English Reformation in the sixteenth century. * * *

"The speech would certainly have been an ill-considered one if it had in fact represented 'a similar line of argument' to the Communist one with which you so imaginatively compare it. But, in fact, I was not talking about the English Reformation, or even about Peter the Great; I was talking about the partition of my country, which was effected by Great Britain in 1921 and which is still, in 1951, being maintained by Great Britain. This is not an 'old unhappy far-off thing' but something very modern and, to us, very important. Some English people would rather forget about it. That is quite understandable. It should be understandable also that we in Ireland find it hard to forget about it; to us it is very real present-day fact. In fact, however, many people in Britain, and yourself, sir, apparently among them, do sincerely find it hard to understand that a small nation which has opposed British rule for hundreds of years should object to your continued interference in its affairs. That inability to see our point of view is what I ascribe to your imperialist traditions; I have no interest in those traditions except insofar as they affect living issues in the world today. * * *

"You will, I hope, forgive me if I see in your own editorial some evidence of an imperialistic tradition which is characteristically your own. You say that instead of attacking in principle the partition of my country as I did, I would have done better 'to dwell on the evidence that can be brought forward to support the view that the Catholics of Northern Ireland are the victims of religious discrimination.' Now the Catholics of Northern Ireland are subject to religious discrimination, and 'the evidence that can be brought forward to support the view' that this is so, has, in fact, been brought forward by Mr. Geoffrey Bing in his pamphlet John Bull's Other Ireland, published by Tribune. I may say that some of us find it rather noteworthy that the honorable task of inquiring into this injustice was carried out by Tribune rather than the Tablet. But from our point of view the anti-Catholic discrimination in the six counties, despicable as it is, is not the only matter involved. We would still object as strongly as ever to the partition of our country if the Catholics in the partitioned area were pampered. Ireland would still object because Ireland is a nation, and a nation, as long as there is life in it, will not accept division, whatever the motives and circumstances of the division are. * * *

"THE UNGRATEFUL IRISH

"In your comments on discrimination and on the Dutch affair you are taking, perhaps unconsciously, the attitude which your paper has so often in the past taken toward Ireland. The Irish, for the Tablet, have always been simply a type, and not quite the best type, of Catholic Britons. You and your predecessors have been perennially unable to understand why the Irish are still not satisfied when some new 'benefit' such as the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, or a Catholic Lord Lieutenant, or a squadron of foreign airmen, is conferred upon them. The Irish, I can assure you, will not be satisfied until their country is free and united, a republic of the 32 counties. You would not, I think, find such a demand strange in a case where Britain was not involved. If, for example, Russia were able to inspire the secession to the Soviet Union of areas of France in which the Communists had a majority and adjoining areas which they were able to dominate, you would probably not find it eccentric on the part of the majority of the French nation if they were to seek the reintegration of their country.

"That brings me to the main burden of your article, which is that, in the great crisis of the world today we should forget about a little thing like partition. We are 'in the presence of the Soviet power,' and as long as we are so—which may be a long time—we should subordinate everything to defense; in effect 'freeze' conditions as they are today, however unjust they may be. This was, if I remember rightly, the method by which the holy alliance sought to resist the ideas of the French Revolution. It was natural enough that the doomed aristocratic order should rely on such a system, and if I believed that our democratic civilization was doomed I would agree that the best thing to do was to fight a rear-guard action against a change of all kinds. I do not, however, believe that this is the case. I think that this is a time, as I said in Washington, for the 'free and voluntary' merging of national sovereignties. As you rather grudgingly admit, that has been the tendency of our efforts in the Council of Europe, and also, though this you do not mention, the OEEC. We are trying to move toward that end by all the means in our power, but the means in our power do not include the conclusion of a military alliance with the nation which partitions us, and the guaranteeing of that nation's territorial integrity within our own shores.

"OPEN AND CONSTRUCTIVE DISCUSSION

"The suggestion contained in your last sentence, that there is an opportunity for Ireland to exist as one unit within the framework of the western community, is one with which I am thoroughly in agreement. What I fail to see is how we should be moving to that end by accepting partition in order to enter a military alliance. When, as Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, I was obliged to refuse the invitation of the United States to enter the Atlantic Pact, I explained Ireland's reasons and suggested that a conference of the nations involved and of Irish representatives should be held to discuss methods of solving the problem. I think that you, sir, would be rendering a more real service to the unity of western civilization by influencing English public opinion toward an open and constructive discussion by way of such a conference than you are rendering by the admittedly easier and more habitual work of lecturing the Irish."

In the same issue of the Tablet, Mr. James Dillon, Minister for Agriculture, writes:

"Neither Mr. MacBride nor anyone in Ireland is thinking about the imperialism of Britain in the eighteenth or nineteenth century. They are thinking and feeling about what Great Britain is doing in 1950 and 1951, and what she claims the right to go on doing so long as she is physically able to do so—i. e., occupying the six northeastern counties of our country.

"This is not ancient history; this is not ancient wrongs nor injustice of long ago; it is going on now; and I sincerely hope it will stop, before history repeats itself again, in what, for me, would be the third generation."

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, for a period of many years, Congress has encouraged soil-conservation practices by appropriating funds in order to provide expert advisers to farmers. These funds will be returned by increased value of our most important natural resource—fertile soil. It is very apparent that succeeding generations will inherit a huge national debt; but, at the same time, I sincerely hope they will become heir to land that has not been impoverished by time.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. D. M. Ginn, a leading land conservationist, to Mr. D. W. Fortenberry, his district conservationist, which recently appeared in the Mississippi Conservation News:

STEP BY STEP

Present-day soil conservationists will be interested in the fact that its principals were recognized prior to the turn of the century. We reproduce for the benefit of our readers the following letter written by Mr. D. M. Ginn, of Walthall County, to Mr. D. W. Fortenberry, district conservationist, of Columbia, Miss.:

TYLERTOWN, MISS.

Mr. D. W. FORTENBERRY,
District Conservationist,
Columbia, Miss.

DEAR SIR: The first attempt at soil conservation that I can remember was about 1888 or 1890, but then we didn't know it as "soil conservation," as that word hadn't then been coined.

One T. D. Richmond, grandfather of Thomas and Ray Richmond, began a system of hillside ditches, on what was then known as Leatherwood Creek, using a rafter and plumb bob as an instrument. This method was continued into the early 1900's, and spread to only a very few farmers, until one of my neighbors secured a farm level. We, then, began the ridge-type terraces with a hillside ditch, with no particular rule or system, but every farmer had his own idea, all of which were from bad to worse.

In 1930 a few farmers had a fairly good system, but still carried the water around hills and over natural waterways to a road, land line, or other disposal place. Then, finally, came the wider and extremely high terraces, on which a few of us planted one row. Later a few were widened to three rows when we heard of the Copeland system as a better way of protecting our soil; and too, by that time we had heard of sheet erosion, and had begun to train our water into more natural waterways. However, we had to go from there because we have not conquered soil depletion or reached a state of perfection by any means.

About 1914, we had never thought of cover crops, but a county agent (then known as county demonstrator), G. C. Minges, persuaded me to try crimson clover as a winter cover crop. I secured 100 pounds of seed, which cost about $4, and planted 4 acres, without inoculation, as we had not then learned that there was such fertilizer as inoculation. However, after being red all winter, by March 20, 1915, that had given me a growth of about 6 inches which was turned under and followed with corn. That convinced me that we had found something worth holding to, and the following fall I planted 15 acres to crimson clover with seed costing $5.25 per hundred. Then came World War I, and we forgot cover crops but by that time a few of us were getting a little less shy of county agents. After 1920, we began to listen to them again but we still believed that we knew more about cropping than they.

In 1924, a county agent persuaded me to plant 500 pounds of hairy vetch, it being inoculated, and it did well. Since then I have not been without winter cover crops on row crop land. In 1930, I planted 100 pounds of Austrian winter peas, fertilized with 4-8-4, and planted in rows that gave me a wonderful growth. That same year I planted 100 acres of hairy vetch to be turned under in the spring, and 20 acres in vetch and oats. The oats crop gave a growth of 4 to 6 feet tall and the vetch, of course, reached a height of the oats. That 20 acres was harvested for feeding purposes. All of the new-known varieties of cover crops are good, but I prefer in most instances wild winter (Singletary) peas.

Finally, in late 1941 or 1942, we succeeded, under the leadership of County Agent O. B. Elliott, to organize the Walthall County Soil Conservation District, with you, D. W. Fortenberry, as conservationist. I remember that I met you on your first day in our town, and after exchanging greetings, you began to talk kudzu, and to my knowledge, you haven't let up until this good day, being 7 or 8 years. I finally agreed to put two acres of the abominable stuff in a section of the farm that could be given away or fenced off, if it proved as obnoxious as I believed it would. However, we finished that planting in the spring with about 5 acres in waterways of a 60-acre field, from which planting and later plantings, that field at this time is about covered. In further experiments, we planted wild winter peas in the kudzu, which combination gives us a very satisfactory and profitable grazing crop. On September 10, 1949, we turned 62 cattle to that kudzu field and they made a good growth, having all they needed until November 15. Then in 1950, we gathered from that field more than $300 of kudzu crowns that went to several neighboring counties.

After all, our county has been exceedingly fortunate in getting started in soil conservation fostered by Federal and State at the time we did. They have kept telling us, through you, that soil conservation and better land use must go hand in hand, if we expect to carry out the command to strive daily and continually, that we leave to our posterity a better world in which to live than we found.

I have been told that I am the first man that successfully grew any of the winter legumes in this section and if that is true, I am very proud of the fact that I was instrumental in beginning a program that has meant so much toward better land conservation.

Remembering our pleasant association in the past, and hoping that we, together, may continue to go forward in all phases of soil conservation, I am,

Yours very truly,

D. M. GINN.

Small Business and Inventive Genius Needs Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, small business is the backbone of free enterprise and a fundamental pillar in the structure of our American form of democracy. Its preservation is essential to the free-enterprise system, and every effort must be made to recognize its needs, insure its survival, and encourage its development and expansion.

Today due to the critical shortage of many essential materials which are needed in the defense program, small business is faced with a famine of raw materials which may result in the failure of many small plants—plants which cannot be converted to the production of defense materials or cannot qualify for defense contracts—in the event some allocation of these materials is not specifically designated for the use of small business.

Many of the small-business concerns have long provided a proving ground for new ideas for labor saving devices, household utensils, and many other types of inventions. Many of these have later been utilized by the Nation's great manufacturing industry.

Mr. Don L. Davis, chairman of the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry, recently appeared before the House Small Business Committee during the committee's session at Los Angeles, Calif. The following is the statement of Mr. Davis and is an excellent exposition of the position of small business at the present time and the need for special consideration of the problem of material supply for small business:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Committee on Small Business, first, may I as an American citizen and spokesman for the Invention Industry express my deep personal and professional appreciation and gratitude for the courtesy extended us in this invitation to appear before your committee. To my knowledge, this is the first time the Invention Industry officially has had an opportunity to have its views heard and recorded by a committee of Congress.

I appear before you today in my official capacity as chairman of the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry. The council is composed of the National Association of Inventors, Inc., a trade association of American inventors duly chartered as a nonprofit organization under the State laws of California; the National Gadget Manufacturers Association, a trade organization composed of manufacturers who make new products and registered and duly chartered as a nonprofit corporation under the State laws of California; the National Independent Distributors Association, Inc., a nonprofit corporation chartered under the State laws of Illinois; the Gadget-of-the-Month Club, Inc., an international sampling organization for new products; and Consumers Testing League, a new product research organization. These five organizations comprise the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry.

In my remarks, I will refer to the industry at various times both as the invention industry and/or the gadget industry. Both names are used interchangeably to refer to those millions of Americans engaged in the creation, discovery, development, and distribution of new products and/or gadgets.

The invention industry defines a gadget as "any product which is a labor-saving device of any nature, kind, or description." Webster's dictionary defines a gadget as "anything new for which a name cannot be thought of at the moment." In the invention industry, we contend and history has proved that everything new is first a gadget; when hundreds of thousands of people use it, it becomes a standard staple; and

when millions of people can no longer live without it, it becomes a necessity. The progress pattern, therefore, of any new idea of merit is, first a gadget—then a staple—and then a necessity. We of the gadget industry contend, and as its spokesman if sufficient time were allotted we could prove, that the invention industry has mothered directly or indirectly every major industry in America today. And were it not for the invention industry, these United States, our country, would be a land of farmers. Our place in the world today, our position as a world power is due directly as we all I am sure must agree, to the ingenuity and industrialization of America, and we contend that this very great industrial development and almost limitless power of production is due to industry of all nature, kind, and description which has been conceived and mothered by American ingenuity, created by American inventors, aided and abetted by those fellow Americans who have had and still do have the courage, the foresight, and the vision to pioneer new ideas and new methods.

We of the invention industry contend that the only way for an average American and for an American businessman to make any real money is in discovery, development, and distribution of new products and services. Under our system, and only under our system, thank God, a man with an idea can still become a millionaire overnight.

We believe that it is elementary and fundamental to point out in passing that the giant American corporations today were small businesses yesterday and the future and security of our country lies in the perpetuation of that fundamental system, for example, the encouragement of small business. We all know that it was the horseless carriage that gave us the automotive industry, the inventors that gave us the flying machine which mothered the aircraft industry, the iceless icebox which became electric refrigeration, radio, television, and countless other illustrations.

We understand that the Congress defines small business as companies and organizations employing 500 persons or less. We believe that if that is the popular congressional conception and treatment, that the Congress must realize that the vast majority of small business in America today, and this is particularly true of the hundreds of thousands of persons engaged in or represented by the invention industry, employ an average of 10 or more people. Twenty-five or fifty would be a more realistic national average. Accordingly, the problems of a manufacturer employing 10 to 25 people are vastly different from those employing 100 to 500 people.

From all available statistics and estimates compiled over a period of the last 5 years, it appears that the gadget industry as such is a half-billion-dollar industry.

We do not think it necessary to prove to the committee that all Americans love gadgets, that gadgets are an American phenomena, and that the very word "gadget" is as American as apple pie. There is not an American home whose confines do not house countless numbers of these labor-saving devices, some good, some bad, some indifferent.

We think that it is significant to call to the committee's attention the fact that although our industry has done so much for our Nation, it has received so little attention, consideration, or even recognition as an industry whose activities are so integrally woven into and a part of the national character and lifeblood of America.

One popular fallacy that we would like to correct in the minds of our fellow Americans is that when most people think of invention and development of new products, invariably they visualize the universities' and corporations' labors and think only of scientists, engineers, and the like, working under corporation grants and benefactors' endowments. I do not represent them. The organized gadget industry knows that they represent a very minute percentage of the activities of our industry. When we refer to inventors, we mean the millions of average Americans in all walks of life who have an idea and who have got the guts to back that idea, often with all their resources. No long-haired inventors, no scatterbrains, but the average American citizen who creates an idea, this is what we mean when we refer to inventors and new products. We say "invention is inspired, not hired." We define invention as "man's rebellion against stupidity, against doing things the hard way." We contend that no man or woman can do a job day after day for a number of years without coming up with an individual trick, invention, gadget, or gimmick to do that job quicker and better, faster and cheaper. When that happens, we have invention and the approximately three million patents already issued by the United States Patent Office only represent a small percentage of the millions of ideas, many of them excellent, which have for one of a hundred reasons never had a final patent granted. It is from these sources and from simple American citizens that have come the greatest ideas which have helped make America great. For every Alexander Bell, every Fulton, every Kettering, every Orville Wright, who has received recognition, we know that there are thousands with equally great inventions and for various reasons too detailed to discuss, they haven't been heard from or recognized.

In peace, as in war, citizen lay inventors have made solid and substantial contributions to the national welfare, progress, and security. Proof of that is attested to by the fact that a National Inventors Council was established by a Presidential directive.

It may be curiously significant to the committee that the headquarters of the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry and other component members are located in California. For the record, I wish to point out this fact that 34 percent of all the patents issued by the United States Patent Office have been issued to residents of California. The explanation of that fact is that the invention industry has discovered that where there is a high rate of retired people in the area, there happens to be a correspondingly high ratio of invention. It appears that it takes a man almost a lifetime of experience and observation to be able to make things better, quicker, faster, and cheaper.

So much, gentlemen, for background of the invention industry. I hope I have established it in your minds, and now we come to the crux of the problem.

The President has declared an emergency. The National Production Authority have issued regulations, restriction orders, and directives. Steel, copper, aluminum, rubber, plating, nickel, chrome are all on the restricted or banned list. We find that the industry today faces virtual extinction unless we obtain relief. Imagine, if you will, a man with an idea. He gets a patent. He goes to a number of manufacturers and for any of a number of reasons, cannot get the item manufactured. However, he is a man of good judgment, a sound businessman. Maybe he has worked for someone for years, maybe he has retired. He feels his idea is sound. He takes his life savings, or he organizes a company and gets two or three partners or a dozen people interested. Investment may run from as little as two thousand to as high as seventy-five or one hundred thousand dollars. He begins to manufacture. Sometimes he does very well at first; sometimes it is a question of building slowly. Maybe he does the whole production job himself; maybe he has it subcontracted. And then comes the emergency. His subcontractors say they will do all they can for him and they give him only a few parts, or maybe they turn him down because they think they will get some defense orders, or maybe they are grateful to him because he has been a good customer, but they cannot help him very much because their supply of steel or aluminum is drastically reduced. What is this American to do? He has worked hard for the last 4 or 5 years to build his business. It has cost him thousands of dollars to break into the retail market. He has spent money on advertising and promotion, or sales efforts, and all of a sudden, he finds himself with little or no materials and he is stuck right halfway in the middle. Maybe the company has made money, but not enough money to amortize its tooling, its plates, its jigs, and its dies. Maybe they have just begun to show a profit. What are they supposed to do? Close down and go to work in a defense work? Or are they supposed to close up and, like an Arab, fold their tent and steal away. They have made money. They have paid their taxes. They have a set-up that has cost countless thousands, to say nothing of the blood, sweat, and tears that have gone into this business. If I were talking about 1 company, or 1 individual, or even 10 or 100, that would be a different story, but I am talking about thousands from coast to coast to whom these directives from Washington on drastic curtailments mean the end of everything just as though they were living in Russia or Argentina or some other dictator country. What are these people going to do? Gentlemen, they represent a real and very serious problem that I am sure, and I know that our representatives in Congress have too long overlooked. These people are too big and too many to be ignored and yet apparently, they are too small to be converted to defense activities, or at least that seems to be the impression they have received.

Every time a small group of Americans band themselves together to manufacture or sell a new item and they "go broke" because of circumstances beyond their control the personal loss and the individual loss is heartbreaking, but from where we stand we believe that the loss to the Nation is stunning and staggering because these little men, these little people, are the very backbone and the sinews of America. They are the living manifestation of free enterprise. It is from these people that tomorrow will come the General Motors and the General Electric and the other giants of industry. These giants of industry have helped make America great by their industrial production, by their employment to fellow citizens, by their tremendous tax payments. It is from these little people and these little corporations that come the additional pillars which keep this country great. Ignore them, break them, push them aside, and you have broken and forgotten and betrayed and repudiated every principle of American free enterprise. Don't you gentlemen realize that Henry Ford was just a little guy not many years ago, and there are a great many counterparts of Henry Ford here in our industry. As long as an American with an idea still thinks that he can become a millionaire, that's so long as free enterprise will have a deep-rooted, real, and personal meaning to every American working man and woman. In my humble opinion, that is the only American antidote for communism, because history has proved that the only time communism flourishes is when people are wage slaves and every hope for personal profit and personal progress has been dashed and is futile.

Those manufacturers who are larger and who have some equipment and who are in the position to convert to do some defense work are being beat down by the discouraging delays, the endless red tape. Not only that, but the larger organizations keep raiding our manufacturer's staffs by offering higher wages and more inducements.

Being "little people," we have no lobbies in Washington. We have no "ins" with the big boys, and we are too small for even the 5 percenters to be interested in us. Gentlemen, little people can be kicked around just so much. We can stomach just so much. Our patience can last just so much. And then we get mad. That time has now come for the invention industry, and my appearance before this committee today is proof positive that the time has come to quit "beefing" and try to get some consideration for our cause. All of us in our industry have worked too long and too hard, and we've got too much at stake to be put out of business with the stroke of a pen. We give no quarter, nor ask any quarter on our patriotism, but we just aren't going to sit still and see ourselves put out of business for the duration when nobody can tell us or seems to know how long that duration is going to be. If we've got to have a lobby in Washington, we'll get one. If we've got to do the things the way the big boys do it, we'll do it. True, we'll be fighting with pennies and not with dollars, but it is a question now, gentlemen, of survival. It is bread and butter that we want, not cake—just plain bread and butter, and I think you will agree that we've got a right to bread and butter.

Now what do we propose? What's the answer? What can you gentlemen do for us? Anything you do will be appreciated, but specifically we base our hopes upon this one major consideration. Allocate a percentage of materials earmarked exclusively for the development and manufacture on pilot-plant basis for new products. Let us have 10, 25, any percentage so that short of shooting war and an all-out state of emergency, the development and manufacture of new products can continue. Don't let our tools and dies and jigs rust. Let us have just enough material to keep going so when the crisis is over and peace comes again, the little man can still be there. We're not asking for any subsidies; we're not asking for any hand-outs; we're not asking for any grants; we're not asking for anything for nothing. Only for the right and the opportunity to make a living and to pay taxes so we can help in our own way. Let's not make American citizens displaced persons in their own country. Tomorrow always comes. Tomorrow always will come and it is for tomorrow that we all work and sacrifice. Gentlemen, if you could see the blueprints and the ideas that I have seen and that I see every day of my life, you would understand why we of the invention industry are making this plea for survival.

Our industry knows that while yesterday has been glorious and rich, tomorrow is even greater. We have no ceilings and we have many frontiers to pioneer. We want the opportunity and the promise and the tools to make a reality of the tomorrow that every American looks for, works for, fights for, and is willing to die for. Our industry is a real manifestation of free enterprise and our Nation's best barrier against communism.

The invention industry asks that the Congress of the United States give serious consideration to our plight and to enact such legislation or effect such remedial measures immediately so as to give the invention industry the opportunity to work for, serve, and help build a better America. Thank you.

Pay Increase for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition of Minnesota Department, American Federation of Government Employees, in support of H. R. 241, pay-raise bill for Federal employees:

MAY 3, 1951.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned United States Government employees, hereby petition your active support for passage of H. R. 241, the pay-raise bill, which is urgently needed to partially offset our increased cost of living:

Joseph J. Pingatore, Fort Snelling, Minn.; John C. Gray, Fort Snelling, Minn.; John F. Ryan, Minneapolis, Minn.; Edwin Murphy, St. Paul, Minn.; Ella T. Lorentsen, Minneapolis, Minn.; Genevieve D. Stoffel, St. Paul, Minn.; Raphael H. Pezalla, St. Paul, Minn.; Betty J. Bennett, Minneapolis, Minn.; Irene D. Taraba, St. Paul, Minn.; Ruth E. Oleson, St. Paul, Minn.; Mary Jane Kroitlow, Minneapolis, Minn.; Ruth C. Benings, Minneapolis, Minn.; Geraldine L. Lindquist, Minneapolis, Minn.; Adele Broghamner, Minneapolis, Minn.; Leona J. Pelava, Minneapolis, Minn.; Leonard V. Bussen, St. Paul, Minn.; Eugene P. Daly, St. Paul, Minn.

B. A. Carey, St. Paul, Minn.; Matthew D. Lanigan, Minneapolis, Minn.; T. Vogel, Minneapolis, Minn.; Allen Wissinger, St. Paul, Minn.; K. J. Shaughnessy, Minneapolis, Minn.; Robert N. Faulkner, St. Paul, Minn.; John N. Willems, St. Paul, Minn.; Frances O. Walseth, Minneapolis, Minn.; Rudolf Zimmerman, St. Paul, Minn.; Melvin M. Leaneau, St. Paul, Minn.; Arthur A. Kloos, St. Paul, Minn.; Ernest M. Swanson, Minneapolis, Minn.; William J. McEvoy, St. Paul, Minn.; J. H. Brody, St. Paul, Minn.; Gerald M. Stevens, St. Paul, Minn.; R. M. DesJardens, St. Paul, Minn.; Martin Holland, Minneapolis, Minn.; Emil A. Zeyereisen, St. Paul, Minn.; George E. O'Laughlin, Minneapolis, Minn.; Homer Gannaway, St. Paul Park, Minn.; William S. Harrison, Minneapolis, Minn.; Frances E. Klyabu, Minneapolis, Minn.; O. N. McNeil, Minneapolis, Minn.; Louis D. Wegwerth, St. Paul Park, Minn.; W. Sherk, Minneapolis, Minn.; K. C. Carlson, St. Paul, Minn.; E. M. Granstrom, Minneapolis, Minn.; John E. Hinslin, Minneapolis; Ray McCraney, St. Paul, Minn.; John J. Stader, St. Paul, Minn.; J. L. O'Reilly, St. Paul; W. M. Anderson, Minneapolis; Arthur Durrant, Minneapolis; K. W. Osborne, Minneapolis.

Earl Holmes, Minneapolis; S. A. Greenlee, Minneapolis, Minn.; A. E. Saltz, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. A. E. Saltz, Minneapolis, Minn.; Leo F. Motylewski, Minneapolis, Minn.; Allen B. Burt, Minneapolis, Minn.; Ardell Motylewski, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. A. B. Burt, Minneapolis, Minn.; John S. Hoffrue, St. Paul, Minn.; A. F. Decouski, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. Isabel Greenlee, Minneapolis, Minn.; Pansy M. Johnson, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. Earl Holmes, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. Roy Ginnow, Minneapolis, Minn.; William J. Carson, Fort Snelling; Norman R. Lundeen, St. Paul, Minn.; Ruth Stone, Minneapolis, Minn.; Annie Furrier, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mae E. Johnson, Minneapolis, Minn.; LeRoy K. Ginnow, Minneapolis, Minn.; David S. Baines, Anoka, Minn.; Harry F. Masten, Minneapolis, Minn.; Arnold Brooks, Minneapolis; Warren O. Johnson, Fort Snelling; Willis M. Bisenin, St. Paul, Minn.; Alfred M. Larik, Minneapolis; Earl T. Weinand, Minneapolis; Mrs. Earl T. Weinand, Minneapolis; Anthony J. Moser, Minneapolis; Bernadine Moser, Minneapolis, Minn.; Michael N. Bigelbach, St. Paul, Minn.; George R. Dennis, St. Paul, Minn.; Wilfred J. Bonquit, St. Paul, Minn.

Foreign and Domestic Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me containing some comments on our foreign and domestic policies, delivered before the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of New Mexico, at Hobbs, N. Mex., May 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, DEPARTMENT OF NEW MEXICO, HELD AT HOBBS, N. MEX., MAY 3, 1951

SOME COMMENTS ON OUR FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC POLICIES

Recent experiences in the Far East have not been too reassuring as to the definiteness or certainty of our objectives. I will not comment on General MacArthur's being relieved of his command, except to say that in a Democratic State such as ours, the emphasis has always been on civilian control of the Armed Forces. Therefore, regardless of the merits of the case, the assertion of the preeminence of the civilian over the military must be definitely accepted. After all, it is one of the things that so distinguishes us from any of the military dictatorships we have seen rise and fall.

And yet, these differences should be debated in public so that our fellow citizens may know what is transpiring, what is causing the formulation of the policies that you have had to fight for, which others such as you are fighting for in Korea, and which still others will fight for in wars yet to come.

And here I pause to tell you that your organization and other veterans' organizations represent the backbone of America. By keeping before our fellow citizens the necessity of keeping America prepared for emergencies, you are educating our youth. You are directly representative of the American people, for you have demonstrated your patriotism by fighting overseas to protect the shores of our beloved land. If there is any place where no Communist or fellow travelers will be found, it is among groups such as this—a convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the State of New Mexico.

I am deeply complimented to have this opportunity of addressing you.

Our Korean adventure is not calculated to instill confidence in our Asiatic neighbors, neither as to our military prowess nor our

lack of imperialistic designs. In the ultimate analysis Koreans are fighting Koreans and both the Chinese and ourselves must be regarded as intruders. We need but think of our own War Between the States and the assistance furnished by France and England to the Confederacy to appreciate the fact that only a bitter hatred and a deep resentment can result from this unfortunate intervention on a foreign soil so far distant from our own.

What do we seek to achieve by this foreign adventure? Are we permanently committed to fight the Chinese—all 500,000,000 of them, or as many of them as are Communists? And here let me pause a moment and analyze the significance of what is called communism as it pertains to China. To me it is a misnomer.

What is going on is a revolution of a poverty-stricken and starving people striving for a better way of life—in fact, for their very existence. Their hapless plight gives the Russian Communists the opportunity to exploit this human misery to their own selfish ends.

The ownership of the land is promised by the Communist Party in China.

If you will but realize that the vast majority of the Chinese are tenant farmers who are thoroughly squeezed and exploited by the absentee landlords, guerrilla bands, and war lords, you will understand the intense land hunger that permeates the vast mass of humanity concentrated in China, where floods and famines are regarded as blessings because they decimate the population.

There the theory of Malthus (in his essay on population) is carried into practice. This is his contention: That famines, wars, plagues, and pestilence were necessary afflictions, for otherwise all of humanity would suffer starvation. This he based on the fact that food supplies increases only by addition, whereas the population increases by multiplication. In other words, it is arithmetic progression versus geometric progression.

But what of the effect on us? The Chinese can afford to lose three for one of ours, and when the war is over they will still have many more people than we had at the outset. In the meantime the real enemy in the Kremlin has lost Koreans and Chinese but no Russians. What will we use as reserves should we be plunged in a war with the Soviet Union? Will we have any allies?

We will be far safer to count on ourselves alone and the people south of the Rio Grande, our neighbors who in the last war supplied us with men and so many essential materials of war.

The problem confronting the United States is to maintain satisfactory relations with its Latin-American neighbors and Canada. Long years of doubtful financial, commercial, and political dealings with us, the Colossus of the North, have left upon the Latin-American psychology an indelible imprint of suspicion and even cynicism with regard to any act or policy of ours, even though altruistic.

Beginning with the first Roosevelt to be President and his motto, "Walk softly and carry a big stick," and the imprudent ventures in the Dominican Republic, on down through the years of the development of the good-neighbor policy, the Latin-American people have had little reason to put away their fear and mistrust of us. But the strong efforts of President Franklin Roosevelt to adhere to the policy of nonintervention and to promote cultural understanding between all the peoples of the Americas have actually brought about a more sympathetic relationship.

With the attack upon the United States by Japan, and the subsequent extension of the war to Europe, popular opinion in Latin America, ever mindful of the struggle for liberation that occupied the Latin-American patriots in the early days of the last century, was substantially behind the United States as the champion of individual liberty, freedom of thought, and the right to pursue one's individual destiny with a minimum of governmental interference. Many of the Latin American Republic showed their profound sympathy for our stand by formal declarations of war upon the Axis Powers. Thus was established an identity of interest and a given purpose which brought our sister republics into a much closer bond than had ever been achieved before.

At the end of the Second World War, it seemed indeed, that the United States and Latin America were well on the way to translating the good-neighbor policy into an actual living friendship.

Somehow, however, our Government stumbled upon an unfortunate policy involving interference in the internal affairs of some of our more prominent Latin-American neighbors. Again, suspicion and distrust, doubts and fears beset our neighbors to the south. The good work of the previous decade was largely undone and again the atmosphere was permeated with hostility. Our unfortunate experiences in Argentina have borne bitter fruit and this at a time when we must rely on our neighbors—neighbors who share our hemisphere and who have similar problems, similar aims, and similar aspirations.

There is no blinking at the truth. Shorn of all hypocrisy, sugar-coating and double-talk, the real enemy is the Soviet Union and its evil genius, the Communist Party. Our quarrel is not with the Russian people, certainly not with the farmers or the workers who earn their living as you and I do by the sweat of their brow and their daily toil. Our quarrel is with those who seek to destroy us—those who would bore from within, who would undercut the ground we stand on, those who would foster disunity, promote dissension, make our people, class, race, and color conscious.

Our enemies are aware of the weaknesses that are inherent in our body politic. They strive also to prey upon the fear and distrust, and to exploit the suspicions of our neighbors to the south. They dwell upon these factors in their constant propaganda campaign, just as they incite the underprivileged and substandard humans to strive to improve their lot by force and violence (as at Bogotá) rather than by constitutional means. Their motto is: "Bullets, not ballots."

There has never been any doubt in my mind that our State Department officials have had the best of intentions, even when seeking to intervene in the internal affairs of Latin American and other countries. Nevertheless, however good these intentions may be our own history demonstrates that in our infancy we were quite indisposed to view such intervention with equanimity, nor would we brook it as we achieved maturity.

Our own Monroe Doctrine which had fallen into relative desuetude since our more recent European adventures, and more especially since the Korean incident, stated plainly to all and sundry that the Western Hemisphere was closed to monarchy and to colonization. And we made it plain that we wanted no part of Europe's many wars or the embroilments which follow in their wake.

Nonintervention in the internal affairs of our sister republics is a sine qua non—an absolute condition—to a sympathetic understanding between the northern and southern parts of our hemisphere.

Even though these good intentions have been proclaimed with obvious sincerity through the ages, it has been observed that all too often the altruistic ends and the avowed intent to help others are often but a thin disguise to exploit and use the resources of the state wherein the economic penetration is accomplished.

If we return to our own infancy, we may recall an episode wherein we were made the objects of a similar attempt by one Citizen Genet representing the newly created Republic of France. Upon arrival in the United States in 1793, Genet decided that the painstaking neutrality maintained by the Government of the United States as between the European belligerents was not in accord with the desires of the majority of the American people. Thereupon citizen Genet carried the issue to the people by a series of public speeches, meetings and assemblies. Our Government did not relish this type of internal intervention and promptly requested the recall of Genet. Upon his recall interference in matters of internal concern ceased abruptly.

Likewise, the United States has been quick to resent and in every way possible to prevent any European intervention in Latin-American affairs. Time and again we have taken action as was feasible and was practicable to maintain that territorial integrity and the political independence of our good neighbors.

The War Between the States was hardly over before our Secretary of State, William Seward, notified the French Government that its troops must be withdrawn from Mexico where they were maintaining Maximilian's empire at the point of the bayonet. In 1866 the last of the French troops departed, leaving the ill-advised emperor to face a firing squad at Queretaro.

When Great Britain and Venezuela had a dispute over a common boundary in 1895, President Cleveland, sensing that Britain intended to have recourse to force, announced that this matter should be decided by arbitration. He intimated quite plainly that if Britain used force, the United States would meet force with force.

The record of our protective efforts in Latin America reminds me somewhat of the man who assured the object of his affection that he would protect her against all comers. But when she asked him somewhat demurely, "And who will protect me from you?" he was at a loss for an answer. Actually, no one has protected the Latin-American countries from such intrusions as we consider necessary.

Dollar diplomacy has been so severely and so bitterly criticized that I hardly need dwell on it. One of the best examples is furnished by our immediate neighbor to the south—the Republic of Mexico. For years Mexico has been kept constantly aware of the existence and power of the great financial interests that could make or break a government; and after decades of living within the shadows of fear and economic want, Mexico now has a government representative of the people.

We have but two courses of action: (1) to be good neighbors in our deeds as well as by our words, and to impress upon our friends of the south our sincerity and earnestness of purpose; or (2) we can revert to the policy of intimidation and become again the colossus with the big stick, the policeman of the Americas. No compromise between these two policies appears possible.

Should we fall back into the latter role, we can be the self-appointed guardian of the peace. We can be a twentieth century suzerain surveying our feudal domain to the south, acting as overlord in settling the disputes of our vassals, by the sheer power and force of our economic and military strength. Thus, we will make and unmake governments, create or destroy prosperity, raise or lower the standard of living, establish and disestablish alliances among the various Latin-American Republics at will, and cast the votes of all of these Republics en bloc, in the councils of the United Nations and other world assemblies.

But there is another aspect. A determination to browbeat the Latin-American Republics will afford fuel for the sparks of communism that already exist south of the Rio Grande. That, coupled with the economic want, the submarginal standard of living which the majority of the people face daily, provide a fertile basis for Communist propaganda. Communists are quick to seize upon these misfortunes; and how are these people to know that the Communist promises of plenty, of total employment, of complete economic security, will never be fulfilled? If we do nothing to help these people, they may well try communism, for what have they to lose?

The billions we are spending in Europe and in the Far East will probably inure to the advantage of the Soviet Union, having as it does the tremendous advantage of geographic proximity. So we build an industrial potential and Russia will probably reap the industrial harvest and use our own machines in the endeavor to destroy us. Would it not be far preferable and infinitely more productive to invest in our good neighbors by raising their standard of living and thus to forestall the Communist promises by actual achievement? Why not make these human beings thankful that they are living under the principles of democracy and that they yearn not for a foreign ideology and a Communist Party line—a totalitarian state.

By developing the resources of Latin America, we are also improving our own economic conditions. Since the Latin-American countries are potentially our best customers, it is to our advantage to assist them to achieve a higher standard of living. The higher the standard the greater the demand for our goods and, therefore, the more profitable the trade. By supplying us with raw materials, which we need, these countries can establish credits which will pay for the manufactured goods exported to Latin America and required for the achievement of a higher standard of living.

With the Latin-American peoples on an economic par with Canada, then our neighbors south of the border would constitute an impressive market which would act as a stabilizing factor on our own economy and aid in preventing the recurrent depressions or economic crises which have been the bane of our people. Furthermore, with this economic development to strengthen them, they would constitute a far more powerful factor in world affairs.

Certainly we should promote a standard of living in Latin America comparable to that now existing in Canada.

By investing our money in the resources of Latin America, we will be creating an industrial reservoir of productive enterprise and of essential raw materials, which will be essential when the war with Russia comes. We will be taking advantage of our geographic proximity, and at the same time, by raising the standard of living prevent the spread of the Communist influence.

On the other hand, years of work will be undone and again the United States will be hated and feared throughout the Americas if the policy of imperialism prevails in place of genuine cooperation by our equals in the society of nations, we will only have a superficial, albeit obsequious subservience of our vassal states.

The pages of history furnish us with a parallel, an illustration worthy of note. During the Napoleonic era, of the grand army of France consisting of 600,000, only 60,000 French marched out of Russia. Where were the rest? Dead or deserted. As soon as it was apparent that victory would not attend the French armies, the Allies departed like the snow under the torrid rays of the noonday sun.

Have we any reason to believe that our Latin-American allies, united to us by fear, would react otherwise? Imperialism does not beget loyalty.

But if we adhere to our good-neighbor policy, we may make sacrifices and we may be called on for financial aid and we may not even be able to persuade our southern neighbors to accept our concepts of democracy, but over the years, we may build a strong and lasting friendship which may serve us well in our hour of need. Remember, a friend in need is a friend, indeed.

Furthermore, our Government will inevitably be subjected to pressure by financial and commercial interests adversely affected by the ever-growing and expanding economic nationalism of Latin America. The temptation will be strong to intervene just a little, or just this once, but intervention marks the end of the neighborly feeling.

Following a century and a quarter of confusion in its Latin-American policy, it is high time for the United States to decide upon a definite and continuing policy toward its sister republics of the hemisphere.

We must accept the fact that these are nations in a world community, entitled to equal treatment before the law. Pursuant to the convention in Montevideo in 1933, we must follow the doctrine that no nation has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another.

Unless our good faith is shown in pursuing this policy, we cannot hope to count on the assistance of the Latin-American republics in our hour of danger, an hour which may be far closer and far more dangerous than my fellow countrymen care to believe.

Steel Mills Turn to Canada for Ore but Not to the Much-Touted Labrador-Quebec Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following article taken from the New York Times, January 21, 1951, reveals that our steel mills are turning to Canada for ore but it is not to the much-touted Labrador-Quebec project.

Every Member of Congress should read the following article because it explodes the arguments of the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway that the Labrador-Quebec project as a source of ore is indispensable:

STEEL MILLS TURN TO CANADA FOR ORE—BETHLEHEM, YOUNGSTOWN SHEET, INTERLAKE CORP. TO EXPLORE STEEP ROCK PROPERTIES

(By Thomas E. Mullaney)

In their quest for new sources of iron ore to replace the fast-dwindling prime deposits of the Mesabi Range in Minnesota, heretofore the supplier of about 85 percent of the ore consumed in this country, several leading American iron and steel companies are now manifesting great interest in the properties of Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., in southwestern Ontario, Canada.

Last week Pickands, Mather & Co., a Cleveland management concern, announced that it was negotiating with Steep Rock for an agreement to explore and for a leasing option on 1,600 acres of its vast properties in behalf of Bethlehem Steel Corp., Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Interlake Iron Corp., and the Steel Co. of Canada, Ltd.

More than a year ago Inland Steel Co., of Chicago executed a similar agreement with Steep Rock covering another large tract on which it has already conducted some test drilling.

Inland Steel said it is too early yet to tell whether the properties will prove high in ore content. Since there is still some water above the indicated ore body in the Inland area, the company does its testing in winter when the water is frozen and expects to conduct its drilling operations over three winters.

However, Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland industrialist and chairman of the Steep Rock board, stated recently that the "Steep Rock reserves of high quality iron ore now are known to exceed those of any other range, old or new, on the continent."

Some ore has already come from the properties, but the volume is said to be only a fraction compared with the area's potentialities. The company, formed in 1938, uncovered its ore by draining off the 150-foot-deep Steep Rock Lake, about 140 miles from Port Arthur on Lake Superior. During the last shipping season, its sixth, the company mined about 1,215,000 tons of ore, said to be of very high quality.

Enthusiastic engineers have estimated that at least 1,000,000,000 tons of excellent quality hematite ore will eventually be proved on the Steep Rock properties, now divided into three large ore bodies. They believe annual production could soon be stepped up to 10,000,000 tons.

If this Canadian mine is as rich as its operators believe, it could become an important supplier of various Midwest steel mills, since it would require only a 140-mile railroad haul to available Great Lakes shipping facilities.

Republican Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address on Republican responsibility, delivered by me last Thursday evening in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS ENTITLED "REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY," BY UNITED STATES SENATOR IRVING M. IVES AT THE THIRD ANNUAL DINNER OF THE NEW YORK REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE, MAY 10, 1951, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY

"If the Republican Party will put duty to our country above party politics, I am sure the Republican Party will have the support of the people in the next election."

This is not my statement. It refers to the election of 1952. It comes from a woman who was born, brought up, and educated

in the South, and who has an unusually pronounced Democrat Party background; her great-grandfather served in the Congress of the United States. Her statement is typical of many pronouncements I have been receiving in recent months from disillusioned Democrats and angry independents.

Sometimes, in a supreme desire to capitalize on the weaknesses, the incompetence, and the general rottenness, which pervade the Truman administration, we fail to recognize that there is a vast group of independent voters among the Amercian electorate, who are looking anxiously to the Republican Party for something more than criticism and condemnation of the New Deal. The temptation to follow the line of least resistance is always strong.

Five percenters and deep freezers and Harry Vaughan; mink coats and the RFC scandals; red herrings and Alger Hiss and Dean Acheson; the President's inexcusably abominable treatment of General MacArthur—these are symbolic of an administration which has lost the confidence of the American people. They are evidences of Pendergastism saturating Washington. They provide an illusion of alluring political issues.

But millions of American citizens do not have to be convinced that these deplorable symbols of an administration, which has been derelict in its duty and has betrayed the trust imposed in it by the electorate, are a tragic reality. For many months the newspapers and the radio and television have portrayed vividly the sad estate to which the character of our National Government has sunk.

Millions of Americans have lost confidence in their Government. Among many of them there has been such a growing cynicism toward government itself that they no longer have faith in any of us who hold public office.

Merely to emphasize nowadays the failures and shortcomings of the party in power in Washington can only increase the cynicism and spread the growing lack of confidence in government. It can only aggravate a serious condition and trend which, unless soon reversed, may lead to the eventual disintegration of our American form of constitutional, representative government and to the decadence of our American society.

If I understand the American people, they are no longer in a state of mind to be lured by glittering promises and phony panaceas and the glib talk of demagogues. What they demand now is a political party and political leadership that are honest and forthright and possess common sense and realism.

The American people are fed up with the subsidies and with the extravagance and inefficiency which are part and parcel of the present National Government. As taxpayers they are revolting at the waste of money and manpower in our Federal establishment. As taxpayers and patriots they are willing to contribute whatever may be necessary to the adequate defense of our country and for the effective operation of governmental functions which the intricacies of modern-day society have forced upon us.

But as taxpayers the American people are demanding a dollar's return for every dollar spent. They are demanding that nondefense expenditures be cut to the bone and that every governmental service that is not truly essential to the welfare of the country be eliminated. They are demanding that there be frugality in defense expenditures, including expenditures for the armed services, just as far as the justifiable requirements of our preparedness program will permit.

In short, the American people demand, as well as deserve, a government which is honest and efficient. And they demand a major political party which will put these virtues into practice without turning to reaction in doing so. This is where the Republican Party has its greatest opportunity and faces its greatest challenge since 1860.

We Republicans, solely on the basis of the Truman record, can and should win in 1952. But we can afford to win in 1952 and the country can afford to have us win in 1952 only if subsequently our administration is to show a radical improvement over that which is now in power. Without such improvement victory for us would mean the end of the Republican Party and perhaps the destruction of the two-party system in the United States.

What we need in Washington is an administration possessing the vital qualities I have enumerated. What we need in Washington is an administration which will place the welfare of our country above politics and partisanship. What we need in Washington is an administration with vision and courage and integrity, such as are displayed in the great administration of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in our own State of New York.

We Republicans know that our great party has met these tests of character and capacity in the past. We know that we can meet these tests again. We know that, meeting these tests, not only shall we be victorious in 1952 but our victory will be complete and the performance of our Republican administration will restore the faith of the American people in their Government.

It remains for us Republicans and Republicans everywhere who are active in politics to do the job that can and must be done for the sake of our party, and most of all, for the sake of our country.

Tribute to the Late Senator Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg was a great man. He showed his greatness in many ways. It is said that one trait of greatness is the ability to change one's opinions and views and to admit such changes. If that is a trait of greatness, then surely it was a mark of statesmanship on the part of Arthur Vandenberg, for he shed his deep isolationism to become the foremost architect of our bipartisan foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article I recently wrote about Senator VANDENBERG.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel, April 25, 1951]

WASHINGTON AND YOU

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—I shall always remember Senator Arthur Vandenberg. He was an outstanding statesman, a colleague, and a Republican whose views on foreign policy, I shared. But, more, I shall remember him because he was a good friend in whom I could place full confidence in judgment and in telling me the truth.

I vividly recall the day I was sworn into the Senate. Senator Vandenberg as the retiring President pro tempore of the Senate swore me in. His very first act after he relinquished the post to Senator MCKELLAR, the Democrats having taken over control of the Mighty-first Congress, was to walk directly to my seat in the Senate Chamber and offer his personal congratulations to me and welcome me into the "club."

Another occasion stands out in my mind. The Senate was voting on the military assistance program to Europe, a measure designed to send materials, equipment, and technical assistance to the member nations of the North Atlantic Pact. The legislation was to implement the North Atlantic Treaty and to start building real forces-in-being to back up the mutual defense provisions of the pact.

I had some reservations about the bill because the Members of the Senate who were not on the Foreign Relations Committee or the Armed Services Committee had not been fully informed on the world conditions that prompted the legislation. I went to Senator Vandenberg and told him of my reaction. In response he gave me a full briefing on the facts that had not been revealed outside the two committees. His briefing left no question in my mind as to the necessity for the legislation. I remarked that it was a shame that the Senate legislated so much in secrecy. He agreed.

Those of us who sat beside and talked with Senator Vandenberg during his last few months in Washington knew of the pain that he was enduring. We knew not because of what he said, because he never complained, but rather because of what we could read in his face and the way in which he walked to his seat. He could not conceal the strain.

He was silently carrying not only his own physical pain but the sadness of seeing his wife pass away last June. But his grief over his wife and his pain did not deter him. He saw the North Atlantic Treaty ratified and the military assistance program passed before he gave in to the doctors. He carried a tumor in his left lung for over a year before submitting to surgery. He just didn't have time to take care of himself. He couldn't take out time from his consecrated service to his country, to his people, and to the peace of the world.

We have often heard national leaders called war casualties in as full a sense of the word as soldiers who died on the battlefield.

Senator Arthur Vandenberg was a casualty of peace—not war—as he literally gave his life to his country on the floor of the United States Senate. To those who condemned him fuzzy-minded internationalist, I suggest that they now pause and ask themselves if they have done as much for their country and for peace as Arthur Vandenberg and if they are willing to give their lives as he did.

Television: How Can the Public Interest Best Be Served?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Television: How Can the Public Interest Best Be Served? delivered by me at the opening session of the Twenty-first Institute for Education by Radio-Television, May 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEVISION: HOW CAN THE PUBLIC INTEREST BEST BE SERVED?

(Following is the text of the address delivered by Senator BENTON at the opening session of the Twenty-first Institute for Education by Radio-Television, May 3, 1951. Although the institute met in Columbus, Ohio, Senator BENTON spoke by closed-circuit wire from New York, where he stopped en route from Washington to New London, Conn., on his way to represent the Senate at the annual visitation day at that U. S. Coast Guard Academy.)

Mr. Chairman and my friends in educational broadcasting, I want to congratulate Keith Tyler on the steady growth of this institute, which is almost as old as radio, and yet as young as television. I'm grateful to Keith for letting me talk to you out of a loudspeaker—though possibly you won't be—instead of face to face. I would be in Columbus tonight were it not that tomorrow is the annual Day of Visitation when I must represent the United States Senate at the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn.

I interrupted my journey from Washington to New London to tell you that today you can be one of the most important groups in the United States. Except for those who are responsible for the formulation of our foreign policy, I don't know any group which could have a greater impact on our country's future. You are tonight poised on the threshold of a great new mansion for the human mind. I want to encourage you to cross it boldly.

I don't need to tell this institute about the power of television, or about its potentialities for education. That would be carrying coals to Columbus—or perhaps I should say, carrying coaxial cables. I wish Congress understood it as well as you do.

The figures are startling—indeed, terrifying: TV receivers up from 7,000 on VJ-day to over 11,000,000 today; that total likely to be doubled in the next 5 years. The number of stations potentially multiplying tenfold by 1956. One hundred million man-hours a day—and woman-hours and boy-and-girl-hours—already devoted to the TV screen. Reading slumping in TV homes. A survey in Stamford, not far from where I live, showing that children spend as much time watching television as they spend in school.

For most of us, a single revealing experience often gives us greater insight than a deluge of figures and syllogisms. I had such an experience with radio in the spring of 1929 in Chicago. I had thought I knew something about radio. I had used radio in behalf of Palmolive and other advertising clients. Then one warm evening, as I walked home from work, I heard the full Amos 'n Andy program through open windows, as I paced block after block through the near north side. It was before the Hooper ratings, so I made my own rating: 13 homes out of 17 tuned to Amos 'n Andy. That was a revelation. I spent the next 8 years doing something about it, for my own profit and the profit of my clients.

My television revelation didn't come until March of this year—until Senator KEFAUVER's committee hearings were televised.

As chairman of an educational-film company, Encyclopedia Britannica Films, I had, of course, been keeping a watchful eye on television's rise. But the full realization of what television might do as a servant of society came only with KEFAUVER. For me—and, indeed, for most Americans—the television age can henceforward be divided into two eras—BK and AK—before and after KEFAUVER.

Not long after those hearings closed, I was dining in Washington with Paul Hoffman and Robert Hutchins, of the Ford Foundation. We agreed that the greatest finding of the KEFAUVER committee was not that they exposed crime but that they revealed television. Out of that discussion came my decision to call for an immediate Senate study of the role the Federal Government ought to play in developing what Professor Siepmann calls this explosive new instrument—this instrument which can transform and uplift human relations.

Technically, the problem is a single problem. It is the theme of this year's institute: How Can the Public Interest Best Be Served? I shall discuss it in two major parts. Let me first discuss education's own TV stations.

In March the Federal Communications Commission made tentative channel allocations for 209 educational stations. These allocations represented about 17 percent of the hitherto unassigned VHF channels, and somewhat less than 10 percent of the more speculative UHF channels. It took both enlightenment and courage on the part of the FCC to make these educational assignments. The pressures on that agency are immense. But I want particularly to congratulate those of you in Columbus tonight, who, with no prospect of reward other than the satisfaction of doing an important job, banded together to make education's case before the FCC—those who took part in "operation education."

Many educators feel they didn't get all the channels they will need, and I'm not at all sure they asked for enough. In my State, for example, there is only one educational reservation—that one in the ultra-high-frequency range—assigned to Storrs, the seat of the University of Connecticut. I'm told that five of the eight counties in Connecticut will be unable to get the signal from that station, if the station materializes, and that not all parts of the other three counties will get it. Similarly our neighbor, Massachusetts—Massachusetts which is nearly as famous as Connecticut for its educational achievements—has only one educational reservation. We won't be able to elevate the level of Massachusetts, and they can't try to elevate us. New Jersey, the home of Princeton and Rutgers, has no educational reservations. There isn't going to be much ivy on those new transmitters.

Education is slow to adopt innovations. There's no profit-prod toward moving fast. Professor Thorndike once showed that 20 to 30 years elapse between the introduction of a new idea in education and its widespread adoption. Indeed, it has taken us a hundred years to reach our present percentage of secondary school enrollment. This time we aren't going to have a hundred years, or even 30 years. We must start now—this year—this month.

Two taunts are hurled today at the hopeful television educators. One is, "Look what happened to education's AM radio frequencies. Most of them were abandoned." The other is, "Where is the money coming from?"

I do not accept the analogy between radio and TV. Television isn't just a cousin of radio. It is sui generis—a new species. And it is uniquely adapted to education. It adds sight and motion to sound, but it does more than that. As John Crosby points out, television has five times the impact of radio—I believe he used the word "wallop"—but it also requires five times the attention. Attention is indispensable to education. Television can demand it, and grip it as radio never could.

And where is the money coming from? Here I must declare my faith in the American people. They believe in education. They have fought for it. They spend perhaps $5,000,000,000 a year for it today. Once they have been shown the power of educational television, I cannot believe they will deny it to themselves or to their children.

We can all of us be heartened by the fact that in the past several months three foundations have made grants for educational radio and television totaling over a million dollars. This, of course, is "seed-money."

Several State legislatures already have before them appropriation requests in support of educational TV stations. There will be more, as you here make your voices heard. And should not Congress now consider the idea of providing matching grants-in-aid for educational stations, since the national interest is so deeply involved?

I have myself been deeply interested in the idea of subscription radio and subscription television. This idea has tremendous promise, across the whole range of broadcasting. It could provide, within the American concept of broadcasting, an alternative to and a competitor with the system of exclusive reliance on advertising revenue. Whether the subscription technique could be developed as one means of financing educational stations I do not know. It is a possibility eminently worth exploring. One of my former associates at the University of Chicago has advanced the novel idea that colleges and universities might finance their TV stations by televising their football games on a subscription basis. That is a remarkable suggestion to emerge from the University of Chicago, where the football stadium has been converted into an atom laboratory. Imagine football profits being used to finance education rather than baseball, swimming, or track.

Let me turn now from education's own efforts in television to the second major issue: the educational and public service programing done by commercial stations. We don't have to dwell on the depressing history of radio. Let us look not at radio's past but at television's present. One of the most telling exhibits the educators presented to the FCC in January, in making their case for educational stations, was the monitoring study on New York's seven TV stations, covering 1 week earlier that month, made by Professors Horton and Smythe. They found that only 4 percent of the week's programs were what they called informational; of these only one was identified as a genuinely instructional program. As for the evening hours between 7 and 11, they found—and I like this language—that a "clear majority of the time was devoted to entertainment programs with relatively low or perhaps negative survival value for the individual viewer or for society." Fifty-five percent of this evening time was devoted to wild West drama, crime, drama, sports, quizzes, stunts, and contests.

Professor Seipmann has written—foreboadingly—"We may now be witnessing a peak in television's service to a variety of tastes." I suggest that he get together and compare notes with Professors Smythe and Horton. I have great admiration for the creative talent of commercial broadcasters. But I fear that this talent may be channelled, in television as in radio, into a limited number of stereotyped but salable program formats. And I ask, are there any steps which the people of the United States, acting through the Congress, might now take to divert at least a fraction of that talent into the development of genuinely educational programs carried by the commercial system? Should the Congress now lay out clearer guide lines for the Federal Communications Commission? Can we afford to waste as much time and talent on trivia in television as we have in radio? Can we lay down new guide lines without limiting essential freedom? I pose these questions as worthy of the highest consideration by Congress in terms of the challenge of the television age.

I have framed my Senate resolution so that it invites study by the Senate of such specific issues as the following among others:

1. Should the Communications Act of 1934, which was drawn for radio and not for television, now be amended to spell out the meaning of the phrase, "public interest, convenience, and necessity," particularly with respect to education?

2. Under such a clarification should the act require licensees to devote a portion of their best hours to education?

3. Should the act require, rather than merely authorize, the FCC not to renew the licenses of those who fail to live up to the promises in their applications?

4. Should Congress create an education division within the FCC, or perhaps a national commission advisory to the FCC, to strengthen the hands of that agency and help it gage the educational promises and performance of licensees?

The FCC already has broad powers. But, in view of the pressures it must cope with daily, it cannot be expected to exercise those powers vigorously in behalf of education without renewed support and guidance by the Congress, whose instrumentality it is. The issues are too big, too important, to be left wholly in the hands of a single agency, no matter how competent it may be.

My message to this institute tonight is this: You here have taken the first step—the first of many steps—toward the realization of television's great educational mission. The leadership in the next step—and the next step after that—must continue to come from you. There is no one else who can give it. Only you—as you are inspired by what you are already doing—only you can lead. That means you must learn to be publicists, and promoters, and politicians, as well as educators. It means you must go to work on your trustees, and your school boards, on your State legislatures and your Congress. I and many others can and will help. I wish you would write me your views; or better yet, write to your own Senators, or to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. But it is you who must lead.

Israel's Struggle: A World Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Israel's Struggle: A World Example, delivered by me at a luncheon meeting of Hadassah, New Mexico Chapter, at Albuquerque, N. Mex., on May 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL'S STRUGGLE: A WORLD EXAMPLE

(By Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ)

Before expressing myself on the subject for today's discussion, I should like to make a comment as your Senator about the work of Hadassah in relation to my work in Washington.

I am particularly and keenly aware of the work of your membership acting on its responsibilities as American citizens. It so happens that one of my major assignments in Washington concerns all matters relating to social-security and public-health appropriations. I have found Hadassah in the forefront supporting the extension of social-security benefits and in working for a public-health program. Your membership certainly did a great deal to obtain the passage of the Displaced Persons Act, and I, for one, am most grateful that your membership has always been alert and informed on all civil-rights legislation. Had other groups shown the same intelligent militancy as did Hadassah, back in the Seventy-ninth Congress, we would have had more liberal legislation and poll taxing and lynching would be violations of Federal statutes today.

It is important that Hadassah, no matter how demanding and absorbing the Israel problem is, never diminishes its ardent work in behalf of a better America. You are unique in the fact that you pursue this dual program of activity, and there is no group to take your place in either arena.

Volumes of statistics have been compiled to tell the astonishing progress of Israel in the past few years. Every fact and figure has been marshaled to show how much is being done, but I feel that all of these facts and figures fail to tell the real story. The engineering, the finance, the trade and housing, and agriculture don't explain what has happened nor why. The key to Israel's success—and it is a success—is the human element.

For 80 generations the children of Israel wandered in exile. For 80 generations the yearning and the hope refused to be extinguished. And for 80 generations these wanderers kept alive their quest for their homeland. The great urge to return and reclaim their country was not religious alone—it was a national urge, and it maintained itself in an organized, determined fashion. The orthodoxy of the Hebrew community was not only a way of worshiping God; it was also a discipline to retain political solidarity and preserve the identity of the Hebrew in exile. Always there were certain institutions and practices which were retained and resurrected wherever these people happened to wander.

In the long historic quest you ladies of Hadassah represent the final effort in a great chain of events which helped bring about the Israeli Republic of today. I feel that your work, particularly in the educational and welfare field, in the teaching of children and the support of hospitals, has been right in line with the effort which began 80 generations ago. The fact that you have acted as interpreter and bridge between the Zionist pioneers and the people of America has been your unique and special contribution. I feel that you richly deserve the rewards of being a contemporary of Israel, and I too am proud to have been able to help, in a small measure, to assist in that birth.

I say this to you as fellow Americans—members of a common team who battled for a free Israel for similar reasons. I do not believe in hyphenated Americans. On the other hand I do not believe in Americans without heritage. Every American has been able to claim a heritage, and point to the land of his ancestors. This has been the secret of the melting pot.

But the Jewish-American, rich though his heritage may be, was never able to point to one homeland, as could the Irish, Italian, Spanish, Chinese, and Slav. The Jew faced an international problem, he was identified with trouble, and his children were raised with a feeling of insecurity, that of being in some way identified with a pariah. And then, exactly 3 years ago next week, on the 14th of May 1948 came the declaration of a free Israel, and the Jews in this country and every other part of the world were no longer related to a problem, they were related to a land.

I feel that the establishment of a free Israel Republic was essential for several reasons:

First, it was absolutely necessary to solve the problem of world antisemitism. As long as there were Jews who were persecuted and degraded under law as Jews, it was essential that they have their own geographic homeland.

Second, it was essential for those of the Jewish faith, but who were personally and politically identified with the lands where they lived, such as the Jews of France, Brazil, and America, to be able to indicate that they are Americans, or Frenchmen, or Brazilians, not in exile but as a matter of clear choice. The relation of such Jews to Israel was something to be regarded with sentiment and mutual respect but not as a political or territorial relationship;

Third, there were the displaced persons, whose physical existence and mental health could only be succored by the immediate securing of a home—not a refuge, not a haven—but a permanent home where they could live in dignity.

Fourth, the world needed an example, a powerful and revealing demonstration in human relations. This Israel is giving us today.

Much has been said about what Israel means to the Jews. I shall discuss what Israel means to the world.

Israel is an example which we Americans must observe closely. There are lessons to be learned.

It is my prediction that the genius and energy of Israel will set the pattern for the development of backward and impoverished areas the world over. Israel is our pilot plant.

Since the establishment of the sovereign state of Israel, a scant 150 weeks ago, some three-quarters of a million people have been returned to the homeland, doubling the population. In Israel the land under cultivation has increased by 50 percent. Industry has increased by 40 percent. In 3 years over 18,000 new housing units and 20 agricultural settlements have been set up. Israel inaugurated an airline engaged in internal and international operations. Merchant ships flying the White Star of David are seen in all parts of the world. Israelis will soon be traveling around their country on domestically made motorcycles. The men will be shaving with home-produced razor blades. New methods of refrigeration, radio manufacturing, and even an iron lung will shortly carry the words "Made in Israel."

And to make the difficult task touch on the impossible, all this has taken place while Israel has been in a state of semisiege, surrounded as she is by hostile neighbors.

In this unprecedented development we have the perfect pattern for our own point 4 program. If Israel can go through a 30-years' development in 3, why can't a similar program be undertaken in other lands? I understand that a great deal of interest is being shown by Puerto Rico in Israel's development, since the problems of the two countries are not dissimilar.

Incidentally, the wife of the Governor of Puerto Rico, Senora Marin, is an honorary member of the Hadassah in San Juan.

We have heard Israel's development belittled because it depends on capital and equipment from other countries. If we try to concentrate the development of centuries into 3 years, then it is necessary that enough capital to finance the development be imported to make up for the fact that no new nation in all of history ever had savings to draw on.

The United States of America was a debtor country until 1914. It financed its development by borrowing. This is a simple principle of common sense, which applies to all walks of life. The Israelis are ready to lift themselves by their own bootstraps. The only thing that they ask us to do is to lend them the bootstraps.

For this reason, I wish every success to the half-billion-dollar-bond drive which the Israel Government launched in the United States on May 1. These bonds are an important investment from an international point of view, for on them will depend the strength of democracy's beachhead in the Middle East. It is obvious that a free, strong and prosperous Israel is the greatest bulwark we can have against communism in that most strategic area of the world.

In the great battle of today, the lines are drawn between the "haves" and "have-nots." Unless the free world finds a dynamic way of lifting the world from feudalism, the Communist will surely march forward, carried on the wave of their false ideology. This is why Israel's struggle is so important to us. If, there, in the land where the prophets once walked, a bulwark of democracy can be constructed, the cause of freedom and civilization will be furthered.

That this will be, I have no doubt.

The new Republic proclaimed to the world that the "State of Israel will be open to immigration of Jews from all the countries of their dispersion; will promote the development of the country for the benefit of all the inhabitants; will be based upon the principles of liberty, justice and peace; will uphold the social and political equality of all its citizens without distinction of religion, race or sex; will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience and culture; will safeguard the holy places of all religions and will loyally uphold the principles of the United Nations charter."

These principles can never perish.

Far Eastern Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter entitled "Path to Victory," written to the editor of the Cornell Sun by a freshman at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

I call this letter to the attention of Senators because of the great force of the truth and common sense which it contains.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATH TO VICTORY

After reading the editorial in Friday's Sun on General MacArthur, I think it is time something sensible was said about his far-eastern strategy. Why do I think so? First, let me assure you that it is not because I follow the Republican Party. It is because, like every other American my age, I may find myself in Korea some day soon. And when I do, I don't want to be fighting the one-sided war that's being fought today.

I don't want to be fighting an enemy that is free at any time to step over an imaginary barrier into the untouchable zone of safety north of the thirty-eighth parallel. I don't want to sit there knowing that our supposed allies, especially Britain and France, are freely trading with our enemies, supplying them with the means and sinews of war while Washington kowtows to their wishes. I don't want to fight knowing that enemy factories and installations just to the north cannot even be looked at, and that the thousands of Nationalist Chinese troops ready to open a badly needed second front are unable to do so. Nor does enacting these policies mean total war as Mr. Truman claims, but rather a speedier and more decisive end to the present war.

The very fact that our casualties in Korea have been greater than they were during the first 14 months of World War II proves that this war is a real one, and not at all limited. Also while one rarely hears of any of our planes being shot down in Korea, we have nevertheless lost more planes to enemy fire in this so-called police action than we lost in a similar period at the start of World War II. And while everyone, even the Truman-Acheson contingent, would like to see the end of this war, I do not think it is in sight as long as our enemies receive aid from our allies while we erect neither an economic nor a naval blockade. I do not think an end is possible while our enemy is able to rain his hordes upon us unhindered by a second front undertaken by the Chinese Nationalists. Nor is it possible while our enemy remains invisible behind the thirty-eighth parallel.

There are only three alternatives open to us. The first is to remain in Korea, fighting as we are today. The second is to withdraw entirely. The third is to follow the advice of the world's foremost expert on far-eastern affairs, General MacArthur. To stay in Korea means to continue fighting an extremely costly war, with America obviously holding the short end of the stick. To withdraw is to leave the aggressor victorious. The path to victory lies in the adoption of MacArthur's four-point policy.

The United States Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I spent Friday, May 4, in New London, Conn., at the Coast Guard Academy on the official visitation day for Congress, as a representative of the United States Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of my letter to Secretary John Snyder expressing the appreciation of Representatives MCGUIRE, MORANO, and myself of the hospitality accorded us. It also contains some suggestions for review of academic policy affecting the Academy. A copy of this letter has been sent to General Marshall, because the same suggestions apply to the Military and Naval Academies.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
May 10, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Last Friday I spent the day at the Coast Guard Academy in New London. This was official visitation day for the group selected by the Congress. I attended representing the Senate and Congressmen JOHN MCGUIRE and ALBERT MORANO attended representing the House of Representatives.

We had a most interesting day. Indeed I cannot remember a day that was personally more interesting to me since I entered the Senate. The three of us join in telling you what a creditable institution we feel the Coast Guard Academy to be, and what a great credit and asset it is to our State of Connecticut. Admiral Arthur B. Hall, Superintendent of the Academy, together with Captain Roland and other members of his staff in New London, gave us a warm welcome. The cadets put on a great show. Indeed, for me the day could be called a "dream day" of a retired private—a private of World War I—the dream day comes true in middle life, with the admirals in attendance and a parade in his honor.

This letter is to convey to you and your associates the appreciation of Congressmen MCGUIRE, MORANO, and myself, and our congratulations.

Speaking personally, and as a trustee of one of America's great universities, and one of America's leading colleges, I have the following comments which I have transmitted orally to Admiral Hall. I was not able to discuss these views with Congressman MCGUIRE and Congressman MORANO. These comments come out of my long and deep interest in education. Perhaps you know that I served for 9 years as a part time officer of the University of Chicago, which is 50 percent longer than I served as an officer of the advertising firm I founded in New York with Chester Bowles.

The service academies and notably West Point, are widely criticized among informed academic people for their low scholastic standards. They are accused of grevious inbreeding and of scholastic standards far, far below the college standards with which they ought to be compared.

I have no first-hand knowledge of the standards of the Coast Guard Academy, in comparison let me say with the California Institute of Technology or MIT—as technical schools—or with nearby Williams or Wesleyan in the fields of liberal arts. But at a glance I question whether the faculty is not overloaded with officers who are not trained as teachers, and whether the staff is not deficient in the number of teachers who have received the best available advance instruction at the leading universities of the country.

I personally would recommend that a special consulting committee of educators be set up to consult with the Academy on the improvement of its academic standards. With the deepening crisis, and the increasing need for the most highly trained technical personnel in the Coast Guard, as well as in every branch of military service, I would, of course, like to see the question of academic standards reviewed—not only for the Coast Guard Academy—but for West Point and Annapolis as well. This subject is a matter of highest national import. I am consequently sending a copy of this letter to General Marshall so that, through his aides, my suggestion may be reviewed, and, I hope, applied to the Military and Naval Academies.

May I also suggest that this would be an excellent time to review the methods and procedures of selection of the boys who apply for the Academy? One of the young men who is graduating, with whom I had lunch, told me that of his entering class of 150 only 57 were graduating. Later Captain Roland told me that over the years the average percentage of graduates, in contrast to the number entering, ran about 48 percent.

Captain Roland says that something like 10 percent of the entering class drop out in the first 90 days. I would gather that perhaps as many as 33⅓ percent are dropped out by the authorities because they fail to

measure up to the high standards maintained by the Academy. Most of these failures seem to come in the second year, after considerable cost to the Academy and the taxpayers, and many failures are students who quit trying because they don't want to continue.

It is a costly as well as interesting fact that over half of the young men who are selected either discover that they do not like the service, and do not want to adjust themselves to the rigorous discipline and the life, or else are unable to do so.

Now, the 150 boys who entered the present graduating class of 57, were chosen from a group of applicants numbering 700. Yet for the coming year, when I understand that 200 are to be chosen, the applicants number almost 10 times as many—over 6,000. Surely when 200 boys are to be selected out of a group as large as 6,000—there must be techniques for selection which could increase, if not immediately, at least gradually over the years, as better and better techniques evolve—which could increase the percentage of young men who prove satisfactory and who finish their 4-year course and then carve out their careers in the Coast Guard, careers in the Coast Guard, careers with which they are happy and of which they are proud.

At the University of Chicago and elsewhere many scholars have devoted their lives to the development of criteria for the selection of young men showing aptitude and promise for varying kinds of activities in adult life. I know that much is known about this by the armed services, and undoubtedly by the personnel division of the Coast Guard. I now suggest that this is an excellent time once more to review the matter. Surely there never was such an opportunity as now, with young men of great talent and promise eagerly seeking entrance to our three Academies—in far greater numbers than ever before.

Again expressing the appreciation of Congressman McGuire, Congressman Morano, and myself for the splendid reception and hospitality shown us at the Coast Guard Academy, I am

Very sincerely yours,

William Benton,
United States Senate.

Public-Opinion Poll, First Congressional District, West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of March, I conducted a public-opinion poll in the First Congressional District. When I was considering such a poll, I had my staff discuss technique and methods with officials of the Bureau of the Census, whom I consider very expert in sampling. We are all familiar with the accuracy with which the Bureau is able to predict population and retail sales trends through its periodic samplings.

I want to emphasize, however, that the discussions with Bureau officials were strictly informal. I merely sought guidance. I believe procedure recommended was followed to the letter. The poll, however, is my own.

Twenty-six hundred questionnaires were mailed out; one to each sixtieth name appearing on the voting list. Thus the sampling was confined to bona fide adult residents of the district. We made a special check, using Hancock County as a guinea pig, and found that by selecting every sixtieth name from each precinct list, we achieved the proper balance between Democrats and Republicans, according to the ratios in effect prior to last fall's election.

The response to the poll was excellent; far better than we expected. We had about 1 percent of the questionnaires returned by the postal service as not deliverable or forwardable. We enclosed self-addressed return envelopes to facilitate replies. We achieved approximately a three-fourths return.

Of the returns coming in, about three-fourths contained comment. This comment was extremely interesting and it varied. At one extreme was a blank questionnaire, upon which had been inscribed: "Anything you do is all right with me." At the other extreme was the comment: "If Francis Love had been elected everything would be all right."

Mr. Love, a former Member of the House in the Eightieth Congress, was my Republican opponent last fall.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the results of my poll as a part of these remarks. I hope my colleagues find these results as interesting and enlightening as I did. I called attention to early returns on universal military training and drafting of 18-year-olds when the military manpower bill was under consideration in the House last month. It will be noted that the trend has remained unchanged, now that we have completed final tabulations.

I am listing the results of the poll in terms of percentages, since I believe the value of such a poll is in establishing a trend, and for this purpose percentages are superior to mere enumeration.

Some of the trends require a word or two of explanation. For instance question 2 (B) shows 35 percent no comment. Many of those who answered question 2 (A), "Do you favor the drafting of 18-year-olds?" did not answer the question relating to draft of veterans and fathers. Since many constituents indicated either a "yes" or "no" to both, when an answer was not indicated for either, we tabulated it under "no opinion."

The vote on sending troops to Europe also requires explanation. On the questionnaire it is listed as "Send troops to Europe without congressional consent." A number of voters indicated "yes" but scratched "out," so the proposition would read "Send troops to Europe with congressional consent." Such answers were tabulated as "no" answers since I wanted to determine not only the thinking relative to sending troops to Europe, but also relative to the issue of congressional consent.

Actually, then, considerably more than 67 percent of the voters of the congressional district favor sending troops to Europe, but only 67 percent agree that congressional consent is either not required, under the constitution, or not advisable.

Question 7: "Do you favor a national health plan, under which the Federal Government would aid in building hospitals and educating an increased number of doctors" found favor with 57 percent of the voters of the First Congressional District. Admittedly, it was a question on only two phases of the administration's health program. The proposal for national health insurance was purposely omitted. This proposal was a major issue in my campaign for reelection. The Republican opposition, as well as segments of the medical profession, and some pharmacists hit—and hit hard—my support for national health insurance. I met the issue head-on; spoke in its favor on several occasions, and answered the last-minute, desperate arguments by newspaper advertising and radio broadcasts. I was reelected. Therefore, I feel that I know the trend on national health insurance. The other two phases were sidetracked during the campaign, and I took this opportunity to canvass sentiment.

Question 10: "Do you favor the use of the atomic bomb against the Chinese Communists?" Fifty-three percent of the voters say "Yes" and 38 percent say "No." This bare tabulation, however, is not a complete picture. About half those answering "Yes," qualified their answer with a notation "if absolutely necessary," or "if the military say so." On the other hand, about the same proportion of the "No" answers were also qualified, "unless absolutely necessary" or "unless the military say so." Some of the "if's" and "unlesses" left the decision up to General MacArthur.

I believe, therefore, that the true picture of thinking in the First Congressional District, is to use the atomic bomb against the Chinese Communists only as a last resort.

The question of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was added only to determine if there had been any change of opinion since the November elections as a result of the two stoppage of work in the railroad industry. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley was a part of my campaign platform in 1948 and 1950. This poll shows that the majority in the first district remain opposed to this law.

Mr. Speaker, this sampling of opinion is a new venture for me. Like my colleagues who have conducted polls in the past, I find it a refreshing experience. It met with favor. While tabulation of the individual comments was impossible, a very great many were prefaced with praise for the project as democracy in action. With the success of this effort, I intend to conduct other samplings as grave and important issues are presented. I feel, too, that the technique of using the voting lists presents a true cross section, with the sampling getting the proper ratio as to political affiliation, occupation, and economic status.

Results of poll, First Congressional District, West Virginia

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
1. Do you believe full wartime mobilization is necessary at this time?	88	35	7
2. Do you favor the drafting of—			
(A) 18-year-olds?	74	21	5
or			
(B) Veterans and fathers?	15	50	35
3. Do you favor universal military training?	81	15	4
4. Do you believe the withdrawal of our troops from Korea would leave Japan, the Philippines and Hawaii open to attack by Russia?	67	28	5
5. In defense of Western Europe, do you favor—			
(A) General Eisenhower's plan—Send troops to Europe without congressional consent?	67	29	4
or			
(B) Hoover plan (so-called)—Have the United States give up its bases in Europe and north Africa and try to defend our country from its own shores?	16	55	29
6. If war comes with Russia would you prefer that the United States—			
(A) Fight on its own shores?	12	50	38
or			
(B) Fight as far away as we can sustain troops?	84	8	8
7. Do you favor a national health plan, under which the Federal Government would aid in building hospitals and educating an increased number of doctors?	57	40	3
8. Do you favor heavy Federal taxes as a device to prevent inflation?	45	51	4
9. Do you believe that price and wage controls are necessary to assure a decent standard of living?	63	32	5
10. Do you favor the use of the atomic bomb against the Chinese Communists?	53	38	9
11. Do you favor, as an aid in fighting Communist aggression—			
(A) Rearming Western Germany?	71	17	12
(B) Rearming Japan?	65	19	16
12. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	64	33	3
13. Do you favor repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?	52	41	7

Regulation of Migratory Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Chavez' Pounding Improves Senate Bill of Regulating Migratory Labor," by Thomas L. Stokes, published on May 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chavez' Pounding Improves Senate's Bill of Regulating Migratory Labor

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Washington, May 9.—The Senate has made a start toward coping with a recently widely publicized human problem directly affecting the South, Southwest, and West, but also spreading its harmful effects into our whole economy since a cancerous condition in any area ramifies ultimately to others.

This is the problem of migratory farm labor, consisting of importees, legally and illegally coming in from Mexico, and native agricultural workers—"stoop labor"—who year after year follow the crops northward from the South with the seasons. These wanderers were portrayed graphically several years ago, in depression times, in "Grapes of Wrath," by John Steinbeck, who showed how they were exploited. They still are—Mexican and American.

The problem still exists. It is not solved by the bill sponsored by Senator Ellender, Democrat, Louisiana, and passed this week in the Upper House. That measure regularizes the traffic in farm workers; it does not tackle the underlying human, social, and economic evils involved, and is not the satisfactory answer.

However, it is much better than the original Ellender bill. That is due chiefly to Senator Chavez, Democrat, New Mexico, who pounded away ceaselessly and got inserted some provisions from his more comprehensive measure drafted along lines recommended by the President's commission on migratory labor and against opposition of powerful big agricultural interests of his State. He had the assistance of a group, including Senators Douglas, Democrat, Illinois; Humphrey, Democrat, Minnesota; and Lehman, Democrat, New York.

HOUSE BILL PENDS

The fight now moves to the House where there is pending before the Rules Committee, for the go-ahead signal for House action, a measure sponsored by Representative Poage (Democrat, Texas), similar to the original Ellender bill. Any attempt to broaden it into a really effective measure will be stoutly resisted by the powerful southern bloc in the House which, like its counterpart in the Senate, is solicitous of big farming interests which utilize this labor and want it as cheap as possible.

The bill has been labeled the wetback bill, a handy designation because it seeks, among other aims, to stop illegal entry of Mexican farm workers who figuratively swim the Rio Grande. The bill gets at this problem by tightening enforcement machinery and imposing penalties on farmers who use illegal entrants. The penalty provisions, not included in the original Ellender bill though in a separate measure of his now before the Judiciary Committee, were added at the instance of Senator Douglas.

The wetback tag is somewhat unfortunate. For the problem goes far beyond that. The competition of Mexican labor, both illegal and legal—the latter brought in under regulations—affects thousands and thousands of native farm workers. Because of the low-wage standard for the Mexican labor competitors, they roam far beyond their homes and travel to the North for months at a time to get better wages paid there.

AIMS OF CHAVEZ

It was the objective of the President's Commission, embodied in the Chavez bill, to provide means to study the whole problem, find out labor needs, determine how far they could be met by local native labor, reduce importations where possible, and stabilize employment by decent pay that would keep labor in its own home area. Another aim, too, would be to improve conditions, sometimes ghastly, under which some of the Mexican immigrants live. For these purposes Senator Chavez proposed a national farm labor board, which, however, was rejected by the Senate.

The southern bloc was defeated in an effort to have labor recruitment under control of State directors—a State's right project obviously favoring local interests with large political influence. Instead it was put under the Secretary of Labor here in Washington. The Southerners, however, did succeed in restricting reception centers to the border and under such cost allowances as to favor southern farmers. Senator Cordon (Republican, Oregon) was defeated in an effort to provide reception centers in other areas to facilitate movement of labor to meet their needs.

The bill is limited to Mexican labor. Attempts failed to apply the standards prescribed to imported labor from other countries in the Western Hemisphere, now arranged by diplomatic agreements.

Contribution of the Farm Credit Administration to Land Tenure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address on the subject Contribution of the Farm Credit Administration to Land Tenure, by I. W. Duggan, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, at Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, on January 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Contribution of the Farm Credit Administration to Land Tenure

(By I. W. Duggan)

I think that it is well that you are, this week, taking a critical look at land tenure in the Southern States. The problems of land tenure are nothing new. In fact, they are of very long standing. I would like to quote from a paper I prepared in 1936. The title happens to be "Cotton, Land, and People: A Statement of the Problem." In fact, I stated the problem rather than trying to answer it.

"Probably one of the most discussed problems in the South is the high rate of farm tenancy. It seems to me, however, that the South's system of tenure, or cropping system, and the credit system have grown up together and are so closely entwined that it is difficult to deal with any one of these problems separately.

"Sharecropping dates back to the War Between the States and is an outgrowth of the conditions following the emancipation of the slaves. The planter had possession of the land, tools, and in many cases, equipment, but no money with which to employ labor. The laborer had no money with which to acquire land, tools, or equipment, or to finance his operations, and was unskilled in any occupation except agriculture. Out of this situation grew the sharecropper-tenant system as we have it today. The need for credit to finance crops made it essential that crops be grown for which there was a ready cash market. Cotton was a natural answer to the cash crop problem.

"The high rate of farm tenancy in the South is too well known to you to require much discussion. It will be sufficient to remind you that 40 percent of all the farmers

in the 10 States are tenants or sharecroppers. The percentages range from 47 in North Carolina to 70 in Mississippi. Despite the heavy Negro farm population, there are 40 percent more white than Negro tenants in the South. Tenancy has shown a steady increase, even during the relatively prosperous years of the twenties. In the State of Oklahoma, for example, which started about 60 years ago as free land to all who would homestead it, we find today that 61 percent of the farmers are tenants. On the average, about 40 percent of the tenants in the South move every year, and over half move every 2 years.

"The credit system of the South with high interest rates has contributed to the tenancy problem. However, providing lower-interest credit alone will not solve this problem. If the income from the farm is not sufficient to pay back the principal, a low-interest rate in itself would not bring about farm ownership. The press of a dense farm population for land tends to lead to the overcapitalization of land values and retards operator ownership."

In dealing with land tenure in the Southern States, one of the first problems we must face is the question of a dense farm population pressing against limited resources. There just is not enough total farm income in the South to support its dense farm population. The average per capita earnings of rural people is unbelievably small. "There is no hope of correcting these ills through the redistribution of the available income, because that income is so small and so inadequate that even if it were redistributed there still would not be enough to go around. The first problem is to increase the total income going to the South so there will be more to divide among its dense farm population." Progress has been and is being made.

However, the cropland per capita of farm population in the South is far too small. In that same paper, back in 1939, I pointed out that in 5 of the 10 States, there were only about 6 acres of cropland per person on farms. The cropland was only about 80-85 percent as productive as the United States average. With that problem it is very difficult to move into a solution of the others.

While improving, the opportunities for farm people to find employment in industry are far too limited. Most of the South does not have industry or the opportunity for off-the-farm employment in proportion to the population equal to other areas. It is important to solve the off-the-farm employment problem in order to increase farm ownership. Two out three farm families who have gotten to own their land or farms have gotten some part of the money from savings they made from off-the-farm jobs. The problem that has to be recognized by this group and brought to the attention of the leaders in your community and State is the importance of having industries developed. And we can develop many industries in the South and raise the standard of living in the South without hurting any other area of the country because there is an opportunity to increase consumption of goods right here in the South if we can get production and distribution of all types.

We also have to recognize that farms change hands every generation. We find in farm credit that a large percentage of the original land-bank borrowers are not the ones who finally pay off the long-term-mortgage loans. This is because the farm frequently goes into other hands during the period of a 34-year-mortgage loan.

Our American family size farm is the cornerstone of democracy; in fact, of the free-enterprise system. It is on the family owned farm that our people develop initiative, self-reliance, and independence. Their habits of work have helped us immeasurably in the battle of production on the farm and in our factories as well. Their self-reliance developed on the farm has been important on the battlefield where our soldiers, sailors, and marines are having to fight so hard. As you know we are fighting a cold, and at times a hot war, to defend the right of individual ownership. The individual family farm is the mudsill of our democracy. If it rots, so does democracy. If we lose the mudsill—if it rots into communism or any other ism—then we lose democracy.

It is becoming, in some ways, much more difficult for young people to acquire farm ownership. To be economic units that will raise the standard of living, farms have to be larger. We are going into mechanization. It is well that we are making progress now throughout the South in increasing the size and efficiency of our farms. It is well that we are doing it more rapidly during the time when we have opportunities in industry for full employment. The increasing mechanization and increasing size of farms require larger capital investments. The average age at which farmers acquire ownership of farms is older than it was a few years ago even when there are mortgages on the farms. It takes much longer even with a few high-income years to accumulate adequate funds with which to make a big down payment.

In New York State a study was made of a group of farms in 1907, 1917, 1927, 1937, and 1947. The study started with approximately 200 farms and ended with about 70. The acres operated had gone from 132 to 191 acres; the number of cows from 11 up to 25. The study showed that the capital per family-size farm required in 1907 for land, buildings, livestock, and equipment $6,365. In 1947 the capital was $23,141. That's four times as much capital required in 1947 as in 1907. The study also showed that receipts from these farms had gone up nine time from $1,495 per farm to $12,722. Receipts have gone up faster than capital investment. Expenses for farms have gone up from $657 to $9,243—14 times. Yes; farming today is a bigger business and more profitable. Farming has always been a gamble and stakes are higher than they ever were 10 or 40 years ago. Money can be made faster on a farm today, and a farmer can lose his shirt faster. If these farmers lost their cash operating expenses every year, they could go 9.7 years in 1907 before they would lose all of their capital investment; in 1917, 7 years; in 1927, 5 years; in 1937, 4.1 years; and in 1947, 2.5 years. Total cash operating expenses are more important today in proportion to total investment than they have ever been. Higher operating costs have changed our whole credit picture for farm real estate. In 1907 if a man owned his farm debt free, he could get what little money he needed for operating expenses by borrowing against his land. A man may own his farm debt-free today and in 2½ years lose it by losing his cash operating expenses. This raises serious problems with respect to land tenure.

We are developing another period of land inflation. There is pressure from groups of people to buy farms around cities. Workers want to get away from the city to do part-time farming to supplement their incomes or lower their cost of living. And they're buying poor land at inflated prices. Then there's the group of people who'd like to get away from the congested cities to enjoy life, etc. They're buying the better farms at inflated prices. Another group wants to get away from the possibility of being bombed out. They're moving out of the cities and also buying the better farms at inflated prices. Then we have the group of people who have accumulated some funds and want to invest in real estate. They're interested in buying land for an investment. I was at Auburn sometime during last winter. The secretary of the farm loan association there reported that he'd had more inquiries from people wanting to buy land than he had had at any time since he has been secretary of the association. There were very few wanting to borrow money—most of them wanted to buy land as investment. As a result, we have land prices going up. In 1920 the index based on the 1912-14 average land values reached a postwar peak and was 177. It was 179 in November 1950.

Inflation and high prices increase the pressure on farmers to raise cotton. Farmers in the South didn't go into cotton originally because they necessarily wanted to. They had to have a cash crop in the beginning. Then with the dense farm population, more productive hours could be put on cotton, tobacco, and truck crops. To keep that population even partially employed they had to produce cotton. With livestock there would have to be larger units and fewer people on farms. It is a problem for other people, as well as agricultural people, to find off-the-farm employment for people who cannot be used on the farm efficiently. We don't want any able-bodied group condemned to a subsistence type of livelihood.

Looking back to farm credit and what we can do, I think you are more or less familiar with it. Farm Credit is composed of farmer-owned cooperative credit units and Government-owned institutions which are serving the cooperative institutions. We have the Federal land-bank system—the oldest unit in the Farm Credit system. There are roughly 13,000 farmers in Alabama who have Federal land-bank loans. Since its organization in 1916, 44,000 farmers in the State have borrowed from the land bank. Today there are 300,000 farmers in the entire United States who are using this system. This is not as many as there could be because many farmers now get credit from other sources such as commercial banks, insurance companies and individuals who almost or actually quit lending during the early 1930's and have now come back pretty heavily into the mortgage lending field.

The 12 land banks and the 1,200 national farm loan associations are wholly owned by farmers. There is not a penny of Government capital now in any of the land banks. All the Government capital has been repaid. It shows that farmers can manage and operate their own credit systems and make a success of them. All we do in Washington is to examine and supervise the land banks and farm loan associations. Our work is somewhat comparable to the work of the Comptroller of the Currency in supervising and examining national banks. The land bank system, of course, sets the pace in making 20- to 34-year loans, on normal agricultural values rather than speculative values. During the depression land bank loans frequently were higher than the actual market prices at that time. In fact in many cases there wasn't a market price. These loans were based on normal agricultural values. Loans are still based on normal agricultural values on the assumption that a loan which is not good for the bank is not good for the borrower; that a loan which is good for the borrower is good for the bank.

There's a field of work for the Farmers Home Administration for farmers who need a Government subsidy because they cannot or haven't reached the stage where they are able to use cooperative credit or other types of commercial credit. In many cases they do not have a large enough down payment to bring the loan down to 65 percent of the normal agricultural value which is the maximum the land banks can loan.

The history of the land banks and farm loan associations has demonstrated that these credit cooperatives are workable; that farmers can work them, manage them, operate them, and capitalize them. The land banks have $260,000,000 of capital and reserves. At the low ratio of 1 to 10 the associations could lend $2,600,000,000 without having to go back to the Government for additional capital. They are in good financial condition

and are able to serve the farmers' needs if land prices can be kept from getting too high. So much for the land bank system.

Now for the production credit system. With 7,200 borrowers in Alabama last year, which is between 3 and 4 percent of the farmers in the State, $13,000,000 in loans were made by eight production credit associations in the State. I am sure you are familiar with this type of production loan. The farmer works out a budget at the beginning of the year in which he asks for the money as he needs it during the year and agrees to repay it as he sells his crops or livestock products. He pays interest on the loan only for the time he is actually using the money which is, on the average, about 6 months. He does not have to pay interest on money which he does not use. On the average, farmers get about four advances and make about four repayments a year on production credit loans. There is about $18,000,000 of Government capital now invested in the PCA's, compared to over $90,000,000 at the peak. So they are rapidly becoming farmer owned, cooperative credit institutions.

The funds production credit associations and the land banks lend are not Government funds at all. The funds they lend are gotten through the sale of bonds and debentures to investors by the intermediate credit banks and the land banks. These bonds and debentures are not guaranteed by the Government. If the issuing banks can't pay them off, the Government has no liability. These banks have always been able to get favorable rates—not as high as the best corporations pay, but not as low as the Government gets its money. Every farmer who gets a loan in Alabama is affected by the interest rates paid by the intermediate credit banks and the land banks.

Sound credit and low interest rates are not enough in themselves to increase farm ownership in the South. They are important and necessary and I think we should have them, but alone they are not going to insure farm ownership of family-size farms. When we have established a definition for an efficient, economic family-size farm, we'll have a better objective in farm credit. If a lender helps a man get located on an uneconomical farm unit, he is going to have to lower the living standards of himself and his family. Then when it comes to the time of recession he'll be disillusioned and the lender will not have done him a service. We must not overlook the fact, however, that the desire for farm ownership must be strong enough so that farm families are willing to cooperate in every way possible to achieve their goal. This cooperation calls for hard work on the part of every member of the family. It frequently means sacrificing the standard of living until the family has built up a farm business and paid off its debts. The need for that spirit of family cooperation holds true just as much today as it ever did, and it will continue to do so in the future. The women probably contribute more to the farm than the men. They are willing to sacrifice and contribute to the productivity of the farm.

Local, State, and Federal agencies can set the rules of the game and help make sure farm credit is available, but in a free democracy none of these agencies can give anyone a farm. The right to own property is the keystone of our democracy and of the free-enterprise system. So long as we have courts to protect this right, we shall always be a free and a great people. That's because the Government guarantees protection of the right to own property. Without this protection the strong and the cunning could take property away from the weak, and they would do it. This key to our democracy was not easily attained and we are not going to give it up easily. Our American family farm has grown and prospered from it. Our democratic system of free enterprise which made this possible is what our Nation is now called upon to defend and to protect.

Norway Gets Its (Home) Guard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Norway Gets Its (Home) Guard Up," written by Nat S. Finney, of the Minneapolis Star editorial-page staff, and published in the Minneapolis Star of recent date. It is an excellent report on the country of Norway. We have often heard the question asked: "Will the countries of Western Europe defend themselves?" The article affords a good answer to that question.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWAY GETS ITS (HOME) GUARD UP

(By Nat S. Finney)

OSLO, NORWAY.—Norway has memories that burn, but none burns more painfully than the memory of what happened to the proud old Hansa city of Bergen on April 9, 1940.

On that day 1,500 German soldiers sneaked into Bergen from the sea and took a city of 165,000—a city that, if you go back far enough, had a Viking tradition of winning its fights.

It is difficult for a visitor from America, a country unfamiliar with the bitter taste of defeat, much less the ignominy of occupation, to grasp the tight-lipped resolve of a strong people who have failed themselves as Norwegians did at Bergen.

But sitting across a plain table at the Oslo home guard barracks from Col. Mons Haukeland, commander of the guard, you get the idea that Norway will fight another invader with the guile of a fox and the spirit of a hedgehog.

A discussion with Colonel Haukeland about the guard leads to the conclusion that Norway has learned how to make this northern country the thorniest rose a conqueror might try to pluck. If the Muscovite tries it he can expect to lose a few fingers in the attempt.

The guard, Colonel Haukeland quickly makes it clear, must not be confused with Norway's regular military forces. Norway has agreed to raise four divisions, to train them along American lines, and to have them ready under General Eisenhower's command. These and other units—sea, air, and land—are the regulars. They are drafted men.

Ranks of the guard—soon it will number 160,000—are filled by volunteers for what amounts to lifetime service.

A man or woman can enlist at 17 or 18 in his or her own community, and serves indefinitely. In quiet times resignation will be considered on 3 months' notice; now the notice time is 1 year. Resignations aren't accepted if the service requires any man who asks to be released.

Experience with enlistments to date is that everyone wants to get in and none wants to get out. The problem is to find more equipment to expand, not more volunteers.

But the differences, not the similarities, between Norway's guard and that of other countries make the organization striking. In many ways Norway has borrowed from the experience of guerrilla, underground, and paramilitary forces; and some of the security features of the guard make it seem a political organization.

For instance, members of the Norway guard have personal custody and care of their weapons and other equipment. They are responsible for showing up at secret assembly points within 3 hours, armed, provisioned for 3 days, and ready to move at once.

Colonel Haukeland says with a quiet smile that, so far, weapons have been excellently cared for.

Leaders of the guard have been selected mainly from men and women who served in the wartime underground, and whose reliability and guts are well known both to their neighbors, whom they command, and to the central government. Getting into the guard is a good deal like getting into a choosy private club—you don't make it unless your homefolk know and trust you.

Even so, nothing is written down about where stores of ammunition, heavy weapons, communications posts, etc., are cached; nor is the chain of command for emergencies known to more than a few in each guard area.

Home guard leaders have had experience with gestapo operations, and have no intention of letting their organization be penetrated and betrayed.

Guard members are free to suggest and criticize; they are in fact encouraged to do so by a system of awards for ideas that reaches to the bottom of the ranks.

The home guard is carefully nurturing an offensive spirit. (The word defense is in disrepute.) Exercises and training emphasize the quick, daring thrust at the enemy, and indoctrination preaches the futility of light infantry accepting pitched battles with regular forces and the virtues of chewing an enemy's flanks.

Very few bets have been overlooked by Norway where resisting an invader is involved. This country, where communications are difficult, is a "ham" radio operator's paradise, and some 90 percent of the amateur radio men are communications men in the home guard.

Colonel Haukeland is bothered because his guard is not trained and equipped with weapons that could handle light tanks—which he sagely figures is all an enemy could get ashore over what jetties his groups would leave an enemy.

He'd be a happier man if he had a few hundred superbazookas squirrelled away in Norway mountains, and four dozen batteries of new recoilless rifles cached away where they might do the most good.

But even as things stand Colonel Haukeland is confident Bergen will never fall again to a handful of invaders. He has a home guard outfit in that area—he prefers not to say how many—who'd make things rough for anyone who dared attempt its capture.

Importation of Alien Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram I have received regarding the fight I made against the importation of alien labor in connection with the agricultural labor bill. The telegram is from the Citrus Workers and Fruit Processors Union, Local 24473, of Mission, Tex.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAYMONDVILLE, TEX., *May 8, 1951.*

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are sure that all American citizens of Latin extraction of the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas join the 1,000 members of the Citrus Workers and Food Processors Union of the American Federation of Labor in extending to you our congratulations in regards to the stanch stand you have taken against the importation of alien labor to work in the agricultural fields and allied industries. Your name has appeared daily in the newspapers of this region, therefore those that know about you and all those that have learned to know about you have nothing but admiration for the kind of representation you are giving the people of this country and the kind of representation we only wish we had in our State.

RAUL HERNANDEZ,
President,
ELISARIO GUZMAN,
Recording Secretary,
JOSE L. GONZALEZ,
Financial Secretary,
VENTURA VALADEZ,
Treasurer,
Citrus Workers and Fruit Processors Union 24473, Mission, Tex.

How Come, Comrades?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Come, Comrades?" published in the Washington Evening Star of May 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW COME, COMRADES?

Several Russian diplomats and their families have set out for home aboard the liner *America* without large part of the baggage they had planned to sail with. The baggage—which some capitalistic longshoremen refused to handle—has been put in a New York warehouse at the request of the Soviet Embassy. It consists of 17 big crates filled with television sets, washing machines, refrigerators, and similar hallmarks of our decadent, bourgeois, imperialistic, warmongering, worker-enslaved Nation—a nation which the Moscow propagandists depict as a place where nothing is manufactured except guns and chewing gum and where millions and millions of people are unemployed and downtrodden and barely managing to exist while a few bloated billionaires get richer and richer.

How come, comrades? How come those diplomats wanted to sail away with that kind of baggage? Is not the Soviet Utopia supposed to be the land of peace and plenty, the land where there is no rearmament and where production is concentrated on the task of increasing the happiness, comfort, and living standards of everybody? Why therefore should a Russian have to buy a television set in America? Or a washing machine? Or a refrigerator? Is not there an abundance of such things in the stores of Moscow, or Minsk, Pinsk, Omsk, Tomsk, and Bomsk? A word of explanation, please. What is the meaning of this luggage incident?

Yes, indeed, comrades, how come? Anything to say, Pravda? Got an answer, Investia? A lot of us over here pause for reply.

The Washington Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Arthur I. Boreman, publisher, Des Moines, Iowa:

[From the Merchants Trade Journal, May 1951]

THE PUBLISHER'S PAGE

(By Arthur I. Boreman)

During recent months I have made a thorough study of statistical and historical data, and other information regarding Russia's ability or inability to successfully engage in a prolonged, highly mechanized war. I think the information that follows will give you the answer. Because of its importance, I am devoting the entire space to this one subject.

Stalin, himself, explodes State Department and U. N.'s major argument for present appeasement policy of fear and defeatism. Known facts completely refute the claim of the U. N., State Department and Defense Department and White House, that bombing bases in Manchuria, blockade of China, use of Chinese Nationalists and aerial reconnaissance would risk direct intervention by Russia and world war III.

We are told that Europe is Stalin's major objective and our major defense objective. Here are known facts that simply cannot be disputed. Russia flatly and repeatedly refused to declare war (or join in the war) against Japan until Germany was defeated. Stalin said Hitler (and others he named) had made the fatal mistake of battle on two fronts. Stalin repeatedly stated he would never be dumb enough to risk involvement on two fronts. In spite of the fact that his two powerful allies (United States and Britain) were obviously winning the war. Is Red China any such powerful ally? Would Russia risk two-front involvement by direct intervention in Manchuria or China? In spite of any so-called pledge of aid has Stalin hesitated to violate and repudiate solemn written agreements? Anyway, doesn't that pledge of aid apply only to attack by Japan, etc.?

In view of those facts, doesn't it seem as though the U. N., State Department, Defense Department, and the White House should either give to Congress and the public evidence that contradicts and outweighs those known facts, or recognize those facts and accept MacArthur's advice as to what should be done in Korea?

1. It is a known fact that those countries closest to Russia have the least fear of Russia or a major war.

2. Tito: Tito has not only defied, but actually ridiculed Stalin and the Politburo. He has gotten away with it. Russia could easily have taken over that country. Russia did not strike.

3. Oil: No prolonged mechanized war can be successful without oil (and gasoline) and lots of it. Russia controls less than 20 percent of the world's oil supply. The United States and Great Britain control 80 to 90 percent of the world's oil supply. Russia's oil fields that were destroyed in World War II have not yet been completely restored to prewar production. Our available oil supplies have been greatly increased. The Middle East oil fields could and would be quickly destroyed if Russia made a move to get them.

4. Steel: About the same situation exists in steel as in oil. We can expand our steel production immeasurably faster than Russia.

5. Satellites: Russia cannot trust her satellite countries. These satellites would turn on her and tear her apart once the tide turned against her and Russia's rulers know this. Already, sabotage, resistance, and revolt are widespread in satellite countries. In East Germany, for example, five new blast furnaces were started. All of them are now closed down. Obviously sabotage. Miners stage slow-downs. Farmers hide grain and livestock. There is resistance to Russia in every satellite.

6. Internal unrest: No major war can succeed without unity and safety at home. Russian police are completely disarmed when they go off duty. When Stalin reviews the troops, all ammunition is removed from the guns. No member of the Politburo dares go unprotected.

7. Navy: Russia has practically no navy and could not fuel her submarines for very long without control of a much greater oil supply than she has now.

8. Air power: Russia has a lot of fighter planes and they are very good. Here again shortage of oil and steel would be a serious handicap and Russia's rulers know that regardless of the number of planes she may have, she could not successfully wage a prolonged major, mechanized war. Russia has comparatively few long-range bombing planes. She is immeasurably weaker than we are with reference to strategic bombing. This indicates that she has no intention of risking world war III or our atomic-bombing attacks.

9. Soldiers: Russian soldiers fight well on their home soil, but not well away from home. Remember how long it took them to whip little Finland?

10. Autos and trucks: Without our trucks, tanks, etc., Russia would have had great difficulty stopping the Germans. Our productive capacity so greatly exceeds hers that there just isn't any comparison.

11. Geography: Individual initiative, cohesion, coordination, cooperation, and unity are vital factors in a major war—especially one of aggression and away from the home land. What we call Russia is a conglomeration of various parts of Europe and Asia. A many-languaged federation of states with 180 languages and dialects in daily use. There is very little intercommunication or traffic between the different communities and their different traditions, customs, etc., are a terrific handicap in the event of all-out war. A strong country is one welded together with a common language, common customs, and habits. Most of Russia lies north of 45 north latitude. It is a confirmable, historical fact that little wealth or progress is ever made in agriculture or industry that far north. Twenty-three percent of Russia's land is in the Arctic Circle. Her southern border faces mountain ranges and high land which prevent tropical, moisture-laden winds from reaching her soil. Russia's eastern border lies on the Pacific Ocean. Westerly moisture-laden winds blow away and not onto her soil there. Her western border faces open country, but too far from the Atlantic Ocean to receive great benefit from westerly moisture-laden winds. The fact that her western border is so vulnerable to land attack explains her huge land army and emphasis on fighter planes for tactical rather than strategic use. All of this explains why less than 25 percent of Russia's land is arable in the first place and only 25 percent of that arable land can be successfully cultivated and made productive. All of this has a powerful bearing on her ability to successfully wage a long mechanized war away from home and her rulers are certainly well aware of the fact.

12. Research and invention: In all her history, I have been unable to find a single important scientific invention ever to come out of Russia.

13. Greece: We gave heavy military aid to Greece. Russia could have occupied Greece any time she wished. Why did she not intervene? Wasn't the most logical reason for no intervention her fear of world war III and our A-bombs?

14. Berlin airlift: When Russia slapped her blockade on in the hope of driving us out of Berlin, we established our airlift, yet Russia did not dare shoot down those airlift planes or take any action in connection therewith that might involve her in world war III.

15. In spite of Russia's alleged common defense pact with Red China, I am unable to find a scintilla of evidence to support the fear that bombing Manchurian bases would bring one iota more help than she will give Red China without such bombing. On the contrary, Russia has repeatedly broken written pledges, and evidence clearly indicates Russia will not risk any chance of world war III (and our A-bombs) if we bomb those Manchurian bases.

16. All evidence seems to indicate that the Kremlin will continue to use satellites to wear down our manpower and materials; to weaken us economically, if possible. (Long ago Lenin said, "Whoever controls Asia controls the world.") Evidence mounts showing Asia, not Europe, to be Stalin's major objective. President Truman, unintentionally, confirmed this.

17. There seems to be a fear that Russia may make a sneak atomic bombing attack on our cities. The evidence presented here clearly indicates the Kremlin will not do any such thing.

18. It seems obvious Britain doesn't care how many Americans must be killed or maimed so long as her trade with the Reds is not affected.

From the evidence presented here (and much additional available information), it seems clear to me (I believe you will agree) that—

(a) Stalin is pulling the most colossal bluff in world history.

(b) The Kremlin will continue to use satellites to bleed us until their bluff is recognized and called.

(c) Bombing bases in Manchuria will not bring any more Kremlin aid to Red China than they will give anyway and that the Kremlin will not risk world war III and our A-bombs by direct intervention.

(d) Russia is in much greater fear of world war III (and our A-bombs) than even the appeasers in the State Department and/or the Pentagon.

(e) Russia would not intervene if Chinese Nationalists were told to go ahead; if China is blockaded.

(f) The United States can safely act alone without the U. N. approval.

(g) That Asia, not Europe, is the Kremlin's major objective.

What action should be taken now? To me (and I believe you will agree) this and other available evidence clearly indicates that the war in Korea can be quickly ended with unconditional surrender of the present Peiping regime; a complete new Republic of China can be created—a potentially powerful and friendly ally. That this would make world war III impossible.

Here's how it might be done. Fortunately, we now have the most competent, conscientious, patriotic, courageous, and bipartisan Congress in my memory. Otherwise we might be in an even more dangerous position.

It is my belief that—

1. Congress should reopen the investigation of the Amerasia case and the State Department. Examine closely the possible influence on our present appeasement policy because of the long time, very close, and very intimate association between Alger Hiss and Secretary Acheson.

2. Congress can and should force the administration to immediately advise Britain and the U. N. that we intend to give General Ridgway both authority and instructions to bomb Manchuria (using A-bombs if necessary); use Chinese Nationalist troops and do whatever is necessary to bring about the unconditional surrender of the Chinese Reds, at once, either with or without U. N. approval. That appeasement is out of the window.

3. Following the Peiping regime's surrender, General MacArthur (or some one equally competent) should be placed in charge of helping the Chinese people establish a representative and free republic. Do the same kind of job in China that MacArthur has so ably done in Japan.

Before starting the bombing (etc.) of Manchuria, Russia could be warned that any intervention by her would at once bring atomic destruction of her cities. (This warning probably would be unnecessary because it would actually be obvious to her. It is her fear of world war III and our A-bombs that has kept her from action up to now, anyway.)

Immediately following surrender of the Chinese Reds, Congress should demand (and force, as it can through appropriations) that Russia be told (either by the U. N. or the United States, acting alone if the cowardly U. N. appeasers are too frightened to act) to sit down to work out a real world-wide program of disarmament, free international trade, removal of the iron curtain, etc., etc.

Russia would not then dare refuse.

In conclusion, I believe this evidence does clearly indicate that: (1) Russia won't start world war III; (2) we can end the Korean war very quickly; (3) a real start can then be made toward many years of world peace; (4) it seems that only Congress can force the changes in our foreign (and military) policies that will produce these results.

The Wetback Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator CHAVEZ' Battle Over Wetbacks," published in the Parkersburg News on May 4, 1951, discussing the fight I made in the Senate on the so-called wetback issue in connection with the farm labor bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CHAVEZ' BATTLE OVER WETBACKS

Little known to the public, and scarcely making a ripple in the headlines—as yet—Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, is waging a brilliant and courageous battle on the so-called wetback issue, a battle which in reality is to destroy a mushrooming peonage system in the United States.

A wetback is an illegal Mexican immigrant who crosses the Rio Grande to take employment at substandard wages on United States industrialized farms, thus destroying the job opportunities of American citizens, including American Indians of such tribes as the Navajos, the storied Apaches, and the Pueblos, not to mention many of Anglo-Saxon lineage.

Senator CHAVEZ compared the situation to that of the Okies, made famous by John Steinbeck in his book, Grapes of Wrath. The Senator first pointed out that while there are 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 farms in the United States, there are only 125,000 large corporate farms, or "factories of the field," where the imported workers could possibly find employment. "Those who operate the 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 family-size farms," said Senator CHAVEZ, "do not want to take advantage of human misery. On the other hand these vast corporate farms are owned by less than 2 percent of the Nation's farm operators, and produce only 7 percent of the food and fiber products sold on the American market."

The bill now before the Senate, said Senator CHAVEZ, if enacted without saving amendments, would bring back in my State the return of peonage which was outlawed in 1868.

The illegal immigrants, said the Senator, "want to get something to eat, and that is why they are willing to work at stoop labor for 60 or 70 cents a day. It is a pernicious system. But we cannot blame them. They are hungry."

The President's Commission on Migratory Labor recently brought in this report:

"We have long wavered and compromised on the issue of migratory labor in agriculture. We have failed to adopt policies designed to insure an adequate supply of such labor at decent standards of employment. * * * We have impaired the economic and social position of the family-farm operator."

We are strongly inclined to side with Senator CHAVEZ in this matter. We believe him far-sighted and just and striving to right a grievous social wrong. It is difficult to see how any Senator of the United States, gazing about him over the world and noting how the flames of communism blaze up in just such instances of exploitation of the ignorant and the wretched, would want to ignite what could become a prairie-fire in the United States. Therefore we believe Senator CHAVEZ will prevail ultimately, if not now. He will prevail because he is right. American jobs ought to go to Americans first.

Preparations for Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely and

challenging column on civil defense, written by Mr. Philip Wylie as guest columnist for Mr. Walter Winchell, and published in the New York Daily Mirror of May 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

Mr. and Mrs. United States:

(Today's column is by Philip Wylie, the bookwriter, whose best sellers include A Generation of Vipers and the Disappearance. You've probably met Wylie in the Satevepost (and other swags) via his delightly essays about deep-sea fishing, etc. Readers who still miss Heywood Broun's common sense and word magic appreciate Wylie's. Don't skip through this one, please. Clip and file it away in your pocket or desk—after your neighbors borrow it. Remember Pearl Harbor, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki.)

DEAR W. W.: In the spring days of 1951 I have begun to wonder if the American people have lost their minds. Maybe you can ask them. Any maybe I'm the nutty one—though people like you and me were called nutty before the Second World War and it proved we were right then, while the public was day dreaming, in the main. Here are some questions I wish I could answer.

Since the American people now know that the Soviet has a stockpile of plutonium bombs, why don't they react like people in a dreadful danger—people whose peril will grow less only after they act by the millions in a thousand ways?

The people have been told exactly what atomic bombs are like. They've been told that if they get set to be slugged in their cities they can "take it' 'and cut casualties to one-fifth of what they'd be now.

Getting set for that means a lot. It means 20,000,000 volunteer workers. It means spending billions of bucks to stockpile medicines and drugs, and to reinforce buildings and to arrange and rehearse systems of priority evacuation—beginning with children—and it means preparing the whole landscape around every big industrial city to receive, temporarily, city refugees. It means new fire-fighting equipment, mass produced. It means all sorts of electronic equipment and people trained to run it.

Getting set means more. It means basic training for every man and woman and child in a possible target area. It means bracing the nerves and minds of people likely to be in an A-bomb-hit area for the terrible sights bound to ensue—the burned, the wounded, the fire storms, the naked, the hysterical, and so on.

Getting set means having the stuff and the know-how to save the injured, to rescue the trapped, to douse the gigantic fires. It means, also, being ready to bear the terrible (but not dangerous) after-show of atomic bombs. It means having the guts to go about your business, after a hit, though you know there may be another.

Getting set, moreover, may well mean that no enemy will try to use atomic bombs on city populations. Because a city that's set is a poor target; you can't hurt it badly enough to be worth the try.

But the people I meet in big cities, Walter, aren't doing these things. They don't seem to realize all civil-defense problems differ from city to city and have to be solved locally and, in the event of a hit or hits, dealt with by local people—themselves.

The people I meet are fatalistic. They hope if a bomb comes they'll be the first killed. Some are just going ahead as if nothing were different—which is like letting yourself drown. And others are having a last fling—which, in my book, is damn near treason.

For a time is coming, perhaps is very near, Walter, when we could knock off all the Russian cities—and yet not knock out Russia. We can't reach the vast majority of Russians with atomic bombs—or the Red army—or the Government. Slave state people haven't the communications and transport that lead to national panic. We have.

The Soviets, with far fewer bombs, might quite conceivably so shock and horrify an unready United States of America that our folks would abandon our cities and refuse to go back. Then we'd have to surrender. We can be sure we are strong enough to face those birds on a city-trading basis only if and when the whole 150,000,000 of us are all set and prepared and briefed and rehearsed for the evil show—the show they could start tomorrow.

But what, Walter? A congressional committee puts the nix on the civil defense appropriation bill. In the Senate, a bill to disperse Washington is dropped. Are all those people insane?

They know Russia has the bomb. They know we could get in a war with Russia. MacArthur admits it—even accuses Truman of increasing the danger. The Congressmen smilingly tell you that in the first hours of any war Moscow would vanish. Well, so would Washington, just as sure as the Lord made little apples. So would New York, perhaps; so, surely, would a whole lot of other places. That's what the Soviet A-bomb means.

I remember writing a poem about waking up America in the days when the Nazis were eating a new country a month and you printed the verse. Now the danger is, say, 1,000 times as great, as savage, as terrible. It can be met only by facing the facts and getting braced in all the ways I've mentioned and many more. For if there's a next time, Walter, we're "for it"—and nobody I know is even 1 percent ready to face and to do what he must—to win.

The Japs, used to air raids but unprepared for atomic bombs, couldn't stand them. The Germans were knocked flat by fire storms—a mere side-effect of plutonium bombs. They weren't ready, either. And the British darn near lost their part of the war three different times, owing to air assault. We know we are a gritty people. And if we put our backs in it, we can do anything. But the massive atomic bombing of United States of America without preparation—immense, costly preparation—might be curtains for the land of liberty.

The home front, Walter, is the naked flank of American defenses today. Protecting it is not a Pentagon problem but everybody's business. So why don't we all catch on and pitch in? And why doesn't Congress begin to realize that unless it, too, acts sensibly, there may sooner or later come an instant when the Capitol and the monuments, the Pentagon and the White House just won't be there any more?

This time, civil defense is no clambake; it's the front-line trenches and we're all in them and we better learn how to fight an atomic war or we may one day be looking up our flagpoles at a hammer and sickle—those of us willing to live like that, I mean.

As ever, for freedom,

PHIL WYLIE.

What Allies Are We Afraid of Losing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., of Saturday, May 5, 1951:

WHAT ALLIES ARE WE AFRAID OF LOSING?

General MacArthur, in suggesting we ought to go it alone, if necessary, in order to knock Red China out of the Korean war in a hurry, appears to have astonished some of Washington's too-too liberal internationalists.

And yet his suggestion makes a lot of sense.

To date in this Korean affair, the United Nations boys have been strictly fair-weather friends. As long as things were going well, they stood up to the Commies and resoluted to beat all get-out.

That was when we were fighting the North Koreans alone. But as soon as the Chinese Reds got into the scrap, the United Nations started to drag its feet. And the U. N. has been dragging its feet ever since.

Let's face it. If Great Britain and France hadn't been hanging about our necks, isn't it possible that this MacArthur controversy never would have come up?

It's been pretty definitely established, by this time, that as late as January 12 the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur were in virtual agreement about how the military phase of the Korean affair should be conducted.

Who blocked that program? Obviously, the diplomats—not our own, exclusively, but the foreign offices of our so-called allies.

Our difficulties to date in Korea—and a large part of those difficulties are reflected in the 60,000-plus casualties the United States has suffered—have come as a result of putting our field commanders under wraps.

General MacArthur has testified that when the Chinese Reds started to pour across the Yalu in force, they should have been served with an ultimatum to get the hell back where they belonged, or get the very bedevil kicked out of them.

That's in the American military tradition. Our history books are filled with such classic wartime rejoinders as "Don't give up the ship," "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead," "We'll fight it out on this line if it takes all summer," "Surrender? Never," and "Nuts." To recall only a few.

If General MacArthur had been permitted to reply in kind to the Reds when they crossed the Yalu, and to have plastered them with everything we had from the air, the sea, and by means of diversionary raids on the mainland of China, chances are this war now would be over.

But for seven long month's we've been pulling our punches. Why our Air Force isn't even permitted to bomb certain places in North Korea itself. Meantime, our boys have been going through what General MacArthur calls an accordion action, up and down, up and down, up and down the narrow Korean peninsula. We've been waiting for the dust to settle—and meantime have soaked that dust with blood, American blood.

Why? Because we've been yellow? Because we don't know how to fight? No. Because the United Nations and the principal allies with whom we're associated in this police action are thinking of Hong Kong and other interests in the Far East.

It's nothing short of criminal that our delegate to the United Nations, 7 months after the Chinese Reds entered the war, is only now pleading with our so-called allies to stop shipping critical matériel of war to the very enemy that is killing our sons—and their own.

These fair-weather allies of ours—who've got their hands out for military and economic aid from us in Europe—have only token forces in Korea. Yet they have just as loud a voice—louder, collectively—as we do in calling the military shots in Korea.

Meantime, Harry Truman and Dean Acheson are willing to doom thousands of American boys to a senseless meat-grinder operation in which we trade one American life for 20 Chinese lives in an indeterminable limited war—in the pious hope that some day the Reds will get tired of it all and will consent to talk cease-fire with us.

United States would be a lot better off in Asia today if we'd never heard of the United Nations. The city slickers hoaxed us into a diplomatic poker game and they've been taking the shirt off our back in Korea ever since.

We go all the way with General MacArthur on that score. Why worry about losing our allies in Korea? We never had any to speak of.

Isn't it about time we showed a few characteristic American feathers? Isn't it about time we said to these so-called allies, in effect:

"Look, brother, we've had enough of this fiddle-faddle. This is the way it's going to be. Are you with us? If not, get out of our way. We've got a job to do."

And we'd like to lay a little bet—2 to 1. Those fellows would go along. Because they need us a lot worse than we need them. Lose our allies? Why we couldn't beat them off with a club. (And sometimes, we think, more's the pity.)

"Do as I Say, Not as I Do"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News:

"DO AS I SAY, NOT AS I DO"

Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson, who had long since put a crimp in local public-works projects by clamping down on scarce materials, now asks all States, cities, and counties to "postpone borrowing no matter how worthy the purpose, if the project is postponable."

The new edict seeks not only to curtail those projects that consume priority materials, but all those that create credit and thus feed inflation—including borrowing for soldiers' bonus payments, for sites and rights-of-way for future projects, for funds with which to purchase privately owned utilities, etc.

As anti-inflation medicine, this Spartan prescription makes obvious sense. But it would make a good deal more sense—and be better heeded—if Uncle Sam were leading the way instead of merely issuing the commands.

So far, the Federal Administration itself has not shown the slightest disposition to practice any of the belt-tightening or credit-husbanding virtues about which it economic stabilizers preach.

The President's budget for the year beginning July 1—a budget which he has repeatedly dared Congress to cut—shows most of the Federal credit and public-works programs running in high gear. Many adjustments have been made to give a defense label to programs that were advocated under other guises before the Korean War, but the totals, in most cases, are higher than ever.

Take, for example, the total for civil public works. Actual spending for all these programs was less than $1,700,000,000 in fiscal 1948 and again in 1949. Last year, it came to $2,053,000,000. But the President's 1952 budget asks $3,353,000,000 for these purposes.

Or take the total of Federal credit programs. Last year's new commitments for all types of Federal loans and guarantees came to $11,967,000,000. For next year, the President has asked a total of $13,340,000,000. Some of these loan-expansion programs, to be sure, carry a defense tag. For instance, $90,000,000 for civil defense, and $1,950,000,000 for expansion of defense production. But the biggest items represent continuance of regular peacetime programs. The scandal-ridden RFC is down for $308,000,000 in new lending authority for ordinary loans to business—this at a time when the economic-stabilization officials are pleading with private lenders to cut down on business credit. The Veterans' Administration is down for $3,055,000,000 in new commitments for veterans' housing (compared with $2,518,000,000 in the 1950 fiscal year)—at a time when Mr. Wilson is urging the States to postpone veterans' bonus payments.

The worst thing about this contrast between what Uncle Sam practices and what he preaches, of course, is that it is all too typical of the let's-everybody-else-sacrifice approach to mobilization. As long as the Federal Government carries the big club, the States and cities will probably do what they're told—at least so far as the timing of their public-works programs is concerned. But they would do it a lot more willingly, and with a lot more of the feeling that we're all in this thing together, if the Federal Government showed any disposition to lead by example instead of by command.

Paul Wooton at 70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the remarks in the RECORD. I wish to call to the attention of the Congress the 37 years service of a distinguished journalist, originally from my district in Louisiana, Paul Wooton, who was honored by the Washington newspaper correspondents on the occasion of Mr. Wooton's seventieth birthday.

The people of my district and Louisiana are proud of the service and stature attained by this fine and able man who through the 37 years of his assignment in Washington has exemplified the highest principles in journalism and has contributed so unselfishly to the success of many a new and young reporter who came to Washington from all sections of the country and who through his solicitious guidance became some of our foremost national newspaper columnists and publishers.

Mr. Speaker, I include in these remarks a copy of an editorial from the Washington Star of May 10, 1951, entitled "Paul Wooton at 70," as follows:

PAUL WOOTON AT 70

The Washington press corps did honor yesterday to "the indispenable man." Paul Wooton, whose 70 years sit lightly on him, had a brithday party.

For 37 years, while the world has passed through one of its most tumultuous periods, Paul Wooton has built a distinguished career in journalism in the Nation's Capital. Friend to Presidents and to statesmen in general, he has most of all been a friend to other newspapermen. With devotion to his profession and a kindness of heart well known to all his colleagues, Paul Wooton has been the wheelhorse in virtuslly every newspapermen's organization in Washington. It was not inappropriate that one of those who spoke at the luncheon honoring Paul yesterday referred to his "benevolent despotism" and suggested that many of the world's problems could be resolved by adoption of his high principles of human relations.

It is a safe guess that American newspapermen now scattered all over the world were present in spirit at yesterday's party to wish "happy birthday" to one of their best friends and most beloved colleagues.

Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education Established as Tribute to Statesman and Promoter of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the State of Tennessee granted the charter for the Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education. This was a most historic action and was the culmination of many months of endeavor by friends and associates of that great Tennessean, Cordell Hull, to create a suitable monument to the decades of public service and untiring efforts for world peace and accord which this great American has rendered to all mankind.

Formal announcement of the formation of a multi-million-dollar fund for the granting of scholarships to students of other nationalities for study in the United States was announced on the same day by Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University at Nashville, Tennessee. Most regrettably the announcement of the formation of this great foundation has come at a time when the revered statesman continues ill at the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda and as his multitude of friends in Tennessee and throughout the world earnestly hope and pray for the restoration of his health.

The Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education will encompass the ideals for which Judge Hull has dedicated his long and useful life—that is, the attainment of international harmony through the practice of good will and neighborliness among nations. Through the granting of these scholarships, students of other lands may come to our great country to pursue their studies and learn about us at first hand. By the same token we of this country

may become better acquainted with our international friends through association with these unofficial ambassadors of good will. No more fitting tribute to the great Cordell Hull, promoter of peace and good will, could be conceived. The Cordell Hull Foundation will take its place as an instrument of peace along the United Nations and the Pan-American Union whose formation Mr. Hull inspired.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times and an editorial from the Nashville Banner, May 10, 1951, on the creation of the Cordell Hull Foundation. The article is as follows:

Friends and admirers of Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, have established in his name an educational foundation to promote world peace and good will through an international scholarship program.

Formation of the Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education was announced here yesterday by Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancelor of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. He said it was expected that several million dollars would be provided for the project.

Dr. Branscomb, who made the announcement at the Roosevelt Hotel, also made public a letter from the 79-year-old former statesman, who is critically ill in the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md. Mr. Hull, a native of Tennessee, endorsed the program and observed that better understanding and cooperation between nations was desperately needed in the present world situation.

FOUNDATION'S TENTATIVE PLANS

The foundation's program, still in the formative stage, envisions the setting up of scholarships and fellowships that will enable students from the 20 Latin-American countries to study in the United States, Dr. Branscomb explained.

He said that, beginning in 1952, 40 students a year would be brought here—2 from each of the 20 countries. Later it is hoped to offer similar opportunities for European students.

The foundation also plans to carry on studies in international relations at the university center in Nashville, which embraces the schools and colleges of Vanderbilt University, and to send faculty members abroad to study and teach.

Dr. Branscomb made public an incomplete list of trustees of the new foundation, explaining that it would be expanded later. The list included Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Associate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas; James A. Farley, former Postmaster General; Warren R. Austin, chief United States delegate to the United Nations; Myron C. Taylor, retired industrialist and diplomat.

Will L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State in Charge of Economic Affairs and Under Secretary of State during Mr. Hull's administration; George A. Sloan, president of the Metropolitan Opera Association; Leo Pasvolsky, director of international studies for the Brookings Institute; Frank Houston of the Chemical Bank & Trust Co.; Henry C. Alexander, president of J. P. Morgan & Co.; Jesse H. Jones, former Secretary of Commerce; and Chief Justice A. B. Neil, of the Tennessee Supreme Court.

Winston S. Dustin, southern radio executive, is executive secretary.

Mr. Hull's letter to Dr. Branscomb was dated April 4 and was in reply to a memorandum from the college chancelor outlining the purposes of the foundation. The former Secretary of State emphasized the need to elevate the standards of political morality and action on the part of our citizens and the citizens of all countries, and added:

"Only through such activities can we hope that men and women everywhere will keep alive and constantly renew faith in the dignity of the individual, in institutions of government founded upon the concept of the governed, and in enduring peace based on freedom and justice.

"These are the abiding values of a truly Christian civilization, and their presentation requires faith in their eternal worth, and stanch determination to uphold them and willingness to make whatever sacrifices may be needed to that end.

"I think it is wise, as you plan, to begin your endeavors in the realm of inter-American problems and relations. The nations of this hemisphere have in common many traditions and aspirations. All of them were born of a passionate desire for liberty and freedom, and all of them face today the fateful challenge presented to mankind by the unspeakable doctrines of communism and of other similar movements directed toward enslavement of the individual by the soulless state."

Mr. Hull also declared that no country or region could be secure in freedom unless an overwhelming majority of mankind move forward together toward the attainment of the noble purposes and principles that are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Dr. Branscomb, who is chairman of the United States Advisory Commission for Educational Exchange, said it was intended that the foundation would perform a comparable service to the Rhodes scholarships. He is a Rhodes scholar.

He explained that the idea for the foundation grew spontaneously from a number of Mr. Hull's friends and colleagues and that the plan had been discussed with both Mr. Hull and Mrs. Hull. He said that eventually a headquarters building, to be known as Hull Hall, would be erected in Nashville.

In his memorandum to Mr. Hull outlining the project, Dr. Branscomb declared that the former diplomat belonged not only to the United States but also to other countries of the free democratic world which his statesmanship has served.

"Your friends, and others joining with them, believe," the communication added, "that the most appropriate monument we could establish in your honor would be a program of international education which would bring together promising young men and women from many countries in a common educational experience."

Dr. Branscomb said the charter for the new foundation had been formally granted yesterday in Tennessee.

The editorial is as follows:

THE CORDELL HULL FOUNDATION

The announcement by Chancellor Harvie Branscomb of Vanderbilt University that the newly established Cordell Hull Foundation will have its headquarters at the University Center here should be a source of pride and gratification to every Nashvillian.

Already the site of numerous educational and religious institutions, Nashville now will have the opportunity to expand further its reputation as an international center of learning. The new multimillion-dollar foundation initially will focus its attention on the education of students from Latin-American countries but later it is expected to broaden its scope and include other countries in its program.

The announcement occurs at a time when the people of this State, the Nation and the entire world are hoping and praying for the recovery of the former Secretary of State, now critically ill.

The project's stated purpose of promoting, by educational activities, better understanding and good will among the peoples of the world and especially between the peoples of the Western Hemisphere is a just tribute to the "father of the United Nations" who contributed so greatly to a better understanding between this Nation and those of South America.

The people of Tennessee have long remarked with pride the skill and vision of statesmanship marking this illustrious career, and the inspiration and influence of his gracious wife upon that career. Their name, their influence, their generosity on behalf of humanity's uplift are perpetuated in this great new enterprise—shared by those having a part in its establishment.

The Cordell Hull Foundation can and will make a major contribution toward strengthening the bonds that already exist between the continents of North and South America. Through its contemplated program of exchange students at Vanderbilt and other schools, it will foster and encourage personal friendships among the students of the various countries and when the students return to their homes, these friendships will go a long way toward increasing understanding and cooperation on the international level.

Nashvillians, especially, are indebted to Chancellor Branscomb and to the other men of vision who conceived this memorial and who played a part in having its headquarters located here. They should be grateful for the opportunity ot take part in its program and should feel an obligation to support the foundation and to share in its work.

Public Power—The Preference Clause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, one of the cornerstones of the Government's so-called power policy is that preference in power sales from Federal multiple-purpose projects shall be given to public agencies, cooperatives, and the like.

During debate in the House on the recently passed Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1952, public power supporters declared that the preference provision reflected a philosophy laid down by Congress in 1906 in making it essential for the Congress to build transmission lines to serve preference customers and, in effect, ignore anyone else who might have need for power.

In 1906 the Congress passed the first act which contained a preference provision—the Reclamation Act of April 16, 1906. Section 5 of this act stated that the Secretary of the Interior may lease surplus power from irrigation projects "giving preference to municipal purposes."

This law has been cherished and cited by public power supporters as if it were on a par with the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. Whenever the wisdom of preference provisions is questioned, we are always referred in voices filled with awe back to this law of 1906. It is from this one piece of legislation that all of the subsequent preference provisions have flowed, and today preference has become the hub of the public power wheel.

What was the intent of the legislators who framed the original preference clause? What were the circumstances that surrounded its inception? The 1906 bill, which originated in the Senate, did not primarily concern power. It provided for the withdrawal from public entry any lands needed for town-site purposes as provided for under the Reclamation Act of 1902.

Apparently the Senate held no hearings on this bill as no transcript can be found. There was little debate on the Senate floor before the bill was passed. It should be noted that neither the bill as proposed or as passed by the Senate contained any preference provision at all. This provision appeared in the bill as reported by the House Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands. However, no House hearings have been located either, so we must assume that no hearings were held by that body. The House report offered no hint either as to the origin or purpose of the preference clause.

This is the law that those who would nationalize our electric industry point to as the basis for preference, the cornerstone of their so-called public power policy. The preference section was only one clause in one section of a five-section bill which in itself did not concern power. This provision was included in a piece of legislation before the Federal Government had an appreciable amount of surplus power available from irrigation or other projects. In 1912, 6 years after the passage of the 1906 act, a report of the Commissioners of Corporation on the subject of Water Power Development in the United States, stated that "a considerable portion of power developed at irrigation projects is utilized for the operation of pumps, and power for commercial use is of comparatively little importance."

During the recent debate on the Interior Department bill the statement was made that Federal power legislation had been approved by the Congress for the purpose of helping all kinds of people. Such legislation should help, not all kinds of people, but all people. In fact I challenge that, with preference as a cornerstone, Federal power legislation does not even help all kinds of people, but only certain people. That this is true can be shown in my own State of Michigan.

It has been estimated that 11 percent of all the power customers in Michigan could be classified as preference customers. If the Bureau of Reclamation built a huge multiple-purpose project in Michigan, only 11 percent of Michigan's customers would be entitled to this power. Although 89 percent of the customers had, through their taxes, contributed to the building of this project, they would be denied any benefit from the project because they happened to patronize the wrong power distributing concern.

This reasoning is all based on a law passed back in 1906 that did not involve power, and on which no hearings were held.

This is the history of the act that first offered the preference idea which in turn has been used ever since as a beacon by public power advocates to light their way toward nationalization of the electric industry.

Editorial Re Rumely Jury Conviction and Freedom of Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying during the last session of Congress, the Hon. Frank Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, in his lifetime made request that the following editorial in the Denver Post for Saturday, April 21, 1951, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of all who might read.

I had the responsibility and privilege of serving as a member of the Select Committee on Lobbying. There is no question in the minds of those who had the honor of working with him that the heavy and diligent work he did on that committee during those months was the cause of hastening his untimely demise.

So now that he has passed on and is unable to personally ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks and include therein the following editorial, it is my privilege and pleasure to do it at the request of his able assistants in his congressional office.

Representative Buchanan sat next to me on the floor of the House of Representatives on the occasion when the distinguished American, General MacArthur, spoke to us at the joint session. It was his last presence on the floor of the House.

At that time he knew of the verdict of the court jury holding Dr. E. A. Rumely guilty of contempt of Congress and spoke to me about it. Even though the jury took only 20 minutes to arrive at its verdict of guilty for Dr. Rumely, Representative Buchanan told me he was awfully sorry to see any American citizen in a legal position where he was found guilty by an American jury of violating American statutes and ordinances. He did not gloat over the fact that Dr. Rumely had been convicted. He did, however, tell me that he felt that a verdict of guilty, arrived at after only 20 minutes' consideration by the jury, justified the vote of the majority of members of the Select Lobbying Committee to recommend to the House of Representatives that he be cited for contempt.

The following editorial speaks for itself:

NO RIGHT TO SECRECY

The jury which convicted Dr. Edward A. Rumely of contempt of Congress reached its verdict in only 20 minutes. The facts in the case were uncontroverted. Dr. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, admitted he had refused to give a lobby investigating committee full information on persons who made quantity purchases of books published by the Committee on Constitutional Government.

Dr. Rumely's only defense was based on constitutional legalistic grounds which Federal District Judge Keech found to be invalid. Those grounds will now be tested further in the course of appeals to higher courts.

That the Committee for Constitutional Government is one of the major lobbying organizations of the country seems plain to us. For years it has sought to influence public opinion on matters relating to legislation. It has been on such friendly terms with some Congressmen that it has been able to send out large quantities of literature under free postal franking privileges.

One of the ways of Committee on Constitutional Government finances its activities is through the sale of books. Under existing lobbying laws, the organization cannot accept donations of $500 or more from anyone without disclosing to Congress the source of the donation. The Committee on Constitutional Government has taken the position, however, that if it sells $500 or $1,000 worth of its books to one of its supporters it does not have to reveal the identity of the purchaser.

Whether the book-selling business of the Committee on Constitutional Government—or any similar group—provides a loophole in the lobbying law which should be closed is a question which the congressional committee has been studying.

The powers granted to the congressional committee were broad enough to cover a full investigation of book-selling activities. But, when Dr. Rumely was ordered to produce records of bulk purchases by publicity-shunning supporters of the Committee on Constitutional Government, he refused and sought to invoke the constitutional protection of freedom of the press.

We cannot agree with Dr. Rumely's interpretation of what press freedom means. The right of the Committee on Constitutional Government to publish any books that it may wish to put in print is not questioned in any way. The right of freedom of the press does not carry with it any right to keep secret the names of those who give financial support to publications seeking to influence public opinion.

Postal laws very properly require newspapers to disclose the names of their principal stockholders from time to time. Anonymity in any publishing business could be a dangerous thing. Those who object to Government by unseen forces will approve the action of the court in Dr. Rumely's case.

The Pinkest Cheeks in Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, who advised the President last year that the Chinese Communists were too intelligent to get into the Korean war? Bless his heart, it was Secretary Acheson who told the world that this would never happen, and he put it on television so all could hear and see him.

Ruth Montgomery, in her column D. C. Wash, cites a very interesting, yet

embarrassing situation within the spats and cane division. I include part of her article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 12, 1951]

D. C. WASH

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON, May 11.—The pinkest cheeks in town this week belong to our State Department boys. They've pulled another blooper, bless 'em. The spats and cane division was holding one of a series of indoctrination classes for new Foreign Service personnel. To vary the usual lectures about what a wonderful job the Department is doing [hear, hear], the institute officials decided to show a kinescope of a television interview with Secretary Acheson. This was in order to demonstrate what a warm and human fellow the outwardly frosty Secretary really is.

It proved he was human all right, to the blushing consternation of the officials. The kinescope, which had apparently not been previewed by the Department since the dismissal of General MacArthur, represented a television interview with Acheson last fall by three CBS correspondents. In it Griffing Bancroft asked the Secretary whether he thought the Chinese Communists would come into the Korean war. The Cabinet officer emphatically reassured Bancroft against such a possibility, because the Chinese Reds were too "intelligent" to take such a risk.

It's human to err. Practically everybody admits to pulling a few—except President Truman, that is. A handful of the fledgling Foreign Service officers, too new to have been properly indoctrinated, suggested that the embarrassing kinescope ought to be dispatched to the White House. After all, our Chief Executive at the recent Jefferson-Jackson Day political rally shrugged off all blame for the Korean war tragedy by complaining petulantly that MacArthur had predicted the Chinese Reds wouldn't come in.

A General Far Eastern War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD the following comments by Walter Lippmann. They are taken from today's Washington Post:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A GENERAL FAR EASTERN WAR?

It is, I think, clear that one of the determining factors in General MacArthur's mind is that in the Far East the Soviet Union can exert only a small part of its military power. From the main Russian centers of population and of industry the distance to the Soviet Far East is great and the communications are poor.

Russia, seen from Japan, looks and indeed, is, a far less formidable power than Russia seen from, let us say, Paris or Bonn or Trieste or Ankara. The Red army can march against Europe and the Middle East and pick up war industries and supplies as it advances. But in the Far East there are only the comparatively limited forces east of Lake Baikal with their limited local war industries, dependent in case of war upon the vulnerable and inadequate Trans-Siberian Railway.

Moreover, it might even be easier for the United States with its command of the sea and air to build up power based on Japan than it would be for Russia to build up power based on the Soviet Far East and Manchuria.

Thus, a war in the Far East, even against Russia and China combined, would be—provided it was confined to the Far East—a war in which neither side could bring all its military forces—nor even its main military force—into the fighting. The Russians could not bring in their immense army. We, for lack of decisive targets and essential bases, could use only a fraction—and not the most effective fraction—of our sea and air power. A far-eastern war, confined to the Far East, would be a big war. But it would be a limited war. Since neither side could use its whole power, there could be no decisive victory for which it has been said, there is in war no substitute.

But, seen from Japan and Formosa, an interesting case can be made for that sort of far-eastern war. It would commit great American forces to the Far East. They would have priority. Since the war would have to be indecisive, it could not be terminated by the kind of victory without which all is now appeasement. Therefore great American forces would be committed indefinitely in the Far East and a condition of permanent hostilities, without the danger of a truce or a negotiated settlement or any kind of modus vivendi, would be guaranteed to Joe Stalin.

The administration's argument against General MacArthur has been that such a general war against China would almost certainly bring in Russia and that this would mean that the third world war with the atom bombs and the overrunning of Europe and the rest would follow. General MacArthur's comment on this argument was to say that: "The Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves."

The general meant, of course, that the Soviet might not go openly to war if we bombed the Manchurian bases of the Chinese army in Korea but that even if they did, the Far East is the most important place to fight the war and that this is as good a time as any to have a war with the Soviet Union.

I wonder whether Stalin and Molotov and the rest of them may not be of the same opinion. We cannot know for sure what they think—not at least until the Politburo holds its next public debate on Soviet strategy and high policy—with stenographic reports, only slightly censored, every hour on the hour at 12 cents a page.

One thing I would bet on. The Kremlin has before it a comprehensive report which we are providing for them of what we know and of what we don't know and of what we are thinking and hoping and wishing and worrying about. There is no doubt, I think, that the Kremlin will mesh their actions with ours. The Russians are chess players. As we are now informing them that we shall use either the queen's pawn opening or the Ruy Lopez, they will certainly be fully prepared to mesh their moves with ours when we make our moves.

There are, I believe, a great many bits and pieces of evidence—including Mr. Gromyko's behavior in Paris—which indicate that the Soviet Union may also have come to think that the Far East is the best theater in which to have war break out. For the Soviets the Far East is the safest and the most advantageous place to have a world war break out. In the Far East they have their most powerful ally. In the Far East we have no alliances. The Atlantic Pact does not operate outside the region defined in the pact, and while the British would no doubt join us in a far-eastern war, they are not any longer capable of important military action in the Far East.

In a far-eastern war the Soviet Union cannot be defeated. It cannot even be deeply injured. Thus a war which broke out in the Far East would engage great American forces in a struggle that was certain to be indecisive and interminable. The war would strain, and almost certainly disrupt the Atlantic alliance because France and the Low Countries and the Scandinavian countries cannot be expected to declare war on Russia for the sake of Korea when that means inviting the Red Army to invade them. If the Atlantic alliance is disrupted, if we are at war with Russia without the active support of most of western and southern Europe, we shall fight without being able to use our right arm. American atomic power would be not entirely but in very large measure neutralized.

Therefore it might well be that the Russians may decide that a war in the Far East, and really confined to the Far East, would be the one of all the kinds of wars they could engage in that promises them the biggest advantages at the least cost.

The University of Arkansas and the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter giving a factual account of recent developments at the University of Arkansas. The letter was written by Harry S. Ashmore, of Fayetteville, Ark., and was published recently on the editorial page of the Arkansas Gazette. So many people of the eastern and northern parts of the United States are so ignorant of the developments in the Southwest that I believe it may be helpful to bring these facts to their attention.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AND THE ARTS

FAYETTEVILLE.—Over the years the ancient trade-out by which the city of Fayetteville obtained the University of Arkansas has proved to have both advantages and disadvantages. It would be hard to imagine a lovelier site for a university than this high valley in the Ozarks, and as every scholar knows isolation can be an academic blessing in seasons of political stress and strain. On the other hand, the fact that the university is tucked away in the remote northwest corner of the State, and is not even on the road to anywhere, has kept most of the citizens of Arkansas from realizing how wisely they have been investing their money in recent years.

The latest physical manifestation of growth and change was dedicated this week end as a high point in the Rites of Spring which celebrate the annual burgeoning of academic degrees. It is a fine arts center which is by all odds the most handsome public building in Arkansas, and which has already elicited admiring comment from architects all over the world. A few traditionalists, it is true, have expressed dismay over the contrast between the lift, airy structure, sprawling with conscious grace, and the high-shouldered bulk of Old Main across the campus. But they are few, and even the hardiest of them

subside when it is pointed out that the fine arts center cost, on a square foot basis, a little less than half the conventional wing which is under construction at the engineering building.

The center is actually two buildings. The larger houses classrooms, lecture halls, music and art studios, and a music hall complete with pipe organ. The smaller is perhaps the only theater in the world in which more space is devoted to the actors than to the audience. Connecting the two is a glassed-in exhibition hall which is currently housing the finest collection of contemporary art ever shown in Arkansas. An extensive terrace and a small outdoor amphitheater flank the S-shaped main structure.

The genius who created the design for the center is a Fayetteville boy whose class at the university unanimously voted him the least likely to succeed. In the course of confounding that prophecy Edward D. Stone has pursued a career that led him to study at Harvard, won him traveling fellowships abroad, took him to Yale as a professor of architecture, and produced such monuments as the Museum of Modern Art in New York, a Long Island house for Henry R. Luce, and a hotel in Panama. While Mr. Stone has grown both famous and rich (or would have if he didn't have the whimsical habit of spending more than he is paid on such labors of love as the fine arts center) he had somehow failed to acquire an academic degree along the way. The university corrected that yesterday when it made him a doctor of fine arts, a rare degree which a research committee found had once been given to Frank Lloyd Wright, the architect with whom Mr. Stone is usually compared in the professional journals these days.

In the Fine Arts Center Mr. Stone made bold and effective use of common and inexpensive materials like cinder blocks, and laid in glass with a lavish hand. He built, as he always does, from the inside out, starting with the function each square foot of space was expected to serve. This was no mean task, since he had to build around such complex mechanical marvels as the fully equipped experimental stage in the theater, provide on a limited budget perfect acoustics in those portions of the building devoted to music, and see that the painters had plenty of light. His success has earned him not only a degree, but the gratitude of all those who work, study, or visit in the building, and of those who only walk by it, for from any angle it displays an eminently satisfying purity of line and of proportion.

While the university only got around to dedicating it this week end, the center has been in service for several months now. At the moment a student production of The Marriage of Figaro is running at one end of the art exhibit, and The Guardsman is playing a repeat performance in the theater. Attractions of this sort, plus the lure of the building itself, have kept a steady stream of students passing through the great glass doors. The university's president, Lewis Webster Jones, is particularly pleased that many of these are intensely practical people from the schools of commerce, engineering, agriculture, law, and the like who in the past have been given to curling their lips at the arts.

Indeed, President Jones sees the Arts Center as the partial fulfillment of a goal he set for himself when he came to the university 4 years ago. Of necessity he had to devote his first efforts to shoring up those schools and departments which meet Arkansas' immediate need for specialized services and trained personnel. One of his first creations was an Institute of Scientific Research, which has launched into a dozen fields and which, happily, has been able to attract a good deal of private capital to underwrite its activities. He has concentrated much effort on Agricultural Extension Service. He has also labored long and hard over the medical school at Little Rock, and he succeeded in salvaging out of the fiscal wreckage of the last legislative session enough money to finance a new teaching hospital, which Mr. Stone has also designed. But, willing as he is to turn out scientists, technicians, farmers, doctors, lawyers, and businessmen in the largest practicable quantity, Dr. Jones is also determined to see that they receive a general as well as an applied education. The world, he believes, is getting cluttered up with what he calls educated illiterates, people who know all about the cultivation of lespedeza or the most practicable method for removing an appendix, but who have no real understanding of the awful complexities of the age they live in, or the demands it makes upon them as citizens. An educated man, he argues, does not have to be a creative man, but he has to have some understanding of, or at least tolerance for, those who wrestle with the verities.

The Jones influence is visible to even the most casual visitor to the campus. Even with the financial uncertainties that now beset the institution—everybody knows that the faculty is going to have to be cut back next term and some projects abandoned in the wake of the legislature's failure to meet the projected budget—there is the feeling of optimism and excitement common to people who are convinced that they are taking part in something important. Fayetteville has become the sort of place where, on last week end, you could find Erwin Edman, the Columbia University philosopher, sitting under a tree, sans necktie, at the annual Agri Day Barbecue. Professor Edman made a neat symbol; it was obvious that this native of New York and citizen of the world of ideas liked being there, and it was equally obvious that the students and teachers of agriculture who sat with him were enjoying his company.

The university, like the rest of Arkansas, is in a state of transition. There is a good institution of higher education up here in the hills, and with the help of God and the general assembly, there may soon be a great one.

HARRY S. ASHMORE.

Senator Kem's Attitude on Sale of Arms and Strategic Materials to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject Aiding the Enemy, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star. This is a very fine tribute to our able and courageous colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIDING THE ENEMY

Those Senators who insist that any ban on economic aid to countries which sell arms or strategic materials to Russia and its satellites must be mandatory, and not permissive, are entirely correct.

The Senate adopted a similar mandatory provision last year. But in conference with the House it was watered down to a permissive ban. In other words, the administration was authorized, but not required, to withhold ECA aid from countries that were trading with the enemy. The results were nil.

Senator KEM told the Senate on Thursday that he had tried to find out what the National Security Council had done under the permissive arrangement. "So far as my information goes," he said, "it has done nothing but negotiate and consider. Not one gun, not one barrel of gasoline, not one ton of rubber has been withheld from the Marshall plan countries which were shipping materials of that kind to Russia and her satellite nations including Communist China. What the Senate wants, I think, is a definite, mandatory law, with no ground for horse-trading, no ground for discretion, but a definite direction to ECA not to send any materials to Marshall plan countries or any financial assistance if they are shipping materials of war to Russia or her satellites."

The best evidence that Senator KEM is right consists of the fact that last year's discretionary power was never used in any effective way. Other nations, supposedly associated with us in the Korean war, have been doing a lively business with the enemy. This country did the same until last December. The whole record is shameful and disgraceful. It is nothing less than criminal to send boys into a war and then to sell to the enemy any material which can be used, directly or indirectly, to kill them. It can be stopped to a very large extent if the ban, which the Senate has approved unanimously, is adopted. Under no circumstances should there be any retreat from it this time.

Marshall Can't Duck His Responsibility for China Policy—He Was One of Its Architects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Gen. George Marshall had the opportunity to be recorded as one of the great soldiers of the Nation. Those who will write the history will hesitate to so record Mr. Marshall, I am sure. Perhaps his ability and capacity as a military man in the field will not be questioned, but certainly considerable doubt will arise as to his veracity.

Mr. Speaker, to this day, Mr. Marshall would have us believe that he did not remember where he was the night before the bombing at Pearl Harbor. No man in his position, if he was conscious, could have such a lapse of memory. Some day the facts will be known—the truth will out eventually.

When Secretary Marshall was before a Senate committee for confirmation as Secretary of Defense, he testified that he was not a party to writing China policy before he went on an ill-fated mission to China in 1945. On last Thursday, May 10, he again gave the same impression when testifying before a joint Senate committee in the MacArthur matter.

Mr. Speaker, for the second time the Washington Post has called the turn on Marshall's testimony in well-reasoned

editorials. I include as part of my remarks in this connection the one that appeared today. George Marshall should learn to tell the truth or retire from public life.

CHINA DIRECTIVE

Secretary Marshall has again left the impression with the people of America that he was not party to the instructions which he bore to China for his mediation mission of 1945–7. He did the same thing during a Senate interrogation when he was appointed Secretary of Defense. On Thursday he said he presumed Secretary Byrnes and Under Secretary Acheson had a hand in his directive; he was certain that John Carter Vincent had. It seems incredible to us that a man of General Marshall's stature was only an errand boy to China, yet this is the impression he leaves.

Nor does the story as we gathered it at the time bear out this odd construction. It was necessary in late 1945 to hammer out a new policy toward China because of two circumstances. Civil war was on the brink of breaking out, and there was a holler in the country to bring home the 50,000 marines stationed in China. Working papers were prepared in the State Department covering all courses of possible action. These formed the basis of a discussion with General Marshall as the new special Ambassador to China. Secretary Byrnes in Speaking Frankly says this of that conference:

"The Sunday before I left for Moscow, Under Secretary Acheson, General Marshall, and members of his staff met in my office. By the end of the morning's discussion, we had agreed upon the statement of policy that subsequently was approved by the President and released to the public on December 15. Thereafter the President made no change in that policy except upon the recommendation of General Marshall or with his approval."

This statement of policy was the directive about which Secretary Marshall was questioned up till Saturday at the MacArthur hearings.

The directive conveyed through General Marshall an offer of assistance to the national government under Chiang Kai-shek in bringing about a cessation of internal strife and the establishment of a government representative of the contending factions (mainly Nationalist and Communist) in which the Nationalists would predominate. The mission failed. The idea of popular-front governments has since been proved to be a favored ruse of the Communists to capture control. Nevertheless there is no reason to botch history because of either circumstance. This, however, is what has hitherto been happening—in the administration's denial till the present hearings that there was ever any intention of encouraging a coalition in China containing the Communists and in Secretary's Marshall's implication that he had virtually nothing to do with his own instructions.

At the time General Marshall was not only privy to and a coinspirer of his directive; he was enthusiastic about the mission. This was very noticeable midway through his mission when he paid a flying visit to America and addressed the National Press Club. It was equally obvious from the way the mission was handled. Apparently General Marshall insisted upon keeping a kind of state department within the State Department. His own appointee, General Carter, was brought in, and all the Marshall reports came to him, and were then transmitted direct to the President. Thus, whatever the exact truth about the original instructions, the policy for China from the day the general received his terms of reference until he left China was as much the policy of General Marshall as of anyone else.

Fulbright Exchange-of-Students Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as an example of what is being done under the exchange-of-students program, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, dated May 7, 1951, from R. Douglas Archer, a participant in the program, who came from Australia to the University of Minnesota, where he is taking postgraduate work in aeronautical engineering.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in this connection, an editorial entitled "Fulbright Scholars," published in the New Orleans States on May 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the letter and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 7, 1951.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
United States Senator,
Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is nearly 8 months since I left Australia to go to the University of Minnesota for postgraduate study in aeronautical engineering. My journey, which covered nearly 10,000 miles, was free. It was a gift made possible by your inspiration and leadership and by the generosity of America.

For me this journey was the opportunity of a lifetime. At the magnificent Minnesota campus I have received very valuable advanced academic training. In addition, I have had time to travel at will within the United States, to wonder at the manifestations of technological progress, to observe for myself habits and customs, the very high standard of living and extensive distribution of wealth, to admire the American sense of moral values and of freedom, and, above all, to see the forms and operation of the institutions of self-government.

I am constantly amazed by the favorable difference between the facts and the impressions of America which I previously had, and what others would have one believe. It has been a refreshing and invigorating experience to say the least. You and your student exchange programme has brought great benefit to me and, as we know, to many thousands of students both foreign and American. I am certain that this is a tremendous force against ignorance, skepticism, and cynicism, and an immense power for extending understanding, hope, and faith in the future. May it continue to do so. May it embrace more young men around the world.

Please accept my sincere thanks.

Very truly yours,

R. DOUGLAS ARCHER,
Teaching Assistant.

[From the New Orleans States of May 8, 1951]

FULBRIGHT SCHOLARS

However much they are obscured by clouds from the battlefield, legislative assemblies, and international tribunals, forces for peace are at work today. These are the long-range forces to which civilization must tie its hopes.

In mind, immediately, is the Fulbright scholarship program now in its fifth year. What it does is to make possible on a scale hitherto inachievable international exchange of students. A basic cause of war is lack of international understanding between races and nationalities. Fulbright scholarships strike at this root of the trouble.

This coming year some 3,300 students of 20 countries will receive financial help in their postgraduate work at home and abroad. Seven hundred of those will be Americans who will go overseas to conduct research, lecture, study, or teach.

Money for the scholarships came from the sales of United States surplus war property left overseas after World War II. Part of the proceeds, in foreign currencies, was bartered for tuition and living expenses for students. All told, the funds were about $140,000,000 and earmarked to be spent over a 20-year period.

Connivance and crookery in the handling of some of the Nation's vast store of war surplus should not be allowed to hide the good to which much surplus was turned under the guidance of neighbor Arkansas' wise Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most thought-provoking statement entitled "My Stand." It was written by Mr. E. S. Weed, of the Marbleheac (Mass.) Messenger, and I hope that my colleagues will take time to read it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY STAND

For my own part General MacArthur is the true American. I doubt if there has been more considered, more thoughtful, and more honest testimony given before any Senate committee in our history. I wish to say this, that if we are going to divert from the aims and hopes and purposes, as they have been expressed in all the testimony of General MacArthur, for an uncertain peace, then I for one believe we are moving in the wrong direction.

There is only one answer to all of what the general says, and that is the answer which General Marshall and President Truman have given, that they are buying time in order to save the peace, well knowing the destructive results of a third world war. Both Truman and Marshall believe that time can be bought, while MacArthur believes that it cannot be bought at a social profit.

I have said several times that I am unable to see any difference between the situation which we face now with respect to communism and that which England and France faced in the thirties with respect to Hitlerism. At that time, when Hitler was raging, Churchill said that the issue should be met squarely, that there should be no appeasing and that every minute which passed was a minute added to the assets of the enemy. Chamberlain said then what Truman and Marshall have said. All three have striven for peace fearing a breakdown of civilization in the event of war. The destructive use of gas in those days was thought to be such as would destroy civilization. And now are there similar thoughts with respect to the atom bomb?

Chamberlain certainly exchanged time for the sake of peace.

I should like to suggest some differences in the picture had Chamberlain continued to buy time for the sake of peace, let us say for 12 months longer than he did. This assumption being a fact, the Second World War would have run its course a year later than it did.

In the winter of 1945, in fact 6 months before the end of the German war the snorkel submarine was put into use, and the speed of the submarine under water, run up to 30 knots. During the month of December 1944, 32 vessels of 10,000 tons or more were sunk in the English Channel within a 10-mile area between Cherbourg and Southampton. I spent the entire evening, the night before Christmas, shuffling the dead from ship to shore, the result of a transport sinking 2 miles from the Cherbourg breakwater. More than 8,000 bodies passed over our decks between 6 o'clock and 1 o'clock in the evening. These submarines would have roamed over the ocean for somewhat more than 18 months. We had no defense except to keep out of sight. What effect would that have had upon the war?

It was in the fall of 1944 when the American armies were on German territory when the first German jet planes with rockets were used. Our armies would have had to face those jet and rocket planes, infinitely superior to our own in the Normandy landing. Would the results have been different?

V1 and V2 were born in July of 1944 and turned against England. Instead of a few months nearly 2 years of V1 and V2 bombings would have been turned on England. Only a fluke stopping of the bombing in 1941 saved the English nation from surrender. Any honest Englishman will tell you that. What would have been the result had V1 and V2 been used in England for 24 months.

I have read thoroughly the writings of Churchill, and of Eisenhower and Bradley. I saw some of the activities myself. Had Chamberlain tried to buy peace for another 12 months there would have been no England and no France and the Power of Hitler would have been far greater than that which the Russians now possess.

As MacArthur has said and as Marshall has said, and as anyone with sense should know, nothing but life can be gained from war. Only a fool would advocate it as an instrument of policy.

The goal of peace should be sought wherever all men know that war is futile. But peace cannot be sought where there are men who do not know or do not care of or about the futility of war.

During the last 20 years there have come into this world groups of people who do not seem to understand that war is futile. Mussolini was one. Hitler was another. And the Russian dictatorship is made up of others. The proof of this is that, well knowing the horrors and the costs of war, they have in fact started a war, and a war in proportion as damaging as the First World War. As long as these kind of leaders are in control anywhere on earth the survival of other people will have to be fought for and should be fought for at whatever cost.

The time we are buying now is as much of an asset to the communistic world as it was to the German world. The Russian nation is in the formative stage, industrially and scientifically. At maturity and lacking the moral values which are held dear by civilized people the communistic program as it is being carried out by the Russian people can and will destroy the civilized world.

The time to act is now.

The Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Petroleum Engineer Publishing Co. entitled "What's Wrong With Being an Oil Company?"

I have received this through the courtesy of Hon. Walter S. Hallanan. The principle expounded in the article could apply to steel, textiles, mining, agriculture, transportation, and many other industries in our country.

The heads of oil companies have also done much for the advancement of culture and religion in our country. In Pennsylvania, the Mellons, as head of Gulf Oil; the Pews, as head of Sun Oil; and the Benedums, as head of a group of companies, have made large contributions for the promotion of health, welfare, good government, and the work of religion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH BEING AN OIL COMPANY?

(By Ernestine Adams)

(We have reached a point where we are fed up with this papa-knows-best attitude of a group that tries to be the advance agent for national socialism. This clique seems particularly to desire a devitalized, clinging oil industry that will put its faith in a bureau and maybe end up with a subsidy. If United States citizens realized the spectacular contributions to the Nation of the oil industry under its own initiative, they would beware of trading it off for the supine, controlled ghost of an industry that the conspiracy of socialism would have them accept. The oil industry has been a silent whipping boy for imagined ills long enough. It's time to look at the record—and what a record.)

I'm getting tired of hearing about those "rich oil companies." I'm getting tired of hearing former Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes talk about rich oil companies growing "merrily wealthier out of oil belonging to the whole people," and tired of Columnist Drew Pearson shuddering piously every time he mentions an oil company or an oilman. I'm getting tired of the implication that for an oil company to exist is an affront, and for one to be rich is sinful.

Will someone tell me what is wrong with being an oil company or with an oil company's being rich? How long do you think an oil company would last if it didn't handle a lot of money? It takes barrels of the stuff just to keep a company going.

And who is going to find and produce and process oil if not the oil companies? The Socialist answer is—the Government, but no government yet has been able to build a successful oil industry, although lots of them have tried. The Soviet Government, for instance, has the greatest potential oil resources in the world, and it runs its own industry as you have probably heard. Do you know how much gasoline you would get for your car if all our cars were in Russia and you got a full share of all that was made? You would get less than 5 gallons a year. That's a year—not a week or a month. Now how would you like that? Actually you wouldn't get a gallon because it is all reserved for government and the war machine. In the United States you buy on the average nearly 700 gallons of gas a year for your car and there is no shortage to stop you.

Where do the oil companies get their money? Out of the earth? Oh, no. That's where a lot of people make a mistake. Oil brings wealth only as it is transformed into useful goods. The oil companies get their money right out of your pockets. They coax it out of you with the biggest bargains on the face of the earth. You can have all the gasoline you want and at the world's lowest prices. You can have varnish and insect spray, synthetic rubber and machine oil, nail polish and floor wax. You can have gas in your house and your factory, and if the pipeline doesn't connect, you can have liquid gas in tins to hook on your stove or refrigerator.

You get some products you didn't even know had petroleum in them. It is in your soap and detergents—oh, wonderful oil companies that thought up detergents. It is in your nylons to prevent runs, in your lipstick to keep it moist, in covers of your books to prevent cracking, in your raincoat, your shoes, your medicine, your paper lamp shade, your roof—on and on and on you can go.

In fact, let's face it—you pay the oil companies billions of dollars a year—about $7,000,000,000 last year—for all kinds of things that make it easier to live.

And what do these bloated capitalist do with those buckets of greenbacks, you'd like to know. First they have almost 2,000,000 employees who get the biggest dip into the kitty. Employees get paid better than most, which is as it should be because a lot of them have to have a technical or scientific education and years of specialized training. There aren't many strikes, you'll notice, and the rare ones they have are in the refining industry. In the drilling end things are free and easy. If you go broke drilling dry holes, you may be working for your driller next year. Plenty of roughnecks or roustabouts think they'll have a right of their own one day, and a good many of the high moguls in the industry who look as though they never saw a shovel have dug many a slush pit in their day.

These big wheels get big pay—about on the level with other industries, except that there are more of them. There aren't many automobiles companies, for instance, but there are a bunch of big oil companies and thousands of little ones. The Oil Information Committee says there are 36,000 companies in the industry.

Well, to get on with it, they've got some billions left after paying the help, so they give Uncle Sam his—which means a few more billions. The oil industy pays the biggest tax bill of any industry. In fact, some $3,500,000,000 a year goes for Federal, State, and local taxes levied on the oil industry and its products. This is about 7 percent of all taxes paid.

Yet President Truman calls this gross undertaxation and all the "gimme" boys chime in. What do they want? A crippled industry that has to be propped up by Government subsidies?

If a profit is made—it isn't always—the stockholders get theirs. Since you customers are so steady now, the dividends over the years average up about like preferred bonds. This takes care of several millions more people who have their hands—or money, that is—in the oil business.

THEY DRILL ANY PLACE

With the billions that are left the oil company does as fast a job of getting ahead as you're likely to find. The companies drill holes any place that looks as if it might have oil. They drill as deep as 4 miles, they drill in the desert, in the jungle, in the ocean; the derrick may be standing in sticky

waves of heat or may be covered with thick ice. They drill where savage tribes have wrecked the rig, and where a plane has to bring in the machinery. They got no sense at all. Oil is where you find it, they say. They spend buckets of money. They spend a million and a half sometimes for one hole and get no oil, either. They spend millions just to find out where to put the drill down. They pay some more millions to a million or so other people for the privilege of using their land to drill on. If the drill hits an oil sand, they give the owner of the land a proportionate share of the oil they find.

And what if the oil is next door to the end of the world with no customers in sight? They build a pipeline to the sea or to a refinery, which they also have to build, then build a harbor so the tankers they build or buy can take the oil to you customers. They have to put up a lot of cash before you drive into a filling station and say "Fill 'er up." It may be a year or two before the money begins coming back. It may be 10 years. It may be never.

THEY MAKE ANYTHING

Of course, you have no use for that black crude oil, and so the refining comes in. This process takes tons of crude oil and separates the molecules, then pieces them together to give them a new look. There are plants that do one thing—like separate gasoline from gas, and plants that do dozens of things. There are plants that make powdered sulfur out of gas and plants that only process materials for other plants that make dyes, plastics, explosives, or drugs. There are plants that take out certain wanted hydrocarbons and put the dry gas back in the oil formation to bring up more hydrocarbons, like a dumb-waiter.

A refinery is always expanding, renovating, adding, experimenting, and revising. It has to keep ahead of you customers—it has to provide more gasoline in the summer and more fuel in winter from the same spot and with the same crude oil. The inventions in this line come so fast and furious that you stay in there pitching or go broke. So the oil companies part with a few more billions because they have to keep up. They have to make the best petroleum products possible and make them at such low cost that you can't resist putting out your money.

The companies also hire some of the top scientists to study how methods in the industry can be improved and how better products can be made. They have to have big laboratories and smart technical staffs. They have laboratories that work only on agricultural uses of petroleum and laboratories that test a hundred uses of petroleum in everything from paints to pavements. They spend about one-fourth what all United States industry spends on research.

Since the war, the oil industry has spent $12,000,000,000 making improvements and expanding facilities. In the United States, the oil industry now has an investment of $32,000,000,000, or $200 for each man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Do they expect to make this towering investment pay? In time, yes. And then what will they do with the buckets of dough they will make, these rich oil companies?

WHAT THEY'LL DO

What they have been doing all along.

Drill more wells and find more oil so we won't run short in peace or war.

Build bigger and longer pipelines from fields to refineries and from refineries to customers so the supply is always available.

Construct better refineries to make fancier products that will fill more needs in your life.

So you see why I am tired of hearing about rich oil companies. The people are getting the people's oil and gas resources—more people are getting more than under any other plan ever devised. Several millions of persons are getting benefits from oil and gas operations in wages and salaries, dividends and royalties, pensions and contracts, profits on sales and commissions.

Everyone in the United States benefits from the use of low-cost petroleum products—a use that has launched and shaped our modern life.

The whole world benefits from the fact that oil resources grow in the hands of free enterprise and stagnate under the thumb of government monopoly. The whole huge Communist world has about 9 percent of the world's production of oil—the free world has 91 percent, all developed by individual capitalist oil companies, which spend to good effect the riches we pay them for their goods.

So let us give the oil companies their due and admit they provide us the best service ever given on developing oil and gas reserves and transforming them into useful and vital products. Their service cost is low, too, come to think of it.

Why Farmers Will Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Progressive Farmer, by Charles Morrow Wilson, together with an introduction by Dr. Clarence Poe:

[From the Progressive Farmer of May 1951]

We are here printing the second half of one of the most important articles we have published in recent years—Farmers Will Stop Communism, by Charles Morrow Wilson. Mr. Wilson, a native of Arkansas, whose business in managing large tropical plantations has taken him all over the world, makes this plain—that communism was made especially for city wage earners and hence never can fit the desires of farmers whose highest ambition is to own and love some bit of land as their very own.

Instead of freeing the peasant farmer from slavery to the landlord, communism merely makes him an equally hopeless slave of the state. Senator Borah once said, "Three basic needs of every man are: something to own, something to love, something to worship." Atheistic communism's disbelief in God, in family ties, and in land ownership repudiates all this. Hence I believe farmers the world over will indeed stop communism. But to make sure of this, all America must try to encourage more home ownership, fairer rents, and better farm methods among the poverty-cursed millions we discussed on this page last month. At no great cost farmers cooperative demonstration work such as Dr. Seaman Knapp used to revolutionize southern farming methods could bring new hope and better living for those 1,000,000,000 underprivileged folk in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I commend to all readers Mr. Wilson's second chapter.

CLARENCE POE,
President and Editor.

WHY FARMERS WILL STOP COMMUNISM

(By Charles Morrow Wilson)

I believe what I see. Early in 1938 I went to Cuba to learn about sugarcane farming. In Cuba I began to see and learn about what was (and still is) there called communism. It is basically different from the Kremlin line, however much Moscow tries to influence it.

Promptly I heard of Communist headquarters in principal cities in Central and South America—Habana, Mexico City, Kingston (Jamaica), Bogota, and elsewhere. But like so many other newcomers, I observed that the hired help of what was then called the third International was firmly attached to the cities, within easy walking distances of the better barrooms. I learned, too, and at close range, that the overwhelming majority of the Latin Americans who were being called Communists are not that at all.

My first lesson in Cuba was particularly revealing. There had been a great deal of labor strife in the sugar-milling districts back of Santiago. Faced with badly sagged markets, the Cuban Government had dropped sugar quotas to the very floor. The big cane-grinding mills were running only 6 weeks a year. But an attempted Communist seizure of one of the great sugar strongholds of Cuba resulted in a complete flop.

After Cuba I went to Central America, to a succession of banana farms in the hot, green valleys of Guatemala and Honduras, west Costa Rica, and south-coast Panama. Those were the closing 1930's and the beginning 1940's when there were deluges of talk about the Caribbean and South America going Red. The Kremlin branch offices were springing up like ragweeds in April. The radical Toledano labor unions were seeping across many boundaries south of the Rio Grande. Soviet Russia had assigned to the area Comrade Oumanski, an exceptionally able propagandist whom the Kremlin made U. S. S. R. Ambassador to Mexico and Costa Rica. Throughout the entire area, depression, joblessness, and political unrest were altogether too plentiful. The times were distinctly ripe for the Commies, and from their standpoint taking over was a now-or-never proposition.

The Reds failed much more decisively than was generally reported. There are many reasons why they failed. One was that the Communist Party employees were preponderantly incompetent. The U. S. S. R. had some brilliant men; but not enough to go around. Furthermore, Soviet know-how regarding the needs and viewpoints of the tropics is far under par. Marxism, and all the Kremlin gang leaders have been able to do to and with it, which is a great deal, is still an industrial credo for industrial places and cold places. It has never taken real account of the generosity of nature and producing earth.

Soviet brain-trusters have never understood the farmer and his viewpoint either at home or abroad. This preeminent weakness grows more apparent as and where the ratio of farmers to the total population keeps rising.

The United States, like most of West Europe, has become a majority industrial and city-or-town Nation. But as one goes south in either hemisphere, the percentage of farm people keeps rising. About two-thirds of all the Caribbean peoples are farmers. In many parts of South America this ratio rises to 80 percent or higher. About the same holds true for most of Africa and most of the great fertile areas of Southeast Asia.

Josef Stalin has defined communism as a "man-made way of thinking." But farming is the most literal, the most demandingly factual of all the great professions. Throughout most of the world, as in the United States, a farmer remains a very distinctive combination of worker, property owner, executive, and planner. It is impossible, at least up to date, to hatch out any ideology or "ism" which takes care of all these activities in one breath or dose.

I have learned this in many different countries. In my early farming days in Central America, I worked with a farm foreman named Juan Ramirez, who made an exceptionally accurate diagnosis of the way the great majority of our southern neighbors think about communism. "Here we live in our own world," he said. "Communism like the other foreign "isms" calls to us from another world. * * * As we use it in these countries 'Communist' is mainly a word in politics—what men in office call those who want to be—between elections. But communism, the kind the Russians preach, does not belong in lands such as ours. It is dreamed up for the big cold cities where many poor people can easily starve and where men must work close together in factories and walk on pavements where corn and beans will not grow."

This point of view, as I have learned during nine busy years among farmers from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, represents one of the toughest challenges that Stalin & Co. have to face and answer.

But this very basic viewpoint is by no means limited to the Western Hemisphere. It is a world institution. Quite personally I have followed farmers' viewpoints in an even dozen American nations. In general it is remarkably like our own, and it is overwhelmingly against communism. In general, these Latin-Americans are good neighbors and good and honorable Christian people who truly love the land. Accordingly they have the makings of great farmers. Farming in Central and South America has a long way to go before it overtakes or even approaches ours. But on the whole its gains during the past dozen years have set a world record.

It is well, therefore, for us in North America to look south again. Also southwest and southeast, where at present about half the human race lives. The fact is being pointed out that the peoples of lower Asia, numbering about three-quarter billion, and in Africa, numbering about 160,000,000, have never yet lived well enough to understand what democracy can mean, and that we have not told them effectively what it does mean.

As a firsthand student of farming in many lands I have yet to meet one farmer in any land who is at heart a Communist. In the middle 1940's I went to equatorial West Africa to work on and learn about rubber plantations, coco, oil palm, and tribe farming in darkest Africa where I met and talked with some of the greatest farmers I have ever known anywhere. Some of them are tribal chiefs; the majority are commoners. Some were scholars, graduates of renowned universities of England, the United States, and Europe. Many of them work lands that are owned by the community or tribe. But throughout all my African roamings I never met a farmer yet who is a Soviet-style Communist, or even a reasonable copy thereof.

Three years ago, when the Kremlin was opening its momentously busy propagandizing in Southeast Asia, I made a trip to lower India, Siam, Singapore, and Malaya and briefly into Java and some fringes of Sumatra. In ports and other cities, I heard a great deal about the wonders of communism and the windness of the "comrades" in the cold and distant Kremlin. Here again the propagandists were city slickers bound to the street lights and fashionable bars, but very evidently not inclined to swinging on plowshares or bumping along on tractor seats or viewing and caring about what grows from the good earth. There is great poverty and much human desperation in Southeast Asia, in fact in most of Asia. There are tremendous problems and tremendous faults about lower Asia. There are none that communism has solved or can solve. Ten years ago Communist China was in desperate straits agriculturally. Its farm quandaries are worse today and they are going to be worse tomorrow.

The iron curtain has shut off all dependable news from Russia. But we know that Soviet agriculture, practically speaking, has a truly dismal record.

The important truth stands that the Kremlin gang has not been able to get along with Russian farmers. Also that they have made less than no progress at all in getting along with farmers beyond Soviet boundaries. This reporter has heard and seen a great many things during a busy, far-traveled lifetime. But as yet I have never seen a good farmer anywhere in the world who is actually a Communist. After 45 years of being a farmer, and living and working among farmers, I don't expect to. But I am entirely convinced that what real farmers think and feel will win the world for democracy.

Inland Waterways Face New Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by Mr. John L. Springer, published in the Washington Sunday Star of date May 13, 1951, as follows:

INLAND WATERWAYS FACE NEW DEMANDS

(By John L. Springer)

Once again the national defense effort is putting pressure on the Nation's transport facilities. And once again a heavy burden is falling on the unsung branch of transportation—the inland waterways.

In World War I the railroads were overwhelmed with shipments. So much war material piled up in freight yards that the success of the war effort itself was jeopardized. In desperation Army engineers began to exploit the almost forgotten inland rivers and canals. The freight bottleneck was broken.

In the early days of World War II Nazi submarines lurking off the Atlantic coast sank so much allied seagoing shipping that desperate measures again had to be taken. Once more shippers turned to the inland waterways and another crisis was averted.

America's watery roads now face new demands. There are 27,500 miles of them—equivalent in length to seven coast-to-coast railroads. Slightly less than half of this total is taken up by the vast Mississippi system, with the 30 navigable rivers and canals which flow into it. The Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico coast rivers make up much of the remainder and the Pacific coast rivers are also a factor. The Great Lakes are not included.

In 1949 these waterways carried an estimated 170,000,000 tons of freight.

Often barges are wired together to form a floating freight train. These barges may carry as much as 3,000 tons of freight each—coal and oil barges, carriers with tier after tier of new automobiles en route to showrooms, ore barges heading for steel mills, barges with assorted cargoes like sand, chemicals, and sugar. Twenty of these barges in a train will measure more than a thousand feet long—longer than the *Queen Elizabeth*.

Paradoxically, shipping by inland waterway is one of the oldest ways of delivering freight in the United States and also one of the newest. In pioneer days, before the days of railroads and trucks, most freight went by water. Those were the days when the Mississippi was jam-packed with traffic.

Then in the case of most of them, weeds sprang high along their banks and silt settled on their bottoms. Almost nobody cared. When the World War I crisis came, however, Army engineers dredged and widened the channels. Since then the inland waterways have increased in their importance to the national economy.

Stop the Shipment of Strategic Materials and War Goods to the Chinese Reds by Our European Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is time drastic action was taken by our Nation to stop the shipment of strategic war material to the Red Chinese by our so-called European allies. Already we have supplied the fighting forces in the Korean war. Little or no help has come from the United Nations. This situation is bad enough, but, it is made even worse by the help that is given our enemies by shipping strategic war material either direct to the Red Chinese, or, indirectly through Russia and its satellites. This situation was brought to the attention of our State Department in the summer of 1950, shortly after the Korean war started, but it has been permitted to continue all of the intervening months. In the meantime we have suffered 60,000 or more casualties. Our first duty is to our American boys. If European nations cannot be depended upon to help us they should at least be required to stop helping our enemies.

I have included as part of my remarks, in accordance with the consent granted, paragraphs 7, 8, and 9 of the Foreign Letter, No. 1673, of the Whaley-Eaton Service, dated May 8, 1951. It reads as follows:

7. Only now are the European allies getting around to banning the sale of strategic, as well as direct war goods, to the Chinese Reds. No successful effort has been made anywhere to halt the smuggling of all manner of critical materials and specialized machine tools behind the iron curtain. Britain has reversed her position in the U. N. on a strategic blockade of China. This is, in part, due to the internal outcry over heavy British casualties in the recent counter-offensive in Korea. The Grenadiers reportedly have suffered 1,000 casualties.

8. A complete and successful embargo on the movement on only a few items into Russia could cripple the Communist war effort. Best information available is that the Soviet does not have sufficient domestic supplies of tantalum, molybdenum, chromium, tungsten, cobalt, or nickel. Without these commodities she cannot produce armor plate, high-temperature steels needed in jet engines, cutting tools, gun barrels, armor-piercing projectiles, much essential electronics gear—in fact, most of the weapons of war. These are the things Russia will pay any amount for in any quantity from whatever source, as well as ball bearings, industrial diamonds, specialized machinery and plans and specifications of the West's newest industrial machinery and techniques.

9. Throughout much of Europe, smuggling is on such a scale as to have the appearance of legality. Even through legitimate trade channels there are still many serious leaks. Both Switzerland and Sweden, of course, are neutral. Many exports, banned to Red communities by the United States, are not banned by other Pact countries. For instance, Russia has on order more than 80 merchant vessels, including oil tankers. Most of them are being built in ECA countries—Allied—shipyards.

Appeasement of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, there have been many loose charges of appeasement during the course of recent discussion of foreign policy. In a recent editorial the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a great newspaper, marshaled a very compact set of pertinent facts which merit attention in this respect. Because of the particular enlightenment it affords at this time I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO MUCH NONSENSE

Commonest of the charges against the Truman administration from the minority party orators these days is that the Government's policy is one of "appeasement of communism."

This complaint is repeated and repeated by opposition speakers who have their eyes on 1952. It is echoed so often that some people may be coming to believe it solely because of the frequent reiteration.

For example, Senator TAFT made it a major part of his theme when he debated foreign policy with Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. In view of the record, the Ohio Republican said that he was afraid the administration was getting ready to "appease" the Reds in the Pacific.

Since there is so much talk of appeasers, appeasing, and appeasement, why not have a look at the facts and see how well—or how poorly—founded the charges are?

After a careful check of the record since Harry S. Truman entered the White House 6 years ago, we conclude that there are five American entries of transcendent importance in the field of foreign affairs. These are the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the Atlantic pact and the stand to stop military aggression in Korea.

Let us examine each briefly and see how it fits in with the charge that the United States Government now is engaged in a policy of appeasement of communism.

1. Truman doctrine: Announced March 12, 1947, by the Executive in a historic address to Congress, it called for $400,000,000 in aid and American military and economic advisers to stop the spread of militant communism in Europe. Particularly Mr. Truman proposed immediate help for Greece and Turkey, then under heavy Soviet pressure. By this doctrine it became the policy of the United States "to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure."

Just where is the appeasement in that?

2. Marshall plan: Proposed June 5, 1947, at Harvard by George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State, the European Recovery Act became law December 17 the same year. The enacting session of Congress was one which Mr. Truman called October 23, expressly to consider and pass legislation to help European nations build up their economy so as to resist Communist infiltration and propaganda. The first ECA appropriation was for $540,000,000 to shore up China, France, Italy, and Austria, all then under heavy pressure from the Kremlin and its agents.

Senator TAFT, in the Senate Friday, admitted that the State Department has stood firm against communism in Europe, but argued that "appeasement" has been the policy in Asia. The fact is that our Government in the 4 years after VJ-day gave Chiang Kai-shek loans and grants totaling more than $2,000,000,000. In addition we turned over to Chiang for his fight against the Communists arms that originally cost us more than a billion dollars. As Senator MCMAHON said, we gave Chiang enough arms to equip 39 divisions, and artillery and planes besides.

Just how was that the work of appeasers?

3. Berlin airlift: When the Communists threw a land blockade around Berlin, the Truman administration surmounted it by building an air bridge from West Germany to the American, British, and French sectors of the beleaguered city. Begun June 26, 1948, the airlift of more than 275,000 flights cost the United States some $360,000,000 and the British about $40,000,000. Seventy airmen lost their lives in accidents incident to the heroic efforts to keep the Allied parts of Berlin supplied with wood and fuel. When the airlift was completed, September 30, 1949, it had been in operation for 15 months.

Just how was that a demonstration of appeasement?

4. Atlantic Pact: Made public March 18, 1949, this treaty joined the signatory Atlantic area nations in a common security agreement to last at least 20 years. Members pledged themselves that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all. The parties also declared that they will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. In the event of such attack, all member nations pledged to assist the party or parties attacked forthwith, with armed force.

Just how did that take on the color of appeasement?

5. Korean defense: When the Korean Communists crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, June 25, 1950, the United States took the lead at the U. N. in gathering the strength of free nations against the naked Red aggression. Almost at once American air and naval forces were put on the side of the South Korean defenders. In a few days, American ground troops were sent in. For 9 months the war has raged and more than 50,000 casualties have been suffered by the United States. Only the two World Wars and the Civil War have brought this Nation more battle losses. And tragically, more are still to come.

Just in what way is this appeasement?

These questions, of course, require no answers. This record speaks for itself. Let Senator TAFT and the other 1952 political hopefuls shout "appeasement" all they like. They only measure themselves when they do it.

The Truman administration has its faults—all too many faults. But appeasing communism is not one of them.

To say so is to prate so much political nonsense.

The Foreign Policy Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a very interesting and instructive interview on foreign policy given by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and broadcast over 10 West Virginia radio stations on May 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT ON FOREIGN POLICY FROM RADIO INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE OVER 10 WEST VIRGINIA STATIONS ON MAY 13, 1951

ANNOUNCER. Now, Senator KILGORE, what about the foreign-policy debate?

Senator KILGORE. My firm belief is that the main issue in the foreign-policy dispute is simply this: Can we afford at this time to follow Gen. Douglas MacArthur's military recommendations regarding our policy in Asia or should we continue to pursue our present global strategy? From all of the facts I have been able to obtain—and I might say they come from supporters of both policies—I have reached the conclusion that we should take every honorable step to avoid an all-out war with Red China at this time. This is not an easy course of action. It is one that requires clear thinking, patience, and courage. Gen. George Marshall, Secretary of Defense, set forth his views on this great issue in clear, concise terms. Testifying before the joint meeting of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, he emphasized, and I quote:

"This fundamental divergence is one of judgment as to the proper course of action to be followed by the United States." Then he said: "This divergence arises from the inherent difference between the position of a field commander, whose mission is limited to a particular area and a particular antagonist, and the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President, who are responsible for the total security of the United States, and who, to achieve and maintain this security, must weigh our interests and objectives in one part of the globe with those in other areas of the world so as to attain the best over-all balance."

ANNOUNCER. Senator, I do not wish to interrupt, but judging from the letters from many people throughout the Nation, there is a great question as to where this global policy will lead us in terms of the Korean war.

Senator KILGORE. Yes; I know that some people in and out of the Congress are saying that the administration is following an appeasement policy in Asia. I wish to emphasize in the strongest manner I know how that I disagree completely with that view. By and large this charge comes from officials who have opposed our foreign policy since the end of World War II. The late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, a truly great statesman, was bitterly opposed by many of these same people. In recent days both President Truman and General Marshall have emphasized that "our objective in Korea continues to be the defeat of the aggression and the restoration of peace." In his testimony, General Marshall pointed out that in our efforts to confine the conflict to Korea and to prevent its spreading into a third world war, we stand allied with a great majority of the members of the United Nations. He reviewed the Korean situation in these words:

"Our efforts have succeeded in thwarting the aggressors in Korea, and in stemming the tide of aggression in southeast Asia and elsewhere throughout the world. Our efforts in Korea have given us some sorely needed time and impetus to accelerate the building of our defenses and those of our allies against the threatened onslaught of Soviet imperialism."

ANNOUNCER. Senator, from all indications, that last statement will be debated vigorously in Congress. What do you think will be the outcome?

Senator KILGORE. First, let me explain that I have always said that I thought a vigorous foreign policy debate—conducted on a basis of issues rather than passions and personalities—would be a fine thing for the country.

I hope that every American will carefully weigh the possible consequences of General MacArthur's policies before reaching a decision on this vital issue. Certainly every American should consider very carefully these words of General Marshall. He said:

"General MacArthur would have us, on our own initiative, carry the conflict beyond Korea against the mainland of Communist China, both from the sea and from the air. He would have us accept the risk involved not only in an extension of the war with Red China, but in all-out war with the Soviet Union. He would have us do this even at the expense of losing our allies and wrecking the coalition of free peoples throughout the world. He would have us do this even though the effect of such action might expose Western Europe to attack by the millions of Soviet troops poised in Middle and Eastern Europe."

In a time of crisis there is a natural tendency on the part of some people to seek some easy way out. All too often we have followed such a course prior to World War II, and I think the consequences of those actions should be clear by now. I pray that we will not get ourselves into the position of going it alone in Asia. I am afraid that if our Nation should decide to adopt that type of program, we would suffer terrible consequences. Let me quote briefly from a recent speech of President Truman on that score. He said: "If we go it alone in Asia, we may destroy the unity of the free nations against aggression. Our European allies are nearer to Russia than we are. They are in far greater danger. If we act without regard to the danger that faces them, they may act without regard to the dangers that we face. Going it alone brought the world to the disaster of World War II. We cannot go it alone in Asia and go it in company in Europe. The whole idea of going it alone is the opposite of everything we have stood for and worked for since World War II. In this way, going it alone in Asia might wreck the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty and the whole system of collective security we are helping to set up."

ANNOUNCER. But, Senator, there is another school of thought—judging by many of the letters to Congress—that charges the administration with bungling and failure in the whole field of foreign policy. Basically, this belief is that we have spent a great deal of money in Europe with little or nothing to show for it.

Senator KILGORE. I disagree completely. I well remember the great cry that the United Nations could not succeed. I well remember the great cry against the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine of aid to Greece and Turkey, and the lesser cry against the North Atlantic Pact.

Since the end of World War II our national policy, shaped by those who have the responsibility for our national survival, with little help from those who sit back waiting for a chance to criticize, our national policy has been shaped in terms of two long-range objectives. These objectives are, in brief, the containment and eventual suppression of Communist aggression, and the prevention, if possible, of a third world war. This has been, of necessity, a global policy. It has had to take into consideration our total resources and what we are able to do on a world-wide scale. It has been a policy which had to be shaped and carried out with cool determination, and with intelligent and informed realism. The first great step was the application of the Truman doctrine in Greece and Turkey. This policy prevented the Communists from engulfing those two countries. The second great step was the development and application of the Marshall plan.

This program has been very successful. It enabled the democratic nations of Western Europe to thwart strong Communist movements that threatened to take over—not through external aggression—but through internal weakness that grew out of the war. The third great step has been our effort to stem Communist aggression in Korea.

ANNOUNCER. Senator, many letters to Congress ask, Can we afford to continue such a policy? Can we afford to continue pouring out our national resources? Can we continue to build up our Armed Forces without wrecking our economy?

Senator KILGORE. My personal view is that we must not relax. The consequences would be very dangerous. We must continue to build up our defenses; we must continue to strengthen our allies. If we had followed the policies of those who have opposed these great measures, we would today—this very day—be without allies of any strength. We would be living in a world in which the iron curtain had moved ever closer to us, taking over nation after nation.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, for further clarification of one phase of the controversy over General MacArthur, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not My Responsibility," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 5.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT MY RESPONSIBILITY

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON brought out perhaps the most telling point of the MacArthur hearings. When General MacArthur was explaining his view that the Korean war can be expanded without provoking direct Soviet intervention, Senator MCMAHON asked him how he proposed to defend the Nation if his hunch should turn out to be mistaken. General MacArthur replied.

"That doesn't happen to be my responsibility, Senator. My responsibilities were in the Pacific, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the various agencies of this Government are working day and night for an over-all solution to the global problem."

Later Senator MCMAHON, pursuing the idea that an expansion of the war in Asia might lead to a further expansion of it into Europe, asked the general if he considered the Allies ready today to withstand an attack in Western Europe. General MacArthur replied:

"Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area. My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I do not pretend to be the authority now on those things. When I was the Chief of Staff 20 years ago, that was my problem and I would have answered it. The Chief of Staff or others here are the ones to answer that query, not me."

There is the controversy in a nutshell. A decision to expand the Korean war cannot possibly be taken solely as a Pacific theater decision. Its implications are global in scope, yet General MacArthur is not willing to assume responsibility for the global consequences which might flow from the decision he advocates.

As we have often said, General MacArthur had every right to present privately to his superiors his own views on global as well as theater strategy. He was grievously mistaken in carrying the controversy into the political arena when he was overruled. He displays a heedless lack of restraint when he describes as "all tommyrot" President Truman's statement that the general prevented Central Intelligence Agency from operating in his theater until last January. This report has come not only from President Truman but from other well-informed sources, and the country is entitled to a better answer from General MacArthur than an expletive.

Apart from the methods he has chosen to use, General MacArthur must be judged on the merits of the course he advocates. It is a course of expanded Asian war regardless of the consequences. General MacArthur regards anything else—even the limited war we are now fighting—as appeasement. He believes that war must be total, that war is the ultimate process of politics, and he says plainly that once a nation has gone to war, "you must trust the military" to make the vital decisions.

This is a concept so foreign to the whole American tradition that General MacArthur has done the country a service by explaining so frankly the philosophic background of his views.

Victory in the War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial A Will To Win, which appeared in the May 14 edition of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WILL TO WIN

A will to win is a wonderful thing to have in a fight. If you don't have it, as everyone knows from common experience, you are likely to get your ears beat off.

As everyone also knows or ought to know, a will to win is precisely what has been lacking lately in this country. The fashion is to say that it has been lacking in Washington, in the State Department, in the Pentagon, at the White House—and among the other countries of the free alliance. But the lack

goes a lot deeper and has been a lot closer to home than that. Right down to the roots of our country, among the people of the United States, there has been a prevailing lack of a will to win the biggest fight that has ever engaged mankind.

Americans and their Government have had the will to do many things. To fight communism. To resist aggression. To prevent war. To join with other nations in what the President recently called the "high principle" of collective security. But the actions, policies, and purposes expressed in these and similar phrases have not added up to a will to win the struggle with the Communist enemy, whether in Korea or in the world at large. On the contrary they more often than not have been avenues of escape from the very thought of having to win.

Now all that is changing. A will to win—to win the battle in Korea; and to win the world struggle, in its several forms—is unmistakably shaping up in this country. It is shaping up slowly, with all the thought, the care, the hesitations called for by the burdens and the risks involved. But the time is near when a will to overcome the Communist enemy and win the world struggle may fairly be said to be the manifest will of America.

OUR MAIN ENEMY

This growth of national purpose is occurring in a very American way. A vast amount of noise accompanies it, causing some concern at home and much trepidation around the world. At such times faith and perception are needed—the kind of faith that assumes a healthy and fruitful outcome; and the perception to note and heed certain signs and characteristics of American debate which in the current instance point to a beneficial outcome.

One such sign is the emergence of individuals who have come to be symbols of a particular idea. Hitherto incoherent and perhaps unvoiced needs and purposes crystallize around them. Opposing views and instincts crystallize against them. The result, for a time, is violent and seemingly destructive controversy. Pundits and kindred sophisticates deplore the whole process, forgetting that the symbols can be effective only if they represent some trend that is real and strong in the country.

The foremost symbol of a will to win is General MacArthur. At the moment, and by his own doing, he is especially the symbol of a will to win the shooting wars. When he testified in Washington last week the shooting war on his mind was the one in Korea. With brilliance and passion he insisted that this war can be won and must be won. He chose to duck some other points in a fashion which at times seemed very weak and unconvincing, and his enemies no doubt will make the most of the defects. But he carried the day on many, many other points. His biggest point of all—his inclusive point was that "communism throughout the world" is "our main enemy"; that "the total power of communism throughout the world" must be diminished and eventually defeated; and that any objective short of the decisive defeat of the present enemy in Korea can mean nothing but a victory and an increase of strength for "communism throughout the world."

General MacArthur showed, among other things, what a will to win can do for clarity of mind. Billed as a man of inclusive and dangerous certainty about everything under the sun, he turned out to have only two certainties—that world communism is the main enemy, and that the United States ought to win its fights once it gets into them. He refused to be certain that the Soviet Union is the main enemy ("I said that communism throughout the world was our main enemy"). He refused to be certain that the Soviet Union is hell-bent on a general war (so far as he could see, the Soviet Union's own forces are mainly on the defensive). He refused to be certain that the Kremlin is the seat and center of enemy power ("How would I know?"). He refused to be certain that facing the fact of war with Communist China necessarily entails the overthrow of the Chinese Communist Government ("Our purpose * * * is to force China to * * * stop killing our boys in Korea"). He refused to be certain that after a year or two of building up our forces we will be better able to deal with Soviet power than we are now (How can we know, he asked with the wallop of common sense, that the Soviet Union isn't building up faster than we are?).

A VISION OF VICTORY

He refused, above all, to be certain that some of the most respected clichés of the day mean anything.

"Resisting aggression," for instance. General MacArthur said right out that he did not know what it meant, and abruptly suggested that "resisting aggression" means nothing unless the purpose is to defeat the aggressor.

Asked whether he believed in "collective security," he did not reply with automatic piety that he did. Instead he twice asked his badgering questioner, Senator MCMAHON, "What do you mean by collective security?" Senator MCMAHON meant "a military alliance to keep the peace." Merely by raising the question, General MacArthur left the revolutionary impression that "collective security" may just possibly mean nothing at all—until and unless it means a collective effort to overcome the common enemy.

As General MacArthur knows better than most, the decisive conflict and the decisive victory may be won by the side which is at its best in the nonshooting, or cold war. So far he has chosen to let others bespeak and symbolize the will to win that kind of war. In this respect, a perfect counterpoint to General MacArthur is provided by Paul Hoffman. His war—the war he understands, prefers, and hopes to make the only war—is the cold war. He has just written a book about it, wishfully mistitling it Peace Can Be Won (Doubleday, New York; $2.50). More than any other American in public life, Paul Hoffman typifies the will to win his kind of war and the United States is lucky to have him around. The country would be fortunate if more Americans really understood his vision of victory.

A sign of the times is that President Truman is at last constrained to say that he, too, wants to win. For the very first time in his painful progression from a fixed belief in "no war" to the reluctant recognition of "some war," the President last week used the verb "to win" in connection with the contest for freedom. Referring to recommended measures of military, economic, and political warfare, he said, "All these elements are essential to enable us to win the kind of struggle that the Kremlin has brought about."

In the same document—a letter explaining his latest defense budget—the President nevertheless held forth the same old balderdash of limited necessity and limited national effort. So long as the President and those around him deal in such inadequacies, he cannot expect to have the belief and confidence of the country when he speaks of winning. For leadership, and for the expression of what is right and needful, the country must continue to look instead to the MacArthurs, to the Hoffmans, and to the brave men who are dying without reward in Korea.

Seventy Years Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Paul Wooton celebrated his seventieth birthday.

Paul Wooton is universally loved in our Nation's Capital.

As the Washington Post pointed out in an editorial, he is indeed a newspaperman's newspaperman. Throughout his long service he has subscribed to the code of honesty and fairness. I have never heard a person question the accuracy of a Paul Wooton story. He has never been too busy to lend a helping hand, to give a word of advice, or to write a line of praise.

When Mrs. Boggs and I first came to Washington, 11 years ago, he and his lovely wife, who has since passed to her reward, helped us find a place to live. His life epitomizes the noble thought that "it is better to give than to receive."

Not only has he brought honor and credit to himself, but he has also added tremendously to the prestige of the great newspaper he so ably represents, the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

Mr. Speaker, several days ago my colleague, Hon. FRANK SMITH, incorporated in the RECORD the Post editorial entitled "Seventy Years Young." It was a beautiful tribute.

Hoover Commission Recommendations for the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, healthy criticism is a good thing for individuals and for Government agencies. It is in this spirit, that we constantly try to improve the various departments of Government, that I call attention to the following newsletter written by Mr. Louis F. Fowler, director of the United Business Service, recommending adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations for the Post Office Department:

APRIL 7, 1951.

Here's your first quarter index and a visit over mail service.

I guess this is the first letter I've ever written to you, our clients, where I griped about anything, but when it comes to the present mail service, what else can one do?

Many of you have written me about the poor delivery service of our reports. We use first-class mail, and it is metered to expedite post-office handling.

It has been my privilege to serve off and on on the Postal Facilities Committee of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, twice as chairman. This, plus the fact that I have kept in close contact with postal affairs for the past 27 years, as we of the United Business Service are among Boston's largest mail users. In fact, the local post office has told us that we rank No. 1 as far as the volume of air mail going out of Boston is concerned.

We have written our Congressmen to get back of the nonpartisan report of the Hoover Commission, which would result in higher efficiency, lower costs, and service to the American public to which they are entitled from their post office. I am sure you will not accuse me of playing politics when I urge you to do the same.

We do not go to press until after the close of the New York stock market on Friday in order to give you up-to-the-minute information. Our presses run at least until midnight Friday, we begin inserting the reports in their envelopes at 7 a. m. on Saturday, and start delivering them to the post office within an hour. This should insure every client receiving their reports the first delivery Monday morning, which is the same time that clients located right here in Boston get theirs; no one can, therefore, under any conditions receive them before the close of the market on Saturday.

In contrast to deliveries here in the United States—we have clients throughout the world—we just received a letter from a client in Switzerland telling us that by air mail he receives the reports on Monday.

We do know, however, because of our close contact with the Boston post office, that our weekly reports are promptly dispatched by them to the airlines and the railway mail each Saturday. We tie them in bundles and deliver them ourselves in regular mail bags to the post office.

We certainly do everything we can to start the reports promptly on their way, so if you don't receive them promptly, I hope you will complain to your local post office. With enough complaints, this present unsatisfactory postal situation should, at least, improve somewhat.

Cordially,

LOUIS F. FOWLER,
Director of Service.

State of Israel: Anniversary Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today is the third anniversary of the State of Israel. Wherever the ideas of independence, liberty, freedom are held as cherished human possessions, Israel's independence day is an event of importance. It is especially significant for us in this country because we had a great deal to do with the creation of Israel. Israeli leaders had not only our sympathy and support but they also had material and financial aid from this country.

This assistance was extended willingly and generously in the knowledge that it was for a good cause—the rescue of a victimized and distressed people and the restoration of their homeland.

In terms of years the history of the Republic of Israel is short indeed, but in terms of sheer accomplishments that brief history is extraordinary. Three years ago, at the time of the Israeli declaration of independence, the area of the country was circumscribed, having only 5,000 square miles with some 600,000 inhabitants. Today its area is more than 8,000 square miles and the population exceeds 1,250,000. The annual rate of immigrants exceeds 200,000. In this task of repatriation and settlement, the Government of Israel has worked most conscientiously. Every effort has been made and is being made to rescue suffering and destitute Jews from European and middle eastern countries. Of the immigrants totaling more than 500,000, about half have come—or fled—from the iron-curtain countries. More than 100,000 were brought in from Arab countries. Out of the "blood, sweat, and tears" the new Republic of Israel is being built as a model of progress and democracy in the Middle East. Let us hope that they will have the peace which is so necessary to the accomplishment of this purpose. Jews have always looked forward to the regaining of their historic homeland. During their centuries-long life in Diaspora they have devoutly cherished this deep-seated hope. Through their persevering efforts and their sacrifices, they have at last attained their goal. Let us hope, on this third anniversary of independence, the Republic of Israel will grow strong and prosperous and become a powerful factor for peace and progress in the Near East.

Teaching the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Congress and the country an editorial written by Robert D. Lynn, editor of the Shield and Diamond, the official publication of the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity. In my opinion, it provides some food for thought for all those connected with the great profession of education—whether it be as educators; as school, college, or university administrators; as members of boards of education, or trustees and regents of higher institutions of learning; or as members of parent-teacher associations. It might also be read reflectively by those whose financial contributions comprise the great endowments which enable public institutions to serve a noble purpose. In brief, this editorial points up the fact that it is essential to follow through on the business of education in order to make certain that what is taught is designed to preserve and protect America, and to enrich its blessings, rather than to destroy the faith of our fathers and the capacity to appreciate those things about this country which are fundamentally sound and right.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSOR, ARE YOU TEACHING THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE?

(By Robert D. Lynn)

Many fine youths have entered our institutions of higher learning expecting our democratic way of life as the routine way and the benefits of our democracy as fruits to be expected and enjoyed without thanks. During their university years they progress a step forward and become vocally critical of various democratic institutions and practices under the learned proddings and cynicisms of many professors who spend the major part of their time destroying rather than strengthening our great democracy.

This is no idle generalization. The results of the general trend in higher education in recent years toward such cynical criticism is graphically illustrated in statements made by several highly intelligent American citizens who have professed to following the Communist Party line. In his profound address before the All American Conference to Combat Communism, United States Senator KARL E. MUNDT, urged that every school in American include in its curriculum one course in "What's Right With America." He graphically indicated the need for such a course by reporting the testimony of Miss Elizabeth Bentley before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Senator MUNDT stated:

"I never want to have to listen again to what I heard from the lips of Miss Elizabeth Bentley, when our House Committee on Un-American Activities was conducting the investigation and I serving as chairman. J. Edgar Hoover says that she is the smartest woman spy ever to work in our country. She had under her domination a young man in the Commerce Department who was passing on the strategic aspect of our export of arms to Russia. One of Miss Bentley's boy friends confessed to the committee that he was giving her money but that it was not for Communist dues; that he was simply subscribing to the Communist Daily Worker for himself and some of the lads over at his rooming house. That was his defense; that is, if such an admission can be called a defense.

"So I asked Miss Bentley one day:

"'Tell me, Miss Bentley, how in the world did you become an American spy working for the Communist government?'

"Pulchritudinous, pleasant, personable, from a fine old Republican, New England banking family, she had all the advantages of a public school education, a graduate of Vassar and of Columbia—how did she become a Communist?

"She said:

"'Senator, let me tell you that in all my educational career, grade school, high school, college, and graduate school, I never had a single professor or teacher ever talk to me with enthusiasm about the virtues and values of the American system and without some kind of carping criticism that destroyed the glamor of the whole thing. Each of my teachers had a "yes-but" approach to our American virtues and each found as much to criticize or condemn in our environment as he found to praise. So when a Columbia University professor of mine took me to a Communist cell meeting, I heard a man for

the first time in my life talking about politics, about economics, and about government with a gleam in his eye, with enthusiasm in his voice and with the force of a person who is convinced his way is right. Thus I was an easy push-over and I joined up with the Communists.'

"Whittaker Chambers and others have told us similar stories of how early school training had failed to impress upon them the virtues and values of our American success formula of freedom. As you all know, Alger Hiss was convicted by a jury of his peers here in New York City of perjuring himself by lying about his faithfulness to America and his fidelity to communism which led him to steal secret State Department papers and deliver them to a Communist espionage apparatus of which Chambers was one of the main operatives.

"The question is, who is responsible for Alger Hiss? I don't believe Harvard University can escape all responsibility. I don't believe his mentor there escaped by securing high judicial position either. Columbia University cannot escape all responsibility for Henry Julian Wadleigh. Hiss and Wadleigh were smart young men whose minds became perverted some place in the educational mill. It seems to me that in a college or university there is a responsibility to turn out citizens who are sound and who are right and who are patriots."

This is a serious charge, Professor. Is your teaching today responsible for some future Bentley or Hiss? Do you teach your students to became "citizens who are sound and who are right and who are patriots?"

Gromyko's Behavior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from a recent issue of the Evening Star:

GROMYKO'S BEHAVIOR

For more than a month now, in a dreary grind of dreary sessions, the deputies of the Big Four Foreign Ministers have been meeting in Paris to work out an agenda for a full-dress Anglo-French-American-Russian conference to ease international tensions. But the net result of their efforts to date is nothing, or worse than nothing. Andrei Gromyko, the Soviet delegate, has seen to that. He has been at his ugly best in putting on an act that seems to make such a gathering virtually impossible.

At any rate, it is difficult to see how anything short of a complete change in Gromyko's behavior can save the Paris meeting from blowing up in a way that will end whatever hope may still exist for a big four conference. His threats, his insults, his insolence, his unparalleled invective, and especially his contemptible remarks about our American and allied United Nations forces in Korea have done such violence to the rules of diplomacy and simple, human decency that the western representatives can hardly put up with much more of the same without practicing the virtue of patience to the point of downright silliness. It is all well and good to make allowances for certain types of boors, but when they display their boorishness as if it were a mark of statesmanship, they have no right to be heard with forbearance.

There is no doubt, of course, that Gromyko's snarling conduct conforms with orders he has received from Moscow. He has made himself deliberately obnoxious (he has a personality naturally well suited to the role) because that is the way the men of the Kremlin want him to be. Their exact reason for this is anybody's guess, but the indications are that if they were sincere last November when they first proposed the big four conference, something has since happened to make them change their minds. Quite obviously their Deputy Foreign Minister in Paris is not behaving as if they really wished to hold one. Unless he puts an end soon to his insufferable nastiness, the western delegates ought to pack up their bags and head for home.

Salary Increases for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Springfield, May 11, 1951.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In compliance with House Resolution 56, I have the honor to transmit herewith photostatic copy of said resolution.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

House Resolution 56

Whereas it has come to the attention of members of the house that the employees of the United States Post Office Department have not received an increase in pay for some 2 years; and

Whereas the last pay increase, in 1949, was not commensurate with the increased costs of living; and

Whereas all living costs have greatly increased within the last several months, and the salaries and rates of pay of postal employees are not adequate to meet the high costs of living; and

Whereas there now is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill or bills to raise the salaries and wages of postal employees: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide realistic salary increases for postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each United States Senator and Congressman from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, May 10, 1951.

WARREN L. WOOD,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUNGE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Filed 1:20 p. m., May 11, 1951.

EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

The International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks one of the most thoughtfully written communications I have received from my constituency. I believe that Mr. and Mrs. Taylor have expressed the views of the average American citizen clearly and concisely. Their summary of the current international situation is similar to many others that I am receiving daily, and I commend their communication to the attention of my colleagues:

MENLO PARK, CALIF., *May 2, 1951.*

Representative JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Your form letter in reply to our telegram re MacArthur has just been received. We appreciate that in your press of business you found time to send even that acknowledgment.

We realize that you may never have the time to read this letter, but since we will probably never have the opportunity to talk with you personally, it was felt that one of us should try to put our collective thoughts into words. This is the first time we have ever written our Representatives in Congress and tried to put our political ideas on paper, so we hope you will find the time to read it—just so you will know that some of us try to think—even in our limited way.

We have talked much pro and con since this furor has arisen, among our family and friends. Our immediate family (both sides) number some thirty men and women. We are the middle groups, in age; in income; old enough to have served in World War II and still young enough to be called for any all-out military action now. Our sons, nephews and some brothers are now in Korea. We will pay for this action both in blood and taxes for years to come, so we naturally give it thought.

First, let us say we realize that any thought of impeachment is out of the question; there are insufficient grounds, and it would be poor statesmanship at this time, even though many hotheads advocate this.

Second, we do not question the President's right to remove General MacArthur—we have all been in one branch of the service or another, and understand very well the rules of military conduct—provided, of course—that a definite breach of such conduct actually occurred. What we do question is the humiliating manner in which this was done—a very poor reward for so many years of gallant and excelling military service.

Third, Democrat or Republican, we feel that this is a time when partisanship should be forgotten, for the good of our country should come before any thought of party politics.

Fourth, we feel our present foreign policy as carried out by our Secretary of State Acheson is definitely not to the good of the country. We do not, and never will believe in any form of appeasement—we question the right of the State Department to cater to the selfish desires of any foreign allied governments, when such desires are obviously motivated by a wish to gather the remnants of an already moth-eaten Empire, and particularly when the several allied governments have shown themselves to be so politically, financially and militarily unstable.

Fifth, the question of the possibility of war with Russia at this time, should General MacArthur's recommendations be carried out—it is, of course, possible, but we do believe highly unlikely. It is true that the Soviet forces are spread over much of the European Continent, but—and this is a big but—those forces must be kept there to keep the subject peoples under control, as we do definitely believe that if the Soviet were to weaken its grip in any way, the people of those occupied countries would rise in revolt and throw them out—much as they did the Nazi forces—and well does the Soviet know this. Therefore, being forced to keep such a large force of arms present in Europe, could they spare much of a force and materials to meet an Asian campaign? It is said we are not militarily ready to meet such a force if loosed—we were less ready on December 7, 1941, but we made it. We have the necessary economic and industrial power to back such a move, and we—speaking for our family—are ready to pay for it if the need arises.

Sixth, how much material is being lost by this policy of constant advance, fall back, advance, fall back now going on in Korea? What does it do to our morale and that of the peoples of the world who look to us for guidance? Every time we fall back, what of our supplies and armament which must be left behind, to say nothing of the men? We know this is all considered expendable—we have heard that before. But is it necessary expense?

Seventh, we have many friends—Chinese-born in this country or not, living in this part of the country but who, nevertheless, have close contact with China. While they do not in many ways care for Chiang Kai-shek they feel, as we do, that the Communist government is not to be borne. Why not permit him to do what he can to assist in this struggle? This is his enemy we are fighting now, as well as ours—is he not an ally? If and when the Communist invasion is driven out of China and the people have had time to adjust to the advances of the postwar world—then it will be time for them to hold a free election and secure the type of government and leader they want, not what is forced upon them.

We realize that this letter is lengthy and there is more we would wish to say if we were able to talk with you—but it does express a large part of our general feeling, and may let you know we do some thinking in the matters now before the people. We realize there is a coming election, but we do most definitely feel that regardless of political party, we must examine closely the record and person of the man who runs for the office of the President of the United States; it is a burden only a very strong and good man could carry and we desperately need such a man. We must depend upon you in Washington to put forward such a man for nomination—we will do the rest.

One last thought: What is there in the Marxist or Communist tenets that leads any thinker to believe that its believers would ever live peacefully side by side with more liberal governments? Does the lion lie down with the lamb? Not in this world.

Thank you for your past courtesies; we hope you will find the moment to read our thoughts.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR G. TAYLOR.

Resolution of United Society of Friends Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a set of resolutions recently adopted by the United Society of Friends Women that were forwarded to me by Mrs. Mary E. Cadwallader, an active member of the organization, who lives in Oskaloosa, Iowa.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE UNITED SOCIETY OF FRIENDS WOMEN, MAY 1951

Deeply concerned by the increasing militarization of our country, we call upon our Government to replace its negative, fearful foreign policy with a constructive program worthy of a Christian nation.

As our forefathers united diverse races, nationalities, and States into one Nation living in peace under law, the central aim of our foreign policy in this second half of the century must be the building of such a community of the world. Without an all-out positive program for world law and world welfare, there is a bleak future for our civilization.

Specifically, we urge that our Government lead in strengthening and changing the United Nations to provide security against attack and war through enforceable "foolproof disarmament" under law.

We urge that money now spent for armament be used by the United Nations to develop the poverty-stricken countries of the world. We would expand the United Nations organizations for refugees, agriculture, child welfare and technical assistance. The Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization especially need to be developed into agencies capable of making a concerted attack on world hunger and disease. We support the efforts of Senators BERRY MCMAHON and RALPH FLANDERS and Congressmen JUNE and HAYS to bring this about.

We urge that grain be sent by the United States to India immediately as a gift and not a loan. We want our country to share its surpluses generously in Christian love, without political strings attached.

We urge that the United Nations ability to mediate disputes be used and expanded. We urge that the United Nations, which has stopped the fighting in Indonesia and Israel, continue to negotiate the Korean war.

We urge that in the present debate on Korean policy the principles of civilian control over the military be upheld. We deny that the only way to stop a war is to win it. We oppose extending the war to millions of other people.

We oppose the extension of conscription and universal military training. We doubt that such measures and expanding armament will insure peace.

We disapprove of the growing trend toward the garrison state as evidenced by increasing pressure for loyalty oaths, increasing military influence in education, increasing restrictions on freedom of thought, speech and conscience. It is unthinkable that men should be sent to prison in Christian America for conscience sake.

We wish our country to remain an asylum for political and religious refugees. We oppose barriers to immigration based solely on race or national origin. We urge the repeal of the present McCarran Act and the defeat of similar legislation in the future.

Nonphysical Retirements of Military Personnel During the Present Emergency Are Costing the American Taxpayers Nearly a Million Dollars Annually

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the present emergency the American taxpayers are being called upon to spend nearly a million dollars a year on the retirement of military personnel for other than nonphysical reasons.

For the period of 8 months starting July 1, 1950, to March 1, 1951, the total of 1,914 officers and enlisted personnel of our Armed Forces were retired on age or forced to retire. Their retirement pay for the 8-month period amounted to $685,247.36. Many of these persons are in their early fifties and when retired have no difficulty in meeting the physical standards for employment in private industry.

I have just introduced a bill designed to suspend certain provisions of law with respect to retirement for other than physical reasons for members of the Armed Forces. My bill provides in substance that notwithstanding any provisions of law, until June 30, 1954, no member of the Armed Forces shall be compelled to retire or be ordered without his consent to inactive duty for other than physical reasons.

Because of existing law, hundreds of duly qualified officers and enlisted personnel are being retired after 30 years of service or on age. In addition, many senior officers not selected for promotion are also forced to retire.

This practice of retiring military personnel with pay during an emergency, despite the fact they are fully qualified for further duty, is a waste of money and manpower, since it not only requires two men to fill one job, but it also places both of them on the Federal payroll.

For example, the retirement of military personnel often requires the calling up of reserves to fill such vacancies. As an illustration, I know of a Navy captain,

who at the age of 51 years, was forced to retire recently because he failed to be selected for promotion to rear admiral. His pay at the time of retirement was $860.25 and after being retired he received monthly $523.68, which he will continue to receive for the remainder of his life. This officer is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy and his education cost the taxpayers of America approximately $30,000. In addition to the experience that he gained during his naval career, he attended several postgraduate schools that added another $10,000 to the taxpayers' bill for his education. The result of his retirement is that after the taxpayers spent $40,000 on his education, at the age of 51 he was forced to retire because he was not selected for promotion to one of the few billets as rear admiral in the Navy. Thus, as a retired captain he will draw for the rest of his life $523.68 monthly.

To replace the retired captain a Reserve commander was called from civilian life whose base pay monthly is $689.25. Therefore the total cost to the Government for filling the vacancy caused by retirement of the 51-year-old captain is $1,213.23 monthly. Keep in mind that before retirement the 51-year-old captain was doing the same job for $360.25 monthly and in a more efficient manner because of his education and experience. Thus, this one example alone discloses a waste of taxpayers' money in the amount of $523.68 monthly.

This retired naval captain is only one of 1,914 officers and enlisted personnel of our Armed Forces who have retired on age or were forced to retire since the beginning of the Korean war. There is no doubt that many of these officers and enlisted personnel have similar case histories to that of the retired naval captain.

The attached table gives a breakdown of the 1,914 persons retired from our Armed Forces for other than physical reasons. By referring to the attached table you will observe that while these 1,914 men were on active duty, the total cost for their services was $805,156.92 monthly. Through their retirement, you have added $605,247.38, so that the net cost to the taxpayers of filling these 1,914 vacancies was $1,410,404.30.

If the provisions of my proposed bill had been in effect when these 1,914 persons were retired, a saving to the American taxpayers would have been effected in the sum of $605,247.38, which represents their retirement pay from July 1, 1950, to March 1, 1951, a period of 8 months.

Assuming that the Armed Forces will retire personnel at the same rate as during the period from June 25, 1950, to March 1, 1951, one can readily see that if my bill, which provides a 3-year moratorium on nonphysical retirements, should become law, the American taxpayers will be saved $2,723,613.21 in a 36-month period.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is making every effort to cut nonessential governmental expenditures to a minimum. If Congress will approve my bill, it will be possible to save nearly a million dollars annually and at the same time eliminate the necessity of calling up Reserve military personnel to replace Regular personnel retired in the prime of life and while qualified and physically able to continue their services to their country.

Officers and enlisted men retired from armed services on statutory age and length of service, June 25, 1950, to Mar. 1, 1951

Pay grade	Rank	Army	Navy	Marines	Air Force	Active-duty pay per month	Retired pay per month	Total of both active-duty and retired pay	Total	Total active-duty pay	Total retired pay
08	Rear admiral [1]		13			$954.75	$716.06	$1,670.81	24	$22,914.00	$17,185.44
	Major general	10			2						
07	Rear admiral [2]		1	1		826.50	619.88	1,446.38	31	25,621.50	19,216.28
	Brigadier general	27			2						
06	Captain		131			698.25	523.96	1,222.23	85	268,826.25	201,732.30
	Colonel	229		5	20						
05	Commander		11			584.25	438.19	1,022.44	129	75,368.25	56,526.51
	Lieutenant colonel	111		2	5						
04	Lieutenant commander		24			513.00	384.75	897.75	139	71,309.00	53,480.25
	Major	87		6	22						
03	Lieutenant		4			411.75	331.31	743.06	54	22,234.50	17,890.74
	Captain	49		3							
02	Lieutenant (junior grade)		1			349.13	261.88	610.96	14	4,887.82	3,665.90
	First lieutenant	12		1							
01	Ensign					313.50	235.13	548.63	3	940.50	705.39
	Second lieutenant	3									
W 4 and 3	Commissioned warrant	12	1	14	1	465.60	349.20	814.80	28	13,036.80	9,777.60
W 2 and 1	Warrant	13		1	12	349.20	261.90	611.10	26	9,079.20	6,808.40
E7	Chief petty officer		70			294.00	220.50	514.50	705	207,270.00	155,452.50
	Master sergeant	315		39	281						
E6	Petty officer, 1st class		3			249.90	187.89	437.79	139	34,736.10	26,116.71
	Sergeant, first class	92		6	33						
E5	Petty officer, second class		2			227.85	170.89	398.74	156	35,544.60	26,658.84
	Sergeant	60		6	60						
E4	Petty officer, third class		1			191.10	143.33	334.43	44	8,408.40	6,306.52
	Corporal	33		4	1						
E3	Seaman					147.00	110.25	257.25	20	2,940.00	2,205.00
	Private first class	17		1	2						
E2	Seaman					120.00	90.00	210.00	17	2,040.00	1,530.00
	Private	17									
E1	Seaman										
	Private										
Total						5,951.98	4,045.11	11,740.89	1,914	805,156.92	605,247.38

[1] Upper half.
[2] Lower half.

Shipyards on the West Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, in time of national emergencies, when every ship that can carry troops or supplies is required for an all-out effort, the merchant marine and the facilities which care for it are known to all of us to be as necessary a part of the Military Establishment as the armed services themselves. Not only must we have the ships but we must have the facilities that will keep them in operation. Such facilities are not brought into being overnight. There must be organizations of skilled management and skilled men constantly active during normal times and available as a nucleus for expansion when emergencies arise.

It is well, therefore, to take inventory from time to time. On the Pacific coast the present situation is not very good. It is somewhat indicated by the letter of April 24, 1951, which was addressed to me by Mr. Thomas A. Rotell, chairman, and Mr. R. J. Brennan, secretary, for the Pacific Coast Committee for Shipbuilding for National Defense. A temporary and partial remedy for the immediate future is suggested in a resolution set forth in a letter dated April 25 addressed to me by Mr. A. T. Wynn,

secretary of the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council.

The letters to which I have referred read as follows:

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE FOR SHIPBUILDING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE,
Oakland, Calif., April 24, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: We have talked, wired, written and, in general, campaigned many times over a period of years relative to the decline of the private yards of the Pacific coast. Recently, a survey was made of employment in the three largest yards of the bay area. The facts obtained, more clearly than any words of ours, illustrate what is happening. The figures are as follows:

The number of employees working as of April 19, 1951, were:

Moore Dry Dock, Oakland	1,400
Todd Shipyard, Alameda	350
Bethlehem, San Francisco	500
Total	2,250

The figures of 1950 after the Korean incident for the same three yards were:

Moore Dry Dock	1,900
Todd Shipyard	2,100
Bethlehem	2,600
Total	6,600

This represents a decline of 4,350—or 65.91 percent in these three yards alone. It means that only 34.09 percent of those working in these yards during the latter part of 1950 are working there today. The figure of 4,350 represents those experienced shipyard workers who are drawing unemployment insurance, or have accepted employment in other industries in this, a time of emergency. Unfortunately, the acceptance of other jobs is altogether too prevalent.

Smaller yards (Triple A Machine Shop, San Francisco) reveal an even more alarming trend. Today 50 are working. Three weeks ago, the figure was 600—a decline of 550—or 92 percent in three short weeks.

It is particularly discouraging when the figures of World War II for the same three yards are noted. These figures are:

Moore Dry Dock	38,000
Bethlehem, San Francisco	18,500
Todd Shipyard (then United Engineering)	7,000
Total	63,500

A comparison of these figures with those of today shows a decline of 61,250—or 96.46 percent. If to World War II unemployment figures were added those of the Kaiser yards, General Engineering, Bethlehem (Alameda), Western Pipe & Steel, Marinship, etc., they would represent a decline of approximately 99 percent. To us, these figures are tragic. Joe Stalin might get comfort from such figures, but not those who are concerned with the security of the United States.

Anything you can do to assist in the correction of these conditions will be deeply appreciated, and thanking you for your splendid cooperation in the past, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. ROTELL, *Chairman.*
R. J. BRENNAN, *Secretary.*

BAY CITIES METAL TRADES COUNCIL,
San Francisco, Calif., April 25, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ALLEN: The following resolution was passed at the regular meeting of the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council of April 16, 1951, and I was instructed to send same to you for your consideration and action. We respectfully request you to give us your views on this very important matter:

"Whereas since 1947 contracts for the construction of only a few small vessels have been awarded the private yards of the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas recognizing the danger of national defense of a policy of not maintaining well-dispersed shipyards, staffed with a nucleus of skilled workmen, constant efforts have been made to win an allocation of contracts to the private yards of the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas despite the recognition of this principle, agencies of the Government have opposed allocation, contending that in peacetime only a relatively small number of vessels would be constructed, and that any arbitrary division of work would 'destroy the more efficient yards'; and

"Whereas specifically the Maritime Commission said, 'The volume of work involved in a wartime or emergency program makes the allocation of work desirable, whereas a peacetime limited construction program does not' (letter from Philip B. Fleming to Schuyler Otis Bland, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, July 6, 1946); and

"Whereas specifically the Munitions Board said 'The proposed allocation would be effective only when applied to a large Government construction program. When applied to the current program, the work may be spread so thin as to put out of business valuable east coast yards with many years of experience.' (Letter of May 27, 1949, to Schuyler Otis Bland from Maj. Gen. Patrick W. Timberlake, Munitions Board Deputy Director of Staff, Merchant Marine Committee hearings, p. 118); and

"Whereas specifically the Navy said 'Recognition of the fact that there is less than a desirable distribution of shipbuilding throughout the country does not permit the conclusion that part of the existing effort should be transferred elsewhere. Rather should it follow that additional shipbuilding should be fostered, and the industry nurtured to a healthy condition.' (Supplementary statement of Rear Adm. Charles D. Wheelock, Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships, made to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, June 23, 1949, contained on p. 122 of hearings); and

"Whereas Congress preparing intelligently to meet this emergency has authorized:

"(1) The construction of mariner-type vessels by the Maritime Board;

"(2) The construction of 170 naval vessels and the conversion of 291 others; and

"Whereas the private yards of the Pacific coast, which built 42 percent of the vessels constructed during World War II, have little work, unstable employment conditions are forcing skilled shipyard employees into other industries in this a time of national emergency: Now therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, in meeting at San Francisco, Calif., the evening of the 16th day of April 1951,* That the mobilization base be expanded to embrace the private yards of the Pacific coast, the construction records of which were unequaled in World War II; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That—

"(1) The remaining mariner-type construction contracts (10 estimated) be allocated to the Pacific coast yards, 25 already having been assigned Atlantic and Gulf coast yards, and

"(2) That a fair share of the Navy construction and conversion program be assigned to the private yards of the Pacific coast; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Maritime Board, the Navy Bureau of Ships, and to all Congressmen and Senators from the States of California, Washington, and Oregon, and the Metal Trades Department, A. F. of L."

Respectfully submitted.

A. T. WYNN, *Secretary.*

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER B. McMULLEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune of April 12, 1951:

IT'S BIGGER THAN MEN

It is important to make clear in the beginning that this newspaper has not been sympathetic with many of President Truman's actions. We have criticized him—and severely so—on many occasions. As for his momentous order relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from all his commands, however, we agree the President has taken proper and corrective action.

Certainly the decision was one of the most difficult of Mr. Truman's career. It must rank next to his order approving the use of the atomic bomb in World War II.

Undoubtedly the President realized the dismissal of the hero-general would set off an emotional and political bomb at home. He was well aware of the attitude among many Americans—and not all of them in the Republican camp—that General MacArthur could do no wrong. But he also recognized there are issues of higher significance than the future and ambitions of a five-star general.

To those citizens who can see nothing right in the President's action, to those who uphold MacArthur's position without question, we would like to point out that it is an important tradition in this democracy that military authority is subordinate to civilian authority.

General MacArthur was wrong in taking his case to the public over the heads of the civilian authorities and in violation of the orders of his own superiors. Not even a five-star general is bigger than the Government of the United States. It was his duty to present his views or to criticize political and diplomatic decisions, which had been made by our civilian authorities, through proper military channels. As he repeatedly refused to do so, his removal was justified.

To be sure, there is more behind the dismissal than insubordination. At issue throughout the controversy has been the broad question of priority in fighting the world-wide battle against communism.

As he did during World War II, General MacArthur contends it is more essential to crush the enemy in Asia than in Europe. He has been agitating for a big push aimed at the bear of China. Isolated in the Far East for many years and seeing only one side of the world picture, he has been promising, in effect, that in winning an Asian victory Europe "most probably would avoid war."

THE DANGERS OF HIS POLICY

Our Government, our top military leaders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and our allies in the United Nations have rejected the MacArthur policy, which could easily fan the Korean action into a major war before the free world is strong enough to fight such a war. They have opposed the use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops and bombing attacks on the Chinese mainland, knowing full well that a general war with the Red Chinese might embroil us in the quagmire of China for decades.

Again, to the MacArthur admirers, and to the Republicans who think that egging MacArthur on against the administration and our top military advisers is sound politics in the year preceding the 1952 presidential election, we say: "Shall we risk a conflagration in the Far East? Shall we follow the MacArthur course and destroy the whole painfully built structure of American alliances?"

Let us remember that Red China and Russia have a mutual defense pact. If we attack China proper, if we send Chiang back to the mainland and follow behind to support or bail him out, the Soviets may well come in. And world war III, which the American people want to avoid and for which we are far from prepared, may be under way.

The President's action has, of course, generated a new and bitter domestic controversy. Tempers have risen. Emotions are inflamed. But the heat of the controversy should not blind us to the fact that we comfort only the enemy when our passions get out of bounds.

Fundamental foreign policy decisions must now be made. If it takes another great debate to decide between the aggressive and dangerous MacArthur policy and a renewed commitment to the primary defense of Europe, let the discussions be conducted honorably, sincerely, and in the best American democratic tradition. In the present hair's-breadth zone of all-out war, this Nation must rise above personal and partisan bickering. Only as we realize that the question of fundamental policy is bigger than either General MacArthur or President Truman can we hope to achieve unity and arrive at decisions which will affect our whole national future.

Increases in Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, while I realize there should be some increase in postal rates, I do not agree that the heavy increase demanded by the administration is necessary or justified. Some very interesting arguments against the administration position are carried in an article in the West Concord Enterprise, West Concord, Minn. in its issue of March 15. I hope the Members will read this article very carefully:

OUR CORNER—STATEMENTS REGARDING INCREASES IN POSTAL RATES

The statement made by President Truman in his message to Congress on February 27, contains certain statements which do not present the situation fairly to either the Congress or the public. The figures in the President's message are based upon Post Office cost accounting figures. Publishers believe these figures to be erroneous because the fundamental and realities of the proper cost accounting method are ignored.

Post Office cost accounting is determined on a weight and per piece basis without consideration of public service factors or priorities. However, these factors are basic and paramount in the operation of the Post Office, because the Post Office is not a business, but is a service to all the American people, and hence cost figures determined as they would be in competitive business are of little value for the setting of rates.

For illustration, according to the Post Office's own records, there are some 39,000 of the present 41,000 post offices in the United States which do not take in sufficient money to pay their own expenses. Ninety-four percent of all post offices are in this category. It is held that this fact is a self-evident indication that the Post Office Department is created primarily for service to American citizens and not as a business proposition.

A further illustration is the Post Office rural delivery service which certainly exists as a service to American farmers. The cost of rural delivery service in 1950 was $152,800,000. Under the Post Office cost ascertainment system, this amount is allocated to the various classes of postal service. But the service is provided by the Government to those who live on rural routes as is provided by the Government to those who live on rural routes as is proven by the fact that the "R. D." was for many years known as rural free delivery. It is primarily for the recipients, not for the users of the mails. This is indicated by there being no higher charge for letter mail to "R. D." addresses than to urban addresses.

These various facts should certainly be considered when the statement is made that first-class mail is profitable to the Post Office, for much of the expense now charged to other classifications is incurred, as indicated, in order to make first-class service possible.

The idea that the Post Office should serve all of the American public on a business basis is not in agreement with the handling of other Government departments. For example, in 1950 there were differences between income and outgo as follows: Interior Department, deficit of about $460,000,000; Commerce Department, deficit of about $668,000,000; Agricultural Department, deficit of about $475,000,000.

Each of these serves mere segments of the population. The Post Office serves everyone.

The President in his message of February 27 gives the estimated net postal deficit for 1952 as $361,000,000, which is less than those just mentioned.

The President points out that the matter of postal rates should be subject to very thorough study. The publishers have been urging such a study for years. It is felt that such a study will prove conclusively that the post office is a service agency of the Government that cost accounting charges should fundamentally be divided into two groups—Government service and business handling—that the first class should be paid for wholly by the Government, as are the deficits in the Interior, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments, and that the costs in the second group should be reflected in the rate structure of the postal service.

For the reasons indicated it is urged that the enactment of the rate increases at this time either be deferred or kept at a very low level, and that the survey which the President suggests should be completed before any substantial rate increases are attempted. It is urged very strongly that this thorough survey of the whole subject of postal rates be undertaken by an independent body similar in type to the Hoover Commission or the committees who in the past have made studies and recommendations in connection with social security.

Cutting of Plywood Tariff Imperils Employees of the Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the American State Department in trade negotiations with 17 foreign nations at Torquay, England, last week agreed to cut by 50 percent the tariff that is charged on plywood shipped into the United States from foreign countries.

By this action, the State Department has imperiled the prosperity and employment of the 35,000 to 40,000 workers who are employed in the plywood industry of the three Pacific coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California.

The existing tariff on plywood is 40 percent ad valorem—on value. This means that on every $100 of plywood shipped into the United States from a foreign country the foreign supplier is required to pay a duty of $40.

Under the 50-percent reduction in the tariff on plywood, which was agreed to by our State Department at Torquay, England, this tariff hereafter will be $20 on each $100 of plywood shipped into the United States.

AMERICAN WORKERS TO LOSE

Even under the existing 40-percent ad valorem tariff, Canada last year shipped a total of $11,032,465 of plywood and veneers into the United States. Despite the fact that the Canadians were required to pay a $40 duty on each $100 of plywood shipped into the United States they were able to profitably market large quantities of plywood in the United States.

Now, with the tariff on plywood cut in half the Canadians will be in position to market even larger quantities of their plywood in the United States. The bad effects of this sellout of American plywood workers to foreign nations may not be felt immediately, due to the present large demand for plywood, but once there is any slackening of demand, this lower tariff will enable foreign mills to get the business and it will be our American mills that will be forced to close first when any decline in demand occurs.

COSTS LOWER IN CANADA

Costs of labor, stumpage, freight, and taxes are much lower—about 40 to 50 percent lower—in Canada than in the United States.

For example, last summer when I made a detailed study of this problem, I found that American plywood workers then were receiving $1.72½ an hour while plywood workers in Canada were getting only $1.22. The wage rates in both countries have increased since then, but are still much higher in the United States than Canada.

The 40-percent ad valorem tariff on plywood imports compensated for the difference in American and Canadian wages.

By reducing by $20 the duty Canadians must pay on each $100 of plywood shipped into the United States, the Canadians will be able to undersell American mills in the American market.

One of the probable results of this great advantage given to the Canadian plywood industry by our American State Department is that more plywood mills will be built in Canada, with either Canadian or American capital. The Canadian output of plywood, as a result of this lower tariff, is likely to increase by leaps and bounds and within a few years much of the American market now enjoyed by American plants may be lost to Canadian mills.

STATE DEPARTMENT ARGUMENT

The argument of the American State Department for decreasing the plywood tariff is that if the Canadians are enabled to sell more plywood in the United States they will get more American dollars. The State Department holds that the Canadians will spend these additional dollars in the United States to buy automobiles, farm machinery, and other goods.

This will no doubt be to the advantage of the automobile and farm-machinery makers, but it will be hard on the Pacific coast's 35,000 to 40,000 plywood workers, who in the long run may see many of their jobs lost to the lower-wage Canadian plywood industry.

JAPAN COMPETITION POSSIBLE

The State Department's agreement to cut the tariff in half on plywood imported into the United States from foreign countries may result, within the next few years, in Japan getting back into plywood production on a large scale and the shipping of her plywood into the United States.

Japan, prior to World War II, was a big producer of plywood. In 1938, Japan manufactured 1,100,000,000 square feet of plywood which was equal to one-half of the entire production of plywood in the United States for that year.

Japan has large forests, and therefore the raw material from which to manufacture plywood. The wage rate for forest-industry workers in Japan several years ago was 256 yens a day, which in United States dollars is the equivalent of 61 to 81 cents.

If Japan resumes plywood manufacture with labor that costs only 61 to 81 cents a day our American plywood workers, whose wages now are about $2 an hour or $16 a day, cannot compete with this 61 to 81 cents a day labor.

PLYWOOD MAKING BIG INDUSTRY

The Douglas fir plywood industry of the United States is largely centered in the three Pacific coast States of Oregon, Wahington, and California, although there are many hardwood plywood mills in the Southern States, which likewise will be adversely affected by this 50-percent reduction in the plywood tariff.

The three Pacific coast States today have 56 plywood plants, and the number of these is increasing. These plywood plants employ approximately 18,500 factory workers, and a similar number of workers are engaged in supplying these mills with logs, glues, and other materials used in making plywood.

These plants, for the most part, are located in small communities. In many cases a whole community is dependent on a plywood plant for its income and livelihood.

A State Department policy that results in the closure of any of these plants well may result in destroying the economy of an entire town or a whole region.

In my opinion, the State Department by agreeing to reduce the existing tariff on plywood by 50 percent has sold the Pacific coast's 35,000 to 40,000 plywood-industry workers down river.

Communists Have Suffered Serious Blow in Hollywood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by L. Edgar Prina entitled "Communists Have Suffered Serious Blow in Hollywood" which appeared in the Sunday, May 13, 1951, edition of the Washington Star. As a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I commend this well-written and documented article to my colleagues for their information:

COMMUNISTS HAVE SUFFERED SERIOUS BLOW IN HOLLYWOOD—COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HAS CHOKED OFF BIG MONEY SOURCE

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is at the halfway point in its investigation of Red influences in Hollywood. What has been accomplished? What conclusions may be drawn?

One big fact stands out: The Communist Party, its rise to power in the film capital abruptly halted by the 1947 hearings, has suffered a series of crippling blows in the past few weeks.

Despite Hollywood's fight to rid itself of Reds, the testimony has demonstrated clearly that there were plenty of Communist actors, directors, and writers employed in the movie industry as of last February 22 when the Star broke the story of the new inquiry.

More than 60 already have been named as Communists at one time or another, and additional identifications are coming. Chairman Parnell Thomas in 1947 said the committee had "a very complete record on 79 very prominent persons active out in Hollywood."

THREE PRIME REASONS

According to testimony of admitted former Reds, confirming long-time committee contentions, the Communist Party infiltrated Hollywood for three principal reasons:

1. To tap a lucrative source for party funds.

2. To gain prestige for the party by luring big names into front groups.

3. To control the content of films, in order to bar anti-Communist pictures or disseminate Red propaganda. This was to be done by domination of both talent and craft unions.

In the past the Reds have had considerable success on Nos. 1 and 2. But they have fallen flat on No. 3.

Now, in wake of the revelations before the committee, the once fabulous flow of money into the party coffers is expected to become little more than a trickle.

The reason for this is that witnesses who refuse to state under oath whether they are or were Communists, and others identified as Reds, almost automatically become unemployable in Hollywood. Contracts are terminated, wage earners are fired, and gone are the fat salaries.

An indication of the amount of money the Communist Party has taken out of Hollywood was given by Screen Writer Richard J. Collins, a party member for about 10 years and one of the most articulate witnesses yet heard in the inquiry.

Mr. Collins said that, in addition to regular party dues, he, like other highly paid Reds, was assessed a flat 4 percent of his salary.

"I suppose I gave about $165 a month for 3 or 4 years," he added.

Two other top film writers, both identified as Communists, Dalton Trumbo and Lester Cole, together received a total of $382,000 from Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer alone in the 3 years 1945–47. A 4 percent assessment would have meant $15,280 for the party.

HIGH FINANCING

When one considers there were several hundred Communists in the movie industry during the war, according to Collins, a lot of party activities throughout the country, from atomic espionage to aid for the tottering Daily Worker, could have been financed from the Hollywood take.

The Reds still have ways of tapping some of the movie gold, however. Screen star Sterling Hayden told how Karen Morley, an actress, attempted to persuade him to become a passive member after he quit the party in 1945.

He said Miss Morley told him he would have to take no part in party activities—just contribute. Hayden refused, but how many "passive" members and fellow-travelers today are contributing to Red causes is something the committee would like very much to know.

During the last few years, because of the cold war and naked Red aggression, it has become extremely unpopular and unprofitable to be a member of a Communist-front group. Even the most gregarious person nowadays checks thoroughly into an organization before joining. Hence, the Communists are finding it more and more difficult to lure "big names" into their front and thereby gain prestige and dollars from innocents and suckers.

Much testimony has been received bearing on the matter of efforts to inject Communist propaganda into films. There can be no doubt that there were attempts to respond to Lenin's admonition that the cinema, perhaps the most important medium for educating and propagandizing the public should be exploited carefully.

But the consensus of former Reds is that this was almost impossible. The reason: the producer, director, stars and front office all had a veto over the script. In other words, there would have to be a chain of Communists or fellow-travelers from the writer to the studio boss.

The party soon realized the difficulties and launched its vigorous campaign to control all unions in the film industry. The idea was simple: Control the unions and you have a powerful weapon to hold over the heads of the studios.

At the height of their power in 1946–47 the Communists dominated the Screen

Writers' Guild and the Conference of Studio Unions. While Reds infiltrated the Screen Directors' Guild and the Screen Actors' Guild, they were in no position to dictate policy in these groups.

Meanwhile, one witness testified that party instructions, as laid down by Screen Writer John Howard Lawson, identified as the Communist boss in Hollywood, were these:

"Try to get 5 minutes of the party line in every picture you write.

"Get it into an expensive scene, a scene involving expensive stars, large sets, or many extras, because, even if it is discovered by the front office, the business manager of the unit, the very watchdog of the treasury, the very servant of capitalism, in order to keep the budget from going too high, will resist the elimination of that scene."

Even this proved unsatisfactory, however, according to Collins, who said:

"Inclusion of several progressive lines per screen play was pushed, but they learned it didn't mean anything unless you had the code book with you. So the program was dropped."

Mr. Collins contended that the only time Communist propaganda gets into films to any appreciable degree is when it jibes with the attitude or opinions of a large segment of the American people.

WARTIME JOB EASIER

As examples, he cited the antinazism theme of certain wartime films and pictures concerned with racial discrimination.

The current hearings also have shown the solidness of 1947 testimony given by Louis J. Russell, senior staff investigator, concerning the Communist affiliations of 9 of the 10 witnesses heard at that time. Mr. Russell introduced what he said were photostatic copies of the Communist Party cards for 7 of the 10. Edward Dmytryk, a movie director and himself one of the Hollywood 10, and other former Reds, identified 9 as onetime Communists.

Twenty-one witnesses have taken the stand to date. Six have admitted past Communist Party membership: Hayden, Collins, Dmytryk, Larry Parks, and Marc Lawrence, actors, and Mrs. Meta R. Rosenberg, former story editor at Paramount Studios.

Fourteen have refused to state whether they were or are Communists, on the grounds of possible self-incrimination. They are:

Anne Revere, Gale Sondergaard, actresses; Howard da Silva, Will Geer, Morris Carnovsky, Victor Killian and Fred Graff, actors; Paul Jarrico, Waldo Salt, Abraham Lincoln Polonsky, Robert Lees, and Harold Buchman, screen writers; Sam Moore, radio writer, and George Willner, writers' agent.

One witness has denied ever having been a Red, althought admitting association with front organizations. He was John Garfield, stage and screen star.

The committee assumes that when a witness refuses to answer questions on communism it is because a truthful answer would be self-incriminating. The Congressmen have developed a technique which points up the issue sharply. For example, when Polonsky was asked whether he was a member of the Silver Shirts, a right-wing subversive group, he answered angrily:

"You know what the Silver Shirts is—it's a dirty Fascist organization!"

The next question followed quickly: "Are you a member of the Communist Party?"

"I decline to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me," Polonsky said softly.

Then the final challenging query: "Can you name a single person who has appeared before this committee and answered truthfully who has been incriminated?"

Polonsky, like all other defiant witnesses, could not do so.

ATMOSPHERE HAS CHANGED

What makes the current hearings so successful, in comparison with those of 1947, is the temper of the times. Four years ago, the committee had documentary proof of the extensive infiltration of Hollywood, but it had no cooperative witnesses.

"I had a dream which became a nightmare that in the event of war with Russia I would be arrested as a friend of the Soviet Union, when, in fact, I was an enemy," Collins testified.

One major reason the cooperative witnesses broke with the party was its totalitarian discipline, the strait-jacket put on independent thought.

"They felt they had the key to all problems," Hayden said. "Everything was predetermined."

"I began to feel like a trained zombie," Collins declared.

"I objected to 'thought control,'" Dmytryk asserted.

These former Reds testified that it was idealism that brought them into the party and idealism that took them out.

Mrs. Rosenberg put her experience this way:

"I was an anti-Nazi and anti-Franco, and it seemed perfectly reasonable to join the Communist Party, which was the most violently anti-Hitler and pro-Loyalist organization in America."

The committee still has to hear at least 20 more witnesses, including a half dozen or so who have been avoiding service of subpenas and these headliners:

Jose Ferrer, this year's Academy Award winner; Budd Schulberg, novelist, whose The Disenchanted currently is a best seller; Abe Burrows, television and radio comedian and writer of Duffy's Tavern and Robert Rossen, director-producer, whose All the King's Men won an Oscar in 1949.

Truman-Acheson Fail To Answer General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to an excellent editorial in a recent issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier.

In a letter to President Truman in February of this year, I asked among other things:

What is your objective in Korea? Are Americans to go on fighting and dying endlessly and forever with practically no help on the ground from other members of the United Nations? In utmost sincerity, and lacking a definition of your objective, I must again demand that you evacuate our ground forces from Korea. If you think you have a valid reason for continuing the war under present conditions, tell me what it is. I insist the American people deserve more from you than vague generalities and evasion.

It was my contention in letters to the President in January and again in February that the United States could not win a war of attrition against the Asian forces that could be mobilized; that our forces should be evacuated from Korea and followed with an effective sea and air blockade of the Chinese mainland and Hong Kong to stop the flow of war materials to the Communists, meanwhile protecting Japan, Formosa, and other strategic islands.

No reply has been received from Truman in response to either of these letters. It is obvious that the President is as unprepared now as he was in January and February to provide the citizens of this country with information to which they are fully entitled.

As the Waterloo Daily Courier well points out, continuation of this half war is intolerable. Here is the editorial:

WE MIGHT GET IN WAR

Both President Truman and Defense Secretary Marshall have attempted to answer the criticisms of General MacArthur. Their constant refrain is that following the MacArthur policy might get us into war with Russia.

All will agree that possible Soviet intervention must be carefully weighed. Running the danger of war has been inherent in every decision we have made since VE-day. We ran that risk in Iran. We ran it in Greece and in Berlin. And, finally, the possibility that Russia might intervene obviously had to be considered in making the decision to send troops to Korea.

Let us suppose, however, that the administration has authoritative information that Russia will enter the war if the MacArthur policies are adopted. Is it conceivable that the Kremlin would intervene rather than let us win a speedy MacArthur victory in Korea, but would not intervene to prevent a slow Truman victory after many years of fighting and enormous casualties on both sides?

In other words, if Russia intervenes in Korea, she will obviously do so for only one purpose—to prevent us from winning the war there. If the Kremlin is going to fight, it will fight equally hard to prevent a slow Truman victory as a speedy MacArthur victory. The only purpose of war is victory and if Russia proposes to win a Communist victory in Korea she will intervene whether the MacArthur or Truman policy is adopted. It makes no difference.

Perhaps, however, Truman does not propose to win in Korea. Perhaps he and Acheson are still clinging to the forlorn British hope for a negotiated peace following a stalemate. Then the Truman policies become equally intolerable. For in that case American troops are being sacrificed in a gamble that has so far proved vain and from all signs will continue to be so.

For if the administration does not even propose to win the Korean war, then its only alternative is to get out of Korea. It is not defensible to send an army into Korea and then refuse to give it maximum support. The public will not long tolerate continued casualties in Korea when the only objective in view is a stalemate based on the unreasonable hope for a negotiated peace. We cannot engage in a little war and then let it drag on for years because we are afraid an attempt to win it would result in a larger war. If the administration thinks Russia will not let us win in Korea, then it should never have entered the conflict in the first place.

The net effect of Truman's and Marshall's arguments in attempting to answer MacArthur, therefore, is to build up a convincing case for withdrawing from Korea entirely. If the fear of atomic war as pictured by the President is to deter us from giving full support to our troops in Korea, then we must withdraw from Korea.

Truman and Marshall have not answered MacArthur's arguments. If their conclusions are sound, the only course is to withdraw from Korea entirely. Continuation of the half war is intolerable from any point of view.

Study in Vacuums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, which may serve to clear up some of the confusion which has existed over the question whether or not the administration has devised a policy for the conduct of far-eastern affairs. The conclusion is reached that a principle exists, still unimplemented by any established policy.

STUDY IN VACUUMS

General MacArthur says a policy vacuum exists toward Korea.

Warren Austin, top American delegate to the U. N., replies that there is a clear, positive, and consistent policy on Korea.

Mr. Citizen, trying to resolve these skirmishings in the great debate, may suffer a clear, positive vacuum all his own.

Could the trouble, the confusion, lie in definitions? Could a brief sortie into semantics help Mr. Citizen straighten his thinking? He could start with Mr. Austin's concise definition of policy in Korea:

"Militarily, the objective is to repel the aggression and restore international peace and security in the area. Politically, the objective is to establish a unified, independent and democratic government in the sovereign state of Korea."

This, Mr. Austin says, is policy. Now Mr. Citizen might turn from Austin to Webster, and look up the definition of "policy." One of the most common is "a settled or definite course or method adopted and followed." From there Mr. Citizen might flip ahead a few pages and look up the word "principle." Here again several definitions; the one most widely used is "a governing law of conduct * * * settled rule of action."

Now back once more to Mr. Austin's quoted definition of what we're doing in Korea. Is it best covered by the word "policy" or "principle"?

If we are to take principle as a law of conduct, and policy as a definite method, then a good case can be made that we have fine principles in Korea but no policy. Repelling aggression and restoring peace is a generality. It is the diplomatic way of phrasing an old individual right, the right to slap down a bully and keep peace in the home. It is a principle of freedom.

Perhaps Mr. Citizen will arrive at the opinion that policy adds the "how" to principle's "what." He might even decide that there would be no quarrel at all if the administration and the U. N. would change their label of policy to principle and cling to it; then implement it with MacArthur's policy.

American Successes; Russian Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, for clear-cut statement of American foreign policy I commend the reading of the editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser entitled "American Successes; Russian Failures":

AMERICAN SUCCESSES; RUSSIAN FAILURES

President Truman is probably too harried a man to have pondered the fact that after 6 years of relentless, resounding attack, the "event MacArthur" has suddenly brought him the ardent support of a majority of American papers. Like the Advertiser, these newspapers have been incessantly hostile to Mr. Truman on domestic issues, but they consider that in this case he represents right and wisdom. In general the Advertiser has been in good company in its views on the struggle with Russia; our views have been harmonious with such papers as the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Christian Science Monitor, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Post, the Hartford Courant, the Atlanta Journal, the Louisville Courier-Journal. This is reassuring. Equally reassuring is the fact that our viewpoint is opposite to that of the inexcusable Chicago Tribune and the unpardonable Hearst press.

The following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal is specifically similar to the viewpoint expressed on this page repeatedly:

"It is being charged with increasing irresponsibility that the United States has no foreign policy, that our military and diplomatic leaders are 'drifting,' that we have failed to take a strong stand against communism.

"What is the record?

"Was the decision to aid Greece, a program that stopped Communist aggression in southeast Europe, a policy of 'drift'?

"Was there lack of action and determination in the Turkish aid program which made that nation a southern bastion against Russia?

"Was there lack of imagination and inaction in the Marshall plan, which saved Europe from economic collapse?

"Was the North Atlantic Defense Pact 'softness' toward communism?

"Did the Berlin airlift, which blocked the Russian plan to squeeze us out, show lack of courage and determination?

"Is our sending American troops to Europe in peacetime a passive subjection to Russia?

"Was our decision to stand against Communist aggression in Korea in company with the United Nations 'appeasement' of communism?

"Of course not.

"All of these programs and the decisions which led to them were courageous, bold, imaginative, and clear warnings to the Communist world. Each was the opposite of appeasement. Each hurt communism and hobbled Russia's program for expansion and aggression. Each saved a part of the free world.

"Who made these decisions and took these actions which have no peacetime parallel in American history? The administration—the political, military, and diplomatic leaders of both parties who are still directing our foreign and military policies.

"By what logic does anyone believe that men who were capable of such successful and realistic programs and policies should suddenly become inept drifters, appeasers, and not deserving of confidence?

"These men—again, men who represent both parties—have been a winning combination. They have made errors, of course. But does a baseball manager break up a winning team every time a shortstop overthrows first base or an infielder misjudges a fly ball?"

The Advertiser considers it important to harp on these American successes because of the national propensity for swift commuting between optimism and pessimism. We are disposed to have eyes only for Russia's successes and America's failures. It is in order to consider that time after time Russia has been frustrated or defeated in her aims.

For example, we fume and agonize over the lack of full support from our allies. And this newspaper does not hedge in acknowledging that the response of America's allies leaves much to be desired. But on that basis, Russia has twice and thrice the cause for grief that America has. None of our allies has fallen away as Yugoslavia has fallen away from Russia. That was a massive disaster for Russia. The rebelliousness in the satellite countries is well established.

The anxieties and difficulties of the Russians are immense (as MacArthur brought out). It is not realistic to blind ourselves to Russia's difficulties, any more than it is to became complacent over her advantages.

Russia was more exercised over the delayed opening of a second front in the course of a 2-year period in War II than we are about the instantaneous end of the Korean war. Even the English people grew restless and outspoken, just as we are today. But they had to wait. Rome wasn't built in a day.

We Can't Afford Their Stupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial from the May 4, 1951, issue of the Arizona Plain Talk. It certainly speaks for itself.

WE CAN'T AFFORD THEIR STUPIDITY

The matter of getting water for Arizona's farms, and hydroelectric power for its industries is all-important to the future of the State. Yet that matter has been left in the hands of the same people who failed in the past—and who have apparently learned nothing by their defeat.

To begin with, they have not learned that securing the water of the Colorado River cannot be accomplished by hurling accusations against the inhabitants of the sovereign State of California. It can only be accomplished by convincing the remaining States of the Union that we have a thoroughly sound project, on which the better than three quarters of a billion of Federal dollars necessary to make it an actuality would be well spent.

The central Arizona project, as it now stands, is decidedly not a project for which a conscientious legislator could vote the expenditure of a cent amount of Federal money because (see April 27 issue of Plain Talk) over 50 percent of the land within the project's area is owned by a few hundred excess acreage farmers and syndicates. These individuals and corporations, some 420 in all, have not only taken up holdings far larger

than the 160 acres allowed to participants in a Federal irrigation project; but they have put themselves in a position, by sinking wells to the underground basins which the diverted waters of the Colorado would flood, to get water for which they would pay back nothing.

These facts have been exposed on the floor of Congress. What's more, a group of Congressmen recently made an on-the-spot investigation for themselves. As a result, the central Arizona project was killed in committee; and we predict it will never come to life until we in Arizona come to our senses and secure the services of a new organization to put the project over.

But what has happened has evidently made no impression either on the political leaders winking at the irregularities which discredit the project with the rest of the country or the highly paid mishandlers of public relations, with their senseless program of vilification against California.

Both of these groups continue to act as if their managing of this important matter deserves our confidence, not to mention every nickel they can shake us down for. Meanwhile neither of these groups has shown any evidence of a change in their thinking or course of procedure.

Well, do we, the rest of us, want the water, or don't we? If we do, we'd better devise a way to shake off the free riders, and we had better create a public relations plan—conceived on a level of adult intelligence instead of one of childish name-calling—which will sell the project to the 46 States whose votes we need.

Why William Crawford Gorgas Was Elected to the New York University Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege today to obtain unanimous consent of the House of Representatives to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an essay by Miss Clarice Sanford entitled "Why William Crawford Gorgas Was Elected to the New York University Hall of Fame." Miss Sanford is a student at the Thomas W. Martin High School in Gorgas, Walker County, Ala.

On March 5, 1951, Mr. Martin, for whom the high school at Gorgas was named, expressed interest in the school and its students by offering a prize of $150 and a trip to New York City for the best essay written by a member of the senior class on the subject, why William Crawford Gorgas was elected to the New York University hall of fame. The trip to New York City was offered to enable the student to attend the unveiling ceremony of the bust of Dr. Gorgas to be held at the Hall of Fame of Great Americans on May 24, 1951.

Dr. J. M. Mason, Birmingham; Dr. John Temple Graves, Birmingham; and Dr. J. C. Gladney, of Jasper, were announced as the judges for the contest, and on April 26 they announced Miss Clarice Sanford, of Good Springs, Ala., as the winner, with Miss Barbara Widman as runner-up.

The Seventh Congressional District is proud and appreciative of the honor that has come to Alabama by the election of one of its great sons to the New York University Hall of Fame.

I am likewise proud that one of the finest communities of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent was named for the great Gorgas, whose contributions to mankind in the fields of medicine and sanitation loom larger in their significance with each passing year.

Mr. Thomas W. Martin has performed a fine public service through the years in calling the accomplishments of General Gorgas to the attention of Americans everywhere. His efforts in this direction stimulated Miss Sanford to write her talented essay on Gorgas.

Miss Sanford's essay reads as follows:

WHY WILLIAM CRAWFORD GORGAS WAS ELECTED TO THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY HALL OF FAME

(By Clarice Sanford, Martin High School, Gorgas, Ala.)

Fame cannot be measured. Neither can William Crawford Gorgas' services to humanity. He was great in the eyes of great men and in the eyes of uneducated laborers.

Perhaps yellow fever had more influence in the life of William Crawford Gorgas than of any other person in the world. Indirectly, or in some cases directly, yellow fever caused the major stages of his life to be directed over a path, seemingly well planned by some superior being.

The first part yellow fever played in the life of Gorgas was bringing his parents together. Even before William was born, it seemed the fates were weaving his life around a pattern of yellow fever. In October of the year 1853, an epidemic of this dreaded disease ravaged Mobile, and naturally caused a hurried evacuation of the city. Amelia Gayle moved from there to Mount Vernon away from swamps and yellow jack, and here she met a promising young officer, Josiah Gorgas. After a brief courtship, the two were married, and this daughter of a former governor of Alabama settled down in an aristocratic old house to rear a family.

William Crawford, the first child of the Gorgas', was born on October 3, 1854. Josiah had been placed in command of the army arsenal at Mount Vernon; therefore his son grew up learning and loving army life.

After the Civil War, Josiah Gorgas was appointed president of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn. William grew up at Sewanee. He was a slender, handsome youth, energetic and generally popular. A baseball field seemed to be the place in which William was more at home during the first years of his college life. While his enthusiasm for sports was at its peak, he was an extremely bad student, but in his final year, he turned scholarly. He won the Alabama medal for class leadership, and to cap the stack he began pining for a military career.

Gorgas' father discouraged this ambition, so he went to New Orleans and studied law for a year. He knew from the beginning that he would always detest this profession, and several times during that year he applied in vain for admission to the United States Military Academy. Finally, he decided that the only remaining possibility for an army life was for him to win a degree in medicine and thereby enter the Army Medical Corps.

At that time Gorgas had no interest whatsoever in medicine; his sole goal was the army. With this in mind he set in to learn medicine. His father strongly protested his becoming an army doctor, for next to a navy medical man, he considered an army doctor the lowest form of animal life in existence.

The first 2 years of medical school were mostly financed by the old captain, and during this time Gorgas became casually interested in his medical studies. Casual interest soon changed to enthusiasm, and when his father was no longer able to send funds, he stayed on, frequently hungry. While other students drank and caroused, Gorgas could be found studying.

In June, when he was 24, William Gorgas received his degree as doctor of medicine. At commencement, which was held in one of New York's most handsome theaters, the Academy of Music, Dr. Gorgas was favored with a beautiful bouquet of roses—his first flowers of praise on the way to fame.

One year after being awarded his doctor's degree, Gorgas entered the Medical Corps. The first years of his life as a first lieutenant were spent in typical frontier posts. After disposing of his work as sanitation inspector, hospital work, record keeping, and dozens of other army tasks, he found opportunity for outside fee work. There was plenty of such work due to blizzards, floods, hurricanes, plagues, and, most tragic of all, yellow fever, but usually the fees were lacking.

In addition to the life of a typical army doctor and keeping up his social obligations, Gorgas continued his study of medical science. He probed into this science which had been awakened by such men as Pasteur, Lister, and Koch. William Gorgas was helping medical science to plunge forward, but yellow fever, apparently ignorant of this march of science, steadily increased.

Dr. Gorgas' first real combat with yellow fever was at Fort Brown, Tex. Over 23,000 cases of yellow fever were well on their way when Gorgas finally arrived. There were differences of opinion as to the cause of this disease. Some said a "yellow fever breeze" brought it across the Rio Grande from Mexico; others laid the blame on bananas and oranges; but most everyone agreed on the preventives—mustard seed and whisky.

While doing what he could to relieve the sufferers, Dr. Gorgas met Marie Doughty. She was afflicted with yellow fever, and everyone concerned agreed that it was best to bury such victims as soon as possible after death, so her grave was made ready. Gorgas was also stricken, and while the two were convalescing, they began their courtship. Later, they were married. Thus yellow fever was responsible for another major happening in the life of William Gorgas.

When Gorgas, then known as the yellow fever specialist, was appointed sanitary officer and commissioned to Habana; ahead of him was a real job of cleaning up a pesthole of filth. Already several doctors had put forth theories concerning how yellow fever germs were transmitted, but not a one of them offered a solution. Walter Reed was also sent to Habana, and when he satisfactorily demonstrated that a certain type of mosquito does carry yellow fever germs, it was considered by scientists as merely a brilliant statement. They didn't see how the mosquito could be punished, without having been proven guilty.

To the people of Habana, Reed's discovery came like a sentence of death. To them it seemed just as impossible to banish the mosquitos as it would be to banish the air which they thickened. Were they always to live knowing their enemy and dreading to even sleep? What Reed regarded as accomplishment merely added horror to the lives of the people in Habana.

In about 6 months, Gorgas had made the city the cleanest of all tropical cities. Since it was so clean and attractive, immigrants started pouring in. Yellow fever, seemingly in subjugation, broke out anew with this fresh supply of blood with no resistance. When Gorgas saw that his clean-up campaign had failed to ward off this worst epidemic, he started from a different angle.

The Alabama doctor started studying the disease-carrying mosquito. The sanitation campaign had cleaned up some of the breeding places of the mosquito, but now Gorgas undertook the embarrassing job of going into private homes. Inside buildings was the favorite breeding place of the mosquito. The home inspection did not cause Gorgas to become unpopular, however; instead it brought him nearer the hearts of the group of humanity he was serving.

The second anti-yellow-fever war in Habana lasted about 6 months and was indeed a great success. Just the beautiful, healthful city of Habana and the pride which the Cubans have in the city is a living monument to the work of William Crawford Gorgas.

In June of 1905, Gorgas was sent to Panama where the United States was attempting to dig a canal. The French had failed on this very project because of the yellow fever and other diseases which were far too common. When Gorgas asked the Canal Commission for the necessary materials to launch an attack against disease, they scoffed at his requests for screen wire and oil spray.

The Governor of the Canal Zone, the Chairman of the Canal Commission, and other officials were not reluctant in getting appropriations for coffins, but they did not try to understand why the sanitation committee needed screen wire to clean up the Canal Zone.

While Gorgas and his helpers struggled against all this official opposition, yellow fever was getting the upper hand. As soon as a boat load of workers unloaded, they got a view of a row of coffins, not empty ones, and became frantic trying to get return passage on the same boat.

After what seemed endless delay, help arrived from the United States with more doctors and nurses and the attack on yellow fever began to gain ground, and by September of 1906 it was fairly well under control.

Though the Senators and Canal Commission officials had stamped and declared in a loud voice that the Big Ditch was an impossibility, Gorgas proved that neither it nor he was a failure. The greatest handicap had been the politicians who seemed to think they knew so much about Panama, even though they had never been nearer than Washington, D. C. The feelings of the great doctor must have been a mixture of the pride of a conqueror with humble gratefulness to God.

Even after Gorgas had so nearly completely abolished yellow fever, some of the Commission tried to have him replaced. They did not believe all that nonsense about the mosquito and claimed that every mosquito that Gorgas killed had cost the United States $10. Fortunately, President Theodore Roosevelt refused to carry out the recommendation of firing Gorgas.

The presidency of the University of Alabama was offered to Gorgas, but he declined this offer so that he might carry on as a helper of humanity. Along about this time he received honorary degrees from Harvard, Brown, University of Pennsylvania, and the University of the South.

Gorgas realized that the completion of the Panama Canal had been a triumphant accomplishment, but he could not keep from thinking of the millions of sufferers in other lands. Truly, this doctor had dedicated his life in making the lives of others happier.

Diamond mines had been opened in South Africa, and as is sometimes the case where wealth is involved, greedy operators were cruelly mistreating the workers. Heedless of the needs, diseases, and even deaths of their workers, the operators paid wages on which health could not be maintained. Due to unsanitary housing conditions, unnourishing food, and scanty clothing, the Negro workers were dying of "minus pneumonia." This disease spreads like wildfire, for the Negro is especially susceptible to lung disease.

Months of investigations and hard work soon slackened death's pace, and a Gorgas assistant was left as sanitation director. The British Empire was in charge of the mines, and they, the British, were thankful for the lives of their workers being saved. During this time the elderly doctor was promoted to Surgeon General, and he toured parts of South Africa spreading good will, and good advice. His audiences usually consisted of farmers, and he spoke on sanitation and malaria control.

Since the opening of the Panama Canal meant that people from all parts of the world would be traveling at proximity to the United States, the Americans realized that the whole globe must be freed from yellow fever. The International Health Board made Gorgas director of a world-wide campaign against yellow jack.

Then the United States declared war on Germany, and as Gorgas was a general, he had work to do. Base hospitals were built; sick and wounded were cared for; preventive serums were injected; the doctor was leading a busy, useful life at an age when most men are retired.

Although he had conquered an enemy which killed more men than actual bullets did, Gorgas still dreamed of leading men into actual combat. At the age of 64, the yellow fever specialist said that he still had not realized his full army ambition. He wished that his rank could be reduced from major general in the Medical Corps to brigadier general on active duty at the head of a brigade of Alabamians. He was not a warmonger, however, for about this time one of his aides heard him remark that he wished the war were over. If so, he would go to South America and exterminate the last wisp of yellow fever from the earth.

After the armistice was signed, General Gorgas was retired. When reports of outbreaks of yellow fever came from West Africa, Gorgas was off to the battle. The Harbin Medal for services to mankind, awarded by Belgium, was to be presented to Dr. Gorgas at the International Hygiene Conference at Brussels in 1920.

On the day after Gorgas landed in London, he was taken ill. Being a doctor, he had a fairly accurate conception of his condition, so while lying in bed at Willesk Hospital, he stated quietly that he would fight to the last, though he believed he was dying.

The King of England visited Gorgas at the hospital and in a simple ceremony presented him the insignia of the Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George.

About 4 weeks later, Dr. William Crawford Gorgas died. His funeral was held at St. Paul's Cathedral, and his body was returned to Arlington Cemetery.

William Crawford Gorgas is without a doubt justly represented in the New York University Hall of Fame for Great Americans. Not only has he won the respect and admiration of Americans, but of suffering humanity everywhere in the world.

Rubber for the Wheels of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a very timely editorial published in the Albion Journal-Register, Albion, Ill., last week in which this splendid paper cries out against the shipment of strategic material to Red China through the connivance of the British Government.

I believe this short editorial will be of interest to the Members of the House:

RUBBER FOR THE WHEELS OF CHINA

As the American battle toll this week mounted to more than 62,000 men, killed, wounded, and missing, Great Britain grudgingly announced that it has finally suspended shipment of war materials to Red China. That announcement came only after an exposé of trade relations between England and China shocked all democratic nations, and stirred deep indignation in these United States.

England as a member of the United Nations—is supposed to be supporting the U. N.'s decision to resist aggression wherever aggression appears—even has a tiny fighting force in Korea—but, England and British companies in the Far East shipped more crude rubber into Red China during the first 9 months of the Korean war, than during the whole of 1949.

Number 10 Downing Street is now opposing sanctions against the Chinese Reds. The move to blockade the Chinese coast and ports—one of the strongest weapons against any aggressor—is bogged down in U. N. red tape.

Why?

That's the question the majority of Americans are asking.

Why are our men dying in Korea in a campaign that precludes either victory or a quick and decisive end to the conflict?

Why must American delegates to the U. N. wrangle with other delegations for days or weeks before sanctions against Red China can be made effective?

Why should England, while attempting to dictate U. N. policy, traffic in war materials with the government that is killing and maiming American troops?

Why does the United States—and that means our State Department as well as the Executive—permit the U. N. to vacillate, permit the pinko dentures of Downing Street to traffic with the enemy, permit our men to die while the rest of the world and especially the British empire, profit from their bloodshed?

How long are Americans going to permit a continuation of the Korean fiasco? How soon will they issue a mandate to the White House and to Congress? How soon will they demand that we either fight to win in Korea, or pack up and come home?

How long is it going to take the American people to discover that the U. N. is playing the United States for a sucker? How long must we delay notifying the other U. N. members that unless they support the Korean effort, support it wholeheartedly and with troops and guns and materiel, that we're through supplying the goon squad while they play footsie with the Reds.

It's about time that the United States notified the world that as long as we're furnishing the men, the supplies, and the money, that we're going to make the rules.

The Defense Secretary Makes Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent article entitled "The Defense Secretary Makes Answer" which appeared in the May 9 edition of the New Haven (Conn.) Evening Register. This editorial is a penetrating and thoughtful analysis of the testimony of Secretary of Defense George Marshall and General MacArthur. I should like to call particular attention to one sentence of the editorial:

The whole MacArthur program of protest appears to us as a very serious mistake and as a major blunder.

The editorial follows:

THE DEFENSE SECRETARY MAKES ANSWER

At the outset The Register wishes to state that it finds itself almost completely in accord with everything that Secretary of Defense Marshall has thus far had to say in stating the political and military program which this country now proposes to follow.

Secretary Marshall has testified that in his opinion General MacArthur's Korean war plans would risk our involvement in an all-out war. He has said they might cause the United States to alienate and possibly lose its European allies. The Register is in complete accord with this opinion.

We might even be franker in the matter and say that Secretary Marshall is in complete accord with us. For in a front page editorial at the time of General MacArthur's sudden dismissal this newspaper urged against any extension of the land war in Asia with realization that this represented but one phase of the global picture.

In that editorial it was advocated that we protect the situation in the west, that we take into consideration the views of our allies in Europe and in the United Nations, and that we must continue to cooperate with them. Failure to do so would weaken or destroy the United Nations effort, both in Korea and elsewhere, perhaps leaving us to act alone. It would tend to break down the Atlantic Pact and lessen the European will to resist aggression.

It is certainly time that the American people cast aside their illusions and realized it is all very well for the United States to assume leadership, but in so doing it must preserve harmony and unity with its allies.

One may well hesitate to criticize General MacArthur too severely. Nevertheless, he seems to have fallen into error through his great enthusiasm for a sweeping victory in the Far East. This might be accomplished. But it also might not unless we threw the major part of our military resources in men and war materials into a supreme struggle in that area—a very serious gamble, the failure of which might lead to disaster to the whole cause of global defense against Communist aggression.

The general took it upon himself to determine military, diplomatic, and political policy from the standpoint of Asia alone. This would be taking a chance, and a very desperate one.

The whole MacArthur program of protest appears to us as a very serious mistake and as a major blunder. As was suggested in our editorial of April 11, nothing has been accomplished except to widen the growing misunderstanding between the United States and its allies and to alienate them, to cool their ardor for further cooperation in Europe, and even to lead to a possible complete breach with them.

Worst of all, the matter of our foreign policy is now being rehearsed in public for the benefit of Russia and Red China. These two countries can now make their plans for the immediate future in view of what appears to be a lack of definite policy agreement between the United States and its allies. This ventilation of our disagreements with Britain, France, and others of our United Nations allies can only be viewed as a serious weakening of our leadership. This is very likely to present new and difficult problems of global security for us and for the United Nations.

Already our actions in the Far East have nearly upset the British Cabinet, causing resignations from its membership, and brought President Auriol on a hurried and unprecedented visit to Washington to assure us that the present French Cabinet crisis will not alter French cooperation. General MacArthur's suggestion that America, in spite of this, should assume world leadership might easily leave us in the seemingly glorious but inconsequential position of leadership with only reluctant and unenthusiastic supporters and followers.

Reorganization of the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with my colleague, Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, in the introduction of a bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of State of the United States in the interest of economy, efficiency, and a more effective administration of affairs, both foreign and domestic. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to explain my views regarding the need for such action.

This bill as introduced by Senator CASE has been designated as S. 1389, and was introduced April 26, 1951.

NEED FOR REORGANIZATION

The people of the United States, and possibly many of the people of the world, have lost faith in our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. They no longer have the trust and confidence that is needed in an official who holds the position that Secretary Acheson holds. Especially in times as critical as these do we need someone at the head of our Department of State who not only has the confidence of the people of this Nation, but the people of the world as a whole.

When this situation exists, the people of the Nation look to Congress to bring about the changes they feel should be made in the executive branch of the Government.

There are probably three involuntary methods of replacing an official in the executive branch:

First. Discharge.

Second. Impeaching.

Third. Reorganization of the department.

The first of these methods—discharge—is probably too remote to warrant consideration. The Secretary of State is responsible only to the President, and it is extremely unlikely that the President would discharge the present Secretary.

The second ground—impeachment—is the ground I should first like to have you consider with me. It is my purpose to outline to you the grounds, the procedure, and the evidence that you may be fully advised and reach your own decision, but after my study, I have come to the conclusion that, although grounds for impeachment may exist, the process is lengthy. It would require much time on the part of the House and Senate, and at a time when the fate of the Nation may be hanging in the balance, I wonder about the advisability of such a proceeding.

Under these circumstances, I have come to the conclusion that the better method of accomplishing the purpose of this Congress is to reorganize the Department of State. My colleague, FRANCIS CASE, for many years a member of this body, has developed a program for reorganization which is complete in every detail and which would make for a better and more efficient Department, even though no other purpose were being served thereby.

GROUNDS FOR IMPEACHMENT

The provisions of the Constitution of the United States bearing upon impeachment which might be involved in this study include:

Article I, section 2, clause 5:

The House of Representatives * * * shall have the sole power of impeachment.

Article I, section 3, clause 6:

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present.

Article II, section 4:

The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

The grounds for impeachment, stated in article II, section 4, are treason, bribery, and "other high crimes and misdemeanors." The terms "treason" and "bribery" require no definition. Treason, in fact, is defined in article III, section 3 of the Constitution, and the meaning of bribery is well established—Yankwich, district judge, Impeachment of Civil Officers Under the Federal Constitution, 1938, 26 Geo. L. J. at pages 852–853; Third Willoughby on the Constitution, 1929, at page 1449.

The only real question arises as to the meaning of "high crimes and misdemeanors." It has been argued that the phrase comprehends only crimes or offenses under the Federal statutes, the Constitution or the common law. But the view sustained by the better authority is than an offense may be grounds for impeachment even though not a statutory or common law crime—Yankwich, opere citato supra, at pages 853, 860—"a study of English and American precedents in impeachment cases leads to the conclusion that they cover general official misconduct"; from the precedents "it is evident that the interpretation which is placed upon the words 'crimes and misdemeanors' is a broad one; that persons have been impeached and found guilty for acts of misconduct, some of a personal, others of an official character which do not amount to a crime"—Third Willoughby, opere citato supra, at pages 1449–1450; Simpson, Federal Impeachment, 1916, Sixty-fourth University of Pennsylvania Review, at pages 676–695; Story, Commentaries on the Constitution, fourth edition, sections 796–800; First Tucker on the Constitution, 1899, section 200. In Second Watson, opere citato supra, pages 1034–1035, the author declares:

Blackstone says that a crime or misdemeanor is an act committed, or omitted, in violation of a public law either forbidding or commanding it, though crime in a narrower sense is distinguished from a misdemeanor as being an offense of a deeper and more atrocious dye, and usually amounting to a felony.

A misdemeanor comprehends all indictable offenses which do not amount to a felony; as perjury, battery, libels, conspiracies, attempts and solicitations to commit felonies, and so forth. These seem to be the definitions of these terms at common law, but it would be strange if a civil officer could be impeached for only such offenses as are embraced within the common law definition of "other high crimes and misdemeanors." There is a parliamentary definition of the term "misdemeanor," and a modern writer on the Constitution has said: "The term 'high crimes and misdemeanors' has no significance in the common law concerning crimes subject to indictment." It can only be found in the law of Parliament, and is the technical term which was used by the Commons at the Bar of the Lords for centuries before the existence of the United States. Synonymous with the term "misdemeanor" are the terms misdeed, misconduct, misbehavior, fault, transgression.

Suppose the President of the United States should insist upon using the White House for some purpose which would bring moral disgrace upon the Nation and the established rules of civilized society. Is it to be claimed that he would not be liable to impeachment for such conduct because the offense was not indictable under a Federal law? Or suppose he should refuse to perform the duties, or some of them, which the Constitution enjoins upon him? Would it be claimed that he was not impeachable? In *Mississippi* v. *Johnson*, supra, (4 Wall. 475), Chase, Chief Justice, asked, "May not the House of Representatives impeach the President for refusing to execute the laws of Congress?" Suppose the Vice President should refuse to preside over the Senate, or to discharge any of the duties incumbent upon his high office? There is no statute under which he could be indicted and consequently he would escape punishment and would continue to hold his office and embarrass the operation of the Government, but will it be claimed that he would not be subject to impeachment? The managers on behalf of the House of Representatives in the impeachment of President Johnson crystallized the doctrine of impeachable offenses into the following rule: "An impeachable crime or misdemeanor is one in its nature or consequence subversive of some fundamental or essential principle of Government or highly prejudicial to the public interest, and this may consist of a violation of the Constitution, of law, of an official oath, or of duty, by an act committed or omitted, or, without violating a positive law, by the abuse of discretionary powers from improper motives, or from any improper purpose."

The author further states—pages 1036 to 1037:

A civil officer may so behave himself in public as to bring disgrace upon himself and shame upon his country, and he may continue to do this until his name would become a national stench, and yet he would not be subject to indictment by any law of the United States, but he certainly could be impeached. What will these who advocate the doctrine that impeachment will not lie except for an offense punishable by statute, do with the constitutional provision relative to judges which says, "Judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior?" This means that as long as they behave themselves their tenure of office is fixed, and they cannot be disturbed. But suppose they cease to behave themselves? When the Constitution says, "A judge shall hold his office during good behavior," it means that he shall not hold it when it ceases to be good. Suppose he should refuse to sit upon the bench and discharge the duties which the Constitution and the law enjoin upon him, or should become a notoriously corrupt character, and live a notoriously corrupt and debauched life? He could not be indicted for such conduct, and he could not be removed except by impeachment. Would it be claimed that impeachment would not be the proper remedy in such a case?

And in connection with the investigation of the conduct of District Judge English, the House Committee on the Judiciary made the following statement in its report—House Report No. 653, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session—as set out in six Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, 1936, section 545:

Although frequently debated, and the negative advocated by some high authorities, it is now, we believe, considered that impeachment is not confined alone to acts which are forbidden by the Constitution or Federal statutes. The better sustained and modern view is that the provision for impeachment in the Constitution applies not only to high crimes and misdemeanors as those words were understood at common law but also acts which are not defined as criminal and made subject to indictment, but also to those which affect the public welfare. Thus an official may be impeached for offenses of a political character and for gross betrayal of public interests. Also for abuses or betrayal of trusts, for inexcusable negligence of duty, for the tyrannical abuse of power, or, as one writer puts it, for a "breach of official duty by malfeasance or misfeasance, including conduct such as drunkenness when habitual, or in the performance of official duties, gross indecency, profanity, obscenity, or other language used in the discharge of an official function, which tends to bring the office into disrepute, or for an abuse or reckless exercise of discretionary power as well as the breach of an official duty imposed by statute or common law."

The committee held, however, that "No judge may be impeached for a wrong decision"—Sixth Cannon's, opere citato supra.

PERSONS AND OFFENSES COVERED

As indicated above, article II, section 4, of the Constitution designates who may be removed by impeachment, and the offenses, including treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors:

Impeachment is a criminal trial. A true crime must be charged, and the jurisdiction of the Senate is neither more extensive nor more restricted than that of the House of Lords in respect to the nature of the offenses charged. * * * Whether a crime ("Crime" is used, not in a technical sense, but as meaning a "criminal act," the chief element of which is the evil, as distinguished from the virtuous intention) does or does not appear can be determined to some extent by decisions of the Senate in cases of impeachment, but is chiefly to be decided by common-law rulings in similar cases; and in new cases we must frequently be guided by the definitions furnished us by writers on the criminal law, as a result of a close study of the cases decided in the common-law courts. (Impeachable Offenses Under the Constitution of the United States, by George Willett Van Nest, American Law Review, June 27, 1892, pp. 818–819.)

INITIATION OF IMPEACHMENT

The sole power of impeachment is conferred upon the House by article I, section 2, clause 5, of the Constitution of the United States, which reads:

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment.

Impeachment may be initiated by charges made on the floor by a Member on his own responsibility. The question of impeachment is one of constitutional privilege which may be presented at any time by any Member of the House, but recognition to raise a question of constitutional privilege must be preceded by a resolution or notice in writing, and a mere proposition to investigate the conduct of a civil officer is not presented as a matter of constitutional privilege, even though impeachment may be contemplated. Impeachment may also be initiated by a memorial containing charges under oath, by a message from the President, by a charge preferred by a State or territorial legislature, and by petition.

Charges always have been examined by the House before impeachments have been voted. After the charge is originally made, it is by resolution referred to a standing committee, or to a special committee for investigation and report. The investigation by the committee may be conducted ex parte, or it may be conducted to permit respondent to appear in person and by counsel to testify, to present witnesses, and to cross-examine. The House of Representatives, when acting in impeachment proceedings, has the power to compel the attendance of witnesses. The investigations are conducted more or less according to the established rules of evidence, but the strict rules of evidence have been relaxed. Upon the conclusion of the investigation by the designated committee, a report favoring impeachment may be referred to the House Calendar or may be committed to the Committee of the Whole House on

the State of the Union. If the latter procedure is adopted, when debate is ended, the Committee of the Whole arises and reports its resolution to the House, whereupon the question is put: "Will the House concur with the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union in the adoption of said resolution?" Usually a record vote is taken, but it is not required.

Managers have been selected by three methods: First, election by ballot, a majority vote being required; second, by resolution naming them; and, third, by resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint. These managers are usually appointed from those in accord with the sentiment of the House and from both parties. The chairman is designated by the managers selected.

After the House has voted impeachment, it notifies the Senate thereof by message.

Upon receipt of message from the House, the Senate adopts an order and sends a message to the House that it is ready to receive articles.

The managers, on the part of the House, present to the Senate the articles of impeachment signed by the Speaker and attested by the Clerk. The Chairman of the Committee impeaches at the bar of the Senate by oral accusation and requests that the Senate take order as to appearance.

The accused may appear in person or by attorney, or he may not appear at all in which case trial proceeds as if a plea of not guilty were entered.

The sole power to try impeachments is vested in the Senate by article I, section 3, clause 6, which reads:

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside. And no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present.

On the final question of whether an impeachment is to be sustained, the yeas and nays are taken on each article separately, upon which there must be an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members present.

The extent to which a judgment in an impeachment proceeding may go is set forth in article I, section 3, clause 7, of the Constitution which reads:

Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States: but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment, according to law.

GROUNDS AND EVIDENCE

In laying a foundation for any proceedings by the House of Representatives against the Secretary of State for breach of official duty by malfeasance or misfeasance of office, we should have a complete outline of the law and the acts of the Department of State leading up to the present situation—a situation in which we find ourselves engaged in a major war in Korea without United Nations authority, without constitutional authority, and without authority of Congress, a "police action" in which the United States has already suffered some 65,000 casualties, an undeclared war against at least one major power and one minor nation in which the Secretary of State was at least the moving hand in advising the President in his leadership.

The first step in obtaining a background is to find the legal, the constitutional, or the treaty basis for our involvement in Korea. In considering the legal and treaty basis, we turn to the United Nations Charter.

UNITED NATIONS AUTHORITY

The United Nations Charter, setting forth fully and completely the purpose and authority of the organization, membership, and obligations, was adopted by the Congress of the United States in July 1945.

It is the contention of the State Department that such authority as the United States had under the United Nations Charter in sending troops into Korea is under article 39 of the United Nations Charter and the resolution pursuant thereto. Article 39 reads as follows:

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

I call your attention to this phrase, "and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Article 41 empowers the Security Council to decide what measures not involved in the use of armed force may be employed to give effect to its decision, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. It reads as follows:

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

It should be emphasized that nothing in article 41 could be constructed as authorization for the use of armed force.

Article 42 reads as follows:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Attention is called to the wording of section 42 which says, "such action 'may'."

Article 43 provides:

1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Again I emphasize, "and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

I would like to quote article 44:

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under article 43, invite that member, if the member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that member's armed forces.

This further points out that the "agreement or agreements" had to be made before force could be used.

Article 45 provides:

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of those contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the military staff committee.

I point out the wording, "within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the military staff committee."

THE PARTICIPATION ACT

Although more than 5 years have elapsed since the United Nations Charter has been adopted, neither the United States nor any other member nation has entered into any agreement or agreements with the Security Council of the United Nations, nor has the Congress of the United States had any opportunity to take any steps which might implement the Charter as therein provided, except that in 1949, Congress, by the United Nations Participation Act as amended in 1949, authorized the assigning to the United Nations an amount not to exceed 1,000 noncombat personnel of the Armed Forces.

In order to authorize the President to enter into the agreement or agreements, the Congress in 1945 enacted H. R. 4618 and S. 1580, the same being section 287d of title 22 of the United States Code, which is as follows:

The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the

numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That except as authorized in section 287d-1 of this title, nothing contained in this section shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

To further explain the meaning of the charter and the law, at the time of the hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on December 7, 1950, reported on page 23 of such hearings, Secretary Acheson testified as follows in response to questions from members of the committee:

Mr. BURNET. Mr. Chairman, does that mean the Security Council names the number and amounts of troops and equipment we shall furnish the Security Council?

Mr. ACHESON. No. It means that we must work out with the Security Council a special agreement or agreements in which we develop the number of troops, the location, the degree of readiness, etc.; and that when we have done that, and when you gentlemen have approved it, then and only then, are we bound to furnish that contingent of troops to the Security Council; and the President is not authorized to furnish any more than you have approved of in that agreement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This, then, would be in the nature of a police force which the President could make available automatically, but he would be unable to go beyond that with the unlimited force which Congress would still have to pass upon for unlimited war?

Mr. ACHESON. Yes. Beyond the amount which you have agreed in the special agreement, and the President is not given authority to furnish any additional troops, and whatever happens after that is determined by the ordinary constitutional relations between the Congress and the President.

Let us look at pages 25 and 26 of the same hearings and see the answer Secretary Acheson gave in answer to a question of Congressman KEE:

Mr. KEE. I would like to clear up a question that is in my mind in respect to section 6 (U. N. participation act) that authorizes the President to negotiate special agreements with reference to providing troops and so forth, and the Armed Forces to be provided. The President has negotiated this agreement with the Council, as I understand this, without consulting or submitting the matter to Congress. If it becomes necessary in the course of an emergency, he can proceed to supply the forces agreed upon before submitting the agreement to Congress for action, is that correct?

Mr. ACHESON. This is an important question of Judge KEE, and may I state his question and my answer so that it will be quite clear here. The Judge asks whether the language beginning on line 19 of page 5, which says the President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of the Charter, means that the President may provide these forces prior to the time when any special agreement has been approved by the Congress.

The answer to that question is "No," that the President may not do that, that such special agreements refer to the special agreements which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress, so that until the special agreement has been negotiated and approved by the Congress, it has no force and effect.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is a little hard for us to get the meaning of article 42, Mr. Secretary. Will you explain what this is?

Mr. ACHESON. Article 42 says—should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41—now those are the measures short of armed forces—would be inadequate or prove to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security, and such action may include demonstrations, blockades, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations. Now that is the article under which the international organization puts into effect the police forces which are made available to it under article 43, and the only reason that the President is permitted to make these forces available, after the special agreement has been approved is to carry out the provisions of article 42, to which we are committed by our ratification of the Charter.

Mr. RYTER. That may mean actual fighting, may it not?

Mr. ACHESON. Yes, it may.

Mr. FLOOD. It is also true, is it not, Mr. Secretary, that these occurrences come up only in the case of the breach of the peace or threatened breach of the peace?

Mr. ACHESON. That is correct.

In this connection it is also interesting to note the statement of Sir Gladwynn Jebb, United Kingdom representative to the United Nations, which can be found on page 54 of House Report No. 2495, dated July 11, 1950, in which he said:

Had the Charter become fully into force, and had the agreement provided for in article 43 of the Charter been concluded, we should, of cource, have proceeded differently and the action to be taken by the Security Council to repel the armed attack would no doubt have been founded on article 42. As it is, however, we can naturally only act under article 39, which enabled the Security Council to recommend what measures should be taken to restore international peace and security.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee, when reporting the bill to the floor for consideration by the House as a whole, included in their report the following:

At the same time the bill, by providing that the Congress shall approve any such agreement or agreements as may be negotiated, insures that the Congress will have full opportunity to pass upon the terms and provisions thereof.

At the time the legislation was considered on the floor of the House, Chairman Sol Bloom, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in his explanation of the legislation, stated on the floor, and this can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 9, page 12267, the following:

The position of the Congress is fully protected by the requirement that the military agreement to preserve the peace must be passed upon by Congress before it becomes effective. Also the obligation of the United States to make forces available to the Security Council does not become effective until a special agreement has been passed upon by Congress.

In considering this legislation on the floor of the United States Senate on November 26, 1945, Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, stated, which statement is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 8, pages 10967 and 10968, as follows:

These contracts must be submitted to Congress. When the agreements are made with the Security Council, they must come back here. Senators will have an opportunity to debate them, to offer amendments, to qualify them, and so forth. As to declaring war, that is not a question which is involved here at all. These forces are not exacted to make war. They are exacted as peace forces, to undertake to preserve peaceful nations against aggression and attack. If we wish to go to war, we can still go to war, by declaring war and making use of our entire armed forces. I do not suppose we would hesitate to do it if we felt that the national interest required or demanded it.

Thus it is made clear by the original United Nations Participation Act that we, as an individual member of the U. N., had not in any way committed ourselves to furnish armed forces to the United Nations for use in armed intervention under the provisions of the articles of the United Nations Charter to prevent breaches of the peace or maintain international security.

In 1947 we find that evidence is further presented to the effect that these agreements must be completed before troops or armed forces could be assigned to the United Nations by a speech delivered by Herschel V. Johnson, who was the Deputy United States Representative to the United Nations. Mr. Johnson, in a speech delivered on June 4, 1947—and this speech can be found on page 1143 of Document No. 123, Eighty-first Congress, first session, of the Senate entitled "A Decade of American Foreign Policy." Mr. Johnson said as follows:

One vital organization task remains undone. Article 43 of the Charter imposes upon the Security Council the responsibility for negotiating "as soon as possible" special agreements under which the member states will make available to the Security Council, on its call, "armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security." Until those agreements have been concluded and put into force, the Security Council will be unable to fulfill its responsibilities as the enforcement agency of the United Nations. Chapter VII of the Charter, insofar as it relates to military enforcement measures, will remain inoperative.

Therefore we see that even in 1947 there was no authorization.

On October 10, 1949, the Congress enacted 287d-1 of title 22 of the United States Code, which specifically provided that they could not involve the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The limitations were specific. That legislation authorized the President to detail a total of not more than 1,000 noncombat personnel to a mission at any one time.

In connection with the legislation which was enacted, it is interesting to

note on page 17 of the hearings which were held before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on H. R. 3005, 4497, 4708, on May 10, 11, 12, and 13 of 1949, the statement was made by Mr. Ernest A. Gross, now adviser to Ambassador Austin at the United Nations, as follows:

I think this is even a more important point. Because of the fact that under the Constitution American military personnel cannot be made available to foreign powers or foreign organizations, except by authority of law, it has been necessary, instead of detailing the personnel to the United Nations for service with these missions, to keep them within American control, so to speak, so they would be responsible to and report to the military chief, the American military chief, or to the top American diplomatic official in the area or attached to the commission.

SUMMARY

From a complete research of both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it is a certainty there have been no agreement or agreements entered into between the United States and the United Nations Security Council as provided for in article 43 of the Charter and the Participation Act of 1945. On June 25, 1950, the Security Council had no authority to send any troops to Korea. The President of the United States had no authority to send any troops to Korea under any authority of the United Nations.

HISTORY OF KOREA

According to the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations pursuant to House Resolution 206 entitled "Background Information on Korea," on page 43 thereof is the statement by our representative to the United Nations on June 25, 1950, which is in part as follows:

At 4 o'clock in the morning Sunday, June 25, Korean time, armed forces from North Korea commenced an unprovoked assault against the territory of the Republic of Korea. This assault was launched by ground forces along the thirty-eighth parallel, in the Ongjin, Kaesong, and Chunchon sectors, and by amphibious landings on the east coast in the vicinity of Jangmung. In addition, North Korean aircraft have attacked and strafed the Kimpo airport in the outskirts of the capital city of Seoul.

Mr. President, I have tabled a draft resolution which notes the Security Council's grave concern at the invasion of the Republic of Korea by the armed forces of North Korea. This draft resolution calls upon the authorities in the North to cease hostilities and to withdraw armed forces to the border along the thirty-eighth parallel.

The draft resolution requests that the United Nations Commission on Korea observe the withdrawal of the North Korean forces to the thirty-eighth parallel and keep the Security Council informed on the implementation and execution of the resolution. The draft resolution also calls upon all members of the United Nations to render every assistance to the United Nations in the carrying out of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

As a result of that report, Resolution 1 was adopted by the Security Council, which resolution is in part as follows:

III. Calls upon members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

On page 45 of the above-mentioned House report appears the statement by the President of the United States on June 27, 1950, which is in part as follows:

In Korea the Government forces, which were armed to prevent border raids and to preserve internal security, were attacked by invading forces from North Korea. The Security Council of the United Nations called upon the invading troops to cease hostilities and to withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel. This they have not done, but on the contrary have pressed the attack. The Security Council called upon all members of the United Nations to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution. In these circumstances I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support. * * *

Accordingly I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa. As a corollary to this action I am calling upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done. The determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan, or consideration by the United Nations. * * *

I have instructed Ambassador Austin, as the representative of the United States to the Security Council, to report these steps to the Council.

It should be noted at this time that the minutes of the United Nations for June 27, 1950, contain the statement of Ambassador Warren Austin as follows:

The United Nations finds itself confronted today with the gravest crisis in its existence.

Forty-eight hours ago the Security Council, in an emergency session, determined that the armed invasion of the Republic of Korea by armed forces from northern Korea constituted a breach of the peace. Accordingly, the Security Council called for a cessation of hostilities forthwith and the withdrawal by the northern Korean authorities of their armed forces to the thirty-eighth parallel. The Security Council also requested the United Nations Commission on Korea to observe the withdrawal and to report. Finally, the Security Council called upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of the resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

The decision of the Security Council has been broadcast to the Korean authorities and is known to them. We now have before us the report of the United Nations Commission for Korea which confirms our fears. It is clear that the authorities in North Korea have completely disregarded and flouted the decision of the Security Council. The armed invasion of the Republic of Korea continues. This is, in fact, an attack on the United Nations itself. The North Korean authorities have called upon the established government of the Republic to surrender.

It is hard to imagine a more glaring example of disregard for the United Nations and for all the principles which it represents. The most important provisions of the Charter are those outlawing aggressive war. It is precisely these provisions which the North Korean authorities have violated.

It is the plain duty of the Security Council to invoke stringent sanctions to restore international peace.

The Republic of Korea has appealed to the United Nations for protection. I am happy and proud to report that the United States is prepared as a loyal member of the United Nations to furnish assistance to the Republic of Korea.

I have tabled a resolution which I ask the Council to consider favorably as the next step to restore world peace. That resolution is as follows:

"The Security Council—

"Having determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace;

"Having called for an immediate cessation of hostilities; and

"Having called upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the thirty-eighth parallel; and

"Having noted from the report of the United Nations Commission for Korea that the authorities in North Korea have neither ceased hostilities nor withdrawn their armed forces to the thirty-eighth parallel, and that urgent military measures are required to restore international peace and security; and

"Having noted the appeal from the Republic of Korea to the United Nations for immediate and effective steps to secure peace and security;

"Recommends that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area."

This is the logical consequence of the resolution concerning the complaint of aggression upon the Republic of Korea adopted at the four hundred and seventy-third meeting of the Security Council on June 25, 1950, and the subsequent events recited in the preamble of this resolution. That resolution of June 25 called upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution, and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities. This new resolution is the logical next step. Its significance is affected by the violation of the former resolution, the continuation of aggression, and the urgent military measures required.

I wish now to read the statement which the President of the United States made today on this critical situation. (Statement herein quoted above in part.)

It is unquestioned from the United Nations Security Council minutes that this resolution and the report of the President were tabled at 3 o'clock in the afternoon on June 27. Attention is called to the fact that the statement of the President of the United States which was tabled with the resolution says:

I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support.

Alhough it is not known the exact time such order was made by the President, it was, of necessity, made prior to 3 p. m. on June 27.

According to the Security Council meetings, when the Council convened at 3 p. m., on June 27, there were tabled two resolutions—the resolution of Yugoslavia Government and the Austin resolution. The Yugoslavia resolution was reported in the New York Times under date of June 28, 1950, as follows:

Today Dr. Bebler said that the Council "after only 2 days of fighting," should not abandon hope that the two sides would enter into negotiations, and introduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a United Nations mediator.

According to the minutes of the Council, a recording is made of the two resolutions. The President of the Security Council said that under rule 32, motions

and draft resolutions have precedence in the order of their submission. "Under this rule, I have to put the United States draft resolution to the vote first," he said.

Austin presented this resolution at the time the Council convened at 3 p. m., and that meeting adjourned at 6: 15 p. m. The Council then reconvened at 10: 25 p. m., and it was during the meeting that convened at 10: 25 p. m., that both resolutions were voted upon.

According to the minutes of the United Nations Security Council, there was a lapse of time from 3 p. m., until at least 10: 45 p. m., that night before the Austin resolution was adopted. It should be noted that in the afternoon meeting, Austin read President Truman's statement in which he said, "I have ordered United States air and sea forces," and so forth.

Even if the agreements had been in force, and they are not, President Truman still would have jumped the authority of the resolution by at least 7 hours in ordering American armed intervention in the Korean war.

The next official action taken by the United Nations Security Council was on July 7 when the following resolution was adopted:

The Security Council, having determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace, having recommended that members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area:

(1) Welcomes the prompt and vigorous support which governments and peoples of the United Nations have given to its resolutions of 25 and 27 June 1950 to assist the Republic of Korea in defending itself against armed attack and thus to restore international peace and security in the area;

(2) Notes that members of the United Nations have transmitted to the United Nations offers of assistance for the Republic of Korea;

(3) Recommends that all members providing military forces and other assistance pursuant to the aforesaid Security Council resolutions make such forces and other assistance available to a unified command under the United States;

(4) Requests the United States to designate the commander of such forces;

(5) Authorizes the unified command at its discretion to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating;

(6) Requests the United States to provide the Security Council with reports, as appropriate, on the course of action taken under the unified command.

On July 8, the President of the United States made the following statement:

The Security Council of the United Nations in its resolution of July 7, 1950, has recommended that all members providing military forces and other assistance pursuant to the Security Council resolutions of June 25 and 27, make such forces and other assistance available to a unified command under the United States.

The Security Council resolution also requests that the United States designate the commander of such forces, and authorizes the unified command at its discretion to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against the North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating.

I am responding to the recommendations of the Security Council and have designated Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the commanding general of the military forces which the members of the United Nations place under the unified command of the United States pursuant to the United Nations assistance to the Republic of Korea in repelling the unprovoked armed attack against it.

I am directing General MacArthur, pursuant to the Security Council resolution, to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against the North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating.

PRESIDENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

It has been noted in the past that numerous Presidents have sent troops into foreign lands in defense of the lives, the property, and treaty obligations of the United States. However, in this case it should be noted that at the time of entry, there were no lives and no property involved in South Korea. It should further be noted that there was no treaty with South Korea requiring us to furnish them with military assistance, and that under the United Nations Charter and our Participation Act we had not completed the agreement or agreements with the Security Council to provide it with troops. As stated by Herschel Johnson, the United Nations Charter did not become a treaty and binding upon the United States until the agreement or agreements had been executed.

Even though the President in his statement of June 28, 1950, attempted to represent to the American public the fact that he had the authority to send American Armed Forces into Korea under Article 39 of the United Nations Charter and pursuant to International law, it is very clear that neither of these authorities existed at that time, because he had not implemented the Charter under Article 43, and there were no American lives and no American property involved.

To summarize, there is no precedent in the history of this Nation for the President of the United States to involve this Nation in a war, such as that in which it is involved at the present time under the Constitution without a declaration of war or approval by Congress. There is no authority under the United Nations authorizing the action which this Nation has taken, and in the words of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS in hearings following the introduction of a resolution to revise the United Nations Charter he stated on page 12 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on February 2, 1950:

For it should never be forgotten that the Charter of the United Nations declares that the first purpose of the United Nations is * * * to maintain international peace and security and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

That is what we agreed to when we ratified the Charter. But due to structural defects in that Charter and to to the Russian attitude, we have failed to realize that purpose.

FOREIGN POLICY

In a brief prepared by the Department of State on the authority of the President to repel the attack in Korea found in Background Information on Korea, page 65, the Secretary of State said as follows:

Thus, even before the ratification of the United Nations Charter, the President had used the Armed Forces of the United States without consulting the Congress for the purpose of protecting the foreign policy of the United States. The ratification of the United Nations Charter was, of course, the landmark in the development of the American foreign policy.

The agreement or agreements had not been consummated with the Security Council, implementing the United Nations Charter, thus the adoption of the United Nations Charter had not, as yet, become a part of the United States policy. On June 27, 1950, when the President ordered American troops into action at least 7 hours prior to the resolution of the United Nations Security Council upon which authority they rely, such action could not have been taken for the purpose of "protecting the foreign policy of the United States under the United Nations Charter."

It cannot be said that the policy of the United Nations with regard to Korea became a policy of the United States, calling for armed intervention with regard to Korea, since Resolution No. 1, which was the only one adopted at the time, calls for only cessation of hostilities, calls for withdrawal of North Korean armed forces, and requests the United Nations Commission on Korea to keep the Council informed. I call your attention to the fact that section 3 says:

Calls upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

The words "in the execution of this resolution" preclude the President or the Secretary of State from claiming that the United Nations called upon all members to render "military" assistance to the United Nations because of the phrase "in the execution of this resolution." The resolution itself covers merely cessation of hostilities and authority to the Commission on Korea, it carefully avoids reference to military assistance to South Korea, and then, since our Government ordered troops into Korea without any recommendation or request from the Security Council, there can be no claim that the action taken by the President was in any manner in support of American foreign policy under the United Nations Charter. The minutes prove that the Security Council has not even considered military operations or the authorizing of any such operations.

FOREIGN POLICY

It should be further pointed out that the adoption of the United Nations charter had no bearing on American foreign policy, because on January 12, 1950, Secretary Acheson stated that our

foreign policy insofar as Korea was concerned was as follows:

Defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus [Okinawa] * * * [and] to the Philippines. * * *

So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack. But it must also be clear that such a guaranty is hardly sensible or necessary within the realm of practical relationship. Should such an attack occur—one hesitates to say where such an armed attack could come from—the initial reliance must be on the people attacked to resist it and then upon the commitments of the entire civilized world under the charter of the United Nations. * * * But it is a mistake, I think, in considering Pacific and far-eastern problems to become obsessed with military considerations.

It was not an obsession on January 12, 1950, but on June 25, 1950, it was. On January 12, 1950, we were not to become obsessed with military considerations; today we are obsessed with some 65,000 casualties.

What was the American foreign policy on June 26, 1950? Quoting the New York Times for June 27, 1950, it read as follows:

Rear Admiral Hillenkoetter, Central Intelligence Agency, convinced Senate critics that the intelligence service was not caught by surprise by the Korean invasion. He revealed that the invasion of South Korea was detailed in the Soviet publication, Izvestia, which on June 10, 1950, printed a timetable for uniting Korea under a single parliament.

UNITED NATIONS EFFORT?

On June 29, 1950, on July 3, 1950, and on March 24, 1951, the State Department issued memorandums on the authority of the President to repel the attack in Korea, portions of which are as follows:

All actions taken by the United States to restore the peace in Korea have been under the aegis of the United Nations. * * *

In conclusion, the action of the United States Government in Korea is taken in support of the authority of the United Nations. It is taken to restore peace and security to the Pacific area.

Secretary Acheson at his news conference on June 28 emphasized that the actions of the United States had been taken in support of the United Nations. "After June 25," he said, "all action in Korea has been under the aegis of the United Nations."

The political issues, which General MacArthur has stated are beyond his responsibility as a field commander, are being dealt with in the United Nations and by intergovernmental consultations.

The last statement was released the day General MacArthur asserted he was ready to confer in the field with the commander of the Chinese and North Korean forces to end the war.

All of these quotations indicate an attempt on the part of the Secretary of State to disguise our military actions as those of the United Nations. In contradiction of these I set forth a letter received by me from Secretary of State Dean Acheson under date of April 17, 1951, which sets forth as follows:

I am in receipt of your letter of March 19 in which you pose the general question of the status of United States troops in Korea. This letter will amplify more fully what, of necessity, were rather brief responses to questions asked on March 15 when I had the privilege of meeting with you and other Members of Congress.

The over-all directives under which military action in Korea is being conducted are in the main embodied in three resolutions passed by the United Nations shortly after the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. In general, the Security Council resolution of June 25, 1950, determined that the attack on the Republic of Korea was a breach of the peace, called for immediate cessation of hostilities, and called upon United Nations members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of the resolution. The Security Council resolution of June 27, 1950, recommended that members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as necessary to repel the armed attack and restore peace in the area.

On July 7, 1950, the Security Council passed a third resolution recommending that the United Nations members make their forces and assistance "available to a unified command under the United States," and requesting "the United States to designate the commander of such forces." This same resolution of July 7 authorizes "the unified command at its discretion to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of various nations participating."

On July 8 the President of the United States stated: "I am responding to the recommendation of the Security Council and have designated General Douglas MacArthur as the Commanding General of the military forces which the members of the United Nations place under the unified command of the United States pursuant to the United Nations" assistance to the Republic of Korea in repelling the unprovoked armed attack against it.

"I am directing General MacArthur, pursuant to the Security Council resolution, to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against the North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of various nations participating."

Pursuant to the Security Council resolution, the forces furnished by the United States and by all other United Nations Members are fighting under their own flags and concurrently under the United Nations flag.

The Commanding General of the forces placed under the unified command reports to the President of the United States through the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Therefore, it follows that any military action taken by the unified command is taken in the same manner as military action taken by the United Staets. In the event the United Nations should disapprove actions of the United States Government in its capacity as the unified command, presumably the United Nations could revoke the authority of the United States Government to act as the unified command. However, such action would not affect the relation of the United States forces and the United States commander.

The United States forces supporting the Security Council resolutions are commanded by the Commander-in-Chief of the United States Forces in the Far East (CINCFE). This officer is not an agent of the Security Council. The Security Council has no force of its own, and therefore, it has not designated any commander of such a force. It has recommended that Members of the United Nations render assistance to repel the attack and restore peace in the area, that Members make forces and assistance available to a unified command under the United States, and that the United States designate the commander of such forces. No action has been taken which has transformed the United States forces into United Nations forces, and the United States forces have, as well as other forces participating in the effort, retained their identity.

The resolutions passed by the United Nations under which military action is being taken in Korea contain broad directives. No United Nations resolution attempts to give to the unified command instructions as to how military action is to be carried out or to place any limitation on military action taken in Korea to accomplish the objective of the Security Council resolutions "to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area." Thus, the Commanding General of the forces made available to the unified command is free within the framework of directives from the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff to make the necessary decisions to carry forward the military phase of the United Nations action without further Security Council decisions.

IN SUMMARY

By way of summary, there are three involuntary methods of replacing an official in the executive branch of government:

First. Discharge.

Second. Impeachment.

Third. Reorganization of the Department.

I have already stated that discharge is improbable.

I believe I have presented a sound case of misfeasance and malfeasance in office under which the decisions of the courts amount to high crimes and misdemeanors under the Constitution. That such high crimes and misdemeanors are based upon the fact that the Secretary of State of the United States advised the President of the United States to send Armed Forces into Korea without authority of the United Nations, without authority of the Constitution, without authority of the Congress.

With or without authority, this Nation is actually engaged in war in Korea, a war which must be terminated honorably, successfully, and at the earliest possible date. Since this is true and since unity of purpose is essential to the speedy termination of such war, I believe it would be for the best interests of this Nation that no impeachment proceedings, which would disrupt national unity, be commenced. I therefore recommend to the Congress the passage of legislation providing for the reorganization of the Department of State, which I am today introducing in this body and which my colleague, FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, has already introduced in the Senate.

Nazi War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House were terribly shocked recently by the action of our American authorities in Germany who reprieved the death sentence of 21 German war criminals and completely set free a number of others. These reprieves and pardons for outright murderers, who committed the greatest crimes recorded

in human history against millions of innocent and helpless people of all religious faiths and of various nationalities and races, have aroused against us the contempt of all freedom-loving and righteous people throughout the world.

By our action, we are courting a discredited and despised element—discredited and despised even in Germany—and in so doing we are jeopardizing the tremendous moral support we have had throughout the world in our struggle against the destructive ideologies of Nazi totalitarianism. Upright and fair-minded people in this country and all over the world were shocked by this disgraceful action of our officials in Germany and their unwarranted disregard of the decisions handed down by the Nuremberg courts against these war criminals.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting letter which was published in the Christian Science Monitor, May 1, 1951, and written by Frederick C. McKee, chairman of the Committee on National Affairs. This committee, whose main offices are in New York, is encouraging all "action to strengthen national and international organization for security, freedom, and justice," and lists on its executive committee such outstanding Americans as the noted church leader Dr. Henry A. Atkinson; Editor Barry Bingham, of the Louisville Courier-Journal; Russell W. Davenport; Clark M. Eichelberger; George Fielding Eliot; August Heckscher; Edgar Ansel Mowrer; former Ambassador Ruth Bryan Owen Rhode; Gen. Telford Taylor; former chief counsel for war crimes in the United States Military Government in Germany, and others. Mr. McKee's letter follows:

NUREMBERG COMMUTATIONS—WAR CRIMINALS

To the Christian Science Monitor:

The recent commutation by High Commissioner McCloy of the sentences of 79 German war criminals convicted of heinous crimes against humanity is alarming. Among the criminals, of whom 21 now escape the death sentence and 34 are set free, are Nazi officials who planned and executed Hitler's murder program, who directed a campaign of wholesale slaughter in the occupied areas, and who committed atrocities in the concentration camps. These sentences had previously been confirmed by General Clay upon the advice of counsel of impeccable integrity and competence.

The Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals, appointed by Mr. McCloy, heard only the lawyers representing the convicted criminals, representatives of the prosecution not being allowed to participate. In recommending the reduction of sentences they nevertheless pointed out that they were "not entitled to grant relief beyond that warranted by mitigating circumstances and fair consideration of individual situations." They further stated that clemency "may be an encouraging example, but a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder would be a mockery. It would undo what Nuremberg has accomplished if in the end we were guided entirely by considerations of sympathy or generosity. Executive clemency does not exist to that end."

But the fact is that these commutations are "a mistaken tenderness towards the perpetrators of mass murder," constitute "a mockery" of what Nuremberg has accomplished, and are dangerous for the following reasons:

1. They tend to throw into doubt the entire basis, procedure, and judgments of the trials conducted by the United States military tribunals at Nuremberg. Although both Mr. McCloy and the members of his clemency board defend the Nuremberg trials, it would have been more appropriate to sustain the results of the trials by confirming rather than by upsetting the verdicts. In granting the commutations expediency appears to have been a factor in seeking the favor of those elements in Germany whose devotion to democracy is suspect.

2. At a time when it is contemplated that Germany be granted greater independence, to reduce the sentences of the perpetrators of inhumanities, many of whom are now able to return to public life, hardly encourages the democratic elements in Germany.

3. The commutation of the sentences of Nazi war criminals has alarmed our allies among the democratic nations of Western Europe and among the believers in democracy in the countries behind the iron curtain.

4. If these commutations were intended to placate German opinion in the effort to make Western Germany a bulwark against the very real threat of Soviet aggression, such a policy of expediency does not accomplish its purpose and leads to other evils. Reports already indicate that the Germans are not satisfied with the extent of the commutations and are urging the release of all war criminals. The United States cannot safely copy the Russian technique of currying favor with former Nazi leaders, for these criminals are basically totalitarians, and hence more sympathetic to the totalitarian East than the democratic West.

FREDERICK C. MCKEE,
Chairman, Committee on National Affairs.
NEW YORK.

Ready in Revolt, Chinese Reds Kill, Starve, and Enslave People of China—Letter Tells of Sufferings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the pertinent facts in a letter which I have received from China. I am eliminating such parts as might lead to the identification of the sender, in order to prevent any retaliation against him.

The letter reveals the deplorable and horrifying conditions in China today. It also reveals why it would be possible, with intelligent guidance, to create a backfire that would end the war in Korea and prevent thousands of additional American casualties; and at the same time, help to save Asia and the world from the Communist threat.

This letter said in part:

Although I am one of the millions who have a definite reason to oppose communism, not only realize there is no middle course to take, but also advocate such antihuman or inhuman slave policy must be done away with. I join you at least in spirit to carry out your brave and wise action. I admire the Americans and I admire you.

As a Chinese and being enslaved by the Chinese Communists, who are themselves slaves of Moscow, I secretly succeeded in getting this letter through and asked a friend of mine to mail it to you.

Innocent people are being slaughtered in China by the thousands in a month. There is no freedom, but fear; no food, but hunger. It is hell. I am an American-educated Chinese and forced to do degrading work by the people's government. I know my fate will be worse yet.

I hope you will try your best to help the central government in Formosa to fight back to the mainland and thus restore freedom to the millions. I think America must wake up before it is too late.

A Great Fermentation Is Taking Place; the Distillation Will Be Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, in which are proposed and answered many questions of national interest vitally affecting the welfare of our country. The editorial writer reaches an optimistic conclusion, to which all all of us hopefully subscribe. It is worthy of wide dissemination.

A GREAT FERMENTATION IS TAKING PLACE; THE DISTILLATION WILL BE UNITY

It should be remembered in all the flaming discussion of the hour that the American people are not as disunited as a stranger might think. It cannot be doubted for a moment that the President and his Cabinet members, the Congress and the Defense Department are governed by the same love of country and eagerness for sound peace that moves the rest of us. It is true that even in America there are weasels and skunks and other unpleasant fauna. They are outnumbered; they can do no lasting harm.

Our differences are in the method of achieving what we all desire. We believe there is a definite weakness in our leadership. We also believe that those weaknesses can be overcome in the democratic way and that eventually we will win through.

Washington is a land of geysers. Excitement, politics, foreign relations, and domestic affairs are in constant eruption. Some of those fountains emit nauseating odors. Others excite awe. Together they lead the more thoughtful citizen to prayerful thought.

The great geyser of the past few weeks was the MacArthur visit. Because that visit sent emotions soaring, because it brought into clear view the basic differences of opinion as to our conduct in the Orient, it was one of the great dramatic events of the years. And because it was so all-encompassing it shed a white light on the confusions and the conflicts which rule in Washington.

Little Alice, if you remember your wonderland, nibbled a bit of cake and shrank so quickly that her chin smacked against her slippers. As our cartoonist shows in an adjoining column, our President has been eating some bitter cake and as a result has lost stature. Alice recovered. Whether the President can find a speedy antidote for his cake is a problem to which he doubtless is giving attention.

MacArthur has one great advantage over the President. He has a definite program for prosecuting affairs in the Far East. The President has none. MacArthur would do something positive. He would move as the British, weak as they are, moved to threaten military action in Iran if that Government choked off their oil supply. He speaks as one knowing the territory and knowing the opposition. He proposes direct action, confidence in victory. That program opposes a weak, wavering, and indecisive course laid out by the administration.

There will be debate and hearings on the subject before we know whether we are to continue in a period of indecision or will take counteraction against the Reds. Unfortunately the choice between the two plans is political at the moment. We are arguing about defense along the party line rather than along the American line.

Mr. Truman lost stature by his treatment of MacArthur. No matter how one argues his rights in the matter, the sacking of the general was a brutal affair. The President compounded the offense by ignoring the general's return to Washington to finish 52 years of distinguished service. Or, worse yet, he sulkily recognized the return by sending his pseudo-military aide to represent the White House.

But there have been other ingredients in the bitter cake nibbled by the President. His sheltering of shady friends. His support of weak advisers. His stubborn defense of ill-advised programs in the domestic field. Because of all these we have no true over-all program. The President says he works for peace and we must believe him. Yet he offers no positive program. He works in secret and snubs the public's interest in the outcome of our difficulties.

As a matter of fact, Washington just now raises more questions than it answers.

Will MacArthur's proposals as to Korea go unheeded? Probably not. Some of them already are undertaken in part.

Will there be a cleaning out of those who have sullied the administration? Probably not; the President still is unconcerned over the misdeeds of his pets.

Will there be a real system of controls? No. Too unpopular.

Will there be a reasonably satisfactory system of universal military training? Yes, thanks to nonpartisan action in Congress.

Will Dean Acheson remain as Secretary of State? Doubtless, as long as he can stand the criticism fired at him from every direction.

Will General Marshall remain as Defense Secretary? Probably as long as he desires to do so. He is surprisingly vigorous. He is admired as a soldier, criticized by many as ineffective in matters of policy.

How about the experiment of a woman as a Deputy Defense Secretary? Anna Rosenberg is an eloquent, able, hard-working person.

What of the Joint Chiefs of Staff? They are brilliant, able fighting men. They have not looked too good in the current controversy because some of them were dispatched as errand boys to support the President against MacArthur. MacArthur may be able to prove that actually the chiefs were in agreement with his own plans on winning a war and a peace.

RFC is being cleared up, but rascals who used it are not being cleared out.

* * * * * *

Washington is confused and in conflict. National affairs are mingled in politics. Personalities sometimes are lifted above policy. Yet part of the confusion is due to the fact that a great fermentation is taking place. The scum eventually will be cleared. This still is a great and powerful country, making headway despite all the disturbance. The President has lost stature, but the presidency has not.

We will win through.

Congressman Roosevelt's Views on National Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York, the Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., has delivered a most interesting report on national affairs to his constituents in the Twentieth Congressional District in New York City on Thursday evening, May 3, 1951, at a meeting of the Liberal Party at the Cameron Hotel. The following are excerpts from his address:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful to the Liberal Party for calling this meeting and giving me the chance to submit to you this interim report on a few of the important questions which confront us.

Since two of the previous speakers have referred to the increase in the sales tax and the revelations of the Kefauver committee, I would like to make clear my position on these two issues at the outset.

First, the sales tax. I hesitated considerably before I wrote my letter to the deputy mayor, Mr. Charles Horowitz, who, you will remember, was my campaign manager in 1949, because I did not want to appear to be interfering in the problems of city government. However, because of the importance of this issue and because of my personal friendship for Mr. Horowitz, I felt that I could not sit idly by. As you know, I was then and I am now deeply opposed to this increase. * * *

The second issue is that of the Senate crime investigation. I recently urged that the three great civic, nonpartisan, nonpolitical foundations, Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller, all dedicated to the public welfare, appoint a citizens' committee to investigate the whole field of morality and ethics in the profession of public service, and then recommend a code of ethics for politics. We have such codes of ethics in the medical profession and in the legal profession. However, the only restraints on a public servant are his conscience and the criminal law. Unfortunately, it is apparent that the conscience of some public officials is below par. The establishment of a code of ethics and a commission to enforce it would do much to remedy this situation. * * * In this connection, there is an additional problem, that which involves those who hold office in political organizations, such as the party officials of the Republican, Democratic, Liberal, and other parties. I do not feel that any individual who, either socially or otherwise, is on a familiar basis with the crooks and the gamblers—those people who devote themselves to violating the law and helping others to violate the law—should hold a party office.

This country has never gone on such an emotional jag or enjoyed such complete confusion as it has in the last 2 or 3 weeks. It is probably a good thing. I would like to make clear at the outset that as one member of the United States Navy who served in the Pacific, I have nothing but the utmost admiration and respect for General MacArthur. He is a remarkable military genius. But, unfortunately, the old soldier who is fading away is being replaced by a resurgent politician. This subject requires calmness, objectivity, and courage, because whether we like it or not we are leaders of the free world today. We cannot shirk our responsibility, we must act as an intelligent and mature people. We cannot afford to reach our decisions out of emotion, prejudice, or hate. We must maintain our respect for our civilian leaders and we must give due weight to the recommendations of our military leaders.

I think there are two questions involved in the present problem. First, the right of the Commander in Chief of the United States, the President, to remove any military leader, and, second, the question of our far-eastern policy, keeping in mind its relation to our world policy. We should try to keep these two issues separate in our minds. We must not let any resentment for the way the President carried out his decision impair our judgment.

I have yet to meet a responsible official in Washington who disputes the right and the rightness of President Truman's removal of General MacArthur when it became apparent that the general could not and did not support the policies of the United States Government of which he is a servant. I need not remind you of the basic American doctrine—the superiority of the civilian authority over the military. * * *

The other problem, our far-eastern policy, is far more complex. There are three possible choices. The first is to do what Mr. TAFT and Mr. Hoover recommended last December and January. Pull out of and abandon Korea; don't send troops to Europe; and, as Mr. Hoover stated, set up a Gibraltar ring of island defenses—in short, let the rest of the world go to blazes. That is one choice, it is an extreme. The other extreme, or the second choice is now proposed by General MacArthur, which I would like to take up in detail. It is a rather confusing proposal because he has stated it in separate major documents in different degrees. In his address to the Congress, one of the great oratorical efforts in our history, he proposed a four-point program, a program set forth as a study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

1. Economic blockade of China.
2. Naval blockade of China, or, as the study report said, preparing for a naval blockade in case of certain eventualities.
3. Air reconnaissance of the coastal areas on China and Manchuria.
4. The logistic support for the effective use of the Nationalist troops on Formosa. (Logistic support means supplies. It does not mean air support or naval shore bombardment prior to making a landing.) Naval warfare is not logistic support.

The second phrase "effective use of the Nationalist troops on Formosa," is susceptible to many different interpretations. The effective use might mean the defense of Formosa, or hit-run raids. Or it might mean in the extreme a Normandy-type landing to create a second front in China.

However, in his letter to Mr. JOE MARTIN, the Republican leader in Congress, General MacArthur added two points: First, the bombing of the so-called Manchurian sanctuary of the enemy. In this connection, I might point out that the United Nations forces have been enjoying a similar sanctuary in Japan, and, furthermore, South Korea has not had air attacks from the enemy. But we have enjoyed complete air supremacy in attacking the enemy and his supply lines in North Korea. Certainly the Joint Chiefs of Staff have never agreed to these two additional recommendations by General MacArthur, two additional recommendations which he had made at the time of his removal.

This is a new kind of war in Korea. MacArthur was right when he said that there had never been in all history an alternative to victory in war, but I submit that perhaps civilization has gone one magnificent step forward toward achieving world peace and the settlement of international differences not by force but by law, when we say that our objective in this war imposed upon us by the aggression of first North Korea and then China, our objective is not victory over China,

but our objective is to stop aggression in Korea, and to recreate the independence of that liberty-loving people.

We do not want to invade China. That would be no victory. We want only to stop aggression and restore law and order and peace in Korea. This is the first time in history that there has been a limited objective in war. Perhaps because of this world war III may not grow out of this Korean tragedy.

The second point that General MacArthur failed to mention before the Congress, which he did mention in his letter to Mr. MARTIN, was the creation of a second front on the mainland of China by using Nationalist troops from Formosa supported by our Air Force and Navy. Only recently, Chiang Kai-shek announced in Formosa that the Nationalist troops could not possibly undertake a landing unless they were completely re-equipped by the United States. I believe that out of the 450,000 troops on Formosa, there are only 100,000 combat troops and of these only 40,000 are adequately equipped. Suppose we do reequip the Nationalist troops and suppose they land in China, do we know they would be successful? We started in Korea only using our Air Force and Navy, but when the Korean troops were inadequate to stem the Communist tide, our foot soldiers had to go in. If Chiang Kai-shek's troops start to lose, will our Army then be called on to fight on the mainland of China?

It is very easy for General MacArthur to say that his program will mean a quick end and will save lives in Korea. But in ending the war in Korea, he may be very probably starting a much more difficult war in China. In fact, he may be committing American lives and resources to the morass of the Chinese mainland. Furthermore, he may be running the risk that Russia will invoke her treaty of friendship and alliance with Red China. And we may find world war III upon us before we know it. We may be falling into the very trap which many believe Russia has been setting for us. This program might be the first act of the suicide of the free world.

The third alternative to these two extremes is the middle course—to continue to repel aggression in Korea, to limit the war to Korea. This course is heartrending in many ways. It is difficult to see an end and it requires great patience. It is the course recommended by one of our greatest military geniuses, who also has a deep sense of public service and civilian authority—General Marshall. He was in large measure responsible for the strategy in World War II. He is respected and loved by all Americans. I am confident that the peace of the world can rest in no more capable hands.

It is difficult to predict the future, but I have so often been asked how our present policy in Korea will end that I hazard this guess. I doubt that the Communists will ever agree to a negotiated peace, but they cannot absorb the tremendous losses in men and equipment indefinitely. I think that in the months to come we will find that they will simply retire behind the Yalu River and that we will stop our advance considerably short of this natural boundary, and that the no-man's land between will be tactitly agreed upon by both sides as a sort of buffer zone. For a time, this zone may require policing by our Air Force to give warning of any possible new assault, but the actual land fighting will cease and the work of restoring Korea, her independence and her freedom, may be undertaken by the United Nations.

If my hope is right, we will have stopped aggression and I hope prevented world war III, we will have preserved the authority and prestige of the United Nations, we will have avoided being enmeshed on the mainland of China in support of Chiang Kai-shek and abandoned by practically all our other allies, and we will have maintained the united alliance of the free world.

Arizona Admits Speculators Would Make Millions of Dollars on Proposed Reclamation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1950, I addressed the House of Representatives to show how speculators and big landowners would make millions of dollars if the proposed central Arizona project were authorized by Congress. I was bitterly attacked by proponents of the project for my factual disclosures.

The accuracy and truthfulness of my charges have now been substantiated by supporters of the project from within the State of Arizona. On April 27, 1951, the newspaper Plain Talk, published in Phoenix, ran a forceful article under the headline: "Central Arizona project discredited by activities of land speculators."

The complete article follows:

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT DISCREDITED BY ACTIVITIES OF LAND SPECULATORS

The shelving of the central Arizona project was a staggering blow to the economy of Arizona. The disaster, however, should be blamed as much upon the actions of certain citizens of our own State as upon the machinations of California.

As far back as March 8, 1950, NORRIS POULSON made a speech in the Federal House of Representatives which, in our opinion, destroyed congressional confidence in the worth of the project once and for all. It is true that POULSON is from California, but he did not invoke the requirements of that State's large population, its vast industrial needs, etc. Instead he exposed what amounts to a conspiracy on the part of opportunistic farmers and syndicates of Arizona. In effect these, all large landholders, would help themselves to the waters diverted by the central Arizona project, paying nothing for the moisture which would enable them to make fortunes, either from farming their lands, or through selling their acreage at a premium.

The project would permit farmers to have 160 acres serviced with surface irrigation, for which the landholders would pay an adequate fee. But neither the provisions of the project nor any other Federal law governs the use of underground water. As for the new State code, it affects only land bought since 1949, whereas the oversized farms in question were set up before that.

The water diverted from the Colorado River would be brought to the selected areas of Maricopa and Pinal Counties on the surface, but, to quote Representative POULSON, "enormous amounts of this water will flow into underground basins."

Realizing this, the farmers and syndicates in question established what is known as "excess ownership" holdings, often thousands of acres beyond the statutory limitation of 160. They accomplished that by sinking wells hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of feet deep. This was done, as POULSON points out, "in the face of dire warnings that there was no adequate water for such operations."

It was an expensive as well as ruthless gamble with State resources, but the stakes promised to be tremendous—if the central Arizona project could be pushed through before the great pumps started sucking sand. If it was approved, the speculators would have an unlimited supply of water, at a bargain. For while the farmers who complied with the terms of the project would pay high prices to have their 160 acres watered, the operators with the long pumps would have thousands of acres irrigated by water for which they would pay the project not one red cent.

At the time Representative POULSON made his congressional exposé, he was able to report that out of the estimated 638,000 acres in the area, which the Bureau of Land Reclamation reported as having some history of irrigation, 345,000, or 55 percent of the total acreage, were excess ownership holdings. This 55 percent was distributed among only 7 percent of the farms within the project area.

In short, the CAP—at least as far as the farming aspect of it is concerned—would call for the Government expenditure of $780,000,000, over half of whose benefits would go to the enrichening of a few hundred free riders. And these opportunists are already prosperous, or they could not afford the blue-chip ante demanded in this game. The skinny end of the drumstick would go to the thousands of small farmers who would be charged for what the project would offer.

In summing up his case, Representative POULSON said devastatingly: "I can see why the landholders of Arizona want this project, but I cannot conceive of Congress authorizing it." Under the circumstances, we can see no reason why Congress should have done so, either.

Arizona must have the equivalent of the project, but it must be revamped so that it is genuinely designed to benefit the people of the State as a whole, instead of being a grab bag for land speculators. It is preposterous to expect the 46 States not involved in the quarrel over the Colorado to award this State the water of that great river, together with $750,000,000 to implement its use, for the benefit of a few hundred of our already wealthy citizens.

The fact that the people of the State have allowed the central Arizona project to be shaped to satisfy the greed of speculators has given Arizona a stunning setback. It is useless to rage at California, even if its citizens are, not unnaturally, thinking of their own welfare rather than ours. The cold fact is that the project, as set up and presented to Congress, was made to order for indiscriminate speculation.

If we must rage at anybody, let us rage at the exploiters, Arizonians, not Californians, whose conduct went far toward giving our State this crippling loss. We say loss, for we believe that the central Arizona project, as it now stands is not merely set aside, but permanently scuttled.

Meanwhile let us go into a huddle and draw up a bill which will make hard sense to the 46 States whose sympathies for our genuine and critical needs we are trying to win. It must be such a bill, as the central Arizona project now is not, that its background and practical workings will bear the honest inspection of nonpartisan investigators.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, so much happens in such a short space of time that it is easy to forget the headlines of

only a few months ago. Great stress is laid by administration spokesmen on the damage done to Allied unity by General MacArthur's advocacy of his policy for terminating the Korean war. The Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union has republished in an editorial the headline of last November 30 when the President announced to a startled world that the atom bomb would be used in the Far East if necessary to meet the military situation. The decision whether or not to use that ultimate weapon, he said, would be left to the American military leaders in the field, meaning at that time primarily General MacArthur. So far as is known, General MacArthur never advocated such a step. Certainly, whether or not one agrees with all of his recommendations, however, no proposal which he has advanced is calculated to cause consternation and dismay in foreign capitals equal to that occasioned by the President's pronouncement of last November 30.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the above-mentioned editorial, which follows:

Part of the story that shook our allies' confidence:

"UNITED STATES TO USE A-BOMB IF NEEDED, TRUMAN SAYS; SPURS ARMING

"WASHINGTON.—President Truman declared today the United Nations forces will not back down in Korea, and that the atom bomb will be used if necessary to meet the military situation.

"Mr. Truman's firm stand and mention of the most fearful weapon in the world's history came at a news conference.

"The President said that whether the bomb was used was up to American military leaders in the field, but that personally he hoped it would not have to be employed."

The above headline, reproduced from the Times-Union of November 30, bears on the testimony of Secretary Marshall before the Senate committees investigating the summary removal of General MacArthur and our Far East policy.

General Marshall testified:

"By his (General MacArthur's) public statements, he set up a very serious reaction among our allies, which threatened our collective action with them and which threatened our position in the world in relation to this great crisis and which threatened to leave us in the situation of going it alone."

This is the crux of the administration's defense of its humiliation of General MacArthur. Secretary Marshall admits that General MacArthur violated no military orders, but all through his testimony the theme recurs that General MacArthur was out of step with the 13 governments that have furnished one-twentieth of the United Nations forces in Korea.

Time and again General Marshall has expressed grave concern about the reactions of these governments to events in Korea. And time and again he has laid the blame for their hesitancy and distrust of our intentions as agents of the United Nations upon General MacArthur.

We are a forgetful people. But reprinting the headline of November 30 will recall to every reader an offhand statement by President Truman at a press conference that not only shocked the world but strained every tie binding our allies to the United Nations effort in Korea.

The statement was made just a few days after Red China had struck, opening a new war. Every chancellery had the jitters. Spokesmen for every government had to answer questions about Mr. Truman's intentions. Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain rushed to Washington to find out just how far Mr. Truman intended to go. The reaction in this country was just as violent.

A White House statement 3 hours after the press conference attempted, but failed, to repair the damage. It cleared up the President's statement at the press conference that the use of the atomic bomb would be up to the American military leaders in the field, by quoting the law that only the President can authorize the use of the atomic bomb.

Obviously this ill-considered statement of the President on November 30 is not the only factor entering into our allies' reluctance to support decisive measures in Korea. The defection of India, the importance to Britain of Hong Kong, the fear of a European war, the reluctance by some to throw the book at Red China, all enter into it.

But on the point of causing uneasiness among our allies, everything General MacArthur said or wrote was minor compared to the effect of Mr. Truman's outburst of November 30.

Now if the point of recalling the November 30 press conference were merely to say "you're another" there would be no reason to do so. But it seems to us that it illustrates the point that defenders of the administration have become so engrossed in winning an argument that they have drifted into positions unbecoming to the leaders of a nation in time of peril.

Another instance was General Marshall's testimony of Monday. He said General MacArthur's invitation of March 20 to the Red Chinese commander to negotiate an armistice—a time-honored right of every field commander—had cost whatever chance there had been at that time to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict.

As James Reston points out in the New York Times, nobody in Washington believed at that time there was a good chance to make peace. President Truman had submitted to envoys of the allies the draft of a public appeal to the Chinese Reds for peace. But numerous such appeals had been made without result, and there was nothing to indicate that a different fate awaited this one.

Yet, General Marshall's testimony went out as implying that General MacArthur had upset a hopeful peace move.

The present hearings, it seems to us, can hardly settle finally the question of who is right in the MacArthur controversy. The events of the next 10 years will be more important evidence on that point. But meanwhile a sound policy in the Far East and sound conduct of that policy are of vital importance.

Let us look carefully to any line of questions in this inquiry that develop these.

The Miracle of the County Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Delta Democrat-Times of Greenville, Miss.:

LOOKING AT THE SOUTH—THE MIRACLE OF THE COUNTY AGENT

(By Hodding Carter)

Wars and politics to the contrary, the destiny of man is decided by what he does with the land. We forgot that for a long time in the South, but we're remembering now.

The people most responsible for the vital change are at the same time among the most overlooked of all the civilian army of Government employees. That army gets a lot of kicking around. Whenever we get angry with our Government—Federal or State or local—we usually begin and end by damning the people on the public payrolls. The indictments are almost always too general and unfair, for in our anger we forget the notable work being done in a thousand directions by so-called bureaucrats. Reminded that this is so, we generally answer that we didn't mean those fellows but just the ones who don't do anything worth while.

That's a long preamble to a pat on the back for the county agents, and especially those who serve the Southern States. Still, it might be a good idea to remember that bureaucracy does include thousands and thousands of devoted men and women, whose sum total of effort means a better life and a more enduring civilization.

But to get back to the county agents. Now in the fullness of spring is the best time to come face to face with their miracle. All any of us have to do, if our memories go back 20 years and even less, is to get in an automobile and drive along the highways and country roads anywhere in the South and compare the present with the past. The trail from yesterday begins with one crop that grew on abused and tired land; today it is lined with many products of the earth, and the earth itself begins to be strong again.

Driving along that trail, which extends everywhere in the South, the transformation may appear to have been easily accomplished. Yet, on every farm which bears witness to good farming practices has fallen the shadow of a patient, sweating county agent, persevering in his task of bringing southern farmers to their senses and southern farms to life again. Any veteran county agent can tell you of the earlier difficulties; for there was a time, not long past, when the farmers who knew everything except how to make a living would laugh at and deride the young agents and their high-falutin' college notions. They don't laugh now.

The transition from suspicion to full acceptance of the county agent is not yet complete. There are still not enough of them to go around; not enough funds available for them to do all they know to do and want to do; not enough public acceptance of the basic fact that man rises and falls with the land and the way he works it. Many thousands of farms in the South cry out for the county agent's shadow. For some he will come too late; but not for as many as we may fear, for the good earth is durable and can be reclaimed even from the desert.

Today, in the South, we have halted the destructive march toward barrenness; and the men who are responsible are a bunch of fellows on the public payroll. It isn't a bad idea to stop cussing all public job holders for a little bit and say thanks to at least some of them.

Security Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, I have called attention to the importance of maintaining the complete security of our codes and ciphers. These methods of secret communication are vital to the safety of our Armed Forces and our Nation. No traitorous act could have graver consequences for us all than the delivery to our enemies of the keys to our secret codes and ciphers. This fact places a responsibility upon those who are permitted to see and study classified documents. While it is necessary and proper for the Members of Congress to see classified documents in order to be fully informed, it is also necessary that members, as well as other persons permitted to use such documents, be responsible for seeing that they do nothing likely to reveal the contents of such documents to our enemies.

It seems to me that we are witnessing too much laxity in this regard. In addition to discussing our most confidential military matters in public, we are also failing to insist upon absolute adherence by all persons to the rules intended to maintain the security of classified documents. The Associated Press has discussed this subject in a news story which appeared in the New York Times on May 13. I should like to include it in our RECORD for the benefit of Members who may not have seen it:

HEARINGS INVOLVE SECRET CODES; "CRACKING" A MAJOR PERIL IN WAR—MILITARY CONCERNED LEST OUR CRYPTOGRAPHIC DATA, APPEARING IN PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, MIGHT TIP OFF ENEMY SPIES

WASHINGTON, May 12.—The Senate committee hearings on the MacArthur case have produced bare references to one of the most carefully guarded secrets of the military—its system of cryptography.

In war, or even in peace, cracking the code of another nation can have value equal to the destruction of enemy armies or fleets. Because the United States learned Japan's communications code, it was ready when the Japanese fleet made the costly and unsuccessful strike at Midway Island in World War II.

The term "cryptography" really covers both the use of the code and of cipher transmission machines. Thus, a secret message can be transmitted by a machine that transmits symbols or groups of symbols that are (as the military says) "de-cryptographed" mechanically upon reception of the message.

Or cryptography may be merely the old but still useful system of using letters or groups of letters that have no meaning until a key converts the message into plain language.

Of particular concern to those charged with maintaining the security of crytography systems is the chance that a message sent by cipher may appear, by accident, at a later date in a public document. This would be useful material for an espionage agent who, having picked up from radio or other sources a copy of the coded message, could compare it with the plain-language text and thus crack the code.

Cryptographic messages sent in symbol could be as simple as the gadget used to run a player piano or could be much more intricate—which they are.

The military places the tightest protection not only over the machines and codes but over copies of messages that have been transmitted cryptographically. Regulations require that cryptographic material must be kept "in the most secure storage available and will never be left unattended except when locked in a three-combination safe or its equivalent." decoded cryptographic messages may not even be kept in the same safes with the code used to decipher them.

To prevent code-cracking, material sent cryptographically is paraphrased before being released for use by others than those to whom the messages are directed.

Regulations specify that "routine reports and messages which must be given wide distribution, or the contents of which have been or may eventually be furnished the press" should be transmitted whenever possible in plain language, but that if code transmission is required the text should be paraphrased before being distributed.

Precise instructions for paraphrasing also are set down. The sequences of paragraphs and of sentences in paragraphs must be changed; positions of subject, predicate, and modifiers must be altered; synonyms should be used.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Would Be an Easy Target for Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo (N. Y.) News in an editorial in the issue of April 14, 1951, reveals the vulnerability of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway to an attack by an enemy. The editorial follows:

SEAWAY WOULD BE VULNERABLE

As the hearing of those who are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project progresses before the House Public Works Committee the arguments of the proponents of it, previously heard, begin to sound rather hollow. Far from being an element of defensive strength, as spokesmen for the Truman administration have insisted, opponents make a strong case for an opposite conclusion.

Capt. Willis W. Bradley, United States Navy, retired, former Governor of Guam, gave it as his opinions at the committee hearing that the Great Lakes area had become one of the frontiers most exposed to attack and that a lock canal could not be made resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons. He went on to say that enemy attack can and likely would seriously damage the proposed waterway and thus block ship transit for an undetermined time. Thus it would be foolhardy, in his view, to place dependence for an ore supply in time of war on so vulnerable a means of transportation. Incidentally, Captain Bradley stated that such overseas trade as the 27-foot channel might develop would likely be 100 percent in foreign ships.

As a defense route, the seaway obviously would have to be kept in a state of constant military defense. During the war German submarines were reported in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Russia has many submarines, from which aircraft might be launched for an attack on the locks of the waterway. Thus there would be need of naval forces to protect shipping in the Gulf and the channels approaching the Great Lakes and air forces to turn attacks from the vital locks. The opinion of Captain Bradley seems to be that some of the enemy aircraft would certainly get through to this target. In which case there would be no seaway.

The Truman administration has emphasized that iron ore from Labrador is absolutely essential for full-scale operation of the steel mills on the Great Lakes for national defense. But Big Steel (Bethlehem and U. S. Steel) has shown no interest whatever in ore supplies from that source, despite the fact that it is vastly expanding the facilities of its Great Lakes plants. Chairman Eugene G. Grace, of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., told stockholders at the annual meeting last Tuesday in Wilmington, Del., that he did "not think the St. Lawrence seaway is essential to bring Labrador ore to the United States." Moreover, he said that the corporation was developing a process to produce iron from low-grade taconite ore, of which there are billions of tons in and about the Mesabi Range. He indicated that within a year or two Bethlehem would have a practical production from taconite.

Who will believe that practical steel man such as Mr. Grace, who are responsible for private investments of billions of dollars, cannot calculate better than Mr. Truman's Cabinet members what is to the best advantage of their industries? In a business rating who would place the Cabinet members on a par with them? They say that there is no need for a seaway to bring in ore from the Labrador wilderness for their mills, and they ought to know. In the circumstances, it does not make sense to spend perhaps a billion dollars or more for a seaway, one that would become a military zone inviting enemy attacks.

Air Power the Dominant Force in Modern War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a Member of the House has the opportunity to read a literary production by a fellow Member, or—in the case of the article to which I am about to refer—by fellow Members. Indeed, it is not often that Members of Congress, in the pressure of the work at hand, find time to produce a stirring article for a popular magazine. I might add, with some envy, that not all of us are as gifted as the Honorable W. J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, and the Honorable O. K. ARMSTRONG, of Missouri, who have contributed a timely article on the great lessons of Korea to the May issue of Air Force magazine.

There are a number of other things about the publication of this stirring article that seem to me significant. In the first place, the material for it was gathered by the authors on a trip made during the Easter recess, the expenses for which were borne by the authors and Air Force magazine. It was written in the flush of excitement produced by what they saw on their trip. It is not an official report on an official investigation. It is a personal tribute by two enthusiastic close observers of modern warfare to the power that is the dominant force in Korea, and that is ready for use against aggression elsewhere in the world or for war against Russia.

My colleagues went to Japan and Tokyo, talked with generals, pilots, privates, correspondents, and statesmen. In this article they have listed lessons they had learned as the result of their investigation which may be summarized briefly as follows:

First. This is an unreal war.

Second. Airpower has become the predominant destructive force against ground troops in the field.

Third. Airpower must be the keystone in the military defense structure of the free world.

In spite of the fact that their study of the situation in Korea led to their placing this emphasis on air power, their view is not a prejudiced one. They write that they believe—

Air power must be raised in the national mind above the confusions of interservice strife, above the shackles of an unrealistic and outmoded balanced force concept, and certainly above partisan politics. * * * Our admiration for the job being done by the Army, Marines, and Navy in Korea, and wherever else they may be, is as strong as the next man's. We believe firmly that all three services have a vital role in combating aggression. But we cannot, in all honesty, fail to recognize that air power is the dominant force in modern war.

Their soundly argued conclusion is, therefore, that Congress must assert itself, and raise air power to the position it deserves in our military and diplomatic structure. In short, we must recognize once and for all that air power has revolutionized our old traditional military and diplomatic concepts and is our defensive keystone.

Mr. Speaker, the report of my colleagues is so good, so packed with facts, so strengthened by cogent reasoning, that I shall take no more time to comment on it. Instead, I ask unanimous consent to insert both the report and the informative editor's note which precedes it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The report by Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina, and Representative O. K. ARMSTRONG, Republican, of Missouri, from the May 1951 issue of the Air Force Magazine is as follows:

THE GREAT LESSONS OF KOREA

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Shortly after the March issue of Air Force appeared with its special report on the air-ground operation in Korea the editor received calls from Congressmen W. J. BRYAN DORN (Democrat, South Carolina) and O. K. ARMSTRONG (Republican, Missouri).)

Independently each Congressman explained that the March issue of Air Force had, for the first time, cut through the confusion and doubt which prevailed on Capitol Hill regarding the role of air power in the Korean conflict.

The magazine report had already provoked unprecedented interest, but to Congressmen DORN and ARMSTRONG it called for more than interest. It called for action. First of all, each argued, it was high time that elected representatives of the people go to the Far East and see the facts for themselves, and then report to the American public.

The idea appealed to the editor, who wishes every Congressman could get closer to the facts of combat air power, and it was consistent with AFA's interest in better government. Further, it suggested an article for Air Force, prepared jointly by these two Congressmen. Let them form a private, bipartisan committee to search out the lessons of the Korean war which might be applicable to Western Europe and other potential trouble spots, and report the facts as they found them.

The Congressmen at their first meeting offered to forsake their Easter-recess trips back home, and further, to split with AFA the $1,500 per passenger round-trip airline fare to Tokyo.

Congressmen DORN and ARMSTRONG made a good team. They are of different political faiths and from different parts of the country. DORN is young, aggressive, and gregarious, an orator in the pattern of William Jennings Bryan, for whom he was named. ARMSTRONG is older and more reserved, a former university professor, an accomplished author and lecturer, and bylined staff writer for the Reader's Digest. DORN had been a member of an infantry outfit in the National Guard, and in World War II had served 19 months as a corporal with the Ninth Air Force in Europe through five major campaigns. ARMSTRONG, an Air Corps captain in World War I, did welfare work in France after that conflict, and had served the American Legion as a member of its foreign relations committee and at the FIDAC congress in Paris in 1937.

The two Congressmen left Washington aboard a Northwest Airlines plane on March 24. Representative DORN returned April 9 and Representative ARMSTRONG, who also visited Okinawa and Formosa, arrived April 16. Their intensive survey of the Far East had included an hour and a half conference with General MacArthur and an interview with General Ridgway. They had appeared before a committee of the Japanese Diet, visited with American Ambassador John J. Muccio and President Syngman Rhee of the Republic of Korea, and had interviewed scores of officers and GI's of all services from Tokyo to the front lines north of Seoul, including Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, commanding the Tenth Corps, United States Army; Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, commanding the Far East Air Forces; Rear Adm. George R. Henderson, commanding Fleet Air Japan; Lt. Gen. Frank W. Milburn, commanding the First Corps, United States Army; Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Smith, commanding the First Marine Division, and Lt. Gen. Earle E. Partridge, commanding the Fifth Air Force. Congressman ARMSTRONG also interviewed Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault (retired) on Formosa.

Arriving in Washington in the wake of General MacArthur's ouster as supreme commander, the Congressmen were immediately besieged with requests for public appearances. For several days their comments were news, on front pages and on radio and television programs, where they expressed their personal views independent of their Air Force assignment.

We are proud to present the joint report of Congressmen DORN and ARMSTRONG on the lessons of Korea.

REPORT BY REPRESENTATIVES DORN AND ARMSTRONG

From the moment our airliner touched its wheels to the long runway at Haneda Air Force Base near Tokyo and throughout our tour of the Far East, we were both impressed and startled by certain unrealities of the war in Korea.

The war was very real as we stood at the front line north of Seoul and observed the engagement between our doughboys and enemy troops just across the river. The fresh, gaping holes in the B-29 we examined at an emergency landing strip were real enough, and so were the reports of the F-86 pilots we interviewed at Suwon after their return from fighting MIG's over the Yalu River. To the men doing the fighting and dying in Korea, the war is very real indeed.

And yet our mission for Air Force magazine was to search out the lessons of Korea, lessons which might be applied to periphery wars of the future, or war against Russia.

On this basis alone, the first great lesson to be learned from Korea is that this is an unreal war.

In Japan, nerve center of the entire war effort, we were only 360 miles from enemy air bases on the mainland, near enough for our fighter planes, earlier in the war, to conduct combat operations from the islands, as our bombers still do. Despite its vulnerability to air attack, Tokyo reminded us of Washington. Here there was freedom of movement and communications. There were no air alerts or defense drills. Security restrictions were temperate. It was hard to believe we were within fighter range of an active enemy.

In Korea the U. N. supply convoys moved freely in broad daylight right up to the front, bumper to bumper on the main roads. Here our combat cargo planes shuttled back and forth between rear areas and the front on precise schedules rivaling those of our domestic airlines. At Kangnung airstrip on the east coast we watched the little T-6 Mosquito planes take off and land on their fire direction missions quite oblivious to any possible danger and quite reminiscent of our hometown private pilots on a fair weather weekend at the local airport. We ourselves participated in the unreality of it all as we calmly observed the battle areas north of Seoul from the vantage point of one of the Army's little unarmed L-5's, and again, even more calmly, as passengers in an unarmed C-47 which circled lazily over a battle zone so we could watch our fighters strafe and napalm enemy troop positions directly below. It was as if we were seated in the second deck of a ball park looking down on a play at third base.

These were luxuries that had come with command of the air, and command of the air had come in the early days of the Korean war. Freedom of movement was taken for granted in Korea. In all-out war with Russia, or even in another perimeter war, this freedom would be lacking because air superiority would be lacking, as General Spaatz has pointed out so forcefully in this magazine—The Airpower Odds Against the Free World, April Air Force.

From the standpoint of both air and surface forces, command of the air is the key to full understanding of the war in Korea. Without it the Inchon landing could not have been attempted. Without it our Navy could not operate freely off the shores of the peninsula. Without it our B-29 strategic bombers could not be employed in direct support of the troops. Without it, these troops could not obtain what General MacArthur called "The greatest air support any ground forces have ever received in any war in history." And without this air support, we heard from one ground man after another, the U. N. forces could not have remained in Korea.

Thus, we early came to the obvious conclusion that the U. N. effort in Korea was dependent primarily on an unreal situation—unreal, that is, in terms of all-out war, because it would not prevail in all-out war. This, we determined, was a lesson the American people must learn to understand in all its ramifications, lest they falsely project the Korean experience to other areas of the world, lest they take air superiority for granted and forget that in any war with Russia air superiority would have to be fought for and won before our surface forces could move effectively and safely.

In our repeated inquiry into the lessons of Korea that might apply to all-out war, we were confronted repeatedly with the lessons that have not and cannot be learned in Korea.

This experience brought to mind the criticism that was heaped on Maj. Gen. Emmett (Rosy) O'Donnell, former chief of the bomber command in the Far East, for his reported statement a few months ago to the effect that Korea had provided no real lessons in strategic air warfare. The unfavorable reactions to his remarks seemed, in retrospect, to illustrate the misinformed and misguided thinking which has prevailed in the country regarding the war in Korea and especially its airpower aspects.

For example, the so-called controversy over the jet fighter versus the propeller-driven fighter for ground support operations becomes no controversy at all under the light of full investigation. We spoke with Air Force and Navy pilots who must live or die with the subject, and found the jet fighter the established favorite for all types of tactical combat work. In fact, our ground troops have enjoyed their immunity from enemy air attack to a great degree because of the unique capabilities of our jet planes. As Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, commanding general of the Far East air forces, explained, "Had we been shackled with obsolete, single-purpose, piston-driven airplanes, the air superiority we now enjoy might never have been achieved."

Nor did we find evidence to support the much-publicized controversy over the effectiveness of Marine versus Air Force support of our ground troops. If such a controversy did exist in the early stages of the campaign, as reported, it has vanished with time and experience. The military team in Korea is a unified team. At the Joint Operations Centers, heart of the air-ground activity, representatives of all the four services work side by side in harmony. Marine land-based aviation has, since the start of the war, been under the directional control of this Joint Operations Center system, which handles all close support aviation coordination in Korea. From a C-47 over the bomb line near the east coast of the peninsula we watched Air Force T-6 Mosquito planes lead and direct Marine Corsairs to their targets in a mountain valley just below us. Those who continue to stir up this fallacious Marine-Air Force controversy are sabotaging the service unity that is working in Korea.

Looking back, it seems incredible that so many of our citizens were led so far off the track in interpreting the role of airpower in Korea. The misconceptions regarding this effort surely have been instrumental in preventing a realistic approach of our mobilization effort. It was not until publication of the special report, the Air-Ground Operation in Korea, in the March issue of Air Force magazine that our legislators and the public could properly appraise airpower in this war. The statements attributed to Gen. Rosy O'Donnell, untimely as they may have been, are even more understandable now that we have been to Korea and have witnessed for ourselves the conditions under which our men are fighting in the Far East.

It was General O'Donnell, we believe, who first called public attention to the diplomatic barriers to our military effort in Korea, barriers which illustrate further unrealities in this war. Without consideration of the diplomatic issues involved, it must be reported that the prohibition against our bombing beyond the Yalu River has placed our military leaders in Korea—as it did General O'Donnell—in an impossible tactical position.

On missions against the international bridges that cross the Yalu—their bomb runs by necessity paralleling the river line along the Korean shore—our B-29's are like ducks in a shooting gallery, running along a fixed track with the rifles—the enemy's jets and anti-aircraft guns—trained on them. In full view below are the Red airports from which these jets stage their attacks on the bombers. We watched the B-29's limp home in the soup one evening, and we talked to the crews. We heard them relate with understandable bitterness how they watched the Red jets take off from their Manchurian bases, attack the bombers, and then, after expending their ammunition and fuel, return to base, refuel and rearm, and climb up to repeat their attacks. We heard F-86 pilots who escort the B-29's tell how they must give up the chase against the MIGs when they spot the Yalu River barrier below. From an operational point of view alone, it is both a unique and a disgusting situation.

Our inquiry into the B-29 operation revealed further why the Air Force could hardly be expected to learn lessons about strategic air power in Korea. At the start of the war there were only 18 targets in North Korea that could be classified as strategic—targets such as the Chinnampo chemical and metal plant, the Chosen Nitrogen Explosives Co., at Haeju, the Wonsan oil refinery—and all 18 of these targets were neutralized through B-29 attacks by September 15, 1950, less than 3 months after the beginning of the war. They were neutralized with sporadic attacks sandwiched in while the B-29's were employed predominantly in a tactical role. When General O'Donnell was asked if he had learned anything about strategic bombing in Korea, he could hardly have replied except as he did, in the negative.

On the other hand, the Air Force has learned something about tactical employment of B-29's, primarily because these bombers have never before been in a position to be so employed. The Air Force has learned, for example, that the big bombers can destroy targets no larger than railroad bridges and moving trains. To do this, of course, the bombers must come down to an altitude which makes them, from an operational standpoint, unjustifiably vulnerable to ground attack and fighter opposition. This forbids accurate evaluation of their vulnerability, or lack of it, as strategic bombers.

Another unreal aspect of the war concerns both our air and ground units. The ground troops are by now seasoned fighting men, experienced by the hard knocks of battle, experienced in all phases of ground warfare—except one. They have had no opportunity to gain experience in dealing with hostile airpower. Few of them, from commanders on down, have ever seen unfriendly aircraft overhead in Korea. As a result, camouflage, dispersal, communications security and other antiairpower measures are lacking, simply because there is no need for them. The same situation prevails with our air units. In addition, the Air Force is able to devote such a large segment of its air capability to ground support operations that it is gaining little or no experience about air defense against modern fighters.

The war in Korea is unreal for another reason. To the average newspaper reader, for example, its progress is measured by the amount of terrain won or lost by the U. N. forces. The public can hardly be blamed for using this yardstick, inasmuch as it is the official U. N. yardstick. The stated U. N. objective in the war is to join North and South Korea by force of arms as a prelude to establishment of a unified Korea. This objective places the emphasis on gaining real estate, whereas, from time immemorial, the mission of every military commander is to destroy the enemy's military machine. This military mission prevails in Korea.

General Ridgway's Operation Killer was aptly named. Militarily, the objective is to destroy enemy troops and weapons, with the gaining of real estate only a means to that end. Politically, or diplomatically, it is the end in itself. Thus, in Korea a strategic withdrawal, with heavy destruction of enemy troops accompanying it, is temporarily at least a military gain and a political set-back. The Christmas advance to the Yalu, on the other hand, was a political gain and a military set-back.

In evaluating the success of the military mission, it is necessary to understand the nature of the enemy we are facing. Red China's casualties in the war are estimated in the hundreds of thousands. Everywhere we heard that her hospitals are terribly pressed. No one would venture a guess as to how heavy their war losses must be before Red China's leaders conclude that Korea is not worth the sacrifice. It is generally assumed that her casualties are already greater than a democracy such as ours could tolerate, and quite possibly greater than Russia's leaders would permit. It is true that Russia's casualties at Stalingrad were enormous, but it is also true that losses incurred in defending one's homeland are quite different than losses incurred on foreign soil. With Russia pulling the strings of war without suffering the losses of war, the enemy's casualty rate is perhaps higher than could be expected elsewhere.

However, with Operation Killer the military order of the day in Korea, the weapon accountable for most of the killing must, of necessity, take on special significance. In Korea, the airplane is this weapon. The scope of its destructive power against ground troops, given little consideration in the past, is so great that we must conclude:

The second great lesson to be learned from Korea is that airpower has become the predominant destructive force against ground troops in the field.

The Air Force, repeatedly under fire since World War II for its damage claims, has vastly underestimated the number of casualties it has inflicted on enemy troops in Korea.

GHQ estimates, based on prisoner-of-war interrogation and preliminary field reports, have credited our air power with 47 percent of all enemy casualties in the Korean war—an unusually high figure, based on past war experience. We believe, however, that further evidence will reveal that this figure must be revised upward.

Field reports from Army sources, we learned, now indicate that air attack probably has been responsible for more, and perhaps twice as many, enemy casualties in Korea as ground attack. Whatever the final estimate might be after all the evidence is in, there is no question but that—once air superiority has been attained—air power becomes a far greater destroyer of troops in the field than is ground power.

This new development in warfare is full of meaning.

As long as air superiority is on our side, as long as we have command of the air over our troops, we can exploit this great destructive power so forcefully demonstrated in Korea. Under these circumstances, air power becomes the only hope of offsetting the enemy's overwhelming weight of numbers and his willingness to accept abnormally high casualties.

In Korea it was the prevailing opinion that air power—through ground support—had made it possible for U. N. forces to hold the peninsula. General MacArthur called the air-power effort monumental, and he added, "air power has saved our Army in Korea on numerous occasions." Lt. Gen. Frank W. Milburn, commanding the First Corps, United States Army, told us, "We couldn't have carried on the Korean operation without air power." Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, commanding the Tenth Corps, United States Army, added, "The Air Force has done a splendid job in carrying out its air-support mission. The air-ground team is working most effectively." This was the tenor of comment from ground men all down the line.

But now the airplane emerges, not only as a superior support weapon to assist our ground troops in killing the enemy but, in itself, and by a wide margin, the U. N.'s most productive troop killer. This is a new role for air power.

However, we must be bluntly realistic about the air weapon in relation to our current air-power position. We must consider the second lesson of Korea in reverse.

We know from World War II experience that Russia is a past master in attack aviation. We have the report of Gen. Carl Spaatz, first chief of staff of the Air Force (April Air Force) that Russia is assured command of the air over Europe and Asia for several years ahead, at least; that in Western Europe she holds a 10 to 1 advantage in modern planes and will hold at least a 5 to 1 margin over the free world at the end of 1952.

In the face of these alarming facts, we must consider, first, that Russian air power possesses equal if not greater destructive force against ground troops as the force we have revealed with our own air power in Korea; second, that this destructive force is dependent upon sufficient air superiority to insure command of the air; third, that Russia has this command of the air and there is no evidence she cannot maintain it; and fourth, that under this set of circumstances we must be prepared to accept, in any war with Russia and perhaps in a lesser war, the casualty rates which modern war imposes upon an Army that does not have adequate air protection—the type of intolerable casualty rates which Red China has suffered in Korea.

All this compels us to recognize once and for all that air power has revolutionized our traditional military and diplomatic concepts, and prompts the conclusion that:

The third great lesson to be learned from Korea is that air power must be the keystone in the military defense structure of the free world.

Our policy makers are strangely inconsistent in their evaluation of air power as an instrument of national and international policy. Shortly before our departure for the Far East we attended a conference at which State Department leaders acknowledged, in the course of their comments on the world situation, that our long-range air power provided the only major deterrent to all-out Russian aggression. These same leaders, however, revealed a lack of appreciation for the necessity of overwhelming air power for the protection of our troops in Western Europe. If our diplomats are truly interested in deterrents, as they must be, they couldn't find a better one than the U. N.'s command of the air over Western Europe.

On the other hand, we suspect that our policy makers are more dependent upon air power than they themselves realize. Their dependency on the deterrent effect of our strategic air power, and its resultant effect on national policy, is too obvious to discuss here. We refer to the official policy which confines our forces to Korea, as against the alternative of carrying the fight to the Reds with aerial bombardment of their Manchurian bases. This official policy of containment obviously centers in the hope that we can kill sufficient Communists in Korea to force Red China to give up the struggle and settle on "honorable terms." General Bradley said as much in an address in Chicago on April 17. "Our present objective in Korea," he explained, "is to stop the Communists—to kill as many as we can at the least possible cost to ourselves."

That objective is clear enough. The problem is, it is not being supported, at least not in terms of emphasis in our mobilization effort. As we have pointed out, the airplane is—by a wide margin—our best destroyer of Communists in Korea. Thus, air power is—though not recognized as such—the backbone of our official strategy, as defined by General Bradley. Our policy makers, under their own terms, must depend on it as much or more than those who would send our bombers across the Yalu. Therefore, to support their own strategy—since the airplane can destroy enemy troops in other parts of the world as well as in Korea—one would expect an adequate build-up in air-power development. Surely, an all-powerful United States Air Force should be in the making.

Yet, General Spaatz reports that under prevailing policy an Air Force of only 50 modern groups is actually being produced, and that we have slowed down on our whole air-power build-up. This seems not only inconsistent but a direct invitation to disaster.

Whether you take the stand that the calculated risk involved in bombing Manchuria is too great, or that we must take that risk now as the lesser of two evils; whether aggression, or will hasten it; whether you consider the British Isles a dependable military base, or an expendable atomic target; whether you feel we must stop Russia short of North America, or make our own continent a huge air and sea base for the world—no matter which side you're on in the so-called great debate, the determining factor in your argument must be, it seems clear, the air-power capability of the free world compared to that of Russia.

In view of this, we believe air power must be raised in the national mind above the confusions of interservice strife, above the shackles of an unrealistic and outmoded balanced force concept, and certainly above partisan politics. We must forget the service feuds of the past that still plague us to the point that when the capabilities of air power are cited it is charged that one believes air power can win a war alone; when it is argued that the Air Force must be, in keeping with its responsibilities and destructive power, the major service in our Military Establishment, it is charged that this is disparaging to the other two services. The war in Korea—once it is viewed at close range—dispels all such shallow considerations. The doughboy is delighted that airpower is capable of such destructive force; he just wants to get the job done, he doesn't care how, and get back home. Our admiration for the job being done by the Army, Marines, and Navy, in Korea and wherever else they may be, is as strong as the next man's. We believe firmly that all three services have a vital role in combating aggression. But we cannot, in all honesty, fail to recognize that air power is the dominant force in modern war.

Official thinking in this country is seemingly unaware of the military and diplomatic revolution that is taking place as a result of air power development. In the national interest, we urge that the Air Force Association continue and intensify its aggressive policy of bringing the story of this development to the people. We will urge that the Congress assert itself and raise airpower to the position it deserves in our military and diplomatic structure.

If the war in Korea does not force a departure from the surface thinking that permeates our present military strategy, if it does not lead to full realization that air power is the determining military factor in our foreign policy, if it does not hasten the establishment of a sound air power policy for all the free nations, then much of our military effort in Korea will be in vain, and as a nation we will be judged guilty of gross negligence before the facts of modern war and modern diplomacy.

Exchange of Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 15, 1951:

GREATER EXCHANGE OF STUDENTS URGED—ADVISORY COMMISSION'S REPORT TO CONGRESS REVEALS SOVIET METHODS OF INDOCTRINATION

WASHINGTON, April 14.—An expanded State Department educational exchange program to combat Russia's spreading Communist culture was urged in a report to Congress today by the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

Particular stress was laid on Russia's cultural imperialism in North Korea as a prelude to aggression under an economic and cultural agreement made by Russia and her satellite on March 17, 1949. This was cited as an example of what this country should resist through programs tailor-made for the countries in which they are to be used.

Meanwhile President Truman appointed Dr. Margaret Clapp, president of Wellesley College, and Dr. James W. Edgar, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Texas, as members of the Board of Foreign Scholarships that operates the Federal student exchange program. They will serve for 3 years.

More extensive exchange of students, Government officials, labor groups, and youth and professional leaders in all fields was urged with the aim of attaining these three objectives:

"1. To keep alive the spirit of cooperation among the free nations of the world for the purpose of self-protection and progress for all.

"2. To strengthen resistance to communism in countries immediately threatened with infiltration or aggression.

"3. To weaken the forces of communism and diminish its power in areas now under the domination of the U. S. S. R."

"The Commission wishes to make it clear that we do not believe the program has attained its maturity either in scope or definition," said the report.

Signed by the chairman, Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancelor of Vanderbilt University, and his associates, it added:

"The process of adjusting it to the tasks imposed by the Communist challenge will be a continuous one.

"To illustrate, we feel that the reexamination of the content of the presentation made to other peoples, as contrasted with the objectives sought has only just begun. Part of the approach used at one time—the emphasis upon the strength and industrial wealth of the United States, for example—ran grave risks of creating envy and resentment, rather than attitudes of cooperation and friendship."

The commission, however, complimented Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, for giving the program "vigorous and forward-looking leadership."

It is expected that grants for the exchange of persons will exceed 6,500 in 1951, the report said. This Government program is relatively small compared to exchanges made under private auspices, it added. By way of contrast, it reported that 30,000 foreign students were now studying at a thousand American campuses.

In discussing the North Korea infiltration, the commission said the United States program as first conceived had not considered "intensive campaigns for the conversion of whole peoples to the Communist point of view."

"The facts in this instance are so significant that they should be cited specifically," the report continued. "In 1945, some 1,700 North Koreans were enrolled in one or another of the Soviet-oriented cultural societies in that area. By 1949, this number had been increased to over 1,300,000. During the 3-year period prior to 1949, some 770,000 copies of 72 Russians books were published in North Korea. In 1949, some 800 books were translated and large numbers of copies distributed.

"Numerous classes in the Russian language were organized. Almost 70,000 lectures and concerts were given in North Korea by Soviet artists, writers, and other cultural representatives in 1948, and an even greater number were given in 1949.

"In the course of the 5-year period preceding hostilities, hundreds of intellectual, industrial, and political leaders from North Korea were taken to Moscow for indoctrination. This provides a vivid illustration of the Soviet program to misguide and seduce a whole population for violent ends."

Among the books published in 1949, were a total of 537,000 copies of the "History of the Communist Party (Bolshevik)" and Stalin's "Collected Works."

MacArthur's Strategy: Pros and Cons Weighed—Issues Raised at the Senate Hearing and Analysis of Points in Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on Sunday, May 13, carried the following excellent analysis of the MacArthur controversy by its famous authority on military matters, Hanson W. Baldwin:

MACARTHUR'S STRATEGY: PROS AND CONS WEIGHED—ISSUES RAISED AT THE SENATE HEARING AND ANALYSIS OF POINTS IN DISPUTE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Victory through attrition or victory through attack—these were the basic alternatives presented last week to the Senate committees studying the issues presented by the dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

Although General MacArthur and Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall have been, so far, the only witnesses, the battle lines already have been clearly drawn, and the issues considerably, though by no means completely, illuminated.

The Republicans, critical of the policies we have followed in Korea and the Orient, would probably say with Pyrrhus: "One more such victory and we are undone." And the Democrats, supporting the limitation of the conflict in hopes of ultimate gains, would probably agree with Polybius: "It is no doubt a good thing to conquer on the field of battle, but it needs greater wisdom and greater skill to make use of victory."

The strategy for victory in Korea and the Orient and its relationship to world strategy was the major problem that formed the background of the great debate. How to achieve that victory with the least cost to the United States and how to accomplish the political aims of the containment of communism on a world-wide basis was the subject around which all the questions in the Senate committees' caucus room sooner or later revolved.

General MacArthur stressed again and again that American blood was being shed in Korea, and advocated a course of action somewhat similar to the strategy he followed in the brilliant Inchon operation and later in the ill-fated victory offensive toward the Yalu—a course of great risk in the hope of great gain—and a limited extension of the war in the Orient beyond Korea to force Communist China to abandon the Korean campaign.

Strategy of attrition

General Marshall stressed again and again that it was the opinion of the Pentagon that the course advocated by General MacArthur might cause the loss of more, rather than of less, American blood, and might well involve the Nation in the very thing we are trying to avoid—world war III. A strategy of attrition within Korea—the decimation of the Chinese armies thrown against us, and particularly the destruction of their best troops—offered, he suggested, the best hope for an eventual cease-fire, with a safeguarding of American and allied interests in the Orient and the world.

The principal topics discussed were: (1) air reconnaissance; (2) hot pursuit of enemy planes across the Yalu and bombardment of enemy bases in Manchuria; (3) economic blockade of China; (4) naval blockade of China; (5) Formosa and Nationalist troops and guerrillas; (6) the relationship of Communist China to Soviet Russia; (7) the strength and capabilities of Soviet forces in the Far East.

The MacArthur position, the administration position (insofar as the hearings have revealed them) and an analysis of each of these topics follow:

1. AIR RECONNAISSANCE

MacArthur: "Remove now any restrictions on air reconnaissance of China coastal areas and of Manchuria." (Quoted by the general, as representing his position, from tentative proposals suggested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in January.)

Administration: This, and other courses of action, once tentatively suggested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the darkest days of the Korean war, "were considered inadvisable in view of the radical change in the situation. * * * [This course] would have us, on our own initiative, carry the conflict beyond Korea, against the mainland of Communist China."

Analysis: This issue is minor and represents something of a tempest in a teapot. Extended air reconnaissance is a corollary to extended bombardment and, if we bomb in Manchuria, our "photorecon" planes must have freedom to fly nearly anywhere in the Manchurian air space and probably over the coastal areas—not easily defined—of China. Today—and since the Korean war started—our reconnaissance planes are making daily flights from Okinawa, Japan, and elsewhere along the coast of China from the Yellow Sea to Canton, but have remained over the sea. Inspection and photographs of ports is a daily routine, but detailed close inspection of certain areas is not possible.

Other reconnaissance planes have photographed border areas in Manchuria across the Yalu from great heights. By such means we have had forewarning of a Chinese Communist air build-up in Manchuria and of periodic concentrations of junks opposite Formosa. Present reconnaissance, together with other intelligence sources, should give us ample information to wage a war limited to Korea, but would be clearly inadequate if the war were extended beyond Korea.

2. "HOT PURSUIT"

MacArthur: The pursuit of enemy planes beyond the Yalu to their bases in Manchuria and the bombardment of the enemy sanctuary in Manchuria—including airfields, troop concentrations, supply dumps, and railroads—would, together with other actions, "force China to diminish her effort in * * * Korea."

Administration: The administration early agreed to the hot pursuit of enemy aircraft beyond the Yalu, but because of allied opposition, did not authorize it. Bombing of Chinese bases "would not bring victory," but if there were no danger of bringing Russia into the war we would not hesitate to bomb them.

Analysis: This issue involves a question of judgment as to just how much air power can accomplish. General MacArthur testified that if he had been permitted to bomb across the Yalu prior to and when the Chinese Communists struck us in force in late November, "I haven't the faintest doubt we would have thrown them back."

Air power exaggerated

But General MacArthur told the President at Wake Island before the attack that if the Chinese Communists did attack him his air power would slaughter them. Exaggerated optimism about the ability of air power to interdict completely enemy communication lines has characterized much of the Korean war; yet the enemy, utilizing animal transport, human porters, and moving by night and with great camouflage discipline, always has brought up supplies.

There is, nevertheless, not much doubt that our bombardment of enemy facilities in Manchuria would considerably complicate the enemy's ground campaign in Korea, and might, in time, reduce his ability to maintain troops there. But such a result would be conditional upon three other factors: (1) Increase of the strength of our own Air Forces in the Far East; (2) negligible or limited opposition from the Chinese Communist Air Force; (3) no opposition from the Soviet Air Force.

General MacArthur testified that his program of bombardment might require the addition of perhaps one B-29 group and a B-36 group to the far eastern air forces. No public and official administration estimate of the additional effort needed has been given, but some administration spokesmen fear such a campaign would necessitate the reduction in strength of our strategic air command, which now represents the (atomic) right fist of our world strategy, and of our continental air defense in order to supply enough planes for the broadened Far East strategy.

This would be particularly true if the Chinese Communist air force—now believed to number 500 to 700 planes in Manchuria, including two types of modern Russian jets—should retaliate by active attack upon our bases and ground troops.

Question of sanctuary

If the Russian air force, numbering perhaps 3,000 planes east of Lake Baikal, should intervene, all bets, of course, would be off, and Russia has troops, and planes along the Manchurian railways, which are important to the supply of the sizable Russian garrisons at Port Arthur and Dairen.

The administration makes the point that our planes and troops—as well as the enemy's—have a sanctuary in Korea; we are now relatively free from any serious air attack, and that if and when enemy aircraft intervene massively in the ground battle in Korea or in attack upon our bases, our planes will immediately retaliate by attacks upon Manchurian bases and supply lines.

United States air attacks upon Manchuria would certainly broaden the war. And the military gains achieved would be at the expense of the commitment of greater force to the Orient—with consequent reduction in our strength elsewhere. Such action might also result in development of a major air war—in addition to the existent ground fighting—and consequent deprivation of our troops in Korea of the great volume of air support they are now receiving.

3. ECONOMIC BLOCKADE

There is no material difference between General MacArthur and the administration on this point. The administration's difficulty has been to convince its allies—particularly Great Britain—of the wisdom of such a measure, and to control shipments carried in foreign-flag vessels. Recent United Nations and congressional actions indicate that the way has been cleared for tightening an economic blockade which has long been in effect.

4. NAVAL BLOCKADE

MacArthur: China is "peculiarly vulnerable to the process of blockade. * * * There is no weapon of war in my opinion that is quite as efficacious as a blockade. * * *"

Administration: "It would inconvenience them and in time might have a very serious effect on the stability of the Chinese Communist Government."

Analysis: A sea blockade of an island, or of a small nation with limited land access to other nations, is most effective; sea blockades of great continental nations or of half a continent, like China, are generally far less effective. General MacArthur's point is that naval closure of the sea lanes of communication to China, plus the air bombardment of the Manchurian railroads, would cut effectively the main routes by which supplies reach China. This is undoubtedly true. But naval blockade plus air bombardment would probably never be—at least until months after its inception—more than 50 to 75 percent effective. Other land routes beyond our effective reach are still open to China, via central Asia, via India, via Burma, and Thailand, and by blockade-runners.

Moreover, railroads, once bombed are not necessarily severed; they can be repaired quickly, as Germany in the last war and Korea now, have demonstrated; it would require consistent and persistent large-scale effort to halt traffic.

Even when China was limited in the last war to supplies over the Hump and by the Burma Road, resistance against the Japanese was still maintained. Moreover, China is capable of manufacturing in sizable numbers the small arms, mortars and machine guns which form the bulk of the equipment of her army in Korea, and China has sufficient rice to prevent nationwide famine.

Greater naval forces

Like air bombardments, naval blockade, if it is to be effective, would require a greater concentration of United States naval forces in the Far East—how much greater no witness yet has ventured to guess. It would, like air bombardment, increase the risk of involvement with Soviet Russia; General MacArthur advocated the inclusion of Russian Port Arthur in our blockade cordon. It would increase friction with our allies and with "neutrals," and India, at least, would probably pay no attention to it. Yet, even with the naval force now available in the Far East, a blockade which would greatly cut down Chinese imports could be established.

5. FORMOSA

This breaks down into a number of issues:

(1) *Strategic importance*

MacArthur: "I would insure that Formosa shall not fall into Red hands. * * * If it does, you have not only lost everything we gained in the Pacific war, but you have rolled back our strategic frontier * * * all the way to the western coast of the United States."

Administration: "We did not want [Formosa] for ourselves, but it would be very serious for our line of defense there if it got into hostile hands." The administration has advocated "neutralization" of Formosa and last week General Marshall agreed completely with General MacArthur that it should not be allowed to pass to Communist control.

Analysis: Few military leaders would agree with the extreme statements of General MacArthur about Formosa's strategic importance; in effect he said that if we lost Formosa we lost the Pacific. Yet Formosa was in enemy hands in World War II and even in the darkest days our strategic frontier was never pushed back to the Pacific coast. As General MacArthur himself pointed out in his testimony, our military superiority in the western Pacific is dependent upon sea and air superiority; if we maintain such superiority, Formosa, even in enemy hands, could not be a vital military threat. However, enemy jet planes based on advanced fields on Formosa, would have range enough—unlike the same planes based on the Chinese mainland—to operate against the Philippines, and the political and psychological effect of a Communist Formosa would be very grave in the Philippines and the Orient.

(2) *Chiang Kai-shek*

MacArthur: "I believe that to the average Asiatic, Chiang Kai-shek stands out as the great symbol against communism."

Administration: Inherent in the testimony was some feeling of reserve about Chiang Kai-shek's leadership.

Analysis: Few experts would characterize Chiang in the sweeping terms used by MacArthur, but on the other hand, there are few who can name any Chinese leader to replace him who would command the same power. The issue should not be put in terms of Chiang or Mao, but in terms of many anti-Communist leaders.

(3) *Nationalist armed forces*

MacArthur: These forces are on the whole good, but need United States equipment, training, and logistical support. They should be built up and Chiang Kai-shek, with United States support, should be allowed to use them against the continent of Asia. There was also some discussion of their use in Korea. United States help should never include the commitment of United States ground troops on the China mainland.

Administration: On the basis of reports by "the survey party which was sent by MacArthur to Formosa" the Joints Chiefs of Staff were convinced "that these [Nationalist] forces would not be effective" in Korea. No clear-cut statement is available about how the JHS feel today about the use of these troops against the China mainland, but the United States Seventh Fleet is still acting under orders which prevent Nationalist attacks against the mainland.

Aid to Chiang Kai-shek

Analysis: Gradual modification of our Formosan policy since last summer now has reached the point where mutual defense assistance program aid is being given to the island, and a United States military mission—to administer that aid but not to supervise it or to train the Chinese—is now on Formosa. The checks which prevent the use of the Nationalist Navy, Air Force, and Army against the mainland still, however, exist. If they were lifted, immediate small-scale operations against the Communists would be possible, but large-scale operations are months away and would be dependent for their success upon extensive United States supervision and logistic support. Our present policy of giving aid without supervision is largely useless; the reforms needed on Formosa to make the 500,000 men of the Nationalists effective fighting forces are too major to be accomplished without United States supervision and training.

(4) *Nationalist guerrillas*

This subject was slurred over in the released testimony, but a United States program of aid and organization for anti-Communist guerrillas on the mainland of China has been considerably increased in recent months, and there seems to be no difference of opinion about this.

6. CHINA AND SOVIET RUSSIA

MacArthur: Communism, rather than Russia, is the major threat, and Moscow and Peiping are not indissolubly linked.

Administration: Soviet Russia is the main threat. Moscow and Peiping are not indissolubly linked but are close together now, and an attack upon Peiping might further forge this link.

Analysis: This argument seems a quibble. The enemy is both communism and Soviet Russia, but it is indisputable that from a military point of view Russia is the main danger. Psychologically, ideology cannot be defeated by a sword; hence the military measures against Chinese communism which MacArthur advocates would not strike against the main military opponent and might psychologically forge the present link between Moscow and Peiping more strongly.

7. SOVIET FORCES IN EAST

MacArthur: "Their air is not to be discounted * * *. That she [Russia] could get command of the sea * * *, I would be very doubtful of. * * * The Soviet has the capacity to launch a punishing attack upon Japan, but * * * [not] to overrun Japan * * *." There are major industrial and logistic weaknesses in the Soviet military set-up in the Far East. Their dispositions are primarily defensive.

Administration: Figures of Soviet strength were censored, but are nevertheless well known; there are at least 70 Soviet submarines, including some snorkels, in the Pacific; at least 3,000 planes east of Lake Baikal and from 30 to 40 divisions in the same area. There are probably close to 100,000 Russian troops of all types in Manchuria and several hundred thousand others in the Vladivostok area or along the Manchurian frontier. Soviet capability for an offensive effort is not discounted.

Analysis: Any judgments are speculative, but some of the communication and industrial weaknesses cited by MacArthur appear to be dated. They were true prior to World War II, but an improved communication network and industrial facilities have been established in the Far East; there are today, for instance, Soviet submarine-building yards in Siberia. The remoteness of Siberia from the Urals and European Russia undoubtedly would hamper Soviet supply, but there is probably sufficient materiel stockpiled to permit major efforts for some months of war. The Soviet military capabilities, in any case, must be reckoned as initially strong, particularly on the continent of Asia.

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The issues obviously boil down to differing judgments as to the efficacy of the measures proposed, the strength of the Russians in the area, and the Communist reactions to these measures. General MacArthur thinks that the extension of the limited war in Korea to a limited war in China would increase the pressure against the Chinese Communist Government sufficiently to force it to make peace in Korea and that Russia would not intervene, though the risk would have to be taken. The administration doubts the efficacy of these measures, fears more than does General MacArthur the possibility of Soviet intervention, and believes that some of the measures might split us from our allies and weaken us in other areas of the world more vital to our global strategy.

Any objective appraisal would probably fall somewhere between these judgments. Bombardment and blockade is not likely to bring about full-fledged open and all-out Soviet intervention, but it very probably would mean the increase of indirect Soviet aid to China, with a resultant increase in the scale of fighting. On the other hand, there is no present indication that Peiping is ready to cry quits in Korea, and there does not appear to be any foreseeable end to the present campaign of attrition.

In such circumstances it seems likely that we must inevitably move, not all the way to the MacArthur program, but toward a less limited war—the imposition of a tighter and tighter economic blockade, the strengthening of Formosa and the mainland guerrillas, and the lifting of the restrictions that now hamper the Nationalists. But it seems unlikely—and undesirable—that we will, in the near future, bomb and blockade Communist China unless the enemy himself first broadens the war.

In other words, the basic issues of victory through attrition or victory through attack seem oversimplified; neither strategy promises clear-cut victory. For in Korea, as elsewhere in the world, we are engaged in a political, psychological, economic, and military campaign of attrition—with our patience, judgment, firmness, and strength the only factors that stand between us and some future era of greater security and the specter of world war III. We are in for a long pull and a hard pull—and no prescription for a quick and easy cure can change the prognosis.

The Land Where the River Flows North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the great Red River Valley of the North has played an important part in the development of our Nation. Its broad, rich acres produce some of the finest crops in the world, crops which are a basic part of our national economy.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members an article by Mr. H. W. Herbison, which explains the history of the region and its development as a potato center. The article, as printed in the program for the National Potato Conference at Grand Forks, N. Dak., March 29 to 31, follows:

THE LAND WHERE THE RIVER FLOWS NORTH

(By H. W. Herbison)

Where tossed and rolled the mighty waters of prehistoric Lake Agassiz, remaining in the wake of the northward retreat of that great continental ice sheet blanketing the land during the Wisconsin stage of ice invasion, is now an 8,000-square-mile reservoir of soil fertility we call the Red River Valley of the North. Other than the black-land region of the Don in Russia, no strip of land exists quite like it in potential power to produce cereal grains, flaxseed, potatoes, sugarbeets, and legumes in complementary combination with good farm management.

Beginning near Wahpeton, N. Dak., this land-use area extends nearly 300 miles northward in the direction of Winnipeg, Manitoba. In width, it averages about 40 miles (as narrow as 20 miles near its southern boundary and widening out at much as 80 miles during its course toward the Canadian line). More than one-third of it lies within the State of Minnesota; the remaining portion is in six counties comprising the eastern boundary of North Dakota.

The summer visitor is immediately struck with the nearly level topography of the area (ideal for mechanized farming), the rich black color and the depth of its fertile soils.

Climate, past and present, accounts for many striking characteristics of Red River Valley soils and their performance. Comparatively low moisture supplies in centuries past were hardly sufficient to support a general forest vegetation; they were, however, extremely favorable to the growth of numerous grasses. These grasses have been the source of humus imparting the black color to all soils of the region.

While adequate for the accumulation of large quantities of black organic matter in the surface soil, moisture supply of only 20 to 24 inches a year has not been sufficient to leach it to any great depth. Long winters blanket the land with snow to help keep natural surface soil fertility intact for use by plants during the spring and summer months when most of the area's rainfall occurs.

The decade 1870–80 was significant in terms of settlement, public policy, and the development of transportation and markets. The Northern Pacific Railway extended its lines westward. The St. Paul & Pacific (now part of the Great Northern) reached Barnesville, Minn., in 1870. By 1880, Jim Hill was successful in having the Great Northern lines built through the State and Red River Valley. The eastern part of old military reserves was officially thrown open to homestead entry.

By 1883, much of the better arable land of the Red River Valley was already taken up by settlers and its development as an area producing small grains and flaxseed begun.

How large are Red River Valley farms? Average 1950 size of farm approaches 400 acres (all farms). Four hundred and eighty acres appear to be the size most prevalent, interspersed with many half-section farms and a relatively small number which are 640 acres or larger. In gross farm income from all sources, Red River Valley farm operators have averaged a little more than $6,000 in recent years, with the common pattern slightly higher than $10,000.

How about potatoes? Where, when and how do they fit into the land-use picture of the Red River Valley? Historically, commercial potato production came into the land-use picture to stay with the turn of the twentieth century. Before that, ambitious starts were made only to fold up in the face of high freight rates and imperfect knowledge of the potato market.

Early growers sought a row crop that would (1) help to clean up weed infested land for wheat, and (2) another cash crop that could be produced, handled and marketed at a time not in conflict with the production and harvesting of small grains and flax.

Potato acreages grew slowly until new technology following World War I enabled Red River Valley growers to expand commercial production rapidly. By 1919, acreage was only 83,000. By 1929, it had increased to 130,000, then to 140,000 acres in 1940, and finally reaching an all-time acreage high of 191,000 in 1943. By 1945, acreage had dropped back to 175,000 from which 23,460,000 bushels were produced. Since then, potato acreages have tapered off to the lowest level recorded within the span of the past quarter of a century; even so, potato production on North Dakota farms has held right near the 20,000,000-bushel mark in recent years. The same general pattern may be assumed to hold for Minnesota portions of the valley.

What takes the place of displaced potato acres? Sixty-seven thousand acres of dry-land sugarbeets are now grown in the Red River Valley (about two-thirds on the Minnesota side of the river). In the southern section of the valley, corn, soybeans, and sugarbeet acreage has expanded at the expense of potato acreage over a period of 25 years. In the northern zone, these other row crops have also expanded but have replaced potatoes to a lesser degree than in the southern zone.

More and more, commercial table stock potato production has tended to concentrate in the northern zone of the Red River Valley where the combination of land, climate, and producer-handler know-how has made for a community of potato men determined to hold and strengthen their position in the potato market place. With a half century of potato experience behind them, an aggressive State seed department on the alert to vigorous seed stocks, a sympathetic research and extension program expanding its service in production and marketing problem solving, and the benefit of land and climate in which potatoes naturally fit into the overall organization and management of the farm—it seems likely that Red River Valley potatoes may continue to be reckoned with in the market place for quite a while.

The valley now has more than 500 trackside potato storage and processing plants, including some of the newest and most modern in the United States. Potato acreage range from 20 to more than 1,000 acres per grower, averaging 50 acres, with a large production of certified seed. Cobblers, Triumphs, and Pontiacs are principal varieties, although many newer varieties are coming into prominence and research goes on constantly to develop others particularly suited to the region.

The future? The Red River Valley Potato Growers' Association, the Potato Research Center, the Research and Demonstration Farm, and the cooperation extended by the land-grant colleges and Department of Agriculture with the potato industry suggests that there will be a future. Access from here will be on meeting the demands of discriminating consumers and looking well to the costs and marginal efficiency of satisfying consumer demand in our production, harvesting, handling, and marketing policy and practice.

With patience, hard work, and courageous planning the Red River Valley seeks an answer to what the future holds for it by 1960 that may be made compatible with the interests of producers and consumers alike. Progress in that direction is now under way.

The Last Phase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this article by Edna Lonigan speaks for itself:

THE LAST PHASE

(By Edna Lonigan)

I

General MacArthur's triumphant journey from Tokyo to the Halls of Congress is a political earthquake. But the line of cleavage is not between Republicans and Democrats. It is between the people and the mysterious entity called the Fair Deal.

The Truman administration started out as an era of good feeling. Those who did not like the New Deal were glad we had a home-spun Missouri Democrat in place of Roosevelt. They liked his looks, his Midwestern accent, his unexpected dignity in dealing with Congress, with the press, and with the chiefs of foreign nations.

The new President took up the task of international conferences where Roosevelt dropped it, and then, after Potsdam, said what most Americans wanted to hear, that he would go to no more such meetings.

But it soon became apparent that he followed Roosevelt's policies, and he clashed with Congress over price control.

Disillusionment with Soviet Russia set in and, when England announced that she could no longer support her commitments in Greece, we took over, under the Truman doctrine, promising to oppose military force

with force, if any nation was threatened by the U. S. S. R.

The Greek-Turkish program changed rather suddenly into the Marshall plan for economic—not military—aid to all Europe. That evolved into a military alliance, then into arms for Europe, and finally into the plan to send troops to garrison duty there. But though we spent billions, Europe remained helpless against Communist assault.

Meanwhile China fell. We evacuated Korea, and announced that Formosa was not important to our defense line in the Pacific. Plans were made instead to extend the Marshall plan to a billion people in Asia and Africa. Then the Communists moved in to fill the military vacuum we had left.

The President decided to enter the war. After bloody fighting the general who had snatched victory from defeat was summarily dismissed. An outraged people bore him in triumphal procession halfway round the world. The President was booed in a Washington ball park.

It does not make sense.

II

Obviously something is needed to explain this strange performance—something more than mink coats, deep freezers, or Pendergast politics.

There is a simple explanation. It is to be found in a speech of Earl Browder's which is reprinted in a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities in March 1944.

Browder told the American Communist movement it was to abandon the Communist Party and set to work especially through the trade unions, to form a mass organization with members throughout the United States.

The PAC under Sidney Hillman carried out the plan laid down by Browder. Of course 98 percent of the trade-union members did not suspect that the Soviet Government had planned their organization, their policies, and even their publications.

The purpose of forming this mass organization was to build "national unity," to preserve the "gains" of Tehran. It was to unite everyone—workers, farmers, managers, even financiers—in a drive on the Fascists and defeatists, those who doubted that the alliance with Soviet Russia could continue into peacetime.

Stalin and his advisers realized at Tehran that Roosevelt was dying, and that they must choose his successor, and get him elected, or they would lose all the gains the Hisses and others had won. The Soviet leaders also knew that Roosevelt had smashed the Democratic Party, and that whoever mustered the strongest political power could take it over and run it, under the old symbols.

The Communists then built up a network of local political machines in each congressional district, formed first about the labor unions, but gradually drawing in intellectuals, farmers, women, and religious groups. This was the familiar popular front, with which the Communists had softened up France under Blum, before the Nazi-Communist attack.

Truman was chosen as candidate for Vice President by Sidney Hillman, at the suggestion (according to Jonathan Daniels in his recent book, A Man of Independence) of Max Lowenthal, who had known the Senator from Missouri for years through congressional investigations of the finances of the railroads.

The organizers of this coalition were ordered to abandon their revolutionary slogans and to concentrate on uniting all groups except the reactionaries, in order to better destroy the enemies of unity with the U. S. S. R. Their particular hates were Hoover, Farley, Byrnes, Forrestal, and MacArthur.

William Z. Foster reported to the Cominform early in 1950 that this plan had succeeded far beyond all expectations. Its followers included members of all religions, and social classes.

This pattern of the Popular Front is the only concept that will explain the strange history of the Truman administration. If you examine our foreign policy, our unusual military ineptitude, each of our Presidential and congressional campaigns, the vagaries of our labor leaders, and the spread of defeatism and enervation in our literature, the pieces all fit. They fit the military needs of the Soviet Union, to divide us, to sow defeatism, and to make us spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

III

The American people have not had a government of their own since 1945. They could not get anything constructive accomplished in foreign or military affairs because they had no government to do it for them.

Their Government has been captured from within, by a few secret agents in key positions, as Norway was captured by a few Nazi agents placed in key positions by Hitler before his armies struck.

It is time we stopped talking of our present Government with words that apply only to an American Government. We need a new language to describe the Government we have today.

We do not have a President in the American sense, because there is no longer a balance between executive and legislative power. The office has grown until it doth bestride the narrow world like a colossus. We do not have departments or bureaus in the American sense, because Congress does not define their duties or set limits on their power. In a government by law, it is essential that the legislature, which does not benefit by adding bureaus or extending their power, should create and define all Government agencies, as Madison pointed out in the Federalist Papers. We do not have a budget or appropriations in the American sense. When money is managed by the Government, all figures are lies.

Our present-day Government is like a great banyan tree, towering high above everything, and sendings arms out to start new roots in organizations we still think of as private—the labor unions, colleges, women's clubs, churches, foundations, and business associations. This combine of public and private agencies, directed by a small inner group now has almost complete control over the flow of news, ideas, and discussion in the press, movies, radio, and moving pictures, and the press of private organizations. It does not crudely forbid freedom of discussion. It merely jams the press and the other media with banalities written or whispered by its hired ministry of enlightenment.

The American people never thought about how to manage such a combine. They did not know it was operating under the outward signs of their own kind of government. The Soviet leaders knew. They knew in 1943 they must take it over before we woke up.

IV

Defeat and total eradication of the Popular Front party in the United States is the first condition for any hope of peace, or of survival of the United States as a Nation.

The opposition party so far has suffered only heartbreaking defeats. They are like Thor in the German fable, who put forth prodigious efforts to eat all the meat in the trough faster than his opponent, only to find his opponent consumed meat and bones and the trough itself. Thor did not know he was fighting not a mortal, but Loki, God of Fire.

The Popular Front in the United States cannot be defeated by any normal political strategy or party policy. It is a military organization to be defeated only as any usurping government is defeated by organizing the resistance.

Until a few weeks ago, the people were apathetic or cynical, there were no visible leaders, and all communication was blurred by the Government's propaganda skill.

Suddenly the President dismissed our foremost general, the people poured in tidal wave of letters and telegrams upon Congress. MacArthur's course led straight as an arrow to the Waldorf Towers, from which Herbert Hoover had been valiantly trying to arouse opposition to the sellout of our country. Now we have an aroused Nation and potential leadership.

The line of political cleavage is now clear—between a foreign policy that fits Soviet military needs and one that puts American security uppermost. At home the same cleavage runs between a governmental pyramid the Soviet agents can penetrate, and the simple American Government that foreign agents cannot manage. Congress has in the power of the purse the means to tear down the Bastille.

The Truman administration will use every ounce of its tremendous power to discredit MacArthur. They will try to break his heart as they did Forrestal's. Will they win? As "Not merely gossip" asked last week? Can leaders and the people together defeat the machine?

The answer turns on one fact. In the resistance every fighter counts. No one else counts. Every editor, every reporter, every clergyman, every club officer, every man in the street, must take his place in the ranks and do what is nearest him to win this battle.

If we fail ——.

The Coal Industry in the Modern Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, for a great many years, in fact ever since his membership in this body, my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has manifested a great interest in the development of America's natural resources. More especially has he been interested in the great coal resources of this country and of our State. In 1943 he introduced a bill to authorize the United States Bureau of Mines to construct and operate demonstration plants that gasoline can be made from coal and oil shale.

For this work my colleague secured an appropriation of some $30,000,000, and it has now been demonstrated in these plants that gasoline can be made from coal at a cost of 4 to 5 percent more than making gasoline from petroleum.

My colleague delivered an address in Cleveland last evening before the American Mining Congress Coal Show, the subject of his discussion being the coal industry in the modern crisis.

I request unanimous consent that this splendid and informative address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COAL INDUSTRY IN THE MODERN CRISIS

(By Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY)

For the third time in the twentieth century the whole world hovers on the brink of a global war, although the first year of the second half of this century is less than

6 months old. We who have lived in any part of this century need no one to tell us the terrible cost of war in human life and suffering. Veterans' hospitals scattered broadcast throughout the land, in which the soldiers of two World Wars are being treated tell the story of our failure to abolish war. Now we seem to be drifting helplessly toward a third global conflict in which, if it occurs, we know that the great discoveries and inventions of science and technology will be used to destroy millions of lives, to lay waste the habitations of men on every continent, and to cause new soldiers to become patients in these same hospitals and in others yet to be built.

BUILDERS OR DESTROYERS

Is it the destiny of the people of America to participate in such a struggle or have we the intelligence and the will to demonstrate to all the peoples of the world that peace can be achieved? That war can be avoided? And that freedom for men can be permanently established as the way of life for all mankind?

Are we to be builders or destroyers? These questions must be answered by this generation. If the peoples and the leaders of other nations are unable to point the way to peace, must we also be condemned to confess that we are unable to show the world how men can build a permanent peace?

I know of no better forum in which to raise this question than at this session of the American Mining Congress. The answer must be made now because if we turn from building to destroying no one knows better than those who are assembled here that no mind can conceive the measure of destruction which will be wrought if we permit a third global conflict to come. I say there can be no better forum than this because those of you who are assembled here know from personal experience what has been done in the United States to raise the standard of living and security for the people of this country by the intelligent use of natural resources. But you know also what a terrible toll war takes, not only upon the human resources of a nation but upon its material resources. During this twentieth century we have dug the minerals from our hills to scatter them broadcast throughout the world in war. The Mesabi Range in Minnesota was the greatest deposit of iron ore in all the world. Discovered 100 years ago it provided the raw material from which industry made the iron and steel through the use of which this country became the leading industrial nation of the world. Yet, during the 6 years of World War II, we took from those hills one-fifth of all the iron ore that had been extracted from them since iron was discovered there 100 years ago. Millions of tons of the iron and steel made from this ore has been shot away or is rotting away in foreign lands.

Again, in the Korean war we are paying not only with the lives of American soldiers, but we are also paying with American minerals which could be used to build a greater future for this and for coming generations. Instead, it is being used for the destruction of the lives of the soldiers who are involved in the conflict as well as the lives and homes of the noncombatant inhabitants of the Korean peninsula. Approximately 1,000,000 tons of steel, aluminum, copper, zinc, and other minerals that have been fabricated here into bombs and shells and bullets are being showered upon that hapless peninsula, and we know now whatever may be the termination of the war Korea cannot recover in another century from the destruction that has already been wrought in 10 months.

"The anger of man worketh not the justice of God." It is patience, tolerance, intelligence, charity, and, above all, faith in our own ability to use the resources with which nature has endowed us to show the whole world how the builders can in fact abolish the destruction of war.

PEACE THROUGH WISE USE OF RESOURCES

No nation in history was better endowed with natural resources than this, and, because this Nation was founded by men who had faith in freedom, we have made it possible here for the intelligence of the individual to be applied constructively to the utilization of these resources. The ingenuity of the free men who roved at will throughout this continent has achieved the greatest material progress ever registered and has developed here a social culture in which social and economic justice for the individual has been raised to levels never before attained. This has not been accomplished without waste and without sad mistakes. We have not always taken advantage of the opportunities we have had, but the record of what has been done points unerringly to great opportunities yet remaining, if we do not lose faith and surrender to fear.

It was because of my conviction that the future holds vast possibilities for the development of our natural resources in building constructively for peace that throughout my service in the Senate I have been urging better and more intensive utilization of them. It was this I had in mind when in 1943 I introduced the bill to authorize the United States Bureau of Mines to construct and operate demonstration plants to show how liquid fuel can be made from coal and oil shale. These experiments have already proved that the commercial production of liquid fuel is attainable from our huge deposits of both coal and shale that are known to exist in this country. Indeed, it is indicated that gasoline can now be made from coal at a cost of only 4 cents to 5 cents more than from petroleum, and this estimate takes no account of income to be derived from certain byproducts. It is unnecessary to tell this audience what this means for the future of America and the future of the world—provided we can avoid being compelled to use the energy sources with which this country is endowed for the destruction of human life in a third world war.

Of course, the fact that we have this new source of unlimited quantities of liquid fuel means national security in the sense that it equips us to defend ourselves even in modern war against any attack. It means more than that because it enables us to show the world that here in the United States dwells a people who have no design to seize the natural resources of any other people and who have no ambition whatsoever to establish imperialistic control of the world or any part of the world for the exploitation of its inhabitants.

AMERICA THE RICHEST IN NATURAL RESOURCES

It seems to me that the leaders of the coal industry can set a fine example to the leaders of all other industries if by intelligent utilization of our coal resources we can set an example to the peoples of other lands to do likewise. We can prove that there is no ground for fearing that natural resources will be exhausted and the people rendered unable to support themselves. That fear has been entertained by peoples from the beginning of time. Dr. Max Ball, distinguished oil geologist, testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs last March, reminded us that in the early days of the Roman Empire the Romans were worried that the copper mines of Cyprus and Spain would be exhausted and that they would be without the essential mineral from which their bronze weapons were made. Here in the United States for more than a generation experts have been predicting the exhaustion of our supply of petroleum, but our petroleum reserves are greater today by far than they were when the first prediction was made early in the century that the Nation would soon run out of petroleum. Even with the increase of our petroleum reserves, the demand for fuel in the United States is so great that it is necessary now to supplement these reserves by greater utilization of coal.

COAL: THE NATION'S BASIC FUEL

Fortunately, no one can predict that our coal reserves will be exhausted, because it is a scientific fact that coal is our largest available source of fuel, that it cannot possibly be exhausted at any imaginable rate of consumption for more than a thousand years, and that within the boundaries of continental United States lie practically one-half of all the known coal reserves of the world. We know that coal is rich in byproducts and that there are many productive ways of using it besides burning it in its raw state under a boiler. It is an invaluable source of chemical products as well as of energy supply, and yet we have been accustomed to hearing the coal industry called a sick industry and we have been accustomed to being told in the press that coal is being pushed out as a fuel. That is not the fact. We are consuming in excess of 100,000,000 tons more coal every year now than we were at the turn of the century and we are mining coal much more efficiently than we were at that time. The people of the United States are using more energy than at any previous time. Our population has doubled in the last 50 years, but the energy resources we have enjoyed have more than quadrupled. We are consuming more coal, more oil, more gasoline, and more hydroelectric power, and every citizen of the United States living today has twice as much natural energy working for him as did the individual in 1900.

Coal pushed wood from the parlor stove, from the kitchen range and from the locomotive during the nineteenth century. It has been finding competition from oil and gas in recent years so that it no longer supplies as large a percentage of the total energy consumption of the United States as it once did, but it is still a most vital source of energy and it can be made more so.

In 1908, 460,000 men were working in the mines producing 315,000,000 tons at the rate of 3.24 tons per man per day. In 1948, 433,000 men were producing 438,000,000 tons at the rate of 6.43 tons per man per day. In 1949 this coal, though it exceeded the production of 1905 by 100,000,000 tons, represented only 39.8 percent of the Nation's energy consumption, as compared with 66.9 percent in 1905. The utilization of coal has not kept pace with the energy demands of the people, but because of its extraordinary nature, because of the products which can be made from it, the opportunity is now presented to the industry to make a greater contribution than ever before to the industrial and economic needs of the people. This can be done without displacing any other energy resource so long as we continue to improve the economic status of the people, for there is no known limit to the demand for fuel and energy which will develop in an expanding economy. Maximum employment and good wages under good working conditions for all workers create an ever-growing demand for all the products of industry.

The greatest handicap that mankind has suffered in all past centuries has been the conviction of some people that there is not enough to go around and that, therefore, the masses of men must be exploited in order that the exploiters may live in luxury and security. It was this fear that brought Mussolini and Hitler into power. It is this fear which builds the slave camps of Siberia.

HUMAN INGENUITY: OUR BASIC RESOURCE

The economic progress of the United States has demonstrated that the fear is utterly groundless and that a future of peace and

plenty awaits all mankind provided only that we unite to improve the utilization of the natural resources with which the planet upon which we live is filled to overflowing. Man has never failed to find, to produce, and to use the resources he needs. When one commodity becomes scarce, human resourcefulness has been able to replace it. This is history. This is the story of science. This is the story of industry, and coal, the inexhaustible deposit of energy, affords the men and women who are engaged in its production and utilization a grand and glowing opportunity to prove how freedom and cooperation can build a peaceful world of progress and justice. Bear in mind that I said freedom. The glory of America is that it has preserved freedom for the individual. The continued development of coal and every other natural resource depends upon the maintenance of freedom for the individual because, after all else has been said about the material riches of the world, the greatest natural resource is the heart, the mind, and the industry of a free man. So I would like to see the progress of the coal industry carried on by the maximum utilization of individual initiative.

THE PLACE OF SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

That is what I had in mind when in February 1948 I introduced amendments to the then-pending tax bill to provide a 27½ percent depletion allowance and accelerated amortization to stimulate the investment of private capital in plants designed to make synthetic liquid fuel from coal. The amendment was not adopted by the Eightieth Congress. I know of no reason why coal used for such a purpose should not have as great a depletion allowance as that granted to any other mineral. I understand that the Ways and Means Committee of the House has tentatively decided to raise the general depletion allowance for coal from 5 to 10 percent, but the social and industrial gains for all the people of the United States will be so great if private capital can be induced to invest in the synthetic-fuels industry that, in my opinion, special consideration should be given to the private investment that may be made for the extraction of oil from coal. I shall offer the amendment again.

When I introduced the synthetic-fuels bill authorizing the Bureau of Mines to construct and operate demonstration plants, it was not intended to be a first step toward putting the Government into industry, but only a necessary step to test the scientific methods by which liquid fuel is made from coal and shale and to conduct the operations that would tend to prove whether or not the product would be competitive commercially. Public research is a benefit to all and the operations of the United States Bureau of Mines in its tests of the possibilities of making liquid fuel from coal and oil shale have justified every dollar which has been expended.

WILL PRIVATE ENTERPRISE DO THE JOB?

The time is here, however, for private capital to act, for coal deposits are to be found all over the country and the public demand will soon begin to arise for the construction of Government plants if private initiative does not take the lead. The public-land States have great coal reserves. My own State, Wyoming, has greater reserves of bituminous and subbituminous coal than any other State and it is only natural that the people of these areas should want to see such resources developed.

The alternatives are plain. We shall have free private competitive enterprise at work making liquid fuel or we shall have Government doing it. We shall have it done locally by the coal industry and by the users of coal putting up their own capital to build the plants, or we shall have the pressure continue to have the Government enter the field.

When the Defense Production Act was under consideration during the last session of Congress, I appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency in charge of the bill to urge the inclusion of language that would provide Government cooperation with private business to stimulate "the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes, or the production of essential materials" needed for the defense program. The provision was written into the law and it is now possible, therefore, for the Government through contracts for the purchase of materials needed in the national defense to cooperate with private firms and corporations engaged in the production of such materials. This provision of the Defense Production Act, which I urged upon the committee, includes specifically "liquid fuels for Government use or for resale." Thus, it is clear that by the enactment of the synthetic fuels bill, which I introduced in 1949, by the enactment of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and by the consideration which is now being given to accelerated amortization and an increased depletion allowance which I suggested for the first time in February 1948, the way is being cleared for private capital to enter this field. It remains only for private capital to take the initiative.

CENTRALIZED INDUSTRY INVITES ATTACK

There is another consideration which must be borne in mind, namely the great need for the decentralization of industry. The threat of atomic warfare shows how unwise it would be to build new liquid fuel plants in those areas of the country in which heavy industry is already concentrated and which naturally would be the primary target for an enemy in war. Let no one have the slightest doubt that these industrial centers are now pinpointed upon the maps in the Soviet headquarters in Moscow.

The hydrogenation of coal affords a new method of producing critical materials needed in war. We are short of benzine, toluene, as well as xylene, chemicals which are invaluable in the production of explosives and aviation gasoline. Sulfur, another commodity in which the United States is in short supply, and pyridene are chemicals which can be produced as a result of the hydrogenation of coal. The conditions therefore exist in the defense program for the construction of liquid fuels plants. It would be highly desirable and highly intelligent to make certain that such defense plants would be constructed in areas remote from those in which so much of our industry is presently concentrated.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM FOR NEW INDUSTRY

Then, too, decentralization involves the avoidance of concentrated economic control of this great new potential industry. Economic concentration through fiscal or managerial control is another element that stimulates the demand for Government to enter the field. The basic cause of the present international controversy is the conviction of the masters of the Kremlin that the capitalistic world cannot avoid monopoly. Our belief in the American system of competitive free enterprise should therefore impel us to exercise every precaution to make certain that this new industry shall be developed in the American way, namely, that of free competitive enterprise. The acts which have been passed by the Congress and the tax law now under consideration create the opportunity for the construction of needed new plants in regions outside of the concentrated target area and free from concentrated economic control.

Only habits of thought stand in the way. We have been accustomed to have coal shipped in its raw form great distances at great expense to the factories in which it is consumed. How much more sensible it would be to utilize the coal in the area where it is mined, thus avoiding the great expense of our traditional methods of transportation. The synthetic fuels development makes this possible without loss to the transportation agencies. The commodities shipped into a growing community around a liquid-fuels plant would offset the loss of business in the reduction of the raw coal shipped out, and for such shipments there would be substituted the outgoing carloads of the products, gasoline, fuel oils, chemicals, etc., resulting from the hydrogenation development.

Fears of loss arising from progress which changes old habits have never been realized, as the industrial and economic growth of this country amply demonstrates. When the standard of living of the masses is raised, new markets are created for every industry and a liquid fuels plant would be a direct benefit to every other producing or transporting industry. This becomes apparent when it is realized that liquid-fuel plants would operate on a 24-hour schedule 7 days a week and would thus create a huge new demand for the production of coal. It is estimated that a plant capable of producing 10,000 barrels of liquid fuel a day from coal would need a daily mine capacity of about 7,600 tons produced from mines operated not less than 240 days in the year. This development would also make possible improved conditions for the miners for, after all, the human aspects of every industry are paramount in importance. Living standards must be maintained at the highest possible level so as to permit a fuller utilization of the unlimited resourcefulness of the individual.

The first obligation of America in this world crisis is to keep itself strong, and the citizen who would see the American way of life thrive in the present world conflict of ideologies must be able to see that all we are fighting for is opportunity for the individual. The Communist says that the individual cannot, in this scientific age, control either his political or his economic destiny, but must be content to become the pawn of the state. He who would sustain the American ideal of individual supremacy, the principle embodied in the Bill of Rights of our Federal Constitution, the principle which underlies our oft repeated talk about the maintenance of free enterprise, must make up his mind to defend the right of the individual to take advantage of every opportunity that the advance of science and technology provides. If we are to keep America strong enough to become an example to the people of the world, it must be an America in which the individual has this opportunity. It is not sufficient that the citizen shall be politically free. He must also be economically free. This is the great opportunity which is presented to this generation of Americans. We can, if we will, win both political and economic opportunity and freedom for all men everywhere. Men will be free in every nation and on every continent when we show the way. There is no iron curtain that can exclude from any people anywhere the knowledge of the gains that can be achieved for every individual in a nation which enjoys freedom.

They Too Pay Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Swift County (Minn.) Monitor for April 27, 1951:

THEY TOO PAY TAXES

During the past several weeks this newspaper has published a series of advertisements sponsored by the Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., wherein cooperative and mutual corporations have been depicted as being nontaxpayers.

We accepted these advertisements for publication because we feel that the columns of a newspaper should be open to free expression of ideas and opinions whether we are in agreement with those ideas and opinions, or not. It is a fundamental policy, inherent to the democratic institutions of our country.

In allowing free dissemination of ideas, a newspaper also has the responsibility of correcting misstatements of fact and to challenge ideas and opinions which, in its opinion, are detrimental to the public welfare.

In the series of advertisements mentioned, we have a good example of what we mean in the foregoing statement of policy. We published them, but we do not agree with the idea they convey. They are misleading. They convey ideas concerning the tax status of cooperative and mutual corporations that are not substantiated by the facts.

Specifically, these are some of the errors of fact we find:

1. "You pay more taxes because Congress continues to allow a favored few big businesses (meaning cooperatives) to pay little or nothing."

One of the biggest cooperatives in this area is Midland Cooperative Wholesale. The little or nothing that Midland paid in income, real-estate, and personal-property taxes for the years 1947 through 1949 was more than $800,000. In our own community we have cooperatives that are listed year after year among the highest taxpayers.

2. The cooperatives are called big business.

It is true that regional cooperatives, made up of scores or even hundreds, of local associations, have impressive accumulations of assets and do a big volume of business. But, in the sense that Americans think of it, they are not big businesses. If all the cooperatives in the country were combined, they would not equal, in assets or business volume, the size of any one of a number of giant American corporations. Furthermore, since when is bigness a crime in the American scheme of things?

3. "Congress lets them escape nearly a billion dollars a year in income taxes by granting them special exemptions."

This statement has been flatly contradicted by an investigating committee of the House of Representatives. The fact is that only one-sixth of the cooperatives in America qualify under the law as being exempt from paying income taxes. These are agricultural cooperatives, and the congressional committee found that, in the case of these relative few that are exempt, the aggregate amount of income retained is relatively small. No appreciable amount of revenue would accrue to the Government if income taxes were levied on these amounts. Five-sixths of the cooperatives pay income taxes on exactly the same basis as other corporations.

4. The ads would have the public believe that cooperatives are expanding on tax-free profits.

Cooperatives expand on the savings and investments of their member-owners just as other businesses expand on the invested savings of their owners.

Here in Minnesota we have seen the great advantages that have come to our State and to our communities because our farmers have had the good sense to organize cooperatives. Within the last 15 years we have witnessed electrification of rural homes all over America by farmer cooperatives. By bringing a vitally needed service to rural people, they have enhanced the individual income of farmers, and have provided billions of dollars of business for business people in towns and cities.

The result, income-tax-wise, has been, and will continue to be, a broader base for income-tax levies both for the farmer and the businessman who profits by the farmers' purchases of electrical merchandise and services. Other taxes that any other business pays must, of course, also be paid for all real and personal property the electric cooperative owns. Surely, there is no lessening of tax revenues in a deal like that.

The late J. V. Weber, when editor and publisher of the Murray County Herald at Slayton, saw the issue clearly. He wrote in the Herald of January 31, 1946: "Cooperatives have made great contributions to general prosperity. They have made Minnesota one of the great egg, butter, grain, and livestock States, and through their abiding interest in 4-H Club and similar work, they have made farm life more attractive. They have done a great job; they have saved their patrons money; and they have enlarged the vision of most rural people."

Close to the Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Citizen-News, Hollywood, Calif., for May 11, 1915:

CLOSE TO THE CENTER

Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON calls attention to the contrast in the reactions of some people to the congressional investigations into subversive activities.

Congressman JACKSON, from West Los Angeles, is a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In his weekly letter he says:

"Your Representative was verbally flayed this week in an editorial written by Les Claypool, political editor of the Los Angeles Daily News.

"The editorial took exception to the manner of questioning employed by us during the recent appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee of actor John Garfield. The sum of Mr. Claypool's editorial seemed to be that we were persecuting Mr. Garfield and seeking to convict the actor through 'guilt by association.'

"Other complaints have been received recently condemning us for attempting to whitewash Garfield and others. With the Daily News dissenting on the one hand, and a prominent far-right columnist disapproving on the other, it could be that we are close to the center line.

"No protest is made by the liberal wing when an Alger Hiss calls Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and two Justices of the United States Supreme Court as character witnesses in an effort to prove his innocence by association, but mention a long list of Communist-front organizations and activities with which a star, director, or writer has been associated, and immediately there rises to high heaven the wail of guilt by association.

"Some days ago the committee was listening patiently to the arrogant and contemptuous statements of a recalcitrant witness before the committee. He had refused to say anything at all with respect to his association with Communist-front organizations, but he did bridle and fume at the following question asked by your representative:

"'Did you ever belong to a Fascist group known as the Silver Shirts?'

"The witness was vehement in his denial of membership and fairly frothed at the suggestion that he might have held membership in the group. We then asked:

"'Did you ever belong to the Communist Party?'

"The answer to that one was a flat refusal to answer the questions on grounds of self-incrimination and a denunciation of the committee generally and the members specifically.

"'Thought control' about which the antagonistic witnesses make such a great fuss, is a wonderful thing to rant about when questions are asked which might lead to a charge of perjury, but when the sky is clear and no legal consideration bars the way to wrathful answer, stand by for fury."

Congressman JACKSON, it appears, has an excellent understanding of Communists.

De Gaulle in New Bid for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Evening Star for May 15, 1951:

DE GAULLE IN NEW BID FOR POWER—WOULD INCLUDE GERMANY IN WESTERN EUROPE DEFENSE IN REALISTIC PROGRAM TO SPEED PREPAREDNESS

(By Constantine Brown)

The stormy petrel of French politics, Gen. Charles de Gaulle, is making a serious bid to return to power as head of the government this summer.

The French elections are scheduled for June 17. All parties are determined to put up a serious fight to reduce the membership of the Communists in the new National Assembly. The Communists in the past have been the largest single political group in the Assembly.

Most non-Communist politicians are fearful of General de Gaulle, who is stubborn and uncompromising in matters of national defense.

At present he is believed to be the only French political leader who can approach the problem of Europe's defense realistically. In conversations with a number of Americans, General de Gaulle appears to present a far more constructive program to hasten preparedness than any other French politician.

He is said to favor strongly the following program:

1. The inclusion of Germany in Western European defense on a far more equitable basis than previous French governments have indorsed it. He is less fearful of a resurgence of Germany's military might. While not discounting German military revival, he believes in first things first.

General de Gaulle apparently is convinced that we shall have a war in a very short time if present conditions persist in Europe. The only deterrent to Russia is a strongly rearmed free world. Diplomatic solutions, attempts at cooperation with Moscow and appeasement in whatever form are no longer of avail and, in his opinion, will result only in an increase of the Kremlin's demands.

The threat to the free world, he says, can be lessened only by a real show of strength and determination to meet force with force. Under such conditions France's fears of its neighbor across the Rhine should be subordinated to the actual advantages which can be obtained by creating a sovereign Germany, which would eagerly join in the West's defense effort.

2. In the same vein, General de Gaulle believes strongly in the inclusion of Turkey and Greece in the Atlantic Pact. His thinking is military rather than political. So far, the French and British Governments—for reasons which are still obscure to the average observer—have prevented these two Mediterranean nations from joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in spite of the pressing requests from Ankara and Athens. This stubborn refusal has given the Turks the impression that the great powers have in mind some appeasement proposal to Russia at the expense of the Turks.

General de Gaulle apparently does not follow the tortuous thinking of the diplomats when he favors inclusion of Turkey and Greece in western defense. The only thing he has in mind is that these two countries combined have trained military forces in being which exceed considerably that of the entire NATO.

3. General de Gaulle is reported also to favor the inclusion of Spain in the Western European defense system. He appears less interested in the totalitarian form of government which exists across the Pyrenees than in its manpower potential.

As a soldier he places political ideologies in time of near war far behind the military necessities of the free world. Spain has never threatened France militarily. Spain is strongly anti-Communist. These two considerations are ample for this Frenchman to believe that the neighbor across the Pyrenees, with an army of some half million men under arms, should not be left out of Europe's defense coordination.

4. General de Gaulle is said to have expressed strongly the view that France and the other western nations are marking time and are not doing all in their power to mobilize their military potential. The politicians who have headed the French Government since the crisis became acute still hesitate to increase the compulsory military service from 18 to 24 months. General de Gaulle is said to be determined to force this increase if he becomes head of the French Government.

These revolutionary views of General de Gaulle will be strongly opposed by the non-Communist parties, which in the past have contributed greatly to the slow-down of French rearmament. Their inactivity has been followed by the other nations of continental Europe, to the distress of General Eisenhower.

While public opinion in the United States has exercised a sufficient pressure to force the administration to change its tactics in regard to European rearmament, the present Governments of France and Britain have been the major handicaps in the inclusion of Spain, Turkey, Greece, and Germany in the defense set-up.

The State Department met the criticism of being too ideological at a time when aggression by Russia may be expected any day by saying that it could do nothing, since Paris and London were irrevocably opposed to further broadening of NATO.

A Cynical View That Doesn't Pay Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Oklahoma City (Okla.) Times, of May 10, 1951, is timely because it deals with a subject which is important in the long-range planning for this country. Upstream soil conservation, which has never received proper emphasis because of the stronger pull of funds into the so-called big dams program, must sooner or later be increased if we really accomplish the job we need to do. Also, since so many big dams already have been built, this upstream conservation program becomes more important as it is now needed to lengthen the lifetime of these dams.

The editorial follows:

A CYNICAL VIEW THAT DOESN'T PAY OFF

A considerable number—probably a majority—of the influential citizens of Eufaula oppose the building of the proposed dam near that city. They can't see any percentage in creating what the promoters of the dam call a "silt trap," at the same time putting out of cultivation more than 100,000 acres of their best bottomlands, to begin with, and additional thousands of acres upstream on the Canadian rivers which will be gradually ruined because of the backwater effect of siltation and the flooding of upstream bottomlands. They know that the theory of a sportsmen's paradise on a muddy lake has turned out to be a phony in the Madill-Tishomingo area of Lake Texoma, and will be repeated around Eufaula and McAlester.

The Indian Journal, the Eufaula newspaper, has strenuously opposed the building of the dam in the past, and a few days ago it carried another editorial deploring the bad effects of the proposed project.

However, in concluding the editorial, the newspaper expressed a feeling of despair and cynicism, as follows: "Farming no longer builds big towns, it seems. Prosperity goes to those towns and cities into which the Government pours taxpayers' money. Eufaulans' money, and small towns of this area have seen precious little of it."

This point of view is unfortunate, and should be corrected by a realistic calculation of economic factors.

The soil, over a period of two or three decades and from there on into the future, is the basic resource and economic foundation of all towns and cities, even New York. Ultimately no city can grow if the tributary soil is unproductive. The small town feels the lack of good soil first, but ultimately all communities suffer. Otherwise you might see big cities in the Idaho deserts.

Madill and Tishomingo people were highly elated when the Texoma project was promoted, on the theory that the vacationists and fishermen would make them prosperous. They have been sadly disillusioned. In addition to the failure of the sportsmen's paradise, they now keenly feel the disappearance of the rich bottom lands which used to pour farm produce into their markets.

The spending of Government money for labor, and the privilege of boarding the labor force during the building of a big dam is like a shot in the arm. It creates a temporary illusion of prosperity, but when the dam is finished, the workers pick up their sacks of potatoes and go away, and the local businessmen find that concrete and steel walls don't buy automobiles, groceries, or overalls. Then it is realized that the most precious resource of all—the soil—has been badly reduced in area, and there is nothing to take its place. There's no guesswork or theory about it—the proposition is as plain as ABC.

No city or town in Oklahoma can afford to labor under the delusion that it can live without a background and tributary territory of good farmland. Any number of instances can be shown to prove that when the soil goes, everything goes. Even the industrialized cities can't take it, for eventually they have to sell their products to other communities that depend more directly on the soil. Shot-in-the-arm prosperity makes pleasant dreams but the hangover is terrible.

The California Eagle, an Old Newspaper With a New Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD some very interesting comments by Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, as reported by Mr. Bob Ellis in the new California Eagle. Along with the news story, I am including an editorial from the new California Eagle printed in the first edition of the paper following a change of ownership which brought in as publisher a very able leader, Mr. Loren Miller, of Los Angeles. The California Eagle is an old paper which, like the legendary phoenix bird, is commencing a new life. It has a new owner and a changed viewpoint.

The California Eagle is devoted primarily to the interests of our Negro citizens, but the new publisher's conception of the role of a newspaper rises above race or class and encompasses all phases of good citizenship. The editorial, signed by the new publisher, is a wholesome and a refreshing statement of inspiring American ideals. All of us who cherish a truly free and honest American press welcome and wish success to the new California Eagle.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Eagle of May 3, 1951]

BUNCHE SAYS: "LIMITED WAR SAVES LIVES"—APPEASEMENT ISN'T PEACE, U. N. MEET TOLD

(By Bob Ellis)

"Don't confuse peace with appeasement," Dr. Ralph J. Bunche warned Presidential Adviser W. Averell Harriman and leading Los Angeles citizens Sunday at a dinner for the Nobel prize winner sponsored by the American Association for United Nations.

While newsreel and television cameras filmed Dr. Bunche before a flower-decked table at Romanoff's Restaurant in Beverly Hills, the director, Trusteeship Council of the U. N. continued quietly: "There will be much less misunderstanding about the United Nations if Americans realize the U. N. is in the business of preserving peace—not peace by appeasement but by means of honorable negotiation."

Admitting that there is a growing dislike for the United Nations in America, Dr. Bunche lashed out at the "blind emotional cynics."

"People must understand," he continued, "that while a war is limited there is a chance to stop it and save lives. The U. N. was able to do this in Israel and in Kashmir and we must continue to try to end the war in Korea."

In what was interpreted as a reference to the MacArthur controversy, Dr. Bunche said: "Victory is not needed in war. There is only a need to stop war." * * *

Speaking calmly, with a slight hesitation before his sentences, Dr. Bunche emphasized, "Fewer lives will be lost in a localized or limited war than in an atomic war. People must understand that and not lose their heads."

"It is in the American tradition to seek conciliation. Negotiation is an honorable word. We must all remember that the United Nations is the last hope of peace in our world."

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Eagle of May 3, 1951]

HERE'S WHERE WE STAND

The California Eagle has changed hands.

Loren Miller has assumed the position of publisher.

Mrs. C. A. Bass no longer has any interest, direct or indirect, in this newspaper; she has no voice in its editorial, news, or advertising policies. Her staff has been entirely replaced.

This change in ownership will result in a sharp break with The Eagle's immediate past and a repudiation of its stand on many issues.

The Eagle will seek to reestablish the proud position it once held as the spokesmen for the Negroes of Los Angeles and of California.

The primary aim of this newspaper will be to print the truth in its news columns. We shall try to report faithfully and completely what Negroes are doing, what they are thinking, and what is happening to them, and about them.

Out of the belief that realization of democratic ideals offers the fairest promise for complete equality for all citizens in all phases of American life we shall pursue an editorial policy designed to assist in preserving and extending the democratic way of life.

We shall support legislation—Federal, State, and local—which is aimed at wiping our racial inequalities in every aspect of our national life. That means we favor FEPC on Federal, State, and local levels, anti-lynching legislation, anti-discriminatory laws and ordinances of every kind and the full range of measures comprehended in the President's Civil Rights proposals.

We shall support organizations that have as their purpose the realization of democratic goals through removal of racial barriers in the political and economic affairs of America. That means we shall offer unstinted support to the NAACP, the Urban League, the Women's Political Study Clubs and similar groups.

We shall support such institutions as churches, the Red Cross, the YMCA, the YWCA, and kindred groups, which aim at the improvement of the general lot of all citizens.

We shall support Negro business institutions, and all other business or industrial organizations that follow the ideally American practice of offering employment and advancement on the job without reference to race, or religion, or color.

We shall support labor unions out of the belief that Negroes, the preponderant number of whom are workingmen and workingwomen, cannot secure adequate wages and decent working conditions unless they are organized into unions of their own choice.

We shall support candidates for public office whose platforms and records indicate support of the objectives which we endorse.

It is only fair to add that our support of the democratic system will not blind us to its shortcomings nor deter us from seeking its improvement. By the same token, we shall not spare criticism of individuals or organizations when their conduct merits it.

The affirmative program we have just outlined carries with it a pledge of opposition to opponents of our aims.

We shall oppose communism, and oppose it vigorously and with every means in our power, because its triumph would mean the destruction of the democratic system to which we are committed. That means that we shall oppose Communists and their stooges, Negro and white, in their attempts to win converts to their cause, or win political office, or assume leadership in civic and community organizations.

We shall oppose racial discrimination and its handmaiden, racial segregation, and all individuals and organizations which countenance or connive at discrimination or segregation.

Negroes have many problems other than those growing out of their racial status. Like other Americans they are, or should be, concerned with international relations, with adequacy of national defense, with problems of local government, and with social reforms of a general nature.

Laying aside details for the moment, we shall generally support the United Nations, extension of social security, adequate care for the aged, a housing program to afford decent shelter for all, and a military policy based on the realities on the world situation. We shall insist on preservation of the civil liberties guaranteed in the Constitution.

In municipal affairs we shall support every move for better transportation, better schools, and a generally higher level of police protection. We shall support measures to curb juvenile delinquency, and public health programs designed to lower death rates and stay the ravages of disease.

It is plain enough that this ambitious program cannot be realized without the support of the people of this community.

We must have readers.

We must have advertisers—and we can keep advertisers only if our readers respond to their advertisements.

We must have the support of those institutions, organizations, and individuals to whom we have made this pledge of support.

This editorial, then, is both a statement and an appeal.

It is a frank revelation of our aims.

It is just as frank an appeal for popular support.

We have undertaken this venture out of a profound belief that Los Angeles deserves a better newspaper than it has had for the past 2 years. We want to give you the kind of a newspaper that Los Angeles deserves.

If you agree that this city does deserve a better newspaper and that our program as outlined here promises such a newspaper, we urge you to help us realize that goal—by subscribing to the Eagle or by buying it at your nearest newsstand, and by telling your friends about us.

If you're in business we want your advertising, and if you're not you can help us by patronizing those who do advertise in the Eagle and by requesting the firms with which you do business to advertise with us.

We want your frank criticism, too.

We want you to tell us about your problems and what you think we can, or ought to do about them.

Out of the cooperation between the staff, and you as readers, we can together fashion a newspaper that will hasten that good day when the democratic system fulfills its promise of equality for all men.

LOREN MILLER.

Tribute to Finnish Maritime Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me paying tribute to the Finnish maritime industry, and to the sons of Finland, whose integrity of character makes them such outstanding citizens of our country, and of my State of Michigan in particular.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO FINNISH MARITIME INDUSTRY

Recently I was privileged to be among those invited to the harbor in Alexandria, Va., to attend a reception for a shiny new 414-foot ocean-going motorship, the *Finntrader*, here on its maiden voyage from the Republic of Finland. It is a modern, streamlined freighter, with superbly fine quarters for 12 passengers, and capacity for 6,000 tons of cargo. It is owned by Finnlines, Ltd., a subsidiary of Enso-Gutzeit, the largest producer of pulp paper and wallboard in Finland.

It wasn't so many years ago that Finland got started as an independent Nation, following the First World War when it divorced itself from the crumbling empire of the czars. It set up a constitutional government and remains today the only one of the many postwar governments of that day to survive in its original form. All the others have disappeared or are disguised as free units under Communist totalitarianism.

We of America are proud of Finland. We are proud of her fealty to democratic principles; we are proud of her bravery under fire; we are proud of her integrity and honesty in meeting her obligations. It was a worth-while act on the part of the United States to pass the bill, of which I had the honor to be a cosponsor, which diverted future debt payments by Finland on her First World War obligations to the education of students and the interchange of scientific and technical information. That program is proceeding satisfactorily, and the future will show the true and lasting value of it.

To return to this new evidence of Finnish enterprise, the *Finntrader*: It is an eye-filling sight. It rides well, says the master, Capt. Einar Marander. "Our maiden voyage was unique because it was uneventful," the captain explained. He said the ship rode so well that no one got seasick, even those who had never been at sea before.

The ship was launched early this year in Holland, where she was built according to Finnish plans. *Finntrader* was christened by Mrs. Greta Skogster Lehtinen, wife of William Lehtinen, managing director of Enso-Gutzeit. Mrs. Lehtinen, a noted designer of textiles, planned the entire decorative scheme of the interior of the vessel. Her picture hangs proudly in the main saloon.

The plans of the company, I am told, are to construct three more similar ships. Orders for two have already been placed with Dutch shipyards. The provisional names of the two will be *Finnmerchant* and *Finnsoyager*. These new units in an expanding Finnish merchant marine bring to light the brilliant history of the Finns in maritime annals.

For years, Finnish sailing ships were the glory of the seas. Used in the wheat trade primarily, they were trim and speedy and plied the seven seas before the winds. Some of the greatest sea legends revolve around the tales of these Finnish windjammers.

In the 1850's and 1860's, our own Pacific coast records show that five out of every seven sailing masters in the booming gold-rush trade were Finns. San Francisco named a street for them. The maritime history of the Pacific would not be complete unless we mentioned the fact that two Finnish admirals, in the Russian service, were governors of what is now Alaska in the days before we purchased that territory from the Russians. Their headquarters were at Sitka. One was Admiral Adolf Etholin, called the "builder of Alaska," and the other was Admiral Johan Humpus Furuhjelm. Etholin served in the 1840's and Furuhjelm in the early 1860's.

Now, with Finland as an independent republic, the maritime capabilities begin to show themselves again, and Finland's expanding commerce makes a new start after the disasters of two wars with Russia. Commerce over the seven seas, says President Lehtinen, will be their motto.

We, of Michigan, are proud of the Finnish traditions of personal honesty, industry, and forthrightness, which has made them such valuable settlers in our own countryside and such good American citizens.

Finland, too, can be proud of the record these Finns have made in the New World, participating in and helping maintain our American institutions.

Necessary Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, sooner or later Congress must face the growing demand that some action be taken to tighten controls on certain of our relief programs, and one of these is the proposition that persons receiving certain public assistance be removed from the protection of secrecy.

The following editorial from the Tusla (Okla.) Daily World points up a lot of public thinking these days on this subject and indicates a strong interest in legislation now pending before the Congress. I present this editorial here because I feel it contains merit:

Two highly controversial bills, which have been introduced in Congress, would amend the Social Security Act to permit States to make welfare department records a matter of public information. The Federal Government pays approximately one-half of the money for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children and general assistance. For States to receive these grants, observance of the Government's order keeping assistance records confidential is compulsory. Several States, however, are considering legislation to publicize the relief rolls. It will require an act of Congress to change the protective phrase of the Social Security Act. Opponents of the proposed legislation contend the indiscriminate publishing of welfare information would be humiliating to the majority of worthy welfare recipients. Supporters of the legislation seem to have the stronger argument. They rightly contend if this information is made public it will help to eliminate the many chiselers and improve the efficiency of State welfare departments. Publicizing the relief rolls would prove extremely beneficial.

German War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated May 1, 1951, addressed by Frederick C. McKee, chairman of the Committee on National Affairs, to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, and published under the heading "Nuremberg commutations." The letter deals with commutations of the sentences of 79 German war criminals.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUREMBERG COMMUTATIONS—WAR CRIMINALS

To the Christian Science Monitor:

The recent commutation by High Commissioner McCloy of the sentences of 79 German war criminals convicted of heinous crimes against humanity is alarming. Among the criminals, of whom 21 now escape the death sentence and 34 are set free, are Nazi officials who planned and executed Hitler's murder program, who directed a campaign of wholesale slaughter in the occupied areas, and who committed atrocities in the concentration camps. These sentences had previously been confirmed by General Clay upon the advice of counsel of impeccable integrity and competence.

The Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals, appointed by Mr. McCloy, heard only the lawyers representing the convicted criminals, representatives of the prosecution not being allowed to participate. In recommending the reduction of sentences they nevertheless pointed out that they were not entitled to grant relief beyond that warranted by mitigating circumstances and fair consideration of individual situations. They further stated that clemency may be an encouraging example, but a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder would be a mockery. It would undo what Nuremberg has accomplished if in the end we were guided entirely by considerations of sympathy or generosity. Executive clemency does not exist to that end.

But the fact is that these commutations are a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder, constitute a mockery of what Nuremberg has accomplished, and are dangerous for the following reasons:

1. They tend to throw into doubt the entire basis, procedure, and judgments of the trials conducted by the United States military tribunals at Nuremberg. Although both Mr. McCloy and the members of his clemency board defend the Nuremberg trials, it would have been more appropriate to sustain the results of the trials by confirming rather than by upsetting the verdicts. In granting the commutations expediency appears to have been a factor in seeking the favor of those elements in Germany whose devotion to democracy is suspect.

2. At a time when it is contemplated that Germany be granted greater independence, to reduce the sentences of the perpetrators of inhumanities, many of whom are now able to return to public life, hardly encourages the democratic elements in Germany.

3. The commutation of the sentences of Nazi war criminals has alarmed our allies among the democratic nations of Western Europe and among the believers in democracy in the countries behind the iron curtain.

4. If these commutations were intended to placate German opinion in the effort to make Western Germany a bulwark against the very real threat of Soviet aggression, such a policy of expediency does not accomplish its purpose and leads to other evils. Reports already indicate that the Germans are not satisfied with the extent of the commutations and are urging the release of all war criminals. The United States cannot safely copy the Russian technique of currying favor with former Nazi leaders, for these criminals are basically totalitarians, and hence more sympathetic to the totalitarian east than the democratic west.

FREDERICK C. MCKEE,
Chairman, Committee on National Affairs.

NEW YORK.

Attitude of British Toward America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The British," written by Bruce Barton and published in the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post-Times of April 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRITISH

(By Bruce Barton)

Dr. George Riley, the famous osteopath, was once invited to meet George Bernard Shaw, a devotee of osteopathy.

They had hardly shaken hands before Shaw burst into bitter vituperation of America.

Dr. Riley stood it for about 3 minutes and then cried out: "Stop that. You ought to be ashamed of yourself. How dare you, a man whose food and clothes and roof-tree are principally paid for by the money of American book buyers and playgoers, how dare you say such things about a country and a people of which you are so abysmally ignorant. I never knew such impudence."

Shaw shut his mouth. A look of amazement came into his eyes, but with a glint of admiration. He told a friend afterward: "That man Riley is one of the most interesting people I ever met."

Too many British authors and lecturers have accepted our hospitality—often lavish and effusive to the point of servility—taken their winnings and gone back home to write and talk scurvily about us.

Too many of the British people as a whole, jealous of our prosperity, are unfriendly at heart. For years they sold us the idea that, except for the protection of their fleet, we would have been helpless. But they never said from whom their fleet was protecting us; and in our Civil War, when our need of help was most desperate, their seapower, instead of helping us, tried to destroy our merchant marine.

Yet I admire the British. They write the English language better than we—we have no Shakespeare, no Milton. Their administration of justice is swifter, cheaper, and more dignified. In the conduct of foreign affairs they are so much smarter that it just isn't funny.

Indeed, one of my distinguished lawyer friends, a long-time subscriber to the London Spectator, tells me that by reading it he has been able to predict 6 months in advance just what our State Department would do—the British loan, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, etc.

Lately, Russia has been making our foreign policy. When she lets out a blast, we promptly blast her back. When she nudges the North Koreans into starting a rumpus, we obligingly reply with our whole Army and Heaven only knows how many billions of dollars, while she loses not one soldier or one ruble.

"Dancing to Russia's fiddle is getting us nowhere. We might better go back to letting the British manage us. They know their way around, especially in the Orient, where they operated for more than 150 years at a handsome profit.

"Many of us have another idea—that we ought to have our own American foreign policy. But since, to make any sense, this would have to based on America first, it seems to be out. Every other nation can be for itself first. But not the United States. The mere suggestion is branded 'un-American'."

The Beef Price Roll-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial referring to the beef price roll-back, which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on May 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Speaking to his press conference, President Truman said that the beef price roll-back will be enforced. He dismissed the protests of the spokesmen of the livestock industry with the observation that they are like all others who scream when their toes are stepped on. He said that if there is to be a beginning with controls it might as well be right there.

Would that the issues raised by the livestock industry could be put aside so simply. President Truman begs the question by avoiding the issue. The livestock people do not, of course, like to be singled out for this kind of treatment, but the essence of what they are saying is that this attempt to roll back the price of one meat commodity, will not have the result for which the administration hopes.

Beef prices are high because there is money enough in the hands of consumers to buy beef. Unless measures are taken that reduce the pressure of demand, the result of the roll-back will be either to drive the livestock industry into production of other meats, or to divert a large part of our beef production into black market channels.

The consequence of the first result will be that there is less beef, and the administration will be compelled to take the next step, which is rationing, if there is to be a fair distribution of the available supply among all who want it.

The consequence of the second possible result will be that beef prices will remain high, and the existing marketing, processing and distribution system will be disrupted, with vast waste of the various secondary food and byproducts that are produced by the highly developed factory methods of our great packing plants. This is to make no mention of the fact that the highly refined system of Government inspection and grading goes out of the window when the processing of meat animals is diverted from the regular channels into fly-by-night local slaughterhouses in every nook and cranny of the livestock country.

Despite Mr. Truman's bland confidence that the roll-black can be enforced, this second result is the one that is likely to be predominant, though there will also be a considerable contraction in the production, the feeding and finishing of cattle. The Government did not succeed in enforcement during the war and it is in a weaker position for the job today than it was then.

It does small good to denounce some people for going into black market production and slaughtering and others for patronizing such sources of supply, though the denunciation is deserved. Neither does it contribute anything to solution of this problem to say that it is confession of national moral delinquency to point out the probability of a breakdown in enforcement of such price controls, if they stand alone.

The whole point of the protest of the livestock industry is that a beef price roll-back in the absence of basic measures to remove the causes of inflation through drastic taxation, harsh commercial credit control and rigid wage controls, will not work. Treating a symptom, and one isolated symptom at that, leaving a thousand other avenues for excess buying power to take, is doomed to failure.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Seaway and the Waterway," appearing in the Chicago Tribune for May 3, 1951, relating to the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway on the Chicago plans for developing traffic on the Illinois seaway. It is interesting to note that this editorial raises exactly the same points regarding our sovereignty over Lake Michigan as those to which I first called attention in my statement to the House Committee on Public Works on April 12 of this year, which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEAWAY AND THE WATERWAY

The Buick Motor Division of General Motors Corp. has announced plans to build a multimillion-dollar plant for the assembly of jet aircraft engines near Willow Springs. The plant will receive its fuel, both coal and oil, by barge on the Chicago sanitary and ship canal.

On the banks of the same canal two huge power plants are under construction. One is the Commonwealth Edison Co.'s $70,000,000 Ridgeland generating station, already in partial operation. The other is the Will County power plant of the Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois near Lemont. These plants, too, will receive their fuel by water.

Industry thus is recognizing the importance of the Illinois waterway, although few persons in Washington seem to know or care that it exists. Administration leaders instead are yammering for the billion-dollar St. Lawrence seaway project, and Secretary of State Acheson, in his testimony for the project, referred to the objectionable diversion of Lake Michigan water into the canal that makes the Illinois waterway possible. Acheson also remarked that the diversion issue was settled by the 1930 Supreme Court decision.

This is what might be expected from Truman's Secretary of State. He would like to see Lake Michigan made an international body of water, even though the lake lies wholly within the United States. Trustees of the Chicago Sanitary District properly retorted that the diversion issue is far from being settled, that it can be reopened at any time by Congress, and that it ought to be reopened.

Chicago has met all the requirements of the 1930 Supreme Court decision, spending many millions of dollars on sewage-treatment works. It is now plain that the diversion limit set by the Court is insufficient for the drainage cana and waterway and that an increase would have negligible effects on water levels in the Great Lakes.

The Lakes-to-Gulf waterway must be protected. One way to do so is to insist that the agreement between the United States and Canada for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway specify that adequate diversion of water from Lake Michigan be guaranteed in perpetuity for operation of the Lake-to-Gulf system.

With such a provision in the agreement, the argument that the seaway project is essential to the national defense would have more validity.

Planning Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated May 10, 1951, addressed by Charles Scott Williams to the editor of the Williamsport (Pa.) Sun, discussing the results of planning on United States foreign policy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1951.

To the EDITOR, WILLIAMSPORT SUN,
Williamsport, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Although General MacArthur has retarded some of the policies of General Marshall and the State Department planners, it is imperative that our Nation receive a change of blood, inspiring a change of thought, with an injection of character,

This is the only way we can be successful in abolishing war through world government.

Since these planners have been in power—Russia was recognized by them in the thirties—among other things the following has happened:

1. The Russian Communists have taken over Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Bessarabia, Manchuria, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, part of Germany, part of Finland, Czechoslovakia, and China. We raised no voice of protest, and as to Poland and Manchuria, we cooperated.

2. Our soldiers were halted 15 miles from Berlin to allow the Russians to capture this important city, and our planners scoffed at Churchill's idea of attacking through the Balkans, this would have allowed our Armies to occupy the Balkans.

3. Berlin was divided into zones, with the consent of General Marshall, who was on the scene at that time, and we now have to travel through Russian territory to go to the American zone of Berlin. Insulted, we had to use an airlift to feed our Berlin Germans.

4. We withdrew all support from our friend, Kai-shek, allowed the Communist Chinese, with the aid of Russia, to absorb China. Our General Marshall attempted to get Kai-shek to form a coalition government with the Communists, and when Kai-shek refused to do this, and refused to hand over Manchuria, these State Department planners were angered. MacArthur has said that you can no more mix the Communists and Nationalists, than mix oil and water. Our planners should have known this, as the Russian Communists did not even allow our planes to land on their soil when they were our allies.

5. Russia was given an important part in the Japanese peace treaty, and was handed control of Manchuria, despite the fact that the European war was finished at that time and an early end to the Japanese war was expected. Not a Russian shot was heard in the Japanese war.

6. Our planners put us into Korea, withdrew us, returned us, and now, we, and the South Koreans, representing the United Nations, have to furnish 85 percent of the troops. The other United Nations deal with the enemy.

7. These planners have us involved in a major war within 5 years of World War II, in which we Americans have had casualties as great as our casualties in the first year of World War II; this Korean war has already lasted longer than the time it took the Americans and their allies to defeat the Germans after we landed in Normandy.

8. Our country has spent billions of our national wealth in assisting countries, who now, because of trade, or otherwise, write a set of rules for the Korean war in which we are not allowed to bomb bases of aggressors, nor blockade the enemy. Our Lycoming County has had more casualties in this war than the casualties of many of our allies.

9. Our planners were so negligent that the Russians were allowed to steal the atom bomb and other secrets of the Nation; Communist sympathizers have been allowed in high places.

We are now in worse shape than when these planners began. Perhaps some of them wanted it this way.

Our everlasting thanks must go to General MacArthur. Since he centralized the thoughts of the people on our plight, the following has happened:

1. The British are tightening control of their ports with respect to war material and aid to Chinese Communists.

2. Our Government has publicly declared that Formosa will not be turned over to the Communists, and that America will object to the seating of Chinese Communists in the world government.

3. Military assistance is being sent to Formosa.

4. An airfield near the Manchurian border has been bombed.

5. The Russians have withheld aid to the Chinese Communists in their latest aggression.

It is important that we keep this matter above a party basis. However, no longer can those garbed in the cloak of the administration's past thinking say "This is our course" and expect our representatives, or the people, to blindly follow. Our way of life is based on the freedom of the individual and the dignity of man. It is now time for us to step forward with those who believe in our way of life. In so doing, we cannot besmirch our principles, nor can we think of our own safety while our boys are dying in Korea.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES SCOTT WILLIAMS.

Who Took the Record at Wake Island?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Chicago Tribune under date of May 7:

WHO TOOK THE RECORD AT WAKE ISLAND?

CHICAGO, *May 4, 1951.*

You can take it from a court reporter of 32 years' experience, and some standing, that the young woman who says she took down the MacArthur-Truman meeting at Wake Island is just plain lying

In the first place, no court reporter worth the name would take on such a task as trying to report the verbatim conversations of a flock of men seated in another room, and every court reporter in the United States with 2 years' experience will say the same, and laugh.

In the second place, the most experienced court reporter in the world just wouldn't know who was saying what, even if he could hear what was being said from that distance.

In the third place, it is a well known fact among court reporters that they must be as close as possible to the people doing the talking, and most certainly must have the ability to see the person talking to know whose name to put before a given remark. A distance of 20 feet from any fast talker renders his speech so difficult that an experienced court reporter, if he knew in advance he would be confronted with such a task, would refuse the job, even if he were paid the going rate in Chicago.

How, then, can any one say that a strip of a girl, beautiful, too, just picked up her pencil, luckily had a pad of penciled paper, had no assignment to do the job, is not a verbatim reporter (or she would be a stenographer, believe me), and just out of the sheer love of writing shorthand 100 words a minute beyond her speed, took on a reporting task that no seasoned court reporter in the United States would assume under like circumstances?

Nuts, says every court reporter in America—2,000 of them. And nuts, says every office stenographer in America—100,000 of them. All of us, pros and amateurs alike, would run from the job. But she just thought it seemed the natural thing to do. Say, "stenos" of America, was that the human thing to do?

Who had her lie like that?

A. E. CARVER.

CHICAGO, *May 4, 1951.*

The fact that a State Department employee took notes, unknown to General MacArthur, at the Wake Island conference in October, proves they were attempting to find some excuse at that time to get rid of him.

The stenographer did not just happen to be there, nor just happen to take notes. They planned it that way.

PATRIOTIC AMERICAN.

A Couple of Straws in the Wind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of May 9, 1951:

ABROAD—A COUPLE OF STRAWS IN THE WIND

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

Last week when the United States presented to the United Nations a resolution calling for an arms embargo on Communist China the proposal had a cold and critical reception from Great Britain, Australia, and other nations opposed from the first to applying sanctions to the aggressor in the Korean war. These nations were reluctant even to call the Peiping government an aggressor, and their reluctance, paradoxically, was based on the same reasons that impelled the administration to turn down General MacArthur's recommendations to bomb the Chinese bases in Manchuria. They feared it might extend the war and would certainly slam the door on any hope of ending it by negotiations.

Whether or not this hope has been abandoned, the attitude of these Powers has changed in the last few days. Reports from the United Nations indicate that opposition to the resolution has evaporated and that it will probably be passed by the Additional Measures Committee and submitted next week to the General Assemuly.

BRITISH TRADE WITH CHINA

At the same time Sir Hartley Shawcross, president of the British Board of Trade, replied to questions in the House of Commons on General MacArthur's charges that great quantities of war materials have been passing into Communist China through Hong Kong. Sir Hartley admitted that both Britain's and Hong Kong's trade with China increased in the first quarter of 1951. He explained, however, that goods of direct or indirect military importance were "totally prohibited," and added that in view of the failure of the good offices committee of the U. N. to obtain a settlement in Korea plans for further action were being discussed with the United Nations, the United States, and the colonial governments that export rubber and other raw materials to China.

There is no question that cutting off commerce with China would be a severe blow to British trade and would endanger the life of Hong Kong as a British colony. But "loyalty to the United Nations must be the keystone of our policy," comments the London News-Chronicle. "If the United Nations should decide to impose economic sanctions on China," says the London Times, "or if, as a result of further negotiations, the British Government and people were finally convinced that no alternative policy was possible, this country would take every step to render the blockade as effective as such a blockade could ever be."

This is a straw in a veering wind. Another straw is the swing toward the American point of view regarding negotiations with Moscow that has developed out of the interminable argument with Mr. Gromyko in Paris. Our reservations on the value of a foreign ministers conference before the west is militarily stronger in relation to the Soviet Union irritated the British and the French. They were convinced that the Russians wished to talk and that our open doubts about the efficacy of "another try" at this time blocked a possible approach to a settlement. We went along, and the American deputy in Paris has cooperated fully in the effort to open the way; he has come up with dozens of suggestions to end the deadlock and made no move to break up the meeting. After 10 wasted weeks, it is the French and the British who are discouraged and talk of adjournment.

American foreign policy has been under such a barrage of criticism at home and abroad that it is pleasant to perceive signs that our allies are edging toward our side in areas where their misgivings about our policy are greatest. We are listening these days to something new in history—a great power arguing with itself, in a loud and solemn voice, about what it will do or will not do in a crisis that involves the future of the world. In the reverberating thunders of this extraordinary controversy, it is just possible that other nations as well as ourselves are learning to understand better the issues and the risks that lie before us all. When the powers that opposed it change their minds about embargoing arms to China, when the British and the French are forced by the Soviet tactics in Paris to agree that Russia is not ready to negotiate any question, it means that time and events have worked to vindicate our policy and bring our allies nearer to our estimate of the world situation.

A COORDINATION OF POLICY

This shift of position is not big enough to close the gap between opposing views. Nor is it altogether the effect of the negative attitude of Moscow and Peiping toward any form of negotiation. The British have been assured by Charles E. Wilson that the United States does not intend to hog all the raw materials essential to keep war and peace production on something like an even keel. Furthermore, they are beginning to be as worried as we are by the steady deterioration of Anglo-American relations.

The continental nations, on their side, are increasingly concerned over the strain between Britain and the United States. The British will have no part either in the Schuman plan or the project for a European federation. Hence, Dr. Stikker, Chairman of the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers, begins to talk of a European-Atlantic Union as a way of making Britain the link in a bicontinental alliance. What the signs add up to is that Western Europe is beginning to realize that the Atlantic alliance has to prove itself on both sides of the ocean. To coordinate a multinational policy is as important to its strength as to coordinate a multinational army.

Changing Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for May 14, 1951:

CHANGING PATTERN

The "mores of the community" which have so frequently been made a pretext for the continuance of racial segregation are not immutable. They are undergoing an accelerating change. But change takes place only under the impetus of leadership; it takes place when community leaders have the resolution and intelligence required to break new ground—the kind of resolution and intelligence shown the other day by members of the District Medical Society. The society voted to admit qualified Negro physicians to membership. The action deserves, we think, community commendation.

The exclusion of Negroes from the Medical Society in years past has been a reflection of prejudice where it should be least tolerated—that is, among scientists. And of course the example set by the doctors, precisely because they are so highly respected, has been followed in less enlightened quarters. The change of direction they have now initiated will exercise, we are confident, a powerful influence toward the development of a healthier, more rational community pattern. We hope the doctors will follow it up by efforts to enlarge the meager opportunities for Negro medical students to receive training in local medical schools and hospitals—and so to become qualified for membership in the Medical Society.

Address of Hon. Page Belcher, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Hon. PAGE BELCHER, of Oklahoma, to the Republican National Committee in Tulsa, Okla., May 11, 1951:

I want to join with my colleague, George Schwabe, our national committeeman, Bailie Vinson, and His Honor, George A. Stoner, in welcoming all of you folks to our great State of Oklahoma. We hope and trust that your stay here will be pleasant as well as profitable.

It is more or less a time-honored custom for speakers to open a speech with a humorous story. I am sorry, but in the very limited time that I have at my disposal I cannot indulge in humor. In addition to that, with America facing this terrible crisis, I feel too deadly serious to want to tell a funny story if I knew one. In my opinion, America is facing one of the gravest crises that have confronted this Nation in all of its history. The decisions that are made within the next few months may well determine not only the future of our Nation but the future of the world as well.

That the people of America are fully aware of the seriousness of the situation is demonstrated, I think, by the fact that 2,000,000 communications reached the Members of Congress in the first 72 hours after the dismissal of General MacArthur. Much as the American people resented the dismissal of General MacArthur, I think it was but the final straw that caused a blow-off of steam that had been generating in their minds for many months. As many people wrote to me, "This is the final blunder;" "This is the straw that broke the camel's back;" "I cannot keep still any longer." The American people were already aroused over deep freezes, mink coats, collusions between gangsters and public officials, deficit financing, unnecessary Government expense, lack of integrity in Government, as well as many other things that had tried their patience. Their tempers were aroused.

There are good people in this country who feel that in the interest of unity everyone should submerge his own convictions, and, right or wrong, line up behind the commander in chief. Unity is a great thing, but unity behind the wrong cause has caused the destruction of more nations than any other one thing in the world. There was unity behind Hitler—there was unity behind Mussolini—apparently there is unity behind Stalin. If the signers of the Declaration of Independence had believed more in unity than in the strong convictions which they had that freedom was worth dying for, we would now have Clement Attlee as prime minister, and we would be a part of the British empire. God save the day that we have unity in this country behind an administration that is more interested in the preservation of England's foreign trade with the Chinese Communists than in the safety of the boys in Korea or the preservation of America. If that constitutes unity, may God give me none of it.

Are our boys dying for a cause, or are they dying to protect British commerce with the Communists in order that the Labor Government may continue to buy elections with socialized medicine and Government handouts? Even the common people of Great Britain are getting tired of their Socialist government, and the Labor Party is just hanging on by the skin of its teeth. I heard one man say he was getting tired of hearing the Republicans complain that our allies are doing nothing. I told him the statement that our allies are doing nothing is wrong. Great Britain sold $40,000,000 worth of war materials to the Chinese Communists in 1 month. During a 9-month period in 1950, there were 120,000 tons of rubber sent to Red China. You surely would not say that Great Britain was doing nothing.

The people of America, in my opinion, are crying for courageous leadership. They want a political party with a purpose. They are willing to follow a leadership with ideals, courage, and integrity. I pray that in the interest of saving America the Republican Party will give to the people of this Nation that kind of courage and leadership. The Republican Party has the greatest opportunity in all of its history, not only to win a great victory in 1952 but to be the instrumentality through which the greatest Government ever conceived by the mind of man may be preserved for posterity and the world saved from communism. In my opinion, the Republican Party can win a great victory in 1952 if we as a party are worthy of being entrusted with the future of this country.

The American people want the truth. The American people can stand the truth. The Fair Deal way of winning votes has been with promises. The people don't want promises—they want facts. One of the most peculiar things about the great backing MacArthur has received is that he has promised nothing. He doesn't ask to lead us to a promised land. He gives no assurance of peace, even less of prosperity. He does not promise good prices, full employment, or security. He merely says that we are in a desperate predicament, and people go wild with excitement and cheering.

This is a contrast to the current standards of winning elections, and the Fair Dealers are bewildered. Washington, at Valley Forge, could inspire his ragged soldiers to even greater sacrifice. Lincoln could face up nobly to disaster. Churchill could call

for blood, sweat, and tears. The people following this leadership were fighting for ideals, not Government hand-outs or RFC loans.

Throughout all history great waves of moral regeneration come from the common people. I hope and pray that the leadership of our great party may catch the inspiration and offer the kind of leadership the people hunger for. I hope we shall quit trying to out-promise the Truman administration and will offer the American people honesty in government, sincerity of purpose, and an adherence to Christian principles. May God give us the strength and the courage to provide the leadership which will save this Nation in its darkest hour, to lead it on to greater heights, and to preserve the last and best hope for all of humanity.

Address of Dr. Umphrey Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 2, Dr. Umphrey Lee, president of Southern Methodist University, of Dallas, Tex., delivered a thoughtful and significant address at the annual dinner of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Dr. Lee's speech, which follows, goes to the heart of some of the most serious problems this country faces:

The subject of this meeting has to do with our freedom, and no more timely topic could be discussed. You will not think me irreverent or merely facetious if I begin by quoting an old nursery rhyme.

"Little Jack Horner sat in a corner
Eating his Christmas pie;
He put in his thumb and pulled out a plum
And said, "What a smart boy am I."

I do not quote this to criticize young Mr. Horner's production methods, although some might think his extraction process a little crude. The point I would like to make is that he missed the essential fact of his situation.

What young Horner thought was important was, of course, his own action in taking the plums out of the pie. It seems not to have occurred to him that the really important thing was that he had a pie that had plums in it. Literally, he had been handed the plums on some kind of a platter.

I mention this only as an illustration of what I want to say to you. The greatest treasures of this our land are those which this generation did not invent, did not procure and some of which we have not even been able to preserve. If we can stop admiring the ingenuity with which we have been availing ourselves of these treasures long enough to ask ourselves where they came from and how we are going to keep them, we may perhaps do ourselves and our posterity much good. I am not competent to speak to you about the natural resources of this country which have made our material wealth, but I do want to say something to you about some of the spiritual treasures for whose existence we are no more responsible than we are for the coal and the iron and the oil.

One of the greatest of our spiritual legacies is this freedom you have been talking about. It is somewhat disconcerting to look back and see how freedom has developed with us. The people who came to this country in its founding days were people who wanted freedom, and they wanted freedom because they had had something else. They knew what it was to live under governments which regulated the details of a man's life, which decided what kind of societies he could belong to, how he would earn his living and how he would conduct himself. When we come to consider how we are going to preserve our American liberties, we must recall that our present generation is a generation that has always known our kind of freedom and therefore does not have as great a concern for it as for other things which this generation has not had. We have not had peace. We have not had security—therefore we long for peace and we long for security. If we had, as our fathers, experienced the tyrannies of an overbearing government long enough and in sufficient severity, we might be as passionate for liberty as they were.

Moreover, our fathers who wanted freedom had a chance to find it and develop it in a big country. It is impossible for us today to appreciate what it meant in the first decades of this country's history for a man to be able to move out of one neighborhood into another, out of one part of the country into another, to leave, if he desired, the civilized settlements and go to the frontier. We know, of course, that a man oftentimes did not better his condition but he thought that he could, and the ability to change his conditions by moving was one of the most important things that happened to people in these early days. By moving to a less settled community a man found himself with less inequalities. Birth meant nothing, wealth meant very little since there was no wealth. The kind of liberty that we have now was developed in a country where a man could get up and leave an old community if he did not like it.

The fact that this was a big country meant also that men did not have to live in constant contact with neighbors who might be irritating or dominating. Men prized their independence and resented interference with their private affairs. As the cowboy poet put it, "I like my fellow man the best when he is scattered some."

Our liberty grew also partly because of what our people did not have. One of the greatest of living British historians, in speaking of eighteenth-century England, said that English liberty in that period owed more to the lack of communications than to Magna Charta. Until the latter part of the nineteenth century communities in the United States were so isolated from each other that of necessity they developed an independent spirit and the habits of freedom. One hundred years ago it would have taken so long for a directive from Washington to have reached Texas that whatever local problems the directive might have aimed to settle would have been disposed of before the message reached its destination, supposing that the Texans would have paid any attention to it when it did arrive. No one for a moment suggests that you can have liberty only in a land with poor communications, but the kind of liberty that we have grew up partly because we did have poor communications. No central government can operate in the fashion of modern governments without modern means of communications. And now that we have these means there will never again be an opportunity for communities to develop a spirit of self-government and habits of our kind of freedom unless they have them to begin with.

This country was also favored by the fact that there were large bodies of water on each side of it. From 1812 until this present hour there has never been an invasion by a foreign power unless, indeed, we are to remember one or two crossings of the border by Villa and his bands. We have had our wars, and terrible wars some of them have been, but for almost the entire nineteenth century we were free to deal with our continental problems without foreign interference. What this meant is that in this country men have had a chance to develop their ideas and to form their habits without having now and again to repel some foreign invader who sought to impose a different way of life.

What I am saying is that our liberties have developed under certain peculiar conditions, conditions which will never happen again in the history of the world unless, indeed, some major catastrophe should wipe us all out and we should have to crawl up again from the caves and the jungles toward civilized life. I believe this to be true, but I also believe that we can keep the essential parts of our freedom if we are wise enough and courageous enough. To do this will be difficult because we are not aided by those fortuitous circumstances which aided our fathers. We no longer live in a land where a man can change his situation by moving from one community to another. One community is much alike another now, and while economic reasons may cause a change, there is not much chance that man in moving from one community to another will move into a land of greater freedom and less inequality. Neither is it probable that men in our time can live in such isolation that they are compelled to work out their own problems without recourse to some central government. Nor will ever again on this earth be a people so remote because of natural barriers that they are secure from invasion by predatory nations.

In short, as we have inherited freedoms for which we did not labor, so also, in a sense, did our fathers. It is true that they wanted freedom and worked mightily for it; but it is also true that they found themselves in a land where freedom was the natural way of life. We, their successors, however, live in a world which seems designed to promote dependence, instead of independence, subservience instead of liberty. If, then, the material conditions under which our kind of freedom naturally flourishes—that is, lots of room, poor communications, isolation—are gone, what can be done to preserve this great inheritance? You have doubtless heard much of this specific remedy, that bit of legislation to be passed or to be repealed. Let me respectfully make some observations on certain fundamentals.

When we talk about freedom we usually talk about individual freedom, the right of John Doe to do this or that. Unquestionably, this is central in our liberties, as the Bill of Rights testifies. But this freedom is impossible in any sense which we Americans would recognize without a further freedom: The freedom of John Doe and of Richard Roe and of any other citizens to join themselves together for worship, for instruction, for pleasure, for profit, or for any other purpose not inconsistent with public safety or public morals. The freedom of association, of societies, or—in the technical sense—the freedom of corporations is an essential and absolutely necessary part of our liberties.

If John Doe wants to join a singing society composed only of red-headed men, that is his privilege. If he wants to worship God by standing on his head every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 9 until 10 a. m., that is his privilege, so long as he does not disturb his neighbors. If he wants to join with others to promote the theory that the moon is made of green cheese, that is his business. The right of free association, within the limits necessary for public welfare, is a part of our liberties.

There is no need to pretend that this, or any other liberty is absolute. If ever anyone believed that all restrictions could be removed and some beneficent providence

would make all men just and honorable, it would seem that recent congressional investigations would make such faith a little difficult to hold. In simple truth, no one in this world ever did have absolute freedom.

One of the most distinguished lawyers who ever lived in our city was a man of great humor and some eccentricities. In his old age he was one evening playing some game with his cronies when one of the old men said, "Colonel, I expect we had better be getting home." The colonel assured his guests that they need be in no hurry and the game was resumed. A little while later another old man said, "Colonel, I think we had better be going. Your wife won't want you to stay up so late." The colonel drew himself up and said, "Gentlemen, I would have you know that I am Caesar in my household." Just then the colonel's wife looked around the side of the door and said, "Gentlemen, I hope you will stay just as long as you want to stay. The icebox is in the kitchen and you'll not disturb anybody at all. As for Caesar—he is coming to bed."

Nevertheless, an essential part of our freedom is that the associations to which men belong are supposed to be, insofar as is consistent with public safety and public morals, free. Let me quote from a distinguished Englishman who, nearly 40 years ago, wrote a work that ought to be better known in this country:

"You are not merely John Doe or Richard Roe, but as John may probably be a member of the Christian church by baptism, a Doe by family, an Englishman by race; all three are social institutions which have grown into you. In addition to this, you are a member of a school, an alumnus of a college, a sharer in this club, a president of that, and so forth. All these groups and unions have their effect, and limit and develop your life, make you do, or refrain from doing, what otherwise you would not, and insofar prevent you being a free and untrammeled citizen of the state. * * * It is largely to regulate such groups and to insure that they do not outstep the bounds of justice that the coercive force of the state exists. It does not create them; nor is it in many matters in direct and immediate contact with the individual."

The sense of stability and security which you and your family have does not come primarily from the fact that you recognize yourself to be a member of the American people or the American Nation. The sense of stability and security which you have is largely a result of the fact that you belong to a family, to a club, to a church, to a union, to some voluntary organization which, as the Englishman that I quoted said, is regulated by the state but is not created by the state.

Yet we are neglecting the voluntary societies whether they be business or professional, fraternal or religious, because in this country we are concentrating upon two things. In the first place, almost all that we hear about is the preservation of individual rights. In the second place, we are neglecting the preservation of our voluntary associations because we are thinking of only one voluntary association and that is the association which we call a business organization.

I trust you will believe that it is because of my devotion to American freedom, which includes my firm belief that American business ought to have as much freedom as is possible in our kind of world and with our kind of population, that I say to you this thing: Unless we preserve the freedom of other voluntary associations it will be impossible to preserve free economic institutions. There are simply not enough stockholders in this country to preserve business associations unless they are a part of a larger whole. Let me illustrate.

There are three times in a man's life when he is particularly susceptible to influence—when he is young and ambitious, when he is sick and despairing, when he is old and helpless. There was a time when at each one of these periods a man was relieved by the voluntary action of his neighbors. That time has passed. There is hardly a hospital in this country that is not being built partly or entirely by Federal funds. The aged are now the care of the Government. It seems to be entirely possible that in a short while the entire care of man's bodily wants, when he is sick and when he is old, will be in the hands of Government agencies. I sincerely hope that I am wrong about this, and I hope that our dear friends the doctors will improve their public relations sufficiently that they can convince the American public of the great need of retaining a free medical profession. But it is already true that in sickness and in old age American men and women turn to the state. If the doctors lose their fight, then two of man's neediest hours will be taken care of entirely, not by voluntary associations, but by the state.

I said that one of the times when a man is most susceptible to influence is when he is young and ambitious. I am amazed to learn that most businessmen do not seem to know that in higher education in this country exists one of the greatest strongholds of freedom from governmental control. This country, almost from its beginning, has had a dual system of higher education. Along among the nations of the world, we have had both State-controlled colleges and universities and privately controlled colleges and universities. It has given us the advantages of a State system and the independence of a private system.

This country began with a dual system; it has continued a dual system. And I find to my astonishment that many people are utterly unaware of it. They think, for example, that the only nongovernmental colleges and universities in this country are first, the Ivy League, secondly, a few small denominational colleges which are preserved for old times' sake. The truth is that 48 percent of all college and university students in America are in institutions not governed by the States, and there was never as much as half of the college and university students in State institutions until after World War II with the consequent growth of existing State institutions and the building of new ones.

The control of our colleges and universities by different groups, some of them semipolitical if not altogether political, some of them by voluntary groups of various kinds, has worked for the betterment of our total education. The interplay between the two groups has been for the good of each, and we do not believe that we shall be the better if this difference ceases to exist. All institutions that deal with the public are subject to pressures. The private institution is subject to pressures from the social system of which it is a part. It is inevitable that institutions which depend upon gifts from people who have accumulated capital or who have earned capacity should make those institutions a little less critical than they perhaps should be of the economic system that exists. On the other hand, the State institution inevitably is subjected to political pressures with which the private institution does not have to contend. But the existence of two kinds of institutions, each taking care of approximately half the college population of this country, is healthy. Many of us believe that it is very helpful for half of the college population to be told that if they desire to outstrip their contemporaries in preparation they must pay out of their own or their parents' pockets for that privilege.

But in education also private enterprise is losing out. With higher costs, with the disappearance of great wealth, and consequently of great patrons of education, and with competition from the apparently boundless pockets of State treasuries, the nongovernmental institution has come upon parlous times. And where can the independent educational institution turn?

On all sides the answer is being given: The State. It may be that the sources of income upon which private institutions have depended will dry up, that there will be nowhere to turn except to the Government. I do not need to attribute any sinister motives to anyone when I say that one of the greatest influences for promoting the spirit of freedom and of independence in this country will disappear when half of all college and university graduates are no longer educated at their own expense and at the expense of a liberal business community, in an atmosphere untroubled by political pressures.

What I am trying to say to you is that we cannot preserve the liberty of the individual without preserving also the liberty of associations, of societies, of corporations. And we cannot preserve just one kind of association. If we bring up the next generation in a country in which health, education, charitable relief, and old age are taken care of by the Government, you need not expect that business will be made a grand exception. You cannot be saved by yourselves. If independent education goes under, if the free professions go under, you haven't a chance.

There is something else that ought to be said. Freedom is expensive business: especially does it exact a high moral cost. Let me try to explain what I mean.

Just before World War II, a distinguished Italian historian said that all society is held together either by iron fetters or by silken threads. What he meant was that there are essentially two ways to have order: One is by the police state, the other is by dependence upon the moral character of a people. If a people agree that they will have elections at certain times, and that they will respect the results of those elections, you can have order without guns and bayonets. If the majority of people voluntarily obey the laws, you can have police to take care of the criminal fringe, and you have order. But there is no middle ground. If you have freedom, you must have true men.

This is why such disclosures as we have had in recent months sicken all those who love freedom. But there is something even more sinister in recent disclosures than the corruption of Government. No man ever sold influence in government unless someone bought it. No government official, no army officer ever retired to take a high-salaried place in some business which had benefited or could benefit by his influence unless that business invited him. If we expect to clean out government we must clean out our own house.

I can speak without restraint to you because, of course, no one within these walls has ever been guilty of business immorality. But decent American business must help change some habits in American society as a whole if we are going to do anything about Government immorality. And it cannot be done by laws alone. The moral climate must be changed. Every dishonest man in this country is helping to destroy our freedom. When we can no longer depend upon men's honesty, then we have no recourse but to the police. In other words, when honor is gone there is nothing left but the all-powerful state.

If we make up our mind in this country that the only question is what is legal, and that any morality that demands more than the law requires is foolishness, then there is no need to complain when some government announces the law of the dictators, that is, that the government is the only judge of what is right and wrong. If we make up

our mind that we can tolerate liars and thieves in business and ordinary society, we need not complain when we get them in Government. The Government in Washington will rarely be better than the government in the separate States or in the city of Podunk; and the Government in Washington will never be more moral than the American home. There is no use in talking about old-fashioned liberties unless we can restore the old-fashioned virtues on which these liberties were founded and on which alone they can stand.

There is nothing lacking in this country but the knowledge of what we want to preserve and the moral character to preserve it. We are supreme in military power, we are supreme in natural resources, we are great in a free tradition. There ought not to be any question of our future. A little more than 34 years ago this country declared war upon Germany and thereby entered World War I. The next morning after we declared war on Germany, a Canadian officer who had been at the front since the beginning of the struggle spoke to some graduate students in an eastern university. The officer was a Canadian novelist whose books are now forgotten. But none of those who heard him that morning will forget his first words. When he came before this little group of students, the Canadian officer said, "Gentlemen, this morning I do not know when the war will end but I know how it will end." If America can be returned to her primitive integrity in business, in Government, and in social life, we may not still be able to predict the time when the present struggle between freedom and slavery will end, but we can know how that struggle will end.

A Crucial Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article entitled "A Crucial Question" which appeared in my hometown paper, the Evansville Courier, in Evansville, Ind., on Sunday, May 13, 1951:

A CRUCIAL QUESTION

In one of the most remarkable and momentous hearings in the history of free peoples and their institutions, the differences and the points of agreement between General MacArthur and Secretary of Defense Marshall, representing the administration, have been clarified.

The area of agreement between General MacArthur and General Marshall is large. Both agree that Formosa should be held at all costs, that Red China should never be admitted to the U. N.

General MacArthur did not join the Hoover Fortress America camp. He stands, it is quite clear, on the internationalist side of Senator TAFT. He has rejected the words of those who say we made a mistake in going into Korea last summer. He grants that Europe is a vital defense bastion and it is difficult to see how his internationalist thinking can be reconciled with the Chicago Tribune which sponsors him for President.

It seems clear enough to us that General MacArthur spoke his own mind in all that mass of testimony and opinion he gave a Senate committee. He didn't fit it into anybody's political pattern.

But the major difference—and that is what all the argument simmers down to—remains between General MacArthur and General Marshall. It is over the immediate conduct of the Korean war. MacArthur wants to widen it and try to knock China out and thereby avert a clash with Russia.

Marshall wants to limit the war, so long as we have control of it, and avoid now a world war which he believes would start in China and spread to Europe quickly, in case MacArthur's program were carried out.

A major point in considering the attitudes of the two men, it is quite clear, stems from the jobs the two men have had to do. General MacArthur's job was in the Orient. General Marshall's has been to consider the over-all picture, with all the factors in the defense of America and the free world before him for continuous appraisal. The limited attitude with which General MacArthur approaches the Asiatic conflict was illustrated in his own testimony. When asked what plans he had in mind to defend the United States in the event his theory was wrong and a widening of the war in Korea brought Russia into the fray, he said that was outside his jurisdiction, or words to that effect.

Some idea of the problems of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—men who are obligated to look at all the factors involved in this perilous period—is found in the report of the research and policy committee of the Committee for Economic Development. This is a group of outstanding businessmen who several years ago set up an organization to carry on research about our greatest problems and make nonpartisan and objective surveys and reports to the people. It has won a great measure of respect.

In discussing some of the economic aspects of achieving North Atlantic security it says:

"From the point of view of European security, the main significance of the Korean war lies in the altered assessment of Soviet intentions which it has necessitated. If the Politburo is willing to induce or allow a larger ally, Red China, to become involved as the aggressor in a large-scale fight with the United States and other U. N. forces, despite a real risk of general war, might the Russians not be willing to resort to armed force to gain their objectives in Western Europe? We can only consider that the Soviet willingness to risk a general war in Europe has increased. Accordingly, the United States must ask itself what costs it must bear, and what risks it must assume, in order to deter, and if necessary to oppose, Soviet aggression against Western Europe.

"The United States could perhaps survive the collapse of Western Europe and its delivery into Soviet hands. This proposal, however, is one which no reflective American can contemplate without dread and foreboding. Even in terms of the coldest strategic calculations, the extension of Russian hegemony over Western Europe would give the Russians access to potential military assets of incalculable value—the vast industrial capacity of Western Europe, millions of trained industrial workers possessing a degree of skill unmatched in the Soviet Union, and many of the best scientific and inventive brains in the world. The fall of Western Europe would open up the prospect of Soviet control of European colonies, dependencies, and affiliated territories in other parts of the world. Considering that American reverses in Korea caused people in other countries to doubt the ability of the United States to halt the spread of communism, it requires little imagination to foresee the strength of the wave of the future psychology which would also sweep the world in the event of the Soviet conquest of Western Europe. The Russians would then be in an excellent position of using tactics of psychological warfare and internal subversion in driving to neutralize or dominate many of the countries remaining outside the Soviet orbit, and thus largely to isolate the United States—strategically, diplomatically, ideologically, and economically."

Thus it is easy to see that General Marshall and the Joint Chiefs of Staff feel that the Korean conflict has increased the likelihood of Russia in the near future committing aggression in Western Europe. And they fear that if we get involved too deeply in the Orient, Russia will strike in Western Europe.

This is the crux of the whole argument between General MacArthur and the administration.

MacArthur already has brought about a stiffening of not only our attitude but the attitude of our allies toward Red China. There is going to be an economic blockade—something that should have been invoked last winter when the Red Chinese entered the conflict—against the Chinese.

But the main argument may be water over the dam next week or the week after next. The Russians and the Red Chinese may decide to widen the conflict on their own. A new Chinese drive is in process of preparation and the U. N. forces are expecting the intervention of a real enemy air force for the first time. If that happens, undoubtedly the orders to bomb Chinese air bases in Manchuria will be given.

So far, under the ground rules both sides have been observing, the enemy air power has been a rather negligible factor in the war. We have had undisputed air supremacy, although it has been known right along that the Russians have several hundred modern planes in that part of the world.

As a result of this second great debate the Russians know everything we are thinking about. They know about our fears and our plans. They know we want to limit the struggle in the Orient until we gain enough time to become stronger and to build up a defense force in Western Europe. For the cold-blooded planners of the Kremlin the obvious course of action would be to strike before we are ready, and get us involved as deeply as possible in other places before moving in Europe.

The only real deterrent to immediate action undoubtedly is still the atom bomb superiority of this country. How long that is to be a sufficient deterrent is a crucial question of our times.

Korean War Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest the continued appeasement which is evident in the administration's policies in the conduct of the Korean war.

I use the term "war" advisedly. It is well known that our Chief Executive has described Korea as a "police action." But I maintain that whatever the term applied, the men who are fighting and dying there cannot distinguish the difference. In either case, no matter what we call it, those men still are undergoing the rigors of war, are suffering the miseries of war, and are dying the death of war.

Now, I do not consider myself a warmonger. I am a veteran of World War I, and I know from first-hand experience what war can do to individuals and to nations. To me, nothing is more horrible than war; there is nothing that I dislike more. I do not look with favor upon the necessity of sending young men into battle. This has become necessary through a series of "secret agreements" between our Nations' leaders and those of foreign powers, through a variety of blunders which I will not enumerate here. They have been dealt with in detail upon many occasions, on the floor of this House.

My purpose today is to register my most vigorous protest at the defeatist attitude taken by some of our administration stalwarts in recent statements.

This country of ours grew strong, became one of the world's great powers, through generations of standing on our own feet. We progressed through good times and bad by guiding our own destiny and by building up international prestige through years of painstaking diplomacy.

Early in the life of this Nation, we were warned against forming entangling alliances. In recent years, we have been so entangled in foreign alliances that we have been led to the very brink of national disaster.

Some of these alliances were formed in good faith and with the full knowledge of the American people. Others—insidious ones—were negotiated in secret, without the knowledge of the people, and definitely not to the best interests of this Nation.

We cannot undo what has been done, be it good or bad. Our plight now is one of finding the way out of the maze of entanglements and back to the true course set for the Nation by our forefathers.

This way is not by the appeasement route.

Our leaders tremble in fear that we will affront our former ally, "Good Old Joe" Stalin. They quake in their boots at the reaction of present allies to our national policies. They are afraid of the effect of efforts to bring the Korean conflict to a speedy and victorious conclusion. They favor a stalemate in Korea, a sparring for time—and all the while more and more American boys are dying on bloody battlefields in a foreign land.

Sparring for time, for whom?

Certainly, our national military strength will be increased at our present rate. But so will that of other powers whose design is our destruction. We will be buying time with American lives, time which will be of as much benefit to real and potential enemies as it will to us.

Already we have well begun the course to national bankruptcy, one of the primary objectives of our potential foreign adversaries. There seems to be no inclination, on the part of the administration, to halt this headlong flight to economic ruin. Rather, efforts are being accelerated to continue buying disrespect from foreign nations, supposedly our allies in the struggle for freedom.

Administration spokesmen insist that a firm, victory-seeking policy in Korea will bring down the wrath of the Soviet Union. To that, I say "rubbish." The Soviet Union, if she intends to wage world war III, will do so in her own time and in a place of her own choosing. Only the Kremlin can accurately predict the future in this regard.

It may be that General MacArthur's beliefs, if put into active use, would hasten world war III. Perhaps not. This much is certain: That this country of ours did not gain its strength and international prestige by cowing like a whipped cur, its tail between its legs and licking the hand that struck it. Neither have we been spoiling for a fight. We simply have faced the issues squarely, and met them fairly.

Now is the time to again face the issues, to determine a course which will bring true peace—not one of appeasement and continued waste of American lives. It is all well and good to talk of the tremendous losses suffered by Red China. It is not Red China's losses with which American parents are most concerned. They are concerned, and rightfully so, with the loss of American lives.

In short, I do not like our present administration's defeatist attitude, its fear complex if you will. They are so instilling fear in the American public through statements in the press and on the radio, that public and military morale alike will suffer.

They are afraid the United States will have to go it alone in Korea. Just what do they think we have been doing, in substance? This country has supplied virtually all the manpower and materials involved in the Korean conflict, aside, of course, from the South Koreans themselves.

I call for a reversal of policy, for determination of a policy which will make the fullest use of our resources to speed the Korean conflict to victorious conclusion, with the least possible loss of American lives and expenditure of American means.

I urge a return to the traditional American self-reliance. We owe it to the men who are on the fighting fronts to restore the truly American way of doing things. We must assure them that they are not earning victory on the battlefield only to have the peace thrown away once more. In the past we have won the battles, but we have failed miserably at the peace table. We must not let this reoccur.

National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., Takes Exception to Letter of Comptroller General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a letter addressed to me by Mr. Frazer A. Bailey, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., in which he takes exception to a letter addressed to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee, and inserted by the latter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 7, 1951, by the Comptroller General of the United States:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SHIPPING, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1951.

The Honorable EDWARD J. HART,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE HART: I have just finished reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, 1951, beginning at page A2549, a letter addressed to Congressman ALBERT THOMAS (Texas) by the Comptroller General of the United States which is preceded by a tabulation of ships said to have been chosen at random by the Maritime Administration and alleging to show the acquisition cost to the owner, the amount paid by the Government for charter hire, and the amount paid to the owner when the vessel was sunk.

The schedule gives such a distorted picture of the true relationship of the facts that we feel constrained to call the matter to your attention. Without taking each individual item and tracing it through to a conclusion (which we will be happy to do if you so desire) may we point out the basically misleading impression which must necessarily be gained by contrasting the data shown in the schedule.

It would be assumed that the purpose is to demonstrate that a vessel which cost the owner the modest sum stated was chartered to the United States Government for the period shown at a very high rate of charter hire, and that upon loss of the vessel, presumably from war hazards, the owner recovered a relatively large sum.

Nothing is stated to show that these vessels were under "time charter" except the small letters "t/c" which by reference to a line in the heading of the schedule is indicated to mean "time charter." Nothing is stated to show that the term "time charter" means that the vessel owner supplies not only the vessel but a full crew, including its wages, food and sustenance; repairs to maintain the vessel in operating condition; engine, deck and steward's stores, excepting only fuel and fresh water; and overhead management to take care of the procurement of those items supplied by the shipowner. Looking at the rate per month shown, it will be noted that the charter hire rate is slightly in excess of $1,000 per day. At the rate of pay for sea-going wages during the period stated, the daily crew wages would have amounted to almost one-half of that sum without taking into account food, repairs, stores, management costs, etc.

Therefore, if the reader were to assume, as he has a perfect right to do, that the schedule relates the cost of the vessel to a charter hire rental for the same vessel, the conclusion would be enormously distorted.

Further, the schedule shows a column headed "Estimated cost to the owner." The assumption of the reader is naturally that this is the amount paid by the shipowner to the Government for a surplus war-built vessel of World Wars I or II. From my personal knowledge of some of the few ships included in this list, such is not the case. Further, in the case of at least one of the vessels which was purchased from the Government as surplus from World War I, the vessel was bought as part of a fleet of 21 ships with a contract to operate the fleet for a period of 10 years over four trade routes

found to be essential to the foreign trade and commerce of the United States and certified as such by the Maritime Commission. The cash consideration paid by the purchaser was considered by the company (and I was one of its directors at the time) to be only a part of the cost of the vessels. The obligation to run a year-round service over 4 routes with 21 vessels for 10 years was by them considered a very substantial part of the acquisition cost. True, ocean-mail contracts of that period were subsequently secured to equalize at least in part the competitive disadvantage of American and foreign ships plying those routes, but there was no assurance that the operating losses would not substantially exceed the cash consideration paid. While on this point, may I say that it would be a fair inference from the tone of the data supplied by Mr. THOMAS that this was a negotiated deal and that the Government was induced to sell the vessels at a ridiculously low price. The fact is that at least as far as the vessel with which I am familiar is concerned, the fleet of 21 ships and the contract obligations were all put up to public bidding, well advertised in advance, and the Government obtained the highest market value for the property which it was offering.

Now as to the column headed "Amount paid for loss," which is assumed to be the liquidation of the Government's obligation to the owner due to the sinking of the vessel through war risks and hazards. The charter party between the Government and the shipowner for the use of these vessels provided that in the event the vessels were lost the Government was obligated to pay the shipowner the constitutional remuneration of "just compensation." Further, as the date of loss shown will reveal, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was in existence and the so-called enhancement provision, under which the amount so paid is not to be enhanced by the causes necessitating the taking or use, was in effect, and therefore no war-inflated values could have been or were paid for these vessels. This enhancement clause is a provision which is not applicable by law to any other public property taken by the Government in the course of the prosecution of the war, and destroyed while in the Government's possession. In all other cases "just compensation" value as of the time of loss represents the sum to which such property owner is entitled. As far as the circumstances are concerned, instead of making out a case against the shipping industry, it is possible to show that this industry was discriminated against with respect to the taking of private property for public use.

Mr. THOMAS appears to relate only those factors which tend to prove a predetermined conclusion. He does not say to you that the charter hire rate shown for these vessels was substantially below the rate of hire currently being paid in the world market for similar ships. I would have to check the charter market of the period, but it is my impression that the figure is about two-thirds of the prevailing charter hire rates of the period. He also does not tell you (and it could hardly have slipped his memory, as Mr. BONNER brought it to his attention within the last 4 days) that rather than a showing of excess payments as just compensation for vessels taken for public use, the courts have awarded as to all vessels for the period, and not just the selected few which Mr. THOMAS cares to enumerate, 160 percent of the just compensation values offered by the Maritime Commission but refused by the owner and carried to the courts for determination.

There are a number of instances stated in the Comptroller General's letter which by contrasting the figures shown would tend to alarm the reader. However, as no names of companies or vessels are shown, we cannot give you an accurate statement.

The Comptroller General says that the Government inevitably sells in a buyer's market and buys in a seller's market. This is true, but the cause thereof is interesting. For the reason that we do not maintain an adequate merchant marine to carry our commerce and to provide military auxiliaries for national defense, it is necessary for the Government to engage in gigantic shipbuilding projects of an expensive—yes, extravagant—nature to meet the exigencies of war. Naturally these become surplus at the termination of the emergency and create what the Comptroller General chooses to call a "buyer's market." When the Government requires vessels, it is inevitably a period of international stress. Shipping is one of the first industries to feel the effect of war or preparation for war. Vessels are in demand to assure the accumulation of critical or strategical materials; vessel values and user rates necessarily rise. It is during such times, when these emergencies affect the United States, that the seller's market, to which the Comptroller refers, comes into existence.

The shipping business is necessarily a complicated and technical one. It is difficult for the public and even for many Members of Congress to understand these intricate matters. We have seen the time when they confuse members of the industry itself. It would be greatly helpful if persons who assume the role of critics would be careful to avail themselves of all the surrounding data and to present it in the proper perspective.

In the hope that we may at least make a start toward a frank and forthright understanding of at least some of these matters, we would appreciate it if you would have this communication placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if, in your opinion, it merits it and would serve a useful purpose.

Sincerely yours,

FRAZER A. BAILEY.

Net Working Capital of Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of May 7, 1951:

NET WORKING CAPITAL UP $5,700,000,000 IN 1950 FOR BIGGEST GAIN SINCE 1947—$75,-800,000,000 TOTAL REPORTED BY SEC WITH CURRENT ASSETS AND LIABILITIES RECORDS AT $150,500,000,000 AND $74,700,000,000

WASHINGTON, May 6.—Net working capital of corporations in 1950 increased $5,700,000,-000, largest annual gain since 1947, to $75,-800,000,000, according to the largest estimate made public today by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Current assets of corporations rose $21,-900,000,000 to a $150,500,000,000 record while current liabilities also reached a new high of $74,700,000,000.

The increase in working capital was recorded in the first 9 months of the year, the last quarter showing a slight decline, the report said. Current assets in the last 3 months increased by about $7,400,000,000, but current liabilities increased by a somewhat larger amount.

The increase in current assets in the last quarter of 1950 was accounted for by a $5,000,000,000 increase in inventories a $2,100,000,000 increase in receivables and a $400,000,000 rise in holdings of Government securities.

A $4,300,000,000 increase in notes and accounts payable, a small increase in other liabilities and a $3,200,000,000 addition to Federal income-tax liabilities accounted for the rise in current liabilities in the final quarter of 1950.

In addition to the $5,700,000,000 increase in working capital in 1950, the report estimated that corporations invested $16,800,-000,000 during the year in plant and equipment. To finance this combined total of $22,500,000,000 in expansion, corporations secured about $3,700,000,000 from external sources. Net new bond issues amounted to about $2,000,000,000 while stock issues added $1,700,000,000. Internal sources—depreciation accruals and undistributed profits—provided the remaining $18,800,000,000 for corporate expansion last year.

Are the Industry Advisory Committees of the National Production Authority Hamstrung?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter I have just received from Mr. Lyman A. Beeman, president of Finch, Pruyn & Co., manufacturers of printing and converting papers. Addressed to Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the letter records Mr. Beeman's resignation from the industry advisory committee of the Ground Wood Paper Manufacturers, and sets forth his reason for so doing. If Mr. Beeman's experience is typical of the way industry advisory committees are being treated by the National Production Authority, the Congress should indeed determine forthwith whether this situation is ineptness or a studied attempt toward Government dictatorship of business.

Mr. Beeman's letter follows:

MAY 8, 1951.

CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I have felt great security in your acceptance of responsibility in Washington and I wish to aid you in every way in our national emergency. To discharge this patriotic duty, I accepted an invitation to membership on the Groundwood Paper Manufacturers Industry Advisory Committee of NPA.

This committee met last Tuesday and I was astounded to have Mr. Nathaniel Rafler, Industry committee adviser, refuse committee members, either individually or as a whole, the right to have legal counsel of their own. He furthermore told us we were to have no secretarial, technical or other aid or advice. No minutes of meetings were to be kept, except as the Government chose to write summaries. When protest was made Mr. Rafler told us if we didn't like the conditions he would suggest we resign.

The conditions are such as to make the committee impotent for constructive effort. I could not help but draw the conclusion the National Production Authority had no intention of organizing its Industry Advisory Committees as honest, fair and efficient aids in administering controls. Since the meeting I have discussed and thought about the matter very carefully and it is difficult to decide whether this situation is ineptness or whether it is a step in a studied attempt toward Government dictatorship of business. In either event it is my obvious duty to resist no matter what the danger to me personally or to our company.

It is, therefore, with great hesitancy and after due consideration I realize the only way I can resist is to resign from the committee.

Very truly yours,

FINCH, PRUYN & CO., INC.,
LYMAN A. BEEMAN, *President*.

The Battle for Peace—Remarks by Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we become so absorbed in the conflicts and the tensions of our day that we forget to look to history for an understanding of them. The present, which leads inevitably to the future, is the product of the past, and not always unlike it. We may turn, therefore, to the past for guidance. History may suggest, when wisdom fails us, how to meet the great troubles that beset us and keep them from becoming destructive wars.

I am impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the grasp of history consistently displayed by that erudite, philosophic and able man who, to the good fortune of our Nation, serves his country as the Secretary of the Air Force. Recently, in a speech made before a group of educated men, Thomas K. Finletter gave further proof of his knowledge of history, his deep concern with world affairs, and his concept of the task that lies before us. I refer to Secretary Finletter's speech on Thursday of week before last after receiving the Guggenheim honor cup for 1951, presented by the University of Pennsylvania Club of New York.

The events to which Mr. Finletter turned for an illumination of today's events are not, however, ancient. They occurred in Ethiopia in 1935 and in the Rhineland in 1936. Citing them, and the great war that followed them, Mr. Finletter asks:

> Who can say what might have happened, what great precedents might have been established, how aggression might conceivably have been nipped in the bud, and World War II avoided, had the collective power for peace of the League been used on those two great occasions.

The events of today which Italy's conquest of Ethiopia and Hitler's militarization of the Rhineland illuminate are taking place in Korea, but with a difference that is fundamental. The member nations of the League of Nations failed to face up and resist acts of aggression 15 years ago, even though the aggression was committed against one of their own members. Mr. Finletter did not, but might have, referred to the moving and prophetic farewell speech of the Emperor of Ethiopia as he surrendered Ethiopia's seat in the League of Nations and went into exile. As the Emperor predicted, a greater war followed. But the free nations of the world today denounced the aggression in Korea. Through the medium of the United Nations they are fighting to sustain the great principle that aggression is illegal, and that the preservation of democracy as well as peace demands that aggression be suppressed. They are taking positive action to avoid a world war.

Pointing out the differences between the aggression of 1935 and the aggression of 1951, and how we are meeting it, Mr. Finletter said:

> Our military objectives thus are in aid of these two great principles—our search for peace and our determination to be strong until we get it. Particularly is this so in the Korean war. Indeed, it is the fact that this Korean war is not a war of the ordinary type which makes its conduct so difficult and so delicate. For the purpose of the Korean war is peace.

And Mr. Finletter continued:

> The battle for peace in Korea is not yet won. We are in the midst of the most troublesome phase of that great event. How we conduct ourselves and the determination and patience we show will decide the manner in which history will record this great event. The issue of collective action for peace through the United Nations is at stake.

But Mr. Finletter warned:

> It is not just in Korea that military action is playing its part in carrying out these great purposes of our foreign policy. Our large build-up of military forces and the strengthening of the military position of our allies, with the sacrifices that this will require from the American people, also are a part of the bigger purposes of our national policy.

Mr. Speaker, this thoughtful speech by Secretary Finletter should serve to clarify our thinking on problems of gravest concern. Instead of being confused by the debates going on today, we should find in them leaven to raise our hopes, to strengthen our faith, and our determination. The build-up of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force is for the sole purpose of supporting our national policy in seeking peace and in maintaining a position of strength which will most effectively lead toward the achievement of peace.

It is a source of hope, and encouragement for the Nation that the man in whose hands rests the responsibility for the build-up of the Air Force can survey the current unrest, review the present debate and assert:

> There is a chance that our program for peace will succeed.

But it is a challenge to the rest of us, that Mr. Finletter should conclude:

> I believe that we must increase and double our efforts in the search for peace.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of the Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter after receiving the Guggenheim honor cup for 1951.

The remarks are as follows:

I shall talk to you this evening about the Air Force and, more particularly, about the way in which the work of the Air Force is fitting into our over-all policies in international relations.

There are at the moment two main activities of the military services which are and must be closely tied in with our foreign policy.

In the first place, we are engaged in a serious war in Korea, and this war, as I shall try to explain, is of a special kind involving complex and important considerations in our international relations.

Secondly, the Air Force, along with the other services, since the beginning of the Korean war nearly a year ago, has been engaged on a program of major build-up of the basic Military Establishment. The nature of this build-up is one which much be directly related to the aims of our foreign policy.

In times such as these when the country is not in an all-out war for survival—for Korea is not that, no matter how grievous the sufferings in that war—our military operations and planning must necessarily be subordinate to and in aid of our major political objectives.

This is not true to the same extent when the country is engaged in an all-out war (such as World Wars I and II) where there is a struggle to the death, where the issue is survival.

Even in an all-out war it is the Commander in Chief, a civilian, who is the highest authority in the executive branch on all matters, civilian as well as military. But military considerations then assume a particularly high importance. However, they must remain in closest consonance with our international political objectives. The principles for the peace settlement must be drafted. And even during the war there is room for political maneuver such as trying to divert allies from the enemy, to obtain allies for ourselves, to attempt to break the enemy's determination to resist (as in the case of Wilson's 14 points), and politically directed economic measures—all destined to weaken the enemy. In short, military considerations, under the direction of a civilian Commander in Chief, assume much higher importance during an all-out war.

But when the country is at peace, or in a betwixt-and-between time such as the present when we are not engaged in full-out war with our survival at stake, military operations and programs must be even more subordinated to considerations of foreign political policy.

This is especially so at the present time and in the case of our own country. Until recently in history the most that the foreign policies of the democracies hoped to do was to stave off the happening of war for as long as possible and to establish those relationships with other countries which would put one's own country in the best possible position for a war, if unhappily, one should come.

Not until the great American initiative of the League of Nations under Woodrow Wilson did it become one of the tasks of the foreign policy of the free world to seek the permanent and effective elimination of war as an institution.

Indeed, during the period of the family dynasties before the French Revolution, war was but an extension of foreign policy. And unhappily this has continued to be the case with the great aggressors of modern times.

The United States with the position of world leadership which has been forced upon it, fortunately has an entirely different concept. Its purpose is not only to stave off war

for as long as possible and to persuade as much of the world as possible to agree with it in its search for peace, but also our country has, I believe, despite the difficulties that often seem insurmountable, determined to work through the United Nations to seek the elimination of war as a method of handling disputes between the nations.

The United States has not accepted the proposition that all-out war is inevitable. Perhaps you may say we are naive about this. Perhaps, as is sometimes pointed out, we are new at this business of world leadership and perhaps, you may say, that when we get a little older we will acquire the cynicism which has produced the unending series of wars which 6,000 years of history shows.

I do not believe so. I do not believe that we are going to adopt any such cynical point of view. Perhaps because of the protection which we have enjoyed—until recently, until the development of air power—back of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, or perhaps because of something in the spirit of the people of this country, we are going to try to change the rules and to use our leadership at least to make a try, and perhaps to succeed, in establishing a reign and rule of peace in the world.

This, I believe, is the attitude of the country. I do not believe that we are making the sacrifices in Korea with any feeling that these sacrifices will be in vain. Certainly the attitude of the Government is that all-out war is not inevitable, that we are going to do everything we can to get rid of it as a human institution, and that for all the odds against us and the intractability of some nations, we have a real chance to succeed.

This, I believe, is in the American tradition. It is not our custom to say that things are impossible. I believe that we will put the same effort into seeking peace as we have in the terrible sacrifices of war.

Time and again you will find the fact that peace is the primary business of the United States stated in our announcements of official policy. These are not just generalities, pious hopes of unattainable ends in which one does not believe. Specific proposals are made—proposals which when and as other nations are ready and willing to accept the idea, can be a base and a workable agenda for carrying out a regime of enforceable peace.

The record starts with the Atomic Declaration of November 1945, when the President of the United States and the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom and Canada put forward a specific plan for enforced disarmament of the modern weapons of mass destruction.

The record goes on through the United Nations Assembly resolution of January 1946, the Secretary of State's committee report on atomic energy of March 1946, and down to the most recent statement of the President of the United States before the United Nations on October 24, 1950, when he proposed the following as an aspiration of our country—an aspiration which could be the greatest gift to civilization one could think of if it were to become the accepted policy of the nations:

"We intend to build up strength for peace as long as that is necessary. But at the same time, we must continue to strive, through the United Nations, to achieve international control of atomic energy and the reduction of armaments and armed forces. Cooperative and effective disarmament would make the danger of war remote. It would be a way of achieving the high purposes of the United Nations without the tremendous expenditures for armaments which conditions in the world today make imperative.

"Disarmament is the course which the United States would prefer to take. It is the course which most nations would like to adopt. It is the course which the United Nations from its earliest beginnings has been seeking to follow. • • •

"Years of effort have served to bring to the attention of all nations the three basic principles upon which any successful plan of disarmament must rest.

"First, the plan must include all kinds of weapons. Outlawing any particular kind of weapon is not enough. The conflict in Korea bears tragic witness to the fact that aggression, whatever the weapons used, brings frightful destruction.

"Second, the plan must be based on unanimous agreement. A majority of nations is not enough. No plan of disarmament can work unless it includes every nation having substantial armed forces. One-sided disarmament is a sure invitation to aggression.

"Third, the plan must be foolproof. Paper promises are not enough. Disarmament must be based on safeguards which will insure the compliance of all nations. The safeguards must be adequate to give immediate warning of any threatened violation. Disarmament must be policed continuously and thoroughly. It must be founded upon free and open interchange of information across national borders."

This is one great line of our policy. Parallel with it is our determination to be strong in a world in which these great plans for peace have not yet been accepted.

But the matter of being strong is one which ties in with and is in aid of the purpose of peace. Our strength is not for aggression. It is to create a military posture which will provide no incentive to aggressors to attack us and may perhaps persuade them that war would be unprofitable and that peace should be put upon the agenda.

Our military objectives thus are in aid of these two great principles—our search for peace and our determination to be strong until we get it. Particularly is this so in the Korean war. Indeed it is the fact that this Korean war is not a war of the ordinary type which makes its conduct so difficult and so delicate. For the purpose of the Korean war is peace.

Let us try to put this action of the United Nations in Korea in historical perspective. I believe that when history is written the obvious comparison will be made between the Korean war and the events of Ethiopia in 1935 and in the Rhineland in 1936.

You will remember that those two events are now regarded as the critical points when the League of Nations had to decide whether it was to go forward or backward, whether it was to become an effective agent for the suppression of aggression or whether it was to become an impotent debating society. The decision was that it was to become impotent. The reason was that it failed to face up to and resist those acts of aggression.

You will also remember how, in looking back, it has been pointed out that determined action by the League of Nations would have stopped the Ethiopian aggression and how the troops of Hitler had their orders to withdraw in the face of determined action by the victors of World War I to enforce the principles of collective security upon which they had agreed; and how this action was not taken. Who can say what might have happened, what great precedents might have been established, how aggression might conceivably have been nipped in the bud and World War II avoided had the collective power for peace of the League been used on those two great occasions.

When we come to Korea I believe that history will look back and say the free world had learned the lesson of the period between World Wars I and II and that when the new Ethiopian and the new Rhineland took place by the aggression of the North Koreans in Korea this time the free nations stood up, and through the medium of the United Nations fought to sustain the great principle that aggression is illegal.

The Korean war has been grievous. Great and heart-breaking losses have been sustained and are being sustained. It is a great trial for this country, which is bearing the heaviest burden, and for our fellow members of the United Nations whose sons also are being killed and wounded in this terrible business.

The battle for peace in Korea is not yet won. We are in the midst of the most troublesome phase of that great event. How we conduct ourselves and the determination and patience we show will decide the manner in which history will record this great event. The issue of collective action for peace through the United Nations is at stake.

We need the greatest patience and the greatest character both for ourselves and our allies if we are to bring this Korean war to a conclusion consistent with the purpose for which we decided to enter it. It is said sometimes that we are an impatient people, that this is not the sort of thing that we can do well. I think that it is probably true, if we fail to state and to recognize our purpose in Korea. But I believe that, understanding the great purpose and the enormous stakes for our country which are at play, we will show the determination and the patience to see the Korean war through and to keep up the fight for peace.

It is not just in Korea that military action is playing its part in carrying out these great purposes of our foreign policy. Our large build-up of military forces and the strengthening of the military position of our allies, with the sacrifices that this will require from the American people, also are a part of the bigger purposes of our national policy.

This build-up is a coordinated effort of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Since I am associated with the Air Force, I shall speak for a little about the Air Force's role and plans in this build-up which is so important a part of our national policy.

Our Air Force has four main commands back of which is all the rest of the Air Force establishment; but it is these four commands who are the active agents, the end product as it were. All of these commands are being built in such a fashion as to fit in with these double purposes of our national policy—to seek peace and to maintain a position of strength which will most effectively lead toward the achievement of that peace.

These four commands are the Air Defense Command, the Strategic Air Command, the Tactical Air Command, and, serving these three, the Military Air Transport Service which provides the great lines of logistic supply by air.

I hope I have made it clear that the Air Force, as well as the other services, is doing its best to fit in and to aid our national policies.

Let me conclude by making two points about all of this great effort. The first is that the maintenance of our posture of defense is expensive and will put a heavy burden on the American economy and on the American taxpayer. I believe that we will have to maintain a high level of military spending until such time as our efforts for peace show results.

Our ability to maintain this military posture, and to pay for it, will require the same characteristics of patience and determination as we must apply in the battle of Korea.

We will have to accept these high expenditures regardless of the immediate variations of the international scene. The maintenance of our military posture must be a fixed and stable policy, not yielding on the one hand to sudden worsenings on the international front, and, on the other hand, not falling prey to unjustified optimism caused by minor and temporary improvements on the international scene. We will have to make up our minds what kind of a military establishment we want. We must not leave this decision to events or to the decisions of other powers.

The second point I would make is that there is a chance that our program for peace will succeed.

I know that the situation could not look much worse than it is now. But nevertheless I believe that the peoples of the world everywhere are so anxious to get rid of war that there is some chance that in time their will will prevail.

But more than that, even if we were convinced that the situation looked completely impossible it would not be in the American tradition, I believe, once we have determined we want to get this great end of the elimination of war, to make no effort to try to get it simply because it looked hard to get.

I believe we must reject all cynicism in this matter of seeking peace.

I believe we must not think of the odds against us any more than a soldier thinks of the odds against him when he attacks a strong point.

I believe that we must increase and double our efforts in the search for peace.

History of I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from an address delivered by Charlotte Baruth, president of the Charlotte Baruth Association, at a banquet in her honor given by the members of the veterans' service organization which bears her name:

CHARLOTTE BARUTH. You are my true and loyal friends, and I love you with a full heart. Your friendship and teamwork mean more to me than I can describe in words.

The third Sunday in May is almost here and somehow, tonight, I have a feeling that I should say something about the simple fact that we are gathered here in friendly assembly. None of us was forced or coerced to be present. No secret police watches or listens. We can express ourselves freely and without fear.

How fortunate we are to enjoy the seven rights of American democracy: The right to live, work, worship, assemble, petition, speak, and vote.

Throughout history, men and women of purpose and conscience have found ways and means of meeting together, regardless of consequences: witness the catacombs, the hedgerows of Ireland, the ghettos of Europe and Russia's Siberia, all of which have revealed stories of death and worse than death. What a contrast in glorious America.

In this year of grace, 1951, it seems fitting for me to give you a brief history of one example of the American way of life. More than one of our seven cherished rights are demonstrated by a movement which started just before World War II. It has to do with living, assembling, and speaking in this great country of ours.

I might explain to you that I am especially familiar with this movement, if that's the right name for it, because Benjamin Edwards Neal, a long-time friend of the Baruth family, is the one who originated it. We call him Uncle Ben, as does most everyone else.

I want to tell you about how this American tradition started and how it quickly found a place in the hearts of America. First, I'll make a prediction of things to come, based on past records and with the proviso that the weather is clear and warm.

I predict that on the third Sunday of this month, one of the grandest spectacles ever witnessed in the United States will be staged at the Mall in Central Park. More than a million Americans will join in patriotic festivities, renewing their pledge of allegiance to the flag.

I also predict that in cities, towns, and hamlets throughout the Nation, more citizens—big, little, old, and young—will assemble in public places on May 20 than ever before in the history of our country.

To me, this is very significant. In some sections of the world, listening to a radio broadcast can prove hazardous. In contrast, here in America, there will be an outpouring of citizens who will assemble voluntarily; speeches will be broadcast and uncensored; no one will be banished or jailed for expressing his opinion.

The occasion I speak of, as all of you know, as I Am An American Day. The thirteenth annual observance will take place this month. It has already been proclaimed by the President of the United States, by governors and mayors throughout the and.

I Am An American Day is designed to honor new-voting citizens: native-born who have reached the age of 21 and foreign-born who have been naturalized during the past 12 months. Its basic purpose is to impress these new, full-fledged citizens with the seriousness of their obligations in this free country. With the public as witness to their induction, the ceremony is a thrilling and unforgettable experience.

Sponsored nationally by the act of Congress and the I Am An American Foundation, the celebration in New York is sponsored jointly by Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri and the Journal American newspaper. In less serious times, the attendance at the Mall has exceeded the million mark. Given clement weather, all attendance records are expected to be broken in this year of decision.

I am sure you will be interested to know how I Am An American Day happened to be born into this troubled world. It so happens that I have had the opportunity of reading excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also from Los Angeles papers where it originated: the Times, Examiner, Herald-Express, News, and the Hollywood Citizen. Naturally, my interest in these background stories was influenced by the fact that our friend, Uncle Ben, is the founder of I Am An American Day.

It was in the prewar era of 1938–39 when the Fascist leaders of Germany, Italy, and Japan were whipping the minds of youth into a frenzy of national fervor and warlike spirit, that Benjamin Edwards Neal (our Uncle Ben who was born in Texas and was then living in California) conceived the idea of I Am An American Day. He felt the need of a campaign to fight complacency and inspire the Nation to a greater sense of patriotism.

Although attention was focused on the new-voting citizens, the observance attracted Nationwide attention and its spread throughout the country is without parallel in our history.

The first I Am An American Day was observed with ceremonies in Hollywood Bowl on June 12, 1939, with the enthusiastic cooperation of local government agencies, church, education, civic, patriotic, and women's groups. Newspapers, newsreels, and radio carried the story to all parts of the Nation.

In early 1940, at the invitation of Senator A. B. Chandler, Mr. Neal, and Edward Arnold, Hollywood's Mr. President, who succeeded Uncle Ben as head of the I Am An American Foundation, went to Washington—not at Government expense—to testify about the first I Am An American Day before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee of which Senator Chandler was chairman. Also a member of that committee was the present ranking minority member, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.

The joint resolution, authorizing the President of the United States to issue an annual proclamation setting aside the third Sunday in May as I Am An American Day, was unanimously approved by the Congress, thus converting a local celebration into one of national proportions in less than 12 months. Subsequent growth has been equally unprecedented.

Before leaving the subject of this fine American story, I want to give you two or three side lights. I happen to know that I Am An American Foundation never put on a drive for contributions. The small group most interested took care of the net expenses. And when the invitation came to have the story of the first celebration told to the Judiciary Committee, Edward Arnold paid almost $5,000 out of his own pocket for this expense.

Another interesting side light is the fact that, while Mr. President, or rather Mr. Arnold, was in Washington, MGM called him back to Hollywood for retakes on the ending of his latest picture. For the first time in his life Mr. Arnold traveled by plane and then later returned to Washington by train. Incidentally, when that picture finally was released the original version was used.

In giving the history of I Am An American Day I should also pay tribute to Mr. Manny Strauss, genius of publicity and public relations, who showed Hollywood a thing or two about making news in the early stages of this celebration. Uncle Ben has told me many times that he stands at salute to Emm Ess.

Uncle Ben has told me also how deeply indebted he is to Capt. Watson B. Miller, executive assistant to the national commander of the American Legion, for assistance to him and Edward Arnold in guiding them through the mysteries of Capitol Hill.

Uncle Ben has an album called Book of Good Neighbors which has many interesting photographs of I Am an American events. Especially interesting to me was one showing the page boys of the House and Senate gathered in the Senate reception room with Senate Majority Leader Alben W. Barkley, Minority Leader Charles R. McNary, and Congressman Harry R. Sheppard, who represented the House of Representatives. The expressions on the faces of these page boys as they staged a miniature I Am an American celebration was truly something for the book.

The first network stories about I Am An American Day, even before it became national, were told on News and Views by John B. Hughes and by George Jessel.

I Am An American Day is America's day of rededication. How fortunate we are to have the privilege of saying, "I am an American."

Time To Think and Not Throw Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial comment by

Paul Calvin Payne which appeared in the Presbyterian Life, Philadelphia, Pa., on May 12, 1951:

TIME TO THINK AND NOT THROW WORDS

Out of the suffering of World War I came these lines:

"Now you who live must do
A harder thing than dying is,
For you must think
And ghosts will drive you on."

It is calamitous that decisions on which the future of America and the world depend are being approached in an atmosphere dangerously charged with emotion. Emotional thinking is never clear thinking. As Nehru put it, in an interview with Norman Cousins, "People hardly think nowadays. They throw words at each other."

In an atmosphere supercharged with such emotional tensions, General MacArthur, at the time of this writing, has just given his notable address before the American Congress. Reactions are pouring in by radio and press. As one newspaper put it, "He spoke, as he emphasized, not as advocate of any partisan cause, nor as one pursuing political aspirations, but as an American who is trying to serve his country."

What is all important now is that the issues which he presented be freely discussed and that differing points of view be offered, as General MacArthur himself said, "without rancor nor bitterness."

It is especially important that they be discussed within the church, by thoughtful Christians whose views differ. To rule out such discussion, or to slap it down by labeling as pinks, fellow travelers, or Communists, those whose opinions differ from our own is to leave the discussion entirely to secular interests, who, through radio and press, are currently discussing them with appalling rancor and bitterness and recrimination. It is asking too much to expect wisdom or truth to emerge from such an atmosphere. Under these conditions people don't think; they throw words at each other.

If there is any hope of clearing the air, it rests in the readiness of persons committed to the Christian way of life to discuss these highly charged issues in the full exercise of Christian charity toward others who hold opposing views. We are united in our opposition to the Kremlin and all its works. We want no part of it. Let us not then join in the service of Moscow by allowing ourselves to be divided into opposing camps because of our differences—at the moment, over the methods by which Communist aggressions can be checked. Above all, let us avoid as the plague the temptation to vituperation, for such practice precludes all possibility of any intelligent facing of vital issues.

These issues far transcend personalities, and it is a positive disservice to stoop to attribute sordid motives to the President or to General MacArthur.

The general does not go along with those who have been urging that we "cut our losses and get out of Korea." He differs "from those who would 'scuttle' Europe by withholding troops and retreating to the Western Hemisphere and a few outlying bases."

This does not mean that there are not profound differences between General MacArthur and the administration, but the speech before Congress reduced them to "differences regarding the means of giving effect to principles on which there is agreement."

These differences raise two questions: 1. How deeply should we become involved in military commitment in Asia? 2. What would be the consequences of our taking unilateral military action, contrary to the expressed judgment in the United Nations?

On the first point General MacArthur does not believe that bombing Manchuria would bring Russia into the war, or that increasing our military commitments in Asia would weaken our position in Europe. He characterizes such judgments as "defeatism" and continues, "If a potential enemy can divide his strength on two fronts, it is for us to counter his efforts." He is careful to say, however, "The Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves." Russia, however, is bound by treaty to declare war on any nation attacking China. Also, the general did not think China would invade Korea last fall, in spite of the ominous massing of Chinese forces north of the Yalu.

There is no evidence that military authorities are convinced that we can, as of today, defend Europe if it is attacked. If the bitter choice were necessary, Russian occupancy of the Ruhr would pose a far greater immediate danger to us than continued Communist domination of China. Russia is not now committed on any front. She has complete freedom of action, while we are restricted in proportion to our commitments in Korea. The question as to whether indefinite stalemate in Korea is the only alternative to world war III is one which no one can answer. Nevertheless, if we label as appeasement all efforts to effect any kind of a compromise settlement, we are dangerously near the assumption that, unless all settlements with the Communists can go our way, we are prepared to embark on a third world war.

As to the second question at issue, the policy as of today indicates that the bombing of Manchuria would be opposed by all our friends and allies in the United Nations, and would offer to that body the choice of disruption or surrender to American domination. In either case the result would be calamitous. If it brought on war with Russia, we would find ourselves in a conflict in which we had alienated the sympathies of the rest of the world. The greatest political victory the Kremlin could win would be thus to break up the United Nations and isolate the United States. We dare not let our sense of power betray us into the illusion of omniscience. We must respect the judgment and feelings of the other free nations of the world. In a struggle where power is so evenly divided, our ability to do this may well spell the difference between ultimate victory and defeat.

Wait for All the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I include an interesting editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune, Tampa, Fla., of May 4:

WAIT FOR ALL THE FACTS

Those Americans who are sincerely desirous of obtaining all the facts regarding our broad policy and military strategy in Korea, China, and the rest of the Far East will not jump to hasty conclusions just because General MacArthur testified yesterday. They will remember that General Marshall, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other witnesses will appear before the Senators.

Moreover, they should set down some of yesterday's statements and predictions alongside other recent statements and happenings. Take this matter of the Wake Island conference.

According to the report just released, General MacArthur told President Truman and other conferees that he saw little chance of Red Chinese intervention in Korea. He believed only about 50,000 or 60,000 Chinese could cross the Yalu River, and if they tried to attack toward Pyongyang, he thought they would be slaughtered. There was talk of getting troops back to Japan by Christmas.

We know, of course, that the general was wrong. The troops didn't get back to Japan at Christmas, and a lot more than 60,000 Chinese Communists have crossed the Yalu River, as our men fighting bitterly at the front today can testify.

Yet General MacArthur is now quoted as saying that the Wake Island reports have "just about as much bearing on the problem of Korea today as would a report on the military operations of Bunker Hill." And his aide, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, has presented the statement that the question of Chinese intervention was basically a political one and quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's military intelligence.

These statements prompt several significant questions: If Chinese intervention in Korea was basically a political question, is not the question of Russian intervention in case of Manchurian bombing and a second front on the Chinese mainland even more basic politically?

If he should not have been expected to pass on Chinese intentions, why should his predictions now about Russian intentions be classified by Republicans as authoritative?

If his intelligence officers were so handicapped in getting information about the Chinese Communists, how is it possible for the general to be so positive about conditions on the Trans-Siberian Railroad and Russia's inability to "launch any predatory attack from the Asiatic Continent?"

We would also remind all the people that some of General MacArthur's more energetic and emotional friends are trying to work both sides of the street. They say he is both a great soldier—as he is—and a supreme authority on minds and methods in the Far East.

But they also say that if political calculations in his statements go wrong, he is not to be held accountable, for he is a military expert.

The point is that we cannot have it both ways. If the general, in addition to being a wise military leader, is presented as an authority on international politics in Asia, he cannot be relieved of responsibility when his judgment is proved to be wrong, as in the case of Communist China. That is why we say thoughtful Americans must wait for all the facts and information before deciding what is the best course to pursue in the Far East.

Second Connecticut March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a most interesting and varied history concerning the famous Connecticut Second Regiment March. It is taken from the May issue of the Connecticut Guardsman which is published monthly by the Information Division of the Adjutant General's Department, State Armory, Hartford. It is the official publication of the Connecticut Military Department headed by the Adjutant General, Maj. Gen. Frederick G. Reincke, and its editor is Maj. Earl C. Branniff.

As the article outlines, there are two versions about the origin of the march, the first being of more direct concern to Connecticut, and the second implies a condition precedent in order to attend a Presidential inauguration in Washington. The article follows:

SECOND CONNECTICUT MARCH HAS INTERESTING, VARIED HISTORY

The curiosity of a Virginia newspaperman resulted in considerable research and finally a good deal of information on the famous Second Connecticut March. The stirring march, ever the outstanding favorite of Connecticut military and other bands, also is associated with the State. Likewise it has become a popular theme song for several radio programs originating in Connecticut. During the course of the research it also was learned that the music was set to words and was adopted by some high schools as their school song.

Miss Marjorie E. Case, at the Connecticut State Library, found most of the pertinent information about the march and in relaying the information still further light was thrown on the famous musical melody before the report was forwarded to Virginia.

The march was composed by D. W. Reeves and copyrighted in 1877. A copy in the library contained a large picture of a military leader on the outside cover. At first it was thought that the picture was that of the composer and leader of the American band in Providence, R. I. It was learned that he was one of the most outstanding if not the outstanding band leader of his time.

DEDICATED TO SECOND

The picture on the cover, it was later learned, was that of Col. Stephen R. Smith, then commander of the Second Connecticut Regiment, Connecticut National Guard. He was a New Haven man who died in 1889 at the age of 53 after having served as adjutant general of the State. The march was dedicated to "Colonel Smith and the men of the Second Connecticut Regiment."

Information available at the State library indicated that the Second Connecticut Regiment was a fine military organization in those days and had an excellent band; members traveled around to many eastern cities where they drilled and paraded. It also was indicated that the unit also was well known outside of Connecticut.

The militia brigade of four regiments, including the second, spent a week in encampment at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia in September 1876 and from news accounts made quite an impression there. Among other excursions of the Second Regiment was one to Boston and Providence in June 1878. It was the opinion of researchers that the march may have been written for the centennial appearance for the anticipated trip to Boston and Providence.

PICTURE DISPLAYED

Warrant Officer Anthony R. Teta, bandmaster of the One Hundred and Second Army Band at New Haven, agreed with the date and name of composer and furnished the information that a large picture of Band Leader Reeves is on display in the bandroom at New Haven and is the source of a good deal of interest on the part of visitors to the room.

Mr. Teta would not disagree with the conclusion reached as regards the occasion of composing the march, but said that he was inclined to go along with another version of the origin of the famous piece of martial music. Mr. Teta said that the other version was to the effect that after a presidential election it was the desire of Colonel Smith and members of the regiment to march in the inaugural parade in Washington. The authority to go to Washington was on one condition and it was that Mr. Reeves would compose an original and stirring march to be played in the parade.

LITTLE TIME

When the condition was made known to Mr. Reeves he had little time left, but according to the same version of the origin, he supposedly sat down, went to work and completed the piece within a week's time.

The election in 1877 was that of Rutherford B. Hayes, following the 8 years of U. S. Grant. So that version could not refer to the Hayes inauguration as the march was popular in 1876. It is doubtful that it could have referred to the inauguration of Grant, because a casual reading of the history of the New Haven Grays shows no mention of a trip to Washington although there is an account of an excursion to Washington about that time.

AT CENTENNIAL

The Gray's publication throws some more light on the subject but not conclusively enough. Included in its pages, however, is mention that the New Haven Grays sought and eventually was given the right to represent Connecticut at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia and was led by the American Band with Reeves as bandmaster, so it is possible that the right to represent the State may have resulted in the condition of the march.

The New Haven Palladium of Friday, September 1, 1876, in describing the departure of the main body for Philadelphia, told of marching through the streets of New Haven to the railroad station. It was in connection with this event that the Second Connecticut March was first mentioned in the volume of the Gray's History. The Palladium story included the following in the parade description: "The streets were filled with friends of the regiment who waved adieu to the departing soldiers. The American Band played the Second Connecticut March which is growing very popular."

WORDS PUBLISHED

In addition to being an outstanding supervisor and teacher of music in the Hartford public schools, the late Ralph L. Baldwin assembled a group of classical selections for use of high school choruses and glee clubs. To stimulate interest in arias, he frequently changed words to produce a lighter and more popular appeal among high school students. Included in the volume in use over 25 years ago was a stirring version of the Second Connecticut March. It apparently was popular with students because some in Connecticut and Massachusetts adopted the number as a school march for use at football games. Some schools used the published words without reference to the particular school in much the same fashion that the West Point cadets unofficially adopted the Sons of Toil and Danger for a contemporary operetta.

While there may be some vagueness as regards some phases of the history of the Second Connecticut March torch bearing members and ex-members of the One Hundred and Second Regiment who maintained that the Second Connecticut is the second oldest regiment in the world, second only to the Coldstream Guards. The History of the Grays however, is a little more modest on the subject reporting in connection with its arrival in Philadelphia that it was "one of the oldest regiments of the Centennial Legion." Organized in 1816, the Second Regiment continued as such until it joined other troops in the Civil War. In 1865, when the Connecticut Militia was reorganized, the unit continued as such until 1917 in World War I when it was redesignated the One Hundred and Second. During the war it was split to form the One Hundred and Sixty-ninth and One Hundred and Seventieth Regiments. The One Hundred and Seventieth was redesignated the One Hundred and Second in 1924 and continues as such today as a part of the Forty-third Division.

Rent Control at Oak Ridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a bill which I have today introduced in the House to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 so as to provide for control of rent charged by the Atomic Energy Commission at Oak Ridge, Tenn. We have all heard of the parent who told his son, "Do not do as I do; do as I tell you to do."

It seems to me that this admonition describes the attitude of the sovereign toward Government-owned housing which the Government and various agencies thereof rent to citizens throughout the United States. I see no justification for rent control applying to property owned by taxpaying citizens of the Nation and not applying with equal force to the Government itself. Since Oak Ridge is located in the district which I have the honor of representing, and since the rents were increased 10 percent there about a year ago and now a new 28-percent increase has been announced, I feel that the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 and any substitute therefor should apply to all Government-owned rental property and especially at Oak Ridge. There should be outside independent appraisal and determination of what constitutes fair rental on these Government-owned rental properties and that the usual elements which are applied in determining fair rentals and fair return on investment together with the purposes for which these Government units were built should all be taken into account.

Accordingly, I have today introduced the following bill:

A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, so as to provide for control of rents charged by the Atomic Energy Commission for housing accommodations at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 204 (l) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 (50 U. S. C. App. sec. 1894 (l) (1) is amended by adding after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence:

"The Housing Expediter shall by regulation or order establish maximum rents for all housing accommodations in the vicinity of Oak Ridge, Tenn., which are owned by the United States and rented or offered for rent by the Atomic Energy Commission to its employees."

Strasbourg Seeks a Link With Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of May 14, 1951:

STRASBOURG SEEKS A LINK WITH WASHINGTON

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The old town of Strasbourg has taken on a new animation since it became the capital of the Council of Europe, 2 years ago. It is a border city; the bridge over the Rhine connects France and Germany and the German landscape on the other side is dominated by the incongruously lacy spires of the massive red cathedral. Strasbourg is like the cathedral—a sober, solid place with an overlay of lightness.

But Strasbourg is no longer just a city on a contested frontier. It is a city looking beyond frontiers, a pioneer in a political wilderness. The eighteenth-century architecture still dominates, despite the modern buildings erected to replace the battered shells left by the war—Marshall plan houses, they are called—or to accommodate the European Parliament, but the eighteenth century, heyday of dukedoms, principalities, and little states, is deader in Strasbourg than anywhere else in Europe. So is the Franco-German conflict. Too little stress had been laid on the fact that it was on this bitter boundary, within the month, that West Germany was received into the council and the Schuman plan was endorsed by an 80-to-7 vote. It may be said that the famous Strasbourg clock is the first on the Continent to tell the new time.

THE GOAL OF THE MOVEMENT

So far, to be sure, the Assembly is more a symbol than a real force. In 2 years it has merely turned an idea into an organization, and this organization is without power to legislate or make policy. It cannot take practical steps to bring about the unity it seeks. At the current session it even took a step backward by shelving the plan for federation in deference to British opposition to any surrender of sovereignty. A federal union, on the pattern of the American Union but looser and more limited in scope, is the goal set for the European movement by continental leaders like Paul Reynaud, Paul-Henri Spaak, and André Philip.

There is a great grass-roots feeling for unity, and the plan will not be given up. Much has to be done, however, before it can be achieved, and if the members of the assembly concentrate meantime on concrete measures to break down barriers and develop broad lines of common policy, national frontiers will be leveled by degrees, without frontal attack. In fact, they are being leveled. The enormous difficulties in the way of the Benelux free trade area, for instance, are far from being surmounted, but nobody in Belgium, Holland, or Luxemburg is now willing to go back to the former system.

The three countries in the pool have discovered that their trading and bargaining position is much better as one unit than as three. Instead of losing they have gained economic power. The Schuman plan faces even greater difficulties, but in the long run—assuming it has a long run—the rewards on the economic side alone will more than compensate for the sacrifices.

On the political side, of course, even as an idea the project is like a gust of fresh air in a closed room. The same may be said of the Council of Europe. Obviously it attempts too much, falls into the habit of old parliaments in being too diffuse and too talkative. It discusses forming a European army when it is clear that nothing can be done about it while the western powers are hard pressed to fulfill their obligation to provide forces for the Atlantic Treaty army. And it fails to come to grips with problems it might exert pressure on governments to deal with. One of these is the urgently dangerous problem of the refugees and deportees, piling up in Germany like an ammunition dump waiting to go off.

Nevertheless Strasbourg expresses an impulse that cannot be brushed aside. No one should discount the power of symbols. The arguments that echo in the Council of Europe today don't get far in practical terms, but at least they are on a new them; they drown out the stale disputes of yesterday. For the first time in a century, the scarred old border city is talking about the Rhine as a bridge instead of a dividing line.

AN INVITATION TO CONGRESS

And in tabling the idea of federation for a while the assembly is growing more rather than less ambitious. Saturday, by a unanimous vote, it invited Members of the United States Congress to attend the fall session. The speeches for the resolution acknowledged the moral support this country has given to European union and the resolution itself stressed the advantages of a public discussion of their common problems and dangers between the Representatives of Congress and the European assembly. This is a new idea and certainly has its points as a means of clearing up the misunderstandings that befog the international atmosphere.

But probably another reason is behind the desire to forge a link between Strasbourg and Washington. The feeling is common among continental leaders that Britain is literally behind the times in standing against or apart from the currents that run toward new forms of political cooperation and larger economic mergers, and beyond that lies the belief that Britain will not join Europe because she fears that it will weaken her ties not only to the Commonwealth but to the United States; therefore linking the Council of Europe to the United States is one way of drawing Britain into the circle. Furthermore—and this is the decisive reason—as soon as the nations of Western Europe begin to think seriously of unity they realize that their union is not big enough. The men of Strasbourg are feeling their way to becoming a part of an Atlantic union.

Legislation Affecting the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, delivered before the northeast Ohio district, National Association of Letter Carriers, Wooster, Ohio, May 12, 1951:

It is a pleasure to speak to members of a group that plays as large a part in the lives of all the people as do the postal workers.

Receiving mail is one of the things in life that we look forward to with keen anticipation. I am sure all of you who have delivered mail to the homes of the cities in this area have seen this anticipation. You have seen it in the face of a boy who runs to meet you, eagerly hoping his Hopalong Cassidy genuine pearl-handled revolver is in your bag. You have seen it in the quiet hope of the retired worker who is expecting his monthly check, or the mother hoping for a letter from Korea. You have all experienced the enthusiasm with which you are greeted when that gun, check or letter does arrive. I hope all of you have found satisfaction in that enthusiasm, for each of us must receive something from his job besides his pay.

There is no group of Federal employees as old in point of service to our Nation as the United States postal workers. There is no group of employees in or out of the Federal service who can justifiably point with greater pride to their record of steadfast, loyal, and efficient service to the Nation.

Yours is a history much older than that of the Federal Government itself, for your service existed before the Federal Constitution was adopted. The Post Office Department can trace its history back more than 200 years to the day in 1737 when Benjamin Franklin was appointed postmaster at Philadelphia. Some years later, in 1753, he acquired the lofty title, "Co-Deputy Postmaster General of the British Colonies in North America."

What is more important to us today, however, is the fact that on July 26, 1775, Franklin became our first Postmaster General and went on to lay much of the foundation for the development of the present United States postal system.

In this development over the past half century the National Association of Letter Carriers has played a prominent and important part. In my opinion, the value of your service to our postal system and to our Nation cannot be overemphasized. Since the founding of the association in Milwaukee in August of 1889, you have had twin objectives, namely, service to the American people, and service to your members. These objectives cannot be separated. They are intimately intertwined and in serving one you must also serve the other.

During the 62 years since the founding of your association, very few of your achievements have come easily. One of the first major tasks that the new organization faced was to secure compliance with the eight-hour law for postal workers which Congress had passed in 1888. Strange as it may seem in 1951, it was actually necessary to resort to court action to compel the Post Office Department to grant the letter carriers their rights under the 1888 statute. That the founders of the association had the courage and the determination to assert these rights is a tribute to their far-sightedness and to the firmness of their purpose to build an organization that could attain the legitimate goals of the postal workers.

During the period from 1889 to 1921, your association time and again was forced to overcome the determined opposition of hostile Postmasters General, gag rules which prohibited not only yourselves but all Federal employees from direct contact with Congress through their duly elected representatives, as well as other formidable obstacles. That the association was successful in the long run is illustrated by the fact that in 1912, the Lloyd-La Follette Act, the Magna Carta of postal organizations, was approved.

Since 1921, however, when Will Hays became Warren G. Harding's first Postmaster General, the men who have held this Cabinet position have had a uniformly friendly attitude toward National Association of Letter Carriers. Since 1921, the influence and prestige of your organization has steadily increased. The realization of the need for high morale among post-office employees and that

the administration of the Department calls for teamwork on the part of everyone seems to have become an established pattern during the 30 years since Will Hays set out to correct the shortcomings in employee-Department relationships in the Post Office.

I want to discuss with you this evening some of the bills now before either the House or the Senate which are of interest both to the association and to you as individuals. I say "some of the bills" because up to now at least 50 have been introduced in the Eighty-second Congress which certainly are of some interest to either yourselves individually or to your association as a whole. In the time we have this evening, it would be impossible to consider the provisions of 50 bills, as you well know, but we can and should consider briefly the provisions of the more important ones now before Congress.

H. R. 244 and similar bills give all employees in the postal service who are six grades or more below the top automatic grade in their class a $600 annual increase in salary. Those employees who are less than six grades below the top automatic grade in their class will receive a $100 increase for each grade they are below the top automatic grade. In addition, all employees will receive a 17-percent increase of their new salary rate.

In the case of clerks or carriers (the largest group of postal employees, numbering about 300,000), there are presently 11 automatic grades representing a $100 increase each, and clerks and carriers progress to the next higher grade each year. These grades are reduced to five under H. R. 244. The new salary grades would correspond in salary to the present salary grades of 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, plus the 17-percent increase. Clerks or carriers now in grades below grade five will go to the new grade of the same number, which, under the new schedule, will be $600 higher than at present. Those in grades 6 to 11 will be placed in the new grade 5, which salary is the same as the present grade 11.

A clerk or carrier who today enters the service as a substitute at $2,670 a year would, under the bill, enter the service at $3,825.90. Clerks or carriers in grades 1 through 4 would thus receive an increase of $600 plus 17 percent. Clerks and carriers in the new grade 5 would receive an increase of 17 percent.

Next come H. R. 337 and S. 190. These similar bills revoke the controversial order of the Postmaster General published April 18, 1950, curtailing delivery and other postal services.

There are 13 bills similar to H. R. 337 and S. 190.

In the field of retirement legislation, two bills have been introduced which amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase annuities of retired employees by 33⅓ percent of the annuity they are now receiving, or by $500 annually, whichever amount is smaller. These bills are H. R. 233 and S. 926, and of course are of most interest to postal workers who have already retired.

Another bill on retirement legislation, and perhaps the most important I shall mention this evening, is S. 995. Its provisions are quite technical.

First, it increases the annuities of all employees on the retired rolls by $120 plus $12 for each two full months that have passed since the annuity began and the date S. 995 goes into effect if it becomes law. However, the total increase cannot be more than $360 and the total yearly annuity cannot exceed $2,400. This means that any retired employee who has retired 3½ years would be entitled to the full increase, provided his annuity remained within the $2,400 limit.

Second, S. 995 increases the annuities of survivors by $120 and the annuities of children, in the case where there is one child, to $720. When there are more than one, the amount cannot exceed $1,440.

These first two provisions refer to employees who have already retired.

As to those who retire in the future, S. 995 sets up a new formula for computing the amount of the annuity. This new formula provides for 1 percent of the highest 5-year average salary plus $30 multiplied by the number of years of service. The present law provides for 1 percent plus $25.

Next, S. 995 increases the annuity for children by providing a minimum of $750, but in no case shall the total annuity, where there are several children, be more than 40 percent of the employee's average salary.

S. 995 has an important disability provision. An employee who retires on disability would receive either the amount of annuity provided under the regular formula, if that amount is greater, or an amount equal to either 40 percent of his average salary or the sum obtained by increasing the total service of the employee to the number of years he would have had if the date of separation was at age 60, whichever is the lesser amount.

S. 995 makes a number of other changes in the present law, for example, lowering the optional retirement age from 62 to 60 after 15 but less than 30 years of service.

As I said previously, the provisions of S. 995 are complicated. Nevertheless, it should be of interest to each of you because if passed, the provisions of the retirement law would be greatly liberalized.

Another bill of great interest to those of you who wear uniforms is H. R. 179. It provides an allowance of $100 annually to each Federal employee required to wear uniforms whenever it is impracticable for his agency to furnish them. The agency is also required to be responsible for the cleaning and repair of uniforms, but if this is impracticable, the employee would be given an additional $25 annually.

There are four bills whose provisions are similar to those of H. R. 179.

Two bills of great interest to all postal employees are H. R. 243 and S. 411. They provide 26 days annual leave instead of the 15 you now have, and 15 days sick leave instead of the 10 you now receive.

A bill which is of primary interest to the association is H. R. 571. It provides for the recognition of the right of officers and representatives of Government employees' national organizations representing a majority of the employees of a department, agency, or subdivision, to present employee grievances, to confer with administrative officers on matters of policy affecting working conditions, to solicit membership, collect dues, and so on.

Another bill, H. R. 1353, establishes a minimum space requirement for post-office stations operated in any building leased by the United States.

Lastly, two bills of great importance to every civil servant of the United States Government are H. R. 418 and S. 412. Both these bills provide for optional retirement after 30 years of service.

Just before leaving Washington I discussed some of these matters with Congressman ED REES of Kansas, who is the ranking Republican member of the committee having this legislation under consideration. I think you all know ED REES to be a real friend of the postal workers for Bill Dougherty said not long ago to a group in Washington, "More benefits were received by postal workers during the Republican Eightieth Congress under the leadership of ED REES than at any other time in the history of this country."

I asked Mr. REES why we had not had some action on some of these pending bills in the committee. He told me that although the scheduling of the bills was up to the chairman of the committee, who is a member of the majority party, but nevertheless, it is the custom that such bills are considered after consultation with members of the Post Office Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget.

He told me that the Bureau of the Budget has not yet acted upon the requests. I think you know as well as I do that the Bureau of the Budget is the right arm of the President and very much under his control. So you can see that the delay, at least until this time, is not the responsibility of the Congress but that of the executive branch of the Government.

To sum up briefly this discussion of bills of interest to postal employees, we have:

1. Bills to raise the pay of postal employees.
2. Bills revoking the Postmaster General's order of April 18, 1950, curtailing service.
3. Bills to increase the annuities of former postal employees now retired.
4. S. 995, greatly liberalizing the present provisions of the retirement law.
5. Bills providing uniforms for postal employees.
6. Bills providing equality in leave provisions with other Government employees.
7. H. R. 571, providing for organization recognition.
8. H. R. 1353, providing for minimum-space requirements.
9. Bills providing for optional retirement after 30 years of service.

In principle, I feel I can support these bills, which will, in my opinion, greatly benefit a very worthy group of loyal Government employees.

In its efforts to improve the lot of its individual members, the National Association of Letter Carriers is doing an excellent job, not only in the field of fostering legislation, but in what I shall call the benevolent field as well. I commend you for your efforts. Your mutual benefit association, your sick benefit association, and your hospitalization plan are all concrete evidence of your determination to be a fraternal as well as an occupational organization. An even more outstanding proof of the fraternal aspect of your organization is the fact that your total of 103,000 members in every State in the Union, in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, is greater than the sum total of regular letter carriers in the United States. That is a very great tribute to any organization. You have every right to be proud of it.

As you well know, an organization can only be as strong as its members are determined it shall be. As I mentioned previously, the fundamental purposes of your organization, as laid down in your constitution, are to represent the letter carriers and to improve the caliber of the postal service. To achieve these objectives, let me urge you to give your association strong, loyal, and continual support. It was founded on high ideals. Its accomplishments are many. It merits your faith, your pride, your devotion.

I, personally, feel that the Post Office Department—and that, of course, means you who are here before me—is doing a remarkable job under the pressure of constantly increasing mail volume. We are all well acquainted with the story of the almost legendary Pony Express which operated between St. Joseph, Mo., and California during a 18-month period beginning April 3, 1860. The Pony Express established for all time the tradition that "the mail must go through." The express was succeeded by the railroad and the railroad has been supplemented by the motor truck and the airplane. Even with all the changes in our civilization, with all our scientific advances, this tradition of the Pony Express still is an integral part of the Post Office. This standard of service has been set over the years, not by the administration in power, not by the Postmaster General, but by the employees of the Post Office themselves. You may well be proud of that standard and of your accomplishments achieved under it.

Third Anniversary of Israel as an Independent State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Israel has been a free nation such a short time, but into those few years it has concentrated a century of progress.

Colonialism and feudalism had kept the Middle East in bondage for so long that life in that area had become just a treadmill where generation succeeded generation with monotonous sameness.

It was then that the Jewish people, fighting to redeem a corner of their native land for their own use—and as a sanctuary in which their persecuted brethren from all over the world might find peace and opportunity—won their independence.

From that moment on, the sluggish East awakened to the fact that the ferment of freedom was working a modern day miracle in the desert, making it bloom with hope and effort and achievement.

We, as Americans, are proud of the remarkable development of Israel which is the most promising child born to world democracy in recent years.

At a time when some other peoples are surrending their birthright of human independence to a gluttonous state, in return for the security that is slavery, it is good to see the Jewish people proving anew that freedom alone can release the creative forces in every individual.

Israel reborn shows the dynamic power of the human spirit when it is liberated. Here is faith at work.

As in the United States, we are prone to point the material evidence first, as the yardstick of development, forgetting the freedom of inquiry and the freedom of action that inspire true progress.

The modern city of Tel Aviv, meaning Hill of Spring, is the showplace of the young Israeli State. In 1909, 66 families founded the new neighborhood of Tel Aviv on the sand dunes north of Jaffa. Today, with the latter incorporated within its boundaries, and nourished by the swelling tide of immigration, Tel Aviv's population has soared to more than 400,000. It is a new city in every sense of the word, with attractive and functional apartment buildings for the average citizen that make us ashamed of the slums in our own American cities.

Some westerners are apt to belittle Israel's magnificent growth against great odds, overlooking the fact that it was deficient in water and wood and virgin soil.

They say it was easy because the Jews were one people and united.

This is not so. In addition to overcoming many economic, political, and natural obstacles, the new nation had to find a modus vivendi that would harmonize conflicting social tensions. The people in Israel have come from all corners of the world, separate from one another in more than fifty different ways. And the problem was further complicated by differences in language, background, and viewpoint. Some of them still suffer from the effects of the physical and mental persecution to which they were subjected in other lands.

In the United States, we measure human progress in terms of development from a normal base. In Israel, there was the prior need of rehabilitation before such progress could be made. That the young nation is succeeding in both, and at the same time, is double proof of its indomitable spirit.

The Jewish people have a great culture, rooted in a brilliant past. But they are not content to rest upon the past like some civilizations that aged and died because they built upon the material rather than the eternal vigor of mind and spirit. In Israel today they are building with all the physical eagerness of youth that also has the wisdom to know how to make the things of life serve the capacities of the human spirit. This is the secret of its liberation. The city of Tel Aviv is the expression of it that meets the eye. But it is within the homes and shops and factories that we see, hear, feel, and share the unfolding story of individual happiness and fulfillment that approximates the goal of brotherhood.

The needs of man himself, in relation to his changing environment, are being given every opportunity in the new society that is being created out of a wilderness.

In the United States, we once had a wilderness of trees.

Now we have a traffic of man-made things, which can become instruments for good or evil, in proportion to the way in which they encourage or retard the yearnings of the human spirit.

Uncle Sam and young Israel are akin. I think we can help one another.

1951 marks another birthday for the youngster, his third and his very own. He will be growing up before we know it. Time to take him into the family business of producing peace and opportunity for all the customers in this world. Israel will be a good partner in that job.

That is what we are thinking as we say: "Happy birthday from our hearts to yours."

Twelve Anti-Red Poles Escape Iron Curtain in Iron Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by the Associated Press entitled "Twelve Anti-Red Poles Escape Iron Curtain in Iron Horses."

Mr. Speaker, further evidence of the effectiveness of the Voice of America can be found in this news report of how the Voice of America reaches behind the iron curtain:

[From the Washington Star of April 28, 1951]

TWELVE ANTI-RED POLES ESCAPE IRON CURTAIN IN IRON HORSES

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, April 28.—Broadcasts by the Voice of America and the British Broadcasting Corp. inspired 12 Polish rail workers to flee their Communist homeland in two stolen locomotives and seek refuge in Western Europe, it was learned last night.

With the help of a forged collective passport, the freedom-loving 12 broke through the iron curtain and made a 17-day journey across Germany to Courtrai, Belgium. Not even the Russian border guards in East Germany questioned their credentials.

Five of the escapees have been given asylum in Belgium. The other seven continued on to France.

One of the railroaders, Stanislav Oles, told newsmen this version of the escape:

Two Belgian-made locomotives broke down and Polish officials ordered them sent to Belgium for repairs. Six good Communists were supposed to take the engines, but the 12 nonconformists steamed off in their stead. And with the help of their forged passport and the connivance of a minor railroad official they made their escape without being questioned.

Oles said he and his friends, several of whom had been threatened with arrest for their opposition to the Red regime, had heard about the free-labor organizations of the Western World through Voice of America and BBC broadcasts.

Oles said some 2,500 Polish railroaders are under arrest for antigovernment activity. He added:

"You can imagine how many more are taking part in the anti-Communist underground fight in Poland."

Ballantine Emergency Disaster Relief Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an account of the incorporation of a Ballantine emergency disaster relief unit into the civil defense plan, of Hamden, Conn., whose authorities immediately pledged the equipment to mutual use by neighboring New Haven.

This pattern, which I am hopeful that other private concerns in Connecticut will follow, was set through the courtesy of the Hamden branch of P. Ballantine & Sons, of Newark, of which Mr. Stanhope B. Healey is manager.

Each truck contains an emergency unit kit consisting of a blanket, a stretcher, a pickax, shovels, first-aid equipment, fuses and flares, storage lights, canvas, lengths of rope, and extension ladders. Ten trucks with this equipment are always on immediate call. A "spot convoy" available in 10 minutes, consists of six closed route trucks and three supervisors' coupes, all manned by personnel experienced in first aid, who will receive additional training in rescue and evacuation work.

A demonstration by a token unit of five trucks so equipped and manned was held in front of the New Haven City Hall on May 2 and showed how the unit may serve for evacuation purposes or as supply transports, and also how it is convertible into mobile kitchens or first-aid stations.

The value of this plan lies in the fact that it immeasurably strengthens our official civil defense preparations without any added expense to Government.

It solves a specific problem that has long vexed civil defense authorities, hampered by small budgets that made inevitable a shortage of transportation. For whether in Hamden, New Haven, or elsewhere in my district, authorities have found it impractical to provide special vehicles for emergency disasters that all hope may never happen.

Acting for Mr. Healey, George Mahoney, sales manager, and Paul McFarland, operator of the truck fleet, pledged 50 Ballantine trucks to First Selectman Michael J. Whalen, of Hamden, for use in event of a major disaster.

This plan for voluntary cooperation with civilian defense efforts was first formulated a year ago by Mr. Carl Badenhausen, president of Ballantine, after the disastrous South Amboy, N. J., munitions explosion.

I am happy also to report that the cooperation of organized labor in this gesture of cooperation toward our civil defense was pledged by James McGrail, president of the local brewery workers, and Matthew Ruppolo, head of the local teamsters' union.

Now it is my constant hope that necessity will never call this emergency disaster unit into use. But it is also my belief that the better we are prepared, against either catastrophe or a potential enemy, the less likely it is to strike.

Mother's Day, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to deliver the address at the twenty-seventh annual Mothers' Day ceremonies sponsored by the American War Mothers which was held at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Amphitheater, Arlington National Cemetery, on Sunday, May 13, 1951.

The address follows:

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, the honor of participating in the twenty-seventh annual Mother's Day ceremonies sponsored by such a distinguished organization as the American War Mothers is one of which I am exceedingly proud. Your organization reflects the true spirit of American motherhood, for you symbolize the patriotic service made by the mothers of America in freely offering their sons and daughters to bear arms, and if need be, to die in defense of liberty and justice.

On this Mother's Day, Sunday, May 13, 1951, America salutes you as it pays homage to the mothers of our country.

It is fitting that we set aside one day out of each year, as a reminder of the love and reverence we owe our mothers, and which in truth, we should express every day of our lives.

The name "mother," is one of the most beautiful expressions in the language of mankind, because it embodies the finest personality on earth. When one mentions the name of "Mother," it calls up all the sweet and noble qualities of human life, because from her, radiates all the purest and hollest aspirations of one's nature.

We honor ourselves when we honor our mother. We need the inspiration of her unselfish spirit. We are all nobler for thinking of mother, for paying tribute to her virtues, and for remembering her many sacrifices. No man or woman can afford to get beyond the sway of her gentle spirit, and to keep within its influence, we honor her on Mother's Day.

In our observance, we pause in the hectic struggle of world and personal affairs to eulogize a mother's love—an influence far stronger for right living—than all the world's philosophies, diplomacy, and wars.

In 1914, when Congress approved a joint resolution establishing Mother's Day, it did so on the eve of America's entry into the first of two global wars. Millions in these two great conflicts lost their lives, including thousands of the flower of American manhood. In addition, we expended the resources of our country in opposing the new ideologies that challenged the cherished possessions of all Americans. This challenge is still with us and grows more menacing with each succeeding day.

As we pause on this May 13, 1951, to observe the thirty-seventh anniversary of Mother's Day, we realize only too well, that we are living in a confused and bewildered world. In Korea, American boys are dying daily, while world diplomats tussle with the problem of averting a third world war too destructive to contemplate.

Despite the efforts made to formulate a just and lasting peace, the goal has not been reached, because the hearts of mankind are not yet attuned to the spirit of universal love, which is essential if the family of nations expect to dwell in harmony with each other.

History is replete, with the experiences of nation after nation, who sought power and glory through conquest and subjugation. It is written on the memories of mankind, that the nation that forgot God, and refused to recognize the human dignity of every creature created by Him, traveled the road to ruin and oblivion.

Yet, how short is the memory of man? Regardless of the lessons from history of the utter destruction of ancient empires, our minds were refreshed during the present twentieth century by the fate that befell modern dictators, who have trod the same path to destruction that their counterparts traversed in the dim and distant past.

We erroneously thought we had learned a costly lesson from World War I, but our entry into World War II was a grim reminder that the armistice of 1918 settled nothing, but was truly, as Webster defines the word—"merely a cessation of hostilities."

We are at this moment within the shadows of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier—a hero of World War I whose real identity is known only to God. What a mockery it is to realize that since his heroic death thousands of American boys, just as eager and patriotic, have been sacrificed on the altar of freedom in a second global war; and, at the moment, we can literally hear the sounds of the violent gunfire on the rice paddies of Korea, as thousands of American fathers and mothers receive the dreaded news from the Department of Defense that a loving and devoted son has lost his life in what may prove to be merely a prelude to a third world conflict.

Meanwhile, the quest for peace and understanding among all nations eludes our grasp because those who fashion world affairs have lost their sense of moral values, and insist on decisions that benefit them alone. This moral degeneracy has been nurtured because a godless philosophy has supplanted the Christian idea of love and brotherhood.

There is not a mother worthy of the name, regardless of her racial origin, who has not counseled her children as to the difference between right and wrong. This sound advice has been given in various tongues since time immemorial, but interpreted the same the world over, as the eternal characteristic of every mother—the intense desire to see her child develop courage, resourcefulness, and virtue. These lessons she has taught her child from infancy, whether she may have been lacking in formal education or the possessor of a college degree. In short, it is the basis of mother love and devotion, and intended as lessons in character building.

Unfortunately, those obstructionists to world peace for the greater part, come from homes where in early childhood they were taught the truths of Christianity. Yes; at their mothers' knees they learned the first prayers of babyhood, and were given additional training in the love and fear of God during their boyhood years. Then as they reached man's estate, they faltered, and embraced the false philosophies that were man-made concepts, and devoid of Christian principles. They were the same philosophies of government, that ancient empires adhered to, and which led them down the road to national ruin. Paganistic in their basic principles, the prime objective is to relegate God to the background, and to ridicule and defy Him.

Is there any wonder, with such an international background of moral depravity, that we grope for a peace that we cannot reach, because of the baseness of men's hearts—the men who literally hold the destiny and the welfare of millions of God's creatures in the very palms of their hands.

Yet, while we pass judgment on the rest of humanity, it is well to remember that we Americans have also departed from the path of right living, and, in doing so, have spurned the teachings that in early life were intended to serve us as a shield against the temptations that we were warned to expect.

We pride ourselves on being the strongest nation on the face of the globe, but are we certain that an inventory of our national strength does not disclose that it is of a material nature and lacking in spiritual values?

It is true that recent reports indicate that there has been a marked increase in the number of people returning to church. This is indicative of the fact that the basic convictions of the American people are rooted in firm ground, but our tendency to become indifferent is an attribute that could easily lead us into serious difficulty.

We practice the virtue of Christian charity to such a degree that we have poured billions of dollars into projects and programs designed to rehabilitate the war-torn countries. These programs, while commendable, are often undertaken while the needs of our own citizens are ignored, especially those who have reached the twilight of life and find the day's burden more than they can bear.

Our indifference is also a matter of national concern, as we witness the exposure of persons appointed to high places in our Government who have succumbed to temptation in accepting bribes for exerting their influence in a questionable manner.

Then, too, we hardly lift an eyebrow as we read of the betrayal of our country by trusted Government employees who, while

in the custody of secret information, have for personal gain furnished such data to foreign agents, and especially to the representatives of a country that poses the greatest threat to our national existence ever recorded.

We are indifferent to the wave of crime that has engulfed us, and which has been accompanied by the revelation that the police department in the greatest city in the Nation is involved. The Nation-wide crime syndicate has invaded various phases of everyday life, and continues to collect billions of dollars annually from the pockets of the rank and file of American citizenry.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, the example of these gangsters has brought a corresponding problem of national significance in the extent of juvenile delinquency in this Nation, which has been traced to refusal, on the part of a misguided portion of our teen-age population, to follow the counsel of their parents.

It is to the credit of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, and to many outstanding leaders in the field of education, that we are being aroused from our spirit of indifference, and brought to realize that juvenile delinquency is a problem that, unless it is solved in a practical manner, can surely serve as a reservoir from which potential criminals may be recruited by the crime syndicate that is no respector of persons in carrying on its far-flung activities.

As we celebrate Mother's Day this year, we realize that there are thousands of good mothers with saddened hearts, because their children have scorned their painstaking efforts to guide their feet along the path of virtue, and instead, have brought disgrace to themselves and those whose love for them knows no bounds despite their wayward attitude.

When you meditate on these observations I have given you, of our laxity as individuals to the happenings around us in our everyday lives, it is not hard to realize that our indifference serves as an incentive for lawless conduct, in every phase of our existence. We are knowingly or unknowingly encouraging practices that endanger our form of government, and that if unchecked will eventually bankrupt us morally and spiritually.

On this Mother's Day, let us face the challenge that confronts us as a Nation by rededicating our own lives to the ideals that our mothers held so sacred, and for which they gave their all so unselfishly.

Let us show our appreciation, our honor and respect, for the memory of the motherhood of America, by caring for the living.

May the blessed memories of our God-fearing, self-sacrificing, and sainted mothers always be an inspiration, and a guiding star in our lives—until that day—when by the grace and mercy of God, we shall meet our mothers in that blessed land, where life is eternal, and from whence no traveler shall ever return.

National Guard Recruiting Program as It Concerns 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter forwarded to me by Maj. Gen. D. W. McGowan, commanding, New Jersey National Guard. It relates to certain misunderstandings concerning the recruiting program of the National Guard as it concerns youths 18 years of age. Also, as part of the extension of my remarks, I insert herewith two newspaper items, one containing the expression of General McGowan's views relating to this subject, and the other being an open letter by General McGowan to parents of high-school boys answering certain questions existing in their minds.

The above-mentioned follows:

NEW JERSEY NATIONAL GUARD,
FIFTIETH ARMORED DIVISION,
Newark, N. J., March 14, 1951.

Hon. EDWARD J. HART,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I know that you will be interested as a friend of the National Guard and because our recruiting effort might readily be misconstrued, and also because you will want to have the facts in the event you receive any letters concerning the National Guard recruiting program as it concerns 18-year-olds.

In all our recruiting efforts, and especially in the advertisement of which I enclose a copy, I personally insured that no one could feel that we were offering means of avoiding military service. Rather we urge they commence basic military training with the National Guard now, while continuing their schooling.

We have pointed out their rights under existing legislation, to assist them to exercise that choice offered by legislation which, in effect, permits them to choose their own outfit and serve with their friends.

Our traditional volunteer system, to which this country has always clung, has always had to be supported by some form of compulsory military service. But, even though enlistments are frequently brought about by reason of the threat of compulsory service, the choice extended to individuals under current and proposed legislation is a welcome means of avoiding the feeling on the part of the youth of our country that they are "conscripts," but are rather "volunteers" or "selectees."

We of the National Guard have repeatedly urged a phased induction of all the National Guard. We agree with the published views of many Members of Congress that it is hard to reconcile the request by the Department of Defense for induction of greater numbers of our young men, when 250,000 volunteers in the National Guard are available and joined the guard expressly for service in time of national emergency.

The National Guard never has been, and can never become, a haven for draft dodgers.

Sincerely,

D. W. MCGOWAN,
Major General, New Jersey National Guard, Commanding.

GUARD CHIEF IRKS MCGOWAN—JERSEY COMMANDER HITS CLAIM SERVICE IS DRAFT DODGERS' HAVEN

Maj. Gen. Donald W. McGowan, comanding general of the New Jersey National Guard, today took exception to charges made in Washington that the National Guard is a haven for draft dodgers. He said that the important position the guard plays in national defense has been repeatedly stressed by Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff.

Speaking of the Jersey Guard McGowan said:

"The New Jersey National Guard has served in every war of the Republic. During my 34 years of service, it was ordered into Federal service three times—in 1916 for duty on the Mexican border, the following year for service in World War I, and again in 1940 for World War II. And now, for the fourth time, New Jersey units are again in Federal service.

"Units of the New Jersey National Guard distinguished themselves in combat overseas in both world wars. The service these units rendered their country in time of war stands as an indisputable answer to any charges that the National Guard is a haven for these who would avoid service to their country."

AN OPEN LETTER TO PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL BOYS

There must be many questions in your minds about the effect of current draft policies on your boy's future; whether he is subject to military service; how he can perform this service; and, how he can continue his schooling—all pertinent questions today. The New Jersey National Guard can supply answers to these questions.

If your son joins a National Guard unit before he becomes 18½ years of age, he is not subject to induction by the draft.

If he is over 18½, but joins a National Guard unit before his local board mails his order to report for his draft physical examination, he will not be drafted under current Department of Defense regulations.

As a member of the National Guard, your son will not be called up for active duty unless his unit is inducted into Federal service. He has an opportunity to get his basic military training while continuing his high school education.

Information on current selective-service policies, and the advantages of National Guard membership, will be presented at a meeting to be held in your local high school during the next 2 weeks, to which all draft-eligible students will be invited. I strongly recommend that your son inquire at your high school about this meeting and that he be sure to attend.

Information is available also at local National Guard Armories every day and evening, Monday through Friday.

I sincerely believe that the New Jersey National Guard offers your son a splendid opportunity to serve his country while continuing his education.

D. W. MCGOWAN,
Major General, New Jersey National Guard, Commanding.

Immediate Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following self-explanatory telegram that I have received:

Representative THOMAS J. LANE,
Congressional Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

The Massachusetts Congregational Conference having a constituency of 600 churches, 190,000 members, urges Massachusetts delegation in Congress use every effort to have food relief sent to India immediately in accord with the following resolution passed unanimously this morning by the Massachusetts Congregational Conference and Missionary Society:

"For months India has been in desperate need of grain, because of a critical shortage in her domestic production caused by flood and other factors. Meantime, we have had in storage millions of tons of surplus wheat

which might have been related to the needs of the people of India. On February 12, 1951, President Truman called on the Congress to take immediate steps to send food to India. However, effective steps yet remain to be taken. It is our conviction that American help should be extended to India without delay as an expression of the Christian good will of the people of America to the people of India: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge Congress to hasten the passage of effective legislation necessary for expediting the sending of American grain to India."

MYRON W. FOWELL,
Secretary.

Boys Advised To Look Beyond Immediate Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by Walter F. Wright, Jr., a fine, thoughtful young American, a student in the Shaddock School, Faribault, Minn.

His editorial was selected to appear in the school's winter, 1951, quarterly, and is worthy of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Congress, so that many thousands of Americans may read with profit to themselves.

My compliments to the author, Walter F. Wright, Jr.:

ADVISES BOYS TO LOOK BEYOND IMMEDIATE FUTURE

(A sample of the thinking being done by seniors at Shattuck is reflected in the following editorial written by Walter F. Wright Jr. of Onawa, Iowa, which is reprinted from the Spectator of January 24, 1951.)

Each day as we look into the newspapers, it seems that the situation the world is in becomes darker and darker. The threat of another world war looms over us as each day passes. Indeed a third world war seems imminent as shown by the fact that Government officials are mobilizing a force to excel the forces that fought in World War II. At the present time a bill is before Congress to lower the draft age to 18-years.

The youth of America are preparing to enter into a war which may cause many times more devastation and destruction than World War II ever experienced. Many of these young men look upon another war as the end of everything. Some even believe it will mean the termination of life itself. This is, however, a flagrant misconception. An atomic bomb, or even a hydrogen bomb cannot wipe out the population of the entire earth. We should not therefore lose hope that there will be a future. Our future goal should be set now. This world situation must not interfere with plans for the future. The war should be considered merely as an interval between the present and the future.

After the world situation is settled and peace reigns once more over the earth, it will be up to the present generation to lead the world and see that a peaceful world is maintained. This generation will have problems which have never before confronted man. Therefore this is not the time for forgetting what lies ahead beyond the immediate future.

Polish Constitution Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered at the Polish National Home, Hartford, Conn., on Sunday, May 13, which address also was broadcast over the facilities of Station WKNB, New Britain:

Mr. President and members of the Connecticut Polish American Congress, officers and members of the combined societies, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is with a feeling of deepest pride that I have returned from Washington to be with this large gathering today, at this fine Polish National Home, celebrating the greatest of all Polish national holidays.

This is an observance of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Coincidentally, today is Mother's Day. I warmly congratulate all mothers on this day especially set aside for honoring them. I, also, extend my deepest sympathy to the large number of Polish Gold Star Mothers of Connecticut who have given our country sons whose lives were sacrificed in the name of freedom.

What, many ask me, is the meaning to the Polish people of May 3, Constitution Day? What, exactly, does it signify since Poland's history goes back more than a thousand years?

Before answering that question directly, let me note that many occasions for celebration arise in the course of each year among our various national groups. Each means something, but not in every case is the meaning behind the celebration solemn and moving.

In the case of May 3, however, it is. The significance of May 3 goes deep, to the very foundation and bedrock of the Polish national tradition. To all Poles this day has the celebrated meaning of our own American Fourth of July.

To all Americans of whatever origin, the meaning of May 3, 1791, should have a solemn and profound meaning because Poland's Constitution was modeled after our own Constitution, which was adopted only 2 years earlier.

In Philadelphia, and Paris, at that time, the problem was to extend liberty. A heritage of regimentation, of a state controlling man's freedom as an individual, had to be abolished. In Poland, in Warsaw, it was just the opposite: to restrain freedom. The old "golden liberty" of the gentry, the unlimited, boundless liberty which is in effect license, had to be given up. In its place a measure of liberty, restrained by order, had to be dealt out to the aspiring and eager middle and farming classes, too long shut out from the benefits of freedom's gold.

The constitution makers of Poland did not dodge the issue. Quickly they performed the task required of them by the peculiar circumstances of Poland's peculiar history. First they proclaimed dead, once and for all, the old, unrestrained liberty. Then, joining hands, as it were, in a mystic union with the constitution makers of our own country and France, they raised the standard of liberty with restraint, of liberty with order.

Here we have the inner, the deep and memorable significance of the constitution of May 3, to which we refer so reverently. In the hour of crisis, Poland had the energy and vision to redeem herself. In the face of every odd, Poland demonstrated that she was capable of going forward, with our own newly emerging United States and with the new France, on the road to modern statehood.

A new Poland was thus forged in 1791, by the hands of a band of patriots. It was a Poland firmly grounded in that principle of liberty with order which is the foundation for our own national life here in the United States.

Proclaim it abroad, therefore, all you who are of Polish origin, that here is the reason for our celebration of May 3 each year. May 3, let it be known, represents a demonstration for all time of Poland's inner, spontaneous vitality, and of her devotion to the great principle of liberty qualified by restraint.

The recognition of equality of all men, the proclamation of religious liberty promised in this constitution, were more than Russia, Prussia, and Austria could tolerate, so these three neighboring countries attacked Poland with full force on all sides. Poland fell in 1795, and was partitioned by its attackers. But, the May 3 constitution kept the spark of spirit and hope alive in the Polish people, because it infused them with a new patriotism and love of liberty.

It was 127 years later, for it was not until 1918 that the people of Poland regained their independence from bondage, their Republic was restored, and with a few technical changes, the new government was set up along the lines of the constitution of May 3, 1791.

Once again Poland flourished as an independent nation, her people enjoying the privileges of democratic living. Not for too long, however, because a happy, progressive, prosperous, free, and independent Poland was blotted out by World War II.

First, Germany invaded Poland and enslaved its people. Then, the Russians took over and made a mockery of freedom and all the principles set forth in the May 3 constitution.

You will say with me that it is unthinkable that Poland should have suffered this fate: betrayal because of idealism. But, to so many here present, and to those within the sound of my voice, the betrayal of Poland and the Polish people who knew in 1939 that in defying the dictatorship of Hitler and at the same moment defying that also of Stalin, is something of which all are familiar.

The 6,000,000 Polish casualties in the war; the heroic deeds of Polish soldiers, sailors, airmen not only in their homeland but from Africa to Norway; in the Baltic, the Atlantic and the Mediterranean; in France, England, and Italy; in every branch of service of our allies to which, at great risk of life in making their escape, they immediately joined up in order to fight back for freedom—all of this effort and sacrifice was betrayed by the infamous Yalta agreement. It happened exactly as the partitions happened. Promises were made by Poland's closest allies that her freedom would be restored. Instead, Poland's allies, outstanding among which was the United States, sold her down the river. It was a crime infinitely more reprehensible than anything that took place in the first three partitions, for at Yalta, we who were supposed to be her friends, committed the deed.

I am daily becoming more convinced that the American people are realizing the enormity of what was visited on the Polish race at Yalta. They are also asking about Tehran and Potsdam. None of these pacts or agreements were ever presented to the United States Senate for acceptance or rejection. The question today extends to the enslavement by communism of China since her independence, like that of Poland, is destroyed, her territorial integrity is violated and liberty ruthlessly denied.

It was in these agreements, as well as by subsequent policies and actions, American leadership sought to buy Stalin's favor at the price of the independence and integrity of both Poland and China, and at the price of our own honor. Such promises as we received, in return, from Soviet Russia were broken almost as soon as they were given. And, while we are at it, we must never forget the people of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, who are jailed behind the iron curtain, and the other neighbors of Poland in Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia who once, not so very long ago, also knew the meaning of freedom.

It was Dr. Arthur Coleman, president of Alliance College, whose home has been here in Cheshire, Conn., who said that "If the Constitution of May 3, 1791, had been permitted to perform its work, if the new Poland it created had been left to develop, it is probable the American national strain would never have been enriched, as it has been, by so vast an outpouring of heroic Polish blood. For Poland would have been a good country to live in, and there would have been no need to emigrate in order to find liberty."

From the outline I have endeavored to give you today, there are lessons for Americans in Poland's Constitution Day celebration, tardy though we may be in heeding them. Outstanding is the lesson that there can be no hope for peace, or for the preservation even of our own liberties, so long as we permit our leaders to barter away other people's freedom, whether they are the peoples of Poland or China or Formosa. It is the lesson that truly nothing can bring us peace but the triumph of principle.

Our American determination and American faith in the fundamental principles on which this country was founded and grew to power must not fade away. America was founded as a Christian nation devoted to the preservation of human freedom, with authority, and strength, stemming from the people themselves. I have hope that time has not robbed us of that devotion to principles and devotion to God. If it has not, the people themselves will fix the proper course. And that course will lead to victory for the men still locked in battle. It can lead to a preservation of the peace they will win. That is the hope that must never simply fade away. By our determination to preserve our own liberties and freedom guaranteed by our Constitution, we will keep the torch of freedom burning in the hearts of every Pole who has faith and belief in the freedoms and independence of the May 3 constitution, which he and she looks forward to again enjoying. Such was the intention of the signers of Poland's historic constitution, adopted 160 years ago.

We Agree With Mr. Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., for May 12, 1951:

WE AGREE WITH MR. GAMBLE

Charles E. Wilson, of Scarsdale, Director of Defense Mobilization, appeared recently before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in Washington to outline the progress and suggest amendments to the defense program. So satisfactory to the committee was his testimony, in marked contrast to others upon occasion, that Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE, of Larchmont, committee member, said:

"Mr. Chairman, I just want the members of this committee to know I am very proud of Mr. Wilson. He is a constituent, and on behalf of the Twenty-eighth District of New York, we are very proud of the great job he is doing and we hope he stays here during the whole course of this 'police engagement.'"

With that sentiment we are sure not only the Twenty-eighth Congressional District but all of Westchester is in sincere agreement.

And, we do not doubt in the least, so is also a large preponderance of the American people.

Registration of Firearms—Organization of a Hunters' Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a number of excellent sports authorities have voiced their approval of bills H. R. 3023 and H. R. 2897, concerning the registration of firearms and the organization of a hunters' corps to protect the United States. I am grateful for such valued assistance.

In the May 1951 issue of Sports Afield, Mr. Michael Hudoba, managing editor of this large publication, writes as follows:

The Congress has another chance to save the tiny key deer from extinction; that is, should it act promptly on bill H. R. 2897 by Representative WILLIAM LANTAFF, Democrat, Florida, to set up a wildlife management area in Florida for this unique species.

Pending in the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the bill provides a ceiling of $100,000 in establishing the management area. It was the lack of such a ceiling that killed the key deer bill in the previous Congress.

Whether it is already too late to save the estimated 25 to 50 specimens of this unique deer believed to be left is a question. Certainly Congress cannot afford to delay consideration of the measure. The tiny key deer weighs less than 50 pounds, stands about 26 inches high and measures about 38 inches from nose to tail. It is believed to be the stag described by Columbus—the first American deer seen by white men.

A hunters' corps to guard the home front is proposed by Representative EDWIN A. HALL, Republican, New York, in bill H. R. 2237, referred to the House Armed Services Committee. The volunteer army of home-front hunters and sportsmen, designed to strengthen national defense, would be neither in the draft nor armed services but would revolve around local sportsmen's organizations. Army officers would be detailed to assist in coordination of the local programs.

The sportsmen's firearms would be the primary weapons. And here is a negative feature of the proposed legislation: it provides for permits to be issued for such guns. This provision could become a wedge for registration. To prevent this, Representative HALL has introduced another bill, H. R. 3023 (for which see following item).

Ammunition would be made available to this auxiliary force by the Secretary of Defense through regular business channels.

When Representative HALL recently proposed a similar plan as an amendment to the civil defense bill, it was turned down by the Congress (see March report). He said then that the sportsman is the best home-front defense because the hunter is not only a woodsman and good shot, but also is familiar with the local terrain and thus could become a guerrilla defender in case of invasion.

It goes without saying that should this eventuality occur, the American sportsman would know what to do, and do it.

A firearms antiregistration bill (H. R. 3023) was introduced by Representative EDWIN A. HALL, Republican, New York, to supplement his hunters' corps proposal (see above), and referred to the House Ways and Means Committee. It would prohibit registration of firearms already issued legally and protect citizens against unconstitutional seizure of private weapons.

Mr. HALL uses strong language against firearms-registration efforts and should Congress pass the bill as written, its words would affirm in statute what most sportsmen have said in their fights against previous attempts to register firearms. The bill reads:

"Whereas during World War II, Nazi-minded officers attempted to pass laws abridging the constitutional right of a private citizen to bear arms; and these same officers started their anti-American program by calling for registration of all privately owned firearms; and whereas our founding fathers wisely incorporated within the Constitution of the United States this inherent privilege of our citizens to protect their hearths and homes by possessing arms; and whereas in the several States, the revival of tyranny is asserting itself in the form of proposals to register all legally issued private weapons with design to eventual seizure of firearms owned by individual citizens; therefore no citizen shall be compelled to register firearms which he is in legal possession of. * * * No Federal, State, or local officer shall have the power to seize firearms belonging to private citizens who legally possess them."

The St. Lawrence Seaway Project Is Not Economically Justified From the Standpoint of the Nation as a Whole, According to Gen. W. F. Heavey, of Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Gen. W. F. Heavey, representing the Port Houston and Texas Ports Association recently told the House Public Works Committee that the St. Lawrence seaway project if it ever becomes a reality would "rob already constructed channels of much of the traffic which justifies them today."

General Heavey's statement before the House Public Works Committee is commented upon in the following editorial appearing in the April 10, 1951, issue of the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle:

UNSOUND ST. LAWRENCE PLAN

The proposed St. Lawrence waterway project is, as Gen. W. F. Heavey testified in Washington Monday, not economically justified from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole.

General Heavey, representing Port Houston and the Texas Ports Association at a hearing held by the House Public Works Committee, protested that the project would "rob already-constructed channels of much of the traffic which justifies them today."

The St. Lawrence seaway idea was first advanced as a means of helping Midwest farmers, later as a hydroelectric project. Then national defense became the argument. Now the excuse is for transporting iron ore from Canadian mines to the sea with a national defense slant again.

But, as General Heavey pointed out, the project at the best can only barely be justified as a 27-foot channel. And that depth will not accommodate oceangoing steamers. To make it a 35-foot channel would cost more than $1,000,000,000—and again, at this time just as in 1941, we don't have the men, money, or materials to devote to it while fighting a war and preparing for a possibly much bigger one.

The St. Lawrence project would not create new tonnage. It is almost entirely a Canadian project, geographically. If the Canadians can see where it is economically justified, why don't we do as Raymond Moley suggested on this page Monday—let Canada build it?

The Pulitzer Prize and William H. Fitzpatrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have most definitely a very personal feeling and interest in addressing myself to the House today on the recent selection of William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States, for the time-honored Pulitzer Prize Award for excellence in editorial writing.

I believe that this personal satisfaction which I take unto myself will be readily understood because of my long-time association with the New Orleans States and with Billy Fitzpatrick.

The New Orleans States is the only newspaper in American journalistic history, which has on two different occasions been awarded the Sigma Delta Chi plaque for courage in journalism. The first time that this award came to the New Orleans States I was privileged to have been the city editor of that newspaper. I left the city editor's desk to come to Congress and my successor was William H. Fitzpatrick. From city editor, as my successor, he subsequently became managing editor and editor of the New Orleans States and during this period the New Orleans States was again signally honored by receiving the Sigma Delta Chi plaque.

But Billy Fitzpatrick has gone beyond the achievements of his newspaper and has been acclaimed in his own personal right as the author of the series of editorials on Treaty by Government, which has signalled him out as an individual of ability.

Is it little wonder that I have such a personal feeling in this recognition.

These editorials are not new to the membership of this House. You are already familiar with them because I have previously brought them to your attention and have long ago placed them before you, even before they were brought to the attention of the Pulitzer committee.

It was this series of editorials which inspired me to propose a constitutional amendment to carry out their intent and purposes. I have already announced that I will introduce such a resolution in the Congress. The American Bar Association has in preparation at this time such a proposed amendment and I shall follow the pattern agreed upon by them in formally introducing the proposed amendment. When they are ready I am ready to bring the proposition before the Congress.

I have from time to time brought to your attention many other articles written by Billy Fitzpatrick because I have thought they contained sound thinking and fundamental Americanism.

Do not be misled into believing that in making these remarks and eulogizing this editor, that I have been in full accord with him at all times. I have opposed him most violently on occasions and perhaps may disagree with him in the future, but in doing so there is exhibited the very fundamentals of Americanism which Billy Fitzpatrick seeks to protect in this crusade of his, because crusade it is.

This accomplishment has not been easy. From my own observation I know of the hours and the hard work put into these editorials. They are the result of study and research and the ultimate result has been far more than merely a writing job of presentation.

Since his selection as winner of the Pulitzer prize, Mr. Fitzpatrick has been showered with congratulatory telegrams. It is as it should be. I have been delayed in recognizing him on this forum because of my absence at Eniwetok. Next Wednesday night in New Orleans he will be honored at a testimonial banquet by his fellow citizens. That is also as it should be and I shall have the privilege and honor of personally attending to join in the tribute which is his just due.

If the American way of life, as we understand it, is to be preserved, we need more editors of the type of William H. Fitzpatrick to carry the flag of battle and to sound the clarion call.

The tendency of compromise and appeasement fills the air too much these days. It is the weakness of the era in which we live.

Our need is not for strong men to defend the great structure of constitutional government but for stronger men to preserve the foundation upon which the structure has been builded.

Our need is not for strong voices to shout "Yes," but for articulate voices to make themselves heard when they say "No."

Nowhere are these requisites to be found more substantially than in the free press of this Nation as represented by the men and the women of journalism who are ready and willing to carry the torch for that in which they believe.

Here are some of the things which William H. Fitzpatrick has said and which bear repeating and which will probably be repeated many, many more times in the future:

The people of this country are the inheritors of liberties gained at great cost through the centuries.

These liberties—such as religious freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of peaceful assembly, are endangered by such proposed treaties as the Genocide Convention, already submitted by the President to the Senate for ratification, and the Covenant for Human Rights, which is near completion in the United Nations.

These treaties invade the precincts of domestic law.

These treaties reduce the powers of the States while strengthening the powers of a centralized Government.

These treaties strengthen the powers of the executive branch of the Government, thus weakening the historic balance of the legislative, the executive, and the judicial.

These treaties, if ratified by the Senate and upheld by the Supreme Court, can destroy utterly our Bill of Rights and our form of government.

Here are words and admonitions which constitute more than a Pulitzer Award—they are words and admonitions of warning of things to come lest we take heed.

Think it over.

Leoffler's Friends May Halt Transfer of Public Golf Courses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of May 13, 1951:

OF PUBLINX COURSES—LEOFFLER'S FRIENDS MAY HALT TRANSFER

(By Thomas Winship)

Friends of local golf czar Severine G. Leoffler, Sr., are confident they can again block the transfer of the public golf courses here to the District Recreation Board.

Leoffler is rounding out his thirtieth year as holder of the profitable golf links concession. Last year he did about $600,000 gross business with the five courses. He receives an $11,500 salary, plus a sliding-scale percentage.

But starting this week, Leoffler faces a new threat to his regime.

A $375,000 fund to buy out Leoffler and transfer the courses to Recreation Board

control is carried in the District budget, now pending before the House Subcommittee on District Appropriations.

This is the first year that the Commissioners have included the transfer money in their regular fiscal year budget request. The Recreation Board would repay the fund to the city government.

The Bates subcommittee concluded the closed hearings on the District budget last Friday. Public hearings for citizen spokesmen are slated to begin at 10 a. m. Thursday.

Representative JOE B. BATES, Democrat, Kentucky, is chairman of this subcommittee and, it was learned yesterday, he has predicted the transfer fund will not be approved, either by his subcommittee, the full Appropriations Committee or on the House floor.

A Republican member of the Bates subcommittee, EARL WILSON, Republican, Indiana, also said the golf transfer item "would undoubtedly be disallowed. I am basically opposed to Government operation of most activities. It is not the American way."

The Bates subcommittee rejected this transfer money last summer, but gave as its explanation the fact that final details of the transfer agreement between Interior and the recreation board had not been worked out.

The agreement now is signed, so the proposed transfer is facing its first clear-cut test.

The Board of Trade's park and recreation subcommittee is scheduled to meet Tuesday to decide finally whether it will recommend the transfer, back Leoffler, or straddle the issue.

The board group is expected to side with the recreation board in this fight because Leoffler and some recreation officials are members of the Board of Trade.

Since 1948, Harry S. Wender, recreation board chairman, and James E. Schwab, board vice chairman, have sought control of the public links as contemplated in the basic law creating the Recreation Commission in 1942.

Among Leoffler's supporters in the current controversy is Joseph C. Healy, a Justice Department attorney from Covington, Ky. Healy told the Washington Post that he is a friend of Leoffler's and an ardent golfer. "For these reasons I have done what I could to help Mr. Leoffler in this matter," he said.

Healy emphasized that he is not Leoffler's attorney; that he is just a supporter.

Healy described himself as a "good friend and great admirer" of Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY. The Veep confirmed his old acquaintance with Healy. Mr. BARKLEY said that neither he nor his office ever intervened in any way in the golf-course issue.

Healy said he sent letters to all Members of Congress last January defending Leoffler's regime as efficient and a money maker for Uncle Sam. This is denied by recreation board people.

Healy said he also has seen BATES on the golf-course question and plans to see him again this week.

BATES said yesterday that Healy has been in to see him twice since January. The first time was a "social call; the second on the golf matter," the Congressman said.

Said BATES: "I wouldn't know Leoffler if I saw him. But they tell me he's turned a profit for the Government. My position last year was simply this: I will not tolerate taking taxpayers' money to pay for a private operation, and then turn it over to a public agency, when a private operation is not costing the Government any money."

The most serious threat to Leoffler's golf-course control was the 1949 House subcommittee investigation of his operations. The inquiry was instigated by Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, South Carolina.

High point of the investigation was a charge by an auditor that his study of Leoffler's company books led him to believe that the concessionaire owed the Government $119,515 which should have been paid during the 5 years preceding 1949. Leoffler denied this and all other charges of irregular bookkeeping.

The investigating subcommittee concluded its work by recommending that the golf links be transferred from the Interior Department, which would have put Leoffler out of business.

But a subcommittee-approved bill to accomplish that transfer was dropped when Interior at that point said it would effect the transfer without the bill.

As things stand now, Leoffler holds a 5-year contract (signed with Interior last January) which is subject to cancellation any time up to September 1, 1952, if funds are voted to transfer the courses to the Recreation Board.

The chances of a compromise between Loeffler and the Recreation Board—such as a transfer of the courses to Recreation but still run by Leoffler on concession—are slim, according to statements from both sides.

Wender and Schwab say they are not committed to how they would operate the course, directly or on concession. This will be decided after perhaps a 6-month to a year trial period, they say.

And Loeffler said last night, "I would not run the courses under Recreation for 5 minutes."

Lincoln and Now Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, when the current begins to sweep in increasing velocity or when the waves begin to mount in a wind-swept fury, the wise boatman carefully lays by and considers his course of action that he might safely reach the distant shore. In today's political arena we are aware on every hand of sweeping currents and rising waves of proposed action, yet we are not, as indeed we cannot be when the control of the elements is only partially in our hands, positive as to where these moving forces will lead us if we merely ride the current and bend with the on-rushing wind. All logic and historical evidence then demands that we carefully examine the underlying causal forces of the tempest and the goals which we seek over the horizon. For that reason I am calling our attention to an article by Wayne C. Williams, of Denver, Colo., in which he steps into the calm on the leeward side and carefully goes over the whole situation as his study has enabled him to do. Mr. Williams is an attorney, has served as attorney general of Colorado and also as an Assistant Attorney General for the Federal Department of Justice. He has taken this judicious temperament into the study of history and is the author of books on William Jennings Bryan and Abraham Lincoln. Accordingly, his view of the past is considerably broadened over one who has not done the research necessary to document a book. I cannot expect that all will take his evidence and conclusion carte blanche, but I do believe it constitutes a more sober view than seems popular at the moment and therefore I believe it has value to all, irrespective of conviction on this issue. There is room for divergence of opinion on as high a plane as this article is cast, and I think also that there is much more long-term gain to be had from examination and debate predicated upon the view that a better and more peaceful tomorrow is the end in view of today's deliberation and maneuver. Oriented by this perspective, it becomes possible to stick to unpopular policies which in the long run may bring about the goal of universal peace which in itself will make today's struggle worth while.

LINCOLN AND NOW TRUMAN

The most disheartening page of American history is that page telling of the attacks on Abraham Lincoln, at the crisis of the Civil War. The next most disheartening page is being written now.

This is not the place to retell history, but will any American turn back to the story by Sandburg, or any Lincoln historian, and read again of the fearful abuse, misjudgments, and attacks on the great Civil War President when he dismissed McClellan and struggled to find a general who could match the strategy of the brilliant Confederate generals and save the Union.

President Truman is passing through the same type of ordeal and there are enough parallels and analogies to cause us to pause and consider whether the present attacks upon the principles and policies of the man now in the White House will find justification at the bar of history.

There is every reason to believe that Truman's crisis will be much like Lincoln's and that in the long perspective of history Truman is due for a great vindication. I so predict. Not long ago the President said it takes 25 years for a President's policies to be truly judged and that it had taken that long, or even longer, for Lincoln or Wilson's policies to be correctly appraised. The President never uttered a truer historical judgment.

There are two supreme tests of greatness in a public official, especially as a President:

First, his principles, the goals he seeks. Second, successful leadership in a grave crisis. Apply these tests to Lincoln; how superbly he met them and how steadily his fame rises as the white light of history beats down upon that record.

Now it is submitted that Truman has faced the gravest crises that have confronted any President since Lincoln, and nearly all of them he has faced in peacetime.

What crises has he faced? And what decisions has he been called upon to make.

1. The support of Greece and Turkey against Russia and communism.

2. To join in forming an Atlantic Pact to resist communism and save Europe by helping to arm pact nations and prepare to offer military resistance to communism.

3. To sustain the U. N. by supporting with arms and American forces the Republic of South Korea against Russian and Chinese communism.

4. To defend and preserve the American way of life.

Here, with many minor supporting issues, are the grave and profound questions the President has faced and on which he has made decisions. All other decisions, questions, and issues relate to these fundamentals and must be resolved in the light of these profound issues. If the President, by his course, can prevent a world war and finally demonstrate to the war-thirsty communistic nations that the free world will meet force

with force and stop their aggression, then mankind has turned a page in history and President Truman will stand forth in the annals of mankind as one of the greatest and truest of all American leaders who have ever sat in the Presidential chair.

His goals are clearly declared and no American can misunderstand them. They are to stop aggression, sustain the U. N., and lay the foundations for the future, permanent peace of the world.

Truman will be measured by these goals, by his efforts and measures and decisions to accomplish them, and the fortunes of any general, or any individual, will be but a single item or incident in the vast historical program now being unfolded before the eyes of this present generation.

Tested by these profound goals and plans Truman has made to sustain and accomplish them, we may well look ahead 25 years to see how much can be accomplished and measure Truman by that test, and by that test alone.

What becomes then of this hue and cry, this holocaust of adverse opinion sweeping over the land? Is this not just another example of mistaken judgment, of a capricious impulse, of hot and ill-timed, ill-judged opinion that has taken on the form of a wave that catches up the unsound and ill-formed judgments of many who haven't taken a second, sober thought about what is really involved in this grave crisis?

And do not the use of modern devices for rapidly spreading public opinion and forming too-hasty judgments tend to increase this very uncritical emotional sweep? Fanned by these and by a pure-blind partisanship—that has gone beyond all bounds of discretion and bids fair to test the limits of Americanism, subordinating Americanism to partisanship—are we not now actually seeing a duplication of the terrible mistakes made by mass emotionalism misjudgments exhibited in the Civil War?

One other factor must not be overlooked—the presence in the councils of the President of a staff of unusually sound, capable statesmen: General Marshall, the leaders of the State Department, including Acheson, Kennan, Jessup, Harriman, and a cabinet of sound advisers, all of whom have tested political, economic, and executive experience and international vision.

History will sustain those leaders who have counseled the President.

And let us remember, Lincoln, too, was threatened with impeachment and denounced by his own party in Congress, and that the famous Illinois country lawyer had the clearness of vision and wisdom to see clearly his great goals, and the courage to hold on to his convictions and fight through, despite the bitterest abuse and misrepresentations.

Said Wilson, at the height of his bitterest period of criticism, "Regardless of the effect upon my personal fortunes, I am willing to play for the verdict of mankind."

President Truman has great leaders and great examples to sustain him now.

WAYNE C. WILLIAMS.

Kaiser Steel Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as you all know, I am tremendously interested in the industrial development of the West, and particularly in the industrial development of the great State of California, which I have the honor to represent.

When Henry J. Kaiser began producing steel at his big Fontana plant in 1942 there was doubt in some quarters about how long the operation would continue. In the last 9 years Mr. Kaiser has answered the doubting Thomases. He has fostered one of the modern miracles of American industry. Today Kaiser Steel Corp. has taken its place with the country's 12 biggest steel producers.

I want the skeptics who said back in 1942 that Henry J. Kaiser would never make a success of the steel business to become acquainted with the record of Kaiser Steel Corp.

Earnings after taxes in 1950 were $10,952,583, and the ingot capacity of the company's huge plant has climbed to 1,380,000 tons annually.

Comparison of these figures with those of 26 steel producers listed in the current issue of Iron Age discloses that Kaiser Steel ranks tenth in earnings and twelfth in ingot capacity. Henry Kaiser has once again met the challenge to establish a new company in one of America's most competitive industries. The economy of the Nation, and particularly the West, is reaping the benefit of Mr. Kaiser's foresight and ability.

Mr. Kaiser also has successfully answered those critics of the Government's participation in the building of the Fontana plant by repaying last fall, 20 years before they were due, the balance of $123,305,000 in loans. The Government realized a return of virtually $1.23 for each dollar of its loans to build the west coast steel plant.

The success of Kaiser Steel Corp. in this highly competitive field has not resulted in complacency on the part of its executives. An expansion program is now under way to build an eighth open-hearth furnace and a new tin plate mill to supply the West's concentration of tin can manufacturing plants and food-canning industry. This is evidence that the Kaiser enterprises will continue to spearhead the industrialization of the West.

Privilege of Newspapermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the Members of this House read with a great deal of surprise the ruling in the case of Leonard Lyons, the well-known columnist of the New York Post, who refused to divulge confidential news sources. Mr. Lyons published in his column several items regarding the spies convicted in the recent Rosenberg atomic spy trial. The decision handed down by Federal Judge John C. Knox, of the southern district, New York, held that newspapermen were not privileged to withhold sources of information.

Judge Knox's ruling was made after counsel for Mrs. Ethel Rosenberg, a convicted spy, demanded that Mr. Lyons disclose the source of certain information he published about her. Lyons claimed professional privilege to avoid such disclosure, but Judge Knox held:

> As a newspaper reporter or a columnist, Mr. Lyons is not entitled to claim his privilege, which is akin to that which exists between a lawyer and his client, a minister and his penitent, or a doctor and his patient. I have gone into the law very carefully, and I find he has no such privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this ruling will adversely affect the freedom of the press. It was always my understanding—and I am sure also many of my colleagues were of the same view—that newspapermen and others dealing with public information have the professional privilege to refuse to divulge their sources of information. In fact, I feel it is their duty in the public interest not to disclose their sources. However, I can think of two types of cases where we should make exceptions to this general rule: First, where the security of our country is involved; second, where there is concealment of a crime.

In the case of Mr. Lyons, neither factor was involved. The items he published about Mrs. Rosenberg appeared after she had been found guilty as a spy and convicted. In my opinion, Mr. Lyons truly lived up to the code of ethics of his profession by refusing to name his sources of information and by upholding the principle of freedom of the press. I wish to commend him for the courageous stand he has taken in the matter. It is my view that the relationship between a newspaperman and his source is as sacred and privileged as that between a doctor and his patient, a lawyer and his client, and a minister and his penitent. This has been our custom and our practice for a long time; and if no such privilege exists under the law—as Judge Knox states—then let us establish this privilege as a legal fact.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the aforesaid, I am today introducing a bill which establishes for newspapermen and others dealing with public information, who are called to appear as witnesses in Federal courts, the privilege that they shall not be forced to reveal the sources from which they obtain their news. The bill provides two exceptions to this privilege: Where, in the opinion of the court, disclosure is necessary: First, in the interests of national security, or, second, to avoid the concealment of a crime. The privilege which would be established under this bill would apply to any person who is engaged in gathering or presenting news, whether for newspapers, periodicals, radio, or television.

From a technical standpoint, the first section of the bill amends title 28 of the United States Code—relating to the Federal judiciary and Federal judicial procedure—by adding at the end of chapter 119 thereof—which deals with evidence and witnesses—a new section establishing the privilege. The bill contains a section 2 which makes a necessary

conforming change in title 28 to reflect, in the table of contents for chapter 119, the new section which is added to that chapter by the first section of the bill.

A very pertinent editorial covering this subject appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on May 14, 1951. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

NEWSPAPERMEN'S JUST CLAIM

Newspapermen have long contended that in refusing to divulge confidential news sources they should have the same privilege that now protects the confidential relations between lawyer and client, doctor and patient, clergyman and penitent.

At present, in Federal jurisdiction the newspaperman has no such privilege. This is the sum and substance of a ruling made from the bench this week by Federal Judge John C. Knox "after very carefully going into the law."

Since the ruling is general, merely noting it need prejudice neither the particular case before Judge Knox nor his now postponed decision on whether or not to order the particular newspaperman involved to divulge.

The general ruling itself, however, calls public attention anew to the crass injustice of discriminating against newspaper reporters by refusing them the statutory protection already given doctors, lawyers, clergymen, and nurses when these latter refuse to betray those who have trusted them.

In this State, after two Newburgh newspapermen had been jailed for contempt in 1948, State Senator Thomas C. Desmond and Assemblyman Lee B. Mailler sponsored a genuinely protective measure which the legislature only shunted into the law revision commission for a year's study.

But this commission recommended the next year nothing better than a weakened, emasculated bill which provided that any Supreme Court justice could, on petition and after a hearing, break through the newspaperman's privilege of silence and force a disclosure if the justice deemed it essential to the protection of the public interest.

Even this timid, half-hearted measure, which wasn't worth passing anyway, was defeated as usual with the help of lawyer-legislators who have always balked at seeing this lawyer's privilege extended to cover newspapermen.

Meanwhile, however, in States that already have confidence laws, including New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, executives report that such statutes have freed newspapermen to expose waste and corruption in public office, protected sources of information necessary to obtain news, enabled newsmen to help police in criminal matters, and give legal recognition to the code of ethics adhered to by reporters.

The press should never cease its fight to have this reporters' code respected and safeguarded against gags or jail threats, whether in State or Federal jurisdiction. Even Federal Judge Knox may one day have to change his ruling on a newspaperman's privilege.

Your Son and the Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by Chaplain Patrick A. Killeen, United States Navy, on May 13, over the NBC radio network.

Chaplain Killeen's message, directed to the mothers of America—in particular to the mothers of our marines serving in Korea—deals with the seldom-touched side of the story of our fighting men. It considers their spiritual lives, and its words should impart a note of encouragement into our hearts. For men will only be as strong as their moral spirit is strong; and, if we should judge from Chaplain Killeen's words, our boys in Korea do possess that moral, spiritual strength.

The address follows:

YOUR SON AND THE MARINES

(By Father Patrick A. Killeen, lieutenant, junior grade, Chaplains' Corps, U. S. Navy, Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.)

Today's Mother's Day will be the same wonderful day it has always been. In church mothers will hear themselves justly praised and even compared to the most holy of all mothers—our Blessed Mother. At home, amid the gay flowers and boxes of candy, they will be happy as they see their little John or Judy pledge their love with some inexpensive gift and a great big priceless hug. The new young mother will be happy as she holds her tiny infant in her arms, the evidence of her share in the God-given right of all mothers, to help in His work of creation. She will be happy as she joins all the mothers as they say "thank God for all of this."

In one way, however, this Mother's Day will be a sad one, for the radio and the newspapers give us a very dark picture of the world in which we live. Mothers with sons in service or just old enough to go in will have a heavy, aching heart as they read about Korea; as they see the friendly nations of the world fighting among themselves, while Russia gloatingly works the strings that bring all the godless puppet nations into action against us. It is with these mothers in particular that I should like to visit today to talk about your son and the marines.

At the present time the attention of all those connected with marines is drawn to the men of the First Division in Korea. Any news from Korea seems very close to me at this time, for the towns mentioned in the news releases are not merely names, but rather memories of charred remains of once happy villages. The filth and the mud, the cold and the weariness are all very real, for little more than a month ago I lived with them.

I see now how one-sided a picture we are getting from the newspaper accounts as we read the papers; we see nothing but the grim, horrible side of war which would tend to break the heart of any loving mother. Behind the news of the front page, however, there's a lot that would make you happy, would ease some of the burden from your heart, would make you proud that your son is a marine, as proud as I am to be able to say that I have served with them. I have learned what America can mean to a dying 18-year-old boy and have become a better citizen for it. I have learned how close we can really get to Almighty God on this earth, how utterly simple life can be when we put it all in His hands.

One story never mentioned in the papers that will make every marine mother proud took place on Christmas Eve in southern Korea. We had taken part in a sad but glorious page of our Marine history—the withdrawal from the Chosin Reservoir. We had crowded aboard transports at Hungnam to go to a rest area. Some said we might even go to Japan. Instead, we were unloaded at Pusan and then proceeded to a muddy bean patch and told, "Go to it; that's your rest camp; have a happy Christmas." Those words stung with bitter irony but now, looking back, I can honestly say that I have never spent a happier Christmas.

We set out to arrange for midnight mass in a natural hollow in that bean patch and before we knew it our marines had built an altar from some packing boxes and, by the miracle of Marine secret supply, even had it painted a gleaming white; our canopy was a tarpaulin stretched on a frame made of some lumber borrowed from the galley; our reredos was made of silk that one of the boys found in a native market and for decoration we had some trees brought in from the nearby hills. This was our church where your sons, with their marine spirit, saw to it that in spite of everything and everyone, they were going to have their midnight mass, to pay their homage to the newly born Son of God.

I tried to collect some thoughts for a sermon, but it was rather difficult, for there seemed to be nothing to make that a happy Christmas. As I began to go over the happenings of the past few weeks even the quiet of the tent was broken by the hacking cough of one of our priests who was on the verge of pneumonia from his exposure to the extreme cold. The past came to mind with amazing clearness. Two of our priests lay wounded in hospitals in Japan, one fighting for his very life, wounded as he brought the Son of God to your sons, their marines. One of the clerks, who would be helping us now, lay buried in the frozen ground at Kotori killed at the side of his chaplain. Another boy who would be serving our mass, as he had done every day while we were surrounded, now lay dead up there, killed as he fought to help other marines. These thoughts and many like them were passing through my mind when I heard one lad outside say to another. "We don't have an awful lot this Christmas but I'm sure glad that we can get to midnight mass." These words came like the breath of inspiration, "We had nothing but Christ Himself. What more could we want?" The simple faith of those marines gave me back what I had lost.

At mass, in the clear, crisp, cold light of a brilliant moon about 2,000 marines worshipped their God and Maker and it was my privilege on that night to bring His Body and Blood to every Catholic in that group, to hear them sing their Christmas carols, to give them that thought—they had nothing but Christ, but, having Christ, they possessed all things.

What will be of great comfort to all Catholic mothers is the knowledge that wherever your son goes in the marines your Catholic priest goes with him trying to replace his parish priest as a pastor, confessor, and a guide. In boot camp his Catholic chaplain, who knows his problems, is willing to guide and to help him as he changes from a young boy to a real man, from a civilian to a marine. He has chapels where he not only can but is urged to attend mass regularly. As he goes to Camp Le Jeune, for instance, he must be impressed by the Catholic chapel, which matches any parish church in the country for its beauty. At Camp Pendleton, he can attend mass at the Santa Margarita ranch chapel, one of the earliest of the Spanish missions in California. He has missions similar to the one just finished at Quantico to keep the light of his faith burning brightly.

It is as he goes into combat however, that he learns how close his priest really is. If I say I am proud to have been with the marines, I am doubly proud, and every Catholic should also be proud, of the priests with the marines and all the troops in Korea. The medals and the glory that came publicly to these priests will never be adequate to give them the praise that is their due, but, like the good men of God they are, they're not looking for public praise. Sufficient for them is the barely audible, "Thanks, Father" from the wounded boy on the stretcher; or the happy sigh from the boy on the line who has just been to confession and received Viaticum and says, "Boy, that makes me feel great"; or the wonderfully simple expression of faith made by my own clerk under fire, "Isn't it wonderful to be in the state of grace."

By the grace of God, last December, when the marines were surrounded in three places, there was a Catholic chaplain in each place and it was at this time that your priests rose to great heights to be with your sons as they needed them most. Isn't it a wonderful, consoling thought that every marine who was wounded and reached a hospital unit had the grace of a priest's presence and received the last rites if he was seriously wounded. To you mothers, who lost your sons in Korea, it must be a comfort to know that every marine who was buried in Korea was buried with the prayers of our holy mother, the church, and in blessed ground.

In so many cases your sons have been a source of pride and even consolation to the Catholic chaplain in the way they profess and practice their belief in God and His church. Imagine how proud the mother would be whose son came to ask me if there was anything wrong if he said seven rosaries in his fox hole at night.

What a wonderful profession of faith your sons made for all to see, at Kotori where every day in a little chapel—three walls of a railroadbed to act as a windbreak, they came and knelt and stood in the freezing cold to attend mass and receive holy communion for what well might be the last time since we never knew what the night would bring.

What a joy to those mothers whose sons came to join in the rosary we said when we would stop to rest during our weary march from the reservoir.

What a magnificent tribute to their parents by those marines who would make a beautifully frank confession in the sight of all as they knelt beside their priest, seated in an open field or behind a jeep. You mothers who have sons in the Marines can read today's headlines about them engaged once again in bitter fighting but you can take comfort from the fact that they are accompanied by their priests and that your boys who left good Catholic homes are doing a magnificent job in keeping their faith and impressing all around them with their real belief in the Catholic church and the teachings of their Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Every day in Korea helped prove the saying that there are no atheists in fox holes but sad experience shows that such is not always the case when the dangers of war are removed. One of the great dangers any marine and your son as he joins them must face is the attitude of indifference to anything that touches on religion. This attitude is common to all service life and it is from this that all our spiritual problems come. This is an insidious, enervating disease that eats away one's principles like a cancer and the unsuspecting soon falls with the terrible crash of compromise. This indifference will show itself to your son in many ways. Not too many people are going to get excited whether he goes to mass or not; he's going to find men listed as Catholics staying in the barracks on Sunday morning. He will find a disregard and often a downright disrespect for the holy name of Jesus and will hear the holy name taken in vain on many occasions. He will find a lack of realization of the seriousness of sins against holy purity; he will find in many cases a complete disregard for the sanctity and goodness of woman and marriage. Many signs but all from the same root—indifference.

What can be done to counteract this? I think the answer can be found in the development of respect—a respect of self; for family and friends and especially respect for the church and Almighty God.

This can come easy to a marine for if we look to see just what it is that makes a marine stand out we will see that it is his intensive training whereby the faults and weaknesses of his character are taken away and three principles are woven into the very fiber of his being: pride, love, and obedience. Not the false pride of the hypocrite but a real honest pride in the possession of something wholesome; a manly love that shows itself in the care and concern for his fellow marines; a willing obedience based on the knowledge that authority is something absolutely necessary, something to be respected and not merely feared. I say it is easy for a marine to develop the respect necessary to ward off that dangerous indifference for with a spiritual, supernatural motive he can elevate his basic teaching whereby his pride will generate a wholesome self-respect; his love for others can give him the respect for his family and friends; his obedience can easily nourish a deep respect for Almighty God. With these he has the makings of an outstanding Catholic and that is what many of our marine Catholics are—outstanding.

Self-respect, generated from honest pride can arm the young man against any dangers that he might face. He knows that he is just as important as the next fellow, he knows that he has the right to go to Mass and practice his religion, he knows that he is showing courage when he does what is right. Just as a marine's pride in the corps is a motive whereby he does things a certain way because that's the way the marines do it so, too, he takes pride in his Catholic faith and upholds his principles because that's the way a good Catholic does it. If it's a question of foul language in the barracks his self-respect and pride will give him the courage to let others know what he thinks about it, he won't give in weakly because he knows he is right and will stand up for those rights. If it's a question of bad company or improper action, just as a marine will never let himself be seen in a sloppy uniform, so, too, he will never let himself get mixed up in situations that are against his Catholic teaching.

His love for others can be turned into that respect for his family and friends and with this he won't fall victim to the idea that he can cut himself loose from family ties and with his newly found freedom become completely independent of his family. Oh what a great thing it is to see a lad who lives and acts as if his family were present on the base. If a man learns respect for others he can be strong against all the temptations to sin against holy purity. He will respect the women he meets as he would his own sister and her friends at home and in that way stay clear of the attitude some servicemen have that women are nothing but the playthings for men. If he has respect for his wife that is a real love, how can he ever fall prey to the frame of mind wherein marriage has no sanctity and fidelity is something impossible because men must be men.

As a marine he will develop a deep respect for authority that shows itself in a willing obedience. In the battle he must fight against indifference toward Almighty God, your son will have that respect for authority. He'll be tried with the test of laziness to stay in bed on Sunday morning but he will realize that it is no earthly commanding officer but God Himself who gives the command "Keep holy the Sabbath day." He might toy with thoughts of immorality but again the order is there, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and he summons up a cheerful but strong "Aye, aye, sir." The Ten Commandments and the commandments of the church will be for him the rules and regulations that will guide him if he is to be a good Catholic.

What, then, can be done to help your son as he comes into service and meets this problem of indifference? I say to start now to develop him or rather help him develop in himself a real respect for himself, for his family and friends, and for God and his church.

Yes, on this Mother's Day, there must be many a sad heart but the picture is not as dark as it might seem. There are problems to be faced but we have the means to face them, your sons will be hurled a challenge but with the grace of Almighty God and the proper preparation and care they can meet the challenge and turn it into a glorious victory.

If you are sad today, go to our blessed mother whose motherhood was climaxed by suffering as she watched her Son die on the cross only to have that suffering make her happiness all the more full as she saw her risen Son, the happiness that comes with the triumph of good over evil. With her help you can bear your burden just as your son, with her Son's help, can conquer the evil he must face. Then you, too, can enjoy the wonderful happiness of a successful son.

The Marine motto is very simple, "Semper fidelis"—Always faithful. What a fitting motto for your son as he joins them, always faithful to himself, to his family and friends; most of all, faithful to his church and his God.

Be proud of your son, today, because if he is a good marine you can be sure he will be a good son and a good Catholic.

As you say your prayers on this Pentecost night pray thus for your Catholic servicemen.

Come, O Spirit of Counsel, help and guide them in all their ways that they may always do Thy will, incline their hearts to that which is good, turn them away from all that is evil and direct them by the paths of the commandments to the good of eternal life, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

God bless you and please pray for your chaplains.

Lawrence, Mass., Girl Wins National Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article about Miss Diane Cameron, a 12-year-old eighth grader from Lawrence, Mass., and the distinction she has won for herself and her community. The Lawrence Tribune gave her front-page recognition for her achievement because, although the accomplishment was hers, all her friends and neighbors are also proud that their city has developed such a talented young lady.

In these days of confusion and cynicism in high places it is refreshing to turn to youth and find there the faith that is untarnished. In time their gleaming idealism will be tempered by "the world's slow stain." Somehow we hope and believe that they will not make as many doubtful compromises as some of the tired leaders who preceded them.

Meanwhile youth aspires to honor, being honest in itself.

This we must commend and encourage, for the future of our Nation in a world community. Miss Cameron has ability.

That is obvious. But of greater importance is her character. With industry and integrity she searched for and found and wrote the truth, which a materialistic world needs above all else.

The article follows:

Miss Diane Cameron, 12-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Aime Cameron, 341 Salem Street, has been notified that she has won the first prize of $100 in the national essay contest, sponsored by the National United Spanish War Veterans, according to an official report received from Washington, D. C., by Miss Helen L. O'Connor, of Fitchburg, department junior vice president, and chairman of the essay contest. This prize is the result of 2 weeks of intensive study and research. Typical of any young girl, Miss Cameron plans on buying a new bicycle and some summer finery with her well-earned prize money. If any of it is left after the shopping spree, it will be added to her bank account. Upon graduation in June, Miss Cameron intends to enter St. Patrick's High School and will take the college course in preparation for the vocation of a nun.

This national award will be presented to Miss Cameron at the State convention to be held at Brockton in June. Over the years this is the first time a Massachusetts student has ever won first prize.

Diane's essay, Some Early Experiences of Theodore Roosevelt Which Helped Make Him a Leader During the Spanish-American War, has brought honor to herself, her school, her parents, and the department of the Massachusetts Auxiliary United Spanish War Veterans.

Miss Cameron, an eighth grade pupil of St. Patrick's school, had already merited the first State award and her winning essay was sent to Washington to represent Massachusetts. The State awards were presented at the State meeting of the Auxiliary United Spanish War Veterans in Worcester, April 21.

Miss Helen O'Connor, in opening the program in Worcester, said, "It has been a pleasure to work with these patriotic children throughout the Commonwealth. Five hundred and thirty children from 97 schools responded to my letter with rules from national headquarters. I picked three judges from different parts of the State for the contest. Miss Margaret E. Kielty, adult alien education and Americanization director of Fitchburg; Matthew J. Clark, department junior vice commander of United Spanish War Veterans of Springfield, and Thomas J. Murphy, director of English Rindge Technical High School, of Cambridge, Mass."

"Great Squadrons of Huge Bombers Should Be Ready on a Moment's Notice To Spray Fire Bombs, TNT, and Atom Bombs on Every City in Russia, if Russia Attempts Aggression Anywhere"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions stated on the floor of the House a fact which has now been acknowledged by military authorities everywhere. That is that the armies of the United Nations would have been expelled from Korea months ago if it had not been for the splendid work done by our Air Force. Because of our perilous position in Korea, coupled with mounting international tensions, there should be no let-up with respect to building our Air Force to the present planned strength of 95 groups. The Washington Times-Herald of March 22 carried a very timely article on the subject of air power which, in my opinion, is merely an expression of common-sense patriotism. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of this article:

UNITED STATES THREAT TO BOMB RUSSIA URGED TO HALT RED AGGRESSION—SENATOR JOHNSON CALLS FOR ACRES OF JETS READY AT BASES TO PULVERIZE SOVIET

Senator JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, yesterday urged the United States to serve notice that Russian cities will be pulverized by American bombers from North Africa, Turkey, and Iceland if the Soviets make an aggressive move.

The Senate meanwhile agreed to start voting on amendments to the controversial troops-for-Europe resolutions April 2 and remain in continuous session until the Chamber disposes of them.

At the same time, a bipartisan group of four Senators offered a new version of the Ives amendment which approves the policy of sending troops to Europe—including the four divisions already assigned—and urges fullest collaboration between Congress and the President.

CALLS FOR MORE AIRFIELDS

JOHNSON called his suggestion a foolproof plan to block both Russia's cold-war aims and hot-war threats.

In a speech prepared for delivery during Senate debate on the resolutions, the Colorado Democrat said the United States should reactivate its World War II airfields in north Africa, build new fields in Turkey, and station acres of jet fighters there to assure control of the skies.

He added:

"And last, great squadrons of huge bombers should be ready on a moment's notice to spray fire bombs, TNT, and atom bombs on every city in Russia if Russia attempts aggression anywhere."

ICELAND BASES URGED

Iceland should be used as another bomber base, JOHNSON declared, so these planes can shuttle back and forth dropping bombs coming and going.

The Senator said he guessed Russia would not have 300 atom bombs before 1960, adding that, at any rate, she is far behind America.

Under the new work schedule, the Senate will recess for Easter from today until next Monday, take Tuesday off, and debate the resolutions Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday with a final vote the following Monday.

The resolutions lost one supporter when Senator CAIN, Republican, of Washington, who backed them in committee, announced he will oppose them on the floor.

Senator LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, warned, meanwhile, that restrictions on United States troop assignments will lead to delay, deadlock, and disaster.

Acheson No Appeaser to Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of May 10, 1951.

I believe that the great Soviet encyclopedia's treatment of our Secretary of State may prove of interest to those persons who have labeled him as an appeaser.

The editorial follows:

ACHESON NO APPEASER TO SOVIETS

Discussing one of our national leaders, the new great Soviet encyclopedia calls him a leader of "aggressive anti-Soviet policy."

With typical Soviet invective, the Communist writer charges him with plotting war against Russia, the "people's democracies" and most of the rest of the world.

The target of this hate is Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, the man whom irresponsible politicians have been attempting to brand as an "appeaser" of communism.

Who's right, Acheson's Soviet or domestic critics?

The argument of the domestic critics hinges pretty largely on the premise that the defeat by the Communists of Chiang Kai-shek's nationalist armies in China before Acheson became Secretary of State somehow makes Acheson an appeaser.

The argument of the Russians is that Acheson deserves much of the credit for the fact that Europe is building an increasingly strong anti-Communist front and that the United Nations and the United States are resisting Communist aggression in Korea.

In our opinion this is one spot in the Soviet encyclopedia that contains the truth.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 last, there appeared in the Asheville Citizen, Asheville, N. C., an editorial entitled "President and General: The Issue Is Joined."

This editorial is so convincing and unanswerable that I think every American should read it.

Weeks later after much testimony has been given on the controversy the editorial stands out like a beacon light ever emphasizing the way we should travel.

More recently in the same paper another editorial appeared entitled "The Return of the Hero." Never have greater words of truth been spoken. This hero will not just "fade away." He will live forever because he is, as the editorial says, "the average hero."

These editorials should be read by every American and I quote them below in full:

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of April 12, 1951]

PRESIDENT AND GENERAL: THE ISSUE IS JOINED

The seat of the Government of the United States is in Washington, not in Tokyo.

The President, elected by the people, is the civilian Commander in Chief in matters of war and peace, as the Constitution directs.

The foreign policy of this country, in tune with the policy of the United Nations, is to contain the Korean war and not to precipitate a world war in Asia.

All these things flow from President Truman's order recalling General MacArthur.

The air at last is clearing.

General MacArthur's brave and devoted service to his country is not to be denied. Neither is it diminished by his recall, for he remains in a true sense a popular military hero to critic as well as idolater. As General Eisenhower said so circumspectly yesterday, when a man puts on a uniform he must not shed his inhibitions. This proved impossible for General MacArthur, for as much as he was a military symbol, so he became a personal, political symbol.

This is intolerable in a democracy. The whole story of MacArthur's tumultuous relations with the President, with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and with the policy-makers of the United Nations has now come to light. That story wholly justifies Mr. Truman's action early yesterday morning.

At every point and in every chapter and verse over a period of many months the story is one of conflict. When MacArthur's view could not prevail, he issued statements over the head of his Government and besought or gave an ear to political opportunists. Pomp and circumstance and excessive vanity surrounded MacArthur headquarters in Tokyo, which became all but a sovereign state. Douglas MacArthur slowly became the captive of his own myth.

This was unhealthy. It led to errors of judgment which no man will make unless he regards himself as infallible (which no man is). Some of the consequences are suggested elsewhere on this page by Wallace Carroll, newspaperman and expert on psychological warfare.

But it is not alone the press, nor the politicians, nor yet the more insidious critics with traitorous motive who have found fault with MacArthur. Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, of Asheville, fought all over Asia and knows the world situation from all angles as well as any man. In a speech the other night at Wichita, Kans., he warned that sending the Chinese Nationalists into action in China and bombing Manchuria would precipitate a world war. According to the Associated Press he added:

"America is not prepared to fight a war with Communist Russia, and everything possible should be done to avoid all-out conflict at this time."

The former commander of the Eighth Army is neither running from a fight nor spoiling for one. He is merely being realistic. His testimony is diametrically opposed to what has become known as the MacArthur policy. It is the kind of testimony, from countless men of knowledge and skill, which moved the President to fire MacArthur.

Mr. Truman has behaved admirably in this crisis. His statement dismissing General MacArthur was dignified and logical, free of crimination and personality. The President's instincts are political, and so he must have smarted for a long time under what the New York Herald Tribune, a Republican newspaper, testified the other day as the effort of those who are "frantically trying to use MacArthur not as an instrument with which to achieve a rational settlement in Asia but as a stick with which to beat the Truman administration."

Lincoln had his McClellan, a disruptive political general who was egged on by northern Democrats. Polk had his Zachary Taylor, who campaigned in Mexico with one eye on the Mexicans and the other on his Whig friends in Washington.

And Truman has had his MacArthur. Yet he did not make the issue now joined a political one. He leaned over backward to accommodate the proconsul in Tokyo. For he knew, as everyone who is reasonable must know, that a foreign policy in this kind of crisis is not the whole product of a President but of many minds—and of many friendly nations.

Now that the people know the facts they will react, we believe, as Americans always react when informed and patriotic. There will be a political storm, and it will be ugly. But it will blow over. The clear air which follows every storm will be the clear air of American unity.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of May 9, 1951]

THE RETURN OF THE HERO

Nine men of the Army have won the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism "above and beyond the call of duty" on the awful battlefield of Korea.

Eight of these young Americans are dead; only Master Sgt. Ernest R. Kouma, a big, blond farm boy from Nebraska, strides among the living.

On Monday Hero Kouma came home. As he stepped from his airplane in San Francisco press photographers trained their cameras on his blushing face and reporters clustered around.

But Sergeant Kouma would have none of this. "Almost painfully embarrassed by the attention"—as one reporter wrote—this "one-man tank corps" of the bloody Naktong ducked his head and fled.

Ernest Kouma, after all, is but an average American hero. Perhaps it is that his profile is undistinguished, but in any case he will not pose for pictures. Why should he? He is an average hero.

Ernest Kouma has nothing to tell the press—on or off the record—and he has nothing to say to a congressional investigating committee. His deeds speak for themselves. An average hero, he followed orders and executed them brilliantly.

Ernest Kouma will not ride in a parade down long canyons of screaming people, dusting the confetti from his uniform as he goes from triumph to triumph. He is an average hero.

Ernest Kouma will go to his home in Nebraska without a retinue of aides and retainers who emit bulletins on the half hour. To be sure, like any other Honor Medal winner, he will rate the first salute of officers of every grade. They will salute the deed, rather than the man, for the sergeant is an average hero among the dozens living and dead.

Ernest Kouma, finally, will retire some day sure in the knowledge that his country is grateful for his singular, selfless devotion. The generals may bicker and compete for place; the cameras may etch on thin and perishable film the ghostly pomp and circumstance of homecoming; the crowd may howl in full throat and strew the pathway of the captain—but the Ernest Koumas go on forever.

For they are the average heroes who slog through mud and dust; who hunch all wet and cold in a fox hole; who pour round on round until the gun barrel is white hot and soft and searing to the touch—the men who march and fight and follow the command and win the battles. The Ernest Koumas are those men, yes.

Save the Republic Before the Symbols Disappear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so much propaganda is being broadcast which is hostile to our form of Government and our way of life, it is inspiring and refreshing to come in contact with people who think American and speak American.

On April 18, 1951, Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, of Huntington, W. Va., delivered an address before the Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution held in Washington, which I hope will be read by people in every section of our Nation.

Mrs. Payne spoke with courage and common sense. It was an appropriate address to be delivered to this patriotic organization, the Daughters of the American Revolution, whose members are doing so much to preserve our Government and to perpetuate our institutions.

Under leave granted, I insert Mrs. Payne's address herewith, and commend it to all those who believe in American institutions, as an address worthy of being read and preserved:

SAVE THE REPUBLIC BEFORE THE SYMBOLS DISAPPEAR

(By Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne)

I deem it a privilege and an honor to speak before your congress because you have fearlessly and persistently protected the concepts and precepts of the American way as the founders envisioned and established them. Although attacked by many left-wing groups for your loyalty, you have not faltered in your support of the fundamental principles which made and kept us a nation. Because you are the Daughters of the American Revolution, you can properly sense and evaluate the un-American revolution which has brought us to the very brink of destruction. I salute you for observing, and therefore preserving, the lost art of American patriotism.

Speaking as a mother and teacher I want to be frank, honest, and realistic. As we think together we must accept a sound premise and admit several very obvious necessities. First, unless we understand that there is a well-organized, highly financed plan to overthrow this free Republic, and establish the proletariat of the people, we cannot possibly approach a sensible solution to the planned and planted problems which confront and confuse us today. Under the Communist-Socialist plan to destroy us everything American must disappear from our remembrance and experience; therefore, one of their most effective weapons is the removal or replacing of the symbols of our religious and national history. They are succeeding far beyond our comprehension or imagination. Where are the patriotic pictures, the songs, the devotionals, the pledge to the flag, the atmosphere of reverence and gratitude for America in the schoolroom? Finally, they have reached the symbol which symbolizes all that we are or ever hope to be—the American flag. Do you think it just happened that simultaneously the United Nations flag appeared all over the Nation? No; it was planned that way. Did you ever think you would live to see the day when American judges would rule that any other flag would supersede Old Glory, or that school officials would not know where to place the Stars and Stripes? We must do more than pass resolutions in conventions; we must implement and activate them in our home towns. The U. N. flag should fly in front of the U. N. building, but never over the courts, schools, or public buildings in the United States or on the same pole with the Stars and Stripes. How gullible can we get?

Another successful technique is to call everything by the wrong name. We celebrate VE-day with our troops waiting on the banks of the Elbe while Russia takes Berlin. We called it a cold war and spent millions trying to cover up the fact that it really was a floor show to keep our eyes on the wrong place while Russia swallowed China. We call treason perjury; we call our country a democracy

when the Constitution, the founders, and the pledge to the flag say it is a republic. Can't you see they will soon change our philosophy by changing the American symbols, vocabulary and patriotic experiences? How can we preserve our heritage of freedom for our progeny if we allow them to take down the signs which blazed the trail for us? This problem is more than academic, it is emotional—We either love our country or lose it!

As we face the situation of saving our country we must ask a question. How did this great free Republic lose the American values, names, and concepts in twenty short years? Because we recognized godless Russia and therefore brought forth on this continent a false concept of liberty, borrowed from Karl Marx and dedicated to the proposition that by violating every American principle and tradition—at home and abroad—we could prove that all men are created equal and destined to live in leisure in a welfare world. Those Communist and Socialist experiments have wrecked our security, economy and peace at home, and our friendships abroad. Because we forgot "The rock from whence we are hewn" we are met on battlefields all over the earth to dedicate them to our sons who fought so valiantly and hopelessly in ideological wars they could not win. The prophets of doom who now predict we must always live in war and confusion belie the doctrine of repentance for wrong-doing and are only trying desperately to cover up their sins against this Nation. Must we lose our flag, our rights, and our lives and live in bomb shelters as a penalty for doing good to all the world? No. We can stop the desecration of the faith of our fathers and survive.

Many commitments have been made all over the world in our name, but not for our sake, and our boys must fight with them, for them or about them at the drop of their hat. From mink coats in Washington to 60,000 casualties in Korea the answer is the same—our leaders have lost the American way. Under such circumstances, What can we do for national defense on the home front? We can stop being gullible and become realistic defenders of our own country. Someone asked me in a forum recently if I thought Dean Acheson was a Communist. I answered, from his recent statements I would say he was not, but from his actions many times and his policies in the Far East and his laxity in ridding the Government of Reds, he cannot blame us if we wonder. Why quibble about it. I know and you know all we need to know about Mr. Acheson. We know when he had his face toward Alger Hiss, he had his back to his country. He should be fired.

We can and must stop the indoctrination of the Communist-Socialist philosophy in the schools, churches, clubs, unions, and Government. To do this we must learn the propaganda techniques used in these groups and a few examples will suffice to prove the point. When Hitler wanted to change the philosophy in Germany he immediately took over the schools and changed the textbooks to meet his ideas; Stalin and Peron did the same thing. Do we have a parallel in our country? Yes. Communism and socialism got great and dignified starts in some of our larger universities and they have spread to the land's remotest border. I have sat as student or auditor in many of these schools and I know this is true. Most of our teachers are good Americans, but the small minority of "red-ucators"—because of their aggressive nature and predetermined plan—are destroying the faith in and respect for our form of Government. These teachers are guilty of the sin of commission, but the parents and good teachers are guilty of the sin of omission. We simply did not stop their un-American activities in the classroom and the propaganda is devastating because our children have not had the real American story. They do not parade under their own banner of Communist names and places and announce their purposes; they have far more effective devices. With clever radio, television, and movie scripts, columnists, forum speakers, textbooks, and big names they simply unsell us on our way of life. Down with capital, profits, and free enterprise and up with Russia and Utopia. The condition of our country today proves the power of propaganda as we live in confusion worse confounded, with race trouble here and labor trouble there and trouble, trouble everywhere—all signs of the divide-and-conquer campaign.

More propaganda—we hear it over and over on the radio, in the left-wing press, and in the classroom that disaster, slums, and insecurity breed communism. This is not so—not in America. For over a hundred and fifty years, this Nation continued its progress toward the greatest good for the greatest number. During those years, we experienced as a Nation and as individuals, the whole gamut of human vicissitudes—fire, drought, floods, depressions, and wars, but it didn't even occur to us to turn to communism. Why? Because every American is born with two impervious armors—faith in God and faith in his country. We did not turn to communism because every American is born with his own ladder of opportunity; some are short and some are tall, according to his several abilities as recorded in the parable of the talents, but the ladder is his and it has a top and he is free to scale it. Herein lies the formula for American success based on human dignity and the rights of free men.

Another danger signal—under the guise of social progress and liberal-mindedness the older American histories, which inculcated in us the love of country, the flag, and things American have been replaced by new books dealing with the scientific and objective approach. The idea seems to be to make our children so objective they couldn't have a conviction about anything. Any man or nation that reaches the stature of greatness believes in something and has very deep and spiritual convictions, so we recognize another device to weaken American strength and solidarity. Some books point with pride to the 5-year-plan in Russia and imply that our system of Government has failed because we did not go and do likewise. Even more damage is done to the national morale and patriotism through books on social problems, economics, and political science, some of which present a conglomerate group of case studies and data which prove nothing and leaves the student confused about everything in general and the American way in particular. Whether the teacher realizes it or not, this is just where the Communists want him. The success of the Communist Party in America is not due to the number of their own members actively at work, but to the success they have had selling confused people—good, gullible, Christian people—their false fronts which propagate and disseminate their social and economic ideologies.

Adding insult to injury, progressive education came along, and, disregarding the successful character building found in the McGuffey readers, they advised us to let the children alone—don't cramp their style or personality by telling them right from wrong; even if they can't read or write or spell, they will have experiences. Too many parents and teachers let them alone—and they came home wagging their confusion behind them.

We cannot hope to preserve the love of and adherence to the basic principles which made us "one Nation, indivisible" if our children are taught intentionally, or unintentionally, to doubt the wisdom and demonstration of our form of Government. Typical of the new trends in textbooks which undermines the faith of the next generation are the following quotes: "Free enterprise is dead," "The Supreme Court could and presumably should do away with all property rights," "You cannot level wealth in America until legislation is passed forbidding parents from leaving their inheritance to their children." Furthermore, it is no reflection on the ingenious work of Walt Disney to charge that our sense of values has drastically changed when textbooks replace Abraham Lincoln with the Disney story. We know our institutions and schools are under constant attack by propaganda and indoctrination, therefore, board of education, teachers, and other officials cannot escape the added responsibility of guarding the Republic by carefully investigating the "thought and intent" of the authors and publishers of textbooks and other school material. This assignment is not difficult for the pro-American teachers and officials, and it must be done. Although much of the propaganda is subtle and too many people overlook it or assume it to be an explanation of or formula for "social progress" and "peace," when we check books from the standpoint of the inescapable realities mentioned here, it is easy to determine whether or not they perform the function of ed-ucating or ed-ucating. Good American teachers appreciate enlightenment on this subject, and the guilty should be fired; because, if they believe in the Communist-Socialist philosophy it will surely get into their teaching, either by "interpretation" or "design." Many parents ask how they can tell when their children are being indoctrinated. The answer is easy. If your child comes home from school—at any level from primary to university—questioning the success of the American Way and debunking the founders and our glorious history, you may be sure he has the wrong teacher, textbook, or both.

If the schools are to continue to preserve our liberties and our heritage (and who said this was not their basic function), they must teach and practice Americanism—the unadulterated kind of patriotism which sends that intangible elixir of national unity up the spines of every American, of every class, creed, or color, when the stars and stripes appear. Do you call that old fashioned? The Communists want you to do just that, but we know, if we have this Nation, we must continue to love it, and that any subject matter which adulterates these concepts and emotions is subversive. What will it profit the child if he gain all knowledge and lose the opportunity to say with Paul, "I was free born." Parents and teachers must have the courage and patriotism to fight these un-American trends in their own community. We must demand that our schools again become the citadel of American liberty; we must demand that every school put back the symbols which portray our national heritage; we must demand that teachers emphasize what is right about America, thus giving students respect for our past record and faith in the future; we must demand that American history be taught with reverence, because its unfoldment in the minds and hearts of every child is the safeguard against serfdom. Let us be practical. Mr. Stalin knows he can take this country without using the atom bomb, unless we wake up. He can take it with four weapons: tax, spend, indoctrinate, and infiltrate. Why do good, gullible, Christian Americans aid and abet the Communists and Socialists by accepting and using every technique they designate for our destruction? Even Rip Van Winkle only slept 20 years.

Finally, let us realize that we can do the job by turning our attention to the schools, churches, and family life. Unfortunately, too many ministers are also victims of the propaganda and some are even carriers of the venom that will destroy us, because through a false sense of "do-gooders" they have sponsored or helped Communist-front crusades. It would be well to remember that the act of joining your club, union, or even your church, is secondary to the fact that you are free to join it, and it is the fact of your freedom which is challenged today. The church had better wake up too. Another safeguard—we believe in the wisdom of the founders who warned of political alliances with foreign powers, and practiced the principle of "open covenants, openly arrived at" therefore, we must protect the United States first and we will not be naive enough to join the World Federalists—or any other group that would or could lose for us our vote, boundaries, sovereign powers, or national entity—hoping that by removing the word "foreign" it would save us from the powers that seek to dominate us. History shows that the game of power politics has shifted the balance of power all over Europe and Asia for generations. Allies in one war are enemies in the next, and I wonder if we are contributing most to the brotherhood of man, and the fatherhood of God when we give our name, prestige, and money for foreign wars, based on old hatreds and new excuses. When this country practiced international philanthropy and humanitarian charity we had friends all over the world, but when we became international bigamists and subsidized inefficiency and Socialist experiments, we lost the friends and wrecked the morale of both donor and recipients. If we keep up the practice we will be responsible for our own bankruptcy and a generation of mental dullards and physical sloths.

If the nations are sincerely interested in peace and the principles of freedom we have demonstrated, they should show some signs of emulating them. By precept and example we have shown the way, and the Master said "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." This is the road to peace for a Christian nation, yet we are trying to solve the world's problems through every other means and through an organization which can and has become a medium for spies and saboteurs, but cannot open its councils with prayer.

There are many lost horizons from Valley Forge and Gettysburg to Korea. Since we started making the world safe for democracy it hasn't been safe for anybody, and from the resulting chaos at home and abroad we know by compromise and appeasement we have lost the American path to peace, security, and our constitutional rights as free citizens. If we ever find them again—even at the risk of being called isolationist—we must turn our attention to saving this Republic from the world. This is not isolationism; it is practicing the time-tested axiom, "The light that shines farthest, shines brightest at home."

Progress lies in both directions. The most progress the prodigal son ever made was when he decided to go back to his father. There is lesson here for all Americans. We have certainly spent our substance and our children's future in worldly living and we must get back to American housekeeping. Whether we call it a prior reasoning or horse sense, we must face facts. Just as we do not outgrow the Sermon on the Mount in our spiritual progress, just so, we do not outgrow the wisdom and demonstration of the Constitution and the free-enterprise system. These great principles must be taught in our schools, loved in our hearts, and practiced in our Government if we are to preserve the American concept of liberty for ourselves and our progeny. Wherever we are involved and whatever the sacrifice, it will be in vain unless these objectives are reached, as we strive once again to rebuild a strong defense for one God, one flag, and one country, lest this Nation, as the symbol and demonstration of liberty for people everywhere perish from the earth. Let us resolve to be practical Christians and make our calling and election sure by supporting men and women for office who still believe that the Bible, the Constitution, Ray's arithmetic, and the McGuffey readers made a great and good country, whose people were God-fearing, independent, free-enterprising Americans. Old-fashioned? Yes. So are the Ten Commandments.

The battle lines are being drawn today for the final conflict between Christendom and atheism. It is symbolized by the two stars out of the East—the star of Bethlehem and the red star of Russia. Whatever conflict appears on the scene, whether it be strife between capital and labor or between race, creed, or color, these planned struggles are only the outward sign of the Communist-Socialist attacks on our free institutions. Only the good, gullible Christian Americans, awakened out of their sleep and mesmerism, induced by false propaganda, can save this Nation. Realizing that "the government is upon his shoulders" we must take the human footsteps in our own home town to save the Republic before the symbols disappear.

May we remember at all times to help the world appreciate, accept, and practice the great principles which make freedom and human liberty possible, and may we also remember that our greatest contribution to the world is to keep that light of freedom burning in America. If we fail here, the light of the world dies. Our forefathers left us a great and good land; it is ours—as trustees—"to have and to hold and to love" but, unless we hold it, and teach our children to love it, their children will not have it.

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet—lest we 'Americans' forget."

The Church and Modern Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Reverend Philip J. Brown, pastor of St. Mary's Church, Bryantown, Md., on the Washington Catholic radio hour, Sunday, February 11, 1951, on Station WWDC:

THE CHURCH AND COMMUNISM

Communism is an economic and political system based upon the theories of Karl Marx. It holds that society is basically materialistic. To the Communist, economic and not spiritual forces determine the destiny of man. These economic forces currently take the form of capitalism, which, according to Marx, is essentially exploitive. It divides society into two classes, namely, the owners and nonowning workers. Since the owners control the means of livelihood, they are the rulers of society. As such, they live upon the toil of the workers. In their mad struggle to amass wealth they oppress the workers. But this oppression in turn unites the workers into a revolutionary unit resentful of their chains. Ultimately they will be driven to a desperate uprising.

Marx considered this process as inevitable. It was founded on the laws of nature. It was as immutable as the chain reaction which unleashes the force of the atom bomb. Hence the Communist Party would ride on the wave of destiny. It would channel and direct forces which are bound to triumph. Its function would be to enlighten the workers, to prove to them that they are slaves and to lead them to revolt.

When they revolt they will cast aside all the institutions which capitalism used to oppress them. Among these will be religion and morality. Marx considered religion as an opiate or drug which was to deaden the agony of exploitation by promising a better world after death. As an instrument of oppression religion must be fought by the Communist Party.

In the light of this analysis communism was destined to be a world movement. Accordingly, the various parties which embraced Marxism united into a Socialist International. In time, however, difference of opinion arose among the Socialists. The more moderate group retained the name while the extreme revolutionaries called themselves Communists. Their International organizations, the Communist Internationale, is better known by its abbreviated title, the Comintern.

When the Communists seized power in Russia in 1917 Vladimir Lenin took over the leadership of the world movement. After his death Joseph Stalin gradually rose to absolute power. Both of these leaders developed the theories of Marx in the light of modern conditions. They were particularly adept in the strategy and tactics of revolution. The result was a blueprint for world conquest which was detailed and effective.

Their writings made one important distinction which is necessary to an understanding of modern communism. They distinguished between principles, strategy and tactics. The principles of Marx and Lenin are unchanging. They envision an unalterable opposition between capitalism and communism. The conflict is essential to the death. Only one can survive.

Strategy, on the other hand, is a long-range plan which may lead but obliquely to the ultimate goal. Thus, on three important occasions, it was necessary to conciliate the capitalist world. From 1921 to 1928, the Soviet Union wanted a period of recuperation and consolidation. From 1935 to 1939, it desired a united front against fascism. And from 1941 to 1945, it cooperated with capitalist powers against the Axis. At these times, peace with the capitalist world was essential for the survival of communism in Russia.

Tactics are short-range plans which can change rapidly. Thus, the Soviet Union fought bitterly against the Peron government in Argentina. Yet when it suited her convenience she did an about face and initiated friendly relations with the same government. Again in early 1946, Stalin and Soviet press took a belligerent war-mongering attitude toward the rest of the world. But in September 1946, Stalin blandly proclaimed his desire for peace.

Normally Communist parties throughout the world must veer and shift with changing line.

It is vital to understand these distinctions if one is not to be mystified by Communist actions. Communism must be judged at all times by its unchanging principles. Strategy and tactics must be considered in the light of the ultimate goal. Any slackening of opposition because of short-range moves would involve fatal deception.

The Soviet Union today is an absolute dictatorship. Supreme power is concentrated in the hands of Stalin and a small group of his advisers, the Politburo. Under them a few million Communists hold all positions of power and responsibility. They rule mainly by virtue of a ruthless and far-reaching secret police which relentlessly crushes the slightest appearance of opposition. In addition, they have developed propaganda to a point of evil perfection. Soviet citizens are hermetically sealed from the outside world, and their radio, press, drama, and schools indoctrinate their subjects as their rulers decide.

The lot of the worker in Russia today is hard. Poor economic conditions may be excused in part because of the ravages of war. But Stalin's 1946 5-year plan concentrated upon military production rather than output for civilians. What is worse, since man does not live by bread alone, is the denial of freedom. The worker has little choice as to the

job he takes. Incentive systems and speed-up plans drive him at a cruel pace. His trade union is a government agency whose purpose is to increase production and not to present his grievances. No American factory manager today has power over his workers comparable to that possessed by a Soviet manager. And there are the "free" workers, whose lot is better than that of the 15 million slave workers in scattered concentration camps.

The citizen has no real political rights. Voting is but a formality. The formation of an opposition party would mean a visit from the secret police and immediate punishment. Their most merciful punishment is death. More common is the lingering agony of a slave labor camp. There is no appeal from these decisions. There is no trial by jury, no witnesses for the defense, no counsel for the poor victim, no writ of habeas corpus. The result is fear and distrust.

Thus, the utopian dream of Marx has been transformed into a nightmare of exploitaton. Nearly 200,000,000 are toiling at subsistence levels in order to build up a giant military machine. These plans for power have been openly stated and constantly repeated. Hence, military might has been added to the weapons of world communism.

Communist imperialism plans to encompass the world. It is engaged in world-wide activity on several levels. By direct or indirect conquest, we have seen the fall of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, eastern Poland, and Bessarabia. Indirectly the Soviet Union has taken over such countries as "free" Poland, East Germany, Finland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and possibly Austria, mainly by setting up puppet governments, liquidating the opposition and using economic pressure to force them into the Soviet sphere. The same story is true in the Far East in China, Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, and we are all acquainted from our daily press with the death struggle in northern and southern Korea.

Another level of penetration exists where there is a strong domestic Communist Party, such as in France and Italy. Funds and trained organizers are sent into these countries with the hope of overthrowing the existing government. By means of strikes and impossible demands made on these governments, the Communist Party hopes to weaken the authority of the government.

Another level of activity involves Comintern policies throughout the world. By revolt and rebellion in colonial areas, by the isolation of the English-speaking world and by cultivating nations other than British or American, the Soviet Union hopes to weaken the opposition to world conquest.

Through failure to understand the real purpose of the Communist imperialism our leaders in the United States were led to believe that permanent cooperation between our country and the Soviet Union was not only desirable but possible. As a result, in Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, we made disastrous concessions. Unfortunately, in the various departments of our Government, especially the State Department, certain traitors to our American way of life were able to do the bidding of the Soviet Union and it is only recently that our top-level leaders have come to understand the real aim and purpose of Communist expansion.

According to the reliable figures of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the well-informed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Communist Party in the United States is numerically small, with some 55,000 dues-paying members. Yet through tactics of incredible skill they have achieved an influence greater than groups one hundred times its size. Real Communists are fanatics who are personal rebels against social or economic discrimination and injustice. Many are members of minority groups who feel that they are being persecuted. A few are intellectuals or idealists who have been fascinated by the blueprint of a perfect society. The fundamental basis of their power is the strength of a well-disciplined and trained minority which is, at the same time, zealous, courageous, and unscrupulous. They aline themselves with disgruntled minority groups much larger than themselves, such as the members of the Jewish community or the American Negro. Any instance of racial injustice is seized upon and headlined in the Communist press. Strong efforts are made to enlist foreign language groups in the Communist struggle, and in many cases they have been successful. Such organizations as the American-Polish Labor Council and the United Committee for South Slavic Americans are typical. American Youth for Democracy shows that not even our American youth are spared. They are restless in their attempt to control or form women's groups, veterans' groups, and even some religious organizations. The type of Soviet propaganda from Hollywood shows that they have made inroads in the field of movies and entertainment. The formation of front organizations has been for the Communists a masterpiece of deception. Many misguided liberals have been taken in by them, while the real issue of communism has been cleverly disguised or made secondary. The Communists say that they are for democracy, peace, and freedom. What they mean by democracy is shown in the present condition of China where for years we were told that the agrarian reformers were true democrats. Our boys in Korea can tell a different story today. Much could be said of their infiltration in the American labor movement. To the everlasting credit of the CIO where they seemed to make the most headway, the Communist-dominated unions were finally removed from their roster. It took some time before such people as Harry Bridges, Lee Pressman, and their ilk were revealed for what they are.

Thank God, the American people and their leaders have finally awakened to the seriousness of the Communist problem in our country.

What should be our answer to the Communist threat here in our country?

One of the first requirements for checking the menace of communism is to have accurate information. When people know the real truth of communism they will not be so quick to line up with its protagonists. The spread of Soviet doctrine can be stopped only when the truth is known. Lies, half truths and deliberate falsehoods have been the reason for the success of communism. Indeed, one of the spiritual works of mercy is the teaching of the uninformed. To do this, each patriotic citizen must become a zealous apostle, spreading the truth about him, in clubs and social gatherings, and among friends and acquaintances. Communism has gained much strength through the indifference of the American people. The Communists will write thousands of letters to influence public officials and the press, largely because they are the only group heard from. Thus, a very prominent Federal official complained that during the period of appeasement of Soviet Russia, he received enthusiastic support. But when he held out for American principles, all he received was abuse. It is the duty of citizens to write to the press and to their public officials.

Coordinated action of several groups of protesting citizens who value the American way of life will increase the effectiveness of their protests. Apostles of truth can bring out effective unity. If Protestants, Catholics, and Jews together stand for freedom and justice, their appeal cannot easily be brushed aside. These religious groups, together with war veterans would scarcely be called warmongers. A joint foreign-policy declaration by various business groups together with non-Communist labor groups would go far toward killing the effectiveness of the smear campaign of those who are for the Soviet way of life.

For members of the Catholic Church, our position is clear. The words of Pius the Eleventh in his encyclical letter "On Atheistic Communism" give a direction which shows great wisdom and prudence. "Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking."

Many an individual, with no allegiance to the Catholic church, has found this truth through bitter experience. It is interesting to note how many former Communists have finally seen the light and have renounced their errors. On principle, no patriotic American should work with the Communist Party or join any of its front organizations.

Patriotic Americans aspiring to leadership in the labor movement should attend approved labor schools where they will learn how to combat the insidious evils and tactics of communism. It is a well-known fact that Communist labor leaders divert union funds into political activities, neglect their duties, and stir up strife. Intelligent and patriotic leadership must be developed to vote these people out of office. The regrettable fact is that many well-intentioned people in labor have not the patience or stick-to-itiveness to fight in a parliamentary way with these fomenters of strife. Thank God, however, Christianity and democracy alike have never lacked for heroic souls who so loved God and country that they would sacrifice without limit for a cause.

The Catholic church has from the beginning of communism been its implacable foe. The church has been vigilant in proclaiming the majesty of God, the primacy of the spiritual order, and the sway of moral law over the hearts of men. The leaders of the church have called for prayer and penance as weapons against the forces of darkness. The church stands for a just and peaceful social order. Destitution and oppression stimulate a spirit of revolt against society. She seeks justice and peace in all fields of life. In fighting communism, the church is striking a blow for the liberty of man, as well as for her own peace and survival in many countries. In a common cause of human freedom, she extends the hand of fellowship and cooperation to all men of good will, whatever their creed, race, or nationality.

Welcome, Mr. Ben-Gurion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Friday, May 11, 1951:

WELCOME, MR. BEN-GURION

It was a beautiful gesture to show the appreciation of a grateful nation to a martyr to its fight for freedom when Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, placed a wreath on the grave of Col. David (Mickey) Marcus, of Brooklyn, at West Point yesterday. Colonel Marcus was killed while serving with the Israeli forces.

The visit here of Israel's Prime Minister has been notable by the warmth with which he has been received by New Yorkers wherever he went. A highlight was the huge rally at Madison Square Garden last night to push the Nation-wide sale of the State of Israel independence bond issue of $500,000,000.

The Eagle feels sure that it speaks for the people of Brooklyn in extending a warm welcome to Mr. Ben-Gurion and also to his wife, the former Miss Paula Moonvess, of this borough, whom he married while here in 1917. The Prime Minister's visit to America should help to cement the already warm ties between the two Republics and should be a big factor in arousing support for the bond issue on which his nation counts so much.

Farm Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the May 1951 issue of the Breeder Stockman an article by Henry T. McKnight relating to agriculture. It is well worth reading by both consumers and producers, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC RELATIONS

(By Henry T. McKnight)

Up until recently, farmers have been the most inarticulate group within the framework of our modern society. They've been called pilferers of the public treasury, growing rich at the expense of the consumers who are obliged to pay through the nose for all farm produce. These consumers consider subsidies and price supports mere legalized highway robbery to make the farmers even fatter. Since Korea there have been organized efforts to place the blame for mounting food prices right in the farmer's lap. And in the face of all this criticism the farmer has just "took" it. He's never answered back in force. And so he sank lower and lower in public esteem.

There's a reason for this. Because of the demanding nature of their work, farmers tend principally to their own business. Farmers are community minded private enterprisers. But as a group they've never considered it necessary to go out beyond the community with the story of their production.

Unfortunately for the farmers we are now living in the era of the press agent. Movie stars, labor leaders, politicians scarcely make a move without consultation of their personal public relations advisers. When Korea came along, the press agents saw to it that the movie stars, labor leaders, et al. were all in there pitching to win the cold war. But the farmer tended to his knitting as usual, sought more agricultural production in the face of unbelievable difficulties, and kept trusting that his position in the public mind was secure. But in a world of sophisticated newspapermen accustomed to press releases by the wagonload, it does not pay to hide your light under a bushel. If you have a good cause, you must tell the world about it.

REPORTS FAILED

Over the years sporadic individual efforts have been made to better agricultural relations with the general public. But the problem has always been to get the different agricultural groups together to present a united front. For instance, the meat people would have one idea they wanted to get across, the cotton people another, the wheat people a third, the co-ops still another. This made for confusion. The results of these efforts were negligible.

But early this year we saw the National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, The National Farmers Union, and The National Milk Producers Federation decide to come out jointly, positively, and constructively to tell the story of farm production to the general public via the newspapers and radio. And now representatives of these groups hold a meeting once a month in Washington to which they invite the Nation's top reporters and commentators interested in agriculture. The first conference was devoted to food prices. Reporters received a general release on the subject which was appended with individual opinions of each of the group leaders. The release stated the current farm position and showed that farm prices are not now high by any comparable standard for business or labor. In fact, the release pointed out, if farmers in 1950 had enjoyed the hourly wage of $1.46 received by labor and if they had the same return on capital investment reported for industry, prices of farm products would have been almost double what it was.

Press reaction has been immediate and enthusiastic. One grateful old-timer, for years covering agriculture for one of the wire services, quickly observed that farm groups were just about 20 years late in getting their public relations squared away.

Next meeting was on subsidies. The next on shortages of fertilizers, insecticides, machinery and repair parts. Such staffed sheets as the Wall Street Journal front paged the news coming from these meetings, and all over the country agriculture got the full hearing it deserves.

Farm Notes paid a call on Paul Taylor, assistant to the national director of the National Grange, and Don Lerch, director of information, to find out how we could be of assistance to create a wider public understanding of the beef cattle industry. We talked of the various programs now under way within our industry, and it was their opinion that in the coming spring and summer months the cause could best be served by holding more and better field days to show the public how we operate.

A glance through the Breeder Stockman shows that several such events are already planned. The more the merrier. Agriculture and the beef cattle industry would benefit immeasurably if one of these field days were to be held in each community this summer.

PROGRAM OUTLINED

Last summer we held such an outing at Cornwell to demonstrate our new Doane pole-frame barn, and if we may venture some suggestions for making a field day a success, they would be these:

1. Keep the field day a simple affair. Remember you have just one function—to show your local public what it takes to produce a beefsteak.

2. Invite a cross section of your community. Don't worry about your neighbors who already know what you're doing. Ask businessmen, nonfarm people, and concentrate your efforts on the housewives. They're the gals who are raising the devil with us because of the price of beefsteak. Most of them will never squawk at a 600 price rise on a television set. But when they're marketing, they hand us the daily insult.

3. Don't hide your light under a bushel. Invite the local newspaper people. Send them information about the affair well in advance, so they can give it plenty of advance publicity. You'll find they'll be delighted to cooperate.

4. Be dramatic. Get up some displays showing what it takes to raise a beef animal for market. Promote your grassland program for what it is; sound agriculture and sound soil conservation. Show rising costs. The consuming public expects you to make a profit. But also show your expenses. This is the item of your farm operation the public doesn't appreciate. Remember, the average meat consumer thinks of you as a country character lying in the shade of the old apple tree with nothing on your mind but a dollar sign. So give the facts of life on production expense.

5. Have a program. A type demonstration using your prize bull as the model is always a fascinating way to show what cut of beef comes from where.

These community field days are always popular. People attending are always glad to spend an afternoon in the country on a good farm. They're in a receptive frame of mind for your public relations message. And there's a practical matter that's not to be overlooked. Such an event is not only good public relations. It's good business for your farm. If you don't sell some cattle as a result of your field day, Farm Notes will gladly eat its hat.

The Basic Issues of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of a television discussion Sunday on the Basic Issues of Our Foreign Policy, between the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. GRAVEL. In the great debate raging on Capitol Hill over the Truman-MacArthur controversy many citizens have lost sight of the basic issues involved. The important issue at stake is American foreign policy, rather than the popularity of the President or the general. Just what is the threat to our national life? Can the United States meet this threat alone, or do we need allies? What is the ultimate end of the Korean conflict. Is world war III inevitable? Where will our present policy lead us?

Today the American Forum of the Air poses these far-reaching questions to our two distinguished guests.

Mr. Harriman, where does the responsibility lie for the present chaotic state of the world?

Mr. HARRIMAN. The responsibility lies in the Kremlin and the men in the Kremlin. We have to understand what they are about, what their objectives are, and the way they are dealing with their objectives. We have to understand in the first place they were part of the international Communist movement and that during the chaos of World War I they seized control of Russia and they have been operating from Russia as their base since that time. Since the end of the war they have been engaged in a world-wide conspiracy to expand their domination and eventually to take over the world. They believe, eventually, that their way of life must be accepted by other nations. They do not believe that freemen can handle their own affairs. They do not believe that free nations can stand together.

Their subversive tactics penetrate everywhere where there is weakness. They use armed force when they think they can get away with it.

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with Mr. Harriman that one of the basic causes of the world situation today directly ties to the Kremlin, but I also believe there is a second basic reason. That reason falls on the shoulders of the administration because of their inability to meet the situation head on. The essence of good government is to foresee the future. In my judgment, that is where the administration in power in Washington has fallen down.

I would change what Mr. Harriman said and say I agree with him on the basic reason for the difficult world situation. It lies in the Kremlin. But I also would add as equally important the inability of our administration all along the line to meet the issues.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I totally disagree with my good friend, Senator BRIDGES. All I ask him to refer to is the record since 1946. In Iran we faced squarely up to the invasion of the Soviet troops and then turned around. We dealt with the threat to Turkey and Greece, and next we developed the Marshall plan.

In 1947 the Kremlin was using the chaos of Europe to press forward and they would have taken over Europe, in my opinion, if it had not been for the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Treaty. We have the initiative in Europe and I defy you to deny that. You cannot foresee everything that is going to happen. You cannot deal with the situation we face unless we and the free world are united.

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with a good deal what you say about Europe and I for one have backed the Greece-Turkey aid, the Marshall plan and various other programs in Europe. Let us speak of Europe for a minute.

We have in Europe countries such as Spain. For years now the administration has been closing its eyes and refusing to apply the same principles to Spain. If Russia has a world-wide conspiracy, which I agree, then we should use all the forces available to meet that conspiracy.

For instance, in Europe we are now embracing Yugoslavia and Tito, even though it is a Communist power and a totalitarian power, because they are opposed, for the time being, to Russia. Yet we have turned our backs on Spain, another equally anti-Communist power, although it is totalitarian in character; they are rabidly anti-Russian, anti-Communist. We have failed to follow through.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Of course, you can argue about specific cases. The question of judgment is as to how and when. I do not think the Senator will disagree that there are times when the Senate takes a bit of time to agree on subjects. We have been working in the direction of bringing Spain into the security arrangements. It cannot be done without our allies.

You know the situation between Franco and our allies in Europe. We are trying to help Franco change his ways to some extent and to help his people have a better situation there. The geography of Spain is recognized, but you cannot do everything all at one time. I maintain the administration has been building consistently since 1945 the unity in the free world.

Senator BRIDGES. I disagree completely on the consistency of the approach. One of the fundamental difficulties with this situation is the basic inconsistency of the American foreign policy. We have been tough in places and then we have been vacillating and weak and appeasing in others.

I think that the basic weakness of our foreign policy is its very inconsistency, its failure to follow through.

May I quote, for example, from a State Department publication which I have here. The Department said, on January 23, 1949, for instance, "the Island of Formosa is of no strategic importance," yet the same State Department in 1948 said: "With the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position."

How can the American people, how can the world, follow us when our State Department, which is supposed to be a guiding light in foreign affairs, takes such an inconsistent position?

Mr. HARRIMAN. We have not been inconsistent. It is perfectly true certain people have tried to confuse the American people and the world. The facts of the matter are that Mr. Acheson and others of our Government have pointed out where we were to have bases, where our troops and where our airplanes and naval bases are to be situated.

It has been consistently said Formosa is not one of those areas we asked for the right to have our bases located. We have consistently said if there is attack on any part of the free world, we will support the United Nations action. That is what we have done in Korea. We can quibble as to words, but that has been the consistent policy of the United States Government.

Senator BRIDGES. Here we are fighting a war in Korea—and I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Times dated March 29, 1951, where it talks of the new admiral who took over the Seventh Fleet. He says, "Not only will the United Nations fleet try to block a full-scale Nationalist assault on China, but it will stand in the way of any commando raids. The 55-year-old admiral said he is trying to avert any Nationalist attack on Communist China." That is pretty inconsistent in line with the fact we are in the middle of a war.

The other day I read on the front page of the Washington Post how a veteran who came back wounded from Korea was denied entrance to a veterans' hospital. Why? Because they said he was not a veteran of any war. The 65,000 casualties in Korea, I believe, will not testify to that fact, nor their parents nor their friends, that we are not involved in a war.

Why be inconsistent in our approach?

Mr. GRANIK. Would you care to answer that?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I would say we are in a limited war, but we are doing our best to limit that war. We are being consistent in attempting to limit it and attempting to deal with the threat and the aggression in Korea without involving ourselves in a more general war. And, Senator, no one has told us when or how or at what cost that wider conflict can be brought to a conclusion. You are attacking me; I would like to attack you, sir, on some of the things you have intimated would be wise policy for our Government to follow.

Senator BRIDGES. I am not attacking you; I am attacking the policies of the administration.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I am part of the administration and I am proud of it. I think the record is one, which when the facts are all known, the American people will support.

Mr. GRANIK. If we take issue in extending the Korean conflict in China, how can this wider conflict be brought to a conclusion?

Senator BRIDGES. I think General MacArthur's views are definitely the answer in order to bring it to a successful conclusion. He has presented the only positive program for China.

I listened to General Marshall all this last week. All General Marshall has said, in substance, is that there are three possibilities in Korea: One is the MacArthur proposals which I think he pushes aside as constituting too great a hazard. The other is evacuation, which would mean the extermination of the millions of Korean citizens, which he pushes aside. Third is to continue fighting within the area of Korea, hoping that eventually we will kill enough Chinese Communists so that they will come to terms.

I do not think this is a very positive program. As far as I know this is the only program the administration has for Korea.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I do not think you quite do justice to the testimony of General Marshall. I do not intend to get into that long testimony, because I think it so lengthy you can pick almost any phrase out of it. General MacArthur has said that in his opinion the war can be brought to a conclusion, but he has not yet told us how or at what cost, or when.

General Marshall has tried to explain in the most forthright manner just exactly what we are up against. In his inimitable way he has told us we have a struggle ahead, that he believes this is the way to win it and that he believes we will win it. It is not just killing Chinamen. It is showing the Kremlin that the free world has the will and the ability to fight and to stand up to aggression when it starts, at the beginning. There are many other reasons he has given.

Senator BRIDGES. I have listened very carefully and I could not put my finger on anything, except to substantiate the position which I have outlined.

Mr. GRANIK. Do you believe another war is inevitable?

Mr. HARRIMAN. No. I think if we are determined enough, if we are vigorous enough, if we do not spend our time trying to find trick answers, and if we do not try to carry through with halfway measures, we can develop unity in the free world and prove to the Kremlin they are wrong, that they cannot divide us and knock us off one by one.

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with Mr. Harriman that world war III is not inevitable, but I do believe that we must change our policy if we are to make it fall in such a category.

If I may point out, for example, the position of the administration in regard to the Far East. Mr. Roosevelt, whom Mr. Harriman had a high regard for—sometimes I agreed with him and sometimes I did not—Mr. Hull, who was Secretary of State, felt that if China fell into hostile hands in the country or person of Japan was sufficiently important to this country so that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull were willing to risk a war. They sent the notes which afterward provoked Japan to make the Pearl Harbor attack and bring on the war, to prevent China from falling into hostile hands and jeopardizing the security of our country. If Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull were right in that position, certainly Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson are not today, or vice versa.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Well, it would take us a half hour to debate the China issue, and, as I understand, you are going to shut us off in half a minute. I cannot deal with all of those questions.

I can only say this: That the misery that exists in the East is a breeding grounds for communism, and there is no question about the fact that there was a miscalculation on the part of many people as to the strength of the Communist hold.

We have done everything since that time, and not always with the full support of the Members of Congress, in getting appropriations to help people in the East build strength.

The administration does understand, and our policies are based upon building, getting rid of human misery and developing stability in these countries in the East so that the China situation cannot happen again.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Harriman, how about the charge that we have a collection of fair-weather friends in Europe?

Mr. HARRIMAN. Of course, that is—anybody who says that does not know history.

I was in England in the year that they stood alone, when the British people faced the great threat of the force of Germany alone. And they fought with determination, and they took pride in the fact that they were fighting not only for themselves but for others——

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with Mr. Harriman on Great Britain's position at that time. But where I would disagree—we are talking about the present. What is Great Britain's position today, when they continue to furnish war materials to Communist China, used directly and indirectly, kill our boys?

I think we are going through the same period today which we did prior to World War II, when this country supplied scrap iron and steel to the Japs that eventually came back here in the bodies of our own boys. I believe, Mr. Harriman, as you do, in collective security, but I believe it has to be collective along a two-way street.

It cannot be all together on our side of the street. It must come to some extent from over there.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Let me say this: That it may be a surprise to you to know, that is, you may not have had time to look into it, that Britain has not been sending any munitions to China for, I think, the better part of 2 years. There have been many things that have been shut off for a considerable period of time.

There has been a lot of to-do about one subject, which is rubber. But Britain does not control Indonesia. They may have been wrong not to have shut it off from Malaya sooner. But it would have come from Indonesia anyway.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Harriman, I hold in my hand the New York Times dated May 3, and it says the United States will go before the United Nations Sanction Committee tomorrow to call for complete arms embargo against Communist China.

That is unbelievable to me, that on May 3, 6 or 7 months after the Chinese Communists have been fighting us, and killing our boys, that the United States on May 3 has gotten around to going to the United Nations asking for an embargo against these materials. It is just unbelievable.

Mr. HARRIMAN. The facts are, Senator, that most of our friends have been shutting off most of these things up to that time. The question was whether formal action should be taken by the United Nations. There was a difference of opinion. And we are going to get formal action now.

Mr. GRANIK. In a moment we will take questions from the audience.

The first question from the audience? Go ahead, sir.

Captain AUSTIN. I am Capt. George Austin, United States Army. I have a question for Mr. Harriman. How long do we expect to be fighting in Korea?

Mr. HARRIMAN. How can anyone answer that question? It is the hope that our troops that are fighting there will prevent another world war, will prevent disaster that would come to our own people here, and that will force the Chinese Communists to give up the struggle.

It may happen next week. It may happen the week after, or it may happen a month or two from now. One cannot tell because you are dealing with an enemy who is under the dictates of the Kremlin.

It may even split Peiping from the Kremlin, if we handle it this right way.

Senator BRIDGES. May I say just one thing on that? I would answer the question by saying that it may be a long time under the present method of conducting this war with at least one hand tied behind our back, when we are not allowed to bomb even areas within Korea, and when we are not allowed to bomb and attack the Chinese bases and supply lines.

I think we are likely to be there a long time unless we make some appeasing compromise which I hope very sincerely will not be made.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I want to say that there is absolutely no appeasement in the policies of our Government. The question is whether if we widen the conflict, there would not be a tougher situation to end, and the grave risk of getting into a general war without any end.

Mr. GRANIK. Is there another question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am Lyman B. Chamberlain, salesman from Littleton, N. H. I would like to direct the question to Senator BRIDGES, from my home State.

What do you think, Senator, about first seeing to it that this country is sound enough economically before we venture any further in trying to support the whole world in food and arms?

Senator BRIDGES. I think Mr. Chamberlain, that yours is a good question. I think that, fundamentally, unless our country is sound at home, both economically as well as militarily, and I might add spiritually as well, we are in no position to give the free world the leadership which they perhaps have the right to expect from us.

So I would say the first essential is to remain strong at home so that we will be vital enough and virile enough to give the world the leadership which they might expect from us.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Harriman?

Mr. HARRIMAN. Of course, we must remain strong at home. We are strong at home. It is true that we are having certain difficulties keeping inflation under check, but we have to move forward and organize the strength of the world and give inspiration and leadership to the world at the same time.

I have enough confidence in America's ability to be satisfied that we can bear the cost of world leadership and give our people a fine life as well.

Mr. GRANIK. The next question?

Mr. SANDY. My name is E. J. Sandy. I am a steel man on leave with the National Production Authority. My question is for Mr. Harriman.

Do you consider the Marshall plan aid for Western Europe finished, and did it accomplish its purposes?

Mr. HARRIMAN. If it had not been for the Korean incident, which showed the blatancy of the Kremlin in bringing on a war, and that has now caused a rearmament program in Europe, the Marshall plan would have been finished probably 6 months before the 4 years for which it was scheduled, and at a couple of billion dollars less than the estimated cost.

Europe is now going into a very heavy armament program, and economic assistance will continue for a time in order to help them switch over with the raw materials and the additional factory equipment that they need, and they will need other forms of economic assistance in order to carry out their military production commitments. So it shall become part of the military program.

Mr. GRANIK. We can take another question.

Mr. KERN. John Kern, currently employed in the Senate.

Senator BRIDGES, since we have not declared war, the present administration takes full discretion on the issues related to Korea. In the future, what factors would be necessary to demand a declaration of war?

Senator BRIDGES. I think that we are in an actual state of war today, and I don't like to see it confused with a police action. Certainly, in the history of our country, we have had in Korea the third largest losses that we have had in any foreign war. In fact, we have had more casualties in the Korean war to date than we had in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War combined. So I think it must be classed as a war. I think if you will talk with some of the veterans coming back, they will not be too happy to learn that we are not in a war. We are in a war today.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Of course, we are in a war today. But there have been limited wars in the past. There have been two world wars in recent times, and it is the attempt of our Government to keep it on a limited basis and try to prevent disaster of a world war.

Mr. GRANIK. Gentlemen, it is time for summaries.

Mr. Harriman, would you sum up, please?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I think we have to recognize that although the menace of war comes from the Kremlin, hasty and ill-conceived actions on our part can lead to grave consequences. As it stands today our men are fighting in Korea to do their part to prevent another world war and preserve our freedoms. We must face the future, and the long future, with the same courage and determination and perseverance.

I am convinced that we can succeed, and I do believe we will succeed. As I have said, the American people have been magnificent during the past 5 years. It is inconceivable for me that anyone can defeat us from the course that we have laid out.

Our job ahead is even more difficult, but the success that we have already achieved in our own endeavors gives promise for the future. Let us not be confused by those who are impatient and would lead us to reckless acts. Let us not be confused by those who have no understanding of the strength of the great association of free nations.

The wise statesmen of both our parties have laid the road to follow, and if you analyze it, you would be surprised to find how many of our policies have had the support of the wise statesmen of both our parties.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Harriman.

Senator BENNETT.

Senator BENNETT. I think that we are at the crossroads today of destiny in the world, and I think that the free world looks to America for leadership. We cannot give leadership to the free world unless we are strong at home spiritually, militarily, and economically.

Then, with this basis, we must start on a consistent program that lacks the vacillation and the appeasing qualities which have been shown so many times in the past.

Of course, the administration has been right in some instances, but what I complain of is the fact that they are tough in one case and weak in another. I think that this country should give to the world consistent leadership of a positive nature.

It is a terrible thing to have the President of the United States have to go on the radio and say that we are afraid of being bombed today after we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars here at home.

Increased Excise Tax on Housing Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and for the attention of the Ways and Means Committee members, I include a petition of Minneapolis, Minn., residents in my district who, because of the shortage of reasonable housing facilities in the area, have had to resort to the use of trailer coaches for shelter; and 92 such families have requested that I oppose the proposed increase of from 7 percent to 20 percent on their temporary living quarters.

The petition follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *May 7, 1951.*

Hon. ROY WEIR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has been brought to our attention that there is a bill before the Congress to increase the amount of excise tax on trailer coaches.

Very few of the modern trailer coaches are in the vacationing or luxury class. Today most trailer coaches are used as mobile housing units; in fact, figures show the number of trailer coaches in use as housing units to be in excess of 90 percent of the trailer coaches sold today.

We, the undersigned, are trailerites (dwellers in the modern trailer coaches) and do vigorously oppose such legislation as a form of class discrimination since no such tax is imposed upon one buying a new home. Even though we own our trailer coach, we think this bill unfair to future owners.

Donald R. Shaw, H. S. Swan, J. Scheufell, V. Kadlec, Wm. Perry, L. H. Ireland, Wm. Duquesne, K. D. Spencer, H. P. Gum, B. W. Minard, C. V. Lance, E. J. Marcoth, Philip E. Call, Cecil R. O'Brien, Lawrence L. Greene. Art Klingwal, Joe King, F. Brown, John Tritchler, George M. Giorurgen, Albert F. Reed, Jr., Mrs. Donald Kennedy, Mrs. C. H. Spicuka, Mr. C. E. Finman, John F. Finman, Kenneth F. King, Phyllis E. Perry, Norman R. Cooper, James E. Lorton, B. Skytta.

G. Perry, M. G. Carbmell, Jack Clayton, F. L. Truman, Frank Piotnek, Forrest O. Balton, Elmer C. Thompson, J. J. Starf, Orvel K. Johnson, Mrs. O. W. Wilkinson, Richard Spence Taylor, Mrs. Harry McKenzie, Mrs. W. C. Sedeberg, Edward S. Kent, Earl Erpelding, Norma Uber, Mrs. Wm. De Gondarah.

Mrs. W. Van Dill, R. W. Bencop, Mrs. C. R. Camp, Mrs. B. H. Mack, Mr. T. D. Duffek, Mrs. Nana Bosler, Mr. and Mrs. Don Forslund, Mrs. Edgar Hemmingson, Mrs. Lawrence Aubert, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Hedger, Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Weir, Lee I. Simonson, Mr. and Mrs. J. Elghmark, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Pitsenick, Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Dalmar, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Erickson, Gust Malmquist, Mr. and Mrs. Bertrand H. Standlund, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Gadbois, John B. Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Post, Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Isaacson, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin J. Mellin, Mr. Floyd Fols, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd E. Horn, Mr. and Mrs. Basil Rice.

Peter Witkowski, Mr. and Mrs. V. F. Houston, Mrs. V. Kingston, Mr. and Mrs. Donald L. Erickson, Mr. and Mrs. George A. Snyder, Mr. and Mrs. Marion W. Fischer, Russell A. Rose, Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Larsen, Mr. C. B. Wheeler, Mr. and Mrs. John Graves, George C. Richman, Mrs. E. W. Zimmerman, M. E. Bailey, Mrs. Ray Thompson, G. E. Flaherty, Mrs. C. R. O'Brien, M. R. Arny, Arthur N. Groud, Harry S. McKenzie.

Young Lithuanian DP Serves in American Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mrs. Dudley Rhodes Campbell, of Birmingham, Mich., regarding a young displaced person who had been admitted to this country under the Displaced Persons Act, and who, like other displaced persons of draft age, was registered with Selective Service and inducted in the Army.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG LITHUANIAN DP SERVES IN AMERICAN ARMY—THE STORY OF STANLEY AIZINAS

(As told by Elise Hatt Campbell (Mrs. Dudley Rhodes Campbell), of Birmingham, Mich.)

When I saw a picture in the Royal Oak Tribune of Stanley Aizinas eating his last breakfast as a civilian, I thought what an unusual chance the reporter had missed to get a news story of human appeal, for Stanley Aizinas, a displaced person, was leaving for the Army, perhaps to return to the Continent which he had left only 18 months before. His short life, 24 years, had been more than filled with war. I suspect that when he embarked for the United States of America, he thought that life now would be a continuous peace. But it was not to be so. Stanley's army service would be more than worth while, from his point of view, if he could aid his country and others behind the iron curtain to be free of Soviet Russia.

Stanley was born in Lithuania in 1927. He was named Stasys, which is Stanley in English. He was the only son of a Lithuanian Army officer, who died of heart trouble in 1939. Thus Stanley grew up during the glorious period of his country's history, an independent republic for 23 years, beginning in 1918. From a beautifully decorated Easter egg, drawn on a dyed egg with a sharp knife, Stanley left my children a brief history of the tragedy of his country. First the Russians came, deporting almost overnight large numbers of healthy young men for slave-labor battallons. "My turn, I heard, was to come next." Then the big guns of the Germans were heard, the Russians fled, and we were occupied by the Nazis, who promised us everything which we had missed under the Russian occupation. But our hopes were soon dispelled, for the Nazis failed to keep their promises. And when, in 1944, the Russian guns were again heard, and the Germans left us, my mother and I decided to flee. "We could not face a Russian occupation a second time. I was the only boy in our city who had roller skates (my godmother had brought them for me from a visit to her son in the United States of America), and these I greased well, and placed them under oily rags along with my ice skates and skis under a board of the floor in a shed we had in our garden. We just packed a few things and closed the door of our house and took the train for Germany."

At this time Stanley was 17 years old. He and his mother lived on the edge of battle under the usual deprivations of war until the American Army was victorious, and then were placed in a camp for displaced persons, where he not only completed 6 years of high school, but held a number of interesting jobs, such as waterfront director for a summer camp of DP camps. He was also active in Boy Scout work, both in Lithuania and in the DP camps.

Stanley fell in love with a beautiful Latvian girl, Solveiga Gulbis, at one of these summer camps. They had to speak German together, their only common language. And so it came about that Stanley's mother was sent to Canada, but the Gulbis family were sent to Michigan. Stanley had an uncle in Canada, but his heart was pledged to Solveiga, so as soon as he could he found a sponsor in Philadelphia, a Lithuanian-American citizen of 30 years, an uncle of his best friend. His best friend had preceded him to Philadelphia, and in August 1949, when Stanley had been in this country about 24 hours, his friend had him a job in a factory, and he had taken out his first papers.

In January 1950 I consulted a volunteer who worked with the Lutheran Charities to find employment for Latvian DP's in the Detroit area. She told me of Stanley and his wish to get work near Birmingham, so he could be near his girl. I got Stanley a job in a fine new plant in Birmingham, where the president was an unusually public-spirited young man, and he lived with us for about 9 months. He soon had a car, so he could get back and forth to Solveiga's, and they spent all their leisure time together. She was a student at a local college. Her parents were like parents to Stanley; he called them mother and father.

One day Stanley got a letter from his best friend from Philadelphia, the young DP. He had volunteered for service in the Air Force. Later he was sent to Germany and became quartered in the same building where he and Stanley had attended school in Germany.

Stanley had a hard time deciding whether to volunteer or to wait for the draft. He had been attending night school all the fall at Wayne University, and he was very anxious to complete his first semester, if possible. His deepest wish was to complete his college education. I should say that if this had been possible, he and Solveiga would have postponed their marriage until Stanley had become a qualified chemist, his great ambition, for both of them value education beyond mere material accretions. But when the letter came telling him to register he did so immediately, and in the course of events passed his physical, got an A-1 rating, and finally was notified he would be called late in February. Early in February he and Solveiga were married, they had a wonderful reception at Solveiga's parents' house, and he and his bride had a ski trip in northern Michigan for a honeymoon. Then came induction in the Army, this last breakfast scene in Royal Oak, and Solveiga returned to her college.

Stanley was in Fort Riley for his basic training, and was to be placed in the interpreter's corps because of his fluent speech in English, German, and Lithuanian. No doubt he will be sent to Europe, and so will complete the full circle, as did his friend.

Stanley was one of those young men who did everything he touched well, thought deeply about his relationship with his old and his new country, wants nothing better than to build his life on his return completely on an American basis. I hope he and Solveiga will have a chance to work out their life together according to their American dream.

Third Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is the third anniversary of the State of Israel, the newest and the smallest state in the entire Middle East. The birth and the sudden growth of Israel is one of the miracles of our age.

Nearly 2,000 years ago when the Israelis were banished from Jerusalem and when nearly all of them sought refuge in many lands, it probably did not occur to most of them that centuries later a new state would be created in their historic homeland by their enterprising and energetic descendants. But the hope for

such a development—a return to the promised land—was kept alive and passed on from generation to generation. Three years ago the dream of 2,000 years actually came to pass.

Many historic events were instrumental in the creation of the State of Israel. The tragic history of the Jews in certain European countries, especially since early 1930's was an important factor. Just as important was the idea of Zionism as evolved by Theodore Herzl more than half a century ago. That idea called for the spiritual regeneration of the Jewish race. But the most important factor, the determining element in the creation of this new state was and still remains, the willingness of Jews to sacrifice their wealth and their lives for the attainment of their most cherished goal. They sacrificed themselves by the thousands; they withstood man-made calamities; and always kept their goal before them.

In the end, when they had to fight against heavy odds, they fought courageously and bravely, and thereby earned their well-deserved independence.

I said the State of Israel is one of the miracles of our age. Nothing short of miraculous is the method by which it is being built up and strengthened. In an area of about 8,000 square miles they already have sheltered more than 1,500,000 Jews. During the last 3 years, the population of this new state has increased annually by more than 200,000 immigrants. Israel has accommodated all Jews seeking refuge. The Government of Israel, with the cooperation and financial aid of Jewish organizations abroad, is endeavoring to assist the distressed Jews in many countries, especially those in Eastern Europe. In this task it has been remarkably successful. Jewish people have been rescued by the thousands, even from countries behind the iron curtain. This is an accomplishment without parallel. It is a demonstration of the determination of the Israelis to help their unfortunate brethren, of their willingness to fulfill their responsibility no matter how great the difficulties.

Israel, today, is vigorous and confident. It reveals all the characteristics of a progressive, democratic state. It is growing stronger and more prosperous and is becoming a decisive force in the politics of the Middle East. I know that my colleagues in the Congress join with me in wishing the State of Israel continued peace and prosperity on this, the third anniversary of their independence.

Correcting the Record on Fred Searles, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 13, 1951, my colleague and friend, Congressman RICHARDS, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Correcting an Injustice to Fred Searles, Jr." The article relates to my criticism of Mr. Fred Searles, Jr., as mining adviser to Charles Wilson, Mobilization Director. It contains a laudatory letter written by Gov. James Byrnes, who is a vice president of the Newmont Mining Corp., of which Fred Searles, Jr., is president. A letter of defense by Mr. Searles is made a part of the article. It is claimed that Mr. Searles was not given a chance to be heard in answer to the criticism of him, and Mr. Searles complains that he was charged with "improper conduct" in his position. He denies, however, that that caused his resignation. I am submitting the following statement to correct the record.

In the first place, Mr. Searles was not denied an opportunity to be heard by the committee.

He was invited to appear before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining on April 4, 5, or 6, but he did not appear. Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the Mobilization Director, wrote a letter to the chairman of our full committee, Congressman MURDOCK, under date of April 3, 1951, in which he stated that Mr. Searles could not be present on April 4 and would not be back in Washington until April 6. Mr. Wilson also said that Mr. Searles had "given up his position as Assistant to the Director."

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, before which Mr. Searles was to appear, was in session on April 6, presided over by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN]. Mr. Searles could have appeared if he wanted to—and for that matter he can still appear if he wants to.

Mr. Searles says in the letter defending himself that I had called for his resignation because of improper conduct in his position. That is not the case. I did not charge Mr. Searles with improper conduct. I charged that he disagreed with the basic objectives and purposes of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as it relates to the encouragement of the production of critical and strategic minerals and metals.

I specifically disclaimed any intention to charge Mr. Searles with improper conduct. That disclaimer was made in the open hearing at the time I called for Mr. Searles' resignation. The following statement appears on pages 39 and 40 of the reporter's transcript of the hearings on April 4, 1951, before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The reporter's transcript reads as follows:

Mr. ENGLE. I am not saying that Mr. Searles lobbyed this particular contract in your agency or used improper influence at all and I am not accusing you of any improper connection with that, either, Dr. Boyd. I want the record to show that; but I am saying—and this is the thing that infuriates me—that at the same time the Newmont Mining Co. was getting a subsidy-loaded contract through the Defense Minerals Administrator, Mr. Searles, was before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and saying that the way to help the domestic mining industry in this Nation is to leave it alone. I think the little fellows out in the country are going to be interested in that kind of information.

Mr. REGAN. That is the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, not the House.

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

I want to make perfectly clear to you, Dr. Boyd, that in this record I am not implying that your agency has been guilty of any impropriety or, for that matter, that Newmont Mining Co. has. All I am saying is that the action of the company is wholly inconsistent, not only here, but abroad, with the testimony given previously, which I say dominates the thinking in this administration with reference to the minerals program.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing, I think, will make it perfectly plain that Mr. Searles was not deprived of a chance to be heard by our subcommittee—and is not now being deprived of a hearing if he still wants it. He simply did not show up when he was supposed to. The committee hearing was not canceled as he says. Further, the record clearly indicates that Mr. Searles was not charged with improper conduct or improper influence. On the contrary, the record shows that I disclaimed any intention of charging him with improper conduct or improper influence.

However, I did charge that Mr. Searles had been appointed as an assistant to the Director of Mobilization, Mr. Wilson, as a specialist, specializing in the minerals program. This is plainly stated in the press release issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization under date of January 3, 1951.

I further charged that Mr. Searles now opposes and has always opposed any assistance whatever in encouraging the exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals. When the Defense Production Act was passed in September 1950 two sections were written into that bill containing provisions which authorize development of our domestic sources of supply of these materials. Further, under the Excess Profits Tax Act passed in January of this year, the Congress allowed special tax benefits to the producers of those critical and strategic minerals and metals. In short, Congress has made it plain in both the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Excess Profits Tax Act that the executive branch of the Government is to encourage the domestic production of critical and strategic minerals and metals.

But Mr. Searles is opposed to encouraging the domestic production of critical and strategic minerals and metals. This has been obvious over a number of years, and more recently on February 13, 1951, was restated by him in his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate.

On February 13 Mr. Searles appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presided over by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Senator O'MAHONEY.

On pages 243, 244, and 245 of the reporter's transcript there appears the following colloquy between Senator O'MAHONEY and Mr. Searles:

The CHAIRMAN. Before he answers, may I read this sentence from the letter in which Mr. Searles made his remarks, and which he addressed to me? This is the letter of August 8, 1949: "I am convinced that the best thing the National Government could do to

help the mining industry in this country is to let it alone." * * * All of this, so far as I am concerned, merely raises the question as to what sort of advice you are going to give to Mr. Charles E. Wilson with respect to the development of domestic sources of minerals and strategic and critical materials here in the United States.

Mr. SEARLES. Well, I am going to give him the advice if he can avoid or adopt any policy which would avoid giving subsidies to the development of speculative mining ventures, that he ought to stop. If he can.

On page 228 of the reporter's transcript of those hearings Mr. Searles in answer to the question propounded by the chairman, Senator O'MAHONEY, made the following statement:

I feel now as I did then, that any type of subsidy for the development of mining is objectionable because it does tend to socialize the mining industry.

On pages 262 and 263 of the same record there appears the following colloquy between Senator O'MAHONEY and Mr. Searles regarding funds authorized by the Defense Production Act for use in developing domestic sources of supply:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the simple question is, Do you believe that any action should be taken under that authority through Congress to stimulate the production of domestic minerals in the United States?

Mr. SEARLES. If I had my way, during the period of intensive expansion of facilities and of production of military end items at the top speed, I would stop any such funds from being borrowed from the Government. However, if it is impossible to stop it entirely, then I would do as little as I could.

On page 284 of the same record, Mr. Searles places himself squarely in opposition to a $10,000,000 Government exploration assistance program then being proposed by the Defense Minerals Administration.

Senator O'MAHONEY asked for Mr. Searles' views:

The CHAIRMAN. In the light of our discussion today * * * would you regard an expenditure of that size ($10,000,000) as being unwise or a calculated risk for the purpose of developing domestic sources of these materials, if they exist?

Mr. SEARLES. I would prefer that it be not done chiefly because of the fact that it sets a precedent.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing makes it perfectly clear that Mr. Searles opposes any program whereunder the Federal Government would assist in the development of domestic minerals and metals. He is opposed to the premium price program on the ground that it involves subsidies to the domestic mining industry. He says that will socialize the industry. He is opposed to any loan program, although it is specifically authorized in the Defense Production Act of 1950.

But that is not all. Mr. Searles has consistently since the end of the last war opposed any program to keep the domestic mining industry going. On August 8, 1949, he wrote a letter to Senator O'MAHONEY in opposition to S. 2105, which was a bill pending before the Senate at that time to give very limited assistance to the domestic mining industry. In his testimony before the Senate committee on February 13, 1951, he reiterates that opposition. On February 22, 1949, he wrote to me—I was then chairman of the House subcommittee on Mines and Mining—and opposed similar legislation then pending in the House introduced by the late Congressman Lemke, of North Dakota, and Congressman Russell, of Nevada.

Moreover, Mr. Franz Schneider, who was executive vice president and director of the Newmont Mining Corp., of which Mr. Searles is president, appeared before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on June 16, 1949, and advocated cutting the requested appropriation for stockpiling in the amount of $830,000,000. The country has recently been informed through the reports of the Johnson committee in the Senate of the tragic failure of the Munitions Board to carry out the stockpiling program as it should. But Mr. Schneider, who is Mr. Searles' associate in the Newmont Mining Co., would have made it even worse if his advice had been followed.

Now, it must be perfectly obvious to anyone that people with this kind of a philosophy in regard to our stockpiling program and the encouragement of domestic mining production should not be acting as top advisers on mineral policy. They think exactly opposite of what Congress has directed should be done.

As indicated by Mr. Searles, he would advise that nothing be done; that "the best thing the National Government could do to help the mining industry in this country is to leave it alone." I think this record completely substantiates the charge which I made against Mr. Searles, that he is fundamentally opposed to the basic purposes and objectives of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as it relates to the encouragement of development of mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals.

Aside from this basic disagreement that Mr. Searles has with the program Congress is trying to put into effect, Mr. Searles' position is made even more untenable by the fact that here and abroad the Newmont Mining Co., of which he is president, has been the beneficiary of precisely the same treatment from Government that he objects to here at home for his competitors.

At the request of the Senate committee Mr. Searles provided a list of the holdings of the Newmont Mining Co., of which he is president, both here and abroad, and a list of the companies in which he has official connections. The lists are as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1951.

Memorandum to Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The following is information requested by your committee on the occasion of my testimony on February 13, stating the present holdings and percentage of outstanding stock of companies in which Newmont Mining Corp. is interested; also the names of the companies with which I have some official connection, and designation of that connection.

FRED SEARLES, Jr.

Newmont Mining Corp.—Common stocks owned at Dec. 31, 1950

Company	Shares owned	Percentage owned of total stock issued and outstanding
A. DOMESTIC		
The American Metal Co. (Ltd.)	1,955	0.1
Atlas Mining Co.	276,000	73.4
Columbus Mining Co.[1]	38,333	38.3
Carthage Hydrocol, Inc.	632	.4
Cyprus Mines Corp.	40,625	13.7
Continental Oil Co.	261,269	5.4
Creole Petroleum Corp.	21,600	.1
East Tennessee Natural Gas Co.	131,037	12.2
El Paso Natural Gas Co.	30,690	1.4
Empire Star Mines Co., Ltd.	43,329	37.3
Equitable Gas Co.	23,000	1.1
Geophysical Exploration Co.	75,000	75.0
Getchell Mine, Inc.	130,700	8.7
Goldfield Deep Mine Co. of Nevada	2,073,890	20.8
Hecla Mining Co.	9,000	.9
Idarado Mining Co.	1,336,201	74.2
Kennecott Copper Corp.	108,800	1.0
Magma Copper Co.	140,658	22.2
New Park Mining Co.	46,039	1.6
Newmont Exploration, Ltd.	620,000	100.0
Newmont Oil Co.	203,226	100.0
Phelps Dodge Corp.	153,051	3.0
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.	233,040	6.6
Verde Exploration, Ltd.[1]	87,400	25.5
Western Natural Gas Co.	16,500	1.6
B. FOREIGN		
Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. (Ltd.)	2,082	0
Berens River Mines Co., Ltd.	1,446,495	72.3
Broken Hill South, Ltd.	15,688	----------
The Consolidated Zinc Corp., Ltd.	24,300	.4
Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Ltd.	50,890	1.8
Polaris Mining Co.	19,900	1.0
Resurrection Mining Co.	579,000	33.3
Richmond-Eureka Mining Co.[1]	12,337	4.0
Safari Corp.	75,000	50.0
St. Joseph Lead Co.	37,254	1.5
Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.	31,230	.5
Texas Gas Transmission Corp.	27,200	1.2
Tomboy Gold Mines, Inc.[1]	113	17.3
Island Mountain Mines Co., Ltd.	584,894	55.7
Mid-African Exploration Co.	100,000	100.0
Newmont Mining Corp. of Canada, Ltd.	65,000	100.0
Société de Développement Minier[1]	650	65.0
Société Nord Africaine du Plomb	22,887	31.8
Tsumeb Corp., Ltd.	1,140,000	38.5
O'okiep Copper Co., Ltd.	575,103	56.3
Rhodesian Anglo-American, Ltd.	138,501	1.1

[1] Inactive.

COMPANIES IN WHICH MR. SEARLES HAS OFFICIAL CONNECTION

Atlas Mining Co., director and president; American Metal Co., Ltd.,[2] director; Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research, Inc., director; Empire Star Mines Co., Ltd., director and chairman of the board; Geophysical Exploration Co., director and president; Hecla Mining Co., director; Idarado Mining Co., director and vice president; Mid African Exploration Co.,[1] director and vice president; Island Mountain Mines Co. Ltd.,[1] director and vice president; New Verde Mines Co.,[2] director and president; Newmont Mining Corp., of Canada, Ltd.,[1] director and vice president; Newmont Oil Co., director and vice president; Newmont Exploration, Ltd., director and president; North Beck Mining Co.,[2] director and president; Northern Empire Mines Co. Ltd.,[2] director and president; O'okiep Copper Co., Ltd.,[1] director; Resurrection Mining Co., director and president; Rhodesian Anglo-American, Ltd.,[1] director; Safari Corp.,[1] director and vice president; Société Nord Africaine du Plomb, director; Tomboy Gold Mines, Inc., director and president; Tsumeb Corp., Ltd.,[1] director; Underhill Gold Mining Co. Ltd.,[2] director and vice president.

[1] Operates outside of United States.
[2] Inactive.

Mr. Speaker, it is shown by this record that the Newmont Mining Co., of which Mr. Searles is president, operates the Tsumeb mine in Southwest Africa, which has had liberal treatment in the matter of tax depletion and depreciation allowances from the South African Government. On page 241 of that same transcript, Senator O'MAHONEY refers to these tax benefits and depletion and depreciation allowances of a generous nature given by the South African Government:

The CHAIRMAN. First, I want to refer to Tsumeb, in which Fortune magazine tells us the company which you brought to life, had the sympathetic support of tax benefits and depletion and depreciation allowances of a generous nature; what distinction do you make between that sort of support in South Africa, the additional support from the Treasury of the United States, through ECA and counterpart funds in North Africa, and the assistance of the Government of the United States to domestic mining operations in this country? Where is it that one is good and the other is bad?

Mr. SEARLES. Taking, first, the Tsumeb mine in southwest Africa, the liberal attitude on the part of the Government of South Africa was entirely necessary to justify opening that mine, because of the fact that after all taxes in Africa had been paid, we have to pay, on top of that, the usual taxes assessed against any corporation in the United States, so that there is a double taxation there, and a very objectionable form which, if the South African Government had not been fairly decent, would not have permitted the mine to be reopened.

In the case of Morocco, the subsidies there are ECA subsidies, which really are granted to French companies. The Newmont Mining Corp. has been willing at all times to participate in those subsidies by joining the French companies, because of the fact that these are counterpart funds, and because of the fact that in the case of any subsidy, if it is once legalized and put into force, the Newmont Mining Corp. is willing to accept it because it is paying the taxes to create the subsidy, and we have accepted subsidies, not only in North Africa, but in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you actively pursue this subsidy in North Africa?

Mr. SEARLES. Yes. We negotiated with the——

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. So it was not merely a passive acceptance of the subsidy.

Senator ANDERSON. It was solicitation, was it not?

Mr. SEARLES. That is right.

It also appears from this record that the Newmont Mining Corp. is interested in a mining operation in North Africa which has had the benefit of something like $4,000,000 in ECA funds.

On page 240 of the same record, Senator ANDERSON asks the following question:

Senator ANDERSON. Let me simplify that by saying did you get help from ECA to open up these mines?

Mr. SEARLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. But you did get the subsidy of ECA funds?

Mr. SEARLES. Yes; continue to get it.

The CHAIRMAN. And that was paid to the Société Nord Africaine du Plomb, a lead producer, in which Newmont Mining Corp. had an interest?

Mr. SEARLES. That is right.

On page 241 of the same record, Senator O'MAHONEY asks the $64 question when he asked Mr. Searles what distinction he makes between that sort of support in South Africa, the additional support from the Treasury of the United States through ECA, and counterpart funds in North Africa, and the assistance of the Government of the United States to domestic mining operations in this country. Senator O'MAHONEY wanted to know why it is good in one place and not in another. Mr. Searles does not give a satisfactory answer to that question, although admitting that he and his company vigorously pursued a subsidy arrangement in each of these instances. He further admits in this record that the production from these operations (including the North African operation, financed and subsidized by ECA funds) is being sold in foreign markets and not coming to the United States where it is vitally needed.

Senator O'MAHONEY very caustically summarizes the situation on page 244 of the transcript, where he comments to Mr. Searles, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. There is no distinction in principle, sir, between government aid in South Africa to mines in South Africa, and government aid in the United States to mines in the United States; but you are the head, by your own testimony, of a mining company which has properties all over the world. You accept government subsidies and sympathetic aid in other countries, but you want the Congress of the United States to deny it to your competitors in the United States.

Senator O'MAHONEY did not know when he made those remarks that the Newmont Mining Corp., of which Mr. Searles is president, at the very time Mr. Searles was testifying in opposition to any sort of subsidy arrangement for the domestic mining industry, was in fact interested in a subsidy-loaded contract being negotiated through Defense Minerals Administration.

The facts in regard to this transaction appear in the transcript of the record of the proceedings before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under date of April 4, 1951. From this record it appears that the San Manuel Copper Co. of Arizona is to receive a contract from the Federal Government to produce copper. The San Manuel Copper Co. is owned by the Newmont Mining Corp., of which Fred Searles is president. This contract provides for the guaranteed purchase by the Government of huge amounts of copper involving $125,000,000 over a period of 10 years.

The following colloquy between Dr. Boyd, the head of Defense Minerals Administration, and me may be of interest. It appears on page 37 of the transcript of the hearings of April 4 in regard to this contract.

Mr. ENGLE. The price paid by the Government would be a subsidy, would it not?

Dr. BOYD. That is correct, sir.

Mr. ENGLE. All right. One further question: Is it a fact that the San Manuel Copper Co. is a subsidiary of the Magna Copper Co.?

Dr. BOYD. That is right.

Mr. ENGLE. And the Magna Copper Co. is owned by the Newmont Mining Corp. of which Mr. Fred Searles is president; is that right?

Dr. BOYD. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. And so it seems, does it not, that the gentleman, Mr. Searles, who appeared before the Senate committee and loudly debated against subsidies for anyone else was, in fact, going to be the beneficiary of a contract, himself, or through his company; is that right?

Dr. BOYD. That is correct.

As indicated earlier in this statement, I do not charge that Mr. Searles improperly lobbied or influenced the approval of that contract, or for that matter, that the contract is not a good one and in the interests of the Government. I do not know about that. But I do say that the fact that the Newmont Mining Corp. has secured a contract containing the subsidy principle does discredit the good faith of the argument made by its president, Mr. Searles, against the application of the subsidy principle for the benefit of the competitors of his company here in the United States. In short, Mr. Searles, the president of the company, is arguing that Government subsidies are not good for the mining industry and should not be allowed; that no loans should be made to help in exploration and development of the mining industry as is done for other segments of American industry; but at the same time the Newmont Mining Corp. has been the beneficiary of generous treatment by the government in South Africa, by our own Government in its operations in North Africa, and is currently the beneficiary of a subsidy-type contract approved by the Defense Minerals Administration.

In conclusion, then, I think it is very clear that Mr. Searles has not only advocated policies which are contrary to the clear mandate of Congress, but while arguing against those policies has himself through his own company been the beneficiary of the type of financial assistance from the Government which he opposes for everyone else. For those reasons I felt justified as I did on April 4, 1951, in demanding that Mr. Searles resign or be dismissed. No injustice was done Mr. Searles, and he properly resigned his position.

Loyalty Is the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial commenting on the testimony of General MacArthur and Secretary Marshall, from the Tablet, one of the leading

Catholic publications in America, in its issue of May 12, 1951:

LOYALTY IS THE ISSUE

Over and beyond the current dispute respecting the views of General MacArthur as opposed to those of Secretary of Defense Marshall and the administration, every American places first in mind the welfare of his country. This supplants debates respecting individuals, political parties, or professional ideologists.

General MacArthur's views respecting peace and the welfare of the Nation may be accepted or rejected. But this is certain: His concern is solely for his country; he spoke without intimidation by any foreign foe; he exuded strength; he breathed confidence of victory; he was free and forthright, not betraying harshness or hiding behind convenient security; he did not engage in personalities; he answered all questions in his field, he kept to the issues and he completed his testimony with his head high.

Secretary Marshall's testimony before the Senate Armed Forces and Foreign Relations Committees is set forth from a different angle. He seems to have a reluctant approach, hampered by apprehension and ever fearful that a politically false move might be made. He is for a limited war, apparently not overconcerned with the loss of American lives; he still appears to be for negotiation with the Chinese Communists, although it is not clear as to what we are to negotiate, for we have nothing to sell except our country and Peiping has nothing to lose since we do not fight upon, or covet, any of her territory. Again, he states bluntly he thinks the purpose of the Communists is "to dominate the whole free world."

Secretary Marshall in his testimony has brought up other subjects which General MacArthur did not touch and which are startling to the American people. Among them are these four:

1. He stated that while serving as delegate of the United States in China, during which time he reportedly indicated that Chiang's defeat was certain and the victory of the Reds inevitable, he never considered the Chinese Reds simple agrarians but believed they were genuine Marxists. If this is true, then Americans wonder why he insisted Chiang take these world destroyers into his government and why he punished him for refusing to follow an order to do so.

2. Equally shocking is Secretary Marshall's testimony that the American people had lost their independence in military action during war. He admitted that decisions made by President Truman and our Chiefs of Staff are vetoed by other governments and the veto is kept secret from the American people. The Secretary of Defense conceded that foreign governments, which have given little manpower and resources to the war, have forbidden the United States to pursue the enemy across a certain line. In addition he asserted that although the United States endeavored to secure an economic blockade to stop war matériel from going to the enemy, the principal U. N. countries have not, after over 9 months, acted in favor of the blockade; in fact, some of the same foreign regimes which give our armies their orders also permit munitions to reach those who shoot our boys. This, then, is the shocking feature: According to Secretary Marshall's testimony, the United States, which supplies the overwhelming majority of men and supplies to the war, has lost its independent control of the situation and surrendered the fate of our boys to the pleasure of foreign governments. The Secretary said General MacArthur's attitude had made the U. N. "uneasy"; one wonders if the thousands of American casualties and the shipping of munitions to the Reds by member nations created any uneasiness.

3. Secretary Marshall gave a turn to the appeasement dispute which must agitate Americans. He asserted, using the same phrase Secretary Acheson pronounced, that the unification of North and South Korea had been set up as a political rather than a military objective of the United Nations. While this would appear to be a new form of objectives in war—and for which Americans are dying—the ominous part is that if this is a political matter it is possible that while the United States will continue to oppose recognition of Red China, and the selling out of Formosa, the other nations—including those who have traded with the Reds—will have to decide the issue. Secretary Acheson made it clear that the United States will not veto admission of Red China to the U. N. if a majority of nations favor it. In other words, there is grave possibility that, despite our great sacrifices in Korea, Red China may still win its objectives, which would be appeasement of the first order.

4. Senator BRIDGES of New Hampshire, in questioning Secretary Marshall, asked whether an officer's first loyalty was to his country or the administration then holding office. Senator HICKENLOOPER clarified the question when he said: "There is a book called The Armed Forces Officer that is rolling on the press right now, issued by the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall. I am reading from page 8, so that the record will be clear: 'The service officer is charged only to take a lively interest in all such discussions—that is, about public matters and affairs of the military—and has no more right to condemn the service unfairly than has any other American. On the other hand, he is not expected to be an intellectual eunuch, oblivious to all the faults in the institution to which he gives his loyalty; or to the contrary, that the nature of that loyalty requires that he will use his force toward righting of those things which reason convinces him are going wrong, though making certain that his actions will not do more damage than repair. His ultimate commanding loyalty at all times is to his country and not to his service or superior.'"

Secretary Marshall, whose name was affixed to the recently printed document from which the above quotation was taken, gave this surprising answer, "I had not heard that particular paragraph before. It is a generalization, of course. My own thought would be that it could not be given application in this matter."

Senator BRIDGES then asked whether an officer's first loyalty was to his country or to the administration in power—and he emphasized that General MacArthur had placed his country first. Secretary Marshall said it was to his country. Then the Senator asked the Secretary if a top officer felt his country was being betrayed and was aware of a Communist infiltration in the State Department, what he should do. The Secretary said he should resign from the military service.

In other words, a man must sacrifice his career if he wants to give his views to Members of Congress. His first loyalty is not to the country, to its Constitution, or to his conscience, but to the administration. In fact he cannot even consider Congress as a civilian branch of the Government coequal with the executive branch. He must be a yes-man. Was not this the same attitude Hitler manifested toward his generals?

Throughout the testimony of Secretary Marshall there seemed to be a note of defeatism. President Truman, likewise in his address Monday evening emphasized the weakness, and not the strength of America, as if we were prisoners of our mistakes. His message of fear, because of the Soviet's possession of atomic bombs, and his castigation of the Kremlin's agents abroad, expressed defeatism at its worst. Reliance was placed by the President on the United Nations, yet nowhere was it indicated that the effective membership of the U. N. Security Council is one quarter Kremlin—and that admission of Red China would make U. N. almost half pro-Soviet.

Secretary Marshall conceded General MacArthur, our outstanding general, had been dismissed not for breaking any rule but rather for not following a directive—and even this is not clear, for Mr. Marshall did not convincingly show what directives had been disobeyed and he conceded liaison work with Tokyo was miserable. And he denounced the commander for mentioning the great American losses in Korea; he implied only the losses suffered by the Chinese Reds were of interest to the administration. We believe the American losses in Korea are all important; we want to know how many casualties we have, we want to know how long this war is to continue, we want to know how it happened and who is responsible for the conflict.

These are elementary but important questions. Our loyalty is to our country, our conscience, and our boys at the front.

What the American people need most today is a renascence of faith and fortitude—the faith that comes from loyalty to our principles and ideals, and the fortitude which comes from our strength, determination, and resources. The missing factor in our entire war program—particularly at secret conferences—has been the absence of a moral concept, the failure to invoke ethical principles and the disregard of the value of spiritual mobilization. Patriots of old loved and sacrificed for their country; patriots of today must do the same by opposing the enemy from within as well as from without.

Are We Chickens or Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Eastern Idaho Farmer of May 11, 1951:

ARE WE CHICKENS OR AMERICANS?

What's happened to the leadership of the United States of America? Are we to forget our heritage to quake at what may happen to us if we display courage that measures up to the courage of those who dared fight a war, against great odds, for independence? Are we then servile and obeisant to a power that may be no more than a hollow shell?

Have we forgotten that, if Patrick Henry had urged the necessity of matching England's weapons and England's power before we dared defy her might, there would have been no "Give me liberty or give me death," no Revolutionary War, no free United States of America? Have we forgotten the "big stick" of Teddy Roosevelt? Have we forsaken Woodrow Wilson's concept that peace is worth fighting for? Have we so soon forgotten that within the decade we had the courage and developed almost overnight, the power to fight two wars, across two wide oceans at the same time and humble two powerful enemies?

Are we chickens or are we Americans? Are we to continue to pour our sons' blood into the soil of Korea in a war we can never win and a war that could be the first one we've ever lost because we do not dare to fight for victory? Are we defeatists, afraid to do what we know is right and to risk, however grave that risk may be, the consequences? Are we afraid to face what we've been told again and again is inevitable: a showdown with communism?

Are we forever consigned to the defense? Are we to bleed and die on far fields everywhere in wars in which there can be no victory? Are we?

Not, we're sure, with the approval of the people of the United States of America. If this thing has to be faced—as it does—the American people want to be led by men who have the same courage, faith, and will to win who conceived, fought for, and built the United States of America. We are not craven to evade a responsibility no matter how grave are the possible consequences of facing it honestly and fearlessly. If we are to be enslaved by fear and threat, there can be no hope, no future. Even the atheistic, slave-labor totalitarianism of communism is better than that.

What we want in the United States is leadership with vision and courage to stand where Americans have always stood: for liberty, for human rights, and with a determination to face anything for them.

We aren't getting that leadership. By that much, we today are failing to live up to our proud heritage, failing our boys who are bleeding and dying in Korea in a conflict without purpose and without end. If we are still Americans, it's high time we started acting like Americans again.

Ban on One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Stamp for Brooklyn's Battle Is Baffling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, May 14, 1951:

BAN ON ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY STAMP FOR BROOKLYN'S BATTLE IS BAFFLING

The refusal of Postmaster General Jesse Donaldson to approve the issuance of a special commemorative stamp marking the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Long Island—or, as it is now more accurately described, the Battle of Brooklyn—comes as a great disappointment here.

The campaign for this recognition has been going on for upward of a year and has been spearheaded by Borough President Cashmore, all nine of Brooklyn's Congressmen, Postmaster Edward J. Quigley and Borough Historian James A. Kelly, who served as chairman of a committee comprised of this borough's leading citizens.

The impression created by Mr. Donaldson that Brooklyn's efforts were somewhat belated is not based on the facts. Separate bills in the interest of this special stamp were introduced in Congress by Representatives HEFFERNAN and ANFUSO last year in more than ample time. As a matter of fact Mr. Cashmore sought such a stamp 5 years ago and at that time he received broad assurances about the consideration a renewed plea would receive for the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary.

The whole position of the Postmaster General seems to us extremely weak. The program was restricted, he said, to four stamps because of present conditions. Why it could not have been just one more is hard to understand.

The choice of the four is baffling. We can understand the historic importance of the one hundredth anniversary of the settlement of Nevada and the anniversary of the statehood of Colorado. Also we can understand the sentimental interest in the final encampment of the United Confederate Veterans and the influence exerted by all the Southern States in such a special stamp proposal.

But what could be the possible excuse for approving a stamp for the anniversary of the American Chemical Society over one for Brooklyn's famous battle is beyond our comprehension. George Washington's military genius was never better demonstrated than here in his successful strategic amphibious withdrawal of his harassed troops over the East River to old New York, where he was able to rally and reform them and carry on to ultimate victory. If his army had been bottled up and captured it might have meant the end of the American Revolution.

The Postmaster General's decision that the anniversary of the American Chemical Society—with all due respect to that eminent and most important organization—is of greater national significance than the great battle fought on August 27, 1776, in what is now the Borough of Brooklyn, is an amazing exhibition of historical values.

A Plan To Help Humanity—The New York Times Comments on a Vitally Important United Nations Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental basis of our struggle against communism must be threefold: Military defense, economic reconstruction and development, and ideological exposition. The improvement of standards of living among the underdeveloped peoples of the world constituting well over half the world's population and living on a standard based on an annual income of $100 per capita or less compared to our $1,700 per capita per annum demands urgent consideration. The United Nations has now come out with a detailed study on the subject which is deserving of the interested attention of every Member devoted as we all are to success in this struggle for the freedom of mankind.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

A PLAN TO HELP HUMANITY

The five United Nations economists who have reported a plan to produce $19,000,000,000 a year of capital investment in underdeveloped countries are not utopians. What they demonstrated was that a vast proportion of the world's population—about a billion and a half persons—are greatly in need of economic aid and could be greatly helped if conditions were favorable. In a 108-page document these eminent scholars took account of the difficulties as well as the opportunities. The great obstacle is that there is no sure peace in the world and that consequently the free countries must spend on armament many billions of dollars that could otherwise be released for constructive foreign investment. This pressure for expenditures for defense is caused by the aggressive activities of a nation which represents itself as the friend of the common man.

The U. N. experts did not suggest that $19,000,000,000 a year be poured out without question by the United Nations or by governments or by private investors. What is actually needed seems to be about $10,000,000,000 a year of capital imports into the underdeveloped countries, of which about 60 percent should go to countries of south central Asia and the Far East. The total sum amounts to somewhat less than 3 percent of the annual incomes of the nations of Western Europe, Australasia, the United States, and Canada. Of course, the United States through one agency or another would be the largest investor.

The economists face up to some of the inherent difficulties of such investments. No country can get ahead economically unless its people are willing to make the necessary sacrifices, which is not always the case. As the report says: "Ancient philosophies have to be scrapped; old social institutions have to disintegrate; bands of caste, creed, and race have to be burst; and large numbers of persons who cannot keep up with progress have to have their expectations of a comfortable life frustrated." The economists dared to suggest that rapid progress in some countries cannot take place until a social revolution has effected a shift in the distribution of income and power. We take it they mean a peaceful evolution such as generally takes place when there is a great technological advance. They may also believe, though they do not explicitly say so, that the fake reforms of communism will have to be counteracted by real reforms encouraged by the democracies. The task will not be too easy. For one thing as the report says, "the technology of developed countries cannot simply be transferred." The new methods of production must be adapted to the customs and temperament of the people who are to use them. On one point the economists are refreshingly optimistic. They believe that under favorable circumstances production can keep ahead of population. They do not suggest that we allow people to die of unnecessary diseases because there is danger that they will be underpopulated if they remain alive.

It will be a long time, one would guess, before any program like this can get into full stride, assuming that it is accepted by the Economic and Social Council and implemented, as the economists suggest, by such agencies as the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. But the obstacles are political and psychological, not material. If we could have an assured peace, or even an indefinitely prolonged truce, the principles laid down in this report might be used to bring about an enormous spread of well-being and of freedom.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call to the attention of the House the following splendid editorial on statehood

for Alaska and Hawaii from the Christian Science Monitor:

TWO MORE STATES: AND WHY NOT NOW?

Proponents of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska may take some small measure of encouragement from the fact that the Senate insular affairs committee thus early has reported favorably bills to accomplish that end.

Heretofore it has been in the Senate that statehood bills for these territories have expired, the House last year having approved such measures. In matters of population, importance to defense, and rapidity of communication with the mainland these noncontinental areas would seem to qualify for self-governing participation in the union.

Earnest arguments are made against statehood, it is true, but most of these could have been made against present States when they were admitted or even today. Apparently the greatest resistance arises not from questions about Alaska or Hawaii themselves but from apprehension that the four new Senators from these constituencies would help overcome southern resistance to the President's civil-rights program.

This is a narrow base on which to oppose the aspirations of fine groups of people for full citizenship and national responsibility. The decision ought to be made on the merits rather than an incidental effect.

Jackie Robinson, the Pride of His People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, when it first became known back in 1945 that Jackie Robinson, a Negro ballplayer, had signed a contract with a big-league baseball team, it created somewhat of a sensation in the country. For until then Negroes could not be taken into the major league teams, although they were able to participate in other professional sports, such as boxing, basketball, and football.

Jackie Robinson, recognized today as one of the best second basemen in the National League, actually joined the major leagues in 1947 when he became a member of my home-town team, the Brooklyn Dodgers, known affectionately as "dem bums." By joining the Dodgers, Robinson had accomplished more than the mere fact of being the first Negro to break into the major leagues; his acceptance into the ranks of our great national sport automatically erased the "unwritten law" which had kept out Negroes from the big leagues until then.

He has since proved himself to be an outstanding player, a hard hitter, and a respected teammate. His exemplary conduct and his sportsmanlike and intelligent behavior have encouraged other Negro youths to enter this field of sports, so that today nine Negroes are reported playing with teams in the National League and four in the American League, or a total of 13 Negroes in both major leagues.

Robinson also earned the plaudits of millions of people in this country through the movie The Jackie Robinson Story, which struck at the evil of bigotry and racial intolerance. Thus, in the space of a few short years he has done magnificent work for his race, particularly for its youth, whose idol and inspiration he has become. Now he has undertaken a new task to warn teenagers against the danger of using narcotics. He has dedicated himself to that task, which is a great service to his country and his people. The Negroes of this country have all the reason in the world to be proud of Jackie Robinson, just as we in Brooklyn are proud of him.

I am placing in the RECORD two pertinent items from the New York World-Telegram and Sun, one a news article published on April 26, 1951, and the other an editorial which appeared in the issue of April 28. They are as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of April 26, 1951]

JACKIE ROBINSON BEGS KIDS TO AVOID NARCOTICS

Jackie Robinson, the hard-hitting, flashy second baseman of the Brooklyn Dodgers, today offered this advice to New York teenagers who might be tempted to take dope:

"Don't be a sucker, a fall guy. Organized dope rings—real bums—are out to make a slave of you. First, they'll hand you a reefer. Suck the fumes deep for a big thrill, they'll say. Next, a sniff or two of heroin. Then, the needle."

Jackie, idol of millions, drew an analogy.

"The kid who takes dope has as much chance of survival as the swimmer who fights a strong current wearing handcuffs. The dope addict's fate is even worse. A social outcast, his future is mired in the physical and moral wreckage of his own doing."

TO APPEAR AT SHOW

Jackie, praising a realistic, open-air drama titled "Dope," now being presented nightly by the East Harlem Protestant parish on vacant lots, said he will make a personal appearance tomorrow evening at the show "to lend whatever assistance I can to this terrible problem."

The drama, written and directed by Maryat Lee, Wellesley alumna, features original music by Otto Thompson, graduate of the Juilliard School. Its cast comes from the east Harlem area, the literal backyard of the Nation's most vicious narcotics rings.

Actual case histories of teenage addicts' problems provide material for the drama, which has played to more than 5,000 standees since Monday. Thousands of spectators have signed petitions urging the city to provide medical treatment for addicts.

URGES PARENTS TO MEET

Charging that addiction eats at the vitals of the home and community, Jackie said:

"Parents in Harlem should hold emergency meetings and have experts on the narcotics menace address those meetings. Parents should also warn their children of dope's terrible effects upon kids. Save them before they're hooked.

"A detective in Harlem has a cured addict ready to address any interested group on how to cope with the problem. I'll certainly do anything in my power to lend a hand. If groups need any help I'll be available on any off-day of the Dodgers' schedule."

CALLS FOR NO MERCY

While police are doing a superhuman job in trying to eradicate dope rings in Harlem, Jackie said the present crisis calls for even more drastic policing of the area.

"Authorities should move in sufficient numbers of police to rid East Harlem of every dope pusher. Judges should show no mercy on a man who wrecks the lives of whole armies of children. The narcotics peddler today eats at the social structure like cancer. "He should be thrown away for keeps."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of April 28, 1951]

ANOTHER ROBINSON STORY

Jackie Robinson, whose career has been an inspiration not only to youngsters of his own race but to all who are working for racial unity, has taken on a new campaign, that of warning teenagers against the mounting menace of drugs.

He has announced that he will spend such time as the Dodgers' schedule permits in personal appearances and talks to tell the youngsters that "the kid who takes dope has as much chance of survival as the swimmer who fights a strong current wearing handcuffs."

Through the film, The Jackie Robinson Story, the star second baseman struck a strong blow for racial tolerance. In his new role, that of a campaigner to save the youngsters before they're hooked, he has an even more important story to tell.

The Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed to learn that today the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is beginning hearings in connection with the Railroad Retirement Act as amended. It seems to me highly important that this act, which directly affects the lives of so many thousands of Americans, be revised in light of current realities.

The question of pensions for the aged worker, for the disabled worker, and for the widow and children of the deceased worker presents a complex problem in our economy today. Pension plans, both private and public, have had their greatest growth and development during the past 15 years. During the same period, we have witnessed a sharp decrease in the value of the dollar. Measured purely in dollars, an adequate pension 10 or 15 years ago is by no means adequate today.

In objectively approaching the problem of security for the aged, our first difficulty is the lack of any national policy. Some plans, including that for the railroad workers, are actuarily sound, based on current life expectancies. The advancement in medical science which we all hope for and expect may change this picture. The social-security program which covers such a large segment of our society, is obviously not on a sound trust-fund basis and will some day require pay-as-you-go supplements unless it is altered. Because of this situation, we find a sharp discrimination against the railroad worker. He now pays 6 percent of his wage into the Railroad Retirement Fund. His employer matches that payment for a total of 12 percent. Unless corrective legislation is adopted, these payments will go up to 6¼ percent each next January 1. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2343, to prevent this increase. This bill has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The man or woman covered by social security makes a very much smaller payment, 1½ percent to be exact. This amount, through a gradual increase is, according to present law, supposed to reach 3¼ percent by 1970. However, based on our experience since 1937, the Congress generally freezes the tax rate even though increments have been provided in previous legislation. At present, a man earning $3,600 per year pays $54 per year as social-security tax. The railroad worker with an identical income pays $216 per year into the railroad retirement fund. The average retirement pension for a railroad worker is $82.73 per month, while the average retirement pension under social security for a man is $72.45 and if his wife is living and over 65, this figure is increased to $96.60. The discrepancy between the pensions in proportion to the payments is obvious.

In many of our major industries, such as steel, automobile, coal mining, there are private pension plans, industry-wide or with individual companies, which supplement the social security. The employee's contribution to these plans varies perceptibly. In some cases it is sizable, but in most cases, it is negligible. The cost of these plans is passed on to the ultimate consumer and because of that, is partially borne by the railroad worker and his family, although he is in no sense a beneficiary. Still another large segment of our population, the classified employees of the Federal Government, are covered under an entirely different plan. This plan happens to be on a sounder basis than the broad social-security program.

The problem of how much of the security for the old people of this country shall be financed through a sound trust fund and how much shall be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis is a matter of policy which will require careful and intense study. This policy should be established. A select committee of the Congress may be required to make the necessary study in order to determine the proper policy to be pursued. The studies to be undertaken by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are a step in the right direction. It is the duty of this Congress to eliminate the manifest discrimination which now exists. The railroad worker is not asking to be included in social security, but he is asking for a plan which does not penalize him in comparison to the industry worker covered by social security.

My reason for suggesting a select committee is that these various plans fall under the jurisdiction of several standing committees of the Congress. The Railroad Retirement Act falls to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; the Social Security Act to the Committee on Ways and Means; the Civil Service Retirement Act to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; private-industry plans, indirectly, to the Committee on Education and Labor. It is apparent that in such a situation we are apt to get four different answers to the same problem. For that reason, a select committee for the purposes of intense study seems to me appropriate.

Welcome Back, Colonel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I am pleased to include with these remarks the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, May 14, 1951, concerning a distinguished member of a fine family of the Twelfth Congressional District of New York:

WELCOME BACK, COLONEL

It's a pleasure to see one of Brooklyn's war heroes come home from Korea and receive the honors due him. We're speaking of Col. John T. Corley, the most decorated colonel in American history. Colonel Corley is now taking a well-earned rest with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Corley.

He was honored by the Army on Friday when he reviewed the weekly retreat parade on Governor's Island, where he was on staff duty before the war broke out.

He received the Distinguished Service Cross for heroism in combat in Germany during World War II. Then, as if that second-highest military honor wasn't enough, he received another D. S. C. for extraordinary gallantry in Korea. Add to these seven Silver Stars, the Legion of Merit, the Soldier's Medal, four Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart and French and Belgian decorations.

Needless to say, Brooklyn is proud to see Colonel Corley back.

Protect the American Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address I gave before the seventh annual convention of the American Watch Workers Union which convened in Washington on May 14. Nearly one-fourth of the members of this union reside in Lincoln, Nebr., where they are employed in the Elgin plant. I think the American watch industry is in one of the most critical situations we have today, in view of the threatening international situation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECT THE AMERICAN WATCH INDUSTRY

(Address by Senator HUGH BUTLER)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, officers, and delegates to the American watch workers' convention. I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here with you today.

We are rather proud of the Elgin watch factory that we have at Lincoln, Nebr. A good many people seem to think that Nebraska is all agriculture and no industry. I suppose it is quite a surprise to most of them to learn that we have a plant employing from one to two thousand persons making jeweled watches that are just as fine as the watches made anywhere else in the world. That plant has helped us demonstrate Nebraska's industrial potentialities, and, as I said before, we are proud and happy to have it in our State.

I understand that this is the first time you have held your convention in Washington. I can realize why you have picked Washington for this convention. It is because the fate of the industry you work in and the fate of the jobs of your members may be settled here in Washington this week.

It probably seems strange to a good many of you to have to come to Washington to go before a Government commission and beg on bended knee for the right to make a living. We all like to think of America as the country where no man has to beg another man for the right to make a living. We like to think that in America a man has a right to go into any kind of work that he wants to and to earn a decent wage in that line of work without asking permission of any Government official.

You have found out that is not entirely true any longer. You have found out that your jobs are dependent on the decisions of some few officials in the State Department or the Tariff Commission or other Government agencies. In a good many cases, you do not even know and you cannot find out the names of those officials who make those decisions. All you can find out is that the decisions have been made, and that you have to suffer the consequences.

You men who represent the workers in the jeweled-watch industry have had some bitter experiences. Under this so-called reciprocal trade agreements program, you know what the domestic jeweled-watch industry has suffered as a result of foreign competition. You have tried again and again to make the State Department understand your problem. You have answered every question they had to ask, and you have dug out and presented every fact that could possibly have any bearing on your problem.

It has been a pleasure to have known your president, Mr. Walter Cenerazzo, who for several years now, has been before congressional committees in your behalf. He has done an absolutely first-rate job of presenting your problems and your case. In his last appearance before the Senate Finance Committee, he made, I believe, a more thorough and complete presentation than any other witness we had before us. He had every fact at his fingertips and he answered every question that any member of the committee asked without the slightest hesitation. He did a magnificent job of presenting your problem.

As I said before, you have presented your case again and again to congressional committees and to the State Department and others. You have showed conclusively what these imported Swiss movements are doing to your jobs. In reply, the only answer you have ever received from the State Department was that you have not been seriously hurt.

I believe you men know better than the State Department whether you have been hurt or not. Your president showed us at the Senate Finance Committee hearings that two or three thousand watch workers are out of jobs, at the very time the rest of the country is on a boom.

If your union has not been injured by this Swiss trade agreement, then I don't know what the word "injury" means.

In the Senate Finance Committee hearings, Mr. Cenerazzo gave us very complete and

voluminous data regarding the wage rates paid to Swiss workers in the watch factories over there. It was very important and interesting information. I am sure it was all correct because he has been there, and personally inspected the factories and visited with the workers. He was the only witness we had who could give us the facts on Swiss wage rates. The State Department didn't have those facts, although they should have had them.

I was interested to look through some of the tables on wage rates that he presented and note the comparisons made between the wage rates in the Swiss watch industry and the average rates here in America. He showed the rate per hour for each type of job and then he showed the average wage rate for all Swiss workers. This average rate which included all fringe benefits was 61.1 cents per hour.

Of course, it is not possible for American workers to compete against wage rates like that.

As you all well know, we have a national minimum wage rate in this country for all industry that ships goods in interstate commerce. The rate is 75 cents an hour. That is certainly not a very high wage rate. I don't suppose that there is any worker in the American jeweled watch industry who is paid as little as 75 cents an hour. When I looked through the lists of wage rates for Swiss workers, I didn't see any job that paid as much as 75 cents an hour. About the highest wage paid by the Swiss industry, even for some of the skilled jobs was 60 or 65 cents an hour, according to these tables compiled by our American Legation in Switzerland.

We have only had a national minimum-wage law in this country for about 15 years. Before that time some of the States had minimum-wage laws, but there was no national law setting minimum wages. The State laws on minimum wages didn't work very well, and I am sure you know why. It just wasn't practical for one State to try to raise minimum-wage standards very far above the standards of the other States. Any State that did that would find that sweatshop industries would be established in the low-wage States. Goods would be manufactured in those low-wage States and shipped into the States that were trying to raise their wage standards.

In this country, of course, there is nothing to stop the shipment of goods from one State to another. There was nothing to prevent sweatshop employers from establishing factories in States where the wages were lowest and then shipping their goods all over the country at a competitive advantage. That was done pretty frequently. There had to be a national minimum wage scale, so that there would be fair and equal competition among plants in various States.

You watch workers have exactly that same problem with Swiss competition, only there is no minimum wage to protect you. The wage rates in some of the Swiss factories go down to 14, 16, and 18 cents an hour for beginners. The wage rates for a lot of the jobs of experienced workers are only 30, 40, or 50 cents an hour. That is the kind of competition that you are up against. That is the whole cause of your problem

If the principle of Nation-wide minimum wage is sound, then the principle of protection against foreign low-wage labor is just as sound. If an American manufacturer tried to pay wages at the rates in the Swiss factories, he would be prosecuted in no time by the United States Department of Labor.

There just isn't any doubt that these low Swiss wages are the whole cause of the trouble.

Of course, the State Department may claim that we have no right to tell the Swiss how to run their business. That is true, but we should have a right to say something about it when the Swiss watches come in here at prices far below what American manufacturers can meet.

If the Swiss want to hold their wage rates at a low level, that may be their business. But if they want to send in here the watches made with low-wage labor, then it becomes our business. We have a right to insist that they pay a fair tariff or import fee or whatever you want to call it, that will equalize the cost of production and particularly the difference in wage rates.

In spite of all the State Department propaganda about international trade and international understanding and good will, you can't get away from the fact that this so-called reciprocal trade agreements program is being used to break down the American wage standard, and as a result our living standards.

Now I understand that you are planning to make an appearance before the United States Tariff Commission tomorrow and ask that the United States Government make use of the escape clause in the trade agreement with Switzerland, to get the tariff rates raised to what they ought to be. I am all for you, and I want to wish you the best of luck. I intend to file a brief statement with the Tariff Commission, myself, backing up your position.

I hope you realize that it may not be an easy job to get this administration to use that escape clause in the Swiss agreement.

The escape clause is something that your industry and your union have been working to have put in the Swiss agreement for a good many years. I remember back 4 or 5 years ago when I made a speech in the Senate insisting that the State Department ought to put an escape clause in the Swiss agreement. At that time there was not any escape clause in the agreement, so you didn't even have the right to go to the Tariff Commission and present your case. I made an argument that the State Department could have an escape clause put in on 6 months' notice and that they ought to do so. I believe I convinced most of the people who listened to me, but unfortunately I had too few listeners.

That was shortly after the end of the war. It took the State Department 3 or 4 years to put an escape clause in that agreement so that you could even go before the Tariff Commission and ask them to use it.

As I said before, the escape clause won't be of much help to you unless the administration is willing to use it to escape from the commitments we have made on the tariff on watches. It may not be an easy job to win your case. Up to date, the Tariff Commission has handled 19 applications for escape under the escape clauses in the various agreements. To date they have been willing to take action to protect American producers in just 1 case out of those 19 applications.

That is not a very encouraging situation. I am not trying to discourage you, and I am sure I couldn't if I tried. You men know the problems of your industry, and you know what has happened to the industry and jobs as a result of these Swiss imports. You will have to make it clear to the Tariff Commission just what has happened under this agreement.

The Tariff Commission is supposed to be a nonpartisan agency composed of three Republicans and three Democrats. They are supposed to decide your application based purely on the merits of the case. In other words, they are supposed to sit like judges in a court and grant you protection against imports if they find that your industry has been hurt as a result of this so-called reciprocal trade agreement. They are not supposed to be influenced by political considerations or by State Department pressure or anything of that sort.

In the Senate Finance Committee we have made a real effort to see to it that those appointed to serve on the Tariff Commission are fair-minded, nonpolitical men who will hear a case fairly and decide it on its merits. I don't know how successful we have been. The Senate confirms these appointments, but first of all, the President selects the men, and sends their names to the Senate for confirmation. All of the members of the Tariff Commission have 6-year appointments, which means that they come up for reappointment by the President from time to time. Under those circumstances there may be a temptation for them to think about the political slant of the administration in passing on those cases.

Even after they have arrived at their conclusions, the Tariff Commission does not have the final decision. The President may accept or reject their recommendations. In reaching his decision on that, he will probably consult with members of his Cabinet, including the Secretary of State. Just speaking personally, I am afraid he takes the advice of the Secretary of State more often than he ought to.

That is the problem you are up against. I am giving you some of this background so you will understand why it has been so hard to make any headway. Now that you have gotten a formal hearing before the Tariff Commission, I feel that you have made tremendous progress. I am very optimistic that you will get favorable results.

It happens that you have come to Washington at a fortunate time in more ways than one. Just this week we have up in the Senate a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act for another 2 years. If you have time, I hope some of you will come down to the visitors' gallery in the Senate and listen to the debate.

My own feeling about this particular bill is mixed. There is a temptation to vote against it entirely. Unfortunately, even if Congress refused to pass the bill, it would not restore any of the reduced tariff rates back to the old levels that existed before any trade agreements were negotiated. In other words, we could stop the Secretary of State from making any more agreements by defeating this bill. We could not cancel out the reductions that have already been made by that means. Existing trade agreements, such as the Swiss agreement, would continue in effect until canceled by the State Department.

On the other hand, this bill does contain some real improvements over what we have had in the past. For one thing, it makes the "escape clause" provision a good deal stronger. It attempts to give the complaining domestic industry a much better chance to secure relief from destructive competition through this means. Those of you who have studied Mr. Cenerazzo's testimony before our committee realize that the present "escape clause" does not always work too well for the domestic industry that is injured. Our committee has tried to improve on that point in the bill we have up in the Senate beginning today.

There is another provision in this new bill which may be of some benefit to your industry. I take some personal pride in it, since I proposed the amendment in committee at the request of your industry. It is the provision which restores section 516 of the old Tariff Act into full operation.

This section will give a domestic industry such as yours the right to go into court and contest the decision of a customs official in classifying import goods. Your president pointed out to us that a good many imported Swiss movements were only paying the tariff rate on "unadjusted movements," although, in fact, they are fully adjusted when they come in here. If a customs official makes

the wrong classification in that way, it may permit imports to come in at a lower rate of duty. That means that the imports will offer just that much more competition to your own watches.

Some of these charges are rather technical and I don't intend to bore you by going into them in too much detail. The important point is that we have tried to improve the law in any way we could so as to give domestic industries and American workers more protection. The bill is a sort of a compromise. It gives the State Department part of what they have asked and, at the same time, it tries to give domestic industries a little better chance to protect themselves than they have had in the past.

We know that the only kind of a bill we can get through is a compromise bill. If the Congress passed the kind of bill that I would like to see, the President would likely veto it and we would be right back where we were. In fact, I would like to have a bill passed that simply raised the tariff rates on Swiss watches or established a quota. We can't get that through, so we are trying to do the next best thing.

I have appreciated the opportunity of being here with you today and of talking over your problems with you. I have given you some of my ideas on this question, and I hope you won't hesitate to give me your suggestions. Mr. Cenerazzo has never been hesitant about giving us his ideas and recommendations and I respect him for that. I have been pretty familiar with some of the problems of the jeweled-watch industry for quite a while, but this is the first chance I have had to meet with your whole group. You are here fighting for the jobs of your members. You have a tough problem before you. I want to offer you 100-percent cooperation in tackling it. I believe you will solve it because I just don't believe the Tariff Commission, the State Department, and the White House will dare to tell you that your members don't have a right to a decent job at a fair rate of pay.

Thank you for your courtesy and your hospitality.

The British and the Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We're All Subject to Each Others' Whims," which appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune on May 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE ALL SUBJECT TO EACH OTHERS' WHIMS

Exchanges between Senators and Defense Secretary George Marshall have refuted mischievous gossip blaming the British for Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal. Marshall and the President have made clear that the decision to recall MacArthur was purely an American one.

It is hard to excuse such an irresponsible canard at a time when it is so useful to the Communists to foster ill will and disunity between the free nations.

Those who do not seem to shrink from isolating the United States from its allies and the U. N. or undermining the morale of the American people now are fostering another dangerous line of talk.

Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, asked Marshall last Wednesday if our arrangement with the U. N. does not mean that "we have virtually lost control of our own 350,000 men in the field."

David Lawrence, a syndicated columnist, previously had charged that "America has surrendered its independence of action and its leadership and has abandoned 350,000 American boys to the whim of foreign cabinets."

Such talk finds ready listeners in a Nation which, despite its having become the world's No. 1 power, has never wholly rid itself of an inferiority complex developed during the years when the great decisions were made by foreign governments.

Marshall told WILEY that we have not lost control of our troops any more than we lost control of them in Europe though an American was Allied Commander in World War II, just as an American is in command in Korea.

What those overlook who seek to create the idea that our destinies and the lives of our soldiers are at the "whim of foreign Cabinets" is the unprecedented extent to which other free nations have put their destinies and the lives of their soldiers at the whim of American domestic politics.

The United States has never subjected its policies or the lives of its soldiers to foreign leadership to the extent that the British did when they accepted Dwight Eisenhower as their supreme commander in Western Europe in 1942. At that time the Armed Forces of the United States in Western Europe were inferior in numbers and in battle experience to those of Britain. British commanders with more war experience and greater fame than Eisenhower then enjoyed were put under an untried commander. The British later were glad they did but it was hard to do at the time.

The British modified their sovereignty in wartime to permit Eisenhower to function with maximum effectiveness on their soil and again to permit the United States to establish peacetime air bases on their island.

All of the members of the Atlantic Treaty Organization, including France, which is especially sensitive about such matters, have surrendered sovereignty as well as pride to enable Eisenhower to create an integrated Western European defense establishment.

And the 13 other countries with troops in Korea willingly placed them under an American commander. While some of them have not sent as large forces as we would like to see fighting alongside ours, all realized that in entrusting their soldiers to American supreme command they also entrusted us with their national security. The Communists can strike just as hard at a nation with 1,000 troops at war against them in Korea as against a nation with 300,000 troops at war against them.

The way to get more allied troops to line up alongside our troops in defense of collective security is to recognize our allies' right to be consulted about basic policies and give credit for contributions made. To deny our allies a voice in decisions which affect their security as well as ours and to sneer at their sacrifices for the common cause is to treat them as satellites and risk isolating ourselves.

This is not the way most Americans would deal with our allies or the UN and we are glad President Truman in his speech last Monday night and in the letter to General MacArthur published Friday made that clear. "The path of collective security is our only sure defense against the dangers that threaten us. It is the path to peace in Korea, to peace in the world."

We must let nothing divert us from that path.

Attorney General of New Mexico Urges Federal Control of Offshore Oil Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the problem of handling the submerged lands off the coasts of the United States containing vast deposits of petroleum has been of great concern to the people of the United States, and to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has been studying the problem intensively this year and last particularly. The committee has before it a measure introduced by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself to provide for interim operation of these petroleum resources under the Secretary of the Interior, so that the United States will not be deprived of production and exploration while Congress is making up its mind upon the final settlement of the controversy which has gone on for the last 8 or 9 years.

As chairman of the committee, I have received numerous letters from all parts of the country with respect to the problem. One of the most interesting of these was received by me today from Hon. Joe L. Martinez, attorney general of the State of New Mexico. Mr. Martinez was formerly upon the staff of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and, like myself and the senior Senator from New Mexico, studied law at Georgetown Law School. I have therefore read his letter with particular interest.

Mr. Martinez not only contends, as I do, that the Supreme Court of the United States was right in holding that the Federal Government has paramount jurisdiction of these submerged areas, but he goes further and contends that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized by present law to take immediate administrative jurisdiction over these lands.

The letter from Mr. Martinez is of such great interest that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 14, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have asked my views in connection with the proposed legislation to permit continued production and further development of the mineral resources of the submerged ocean lands.

I have studied the enclosed pamphlet in your letter giving both sides of the controversy and, in accordance with other research in this field over a period of several years, I will outline my views and the results of my studies.

First, the Federal Government has the paramount authority in and is the owner of the so-called marginal sea area, that is, from ordinary low tide seaward 3 miles. The opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of

United States v. *California* made clear the ruling of the Supreme Court. The complaint of the United States alleged that the United States "is the owner in fee simple of, or possessed of paramount rights in and powers over, the lands, minerals, and other things of value underlying the Pacific Ocean, lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark off the coast of California and outside of the inland waters of the State, extending seaward three nautical miles." In the final decree in the California case the Court held that California had no property interest in the marginal sea area and that the United States had paramount rights. It was not, and is not, necessary for the Court to use the words "title" or "ownership." As the Court said in *United States* v. *California*:

"The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner."

In short, the highest and broadest and all-inclusive rights were vested in the United States. And this is as it should be. As the Court went on to say in *United States* v. *California*:

"The Government also appears in its capacity as a member of the family of nations. In that capacity it is responsible for conducting United States relations with other nations. It asserts that proper exercise of these constitutional responsibilities requires that it have power, unencumbered by State commitments, always to determine what agreements will be made concerning the control and use of the marginal sea and the land under it."

It is my opinion that in this marginal sea area national rights must be paramount at all times, and the National Government should not be encumbered with State authority or jurisdiction.

It is mere quibbling to say that the Supreme Court did not vest ownership in the United States. "Paramount rights" include the highest and broadest rights. Furthermore, it is superfluous to point out that the Court clearly held that the State of California, and consequently any other State, has no property interest whatsoever in the marginal sea area—that the States do not own, and never have owned the subsoil beneath the marginal sea.

Second, the so-called States' rights concept is wholly inapplicable and not advanced by its proponents in the best interests of the Nation. There has been tremendous agitation, as you well know, Senator, by some of the individual States in behalf of quitclaim legislation, or other similar legislation giving the States the marginal sea area, and I, as attorney general of New Mexico, have, of course, given very serious consideration to the claims made, or to be made in behalf of the States. As attorney general, it was and is my duty to closely peruse and evaluate the facts and to weigh the consequences. I will answer proposed quitclaim legislation by quoting the statement made by a fellow attorney general, the Honorable A. A. Carmichael, the attorney general of the State of Alabama. His statement was:

"If the Congress made such a gift to the States, it will be tragically derelict in its duty as the highest legislative body in the United States."

In effect, the proponents of the so-called States' rights concept are asking Congress to make an outright gift to a few States, particularly California, Texas, and Louisiana. It is my opinion that the tremendous subsea resources should be conserved and administered in accordance with the national interest and security to the benefit of all of the States. The argument of States' rights is wholly inapplicable. There can be no deprivation of rights if the States had no rights in the first place. The Supreme Court has held that the States never did own the marginal sea area.

The anomaly is that the so-called States' rights concept would benefit only a handful of States; whereas, Federal control could and would inure to the benefit of all the States, without sacrifice of natioal security and welfare. The tremendous subsea wealth could and would support many national public benefits or projects.

What is behind the States' rights concept? Does it seem logical that land-locked and inland States should be particularly concerned with the rights of a few coastal States, to the detriment of the inland States? And if the States' rights concept is the righteous issue, why is there vehement opposition to any legislation quitclaiming to the States, but reserving the right in the Federal authorities to administer the oil?

Unfortunately, the various pressure groups in behalf of the States, primarily the oil lobby, have shielded their activities in such a way that their real purpose—to control the subsea mineral wealth, particularly oil—has been disguised. It is inconceivable that the general welfare and national security would be benefited by donating the national wealth in the marginal sea to a few coastal States. The welfare of the people in the inland States is no less important than that of whose who reside in a coastal State.

I find no law to support the proposition often advanced that the States have always owned the marginal sea area. All the cases cited can be distiguished and all must be read in accordance with the facts in issue. In the first place, only in the past 10 or 15 years has the issue arisen as to the ownership of the area from ordinary low tide seaward 3 miles. The problem came squarely before the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *California*, and the highest Court in the United States held that the State does not, and did not, own. That should be sufficiently clear for all purposes. Nothing is gained by attempting to quote cases decided some 50 or 100 years ago on a different set of facts. No issue was ever presented 50 or 100 years ago concerning the area from low tide seaward 3 miles. The Supreme Court has spoken in clear and unmistakable terms in the three recent cases involving California, Louisiana, and Texas. I fail to see how there can be any further question. It is my opinion that the decisions in the three cases were well-reasoned and entirely in accordance with the law.

It is my further opinion that the various pressure groups, particularly the oil operators, have grossly misrepresented this problem to Congress. We are told that the oil operators and the handful of States involved are innocent pawns. To my knowledge, the wealth of the marginal sea area is still being drained since the June 1947 decision in *United States* v. *California* under leases from the States or their assignees. Are these innocent parties? Is a party innocent who continues operations on land in which the highest court had held that this party or its assignor or contractor had no property interest? I know of no other case in our history where there has been such flagrant contempt for the decision of our highest Court—I repeat—flagrant contempt for the decision of our highest Court.

For example, it is common knowledge that extensive oil operations continue in California in the offshore area and that the impounding of funds, pending settlement of the final question, is a loose and incomplete process. The State continues to lease to oil companies who are draining the national wealth, some of the leases being to other than the highest bidder, to the consequent loss to the Federal Government. Was there ever such a willful disregard of the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States? Can California or the oil companies leasing or claiming under the State of California claim that they are innocent parties or innocent operators, especially since the June 1947 decision? Why should several States and the particular oil companies drain the wealth that belongs to all the States and the entire Nation? I consider my own State of New Mexico as having a definite interest in the national wealth and resources that surround our Nation in the offshore area. No doubt, Senator, your own State of Wyoming is concerned that the national wealth is drained by a few. In truth and in fact the so-called "good faith" by a few States and some oil operators is both a travesty and an injustice.

Furthermore, I wish to raise this point. The purported good faith of the oil companies is far less worthy of protection than the extreme good faith of private applicants who filed on offshore areas under the laws of the United States duly passed by Congress. I am informed that many of these applicants filed 10 or 15 years ago and have been fighting their battle to preserve their rights single-handedly. The private applicants filed under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, but because their resources are not extensive, their voice has been drowned by the oil operators and the States. I submit that Congress should give strong consideration to the good faith as honestly portrayed by private applicants, who are for the most part ordinary private citizens, who look to their Government to uphold law and order.

In concluding on this point, it is my opinion that unless there is much clear thinking done in this so-called tidelands question as it particularly relates to a few States and powerful oil companies, there is a strong possibility of a scandal which will dwarf any recorded in our past history. It is a matter for sober thought.

Third, the Federal Government should immediately take over and administer the marginal sea area. Since the decision in *United States* v. *California* in 1947, the statement has been made that there is no legislation or authority under which the Federal Government could act to take over and administer the marginal sea area. The categoric statement is made and apparently never questioned. Congress has always assumed legislation is necessary and must be passed, but Congress has never taken cognizance of legislation presently in effect. May I point out, Senator, the broad, clear provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended. Every time a statement has been made in regard to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the cry is immediately raised that it is not applicable. But those who raise the cry give no reason for its inapplicability.

It seems very strange that no inquiry is ever made of the applicability of the Mineral Leasing Act—only the complete assumption there is no legislation presently in effect that is applicable. If you will pardon the reference, Senator, the recital in Senate Join. Resolution 20, introduced by you and Senator ANDERSON, states:

"• • • thus making it essential that this resolution be enacted in order to protect the interests of the United States pending the enactment of permanent legislation by the Congress respecting the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf • • •."

The apparent assumption by all that the Mineral Leasing Act was inapplicable led me to investigate some time ago this matter fully. A detailed investigation of this categoric assumption revealed that the entire premise and assumption was based on a very short opinion of the solicitor of the Interior Department. It is my honest belief after much research and thought that the opinion of the able solicitor is not in the slightest supported by law. To be sure, the then Attorney General of the United States gave a cursory approval of the opinion, but rendered no opinion of his own.

It seems unthinkable that the opinion of the solicitor has in effect led to the loss by the United States Government of millions in revenue and has further been the basis of a passive policy by the United States Government as to the billions of dollars of our subsea wealth. But there is even stranger activity no doubt based on and in line with the opinion of the solicitor. For example, in the offshore area off the city of Long Beach, Calif., we find the ill-conceived and illegal stipulated line, entered into by the then Secretary of the Interior and Attorney General. Neither officer of the United States Government has or had the authority to give away the property or rights of the United States, and I believe those in authority in other States should be aware of these facts. The stipulation continues with the ostensible approval of the Federal Government, and the city of Long Beach and the oil operators enjoy for themselves alone the wealth that belongs to the entire Nation. May I refer the Senator to the original surveys in this area of California which clearly show that much of the area landward of the stipulated line is open sea of the Pacific Ocean. The city of Long Beach claims to have an inland water, but an inland water is not made by building harbor installations—and those installation were built with money from the resources that belong to the entire Nation. I particularly emphasize this point, Senator, because you have been quoted in the press as defending the position of Long Beach. It is my belief, Senator, that the stipulated line should be abolished and the entire harbor or offshore area of Long Beach claimed for the Federal Government. But the passive policy of the Federal Government has resulted in Long Beach and the oil companies involved enjoying the wealth from the resources that belong to the entire Nation, including the particular State which you and I serve.

Now let us examine the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended. Section 1 of the act provides:

"Deposits of coal, phosphate, sodium, oil, oil shale, or gas and land containing such deposits owned by the United States, including those in national forests, but excluding the lands acquired under • • • the Appalachian Forest Act, and those in national parks, and in lands withdrawn or reserved for military or naval uses or purposes, except as hereinafter provided, shall be subject to disposition."

In my opinion, the provision could not be clearer. The applicability of the Mineral Leasing Act to submerged lands is clear and the Secretary of the Interior should and could have taken over the marginal sea area for and on behalf of the Federal Government. The authority in the above act is clear.

In all of this discussion I am not unmindful of the Presidential proclamation of September 28, 1945, and the Executive order of the same date whereby the resources of the Continental Shelf were placed under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of the Interior "for administrative purposes, pending the enactment of legislation in regard thereto." But again this should be no barrier to the Secretary of the Interior.

Assuming that such legislation is necessary and assuming, as everyone has done, that the Mineral Leasing Act is not applicable, it is clear that the Defense Production Act of 1950 gives clear authority additionally. Very broad general powers are given to the Executive. The act is also broad in its statement of authority given the Executive to delegate to various departments of the Federal Government, and the Secretary of the Interior has the same general powers to conserve and administer the mineral resources of the United States. Unquestionably the Defense Production Act of 1950 also gives the Secretary of the Interior authority under which to act as to all the mineral resources of the United States, including the subsea resources.

In connection with any proposed legislation, including Senate Joint Resolution 20, one very important consideration should not be overlooked. In view of the broad general scope of the legislation presently in effect, any legislation hereafter passed by Congress, including any interim bill, will result in numerous uncertainties and conflicts. It is my understanding, for example, that there are numerous suits pending in the Federal court in Washington, D. C., to test the applicability of the Mineral Leasing Act. The question of the arbitrary taking of property rights and the effect of retroactive legislation will also no doubt be the subject of litigation primarily by private applicants. If the Mineral Leasing Act is declared applicable, and my opinion is that such an eventuality is highly probable, we will then be in a maze of conflicts. Under the aforesaid circumstances, the national interest and national defense can only suffer.

Thus, I have the basis as pointed out for my great concern that the Secretary of the Interior should take action immediately to take over the lands in the marginal sea area. Present draining of the national wealth by a few is not in the best interests of the nation. I feel that my own State has great interests at stake, along with all the other States. The attitude of the Secretary of the Interior and the entire national policy, or lack of national policy, should not be based on the very questionable opinion written by the Solicitor of the Interior Department. The Secretary of the Interior has every right and authority to take over and administer the submerged lands in the marginal sea area for and on behalf of and in the interests of the entire Nation. And this right, in my opinion, is clear under existing legislation, particularly the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended.

Any proposed legislation at the present time will only help those who have shown themselves to be ruthless trespassers attempting to nullify the clear import of the decision of the highest court of the United States; it would aid only those who continue to violate the law—a few States, their assigns, and the oil companies. We can hardly expect the respect and obedience of ordinary citizens of law and order if trespassers are to be rewarded. Furthermore, any legislation will undoubtedly result in further legal action by others claiming rights in the marginal sea area thereby making the picture more cloudy. Meanwhile the trespassers will continue to drain the oil resources of the entire Nation, and attempt to nullify the clear import of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I don't wish to be misunderstood in this matter. The tremendous efforts you have exerted personally, and your committee, in an attempt to reach a satisfactory solution deserve the highest praise, and all who have knowledge of this problem are deeply appreciative. There are various stumbling blocks which cannot be overcome by legislation containing the various provisions that have been proposed, quitclaim and otherwise. It is my sincere belief that the national welfare and security, or foremost concern, can be benefited only by immediate, direct, and forceful action by the Secretary of the Interior in assuming control and administration of the 3-mile belt under presently existing legislation. Only in this manner can the rights of all persons be given due consideration, without sacrifice of the national welfare and security.

With kindest personal regards, and thanking you for this opportunity to express my views in this matter, I remain

Very truly yours,

JOE L. MARTINEZ,
Attorney General.

Reclamation Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by me to the Nebraska Reclamation Association last February, dealing with the recommendations of the special Commission appointed by the President to recommend a national water policy.

It is my information, Mr. President, that the Water Resources Policy Commission, upon completion of its three-volume report in February, submitted to the President the proposed legislation to which I referred in my remarks. It is understood that this was impounded by the Bureau of the Budget pending receipt of comments from the affected Federal agencies on the report. Doubtless some time will elapse before the Congress is advised of the administration's program.

I note that several national organizations have appointed special committees for studying the report and to make specific recommendations on it. Among these are the National Reclamation Association, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and the Edison Electric Institute. In view of the scope of the subject, and the inevitable struggle between State's rights advocates as against bureaucracy, it will probably be some months before we shall see the final proposals of the administration.

It is related that several Bureau of Reclamation speakers during the Spokane, Wash., meeting of the National Reclamation Association last November each began by stoutly affirming, "I am a bureaucrat." Webster's New International Dictionary, unabridged, defines bureaucracy as "a system of government by bureau heads, responsible only to administrative officers above them, having complete power over subordinates and, in official duties generally, not subject to the common law of the land." Which side will Senators support?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION POLICIES

(Address by Senator HUGH BUTLER)

About mid-December the Nation was advised by the press that something new had been submitted to the President, by a special commission appointed by him, relating to a water policy for the American people. This seven-man commission was created by an Executive order dated January 3, 1950, and it was declared to be a temporary agency of the President.

The Commission released at this time volume I of its report to the President. This volume contains the findings and the recommendations of the Commission. It is, in many respects, a splendid summary of exhaustive studies based upon the experience of Federal agencies in the fields of land use,

reclamation, flood control, water transportation, and their byproducts. Some of its recommendations are timely and are deserving of our continued consideration. I commend especially those recommendations concerning the necessity for more basic data and those stressing the importance of watershed management. I am inclined to agree generally with the reference to the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture in the selection of agricultural programs. However, I should like to discuss with you some of their recommendations about which I am uncertain and therefore suspicious. I have no knowledge of the nature of the legislation this Commission is now preparing to accomplish the achievement of its policy, therefore let us review the situation as it was developed. Paragraph 2 of the Executive order reads:

"The President's Water Resources Policy Commission shall study, and make recommendations to the President with respect to, Federal responsibility for and participation in the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, including related land uses and other public purposes to the extent that they are directly concerned with water resources. The Commission shall give consideration in particular to (a) the extent and character of Federal Government participation in major water-resources programs, (b) an appraisal of the priority of water-resources programs from the standpoint of economic and social need, (c) criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of water-resources projects, and (d) desirable legislation or changes in existing legislation relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources."

It appears that the Commission in some instances failed to achieve the goals in its charter, and in others went beyond the scope of its assignments. These are not necessarily serious faults. But as I read the introduction to the report, it seems to me that the recommendations are couched in such broad phraseology that definite conclusions as to their meaning is very difficult, if not impossible. I shall go into some details. However, let me assure you that any reasonable man, upon reading the whole of the policy as expressed in the 70 recommendations, could readily say that if a new and different policy is not here suggested, the study presented certainly leans strongly toward centralization of authority to be vested in a few men responsible only to Washington.

I will now briefly examine some of the 70 recommendations which make up the policy submitted to the President, confining myself to those that clearly concern the functions of reclamation and flood control. All recommendations are in conformity with certain principles the Commission first adopted, and they named this set of rules a framework. Let us examine this before we discuss the recommendations.

The framework is this: (1) Water resources programs are to achieve regional and national goals; (2) planning water resources works shall be through a single coordinator for each basin or region; (3) the test for the financial feasibility of the works should be standardized by simple rules; (4) all beneficiaries of public works should pay their share of the costs; (5) costs and reimbursements should be lumped together for each river basin, and the merits of individual undertakings should not be controlling.

I point out certain particular recommendations to show the general character and trend of the thinking of the Commission:

No. 1: "As a guide to national investment in natural resources development, all Federal agencies should be directed to judge new river basin programs in terms of a set of clearly defined national objectives established by Congress."

No. 4, in part: "Congress should set up a separate river basin commission for each of the major basins. These commissions, set up on a representative basis, should be authorized to coordinate the surveys, construction activities, and operations of the Federal agencies in the several basins, under the guidance of independent chairmen appointed by the President and with the participation of State agencies in the planing process."

No. 3: "Congress should direct the responsible Federal agencies to submit new proposals for water resources development to Congress only in the form of basin programs which deal with entire basins as units and which take into account all relevant purposes in water and land development. This multiple-purpose basin approach should apply to the whole process by which water-resources projects move from the survey to the authorization and appropriation stages."

Before going further, let us consider what principles we start out with. We have here as clear a recommendation as could be written for a valley-authority type of planning, development, and administration. While local interests may be consulted in the planning state, thereafter, they and their representatives in the Congress are out of the picture. Thereafter, the Congress only appropriates funds and the people pay whatever the separate river basin commissions determine to be necessary to make some repayments of the costs, and to provide funds for the employment of large numbers of investigators and administrators without limit. The question arises, naturally, as to the origin of these principles and recommendations.

On examination, it is evident that the several subcommittees appointed to prepare task-force reports on reclamation, power, navigation, and so forth, were completely controlled by employees of agencies of the Federal Government. Indeed, it is difficult to find in the list of the committee memberships the name of anyone not an employee of the Government. The only way the public had an opportunity to influence the finding of the Commission was through presentations at the half-dozen, or so, hearings held in the country.

I was on the Senate committee that held hearings on S. 555, Seventy-ninth Congress, a bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority. I signed the adverse report on this bill. I relate this to illustrate how sensitive I am to any bills which recommend commissions, administrations, or authorities to operate on an exclusive basis the programs for the development of water resources in the country. It will be specifically proposed by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission that 10 major basins be designated for the United States, each to be supervised by a river basin commission responsible to the President.

Going next to recommendations Nos. 8 and 14:

No. 8: "The orderly formulation of national water resources programs requires the establishment of a Federal Board of Review appointed by the President with the confirmation of the Senate. This Board should perform, among others, the functions of the review agencies recommended in the reports of the Hoover Commission."

No. 14: "Congress should direct all Federal departments and agencies responsible for the development of water and land resources, in cooperation with interested States, to promptly review all existing plans and programs, and to cooperate in preparing coordinated plans for water resources development for the several river basins. Plans already authorized by Congress should remain undisturbed unless this review results in specific recommendations for change."

Now we have the manifesto of the Commission. If a board of review were appointed with the powers suggested, such board would constitute the top level control of all the planning, construction and operation of reclamation, power and flood-control projects in the 17 Western States. Does anyone here have any doubts about it?

Perhaps I am prejudging the policy. In a short time, we will have the proposed legislation of the Commission, and it is hoped that it will be in a form fully understood by the Congress. We have seen an outstanding example of administrative misinterpretation of a simple statute where section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 is given as congressional approval to utility-type contracts with the water users on reclamation projects. I hope we may have the opportunity soon to correct this misinterpretation which is an evasion and nullification of basic reclamation law, both as to repayment and water rights. For this reason we will be obliged to scrutinize any new legislation with particular care.

Recommendations Nos. 25 and 26 are in such form that I am free to admit of ignorance as to what is mean by reimbursement for the various benefits of water conservation projects. No ceiling on repayment periods is suggested. The Congress will want to know about this, and about the controls over a farmer and his properties that may be required by the Secretary of the Interior, the Board of Review, or by the River Basin Commission. Perhaps the recommended legislation will include a section giving to the administration the power to enforce such rules and regulations as it deems proper in order to carry out its objectives. The Congress represents the people and cannot safely surrender its prerogatives to protect their interests. I do not intend to sponsor or to support legislation which will deny the rights of the people in the West to self-determination, and I speak broadly, in the matter of planning, use, and operation, and responsibility in local administration in connection with their own resources of land and water.

The executive department of our Government is rapidly and boldly assuming to itself powers never intended by law, and its stated objective is the valley authority form of river basin government. Would you expect the Water Policy Commission to act in a manner contrary to the plans of the President?

I hope this association will do its part in supporting the resolutions of your national organization, which I considered of sufficient importance to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Let us keep, in these troubled times, a clear and definite resolution to extend and preserve local autonomy.

To further and strengthen State rights in both the planning and development of its water resources, I suggest that this association could profitably consider endorsing legislation giving to the Governor, the State engineer, and the attorney general the authority and responsibility in these matters commensurate with their importance. Such legislation might create a commission including an attorney and an engineer, not employees or officers of the State, to pass on project feasibilities, on legalities of repayment districts and their financial capabilities. This procedure would not entail great expenditures and it would serve as a clearinghouse where there would be a guarantee of mutuality between Federal agencies and agencies of the State.

An Awakening America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, well fed, well clothed, well housed, comparatively happy and prosperous, careless and unthinking, in recent years the American people have let the Government get away from them.

Engaged in the pursuit of prosperity and happiness, of the good things of life, all too often complaining, demanding more of the Federal Government, forgetting that the Federal Government has nothing which it does not take first from them, our people have gone along the easy road.

Neither the first, the second nor the third world wars, with all the sacrifices made by those who either volunteered or were conscripted to fight in those wars, made our people conscious of what was happening to their Government and through that Government to them. Waste, extravagance, selfishness, corruption, and criminality—all grew and thrived throughout the Federal Government.

It took the removal of General MacArthur—the patriot who unselfishly for 52 years has given his surpassing talent in the service of our Armed Forces—to awaken them to a realization of what has been happening here. The removal of General MacArthur from his commands in Asia made possible his return to America—has given the American people the opportunity of learning first-hand the situation as it exists in Asia.

If now the people will follow through, heed the advice of Abraham Lincoln, when, on February 11, 1861, at Indianapolis, Ind., he told them, "It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me," our Nation's future will be secure.

Lincoln then added, "I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents' not with office seekers, but with you, is the question: Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?"

Editors, not only within but without the great metropolitan centers, often lead the thought of our people. Permit me to read three editorials. The first is from the pen of Mark P. Haines, who publishes the Sturgis Journal at Sturgis, Mich., and it reads as follows:

A DAY OF DEGRADATION

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, conqueror of Japan, and one of the greatest military tacticians the Nation has ever produced, has been fired. Not since Gen. Benedict Arnold tried to sell out his country in the war that won independence for the United States, has there occurred an event comparable in infamy to Truman's incredible abuse of his power.

Today the American people are stunned and bewildered by the contemptible action of President Harry Truman in removing from his high office a man whose achievements and reputation so far transcend those of the puny man in the White House that it is like a gnat trying to sting an elephant.

Under the Pendergast ward-heeler who tries to act like a President the Nation now touches a new low in political and diplomatic expediency. Ashamed and humiliated this once proud country bows its head in anger and indignation.

It will be a day of rejoicing for America's enemies. Removed from power is the one man of whom the Kremlin is afraid. It will bring satisfaction to the snipers in the United Nations which has never demonstrated any real desire for a decisive victory in the Korean war. From the very first, General MacArthur has seen the Korean conflict for what it really is—the initial move of the Communists to conquer the world.

Handicapped by diplomatic commissars in Washington and with only half-hearted and wholly inadequate support from other U. N. nations he has waged a magnificent war in Korea. Now, with victory in sight, he is removed from command by a disgruntled politician in Washington who has abjectly capitulated to the Reds in the U. N., England, and France. All of the bloody sacrifices that this country has made in Korea are now outweighed by consideration for our phony friends in the U. N.

One ray of hope remains. Douglas MacArthur is free now to return to the country he has served so well. He will be able to tell the American people the true story of what is happening in the Orient. We predict that it will arouse the Nation as it has not been aroused since Pearl Harbor was bombed by the Japs.

General MacArthur has not been fired by the American people he has served so generously. He will live forever as a symbol of our military genius along with Washington, Grant, Pershing, Sherman, and many others.

The time is now at hand for the American people to fire President Truman. It had better be soon.

The second editorial is written by Stanley Banyon, at one time an associate and adviser of Michigan's Senator William Alden Smith, now editor of the News-Palladium, of Benton Harbor, Mich. Mr. Banyon wrote:

AMERICA BETRAYED

The American tragedy of incompetence and intrigue in the highest echelons of the Nation's Government has come to a blazing climax with the dismissal by President Truman of General MacArthur, as supreme American commander in the War East.

We refer explicitly to General MacArthur as the American commander, although his formal title has been United Nations commander. That is a misnomer and phony.

There is not now, and never has been, a United Nations worthy of the name. It was and now remains a delusion of addled brains.

Exercising his perogative as Commander in Chief, Mr. Truman dismissed one of America's greatest heroes because that man was compelled by patriotism and conviction to violate a rule of silence imposed upon him.

The Truman alibis will not fool the American people. As a soldier, General MacArthur owed obedience to his superior officer, but there are limits. Washington's foreign policy became so utterly insane that the commander in the field had no moral alternative but to speak out in protest.

For his morality and his courage, General MacArthur has been kicked out. He was discharged by a small-time politician who, confronted with the choice of standing by his subordinate and the American people or bowing to the dictates of a mercenary Britain, gave obeisance to the latter.

If there were any remaining benefits of confidence in the White House and State Department, they have been destroyed by the President of the United States.

If there remained any hope that order would somehow miraculously emerge from chaos in Washington, it has been dashed.

The people, General MacArthur and thousands of American boys who are fighting in Korea over the bloody ground where their comrades died, have been betrayed.

The dismissal of General MacArthur is the greatest victory ever won by Josef Stalin.

There is joy and gaiety, no doubt, in the Kremlin, because the appeasers of infidel communism have triumphed. British trade has won and democracy has compromised with perfidy.

It will be hollow victory and a short one. The people of America are aroused as perhaps never before in the history of the Republic.

The Truman-Acheson gang must go. It will go into ignoble oblivion, forever disgraced.

It is the Truman policy—if such it may be called—to feed American flesh into the Korean maw, but to guarantee to the enemy that his bases shall be inviolate, his frontiers secure.

It is the Truman policy to accept the dictates of foreign schemers at whatever sacrifice may be entailed.

It is the Truman policy to appease communism in the east and mass America's resources to combat communism in the west.

It is nothing short of idiocy if not worse.

From the dark days of Bataan to the surrender of Japan in Tokyo Bay in 1945, General MacArthur led the forces of freedom back the long, heartbreaking road by land and sea. Because of his genius, Japan was speedily rehabilitated, morally, politically, and economically to become our stanch ally. Under his leadership American prestige rose to its greatest peak in Asia while American prestige and European will to survive ebbed in the west.

Washington condemned General MacArthur to the ill-starred Korean adventure. It refused his appeals for permission to knock out the Reds; it spurned his advice; it withheld from him the freedom of action to fight for victory.

In the darkness of this tragic hour in American history, there still shines the light of hope. The people at last shall know the truth, because General MacArthur is no longer forced to remain silent. He is free at last to return to the United States and to expose our country's plight.

In this climactic hour, General MacArthur has gained stature, and Harry Truman the bewildered has shrunk to gypsy size, a lackey for British socialist-imperialism.

The third editorial appeared in the Times-Herald of Washington the day after General MacArthur addressed the Congress. It follows:

AN AMERICAN SPEAKS

"Old soldiers never die. They just fade away."

But if this was the fade-out of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, it was accomplished in a blinding flash of light.

RING OF TRUTH

No one who heard the general's intensely moving and dramatic oration will forget it. No one will fail to agree with its logic and compelling truth. In a stroke the floundering debate over America's foundering course in Korea was ended. The confusion was dispelled. There is nothing any longer to argue. There is no possibility of misinterpretation.

For the country heard a great man, a sincere man, a patriot, speak. In long years it has not heard a voice like that. The

glittering forensics of such a master politician as Franklin Roosevelt were, in comparison, the sparkle of fool's gold, to catch the votes of fools.

The speeches of President Truman were reduced to the pitiful disclosures of the limits of a small mind.

For General MacArthur spoke, not to win something, but to save the two greatest things in his world—the security and liberty of the United States, and the infinitely precious lives of Americans wearing the same uniform as he. Of these Americans, thrown by Presidential warrant into the slaughter in Korea without reference to Congress, with its constitutional prerogative of declaring war, MacArthur said:

"It was my constant effort to preserve them and end this savage conflict honorably and with the least loss of time and a minimum sacrifice of life."

HYPOCRISY IS NAILED

But, in this endeavor, their commander made unmistakably clear he was frustrated. If one is in a war—no matter how one may abhor war—the only possible object can be victory. When Red China intervened, after MacArthur's forces had totally defeated the original North Korean adversary, he called for reinforcements. He was told none would be forthcoming. He then proposed a series of military measures, none of them envisioning an inconsequential ground war with China. The views he advanced were "fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

"Including the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

What consummate hypocrisy, then, was manifested by General Bradley, when Mr. Truman's chairman of the Joint Chiefs endeavored to counteract General MacArthur's address by publicly declaring, in advance of it, that the views entertained by MacArthur were "contrary to our best interests, and by jeopardizing world peace, ultimately would threaten our security." Bradley becomes a mere lackey for Truman.

But the military measures advanced by General MacArthur were not accepted. His counsel was spurned in "lay circles." What can that mean, except that the Nation's greatest military man was overruled by Truman, by Secretary of State Acheson, by the State Department appeasers who think that Communists can be jollied into good behavior, by the British foreign office, which seeks the preservation of its Asiatic colonial interests and its trade, and by the United Nations, that organization of global Mr. McCawber, which spends its time, as the Korean conflict goes on and on, always in the hope that "something will turn up."

"The Chinese Communist intervention," said General MacArthur, "presented the fact of a new war. It called for new decisions in the diplomatic sphere to permit the realistic adjustment of military strategy. But," the general said, "such decisions have not been forthcoming."

WAR'S OBJECT IS VICTORY

Truman dawdled, Acheson dawdled, the appeasers thought up suitable bribes which might tickle the fancy of Communist China—among them the surrender of the island of Formosa, indispensable to America's future security—and the British sniped.

"I have consistently called for the new political solution essential to a solution," said MacArthur, for to continue in the course of inertia was to accept a situation which forbade victory and would result in the constant attrition of America's forces.

"War's very object is victory," the general said, "not prolonged indecision."

For all of his efforts to win the war or end it honorably and to save life, the reward the general received was, in his own words, "to be called a warmonger," especially by those foreign elements, particularly British which were forever seeking to discredit and undermine his position—their own stake, through combat participation in Korea, being negligible.

When the State Department appeasers temptingly held out their bribes to the Communist enemy—even to the promise of Formosa, whose surrender, in MacArthur's view, could entail an American retreat to the west coast—his soldiers asked him: Why surrender military advantages to an enemy in the field?

"I could not answer."

HIS GREATEST SERVICE

General MacArthur has put before Congress its duty to the American people, and to their sons in Korea. It is to abandon the U. N. program of drift and delay, the Acheson program of bestowing a loving embrace upon Communist assassins to court their favor, the Truman program of consigning Americans to the meat grinder of a never-ending war, the British program of using the United Nations and our own State Department to hold the arms of the American fighting man while the Reds slug him.

General MacArthur's magnificent appearance was the final service in a career of 52 years of "an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty." Of all his memorable services, this, perhaps, was the greatest.

Importance of United Public Opinion on Public Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have long been acquainted with the work of an organization devoted to advancing American ideals on the international scene, called the Society for the Prevention of World War III. It had been my intention to address the semiannual meeting of its board of directors in New York City on the 29th day of this month, but because of my official duties as a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Geneva, I shall be out of the country on that date. I therefore ask that the text of the address which I had intended to deliver may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE SEMI-ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 29, 1951

In the long run, the lifeblood of a dynamic democracy is nourished by the active participation of all the people in the crucial issues affecting their lives. The shrewdest observers of the American scene have noted that the vitality of our democratic institutions has in a large measure stemmed from the fact that throughout our land there are numerous private organizations sponsored by groups of citizens actively dedicated to the security of our institutions and the solution of our economic, political, and social problems. These organizations provide our people with the opportunity to participate in the life of our country and to ultimately contribute to its security and the shaping of its destiny.

The various representatives of departments of our Government consult with these private organizations from time to time, since they provide our Government with a cross section of American public opinion and thereby enable our officials to formulate policies corresponding to the needs and wishes of the people. These organizations therefore play a vital role in strengthening the hand of Government whether it be in time of peace or of war.

Among these organizations which have come to my attention over the past few years and in which I have been particularly interested, is the Society for the Prevention of World War III. It is a unique organization. Indeed, I do not believe that there is any other group of its kind in this country today. Strange as it may seem the Society for the Prevention of World War III was founded during the latter part of World War II when the fortunes of the Allies were rising and the future of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis was bleak. Yet its founders were farsighted enough to stress the importance of preventing World War III. They were realists, and it was their firm conviction that unless the seeds of World War I which flowered into World War II were destroyed, then the United States and the rest of the world would be confronted with a greater and more devastating holocaust.

As is characteristic with most American organizations and groups, the founders of the Society for the Prevention of World War III came from all walks of life. I am personally familiar with their backgrounds, their complete devotion to American ideals, and their high sense of honor and integrity.

Permit me to dwell for a moment on the identity of some of the founders of the Society for the Prevention of World War III.

Mr. Rex Stout, the well-known author, who served with distinction as chairman of the War Writers Board during World War II, was one of the Society's leading spirits. During the war he took on the task of exposing the propaganda of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis and his devastating barbs made the Nazis and the henchmen of Hirohito most unhappy.

Mr. C. Monteith Gilpin was another founder of the Society for the Prevention of World War III. Though a lawyer by profession, Mr. Gilpin devoted much of his time to analyzing world events and was a keen student of German militarism.

Mr. Lyle Evans Mahan was the first vice president of the Society. As the son of the brilliant Admiral Mahan, he captured the spirit of his father's concern for American security.

Herbert C. Pell succeeded Mr. Mahan as vice president of the Society for the Prevention of World War III. Mr. Pell is among our most distinguished Americans. His reputation is firmly established not only in the United States but abroad. He is a student of history, a statesman, and a diplomat. Mr. Pell was former American Ambassador to Portugal and Hungary. He was the former vice chairman of the Democratic National Campaign Committee, and, from 1919–21 he served as a member of the Sixty-sixth Congress. His profound understanding of international events was a decided asset to the Society's work. Mr. Pell was the American delegate to the Allied War Crimes Commission, which organization prepared the ground work for the international war-crimes trials. Through his long experiences abroad, Mr. Pell was able to discern the pattern of German aggression long before it became evident to most of his countrymen. I can say without exaggeration that not only the Society, but the American people at large, are fortunate in having in their midst this wonderful citizen and clear thinker.

Among the other members of the Society's council are to be found such distinguished leaders of American thought as Mr. Louis Nizer, nationally prominent attorney, and author of several books, including the much-read What To Do With Germany; Mr. Dean Alfange, formerly chairman of the Liberal Party; Mr. Clarence H. Low, the well-known former treasurer of the Democratic State Committee of New York; Dr. Bernard De Voto, of the editorial board of Harper's magazine and the Saturday Review of Literature; Mr. William L. Shirer, the internationally famous radio commentator, author, and foreign correspondent; Mr. Quentin Reynolds, the universally beloved war correspondent; Mr. William B. Ziff, prominent New York and Chicago publisher; Rear Adm. S. S. Isquith, retired, one of the great heroes of Pearl Harbor; Mr. R. J. Thomas, the respected labor leader; Prof. Mark Van Doren, of Columbia University; Dr. Lewis Mumford, the well-known philosopher and historian; Mr. Richard De Rochemont, producer of the March of Time; Dr. Albert Simard, a founder and leader of that powerful arm of French resistance during the Nazi occupation, France Forever; the Reverend Roelif H. Brooks, respected rector of St. Thomas' Church in New York; and Mr. Morris L. Cooke, the distinguished consulting engineer who has served our Government in a dozen vital capacities during three different wars.

Another of the Society's founders is Mr. Isidore Lipschutz, successful businessman whose experiences in Europe and knowledge of the fundamental forces making for war, equipped him to play an important role in the development of the Society's educational work.

The men who organized the Society were convinced that as a first step toward preventing a new war, it would be essential to eradicate the roots of German aggression. They were fully aware that these roots were deep in the soil of German history. The German impulse to war goes back to the days of Frederick the Great. Later, this militaristic drive enabled Prussia to conquer the rest of Germany and then to inflict a devastating defeat on France in 1870. As we all know, the German drive of conquest did not stop in the nineteenth century. On the contrary, in 1914 Prussian militarism ran rampant spreading death and destruction throughout Europe. Had it not been for the timely intervention of the United States, the dreams of the Kaiser may well have been realized.

The special victim of this aggression has, of course, been our sister Republic of France—the country whose history has, along with our own, so often provided the birthplace for new movements of liberty and freedom. During the Second World War, in connection with my official duties, I had occasion again and again to realize the unbelievable, unjustifiable and inhuman suffering to which the people of France have been put as a result of three wars of German aggression within the last 75 years—and we must look through the eyes of the widows and orphans of France, if we would appraise Prussian terrorism fully as the evil thing that it is.

The humanist traditions of Goethe, Heine, Schiller could not withstand the paralysis of Prussian militarism and its goose-stepping culture. The glorification of war became the dominant theme of those who controlled the minds and the destinies of the German people. It was expressed in the ideology of Pan-Germanism which intoxicated the Germans with the idea that they were the super race and that the German Nation had the special mission to rule the world and to establish the German order everywhere.

As early as 1905, the Pan-German professor, Josef Ludwig Reimer, wrote in his book A Pan-German Germany, "Our race with its culture is superior to all the other nations and races of the earth; for * * * our civilization has reached a height where it incomparably excels and dominates that of all the other nations and races of the earth." This mad boast was repeated by Kaiser Wilhelm II who, in his saber-rattling speech at Tangier in 1905, said: "We are the salt of the earth * * * God has created us so that we should civilize the world."

Germans who had been brought up in the humanist traditions found life in Germany intolerable. Many of them departed, repeating the exodus of German liberals from Germany in 1848. Several of these Germans were associated with the foundation of the Society for the Prevention of World War III.

Two internationally known figures who lived most of their lives as Germans but who also departed from the growing militarism of their native land, were Dr. Emil Ludwig, the noted historian, and Prof. Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, philosopher, educator, and statesman. Dr. Ludwig spared no effort during World War II to counsel the Allies as to the policies they should pursue in the occupation of Germany. His was the voice of experience and many of his suggestions received the serious consideration of Allied officials.

Dr. Foerster who came from an old Prussian family with a long militaristic tradition almost lost his life in his dauntless efforts to put the world on the alert regarding the intentions of the German militarists. Dr. Foerster is probably the leading authority on Pan-Germanism and his works have an international reputation. His numerous books on philosophy and education have been translated into most European languages and his teachings today are applied by German educators.

Professor Foerster's voice was not stilled when he was forced in 1923 to flee from the clutches of the German General Staff. In 1926, when the great powers met in Geneva, Switzerland, to discuss disarmament, Dr. Foerster boldly revealed the plans of the German General Staff to secretly rearm behind the pacifistic mouthings of the German Foreign Minister Stresemann in whom so many western statesmen had confidence. Throughout the 1930's, Professor Foerster warned against the folly of appeasing Hitler and foretold that that policy would only hasten the day when the German armies would sweep over Europe. We Americans owe Dr. Foerster a debt of gratitude for his courageous and sacrificial efforts to alert us in time as to the true intentions of the Nazis and the German militarists. Though Dr. Foerster is 80 years old, he continues to lend leadership and wise counsel, and it is my sincere hope that we Americans shall always take heed of what he says.

These are some of the individuals who helped create the Society for the Prevention of World War III. And as I have indicated, they did so motivated by the highest kind of patriotism. I realize that my description of Pan-Germanism has been brief, and I could elaborate more fully on it. Perhaps the following illustration will make clear just what Pan-Germanism means, not only in terms of world peace but in terms of the security of the United States of America.

I believe that it is not generally known by most Americans that in 1898 Commander Dewey, who later became admiral, reported to the United States Navy a most significant conversation he had held with the German admiral, von Goetzen. This occurred shortly before the battle of Manila Bay took place and at a time when a clash seemed imminent between German naval cruisers and American warships. Von Goetzen told Commander Dewey (and here, so that there can be no misunderstanding, let me say that I am quoting from the official archives of the U. S. Navy Department, record 38 vol. 52, p. 558): "About 15 years from now my country will start a great war. She will be in Paris about 2 months after the commencement of hostilities. Her move on Paris will be but a step to her real object—the crushing of England. Some months after we finish our work in Europe we will take New York and probably Washington and hold them for some time. We will put your country in its place with reference to Germany. We do not propose to take any of your territory, but we do intend to take a billion or so of your dollars from New York and other places. The Monroe Doctrine will be taken charge of by us. We will then have to put you in your place and we will take charge of South America as we wish to. Don't forget, about 15 years from now it will interest you."

The predictions of the German admiral seemed fantastic; yet, as we all know, World War I started 16 years later. How many of our leaders understood at that time the aspirations of pan-Germanism and what a serious challenge they were to our very existence? I do not believe that many did. But the record does show that Admiral Mahan, as early as 1890, understood the real face of German imperialism. In his book, The United States Looking Outward, he wrote:

"All over the world German commercial and colonial push is coming into collision with other nations. * * * It is noteworthy that, while these various contentions are sustained with the aggressive military spirit characteristic of the German Empire, they are credibly said to arise from the national temper more than from the deliberate policy of the Government which in this matter does not lead, but follows the feeling of the people—a condition much more formidable."

These documents were first brought to the general attention of the American people when they were published in the third issue of the Society's magazine, Prevent World War III, in September 1944. These documents and others which the Society has published from time to time show how far back we have to go to understand the forces underlying the upsurge of nazism.

The Society for the Prevention of World War III was never under any illusions with regard to nazism. It did not regard Hitlerism as an aberration or as a passing phenomenon. On the contrary, the Society saw in nazism the twentieth-century expression of the Pan-German drive for world conquest and the subversion of other nations by force, infiltration, and trickery.

Professor Foerster, who, as I said, is probably our outstanding authority on the problem, has reported from time to time the aims of the Pan-Germans. He quoted the Kaiser as stating during the First World War that "Three Punic wars will be needed to crush the Anglo-American powers." He has reported the statements of leading German geopoliticians: "The First World War destroyed France as a first-rate power. The Second World War inflicted deadly wounds on the British Empire, and the third world war will deal the death blow to the United States." Professor Foerster has also quoted Hitler's leading geopolitician and adviser, Haushofer, as telling an American newspaper correspondent, Carlton Smith, "Young men, we think in terms of centuries. In case we should lose this war you may be sure that from the first hour of the armistice we shall prepare for the next war."

Is it any wonder that the people who founded the Society stressed the importance of preventing the recurrence of German militarism? They were well aware of the nature of Pan-Germanism in all its guises, whether it be nazism, supernationalism, or aggressive militarism. The Society has constantly refused to underestimate the intentions of the German master minds. They have never indulged in wishful thinking. That is why the Society's educational program is based on the record of German

history and on the nature of Pan-Germanism.

The Society was determined to inform the people as to the dangers not merely of nazism but of the whole complex of militaristic and chauvinistic doctrines which have saturated the German mind for almost 100 years.

From 1943 to the present, the Society has endeavored to explain and enlighten the American people as to the meaning of the German problem and its relationship to world peace and security. In planning the peace, the Society, on the basis of its studies, suggested that a realistic solution of the German problem would involve the following:

1. That Germany's war potential be whittled down to genuine peacetime needs.

2. That encouragement be given to the development of German light industries.

3. That Germany compensate at least in part in reparations to those nations victimized by her aggressions.

4. That the huge German cartels and economic concentrations be smashed so as to foster the development of genuine free enterprise, something which the Germans have never known.

5. That all the major war criminals who were responsible for the mass slaughter of millions of human beings be apprehended and prosecuted to the fullest extent of international law.

6. That a realistic and thorough denazification program be enforced so as to prevent the same forces which served the Kaiser and then Hitler from regaining positions of power.

7. That German political institutions be decentralized, thereby avoiding the re-creation of a new Reich.

8. That all German assets and loot salted away in neutral countries be vested in the allies and allocated proportionately to all the victims of German aggression.

9. That a broad program of democratization be instituted as a first step toward eradicating the superman obsession of the German people.

10. That such institutions and organizations as churches, trade unions, business associations, be encouraged to partake in the development of a truly democratic Germany which could be accepted into the family of nations.

These fundamental recommendations were not out of step with our national interests. On the contrary, they formed the core of American policy in Germany in 1945. This fact alone demonstrates that the Society's educational program was predicated at all times on the basic desire to serve the national interest. Through the years the Society has endeavored through its manifold educational program to enlighten the people on the German problem. The Society's literature, particularly its bimonthly magazine, Prevent World War III, and the booklet, Know Your Enemy, has been widely read and circulated. During the war requests for the Society's regular publications as well as requests for specific research jobs in connection with Army orientation programs came to the Society from military establishments in the United States and abroad. All of this material was provided free of charge. I think it appropriate to read excerpts from some of the letters I have seen from Army establishments which assess the Society's educational work in relation to the Army orientation programs.

Here are some examples:

"[This Society's magazine] is splendid source material for the lectures that my orientation officer and I have been working up, and I am most anxious to obtain a copy. I should be very grateful to learn how I can do so. I should like also to get approximately three copies of Know Your Enemy for my orientation reading room. It is most encouraging to learn that this educational work, so necessary to prevent a recurrence of war, is being carried on. I feel that informing my men on this subject is a vital part of their training." (Letter to Rex Stout, president, Society for the Prevention of World War III; signed by Brig. Gen. Eric S. Molitor, Camp Mackall, N. C.)

"I was much taken by the first-rate analysis of the troop information problem as presented in your October letter to the Secretary of War. * * * I enjoyed my brief visit to New York, the meeting of the writers' board and the opportunity to meet you and some of your friends." (Letter to Isidore Lipschutz, treasurer, Society for the Prevention of World War III; signed by Brig. Gen. C. T. Lanham, Director, Information and Education Division of the War Department.)

In connection with this, it is interesting to note that Brigadier General Lanham incorporated some of the Society's studies in official publications.

"I wish to take this occasion to acknowledge receipt of and to thank you for your literature dedicated to the prevention of world war III. The material was extremely interesting to me and is very vividly and effectively presented. Your line of reasoning and logical conclusions cannot fail to impress all who see it with the scope and importance of your venture. It is one which should not fail." (Signed by Col. Delmar T. Spivey, of the Army Air Corps in Barksdale Field, La.)

"I have been distributing society material to every suborganization in the field artillery school and the field artillery replacement training center as well as post headquarters organizations. I have also checked with other officers and they state my distribution has been their only source of supply. They also praise very highly the type of material you are putting out." (Signed by Maj. Albert W. Holt, post information educational officer, Fort Sill, Okla.)

"A copy of your booklet Know Your Enemy, by T. H. Tetens, has come into my possession. The factual data contained in the text of this booklet is considered of such importance in the conduct of the activities of this office that it is desired that additional copies of this book be obtained for the use of officers engaged in the activities of morale services in this theater. I regret that I have no available budget to procure these booklets but if it is possible I would like to have any number from 25 to 100." (Signed by Col. William P. Scobey, of the North African Theater of Operations, SOS NATOUSA.)

Gilbert C. Ashley, first lieutenant and orientation officer for the Second Parachute Training Regiment at Fort Benning, Ga., wrote that the Society had "exceptionally interesting and educational material for public consumption." In addition, he told the Society that this material would "be incorporated into the general educational program displayed in day rooms, service clubs, and our library."

Capt. Richard F. Eggers, attached to the Information and Education Section, Headquarters, Forty-third Infantry Division, wrote:

"I am taking this opportunity to thank you very much for all the valuable literature that you have been sending us from your organization. Your literature had had a wide circulation and is invaluable."

First Lt. Arthur B. Lawrence, assistant orientation officer at Camp Mackall, N. C., commenting on the book What To Do With Germany, written by Louis Nizer, one of the members of the Society's advisory council, and distributed by the Society, wrote:

"I can say without qualification that it is one of the finest I have ever read on this politically and diplomatically vague subject."

I could go on reading numerous other letters expressing deep appreciation for the Society's educational work. However, I believe the above samples are indicative of the Society's patriotic services which helped to buttress our Army's morale during the most difficult days of the war.

Indeed, as late as January 15, 1948, R. T. Alexander, Chief of the Educational and Religious Affairs Branch of the Office of Military Government in Germany, wrote the Society as follows:

"I am sure that there are many ways in which your organization could be of assistance to our program of education here, either through visitation or direct assistance and advice."

Letters requesting the Society's publications have come from the highest quarters of our Defense Establishment, such as the United States Military Academy at West Point, the War Department, and from the Army War College.

Lt. Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, former head of the Central Intelligence Group, wrote the Society expressing appreciation for its offer to assist in the "full establishment and operation of the Central Intelligence Group." In addition, he declared his hopes "for the complete success of your own [that is, the Society's] vitally important mission."

Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring, of the War Department, wrote the Society a letter, from which I quote:

"I think it is highly important that our citizens maintain an interest in the vital business of establishing a peaceful world, and I have been very much interested in the lively manner in which your Society is doing its part in this enormously important and difficult task."

Col. Herman Beukema, professor at the Military Academy at West Point, wrote the following:

"The material in your magazine is of more than usual interest to the officers of this department and likewise to our cadets. As future officers, the latter can anticipate a long spell of duty in Germany. The manner and effectiveness of their performance will have a definite relationship to the allies' success or failure in uprooting the roots of World War III."

The Society has also received the warm commendations of many of our civilian officials both from the executive as well as legislative branches of the Government.

In a letter dated August 9, 1945, President of the United States Harry S. Truman wrote to the executive secretary of the Society as follows:

"I am strengthened and encouraged by the fine message received today signed by you as executive secretary and by Mr. Rex Stout as president and the many other citizens associated with you in the Society for the Prevention of World War III.

"These are indeed grave days and the whole effort of serious-minded men and women is and must be directed increasingly to the task of preventing another holocaust such as that which the civilized world has suffered now for almost 6 years. It is well, therefore, that so earnest a group as yours is already working to prevent its repetition."

Owen J. Roberts, then Supreme Court Justice, wrote the Society acknowledging a copy of Know Your Enemy. He said:

"Let me congratulate you on your work for the prevention of another war. Too few of the thinking and influential citizens of the nation are working on this problem. More power to you."

William Power Maloney, assistant to the Attorney General, said of the Society's magazine:

"I received the October Bulletin today and I read it through without putting it down.

"It is a grand job you are doing and one that is vitally necessary in these days when the kind-hearted muddleheads are doing their best to set us up for the third and possibly the last strike."

C. S. Black, Third Assistant Postmaster General, wrote the following in a letter to the Society:

"I have received your letter of March 13 and also your booklet, Know Your Enemy, which I have read with a great deal of interest. The contents of Know Your Enemy

should be read by every thinking person who is concerned with the problem which faces us right now as well as a reconstruction period after the war is won.

"It is my opinion that you have dealt with your subject in a reasonable and logical manner and without any attempt to distort the facts."

From the United States Senate the Society has received praise both from Republicans and Democrats alike.

In praising the Society's educational work, Senator HENDRICKSON wrote the following:

"A cursory examination of the latest issues of your magazine furnishes eloquent testimony to the fact that you have a well coordinated program and that you are directing your enthusiastic support toward the major issue of the world today, and, namely, that of establishing a just and lasting peace."

The former Senator and now Supreme Court Justice Harold H. Burton having received a copy of Know Your Enemy wrote:

"I have received the copy which you sent me of Know Your Enemy. This had come to my attention before, but I am glad to have this special opportunity to take it up and go further with it. I may add that Mrs. Burton picked up Know Your Enemy this morning, read it through and was deeply impressed with the strength and seriousness of the message it presented."

Senator MCMAHON replying to the receipt of the Society's literature said:

"I am anxious to keep up with the facts on Germany's condition and your letter has been a help."

The many articles published by the Society have been extensively used and quoted in the press. Many newspaper correspondents and columnists have also referred to its splendid work. The News published in Lynchburg, Va. (July 1, 1944), recommended that all individuals who were interested in international problems obtain copies of the Society's magazine, Prevent World War III. The newspaper editorial continued:

"So soundly edited is this bulletin, Prevent World War III, that it is difficult to see how its contents can be effectively challenged. The material covers every phase of German culpability at present and in the past.

"We know of no organization better able to guide properly and soundly the thinking of the American people along lines of winning the war and the peace and preventing another world war than the Society for the Prevention of World War III as represented in its bulletin."

The radio commentator Foster Williams devoted an entire program to the Society's work (December 10, 1944). Mentioning the danger of the German fifth column in this country, he said:

"Isn't anyone combating these groups—you will ask? * * * Have they the field to themselves? Is everyone in America sitting back and letting them get away with what they are doing completely unchallenged? No, thank God, there is one organization that is fighting them with all the might they can muster—the Society for the Prevention of World War III."

He further remarked that he desired "everyone who is listening to me tonight to read the literature of the Society for the Prevention of World War II. You owe it to yourselves to be informed on the thing that is second only in importance to winning the present war—the making of a permanent peace."

The Servicemen's Magazine of June 21, 1945, contained the following item:

"The Society for the Prevention of World War III has made reprints of a brilliant study of this highly topical subject by Francis X. C. Balling, associate research professor at the Graduate School of Fordham University. Based on thorough research, Professor Balling's piece gives figures and facts on why Germany should and could be deindustrialized without endangering the livelihood of the German people."

The Independent Star of Indianapolis (January 13, 1946) ran an editorial which began as follows:

"Delegates at the London General Assembly meeting of the United Nations organization will take courage in knowing that help is being mobilized in this country. The Society for the Prevention of World War III has been incorporated and is functioning from a suite of New York offices. It has supporters in all parts of the country. Theirs is a spirit of patriotic endeavor that deserves commendation."

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin (August 8, 1946) in reviewing the Society's magazine, Prevent World War III, said:

"The periodic publication of this pamphlet (Prevent World War III) enables us to keep in mind the major premises upon which our European occupation plans were first established and to check the progress or difficulties which are being encountered. This nonprofit organization is working with honest zeal to check the short-sighted sympathy which would aid Germany once again to triumph over her neighbors."

On September 19, 1948, the Denver Post wrote the following:

"In our preoccupation with the Soviet-American struggle Americans tend to forget that there are forces in this country working for the revival of German might, for Deutschland ueber alles.

"The voices of the pro-Germans and pro-Nazis in the United States were stilled by the war, and even now are not yet much more than a whisper. But they are whispering constantly to advocate the rebuilding of the German military machine.

"The most tangible evidence of this appears in the German-language press in this country. A few examples from the bimonthly magazine of the Society for the Prevention of World War III indicate that there is a definite move in America to rebuild Germany—not as a productive nation in an integrated European economy but as a strong military state."

On June 29, 1949, Edward A. Harris, Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, mentioning reports from the Office of Military Government regarding the resurgence of neo-nazism said:

"This report lends weight to the repeated contention of the Society for the Prevention of World War III that nazism is on the rise in Germany and that efforts to democratize the defeated nation have been largely ineffectual."

The Society's educational program and work is quite large in scope considering that it employs a small staff and that it depends on voluntary contributions. For example, the Society established a radio department which presents the Society's educational material in dramatic form. Literally, thousands upon thousands of requests are received for the scripts put out by this department. More than 1,000 schools and 55 radio stations utilize the material put out by the radio department. I have seen many letters ranging from elementary schools to universities praising these scripts which are sent out free of charge.

More than 100,000 books dealing with various aspects of the German problem were distributed free of charge. The Society's literature has a nation-wide circulation. A remarkable booklet, Know Your Enemy, has been distributed in the hands of tens of thousands, not only among the civilian population, but in Army camps both here and abroad. Its magazine, Prevent World War III, also has a nation-wide circulation; its fine articles and studies have been used by well-known newspaper columnists, radio commentators and students of international affairs. Practically every newspaper editor in the country receives Prevent World War III as do thousands of universities, libraries, professional organizations, etc. It is widely read among the American officials in the office of the high commissioner for Germany. Because of the excellence of many of the studies prepared by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, they have often been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In addition to these educational services the Society for the Prevention of World War III has provided many organizations with speakers and consultants who are experts on international affairs. Veterans' organizations, women's organizations, church groups, business associations and trade unions have from time to time consulted with the Society's experts and have used the Society's material. The frequency with which the Society's material is used may not always be obvious in view of the fact that it has never sought publicity. Indeed, it is the policy of the Society for the Prevention of World War III that all of the original material published in its magazine may be reprinted or quoted. The Society is primarily concerned with the security of our people and with the problem of enlightening them with regard to the prerequisites for lasting peace.

It is not without significance, I believe, that the Society's literature is constantly referred to and quoted in the foreign press whether it be in Europe or as far away as Australia.

As I have mentioned, the Society does not harbor any illusions as to the future role of Germany in world affairs. To some extent the Society's assessment of the German problem is summed up by the words of Mr. Herbert Hoover in the introduction to the Future of German Industrial Exports, by H. Herzog, published by Doubleday, Page & Co., 1916:

"Not content with dominion by force of arms, we find Germany plotting for commercial supremacy, with that insolent disregard of the rights of others and that resort to deception that has characterized all her policies since Frederick the Great's reign. * * * For 40 years the Germans have been plotting to realize their dream of Pan-Germanism—eventual world conquest and dominion. For two generations they have been thinking in terms unknown or little understood by an innocent and unsuspecting world * * * deception and fraud form the background of their most important international relations and undertakings. They have made Germany an inherently dishonest nation. * * * Well organized and comprehensive espionage and insidious German propaganda have been at work for two generations to plan the success of German victories. * * * Let the manufacturing, the banking interests, and the laboring and professional classes of all nations be warned in time to devise antidotes and counterattacks to the Machiavellian devices of a class gone mad with lust of conquest, deliberately plotting to fatten itself upon the life blood of other peoples even after the war. Let us consider in making peace what protection we can give to the commercial existence of the freed nations."

This statement by Mr. Herbert Hoover was reprinted in the February-March 1947 issue of Prevent World War III.

From Mr. Hoover's remarks, with which the Society wholeheartedly concurs in its publications, the belief that Germany can be a reliable bulwark in the defense of the west against the forces of aggressive communism is sheer day dreaming. The Society has shown that through the years before and since the war the Germans have played a double game, playing east against west, extracting as much as it could from the present cold war. More than that, the Society has shown that the Germans, given the opportunity, would not hesitate to enter into an alliance with the Soviets against the west.

In its publication, Prevent World War III, the Society pioneered in exposing the Soviet-sponsored Free German Committee, which

had as one of its main objectives the preparation of such a tie-up once the war was over. The Society has published authentic documents showing the close collaboration between the German General Staff and the Russians. In the September-October 1949 issue of Prevent World War III, one of these sensational documents entitled "Germany Looks to the East," revealed how the German General Staff was planning their postwar resurgence based on an alliance with the Soviets, even while pretending that they were the arch foes of communism. This memorandum, written a few days before the German surrender in 1945, was initialed by the chief of the high command of Hitler's Wehrmacht, Field Marshal Keitel and Grand Admiral Doenitz.

In the most recent issue of Prevent World War III, the Society published an extended analysis by Dr. Jean Pajus, entitled "Back Door Trade Between Ruhr Industrialists and the Iron Curtain Countries." In this article, Dr. Pajus cites facts proving that the Ruhr barons who supported Hitler are trying by hook or crook to establish close ties with the Russians and their satellites. Indeed, the Society discloses the amazing fact, which incidentally received scant publicity in the American press, that some of the leading German trusts had recently been advertising in the Communist papers in the western zones. These factual exposés of German-Russian relations are intended to keep the American people vigilant as to the true designs of the Germans. They are intended to prevent the American people from falling into the trap of complacency with regard to the ramifications of the revival of Germany's economic power.

The Society has long warned against the danger of a German-Russian tie-up. Historically, militarists in both countries have long dreamed of the Juggernaut which might be built, by combining German technical resources and Russian manpower.

The obvious facts of geography, and the repeated lessons of history, should warn us that this danger is no mere dream-world phantasmagoria. Level-headed reflection will tell us that it is in fact the one greatest danger which might suddenly confront the free world of today.

Just as the Krupp family of pre-World War II days did "good business," both with the Russians and with the Third Reich, so may Krupp today, newly freed, again do "good business" with both sides, if we permit, in the not far distant future. Only by reducing Germany's economic power to the minimum of genuine peacetime needs, the society maintains, can the danger of a German-Russian rapprochement be safely averted.

Today's back-door trading between Russia and Germany, given the opportunity, can develop overnight into a full-fledged German-Russian combine. This is the grim prospective which the Society spotlights.

The possible harnessing of German economy by Russia would of course lose most of its potential danger if Germany's war power were whittled down in advance, for then any eventual alliance between Germans and Russians would not significantly increase Russia's aggressive strength. Such a realistic approach to the German problem, the Society believes, would be the best means of averting the catastrophe of a Russo-German alliance.

The Society has maintained its position against the revival of the German war machine, against the resurgence of nazism and of the cartels, and against the possibility of a Russo-German alliance.

In the first issue of its magazine in May 1944, the Society for the Prevention of World War III carried a sensational secret memorandum attributed to General von Stulpnagel, one of the most influential of the German militarists. This secret memorandum said that Germany must avoid the mistakes of World War II. Von Stulpnagel said:

"In the next world war, which should take place within 25 years, the same mistake must not be made. The principal adversary will be the United States and the entire effort must be concentrated against this country from the beginning. * * * We shall be wrong if we try to conquer Russia, while leaving intact the American industrial potential."

In planning for German resurgence, the memorandum said:

"Our enemies will grow weary before we do. We shall have to organize a campaign of pity designed to induce them to send us needed supplies at the earliest possible moment. Above all, we must hold on to the assets we have deposited in neutral countries. * * *

"The present war will thus have been victorious in spite of our provisional defeat because it will have been a march forward toward our supremacy. * * * We have not to fear conditions of peace analogous to those we have imposed because our adversaries will always be divided and disunited. * * * We must force ourselves to create in the coming peace treaty the germs of future divisions. * * * These are the conditions for victory."

Thus spoke General von Stulpnagel and, as the Society has proven, he is not the only important German general who has expressed such views.

It is the considered judgment of the Society that Pan-Germanism has not been destroyed. A reading of the Society's literature shows that the forces of Pan-Germanism are rising again under new disguises and new slogans.

The reprieves and pardons just granted a large number of important Nazi personages by Commissioner McCloy and General Handy serve only to underline the manner in which we again fall prey to the wiles of German militarism. Why should we have to release from prison Nazi officers who helped plot the massacre of American soldiers? Why should we have to pardon the chief munitions suppliers of Adolf Hitler? There is a certain school of psychiatry which contends that when people get together to do a great crime, they end up with a subconscious desire to exterminate themselves. Perhaps, in the crime that we are now doing, by preparing the way for the revival of German militarism, we are indeed moved by a subconscious motive of self-destruction.

In ending my comments on the Society for the Prevention of World War III, I think it appropriate to quote from the Christian Science Monitor of March 3, 1950. Writing under the title of "Neo-Nazism; Unfinished Business," Mr. Ernest S. Pisko, special writer of the Christian Science Monitor, said the following:

"To remind him of unfinished business of the previous war, Xerxes, King of Persia, had a 'remembrance slave.' The Roman Senate, for the same purpose, had Marcus Porcius Cato. And we have the Society for the Prevention of World War III. * * * Still we must not forget the neo-Nazis. That is why it is useful to give the publications of the Society for the Prevention of World War III a more than perfunctory reading—and file them for reference just in case."

This is a fitting tribute to the Society's work, with which I have been long familiar. I have attended the meetings of this organization from time to time, have spoken to the various officers and experts of the Society, have listened to their brilliant analyses of the German problem. Yes; the Society is a unique organization and so long as our security is threatened, may it endure.

The right to dissent is an old-fashioned American privilege and I know that the Society subscribes to and upholds this basic principle of Americanism. It is, therefore, understandable that the Society should expect that it be accorded the same treatment and respect as it gives to the opinions of others. Those who disagree with the Society's objectives, however, should stick to the issues involved. I say let the people exercise their free choice in a marketplace of ideas. They have always been able to discern truth from falsehood and when an idea runs counter to the needs and interests of our people, it is bound to wither and die. This is the way democracy works. It should be clear, however, that the American people will never support a campaign of calumny and smear which is intended to deliberately confuse the issues and thereby muddy the waters of public information. The people want facts and not fairy tales.

Before ending my remarks I wish especially to add a few words of praise concerning the activities of Mr. Isidore Lipschutz, the man who has served as treasurer of the Society since its inception, and who has, incidentally, been foully traduced in certain publications on account of his patriotic leadership in this fight. Mr. Lipschutz was the first industrialist of importance to see the menace which the rising power of Hitler's brown shirts raised for the world. As early as 1932 and 1933 he personally organized the publication of underground German newspapers, which were printed in Belgium and secretly distributed in Germany, and which provided the pattern for subsequent activities officially engaged upon by the United States and our allies, as the inevitability of war with Germany became clearer.

Because of his anti-Nazi activities in Europe Mr. Lipschutz was singled out for attack in the Stuermer by the war criminal Julius Streicher, who was hanged at Nuremberg.

When Mr. Lipschutz removed his business to America he continued his work for democracy and world peace, and I may say from my personal knowledge that ever since his immigration here he has devoted more attention to the public interest than to his own business.

That his services to his native country and to world peace were generally appreciated is evidenced by the many distinctions bestowed upon him:

In 1931: By special decree of the King of Belgium, the title of "Chevalier de l'Ordre de Leopold" (Knight of the Order of Leopold) was awarded to him.

In 1936: By special decree of the King of Belgium, the title of "Officer de l'Ordre de Leopold II" (Officer of the Order of Leopold II) was awarded to him.

In 1937: The Belgian Red Cross awarded him the Medaille de Merite (Medal of Merit).

In 1938: The French Government awarded him the title of "Chevalier de la Legion d'Honneur" (Knight of the Legion of Honor).

In discussing the activities of the Society for the Prevention of World War III, vis-à-vis, the alarming situation confronting us in the world, I have taken some trouble to set forth the origins of this Society and the fine backgrounds of the men who are its leaders.

This seems to me to be pertinent, and especially deserved in view of the bitter attacks which some of these men have had to face, as a result of patriotically standing up for the right.

In times of international tension, like today, it is of the greatest importance that public opinion be well and accurately informed on the grave issues confronting our country. In a democracy, public opinion must and should determine our course; but only ar informed public opinion, supplied with the true facts, can serve as a safe guide. It is our problem, in these times, to distinguish informed and patriotic opinion from propaganda and selfish pressure. Once the true facts are appreciated, our people will be united and resolute in their action.

Three Important Questions Raised by General Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1591

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask three questions.

In his testimony at the MacArthur hearings Tuesday, Gen. Omar Bradley said he believed that the MacArthur strategy would involve the United States "in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy"?

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people are entitled to an answer to my three questions:

First, in those fateful days last June when President Truman decided to put the United States into the Korean war, did General Bradley or anyone else suggest to the President that he might thereby be involving the United States "in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy"?

Second, if and when the next Korean war breaks out—whether in Iran or elsewhere—will the President again arrogate to himself, in disregard of the Constitution and the Congress, the decision as to whether the United States is to enlist in that war also?

Third, in other words, Mr. Speaker, is President Truman to have a free hand to engage in a one-man trial-and-error effort to find "the right war, at the right place, at the right time, and with the right enemy"?

In Praise of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, too often one hears nothing but derogatory remarks for the fair city of Washington which is the seat of our Nation's Government; which by the time they reach the furthermost limits of this great Nation, contain only a very small particle of truth. Such stories tend to paint a dismal picture of this great city and result in a feeling amongst our citizens that it is a place to stay away from, despite the fact that it is a historic spot and one that should be closest to the hearts of our people.

However, Mr. Speaker, every so often a refreshing article appears praising our Nation's Capital and for that reason, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which appeared in the May 16 issue of the Washington Post entitled "In Praise of Washington" written by a man who emigrated to this city to do his share in this Nation's defense effort:

IN PRAISE OF WASHINGTON

I am on leave from the Pennsylvania State College to fill an assignment in the Defense Department. My wife and I and our four small children have been living here in the District community now for about a year. My amusement almost balanced my pique when recently I read Dr. Clifford R. Adams' pronouncement that married couples who live in Washington and hope for a happy home life and a successful marriage should "go and live somewhere else." Since Dr. Adams is my friend as well as my colleague at Penn State, may I gently rebut this frivolous advice.

Cliff, I think that your crystal ball must need a shine, or that your fact gatherers must have been briefing you too briefly, or (heaven forbid) possibly you have been reading a popular dreggy but misleading book about Washington.

To state it truly, Washington adds up to a stimulating, challenging, and satisfying city in which to live. Our Nation's Capital is a beautiful city filled with monumental buildings, great museums, and exquisite art galleries. We have superior music and Broadway theater, even though the latter may be a little late in arriving. If Washington is not the cleanest large city in America, it must compare favorably with whatever urban center has that distinction.

Washington is a city with stately churches of every faith and many congregations find it necessary to hold two services on their Sabbath Day in order to serve all of their communicants.

From village, farm, and metropolis, the Nation sends its most highly trained and competitively selected superior citizens to Washington to serve in its Government. The population of this community has a larger percentage of members of Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi than any other American community, including university centers. The IQ curve of the city's public-school children shows more individuals with superior ratings than are found in our population generally or other specific cities.

My work here has acquainted me with many persons in that large segment of the district's population which is comprised of career personnel in the three military services. It is my observation that these families of military folks are unusually stable and and successful, frequently following a proud family tradition of several generations' standing; and their children (contrary to the stereotyped military-brat idea) are well disciplined, gracious-mannered, and happily adjusted boys and girls. It is logical to assume that many equally successful families exist in other large elements of the population such as the Diplomatic Corps, Civil Service careerists, etc.

Even a word of praise is in order for Washington weather. Taking the year as a whole, the climate is pleasant. Admitting a few weeks of hot weather, throughout the year there is more sunshine than cloudiness, and the winters are open and free from the discomfort and inconvenience of excessive cold and snow.

Here then is a clean and beautiful city with a salubrious climate, where the standard of living and the community's earnings are high, where the population is representative of the selected best garnered from the whole country. We submit that a couple unable to make a success of marriage in an environment so favorable physically, socially, culturally, and economically should indeed go and live somewhere else—alone.

DR. PAUL R. BEALL,

Director, Information Division Research and Development Board, Department of Defense.

WASHINGTON.

They Heard You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, though the dismissal of General MacArthur from command in the Far East was the spark which touched off the people's resentment against the policies of this administration, Members of Congress indicate they are not only aware of, but intended to give some heed to, the protests for economy which have been overwhelming them.

For a long, long time Members of Congress have been hearing suggestions from the voters that, if they did not mend their ways and do some of the obvious things which were necessary to bring a little efficiency and economy into the Federal Government's activities which the people were convinced would sooner or later ruin us, they might hear a different protest in November 1952.

The thought has finally penetrated some congressional heads that the people were fully aware of what has been going on. Some Members of Congress mistook charitable complacency for a lack of information and determination.

The MacArthur incident—or, more accurately, the protests growing out of it—convinced these gentlemen that the people were not quite as complacent as some thought; hence, the awakening of the Congress.

May 2 the Congress was called upon to vote on an appropriation bill for the Interior Department. The Department's request for funds had been cut some $39,000,000 by the House Appropriations Committee which sent the bill to the floor. After several days of debate, the House, by amendment, cut the bill another $23,000,000.

Mr. Truman's leadership in the House, amazed at that action, called for a record vote on nine amendments. The vote was taken and on nine separate and distinct roll calls the administration was defeated, the cuts were approved.

The moral: Before the MacArthur incident, the economy-efficiency-minded members would not have had a chance of making even these cuts, which, by the way, are inadequate.

The protests growing out of the MacArthur incident, if continued, will eventually result in other savings, the prevention of additional waste and extravagance and, it is my hope, in the removal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson. He, as I have repeatedly advised you, has acted in the interest of the British Government. His policies, whatever his intention—I repeat it again—have aided the Communist cause.

My record indicates that I do not need prodding on any of the points above suggested; in fact, I have been criticized as being too economy-minded, too tonsilled to disagree with the Administration, particularly with the State Department's activities.

To be effective, the people's protests should be directed to those Senators and Representatives who, in the past, have supported the socialistic program of the administration, adopted and followed the suggestions of an international-minded State Department.

Here is your opportunity, talk with your friends and neighbors, point out to them where this administration's policies—especially in foreign affairs—are taking us; then, all of you write to those Senators and Congressmen who go along with the New Deal, and insist that they, your servants, do the things you want done.

It is unfortunate that such a protest should be necessary but, because the people have so long complacently gone along with, and, at election time, approved the programs advocated by the preceding and this administration, such a protest seems to be necessary.

Containment of Russian Communist Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, Tuesday, May 15, 1951:

TWO WAYS OF OPPOSING COMMUNISM

Just what does it mean to say that American policy aims at "containment" of Russian Communist influence in the world today? A recent survey by the Council on Foreign Relations indicated that this policy is supported by a large majority of the leading citizens who form its committees in 24 cities. Yet, common observation indicates that the objectives of the policy could and should be more widely understood.

First of all, is the United States engaged in a mission to suppress communism? Over 90 percent of Americans evidently disagree with communism; its theories can be disproved and its practice has shown cavernous weaknesses. Yet, Americans could view communism with relative equanimity if its spread depended on adoption by free consent of self-governing peoples. Its propaganda could be met on the ideological level with assurance, as indeed it must be.

But the nature and doctrine of international communism is to seize power by violence and to exert minority rule through dictatorship. In practice it has spread by extending the power of the Soviet Union, either through direct expansion or through satellites—in either case by various forms of aggression against free governments and the liberties of free men.

It is that aggression, that subjugation of free peoples by violence, which constitutes communism's crime in the world today, just as it constituted the crime of Nazi-Fascist totalitarianism.

And it is that aggression, that expansionism by force over unwilling victims, against which the policy of "containment" is legitimately directed. This does not mean a crusade or holy war to extirpate communism from the earth; eradication of mistaken doctrines must come by other means. But it does signify, in the phrase of the Council on Foreign Relations, that America should "try to frustrate the expansion of Soviet power whenever it shows signs of encroaching upon the territorial integrity" of free nations.

That is something like the distinction drawn by the American Government and by most thoughtful citizens in dealing with communism as a domestic problem. Majority judgment has held against attempting to punish the mere holding of communistic opinions as a crime; but it has supported heartily the endeavor to punish the commission of illegal acts, as in the trial of 11 Communist leaders for conspiracy against the Government.

Most serious students of Stalinist Marxism are convinced that if it is deprived of unfair, coercive, and violent means for its extension it cannot survive. Most of the Foreign Relations Council members believe that the Soviet regime is such that it must expand or lose power internally. If that is true, then resistance to its expansion amounts to resistance to communism itself.

But the distinction earlier stated is still important. It is aggression that is the enemy. It is the attack on other people's lives and liberties that constitutes a ground for war. In the absence of such a casus belli, a military crusade, or "preventive war" against certain people simply because they are Communists or ruled by Communists would become itself an aggression and would forfeit moral stature.

Let's keep the sights on the target. It is aggression that constitutes the international crime. Only a system that can succeed by appealing to intellects and loyalties of free men deserves to succeed. Only such a system can expand, or long endure, if aggression is resisted.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter which I have received typifies the approach of every citizen who has the interest of our country at heart. I hope that many of our colleagues here will adopt that attitude. If they do we can look forward with hope for, and faith in, the future of this country:

E-Z MILLS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 10, 1951.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: No reply is expected to this letter, because if my judgment is correct it will be merely one of thousands of similar letters you will receive on the same subject. All I ask is acknowledgment so that I may be sure it has been received by you.

During the past months I have not been a supporter of General MacArthur in his controversy with the President. My reason has been that as a manufacturer I have learned through years of experience that anyone directing a large organization cannot do so effectively if he does not have the wholehearted support of his associates regarding his policies.

I am not prepared to go all out for General MacArthur today, regardless of the profound impression his speech to Congress made upon me, for the simple reason that I, like most American citizens, am not in possession of the pertinent facts upon which to make a sound decision.

There is one point upon which I have very definite ideas. General MacArthur has raised questions of differences on basic policy which I feel if not decided correctly will have a very adverse effect on the lives and happiness of my children and their children.

This letter is to urge you to go to the root of this controversy which has developed between the President and General MacArthur and to use your influence to have it decided to the best interest of our country and its people. The subject is far beyond partisan politics, as I know you will agree.

Very sincerely,

SHERMAN P. HAIGHT,
Chairman of Board, E-Z Mills, Inc.

George Catlett Marshall Day at Virginia Military Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address of great wisdom and merit, delivered in Lexington, Va., on May 15, 1951, by Hon. Bernard M. Baruch on the occasion of George Catlett Marshall Day at Virginia Military Institute.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is hallowed ground. Northern and Southern troops fought for the possession of this lovely Shenandoah Valley, and none more gallantly than the students and officers of the Virginia Military Institute.

My father, a Confederate doctor, campaigned in this valley. He had a favorite tale he liked to tell on himself. During one battle, the Confederate troops were thrown into a panic. The Southern commander cried to my father, "Help rally the men!" My father, with a standard in hand, rode among the men shouting, "Rally! Rally, men, for God's sake!" Just then a shell burst close. His horse dashed madly off while father sought to bring the animal under control. Whereupon one of the soldiers nearby shouted, "Rally? Why in hell won't you rally?"

We have come here to dedicate this new arch to VMI's barracks. To our left we can see the arch which commemorates Stonewall Jackson, who taught here, and who was one of the greatest military tacticians of all times. Beyond these buildings is another arch erected to the memory of America's first soldier, George Washington. He not only won us our first victories, but it was he who first cast the mold which shaped the tradition of American soldiering. In an age of military adventurers—Napoleon was only a few years off—George Washington established the role of the American soldier as a servant of peace and a guardian of liberty.

That your third arch should be dedicated to George Catlett Marshall is singularly fitting. He is a living example of the tradition of the civilian soldier which Washington began. VMI's most illustrious graduate, George Marshall is symbolic of the new union of Americans which was demonstrated in the last two world wars and which has banished forever the disunity that made possible the war between North and South.

But this arch, which we are dedicating today, does more than look back upon the past. It also looks out toward the future. In honoring George Marshall we also do honor to a concept which saved the free world once and which can save it again.

That concept was the strategy of global defense. As history's first global strategist, George Marshall was called upon to organize the most stupendous military effort man has ever known. Its climax came in the two greatest amphibious landings upon hostile foreign shores—Normandy in the Atlantic and the Philippines in the Pacific. Each landing half the globe apart, yet conducted almost simultaneously. Think what a host of problems had to be overcome to make those victorious landings possible—assembling the men and weapons, the food and medical care, the convoys and landing craft, with everything transported across thousands of miles of ocean to meet a D-day schedule.

Today, as Secretary of Defense, George Marshall, perhaps under even more difficult conditions, is called upon to devise the global strategy which will bring us victory in the peacemaking, and avoid the need for any amphibious landings on hostile shores.

When I was asked last March to join in dedicating this arch to General Marshall, I immediately thought of a remark which Gen. John J. Pershing made in 1920. We were to have dinner together. When General Pershing came in he said, "I have just done a fine thing for our country. President Roosevelt asked me who would be a good man for Chief of Staff. I recommended George Marshall."

The years that followed more than amply confirmed General Pershing's confidence. It was General Marshall who organized the means which made possible victories on all fronts.

I wonder how much of the controversy in recent days is really a reflection of the difference between the leader of troops and the organizer. A great leader of troops naturally is zealous in desiring that when his men become locked in battle that every resource be marshaled which might increase the chance of their winning or of decreasing their losses. The very qualities which made him so valiant a leader of troops would make him impatient of any limitations on his action.

But the organizer has to think not only of the men fighting on the one front, but of all the fronts of war and defense. He must weigh each theater and its relative importance upon the scales of a globe-flung strategy. Where to concentrate our forces and where to hold? Will action in one part of the world invite a counterblow somewhere else? What of our allies? Are they prepared or do they need time to ready their defenses? how much can they be hurried?

And what of the American people? How quickly can their strength be mobilized? By how much can they be hurried?

Like those of the troop commander, the decisions of the organizer are also weighted in lives; like the troop commander, the organizer also labors under inhibitions.

Whatever the demands from the commanders abroad, the organizer can allocate only the weapons he has been permitted to procure. He can draft and train only the men permitted under the law. When the commander in the field asks how far he is permitted to go, the organizer must decide first whether the troops and equipment will be available to see the offensive through, without jeopardizing other areas. And if the organizer, looking into the future, a year, or two or three ahead, asks for what he thinks will be needed—and he is turned down, what does he do?

Many issues have become involved in the raging controversy over far-eastern policy. I would not want to seem to be answering or dismissing them. Still, I would like to put forward this one thought of my own—much of our trouble is the result of military weakness.

In our present situation, whatever is attempted on behalf of peace must fall short because of a lack of supporting military strength.

We are trying to enforce a global doctrine of opposition to communism with a Military Establishment which is sorely strained by the demands of only one theater.

Many of the issues—and choices—raised by the controversy would solve themselves if more of America's strength were mobilized. Until we have mobilized, few, if any, of the issues which have been raised can really be solved.

There is strength in unity. But there is also unity in strength.

We—our allies as well as this country—must first grow stronger militarily before we can have a unified foreign policy.

In Korea today we are buying time—no; it is not we who are buying time; it is our young men who are buying the time—for the whole free world to rearm. Are we doing as much as we possibly can with this time? As quickly as we can? That is the question we should be asking ourselves—what are we doing with the time being bought for us at so great a price?

I would be less than frank if I did not say I do not believe that we, as a nation, or our allies, are doing enough. I might add that even if the fighting in Korea is brought to an end, as we all hope, the need to rearm would remain.

But I am straying from the purpose of this occasion. I have known George Marshall since he served as an aide to General Pershing. I have watched him rise and grow as he rose. Always he has seemed to me the very prototype of the soldier-statesman.

In outward demeanor he may appear austere. Yet he is warmly aware of the human side. During the last war he would insist that the members of the General Staff get away from Washington frequently. "I don't want tired men making decisions that affect human lives," he once told me.

Although he had to make many of the decisions of grand strategy, he was always deeply concerned for the welfare of the men and women on the fighting fronts and their families at home. He saw that our troops had the best this country could furnish—in rations and clothing, in medical care and nursing, in equipment and leadership. Before we entered the war some armchair strategists were saying the day of the mass army was gone. The day of the mass army in the old sense of trying to win by sheer force of manpower was, indeed, gone, but not the skillful command of forces of considerable size to maneuver, to strike, and to pursue. This required leadership on an unprecedented scale. General Marshall foresaw the tactics and the strategy that would be needed in case of a world war. I remember his explaining the necessity for training our commanders in handling large numbers of troops. He expanded the scale of army maneuvers in this country to where they covered areas as large as some European countries.

How often have I marveled at the apparent ease with which he has borne his responsibilities. Nor has it been easy for him to unburden himself. At times, I believe, General Marshall has talked quite freely to me of things on his mind. But I can also remember a week end at my place in South Carolina during which he hardly spoke beyond the routine courtesies. General Marshall has been singularly fortunate in his choice—or maybe she chose him—of so charming, gracious, and understanding a wife. Yet there have been times when he couldn't take even her into his confidence.

Both of them now like to tell the story of an incident a few days before our landings in North Africa. It was our first amphibious expedition. Had it been repulsed, the effect might have been disastrous. There was grave fear the Germans might learn of our plans. There was the even more serious question of what the French in North Africa would do. Would they welcome our soldiers, or would they fight them?

The responsibility for ironing out all these problems had been entrusted by the Combined Chiefs of Staff to General Marshall. Finally, all the details were worked out. Our hope for winning over the French was General Giraud, who was to issue the orders to the French in North Africa to lay down their arms.

Noticing how hard General Marshall had been working, Mrs. Marshall arranged a duck-shooting party for him. The night before the duck hunt the General's bedside phone rang. It was the War Department calling with a message from Robert Murphy that Giraud was insisting that the invasion be postponed for 3 weeks or he would be unable to guarantee French support. The convoys were already at sea, 800 ships off the entrance to the Mediterranean sailing under radio silence. Could this vast naval force be turned back? If not, what would happen when they landed in North Africa?

After listening to the message General Marshall said he would be in the office in the morning and hung up. Mrs. Marshall, hearing him, asked, "Does that mean you won't be able to go duck hunting tomorrow?"

"I'm afraid it does," General Marshall replied, "but it's pretty important."

Mrs. Marshall said, "Oh, you think every little thing is important."

General Marshall has worn a soldier's uniform for so long that it is difficult to penetrate to his true qualities. He is a warm friend, a fine fishing and hunting companion. In all matters of national security, though, he strives to be impersonally right, knowing how many lives rest upon the integrity of his military judgments. That integrity won him the complete confidence of President Roosevelt, even when they disagreed; it won him the equally complete confidence of the British, with whom he also had his differences; and it gained him the respect, if not the confidence, of the Russians, who don't even trust their own people.

No one has been more respectful of our civilian institutions and traditions. The one problem which has never been out of General Marshall's mind, these last years, has been how to build a military establishment which would be adequate for our national security and yet be one which the American people will maintain indefinitely, without bankruptcy.

Even before the last war ended, he was worried over the kind of military establishment we would maintain in the after-war period. We talked often of this problem. Always he would hark back to the same conviction—if the American Nation were to survive, we had to break with the old feast-and-famine tradition of military spending, or alternating between frantic all-out mobilization for war and equally frantic all-out demobilization for peace. We had to develop a military policy which we would sustain year in and year out and which would

serve as the enduring foundation for an equally enduring foreign policy. That is why General Marshall has been so insistent upon universal military training.

In this, he and I have been of one mind.

General Marshall impresses one as being so much the good soldier, and yet I know how deeply he has yearned for the quiet of civilian life. At the first chance after the last war ended, he retired to his home at Leesburg. There he struggled with the problems of gardening, with the logistics of weeds and fertilizer. He was called from his gardening three times. Once to go to China on a mission for the President; a second time to serve as Secretary of State; and a third time to head the American Red Cross, dropping that to take on his present responsibilities.

One tree which General Marshall planted in these latter posts is already bearing fruit—the Marshall plan. Other undertakings are still seedlings, of uncertain fruition. For a full measure of his accomplishments we will have to wait for the battle of peace to be decided. The measure of his greatness as a man we already have.

Let me conclude by relating one more incident. One day I noticed a portrait of Robert E. Lee hanging on the wall in General Marshall's Leesburg home. I have always revered General Lee, who lies not far from here. He was to the southern people and their soldier sons what no commander has ever been to any people.

I asked General Marshall, "Tell me what you think of General Lee."

General Marshall replied, "You know he had many offers of enormous sums of money to take commercial positions. He refused them all because he thought he owed a duty to the young men of the South and so he took a position for $125 per month as president of what is now Washington and Lee University."

Sometimes a person will reveal more of himself when talking about others. That response of General Marshall's—the trait of Lee's character which immediately came to his mind—etches an indelible portrait of the man we honor here today.

"Do your duty in all things," General Lee urged. "You cannot do more. You would not wish to do less."

I congratulate you, General Marshall. I congratulate the students and faculty of the Virginia Military Institute, who can justly take pride in the school which could produce a George Catlett Marshall.

I know that the whole free world joins with us in wishing you, General Marshall, continued success in your present task as freedom's global strategist, and that with the peace won, you can return to your gardening.

The St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was printed in the Utica (N. Y.) Press, on March 17, 1951, with reference to the St. Lawrence project.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

Utica Chamber of Commerce is taking another look at the St. Lawrence seaway-power project and we hope it will finally recognize the potential benefits to northern New York and to Utica. The matter is now before Congress in what may be the decisive struggle over that long-planned development. Unless now accepted as necessary to the national defense, the project as at present conceived may never be undertaken.

Congress remained unmoved when the St. Lawrence development was pressed upon it by President Roosevelt during World War II as a means of providing additional supplies of electric power for defense plants in the Northeastern States. But now the project has been given a new angle by the depletion in the last war and since of the high-grade iron ore reserves of the Mesabi Range near Lake Superior. President Truman is asking quick approval of the project on the ground that the proposed 27-foot channel from Lake Superior to the sea is needed to give midwestern steel mills safe and economical access to newly discovered open-pit ore resources in Labrador.

The administration has sent an impressive list of witnesses to testify before the House Public Works Committee that the project is essential to the national security, that it can be made to pay for itself through sale of electricity and collection of tolls from ships using the waterway, and that it will make a mighty contribution to economic development in the North Atlantic area and the Great Lakes basin.

Opponents of the project include railroads, public utility companies, coal operators, shipping interests and port cities along the eastern seaboard which would lose traffic to the waterway. They have not yet made their case in formal testimony but their arguments are fairly familiar. For two decades these arguments have been sufficient to prevent acceptance of the seaway-power project by Congress.

Supporters of the St. Lawrence project admit that resources of the Mesabi-Lake Superior region, on which the steel industry has depended for 85 percent of its ore supply, are far from exhaustion. But all authorities agree that sooner or later there will be a sharp falling off in production. And because of increasing demands for steel, it is estimated by Secretary of the Interior Chapman that by 1960 "we must be prepared to import 40,000,000 tons of ore a year." The National Security Resources Board says that by the end of the present decade "50,000,000 tons must be furnished from entirely new sources of supply."

Steel is important but the power means more to Utica.

Small Business Is Hit by Defense Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, during the first 2 years of World War II, some 16 percent of the total number of business enterprises were forced to close their doors. The same problems are today facing the small, independent businessmen of the Nation who are faced with the twin spectres of material shortages and a lack of defense contracts. In the New York Times for Sunday, May 13, was a fine presentation of this situation written by Joseph A. Loftus. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS IS HIT BY DEFENSE RATIONING—UNABLE TO GET MATERIALS, MANY FIRMS APPEAL TO GOVERNMENT FOR RELIEF

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, May 12.—Small business is one of the casualties of defense, just as it was in the early days of World War II. Why this should be so, in the face of booming production and the need for still more production, is one of the paradoxes of our economy.

On its face, it doesn't make sense. On closer examination, one finds that some casualties are unavoidable. The problem is one of degree—how to cut the losses.

In the first 2 years of World War II, 16 percent of the small business men of the country were forced to shut shop. Select committees of the Senate and the House are campaigning against a repetition of that debacle, but actual results are in doubt. There is already a suspicion at the Capitol that when the corpses are finally counted this time, the fatality rate may be even higher than it was in 1942 and 1943.

What is small business, and why all the to-do about its survival?

A simple definition of a small business is this: An establishment with fewer than 500 employees. Statistics are kept on that basis. The congressional committees are not rigid about the 500-man ceiling when they seek help for their constituents. In the Congressional view, any business that is not dominant in its field is a small business. That tent would cover some companies with far more than 500 employees—the secondary steel companies, for example.

BROAD BASE OF INDUSTRY

Small business commands so much attention from Congress that one may safely decide it is a politically significant area of our economy. It is numerically important. About 3,670,000 small businesses form the broad base of our industrial-commercial pyramid. It is articulate. The appeals to Congress for information and help have been enormous. Letters reaching the small-business committees ran to 9,000 one day. The average intake is 450 to 500 a day now.

There is an emotional attachment to small business that has made it, to many, the economic symbol of the American way of life. The independent entrepreneur commands a kind of admiration different from that accorded the big fellow who provides mass employment and boasts an efficient assembly line.

In economic actuality, small business is the bulwark against monopoly, the guaranty of a competitive economy. In a wartime economy, as contrasted with today's readiness economy, we need all the productive facilities obtainable. Hence the concern about the liquidation of those facilities now.

What's the trouble? The trouble is a shortage of materials. Take aluminum. There are 18,000 aluminum fabricators. Most of them have sprung up since the close of World War II. They have been making a couple hundred kinds of items for the civilian trade.

Now the military has placed large orders for aircraft. That calls for a lot of aluminum. There is not enough for the airplanes and all the civilian production, too. Small aluminum fabricators cannot make airframes. They have had to cut back 35 percent on more than 200 products. They were to be cut back 100 percent on April 1, but the death sentence has been stayed till July 1. By that time new basic capacity may have brought in enough additional aluminum to win for these establishments a stay of execution. If so, the congressional committees will claim credit for saving hundreds of these concerns from extinction by getting delays in the death sentence.

SHORTAGES IN OTHER FIELDS

The story is somewhat the same in steel, plastics, and copper, and other areas. As military procurement was stepped up, material shortages developed in the civilian lines, making the small manufacturer's plight desperate. He turned to Government contracts as his only salvation.

It is clear that the small-business man, by definition, cannot qualify as a primary contractor for a ship, a tank, or a plane. He can qualify as a subcontractor on parts for these products; he can qualify as a primary contractor on many small items.

He did not do so badly, either, as long as the military advertised for competitive bids. But bidding has given way largely to negotiated contracts. That is the little fellow's big gripe—that and the lack of information about requirements and awards.

The small-business man complains that some big companies are expanding their manufacturing facilities to avoid subcontracting. The Senate committee reported a typical instance in which a small manufacturer of cellar doors made of sheet steel could not obtain sheets from his mill. The mill, however, shipped the sheet to its own fabricating plant and sold the manufacturer partially stamped cellar doors.

EQUIPMENT IS WASTED

Not only does that practice increase the cost of the product to the consumer—in this case, homeowners—but the small manufacturer's stamping equipment is idle and represents to him and to the country an economic waste.

The procurement agencies of Government are supposed to discourage expansion of facilities by a primary contractor if subcontractor facilities are available. They assert they have had some success in doing so.

To get a subcontract for a part of a tank, or a gun, or whatnot, the small enterprise has to know who got the primary contract. Complaints were lodged that the security-conscious military were withholding information about the size of primary contracts.

The Munitions Board's own figures show that the dollar amount of contracts awarded to small business dropped from 24.5 percent of the total awards in the fiscal year 1949–50 to 21 percent in the first 9 months of fiscal 1950–51. That means a few big companies, relatively, received 78 to 79 percent of the dollar volume. (From 1940 through 1944, for example, the hundred largest corporations got 60.6 percent of all prime contracts awarded.)

The Munitions Board does not know how much business went to small enterprises in the form of subcontracts and sub-subcontracts, and says it has no way of finding out without installing a costly statistic-collecting system.

The Board says primary awards to small business have been rising steadily month by month in the first quarter of this calendar year. In March the proportion was 25.9 percent. Congressional champions of small business propose to establish a small-defense-plants corporation, like the agency that operated in World War II. Both the Munitions Board and the National Production Authority have advised against it.

In sum, a lot of mechanism is in motion, but the returns are not all in yet.

Republican Band Wagon Will Become a Hearse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release issued by me, relative to certain proposals by General MacArthur and Republican reaction thereto.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Republicans jumped into the MacArthur controversy, thinking it was a band wagon to roll them into the White House in 1952. Now, they jump out because it looks like that old familiar hearse ready to haul them back to the political graveyard.

Yes, even the Republican Party has caught on to the fact that the American people do not want to follow General MacArthur into an all-out war on the mainland of China. These Republican politicians who used MacArthur for all he was worth are now ready to pass him up.

This sudden change of face showed up plainly at the meeting of the Republican National Committee in Tulsa this week end, according to all reports I read and received. As one Washington newspaper headline summed it up: "GOP committee shuns MacArthur's program." And, further, "There is no talk here whatever of a possible presidential candidacy for General MacArthur."

This retreat away from the militant MacArthur was confirmed by another Washington correspondent who wrote (Saturday morning): "There was not so much as a sentence that favored Republican support of the program of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The attitude of the Republican politicians here is that the party ought to benefit all it can from General MacArthur's quarrel with President Truman, but ought not to let itself get into position of being MacArthur's champion. * * * They think this (MacArthur program) is dangerous, politically."

Remember? This is the same Republican Party which has been on such a hysterical, emotional jag during the past month. They wailed loud and long about General MacArthur. Now, they just wail.

Frankly, I have never seen such a demonstration of political avarice and cowardice. I have believed all along that they were playing politics with the security of this Nation. I have believed all along that they had no real convictions about the issues involved in the controversy. This turn in Tulsa certainly proves both. Just listen to what they are saying.

Clarence Buddington Kelland, of Arizona: "I do not believe that the Republican Party should tie itself to the issue of military action as developed between General MacArthur and Mr. Truman."

Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts: "I do not think that the Republican Party should tie itself to MacArthur in this controversy or make a party issue of it."

General MacArthur, however, had boldly declared that his policy differences with the administration would be the issue in the regular referendum occurring next year, as it does—in his words—"each 4 years." I guess MacArthur thought if he got out of their way for President, they could at least stick by his program.

In the presidential push, Senator TAFT was said to be losing ground with the grass-roots politicos because of his excessive enthusiasm for the militant MacArthur program. His supporters and admirers at Tulsa expressed surprise and concern over his course.

Yes, those Republicans have frozen up on General MacArthur. I am told that seven Republican governors made speeches, and not one so much as mentioned his name.

Apparently, the GOP
Just doesn't want to be
The "General's Own Part-ee."

The Small-Town Editor and Conditions in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk two editorials from the Ephraim Enterprise, a weekly newspaper published each Friday in Ephraim, Utah, a small town of 1,991 people. The views expressed by Roscoe C. Gee, editor and publisher of this paper, are significant because they show that the small-town country editor is right on top of the important events transpiring in our Nation. This editor, like the editors of the many weekly newspapers of my State, exemplifies the editorial prerogative in its finest tradition—in a manner typified by the late William Allen White. The process by which national issues infiltrate to the grass roots of our communities and are discussed intelligently and with understanding by our small-town editors is one of the most healthy conditions existing in our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the two editorials from the Ephraim Enterprise inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE TO, AMERICA?

America, where are you headed?

Many signposts along the way indicate that you are on the wrong track and going ever farther in the wrong direction.

To be frank, America, it seems you have denied the faith and forsaken the God of the founding fathers; that you have dethroned the Goddess of Right and the endeavoring to enthrone the champion might as your present deity.

The founding fathers, the leaders for many generations, Abraham Lincoln, the savior of the Union, all acknowledged God as the King of America.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," states the Declaration of Independence.

Patrick Henry, in urging that all delegates sign the Declaration, pointed to America as the refuge for the downtrodden of Europe, and said:

"But hark! The voice of Jehovah speaks out from the awful cloud. 'Let there be light

again. Let there be a new world. Tell My people, the poor, downtrodden millions, to go out from the Old World—tell them to go out from wrong, oppression, and blood. Tell them to build up My altar in the New.'

"As God lives, my friends, I believe that to be His voice. Yes; were my soul trembling on the wing of eternity, were this hand freezing to death, were my voice choking with the last struggle, I would still, with the last gasp of that voice, implore you to remember the truth—God has given America to be free. * * * In the name of the One who made you, the Savior who redeemed you, in the name of the millions whose very breath is now hushed, as, in intense expectation, they look up to you for the awful words, 'You are free'."

Abraham Lincoln, on leaving Springfield, Ill., on February 11, 1861, to take up his duties as President, expressed his sorrow at leaving and:

"I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail.

"Trusting in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

An account of a parade by the American Army the morning of May 7, 1778, after the terrible winter at Valley Forge, tells that "in solemn silence the American Army at Valley Forge united in thanksgiving to Almighty God that He had given them one friend on earth. One theme was universal and it flutters yet in the breasts of millions: 'Praise God from whom all blessings flow.'"

Daniel Webster, in a speech before the New York Historical Society, February 22, 1852, said:

"And let me say, gentlemen, that if we and our posterity shall be true to the Christian religion, if we and they shall live always in the fear of God, and shall respect His commandments, if we and they shall maintain just, moral sentiments, and such conscientious convictions of duty as shall control the heart of life—we may have the highest hopes of the future of our country."

And so it was in the speeches of leaders of all parties. All spoke of God and acknowledged His help in forming and prospering the United States of America. They accepted sincerely the adopted motto, "In God we trust." They believed literally in the prophecy in the last verse of the national anthem, "Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just; let this be our motto, 'In God is our trust,' and the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

But where are we today? The mention of God is not permitted in many of our publicly supported schools. Teaching of religion is tabu in all public schools, yet atheism and communism have been taught both openly and secretly, and the former still is being openly taught in many schools of the Nation.

In place of acknowledgment of divine favors and appeals for divine guidance, many leaders today mention God only by using His name in vain in hurling epithets at someone opposing them.

One of the latest acts of replacing right with supposed might is the ruling made which does not exempt from the draft young men called as missionaries for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. Real leaders all over the Nation are pleading for a rebirth of morality and spirituality among the people of America and the world. It is doubtful if any system in the world is so potent in producing lasting spirituality and morality as is the Mormon missionary system. Yet now that system is being subordinated to the draft—another victory of so-called might over right.

Abundant evidence is readily available to show that these missionaries, after spending 2 to 2½ years in church service, have been outstanding in the military organizations of our country. Not only have they lived righteously in the midst of temptations, but they have helped countless numbers of their buddies to live high moral standards not common in the Armed Forces. As the knight of old said: "My strength is as the strength of 10, because my heart is pure," so have these returned missionaries been an outstanding asset to the armed services.

But now the powers that be have said that this missionary training must stop, except as permission might be given by the draft boards.

America, whither are you going? Can you hope to overcome evil with still more evil? Armed might with still more armed might? Remember it has been said "He that lives by the sword shall perish by the sword."

Let's not dry up our fountains of righteousness in our frenzy to rearm. No weapon is so potent against the evils of communism as are Christian standards. Let's be sure these are maintained, lest we in America, though blest with victory in armed conflict, may find that we have lost something even more precious—our ability and desire to champion right.

Surely the words of Abraham Lincoln, written in a proclamation of March 20, 1863, are even more applicable today than then:

"We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power, as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us, then, to humble ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

Pity the Poor Businessman

With the imposition of price controls, a mere protective dike against the surging tide of inflated currency and easy credit, we can expect to see the groceryman, the drygoods dealer, the furniture dealer, and other businessmen putting in a supply of aspirin as though to compete with the drug stores. But these merchants will not be stocking the aspirin for sale, but as a relief from the headaches they are now experiencing in trying to go along with the price-control program.

The first headache comes with the receipt of the voluminous and, often, confusing mass of directives, instructions, etc., which pour out uninterruptedly from the various Office of Price Stabilization offices. These require hours of study and cause more hours of worry for the groceryman and others, hours formerly spent in giving better service to customers at the lowest possible prices.

The next headache comes when the merchant tries to carry out the numerous directives which often, to him, seem contradictory, useless, or meaningless. He finds in marking his goods with both the ceiling price permitted by OPS and his own selling price, that the latter is almost always by far the lower of the two. Why, then, the ceiling price, when competition and the grocer's (or other businessman's) natural American desire to give his customers as much in goods and service as possible for the lowest possible price have kept and are keeping prices down? But here again go many hours of labor that ordinarily would be spent in service to customers, care of store, examination of stocks, etc.

Then comes a third headache in making out reports of this, reports of that, triplicate and duplicate reports seemingly without end. "When, oh, when, will I get time to take care of my business so as to serve the wants of my customers?" the exasperated businessman moans.

Then the final convulsion, the one which is liable to blow the top right off that businessman's noggin, will probably come when some politically appointed director, without experience in running a grocery or other store, comes in and starts telling the bewildered manager what to do, what not to do, what he has done wrong—and penalties which might be imposed—what he has failed to do at all, and so on and on and on until the groceryman (or other businessman) is liable to exclaim:

"Here, take my store, stock and all, run it the way it should be run, and I'll go out and get one of those common laborer jobs at a defense project or somewhere else and reap some of those inflated wages without this inflated headache the OPS is imposing on me."

Talk about waste of manpower. When a nation's energies, or even a considerable part thereof, are primarily used up in following directives from bureaucrats, instead of being used for production and service, that nation is on the road to decay. And when increasing numbers of men are taken from useful pursuits to police and enforce the directives, there is another great loss of productive power.

At best controls are but a dike against the flood of inflationary money, credit, featherbedding, etc., created or openly permitted by the same government which imposes the controls.

There are several ways of fighting inflation and every one calls for sacrifice on the part of some portion of or the entire citizenry.

The first and most important step is for the Federal Government to repeal the many inflationary laws and practices inaugurated during depression days to overcome deflation, such as easy credit, abundant currency without solid foundation, hundreds of thousands of Federal employees doing nonessential work or, as was the case of the former Georgia Governor, doing no work at all.

The next move is for States and counties and other taxing units to reduce nonessential expenditures for luxuries which are nice (for some) and to which many are now accustomed but which we cannot afford if we are to go all-out in defeating inflation at home and the Red menace abroad. Some of these luxuries may mean the trimming drastically of some unemployment compensation and of welfare assistance for persons who are perfectly able to work but who gladly accept—and in many cases demand—a living supplied by the sweat and toil of their neighbors.

Another step in defeating inflation must be longer working hours with no increase in pay for millions of laborers. There must be no more wage or salary increases, anywhere, without a corresponding increase in production or service.

Another way to fight inflation will be for people to buy more savings bonds and otherwise put part of their earnings into savings. But, until the Federal Government acts to show it is sincere in its desire to stop inflation, it's going to have a mighty hard job in selling savings bonds. People just don't want to put hard-earned money away in bonds which, when they mature, won't buy half as much as the money invested would have bought.

And finally, we must pay as we go for all defense and preparedness projects. This will mean higher taxes, of course, but if people

feel their taxes are being used wisely and not squandered on unnecessary activities and Government featherbedding, if they feel sure such taxes will help defeat both the Reds and inflation, they are not going to kick a great deal at tax increases.

Yes, to fight inflation calls for the same patriotism, the same sacrifices, the same determination that is required to fight a foe in Korea or elsewhere. And, as men are wounded and even die on that battlefield over there, so is the fight on inflation going to hurt some individuals and some groups here at home. But this inflation fight must be won if freedom is to continue in America. Have we, as a people, enough individual and group patriotism and fortitude to win that battle? An affirmative answer to that question must come very, very soon or America will go over the brink of national disaster.

One thing sure, controls are not the answer.

Policy Based on Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Policy Based on Fear," which appeared recently in the Idaho Statesman, Boise, Idaho.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY BASED ON FEAR

The administration rebuttal to MacArthur, on the part of the President and the Secretary of Defense, practically guarantees that the continued conduct of the Korean war will be along lines prevailing at present. Main contentions in the administration position could be summarized as follows:

1. China may be defeated, and peace restored, after enough Chinese soldiers have been killed in Korea to convince the Peiping Government of the futility of further conflict.

2. Carrying the war to the Chinese mainland would alienate America's allies, and perhaps bring Russia into the struggle.

3. War with Russia would almost certainly mean devastation of American cities by atomic bombs.

In addition to these points, the contention was made that General MacArthur had destroyed a peace possibility in his battlefield overture to the Red commander, and that his abrupt dismissal had kept him from making farewell statements which would have complicated General Ridgway's task.

The latter two items can be dismissed with the observation that they have not an iota of fact to justify their utterance. The remainder of the administration position can be summarized in one sentence: fear that an attempt to crush the Chinese Reds and end a war of indecision will convince Russia that the hour has struck in which to make its final, all-out bid for world conquest.

There is no denying the possibility of such an event; but its probability, as MacArthur emphasizes, is clearly another matter. Dictatorships, as Hitler proved, go to war when a careful assessment of relative strength convinces them that they have achieved a state of final readiness, with a better than 50-50 possibility of sudden victory—and with a careful attention to the element of planned surprise. No indication exists today that Russian strength has either been pushed to its total limit of war readiness or that its existing supply of military equipment would see it through a world war show-down—keeping in mind the massive superiority of American industrial production.

But always the counsel of the men around the President is to emphasize and overemphasize what Russia could do to this country in the event of a war, with little attention paid to what it would mean for any country to take on the United States in a final struggle for world ascendancy. General MacArthur labeled this attitude "defeatism," and it would seem to be an appropriate term.

A policy based on fear of Russia, rather than one based on actions calculated to make Russia fear this country, is the factor presently standing in the way of making Red China rue the day it asked for war. Pusillanimous actions and minimum assistance from U. N. allies have contributed to this sorry state of affairs, destroying any real hope of a truly unified offensive against a common foe, and laying the dreadful cost of protracted war squarely on the American people.

How long can the Korean war be allowed to continue, while a confused leadership hopes that the light of sweet reason will dawn upon Mao Tse-tung and the remainder of the Chinese puppet prisoners of Russia?

How long can the steadily increasing costs be borne—in lives and dollars?

The time is not too far off, it would seem, when these questions must either be answered, or the validity of continuing a halfway and hopeless conflict must be questioned.

The Korean war can easily drag on for years (as General Marshall himself admits) and in the meantime Russia will grow stronger (never using its own troops) while the United States is bled of its strength. The net result will be to weaken anti-Communist force throughout the world, in Europe and elsewhere, for American responsibilities are far-flung.

If no effort is to be made to knock China out of the war, in the interests of husbanding strength for the inevitable day of reckoning with Russia, then any further conduct of the Korean war appears to be without sound objective. Plainly the role which has been assigned to China is that of tying the United States down in a costly conflict, while feverish effort is being readied for Russia's final bid.

Better the United States should recognize that Korea has been a horrible trap, pull its army out entirely and fall back on Japan and Okinawa, than to keep it forever tied down in a stupid conflict in which it has no decent allied support and in which no final decision is to be sought.

New Sources of Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Sources of Steel" which appeared in the Washington Post, of March 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SOURCES OF STEEL

Sponsors of the St. Lawrence seaway have marshaled some convincing arguments before the House Public Works Committee. Among the most impressive is the contention that the seaway, opening the Great Lakes to oceangoing vessels in the Atlantic, is needed to make the rich iron-ore beds of Quebec and Labrador more available to American mills. With the present strong indications that this country will be drawing heavily upon these deposits in future years, it would not make sense to leave the development of the seaway to Canada alone. It is the type of project that preeminently calls for international cooperation.

Of course, the United States is not facing any critical shortage of iron ore. The Bureau of Mines estimates that only 25 to 30 percent of the Lake Superior-Mesabi deposits of 1,750,000,000 tons have been drilled. Other deposits are available in this country, in Venezuela, Mexico, and various parts of Canada. But in this age of steel a nation the size of ours must be forehanded in tapping mineral resources that may be urgently needed in the foreseeable future. Our standard of living no less than our security is dependent upon steel. For these reasons alone there are substantial advantages in drawing upon the estimated 2,000,000,000 tons of ore in the Labrador-Quebec ranges before our domestic supplies are exhausted. The St. Lawrence seaway would also make available by easier shipping methods an estimated billion tons of iron deposits in Newfoundland.

George M. Humphrey, president of the Cleveland company which is now developing huge iron-ore deposits in Labrador, called the seaway a vital necessity when he appeared before the House committee on Monday. It is natural that he should think so. But many others who have nothing directly to gain from the new shipping lanes that the St. Lawrence seaway would afford have come to think in similar terms. And their demands upon Congress are supported by still others who see widespread advantages in the new supplies of power that the project would create.

Beef Roll-Back Is Unfair to the Cattle Feeders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, since the announced roll-back on beef prices, there has been confusion and much misunderstanding. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by Max E. Markley, a cattle feeder, to the editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, and published in the May 13 issue of that newspaper under the heading, "Beef Roll-Back Is Unfair to the Cattle Feeders."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEEF ROLL-BACK IS UNFAIR TO THE CATTLE FEEDERS

To the EDITOR:

In the controversy over the beef roll-back order the administration takes the position that the returns to the producer are adequately covered by the parity figures. There is some merit in this argument with regard to the position of the primary producer of beef animal, but parity prices mean little or

nothing in determining the profit or loss in the later or fattening stages of beef production.

Beef production has quite generally passed the stage where one man has the cow herd, raises calves, carries them on until ready for grain feeding, and then fattens them before selling. Now it is usual for one rancher to specialize in the production of weanling calves, selling them in the fall to another specialist who winters these calves on hay and then runs them on grass through the second summer. When these calves are from 15 to 18 months old they are shipped to the central market and sold to the Corn Belt feeder. Some large feeding operations are conducted upon small acreages close to the terminal markets with all feeds purchased.

It is in these latter stages of beef production that the parity principle does not apply and where the roll-back is creating the grave injustice. To demonstrate, the following shows a somewhat simplified balance sheet of feed-lot operations.

100 choice 800-pound feeder steers at 36 cents	$28,800
Interest 6 months at 6 percent	864
Trucking, commissions, yardage, taxes, etc	1,650
Corn, 5,000 bushels at $1.40	7,000
Alfalfa hay, 20 tons at $30	600
Linseed oil meal, 18 tons at $60	1,230
Labor and power	1,440
Total costs	41,634

With a 1-percent death loss and a 2-pound-per-day gain there will be 113,850 pounds of live weight to sell. To cover all costs the feeder must have a price of 36 cents per pound to break even. At the pre-roll-back price of 40 cents per pound his net profit would have been but $4,554 for this sizable business operation. Under the present order his selling price for high-choice cattle is reduced to approximately 32 cents and this gives him a net loss of over $4,500.

Without the feeder beef supplies would be highly seasonal with an overabundance in the fall and early winter and a dearth during the balance of the year. The total supply would also be very short. The 800-pound feeder steer would yield but 400 pounds of tough stringy grass beef but after 6 months full feed in the lot the yield would be 700 pounds of top-quality tender meat.

MAX C. MARKLEY,
Cattle Feeder.

ST. PAUL.

The Constitution: Worth Having, Worth Defending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a short statement by me, and a copy of the oration delivered by Miss Kay Jon Mildon, the winner of the American Legion Oratorical Contest in my State. I ask unanimous consent that my statement and the oration be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and oration were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

Not many months ago the hearings before the House Un-American Activities Committee on communism developed that some of the graduates of America's most prominent educational institutions are allowed to receive their degrees without exposing themselves to a single course in American history, civics, or government. It is apparent to many of us that this real gap in the education of some of our so-called educated people is one of the reasons the totalitarian governments have been able to make impressions of their philosophies upon persons who do not realize the true nature of the heritage we Americans have, as a result of the struggle and fighting of our progenitors for our Government and its principles.

I am proud that the schools of my State are teaching history and government to the pupils. The oration of Miss Kay Jon Mildon, of Weber County High School, Ogden, Utah, the winner of the State American Legion oratorical contest in my State of Utah, indicates that she has been taught the real value of our heritage and the importance of our preserving it. I am having the oration printed in the RECORD so the Senate will know the views of this high-school girl on the Constitution, and will know what the schools of my State are teaching the youth.

THE CONSTITUTION: WORTH HAVING, WORTH DEFENDING

(Oration by Miss Kay Jon Mildon)

Man's destiny is progress. Across the centuries each thrust back has been canceled by a longer surge forward. The American Constitution crowned the best of all the ages which preceded it. It was the freedom of Greece and Rome, the Magna Carta, the defense of reason, the search for truth. It was the accumulated declaration of all human dignity.

"We, the people of the United States"—with these revolutionary words the writers of the Constitution introduced an instrument of government launching the greatest adventure in human liberty ever known to man. "We, the people"—our Government in our hands. Here is the true revolution of world history.

The Constitution is a design for independent men. It inspires critical thinking without conformity to any mind or time and lays aside all remorseless limits of inheritance. It dignifies the human spirit and says, "With what you are build your future." William Morton challenges pain and human suffering is eased; Cyrus Field believes the immensity of an ocean is not too wide for words and the Atlantic cable is laid; Benjamin Franklin makes service and wisdom and humor American trade-marks; Henry Ford gives distance a smaller meaning.

Poet and explorer, inventor, laborer, statesman, and architect—here is a legion of free men, each building America in the way he finds best, savoring the magic of the land, pushing back frontiers, justifying a way of life endorsed by the signers of the Constitution.

And a people worked and dreamed. The thing that was they made better. That which was not they created. The sun shone on an empire rising from a people's total genius. The burdens were lifted from men and animals to engines and machines. No unsolved problem went unchallenged. New power and skill brought higher productivity. They call it American know-how. Its other name is freedom.

From a compact of a people with themselves has evolved a state spanning a continent; whose wounds of civil war healed in insoluble oneness of spirit and purpose. There has grown up a mutuality of pride that this sovereign people could achieve so well.

For we are not a unique people except as our opportunities and heritage make us unique. We are the Slav and the Greek, the Norwegian and the Dane; we are the Welchman from the coal mine and the peasant from the field; we are the refugee from tyranny; we are the outcast and the adventurer, but we are freedom too—the product of the circumstances which gave us the power of decision.

We are nurtured where the first instinctive reaction is one of trust, for the protection of the constitution is constant. We can attend to our civic duties and then go about our affairs satisfied that our security is not hourly menaced.

Insecurity and fear are well known in America, but it isn't the pervasive fear of the informer, or the fear of guilt by supposition; it isn't the late knock at the door striking the heart cold. Our fears are tangible and capable of alternatives. They are tempered with the knowledge that extreme cases will be justly served.

Today with ours the strongest state left on the side of Christian civilization, we are confronted with the question, "Is the Constitution worth having, worth defending?" The freedom or slavery of mankind for hundreds of years may rest with our answer. Our time is now.

What are we going to do with our time? One man said, "I give you peace in our time." But men of good will declared peace was not enough. Another grasped for power. It was not enough. What is enough? How shall we acquit ourselves before the tribunal of the future? The noble objectives stated in the preamble of the Constitution have survived a turbulent century littered with the wrecks of governments and constitutions. Those whose footsteps preceded ours across the vast unknown of history have not faltered. They kept faith with destiny.

Let us ask ourselves what duties and obligations are ours and accept them with the same readiness that we do our privileges.

We have the duty, civic and moral, of social responsibility. Our time is now.

Our first civic duty is political insight. Knowing the fundamental concepts of our democracy is the surest avenue to its security. We shall not build it wide enough with ignorance. It has been the recurrent tragedy of history that men who had achieved a measure of freedom have let it slip from their grasp. Justice and liberty do not automatically reproduce themselves. They are born again and again from the vigilance of the people. It must be a realistic vigilance which considers both our limitations and potentialities. We are in need of competence in the basic operation of self-government.

Our second civic duty is action. We must vote according to our most considered conviction. We shall follow the performance of those whom we entrust with our Government and reinstate only those who are faithful to that trust.

It is our third civic duty to pay our taxes honestly. They secure for us blessings which no amount of money can safeguard elsewhere in the world. What price freedom to speak, to read, to hear, and choose? What would you bid for a fair trial, the right of habeas corpus, and property? For how much would you sell your right to vote? What price freedom to worship? What price freedom? The privileges and security we enjoy should be paid for by us who possess them.

And there are other civic duties we must assume. We shall give our laws and respect of observance; we shall serve on juries as called and be willing witnesses in court as the occasion arises; we shall act to seek out those who wrap themselves in the protective cover of the Constitution they conspire to destroy; we shall promote the settlement of disputes by peaceful means which unites our strength or the common welfare.

Exploding in headlines across our daily newspapers is the news which is no longer news—that democracy is in danger. The nations sit like competitors at a game board, wary of every move, jostling for advantages, real or imaginary. What will happen to the Constitution? The answer will have to come from the actions of common men.

Our social responsibility includes moral duties based on the Christian ethic. The Christian ethic is the tap root of our national greatness. From it our moral code derives its vitality. Let us not assume that we can defend our Constitution without a deep and abiding faith in God, and the fulfillment of our duties in accordance to that faith.

We need to think not alone in terms of our rights but also of the rights of others; not always in terms of what's in it for me, but what can I put in it for him. It is a practical principle which means further that we will insist upon justice and equality for others. The loss of a single right can weaken or destroy democracy. We shall corrupt no man to gain a privilege and refuse corruption to ourselves. We should be as eager to be worthy of success as we are to be successful. We should keep our spiritual and intellectual forces abreast of our material gains. Otherwise the very means we use for self-defense may be self-defeating. The fulfilling of our best possibilities will not be too much. Our time is now.

It is our duty to direct the immense productive energies of America toward the end of poverty and want and the causes of war. We must keep the power of world decisions in the hands of those who love justice and right. Otherwise we may have no Constitution to defend. Our destiny of greatness is ours only by performance.

There are many called upon to defend the Constitution in ways more heroic than words. In places of Government upholding their highest convictions unswerved and unbought. Upon the battlefield there is a price for freedom. In our lives so little altered by the rumble of distant guns it is easy to forget. We must be fortified with our cause. America was built by a people unafraid of the future. It shall be upheld by a people who are unafraid, a people fulfilling their civic and moral responsibilities.

Turning from the last momentous struggle to preserve our freedom we took stock of the miracle of accomplishment, and the price which had been paid. From the peaceful American soil had sprung the giant machines of war, and the valiant hands to use them. Together they went out to explain a free man's love of freedom and his determination to keep it. It came at a price. But there are better ways to measure lives than by their years. These had been spent for the bright coin of freedom.

We are the children of a way of life made possible by the Constitution. The present effort may have to speak even more eloquently than the last to preserve our civil liberties. Our time is now.

Is the Constitution worth having, worth defending? There is only one answer—given in sober dedication.

Yes, America.

American Legion Proposes a Strong, Sound, and Thoroughly American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the national executive committee of the American Legion at its spring meeting in Indianapolis has adopted a fighting program against communism. If by some happy miracle the main points of this program would suddenly be adopted by our Government, it would be like a blast of fresh air across the Nation inspiring new life in our decaying foreign policy.

True to its tradition, the Legion plainly recognizes America's foes. The Legion is not fooled by the propaganda of the Communists. It is well aware of the fact that America is in a fight to the finish with communism and that we can afford no compromise with it.

If the Legion program for America were adopted in the main we would be through forever with coddling Communists at home and appeasing them abroad. Childish notions that the Communists may drop their aggressive ideas play no part in shaping this program which maps a path for America's survival.

I include herewith a news item which appeared in the May 10, 1951, issue of the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes, which article sets forth the high lights of the foreign relations resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion:

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF LEGION SEEKS TO BREAK REDS—MAY MEETING ADOPTS AGGRESSIVE PROGRAM AGAINST COMMUNISM AT HOME AND ABROAD—BACKS COCKE IN MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY—WOULD CHALLENGE KREMLIN WITH FORCE—WANTS ACHESON FIRED

The national executive committee of the American Legion got tough May 2-4 at Indianapolis, Ind., when, at its spring meeting, it molded an aggressive program to "break the hammer and blunt the sickle" of communism both at home and abroad.

The first action of the committee backed completely by resolution the attitude and policy voiced courageously by National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., of Dawson, Ga., when he came out publicly for the removal of restrictions on military operations in the Korean war. Cocke recently completed an unprecedented world tour, during which he visited 22 countries and traveled 32,000 miles in 37 days. During that period he had conversed with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo. He went to Korea for first-hand battle-line information, spent time with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, and covered pretty thoroughly the European theaters of possible world war III action. The Legion supported its national commander when it reaffirmed policies earlier adopted by the organization seeking the use of Chiang's troops in the Korean war, calling for the bombing of strategic areas in Manchuria, for the blockading of Red Chinese ports, and demanding a defense of Formosa.

The committee, with a few minor changes, went on record in a 36-point resolution in support of the report of the foreign relations commission, headed by Donald R. Wilson, of West Virginia. This long resolution also in large measure reaffirmed Legion policy which seeks to gird this country for a possible global war with communism.

It not only called once more for the ouster of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State, but it also pulled no punches in condemning Great Britain for "trafficking with the enemy" by carrying on trade with Red China.

The committee adopted a series of resolutions presented by its Americanism commission, through A. Luke Crispe, of Vermont, seeking a "get tough" policy with Reds at home. It reiterated by resolution further demands of the Legion, through its security commission headed by Bruce P. Henderson, of Ohio. In all, some 14 commissions and a half dozen committees made strong reports on international and national affairs and dealt with internal organization matters.

FOREIGN RELATIONS DEMANDS

High lights of the Foreign Relations resolution included:

1. Branding of the Soviet Union and her satellites as having embarked upon a course of conduct calculated to enslave the world, characterized by duplicity, savagery, immorality and lawlessness, and condemning their international banditry.

2. Reaffirmation of faith in the ultimate victory of the principles and ideals of the United Nations and rededication to the effort to strengthen this international organization.

3. Reiteration of opposition to United States participation in any form of world federation.

4. We must continue to aid those nations of Western Europe and others throughout the world which have joined with us in the global struggle to destroy the forces of Communist aggression. But we say the time for give-away programs has ended. The Santa Claus attitude of our State Department has not won us fighting friends but has only increased the cries from all over the world for more and more of the American taxpayers' dollar.

5. Limiting, reducing, and discontinuing as soon as possible Marshall plan aid so that the drain on the United States Treasury will be stopped and limiting point 4 aid to offering American technical know-how.

6. We see a growing tendency on the part of the State Department to become an operating department rather than a policy-making agency. Instead of giving away the substance of America in a very unrealistic way, we suggest that the State Department concentrate on the major task of formulating American plans to combat the very real threats to our security throughout the world. * * * We don't have that kind of leadership in our State Department today. To get the leadership required, we must remove the present corps of leaders whose every action has reflected incompetency, indecision, and defeatism. They must be replaced by a corps of realists—men of high purpose and courage—who are not afraid, who have underlating confidence in American power and ingenuity and who will by meriting our respect, face the future with resolution and faith.

7. Continued strengthening of the military and political effectiveness of the North Atlantic Treaty organization and the inclusion of Spain, Greece, and Turkey.

8. Strengthening of Western Germany economically, politically, and militarily.

9. Treating Communist China in every sense as an aggressor.

10. Opposition to recognition of Red China by the United States and against seating Red China in the United Nations.

SCORES TRAFFIC WITH ENEMY

11. Calling on Congress and the U. N. to take the necessary steps, including the imposition of a blockade, to stop trading in war materials with Communist countries.

12. Bombing of Communist bases, concentration of troops, supplies, and equipment in China or wherever they may be found to prevent their being used by the forces of aggression to forestall and make more costly the successful prosecution of the present conflict in Korea.

13. Continue defense of Formosa.

14. Remove all restrictions against the use of Chinese Nationalists in fight against Communist aggressors.

15. Speedy conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan.

16. Aid to the fullest extent to the Philippine Government.

17. Creation of a regional defense pact by the free nations of the far Pacific and southeastern Asia.

18. We are practicularly concerned with the precarious geographical location and the strategic and economic importance of Iran and we urge that any attempt by outside influences to take over control of that country be vigorously opposed by the United Nations.

19. Providing grain for India only in exchange for the strategic materials which we need and which they can provide to us.

20. Revitalizing of the Voice of America program and transferring it from the Department of State to an independent administrative and operating agency.

21. Development of guerrilla forces in Communist countries to carry on a campaign of sabotage such as Russia is carrying on against other nations of the world.

AMERICANISM PROPOSALS

Resolutions of the Americanism chairman included:

1. Swift and adequate retaliation against Czechoslovakia for the imprisonment of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis to end the persecution of American citizens by Communist governments.

2. Immediate arrest and establishment of detention camps for 14,000 highly skilled saboteurs now under surveillance and awaiting only the Communist order to unloose violence and destruction.

3. Denial of bail for persons found guilty of subversive acts, pending their appeal.

4. Disbarment of Communist lawyers.

5. Denial of the use of the mails to subversive groups.

6. Full-scale probes by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the extent of subversive infiltrations in defense industries, communications, transportation, Government agencies, the field of entertainment and other sensitive branches of the country's nerve system.

7. Setting forth a five-point sincerity test for recanting Communist and Communist front supporters.

1951 Merchandising and Management Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Monday, May 14, our colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] delivered a fine address before the 1951 merchandising and management conference held under the auspices of the University of Maryland. Through long experience in his present post as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, the junior Senator from Alabama is well qualified to discuss the problems facing the 2,000,000 retailers who constitute so large a segment of our economy. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, I am especially pleased to be with you this evening and to have the opportunity to participate in the University of Maryland's merchandising and management conference. One reason is that I believe in times of economic stress the problems of the distributive services do not in general receive the attention they deserve.

In any industrial mobilization program, with its heavy emphasis on production, there is perhaps a natural tendency for manufacturing to be in the limelight. It is regrettable that there is not a more general awareness of the problems and difficulties encountered by retailers. That is why such conferences as this which stimulate discussion and thinking about retailing in a defense effort serve such a useful purpose.

Another reason why I welcomed this occasion to talk with you is because, as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, I have a deep and active interest in the problems and welfare of retail establishments, the majority of which, as you know, are considered small business.

No one will fail to agree, I am sure, that our almost 2,000,000 retail outlets form, in large part, the economic backbone of every American community. Our tremendous national talent for production has its fruition when an article of merchandise crosses a store counter into the hands of a consumer.

There can be no doubt that the key factor in our ability to sustain a major and extended defense effort is the continued expansion of our entire economy. This means that we must not overlook a single workable method of maintaining a balance between our military production and the continuance, at as high a rate as circumstances allow, of goods and services for our civilian needs. Achieving that state of balance is one of the most difficult problems confronting the Congress and the executive branch today.

Those officials charged with the management of our mobilization program are trying—and rightly so, I believe—to achieve a rate of armament production which will make us as strong as we need to be militarily, while at the same time they are attempting to minimize the disruptions in our civilian markets. It is really a problem of scheduling. We are trying to avoid a rising curve of military production which would be straight up for the next year or two. If we did that and overloaded ourselves with munitions, and if by then there was no outbreak of a general war, our economy would certainly be strained by the abrupt cessation of military purchases.

Currently, we are spending some $5,000,000,000 a month on military goods. About 8 percent of our productive capacity is channeled into defense production. This rate is expected to increase until, in 1953, about 20 percent of our industrial effort will be on a war footing. It is my sincere hope that we shall be able to achieve this goal without the economic dislocations which raised such havoc with small-business establishments during the early years of World War II.

Then, as you will easily remember, many small enterprises become home-front casualties. In 1941, total retail establishments numbered 1,590,000. A year later there were but 1,433,700. In 1943, a further decrease brought the figure down to 1,324,700. In other words, 18 percent—almost one out of five—of our retailers closed their doors between 1941 and 1943.

The situation now, of course, is nowhere as grave as it was during the dark early days of the last war. Let us not on that account, however, become complacent. We must guard carefully against that. For I need not tell you that we are living from day to day with the possibility that the Kremlin may decide at any time to set the civilized world aflame.

One of the prices which as individuals and as businessmen we must pay to make our country strong is a greater participation by Government in the affairs of business. In a word, controls.

Regimentation, as such, is repugnant to all of us. We are now as a Nation, in fact, fighting a war against an enemy who would fetter the bodies and minds of free men. There is probably no one here this evening who does not realize that our very existence depends on our ability so to manage our economy that it will be able to withstand the tremendous pressure we are placing on it.

It was Stalin's predecessor, Lenin, who said: "The easiest way to conquer a country is to debauch its currency." That is frightening truth. The valor of our fighting men will be nullified if we at home permit inflation to sap the strength from our economy. To get out of the shadow of printing-press money we have had to impose price, wage, rent, and credit controls.

Only last week the President stated that there is a better chance during the next 2 years of our controls having to be made tighter instead of their easing off. It looks as though we are going to have to learn to live in a partially controlled economy. I think the best way to do that is to increase our awareness of the objectives of those who have been given the very heavy responsibility of guiding our national economy in the troubled days ahead. Most reasonable men, I feel confident, will be willing to trade, on a temporary basis, a few of their time-honored ways of doing business in order to help preserve our national heritage of freedom.

I realize that the pricing regulations of the Office of Price Stabilization have been a burden to many businessmen. They bear, of course, most heavily on the small retailers, such as hardware-store owners, who must establish prices on hundreds of small items. Admittedly the reporting requirements will at first be troublesome. There are bound to be inconveniences, even possibly some inequitables, in the early stages of any program of national scope. Efforts will be made to correct them, I am sure. And I can assure you that the staff of the Senate Small Business Committee is constantly in touch with the regulatory agencies in an effort to represent the interests of the smaller members of our business community.

Because of my interest in the problems of small retailers, I had recently brought to my attention a suggestion which certainly seems worth exploring. The idea, in brief, is that all retail stores with an annual sales volume of less than $50,000 could be exempted from all pricing regulations. The points made by the advocates of this plan contend that the smaller stores are overburdened with the task of complying with the complicated pricing regulations, especially the time and manpower involved in preparing the pricing charts under ceiling price regulation 7. It is further contended that OPS will have to have a tremendous enforcement staff to check on the approximately 987,000 retail establishments which fall within the group of those doing less than $50,000 business.

Those who favor this small-business exemption feel that the price competition afforded by the larger stores which would be under regulation would force the smaller store owners to keep their prices in line with the ceilings. As I have said, the proposal is interesting and certainly one which our Small Business Committee will look into carefully. It does occur to me, however, that there must be many communities in this vast country of ours in which there are no stores with sales much over $50,000 a year, and these small towns and villages would then, in a price sense, not be in a competitive area.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that, when it comes to combating inflation, we must move on a level which is above the narrow interests of any particular groups. One of the most insidious aspects of inflation is that it gives many persons a false

sense of well-being. This is psychological sabotage in its least detectible and therefore most dangerous form. Wages, income, and profits are high. Everybody likes that. Personal income in March was at the record high annual rate of $242,000,000,000. Despite the wage stabilization order of last January, wages rose for the thirteenth consecutive month.

It is estimated that since March of 1950, the total wages paid by private industry climbed 18 percent. Corporate profits, of course, have more than kept pace with wages, to say nothing of the cost of living index.

It is not to be wondered then, that some harsh economic realities tend to be glossed over by those who are unmindful of the danger inherent in a runaway type of inflation. For instance, the tax bill passed by the Congress last October was designed to raise the Government's revenue by about $4,500,000,000. Since then, spiraling price increases, totaling some $6,000,000,000, have wiped out that gain.

Or to state it another way, rising prices have chewed up $2,000,000,000 out of every $10,000,000,000 that has been appropriated for the mobilization program. As retailers, as consumers, and certainly as taxpayers you should have a very direct interest in your Government's efforts to curtail all unnecessary expenditures in connection with our defense activities. We could afford to buy a great many long-range bombers with the money we have let run down the drainpipe of inflation.

You in the retail trade will probably agree that our wage and price controls have already had a breaking effect on "scarce" buying. I am told that since the first of the year, consumer buying has resumed a more normal pattern. Present heavy inventories have produced price reductions in many lines.

On the subject of pricing regulations and of retail inventories, I recently received an interesting letter from a department-store owner in my own State, which said, in part:

"I don't think you are going to have to worry much longer about price ceilings because the consumer market is glutted with merchandise. Somebody woefully underestimates the ability of industry in this country to produce. Unless something is done, my opinion is that by 1952 it will require the most phenomenal selling effort in history to move the merchandise produced in the factories of the United States."

I do not believe, however, that we can look for a continuation of the present inventory picture. As our mobilization program gains speed in the months ahead, we can almost certainly expect spot shortages in some classes of consumer goods. The military is going to take bigger and bigger bites out of the available supply of materials. It now appears that by July more than half of our steel production will be earmarked for defense and defense-supporting programs. That means that unless we place some curbs on consumer purchasing power, more and more dollars will be competing for less and less goods. That is also why our real battle with inflationary forces is yet to come.

The Congress has started to frame new tax legislation which is expected to raise revenue estimated to be in the neighborhood of $7,000,000,000. Taxes, of course, are always painful. But I do not believe that any tax program in the history of our Nation can have a more salutary effect than those which we must raise to finance our present defense effort.

Current taxes provide us with two direct benefits. They help us, in the first place, to keep our rearmament program on a pay-as-you-go basis. The desirability of this, the absolute necessity, in fact, needs no explanation. If we do not foot our defense bill as it falls due, we shall certainly have to pay a higher price for it in terms of skyrocketing living costs and higher defense costs.

Secondly, I think we all by now realize that price and credit controls cannot by themselves effectively clamp a ceiling on prices. The amount of spending money in corporate and consumer hands must also be curbed if we are to avoid the disastrous effects of a widespread buying spree.

If present deliberations on the subject prevail, we as individuals will have our tax rate increased by three percentage points in each bracket. That will provide the Government with slightly less than $3,000,000,000. In addition, levies will be made on your companies to raise between two and three billion.

In the field of taxation I and my colleagues on the Senate Small Business Committee have tried to protect the interests of small independent enterprises. I think our efforts have met with some success. Under the original excess-profits tax, as you will recall, no minimum credit was provided. Now, any company or store earning less than $25,000 does not have to pay an excess-profits tax. In addition, new companies, started since the beginning of 1946, are entitled to a credit equal to their entire industry's average rate of return on assets during the base period.

The exemption for the smaller retailers becomes quite significant when you stop to realize that about 56 percent of all retail establishments have annual sales under $50,000.

No discussion of retailing and our defense effort can be complete, I am well aware, without commenting on regulation W. I can recall that last September, just before this curb on credit was instituted, many businessmen, and especially small retailers, felt that they were going to be badly hurt. I think there was a sense of relief when it became clear that our own installment-credit regulations turned out to be much less stringent than those in Canada, which require 50 percent cash down with only 12 months in which to pay the balance.

We all know that a great part of consumer and business spending since 1950 had been, so to speak, on the cuff. From the end of June 1950, through March, bank loans increased by more than $12,000,000,000. This splurge in credit was almost as much as had taken place in the entire years of 1947 and 1948. There seemed to be a mass impulse for the buying public to dip into savings for current expenditures. From June through March of this year redemptions of savings bonds exceeded bond purchases by over a billion dollars. Savings accounts themselves shrank by three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Regulation W then was a necessary hold-the-line action until such times as we could throw our price ceiling mechanism into gear. The anti-inflationary effect is seen in the reduction between December 1950 and March of this year of $364,000,000 in installment credits.

Softening markets in some consumer durable items have crested demands for the relaxation of regulation W. The television industry, for instance, has requested the Federal Reserve Board to ease the credit terms on television-set sales. The industry would like to see dealers permitted to accept old sets to count as trade-ins as part of the down payment or, better yet, a reduction in the down payment from 25 to 15 percent.

At present the Reserve Board is disinclined to tamper with the present terms of the regulation, on the grounds, I am informed, that a firm case has not been made that the credit restrictions alone are responsible for the slacking TV sales.

I do not believe that anyone will disagree that regulation W's bark turned out to be much worse than its bite. The dollar sales volume of department stores, for instance, are substantially ahead of last year's figures, with consumer durable and semi-durable goods seeming to have had the greatest appeal to the buying public. In the District of Columbia for March, the sales index of department stores stands at 249 as opposed to 234 for March a year ago.

On a Nation-wide basis, department-store sales for the week ending May 5 rose 8 percent above the figure for the same period of 1950. Specialty stores recorded only half that gain.

From what we know about the effects of restricting installment-credit buying, I do not think we can reasonably take a harsh view toward regulation W. In fact, I should not be surprised if there are not some small retailers who have actually benefited from it, at least to the extent that it has placed all sellers on an equal basis. The lower down payment with longer balance periods by which heavily capitalized firms were able to entice customers possibly worked to the disadvantage of smaller firms which could not wait so long for their money on a sale.

I am not at all sure that some action should not also be taken to restrict charge accounts, which can easily be viewed as the installment buying of the relatively well-to-do. In this connection it would perhaps be pertinent to cite another phase of the problem which was brought to my attention recently in a letter from a small appliance dealer in Mississippi.

The letter reads in part: "The Federal Reserve Board is basing their decision on factory sales figures, which represent buying by large well-financed outlets for stockpiling purposes. The large well-financed outlet is also selling the appliances on a 30- or 60-day charge account, knowing full well that the customer cannot pay this in that time. The customer will then go to a bank on credit company to pay the debt in full, and then pay for the appliance without making any down payment at all. A large outlet is also able to put a specific article in the lay-away-plan, which we cannot do."

It seems to me that retailers will directly benefit from the general manufacturers' order, recently issued by the Office of Price Stabilization, to establish new and more realistic ceiling prices for some 75,000 industrial firms. This order obliges manufacturers to roll back those prices which have risen excessively since Korea. We know that price increases have been more on the producer and wholesale level than at retail. For example, the retail price of woolen blankets has increased approximately 25 percent. Raw wool, however, is almost 150 percent more than it was last June. Consumer resistance has made it impossible for stores to match the increase at the producer level. One result is that some stores are replacing wool blanket inventory with less expensive, but more salable, synthetic blankets.

I would like to give you my assurance that the Congress, and especially the Senate Small Business Committee, intends to make the burden of our mobilization program fall as lightly as possible on the smaller business units, whether they be factories, wholesalers, retailers, or operators of service-type establishments.

I think that you may accept as a token of this intent the fact that the Small Business Committee, the chairmanship of which I consider a high privilege, is the first permanent committee created by the Senate to maintain a watchful guard over the interests of our smaller independent businesses.

In addition, the Defense Production Act of 1950, which provides the legislative framework for our war effort, clearly states that it is the policy of Congress to encourage small businesses to make the maximum contribution toward our defense program. It also contains such safeguards as providing that small business shall have representation on all business advisory committees, and that special efforts shall be made for

the expeditious handling of all requests, applications, or appeals from hardships and regulations by small concerns.

The act, moreover, directs the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission to study any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, strengthen monopolies, or in any way injure small business by promoting undue concentration of economic power.

Even so, I am not personally satisfied that we have succeeded in setting up adequate safeguards for smaller firms. In order, therefore, to make as certain as possible that small concerns are given a square deal, I have reintroduced in the Senate a bill now known as the Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1951.

Briefly, the bill provides for the establishment of an independent agency with the authority to make loans to small businesses and to provide many other general services required by smaller companies which must meet the keen competition of big business.

Meanwhile, our Senate committee is trying to fill the gap. For we realize that there are many disadvantages, many instabilities inherent in smallness. These are accentuated in times of economic stress. Our job is to see to it that the rules of fair play are observed. As the momentum of our war effort mounts, business dislocations will create continuous problems for all businessmen.

Some concerns dealing in nonessential lines will undoubtedly suffer hardships. There will be consumer shortages. Do not lose sight of the fact that we must share many of our basic materials with our friends throughout the world who share with us a dread of communistic aggression. We know that we are going to have to shoulder a much heavier tax burden. And business is going to be called upon to operate with many restrictions until the present emergency is past.

These are facts which we shall have to face and live with for an undetermined number of years. It will require sacrifices and much self-discipline. For we are in this struggle for better or for worse. We cannot hope for victory in this struggle for freedom if very many of us fail to accept our full responsibility as citizens and, most importantly, as businessmen.

You, as representatives of retailing, have a vital role to play from now on out. To a considerable extent our civilian economy is in your hands. Our standard of living, our entire American way of life is symbolized by the goods and services you provide. I know they are in good hands.

Need for Full and Careful Study of Various Services to the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct attention to the fact that I have introduced H. R. 4079, a bill to establish a Temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind.

At the present time the various Federal programs for services to the blind are being handled by nearly a dozen bureaus and agencies. You can readily visualize the confusion that has developed in the mind of the average blind person seeking guidance and assistance when that person makes an inquiry for help from the Federal Government and does not direct the inquiry specifically to one of the immediate agencies concerned. Days and weeks pass sometimes before a letter finally reaches the correct office for attention. When we realize that Government expenditures for services to the blind amount to approximately $80,000,000 annually and that many other agencies, including private agencies, expend approximately $60,000,000 annually in this important and worth-while effort, it is readily apparent that careful planning and coordination are essential to accomplish the maximum benefits and services intended.

The problems arising from blindness constitute a major social and economic problem in our country. I am told that approximately 30,000 people are going blind in our land every year. We must, therefore, make every effort to plan and coordinate all activities in order to accomplish the maximum benefits and services in meeting this most important problem.

The recent expansion in welfare work supported by taxation frequently raises questions regarding the relationship between publicly supported and privately supported activities in behalf of the blind, specifically in regard to possible duplication or overlapping of efforts. A well coordinated and integrated program should result in maximum services which in no way compete with each other, duplicate or overlap the various efforts. Every consideration should be directed toward making these services more complete and more effective.

As early as 1862, legislation was enacted in this field which has from time to time been supplemented, amended, and added to, without much, if any, reference to any preconceived plan. Future development will probably follow the same lines unless a careful over-all study is made at this time with a view to making recommendations to the President and to the Congress for complete, intelligent, coordinated effort in this important field. Until such a study and recommendations are made, it is doubtful if there will be anything approaching uniform services to the blind throughout the country.

I wish to emphasize that such a study would in no way lessen the need for the effectiveness of national private agencies for the blind, because there is a definite area of opportunity both for private agencies and public agencies on all levels—national, State, and local.

I sincerely believe that the efforts of this national committee would materially strengthen the work for the blind throughout the Nation. I am hopeful that the Members of Congress will give early and favorable consideration to this proposal.

The provisions of H. R. 4079 are as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TEMPORARY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE BLIND

SECTION 1. There is hereby established a National Advisory Committee for the Blind (in this act referred to as the "committee"). The committee shall investigate and study the entire field of existing Federal, State, and local activities related to the granting of service to the blind, including the history and development of such activities. The committee shall report to the President and to the Congress, on or before January 3, 1953, the results of such investigation and study, together with recommendations (1) for accomplishing greater coordination of and more effective results from such activities, (2) for the attainment of maximum benefits for the blind, and (3) with respect to such other matters as the committee may deem appropriate.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 2. (a) The committee shall be composed of nine members to be appointed by the President, as follows:

(1) One individual from the executive branch of the Federal Government;

(2) One individual from the Senate of the United States;

(3) One individual from the House of Representatives of the United States;

(4) One individual from among officers and employees of State governments;

(5) One individual from a national association of professional workers with the blind;

(6) One individual from a national organization of the blind;

(7) One individual from a national research organization for the blind;

(8) One individual from the field of education of the blind; and

(9) One individual from the public at large.

(b) Members appointed pursuant to paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9) of subsection (a) shall be appointed from among individuals who are not officers or employees of the United States or of any State or local government.

(c) Not more than five members of the committee shall be from the same political party.

(d) Any vacancy in the committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 4. Five members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) Each member of the committee who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for his services as an officer or employee of the United States, but he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in him by the committee.

(b) Each member of the committee who is not an officer or employee of the United States shall receive $25 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the committee, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of his duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 6. The committee shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

POWERS OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 7. (a) The committee, or any authorized member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the committee or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the committee may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the committee or before any authorized member thereof.

(b) The committee, or any authorized member thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the committee, or any authorized member thereof, upon request made by the chairman of the committee or any authorized member thereof.

(c) The committee, or any authorized member thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated under authority of this act. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member. Sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 9. The committee shall cease to exist within 30 days after the committee submits its report pursuant to section 1.

Conditions in Pacific Coast Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to my remarks today on the danger to national security presented by the weakened condition of our American merchant marine and the maritime industry as a whole, I wish to place in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, an organization of San Francisco area unions, at their meeting of April 16. This resolution calls particular attention to the disastrous state of affairs now existing in Pacific coast shipyards and presents a program for their betterment. I certainly subscribe to the two recommendations in the resolution and urge that immediate steps be taken to effectuate them.

The resolution follows:

Whereas since 1947 contracts for the construction of only a few small vessels have been awarded the private yards of the Pacific coast; and

Whereas recognizing the danger to national defense of a policy of not maintaining well dispersed shipyards, staffed with a nucleus of skilled workmen, constant efforts have been made to win an allocation of contracts to the private yards of the Pacific coast; and

Whereas despite the recognition of this principle, agencies of the Government have opposed allocation, contending that in peacetime only a relatively small number of vessels would be constructed, and that any arbitrary division of work would "destroy the more efficient yards"; and

Whereas specifically the Maritime Commission said "The volume of work involved in a wartime or emergency program makes the allocation of work desirable, whereas a peacetime limited construction program does not." (Letter from Philip B. Fleming to Schuyler Otis Bland, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, July 6, 1949); and

Whereas specifically the Munitions Board said "The proposed allocation would be effective only when applied to a large Government construction program. When applied to the current program, the work may be spread so thin as to put out of business valuable east coast yards with many years of experience." (Letter of May 27, 1949 to Schuyler Otis Bland from Maj. Gen. Patrick W. Timberlake, Munitions Board Deputy Director of Staff, Merchant Marine Committee hearings, p. 118); and

Whereas specifically the Navy said "Recognition of the fact that there is less than a desirable distribution of shipbuilding throughout the country does not permit the conclusion that part of the existing effort should be transferred elsewhere. Rather should it follow that additional shipbuilding should be fostered, and the industry nurtured to a healthy condition." (Supplementary statement of Rear Adm. Charles D. Wheelock, Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships, made to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, June 23, 1949, contained on p. 122 of hearings); and

Whereas Congress preparing intelligently to meet this emergency has authorized:

1. The construction of Mariner type vessels by the Maritime Board.

2. The construction of 170 naval vessels and the conversion of 291 others; and

Whereas the private yards of the Pacific coast, which built 42 percent of the vessels constructed during World War II, have little work, unstable employment conditions, are forcing skilled shipyard employees into other industries in this a time of national emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, in meeting at San Francisco, Calif., the evening of the 16th day of April 1951, That the mobilization base be expanded to embrace the private yards of the Pacific coast, the construction records of which were unequaled in World War II; and be it further

Resolved, That—

1. The remaining Mariner type construction contracts (10 estimated) be allocated to Pacific coast yards—26 already having been assigned Atlantic and Gulf coast yards, and

2. A fair share of the Navy construction and conversion program be assigned to the private yards of the Pacific coast; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Maritime Board, the Navy Bureau of Ships, and to all Congressman and Senators from the States of California, Washington, and Oregon, and the metal trades department, A. F. of L.

Postal Pay Increase Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a self-explanatory newspaper article from the San Jose Mercury-Herald:

FIFTY-FIVE TO QUIT POST OFFICE IN SAN JOSE IF NO PAY RAISE, POLL SHOWS

San Jose Post Office may face a [illegible] shortage if Congress fails to authorize a 17 percent across-the-board pay raise under bills pending in Senate and House bills propose raises for all postal workers in the United States, including supervisory.

Cross-section poll of 118 out of the San Jose carriers showed that 55 plan leaving the service if Congress does not approve the raise, according to C. C. Rambaw, legislative committee chairman, branch 195, National Association of Letter Carriers. "Twenty-four percent have part-time outside jobs to make ends meet," he said. "Wives of 35 percent also work to help out."

"We are appealing to the public to write California Representatives and Senators urging passage of the bills," said Rambaw. "Pending is Senate bill 353 and H. R. 3[illegible]. Senate hearings have been held but not even a subcommittee has acted in the House.

"Our survey showed," said Rambaw, "that the average carrier has approximately three dependents, besides his own [illegible]. Twenty-three percent rent homes, 16 percent live with relatives, and 32 percent are buying homes. Nine percent were unemployed for [illegible].

"Take-home pay averages $[illegible] a month. Total income last year was $4,[illegible], which was subject to withholding, retirement, and other deductions. On top of that were State and Federal income taxes. Too little remains."

Rambaw said that carriers' starting wage is $2,670 and graduates up to $4,970 after 25 years service, but that the $4,300 is today's average for all. Affected here in wage raise efforts are 400 employees. Clerks are represented by National Federation of Post Office Clerks. Al Gould, W. J. Sheehy, and Clarence Ashford are other members of Rambaw's committee.

Malicious Attacks Against Leaders Reach New Extremes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, during times of prolonged crisis and great emotional stress, some persons have a tendency to lose all sense of balance. From such persons, we can expect some rather uncontrolled outbursts. Our staff is apt to contain, and Mr. [illegible] has overlooked, vicious personal attacks on our national leaders.

We can overlook much of it as the work of harmless cranks. Criticism, calm, or heated, we welcome as signifying a healthy democracy. But we in

a democracy have a limit beyond which our rules of fair play will not allow us to go. One scurrilous piece which came to my attention this week has gone beyond the limit. It reeks of malice and attempts to incite violence.

I do not mean to dignify it by bringing it to the attention of this House. I mention it here only so that the Members can be warned that such material is being distributed, and so they can be on guard against it in their own districts and can make sure that the proper action is taken to see that their constituents are placed on guard against these irresponsible enemies of democracy.

The particular piece which I refer to is one which actually threatens the lives of some members of the present administration. It suggests that the death sentence is the proper reward for their Government service and attempts to class them with convicted traitors.

I know that the Members on the other side of the House will join me in showing their abhorrence of this viciousness. It is true that those on the minority side have directed heavy political attacks at many of the same persons for whom the death sentence is suggested, but I know that I am speaking for all parties when I say that all true and patriotic Americans want to keep our present discussions on a level of decency and honest discussion.

I am turning this vile piece of literature over to the proper Government authorities to investigate the possibilities of taking action. I am doing this, as I give this information to the House, so that we can be on guard against this type of enemy within.

The Story of a State Department Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Johnstown Democrat on May 16, 1951, entitled "The Story of a State Department Call."

This story which has now been disclosed and carefully documented should be investigated immediately by the House Foreign Affairs Committee to determine who in our State Department should issue orders such as this.

The editorial follows:

INSIDE LABOR—THE STORY OF A STATE DEPARTMENT CALL

(By Victor Riesel)

It can now be disclosed, and documented that a representative of Dean Acheson's State Department recently visited the most strategic waterfront union headquarters in this country—and urged its leaders to have their wharf-working followers refuse to load guns and ammo on ships rushing military supplies to our friends in Europe.

This spokesman for the United States Department of State introduced herself as Edith Cameron Wall. She carried the usual credentials used by Federal agents. In addition, she presented a letter from Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin, which, in effect, urged union leaders to cooperate with her.

This conversation took place in the national headquarters of the A. F. of L. International Longshoremen's Association, long a target of the opposition. Through its dockwallopers it controls all ocean traffic to and from almost the entire world.

Lest there be the slightest doubt as to time, place and participants, I record here that the lady (still in the employ of the State Department at this very minute) made this proposal in a talk with husky ILA chief, Joe Ryan, in his private office at 265 West Fourteenth Street, New York City, at about 4:30 on the afternoon of March 13.

Joe threw the lady out, gently, and immediately telephoned top A. F. of L. leaders in Washington. Protests were rushed to the State Department. But labor got no satisfaction—and the lady is on her way to Europe on a special mission starting in Paris.

The best that the indignant Ryan and national A. F. of L. secretary George Meany, could get was a State Department apology—a polite brushoff—saying, so sorry the lady took up so much of your time.

It all began some days after Ryan had made certain that special Italian cargo ships were swiftly loaded with war stuff and sped on their way to Rome's military depots. Ryan had to see to this personally early in March when he was informed that a Communist propaganda spree was growing in Brooklyn, at the army waterfront base there.

Apparently an Italian Commie squad, operating out of its Henry Street catacomb, had spread out among the Italian longshoremen on the military piers and was urging the cargo slingers not to load the Italian freighters.

Joe got out there fast. So did Pentagon officers and city officials, including the mayor. The ships were loaded.

Some days later, Ryan received what he believed was a routine call from one of the many Government officials who seek his union's aid in this war. It was a lady. She was from the State Department and said she also had the Labor Department credentials. She wanted to discuss the union's manpower problems. They got together about 4:15 p. m. There was some technical talk. She saw union records. She revealed she had just returned from Norway—and was going to the other United States ports before leaving on a special mission to France.

Suddenly and sweetly the lady said:

"You have just issued orders to your men to load war supplies. And when I go over to France, the French longshoremen will ask me about their brothers in America and what they're doing. When I tell them that you are going to persist in your policy of sending the cargoes over there, will that not drive them into Communist hands?

"Won't you let me have your word that I can give them practical assurances that you will change your policy on loading these ships?"

Never famous for his shyness, Joe Ryan got slightly apoplectic.

"Listen, girlie," he snapped, "those French longshoremen are in the Communist Party. They went in back on December 4, 1936, when they refused to unload our steamship *George Washington*, of the United States Lines, and you, or your people, know it. They even refused to take off baggage. What kind of a quiz program am I in here? Is this your opinion, or did the State Department send you in here to tell me not to load these ships? You got in here only because of the State Department and I know you've been visiting other waterfront unions."

Startled, she stuttered:

"No; I'm voicing my own opinion."

Joe opened the door, and shouted for his secretary to throw her out before he lost his temper and forgot he wasn't on the docks.

Then the protests were shot to the State Department. But it has refused to condemn her, or dissociate itself from her.

Who sent her? It doesn't seem possible that she could dare to do this without orders from some superior. Who is he?

John Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a beautiful letter from the staff of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to Mrs. John Kee, wife of our late beloved chairman:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
May 16, 1951.

Mrs. JOHN KEE,
George Washington Inn,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. KEE: In the passing of our beloved chairman, Judge Kee, all of us on the staff of the committee feel a profound sense of personal loss.

The judge was a great chairman, with an outstanding record of unselfish public service and devotion. But he was more than that to us, however. Despite his heavy and demanding work load, he always found time to take an active interest in us and our problems, and was anxious that we find a maximum degree of happiness in our work. His kindliness, friendliness, and deep understanding made it a simple matter for us to achieve that happiness.

You and your family can be justly proud of, and comforted by, the great and noble reputation he leaves behind.

We wish for you and each member of your family many years of health and happiness.

Sincerely,

Boyd Crawford, Ira E. Bennett, Sheldon Z. Kaplan, George Lee Millikan, Roy J. Bullock, Albert C. F. Westphal, June Nigh, Winifred Osborne, Mabel Wofford, Mary G. Chace, Helen Mattas.

State Department Negotiations Cut Plywood Imports 50 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, our State Department, through its negotiations at Torquay, England, has entered into trade agreements with 17 foreign nations and has brought about a 50-percent decrease in the tariff which now

applies on the importation of plywood into the United States by foreign countries. Under the favored-nations clause, countries not included in this trade agreement may also be permitted to import plywood into this country under the agreements negotiated.

On February 9, 1949, in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, I called attention to the fact that we had a threat in foreign-produced plywood to our American industry which, at that time, was employing about 13,000 workers in this industry.

On June 20, 1950, I appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information protesting the contemplated cut in the import levies and called attention to the fact that there were eight Douglas fir plywood and veneer plants located in the First Congressional District, which I represent, and are centered in the counties of Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte. I also pointed out that the average wage existent at that time for the American worker in this industry was $1.725 per hour while, in British Columbia, the nearest to our wage scale had workers receiving the equivalent of $1.10 in United States currency. I called attention to the fact that, in the United States, the man hours necessary to produce 1,000 square feet of plywood cost $23.88; while, in Canada, the cost in equivalent American dollars was $15.18. In the United States, the logs necessary to produce 1,000 square feet of plywood cost $37.50; in Canada the cost in equivalent American dollars was $26.52. I proceeded to give further comparisons of the difference in the cost of production and the threat to this industry should tariff reductions be made.

At that time, the best information I had was that there were some 18,500 men employed in this industry on our coast. The three Pacific Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington are the main producers of plywood in the United States, and I am informed now that there are between 35,000 and 40,000 people engaged in these mills and the supplying of material for their operation. New plants have been built and only this week I assisted in the procurement of necessary materials to put into operation the Arcata Plywood Co., located in Arcata, Calif.

Of course, I realize that damage to the industry is not one of immediate concern as plywood is in such heavy demand. However, if this demand for materials eases off, there is bound to be a tremendous reaction in the areas in which these plywood plants operate. In many instances, they become the important source of employment for many people and any slackening of production would adversely affect every businessman in the area.

The tariff agreements entered into at Torquay, England, amount to a 50 percent reduction. Under the present 40 percent ad valorem—on value—of every $100 of plywood sent into this country, a tariff of $40 is levied. The reduction means that, for every $100 of plywood shipped into our country, there would be only a $20 duty required.

Under the present tariff arrangement, there was imported from Canada last year $11,032,465 worth of plywood and veneers. Despite the $40 per $100 tax on this import, Canada was able to compete in the market with American production. Within a few years, it may again be profitable for Japan to engage in the plywood industry as it has in the past. They have supplies of timber and, furthermore, shiploads of our American logs were shipped to Japan for processing into plywood.

I am greatly concerned over this last action of the State Department as I feel that it not only threatens this industry in my district, but it will adversely affect the many thousands of men and women who are employed in this comparatively new and essential industry to northern California. I protest this action and call upon those who are financially concerned to register their protests and to be on the alert that this trade agreement may be rescinded before its evil effects are reflected on the industry.

The extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is still pending before the Senate. When this bill passed the House, we had written into it the "peril point" and the "escape clause." If the Senate approves of this bill as written in the House, we will have some right to insist under the escape clause that we be able to renegotiate if and when our industry is adversely affected.

We must be ever vigilant and watchful if we are to keep our American industry, our laboring men, and our economy from having to face competition created by substandard conditions which they cannot meet.

Federal Tort Claims Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following very interesting article that appeared in the Bar Bulletin, issued by the Boston Bar Association, entitled "The GI and the Federal Tort Claims Act," by Attorney Lenahan O'Connell.

Mr. O'Connell is an able and capable member of the bar and is now assistant attorney general in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He has given considerable thought and study to military legislation and has had considerable experience with the administration of the Federal Tort Claims Act:

THE GI AND THE FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

(By Lenahan O'Connell)

When Congress enacted the Federal Tort Claims Act (which is now 28 U. S., sec. 2672), the public-at-large, in my opinion, did not realize that there would be claims presented to the United States District Court by members of the Armed Forces for injuries arising out of accidents in which they were involved while still in uniform. However, a series of claims were lodged in the several district courts of the United States, and, finally, the Supreme Court granted a writ of certiorari in a case arising from the Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit. It was the case of *Brooks v. United States* (337 U. S. 49), where two soldiers, who were brothers, on furlough, accompanied by their father, were driving along a highway and were struck by a Government-owned and operated vehicle, causing one soldier's death and severely injuring the others. The Brooks case opened a new chapter in the realm of claims against the United States. The late Mr. Justice Murphy, who was an active Army Reservist, said quite succinctly: "We are not persuaded that 'any claim' means any claim but that of servicemen." The Court seemed to lay great stress on the fact that Congress must have had servicemen in mind because, under the Federal Tort Claims Act, they made two specific exceptions, namely, claims arising in foreign countries; and, also, claims arising out of combat activities. The Court said that the remedy under the act was an exclusive remedy. However, the Brooks case did leave the door open for further discussion and reasoning by the Court because they said in their decision: "We are dealing with an accident which had nothing to do with the Brooks' Army careers; injuries were not caused by their service, except in the sense that all human events depend upon what has already transpired. Were the accident incidental to the Brooks' service, a wholly different case would be presented."

A most interesting excerpt in the majority opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, denying the Brooks' recovery, is as follows: "If a soldier could sue for such injury or illness based on the alleged negligence of the company cook or mess sergeant, or if soldiers who contract sickness on wintry sentry duty had a right of action against the Government on this allegation of a negligent order given by the company commander, then the traditional grousing of the American soldier would result in the devastation of military discipline and morale."

It should be of interest to the members of the bar that, even if recovery is had under circumstances outlined in the Brooks case, the Brookses are fully protected under all the other remedies afforded to military personnel, if their accident was classified as "line of duty." The Feres decision, referred to below, does not overrule this phase of the Brooks' decision.

Following the Brooks' decision, the several district courts and courts of appeal were in disagreement as to whether any claim should be allowed wherein the plaintiff was a serviceman.

In the Feres case, the New York district court dismissed an action brought by the petitioner to recover for death caused by negligence. The decedent perished by fire in an Army barracks, which the petitioner said was unsafe because of a defective heating plant. The Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, affirmed the dismissal.

The Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in the Jefferson case, affirmed a decision whereby the plaintiff was denied recovery where, on active duty, he was required to undergo an abdominal operation and the Army doctor failed to remove a 36 x 18 inch towel marked: "Medical Department, United States Army."

In the Griggs case, the Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit, allowed the plaintiff to state a cause of action wherein the petitioner alleged that, while on active duty, death was caused by the negligent and unskillful treatment by the Army surgeons.

The Supreme Court granted certiorari in these three cases and they were argued together. The decision is *Feres v. United States* (340 U. S., 135). The Court, after a long

decision, came to the conclusion that the Government is not liable under the Federal Tort Claims Act for injuries arising out of or in the course of activity incident to service.

While the Court said they did not think the Congress, in drafting the Federal Tort Claims Act, created a new cause of action, it did not reverse the Brooks case, stating that the Feres case is a wholly different case.

The Court, in writing its conclusions that no new cause of action was created by the Federal Tort Claims Act, stated, "Congress was suffering from no plague of private bills on behalf of military and naval personnel because a comprehensive system of relief had been authorized for them and their dependents by statute."

The Court went on to explain that there is nowhere in our body of law any precedent where members of the armed services were permitted to maintain a tort action for injuries sustained in the military service; and, thus, the act really, in effect, waived immunity from recognized causes of action, and was not to visit the Government with novel and unprecedented liabilities.

The Feres decision leaves a still further question open to members of the armed services and that is: just what, exactly, is an injury that arises out of or in the course of activity incident to service? There are several problems that would be presented, one of which comes to my mind: If a soldier lives outside the garrison and is injured after he leaves the area encompassed by the post camp or station and before he arrives home, is he covered by the Federal Tort Claims Act? It might be of interest for the bar to know that the enlisted and officer personnel stationed at the Army base, Boston, do not have quarters provided for them and must live around the city of Boston; several of them live at the YMCA. What would be the status of a soldier injured by a Government vehicle, after the soldier left the Army base and prior to his arrival at the YMCA?

In view of the large numbers of men we have in the Federal service, now, the problem will multiply, and the courts will be confronted with the fine question: What injuries arise out of and in the course of activity incident to service? As far as the armed services are concerned, when an injury results—unless a man is a. w. o. l.—he is, invariably, marked: "Line of duty." Will this over-all presumption of duty preclude a soldier from presenting a claim under the Federal Tort Claims Act? In the Brooks case, line of duty does not enter into the picture, if a soldier is outside the camp post or station on furlough.

It is the writer's opinion that the Brooks and Feres cases still allow a wide margin of latitude for presentation of claims under the Federal Tort Claims Act because the courts must determine the very fine question of what is an activity incident to military service.

Until Congress definitely bars military personnel, stating that separate legislation covers them, our United States district courts will have an increasingly large number of cases to determine, especially where so many of the married officers and enlisted men live off the military reservations and commute daily; and, on a permanent change of station, use privately owned vehicles for transportation.

The concluding thought in my mind is this: Is a soldier on furlough to have his rights under the Federal Tort Claims Act open to him; and the soldier, on change of station, to be precluded?

I recommend to the members of the bar a very fine article on this subject which appears in the George Washington Review, volume 19, No. 1.

Free Enterprise Is a Producer, Not a Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial appearing April 21, 1951, in the Enterprise-Record, published at Chico, Calif., wherein the importance of the tax bill paid by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to Butte County is graphically disclosed. This could be extended to include every county in the State where facilities of the power company are located.

Private power companies adequately pay their way through the huge tax burdens they carry. Without this source of revenue, it would be necessary for all levels of government to impose larger burdens upon individuals, property, business concerns, and every source from which they derive revenue.

Those who argue that cheap electricity is obtainable only through Government power development, are standing on unstable ground. As private enterprise, power companies not only maintain a high standard of service to their consumers, but have consistently shown a decline in their rates over the years.

Government plants, on the other hand, are subsidized and operate largely tax free. They are not faced with the incentive that comes from competition, so therefore it is reasonable to assume they would render an inferior brand of service.

The needs of our country and the standards we demand, are best served by free enterprise. Government intervention into any field adequately served by private interests tends to produce more waste, extravagance, and confusion—than the good it accomplishes.

The editorial referred to above, is as follows:

ONE OF THE FEW BARGAINS LEFT

George L. Works, manager of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s DeSabla division, has just announced the company's tax payments to Butte County for the 1950–51 fiscal year.

The staggering sum of $1,006,658 (million, that is) was paid into the county treasury for the support of county government, public schools, district taxes, and support of municipalities.

Six hundred and thirty-six thousand nine hundred and forty-five dollars went for the support of county government, $302,229 to support public schools, $47,982 for other district taxes, and $19,502 was paid to the cities.

With figures like these it is not strange that the voters of Redding, in an election last year, voted to renew a contract with the P. G. & E. and turned down an offer from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Works aptly put it when he said, "The significance of these figures is that a business-managed utility company produces taxes instead of consuming them."

There are those that advance the argument that the utility doesn't pay the taxes—that the $1,006,658 the P. G. & E. turned over to Butte County last year was actually paid by the consumers. That in our opinions is stupid (we were going to say asinine but President Truman has overworked the word) reasoning. For, if those who think that way are right, no enterprise pays taxes—not the motor manufacturer, not the oil company, not the farmer, not the corner store. It just collects the money from the consumers and gives Government a part of it.

Reasoning on from this point, it is now clear that we need not worry at all when Government destroys taxpaying industry. Let the Government run the farms, the stores, the newspapers, the factories—everything. After all, if the Government is to supply your power, it could just as logically supply your shoes, your food, and your radio programs, and comic strips. And what have we now? The answer can be expressed in one word. We have communism.

While we are thinking of utility companies and electricity, let us consider the price of electricity as compared to other things in these times of inflation. An article in the New York Times by John P. Callahan sums it up quite well:

"Last week the power and light industry rustled through price index components and underscored the one item that tends downward in the spiral-like consumers' price index. The item, of course, is electricity.

"While the dollar today has less than one-third the purchasing power it had at the beginning of the twentieth century, that depreciated dollar buys more than twice as much electricity as the far more valuable dollar did in 1913.

"Fifteen years ago the average revenue per kilowatt-hour for all the residential electricity used was 5.01 cents a kilowatt-hour. Since then it has dropped to 2.89 cents."

The present average rate for Chico under P. G. & E. is 2.5 cents per kilowatt-hour.

That, as Mr. Callahan observed, is good news for the household consumer. And it is good news for the agricultural and industrial consumer, too. On the farm and in the factory, as in the home, electric power is usually one of the smallest items of total operating cost.

Moreover, here is the answer to those who emptily argue that socialized government power development is the only road to "cheap electricity." We have cheap electricity now, all we want of it—and the industry which provides us with it pays out some 20 percent of all its revenues in taxes. Government plants, by contrast, are tax-subsidized, and wholly or largely tax free.

When you push that light button, you're getting a bargain.

The Great Decline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego (Calif.) Union of April 29, 1951:

THE GREAT DECLINE

To understand the tragic decline in national morality over the last few years it is necessary to look into the political antecedents of Harry S. Truman. For generations we have looked to the White House for exemplars of moral, ethical, and social standards. Seldom have we been disappointed or disillusioned. But in later years we have witnessed a sort of cynicism in political and civic standards which has been reflected in the indifference toward American idealism on the part of the masses of our people.

It is not to the discredit of Harry Truman that he failed in business; many honorable men have had the same experience. Probably he served capably in his minor capacity as a county judge, a job requiring no brilliant legal talent and involving no heavy responsibilities.

The particular trouble was that this small job was a link tying him with one of the most conscienceless political machines in the United States—the Pendergast machine of Kansas City.

Harry Truman no doubt was almost as greatly surprised to be named as the machine's candidate for United States Senator—with assurance of election by the methods of this machine—as he was to fall into the Presidency. His service as a Senator was mostly undistinguished, but gave him some publicity as head of a committee investigating war industries. Even this negative role was not to his discredit.

His weakness, from the time of his county judgeship to his incumbency in the White House, has been a mistaken loyalty to his political godfather, Pendergast. This trait has colored numerous of his official activities. One of his first acts as President was to "fire" the able Federal district attorney who sent Pendergast to prison. A sequel was his granting of full pardon to some 30 members of the machine convicted of corruption, restoring their voting rights on the eve of a congressional election in which he was backing a favored candidate. A sequel to this sequel was his utter failure to prosecute the machine conspirators who aided his candidate by stuffing ballot boxes and later dynamiting a courthouse vault to destroy the evidences of their crime.

In keeping with this trait of "loyalty," Harry Truman has retained in his intimate service officials of the presidential household who have made grain speculations on "inside information," 5 percenters who have used their White House connections to collect fat commissions; such characters as Harry Vaughan, of deep-freezer fame, and Margolis, the goat for an international graft project. Typical is the "mink-coat scandal" involving influence in the multibillion-dollar RFC.

Now these things may not directly affect the operation of the Government. But they do have immense psychological import.

The low standards of the White House are reflected in the cynicism or indifference of the citizenship.

New B. & O. Railroad Pier at Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of the great free State of Maryland, dedicated a new pier—the largest of its kind on either coast—at Baltimore. This pier, erected by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad at a cost of more than $5,000,000 is the finest example of free enterprise at work in the American way for the creation of more business and more jobs for the American people. For a thoughtful and splendid exposition of what this free-enterprise system means to our Nation, I commend the address made by Governor McKeldin.

The address follows:

While great debates rage and greater debates follow about where and when wars should be fought; while politicians, statesmen, near-statesmen, and would-be statesmen fret and fume over the issues; while generals fall, and others rise to take their places, American industry marches on.

Here is the real strength of the United States.

Here, today, in the initial utilization of this great ore pier, is a concrete symbol of that which makes our Nation the greatest, the strongest, and the winner of the decisive battles, whether in war or peace—the free-enterprise system.

We read and we hear that potential legislation of great moment gathers dust in committee-room pigeonholes while personalities clash and bitterness holds sway as some Members of the Congress seek to resolve—and others seek to complicate—the diplomatic and military problems of the times.

But the wheels of American industry, without the shackles of socialization and minus the dictator's regimentation, speed on to build and stock the arsenal which is the best hope for our continued freedom, and eventually, for the freedom of the world.

Allies worry over what they call our disagreements in official circles and enemies rejoice over what they seek to interpret as a lack of American unity within our Government and among our people.

But while the tongues wag and the gloomy prophets shake their heads our muscles grow stronger as we add new facilities and increase our real, free wealth.

It is, indeed, proper and fitting that this pier, the greatest of its kind on either coast, and perhaps the greatest in the world for the importation of ores from other lands, should be located in the great, free-enterprise port of Baltimore. Here, unlike many other ports of the Nation, we have proved that socialization can be avoided in the operation of a port and that competition can be successfully and profitably encouraged.

The erection of this pier here by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad at a cost of more than $5,000,000 therefore becomes double proof of the wisdom and success of the free-enterprise system.

This facility will be of the utmost importance to the Nation in its preparations for defense and possibly for war.

It will continue to be of great value to the Nation in the years of peace that we all hope will come as it provides the raw materials for the metals to build a greater and greater America. Aiding with the importation of ores from Venezuela, Liberia, Brazil, and other places, it will help to conserve our own deposits.

If stronger bonds were possible, this new facility would tie this great transportation system—the B. & O.—even closer to the State of Maryland and the City of Baltimore. The State and city owe much to the Baltimore & Ohio, and I believe the officials of the railroad will agree that they like the city and the State. The relationships have been of the best—as they should be. We are proud of this carrier, of its long line of past executives, present executives, and the great body of men who man the engines, the cars, the shops, the maintenance lines, the piers, and all of the great road's facilities. This new pier will add considerably to the payroll and will greatly increase the importance of this harbor.

When we look at this fine pier and think of its use, we must think of the carload after carload of coal that will be brought here for shipment from the port by the same cars that will receive the ore for use in this country.

We must think of the miles upon miles of rail over which the laden cars travel to and from this pier. We must think of the mills to which this ore will be carried, and the new mills that will be built to receive it. We must think of the plants to which the refined metals will go and of the products that they will produce for use in war, in the homes, in the mines, on the farms, in great and little factories. Looking at this pier we can see the beginnings of bridges and skyscrapers, tanks and cannon, plows, bulldozers, hammers and nails, bathtubs, kitchen stoves, and baby carriages.

Yes, this is more than just a great, new pier, modern in type, and highly useful in purpose. It is a symbol of America. It is industrial progress.

We can criticize the politicians, the statesmen, the near statesmen and would-be statesmen, and their great and greater debates. We can take sides with this general or that general on ideas and plans for winning a war or preventing a bigger war. We can ridicule the men at the head of our Government or the men who want to be at the head of it.

But with all its debates, with all its delays, with all its shortcomings, we'll never ridicule the form of that government—the form under which free enterprise is made possible.

A Review and a Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Federationist, official monthly publication of the American Federation of Labor carries in its May 1951 issue an article by Mr. James A. Brownlow, president of the Metal Trades Department of the A. F. of L. The article is entitled "A Review and a Warning." Because of its timeliness, its logic, and the tremendous importance to the United States of the message it brings, I ask that it be printed in full following these remarks.

The review to which the article refers is a review of the wartime and post-wartime history of the American merchant marine in its relation to our foreign competitors. The warning, which Mr. Brownlow voices, is raised against a continuation of present policies which are fast making the American maritime industry a weak and inadequate arm of our national security.

Mr. Brownlow calls attention to a situation the seriousness of which can scarcely be exaggerated. It is a situation which the maritime unions and the maritime industry as a whole have pounded on through the years. The previous warnings were not listened to,

and we paid dearly for the failure to listen. As an example, shortly after World War II and since that time the A. F. of L. maritime and metal trades unions recommended and urged that a large number of ships from the reserve fleet be kept in operable condition at a cost of about $25,000,000. The proposal was shouted down as being "rank extravagance." We have just gone through, and are still going through, the process of pulling those ships out and rehabilitating them at a cost many times higher than $25,000,000. It is about time that Congress and the American people pay some attention to maritime industry and union men who are actually on the job and know the score on these matters. Men who are primarily interested in the security of their homes and families and of the Nation as a whole, rather than in the sacred dollar. There are still people around who, unfortunately, and for some unknown reason, cannot see the relationship between national security and a flourishing American merchant marine. If we do not keep our ships sailing, and our repair yards and construction yards operating, those people will wake up to find that their blindness has cost far more than the sums required to put Mr. Brownlow's recommendations into effect. Those recommendations follow the program I have been fighting for ever since coming to Congress. I hope that the review and warning in this article will make some of us who have refused to see the very real danger it points to sit up and take notice:

A REVIEW AND A WARNING

(By James A. Brownlow)

In 1946 the metal-trades department of the American Federation of Labor, through its representatives, called to the attention of the Government the need of a sustained merchant marine. During the years following—1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950—this merchant-marine need of the United States was reiterated more emphatically each succeeding year.

The essence of the metal-trades department's support of an American merchant marine might be summed up in these three reasons:

First, the United States should retain its standing among the commercial nations of the world. United States flagships should sail all seas and penetrate all harbors, carrying our exports and imports.

Second, as a Nation we should not allow our skilled shipbuilding mechanics and ship-operating personnel to become dispersed and be deprived of the opportunity to engage in the work in which they are skilled, or our shipyards and other ship-maintenance facilities to become dissipated, deteriorated, and, in many instances, unfit for future use.

The last and perhaps most important reason is that the United States must remain independent of any nation or group of nations in the carrying of our commerce and in maintaining our first line of national defense. National emergencies must never find us again dependent upon the ships of other nations to carry our troops or implements of war.

It would be assumed that two experiences would suffice to impress upon us the magnitude of successive blunders and fully prepare us for future needs. Quite the contrary is true, however. As late as mid-1950 there were loud clamors emanating from some spokesmen for Government that the sacrificing of our merchant marine would aid in the closing of the dollar gap existing between the United States and some foreign countries.

The belief that American products and exports should be carried in foreign bottoms also had its strong advocates. In fact, this advocacy was put into practice to the exclusion of the use of American ships until Congress insisted, by statute, that at least one-half of United States Government financed and provided goods and produce be carried in American bottoms.

With war clouds growing darker each day over the world's horizon, and with hostilities raging in Korea, not so much is heard about the closing of the dollar gap at the cost of the remnants of the United States merchant marine. But it must be confessed that it was incidental that the merchant marine was not wholly obliterated, rather than because of any deep conviction or planned preservation of it as a means of carrying commerce or of national defense on the part of some agencies of government.

We must examine our merchant marine as it is today and face up to the needs of our Nation with the determination that we can be and will be independent of any country or group of countries in the carrying of our commerce during peacetime as well as when we are confronted with war.

Gen. Philip Fleming, then Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, said in 1949:

"There are four essentials to the development and maintenance of shipping services under our flag, adequate for the needs of commerce and defense. These are, first, an active fleet; second, an active shipbuilding and ship-repair industry; third, an adequate training program; fourth, a national defense reserve fleet."

All with an interest in our merchant marine will readily subscribe to the general's statement. But even with him, as Chairman of the Maritime Commission, taking that strong position, there was little done about rebuilding or operating a larger fleet of merchant vessels. There continued the operation under foreign flags of vessels once owned by the United States Government. The repair of these vessels in foreign ports continued, and the United States merchant marine further declined.

This went on until the sad awakening came for the third time, and we found ourselves facing an emergency, one which may well be our Nation's greatest trial. We are responding by recognizing our need of ships and shipping, of skilled shipbuilding mechanics, and of modern, up-to-date facilities for repair and new ship construction.

Yes, we are even recognizing it to the extent that we are requesting the return of several hundred vessels which we loaned to Russia during the latter part of the last emergency and which we had conveniently forgotten about until it seemed as though they might be used against us.

We are rehabilitating hundreds of vessels of the Liberty and Victory type which have been laid up in rivers and harbors in all coastal areas. There is some activity in the repair yards because of this work, and it is reflected in the employment of skilled shipbuilding and ship repair mechanics.

The administrative branch of Government and Congress have recognized that the recommissioning of old vessels is not enough to fill our needs. They have recommended and there have been enacted statutes providing for the construction of a number of fast cargo vessels. In addition, large sums of money have been appropriated for future development and expansion of our merchant marine.

It must be recognized that present appropriations are inadequate to restore our Nation to its proper place in relation to other nations of the world engaged in commerce. The day of being second or third or lower in the list of nations of the world, and not first, is gone. We must never again be dependent upon the ships of any other nation or combination of nations to carry our commerce during peacetime or our commerce, troops and other necessities of war during periods when we may be engaged in war. We must be and must remain self-sustaining.

We might examine briefly our status in relation to other nations in both shipbuilding and operation. The National Federation of American Shipping recently made poignant comments on present trends as they affect shipbuilding and ship operation. They emphasized that America's multi-billion-dollar waterfront is showing a remarkably large and steadily increasing number of foreign flags flying from the masts of merchant ships and that American flag merchant ship entrances and clearances are steadily declining in American ports.

The total net registered tonnage of all vessels entering and clearing United States ports in 1950 with commercial cargo was 112,466,000. Only 42.7 percent of this tonnage was merchant ships carrying the stars and stripes. In 1949 the figure was 48.5 percent. In sharp contrast, in 1950, of the 102,775,000 net registered tons of vessels entering and clearing United Kingdom ports with cargo, 65.7 percent were of British registry.

The federation study also showed that while vessel entrances into United States ports with cargo totaled 27,500, vessel clearances with cargo totaled only 16,671, a greater imbalance than that recorded in 1949.

These figures indicate a loss of 6 percent carried in American bottoms from 1949.

That the United States is losing ground in the international race aimed at restoration of the world's merchant passenger vessel fleet to its pre-World War II size is becoming more and more obvious.

In a study of world merchant passenger vessel construction, it must be noted that while the stars and stripes flew over 8 percent of the world's passenger fleet prior to World War II, today it flies over only 5 percent. Further, it may be pointed out that while foreign nations are building or have under contract 97 passenger-carrying vessels of close to 1,000,000 gross tons, the United States is building only 2 passenger ships totaling 71,719 gross tons.

Statistics show that at the beginning of 1951 the world's merchant passenger vessel fleet was 75 percent by number and 70 percent by gross tonnage of its pre-World War II level of 1,500 ships of 12,000,000 gross tons. But it is difficult to reconcile the position of the United States when one considers the far better job being performed by other nations of the world in rebuilding their passenger fleets, as evidenced by the fact that, upon completion of present construction, the United Kingdom will have about 92 percent of her prewar passenger tonnage, the Netherlands will have about 78 percent, and France 76 percent. Among the smaller maritime nations, Argentina will have increased her passenger fleet 10 times over her prewar level.

The United States, after completion of ships under construction, will have only 62 percent of her prewar tonnage, or slightly more, relatively, than Italy, which will soon have over 54 percent of her prewar passenger fleet.

Among all the maritime nations of the world, the United States ranks only fifth in the amount of gross tonnage of passenger vessels being constructed and a poor eleventh in numbers of such ships being built. In contrast the United Kingdom is in first place, followed by France, Italy, and Argentina.

These statements point up the peril with which we are confronted as a result of our failure to keep pace with the other nations of the world in proportion to our standing as the first nation of the world.

It is of interest to note that though at the present there are 28 vessels of 516,064 gross tons in some stage of construction or contracted for in the yards of the United States, 25 vessels of 315,000 gross tons are the recent ones contracted for but not started. In Japan there are 35 seagoing vessels of 240,986 gross tons in some stage of construction.

These comparisons with other nations may bring forth the comment that there is a selfishness predominant which would destroy the merchant marines of other nations and confer the carrying of commerce and the ship construction to the United States. This is a mistaken premise. However, the maritime interests of the United States have not been protected with nearly the same zeal as other facets of our economy have.

We have but to witness the policy being carried out in Germany to see what is happening to our merchant marine.

In April 1949, the Washington agreement, entered into by the military governors of three major nations, provided that up to 100,000 gross tons of tankers, not to exceed 10,700 gross tons each, and 300,000 gross tons of dry cargo ships, none to exceed 7,200 gross tons, be authorized as being adequate for German recovery.

There were many modifications of this program in ensuing months up to April 1951, at which time all restrictions were removed except that the vessels built could not have characteristics which would permit them to be readily convertible for military purposes. At the time of the last agreement, as a result of the amendments from April 1949, the tonnage had catapulted to 650,000 gross tons and will shortly be 800,000 gross tons.

Prior to the last war German merchant ships carried 45 percent of her aggregate overseas commerce. In 1949 her ships carried 19 percent. In 1950 Germany's merchant ships were again carrying 45 percent. In contrast, the United States-flag vessels are currently carrying 35 percent of the United States overseas dry cargo commerce.

This comparison clearly indicates that again foreign nations are progressively increasing their commerce-carrying shipbuilding facilities, while the United States is failing to keep pace.

Further consideration of foreign nations' shipbuilding and operating expansion may well provoke conjecture in connection with the Russian merchant marine. The building of ships for the Soviet Union by nations receiving ECA assistance may well be challenged.

Under trade agreements, nations receiving ECA funds are building freighters, tankers, large deep-sea fishing boats and other vessels to augment the Soviet merchant fleet.

None can object to the expansion of the commercial strength of the Soviet. Neither can we, with good conscience, oppose, except in a competitive way, increased production in the shipyards of Holland, Belgium, Italy, France or any other nation. However, we should voice loud objections if the activities of the shipyards of the above countries are being financed, in whole or in part, by money from the Treasury of the United States.

We question that the Congress of the United States intended to give aid to the shipbuilding and operating companies of foreign countries while, at the same time, it is denying assistance to expand its own shipbuilding and operating facilities.

Neither did Congress intend to build a merchant fleet, far superior to that of other nations, for a country whose objectives are so contrary to those of our own that the differences may be resolved only by armed conflict.

It is imperative that the United States do something more than deplore the status among nations of our merchant marine. We are spending billions of dollars for national defense, including the development of the most highly technical machines of war, much of which development can be and will be used for commercial purposes, and the results of which will become part of our expanding economy during peacetime. This is true of all technical advances which are being made throughout the country with the exception of the Navy, which is solely an agency of defense.

The same cannot be said of our merchant marine. During this period we should be developing fast commercial vessels capable of being quickly converted into troop carriers and being equipped with the latest modern protective devices. These vessels should further be of such type as to enter most harbors, with quick loading and unloading facilities, and of fast turn-around ability. They should be built in such numbers as to replace the obsolete vessels built during the Second World War, which in many instances were built with the expectation that they would pay for themselves if they were successful in making one or two trips.

The day of the convoy is gone. We cannot afford to risk either our troops or our commerce in slow and antiquated vessels. The choice is not ours but is being forced upon us by the rapid development on the part of foreign nations of ever faster and faster commercial and war vessels.

It has been contended that private operators and builders cannot hope, from their own resources, to build and operate these vessels at a profit without some inducement from the Government. This being true, it is the obligation and duty of the Government to aid these operators through subsidies, grants, or other privileges which will enable them to compete on an equal basis with foreign ship operating and shipbuilding companies. Every other major nation in the world subsidizes its ship operating and shipbuilding companies to a much greater extent than the United States does.

There is another most essential reason why we must keep an ever-expanding merchant marine, and that is manpower. A merchant marine is only as strong as its operating personnel, and we cannot afford to have idle-ship operating forces. Men will no longer remain "on the beach" waiting to be assigned to a vessel when other attractive employment is available. It is essential that jobs be provided for these men, or the cost of training new workers will far exceed the provisions being made for those already trained. This will affect not only the operating personnel but also the shipbuilding and ship-repair mechanic.

The shipbuilding and ship-repair industry at its peak employed in excess of 1,500,000 persons. This was exclusive of those employed in the naval shipyards of the country. Today, on the three coasts and the inland waterways, there are approximately 54,000 employed in this industry. This means that the great bulk of trained shipbuilding workers and ship repairmen have gone into other industries. Should another emergency develop, this is not a sufficient number to serve as a nucleus to train the thousands of additional employees that will be necessary.

The metal trades department has long affirmed that shipbuilding and ship-repair work is essential to keep a reasonable number of skilled mechanics in training and available for ship construction and repair work. Also, there must be an equal distribution of new construction and repair yards on the respective coasts of the Nation. We cannot afford, during any national emergency, to have complete concentration of yards or manpower in any one area.

If the United States is to retain its place as the leading nation of the world, one of its most important assets is a strong merchant marine, adequately manned, reinforced by shipbuilding and ship-repair yards employing skilled shipbuilding and ship-repair mechanics in sufficient numbers to assure us of a merchant fleet commensurate with our standing among the nations of the world.

The Defense Production Act and Wool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

NATIONAL WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 15, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully call to your attention the enclosed editorial published in the Boston Herald of May 15. We heartily endorse this editorial.

Very truly yours,
NATIONAL WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION,
HUGH MUNRO, *President.*

WHO BUYS WOOL?

The wool trade is greatly concerned at the moment with a proposed amendment to the Defense Production Act which may or may not have anything to do with wool.

Under the act as adopted last year, the Government is empowered to purchase certain critical materials abroad and resell them to private businessmen here, but it is specifically debarred from acquiring agricultural products in this way. The new amendment, proposed, along with many others, by the President last month, would simply remove the agricultural restriction.

The wool men, who are already bruised and buffeted by the Government's mishandling of their problems since the outbreak of the Korean crisis, suspect a new move by the Fair Deal planners to get into the wool act, and they want no part of it.

We heartily sympathize with this attitude. Whatever the actual purpose of the proposed amendment, it should definitely not be used as a means for putting Uncle Sam in the wool business. The situation doesn't call for such drastic measures now and bulk purchasing by Government wouldn't recommend itself as a method even if the emergency were worse than it is.

The system of Government purchase has been tried before, but even where elaborate safeguards have been set up (as in Britain during the war) it has tended to be inflexible and unsatisfactory. Government buyers, no matter how conscientious, simply can't take over the function of private wool men with lifetimes of experience. When you are dealing with some 3,000 different types of wool and market conditions changing by the day and hour, you are either an expert or you are not good enough.

If Congress is wise, it will make certain either that existing safeguards stay in the Defense Act or that new ones, fully covering wool, are added.

The Late Lessee R. Legendre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the House of the sad passing of a great soldier and

patriot and one who has given untold help to his comrades, especially the disabled of all the wars.

Leonce R. Legendre, 56, widely known assistant national adjutant of the American Legion, is dead of a heart attack here.

The two-war veteran who held a series of national American Legion positions over a period of 16 years, was stricken as he left his office at 5:30 p. m., May 15. Death occurred 5 minutes later in Farragut Park, one block from the new K Street American Legion branch headquarters. Watson B. Miller, American Legion official, was present.

Funeral services will be conducted Friday morning at the Church of the Annunciation with burial at Arlington National Cemetery. National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., will lead American Legion representatives and an Army unit from nearby Fort Myer in according full military honors at the graveside.

A native of Thibodeaux, La., and a 30-year member of the American Legion, Legendre was in charge of the organization's national office in Washington from July 1, 1946. He came to the Nation's Capital as chief of contact in that office in 1938, following 6 years as American Legion national field secretary serving Southeastern States. For a brief time in 1940 he was department adjutant of the Louisiana American Legion.

Legendre also was chairman, from 1926 to 1932, of the Veterans' Administration claims rating board for the State of Louisiana.

A lieutenant of infantry with 28 months of service in World War I, he returned to active military duty in 1942. He held the rank of lieutenant colonel, as executive officer of the military district of Washington, in charge of the Capital's civilian-defense program. His active military service terminated in September 1946.

Surviving are his wife, Helen Murphy Legendre, of 4916 Westway Drive, Chevy Chase, Md., and a sister and two brothers, all residents of New Orleans, La.

Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a very important statement by Mr. G. E. Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association. Mr. Leighty testified before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on May 14 in support of H. R. 3669, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

I am supporting H. R. 3669 and in my opinion the merit of that bill is very clearly set forth in Mr. Leighty's statement. The advice of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, for whom Mr. Leighty is spokesman, has always proven to be sound in matters of railroad retirement. All members of the House would be well advised to carefully study Mr. Leighty's presentation in order that they be completely advised in the field of railroad retirement.

Mr. Leighty's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF G. E. LEIGHTY BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE WITH RESPECT TO AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

My name is G. E. Leighty. I am president of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers and chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association. I appear here as spokesman for the association.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association is an association composed of the chief executives of 18 standard railway labor organizations and the president of the Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., which is itself an association of the 7 shop craft organizations who are all individually represented in the association through their chief executives. The organizations represented are the following: Switchmen's Union of North America; the order of Railroad Telegraphers; American Train Dispatchers' Association; Railway Employes' Department, A. F. of L.; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; International Longshoremen's Association; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union; Railroad Yardmasters of America.

The employees represented by organizations whose chief executives compose the association constitute approximately three-fourths of all the railroad employees.

The association has, and has had for some years, a standing committee whose function it is to watch over the functioning of the railroad retirement system and particularly to develop and recommend amendatory legislation whenever such legislation appears desirable. The committee is under the chairmanship of Mr. George M. Harrison, grand president of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. In addition to Mr. Harrison, the committee includes Mr. T. C. Carroll, president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes; Mr. Michael Fox, president, Railway Employes' Department, A. F. of L.; Mr. J. M. Burns, vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; Mr. William J. Van Buren, secretary-treasurer, National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; and myself.

Over a year ago this committee concluded that the need for amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act was imminent. However, it has not been possible to bring to completion an integrated program of amendments until quite recently, partly because the problems to be met were difficult and it took much time and study to find the proper solutions and partly because, insofar as the problems are related to amendments recently made to the Social Security Act, any solutions had to be tentative until after those amendments were enacted and their final content was known.

The bill, H. R. 3669, which is before this committee, embodies the program of amendments which the Railway Labor Executives' Association is sponsoring as the result of the investigation and study that I have described. The bill was prepared by our counsel under the direction of the association, with the assistance of members of the staff of the Railroad Retirement Board and in consultation with interested Members of Congress. Its terms are identical to S. 1347 which has been introduced in the Senate by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, on behalf of himself and 11 other Senators. Full hearings on the bill have been held before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I shall not undertake to present to you a detailed analysis of the bill itself. Our counsel, Mr. Lester P. Schoene, who will follow me as the next witness on behalf of the association, will do that. It is my purpose to place before you a statement of the problems with which we have been wrestling and a general description of the legislative changes which we believe to be necessary to solve these problems. The bill embodies these proposed solutions.

In the forefront of the problems with which we are confronted is the urgent necessity for increasing the amount of the monthly benefit payments both to retired employees and to the survivors of deceased employees. You as well as we are, of course, thoroughly aware of the tremendous increase that has occurred in the cost of living since 1937 when the railroad-retirement system was enacted. When the system was established its benefit provisions were set to bear a reasonable relationship to the cost of living as it then was and to the wage income that employees were accustomed to receiving prior to their retirement. As a result of the increase in living costs and to provide some improvement in the living standards of wage earners, wage rates generally, and the wages of railroad employees, have increased very substantially since 1937. As a consequence relationships of retirement income to living costs and wage rates existing in 1937 have no validity whatever today.

Some measure of relief, so far as retirement benefits are concerned, was attained in 1948 when the act was amended to increase these benefits by 20 percent. That increase, however, was inadequate at the time to reestablish the 1937 relationships and, as you know, both living costs and wages have again increased substantially since that time. So far as survivor benefits are concerned, there has been no increase since the provisions for paying survivor benefits were enacted in 1946. The level of those benefits as of that time was determined not with reference to living-cost requirements or wage rates but rather with reference to the survivor benefits paid under the Social Security Act. The level of those benefits was established in 1939 and was pitifully low even as of that time. Although the level of survivor benefits set in the Railroad Retirement Act was on the average about 25 percent higher than those provided in the Social Security Act, to give some slight recognition to the much higher tax rates paid by railroad employees, nevertheless the level of survivor benefits as so established in 1946 was less adequate to meet living-costs requirements as they then stood than the social-security benefits were when they were established in 1939. There has been no increase in the amounts payable to survivors since they were first established and the maximum benefit a survivor can now draw is approximately $41 a month.

That the amount of benefit payments should be increased no one can doubt. If we felt free to increase benefits to the levels warranted by the increase in the cost of living we would have to recommend much greater increases than those proposed in the bill. Necessarily, however, in a prudently financed system the extent to which benefits

can be increased is limited by the prospective revenues coming into the system. Railroad employees feel very strongly that the tax rates now in effect for the support of the Railroad Retirement system should not be increased. They are now paying 6 percent on their compensation up to $300 per month and will pay 6¼ percent beginning next year. Employees in other industries covered by the Social Security Act until recently paid only 1 percent, are paying only 1½ percent now and the maximum they are scheduled to pay is 3¼ percent many years in the future. It is apparent from these comparisons that any increase in the present rates would make the discrepancy intolerable.

At the same time railroad employees feel equally strongly that the financing of the railroad retirement system must be maintained on a sound basis. Improvements in benefits are therefore limited to such improvements as can prudently be made within the limits of the present financing and such new financing as can be provided without increasing the tax rates.

The problems with which we are confronted are further complicated by the very far-reaching amendments that were made last year in the Social Security Act. The railroad retirement system grew out of and was specifically designed to meet the needs of the railroad industry independently of what might be provided to employees in other industries through the general social security system. It is important to the industry that the railroad retirement system continue on this independent basis to serve the needs of that industry. However, this does not mean that the existence of the Social Security system can be ignored. Benefits under that system have now reached such levels that comparisons unfavorable to the Railroad Retirement system cannot be avoided. At the present time all survivor benefits under the Social Security Act and many retirement benefits exceed the benefits that would be paid for equivalent service under the railroad retirement system notwithstanding the much higher contribution that railroad employees make. We have come to the conclusion that although, it is not necessary that the Railroad Retirement Act provide benefits in all cases exceeding those provided under the Social Security Act, we cannot justify the continuance of a condition in which an individual in railroad service, paying the higher tax rate, derives less benefit from that service than he would if it were covered by the Social Security Act.

The provisions of the Social Security Act give rise also to other problems. The Social Security Act does not in express terms give credit for service rendered prior to 1937, as the Railroad Retirement Act does. However, the formula used in computing benefits is so weighted in favor of those who retire in the early years as in effect to give recognition to prior service. If the same individuals have sufficient service covered by the Social Security Act to qualify for benefits under that act and also receive a railroad retirement annuity based on prior service, they are in effect getting double credit for service with respect to which no tax was paid. Such generosity cannot be justified in comparison with the benefits it is possible to provide to those who make their careers in the railroad industry or in some other industry covered by the Social Security Act.

The railroad retirement system was designed and has always been thought of as being a system covering career employees in the industry. When the system was formulated it was believed that the phrase "once a railroader always a railroader" had practically universal validity. Up to that time there were not available collected individual employment records from which it could be determined to what extent people whose major employment is elsewhere work casually in the railroad industry. Through the maintenance of the individual records that the Railroad Retirement Act requires, that information has become available, and what it shows is very disturbing. It does show that the basic assumption of career employment is correct with respect to the big solid core of employees working at any particular time. However, it also shows that there is always a substantial fringe of casual employees who do not make railroading their career and who in the aggregate over a period of years outnumber, many times over, the career employees. The last Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board shows, for example, that 64 percent of the employees in service in 1948 had worked every year after they entered service and half of that group had entered service before 1937. On the other hand, out of the total number of new employees who entered service in 1938, only 13 percent were working in the industry in 1948. The aggregate result of this condition to date is shown by the fact that there are now approximately 8,000,000 individuals who have had some creditable service under the Railroad Retirement Act, although the number employed at the present time averages only 1,500,000 to 1,600,000.

I have already stated the conclusion that we cannot justify paying an individual less benefits for his railroad service than he would be paid for such service if it were covered by the general Social Security Act. However, the Railroad Retirement system cannot serve its primary function of meeting the requirements of the career employees, and also undertake to match social-security benefits for those short-term employees who work casually in the industry from time to time. Furthermore, since these short-term employees are virtually certain to have their major employment under the Social Security Act they are most likely to qualify for benefits under that act. If the Railroad Retirement system were to undertake to pay for such service independently of the employment covered by the Social Security Act there would be an unwarranted duplication of benefits and an unwarranted expense to the railroad-retirement account for the payment of benefits to individuals whose needs the System was not primarily designed to serve.

I have so far discussed the most serious and most difficult of the problems with which we are confronted. I should now like to tell you in a general way how the bill we are asking you to enact meets these problems together with a number of others that I shall develop in the course of the discussion. The bill contains a number of provisions which increase the amount of benefits payable. It provides for increasing retirement annuities by an average of 13.8 percent. The basic formula in the present law for computing annuities requires multiplying certain percentages of the average monthly compensation by the number of years of service. Those percentages of average monthly compensation under the present law are 2.4 percent of the first $50, 1.8 percent of the next $100, and 1.2 percent of the next $150. The bill would change these percentages to 2.8 percent, 2 percent, and 1.4 percent, respectively. The pensioners who were taken over from the railroad rolls at the beginning of the System and are receiving relatively smaller benefits than annuitants would have their pensions increased by a flat 15 percent.

From the changes just described all annuitants will receive a moderate but still substantial increase in benefits. The maximum annuity now payable would be based on an average monthly compensation of $300 per month with 30 years of service and comes to $144. Under the revised formula that would be increased to $165. Of course most employees do not get the maximum and the average is far under the maximum. The average now being paid is approximately $64 and that could be expected to increase under the bill to about $95. Such an amount appears particularly inadequate for an individual who has a wife to support. The Social Security Act has long recognized the greater need of such individuals. We believe the time has come when we should do likewise. The bill consequently provides that when a railroad employee has retired and is age 65 or over and has a spouse who is also age 65 or over the spouse shall be entitled to an annuity equal to one-half of the employee's annuity but with a maximum of $50. We believe that the combination of an increase for all annuitants with provision for the spouse's annuity makes a well-balanced program of recognizing the needs of all annuitants while at the same time recognizing the greater need of the man and wife.

With respect to survivor benefits the method of computation is liberalized and simplified. The new formula would allow 40 percent of the first $100 of average monthly remuneration plus 10 percent of the creditable remuneration over $100. This would provide a survivor benefit of $60 if the average monthly remuneration is $300, the maximum it is now possible to have. The amount so computed is equal to what the benefit would be under the amended Social Security Act on the same remuneration. However, in order to give some recognition to the higher tax rate paid by railroad employees our bill provides that there shall be added to the amount so computed $1 for each year of service on which taxes were paid.

In addition to these liberalized provisions for retirement and survivor benefits the bill would establish an over-all minimum applicable both to retirement and survivor benefits that in no case shall the benefits paid be less than the benefit or additional benefit that would have been derived from the railroad employment if it had been covered by the Social Security Act. The Railroad Retirement Act as enacted in 1937 carried a similar minimum referring to the original Social Security Act, but that provision became inapplicable when the Social Security Act was completely revised in 1939. Until the last revision of the Social Security Act the level of social security benefits was so low that a restoration of such a minimum was not a matter of great importance. Social-security benefits, now, however, are of such a level as to make it important again to guarantee that no employee shall sacrifice benefits by working in the railroad industry.

The problem presented by the casual employees is met by introducing a 10-year minimum service requirement as a condition of eligibility for either retirement or survivor benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. Provision is made that employees who at retirement or death have less than 10 years of service under the Railroad Retirement Act shall have their railroad service credited under the Social Security Act. They will thus receive under that act benefits based on a combination of their railroad and nonrailroad service, thus avoiding both duplication of benefits and a loss of benefits through having been in railroad service. In addition, such employees would continue to be subject to the guaranty now provided that the benefits derived from the railroad service shall not be less than the amount contributed in taxes plus an allowance in lieu of interest. By adjustments between the railroad retirement account and the old age and survivors' insurance trust fund, which I shall refer to more in detail later, the social security system is compensated for crediting this railroad service to the same extent as thought social security taxes had been collected on such employment.

Although the problems to be met which I I have already discussed are the most serious and difficult, there are other troublesome problems with which we are confronted but

to which the solution is more readily apparent. In 1937, the maximum of compensation that is creditable and taxable was set at $300. At that time relatively few employees were making over $300 per month. The ceiling, therefore, did not result in reducing benefits in any large proportion of the cases and did not serve substantially to reduce the tax income. Under present wage scales, however, its effect in both these respects has become much greater. We are proposing, therefore, that beginning with compensation paid after this year the maximum creditable and taxable compensation should be increased to $400 per month. Since there is no prior service obligation in connection with this change and since the annuity factor applied to this additional $100 of compensation in computing the annuity is the smallest of the three percentages, this change will result in a net gain to the railroad retirement account.

I have heretofore referred to the fact that the weighting of the social-security benefit formula in effect allows credit for service rendered before 1937. The Railroad Retirement Act expressly recognized such service for persons who held an employment relationship to the industry at the time the 1935 act was enacted. In order to avoid duplicate credit for service on which no taxes have been paid to either system the bill provides that individuals who are entitled to retirement benefits under the Social Security Act shall not be credited with prior service under the Railroad Retirement Act, with the qualification, however, that the resulting reduction in the annuity shall not be greater than the benefit to which the individual is entitled under the Social Security Act.

Under the present law an individual who continues in service after age 65 pays the same taxes on the compensation he then earns as other employees pay, but he receives no credit for that service or compensation in the computation of his annuity. At the time this provision was written it was considered a desirable inducement for the older employees to retire so as to help relieve the unemployment problem. During the last war, however, our problem changed from one of unemployment to one of a manpower shortage and that condition continues. That condition results in pressure on retired employees to reenter service and on employees eligible for retirement to continue in service. When such individuals have not accumulated 30 years of service at age 65 it appears to be an unwarranted discrimination against them not to allow them credit for such service up to the 30-year maximum which applies when prior service is used. The bill therefore proposes that in future awards service rendered after age 65 be credited in the same manner as service rendered prior to that time, retaining, of course, the 30-year maximum where prior service is used.

Prior to the 1946 amendments the Railroad Retirement Act made no provision for survivor benefits as such. However, the act did afford an employee the option, within certain limitations, to take a reduced annuity during his lifetime so as to provide a survivor annuity for his spouse if she survived him, the combined amounts being computed to have a value equivalent to the single life annuity to which the employee was entitled. With the introduction of survivor benefits the authority to make such elections was discontinued but a few such elections are still in effect by reason of action taken prior to 1946. In such cases if the spouse predeceases the employee the employee cannot understand why he must continue to take a reduced annuity even though it is an established fact that no survivor annuity will ever be paid. He feels that by taking the reduction during the period that there was any chance that a survivor annuity would be paid he has paid for the chance that did not materialize. This situation gives rise to bitter complaint that is all out of proportion to the savings that accrue to the Railroad Retirement Account through continuing the reduction after the death of the spouse. The bill therefore proposes that in such cases annuities accruing after the death of the spouse should be in the same amount that would have been payable if no election had been made.

At the present time the only restriction upon retired employees reentering employment is that the annuity is not paid for any month in which they work for a railroad employer or for the last person by whom they were employed before the annuity began to accrue. Under employment conditions existing in 1937 such a provision was deemed sufficient to assure that individuals who applied for annuities at a time when they were eligible to receive them genuinely meant to retire and not simply draw annuities to supplement wage payments. Retirement annuities are meant to support people who have retired and it is an abuse of the system to use them merely to supplement wage income. Under present employment conditions, such abuses can readily occur. We are consequently proposing the introduction, in addition to the existing restrictions, of a work clause like that in the Social Security Act, namely, that the annuity will not be paid in any month in which $50 or more is earned in wages or self-employment covered by the Social Security Act.

I think I have now covered the major subjects dealt with in the bill except the matter of financing. There are a number of changes in detail which I have not discussed but which will be covered in Mr. Schoene's testimony. I stated earlier that the available solutions to our problems were limited by the requirements of prudent financing without increasing the tax rates. We meet that limitation in a variety of ways. In the last actuarial valuation the level of future taxable payrolls was estimated as equal to an average of $4,600,000,000 per year. In making those estimates no account was taken of future increases in wage rates and substantial increases have already occurred. Under present conditions, it is reasonable, and in fact I think very conservative, to estimate the future level payroll at $5,200,000,000, particularly in view of the raising of the maximum creditable and taxable compensation from $300 per month to $400. This revision of payroll estimates has two important consequences with respect to financing. I have already pointed out that the raising of the taxable ceiling in itself results in a net gain. In addition, the cost of benefits based on prior service results in a smaller percentage charge on the payroll when it is spread over a larger taxable payroll.

The elimination of prior service credits for individuals who are entitled to benefits under the Social Security Act also will result in savings to the account. Similarly the more restrictive work clause will result in savings either through the postponement of retirement or through nonpayment of annuities. Likewise savings will result from the introduction of the 10-year minimum-service requirement. The bill contemplates that in the adjustments that will be made between the railroad retirement account and the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund the standard to be applied will be that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund shall be placed in the same position in which it would be if railroad employment were covered by the general social-security system. Since the railroad population is a relatively higher cost segment of the working population than the working population as a whole, the separate maintenance of the railroad-retirement system relieves the general social-security system of obligations more than commensurate with the tax income that would be derived from the collection of social-security taxes on railroad service. It is contemplated that in the adjustments to be made between the two funds the railroad retirement account will be given due credit for what it thus contributes to the maintenance of old-age and survivors protection of the whole working population.

The actuarial experts of the Railroad Retirement Board have made an estimate, in terms of level percentage of payroll, of the cost of the railroad-retirement system as it would be amended by H. R. 3669. That estimate is included in the Board's report to this committee. In making that estimate, account was taken of both the increased benefits and the savings provided by the bill. The experts estimate that the cost is approximately 14 percent of payroll. The tax rate, beginning next year, yields 12½ percent of payroll. The difference between the tax rate and the estimated level cost is, therefore, only about 1½ percent. Taking into account the fact that the cost estimate must be based on predictions extending to perpetuity, it is obvious that such an estimate can at best be only an approximation by which to guide one's judgment. Necessarily as experience develops, adjustments in the system will have to be made from time to time. It is our considered judgment that when the tax rate is within a range of as little as 1½ percent of an estimate cost running to perpetuity, prudent financing does not require a change in the tax rate.

We exercised a similar judgment in 1943 when we recommended and Congress adopted amendments increasing retirement benefits by 20 percent. The estimated cost of the system as so amended was a little over 1 percent in excess of the tax rates. Developments since 1943 have already established the validity of the judgment then exercised.

All our experience under the Railroad Retirement Act, since the very beginning, indicates that our experience with the 1943 20-percent increase is not unique or accidental. We have never yet had an actuarial estimate that was not shown by developments in the next few years to be an overstatement of probable costs. The first actuarial valuation of the railroad retirement account, made as of December 31, 1938, but published in 1941, showed an apparent shortage of 3.6 percent of payroll between the established tax rates and the estimated cost. Without any increase in taxes or reduction in benefits, the second actuarial valuation, made as of December 31, 1941, and published in 1943, showed a reduction of this apparent shortage to about 3 percent of pay roll.

In the 1946 amendments there was included an increase in taxes to meet the apparent shortage disclosed by the first two valuations; but the increase provided was not the 3 percent or more indicated by the valuation, but only 1½ percent. The opponents of the bill argued vigorously that the shortage was at least 3 percent. However, when the third valuation was made as of December 31, 1946, the account was shown to be virtually in balance.

By 1948, estimates then made showed that no increase at all would have been necessary in 1946 to cover any shortage. It was because the 1946 increase of 1½ percent was not necessary to cover previously indicated shortages that it was possible in 1948 to make a 20-percent increase in retirement benefits, costing about 2½ percent of payroll by incurring a then apparent shortage of only about 1 percent. But such an apparent shortage was incurred to provide the 20-percent increase with no increase in taxes. It was recognized, of course, that if costs worked out exactly according to the estimates, or worse than the estimates indicated, some adjustment either in benefits or taxes would have to be made. However, it was our judgment and that of Congress that experience would show the apparent shortage to be nonexistent, and when the fourth valuation was made that judgment was vindicated. Current estimates of the cost of the

present act come to 12.18 percent, as against a tax rate of 12.5 percent, or apparent overfinancing to the extent of .3 percent.

Just to see what would happen if, contrary to all previous experience, the costs of the act as we propose to amend it were to follow exactly the actuarial estimate of about 14 percent, we have had the Railroad Retirement Board actuaries run a projection of the progress of the Railroad Retirement Account on that assumption. I hand you that projection, and would like to have it incorporated in the record at this point. I offer it not as a prediction of things to come but as an indication of the time in which necessary adjustments can be determined and made if developments are worse than past experience leads us to believe. It indicates that for a period of about 15 years the reserve would continue to increase and would then reach a level of over $5,000,000,000 as against the present $2,100,000,000. Even at the end of 40 years the reserve would still exceed its present size. When we bear in mind the numbers of changes that have occurred in the last 10 years we have no reason to fear our inability to adjust ourselves to conditions as they actually develop. Such a program is practical and realistic. The comfort some people derive from precise mathematical equality between the present tax rate and predictions of cost is the comfort of an illusion.

Of course, we do not want to take chances with the solvency of the railroad retirement account. The bill does not propose to take such chances.

If experience indicates that changes should be made, we will have ample opportunity to make them. Neither we nor the Congress have any intention of going out of business in the foreseeable future.

We have devoted months of investigation and study to all phases of our railroad retirement system, including the innumerable amendments which have been suggested, and the proper financing of our system. We have arrived at certain conclusions as a result of our labors. We believe that we have prepared a well-rounded balanced program that meets all the really serious and difficult problems with which we are confronted. We recognize that many of the employees we represent would like to see a considerable number and variety of other changes in the act. Some of these might have merit if they could be considered in isolation and apart from all the other problems with which we have had to deal. We have given careful consideration to all suggested revisions that have come to us. We have had to choose and select and exercise our best judgment in relation to the total situation. In the exercise of that judgment we have developed the program I have discussed with you and we earnestly and respectfully solicit your cooperation in obtaining its enactment.

Obstacles to Exercise of State Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid article entitled "States in Strait-Jackets," by Hon. Richard L. Neuberger, a State senator in Oregon, which appeared in the April 1951 issue of the American magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES IN STRAIT-JACKETS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Have the elected officials in your State failed to give you promised improvements? Could be that they're stymied by a horse-and-buggy State charter. Here are some of the fantastic ways our outmoded constitutions can thwart the will of the voters.

Our Oregon Senate Committee on Local Affairs was listening to a delegation of high-school students from Portland telling us how they could not afford to go to college unless a State university was established in their community. The senators were sympathetic. We realized Portland was the only large city in the West without a State university in its environs.

Then from the corner came the dry voice of the committee's legal adviser. "I must remind you gentlemen," he said, "that article XIV, section 3, of our State constitution forbids the founding of any new public institution outside Marion County. Portland is not in Marion County."

This ended the matter. Only a vote of the people of the State could overturn the constitutional clause, and that would be after these particular students had matured beyond their college entrance years. I shall never forget the crestfallen faces of those high-school boys and girls, who had been so eagerly hopeful a short time before.

State government in America today is trussed and bound by a strait-jacket which perils all local sovereignty. This strait-jacket consists of State constitutions so absurdly cluttered with provisions promoted by pressure groups that the men and women under our capitol domes can barely carry out their responsibilities of office. In the vacuum thus created, the Federal Government has spread its heavy domination across the land, reaching into the lives of every individual family.

The Constitution of the United States, which rules the vast breadth of America from coast to coast, contains only 7,500 words. Forty-five States have constitutions longer than this. Indeed, many State constitutions actually triple and quadruple the length of the Constitution which the founding fathers wrote for the whole Nation. Political factions with an ax to grind have discovered that they can by-pass governors and legislatures if they put their pet theories, not on the statute books, but into the very heart of the State constitution.

As a member of the State Senate of Oregon, I have seen vividly how responsible government can be thwarted by a constitution packed with clauses put there by selfish local interests.

Sometimes executives and judges become exasperated, and the express provisions of a constitution are disobeyed. This sentence is in Oregon's constitution: "The governor shall receive an annual salary of $1,500." At 1951 prices this would barely keep a canary alive, much less a governor. So, in spite of the clear constitutional language to the contrary, Oregon has been paying its chief executive $10,000.

Although the United States Constitution leaves the Federal Government free to pay its officials adequate salaries, State constitutions have not followed this example. They impose heavy shackles on pay scales. These restrictions drive able men out of State governments, with the result that States' rights are further endangered.

Maryland's Constitution, which is three times as long as the national charter, limits the governor to an annual salary of $4,500, which is less than he might earn clerking in a store. The governor of Alabama gets a constitutional salary of $6,000, and that of Oklahoma $6,500. For a time the State of Washington circumvented a pay limitation of $6,000 by bestowing on the governor a living allowance three times the size of his salary.

In the case of State legislators, the pay manacles clamped on by constitutions are even more ridiculous. New Hampshire's senators and representatives receive constitutional wages which amount to $3 a day. Those of Rhode Island are paid a token of $5.

These constitutional pittances, set by iron-clad mandates stemming from an era when beefsteak retailed for 15 cents a pound, provide a field day for lobbyists, who need pick up only a few meal checks to win the gratitude of honest but hard-pressed legislators.

Service in State government was once the most direct route to the White House. Five of the past eight Presidents journeyed directly from gubernatorial chairs to a place on the national ticket of their parties—McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, Coolidge, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Yet despite these historic examples, the trend today is for outstanding men to shake the dry dust of State government from their feet in a quest for a niche in the United States Senate.

Twenty-five present Senators once were governors of their States. Not one former Senator has sought a governor's office. The ex-governors now in Senate service include such famous names as BYRD, of Virginia; AIKEN, of Vermont; BRICKER, of Ohio; DUFF, of Pennsylvania; and LEHMAN, of New York.

"Too many frustrations around here," commented a vigorous Governor of Idaho as he filed for a congressional post in distant Washington, D. C. "Whenever some responsibility faces the State, an outdated constitution prevents us from handling it in the right way."

Numerous State constitutions contain clauses which would be fantastic as mere laws. West Virginia's constitution makes it illegal for an official of a railroad to sit in the legislature. Dating from the rule of George III, the New Hampshire Constitution set the accounts of the State in shillings and pence. The Constitution of Texas calls for five times as many courts and judges as serve the infinitely larger population of Great Britain. California's Constitution goes into endless detail regarding such matters as the length of wrestling matches and the breeding of crustaceans and molluscs.

Occasionally these clogged constitutions are merely funny. But concerted attempts to wedge special privilege into the basic charter of a great State can be sinister and dangerous.

Last November it took the vigorous efforts of California's churches, newspapers, and civic organizations to defeat a constitutional amendment which would have legalized gambling in the most audacious fashion ever proposed in this country. Written right into the amendment were the names of the five individuals who would supervise and license race tracks and slot machines in California. Had the amendment passed, these men would have become the czars of gambling in our second largest State, and the constitution would have protected them from being overruled or held in check even by Gov. Earl Warren himself.

California has had sorry experience with the writing of personal names into its State constitution. In 1948 the electorate adopted an amendment installing a redheaded woman with blue eyes and freckles named Myrtle Williams as director of social welfare at a beginning salary of $12,000. To make sure no other Myrtle Williams would mistakenly be honored, the constitution gave her exact address: 420 Avondale Street, in Monterey Park.

Because Mrs. Williams' name was rooted in the basic charter of the State, neither the governor nor the assembly at Sacramento had full control over a branch of the California government which supervises the

spending of nearly $300,000,000 a year. Constitutional mandates cannot be touched or modified by the highest State officials. A costly special election finally separated Myrtle Williams from her job.

Since its adoption in 1789, the United States Constitution has been amended only 22 times. Yet some State constitutions have been amended hundreds of times, and each amendment is beyond the reach of the governor and legislature. They cannot cross a "t" or dot an "i." "Mine not to question why," said the governor of a western State, as he surveyed a constitution in which one section was longer than the entire Constitution of the United States.

Arizona entered the Union as late as 1912, but 45 amendments have already been plastered onto its constitution. California's bristles with patches, 312 of them. The constitution of Texas has been amended 104 times.

Article XIX of the 21,000-word Louisiana Constitution provides: "August 30, the birthday of Hon. Huey P. Long, now deceased, late Governor of Louisiana, shall be and forever remain a legal holiday in this State."

Not even George Washington's birthday is thus sanctified by constitutional fiat in Louisiana.

Pressure groups have discovered that it is no harder in some States to pass a constitutional amendment than a mere law. This may be why the South Carolina Constitution is poulticed with 192 amendments and that of Oregon with 113. The voter, confronting a ballot the size of a hearthrug, does not notice whether he is enacting a statute which the legislature can change or a constitutional clause which will clutch State government in an immovable vise.

Pension clubs, riding a temporary surge of popular enthusiasm, forced into the Colorado State Constitution a clause setting aside 95 percent of collections from State excise taxes for old-age assistance. A disproportionate share of the Colorado revenue dollar now goes to pensions, but neither the Government nor the legislature can do anything about it. They are bound by their oaths of office to follow the constitution to the letter.

Other State functions have been starved while old-age groups, protected by the constitution, take the first big bite out of the Colorado treasury.

"We know it's wrong," explained a senator at Denver, "but we in the legislature are helpless. This kind of special-interest subsidy has no place in the constitution."

Although ore-rich Colorado ranks first nationally in grants of old-age assistance, it is twenty-third in aid to needy children, twenty-third in general relief for hungry families, and a low thirtieth in average salaries for school teachers. The constitutional bounty enjoyed by pensioners is at the expense of education, for Colorado teachers languish near the bottom of all the States of the far West in their rate of pay.

In fact, the highest elective officials of the State of Colorado have comparatively scant authority over their own departments. This is because bureaucrats in the domed capitol below Pikes Peak succeeded in adding to the State constitution a clause which makes them accountable only to an appointed civil-service commission.

The result has been to thwart the will of the people as expressed at the polls. A candidate for governor or secretary of state may be triumphantly elected in Colorado because of popular indignation over a certain public policy, yet he will find himself lacking power to remove the department head responsible for that policy. The Denver Post calls this constitutional autocracy. Even now the Post blames the ironclad Colorado Constitution for preventing Republican Gov. Dan Thornton, a young rancher newly elected in November of 1950, from carrying out pledged reforms in the blundering management of certain State institutions.

Some constitutional provisions actually force reckless and irresponsible government on a State. The Governor of Tennessee is forbidden to sign or veto a bill after the legislature adjourns. Bills automatically die when the assembly goes home. In the closing days of a session they flutter into the Governor's office like snowflakes. There are not enough hours around the clock for the Governor and his staff to read all the measures which he must sign into laws affecting 3,292,000 people. More than one Governor of Tennessee has admitted approving an important bill he had no chance to study or analyze.

"A State constitution that may have been excellent in 1870 is certainly not necessarily excellent in 1950," observes Charles McD. Puckette, general manager of the Chattanooga Times.

Changing conditions create new problems, but many State constitutions seem immobile. The charter of Washington forbids the use of public funds for religious exercises. Inasmuch as public funds heat classrooms and pay teachers, this provision has been held to bar even the reading of the Bible in the common schools of the State. Minnesota cannot use voting machines, because the constitution compels all elections to be "by ballot," although this clause was written before voting machines were ever invented.

I remember sitting at my desk in Oregon's senate, listening to legislators representing less than one-third of the people as they voted down machinery for providing needed school levies in our State's only large city. Under a constitution written before Oregon had one paved sidewalk or electric-light bulb, the city had no authority to govern itself.

In wide-open New Orleans a young reform mayor, deLesseps (Chep) Morrison, tried to clean up the city. He made some progress, but Louisiana's State constitution, longer than most detective novels and just as fanciful, gave the legislature dominated by the Long machine authority to take over the municipal courts and thus balk Mayor Morrison with restraining orders. The New Orleans Bureau of Governmental Research claimed the city was the victim of "botched-up State constitutional provisions."

Is there no hope? Must government in our States continue to decline in prestige and in the quality of its personnel? Must cities dawdle along without real power to provide services for an ever-increasing number of residents?

New Jersey has shown there is hope, plenty of it. In 1948 New Jersey's energetic Governor, Charles Edison, a son of the great inventor, told the people that "State government is the most antiquated, incompetent part of our whole American system."

Edison asked the voters of New Jersey: "Why don't we change our State constitution to make State government conform to the facts of urban life in the twentieth century?"

Edison had found it was impossible for the Governor to administer the vast government he was supposed to head. There were 63 separate State departments, many not responsible to the executive. Some of these officials reported directly to the legislature. They never went near the Governor, who was kept in the dark concerning their budgets and programs. In addition, the legislature was in a constant political dither, for the New Jersey constitution of 1844 compelled the 60 assembly members to run for election every year. On top of all this, the State's highest tribunal, the court of errors and appeals, was composed of 16 judges, making it the largest appellate court in the world.

"Justice by mob," wrote one New Jersey newspaper.

In 1944 the voters turned down a new constitution drafted by some of the State's most eminent leaders. The margin of rejection was 126,521 votes. Mayor Frank (I am the law) Hague, of Jersey City, played a decisive part in the defeat of the new charter. Hague was satisfied with the status quo which prevailed under the constitution of a century before. He got help from some farm and labor spokesmen, who feared their organizations might lose certain advantages if State government were made more robust and responsible.

But Edison kept hammering away at the fact that except for the bill of rights, there is hardly a part of the present State constitution that is not grievously frayed, ripped, or misshapen.

A Democrat, Edison was joined in support of a new constitution by an ex-Republican governor, Walter E. Edge. Taxpayers' groups and the League of Women Voters insisted that economy, like charity, should begin at home. If New Jersey people wanted to save money on local taxes, they should adopt a constitution which would make efficient government possible.

A new governor entered the capitol at Trenton, Alfred E. Driscoll, and carried on the crusade for a State charter that would work. The movement gathered force like water surging through a penstock. Hague's baleful influence was waning. On January 1, 1948, a streamlined State constitution began to govern the affairs of New Jersey's people. They had enacted it at the polls by an overwhelming margin of 470,826 votes.

One of the most important innovations in the modern New Jersey constitution gives the Governor power to appoint the secretary of state and other officials. This follows the United States Constitution, which allows a President to pick his Cabinet. Under anachronistic constitutions in many States, all officials are elected. While fine in theory, this leads to desperate political Donnybrooks which often paralyze government. One need only imagine what might happen in Washington, D. C., if all heads of major Federal departments were chosen at the polls. Could President Truman plan diplomatic negotiations with Secretary of State JOE MCCARTHY?

Gov. Earl Warren was saddled for years with an elected attorney general whom the Governor openly accused of blocking the program of the California Crime Commission. The State of Washington is run by a Republican governor and a Democratic secretary of state, who probably will be the governor's adversary at the next election. This does not make for amity under the marble dome. For 2 years Oregon had a governor and an elected State treasurer, the fiscal directors of the Commonwealth, who were not on speaking terms.

It is not without significance that 42-year-old Governor Driscoll, who has taken the lead in ending this hydraheaded operation in at least one State, now ranks as a potential nominee of the Republican Party for President or Vice President in 1952. A committee for a new constitution in Ohio has recommended following the New Jersey practice of allowing a governor to commission the heads of all major agencies. In 1952 Ohio's voters will decide at the ballot box on the question of calling a convention to draft a new constitution.

The National Municipal League, which has been crusading for better government since 1894, recently drafted a model constitution that could apply to any of the 48 States. The officials of the league, who include ex-Governor Edison, fresh from the battle front in New Jersey, have reluctantly arrived at the conclusion that the bulk of State constitutions are too far gone to be amended successfully. They advocate a fresh start, warning that most State constitutions are serious obstacles to responsible and effective State and local government.

Tennessee's Constitution, to cite one extreme, has never been amended at all. It still prohibits duelists from holding office and names the bygone farm of long-dead Ben Posey as forming the Grundy County line. At the opposite pole, the California Constitution bristles with 312 amendments, some of which set forth rules for the slaughter of steers or the management of the Escondido Water Co.

California's Legislature, well aware of the documentary colossus which sits like the Old Man of the Sea on the shoulders of State government, has created a constitutional revision committee. Tennessee has gone further. In November of 1949 a proposal for a convention to draft a new State constitution was submitted to the electorate. It carried in the cities but lost in the cautious countryside. The result was a slim rejection—62,483 votes for the constitutional convention, 65,417 in opposition. This was far closer than New Jersey came on the first attempt, and Gov. Gordon Browning's forces are expected to try again in Tennessee, which even has a constitutional provision barring ministers of the Gospel from serving in the legislature.

Agitation for new State constitutions is becoming Nation-wide. In 1945 Missouri and Georgia adopted charters which had been greatly modernized, although neither was as streamlined as experts urged. Leading professors at the University of Texas Law School have made a critical study of a constitution adopted during buckskin days when Dallas was too small even to be included in the census. A Texas editor has thus described his State's constitution, in language which can be understood by Texans: "The harness is too small, the strap drawn too tight, the checkrein pulled up to the last buckle-hole."

Kentucky has just done away with a constitutional salary maximum of $5,000, which prevented the employment of outstanding educators and scientists. Florida, Minnesota, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Washington are among other States in which efforts continue to knock off the constitutional handcuffs. Oregon at last has erased a clause, dating from the frontier prejudices of the gold-rush era, which prevented people of Chinese ancestry from owning land or working a mining claim.

But in most States the constitutional strait-jacket remains. If the laces are fraying, it is because voters are demanding that the government closest to them live up to its responsibilities in the atomic age. States' rights will survive in America only if State governments are free to exercise those rights.

World Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during an audience with the delegates to the fourth congress of the World Movement for World Federal Government, April 6, 1951, at the Vatican, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, stated the position of the Catholic Church on world federal government, declaring that such government is in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the church, striving for peace among nations and peoples of the world, and in harmony with the principles of social and political life founded and sustained by the church.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved and heartened by the fact that the Pope has expressed this support of the movement aimed at the attainment of a federal world government, to which movement I have been rendering my full cooperation. Faced with the realization of the limitations of a single nation, or even a group of nations, in the field which embraces the entire globe, and during an era in which the basic power of the universe has been harnessed to a bomb containing within itself the seed of potential world destruction, I have maintained, and still do, that only through the cooperation of all nations can we avert the terrors of global conflicts, and effectively strive for world order, justice, and peace. For that reason, I had lent my support to House Concurrent Resolution 64, proposing the development of the United Nations Organization into an efficient body capable of coping with the problems of international aggression, and of maintaining peace.

The discourse of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, was delivered in the French language, and its English translation, made for the Catholic Mind, which I commend to the attention of this august body, is as follows:

POPE PIUS XII ON WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We are very appreciative of the deference you have displayed by this visit and we take pleasure in addressing you members of the World Movement for World Federal Government. We give you cordial greetings of welcome. Our lively interest in the cause of peace in the midst of a humanity so grievously tormented is well known to you. We have given frequent proofs of this interest. That interest, moreover, is inherent in our mission. The maintenance or the reestablishment of peace has always been and increasingly will be the object of our constant solicitude. And if, too often, the results have fallen far short of what our efforts and our acts aimed at, lack of success will never discourage us, so long as peace does not reign in the world. Faithful to the spirit of Christ, the church is striving and working for peace with all her strength; she does this by her precepts and her exhortations, by her incessant activities and by her ceaseless prayers.

THE CHURCH DESIRES PEACE

The church is indeed a power for peace, at least wherever are respected and appreciated at their true value the independence and the mission which the church holds from God, wherever men do not seek to make her the docile servant of a political egoism, wherever she is not treated as an enemy. The church longs for peace, she strives incessantly for peace, and her heart is ever with those who, like her, desire peace and devote themselves to it. She knows also, and this is her duty, how to distinguish between the true and the false friends of peace.

The church desires peace, and therefore applies herself to the promotion of everything which, within the framework of the divine order, both natural and supernatural, contributes to the assurance of peace. Your movement dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the church, nor better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate and illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances.

It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race in which, for decades past, the peoples have been ruining themselves and draining their resources to no effect. You are of the opinion that this world political organization, in order to be effective, must be federal in form. If by this you understand that it should not be enmeshed in a mechanical unitarism, again you are in harmony with the principles of social and political life so firmly founded and sustained by the church. Indeed, no organization of the world could live if it were not harmonized with the whole complex of natural relations, with that normal organic order which rules the particular relations between men and men and between different peoples. If it does not do that, then, no matter what its structure may be, it will not be able to stand up and endure.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

For this reason we are convinced that your first concern should be to establish solidly or to restore these fundamental principles in every field: national and constitutional; economic and social; cultural and moral.

In the national and constitutional fields at the present time, the life of nations is everywhere disintegrated by the blind worship of numerical strength. The citizen is the voter. But, as such, he is in reality nothing but one of the units, the total of which constitutes a majority or a minority, which the shifting of a few votes or even of a single one would suffice to reverse. As far as parties are concerned, he is of importance only for his voting value. No concern is shown for his position and role in his family and his profession.

In the economic and social fields there can be no natural organic unity among those engaged in production so long as quantitative utilitarianism, the consideration of maximum profitability, is the sole norm which determines the location of plants and the distribution of work, so long as the concept of "class" artificially divides men in society and there no longer exists a spirit of cooperation within occupational groups.

In the cultural and moral fields individual liberty, freed from all bonds and all laws, all objective and social values, is in reality only a death-dealing anarchy, especially in the education of the young.

Unless the universal political organization rests upon these indispensable foundations, there is risk of its being infected with the deadly germs of mechanical unitarism. We would like to invite those to reflect on this point, precisely from the federalist viewpoint, who dream of setting up a world parliament. Otherwise they would subject themselves to the play of those disintegrating forces from which our political and social order has already suffered too much. They would only finish by adding one more legal automaton to the many others which threaten to stifle the nations and to reduce man to the condition of inert instruments.

MORAL FEDERALISM

Just as, therefore, if it is to be true to the spirit of federalism, the future world political organization cannot under any pretext allow itself to be caught up in the play of mechanical unitarism, so also it will enjoy effective authority only insofar as it safeguards and encourages everywhere the life that is proper to a healthy human community, to a society in which all the members cooperate together for the good of the whole of humanity.

What a fund of moral steadfastness, intelligent foresight and capacity for adjustment this world authority will have to possess, qualities more than ever necessary in those critical moments when, in the face of malevolence, people of good will must resort to its authority. After all the proofs of the past and present, would anyone dare to say that the current resources of Government and politics are adequate? In truth, it is impossible to solve the problem of a world political organization without being willing to leave the beaten path from time to time, without appealing to the witness of history, to a sane social philosophy, and even to a certain divining of the creative imagination.

Therein lies a vast field of work, study, and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to you our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray to God to grant you His light and help in the performance of your task.

Northwest Iowa Leads in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare privilege and an honor for me to represent the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa in the Congress of the United States. The farming area comprising the Eighth Congressional District is one of the richest agricultural areas in the United States today. Personally, I do not know of another area in the country which can present such a flattering picture for so large an area.

Mr. Frank R. Wilson, information assistant to the Director of the Bureau of the Census, has recently prepared a most remarkable statistical picture of this great agricultural area, and the same is included herewith as a part of my remarks.

It should be pointed out that in preparing his statistics, Mr. Wilson included Monona County which no longer is a part of the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa. Aside from the figures relating to Monona County, the 12 remaining counties mentioned comprise the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa.

The statement follows:

The 26,143 farms in 13 Iowa counties of northwest Iowa, of which 12 are in the Eighth Congressional District, have a land and building value of nearly $1,000,000,000, according to computations from the 1950 census. The actual figure on valuations as returned by census enumerators was $979,186,780. Thus, the average value of land and building, per farm, approximated $37,500. Figured in connection with the 4,869,962 acres in these farms, the value was approximately $200 per acre.

Sales of farm products from these 26,143 farms in 1949, the full year prior to the census, amounted to $285,797,318. Thus, the average sales of farm products per farm approximated $11,000 and the sales of farm products per acre were at the rate of nearly $60 per acre.

Of the 26,143 farms, electricity reached 24,222, and facilities for modern living, such as telephones, electric washers, corn pickers, automobiles, and trucks were almost universally available. These 26,143 farms had an average monthly electric bill of $11.73.

This northwest Iowa district contains the champion county of Iowa in land and building values. It is Sioux County whose 2,971 farms were valued at $117,559,499. The second county of highest farm values in Iowa was Kossuth, with over $114,000,000 (with much greater area), and Plymouth County, Iowa, was third with $107,341,785.

Of the $285,797,318 sales of farm products in 1949, Sioux County, with $35,906,966, was second in the State to Pottawattamie with over $37,000,000 of gross farm revenue.

Northwest Iowa farmers market most of their crops through livestock. Of the $285,797,318 gross revenue, $97,123,480 was obtained from the sale of cattle. Hog sales amounted to $92,599,982, and calves brought $5,876,040. Among the 13 counties, Sioux County was first in cattle sales of $14,010,043, but Plymouth County was first in hog sales at $11,649,942. Plymouth County was second in cattle sales, and Cherokee County was third, with Woodbury fourth.

These 13 counties had 1,768 farms whose farm products sales exceeded $25,000, and they had 7,744 farms whose sales ranged from $10,000 to $25,000.

The valuations of land and buildings do not include other equipment on the farms, nor does it include the tremendous volume of livestock. The livestock inventory of the 13 counties included 665,742 cattle and 1,656,319 hogs.

Plymouth County was first with number of cattle with 82,920, and Sioux was second with 78,260. Woodbury had 65,971 and Cherokee 56,240. In numbers of hogs Sioux County was first with 215,450; Plymouth was second with 210,791; Cherokee third with 152,471, and Woodbury fourth with 145,329.

Northwest Iowa farms have high yields and values

[From the 1950 census]

County	Number of farms	Farms with electricity	Acreage in farms	Farm product sales, 1949	Value of farm land and buildings
Sioux	2,971	2,776	473,323	$35,906,966	$117,559,499
Plymouth	2,817	2,758	426,766	32,801,178	107,341,785
O'Brien	1,961	1,810	358,104	22,802,547	88,456,783
Ida	1,965	1,871	364,327	21,108,651	84,340,665
Buena Vista	2,063	1,991	360,624	21,395,576	80,837,045
Lyon	1,920	1,815	364,680	20,651,327	75,985,921
Cherokee	1,798	1,782	357,616	26,340,757	75,402,724
Woodbury	2,873	2,505	320,786	26,052,715	74,757,061
Clay	1,796	1,651	347,520	19,345,631	74,372,369
Osceola	1,306	1,165	351,081	13,194,252	53,947,279
Monona	1,945	1,640	421,147	14,041,587	53,106,639
Ida	1,454	1,343	273,448	18,364,184	52,588,342
Dickinson	1,234	1,115	233,428	10,462,147	40,082,783
Total	26,143	24,222	4,869,962	285,797,318	979,186,780

St. Lawrence Seaway Inspection Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, once again—for the third time—the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway are trying to sell their pet project to Members of Congress through a junket to the area that will be packed full of hospitality.

The Mobile (Ala.) Register in an editorial dated May 5, 1951, calls this air junket unjustifiable and states that if it were submitted to a taxpayer referendum it would be ruled out by a landslide:

The editorial follows:

AIR JUNKET BY CONGRESSMEN

Speaking of last straws, or something of the kind, the congressional committee which has been conducting hearings on the proposed white elephant so-called St. Lawrence seaway has decided to travel by air over the route of the hocus-pocus project.

This sight-seeing aerial junket is planned by the House Public Works Committee as a preliminary to voting on the seaway bill.

"After an hour's discussion at a closed committee session," Chairman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Democrat, of New York, told reporters no objections were raised to taking the trip," the AP relates.

Congressman BUCKLEY meant, of course, that none of the committee members present at the closed meeting objected to the junket. He could not have meant that none of the Nation's taxpayers objected, because the taxpayers were not consulted.

But our guess is that if this contemplated congressional junket and others similarly unjustifiable were submitted to a taxpayer referendum, they would be ruled out by landslides approximately of the size that may hit some of the Nation's junketing congressmen one of these days.

Statement of Clarence B. Randall to the Stockholders of Inland Steel Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the following statement by Clarence B. Randall, president of Inland Steel Co., to the annual meeting of the stockholders on April 25, 1951:

It has been a matter of deep satisfaction to the officers of the company, as I am sure it has been to each employee, that Inland is making such a great contribution to America's rearmament program. Since the outbreak of the war in Korea last June we have had the happy experience of breaking production records month after month. Never have so many new records been made and old ones shattered in such a short space of time. Often a new figure set in one month has itself been exceeded in the next following, and many of the all-time highs reached in March, which were so numerous they cannot be listed here, are already in danger as April draws to a close. Fine teamwork in the company's plants inspired by the vigorous and intelligent leadership of our operating officials has brought this about.

Yet side by side with this magnificent day-to-day production achievement this same operating staff has been driving ahead with the largest expansion program in the company's history, not only at our principal plant, but in those of our subsidiary companies as well. What this means in terms of long hours and devotion to the company's interest must be seen at first hand to be appreciated. We have no reserve of able men who have leisure for new duties. Busy men whose energies were already fully taxed in pressing for added production from our present facilities, have had to take on the added responsibilities of planning and carrying forward the expansion program. Nor should I fail to mention those good citizens from our sales and other departments who have voluntarily left their jobs here and their homes to serve temporarily in various defense assignments at Washington. Inland is proud of this immediate and effective response to the challenge of the national need. We know that no such sacrifice can equal that of the fine young men who have left us to enter directly into the defense forces.

Yet when a thoughtful American reflects that what is going on at Inland is going on everywhere throughout the country, he cannot help but wonder where it will all lead. No one doubts for a moment that communism must be stopped; our doubts arise when we ask whether we are doing it in the right way. And today the right answer to that question far transcends in importance to our company any question of internal administration. No amount of foresight and sound planning could bring prosperity to the employees and stockholders of the Inland Co. if the planning for the Nation is bad.

We sadly need a reappraisal of our national aims, a clear statement of our objectives. We need to know what we are trying to do, then how we shall do it, and in what period of time.

Take foreign aid, for example. Obviously there is a limit to what our economy can bear in the way of support to that of the whole world. The job we set out to do in Europe is done, and ahead of time. If now a new obligation is arising for the economic support of European rearmament, we in American business are entitled to know the measure of it. Our military advisers must make known the proposed limits of the program, both as to money and as to time, and then Congress, and Congress only, must make the commitment.

Or take our own rearmament program. We in American business are entitled to a clear picture of its magnitude, and again this should be expressed both in dollars and in time. Is what we are doing well conceived and well executed, or are we going about it hit or miss, with uncoordinated agencies buying too much and asking for delivery before it is really needed? The armed services today hold in trust the almost unbelievable capacity of Americans to make sacrifices, and it seems fair to ask that they proceed in an orderly way, with a minimum of waste, toward a clearly understood goal.

Or take the current dilemma of whether our economy can remain free or whether we must start down the tragic path of controls from which no nation has ever yet fully returned. Unfortunately we debate that problem in the dark. Because we do not understand our national aims and because we do not know the measure of our future world commitments, we cannot determine the degree of sacrifice required from each company and each citizen. Instinctively we resist planners who plan solely for the sake of planning. We would resent deeply any attempt to exaggerate a crisis for the sake of imposing controls that would not be accepted otherwise. We react badly to vague emotional appeals, but magnificently to an honest statement of facts, whether they be pleasant or unpleasant.

Or consider the problem of capital accumulation for the expansion of production. The steel industry has been under great pressure from the Government to enlarge its capacity. Yet the same Government proposes to cut off the funds required for that expansion by increasing corporation taxes. They obviously can't have it both ways. Earnings are the principal source of capital for industrial companies, and what is withdrawn as taxes is actually withdrawn from plant expansion.

This document seems a far cry from the customary report of a president to the stockholders of his company, but it reflects the sort of world in which the affairs of the company must be carried on. I believe that, judged by normal standards the company is in strong shape, and that its problems are being met with intelligence and fortitude. But I hold the deep conviction that the welfare of the company and its stockholders will in the ensuing year be determined by forces lying entirely outside of the power of your officers to control, and that what Inland and every other industrial company needs most is a reappraisal and restatement of our national aims.

"Without Fanfare, and With a Storage Capacity Equal to 10 Railroad Boxcars, the United States Air Force Giant C-99 Plane Carries 42½ Tons of Cargo 2,600 Miles Nonstop"—United Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, how well I remember as a young man the "lighter than air" airship arguments then advanced—and by noted men—that nothing heavier than air could fly through the air. Certainly, since that day, man has not alone, learned how to travel far but he has also learned how to travel fast.

Mr. Speaker, it is a feat that challenges, if it does not stagger, one's imagination, to take a great mass of iron, steel, lead, copper, aluminum, zinc, tin, and other inorganic and organic substances and energize them so that they fly through the air. It is as equally great a feat to fabricate these materials into a shape that encompasses the cubical content of 10 standard railroad boxcars, load them down with 85,000 pounds of freight and then cause them to fly through the air at prodigious speeds.

I have intended for some time past to address this body and tell of the marvelous contribution that Brookley Field in Mobile is making to national defense and also to tell you all how I have sat in my home and watched the huge C-54's rise off that field and start on their scheduled flights to the continent of Europe.

I shall look forward to the arrival at Mobile of this new giant of the air, the C-99, with its tail five stories high and with the same wingspread but with a 20-foot greater length than a B-36.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the flight of this new plane tells of its ability to carry 400 fully equipped troops and the possibility for the development of the use of this plane in war as well as in peace opens up a whole new concept, not alone of military tactics but of economics and transportation.

All hail to the United States Air Force for its latest feat in developing this great giant of the skies.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all may read the United Press report with respect to the United States Air Force C-99, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein that story as clipped from the Washington Post of May 14.

That article is as follows:

HOLD EQUALS 10 FREIGHT CARS—GIANT C-99 CARRIES 42½ TONS OF CARGO 2,600 MILES NONSTOP

Without fanfare, the largest land plane in the world has been performing remarkable feats of weight lifting for several months, it was learned yesterday.

The plane is the United States Air Force's almost forgotten giant C-99 transport, which steadily has been carrying cargo loads three times those of commercial air freight planes.

Most outstanding of the flights was a 2,600-mile, nonstop trip from Sacramento, Calif., to Savannah, Ga., on which the colossal ship carried 85,000 pounds—42½ tons of cargo. No other airplane has approached that record. On short flights the C-99 has carried more, perhaps 100,000 pounds.

The C-99 is a sister ship of the B-36 superbomber. Only one of the six-engine transports has been built. It was so large that before completion it had to be moved into a huge yard because Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp. had no building at San Diego, Calif., that would hold it.

Having the same wing span as a B-36, 230 feet, the C-99 is 182 feet long, 20 feet longer than the bomber. Its tail is 57½ feet high. The fuselage has a volume of 30,000 cubic feet, equivalent to that of 10 railroad freight cars.

On its two decks, the C-99 could carry 400 equipped troops or 300 litter patients.

The Fallacy of the Middle Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Frank Chodorov entitled "The Fallacy of the Middle Way."

This article proves that there can be no meeting of socialism and capitalism and that the world is not big enough for them to live in in peace.

The time has come to choose between the two. England's example is there for us to study and avoid. The article follows:

THE FALLACY OF THE MIDDLE WAY

(By Frank Chodorov)

I

The resignation of Aneurin Bevan from the British Government poses a question for so-called intellectuals who glibly advocate a mixed economy—partly socialistic, partly free. Can it work? Bevan is convinced it cannot. He and his group blame austerity on the mixture. The Attlee regime, they maintain, has failed because it has been too timid, too reluctant to wipe out what is left of capitalism in England.

Bevan is logically sound as a nut. Capitalism and socialism are so antagonistic in texture that there is no way to make them mix. The one is a way of life grounded in the axiom of private property; the other denies the axiom out of hand. How can you have harmony in a social order that accepts the axiom in some areas, rejects it in others?

When you reject private property, as an axiom, you have government intervention

and control. But, a social economy—as distinguished from a Robinson Crusoe economy—is so meshed that it cannot be partly controlled, partly free. When the government undertakes to fix prices it is compelled to fix wages. Intervention in the meat business at the butcher-shop level leads to intervention at the slaughterhouse, then on the farm, and when you follow through you come to the tannery and the shoe business. Each control calls for control of contiguous areas in order to make the previous control work.

Experience has shown that once socialism pokes its foot into the door, capitalism is on its way out. A mixed economy is a temporary concession to capitalistic habits and traditions. Bevan's position is this: since capitalism is doomed, why not be done with concessions and hurry the inevitable along? He is logical.

II

Now, if socialism and capitalism cannot be housed within a given country without causing friction, can there be harmony in a world of sovereign states, some socialistic, some capitalistic? Karl Marx said it is impossible, and the unmixed Socialists have always stuck by their prophet. They sometimes disagree among themselves as to whether evolution or revolution will ultimately wipe out world-capitalism and replace it with world-socialism, but they are unanimous in the opinion that a half-and-half arrangement is untenable. Only American intellectuals profess belief in the possibility.

Again logic is on the side of the Lenins, Trotskys, and Stalins. The world is so thoroughly integrated—economically and physically—that no part can hermetically seal itself off from the rest. For one thing, the natural distribution of raw materials over the face of the globe works against economic isolationism; without iron, the tropics would be hard put, while coffee improves breakfast in the temperate zone. Ideas, too, have a way of vaulting borders, and ideas germinate desires and action.

Socialism is convinced that capitalism—private property—is an evil idea, the worst man has ever thought up; before the ideal society can be realized this idea must be eradicated from the human mind. Within a given country, where the Socialists have got control of its political machinery, the task of eradication is possible of accomplishment; one way or another, the fiction of private property is removed from man's consciousness, and he ceases to think that way. But if the idea rides high in the outside world, it is a constant threat to this process of eradication. That is to say, a cause bell always is present in a world partly socialistic, partly free.

Bevan is reported to have expressed resentment toward America. Were he to entertain any other sentiment toward a capitalistic neighbor he would be ideologically inconsistent. His particular grievance against America is of no importance; so long as capitalism has a toehold here, just so long will English socialism find America an irritant and a danger. There will always be Bevans and issues.

That suggests an unthinkable thought: is it possible that an Anglo-American conflict could arise from the antagonistic social systems? No Socialist would be consistent if he thought otherwise. To be sure, clashes between nations arise from a multiplicity of causes, and their advent is subject to military and political exigencies. In the present world situation, England needs us and we need England, and the pressing interdependence overshadows the friction of conflicting ideologies. The point is that the friction does exist and will continue to exist because socialism cannot tolerate capitalism.

Realistic Russia seems to be pressing for a vindication of this Marxist tenet on the battlefield. England is on our side. Whether she likes it or not, her existence as a sovereign nation, socialistic or otherwise, is dependent on the military and economic help given her by a capitalistic nation. On which side would she be if that help were withdrawn? Ideologically, it would be Russia, but that choice would mean her national liquidation—and that brings up another question.

III

Is international socialism a durable modus vivendi? To repeat, an internal mixed economy is at best a troublesome transition from capitalism to socialism. An international mixed economy is likewise fraught with difficulties. Well then, if all the nations in the world were to embrace socialism could they (a) continue to exist as sovereign nations, and (b) live in harmony with one another?

Socialists have always insisted that war is a product of capitalism, and that when private property is done away with, the political establishments based on private property would wither away, and so would nationalistic loyalties and ambitions. The U. S. S. R. has made that theory look so foolish that the doctrinaires resort to denying its claim to being a socialistic nation. Nevertheless, most simon-pures admit the necessity of introducing socialism on a national basis; first things first.

That simply means that, in the beginning anyway, all socialism must be national socialism—resembling in substance the Hitlerian scheme. When one considers the job of reconditioning people to the new order one realizes why this must be so. To rip out of men's minds the traditions of capitalism, backed by centuries of practice, requires a lot of doing—reeducation, purging, and outright liquidation. It is a task that is proportioned to the size of the nation. It is perforce a local job.

This reconditioning is made difficult by contamination from the outside world. Even if the next-door neighbor also professes socialism, a differential in wages might arise from a difference in natural advantages, and news about it could start a migration of workers. That would upset the controls, just as the free importation of goods must make the regulation of prices a farce. In short, to institute socialism in any one country requires its immunization against all foreign contacts. The iron curtain is a necessary property in a socialistic performance.

But, there is always the problem of the maldistribution of natural resources; in that respect, nature is oblivious of the glories of socialism. Under capitalism, the disequilibrium is righted, though imperfectly, by its intricate system of exchanges. When all the nations of the world have abolished this capitalistic system, how will the coffee of Brazil get to Italy, the turpentine of North Carolina to Tokyo? Doctrinaire socialism has no answer, not one that makes sense anyway. Russian socialism has an answer, and it resembles what the doctrinaires used to sneeringly refer to as imperialism.

Yes, the boys in the Kremlin are the most logical of all Socialists. They know that socialism hasn't a chance if capitalism exists anywhere in the world. They know that separate socialistic nations will be at one another's throats. The only way, then, is to wipe out both capitalism and nationalism at one fell swoop, and to inaugurate global socialism controlled by a single central intelligence.

IV

England's situation, which Bevan's resignation dramatized, is precarious. She hardly gets going on national socialism when her national existence is threatened by the intransigents of the East, bent on fulfilling the destiny bequeathed to them by the Prophet Marx. If they succeed, England will be relegated to a subdivision of world socialism.

On the other hand, what will be her fate if the western capitalistic colossus prevails? The impending struggle promises to leave the world a shambles, making it incumbent on the victor to manage and police it. England will necessarily be one of the policed nations.

In the circumstances, Bevan's proposal that England cut herself adrift from both menaces, so that she can pursue her way toward complete national socialism, is born of despair. Is there no way out for her? Only one escape suggests itself, and that is to go back to the capitalism that, in the nineteenth century, enriched her and gave her strength.

For all the faults of nineteenth century capitalism, its record of achievement compares most favorably with the socialistic and mixed economies of the last 50 years. Production piled on production, taxes were low and the individual was less harrassed. Even its depressions were overcome without austerity, hand-outs, and controls.

In the matter of wars, it is noteworthy that the nineteenth century had no major war comparable to either of the two we have had since 1914. Whatever causes war, it is a certainty that socialism does not bring peace; the evidence is all for the proposition that imbedded in socialism is a prime cause for war.

Perhaps, then, a full measure of capitalism, without mixture, would restore England to vigor and independence. Her productive capacity would certainly improve to the point where she would no longer be a mendicant nation, and the well-being of her people would give pause to the realistic Kremlin. One does not pick on a strong fellow.

That, of course, is what America should do, before the slow poison of a mixed economy brings her to England's plight.

Not Much of an Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me previously, I should like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Press on Tuesday, May 8, 1951:

NOT MUCH OF AN ANSWER

The President last night, in what obviously was intended as a reply to General MacArthur, stressed "the awesome and terrible possibility" of an atomic war.

"No matter how good our air defense may be, or how big an Air Force we build, a determined air attack by the Soviet Union could drop bombs upon this country," Truman said.

The best defense against such an attack, he added, "is to prevent the outbreak of another world war and achieve a real peace."

Few Americans will disagree with either statement. But it is possible to accept both without sharing the President's assurance that his present policies will prevent another world war, achieve real peace or win the war we are already fighting.

Defense Secretary Marshall's testimony before the Senate committee yesterday also failed to satisfy on the same count.

That testimony included an apparent contradiction of one of Truman's own assertions.

The President said he had refused to extend the area of conflict in Korea on "the best collective military advice in this country."

Yet General Marshall said he had "urgently recommended" adoption of a proposal by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to permit "hot pursuit" of enemy planes for a stated distance beyond the Yalu River into Manchuria, but we were forced to abandon that plan because the 13 nations allied with us in fighting voted solidly against it.

That seems to indicate that, though the United States is bearing 95 percent of the war burden, vital strategy is being dictated by 13 nations represented in Korea by mere token forces.

These same nations are dragging their feet on the American proposal for economic sanctions against Red China.

"We cannot go it alone in Asia and go it in company in Europe," Truman contended.

Would it be more hazardous to go it alone than to continue to let ourselves be hamstrung, against our better judgment, by so-called allies who insist on working both sides of the street? Can we depend on them in Europe if we can't in Asia?

Some time, some place, we shall have to insist that our friends stand up and be counted. We are losing most of the blood and we have, at least, the right to expect our Allies to stop trading with the enemy, as some of them are doing right now.

If this is the "system of collective security" which the President says we are helping to set up, we should demand that it be replaced by a one-for-all-and-all-for-one arrangement.

Any hitch-hikers who might leave us on such a showdown would be no loss.

Money we are wasting on them could be spent to far better purpose if divided among the nations, including Nationalist China, which are willing to fight.

About all that can be gathered from those portions of Secretary Marshall's testimony made public is that he favors our present course because he believes it less likely than the course advocated by General MacArthur to involve us in war with Russia.

That is conjecture. What is more probable is that we encourage Soviet aggression by official utterances which would lead the Russians to believe that we so fear them and their atom bombs we dare not risk offending them by exerting enough force to end the war in Korea.

If there is a "best way" to prevent a third world war it is to be prepared to win one if it is forced on us—so well prepared to deliver our big bombs on the other fellow's doorstep that he will be as anxious to avoid breaching the peace as we are eager to preserve it.

Our safety depends on swift and adequate preparedness. Let's get going faster.

Meanwhile, Secretary Marshall's self-censorship didn't pass much to refute General MacArthur's opinion that the Chinese Reds can be forced out of Korea by cutting off their supplies.

Praying for Peace With Expectancy of Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following excerpt from a recent edition of the Capitol Gist:

ON PRAYING FOR PEACE WITH EXPECTANCY OF SUCCESS

If one visualizes the millions of men, women, and little children who pray daily for world peace on bended knee or with bowed head, one cannot refrain from joining in praying and working for "on earth peace, good will toward men."

And all may pray—and with expectancy of success, or faith that as a result of the terrible sacrifices, sufferings, and destruction in the U. N. police action in Korea that the world will have learned its lesson and global peace attained.

Then the loss of part of the flower of America's young manhood on the far away hills and mountains and ravines of Korea will not have been in vain and this war-weary world can enter a new era of peace, progress, and plenty for all people on this troubled planet.

Now is the time to put into practice the Christian principles which we profess, and abide by: "Thy will be done."

The Continued Threat to American Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years I have repeatedly warned of the threat to the American glass industry which is poised by imports from foreign countries, including countries behind the iron curtain. It is obviously impossible for our local industries, maintaining good wages and high working standards, to compete, for example, with Czechoslovakia which does not have comparable wage scales, and is quite indifferent to working standards. Moreover, their production costs are not especially significant since the economy of the country is controlled by the Government, and they frequently export without any real reference to the cost of production, but simply to obtain needed American dollars.

All of this is well illustrated in a recent editorial in the Vineland (N. J.) Times-Journal which is herewith included:

CLOSE TO HOME

In direct contradiction to an occasionally voiced opinion that the average workingman has little stake in national elections decided on international issues, is the distressing situation in the American glassware industry. And in Greater Vineland when the glassware industry is threatened, the circumstances are of vital importance not only to the glassworker whose livelihood is directly affected but to most of the rest of us in the community.

That is why we were interested in a letter passed along to us by our friend Jim Mitchell, international representative of the American Flint Glass Workers Union of North America. The letter was written by Harry H. Cook, international president of the union, quoting a recent Inside Labor column by Victor Reisel in the New York Daily Mirror.

Writing from Cincinnati, Reisel said: "It's here in Ohio that one sees the effect of the Soviet slave apparatus in microcosm. Here the glass struggle is on. And the shrewd Marxist Russians appear to be winning. They're hurting our own glass industry badly. Before war work seeped into the Pennsylvania-Ohio-West Virginia-Indiana glass area some 2,000 of our skilled glass technicians were thrown out of work by Soviet slave competition. * * *

"For some years now, Communist Czechoslovakia had led all the rest of the iron-curtain tribes. In 1949, this land of the Skoda Munitions Works (now grinding out guns for the Chinese Soviet armies) dumped most of the 12,071,991 dozen pieces of hand-made glass that came into the United States. Last year this jumped to 23,668,324 dozen pieces, worth millions of dollars—as the Soviet secret police (MVD) moved in to exploit that land of once free people.

"Add to this the heavy cut glass from Poland, once again popular in this country, and you find that the union's fears are justified. Our own artisans are being forced to abandon a trade for which they trained for years.

"Here is evidence that this trade is a glass-for-guns business for the Russian overseers of Czechoslovakia. Recently a member of the Czech Communist ministry controlling industry called some of his people together and briefed them on the importance of this trade. He was comrade F. Markovic, who said:

" 'Export prices here are not based on production costs but upon the Czechoslovakian need for currency of the country to which the merchandise is being exported.'

"He meant us and the good old United States dollar. Here's what happened. There is an item, for example, which cost American employers $2.12 a dozen just for labor, but the Soviet slave marketeers sell that same glassware for $1.73—complete.

"So cheap is this stuff that it flooded the country and endangered the jobs of 50,000 American workers, some 16,000 of whom are skilled. Just as cheap are the slave glass imports from Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Romania, Russia itself, and Red Manchuria from which the Soviet Chinese armies get much of their steel, coal, and other heavy equipment and fuel.

"The Treasury Department can cripple this trade with just a simple single sentence regulation. But nothing's happening. And won't happen until we make as much noise as we did about the slave crabmeat."

In its issue of last month, the official magazine of the glassworkers noted that 20 percent of hand-made glass sold in the United States in 1950 was imported from abroad—and again the same reason was given; cheap labor.

The issue of a protective tariff or destruction by foreign competition is one that faces not only the men and women who make glassware but many other American industries. War production creates full employment and so the problem is not pressing at the moment; yet the flow of dollars to iron curtain countries cannot be overlooked.

Paralyzed Vet Weeps as 2,500 Cheer His Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald for today:

PARALYZED VET WEEPS AS 2,500 CHEER HIS MUSIC

BOSTON, May 17.—A paralyzed Navy veteran sat in a wheel chair at Symphony Hall

last night with tear-filled eyes as 2,500 persons stood and cheered when the Boston "pop" orchestra finished playing an original composition he picked out with one finger while a hospital patient.

"This is the greatest night of my life," said Robert Grant, Jr., a victim of multiple sclerosis. "This happening to me is out of this world. It just can't be."

CHEERS BRING ENCORE

But it was. The audience cheered his Evening Prayer so long and hard, Conductor Arthur Fiedler had the orchestra play it twice. Again the audience went wild and many swarmed around Grant, who couldn't rise from his wheel chair at a table near the door.

The first time through the music, the 26-year-old veteran sat clutching a sacred heart medal and beaming proudly.

But when the audience gave the religious song its first ovation, Grant became choked with emotion and as the tears flowed, he found it hard to speak.

"The orchestra was tremendous," he said. "This is the kind of thing that just doesn't happen to anybody."

HE JUST PECKED AWAY

Sitting on Grant's left was Mrs. Charles Davidson, the Red Cross Gray Lady at the Cushing Veterans' Hospital in Framingham who encouraged him to try and put his poem to music. The veteran loved music, but never thought of composing.

However, he had plenty of time and pecked away at the hospital piano until he had a melody to fit the words. Fiedler heard about the song, visited Grant and listened to his music. Then he ordered his own arrangur to make a full orchestration which was played last night.

Mrs. Davidson and her daughter, Jane, who first sang the song for Grant, both wept as they sat listening to tenor Gene Cox of Boston sing the words that thanked God for all the things he has given mankind.

HIS FATHER ATTENDS

Also present was Grant's father, but his invalid mother could not attend. A recording of the performance was made, but the veteran had to return immediately to the hospital and could not take it with his father to their Cambridge home.

A Dartmouth graduate in the class of 1947 and a former Navy boxer, Grant was surrounded by former classmates and some 250 other veterans and hospital personnel from Cushing. Twenty-five of the patients also were in wheel chairs.

AMVETS Speak Up About United Nations and General Wedemeyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II,
DEPARTMENT OF IOWA,
Atlantic, Iowa, May 10, 1951.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENSEN: First we want to congratulate you on your recent victories in Washington in starting the economy drive and in cutting down on nondefense and unnecessary spending in Government.

Also, just in case you may be interested we are enclosing a copy of the resolution passed by the representatives of the veterans of World War II in this southwestern Iowa community. Apparently the men here are becoming quite disgusted with the nonproductive debating work going on in this United Nations assembly, and with complete disregard, apparently, of our men dying daily in Korea. It is time for positive action and a positive foreign policy.

We do thank you for your untiring efforts, though, for honest and efficient Government.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE H. FRIES,
Commander, Walnut, Iowa.
R. G. ROBERTS,
Atlantic, Iowa.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II, ATLANTIC, IOWA, MAY 10, 1951

Whereas the Korean police action is still see-sawing back and forth across the peninsula, costing 1,000 and more casualties weekly (mostly American blood), it is now time to look to the future and study the road ahead. It is noted that the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, is expected to finish drafting the bill of rights for all the peoples of the earth; and

Whereas this bill, described as a guaranty to free speech and a free press is simply an exercise in applied hypocrisy. The bill begins by saying: "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression * * * freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas * * * orally, in writing, or in print * * * or through any other media." The next section of the covenant cancels out the promise. It says "The right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may, therefore, be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions"; and

Whereas the covenant on human rights, if accepted by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, would become a treaty, and treaties, under the provisions of the United States Constitution, become the supreme law of the land. "The American Bar Association, at its midwinter meeting in Chicago, expressed grave anxiety that United Nations treaties might thus undermine our bill of rights and transform the Nation into a Socialist despotism. As a safeguard against this, it has been proposed that the United States Constitution be amended to prevent treaties from superseding Federal and State laws." To continue this quotation: "But a simpler and better safeguard would be to get out of the United Nations. The United Nations will never have anything but Socialist ideas to offer because it is dominated by socialism—except when it is dominated by communism": Be it hereby

Resolved by the members of this AMVETS organization, the American Veterans of World War II, meeting this 10th day of May 1951 in a special meeting in Atlantic, Iowa, That in view of the inherent dangers to freedom of speech, freedom of the press and the radio, and even danger to our freedom in religion and worship, and loss of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, we do protest strongly the adoption of these Socialist doctrines, and do urge the United States to get out of the United Nations. It is believed by the members of this organization that we cannot only save our country from the despotism of socialism but also could then offer real assistance to our brave men now fighting in Korea or maybe later all over the world.

Whereas Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer is now separating from active duty in the armed services, and since he has written his report on far-eastern affairs that has proven 100-percent correct, and most likely would have avoided the Korean affair, thus saving some 62,000 American casualties, it is hereby

Resolved by the members of this AMVETS organization, That General Wedemeyer should be called before the United States Senate and before Congress to give this body of our representatives his valuable findings and his opinions on important matters in the Far East, and that this call should be made at once.

GEORGE H. FRIES,
AMVETS Commander,
Walnut, Iowa.
R. G. ROBERTS,
Atlantic, Iowa.

Hon. Eugene Worley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the April 1951 issue of the Texas Bar Journal, the official publication of the State bar of Texas, there is a very interesting article about our former colleague and friend, Judge Eugene Worley, of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. On the front cover of this magazine appears a very fine portrait of Judge Worley.

I know that the members of the House will enjoy reading this article because it tells of Judge Worley's career as a lawyer, legislator, and a member of the judiciary of this country. Of particular interest will be the story of his successful campaign for election to the Seventy-seventh Congress.

It is a privilege for me to recall that I have had a long and pleasant personal association with Gene Worley. Gene and I were classmates at the University of Texas, both of us having received our legal education at the law school at that university. It was there that I also came to know his fine wife, Ann, prior to the time that Gene was fortunate enough to persuade her to marry him.

Later on it was my privilege to join him in the Texas Legislature when he had already completed one term in the house of representatives of that legislature. The two of us had the opportunity of serving together two terms in that body, at the end of which he was chosen by his neighbors and friends to represent them further here. Both of us served in the Navy during World War II. It was, of course, a high privilege for me to join him again here during the Eighty-first Congress.

The article follows:

EUGENE WORLEY: A FORMER CONGRESSMAN, TEXAS LAWYER, IS NOW JUDGE ON UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Eugene Worley, 42-year-old lawyer from Shamrock, Wheeler County, is one of the five judges on the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, Washington, D. C.

President Harry S. Truman appointed him to the court in the spring of 1950.

No stranger in the national capital, Judge Worley first went to Washington in December of 1940 as a Texas Congressman. He began serving in the Seventy-seventh Congress, continued serving as a Congressman until the President's appointment.

There's an interesting story about Congressman Worley's first election. A group of high-school boys and girls helped elect him as Democratic nominee to the House of Representatives in Washington from the Eighteenth District of Texas. Panhandle newspapers in the fall of 1940 said the "Mr. Worley Goes to Washington" Club organized by the young people did more than anybody else in the Panhandle to elect him to Congress.

In April some Pampa high-school students and one 13-year-old junior-high boy organized the club, functioned desultorily for a few months, then realized that their candidate, Gene Worley, might not get into the run-off election in the first primary, July 27.

The "Mr. Worley Goes to Washington" Club went into action. With the president of the student council and players on the football team as speakers, the club members went all over the Panhandle making speeches. A pep squad leader led the cheering every once in a while. Members of the high-school band did their part.

No one was more surprised than the candidate himself. He did not know about the club's plans until the first time his supporters went out to speak for him. They learned he was to speak on the main street in Borger. They went over there, rode a fire truck down the street with the band playing, soon attracted the biggest crowd Mr. Worley had drawn up to that time.

The "Mr. Worley Goes to Washington" Club did their job so well they offset Mr. Worley's disadvantages—no billboards, no radio time. In the first primary campaign the club held 30 campaign rallies in 18 of the 28 counties.

There were 12 other candidates besides Mr. Worley, and he barely got into the runoff.

His opponents failed to realize the importance of "the high-school stuff." They overlooked the fact that the youngsters had 2,000 parents who could vote, even though they themselves were too young to vote.

By runoff time there was a different story. Gene Worley was elected by 7,000 votes and carried 24 of the 28 counties.

And that's the story of how Mr. Worley went to Washington.

Judge Worley sits on a five-man appellate court that gets appeals from the United States Customs Court and from the United States Patent Office. There is only one customs court, seated in New York, but it conducts hearings in all parts of the country.

Decisions of the Customs and Patent Appeals Court can be carried to the United States Supreme Court for review.

Chambers of the Customs and Patent Appeals Court are on the seventh floor of the Bureau of Internal Revenue Building in Washington.

Eugene Worley was born at Lone Wolf, Okla., October 10, 1908, the son of John B. and Idelle (Johnson) Worley.

He was a student at Texas A. & M. College for 2 years, 1927–29, before entering the University of Texas, where he earned his academic and legal degrees.

He was already a member of the Texas House of Representatives when he was admitted to the bar in 1936, and he was reelected twice, serving in the forty-fourth, forty-fifth, and forty-sixth legislatures.

Judge Worley was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1936.

He is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Delta Phi Delta, Phi Delta Theta, Methodist Church, Masonic Lodge (thirty-second degree), Odd Fellows, and State bar of Texas.

We Americans Don't Like Aristocracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this timely editorial from the Auburn Parker of Chicago, Ill., issue of April 25, 1951:

WE AMERICANS DON'T LIKE ARISTOCRACY

(By Earl B. Fox, president of Fox College)

We don't like aristocracy of wealth, of blood, or of education. We know that the opportunity of education only for those endowed with a high I. Q. is definitely un-American.

It was Plato who said: "That the purpose of education is to develop in the mind and in the soul and in the body all the perfection and all the beauty of which they are capable." Others have defined education as "an adjustment to environment." To deny this opportunity to all on an equal basis is cruelly wrong. While it is understandable that university presidents and professors are much concerned over the prospective lessening enrollment, poorer athletic teams, etc., we violently take issue with their present solution of this problem.

Since the source of every socialistic scheme that now burdens our industry and clouds our thinking was hatched on our university campuses—it is ridiculous to see these same universities propound such an unsocial idea as draft exemption for those with a high I. Q. It is so out of character.

It was Will Rogers who said, "I have three children, and thank God not one of them is a genius." One's I. Q. is not very important. What he does with it is most important. Give me in addition to one's I. Q. his P. Q., that is, his personality quotient plus his ambition quotient—then and only then—can I give you his coefficient of success. Without an agreement with the Pentagon the universities would have been hard hit. It would have been so bad that some of the professors would have to take jobs in war plants. Maybe that would have been justice. After all, it was the original Brain Trust (composed of college professors and their protégés) that brought about the recognition of Russia. It was this same group that propounded the idea of killing pigs, plowing under young corn and tender wheat. It was this group of Brain Trusters who scuttled the Atlantic Charter and made Russia strong. This proposed plan of I. Q. tests for draft exemption classifies every GI as a moron—poor thanks to those who are giving and will give so much—maybe their all. What effect will this have upon the sincere university student? Will not his educational aims be seriously affected when socially he is blackballed as a slacker, goaded with the guilty conscience of dodging his duty? Can those of us who so highly respect the universities and their glorious traditions of the past stand idly by and see these glories traded for a mess of pottage?

There is no valid excuse for any young man to be excused from the draft. If it's important enough for one to serve, it is important enough for all to serve of that respective age bracket. No young man should be denied the privilege of serving his country in uniform to the maximum of his ability. If he be a IV-F or even subnormal, isn't that sufficient punishment? Must we heap coals of fire upon his head by denying him the privilege of wearing the uniform? We don't dare to deny anyone that right when we will let him vote now or later. The privilege of voting implies definite responsibilities.

True, all can't serve in top capacity, but with proper ingenuity and sufficient effort a job can be located somehow, somewhere, for every man who has the American right of wearing the uniform. We all know it takes nine men to support one in the field. Those who can't serve in the field can, most assuredly, serve behind the men behind the gun. Then if all men go in uniform, does that mean all our universities must close? Where will we get our future scientists, engineers, those for research, teachers, etc.? The answer is very simple. For now we have ample proof that there isn't a single job that our young men are doing that can't be done just as well by the modern American girl.

Unfortunately, we have far too many families that feel that giving a girl an education is not important. (It is interesting to note that no widow ever feels that way.) Since the universities have served their alumni so well, since these college graduates are so financially successful, since they will be happy to express their loyalty to their alma mater, why not appeal to our alumni? Let each alumnus select the right girl from his neighborhood and pay her tuition as a candidate to his alma mater. If that is too big an obligation—and I doubt it—why not the alumni form themselves into groups of 10 as a sponsoring group for only 1 candidate and equally sharing the cost of this scholarship. That not only would take care of all our future needs for well-trained scientists and those of the professions, but also it would fill all our colleges to capacity.

We have ample proof of the loyalty of the alumni. Look at the number of athletes that are well set up in the universities by the alumni. If our services to our former students haven't been great enough to deserve and achieve this cooperation, may God give us courage to say, "We deserve to have our doors closed."

Acheson Trapped by Own Double Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, of all the qualities that are necessary in a member of the Cabinet, none are more important than integrity and adherence to truth. I raise this question today because of an important statement made yesterday by the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, at a press conference. Mr. Acheson was being questioned about his attitude toward letting Communist China into the United Nations. He replied heatedly that he is opposed to admitting Red China. Then, according to this morning's Washington Post, he added:

> So far the United States has been successful in convincing the vast majority of countries that it was right in opposing the seating of Communist China.

Other papers quote him similarly.

Now let me recall what Mr. Acheson told a press conferencc on June 7, 1950—New York Times, June 8—in discussing admission of Red China to the U. N. He said:

> We believe each nation must decide for itself how it is going to vote on the question,

and we are not going to try to influence them.

When a matter of truth is involved the facts speak for themselves. Mr. Acheson's own double talk has finally trapped him.

Some More Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent summary of the reasons for MacArthur's dismissal is contained in the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, May 13, 1951. It is precise and to the point, so that even he who runs may read:

REASONS FOR DEMISSAL

Why was General MacArthur dismissed?

Secretary Marshall said there was nothing new about a theater commander getting so wrapped up in his own aims that he was dissatisfied with his orders from above. "What is new," said Marshall, "and what has brought about the necessity for General MacArthur's removal is the wholly unprecedented situation of a local theater commander publicly expressing his displeasure at and his disagreement with the foreign and military policy of the United States."

MacArthur had issued a series of public statements about the heavy American defeat of late November. He was critical of Government policy. On December 6 an order was sent to him from Washington, phrased in general terms to avoid making it too personal, forbidding him to issue further statements without having them approved in Washington.

On March 20 the Joint Chiefs of Staff told MacArthur that the President was preparing an announcement, in conjunction with the United Nations, to the effect that we were ready to discuss a Korean settlement. Four days later MacArthur issued a statement of his own along similar lines, without U. N. approval. This disrupted the delicate talks that Truman was having with our allies, said Marshall, and it became necessary to abandon the projected U. N. declaration "thus losing whatever chance there may have been at that time to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict."

Finally and climactically came MacArthur's letter to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., urging that we bomb China.

"It became apparent," said Marshall, "that General MacArthur had grown so far out of sympathy with the established policies of the United States that there was grave doubt as to whether he could any longer be permitted to exercise the authority in making decisions that normal command functions would assign to a theater commander. In this situation there was no other recourse but to relieve him."

Mr. Speaker, at the same time it would be well for those who are constantly asking, and not expecting an answer, as to what our Formosa policy is, to read the following summary which appeared in the same newspaper the same day:

POLICY AS TO FORMOSA

On the topic of Formosa, Secretary Marshall dealt with two points brought up by General MacArthur.

The established policy of the United States, said Marshall, is to deny Formosa to Communist China and to oppose the seating of Red China in the United Nations. We would not bargain about these points in any talks about a cease fire, said Marshall. However, when negotiations for a final Korean settlement take place, these points will be brought up in the U. N., whether we like it or not. He thought the United States would oppose any settlement which would reward the aggressor in any manner whatever.

On the subject of the use in Korea of the Chinese Nationalist troops now on Formosa, Marshall said MacArthur himself advised against it last July. He thought the 33,000 troops offered by Chiang Kai-shek would be ineffective and lack logistic support. During the alarming period of defeat in late November, MacArthur changed his mind and asked for fifty or sixty thousand Formosa troops, which number he believed were sufficiently well trained and equipped to go into combat. The Joint Chiefs of Staff rejected his suggestion, feeling that past performances of these same troops on the Chinese mainland and current reports on their fitness did not indicate that they would be effective in Korea.

Besides, the Joint Chiefs thought Chiang Kai-shek's troops on Formosa were needed there to protect the island against Communist invasion, and that they would have their hands full if an invasion were launched.

The Postal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 9, 1951.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANFIELD: Knowing of your deep and continuing interest in Post Office Department operations, I am taking the liberty to point out an inaccurate statement made to you by Postmaster General Donaldson some months ago. Only recently have I been informed that he cast aspersions upon the Citizens Committee's estimates of potential reductions in the postal deficit.

In response to your questioning at the House Appropriations Subcommittee's hearings on the Treasury Department-Post Office Appropriations bill for 1952, Postmaster General Donaldson made the following statement—and others of like character—to the subcommittee:

"It has been rather well circulated throughout the country by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Commission * * * that if we had a modernized and streamlined accounting system $250,000,000 could be saved" (p. 54 of printed hearings).

The Citizens Committee has made an official estimate as to the potential savings which could accrue to the installation of a modernized and streamlined postal accounting system. This was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 17, page A5206, by the Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN:

"The measure (the Post Office Financial Control Act, Public Law 712, 81st Cong.), in itself, will not save great sums of money. One million dollars annually is the estimate of the Citizens Committee."

Mr. Donaldson appears to have added $249,000,000 to our estimate of $1,000,000 for potential savings from better accounting in his department.

The Citizens Committee, using specific dollar figures presented by the Hoover Commission and accounting information in official Post Office Department publications, estimated that the current annual postal deficit of $555,000,000 can be greatly reduced as is set forth below.

I. THE HOOVER COMMISSION

The Hoover Commission's estimates were that the postal deficit could be cut by $256,000,000 annually as follows:

Present deficit	*Reductions*
1. Increases in rates for special services	$64,000,000
2. Increases in rates for penny post cards	80,000,000
3. Managerial economies (post offices with receipts over $1,000,000)	90,000,000
4. Economies through modernization of methods and equipment	60,000,000
Deduct annual cost of economy program plus new equipment to effect (3) above	−8,000,000
Current revenue and expenditure estimates indicate a further increase in reduction of $6,000,000 through items (1) and (2) above	6,000,000
Total reduction accruing to Hoover Commission recommendation	262,000,000
Annual deficit	555,000,000
Net deficit after installation of Hoover Commission program	293,000,000

II. SEGREGATION OF SUBSIDIES

Postmaster General Donaldson stated in a letter of February 21, 1949, to Speaker RAYBURN that a deficit of around $150,000,000 represents the cost of official penalty mailing, franked mailing, airline subsidies, and other costs not properly chargeable to the users of postal service.

Total subsidies payment not properly chargeable to operations of the Post Office Department	$150,000,000
Net postal deficit after installation of Hoover Commission recommendations and proper segregation of subsidies (regardless of rate increase on first-, second-, third-, or fourth-class mail)	143,000,000

Following the facts and reasoning above, the Citizens Committee states that, if the Hoover Commission recommendations were fully installed and administered with skill and if the subsidies were properly segregated, the true postal deficit would approximate $143,000,000 annually, not $555,000,000.

At least a portion of this remaining deficit of $143,000,000 might then be met by some increase in rates to special commercial users, as stated by Mr. Hoover in his speech of June 30, 1949.

The estimated annual loss of $435,000,000 on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail and foreign-surface mail might more properly be studied against the $143,000,000 over-all postal deficit which would remain after reorganization and segregation of subsidies.

You are free to make such use of this letter as you may wish.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT L. L. MCCORMICK,
Research Director, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

The Story of the Origin of the Milk Bowl in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, down in the Tenth District in Texas, at Gause, I have a friend, Mr. E. C. Weafer, who has furnished the inspiration for a program to encourage the youth of our country.

He and the members of his family are responsible for the Milk Bowl, which provides an opportunity for the "small fry" to engage in junior football in Texas. I think it is a program worthy of the attention of the Members of the House, and therefore call your attention to a reprint from the American Farm Youth magazine concerning pee-wee football in Texas:

THE MILK BOWL, INC.

(By E. C. Weafer, secretary, Gause, Tex.)

Listeners to the broadcasts of radio station WFAA, Dallas, recently heard Ralph Widman, sports director of the station say, "A city is not measured by the size of its buildings, but by the quality of its people. In my books, the biggest city in the world is Gause, Tex., United States of America." Gause, an almost forgotten hamlet in central Texas and almost untouched by the prosperity of recent industrialization, thus reached a point in fame that had been undreamed of as several generations of Gause folks watched first their bank then other businesses disappear.

What was the cause of the revival of the community? It was the Milk Bowl, which was described by Jinx Tucker, sports editor of the Waco News-Tribune as just about the most important sports event in Texas for many years. The Milk Bowl was the first annual bowl game for small-fry players, played at Cameron, Tex., on December 10. All players were required to be under 100 pounds and not over 14 years of age. Two teams of rural youth played, one from Gause, Tex., and the other from San Saba; the final score 20-7 in favor of San Saba. All the features of a big-time bowl were present; play-by-play broadcast over a major station, half-time activities, and other colorful features. Significantly a national manufacturer paid for the radio time, and bidding now goes on for radio rights. NBC tie-ups is in prospect.

The game has resulted in a wave of enthusiasm for junior football in Texas. More than that, it has caused Texas farm folks to take an interest in the extracurricular activities of the schools, and has brought about a study of the recreational and community needs of rural communities. It may soon cause a State-wide, official study and a series of conferences on what may be done in rural Texas to develop community-centered activities for persons of all ages. By beginning with the interest in football, the promoters of the bowl have done more for farm youth than has been accomplished, thus far, by consideration of blueprints for community unification and recreation.

The famous Milk Bowl began in a small way but with a big purpose. The local school had been without men teachers for over a decade. There were no athletics. The passing of the Gilmer-Aikin bill and subsequent raising of salaries brought in men teachers. Soon the cow-pasture campus was cleared and football practice was begun. When the community saw its boys playing in overalls and sweatshirts (many of the people and most of the boys had never seen a football game), a collection was taken for uniforms. Even though several lads were inclined to run the wrong way with the ball and one of them actually did, the country boys played a schedule with city teams, and won smashing victories. Then, Mrs. Weafer, 24-year-old housewife and mother of five children, suggested a bowl game for peewees to Ralph Widman, sports director of WFAA; with the support of that station, the Dallas Morning News, the Waco News-Tribune, and other agencies in Texas, the bowl was promoted and won enthusiastic acclaim throughout the State.

Two significant developments have taken place recently. Several Southwestern Conference athletic directors have indicated willingness to have peewee games played as preliminaries to the regular games of the conference, thus opening the way to the promotion of junior football and rural recreation on an unprecedented scale. Then, word has come from Chicago that the city championship peewee football team of Chicago, coached by the immortal Red Grange and a staff from the Chicago Bears and Cardinals might possibly be available for the 1950 Milk Bowl, so that the best team in Texas would have outside competition.

The Milk Bowl, Inc., a nonprofit Texas corporation is made up of the following people: Joe Moore, for 10 years lead-off man for the New York Giants; Gene Walker, former Texas leaguer; Terry Moore, one-time Arizona leaguer; Gerland Varner, Gause businessman; Ralph Widman, sports director, radio station WFAA, Dallas; Mrs. Myrtle Varner, superintendent of schools, Gause; Eugene C. Weafer, athletic director of the Gause Public Schools.

This all proves to farm youth everywhere that people do not have to live in big places to do big things. Opportunity starts at a young person's front door.

And maybe that Gause has now learned to believe in itself, it can also learn to believe in its land, which can be put to greater productive use following the appropriate kind of studies and the suitable plan of land use.

We farm folks can think "big" and we are people, too.

Evidence, Not Emotions, Prove the Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the evidence continues to pile up that President Truman was right and General MacArthur was wrong. I am pleased to incorporate in the RECORD editorials from the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, May 13, and May 17, 1951, as follows:

A MAJOR VICTORY

Secretary Marshall was well justified in pointing out to the Senators one of the most serious consequences of General MacArthur's emotion-charged campaign. It has entangled MacArthur in a position in which, in order to defend his case, he must shout to the world that the Eighth Army is being committed to futile battle in a "vacuum" of policy; that the administration is "buying time at the expense of American blood"; that it is abetting a "dreadful slaughter" of our men without "definite end" and without hope of anything save indecisive stalemate. The effect which these inaccurate, plainly exaggerated but moving phrases might have had upon the morale of the Eighth Army is appallingly apparent. It is even more apparent that this estimate of the situation coming from the late top United Nations commander at a moment when the enemy is counting his losses and debating his next moves, could tempt only to incite Peking to one more bloody effort, which our forces might otherwise be spared.

It is difficult to imagine a worse disservice to the devoted men of the Eighth Army. Fortunately, that army has disregarded the self-justifications of its former commander; its morale reportedly stands at a higher peak than ever before, and while MacArthur at home has in effect been encouraging the Chinese Reds to try again, the men in the field have been supplying the Peking dictators with compelling counterarguments that may yet prove convincing.

It is simply not true that the Korean war has been fought in a "vacuum" of policy; or that the policy, very clearly defined, which has been followed can offer nothing save an endless continuation of "dreadful slaughter." In the last 3 weeks the Eighth Army and its associated air and sea elements have won a victory of remarkable, conceivably of decisive, proportions with a minimum of losses. It is not simply that the lines were substantially held. By maneuvering the Chinese into an offensive, the Eighth Army shattered a major effort, built up on a scale which Peking will certainly find it increasingly difficult to repeat. It wrecked many of the best Communist units so thoroughly that the enemy was forced not merely to halt but to break off the action. He has now retreated beyond range of the terrible United Nations artillery; his supply system is in a shambles which leads General Almond to suspect that he may already be "wilting on the vine," while intimations of efforts to bring up armor and air forces in support carry some hint that even a Chinese conscript army cannot indefinitely survive the brutal expenditure of light-armed infantry masses.

The U. N. field commanders warn against another effort, but they are more confident now than at any time in the past. Many wars have been decided by great defensive victories. The strategic consequences of this one cannot yet be estimated, but to assume that they are nothing and bring us no nearer to a conclusion is to fly in the face of military history. The battle in Korea, tragic as it still may be, is of far greater significance than the battle in the hearing rooms of Washington.

THE CENTRAL POINT

The course of the examination of General Marshall last week took in a great deal of territory, from Washington to Yalta. This was inevitable under the forms of congressional committee procedure and the intense interest of the public in all aspects of far-eastern policy. But it would be extremely unfortunate if, in the meanwhile, the central point of the investigation were lost to sight. That is, of course, the policy to be pursued now in Korea.

In this connection, one of the most significant documents produced by the inquiry to date has been President Truman's message of January 13 to General MacArthur. This was not a directive. But the paraphrase released to the public indicates that it was a clear and comprehensive survey of the political objectives of the Korean war—under the circumstances which prevailed after Red China's intervention—as well as the limitations which both political and military considerations imposed upon American policy in Korea. The advantages of continued United Nations resistance in the peninsula, including a fighting retreat from Korea, if that became necessary, were given forceful expression. Equally pointed were the references to the need for safeguarding and strengthening relations with America's

allies and building up the strength of the United States, which acted as a brake upon extending the area of conflict or sending large reinforcements.

It would be impossible, in the light of this note, to allege that the United States does not have a policy in Korea. Many of the objectives stated by the President in those dark January days have already been achieved. The free peoples of Asia have had time to organize—Indochina, for example, has been saved from imminent destruction. Red China's military prestige has been amply deflated. The defense of the West has been stimulated, its unity reinforced. The combination of vigor and restraint foreshadowed in Mr. Truman's message has been of inestimable advantage to America and its associates.

The charge that can be justly leveled against the administration is that it did not make its policy clear and comprehensible to the public. Even with the reservations which diplomacy and the danger of providing too much information to the enemy might require, the fundamental conditions outlined on January 13 might have been told to the American people as plainly and persuasively as they were given to General MacArthur. Had this been done, had there been more candid and effective leadership at home, many of the doubts and confusions which cloud the Korean war need never have arisen.

THE BATTLE IS THE TEST

General Bradley's testimony, so far as it has been allowed to go, has been concise, clear, and distinct with the soldierly qualities of judgment and responsibility which have distinguished this high officer. It has contributed the best brief statement of the case against the MacArthur program—that it would tend toward getting the Nation into "the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time and with the wrong enemy"—so far offered. And it has confirmed the growing evidence that the facts were in certain important respects other than General MacArthur represented them and certainly very different from what his supporters and enthusiasts have too rashly assumed them to be.

As this became more and more apparent the solemn senatorial search for the "facts" degenerated into an irrelevant partisan and legal wrangle which, after occupying half of Tuesday's session and all of yesterday's (with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff kept sitting idly in his witness chair most of the time) is still unresolved. But while the Senators in Washington are thus bringing their inquiry down perilously close to the ridiculous, the Eighth Army in Korea and its associated air and naval forces are again writing the real answers to the real issues of our times in blood rather than in words.

It is still a little unclear as to whether the Communists have actually unleashed their second great effort, or are only stepping up the probing attacks which have plainly foreshadowed it. None of the actions of the last day or two seems to have gone beyond the preliminary give-and-take across what amounts to a no man's land; but no one doubts that another major shock is at most a matter of hours. The American commanders are awaiting it with greater confidence, and in seemingly much more strongly prepared positions, than they enjoyed when the first wave was delivered on April 22. But whatever the outcome, it will be far more significant for all questions of future policy and strategy than anything which can possibly be produced in Washington committee rooms. Valid answers for all the problems being bandied among the Senators—what tactics offer best promise of success, what is the relative strength of U. N. mechanized firepower and Chinese infantry masses, which side is being hurt the most, above all, how the war can best be won—can be read only on the ground by the lurid light of actual battle. As the test again impends, it is not only our hopes that concentrate on Korea and its defenders; it is there also that our best thought and soberest powers of analysis must be directed.

Mr. Speaker, I am also glad to incorporate in these remarks the following statement adopted by the executive board of the New York State CIO Council:

STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT'S ACTION RE MACARTHUR

The executive board of the New York State CIO Council fully endorses President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur from his commands.

In reaffirming civilian control over the military, the President has strengthened a vital democratic principle. In making clear the determination of our country to use its fighting strength most effectively to advance the cause of peace and freedom, he has strengthened our leadership in the world.

The President's action was in the best interests of the Nation and its purposes in this time of world crisis. The artificial storms which are being whipped up by reactionary newspapers and politicians for selfish and unpatriotic purposes cannot obscure that fact.

We are certain that the overwhelming majority of the American people join with us in approval of the President's stand.

Urges Amendments to Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a statement concerning amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act prepared for the record of the hearings which are now being held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL W. SHAFER, OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MAY 17, 1951

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now finds its possible to consider amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. Along with all other Members of Congress, I am deeply interested in making whatever changes can be made in this act within reasonable bounds of safety.

Since coming to Congress, I have always been interested in the Railroad Retirement Act for two reasons: First of all, inasmuch as the district that I represent contains substantial railroad installations, the welfare of a number of my people is involved. Secondly, I have been keenly interested in the determination on the part of the railroad workers themselves that their retirement system not be a form of socialistic subsidy.

No doubt all of the members of your committee are fully aware of the facts warranting amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. Except to say that my mail indicates that there is a substantial feeling that benefits for widows and children especially should be improved, I will not go too much into detail as to what I think should be done in the way of amending this act; but rather, if you will permit me, I should like to discuss for a moment the independence of the railroad-retirement system, which I have mentioned above.

Railroad employees and railroad management in combination are now contributing 12 percent of their total payroll to the maintenance of their retirement system. Other workers covered by social security, of course, pay much less. There have been complaints that one system costs too much and the other system costs too little. I am not an actuary and, of course, cannot discuss the merits or demerits of these complaints. I seek only to pay tribute to the railroad employees who have historically insisted that they must pay their own way in the field of retirement. No group has resisted the inroads of socialism in a more determined fashion than these railroad employees.

Any of you who are familiar with my record in matters of labor relations will agree that I have acted in an independent manner. There are times when I agree with the labor unions and times when I do not. I am pleased to say to you today that I am in full agreement with the Railway Labor Executives' Association and their sponsorship of H. R. 3669, a bill whose author is the distinguished chairman of this committee. I have, in the past, found the advice of the Railway Labor Executives' Association in matters affecting the administration of the Railroad Retirement Act to be dependable and honest. They are now proposing a bill which will afford relief to widows and children as well as all other classes of beneficiaries under this act. I therefore am pleased to advise this committee of my support of this bill and I hope that it will be reported expeditiously in order that we may jointly move for passage on the floor of the House.

Delaware's One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including a newspaper article calling attention to the State of Delaware's one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary. This article appeared in the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News on Tuesday, May 15, 1951. It was written by that well-known Delaware columnist, Bill Frank.

All Delawareans are proud of the glorious history and traditions of the people of the State of Delaware. This article serves as a reminder of the great courage and self-reliance characteristic of our ancestors. Our forefathers were inspired with a vision of keenest foresight and quickly perceived the advantages offered and made Delaware the first State in the Union.

Inspired by great traditions, Delaware continues in the forefront in all fields of endeavor in the great struggle for freedom and human progress under God.

The article follows:

FRANKLY SPEAKING

(By Bill Frank)

Delaware as a State has a birthday anniversary coming up real soon—175 candles, each one burning brightly and proudly through the years.

For it was 175 years ago on June 15 Delaware—through her representatives assembled in New Castle—declared she was no longer a colony under the domination of Great Britain.

And those representatives also further declared that thenceforth our State was to be a part of the United States of America.

We were no longer to be merely three counties on the Delaware but a sovereign State with its own government.

And, actually, our first chief executive was Caesar Rodney, who was then speaker of the assembly, and he replaced Gov. John Penn of Pennsylvania.

In our State histories and in our various studies of the annals of Delaware, we always point to the date of the landing of the Swedes and the founding of New Castle, etc.

All very important—but this beginning of Delaware as an independent State of its own, with a constitution of its own, isn't discussed as much as it should be.

It was on June 15, 1776, that our Delaware Assembly adopted a Declaration of Rights—before the Declaration of Independence became a fact in Philadelphia.

And later on September 20—175 years ago—a convention of Delawareans adopted our first State constitution.

It was not a long-lived constitution. In many ways it was cumbersome and soon had to be replaced—but the fact is that this first constitution plus the Declaration of Rights breathed the very life of independence and freedom.

And it would do all of us good some day to reread this Declaration of Rights and the first constitution of our State—and realize that it took lots of courage and fortitude for our early leading citizens to subscribe to the principles of those documents.

And, coincidentally, it is interesting to note that the New Castle tercentenary comes on June 16 of this year—the day after the anniversary of our State birthday—and also interesting to note that those momentous events of 1776 took place in New Castle.

The Declaration of Rights of 1776 was quite a document. It started off by saying that all government of right originates from the people, and is founded in compact only and instituted solely for the good of the whole.

It continued to declare the rights of the freedom of worship and free elections, the importance of trial by jury, the importance of a well regulated militia, the freedom of the conscience, and that at all times, the military ought to be under the strict subordination to and governed by the civil power.

The Delaware Declaration of Rights also proclaimed that the liberty of the press ought to be inviolably preserved.

This was no perfunctory declaration. It was not a grandstand show of mere grandiose words. We were at war in 1776—and the affairs of the war were not going too well for the American cause.

Here in Delaware, not all our citizens were in favor of independence; not all our residents were in favor of the War for Independence.

Then, in August of that year, began the drafting and later the adoption of our first constitution.

Prof. John A. Munroe, of the University of Delaware, has written that this constitution was the first to be written by any State through a device now generally considered correct—the election of a special convention for that purpose.

In addition to the articles that provided for the mechanics of operating the State government, there were a number of articles based on broad principles of freedom.

For example, article 25 gave the right of lawmaking to the legislature except that no laws could be enacted that were repugnant to the declaration of rights and the State constitution.

Article 26 in very plain and in simple terms declared that "no person hereafter imported into this State from Africa ought to be held in slavery under any pretense whatever and no Negro, Indian, or mulatto slave ought to be brought into this State for sale from any part of the world."

The first State constitution's provision for free and nondominated elections is interesting.

It declared that no persons should go to elections armed and that no muster of the militia shall be made on election day.

And what was more—the constitution declared that no company of armed men, in the pay of the "continent or of this or any other State, be suffered to remain at the time and place of holding said elections, nor within 1 mile of the said (election) places."

No one religious group was to be given preference over another in this State and no clergyman was permitted to hold any civil office.

And the first State constitution concluded with the statement that certain principles of freedom and rights already enunciated should not be "violated on any pretense whatever."

This certainly was very broad and so worded as to prevent any subterfuge of action.

The historians tell us this was not a perfect constitution, though helping in its drafting were distinguished Delawareans—5 later to become governors; 11 to become judges; 3 to become chief justices, and 2 United States Senators.

Maybe it wasn't a perfect constitution but it did establish and guarantee rights to be secured by the action of Delawareans, determined to abide by them.

This then is the year to be remembered in our State.

Statement of Louis P. Tonoli

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the statement of my friend and constituent, Louis P. Tonoli, of Clinton, Mass., president-treasurer of the New England Associated Businessmen, at a hearing of the House Small Business Committee at Worcester on April 25. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members, as the head of a business association which numbers most of its members in the small business class, in business myself until a few years ago, and presently connected with the Van Brode Milling Co. of Clinton, Mass., as a contract negotiator in charge of subcontracting for this firm, I believe I am in a position to offer possible suggestions to this committee.

Van Brode Milling Co. is engaged on Government contracts for the Army, Navy and Quartermaster Corps. Cereals, plastics and packaging of rations are among its activities. Recently we have bid on survival kits of large size, most of which we intend to subcontract. At present we intend to bid on a large contract for life-raft accessory kits. If we gain this contract I shall subcontract metal, plastic and cloth items to about 20 subcontractors.

Having operated a small business and done work for the Government myself, I can appreciate how difficult it is for most small firms to do business with the Government. The owner of a small firm in many cases is manager, workman, and even down to floor sweeper in some cases. It is almost impossible for the small-business man to go to the various purchasing agencies as he should each day if he wishes to know the various items the Government has out for bid. Taking a prime contract is out of the question; in most cases he must subcontract certain items which he cannot produce and he has neither the time nor the knowledge to do this work. They are more than pleased when someone like myself comes to their door with an opportunity for them to bid on certain items of which they have an acquaintance. It is of great help to them when, as in many cases, I have the visible item that can be seen besides the blueprint of the article. No matter how acquainted anyone is with prints, looking over what is to be made is of great help.

The procurement agencies state that it is not necessary for any employment to be made and no agents need be employed to secure a contract. They make mention that a daily synopsis sheet is sent out by the United States Department of Commerce to chambers of commerce and accredited business groups.

This is a step in the right direction and does have a great deal of value. However, unknown to some people, there are many small firms who do not belong to chambers of commerce and associations and even now have no idea of this service. To those who take advantage of this information it is helpful, but in the majority of cases by the time they receive bid sheets the bid opening date is most times a week, sometimes less. It is not possible to then write for the necessary specifications and then check for materials because the time is too short. As a result, even the firms who get the synopsis sheets do not pay much attention to them.

The United States Department of Commerce also issues weekly the awards of contracts of over $25,000. This was a great help to small firms until a short time ago. A firm who was interested in getting subcontract work could check as to who got an award and then could contact the firm who got the contract. I know of some firms who got work this way. However, whether for security reasons or otherwise, the award sheets now make no mention of quaility or dollar value as was announced until a while ago. Most certainly the majority of small-business men of my acquaintance would like the sheet brought out as it was previously. This would be helpful to them they feel.

Speaking for an association and as a businessman, I am interested in seeing that New England gets its fair share of procurement work given out by the Government. Present results to date by individuals and groups have been disappointing.

This condition is comparable to the situation in 1940 through 1942, when for these 2 years the small-business man was forgotten. During this period, nearly 16 percent of the small businesses of the United States closed their doors. We do not wish to see such a condition occur again.

As Chairman of the Board of Selectmen of Clinton, I appeared before the Senate Small-Business Committee in Washington in 1941. Some of my suggestions had merit, I believe, and in 1942 the Smaller War Plants Corporation was formed and did much useful work. This group assisted small firms in obtaining nearly a billion dollars in subcontracts and more than $5,500,000,000 in prime contracts. It loaned more than $550,000,000 to small business with insignificant losses. Over 5,000 of New England smaller plants registered with Smaller War Plants Corporation and received contracts for about $600,000,000 of war materials.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Either a corporation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation type should be set up or a group of a similar type contained within the National Production Authority under the Department of Commerce to handle procurement opportunities for small business.

2. Adoption of the Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN and Congressman RICHARD WOLGLESWORTH bills. These were introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by the respective Congressmen. House Resolution 941 has been reintroduced in the Eighty-second Congress by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN. It is a bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns and consists of the following:

"That section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section if the agency head determines that such action is advisable in the interest of the national defense in order to make or keep suppliers available for furnishing supplies in the event of a national emergency, or that the interest either of industrial mobilization in case of such an emergency, or of the national defense through maintenance of active research and development, will be served by such action, supplies may be procured on the basis of, and in accordance with, an invitation for bids containing provisions which specify—

"'(1) that a part, not exceeding 20 percent of the total procurement involved, when practicable may be withheld from the successor bidder or bidders for distribution among the small-business concerns, not exceeding five, which submit, as to all or such part of the procurement involved as may be specified in the invitation, the lowest bids submitted by small-business concerns; and—

"'(2) that the part of the total procurement so withheld when practicable may be distributed among such small-business concerns (either by acceptance of the bids made by them or by negotiated purchase or contract) on a basis involving payment to each of a price not in excess of 15 percent above the lowest price paid to a successful bidder.'

"SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act is amended by inserting after '2 (c)', wherever appearing therein, the following: 'or 3 (c).'

"SEC. 3. Section 7 (b) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: The power of the agency head to make the determinations or decisions necessary under section 3 (c) shall be delegable only to a chief officer responsible for procurement."

3. Revision of Public Law 413 to authorize procurement officers to negotiate or to award contracts on a sliding-scale basis so that the small manufacturers may fairly compete with the larger ones whose advantage in large-scale purchasing and multiple-manufacturing processes virtually eliminates competition.

4. Small plants want defense work but many owners realize that they cannot handle big contracts and as a suggestion some system might be set up so that contracts would be awarded to companies agreeing to subcontract the greatest part of the work. Or a contractor securing a large contract would be required to let out certain percentages of a prime contract.

CONCLUSION

The smaller plants of the country showed their worth in the last war. Some immediate effort should be made so that their facilities could be utilized. In the event of an emergency all the manufacturing plants and the manpower of the country is needed.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this able committee and assure you that both the businessmen and the workers of central Massachusetts as well as of New England thank you for including Worcester in your itinerary.

In Asia We Are Reaping as We Have Sown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is an eternal verity that we reap as we have sown. This truth is clearly demonstrated in Asia where we are involved in the Korean war and where the Truman-Acheson policies sold free China down the river. If President Truman, his State Department, and military advisers had not been blind to the truth and facts of a report furnished to the President by Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer the tragedy now going on would not have happened, and thousands of American boys would not be in their graves in Korea. General Marshall, who was then Secretary of State, consistently refused to permit the Wedemeyer report to be made public. His conduct resulted in tragedy, and by it he has demonstrated his incapacity to hold public office. He should resign.

Mr. Speaker, the United States News and World Report of May 11 contains an excellent article on the Wedemeyer report, and I shall include certain excerpts from it so that Members of this body and the American people generally may fully understand the importance of that report. General Wedemeyer was sent to China on two missions—in 1945 and in 1947. The first one was as commander of the United States forces with those of free China. At that time he reported the Chinese Communists as real Reds and not agrarian farmers.

In 1947 he went to survey general conditions in China and Korea. Upon his return he made a personal report to the President. This report was suppressed until 2 weeks ago, prior to the appearance of General Marshall before a joint Senate committee investigating the MacArthur case. This unconscionable act has cost thousands of American lives and billions of dollars.

The United States News and World Report has this to say:

The real story (1945) of General Wedemeyer's recommendations on China is far more important than the simple account of his 1947 mission and the suppressed report that now is creating such a stir. The 1947 report was only an echo of his earlier efforts to shift the course of United States diplomacy in China.

In 1945, when in command of United States Army forces in China and also chief of staff to Chiang Kai-shek, General Wedemeyer had reported that the Chinese Communists, against whom Chiang was fighting, were not democratic agrarians, but real Communists. He predicted that it would be impossible to work out a coalition of Nationalist and Communist forces and that real civil war would follow.

At that time General Wedemeyer described the weaknesses of the Chiang government and said that Chiang could not gain control of China without American aid. But he said that, with the right kind of American help, Chiang could get and hold all of China up to the Manchurian border.

The general did not think that Chiang could win Manchuria. And for that area he proposed a three-power trusteeship, handled by the United States, Russia, and Great Britain.

That kind of help that General Wedemeyer proposed for Chiang called for temporary American cooperation in the civil and military fields of the same sort that the general himself had been conducting for a year on the military level. With Chiang's agreement, there would be reforms in the army and the government. There was no thought of sending United States troops to fight on Chinese soil.

When his old chief, General of the Army George C. Marshall, went to China a few months after the 1945 report to try his hand at conciliating the Nationalist and Communist forces and bringing them together into a coalition government, General Wedemeyer repeated his warning that this would not work and urged that the United States throw its weight back of Chiang.

But by this time the administration in Washington had given up hope of achieving any sort of cooperation from the Chiang regime. The scathing reports of Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, Wedemeyer's predecessor in the China command, still were fresh in mind. There had been too many well-documented reports of corruption in the Chiang government. And in Washington there was still the thought that the Chinese Communists were more reformers than Communists, that they were not tied to Russia.

General Marshall, sick, tired of war, trying to conciliate, cut off help to the Nationalist Government to convince the Communists that he was acting in good faith in his negotiations. Month after month, General Marshall worked patiently. Finally he gave up, went back to Washington and washed his hands of both sides in the dispute.

Mr. Speaker, the above has to do with the 1945 Wedemeyer report and in 1947 General Wedemeyer returned for his last mission being acknowledged as one of the very great authorities on the Far East. I quote again an excerpt from the United States News and World Report:

The Wedemeyer mission in 1947 was one final gesture by General Marshall. He then was Secretary of State, ready to fix a lasting Chinese policy. He sent General Wedemeyer back for a resurvey.

The 1947 report was largely a reiteration of General Wedemeyer's views of 2 years before. He still thought that all of China except Manchuria could be saved from the Communists by giving the right kind of help and advice to Chiang. He still thought of Manchuria as ripe for a trusteeship.

General Wedemeyer proposed a similar government for all of Korea. He found Russia training an army in North Korea, creating a government that was dominated by Communists. He warned that the North Korean army would strike at South Korea after American troops were withdrawn unless a force, officered and controlled by Americans, was developed there strong enough to beat off attacks from the North Koreans.

In Washington, General Marshall ordered the Wedemeyer report suppressed. The decision against Chiang was set. Plans were being made to bring American troops out of Korea. The State Department said it figured that a proposal to take away part of China and put it under a trusteeship in which Russia had a part would not be helpful at that time.

And the distrust of Chiang, with his corruption-ridden administration, ran deep. Thus, China went to the Communists, Chiang

fled to Formosa. And the stage was set for Korea. And General Wedemeyer, his ideas running contrary to top strategy, was shunted to an Army sidetrack.

General Wedemeyer had full confidence that the kind of cooperation with Chiang that he had proposed could be carried out. He has seen how it could work.

General Wedemeyer had replaced General Stilwell after the long and bitter feud between General Stilwell and Chiang had reached such a point that neither of them could endure further contact with the other. General Wedemeyer, the youngest lieutenant general in the Army and the youngest theater commander in the war, was plumped into that irritated situation in 1944.

After the acrimonious disputes of the Stilwell regime, General Wedemeyer was a soothing balm to the Chinese situation. But he found the problem aching and acute. The corrupt officials around Chiang were a constant irritant.

General Stilwell had been convinced that the Chiang regime was corrupt from top to bottom and any swap would be for the better. To a large degree, this view came to prevail in Washington. The assumption was that Chinese soldiers would not fight except under American leadership and that reform by persuasion was not possible under Chiang.

Working carefully, General Wedemeyer brought a change. He announced that lack of friendliness to the Chinese would not be tolerated in his command. As a result of this order, he had to send out of the area two major generals, four brigadier generals, and twelve colonels.

The general broke down the tradition that white men do no manual work in the Orient. American officers greased trucks and slid in the mud to teach Chinese officers how to care for equipment and to take cover. Wedemeyer's liaison team slept on plank beds with Chinese soldiers, rode with them on flat cars.

General Wedemeyer found Chinese troops literally starving. He picked 39 divisions to be American sponsored. These got helmets, canteens, leather shoes, modern training and weapons, vitamin pills, inoculations against disease.

Relations improved. Chinese homes were opened to Americans. Chinese saved hundreds of American lives. Once, 60,000 Chinese farmers left their fields to build an emergency airport. And the Wedemeyer-trained troops (Chinese) began to take on the Japanese and win.

Inspired by the Wedemeyer brand of cooperation, Chiang Kai-shek offered to let the United States undertake a complete reorganization of the Chinese Government. The war was still going on and the State Department shied away from accepting such broad responsibility. In Washington, there still lingered the view that Chiang was not to be trusted. But General Wedemeyer, on the ground in China, said Chiang never once failed to carry out an agreement made with him.

This was the background of relations with the Chiang government upon which General Wedemeyer made his proposal for aid to Chiang against the Communists, with the United States to do a clean-up job on the Chiang regime.

Mr. Speaker, ungrateful politicians, incompetent military leaders who refused to face the facts as contained in the Wedemeyer reports not only ignored the recommendations made in them but they actually sabotaged General Wedemeyer and railroaded him to an insignificant military post in the West; all because he had the courage to report his convictions and to tell the truth as he saw it for the good of his country. The New Deal is today paying its price for the perfidity of its conduct toward General Wedemeyer, a great American, a great general and a military statesman.

Mr. Speaker, summarizing the Wedemeyer report of 1947, the United States News and World Report record the situation as follows in crystal-clear fashion:

WHAT GENERAL WEDEMEYER WANTED DONE IN 1947

In China: United States to bolster non-Communists with arms, military missions, technical aid, but no United States troops to stop Communists.

In Manchuria: A United Nations trusteeship.

In Korea: U. N. to create a government for the whole country; United States to build strong South Korean military forces before withdrawing.

WHAT WAS DONE AFTER 1947

In China: United States withdrew major aid to non-Communists, gradually ended technical and other assistance.

In Manchuria: Communists were permitted to take over without opposition.

In Korea: American troops were withdrawn except for a few training units for a Korean constabulary. No provision for strong South Korean military force.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

In China: Communists took over the whole vast nation, after taking Manchuria. Non-Communist Chinese Government fled to Formosa, which Communists then demanded.

In Korea: Communists built strong military forces, attacked in 1950, started a war in which United States intervened. War has cost 60,000 United States casualties.

Mr. Speaker, here is the record of events which led to the loss of 400,000,000 people—our friends, in China and Korea. Here is the record of failure on the part of the Chief Executive, the President of the United States. In view of this record can there be unity? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the American people will not unite behind leadership which has led from one failure to another, and then into an undeclared war.

Defense Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD as part of my remarks a letter received by me from our colleague, JOHN J. RILEY, together with the letter he refers to, from the secretary of the Western Carolina Council, addressed to the members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

I hope those who voted against the rule, thus prohibiting consideration of the defense housing bill on the floor of Congress, will take note of the tremendous injustice they have worked.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1951.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The various towns in South Carolina located around the perimeter of the Savannah River project being built by the Atomic Energy Commission have organized themselves into a western Carolina council for the purpose of assisting the Atomic Energy Commission and the du Pont Co. in the many problems arising out of this project. Membership is voluntary and the representatives have no other thought in mind other than to help the Atomic Energy Commission meet the problems involved.

As I explained to the Banking and Currency Committee when I testified in behalf of H. R. 1272 (H. R. 2668) there is sufficient private capital to construct the necessary homes with the aid of Government-insured mortgages, but there is presently no way to finance the necessary expansion of water, sewage, schools, and hospitals which are necessary. The school districts and municipalities are already bonded to the constitutional limit.

I want to urge that you give every possible consideration to reporting out favorably a housing and facilities bill which will remedy this situation and like problems in other defense areas.

I beg to enclose a copy of a letter which I have just received from the Western Carolina Council sent to me with the request that I transmit it to you.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,
Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. RILEY,
Member of Congress.

MAY 9, 1951.

To the Members of the Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Western Carolina Council, composed of representatives from cities and towns in Edgefield, Aiken, Lexington, Barnwell, Bamberg, Allendale, Orangeburg, and Hampton Counties in South Carolina, desires to call to your attention the following facts:

Due to the location of the Savannah River project of the Atomic Energy Commission in our section, we are faced with many problems. Our communities are unable to handle these problems without the assistance of the Federal Government. Senators MAYBANK, CAPEHART, FERGUSON, and BENNETT have visited our area and we believe they will support our plea for help. These Senators know that we are doing all that we can to cooperate with the Atomic Energy Commission and the du Pont Co. in the solving of the many problems confronting this area.

Our schools are overcrowded at the present time. Without some assistance we do not see how we can take care of additional children at the beginning of the fall term and estimates from AEC and du Pont officials indicate that we may expect approximately 3,000 additional children in Aiken County alone for the next school year. Now is the time for securing teachers for the next school term. More busses will be needed for transportation as well as additions to buildings. County and State funds are not available.

Our community facilities, especially water and sewerage systems need expansions to take care of the new houses being built and contemplated. The housing situation in each community is critical. Houses are being built by private enterprise, but water and sewerage is essential.

Our hospitals, health, recreation, and welfare agencies are taxed to capacities and are unable to cope with the influx of people without aid from Federal funds.

We have no desire to make money or to speculate on this project. Each community realizes that it has a responsibility to the thousands of good citizens who are coming here to live with us. We want to welcome them with decent homes, good schools for their children, protect their health and welfare and to give them an opportunity to lead normal American lives. Won't you

help us to do this? We pledge our full cooperation.

We hope that the delay in the passage of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 has not been due to politics. These new citizens for whom we seek aid to provide necessary facilities are neither Democrats nor Republicans as far as we know—we consider them simply American citizens who desire to live as Americans should live. We believe that you gentlemen will agree and will do all in your power to secure passage of the necessary legislation.

We deeply appreciate your efforts in our behalf.

Respectfully yours,

SARAH H. BUSCH,
Secretary of Western Carolina Council.

Southern California Faces Severe Water Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, anyone who is familiar with the great Southwest of the United States knows that paramount in the minds of the citizens of the States in that area is always the supply of water. For upon water depends all development and expansion. And upon water ultimately depends the lives of those who live within this area.

The bitter struggle which has developed between Arizona and California over the distribution of the water from the Colorado River is but another chapter in the fight for water in the West. From earliest history the West has seen water as a center for violent controversy. Miners and prospectors hoarded it in their search for gold. Cattlemen fought bloody range wars for control of water rights. And today even with all the modern developments to save, salvage, and store water and to utilize every water source, there is not enough water to supply the needs of the people.

In southern California, the water shortage has reached serious proportions due to the enormous expansion in that area in the last few years. Population in southern California has soared. Industry has grown until the Los Angeles area has passed Pittsburgh as a producer of the Nation's steel supply. The Los Angeles area is the largest production center for aircraft in the Nation, and many other industries are now operated in southern California on a large scale.

But the water table has been going down steadily in the State decreasing the supply for the enormous population concentrated in southern California. Droughts have further depleted the normal water supply, and the present supply from the Colorado River is inadequate to meet industrial, agricultural, and domestic needs. New sources of water must be found and California must now receive all of the Colorado River water to which it is entitled or face serious, even catastrophic, water shortages in the foreseeable future which will curb development and endanger the whole population.

The following is a recent excellent editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News relative to the serious water problem in southern California:

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA MUST FIND NEW WATER SOURCES

As a foreword to a great deal more that will be said later on the subject, your attention today is called to the water situation in California.

To put it bluntly, California is faced with a serious water shortage. It is more serious in some places than in others. In San Diego, for instance, it is against a city ordinance to wash your car with city water.

Los Angeles gets its water mainly from three sources: the Owens Valley, the Colorado River, and wells. These supplies will be inadequate for our anticipated and potential development in the foreseeable future.

Many persons believe that the controversy between California and Arizona over water is academic—a sort of political exercise to such face. Such is not the case. Arizona wants more water to serve the central Arizona project. In Arizona it is believed widely that the water for this is vital. In California the project is regarded as more of a series of dude ranches than anything else and the demand for water for it is denounced as excessive and unreasonable.

NEED ALL WE CAN GET

Leaving aside the question of whether the water supply in the Colorado is dwindling we can be certain of one thing: If the population and industry and farming of southern California are to grow they will need every drop of Colorado River water we can get under the basin States compact. If we don't get it, population will cease to increase by immigration and if the birth rate continues it will mean that many persons will have to leave the area in another generation.

As for the wells as a source of supply every one familiar with them knows the water table is going down. In many places where the table seems to remain static the water is being rendered useless, or worse, by the infiltration of salt.

California must face up to its need for water. Even if we survive war, inflation, and natural disasters the future of civilization here is ultimately doomed if we do not find other sources of water than we now have.

There is some talk about converting sea water to fresh water. It is possible, and even feasible, if we could find fuel cheap enough to operate the necessary machinery. But it is not to this source we must turn immediately. We have got to look for other streams to tap. They exist and we will tell you about them later.

STATE ACTION IS NECESSARY

That is not all. Knowledge without action is futile. We must find the means of acquiring the water after we find its source and that is another matter which we propose to discuss over a period of time.

For the immediate present, suffice it to say that we must act. We must act promptly, forthrightly, and seriously. Also, we must act organizationally. The Colorado River Association has done a superb job in its field. The need now goes beyond the scope of that organization. It is an undertaking which must be met on a State-wide basis. The fact that northern California usually has adequate rainfall while the south doesn't is no excuse for being regional.

Failure to act in the near future will mean that water will be the paramount issue within a decade and it could be that lack of water will mean for us what it already means for large areas in China and India.

More Meat and How To Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "More Meat and How To Get It, With a Common Sense Meat Program." It is sponsored by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Meat Institute, and other organizations. I ask that it be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD. I understand that the printing will cost about $150 more than the cost of printing the two pages allowed under the rule.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE MEAT AND HOW TO GET IT WITH A COMMON-SENSE MEAT PROGRAM—HELP STOP INFLATION, GET MORE MEAT TO CONSUMERS, HELP MEET THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY, BALANCE AND STABILIZE THE ECONOMY, NOW AND AFTER THE EMERGENCY

(A program for a sound three-way attack by (1) farmers and ranchers, (2) consumers, and (3) Congress, that will halt inflation and help restore sound dollars, sponsored by farm organizations, livestock associations, meat-industry groups, and allied businesses)

SUMMARY

There is no shortage of meat. There is inflated demand. A common sense, constructive 3-way attack is proposed—with directions set forth in 20 pamphlets as numbered below:

I. Farmers and ranchers have eight production goals:

Goal 1. More corn and other feed-grain production.

Goal 2. Stretch feed, produce more meat per pound.

Goal 3. Grassland improvement, for more cattle and sheep.

Goal 4. Hogs, a quick and efficient way to more meat.

Goal 5. Beef cattle; more beef is on the way.

Goal 6. Sheep; produce more of critically short wool and lamb.

Goal 7. Poultry; rapid broiler and turkey expansion continues.

Goal 8. Dairy cattle; provide 42 percent of beef and veal.

II. Consumers must help; the way is shown in goal 9, thrifty meat buying and use.

III. Congress and the Federal administration have responsibility to exercise leadership.

Goal 10. Restore sound money.

To get action and to achieve the 10 goals, there are 10 task forces proposed. The following pamphlets suggest how each of the task forces can strike at the causes of inflation.

11. Task force, farm organizations.
12. Task force, livestock associations.
13. Task force, meat industry.
14. Task force, bankers and other financial leaders.
15. Task force, feed manufacturers and dealers.
16. Task force, crop; fertilizer, seed, insecticide, implement, and other dealers.
17. Task force, transportation companies.
18. Task force, service organizations, leaders and managers.

19. Task force, agencies, United States Department of Agriculture and colleges of agriculture.
20. Task force, press and radio.

The common-sense meat program can be an example of what all parts of our economy can do to help stop inflation and restore sound dollars.

It is a direct, positive attack on this problem, not wasteful and negative.

FOREWORD

Inflation grips the United States. Money is rapidly losing its value. In an effort to check this economic catastrophe, price controls have been imposed.

This is an attack on the symptoms of inflation—not on the causes. Such controls conceal the effects of inflation—and divert attention from what must be done to halt inflation.

Price controls on livestock and livestock products and the economy as a whole are not necessary, practicable, or feasible.

This common-sense meat program is a sound and positive solution to control inflation. It is the way in which farmers, ranchers, and allied industries propose to help. But more production, efficient processing, and marketing cannot alone stop inflation.

Congress and the Federal administration must strike at the causes of inflation and unsound dollars.

Consumers must do their part with thrifty meat buying and use.

It is good common sense to cure the reasons for inflation.

Inflation and meat

There is no shortage of meat, according to past rates of consumption. The average consumption per person in the United States will be 148 pounds during 1951—up 3 pounds from last year.

This amount has been exceeded in only 8 of the last 20 years. More meat is on the way.

Cattle on farms increased 5 percent during 1950; beef cows are up 10 percent to a new record high; calves are up 11 percent.

Hog numbers are up 7 percent—and hogs under 6 months of age on January 1 were up 11 percent from 1950.

Sheep numbers increased 4 percent during 1950.

Feed supplies are large, but production must be further increased to care for the rapid livestock expansion.

Prices of meat are at present levels—not because of a lag in production—but because of record high incomes and free spending of consumers. Wages paid to industrial workers went up 17 percent in less than 9 months following the outbreak of war in Korea.

The population increase is almost 2,500,000 each year.

Expansion of the Armed Forces will require about 1,200,000,000 pounds more meat—1 out of each 20 pounds of meat produced.

Farmers and ranchers will boost meat output rapidly—in the production race to outrun the increased need—and in an effort to meet the inflated demand. Only lack of confidence in future markets, due to man-made regulations, can cause them to cut back.

Obviously, producers must take into consideration the various and numerous business risks inherent in a program of this nature. Such risks may be even greater than they are in normal times.

This production program stresses increased efficiency by the producer. It is equally essential, however, that all of the other members of the meat team, livestock-marketing groups, packers, and retailers, along with allied industries, constantly strive to do an even more efficient job of processing and marketing. All must help.

This program is a common-sense attack on inflation—to restore free prices and markets and sound dollars.

COMMON SENSE MEAT PROGRAM—A SOUND THREE-WAY ATTACK

I. Farmers and ranchers must do an outstanding meat-production job.

Livestock men must assume some extra risks. No one can predict the weather, the trend toward war or peace, the price at market time, or political actions in Washington.

Nevertheless, they must push forward to produce more meat. There must be a genuine effort to meet the larger demand with more and more production.

This does not mean that individuals should risk their financial security—or the future welfare of their families.

It does mean that risk of less profits is justified in the effort to help meet the emergency—on a positive, constructive basis.

This will be accomplished by the full cooperation and help of all their allied businesses and industries. Meat processors, marketing agencies, retailers, bankers, feed manufacturers and dealers, fertilizer companies, implement manufacturers and dealers, transportation organizations and companies, and all others that help produce, process, or sell livestock and meat must help.

The assistance of the press and radio will be indispensable.

The United States Department of Agriculture, agricultural colleges, and all agricultural agencies should concentrate on giving assistance in more meat production.

II. Consumers must be thrifty meat buyers. They should buy the meat that is most available—guidance by seasons will be suggested.

Consumers can buy more of the less expensive—but equally nutritious—cuts, to get more for the meat dollar.

Home storage and lockers may be used to help carry meat from peak production to scarcity seasons. Buying canned and other meats when supplies are plentiful, to be used in higher price periods, is not hoarding but is an aid in maintaining more even prices and meat supplies all year.

Home economists, the press and radio, consumer groups and all stores selling meat must help promote thrifty meat buying and use.

III. Congress and the Federal Administration must strike at the cause of inflation and unsound dollars by—(1) restrictions on expansion of money supply; (2) strict economy by Government, thereby setting an example for business and individuals; (3) pay-as-you-go taxation; (4) limitations on consumer credit; (5) encouragement of individual savings.

This three-way attack by farmers and ranchers, consumers, and Congress will stabilize the economy—now and after the emergency.

SECTION I

More meat must be produced with efficient methods. Farmers and ranchers should grasp this opportunity to supply consumers more of what they want.

Each organization, business, or agency participating in this program will receive suggestions on what to do, how to proceed, and proper timing of actions. Write for instruction pamphlets and suggestions if you want to help.

Every business has a huge stake in stabilizing the economy. Unless inflation is brought under control, the "free choice" system that has made America great may be permanently destroyed.

The action programs are built around the following:

Goal 1. More corn and other feed grain production

Feed must be produced to maintain and expand the meat output. The amount of feed grains produced tends to set upper limits on the amount of meat produced.

Where equipment is available, the use of anhydrous ammonia, or other nitrogenous fertilizers, should be encouraged to boost yields.

Agricultural college authorities state, "The amount of meat we can produce depends primarily upon two things: First, the quantity of feed we produce; and, second, the efficiency with which we feed it."

The critical planting season has already started.

March 1 planting intentions of farmers show only a 1.6 percent increase in the corn acreage over last year—a total of 66,894,000 acres. It will not be enough—far short of real needs.

The United States Department of Agriculture is asking for 90,000,000 acres. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is urging increased feed production to support increased livestock production for national defense.

Keep established rotations and sound crop programs for the long pull but work in more corn now, where practical.

Grain sorghum acreage should be as large as last year.

This is the corn crop of the West—and more grain will be urgently needed in the West.

Farmers intend to plant less grain sorghum than last year—the indicated slash in grain sorghum production is one-half.

This would be a grave mistake.

Strive for as large a grain sorghum acreage as last year. It is production needed to bolster the national defense.

All feed grains will be urgently needed. Corn reserves are being pulled down fast—already higher feed prices are causing some farmers to cut back on hogs and poultry. The major effort on this crop production campaign must be made immediately—and up to July 15.

Goal 2. Stretch feed

(a) This is a basic and continuing program to produce more meat per pound of feed. It will—get more meat to consumers, increase farm production, step up the volume of all businesses, stretching feed is one of the most urgent needs of the Nation.

(b) Making the same amount of feed produce more pounds of meat is even more effective than merely growing more grain.

(c) Look at the various livestock programs for stretch-feed ideas, such as—save every pig; vaccinate and get rid of worms; use pasture to the limit—this is the least expensive feed; balance rations—let county agents, agricultural teachers and feed dealers help; avoid bruising and crippling of livestock, to protect feed investment; feed salt and other minerals; don't waste feed-producing excess fat; kill rats—this is now easy to do with warfarin; each will eat or waste 2 to 3 bushels of feed; cull constantly—get high production per animal; use all feed—byproducts, damaged grains and all of the plants; keep livestock healthy; keep livestock gaining.

(d) The urgency of the "stretch feed" campaign will build up with livestock numbers—and will be extremely acute should drought strike.

Efficient use of feed can add at least 20 percent more meat for consumers and reduce the production costs of farmers and ranchers.

The methods of efficient feed use are well known. The most able producers get high meat output per feed used. Many feed companies and dealers are doing a good job of promoting better feeding.

Stretch feed to the limit for national defense and stability.

Goal 3. Grassland improvement

Every business, farm, and livestock organization should throw its full influence back of pasture and range land improvement—and wise management.

H. E. Babcock, the great agricultural statesman, until his recent death, "beat the drums" for a strong animal agriculture.

A strong animal agriculture builds a strong Nation: (1) Animal agriculture builds the soil; (2) animal agriculture is our best food reserve; (3) animal agriculture is the backbone of the family farm; (4) animal agriculture provides the nutritious foods we need most and like best; (5) animal agriculture is one of our best guarantees for continued prosperity and stability.

Fortunately, the United States Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges and universities in November 1950 jointly announced such a program and pledged:

"The colleges and the Department will work together with all their resources to gain the widespread improvement of the Nations billion acres of pasture, hay land, and range.

"Better grasslands will provide a solid base for the expansion of the production of meat and other livestock products.

"Grasslands improvements will produce benefits in which the participating farmers, the people and the Nation as a whole will share in the near future as well as in the years which lie further ahead."

A 10-point program was announced. These included the following suggestions:

(a) Pasture is cheap feed.

(b) Apply more lime and fertilizers.

(c) Mow weeds and get rid of brush, cactus and other damaging vegetation.

(d) Do more seeding—and use the best grasses and legumes.

(e) Spread runoff waters on the range.

(f) Irrigate more pastures.

(g) Grassland improvement is the effective way to insure carrying the increased cattle and sheep numbers—and to be sure that they will carry heavy weights when sold off of grass.

(h) Even 5 to 10 acres improved pasture per farm will be a tremendous help. Do not seed down productive land needed for feed grain production.

(i) Every rancher should step up grassland improvement and use the grazing management that will produce more beef and lamb for the years ahead.

(j) Farmers should see their county agent and PMA office for details on the grassland improvement program.

Goal 4. Hogs

Hogs are highly efficient and are profitable converters of grain into meat.

Through two litters per year pork production can be rapidly expanded.

Pork output can be expanded quickly with hogs now on farms by feeding to heavier weights as a temporary measure—but don't waste feed by going above 260 pounds.

After September, save grain by selling at lighter weights—about 225 pounds.

All farmers producing hogs should be reached through seasonal information vital to maintaining an adequate and profitable output of pork. In this they must have the assistance of all allied industries and agencies. Here are examples of actions that will pay off in more meat for consumers and increased income to farmers:

April and May is the time to insure a large fall pig crop. More sows and gilts should be bred.

There is currently plenty of corn and with this program there should be no acute future shortages. Hogs raised largely on grass and byproducts should sell well and help bolster the food supply.

"For fattening pigs, all the good pasture they will eat will save 15 percent on corn and 35 percent on protein. For sows, good pasture will save half the feed during gestation for fall pigs." (University of Missouri.)

A succession of catch crops should be planted to stretch-feed grains by providing continuous succulent grazing.

Full feed early spring pigs to sell at high prices when pork is scarce during the July-September period.

Feed balanced rations. Self feeding cuts labor and saves feed.

"Feeding worms in hogs is expensive—when three ears of corn are tossed to wormy pigs, one ear goes to the worm and the other two to the pigs." (Alabama Polytechnic Institute.)

A south Georgia farmer last year produced over 1,000 pounds of pork an acre, hogging off early hybrid corn. The hogs were sold on the high September market. More pork can and should be produced in the South and West.

Farmers, especially those with less than 5 or 10 sows, should, where practical, add more gilts. When enough hogs are produced to make a larger enterprise, the hogs receive more attention—and profits go up on all the hogs. Purchase of any additional feed that may be needed will be profitable—if used efficiently.

Pork is the quick and profitable way to get more meat to consumers to the limit of feed-grain supplies.

Goal 5. Beef cattle

Breeding herds are being rapidly increased—cows up 10 percent over last year. More beef is on the way.

About 85 percent of United States beef is produced without corn. Good quality beef can be sold off grass—it must be accomplished on more farms and ranches.

The major problem will be to outrun the uptrend in cattle numbers with the grasslands improvement program.

"In time of need, two bushels of corn can be stretched to do the work ordinarily done by three in some kinds of cattle feeding." (Iowa State College.)

A big tonnage of beef—rather than wasteful high finish, must be the goal. Feed cattle with a minimum of grain.

Make full use of silage, by-products, corncobs, beet pulp, and other such feeds for putting more weight on cattle.

Supplemental feeding on grass to get larger gains on market cattle this summer is recommended where practical.

Texas A. & M. authorities urge, "Control parasites with special attention to fly control. Use bulls tested for rate of gain. Overcome mineral deficiencies by direct feeding of bone meal or by fertilizing pastures."

Don't hold cows that are too old or uncertain breeders. "Range cows produce their best calves during their fourth to eighth years." (Montana Experiment Station.)

"Expand the production of fall calves. This will reduce death losses and speed up production." (University of Nebraska.)

Expand cow herds in farming areas—especially in the South.

Better feeding in the South is largely dependent on producing better pastures—fertilizing and seeding.

Georgia State College authorities stress the importance of making cattle heavier before selling. Better grade calves especially should be carried to near 1,000 pounds which will more than double the beef from the same animal.

Full use must be made of all practical methods of producing more beef—and at lower costs.

Grow cattle to older ages to get heavier weights, before fattening, where pasture and roughage can be produced to carry more cattle.

Goal 6. Sheep

Sheep numbers, after being cut almost one-half, are now being increased—up 4 percent in 1950.

Such additions to the meat supply will be small for several years. Ewes held off the market for breeding will largely offset extra lambs for market.

More ewe lambs must be retained by both ranchers and farmers. More small farms should have sheep flocks. Flocks of 40 or more ewes should be on more farms.

Sheep fit in with glassland improvement, goal 3, as they help control weeds and need little but pasture and hay as feed.

Consumer discrimination against heavy lambs should be minimized.

Desperately short wool supplies as well as scarce lamb gives a double reason for rapid increase of sheep.

Goal 7. Poultry

For 16 years broiler production has gone up very rapidly. This increase will continue during 1951.

Broilers furnish a quick supply of meat. Large-scale and low-cost production per bird has encouraged expansion.

Turkey production will set a new all-time high in 1951.

Thrifty consumers should recognize that "A large tom turkey gives 15 to 20 percent more cooked meat for your money than a small bird—whether you buy a whole, large bird or half of one." (Washington State College.)

Goal 8. Dairy cattle

Dairy cows give a two-way income—milk and beef.

Dairy cattle make up 42 percent of the total beef and veal supply. This is nutritious and wholesome meat.

The supply of beef can be materially increased by putting more weight on dairy animals before they are sold for beef.

Profitable dairying is practical without major use of feed grains, since 85 percent of the milk production capacity of milk cows can be obtained from good quality pasture and roughage.

Keep all the dairy heifers from high-producing cows. Grow them into big cows. They will produce more milk—and bring more as beef when sold out of the milking herd.

Some low-producing milk cows, especially of the heavier breeds, can be bred to beef bulls—to produce more veal and beef. Artificial breeding associations now have beef bulls put in at the request of milk cow owners. For example all dairymen in Ohio can get the use of beef bulls for their dairy cows.

Cows having been culled from the milking herd should be allowed to fatten on pasture and fed roughage and supplements when profitable to do so before selling. Low-producing milk cows should be culled more promptly and turned into beef to save feed and labor.

Dairy steers, especially from heavy breeds, usually can be grown and profitably fattened on grass—for more beef.

The sale of lightweight young dairy cattle for slaughter should be discouraged. Farmers with extra grass and forage should buy such animals and put on for additional gains—thus increasing the tonnage of beef.

Vealers should be grown to heavier weights before being sold where practical. In areas of low-priced milk this is especially profitable.

Ohio State University dairy specialists recommend, "Feed veal calves to market weights of 180 to 200 pounds. Dairy farmers can profit in beef sideline."

The quick and easy method of selling "bobbie" calves should be discouraged. By growing them into heavy veal calves the meat output is more than doubled and profits are often increased.

More use should be made of calf meals—they can replace practically all of the milk for even young calves.

Dairymen need not give up milk production to market more beef. By management adjustments they can continue in milk production and sell one-third more beef and veal.

SECTION II

Thrifty meat buying and use by consumers will enable them to buy more meat.

This means higher diet levels—better nutrition for more people—and more stability for farmers and ranchers.

It will help stabilize the economy—now and after the emergency.

Each organization, business, or agency participating in this program will receive suggestions on what to do, how to proceed, proper timing of action.

Write for such suggestions if you want to help stop inflation and restore sound dollars.

Goal 9. Thrifty meat buying and use

There is no shortage of meat. There is a great increase in demand for meat caused by more people who have more money and want to spend it for food.

There will be an average of about 148 pounds of meat per person during 1951—more than in any other recent year, except 1944, 1946, and 1947, when the supply was slightly larger. (Kansas State College.)

Guidance in thrifty buying of meat and planning of meals around less popular cuts will help keep prices in line. Housewives can profit by using a greater variety of meat cuts and can add more appeal to their meals.

Farmers do not set the price of meat—it is set by consumers as they bid against each other. Price control will not correct this situation but will bring hardship to both producers and consumers.

Price controls lead to rationing, black markets, disrespect for law, unsanitary practices, loss of byproducts (including insulin and other important new drugs), and less meat for consumers.

There are many sources through which consumers now obtain guidance for thrifty meat buying and use. Two examples of these are:

The National Livestock and Meat Board, which has national coverage through its homemaker's service.

American Meat Institute publicity for newspapers, magazines, radio, and retail advertisements, which regularly carry meat buying and use guidance for thrifty housewives.

We must concentrate on telling food buyers how to be thrifty in making purchases. We must also educate consumers on how to prepare and serve meat in order to obtain its full value. Over 10 percent of the nutrition of meats is lost because of poor cooking methods and poor meal planning.

Less tender cuts of meat are just as nutritious as the tender steaks. "All meat is tender if it is cooked correctly." (Purdue University.)

SECTION III

While farmers, ranchers, allied industries, agencies and consumers work at their jobs of producing more meat and thrifty buying and use of meat—

Congress and the Federal administration have the responsibility to exercise leadership to control inflation.

It is to strike at the cause of inflation and unsound dollars.

All across the Nation there is demand for such action.

Goal 10. Restore sound money

The methods of stopping inflation and the dwindling value of dollars are well known. Prompt and definite action is needed in Washington on: (1) Restrictions on expansion of money supply; (2) strict economy by Government, thereby setting an example for business and individuals; (3) pay-as-we-go taxation; (4) limitations on consumer credit; (5) encouragement of individual savings.

All citizens who have savings, life insurance, bonds, pensions, and other such property should continue to call upon Congress for action. Write your Senators and Representatives.

The University of Illinois suggests to farmers, "Our Government is responsible for inflation. The Constitution of the United States says that 'Congress shall have the power * * * to coin money (and) regulate the value thereof. * * *' But Congress usually does what it thinks the people want."

The University of Minnesota points out that "A life-insurance policy which would have provided $1,000 of purchasing power in 1946 now yields less than $600.

"An E bond purchased 10 years ago matures this year at a higher dollar value but the latter represents less buying power than the original investment.

"The citizen is under obligation to buy bonds. His Government is under obligation to do everything within its power to assure the purchaser that the value of the bonds will not evaporate through inflation."

Inflation must be stopped or much past and future savings will continue to be wiped out. The dollar is worth about 50 cents—savings are worth far less than they were 10 years ago.

Congress must act if the economy is to be stabilized. This will require an aroused public demanding action—to get action in Washington.

Let your Senators and Representatives know what you want done—they want to act according to the will of the people.

Task Forces

Farmers, ranchers, and consumers need as allies all businesses and fellow citizens. All must join the fight on inflation.

This common sense meat program can be an example of what all parts of our economy must accomplish to stop inflation and restore sound dollars.

To that end, 10 task forces are proposed.

The following list of brief pamphlets suggests how each can quickly bring tremendous forces to bear on the inflation and national stability problem.

Request any or all of these pamphlets—then launch out in a vigorous attack on the causes of inflation—not the symptoms.

This is a sound positive attack—not wasteful and negative.

11. Task force farm organizations: Production goals 1 to 8 will be the special objectives of this task force.

12. Task force livestock associations: This task force will combine the leadership of breeders, feeders, and marketing men.

13. Task force meat industry: Goal 9, thrifty meat buying and use, will be a major objective. Processing and marketing must be efficient.

14. Task force bankers and other financial leaders: Inflation is a problem of money and economics. Leadership from finance will be be especially effective.

15. Task force feed manufacturers and dealers: Goal 2, stretch feed, and sound livestock management will be the field of major service for this task force.

16. Task force crop—fertilizers, seed, insecticide, implement, and other dealers: This task force will work on goal 1, more corn and other feed production, and goal 3, grassland improvement.

17. Task force transportation companies: Railroads, truck companies, and individuals doing hauling of livestock, feeds, and supplies are a vital task force.

18. Task force service organizations, leaders, and managers: In this task force will be chambers of commerce, service clubs, farm managers, and others who will help.

19. Task force agencies, United States Department of Agriculture, and colleges: The Federal and State agricultural workers can be depended upon for aggressive help and guidance.

20. Task force press and radio: The assistance of the press and radio is indispensable. Goals 1 to 10 offer numerous service opportunities.

Organizations cooperating to put this common-sense meat program over, include the following: American Farm Bureau Federation; American Meat Institute; American National Cattlemen's Association; American Stockyards Association; Central Livestock Association, Inc.; Independent Livestock Marketing Association; Kansas Livestock Association; Missouri Livestock Association; National Committee of Livestock Order Buyers and Dealers; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Grange; National Independent Meat Packers Association; National Lamb Feeders Association; National Livestock Auction Association; National Livestock Exchange; National Live Stock Producers Association; National Livestock and Meat Board; National Wool Growers Association; Producers Livestock Cooperative; Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association; Western States Meat Packers Association, and other national, regional, and State associations.

"The Story of the Men of the United States Air Force, Daily Flying Their Jets Fully Armed Along the Boundaries of the Iron Curtain, Is One of the Least-Known Stories of the American Defense of Western Europe"—Mr. Robert McCormick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the echo of acclaim attesting General MacArthur's presence in the Nation's Capital had hardly died before the assistant to the President, the Honorable John R. Steelman, made still further and factual report to the American people on some newer phases of the current problems facing this country. This he did by way of the teledocumentary, Battle Report, Washington, broadcast each Sunday afternoon for 6 months past over the National Broadcasting Co.'s television network and coaxial cables.

The television program Battle Report, Washington, has long since proved itself to be one of the most popular of all weekly news telecasts emanating from the Nation's Capital. On this program, each week, Dr. John R. Steelman presents top-flight officials of the Federal Government to make report to the American people with respect to official matters that come under their immediate supervision.

The statements made by Dr. Steelman and his invited guests are altogether so illuminating that I am taking opportunity of again directing them to the attention of this House.

To make the program even more interesting, some 3 or 4 weeks ago, the National Broadcasting Co. dispatched its ace commentator, Robert McCormick, to Europe. He went to learn, first-hand, the conditions obtaining on the Continent in order that he might bring that report back for the information of the public and use on the Battle Report, Washington, program.

He returned to America some 10 days ago, and, last Sunday, Dr. Steelman presented Mr. McCormick, along with other guests, on the afternoon's program.

Mr. McCormick's presentation of his observations, especially of Air Force activities, is chock full of reader interest as he tells of American jets which—

Every daylight hour of the day, and every day of the week, fully armed, and ready for

action, they patrol the entire United States zone of occupied Germany. The nearest Russian-dominated border only 6 minutes away by air.

The story of these men of the United States Air Force, who daily fly along the boundaries of the iron curtain, is one of the most dramatic and least-known stories of the American defense of Western Europe.

Authenticated by a personal statement made to Mr. McCormick by Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad, and the short statement made by Col. John S. Chennault, commander of the Eighty-sixth Fighter-Bomber Wing, Mr. McCormick's story of the splendid work done by the German weathermen and German radio operators, and other technicians, is interestingly discussed by a German radio operator, who said:

I am only one of the typical Germans who like to do my job, and I like to work together with the Americans, and not only the Americans, but the French and English people—and you know what a war can do. And I feel that it is now a time of crisis and we have to stand all together, and I will do my part of the work here in the Air Force. (Excuse me, I have to take now a message.)

Of more than passing interest to mothers and fathers of America was the statement made by Maj. Gen. Harry G. Armstrong, USSAF, who reported as to the physical and moral conditions of the men of our Air Force in the Pacific theater, as well as in Alaska.

Accompanying General Armstrong on a recent visit in survey of these areas was Dr. Elmer Henderson, eminent surgeon and president of the American Medical Association, as well as six outstanding medical consultants.

In discussing air evacuations made in Korea to date, General Armstrong said, in part:

So far, in the Korean affair more than 121,000 persons have been evacuated by air within Korea and Japan, including many patients transported more than once. There have not been that many casualties. In the next phase, the Military Air Transport Service has transported more than 22,000 patients from Korea to the United States. Not all of them are combat casualties. All of these patients have been evacuated by air and without a single death due to mishandling or aircraft failure.

Mr. Speaker, this particular program of Battle Report, Washington is so full of human interest and contains so much that is pertinent to our fighting men in foreign lands that I particularly commend it to the reading of my every colleague in this House.

That they might have an opportunity of reading the same, I now ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the thirty-fourth Battle Report, Washington as broadcast by Dr. John R. Steelman and his guests a week ago last Sunday.

That program was as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. McCORMICK. As this hero's welcome Washington gave MacArthur continues to echo throughout the Nation—once again NBC Television turns its cameras on the Nation's Capital for a report on the battle that continues in Korea.

Washington, which called upon Gen. Matthew Ridgway to take command in the Far East, and Korea, where the troops he led advanced farther north against the slowly yielding Reds.

Today, Battle Report focuses on an exclusive film report of our jet bomber-patrol in Germany, then on the Surgeon General of our Air Force. But, first, a word from the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Ever since the dawn of history, the return of military heroes has been an occasion for rejoicing and celebration. We are no different from our ancestors in this respect. And rightly so. Men who have dedicated their lives to the defense of their homelands have earned the homage of the people.

I wish it were possible, this afternoon, to tell you that the days of struggle are ended and our celebrations of the past week marked the dawn of peace. But, this is not the case. The vicious, warmongering propaganda of the Soviet still goes on. Hundreds of millions of persons are being taught to hate the United States, and thus, are being conditioned for war. The Soviet repeatedly has blocked all efforts to reach a just and enduring peace through honorable negotiation.

And every hour of every day they hang the threat of war over our heads like the sword of Damocles. Let me give you some cold, hard facts.

Under the hammer and sickle of the Soviet Union itself there are at least 4,100,000 men, armed with the newest and most formidable weapons. Of these, at least 300,000 are in Germany and 100,000 in Manchuria, which borders Korea.

The subservient satellite nations also are armed to the teeth. According to the latest reports, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Albania now have at least 795,000 men under arms. And, in China, there is an almost inexhaustible reservoir of manpower.

These vast armies are poised to strike. They are like daggers at the heart of the free world—and their ultimate target is the United States.

Obviously, this is no time for complacency.

Obviously, our defense program must continue at an ever-increasing tempo.

Obviously, it is time for every citizen to put his shoulder to the wheel and do his part.

This afternoon we will see how one of the borders of the free world is being patroled night and day by the Eighty-sixth Fighter Bomber Wing of our Air Force. Robert McCormick saw it when he was in Europe last month and ordered it recorded on film by the NBC camera team, Charles and Eugene Jones.

With us in the studio is a distinguished officer, Maj. Gen. Harry G. Armstrong, Surgeon General of the Air Force. He is here to tell us how the lives of our airmen are being saved.

And now let us continue with this week's Battle Report, Washington.

VOICE. This is NBC Cameraman Gene Jones, all dressed up with some place to go. On assignment to document Europe with his brother Charlie, here Gene prepares to film the sixth of our exclusive teledocumentaries—eighty-sixth fighter-bomber wing in Germany—America's jet patrol along the border of the iron curtain. Stand by for another NBC first-voiced by our narrator, not long returned from Germany, Robert McCormick.

Mr. McCORMICK. Every daylight hour of the day, every day of the week, American jets like these, fully armed and ready for action, patrol the entire United States zone of occupied Germany. The nearest Russian-dominated border—only 6 minutes away by air. The story of these men of the United States Air Force who daily fly along the boundaries of the iron curtain is one of the most dramatic and least-known stories of the American defense of Western Europe.

We invite you now to start upon this story as we did, at the home of the Eighty-sixth, the Neubiberg Air Base, once the home base of Nazi combat air units that flew on bombing missions in World War II against France and other allied countries. We ask you to begin by listening, as we did, to the commander of our Atlantic Pact air forces, Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad.

Lieutenant General NORSTAD. I am pleased to participate in this program which has for its purpose bringing to the American people first-hand knowledge of their interests and activities overseas. This part of the program focuses attention on one element of our Armed Forces overseas, the United States Air Forces in Europe. This command has responsibilities in the United Kingdom, in Europe proper, and in north Africa. At the typical Air Force base pictured here, you will see some of our most modern aircraft and the men and facilities which support them. These forces, joined with those of the other western nations form the nucleus around which will be built the strength and alert essential to the preservation of peace.

Mr. McCORMICK. The story of our Eighty-sixth fighter-bomber wing in Europe is first the story of efficiency. Radar, constantly screening the border, keeps our squadrons on a 24-hour ready alert. And this truck houses the base's GCA equipment that helps guide planes to a safe landing in bad weather.

While these electronic eyes are at work, careful attention is paid to every detail designed to keep our planes armed and ready. The loading of these heavy bombs, for instance.

Each plane carries two 1,000-pound bombs, or up to 32 rockets.

Belts of ammunition are prepared, too, for the jets' 50-caliber machine guns. All these installations are checked and double-checked. No plane goes on patrol without being combat-loaded.

Meanwhile, the pilots who fly these F-84-E jets prepare to take to the air for their stint on the border patrol.

Not without their mascot, of course.

Take a good look at them, America. Average age 26. Many of them are veterans of combat in World War II. One out of seven has his family with him in Europe. As these selected men—proud of their esprit de corps—get ready to board their planes, let us now take a look at some of the men behind them. You are in the base's weather station. Listen.

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. They have now cleared at 3,000 and they will hold that way, keep 3,000 to 4,000 with occasional ceiling at 3,500, but they should break up by tonight.

UNITED STATES CAPTAIN. Will that hold up to 1,800?

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. Oh, yes; the weather is very nice up there for flying.

UNITED STATES CAPTAIN. Well, Warren, that looks like a good forecast for today.

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. I think we traced that area for that bad weather very well for today.

UNITED STATES CAPTAIN. How long have you been forecasting here?

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. About 5 years.

UNITED STATES CAPTAIN. Were you with the German air force previously?

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. Yes; I was a forecaster. Quite some years ago I volunteered to have a forecaster's position here with the American Air Force, and I like it very well because the operation is about the same as it was before.

Mr. McCORMICK. Here is a former member of the German Navy now working at the base as radio operator.

GERMAN RADIO OPERATOR. I am only one of the typical Germans who like to do my job, and I like to work together with the Americans, and not only the Americans, but the French and English people, and you know what a war can do. And I feel that it is now a time of crisis and we have to stand all together, and I will do my part of the work here in the Air Force. (Excuse me, I have to take now a message.)

Mr. McCORMICK. Yes; we found carefully screened German civilians at work throughout the base on hundreds of jobs—from responsible weather-communications posts to building this new runway.

Back now to the pilots who have this team behind them.

Before taking off, they go over the last-minute details on the day's patrol. And now, each to his own Thunderjet.

Here comes the signal from the tower, and one by one the jets pull out of line to taxi into position. Here's the takeoff.

They buzz the radar truck on the outskirts of the field and off they go.

You are now flying along the borders of the iron curtain countries at 600 miles an hour in a plane with a cruising range of over a thousand miles.

Sometimes you fly high above the clouds. Sometimes you skim the rolling fields below. Windows open on the ground below as people scan the sky to see you roar by. Men pause in their daily tasks to mark your passing, and children playing some German folk game are suddenly excited by the sight of you.

High up in the air, you go about your business, your eyes searching the heavens for some plane that might be trying to sneak across the border. Could it be an enemy bomber? Or is it some friendly aircraft off course? You decide "let's take a look."

The bigger plane seems to stand still as you dive in upon it. It's a friendly plane unknowingly off its course, so you continue on.

Hours go by, just this way. But before returning to your base, you receive orders by radio. For a test of your marksmanship ability, you are ordered to proceed at once to the rocket range for three low-level strafing approaches. You say, "Roger" and do just that.

Suddenly, unknown to you—a tragedy. A jet fighter on routine patrol crashes several miles from the field. The field ambulance and fire-fighting truck rush to the scene of the wreckage. With the latest fire-fighting equipment, men go to work on the flames. But it is too late to do anything at all for the pilot.

Thus, even though there is not yet combat in Europe, the hazard of death constantly faces these airmen on patrol to keep the peace.

And now, to close "Border Patrol, Germany," let's join the son of the famed Flying Tigers of China. Yes; Col. John S. Chennault, commander of this Eighty-sixth Fighter-Bomber Wing since World War II.

Colonel CHENNAULT. This unit, like other Air Force units in Europe, has been assigned certain specific missions. We are all keenly aware of our responsibilities as America's first line of defense in Europe. We are prepared and ready to go.

Mr. McCORMICK. As U. N. ground forces battle to the hills beyond the Hwachon Reservoir, from the Eighth Army's new commander comes word that the Communists' next move is anybody's guess. Says Lieutenant General Van Fleet, "There's a definite build-up. I imagine the enemy would like to take another shot at us. We're ready for him if he does." Meanwhile, the air war grows hotter. More and more, our strafing jets—shown at work here—and our bombers, too, are meeting swarms of Russian-made Migs itching for combat. Just back from a first-hand survey of the medical needs of our pilots, and other Air Force personnel in the Pacific, comes our next guest. For the first public report on his trip, the Surgeon-General of the Air Force, Maj. Gen. Harry G. Armstrong.

Major General ARMSTRONG. Our trip was extensive in that we visited most of the Air Force medical installations in the Pacific theater and Alaska. Our party included six outstanding civilian medical consultants to the United States Air Force, among whom was Dr. Elmer Henderson, an eminent surgeon and president of the American Medical Association.

One of the things that particularly impressed us is the very high morale of all Air Force personnel, both line and medical. The closer we approached the battle lines, the higher the morale. The best of all is with the advanced fighter units and the medical air evacuation squadron flying from forward airstrips in Korea.

The high morale of medical personnel can be attributed to several things. Young doctors in the service are better trained than ever before, and our present medical organization makes it possible to assign them to fields within their chosen specialties. By utilizing these men in their specialties and keeping them busy, we require fewer medical personnel in proportion to troop strength. They are doing a wonderful job, working hard, and each one is making a definite contribution to the total effort. These young doctors are gaining valuable experience, though sometimes practicing under adverse conditions.

All in all, our military personnel are now getting the best medical care in the history of military medicine. A concrete evidence of this superior medical care is the very low mortality rate among combat casualties, which is less than one-half that in World War II. There are several specific factors contributing to this achievement: better and quicker medical treatment in the front lines including the use of blood and blood plasma derivatives; the extensive use of antibiotics, and so-called miracle drugs which drastically reduce the dangers of infection; and we are exploiting the concept of air evacuation of sick and wounded. The concept of air evacuation is roughly divided into two phases. The first carries the casualty from the aid station to a forward surgical hospital and then to a fixed hospital in an area further to the rear or to Japan. Helicopters are proving invaluable in the forward areas for this work, frequently going behind enemy lines for crash casualties or wounded ground troops.

An example of the service being rendered is the case of a young ground force Negro lieutenant. We met aboard an air evacuation flight from Korea to Japan and he told me this: "Five minutes after I was wounded I was back in the battalion first-aid station where my wounds were dressed; and within 50 minutes I was on an airplane being evacuated to a hospital. When we know that such quick care is available we don't mind fighting."

Air evacuation of medical patients is one of the Air Forces' most satisfying operations and we of the Air Force Medical Service contribute to this operation by training and supplying the medical personnel, doctors, nurses, and technicians, who support and fly with every evacuation flight.

Mr. McCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another "teledocumentary," this, then, against the background of Battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your Thirty-fourth Battle Report, Washington.

Britain-United States—No Agreement on China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SMITH OF Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reports that Britain and the United States are in agreement on China policy are not true. As part of my remarks I am including an article by Ludwell Denny that appeared in the Washington News apropos this subject:

DESPITE ALL THE AMICABLE TALK, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN ARE STILL POLES APART ON CHINA POLICY

(By Ludwell Denny)

LONDON, May 16.—Serious disagreements between Britain and America over a China policy continue despite a shift in the British position and Foreign Secretary Herbert Morrison's assurance to Parliament that there is no friction.

These disagreements cover the arms embargo recommended by the United Nations committee to the General Assembly, as well as differences over a total embargo, Formosa, diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Reds and their demand for a U. N. seat.

Though London has modified its pro-Peiping policy under American pressure, at the same time Washington policy has stiffened. So it is still a wide breach.

Frightened by the possible effects of that breach on the North Atlantic Pact and on the British-American alliance, both governments are trying to publicize points of agreement and postpone—rather than settle—their serious China disputes.

RELUCTANT "YES"

For the moment the United States is unwillingly accepting the British-imposed limits on the pending U. N. arms and strategic materials ban because the British Commonwealth, France and a large U. N. majority are on the British side. The British switch permitting this weak measure to pass in the U. N. is not as significant as advertised. Rather it is virtually automatic after Britain's own belated ban on rubber had been forced by Washington's and Winston Churchill's protests and British public opinion.

But London has no intention of extending that limited U. N. ban to a total embargo as the United States has. A provision in the pending U. N. resolution "to continue its consideration of additional measures to meet aggression in Korea and report thereon" is sop to American public opinion. But it is vetoed in advance by British refusal to consider a complete embargo much less naval blockade or political sanctions.

Another grave flaw in the U. N. resolution is the failure to ban rubber by name as it does petroleum. Though rubber obviously is a strategic material, Britain didn't include it in her strategic embargo until recently and justifies what she calls shipments for normal peaceful purposes.

Also, there's a hole in the U. N. clause to prevent evasion of the embargo by shipping and transshipments. It's limited to preventing "circumvention of control on shipments applied by other states pursuant to this resolution." If Indonesia, Burma, India or Ceylon sell rubber or other strategic materials to China, British ships can deliver those goods—unless London rules otherwise.

The biggest hole of all is that British Empire rubber shipments to Russia, which can be reshipped to China, are not banned.

So a strict economic blockade which Defense Secretary George C. Marshall as well as Gen. Douglas MacArthur, says is essential is not imposed by Britain or by the U. N. proposal even in the limited field of arms and strategic materials.

WHY THEY OBJECT

As for the American-type embargo on all goods, London objects on the following grounds:

It would be ineffective because other China traders, including Russia, wouldn't join.

It is enforceable only by a naval blockade which would invite a general war.

Britain and others would lose essential imports from China including tungsten.

It would destroy Hong Kong which is important for the Allies as well as Britain.

POSTPONE DISPUTE

On Formosa, the dispute hasn't been settled, only postponed.

Mr. Morrison's unsolicited statement on this subject to Parliament before its recess last week was double talk. Bowing to America, he said a discussion of Formosa's future would be premature so long as operations continue in Korea, and that decision should be made by the U. N. after consultation with the inhabitants. But for the benefit of the leftists particularly, he specified the policy was the same as that laid down by Prime Minister Clement Attlee last December.

The Labor government, now as then, favors giving Formosa to the Reds with some safeguards for the inhabitants as soon as Peiping ceases aggression. Neither Mr. Attlee nor Mr. Churchill agrees with General Marshall that the island never should fall into Red hands. And, of course, Britain won't support Chiang Kai-shek even to the present limited American extent—unless Hong Kong is attacked by the Reds and Chiang could fight a diversionary action.

Similarly, regarding Red China's membership in the U. N., the British-American dispute is only postponed. Since Peiping's direct participation in the Korean war, London has temporarily withheld support of Peiping's membership until the fighting stops, but only temporarily. That's still the policy here. The question of whether U. N. membership is part of a written bargain for stopping the war or an unwritten understanding is a matter of technique and expediency on which Britain has changed and may change again without willingly altering the basic policy—unless there is a general war.

Educational Responsibilities of Life Underwriters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith for insertion therein an article by Dr. Ernest H. Hahne, president of Miami University at Oxford, Ohio, and chairman of the board of the Cincinnati branch of the Cleveland Federal Reserve Bank.

Dr. Hahne is a graduate of the University of Nebraska, with a bachelor of arts degree in 1911 and a law degree in 1913. He subsequently won his master of arts degree at Harvard and a doctor of philosophy from Chicago University. He taught sociology at Chicago University, economics and sociology at Dakota Wesleyan, economics at Northwestern as professor of economics, and served as assistant dean of the liberal arts college and director of the summer session at Northwestern. An authority on special assessments and Federal taxes, he has served many governmental agencies, particularly just preceding and during World War II. As a research expert, he has served as director of research for Midwest Institute on Fair Trade Practices, United States Office of Education, Illinois State Tax Commission and School of Office Workers, and has been associated with many other important research projects.

EDUCATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS

Representatives of life-insurance companies are engaged in the great social task of education. If their work were to be departmentalized along the lines of the colleges and universities then more specifically they are engaged in the field of economic education. The place of individual and corporate saving, the relation of saving to the creation of capital, and the importance of capital in a capitalistic democracy are among the most significant lessons to be taught.

Not many years ago the life underwriters emphasized, as a part of policy selling, agruments that insurance would enable the buyer to gain a certain amount of independence; that he would gain security for his old age; that he would be buying a first-class investment; and that he would be engaged in the supremely important responsibility of family building.

Today personal independence is in danger of giving way to the state-owes-me-a-living idea. Provision for old age has been taken from the shoulders of the individual and placed in the hands of State and Federal social-security programs, which have followed the Townsend mathematical rhyme—$50-55; 60-65; 70-75, and so on up to $135 per month when Government and private pensions have been combined. The first-class investment argument has been vitiated by rampant inflation. As for family building how often nowadays do we hear about one's responsibility for his grandchildren? Family disorganization has become so common that the moral and spiritual foundations of the family as the cornerstone of democratic institutions are crumbling. Yes, indeed; these are the days when life underwriters must enlarge their scope of economic education as a matter of financial survival and national responsibility.

Whatever menaces a stabilized economy becomes a menace to life underwriting. Today many erroneous dogmas are extant. Some of them undermine national stability. Americans need to be alerted to five of the most widely announced fallacies that are gnawing at the groundsills of the structure of our economy.

First, one of the most common fallacies is that taxation will prevent inflation. I am assuming, of course, that further inflation is considered a menace to life insurance and the credit system. Too frequently, advocates of higher tax rates forget that the money taken from individuals by the force pump of the Internal Revenue Department is collected merely to be respent by those holding positions of strategic power in Government. Behind this may be found the implied assumption that if an individual spends his own income the effect is more inflationary than if the Government spends it, but only 15 years ago we heard that if the Government spends the money then deflation would be stopped and reflation would be started. The same naive persons continue to sponsor these inconsistent conclusions.

Whenever the tax enters into the cost of production, it may be shifted in the form of higher prices for consumers; thus taxes may raise prices. Or if the tax is such that it discourages production and decreases supply as a price factor, it may also raise price. It has been said that the excess-profits tax is not shifted since it falls upon profits computed after costs, but this short-sighted conclusion ignores the fact that corporate management looks to the future on the basis of past experience, and resorts to liberal allowances for advertising, bonuses, pensions, higher wages, lower prices for old customers, consolidations, and mergers that raise costs and lower taxable profits, and general relaxation of efforts toward efficiency and economy in management.

MEASURING TAX LIABILITY

Today we hear that corporate income taxes are not shifted because, like the excess-profits tax, the tax is levied on net income, supposedly the income as made taxable by law. But the fact is, of course, that net income is the measure of tax liability. It is easy to confuse the measure of tax liability and the source of a tax. An income tax may fall on capital. Not a few corporations have found it necesary to set up tax reserves taken from current income in order to pay the exorbitant tax burden that management anticipates from current operations, but because these reserves cannot impair wage agreements, customary dividends, and other drains on income, it becomes necessary to raise prices of goods sold.

One aspect of the income tax that is too frequently by tax analysts develops from increased Government spending because the income tax has proved to be very productive in raising revenue. Thus, public expenditures directly maintain support prices not because the economy needs such a fictitious price system, but because political considerations take highest rank in the minds of those disposing of income-tax revenues. It is nothing but a figment of imagination that the support prices are preponderantly recouped by the Treasury the following year by income taxes, since the primary purposes of such programs, is to raise, not lower prices.

During the depression Washington bureaucrats were vociferously advocating the pump-priming theory that the Government must spend to raise prices, contending at that time that the more the administration spent the more readily would America overcome the depression. But today these same persons not only favor heavier taxation to check inflation, but also favor greater borrowing to conduct the present war.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT SPENDING

If taxes are to become an effective check upon inflation they must be accompanied by a reduction in Government spending, because Government consumption decreases supplies and raises prices just as effectively as though those same supplies were taken from the market by individual purchases. At present I see no signs of the administration's taxing more than it spends, and therefore question the effectiveness of taxation as a means of checking inflation.

Nor will taxation to repay debt prove to be of much help since the dollars paid into the Treasury go into the hands of bondholders who in turn may respend and merely change the channel of spending. If however, the bondholder converts his payments into capital and increases that factor of production, and larger supplies of goods eventually are placed on market counters, these increased supplies may lower prices. The important fact remains that when the Treasury gains the dollars, it does not destroy them, thereby diminishing buying power, but it taxes to spend and spending raises prices.

Life underwriters by converting consumers' spending power into savings tend to check inflation. Two qualifications need to be made, however. First, if the insurance company becomes a lending institution, then little absorption of purchasing power occurs, and second, if the company uses these savings to buy Government bonds, it merely rechannels the flow of savings. Since the companies for the most part assume the duty of converting savings into capital, thereby increasing national product, their activities become anti-inflationary, and much more effective than increased rates of income taxes now being proposed. The conclusion then becomes obvious. Threats of higher income taxes menace savings, stimulates Government spending and borrowing, and impairs the future of life underwriting.

EXPLODING A FALLACY

In the second place, another common fallacy is that no tax is a good tax which is not based upon ability to pay. This fallacy needs to be exploded by life underwriters.

Historically, from the beginnings of the National Government until the Civil War, the

Treasury operated upon the revenue derived from commodity taxes called customs duties, or tariffs, supplemented slightly by revenues from the sales of lands belonging to the public domain. It was a commodity-tax period. Although the Civil War caused a sharp increase in the national debt, the Federal Government continued to tax commodities, but then added what was called the internal-revenue duties on domestically produced goods to correspond with the customs duties on foreign-made goods. They were levied upon the sale of enumerated commodities. From 1862 until the coming of the income tax in 1913 America seems to have managed to muddle through by becoming the most powerful nation on earth. The commodity tax is indisputably the historical basis of American fiscal policy.

Our forefathers seemed to regard this system as equitable and sound, because they considered it the responsibility of all citizens who benefit from Government to help pay for the support of that Government. The excise system was justified before the Supreme Court, as based upon the idea that commodity taxes were a reasonable measure of benefit received.

What has become of the benefit theory of taxation? It has been displaced by the ability-to-pay theory. Today no tax is fair, say many well-intentioned citizens, unless it is founded upon ability to pay. This idea came to America by way of the school of economics, known as the French Socialists, and also through the channels of what in Germany were known as the Socialists-of-the-Chair. Adolph Wagner was the brain-truster for Bismarck, the Iron Duke of Prussia, and he set forth the idea that ability to pay was the soundest socio-politico basis for taxation—that taxes may well be used to redistribute wealth, as well as raise revenues. It was the entering wedge of socialism under the guise of taxation. It is now found in the U. S. S. R. constitution which lays down the Socialist principle that taxes must conform to ability to pay, and that constitution announces that it is a fundamental part of Communist policy. But I do not propose to give a course in the history of tax thought, only to indicate the Socialist origins of the ability-to-pay doctrine.

Since 1913, the World Wars I and II and the Korean war have left America so much in debt that any means of raising revenue seemed to be desirable, and we have acquiesced too readily in the abandonment of the historic principle of benefit received, and accepted too readily the idea that the only good tax is the tax based upon ability to pay. Fees, special assessments, the gasoline tax when used for roads, and to some extent the license system, still retain elements of the benefit theory. Some contend that the personal income tax measures benefits since those with greater incomes receive the greater benefits from the administration. The reasonableness of which I leave to your imagination.

With the Korean war steadily and progressively imposing its burden upon all Americans the present income tax has become fiscally inadequate. This was pointed out in the report of the Senate Finance Committee on the Revenue Act of 1950 showing that the number of taxable returns would approximate 38,000,000, or only 63 percent of the 60,000,000 gainfully employed Americans. Whenever employed, a person receives a public benefit if no more than in the form of law and order, and should be expected to pay for it. According to this report the income of the 38,000,000 reached $131,000,000,000, or 58 percent of the total personal income of $225,000,000,000. In short, 63 percent of the people employed receiving 58 percent of the income pay the personal income tax.

Through tax exemptions much of the lower incomes remain tax-exempt unless reached by commodity taxes. Exemptions are a necessary element if taxes are to be based solely upon ability to pay, but when ability is combined with benefits received then exempted incomes should be reached through commodity taxes. This means a kind of tax that everybody pays. It does not mean taxing luxuries only. In this atomic age protection of life is as necessary as bread, and it is conceivable that taxes upon bread may be necessary to produce atomic bombs and maintain the benefits of a sound government.

A third fallacy widely accepted today that needs to be emphasized by life underwriters seeking to prevent inflation is that the interest rates must be kept down so that the Treasury will not require higher taxes to pay higher interest to bondholders. Insurance companies are lenders. They are in a real sense credit agencies. As credit expands prices rise, and whatever affects the totality of credit affects inflationary causes. There exists a close relation between interest rates and credit trends.

Russian writers have concluded that American capitalistic democracy can be destroyed by the use of two economic weapons. First it is contended that American capitalistic democracy cannot withstand regimentation for a decade. Second, that Americans identify capitalism with dollars, and the destruction of the dollar will lead to the overthrow eventually of American democracy by revolution.

Two ideas of price control are now popular, one that inflation can be controlled by the fixing of prices or ceilings for specific commodities, the second, that inflation can be checked by the use of devices that control the supply of credit. If we use the type of controls formerly employed by the Office of Price Administration, and attempt to regiment American capital, management, and labor, we seem to accept the first Russian objective, that of regimentation for a decade. If we use credit controls, however, we protect the dollar and upset the aims of Russian plotters and planners. Therefore, we need to be cautious in the extent, type, and duration of specific price controls, and courageous in the use of credit controls. Specific price controls do not reach the causes of inflation. For this reason the Office of Price Stabilization has been assigned an exceptionally obnoxious task.

Recently we witnessed within the administration a struggle over the use of these inflationary controls. About 6 months ago the Federal Reserve System announced that it would use the powers at its disposal to check abnormal credit expansion. Regulation W relates to the extension of consumer credit, installment loans, down payments, exempt credits for business and agricultural loans, loans to pay fire and casualty insurance premiums, and in general limits overextended business credit. Regulation X relates to residential real estate credit and applies to banks, insurance companies, mortgage, loan, finance, and real-estate companies. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System began tightening these types of credit last year, and there is not much doubt but that these credit controls have proved somewhat helpful.

Late in the fall the New York Federal Reserve bank announced that it would use the powers at its disposal to check abnormal credit expansion, and imposed an increase in the rediscount rate. But that very day the Treasury announced a refunding issue priced above the existing market, which was designed to force the Federal Reserve bank to renounce its action or be held responsible for impairing the flotation of the refunding issue. By this action the Treasury seems to have taken the position that the Federal Reserve System shall not use its power to tighten credit and raise interest rates, as a general policy checking inflation. More than a dramatic struggle has occurred because the Treasury seems to have taken the position that makes it necessary for the administration to favor specific price controls, concomitantly requiring all the regimentation of American enterprise that perpetuates some of the bitter memories of the last war.

A BANKERS' BANKING SYSTEM

Nevertheless, the Federal Reserve System is still a bankers' banking system. It is not owned by the Federal Government. It is not a tool of any administration. In my opinion, its powers must never be so emasculated that member or nonmember banks cannot test objectively the quality of the national credit. The ominous growth in bond holdings of the Federal Reserve System, plus the tendency of member banks for deposits to exceed loans and bond absorption to increase, accentuates the importance of interest rate control. Whenever the quantity of national credit becomes overexpanded that fact must be reflected in the quality of that credit, and that in turn should be reflected in interest rates, national emergency or not. The excellent report of the Douglas committee also concluded that the responsibility of regulating the supply and cost of credit belonged not to the Treasury but to the Federal Reserve System.

Being lending agencies, insurance companies are intimately affected by movements in the interest rates. As a rank outsider in the business of life insurance, I have heard that certain actuaries have found that a one-fourth of 1 percent drop in interest rates offsets about a 15-percent gain in mortality. If this be true then from the viewpoint of life underwriters it will take very substantial further medical progress to compensate for a change of 1 percent in the interest rates. Twenty years ago life underwriters were getting an investment return of 5 percent; today it has dropped to about 2.7 percent, according to some estimates. Recently some companies have discovered that it takes a return of 3.2 percent to cover cost of losses. In short, this control of interest rates is an essential matter to life underwriters.

The general controls that lie within the power of the Federal Reserve System, such as change in reserve requirements, in rediscount rates, open-market operations, and credit regulations, still remain powerful economic weapons with which to fight dangerous inflationary trends. It is my opinion that the time has come when they should be used, despite the fact that the American people need to be informed by their so-called leaders in Washington about what is behind all this frantic preparation for war on a world-wide front. The American people are beginning to find out that what they need is stable dollars, and not cheap dollars.

Another aspect of this problem looms on the horizon of fiscal thinking. Some advocate the establishment of a department of fiscal affairs that would absorb the Treasury, the home-loan bank, the farm-credit system, and the savings and loan system, as well as the Federal Reserve System. Nothing could be more dangerous than such concentration of monetary power that might be placed at the disposal of ruthless and incompetent office holders. If such action were taken, then I would predict that it would take only one more step to absorb life-insurance companies as well. Life underwriter leaders need to be alert now to the potentialities of this plot.

ANOTHER FALLACY

A fourth fallacy that leaders in life underwriting should closely study is that Government seizure is the solution for the operating difficulties confronted by public utilities and industries essential to the public interest. Recently we observed Government seizure of the railroads, and heard about threats to seize coal mines, steel mills, telephone companies, and power companies. No limitations worthy of American intelligence have been placed upon either the duration, or wage adjustments, or type of controls imposed by Government seizures. Here again political policy comes dangerously near the ultimate

American regimentation envisioned in Russian circles. Americans have paid more attention to the technical weapons of warfare than they have to the economic weapons our enemies may use. We all need to follow the ancient admonition: "Know your enemy."

A PALLIATIVE BUT NOT A SOLUTION

Government seizure has become an accepted national policy as a palliative but not a solution for some of our economic troubles. If the time comes when life underwriters are considered as competitors with the social security program of the national Government the ground work for Government seizure of life insurance companies will have been already laid. This policy needs critical watching, especially by the life underwriters, but also by all thoroughgoing Americans.

In the fifth place, another fallacy that looms in the background is the idea previously called the compensatory economy, whereby the Government will borrow during depressions and during the following period of prosperity will tax and repay the depression loans. Today we hear much from Washington about the heights which the American standards of living have reached, and this must be understood to constitute prosperity. Figures of national income are very attractive in terms of dollars, as well as output, but we do not hear much about using taxes during this period to repay depression loans. The fact is that the spenders of the depression period still are spenders in a period of prosperity, and that they have either intentionally misled us into accepting a vicious fallacy or they are planning to take us into the dangerous inflation that our Russian enemies have planned for us.

As we now enter a garrison state with universal military training for all citizens over 18, it is said that further borrowing is necessary unless we pay as we go. But who is there today sufficiently cognisant of military planning that he is competent to exercise a sound judgment concerning the extent to which future borrowing becomes necessary? The compensatory economy of the Keneslan period in fiscal policy has become a delusion and snare. We borrow in prosperity, just as we borrowed during the depression, and hence must find some answer to those who seek to dominate America by the threats of a constant emergency or state of fear. Again, we need freedom from fear.

A credit system is founded upon man's faith in men. We have been told that through sufficient faith we could move mountains, but that kind of a faith is founded upon truth and not fallacies. Life underwriters attempt to instill faith of buyers in their companies, and to a large extent, therefore, become bulwarks of the credit economy. But there is also a moral obligation on the part of the leaders in life insurance to see to it that the values which policyholders are told that they purchase are realized in fact, and it is clear that by taking dollars that are worth a dollar, and paying back in dollars worth 50 cents, the moral obligation of the company, as well as the agent, is eluded or shirked; man's faith in man is impaired, and the credit economy endangered. There is an inevitable and close relationship between moral obligations and the strength of the credit economy.

IMPORTANCE OF THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE

The time has arrived when colleges and universities must enlist not only the life underwriters, but bankers, professional and businessmen, as well as labor leaders, in the cause of adult education. We are engaged in an active military and economic warfare, and there is danger that the importance of the economic struggle be overlooked because of the dramatic aspects of the military battles and the overwhelming confusion growing out of what seems now to be a drastic changeover toward a garrison state for perhaps the next decade. The social responsibilities of the leaders in life insurance include this necessity of aiding in adult education. I have not completed the discussion of the more common or widely held fallacies, nor do I imply this list to be complete. But life agency leaders with their faith in the future are obligated to help shape that future by destroying contemporary economic fallacies and building foundations of truth upon which a sound future will be constructed for Americans.

Hysteria? Ah, No, Mr. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. T. A. Stevenson, editor and publisher of the Rosemead Review, of Rosemead, Calif., has written an excellent editorial analyzing the tremendous public reaction in favor of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The editorial appeared in the May 3, 1951, issue of the Review.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. Stevenson, a distinguished journalist of wide experience, answers one of the various charges made by a prominent radio commentator who calls the MacArthur popularity "mere hysteria." It is unfortunate that so many of our radio and television commentators constantly support the left-wing line of political philosophy and are ever ready to defend the Truman administration. By their acts, such commentators are preventing the American people from obtaining the truth through our radio and television facilities.

I hope that all of the Members of the Congress will have an opportunity to read Mr. Stevenson's editorial:

HYSTERIA? AH, NO, MR. MURROW

We think the columnists and commentators missed the salient point in trying to find the answer to the MacArthur reception which has passed anything in history.

These chaps spend most of their time in big cities and face their typewriters a long, long way from the quiet firesides of the Nation where public opinion is formed. They tend to grow away from the people and, in a situation like this, have to grope for the answer. It is not to be found in the cocktail lounge of the Statler.

Edward R. Murrow spoke as if he wanted to weep at our emotion and loss of perspective. He called it hysteria. What Murrow needs is to go back to the Palouse Hills of eastern Washington, from whence he came, and talk to the folks he once knew. There he would find himself.

The people stormed the great cities to see General MacArthur because they saw in him the antithesis of what they have been feeding upon for too long. They are sick at heart reading so much of O'Dwyer, Dawson, Vaughn, Maragon, Remington, Lattimore, Pressman and of Hiss, Costello, Cohen, Coplan, Fuchs, Gold, Greenglass, Gusick, and Wadleigh.

General MacArthur richly deserves the applause he has received. His address to Congress was the work of 52 years in the field and worth every minute of it. But the millions who saw him, read his speech and filed it away for rereading, were saying, without being conscious of it; here is a great general, a great leader, a man of genuine integrity and intelligence, a devoted husband, an ideal father, a man of sympathy and understanding, a man who knows where he is going and how to get there. The crowd was cheering both a man and a type—a type they would like to see in many important posts in Washington.

No, Mr. Murrow, this was no idle hysteria, and you need not weep because the people cheered. They were speaking a language all their own and folks along Pennsylvania Avenue would do well to listen.

Scientific Research Fills Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an excellent article by my friend, Miss Florence Birmingham, celebrated Massachusetts civic and political leader, author, and lecturer, which recently appeared in the Boston Traveler under the caption "United States Seeks Best Administrators." It is an admirable analysis and treatment by the distinguished Miss Birmingham of some of the current problems and work of the United States Civil Service Commission. It follows:

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH FILLS JOBS—UNITED STATES SEEKS BEST ADMINISTRATORS—NEW TECHNIQUES USED TO DISCOVER BEST TALENT FOR DEFENSE PROGRAM

(By Florence Birmingham)

In this atomic energy era, with scientific research and development being carried on in many different directions, such as astronomical, industrial, underwater, aeronautical, the pressure of manpower in today's emergency is a distinct challenge to the United States Civil Service Commission.

This is met, according to William A. Foley, New England Regional Director of Civil Service, by resorting to modern, high-speed techniques that today's emergency demands.

In his office in the Federal Building, in Boston, Mr. Foley explained:

"One of the great needs of the Government is for top level administrators to direct and coordinate the numerous intricate programs of mobilizing manpower, materials, and industrial skills in the defense effort, simultaneously attempting to maintain as stable a civilian economy as possible.

I am often asked where and how we can find administrative and technical talent for these vast tasks of the civilian government at the very time the military services and private industry are calling for identical proficiency and skill.

"One of the most interesting and novel answers to this question is the current executive placement program of the United States Civil Service Commission, designed to bring to light within the Government itself the exceptionally qualified experts being sought in the present emergency."

All Federal agencies, Mr. Foley pointed out, are designated by the Bureau of the Budget as either defense agencies or non-defense agencies, depending on how closely their activities are related to defense work.

Therefore, the problem, in part, is to discover the best administrative talent in the nondefense group in order to make available and fully utilize their skills in more vital defense work. And also to uncover in like manner the same, perhaps only partially utilized, abilities of persons within the defense agencies.

The executive placement program is aimed at providing the solution to this problem through giving Federal employees throughout the country, who have served at least a year in grade GS-12, carrying a salary of $6,400 a year, an opportunity to compete in an examination of unusual character, the first of its kind in the history of the civil service.

"For a 3-week period," said Mr. Foley, "beginning March 20, applications are being received by the Commission in Washington, D. C., from such Federal employees. Later in April written tests covering administrative problems and public affairs will be given to the employees filing under this program.

"Federal workers residing in New England who wish to take the test right in this area will be given the opportunity to do so, at whatever examination point is most convenient to them.

"It is noteworthy that the administrative judgment tests, as developed by the Commission, have been successfully used by several agencies in the past 5 years for the upgrading of personnel to administrative positions. These tests have also been used by the Commission in open competitive examinations for administrative positions up through grade GS-13.

"In short, this type of written examination, as a measure of top administrative abilities, has already been proven, but its application on this large scale, is something new.

"As a result of the written examinations, the names of these Federal employees demonstrating the highest aptitudes as top-level administrators and technical directors will be placed on lists which will be made available to agency heads in filling key defense positions ranging from grades GS-13, with a salary of $7,600 a year, to GS-18, the highest grade in the Federal service.

"An employee whose name is on these lists may be referred for key positions only in Washington, D. C., only in a regional area, if he so chooses, or in both. The names of any employees already in defense agencies will be referred to their own agencies.

"The whole program is an entirely voluntary one which has the backing of the agencies themselves through the Federal Personnel Council in Washington, D. C., which worked closely with the Commission in developing the plan."

The executive-placement program, Mr. Foley pointed out, is intended merely to supplement other intensive efforts of the Government to locate and recruit highly qualified administrative and technical personnel for the urgent needs of the defense program.

For example, the Civil Service Commission in Washington, D. C., has a continuously open recruiting circular under which applications are at all times invited and accepted from persons interested in working for the Government as administrative or executive officers, grades GS-13, with $7,600 a year salary, through GS-15 with a $10,500 yearly salary.

These are top-level administrative positions chiefly in the Capital, and involve the direction and coordination of many phases of the Government's activity, from staff administrative positions on through procurement, communications, price regulation, international information activities, and others.

"Similarly in the first region," Mr. Foley stated, "intensive efforts are being made to recruit highly qualified persons from the outside for administrative, technical, and scientific positions representing a wide range of staffing needs for the Government's work in the New England area.

"For instance, there is open continuously at the present time an announcement under which applications are being sought from persons with strong industrial or business backgrounds who can qualify as industrial specialists, business or commodity analysts, contract negotiators, and the like.

"These positions are located in such agencies as the Office of Price Stabilization, the National Production Authority, the ordnance procurement agencies of the Department of Defense, and others.

"While the majority of positions are in the salary levels $4,600 to $6,400 a year, the announcement includes grades up to GS-14, $8,800 a year, and the higher-grade positions involving top-level administrative duties.

"Likewise, in the scientific field announcements are open in the first region for accepting applications as professional engineers of almost every type, physicists, chemists, meteorologists, electronic scientists, and other scientific and technical positions.

"Professionally trained or experienced people appointed to these positions are engaged in a wide range of activities concerned with scientific research or development in such Federal laboratories as the United States Naval Underwater Sound Laboratory in New London, Conn., and the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories; or in Federal industrial establishments, such as Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Boston Naval Shipyard, Watertown Arsenal, or Springfield Armory.

"The positions begin at the entrance professional level of GS-5, $3,100 annually. Some are as high as GS-15, $10,500 a year as top research directors."

In all of these efforts, Mr. Foley emphasized, whether through the executive placement program or the recruiting programs to secure personnel not already in the service, the common denominator is the earnest desire to place in key Government positions the very best personnel available to help carry out the Nation's defense measures.

Backing up the administrative and technical personnel directing and coordinating the work of Federal establishments, it is necessary, of course, to have a substantial force of employees performing more routine, but, nevertheless, essential tasks—draftsmen, office-machine operators, stenographers, typists, and many others.

In fact, the current need for stenographers and typists is so urgent that special recruiting methods are now being resorted to.

Mr. Foley explained that the central office of the United States Civil Service Commission is constantly accepting applications for these positions and holds written tests at frequent intervals throughout the region for persons interested in working in the Capital.

Agency recruiting teams constantly visit New England cities for the purpose of hiring stenographers and typists to work in Washington, D. C.

Because of the great demand for stenographers and typists in Federal agencies in New England, the first regional office and its boards of examiners have continuously open examinations in the Boston area and many other areas such as Portsmouth, N. H., and Springfield, Mass., where there are concentrations of Federal workers.

A streamlined method of qualifying for these positions in New England makes it possible for a person to apply directly to the local civil-service secretary at the post office where the applicant desires to take the test, appear for the examination within a few days and, if eligible, find that his or her name is certified to an agency within a short time after applying.

Problems and Needs of the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the speech of Col. Joseph K. Carson, Jr., executive vice president of the Propeller Club of the United States, made before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1951. The speech is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before you and to lay before you some vital truths about our oldest major industry, the American merchant marine, and also to say a word about the need for aid to our rivers and harbors.

I shall discuss briefly some reasons why American shipping is a perennial problem; why an adequate American merchant marine is indispensable to the United States in war; why it is essential to our peacetime economy; who is responsible for the muddled state of affairs in shipping; our present world status; shipping and our foreign policy; and why we must have preparedness instead of appeasement.

AMERICAN SHIPPING A PERENNIAL PROBLEM

Why is the American merchant marine, our oldest industry, a perennial problem? Why is this industry indispensable to national security, a political scapegoat?

There are many reasons for this state of affairs but before we discuss some of them, let us ask ourselves if the United States has a merchant marine policy. We do have and it is a clear one. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 states that policy clearly but it is not being implemented. Let me give you some of the reasons why it is not being carried out.

1. There are people on the Government payroll who do not believe in the American merchant marine. Some of these fuzzy brained planners, holding fat jobs in Washington have, within the last year, proposed that American ships no longer participate in the movement of ECA cargo and that foreigners haul all of it; that we sell more of our ships to foreign buyers; that all financial aid to the American merchant marine be discontinued and that foreign flag vessels be permitted in our coastwise and intercoastal trades. Only the Korean war caused these marplots to scurry for cover. But they'll be back in sight when the shooting is over.

2. Foreign lobbies are busy day and night and are persuading some of our diplomats to urge that we stay out of the shipping business.

3. Another reason for the present condition of shipping is the lack of knowledge on the part of the general public of what the American merchant marine means to the Nation's welfare and security. The Propeller Club is working to remedy that situation. In fact, we are determined that everyone in the maritime industry, whether shipowner, shipbuilder, management or employee receives the public recognition which is justly due for the unfailing support each has given our forces in the Korean war.

I could cite many other reasons for the financial and political headaches of the American merchant marine, but I must hurry on.

INDISPENSABILITY IN WAR

We cannot fight a war away from our own shores, or indeed anywhere for that matter, and win it, without a fleet of merchant vessels sufficiently in tonnage and types to meet the logistical requirements of a modern military operation. This is axiomatic in military circles but usually forgotten by many of our national legislators and the people in peacetime.

Battle commitments in the Asiatic and Atlantic theaters were limited to the tanker, dry-cargo and troop-carrying tonnage available. To assure victory, we had to spend over 15 billion dollars to build a "bridge of ships" across two oceans.

All of our military leaders whether Army, Navy or Air Force, tell us that the merchant marine is an indispensable member of the national defense team. Indeed, the ships which supply the aircraft carriers, battle wagons and other strictly military naval vessels, are in war—actually men o'war.

What is the use of building tanks, airplanes, guns and other fighting weapons unless we can transport them to the men who use them? Why send troops to foreign lands unless we can supply them with food and other essentials? These questions answer themselves.

The American merchant marine is an indispensable member of our national defense team—ground, naval, and air forces must have the logistical support of their fellow member of that team—the merchantman.

MOST ESSENTIAL TO OUR PEACETIME ECONOMY

If we do not have an American merchant marine in peacetime, we will be without one to serve our Armed Forces in war. Ships cannot be built in a day nor can crews be trained to man them overnight. And, if we do not have a merchant marine of our own in peacetime, we would have to rent one in wartime. From whom would we get such a fleet and at what price? Nobody knows for sure and, not knowing, we are culpable if we leave national defense to guesswork.

We do not have sufficient raw materials to support our internal economy. The list of things we have to import is most impressive. Let us suppose something essential to our standard of living is in short world supply. Are we childlike enough to believe that foreign vessels would supply our needs of a particular material, if their own nations wanted delivery of the same thing? If we do not have a merchant fleet of our own, shipping cartels are certain to be formed against us. We can't begin to carry out any substantial part of the point 4 program without American flag ships of the right kind and number to insure success.

If we do not have an American merchant marine in peacetime, we will lose all of our shipbuilding skills and our merchant sailors will be without jobs. We sometimes forget that if foreigners do all of our ocean hauling, it will simply be another means by which they can export their cheap labor into the country tax free, while the foreign shipowners will be able to reap huge profits through monopoly.

Finally, our national prestige will suffer greatly if ships flying the Stars and Stripes no longer ply the great trade lanes of the world. Then, too, a merchant ship is essentially an ambassador of good will. One seldom trades with one's foes, although the reports about our allies trading with Red China are disquieting.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MUDDLED STATE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE?

If what I have said about the necessity for an adequate American merchant marine is true, why then is it a perennial problem? That is easy to answer.

A combination of foreign lobbies, misguided American diplomats, bureaucratic bunglers and hare-brained theorists are the culprits. They are not necessarily working in concert but they are as effective as if they were. Add to the damage which these mischief makers conjure up, the lack of knowledge on the part of the public and we find we really have a problem. It can and will be solved. But we must first break up this un-American combination and have a good old-fashioned house cleaning.

OUR PRESENT WORLD STATUS

World Wars I and II have caused great changes to appear on the face of our harried old world. From out of those maelstroms of human strife there emerged the giant of the West, the United States of America. We find ourselves in a position of world primacy which we never planned or consciously sought. A combination of private initiative and vast resources had wrought a miracle. We became the world's banker. We have become the world's industrial colossus. We lead the world in communications, agriculture, and in all forms of transport—except shipping. In the field of shipping, we are faced with block obsolescence, and nothing much is being done about it. There is no plan for replacement of our fleet. We plan for this and we plan for that but hysteria, prejudice and ignorance pervade the atmosphere of merchant shipping.

Yes, we are the world's greatest Nation and we must recognize the fact that we have left our cocoon of isolation and have responsibilities coequal with our inherent power. One of our responsibilities is to become and remain strong in every phase of national defense.

SHIPPING AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

We are far from realistic in our foreign policy. A foreign policy, if it works, is a military policy. When diplomacy fails on its face, the military has to take over. An effective military policy is one which insures execution of a foreign policy. The military must be prepared in all respects if it is to accomplish its mission. It is unprepared unless it has a merchant marine sufficient to furnish logistical support in every theater of operations.

In spite of this, some of our diplomats want us to scuttle our merchant marine and allow foreigners to reap all the profits in world shipping. Some of these fellows advocate that if the present war spreads that we rent foreign ships to supply our battle lines.

Certainly the foreign shipowners want all the shipping business. We can't blame them for that. But it ill behooves people on Uncle Sam's payroll to help them get it. I care not what others may call this sort of business—I call it appeasement of a blushing red variety.

This trying to please the other fellow reminds me of the story of the young lieutenant just out of West Point who reported to a tough old commander of a remote western post. The old man received the young man very cordially, which greatly assured the lieutenant. Upon leaving the young man said, "Colonel, I am sure we'll get along fine." The colonel said, "Mr. Smith, we will, that is providing you do all of the getting along."

I believe in getting along but I am not the least bit ashamed of being an American and I don't propose that we shall be the world's good provider and a knightly protector only to receive as our reward the derisive title of Uncle Sap.

As most of you know, one of the principal objectives of the Propeller Club is: "To aid worthy and economically justifiable river, inland waterway, and harbor improvements."

At our last national convention we mentioned by name specific river, inland waterway, and harbor improvements and promised to do all possible to bring about their speedy completion. Since the convention we have written to our national vice presidents to assure them of our interest in the problems faced by those engaged in transportation on our rivers and inland waterways and have requested their views and comments.

It is not our purpose to try to tell you how to go about solving problems with which you have labored for years. Quite on the contrary, we want you to tell us what you believe we should do to help you and suggest to us the ways to do it.

During the last few years we have been sending billions to nations abroad, while worthy river and harbor projects for which you have been fighting for decades, have never been started—or remain incomplete.

What is the reason for this? Have the meager appropriations for river and harbor improvement and maintenance work been the result of governmental economy?

Let us take a look at the record. How much money has Congress appropriated for river and harbor improvement and maintenance work? The first appropriation for this purpose was made in 1802. Since that time a total of $3,951,000,000 has been appropriated.

How does that figure compare with lend-lease? Well, lend-lease has cost over $50,000,000,000. Russia got $11,000,000,000 of it but now refuses to return several hundred ships we loaned her. What about ECA? Through June 1950 we had dished out $9,254,000,000 for ECA, or more than twice the amount expended for the improvement and maintenance of our own rivers and harbors in 148 years. Army relief in occupied areas has already cost over $3,700,000,000. UNRRA appropriations amount to almost $3,000,000,000. Who said "pork barrel?"

Unfortunately, while we have been ladling out billions to help nations across the seas, some of those who were engaged in that costly business were trying to scuttle our merchant marine. As this was going on, others were putting our rivers, inland waterways and harbors on a starvation diet.

It is our intention to do all we can to make sure that our river, inland waterway and harbor facilities receive the support and financial backing their importance demands.

CONCLUSION

We of the Propeller Club respectfully submit that an adequate American merchant marine is indispensable to national security and essential to our peacetime economy. We are in a battle for survival. In this conflict we welcome the cooperation of other nations which embrace the same philosophy of life as do we. But self preservation is our goal and we must be sure we have all the means at hand for attaining it. A strong American merchant marine is one of those means. Development of our rivers, inland waterways and harbors is another. As long as we can prevent it, we don't intend that either become an expendable item.

We do not propose that appeasement and neglect shall become a substitute for preparedness and prudence.

Windsors' Brooklyn Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct my colleagues' attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of April 16, 1951, and which reflects credit upon the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital and its director of public relations, Max Abelman:

WINDSORS' BROOKLYN VISIT

Two more notable world figures—the Duke and Duchess of Windsor—have come to Brooklyn to affix their signatures to the famous mural which grace the wall of the children's ward in Brooklyn Jewish Hospital. Escorting the man who renounced the British throne and his American duchess were a number of high officials of the hospital headed by its president, Supreme Court Justice Emil N. Baar.

Brooklyn may well take pride in this great institution whose strikingly decorated children's ward has attracted such notables as Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Gen. George Marshall, Gen. Omar Bradley, Lord Halifax, former British Ambassador to the United States, General Romulo of the Philippines, the late Wendell Willkie, and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

The Duke and Duchess were obviously thrilled by their experience and were most gracious in all their contacts during their visit. A word of praise is also due the well-known Brooklynite who is responsible for bringing these famous people here—Max Abelman, director of public relations at the hospital.

Our Purpose Is Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 19, at the annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Oklahoma, an eloquent and important address was delivered by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Oklahomans, certain facts stand out bold and clear before the American people and before the Government of the United States:

First. We are in the midst of the most critical period in our history.

Second. Our purpose is peace.

Third. Our primary and principal enemy is Red Russia.

Fourth. We must keep all the friends and allies we now have and make every effort to secure new ones.

Fifth. We must continue to mobilize our manpower, physical resources, and productive capacity.

Sixth. We must continue to work through the United Nations to stop aggression, prevent its spread if we are able to, and keep it as far removed from our own shores as is humanly possible.

In all these things we must work at home and with our allies for that abiding peace which is the ultimate goal of all our aims and all our efforts.

I am opposed to any political, diplomatic, or military policy on the part of my Government which assumes fatalistically that an all-out war with either Soviet Russia or Red China is inevitable; and I am opposed to any act on the part of any responsible Government official calculated to permit or provoke such an all-out struggle.

We are not in Korea today to start a world war; we are there to prevent such a war.

General Bradley made this very clear in his opening statement to the joint committees of the Senate last Tuesday. He said:

"As long as we keep the conflict within its present scope, we are holding to a minimum the forces we must commit and tie down.

"Enlargement of the war in Korea to include Red China, would probably delight the Kremlin more than anything else we could do. It would necessarily tie down additional forces, especially our sea power and our Air Force, while the Soviet Union would not be obliged to put a single man into the conflict.

"Red China is not the powerful nation seeking to dominate the world. Frankly, in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, this strategy would involve us in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy.

"Statements have been made that the President, as Commander in Chief, and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense have a policy all their own, and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been overridden.

"This is just not so.

"There are also those who deplore the present military situation in Korea and urge us to engage Red China in a larger war to solve this problem. Taking on Red China is not a decisive move, does not guarantee the end of the war in Korea, and may not bring China to her knees. We have only to look back to the five long years when the Japanese, one of the greatest military powers of that time, moved into China and had almost full control of a large part of China, and yet were never able to conclude that war successfully. I would say that from past history one would only jump from a smaller conflict to a larger deadlock at greater expense."

My friends, General Bradley in these brief quotes makes a complete but simple answer to MacArthur's proposals and charges. I knew Bradley was the GI's general but I never knew how clear a talker he was.

Now, we all know that Oklahoma has about as high a percentage of her sons in Korea as any State. We have suffered about as high a rate of casualties. No words of mine are adequate to pay the tribute deserved by those brave men and their families. They are fighting for the security of their country. They are fighting for American freedom. Some will not come back. Most of them will return to help build a greater America.

And while they and their comrades are holding the hordes of aggression at bay, there is a great effort being made here at home to mobilize our manpower and our industrial and productive capacities—to insure that this Nation and her allies will be in a position of impregnable security.

My part in the MacArthur controversy came without warning. There are those who seek to discredit me—who charge that I was acting for others when I spoke out against the general. That charge is entirely false. There was no suggestion either from the White House or the State Department that I do what I did. As a matter of fact, I was the first official that I know of who publicly expressed a lack of confidence in General MacArthur and his effort to expand the war.

I was the first to make a public issue of the possibility that what he recommended would do more harm than good. I was the first to warn the American people that what he was saying and proposing could get us deeper into war instead of successfully ending the one we are already in. It was my deep concern for the immediate safety and welfare of Oklahoma's Forty-fifth Division which prompted my first outspoken opposition to MacArthur and his policies. This concern was shared by practically every member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress. We knew the Forty-fifth had been ordered to Japan.

We went to the Department of the Army to find out the purpose for which Oklahoma's National Guard Division was being sent to Japan. We knew they were in the Armed Forces, we knew they were available for their country's call. We also knew the grave concern in the hearts of the fathers and mothers, the wives and the children of those men when that magnificent division started the long trek yonder across the Pacific to Japan.

We were advised by the Secretary of the Army that they were going to Japan for occupational duty. We inquired specifically and were advised that their training would be completed before they were assigned to any duty.

At about this time, just as we were feeling some degree of comfort from the assurances given us, we read in the paper where the War Department had worked out a well-deserved program of rotation for the fighting men in Korea, whereby certain numbers would be sent home each month and replaced with other soldiers. The thought came to me that possibly the Forty-fifth Division was to be used as replacements.

I went to the office of the Secretary of the Army and I asked him if there was such a possibility. He told me, "No." He said the rotation program would go into effect, but that replacements would come from training centers in this country direct to the units in Korea. I said, "Will the Forty-fifth Division be broken up?" He replied, "No." I then said, "Mr. Secretary, we are mighty happy to get these assurances, that the Forty-fifth Division will not be broken up, and that the men in it will not be used as replacement troops in Korea—but can we depend on this program being carried out?" The Secretary replied, "Senator KERR, this is the program and the plan and it will be carried out so far as we here in Washington are concerned." I then asked, "Is there anybody who can change this plan?" And he said, "Nobody but the theater commander."

I knew who he meant—General MacArthur, and right then I became more keenly interested than ever in General MacArthur and his policies. Of course, I was aware of the argument that had been going on between General MacArthur out yonder in Japan and the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, and I had been greatly concerned about it. I knew that it was the purpose of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to stop aggression, punish the aggressor, and in doing so to limit the conflict to the narrowest possible confines and prevent its spread.

I had read with great concern the published views of the general that a second front should be opened up on the mainland of China by sending in the forces of Chiang Kai-shek, and I had been uneasy about that. I got to thinking about how he was going to get Chiang Kai-shek's army back to the mainland of China. I remembered how they had been driven off the mainland when they had 10 times as many troops as they now have in Formosa, and how they had abandoned their guns and tanks—most of which we had furnished them.

As I studied and learned more about the situation, it became apparent to me that the only way they could be placed back on the mainland of China was for the United States Navy to transport them, and this would have to be done with the protection of the United States Air Force, and the support of United States ground forces. General MacArthur himself said we would have to give logistical support, and that means transportation and the furnishing of supplies and food and military equipment wherever the fighting forces are. He further said we would have to furnish the officers and men needed as technicans and specialists.

And as I thought about that and realized that Oklahoma's Forty-fifth Division and California's Fortieth Division were on their way over there, and that they would be the only troops in Japan, I became more uneasy. Could it be that if the general had his way and was permitted to open up a second front that it would fall the lot of these two divisions to become the shock troops to open up the way to put Chiang Kai-shek's forces on to the mainland?

Then it was that I sounded off regarding MacArthur's policies. Then when it became apparent that in violation of orders, in spite of the directives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander in Chief, MacArthur was threatening to force his program through, the only solution I could see was to replace him.

You know, my fellow Oklahomans, thank God we've got a democracy in which the civilian authority is in control of the military. And under no circumstances must we ever permit that to change.

Let me read you some words placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just a few weeks ago:

"The national strategy of any war, that is, the selection of national objectives and the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in attaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war, are decisions that must be made by the head of the state acting in conformity with the expressed will of Congress. No single departmental head, no matter what his particular function or title, could, or should be responsible for the formulation of such decisions. The issues involved were so far-reaching in their effect, and so vital to the life of the Nation, that this phase of coordinating Army and Navy effort could not be delegated by the Commander in Chief to any subordinate authority. Any such attempt would not constitute delegation, but rather, abdication."

That's a pretty clear declaration of the principle of the superiority of the civilian over the military, isn't it?

Who do you think made that statement? Who do you think wrote the words I just read? Was it Bradley? Was it Marshall? Was it Eisenhower? No. The man who wrote those words back in 1952 when he was Chief of Staff was none other than Douglas MacArthur.

He was right when he said this in 1952, and the Commander in Chief was right when he applied that very same principle to General MacArthur in 1951.

Let me say, my fellow Oklahomans, that no one respects more than I, the distinguished military career of the general. I glory in a country such as ours whose sons can achieve the distinction that Douglas MacArthur has gained. But I am more proud of the fact that no matter who they are, or how high they go, they still are a part of the military team, and they are still subject to the orders of the Commander in Chief who is elected by the people. And the fact is, as great as MacArthur was, he has made many, many mistakes.

John Gunther, in his recent book, The Riddle of MacArthur, said:

"General MacArthur was severely embarrassed by the destruction of his planes on Clark Field on Pearl Harbor Day. The Japanese caught him in exactly the same cloked and exposed state as they caught the Americans in Hawaii, though he had ample warning since the Pearl Harbor attack had come 10 hours before."

Reading further, Gunther says, "General MacArthur has several times made serious blunders in judgment, based on faulty information. The attack on South Korea on June 25 apparently took him by complete surprise, and he thought that the Korean war was won after the landing at Inchon on September 15. He told Mr. Truman at their meeting on Wake Island a month later that the danger of Chinese intervention had passed, but the Chinese drastically fooled him. Then (though he tried to wriggle out of this by saying that the remark had only been 'jocular') he predicted flatly that the American troops would be home by Christmas—only 3 or 4 days before they were caught by surprise and hammered back. General MacArthur, having scouted the ground personally for what was to have been his final advance, crashed into a colossal trap—moreover a trap about which he was fully aware."

The United States News and World Report is probably the most pro-MacArthur publication in America. But in its issue of May 4, 1951, is the following quote:

"1930—General Douglas MacArthur:

"A successful invasion of the Philippines would take a half million men, $10,000,000,000, tremendous casualties, and 3 years' time." But the magazine goes on to say it took the Japanese only 5 months to complete the capture of the Philippines.

The New York Herald Tribune is one of America's greatest Republican newspapers. Its Pulitzer-prize-winning correspondent, Homer Bigart, in a special article in a January issue of Look magazine, made the following statement with reference to Korea:

"Unsound deployment of the United Nations forces and a momentous blunder by General MacArthur helped insure the success of the enemy's strategy. MacArthur grossly miscalculated the intentions, strength, and capabilities of the forces against him. And no nation in the spot we are in can string along with a leader whose ill-considered decision to launch the offensive of November 24 precipitated and magnified the swift disaster."

I do not recite these mistakes he has made to cast doubt upon his patriotism, or reflect upon his reputation. I do so only to remind you that he, also, is human; that he, like all of us, has made mistakes in the past and some of them have been tragic and costly.

He admits that Russia has a mutual assistance treaty to join Red China if Red China is attacked. Yet, he says we should ignore that treaty and launch an all-out attack against Red China. With a wave of the hand he tells us that Russia would not come to China's aid.

I say this to you, that if we followed him in his proposal to carry an expanded war to China and then found out that he had made another mistake, and that Russia did come in, all of the mistakes that he has made rolled into one would be as nothing compared to the tragedy that would befall us.

We must not risk the survival of this Nation upon the unsupported judgment of one man who has been so wrong so often. Instead, we must be guided by the combined and unanimous judgment of our Joint Chiefs of Staff who are set up for the specific purpose of making just such decisions.

In this critical hour we must never for one instant lose sight of the most important objective of our lifetime—achieving and keeping peace. The No. 1 enemy who threatens that peace is Russia. It is Red Russia that has loosed the tempest of evil purposes and deeds that has lashed into violent upheaval the waters of that deep ocean which we must cross to reach the harbor of the peace we seek.

My fellow Oklahomans, we alone cannot win and keep the peace. No one nation in this world can accomplish that single-handedly. And for that reason, with high ideals, and inspired vision, we helped create the United Nations.

To do this we laid aside partisan politics. Under the leadership of the ablest men in both parties we resolved that insofar as our national security and peace were concerned, politics must stop at the water's edge. In that spirit we have fashioned an alliance with most of the nations in this world whose people and whose governments want peace.

When Red Russia sent her puppet on a mission of naked aggression into South Korea last June, she threatened the peace of the entire world, and the security of every free nation. That aggression had to be stopped and the aggressor punished or the United Nations would have ceased to exist except as an empty shell. The United Nations moved into Korea to halt that aggression and restore peace. That action was approved by an overwhelming majority of the American people, regardless of political party.

It was a bitter struggle but the North Korean aggression was stopped and thrown back, and we stood at the threshold of victory and peace. Then one of the saddest events in all history took place. Red Russia moved again. She sent another, and far more dangerous, puppet into action to prevent the United Nations from winning either victory or peace. We and our allies have checked that aggression, at least for the time being.

Our forces are now locked with the hordes of Red China in a desperate battle. The first drive of this much-touted spring offensive fell back under the relentless pounding of our guns and tanks and planes. Never have American forces performed more valiantly and heroically.

Now, our heroic men and those of our allies are giving their all to stop and turn back another thrust on the part of the enemy aggressor. Our hearts are heavy at this critical hour. We hope and pray and we believe that our successes will be repeated. We hope this will be the climax. We hope that then a defeated enemy will seek an honorable peace.

But if that enemy forces us to continue the struggle we will still strive to limit it as much as possible.

We do not know how long we will be able to limit this conflict but, unless Russia herself comes in, we believe we can prevent Red China from ever being victorious on the peninsula of Korea. Meanwhile the united strength of the free world is growing by leaps and bounds.

During these past 11 months we have more than doubled our Armed Forces. We have traveled far toward the goal of an adequate mobilization of our manpower, our industrial resources and our productive capacities.

Some of our allies are weak—and I want to say right here, my fellow Oklahomans—that no one is more aware of those weaknesses than I. No one is more aware of the hesitancy of some of the nations who sit in the shadow of the iron curtain to join us in a united effort to fight this aggression.

There are those who complain of our allies because of their meager help in Korea. I understand that complaint, and I join in it. That is just one of the reasons I am so bitterly opposed to MacArthur's effort to expand the war into China. It wouldn't be meager help we would then be complaining of if we did that. In that bigger, harder struggle we would have no help at all.

We would have to send more and more troops into Asia. Red China, however, would be fighting Russia's battles, while Russia, our number one enemy, would be free to pounce on Europe which is the real strategic prize. In defense of this threat, our European allies would have to save their own manpower. So, if we get bogged down in Asia, we could not help our own allies and they could not help us. By default, we would have lost on both fronts to the common enemy.

If we are forced into a bigger war we should never permit the men in the Kremlin to forget that our fighting power will be hurled against them and not at their stooges.

Our allies can never make themselves very effective in Korea or China, nor is there interest primarily in either. Russia's strongest ally is China. However, that ally is only partially committed in Korea. What MacArthur proposes would unite the Chinese, now divided and becoming more divided all the time. Vast numbers of the Chinese people hate their Communist masters and even now seek to throw off their yoke of tyranny. But what MacArthur proposes would drive all of China into Russia's corner and crystallize her opposition to us. Thus, we would be committing more and more of our strength against Russia's ally and fighting where we would have the least possible help from our own allies.

In Europe it would be just the opposite. If war comes there, Russia would have to commit her own manpower and military strength. If war comes there our allies would have the primary interest. They must be prepared to fight if war comes in Europe. They now conserve their manpower for just such an eventuality. But if and when Russia uses her manpower then they will use theirs.

In Europe our allies will fight with all their power and all their men. Our contribution would then be more in naval power, air power, and equipment rather than in men. In China we would have to furnish the munitions of war and the manpower.

We do not want war anywhere. We will do all within our power to prevent it occurring at any place at any time. But if it must come, we would have our greatest advantage over Russia fighting in Europe. Russia would have her greatest advantage over us if the war were in China.

What folly to contemplate such a tragedy if it could be avoided. There is no other war that would or could gain as much for Russia or cost her as little as an all-out war between the United States of America and Red China. There is no other war that would or could cost us so much and gain us so little.

Therefore, we would be stupid to permit such a war if we could avoid it; we would be insane to provoke it. I repeat what General Bradley said: "This strategy would involve us in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy."

Russia is still the No. 1 enemy and threat to peace, and we need time—time during which we must limit the conflict to the smallest possible area. If we are given this time, we and our allies will build a united strength that will constitute our best insurance against another world war, and provide us with that which will enable us to win, if we are forced into it.

It was with these plain and simple facts before me that I sounded my unalterable opposition to the policies advocated by General MacArthur. I did not oppose him because of any personal resentment. I appreciate his many years of service to his country. I did not oppose him at the request of anyone. I opposed him because I thought he was wrong.

When he refused to accept the policies of his Government; when he declined to follow the orders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander in Chief; when he told, not only his own superiors but, in violation of orders, told the whole world that he could not and would not play as a member of the team, he just simply had to be removed from that team.

The general made a great speech before the Members of Congress. He said, "there is no substitute for victory," and I do not contest that statement. But we must ask ourselves: What constitutes victory? The general's objective and concept of this is a military victory over China.

But, as General Marshall and General Bradley pointed out, the aggressive moves advocated by General MacArthur, would not be decisive in Korea. They would just make peace and victory and peace a lot further off, and would greatly multiply our casualties over what our forces are now suffering in the limited engagement.

I say to you that we did not go to Korea to become engaged in that kind of a conflict, and I say further that the greatest defeat we could suffer in Korea would come if we permitted ourselves, through any fault of ours, to become engaged in an all-out military struggle with Red China.

Oh, you say, but aren't we at war with China? We are engaged with only a small part of the forces of Red China. Red China doesn't have 10 percent of her military power in Korea. If we were to open up that second front, which General MacArthur says is so necessary for victory over China, we would be taking on a fight 10 times more terrible than the one we now have in Korea. Our casualties would be 10 times what they now are.

And I ask you, "Who would win?" We wouldn't. Red China wouldn't. But you and I know who would, and it doesn't take a military strategist to figure that out. Red Russia would win.

If Russia could entice us, or seduce us, or compel us to become engaged in an all-out war with China it would give the men in the Kremlin the greatest satisfaction on earth, for Russia would be the ultimate winner—the only winner.

Therefore, I submit to you that victory in Korea can be won only if we avoid an all-out war with Red China. Of course, they may force it upon us, and in that event we would have no choice. But I say to you that at this time we do have a choice, and it is the purpose of our Government, our Chiefs of Staff—our Commander in Chief, and of our allies, to do these things: Stop the aggression in Korea and punish the aggressor until he seeks an honorable peace; limit the conflict to the smallest possible area; and in the meantime continue the mobilization of our manpower, mobilization of our resources, development of our cooperative effort with other nations, and thus, through collective effort and strength, achieve that impregnable security that will enable us to win and keep the peace.

I am not one of those who believe that another world war is inevitable. I would be unfair to my trust as one of your representatives if I did not join others of like purpose and do all within my power to avoid world war III. We must make the greatest effort of which we are capable to prevent it. If, in spite of this, Russia should provoke that war and force it upon us, then the blood we spill in that greater conflict, as well as in Korea, would be on her hands. She would have to answer for it before God and before the bar of world opinion.

But—and carefully note and long remember these words—if we permit that war to develop when we might have prevented it, or if—and God forbid—we should provoke it, then that blood would be on our hands and we would stand convicted before the world.

I am convinced that we yet have a chance, a clear chance, to avoid another world war. It may be the last clear chance, but we must develop it to the greatest extent of which we are capable. We must succeed in this effort if it is humanly possible.

I am convinced that under God we can succeed. I believe that with Divine guidance we can achieve that strength and unity at home and with our allies abroad whereby we may avoid that awful war or, with God's help, win it if it is forced upon us.

The Fruits of Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended profound editorial from the New York Times of May 17 deserves the attention of every Member. Totalitarianism, red, brown, or black, is equally a mortal danger to us. It is for this reason that so many of us have been urging that the struggle will be long and our efforts must be heroic, that military means alone will not conquer totalitarianism, but that it will take economic, ideological, and, beyond all, spiritual means as well.

THE FRUITS OF FASCISM

It would be a lack of proportion to take the International Fascist Congress at Malmoe, Sweden, too seriously, but it would be even greater folly to ignore it. The delegates who met there were few and unimportant but they called attention to something we must never forget—that fascism is still very much alive although we fought the bloodiest war in history to kill it. We killed Mussolini and Hitler and a lot of Italian, German, and Japanese Fascists and we devastated their countries, but we did not destroy fascism.

The first and most obvious conclusion to draw is that we could today destroy Stalin, Mao, Ho Chi Minh, their politburos, and every Communist leader everywhere and we could virtually destroy their countries with atom bombs—but we could not destroy communism. One could go further and say that if in some miraculous way we could wipe out every Communist Party and every individual Communist on the face of the earth, something like communism would rise instantaneously from the ashes. The totalitarians are a response to a situation, a dusty answer to the problems of our times. So long as the conditions remain that gave birth to fascism and communism, so long will those or similar doctrines last.

We must never fool ourselves that the ideas of the totalitarians can be killed by anything but better ideas that win universal acceptance. We must never indulge in the foolish hope that fascism and communism can destroy each other. The conflict between the two is nothing but a struggle for power. It is not an ideological conflict; both use almost similar methods and—most important of all—both have a common enemy in democracy. The classic proof of this thesis will forever lie in the Hitler-Stalin pact of August 1939.

Therefore, this is not an academic proposition, but one closely tied to reality. Just as it warns us to be cautious in our links to Tito, so it warns us to be careful in dealing with rulers like Franco, Peron, and Malan. The men who founded a neo-Nazi international movement in Malmoe on Monday may have come from the lunatic fringe of European politics, but their roots go down deeply, roots that have never been eradicated and that can bear evil fruits in the months to come.

Kyle Palmer Discusses MacArthur Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress a recent article by Mr. Kyle Palmer which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on May 13, 1951. Mr. Palmer is the distinguished political editor of the Los Angeles Times.

This article discusses clearly and concisely the great issue of our far eastern foreign policy which was so graphically brought home to the American people by the President's tragic dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur last month.

I feel that Mr. Palmer's discussion of this issue is worthy of serious consideration. The article follows:

EXPLANATIONS NOT IMPRESSIVE

(By Kyle Palmer, political editor)

The Truman administration's case against General MacArthur can be likened to that of a man who, having done another a great injury, sets out to justify the offense by further outrage and abuse.

For the record, the general now is portrayed as a rash and reckless swashbuckler who wanted to play so rough with the enemy that he not only succeeded in knocking his foes around, but scared his friends!

President Truman's decision—without consulting MacArthur—to launch a war in Korea against Red China and its Soviet boss is described as a peaceful move; whereas MacArthur's determination to win the war the President started is set forth in all seriousness as an out-and-out invitation to the Reds to start a rain of atom bombs on American cities.

According to the Truman administration's formula for war with communism, you can fight a little bit, kill and get killed on a sort of retail basis, but you really must not tempt the enemy beyond all forbearance.

If we have the bad luck or the ill grace to make the Russians really mad they may try to get tough. Instead of sending guns, tanks, bombs, rifles, ammunition, airplanes, military advisers and all other appurtenances to warring on us in Korea, why, if MacArthur were allowed to have his way, the Russians might start something somewhere else.

The Truman administration spokesmen are not sure the Russians won't grow tired of being beaten in Korea even with General MacArthur out of their hair.

But the administration indulges the prayerful and pious hope that our Red enemies will continue to be patient while, right under their noses, we build a war potential adequate to keep them peacefully in their place.

The picture, as painted by Secretary of Defense George Marshall—who told his Senatorial inquisitors last week that he "reacts more quickly" when called "general"—is dreary and grim.

One gains an impression from the general's testimony that MacArthur was snatched away just in time; had he won a few more battles and carried the war more rapidly to a victorious conclusion almost anything might have happened.

President Truman in his radio address to the country last Monday went even further in what seemed to me a most shoddy effort to scare the country to a point of hysteria—and all under the plain implication that his wise, impersonal, and courageous removal of MacArthur had saved us from the terrible consequences of all-out war.

General MacArthur himself told the inquiring Senators that he believes Russia will attack us where and when the Reds decide it is to their advantage to do so. He does not believe they are any more prepared to attack us than we are disposed to attack them.

But he still insists that the attack, if and when it comes, will be a matter of decision by the Communists.

According to the Truman-Marshall-Acheson theory, the free world is not strong enough to prevent a third world war at this time and, hence, faces a foe whose strength is at its peak.

Nevertheless, say Messrs. Truman, Marshall, and Acheson, by watching our diplomatic step in Korea, by keeping one hand tied behind us at the Manchurian border, by looking in another direction as the Russian-supplied and Russian-advised Chinese Reds organize their armies and accumulate their supplies in the Manchurian sanctuary, the Soviet will sit quietly at home until we have the weapons to knock them silly.

It does not make sense, even to those who know very little of the art of war and next to nothing of the ways of diplomacy.

And the attempt to picture Douglas MacArthur as a military commander willing to precipitate a world conflict by ill-considered and impulsive action in a limited theater of war, can have little damaging effect upon the people's confidence in their old soldier.

It seems quite doubtful that current or future discussion of the Truman-MacArthur controversy will materially modify the opinions and conclusions which most of us have developed, but all of us, regardless of opinion, should keep steadfastly in mind the fact that the country's security is involved.

General Marshall in his defense of the Truman removal order is merely carrying out a hard and, in all probability, a most distasteful chore. He has not done a very good job because he hasn't a very good case, but he has done his best.

Admirers of Marshall who know of his great services during World War II have had renewed evidence of the fact that his return to public responsibility after retiring as the Army's Chief of Staff has not added to his stature nor greatly advanced the announced objectives of the national administration.

Marshall is the administration's more important witness and he commands more respect in the Congress and in the country itself than any administration spokesman.

But in no important instance has he been able to shake the over-all position taken by General MarArthur.

The President, his Secretary of Defense, his Secretary of State and, it must be presumed, his Chiefs of Staff have challenged or will in one way or another dispute with MacArthur.

The collective assumptions and conclusions of the MacArthur critics, however, remain more in the category of a weak defense than of a convincing counterattack.

Meanwhile, the outside world composed of our apprehensive and critical friends and of our derisive and watchful foes is witnessing the rare spectacle of a nation caught in the meshes of confusion, indecision and rancorous debate.

Let us concede that much of the confusion and some of the indecision may be eliminated if the debate is kept within reasonable bounds and does not become a mere vehicle for personal and partisan bickering, but one basic fact continues to stand:

That is to say, the colossal folly of the manner in which the President dismissed the General. Secretary Marshall's lame explanation was, under the kindest of interpretations, unfortunate. And nothing Mr. Truman has said mitigates in any way the raw and reckless procedure he followed.

Alone and, so we're told, virtually single-handed, the President made an almost unprecedented contribution to national disunity and international uncertainty.

Had his victim been a lesser man or one less devoted to the welfare of the Nation, Mr. Truman might have plunged the country into a political debacle. Fortunately, General MacArthur set aside his natural feelings of resentment and pride and adhered strictly to an objective appraisal of the entire matter.

When the passions and prejudices of this generation have been forgotten by a posterity that will have its own emotional stresses and strains to resolve, the undeserved slights put upon a great man by a small one will remain fresh in the Nation's memory.

And what justification the future may hold for the act of removal itself is not only a subject for current conjecture, but may be one of interminable argument.

For those living in the contemporary world the all-important question is which side in the Truman-MacArthur episode is fundamentally right; which side fundamentally sound in its approach to ways and means for meeting and subduing communism's march.

In all probability, we shall discover in the hard way whether MacArthur's formula of strength or the Truman administration's program of pussyfooting offers, or eventually will offer, the best course to pursue.

Rest assured, if General MacArthur is correct in his view we face a long period of harassment and humiliation, to be followed inescapably by a formidable challenge to our very existence. And even under the Truman-Marshall-Acheson procedure we shall suffer the harassment and the humiliation with no assurance that the final challenge, after all, won't be there waiting for us.

My money remains on MacArthur.